FEB 20 1950

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 95—PART 13

MARCH 14, 1949, TO MAY 10, 1949

(PAGES A1421 TO A2848)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

FEB 10 1920

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Germ Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks a frank, forthright, informative, and timely statement made on Saturday last by Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense. His statement is one of particular interest to the American people, and, in addition, is one of world-wide interest. Secretary Forrestal is to be congratulated in making at this time such a clearly understood statement on the question of biological research or "biological warfare."

War inevitably brings with it the development of new and more effective weapons for the destruction of life or property. Such a new weapon was being developed by our enemies during World War II. This weapon was disease—the production of germs for deliberate introduction into enemy territory to cause sickness or death among its people and livestock or the destruction of its food crops.

Because of its nature the use of this weapon has been called biological warfare.

It is the responsibility of the armed forces of a democratic nation to inform the public of their activities as far as it is consistent with national security. With this responsibility in view, the War Department on January 3, 1946 released a report by Mr. George W. Merck to the Secretary of War.

This release informed the public of the combined efforts of American scientists and industry working with the armed forces, and in cooperation with agencies of our allies, to develop means for defense against possible enemy attacks by biological warfare.

Obviously in the press release concerning the Merck report (which subsequently was withdrawn from circulation), it was not in the national interest to reveal in any detail the extent of progress made in this new field of military research, or to attempt a definite evaluation of the capabilities and limitations of this new weapon.

The announcement was followed by a number of unofficial articles in newspapers and magazines and the subject was also discussed in domestic and foreign radio broadcasts. Owing in some measure to the limitations of official information, a great deal of this discussion was extravagant, inaccurate, and unduly spectacular in the light of present scientific knowledge.

Some was so sensational as to be completely misleading. Such treatment unfortunately overshadowed in the public mind those articles which presented more sober and reasonable reflections on the subject.

Therefore it is felt advisable that the American people be given an official statement concerning the potentialities of biological warfare.

Prompted by intelligence reports of enemy activities in this field during World War II, intensive investigations of the possibilities and potentialities of biological warfare were initiated in the United States in close collaboration with our British and Canadian allies.

These investigations were aimed primarily toward securing for this Nation adequate protection against the possible use of biological warfare by our enemies. Toward this end, Army, Navy, and civilian scientists, universities, private research institutions, industries, and several departments of the Government all worked together.

The Chemical Warfare Service, now the Chemical Corps, was made responsible for the program in the War Department with the cooperation of the Office of the Surgeon General on certain medical aspects. The Navy Department worked in close collaboration with the War Department in this field and made important contributions to the program.

Since these investigations involved many sciences and entirely new approaches, unique facilities had to be constructed to enable us properly to conduct our research.

Actually large-scale biological warfare has never been used by any nation. Our research indicated, however, that germs or their poisonous products could be used effectively as weapons of war.

It was also realized from the results of this wartime research that work in this field could not be neglected in time of peace and had to be continued on a sufficient scale to provide us with adequate defenses and to enable us to utilize this weapon in the future should it become necessary.

As a byproduct of the research on this subject during and following the war much information of great peacetime benefit to mankind in the medical, agricultural, and allied fields has been freely given to the public. Over 160 technical articles describing these investigations have been released through the medium of scientific journals.

Unfortunately, the public has been given an exaggerated impression as to the potency and state of development of biological warfare.

For example, it has been stated that a single plane with a small bomb filled with a biological agent would be capable of wiping out the population of an entire city with a single blow. Such a statement is not in accord with the facts as we know them today.

As a further example, in a recent article it was stated that one ounce of a particular biological material would be sufficient to kill 200,000,000 people. The facts are that it is impossible to spread an ounce of any kind of material for the purposes of warfare in such a manner as to affect even a small percentage of such a tremendous number of persons.

Many other exaggerated statements have appeared. One article stated that biological warfare makes it possible to kill the inhabitants of an entire continent very quickly. Another stated that it would be a simple matter to spread plague in the United States.

Still another maintained that a means is available for spreading various diseases among millions of people by dropping a few capsules from one airplane. Such claims are fantastic and have no basis in fact.

While it would be folly to underestimate the potentialities of biological warfare, there is no factual basis for extravagant claims of the existence of a biological superweapon.

Many articles have described biological warfare as more terrible than the atomic bomb. The fact is that these two weapons differ from one another so basically that a direct comparison is meaningless.

The atomic bomb destroys not only life but also buildings and other structures, and is in that respect similar to high explosives. In addition, atomic radiation may persist indefinitely in contaminated areas and produce serious effects on living matter.

Biological warfare agents, on the other hand, affect only living matter, do not destroy material structures, and, in most cases, are nonpersistent. Death, protracted sickness, or only temporary incapacitation might be produced in man by the selection and dissemination of the proper biological agent.

Biological warfare is an attempt to harness certain forces of nature for purposes of war. In such warfare either epidemic or nonepidemic diseases might be used. In the language of biological warfare, an epidemic disease is one that is easily and rapidly spread from person to person, animal to animal, or plant to plant.

A nonepidemic disease spreads less easily and therefore would be largely restricted to persons, animals, or plants directly exposed to the germs as they were distributed during an attack. In the case of epidemic diseases of man the factors governing spread are not completely understood, and in any case not all are controllable; hence, it is not at all certain that an epidemic of significant proportions could be produced at will.

Even if an epidemic were started, adequate public-health and sanitation measures and proper treatment methods promptly instituted would tend to limit the spread and minimize the effects. The distribution of nonepidemic disease-producing agents and toxins would have to be very widespread to have a decisive effect.

Biological warfare would not be instantly destructive of life and it should be appreciated that illness induced by biological agents may be counteracted by specific medical measures. An important defense against biological warfare lies in the early identification of diseases implanted and prompt

institution of appropriate countermeasures to prevent further spread and restore the health of those affected. But it is obvious that extensive preparation for such defensive measures must be made in advance of an attack.

During times of peace various governmental agencies are concerned with the control of natural outbreaks of disease. Not only our population but also our crops and animals must be protected. To this end the United States Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, other Federal and many State and municipal agencies are always on the alert.

The threat of biological warfare has increased their responsibilities and difficulties. If a biological attack were made, the above agencies, in addition to the armed forces would play an important role in counteracting the implantation and spread of disease.

We must guard not only against natural outbreaks of disease and biological attack in time of war, but also against the use of biological sabotage methods before a declaration of war has been made. Our food supplies would be particularly vulnerable to attack by saboteurs with biological weapons. We must, therefore, rely on the maintenance of our high standards of public health and sanitation, and on our protective measures for animals and crops as our first line of defense against any biological warfare attack.

Appropriate steps are being taken to insure the coordination of the activities of our protective agencies. In addition, an active research program on biological warfare including methods for the prevention and treatment of diseases which might be caused by such warfare is being conducted in the interests of national defense.

Tax Settlement Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following article from the New York Times on the proposed Tax Settlement Board, and to an editorial from the Wall Street Journal on the same subject.

[From the New York Times of March 6, 1946]

SETTLEMENT BOARD FOR TAXES BACKED—PROPOSAL OF REPRESENTATIVE MILLS TO SET UP NEW AGENCY IS VIEWED AS IMPORTANT, TIMELY—SEEN MEETING REAL NEED—WOULD ESTABLISH INEXPENSIVE, SPEEDY WAY TO RESOLVE DISPUTES, SPONSOR SAYS

(By Godfrey N. Nelson)

Whether or not Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, anticipated that the United States Tax Court will be made a court of record, his introduction, on February 24, of his bill (H. R. 2983), in the House of Representatives, the purpose of which is to establish a Tax Settlement Board, is important and timely.

That the Congress will make the Tax Court a court of record appears to be only a question of time. The reasons therefore are impelling. But regardless of when this occurs, there is also a real need for the establishment of a wholly administrative agency whose functions would be to resolve controversies between taxpayers and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In his introduction of the bill on the floor of the House, Representative MILLS stated that its purpose was to establish a board "which could bring about speedy and inexpensive settlement of controversies between taxpayers and the Bureau." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1949, p. 1490.) The board would hear cases which, to the taxpayer, do not justify the expense of a lawsuit.

RECOURSE IS DIFFICULT

At present the taxpayer has, of course, the privilege of conferring with members of the bureau on any adverse treatment of items appearing in his income-tax return. If an agreement is not reached satisfactory to the taxpayer, however, he must either accept the Bureau's decision or incur the expense of filing a petition with the Tax Court. If he pays the asserted deficiency he may, subject to jurisdictional limitations, bring suit for recovery in the United States District Court.

"The proposed Tax Settlement Board," said Mr. MILLS, "would provide an impartial means of settling the dispute at minimum expense and loss of time to the taxpayer and to the Government." Representative MILLS observed that the idea of such a board is not new. He recalled that the Treasury Department had recognized in the early 1920's the need of such an informal appeals agency and recommended its creation.

Accordingly a bill was prepared by the Ways and Means Committee by which a Board of Tax Appeals would be established. Although the bill was adopted by the House, it was amended in the Senate so as to give the Board the formal characteristics of a court. The Treasury, however, had originally recommended a board within the Treasury Department in addition to an independent board or court. The first was intended to be an agency to settle tax cases and the second "to establish precedents for the disposition of other cases pending in the Department." (Quotation from testimony of A. W. Gregg, Solicitor of Internal Revenue, before the Ways and Means Committee.)

TO DETERMINE SETTLEMENT

Mr. MILLS' bill provides that the proposed "Tax Settlement Board shall not require the introduction of evidence and shall not make findings of fact or issue conclusions of law, but shall determine in its discretion what would be a fair settlement of the controversy, having regard to the contentions of the taxpayer and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the probability of establishing the correctness of such contentions in fact and in law." Based thereon, the board would determine and state the amount of deficiency to be paid by the taxpayer and the reasons for such determination.

Thereupon both the Commissioner and the taxpayer would be allowed 30 days in which to file notice of acceptance of the findings. Upon failure to file such notice the settlement would not be binding on either the Commissioner or the taxpayer, and the taxpayer would have the right to file a petition with the Tax Court or to take such other steps as are allowed by law as though there had been no proceedings before the Tax Settlement Board. No part of the proceedings before such board or the findings would ever be admitted in evidence in any court.

The proposed board would be composed of 25 members to be appointed by the President. Hearings would be held at times and places to be prescribed by the chairman of the board. Although the board would have limited jurisdiction, the members of the Tax Court would thus be relieved of many cases now being heard by them.

Under present practice a taxpayer who has filed a petition with the Tax Court may be permitted in advance of trial to review his case with the technical staff of the Bureau with a view to settlement. One of the effects of the bill would be to offer this opportunity in advance of filing a petition.

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1949]

FOR THE SMALL TAXPAYER

To protect the taxpayer who could not afford litigation, Congress, a quarter of a century or so ago, established the Board of Tax Appeals to which aggrieved taxpayers could resort without the expense of hiring legal counsel. Although the name of the board has been changed to the Tax Court of the United States its functions are unchanged and it has remained an administrative body and not part of the judiciary system. So well has the Tax Court fulfilled its functions that the Supreme Court a few years ago held in effect that its findings on questions of fact were final.

A bill (H. R. 2447) is now before Congress proposing to make the Tax Court a court in fact as well as in name. Testifying before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, Mark E. Richardson, chairman of the committee on Federal taxation of the American Institute of Accountants, opposed hasty enactment of the measure. The institute, he explained, had no objection to the idea of a special court to consider tax cases. It did object to leaving the taxpayer without an informal and inexpensive appeals agency.

Mr. Richardson suggested that consideration of the bill be delayed until another measure (H. R. 2983), creating an informal tax settlement board, is enacted. Unless there is such an appeals body, he said, the taxpayer would have no place to take a dispute without considerable expense. This, he suggested, would not increase the confidence of the taxpayer in the Government's fairness.

This newspaper agrees. Due to the growing complexities of tax law the creation of a regular court giving its entire attention to tax problems should be a distinct addition to our judiciary. But it is more important that the small taxpayer should have a tribunal where it will not cost him more to fight a tax dispute than to pay the amount claimed. And this tribunal, like the Tax Court, should be independent of the Treasury.

Oleomargarine

REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, among many other mournful things the housewives of the Nation heard last week the butter lobby had triumphed again. It was something like the expected Dewey victory, it was unexpected. I want it to be known that I am not on the defense, I am on the offensive, as usual. The housewives of the Nation are, under that bill, holding the bag, the oleomargarine bag, if you catch the point. Thirty-five million of them now are expected to be deprived of the right to eat yellow margarine.

It reminds me of the little bit of poetry about the girl who said to her mother—

Mother, may I take a swim?
Yes, my darling daughter.
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb
But don't go near the water.

That bill does not object to the margarine's being manufactured, all it objects to is the American people's getting it and eating it. When that bill comes onto the floor we are going to knock it

into a cocked hat. We are not going to see the American housewife any longer deprived of the right to eat the poor man's spread.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in yesterday's Sunday Star is of interest in this connection:

THE "BUTTERLEGGERS"

The dairy interests have come up with a scare word—"butterlegger"—in their effort to prevent or restrict as tightly as possible the sale of yellow margarine.

This is one of two main lines of attack being pursued by butter spokesmen. The other argument is an economic one. It is said that the price of butter would have to be cut drastically to compete with unrestricted yellow margarine, and that this would have a seriously depressing effect on the butter industry and on those segments of the economy allied with it.

Perhaps this is true. But if so, the corollary is that the butter industry can be maintained only at the price of depriving consumers of a cheaper but equally nutritious product. And that, in turn, would be the antithesis of economic progress.

The butterlegger argument comes down to a contention that yellow margarine is being palmed off on unsuspecting consumers as being butter, the dairy industry having made a survey in Arkansas which indicates that this is being done in a substantial number of restaurants in violation of State law. But if this is true the proper remedy would seem to lie in enforcement of the State law, not in forbidding any sale of yellow margarine.

It certainly is true that many housewives, given the price differential, would buy yellow margarine in preference to butter. Many of them are doing this today, and what the dairy interests really fear is not the butterlegger, but the prospect that with unrestricted sale housewives would willingly and knowingly buy yellow margarine on a scale which would substantially curtail the market for butter.

For years they have tried to prevent this through a penalty tax on colored margarine. But this device, in addition to being none too successful, has become rather thoroughly discredited. So a new tack has been taken.

Last Wednesday the House Agriculture Committee approved a bill which would lift all tax on margarine, but forbid its interstate shipment. An editorial in Thursday's Star erroneously stated that the effect of this would be to require housewives in the district and in 35 States which do not have their own manufacturing plants to continue to pay the old 10-cent tax on each pound of colored margarine.

Actually the effect would be much worse. Consumers in the District and the States lacking manufacturing plants would not be able to buy the colored product at all. In other words, to enact this bill would be to give butter a very substantial national monopoly at the expense of the consumer. Needless to say, it should not be passed.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the State Republican convention in Grand Rapids, Mich., on socialized medicine.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more apparent that socialized medicine is not needed in this country. It would mean a lowering of the quality of medical care. It would not be satisfactory to either the doctor or the public. Before this Congress takes any action toward fastening a socialized-medical system on the American people, they ought to study more closely just what has happened in England.

In a few days, I expect to propose a resolution which will set up a committee composed of Members of both Houses of Congress, and others which will have for its purpose a thorough study of socialized medicine as it is practiced around the world, particularly in England. The committee will also study all phases of voluntary plans now being carried on in the United States and make such other suggestions as they see fit for the consideration of Congress.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Socialized medicine is not the answer to the country's health problems. Our medical and health problems will be better solved by enabling more qualified individuals to train for the medical profession by lifting educational bars to racial minorities so that they may participate in medical and dental training and practice, by relaxation of Federal taxation so that the States may handle their responsibility in this connection, and by the spread of private health service plans.

Basing-Point System "Bunk" and Hypocrisy, Says Important Member of Cement Institute—System Unfair to Small Business—Misinformation Disseminated To Create Confusion in Minds of Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, through the basing-point system, prices are fixed down to the seventh decimal point, as evidenced in the case of cement. The following statement, which was submitted in the trial of a case, is self-explanatory:

SPECIFICATIONS: SERIAL NO. ER-W911-36-219

Abstracts of bids for furnishing and delivering 6,000 barrels of cement, received in response to invitation for bids dated April 8, 1936, and opened April 23, 1936, at the United States engineers office, Tucumcari, N. Mex.

Balance available, appropriation 013028, emergency relief, War, Rivers and Harbors, flood control, etc., 1935–47: $998,769.95.

No. of bid	Name and address of bidder	Total price	Discount (days)
1	Monarch Cement Co., Humboldt, Kans	$3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
2	Ash Grove Lime & Portland Cement Co., Kansas City, Mo	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Kansas City, Mo	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
4	Southwestern Portland Cement Co., El Paso, Tex	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
5	Oklahoma Portland Cement Co., Oklahoma City, Okla	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
6	United States Portland Cement Co., Denver, Colo	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
7	Consolidated Cement Corp., Fredonia, Kans	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
8	Trinity Portland Cement Co., Dallas, Tex	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
9	Lone Star Cement Co., Dallas, Tex	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
10	Universal Atlas Cement Co., Waco, Tex	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.
11	Colorado Portland Cement Co., Denver, Colo	3.286854	10 cents per barrel, 15 days.

Award made to bidder No. 3, Lehigh Portland Cement Co. One of 11 equally low bidders. Award made by lot.

I certify that the foregoing is a true abstract of all proposals received.

JAMES H. STRATTON,
Captain, Corps of Engineers, Assistant.

This is not just an accident; it is done all the time. Such identical bidding has been going on for 25 or 30 years in all contracts. The Supreme Court has finally outlawed it. Now an effort is being made to legalize such a system.

During the trial of the Cement case in New York City of June 7, 1934, there was inserted in the record a letter that was written a few days before by John Treanor, who was chairman of the Marketing Committee of the Cement Institute, a director of the Cement Institute, and the president of one of the principal members of the Cement Institute—the Riverside Cement Co., of Riverside, Calif. Mr. Treanor was a member of the committee designing the propaganda that was intended to cause Members of Congress, State legislators, county commissioners, county engineers, mayors, and city managers and city engineers to have the right attitude toward the cement trust. The letter accepted as evidence by the Supreme Court of the United States was written after the Federal Trade Commission had been attempting and after the Federal Government, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt, had pleaded with the cement industry to submit to the Federal Government f. o. b. mill bids so as to avoid price fixing. The letter was written to another director of the Cement Institute, B. H. Rader, the vice president of another one of the Big Five, the Lehigh Portland Cement Co., and also a director of the Institute in Chicago.

The letter is as follows:

COMMISSION'S EXHIBIT NO. 7A, A LETTER DATED MAY 17, 1934, ADDRESSED TO B. H. RADER, REGIONAL MANAGER, THE CEMENT INSTITUTE

DEAR BUD: I have been thinking about your telephone call, from which I get the impression that you sent a pretty unyielding telegram to Murray—as you say at least that you "did not intend to make any concession before the trading starts."

Now I would have conceded the mill price at once on Federal business and I would have indicated a very open-minded attitude toward the larger question; and this to create

the impression, deliberately, that something besides obstruction and short-range trading can be had out of the cement industry. I would have taken advantage of this great opportunity to lay a telegram on the President's desk which he would have read. We know he is watching the cement question. I would have tried to strike a new note of cooperation and reasonableness, in contrast with what Ickes and the Federal Trade Commission tell him about us. This could have been the beginning of a real campaign for that is why I am writing you. The only thing that I think has been lost is a neat opportunity to score our point with the President himself.

As a member of this industry, my fate is to a considerable extent in your hands, so that I have both a right and a duty to let you know my views.

If we were a generally well-regarded industry, we might be justified in taking a stiff trading position upon the President's request. However, we are anything but popular, we have a very difficult position to maneuver out of, and we should not gamble unnecessarily, running as we do the risk of a blast from the President's office that may be ruinous.

The f. o. b. mill price on Federal business is of no real importance, is entirely practical to grant, can and I think will, be forced out of us—therefore good trading would have been to give it without any trading.

Now, when it comes to the larger question of mill price on commercial business, much as I would like to think otherwise, I am convinced that we will have to maintain our basing-point position and refuse the President's request. It will not be an easy refusal to defend upon economic grounds. It will be almost impossible to persuade an unsympathetic Government that we are justified in our refusal. But the least we can do is to prepare the way by an initial showing of open-mindedness, which might entitle our later argument to sympathetic hearing.

NOTICE THE PHRASE "SHEER 'BUNK' AND HYPOCRISY"

Do you think any of the arguments for the basing-point system, which we have thus far advanced, will arouse anything but derision in and out of the Government? I have read them all recently. Some of them are very clever and ingenious. They amount to this however: That we price this way in order to discourage monopolistic practices and to preserve free competition, etc. This is sheer bunk and hypocrisy. The truth is, of course—and there can be no serious, respectable discussion of our case unless this is acknowledged—that ours is an industry above all others that cannot stand free competition, that must systematically restrain competition or be ruined. We sell in a buyers' market all the time. The capital cost, as distinguished from the out-of-pocket cost, of producing cement is extraordinarily large. In free competition this capital cost is whittled away and this means loss and ruin.

Now an industry in this fix needs some sympathetic understanding on the part of the Government. I think our case can be made out, but it is not going to be done by the route of hard-boiled short-range trading. We are either dealing with a very important large question of public relations or we are not. If we are not, we don't have to be so careful of our methods. If we are, then we had better approach the question in a large way; and the first approach is to acquire some good will in governmental quarters. All that we need for our reasonable prosperity is consistence with the President's original plan for NRA.

I haven't seen the telegram you sent. This letter may be unwarranted and is pretty sure to make you sore, but it is based upon your remark about "trading" and upon some general views of industry policy which I heard advanced by some of the very influential men of our industry.

Yours truly,

JOHN TREANOR.

Government Cost Goes Up, Up, and Up

REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, as we approach the last day for the payment of 1948 income taxes, someone should say a word in behalf of America's forgotten citizens—the millions of income taxpayers.

During the first 3 years of our National Government—1789 to 1791, inclusive—the total amount of taxes collected to operate the Federal Government was $4,418,013. This, mind you, was for 3 years, not 1. In the fiscal year 1948 Federal tax collections amounted to $44,745,542,076 or 30,000 times the amount of taxes levied in any one of the first 3 years of the George Washington administration.

The amount of money our Federal Government collected in taxes in a single day in the fiscal year 1948 was sufficient to have operated the Federal Government for more than 100 years at the George Washington administration's rate of spending.

I admit the figures are not fair. The Nation's population is greater now than in Washington's time. So, let us look at the figures in another way.

In George Washington's administration the Federal Government collected 37 cents a year per capita from the American people. In 1948, our Federal Government collected almost 900 times that much per capita from its citizens, or an increase of 85,100 percent above the amount of taxes levied by Alexander Hamilton, who was Washington's Secretary of the Treasury.

This 37 cents a year per capita for Federal taxes in the George Washington administration had risen to only $1.59 a year per capita by the first year, 1860, of Abraham Lincoln's term as President.

By 1910 the American people were paying $6.78 a year per capita in taxes and by 1930, only 18 years ago, Federal taxes amounted to only $29.54 a year per capita.

Last year, Federal taxes collected from the American people was approximately $315 a person or about $1,260 for the average American family of four members.

The per capita taxes collected from the American people last year were 900 times those collected in Washington's administration; almost 200 times the per capita taxes of the first year of the Lincoln administration; 47 times the per capita taxes of 1910 and more than 10 times the per capita taxes collected in 1930.

MONEY UNLIMITED

An Ohio Member of Congress said to me the other day that he had heard someone remark that if all the annual Federal taxes which now are collected from the American people were paid in $1,000 bills that these annual tax payments would build a pile of $1,000 bills as high as the Empire State Building.

I asked a banker about this. He measured up a pile of 1,000 crisp new $1 bills, which are of the same thickness—or should I say thinness—as $1,000 bills. That measurement revealed that one thousand $1,000 bills, $1,000,000, would make a pile 4 inches high.

A billion-dollar pile of $1,000 bills therefore would be 1,000 times 4 inches in height or 4,000 inches tall or 333 feet high. Since our last year's Federal collection of taxes amounted to more than $44,000,000,000, it would require a pile $1,000 bills to a height of 44 times 333 feet or 14,652 feet high to contain $44,000,000,000. This would be a pile about 2½ miles high or 26 times as tall as the Washington Monument.

The national debt, now $252,000,000,000 is approximately six times last year's tax collections. To pay off that national debt would require a pile of crisp new $1,000 bills that, if neatly piled on top of each other would extend 15 miles into the sky.

Such being the financial climb that is ahead, before we Americans get out of the financial hole in which we find ourselves, Congress should begin pruning extravagance and wasteful spending wherever it finds it.

The Hoover Commission reports offer some happy suggestions as to many places where the pruning shears could be used to the great advantage of America's forgotten man—the taxpayer.

American Legion Pension Bill—Speech of Gen. John Thomas Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered over the radio on Saturday, March 12, by Gen. John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, on the veterans' pensions bill, usually referred to as the Rankin bill, which General Taylor calls the American Legion pension bill.

I hope every Member of Congress, and especially the ones who have been misrepresenting this program, as well as everyone else throughout the country, will take the time to read this speech.

An article published in a local paper on yesterday shows the hand of the opposition to this veterans' bill. They are

trying to get legislation passed that will force the whole country under a program of social security, which would mean that the old World War I veteran, when he passes the age of his earning capacity, and has nothing on which to live, may seek refuge in the county poorhouse.

In that connection, I want to read you from a report by Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget, under date of March 7, 1949, on this question.

Here is what Director Pace says:

Apart from these expenditures for veterans' programs—

Note that, Mr. Speaker, he says:

Apart from these expenditures for veterans' programs, the costs of the expanded social insurance system are expected to reach a peak of $15,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 annually by 1990.

That is many, many, many times as much as this pension bill could possibly cost, even at its peak. Remember that a large portion of that money is to come out of Federal revenues, and as I said, the old soldiers, and especially the World War I veterans, would be practically left out.

The rest of you can do as you please, but so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to see these old veterans go to the poorhouse in order to get something to eat in their declining years if I can prevent it.

General Taylor's speech reads as follows:

First, I want to make it absolutely clear that the American Legion, now numbering 3,500,000 men and women who honorably served in the armed forces of our country in the two great world wars, and the American Legion Auxiliary, with a membership of approximately 1,000,000, are wholeheartedly supporting the American Legion bill (H. R. 2681) providing service pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II, which was favorably reported to the House of Representatives by its Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I make this statement so there can be no doubt in anyone's mind as to our stand on this important legislation, and also to counteract the whispering campaign conducted by some opponents of this legislation to the effect that the Legion is not in favor of pension legislation.

There is nothing new in the suggested policy of providing pensions for veterans of the two great world wars. In fact, the policy has been traditional, and was inaugurated in the early days of our great democracy, when service pensions were provided for veterans of the Revolutionary War. This policy has been adhered to by the country down through the years. Pensions were provided for veterans of the War Between the States, and at present pensions are being paid to all veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows.

At the National Convention of the American Legion, held in the city of Miami, Fla., last fall, resolutions were adopted calling on Congress to enact legislation granting service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II. In addition to service pensions to be paid all veterans at age 60 and 65, the Legion resolutions advocated nonservice-connected disability pensions for veterans below the age of 60. Companion bills H. R. 1692 and S. 596 were introduced for the American Legion in the House and Senate to carry out our mandates.

The first hearings conducted by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs were on the Legion pension bill and other similar bills. Testimony was received by the committee from Members of Congress, officials of the Veterans' Administration, and representatives of veterans' organizations. The chairman of the Committee, Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, presented the opportunity to be heard on these pension bills to anyone desiring to testify.

Following the hearings the committee ordered our bill (H. R. 1693) favorably reported to the House, as rewritten, with instructions to Chairman RANKIN to request speedy consideration and passage. The bill received the new number, H. R. 2681.

The bill reported by the committee provides a general pension for all veterans of $90 per month at age 65, regardless of physical or financial condition, who served not less than 90 days during World War I or World War II, and were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Such a pension is at present being paid to veterans of the Spanish-American War and, in addition, veterans of that war, upon reaching age 62, receive a $43.20 monthly pension. There is no provision in the Legion pension bill, as reported, for any pension for veterans under age 65.

The Legion bill further provides $120 per month pension to any veteran who, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, is helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

The bill also places widows of veterans of World War I and World War II upon the same basis, and the income limitation for widows and children without dependents is $2,000, and, with dependents, to $3,000.

As has been the case in the past, every time new legislation is proposed in the Congress providing any benefits for veterans a campaign is immediately developed by opponents of veterans' benefits, who have resorted to their usual policy of gross misrepresentation, and in the present case, to conducting a smear campaign unequaled in the past. Some newspapers and other periodicals, in their news and editorial columns, and in the writings of individual columnists, have not only failed to make an accurate report as the provisions of the pension bill, but have grossly exaggerated its estimated cost.

These publications and individuals opposed to the pension have uniformly referred to the proposed legislation as the "multibillion dollar pension bill." Their astronomical figures are arrived at on the basis that every single veteran of World War I and World War II will live to the age of 65 and receive the pension, whereas they know that at least 10,000 veterans of World War I are dying every month, and the number of deaths among these and the older World War II veterans will greatly accelerate during the next few years, thereby reducing each year the number of such veterans eligible for the pension. An estimated $2,000,000,000 was publicized as the cost of the pension plan for the first year, whereas the actual cost will be less than $65,000,000.

Other evidence of the desperation and unfairness of opponents of the American Legion's pension bill is the quoting and publication of tremendous figures covering the total cost of the pension plan over the next 50 years of as high as $200,000,000,000. Seldom do Government agencies quote ultimate costs of Government expenditures on specific subjects. Such gross figures are not used in other items in Government appropriations, such as social security, farm aid, national defense, rural electrification, etc. How then can an exaggerated accumulated figure be used in connection with a World War veterans' pension?

The latest development in the vicious and malicious campaign of opponents to the veterans' pension is the revival of an old and often discredited custom. Knowing that the Legion pension bill cannot be defeated on its merits, they are now resorting to personalities, unfairly attacking congressional supporters of our bill, particularly Chairman RANKIN, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary. As stated before, they have deliberately misrepresented and falsified the Legion's stand, knowing very well that the entire organization of the American Legion and the American Legion auxiliary are definitely on record in support of the pension legislation, not only having actively supported but having originally sponsored the pension bill.

It has been stated by those opposed to the service pension that World War veterans in their declining years may enjoy the benefits of social security which veterans of previous wars did not enjoy. Only a small minority of the working people today participate in the benefits of old-age insurance, which means that only a small minority of veterans are participants in social security. Furthermore, the social security is a form of insurance paid for by its beneficiaries, and such veterans as may be covered are paying their full share for any benefits they may receive.

Now, let us briefly review the history of service pensions such as is provided in the pension bill. The country has always heretofore recognized men and women who served in the armed forces during conflict. On every occasion when the country has found it necessary to go to war men and women who entered the service, whether voluntarily or otherwise, were assured that a grateful Nation would remember them, that when they were disabled or aged they would never be in want. Some who gave this assurance in flowery oratory and comments in the press have already either forgotten or have retracted their promises, and are now resorting to every means they can conceive to deprive these same men and women of some security in their old age which a service pension would provide.

Another justification for a service pension is the fact that a very high percentage of disability cases among veterans are service connected, although there may be no direct evidence that the disability is service connected. Throughout the entire organization of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary requests are received from disabled veterans seeking assistance in securing rights and benefits due them under the laws Congress has passed for their protection. It has been our experience that, in far too numerous cases, a veteran has been deprived of the full benefits of the law because of some technical, procedural requirement of the administrative governmental agency handling his or her case. The pension bill will be of much assistance in remedying this situation. It is designed to apply equally to all veterans and may be applied with a minimum of administrative difficulty.

A large number of veterans, particularly of World War I, have reached the age of 65. For nearly all of them it is impossible to secure employment and earn their own livelihood. They have not been able to accumulate sufficient worldly goods to provide for their care during their old age. They have become a charge and expense to States and local communities, where their names will be found on relief rolls. These are the same men and women who were sent off to war to the accompaniament of martial music from bands ringing in their ears, the cheers of the populace and the promises and assurances that they would never be forgotten.

The American Legion feels that the security of veterans in their old age is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is a much greater and far more deserving responsibility than the care and assistance granted to the peoples of a large number of foreign countries on which the

United States has spent, is now spending—and will continue to spend—for an indefinite period many, many billions of dollars.

On Wednesday, the 9th, the Rules Committee voted to take no action at this time on our bill, although we had assurance that more than a majority of that committee would vote to bring the pension bill to the floor of the House for consideration.

Heretofore, it has not been possible to bring bills before the House unless permission was granted by the Rules Committee. However, on January 3 the House changed their general rules in a way to strip the Rules Committee of its blockading powers, and provided if they refuse to grant permission for consideration of the bill within 21 days after the request has been made, then the chairman of the standing committee may bring the bill up on the floor of the House as a privileged piece of legislation. In addition, there is a 60-year-old rule of the House, which has not been changed, and which will permit the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to bring up the pension bill at any time. Under this old rule, pension bills were made privileged motions, and the committee chairman must be recognized when he is ready to offer one. Therefore, there are two rules under which Chairman RANKIN can secure consideration of the pension bill on the floor of the House, and unquestionably the bill will be given such consideration at an early date.

When the pension bill is considered, it is expected that opponents of the bill will use every trick in the parliamentary bag to defeat it. Numerous amendments will no doubt be offered, not to improve the bill, but in an effort to load it down in such a way that it will not pass.

The American Legion, the American Legion Auxiliary—and, I am convinced, the overwhelming majority of our citizens who believe the Government should fulfill its just obligations to our veterans—will be watching the actions and votes of our elected Representatives in Congress. They are convinced of the great need of such legislation to enable the country to fairly and adequately give our veterans the consideration and care which they have so nobly and courageously earned. They feel that the country owes a debt to our war dead and to our veterans that can never be paid in full. They feel that the responsibility of our Government to the veteran holds first priority among all governmental obligations and duties, and that the enactment of the American Legion pension bill would be an expression of the Nation's appreciation of services rendered.

They are confident that the Congress will ignore the vicious, unfair conduct of those who have fought the pension bill through a smear campaign of misrepresentation and vilification, and will carry on the long-established tradition of a grateful Government by promptly passing our bill to grant a pension to the veterans of our two great wars.

Seventy-five-Cent Minimum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGO S. SIMS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post March 12, 1949.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I voted with the majority in a 13-to-12 vote which resulted in reporting out the 75-cent-minimum-wage bill. In the committee I attempted, by amendment, to modify the bill by providing that the 75-cent minimum would go into effect over a 7-year period. If my amendment had been adopted, the 75-cent minimum wage would be reached in exactly the same manner that the 40-cent minimum wage was reached as a result of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The Post editorial is as follows:

SEVENTY-FIVE-CENT MINIMUM

The lifting of the minimum-wage rate from the present level of 40 cents to 75 cents per hour, as provided in the bill just approved by the House Labor Committee, is an adjustment made necessary by the great increase in living costs since enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Representative BAILEY estimates that about 5,000,000 workers would benefit from the proposed increase in minimum pay, of whom a million and a half earn less than 40 cents an hour. If these estimates can be relied on, it is obvious that some employers will find it difficult, if not impossible, to meet the new scale of rates. In any case, the bill is defective in not providing for a succession of increases in pay that would allow time for essential adjustments, as was permitted under the original Fair Labor Standards Act.

The committee bill has been improved by discarding a plan incorporated in the original administration bill that would have permitted industry committees to raise the minimum rate of pay to the dollar level. That proposal would have opened the door to haggling over rates of pay and was not calculated to further the purpose of minimum-wage legislation. But in our opinion there should be some arrangement for administrative adjustment of minimum-wage rates to allow for future changes in living costs without an appeal to Congress for amending legislation.

While coverage is extended under the House bill to embrace 2,000,000 additional workers, a proposal to extend the wage-hour law to activities affecting commerce fortunately has been dropped, and exemptions applying to retail establishments have been clearly defined. The bill also provides that overtime payments must be calculated on the basis of regular rates of pay, so defined as to avoid overtime-on-overtime payments. Most important of all, of course, is the proposed change in the minimum rate. This ought to be approved, though it is to be hoped provision will be made for a step-by-step approach.

Some Straight Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Journal of Sturgis, Mich., which appeared during the week of March 7, 1949.

Here is a country editor who has put his finger on some of the issues before the American people with unerring truth.

THE PRESIDENT FLOUNDERS

The plight of President Harry S. Truman today is indeed sad.

Congress is deadlocked over the filibuster and not a single item on his legislative program has been enacted.

Although there are Democratic majorities in both the Senate and House, Mr. Truman has lost control of Congress. In his Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner speech he threatened to stump the country to build a fire under Congress. Thus he plans to go over Congress' head and take the fight to the people.

When he claims that the Eighty-first Congress is what amounts to a do-nothing Congress, to recall a phrase, he is attacking his own party.

Mr. Truman has asked for trouble. He has jumped hastily into one program after another without conferring with congressional leaders of his own party. His stand on the North Atlantic Defense Pact couldn't be explained by Chairman TOM CONNALLY, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Without sounding out opinions of the Democratic majorities, he presented a watered-down version of the Taft-Hartley Act which is getting nowhere. His minimum-wage legislation has been weighed down by so many Labor Department amendments that it is swamped in a whirlpool of confusion. He has outraged his own staff by such spontaneous public utterances as his "s. o. b." reference to Drew Pearson.

It is not pleasant to see a President flounder.

It is less pleasant to consider where his madcap policies are leading this country.

As a graduate of the Kansas City Pendergast machine, Mr. Truman realizes the value of a vote. He will stoop to any depth to get the vote—even as deep as selling the country down the river.

That is exactly where his socialistic program will end up—with the United States on the scrap heap. Mr. Truman proposes more Federal aid to all classes of voting citizens with the idea of perpetuating his own political crowd. His proposals run on the one-way street to socialisim and collectivism. Through taxation he would control and destroy production and would have the Federal Government take on such huge and widespread functions that the private citizen would be lost under perpetual inflation of ever-increasing taxes. Mr. Truman would make the State master of the citizen—just the reverse of the American tradition. Perhaps that is not the end he has in mind, but that is undeniably where he is leading us.

Because of the mountains of propaganda ground out by the bureaucratic agencies in Washington, John Q. Public often forgets that the American economic system pays the world's highest wages while selling at the world's lowest prices.

Mr. Truman would scrap this system and drag us down to the poverty level of the European socialistic regimes.

Private enterprise plus the profit-and-loss system make it possible for the average worker to earn a package of cigarettes in 9 minutes of labor. The British worker must toil 84 minutes for the same item, and Russian workers (those who get paid) have to work 124 minutes.

Mr. Truman is trying to sell the country on socialized medicine, not because the country is asking for it, not because it will improve health standards, not because it will reduce the costs of medical and hospital care, but because he sees a chance to grab more votes. Administrative whips are reminding Democrats of the latest English byelection at Hammersmith to show what socialized medicine will do for the politicians. In Hammer-

smith the Labor Party candidate was elected because he ran on the party's health-insurance record. Because of such policies the Labor Party has won the 48 last byelections in England. This they have done at the expense of reducing England to a second-rate power which must borrow from the United States time after time to forestall the inevitable bankruptcy that has befallen every planned-economy government in history.

Mr. Truman's policies would do these same things to the United States. They have done the same thing to France, Italy, Belgium, and Nazi Germany. World's best example of a planned economy is, of course, Communist Russia.

How could Mr. Truman bankrupt the United States? One way would be for him to continue to advocate that taxes be kept at their present high level so that the national debt can be retired while at the same time he advocates more Federal aid to States and local governmental units. How would this aid be paid? Not out of cash balances, because there are none available. Federal aid would be paid by selling more Government bonds, thereby taking more cash out of the hands of the public. To top off this madness, the President asks for more taxes in the form of pay-roll deductions for old-age insurance, unemployment insurance, and socialized medicine.

Last year Federal and local taxes grabbed 23 percent of all goods and services produced by this Nation. And yet Mr. Truman wants still a bigger share.

Those Americans who have the good of the country at heart must realize that the pendulum has swung as far to the left as it can possibly go without a catastrophe.

The time is ripe for the Republican Party to declare war on Truman's form of socialism and advocate a return to the freedoms which have made the United States of America the greatest Nation in the world's history.

Ideals, traditions, freedom, private property, free will, and the Nation are at stake. Let the Republican Party take the side of freedom and private enterprise. There is a great need for such action, for it will be the salvation of the land.—R. E. H.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, when developed, will be the most important inland waterway in the entire world.

It will tie Alabama's water transportation heart, the great port of Mobile, the great industrial city of Birmingham, and the coal fields of Walker County, Ala., by water highway to Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia, Decatur, Guntersville, Huntsville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville on the Tennessee; to Cincinnati and Pittsburgh on the Ohio; to New Orleans, Memphis, St. Louis, and Minneapolis on the Mississippi; to Chicago on the Illinois; and to Kansas and Sioux City on the Missouri.

But this does not tell the full story of this great proposed waterway. The Mississippi is the greatest waterway in the world for downstream traffic. The current is swift and for that reason boats and barges that move down the Mississippi are put to tremendous expense in navigating the current back upstream. This Tennessee-Tombigbee project would allow the boats and barges that come down the Mississippi filled with the commerce of the North and West to return to their destination by way of the intercoastal waterway to Mobile, thence up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee River. From that point these boats and barges can make connections with the cities and rivers already mentioned. The entire return trip from New Orleans to Cairo, Ill., would be in slack water to the Tennessee River and from the Tennessee River to Cairo, Ill., downstream. These boats and barges will, in my judgment, load themselves with the raw materials of the South, cotton, cottonseed, lumber from the magnificent hardwood and pine forests of the deep South, oil from the new fields in Alabama and Mississippi, salt from the newly discovered salt deposits of south Alabama, coal from the Alabama coal field, iron ore from Birmingham and Russellville, Ala.

One of the largest deposits of brown iron ore in the United States is located in Franklin County, Ala., where I was raised, and in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here. These brown iron-ore deposits are less than 50 miles from this proposed waterway.

In fact, the territory through which this project would move is laden with raw materials, many of which are untouched and undeveloped. The building of this proposed waterway would stimulate the development of these raw materials and make the Tennessee-Tombigbee project an artery of inland-water commerce second to none in the entire world. There is no selfishness involved here. While this project would mean much in the years to come to the congressional district which I represent, yet it would undoubtedly mean as much or more to St. Louis, Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cairo, Chattanooga, and Knoxville. This waterway will work to the great benefit of the people of the United States. Boats and barges serving the Mississippi River traffic downstream to New Orleans will be able to return to their place of origin at a saving of thousands of dollars in fuel bills alone. When you add to that fact the fact that these same boats and barges will be able to carry loads of our southern raw materials on the return trip, you have real economy and this project will save in freight rates in a very few years its entire cost of construction.

The Army engineers have said that the plan is practical; they have done the preliminary surveying and engineering work; they have recommended this waterway for construction.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway would connect our great atomic-energy defense plant, covering many square miles, and using untold tons of raw materials at Oak Ridge, Tenn., to the Gulf of Mexico, through the port of Mobile, Ala., and cut the water distance between the two points by 800 miles. In my judgment, the Oak Ridge, Tenn., atomic plant will continue to be of the highest importance and significance for years to come. I am using it as an example because it strategically illustrates the need for this waterway development, and the benefit of such development to the people of this entire country.

The President did not see fit to include funds for beginning the construction of this waterway in the budget for the fiscal year 1950. But, believing that this project is of major importance, we are asking the Appropriations Committee for $10,000,000 with which to begin construction on this great waterway.

I do not oppose foreign spending where it appears to be necessary for the future security and safety of this great country of ours. But I do call your attention to the fact that we must use at least a part of our wealth to improve this country of ours for the benefit of our own people. This waterway will stimulate the development of business and commerce and its direct and indirect benefits will be, in 20 years, several times its cost. This project is primarily concerned with navigation. It will be accomplished by digging a canal about 25 miles long through a sand ridge, and the building of the necessary locks to maintain a sufficient depth of water for the boats and barges using the waterway.

The Army engineers say that the plan is practical and is economically justified. The Tennessee Valley Authority says that a direct connection to the Gulf by water would provide a new transportation route of great importance and would assist in the stimulation of commerce, agriculture, and industry in the Tennessee Valley.

There would be intangible benefits arising from the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, including the stimulation of new production of undeveloped raw materials, and the provision of a shorter water highway between the Gulf and northern inland cities. This waterway would be used in time of war for the movement of strategic supplies and materials and for the craft and munitions of war. Last, but not least, the improvement of recreational facilities and land values in the tributary area are beyond calculation.

I trust that the Appropriations Committee will recommend this appropriation, and that the House of Representatives will vote it.

The Old Slater Mill and Cotton Manufacturing in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1949, marks the one hundred sixtieth anniversary of cotton manufacturing in America.

Because of the important part this industry plays in our Nation's economy, its

one hundred sixtieth birthday should not be allowed to pass without notice.

In the hope of focusing attention on this great industry, which provides the means of livelihood for hundreds of thousands of our people and clothing for millions of them to wear, I have introduced the bill, H. R. 3277, which provides that the Postmaster General issue, during 1949, a special postage stamp bearing a reproduction of the Old Slater Mill in Pawtucket, R. I., "the cradle of the American cotton industry."

While there exists interest in cotton manufacturing to a marked degree in 23 States that manufacture cotton, and this interest is also strong in cotton-growing States from Virginia to California, it is hoped that a full realization of the importance of manufacturing and growing of cotton can be brought to all our citizens. I know of no better way to do that than through the issuance of a special postage stamp.

We in Rhode Island have an extra special interest in the cotton manufacturing industry because it is the basic industry in our State. But further than that, we take pride in pointing out that the first cotton-textile mill in America is located in the city of Pawtucket, R. I.

The original building—the Old Slater Mill—still stands. It is being preserved, and plans are going forward to develop it as a museum of cotton manufacturing.

It is interesting to look back 160 years and to realize that the first cotton-working machinery in America was the brain child, so to speak, of Samuel Slater, who came from England to America with the deliberate intention of building cotton mills.

At the time Slater came to America, there were in England a few cotton mills operating by steam power. Arkwright and Strutt held patents in England on some cotton-working machinery but their patents were revoked by the English courts. It was estimated at that time that there were in England 30,000 cotton workers using machines and systems for which Arkwright and Strutt were largely responsible.

England tried to prevent export or duplication of the then existing machinery but Slater had what might well be termed a photographic memory and upon arriving in America began to build from memory—without the benefit of drawings or models—duplicates of the power-driven cotton-spinning machinery which Arkwright had developed so successfully in England.

Slater's efforts were crowned with success when in 1790 his dream became a reality and his cotton-spinning and preparatory machinery began to function. In 1793 all his machinery was transferred to a new factory building, on the shore of the Blackstone River, in Pawtucket, R. I., the very building which is now known as the Old Slater Mill.

We may be pardoned, I am sure, for taking justifiable pride in our claim to fame and for asking that a reproduction of the Old Slater Mill appear on a special postage stamp commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of cotton manufacturing in America.

Seventy-five-Cent Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Education and Labor is to be congratulated on its action of reporting favorably on the 75-cent minimum wage bill.

I am incorporating with my remarks a letter from an employer in Evansville, Ind., who endorses this legislation.

NATIONAL FURNITURE
MANUFACTURING CO.,
Evansville, Ind., March 11, 1949.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The evening newspaper advises that the House Committee on Labor and Education has passed on a 75-cent minimum wage bill, and I would like to go on record as saying that I feel this is a very good measure and wish to congratulate the members of the House committee for doing same.

I hope that the Senate takes favorable action on this bill. If favorable action is taken, it will mean that all manufacturers will have an equalized minimum base, and that an efficient plant will not have to suffer because of low wages paid by submarginal producers.

Thanking you for your consideration of the above, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DAN F. CALDEMEYER, *President.*

Guns For Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many aspects of the North American Alliance and one which is very controversial is that of the United States providing munitions of war to western Europe.

Mr. Robert Boyer, editor of the Altoona Tribune, on Saturday, February 26, carried in the editorial column of his paper the following editorial—Guns for Russia?

Upon reading this editorial, I could not help but think of what happened in China not so many weeks ago when the Chinese Communists marched into Tsingtao, equipped with American-manufactured six-wheel trucks, weapons carriers, and jeeps. These American-manufactured necessities of war were taken from the Chinese Nationalist Army, whom we equipped with them.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Boyer, when he wrote the following editorial, had in mind that the same thing can happen on the continent of Europe that happened in China.

Mr. Boyer's editorial follows:

GUNS FOR RUSSIA?

A tremendously important aspect of the North Atlantic alliance and the program for this country to provide munitions of war to western Europe was mentioned by Senator TAFT the other day.

It is this: Is it wise to provide western Europe with all the equipment for modern war considering that the Soviet army could, according to most estimates, occupy the entire Atlantic-seaboard region of Europe within 1 or 2 months' time?

The estimates, of course, vary, for it depends, naturally, upon the time, and the state of Allied preparedness. But, if war were to come at this time, military men have said there is little to stop the Soviet armies in their march to the sea.

A dispatch from Finland announces that Russian troops have been moved up to the Norwegian border. It was further said that there was almost nothing to stop Soviet invasion of Norway and the Scandinavian Peninsula from the north.

Just prior to World War II, Holland assured Mr. Churchill, the former Prime Minister says in his memoirs of the war, that it could hold invading Germans for weeks by means of water barriers—flooding whole areas, from the dikes and sea walls.

But they didn't, said Mr. Churchill. They did not get a chance to open their flood gates.

There is every reason now to believe that if Russia wanted to bring her aggressive policy to the point of war, she could invade western Europe from the north and the south simultaneously, while her heavy central armies drove against our comparatively small occupational forces in central Europe.

Since it is reasonable to expect that it would be several years before western Europe could perfect armies sufficient to halt invaders, the question naturally arises as to the wisdom of putting large supplies of American war equipment in the path of prospective invading Red hordes.

It is said in Washington that the amount to be asked of Congress for rearming western Europe would be in the neighborhood of a billion dollars * * * probably nearer two, when the thing is done. This is in addition to an estimated $600,000,000 for arms for Greece, Turkey, China, and Korea.

American munitions are being spread around the world. Soon, Russia could take almost any sector and capture vast amounts of war equipment made in America, to be turned against us.

The value of trying to arm doubtful foreign armies in order to dissuade the Russians from war seems, indeed, to be a dubious prospect when viewed beside the ultimate threat that this country could aim at aggressors if our military strength were concentrated in dependable and maneuverable form.

The doubtful aspects of arming western Europe are emphasized by the statement of the French Communists that, in the event of war, they would back, not their native France, but Soviet Russia.

Could we count on a French Army, even though well equipped with American arms, as long as the Communists hold an influential place in French life and politics, as they undoubtedly do?

What reason have Mr. Acheson and other administration leaders to believe that western Europe could do a better job of holding the Russians than a prosperous, well-armed, and relatively well-off western Europe did against the Nazis in 1940?

Hitler hordes went through western Europe in a few weeks' time.

Western Europe is devastated by war. Its people are sick of war, and with little will to fight, according to every report we have seen from the Continent. It has no ready re-

sources, except what this country can provide.

It took America and Britain from 1941 till 1944 to prepare and launch an invasion against Hitler.

What better prospects would there be against Soviet Russia? And does that prospect warrant placing billions of dollars' worth of war equipment within range of Soviet armies?

Of course, the atomic bomb has been developed since then. But, for all we may know, Russia, too, has the atomic bomb. Guesswork is not adequate when dealing with such a terrible weapon.

Shall we arm western Europe, or save our strength?

A Personal Appeal Against a CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from J. Carl Baldridge, of Boise, Idaho, explaining his viewpoint on the President's proposal to authorize a Columbia Valley Authority. Mr. Baldridge does not represent any special interest and speaks only for himself and family.

BOISE, IDAHO, *March 4, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
Representative from Idaho, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SANBORN: Local news items, as well as items in the press from a distance, for some time have had frequent references to the possibility of a Columbia Valley Authority for the watershed of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

I have been a resident of Idaho for nearly 45 years. During most of that time I have been and am now an owner of irrigated land. I realize that there are other things than control of the supply of water for irrigation at stake that are tied up with such an Authority. It seems to me that my own interests and those of others who are likewise situated lie in retaining the control, as we have now, of the water that is used on our lands for growing crops. As far as some of the other so-called advantages in relation to erosion control, forest, wildlife, etc., I cannot see how it would benefit the area which it is proposed to include in the Columbia Valley Authority, or that it would be any better off than it is now to have control entirely in the hands of some Federal bureau or board.

We have had plenty of experience with the Bureau of Reclamation, and in my trips over the State, and what is known as the western part of the United States, I find that the Bureau of Reclamation, for the purpose for which it was originally created by our Federal Government, is held in very high esteem. Large-scale developments for those things which it seems rather obvious that the Federal Government can do are already being done. Again I cannot see any advantage in putting other activities under any regional commission or board, however appointed, however administered, once it has been created.

I can speak for seven more men and women who are directly in my family, including my wife, sons, and daughter-in-law, in asking that you not only vote against such a proposal as CVA, if it should come to a vote, but that in the meantime you use your influence to combat any movement looking toward the establishment of such an Authority.

My work takes me almost continuously over the State, meeting people in many divers occupations and professions, and I do not think there is any real sentiment for the creation of the Columbia River Authority.

Yours sincerely,

J. CARL BALDRIDGE.

Trial of Protestant Churchmen in Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article covering the trial of 15 Protestant clergymen in Bulgaria by the Communist government:

TWO LOCAL CLERICS CONDEMN TRIAL—REVERENDS GOLIGHTLY AND WELD HIT SOFIA TRAVESTY

The trial of 15 Protestant churchmen in Bulgaria by the Communist government was denounced today by two of this area's most prominent Protestant clergymen.

Rev. Dr. William D. Golightly, pastor of Immanuel Baptist Church, and Rev. Dr. Hiram C. Weld, pastor of Elm Park Methodist Church, characterized the trial as a travesty of justice.

Dr. Golightly, who also is chaplain of Koch-Conley Post, American Legion, said the trial was part of a campaign in all iron-curtain countries to sever connections between the churches there with the outside world.

The statements followed developments in the trial yesterday when Rev. Nikola Naumov, head of Bulgarian Baptist churches, and Rev. Yanko Ivanov, head of Bulgarian Methodist churches, confessed that they had acted as espionage agents for the United States and Britain to provoke western intervention in Bulgaria.

In this 3-hour confession, Rev. Mr. Naumov pleaded guilty to all charges and recommended the security police as the best school for political reeducation of "waverers."

Dr. Golightly called the confessions "contrary to the character of the men." He said the confessions probably had been "wrung out of them by tortures that are a throwback to the Dark Ages."

CARDS ARE STACKED

Dr. Weld stated that the trial was a move by the Bulgarian Government "to curry favor with Moscow. Obviously the cards are stacked against the men, but the trial will be dressed up a little better than that of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary."

Agreeing with Dr. Golightly that the Communists want to sever all outside ties between churches in their countries and the outside world, particularly the west, Dr. Weld said the next trial would occur in Czechoslovakia.

"American-controlled or Vatican-controlled churches will not be given freedom behind the iron curtain," Dr. Weld added. "Bulgaria thinks it has chosen the psychological moment to persecute these men in light of the Hungarian trial."

In their confessions the two Bulgarian clergymen repeatedly emphasized that they had been led into espionage through their connections with the west. Rev. Mr. Naumov said he had connections with the United States intelligence system through the Supreme Council of United Protestant Churches.

Dr. Golightly said that last night the executive committee of Koch-Conley passed a resolution calling on President Harry S. Truman and Congress to formally protest the trial.

Earlier this week a State Department protest was rejected by the Bulgarian Government.

Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington and a former Scranton resident, called the trial a "mimicry of justice."

The United States and Great Britain have official observers at the trial.

Union Chiefs Unite on New Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 13, 1949:

UNION CHIEFS UNITE ON NEW LABOR BILL—DEMOCRATS ARRANGE BROADCAST TO STIR UP SUPPORT FOR ADMINISTRATION PLAN

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Organized labor presented a united front tonight in a special broadcast arranged by the Democratic National Committee to stir up public sentiment for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and enactment of the administration's new labor law, which faces a hard fight on the Senate floor.

Brought together on a single program were William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; James Carey, secretary of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Harvey W. Brown, president of the unaffiliated International Association of Machinists; and George M. Harrison, speaking for railway labor as president of the Grand Lodge of Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

Senator ELBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and sponsor of the administration bill in the Senate, was moderator. The program was broadcast by the American Broadcasting Co. network.

Mr. Green declared that the fatal error of the Taft-Hartley Act was that its major purpose was to make strong unions weak and weak unions weaker, thus eventually tearing down the high American standard of living which the unions have helped to build up over the years, not only for union workers, but for all the American people.

SEES UNIONS AS EXPOSING REDS

Declaring that the American trade-union movement had taken the leadership in exposing the hypocrisy of the Communist philosophy, he said that strong unions were America's first line of defense against infiltration and boring from within by Communists.

"Is it not, then, the better part of wisdom for our Government to protect this effective defense line, rather than to weaken it by oppressive legislation?" Mr. Green asked. "If for no other reason than this, Congress should adopt the Thomas bill without delay."

Mr. Carey said that the 1948 elections demonstrated the American public wanted the Taft-Hartley Act wiped off the law books and the Thomas bill enacted to reestablish sound, peaceful, constructive relations * * * between workers and their employers.

"Under the Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Board handled more than 100,000 cases, and settled them," he continued. "Our unions grew; they won better conditions for their members; they helped strengthen our American democracy during peacetime and war.

"The Taft-Hartley Act, which replaced the Wagner Act, has turned us back from the

path of progress. It has weakened the rights of workers. It has limited their rights of free speech. It has weakened their security on the job."

Mr. Brown emphasized how the broadcast offered concrete evidence that all labor was united in support of the administration bill, which, he said, would help to restore friendly and peaceful labor relations in the United States and avoid many disputes so common under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The unions, Mr. Brown said, "are a breastwork against depression" and therefore "collective bargaining is a better policy for the United States than individual bargaining." That policy, he emphasized, was endorsed in the November elections, but since the election the defeated forces have used every trick they can conceive to confuse Congress and the people on the Taft-Hartley Act. He urged trade-union members to write their Senators asking them to vote for the Thomas bill without amendments.

Mr. Harrison sought to meet the argument that the new law would not adequately protect the public against work stopages in vital industries affecting the public interest.

Oil-Country Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been very interested in the supply of materials used by the petroleum and gas industries. Our independent oil and gas men have had much difficulty in the past obtaining necessary supplies. We have had considerable shortages in oil-country goods. I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter which relates to the current supply of oil-country goods:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INDUSTRY COOPERATION,
Washington, March 9, 1949.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Following your talks with the Secretary and with Acting Assistant Secretary Blaisdell with respect to the oil-country-goods situation, the matter was referred to my office for the purpose of addressing you somewhat in detail on that subject.

In order that one may better understand the present situation in oil-country goods, it is first necessary to review the record of production of such tubular products over the past 13 years:

Production—oil-country goods

	Tons
1936	1,116,000
1937	1,419,000
1938	1,035,000
1939	1,005,000
1940	1,028,000
1941	1,050,000
1942	452,000
1943	675,000
1944	1,127,000
1945	1,118,000
1946	1,095,000
1947	1,399,000
1948	1,675,000

Last December the Interior Department presented the following revised basis of operations as necessary to meet the requirements of the over-all domestic economy for 1949:

	Interior Department objectives, year 1949	
	March 1948 estimate	Current estimate
Wells to be drilled	38,000	43,000
Footage to be drilled	134,000,000	150,000,000
Oil-country goods (tons per year)	1,501,000	1,680,000

At the time of the establishment of the original domestic objectives in 1948, the steel industry estimated its possible maximum production of oil-country goods for that year at 1,600,000 tons. It was determined at the end of the year that the actual production record of both integrated and nonintegrated tubular goods producing mills would be 1,674,876 tons. This production exceeded the stated requirements for 1948 domestic purposes.

It must be recognized that conditions during the past year in many areas of the oil country were far from satisfactory due to maldistribution of the steel products involved. It was alleged by some during the period of greatest hardship that the close customer relationships existing between the large producers of oil-country goods and the larger oil operating companies resulted in the latter's receiving more than their fair proportion of such products. This opinion was, of course, contradicted on many occasions by representatives of some of the producing mills.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, as you probably are aware, has for some time been pressing for more favorable consideration of the requirements of the smaller and independent drilling operators. At the January 1949 meeting of the National Petroleum Council the Independent Petroleum Association of America presented a report of the results of a survey covering the distribution of oil-field tubular goods to representative oil operating groups in the United States. The essential facts then presented were based on a survey covering 249 oil operators in the United States using 275,082 tons of oil-field tubular goods in 1948. This is admittedly only a fraction of the total number of operators active in that year. Based on an actual production of 1,674,876 tons of oil-country goods, the survey represents the experience of only about 16 percent of the users of such products.

According to the report the weighted average purchases of tubular goods of all those reporting were the following sources:

	Percent
Regular suppliers	61
Gray market	12
Second-hand pipe	11
Conversion	9
Tie-in sales	7

The four groups—according to tonnage requirements—into which this study was divided secured materials from the following sources:

Number of operators	Regular suppliers	Gray market	Second-hand	Conversion	Tie-in
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
104 using 200 tons or less	42	20	25	1	12
96 using 201 to 1,000 tons	55	16	15	4	10
39 using 1,001 to 5,000 tons	64	10	9	6	11
10 using 5,000 tons and over	63	10	11	14	2

In an effort to correct the reported maldistribution of oil-country goods OIC recommended last spring a voluntary program to the Steel Products Advisory Committee covering the then anticipated maximum production of 1,600,000 tons with a certification of usage provision incorporated in the agreement. The purpose of the proposed agreement was to insure the continuing maximum allocation of materials to the integrated and nonintegrated mills producing these products. It also was to help in the equitable distribution of the steel products to all sizes of operators by requiring each order presented to the mills being accompanied by a certification to the effect that the products would be used in the development of a well within a reasonable operating period, for example, 60–90 days. The steel industry did not enter into such an agreement largely because it was considered as involving the policing of another industry. The OIC represented the proposal of a voluntary plan later in the year but the decision of the steel industry remained unchanged.

As to the current situation, reports have been coming to the Office of Industry Cooperation for some time that conditions in the oil fields are improving from week to week. The over-all situation was considered sufficiently improved last month that adjustments downward were considered as possible in the so-called tank and oil-field production equipment program. This voluntary agreement covers the end items used in the well-head equipment group. The units involved have a direct relationship to the amount of oil-county goods used in the gas and oil industry. The contemplated cutback in this program was based on a survey by OIC of the steel producers which are participants to the program in question. A review by the steel mills of the certified orders placed by the consuming participants disclosed the following:

Status of allotments under Public Law 395

Month	Total monthly allotment to industry	Certified tonnage placed	Tonnage not ordered
	Tons	Tons	Tons
January	16,530	13,592	2,938
February	16,530	13,602	3,928
March	[1] 18,530	[2] 15,003	3,527
April	[1] 18,530	[2] 12,330	6,200

[1] Allotment increased 2,000 tons per month to take care of 12 prospective additional consuming participants.
[2] Includes orders of 6 new consuming participants declared eligible to date (of 12 prospective new participants).

Before proceeding with a cut-back in the program the members of the industry advisory committee were contacted in the field for their report on the situation. All admitted a slowing down in well-drilling activities but recommended no cut-back since the situation might be temporary in character. The chairman of the tank and oil field production-equipment program then in the Oklahoma oil country reported to the Chief of the Petroleum, Gas, and Oil Negotiating Division of this office on February 11, as follows:

"As of the present writing it appears development work in the oil industry has been curtailed to a noticeable degree for the first quarter of the year 1949. This slowdown in operations will undoubtedly give the steel mills plenty of time to catch up on the back orders for oil-field tubular goods, and therefore I do not expect the Department of the Interior or the Independent Petroleum Association of America to be so persistent in their demands for more oil-country pipe.

"This decrease in drilling operations has not affected the business of the tank and oil field production-equipment industry to any marked degree as of the present writing; however, we will undoubtedly feel its effect in approximately 2 months' time.

"A large number of companies and individuals who had contracted for conversion steel, or who had actually purchased and had in possession appreciable quantities of oil-country tubular goods obtained at very high prices, have been very anxious to dispose of this material. It seems as though everyone who had any high-priced steel in their possession is putting forth a special effort to unload at the present time."

From the above it would appear that the domestic oil-country-goods situation is materially improved over conditions existent a year ago; in fact, we feel confident that the over-all situation will have improved to such extent that few critical areas may develop throughout 1949. Our staff has recently been advised by active oil operators that the maximum number of wells to be drilled during 1949 may not exceed the 39,000 drilled last year.

Should you have any further questions, I will be pleased to attempt to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

EARL W. CLARK,
Director.

Good American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of March 16, 1949:

GOOD AMERICAN

Sol Bloom was a good Congressman. He saw America whole, not as a segment bounded by the lines of his voting district. He early caught the vision that America must play a world role for the sake of peace and he intelligently and realistically endeavored to block any backtracking to outmoded isolationism. But he did not go overboard. One of his last acts was to challenge the double talk of Henry Wallace before a congressional committee. Mr. Wallace was delivering a harangue on how Russia was reaching democracy through economic dictatorship. That was too much for Mr. Bloom. "Oh, stop kidding," he hurled at the fumbling Wallace.

He had the measure of Wallace because he himself was an outstanding authority of what an American should be. Put in charge of an effort to observe properly the two hundredth anniversary of George Washington, he made the Nation Washington-conscious on a prodigious and invaluable scale at a time when patriotism was taken for granted. From coast to coast, in every corner of the Nation, the character and accomplishments of the first President were revived through the unstinted energy and funds of one Sol Bloom. For this alone the Nation is indebted to a great Congressman.

Town of Chichester Decries Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of Manchester, N. H., of March 11, 1949, entitled "Town of Chichester Decries Communism":

TOWN OF CHICHESTER DECRIES COMMUNISM

The good citizens of Chichester—and they are good citizens indeed—stood up at Town Meeting to be counted as stalwart Americans when they adopted a resolution reading: "We, the voters of Chichester, N. H., at our annual meeting on March 8 go on record as opposing the Communist Party and recommend drastic curbs on its activities."

Chichester has made wholly constructive history. Its awareness of communism's menace to this democracy, followed through by its support of effective countermeasures, should be emulated by towns and cities throughout the Nation. For the sad fact is that too many people minimize the danger of Red inroads, even those already made. They dismiss the Communist and his plottings as remote from their own lives and their well-being now and in the future. And even when the threat is recognized, few bother to oppose it, either as individuals or as members of combating organizations.

Chichester's recognition of the situation, however, gets down to grass roots, which is exactly as it should be. What the people of that town have said, in effect, is this:

We of this little republic have been brought up under the blessings of democracy, as were our fathers and their fathers before us. We want to preserve those blessings for our children and their children. We are free to worship God according to our own conscience. Freedom of speech is ours. We can choose our work in life. We come and go as we please. We can vote men into office—and out. Communism makes slaves of people. The Communist Party actually isn't a political party at all. It is a cell of so-called Americans sworn to destroy our freedom by overthrowing the Government which guarantees that freedom. We want steps taken to kill off communism before it kills us off.

If that thinking were unanimous—if only it were unanimous—this Nation would be prepared to meet and overcome Soviet subversive activity. Preparedness in arms is not the only need. Also essential is a people united in thought and action. Chichester's unity in demanding drastic curbs on Kremlin-inspired misdoings is a national must.

How To Start a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

HOW TO START A WAR
(By Irving Pflaum)

On page 16 you'll find stories from Walter Lippmann in Washington and Frederick Kuh in London which I urge you to read. They raise the issue which Protestant clergymen have been debating all week in Cleveland: The issue of war or peace. It can be stated thus:

How can our defense pacts become a mortal threat to Russia, the allegedly potential aggressor: Not to communism's assumed plans for future aggression, but a threat to Russian security, an attack on the safety of the Soviet fatherland? How, in other words, could our defensive, regional peace pact bring about a war?

Statesmen, who think they understand why nations fight, have an answer:

A defensive alliance always becomes a war threat when it creates military force in an area too close to the opponent's homeland.

Or, they add, when it completely surrounds the opponent and blocks his legitimate avenues of peaceful growth.

In today's dispatch on page 16, Lippmann (quoting John Foster Dulles in Cleveland) says our Atlantic Pact is heading toward the first mistake. Kuh hints that our other world-wide regional pacts are heading toward the second.

Both cite authorities who have no desire to appease Moscow. But these good Democrats fear Moscow's reaction to an arrangement that brings United States military power to places like Norway and Turkey.

I share their fears. It would be an error to back the Russians into a corner. For, as Lippmann says, we could then bring the cold war to a point where only a solution by hot war is possible.

And this we might do if, under the Atlantic Pact, we based our armed forces in Norway or Turkey.

The Norwegian Government has said it wouldn't permit this as long as Norway is not attacked or subject to threats of attack. But Norway is joining the Atlantic alliance and will receive United States lend-lease military aid.

Might not the suspicious Soviets believe that this means the establishment in Norway of powerful United States air and sea forces, and, so believing, subject the Norwegians to threats of attack?

No one can say this won't happen. And it could be the point when war became inevitable. Hence many American statesmen and militarists who see the danger want to avoid it while there is time.

But we can avoid it only by reassuring Moscow in the clearest and strongest way that we will not use Norwegian territory as a military base.

There must be no misunderstanding here, or about our determination to fight, if necessary, should the Soviets attack their neighbors.

President Truman and Congress can make our intentions so clear that Moscow will have no excuse. Dulles and Lippmann, and the European statesmen who talked to Kuh, may not be able by themselves to stop the car before it skids into the ditch.

One Year of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins from the Detroit Times of January 12, 1949:

ONE YEAR OF THE MARSHALL PLAN
(By E. F. Tompkins)

Putting politics and ideologies aside, the new Democratic Congress should reconsider—and in fact should drastically revise—the operations of the Marshall plan.

The desirable purpose of the plan was to make western Europe self-supporting and to improve social and economic conditions in other parts of the world.

It was calculated that in 4 years—by 1952—and with American expenditures of $18,000,000,000, there would be no more need

for American aid which since the war has been costing us billions of dollars a year.

Approximately 1 year's experience, and an investment of more than $4,000,000,000, shows conclusively that the plan is not accomplishing its benign objective.

The 19 countries that are beneficiaries of our bounty are preparing a progress report that indicates anything but progress.

Their report is expected to say that $4,000,000,000 a year is not enough money and that 4 years is too short a time to rescue Europe.

The danger obviously is that, unless the plan is reorganized, such vast donations will be exacted from us, over so prolonged a period, as to bankrupt the United States, without achieving what we have set out to do.

The impending progress report from Europe puts us back where we were when the Marshall plan was first devised.

At that time western Europe was invited to draw up a rehabilitation program which America would endow.

The response amounted to a long-term draft on our production and financial resources aggregating about $30,000,000,000.

This country reduced the total by some $12,000,000,000, and Congress authorized the first year's disbursement, which has now been made.

That sum is irrevocably gone.

Because it went abroad mainly in the form of goods, its disposal has magnified our shortages and aggravated our inflation at home.

And it has not performed its mission in Europe.

Consequently, Europe wants to continue as our dependent for a much longer time than we had ever contemplated and at a vastly greater expense than we can safely sustain.

The situation into which our hillbilly statesmen and our doctrinaire planners have propelled us is really preposterous.

We could not reasonably be expected to save Europe if doing so meant ruining ourselves.

In spite of that, however, we are being inveigled into economic and social dishabilitation with the very evidence before our own eyes that Europe is not being saved.

The truth is, of course, that Europe does not want to be saved from its errors and illusions which are the root causes of its major ills.

Europe wants to be supported by American industry and American labor while it conducts an impoverishing collectivist revolution.

The $4,000,000,000 that we have dispensed could have been of enormous benefit to Europe had it been entrusted not to visionary politicians, but to capable industrial and financial rehabilitation commissions, and had it been honestly applied as new capital to revitalize production, to foster pay rolls in private undertakings, and to substitute sound monetary exchanges for managed currencies.

But these things could not be done well without releasing free enterprise from Marxian bondage—and thereby rewarding and stimulating the productive energies of the people.

And Europe, under its present managers, does not want free enterprise.

Europe—that portion of it that is not Communist—has gone completely Socialist and all of its governments are Socialist governments.

Hence the benefactions of American free enterprise are misappropriated to build socialism in Europe, not to enlarge the areas of democratic freedom and encourage the fruitful efforts of individual initiative.

Actually—and with our misguided connivance—Socialist Europe made certain that this would occur.

In its initial blueprint for accepting American aid, Europe stipulated that our grants and loans should be unconditional—that there should be no interference with Europe's internal affairs.

The demand was equivalent to asking a banker to risk loans, or a philanthropist to bestow charities, without the elementary and protective right to inquire how the funds would be applied—without any assurance that the accommodations would not be abused and that the donatives would not be misapplied and dissipated.

And the New Deal itself was so tainted with socialism that it received Europe's insolent dictation without demur.

The predictable consequence has been the costly failure up to date of the Marshall plan—a failure that can only become greater and more costly unless this country, as the source of its own gifts, either alters the Marshall plan fundamentally or else abandons the misconceived and misdirected adventure entirely.

What Policy for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 13, 1949:

WHAT POLICY FOR PEACE?

Last week the Nation's Protestant leaders, at a conference in Cleveland called by the Federal Council of Churches, heard a State Department explanation of the North Atlantic Pact and then declined to endorse it.

The church leaders did not actively oppose the pact, but neither were they ready to approve its principles or details. Their hesitations and doubts, we believe, accurately reflect the mood of a great many Americans.

Americans want peace. The vast majority of them fully understand that in order to maintain peace the United States must assume a leadership in world affairs which involves a commitment to defend by force, if necessary, the security of free nations from armed aggression.

It is no lingering isolationism that disturbs these Americans. Most of us have put side forever the illusion that we can have peace by turning our backs on the rest of the world. But many of us do want more information from our Government as to just what long-range policy we are following.

The core of the problem is the lack of a peace settlement in Europe. As Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recently told a Chicago audience, the United Nations is weak because the big powers have never made the peace which UN was designed to keep.

That is the reason for the cold war. That is the reason for the armaments race. That is the reason for the North Atlantic Pact and the revival of military lend-lease.

The core of the European problem is Germany.

Has our Government a clear and coherent policy on Germany? What is the policy? Is it one that will make a peace settlement possible? Is it one that will encourage general disarmament? Is it one that will free Europe from fear?

President Truman and the State Department, this newspaper believes, owe the people frank and full answers to these questions.

Three and a half years ago, when the Potsdam agreement was signed, our German policy was based on the idea of destroying the Nazi Party, eliminating Germany's military potential, reducing its economic power, and then erecting a federal state under which the Germans would run their own country, subject to four-power control of its basic industry.

That was supposed to be the policy of all the big powers at the time of Potsdam. It was taken for granted then that the peace settlement required a single German state which neither the west nor Soviet Russia exclusively controlled—a state over which the west and Soviet Russia would stand joint guard.

Today there are two Germanies, east and west, each under tight control of one of the two parties to the cold war. The division lines seem to harden every week.

Let us recognize that Soviet Russia was the prime factor in bringing about the division. It was Russia's policy in eastern Germany, and her obstruction of economic unification, that led to the split in the first place.

All that is history. The big question today is not how we got into the situation, but how we can get out of it with world peace, not world war.

The reason for getting out of it is that a policy based upon a perpetual partition of Germany seems to imply an indefinite military occupation of Germany, whereas the major objective of a peace settlement must be to bring about the evacuation of central Europe by both Russia and the west, under circumstances that give both west and east reasonable security.

What is our German policy today? Have we abandoned altogether the Potsdam idea of a unified Germany running its own affairs under four-power surveillance? If so, the State Department should frankly say so, tell the people frankly why and explain fully all that this implies.

Are we building up western Germany as a temporary measure only, intending to revert to the Potsdam idea at a favorable time? If so, the State Department should tell us that, and explain how eventually it is proposed to get back on the track.

Nobody knows, of course, whether Russia is now ready to reach a reasonable compromise on Germany. It is known, that ever since last summer Russia has been trying to maneuver the west into a conference on Germany which just possibly might lead to a solution. It is also known that the alternatives to a conference—the pact, the arms race, the continued cold war—may so crystallize the situation as to make later agreement impossible.

Our Government owes the people a convincing explanation of its objectives in Germany and Europe. If it gave that explanation, it might allay some of the doubts and fears which many Americans feel about other aspects of our policy.

A Threat to Child Care in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives,

considering H. R. 2892, the Public Welfare Act of 1949, on March 10, 1949:

A THREAT TO CHILD CARE IN THE UNITED STATES

For more than a hundred years the care of dependent, neglected, and delinquent Catholic children has been the basic concern of Catholic charities in the United States. In the early days of the church in this country large numbers of Catholic children were reduced to dependency by the premature death of their parents. Most of the child-caring institutions of the church were built in order to save these children to the faith. In most of the large centers in the United States local governments were willing to contract with Catholic institutions for the care of Catholic children. They recognized that the care of children away from their own homes is a very serious responsibility. The agency that assumes this responsibility is really taking over the responsibility of parents. The same type of child-care programs that were developed by the Catholic Church were also developed by other religious denominations.

In many of the larger communities in the United States it has been a recognized principle for a century or more that Catholic children should be turned over to Catholic agencies for care, that no other agencies can provide the type of religious care that they need. In communities in which Catholic agencies were not developed, large numbers of Catholic children were turned over to governmental or other agencies and were lost to their faith.

Catholic and other religious organizations set up for the care of children away from their own homes have made far-reaching contributions to the welfare of orphaned and neglected children. They have constituted a large sector of American charities and social welfare. They have saved millions of dollars to the taxpayer by their devotion and self-sacrifice. Any effort or movement that undermines the great work of our religious organizations and institutions engaged in the care of orphaned and neglected children would be a serious threat to all the best traditions of American social welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION A SERIOUS THREAT TO CATHOLIC CHILD WELFARE

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has now before it a bill (H. R. 2892) which is a serious threat to Catholic child welfare in the United States. If the bill is passed, it will mean that large numbers of Catholic children now under the care of Catholic agencies will have to be turned over to public departments. These children are in Catholic institutions and Catholic foster homes. The church has expended millions of dollars in developing facilities for their care. Government has nothing to gain and everything to lose by discontinuing the use of these facilities and developing purely governmental programs. Such programs would cost the taxpayers several times the amount that is expended in the care of the children at the present time, and would offer no guaranty that the children would receive comparable care. We know the difficulties that governmental agencies now endeavoring to take care of Catholic children experience in finding Catholic homes. In these agencies we almost invariably find a considerable number of Catholic children being cared for in homes not of their own religious faith.

WHAT AMERICAN COMMUNITIES WILL LOSE BY THE WEAKENING OF RELIGIOUS AGENCIES

Proposals for turning over to governmental agencies children now under the care of Catholic charities would mean the weakening of Catholic charities in a large number of communities in the United States. The same is true of other religious child-caring agencies. The work of Catholic and other private children's institutions has been the basis of the powerful appeal made by voluntary social work in the past. If the work of caring for these children is turned over to Government it will mean that all private child care in the United States will lose a very large part of its appeal. We know very well what this appeal has done in keeping the spirit of Christian charity alive among all citizens. How can we maintain our spirit of Christian charity, our spirit of brotherhood, without the appeal of the great charitable institutions for the care of children?

HOW H. R. 2892 WILL INJURE CATHOLIC SOCIAL WORK

The bill before the House of Representatives will injure Catholic work for dependent children because:

First, it proposes to set up a public program for the care of children in every community in the United States. This program will replace a Federal program that was designed to provide governmental assistance to child-welfare programs in rural areas and areas of special need. When legislation for the present program was being discussed in 1935, the thought was that the large centers already had well-developed child-care programs and that it was unnecessary for the Federal Government to interfere with these programs; that the Federal Government should confine itself to areas that were not reached by existing programs, namely, rural areas and areas of special need. The bill now under consideration would bring the Federal Government with all its rules and regulations into every community in the United States to set up governmental programs for the care of children.

Secondly, the bill provides that the States must formulate complete State-wide plans for child care, but it really tells them what kind of plans they must have. If, for instance, as happens at the present time in a number of cities, a juvenile court has been committing children to Catholic agencies, this plan will have to be discontinued because, the bill says, that in every community there must be one agency that has entire responsibility for the care of children. In certain communities the care of children is under a different civilian agency from that charged with the administration of public assistance. Under the proposed legislation this agency would have to become part of the public assistance agency. If a community has decided to use voluntary organizations for the care of children, it will have to set up a public program.

The proposed legislation, H. R. 2892, provides that each and every State must contribute State funds to programs for child care. Now in a number of States it is questionable how far State funds can be used to purchase from religious organizations services for the care of children. This is very clear in the State of Pennsylvania. All funds for the care of children in Pennsylvania are now local funds. Under the proposed legislation Catholic and other religious child-care programs in Pennsylvania would be practically wiped out. While this problem has been solved by constitutional amendments in New York and by court decisions in some other States, it will still be difficult to maintain the purchase of service for the care of children with State funds in a considerable number of States.

The proposed legislation will affect not only the work of local voluntary agencies in the care of children to whose support local public funds are being contributed; it will affect the entire program of Catholic and other religious agencies. It envisages a complete governmental program that will virtually take over the entire field of child welfare. It proposes that governmental agencies take over the care of unmarried mothers, the placement of children for adoption, day care for children, all types of counseling service for both families and children. It really presents to the American people a false picture of the actual reality. We have already had a considerable amount of experience with the work of governmental agencies in dealing with families that are receiving aid to dependent children. Very little social service is being done in this field. Now it would seem more appropriate if the governmental agencies would achieve effective work in the areas in which they are now engaged before entering into new areas.

The enactment of H. R. 2892 would really be an announcement to the American people that the Federal Government now proposes to enter into the entire field of child care in the United States. The broadcasting of this news will in itself do a great damage to voluntary child welfare under religious auspices. The Government will be virtually announcing that it is ready to undertake a program for which it does not have the necessary facilities.

GOVERNMENT MIGHT CONCENTRATE IN AREAS TO WHICH IT HAS ALREADY BEEN COMMITTED

Under the Social Security Act the Government provides assistance to the States for the care of children in their own homes and in the homes of close relatives. The purpose of this aid-to-dependent-children program is to assist in the maintaining of family life. But in spite of the vast sums expended by the Government for the care of children in their own homes we find that more and more homes are being broken up and that the facilities of agencies engaged in the care of children away from their own homes are overtaxed. When Federal assistance was first granted to the States for the care of children in their own homes it was expected that there wouldn't be as much need for the care of children away from their own homes. What has happened, however, is that the governmental agencies engaged in the care of children in their own homes are not providing any program of service for the children or their families. It would be more desirable for the governmental agencies to concentrate in this field rather than to seek a wider field. If they have not developed the necessary competence in caring for children in their own homes how can they expect to develop the necessary competence for the more delicate task of caring for children who have been deprived of care of their own parents.

The Social Security Act provided assistance to the States for child care in rural communities and in communities of special need. But after 13 years we do not yet have any adequate programs of child care in rural communities and in many of our mill and mining towns. After 13 years this field still remains to be cultivated. It is more challenging now than it was 13 years ago.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND GENERAL RELIEF

In his message to the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1936 President Roosevelt said: "The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers. I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash, of market baskets, or of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destruction but also their self-respect, their self-reliance and courage and determination."

At the time that President Roosevelt spoke, the social-security program had just gone into effect, and this program was designed basically to protect the workers against the hazards of life by a series of benefits based on rights. This was in harmony with the report of the President's Committee on Economic Security made in 1935: "The measures we suggest all seek to segregate clearly distinguishable large groups among those now on relief or on the verge of relief and to apply

such differentiated treatment to each group as will give it the greatest practical degree of economic security. We believe that if these measures are adopted the residual relief problem is apt to be diminished to a point where it will be possible to return primary responsibility for the care of the people who cannot work to the State and local governments." The measures that the President's committee recommended included old-age insurance and unemployment compensation—which were to provide the foundation stones of a social-security program—and supplementary programs including aid to the States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind.

THE PROGRAMS AFTER 13 YEARS

The programs recommended by the President's Committee on Economic Security have been in effect for 13 years. We recognize that old-age and survivors insurance has not developed as rapidly as might have been expected. In the meantime, the public assistance programs have expanded at an enormous rate and as they have expanded the problems of administration have become more and more complex. Anybody who believes that the basic problems of administering aid to dependent children under the Federal-State program has been solved, is really not looking squarely at the facts. Some of us have reserved our criticisms of local administration because we were afraid that it would lead us into a worse situation. We had always expected that aid to dependent children would solve many of the problems of child dependency and delinquency, but we have been disillusioned. We have been disillusioned by the lack of service in families receiving aid-to-dependent-children benefits. On the local level we are endeavoring to get our Catholic groups to participate more actively in the administration of aid to dependent children. These volunteers have to keep constantly calling the attention of the workers in the public agencies to the wholesale neglect of the children in families receiving aid to dependent children. We hear well-founded complaints about mothers who call up the officers of local agencies to ask how much they could get if they divorced their husbands. Sometimes they find that they can get more in the way of public assistance than they can get from their husbands.

Many people all over the country are asking: "How soon are we going to find a substitute for this program of aid to dependent children?" People have asked me, "Why don't you study the Canadian family-allowance system and promote it in the United States—something that is more consistent with the dignity of the individual and the family than our present program?" It was our hope that the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance would take up an increasing number of mothers with dependent children. And it has taken up a considerable number. At the present time 570,592 children are receiving survivors' insurance benefits. On the other hand, a total of 1,176,198 are receiving aid to dependent children. It was hoped that under aid to dependent children child dependency would decrease, but we find that the problems of child care confronting our agencies are increasing rather than diminishing.

I have talked rather frankly during the past 6 months to many county officials charged with the administration of aid to dependent children in various sections of the United States. I have found very few among them who were satisfied with the program. They told me that they were bound by rules and regulations coming to them from the Federal Government, and they presumed from Washington. Among the ordinary citizens in these counties I found great dissatisfaction with the administration of the program. I am honestly convinced that year by year the program is going to become more expensive and more demoralizing to American families. I feel that it is necessary to speak thus severely at the present time, when it is proposed to carry the same program into much larger areas. I feel that the farther away we get from the present public assistance philosophy in serving the needs of American families the better it will be for all concerned. What was back of this statement that the late President Roosevelt made to the Congress in 1936 that "the Federal Government must and shall quit the business of relief." I talked to Harry Hopkins and his associates many times about this question. Why did the Federal Government get out of the business of direct relief? The answer was, "Costs kept on increasing, standards kept going down."

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE CONTRASTED WITH OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

According to the latest figures, we have some 2,469,000 persons receiving old-age assistance in the United States as compared with 2,254,000 receiving old-age and survivors' insurance. I know that generally speaking the people receiving old-age assistance get more than those receiving old-age and survivors' insurance, but does this mean that they are satisfied? On the contrary, I find very few people receiving old-age assistance that are really satisfied. It has been our hope that more and more of the aged will be covered by old-age and survivors' insurance as much more economical and much more in harmony with the dignity of the American citizen. Here we have a benefit to which the individual has contributed. He considers it his own and in accepting it he feels no loss of dignity and respectability. One cannot fail to note, however, that the ordinary aged person who has been self-supporting all his life is very sensitive about receiving old-age assistance.

The ordinary workers and the ordinary farmers receiving old-age assistance are really products of the depression, but I do not believe that the ordinary middle-class citizen of our country is going to be satisfied with old-age assistance as a means of protecting himself against the hazards of old-age dependency.

A GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Implicit in the whole thinking of the Federal Security Agency is the principle that the Federal Government is fundamentally responsible for getting to every American family everything that it needs on the basis of a careful and detailed budget analysis. Apparently the Agency does not accept the guiding principles of the Social Security Act. It is leading us more and more toward the concept of needs in contradistinction to a certain minimum protection against the basic hazards of life.

Let us think for a moment what this basic responsibility for supplying all the needs of American families on a budget basis would mean for the National Government and for the people of the United States. It would mean an analysis of the resources and needs of every family that needed assistance. On the basis of this principle several million wage-earning families would have to be included. As a matter of fact, at the present time many families receiving aid to dependent children are getting more than their neighbors who are working for wages. Of course, one can see that these families are in need. They can't supply all their budgetary requirements. This again assumes that they are bankrupt, that they do not have any initiative left. One might ask, what will this general subsidizing of the wage system do to wages? Will it not encourage lower wages? Again, what will it do to families? How far will it tend to demoralize family life in our country? How far, moreover, is it practical to apply the type of needs test indicated, to four or five million families. The resources and needs of families change from time to time. We would have to have a continuous study of families in order to apply the needs test effectively. It would require an army of workers to carry out the principles of the needs test.

MOUNTING COSTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will want to understand something of the costs of an enlarged public-assistance program. For the fiscal year 1945–46 Federal grants in the amount of $439,132,000 were certified for these programs; for the fiscal year 1946–47 Federal grants in the amount of $613,831,000 were certified; for 1947–48, $775,602,000 was certified. The estimate for 1949 is $842,961,-114, and for 1950 it is $1,078,000,000. It should be remembered that these increased expenditures have been made in a period of relatively full employment. One can readily appreciate what will happen if the Federal Security Agency extends its effort to the larger fields contemplated under H. R. 2892. One can readily hazard a guess that the relief expenditures of the Public Assistance Division will exceed $2,000,000,000 a year, and they will not stop at this point. They may well be increased by another billion within the next 5 years.

NATIONAL CONTROL OVER FAMILY LIFE IMPLIED UNDER H. R. 2892

I would like for a moment to examine another very important implication of the responsibility which the Federal Government assumes under H. R. 2892. Under this proposed legislation the Government is virtually going to guarantee every faimly what it needs on a budget basis. Every family that receives assistance under this formula will virtually be taken over in bankruptcy. What does this mean from the standpoint of national control over family life?

I know that the Federal Government has been trying to get away from this responsibility and it has been trying to get the State and local governments away from a serious consideration of its implications. Charges and counter charges have been made in community after community in the United States that the funds given to families have been abused and that the money given for the support of children is not used for their benefit. I have heard these charges made in one city after the other but the agents of the Government keep saying, "We are not responsible for the way in which families live. We have no responsibility for the way they spend the money we have given them." This certainly is a new concept in the administration of relief. I suppose it is an effort to get away from trying to control the lives of the families, but what are we going to do about the situation? We cannot overlook charges of neglect of children in large numbers of families that are supported by Government funds.

The difficulties to which we have pointed will be greatly multiplied if the Government should take over the larger part of the relief field.

When the Social Security Act was passed by the Congress, grants-in-aid were provided to the States for certain well-defined areas of public assistance, including the aged, dependent children, and the blind. It was assumed that as the insurances developed, the need for these categories would decrease. Nobody envisioned the expanding program that has been developed, especially through years of full employment. From the way in which the program is developing now it is beginning to look as if the Federal Security Agency wants to change the entire pattern, that it wants to give us a relief program rather than an insurance program. Many people have been raising this question. They have stated also that most of the thinking about social security has been done by a few people in the Agency. If one disagrees with them, he is supposed to be very unorthodox to say the least.

Some of the advisers of the Federal Security Agency on the outside do not make any secret about their desire to substitute a complete public-assistance program for a social-insurance program. This indeed would be a great tragedy for the American wage earner and for the American people as a whole.

I know some of our conservative brethern believe that relief is less expensive than social insurance; they believe that relief will be governed largely by local standards, but once we get the program envisaged by H. R. 2892, I doubt if assistance administration will be any longer determined by local thinking.

VARIATIONS BY STATES IN THE NUMBER OF PERSONS RECEIVING OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

There is a great variation in the number of persons receiving old-age assistance in the States. Of every 1,000 persons over 65 years of age in Louisiana, 791 receive old-age assistance; in the District of Columbia, 47; in Oklahoma, 593; in Delaware, 58; in New York, 97; in Colorado, 464. This must mean that there is a great deal of variation in the needs test as it applies in the States mentioned. The needs test as interpreted by the Federal Security Agency means a complete study of the resources and needs of the individual and the making of a definite budget. However, the legislatures in States having a large number of persons receiving public assistance write a good part of the needs test. They try to define what resources are. They say that an insurance policy of a certain amount should not be considered; that a house valued at less than a certain amount should not be considered; that cash of a certain amount should not be considered. In other words, there is a struggle on between these States and the Federal Security Agency. The States want a pension; the Agency wants assistance. Now in the program envisaged by H. R. 2892 all the Federal grants are based on a general-assistance category. It would be very interesting to watch the reactions of the States that have set up what is virtually an old-age pension. Would they be satisfied to return their old-age-assistance recipients to a general-assistance category where they would receive only the same consideration and have to pass the same needs test as the recipients of general relief?

PROVISIONS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

H. H. 2892 would set up a system of grants-in-aid to the States to provide medical assistance which is defined as "medical services for needy individuals, provided by the State agency through payments to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services, but does not include medical services for individuals living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution."

This would bring the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Administration and the State departments of welfare into a very large sector of medical care in the States. It is based on the assumption that medical services in the States at the present time are very inadequate and that grants-in-aid are necessary to enable local agencies to secure medical care for relief clients.

On the whole, medical care in communities in which there are adequate facilities, is fairly good. In the communities that I visited in Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and Illinois during the past 6 months, I found that medical care is looming very large in local expenditures. The greatest difficulty I find in other areas is the lack of adequate facilities for medical and hospital care in local communities. The hospital facilities are inadequate; the medical facilities are inadequate. Assuming there is an unmet need, there is a question whether this need should be met by adding to the responsibilities of State and local welfare departments. Isn't this definitely a health problem? We already have two divisions of the Federal Security Agency now interested in health, namely, the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. They are working with the States on health problems. Will this put a third division in the health field? Moreover, it is fairly well recognized today that our first step in any health program is to provide more adequate local facilities. We need more hospitals, more nurses, more doctors. We need more health centers in areas in which there are virtually no hospitals and no facilities for medical care.

One may very well ask today, in view of the general debate on a national program for medical and hospital care, whether the best approach from the standpoint of the Federal Government in dealing with the medically indigent would not be to concentrate for the time being on providing more facilities. I believe that it can be said that in the ordinary communities in the United States, outside of certain areas that do not have facilities, the medically indigent are receiving better medical and hospital care than the ordinary wage earners.

GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL UNNECESSARY AT THE PRESENT TIME

At the end of 1948 some 33,000,000 people were covered by unemployment compensation. This number of people, therefore, with their families, were protected against the hazards of temporary unemployment. In three States—California, Rhode Island, and New Jersey—we have provision for temporary disability due to ill health. The chances are that before the adjournment of their present sessions a number of other State legislatures will have made provision for temporary disability. We have also in the States, rehabilitation programs which take care of a sector of the physically handicapped. We have some 15,000,000 people included in veterans benefits of one kind or another. We have the prospects of larger coverage under old-age and survivor's insurance to cover the permanently handicapped. We have the prospect of a large housing program that will help to improve the standards of life of large numbers of people in the United States. We have voluntary health protection of one kind or another covering 53,000,000 people. There is no reason therefore why the Federal Government should embark on a greatly expanded program of public assistance which will cost the people of the United States another billion dollars.

I am sure that nobody is looking ahead to public assistance as a means of protecting the workers against the hazard of continuous unemployment. We do not need to look ahead to any continuous unemployment during the next year. Even if we should have a large volume of unemployment, public assistance would be the poorest remedy we could devise for it. We learned that from our experience in the early 1930's.

It will be much sounder for the Federal Security Agency at the present time to look ahead to ways and means of improving the administration on the Federal level of the various benefits committed to its charge. A great deal of improvement is needed especially in the administration of aid to dependent children. There is general dissatisfaction throughout the country with this program as it is presently administered. The Federal Security Agency should devote itself to studying ways and means of preventing the abuses that have arisen, of providing more adequate service for the families receiving aid to dependent children, and of preventing that process of deterioration which is affecting the lives of so many of these families at the present time.

Under title V of the Social Security Act, the Children's Bureau is charged with the administration of child-welfare services in rural areas and areas of special need. The Children's Bureau might very well now study its experience during the past 13 years. Why is it that there is so little constructive social service in our rural communities? The Children's Bureau is expending considerable money at the present time in the training of workers in the field of child welfare. How many of these workers are qualified to deal with the programs with which the Children's Bureau is charged? How many of them are qualified for work in the country? If this work in the country is not undertaken by the Federal Security Agency through the Children's Bureau, it may be that the people of the United States will have to devise other means of providing welfare programs for the large number of families that need service in our rural communities. We cannot go on without a more adequate social-work program in the country. The Farm Security Administration made an excellent beginning in this field but its operations have been restricted and now there is nothing to take its place.

I am sure that our American wage-earners look to a social-insurance program that is in harmony with their dignity, that gives them a certain amount of protection against the major hazards of industrial life. They do not want a needs test. They do not want to admit that they have to be taken over in bankruptcy. They have a great deal of initiative and resourcefulness on their own. They want to be able to walk into the social-insurance office and secure the benefits that are coming to them as a matter of right; benefits to which they and their employers have contributed; benefits which are really a continuation of their wages during the periods in which they can no longer work.

Amendments to United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby include a proclamation issued by the Honorable Chester Bowles, Governor of the State of Connecticut, relating to a referendum held in the State of Connecticut at the last election. The electors of the State of Connecticut, by an overwhelming majority, indicated their intention that the representatives of the State in the Congress urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

In pursuance of this referendum, a resolution, known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 15, has been introduced into the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut. This resolution urges the Connecticut General Assembly to make application to the Congress to take the necessary steps, under article V of the Federal Constitution, to amend the Constitution of the United States in such a manner as to make it possible for the United States to join a world federation which is derived from a strengthened United Nations, when and if it is set up.

It is my hope that any action which leads toward the strengthening of the

United Nations, so that it may more successfully grapple with the problem of assuring world peace, be given the serious consideration it deserves.

The proclamation of the Governor of the State of Connecticut is as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, CHESTER BOWLES, GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, duly convened in special session at Hartford in August 1948, did enact the following act which was duly approved by the Governor on August 26, 1948:

"An act concerning question concerning charter of United Nations: Section 1871 of the 1947 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: The following question shall be voted upon at the general election to be held on November 2, 1948, and the designation thereof hereinbelow provided may be placed on the same ballot or voting machine as the names of the candidates to be voted for at such general election: "Do you, as a sovereign citizen of Connecticut and the United States of America, direct our representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting and enforcing laws to prevent war?" The designation of said question which shall be used on ballots and voting machine ballot labels shall be "Question re recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, Yes" and "Question re recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, No," and, in voting machine towns, shall be provided for use in accordance with the provisions of section 722 of the general statutes; and, in towns which do not use voting machines, the vote shall be taken in the manner provided by section 106f of the 1941 supplement to the general statutes. Said question shall be voted upon in accordance with the applicable provisions of law concerning voting upon the acceptance of amendments to the constitution of this State"; and

Whereas a copy of said question was, in pursuance of said act, transmitted by the secretary of the State to the town clerk in each town in the State, and said question was presented to the inhabitants thereof for their consideration, at a town meeting in each town, legally warned and held for that purpose on the second day in November 1948; and

Whereas pursuant to said act, the secretary, the treasurer, and the comptroller, as the board of canvassers, did, as provided by law, duly canvass said votes and did then transmit to the Governor their certificate under their hand in the words and figures following to wit:

"To His Excellency, JAMES C. SHANNON,
"Governor:

"We, the undersigned, having been designated by law to canvass the votes cast in favor of, and against the proposed world government referendum by the electors of this State at town meetings warned and held for the purpose of submitting said referendum to said electors, as specified by law, do hereby certify that we have duly canvassed said votes which were received from all the towns in this State as by law provided.

"The whole number of votes received and counted relative to said proposed world government referendum was 155,757, of which number 141,625 were in favor of the adoption of said referendum and 14,132 were against the adoption of said referendum.

"FRANCES BURKE REDICK,
"Secretary.
"JOSEPH A. ADORNO,
"Treasurer.
"FRED R. ZELLER,
"Comptroller."

And whereas it appears from said certificate that a majority of said votes are in favor of directing our representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

I do, therefore, herein so declare; and I do herein declare that a majority of the electors present at the town meetings aforesaid have indicated their intention that our Representatives in the National Congress urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed and have hereunto set my hand at Hartford on this 24th day of February in the year of our Lord 1949, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

CHESTER BOWLES, *Governor.*
By His Excellency's command:
[SEAL] WINIFRED MCDONALD,
Secretary of State.

Opportunity for GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Tucson Star:

OPPORTUNITY FOR GOP

President Truman's address on the occasion of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner will give the country a good chance to see whether there is a Republican party, or Republican leadership, ready to play the necessary role of an opposition party. The President has handed the Republicans a perfect issue by demanding the passage of his vast legislative program and threatening to take the issue to the people of the country by a Nation-wide speaking tour. The Republicans, the opposition, could not ask for a better opportunity.

If, for instance, the people of the country realized the implications of the program the President recommends, what it means to the people out in the grass roots, the chances are that it would undergo a profound modification. The President in his proposed social and economic proposals is in effect asking he be granted virtually dictatorial powers over economic activities, and for so-called social legislation that will set up within one year new and gigantic government bureaucracies to regulate what are today numerous normal activities.

How many housewives realize that, under the extension of social security legislation, they will have to keep a set of books on household help they hire?

How many realize that they will have to pay taxes, make deductions from the pay to household help, and make regular reports to the collector of internal revenue?

How many small-business men realize that they, too, will face this same new burden of paper work and tax payments?

How many farmers realize that they, too, are included? How many of them realize that they, too, will come under the minimum hourly wage?

How many wage earners and salary workers realize that under the so-called health insurance program a new withholding tax will be made to pay for the bureaucratic insurance administration they will get in return?

How many workers realize that they will be called upon to pay for the medical attention that malingerers and others who "enjoy bad health" will get?

How many realize that this proposal will set up in every community of the country, not new hospitals nor more doctors, but a Federal bureaucracy to manage the routine of illness which is now carried on without any government expense.

How many realize that the proposed housing program calls for the creation of another vast bureaucracy, and the implied assurance that new and low-rent housing automatically follows from such a bureaucracy?

Here in Tucson the next year will undoubtedly show that the housing emergency, which follows every war, has been solved, and solved quicker than it would be if bogged down in the swamp of a government bureaucracy.

How many people of the country have stopped to note the lack of strikes under the Taft-Hartley bill, the increased productivity and the beginning of the lowering of prices?

How many have noted that labor unions are prospering, and so are their members, despite the charges that labor is being enslaved?

Those are just some of the ways the President's program is going to affect the people out in the grass roots of the country. But there are others.

The President's program with its vast allocation of personal power to him, and its vast extension of government controls over normal life, in effect forms a foundation out of the life of a free society.

Those who doubt this have only to look at history, both ancient and contemporary, to note how usurpation by government of authority over normal economic activities inevitably leads to an authoritarian state and its control over personal liberty and eventually personal thought and worship.

That is the challenge the American people face today.

Are they going to rise to meet it?

If they are, it will require political leadership opposing the President's program.

Normally that is the duty of an opposition party in a free society.

Are the Republicans going to meet the issue? Or are they going to do as they have been doing under present and past leadership and offer, "Me too, but not so much"?

Unless the Republicans openly and unapologetically organize opposition to the President's program, it will, through sheer default, prevail.—Tucson, (Ariz.) Daily Star.

Waterways of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives from Massachusetts has instructed me, as its secretary, to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of resolutions, petitions, and memorials

which may be sent to the entire membership of that delegation.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now insert the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolutions relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth

Whereas the general court of Massachusetts favors and urges the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth, wherever feasible, for the production of hydroelectricity to free the Commonwealth from dependence on coal and other fuels which are scarce or nonexistent in the Commonwealth, to stimulate industrial enterprises in the Commonwealth, and to encourage the establishment of new enterprises in the Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to effect said development of waterways for the production of hydroelectricity to be distributed through private enterprise and municipal power and light plants; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts invites and urges the cooperation of the five other New England States and the State of New York in the development of waterways coming to the New England States and the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth to the Governor of each of the five other New England States and the State of New York, and to the presiding officer of each branch of the legislature of each of said States.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 2, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 10, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Greek Kids Sing of Hate for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

GREEK REFUGEE KIDS SING OF HATE FOR UNITED STATES

(By Alex H. Singleton)

BELA CRKVA, YUGOSLAVIA.—They sang as they marched—this Tom Thumb army of Greek refugee children who have found food and shelter in Yugoslavia away from their country's civil strife.

The songs were songs of hate. A youthful voice called the tune. A half thousand youthful voices, boys and girls, 7 to 14 years old, picked up the melody.

MARCH INTO YARD

"Out with Anglo-Americans from our country," they sang. "We don't want them. The Anglo-Americans, the new occupiers, came to our country and helped the Monarcho-Fascists kill our countrymen."

A thousand boots clumped with precision into the courtyard behind the spic and span white buildings which house 560 of approximately 11,600 Greek children in Yugoslavia.

Clad in powder-blue wool uniforms, modeled on GI battle dress, the youngsters marched three abreast from classroom to courtyard for their daily drill and organized folk dances.

Great Britain has charged many of these youngsters were kidnaped. Chiefs of Greek partisan factions denied this. So did Yugoslavia. Both claimed the youngsters were given sanctuary to save them from bombs and bullets.

FARING WELL

The Yugoslav information office arranged an inspection trip for foreign corrrespondents to the refugee center here, 80-odd miles from Belgrade. The Red Cross of Yugoslavia, which pays the bills, says the children's mental and moral training is left up to the Free Greeks.

The young Greeks are obviously looking good.

They are well-scrubbed and plainly but adequately fed. They are warm, in well-made clothes.

Nikola Georgiades, once a school teacher in Greece and now administrator of the children's center for the Greek commission, said education is designed primarily on the three R's.

Picketing the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

PICKETING THE COURTS

From a resolution unanimously adopted in Chicago on February 1 last by the American Bar Association's House of Delegates we quote this salient paragraph:

"Be It Resolved, That the American Bar Association condemns the picketing of courts as an interference with the orderly administration of justice, the purpose of which can only be to influence, intimidate, and coerce the courts in connection with matters prospective or pending before them, and such picketing constitutes a clear and present danger, as well as a major threat, to the integrity and independence of the judiciary and to our form of government."

The practice thus strongly condemned seems to be spreading. Courts have been picketed in Portland, Oreg., in San Francisco and Los Angeles, Calif., and now in New York City as one of the circus features of the current trial of 11 Communists indicted by a Federal grand jury.

These mob manifestations obviously can have no other purpose than to intimidate or influence trial judges, court officers, and juries. If that purpose could be accomplished, the administration of justice in this country would suffer irreparable loss in character, reputation for impartiality and in public confidence. Mob coercion of our courts would break down the principles and guaranties embodied in our Federal Constitution thus work disastrous change in our form of government.

No thoughtful and patriotic American can seek, or condone, that calamity. Whatever preventive action may be necessary should be taken by the courts themselves or by Congress now, before this subversive practice spreads further. The American Bar Association's protest and warning should stir these authorities to remedial action which can be sure of the support of public opinion.

Louisianians will note with special interest that the Louisiana State Bar Association was the first of such organizations to express its condemnation of court picketing, and that the resolution just adopted unanimously by the national association's house of delegates was presented there by two representatives of the Louisiana bar, Messrs. Cuthbert S. Baldwin and LeDoux R. Provosty.

The Current Indomitable Might of the Air Force, the Development of the Rocket, the Ram Jets, the Turbo Jet, the Mammoth B–36, and the Globe-Encircling Flight of the B–50 Bomber Are All Tributes to President Truman's Sagacity and Farsightedness in Appointing the Hard-Driving Hon. Stuart Symington Secretary of the Newly Established United States Department of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago we read much in the press and heard considerable misgivings over the air as to our ability to carry out strategic bombing missions unless more billions of dollars were voted the Navy to build superairplane carriers or else acquire more airfields and bases abroad.

Mr. Speaker, today, thanks to the youth, the verve, the drive, the will to do their bounden duty to insure both our national security and the American way of life, the United States Air Force has proven that today American air power is truly world-peace power.

Today the whole world acclaims another new and further accomplishment of our great Air Force.

Public demonstration has now been made that the United States Air Force medium and heavy bombing planes can actually roam the world at will. Furthermore, it has now been proven that in doing so and in the event of war they can ride so high in the heavens and above the earth, that they are practically without danger from either anti-aircraft guns or fighter plane interception.

Mr. Speaker, howsoever we might differ with respect to our political, our social, or our economic beliefs—whether we are pro-Army, pro-Navy, pro-Air or even anti-Air Force—every member of this

House thrilled upon learning of the marvelous feat of the United States Air Force in encircling the globe in a B–50 bomber.

Mr. Speaker, ponder on the fact that the B–50 has a loaded weight of 120,000 pounds, that it is a highly intricate precision machine, a superfortress and a worthy successor to the war famed B–29, a machine made of steel and of iron, of copper and lead, of tin and brass, of aluminum and magnesium, of cotton and wool, that it took off from the earth, roared eastward at an average speed of more than 4 miles a minute out across our great South country. It passed overhead within a few miles of this Capitol and then raced onward across the Atlantic. It had a rendezvous with a mother ship—a B–29 aerial tanker. High in the heavens, away off in the far-flung desert of Saudi Arabia and above the clouds, her gas tanks were refueled as she continued on her course.

I am advised that security reasons alone preclude disclosure as to the program and method of refueling from continental American bases.

Mr. Speaker, with several more such refuelings the United States Air Force B–50 did not put down until after encircling the earth she landed back in front of her own hangar at the headquarters of the Seventh Heavy International Bomber Wing located at Carswell Field in your own great State of Texas.

Its superb crew actually returned that ship with thousands of gallons of spare gas in her tanks to its home base within 2 minutes of the time it was scheduled to return.

I want you to envision the brain, the brawn, and the scientific skill of the American people built into the engines that powered that great flight. I want you to give consideration to the skills and the background of the young men who flew that ship.

They were skilled as navigators. They were skilled as pilots. They were skilled as bombers. They were so adept in communications that they kept that ship throughout its entire course in constant and absolute communication with its command, by use of an electronic device using scrambled frequencies of unique and peculiar wave lengths that defy detection and the most avowed attempts at interception.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I say absolute communications, I mean to say that bombers of that type, when on strategic missions are equipped with one of the marvels of radio communications, a system that enables a crew to make its flight free from any thought of possible interception of its communications by any possible enemy.

I want you to envision with me the skill, the knowledge of navigation, mathematics, climatology, meteorology, astronomy and a host of other subjects possessed by the men that flew this ship on that remarkable journey, and around the world, in so short a time.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, that was not a test flight. It was not a publicity or exhibition stunt put on by the United States Department of the Air Force.

I want you to know, however, that it did more than make good the statement of the Honorable Stuart Symington, Secretary of the United States Air Force, when he declared some several months ago that—

> We have learned that we can fly anything—anywhere—anytime—climate, mountains, oceans, weather—they cannot stop the United States Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, may I also recall to you and to my every colleague that under date of April 27 last year, and but 11 months ago, Secretary Symington, in an appearance before the Appropriations Committee of the House, told the members of that committee of what the Air Force planned to accomplish with the money which he asked them to provide for building the new B–50.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he made good what he said.

Refueling airplanes in flight is not a new practice to our Air Force. More than 20 years ago, Gen. Tooey Spaatz, the former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, himself conducted a refueling test. In that test and in "one of the crates" which he flew in those days—he remained aloft—and in continuous flight over the city of Los Angeles for a total of more than 151 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I am authoritatively advised that the B–50 flight which terminated at Forth Worth yesterday was not conducted or flown by any "high brass" of the United States Air Force. It was, in fact, simply the result of the ordinary extended daily practice flights such as the Air Force has been making in the United States Air Force training centers for months past. It was flown in its entirety by a regular and ordinary operating bomb crew consisting of 14 men and by but one of hundreds of such crews that are capable of repeating that same performance at any hour of any day or night.

I am satisfied that the eyes and ears of the world looked, listened, and marveled at this latest unsurpassed accomplishment of our Air Force.

Democratic loving peoples in every nation of the world have long since come to recognize the peace that would come to them with the invincibility of America in the air.

They will soon come to learn that American air power means not alone security to the peoples of the United States, but that it means peace—to themselves and to all the people of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, at about the time that the B–50 bomber was approximately halfway around the globe there was deposited with the Clerk of the House a report from the Commission of the Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, or the Hoover commission. The burden of that report pointed out: "Interservice rivalries, lack of teamwork, 'extravagance in military budgets, and waste in military expenditures' were noted by the Commission."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am not one who views with any alarm whatsoever slight evidences of departmental rivalry such as we see expressed at the Army-Navy football game.

There real sportsmanship is expressed by the President of the United States. As Commander in Chief, he sits first on one side of the field with the Army for one-half of the game and then sits on the other side of the field with the Navy in the other half of the game.

Now, I am not saying that I for a moment would tolerate the least extravagance, waste, or the unwarranted expenditure of a single dollar of the taxpayers' money in order to foster petty jealousies or prejudicial departmental contentions, whether in carrying out their several missions or in trying to gain any undue percentum of congressional appropriations.

So far as economy of operations is concerned, however, I don't think that is a problem to which this House will have to address its attention with respect to any expenditures made by the newly created Department of the United States Air Force.

All one must do to satisfy himself as to that point is to critically scrutinize and evaluate the business administrative principles that have been inculcated into Government with the establishment of that new arm of our national defense.

Under the fiscal policies laid down by Secretary Symington every last dollar budgeted in the Department of the Air Force is subjected to a highly integrated and vigorously imposed system of cost control.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, every dollar expended is equally subjected to most rigorous and constantly continuing system looking toward the control of costs in the expenditure of every dollar. Interdepartmental allocation of funds insofar as the Air Force is concerned, is not made to the branches of service per se—but commensurate with their operations, each branch is given the funds necessary to carry on the work that is to be performed by it in their accredited operation.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, these new economic and administratively sound business principles now made applicable to the administration of governmental expenditures is an action program that we some day hope to see established in all governmental activities.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the newly established system of purchasing and procurement that has been adopted by the United States Air Force is a system that meets with the commendation and support of every Member of the Nation's Congress.

Efficiency and economy both in procurement and in operations have been the battle cry of Stuart Symington since the day upon which he took his oath of office. I, for one, feel that there is no private corporation in these United States which enjoys a more efficient, prudent, economic administration of its business affairs—through the application of progressive business principles—than does the newly created Department of the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, it was the proven executive and administrative abilities demonstrated in the reorganization and management of private business enterprises that caused President Truman to appoint Stuart Symington for first Secretary of the newly created Department of the Air Force.

The current and indomitable might of our Air Force, the terrific speeds which have been achieved—the tremendous heights at which our aircraft can now fly, the veritable catalog of airplane types—military and mechanical improvements—the reduced costs—improved armament—the patent vigor and the drive that has been installed into this new infant department of our Armed Services—I hold are all directly attributable to the sagacity and farsightedness of President Truman in selecting Stuart Symington to organize and perfect the new Department of the Air Force.

That the Secretary of the Air Force has done a good job is acknowledged by every member on both sides of the aisle. Through him and the United States Air Force—President Truman is building peace of the world—first and foremost in the program to which President Truman has consecrated himself.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote a few lines from an editorial entitled "Around the World Without a Stop" carried in a recent edition of the New York Sun. I quote:

But the significance of this training mission, so quietly launched, so calmly completed, so dispassionately described, will not be lost on any part of the globe so neatly girdled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up the time of this House for so long a period in addressing myself to the great feat performed by the Air Force in encircling the globe.

Certainly there is no private business in the United States annually expending billions of dollars which is better or more efficiently managed than is our Air Force.

As to the other phases of the question of unification of the Armed Services, you all are going to hear more on that subject from me at some later date.

Why I Oppose an MVA Patterned After TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past month or so several of my constituents have written me requesting that I inform them of my position regarding a Missouri Valley Authority like TVA.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Post of March 13, 1949, and my letter in answer to those who have written me regarding an MVA, so that all may read and know why I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of powerful river valley empires to take the place of our 48 free and sovereign States, which comprise our great Republic:

[From the Washington Post of March 13, 1949]

TVA-TYPE PROPOSAL FOR NORTHWEST MARSHALS FORMIDABLE ARRAY OF FOES

(By Tom Humphrey)

PORTLAND, OREG., March 12.—The proposed Columbia Valley Authority, modeled after TVA, may look wonderful to Representative HUGH MITCHELL (D., Wash.) and his CVA League. But it doesn't look that way to the Governors of five of the seven CVA States, or to Oregon Congressmen or Northwest newspapers or to approximately 100 agricultural, industrial, and promotion groups of the Pacific Northwest. On the contrary, they're asking:

"What's TVA got that we haven't got?" And they're prepared to fight it out in the region and in Congress.

The CVA Leaguers have been having a field day since President Truman made his surprise CVA declaration and asked a five-agency committee to put it in legislative form. They're rallying around Representative MITCHELL, who has tried repeatedly to interest Congress in a TVA for the Columbia Basin.

They figure that what's good for the Tennessee Valley would be good for this region. And they're saying that with a CVA this region would get more Federal money, there would be no more floods like those of last year and there would be no power shortage.

Grange masters of Oregon and Washington, who will buy anything with a public power label on it, are whooping it up. Several labor leaders have climbed on the bandwagon. Representatives MITCHELL and JACKSON of Washington and Senator TAYLOR of Idaho, third party running mate of Henry Wallace, can't wait for Mr. Truman's committee to report. They're for introducing their own CVA bills.

Finally, Bonneville Power Administrator Paul Raver, strong advocate of coordinated development of the Columbia Basin but lukewarm advocate of CVA, went to Washington, talked to his boss, Interior Secretary Krug, former power manager for TVA, then came out wholeheartedly in favor of a regional agency in the nature of a CVA.

BACKS ENGINEERS' PLAN

And right there the opposition came to life. Governor Douglas McKay of Oregon demanded:

"What's the matter with the way we're doing now?

"I cannot agree with any plan for a Columbia Valley Authority under which the States surrender their autonomy and our natural resources pass into complete control of Federal bureaus," he wired President Truman. McKay urged the President to let the Army engineers complete the power, flood-control and navigation projects outlined in their master plan for the Columbia Basin.

Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, said: "On the basis of past performance, of knowledge both special and general of the entire area, it is my belief that existing agencies can best develop the Columbia Basin."

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, started a backfire against CVA by sponsoring a senate bill giving his State authority to go into the power business at the wholesale level. He declared it would protect the State against the overpaternalistic interest of Federal Government.

Gov. Vail Pittman, of Nevada, and Gov. C. A. Crane of Wyoming, parts of whose States would be in the proposed 279,000-square-mile Columbia Valley Authority area, also oppose it. That makes five out of the seven governors on record against valley-authority proposals. Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah, is expected to clarify his position soon, and Gov. John Bonner, of Montana, ran on a platform of Montana people.

MUNICIPAL OPPOSITION

Heads of the three outstanding municipal power agencies of Oregon and Washington also strongly oppose CVA.

E. R. Hoffman, superintendent of Seattle City Light, and C. A. Erdahl, Tacoma commissioner of public utilities and chairman of the Northwest utilities conference of public- and private-power agencies, say that existing agencies can do a satisfactory job in the development of power on the Columbia River and its tributaries, if given a free hand.

"I should be most unhappy to see any major part of this immediate (power development) program caught in the rip tides of politics," Erdahl said.

J. Frank Ward, superintendent of Tacoma City Light and former Bonneville engineer, added: "Coordinated development is desirable, but not so desirable that the people of the Northwest can afford to lose control of the development of their own area. I feel that will be the inevitable tendency of a large authority unless it is made very responsible to the people of the Northwest."

And R. R. Boals, general superintendent of the Eugene, Oreg., water and power board, said: "I very much object to a Columbia Basin Authority or to any other authority so far proposed."

Oregon Congressmen are almost unanimously opposed to a TVA-type CVA.

Senator GUY CORDON, who is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee has waged a successful fight for funds for McNary Dam and other Army engineer projects, strongly opposes CVA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, progressive Republican, says: "I am anything but convinced that we in the Pacific Northwest want any Government agencies in control of our rivers based upon the Tennessee Valley pattern. Our economy is entirely different and our people are strong believers in a maximum of local self-government."

Senator CAIN, of Washington, is not expected to go along with his authority-minded Democratic colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, when the chips are down. And Senator ECTON, of Montana, appears to be just as strongly opposed to CVA and a Missouri Valley Authority as Senator MURRAY is for them.

PRESS FIGHTS PLAN

Every major newspaper and more than 85 percent of all newspapers in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are on record against CVA, strong as they are for development of the Columbia Basin. Every power-company president in the region, while favoring McNary Dam and other Federal power projects, is actively antagonistic to CVA, remembering, no doubt, that TVA has elbowed 32 privately owned electric utilities out of the picture in the Tennessee Valley, either in part or in toto. Every major chamber of commerce, including Portland, Seattle, and Spokane, is on record against CVA, recalling that TVA engages in 30 different business enterprises in competition with private enterprise.

And while Oregon and Washington State grange leaders are plugging for CVA, other farm groups are adamant in their opposition, including the Idaho State Grange. The Pacific Northwest Development Association of Portland says there are nearly 100 farm, industry, and promotion organizations on record against a Columbia Valley Authority. Even the tribal council of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation of Oregon is against CVA.

The reasons they give are varied.

The Pacific Northwest is one of the most progressive and prosperous regions in the United States, in marked contrast to Tennessee Valley States. It has the highest per capita income, while TVA States have only 60 percent of the national average despite

15 years of TVA. Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are among the top eight States in rural electrification, while Tennessee is forty-fourth. This region has cheaper power than TVA, the domestic rate in Portland under private company operation averaging 1.28 cents per kilowatt hour, while the average under the TVA is 1.58 cents.

Working through the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Pacific Northwest has developed within 10 percent as much power at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other Federal projects as TVA has developed at 28 dams—and for less than half the cost. The Army engineers have provided ocean-steamer navigation as far up the Columbia as The Dalles, Oreg., 200 miles from the sea. The Bureau of Reclamation is developing at Grand Coulee the largest reclamation project in America—the 1,200,000-acre Columbia Basin project, Washington. And Bonneville and Grand Coulee are repaying every cent they cost, with interest, in 50 years—something TVA isn't doing and cannot do.

GROWTH REQUIRES POWER

The Pacific Northwest is short of power, all right. The fastest-growing region in America, it needs at least 6,000,000 kilowatts more in the next 10 years to keep pace with its needs. But it has 40 percent of the Nation's hydro sites and the Army engineers have just completed comprehensive plans for basin development. If they are approved, it can supply its power needs through Federal, municipal, and private company projects.

The Pacific Northwest has a flood-control problem, too, but again the Army engineers have plans that will cut flood damage to 10 percent of last year's figure.

On the other hand, TVA has a power shortage, too. Its hydro sites are exhausted. In fact, it stirred up a national controversy by asking Congress for $54,000,000 for steam plants.

And TVA still has floods, too, despite some $165,000,000 allocated to flood control. In fact, its 28 dams permanently flood more productive land than seasonal floods ever covered. And while the 1948 report of TVA boasts that its flood-control program has averted $13,000,000 worth of damage in the Chattanooga area, the fact remains that the people of Chattanooga appealed to Congress to authorize the Army engineers to provide flood protection TVA hasn't supplied.

Thus, the difference is that most of the people of the Pacific Northwest believe that the Army engineers, the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee and the Bureau of Reclamation have done and can do a better job for this region for approximately $350,000,000 than TVA has done in the Tennessee Valley—despite the expenditure of almost $1,000,000,000.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to have your letter which gives me the opportunity to state my position regarding a Missouri Valley Authority, or the Missouri Valley development program under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now going forward in an orderly manner.

My criticism of the TVA set-up is that a Board of three men, appointed by the President, and not elected by the people, have, in effect, full and complete control over the very existence of the people living in the Tennessee Valley. We must bear in mind that he who has the authority to control the electric power and water resources of America, or any given area in America in this electric age, can completely control America or that area under such control.

Congress appropriates each session a lump sum for TVA to build power dams, transmission lines, flood control, forestry, navigation, and, in fact, for most everything to carry on the Federal functions in the valley. Then this Board of three men spend that money at will to run their empire, so you see in reality the TVA is a separate and distinct empire within our American Republic. Not only the people's elected Government officials have lost much of their authority, but this Board of three men have taken over too much of the States' authority, which was specifically delegated to the sovereign States by the Constitution.

Now if this kind of autocratic regional control is carried on to its ultimate conclusion in the 11 river valleys of America, the Missouri being 1 of them, 33 men could completely control America. The 48 States could very well be expected to lose their sovereign rights and identity, and we would have in their place 11 separate, powerful regions or valley empires. I am quite certain you do not know that program is the recommendations and hope of the Communist Party of America. They know that so long as our Nation is composed of 48 States that are free and sovereign, whereby the people of the respective States elect their public servants, communism can never completely take over here.

Under the plan known as the Pick-Sloan Missouri Valley development program, the Governors of the 10 States of the Missouri Valley, which are all or partly in the valley, are members of the Missouri Valley Board, and that board of elected officials meets with the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation officials in open session at regular intervals to discuss with each other and any interested person about matters pertaining to the Missouri Valley development program. Surely no fairer, better, or safer program could be devised.

The Republican Eightieth Congress appropriated over twice as much for hydroelectric power dams and transmission lines than had any previous Congress. And so far as the Missouri Valley building program is concerned, the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I was chairman during the last session of the Eightieth Congress, recommended and that Congress appropriated over $54,000,000 for hydroelectric dams, power producing facilities, transmission lines, and related facilities for the Missouri Valley development program, which the Bureau of Reclamation will expend on the tributaries of the Missouri River in the upper reaches, and almost a like amount was appropriated by that same session of Congress for the Army engineers to extend for like purposes on the main stem of the Missouri River.

Randell Dam in South Dakota, and Garrison Dam in North Dakota are expected to start generating power in the year 1953. Transmission lines will be built ready to carry the power as far south as Sioux City, Council Bluffs, and Omaha. The farmers and townspeople in that part of Iowa, located in the Missouri Valley, will have access to such power according to plans.

In conclusion I must say, in fairness to myself, that I was born and raised on the farm when we carried the old lantern morning and night, turned the corn sheller, corn grinder, churn, washing machine, separator, and everything by the man- and woman-killing strong-arm method, and let me assure you I have not forgotten it for a minute since I came to Congress. My record will prove however that I want progress in the safe and sound American way, and not at the expense of our God-given liberties. Many nations of the world accepted government control little by little, until they lost all their rights as individuals to a powerful centralized control. Now they have neither liberty nor security. I shall never be a party to that kind of business, whether in Congress or out of Congress. I give you my word on that proposition, and you can bank on it.

With kindest good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Something for Nothing—So You Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the heat for Federal money continues to be put on Members of Congress, first for this, then for that. Congressmen would like to give everyone all he asks, but where can we get the money?

Through taxation you must furnish the money. Next week, I will give you some information about the taxes you are now paying, but at present let me show you the way in which Federal aid to States, municipalities, and to projects sponsored in part by the Federal Government, is being increased.

Here is a summary of Federal expenditures made as direct payments first, to States under cooperative arrangements, and second, payments within States to provide relief and other aid exclusive of grants and loans:

Year	Category 1	Category 2	Grand total
1932	$254,793,161	$14,632,091	[1] $269,425,252
1933	331,748,851	9,664,064	341,412,915
1934	[2]	[2]	1,826,013,207
1935	[2]	[2]	2,221,313,207
1936	[2]	[2]	2,171,861,084
1937	[2]	[2]	3,746,175,672
1938	[2]	[2]	2,952,068,617
1939	[2]	[2]	4,420,564,218
1940	[2]	[2]	3,922,290,408
1941	[2]	[2]	3,476,396,744
1942	[2]	[2]	3,225,636,378
1943	[2]	[2]	2,729,651,075
1944	612,868,891	1,149,242,041	1,762,110,932
1945	[2]	[2]	1,353,427,727
1946	847,328,443	442,778,740	1,290,107,183
1947	1,174,917,749	519,152,327	1,694,070,076
1948	1,592,515,224	3,958,538,822	[3] 5,551,054,046
Grand total			42,953,579,445

[1] In 1932, distribution of funds was under 18 objective classifications, and appropriations for direct relief or loans to States on account of floods, fires, hurricanes, etc., were not included.
[2] Not available.
[3] Includes $3,584,666,608 for Veterans' Administration and readjustment benefits under Public Law 346, and vocational rehabilitation under Public 16, and 56 other categories.

Now is not Uncle Sam a fine, generous, wonderful old boy? He sure is. But do not forget that, with this money, always, without exception, goes Federal control and finally those who receive a Federal dollar will be told when, where, and how to spend it. Farmers may shortly be told what, how much, and when they can sow, harvest, and sell. Other producers will have similar restrictions clamped down on them.

Oh, yes, and I almost forgot. You may wonder where the money is coming from. Maybe you have guessed. Just lay this away and next week I will tell you about that.

Tax on Freight Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I introduced a bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property, which I feel will equalize one of the most unfair and discriminatory taxes we have on our statute books—the 3-percent tax on freight bills.

In California we are so far removed from the center of consumption that our transportation costs of necessity are high. The application of a tax on a freight bill seems very unfair. This bill will not only be for great benefit to California, but will favorably affect the entire Southern States and all west of the Mississippi.

My bill provides for a tax of 3 percent on the first $100 of a freight bill; 2 percent on the second $100, and 1 percent on all over $200. While we will still be penalized, this bill will give great relief to the farmers in the shipment of their crops and will benefit everyone, as automobiles, machinery, and so forth, are billed f. o. b. shipping point, plus tax.

Of course, I would like to repeal the existing law in its entirety, but feel that we can justify the equalization of the tax burden without too great a revenue loss.

When Will the Secretary of State Act on German Immigration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is not following the clear mandate of Congress. At the last session, it was provided in Public Law 774, enacted by an overwhelming vote, as follows:

SEC. 12. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for applicants for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws.

This act was approved in June last year.

For 3 months nothing was done. This administrative delay was perhaps understandable and excusable. Then on September 17, 1948, it was announced that general German immigration, under the usual quota restrictions, would be resumed immediately by the acceptance of new applications for immigration visas.

This happened at a time when I was in Germany last fall. At that time I endeavored to impress upon the American consuls charged with responsibility in this matter the desirability of expediting in every possible way the actual departure from Germany of qualified persons, within quota regulations, desiring to emigrate to the United States for permanent residence. I realize, of course, that some delay was inevitable. I emphatically expressed to them the hope, however, that not later than the first of this year actual movement of intending immigrants would take place.

Only this week, however, I have been advised by the Department of State that not a single visa has been issued up to this time to a German national. In other words, 6 months have elapsed since the announcement of the reopening of German immigration without one person moving toward our shores from Germany. Indeed, 9 months have passed since Congress directed the Secretary of State to lift the suspension on receipt of visa applications.

The fault does not lie with the various consulates in Germany. The conclusion is inescapable that a policy has been adopted in Washington by the high command in the State Department to thwart the clearly expressed will of Congress in this regard. The injunction upon the Secretary of State to act immediately has been construed in this instance to mean to delay indefinitely.

During the very time when this colossal inaction on one phase of Public Law 774 was taking place, most strenuous efforts have successfully been made to implement the other provisions of the same law. Large numbers of displaced persons are now coming to our shores every week. This is not pointed out critically or unsympathetically. On the contrary, such action is in exact compliance with the law. Furthermore, I have at all times favored the principle that the United States should participate with other nations in a fair and humane solution of the distressing plight of these unfortunate people of Europe who have suffered so much at the hands of their oppressors.

What I point out is that the substantial progress made in the displaced-persons program, when viewed in the light of the complete break-down, at least to date, in initiating the program for general German immigration, demonstrates that the Secretary of State is pursuing a policy in this matter which is not only contrary to law, but decidedly not designed to create tolerance among our own people or further international good will.

Many of our finest and most loyal American citizens are of German origin. They have beloved relatives, many of them aged parents, war orphans, and others, who have suffered greatly and innocently from the horrors of war. They have long ago executed the necessary support papers and assurances to bring these relatives here under the provisions of the immigration laws. They have been told that Congress passed a bill and the President signed it last June to provide for the reopening of German immigration. Yet nothing happens, except that in some instances their loved ones in Germany may have received a piece of paper giving them a quota number. They cannot understand such treatment from their Government. I do not wonder. This closing of the door by the Department of State to German nationals accomplishes nothing except to arouse bitterness and disappointment and to increase human suffering at a time when our efforts should be unitedly directed toward creating a better understanding and relieving sources of tension and suffering.

Our immigration laws, properly administered, are designed to establish safeguards against the admission into this country of subversive elements, either of the right or of the left. Anyone seeking to enter this country should be subjected to a rigid screening process. We should, of course, exclude undesirables. We provide, however, for a certain annual quota of German nationals. Of course, during the war such immigration was suspended. Three years after the end of the war Congress directed that this suspension be lifted. Nine months more have elapsed since Congress spoke. Yet nothing has happened. When will the Secretary of State carry out the clearly expressed will of Congress?

Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, petitions, letters, and postcards to the number of several thousands have come to my desk, asking that the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed, the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction Act be reinstated. Communications indicating opposite views have reached me.

Those asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the reenactment of the Wagner law and the restoration of the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction Act, with but very few exceptions, fail to point out the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which support their conclusion that it is an antilabor act.

Many of those who approve of the act sent in answers to the 18 questions carried on the leaflet of the General Electric and the 19 propositions stated by radio commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr.

I am familiar with the Wagner Act, for I was here when it was written. Attended most of the hearings held by a special congressional committee—the Judge Smith committee—which investigated its interpretation and administration. I attended the 7-week hearings preceding the writing of the Taft-Hartley Act, and assisted in writing that act, both in committee and in conference.

In the main, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act come nearer to protecting the public, individual employees, and union organizations than any prior legislation. No one so far has cited any of its provisions which impair the rights of the worker.

As is always the case, there are some provisions in that law which should be amended, as, for example, the one which requires the officials of unions to sign anti-Communist affidavits, which should be broadened to cover employers and the officers of corporation employers.

The Taft-Hartley Act is an effort—

First. To protect the public health, safety, and welfare when threatened by labor disputes or strikes.

Does anyone contend that is wrong?

Second. To protect the individual employee, whether union or nonunion, from coercion from any source—from coercion on the part of the employer, the union, or the union official.

Third. To give equal privileges, such as free speech, to employees, to union officials, and to employers.

Fourth. To impose upon employers, employees, and union equal obligations to carry out the agreements which they have entered into freely and after due consideration.

Fifth. To give the individual the right to join or not to join a union, to work or not to work at any available job.

Sixth. To make certain, insofar as possible, that union policies shall be determined by the members of the union, rather than by union or international union officers.

The act does curb the arbitrary power of union and international union officials. That is justified on the ground that men and women who must work for a livelihood, who are dependent upon a pay check, should have restored to them the right to determine when, in view of the last offer of an employer, they should or should not go on strike.

I know that ultimately I must use my own judgment in voting for or against legislation. It is easy to be mistaken as to the merits or the justice of a particular bill, and because I wish to serve the interests of my constituents, I am asking that those writing me with reference to proposed legislation point to those provisions of the various acts which they either approve or condemn, which should be changed or modified.

Fish Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, imports of foreign fish and fish products are increasing so rapidly that these now threaten ruin for our American fishing industry and the hundreds of thousands of fishermen and workers it employs.

Recently, I wrote the Director of the Office of International Trade, for information concerning this increase in fish imports.

He supplied me with figures on our fish and fish product imports for the years 1939, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

These figures reveal that the United States in 1948 imported 472,427,000 pounds of fish valued at $110,954,000.

These imports were 40 percent larger by weight and 300 percent greater in money value than the imports of 1939, the last peacetime year.

Most of this great increase in fish imports came from South America, Japan, and Canada where wages and living standards are much lower than in the United States.

If these imports of foreign fish continue, our American fishing boats will be driven from the seas for our American fishermen cannot, and should not, be expected to compete with the fishermen of low-wage, low-living standard countries.

HEARINGS ASKED

Alarmed by these rising imports and the threat that these increasing imports are to our American fishing industry and its employees, and also to our American economy, I appealed to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to hold hearings on what can be done to protect our American fishing industry from the growing menace of increasing imports of foreign fish.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my letter to Mr. BLAND. The letter follows:

MARCH 12, 1949.

Hon. OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Office of International Trade, at my request, has just supplied me with a statistical table showing that 472,427,000 pounds of fish and fish products, valued at $110,954,000, were imported into the United States in 1948.

This is an increase of approximately 50 percent in tonnage and 300 percent in money value over the fish and fish-products imports of 1939, the last peacetime year.

This alarming increase in fish imports from low-wage, low-living-standard countries, unless halted or decreased, means ruin for our American fishing industry, its cannery operators, and its fishermen, with the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars which they have invested in plants, docks, cannery equipment, fishing boats, and fishing gear.

I earnestly urge, in the interests of our tens of thousands of fishermen, that your committee hold hearings at an early date to determine what can and what should be done to remove the threat to our fisheries industry that is inherent in these alarming imports of fish from low-wage countries.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL V. MACK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, Third District.

BOTTOM FISHING INDUSTRY

During the war years, when the Nation appealed for more fish to replace our dwindling supply of pork, beef, and mutton, many Americans built fishing boats and went into the fishing business. If increased imports of fish are permitted to continue, these fishermen soon may be put out of business, and the millions they have invested in fishing boats and fishing gear made valueless.

We hear a great deal of talk in Congress about aiding the small-business man. Fishermen are small-business men. Most of the fish landed at American seaports are brought in by boats that operate with one- to six-man crews. The owners of these boats, for the most part, have their life savings invested in their boats and fishing gear. Many of them are still in debt. They are entitled to protection.

One of the great fishing industries which developed on the Pacific coast during the war years was that of bottom fishing. Bottom fish are the fish that are taken off the floor of the Continental Shelf with drag nets.

Species of bottom fish taken in our western waters are sole, cod, red snapper, and several other kinds. When the fish are landed, the meat is stripped from the carcasses of these fish and is sold as what we commonly call fillet of sole.

In the last peacetime year, 1939, only 9,426,000 pounds of these fillets, valued at $714,000, were imported into the United States. Last year, 1948, we imported 53,964,000 pounds of these fillets, valued at $10,752,000. This more than tenfold increase in this type of fish is just enough to ruin our whole bottom fishing industry.

TUNA IMPORTS

Last year—1948—we imported 17,431,000 pounds of tuna valued at $6,339,000 according to the figures supplied me by the Office of International Trade. Most of this tuna came from Japan and Peru where, as you know, wages and living standards are far lower than those prevailing in the United States.

The tuna landings at my own hometown port of Grays Harbor, in the State of Washington, in some recent years have been almost $2,000,000 a year. Most of these fish are caught by two-man boats. The small-business men who operate these small boats can and will be ruined if tuna imports are permitted to increase.

The ruin of American fishermen will have far-reaching effects for if they are forced out of business by Peruvian and Japanese competitors, the canneries which these American fishermen supply

also have to go out of business and many thousands of cannery workers will lose their jobs.

CRAB IMPORTS

In 1948, according to the figures supplied me by the Office of International Trade, the United States imported 1,341,000 pounds of crab meat valued at $754,000. More than one-half of all this crab was imported from Japan, where wage rates and living standards are notoriously low.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, the Pacific coast had no crabbing industry of importance. Eighty-five percent of all crab marketed in the United States came from Japan in those years.

When Japan, at Pearl Harbor, blew herself out of the American crab market, thousands of American fishermen went into the crab-fishing industry. Thousands of small crab-fishing boats were built by enterprising citizens. These boats and the gear they used cost all the way from $6,000 to $20,000 each. Many Americans went into debt to build or buy boats and gear. Some of them still are in debt. If they are not granted protection against Japanese crab imports they may be destroyed financially.

So will the scores of men who have built canneries to process the crab landed by American boats. Ruin should not be forced upon them. It will not only be bad for them, but likewise harmful to all those who have gone into the business of building fishing boats, manufacturing nets, crab traps, and other gear required by the trade. In short, the financial ruin of one class of workers will have far-reaching effects on many other groups.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a table showing various classes of fish imports for the years 1939, 1946, 1947, and 1948 which was supplied me by the Office of International Trade. The table follows:

United States imports for consumption of fish: Total and leading kinds from Japan, 1939, 1946, 1947, and 1948

Item	1939	1946	1947	1948
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	346,240	473,085	407,491	472,427
Amount, thousands of dollars	32,404	89,702	82,978	110,954
Tuna, fresh or frozen: [1]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	14,595	3,997	9,204	9,143
Amount, thousands of dollars	749	612	1,237	1,616
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	5,202	----------	----------	2,392
Amount, thousands of dollars	328	----------	----------	536
Tuna in oil: [2]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	10,126	4,739	6,148	8,288
Amount, thousands of dollars	1,669	1,952	3,241	4,723
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	7,764	----------	[3]	645
Amount, thousands of dollars	1,314	----------	[3]	418
Crabmeat, sauce and paste:				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	13,507	23	390	1,341
Amount, thousands of dollars	4,582	17	312	754
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	0,719	----------	377	480
Amount, thousands of dollars	3,767	----------	302	396
Cod, hake, haddock, and cusk:				
Fresh or frozen: [4]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	1,462	6,370	2,196	5,278
Amount, thousands of dollars	57,220	430	199	502
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	----------	----------	----------	----------
Amount, thousands of dollars	----------	----------	----------	----------
Filleted, skinned, boned, sliced, or divided, n. s. p. f.: [4]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	9,426	49,171	35,093	53,964
Amount, thousands of dollars	714	9,929	6,193	10,752
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	----------	----------	----------	----------
Amount, thousands of dollars	----------	----------	----------	----------
Dried and unsalted: [5]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	4	897	1,100	925
Amount, thousands of dollars	[3]	269	308	270
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	1	----------	----------	----------
Amount, thousands of dollars	[3]	----------	----------	----------
Pickled or salted: [4]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	53,918	50,011	25,350	54,232
Amount, thousands of dollars	2,257	7,251	3,960	8,540
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	898	----------	----------	----------
Amount, thousands of dollars	57	----------	----------	----------
Smoked or kippered: [4]				
Total:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	2,617	5,189	2,979	3,707
Amount, thousands of dollars	261	1,181	619	817
From Japan:				
Quantity, thousands of pounds	----------	----------	----------	----------
Amount, thousands of dollars	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Imported mainly from Costa Rica in 1946 and 1947.
[2] Imported mainly from Peru in 1946 and 1947.
[3] Less than 500. N. s. p. f.—not specifically provided for.
[4] Imported mainly from Canada and Newfoundland.
[5] Imported mainly from Norway.

Source: Prepared in the Department of Commerce, by Special Programs Branch, Areas Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, March 1949.

Program of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by me over Station WLOA, Braddock, Pa., on Sunday, February 20, 1949, as follows:

The election of 1948 is now history. The people of the United States in a free election have raised their voices and spoken out in favor of the program of the Democratic party. They have given President Truman and the Eighty-first Congress a mandate to perpetuate and extend the program and hopes of our late, departed President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Now that the election is over, we cannot consider the fight won. The legislative job still lies ahead. And we are going ahead to fulfill our promise to the American people.

We have a proud heritage. A strong and vital democracy. But it is not perfect. We are all aware of its shortcomings. That is one reason why we have elections. When we want things done we elect people to do that job. That is one reason why the present Congress is composed as it is today. The Eighty-first Congress is pledged to raise the standard of living of the peoples of our country; give every American full civil rights—and enforce those rights with all the authority of government; provide decent homes for all Americans; proper education; adequate medical care; social security; and full employment with jobs at fair pay.

There is an urgency to our job. For two years the Republican Party has been at work undermining the program of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They have turned the clock back a quarter century as far American labor is concerned. They have proved their lack of concern with civil rights. They failed to act upon President Truman's fine civil-rights program when it was presented to them on a platter. Not only didn't they act upon this program, but they presented the Eighty-first Congress with a discriminatory displaced persons mess, with their anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish bill. They turned a deaf ear to the housing needs of the American people.

They allowed this country to go into the greatest inflationary spiral in its history. They tried to pass the buck to labor. What is the truth? Corporation profits after taxes were $6,400,000,000 in 1940. In 1948, they were $20,800,000,000. At the time of the election last fall, 31 percent of all American families were earning less than $2,000 a year. The Bureau of Labor Statistics said last fall that an American family required a minimum of $3,200 a year in order to maintain minimum food, clothing, and housing requirements. More than one-half all American families are below this minimum.

There is the Republican tax bill, giving the highest-income group an opportunity to pocket more of their all-time high earnings. And this at a time when Government expenditures were at a peacetime high. Our children need good schools and adequately paid teachers. The Republicans did not think so. Millions of workers are outside the coverage of our social-security laws. The Republicans opposed doing anything about it. And our old people. Who can live on the old-age benefits currently allowed them? The Republicans were not concerned with them.

This is part of the mess the Republicans have turned over to us, the members of the Eighty-first Congress. Many people are impatient. They say, "You fellows have been in Washington since the beginning of the year. The Taft-Hartley law is still in existence. Where is this health bill? And what about that slum clearance and public-housing bill?"

The Eighty-first Congress will not break its pledge to the American people. The first job of the Eighty-first Congress was to establish its committees to hold hearings and discuss the legislation in question. The committees and subcommittees have now been established and are at work. President Truman has forwarded to Congress legislation pertaining to the campaign promises of the Democratic Party. His bills are at the present time under study and discussion. Time tables have been established. Witnesses are appearing daily to testify for or against the bills. Under our democratic system we would not have it otherwise. Every American has the right to be heard.

The test of the pudding is in the eating thereof. Our Republican opponents, like the honorable Senator TAFT from Ohio, tell the American people that only minor changes will be made in the Taft-Hartley Act. They say the same thing about our intentions regarding civil rights, health, education, displaced persons, and housing. Are they so callow as to believe we would fail to carry through the mandate we have received from the people?

To attack the Eighty-first Congress is to attack the intelligence of the American people. The American people want peace, freedom, and security. They want it now. They want to work together as a Nation—as brothers—to increase our production and to raise the standard of living for all Americans. To work together as brothers means equal opportunity and equal treatment before the law and on the job. Our Negroes have not been treated fairly. Economic, social, and political discrimination has been common. Other minorities, to a lesser, degree, have known this discrimination.

The Democratic Party has pledged "The right of full and equal political participation." This means the end of the poll tax.

The Democratic Party has pledged "The right of security of person." This means an antilynching bill and the strengthening of our civil-right laws.

The Democratic Party has pledged "The right of full and equal opportunity of employment." This means a Federal FEPC.

The Democratic Party has pledged "The right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our country." This means no segregation and discrimination in our armed forces.

Seven States still have the poll tax. In the 1948 election only 14 percent of the eligible voters voted in poll tax Alabama. Only reaction can be maintained by such laws, which have as their basis the belief that only a small minority should vote and legislate.

Today the Federal Government is without power to interfere in lynching cases. And the States are not willing to use their authority to do anything about it. State courts throw out all lynching cases, although some go through the farce of having jury trials, with the decisions known before the trials start. Lynching is more than just killing someone. It is more than murder. It is a threat to a whole people that they had better do nothing to stand up for their rights under our Constitution. Only a Federal law can stop lynching.

The weapon of reaction in Congress today is the filibuster. It remains yet on the books. Another weapon of reaction, the seniority rights of poll-tax State legislators, has been weakened considerably by the Eighty-first Congress. In the past by stacking congressional committees with legislators from poll-tax States who are reelected without opposition time after time, liberal, constructive legislation had a hard time being heard. The Eighty-first Congress has overcome this handicap. The problem of the filibuster still remains. There is every indication that the Eighty-first Congress will take care of filibustering before the civil-rights program appears on the floor of the Senate.

Millions of workers in this country will not feel secure until the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed. The Taft-Hartley Act abridges labor's fundamental rights. We must return to the spirit of the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act had two main purposes. One was to permit workers to join unions without the fear of losing their jobs. The second was to make management bargain collectively with unions freely elected and representing a majority of the workers.

The purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act was to destroy unions. It was never intended to regulate labor-management relations. Even Business Week and Time magazine admit this. The Taft-Hartley Act permitted workers to ask the NLRB for a new election, on the ground that they really represented the workers of a plant and not the union. The Taft-Hartley Act also forbade the closed shop. With an increase of unemployment, the whole union movement could be destroyed legally in this country.

Americans have a right to be healthy. Our medical care is too costly. Families can't save for future medical expenses. Certain hospital treatments cost more than families earn annually. About 70,000,000 Americans have no savings today. An illness would be a serious financial burden on them. The cost of medical care is often the real cause of death in many fatal illnesses. People do not go to doctors when they should because they do not have the money. Often they wait until it is too late.

Our medical care is inadequate. Almost 1,200 of our 3,000 counties are without hospitals. We have 140,000 doctors. We need 200,000. Our medical care is not evenly distributed. Rural areas do not have the same proportion of doctors to population as do urban areas. The South does not have half the doctor-population ratio that the North has.

The American Medical Association is frightened today that the Eighty-first Congress means business. For the first time it has offered a program of its own—a sadly inadequate program, but an indication that it knows it has not been playing fair with us.

The bill the Eighty-first Congress is considering plans to double the number of medical-school graduates each year; to add 600,000 new hospital beds by 1960; to expand psychiatric, rehabilitation, and medical research. By a pay-roll deduction system matched by the employer and added to by the Government, all services would be provided to Americans. Doctors would be paid from the insurance fund and would be free to join the program or stay out, free to select their patients. The American Medical Association is spending $3,500,000 to defeat this measure before the Eighty-first Congress. They will not succeed in killing the national health bill.

We come now to the matter of housing. Under the administration bill, we hope to present an adequate and successful program to conquer our slum problem and make housing available to the lower-income groups. Our bill takes into consideration the needs of 2,500,000 families now living doubled up. The United States Census Bureau estimates that by 1960 there will be about 7,000,000 more nonfarm families requiring homes than there were in 1947.

About 3,000,000 farm dwellings would have to be rebuilt between now and 1960. There are about 6,000,000 nonfarm housing units that are substandard and will have to be replaced. Altogether it is estimated that we will need about 17,000,000 dwelling units by 1960. The Republicans would have us do nothing except end rent control and make more credit available for high-cost high-income construction.

Housing costs are so high today that it is prohibitive for all but the well-to-do to build homes. The administration's housing program would provide Federal loans and grants to local governments to eliminate slums and blighted areas. It would also authorize Federal financial assistance for more than 1,000,000 low-rent public-housing units.

The administration is pledged to increase the coverage of our social-security laws and to increase the benefits therefrom so that they will provide the security they fail to do today. The cost of living has gone up 75 percent since 1939. Benefits—inadequate in the first place—have not been increased. We need universal coverage. The present administration recognizes this and plans to do something about it. Only 40,000,000 of our labor forces of 70,000,000 are covered. There is no reason why farmers, farm workers, nurses, janitors, domestics, teachers, and Government workers should be excluded.

Unemployment benefits, old-age benefits, aid to the handicapped is below the minimum level necessary to be of real assistance.

The Eighty-first Congress recognizes that our educational system is inadequate. We do not have enough schools. Millions of children are forced to attend school on a part-time basis because of the shortage of facilities. We do not have enough teachers, nor are the teachers available adequately paid or trained. Some States provide better educational training than others. A child should not be penalized because he was born in Mississippi. Our schools are now a Federal problem. The States can no longer cope with the expenses of providing adequate service. They need Federal funds on a loan or grant basis.

The Eighty-first Congress is pledged to raise minimum wages. The present minimum wage of 40 cents an hour has been in effect since 1938.

The United States must expand its productive facilities and produce more goods for its growing population. This is something that cannot be left entirely to the whims of the market place. If we allow our national income to fall, plants will curtail production, unemployment will rise, and our standard of living will fall. Congress recognized the right of every man to a job when it passed the Full Employment Act. This is today a Government responsibility. We must insist on national democratic programming so that our industrial capacity will be sufficient to produce the goods we need. And we must make certain that raw materials are not squandered but are directed to their best use. When industry is unwilling to expand its capacity Goverment must act if the alternative is unemployment, inflation, and lower standard of living.

The Eighty-first Congress will accept the responsibility of our Government to develop and conserve our resources. When our country was young there was no need to have the Government concern itself with reclamation, reforestation, and flood control. But today it takes Federal planning and dollars to handle the immense job. We began as a nation with 8,000,000,000,000 board-feet of lumber Today we have only 1,800,000,000,000 board-feet. One-third of our 500,000,000 acres of commercial forest land is denuded or poorly stocked. Over a third of our topsoil has washed away, or the equivalent of 140,000,000 acres of land. A heavy flood on the Ohio River covers millions of acres.

These disasters are national. They encompass more than the boundaries of individual States. Twelve years of the TVA have proved

to us what the rest of the country has to gain by similar programs. The original charge of communism against the program has proved ridiculous. So has the charge that the people in the Tennessee Valley would lose their individual freedom.

The TVA has proved that flood control actually controls the wanton damage of unregulated rivers. It has proved that regional planning will raise the standard of living. It has proved that private power companies in this country charge too much for their power. It has proved that private power does not readily expand its facilities unless it feels competition.

In the past half century, every President has come out in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The opposition has always given the alarm that we were not prepared for such action. "Let us study it some more," they cried. And today the St. Lawrence waterway project is probably the most-studied program ever put before Congress. The Republicans today would like to have the Eighty-first Congress continue studying it. But we know that it will provide cheaper and more power than the TVA and that it will add mightily to our industrial capacity.

The Eighty-first Congress is pledged to maintain farm prosperity. We are concerned with the problem of farm production and farm income. The Eightieth Congress would not pass the international wheat agreement, which would have provided our farmers with a floor price for their export market. These international agreements are necessary to cover all our farm commodities going to overseas markets.

The Eighty-first Congress wants to maintain high farm production and expand farm income. The answer is not to increase prices by cutting farm production. There are too many Americans who would suffer as a result. Abundance is what we want—and not scarcity.

The Eighty-first Congress is pledged to help western Europe revive so that free institutions can be strengthened there. The ECA program means an opportunity for western Europe to raise its productivity and compete once more in world markets. The ECA program means an opportunity for western Europe to raise its standard of living. The ECA program means that we are concerned with peoples elsewhere. We are our brother's keeper.

In his inaugural address, President Truman has pledged himself to develop the backward areas of the world. He did not mean the old type of imperialism of masters and natives. Nor did he mean giving everyone in the world a bathtub. Our new Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, has expressed it well.

"At home and abroad our aim is to enable the individual to attain the freedom and dignity and fullness of life which should be the purpose of all government.

"It is not that we believe that other people need or wish things for their own purposes merely to have these material things. It is not that material objects in or of themselves make a better or fuller life. But they are the means by which people can obtain freedom—not only freedom from the pressure of these other human beings who would restrict their freedom, but also help in the ancient struggle of man to earn his living and get his bread from the soil."

The Eighty-first Congress is pledged to help the new Republic of Israel get a good start in its career in the family of nations. Already the World Bank has made available $100,000,000 for developmental purposes and American research and scientific know-how will be made available to Israel. In time the Jewish population of Israel may reach 2,000,000 persons, and as such will be the third largest Jewish community in the world.

The road ahead is not smooth. Problems will arise and at times the Eighty-first Congress will feel the road blocks and fences are in its path. But with the mandate from the people and the desire to build a better America, the Eighty-first Congress will not fail. We are on our way.

Mr. Dulles on Scandinavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post, Thursday, March 10, 1949:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
MR. DULLES ON SCANDINAVIA

It has been known for about a week in Washington that Mr. John Foster Dulles intended to say publicly at the Cleveland Conference sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches what he has been telling officials privately since before the election: That the United States should not seek military bases so close to the Soviet Union as to carry an offensive threat that is disproportionate to defensive value, and that that is why our fellowship with the peoples of western Europe, and particularly of Scandinavia, ought not to seem to bring United States military might directly to Russia's border.

Since the effort to unite Scandinavia in an independent defensive league has been torpedoed, and Norway with Denmark about to follow has joined the Atlantic Pact, is Mr. Dulles' warning a case of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen? Some who really agree with him said, when they heard he would speak out, that he is too late. In the sense that we now have a special commitment, which must be honored, to protect Norway and Denmark against the consequences, it is too late to undo what it would have been much better not to do.

But it is by no means too late to consider very seriously how we are to deal with the consequences. The pact is not an honorary society in which, once elected, the new member wears his decoration on gala occasions. Nor is the pact a simple case of our promising to defend—let us say Norway and Denmark—and of letting them buy weapons in return for their promise to go to war if the other members are at war. The pact is, as all the world knows, a legal framework within which the high command of the principal nations are to organize a strategical system.

The plan of that system is still under discussion, and that is why the intervention of Mr. Dulles has great practical significance.

His warning against seeking military bases so close to the Soviet Union must be read in connection with the Norwegian reply (March 4) to the Soviet Union. Norway, says the note, desires to reiterate most categorically that it will not grant bases for foreign military forces on Norwegian territory as long as Norway is not attacked or subject to threats of attack.

Were the full story of our Scandinavian policy during the summer and autumn as well known here as it is abroad, it would be clear that the Norwegian statement together with Mr. Dulles' warning are an attempt to stop the car before it skids into the ditch. For, as Mr. Dulles said, it can be assumed that the Soviet state would use the Red Army if its leaders felt that their homeland was imminently and seriously menaced * * *. It would, inded, involve a high tribute to Soviet leaders to assume that, under these circumstances, they would exercise more self-control than would our people under comparable circumstances, as, for example, if the Soviet Union had military arrangements with a country at our border.

This warning is timely not only in respect to the next steps in Scandinavia but also in respect to the extremely sensitive southern flank of the Soviet Union. In the past few days we have had from Turkey a little-noticed dispatch to the Times in London reporting that the Soviet Ambassador had made inquiries, similar to those made in Norway, about the Mediterranean pact, which is being considered in London and Washington.

On Tuesday there was a diplomatic denial from the Turkish Foreign Office. The report of the Times correspondent may be completely unfounded as to what has happened. But no one need think it is completely unfounded as to what is sure to happen.

Now there should be no misunderstanding about the position of those who, like Mr. Dulles, believe it necessary and wise to halt the quest for military bases on the borders of the Soviet Union. They are not, and never have been, advocates of appeasement. They have been among the first to insist that this country should by a show of force, backed by rearmament and conscription, make it unmistakably clear that any movement of the Red Army anywhere beyond the armistice lines would, without benefit of any pact but, as a matter of vital American self-interest be resisted. That policy, which was indicated by the dispatch of the battleship *Missouri* to Turkey 3 years ago this month, was a turning point in the east-west conflict. The American action restored the balance of power and, thereafter, the conflict was limited to a cold war.

The objection to the Scandinavian policy, which has changed the original character of the Atlantic Pact, is that it may, if it is not checked, bring the conflict to a point where only a solution by war is possible. That is what Mr. Dulles was talking about, in effect, that American power should be used to deter Soviet aggression but not to back the Russians into a corner. And what he was saying reflects the views of our most responsible military leaders. They are by no means pleased with the handiwork of some of their more impetuous colleagues in the Pentagon and of the foreign-service officers who are more strategically minded than the responsible strategists themselves.

Some of them, indeed, have not forgotten what General Eisenhower said on November 14, 1942, in a telegram to the War Department, now reprinted in his book, about the political advice he had received before the landing in north Africa from one of the principal figures in the Scandinavian affair—that existing French sentiment here does not remotely agree with prior calculations.

You'll Never Miss the Oil Till Well Runs Dry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while we hear so much about conservation few people realize our absolute dependence on the use of petroleum energy

in practically every line of human endeavor. Every nation on earth recognizes that gasoline is indispensable in waging war. What would happen to our farming industry and our food supply if gasoline was unobtainable for even a month?

If there is any resource that should be conserved in this country it is our petroleum reserves. For the consideration of my colleagues there is inserted here a letter received from the Interstate Oil Compact Commission captioned "Dedicated to the conservation of oil and gas" with my reply thereto.

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 8, 1949.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: We have received the copy of our statistical bulletin which you returned with your comments: "It is only a short time until the petroleum reserves of this country will be used up."

We do not know whether you are serious in this statement. Some good men believe this is true, but our information does not support it. Our known producible reserves are greater today than ever in our history, and at the same time we are producing more oil than there is demand for, so that above-ground stocks are increasing. In some States it has been necessary to cut back production in order to prevent waste. In addition, we have large reserves which are under known methods at this time not producible, but it is anticipated that they will be under future methods, and we have reserves in shale in the Rocky Mountains and other areas, sufficient to supply the Nation for years when it becomes economically profitable to develop the same, all of which indicates to us that our reserves will not be exhausted in a short time.

I take it from your returning the statistical bulletin that you do not care to receive future copies. At the request of a Member of Congress we placed all Members on our list to receive our statistical bulletin and our newsletter, Compact Comments, but we are removing your name from our mailing list.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which is an association of 21 oil and gas producing States under a compact approved by the Congress, stands ready to furnish any information you desire at any time.

Yours very truly,

EARL FOSTER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. EARL FOSTER,
Executive Secretary,
Interstate Oil Compact Commission,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

DEAR MR. FOSTER: It is reassuring to receive your optimistic letter concerning the permanence of our national oil supply obtainable from our petroleum reserves.

I'm told by the petroleum experts of the Department of the Interior it is estimated that we have in sight at the present time petroleum reserves to last another 12 years.

As secretary of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, you must have observed how dependent the American people are on the use of petroleum energy (gasoline) in most every line of human endeavor. I shudder to think what will happen to our national economy when the source of this energy is exhausted. You say "We have reserves in shale in the Rocky Mountains and other areas, sufficient to supply the Nation for years," which is certainly on optimistic statement when you look over oil storage facilities over the country and estimate the size of the stream of gasoline that is being used to keep these tanks filled. It would seem that when our oil wells are exhausted that enough shales will have to be crushed and the oil extracted to fill a good-size river to supply the petroleum and gasoline needs of the Nation, when every airplane that flies, every boat that plies the sea, and most of our railway locomotives, to say nothing of the trucks, busses, and every automobile that rolls, is draining away the precious energy that we must depend on to plant, harvest, process, and transport everything we eat and wear.

We hear much about conservation while billions of gallons of oil are being burned, displacing coal, to generate steam, because it is a little more convenient to inject oil into the firebox than shovel coal. Now, we are hauling coal through the air by using gasoline in airplanes, to fuel a European city, about as large as Chicago.

I wonder what your grandchildren and mine will think when they come to know the wastefulness of the period in which we live, as I used to do as a boy on an abandoned plantation in the Deep South, when I heard of ease and affluence, the lack of economy of slavery days "befo' de war." Maybe you and I should not disturb the assurance and sweet dreams of the future and the opulence of America by speculating what will happen when our reserves of petroleum run out.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Another Rip Van Winkle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sure, better late than never, but it is interesting, as well as refreshing and encouraging, to note that some of the editors who have been asleep—not quite as long as old Rip Van Winkle—but for some 10 or 15 years, are awakening to the fact that "the public will not be damned."

For 10 years or more, I have been insisting in and out of Congress that the public, as well as employees and management, was entitled to fair labor legislation. For my efforts and as a reward, not a few left-wing columnists, some of them encouraged by Collier's, repeatedly attempted to take my hide off with smear paragraphs and articles.

I was branded as antilabor, as an old reactionary, as a has-been, as adhering to the horse-and-buggy philosophy, as a tool of the economic royalists.

And now, lo and behold, at last, when public sentiment seems to have swung that way, out comes Collier's, in their issue dated March 19, with an editorial which reads as follows:

COLLIER'S BELIEVES THE PUBLIC WILL NOT BE DAMNED

Collier's thinks the public is the party to protect in labor controversy. Labor is not downtrodden, not any more. Capital and management are neither helpless nor inarticulate. The public—all of us, that is, employed, employers, workers, consumers—is the one in need of help.

We pay the bills. We are the people about whom the Congress should be concerned. Right now is a good time to think about the public interest in labor controversy. Congress is making a new law. Why not remember the salient facts?

About 3 years ago we had a railroad strike. Two railroad brotherhoods, the trainmen and the engineers, rejected a settlement that had been reached through the machinery of the Railroad Labor Act. So they called a strike.

The United States could not stand a long-fought-out railroad strike. The people of every great city would be hungry and finally starve if railroad transportation were suspended too long.

Few cities have more than 2 or 3 weeks' supply of food, fuel, and medicines. People are not going to starve quietly because employers and employees cannot peacefully agree on wages, hours, or whatever they wrangle about. Make the public mad, and it will act violently and not necessarily reasonably.

Remember what happened when the railroad strike was called? We were inconvenienced for a day. Then people began to get angry. They got scared. Then President Truman asked Congress for authority to draft the strikers into the armed forces. By that time the union leaders were scared, too. They denounced Mr. Truman, but they called off the strike.

But the notion of breaking a strike by calling the strikers into the armed forces is surely not the final answer to protecting the public welfare at a time of labor trouble. Congress did not pass the bill suggested by the President. He possibly was glad not to be given the authority and the responsibility.

On the face of things the Army and Navy are not places of detainment for unionists who have an unsettled difference with their employers. The armed forces should not be asked to perform such a service, but they will be asked to do such things again and again if Congress does not provide more sensible ways of protecting the public health and safety.

The truth is that we have never faced the facts of our modern living. A general strike that would deprive the public of food, fuel, transportation or any of the essentials of life would be intolerable. No government, conservative, liberal, Communist, or even labor, could tolerate it.

A successful general strike in any important field would be a rebellion against the existing government. That government would fight it. If the strikers won, the government would be defeated and discredited. No government would like that. No public would permit it.

Consequently, Collier's thinks that in whatever changes the Congress makes in the Taft-Hartley law, it had better write something soundly and clearly about the public stake in labor controversy. It is not enough to rely upon the President to improvise a solution in the heat of battle.

Grover Cleveland had to call out the United States Army 55 years ago when the railroads were strike bound. Theodore Roosevelt had to improvise a settlement when the coal mines were shut down too long forty-odd years ago.

When John L. Lewis decided to challenge the authority of the National Government by forcing a coal strike, President Truman was not so helpless. A simple court procedure showed Mr. Lewis in short order who was bigger, he or the country. So by the reasonable means of negotiation an agreement was reached. It did no injury to the United Mine Workers.

It would be a step backward to wipe off the statute books the protection now given the public interest, unless something better is substituted. And that is not too easy. There is no facile solution of the conflicts of interest between employers and employees in a democratic republic of freemen. Compulsory arbitration, once hailed as a solution, has fewer adherents as time passes. The in-

tricate provisions of the Taft-Hartley law admittedly are not perfect. Whoever can find something actually better will be entitled to public gratitude.

The Taft-Hartley law has been so befouled politically that it has been very difficult for Congress or the public to approach it reasonably. Actually the congressional committee that was created to observe its operations and to recommend revisions has not found much bad to report.

The union leaders were against it. Among other things, the law made the union officials go back to the union members for authority. Perhaps the membership of the unions were not opposed to this.

At any rate, the law was an issue in the last Presidential campaign, and has been getting congressional attention because of this fact if for no better reason.

Collier's hopes that Congress will find a reasonable, democratic American way of safeguarding the national interest in time of great labor controversy. Collier's hopes that in whatever revisions are made Congress acts equitably in the public interest.—W. L. C.

Well, I remember the old saying, something to the effect that there was more rejoicing over the one sinner who repented than over the ninety and nine who never strayed from the fold.

A great publication like Collier's should be willing to lead, not just tail along in the wake of public sentiment.

The answer to strikes which injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare is not an injunction but a provision in the Federal law which will permit those in charge of industries and enterprises which must be operated in order to serve the public health, safety, and welfare to, after a reasonable waiting period, discharge the employees who do not want to work, hire others who do. It is as simple as all of that.

No End of Luxury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on excise taxes in the New York Daily Mirror of Friday, March 11, 1949:

NO END OF LUXURY

Among taxes that are unfair and self-defeating the most glaring examples are the wartime excise levies on various so-called luxuries.

These impose their burden on every family in America. They are killing off businesses. They are particularly destructive in the New York City area because here are situated many of the enterprises which these taxes directly attack.

This newspaper recently pointed out in a series of articles on the "20-percent death" how this excise blight is causing bankruptcies, creating unemployment, robbing the housewife and the workingwoman of a great deal of her allowance or pay check.

The mother who buys a bottle of baby oil or a jar of baby powder pays her 20 percent luxury tribute to the Federal Government.

GOVERNMENT'S VICTIMS

The purchaser of a handbag, a piece of luggage, cosmetics which are absolutely essential to the well-being of the modern woman, or a fur coat, which is a long-wearing, economical garment, hardly a luxury in today's living, suffers the same bite.

Make a long-distance telephone call, send a telegram—and the Federal Government sticks you for not 20, but 25 percent, above the cost of the service.

If the movies provide much of your recreation, as they do for so many city dwellers, just write off 20 cents added to every dollar as gravy for Washington.

Your electric light bulbs? Luxury. Ten percent.

It would seem reasonable that anything that goes by the name of the Fair Deal would be interested in lifting some of these unfair and discriminatory burdens off the backs of the people.

But Fair Deal is only a political slogan. Its fiscal agent, Secretary of Treasury John W. Snyder, says it would be dangerous to reduce the excise taxes without increasing other taxes to replace the revenue.

That's a familiar old New Deal-Fair Deal tune.

Probably the melody will linger on, but then—maybe not.

THE WAY TO RELIEF

There are evident some few glimmerings of hope in the growing bipartisan revolt against the Fair Deal spending program and in the support gathering for Representative JOSEPH MARTIN'S bill which would cut the excise taxes back to their prewar levels.

The outrageous telephone and telegraph taxes were originally intended only to help keep the wires clear for heavy wartime traffic.

Likewise, the doubling of the other taxes made sense in the war year of 1943, particularly as it was accompanied by the Government's solemn promise of a cut-back as soon as hostilities were over.

No Congressman, Democrat or Republican, can defend these asinine levies. So it seems to be up to us, the people, to make as much noise as it will take to get them knocked down to size. Best way is the time-honored "write your Congressman." While you're at it, drop a line to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., in support of his bill.

We repeat: These taxes are a burden and a blight everywhere, but they are a particular plague in the great New York area, a plague from which we all suffer, an economic sickness that may wipe out your job, or your neighbor's job.

United States Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of March 13, 1949, by Lester Allen in reference to the training of persons for the Diplomatic Service of the United States:

UNITED STATES MAY TRAIN ITS DIPLOMATS—WE WIN OUR WARS AND LOSE THE PEACE BECAUSE WE NEGLECT THE FIELD OF DIPLOMACY

(By Lester Allen)

There is a persistent and quite erroneous American belief that given the opportunity almost any free citizen of this Republic could give a creditable performance as President, five-star general or admiral, captain of industry, Secretary of State, or what-does-the-country-need.

No one in his right senses would wish to change that circumstance for it is the essence of the American dream, the hope of a pure and unfettered democracy. There are no limits to what people can accomplish by their own efforts in the United States insofar as rising in the world is concerned. Whether or not the individual functions efficiently and for the greatest good of the greatest number in the exalted position is quite another thing.

At the moment the greatest obstacle to real unification of the security services of the Nation—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—is basically the rivalries imposed on the mores of students in the service schools which are carried through a lifetime. This has been one of the favorite arguments for a revision of the educational systems at Annapolis and West Point. The suggested changes, however, seem to tackle the problem from the wrong angle.

WE WIN AND LOSE

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, has proposed still another service school in a bill, H. R. 471—a United States Foreign Service Academy. In a few well-chosen words Congressman LANE has summed up the need for such a school. "Why do we win wars and lose the peace," he asks, "the losing of which breeds more wars? Because we train men—career men—in the military arts but leave our diplomacy to amateurs. Take a recent trend—a man became a successful soldier—a general with several stars; he has learned how to command. Then we appoint him to a diplomatic post where he must exercise the flexible and understanding talent of a conciliator. It just doesn't work. We might as well put a bull in a china shop. Or, a man has wealth, social connections, or political pull. These are supposed to invest him overnight with an intimate knowledge of international affairs and all these other special qualities of a profession requiring years of study and experience.

"Diplomacy is a vocation, not an avocation. In the United States, however, we have come to regard it as a delayed-action Cook's tour. We pick a man who is successful and a regular fellow. We put him in charge of an embassy which is like an American island put down in the strange sea of some foreign country. He knows nothing of the language, customs, political organization, and history of that country. He blunders—unintentionally, of course—and ruins the good will we have built up through the sacrifice of many American lives and the expenditure of much American wealth. Then he is transferred, and the people back home begin to suspect that something is lacking in such an arrangement."

That is exactly what has been happening, and it is an excellent argument for the training of diplomats in a service school, if the demonstrated defects of our service-school system are avoided.

Just what are the defects of the service schools as they are now operated? They do turn out great military and naval leaders. That much has been demonstrated. But, unfortunately, they turn out officers with a prejudiced cast of mind, whose thinking is channeled along the lines of the services they will enter—and not very well channeled at that.

It is the accepted practice, for example, for the top men of the graduating class at West Point to enter the Corps of Engineers—the elite corps in the Army. The chances are that the officer who rises to the top in the Corps of Engineers will spend the majority of his time on nonmilitary projects—rivers, bridges, harbors, public works. The infantry—so-called queen of battles—gets the

lower- or lowest-ranking members of the class, except in those few instances where the young graduate himself elects the foot-slogging branch of the Army, which he will not do if any other choice is offered. Nevertheless, the infantry officer is the backbone of the Army.

CHIEF DEFECT

It has often been proposed that all nominations to West Point and Annapolis come from the ranks. This would be possible and effective only if there were universal military training, for such appointments would then be truly selective and on the basis of merit and promise. There would still be no guaranty, however, that the service rivalries would be stopped, or whether it is desirable to stop the rivalry.

The chief defect as the system now operates seems to be in the original selection of individuals to be trained as eventual leaders of the Nation's services. As it is now any young man who can get an appointment, either in competitive examination or by favor of a Member of Congress, is taken into Annapolis or West Point and thumped into conformity with what the rival services believe that an officer should be regardless of whether the individual has aptitude for the kind of life he must live in following his career. The service-school authorities argue that the unfit are weeded out before graduation, but that is mere expedient argument. It is not true. The unfit with powerful friends in the right place can move right on up to five stars. Can and do.

It was demonstrated during World War II that in open competition in the armed services for key posts in the officers corps of all the services—reserve or nonreserve school officers—gave the trade-school boys a stiff standard of competence to meet. Of course, the trade-school clique set it up so that their boys were always on top, and they made certain that when the war ended their boys were still in the rail position. Not a voice was raised against the wholesale dismissal to civilian life of officers who had proved their superiority in war by the trade-school boys, with the result that, today, they are trying to lure back the younger reservists. But, what's the chore they want them for? To do the back-breaking job of training new conscripts and volunteers, not for staff jobs, you may be sure. Not for procurement, or economic mobilization, or any of the complex planning that keeps the Nation prepared.

Congressman LANE has proposed some requirements for the Foreign Service Academy that could very well be adopted by the armed-services academies. One is that in making original appointments of permanent officers in the Foreign Service, preference shall be given to graduates of the Academy—after they have served 2 years as temporary employees at foreign stations. It would be a great improvement if the midshipman or cadet were given preference for permanent commission in the United States Army or the United States Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force after 2 years service in that force, and afford to non-Academy individuals the same chance for permanent appointment.

KNOW TOO LITTLE

Theoretically the reservist has the same chance, but in actual practice there are too many road blocks set up by the trade-school boys to make it effective. The fact is that the trade-school graduate is still raw material when commissioned. His real value to his country, and his ability are developed later, in the daily discharge of his duties, in special assignments, and in the staff colleges. The trade school merely prepares the man for what comes later on, but, so do any number of high-ranking colleges.

As it is in the Army and Navy, so it is in the United States Foreign Service. It is not a newly discovered condition. It has been known for a long time that there were too many American diplomats who knew how to balance a cup of tea but knew all too little about their own country, and less than that about the country in which they were stationed.

Congressman LANE has summarized the need in his bill, and he has pointed out that one of the objectives of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, was to insure that it was broadly representative of the American people, and fully informed in respect to current trends in American life.

This can be achieved by the medium of a foreign service academy which will make certain that such officers receive a thorough training in the traditions, the history, and the performance of our way of life as well as that of the countries to which they are assigned.

How many times have we felt that our colleges and universities as such, were taking the United States for granted, and were failing to provide that awareness of American culture and civilization, with all its accomplishments and its shortcomings which must serve as the basis of their occupations and their lives?

SERVICES DIVIDED

We cannot leave our Foreign Service to men and women who are not specially trained in Americanism first.

Many people do not know that our State Department and the Foreign Service are two distinct organizations, each with its own personnel, appropriations, and administration.

This dual structure makes the United States today the only major power with its foreign-affairs organizations divided into two segments, and often alienated, one from the other.

Our Foreign Service personnel, to keep in touch with their fellow Americans and the viewpoint of Americans, must serve in the United States for longer periods than actually is the case today.

This signifies in part that there is lack of a unified basic training for the Foreign Service.

In a one-world atomic age, we cannot rely upon cloistered scholars nor upon those who have acquired most of their formal education in foreign countries, to provide the personnel to represent us in diplomacy.

Our own colleges and universities, do not offer complete professional training in foreign service as a career.

Furthermore, they are limited in their approach because such training is a primary function of the Government and should be provided by the Government.

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a matter which, in my opinion, is of the utmost importance to the Nation, and that is the control or eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to include in these remarks copies of two resolutions adopted by the Senate of the State of California which brings this matter forcibly and opportunely to the attention of the Congress, and I beg to submit the same as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 8

Relative to the proposed International Animal Quarantine Station on Swan Island

Whereas the people of this State remember with the direst apprehension the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924 and 1929 and the paralyzing effect each of these outbreaks had upon the economy and welfare of California; and

Whereas the bulwark of protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States or this State has been subdivision (a) of section 306 of chapter 497 of the United States Statutes of 1930, providing that if the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited; and

Whereas restrictions on importations have from time to time been issued pursuant to the authority of Congress and by that means foot-and-mouth disease has been kept from the United States or any part thereof; and

Whereas chapter 592 of the United States Statutes of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, situate in the Caribbean Sea, an international animal quarantine station and permits the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, but subject to regulations prescribed by him to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, to permit animals to be brought into the Swan Island Quarantine Station from any country, including those in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists and to permit the same to be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

Whereas on December 7, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States gave notice of his intention to issue regulations relating to the Swan Island Quarantine Station, which regulations permit ruminants and swine to be shipped into the quarantine station if they originate in an area in a foreign country which has been free from foot-and-mouth disease for at least 60 days immediately preceding the date of movement of the ruminants and swine therefrom and after quarantine at Swan Island for not less than 90 days may be brought into the United States; and

Whereas the report on foot-and-mouth disease made to the Senate of California on March 18, 1948, by the Senate Interim Committee on Livestock Diseases, created by Senate Resolution No. 145 of the 1947 session of the California Legislature, shows that 316 Cebu bulls were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 and were removed from said island to the vicinity of Veracruz, Mexico, on the 28th of September 1946, and were thereafter inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease and 3 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the vicinity into which the Cebu bulls had been imported; and

Whereas the regulations for the operation of the Swan Island Quarantine Station pro-

posed by the Secretary of Agriculture can therefore not give any assurance that Swan Island will not become the avenue through which foot-and-mouth disease will be introduced into the United States; and

Whereas the California State Board of Agriculture at its meeting on January 17, 1949, attended by representatives from the California Farm Bureau, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, adopted a resolution with the unanimous concurrence of those in attendance, that the regulations for the Swan Island Quarantine Station should prohibit the importation into the United States of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture thereof that no action be taken for the use of Swan Island as a quarantine station with respect to the importation into this country of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in any part of which exists foot-and-mouth disease, and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to this effect; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Senate Joint Resolution 9

Relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the joint commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific, and general ways and means; and

Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the joint commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the joint commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program or planning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot and Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico, and commends the Commission for its excellent work; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these resolutions emanate from the State of California, I am taking the liberty to suggest that the Members from that State look into the matter, and if, in their judgment it is proper that one of the Members from that State introduces legislation as is suggested in the foregoing resolutions, and if such legislation is introduced, I feel sure that Members interested from other States will join in the support of this important legislation.

Why I Am That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have asked me why on occasion I voted as I did. My answer was that I was trying to vote my convictions and what I thought my constituents wished.

A letter received last week, which is typical of the letters from the district, will explain to the curious who care to read it the thinking of the average citizen of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. That letter reads as follows:

DECATUR, *March 7, 1949.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: In reply to your request, I wish to say, that we are definitely in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act, as are many other with whom we have talked.

What is wrong with it? Most of the complainers let someone else read and interpret it for them.

There is too much of that being done. I fear that some day, when it is too late, many are going to awaken from their lackadaisical way of letting someone else do it for them, and realize to their sorrow what it is all about, and that day is far too close to be comfortable; in fact, we think it is already here in its first stages.

TAFT, himself, has said that "there probably should be some changes made," and has expressed a willingness to make them. What more can one ask? So far as we can see, this bill gives the worker the greatest protection he has ever had, including protection from the heads of unions where they need it most.

Would you not think they could see it? All anyone seems to think of is shorter hours, more pay, more insurance, more vacations—Harry included—larger pensions so they can spend more time in taverns and pool rooms—more, more. Do they not realize that sometime, somehow, someone had to work to accumulate what they had hoped and had pride enough to believe would be enough to take care of them when they no longer were able to work? And now this gang comes along and wants to take it all away by taxation, while they are on vacation, and put us where we, too, will need a pension. When that day comes—oh, boy—I'm all for big ones.

Another thing, Why tax us to fight communism, then continue to let them come in here to lecture and spread their dirty doctrine?

Yesterday's Chicago Tribune gave an account of booklets being published in Washington showing air views of strategic places, atomic plants, etc.; then selling them to Russia for a few cents each.

Why charge for them? I move that we make it an outright gift; we have given away about all else we possess; they even have a good start on the shirt on our back.

I often read or hear something that so riles me, I think I will write to you; then on second thought, I take pity on you and think—oh, no, dear God—let him rest while he would be reading my protest. After all, we do still have faith in you and confidence in your judgment. We believe that being right there on the job, where you hear both sides, that your judgment is probably much better than anything we might suggest; so just go on being a good American. Fight and vote for the T-H Act and all else that is good for us.

Decatur has been Republican; I am not at all sure there is a party any more.

Sincerely,

MAME BOPE
(Mrs. W. P. Bope).

You Can't Explain a Dead Cat Out of the Family Cistern

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just told us of a large industry that is getting ready to leave the State of New York. He seemed to attribute its moving to the lack of a higher tariff.

Of course a tariff is an indirect tax on the consumer. The Fordney-McCumber tariff law, passed during the Harding administration, levied a tax on everything the average person has to buy, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining in the coffin in which old age is laid away.

Then the Smoot-Hawley tariff law was passed during the Hoover administration which levied a tax on his tombstone by placing a tariff on granite.

Someone has said that was done for the benefit of the granite "growers" of New England.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] gave the wrong reasons for this industry's running out of New York. It is not the tariff, or the lack of a tariff, but the FEPC law—that communistic monstrosity that was forced on to the people of that State by the pressure of a racial minority, and signed by Mr. Dewey with 22 pens, that is driving this enterprise out of the State.

When Governor Dewey signed that crazy measure, he signed away the Presidency of the United States.

All the perfumes of Arabia would not have sweetened his little hand after that.

That vicious FEPC Act, which was first promulgated by Joe Stalin in 1920, is hanging like the sword of Damocles over the head of every American businessman in the States of New York,

Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

On last Friday, March 11, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] attacked my speech on this subject which I made more than 2 years ago; and in his attempts to defend this communistic piece of legislative monstrocity, he reminded me of the words of the great iconoclast, W. C. Brand, who once said:

You can't explain a dead cat out of the family cistern.

The racial minority which forced this vicious measure through the Legislature of New York, and which is now attempting to force it onto the rest of the Nation, does not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They are simply using the poor Negro as a smoke screen. They are doing the Negroes far more harm than good.

I said when Mr. Dewey signed this vicious measure that he had got his mustache in the wringer, and I did not believe he would ever get it out.

My predictions came true.

They put this proposition on the ballot in California in 1946, and it was defeated by a clear majority in every single county in the State. The majority against it in the State was more than a million.

They tried to ram it through the Legislature of Pennsylvania a short time ago, but the intelligent legislators of that great State killed it as dead as Hector.

They are now trying to ram it through the Legislature of Ohio, in the hope of lining that State up, and trying to impose it as a national proposition.

I do not believe the legislators of the great State of Ohio are willing to commit industrial suicide for that proud Commonwealth just to gratify the cupidity of an alien minority that is trying to force this communistic measure on to the whole country, because of the effect it is having on those States that have gone so far afield as to write it into their statute books.

They had better repeal it and save those States from disaster.

They are trying to do the same thing in Minnesota. I pointed out the other day that it would probably mean industrial suicide for the State of Minnesota, as it would for the State of Ohio; because I do not believe they can ram this vicious measure through the Congress, and force it onto the other States, from now until doomsday.

In this attempt to "explain the dead cat out of family cistern," the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] presumed to take issue with some of the things I said, and admitting a large portion of them by omission. I simply took the record and read the regulations imposed on the people of New York under this measure into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here is what I said then, and I stand by it today.

The speech referred to follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I arose to discuss a measure introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] for the re-creation of the now defunct FEPC, or the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee.

I believe Mr. Dirksen made a speech for such a measure in the last Congress.

It would certainly take a genius to reconcile that speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and this FEPC bill he has introduced with his recent speech against communism, especially since that FEPC is the chief plank in the Communist platform.

It is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened in all its history. I am going to show what it would do to the people of Illinois by pointing out what it is doing to the people of New York, where this vicious measure was written into the laws of that State without consulting the people who are suffering under it.

All these bills contain the same old bunk about making it a crime to discriminate in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, etc.

Before Mr. Dirksen attempts to ram this monstrosity down the throats of the people of Illinois, and all the other States, I suggest he do as they did in California, let the people of Illinois vote on it. That is what they did in California in the last election, and it was defeated by a majority in every single individual county in California.

Now let us see what such a measure is doing to the people of the State of New York.

A man from New York said to me this morning, "You know this measure is being operated in New York simply by failure to operate it." The other night there were two men from New York in a taxicab here in Washington driven by a man who works here on the Hill. They got into an argument. One of them said, "I told you this FEPC would ruin the State of New York if they ever put it on the statute books." The other one said, "I did not think so. I thought it was a humanitarian measure. But I now see my mistake."

Then the other man said, "Here is what it has done to me. I own a good home," I believe he said "out on Riverside Drive, and I also own a house next to it which I bought for my own protection. I had a friend living in the other house, but his business took him to another section of the country and he had to vacate. Like a fool, I put up a sign 'For rent,' thinking that someone in the community whom I could afford to rent it to would apply. Somebody put a colored fellow up to come and apply for it and the court now says I must let him have it."

I bring this to you for what it is worth. I understand the Communists in New York are demanding that the same rule be applied to rooms or apartments for rent.

But I want to read you some of the regulations that are now being imposed upon the people of the State of New York under this vicious law. Businessmen from New York tell me that the way they are getting around this measure is by operating through employment agencies, because no intelligent businessman would go to a State with that kind of law on its statute books and attempt to establish a new business or a new enterprise, especially with the regulations or rulings under it which I am now going to read to you.

Remember the, put this measure on the ticket in California and the people voted on it in the last election; and it lost in every single individual county in California. It was beaten in the entire State by about 3 to 1.

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent, law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:

"State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next "unlawful practice":

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make "inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into these questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War; i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States.

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

It will be remembered that this so-called FEPC was set up here in Washington by Executive order. But when we turned the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity on to it, the Congress refused to appropriate money for the continuation of any such communistic program.

In that fight I made a speech against that vicious program, on July 12, 1945, which I am inserting at this point for the information of everyone who reads this RECORD.

It reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the Crucifixion.

When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and has been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such dominion "when Federal

drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic."

But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

Here is the official list:

Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washigton, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

Field Operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Satio, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliation with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

It would be interesting, and probably enlightening to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat."

More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

Here is the list:

Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

LEGAL DIVISION

But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

INFORMATION DIVISION

Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

Mail and files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G.	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R.	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessman of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the "city of brotherly love." At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

Regional Office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what the supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position

that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Marzen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a super-government of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

Retained Earnings of Industrial Corporations Serious Problem for Nation and Stockholder Who Is Becoming Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, before World War II, and during most of the period during the war, corporations (including trade, transportation, banking and utilities) paid to their stockholders two-thirds of their earnings and retained one-third.

Section 102 of the Internal Revenue Act contemplates that 70 percent of such corporations earnings should be distributed as taxable dividends. In 1948 these corporations earned $21,000,000,000 in profits after the payment of taxes. Instead of paying out to the stockholders $14,000,000,000, or two-thirds of the earnings, they paid to them only $7,000,000,000. If the other seven billion had been paid to the stockholders, there would have been more money available for these stockholders to go into small businesses of their own, or to invest in other small businesses, or to buy more stock of the corporations that paid them the dividends. The officers and directors, having kept this $7,000,000,000 in the funds of the corporations deprived the United States Government of around $2,000,000,000 in taxes, and at the same time dried up the capital market to the extent of $5,000,000,000.

Last week I had a press conference at which I proposed that these corporations should be required to distribute these earnings as customary before World War II. Since that time I have received quite a few interesting letters. I am going to quote from some of them.

The following letter from a citizen of New York is self-explanatory:

Naturally I am 100 percent in favor of your suggestions on margin reductions, but in a broader sense its contribution to the capital problems of small business, and even large as well, should be enormous.

I feel rather well qualified to make this statement, because in the last 20 years I have been selling listed securities to the public, I have never experienced sales resistance, the equal of the 1949 version, especially when securities judged by the yield and earning basis have never been more attractive.

And isn't it ridiculous to margin $12,000 worth of soy beans (trading dynamite) with $750, when it costs $11,100 to margin 100 shares of conservative widow-supported American Telephone & Telegraph.

Good luck to you, and my respect for your intelligent leadership. The country can use plenty of this commodity.

From another citizen of New York the following letter was received:

I was happy and very gratified to see someone at last voice objection to the policy of corporations in merely salting away dollars.

I believe earnestly with you that the Government is being bilked out of taxes and that stockholders are being grossly victimized by the policy of corporations refusing to pay out dividends and in using cash for such flagrantly selfish purposes as establishing enormous personal pension funds to aid the management over the bumps in their old age.

The management, of course, blithely ignores the fact that thousands of people in each large concern are now dependent on dividend income to carry them through each year in their old age.

* * * * *

There are corporations selling at one times earnings and one and one-half times earnings because of the dividend pattern established by the management.

The public, the investors, of whom there are millions in America, people dependent on dividend income, and the Government are all being coolly, calmly, steadily deprived of their revenues and their rights.

I hope and trust you will continue your fight successfully. Good luck to you.

From a citizen of New England the following letter:

Allow me to congratulate you on your courageous character and sound common sense in connection with your public statement in favor of larger dividends and smaller margin requirements. An analysis of stockholders of any large corporation will show that the small stockholders are in the majority, and they are the people who are with you 1,000 percent. Everybody I spoke to today was enthusiastic about your splendid statement, and it has been suggested that I write and thank you for starting something which is really worth while and has enormous public support.

From another citizen of New England the following letter:

Please accept my heartiest congratulations in your magnificent defense of stockholders.

The unfair treatment accorded stockholders by corporations today would be most adequately rectified by the acceptance of such a bill as you propose.

I am completely in accord with your proposal to penalize corporations at least 20 percent of their earned surplus. In that event stockholders would receive their just and fair dividends and I wholeheartedly extend my most sincere wishes for a very speedy acceptance.

From a lady on the east coast the following letter:

As one of the many thousands of small investors throughout the country, I would like to express my appreciation of your effort for congressional action to force corporations to distribute more of the profits to the stockholders. From experience I am frank to say the abuse is growing worse and should be stopped. May I cite one extreme example?

I am the owner of 50 shares—7 percent—preferred stock of the Marion Power Shovel Co., purchased April 13, 1927, date of the initial sale of issue. Without going into too much detail, there has accumulated $112 in unpaid back dividends. In 1946 the company earned $9 per share and paid nothing; in 1947, $94 a share was earned, and in 1948 estimated earnings are $110 a share after

taxes. In the last 2 years regular dividends of $7 a year were paid, nothing on the accumulative dividends in arrears.

On several occasions in the past 2 years, the company offered various unsatisfactory exchanges for the preferred stock; with each successive occasion additional inducement was offered. Evidently the present management is intent on acquiring this preferred stock at the lowest price possible, at the same time depriving their owners of any payment on arrears, the earnings being held as risk capital, on which the company pays nothing.

I am sure I am expressing the opinion of the multitude of small investors throughout the country, who make these investments in the expectation of a reasonable and fair break from management, that the Congress will do somthing to rectify this abuse of the distribution of profits to stockholders on the part of so many corporations.

The people in our great State of Texas are also interested. The following is self-explanatory:

It was very heartening to read your timely remarks today regarding lowering of margins and paying out of more profits to stockholders.

Have been in the brokerage business for the past 19 years, and have noted the gradual decline in new business for some time. The above recommendations that you have made would more than adequately offset the poor business we have been doing lately.

You've broken the ice for us.

Another letter from Texas is as follows:

May I take this means of expressing my approval of your recommendation that corporations pay out to the owners of the business a more substantial part of the earnings than what they have the last several years. You are certainly right in saying that the stockholder should get and be able to spend his part of the earnings in his own way. Retention by a company of 30 percent of the profits should be sufficient.

May I take the privilege of suggesting that you also consider the unreasonableness of the present tax law that penalizes a stockholder. As you know, a corporation very properly pays tax on earnings, and presently when a stockholder gets the dividend he has to pay a tax on same too. This seems unfair for a stockholder is obviously paying twice on the same company's earnings. This policy is discouraging venture money going into old or new enterprises.

As we all know, business furnishes employment, and if the "tools" are not furnished in this way, then there is bound to be a resultant unemployment with a depression following in its wake. The alternative would be "State" financing which in my humble opinion is un-American for it is socialistic.

At any rate I feel that your thinking is along the right lines, and I want to take this means to commend you for your views and your efforts in behalf of the forgotten man—"the small investor" who is greatly responsible for furnishing the capital of big and small businesses without which our wonderful country could not be the big industrial power that it is.

A very interesting letter was received from a citizen of New Jersey, a plumbing and heating contractor, it is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thoroughly agree with your views on legislation to compel corporations to distribute larger amounts of their net profits to their shareholders, especially the ones who have invested their savings in the common stock of these companies.

It seems that the directors of the majority of corporations in recent years have adopted a set policy of retaining two-thirds of their net profits and giving one-third to the stockholders, but the selfish personal interest is shown by them by their increased salaries, long-term employment contracts with pensions along with incentive bonus payments, and many other schemes to eat up company profits to legally avoid income-tax payments in actual amounts of net profits earned.

These officers and directors forget that only a few years hence many of their companies were reorganized or were on the edge of bankruptcy but due to war contracts and the resultant business that came along with it they have made great progress in their financial structures, in many cases paid off their funded debt, modernized and expanded their plants along with building up huge reserves at the expense of our Government and the people who originally were the ones who made it possible to finance their business ventures, the common stockholder who should have been getting the two-thirds of the net profits.

This present-day procedure of dividend payments has driven the small investor out of the market of corporate financing because he has learned by sad experience that a reduction in profits mean less or no dividends to the common stockholder along with depreciated market value on his holding and eventual loss of his savings. The results are that it is practically impossible under the present methods of division of net profits to get people to invest in any form of corporate financing. So who are responsible for this condition? Not the people.

Your suggested bill to compel larger amounts of net profits to shareholders is sound business and good legislation that should have been enacted many years ago, there being no question about the increase in tax collections from the corporations and the individual investor.

I can picture the howl that is going to be made by those who are running our large corporations for the benefit of a few at the expense of the many people who hold common stock, along with the organized campaign that will be staged to oppose your idea, no doubt with flag waving by the big boys. Yours is one of the few practical, sound, beneficial proposals that have been presented in recent years for the maintenance of our American way of life and standards of living by giving moneys that belong to the people to spend in acordance to their own needs and ideas rather than an indirect managed economy by a few persons who sit on various boards of directors providing for their own personal future security at the expense of millions of common-stock holders.

Wishing you every success in this legislation as it will help business bring out idle money for investment, restore confidence, increase taxes, and at the same time help the corporations who have discouraged the investing public.

A citizen of Pittsburgh, Pa., writes:

Just read your article in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette regarding dividends and margin rates. This is the best news that has come out of Washington since election. It will be a great help to the small-business man and to people whose only source of income is from dividends and possible capital gain. More power to you and hope you can succeed.

A former Texan, but now a citizen of California, writes an interesting letter as follows:

My native State being Texas, and seeing an article in the paper, regarding large earnings for industries, and low payments in dividends to stockholders, felt you would be interested in concrete example.

Atlantic Refining Co., home office Philadelphia, Pa., (I have been in this plant) earned $12.68 in 1948—they paid the stock holders $2 for the entire year—this to me is an outrage. $10.68 went back in reserve funds, they should have paid at least $4.

This low dividend to stockholders reflects on the price of stock on the New York Stock Exchange. Should one wish to sell their holdings—stocks whose earnings, ranging from $6 to $8 a year are selling 5 to 10 points higher, due to a more liberal return to stockholders.

Standard Oil of Indiana, which paid dividends successively for over 50 years, earned $9.08 in 1948—they paid $2.50 to stockholders.

There are a few million people in the United States, such as school teachers, older people, et cetera, who are dependent on their return on odd lots they own, and if you could do something to see that such firms as mentioned above were forced to pay an extra dividend to stockholders out of their large 1948 earnings, I am sure it would not only be a feather in your cap, but many would bless you, and sometimes a good deed, to those in need, during these times of high prices brings blessing to the one who performs the good.

I happen to be one of these old "birds" from Texas who are dependent on dividends from some odd lots of stocks.

Hoping you may be successful, and with every best wish for personal success, I am with best wishes,

Another citizen of New Jersey wrote the following interesting letter:

Have read with interest your article in the New York Sun, dated March 9, relative to having corporations increase their dividends.

You are absolutely correct about your statement, and no doubt you will receive substantial support from many who will show their interest, as I am particularly concerned and you have my whole-hearted cooperation.

Only recently I communicated with a concern, after receiving their annual statement; their earnings were immense; they expanded immensely; their dividends (small) 15 cents quarterly; but their executive officers received enormous salaries. Where does the poor investor come in? With labor conditions, the wages are on a high scale, and the investor does not receive his ratio share; comparing with their earnings. Every investor likes to see the companies they invest in—that they grow—but as you write in your column: give the investor his share he is also entitled to larger dividends. Therefore, I urge you in every way to proceed with your program, as I certainly commented to several brokers that something should be done about the poor investor.

I, on the other hand, had to resign my position, due to death in family, and must take care of my invalid husband, who is unable to walk, nor speak well, as he suffers from the dreadful disease multiple sclerosis; naturally, placing yourself in my position, I must depend upon the small income, but, as you say, the dividends could be increased and would certainly help many people; either by reinvesting or other purposes, by supporting themselves.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT RULE BROKEN BY BANKS

A member of the New York Stock Exchange from Ohio wrote the following letter:

It was indeed a pleasure to receive the press reports regarding your activities in reducing margin requirements for the purchase of listed securities on our various exchanges.

There is one thing, however, that I would like to call your attention to which is decidedly in error in this press report that states: "The Federal Reserve rule now is that brokers, dealers, and banks may give credit only for 25 percent of the market value of securities so that the investor has to put up 75 percent in cash."

May I call your attention to the fact that ever since this rule has been in effect, it has

been broken right and left by banks. The ones that we have had experience with have paid absolutely no attention to this regulation and have loaned investors, some of whom were carrying their accounts in our office, decidedly in excess of the amount allowed under this regulation.

This is known to everybody in the securities business as well as the officials of the Federal Reserve Bank, and I think you would be doing our industry a most constructive piece of work if the banks of this country were forced to observe this rule as strictly as do members of the New York Stock Exchange. It is most unfair to allow the banks to take customers away from brokers because they can loan them up to 80 percent on the value of a security where we are confined to the customary 25 percent.

You are on the right track, Mr. PATMAN, and I congratulate you for the efforts you have put forth so far. May they be crowned with complete success, and, if they are, you will make lots of friends scattered throughout the country.

I hope the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System will take notice of this letter. It contains a rather serious accusation.

The following advertisement appeared in the Boston Herald, March 10, 1949, page 21:

STOCK TRADERS

We finance your stock market purchases and make loans on listed stocks. Twenty percent margin required.

Beacon Finance Co., 41 Beacon Street, Boston. LA 3-2155.

February 1, 1949.

It is typical of such ads appearing in other cities.

A citizen of Kentucky had the following to say:

I was gratified to read in the Cincinnati Enquirer on Thursday, March 10, an article in which you had recommended a larger distribution of earnings.

Congratulations upon your effort to help us small stockholders.

In the year of 1948 Cities Service Corp. earned $13.25 and paid stockholders $3; Sinclair Oil earned $7 and paid $2, so your statement is absolutely correct. How can the corporations expect public interest to invest their money in business on such basis as this?

I certainly appreciate your well-spoken words and trust you succeed further in your efforts.

TAX EVASION CHARGED

Another citizen complains in a letter that monopolies have evaded taxes through retaining earnings, as follows:

Permit me to congratulate you on your splendid effort to expose and clamp down on the monopoly capitalists in their greatest steal of the century. These monopolies have unquestionably evaded taxes through retained earnings. They have beyond any doubt plowed back many billions of dollars to their capital structures by robbing the stockholders as well as the Government.

These monopolies with their managerial despotism have denied the stockholders their rightly earned dividends and therefore your fine effort to invoke the taxing authority of the Nation to compel them to disgorge the stockholders' money is well justified. By your undertaking, you will benefit not only the stockholders but the corporations as well, as the stockholders will feel renewed faith in the corporations.

If you succeed, you shall have laid the foundation to a truly free-enterprise economic system. You will have earned the gratitude of millions of small investors who have put their life savings into these industrial enterprises.

One of the most interesting letters on this subject was from New York and is as follows:

I read with much interest the newspaper accounts of your calling for a law that would force corporations to pay out the greater portion of their earnings in dividends.

It is my belief that many corporations are piling up undue earned surpluses, not because they feel that the funds will be required for replacement or expansion facilities, but simply because those in control of the corporations have a large income and any additional current income would be swallowed up by taxes; this is, of course, to the detriment of the small stockholder.

As an example of this, and which may be of some interest to you, I am attaching the latest statement of ——— Manufacturing Co. It will be noted that their current earnings are practically nil, but they have accumulated an excessive surplus through past years' earnings and tax refunds. Three million dollars of the surplus came from a tax refund made to the corporation in 1947. Their present financial condition is all out of proportion to the volume of business and to any reasonable business requirement. You will note from the statement that their cash assets are almost $7,000,000 and is greater than their total annual sales volume.

DESIRE TO AVOID INCOME TAXES

Why don't they pay a dividend? The answer is given in the president of the company's letter to the stockholders dated April 12, 1948, which letter was issued as a rebuttal to a stockholders' committee, which was endeavoring to have a dividend declared from the unnecessarily large cash surplus. I have underlined the pertinent paragraph and you will see the only reasons that dividends are not declared is because of a desire on the part of the directors to avoid income taxes.

I and probably others who are small stockholders would like to receive the substantial dividend this corporation could afford to pay and would willingly pay the necessary income taxes, but unless someone like yourself champions the cause of the small stockholder, we are at the mercy of the controlling factions, who are not particularly interested in dividends during the high tax years, as their income from other sources has probably taken them into the very high tax-rate brackets.

Several months ago the Investors Digest, a house publication of the stock-brokerage house of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, carried an article about the Income Tax Bureau case against the Trico Products Corp., of Buffalo, N. Y., wherein the Tax Bureau had levied a special tax assessment against them for failure to properly and adequately distribute their earnings as dividends and that the case was headed for the Supreme Court. It also pointed out that this was the second time this had happened to the same corporation, and that on the previous occasion the stockholders had been able, through the courts, to hold the directors responsible because of their failure to declare a proper dividend and avoid the extra tax penalty. Assuming that the present tax laws permit such extra levies, then the failure to enforce the law seems to be the trouble.

I hope that you are successful.

It will be noticed that a corporation was referred to as withholding dividends because the dividend would be taxable.

In a letter sent out by the manufacturing company on April 12, 1948, the following paragraph was included:

Careful thought has been and is being given by the directors to the possibility of effecting a distribution of cash on hand in excess of the reasonable anticipated needs of the business in a manner not subject to income or surtaxes. To date, no method has been devised which has obtained Treasury Department approval. The directors' efforts in this respect, however, have in no sense terminated.

This same complaint has been received from numerous people concerning many different corporations.

ARGUMENT AGAINST CAPITAL-GAINS TAX

The following letter from a person in San Francisco contains an interesting suggestion about capital-gains tax. I am trying to ascertain now how much is actually collected by the Government through this method of taxation. If the amount is as small as I have been told, it is doubtful that it is in the interest of the Government for the capital-gains tax to be retained. This letter contains an illustration typical of many that should receive consideration. It is as follows:

I note that you are interested in lowering the margin on security purchases. If I may make a suggestion, I believe a number of changes should be made in regard to the law governing securities.

Take my case as an example. Having been in business in the East, naturally I acquired eastern securities. Later, moving to California, I was desirous of selling the eastern stock and investing in Pacific coast securities, merely to have my assets where I live. This was practically impossible, because it happened that I hold securities for investment only, having bought them at a time when the market was considerably lower than at present. Thus I could not dispose of them and transfer my holdings to the Pacific coast because of the income tax involved.

I believe that the Government could get more revenue if they would charge a higher rate on transactions and eliminate the income tax on the profit made on sales. This would increase the transactions very considerably and help stabilize the market and would allow holders to switch their holdings whenever desirable.

In other words, capital gains should be treated as capital (like they are in England) and not as income (which they are not), and this should apply to any and all capital gains, whether they are the result of sale of securities, real estate, business, etc.

POLICY OF UTILITY COMPANIES

Since I am sure that the author of the following letter will not object to his name being used, I am inserting it in full. It discloses a policy of the utility companies that is certainly more favorable to the stockholders and the public than the policy that is used by large industrial corporations. The profit figures for all corporations include utilities and banks. If they were separated the industrial corporations would appear more vulnerable.

C. D. ROBBINS & Co.,
Newark, N. J., March 10, 1949.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been in the securities business for 40 years and am a Republican. I want to take this occasion to congratulate you on your attitude on margin requirements on securities. Furthermore, I believe you are on the right track in your feeling that some law should be passed to tax undistributed profits up to a certain percentage. There is an Internal Revenue Bureau ruling now—section 102—requiring that corporations distribute up to 70 percent. This is not followed very carefully nor does it seem to be enforced. Large corporations retain, in many cases, 60 to

80 percent of the earnings belonging to stockholders rather than distributing and giving the stockholders, who are the real owners of the business, the right to invest their own money. If stockholders do not benefit in boom periods, they certainly are not going to benefit in the way of dividends in a depression. The money is used by corporations in a boom period for expansion and improvements at high costs. The public-utilities industry pays out a fair proportion of its earnings in dividends, usually from 60 to 80 percent, and when they have to do any financing for additions and improvements, they go to the stockholders and offer them stock at an attractive price, or they sell low-coupon bonds to raise part or all of the money. Utility companies endeavor to keep their stock and bond ratio in balance. Utility companies which have 20 percent or less in common stock in their capitalizations usually pay 50/60 percent of their net earnings in common dividends on common stocks. Those companies which have a ratio of stock to bonds between 20/25 percent usually pay from 60/70 percent of their earnings in dividends. Some of the companies which have above 25 percent in common stock pay about 70 percent. There are some utility companies with stock ratio to bonds of 40 percent or more which pay out as much as 80 percent of earnings in common-stock dividends. The stockholder is thus given fair treatment and the Government collects its just share of taxes. A formula somewhat like this should be applied to large industrial corporations.

I am glad that you have started the ball rolling on both of these matters and hope you will keep it going.

Yours very truly,

C. D. ROBBINS.

GOVERNOR ECCLES' STAND ON RETAINED EARNINGS

The United States News and World Report for January 3, 1949, contains an interview with the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, member of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

In this interview, the following question was asked Governor Eccles by David Lawrence and his reply follows the question:

Question. What sort of tax increase then do you suggest?

Answer. I would prefer a tax on those corporate earnings which are not paid out as dividends. This would mean the equivalent of an increase in the normal tax only on that part of the corporate profits which is retained in any year instead of on all the profits. This is justified on the grounds that the Government does not collect personal income tax on these earnings, whereas on the earnings distributed, a large percentage is paid in individual taxes. The failure to have such a tax has induced corporations to retain an abnormal amount of their earnings. It is estimated that they paid out only 35 percent of profits in 1948 as against 50 percent during the war years and 70 percent in 1929. In order to avoid a penalty under existing law, section 102, corporations have had to show a need for the retained funds and this has made for inflation, particularly in the construction field, and has tended to bring about business concentration through the buying up of related property and businesses, especially small business. A 15-percent tax on the corporate earnings retained in 1948 would yield the Government about $2,000,000,000. In case such a tax induced corporations to pay out more of their earnings, the taxes collected by the Government would be substantially higher because the average rate paid by individuals receiving the dividends would be much higher than the 15 percent. The suggested tax would serve as a substitute for the penalty tax provided under section 102.

This kind of tax would also be especially good to have on the books during a depression period. Whereas in an inflation, as I have stated, business uses its earnings freely and adds to the inflationary pressures, the reverse is true in a depression. This tax would tend to put into circulation corporate earnings which otherwise, in a depression, might lie idle or be used unnecessarily to pay off debt, which is deflationary. Based on past experience, business becomes more liquid in depressions because of lower prices, smaller inventory, and reduced outstanding accounts, and there is less need for capital expenditures. They do not as a general rule have use for their rainy-day reserves when the rainy day comes. Therefore, they should not add to them and thereby add to deflationary pressures during a depression period.

Our Farming Must Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Nathan Koenig, executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture:

OUR FARMING MUST CHANGE

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ARE TRYING HARD TO INCREASE FOOD PRODUCTION TO BECOME SELF-SUFFICIENT; THIS MEANS AMERICAN FARMERS MUST TURN TO LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AS FOREIGN DEMAND FOR GRAIN FALLS OFF

(By Nathan Koenig, executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture)

(During each of the last 3 years, Nate Koenig spent several weeks in Europe, surveying conditions for the U. S. D. A. In this report on his most recent trip, he tells Successful Farming readers of the progress made and its likely effect on American agriculture.)

The European market for American farm products is beginning to close down.

Each year since the start of World War II, Europe asked for and received more and more food. This country shipped unprecedented amounts of bread-grains, canned and dried fruits and vegetables, fats and oils, and livestock products, including millions of pounds of dried eggs.

Today, countries of western Europe are figuring hard on how to pare down on what they buy from us. This shopping list gradually is being narrowed to bare essentials.

This turn is of real significance to American farmers who only a few years ago had geared their production to the skyrocketing demands of a world at war. It's the signal for a return to peacetime demand.

The problem

Our farmers face the problem of changing their pattern of farming, not only to improve the balance in agriculture, but also to maintain its prosperity. Fortunately, United States consumers will take more of our wartime increase if they can have it in the form of meat and milk. Farmers must turn more of their grain crops into livestock and livestock products. Today's real need is for greater emphasis on livestock in our peacetime farming.

Make no mistake about it, countries of western Europe need more food than they now produce. True, food is available from outside sources, but it takes money to buy it. That's the difficulty.

Dollar shortage

The most acceptable medium of exchange is the dollar, and all European countries are short on dollars. Because of this shortage foreign countries are cutting down on imports of goods from areas where dollars are required in payment. Instead, they are spending their dollars, as far as possible, for the purchase of raw materials, machinery, and related capital goods which will increase production and lead to their self-support.

How they are managing and what they plan for the future I learned first-hand during a recent visit to Europe. I saw a healthy change from the stagnation and gloom I found during visits in the summers of 1946 and 1947.

Good harvests this year, in Europe and in other parts of the world, and the very substantial help under the European recovery program have rekindled the hopes of western Europe's 280,000,000 people.

For the first time since the war's end they see enough bread in the world to keep them from being hungry until the next harvest. With this security in the food supply and with our financial help through ERP they feel that further progress toward economic recovery is a sure thing at least for the year ahead.

Fear hunger

However, the fear of future hunger still dominates the minds of people in western Europe. In the dollar-short countries, I found great emphasis is being placed on increased production at home in an effort to reduce the need for imports.

At the same time, these European countries are looking more and more to each other and elsewhere for food stuffs and other supplies in order to save their precious dollar credits. The idea is to obtain needed goods either with their own currencies or through an exchange of the increased goods they are producing.

Saving dollars

Until they can get more dollars through greater exports to this country, western European nations feel they must follow a belt-tightening policy on imports from the United States and other dollar areas.

In England I found the Government pushing a newly announced food plan. This plan would raise England's food and feed production by 1951–52 to a level 50 percent above prewar. This goal is 15 percent above the peak of wartime production reached in 1943–44, or 20 percent above the 1946–47 output.

Increases sought by 1951–52 would raise wheat production above prewar levels by 60 percent, 170 percent for barley, 56 percent for oats, 20 percent for potatoes, 31 percent for sugar beets, 23 percent for milk, 52 percent for eggs, and 10 percent for beef and veal.

In the case of flaxseed, a crop which was hardly grown in Great Britain before the war, the goal for planting is set at 400,000 acres. In addition to fiber, this crop is a valuable source of protein for cattle and oil for industrial uses.

In France the emphasis is on greater wheat production so that country won't need to depend upon imports. From the French Government's standpoint, that's good politics, in view of the importance of bread in the French diet. "Wheat, the noble grain," is the thought being driven into the minds of school children.

Switzerland intends to keep grassland, brought into cultivation during the war years, in crop production. Like Great Britain and Denmark, Switzerland has developed techniques for making silage and for artificially drying hay. This enables dairying to expand despite limited land area.

In Sweden I found a renewed emphasis on agriculture. During the early 1930's, Sweden began to stress industrial expansion. As a result, the farm population declined. Now she is paying greater attention to increasing agricultural production in order to reduce the need for food imports.

Wherever I went in Europe I found hopes of achieving greater self-sufficiency heightened by last season's good crops. During and since the war food shortages have made it necessary to eat grain instead of feeding it to animals. This cut flocks and herds in many countries.

Now, with more grain available, European farmers plan to increase livestock and poultry numbers. Farmers look upon this move as necessary for restoring a balanced type of farming. Livestock always has played an important role in European agriculture, and in most of the countries the increase will be mainly in cattle.

Because reduced livestock numbers cut the supply of manure, European farmers have had to rely more on chemical fertilizers. Although some still hestitate to use it, the use of commercial fertilizer has become very popular. As a result, demand still exceeds the increasing supply. High yields obtained with chemical fertilizers virtually insure their continued heavy use, even though manure becomes more plentiful.

The wartime need for more home-produced food also brought on another change in European agriculture. Farmers turned more to mechanized farming, with the United States supplying much equipment. With a shorter labor supply and higher farm income, European farmers are interested in machinery. Not only that, but the preference is for American-made equipment.

There is much room for better distribution and use of farm machinery; at the same time, the need is great for more of it.

In France and in England, I saw combines harvesting grain. The owners said they were not getting the maximum use out of them because of wet weather usually encountered at harvest time. What smaller European farmers need are more new grain binders. On larger-than-average farms in Denmark, there's a great demand for tractors, tractor-drawn machinery, and mechanical dairy-barn equipment.

In many instances, smaller farmers in a community have formed cooperatives for the joint purchase and use of larger pieces of equipment.

But despite future advances through mechanization of European agriculture, there's little chance for wide use of farm machinery in many countries, especially in western Europe. Most farms are small and must be operated intensively to provide only a fair return. These small farms always have been run with a great deal of family hand labor, and habits change slowly.

However, as long as the deficit food-producing countries of Europe hold their imports to a minimum, strong public support for increasing food production at home can be expected. And subsidies may be used even more generously as an inducement to step up food production. In the end, this will mean high-cost food and a low standard of living.

Another important factor is that agricultural countries of Europe, which normally exported grains and other foodstuffs, also are out to step up production. Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, and Poland, and others behind the iron curtain not only aim to restore their agricultural output to prewar levels, but they are determined to exceed it in order to increase exports.

Thus, the foundation certainly is being laid for a clash of interests. Trade, instead of being broadened, will be narrowed. There are signs of it already

Here and there surpluses are cropping up. When this occurs, either the countries have more than enough goods from their own production, or other nations who otherwise would buy can't afford to.

For example, Italy and Holland last summer couldn't sell all their exportable fruits and vegetables. Some were shipped into Germany, on top of food supplies sent from the United States. While in Germany, I heard farmers actually complaining that these imports were reducing prices for their own good crops.

And Communists have been ready to take advantage of this kind of thinking. They have spread the line that the European recovery program is nothing more than a plan by which the United States hopes to dump its expected surpluses.

To farmers in Turkey or Greece, where surpluses of dried fruits and tobacco already are piling up, such an argument sounds reasonable. But, fortunately, the Communists aren't making much headway with it in western Europe.

It seemed to me that people in the ERP countries know more about the program's basic goals than the Communists will admit. Each day they see benefits from the program. They have more to eat and more to wear. Housing is improving. Their factories are turning out more goods; production is increasing; and employment is rising.

From the American standpoint ERP is a good investment in world peace. If, as a result, the countries taking part again become self-supporting, the program will have been a success. But self-support which provides the foundation for broad international trade is far different from self-sufficiency, which ultimately stifles such trade. That's what the United States and the ERP countries must guard against.

Looking ahead until the next harvest, this country should be able to export at least as much grain as we did last year when we moved about 580,000,000 bushels, including 480,000,000 bushels of wheat.

In fact, grain-export allocations already made for the 9 months July 1948 through March 1949 indicate that this total for last year will be reached 3 months before the end of the current shipping year. With European farmers eager to start expanding their livestock production, there is a good chance that our grain exports for this year will set a new record since we have corn to spare.

The difficulty, however, is with other farm products such as tobacco, dried fruits, and dried eggs. Extent of these exports is a question as long as Europe is short of dollars.

With foreign demand for our farm products starting to fall off, we are beginning to adjust production to peacetime needs. At best, such an adjustment must be gradual. But with the good corn crop last year, farmers must plan to produce more livestock and put more cropland into grass. This will be a help as grain exports decline to normal. Equally important is the opportunity this offers farmers to follow soil conservation practices and rebuild the soil.

But, from the longer range standpoint, we still will need export outlets for around half the wheat we have been shipping in recent years. We'll need foreign markets for around 4,000,000 bales of cotton, 500,000,000 to 600,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and for our surpluses of dried fruits, apples, pears, citrus fruits, rice, some corn, and for limited amounts of livestock products.

The fact that the big export demand for our farm products is falling off should not be a surprise to American farmers. Since the war began, we have been shipping foodstuffs abroad in quantities far out of proportion with normal world trade. For example, since the war's end our wheat exports have averaged about 50 percent of the total international movement. Before the war, our share was around 5 percent.

The big increase is largely because other sources of supply virtually had dried up, and we were able to fill the gap. Restored production in other areas gives us the chance we so sorely need to balance our own agriculture.

What concerns us now is how far European markets will close down after ERP ends and dollars are no longer being handed out.

The answer to that, it seems, rests largely on our willingness to import goods from these countries, so they in turn will be able to buy from us.

Water Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the New Leader of March 12, 1949:

THE RIVERS: OUR GREATEST RESOURCE—TVA FOR NEW ENGLAND

(By William E. Leuchtenberg, Boston director, Americans for Democratic Action)

Fed by hours of torrential rains and days of rapidly melting snows, the rivers of western New England roared over their banks early last New Year's Eve in the worst flood in a decade.

The industrial city of North Adams was isolated by the rain-swollen Hoosac River. All highways out of Pittsfield were flooded. In Great Barrington, where roads were a foot under water, the Housatonic rose 2 feet higher than in the great floods of 1938. Air-raid sirens sounded in the night to warn residents of the Westfield River Valley to evacuate their homes. Westfield, a town of 20,000, was cut off from the world. Water pollution was feared in Lee and Stockbridge, and typhoid serum was rushed to the area. Only the miracle of a sudden frost, which changed the rain to harmless snow, prevented a major disaster.

When the rivers subsided and the dreary work of reconstruction slowly began, the citizens of western New England counted four dead and over a thousand homeless. The idyllic Berkshire Festival towns of the Housatonic Valley were covered with silt and rubble. In one street in North Adams, rocks and dirt were piled 6 feet high. The total cost to Berkshire County alone was over $2,000,000. The floods left death, misery, and destruction.

The floods also left an aroused citizenry determined that it wouldn't happen again. In 1936 and 1938, when far worse floods had hit New England, efforts at flood control were damned as Government paternalism and a reflection on Yankee ingenuity. The embattled Vermont farmers regarded the attempts of the Army engineers to dam the West River Valley as a foreign invasion by a hostile power. When a four-State flood-control compact was drafted in 1937, three utility-company attorneys wrote a provision into the agreement to end Federal power control. An alert Congress preserved our Federal power policy by killing the compact, but as a result New England got neither flood control nor power.

Much has happened in New England since 1938. One important mill after another has been moved to the South because of the dearth of power in New England as well as the quest for cheap labor in the Carolinas. The power famine was so severe a year ago that naval vessels from Pearl Harbor were

anchored off the Maine coast to generate enough electricity to light the towns. Unemployment-compensation claims in New England have soared 52 percent in the past year. In any mill town in the Merrimack Valley, you can hear men talking anxiously about lay-offs at the plant or whether another factory will move away. As Seymour Harris' survey dolefully concluded: "New England is not developing new industries rapidly enough to take the place of tottering ones."

The moral is obvious enough. The same rivers that were flooding towns in Massachusetts and Vermont on New Year's Eve should be harnessed to provide the cheap power to keep New England's factories going. Since flood-control legislation was clearly imperative, this problem was tackled first.

The North Adams Transcript urged communities in the Hoosac Valley, where there have been four serious floods in the last 21 years, to demand a Hoosac Valley flood-control authority. Mayor James Bowe, of Adams, and his board of selectmen demanded a restudy of the $14,000,000 flood-control project which had been shelved just 2 years ago as unjustified.

The Boston Herald typified press reaction in blaming the floods on financial niggardliness and the lack of an interstate compact on flood control. Three weeks later, Governor Paul Dever asked the Massachusetts State Legislature for a $2,000,000 grant for flood relief in the Hoosac and Housatonic Valleys, and then took off for Washington to request Federal flood-control action.

Even more important, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire signed a Connecticut River flood control pact, while the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts reached a similar agreement to curb the Merrimack. Unfortunately, the new flood-control compacts once more play into the hands of the private power interests, but the good faith of the respective State administrations cannot be questioned, and the compacts are expected to be rewritten with more attention to future power sites.

If the rapid action on flood control was a notable development in a region that had traditionally accepted floods resignedly, the change in attitude on public power has been even more striking.

In a special message to the Vermont Legislature, Republican Gov. Ernest Gibson asked for the creation of a State power authority with power to build generating plants, transmission lines, to buy and sell electricity, and to issue bonds and secure capital.

In New Hampshire, State Representative George D. Angus, of Claremont, introduced a bill early in January to establish a New Hampshire Power Authority to prevent power trusts from further use of water power resources. When Senator Eugene S. Daniell, Jr., of Frankin, N. H., attacked the Manchester Morning Union as a spokesman for the private utilities, the conservative editor hotly replied that "we have repeatedly attacked the electric-power utilities—in this case the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. and the New England System—for their wantonness in seeking to devastate the rich farm lands along the Connecticut River."

In Holyoke, Francis King, director of the municipal gas and electric department, found new adherents in his fight against the private utilities for control of the power site on the Connecticut, notably industrialist Roger Putnam, former mayor of Springfield.

Nor are flood control and power the only issues. Timber lands have been badly overcut, leaving desolate stretches of land in northern New England, where little brooks become swollen creeks, opening gullies and causing downstream floods in the major river valleys. Stream pollution completely spoils the beautiful Connecticut as a recreation center, and people in such large mill towns as Lowell and Lawrence are without adequate recreational facilities because the Merrimack, the lovely stream of Thoreau's voyage, has been turned into an open sewer for industrial wastes. Fishermen are bitter over the disappearance of the shad from the upper Connecticut, while salmon runs on the Merrimack are a thing of the past.

The idea of multipurpose river valley development, the TVA approach to floods and power and erosion, which had once been spurned as Government boondoggling, is receiving serious consideration in New England today for the first time.

On January 3, Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, introduced H. R. 463, to create a Merrimack Valley Authority. At least one bill will be introduced this month to establish a Connecticut Valley Authority.

Even Republican Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, who led the fight against the St. Lawrence seaway in the Eightieth Congress, has introduced a bill (S. 353) "to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvement on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible."

While New England projects for specific valley authorities will continue to be pushed because, requiring less funds, they are more feasible politically, the ultimate solution for New England is an over-all regional authority. Moreover, a New England authority would ultimately have to be concerned with more basic economic changes in overhauling the New England economy than is the TVA, which has been concerned with a relatively undeveloped region where water resources are much more important than in New England today.

Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, went even further in a news conference in New York on February 2, suggesting a Federal power authority for New York State and New England, based on the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. Asserting that such a northeastern authority "would be as favorable from the viewpoint of cost as the Tennessee Valley Authority," Krug declared that Truman, who has come out flatly for a Columbia Valley Authority, will follow a policy of power distribution on a regional rather than State basis.

On April 21–23 in Washington, D. C., interest in regional planning in New England will be crystallized for the first time when delegates from six New England States to the first national conference on river valley development meet to plan the creation of a New England committee on regional planning.

Appeal From Western Union Employee for Cutting Excise Tax on Telegrams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Louis Carper, former Western Union employee, appeals for cutting of Federal excise tax on telegrams, which has reduced employment by Western Union in New York City from a force of 7,000 to about 1,500. His letter follows:

BRONX, N. Y., *March 11, 1949.*

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

DEAR SIR: Pardon my seeming presumption in taking the liberty to acquaint you with the plight of the employees at the Western Union, 60 Hudson Street, New York City.

The Western Union in New York City up to 1945–46 had a force of 7,000 employees; today, March 11, 1949, the force is about 1,500. You can't blame the officials of the Western Union. I attribute this to the excise tax which the people that normally would send telegrams, refrain from doing so. All the wires in the company are practically idle all day and night due to this burdensome tax. It is certainly a plague from which practically 5,000 people have lost their jobs, some of whom have been with the company 15 to 20 years and who are unable to obtain gainful employment in any other field.

Trust you and your Congressmen can see fit to lift this tax, so that we people who have lost our jobs could get to work again.

Very respectfully yours,

LOUIS CORPER,

Morse telegraph operator.

Watershed Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Kent Leavitt, presented as part of a panel discussion during the Fourteenth North American Wildlife Conference, Washington, D. C., March 8, 1949:

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

(By Kent Leavitt, president, National Association of Soil-Conservation Districts)

Within the next 10 years, I believe we shall have under way in the United States a conservation effort of such scope, and such quality, that the future of our "renewable" natural resources will be assured. We still have our problems, of course, and some of us get impatient at times, but the long and hard beginning has been made. In my opinion, the United States is on the threshold of the greatest conservation progress the world has ever seen.

I do not believe I am being unduly optimistic. Conservationists are often given to being somewhat pessimistic. There is much in the history of our cause to warrant such an attitude. Nevertheless there have been major and favorable developments in recent years. While we have not moved ahead as fast or as far as we would like, there is reason for some satisfaction in the record. We need to recognize the source of our present strength in order to proceed in the future with purpose and confidence.

Consider some of our assets. We, as conservationists, are better organized today than ever before in our history. Numerically we are stronger. We have made a great deal of progress in actual conservation work. Our technology is steadily improving. We have more friends than we have ever had, and they represent all walks of life. More people understand what we are talking about and doing. More people share our aspirations. And perhaps most important of all, we are learning to make common cause.

The time is about past when the forester thinks only of forestry, the soil conservationist only of the land, the engineer only of his structures, and the biologist only of birds, fish, game, and other forms of life. We are

all coming to understand the interdependence of land, water, forests, and wildlife. They all fail or prosper together. The same is true of human beings. Our part in this situation is the most vital of all.

Conservationists, perhaps to a larger degree than any others, understand how directly our standard of living, our strength as a Nation, and our whole civilization depend on our natural resources.

In this connection, I believe the work of a great many conservationists, over a period of a great many years, is now bearing considerable fruit. The value of our resources, and their relationship to each other, is better recognized today than ever before.

As we make greater demands on our water supplies, the need for wise and comprehensive watershed management is becoming apparent to an increasingly large number of people. The soil is the greatest water reservoir we have, after the oceans. By utilizing all the science at our command and by applying all the proven and appropriate methods of resource management throughout our watersheds, we can put this great earth reservoir to work for us. The individual methods are too numerous to recount here. Together they constitute a powerful tool not only for water conservation, but all the related resources. Watershed management, based on use of the land in accordance with its capabilities and treatment of it in accordance with its needs, means improved agriculture, improved water supplies, reduced sedimentation, reduced flood hazards, protection for downstream engineering structures, more and better wildlife habitats, and improvements in range and woodland.

Word of the value of this kind of conservation work has gotten to Congress, too, and I think the fight for conservation there is on a broader and more constructive basis than it was in Teddy Roosevelt's day. Certainly there are a larger number of Congressmen better informed on true conservation today than we have had in the past. One of the really great friends of conservation will speak to you this afternoon—the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas. The work that he and his associates on the House Committee on Agriculture have been doing in the field of conservation is pioneer work. It has tremendous significance and promise for the future.

Across the length and breadth of America, all conservationists can find another, and powerful, reason for some optimism about the future of our resources. I am referring to soil-conservation districts. There are more than 2,000 of these districts today and they cover more than half the land area of the country. Within their boundaries are more than three-fourths of our farms and ranches. Approximately 10,000 district supervisors—most of whom are farmers themselves—are managing district affairs. They are working with an ever increasing number of farmers, and the total already runs into the hundreds of thousands.

Most of you, I believe, know the story of soil-conservation districts. You know that the first one was organized in August of 1937. You know the manner in which they are formed and operated. Many of you have had some personal experience with districts. You know that the work being done is not restricted by any narrow concept of soil conservation. As we in soil-conservation districts see our job, we are working toward the goal of proper land use for America, and assuming our full share of responsibility as citizens for getting the job done.

Proper land use, as we see it, involves the wise and productive use of land, water, forest, and wildlife resources. To the largest possible degree, our work is being done on a watershed basis. We are well aware that any other basis is an artificial and unnatural one which only compounds the difficulty of the job.

As organized owners and operators of farm and ranch land, we are probably in a better position than any other single group of private citizens to make an actual, material contribution to the cause of soil and water conservation, not only on a watershed, but on a national scale. The cause of conservation is our cause. We have no other, except the larger one which consumes all of us—the cause of America and our way of life.

I think we may take pardonable pride in the accomplishments that districts have already made. Not only are they actually doing conservation work but they are telling others about it. Districts are proving that when people understand a problem, and are given an opportunity to do something about it, they can accomplish miracles.

I hope those of you who are in wildlife, forestry, and water-conservation organizations will recognize that you have a new and strong ally in soil-conservation districts. The men in soil-conservation districts are with you, and for you. They realize, I am sure, that all of us must stand together.

There are some fundamental aspects to watershed management, it seems to me, that all of us should consider. As our Nation has grown in population, and as more and more people have moved to large industrial areas, our conservation problems have become somewhat more complex. Families living in Detroit, Houston, New York, and Los Angeles seem far removed from the resources that actually support them. It seems hard for these families to contribute to conservation. Nevertheless, since more than three-fourths of our population lives in cities, a way must be found to make this possible.

One way we have found is through government. City people as well as farmers pay the taxes that support our conservation agencies and programs—Federal, State, and local. This is proper, because the American people as a whole have a vital stake and responsibility in keeping land, water, forest, and wildlife resources in good condition.

What happens to the individual land owners—the men who are custodians, or trustees, of most of our land and wildlife, as well as important parts of our forests and waters? Under the American form of government, the individual land owner can enter into a cooperative partnership with American society as a whole in order to accomplish mutually beneficial objectives, while expressly reserving for the individual a full and effective voice in the direction of that partnership.

There is, in short, a middle ground between regimentation and rugged individualism. This middle ground is a partnership shared by the individual and Government, without any loss of integrity on either side.

There is an almost unlimited opportunity for development of this partnership in the watersheds of the country. There is also a similar opportunity for this partnership to bring about accomplishments of lasting value to all the people of the Nation.

Our country is made up of watersheds and the character of each one has a real bearing on the welfare of the people living in it and below it. Some watersheds are hard to live with and some are easy. All watersheds, however, are susceptible to management, so that living with them is not only easier but more rewarding. By management I do not imply any controls that we can apply to nature, but rather an understanding and an adjustment of our affairs to the end that we can live in harmony with nature indefinitely.

Very often we have not recognized some of the simplest knowledge at our command, such as the fact that water will run down hill at great speed if no barriers are left in its path If bare soil is left exposed to the beat of rain or to the cutting power of rushing water, then soil will also be washed down hill. Neither flood control, irrigation, or power structures are safe against the threat of silt as long as erosion is permitted to continue unchecked on the watersheds behind such structures. Forest fires, exploitive timber cutting, wasteful use of surface and underground water supplies, disregard for the values of wildlife, and inattention to the quality and amount of grass on the range are other sources of trouble on our watersheds. These, of course, are not the only ones.

It is within our power, however, to solve every one of these problems and do so harmoniously with nature. It is also within our power to protect and develop our great natural wealth, including hydroelectric power, oil, minerals, land, water, forests, and wildlife, without doing offense either to nature or to our independence as individuals in a democracy. As a matter of fact, this is one of the big tasks ahead of us. All the weight of science and experience indicates that we must make our peace with nature on a watershed basis. And there is every reason to believe, also, that one of our greatest hopes for a richer life lies in the protection and wise development of these same watersheds.

We need to provide for the comprehensive development of the Nation's major river basins on the basis of a unified plan developed and carried out by existing Federal and State agencies, including soil-conservation districts, and without recourse to the delegation of extreme authorities to new agencies. In my opinion, there are a number of responsible nongovernmental agencies also in a position to contribute to the development and realization of such unified plans.

There is, I believe, a widespread endorsment of the need for watershed management and comprehensive valley development, but the public so far has been asked to choose between an authority approach on the one hand and a laissez-faire approach on the other. The choice is too limited. In my opinion, all the possibilities have not been fully explored.

The advocates of laissez-faire want us to leave things alone and promise that somehow things will turn out all right, eventually, in the end. The advocates of the authorities, on the other hand, say that we will never make the kind of progress that is needed until we set up a corporation and grant it complete power to take on a valley job single-handed, from start to finish. It is the only way we can get the necessary decisions, they say.

We know that Americans have never countenanced a timid point of view for very long. And we know, also, that Americans have never hesitated to vest especially selected citizens with the power of decision in the case of disputes among their fellows. We have courts, boards, and commissions vested with such powers today in varying fields and in varying degrees. In addition, we have a greater force—that of intelligent public opinion.

Somewhere between the two extremes we should find our solution.

We have the ability to manage our watersheds and develop them to the fullest extent. We can develop the plans. We can probably come to a nearly unanimous agreement on 80 to 90 percent of all the objectives. We can establish for each major basin a board or commission to make any necessary decisions arising out of disputes over the wisest course of action in any given situation. And we can carry out the plans we helped develop ourselves.

The question today is no longer over the wisdom of watershed management. Its value in the conservation of resources is widely accepted. The question now is wether we shall participate in the management or be the object of it.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday next, March 17, Hibernians in all parts of the world will pay homage to their patron, St. Patrick, and, in the light of present-day developments, I deem it most appropriate that the following editorial, entitled "St. Patrick's Day, 1948," which was published in the National Hibernian, official organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, a year ago this month, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with the poem, Valor of the Celt, written during World War II by James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a captain in the Army during the First World War and a member of the Commodore John Barry Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1948

The Apostle of Ireland was a man of peace. To the highly civilized but extremely warlike pagan Gaels he brought faith in the Prince of Peace. He conquered warriors without shedding blood. The secret of his successful mission is needed today as much as it was ever needed in the history of the human race. Just as the foundation of World War II was laid at Versailles in 1919, so the foundation of future war is being laid now. * * * St. Patrick was no appeaser. He knew exactly what he believed, and what he believed he clearly preached. We should formulate our aims with similar precision, in order that men of good will in all parts of the world may know them, and accept them, and work for their fulfillment. St. Patrick prayed. So should we. Even as we pray we shall be guided toward the wise, the unselfish, the successful way of peace.

VALOR OF THE CELT

What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

Who can recount each deed, recall each name
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies;
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Why Is Selective Service Kept Alive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much discussion is taking place as to why the Selective Service System is kept alive when inductions have been suspended. In order to clarify the situation, national headquarters of the Selective Service System has furnished me with the following statement, supported by the necessary statistical information. It is my hope that Members of Congress will analyze this information, keeping in mind the value of having a Selective Service System, and the relationship of that value not only to the active armed forces but especially to the Reserve components.

The statement is as follows:

In the spring of 1948, when it had become evident beyond question that the strength of the armed forces could not be achieved or maintained by voluntary methods, the President requested the enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

Congress, in its response to this urgent situation, declared:

"The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of the Nation."

The mission given the new Selective Service System was in fact threefold;

First, by direct means the strength of the active forces was to be raised and maintained,

Second, by less direct means, the strength of the Reserve components of the armed forces were to be raised and maintained,

Third, the functions of the Office of Selective Service Records were to be assumed and continued, which include among other things the preservation of the records, the knowledge and the methods of selective service.

It is of the essence of the act of 1948 that the procurement of personnel for the armed forces be by voluntary means so long as such means are adequately effective, but resort to inductions in support of recruiting is authorized and intended.

With the passage of the act, voluntary enlistments increased immediately. Registration and classification were pressed rapidly to produce quickly the desired results. Inductions of comparatively small numbers of men occurred in November and December 1948 and January 1949. A total of 30,000 men so far have been inducted, but the enlistments in the active armed forces to the end of the first 2 months after the passage of the act alone exceeded 90,000. Enlistments in the active Army rose to the highest figure since September 1946, in which month the Selective Service System filled its last call under the 1940 act. Until the recent announcement that calls would be suspended, voluntary enlistments continued at rates far above any attained between September 1946 and the passage of the new act. With the suspension of calls the figures have dropped, but not to the level to which they fell when there was no Selective Service System to influence and support recruiting efforts. There is attached a graphic record of the influence of the Selective Service System upon voluntary recruiting.

The Reserve components (organized units) and particularly the National Guard, were direct beneficiaries of the reestablishment of selective service. Immediately it became certain that the act would be passed, and just prior to its being signed on June 24, 1948, enlistments in these forces reached record levels. Maintenance, however, of these vital strengths presents quite another picture in that the law provides for the deferment of these individuals "so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit."

It was the influence of selective service which brought them in. It has been that same influence which has caused them to "continue to serve satisfactorily."

However, there is even now a very evident and quite disturbing tendency on the parts of many reservists and guardsmen to regard less seriously than they should the obligation they have under their enlistment contract. The growing belief that no more inductions will occur has resulted in too many separations because of unsatisfactory performance of duty. Adjutants General and commanders of naval and other Reserve units have reported this recent change in attitude. The President has called for the revitalization of the Reserves of the armed forces. Revitalization will be impossible if the right manpower is not brought into the Reserve components and by effectual means caused to remain there long enough to receive proper training. Unless the Selective Service System continues ready to resume inductions, unless the System continues to register and classify men of military ages, all that the past 8 months have accomplished will be lost and we shall stand again in that unenviable position in which we awakened in the critical spring of 1948.

Preservation of the knowledge and methods of selective service during the short period March 31, 1947–March 17, 1948, paid tremendously even though it was a period following immediately the big undertaking of 1940–1947.

When the President asked for selective service on March 17, 1948, there was one agency ready with positive plans of action. The Office of Selective Service Records (act of March 31, 1947), had preserved the knowledge and methods of selective service. It has preserved also a very small nucleus of trained officers who had made plans and had continued the training of key people in the States.

Had these things not been done, the reorganization of the System would have been very difficult, very much more costly than it was, and the immediate good results achieved would have been impossible.

In the real sense, national security is best served by preventive measures. The existence of selective service is at the same time a preventive measure and an active influence upon national security. It is far less important that we are not inducting than it is that we be prepared and ready to induct. At the moment, the very fact that we are not inducting is highly significant. It is proof of our effectiveness and sustains the logic of the President's statement on the subject:

"Although present recruiting rates indicate that only small inductions, if any, will be necessary under selective service, it is essential that such authority remain available in the event that voluntary enlistments drop. Moreover, it must be recognized that the existence of the Selective Service Act has in itself been a contributing factor to the current results of the recruiting programs of the services."

It is seen as the duty and the responsibility of the System to perfect and preserve itself in that position from which it may respond effectively in any emergency that may arise. The duties and responsibilities considered necessary to carry out this mission are as follows:

1. To register all male persons residing in the United States who are between the ages of 18 and 26, and who have not previously registered in accordance with the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

2. To continue to register all male persons attaining the age of 18 years. It is estimated that 1,200,000 during the fiscal year 1950 will attain the age of 18 years.

3. To classify registrants, particularly as such action applies to change in marital status, completion of military service, and changes in classification due to the registrant's attaining his twenty-sixth birthday.

4. To keep current the records of all registrants as required by section 15 (b), title I, of the Selective Service Act of 1948, which provides as follows: "It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President."

5. To preserve and service the records of the former Selective Service System now assembled in the various Federal records depots in accordance with Public Law 26 of the Eightieth Congress. This function of the former Office of Selective Service Records was transferred to the Selective Service System by Public Law 759 of the Eightieth Congress.

6. To evaluate for preservation or destruction certain records of the former Selective Service System in compliance with the mandate of Congress (H. Rept. 2454, 80th Cong.) and the sorting and transferring of other permanent selective-service records to the jurisdiction of the National Archivist.

7. To furnish veterans and their designated representatives and authorized Federal, State, or local agencies, information from the selective-service records.

8. To perfect plans and to train the individuals necessary to an expanded effort in the event of a sudden extreme emergency.

Fiscal year	Public law No.	Public law Cong.	Amount appropriated	Other funds made available	Total funds available	Total expenditures	Lapsed or unused funds
1941–42	800	76th	$24,825,108				
	528	77th	−3,500,000	[1] $383.42	$21,325,491.42	$21,129,561.50	$195,929.92
1942	28	77th	33,500,000				
	[2] 528	77th	3,500,000				
	[3] 528	77th	3,770,000	[1] 9,902.62	40,779,902.62	39,804,763.47	975,139.15
1943	630	77th	34,745,000				
	[3] 3	78th	21,160,000				
	[4] 132	78th	2,603,000	[1] 4,023.14	58,532,023.14	55,939,121.78	2,592,901.36
1944	135	78th	51,856,000	[6] 4,052,210.00			
	[5] 279	78th	7,087,000	[7] 4,895,741.00			
				[1] 2,949.44	67,893,900.44	64,940,032.10	2,953,868.34
1945	372	78th	62,500,000	[1] 331.31	62,500,331.31	59,767,990.30	2,732,341.01
1946	156	79th	52,000,000				
	[8] 301	79th	−2,957,500				
	[8] 521	79th	−1,100,000	[1] 21,041.66	47,954,541.66	46,000,945.00	1,953,596.66
1947	[9] 521	79th	27,750,000	[10] −100,000.00			
	[11] 76	80th	5,103,000	[1] 2,566.43	32,755,566.43	31,691,048.74	[12] 1,064,517.69
1948	271	80th	4,250,000		4,250,000.00	3,637,184.33	[13] 612,815.67
1949	[11] 491	80th	2,476,700				
	[9] 785	80th	25,000,000				

[1] Refunds to appropriation.
[2] Transfer from 1941–42.
[3] Supplemental appropriation.
[4] Supplemental appropriation (overtime pay).
[5] Supplemental appropriation (pay raise and overtime).
[6] Transfer from Navy for travel of selectees.
[7] Transfer from Army for travel of selectees.
[8] Rescission.
[9] Selective Service System.
[10] Transfer to Department of Labor (Public Law 161, 80th Cong.).
[11] Office of Selective Service Records.
[12] Funds do not lapse until June 30, 1949.
[13] Funds do not lapse until June 30, 1950.

Selective Service System

		1949 actual obligations July 1, 1948, through Jan. 31, 1949	1949 appropriation by objective classification	1950 estimate by objective classification
01	Personal services	$6,443,315	$15,001,686	$12,706,850
	Cost of Public Law 900	211,115	645,150	463,650
02	Travel	682,243	4,632,637	347,320
03	Transportation of things	165,634	189,100	74,890
04	Communication services	248,087	767,741	537,920
05	Rents and utility services	765,994	2,347,911	1,929,520
06	Printing and binding	491,842	1,250,000	100,000
07	Other contractual services	241,396	489,128	215,000
08	Supplies and materials	263,618	474,000	266,850
09	Equipment	843,234	1,669,347	48,000
13	Refunds, awards, and indemnities	0	10,000	10,000
	Total	10,356,478	27,476,700	16,700,000

INFLUENCE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ON ENLISTMENTS INTO THE UNITED STATES ARMY, JANUARY 1946–DECEMBER 1948

According to the accompanying chart, based on total voluntary accessions of enlisted personnel into the United States Army in January 1946–December 1948, there is an obvious relationship between the existence of selective-service legislation and the number of voluntary accessions into the United States Army. As a rule, month-to-month variations in the number of enlistments also reflect policy variations, such as the size of the call, and the administration of selective service.

From a high point of more than 110,000 voluntary accessions into the Army in January 1946, the number of enlistments declined to a low point of around 15,000 in May 1947. The total remained low until the passage of the 1948 selective-service law and then increased very sharply to the level of around 50,000 per month.

There was a rapid decline in a number of these accessions in 1946. This was consistent down to a total of 50,000 in May. This does not appear to be due to the falling off of selective-service calls during this period so much as to the fact that the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was to expire within a short time unless extended by congressional action. An extension to July 1, 1946, was voted by the Congress in May of 1946 and there was an immediate increase in enlistments of about 15,000 in June. Studies of the trend of enlistment over a period prior to the passage of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 indicate, however, that a part of this June increase was probably due to a seasonal increase in enlistments during June, the result of students volunteering after the end of the school year. The Selective Service Act was also extended to March 31, 1947, the date of this enactment being June 29, 1946. In July and August there were no selective-service calls, and enlistments fell to a figure in the neighborhood of 40,000 per month.

Selective Service levied a call of 34,000 in September and an even larger one for the month of October, part of the latter of which was canceled on October 15, 1946. As a result of these calls the enlistment totals increased again to more than 30,000 in September and totaled about 50,000 for October. In November and December there were no selective-service calls and enlistments dropped to less than 20,000 a month, the lowest figures for 1946.

In January 1947, due again to a seasonal factor, the enlistment total rose to around 35,000. This seasonal factor appears to be the result of a lag in enlistments during the holiday month of December, which is compensated for after the turn of the year. Figures over a long period of time indicate this seasonal trend. Enlistments dropped to around 20,000 during the months of February and March and stayed below 30,000 the rest of 1947, during which time there was no selective-service law in effect, nor was there any being given very serious consideration by the Congress.

In the early months of 1948, probably due to the critical situation in Europe as the European recovery effort was getting under way and the cold war was constituting a serious threat to peace, enlistments rose slightly to around 30,000 a month. Part of this rise may have been due to the request by the President that the Congress pass universal military training and selective-service legislation. There was another decline in enlistments in May, however, and it was not until the selective-service law was actually passed in June that a pronounced increase occurred in voluntary accessions.

Italy and the Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the national Catholic weekly, America, entitled "Italy and the Atlantic Pact," which will appear in the March 19th issue.

ITALY AND THE ATLANTIC PACT

It is a relief to learn that opposition to inviting Italy to join the Atlantic Pact is lessening both in the Committee of Ambassadors negotiating the pact in Washington, and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Some opposition arguments have been insubstantial to the point of flippancy, such as Senator TOM CONNALLY's "This is an Atlantic Pact, not a Mediterranean Pact." The negotiators answered that one by including in the operative area of the pact Algeria, which extends for 650 miles along the

Mediterranean. If Algeria has been included, at least geographically, for strategic reasons, it is hard to see how Italy can be excluded. Italy is not only the "soft underbelly of Europe," in Churchill's pungent phrase, it is the soft under-belly of the Atlantic bloc as well. The French see that, and want Italy included.

The contention heard in Great Britain, Canada, and the Low Countries that there would not be enough United States military supplies to go around if Italy were included sounds selfish to us. The United States should be allowed to decide the point. In fact, the responsibility for the decision as to whether Italy should be invited rests squarely upon our Government. In this connection it is almost impossible to credit the report that at one stage of the negotiations the State Department passed the buck to the British, saying that the United States would go along with any decision they arrived at. Now that we have again assumed leadership in the discussions, the State Department will, we hope, prove that it has recovered from what Herbert Agar once called its neurotic inability to come to a decision.

The reasons for making Italy a partner in the pact are numerous and weighty. She has already been formally invited to join the Council of Europe, which is the political counterpart of the Atlantic military pact. If the legalistic argument that Italy is not a UN member and therefore cannot be brought into an arrangement based on article 51 of the Charter has any weight, then she cannot be included in the Council of Europe; and Russia's veto of UN applications would mean a veto on the Council of Europe as well.

While primarily military, the Atlantic Pact has loud political overtone. Unless they can be assured of security, the free nations of the west will hardly exert their full efforts toward economic recovery. This is perhaps especially true of Italy. What the moral, psychological effect of exclusion from the pact would have on the Italian people is not hard to imagine. On the de Gasperi government the effect would be nothing short of calamitous. On March 8 the Italian Cabinet voted unanimously in favor of the pact. It is undoubtedly counting upon unofficial American assurances that a request for admission would not be refused. The Communists and their allies, the left-wing Socialists, would not be slow to seize upon a refusal to bring about the overthrow of the Government.

Thanks to the iniquitous peace treaty, to which we were a party during our period of appeasement, Italy is powerless to resist aggression. She does not even have arms sufficient for internal security against the Communists. Military equipment, under the arms agreement of the pact, would bolster her powers of resistance and her confidence as well.

A considerable number of influential Italians sincerely believe, as Etienne Gilson in France seems to believe, that Europe would be safer if it remained neutral than if it accepted the "illusory protection" of the pact. This despite the formal pronouncement of the Holy Father last Christmas that "among these goods of humanity some are of such importance that it is perfectly legal to defend them against unjust aggression. Their defense is even an obligation for the nations as a whole, who have a duty not to abandon a nation that is attacked."

If we should exclude Italy from the pact, this school of thought would be immensely strengthened. This idealistic, anachronistic, and nostalgic yearning for neutrality will be exploited by the Italian Communists to sap the Italian will to resist, as the Nazis sucked the strength from prewar France. A neutral Italy would soon be a Communist Italy.

Truman's Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

TRUMAN'S WONDERLAND

Once upon a time there was a kind, generous king who lived in a gleaming white castle surrounded by marble palaces. He had a storehouse of treasure which was the wonder of all the world. It was stacked with bulging chests of gold and silver and contained row upon row of bins heaped with precious stones.

One day the king summoned his counselors and addressed them as follows:

"My heart bleeds for my people," he said. "There are so many things they lack which only I can give them. They ought to have more medical care and more savings for old age, sickness, and unemployment. They should have better and wider roads to travel upon. They ought to have more steel, more electricity, and more irrigation. They ought to build better houses and more of them. They ought to have more schools and more teachers. The city workers need more wages because food is so expensive. The farmers need more storage space so they can hold their products off the market and get higher prices for them.

"So I shall share my treasure with my people. Let all of them come to my storehouse and each help himself according to his wants."

When the people heard these tidings, they praised their king for his kindness and generosity. According to the decree, each of the king's subjects went to the storehouse and took from it the amount of treasure necessary to fulfill his desires. And the people rejoiced, because they were getting something for nothing.

The next day the king went to his storehouse and found it bare. Again he summoned his counselors and spoke thusly to them:

"So that I may continue to minister to the needs of my people, it will be necessary to replenish my storehouse," he said. "In addition to payments necessary to safeguard the welfare of my people, the expenses of government have become very burdensome, and I have also promised to send gold and silver and arms to the people across the sea so that they may protect themselves from the barbarians who threaten them.

"Therefore, I have decided that all my subjects shall be taxed, each according to his means. From those who have little, little shall be taken. But from those who have much, much shall be taken, until all people are equal in the possessions they retain."

And so the tax collectors went forth and came to the houses of the people and demanded payment. And they gathered up the gold and silver and precious stones the people had taken from the king's storehouse, save that the poor were permitted to keep a small part of the king's bounty, while from the rich they took in addition their household goods and other possessions until they had left only as much as the poor.

The tax collectors kept some of the treasure themselves since, not being producers of wealth, they had no other source of livelihood, and gave the rest to the king. Soon the storehouse was full of treasure again, and the king was pleased, saying: "Have I not dealt fairly with my people?"

Some of the people were pleased and some were not. The poor said: "Why should we work any more? The king will take care of us." The rich said: "Why should we work any more when the king takes away from us the wealth we produce?"

And so the people worked less and produced less, and every time after that when the tax collectors came among them there was less wealth to divide. Instead of everybody getting more, everybody got less. But the tax collectors were happy, because they always got their share, and the king was happy because his storehouse was always replenished. "I have given everybody a fair deal," the king said.

This is not as fantastic a fairy tale as it sounds. As Henry Hazlitt wrote in a recent issue of Newsweek, the Government cannot distribute more under President Truman's fancy hand-out program than the people produce. And it is not the Government which produces wealth, but private enterprise. But before the Government can give part of this wealth to some of the people, it must take it away from others.

Citing the President's demand for "prompt Federal financial aid to the States," Hazlitt pointed out that the Federal Government has nothing it can give to States that it doesn't first of all take from the people of the States.

This is true of every instance in which the administration proposes to distribute Federal largesse. The money first must be taken from some people before it is given to others. Frequently it will be taken from the same people who are intended to be the ultimate beneficiaries.

But in no case do the people get back all that is taken away from them. The Federal Government gets a rake-off on every pot to pay the costs of administration and, incidentally, to support an ever growing Federal bureaucracy.

Such financial legerdemain eventually must lead to a tax burden which will devour the rewards of prudence, thrift, industry, skill, and foresight, and destroy the incentives to work and produce. We are farther along that road than we think.

Warmongering by Members of the Armed Forces Should Be Forbidden by Someone Who Has the Power To Compel Them To Keep Their Mouths Shut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation have poured out the blood of their sons like water and their treasure like sand in two world wars. We are now preparing to pour into Europe an additional $5,000,000,000 for European relief. We are financing the United Nations as a peace agency, and our Government is the chief factor in setting up an alliance between ourselves and the free nations of Europe to

keep the peace. It is highly important that to make this alliance effective against further Russian aggression, we help arm the European nations. The Russians understand the language of force. They comprehend and respect no other. All these things we are doing in defense of our country. Despite our efforts for peace, Russia may inflict the third world war upon us. These facts, however, do not justify anyone in our Government, clothed either with actual or apparent authority, to utter words or take actions calculated to lead to war. We may take a leaf from the book of our Texas friends, who have a saying that it is never wise in a situation of danger to "talk with your mouth."

I include as a part of these observations a timely editorial from the Washington Post, entitled "Warmongering."

From now on, in the words of Theodore Roosevelt, "tread softly," "carry a big stick," but speak softly, remembering that:

First. "A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger."

Second. "The tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright: but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness."

WARMONGERING

It would be hard to convince a foreigner reading of the latest wave of publicity exploits by the Air Force that the United States is not hell-bent for war. First came the round-the-world flight of the B–50 and attendant interpretations of this country's ability to bomb any spot in the world. Then the story that the B–36 had flown 9,600 miles nonstop, carrying a bomb load 5,000 miles. Then the Air Force "finding" that Russia has no adequate defense against the B–36. Finally, there comes what appears to be an inspired leak to the effect that some 70 strategic targets in Russia have been earmarked as possible bombing objectives and that the Air Force has assured the Joint Chiefs of Staff that each of these cities could be attacked from bases on this continent.

Military strategists would be remiss if they did not have plans for hitting back at Russia—and any other potential aggressor—in time of war. By the same token such plans ought to be a highly guarded secret. To allow a description of them to be leaked into print is an utterly inexcusable piece of provocation. Even the blustering of the Russians has never approached this. Moreover, the rather dubious manner in which the "findings" on the B–36 were presented to the Joint Chiefs makes it look as if the Air Force was primarily concerned with headlines.

Such exhibitionism is of a piece with the military huckstering that has coincided with the congressional appropriation hearings. The effect, to anyone not cognizant with the facts, is to indict us as a Nation of warmongers where the military has run wild. What must be the reaction to such stories in Europe, where the very essence of our efforts is to counteract fears of war? How much more dangerous must be the reaction in Russia, if the Russians are actually the victims of an insecurity complex.

Is it not time to put an end to this juvenile swaggering which has no relation to legitimate defense preparations? One of the first jobs of the incoming Secretary of Defense ought to be to muzzle the irresponsible zealots before they talk us into war.

George Washington—The Heritage of Every American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Hearst newspapers from coast to coast on February 22, 1949:

GEORGE WASHINGTON—THE HERITAGE OF EVERY AMERICAN PATRIOT

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

To remember Washington is to rejoice in freedom.

Today is the two hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington. Today is sacred in the calendar of our patriotism.

It revives the inspiring memories of our history. It reawakens the echoes of '76.

Washington. How dear his name to the American heart.

It is the birthright of every American citizen. It is the heritage of every American patriot.

It is a theme of which poets have sung. It is a theme of which orators have spoken.

Let us repeat his story. Let us relate his services. Let us recount his virtues.

Wherever the name of America is known, wherever liberty or the desire for liberty dwells upon the earth, there his name and fame is hailed.

The eye shall kindle at the sight. The lips shall quiver at the thought. The heart shall leap at the remembrance.

He was the first General of the Army. He was the President of the first Constitutional Convention. He was the first President of the United States.

Washington was the greatest of good men and the best of great men in his era.

His memory is the poetry of our history. Its cadence blends in the cabinet consultation. Its truths are for the chamber of diplomacy, for the military council, for the academy of learning, and for the retreat of quiet study

These truths follow the free plowman as he stalks afield. They follow the pioneer into the Western World. They follow the mariner over foreign seas.

They penetrate the happy seclusion of our homes. They enter the cloisters of our inner life. They make lustrous the stars of our national ensign. They gild the spires which point heavenward from our public altars.

He was the genius of American liberty.

Today we must inspire our people with the spirit which glittered at Trenton, which gleamed at Valley Forge, and which glowed at Yorktown.

Today we hold in our hands the fate of unborn generations. Today we hold in our hands the fate of democracy.

If this western sun be struck out of the firmament, at what other fountain shall the lamp of liberty be lighted? What other orb shall emit a ray to glimmer in the darkness of the earth?

Today we face a question of whether the world shall be free or slave. Today we face a question of whether God's word shall remain inviolate together with the light of righteousness it sheds.

No force has been able to smother its radiance. No force ever will.

We are determined—142,000,000 of us—to battle for the freedom which was gained in '76. We are determined to stand reverently before the Declaration our forefathers signed.

We will expose the traitors in our midst who are clamoring for the abandonment of our traditional principles of liberty; who are clamoring for the creation of a totalitarian state wherein man would no longer be recognized as possessing inalienable rights.

We will rid America of fifth columns. We will keep America free from foreign isms.

This day shall have failed of its purpose, of its lessons, and of its meaning if we do not now resolve to be eternally vigilant and do battle with the dark and malignant forces which openly and covertly assail our freedom.

We solemnly affirm on this birthday of the Father of our Country that we shall stand behind our sainted heroes of '76 who, with high purpose in their hearts, with high hopes swelling in their bosoms, with high determination written on their faces, led our people from tyranny and oppression to moral and religious freedom, where the sunlight of heaven shines over all of us with the same compassion of love, justice, and equality.

May He who gave us Washington make us worthy of the gift.

We thank Thee, O God, for this home,
This beauteous birthland of the free,
Where wanderers from afar may come
And breathe the air of liberty.
Still may her flowers untrammeled spring,
Her harvests wave, her cities rise,
And yet till time shall fold his wing,
Remain earth's loveliest paradise.

Ambassador Lane's Book on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a recent address by Mr. Eugene Lyons, roving editor of the Reader's Digest, over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., in which he reviewed Ambassador Lane's cogent book I Saw Poland Betrayed.

This admirable address serves as another vivid reminder of the frightful injustice visited upon the gallant Polish people. Let us never cease our protests until this grievous wrong against humanity has been righted.

The address follows:

AMBASSADOR LANE'S BOOK ON POLAND

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk to you today about a man—and about a book. The man is Arthur Bliss Lane, one of the foremost American diplomats. The book is the one that he published last year under the arresting title "I Saw Poland Betrayed."

Now this is not just another volume of polite reminiscence by a man close to recent history in the making. The circumstances surrounding the birth of the book are as dramatic as its title. Mr. Lane, it happens, resigned from the State Department, after 30 years of continuous service, for the specific purpose of telling this story.

He wanted to tell it frankly, sharply, without official inhibitions, without concealing his heartbreak. That he could do only as a private citizen. Thus he faced a hard choice: between his career and his conscience. And he decided to throw up the career in deference to his conscience.

Our country, unhappily, has little cause for pride and ample cause for shame as it looks back on the ordeal of Poland. Allied policy—American policy—must share the blame for the present enslavement of Poland by its Soviet neighbor. Blundering confusion, political cynicism, the machinations of Stalin's fellow travelers in high places in Washington—all these contributed to the colossal tragedy that has engulfed 125,000,000 people in eastern Europe. It's not an appetizing picture.

But against this sordid backdrop stands Arthur Bliss Lane, an American who put duty above self-interest in a determination to crash through the complacency of his fellow countrymen. He provides the living proof that our national sense of justice has not expired, that sooner or later America will face up to its moral responsibility for the fates of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and the rest of the nations writhing under the iron heel of communism.

Mr. Lane had lived in Poland as our Ambassador for 18 months packed with shocking and tragic events. He had watched the systematic strangulation of a freedom-loving people whom we had light-mindedly delivered to the embraces of the Russian bear. He had done what he could to resist the swift and ruthless subjection of a great country. After the farcical elections in January 1947, he felt that he could no longer keep silent. And so he wrote to the State Department, and I quote:

"For all practical purposes my mission in Poland is ended. I believe I could do more by educating American public opinion as a private citizen than I can by remaining in Poland, where my continued presence would be considered as tacit acquiescence in the recent fraudulent election. I should therefore appreciate it if the Department would permit me to retire from the Foreign Service."

I Saw Poland Betrayed is his report to the Nation—his attempt to educate American public opinion. Though written in a quiet, sober style, it is in fact a stirring protest against smugness and a flaming indictment of political amoralism.

Betrayal. It's a word that has been so often invoked in recent years that it is a bit threadbare and trite. We have become calloused to its reproof. Yet, as one reads Mr. Lane's careful and detailed account of the betrayal of Poland, the word comes alive. It stings like a whip. It stirs up the embers of our national pride.

I shall not attempt to summarize Mr. Lane's book. Suffice that it rehearses every one of the tragic acts of duplicity and immoral appeasement which forged the chains in which Poland today is bound and gagged and helpless.

There is in his pages, for instance, the whole blood-curdling story of heroism and brutal betrayal which was the 40 days' Warsaw uprising under General Komorowski-Bor. "The incredible crime," Ambassador Lane calls it. Under the prodding of Moscow radio appeals, the Polish underground came out into the open, with its primitive weapons, to confront the immense mechanized might of the Nazi war machine. The Red Army stood at the gates, on the eastern bank of the Vistula. In a series of swift blows, General Bor's forces wrested most of Warsaw from the hands of the Hitlerites. They took it for granted that the Red forces would move in to finish the job.

Then the horrifying truth came out. The Polish heroes had been prompted to fight in order that the Nazis might destroy them. It was a trap, carefully set by the Kremlin, baited with patriotic appeals. A trap in which 250,000 men and women and children were caught and cornered and killed. In all the annals of human chicanery, there are few episodes to match this one for cold-blooded cruelty. Whatever may happen to Poland, whatever may happen to the terror regime centered in Moscow, the martyrdom of Warsaw will never be expunged from the record.

Mr. Lane traces the whole shabby history of allied appeasement of Stalin at the expense of the country which offered the first resistance to the Hitler scourge. Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, San Francisco. I know, it's a familiar story. So familiar that we have ceased to feel its horror in our bones as we should. But in the pages of I Saw Poland Betrayed, the feeling is revived. We see how a totalitarian monster is fed chunks of Poland's flesh, then chunks of Polish sovereignty, then chunks of Polish freedom in the stupid hope of satiating its appetite for booty. We see how that appetite grew with the eating, until all of Poland was devoured, until not even the bones of its national freedom remained.

The Ambassador does not spare his own country and his own State Department in recounting the brutal facts. Again and again in the course of his 18 months in Warsaw, Mr. Lane pleaded with our Government to intervene, to insist on the fulfillment of obligations solemnly undertaken by the Big Three victors. Washington either did not hear or would not understand.

The primary responsibility for the crushing of Polish liberty rests on Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia. Of course it does. Who does not remember the shocking bargain in which the Brown and the Red dictators cut Poland in half between them with a bloody sword? But that does not exonerate British and American statesmen. It was their blundering and conscienceless attempt to buy peace by paying off the Kremlin with the freedom of small nations that helped finish the job started by Ribbentrop and Molotov.

The behavior of Soviet Russia was a crime. The behavior of America—its acquiescence in that crime—was a betrayal. The sooner we face that bitter truth the better for our self-respect and our immortal souls.

A large part of Mr. Lane's book, naturally, is devoted to the Red terror which preceded the so-called free and unfettered elections called for by the Yalta deal. He tells how the democratic parties were hounded and disfranchised, how leaders were arrested and tortured and killed, how the results of the election were rigged in advance.

Poland was the Communists' laboratory. The techniques of ruthlessness, having succeeded there, were in due time applied in Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia. What we watch in Mr. Lane's book is not merely the conquest of one country, but the pattern of conquest of all countries.

Perhaps the most shocking chapter in the tragedy was the conduct of our own administration. On the eve of the Presidential election of 1944, you will recall, Mr. Roosevelt assured a delegation of the Polish American Congress that he would defend the sovereignty and integrity of Poland to the bitter end. The cruel truth is that at the time Mr. Roosevelt had already agreed, at Tehran, to the dismemberment of Poland and its subordination to the Kremlin, though the outrage was still secret.

The history of American politics is filled with examples of double-dealing. Among them, I am sorry to have to say, that piece of trickery at the expense of the Polish people—carefully calculated to hold the votes of Americans of Polish descent—will forever have its place of dishonor.

I Saw Poland Betrayed is not a pretty story. It is grimly realistic. Nevertheless, Mr. Lane finds it possible to end on a note of guarded optimism. The Polish people, he points out, "are the most homogeneous in Europe today. They are almost all, he adds, of one race, language, and religion; they are closely knit by suffering and by tremendous devotion to their country. In the partitions of the eighteenth century they proved a most difficult country to subjugate. During the Nazi occupation they never lost their cohesion or their spirit."

It may therefore prove that the Kremlin has bitten off more than it can chew * * * certainly more than it can digest without violent abdominal convulsions. The reports in recent weeks of the arrest of new underground resistance groups is proof that Polish fighting spirit has not been fully crushed. Repeatedly the Communist quislings have announced the liquidation of Polish resistance. Then, a few months pass, and they are obliged once more to liquidate new opposition.

No; we must not despair. A lot of suffering * * * perhaps another war more destructive than the last * * * awaits Europe and the world. But in the end Stalin will go the way of Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo. Man's long struggle for freedom and human dignity is by no means finished. We have lost important battles—Poland was one of them. But we shall win the great conflict as a whole.

Meanwhile I Saw Poland Betrayed stands as a reminder for all democracies, and for America in particular, of their responsibility and their duty. As long as Poland and the other victims of Red imperialism are enslaved, none of us are free. The world has become too small for tyrants. Freedom and decency are now indivisible.

Recession in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Haven Register of March 6, 1949:

STATE IN GRIP OF RECESSION, DECLARES EGAN—LABOR HEAD SEES NO INDICATION OF HALT IN RISING JOBLESS FIGURE

HARTFORD, March 5.—Connecticut's jobless roll has jumped more than 10,000 in the past month, and the State is now definitely in the grip of a recession, according to State Labor Commissioner John J. Egan.

Egan said he saw nothing to indicate a halt in the steadily swelling unemployment figure.

JOBLESS TOTAL 56,120

There were 56,120 Connecticut people on the jobless list February 26, according to the commissioner. This represents an increase of 10,567 since January, he reported.

New lay-offs include 650 who were indefinitely laid off at the U. S. Rubber Co. footwear plant at Naugatuck. Another 520 workers were laid off at the Waterbury Tool Co., which announced it would suspend operations indefinitely starting next Wednesday.

Commissioner Egan added a further gloomy note with the comment that there may be a

buyers' strike in progress in Connecticut. Even persons with jobs are slackening their purchases, he said.

Egan pointed to the fact that lay-offs have principally been in consumer-goods industries, such as hats, shoes, clothing, tires, radios, toys, and silverware. So-called heavy-goods industries have not been so hard hit.

CAUTIOUS MANUFACTURERS

The commissioner said some lay-offs were due to cautious manufacturers who are uncertain of future price trends. These men do not want to be stuck with large stocks produced at fairly high costs, he said.

In an attempt to avoid this, Egan said, a manufacturer will close his plant for a few weeks, as a precautionary move. If his stocks do not appreciably drop during this time, the plant will remain closed a third, possibly a fourth week, and so on, until his inventory has been reduced.

NEW HAVEN LEADS

New Haven leads the State in the number of claims for unemployment compensation. That city's total of 9,172 claimants last week compares with 8,770 in Bridgeport; 7,073 in Hartford, and 6,274 in Waterbury.

New Haven's total represented an increase of 350 over the previous week. The latest total includes 275 workers at the Churchward boat yards in West Haven who have since returned to work however.

While there were no large lay-offs in the New Haven area last week, there were numerous lay-offs by small plants.

Congressman Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Friday, March 11, 1949, Lawrence, Mass.:

HIS CAREER NOTABLE

The recent death of Congressman Sol Bloom, of New York, chairman of the important Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives, removed from the Washington scene a leading and beloved figure whose life story was an outstanding example of American opportunity. His service to his country and its people will not be forgotten soon.

A son of parents who were poor Polish immigrants, he was born in Pekin, Ill., 79 years ago this month and from that humble beginning rose to great riches, widespread popularity and respect, unusual success, and great prominence in national and world affairs. Virtually his only education was received by Representative Bloom from his mother, a Hebrew scholar. The family moved to San Francisco, Calif., when he was 8 years old and his working days started shortly afterward as a factory employee.

Initial success of the deceased was attained in show business as the creator of unusual acts, then as a writer and publisher of popular songs, proprietor of a chain of 80 music stores and sports promoter. His profitable business enterprises eventually numbered 25, but in 1910 while residing in New York Representative Bloom abandoned all other ventures to devote his entire time to real estate and building construction, in which he made a vast fortune that was retained until his death. Carrying his irresistible ways into the political field, as the Democratic nominee Bloom was elected to Congress in 1923 from the Nineteenth New York District, previously a Republican stronghold, and was reelected regularly every 2 years thereafter. He soon became an outstanding figure there and had been exceptionally prominent since 1939 as the House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman. Probably Representative Bloom's greatest work was in promoting American participation in the United Nations and he became one of the signers of the UN Charter as a delegate to the San Francisco conference in 1945.

Especially creditable to the deceased was his unbounded generosity to charitable institutions, which he aided readily and regularly without regard to religious denominations or nationalities. All that the Congressman cared to know was that the existing need was genuine and the money required was contributed forthwith. Saint Ann's Roman Catholic Orphanage in Washington was among his favorite charities, and Representative Bloom's birthday was the cause of an annual celebration there, with all expenses paid by him. Despite his death, this year's party will be held as scheduled, because the institution's officials feel the Congressman would have wanted it to take place. Undoubtedly they are right, because that is the sort of a man he was.

Crisis of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following timely and pertinent editorial from the Santa Cruz (Calif.) Sentinel-News:

CRISIS OF FREE ENTERPRISE

This may not be the dictatorship of the proletariat that Karl Marx wrote about, but it's dictatorship just the same, and it shows how far we have come toward the end of free enterprise, thanks to the lust for power gaining momentum in some unions.

A local meat market is being picketed at present because the union wants the owner to close down the counter at 6 o'clock. Not that the union butchers employed there ever had to work after that hour. No. They went home when the clock struck 6, and the owner, who is a master butcher himself, took care of the grateful customers who welcomed the opportunity to shop after their own working hours.

It's not a matter of working hours, then. It's not a matter of salary, either. The personnel of the meat market has been receiving full union pay, which incidentally is $90 per week. The top butcher has been receiving $110 per week, a full $20 over union scale. Salary also has been paid when a man was sick.

So it boils down to the sad fact that the labor bosses wish to dictate to a man what to do with his own time in his own privately owned property. By doing so, they are destroying the traditional spirit of enterprise and competition, and incidentally, they are breaking down a service now rendered to hundreds of housewives unable to shop until after regular working hours.

The one local example is relative unimportant. What counts is increasing interference with private lives and private operations by pressure tactics and outright coercion. The outcome is above all the removal of all incentive to do a bigger and better job, it heralds the glorifications of the clock watchers, and it leads to the point where a father may advise his son to become a hired butcher for $110 a week and put in his prescribed hours, rather than toil away from morning to night in the attempt to start a little corner shop which some day shall grow into a giant market.

Unfortunate society in which enterprise is strangled! Unlucky country where nobody can any longer be boss in his own house. Let such trends continue, and the guild system of medieval times will celebrate resurrection in the land of unlimited opportunities. Opportunity will then mean the obtaining of a union card. Prosperity will depend on the initiation fee. And the worker starting on a job may well be like the cartoon character who knows all about his wages, hours, vacations, sick leaves, and special bonuses before he ever found out what he is supposed to do.

There is a place for labor unions in our society. Let's not transgress and allow a good thing to become a vicious dictatorship.

America Needs a Lot More Kent Leavitts With Soil Conservation in Their Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Kent Leavitt, president, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, before the annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, at St. Louis, February 7, 1949:

You have conferred a great honor on me to ask me to attend this meeting of yours and visit with you and get to know more about you, but it is more than an honor. It is a great pleasure, because I know something of your work, and it is a pleasure to be associated here with you who have had the vision to undertake this program of assisting soil-conservation district supervisors. Not only have you had the vision, but you have had the energy and have raised the finances to carry out your part of this program. I feel that I am qualified to speak to you about it and what it means to America, because I have attended several of these meetings, these short courses which Mr. Winter has so energetically organized and run on your behalf.

I have attended them in five different States. I have worked with the supervisors at those meetings, and I know how much these short courses mean to the supervisors. Furthermore, I have visited other States that have not had the benefit of this program, and as I go along with this speech I think you will realize how much you have already accomplished and perhaps, too, how much there is yet to be done. But to me it is particularly important that you started this program here in the Mississippi Valley, that part of the United States that has such rich soil, where cash cropping is so easy, because it is in those areas where it has been easy to make a living off the land that people have been neglectful of protecting the land.

You have seen it back and forth across the valley as I have. Where once this heavy, black, rich soil lay, now you see the yellow

top soil coming through and it is in that area where you have started your program. It is a magnificent one. You know we are apt to lose perspective when we consider a program of this nature. We do some work for it, just as soil-conservation district supervisors do their work, and we often get tired and bored and wonder just where we fit into this whole picture. It is that which I wish to discuss with you this afternoon.

We know that between now and 1952, we will probably have 6,000,000 more people in our country. We know also, if we can believe the figures from the Department of Agriculture, that we will have lost about a million and a half acres by erosion.

I understand there are 5,000,000 acres in the Missouri Valley that can be irrigated. Those are figures I have heard. How long will it take and how many people will we have in this country by the time those projects are completed? Those are the problems that are facing us here in America and in which you are taking such an active part.

Before we go on to the development of this problem, just what is the stake of the businessman in all this question of agriculture? I would like to refer you to an article or rather an editorial that came out in the Country Gentleman last August. Basically, it points out this fact, that never in American history has more than 25 percent of the national income been spent for food and clothing in the United States. The balance, or 75 percent, of the national income is available for all those other things that we consider as our high standard of living, be it expensive government, the radios or hospitals, or churches or automobiles.

You businessmen and men of commerce have a crack at that 75 percent of our national income, but we, gentlemen, are the low man on the totem pole of the great nations of the world. No other nation spends so little for those essentials. No other nation has as much available for the other things that make up a high standard of living. Let's not take the figures today. They are so upset by the last war, but back in the thirties, France was spending 30 percent of her national income for food and clothing. England was spending nearly 40; Italy was spending nearer 50, and in India and China, 90 percent of the national income went solely for food and clothing.

How would you like to do business, how would you like to compete in a country where 90 percent of the national income went for food and clothing? That is your stake in this problem of our land, from which come those essentials to our high standard of living.

When a nation is faced with such a problem, more people and less land, what can it do as a nation to protect itself, to guarantee continuation of its civilization? To my way of thinking, there are three things, three basic things that a nation must do. In the first place, and let's stick to America, we must change our thinking about the ownership of land. The ownership of land today is given to you by State law, a title in fee simple, to do with as you see fit.

I do not want to see the State laws changed, but I do want to see a change in thinking, from one of ownership in fee simple, to one of trusteeship. If we as a Nation can think of land in the terms of a trusteeship, we have taken the first great step. Why? Because a trustee has only two duties.

The first duty of a trustee is to see that the life tenant gets a fair income. You can't take the capital of trust and invest it all in three-quarters of 1 percent municipal bonds and say to a life tenant, that is all you get, and your capital is safe. You can't do that. You have to deliver a fair income, the going rate on sound security. The second duty of a trustee is to pass the principal of the trust on to the ultimate beneficiary in as good condition or better than when received.

If we in America can think of the ownership of our land in such terms, we have taken the first great step in this national problem. There is a second job, and we have also done well in that. I should not say "also" because we haven't done very much about the first one, but we have done well on the second one. The second one is to develop a new science, the science of proper land use.

It is a very complicated science, but it has reached a high stage of development in America. It has been developed by good farmers and ranchers, by our State land-grant colleges and experiment stations and by our Department of Agriculture, and other departments of the Federal Government. If you do not believe that we are a leader in the world in this great science, go and look at the visitors' book in the Department of Agriculture in Washington and see the number of foreign countries that have sent their students, their commissions of agriculture, their important political figures to study this new science that we have developed in America. They have come to take back some of it to their own country.

This science is primarily concentrated in one great bureau of the Department of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Service, where through an outstanding group of personnel and technicians, it is available in most parts of this country to any farmer and rancher who voluntarily seeks it. These farmers and ranchers can get it by forming soil-conservation districts under their State laws and then by applying to the Department of Agriculture for technicians to help them promulgate this science of proper land use.

I said, almost every part of the country. There is one part of the country where it is not available, and it is one thing that upsets me often. The Tennessee Valley Authority has seen wise to be sufficient unto themselves. They do not need the soil-conservation service; they do not want their farmers to cooperate with any other branch of the Federal Government. That is the only place, however, in America where if the farmers want it, they can't have it. Speaking about soil-conservation districts, leads me to the third great job that a country has to do if it is going to keep its natural resources. It must get this new science applied to the land, applied to every acre; that is what we must try to do in America without changing our form of government.

You may wonder at my saying, without changing our form of government. Gentlemen, to me it is one of the vital things in this program, because there are ways of getting this job done, I believe, but we would not end up with a democracy if we tried them. Let's take a look around the world and see what other countries are doing.

Most other countries in the world have decided that if they are going to do this job at all, they are going to do it by mandatory legislation, by domination. We don't want that here in America, but I am very fearful that we are closer to mandatory legislation than most of us think.

Constantly you see articles in the press. I have picked them up all over this country. The only way to get the job done, the editor will say, is to have a law about it. If we have a law about it, gentlemen, we will have the same thing that England has today. Today you can't farm land in England as you want. You follow the dictates of someone from the central government. Why? Pressure of people on the land and nothing else has made that true in a country to which we have always looked for liberal thinking. We have always thought of the British as liberal thinkers and of having a democratic form of government, but now today it is different. Why? Pressure of people upon the land. The result—socialism.

There is a second way that some people in America advocate doing this job. They want to do it by bribery, bribery from the Federal Treasury or the State treasuries. In other words, pay everybody to do everything. Put thousands and hundreds of thousands of more people on the Federal pay roll; spend billions of dollars per annum, not over a long time but per annum.

I have seen, gentlemen, the plans they have drawn up in Washington. They have been there for some time, and the excuse they give is that it is the only way to get the job done in time. A fairly plausible excuse until you stop to think it through; but those programs are now ready. It would be easy to slip it over on America, and there is only one way to stop it from being slipped over, and that is to have a better program; and I believe, gentlemen, we have a better program in America today, and that is the third point that I want to bring to you. The question of getting it done, applying the new science on the land in a democratic way. It must be a Nation-wide cooperative effort such as the one on which you have embarked. The one we are trying to do. But it is not just a farmer's problem. It is everybody's problem. All of us from every strata of our society must start thinking and working at this job of conserving our national resources. We can get it done without changing our form of government, and that is where soil-conservation districts come into the picture.

This question of getting it applied is a question of working from the grassroots on up. Before I go into a little detail, because I think you should know the detail of some of the program for which you have put up your money, I would like again to review it from a slightly different angle to show you what we have to work with, particularly here in this great central basin of ours in the United States.

Now, you know that one of the things of most vital interest to you is water, either too much water or too little water. What did the United States do as its history developed about controlling water? Well, basically, it went at it the wrong way. It started from the bottom up, perfectly logical, perhaps, in the light of history, that it did it that way. But certainly in the light of what we know today we wouldn't go at it the same way as we have in the past.

There is no need of my detailing that. I just wanted to bring it to your attention. We started from the bottom of the rivers and we are gradually working up to where the source of trouble is, not only the source of trouble, but the source of benefit. That point is where the water falls upon the land. That is where the program should have started. In controlling water resources you should start where the water falls.

We went at it the other way in America. We started with the great program of the Army engineers to protect our rivers. I bet there is not a man in this room that would like the assignment of protecting St. Louis against floods, no matter how much money he was given, if he had to localize his efforts in and around St. Louis, but that was the job handed the Army engineers. An impossible job, and then we took a step further and we developed the reclamation program, and now, finally, we have taken the last step.

We have added to those two great programs, the new Department of Agriculture flood-control program, which is designed to fill the gap between where the water falls and where the reclamation, dams, and irrigation work, power development, begin. I think that you will probably agree with me that if you were assigned the job from a clean slate, you would start at the top and work down, thus you would have less to control at the bottom.

I believe the new tripartite program is sound and unfortunately, we have been slow in getting to this point. We have now almost reached it. There are one or two things that I want to point out to you in regard to the

over-all program that faces us here in America today. You and I as citizens and taxpayers must do something about it. Think back a minute. It was only in 1936 that the Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to make a survey of the great Missouri Valley to see what could be done about controlling water at the source, and as well, to control the land upon which it fell and over which it ran.

In the meantime, we have seen the merging of the two great programs we mentioned before: 1944 brought together the Pick-Sloan plan. From 1946 to 1948, the Department of Agriculture was given increased appropriations to develop their share of this plan, and while those Federal activities were going on, you had another very interesting thing, and that was that the 10 great States that make up the Missouri Basin got together, took an interest, and formed their Governor's committee, which has been very active. Their meetings have been very well attended.

I personally have talked with several of the governors of those great 10 States. Now, the governors have gotten together to see if the resources of the Missouri Valley could not be properly integrated and worked out, if the States and the departments of the Federal Government work together on the new plan. The Department of Agriculture, over the last 2 years with new appropriation, has worked consistently and constantly with the governors of these States and now the plan has been finished.

The plan is now in the Department of Agriculture. It has the approval of the governors of the 10 States, and I think that you should take an interest now and immediately for this reason. We now have a finished plan. The survey should be approved as is by the Department of Agriculture, and the Congress. All that is necessary is to have the Congress approve that plan. If Congress will approve the plan immediately and appropriate funds, then we can start on the final step of integrating the three great organization plans together. But, gentlemen, as so often happens, particularly in a bureaucracy such as we have today, everybody else wants to get aboard any sound project. I have heard rumors and I have seen signs, that now that this plan has been drawn up and people see how good it is and how popular it will be, we may fall into the trap of everybody else trying to climb aboard it. If you have any influence, and if you realize the importance of this Federal flood-control project, please use your influence to see that the plan is presented to Congress as it is now drawn and that Congress takes some action on it. It is only with this three-prong effort that we will get our water resources under control here in the Missouri Basin.

Let us return to the over-all picture of getting the new science applied to the land. Where do you and ourselves as districts come into this picture? What is a soil-conservation district? I have a basic definition that I am very fond of for a district. A district is no more than this. It is a group of farmers and landowners and operators who have banded themselves together with certain privileges and certain obligations under State law to do what? To cooperate with any organization or agency, be it Federal, State, be it private, that will help them get proper land-use practices adopted by the farmers of their area and put into effect.

That is all a soil-conservation district is. To me, it is terribly important because it gives a sound basis for democratic control of any program, be it Federal or State, that is wished on the people. We can control it from the grass roots up, if and only if the farmers who have taken on the job of running a district will assume their responsibilities and carry out the program themselves and not be dominated by any agency, be it Federal, State, or private.

In other words, if they will run their districts, if they will help draw up these plans; if they will go out and sell these ideas to the farmers around them; if they will show them it is profit-making, and, good for the future, then the program is democratic. That, gentlemen, is where the Mississippi Valley Association has done such magnificent work. Now, granted, you say that you are interested in 23 States and granted that you have only carried out this program in 5 States, but, gentlemen, you are leaders in America.

There is nobody else carrying out this type of program. I have sat at these short courses 2 days at a time, with supervisors of districts who at your expense or at theirs, have come in to learn more of what they can do and how to do it. Often you get districts organized, and men appointed or elected supervisors, yet they don't know what their duties are. It has been your organization in these five States that has backed them up, has helped them educate themselves, to do their work on a voluntary basis.

You have done it on a cooperative basis of industry and agriculture getting together, and I tell you, it is the soundest thing in America today, the very soundest thing. The very best form of government is this united effort to pull together to put across this program. I would like to say a word right here about Mr. Winter.

Everett Winter is full of enthusiasm, popular among the farmers, knows his subject thoroughly. I have seen him do it out in the States. I have also seen him in your Washington office. I have also seen him before congressional Agriculture Committees, and frankly, I have never seen him make a mistake. His work has been sound, it has been constructive, it has been energetic, and it just couldn't be better. I just can't say enough to compliment him and Miss Anderson for carrying out your wishes so well.

I only hope that some of you will take the time as these schools are carried on in the various States to go and see what you yourselves are doing in this program. These district supervisors should really act as catalysts, to bring other programs of the Department of Agriculture or of the States or private people together into one united effort. They are doing it, not only on a county basis, but on a State basis, and now fortunately for us, we finally have a national organization.

I would say this for our national organization. It has only appeared in Washington once and that was last year to testify, but these same fellows that you have helped to train, 45 of them, went to Washington at their own expense last year. They stood up before the Agriculture Committee of the House and the Senate and the Appropriations Committees, and they gave the Congress such a good, fair, unbiased, and unselfish picture that, I am told, Congress will probably never again attempt to pass any agricultural legislation without at least consulting the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

Why? Because they did not go to Washington and ask for anything. They went to tell Congress what is good for their country. They supported their testimony with knowledge which stems from hard work on the land and which you all have so magnificently assisted them in developing.

I have taken a lot of your time here, and hope that you have followed my thinking. In closing, I just want to beg of you this, that your association get behind this picture and stay behind it even more energetically than you have in the past, because I am sure you do not yet realize what a wonderful thing you are doing and how vital it is to America, that soil conservation districts be given the kind of assistance that you are giving to them.

Thank you very much.

The Chance for Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the English publication Intelligence Digest:

THE CHANCE FOR ENTERPRISE

Observers of world affairs send in report after report of these staggering opportunities. Their reports often include a desperate lament that while the greatest chances ever open to enterprise stare us in the face, little is done.

Vast sums of capital are almost stagnating in America and Britain and bringing in absurdly little return. The deathly creed of security has eaten deep into the soul of merchants whose grandfathers would not have made a dime or a sixpenny piece if they hadn't boldly risked everything and then risked it again, and then still again, for the reward of supreme success.

Private enterprise still has it in its power to smash the present system of penal taxation, and to develop the untouched resources of the world with such vigor and success that not an argument remains to the leftist.

If enterprise used its resources boldly and gave to its workers what they ought to have before and not after it has been demanded, the world situation would be entirely transformed.

THE DEMAND FOR REDUCED TAXATION

There is growing demand for reduced taxation, although Mr. Truman has chosen this very moment to suggest that it should be still higher in America. Unless public opinion insists upon sweeping reductions, and in some cases complete abolition, enterprise will not, of course, get the vital incentive it needs.

The doctrinaire leftists well know this. Smash the spirit of enterprise by snatching away its profits—that is their basic theory. It is very sound.

The ideal that everyone should be ready to work to the utmost regardless of reward has never yet been attained, and is not even attempted by leftists when dealing with the workers. To them profit and inducement are enlarged constantly. Successful private enterprise, which helps to create a successful nation, depends upon inducement.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF REDUCING INCENTIVE

We already witness the disastrous consequences of reducing the profits of industry. Presently we are going to see the same thing happen in the professions. Nationalized medicine, for example, in which the doctor can never expect more than modest financial security, will deprive that great profession of the most adventurous and lively brains. It is true that a doctor must have a sense of vocation—but the rewards of great service have always been and always will be an attraction to most, though of course not all, of the best brains.

It is not fortuitous that in England, where the rewards in medicine were for a long time the highest, the greatest surgeons in history were produced between Lister and Trotter.

It is proven in every nonreligious sphere, that when the rewards are reduced or seized the effort declines and the best brains quit. It is this deeply fundamental fact which accounts for the phenomenon that all Marxist economic policy leads to a slow de-

cline and eventual national poverty, or dictatorship. If men will not work without profit, and a government refuses to face economic decline and won't restore free profits, then dictatorship must follow. And it has.

THE NEED FOR ACTON

It is elementary, therefore, that penal taxation must be smashed. Yet not one conservative party in the whole English-speaking world has had the courage to make an all-out offensive against it.

The people themselves could bring about a complete change within a few months if they exerted themselves. No government can stand against a really roused public opinion.

If, for example, every reader of this digest throughout the world wrote one letter of argument and protest on the subject of taxation and death duties to his or her principal newspaper, a major controversy would be created influencing every political party.

It is a cause of astonishment to observers that millions of intelligent people, and the directors of great enterprises, allow themselves to be slowly destroyed without active protest, and at a time of unprecedented opportunity.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, rent control was a wartime emergency, adopted during the days of expanding Army and Navy training camps, fluctuating population at industrial centers engaged in war production. We are now in the fifth year of peace, prices are declining, the administration is quoted as being concerned over a possible recession, but they demand that rent control be continued, and for a longer period. To date I have not received one single letter favoring continuation of rent control this year.

Note these figures released last year by the Federal Reserve System. With a base of 100 in 1941, living has advanced by 118 percent, apparel 100 percent, all other items 75 percent, and rent has advanced 18 percent. How can the landlord maintain necessary repairs, taxes, and upkeep on his property and yet rent at levels which prevailed early in the war? Who is going to invest in new rentals with the prospect of continuing tightened Government control? Remember the consequences of rent control in France, which has obliterated new home building and produced slums.

Everywhere the Government is eliminating free enterprise with subsidized competition—public housing, medical care, power projects, minimum wage. One more step on the road to socialism and dictatorship. Is not rent control the confiscation of property, and to confiscate real estate is only the beginning of the ultimate confiscation of everything. Somebody has said, "Why spend $15,000,000,000 to suppress communism abroad, and then establish it at home by law?"

Wake up, America, before it is too late. Do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Stop this steady march toward socialism here and now. Return to the concepts of freedom, liberty, and enterprise upon which this country was founded, which have given us the highest standard of living of any nation, and world leadership.

The rent-control law as administered is confiscation of property. It is un-American.

Another home owner, who is neither tenant nor landlord summed it up this way—"The greatest wrong being done in America is not the provisions of the rent control law. The great wrong is that there is any such law at all in America."

The following are good reasons for ending rent control. They were submitted to me from the Property Owners Council, 3315 Fairmont Drive, Nashville, Tenn.

WHY RENT CONTROL SHOULD END

1. Because it is unchristian, un-American, and unconstitutional.
2. Because it is against God and the Bible.
3. Because it is atheistic and Communist in origin.
4. Because it is unfair, unjust and discriminatory.
5. Because it is arbitrary and unprincipled and unbusinesslike.
6. Because it is dictatorial and tyrannical.
7. Because it is basically and fundamentally wrong. It makes orphans out of the tenants and slaves out of owner.
8. Because control has failed in England, France and Russia and everywhere else that it has been tried.
9. Because it destroys the incentive for industry and sacrifice to save.
10. Because it makes demagogues out of politicians and parasites out of the tenants.
11. Because it encourages the spendthrift spirit and destroys individual initiative.
12. Because it puts control in the hands of the politicians and destroys American statesmanship and high principles.
13. Because control destroys the American way of life to gain which our forefathers fought and died.
14. Because it discourages the tenant from standing on his own feet in meeting life's issues on the square.
15. Because it gives more money to the tenant to buy whisky, to gamble, and to throw to the wind.
16. Because it makes an object of charity out of the tenant when the landlord is forced to pay part of his rent.
17. If the poor people need help let's take it out of all the taxpayers' pocket, and not force the property owner to shoulder the whole load.
18. Finally because there is no need for rent control as there are many houses and apartments vacant and without tenants.

Speech of Dan W. Tracy, International President, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address of Dan W. Tracy, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Mr. Tracy is an outstanding labor leader and his organization has shown the way in maintaining peaceful and progressive labor-management relationship through a voluntary arbitration plan. His remarks on the Taft-Hartley Act are well worth noting.

The address follows:

This year, 1949, presents a challenge to labor and to management—a challenge and a rare opportunity to them as a team to solve the problems which face our economy.

Our President was mindful of this teamwork when he gave his State of the Union address to the Eighty-first Congress early in January. Mr. Truman said:

"The Government must work with industry, labor, and the farmers in keeping our economy running at full speed. The Government must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance. These responsibilities go hand in hand."

The President has lived up to the faith which the laboring people of the United States placed in him when they went to the polls last November 2. He has asked Congress for a repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and a reenactment of the Wagner Act, an increase of the minimum wage, higher benefits under social security, steps to combat inflation and promote production, adequate housing legislation, a strengthened Labor Department, and other measures which were part of the Democratic campaign promises. For these issues the President has spoken and as this is written, President Truman's friends—and labor's friends—in the House and Senate have started to push them through and have won the preliminary skirmishes.

The President has promised a Fair Deal for every segment and every individual in this vast Nation of ours.

And that is where we come in. A Fair Deal is all that labor ever wants. Trade-unionists have proved over and over that they can work as part of the team which we know as the American democracy. One of the most striking examples of this teamwork is found in the excellent record made by America's organized workers in this country in World War II. The American labor union is an untiring dynamo in the creation and preservation of American democracy because it is the basis of democratic life. This has been constantly revealed throughout the world during the last few years, dramatically during the last decade, and we know now that the labor union has the greatest stake in democracy. We have only to recall what happened to the labor unions in totalitarian countries with the coming of dictatorship by Hitlers, Mussolinis, or politburos. They were eliminated overnight.

Secretary of Labor Tobin acknowledged this stake which labor has in democracy, when he said in his New Year's Day statement: "American wage earners and their unions have contributed to the strength and welfare of the Nation."

Organized labor is chiefly responsible for the high standards of life which we have in our country. Fewer hours of work, accompanied by efficient production, have created more leisure for the American people than you will find anywhere else in the world. Increased wages have made possible the highest living standards in the world—not just for members of organized labor but for all our citizens. It has been proved without doubt that prosperity among the working people of a nation is the basis for prosperity for every segment of the population. And how are these improvements brought about? In the main by unions and fair, progressive-minded employers, working together under America's system of private enterprise and through collective bargaining.

Yes, in this country, labor has a stake in democracy, and management has a stake in democracy. They are partners—both working for the same goal—a better life for Americans in which all share. Working together they achieve this goal. It's the height of folly to fight your partner. Wrongs bring retaliation and retardation. The way to avoid difficulties is to get together—labor and management—and cooperate. Labor and management have grown up. They are mutually capable of looking the situation over and reaching a sensible understanding.

A year of the Taft-Hartley law has been a lesson to both labor and management. You can't force cooperation. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in a recent report, states that there were more large strikes, involving 10,000 or more workers in 1948, the year in which the Taft-Hartley law was in full force and effect, then there were in 1947. In terms of idleness the Bureau declared, "last year's big strikes resulted in approximately 19,000,000 man-days or 56 percent of the total idleness for 1948, while in 1947 they accounted for 17,700,000 man-days of idleness, or about 50 percent of the total."

Voluntary cooperation and arbitration is the answer to our problems and we in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers are one labor union that is willing, yes, determined, to do our part to make voluntary cooperation work. We want to join with the employers of our members in setting up and maintaining a labor-management program that will work and will bring a peaceful and prosperous status to us both. And we believe the management side of our industry feels that way, too, and will meet us halfway in this endeavor.

In the electrical construction branch of our industry, we can speak with confidence of a program of voluntary cooperation and arbitration, for in our construction field such a program has been in operation and has worked successfully for years. Our council on industrial relations for the electrical construction industry was set up in 1920 by the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and it provided in cases of dispute that five members of the NECA and five members of the IBEW would meet, talk the situation over, until a unanimous decision, to be binding on both parties, had been reached. Through all the years since 1920 this council has decided the issues in dispute which have sprung up between us. We have never had a violation of a decision and gradually the electrical construction industry has come to be known as a strikeless industry.

Voluntary arbitration works and we are determined in this year of 1949 to make every effort to have it work in every phase of our industry—construction, manufacturing, utility, railroads, radio, telephone, wherever there are electrical workers employed. We are determined to do a good job for the industry everywhere, and we appeal to all employers in the electrical industry to join with us, and as a team we will make this the greatest year in the history of electrical production. We will do our part to keep America's economic machine running at top speed.

Labor has matured as an important force in our American life. Although labor has long been a potent factor, there were many who did not fully recognize the position and importance of labor until the elections of last fall. Labor's voice was heard at the polls at all levels—National, State, and local.

One of the most important results in this matter of having its voice heard is found in the fact that labor has many, many friends in Congress. Many of labor's old friends were reelected and in the places of some of the reactionaries are now found friends of labor. It is encouraging indeed, to run down the list of names in the Senate and the House and see the names of the new Members we know we can count as our friends.

But labor's interest in the workings of our Congress and our national democracy is not without consciousness of responsibility. And anyone who knows how labor feels about the problems of the day knows that this responsibility is not taken lightly. We are ready and willing to assume it.

Labor's responsibility can be found in Mr. Truman's theme—"a Fair Deal for all." Labor does not ask for more than a fair deal. We ask no special concessions for the part we played in helping to win the election; we did no more than our part as citizens of this great Republic in voting the way we felt was the best way to preserve it. We eagerly assume our responsibility this year in making democracy work—by consistency of purpose, alert initiative, unfailing determination, and honest work—a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. This responsibility we accept and we ask no special concessions, but neither do we want to be victims of unfair discrimination and legislation such as we have been under the Taft-Hartley era. All we want is an even break.

Labor realizes, as management should, that if our democracy is to be kept thriving and vital, we must all make contributions—contributions in work as well as good will, in active cooperation as well as fine phrases. The world is looking to our country. Here, it might be said, democracy is on trial before the world. If we succeed, as I am sure we can, we must and will prove that the best standard of living and the highest form of liberty and democracy come when man can work and live under the blessings of freedom and a system of unregimented economy.

If we fail to work together and if we fail to prove that teamwork between labor and management can be an effective operation, then democracy fails. Cold fear strikes deep within each of us when we think what might then happen to those precious freedoms we have so laboriously earned in the decades since the founding of the Republic should democracy fail.

Success of democracy is more important now than it has ever been before in the history of the world, since totalitarian systems threaten many parts of the globe, and these systems will threaten us unless we make our political and economic system work. But I feel that I can speak, not just for the electrical segment of organized labor but for all organized labor, when I say labor can be counted upon to contribute its full share in this business of making democracy work.

But making democracy work means giving attention to the workings of our economic and political machinery at all levels—local as well as national. We have seen an example of labor suffering a severe defeat because of State laws. And recent Supreme Court decisions have made it plain that only wiping these laws from the State legislature will solve our problems. These little Taft-Hartley's must go. They have turned back the clock of labor progress many years in the States where they have been enacted. Such a setback for labor is proof once again that labor must be ever vigilant in its rights and its gains in every forum—in the local precinct, in the city, in the State, and, of course, in the Nation.

As we look forward to the critical days ahead in our democracy, as we resolve that we are going to be dealt with in a fair-minded manner, we at the same time resolve that we are going to reciprocate in kind—that we are going to produce full value for wages received; that we are going to cooperate with our employers as we feel confident they will cooperate with us, and together we can work to the end that our Government can preserve a thriving democracy and keep our economic machine functioning at a high level of production and employment, creating a better living for all.

Unless cooperation obtains in all industry through sensible effort contributed by employer and employee alike, all that democracy stands for must fall. While the ugly head of totalitarianism has been smashed in parts of Europe, its nostrils still exhale annihilating flames consuming all liberties in the Russias and other segments of the world.

The employer who persists in blinding himself to the fact that totalitarianism is the antithesis of capitalism, and that labor enlightened and free is the first line of defense for our economic system, is in the unfortunate position of being as blind as those who will not see, and must eventually pay the penalty. If labor does not visualize, in the failure of cooperation, the destruction of its liberties and freedom, it is equally blind and is courting consequences. Let us all resolve to recognize each other's rights so that democracy will be safe for all who are willing to embrace it.

However, the basis for such cooperation is economic justice. The lion's share for labor would leave capital on lean rations. In either case the public—embracing those who labor and those who invest—would suffer. The flickering of Taft-Hartley candles is but a shadow in the brilliance of enlightened cooperation.

Plight of Jews Behind Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from the report on the plight of Jews in countries behind the iron curtain, delivered at the convention of the Jewish Labor Committee on February 27, 1949. It is further evidence of what minority groups may expect when they come under the domination of Soviet Russia or any of its satellites:

The Jewish Labor Committee has considered it its duty to gather all available facts and information on the present plight of the Jews residing in countries behind the iron curtain.

All delegates to this convention will receive a detailed written report on what has happened to Jews and Jewish institutions in countries controlled by Soviet satellite regimes.

About 5,000,000 Jews lived before the war in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and the Balkan countries. This constituted 30 percent of the Jewish population of the world. In these countries the Jews have for centuries built their scholarship, religion and modern culture. Every city and town had Jewish schools, libraries and social and economic organizations. There also grew the mighty Jewish labor movement which led the movement for freedom and justice throughout the world. There also developed the mighty Jewish National movements which enriched Jewish life in all countries of the world.

Then came Hitler's war of extermination, resulting in the annihilation of millions of Jews. At the end of the war about 650,000 Jews remained alive in these countries. In addition there were 300,000 Jews in Siberia, in the displaced persons camps in Germany, and in the Allied Armies waiting for their return home. All these survivors were imbued with a burning desire to reconstruct their lives and institutions to spite Hitler and the home-grown anti-Semites, especially

those in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania. A substantial number of the surviving Jews chose to emigrate and leave their countries of birth forever, as they felt that the earth of these lands was soaked with the blood of their closest and dearest. Others, however, decided to remain and rebuild Jewish life on the ruins.

We of the Jewish Labor Committee gave aid to both groups—those who chose to emigrate and those who decided to remain.

Fate decreed that close to a million surviving Jews found themselves after the war in the Russian sphere of influence. Within a short period of time these Jews were turned over to those elements which years ago destroyed Jewish life in Russia. What has happened in the past 3 years to Jews in Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Balkans? We are not including in our report the Baltic States, as these were immediately after the war incorporated as provinces in the U. S. S. R.

Let us examine, then, the situation of the Jews in these four Soviet satellite countries and start with—

RUMANIA

About 400,000 Jews out of a prewar Jewish population of 750,000 to 800,000 survived the world cataclysm. However, only 210,000 were there at the time the Germans were driven out. Seventy-one thousand returned from the camps in Transnistru. Some 13,500 returned from the Hungarian labor battalions, and between 20,000 and 25,000 returned from Poland, Bukovina, and Bessarabia, making a total of 400,000 living in Rumania after the war.

The economic plight of the Jews in Rumania deteriorated daily. At the end of 1946 only 27.5 percent of the Jewish population found employment; 150,000 Jews lived on relief, and at the end of 1947 50,000 Jews had no means of support. The decrees which the Rumanian Government issued nullifying all Nazi transactions and restoring to Jews their former possessions were never carried out, as those who were supposed to effectuate the laws were either themselves anti-Semites or were following the general policy of the Communist-dominated government not to antagonize the anti-Semitic-ridden population.

By the end of 1947 the Jews succeeded in occupying only 4,000 homes out of 18,000 which had belonged to them before the war. The government also failed to carry out the law for the return to the Jewish communities of possessions of Jews who had died leaving no heirs. These possessions amounted to $1,125,000,000. Poverty, unemployment, and homelessness became the economic fate of the Jews in Rumania.

In spite of the government's official opposition to antisemitism, the antisemitic feelings among the population have not subsided. The government apparatus was ridden with antisemitism and intolerance. The government also declined to mete out harsh punishment to those who were guilty of the destruction and spoliation of Jews during the war. Collaborators of the former reactionary antisemitic government such as Foreign Minister Tatarescu were taken into the government with the blessing of the Communists.

On June 29, 1941, a pogrom took place in the town of Jassy whereby some 14,000 Jews were killed. After the war, thanks to the Jewish organizations, 150 participants in this mass murder were located. The government evaded prosecution of these criminals, and only by the middle of 1947 brought them to trial. By that time about 65 had died or disappeared. The trial was dragged out for months, and by 1949 only a few of them were given minor punishments.

The Rumanian Government gave very little financial support to the suffering Jews, in spite of its numerous promises. At one time the then Premier Groza stated that the government's promises will be carried out if the Rumanian Jewish community will influence American Jews to grant Rumania $100,000,000.

Georgiu Des, vice premier of Rumania, stated at the opening of the newly elected Communist-dominated parliament that the Jews constitute a danger to the economic situation in the country; that they sabotaged production, that they are reactionaries, and that they have their eyes turned toward the west.

In 1947 and at the beginning of 1948 tens of thousands of Jews started an illegal trek out of Rumania through Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The Rumanian Government confiscated the possessions of the illegal emigrants.

Immediately after the war an intensive Jewish communal civic and cultural renaissance started in Rumania. The various Jewish political groups rebuilt their organizations; by January 1947 there were 114 functioning Jewish communities with 30 kindergartens, 65 public schools, 15 high schools, 60 Talmud Torahs, and 6 Yeshivas providing Jewish education to 15,000 children. A number of cooperatives and trade schools were established, and the ORT organization opened 54 vocational schools for 8,000 Jewish young people.

This situation did not last very long. The small minority of Communists among the Jews has at all times conducted an opposition against the Jewish communities and their leadership through a front organization called Jewish Democratic Committee.

The first victim of the Communist attack was the Social Democratic Jewish labor movement. This was followed with a blast on the Federation of Rumanian Jews. Subsequently the president of the Federation of Rumanian Jews, Dr. Filderman, was forced to leave the country, and in his place was appointed a Communist. As Chief Rabbi was designated a Dr. Rosen, also a Communist, who is today the religious leader of the Rumanian Jews.

In February 1948 the Communists took over the Federation of Jewish Communities and the Communist leader, Serban Libovici, became its general secretary.

The liquidation of Jewish civic, educational and cultural life then took place at a rapid pace:

1. During 1948 the Jewish communities and all Jewish civic institutions went through a drastic purge.

2. In the summer of 1948 the autonomous Jewish schools were forcibly liquidated.

3. At the end of October 1948 the police raided the offices of the Jewish National Fund, and Mr. Leon Itzko, editor of the Zionist weekly, Montuirea, was arrested.

4. On November 5, 1948, 19 Jewish hospitals of the Jewish communities were nationalized.

5. On November 5, 1948, the Federation of Rumanian Jews, which had existed for 40 years, was liquidated.

At the same time the Jewish communities were deprived of the right to manage their institutions, such as old-age homes and orphan asylums, and all sports clubs which bore Jewish names were ordered to change their names to Russian and Rumanian names. The Communist organ Unirea proclaimed that "the unjustified tolerance is over * * * the government has launched a fight against the Jewish bourgeoisie which is not an exception in the capitalist jungle." The political bureau of the Communist Party adopted a resolution that "Zionism is a political reactionary movement of the Jewish bourgeoisie which aims to hinder Jews from joining the progressive forces in the struggle against capitalism and their own bourgeoisie." Then followed a number of bloody fights which lasted for 8 days, resulting in the final liquidation of the Zionist clubs. The final upshot is that there are no more Jewish schools, Jewish cultural groups, Jewish communities, Jewish organizations. A small, powerful Communist group reigns over the Jewish community in Rumania.

HUNGARY

The second country where a substantial number of Jews remained alive after the war is Hungary. In 1941 about three-quarters of a million Jews lived in expanded Hungary; 400,000 on prewar Hungarian territory, 180,000 in the annexed part of Transylvania, 150,000 in occupied Carpatho-Russia, and 20,000 on Yugoslav soil which was turned over to Hungary by Hitler.

About 80 percent of these Jews were annihilated during the war, chiefly in the Polish death chambers. The number of surviving Hungarian Jews at the end of the war estimated at between 150,000 and 180,000. A number of Hungarian Jews are to this day interned in the camps of Russia. The economic situation of the Hungarian Jews has in the first years after the war been the worst in Europe.

Not less than 120,000 Jews had to obtain food from the American Joint Distribution Committee. The Jewish trading element was ruined because of inflation and deflation. Jewish possessions were not restored to the rightful owners in spite of the many promises by the government. Anti-Semitism which had strong roots before the war became more intensified in the postwar years. None of the parties, especially the Communist Party, dared launch a campaign against the anti-Semites, as they did not want to lose their popularity. The Communists as well as the Small Landholders Party vied for the favor of the anti-Semitic-ridden Hungarians, with the result that the government machinery was infested with bigots and anti-Semites. When the Communists obtained complete control over the country they declined to take drastic steps to restore property to the Jews, as this was contrary to their nationalization and collectivization plans.

The attacks upon Jews by anti-Semites became a daily occurrence; anti-Semitic literature was widely distributed among the population, and a number of Jewish cemeteries were desecrated.

Officially the government was committed to fight anti-Semitism; in practice, however, very little was done to put a stop to it. One of the basic causes for the growth of anti-Semitism was the fact that several Jews have occupied leading positions in the Communist Party. The anti-Semites utilized this and held the Jews collectively responsible for the policies of Communist government.

The truth, however, is that the Jewish population in Hungary is not pro-Communist. During the only more or less free election for Parliament which took place after the war, some 45 percent of the Jewish people in Hungary voted for the Small Landholders Party; 30 percent for the Social Democrats, and only 25 percent for all other parties, including the Communist Party. The so-called Jewish Communists have nothing whatever to do with the Jewish people, as they are assimilated Hungarians.

In spite of their bad economic plight and the rampant anti-Semitism, the Hungarian Jews demonstrated Herculean energy in rebuilding their Jewish cultural and social life in the land of their birth.

In the years after World War II they established communal institutions, societies, organizations, and by the beginning of 1948 there were about 20 Jewish religious and secular schools in Budapest. In July 1947 a Jewish museum was opened in the capital of Hungary, and the Zionist movement conducted intensive activity.

Officially the Government looked with favor upon zionism. The leader of the Communist Party, Mathyas Rakosy stated that the Government will allow every Jew to emigrate to Israel with his possessions.

This situation, however, changed subsequently, and by the end of 1947 two representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine were deported from Hungary. In an election for officers of the Jewish community of Budapest, one single united list of candidates was decreed by the Communists, with the result that complete control of the Jewish community was taken over by the Communists.

On June 11, 1948, all Jewish schools were nationalized, and all academic subjects were henceforth to be taught in Hungarian. In September 1948 the Hungarian Zionist weekly was, because of "a shortage of paper," closed down. Even the Jewish members of the Communist Party were finally purged with only a few remaining in its ranks.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In 1938 before the Munich Pact, 380,000 Jews lived in Czechoslovakia. After the Germans were driven out, about 40,000 Jews survived. When Subcarpathia was occupied by Russia the Jews emigrated to Czechoslovakia.

The democratic government of Benes and Masaryk was friendly toward the Jews. Upon the return of many of them from the camps they were given back their homes, and in 1945 a law was passed nullifying all transactions which had been imposed upon the Jews after 1938. The newly established Jewish community received 5,000,000 kronen as part of the property which was found in the German camps. Detailed laws were also passed for the restitution of all Jewish possessions.

A number of difficulties, however, were soon encountered by the Jewish population, especially those of Subcarpathia. The "crime" of the Jews of Subcarpathia was that when Czechoslovakia turned over Subcarpathia to its "great friend Russia," these Jews escaped into Czechoslovakia. The citizenship of these Jews was not recognized in Czechoslovakia, and the Communists launched a huge campaign against them. The Communist Minister of Information, Mr. Kopecky, denounced the Jews on March 27, 1947, for daring to "abandon the proletarian fatherland" and "for bearing animosity toward communism." He called the Jews "the bearded Szlamas, the Jewish good-for-nothings." The Social Democratic newspaper Prado Lidu protested against Kopecky's anti-Semitic remarks.

In August 1946 when the Communists held a conference of partisans in Bratislava—the so-called partisans of Slovakia consisted largely of Slovak Fascists who joined the Communist ranks—the partisans started a pogrom upon Jews which lasted 4 days, with the result that dozens of Jews were injured and Jewish stores were robbed.

After the Communist coup in February 1948, anti-Semitism was given greater impetus in the country. Although Jewish Communists do not play a leading role in the Government, anti-Semites point a finger at Rudolf Slansky, general secretary of the Communist Party, who happens to be a Jew. The name Slansky and a few others add fuel to the anti-Semitic fire.

In August 1948 there was a big pogrom in Bratislava which lasted from 9 in the morning to 10 o'clock at night. The highest punishment meted out to the guilty ones was 4 years' imprisonment.

It is not true, as the representatives of the Czechoslovak Embassy in the United States stated on numerous occasions, that all possessions have been restored to the Jews in Czechoslovakia. Only 2,600 of the 16,000 applicants have to date recovered their property. The Communist Deputy Kapun stated his party's attitude toward this problem in May 1947: "The restitution of Jewish possessions is a difficult thing. Before the war the Jews had Germanized themselves, and after that they escaped because of racial reasons. We cannot trust their patriotism. The pot in which food was spoiled once smells bad even though it has been thoroughly cleansed."

After the war the Jews have given a great deal of energy to the reconstruction of their civic and cultural life. By September 1945 there were 55 Jewish communities in Czechoslovakia, and the ORT organization established 15 vocational schools.

By the end of 1947 and the beginning of 1948 a so-called Jewish Action Committee, led by Laura Simkova, a member of the Communist Party, was organized. To this committee was given the task of purging Jewish life. The former president of the Jewish community of Czechoslovakia was dismissed and four other leading members were allowed to resign, with the Communist Alexander Knapp becoming the general secretary and the well-known Communist journalist Egon Erwin Kisch taking over the chairmanship.

A similar purge took place in Slovakia with many of its leaders fleeing the country. A purge also took place among rabbis, with Hanus Rezek, the chief rabbi of Prague, forced to resign from his position.

The government's attitude toward Zionism then changed radically, and the Czechoslovak borders were closed to the Jews fleeing from Poland and Hungary to the German and Austrian camps. During the latter part of 1948 a substantial illegal emigration of Czechoslovakian Jews was under way to the American zone in Germany.

POLAND

Jews have lived in Poland for more than a thousand years, and Jewish historians have justifiably called the Jewish community of Poland the heart of Jewry.

Since the end of the war some 300,000 Jews passed through that country and today there are only between 60,000 and 80,000 living there. At the beginning of 1948 it looked as though Jewish life in Poland was being stabilized. A few months later, however, everything turned in the direction of Communist totalitarianism. The leadership of the Jewish community in Poland has been in the hands of the so-called Central Committee of Polish Jews. There was a time when all Jewish groups and parties took an active part in this committee, and each had an equal number of representatives. Subsequently a change took place, and the Communists took over control, its members not having been elected but appointed by those who control Poland today.

In the few years after the war the Jews of Poland displayed valiant efforts and inimitable creativeness. Schools, vocational classes, children's homes, camps, sports organizations, newspapers functioned with considerable success. Jewish books were published and several theaters came into existence. Choral and dramatic groups and Jewish radio programs gave regular performances. As in the other countries, the Jewish Communists for a while were sympathetic to Israel. In the latter part of 1948 a statement on the Jewish question was published by the Communist Party of Poland in which the Jewish Communists were castigated for "considering the petty bourgeois utopian Jewish pioneers in Palestine as one of the factors which led to the birth of Israel. This has resulted in the underestimation of the role of the deciding factor in the birth of Israel, namely, the people's democracies headed by the Soviet Union."

The Jewish Agency for Palestine which organized emigration to Israel was then closed. Unable to win the support of the Jewish community, the Jewish Communists launched a campaign to liquidate the independent institutions and organizations and to terrorize all Jewish parties. They captured the cooperative movement, liquidated the schools, and turned them over to the government.

All non-Communist Jewish parties were smashed. The Jewish Labor Party known as the Bund was forced to purge its ranks and then adopt a resolution denouncing its past as a long chain of errors. At the end of 1948 at a meeting of Jewish Communist leaders a resolution was adopted confessing to a right nationalistic deviation for not being aware that the Jewish community is full of class enemies and for identifying the national liberation struggle of the people in Israel with the ideology of the Zionist movement.

They outlined their tasks for the future as follows: Struggle against the capitalistic elements among the Jews, fight against nationalistic ideologies, get the Jews closer to the Polish working masses, and struggle against nationalistic separatism.

A thorough purge is going on in all phases of Jewish life in Poland. Through various means, politically conscious people are being forced to liquidate their past and confess to errors which they never committed. Those who are able, flee the country.

The conditions of Jews residing behind the iron-curtain countries are fundamentally the same, though they may differ in some detail. On the one side we observed a spirited attempt of the Jews in the various countries to rebuild their culture and their institutions in the lands of their birth, and on the other side the success of the Communist regimes in destroying all independent thinking, and smashing Jewish life including their instruments of self-government and their very souls.

We have gathered this material so that the public may know the whole truth about the Jews residing in the eastern "paradise." What can be done for these unfortunate suffering Jews? The answer does not lie in our hands. The key to the problem lies in the world-wide struggle for freedom, democracy, and the dignity and honor of man everywhere.

National Pension System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement which I delivered to the House Ways and Means Committee Tuesday, March 15, 1949, in support of H. R. 486, which would establish a national pension system to benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee, security in old age is a necessity for all.

Unlike much legislation, which seeks to benefit a particular group, old-age pensions apply to that period in each life which more and more of our people will reach. It will even help to eliminate worry from the lives of those who through unforeseen accident or sickness may never attain the age of retirement.

I represent an industrial district where a majority of the people depend for their livelihood on the mills and factories which are subject to periodic lay-offs. Their ability to earn a living and at the same time provide for old age is beyond their individual control. They are at the mercy of economic factors which have outrun the doctrine of self-reliance. This is the realistic challenge that we must face and solve as a public responsibility.

The people expect this Congress to extend the coverage and increase the benefits of the

present Social Security Act. In my opinion this is just and inevitable.

But what of the millions of senior citizens who have not been employed and have not been insured? They cannot wait for the evolution of a program. Their problem is acute. It is here and now. Some are receiving old-age assistance which is totally inadequate for their existence needs. Others, through understandable and decent human pride, will not expose themselves to pauperizing routines now required of them and so suffer in silence.

They cannot wait much longer.

What are we going to do for them?

A national pension is the only answer.

In time of war we have accomplished the seemingly impossible because we had to. There was no other choice, if we were to survive.

The same issue of survival is before us. Communism is relentlessly attacking us with the charge that capitalism and Christianity are doomed because they failed to provide for the general welfare. We can answer in part by showing the 5,000,000 automobiles we produce in 1 year, or by adding up the number of our churches, or by pointing out notable examples of Christian character and conduct.

But, we cannot answer it by our neglect of the aged.

Only by facing the problem and solving it with a minimum of red tape can we prove by action that democracy works far better than any other system in the world.

If we were a poor nation, we could hide behind such an excuse. But, with all the material help we are pouring out with a lavish hand to help other nations, we cannot deny the claims of those who helped to make that possible; we cannot deny them some security in their declining years; and by them I mean the men and women who gave the best years of their lives to the building of our Nation.

We cannot rely on external, military strength alone for our security. It is but a shell if it is not supported by internal security built on the high morale of our own people. And morale will never come from pretty but evasive words. It requires performance.

Behind the bright and impressive window dressing of our main streets are the homes of America. On them we depend for our true security. Without the confidence that comes from a certain measure of independence, that strength is weakened. In the vast and complex industrial society of today, we must provide basic security for old age. Otherwise we offer a discouraging example of neglect to the young who will also be old some day. It would hardly offer inspiration to them.

The stark insufficiency of our so-called security program is cruelly revealed by the fact that a growing number of old-age insurance beneficiaries must also apply for old-age assistance in order to eke out a bare existence.

The increase in the number of aged recipients during the past year was due to the fact that those covered by contributory insurance had to seek extra help in the form of old-age assistance because the original program had not grown up to its responsibilities.

Why call it insurance when it falls so far short of that goal? To be honest about it and in the light of reality we should call it for what it is: one-half security or one-quarter security.

An assistance payment theoretically may be increased to meet higher living costs, but an insurance benefit once determined usually remains at the same amount for the period of benefit eligibility. After the upward revision in assistance standards that took place in most States when more Federal funds became available following the 1946 amendments, some additional persons receiving inadequate insurance benefits became eligible also for assistance.

Eligible? This implies that a person is qualifying for something higher and better. But in this case it goes into reverse. The beneficiary has been led to believe that as a result of special taxes collected from himself and his employer during the working years of his life he has earned a minimum of security. But when he comes to cash his Government check, he finds that the floor of security has collapsed, plunging him into the cellar. And then he must call upon the helping hand of old-age assistance to bring him up to the level that wasn't so secure after all.

In the process of getting this extra emergency assistance every last vestige of his pride is crushed. Social workers probe into every private detail of his life. His children, with homes and family responsibilities of their own, are hounded. The applicant in many cases must transfer title or control of his small cottage to the State or locality before he can become eligible for assistance. He must prove his residence, and in those instances where he has changed residence from one State to another in recent years he becomes the victim of buck passing as between the States.

That State which is finally responsible then proceeds to fit him into an Oliver Twist budget.

All this is very strange and contradictory in a nation where Government deliberately destroys or withholds food to maintain an artificial price level for the farmers.

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare." These are the opening words of that solemn dedication called the Constitution of the United States.

I am certain that the phrase "promote the general welfare" was inserted after sincere and careful deliberation. It did not contemplate the division of our people into haves and have-nots or that condescending charity which derives self-satisfaction from the crumbs it provides for those who are regarded, if not overtly classified, as paupers.

The modern term "social security" is but a protective device to silence our conscience if it fails to provide a decent and livable income for all who have reached the natural age of retirement.

As a nation, we woke up late to this need, and it required an economic disaster that brought us perilously close to outright revolution before we learned that the people must have a basic security to give meaning to their freedoms. They must have freedom from fear, and freedom from want, before they can develop the values of those positive and constructive freedoms which lead to progress.

There is a definite world-wide trend toward bigger social security programs, with higher benefits and higher taxes, but in the United States we lack many features which are offered elsewhere.

Even such democratic nations as Great Britain, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, have elaborate systems for providing individual security.

In Great Britain pensions start at 65 for men, 60 for women, also for invalids, widows, and orphans. There are cash sickness benefits and free medical and dental care. There are cash allowances for children, unemployment pay and provision for burial expenses.

In France there are pensions for workers at 60, also for invalids, widows, and orphans; cash sickness benefits, maternity and medical care; cash allowance for children; bonuses for children.

The United States zone of Germany has pensions for workers at 65, also for invalids, widows and orphans; cash sickness benefits and medical care; unemployment compensation.

Argentina gives pensions for men at 55, for women at 50, and for invalids and widows. The Government defrays the expenses of maternity care and is responsible for disability compensation.

In the United States, we are lagging behind, for we have scarcely pioneered into the realm of fringe benefits. Our main preoccupation is with the central problem of old-age security. In too many cases, we only provide token payments. We have made a beginning, but much remains to be done before the system has body, and living tissue, and function.

Always there is the danger that such a program may become so overweighted with hair-splitting details that the administration of it defeats the primary purpose of getting necessary income into the hands of the aged while they can still enjoy it.

I recommend H. R. 486 for your approval because it provides a simple and direct method of putting a just pension system into operation, implemented by a tax based on the ability to pay.

My bill is: "To establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation. This act shall be known as the National Pension Act. There is hereby levied a tax of 2 percent upon the gross dollar value of all business transactions consummated for profit within the United States. Wages, salaries, or commissions shall be considered transactions. In no case shall the pension be less than $75 per month or more than $100 per month. In case the total tax returns for any month are not sufficient to pay the minimum pension of $75 per month to each pensioner, the difference will be adjusted from the Treasury. Should the total amount received from the tax levy in any month under this act be more than $100 per month multiplied by the number of pensioners, plus the cost of administration, the surplus shall be paid into the general funds of the Treasury."

This, in brief, is the bill I advocate.

It is an over-all, direct-action solution to the problem. It will tie up the loose ends of our present system and provide complete coverage for the aged, with benefits in line with our higher-priced economy.

It will bring the United States up to date in a field where we have been deficient.

It will build unity, strength, and balance in our Nation, refuting those who point to our national neglect of the aged and will secure that steady progress which genuinely "promotes the general welfare."

Nebraska, North Dakota, and Oklahoma Experience Rapid Decline in Cow Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following information is taken from the testimony of Mr. M. H. Brightman, executive secretary of the Dairy Industry Committee, before the House Committee on Agriculture on imitation-butter legislation:

Cow population declines 2,731,000 from 1945—decline most serious in butter-producing States

STATES WITH AT LEAST 400,000 COW POPULATION UTILIZING LESS THAN 10 PERCENT OF MILK PRODUCTION IN BUTTER PRODUCTION

	Percent of milk into butter	Percent decline in cow population (since 1945)
New York	0.9	3.0
New Jersey		
Pennsylvania	1.8	1.0
Wisconsin	1.8	4.0
California	1.1	3.0
Ohio	9.0	5.9
Georgia	2.0	2.3
Alabama	1.4	7.6
Mississippi	3.5	12.4
Tennessee	5.8	5.9

BUTTER-PRODUCING STATES WITH MORE THAN 400,000 COW POPULATION

North Dakota	72.6	28.4
South Dakota	68.2	25.3
Iowa	65.3	16.9
Nebraska	58.5	24.7
Kansas	41.7	22.9
Minnesota	39.5	14.3
Colorado	33.1	14.3
Oklahoma	32.3	22.8
Missouri	18.8	12.6
Arkansas	15.1	17.0

These figures are especially interesting, as Mr. Brightman was formerly with the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. You will note that the greatest reduction in dairy cattle numbers has been in the States where a large percentage of the milk is made into butter. If States like Nebraska, North Dakota, and Oklahoma have already seen their herds reduced by 24.7 percent, 28.4 percent, and 22.8 percent, respectively, during the past 3 years, just exactly what will the reaction be if Congress fails to pass a bill like the Andresen-Granger bill that will at least allow the States to decide by themselves how rapidly they wish to be put out of the dairy business?

Andrew Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and eighty-second anniversary of a very great man and a great Democrat. In observing the anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson, a ceremony was held at the equestrian statue of Jackson in Lafayette Park.

A wreath made of magnolia leaves from the Hermitage was placed at the statue by Mrs. Clifford Davis.

My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] delivered an address and under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the text of that address:

Ladies and gentlemen, we have just witnessed a beautiful tribute to the memory of Andrew Jackson in the placing of this wreath of flowers at the base of the Jackson Monument and memorial here in beautiful Lafayette Park.

The members of the Ladies Hermitage Association who sponsor this annual ceremony are indeed to be congratulated for their good work in preserving the observance of the birthday of Gen. Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee. This strong and striking victory monument, placed as it is, here in front of the White House in the Capital of the Nation, is a fitting symbol and tribute to his memory.

I am very grateful for the privilege of speaking to you on this occasion here in the shadow of this imposing statue and in full view of the White House, where this illustrious Tennesseean and American dwelt during his dynamic tenure as the seventh President of the United States.

As a Nation that is still growing in its democratic establishment, we are proud to point to many men in our history and say: "There was a great man." But I doubt if the name of any one man whom this Nation hails as great is mentioned more often or revered more ardently than the name of this man whom Tennessee gave to the country, the world, and the democratic ideal.

It has been truly said that Thomas Jefferson gave the people the machinery of democracy, but that Jackson made it work; that Jefferson gave us the democratic philosophy—but that Jackson through his courage and with his sword made our ideal a reality. For service to the average man, Andrew Jackson stood ever alert and awake and in defense of democracy his sword was ever unsheathed. The people loved him because he loved them first. Into their timid spirit he breathed the militant fire of freedom, liberty, and dignity.

When Andrew Jackson soared like a blazing comet into our national life, he found politics to be an exclusive thing. He made it democratic. His pledge to the people he loved was that he would "never consent to any act or thing whatever that shall have a tendency to lessen the rights of the people."

In the critical first years of this nation's struggle to prove our glorious experiment in democracy, there was going on a bitter internal struggle—when the pressures of plutocracy came perilously near to overwhelming the uncertain and unskilled defenses of democracy. To Andrew Jackson, one of the most dynamic, most powerful voices of democracy that the world has ever known, goes the credit for strengthening once and for all the weakened bastion of the democratic state and ending the insidious encroachments of counter philosophy. He gave the government to the people for the first time. Prior to Jackson's day we had a republic. Since then we have had a democracy.

But let us review briefly once again in high tribute the life of Andrew Jackson. Its drama will enthrall as long as we revere the deeds of brave men.

Andrew Jackson was born of penniless Irish immigrant parentage on March 15, 1767, 182 years ago today, coming into a new world aflame with the zeal of liberty. His father was poverty-ridden, but of strong stock. He died shortly before the birth of his son, Andrew. No doubt this man had his dream of the new world and its limitless opportunity for any man of strong arm and heart. This dream reached fulfillment in his son.

We may be thankful that Andrew Jackson knew the devotion and inspiration for 14 years of an exceptional mother. We may believe that her courage and guidance fortified this husky lad when he was left without parent or penny in the unformed civilization of the frontier wilderness. Certainly, we can attribute to her a grace and gentleness which ever afterward was reflected in her renowned son's gallantry, his devoted part as husband, characteristics which gave him, despite his rough background and despite his unquenchable thirst for bold action, history's attribute as "the finest gentleman of the age."

At the age of 21, this tall, rugged youth took the covered wagon trail and pressed farther west and finally settled in the village of Nashville, Tenn. There, through his resolute courage and iron will, his integrity and common sense, he had in 10 years' time attained every office he asked of the people.

But prior to this new life, Jackson had received his emersion in blood in frontier feuds and with British mercenaries. From the age of 13 when he first shouldered a musket for the defense of his meager homestead, Andrew Jackson was first and foremost a soldier, the protector of defenseless people.

He was the first elected representative claimed by the State of Tennessee. Andrew Jackson successively served as senator, judge and once again as senator. From this latter high position he resigned as soon as he felt he had finished the work for which he was elected. It has been said that Andrew Jackson resigned more offices than were ever held by any other citizen of the Republic. The people whom he revered with an almost holy adoration gave him everything he asked of them.

As a major general of Tennessee Militia, from 1800 to 1814, Jackson made two contributions to our struggling country which have yet to be paralleled by another individual.

In the first instance, Jackson covered himself with imperishable glory and renown as commander of the Tennessee Militia and volunteers in the Creek Wars in the early part of the century. This triumph came at the moment when the British—still unreconciled to relinquishing what had been their richest colonial possession—were hammering with great effectiveness at the Atlantic port cities and, eventually, the Capital of Washington.

Without question, this war against the Creeks was one of the most important and bloodiest wars ever waged against the Indians on the continent. General Jackson's subjugation of the Creeks, who were given assistance and encouragement by the British and Spanish in Florida, made possible the western progress of the Nation.

What a shining achievement for this frontiersman whose only tutoring in the military art and science was actual and bloody combat.

And here, as a proud son of a great and glorious State, I must say that it was to the eternal credit of the State of Tennessee that she agreed to stand as sponsor and guarantor for the payment of this large force which made this stand for the growing Nation. It was in great measure Andrew Jackson's own persuasiveness that made this decision possible.

The second instance of Jackson's unmatched military achievement was at New Orleans. Pledged to revenge and to the recovery of its lost territory, the British in the War of 1812 dispatched for a determined stand at New Orleans some 12,000 of its finest regulars, veteran troops of Wellington, together with 1,000 cannon under Sir Edward Pakenham, who was second in military distinction only to Wellington himself. In addition, nearly 1,000 sailors in the finest congregation of vessels of the British Fleet were collected there.

Into such a scene came the courageous Jackson of Tennessee, with some 800 Regulars and other troops of those indomitable Tennessee volunteers—about 6,000 in all. They were ill-equipped and a heterogeneous lot of soldiers—with principles. They were not mercenaries but were as great a group of patriots as ever went to battle.

The rest is history—proud history. But we may say here, as it has been said many times before and will ever be repeated after us, that Jackson's magnificent and unbelievable triumph at the Battle of New Or-

leans ranks as one of the most glorious victories in the history of this country. The whole Nation rejoiced. To every man, woman, and child this rugged son of the frontier was an ennobled hero. Up to the time of the Battle of New Orleans, history tells us, the War of 1812 was a great humiliation and disappointment to the American people. Even our Capitol and the White House that stands before us in majestic beauty had felt the torch of the invader. By this victory, Jackson not only ended the menace offered by the British invasions but restored to our Republic its pride and dissipated its humiliation. His victory made possible our further growth and progress.

It would seem that the call of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency was inevitable. Yet the fact that he achieved this high position was further tribute to the qualities that he possessed and which make him a man almost unique in history for the continuity of victory. Jackson had many political enemies. This was inevitable in the light of his personal fire and the ardor of his philosophy of the dignity of the common man as opposed to the prevailing philosophy of the fitness of only the highborn and affluent to govern the people.

Not the least of these bitter enemies were those titans of the Halls of Congress—Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. They hated this so-called untutored ruffian of the frontier.

One of our historians has declared that Jackson's greatest achievements were not of military nature, but, indeed, of political nature. In the dramatic days of Jackson's Presidency, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, and Daniel Webster were mortal enemies, each of the other. Their animosity reached such state that the legislative process was virtually paralyzed into a battlefield for their personal feuds. But so strong was their individual and collective hatred of Jackson and his philosophy of absolute freedom for the individual that they buried the hatchet in their personal feuds and united in a brotherhood of opposition against Jackson. When the storm of legislative battle cleared, Jackson stood again triumphant, and his bitter political enemies had been put to shame, routed, and annihilated. His victories on the political battlefield were victories for his common people.

We may cite as still another of his victories the victory over the powerful and arrogant forces of the United States Bank, which was fast turning this young Nation into a plutocracy, with rule being the privilege of the mighty financiers. Jackson dared open combat with these powerful forces. He challenged them at every turn, declaring, "That is too much power for any one man or any one set of men to have in this country. I will take it from them." And he did.

In that smashing triumph—against the economic oppression exercised by the powerful United States Bank—the hold of the moneyed forces was broken and the financial freedom of the people was restored. Jackson was not, however, an enemy of business. He was only the outraged champion of the little people against the oppressions of wealth, monopoly, and vested interests. He discriminated between business and brigandage. He was so much the friend of business, we may say, that he fought to free it and to preserve it for the people of every walk of life.

Jackson also proved his abilities as a diplomat when most needed. At a critical stage—just short of war—in the trade and treaty controversy between this country and France, England offered to mediate. Jackson accepted the offer, with the Jacksonian proviso: that the decision must go our way. In the end of this ticklish situation, America, through President Jackson, scored a diplomatic triumph which earned for our struggling Nation the respect of the rest of the world.

In the field of diplomacy and statesmanship on the domestic front, Jackson also showed himself to be astute in the trying period approaching a domestic crisis. South Carolina, in those early days, threatened secession from the Union. Jackson thereupon addressed a communication to the people of the State of South Carolina—and although it is not known and has ever been the subject of controversy as to whether he was born in North Carolina or in South Carolina—he appealed to them in this communication not to secede. He said: "Gentlemen of my native State, I appeal to you. This Federal Union, it must be preserved." This appeal has become one of his greatest State papers. In a critical hour he stood for the preservation of the Union.

Although Jackson gained eminence and fame from the State of Tennessee—and he deeply loved Tennessee—yet he believed in the strength of the Federal Union and his entire career was one of making the Union great and strong.

Yes, withal, Jackson was a man of many parts.

He did not have the literary versatility of a Jefferson, nor of a John Quincy Adams, nor of a Woodrow Wilson. What he did have was hard, common sense; an almost unequaled natural ability; physical and moral courage that is perhaps unsurpassed in our history; and a will that was completely invincible. His will was nearer law in the United States for 20 years, we are told, than that of any other man for the span of even a year. He was most responsible for and influential in the selection of his two successors in the White House. He was the only man in history to rival Washington in the affection and adoration of the people.

Jackson was the most moral and continent of men, the tenderest of husbands, and the most loving of fathers to his adopted children. His devotion to his wife is, indeed, one of the great romances of the age; his chivalry was unexcelled, and he was ever the hero of good women and a gallant gentleman.

Jackson was the greatest Democrat of his day or any generation. He was truly America's first great man of the people and champion of democracy in its most inclusive meaning.

May we not remind ourselves now and always that he was the organizer of democracy; that he found the masses helpless and futile in the midst of their tools and taught them how to use these tools for self-government; that he mobilized the scattered forces of ordinary people, vitalized them with his energy, fired them with his faith, and stretched the sinews of democracy into every hamlet and village in the country. He organized the people everywhere in his broad country into political effectiveness and stirred their faith and belief in liberty and democracy as a lving, breathing thing.

We have heard that many visitors viewing Jackson's magnificent home, The Hermitage, at Nashville—which the excellent ladies of the Hermitage Association have so beautifully preserved for posterity—express amazement at finding that Jackson lived in a mansion rather than in a log cabin or some such humble home. They seem to have missed the point. Although Jackson represented the frontier and the common man, he was also the symbol of the heights to which any man of such humble origin can rise in this magnificent country of ours. He is truly the symbol of the victory of the common man in our democracy.

Yes, when Andrew Jackson vitalized and dynamitized American democracy he rendered a greater service to the Nation than he did through any of his splendid triumphs on the field of battle, great as were these achievements.

It is thus fitting that we should pay tribute to him—to his imperishable name, for his deeds and services to our Nation and to democracy everywhere.

An eminent historian has said of Jackson that he was the lover of liberty, and gave his blood to it; that he was a crusader of democracy, and gave his life for it; and that freedom and liberty in America will never die so long as the people treasure the memory of his battles and follow the shimmer of Andrew Jackson's sword in the defense of democracy.

Let us on this new anniversary of his birth resolve that the shining light of freedom and liberty shall be preserved—that this torch may shatter any oppression that may darken our beloved homeland—our democratic America.

A Tree Grows in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph G. Harrison, Mediterranean news chief of the Christian Science Monitor:

THIS WORLD—A TREE GROWS IN ITALY

(By Joseph G. Harrison)

ROME.—If the tree of sympathy and understanding for the west fails to root itself firmly in the Italian soil, it will not be the fault of James Clement Dunn. For few persons have worked harder to prepare that soil and water that tree than the United States Ambassador to Italy.

So unobtrusively that his efforts sometimes go unnoticed by the professional journalists here, Ambassador Dunn has spent 15 hours a day for the last 2 years in patiently encouraging Italy's economic efforts, in explaining United States motives for the Marshall plan, and in countering the propaganda spread at Moscow's behest about these American motives.

It has been a long, hard job; much remains to be done, but much also has been accomplished.

There is only one way in which the Ambassador could do the job he has given himself, and that is by leaving Rome, going into every nook and cranny of the country, and meeting the Italian worker and peasant face to face.

In the last 2 years Mr. Dunn has delivered no fewer than 50 major speeches outside Rome and a dozen here in the capitol. This is an average of more than two a month, and has meant, at a very rough guess, at least 20,000 miles of travel. When added to the task of running one of the most important American Embassies, this is a major achievement and an indisputable proof of the seriousness with which Mr .Dunn views his work.

VILLAGE-TO-VILLAGE TOURS

Within recent months he has minutely toured two of Italy's wildest, most poverty-stricken provinces—Calabria and Abruzzi. In Abruzzi, for example, he moved from village to village up and down the Sangro and Avezzano valleys, both of which were deliberately devastated by the German scorched-earth policy during the Nazi retreat. In each village he would stop in the tiny square, ask the crowd of villagers which instantly collected how they were getting on, and form his own opinions for reports to Washington.

In order to be able to do these things the Ambassador has had himself tutored regularly in Italian. He is now able to chat with

villagers in a pretty satisfactory manner, and has delivered his last four major speeches in that language.

These speeches and these tours also represent for Mr. Dunn a triumph over what, it would seem, are his personal inclinations. The Ambassador, for all his success as a diplomat, strikes some observers as lacking warmth and cordiality. He is very correct, very reserved, and quite unbending. It is rare when men with such characteristics really enjoy either hobnobbing with villagers or touring the countryside making speeches, which, after all, are bound to be rather repetitious. Such men generally prefer the more intimate type of work in chancelleries and around conference tables.

But any glance at the Ambassador's diplomatic career would quickly convince one that, regardless of possible personal preferences, if his job called for touring and speechmaking, he would do it unhesitatingly and well, for Mr. Dunn has the very great distinction of having started his diplomatic career as a clerk and having moved through some of the most important positions within the Department of State to his present rank.

Persons at the United States Embassy here with whom I have discussed Mr. Dunn's career can think of no other single example of a man who has risen from clerk to ambassador, and this achievement gives some clue to Mr. Dunn's ability, determination, and diplomatic savoir-faire. It is all the more remarkable when it is noted that in Mr. Dunn's official biography, as compiled at the Embassy, there is no mention of a college degree.

The Ambassador advanced through hard work and solid accomplishment—the same attributes which he is contributing to Italy's reconstruction today.

COUNTERS SOVIET PROPAGANDA

An example of the type of speech which Mr. Dunn is often called upon to make in Italy is that which he gave last year in the city of Bari when welcoming the three hundredth American relief ship to reach an Italian port. After cataloging the coal, wheat, and medical supplies abroad, Mr. Dunn said to his audience:

"A great effort is being made to delude Italians into believing that shipments of grain to meet the bread ration and coal to provide employment represent 'American imperialism.' * * * The American Government has asked nothing of the Italian people or their government in return except that Italians give their best efforts to achieve economic recovery."

Those are not words likely to inspire an audience with great emotion. But they are true, they must be said, and Mr. Dunn's patient reiteration of them has, without doubt, done much to convince important segments of the Italian people that American aid aims only at helping Italy help itself.

Mr. Dunn's ambassadorship to Italy may end his diplomatic career as he is nearing the retirement age. If he does, he can step out of Government service with the satisfaction of having done his best for America here.

Flood Control at Hamburg, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, here is a sincere thank-you message quite out of the ordinary. It comes from the hearts of a grateful people who asked their Government to help only after years of floods which they were unable to control:

MARCH 9, 1949.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to thank you personally, Congress, General Pick, and the Army Engineer Corps for the dike along the west bank of the Nishnabotna River which dike protects Hamburg. We have just escaped the greatest flood in the history of the Nishnabotna River by virtue of this dike.

We are all very, very grateful to all of you, and phrases of gratitude have been many and sincere from everyone whose home and belongings were safe from the floodwaters. For once Hamburg was dry.

Best regards to you, and please see that all of the people responsible know how we feel.

F. C. WEATHERHEAD,
Mayor of Hamburg.
MELVIN KEY,
President, Chamber of Commerce.
INTERSTATE NURSERIES.
KIWANIS CLUB.
VFW.
EDWIN A. GETSCHER.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my personal thanks to every Member of the Eightieth Congress, Gen. Louis A. Pick, and the Army engineers, not forgetting the American taxpayers, who furnished the needed funds to help the folks of Hamburg, Iowa, and vicinity, whom I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Knowing them as I do, I am sure they would want me to personally thank each and everyone who had a part in making it possible for them to receive this much-needed and deserved help from their Uncle Sam.

Radio Commentator Earl Godwin Commends Congressman Pat Sutton, of Tennessee, and Housing Bill Which He Sponsors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a portion of a radio script by Mr. Earl Godwin, popular Washington radio commentator, concerning the housing bill sponsored by my colleague, Hon. PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee.

The radio script is as follows:

Good evening, folks: Up to Washington and into Congress this time came a young veteran, 33 years of age, named PAT SUTTON.

He must have been what we call a fightin' fool, because he has several high citations for combat and heroic action in both the Navy and the Army for World War II; wounded twice.

He comes from the Seventh District of Tennessee. He is an individualistic sort of Democrat who seems to have his mind on his people, for he has introduced into this Congress a bill which seems to pierce the bureaucratic fog surrounding the housing shortage. SUTTON'S bill appeals to the individual.

He simply wants to make it easy and more practical for an individual to finance a single home.

He has dropped into the basket in the House of Representatives a proposed amendment to the vast and extensive administration housing bill an amendment which for the first time appears to take into consideration the young couple who want to build their own home.

Most of the bills and plans are for millions of housing units, which means great cities of a thousand apartments each, financed by some vast corporation, O. K.'d by another vast housing bureaucracy at Washington, managed by some cold-blooded statistical experts—everything present but the home spirit.

Many of the low-income public housing projects have been badly built, super-expensively built, and are peopled by middle-class and high-income folks rather than low-income people, and it has been proved from time to time that in some of these projects the tenants were hand-picked families from the right voting list.

Again, there is a ground swell in Congress and among those who plan large public housing projects to put the Government behind a long-range financing plan that will stretch over 60 years, permit tenants to rent or sometimes even to buy homes at $50 or less a month.

The way some of these dreams are to be financed, the prospective purchaser would be paying interest for a lifetime and at the end of the 60 years these housing units would probably have caved in. They are not built as houses were in the days of our grandfathers.

I live in a section of Virginia where there are still forests to be cleared off when a couple want to build a house. Down the road a piece there is a young man and his wife who have bought an acre out of what, tradition says, was once a part of the George Washington ownership. Well, for that matter, so was mine, but I have found no cherry trees.

The point of my illustration is that this young couple bought the land and cleared it off with ax, bush-ax, horsepower, main strength, and awkwardness.

When they got to the point where they could build on the cleared space, they had character enough to borrow enough to get them going. And after that they shopped around, visited the local sawmills, lumber yards, hardware stores, and put their house together themselves as far as possible. That meant also drilling a well and installing a water system within the house.

This is the way to build a home and love it and appreciate it. Thousands of young folks can still do that—millions of others can't, I know, but wherever it is possible, the building of such a home is one more addition to the strength of the fundamental fabric of America.

It is difficult and perhaps impossible for young people to start building a home or buying a home under the current tight financial and loan restrictions. And yet there should come the day when any young man of character in the community can impress his banker enough to get the first cash to start a home.

I say, "any young man of character."

In the soft and easy years into which we have drifted through our short-sighted politics, millions of young Americans have been brought up to do without the sort of character that will entitle them to take somebody else's cash and use it properly.

The fact that we are arriving at a sort of automatic state that looks like security may be wonderful to talk about; but I'll bet you that one of these days something will happen to America and to the world which will

send us back painfully and with poverty in our pockets, hearts, and souls, back to the days when we learned the only advance was by thrift, common sense, and through the plain little lessons which came with the log-cabin era.

A lot of this is divine wisdom. In my book, divine wisdom is not necessarily the trappings of high church or low church or Sunday-go-to-meetin' attitudes. It is also plain common sense by which the world was created and the world of men developed.

When we employ high-falutin' methods to make the folks think we are on a merry-go-round that will never stop, let us remember that common sense is divine wisdom, and recall the words, "God is not mocked."

And that brings me back again to Representative PAT SUTTON and his bill to help the couples who are just starting out to build their own homes.

It is not labeled with that homely phrase; but is a proposed amendment to the vast housing program. It makes it possible and legal for the Government's financial strength to be put back of the financing necessary for a young man to build a house. It does not pamper him. It does not hand him anything for nothing. He has to go get the first few hundred dollars. But it certainly is a sweet little home-like bill in a desert of tremendously bureaucratic plans that would add to the people's regimentation and their dependence on Government.

A Gentleman From North Carolina Opposes the Ruination of the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding witnesses before the House Agricultural Committee during the hearings on the Andresen, Granger, and Poage bills was Mr. George S. Coble, of Lexington, N. C.

He is one of the men who realize that the whole dairy industry is in jeopardy. These men also realize that if imitation butter is made legislatively equal to butter, filled milk, ersatz cheese, and other ersatz dairy products will follow.

If imitation butter, with 80 percent oil and 15-percent skim milk is equal to a 100-percent dairy product, then who can say that filled milk with 3½ percent oil and 96½ percent skim milk is not nutritionally equal to natural milk?

Please note in Mr. Coble's testimony that he states that dairy products income in North Carolina represents 24 times the income from cottonseed oil—used in oleo—in that State.

The testimony follows:

My name is George S. Coble. I am president of the Coble Dairy Products, Inc., with the main office at Lexington, N. C. I operate 7 dairy processing or manufacturing plants, 11 dairy products distributing branches, and 21 milk-receiving plants in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. These dairy-product plants employ about 1,200 persons and process the daily milk supply of about 10,000 dairy farmers. Moreover, I am an actual farmer with 2,100 acres and am presently milking about 250 purebred Guernsey cows. The total purebred animals on my farm number approximately 600 head.

I am a member of the board of directors of the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, a member of the Milk Industry Foundation, the American Dry Milk Institute, and the American Butter Institute. I am president of the North Carolina Dairy Foundation and recent past president of the North Carolina Dairy Products Association.

I am appearing before this committee under joint sponsorship of the North Carolina Milk Producers Federation and the North Carolina Dairy Products Association. Of course, I also speak for the best interests and welfare of the 1,200 employees and 10,000 dairy farmers connected with my company.

At the annual meeting of the North Carolina Dairy Products Association in Winston-Salem on January 14, 1949, the following resolution was adopted:

We favor removal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine provided adequate legislation is enacted to ban the manufacture and sale in commerce of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation or semblance of butter.

The same policy has been adopted by the Milk Producers Federation. Thus, the dairy industry in North Carolina favors passage of H. R. 1703 (ANDRESEN) or H. R. 2023 (GRANGER) or any other bills embodying similar intent.

Agriculture is of the utmost importance to North Carolina's economic well-being. Agricultural activities provide 42 percent of the employment in the State.

In 1947 the sale of dairy products in North Carolina accounted for 4 percent of the farmers' cash income. That is approximately 24 times the income that North Carolina farmers receive from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine.

Consider further that one dollar out of every twenty-two is a dairy dollar in North Carolina. And bear in mind that five out of eight farmers in the State have an economic stake in dairying. Actually, according to the latest available official figures, there are 46,958 commercial dairy farms in North Carolina. This means that more than 16 percent of the farmers in the State would be seriously affected by any deflation in the marketing or price of dairy products.

Even though the major part of my business concerns the processing and distribution of milk and ice cream and includes the processing of butter, condensed milk, and dry milk, I have a real interest in maintaining a sound butter industry. Milk production varies seasonally in North Carolina as in other parts of the country. In order that my company can furnish consumers an adequate supply of milk on every day of the year at a reasonable price, it is necessary that we provide a market for the surplus milk and cream whenever it occurs. Because a ready market has been established for butter, and due to the fact that butter can be stored for long periods of time, cold economic facts dictate that our surplus be made into butter. Currently, our three churns are operating at top capacity daily converting surplus milk into butter because sales of fluid milk and cream, ice cream, and other dairy products have weakened. At our present rate of churning, I will manufacture between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 pounds of butter per year. At present values, this butter from my company alone returns to the producer $2,310,000 per year, or a sum far greater than the total value of cottonseed oil used in the manufacture of oleomargarine in the whole State of North Carolina.

The milk producer in North Carolina is also benefited by a sound butter industry. In the first place, the value of fluid milk and all dairy products is based upon the price of butter. Secondly, with butter acting as the balance wheel, any extra milk supply does not glut the market, resulting in unduly low distress prices.

I am sure that the chairman of this committee will agree that North Carolina is the garden spot of the South or even the whole United States. We are blessed with plentiful sunshine and adequate rainfall to insure almost year-round pastures for our dairy cows.

Oleo propagandists have made a particular issue of the fact that some coloring is used in butter. Such practice is not followed in the State of North Carolina because of the green feed and plenty of cottonseed meal available for the cows. About half of the States making butter are in this same category—this butter is uniformly yellow throughout the year due to favorable milk-production conditions. Butter manufacturers in certain northern States add coloring to a minor degree in the winter months when cows are fed dry forage.

I think their use of added coloring is completely fair and honest with no intention to deceive the consumer. It is not colored to imitate any other food. The use of color does not result in making the product appear of greater value than it is since the yellowest butter does not necessarily contain the most vitamin A. Furthermore, the use of color does not enhance its price.

We are proud that dairying is rapidly growing in importance in North Carolina. North Carolina farmers received $745,428,000 for the products they sold in 1946. Of this total, oleomargarine accounted for only $1,244,000—or less than about one-sixth of 1 percent. Dairy farming on the other hand returned $34,000,000 to the North Carolina farmer. Out of $7,155,000 received by North Carolina farmers for the 1945 cottonseed crop, oleomargarine contributed $743,000. But cottonseed meal fed to dairy cows was worth $786,000. We are hopeful that this committee, conscious of the vital role of dairying will do nothing that could in any way deal a setback to dairying which will affect us of the industry in North Carolina no less than those in the North, Middle West, and far West.

Correcting the Record Relative to the Purported Position of Texas A. and M. College on H. R. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago Dr. Charles W. Shepardson, dean of agriculture, from Texas A. and M. College, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and testified as a witness in behalf of Congressman ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, against H. R. 3, which is a bill to remove all taxes and other discriminations against margarine of any color but which requires it to be positively and plainly identified wherever sold, including identification of each individual serving in public eating places. Dr. Shepardson made it quite plain that he appeared as the special representative of the butter group which has so long opposed free competition with table spreads made of the great vegetable oils of the South and the Middle West.

I do not question Dean Shepardson's right to hold any opinion on this matter, nor do I question his right as an individual to take any position he desires on any matter pending before the Congress. I do, however, definitely question his right to assume to speak for the A. and M. College of Texas without some prior determination that the views expressed are in fact those of the college.

The dean fairly stated that the views he expressed were his own, but he was carefully introduced as dean of the school of agriculture in the agriculture and mechanical college of the home State of the author of H. R. 3. Repeated reference to his connection with the college was made by those committee members who oppose the use of cottonseed products in competition with butter. The truth is that it is simply impossible for the dean to maintain his official position with the college and at the same time to disassociate himself with that position when he speaks on controversial public measures.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that Charles W. Shepardson has a perfect right to his own views on the restriction of competition in the table-spread market or any other subject, but I seriously doubt that he should come to Washington as the special representative of either side—certainly not unless he could know in advance that he actually speaks the official views of the college.

I had thought to ignore the matter until the gentleman from Colorado inserted Dean Shepardson's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and again indicated to the public that the A. and M. College opposed H. R. 3. While I had felt sure that the great agriculture college of my State had not taken any stand against the free use of a product of our State's greatest crop, cotton, I wired Dr. Gibb Gilchrist, the chancelor of the Texas A. and M. College system, as follows:

On page A1271 of the Appendix of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL inserted a statement of the dean of agriculture at Texas A. and M. This article includes the statement "Interests of Texas * * * will be best served by legislation that will prevent the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine." I do not object to any conclusion of any individual but this statement was made with intent of leading congressional committee to believe this is official position of Texas A. and M. College. Will you wire me collect if A. and M. has taken any position on this question? Thanks. Regards.

On yesterday Chancelor Gilchrist replied as follows:

Re tel: The college administration has taken no official position on oleomargarine legislation. We prefer as a whole to keep A. and M. College and system free from partisan and controversial issues except when our own operations are vitally concerned. Dean Shepardson's views are his own. It is my opinion from hearing discussion of the oleomargarine matter about the college that his views as expressed to the committee represent only a small minority. The consensus of most seems to be that our industries to insure continuing success must be able to stand on their own without penalizing others. Personal regards.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the entire purpose of the gentleman from Minnesota and of the butter industry in bringing Dean Shepardson before the committee and of inserting his statement—without the cross examination—in the RECORD was solely to give the impression that the Texas A. and M. College was opposed to my bill H. R. 3. I submit that in view of Chancelor Gilchrist's wire no such inference is justified.

Liberal or Conservative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE?

The terms "conservative," "reactionary," and "Old Guard" are today used rather indiscriminately to describe a class of citizens that through years of vilification has come to be widely regarded as public enemy No. 1. To be a liberal or progressive is to merit divine blessing and the everlasting gratitude of an admiring people.

Let us examine the reason for this. Both conservatives and liberals have as their objective the attainment of the greatest good for the greatest number. It is the method of accomplishing this objective on which they differ. Broadly speaking, a conservative looks to the individual to do the job, whereas the liberal looks to the Government.

The conservative points to the experience of the past as a justification for his position. The liberal ignores history.

The conservative is influenced by our experience with the New Deal, under which the Government has attempted to plan and regiment our economy. He remembers events already forgotten by many, such as the following:

A depression which started in 1929 and should, according to all normal experience, have ended within 2 or 3 years, was stretched to a full 11 years, and it took a war boom to end it. Throughout the history of our country there has been no depression to approach it either in length or severity. According to Dr. Carl Snyder, who for many years was statistician of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the cost of this depression to the people of the United States was the staggering sum of $150,000,000,000—an amount equal to the total investment in American industry at the beginning of 1941.

A comparison of the seven pre-New-Deal years, 1926 to 1932, inclusive, with the seven New Deal years, 1933 to 1939, inclusive, discloses that in the later period, in spite of a substantial increase in population, the average annual national income was 13 percent less, the tax rates were much higher, the cost of the Federal Government was 92 percent greater, the number of unemployed workers was 120 percent larger, wages and salaries were 20 percent less, farm income was 15 percent less, new capital issues were 82 percent less, and private construction was 64 percent less.

Between March, 1933, and January, 1941, the Federal debt was more than doubled, over $60,000,000,000 was spent by the Federal Government, in no year was the Federal budget balanced, and when the defense program started in the spring of 1940 we still had 10,000,000 unemployed.

During this period the functions and power of the Federal Government steadily increased at the expense of the States, and bureau after bureau was established in Washington, with a huge increase in the number of persons on the Federal pay roll.

From a study made by Dr. Carl Snyder, it appears that every 10 years from 1790 to 1930 the national income showed an average rate of growth not differing greatly from one decade to the next. The rate of growth was about 4 percent per annum, compounded, so for 140 years the national income doubled approximately every 18 years.

During the 11 years from 1930 to 1940 this astounding growth was arrested for the first time in the Nation's history. In no year during that period did the national income reach even the level of the last part of the preceding decade.

An excellent statement regarding this period was issued by a group of leaders of the American Federation of Labor on February 4, 1940, excerpts from which are attached hereto.

This, say the conservatives, is what government control does.

But, say the liberals, see what has happened since 1940. Since then we have had, they say, the greatest prosperity and the fullest employment in our history. True, I admit, but this has not been due in the slightest degree to the policies of the New Deal. It has been due to the most devastating war in all history, which created an unprecedented scarcity of materials and goods that is only just beginning to be overcome. There have resulted a national debt of $253,000,000,000, and an inflation that has cut the purchasing power of the dollar in two. This, with the unparalleled demand for goods to supply the shortages created by the war, has produced a national income of $217,000,000,000. At the same time, Federal expenditures have risen to unbelievable heights, with an existing national budget of $40,000,000,000, and a budget of $42,000,000,000 proposed for the next fiscal year. Compare these figures, if you will, with our highest peacetime budget prior to the war of $9,000,000,000 in 1940, and the budget of $734,000,000 in 1916, the year before we entered into World War I.

In other words, our present prosperity is false and artificial, and the bubble will inevitably burst, as it has done in every similar instance in the past.

These are some of the reasons why the conservatives think they are right and the liberals wrong.

The conservatives are also influenced by the following facts:

1. To improve the lot of mankind and to give people the things in life they want, the things must first be produced.

2. There are not enough things or wealth to give everybody what he wants and should have.

The liberals seek to improve the lot of mankind by the adoption of schemes to redistribute wealth, although the redistribution of existing wealth would add but little to the wealth of each recipient. The effect of these schemes is to destroy or lessen the necessary incentive to produce wealth, and thereby to defeat the objective. Only through the production of more wealth can the wants of the people be satisfied. In no other way can it be done.

In closing, let me call attention to the most remarkable transposition of terms that I know of in the English language, 700 years ago, the Barons at Runnymede wrung from King John the Magna Carta, regarded as the beginning of individual liberty among the English-speaking people. From that day on, a continuous struggle has been waged to free the individual from the domination of the state and to make the people, not the government, the master. Had anyone prior to 1932 suggested that King John was a liberal, and that the Barons at Runnymede and those who have since carried on the struggle to limit the power of the state were reac-

tionaries or conservatives, he would have been regarded as a fit subject for an insane asylum. And yet suddenly in 195.. we witness the phenomenon of those advocating an increase in the power of government being called liberal and their opponents reactionary or conservative.

No one has so well described this phenomenon as Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a liberal as that term is used today. In his book, Challenge to Freedom, Dr. Wriston says:

"The proposals of this book are all radical; none of them looks toward any reactionary policy whatever. We have been living in a world where, by a kind of double talk, the vocabulary of liberalism has been stolen by the real reactionaries. Only in a world where values have become topsy-turvy would it be possible for Hitler to describe tyranny as a new order, or for bureaucracy to masquerade in the habiliments of liberalism, or for the planned economy to make a pretense of economic democracy. Government by bureaucracy, control of business by administrative regulation, manipulation of the economy for political purposes—these are stark reaction. Not all the cascades of beautiful words about new social goals, bold social engineering, security from the cradle to the grave can wash away that ineradicable fact."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT BY A GROUP OF LEADERS OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR ON FEBRUARY 4, 1940

For 7 years a great experiment has been undertaken by the Federal Government upon the industrial and social economy of the United States.

* * * * *

It has been an experiment on the lives of 125,000,000 Americans. It has profoundly affected the conditions and the relations of the worker and the employer. It has affected trade and finance, industry and agriculture, government and business.

* * * * *

Innovation after innovation have followed upon each other so fast and furiously that only a trained few could keep abreast of changes. If, after 7 years, the situations of labor, industry and agriculture had materially improved, if happiness and progress, hope and confidence had resulted, we could conclude that the experiment had been worthwhile.

* * * * *

Instead we find labor torn into warring camps. We find industry depressed and capital on a strike. We find 10,000,000 of America's workers unemployed. We find youth discontented and age discouraged. We find not only widespread material suffering, but in every walk of life we find fear for the great intangibles of America; fear for the liberties that Americans have cherished for more than a century and a half.

* * * * *

Experiments are costly luxuries. For the upkeep of innumerable boards, bureaus and authorities, for the maintenance of persistent relief rolls, and the building of new and imposing Government enterprises, the cost has been met by increased taxes and increased public debt.

* * * * *

One of the great drags upon industry during the past 7 years has been the burden of taxation that has been imposed upon big and little business. There are literally thousands of industrial and commercial concerns which have been forced into red figures by the taxes which have been imposed on flagging business.

* * * * *

Of all the factors upon which the prosperity of industry and labor depend, none is more important than confidence. Confidence in the stability of business and of jobs. Confidence in the permanence of the rules and regulations under which business can operate. Confidence in the Nation's currency. Confidence in the fairness and good will of those who are clothed with official authority over management and labor. The most tragic result of the 7 years of experiment has been the destruction of confidence by incessant tinkering with established forms and procedures.

* * * * *

Tinkering with the hours and wages of labor under the NRA. Tinkering with the cost of labor's food under the AAA. Tinkering with property rights in the confiscation of private gold savings. Tinkering with the foundations of American Government in the attack on the Supreme Court. Scarcely a month has passed without action, or rumors of action, which would alter the plans and the outlook of labor and industry. And overhanging all has been general awareness of a national debt of $40,000,000,000 as a mortgage on the future of America.

* * * * *

With money taxed or borrowed from the people the Federal Government has set up a multitude of public and semipublic corporations, which have gone into the States to weaken the authority and the financial soundness of the States.

* * * * *

In many of these instances the Federal corporations and agencies have gone far beyond the intention of the authority which was granted to them by the Congress. But steadily and surely they have undermined the sharp line between State and Federal authority to increase the concentration of power in Washington.

* * * * *

As labor and industry survey what has happened to labor and industry in those lands where all powers have been concentrated in the central authority, they fear and oppose the steps which thus far have been taken here, to enlarge the dominion of the Federal Government over the lives and fortunes of the American people.

* * * * *

It is not a problem for labor alone, or industry and agriculture alone. It is a problem which must be solved by an awakened citizenship. It is a problem to be discussed at every fireside, to be dealt with by every publicist, to be prayerfully considered by those Americans who this year will be called upon to draft the platforms of both political parties.

* * * * *

The hour has come for Americans to recognize the dangers that confront them, and to join in a united effort to halt the drift toward national insolvency and industrial collapse, and to extend opportunity for the Americans of today and tomorrow.

Northwest Does Not Need Government Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, Tom Humphrey, one of the outstanding journalists of the Northwest, wrote an article which was printed in the Washington Post March 13, 1949, on the proposed legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority. The article is so well done and points up the differences of the TVA and CVA I commend it for your reading:

TVA-TYPE PROPOSAL FOR NORTHWEST MARSHALS FORMIDABLE ARRAY OF FOES

(By Tom Humphrey)

PORTLAND, OREG., March 12.—The proposed Columbia Valley Authority, modeled after TVA, may look wonderful to Representative HUGH MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, and his CVA League. But it doesn't look that way to the Governors of five of the seven CVA States, or to Oregon Congressmen, or Northwest newspapers or to approximately 100 agricultural, industrial, and promotion groups of the Pacific Northwest. On the contrary, they're asking:

"What's TVA got that we haven't got?" And they're prepared to fight it out in the region and in Congress.

The CVA Leaguers have been having a field day since President Truman made his surprise CVA declaration and asked a five-agency committee to put it in legislative form. They're rallying around Representative MITCHELL, who has tried repeatedly to interest Congress in a TVA for the Columbia Basin.

They figure that what's good for the Tennessee Valley would be good for this region. And they're saying that with a CVA this region would get more Federal money, there would be no more floods like those of last year and there would be no power shortage.

Grange masters of Oregon and Washington, who will buy anything with a public power label on it, are whooping it up. Several labor leaders have climbed on the bandwagon, Representatives MITCHELL and JACKSON, of Washington and Senator TAYLOR of Idaho, third party running mate of Henry Wallace, can't wait for Mr. Truman's committee to report. They're for introducing their own CVA bills.

Finally, Bonneville Power Administrator Paul Raver, strong advocate of coordinated development of the Columbia Basin but lukewarm advocate of CVA, went to Washington, talked to his boss, Interior Secretary Krug, former power manager for TVA, then came out wholeheartedly in favor of a regional agency in the nature of a CVA.

BACKS ENGINEERS' PLAN

And right there the opposition came to life. Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, demanded:

"What's the matter with the way we're doing now?

"I cannot agree with any plan for a Columbia Valley Authority under which the States surrender their autonomy and our natural resources pass into complete control of Federal bureaus," he wired President Truman. McKay urged the President to let the Army engineers complete the power, flood-control, and navigation projects outlined in their master plan for the Columbia Basin.

Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, said: "On the basis of past performance, of knowledge, both special and general of the entire area, it is my belief that existing agencies can best develop the Columbia Basin."

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, started a backfire against CVA by sponsoring a senate bill giving his State authority to go into the power business at the wholesale level. He declared it would protect the State against the "overpaternalistic interest of Federal Government."

Gov. Vail Pittman, of Nevada, and Gov. C. A. Crane, of Wyoming, parts of whose States would be in the proposed 279,000-square-mile Columbia Valley Authority area, also oppose it. That makes five out of the seven governors on record against valley authority proposals. Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah, is expected to clarify his position

soon, and Gov. John Bonner, of Montana, ran on a platform of "Montana water for Montana people."

MUNICIPAL OPPOSITION

Heads of three outstanding municipal power agencies of Oregon and Washington also strongly oppose CVA.

E. R. Hoffman, superintendent of Seattle City Light, and C. A. Erdahl, Tacoma commissioner of public utilities and chairman of the Northwest Utilities Conference of public and private power agencies, say that existing agencies can do a satisfactory job in the development of power on the Columbia River and its tributaries, if given a free hand.

"I should be most unhappy to se any major part of this immediate power development program caught in the rip tides of politics," Erdahl said.

J. Frank Ward, superintendent of Tacoma City Light and former Bonneville engineer, added: "Coordinated development is desirable, but not so desirable that the people of the Northwest can afford to lose control of the development of their own area. I feel that will be the inevitable tendency of a large authority unless it is made very responsible to the people of the Northwest."

And R. R. Boals, general superintendent of the Eugene, Oreg., water and power board, said: "I very much object to a Columbia Basin Authority or to any other authority so far proposed."

Oregon Congressmen are almost unanimously opposed to a TVA-type CVA.

Senator GUY CORDON, who as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee has waged a successful fight for funds for McNary Dam and other Army engineer projects, strongly opposes CVA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, progressive Republican, says: "I am anything but convinced that we in the Pacific Northwest want any Government agencies in control of our rivers based upon the Tennessee Valley pattern. Our economy is entirely different and our people are strong believers in a maximum of local self-government."

Senator CAIN of Washington is not expected to go along with his authority-minded Democratic colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, when the chips are down. And Senator ECTON of Montana appears to be just as strongly opposed to CVA and a Missouri Valley Authority as Senator MURRAY is for them.

PRESS FIGHTS PLAN

Every major newspaper and more than 85 percent of all newspapers in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are on record against CVA, strong as they are for development of the Columbia Basin. Every power company president in the region, while favoring McNary Dam and other Federal power projects, is actively antagonistic to CVA, remembering, no doubt, that TVA has elbowed 32 privately owned electric utilities out of the picture in the Tennessee Valley, either in part or in toto. Every major chamber of commerce, including Portland, Seattle, and Spokane, is on record against CVA, recalling that TVA engages in 30 different business enterprises in competition with private enterprise.

And while Oregon and Washington State grange leaders are plugging for CVA, other farm groups are adamant in their opposition, including the Idaho State Grange. The Pacific Northwest Development Association of Portland says there are nearly 100 farm, industry, and promotion organizations on record against a Columbia Valley Authority. Even the tribal council of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation of Oregon is against CVA.

The reasons they give are varied.

The Pacific Northwest is one of the most progressive and prosperous regions in the United States, in marked contrast to Tennessee Valley States. It has the highest per capita income, while TVA States have only 60 percent of the national average despite 15 years of TVA. Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are among the top eight States in rural electrification, while Tennesee is forty-fourth. This region has cheaper power than TVA, the domestic rate in Portland under private-company operation averaging 1.28 cents per kilowatt-hour, while the average under the TVA is 1.58 cents.

Working through the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Pacific Northwest has developed within 10 percent as much power at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other Federal projects as TVA has developed at 28 dams—and for less than half the cost. The Army engineers have provided ocean steamer navigation as far up the Columbia as The Dalles, Oreg., 200 miles from the sea. The Bureau of Reclamation is developing at Grand Coulee the largest reclamation project in America—the 1,200,000-acre Columbia Basin project, Washington. And Bonneville and Grand Coulee are repaying every cent they cost, with interest, in 50 years—something TVA isn't doing and cannot do.

GROWTH REQUIRES POWER

The Pacific Northwest is short of power, all right. The fastest-growing region in America, it needs at least 6,000,000 kilowatts more in the next 10 years to keep pace with its needs. But it has 40 percent of the Nation's hydro sites and the Army engineers have just completed comprehensive plans for basin development. If they are approved, it can supply its power needs through Federal, municipal, and private-company projects.

The Pacific Northwest has a flood-control problem, too, but again the Army engineers have plans that will cut flood damage to 10 percent of last year's figure.

On the other hand, TVA has a power shortage, too. Its hydro sites are exhausted. In fact, it stirred up a national controversy by asking Congress for $54,000,000 for steam plants.

The TVA still has floods, too, despite some-$165,000,000 allocated to flood control. In fact, its 28 dams permanently flood more productive land than seasonal floods ever covered. And while the 1948 report of TVA boasts that its flood-control program has averted $13,000,000 worth of damage in the Chattanooga area, the fact remains that the people of Chattanooga appealed to Congress to authorize the Army engineers to provide flood protection TVA hasn't supplied.

Thus, the difference is that most of the people of the Pacific Northwest believe that the Army engineers, the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee and the Bureau of Reclamation have done and can do a better job for this region for approximately $350,-000,000 than TVA has done in the Tennessee Valley—despite the expenditure of almost $1,000,000,000.

Worcester's Museum of Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Carol Heggen entitled "Worcester's Museum of Miracles," which appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Coronet.

This story graphically unfolds a picture of how an inspired, energetic director of a little-recognized natural-history museum, can, in a comparatively short period, arouse the consciousness of an entire citizenry to the potentialities of the invaluable contribution such a museum may project into the community welfare.

In well-deserved tribute to Mr. Richard C. Potter, director, his loyal staff, his civic-minded corps of voluntary assistants, and for the emulation of other American communities, I am pleased to include this story in the RECORD:

WORCESTER'S MUSEUM OF MIRACLES

(By Carol Heggen)

On a snowy morning last winter, the phone jangled in the office of the Edgeworth Street School in Worcester, Mass.

"This is the Dix Street School," said the caller. "Please tell Miss Wahlstrom not to send her seventh-graders over for manual training. The teacher can't be here today."

"But the boys and girls have already left here," was the reply.

"Well, then, we'll just have to send them back."

Accordingly, Miss Esther Wahlstrom was told that her youngsters would be returning early. But after waiting 45 minutes, her tolerance changed to worried concern. Just then, her chattering young truants filed back into the classroom.

"Dix Street School called," she told them sternly. "We've been expecting you for an hour."

"But Miss Wahlstrom," one youngster explained, "on our way back we stopped off at the Natural History Museum for a little while."

In almost any other city such an excuse would have been suspect. But in Worcester, the idea of school children browsing in a museum of natural history seemed so probable that Miss Wahlstrom murmured smilingly to herself, "Why, of course, I might have known that's where they'd go."

For Worcester's Museum of Natural History is a highly popular and remarkable institution. Not because of unusual exhibits—many other museums have rarer collections. Not because of its scientific achievements—with its tiny budget, the museum has no funds for exhaustive research. Not because of a fine building or large staff—the museum is housed in a shabby old mansion, while its paid personnel consists of a director, plus two full-time and one part-time assistants.

No, the popularity of this museum, with children and adults alike, rests solely on its lively program—a program which cannot be surpassed by any similar institution for originality, vitality, and community influence. To the 199,000 residents of this bustling New England city, the museum plays the role of teacher, friend, host, counselor or answer man with equal aplomb.

The well-attended classes range from nature stories for kindergarteners to lectures on astronomy by Harvard professors. Museum projects include everything from settlement-house work to magazine publishing, from maintaining a gift shop to running a summer camp. Also, the museum sponsors such diverse hobby groups as an herb club, an organization for coin collectors and a bicycling club for teen-agers.

School children and retired teachers, Junior Leaguers and workmen's wives, bankers and mechanics are on the roster of regular visitors. The museum maintains a weather station and gives daily forecasts by means of flags flown from the roof; it produces a weekly radio program for WTAG, the local CBS station. Even puzzled gardeners seeking an antidote for insect pests, and summer vacationists plagued with poison ivy bring their problems to the museum.

Indeed, the institution could well be described as being all things to all men. Its benign, 60-year-old director, Richard C. Pot-

ter, is generally regarded by fellow Worcesterians as a sort of latter-day Thoreau, blessed with the financial wizardry of a Rockefeller—the annual budget of only $10,000 covers salaries, maintenance and expenses—and the administrative talent of an Eisenhower—some 177 volunteers give thousands of hours of free time each month to the museum.

But it was not always thus. Eight years ago the museum was a relic of the past, standing in venerable dignity on a quiet side street. Its community influence was negligible. Then, in February 1940, Richard Potter, erstwhile teacher and forester, took over as director.

That first morning on his way to work, Potter decided to experiment. Walking along Worcester's main street, he stopped 10 people at random and asked: "Can you tell me where the Museum of Natural History is located?"

Seven had never heard of the place. The other three gave vague answers. This confirmed Potter's belief that most people think of natural-history museums as repositories for dead fish and stuffed birds.

His interviewing that first morning strengthened his resolve to make the Worcester museum different—to give it purpose and vigor. First, the institution would belong to the people who visited it. Second, it would serve the community in vital and tangible ways. Finally, and most far-reaching, every museum activity would stress an underlying philosophy—the need for conservation of America's natural resources.

Potter started making changes the first day. The building which had been open only for 2 hours in the morning and in the afternoon was suddenly opened to the general public for 12 to 14 hours each day, admission free. Annual attendance rose from 7,000 to the present figure of 87,000, of whom 60,000 are children. Membership in the society increased from a staid 300 to four times that number. And as more and more people came to see what was happening at the museum, they lingered on to work.

To help make the museum a youth center, Potter arranged a program whereby the children published their own mimeographed newspaper, "The Natch" (juvenile slang for naturalist), and sold it from door to door. Proceeds were used to buy paper, scissors, paste, laboratory equipment, and other items needed for nature classes.

Then Potter ran into trouble. Mrs. B. Larz Newton, a Worcester matron, learned that her small daughter was vending papers, and became indignant. Calling Potter, she charged that the museum was exploiting children to make money. He listened quietly, then inquired: "Mrs. Newton, have you ever visited our museum or seen one of our nature classes?"

She admitted she had not.

"Well, then," he said genially, "why not come in and see us? I'd like to talk more about this."

As a result of the interview, Mrs. Newton, the irate critic, became Mrs. Newton, the stanch ally. Also out of that interview grew plans for a group of volunteer women workers known as the director's council, which Mrs. Newton has headed since its inception and which, more than anything else, has helped Potter realize his dream for a truly unique museum.

To these volunteers, Potter promptly managed to convey his enthusiasm and vision. He talked of many plans—for example, of his hopes for a loan department so that the many fine exhibits—birds, plants, and wildlife specimens—could be sent to schools, summer camps, Boy and Girl Scout groups, garden clubs or any organization that needed such material for educational or display purposes. He told of his idea for an official museum publication—not a dry scientific report but a readable little magazine for local newsstands, which would reflect the warm, informal atmosphere of the museum. But he also discussed budget limitations, and explained how each project must, to a large degree, be self-supporting.

The loan department is now a reality, sending out an average of 600 exhibits a month—sometimes to spots as remote as Texas, Delaware, Ohio or Colorado, but more often to Worcester schools and organizations. The magazine, Nature Outlook staffed by able volunteers, is now rounding out its sixth year of publication, and is self-supporting by virtue of enthusiastic patronage of local advertisers.

More and more the museum has fulfilled Potter's dream of serving the community. It has become a second home to Worcester school children, what with free movies, special tours, an annual pet show and classes in all branches of nature study, directed by capable Mrs. Maude Young, curator of the children's department.

Under the leadership of volunteer teachers, the museum's evening classes for adults and hobby groups have made service to the community a part of their programs. The Photo Color Club, for example, not only gives amateur photographers an opportunity to discuss their work, but members also visit shut-ins and old people's homes, using color slides to brighten drab lives.

Still another high light in the museum's program is the Nature Training School. This summer-day camp, devoted to creating young nature leaders, was the first of its kind in the country. Each year, some 200 Worcester youngsters attend daily sessions at the school's outdoor classroom—a 40-acre tract given by Mrs. Frank C. Smith, Jr., and members of her family.

Mrs. Walter E. Masters, director, says that the best measurement of the school's value is the reactions of the children themselves. "The look of wonder on the face of a small boy staring in fascination at a bullfrog, or the cry of delight from a 10-year-old girl when she recognizes the call of a bird, tells us we are accomplishing our aims," says Mrs. Masters.

Establishment of the Piedmont Extension Center, sponsored jointly by the Junior League and the museum, was another milestone in Worcester history. In 1946, Potter decided that neighborhood branches of the museum were needed to reach more people. But he didn't look for the finest neighborhood first; he looked for an area where need was greatest. By checking income groups, delinquency reports, and recreational facilities, he picked his spot—a section where tenements lined crowded streets.

Groundwork was laid when Potter began making anonymous visits to the neighborhood. Dressed in old clothes, he chatted with work-worn housewives, talked with men on their way home from work, watched gangs of young hoodlums playing in the streets.

Convinced that a neighborhood center would receive wholehearted support, he took his project to the director's council. Everyone agreed that it was a wonderful idea—but what about money? Potter, always amiably optimistic, suggested that they go ahead, and the money would take care of itself.

A committee of 32 mothers and fathers from the Piedmont neighborhood formed a governing board for the center. Then they took over an old plumbing shop which had stood vacant for years. Working under the guidance of Luke Barton, Potter's assistant, they attacked the years' accumulation of grime. The men used gallons of paint remover; the women scrubbed floors and walls. They begged and borrowed furniture, and what they couldn't get any other way, they made themselves out of rough lumber.

Then, when the center was getting under way, the Worcester Junior League, seeking a suitable new project, asked local organizations to submit plans. In competition with 17 others, the center program was selected for financial backing.

Now in its second year, Piedmont Center is a thriving though unpretentious community center (the old plumbing shop still serves as quarters). The youngsters have organized football and basketball teams. Parties and outings are held regularly. In one 2-month period, aggregate attendance was more than 6,500. As for concrete evidence of the center's community value, here are sample comments.

A local shopkeeper: "Nothing stolen for weeks—no windows smashed either."

A policeman: "My job is easier now that the kids have discovered new interests."

An official of the Animal Rescue League: "We get fewer calls about pets being mistreated. This used to be one of our worst areas."

Thus in eight short years, Richard C. Potter has given Worcester's museum a new and dynamic personality. A short, rotund man, with a fringe of gray-brown hair and eyes that twinkle behind spectacles, Potter expends more energy in a day than most men do in a week.

The story of Potter's life begins in Littleton, Mass., where he was born in 1888. Along with five brothers and three sisters, Dick grew up in neighboring Concord. There, in Thoreau's beautiful Walden Pond country, the boy fished, camped, and hiked. Later, he earned his tuition at Massachusetts State Agricultural College by doing farm chores—or, as he puts it, "I milked my way through college."

Soon after graduation, Potter became a high-school teacher at Derry, N. H. Then he married Bertha Bodwell from Nashua, and the two moved west when he took teaching jobs in Wisconsin and Illinois. After serving in the Army during World War I, he went into forestry and conservation work, and the Potters with their son and two daughters moved from place to place throughout the Midwest, the South, and New England. In 1940, he came to Worcester to be interviewed about the museum directorship at the suggestion of his brother, Dr. David Potter, professor of biology at local Clark University.

Today, the brothers live on adjoining farms near Auburn, Mass., a 30-minute drive from the museum. It is no life of "gentleman farming," since Dick, with no help except during haying season, raises all his own food, including meat. In summer, he gets up at 4: 30 a. m. to do the chores before reporting to the museum at 9. In winter, in addition to his farm and museum work, he often makes as many as five speeches a week before local groups.

Even with this superschedule, Potter still has time to dream of new museum projects. He hopes to see the day when there will be not one, but six, extension centers serving every section of Worcester. He has visions of an experimental farm, run by the museum, where conservation lessons can be taught in the most practical and memorable way.

That he will reach these new goals no one who knows him doubts. As one of his Worcester friends says: "When Dick Potter took over as director, our old museum got its soul lifted."

Corn Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Leland M. Reichert, of Townsend, Del., I am placing

in the RECORD his letter of March 4, 1949, relative to the corn price-support program.

This letter speaks for itself and indicates concern and dissatisfaction with the administration of the price-support program. Mr. Reichert's letter is as follows:

LELAND M. REICHERT FARM,
Townsend, Del., March 4, 1949.

Representative BOGGS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am calling to your attention the corn price-support program which the United States Department of Agriculture is failing to activate fairly and effectively in New Castle County, Del.

The price requirements are clearly set forth in law, and in conformity the local AAA committee had before last election announced through the press and notices mailed direct to farmers, a support price through loans and purchase agreements of $1.59 per bushel ear corn stored on or purchased at the farm basis.

They have never made good in a single instance on this announced price support.

They insist that applying farmers accept an additional 2 cents over the announced $1.59 ear corn on the farm basis, which changes the loan agreement and purchase agreement from the original announced ear corn on the farm basis to a shelled-corn basis, delivered to a specified rail siding or loading point, at a time specified at the demand of the Government, at the expense of the farmer.

In my case this 2 cents would just about cover the cost of moving the corn from storage to a truck, without any shelling, hauling, or loading at the siding. The best estimate I can get of hiring this work done is 20 cents per bushel.

In other words, by this tricky change of basis, they have successfully evaded their announced obligation of $1.59 per bushel ear corn on the farm basis, making the actual effective support price a variable which changes with the varying costs encountered by each individual farmer as he performs these enforced unannounced extra obligations, in no case can it equal the actual lawful support price.

On the purchase-contract agreements in addition to the cited change of basis, they set some vague unnamed time far in the future when they will activate their obligation of price support by actually taking possession of and paying for the grain.

This results in what is actually a complete abandonment of their obligation of price support of corn prices in New Castle County, Del.

I believe a check of the records of the Department of Agriculture will show they have not supported corn prices by loan in New Castle County, after early December 1948, and that they have never supported corn prices under a purchase agreement in this county by actually paying for and taking possession of one bushel of corn.

It may or may not be a coincidence that the prices received by farmers at the farm for ear corn from dealers approximately equals the lawful support price minus the costs he will encounter from handling if he deals with the Government.

They have also set up certain storage standards, without regard to the quality or complete curing of the corn offered, which prevent loans on completely cured dry corn unless it is in their specification storage suitable for moist fall corn.

By these arbitrary and unreasonable standards they avoid their support-price obligation on completely cured dry corn stored on a dry ventilated barn floor under a tight roof.

Yours truly,

L. M. REICHERT.

Reducing Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the people residing in my section of the country are much concerned about present high taxes. They are perfectly willing to pay all necessary taxes, but they want the Congress to be sure that these taxes are necessary In short, they want elimination of waste, efficiency in government, and a return to a peacetime spending and taxing basis. I agree with them just 100 percent.

My attention was called this morning to an editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, one of the larger out-State dailies in Michigan, and that editorial reads as follows:

Despite the fact that President Truman has asked for an increased tax yield to carry out his proposed program, the Republican policy committee of the House has endorsed a bill offered by Republican leader MARTIN to reduce excise taxes to their prewar level. Such a measure will meet popular approval.

We have become accustomed to the social-security tax and the income tax, but many people still protest when they find they have to pay a war levy when they're buying an alarm clock, or a piece of luggage, or a needed toilet article. All these still carry the extra war tax, although we have had peace 3 years.

Nor are many of these things luxuries. It was once an accepted theory that luxuries like tobacco and liquor and jewels should pay an excise tax. But now electric-light bulbs, which everyone must use for everyday living, are taxed 20 percent. Fifteen percent is collected as a war tax on all telephone bills, and 20 percent on all transportation tickets and movie tickets, 10 percent on sporting goods, and last year the administration took $498,000,000 from automobile traffic by its wartime tax on gasoline. It also added to the price of new automobiles with a 7-percent tax.

These excise taxes last year paid almost four billions into the National Treasury. If the administration's program goes through, they will have to be increased.

Comparison of Communism With Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court of the United States, at a dinner of the Associated Friends of Occidental College, California Club, Los Angeles, Calif., February 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Marx and Engels embraced the theory that in general "the mode of production determines the character of the social, political, and intellectual life." That was the core of their historical materialism. To it they hitched dialectics and marshaled all of man's ingenuity in an endeavor to prove the truth of their thesis, by promoting it. "The materialistic doctrine that men are the products of conditions and education," wrote Marx, "forgets that circumstances may be altered by men and the educator has himself to be educated."

The Soviets have put this system to work. They have supplied it with a political framework, furnished it with propagandists schooled in the art and religion of dialectical materialism, equipped it with secret police so that heretics might be easily ferreted out, and backed it with a mighty army that can impose the program on people or bolster it when it falters.

It is important that we understand the operation of this system.

Dictators have a way of setting down their programs and purposes for all to read. Democracies, for some reason, have a way of ignoring or disbelieving the dictators. We recently had our lesson from the totalitarian right. We waited almost too long before reading Hitler's Mein Kampf. We should not make that mistake today. Like Hitler, the Communists have given us their plans. Before it is too late, we must read and understand the works of Joseph Stalin—such books as The October Revolution, The Problems of Leninism, Foundations of Leninism.

We can put to one side the problems of communism in Russia. We the democrats will be the first to defend the right of any people to live under the government of their choice. When they confine their totalitarian regime within their borders, they are entitled to tolerance in working out their own experiments.

The Russian borders, however, do not mark the orbit of communism. Stalin announced in his book, The October Revolution, that the Russian revolution constituted "the beginning and premise of the world revolution." We have seen much of that prophecy come true. The plan is to undermine all the democracies. The aim is to win by default, if possible, but to win under any and all circumstances and at any price. That is what the current Soviet propaganda means when it says, "There is no power in the world that can prevent the death of capitalism, the growth of the indignation and struggle of the working people against the reactionary bourgeoisie. * * * This is what Leninism, the Marxism of our epoch, teaches us."

The techniques whereby the Communists plan their domination of the world reveal at least three basic and irreconcilable differences between their philosophy and ours.

First, Marx and Engels wrote that "the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation." That has often been taken to mean that the political power of the state was at last to be transferred to the people. The common man was to come into his own. All the people were to have a new charter of liberty. Indeed the current Soviet propaganda in this country is that communism is "a society in which the people themselves are the master and determine the fate of their country."

Lenin, however, made clear that the proletariat and the people were not synonymous. He announced that the dictatorship of the proletariat "has meaning only when

one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people." By Lenin's dictum the political power of the state was to go into the hands of one class and one class only. Everyone else would be disenfranchised.

Today's Communists have gone Lenin one better. They have not placed the political power in the hands of even one class. They have given it all to one select political clique. It is that small group that declares war, makes peace, and establishes the party line that dictates the conduct of their agents in all the countries of the world.

Here we have the first deep and fundamental difference between Communists and democrats. It is the very antithesis of democracy to have the political power of a nation vested in one group—whether it be a man, a corporation, or a class. The struggle of the democracies of western Europe through the years has been to get rid of that kind of dictatorship. We followed that course in this coutnry. We experienced life under a monarchy; and mild as it was compared with Communist totalitarianism, our fathers expended lives and treasures to be rid of it.

We disperse political power among all groups. By doing so we have some guaranty that no one group will permanently acquire the upper hand over others, that no one group will use the sanctions of the law and the power of government for the exploitation of others. When one group acquires all the powers of government, freedom can be had only through revolution. That is, I think, the head and front of all the revolutions the world has seen.

Society by definition is the aggregation of many, diverse pressure groups. The secret of wise government is to leave room for each group to live and express itself. The democratic way, by wide dispersion of ultimate political power among all the people, makes it impossible for any one interest to get and keep, at least for long, the authority to exploit the others.

The Communists defy this principle and by putting all political power in the hands of a few repudiate the basis of free government as we know it.

The Communists do not come to us with any scientific blueprint for a machine age. They, therefore, do not offer us the key to the problem that both here and in the other democracies is most pregnant with potential conflict. Yet even if we could be sure that they offered us an economy of abundance, we could not accept the offer. As we have seen, they substitute rule by one select political clique for Lincoln's concept of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." They trade our political heritage—our right to franchise—for a police state.

This is a matter on which we, the democrats, can never compromise. The difference between us and the Communists at this point is fundamental and irreconcilable.

Second. We come to the second basic difference between the two philosophies. The Communists need a police state because they try to pour man into one mold. It's been tried before—by all the czars, and kings, and Hitlers that have tramped the earth. It has never succeeded for long. And it never will. For man was born for freedom, not for slavery. Man cannot be standardized like automobiles, or screws, or nails. God gave man the same amazing diversity that He gave the flowers in the mountain meadows.

Soviet Russia, with its police state, defies that fact. News is a standardized product issued by a central government bureau. There is no room for a crusading journalist to expose the failings of those in office. Art, music, and literature are weapons of political warfare. They are called subversive if they depict the sad side of the Communist society or raise doubt concerning the wisdom, or virtue, either of the system or the officials who manage it. Like the press they must follow the party line. Defections from it entail severe penalties. There is no free trade in ideas such as Holmes talked about. The solution to every social and economic problem, the answer to every question must meet the approval of the ruling clique. No other answers are tolerated. There is only one road to salvation. All other roads lead to concentration camps.

In the democracies, imperfect as they are, we have great diversity—from art to politics. Some democrats are Socialists, some are capitalists. We are committed to no single panacea for all our problems. We can have a TVA in Tennessee or on the Columbia without nationalizing all the enterprises along Main Street. We can proceed by trial and error and undo 4 years from now what we do today. We can let man express himself in art and the letters. He is restrained only by the laws of libel and obscenity. We can let man give vent to his views, however noxious they may seem to those in power. We can experiment with new techniques unrestrained by commitments to any one political faith.

The Communists have no such freedom or flexibility. Their religion is dialectical materialism which permits of no compromise. All must conform or perish.

We the democrats of the world cannot compromise with that philosophy. To do so would be to discard our Bill of Rights and to place ourselves again in the chains that we struggled for centuries to remove.

Third. A third basic and irreconcilable difference betwen the Communists and the democrats is in their political techniques. Ours is a civic genius described by William James as the tolerance of one political party for the other. The party in power is on probation only. It has its innings and it stands or falls on the record of its performance. No police or army suppresses an opposition or keeps the winner of the last election in office.

The Soviets have no such tolerance for the opposition. Up to the time the Communists win an election, they talk and even act like democrats. They adopt the tactics of parliamentary government. The words and slogans they use are familiar and appealing to democrats. They believe in free elections. They plead the cause of justice. They are against the exploiters of human beings. They pose as champions of every oppressed person or group. But once they take office, it is for keeps. When they take over, the liquidation of all opposition parties commences.

But it is often said that the Communists must be on the side of the angels, since they are identified with every cause that seems to champion human rights. The Communists, however, plead the liberal causes for quite a different purpose than do the liberals. Their purpose is to seduce the liberals, mislead the conservatives, and confuse everyone. A truly liberal government is an anathema to them and their aim is to destroy it. They do not want reform for others. They want power for themselves. That is why they speak in favor of socialism but against the socialist regime in England. Their chance of getting power disappears if democratic government is strong and reliant. Their real hope lies in fostering conditions that breed discontent.

It is important that this technique be understood. Stalin makes it clear in his Foundations of Leninism and the Problems of Leninism. The Soviets plan two revolutions. First, the bourgeois revolution and, second, the proletarian revolution. With the bourgeois revolution the Communists take over existing democratic institutions. That's what happened in Czechoslovakia. That's what they have been trying to do in Italy and France. To gain control of existing democratic governments they use democratic tactics. They talk and behave like democrats and proclaim the democratic virtues even more loudly at times than the democrats themselves. But they take control of a democratic government for only one purpose—to destroy it. Its destruction and the appropriation of its powers by the central body in Moscow constitute the second step—the proletarian revolution. Both revolutions take place without moving an army or dropping a bomb. They have indeed the outward appearance of constitutional government in the democratic sense.

Between these revolutions the Communists bring into play two ancient political techniques designed to eliminate all political opposition—techniques borrowed from the Czar—techniques that have been the political tools of tyrants from time immemorial: Murder and terror.

The use of murder and terror makes fear the dominant, overriding influence in public affairs. Once fear grips the hearts of the people the Communist ranks become swollen.

The political techniques of the Communists stand condemned by the standards of the democrats. We refuse to accept fraud and deceit as standards of public conduct. We reject murder and terror as political weapons.

These then are three of the basic and irreconcilable differences between the philosophy of the Communists and that of the democrats. They pose for us problems on both the domestic and foreign front. They make it necessary that we fashion articles of our own faith and adopt a positive, aggressive program to combat the ideology with which the Soviets bombard the world.

On the domestic front the course is easy:

1. We need not today fear the Communists in this country, for their numbers are small. What we should fear is our susceptibility to their propaganda. Our first duty then is to understand their purposes and methods. If we do that, their influence will be no greater than their numbers. It is only when we do not understand, that the Communists exert an influence far out of proportion to their strength. It is important to remember that the Communist influence in the democratic state is essentially divisive. Their aim is to pit one liberal against another, conservatives against liberals, race against race, labor against management. We, the democrats, must not fall victim of that strategy.

2. We must restore integrity to our own political tactics by putting an end to the shameful practice of branding as a Communist everyone who espouses a liberal reform or promotes a program for the underprivileged. If the late George Norris were alive today, promoting his beloved TVA, some would label him a Communist by showing that in Russia power projects are nationalized. By that reasoning the great Labor Party in England would also be communistic. Yet we know that a socialist-democratic regime is an anathema to the Communists.

When liberals are pilloried as Communists, the Communist influence grows and spreads. For then the liberals and Communists are driven closer and closer together. Thus do conservatives play the Communist game of breaking the ranks of the democrats, dividing a nation into camps that become more and more hostile.

We must keep our country a place where men are not afraid to think and read and speak freely and without restraint.

3. We must become politically more conscious. The Communists through the use of their principle of democratic centralism confine their differences within their ranks. Once the party line is fixed, they present a united front to the world. In that way they make the most effective use possible of their minority position. They also are the most active political agents of all time. While the rest of us relax, the Communist workers are busy ringing doorbells, writing literature, and spreading their faith. We cannot throw

away our political independence and intellectual integrity by fixing our own party line and compelling allegiance to it. But we must take our politics more seriously. If we throw our full energies into political organization and activity, the Communists will be impotent in our affairs. They could not then win by default; and it is only by default that they can gain a strategic hold on important groups in this country. Labor unions have taken the lead in showing how that result can be avoided.

4. Effective democratic government is the political antidote to communism. Reactionary governments nurture the conditions on which communism feeds. The kind of democratic government that will submerge the Communist influence is a liberal, progressive government that recognizes the human rights of all citizens, raises the standard of living at all levels of society, eliminates the insecurity of this industrial age, and wipes out the poverty that has plagued man from the dawn of history. Nothing short of this kind of political program will defeat the aims of the Communists.

On the foreign front the choice is not between war and appeasement. Neither will solve the problem which confronts us. A war would produce a world in ruins with poverty and illness on every hand and suffering and dislocations of life unequaled in history. That is the environment in which virulent ideas flourish. That is when the Communists or Fascists come into ascendency. On the other hand appeasement means that the Communists are encouraged by our default to undermine flourishing democracies.

1. The answer to the Communists on the foreign front, as on the domestic front, is a political program. We must be equipped and prepared to meet the political program of the Communists at whatever point in the world they may select for action. We must ourselves regain the initiative by promoting in our own areas of influence tried-and-true political antidotes to communism.

Our greatest error would be to fashion our foreign policy merely in terms of anticommunism. We will fail miserably if we do no more than that. For then we will end by railing at the Communists, taking no steps to eliminate the conditions on which Communists thrive. If we follow that course, war will soon appear as the only alternative.

2. Our foreign policy must espouse and promote liberal, humanitarian programs for the masses of people of the world. It must strengthen the democratic forces in other nations and not entrench reactionary interests that thirst for power.

Most of the areas of the world are bleak and desolate when measured by the living conditions of the people. At times the people live under a serfdom of poverty and disease. At other times it is an industrial or political serfdom. The Communists are artists in exploiting these conditions. They can promise pie in the sky—in fact the whole world—to those who will enlist in their political army. Revolution may indeed seem a welcome relief to those who have been exploited. It may to desperate men have the appeal of a swift and cleansing purgative that sweeps before it all the rot and filth of the old tyranny that has oppressed them.

Those impulses cannot be controlled by talk and promise of vague and remote democratic ideals. America's voice, if it is to be powerful among the masses of people, must do more than talk of the glories of democracy. If we want the hundreds of millions of the peoples of the world in the democratic ranks, we must show them the way with practical programs of social reconstruction as are embodied in the European recovery program.

The real victory over communism will be won in the factories and rice fields of the world rather than on the battlefields. The fight against communism depends for its ultimate success on the people of the various nations, not on their governments. Thus we must support those who represent democratic values and who have practical programs for political action. When we prop up governments that are self-seeking, corrupt, or Fascist, we lose ground in the world-wide struggle against communism. When we stand behind the liberal and progressive forces in other countries, we become identified with their interests in the eyes of the peoples of the world. Then the democratic cause gains strength and character. Then the flood tide of communism will begin to recede.

4. This course requires the backing of a strong, alert, and mobile military machine. For weaklings have never yet won a campaign—political or otherwise—against dictators.

These should be our articles of faith. Success is assured if we are true to ourselves. We have a system which, though far from perfect, is strong with idealism. It gives elbow room for men of all races and all beliefs. It is vital and dynamic. And it works. We have the means of shaping the world in our pattern. If we do, freedom will be assured for all men. The decision is in the hands of this generation. It is a challenge to our political competence. For western civilization it is the greatest challenge of all time.

How Bureaucracy Swindles the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, recently there appeared an article in the Reader's Digest entitled "How Bureaucracy Swindles the Taxpayer." This seemed to me to present a rather unfair and erroneous picture concerning the Veterans' Administration. I submitted the article to General Gray, the Veterans' Administrator, for his comments.

These comments seem to me rather enlightening, and I feel that they may likewise be of interest to my colleagues in the Congress. I, therefore, request that they be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that the article would occupy five pages in the RECORD, at an estimated cost of $355. I still feel that the article will be very beneficial to my colleagues. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD, notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE, HOW BUREAUCRACY SWINDLES THE TAXPAYER

The caption, subcaption, and much of the article are made up of unsupported generalizations designed to create a state of mind where the reader will accept opinions as facts and half truths as truths.

In this particular case a more serious—even dangerous—aspect of this approach is that it forces into being the very conditions it is deploring, in that it lowers the morale of employees as well as wipes out confidence and lessens the cooperation to be had from veterans whose assistance is essential if they are to receive the services provided by law.

Paragraph 1, page 61: "The inefficiency of the Veterans' Administration is a national disgrace and is sure to become a national scandal when the facts become widely known."

VA comment: This is a summary paragraph, designed to condition the mind of the reader and present opinions to be supported later by facts. It can only be answered categorically, which would accomplish nothing. The alleged facts will be analyzed as he presents them.

Paragraph 2, page 61: "Its records are inaccurate; thousands of veterans' papers have been lost or destroyed; many insurance-premium collections are hopelessly muddled. Thousands of veterans or their widows are forced to wait and wait for money due them; on the other hand, other veterans have been paid nearly $50,000,000 more than they were entitled to."

VA comment: Except for the last statement about the $50,000,000 in overpayments, this paragraph is, like the first one, a summary of intentions. These will be taken up as we come to them.

When he says "veterans have been overpaid nearly $50,000,000 more than they were entitled to," he indicates how little he really knows about the subject. Veterans have been overpaid approximately $179,000,000 more than they were entitled to. Of this, all but the nearly $50,000,000 referred to in the article has been recovered by negotiation. Agreements have been made with veterans for the recovery of another $8,000,000 and negotiations are under way for the recovery of additional millions.

The reasons for these overpayments are indicative of some of the problems that have been faced. In paying subsistence to veterans under the GI bill, the VA was faced with the alternatives of making overpayments and anticipating recovery or of delaying payments to veterans until their purpose was nullified. The decision reached is believed to have been in keeping with the intent of the law.

This condition came about as follows:

The law says that veterans enrolled in education or training shall be paid subsistence while taking courses. It further provides that while a veteran is in on-the-job training the combined amount of what he earns plus his subsistence shall not exceed a specified amount. The purpose of this is to provide financial assistance to veterans while fitting them for civilian activities.

When a veteran enters school and VA is advised his subsistence payments start. They are continued until VA is notified that he has discontinued. Sometimes he is out of school for several months before VA is notified. This results in an overpayment. If a veteran is in on-the-job training, he submits periodic estimates of his anticipated income and is paid subsistence on this basis. Should he get a raise during this period, it results in an overpayment.

Considering the intent of the law and the rate of recovery the VA believes results have justified its approach to this problem.

Paragraph 3, page 61: "Gen. Omar Bradley, who did so much to better the medical service of the VA, was unable to make a dent in the imperturbable bureaucracy of other divisions. Carl R. Gray, Jr., his successor, a distinguished railroad executive, accustomed to directing big organizations, also finds the going difficult. Many capable and enthusiastic men General Bradley brought into the Administration became discouraged and have left."

VA comment: We can find nothing in the statements of either of the Administrators referred to that in any way supports the contention they were dissatisfied with the

progress being made in accomplishing the unprecedented task of the VA; or that they had been unable "to make a dent in imperturbable bureaucracy."

Of course some capable and enthusiastic men have left the VA. Capable and enthusiastic men will continue to leave the VA and all other branches of government so long as the conditions of employment restrict their effectiveness and pay rates are far below those offered by private business. Within the period covered by this article one small service in VA has lost three top-flight men to private business. Every one of them increased his income by more than 50 percent.

Paragraph 4, page 61: "Proof of these charges is to be found in reports made by the House Appropriations Committee, in testimony by Veterans' Administration officials themselves and, most recently, in reports made to the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government. That Commission put Franklin D'Olier, retired president of the Prudential Insurance Co. and first commander of the American Legion, in charge of an investigation of the VA conducted by professional management engineers from the Trundle Engineering Co. The Trundle task force spent 6 months in the VA offices and then turned in a shocking report."

VA comment: This paragraph is so general it will have to be answered as the points are reached in the article. The reports referred to as being made to the House Appropriations Committee have not been made available to the VA, nor has this Administration been advised as to their findings.

Paragraph 5, pages 61 and 62: "The Veterans' Administration spends $6,000,000,000 a year, 15 percent of the entire Federal budget. More than 200,000 employees—1 out of every 6 on the Government pay roll—work for it directly. The agency fans out from Washington into 13 huge branch offices where the unwieldy central organization is largely duplicated, and from these into 70 big regional offices and 539 local offices with more duplication."

VA comment: This paragraph is true in its facts and utterly untrue in its implications. It is an excellent example of how half truths or twisted truths mislead a reader.

The author says the VA spends $6,000,000,000 a year and implies that this money is spent on 200,000 employees spread out in central office, branch offices, regional offices, and others blanketing the country in duplication of effort. The implication is untrue.

Let's look at the money. The VA does spend approximately $6,000,000,000 a year. Of this amount about 5 percent is for general administration, the rest is for direct and indirect benefits for veterans as provided by law.

In the current year general administrative costs are $372,234,800.

Medical and hospital care, which are indirect benefits, cost $564,520,200.

The appropriation for this year was $6,327,920,861, out of which the balance of $5,391,165,861 was paid, as required by law, in direct cash to veterans and their dependents.

The branch offices referred to by the author were eliminated as supervisory units before the article was published, so there appears to be no reason to discuss whether or not they duplicated effort. In these locations VA has centered all field work on insurance and death claims. This work is done at no other point, so it cannot be included in the charge of duplication.

The 70 regional offices have all records other than insurance and death-claims. These are records about which veterans call in person so they are located near the veteran's home where they can be easily reached.

The other 538 offices are small, usually 1 or 2 men, subdivisions of the regional offices established as a convenient means of contact for veterans and their families.

The duplication is not apparent.

Paragraph 6, page 62: "The VA directly touches the lives of 20,000,000 veterans. It handles more than 7,000,000 life-insurance policies valued at more than $43,000,000,000. The $436,000,000 collected annually in premiums is the veterans' own money. They are entitled to as good service as they would get from a private insurance concern. Yet the Trundle investigators found that the 17,000 employes in this VA division fail to keep the veterans' records accurately. They misfile premium payments. They write to the veterans in language which even the writers do not comprehend. They bill veterans for premiums after their policies have lapsed."

VA comment: The exact number of veterans whose lives the VA touches can only be estimated, as no exact figures are kept on this and it is not clear just what the author means by the word "touches." In one sense the VA touches the lives of every person in the United States. However, the number of veterans cannot be 20,000,000, as there are less than 19,000,000 living veterans of all wars and peacetime service.

VA agrees entirely with the statement that the money collected in insurance premiums is the veterans' own money and they are entitled to as good service as they could get from a private insurance concern.

We do not know what part of the Trundle investigation report is referred to by the author. Quotations from this investigation we have seen do not bear out his statements. VA does not know what part of the Trundle investigation report is under discussion. VA never has seen copies of any findings of Trundle investigators, and it has no information that the Trundle report has been accepted by the Hoover Commission. If it has, it was not specifically mentioned in the printed recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to VA organization. The statement "17,000 employees fail to keep records accurately. They misfile premium payments" conjures up a picture of complete confusion. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Never in the history of insurance—Government or private—has there been such a gigantic mass of records as took place following demobilization of World War II veterans. At that time there was nearly the confusion implied in this article. Twenty-one thousand employees were put to straightening it out. There were inaccuracies. Some premium records were misfiled. But these were certainly the exception rather than the rule. The same things happen in private concerns. This is not said in justification. They should never happen anywhere, but they will so long as people are fallible.

Since that time records have been consolidated and straightened out. The number of employees has been reduced to some 15,000; which in itself indicates progress.

The insurance business of the VA is different from that of other insurance companies. VA has no agents. Its business is conducted almost entirely by mail. Customers cannot be questioned by agents when information is needed. Because of this it is of greater importance that full information accompany all payments. When it does not, long correspondence may be necessary to straighten out accounts. Veterans are learning this and are making use of forms the VA provides. This has resulted in correcting errors and putting the activity on a basis where it is comparable to any commercial activity with similar operating problems.

It is not at all unusual for VA to receive communications from veterans and beneficiaries saying they have received better service from VA than from a private company. This is not mentioned as a criticism or to invite comparison but to indicate that the facts are not all on one side.

As for letters being in "language which even the writers do not comprehend," we do not believe this to be true in any case. Insurance correspondence is often highly technical and must be phrased so as to be exact in its legal significance. VA is making serious efforts to simplify its insurance correspondence and forms. Classes are conducted to impress letter writers with the need for simplification.

An example of the progress that has been made is to be found in the 1,500,000 policies recently mailed out to veterans. Some of the country's outstanding insurance executives assisted in making these about the clearest and most easily understood insurance policies ever issued.

The author says VA bills veterans for premiums after their policies have lapsed. This does sometimes happen. The bulk of these insurance premiums are payable on a monthly basis. A grace period of 31 days is granted from the day a premium is due. If the veteran fails to pay his premium on time, it is in force for this extra period and he gets another bill for the following month. If he fails to pay the premium due, his policy is lapsed under the law and he gets no more premium notices, but he does get a notice of lapse.

Paragraph 7, page 62: "A check-up last June 30 showed that the policies of 27,000 men, who had paid to convert their wartime term insurance to straight life, had not been processed. Frequently this processing so lags that premiums become in default; sometimes the policies actually lapse without the veteran knowing it, if he waits for a bill. It takes times to revive such a lapsed policy and if the veteran dies during this period his widow may collect no insurance. More than half of VA conversions have been unnecessarily delayed and a quarter have been mishandled. Yet VA employees handle only 12 conversions a day whereas clerks for the Prudential Insurance Co., for example, clear 32 on the average."

VA comment: Here the author implies that delinquencies in the VA result in conversion lags which are followed by defaults and the loss of insurance protection. This reasoning is difficult to follow.

On June 30, 1948, the date selected by the author, there were 27,000 policies on which conversion applications had been received and which had not been processed. Exactly a year earlier there were 181,800 pending conversions and by February 15, 1949, this number had been reduced to 17,311. An important factor ignored by the author is that of the 27,000 policies he cites, only 8,251 could be processed. The balance were being held pending receipt of additional data or funds from the insured. Of the 17,000 conversions pending in February 1949, only 6,537 could be processed without additional information or money. The normal processing time for the 6,500 conversions on hand, which can be processed, is approximately 10 days. A very different picture from that presented by the article.

As for delay in conversion causing lapse or loss of insurance, it takes a far stretch of the imagination to follow this. When each application is received it is acknowledged. This acknowledgment gives the insured his converted insurance number, and tells him where to mail his premium. It also warns him that it is of the "greatest importance that you continue to make premium payments, without regard to notices in connection with insurance."

The number of conversions on hand at any one time during the past year has not exceeded a normal working margin. During the last 10 months of 1948, the VA processed more than 300,000 conversions. This is at the rate of 30,000 a month. The charge that

a quarter of the conversions has been mishandled simply bears no relation to the facts.

When the author says "VA employees handle only 12 conversions a day whereas clerks for the Prudential Insurance Co. clear 32 on the average," he is drawing a comparison which is odious without being significant. Conversions made by VA are received by mail, reviewed, processed, and completed in the home office. Additional correspondence frequently is required. To compare this with conversions of a private company, which usually are prepared in the field under the guidance of an experienced insurance agent, is impossible. It is obvious that conversion cases verified in the field by an expert insurance man, where only the final action has to be taken at the home office, can be handled more rapidly than cases developed entirely by mail. Certainly, if such a comparison is to be attempted the time of the agent must be considered, which apparently was not done in this article.

Paragraph 8, page 62: "Spot checks disclosed that a veteran's monthly premium often was credited to another person. One employee habitually did this because, she said, climbing a ladder to reach the proper record cards made her dizzy. Accounts were marked 'lapsed' where premiums had been paid for months ahead. More than 268,000 veterans who had sent in their premium payments had not had their accounts credited. The employees were 17 days behind in this bookkeeping. But many of these payments probably never would be credited; the basic records covering 167,289 cases could not be found."

VA comment: In an operation the size of VA insurance it is not surprising that payments are occasionally credited to the wrong account. If by his use of the word "often" in this connection the author means to imply it is the usual thing, he is wrong. In numbers there have been too many payments improperly credited. Percentagewise there have been very few. It is impossible to cite exact figures either way.

When the author says one employee habitually credited a veteran's payments to another person because climbing a ladder made her dizzy, he has quoted a story often heard in connection with filing but never proven to VA officials. In any case, the employee would have been foolish to climb the ladder, as all posting trays are at desk level where the clerks may do their work while seated. All the writer seems to have alleged here is that VA had an irresponsible clerk. It is entirely possible such type of person has been employed by VA Insurance Service. That is not sufficient grounds for attacking the loyalty and capability of every VA insurance employee * * * one rotten apple doesn't prove the entire barrel is bad.

The author points out that more than 268,000 veterans who had (at some unstated time) sent in their premium payments had not had their accounts credited. This appears to be intended to point up the inefficiency of the operation as he adds, "The employees were 17 days behind with this bookkeeping." Premium payments do not come in a steady flow; they are more apt to arrive in waves which seem to conform more or less with pay days. It is not at all unusual to have as many as 268,000 payments to be posted. It is about a normal load, and does not represent a 17-day lag.

The VA is geared to handle 2,225,000 premium payments monthly. Considered on the basis of 21 working days to the month, the 268,000 premium payments referred to represent only 2½ days' work, not 17 days.

In his next statement, which is considered important enough to italicize, the author says many of these payments probably will never be posted, as the basic records covering 167,289 cases could not be found. The VA has no idea what he is talking about. It has not and has never had any information or indication that "167,289 cases cannot be found." The system of cross references maintained by VA make it difficult to imagine how such a loss could occur.

There is a remote possibility the author may be referring to "unapplied remittances." If he is, his work in developing his article is quite as inefficient and inaccurate as anything he finds in VA.

One of the most difficult jobs the VA has faced has been to get veterans to identify themselves when sending in insurance premiums. There is a form known as a postal note which, if not signed by the veteran, is no more identifiable than currency. Yet VA has received thousands of these notes, and in addition thousands of envelopes containing currency or checks, with no accompanying information to identify the sender. It has also received thousands of communications from parents and relatives which read somewhat as follows: "Enclosed please find $6.15 to pay my son's insurance."

It is impossible to credit these payments without investigation, sometimes long and involved research. At one time VA had almost two and one-half million such remittances which had not been credited. This number is now less than 200,000. If these are the accounts referred to, the VA can no more be held responsible than could the gas company if you stuck a dollar bill in a plain envelope and mailed it in to pay your bill.

Paragraph 9, page 62: "Some of these records disappeared in the VA's postwar expansion when insurance operations were dispersed to 13 branch offices. Some records went into the trash or were thrown into toilets because employees were irritated at the moving task. When a veteran moves to a different branch jurisdiction, the VA insists upon sending his records after him. With these documents being sent continually around the country and with clerks filing these in the wrong indexes, still more of them are being lost."

VA comment: Since the author repeats the charge that records have been lost, it may be well to repeat that VA has no knowledge of any large-scale loss of records at any time. It may be well to point up that VA insurance records are so kept that should any be misplaced or lost they can be reconstructed.

Since the author specifically points to the transfer of records from New York to the 13 branches, let us specify every instance that endangered records at that time about which the VA has knowledge.

Some time before the move was undertaken a small fire broke out in the New York office. Some records were damaged, but all were reconstructed.

During the move a railway car containing records was sidetracked for some days. It was found and rerouted, with no loss of records. Also during the move a truck containing records overturned on the highway, but none of the records was destroyed or damaged in the accident. In another instance papers were found in a water closet, but these were work sheets and not vital records.

When a veteran moves to a new area, his records are transferred to the office serving the area in which he resides. This is done to give more efficient service to the veterans. Close controls are maintained, and there is no reason to believe there is any likelihood of loss or damage to the records. As for clerks filing these transferred records in the wrong indexes, VA has no knowledge of this happening and does not believe it to be true. There is no reason to file them wrong when it is just as easy to file properly.

Paragraph 10, pages 62 and 63: "John S. Powers, a Government economist, killed accidentally in line of duty January 6, 1948, left his widow a $10,000 policy. Mrs. Powers knows her way through most of Washington's red tape, for she had worked for the State Department and has influential friends in Washington. Yet she and her three children were thrown on the charity of her friends because neither she nor they could work their way through the VA's bureaucratic maze. Nearly 11 months after her husband's death, she still had been unable to collect a dime on the insurance. VA continued to mail monthly bills demanding payments of premiums just as if Mr. Powers were still alive. The widow's plight eventually came to the attention of President Truman through an article in the Washington Post. He personally interceded."

VA comment: This was a bad case. What the author says is a reasonable presentation of events. The fact that it has been quoted so often is an indication that such cases are fairly unusual and are not to be picked off every tree.

Some of the contributing factors in this unfortunate case were:

That Mr. Powers was residing in Berlin and was killed near Paris, which necessitated information being obtained from both Berlin and Paris through military channels.

That Mrs. Powers did not write the VA until 3 months after the death of her husband.

That Mrs. Powers' original letter did not contain sufficient information for payment to be made on the claim.

That VA had to write her for additional information. That this letter, which was sent to the address of record, was returned as unclaimed from Berlin, Germany; the VA meantime waiting to hear from her.

That Mrs. Powers moved from Germany to the United States without informing the VA of her change of address.

That she had a friend in the VA who was an inexperienced adjudicator, and he sidetracked her husband's file in a sincere effort to help her by speeding a pension claim.

That because of these and other factors the VA was unable to get the necessary papers together until mid-August 1948.

That by the time the papers were assembled the case had become so complicated it took a full month to straighten it out.

The mailing of premium notices did continue for some months after the death of Mr. Powers because VA insurance people did not know he was dead. They were discontinued when VA was informed of his death.

Paragraph 11, page 63: "A sample check of the time consumed in clearing 85 death claims in one office disclosed a routine that would require 42 days for form filling by the beneficiary and 73 days of processing by the VA—115 days in all, on the average—before a payment would be made. Most insurance companies settle claims within 15 days. Investigators found that one private insurance company with fewer employees than VA has in a comparable office handled 7 times as many policies, twice as many premium notices, 6 times as many address changes, 8 times as many changes in beneficiaries, and 12 times as many death claims."

VA comment: The figures cited by the author in these 85 cases are correct. There are, however, two points that deserve consideration:

1. There is no specified time required to complete any step in processing a claim. The periods of time cited are simply how long it took on an average in a selected number of cases.

2. Averages in discussing claims settlements are completely misleading. A claim is considered as pending from the instant it is filed and is so carried until it is settled. The length of time it takes claimants to supply required information is an important factor. VA has cases pending that are more than 3 years old; others have been settled in under 2 weeks. An average of these cases would be misleading.

A check of 51 other cases was made in the same office mentioned by the author. It showed an average of 60 days from date of death to delivery of check. This average time breaks down to 29 days for the beneficiary to supply evidence and 31 days for

VA to adjudicate the claims. The shortest period for settlement of a case in this check was 31 days and the longest 102 days. Beneficiaries took up to 45 days to inform VA of death and up to 68 days to supply evidence after it was requested.

Since VA has no first-hand knowledge of the private companies mentioned by the author, it is impossible to make any comparison. But it may be well to remember that required evidence is usually supplied private companies by field agents whereas VA must wait to get this information by mail.

Paragraph 12, page 63: "Officials were proud that by this year they had managed to reduce the backlog of conversion cases by a third—to 17,600—and of the increased payments by a fourth—to 202,000. But in the same time the veterans awaiting reinstatement of their policies rose from 13,000 to more than 24,000. And the veterans awaiting insurance refunds due them increased from 5,000 to 228,000, throwing this work 2 months behind."

VA comment: The conversion cases referred to here were discussed in connection with paragraph 7, but some of the other figures cited have not previously been mentioned. The "increased payments" which he points out as having been reduced by a fourth, to 202,000, are not understood, so cannot be commented on.

The increase in the number of reinstatement cases awaiting processing results from liberal laws expiring and an educational program launched by VA to inform veterans of the value of their insurance. In the last 10 months of 1948 VA processed 1,009,929 applications for reinstatement. This is more than 100,000 a month. At this rate the 24,000 cases used by the author as the pending load represents less than a week's work at most.

The author's statement that "the veterans awaiting insurance refunds increased from 5,000 to 228,000, throwing the work 2 months behind" is statistically correct. But it is only because of VA action anybody found out there were any refunds to be paid.

During the past few months the VA has been conducting a review of its premium account records on both active and lapsed cases. This was done in preparation for the payment of a dividend. This review disclosed that many veterans, while in the armed forces, had paid slightly more on their insurance than they should have. VA is refunding these overpayments at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 a day. In the majority of cases the veterans do not know these refunds are due them. This is especially true since almost all of the refunds are in connection with policies that have lapsed.

Paragraph 13, page 63: "But most depressing was a backlog of more than 6,000 insurance death claims. With the office which handles these settling them in November at the rate of but 355 more per month than the number of new cases being received, it will require 18 months to catch up."

VA comment: Much that is significant in this paragraph was covered in the discussion of paragraph 11 dealing with claims.

In determining that the pending load of insurance death claims will be cleared up in 18 months the author simply divides 355 into 6,000 and comes up with a miracle.

It isn't that easy. These pending cases cannot be settled until the necessary evidence is submitted. Some of the cases cited may have been settled. Others may be settled next week and others may hang fire for months. Many cases have been pending for years. No claim can be settled until all the evidence is in. The case is listed as pending the minute it is received and continues in that classification until settled.

The fact VA is settling more cases every month than it is receiving indicates it has sufficient personnel to handle the current load, in addition to the older cases that may be ready for adjudication each month.

VA has settled almost 600,000 World War II insurance death claims since 1940. This is at the rate of 75,000 a year or 6,250 a month for about 8 years, which does not suggest indifference to service.

Paragraph 14, page 63: "The causes of this woe which afflicts the entire gigantic agency are basic in VA personnel and management. Many employees are so supported by political sponsors whom VA does not want to displease that they are above ordinary administration authority. And, as in any socialized insurance venture, many of the clients have not the slightest conception of their own responsibilities. Checks arrive without proper identification, without even notation as to what they are for. A mother will send in money with a message such as 'Please put this to my son's account—Mrs. Smith,' with the New York postmark the only clue as to who is who."

VA comment: VA is not a political agency. Employees qualify for their jobs under civil-service regulations and retain them under those same regulations.

The comments on the failure of clients to recognize their responsibilities are apparently prompted by the number of unidentified remittances received. These were discussed previously, at which time it was pointed out they once piled up until more than 2,000,000 were on hand. These have now been reduced to less than 200,000. Simplified forms and an educational program have assisted in securing the cooperation of the insured.

Paragraph 15, pages 63 and 64: "VA must handle its every procedure in strict accordance with a variety of rules and regulations and laws, whereas private business ventures need only remain within the law. Because public money is involved, officials must go through elaborate procedures to prevent cheating or go to jail for losses which businessmen would charge off rather than become involved in red tape."

VA comment: The author is correct in his belief that officials must maintain strict accountability in the expenditure of public funds.

Paragraph 16, page 64: "Some 24 veterans' organizations are officially recognized as having the right to represent individual veterans who have business with VA. Approximately 3,600 of these representatives have space in VA offices, sometimes doing business on a basis which enables favors to be repaid with favors. There are instances where these representatives actually are permitted to screen the cases to be handled by VA officials."

VA comment: Recognized veterans' organizations are provided space by VA by virtue of Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress. These representatives do valuable work in preparing the cases of their clients for presentation to VA. In order that they may do this work they are given access to the basic files of the veterans they represent.

If the author knows of any abuses or improper actions in connection with this system VA would appreciate having them reported in detail so corrective steps may be taken.

Paragraph 17, page 64: "The veterans' organizations had so infiltrated the personnel that, in March 1947, VA had to circularize its employees, forbidding them to become officers of organizations recognized in presentation of claims. Scant heed has been paid to the order. The ranks of VA contact officers, adjudicators, and training specialists have been found to be stuffed with elected officers of local posts who thus are in a position to favor their own organization's clients."

VA comment: Veterans make up the great majority of VA employees. They are free to join any or all veterans' organizations for which they are eligible. The so-called order did not prohibit membership or holding office in organizations. It warned against holding office where an employee would be resolving cases presented by his own organization.

Paragraph 18, page 64: "Civil-service rules make it difficult to discharge a VA employee for incompetence. Consider the case of John Doe, who, when his supervisor could abide him no longer, had to be formally accused of 'conduct unbecoming a Government employee.' That was May 1945. For 2 months thereafter the boss, not the employee, was on the hot seat while a VA committee investigated the charges. The final result was a decision that the man should be fired. Instead, though, the Veterans' Administrator put him on probation, instructing his boss to make another report as to his progress in April 1946. This report showed no improvement as to Doe's work and attitude, so a month later all the old charges plus new ones had to be drawn up. This time, after weeks of deliberation, Doe was ordered fired as of June 13, 1946. He appealed, carrying his case to the Civil Service Commission. As a result five VA officials had to spend hours writing affidavits as to their knowledge of the case. That fall 4 days were consumed with hearings requiring the attendance of high VA officials. In March 1947 still more hearings were held. Finally, on December 4, 1947—2 years and 7 months after his boss had tried to fire Doe—the Civil Service Commission notified the Veterans' Administration that Doe could be discharged."

VA comment: Since the author does not name the employee, VA cannot discuss the case. The subject of the paragraph is actually civil-service requirements under which VA must operate and not the VA itself.

Paragraph 19, page 64: "The new executives brought into the VA by General Bradley have often found themselves in the untenable position of having responsibility without authority. Many have quit in disgust, leaving the field clear to prewar mossbacks. The ranks of these old fogies are solidifying, owing to promotions which the investigators found are almost always based on length of service rather than ability. Thus the top of the VA is clogged with executives who, being unfamiliar with modern methods, bitterly oppose them."

VA comment: Until branch offices were eliminated February 1, 1949, the organization of VA was exactly that set up by General Bradley and under which any people who came with him entered VA. In view of this it is difficult to see what the writer has in mind. Actually this paragraph seems to be devoted principally to name calling, an easy way to avoid specifics.

The idea that length of service disqualifies a person is rather unique. Seniority is generally recognized and rewarded outside Government. The author's conclusion that VA opposes modern methods does not jibe with the facts. Thousands of able executives from outside Government have entered VA since the war, and the organization is using "machine methods" in many operations where they have been found effective.

Paragraph 26, pages 64 and 65: "The investigators found that the lower strata of executives take their cue from those above, adding to their importance and ratings by splitting jobs into infinitesimal parts so that they require retinues of assistants, then resist any action reorganizing their activities which will reduce the number of people under them. Moreover, because of the difficulty of discharging an undesirable employee, the bosses are reluctant to initiate disciplinary action. The far easier way is to give excellent efficiency marks to the most incompetent workers, thus qualifying them for transfer to better positions."

VA comment: This paragraph represents the conclusions of the author or the investigators whom he mentions. Its value would have to be determined on the basis of his qualifications to have an opinion. On this

point VA has no knowledge. It is used chiefly as a springboard to the next paragraph.

Paragraph 21, page 65: "The result of such practices is poor morale and an exodus of employees who are good enough to find jobs elsewhere: 42 out of every 100 employees hired by the VA refuse to stay employed as long as a year."

VA comment: The author says 42 out of every 100 employees hired by VA refuse to stay hired as long as a year. This is offered as a horrible example.

VA figures show the annual turnover to be 34.8 percent, an average of 2.9 percent a month for 1948. This was the average for the entire Government.

Bureau of Labor statistics figures show that it compares with an average turnover of 4.4 percent per month for private industry.

Paragraph 22, page 65: "Such a situation makes of VA a sanctuary for the incompetent. Yet the investigators found that VA's organizational plan is unworkably complicated. The legislation which says a veteran is entitled to educational benefits under certain conditions fills less than nine pages of print. But the VA bureaucrat who has to determine whether veteran John Smith is eligible has to consider 497 pages of regulations, 120 pages of correspondence from the Washington office, plus 77 pages of regulations from his branch office and 300 pages from his section chief—many of them in difficult, obtuse wording. Altogether he has 994 pages of instructions to ponder over and a choice of 69 forms which he can throw at a veteran."

VA comment: The statement that the VA "organizational plan is unworkably complicated" is patently untrue. It is working. Its organization is certainly unusual in Government. VA is very nearly the only Federal agency that has an integrated organization. The others are confederacies of bureaus. The functions of VA originally were conducted by five separate bureaus or agencies. This arrangement was found so unsatisfactory that these agencies were brought together and integrated by act of Congress.

There are four separate and distinct educational programs being administered by VA. The laws setting these up are not quite so simple as the author suggests. He is entirely right, however, when he says the directives of various kinds are much more voluminous than the laws. The laws grant veterans the right to undertake training under certain broad conditions. The regulations must fit these conditions to specific situations, of which there are many. When the program first began expanding, at the time of demobilization, VA was required to fit the laws to many different situations and prescribe procedures for each. Simplification of these regulations and directives has been under way for months. All but a handful of service and station letters have been canceled. Branch office directives are being canceled as rapidly as possible. But there will always be more pages of regulation than there are of law. Every amendment to the basic laws must be implemented by new regulations.

The statement that the "VA employee has a choice of 69 forms to throw at the veteran" is incorrect. The veteran fills out one form when he applies for training and on entering his course fills out from one to three additional forms. The exact number depends on the type of course to be followed.

Paragraph 23, page 65: "Little people who are displeased with their lives sometimes make the most of their miserable authority by pushing veterans around. The investigators note there have been 'improper practices by regional offices in discouraging veterans with legitimate appeals from submitting them, and canceling appeals without proper authority.' This is extremely serious. No one knows what heartbreak has resulted from this denial of legitimate opportunity."

VA comment: If the practices outlined in this paragraph are being followed they should be reported specifically as they would be violations of both regulation and law. VA regulations require that when a veteran's application is disapproved he must be informed in writing of his right to appeal the decision to the Administrator. This right of appeal is granted the veteran by law.

Notices of this kind are mailed to veterans from VA offices throughout the country daily. Any violation is punishable by discipline or dismissal.

Paragraphs 24, 25, 26, page 65: "It must not be concluded from all this that everyone in VA is incompetent or lacks conscience. At the request of the House Appropriations Committee last year, J. R. Galbraith, chief of VA's Inspection and Investigation Service, told of many things wrong with the VA and made recommendations for correcting them.

"Galbraith declared that in VA offices some employees not only 'flagrantly' violate rules requiring them to put in a full working day, but habitually arrive late, bringing magazines and newspapers so they can better while away their time. Such goldbricking, he said, involves all classes from clerks to lawyers and doctors.

"Galbraith suggested 'radical surgery' on the 13 branch offices, stating that they 'have attempted to expand each and every service beyond needs,' that like the central office they have been 'aggressive in staffing' with 'indications of a desire to build an empire.' "

VA comment: Mr. Galbraith never testified before the House Appropriations Committee on the things attributed to him in this article. Here are the facts: He was asked by an official of VA to submit his personal views of what was wrong in VA and what should be done about it. This confidential communication, which was the opinion of one man, was submitted to a committee investigation at his request and in confidence. The one constructive suggestion contained in the quoted portion has to do with the elimination of 13 branch offices. This has been done.

Paragraph 27, page 66: "The Hoover Commission investigators contend the Veterans' Administration could be conducted a lot more efficiently if branch offices were consolidated and thousands of employees were eliminated. The Trundle Co. experts have evolved a reorganization program which would streamline the top-heavy agency. They calculate that by doing away with unnecessary office space and firing 7,000 surplus supervisors and 14,100 other employees—21,100 in all—the veterans could obtain better service at a saving to the taxpayers of $75,000,000 a year. That is 25 percent of the present pay roll."

VA comment: The branch offices again. They have been eliminated; in fact were eliminated before the article appeared; and virtually everybody in VA had been certain for at least 6 months they were going to be eliminated. This elimination calls for a reduction of 2,500 employees before the end of this fiscal year. The proposed budget, now before the Congress, calls for a further reduction of 10,000 man years. This same budget calls for a reduction of nearly $90,000,000, approximately 24 percent from the current fiscal year in funds for general administrative expenses.

Paragraph 28, page 66: "Summing up, however, the Hoover Commission's representatives view the situation pessimistically. They say that firing people alone as the result of outside pressure never can result in the remainder doing more work unless these people can be 'welded by some magic of top personality into a working team.' "

VA comment: The author says these are the conclusions of the Hoover Commission. If so, they have been or will be presented to the Congress of the United States for action. The Congress will decide upon their acceptability.

Paragraph 29, page 66: "In another decade it is estimated that the number of veterans and their dependents will have grown from their present 46,000,000 to include 62,500,000 persons, or 40 percent of the entire population, with Congress likely to expand rather than contract the benefits. Under existing laws our veterans alone received nineteen billions through 1947. It is estimated that the cost of maintaining the current program through just the next 10 years will require an outlay of forty-seven billions."

VA comment: This paragraph suggests a certain amount of crystal gazing and involves national policy in the future. VA does not feel qualified to comment on it.

Paragraph 30, page 66: "The least which can be demanded is that the Veterans' Administration be compelled to increase its efficiency so that veterans shall receive that which Congress intended for them and the Nation not go bankrupt because of a fantastic bureaucracy."

VA comment: Even if you accept everything the author has said previously you would still have to "swallow a camel" to go along with this paragraph.

One basis for determining the efficiency of an operation is the relationship of handling costs to the total volume of money handled. On this basis the VA is operating on less than 5 percent which is more efficient than most commercial or industrial organizations.

VA contends that veterans are and have been receiving the benefits the Congress has voted for them.

VA further contends that one of the most fantastic conclusions in the article is that the Nation that can stand the more than 95 percent of future benefits voted for veterans will go bankrupt because of the less than 5 percent needed to operate a fantastic bureaucracy.

Paragraph 31, page 66: "People who regard the pension, insurance, hospital care, educational aid, and other benefits being given veterans as idealistic forerunners of a new socialistic order for the entire population would do well to ponder what is happening at VA."

VA comment: VA agrees with the writer that the entire Nation would do well to ponder anything on which it spending billions of dollars. The VA is the creation of the people acting through their Congress, and the VA believes both the people and the Congress did ponder carefully before providing the benefits that have been granted veterans.

VA is exactly what its name implies * * * the administrator of laws enacted by the Congress for veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries. It is responsible to the people of the United States for its fidelity in carrying out those laws. It fully recognizes this responsibility and welcomes comment or criticism that will help keep the people fully and honestly informed as to its activities.

Addresses on the Occasion of the Conferral of the Degree of Doctor of Humanities on the President of the United States by Rollins College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 8th of this month one of the great colleges of this country, Rollins College, at

Winter Park, Fla., conferred upon the President of the United States, most fittingly, the degree of doctor of humanities. The degree was conferred by Dr. Hamilton Holt, president of Rollins College. The public orator on that occasion was the distinguished Governor of Florida, Hon. Fuller Warren. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD the outstanding, fitting, and distinguished addresses made on that occasion by the Governor of Florida, as public orator; the president of Rollins College; and the President of the United States, as the recipient of the degree.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Governor Warren, President Holt, distinguished educators, and all the friends of this great school:

This is for me a very happy and a very solemn occasion. The Governor's address was a masterpiece. He has stated admirably the problems with which we are faced.

This visit brings to realization a hope that I have long entertained. I am deeply sensitive of the honor which this college has bestowed upon me.

Rollins College has served the State of Florida and the Nation faithfully and well through more than three score years. I shall always treasure the memory of this day and the parchment which admits me into the noble society of Rollins alumni. The men and women which this institution has given the world now for sixty-odd years have upheld the ideals of democracy wherever they have found their life work.

It gives me special pleasure by my presence here today to bear witness to the debt which we owe to the man who has guided the destinies of Rollins College for almost a quarter of a century.

Since he assumed the presidency of this institution, Dr. Holt has made it a focal point in our effort to educate American youth in principles of freedom under true democracy. You know, there is not a word in any language that has been so severely abused during the last 10 years as that word democracy. Some people make a travesty of the word. It is one of the greatest words in the history of the English language and it should stand for just exactly what we mean when we say democracy, and not for a counterfeit.

Dr. Holt has brought to his work distinguished leadership with a background of accomplishment in many fields. Although he will soon retire from active academic work, he will continue his labors for peace and international good will.

Never before has this country needed as it does today the leadership of thoroughly trained men and women. We must have leaders inspired from their earliest years with the ideals of true democracy.

Education is our first line of defense. In the conflict of principle and policy which divides the world today, America's hope—our hope—the hope of the world, is in education. Through education alone can we combat the tenets of communism. The unfettered soul of free man offers a spiritual defense unconquered and unconquerable.

We may not know what is behind the iron curtain, but we do know that the intelligence of the people in the embattled democracies of Europe, who live in front of the iron curtain, is the world's best hope for peace today.

Education is the most important task before us. The Congress should enact legislation authorizing Federal grants to the States to assist in meeting the operating expenses of elementary and secondary schools. There is general agreement that such aid can be given without interference with State responsibility for the scope and content of the teaching.

If our country is to retain its freedom in a world of conflicting political philosophies, we must take steps to assure that every American youth shall receive the highest level of training by which he can profit.

A soundly conceived Federal scholarship program in our colleges and universities is a necessary step in attaining this goal.

Education has been defined as a bulwark against the acids of fascism and communism. Neither of these totalitarian forms of government can survive examination by educated men and women—men and women free to search for the truth and imbued with the principles of liberty set forth in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States—the greatest document of government, in my opinion, that has ever been written by the hand of man. That Constitution gives us the rule by which to live together in peace. It gives us the means to see that justice comes to every man, be he big or be he small, be he rich or be he poor.

If this great institution will continue to turn out leaders, I am not at all afraid of what the next generation in the world will bring forth. We are working for peace. We want peace. We pray all the time for peace in the world. And to attain that peace, we must all learn how to live together peaceably, and do to our neighbors as we would have our neighbors do to us. Then we will have a happy world, and that's what we want.

ADDRESS BY HON. FULLER WARREN, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA

A man who has been elevated to the highest position in the gift of the Nation by the untrammeled suffrage of all the people needs no introduction to this or any other American assembly. Whether the name of Harry S. Truman will echo down the corridors of time, whether he is marking or making an epoch in human progress, will not and cannot be decided today. Contemporary praise or blame is not the verdict of history.

But this we do know: The man who holds the office of President of the United States occupies the most exalted political position on earth. Not only is he the chosen leader and the servant of a free people, but he is their constituted spokesman in the affairs of the world.

Whether in politics, economics, ethics, or religion, a man may think and act as a reactionary, a conservative, a liberal or a radical. President Truman is liberal. What are the great liberal issues now before our people and all peoples that must engage the attention of statesmen? At least three of these are transcendent, and in each one of them President Truman has already played the role of leader. They are, in brief, the race issue, the economic issue and the peace issue. They are all fundamentally issues of justice.

The race issue is the issue of how to substitute helpfulness and hopefulness for hatefulness and despair in those regions here and abroad where two or more races live together in the same or proximate territories.

The economic issue is largely the issue of distribution. The human race can now produce enough to feed, clothe, and shelter every man, woman, and child in the civilized portions of the earth. But we have not yet learned how to distribute these blessings equitably. Surely the brains and the will power exist to work out an economy which will bring our people and all peoples to a planned and disciplined plenty, and this when accomplished will banish the curse of poverty from the earth.

The peace movement is nothing but the substitution in the international realm of law for war. We have substituted law for war within nations. But between nations the only final way for a sovereign state to assure its rights is by use of force, when applied by one nation to another is war. In other words, the nations of the world are in that state of evolution where, without a qualm, they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner in which they would put their own subjects to death for imitating. Surely in an atomic age the peoples of the earth will not cease working for a "more perfect union," whose goal will be some sort of a world government with sovereign powers over states and peoples.

But its history, by its material power, by its moral prestige and by the genius of its people the United States is the key to these great issues. President Truman, by virtue of his office, is the key to the United States. It is for these reasons we have assembled here this morning to honor our President for giving his all in his commanding, but lonely, office to lead our country, and through our country the world, to higher and happier levels where justice and peace abide.

Mr. President, I have the honor to present to you Harry S. Truman for the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities.

ADDRESS BY DR. HAMILTON HOLT, PRESIDENT OF ROLLINS COLLEGE

Harry S. Truman, it is not because you have put social ideals above material considerations; it is not because you have understood the human and spiritual problems of the millions of unknown men and women both here and abroad whose voices seem never to be heard; it is not because you have already followed the vision of a better land and a better world; it is not for these considerations alone that Rollins would honor you today. It is rather because of our faith in what you are yet to do that we, the representatives of Florida's seven institutions of higher learning, unite this morning to honor you.

As a pledge of our faith in laws yet to be drafted, in State papers yet to be written; as a pledge of our faith in your continuing and enlarging statesmanship-to-be, Rollins College confers upon you the degree of doctor of humanities and admits you to all its rights and privileges.

Time To Discuss Atlantic Treaty Demanded of Senate by Churchmen

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of March 15, 1949:

TIME TO DISCUSS ATLANTIC TREATY DEMANDED OF SENATE BY CHURCHMEN

The Protestant community in the United States has demanded that the American people be given ample opportunity to discuss the proposed North Atlantic defense pact before final action is taken by the Senate.

This demand was voiced by the 465 delegates who attended the National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order. These delegates were drawn from 48 Protestant communions and allied religious organizations, and came together at the call of the department of international justice and

PLAY LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

good will of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The assembled churchmen, following a 2-hour off-the-record presentation by Charles E. Bohlen of the State Department, made clear the fact that many questions would have to be answered before a final judgment could be given on this crucial issue of American foreign policy. With the Right Reverend William Scarlett, of St. Louis, in the chair, the conference declined to take a stand for or against the pact.

APPEAL TO SENATE

"The Atlantic Pact is now in the process of negotiation," the conference said. "We do not take a position with regard to that proposed pact because its final text is not now available to us and because there is no opportunity for this conference to study its principles and consider its implications.

"We call upon the United States Senate not to take final action on this pact until the American people have had opportunity to gain full understanding of its meaning."

From this point the Protestant churchmen went on to declare that regional pacts could add to the total of common security if they are genuinely within the universal framework of the United Nations; if they are based upon a natural community of interest and are, in fact, designed and operated to promote the general welfare of participating nations. Conversely, it was the unanimous judgment of the conference that "such pacts can add to insecurity if their words conceal what is essentially a military alliance which might validly appear to others to be aggressive."

The proposed pact was only one phase of the broader problem of Soviet-American relations discussed by the conference. In their message to the churches the Protestant religious leaders affirmed their conviction that war with the Soviet Union is not inevitable. Such a war was held to be improbable "given proper use by the United States of its power."

"The just society," it was said, "is impregnable to communism, which, although it may lift some burdens, fastens upon the common people other burdens grievous to be borne. Our major attention, accordingly, should be directed to establishing justice within the conditions of freedom throughout the earth."

DULLES GIVES KEYNOTE

Earlier in the keynote speech of the conference, John Foster Dulles, Presbyterian layman and member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, had declared that "so far as it is humanly possible to judge, the Soviet Government, under conditions now prevailing, does not contemplate the use of war as an instrument of its national policy. I do not know any responsible high official, military or civilian, in this Government or any other government, who believes that the Soviet state now plans conquest by open military aggression."

With this judgment the conference agreed. There was a disposition, however, to be critical of what was felt to be the undue influence exercised by the military in the formulation of American foreign policy.

"We do not reflect upon the patriotism nor the sincere desire for peace of the leadership of our armed forces," it was said. "Their professional training, however, does not qualify them to lay down the strategy for peace and to calculate the risks that always have to be taken for peace if we are to win it just as risks have to be taken in war for victory."

The conference deplored the seeming lack of a basic national strategy for peace. Lacking, too, it was said, is coordination sufficient to insure that all forms of official activity, whether military or civilian, fit into that strategy to insure its success.

KEEP DOORS OPEN

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of New York, who presided over the conference section on The Churches and American Policy in Europe, urged that the doors of direct negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States be kept open. In addition to formal diplomatic negotiation, Bishop Oxnam proposed an interchange of religious, educational, business, and labor leaders between the two countries.

No skepticism regarding the achievements of the United Nations was heard during the 4 days of the Cleveland conference. Delegates called upon the people of the United States to give the United Nations their moral support and to make apparent to the Government their desire that the United Nations be not by-passed at any time. Delegates voiced approval of the policies pursued by the United States in the United Nations on questions related to the independence of the Korean and Indonesian peoples.

It was also affirmed that the goal of multilateral and balanced reduction of armaments, subject to adequate international inspection and control, should be kept at the forefront of our National policy.

CONFERENCE REFUSES

Several delegates sought to have the conference declare itself in favor of one or another of the world government proposals currently being debated across the country. This the conference refused to do. That section of the conference dealing with the United Nations, while conceding that world government was a goal to which the churches should aspire, insisted that the agitation to establish world government now was a dangerous procedure.

Waltham Case Seen Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Lawrence R. Goldberg which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post newspaper, Sunday, March 13, 1949.

This story graphically depicts the disintegration of the American watch-manufacturing industry to the particular detriment of our vital national defense resources.

It is my earnest hope that every Member of this House will carefully read this article and be convinced that this Congress is morally bound to adopt adequate measures for the protection of our American working people and the preservation of our vital defense structure.

The article follows:

WALTHAM CASE SEEN TRAGEDY—CONTINUING WATCH FIRM ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE—FORCES NEED SPECIAL TIMING INSTRUMENTS

(By Lawrence R. Goldberg)

The more one delves through the fact file of the American Watch Institute, the more one becomes convinced that the closing down of our Waltham Watch Co. is one of the top tragedies of the American system of watch manufacturing.

The truth of this becomes evident when one realizes that although all types of manufactured goods, such as automobiles, electrical appliances, etc., have been produced in important quantities in all industrial countries of the world, the United States and Switzerland are the only two who have succeeded in developing a jeweled watch industry of any importance.

Continuation of the Waltham Watch Co. is essential to the defense of not only the United States but of the whole western democratic world. This can be seen clearly in the following facts:

UNABLE TO FUNCTION

Without special timing instruments of extremely high precision, a modern military establishment would be virtually unable to function. This is true in an absolute sense in the case of long-range air and naval operations. (The basic concepts of modern Western Hemisphere defense.)

Such timing instruments can be produced (in quantity, at any rate) in only two countries of the world, the United States and Switzerland. Should the productive capacity of either of these be allowed to decline, or disappear altogether, the worldwide balance of military potential would be seriously altered.

Switzerland is in the opposite hemisphere from the United States. In the past war, all shipments of military timing instruments from Switzerland to the Allies were cut off. It may be said, then, that the defense of the United States and of the community of nations associated with us supposes the existence and dictates the growth of the American jeweled watch industry.

ONLY CONTACT OF SUBS

Accurate timepieces are indispensable in the operation of military aircraft and submarines. When a submarine is submerged, its time instruments are just about its only contact with things in the outside world. Without a drift sight and meter, the radio compass, the octant, and accurate timepieces, a long-range bomber would be helpless. An aerial navigator is generally equipped with two master navigation watches and a hack (wrist) watch.

The master watches must be accurate to a fraction of a second, and are checked regularly with the time signals from Greenwich or the Naval Observatory in Washington. (The fact that the navy maintains an observatory demonstrates the fact that time is of the essence in naval operations. If a navigator's watch should be as little as four seconds off when he takes a celestial shot with his octant, his plane would be a mile off its course.

In an artillery barrage, seconds of time may mean the difference between success and failure, even of life and death, to our own forces who may be required to move into an area synchronously with the forward creep of the bombardment. The same is true of integrated air-ground attacks.

START INSPECTION SYSTEM

In fact, virtually all operations of a mechanized nature, whether military or otherwise, must be founded on a precise measurement of time. In the 1880's, when the mounting number of railroad accidents was shocking the Nation, one of the first and most effective remedies found was the establishment of the watch-inspection system. Today a railroader must own a watch which meets certain specifications (it must, incidentally, be an Elgin, Hamilton, or Waltham) and he must submit this watch for inspection every 2 weeks. The critical importance of timing was thus recognized in efficient and safe railroading.

The story of marine chronometers is, perhaps, the most vivid illustration of this necessity. Modern naval operations (and ocean navigation generally) requires that ships be equipped with timekeeping instruments whose rate is constant to the minutest fractions of a second.

The marine chronometer, a special timepiece of marvelous accuracy, was first developed around the middle of the eighteenth century to serve this purpose. Up until the time of the United States entry into the last war, the navies of the world depended

largely on Switzerland and England for their supply of marine chronometers.

They were individually designed and made carefully by hand; the yearly production scarcely exceeded 300 or 400. After Pearl Harbor, which was the signal for the unparalleled expansion of our naval forces, Switzerland, the major sources of supply of marine chronometers, was entirely cut off. If this eventuality had not been anticipated, the situation would have been of crisis proportions.

The only place to turn was the American jeweled watch industry, which until then had never manufactured a marine chronometer. But to the immense relief of the United States Navy (and Allied navies) an American watch manufacturer, alerted in 1940, had had time to tool up and was able to produce thousands of chronometers in an unbelievably short time.

PROVIDE MANY ITEMS

The first, in fact, was delivered only 3 months after Pearl Harbor. The American manufacturer also improved the design of marine chronometer and the American-made instruments have set an entirely new standard of excellence for performance in the field. By 1945, a second American company was ready to produce marine chronometers had they been needed.

The essentiality of the American jeweled watch industry in national defense is not limited to the production of accurate military timepieces alone. Dozens of items of direct military consequence were manufactured for the government or its contractors during the war by the jeweled watch industry. Many war implements require precision manufacture of which the jeweled watch manufacturers alone are capable.

Other industries, such as aircraft, automobile, and one or two more, work occasionally to tolerances as close as those habitual in the jeweled watch industry, but this industry alone uses these tolerances in the manufacture of tiny parts, so tiny that they can scarcely be grasped by the naked eye. No other industry has this know-how, nor can obtain it short of long years of manufacturing experience.

From 1942 to the last months of 1945, the American jeweled-watch industry manufactured no watches for the civilian market but devoted itself exclusively to the production of war materials. Despite this fact, this industry in some cases needed as much as 2 years to meet the engineering and tooling requirements on certain new products which were needed by the military forces and which no other industry was qualified to undertake. If the industry had been large enough to support a greater management engineering and tooling organization, these products could have been supplied much faster and the military striking power of the Allies enhanced in a critical hour in history.

The evolution of the American system of watch manufacture can be illustrated by a single comparison. In 1809, Luther Goddard began the manufacture of watches in Shrewsbury, Mass. By the time he had retired in 1817, he had produced about 500 watches. This was the largest number of watches ever produced by an American manufacturer up to that time. By 1905, a single American watch manufacturer was able, through the use of power-driven machinery, to produce several thousand watches in a single day.

INDUSTRY REVOLUTIONIZED

Within that span of years the art of watchmaking had been completely revolutionized. It was the work, of course, of many hundreds of engineers and technicians. One man among them, however, was particularly notable, a New Englander, Aaron L. Dennison, who is generally celebrated as "the father of American watch manufacture."

In watch manufacture over 700 different sizes of materials and over 140 different metallic alloys are employed.

The base plate or foundation of a watch contains 42 holes, many of which must be accurate in size to one ten-thousandth of an inch and accurate in their location on the plate to three ten-thousandths of an inch. Over 100 operations are required in making such a plate.

The smallest screw used in a watch looks like a speck of dust to the naked eye; it is twenty-sixth one-thousandths of an inch long, weighs one and one-third one-hundred-thousandths of an ounce. Twenty thousand of them will barely fill a thimble. Yet each must be perfectly threaded and slotted.

The wire used to manufacture hairsprings for a lady's watch is approximately four-thousandths of an inch wide and three-quarters of a thousandth of an inch thick. The tolerance on width is five one-hundred-thousandths of an inch and on thickness the tolerance is one one-hundred-thousandth of an inch. Five strands of this wire stacked together would equal the thickness of a human hair.

FOUR THOUSAND OPERATIONS REQUIRED

There are about 4,000 operations in the manufacture of a fine American watch, of which a large percentage are necessary inspections. As one American manufacturer puts it, "almost half of the operations are inspections, of which 20 percent are inspections of inspections. In this plant there is one inspector for every six production workers."

Over 60 American companies have started out in the manufacture of jeweled watches, but only three—Elgin National Watch Co. (Elgin and Aurora, Ill., and Lincoln, Nebr.), Hamilton Watch Co. (Lancaster, Pa.), and Waltham Co. (Waltham, Mass.) have survived. All are over 50 years old.

Four American manufacturers of clocks and other time instruments make clock-type wrist and pocket watches, most of which are nonjeweled. These are General Time Instruments Corp., E. Ingraham Co., New Haven Clock & Watch Co., and United States Time Corp.

Bulova Watch Co., an importer of movements from Switzerland, manufactures an undisclosed number of jeweled watch movements in the United States.

The following figures show those with imported movements, and those manufactured by Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, from 1936 to 1947 (excluding watches of one jewel or none):

	Imports	Elgin, Hamilton, Waltham
1936	2,131,000	1,396,000
1937	2,947,000	1,504,000
1938	2,135,000	965,000
1939	2,700,000	1,290,000
1940	3,267,000	1,484,000
1941	4,169,000	1,886,000
1942	5,107,000	885,000
1943	7,609,000	271,000
1944	6,754,000	174,000
1945	8,709,000	618,000
1946	9,039,000	1,124,000
1947	7,357,000	1,582,000

From 1942 up to the last months of 1945, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham manufactured no watches for the civilian market, their full production being donated to war work.

NEED YEARS OF TRAINING

One of the great dangers to national defense is to ignore the shutting down of the Waltham Watch Co. Its personnel cannot be replaced on short notice. The ability to work to such fine tolerances with minute parts, as are present in this highly specialized industry, can be acquired only after many years of training, and careful initial selection on the basis of psychological and physical fitness.

There are only 10,000 such personnel in all America—one-third of them being attached to Waltham. This personnel attended special schools designed to make them specialists, and were participants for many years in extensive training courses conducted within the plant.

Selection of such personnel involves careful psychological testing and requires even an analysis of the chemical characteristics of the applicants' body. (For example: A person whose perspiration is excessively acid can spoil hundreds of precision implements while still uncased by merely being in close proximity of them for a period of time.)

Every one of the Waltham employees is an essentiality in our national defense.

With all democratic countries throughout the world now being alerted to a third world war, and America spending billions in defense measures, it would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, to assume that the shut-down of the Waltham Watch Co. is just another financial failure.

There is much more than meets the human eye in the knocking over of this tremendously essential, highly specialized, industry. Let's not wait until it is too late to make this discovery.

Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Greatest Danger: Financial Rocks Ahead," published in the Detroit Free Press of February 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DISGRACE—OUR GREATEST DANGER: FINANCIAL ROCKS AHEAD

This country is faced with the gravest danger in its history.

It is a disaster worse than war.

For we have always been able before to rebuild after war and to grow mightier.

That time has gone.

The imminent danger with which we are confronted transcends all political differences.

It is not a question of Republicans against Democrats or New Dealers against Old Dealers. It is not a conflict between unions and management. It has nothing to do with the progress of social security, national health or any other controversial question.

The cold stark ugly fact is that the United States is rapidly drifting into national bankruptcy.

Unless something is done to stem the tide we will be, within a very few years, no better off than the nations of Europe.

It is this condition for which the Moscow Communists are patiently and hopefully waiting.

They know what is coming unless we wake up. They can well afford to wait.

Who will be responsible for this national collapse?

Let's be honest about it. We have all been guilty.

No party, no class, no group has brought these conditions about.

We have drifted into it from generation to generation.

The insidious enemy which is serving Moscow as the deadliest of fifth columnists is mismanagement.

It is bitterly ironic—but a great laugh for Stalin—that America upon whose altars we have placed the god of efficiency is dying of dryrot because of gross and stupid inefficiency.

The most powerful business corporation in the United States would go into bankruptcy within a year if it were so wretchedly managed as is the business of our Federal Government today.

There is this difference, however: The private corporation, mismanaged and criminally extravagant, would pay for its own sins and go broke; but the Government does not go out of business. It simply borrows more money which has to be paid through taxation until all business ceases, the factories remain idle and the people starve.

That is the history of all mismanaged nations since civilization began.

We are now rapidly coming to that period.

Only courage and vision can save us.

Again, this newspaper states as emphatically as possible: This is not a party issue.

We are the victims of our own follies and the follies of past generations.

The guilt rests with both parties and all classes. We thought our wealth would never end.

Today the President of the United States, a Democrat, is working shoulder to shoulder with the only living ex-President, a Republican, to save America.

Never in all our history has there been a more completely nonpolitical approach to the prevention of so great a tragedy. Here, in brief, is the picture:

Eighteen years ago it cost $4,600,000,000 to run the Federal Government.

Today it costs $41,858,000,000.

Under President Hoover there were 300 agencies.

Today there are 1,800.

The reason for this?

Lack of organization and the fight of the bureaucrats of both parties to block reform.

In 1931 Hoover begged Congress to give him authority to get the Government on a working basis. Both Republicans and Democrats rejected the proposal for just one reason:

It might affect the soft jobs of political parasites of both parties.

Ten times Hoover pleaded and 10 times was he refused.

Red tape was killing the Nation.

When Roosevelt came in he was granted powers to meet the depression emergency, but when he asked for power to reorganize he was met with the same stone wall of personal selfish opposition.

With the second war over in 1945 it was obvious to everybody regardless of party affiliations that something had to be done.

President Truman and the Congress agreed.

To eliminate politics it was also agreed that there should be six Democrats and six Republicans on a Commission to draw up a plan of reform.

It was unanimously agreed that Herbert Hoover was the one man in all the United States best qualified to head the group.

Mr. Hoover is 73 years of age. He has no political ambitions of any kind. Regardless of party lines he has served the Nation under President Truman faithfully and brilliantly both in war and peace.

The Commission has drawn the best brains from all walks of life in the United States.

Never before, not even in time of war, has there been such a galaxy of experts on management.

For 2 years these experts have studied our Government. Now they have ready 15 separate reports. All of these mesh into one magnificent presentation of what is needed to save us from national bankruptcy, and to meet Moscow.

No American of intelligence can read these reports without gasping in horror at our dangers.

Yet there is a grave possibility that the greatest task of its kind ever accomplished in the history of America will go for naught.

The mean and petty politicians of both parties are seeking to destroy it for their own selfish ends.

As Hoover stated to the Senate committee, the danger is as it was in all other such efforts, "They died of grasshopper bites."

Here, then, is the call to the American people of every honest shade of political belief.

Here is the challenge to save us from the fate for which Moscow is waiting.

Shall we continue to drift?

Or shall we be aroused in time by a mighty outburst of public sentiment?

The people of America have crusaded for war bonds, for Red Cross, for Community Chests, for every worthy effort devised by the mind of man.

Twice in one generation they have gone to war to fight for human liberty. They have poured forth the lifeblood of their youth and their treasure. They have willingly and without protest taken upon their backs the most staggering burden of debt history has ever recorded.

Has all this been in vain?

The Bible has said that where there is no vision the people perish.

Will the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the AFL and the CIO, the church leaders of all denominations, every civic-minded group, every noonday club, every individual citizen, unite as we have always done in war, to campaign against the evil which is destroying us?

Will there come a clarion call for battle?

Only public opinion can save the United States from the bureaucrats who stifle us.

The politicians of neither party will move unless they hear the mighty roar of an aroused populace. That is what they dread, the only thing they fear.

"Public sentiment is everything," said Lincoln. "With public sentiment nothing can fail. Without it nothing can succeed."

Our one hope is the people themselves.

Facing the Communist horde, surrounded as we are by darkness and chaos across the world, this must be a holy crusade, a fight for God, for country, and for humanity.

Trouble Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post of March 14, 1949, entitled "Trouble Ahead," relating to John L. Lewis' order to suspend mining of coal east of the Mississippi for a 2-week memorial period.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROUBLE AHEAD

The Lewis order to suspend mining east of the Mississippi for a 2-week memorial period will distress miners who will be deprived of their pay and result in loss of revenue and lay-offs by coal-carrying railroads. But with coal stock piles at the highest level reached since 1942, demands for coal slackening and prices slipping, many coal operators will welcome the shut-down, while industrial activity in general will not be seriously affected. Nevertheless, this strike, which Mr. Lewis, by a distorted interpretation of the UMW wage contract, insists is an authorized stoppage, constitutes a threat to the national welfare. For it is a demonstration aimed at coercion of the Senate of the United States—the latest move in the long fight waged by the mine leader to block confirmation of the appointment of Dr. James Boyd as director of the Federal Bureau of Mines.

We hope Senator O'MAHONEY is right in his belief that this arrogant attempt to dictate to the Senate will insure favorable action on the nomination by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which he is chairman. But, regardless of the fate of Dr. Boyd, this latest move of Mr. Lewis is a reminder of the dangerous consequences of depriving the Government of the right to resort to injunctive relief in case of national emergency strikes. For the strike just called is only a preliminary skirmish serving the dual purpose of a demonstration against Dr. Boyd and a means of strengthening Mr. Lewis' bargaining power when the negotiation of a new contract gets under way this spring. By reducing the size of coal stock piles, and possibly preventing further reductions in coal prices, the UMW would be in a better position to press for another round of wage increases and benefits and to enforce its demands by calling another strike that would really create a national emergency.

At present the injunction weapon makes it possible for the Administration to delay a strike for at least 80 days. But the pending labor bill with its feeble provision for a 30-day cooling-off period while a Presidential fact-finding board is investigating the dispute, would not put any compulsion on unions to refrain from striking during the 30 days, and the recommendations of such boards would be purely advisory. If he were freed from the restraints of the Taft-Hartley emergency strike provisions, Mr. Lewis could close the mines until transportation tie-ups and industrial shutdowns either forced the mine operators to sign a new contract on his terms or else compelled the Government to intervene as a last resort to protect the public interest.

Rice W. Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rice W. Means," published in a recent issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine. The editorial relates to Rice W. Means, one of the founders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a distinguished Member of this body for a number of years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICE W. MEANS

Rice W. Means, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a member of the founders' group which organized

the Army of the Philippines in Denver, Colo., in 1899, died at his home in Denver January 30, after a prolonged illness. He was the first commander in chief to be elected when the three veteran societies were consolidated in 1913 to form the VFW.

The distinguished soldier, statesman, and civic official was buried with full military honors in Denver on February 2. Commander in Chief Lyall T. Beggs was unable to attend the funeral services, but was represented officially by Past Commanders in Chief Ray H. Brannaman and Gus E. Hartung, and a member of the national council of administration, Joseph J. Jacques, all of Denver.

Upon hearing of his distinguished predecessor's death, Commander in Chief Beggs issued the statement:

"In the passing of this beloved comrade, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has suffered a very real loss. Rice Means, with an outstanding record in two wars, was always true to the ideals of the organization which he helped to found. His heart was always with the veteran. Though he served his city, his State, and his country in many important civilian capacities, he never forgot his obligation to his comrades in arms. Comrade Means gave unselfishly of his time and energy to causes which concerned those who, like himself, had given much for their country.

"We pause in the observance of our fiftieth anniversary to salute the memory of a comrade whose name will be perpetuated down through the years because of the contribution he made to the establishment of our fraternity as a permanent, Nation-wide association of overseas veterans."

Rice Means was one of the small group of veterans of the fighting in the Philippines who met in Denver in 1899 and founded the Colorado Society, Army of the Philippines, one of the groups which later merged into the Nation-wide organization known as the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Means was born at St. Joseph, Mo., November 16, 1877, moving to Colorado with his family 10 years later. He attended school in Denver, and later entered the University of Michigan, where he received his law degree in 1901.

At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, while still in school, Means enlisted in the First Colorado Infantry and was commissioned a second lieutenant. He served in the Philippines campaign with this regiment and won a promotion. He was twice recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor and was cited three times in official orders. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for gallantry in action during the attack on Manila.

Means enlisted in the Colorado National Guard in 1905 and was twice the winner of the Hogle trophy for being the best-drilled soldier in that organization.

In World War I, Means held the rank of lieutenant colonel. He commanded the Fortieth Division School Arms, then went overseas, where he was in command of the Fourth United States Infantry in the Meuse-Argonne campaign. He came home in command of the One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry, Colorado's own.

From 1902 to 1904 Means served as judge of Adams County, Colorado. He was the Republican nominee for Congress in 1908, and was an unsuccessful candidate for the United States senatorial nomination in the 1920 primaries. From June 1 to September 1, 1923, he was manager of safety for the city and county of Denver. On November 4, 1924, he was appointed United States Senator from Colorado, a post he held until 1927.

For several years after 1928 Means lived in Washington, where he was owner and publisher of the National Tribune and Stars and Stripes.

The current general order, appearing in this issue of Foreign Service, directs that the charters of all posts be draped for a period of 30 days in tribute to Past Commander in Chief Means.

As a Noted Negro Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) News of March 11, 1949:

AS A NOTED NEGRO SEES IT

Joseph Winthrop Holley, D. D., LL. D., is president emeritus of Albany State College, at Albany, Ga. He founded that institution in 1903 as the Albany Bible and Manual Training Institute. Until 1917 it was operated on private funds. Then the State took it over as a college for Negroes, and it became the Georgia Normal College. In 1942 its name was changed to Albany State College.

Dr. Holley recently published his autobiography entitled "You Can't Build a Chimney From the Top." The book is remarkable in several respects. It is the story of a successful Negro educator following the footsteps of Booker Washington and George W. Carver.

It is the story of a devout Presbyterian who has held high office in the church. It is the story of a leader who has sometimes been out of step with his own people in their struggle for advancement, and who is sure that his way is the right way. It is a revelation of canny Negro psychology in dealing with white men. It is a tale that will infuriate a great many radical Negroes, at whose anger this 74-year-old son of slaves will merely smile compassionately.

For Dr. Holley's motto is: "Push, but don't shove; don't fight—compromise. Love God and your fellow man, work hard, gain respect, and time will bring you victory."

Says Dr. Holley: "We colored people can get what we want, if it is within reason, from a white man if we approach him in the right way. * * * My father taught me as a child never to go to a white man for a favor just before a meal and never go to his front door. Wait until the meal is over and he has had time to get his pipe or cigar, and then go to the kitchen and tell the cook you would like to speak to Mr. John Doe."

He tells of his approach to Judge Putney to ask him to give him a cow for his school. The Negroes gathered to see whether "Fess" Holley, principal of the school, would go to the front door or the back door. He went to neither; he went to the barn, and sent a laborer in to ask the judge for an interview. A white maid came out and ushered him into the parlor.

When the judge had finished his meal he greeted Dr. Holley cordially. The professor immediately raised the ante to two cows, which he offered to buy. The judge said he would be glad to donate them for so worthy a cause. This upshot was that Dr. Holley came away with two cows and two calves. On the way home he thought the gift should be matched by one of his own people, so he showed the cows to a Negro farmer, who immediately offered a pig.

In 1928, Dr. Holley was sent to the Congo to study the missionary program of the Presbyterian Church. There he made several speeches through an interpreter. In one he took as his text, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as wool." The interpreter told him that was a hard message to get over, as African sheep do not have wool. In another audience he said, "Let the white man sing, Wash me and make me whiter than snow; and let us sing, Wash me and make me blacker than a crow." That stumped the interpreter; he informed Dr. Holley that in Africa crows are white.

"My higher education," says Dr. Holley, "should have been broad enough to have taught me to reason that wool that would keep a sheep in the Klondike from freezing might burn him to death on the Equator; and also that as I had to leave my dark clothes in Belgium and get a white suit, including a helmet, the crow would need white feathers to survive in the Tropics.

In 1932 the Georgia Legislature passed a bill creating a board of regents to conduct the University of Georgia and its 26 branches, including the three Negro colleges.

The board presented plans which in Dr. Holley's opinion would ruin the work of these colleges, which were chiefly engaged in training students in agriculture, trade, and home economics. He therefore appealed to the governor-elect, Eugene Talmadge, to favor a bill to separate the Negro colleges from the university, and set up a State university for Negroes which would offer all the courses taught in the white schools.

Governor Talmadge directed him to draw the bill and tell speaker of the house E. D. Rivers that he wanted it passed, and Rivers promised to put it through. Then Dr. Holley began to get a bit cold around the legs. He told Rivers that the chancelor would fight it. Rivers said he would see the chancelor.

Next day the chancelor summoned Dr. Holley. There was an argument. Finally the chancelor said it wouldn't be necessary to pass a bill; that the board of regents could take the necessary action, and would do so.

In high spirits, Dr. Holley informed the governor that everything had been changed, and Talmadge dropped the measure. And the chancelor and the board of regents did nothing at all. Apparently nothing has been done to this day. By the time Talmadge was again governor in 1942, Negroes themselves were petitioning him not to separate the management of Negro colleges from the white.

Dr. Holley's advice is still to go slow, and pay no attention to CIO organizers who want Negroes to vote as a bloc. The real leaders of the white race in the South are in a mood to give Negroes a better deal than formerly, and in order to bring this about there must be a real spirit of cooperation between the leaders of both races. Only in this way can pressing problems be worked out.

What Constitutes Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "What Constitutes Security?" from the Ephraim Enterprise of March 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CONSTITUTES SECURITY?

"The most vicious present definition of security is that it resides in political power, or in government."

That is a statement made by Utah's own Wallace F. Bennett, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, in a speech delivered at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 18.

And how true is that statement. Also how untrue and vicious is the belief of so many that governmental agencies can support them and insure them security from want and fear.

We find it locally. Many people have the idea that the city can do most anything—build and maintain a hospital, put in new sidewalks, build a new electric plant and distributing system, oil all the streets, maintain recreational centers, and so forth—but they seldom stop to think where the money for such things is coming from, even in so small a political unit as the city. It seldom occurs to these people that the residents of this city must pay for all improvements made here and that there is a limit to the amount of revenue the city government can collect from its citizens.

And when it comes to State and National matters, few indeed are the people who realize that whatever the State or Federal Government pays out, must first be collected from the people. Governments produce no wealth but at the present time the various governmental units—local, school district, county, State, and National—take about one-third of the income of the citizens. In other words, if you are a worker, you work 1 day for the Government for each 2 you work for yourself. The income from that third day is taken by the Government and distributed among the various governmental bureaus, agencies, and departments, and used to pay the so-called pensions given to old folks and veterans, etc., and to maintain the armed forces, build roads, and pay for the thousand and one other governmental activities.

For years the Government has been collecting social-security taxes from workers and employers, and employment-security taxes from employers. It is supposed to take care of workers in times of old age and of unemployment. It is based on a system that is similar to annuities in life-insurance policies. There is one important difference, however. Life-insurance companies invest their receipts in industry, real estate, buildings, power companies, and other things which produce new wealth and services. Money paid in for social security, teacher retirement, employment security, etc., is invested in what? Most of it is used to pay current governmental expenses, or invested in Government bonds issued to pay current expenses, including interest on debts for past expenses. In other words, the money the workers and employers have been paying in for social security, is secured by debt, nothing more or less.

So just how secure is security that resides in political power, or in Government? Think back just a few years when school teachers were paid by warrants which could not be cashed; when the county paid its workers and its obligations in warrants which might be cashable at some future date. It was then that everyone realized that governmental agencies could pay out only that which they first collected from the people. Hard times had hit the taxpayers. Only a fraction of them could pay their taxes. County and school-district coffers dried up; States went in debt (if their credit was still good), and the Federal Government started deficit spending, debasing of the currency, etc.

As Mr. Bennett also said in his speech, "Security is not the product of political power," a truth which should be pounded home to every citizen of this Republic.

Mr. Bennett then offered a definition for the word "security":

S for spiritual strength.
E for enterprise.
C for character and courage.
U for understanding and unity.
R for responsibilities.
I for individual integrity.
T for truth.
Y for you—you must win this fight for security and truth.

Yes, the greatest need of security in our time is for spiritual and moral strength and stamina. Material security will be a sure byproduct of these, but never of poltical promises.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Difficult To Get Action," published in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, of March 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFICULT TO GET ACTION

After 2 months of messing around, Congress has made no headway at all in the matter of shaping up farm legislation. Congress has become an unwieldy body, a fact which has long been obvious. It is difficult to turn off a piece of business and have it done, with the result that many important matters hang over till some action becomes imperative. Usually a hodgepodge of compromise is the result.

There was pressure on two pieces of farm legislation, and it is getting too late for either. One was a provision for Government-acquired grain-storage space, to take care of carry-overs from last year's crops, and create added space for this year's crops. But it is realized that even now, should such legislation be completed pronto—which it won't be—such added storage could not be made available by the time of this year's harvests. The other was a stipulation to exclude 1949 plantings in allotting acreages permitted in 1950 and later years. This would be aimed primarily at cotton, but it is already too late for that to be effective. Thus cotton growers are presumed to be expanding their acreages this year, in order to have handsome acreage allotments to cash in on future price supports.

The larger question of price supports is still a long way from action, though some hearings have been held. This matter of price-support policy is a prime administration worry. Up to January 31, Government loans and purchase agreements were in effect on a total of 613,614,642 bushels of grains, in addition to a considerable volume of beans and peas. Corn may still be sealed or put under purchase agreement up to next June 30, and by that time it is estimated that the total may reach 800,000,000 bushels of all grain, potentially belonging to the Government. Carry-overs are figured at 700,000,000 bushels of corn and 300,000,000 bushels of wheat. Add those totals to this year's crops, that is surpluses, with the added fact that farm storage is pretty well occupied and probably will be all summer, and you pose the problem of price-support administration.

Such considerations work out in favor of an eventual flexible price-support program once Congress gets around to a decision, though the demand for a rigid policy, at 90 percent of parity, is still to be reckoned with, despite the fact that such a program would inevitably lead to complete control over the operations of individual farmers.

The upshot of it all is that there can be no such thing as a permanent farm program, or one that at any one time is satisfactory to all concerned.

Dedication of Mississippi Rural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the great Methodist Episcopal Church of my State has recently established a Negro community center in Marion County, Miss., which is undoubtedly one of the finest developments of its type of any rural area anywhere in the Nation.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an account of the dedication of the center, as reported in the Columbia (Miss.) Sunday Mirror.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI RURAL CENTER FORMALLY DEDICATED

Before high-ranking church officials and a large audience of whites and Negroes, the Mississippi Rural Center—the first of its kind in the United States—was officially dedicated Monday and turned over to the Negroes of the Lampton community.

Built to serve all the Negroes of the southern part of Marion County, the center was dedicated to purpose of developing the personality of the Negro youth of this part of Mississippi by Bishop Marvin A. Franklin, bishop of the southeastern jurisdiction, Mississippi conference of the Methodist Church.

The act of dedication was led by Bishop Robert N. Brooks, of New Orleans, bishop of the central jurisdiction (the Negro conference of the Methodist Church, including both Mississippi conferences, Louisiana, Texas, and west Texas).

The $100,000 plant was built with funds from the Women's Society for Christian Service, the women's organization of the Methodist Church.

DEDICATORY ADDRESS

In the dedicatory address, Bishop Franklin endorsed the statement made by the president of the Negro WSCS for Mississippi in which she said, "Negro children want everything the children of other races want, and Negro children need everything children of other races need," he said that he would like to see every child of every race have what his child would have.

Bishop Franklin reviewed the stand toward the Negro race that had been taken by

those who had filled his office before him. He told how Bishops Galloway and Decell had striven to afford the Negro race more opportunity.

Going back to the original theme of the message, the bishop told how the great need in this Nation today was integrated personalities. "We need minds that will do creative thinking," he said; he also pointed up the need for better social and religious life.

"Every child should have a chance to play," the bishop said, "and a place far removed from the honkey-tonks."

He brought out that in the center the Negro youth would have an opportunity to breathe pure air and demonstrate that the Negro and white could live together as Christians."

"We must be bridge builders," the bishop continued, "and turn friction into friendship."

In closing, the bishop stated that he hoped that the center would "give to every child and youth the best possible chance to satisfy his deep heart hunger and to become a complete personality."

MANY SPEAKERS

There were many speakers on the platform representing many types of religious work, educational work, and social work of both races. Miss Marjorie Minkler of New York represented the bureau of town and country work of the Methodist church; Mrs. Paul Arrington of Jackson, vice president of the women's division; Mrs. R. T. Rollings, Hattiesburg, secretary of supply work of the Mississippi Conference of the WSCS, Mrs. W. H. Ratcliff, president of the southeast jurisdiction WSCS, Mrs. E. V. Perry, president of the Mississippi conference of the WSCS and leaders of the Negro church, including district superintendents, social workers, editors of Negro church papers, and others.

Music for the program was furnished by the school chorus of Lampton consolidated vocational high school and the Marion County training-school chorus.

At the conclusion of the program, T. R. Hearon, architect for the building presented the keys to the center to Prof. Isaac Pittman, the director and H. H. Wolf, contractor, presented the keys to the cottage.

THE CENTER

The Rural Center Building is 128 by 88 feet over-all and built of concrete blocks, it has hardwood floors throughout. It consists of a gymnasium, two dressing rooms and showers, clinic, nurse's room, secretary's office, general office, a stage, library, two clubrooms, kitchen, balcony, and men and women's toilets.

When the equipping is complete, the main auditorium and gym will seat 1,300 people.

Located next to the center, the five-room cottage for the directors of the work is built as a modern rural home. It is an attractive frame building with asbestos shingle siding. It consists of three bedrooms, kitchen, bath, combination living and dining room, hardwood floors, attic fans and floor furnaces. Utilities include butane gas and electricity.

An artesian well has been drilled near the cottage to serve the cottage, the center, and any residents of the Lampton community who wish it.

THE DIRECTORS

Isaac and Athelda Pittman are to be the directors of the project. They started in their present occupation on November 1 of last year.

Isaac Pittman is a native of this section of the county, born in Walthall County near Sandy Hook, he is a graduate of Alcorn A. and M. of 1935 and has been teaching in Negro schools of Mississippi since that time. He has 2 years in schools in the Delta, 5 years in Choctaw County and 4 years at Prentiss. He is 38 years old.

Athelda Pittman was born in Port Gibson and also attended Alcorn A. and M. The couple have three children, Herbert 14, Ruth, 12, and Sarah 11. They have already moved into the new cottage at the Rural Center.

SCOPE OF THE WORK

The proposed activities which the center will sponsor are in the areas of health, education, recreation, group work, social service and religion.

The work will be carried into other areas some distance from the center through the use of a suburban bus that is part of the center's equipment.

In the area of health the center will be the location for clinics, health education, home health improvement, health conferences, training and other activity. It is in the plan for the center to employ a full-time Negro public health nurse, but that position is not filled at this time.

In the field of education, the center boasts of a library, a traveling library, through the use of the bus, kindergarten and adult education. The center will be used for training on-the-farm veterans. Training in how to use the agricultural and social services of the Government and private enterprise is also planned.

The recreation program that has been set up includes a playground program and music training.

The center also plans to aid in the work of the 4-H, the Scouts, adult homemakers groups, New Farmers of America and the Youth Homemakers of America.

The religious program includes a week-day religious program, church Sunday school, Sunday school teacher training, vacation Bible schools, worship and church-school activities, and worship services with the bus in distant sections.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The board of trustees for this project includes three white citizens of Marion County and two Negroes. The white members are B. B. Bradley, Dr. S. E. Lawrence and H. L. Rankin. The Negro members are John Otis and Scott Chisholm.

TOURNAMENT SCHEDULED

The first scheduled event to take place in the new Mississippi Rural Center will be a Negro basketball tournament with teams from 16 counties of south Mississippi participating.

The tournament will be played Saturday among New Farmers of America teams. The New Farmers of America is the Negro counterpart of the Future Farmers of America.

A large crowd is expected to attend the tournament.

Minnesota—the Saga of the North Star State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the occasion of the ceremonies at the Library of Congress, opening the exhibition celebrating the establishment of the Territory of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA—THE SAGA OF THE NORTH STAR STATE

(By the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator from Minnesota)

Through its 100 years of history, Minnesota has produced sturdy and self-reliant persons, whose sons and daughters we are. The pioneers and their descendants erected a high civilization, known throughout the Union for its contributions to a liberal, democratic society.

It is a considerable part of our country we are discussing today. Minnesota is eleventh in size among the States, 400 miles from north to south and 240 miles in average breadth, standing at the center of the North American Continent and at the top of the Republic. From its average elevation of 1,200 feet flow three river systems, the Red River toward Hudson Bay, the St. Louis toward the Great Lakes and the Atlantic, and the Mississippi toward the Gulf of Mexico. With this advantage in location, her products and her ideas have circulated freely throughout the world. The two are closely related. Minnesota people developed their attitudes toward life, shown in their social and political institutions, during the process of making a living together.

The story of the State therefore begins with the varied resources which nature has provided. Ancient mountains, worn down by erosion, left knobs of granite; forgotten oceans, late in geologic time, which invaded north central Minnesota, left sediments from which the Mesabi Iron Range was formed; and four great ice sheets came down from the north in turn. These advanced and retreated, scouring ridges of rock, polishing knolls, unloading tons of rich soil, and they finally melted leaving heaped-up debris which dammed 10,000 lakes. These are an aid to a great dairy industry and the joy of skater, swimmer, and fisherman. In the south they are broad and shallow, but in the north they lie in deep and rocky basins in the midst of deep forests. Watching the reflections of the clouds in these waters, the Indians gave the region the name of "Minnay Soter" or "Cloud-Tinted Water."

In the northeast are ridges, almost mountainous, and evergreen forests; to the south along the Mississippi are stands of hardwoods, and west and north the prairie stretches into the Red River Valley. In the center of the State the village of Rockville is said to rest on a granite outcrop 5 miles wide and 30 miles long. At Red Wing on the eastern border, high above the wide Mississippi, pottery and clay pipe are made. At Embarass, the Finns still drop stones into pools to make the steam bath and the women with deft fingers card their wool by hand, spin and knit, and make moccasin boots. Minnesota is remarkably varied in resources and people. Nowhere else in this country have two cities so close together as Minneapolis and St. Paul, born almost at the same time, grown to a size so nearly equal. What is even more remarkable is that each of the twins has kept a distinct flavor and character, perceptible even to the tourist on his first visit.

When the early explorers and fur traders came, they found two very different types of Indian cultures. In the northern and eastern forests were the Chippewa, a forest people who had got firearms from the French and driven out the previous Sioux or Dakotas. These went west and became hunters of the buffalo on the prairie.

Artists and writers went with the traders and explorers on many expeditions. Their pictures and books, from the seventeenth century onward, drew the attention of the

outside world to Minnesota, and gave us a picture of the primitive life. Among the famous artists were George Catlin, Thomas L. McKenny, Peter Rindisbacher, and Frank B. Mayer.

They lingered about the frontier forts and councils where treaties were made, sketching the Indian dressed for play or mourning, for the war path or the council ceremonies.

The Chippewa and the Sioux had themselves been artists for many ages before the white man appeared. The exhibit presented by the Library of Congress for this occasion includes some evidences of their skill in carving wood and stone, of their women's patience in making clothing and household utensils. Several thousand Chippewa live in the State today, but under the impact of modern civilization their old culture has largely disappeared.

The Indian could hunt, fish, carve, and fight, but usually could not even read the treaties in which he signed away his land with a mark.

It is believed that two French traders, Radisson and Groseilliers, penetrated Minnesota as early as 1655 to 1659. Then in 1679 came Du Luth, for whom the lake port is named, who set up the standard of King Louis XIV of France in the wilderness. On his second visit, the following year, Du Luth had an amazing experience. When he reached the Mississippi, he met another party of Frenchmen who had been sent by the great La Salle to explore the upper river—Accault, Auguelle, and the famous missionary, Father Louis Hennepin. The priest and his companions had been captured by a band of Sioux and held near the present town of Mille Lacs. On this expedition Hennepin discovered and named the Falls of St. Anthony, and afterward he wrote a book about Minnesota which became a best-seller.

In 1689 Nicholas Perrot, another French trader, proclaimed the sovereignty of France over the whole region, and 6 years later another Frenchman, Le Sueur, set up a trading post on Prairie Island in the Mississippi River between Hastings and Red Wing. Five years later he went up the Minnesota River as far as the Blue Earth region and built Fort L'Huillier.

For many years thereafter France was involved in wars in Europe. Her occupation of Minnesota was suspended until 1727, when the Sieur De La Perrière built a fort and the Jesuits a mission on the west side of Lake Pepin. During the next 25 years La Vérendrye and his sons explored the northern lake country rather thoroughly; the region from Lake Superior west to Rainy Lake and Lake of the Woods has since become known as the Highway of the Voyageurs. They built Fort St. Pierre on Rainy Lake and Fort St. Charles in the "Northwest Angle" of Minnesota, on Lake of the Woods. From the time of their visits until French rule ceased in 1763, the French fur traders paddled over the water routes now followed by the summer vacationist in his canoe.

In 1762, the French secretly ceded to Spain the territory west of the Mississippi; thus for a short period Minnesota was technically under the Spanish flag. But in 1763, when France lost the French and Indian War, the British took possession, and for half a century the British fur barons controlled the region.

Even as they hoisted the British flag over the forts, the first adventurous Yankee appeared. Jonathan Carver spent the winter of 1766 to 1767 among the Indians of the Minnesota Valley, publishing an account of his adventures which rivaled Hennepin's book in popularity. Another Yankee, Peter Pond, lived in the Minnesota Valley from 1773 to 1775, and a trader for the British Northwest Co., David Thompson, explored northern Minnesota as the century drew to a close.

Already, by the treaty of 1783 which acknowledged the independence of the United States, northeastern Minnesota had become American territory. But the British fur traders were slow to learn, or perhaps to appreciate, the news. They stayed at their posts until 1816.

In 1803 the United States acquired the western part of the State as a part of the vast Louisiana Purchase. President Thomas Jefferson decided to assert the authority of the United States and satisfy his personal curiosity about Minnesota. He sent a young Army lieutenant, Zebulon M. Pike, to investigate and inform the British that they no longer owned it. Pike went up the Mississippi as far as Leach Lake and upper Red Cedar or Cass Lake. Visiting the chief British trading posts, he hoisted the Stars and Stripes. For 60 gallons of whisky and $200 worth of trinkets he bought from the Indians military sites at the mouths of the St. Croix and Minnesota Rivers, including most of the present Twin Cities. Fort Snelling, built in 1819 on the site he purchased, was for many years the northwestern military post of the United States and the center of the fur trade.

Other forts planted at strategic points became little islands of civilization, centers of the fur trade and refuges in time of danger. For the next 30 years after the Pike expedition the Americans penetrated the mysteries of the wilderness. In 1820, Gov. Lewis Cass of Michigan Territory set forth to find the source of the Mississippi River. His expedition did not succeed, but a member of the party, Henry R. Schoolcraft, came back in 1832 and found the source of the Father of Waters at Lake Itasca. A great student of Indian lore, Schoolcraft made studies of the legends of the Chippewa. From Schoolcraft's writings, the poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow derived the inspiration for his Hiawatha; and within a few years Minnehaha made Minnesota famous throughout the Nation. She was probably the most effective press agent Minnesota ever had, attracting settlers from New England and all parts of the country.

Maj. Stephen H. Long, in 1823, first revealed the fertility of the Red River Valley, destined to be of one of the granaries of the world. With him was an Italian gentleman named Giacomo Beltrami, looking for the source of the Mississippi. He wrote a book about his adventures, giving a copy of his book to President Jefferson, and his name to Beltrami County.

One of the greatest of the explorers under the American regime was a Frenchman, Joseph N. Nicollet, who traveled all over Minnesota in the late 1830's, keeping a record of his canoe trip down the Mississippi from Fort Snelling, illustrated with maps so accurate that we can still trace his course and his camping places from hour to hour. Another pioneer who came to Fort Snelling as a drummer boy, Joseph R. Brown, will be long remembered; many years later, during one of the last of the Indian attacks, his son Samuel Brown rode 120 miles through a night of storm to warn the settlers. The house of this western Paul Revere is still preserved in a State park.

Relations with the Indians were not always strained. For 20 years the influence of Fort Snelling upon the tribes was effective through the quiet work of its humane agent, Maj. Lawrence Taliaferro. He had come up from the South in 1823, on the first steamboat to reach St. Anthony Falls, bringing with him the first group of Negro slaves to reach Minnesota. Later, he freed them all. As agent of the fort, Major Taliaferro supervised the fur trade, issued licenses to traders, and tried to keep the peace between Chippewa and Sioux. Recognizing his impartiality, the Indians called him "Four Hearts."

Fort Snelling and Mendota, across the river, were the centers of the fur trade. The Americans began to make up oxcarts in trains of 50 to 100, to bring the furs in wholesale lots from the Red River country; for many years, the squeaking of the ungreased wheels could be heard for miles through the wilderness.

The fur trader was apt to be a French-Canadian or a Scotchman, and his assistants were often half-breeds, who had already formed a large and interesting settlement in the Red River Valley, where they wore the skins of the animals they hunted. Negroes were also active in the early days of the trade, as interpreters and independent operators.

The pioneer fur trader could handle the half-wild hunters, trappers, and voyagers, spoke the Indian's language, and knew the way through the maze of lakes, rivers, and portages. Many of the traders were remarkable men, equally at home in the woods and in the duties of forming a government and building a civilization. Fur traders helped the missionaries to translate the Bible and other books into the Indian languages. The famous trader Henry H. Sibley became the first territorial delegate to Congress, and afterwards Governor. Martin McLeod, another trader, wrote the first Minneosta law for public education. They gave their family names to cities, towns, and counties: Sibley, McLeod, Faribault, Crookston, Brown, Renville, and many others.

Early Catholic missionaries traveled with the coureurs de bois. Protestant missionaries came to Fort Mendota in 1829 and made plans for work among the natives. Both Catholic and Protestant preached to the primative Indian and the white pioneer, and as far as they could, tried to bridge the gulf between them. There is something attractive and noble in the picture of the French Catholic fur traders, the Renvilles of Lac qui Parle, sitting down with Protestant missionaries like Samuel and Gideon Pond, Dr. Thomas S. Williamson, and Stephen R. Riggs, to translate the Bible into the Indian tongue. The first church for white settlers was organized by the Presbyterians at Fort Snelling in 1835.

Downstream Father Lucian Galtier came in 1840 as a priest to the populace at Mendota, which had originally been called St. Peter's. Across the river he built a little log church which he dedicated to the great missionary apostle, and from this church the settlement round about took the name St. Paul. Father Augustine Ravoux of Mendota, Bishop Crétin, Father Frederic Baraga, Father Pirec, and the Abbé Domenech were famous Catholic pioneers. Bishop Henry B. Whipple of the Episcopal Church was a lifelong friend of the Indians.

But the day of the explorer, the missionary, and the fur trader was passing, for the surge of white settlement was becoming irresistible. In 1837, by treaties with the Chippewa and the Sioux, the United States acquired the land between the Mississippi and the St. Croix Rivers. In 1848 a land office was opened at St. Croix Falls, and the first great wave of settlers came—lumbermen from Maine, farmers from the mid-Atlantic States, tradesmen and craftsmen from the cities. People were gathering around Fort Snelling, and at St. Anthony, now a part of Minneapolis. Soon there were villages at St. Paul and Stillwater. Before they numbered 5,000, the settlers began to ask for an independent government.

Under the American flag, Minnesota so far had been shuffled around from one Territory to another; it had been a part of the old Northwest Territory, and the Territories of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Iowa, and Wisconsin. When the State of Wisconsin was created in 1848, the Minnesota part was left practically without an administration. The

people took matters in their own hands. They elected the famous fur trader, Henry Hastings Sibley, as a Territorial Delegate to Congress, claiming that the old Territory of Wisconsin still existed. When Sibley got to Washington, somewhat to his surprise, Congress actually seated him, and he began at once to agitate for a Territorial government. The law creating the Territory of Minnesota was signed on March 3, 1849. Alexander Ramsey was appointed Governor, and the first Territorial legislature met in September 1849.

Getting the Indian's land for the farmer and lumberman was uppermost in the minds of the members. By the treaties signed in 1851, the Sioux ceded practically all their lands, and treaties of 1854 and 1855 secured most of the territory of the Chippewa. The Government offered land at $1.25 an acre, and the great river made a highway for the outgoing products of Minnesota and the incoming people. Steamboats came in with settlers and left with loads of flour. Merchant milling began in 1854 at the Falls of St. Anthony; other mills sprang up along nearly every river and creek. Almost from the first the high quality of Minnesota flour was acknowledged, and as early as 1861 the New York market quoted it at a premium. The rivers were choked with logs, the sawmills were taxed to supply lumber for houses. By 1856 there were 253 Minnesota post offices. The boom was on. Immigrants were coming from Great Britain, Canada, Ireland, Germany, and Scandinavia, led by the booster, William G. Le Duc, who kept the presses busy printing guidebooks about the Territory. Minnesota, the Lily of the West, was a popular song, and the Minnehaha waltz or polka was the rage in dance halls of the East.

Sharpers also flocked in, claiming inside information on future railroad routes. A wild speculation in land began to grow, reaching the point at which eastern capital found takers in the Territory at 3 percent a month. Ambitious Minnesota took its first census in 1857, showing 150,000 people. Statehood was in the air.

In the Nation-wide business panic of 1857, the Minnesota boom collapsed. In some ways the disaster was a blessing in disguise, for the people turned immediately to farming the land in earnest; by the following spring of 1858, the cultivated acres in the Territory had more than doubled. And on May 11, 1858, Minnesota was admitted to the Union. Rival conventions, Democratic and Republican, had met in separate sessions at St. Paul in July 1858, producing two drafts of a State constitution, which turned out to be almost identical in their phrasing. The Protestant missionary Stephen Riggs painstakingly translated the new State constitution into the Sioux language, and printed it for the Hazlewood Republic, a short-lived farming community which the missionaries had established for the Indians.

Already, much of the pattern of future Minnesota life had been set. The New England settlers brought with them singing schools and lecture courses, and planted shade trees in the new towns. The first newspaper, the Minnesota Pioneer, was started in St. Paul in 1849 by James M. Goodhue. The telegraph came in 1860. In that eventful year the farms numbered 22,000, producing more than 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, nearly 4,000,000 bushels of oats, and about 2,000,000 each of corn and potatoes. The invention of farm machinery was making possible farms the like of which the world had never seen; one Minnesota farm of that decade boasted 30,000 acres.

Henry Sibley was elected Governor in 1860, and Minnesota cast her first electoral votes by a heavy majority for Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate. On the day after the President's war proclamation, Governor Sibley issued a call for her famous First Regiment, which reached the front in time for Bull Run. Two years later, at Gettysburg, the First Minnesota stopped Pickett's charge, the high-water mark of the Confederacy and the turning of the tide. With a population numbering only about 200,000 the State sent more than 22,000 men to the Union armies. At home the farms poured out wheat to feed the Republic and for export. Meanwhile the ousted Sioux were watching the advancing farms.

Under the Indian treaties, some of the speculators had taken advantage of the red men, and the administration of the treaties was less than just; the missionary Bishop Whipple had warned President Lincoln of the danger. Now, with many of the white men away at war, the Sioux suddenly rose in the autumn of 1862, crossed the Minnesota River, and caught the settlers by surprise. They devastated the Minnesota Valley, killing more than 350 settlers and taking 300 prisoners. A company of soldiers from Fort Ridgely was ambushed and almost wiped out. On the south side of the river the Germans at New Ulm barred the way; 1,500 settlers, refugees, and volunteer fighters withstood an Indian attack. But the town was almost a total loss, and was afterward abandoned.

With stronger forces, the Indians were repelled, and nearly 2,000 were captured or voluntarily surrendered. Of these more than 300 were condemned to death; but after Bishop Whipple asked Lincoln to show mercy toward his red children, only 38 were executed. Most of the Indians left the State, and there were reforms in the Indian administration. Today some 14,000 Chippewa live in Minnesota, many on the White Earth Reservation, while direct descendants of the Sioux of that uprising still live at Pipestone and along the Minnesota River between Granite Falls and Redwood Falls.

A more important event for the future than the Indian uprising was the appearance in 1862 of a wood-burning locomotive, the William Crooks by name, pulling a train on a 10-mile track between St. Anthony and St. Paul. By 1870, there were nearly 1,000 miles of railroad in the State, and the population had leaped to nearly half a million.

About the greatest of the Minnesota railroad-builders, James J. Hill, there are many stories; according to one, Hill first left Canada as an adventurous boy of 18, with the intention of sailing to China or India by way of Minnesota. He had planned to continue westward from St. Paul in a Red River car-train, but finding that he came too late for the last trip of the year he was forced to stay over. In St. Paul he found work as a shipping clerk on the wharves, and made the city his home for the rest of his life while he built a mighty transportation system.

The railroad and the State board of immigration sent agents to Europe and issued pamphlets in every language. By 1870, Europe had sent 50,000 Germans and nearly 60,000 Scandinavians. This was the true Norse settlement. Whether or not the Kensington Rune Stone, as many believe, tells of an actual visit by 30 Norsemen to Minnesota in the year 1362, the descendants of the Norsemen who came after the Civil War very largely made the State what it is today. They worked in the woods and mines and on the farms, bringing their songs and legends, and a strong tradition of personal independence and social cooperation. The Scandinavians introduced the farmers cooperatives in which Minnesota leads the Nation.

At one time, the people of Minnesota were 71 percent foreign-born. Today, the proportion is less than 15 percent, of which almost half are still Scandinavian. The Scandinavians gave the State Governors Johnson, Nelson, and Olson, and Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., as well known in Minnesota in his own right as his son who flew the Atlantic in 1927.

The railroads brought in the people and brought out the crops, and in so doing aroused among the farmers one of the first great popular movements for which the State is famous. Many farmers in the older settlements complained that bumper wheat crops were of little value with markets far from home; they charged the railroads with discrimination and unfair practices, and began to organize to protect themselves. In 1867 a Minnesota man, Oliver Kelley, founded the Patrons of Husbandry in Washington, D. C. Popularly called the Grange, the movement swept Minnesota rapidly. By 1869, out of 49 Granges in the United States, 40 were in Minnesota. In 1874, Grangers were in control of the State legislature and pushed through State legislation, and Federal action followed soon after to regulate transportation in the public interest.

Minnesota remembers the blizzard of 1873, which took the lives of 70 persons on the prairie, and the business panic of that year. Duluth, which had been enjoying a speculative railroad boom, became almost totally bankrupt within a few days, and suffered a drop in population from 5,000 to 1,300. And then came the grasshoppers. By 1876 they not only devoured every leaf and spear of wheat, in the western and southwestern counties, but ate clothing and wood as well. Private charity and public appropriations kept thousands of old settlers on the prairie, and newcomers in their sod huts, from starvation. The Governor appointed a day of State-wide prayer in the spring; and afterwards, although the hoppers hatched as usual, they took flight when fully grown and left Minnesota.

Railroad building resumed after the panic. The early lines were formed into great competing systems which served the State well, and new waves of immigrants came in. By 1885, after the Twin Cities were connected with the Pacific coast by rail, the population passed the 1,000,000 mark. Many of the newcomers were from Ireland, for whom Archbishop Ireland provided shelter in immigrant houses. The railroads found shelter for others. Sometimes the railroads provided whole towns. By 1900 the meat-packing houses also needed European labor, recruited in the Balkans, Poland, Lithuania, and elsewhere, until the whole map of Europe was represented in Minnesota.

More than once the State has enjoyed get-rich-quick hopes, only to find that real prosperity lay in another direction. So it was with the mineral resources. In 1865 the presence of iron ore was known, but a report started in that year that gold could be found, and the gold excitement—although it collapsed the following year—delayed the development of iron. It was not until 1884 that the first load of 100 tons of ore was shipped in five cars from the Vermilion mines to Two Harbors. The first ore found on the Mesabi Range was not thought good enough to warrant mining; but Leonidas Merritt and his six brothers, all timber cruisers, believed otherwise. In 1890 Leonidas took out 141 leases, and by 1895 20 mines were producing nearly 3,000,000 tons. By the 1920's, Minnesota supplied three-fifths of the Nation's iron ore and at last year Minnesota took nearly 70,000,000 tons of iron from its earth—over two-thirds of the national production. The great ore docks of Duluth and Two Harbors, the spectacular pits of the Iron Range, support mining towns which are like few others on earth—equipped with municipal electric plants and other utilities, and splendid community houses, parks, libraries, and schools.

The Finns were recruited originally from the Old World to work in the iron mines. But they took to farming rather than mining. By this time much of the north woods had

been cut over, and many Finns settled on low-cost homesteads. The going was hard. The ground was difficult to clear, a language barrier separated them from their neighbors. It was by force of circumstances, because every penny counted, that the Finns developed the consumer cooperatives in which Minnesota is a leader.

The economic and social development of Minnesota moved forward on every front, only temporarily checked by Indian uprisings, grasshoppers, business panics, and wars. The growth of one industry aided another, Thomas B. Walker, who came to Minnesota in 1862 as a surveyor for the St. Paul & Duluth Railroad, bought great tracts of pine in Cass County and became a leader in the lumber industry. The genius of a French immigrant enabled the flour mills to overcome an obstacle which temporarily threatened the prosperity of the prairie-farmers.

As the spring wheat of Minnesota came into competition with the winter wheat grown elsewhere, the flour made from the spring wheat was found to be darker and inclined to be speckled. Edmund La Croix, a member of a French family which had come in the 1860's, developed a secret process which eliminated the difficulty. Farmers came for hundreds of miles to Dundas, to marvel at the rows of vibrating sifters. La Croix took his process to the Washburns in Minneapolis. Through the use of the middlings purifier, vast stretches of the Northwest were opened for the growing of wheat which could be milled into the whitest of flour. And today the State mills 11 percent of the Nation's wheat, more than 3,000,000,000 pounds.

The opening of the Panama Canal was a severe, if temporary, set-back to Minnesota, as traffic from the Orient no longer flowed from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic through Duluth. In later years the development of barge traffic on the Mississippi has checked high freight rates by rail, and St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth have grown steadily as distribution centers. When and if the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, Minnesota once more will ship the products of the Northwest region direct to European ports.

In 1862 the Rev. Lars J. Hauge, a Baptist minister, had led a group of Danes to Freeborn County. He was a dairying enthusiast, and almost 30 years later, in 1890, he took a hand in the organization of the first cooperative creamery in the State, at Clark's Grove. The cooperative movement spread gradually; after the legislature in 1919 drew up a code of laws to protect farmers' cooperatives they expanded more rapidly. To their research work in production and marketing, in cooperation with the State university, is due much of the prosperity of Minnesota. As lumbering and wheat began to decline somewhat in importance, a golden flow of butter helped to take their place. In butter production, Minnesota today leads the country with 18.4 percent of the United States butter churned, and stands second in the production of milk—8,000,000,000 pounds in 1948. Although it is still a great milling State, the acreage of corn is now five times that of wheat and the record corn crop of 1948 produced 272,055,000 bushels. At the same time, the State harvested 14 percent of the Nation's oats. Two-thirds of the farmers in Minnesota own their land; and the Minnesota State Fair, largest in the United States, is famous everywhere.

Minnesota has some 1,800 farmers' marketing and purchasing associations, including creameries, grain elevators, livestock and produce-shipping cooperatives; the number of cooperative members is more than half a million, the largest in the Nation. In consumer cooperation, the small independent Finnish storekeepers in the Iron Range and Duluth area met in 1917 to form their first wholesale pool. Since that time, the oil-distributing societies have become well known, and with varying degrees of failure or success, consumer cooperatives have undertaken to operate telephones, electric lines, credit unions, bookstores, dry cleaning, insurance, trucking, and even newspapers.

The cooperative spirit, however, is not limited to those who engage in this particular form of business organization. While Minnesotans were fighting in Europe and the Pacific during the Second World War, a small city, Albert Lea, won honors at home, for its voluntary, cooperative, postwar planning to make jobs for the veterans, the businessmen and other citizens of Albert Lea were nationally publicized as an example.

In the census of 1940 the population reached 2,800,000 and the town population of Minnesota for the first time equaled the rural population, as a result of a remarkable rise in variegated industry, but perhaps more important, as a result of mechanization of farms. The mechanical skills of the early immigrants who worked in the shops and mills has been passed on to their descendants. The State today is known for manufactured dairy products, malt liquors, pulp and paper, canning, linseed oil, cake and meal, foundry and machine-shop products, and electrical goods. There has been a rapid development in electric light and power.

In State politics, Minnesota has generally remained with the Republican Party. From 1860 until 1932 she elected only four non-Republican governors: John Lind, 1899–1901; John A. Johnson, 1905–1909; W. S. Hammond in 1915, and Floyd Olson in 1930.

Governor Olson was elected on the Farmer-Labor ticket. Ever since the time of the Granger movement, the State had been hospitable to independent, radical, third-party movements, of American inspiration. The Farmers Alliance movement began to show potential strength in the State in 1881. In 1886, as industry grew in the cities, the Knights of Labor joined forces with the Alliance and drew up a strong railroad and labor platform which it pressed the Republicans to accept in full. By successfully backing candidates pledged to support agricultural and labor interests, the coalition virtually controlled the legislature. In 1890 it strode out upon the field as a third party, and 2 years later the Nation-wide Populist Party was born, largely through the efforts of Ignatius Donnelly, Minnesota's "prophet of experiment."

Governor Lind, first to break the long string of Republican governors, was elected with the support of Democrats, Populists and "Silver Republicans." In 1912, Minnesota voted for the Progressive Republican, Theodore Roosevelt. From 1920 to 1938 the progressive movement expressed itself through the Non-Partisan League and the Farmer-Labor Party, and from 1932 by support of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal and Harry S. Truman and his Fair Deal. Minnesota was represented in another early progressive move, by Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg, who sought world peace through a treaty of all nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact—a plan of world disarmament.

But no party or coalition of parties has a copyright on the progressive spirit in Minnesota life, which has shown itself in the non-political cooperative movement, in arts and letters and the sciences, and in State and local legislation. The territorial government established public schools and the first normal school west of the Mississippi, and took steps toward establishing a university. In 1872 the State board of health was established, the first child labor law was passed in 1909, and a minimum wage act for women and minors in 1913. In 1917 the legislature enacted 37 laws for the protection of children. The State government was completely reorganized in 1939, when Minnesota established a department of social security, with divisions devoted to social welfare, employment, and public institutions.

The State has 57 State parks, recreational reserves, waysides and monuments, and a larger area in game refuges than any other State—more than 3,300,000 acres, an area greater than Connecticut. Minneapolis and St. Paul are outstanding among large American cities for their park systems. Minnesota's most recent wave of national publicity is making known the cold bright days of winter sport, and the summer life of lakes and parks within easy reach of nearly all citizens.

Minnesota writers have had strong local roots, and for the most part a serious turn of mind. Ignatius Donnelly was not only a political experimenter, but a scholar who surprised his colleagues on the Senate floor by quoting Epictetus in Greek. He was a leading exponent of the Baconian theory of the authorship of Shakespeare's plays. One of his novels, Caesar's Column, is reported to have sold 700,000 copies at home and abroad. It contained a prophecy that industrialized America in the twentieth century would become a dictatorship, which happily has not come true.

Thorstein Veblen, brought by his Norwegian immigrant parents to a Minnesota farm when he was 8 years old, studied at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., and began to read the social philosophers from Hume and Kant to Spencer. Here he found his direction as a critical analyst of modern industrial civilization. He was a clear-cut radical of the authentic, home-grown kind. It is said that after returning from Yale with his degree of doctor of philosophy, he spent 7 years at home, apparently doing nothing, and was stamped by his neighbors as a failure. Then he became famous as the author of the Theory of the Leisure Class and other economic classics, and for his translation of an Icelandic saga.

In belles lettres, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Charles Flandrau, Martha Ostenso, and Margaret Culkin Banning are well-known to America at large. Ole Edvart Rölvaag, a Norwegian fisherman, came to Minnesota almost penniless. He won a professorship at St. Olaf's College, where he taught until his death in 1931. In Giants in the Earth he wrote a perceptive account of pioneer life which seems assured of permanence in American literature.

Local pride was hurt in 1920 when Sinclair Lewis, a native son, published Main Street, a criticism of the narrowness and materialism which the writer believed were typical of the American small town. Main Street at once became one of the most influential books in our history, both among writers and the general public. If "Carol Kennicott" today would find life in "Gopher Prairie" more interesting than she did in 1920, part of the credit belongs to Lewis—who was known as "Doodle" in his Sauk Center days.

The lumberjacks created the most famous literary character in the history of the State, the fabulous hero Paul Bunyan and Babe, the Blue Ox. As part of national folklore, they are rivaled today only by Uncle Remus and his friends from Georgia. In Minnesota the activities of Paul are still marked on the map, as in the case of Onion River, which derives its name from a difficulty Paul faced in checking the tears of his loggers as they cut timber in a region of wild onions. Close by, incidentally, is Temperance River, named in the logging days because it was the only north-shore stream with no bar at its mouth.

The Germans brought music. Long before the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra was organized in the 1890's the first string quartet was formed by four Germans in St. Paul, and the Germans in Winona and the Czechs in New Prague each had an orchestra. The Lutheran pastors everywhere saw to it that

their people had trained choirs. The a capella choir at St. Olof's College, the only one of its type in America, owes much to the genius of its conductor, F. Melius Christiansen.

In music, Minnesota has an unbroken tradition—or many traditions—extending back to its early days. Today, Minneapolis is a center of music, with weekly concerts of its famous symphony, with two artists series, one master piano series, chamber concerts, and annual visits of the ballet and the Metropolitan Opera Co. In the arts, there has been more of a deliberate effort at a revival. The people retained for a long time much of the domestic folk art that preceded the machine age in the countries from which they came; in this respect, they were closer than they thought to the Indians whose culture they displaced. The farmer had to make his own tools, his wife made her own bedspreads, the Red River hunter made his own dogsleds, the Yankee farmer and Swedish housewife all had to be craftsmen. As factory-made goods prevailed, the home arts vanished, and were in danger of being forgotten until artists made illustrations of them in recent years for the Index of American Design.

As the machine age began in Minnesota, the women, long before Carol Kennicott complained of the flatness of life in Gopher Prairie, took an interest in the encouragement of art. In 1903, largely through their efforts, the legislature passed an appropriation for a State Society of Art. Among artists of our time, the work of Homer Dodge Martin, Cadwallader Washburn, and Nicholas Brewer among others is well known. Carl Bohnen is noted for portraits, Carl Rawson for his paintings of woods and waters, Jack and Paul Fjelde, father and son, are noted in the field of sculpture.

In science, Minnesota's outstanding contribution had its beginnings in 1883, when a cyclone struck the town of Rochester. The Sisters of St. Francis offered their convent to a local health official, Dr. William Worrall Mayo, to care for 100 injured. Six years later, the order opened St. Mary's Hospital which they placed under the care of Dr. Mayo and his two famous sons, William J. and Charles. Here they first did the work which has since brought them national recognition, and to many thousands of Americans has made Rochester the most famous place in Minnesota. The Mayo Clinic works in close association with the State University.

The arts and sciences, agriculture and industry in Minnesota have all had close ties with the State university, which has gathered a brilliant society of poets, novelists, teachers, scientists, critics, and historians. It is not the oldest college in continuous service in Minnesota, for church colleges established before the Civil War are still teaching American youth. While the university was chartered in 1851, it did not begin its real development until 1867–68 under William Watts Folwell. The university has grown steadily as a focal point for the life of the State. Pioneer leaders like the miller, John S. Pillsbury, have served it loyally and contributed generously. Today it is second in size of enrollment only to California.

The public school system dates from the first year of the Territory, 1849. Today it is one of the best in the United States, serving more than half a million children. The early immigrants of Minnesota were for the most part literate people, many had read about the State in the guidebooks scattered over Europe, and all were eager for more education for themselves and their children. It is largely in the schools that Minnesota has made what many consider its chief contribution to the country as a whole, progress in the art of learning to live together.

The churches of the State stem from the work of the early missionaries, who had comparatively small success in converting the Indians in large numbers, but who built a firm foundation for the work of the denominations today. The Roman Catholic Church, with some 600,000 adherents, is the largest, the Lutherans second. All the leading Protestant churches and the Jewish faith are represented. In the cities are fine, large houses of worship; in the countryside, the modest white steeples of the early days still serve the needs of farming people. Religion is a living element in Minnesota's past and present, a source of inspiration for her social progress, and for her faith in the democratic future.

Even before it was a State, Minnesota had a historical society. It was the first institution incorporated by the State legislature. In the year when statehood was attained a history was published, bearing the seal of the Territory. That seal shows a pioneer with his hand on the plow, gazing toward the setting sun. Above him is a motto, Quo Sursum Volo Videre, "I wish to look forward."

We have the duty not only to honor the founders, but to pass on their faith and fire, to look forward as they did.

American Administration in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Shame on America," published in a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHAME ON AMERICA

There is one thing that General Clay should do in Germany before he has any thought whatever of coming home. That is to clean up the shocking background of the Malmedy convictions obtained by American prosecutors at Dachau. The record reads like the brutalities which the Nazis themselves practiced.

To make a very bad situation even worse, an Army review board at Frankfurt now attempts to justify the beatings, kickings, and other physical and mental torturings of German suspects. The board of review says that there was general use of ruses, stratagems, stoolpigeons, and similar practices, but that these were proper because of the difficulty of cracking the case.

While the Army board claims that physical violence was not systematically applied in order to obtain statements, it does conclude that undoubtedly in the heat of the moment on occasions interrogators did use some physical force on a recalcitrant suspect.

The board admitted without qualification of any kind that some suspects were told that if they did not talk their relatives would be deprived of ration cards. In other instances mock trials were held in which the accused were confronted with fake judges dressed in black, seated behind burning candles and a crucifix.

It is no defense at all of such third-degree handling of prisoners to say that the case was difficult to crack. Nor is it any justification that the massacre of 150 unarmed Americans by a German tank force at Malmedy in the Battle of the Bulge was a revolting brutality. The brutalities of the American military prosecutors were practiced after the United States had become a peacetime occupying power in Germany, dedicated to teaching the precepts of democracy, justice, and respect for the individual.

Not all Americans who were associated with these convictions have shut their eyes to their cruelties and deceit. Col. Willis N. Everett, Jr., appointed to defend the 74 Germans, contended that the accused had not had a fair trial and appealed for them to the United States Supreme Court. As a result of his powerful protest, the Department of the Army sent Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, and Judge Edward Van Roden, of Delaware County, Pa., to investigate the facts.

As long ago as last October that commission recommended commuting the death sentences of 29 of the prisoners. Its report, in addition to the brutalities noted above, said some defendants were kept in solitary confinement for months and that some were beaten in hoods bloody from beatings given other prisoners.

On this record here is an entry in the American performance in Germany which is of a piece with Hitlerism. It has been allowed to be part of our record far too long. What if General Clay does have to reverse the death sentences he has approved? What if he does rebuke the wearers of the Army uniform who forgot the basic principles of justice?

If our commander in Germany does not remove this shame from America in short order, he should be expressly directed to do so by Washington. Better that no one be specifically punished for the Malmedy brutality than that the United States condone brutality by our prosecutors overseas.

Lower Excise Taxes Mean More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House of Representatives, broadcast over the Mutual network Tuesday evening, March 15, 1949:

This was the final day for filing your 1948 Federal income-tax return. You know now how much will be your contribution to the cost of running your National Government, so far as direct taxation is concerned. Of course, you pay much more in the form of hidden taxes—taxes concealed in the cost of things you buy. But so far as your direct tax is concerned, you have observed how much less is your tax bill this year than in the previous year.

Over 7,000,000 people in this country, the men and women with the smallest incomes, will not be obliged to pay anything this year.

May I remind you this is the gift of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Congress you have heard assailed in the last campaign.

These tax cuts this year are a gift to the people by the Republicans and a number of patriotic Democrats in the Eightieth Congress.

It was passed by a two-thirds vote after the bill had been vetoed three times by President Truman.

The hard facts of taxation reach into every home in the land. Many of our people are still sweating over their final returns for

1948. Millions are wondering where the money is to come from to pay the balance due on their Federal taxes. Millions more are asking themselves:

"Where does all this money go in Washington?"

President Truman's budget for the fiscal year 1950, as now before Congress, calls for approximately $282 a year from every man, woman and child in the United States. This is for Federal taxes alone. If we add the State and local taxes, we find that the average American family today must lay aside from its income at least $100 a month for taxes before it has a nickel to spend on itself, for food, clothing, rent, amusements, and medical care.

In the United States today, the average workingman toils every third day for the Government. The other 2 days he works for himself and his family.

Taxes are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. That is why the problems of taxes and Government spending stand today as the first problem of government.

Taxes are too high. They must be reduced to give an incentive to expand and to earn.

The budget for 1950 is the biggest peacetime budget ever submitted to a representative legislative assembly, anywhere, at any time, in all history.

It marks an historic departure from the oft-repeated pledge through all the trying war years, that when the war was won, taxes would be cut back drastically to normal peacetime levels.

The President's revised budget for 1950 is almost $8,000,000,000 greater than the budget for 1948. This bigger government income would not go toward retirement of the national debt. All the increases shown in the 1950 budget are for more spending—not for paying off any part of the tremendous national debt, which now stands at 252 billions.

As Speaker of the House in the Eightieth Congress, it was my high privilege to assist in the enactment of a Federal tax reduction bill—a bill which eased the burden of Federal taxes by about $4,800,000,000 dollars a year. This tax reduction went mostly to families with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. Most of its benefits went to those who are least able to pay taxes.

During the last campaign administration orators condemned this tax reduction bill. But the people are now getting the benefit of lower taxes granted by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

I make a prediction tonight. If the Truman spenders have their way in the present Congress, that tax reduction bill will stand as the last Federal income-tax cut given the American people in our time.

But I do not believe the American people have yet seen their last tax reduction in this generation. On February 2, this year, I introduced another tax reduction bill—one to cut back the misnamed "luxury" taxes to their prewar rates. Many of these excise or sales taxes range from 15 to 25 percent on the retail purchase price of goods or services. Such high tax rates place many commonplace items beyond the reach of buyers. They restrict trade and contribute to spreading unemployment.

No nation can continue to pay wartime tax rates indefinitely in peacetime and maintain a high level of prosperity for its people.

New spending proposals submitted by President Truman to the present Congress would add another sixteen billions a year to the Federal budget during the next 5 years.

Then our Federal budget would be not forty-two billions a year, as at present—but fifty-eight billions a year.

That's the trail embarked upon in this, the fourth year after the end of hostilities. It is the trail which leads at last to complete national socialism—eventually to the police state, where liberty withers and freedom dies. Darkest Russia and her helpless victims behind the iron curtain are the classic example today of what happens to the people when the dictatorship of the spenders comes upon a land.

And let me sound this solemn warning to our people tonight—a bankrupt America is the hope and the desire of the Communists. That would give them their chance to take over the United States.

We have about 3,000,000 unemployed in the United States today—and this at a time when there are tremendous unfilled demands for housing, roads, public works of every sort, for automobiles, for basic tools and machinery of every kind. The fact that we now have increasing unemployment in the face of all these unfilled needs means that excessive taxes and reckless Government spending are discouraging enterprise and investment.

An unfortunate aspect of these excise taxes is that they fall most heavily upon women—for cosmetics and toilet preparations, for handbags, for infant needs, for low-cost jewelry and adornments of apparel, for travel, amusements, and recreation. They are in fact a harsh discrimination against millions of women. There are some 16,000,000 working women in the United States—stenographers, secretaries, saleswomen, and factory workers. Our wartime excise taxes clip these women for 20 percent more than the purchase price of many routine items.

Why hide longer behind the Government's dishonest phrase, "luxury taxes"? The tax today is 20 percent on a bottle of baby oil or infant powder. Do our spending bureaucrats call a baby a luxury in the American home? Many families today are spending $25 to $30 every month on these hidden taxes—enough to buy a week's groceries or more.

I do not believe the lady who buys a $5 handbag thinks she is buying a luxury, but she has to pay an extra dollar in the form of tax. In our state of civilization, most women believe that a few items of jewelry are an essential part of their wardrobe, and not a luxury at all. The bill which I have introduced would lower the tax on these items from 20 to 10 percent and would exempt entirely items classified as jewelry selling for less than $25 at retail.

Federal revenues are now feeling the results of these excessive taxes. Any retailer will tell you of a growing resistance to the high prices of which a 20-percent tax is too large a part. Reduce these taxes and we shall see a repetition of the historic principle that lower tax rates will actually increase revenues.

Since when in this country have electric light bulbs been luxuries? Yet you pay a 20-percent tax on them.

Some sections of our country experience severe winters. For the woman who must travel through a blizzard to a job, a fur coat is not a luxury. It is quite as essential as a pair of overshoes. The record shows that 80 percent of all fur coats sold in the United States retail at $300 or less. Now these are not the coats of the rich. For the most part, they are the coats of women who must work for a living. Yet these women must pay a 20-percent tax on an item which to them is an essential piece of apparel. At the same time, a woman of wealth may purchase a $500 evening gown or even a $1,000 cloth coat trimmed with ermine, tax free.

There is a 25 percent tax on telephone tolls and telegrams, even 15 percent on local telephone service, essential services of our daily lives.

You are still paying wartime excise taxes when you go to a movie or take a vacation trip on any form of public transportation.

Time does not permit me to go into greater detail, as I would like to do. But suffice it to say that these excessive excise taxes are a gross discrimination against a few selected industries, against their thousands of employees and particularly against the American consumers. They are a deterrent to a high level of national prosperity.

The Republican policy committee in the House of Representatives recently pledged itself by unanimous vote to make excise tax reduction one of its pledges for the Eighty-first Congress.

There was not a dissenting vote. We agreed unanimously that these wartime tax rates on everyday items should be cut back this year—at least to their prewar rates.

Through the recent reports of the Hoover Commission, every citizen now recognizes that the Federal establishment is a shocking hodgepodge of waste, extravagance, inefficiency, duplication, and overlap.

These surveys indicate clearly that the present functions of Government are costing about $3,000,000,000 a year more than they should. And if we were to eliminate those activities of Government which are not urgently needed in peacetime, we could realize further savings of several billions more. We can no longer afford many Federal activities launched during the flush days of wartime prosperity.

Excessive Government spending already has given us the 60-cent dollar. Excessive Government spending is one of the reasons why building costs are out of reach today for a vast majority of our people who work for wages.

To remedy this sorry situation, our national planners tell us we should spend more billions in Federal subsidies, another step along the road to national socialism. No, the true path to economic stability and sustained prosperity for the American people is through economy and efficiency in Government.

If we cut this gigantic Federal bureaucracy down to size, there will be adequate funds for the necessary functions of Government. Then we could not only pass the pending excise tax reduction bill, but eliminate these taxes altogether.

We must challenge at every step of the way that philosophy of government which says there is but one solution to our national problems—more spending, more taxes, or ever larger deficits.

California Needs Additional Veterans' Hospital Facilities

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare are starting hearings on the inadequate hospital facilities for veterans, especially in California. I have just testified before the committee. There is a very deplorable situation in the State of California due to inadequate facilities, and particularly due to the executive order curtailing funds for adding to the already inadequate hospital facilities in that State.

I wish to include in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the Department of Veterans' Affairs of California and other correspondence to show that the Veterans' Administration here in Washington has inaccurate figures as to the correct population of veterans of World Wars I and II in California. We not only have the men who were inducted from

our State, but we also have the additional load due to the great number of veterans from all over the United States who have come to California since the war.

The veterans now residing in California are faced with a serious problem when they are in need of hospitalization due to the inadequate facilities available for their care under the Veterans' Administration in that State.

In spite of constant protests, the Veterans' Administration, in estimating the need for additional hospital facilities to care for veterans in California, has continued to base their estimate on obsolete and inaccurate population figures. In fact, a comparison of Selective Service and Veterans' Administration statistics shows that central office credits California with fewer World War II veterans than the number enlisted and inducted from the State.

The records of the Veterans' Administration show on examination a progressively increasing number of case files transferred to California regional offices as compared with those transferred out, and the records also show that more loan guaranties to veterans have been issued in California than in any other single State.

During the last fiscal year the number of veterans receiving out-patient treatment in California through the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities total 206,499, or 10.65 percent of the Nation's total.

According to the latest figures compiled by the California State Department of Veterans' Affairs, there are a total of 1,700,000 veterans now residing in the State. Of this total, 1,300,000 are veterans of World War II, and 350,000 of these World War II veterans entered the State since their discharge.

The need for adequate hospital facilities for our veterans in California is urgent, and consideration must be given to enlarging present veterans' hospitals and constructing new ones rather than discontinuing any of the existing facilities, or curtailing any plan for hospital construction already scheduled.

The State of California is doing what it can to help veterans in need of medical care, but this is a problem which should be solved through the Veterans' Administration. At the present time over 2,000 veterans are in California State mental institutions, and 32 percent of all male admissions at this time are veterans.

Because of the serious need for adequate hospitals for veterans in California, I urge the restoration of the full hospital construction program for that State. The Nation owes this much to the veterans who served in the armed forces, in many cases losing their health due to incidents of service, for the preservation and protection of this country.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Sacramento, February 16, 1949.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: In a news release from Washington dated February 12, 1949, there is a statement that California Members of Congress have been told by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that expansion of veteran hospitals in this State is impossible at this time. The item further quotes Administrator Gray as informing a California delegation subcommittee "that the number of beds available in California veterans' hospitals is greater per unit of veterans population than in other sections of the Nation."

That General Gray makes such a statement is not surprising to the Department of Veterans' Affairs or to any of the veteran organizations in California, since the Washington office of the Veterans' Administration underestimates California's veteran population by 375,000. A comparison of selective service and Veterans' Administration statistics discloses that central office even now credits California with fewer World War II veterans than the number enlisted and inducted from this State.

The Veterans' Administration has consistently refused to consider as factors in establishing its estimate of California's veteran population the progressively increasing number of its case files transferred into California regional offices as compared with those transferred out. It ignores the fact that it has issued far more loan guaranties to veterans in California than in any other single State, and that there are 143 percent more veteran home owners in California than there were in 1945. Even though an analysis of its own December report reveals that the number of California veterans receiving outpatient treatment through the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities during the last fiscal year came to 206,499, or 10.65 percent of the total for the Nation, the Veterans' Administration refuses to recognize this as a factor.

The statement that continued expansion of veterans' hospitals in California is out of the question at this time is a matter of great concern to the veterans of this State. Two additional 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospitals have been long authorized for construction in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas. Over 2,000 veterans are currently in our State mental institutions, and 32 percent of all male admissions at the present time are veterans. Veterans' Administration facilities to care for tubercular patients are woefully inadequate. As for the general hospital situation, a high percentage of the beds are occupied by veterans from other States.

I hope that you will continue to work for restoration of the hospital-construction program planned for California, and if I can be of any assistance to you, please count on my utmost cooperation.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE C. STEVENS, *Director.*

FEBRUARY 25, 1949.

LAWRENCE C. STEVENS,
Director, Department of Veterans' Affairs,
State of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent letter concerning the statement of Veterans' Administrator Gray that no expansion of veteran hospitals in California is possible due to the number of beds now available per unit of veterans population.

I agree with you that Mr. Gray is not using accurate up-to-date figures on veterans population in California when he makes this statement, and have written to him urging that he reconsider the number of veterans in California and obtain an up-to-date estimate based on figures from all available sources so that adequate veteran hospital facilities can be provided in California. A copy of my letter is enclosed herewith.

Very truly yours,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Fifteenth District, California.

FEBRUARY 25, 1949.

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: I understand that you recently stated that no expansion of veterans' hospitals was possible in the State of California since, according to statistics now being accepted by the Veterans' Administration, the number of beds available in California veterans' hospitals is greater per unit of veteran population than in other sections of the Nation.

In my studies of the problems of the veterans in California, I have found that a comparison of Selective Service and Veterans' Administration statistics show that central office credits California with fewer World War II veterans than the number enlisted and inducted from the State. The records of the Veterans' Administration show on examination a progressively increasing number of case files transferred to California regional offices as compare with those transferred out, and the records also show that more loan guaranties to veterans have been issued in California than in any other single State. During the last fiscal year the number of veterans receiving out-patient treatment in California through the Veterans' Administration statistics shows that central abilities totaled 206,499, or 10.65 percent of the Nation's total.

At the present time, California does not have Veterans' Administration hospital facilities adequate to care for the number of veterans in the State. I, therefore, urge that you reconsider the number of veterans in California and obtain an up-to-date estimate based on figures from all available sources so that adequate facilities can be provided in California for the veterans who are now in the State.

Very truly yours,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress, Fifteenth District, California.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Sacramento, March 4, 1949.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: This department has received inquiries from several Members of Congress relative to the number of veterans now in California. For your information an analysis of the veteran population in this State as of January 1, 1949, is as follows:

World War II

California veterans (notice of, enlisted, or inducted from California	950,000
Other veterans (entered State since discharge)	350,000
Total	1,300,000

World War I and other wars

California veterans	130,000
Other veterans	270,000
Total	400,000
Total veterans in California	1,700,000

The Office of Selective Service reports that a total of 1,050,000 veterans were inducted or enlisted in California during the World War II period. This figure has been adjusted to account for casualties and out-migration. Accepted sources indicate 165,000 entered service from California during World War I as well as an unknown number who served during the Spanish-American and other wars. This figure has been adjusted to account for deaths and out-migration.

The sources of information pertaining to in-migration of veterans include: United States Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Census, the United States Department of Commerce, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion (report of March 16, 1946), the United States Employment Service, the California Department of Employment, the California Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and independent surveys of county service offices, and community service centers.

If I can be of assistance in providing additional information on this or any other matter concerning veterans in California, I shall be pleased to comply with your request.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE E. STEVENS, *Director.*

Irregularities Charged in Malmedy Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in support of my resolution—House Resolution 143—asking that a full and complete investigation be made of reports that United States investigators in the Malmedy case have practiced third-degree methods against those charged with the crime, I am including as part of my remarks two news articles which appeared in the New York Times on March 2 and March 5, 1949:

[From the New York Times of March 2, 1949]

PROTESTS INCREASE ON MALMEDY TRIAL—CHARGES OF BRUTALITY BY WAR-CRIMES INVESTIGATORS CAUSE DEMANDS FOR INQUIRY

(By William R. Conklin)

Charges that American war-crimes investigators used physical brutality and other third-degree methods on 74 Nazi defendants in the Malmedy war-crimes trial mounted yesterday as Gen. Lucius D. Clay prepared his final recommendations on 12 men condemned to death in that trial.

Following five separate reviews of the Malmedy verdicts in the last 18 months, General Clay is expected to reach his final decision this week. The American Military Governor in Germany has reviewed the trial record as well as many individual protests and group petitions against death sentences for the 12. Pending his final review, execution of the death sentences has been deferred until March 15.

In Washington, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, has introduced a resolution for a Senate investigation of American military justice in Germany, particularly the Malmedy trial. The Senator joined other critics of the trial in denouncing physical brutality and other illegal methods, which he said had been used against the Malmedy defendants. His resolution is now pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

When Senator LANGER introduced his resolution on January 27 last he quoted reviewing agencies as saying that confessions had been obtained through beatings and brutal kickings, knocking out teeth and breaking jaws, mock trials, solitary confinement, torture with burning splinters, posturing as priests, very limited rations, spiritual deprivations and false promises of acquittal.

In remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he said:

"We cannot have a double standard of justice, one brand for use at home and another for export. We must get to the bottom of this shocking deviation from American principle in American-occupied areas and we must correct the situation."

Informed of these and other charges, Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, said he could not comment on them in detail until he had seen General Clay's final report. Meanwhile, Mr. Royall declared that he could not say whether the charges were right or wrong. He pointed out that the allegations dealt with alleged illegal practices before sentences were passed in the Malmedy trials in July, 1946. The 74 defendants, members of Combat Group Peiper, were accused of murdering 83 American prisoners at Malmedy, Belgium, on December 17, 1944, in the Battle of the Bulge.

While allegations have been made that 137 Nazi defendants in the Malmedy and other war crimes trials had been kicked in the groin and that this was standard operating procedure with our investigators, Army officers in Washington denied that any such charges were part of the trial records. In one review, Col. Howard F. Bresee, chief of the War Crimes Branch, reported on August 12, 1948, that at no time was the mistreatment of war crimes suspects permitted or condoned.

Army spokesmen also pointed out that the 200,000 Germans suspected of war crimes at the end of the war had been narrowed down to the 1,672 who went to trial. They cited General Clay's first review of the cases on March 23, 1948, in which he reduced 43 original death sentences in the Malmedy case to 12. Of 17 others condemned to death in other cases, five have been hanged, eleven received commutation of sentences and one is still under consideration, they added.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the American Civil Liberties Union and The Christian Century magazine have protested the conduct of the Malmedy case. Two American attorneys who defended those accused of the Malmedy murders joined in condemning American prosecution methods. A third, Judge Edward Leroy Van Roden of Media, Pa., said his review of the trial showed that illegal procedures had been used.

In Atlanta, Willis M. Everett Jr., chief defense counsel in the Malmedy trial, was reported drafting a last-minute petition to the International Court of Justice to save the lives of the condemned 12. Since the international body will not entertain cases brought by individuals, Mr. Everett's move seemed to have scant chance for success. He, like Judge Van Roden, holds a colonel's commission in the Judge Advocate General Reserve.

SAYS CONFESSIONS WERE EXTORTED

In New York, Herbert J. Strong, German-born attorney who served as associate defense counsel, said the prosecution had employed strong-arm tactics to coerce the defendants into making false confessions.

Mr. Strong said he had a statement written and signed by Gen. Josef (Sepp) Dietrich, former commander of the sixth SS panzer division, saying that American investigators had kicked him in the groin and had beaten him before the trial. General Dietrich's statement also says that other defendants were subjected to the same treatment, Mr. Strong added. The former Nazi commander is now serving a life sentence in Landsberg Prison, Germany. His statement was not made part of the trial record because of prosecution objections, the defense counsel said.

"In fairness to the United States Army, it should be stated that the Malmedy war crimes trial was an exception to the general pattern of American military justice in Germany," Mr. Strong declared. "I served at the Malthausen and Buchenwald trials, where the rights of defendants were scrupulously protected. Since I was on both the prosecution and defense sides at various times, I had full opportunity to observe the operation of American military justice.

"I was present at the Malmedy trials at Dachau from beginning to end as associate defense counsel. We had less than 3 weeks to prepare a defense for 74 accused Nazis, and we could not get the record of the prosecution's case. As the only German-speaking attorney on the defense team, I interviewed all defendants and took statements from them. In almost every case they complained that physical violence had been used on them. They told me they had been subjected to mock trials to force confessions from them; that they had been kept in solitary confinement in violation of the Geneva convention; that false promises of acquittal had been made to them; and that their rations had been cut down to two meals a day."

KILLING OF PRISONERS DENIED

"Both before and after their conviction," the defense attorney said, "these defendants swore to me that they had not killed any American prisoners. They did admit shooting Belgian civilians in the Battle of the Bulge, because they were afraid of sabotage on their advancing army. But with the exception of two or three privates, all the defendants denied that they had shot American prisoners at Malmedy or elsewhere. SS Trooper George Fletz was identified at the trial by former Lt. Virgil P. Lary, of Lexington, Ky., as the man whose pistol shots touched off the Malmedy massacre. Most of the defendants were former members of the first SS panzer regiment, which broke through Malmedy in the German drive for Liege and Antwerp.

"There is no question that the American prisoners were shot down and that the shooting was done by German troops," Mr. Strong added. "But I am not satisfied that the trial showed that these particular defendants committed that particular war crime. The prosecution's case was largely circumstantial; hearsay evidence down to the second and third person was permitted; and the case rested chiefly on alleged confessions extorted by methods unauthorized by American judicial practice."

Born in Wiesbaden, Germany, of Jewish parents, Mr. Strong was baptized into the Protestant faith and later practiced law in Wiesbaden. He came here as a refugee in 1937 and practiced law here, returning to Germany for 8 months as a civilian attorney for the war crimes trials. He is with the law firm of Scribner & Miller and lives at 118 East Ninety-first Street, Manhattan.

THREE-MAN BOARD STUDIED CASE

Judge Van Roden was one member of a three-man Army commission appointed on July 29 last to review the record of the Malmedy trials and other war-crimes trials. With the Pennsylvania jurist, Secretary Royall named Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, as chairman, and Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence, Jr., of the Judge Advocate General's office.

On January 6 last Secretary Royall disclosed a portion of the Simpson commission report recommending reduction of the death sentences imposed on the Malmedy defendants. The report said that the trial record warranted a guilty verdict, but that sufficient doubt had been cast on the entire proceedings to make unwise the carrying out of the death penalty.

In addition to recommending life imprisonment or less for the 12 Malmedy defendants, the Simpson commission urged similar commutations for 17 others sentenced to death in war-crimes trials.

Interviewed in Chester, Pa., Judge Van Roden said he agreed with the criticisms of

the third-degree methods used by the prosecution and termed them "atrocities." He disclosed that Colonel Everett had tried for 2 years to obtain reduction of the death sentences. After the Atlanta attorney had tried in vain to get the United States Supreme Court to take jurisdiction in a habeas corpus proceeding, the Simpson commission went to Munich and took testimony in its review.

ASSERTS TRIAL WAS NOT FAIR

"In his petition to the United States Supreme Court, Colonel Everett made serious charges that the Germans had not received a fair trial," Judge Van Roden said: "Everett did not claim that all the German defendants were innocent, but since they did not have a fair trial, there was no way of telling which were innocent and which were guilty.

"Everett's petition contains 150 paragraphs, and if his charges against our American investigators are true, they would be a blot on the American conscience for eternity. Our specific assignment was not only to examine Colonel Everett's charges but also to examine the 139 death sentences which at that time remained unexecuted. One hundred and fifty-two had already been executed. While we did not go into the rest of the 1,672 cases tried by the Dachau American Military Government courts, I noted that of the 1,672 on trial 1,416 had been convicted. That is an unusually high percentage, which might indicate a presupposition of guilt.

"Let me say that the crimes for which these Germans were tried actually took place, and that Germans were guilty of them. The Malmedy massacres, in which a group of American prisoners of war were mown after being captured during the Battle of the Bulge, actually happened. But can we not distinguish between the assertion that these atrocities did happen and the assertion that they were committed by these 74 Germans who had been in or near Malmedy at that time? Because some wicked Germans did it, are we right to say that all Germans we lay our hands on are wicked and should be destroyed? That is not the way of thinking that I learned in my church.

"In the Malmedy case the American investigators claimed: 'We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods.' The persuasive methods included some violence and mock trials. The court was told that the cases rested on statements obtained by such methods. There was no jury. The court of 10 officers sat as judge and jury, and the law-member, the only person with legal training, made the final rulings on the admissibility of evidence."

REVIEW RESULTS SUMMARIZED

Summarizing the results of the Simpson Commission's review, Judge Van Roden expressed its findings as follows:

"Statements admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for 3, 4, and 5 months. Confined, between four walls, without windows, they had two meals a day shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families, nor with any minister or priest. Solitary confinement proved sufficient in some cases to persuade the Germans to sign prepared statements."

The Simpson commission's report was classified as secret by its members before transmission to Secretary Royall. Mr. Royall has released excerpts disclosing the recommendations for commutation of death sentences. The commission found that investigators customarily put black hoods over the heads of defendants, punched them in the face with brass knuckles, kicked them, and beat them with rubber hoses.

Judge Van Roden recounted the mock-trial procedure, in which defendants faced investigators dressed in American uniforms seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and only two candles providing light. After the sham court had imposed a sham death sentence he said the investigators again attempted to wring confessions from the accused.

"We were shocked by the crucifix being used so mockingly," the judge said. "In another case a bogus Catholic priest, actually an investigator, entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: "Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you would tell."

NO GENERAL CONSPIRACY FOUND

Judge Van Roden said his reviewing agency had found no general conspiracy to obtain evidence improperly. However, he insisted that the 29 condemned men certainly did not have a fair trial by American standards and should, in justice, have their sentences commuted to life imprisonment in 27 cases, to 10 years in one case, and to 2½ years in the last case.

A veteran of both world wars, the Pennsylvania jurist had two sons in the last war. One son, James, flew 35 missions over Germany, and another son, Richard, was shot down over Italy after 32 missions and spent a year in a German prison camp. Judge Van Roden presides over the Orphans Court in Media, county seat of Delaware County, Pa., and makes his home in Media.

Colonel Everett refused to discuss the Malmedy case for publication, though he has been notified that execution of the 12 death sentences had been postponed to March 15.

Following the imposition of sentences in July 1945, the Administration of Justice Review Board of the European Command reviewed the Malmedy case. In an interim report filed on August 18, 1948, the Board incorporated available testimony on the use of physical violence against Nazi defendants. Its final report, recently completed, was submitted to General Clay for his guidance in reviewing the case.

[From the New York Times of March 5, 1949]

UNITED STATES BOARD CRITICAL OF MALMEDY CASE—FINDS SOME ACCUSED WERE TOLD THEY MUST CONFESS TO SAVE RATIONS FOR FAMILIES

BERLIN, March 4.—Irregularities in the treatment of the accused, including physical force and threats that if they did not talk their relatives would lose their ration cards, are charged in the report of the Administration of Justice Review Board in the Malmedy case.

The case arose out of the massacre of United States prisoners in a field near Malmedy during the Battle of the Bulge.

[Two United States investigators denied in New York Friday that the prisoners had been mistreated or that violence had been used.]

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States military governor, will reconsider each of the 12 death sentences passed on German soldiers for their parts in the slaying as a result of the report.

Recommendations for commutation of sentences, made by the Simpson commission, whose report was released January 6, also will be considered in General Clay's review.

The review board was appointed to investigate allegations contained in a petition to the United States Supreme Court for a writ of habeas corpus filed by Willis Meade Everett, Jr., chief counsel at the trial.

These allegations charged improper methods in procuring testimony and impropriety in the conduct of the trial and raised legal questions concerning the guilt of the accused and the sufficiency of proof to support their convictions.

MAIN FINDINGS OF BOARD

The board confined its findings to the first two points and concluded that—

1. There was a limited use of mock trials in procuring testimony.

2. There was general use of the practice of persuading underlings to talk by telling them the prosecution wanted to get their superiors and was not so much interested in them.

3. Physical force was not systematically applied to obtain statements, but undoubtedly in the heat of the moment on occasions the interrogators did use some physical force on a recalcitrant suspect.

4. In certain instances the interrogators made threats to the accused that if they did not talk their relatives would be deprived of their ration cards.

5. The afore-mentioned practices in certain instances exceeded the bounds of propriety, but the board has been unable to identify such cases.

6. There was general use of ruses, stratagems, stool pigeons, and similar practices, justified by the difficulty of cracking the case.

7. Conditions at the prison and the methods employed in the interrogations had a definite psychological effect on the defendants and resulted in their being more amenable to giving statements.

8. The defense had difficulties in the preparation of its case, but such difficulties were ironed out and the defense, considering all circumstances of the case, had a reasonable time in which to prepare its case.

9. The remaining allegations of the petition relate to matters that are not deemed to have been substantial abuse under the circumstances.

USE OF MOCK TRIALS ASSAILED

Misconduct was alleged in two categories in the petition. The first was the use of mock trials, threats, inducements, and stratagems to procure sworn statements against the other accused and to obtain confessions. The second was the use of physical violence for similar ends.

The board found that in 8 or 10 instances a mock trial had been used to soften up the witnesses.

In these bizarre proceedings the defendant would be brought from his cell wearing a black hood.

The practice of employing these hoods whenever the defendant left his cell was used at Schwabische Hall Prison in Wuerttemburg-Baden to prevent communication with other prisoners and to prevent the individual prisoner from learning his destination, the report said.

Confronting the defendant when he reached the trial would be a table covered with a black cloth on which stood a crucifix and burning candles and behind which sat one or more persons impersonating judges.

At the end of the mock trial the defendant was made to understand it was his last chance to talk and undoubtedly in some cases understood he had been convicted, the report declared.

Another device was to have the man who posed as the defendant's advocate at the mock trial advise the defendant afterward to tell what he knew.

Undoubtedly some defendants would confess at least part of their crimes under the influence of such procedure, the report stated.

USE OF FLOODLIGHTS DENIED

The board dismissed allegations that floodlights had been directed on the eyes of the defendants during the interrogations or that they had been deprived of clothing while being questioned, as had been charged.

Nor could the board find the reason for the suicide of the prisoner who hanged himself in his cell. He had been under interrogation but the board said it was not convinced that

the prisoner had received the treatment alleged in the petition.

Considering the question of inducements the board found the prosecution's strategy had been to get statements first from enlisted men, and get them to involve their immediate superiors, then to confront those superiors with those statements and get them to involve people still higher up.

The board also found stool pigeons had been placed in cells with the accused in attempts to get statements.

The allegation that physical violence had been used to obtain statements was taken up at great length. Virtually all of the accused in their affidavits considered by the board declared violence had been used and all of interrogators and those in charge of them said no violence had been used.

Corroborating the claims of the various accused as to physical violence there is an affidavit from a dentist at the prison that says he treated 15 or 20 of the suspects for injuries to the mouth and jaw, apparently inflicted by blows, the report, asserted.

GERMAN CHIEF DISCOUNTED ABUSE

The German camp commander, on the other hand, said he had seen no ill treatment personally although he repeated in his affidavits rumors of mistreatment.

At the trial only 9 of the 73 defendants took the stand in their own defense and only 3 of them claimed any physical mistreatment. But in affidavits written a year and one-half after the trial nearly all of the defendants described physical mistreatment.

One prisoner testifying at the trial made no claim whatsoever to mistreatment. Yet in an affidavit written February 11, 1948, the prisoner said that he had been kicked and beaten in the face * * * and abdomen February 12, 1946. Another prisoner mentioned beatings administered by a lieutenant and a civilian at the trial but gave no details. But his affidavit stated, "I was beaten * * * in the face, in the abdomen, and in the genitals."

The board noted that if such actions had taken place the defendants had known of it at the time of the trial and presumably so had their counsel.

No reason appears to explain the fact that the matter was not brought out at that time or if brought out was not developed to the fullest extent, it added.

The report mentioned as additional considerations the fact that the accused were hostile witnesses and although young they were tough SS men who had been trained to hate Americans.

The entire case had to be developed from statements from them and because of the brutality of the Malmedy massacre and wide publicity it received the interrogating team was under pressure to crack the case * * * the report declared.

The board was composed of Col. John M. Raymond, Col. J. I. Harbaugh, Jr., and Dr. Carl J. Friedrich.

Ireland's Attitude on Participation in the Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting statement that was issued by Sean Nunan, Minister of Ireland, on the Atlantic Pact:

IRELAND'S ATTITUDE ON PARTICIPATION IN THE ATLANTIC PACT

1. Ireland is essentially a democratic and freedom-loving country. No country in Europe is so deeply attached to the ideals of Christian civilization and the democratic way of life, and, for that reason, no country in Europe is so free from communism. For the Irish people, these ideals mean not merely faith in fundamental human rights, but respect for the principles of national self-determination and of political, civil, and religious liberty and tolerance. More, perhaps, than any country in western Europe, Ireland wishes to be able to play its full part in protecting and preserving Christian and democratic principles and ideals.

2. In the matter of military measures, however, Ireland is faced with an insuperable difficulty from the strategic and political point of view by reason of the occupation of six of her northeastern counties by British forces against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people. It is unnecessary here to set out the full case against the partition of Ireland. It is sufficient to recall that, although no country in the world can claim to have more clearly defined boundaries, a more homogeneous population, or a more distinct national history, Ireland was partitioned by an act of the British Parliament in 1920 for which not a single one of the Irish representatives in the British Parliament at the time voted. The continuance of this partition of Ireland is naturally and bitterly resented by the Irish people as a violation of Ireland's territorial integrity and as a denial in her case of the elementary democratic right of national self-determination.

3. It is obvious that, in these circumstances, any military alliance, or commitment involving joint military action, with the state which was responsible for the partition of Ireland, which continues to occupy a portion of the country with its armed forces, and which supports the undemocratic practices of the Stormont regime, must be quite out of the question so far as Ireland is concerned. Any Irish Government which entered into such alliance or commitment would inevitably run the risk of having to face, in the event of a crisis, the prospect of civil conflict within its own jurisdiction.

4. From the strategic point of view, any such alliance or commitment is equally out of the question. It is quite apparent that the defense of a small island such as Ireland could only be undertaken effectively by a single authority having at its back the firm support of a decisive majority of the population of the whole country. The difficulties of sharing the defense of the country with the state that is wrongly occupying a portion of it are too obvious to require elaboration. Furthermore, the six northeastern counties constitute essentially the industrial area of the country. It would obviously be necessary, from the strategic point of view, that the productive capacity of the country as a whole should be integrated under a democratically elected central authority. This is impossible as long as partition lasts.

5. The political difficulties of the present situation are aggravated by the undemocratic practices of the Northern Ireland Government. It is well known that, in an area approximating four of the six northeastern counties, there is an over-all majority against partition. The people in this area naturally consider themselves to be the victims of undemocratic coercion in that they are prevented from uniting with the rest of Ireland.

6. Taking all the foregoing considerations together, it is only too clear that no Irish Government could possibly expect to find the necessary support for a policy involving a military alliance with a power that continues to lend its sanction, tacit or active, to evils of the very kind which it is the object of the proposed North Atlantic Pact to oppose and prevent.

7. This does not mean that the Irish Government is actuated by feelings of hostility toward Britain. On the contrary, a closer and a better relationship with its great neighbor, Britain, is a major aim of the Irish Government's foreign policy. Since the enactment of the Republic of Ireland Act, there is only one outstanding cause of friction and misunderstanding between Ireland and Britain, namely, partition. Ireland is keenly anxious to develop good and normal relations with Britain. This being in the interest, not merely of Ireland, but of Britain as well, every consideration of constructive statesmanship points to the necessity of ending, once and for all, the centuries-old conflict between the two islands. There are so many factors and so many interests making for good neighbourly relations between Ireland and Britain that it is inconceivable that once British interference in Ireland is removed, and the ordinary geographical, ideological and other forces given full play, Ireland should ever constitute a source of danger or embarrassment to Britain in time of war. Any detached or impartial survey of the strategic and political position must lead to the conclusion that a friendly and united Ireland on Britain's western approaches, is not merely in the interest of Britain, but in the interesta of all countries concerned with the security of the Atlantic area.

8. The wisest and most realistic approach to the question of North Atlantic security lies, therefore, so far as Ireland is concerned, in ending a situation which threatens the peace of these islands and which may, at any moment, prove a source of grave embarrassment to both Britain and Ireland. It is better to face this question as a matter of urgency now, rather than to allow a situation to develop, wherein a solution might become more difficult. Sooner or later, this question will have to be solved. It should be faced now, in a realistic fashion, rather than in other and possibly more difficult circumstances. Far from rendering disservice to Britain, the ending of partition would add considerably to the strength of Britain and to the good relations between the states of the Atlantic community. By offering their assistance and mediation, and by creating a situation wherein the problem could be discussed, the participating nations would not merely assist to end an undemocratic and dangerous situation, but would also render an invaluable service toward the strengthening of the internal harmony and cohesion of the community of states in the North Atlantic.

Report of Consultants to United States Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons, the report which follows is an enduring administrative-law document. It is one of the more fundamental early fruits of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. Among the least significant of its features is the announcement that

some Federal administrative trial examiners should be removed for inexperience or incapacity. Much more important is the fact that it describes the beginning of a system of great promise for the selection of what amounts to administrative judges in Federal agencies. It is not only a notable example of service—uncompensated—by members of the legal profession but also a welcome instance in which an agency of the United States has thus utilized the great resources of the bench and bar in peacetime. It is a long step forward in the creation of a corps of judicial officers worthy of the executive branch of the Government of the United States. It is another hopeful chapter in the reform of administrative law initiated by lawyers a decade or so ago. It is living proof of the determination of the Nation to preserve in the flesh its tradition of government under law.

The report follows:

HEARING EXAMINER PERSONNEL UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—FIRST REPORT OF THE CONSULTANTS TO THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

I. HISTORY, OBJECTIVES, AND PROBLEM

As necessary background it will be desirable to mention first (1) the origin of the project, (2) the appointment of consultants, (3) the standards and limitations applied, and (4) the several different classes of persons examined.

1. Origin of the project. No attempt will be made here to discuss the long history of studies, reports, and legislative proposals which led to the present undertaking. They are summarized in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives with respect to the Administrative Procedure Act (Rept. No. 1980, 79th Cong., pp. 7–16; also S. Doc. 248, 79th Cong., pp. 241–250).

The group of consultants was established and appointed by the United States Civil Service Commission pursuant to the responsibility conferred by section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946.

The whole of the Administrative Procedure Act is important in understanding the policy adopted by Congress and the executive with respect to examiners in formal administrative cases. Section 7 (a) provides that only the heads of agencies or examiners may serve as presiding officers, which in general and with few exceptions means that only examiners may perform functions otherwise committed to officers appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Such examiners, under the same section, must be able to perform those functions in an impartial manner and are subject to disqualification in particular cases. Sections 7 (b) and 7 (c) demonstrate that they are to exercise their hearing functions judicially. Section 8 provides that, with some exceptions, they are not only to hear cases but to take an important part in the decision of cases. Sections 9 and 10 emphasize that their actions must conform to law.

Section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act provides that examiners shall be qualified and competent, perform no duties of a nature which would be inconsistent with their functions as examiners, and enjoy independence and security of tenure. It also provides that, consistent with the act, these objectives are to be carried out within the framework of the civil-service system, and for that purpose the Civil Service Commission is given special powers. Section 11 thus reads in full as follows:

"Subject to the civil-service and other laws to the extent not inconsistent with this act, there shall be appointed by and for each agency as many qualified and competent examiners as may be necessary for proceedings pursuant to sections 7 and 8 who shall be assigned to cases in rotation so far as practicable and shall perform no duties inconsistent with their duties and responsibilities as examiners. Examiners shall be removable by the agency in which they are employed only for good cause established and determined by the Civil Service Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) after opportunity for hearing and upon the record thereof. Examiners shall receive compensation prescribed by the Commission independently of agency recommendations or ratings and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) of section 7 of said act, as amended, and the provisions of section 9 of said act, as amended, shall not be applicable. Agencies occasionally or temporarily insufficiently staffed may utilize examiners selected by the Commission from and with the consent of other agencies. For the purposes of this section, the Commission is authorized to make investigations, require reports by agencies, issue reports, including an annual report to the Congress, promulgate rules, appoint such advisory committees as may be deemed necessary, recommend legislation, subpena witnesses or records, and pay witness fees as established for the United States courts."

Pursuant to section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Civil Service Commission first appointed an advisory committee to recommend requirements and procedures. It assisted the Commission in classifying examiner positions, proposed regulations, and suggested minimum qualifications for examiners. The Commission then held a public hearing at Washington, D. C., where Members of Congress and representatives of agencies, the public, and interested professional organizations stated their views. Thereafter the Commission issued regulations (12 F. R. 6321, Sept. 23, 1947).

Section 34.3 (a) of those regulations provides that incumbent examiners with full or competitive civil-service status "may be given absolute appointments as hearing examiners * * * if they are found by the Commission to be qualified and competent to perform the duties of hearing examiners." Such examiners must have been serving in positions which became hearing-examiner positions on June 11, 1947, and must have been conditionally appointed to such positions under the Administrative Procedure Act on such date. The Commission's simultaneous release of September 22–23, 1947, states that for this purpose the Commission would establish the present group of consultants, that the latter would develop standards, that in accordance with such standards the Commission would make a complete qualifications investigation of each incumbent, that such incumbents would be required to appear before the consultants for oral interviews, and that only those incumbents whom the consultants found eminently qualified to be hearing examiners would receive regular appointments under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

It is to be noted that the foregoing applied only to persons who (1) had full civil-service standing and (2) were actually performing examiner work. But thereafter, in May 1948, the function of the consultants was extended to the determination of the qualifications and eligibility of (1) so-called "war service" or "temporary" incumbent examiners and (2) applicants for examiner positions who were either nonexaminer Government employees or outsiders engaged in private professional work or State or local government service. The consultants were thus asked to function with respect to all present or prospective examiners who are subject to the Administrative Procedure Act.

2. Consultants and associates designated: There are, in fact, two groups of consultants. The first, appointed at the close of 1947, consists of Douglas L. Edmonds, associate justice, Supreme Court of California; Joseph W. Henderson of Philadelphia, former president of the American Bar Association; Laurance M. Hyde, associate justice, Supreme Court of Missouri; Wilson M. Matthews, examiner, United States Civil Service Commission; Carl McFarland, chairman, practicing attorney of Washington, D. C., and former assistant attorney general; and Willis Smith of Raleigh, N. C., former president of the American Bar Association. These have remained the principal group to date.

When the consultants' function was extended to war-service and temporary incumbents and outside applicants in May 1948, on the recommendation of the original group of consultants the Commission appointed the following advisory consultants or associates to function in the several regions of the country: Albert Ewing of Nashville, Tenn., delegate of his State to the governing body of the American Bar Association, for part of the South; Chester T. Lane of New York City, former general counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for New York and New Jersey; Clarence A. Miller of Washington, D. C., vice president and general counsel of the American Short Line Railroad Association, for the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia; Morris Mitchell, practicing attorney of Minneapolis, for Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota; Charles B. Stephens of Springfield, Illinois, executive secretary of the Illinois State Bar Association, for Illinois and Indiana; Robert G. Storey of Dallas Texas, dean of the law school at Southern Methodist University and president of the Texas State Bar Association, for Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; and Glenn R. Winters of Ann Arbor, Mich., secretary-treasurer of the American Judicature Society, for Michigan. In addition, Chief Justice Carl V. Weygandt of the Supreme Court of Ohio and Associate Justice John V. Spaulding of the supreme judicial court of Massachusetts agreed to cooperate in the same work on an entirely informal basis with respect to applicants from their respective States. The original group of six consultants have aided in the regional work at their places of residence.

3. Standards and limitations to be applied: The Commission required the consultants to operate within two concepts. Examiners, or applicants for certification to eligibility for examiner positions, must (a) have had stated general and special experience and (b) demonstrate specified aptitudes or abilities. These requirements are established by the Commission's Examining Circular EC–17 issued October 21, 1947. They may be briefly described as follows:

(a) Prerequisite general or special experience: As a prerequisite to consideration, any incumbent or applicant must first demonstrate that he or she has had at least (i) 6 years' experience of a professional nature, of which the simplest and most common example is 6 years' practice or Government service as a lawyer, including (ii) 3 to 6 years of specialized experience. The latter means experience in the special fields of governmental or private endeavor loosely known as administrative law or public regulation. Examiner positions are of several different professional grades under the Federal Employee Classification Act and, under the Commission's regulations for examiners under the Administrative Procedure Act, the higher the grade (and the salary) the greater the number of years of specialized experience required.

Pursuant to the Commission's instruction that the consultants develop standards, there is attached as exhibit A a statement of the premises formulated and followed by them, together with examples, in applying the rule of the Commission requiring as a prerequisite that incumbents or applicants shall

have had general or special experience of specified duration for the several grades of examiner positions.

It is also to be noted that, as required by the Commission, general or special experience must have been progressively responsible. Thus experience so long past as to invite doubt of present ability may not qualify an applicant.

Finally, the Commission requires that previous experience in each case must be such as to demonstrate conclusively possession of the required aptitudes and abilities discussed next.

(b) Individual aptitudes, abilities, and temperament: In addition to the demonstrated possession of the required general or special experience as set forth above, the Commission has provided that incumbents and applicants must have "demonstrated conclusively" their possession of certain aptitudes and abilities. These may be fairly summarized as the general ability to act independently, objectively, efficiently, and fairly as an administrative judge—which in this case means, more specifically, the ability to preside at hearings with dignity and command, to assure that necessary factual information is developed for the record at a hearing, to analyze evidence and interpret and apply law or policy correctly, and to write decisions or recommendations of high quality. Of course the case of an incumbent or applicant will be aided to the extent that he can further show either diversity of experience or broad knowledge of the technical and other special factors involved in his field of special competence. It should be emphasized, however, that the consultants have sought generally apt, able, and tempermentally fitted examiners—not specialists in particular subjects such as radio, railroads, or rates. "The applicants must also show conclusively that they are persons of judicial temperament and poise."

The application of these directions has largely required the judgment of the consultants in individual cases involving an infinite variety of personal qualities, attributes, and combinations thereof.

4. Classes of incumbents and applicants: Before coming to matters of method and results, it will be helpful to differentiate between several groups of persons who have been subject to the scrutiny of the consultants.

(a) Status incumbents. First are those presently doing examiner work with full or competitive civil-service status, who were serving in positions which became hearing-examiner positions on June 11, 1947, and were conditionally appointed to hearing-examiner positions under the Administrative Procedure Act on that date. This means that they are Government employees of substantial periods of service. The rules and procedure of the Commission contemplate that they be examined first and specially.

The Commission has directed that only eminently qualified status incumbents be approved by the consultants. It is also to be noted that, under the regulations, incumbents or applicants may show the nature and extent of their prior experience in writing or orally up to the time the consultants act on a given case.

(b) Nonstatus incumbents. Next are persons in examiner positions who were either appointed during the war, and hence could not acquire full or competitive civil-service status, or who have been appointed, transferred, or promoted to such positions after June 11, 1947, when section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act became effective. These people compete with other Government-employee applicants and complete outsiders.

(c) Nonexaminer Government employees. A third class which should be mentioned are Federal employees who are not examiners but have applied for certification of eligibility for such positions. These people have in many cases been in a position to obtain valuable experience in public regulation and so-called administrative law. Similarly, many employees of State or local governments have made application for certification, and here too their positions have in many cases afforded them opportunity to acquire valuable qualifying experience.

(d) Private practitioners or specialists: The last group are the private practitioners or specialists. Very often they have had some public-service experience. In the towns and smaller cities their experience is apt to be widely diversified. But the number of applications of persons of high examiner quality from metropolitan areas has been disappointing. Indeed, apart from the special and temporary case of the incumbents, it must be admitted that the number of well-qualified applicants from the ranks of nonexaminer government personnel and from private practice or specialization is disappointingly low. The ratio of high quality privately occupied applicants definitely increases in those areas where an active representative of the group of consultants is available to publicize the opportunities or to consult with those interested—a situation which suggests that consultants may have recruiting ability of appreciable value.

(e) Chief examiners: An unexpected development has been the emergence of a serious problem when agencies ask that consideration be given the case of fairly numerous administrative officers who are called chief, or assistant or associate chief, examiners. Very few agencies do not indulge in the practice of having such officers as a part of their examiner set-up. Whether they do or not is of no concern to the consultants. But it does concern them to be asked to certify that such persons are incumbent examiners when they are in fact either not performing examiner functions are are doing so to a necessarily limited extent. This does not mean that the consultants would see objection to a chief examiner who had no substantial administrative duties and who, like the chief justice of a court, is merely the spokesman or first among equals.

On the other hand, and without seeking to have them certified also for permanent appointment as working examiners under the Administrative Procedure Act, so far as the consultants are concerned any agency may, if it desires, have chief examiners or assistant or associate chief examiners for the assignment of cases, keeping of records, and other office management functions. If so, no reason appears, even apart from the Administrative Procedure Act, why agencies should desire to confer security of tenure and compensation upon such administrative officers.

Some agency heads have requested the consultants to express views as to the proper organization of an examiner corps for an agency. Although that problem undoubtedly differs more or less from agency to agency and advice upon it is not a function of the consultants, the latter can say that in the course of their work they have become convinced that one of two serious defects too often results from a chief examiner form of organization. Either the chief examiner becomes immersed in "housekeeping" routines which do not require an examiner's services, or he becomes a directing executive destructive of the initiative and independence of his flock who under the Administrative Procedure Act are supposed to be freed of such influence.

In any event the consultants have declined to consider administrative officers as examiners, even if they hear an occasional case. In some instances agencies have certified that chief examiners (or associate or assistant chief examiners) were assigned to the duties of a bona fide hearing-examiner position when in fact the individuals concerned did not perform true examiner duties. Hearing examiners, it is true, may properly have some duties other than those of conducting hearings or making or participating in decisions, and for that reason the consultants have considered the actual work of these individuals over a reasonable period of time. If that scrutiny did not disclose real examiner work as of June 10, 1947, the individuals have been rated as any other nonstatus or nonincumbent applicant and, if found eligible, placed on the register for appointment to examiner positions in competition with other nonstatus or nonincumbent applicants.

II. METHOD OF OPERATION

The week of February 9–14, 1948, was devoted to meetings with representatives of agencies, with representatives of the Federal examiner corps, and with the Commission. Thereafter the consultants operated singly or in panels of two or more for the purpose of individual cases. But the whole group met repeatedly for the transaction of general business or the discussion of policy and procedure. Associates, of course, operated singly in their regions except when invited to sit in at meetings of the main group or its panels. Oral interviews or examinations were conducted with all incumbents and with such nonincumbent applicants as seemed qualified on the paper record they had submitted.

Generally, if a case reached the rating stage, the incumbent or applicant was graded on the customary college scale—A, B, C, D, E, and F, with pluses or minuses and C the passing grade. Thereafter the individual or panel who had conducted the oral interview-examination and made the initial rating has discussed the case at a meeting of the consultants or submitted ordinary detailed findings by mail. In November–December 1948 all incumbent cases had been completed, and, for the purposes of this first report, the list of nonincumbent applicants was closed. Results were reconsidered, particularly with a view to making the determinations in individual cases further uniform and equitable. (A postaudit of the results indicates that panels of two or three members tended to more uniform, and slightly more conservative, ratings.) Findings have been made in each case, and ratings and grade levels have been assigned. Consultants disqualified themselves in cases in which they felt they might be prejudicial or partial. They have authorized their chairman to authenticate action in individual cases except that, when he has disqualified himself in a case or is otherwise unavailable, any other consultant may do so.

In other respects the method is best described by classes of personnel, as follows:

1. Status and nonstatus incumbents: In the case of all status incumbents of examiner positions, and of nonstatus incumbents who had been in examiner positions for some time, there was first a careful investigation conducted by picked, legally trained, and well-qualified investigators of the Commission operating under the direction of the consultants. This investigation included interviews, with associates of, and practitioners before, the incumbent as well as a review of his personnel record and the quality of his work. Thereafter each incumbent was interviewed by a panel of two or more consultants, who at that time or theretofore also examined specimen records and reports in cases conducted by the person so examined. When all consultants present at the interview-examination were satisfied that nothing would be gained by further time—well over an hour was the usual interview period per case—the incumbent was excused and each member of the panel recorded his vote and judgment secretly. Immediately thereupon each read what he had so written, the chairman if present and participating announcing his last. Then the next case was imme-

diately called or the session was adjourned. In only a few cases, no matter how many consultants participated, did the several votes and judgments vary in range more than, for example, between C and B. Ordinarily there might be a difference of at most a C, a C plus, and a B minus; or an A, an A minus, and a B. In the usual case two or three panel members would reach the identically same conclusion so that, for example, there would be a C and two C pluses.

2. Nonexaminer Government employee applicants: The application papers of all applicants other than incumbents were examined by the Commission member of the consultant group who, if he found a lack of prerequisite experience qualifications as set forth hereinbefore, marked the application "ineligible" and thus finally disposed of it for the present purposes. Applicants from the Federal service, who were not in examiner positions, were then usually assigned to the two consultants and one associate resident in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area for examination and rating. They first divided the cases. Two of them chose to operate as a panel of two on all their cases. The other chose to operate alone as authorized by the group. Each reported orally on his findings and judgment in each case, and discussed any doubtful or general problems encountered, with the full group at its November-December 1948 meeting.

3. Outside or private practitioner applicants. If found eligible in the preliminary screening of papers submitted, all other applicants were ordinarily investigated, interviewed, and examined by a single consultant or one of the associates located in the region in which the applicant resided. They reported their judgment and findings in each case either by mail or orally at the November-December 1948 meeting. All such cases were either discussed with, or carefully reconsidered on the paper record by, regular consultant members of the group.

4. Future cases. Presumably the future method of operation will remain essentially the same until changed by the consultants or Commission. Investigation and examination of incumbent examiners will, of course, not recur. The consultants, later in this report, recommend certain changes in method. Naturally, there will be fewer cases to consider and fewer vacancies to be filled in agencies or on the register.

III. RESULTS IN SPECIFIC CASES TO DATE

The consultants understand that they will not publish their results in individual cases of incumbents or others, nor would the Commission normally do so. The consultants have not attempted to determine loyalty questions; pursuant to the Commission's instructions those are left to the Commission's loyalty review program, to which the action of the consultants is subject in each individual case. Presumably the Commission will notify agencies respecting action on their incumbents, and an individual letter will also be addressed to the incumbent himself. Nonincumbents will receive the usual form-letter notification. It may, however, be useful to give here the statistics of the results reached by the consultants:

1. Status incumbents: The consultants have not found it possible to apply literally the "conclusively demonstrated" and "eminently qualified" standard adopted by the Commission. But, despite more liberal approach, the number of disqualifications is substantial. Almost all of them are grounded upon (1) lack of the prerequisite experience or (2) abilities indubitably very mediocre at best. Only a handful of the disqualifications are based upon a judgment and finding of bias, prejudice, or lack of objectively judicial temperament. Statistics are given in table I. By agencies, the same results are shown in table IV.

2. All other applicants: Nonstatus incumbents must compete with applicants from nonexaminer positions and private life. Thus, while a status incumbent may retain his position though rated only C by the consultants, a nonstatus incumbent may not so long as there are people with higher ratings on the register.

Since, as explained above, the consultants adopted a liberal rule for the grading of status incumbents, they have met with difficulty in the grading of nonstatus incumbents and nonincumbents because, presumably, the standard should be uniform as between the several classes of persons rated. On such a basis, nonstatus incumbents and nonincumbents become eligible for the register if they achieve a rating of C minus. But it would more nearly meet the quality of person sought by the Commission—that is, persons whose prior experience and performance demonstrate conclusively that they are eminently qualified—if a grade of B minus or better could be established as a passing mark. Since it appears that such cannot be done under present policy and practice, it is the hope of the consultants that the same result will be achieved by the maintenance of a register which, by a sufficiency of highly rated and graded eligibles, will make it unnecessary and impossible for agencies to select persons who are on the register but are rated below B minus. To this end continued recruiting is required and should be a primary concern of the Commission and other interested parties as well as of the group of consultants.

On this basis the results of the work of the consultants respecting nonstatus incumbent examiners are shown in statistical form in table II. The same results, by agencies, are shown in table IV.

The results with respect to all other applicants are shown in statistical form in table III. The figures are self-explanatory. There, unlike the other classes of applicants, some have been disqualified because, for lack of prerequisite experience, they were not eligible for the high grade of position they stated as the minimum post they would accept. These figures indicate that recruiting may become a chief difficulty if the Commission's high standards are to be maintained. However, with increased knowledge of the system and opportunities as well as fewer vacancies to fill, that problem does not appear insurmountable.

3. By agencies: No purpose would appear to be gained by publicizing the incumbent statistics by agencies. The several agencies which have applied for permanent appointment of incumbents are the Agriculture Department, Civil Aeronautics Board, Civil Service Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Security Agency (Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, and Food and Drug Administration), Federal Trade Commission, Interior Department (Office of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Land Management), Interstate Commerce Commission, Labor Department, Maritime Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Treasury Department (Alcohol Tax Unit, and Coast Guard). In terms of results reached by the consultants and without identifying the agencies, statistics respecting incumbent applicants by agencies are shown in table IV. There it appears that there is a wide disparity in the present standards and practices of the several agencies so far as their examiners are concerned.

IV. FURTHER IMMEDIATE PROCEDURE

Pursuant to the Commission's standing instructions to the consultants to make such recommendations as they may deem appropriate, it is suggested that the Commission make due provision for (1) the prompt effective date of the adverse determinations respecting individual incumbents, (2) orderly access by agencies to the register of eligibles, and (3) the establishment of a system of full consultant reconsideration and Commission review upon the request or appeal by any agency or applicant adversely affected. These suggestions may be explained as follows:

1. Effective date of determinations in individual cases: After such consideration and action as the Commission itself may desire to take in individual cases or respecting the whole problem, it is suggested that the adverse results as to incumbent examiners be made operative promptly except that (1) any such examiner should be permitted to complete any case upon which he is presently engaged, but (2) in no event should this period be permitted to extend in any case beyond 3 months save with the written consent of the Commission for cause. The purpose of the recommendation is obvious—to make it unnecessary for any agency to redo any part of any case already in process, and at the same time to permit the Commission to prevent evasions for any undue period.

2. Access to new register of eligible examiners: Not only because of the substantial number of disqualifications found by the consultants but also because many agencies have for some time not been filling examiner vacancies, it is necessary that some means be found to regulate the access of agencies to the comparatively small register so far made feasible. Since it is uncertain what agencies will move first or when, formulation of any hard and fast rule may be impossible at least for awhile. However, it is the recommendation of the group of consultants that the Commission authorize its employee member, who is now also the group's executive officer, to regulate the traffic, so to speak, as best he can with such assistance from other Commission personnel as may appear proper and with a view to achieving the maximum purpose of the whole operation.

3. Reconsiderations by consultants and appeals to Commission: Every action of the consultant group is, of course, necessarily subject to review and revision by the Commission. It has been understood all along that such would not be the case, however, to the extent that matters of judgment in individual cases may be involved. The position of the consultants is that (1) they will remain available to reconsider promptly any case upon any relevant ground and (2), because among other things no court would seem to have authority to review these cases, the consultants desire that no impediment be placed against full and painstaking review of any case by the Commission. For these reasons the consultants suggest that there be two phases to the reconsideration-review process within the Commission, as follows:

(a) Reconsideration: It is suggested that the consultants be permitted, upon due application by any agency, incumbent examiner, or other applicant, to reconsider the grounds of their decision with or without, in the discretion of their chairman, further oral interview-examination by an individual member or a panel of the consultant group. In any case in which new evidence is offered, as for example with respect to prior experience for lack of which an incumbent has been found not qualified, it is suggested that it be mandatory that the case be resubmitted to the consultants for reconsideration.

(b) Commission review: After such reconsideration by the consultants as the Commission may see fit to require, it is suggested that next recourse of an appellant be to the Commission. With a reconsidered judgment of the consultants, the Commission should be in a position to pass upon appeals

expeditiously after any necessary intermediate preparatory procedures and such oral argument as it may desire to accord the appellants.

V. FUTURE OPERATION AND SYSTEM

The consultants do not assume to foresee, much less now to recommend the solutions for, the many problems which are bound to appear. It does not seem to them, however, that these are likely to be serious; they are more likely to be in the nature of adjustments necessary or desirable as the system begins to settle down.

There will indeed be two classes of adjustments. First will be those which do not involve the qualification of examiners. For example, it will be necessary from time to time to review the classification of examiner positions and assure that incumbents are adequately compensated as contemplated by the Administrative Procedure Act. Second will be those problems which involve the qualification of examiners. In this respect the consultants feel that they may presently offer the following several suggestions:

1. Continuation of the consultant system. Although at least for awhile it seems plain that the group of consultants should be held together and continue to operate, some routine adjustants should be made to ease the burden. These need not be discussed here. Their present quarters and staff should be maintained.

2. An official examiner organization. The consultants strongly recommend that the Commission immediately establish by regulation an official examiner assembly, composed of all examiners unconditionally appointed under the Administrative Procedure Act, to act as an advisory body to the Commission and to collaborate with the consultants. Such an organization should be permitted to organize, elect officers, appoint committees, hold meetings, and engage in any activities not incompatible with its general purposes. The executive officer of the consultants might be assigned to act as such for the examiner assembly as well.

3. In-service training, productivity, and promotions: The consultants find that most present incumbents make insufficient effort to keep abreast of legal or other relevant developments. Their horizons apparently narrow to the routines and confines of their quarters, with an occasional contact through the press (particularly a relevant and active trade press) or in conversation respecting the course of administrative law or the national setting of the work of only the agency they serve. Very few have read official studies, such as the report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, or even reports of legislative committees bearing directly on the examiners of their own agency.

This regrettable situation should be corrected. The work of the Commission and the consultants over the past year will certainly be futile if high standards of selection are permitted to deteriorate in the individual case after appointment. It occurs to the consultant that the Commission, through its control of the classification and promotion of examiners, may require of them continued and regular reading, study, or even experience beyond the indispensable minimum necessities of their daily work. The problem, incidentally, affords a splendid opportunity for the proposed examiner assembly to make recommendations to the Commission for necessary future action.

Related to the need for greater expertness and broader up-to-dateness of the individual examiner is the matter of individual efficiency and productivity. Under present conditions, the consultants have noted in some agencies an appallingly low-production record for the average examiner. Increase of real expertness as well as alertness to developments in the relevant related subjects should, of course, carry with them an increased and better case output on the part of the individual examiner. In any event, security of tenure and compensation must not be permitted to be turned into license for poor individual performance. It occurs to the consultants that the Commission will need to take account of this factor in setting up its promotion registers in each agency. In addition, the Commission should undertake some form of periodic check of examiner performance to prevent abuse of the security conferred upon examiners by the Administrative Procedure Act.

TABLE I.—*Status incumbent statistics*

Total number of status incumbent examiners	148
Number lacking required experience	14
Number lacking required ability or aptitude	28
Total found not qualified under Commission rules and standards	42
Total found qualified for permanent and unconditional appointment	106

TABLE II.—*Nonstatus incumbent statistics*

Total number of nonstatus incumbent examiners	69
Number lacking required experience	8
Number lacking required ability or aptitude	4
Number found not qualified under Commission regulations	12
Total graded C minus or better	52
Total graded less than B minus	20
Total at B minus or better	32

NOTE.—These figures include 44 persons appointed to examiner positions since June 11, 1947. Such appointments required preliminary approval of the Civil Service Commission. The incumbents so appointed were required to be selected from applicants for consultant approval after conditional approval by the Commission in the specific case. This system permitted agencies to maintain their examiner staffs during the period covered by this report if they desired to do so. The total of 69 includes 5 recent cases not completed at the date of this report.

TABLE III—*Nonincumbent examiner applicant statistics*

	Public employees	Private practitioners	Total
I. Number of applicants to Jan. 19, 1949			1,499
Number found ineligible on original review of applications	512	237	749
Number found eligible for examination			625
II. Number of applicants disqualified after examination	279	134	413
For lack of experience	163	77	240
For lack of ability, etc.	98	53	151
For grade demanded	18	4	22
III. Total number of applicants qualified after examination	132	80	212
Under B−	27	20	47
At B− or better	105	60	165

NOTE.—Since the examination is a continuing one and additional applications are constantly being filed or processed to final conclusion, the foregoing figures will rapidly change by the addition of new applicants and new consultant actions in specific cases. 90 recent cases are as yet unassigned and 35 cases, though assigned, have not yet been reported ready for final action.

TABLE IV.—*Incumbent statistics by agencies*

Agencies	Total incumbents			Disqualified			Qualified		
	Total	Status	Nonstatus	Total	Status	Nonstatus	Total	Status	Nonstatus
A	48	43	5	12	12	----	36	31	5
B	41	20	21	14	8	6	26	12	14
C	30	14	16	10	7	3	20	7	13
D	18	16	2	3	2	1	15	14	1
E	17	4	13	4	4	----	9	----	9
F	16	11	5	1	1	----	15	10	5
G	9	7	2	2	2	----	7	5	2
H	9	8	1	----	----	----	9	8	1
I	9	6	3	2	1	1	7	5	2
J	5	4	1	3	2	1	2	2	----
K	7	7	----	1	1	----	6	6	----
L	5	5	----	3	3	----	2	2	----
M	2	2	----	----	----	----	2	2	----
N	1	1	----	----	----	----	1	1	----
Total	217	148	[1]69	54	42	[1]12	158	106	[1]52

[1] For the significance of the figures respecting nonstatus incumbents, see the note to table II.

Will the Marshall Plan Destroy American Shipping?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, just recently I received a very interesting report from the National Federation of American Shipping. According to this report, the merchant fleets of Marshall plan nations have recovered from their war losses amazingly well. When their present building programs are completed, they will surpass by more than 5,000,000 deadweight tons their aggregate size in 1939, National Federation of American Shipping reported today.

In a survey of the 10-year status of the merchant fleets of the Marshall plan nations, the Federation stated that not only will their aggregate size be greater, but their ships in operation, on order, or being built, will be more modern, speedier and have larger lifting capacities than prewar vessels.

According to the survey, the Marshall plan nations had, in September 1939, 46,503,300 dead-weight tons of shipping; in June 1948, 43,537,100 tons; and on order or being built, an additional 8,160,000 tons, or a total of 51,697,100 dead-weight tons. This exceeds their aggregate size in September 1939 by 5,193,800 dead-weight tons.

The survey showed nearly six of the nations with sizable building programs as of June 1948, with the largest underway in the United Kingdom of 3,216,000 tons. Next in order of importance of new construction were Norway, 2,799,000 tons; France, 762,000 tons; Sweden, 683,000 tons; Netherlands, 279,000 tons; and Denmark, 254,000 tons.

The federation survey showed three of the nations, Switzerland, Ireland, and Iceland, which had no merchant fleets in 1939, with presently possessing 70,200, 40,900, and 26,700 dead-weight tons, respectively.

Twelve of the number of nations showed greater postwar than prewar fleets when considering ships on order or under construction. Five of the nations, even without including their building programs, have larger postwar fleets than before the war. These are Sweden, Turkey, Portugal, Belgium-Luxemburg, and France.

In summarizing the survey, the federation stated:

From time to time efforts are put forth to gain support in the United States for a program to rebuild the merchant fleets of a Marshall plan nation. The factual situation justifies no such effort. Any proposal to rebuild such foreign fleets is a misnomer and any effort to do so at the expense of the American taxpayer should be opposed.

I think it is about time that this Congress should wake up to the full meaning of the Marshall plan. According to the report that has just come out this morning, our national income is down 8 percent. It is now generally recognized that we will have a budget deficit of at least $4,000,000,000. This means that we will have to place an additional tax burden upon our citizens at a time when their incomes are being depleted, yet these international do-gooders insist on spending over $7,000,000,000 more for the Marshall plan, and other foreign-aid programs, and additional $2,000,000,000 or more to implement the Atlantic pact.

Out of the estimated expenditures of $41,900,000,000, $32,000,000,000 goes for foreign aid, war preparation, and expenditures arising out of past wars. This is 76 percent of the entire budget for 1950. Less than $10,000,000,000, or only about 24 percent of our appropriations will be used for constructive purposes, or for the rehabilitation of our own Nation, our own people, and our own economy. We are appropriating only $2,400,000,000 for social welfare, health, and security; $1,800,000,000 for national resources; $1,700,000,000 for agriculture; $1,600,000,000 for transportation and communications; $1,200,000,000 for general Government; only $400,000,000 for education and general research; only $400,000,000 for housing and community facilities; only $200,000,000 for labor, and the ridiculous sum of only $100,000,000 for finance, commerce, and industry.

It is indeed humorous to read the reports of the task force of the Hoover Commission, making recommendations for the saving of a few nickels here and there, and then to find no agency or group of citizens who would stand out boldly and protest against this terrible shelling out of billions of our taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations.

The cry will soon be raised that we have no money for old-age pensions, Federal aid to education, or for the hospitalization and health program, because of the already overbulging budget. These same people should be reminded that less than $10,000,000,000 is being spent for peaceful pursuits and for our own internal economy. In the present budget we have set up no margin for reduction of the public debt; and also, in the present budget there are no expenditures included for military aid to foreign nations, which will be proposed after the adoption of the Atlantic pact. A report just announced this morning discloses that the national income is 8 percent below that of a year ago at this time. In order to provide for the reduction of the public debt, and for this new additional foreign-aid program, it will be necessary to increase taxes by at least four or five billion dollars. This action will have to be taken in spite of the falling incomes of all of our citizens, business and labor alike. I say that we cannot cut the budget and make savings at the expense of our domestic economy. A cut can be made and should be made in the $21,000,000,000 that we have appropriated for war preparation and for the foreign-aid program. The United States will not be destroyed by any foreign power, but the United States can be destroyed by taxing our citizens and our economy into bankruptcy.

All the greedy and selfish interests have swooped down upon us like a flock of vultures, and by shouting "communism" are picking the very flesh off our bones. In the 1930's, when under the Roosevelt New Deal we were engaged in a liberal spending program and created a great number of alphabetical agencies to rebuild the economy of the Nation, we were severely criticized. But just think what a ridiculous position we are in at this time. We are spending between five and six times as much as we did under the Roosevelt New Deal, and how much benefit are our own people receiving from all of this expenditure?

It will not be long; yes, I will say that within 2 years from now, the taxpayers of the Nation will arise in angry protest against this present program of bankruptcy that has been fostered upon the Nation by greedy and war-minded people. The words of George Washington and his warnings will be recited throughout the land. I wish that it were possible to mail a copy of George Washington's Farewell Address to every man, woman, and child in the Nation, so as to forestall those international leaders who are leading our Nation into bankruptcy and ruin.

Roosevelt before he died came before the Congress and stated that our Nation's economy would stand no more strain, such as lend-lease, or a free foreign-aid program. The International Bank was created to substitute for any further raiding of the United States Treasury; the nations of the world had all agreed to participate. That was the way that the nations of Europe and Asia were to be rebuilt. There was also to be formed the International Trade Organization, whereby trade and business would flow smoothly between all the nations of the world. But, evidently, these two logical ways of rebuilding the world were not acceptable to the greedy bankers and international cartellists. They saw that they could best rebuild their power and international cartels and monopolies by raiding the United States Treasury under the cry of communism. For my part, I serve notice now that I shall continue to vote against all of these free foreign-aid programs. And on the other hand, I shall support a decent national old-age-pension program for our own citizens, hospitalization, health, and education for our people; also aid and assistance to develop the St. Lawrence waterway, flood control, and to protect our natural resources. This program will enrich our own citizens and our own Nation. It is a program of construction. I shall not support a program of so-called foreign aid, which is nothing more than plain thievery of the wealth and income of the American worker and the American businessman.

My Vote To Cut Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD IRVING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, the other day when I cast my vote in favor of the bill to authorize reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, I was well aware that in doing so I was obligating myself to support other legislation to complete the long overdue job of reorganization.

My action in voting as I did then was prompted by two reasons. First, reorganization of the executive branch is urgently necessary to make it more efficient. Second, the streamlining of the executive branch, destroying the multiplicity of agencies and overlapping functions, will save millions of dollars in taxpayers' money.

In committing myself to support the remainder of the program, I felt confident that I would not be asked later to support anything unsound. I have profound faith in the leadership and judgment of both President Truman and former President Hoover. I am certain they will submit only those reorganization plans which will accomplish the two objectives which prompted my first vote.

Substantiating my position in favor of economy in governmental operations was a statement issued by the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey on February 2, 1949, showing how the people in my own home county would benefit individually by money savings if reorganization of the executive branch is achieved as now planned.

That statement reads as follows:

Every citizen of Jackson County can put almost $20, which now goes for Federal taxes, back into his pocket, purse, or piggy-bank if the recommendations of the bipartisan Commission on the Reorganization of the Federal Government are carried out, Missouri Public Expenditure Survey disclosed today.

Missouri Survey, which is cooperating with the taxpayer associations in 35 other States

in supplying information on the work of the Commission, declared that preliminary Commission estimates indicate that over $3,000,000,000 now being spent by the Federal Government can be saved by putting Commission recommendations into effect. The Commission is headed by former President Herbert Hoover, who was appointed by President Truman, and is popularly known as the Hoover Commission.

On a per capita basis, this $3,000,000,000 saving means that every man, woman, and child in this county would have the Federal tax bill now charged against him cut by $19.93 if Congress puts into effect the changes recommended by the Commission. The complete Commission report is to be submitted to Congress within 60 days.

The Federal tax saving for this county with an estimated population of 477,828 would total $9,556,560 on the per capita basis.

Missouri's total saving would amount to $76,800,000, figured on the basis that total Federal tax payments made in Missouri amount to 2.57 percent of total Federal tax revenue.

This $76,800,000 is equal to over half of the entire yearly State tax collections. It is more than the operational costs of public schools in Missouri for 1947, and it is more than the combined yearly cost to both State and Federal Governments of Missouri's huge old-age assistance program.

The saving of $9,556,560 on the per capita basis in this county as a result of Hoover Commission work, looms large in comparison to the combined expenses of the county and municipal governments in Jackson County.

Glaring examples of Federal Government waste as exposed in preliminary reports of the Hoover Commission and reported by Missouri survey show that the Federal Government, spending over $40,000,000,000 of taxpayers' money, does not even keep a complete set of accounting books. Over half of all Federal Government purchase orders are made out for less than $10, and the average single purchasing order processing cost is over $10.

Majority of Democratic State Legislators in Montana Support CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement supporting a Columbia Valley Authority, signed by 49 of the 79 Democratic members of the Montana State Legislature. This statement was forwarded to me by Mr. Jerome G. Locke, a director of the League for CVA and chief engineer of the regional committee for an MVA. Mr. Locke advises me that, at the time this petition was circulated by several legislative members, two or three of their colleagues were absent on account of illness and 8 or 10 more were completely taken up with conference committee work and other procedure during the closing days of the legislative session.

Mr. Speaker, these signatures of a majority of Democratic legislators in Montana are a good indication of popular interest and Democratic support for CVA legislation. Earlier, I called to the attention of the Members the fact that the house of representatives in my State of Washington went on record in favor of CVA by an overwhelming majority of 71 to 26.

HELENA, MONT.,
February 25, 1949.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
President, League for CVA.,
Seattle, Wash.:

We, the undersigned, members of Montana State Legislature, now in session, have been and are active supporters of programs for development of Columbia River and Missouri River, both of which have headwaters in Montana, through the agency of Valley Authority legislation.

We sincerely favor the same type of legislation as was embodied in the bill to set up Tennessee Valley Authority, namely, a public corporation that shall be responsible for the general plan of development and have a free choice in the selection of other agencies (Federal, State, and local) through which the work of development shall be accomplished. We do not believe the service any of these agencies can perform should be specifically denied, but do believe that the most satisfactory result will be obtained by leaving final choice in the hands of the public corporation, to be known as CVA, as was done in the TVA. We earnestly urge that this viewpoint be considered in drafting necessary legislation.

Senator Paul R. Rice, Bynum, Mont.; Senator Ralph P. Blair, Sidney, Mont.; Senator J. M. Hofland, Vida, Mont.; Senator Chas. W. Brown, Terry, Mont.; Senator George W. Wilson, Shelby, Mont.; Senator David F. James, Joplin, Mont.; Senator Edward A. Wenger, Anaconda, Mont.; Senator H. H. K. Wilson, Red Lodge, Mont.; Senator M. J. Mulholland, Butte, Mont.; Senator Le Roy H. Anderson, Conrad, Mont.; Senator Ray Kelly, Polson, Mont.; Senator Herbert H. Haight, Suffolk, Mont.; Representative Lloyd Barnard, Saco, Mont.; Senator Andrew Dahl, Dagmar, Mont.; Representative Earl E. Clark, Roundup, Mont.; Senator Mrs. B. M. Phillips, Landusky, Mont.; Senator J. B. Bourassa, Flaxville, Mont.; Representative H. H. Hess, Havre, Mont.; Representative Paul K. Harlow, Thompson Falls, Mont.; Representative John J. Cunningham, Bridger, Mont.; Representative John M. Jarussi, Joliet, Mont.; Representative Leo C. Graybill, Great Falls, Mont.; Representative Walter Laas, Chester, Mont.; Representative Martin J. Beck, Wolf Point, Mont.; Representative Ole S. Gunderson, Power, Mont.; Representative Richard Nixon, Hogeland, Mont.; Representative Earl E. Clark, Roundup, Mont.; Representative Edward C. Williams, Cut Bank, Mont.; Representative John F. Dusak, Great Falls, Mont.; Representative Oscar Helding, Missoula, Mont.; Representative J. Harry Wilson, Stanford, Mont.; Representative Allen Goodgame, Troy, Mont.; Representative I. A. Robertson, Ronan, Mont.; Representative Henry F. Mernin, Butte, Mont.; Representative Harry Culbertson, Fort Benton, Mont.; Representative Carle F. O'Neil, Kalispell, Mont.; Representative Ernest Burns, Whitefish, Mont.; Representative N. A. Peterson, Valier, Mont.; Representative Ronald W. Holtz, Portage, Mont.; Representative June McCarthy, Butte, Mont.; Representative Dr. Myron Tripp, Polytechnic, Mont.; Representative John Emmons, Anaconda, Mont.; Representative Arthur N. Jensen, Sr., Superior, Mont.; Representative Thomas P. Koch, Mailton, Mont.; Representative Keith W. Trout, Miles City, Mont.; Representative Volney Anderson, Sidney, Mont.; Representative W. C. Howard, Wibaux, Mont.; Representative Robert S. Cotton, Glasgow, Mont.

Extension of Benefits of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include an endorsement of the executive committee, Department of Connecticut, American Legion, concerning H. R. 1556. Action on this endorsement was initiated by the Robert E. Collins Post, No. 131, of Hartford, Conn., and was given subsequent approval by the State executive committee.

Several such endorsements have been received by me and I commend this legislation to the attention of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, before which it is for consideration.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn., March 10, 1949.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: At a regular meeting of the executive committee, Department of Connecticut, the American Legion, held in Meriden on March 2, 1949, it was regularly voted that we endorse the action taken by the Aetna Post, No. 131, of Hartford, Conn., on the attached resolution.

We are forwarding this action to you for your guidance on a matter in which we know you are interested.

Sincerely,

PIERCE U. CLARK,
Department Adjutant.

AMERICAN LEGION,
ROBERT E. COLLINS POST, NO. 131, INC.,
Hartford, Conn.

Whereas there are many veterans of World War II who for such reasons as being over age for further schooling, and being well established in business prior to induction, or who for other reasons beyond their control were unable to take advantage of the educational benefits provided in the G. I. bill of rights: Be it

Resolved, That Robert E. Collins Post, No. 131, of Hartford, Conn., at its meeting regularly convened on February 7, 1949, voted to fully endorse and to petition the national body of the American Legion to support bill H. R. 1556 presented to the House of Representatives by Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON, of the Fifth District, Connecticut, to the Eighty-first Congress, as per copy of bill attached, or similar legislation. This bill provides for the extension of the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the eldest children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act.

H. E. BIERKAN, *Commander.*
WM. H. NICHOLSON, *Adjutant.*

Don't Upset the Boat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, if there is any policy of our Federal Government that should be given thoughtful consideration it is the support program of farm prices. We know what happened to credit and business in the livestock-producing districts of the country when the banks withdrew credit from the livestock industry back in the twenties. Financial distress overtook these communities when the livestock growers and feeders were forced to market both finished and unfinished livestock on a glutted market by the banks calling loans and retiring bank currency all over the country, which amounted to over $2,000,000,000. This financial policy brought ruin to the cattle feeders and their creditors and undermined the agricultural price structure which deprived the farmers and cattlemen of purchasing power and destroyed a large part of our domestic market and thereby upset our national economy.

The question of cattle-support prices has been raised in a letter received from the editorial director of the Western Livestock Journal, which is inserted herewith with my reply thereto:

WESTERN LIVESTOCK JOURNAL,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 14, 1949.
Representative C. I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Each month Western Livestock Journal invites a selected list of its readers to forward a reply to the question of the month.

For the month of April the question is: Are you in favor of Government price supports on meat animals? If so, how do you think such a program could be handled?

We will certainly appreciate it if you will forward an answer to this question not later than March 31.

Question of the month has become one of the most widely read features in the Journal. Livestock industry leaders, State and national legislators, and western stockmen have learned to look for the question page to find a representative selection of opinion on one of the important problems of the day.

We are grateful for your interest, and we'll be looking forward to your response.

Cordially,

E. F. NEWTON,
Editorial Director.

MARCH 16, 1949.

Mr. E. F. NEWTON,
Editorial Director, Western Livestock Journal, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. NEWTON: The best answer to the question submitted in your letter of March 14, "Are you in favor of Government price supports on meat animals? If so, how do you think such a program could be handled?" is to be found in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency considering H. R. 8780, beginning on January 30 and ending on March 8, 1934, which I have before me.

On page 249 you will find statement by Congressman Busby, of Mississippi.

"What happened by and large was that the rediscount banks were called on to make payment to the Federal Reserve of loans they never expected to be called, and that was the condition all through the South. They were notified by the Federal Reserve, 'if you make this loan again you will carry it in your own portfolio, because we will not rediscount that type of paper.'

"The result was that the lumber concerns, the automobile loans, and everything else were put on the black list for rediscount, and consequently in this country, you will find that a billion, eight hundred and fifty million cash was squeezed out of circulation in the course of 15 months, and I believe about 10,000,000,000 of credit. I have checked up on that."

To my mind, that's an example of what happens with the withdrawal of cash and credit support of the products of the farm industry and related business, and was the major cause of the depression of the late twenties and early thirties. Today, with the exorbitant prices charged the farms for all the things necessary to be used in the farming industry, if we don't support the price of farm products, our national economy will be upset as a result, just as it was in the period during the years after 1920.

You do not need to go further for an illustration of the present price situation than taking the past and the present price of the farm necessity—barbed wire—quoted to me in Lewiston, Idaho, at $11.50 a roll, when I used to buy a roll of the identical wire in my home town of Clark Fork, prior to the First World War, at $1.40 a roll—and we know that John W. Gates got to be a millionaire by marketing barbed wire at a dollar a roll.

Surely, farm-support prices are a necessity if our economy is not to be upset and a depression to result.

Trusting that this answers your question satisfactorily, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Excise Taxes on Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California:

Whereas heavy wartime Federal excise taxes on transportation, when first imposed, were reportedly designed for emergency revenue purposes and to lessen public use to a minimum during wartime of transportation and communications facilities; and

Whereas these taxes are still being levied despite the fact the emergencies created by the war have ended; and

Whereas a report by our rate engineers shows that California traffic paid $32,970,000 during 1948 in transportation taxes, both passenger and freight, and $49,634,000 in communications taxes in the same period, or a total of $82,604,000; and

Whereas the 3-percent freight tax inevitably falls heavier upon all shipments originating long distances from the major consuming markets, thus discriminating against all long-haul traffic; and

Whereas, because of the State's geographical location, California products are severely penalized through this discrimination in competition with products from other areas; and

Whereas the 15-percent passenger-fare transportation tax similarly penalizes and discriminates against those who must travel long distances either in their business pursuits or for personal or recreational purposes; and

Whereas in connection with the communications taxes which are assessed at rates running from 8 percent up to 25 percent on telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, and wire-equipment services, it has been found that these levies tend to restrict usage and thus are injurious to both users of communications and utilities providing communications: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Public Utilities Commission does hereby go on record as informing the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners that this commission supports the principles expressed in 20 or more bills pending in Congress to repeal or modify these excise taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That the commission does hereby urge California's Members in Congress to support all efforts to repeal such taxes, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of California's Members in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the statements contained in this resolution be given to the press and public of California so that everyone's attention may be called to the fact that this commission deems the time is past due when these unjust and discriminatory Federal excise taxes on transportation and communications services should be repealed.

The Taft-Hartley Law Should Be Immediately Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the encouragement and promotion of genuine and free collective bargaining should be the primary objective in the formulation of a national labor policy. Mutually satisfactory bargaining arrangements are indispensable to the attainment and maintenance of an era of industrial peace. With these objectives in mind, it is my considered opinion, after carefully considering the subject of employer-employee relations, that the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 should be repealed for the following reasons:

First. The Taft-Hartley Act's ban on the closed shop has resulted in the outlawing of collective-bargaining agreements which had been mutually beneficial to both labor and management and had assisted in the maintenance of industrial peace for a period of over 100 years. We are all aware of the bitter controversy involving the International Typographical Union, which had a long history of peaceful labor relations prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. The act has also disrupted the hiring halls which had been established by collective bargaining and had stabilized industrial relations in the maritime industry. At the time the act was passed

more than 11,000,000 workers were covered by union security agreements. Not only was the closed shop outlawed, but restrictions were put upon union-shop agreements. The procedure under the Taft-Hartley law requiring the National Labor Relations Board to hold elections among employees before authorizing the consummation of union-shop agreements has proved very costly to the Government, and useless. The elections have merely demonstrated the overwhelming preference of workers for this form of security. In about 97 percent of such elections the workers chose a union shop. Proponents of this section, who devised it as a method of harassing unions, have found to their chagrin that it actually resulted in a large favorable vote for the union shop. By providing for numerous elections—representation, union shop, employer's last offer—the Taft-Hartley Act keeps the relation between employers and unions in an unsettled condition, instead of on the basis of stability and confidence so necessary in assuring free collective bargaining.

Second. The Taft-Hartley Act completely outlaws peaceful picketing in many situations, even such types as have enjoyed protection of our courts for several decades. Thus employees who picket an employer because he persists in making them work on partially finished goods produced in another plant at sweatshop wages may be found guilty of the unfair labor practice of engaging in an unlawful secondary boycott.

Third. The Taft-Hartley Act places unreasonable restraints on many aspects of collective bargaining agreements. The check-off—a legitimate labor-management practice—has been surrounded with many unnecessary procedural requirements, violation of which carries a criminal penalty, to the detriment of harmonious relations between labor and management. The law removes from the area of free collective bargaining a subject which is a proper objective of workers—welfare funds established for the humanitarian purpose of protecting the health and security of employees. It is made a crime for employers and employees to establish such funds except under rigid rules limiting their purposes and methods of administration. Furthermore, violations may be enjoined without regard to the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act safeguards.

Fourth. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, State labor laws which contain more restrictive provisions governing union-security contracts supersede the National Labor Act. A recent line of Supreme Court cases upholding restrictive State labor laws clearly indicates that no national labor policy can be effectively administered under such circumstances. Even union shops are banned in some industries engaged in interstate commerce.

Fifth. The Taft-Hartley Act places special emphasis on the use of injunctions to settle labor disputes. The Board, for example, is under a mandatory duty to seek injunctions against unions in all cases involving secondary boycotts, including those for perfectly legitimate objectives, such as the protection of labor standards. In no case is it mandatory that the Board seek injunctions against employers. The increasing use of the injunction as a method of handling labor relations has aroused only hatred, suspicion, and resentment on the part of the workers and has not furthered either the interests of management or labor. The evils of the labor injunction are well known and were recognized by the Congress in the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Sixth. The Taft-Hartley Act provides elaborate and inflexible procedures including boards of inquiry, an 80-day waiting period, enforced by injunction, and secret ballots which must be followed in emergency disputes. Nevertheless, as the President said in his veto message, he and his officers are deprived of their power to take effective action in securing peaceful settlement of such disputes. For example, even the boards of inquiry are deprived of authority to make recommendations for settling the dispute. In the atomic energy and longshore cases these procedures were unavailing and agreements between the parties were reached with the assistance of Government conciliation, only after the machinery provided by the law had ineffectively run its course.

Seventh. The Taft-Hartley Act's broad ban upon political contributions and expenditures by labor organizations is unfair and undemocratic. It is discriminatory legislation because it selects labor organizations as the only type of voluntary associations which are to be denied effective political participation.

Eighth. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the employer can, by petitioning for a choice of collective-bargaining representative, determine the time most advantageous for himself to call for an election, even when not faced with conflicting claims for recognition. An employer can thereby stifle and thwart organization efforts and assure a year's freedom from union organization.

Ninth. One of the most serious consequences of the law is the denial, not only of the right of reinstatement, as under the Wagner Act, but also of the right to vote in representation elections while granting a vote to strikebreaker replacements. The law thus permits an employer who is faced with a strike for better wages and hours in his plant, to hire sufficient nonunion replacements to outvote the members of the union and thereupon to demand an election, the result of which can well be to oust the union from the plant.

Tenth. The Taft-Hartley Act abandoned the uniform procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 and singled out the National Labor Relations Board as the one administrative agency in our Government which should receive different treatment. The law set up a general counsel who has broad discretionary powers and who is independent of the Board. He has final and absolute authority to determine what complaints should come before the Board. Thus, a tremendous amount of power is placed in the hands of one man since he can pick and choose among the cases to be prosecuted.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed during a period of great emotional stress, arising from abnormal disturbance and readjustments, which was an inevitable accompaniment of the return to a peacetime economy. It is true that the strikes which occurred between August 1945 and June 1947 played a large part in creating the emotional atmosphere in which a law like the Taft-Hartley Act could be passed. As stated by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on January 31 last, we should remember, however, that at the time the act was passed economic controls had been off for all practical purposes for almost a full year.

In the period between June 1946 and June 1947 the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumers' price index rose from 133.3 to 157.1, or 17.8 percent. During the same period average hourly earnings, exclusive of overtime, increased from $1.05 to $1.17, or 11.4 percent. Throughout the period the widening spread between wages and the cost of living caused dislocations which inevitably produced exasperation and conflict. Had the Congress been faced in the spring and summer of 1947 with writing a Federal labor law under different economic and psychological conditions the result would have been very different from that act. Today the balance between prices and wages is beginning to adjust itself, and economic conditions are on a more settled basis—of course, on a level of production, employment and income substantially higher than that which prevailed in the years 1935–1939. There is an opportunity now again to return to the basic principles of free collective bargaining which the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 established as the fundamental basis of our national labor policy.

Strong unions with effective power to bolster the wages of their members in terms of real buying power, through the process of collective bargaining, represent the most democratic means of preventing the boom and bust cycles which have plagued our economy over the past 100 years when business has fixed wage in all but a few industries without regard to the needs of their workers or to their ability as consumers to buy back the products which a constantly expanding economy was producing.

In the Wagner Act labor received its Magna Carta, its right to bargain collectively was granted. This guaranty must be preserved and protected.

The 1948 election and the special election on February 15, 1949—when I was elected to Congress—were clear and convincing mandates from the people demanding the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Zealous public servants should therefore carry out the will and wish of the people. Immediate repeal of this unjust, unfair, and vicious legislation is the way to do it.

A New Day for the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Indian problem has agitated this country for 150 years. This continually unsolved problem must end sometime and I think to North Dakota should go the credit for pointing a way to a complete settlement of that problem, and within a reasonable length of time.

Extreme conditions of hardship among the North Dakota Indians brought this about, but the plan suggested, if supported by the Congress, will take the American Indian out of the bondage of government wardship and make him a responsible and valuable citizen of the country.

For immediate use, and to prevent further suffering, the legislature of the State of North Dakota has in the session just closed appropriated $175,000 for the relief of Indians, who should have been relieved by the Federal Government. In addition to that, the State of North Dakota passed an act at the same session creating an Indian commission in the State of North Dakota. This legislation is so new and so far-reaching in the final adjustment of Indian affairs in the Nation that I submit herewith the full text of that act:

An act creating the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, prescribing duties, making an appropriation, and declaring an emergency

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission which shall consist of the governor, commissioner of agriculture and labor, superintendent of public instruction, executive director of the public welfare board of North Dakota, State health officer, and the chairmen of the boards of county commissioners of Sioux, Mercer, McLean, McKenzie, Dunn, Rolette, Benson, and Eddy Counties. The Governor shall act as chairman of the commission and the commission shall select one of its members as secretary. The chairmen of the board of county commissioners who are members of the commission shall receive the mileage and expenses allowed State officers which shall be paid from the appropriation made to such commission.

SEC. 2. The commission may employ an executive director who shall not be a member of the commission and such other clerical, professional, and technical personnel, as it deems necessary, and shall prescribe their duties and fix their compensation.

SEC. 3. In order that the State may be prepared and have the factual information needed to deal effectively with Indian affairs, provide aid and protection for Indians as needed, prevent undue hardships, assist in the integration of Indian citizens into modern economy, and coordinate State, local, and Federal programs relating to Indian affairs, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty,

1. To study, consider, accumulate, compile, and assemble information on any phase of Indian affairs;

2. To formulate and develop proposals for the benefit of Indians who may be in need of assistance in securing employment in agriculture, business, or other usual occupations, on a self-supporting basis;

3. To cooperate with and secure the assistance of the Federal Government or any agencies thereof, in formulating any such program, and coordinate such program, as nearly as may be possible, with any program regarding Indian affairs adopted or planned by the Federal Government to the end that the State may secure the full benefit of such Federal program;

4. To investigate relief needs of Indians in North Dakota and to prepare plans for the alleviation of such needs;

5. To confer with officials and agencies of other governmental units and congressional committees with regard to Indian needs and the coordination of State, local, and Federal programs in regard thereto.

SEC. 4. All public officers, both State and local, shall, upon request furnish the commission such available information as it may require for its purposes.

SEC. 5. The commission or any subcommittee it may appoint may meet at such times and places as it may deem advisable. Meeting may be called by the chairman or by a call signed by a majority of the members of the commission. At any meeting of the commission a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum and a majority of such quorum shall have authority to act in any matter falling within the jurisdiction of the commission.

SEC. 6. The commission, as soon as practicable, and not later than the first day of December 1950, shall prepare and make public a report to the thirty-second legislative assembly setting forth the results of its study and its findings, conclusions, and recommendations. It may submit recommendations in the form of proposed legislation or resolutions and may publish such additional reports from time to time as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 7. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act. Expenditures shall be made upon voucher signed by the secretary of the commission.

SEC. 8. Emergency. This act is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

Along with this legislative action, the superintendent of an Indian reservation, H. N. Clark, Fort Yates, Standing Rock Reservation, himself an Indian, has come forward with a program of rehabilitation of Indians that would fill the requirements of almost any Indian reservation in this country.

Mr. Clark, always insisting that the Indians themselves carry on the work, made a survey of his reservation to learn what each Indian wanted to do to make himself self-supporting, and in addition sent a general questionnaire to every Indian there.

The questions have been answered and there is now a complete file on every Indian as to what land he has, what stock he owns, how many more he could take care of, the number of Indians who want to learn special trades, and other material matters affecting the future welfare of the Indians.

Mr. Clark learned that a great majority of the Indians on that reservation want to engage in the cattle business with supplementary farming that would tie in with the cattle trade. The superintendent then worked out a cattle and land-acquiring program which has gained approval of nearly 75 percent of all the Indians on the reservation. Some, of course, have been dubious; from past experience they have learned to look with disfavor on any plan that comes from the Indian Bureau.

The cattle-raising plan has already been tried, and of 260 who entered the cattle business in 1948, with funds chargeable to the tribal fund, only 16 failed to make good. There on that reservation the Indians have the land base for cattle and farm production and no money is required for land except enough to convey estate land back to the tribal holdings. Individual allotments through the years and through deaths have so divided these estates that in some cases there are 50 heirs owning an interest in 160 or 80 acres of land. The interest of each heir is so small that in some cases it amounts to just a few cents.

With an appropriation of $250,000 these multiple divisions of interest can be repurchased and put back into the tribal lands, where death will not ultimately eliminate the property.

On the cattle and farming program, no new ventures are to be tried this coming year, but a $250,000 appropriation will enable those Indians now having herds to increase them to a holding of 50 head. The cattle purchased will be turned over to those Indians who have made good in the past, giving them units of business sufficiently large to make management worth while. It should be emphasized that this money will by no means be given these Indians, but will be payable back to the tribal fund, and through that to the Federal Government.

The outcome of the Indian Commission work in North Dakota promises to show the Nation just how the Indian problem can be eliminated and the Indian assimilated into State governments. Here again, the way is pointed to final disposition of the Indian question.

The Clark plan will fit any Indian reservation where there is a land base, but on reservations like the Turtle Mountain agency a more serious problem remains to be solved. There, with the passage of time, the great Chippewa Indian domain that once embraced close to a million and a half square miles has to be reduced to less than two townships. Both townships have very poor agricultural land, but are expected to hold 9,000 Indians. There is not room enough for more than 300 Indian families to support themselves on that land. Here the first duty of the Government will be to acquire more land and settle the Indian upon it, then take up the same program that now promises so much for the Indians of Superintendent Clark's reservation.

Pride of ownership appears to be the keynote of the Clark plan. The superintendent reports that where Indians paid for their cattle in full and owned

their own herds, they became very enthusiastic about their business. Independence, which Bureau control prevents, spells a proud new day for the Indian. Through the process of building and encouraging self-reliance in the Indian himself, the Government will reach the solution to the Indian problem.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, rent control is a wartime measure and was enacted to control rentals because of the dislocation of people moved into areas engaged in critical war industries and where housing was inadequate and where demand might cause rentals to be subject to bid, thereby causing hardship in certain localities.

Rent control was made a Federal issue by law, controlled and administered from Washington, the Federal Government taking over a function of government which by its very nature should be a function of local government, because local government regulates, taxes, and polices real estate in accordance with the wishes of the electorate of the various States, counties, and cities.

Almost 4 years have elapsed since the close of World War II. If we are ever to have returned to local government those functions which are rightly theirs, we must begin now or it will be too late. The bill we are considering does not only extend rent control, it recontrols properties which have been decontrolled, it places greater restrictions than heretofore existed—we have curbed some of these restrictions by amendment—but the law will still be dictated and controlled from Washington. I believe the governing bodies of our respective State, county, and city governments are better informed as to housing conditions and local affairs and can do a better job than some appointed bureaucrat sitting behind a desk in Washington.

In 1940, when rent control was enacted, we had in this country 16,000,000 rental units; in 1948 we had 15,000,000 rental units and during 1946–48 there were constructed in this country 2,500,000 housing units. This to me is conclusive that we are discouraging construction of rental property and are forcing owners of rental properties to sell, thereby making the rental situation more acute.

I have received numerous letters from constituents protesting Federal rent control. Many of them have rentals and with increased taxes and maintenance costs they cannot afford to hold their properties much longer. Others desire to invest their money by building rental properties, but are holding back on account of the uncertainty as to whether Congress will by law impose conditions which might jeopardize their investment.

It is my belief that the control and regulation of property is a State responsibility and I feel that the sooner we sever this control from the Federal Government, the sooner the housing problem will be solved.

I am a firm believer in the grass roots of government and the closer we can keep our Government to the people, the better we will be governed. I am opposed to the big centralized Government which we have developed and I strongly favor its return to the people.

Housing Shortage Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 15, 1949:

HOUSING SHORTAGE EXTENSION

The fact that the House of Representatives has cut from 27 to 15 months the period for the proposed extension of rent controls is an indication that even the Democratic Congress is beginning to doubt that the housing shortage can ever be solved as long as rent controls are in effect.

The amendment adopted on the floor of the House directing the rent authority to allow property owners a reasonable return on their investments as far as practicable is a further indication that Congress does not have confidence in the manner in which rent controls have been administered in the past.

Actually, the phrase "a reasonable return as far as practicable" would not compel the rent authority to allow legitimate claims for rent increases. Since nobody likes to pay more rent, and since renters are also voters, the present administration would never find it practicable to permit rents to be increased in the same ratio that other expenses have gone up, including the cost of keeping rental property in repair.

The emergence of the rent-control bill on the floor of the House last week was accompanied by an announcement that the Housing Expediter would decontrol 170 rent areas throughout the country, mostly in rural sections, if he were given the right in the new bill to decontrol them.

This was seen by some Congressmen as a plain case of attempted bribery—offering freedom from rent control in return for votes in support of rent-control legislation. If there is no need for these 170 areas to be under control, why weren't they decontrolled long ago, without regard to the pending legislation?

The fact is, the measure to extend rent controls for 15 months is a measure to prolong the housing shortage for another 15 months.

It is a measure to continue the confiscation of private property under the fiction, upheld by the Supreme Court, that we are still at war and that the emergency war powers are still in effect.

It is a measure to continue the discrimination against war veterans who have been compelled to build or buy housing at high prices in order to find shelter to the benefit of those who, because they stayed at home during the war, acquired the protection of low rent by Government fiat.

Recent surveys, including one made in Cleveland, have shown that the housing shortage is largely artificial and that it is being maintained artificially by rent controls.

According to the Cleveland survey, renters today occupy more space per person than they did in 1940. If the same rate of occupancy which was in effect in 1940 prevailed today, there would be a surplus of housing instead of a shortage, the survey showed.

But why should anyone who is occupying more space than he really needs bother to look for smaller quarters as long as he is paying cheap rent? As long as rent controls are in force, a tenant who benefits from them will have no incentive to look for better housing, which he might be able to afford, or for smaller quarters, which might be more convenient.

Thus, it should be clear to any reasonable person that rent controls have prolonged the housing shortage and are tending to perpetuate it.

It is time that Congress took a long look at the problem and decided whether its objective is to end the housing shortage as speedily as possible or to give one class of citizens something for nothing.

If the objective is to end the housing shortage, Congress should be moving at this time to terminate rent controls instead of preparing to extend them. Several methods of gradual termination have been proposed, such as decontrolling housing in the high-price brackets first and working gradually downward, or permitting a small percentage increase in rents monthly until the supply of rental property is equal to or in excess of demand.

But if the objective of the Government is to give certain classes of citizens something for nothing, why not extend the principle to other items in the cost of living, such as groceries? Why not provide that everyone who stayed home during the war and made big wages should be allowed a 40-, 50-, or even 60-percent discount on his food purchases—at the expense of the grocer, of course?

Obviously such a proposal would be ridiculous. But it is no more ridiculous than a Government decree giving one favored class of citizens a discount on their rent at somebody else's expense, especially when such a rent gratuity contributes to the housing shortage, discourages new construction, and increases the housing difficulties of those who do not happen to belong in the favored category.

Best Informed Labor Is for Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the segment of labor that realizes that millions of people are dependent upon the dairy industry for a livelihood most assuredly are for protecting the dairy industry from the unfair competition of synthetic or imitation dairy products. They realize that thousands upon thousands of jobs are involved, and they do not wish to join the ranks of the millions already unemployed.

Real labor does not support the $58 to $67 per month wage standard in the oil-producing areas but does support the $140 to $150 monthly wage rate prevailing on farms in the dairy section of our country.

The press release by Mr. August Burnier, president of the Dairy Employees Union of Chicago, follows:

DAIRY UNION OFFICIAL FAVORS REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES BUT WOULD BAN SALE OF YELLOW-COLORED PRODUCT LIKE BUTTER

Urging that taxes be removed from the sale of oleomargarine and that Congress enact legislation to prevent its being colored yellow to be sold like butter, August Burnier, president of the Dairy Employees Union of Chicago, whose 4,400 members work in more than a hundred dairies in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana, testified at the House Agricultural Committee hearings today that dairy workers are concerned about loss of jobs if unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine is legalized.

Burnier told the House committee he believed dairy workers would welcome, with other consumers, the repeal of oleomargarine taxes. But he maintained that if yellow oleomargarine is sold in imitation of butter the more economical uncolored oleomargarine may tend to disappear from the market, since the price of colored oleomargarine is likely to follow the price of butter rather than the cost of the inexpensive oils that go into its manufacture, thereby increasing the cost of living.

"The disruption of the butter market will most certainly lead to a decline in dairy-cow numbers, and a consequent decrease in production of milk, veal, and beef, with consequent higher prices for these commodities," stated Burnier, who is a disabled war veteran and employed for years in dairy plants. "Widespread unemployment in local dairy communities, and higher prices for meat and milk would be too high a price to pay for so-called cheaper oleomargarine."

"The only reason the oleomargarine manufacturers wish to color their products yellow," declared Burnier, "is because the color of butter is yellow. If butter were brown, red or blue, you would find them equally as insistent that they be permitted to color their product red, brown or blue. They don't want to sell oleomargarine in the place of butter, but 'just like butter.' The natural color of oleomargarine is white. Why not let it be sold with that color?"

"There are thousands of creameries and dairy plants spread throughout the nation," Burnier pointed out, "whose employees' welfare is involved in producing, processing and delivering butter and other dairy products, and in which unemployment may come about if unrestricted sale of colored oleomargarine is permitted by Congress. The manufacture of butter, by the nature of its production in small plants in widely scattered areas, is greatly decentralized. In contrast, the nonperishable oils used in making oleomargarine makes possible the concentration of that industry in a few large plants, by a handful of manufacturers."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT CHICAGO, ILL., ON FEBRUARY 28, 1949, BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF DAIRY EMPLOYEES UNION, LOCAL 754, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS, AFFILIATED WITH THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering measures to repeal the so-called oleomargarine tax; and

Whereas this action will meet with the approval of workers in the low income brackets since it will reduce the cost of this commodity; and

Whereas if colored oleomargarine is sold in imitation of butter the more economical uncolored oleomargarine may tend to disappear from the market since the price of colored oleomargarine is likely to follow the price of butter rather than the cost of the inexpensive oils that go into its manufacture, thereby increasing the cost of living; and

Whereas the disruption of the butter market will most certainly lead to a decline in dairy cow numbers and a consequent decrease in production of milk, veal, and beef, with consequent higher prices for these commodities, thereby increasing the cost of living: and

Whereas there are thousands of creameries and many thousands of dairy plants spread throughout this Nation whose employees' welfare is involved in protecting butter against unfair competition; and

Whereas widespread unemployment and scarcities and higher prices for meat and milk would be too high a price to pay for so-called cheaper oleomargarine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Dairy Employees Union, Local 754, in executive session assembled on the 28th day of February 1949, respectfully requests the Congress that it repeal existing oleomargarine taxes and at the same time enact legislation prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine colored as butter, so that the public may at all times distinguish between these products; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Representatives and Senators in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the dairy employees' union send a representative to appear before the House and Senate Agricultural Committees to emphasize the very great importance of this legislation to the members of the dairy employees' union and the dairy industry.

Capitol Watchtower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Tom L. Munger:

Judging by the vote in last November's presidential election, American farmers are looking to the Democratic Administration for a continuance of the policies which over the past decade have made them the most favored and prosperous economic group in the country. They are doomed to a bitter disillusionment.

This is not to say that Congress made a mistake in passing the almost unnoticed administration bill to prohibit the use of 1949 plantings of basic crops in determining future acreage allotments. Not so long as farm-price support programs are continued. The measure was designed to benefit farmers by stabilizing farm prices at comparatively high levels. But it will not look like a benefit at first.

What it will do immediately, of course, is to discourage excessive plantings this year (under 90 percent of parity price protection) for the purpose of establishing claims to large acreage allotments when, if and as controls are reimposed on all basic crops under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This act still is on the books, and AAA marketing quotas and acreage controls currently govern tobacco and peanut production.

Both Administration and Congress manifestly are looking toward reimposition of acreage controls on wheat, corn, rice and cotton, the other basic crops. They know there is a prospect of early food surpluses, and the possibility of a farm depression, if curbs are not imposed on such major items of food crop production.

All this in spite of continuing high farm prices, resulting mostly from large-scale food exports by the Economic Cooperation Administration. These exports are decreasing rapidly as food production increases abroad. The food-gift program probably will end in 1952. Thereafter foreign countries are likely to lack dollars for extensive buying on their own account. The food boom cannot last forever.

As matters now stand, there would be no change in the present Agricultural Adjustment Act until next year. Then the Hope-Aiken Act, passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress and signed by the President, would go into effect. This measure was so written as to provide a flexible farm price support scale, ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The greater the total crop, the less in proportion to parity the price support payment—in effect an automatic curb on overproduction.

But the Democratic administration stands committed by President Truman's campaign promises to repeal the Hope-Aiken Act and return to the flat 90 percent of parity. The present Democratic Congress is pretty sure to do this. One reason for thinking so is the passage of the bill to discourage excessive plantings this year, thus scaling down acreage allotments in future years. Now the majority in Congress is in a position to make a grand gesture in hopes of retaining the farm vote next year.

Presently, though, it may dawn upon the farm voters that the Democratic administration is not continuing the policies so dear to the farmer's heart and pocketbook. With one hand the administration will give, but with the other it will take away. Farmers will not be permitted to overproduce extensively in the face of falling demand for farm products. Not with urban industrial populations paying taxes to foot the bill to maintain high farm prices, a major factor in the cost of living. The administration owes too much politically to the labor unions.

It is true that the roundabout method being employed by the administration will force farmers to cut the coat of agricultural production to fit the cloth of demand for the fruits of the soil. But how much easier and simpler, how much more in accordance with American principles, to accomplish the same result by letting the Hope-Aiken Act stay on the statute books. Intrinsically the difference between the Democratic and Republican approaches to the problem is this.

The Hope-Aiken Act, a Republican measure, automatically and by law would regulate farm production and safeguard farm prosperity by keeping supply in balance with demand. "Equal justice under law," as it says in words of marble above the portico that leads to the chamber of the United States Supreme Court.

Evidently the Democrats plan to regulate farm production at the whim of bureaucrats here in Washington. These men will say, on the basis of some earlier small production year, what the acreage allotments shall be. Government power will be even further centralized. The rule will be by men and not automatically by law.

Should it happen the bureaucratic controls are fairly and ably administered, the net result might approximate that of the

Hope-Aiken Act. But it is reasonable to assume, in the light of past Democratic performance, that bureaucratic administration will be strictly in accordance with partisan political necessities. Farmers will have to vote right to get the gravy.

Either way, in spite of President Truman's promises of high prices for things farmers sell and low prices for things farmers buy, it looks as if the lush days of exceptionally high farm income at public expense are due soon to depart. Urban industrial populations will benefit by reason of lower food prices. But farmers won't like it, even though a reasonable degree of farm prosperity should be maintained over a long period.

All of this adds up to one of two things: Either the President's frenzied campaign promises to the farmers were insincere, or he had to learn some of the economic facts of life from Agriculture Department experts subsequent to the election. Neither reflects much credit upon the wisdom or the good intentions of the Administration.

Certainly the course with regard to farm production and prices now being pursued by the Administration and the Democratic majority in Congress is not the course of political honesty. And certainly it reveals the true nature of the bill of goods the farmers of the United States bought for themselves last November.

Information, Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have before me two form letters which puzzle me somewhat.

One has the heading "Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc." and is signed DeWitt Emery, president, "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty."

The other letter has the heading "National Small Business Men's Association, Inc.," and is also signed, DeWitt Emery, president, "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty."

What puzzles me is: What is this Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc.? And what is this National Small Business Men's Association, Inc.? Last but not least: Who is this "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty" DeWitt Emery?

Now I look again at the letter from the Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc., and it lists, as officers and directors, DeWitt Emery, E. N. Calhoun, A. F. Mathews, W. J. Boos, J. Raymond Tiffany, L. M. Evans, and Dr. Alfred P. Haake.

I then turn my head and look at the letter from the National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., and I find the very same names listed, this time designated as trustees, and also supplemented by two or three additional names. Accordingly, I am more puzzled than ever about Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty, DeWitt Emery, who signs both letters.

The letter No. 1, from the Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc., is a solicitation for contributors. It reads, in part:

Of course, all of us like to know the company we are keeping, so I thought it would be helpful in your case to attach a cross-section list of the better-known companies who have currently subscribed up to the acceptable $2,500 maximum.

I then take a look at the list of friends of small business and I find such names as Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the United States Steel Corp. I then look at the second paragraph of the letter:

All of the many leaders in industry who have been asked their opinion as to the effectiveness of our grass-roots approach to the problem of explaining to workers the advantages of our free competitive system of business, quickly concede that this program, originating with the representative small business group, is most likely to accomplish the desired result—i. e., public understanding.

I want to emphasize the phrase used in the letter "the representative small business group": The word "the" is underlined right in the letter.

Apparently these big business corporations are a substantial force behind this so-called representative small-business group engaged in explaining to workers the facts of American life.

I now turn again to letter No. 2, from the National Small Business Men's Association, Inc. This also is a letter of solicitation, this time for a check of $18 in payment of "your first year's dues" in the association. It encloses a reprint of a full page advertisement run by the association in various newspapers in support of the Taft-Hartley Act. This advertisement is also signed DeWitt Emery, president, but this time without the surname "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty."

By this time I have found out something about the Small Business Economic Foundation and about the National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., but have not quite placed Mr. DeWitt Emery. I look at the printed stationery again, and finally I find it: DeWitt Emery, Monroe Letterhead Corp., Akron, Ohio.

To complete my research into these two small business letterheads, I will simply add at this time a complete list of the corporation contributors referred to in letter No. 1: American Rolling Mill Co., American Screw Co., Auto Engine Works, Barber-Colman Co., Bear Mill Manufacturing Co., Inc., Bibb Manufacturing Co., Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., the Lindsay Wire Weaving Co., Lone Star Cement Corporation, Marshall-Wells Co., Mathieson Alkali Works, Inc., the Miller Shoe Co.

Blue Bell, Inc., Borg-Warner Corp., Botany Worsted Mills, Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., the Buckeye Steel Castings Co., Campbell-Ewald Co., Inc., Celanese Corp. of America, the Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co., Chrysler Corp., DeSoto Motor Corp., Dexter Folder Co., Dodge Bros. Corp., Donaldson Baking Co., the Duff-Norton Mfg. Co., Electric Boat Co., Federal Malleable Co., Federal-Mogul Corp., Marshall Field & Co., Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., First National Stores, Inc., Fort Pitt Brewing Co., Furnas Electric Co., the B. F. Goodrich Co., the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Greenlee Bros. & Co., Gunite Foundries Corp., the M. A. Hanna Co., Harnischfeger Corp., E. F. Houghton & Co., Inland Steel Co., the Interstate Co., Spencer Kellog & Sons, Inc., Mine Safety Appliances Co., Mississippi River Fuel Corp., National Brass Co., National Machinery Co., National Oil Products Co., the Okonite Co., Peter Paul, Inc., Pittsburgh Reflector Co., Plymouth Motor Corp., Proctor & Schwartz, Inc., the Pure Oil Co., Republic Steel Corp., Sawyer Stores, Inc., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Shapleigh Hardware Co., W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Stanley Woolen Co., the Symington-Gould Corp., the Texas Co., United States Steel Corp., Vick Chemical Co., Hiram Walker-Gooderham & Worts, Ltd., Western Insulated Wire Co., Wheeling Steel Corp., Edwin L. Wiegand Co., Williamson Candy Co., Wyandotte Worsted Co., Wm. H. Ziegler Co., Inc., and many others.

The Truth About Free Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 9, 1949:

THE TRUTH ABOUT FREE MEDICINE

The longer Congress delays in taking action on President Truman's health program, the greater is the probability that nothing much will be done. This is true because the average citizen is begining to think about the cost.

As originally proposed by Mr. Truman, the scheme for free medical and hospital care doubtless looked attractive to a good many individuals who have found their medical and hospital bills a heavy burden. They did not realize what such care would cost them, if financed through pay-roll taxes. Neither did they know anything about Britain's experience with socialized medical and hospital care. Now they are beginning to learn the truth.

Americans currently spend about 4 percent of their income for medical care and hospital service. In return they get the best health service to be had anywhere in the world. It isn't perfect. It isn't as well distributed among income groups as would be desirable. It isn't on a budget basis for most people as yet. But it is better medical and hospital care than any other country has or ever had.

If we may judge by the estimates of Oscar Ewing and Arthur J. Altmeyer, who naturally would see the bright side, the health program would bring pay-roll taxes up to 10 percent or higher. Some Members of Congress, after examining the problem, think the social-security burden generally will go far above that and approximately 20 percent.

Whatever the correct figure may be, the sort of medical care the average citizen would get under socialization would not be worth the cost. There wouldn't be any more doctors or hospitals, at least very soon.

They would have greatly increased demands on their time and facilities, once their services were made free. The average person undoubtedly would find himself getting a lower grade of medical care and paying more for it. The same would be true of hospital care. Certainly there would not be as good care for those seriously ill, because of the diversion of physicians' time and hospital service to nonessential cases.

We already have, in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, a practical method of supplying both hospital and medical care on a budget basis. Millions of American families are covered by these self-supporting, efficient organizations. Many more millions can be. And those unable to pay anything for medical and hospital care can be taken care of more efficiently through Government aid to these voluntary agencies than by a costly bureaucratic scheme of socialized medicine.

Health Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, doctors all over the country are rebelling at the stand-pat attitude of the American Medical Association on proposals for extending medical care to people who cannot now afford it. Several big medical societies and a group of the Nation's top doctors have refused to pay the assessment levied by the AMA for fighting the President's health-insurance program.

Now the Michigan State Medical Society has run up against the same obstinacy of the AMA hierarchy. An editorial in the Detroit Free Press, of February 28, tells the story. Representatives of the Michigan society attended a meeting called by the AMA to consider its recently published 12-point program. They were dissatisfied with the AMA's plan, which has been denounced from one end of the country to the other as inadequate, and made some suggestions of their own.

According to the Free Press editorial the AMA refused to allow the Michigan delegation to explain its proposals although a majority of the delegates to the conference signified their desire to discuss it. The Michigan representatives then arranged a "rump" meeting, which the AMA tried to block, but which was attended by 46 delegates from 22 States. That shows clearly how widespread the resentment is today among doctors to the AMA's insistence upon status quo.

It is interesting to note that among the proposals the Michigan society wanted the AMA to consider were several ideas for getting doctors and hospitals into the rural areas, which is one of the most important features of President Truman's health-insurance program, which I have the honor to sponsor in the House.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial from the Detroit Free Press, with the comment that some of the references regarding the national-health-insurance program are inaccurate and based on misinformation:

AMA HIERARCHY REBUFFS THE PROGRESSIVE DOCTORS

Is the United States to be saddled with a system of Government-controlled, bureaucracy-operated socialized medicine?

Is this country, by adopting the scheme being offered by the Truman administration, to go one step further along the road to economic and political serfdom which has been blazed by totalitarian countries, and followed by Great Britain?

Our future course in this respect depends upon the answer to one big question which the man in the street is asking. The question is:

How can I obtain for myself and family adequate medical care at a cost which my circumstances permit me to pay?

Up until now, he has listened in vain for a satisfactory reply from the medical profession.

The issue of socialized medicine was projected by Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing. As spokesman for the Truman administration, he proposed a 10-year plan, based on compulsory health insurance, to provide not only increased medical facilities, but full medical care and hospitalization to be paid for out of a joint employee-employer tax and Federal subsidy.

Actually, Ewing's health program is a cleverly camouflaged blueprint for State socialism.

But it has a plausible ring to it. The average person, harassed by rising medical care costs, is unable to analyze it carefully. He will see in it only a way to relief from his difficulties. Therein lies its danger.

No reasonable or workable substitute has been offered to counteract the Ewing plan in terms which will appeal to the people, and which they can understand.

Economists of the Brookings Institution have successfully demolished all of Ewing's fallacies. This was done by a coldly analytical study based on scientific observations. But it offers no comprehensive alternative.

The mother, desperate for a physician to attend her sick child in the middle of the night, or the wage earner, watching his lifetime savings vanish under a long siege of illness, will not be impressed by the impersonal statistics which Brookings has compiled.

We face the threat of getting socialized medicine in lieu of something better.

The medical profession, through the American Medical Association, has failed in counterattacking the Ewing plan with a positive program of its own.

All that the AMA has offered is a 12-point, "me too" policy which admits the faults which Ewing purportedly would correct. Reactionary leadership within the AMA says, in effect, "Give us the Federal money and let us, in our own way, do what Ewing says he can do."

That is not an acceptable alternative to the American people. Large numbers of AMA members are spurning the program of their Association's heavy-footed leaders.

On Saturday, February 12, the AMA called a meeting of representatives of State medical societies at its headquarters in Chicago to define its 12-point program.

Officers of the Michigan State Medical Society attended, armed with a list of questions, forthright answers to which would have clarified the AMA's position.

The Michigan society's queries would have done more than that.

Although propounded as questions, they were in reality the outline for a positive program. Translated into action, they would allay the demand for socialized medicine.

It was entirely fitting and proper that such an outline for action should emanate from this State where the leadership provided by the State medical society and the Wayne County Medical Society is nationally recognized by the medical profession.

It has been said that in formulating policies pertaining to scientific and economic aspects of medical practice, the Michigan societies have generally been from 5 to 7 years in advance of the AMA.

It was Michigan which pioneered the Blue Cross and Blue Shield systems of prepaid health and hospital insurance when the AMA frowned upon anything so radical.

It was the profession of this State which first established rheumatic fever control centers to combat one of the most distressing afflictions of childhood. It was Michigan which first took postgraduate facilities to the doctors in their own communities; which pioneered in the care and treatment of epileptic children; which set up the first central blood bank to make plasma available to communities which had no facilities for storing it.

It is no wonder then, that professional ears pricked up at the Chicago meeting when the Michigan delegation offered its list of questions.

Pointing to the lack of a positive program under the AMA, the Michigan State Medical Society called for a statement of policy to settle the following questions:

1. Should voluntary health and hospital insurance premiums be paid by government during periods of unemployment?

2. What is our policy for financial assistance to families during sickness of the wage earner? Should he have insurance? If so, who is to pay for it, and for how long?

3. What is the policy for medical care to areas unable to support a physician? Are we in favor of assigning doctors to these areas?

4. Do we favor building of health centers for treatment in blighted areas?

5. Do we favor State financing for building small health centers and hospital facilities in areas unable to attract a doctor? To what extent do we favor Federal assistance?

6. Do we favor medical benefits for the aged and chronically ill, in addition to old-age benefits?

7. Do we favor home-town care of the medically indigent by physicians of their own choice, using the same technique for care as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield have used with veterans?

8. Do we favor return to an individual of all money spent for medical and hospital care, which exceeded 10 percent of his net income, same to come from the general fund, thus guaranteeing that no man would be forced to spend more than 10 percent of his income for catastrophic illness?

Here was the outline for a humane, liberal, and workable national health program.

How did the hierarchy of the AMA receive it?

It refused to allow the Michigan delegates to explain it, or to permit discussion from the floor, although a majority of those in attendance signified their desire to discuss it.

Asked if the AMA hall could be available the following day for a meeting for that purpose, AMA officials curtly stated that their building was closed on Sundays.

Despite that rebuff, however, the general membership was so eager to talk over the Michigan program that 46 delegates from 22 States canceled their train reservations and stayed over in Chicago to attend a discussion meeting in a crowded hotel room on Sunday.

The autocratic leadership of the AMA has its eyes and ears closed to new ideas to strengthen the strained relationship between doctors and the public.

The practice of medicine in the United States, the advancement of medical science, is without equal in the world.

But the slow-moving, slow-thinking AMA, which has been delegated the sole voice of medicine, has been unable to keep up, either with public opinion or the progressiveness of its own rank-and-file.

It bitterly resents any suggestion of change which does not originate in the hoary councils of its own hierarchy.

That is why the aggressive, pioneering leadership of the medical profession in Michigan finds no favor in its eyes.

It is the reason that the United States is being pushed toward socialized medicine.

The AMA has given the people of the United States no other choice.

If the practice of medicine is to continue a part of the private enterprise system, with the privilege of the patient to choose his own physician, and of the physician to choose his own patients, America must turn to the progressive elements of the profession for guidance.

The big question is still unanswered by the AMA.

Michigan has shown that the doctors themselves can furnish a satisfactory answer.

Will they now be permitted to take the lead which the AMA has so dismally failed to provide?

How Can the South Better Tell Its Story?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an address made to the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers by Mr. H. H. Williamson, assistant director of extension work, and I was so extremely interested in his thoughts that I believe it very worth while to have it printed in the RECORD so many thousands more can read his remarks.

Mr. Williamson is a Texan who has had a long and distinguished period of service with extension work in the Department of Agriculture. The farmers and ranchers know of the many services offered by the county agents, and this cooperative work of the Federal and State and county authorities has been very beneficial to the individual rural citizens and to the entire Nation.

The South is making rapid progress in its effort to improve its economic status, and in many instances, such as industrialization, it is progressing more rapidly than the rest of the United States. Better agricultural methods are being employed in the South, and the story of the South today is not the same story told so often about the South of yesterday. I commend Mr. Williamson for his expressed ideas of suggesting how we can better tell the South's story.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Mr. H. H. Williamson before a meeting in Baton Rouge, La.:

HOW CAN THE SOUTH BETTER TELL ITS STORY?

The theme for this afternoon's session is challenging. The primary justification for my leading the discussion is the fact that I am intensely interested. The subject poses several subquestions. Among them are: (1) Does the South have a worth-while story? (2) Does that story need to be told? You and I will agree that the answers to these questions are in the affirmative. If so, our thinking needs to be directed to such questions as: To whom should the story be told? By whom, and how? There is a keen appreciation of the need for the American people to know in true manner the facts about the South, its people, its agriculture, and its industry. Maybe we haven't given sufficient consideration to the means and procedures for getting such a job done in an organized fashion. The South is a popular subject for writers, orators, and analysts. Too often the South is played up as the economic problem No. 1 of the Nation. Many of the stories relating to the South are garbled with half-truths—slanted for various purposes. I have reference to stories with a Tobacco Road tinge. They are not void of facts, but are often distorted, somewhat like the ridiculous reflections of the curved mirror we used to find at carnivals.

Our homes consist of three primary parts—the house in which we live, a front yard, and a back yard. It is natural that we endeavor to keep our most attractive yard possessions and ornaments in the front yard and the less attractive ones in the rear. We certainly keep the garbage can and the rubbish in the rear. What I am trying to say is that too many of the stories about the South are based on what is found in the back yard and sometimes include the garbage can. A rejoinder with or without irritation, "'ain't so," is not a satisfactory answer. Such a response is not convincing and it provokes more argument. What the public needs is an opportunity to see and know more of what we have in our front yard.

Fundamentally, Americans do not hate or dislike their neighbors. They are inclined to believe and not to doubt. Our attitudes are formed by what we see and hear. What I am intimating is that to whatever degree there is a lack of understanding and appreciation of the finer things in the South, some of the fault may be found near our doorstep. Maybe we need to complain less and work more at the task under discussion. Just telling the story to ourselves is not sufficient. Agricultural workers are in a key position, but the task is too big for any one group. It is as big as the South. Instead of thinking of it as a job to be done, we should think of it as a great opportunity—an opportunity for the leaders in education, social affairs, agriculture, and industry, working cooperatively on a well-planned program to familiarize the American people with the South of today and tomorrow, telling the story without glamour or concealment of unpleasant facts. Perhaps there is little that can be done this afternoon in charting a course of action or making blueprints of operation. This discussion may prove to be a constructive step if we concern ourselves sufficiently. Procedures and techniques for doing a job follow constructive thinking. Maybe an appropriate suggestion from this group to the general assembly will result in the central theme of some future annual meeting of the association being The Story of the New South.

The wealth and future of any area can be pretty well grouped under three headings: (1) Its people, their education and vision; (2) its agriculture, and (3) its industries. The people of the South rank well in pride and vision, but at times we may be inclined to be a little sensitive. Our educational facilities are rapidly expanding and improving. We have witnessed a rapid expansion of industry, particularly during the past few decades, and there is much evidence to justify the belief that the expansion will be much greater in the decades ahead. As is well known to leaders in agriculture, a new pattern of agriculture is being forged in the South. Our new agriculture is being built with soil conservation, mechanization, greener pastures, more and better livestock, and better farm homes, all of which are resulting in a better rural life. May I repeat—the South has a worth-while story, a story that the public would like to hear. The Southern leaders in agriculture should help tell the story, for the achievements in agriculture and the great changes that are taking place in the rural South would make a large and interesting chapter. The land-grant colleges of the South, through their research and extension divisions, and the various agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, are playing a major role in the making of a new agricultural South. It's a wonderful story. Let's help tell it.

Morning After's Cold Dawn Seen Slowing Truman Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune. I think this article hits the nail quite on the head. Certainly the mandate from the people in my section of New York State was not one asking for the fulfillment of Mr. Truman's campaign promises.

MORNING AFTER'S COLD DAWN SEEN SLOWING TRUMAN PROGRAM—MARK SULLIVAN POINTS OUT NEW DEALERS' ELATION OVER VICTORY IS DULLED BY CONGRESS DELAYS

(By Mark Sullivan)

As Republicans could put it tauntingly, alluding to the lack of legislation accomplished by the new Democratic Congress, President Truman has run into what the late George Ade called "the cold, gray dawn of the morning after." The delay of legislation is much too serious a matter to be passed over with a partisan derision, yet in fact the taunt is a true enough description of what has happened.

Following Mr. Truman's victory last November, New Dealers experienced an elation which led them to overestimate what had happened. Moved more by the surprise of the outcome than by anything that was substantial in it, they assumed confidently that Mr. Truman would have great prestige with the country, great power in the Democratic Congress that was elected with him. This confidence was increased by a corresponding overestimate by the Republicans. They likewise moved more by the surprise than by the substance, overestimated the set-back of themselves as the opposition party.

In the spirit of elation, New Dealers spoke of a mandate from the people, implying a mandate on Congress to enact the promises Mr. Truman had made in his campaign. Another phrase expressing the New Dealers' elation was, "the hundred days." That was a recalling of the early days of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 when measure after measure sent to Congress by Roosevelt was passed willingly and quickly, without much of either opposition or change.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS RECALLED

This elated anticipation failed to take into account some deep-reaching qualifications. Mr. Truman had had a Democratic Congress

before, the Seventy-ninth, which had been elected on the same ticket with President Roosevelt in 1944 and continued for nearly 2 years after Mr. Truman took over following Roosevelt's death. To that Congress Mr. Truman sent more than a score of proposals for social and economic change, nearly all of which the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress rejected or ignored. Mr. Truman, aggrieved, publicly appealed to the people to bring pressure on the leaders of his own party in Congress. This appeal the public ignored as much as Congress had ignored the President's proposals. Many of the proposals which the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress rejected or ignored were repeated by Mr. Truman in his campaign. To assume that the Democratic Eighty-first Congress would do what the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress had refused was to count too much on the psychological effect of Mr. Truman's surprising victory last November.

In the spirit which assumed that the new Congress would accept Mr. Truman's leadership and enact his program of legislative proposals, special emphasis was put on the Taft-Hartley labor law. That was regarded as a symbol. To repeal it would be justification of Mr. Truman's often-repeated campaign denunciations of the Republican Eightieth Congress which had enacted it. Coupled with the Taft-Hartley law as the symbol of Republican infamy was the Wagner labor law as the symbol of the glory of the New Deal. The Taft-Hartley law had superseded the Wagner one. If the Taft-Hartley law could be repealed utterly, that would be an assurance that the Republican Eightieth Congress had been only a brief and unsubstantial interruption of the New Deal—that the New Deal was back and would be kept and extended—and if this could be done promptly it would be another "hundred days."

COMMITTEE PACKED

In this spirit the administration leaders in the Senate arranged that the Labor Committee of that body should consist of eight Democrats and only five Republicans. This set-up gave the Democrats a strength on the committee out of proportion to the party representation in the Senate as a whole. The committee thus organized held many weeks of hearings, at which witnesses and Republican committee members made many suggestions in favor of keeping most of the Taft-Hartley law. All these the Democratic majority of the committee ignored. The committee reported to the Senate an administration measure which would repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

But the time schedule had been slowed up. By the time the new administration labor law was reported out of the Senate Labor Committee some 50 days of the new Congress had elapsed, and much more than a hundred days will have passed before the Senate will have concluded debate on the new measure, not yet even begun, together with action by the House, not yet begun. Besides, untoward events—including a demonstration of the power of labor leaders by John L. Lewis—are unfavorable to enactment of the new administration bill.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the city of Newark, N. J., memorializing Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the Congress:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., as follows:

1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith by the city clerk to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from New Jersey.

VINCENT J. MURPHY,
RALPH A. VILLANI,
M. ELLENSTEIN,
JOHN A. BRADY,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.
H. S. REICHENSTEIN,
City Clerk.

Rankin's Pension Plan Versus Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGO S. SIMS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard L. Strout which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 12, 1949.

Reading Mr. Strout's article brings this question to mind: In voting for the Rankin pension bill, would a Congressman not be voting against providing old-age security for the nonveterans and the majority of the women of this country?

The article is as follows:

SPECIAL PENSIONS OR BROAD INSURANCE?

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The big new Rankin drive for veterans' pensions brings the United States for the first time smack up against a momentous choice.

On one side Mr. RANKIN wants benefits for veterans. On the other, the administration wants insurance for nearly everybody. It seems impossible that both courses can be followed. That would be too expensive. The two are in effect mutually exclusive. The time has come when the Nation has got to decide which path to follow for taking care of citizens over 65—direct Federal grants to veterans, or insurance payments to workers for which they have previously paid contributions.

Except in the amounts involved, there is nothing particularly new in the Rankin proposal. There have been veterans' pensions after nearly every war in American history, though usually they have not appeared quite so suddenly as this one after World War II. But the numbers engaged, even in the Civil War, were trifling compared to those in present global combats. That is where the chief difference lies in the Rankin pension plan—the size. So many people participated in the last war that veterans and their families cover a vast section of the whole Nation. They represent, in effect, a distinct type of old-age benefit of a noncontributory type on a vast scale.

Latest estimates by the Bureau of the Budget set the matter in perspective by showing its scope. The Rankin proposal is $90 a month for veterans at 65, irrespective of need or war-incurred disability, plus benefits to surviving relatives. Here are some official estimates:

By 1950 the cost would be $1,200,000,000 or more annually.

By 1990 the annual rate would be $5,000,000,000.

Total cost for the present century, around $125,000,000,000.

Rate from A. D. 2000 on—$4,000,000,000 a year.

After A. D. 2000 pensions to living veterans would taper off in a decade or two, but thereafter, say A. D. 2020, payments to widows and other survivors of veterans would have reached their peak Says the Government, "They would continue high for several decades thereafter."

The Rankin outlays would be added to already large veterans' compensation to which existing laws already commit the Government. These now run to about $3,000,000,000 annually. The present amounts added to the Rankin amounts would mean, it is estimated, about eight to ten billion dollars for veterans' benefits by 1990.

Let us take a long breath and turn to the alternative system of social security.

The distinction is that the social-security program is an insurance program, whereas the veterans' program is a straight-out treasury grant.

America already has a big social-security system started in 1935, and the administration would like to enlarge it. This may not be approved by Congress. In general, I think it is fair to say that public opinion is setting in toward greater governmental responsibility in organizing social insurance. The Rankin veterans' program would cross this trend sharply.

Let's contrast the new Truman social-security program with the Rankin scheme. The first would apply to nearly everybody,

veterans and nonveterans, the second only to veterans.

The first would make old-age benefits available to all employees and self-employed persons at 65 for men, and 60 for women. The Rankin proposal would be chiefly for men, at 65.

The Truman proposal as an insurance program would be paid primarily by beneficiaries, either as contributors or taxpayers. In contrast, the Rankin program would be borne by all taxpayers, for the benefit only of veterans and their dependents.

Old-age benefits under the social-security scheme, it is estimated, would compare favorably with the Rankin pension in size. In addition there would be temporary and disability insurance, which would cover the great majority of both veterans and nonveterans.

Again, the social-insurance program includes an extensive system of benefits and protection for survivors of insured persons. In most cases such insurance would be more generous than the Rankin proposal.

Sooner or later the Nation must choose between the old traditional system of direct pensions to veterans alone or the new system of earned insurance for veterans and other workers alike. Both systems seem unlikely at the same time.

Keyhole Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, March 15:

KEYHOLE POLITICS

The full story of the wire-tapping plot to listen in on the telephone conversations of high New York City officials remains to be told. But the average good citizen knows enough of it already to feel a revulsion against such methods of conducting politics, no matter who uses them. The late Justice Holmes once spoke of wire tapping as dirty business. It is the resort of the snoop, the sneak, and the peeper. The conscience of the public rebels against this eavesdropping as an invasion of civil rights, the forcible entry into privacy without warrant. Its only standing in law or in ethics is when used strictly for official purposes, under the sanction of proper governmental authority or court determination, in pursuit of the lawbreaker or the enemy of the state. The possible abuses of even this purpose are so grave that conscientious people are deeply troubled over the problems raised.

Without prejudging in any way the connection or the guilt of any of the figures appearing in the present investigation, we assume it is a fair deduction, and one that will certainly be made by the public generally, that this eavesdropping on official wires was undertaken with the hope of gathering information to be used politically against the O'Dwyer administration in the coming election. In the present preliminary stage there are several fusion movements, associated only slightly, if at all, with one another. Since the only opposition that has a ghost of a chance to defeat the Democratic candidates for city office is a fusion opposition, the public, whether justly or not, will associate the wire-tapping conspiracy with what it loosely thinks of as the fusion movement. City hall is obviously opening all the stops to amplify this effect.

The regrettable fact about this whole incident, then, is that sincere, decent people who have the legitimate motive of conducting a clean, aggressive fight for public office have innocently received a serious setback even before they have chosen their candidates, adopted a platform, or begun a campaign. It is inconceivable, because of their known high principles, that any considerable number of the leaders interested in various fusion movements had any part in the wire-tapping episode, yet all fusion suffers from it and from other undignified and ill-advised displays of showmanship that can only be described as spring folly of an election year.

It is wholesome to have a strong fusion movement in this city, and we hope that the able citizens who have been working in that direction will see now, more than ever, the necessity for forming their lines early and getting unified control of a situation that seems at the moment to have got out of hand. There is no necessity for looking to Albany for a State investigation, or to the felonious fringe of underhanded private inquiry to dig for scandal in order to conduct an effective and determined campaign. This city administration's own indictments of conditions within itself and the findings of other official and privately financed inquiries offer a satisfactory basis for a campaign addressed to better government here; to providing a rebuilt waterfront, an extended, improved, and more soundly financed transit system, more new schools, new hospitals, a reconstructed civil service, a simplification of the tax system, sewage disposal, garbage disposal, cleaner streets, justice to libraries and museums, more equitable pay to certain classes of employees, and, most of all, a more efficient, economical administration, with less politics in some of its offices.

That such a basis exists for an opposition campaign is not necessarily a criticism of Mayor O'Dwyer, who has himself been a severe critic of conditions he inherited (some war-imposed) or has been delayed in correcting because of lack of funds. Whoever wins the coming election, the city will gain by a thorough debate on issues and policies affecting the city's future. It is a healthy thing to have an alert and intelligent opposition, and regrettable that, except for occasional interludes, we must wait until an election campaign to have it.

An effective opposition movement depends almost wholly upon the discovery of a man of sufficient stature to be the candidate for mayor, so attractive as to unite all wanted elements in a powerful fusion. He must be a man with the administrative capacity to run a huge establishment whose operations cost more than a billion dollars a year, and whose integrity is matched by popular appeal that will make his election a practical possibility. It is not easy to find such a man, but without him fusion cannot win office against a Democratic machine firmly entrenched and a mayor who, despite his ups and downs, remains popular with a great many voters.

War Against the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of March 9, 1949:

WAR AGAINST THE PRESS

In these columns we ordinarily prefer not to discuss the special problems of the publishing business, because we feel that newspapers and magazines ought to be able to handle such matters on their own time.

But in the last few weeks there has arisen an issue so serious that the whole industry is flabbergasted, and we think the general public ought to know about it.

The thing we are talking about is a bill, H. R. 2495, which the Post Office Department has asked Congress to pass. It would increase second-class mail rates (these are the rates paid by newspapers and magazines) by about 250 percent the first year, and another 50 percent the year following.

Even in these times 250 percent is a whale of an increase. What is the Post Office trying to do?

It says it is trying to reduce the postal deficit.

That sounds reasonable enough, until one reads the report of the Hoover Commission on Post Office Department finances. It says that the Department is not in position to recommend rate changes for its various services, because it doesn't know what those services cost. Until the Department finds out, continues the Commission, its "rate recommendations to the Congress cannot carry proper weight."

If the Post Office Department's interest in second-class rates were strictly financial, it would be understandable and laudable. Even the demand for a 250-percent raise might be viewed sympathetically (especially by those who don't have to pay it).

But such, manifestly, is not the case. The nature of the pending bill reveals that the Department is more concerned with sociological and ideological matters than with revenue.

Under present law, publications which enjoy second-class privileges pay one rate of postage for the reading matter they publish, and another, higher rate for their advertising.

Under the proposed law, the entire weight of the publication would be paid for at the same rate—but the rate would go up tremendously in proportion to the advertising contained. Publications which carry more than 75-percent advertising more than half of the time would be denied second-class mailing privileges entirely.

This is an exceedingly complex business, but the purpose of the new plan is plain. The Post Office Department is trying to set itself up as judge and jury to decide how much advertising matter should be carried by American publications. Obviously this is another move by the bright young men of Washington who have been fighting advertising ever since the early days of the first New Deal. If they are allowed to fix the limit of advertising at 75 percent today, what is to keep them from fixing it at 50 percent tomorrow? And 25 percent on the day after?

The power to penalize and limit advertising carries with it the power to destroy the press.

We do not wish to give the impression that metropolitan newspapers are completely at the mercy of the United States mails. They are turning increasingly to other means of distribution.

In 1921 the World-Herald served 99 percent of its out-of-town readers by mail. Today it serves only 45 percent by mail, the other 55 percent getting their papers by direct delivery, via railroad, bus, and truck.

The proposed new rates certainly would hasten the change-over to direct delivery. The Post Office would be pricing itself out of business.

To some extent it might also price itself out of the magazine field. The large national weeklies, for example, no doubte would try to divert as much of their circulation as possible to newsstand sales, and would hold their mail circulation to a minimum.

But some publications would have no defense. The Christian Science Monitor, for example, has a scattered national circulation and is almost totally dependent on the mails. Small-city dailies and weeklies also would be hurt, because under this bill they would lose so-called "free-mailing privileges" in their home counties. Labor, religious, and educational publications also would lose their special rates.

As usual, the "little fellow," that conversational favorite of the bureaucrats, would take it on the chin.

We are not contending that there should be no increase in second-class rates. Frankly, we don't know if there should be, and we don't think the Post Office knows.

But if the Department is resolved to wipe out its deficit—in which case every taxpayer in the land should shout Hallelujah—its first step should be in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. By means of up-to-date cost-accounting methods it should find out which types of service are being provided at a loss. Then it should try to stop the losses by making its operation more efficient. Finally, if necessary, it should raise rates.

In this bill the Post Office is ignoring entirely the possibility that a large share of the postal deficit may be due to inefficiency and politicking within the Department. Arbitrarily, it is trying to assess a major part of the deficit against the press.

Newspapers, magazines, and their readers should fight H. R. 2495 to the last ditch.

History of Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol, civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force, today has roughly 165,000 participating members, of whom about 137,000 are senior members, male and female air enthusiasts, and some 30,000 cadets. The present goal of the Civil Air Patrol is to have 150,000 active senior members and 70,000 cadets by 1950. In addition, at this time there are also about 100,000 persons in the inactive reserve of Civil Air Patrol.

Civil Air Patrol has been building apace in the past few years after almost dying of neglect immediately after the end of World War II when the pilots who had been flying coastal patrols returned to their normal civilian pursuits.

One man had much to do with reviving Civil Air Patrol, and he died while flying out of Washington, D. C., on a Civil Air Patrol mission. He was Col. George A. Stone. Colonel Stone first became associated with Civil Air Patrol in April 1942 as the State wing commander of Ohio. In July of the same year, Colonel Stone activated and became the first commander of coastal patrol base 14, located at Panama City, Fla. This base was 1 of 21 such bases established along the Atlantic and Gulf coast to combat submarine warfare and escort shipping in these coastal routes. Colonel Stone was successively promoted from captain to colonel during the war years for his outstanding work for Civil Air Patrol.

Shortly after the death of his lifelong friend and associate, Gen. Earle L. Johnson, national commander of Civil Air Patrol, Colonel Stone became chairman of the Civil Air Patrol Board, presently known as the National Executive Board. From February 1947 until August 1948, Colonel Stone spent the majority of his time on Civil Air Patrol affairs, letting his business and personal life revert to a secondary importance. His efforts were instrumental in the passing of Civil Air Patrol legislation; Public Law 476, Seventy-ninth Congress, which incorporated Civil Air Patrol and set forth its objectives, and Public Law 557, Eightieth Congress, which established Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force. Under his leadership, the national executive board formulated policies designed to establish Civil Air Patrol as a permanent organization devoted to the advancement of aviation. The constitution and bylaws of the organization were written and adopted during his term of office as chief executive officer.

Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, national commander of Civil Air Patrol headquarters and headquarters squadron, located at Bolling Air Force base, District of Columbia, took over his command October 1, 1947, and has achieved excellent progress toward the eventual goal of making available to all interested youths a program of air education and an opportunity in the senior organization to put into practice their knowledge.

In addition to General Beau and his administrative staff, the Civil Air Patrol is advised by a national executive board with Gen. Carl A. Spaatz as chairman and Col. D. Harold Byrd, of Dallas, Tex., as vice chairman. Other members of the board are: Col. Harry K. Coffey, Col. Leverett Davis, Col. Irven A. Myhra, Col. J. Michael Morris, Col. Fay M. Thomas, Col. Stuart C. Welch, and Col. W. C. Whelen.

As commanding general of the Army Air Forces, and later as Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, General Spaatz early indicated his friendship for the Civil Air Patrol organization. Partly in recognition of the services of Civil Air Patrol to the Air Force in the early days of the war, and partly because he had faith in the youth program of Civil Air Patrol, General Spaatz guided the Air Force to recognize Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary. Long before the introduction of legislation which resulted in Public Law 557, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Air Force had designated Civil Air Patrol as its civilian auxiliary, and had started a program of assisting Civil Air Patrol through the assignment of Air Force personnel, donation of surplus and obsolete property for use in the cadet program, and so forth.

When Colonel Stone, chairman of the national executive board, died, it was natural that General Spaatz, who was on retired status, should be appointed by the national commander of Civil Air Patrol as chairman of the national executive board. Under his leadership, the board is continuing to build an organization devoted not only to the advancement of aviation generally, but to the civilian defense of the Nation, should an emergency arise which requires such action.

Colonel Byrd, vice chairman of the board, first became a member of Civil Air Patrol shortly after its organization during the early part of the war. He organized the coastal patrol base at Beaumont, Tex.; as wing commander of the Texas wing he pioneered the patrolling by aircraft of forest areas to assist in the control of forest fires through not only patrolling and reporting fires when they are small, but also by mapping the burned areas.

After his appointment to the board, Colonel Byrd resigned his position as commanding officer of the Texas wing in order to devote his time to the work of the board. Together with the late Colonel Stone, he was instrumental in the passage of Civil Air Patrol legislation. He also has been very active in special projects, including the entertaining of foreign students touring the United States under the Marshall plan, and of Canadian cadets of the Air Cadet League of Canada during the exchange of cadets with that organization.

What Now in Israel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Jewish National Fund conference, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., March 15, 1949:

WHAT NOW IN ISRAEL?

As friends of Israel, as friends of the democratic way of life, we must stop to ask ourselves at this point, "what now?" I do not mean that with the note of despair that so often accompanies that phrase. But I do ask it as a serious question. I ask it both as the recognition of responsibility and the acceptance of a challenge.

The waves of fever, with relation to Israel, are subsiding. The high drama of the war drums, the momentum of military victory, the tense pitch that was maintained throughout the whole political struggle for independence are withdrawing. We must acknowledge this, because if we don't, all unseen, and very slowly, the greatest enemy of mankind—lethargy and indifference—will overtake us. It is easy enough to be swept along in the stream of excitement, to understand and to help and to sympathize and to participate. But now the sober moments are upon us.

The Knesseth—Israel's first constituent assembly—has convened. Peace talks are proceeding. The recognition of Israel by most of the leading countries of the world has taken place. The Security Council of the

United Nations has accepted Israel's application to join the family of nations. President Truman, in true statesmanship, has acknowledged the integrity and stability of the newest of all democratic republics, by granting the loan applied for. We need only go back a short eight months to review the miracle of Israel's statehood when Israel, pleading before the bar of the world, found that it had to take the reins in its own hands and shape its own destiny. The impact of Israeli victories on the battlefields was felt all over the world, and Jews everywhere were the beneficiaries thereof.

What we see before us, as contrasted with less than a year ago, is a monument to man's endurance, to the truth of his vision, to the everlasting moralities of justice and liberty.

But I come back again to my first theme. Now the tasks before Israel are without the drums and the banners. They are the daily, solid, undramatic chores. I might make the comparison with marriage. The successful marriage is that which, though lacking the high moments of the wooing and the honeymoon, carries on with sober responsibility the shaping of a pattern of life.

I feel I must stress this point over and over again. Israel needs your help as vitally as she did at any previous time. Now is the period of digging and grubbing and building. Now, all the achievements of Israel must be gathered together and tied in an enduring knot.

As the world has found to its dismay, the problems of peace are tenfold more intricate, more delicate than the problems of war. In peacetime the sense of sacrifice seems to dim. The unity and coordination fall apart; the grumbling and the indifferences set in. We have seen it happen the world over. We stand warned. Let us see that it does not happen to and in Israel.

How can we set aside the role of passive spectators and become active participants in the destiny of a people? One of the most vital answers lies in the participation in the Jewish National Fund.

The Jewish National Fund. I like saying it. Because in it are bound up the realities of Zionist achievement. The Jewish National Fund was founded in 1901 at the Fifth Zionist Congress. Stated like that, it's a neat, bare, and unimaginative statistic. But let's couple it with another statistic: On May 14, 1948, the Jewish state was proclaimed. And there it is—two statistics standing in the center of other recordings, thousands already made and thousands more yet to come out of the turbulent history of the Jewish people. And looking at these two interlocked, unerasable facts, the connection between the two can never be broken.

In 1901, when political zionism was being drowned in an ocean of words, fine phrases, and lofty sentiment, the clear, practical, and realistic approach of the Jewish National Fund was the turning back of the tide.

When I traveled through Israel last September and October, I saw the work of the Jewish National Fund. I saw the development of the water resources by JNF; I saw the people on the JNF land, land redeemed and reawakened; I saw the newly occupied parts of the country, the settlement activities, the antimalarial work and the road construction, the drainage and the hydrological processes, all the work of the JNF. I understood, as I had never understood before, the relationship between the establishment of the Jewish National Fund in 1901 and the proclamation of the Jewish state in 1948.

It must be made clear to the Jews the world over, and particularly to the Jews of the United States, because we have the strength and the numbers beyond any, that the JNF is indispensable. I repeat, indispensable to the political growth and the social maturity of a Jewish state. Can there be a people without a land, a state without a land, a home for the dispossessed without land? I was amazed to learn that many Americans believe that now that the Jewish state exists, the land automatically belongs to Israel. That's a mischievous piece of misinformation. The land, not already acquired, must still be bought, dunam by dunam; that land must be developed dunam by dunam. Its soil must be reawakened to productivity; that means afforestation and the development of water resources. There is the whole area of the Negev which must be turned into a food basket for Israel. Twenty-five thousand to 35,000 immigrants are coming into Israel every month. Their successful integration into Israel requires huge areas of land and the husbanding of all resources. Twenty percent of the people must settle on the land, that is, as keepers of the soil. One family on the land enables four other families to find a livelihood in the cities.

Consider these facts well. The Jewish National Fund spells out security and stability for Israel, security and stability for these thousands of immigrants who are home at long last.

And let me tell you this: The whole history of the development of Israel is the development of the JNF, the land, the people, the holdings, the colonies, the water, the trees. These are all the story of the romance of a people that has written its imperishable history into the soil. What Israel is today is no more and no less than a bold outline of the land holdings acquired by the JNF. What gave reason and logic to the presentation by Israeli statesmen to the United Nations and before that to the presentation before 20 commissions that had investigated and surveyed Palestine? Why could the case be argued realistically and with hard facts that no amount of Arab obstructionist talk could deny? Why? Because the concrete accomplishments of the Jews in Israel could not be denied by the evidences of the five senses. They could be seen, heard, touched, smelt, and tasted. The productivity of the farms, the settlements, the proud, martial bearing of the trees, the afforestation, the cities, the green, rich grass. All these bore convincing testimony that the barrenness of Palestine for thousands of years had given way before the determined and practical idealism of the Jews. The statesmen of Israel did not come before the world with tears, with heartrending, lurid phrases, with sentimental outpourings. No. They came with the fruits of their labor and said, "Look and judge."

And that's what the Jewish National Fund asks of you today. "Look and judge."

I have learned a lesson in my quarter of a century of political life, and I keep it before me always. No argument is more persuasive than the "fait accompli"—that which is already done. The Israeli statesmen knew this; they knew the battle for the Negev, in the political sense, would be a bitter one between the British and the Jews. The leaders of the Jewish National Fund knew this. The JNF established 30 settlements in the Negev and invested millions of dollars in its development, and by so doing made it an integral part of Israeli territory, so integral a part that the United Nations could find no answer to the assertion that only the Jews would and could develop the Negev. Even the obstinacy and the trickery of the British could not overcome that argument. The argument could not be disproved because it had already been done. The JNF, dealing with tangibles and realities throughout the years, tangibles like land, water, trees, had come to know the realities and seized upon them to make them work for Israel.

I say this without fear of contradiction. The 300 settlements that have been developed, the chain of hospitals, the Hebrew language, the culture, the pioneering spirit, the idealism, all this would not have been possible without the JNF. The land is first. The land is foremost. The Jews have a national consciousness which has been kept alive for 2,000 years because once the land had been theirs. It is theirs, at long last, again. The religion, the culture, the memories of a people are all threads of the Jewish people leading back to the land. Whatever term has been used—homeland, commonwealth, state, it related to the ownership, possession, and control of the land—the soil upon which men could walk, build, and plow, as freemen, living in security and dignity.

I remember through these many years the blue and white boxes of the Jewish National Fund. I remember seeing them on the street corners, and in subways, carried and shaken by young boys and girls. I remember how the work-weary hands stopped to drop their nickels and their dimes into the boxes, for the redemption of the land—the promised land. Wherever there were Jews there were the blue and white boxes, keeping the vision alive of a dispersed people who some day would go home again—to the land. To many, it was the one warm dream left in a life that had otherwise been shattered. I remember the stories of the Polish Jews who saved out of their pitiful savings some trifling sum to put into the blue and white boxes—and today, thousands of their children, walk in Israel's sun, on the land which the pennies helped to buy.

I'd like to bring out at this point the brilliant distinction between word and deed which Chaim Weizman sets forth in his autobiography, Trial and Error. In writing of the sense of futility surrounding Fifth Zionist Congress, he states, "I should mention, in connection with the history of our movement that the London Congress was actually of some historic importance; but not as a demonstration. It was there that the Jewish National Fund for the purchase of land in Palestine as the inalienable property of the Jewish people was founded; founded in a small way indeed, and, as it were, incidentally. It was destined to become one of our most important instruments in the building of the homeland, but its birth was obscure, and the attention paid to it was completely overshadowed by big talk of charters and international negotiations."

There it is, the difference between the filibuster and the vote, the difference between excavation onlookers and the drillers, the difference between the gloved and the bared hands, the difference between crowing over the miracle of Israel as parlor conversation and asking, "How was this miracle wrought? And what part did I play in it?"

Today, President Weizmann says, "Interwoven in the record of the Jewish National Fund and of its work and accomplishments is the story of the rebirth of Israel." And Premier Ben-Gurion, emphasizing the unshackling of foreign bonds, states, "The historic task of the Jewish National Fund to root the Jewish masses in the soil of the homeland can now be carried out in full."

Can it? Only if you want it to.

Only a million dunams of land is in JNF possession, land that cannot be alienated or sold for personal gain. One million five hundred thousand Jews cannot be brought into Israel unless JNF acquires 4,000,000 additional dunams. A contribution to JNF is not charity. It is a capital investment, a permanent investment in the future of Israel. It is productive capital out of which the growth and safety of Israel is assured. It is planned investment providing an agricultural base side by side with the industrial development. Israel must provide for her own food. Land provides homes and hope and freedom and a foundation. Land opens up new opportunities for the intensive, though balanced, cultivation of its resources. Land means the mass settlement and the mass movement of Jewish immigration into Israel. In short, land is Israel's future.

Yes; today we look to Israel's future, harking back across a span of centuries to retell the story of Esther and how Haman hanged on the gallows built for Mordecai, remembering the endurance of the Jewish people through every kind of tyranny. For it is written in the Book of Esther, "And that these days should be remembered and kept throughout every generation, every family, every province, and every city; and that these days of Purim should not fall from among the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed."

That is the injunction: "Nor the memorial of them perish from their seed." Nor the memorial of other days when righteousness triumphed over tyranny.

I want to tell you a bit about what I saw and felt in Israel when I was there in September and October and how much JNF contributed to the genesis of Israel. The excitement of my experiences is still with me. Israel poured new life into my old skin. I welcome this opportunity because of the work of the JNF to break forth in a torrent of Israel. There may be those of you present who have been to Israel, and you will understand my fever. I want to say without reservation that anyone who contributes in small measure or large to Israel's rebirth and development has gained for himself an enrichment and fulfillment that no degree of personal self-serving success can bring.

Mark you, when I stepped into Israel, I did not step into a country of luxury, of factories producing at a furious rate, of mile upon mile of growing grain and wheat, of furs and perfumes, in short, of material abundance. No; I stepped into a country at war, with shortages evident everywhere, food, clothing, shelter, a country with bomb-ripped buildings and stricken farms. But if I stopped there, I would be giving you a picture completely out of focus, for there is a tempo in Israel, as quickening to the blood as the rhythms of the Hora that no honest description of Israel dare omit. There is no self-pity; on the contrary, there is almost an exultant fever about the people that animates their whole being, the way they walk, talk—an eagerness and vitality that defy definition. They were fighting a war unaided, they were building a country, they were teaching their young, they were welcoming and integrating the immigrants, they were forming a government, they were in the midst of a hundred and one activities, and yet, over all, there was no feeling at all, none whatsoever, of a regimented people. You will find it hard to believe when I tell you that with all the burdens, the responsibilities, the privations, the dangers, the animosities and indifferences of the world outside, there is today in Israel a joyous people. They feel they belong, no longer surplus, no longer apologetic for being Jewish, no longer alternating between fear and defiance, for this is "their own, their native land."

I think we can sum it up by saying that each one feels he has a reason for living; he's glad he is alive, and that grip on life seeks and finds a diversity of expression, not only in the work in the everyday pursuits, but in the arts and the sciences. Israeli literature is already in the making in the contemporary sense. They are experimenting with art forms. I saw an exhibit of soldiers' art in Tel Aviv and you can believe me that it was far from primitive, although still in the main imitative of the modern masters. I heard the mature performance of the Israeli Symphony Orchestra conducted by our own Leonard Bernstein. I listened to a performance of the opera Thais in Hebrew translation. There are seven Hebrew newspapers published in Tel Aviv alone. Everywhere there was a sense of doing, of personal participation, in the destiny of a reborn people.

This is the spirit that must be kept intact. This is the spirit which assures the sturdiness, the health, social, political, and economic, of Israel. This is the spirit you uphold with contributions to the JNF, so that Israel will live and grow, in justice, dignity, and equality, so that we, in turn, may point with pride to a new light on the world's horizon, a light that will lead to a world more secure, in the interest of peace for peoples everywhere. In serving Israel well, we serve the cause of all mankind. Let there be none who turns his head or heart away.

The B-36 Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of today, March 16, 1949:

THE B-36 STORY

The Air Force is under fire from some quarters because it is suspected of spreading the word that the B-36 intercontinental bomber is capable of attacking Russia with atomic bombs in event of another war.

It happens that the Air Force denies giving out this story, which has been carried by one of the press associations. But whether the Air Force leaked the story or not, it is a piece of information which, if true, ought to be published.

Heretofore there has been a big question mark dangling from the nose of the B-36. It has been generally accepted that it had the range to fly from American bases into Russia and back, carrying an atomic bomb on the ingoing trip. But the critics have insisted it was so slow and lumbering that it would be a sitting duck target for Russia's jet fighters.

This is the big point of the story that has now come out. The Air Force, according to this report, has been conducting experiments with our own jet fighters, and has learned that at 40,000 feet the jets cannot successfully intercept the big bomber. And they reason that if our jets cannot do it, neither can the Russian jets.

There is no way of knowing, of course, whether this estimate is correct. The risks of error and surprise are always present in military calculations. But if the estimate is correct, or if the Air Force, having conducted honest tests, believes it to be correct, then the information is of a kind that ought to be made public to the fullest extent that is compatible with security requirements.

There are several reasons for this. One concerns the sensitive matter of military appropriations. When the Air Force stages a nonstop round-the-world flight, or when a story appears that the B-36 can bomb Russia, the suspicion arises that the objective is a larger slice of the military budget, and perhaps this is the case. But what is wrong with that? If it is true, that 70 strategic targets in Russia have been brought within successful atomic bombing range by the B-36, that is a highly significant development. Why should the Congress which makes the appropriations, or the people who ultimately foot the enormous bill for our Military Establishment, be kept in ignorance of such an important fact?

There is a second, and, it seems to the Star, more important reason.

The prime objective of our policy today, both foreign and domestic, is to prevent another war. Fear has been expressed that publicity on the performance of the B-36 may serve to incite war. The more reasonable view, however, is quite to the contrary. There is small chance of war unless it begins with Russian aggression. So we have been trying by various devices—the Greco-Turkish program, ECA, and the projected North Atlantic Pact—to erect a structure of strength which will discourage aggressive ambitions. The theory is that weakness invites aggression, while strength has the opposite effect. If this is sound, then why not tell the story of the B-36? Is a potential aggressor more or less apt to strike if he knows that retribution will be swift and terrible? We know that Hitler struck because he mistakenly thought he could win a quick and relatively cheap war. If we were to hush up the capabilities of the B-36, might not that help lead the Russians to the false conclusion that they, too, could win a quick and cheap war, at least in Europe? We ought to put ourselves in Russian shoes. If we knew or believed that Russia was capable of devastating 70 American cities with atomic bombs, would that encourage us to launch a war of aggression which would invite such an attack? Or would it make us think long and hard before assuming that risk?

Finally, there is the question of our potential allies. It is said that brandishing a big stick in the form of the B-36 will frighten them off, that fear of Russian reaction will keep them out of any alliance. But why is this so? In the last analysis, they look to us for their security. If we know, and if we let them know, and if the Russians know, that we have the means of carrying ruinous war to Russia, what is apt to be their reaction? Would our prospective allies rather lean on a strong reed, or a frail one?

These are some of the factors that should be considered in weighing the relative advantages of releasing and suppressing information. If the question is considered dispassionately, it will be hard to find any disadvantage that is not greatly outweighed by the advantages of a full and honest disclosure of what we are capable of doing, and what we will do, if forced again into war.

St. Patrick's Bequest to the Irish Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article appearing in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, March 13, 1949:

THE BELL RINGER
(By Steve Walsh)

Twenty years ago, March 18, 1929, a remarkable lecture was delivered at the St. Patrick's Day entertainment, under the auspices of the Xavierian Brothers of St. Michael's Diocesan High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. This discourse was called St. Patrick's Bequest to the Irish Race, and it was spoken to an attentive audience by the late Brother Gilbert, C. F. X., a profound scholar, a servant of Christ, and a dear friend to countless Americans whose forebears were of Irish origin. It depicts the reason why the Celt

will set aside next Thursday to honor St. Patrick. Its substance is presented in its entirety to my readers through the courtesy of Brother Samuel, C. F. X., blood brother of a noble Christian whose memory still remains fresh and green.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

"My dear friends, we are gathered here today to pay tribute to our illustrious ancestors—those brave Irish who have contributed so unselfishly and so magnanimously to the weal of humanity the world over. Their noble impulses in the interests of civilization have not been measured by time or clime; they are as old as civilization itself and as broad as humanity's very foundations.

"For 750 years, Irish genius and Irish energy have woven themselves into the texture of every government wherever government has found a home. Their music and verse have lulled nations in ordeal; their eloquence has given spirit in depression, and fired the irresolute with purpose; their valor has brought succor to oppressed people; their constructive genius has given fiber and fabric to the purpose and the ornament of governments; their faith has brought inspiration, radiance and warmth to the hearts of afflicted people.

"It is only fitting and proper that we should celebrate this day, because there is nothing that can so enkindle and enflame the young to do bravely and to dare nobly in ordeal like the contemplation of the triumphs and tribulations of their own ancestors. A recital then, however, meager, of their fealty in time of war and their devotion in time of peace, together with their unswerving loyalty to that precious heritage, their Christianity, which Patrick bequeathed them from the Hill of Tara, will serve as an inspiration not only to the present generation, but to generations that are not yet born. The intensity of your fidelity in this age is your legacy in devotion to the next.

"From time immemorial, governments have marked the great events in their history, and the birthdays of their distinguished chieftains for celebration, and they have appropriately commemorated those designated anniversaries. They have done so, that by attaching momentous significance to the names and achievements of their early champions, future generations might be inspired to imitate their virtues.

"The function of meditation on joys or sorrows is the enrichment of emotions. Visions of triumphs or tribulations in those who are dear to us refine the soul, encourage to resolution and fire our beings with fresh transports of fidelity and love. And as the heritages, whether spiritual or temporal, which we Irish enjoy today reflect the glories of triumphant past, or the tribulations of a trying one, we mention them in the hope that their vision may cheer timid souls, in the hope of stimulating in all the ardor of gratitude and the ardor of imitation. Indeed, the very purpose of tradition is to promote imitation; and, God knows, the history of Ireland is rich in tradition."

When Irishmen meet

"St. Patrick's Day has unofficially become the memorial day of the Irish. It is the day on which the children of the Gael gather to pay loyal respect and grateful veneration to the memory of their sainted benefactor and his saintly imitators. The Celt finds ample opportunity for expressions of gratitude on St. Patrick's Day. Oh, yes; because beautifully tender, sweetly solemn, and inspiringly impressive are the memories which cluster about the commemoration of this sacred day in Ireland and the world over for Irishmen.

"In harmony with the reawakening of the spirit of love in you, on St. Patrick's Day, there will be a rebirth and resurrection of all nature in Ireland. There the green will spring from the dull dead clods of earth; and bursting assunder the fetters of wintry restraint, it will break forth in floral splendor and vernal verdure over meadow and woodland, and the rivers and streams freed from the icy bands of their mountain fastness will chant their paeans of praise to God as they roll sparklingly to the freedom of the open sea; and the flowers in field and the blossoms upon the bush will burden the air with their nectared fragrance; and the birds upon the trees will distill the fragrance of flowers with miracles of melody informing the world that the voice of Ireland may be stilled but the soul of Ireland lives.

"Today my dear friends, your brothers and sisters in Ireland, their heart and pulse leaping and throbbing with new-born vigor and promise, gathered garlands from the gardens abloom and marched prayerfully down the lengthening aisles of their bivouacs, and wreathed every green mound where a martyr lies with the symbol of their hope and gratitude, and then held up to God the shamrock, that symbol of the rich contribution which Ireland has made to civilization and humanity—her long litany of martyrs and scholars—she pleaded to St. Patrick for mercy upon those souls who loved Ireland dearer than life, and to whose sacrifices she owes, under God, the benedictions with which her children have been blessed throughout the world. Let us, too, be mindful of Ireland's glories as well as Ireland's tribulations on St. Patrick's Day."

Steadfast in faith

"Other nations have selected the birthdays of their statesmen, their wartime heroes, or their national founders as their days of jubilation, but it remained for the Irish race alone to make the faith of their patronal saint the chosen expression of the national ideals. The traits of a race spring from the character of its people, and standing out in bold relief, against all other forces in the character of the Irish race is its wonderful fidelity to the faith and the teachings of the glorious apostle whose festival we celebrate today.

"The strength of that fidelity is best evinced by the fact that notwithstanding centuries of intolerance and persecution, it thrives today as pure and as vigorous as when the first seed was sown in the virgin soil of Ireland. It has taken root, too, and flourished in exotic climes, until today its growth is confined by the limits of no land, and its fruit is found among the products of every progressive nation upon the face of planet earth. The observance of St. Patrick's Day, then, is unique in that it is universal, for in every land wherever conditions and circumstances have carried the Celt, the voice of the race is lifted on this day in memory of Ireland's patron saint.

"It was Shelley who said, 'Our sweetest themes are those that tell of saddest thought.' Lifting the scroll of the ages and peering into their secrets, we behold a nation that stepped from the mellow light of gladness into the dark night of grief. The monuments of her genius have tottered, her universities that pierced the darkness of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries with the light of learning have long since paid the terrible toll which barbarism demanded of culture, but that lone monitor, her Catholic faith, which constitutes the connecting link between the fifth and the twentieth centuries still survives in the purity and freshness of its original radiance.

"O Ireland! The harp of your minstrel is suspended among your ruins, the inspiration of your singers has been stultified, the canvas of your artist has been scattered on the wings of the wind, and the cromlech of your aborigines has long since crumbled into dust; but your faith—that faith that came to you in dower from an humble and lowly shepherd, whose cradle another nation rocked—that faith, defying persecution, oppression, and the lapse of ages, comes down to you over time's terrific and gigantic flood, carrying with it the message of 1,500 years of loyalty, fidelity, gratitude, and reverence."

To honor the dead

"Little is known of Patrick's birthplace, nor does it matter much where he was born. Suffice it to say, that Ireland is the land of his adoption and the field of his apostolic labors. Suffice it to again say, that Ireland is the country which he reclaimed from paganism in the gloaming of the year 432, and presented it to the living God as one of the greenest and fairest laurels that ever ornamented the brow of triumphant Christianity. It is certain, too, of Patrick, that in his old age, when about to rest from his arduous labors that he reclined his weary head on the lap of Ireland, that she possesses the deposit of his sacred ashes, and while she keeps vigil by hallowed urn that contains them, her children are content that other nations, if they will, should dispute the glory of having rocked his cradle.

"The story runs that when Patrick was but 16 years of age, his father's house was ravaged by a band of barbarians. Patrick, it seems, and many of his father's vassals were carried by vandals into Ireland. Torn, then, in the tender years of youth from the sacred ties of home and parental influence, he arrived in Ireland a slave. But the children of Ireland for 1,500 years have exhausted eulogy and the art of bending words that they might pay reverential tribute to their patron for the unceremonious reception that was first given to him in their native land. And be it to the eternal glory of that nation, and that nation's children, that the last noble use that Ireland made of her own freedom was to tear away all the manacles of bondage, all semblances of slavery, and proclaim every man, woman, and child in Ireland free.

"With that last act of legislative power, Ireland bowed her head in bondage through the treacherous deception of Henry II, but she made atonement to St. Patrick, and she gave the nations of the world a sterling lesson on their obligations to their fellow men.

"'Some things more perfect are in their decay
Like spark that going out gives clearest light
Such was my fate whose doleful dying day
Began my joy and termed fortunes' spite
Rue not my death, rejoice at my repose
It was not death to me, but to my woe
The bud was opened to let out the rose
The chains unloosed to let the captive go.'

"St. Patrick was by profession a man of peace, and for 60 years, until he died at Saul in Ulster in 493, he labored zealously in promoting the arts of peace. Scarcely had Patrick reclined his head in the lap of mother earth than we find Ireland transformed into a vast center of learning. From the early part of the sixth to the tenth century, when the clouds of war hovered over western Europe, the sons of Patrick alone held the torch the beacon of learning that poured its flood of cultural light on the science, philosophy, and art, when practically the whole world was threatened with the horrible darkness of barbarism."

To gain inspiration

"Historians and essayists have vied with each other in exhausting eulogy on the glories and the illustrious achievements of the sons of St. Patrick. The princes of other countries were their pupils, and Irishmen according to Venerable Bede took no fee from them either for board or for tuition. England and the world are proud of the immortal Alfred the Great, but Ireland points to him with a greater pride—the pride that is born of the privilege of having sponsored his cultural

achievements that lend luster, and dignity, and probity, and honor, and immortality to his name.

"Nor were their growing virtues confined to Ireland alone. Leaving home, clad in no armor other than their virtues and scholarship, they assailed the very centers of ignorance, where pillage, plunder, rapine, and greed were dominating the impulses of mankind. Into the very citadels of ignorance went the apostles of Ireland, carrying the torch of revelation, and everywhere dispelling with rifts of light the darkest intellectual gloom.

"Columbanus she sent to Italy; Gall, to Switzerland, where the abbey and the town still bear his name; to Germany she sent Killiam and Virgilius, and in Germany today no fewer than 200 churches are dedicated to Irish apostles. Indeed, it is to Irishmen that the world is indebted for the universities of Oxford, Pavia, and Paris. Are we amazed then at the words of St. Bernard, 'that from Ireland, as from an overflowing stream, crowds of holy men descended on foreign nations?'

"For every known country the sons of Ireland carried forth for the sickly flame of knowledge until Ireland became known in the secular and ecclesiastical writings of the times as the 'Island of Saints and Scholars.' I could mention that the Irish scarcely felt the riveted manacles of slavery than France and Italy furnished that great galaxy of geniuses in poetry, music, architecture, and art that merited Leo X's pontificate, the title of 'The Golden Age.' "

To cling to memories

"Verily it was the age of faith—that faith that reared all of the vast miracles of architecture under the vast dome of heaven—those stupendous monuments of genius that are at once the wonder and the embarrassment of your modern masters. No. I will say that Irishmen were the creative inspiration of them, but it is oddly coincidental that when the Irish independence was unsuspectingly assassinated because of an immoral act of King Dermott—that these countries that profited by Irish emigration should spring into new, live, industrial, and progressive nations.

"Lord Macaulay hints that the suspicion is not unwarranted when he says, 'Scattered all over Europe were to be found brave Irish counts, Irish barons, Irish knights of St. Lewis, of St. Leopold, of the White Eagle, and the Golden Fleece, who, if they remained in the house of bondage, could not have been more ensigns of a marching regiment of freemen of petty corporations. These men, the natural chiefs of their race, having withdrawn what remained, were hopelessly passive.'

"There is reason—ample reason even now—for the Irish being scattered all over Europe. In the face of a long litany of tyrannies that were enough to destroy a nation of lesser hardihood, the Celt had to choose between infidelity to his nation's ideals or the shelter of a strange land. Here is the horrible chain of hideous enactments: (1) the Kilkenny statutes, (2) the purpose of the settlement of Ulster, (3) Cromwell's massacres and confiscations, (4) the broken treaty of Limerick, (5) the penal code, (6) the white terror of 1898, (7) the infamous union, (8) Pitt's broken pledge to emancipate the Catholics, (9) the Tithe war, (10) the artificial famine, (11) the coercion acts, (12) Lord John Russell's poor laws, (13) the clearances, (14) the land war, (15) the broken pledge of home rule—all this unhappy litany of outrages simply to prove the truth of Lincoln's dictum, 'No man is good enough to rule another without the other man's consent.'

"My grandfather lived through the terrible famine of 1846–49. Often he related to me some of the gruesome episodes that occurred in Ireland during those three awful years of living death for a nation—tales of Irishmen crawling to a meal of putrid carrion with the same eagerness that Englishmen of the same period went to their carnivals of viands and wine; tales that would make your blood ferment; tales of hollow-eyed and cadaverous Irishmen dying down in the ditches while howling for bread. During that awful night of 3 years when 729,000 people died in the horrors and agonies of starvation—during that awful night of 3 years when all Ireland was on a hunger strike for its faith, its priceless heritage from St. Patrick, the world took little cognizance of it."

Of heroic traditions

"Ireland did not then have 32,000,000 children scattered over the earth, the strongest fabric of powerful empires, and the London Times made bold to show its hand. While brave and valiant Irishmen were awaiting living physical decay, with the glazed eye of starvation and the empty cough of death, the Times hatefully and contemptuously remarked, 'The Celt goes to yield to the Saxon. This island of 100 harbors with its prolific rivers, its beautiful lakes, with its fertile mines, its riches of every knd, is being cleared quietly, surely, and effectively for the interests and luxuries of humanity.' Humanity! Good God, were not the Irish human? Get that word 'luxury' in speaking of famine, and a people's extermination.

"Every conceivable device for persecution was invented in order that her faith might be destroyed. Persecution and oppression were rampant, and Irishmen had to seek the consolations of their faith in strange lands. Forth they went over the highway of the ocean, to Spain, France, Italy, Germany, Australia, Canada, and the United States. Driven from home, her children are found in every land, yet their affections, like the old ivy to the temple, still cling tenaciously to the memories of their national land; memories that are rich in culture and fraught with heroism of her valiant sons. Tonight we entwine a garland of glory from the annals of her history, and with tender sensibilities we place it upon the ruins which persecution wrought on the land of our fathers.

"And we select our mementoes from the bosom of the Emerald Isle—from the grandeur of the causeway of the north and the scenic glories of her Killarney in the south; from the meetings of the waters of Avoca's Vale and the Mystic round bowers in the submerged fields of Glendalough; and from the ivy-clad abbey that shall bear testimony to her undying faith from the moss-grown monastery that shall attest her ages of matchless learning, and from the molding cromlech that shall eloquently proclaim the paganism of the past and triumph of St. Patrick. It shall be a memorial to a race that was triumphant in liberty and distinguished in bondage."

When men and women

"Her ruins! O Ireland! What tribulations are yours! The message of them comes to us over the flood of centuries, reverberating on the waves of Time's terrific tide. The ruins were old long before the great Christopher Columbus pointed the way during 70 torrid days across the trackless ocean and centuries before Cardinal Langlon and his brave Norman barons forced King John to sign the Great Charter of liberties on the famous old field of Runnymede. They were old centuries before the great St. Patrick ascended the Hill of Tara, threw a halo around it, and then gilded its outlines with the light of Christianity. Invaders for centuries sought to destroy them, and the children of Ireland fought bravely for centuries to defend them.

"There is no more illustrious spectacle in history than the conflict of the Danes and Irish on the Field of Clontarf. The setting was appropriate. On Good Friday morning, 1014, a wave of barbaric Danes swept down on Clontarf. Gallantly and fiercely, the sons of Erin, led by their venerable leader, Brian the Brave, locked weapons with Brodar and his heavily mailed Danes in one of the bloodiest battles that, until then, had ever appeared on the horizon of human affairs. And when the din and turmoil of fierce strife were stilled, the avaricious Danes had been driven to the sea, never to return.

"The sword of Erin and the Cross of Christ had triumphed over avarice and paganism. But an odd bit of fate, both Brian Boru and Brodar met death after the battle. Nor has there ever been a moment in the 1,500 years of her Catholicity that the Celt has failed to stand gallantly by the ramparts of his faith. The legions of Henry VIII were sent to destroy her; Elizabeth dispatched armies to annihilate her; and the monster Cromwell outraged her. All apparently aimed at her extinction, but in whatever else they succeeded, of this we are sure, they all failed magnificently in their efforts at tearing her faith from the bosom of her soil.

"The blood of her martyrs not only fructified the seed of faith, but their warm blood touched it with vigor and enkindled it with the fire of divine life and love. Today, it flourishes more beautiful than ever, and its fragrance burdens the air in every clime whether the children of Ireland were driven by persecution, oppression and the penal laws. Father Shealy, S. J., has beautifully said:

Lived and died

" 'Ireland may be called the land of failures. Failure, if you will, but glorious failures. For what is national failure? Poverty? Suffering? The broken arch? The desecrated shrine? The dismantled halls of the princely chief? No. These are ruins, but not failures. The one awful failure of a nation is to fall from her ideals—from her heritages; to give up striving; to be less than herself in aim of effort; to sell her soul to powers or avarice; to be aught that serves the sordid sway of pride and passion. That indeed is failure which succeeds at the price of virtue and honor. Ireland might have been rich and favored. She might have merged her identity and her faith in an alien empire, and in an alien worship. But she fought and she died; she starved and she agonized. Yet in defeat she has conquered. The spirit lives on.

" 'Who fears to speak of '98
Who blushes at the name,
When cowards mock a patriot's fate,
Who hangs his head in shame?'

"That is the glorious resurgent spirit of the Celts. When their cup of bitterness was filled up, when the light seemed parted from their eyes, when their heroes and leaders lay dead before them, when no one could work for her whom he loved, when even their bards could not invoke Erin by name, when Eileen Arcon and Dark Rosaleen became consecrated to their song, they hoped magnanimously, they dreamed beautifully, they loved passionately, and they maintained in hearts that were well-nigh broken, the exalted valor and patriotism and fidelity to heritages by virtue of a faith that can never be broken, by a love that cannot die."

For God and Ireland

"They lived for their heritages and the enthusiasm of their lives has been felt in all the earth, and it has given heart and pulse to every struggle for liberty the world over the past 300 years. And of an ideal John Quincy Adams says: 'It must, it will irradiate the darkness of dissolution; will identify the consciousness of the past with hope of futurity; will smooth the passage from this to a better world, and link the lost pangs of expiring nature with the first raptures of never-ending joy.' "

It was the immortal Grattan who said, "To hell with your concessions, we want our country." And Robert Emmett, "When my country shall take its place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written." And Padriac Pearce, "Life springs from death, and from the graves of our martyred dead spring live nations. England has left us our martyred dead, and while Ireland holds these graves, Ireland, unfree, shall never be at peace."

"The morning breaks. The light ahead is fair to see. It is of good augury that the feast of St. Patrick is celebrated here as well as in Ireland. Noble country! In deep reflection, the spirits of your dead walk its streets today; brood amid thy solitudes; pause beneath thy balconies and belfries to revisit the scenes of their past triumphs; glow with pride in recalling the achievements of her sons; and thrill at the beauties, oh, Ireland, your Ireland of other days; they stand at last upon your monuments, whispering to the stars: 'Grace of dreams, what may betide! God of my fathers, grant our children hearts of grace. God of the universe, shower your benedictions on poor old Ireland.'

"Yes, the mellow light of morning is fair to behold. And as Archbishop Hughes once said, 'We may still hope that the flag of freedom will once more wave on the green hills of that unhappy country, and we may predict that the faith of St. Patrick will continue to be the faith of Ireland, when the religions of those who persecuted the Irish shall be forgotten, or remembered only to convince incredulous posterity that legislatures have dared to invade the prerogatives of God in attempting to dictate what a people should believe.'

"Then here this evening, in consideration of radiant struggles that were and peeping into glorious and brighter days ahead, as we are gathered here in loving communion, freed of faction and purged of selfish purpose, let us pledge anew our fidelity of the precious heritages that St. Patrick bequeathed us, and our veneration and love for the immortal dead of Ireland.

" 'Oh, Ireland! thy sun is but rising while others have set
And though slavery's cloud o'er thy morning hath hung,
The full moon of freedom shall beam around thee yet.
Ireland, oh, Ireland, though long in the shade
Thy star shall shine out when the proudest shall fade.' "

Michigan's State Legislature Opposes Curtailment of Veterans' Hospital-Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution that was unanimously adopted by the Michigan State Senate and the Michigan House of Representatives. The resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution requesting immediate review of recent cuts in the veterans' hospital program

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recently announced the cancellation of plans for the construction of a 200-bed general hospital at Grand Rapids, a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital at Detroit, and a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Toledo, Ohio, from which beds were to be allotted to Michigan mental and nervous cases; and

Whereas it appears that needs of veterans will not be adequately cared for as a result of such action; and

Whereas the citizens of Grand Rapids are now engaged in the conduct of a drive for approximately $4,000,000 to add to the hospital facilities of Kent County and neighboring counties and that such facilities have been shown by survey to be badly needed, regardless of what facilities are provided by the proposed Veterans' Hospital; and

Whereas the action of the Veterans' Administration has caused great confusion and uncertainty and has endangered the welfare of veterans and of all other citizens of the community interested in the development of hospital facilities in the area; and

Whereas the interests of veterans and other citizens generally throughout the State of Michigan are adversely affected by the action of the Veterans' Administration with respect to hospitals at Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Toledo; and

Whereas budget cuts should not be made at the expense of sick and disabled veterans while we are spending much larger sums abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the President, Congress, and the Veterans' Administration be memorialized and requested to reopen and reexamine the decisions previously made with respect to these hospitals, and to determine without delay the need for veterans' hospitals at Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Toledo, Ohio; and be it further

Resolved, That if such need be established as now appears to exist, the Veterans' Administration be requested to reverse its earlier decisions and to continue with its program as originally determined upon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to President Truman, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Unanimously adopted by the senate, February 4, 1949.

Unanimously adopted by the house of representatives, March 4, 1949.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am quite interested in the propaganda against the President's national health-insurance program being distributed by the American Medical Association through its $3,500,000 lobby and propaganda fund.

That fund is being raised by assessing all members of the AMA $25. The Trainman News, the official organ of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, carried an editorial on that assessment which I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in reading.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that editorial and a news story from the same issue of the Trainman News on the 12-point program recently issued by the AMA for the alleged purpose of extending medical care:

AMA PUBLICISTS START WINDOW DRESSING—OFFER REHASH OF PLAN THAT ALREADY FAILED—80 PERCENT OF AMERICANS ARE MEDICAL INDIGENTS UNDER ASSOCIATION RULES

The American Medical Association in its time-honored refusal to face the facts, is offering the public snares and delusions in a frantic effort to forestall effective national health legislation.

They have hired a high-powered public-relations outfit—Whitaker and Baxter—to weave the fantasy and present it to the public in ads and articles.

FANCY PRESS RELATIONS

A fancy press-relations job designed to obscure the AMA's stubborn opposition to any program which would bring medical care within the means of the average man is being presented the Nation, says Dr. Channing Frothingham, chairman, committee for the Nation's health.

In answer to critics, AMA has prepared a program for health centered around the old stand-by of voluntary health insurance—a plan already proved inadequate for the 80 percent of Americans making less that $5,000 per year.

Said Dr. Frothingham: "In reading the AMA program, it would be well to remember that the AMA recently hired a new and clever publicity firm for what is reported the biggest public-relations fee in history and which AMA hopes to pay out of the $3,500,000 propaganda it is trying to collect by assessing members $25 each."

The publicity men have come out with a fancy window-dressing job aimed at obscuring AMA opposition to real advance in providing medical care.

Less than a sixth of the population is covered by voluntary plans, and these offer limited protection. Most plans are controlled by AMA doctors or pay only a small part of total medical costs.

AMA ALWAYS LAST

AMA urges that Government funds be applied to voluntary plans to include "indigent and medically indigent" persons. By its own statistics, said Dr. Frothingham, "80 percent of the population are not able to meet medical expenses out of their own resources."

Thus many self-respecting American families would be labeled "medically indigent" after investigation of personal finances, to meet AMA rules, for Government aid.

Most of the items on the AMA lists are either on the statute books, or are incorporated in President Truman's program now before Congress," said Dr. Frothingham. The AMA is merely accepting the inevitable, and belatedly jumping onto the bandwagon as it has in the case of most social advances in the past.

Can you imagine the howls in the Halls of Congress and the hysteria in editorial offices if a labor union ever announced that it was going to tax its members $3,500,000 to oppose a single piece of legislation? That, of course, is exactly what the reactionary American Medical Association is doing in an effort to throttle President Truman's national health program.

In view of its attitude toward the millions of Americans who cannot now afford adequate medical and hospital service, the AMA ought to change the old slogan to "Physician, 'heel' thyself."

Which Kind of an Economy Do You Recommend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is taken from an official table of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Monthly farm wage rates (without board), 1948

	Per month
South Carolina	$58
Mississippi	62
Alabama	63
Georgia	63
Louisiana	69
Tennessee	71
Arkansas	80
Kentucky	83
West Virginia	83
North Carolina	84
Florida	93
Virginia	94
Missouri	105
Delaware	110
Maryland	113
Ohio	115
Texas	115
Oklahoma	117
Indiana	117
Pennsylvania	121
Maine	129
Illinois	130
New Mexico	132
Michigan	136
Kansas	136
Minnesota	140
New York	142
Iowa	143
Nebraska	144
Vermont	145
New Hampshire	147
Wisconsin	147
New Jersey	150
South Dakota	154
Connecticut	155
Massachusetts	155
Rhode Island	155
Colorado	159
North Dakota	169
Nevada	169
Wyoming	170
Utah	173
Montana	176
Arizona	178
Idaho	187
Oregon	192
California	202
Washington	204

In which area would you prefer to have a garage, drug store, or any other business?

Note that the monthly farm wage—without board—is rather low in the areas where oil and soil-depleting crops are produced, and note that in the dairy and livestock sections the farm wages of $140 to $150 per month are over twice as much as the first-named area.

Why should we let areas that have already witnessed the ruination of their soil forge a program that will ruin the soils of the remaining areas of the country? We should maintain the fertility of our farms by dairying and livestock farming. The more imitation butter produced, the scarcer and higher the price of meat. The more imitation butter produced, the less fertile the soil. Why talk soil conservation and then ruin the soil at the same time? Which labor return should an informed labor group advocate—the $58-per-month wage scale or the $147-per-month wage scale?

World Round Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my own remarks upon the meaning of the historic nonstop flight of the *Lucky Lady II* around the world, I have thought the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should preserve to posterity one of the factual, summary stories carried by the newspapers of the day. For this purpose, the following account by the United Press seems well suited and is here given by permission of the House:

FORT WORTH, TEX.—*Lucky Lady II*, a United States Air Force B–50 bomber, today completed the first nonstop around-the-world flight in history.

Ninety-four hours and one minute after she took off from Carswell Air Force Base here last Saturday, the great four-engine bomber came home again out of a haze hanging in the west.

It was estimated that she had flown 23,452 miles, almost the distance of the earth's circumference at the Equator, without any major difficulty aloft and with the benefit of four refuelings in flight.

Her 14 crewmen scrambled out, proclaiming their willingness to do it all over again after a little rest, and received a royal welcome from top Air Force officers and Air Secretary W. Stuart Symington.

Capt. James Gallagher, of Melrose, Minn., the smiling crew commander, said, "We were on instruments only 4 hours; the weather was excellent."

The last leg—the homeward dash from Hawaii, where *Lucky Lady II* took on fuel from a B–29 tanker Tuesday night, "seemed the longest," Gallagher said.

Lucky Lady II took off from Carswell at 10:21 a. m., MST, last Saturday, February 26. She flashed past the Carswell tower, at the end of her epochal flight, at 8:22 a. m. today, made two great circles about the field at altitude of 3,000 feet and then came down, over Lake Worth at the west end of the runway, for a perfect landing.

Some 400 to 500 persons, most of them Air Force personnel, were on the ramp to wave their greetings to the crew, which had their faces pushed against the windows.

The B–29 tanker planes were with *Lucky Lady II* as she broke through the haze. They had "picked her up" and flown escort on the run in from Tucson, Ariz., this morning.

Symington and the top military men—Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Chief of Staff; Gen. Curtis E. Lemay, strategic air commander, and Maj. Gen. Roger A. Ramey, Eighth Air Force commander—pushed forward and encircled the crew as they climbed down.

The Air Force billed this as a training mission but its obvious pride in the flight was reflected by the presence of all the "top brass."

Air Force B–29 tankers went up over the Azores, Dhahran in Saudi Arabia, the Philippines and Hawaii to deliver fuel to the glory-bound bomber, which circled the globe at an average speed figure unofficially at 249.39 miles per hour.

Vandenberg said the flight was additional evidence that "we have an intercontinental Air Force." It was a demonstration to the world that no enemy objective is outside the range of United States bombers.

It was, said the Post, "a part of a continuing program of in-flight refueling training flights which will be flown to all parts of the world."

Lucky Lady II refueled over the Azores 15 hours and 34 minutes after her take-off; over Dhahran some 35 hours and 9 minutes out of Fort Worth; above the Philippines at the 55 hour and 39 minute mark, and over Hawaii, before turning homeward on the last lap, 78 hours and 54 minutes after the flight began.

Lucky Lady II, drawn from the Eighth Air Force's Forty-third Bomber Group, is a regular combat plane. She carried twelve 50-caliber guns but no ammunition or bombs. For additional safety margin, bomb-bay fuel tanks were installed.

The historic flight was performed on a schedule of masterful precision and precaution.

Ramey and his associates said the flight was ordered on February 18. Three days later, on February 21, the B–29 tanker planes were in place at the refueling points.

Air-sea rescue units were put on alert and 100 to 125 auxiliary landing fields were designated for emergency use.

Hourly reports came back from *Lucky Lady II* to the strategic air command at Omaha and Eighth Air Force headquarters here. So well devised were the channels of communication that reports from the plane reached headquarters in an average time of 30 minutes to an hour.

The 14-member crew was given a physical examination just before the take-off. After a brief press conference, the crewmen were hurried away to flight physicians again this morning for more examinations, to study the effects of their long grind.

The B–50, manufactured by Boeing Airplane Co. of Seattle, Wash., is a vastly improved postwar version of the B–29 Superfortress. It has a combat radius of more than 2,300 miles, but on a straight-line shuttle bombing mission can carry 5 tons of bombs 6,000 miles.

Its operational ceiling is above 30,000 feet, and its load capacity is 10 tons.

The Air Force has ordered 390 of the B–50's, but it has not revealed the number thus far delivered.

ANY PLACE WE NEED TO GO

Lt. Gen. Curtis Lemay, head of the Strategic Air Command, declared the feat is merely an indication of things to come in Air Force achievement.

Asked if this means the Air Force can deliver an atomic bomb to any place in the world, he replied:

"Let's say any place that would require an atomic bomb."

He said the only limit on "mass flights" of the same sort "seems to be the number of tanker planes available.

The *Lucky Lady* skirted Russian and satellite territory, flying across north Africa and India, to avoid crossing land behind the iron curtain.

Powered with four Pratt & Whitney 3,500 horsepower engines, the B–50 has a top speed of about 400 miles an hour, a cruising speed around 300, and can climb to 40,000 feet. Its bomb capacity is stated at 10 tons, its maximum range (without in-flight refueling) at 6,000 miles. Its wing span is 141 feet, its fuselage length 99 feet. The weight of the plane, for normal take-off is about 120,000 pounds.

Lucky Lady II took its name from the B–29 *Lucky Lady*, one of three Superforts which began a round-the-world flight last July. Two of the planes finished the flight, and the third crashed in Arabia.

SECRET FLIGHT

While hundreds of persons apparently were in on the secret of the *Lucky Lady II* flight, no word of it leaked out to the public. Last night in Washington, 54 newspaper, radio, and newsreel correspondents were loaded aboard two B–17 Flying Fortresses and a Constellation transport and hustled to Fort Worth to cover the B–50's arrival.

They were not told of their destination until they were in the air en route.

PREVIOUS WORLD FLIGHTS

On April 6, 1924, four Army planes took off from Seattle, headed around the world. Only two of the original planes finished the flight. It took 175 days, of which 14 days and 15 hours were actual flying time.

In 1929, the German dirigible *Graf Zeppelin* made the globe-circling trip in 20 days and 4 hours from Friedrichshafen to Friedrichshafen, the distance 21,700 miles.

The late Wiley Post made two trips. In 1931, with Harold Gatty as navigator, he flew a northern route of 15,474 miles in 8 days, 15 hours, and 51 minutes. In 1933, flying alone, he covered roughly the same route in 7 days, 18 hours, and 49½ minutes.

Howard Hughes, airplane designer and former Hollywood producer, flew around by way of Russia, 14,824 miles, in 3 days, 19 hours, 8 minutes, and 10 seconds in 1938.

In 1947, William Odom, with Milton Reynolds, the owner, flew a converted Air Force medium bomber over a 20,000-mile route in elapsed time of 78 hours, 55 minutes, and 12 seconds.

CONGRATULATIONS POUR IN

In a telegram from Washington to Secretary Symington and Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff here, Secretary of National Defense Forrestal said:

"The completion of the first around-the-world nonstop flight is a significant achievement. Through you I send my sincere congratulations to the Air Force, and particularly to Captain Gallagher and his crew."

CREW MEMBERS

Besides Captain Gallagher, members of the crew were: First Lt. Arthur M. Neal, Visalia, Calif., second pilot; Capt. James H. Morris, San Antonio, Tex., third pilot; Capt. Glenn E. Hacker, Eldorado, Kans., first navigator; First Lt. Earl L. Rigor, Corvallis, Oreg., second navigator; First Lt. Roland B. Bonner, Bakersfield, Calif., radar officer; First Lt. William F. Caffrey, Boston, radar officer; Capt. David B. Parmelee, Guilford, Conn., flight engineer; Staff Sgt. Robert G. Davis, Niles, Mich., flight engineer; Tech. Sgt. Virgil L. Young, Cranesville, Pa., flight engineer; Tech. Sgt. Burgess G. Cantrell, Pound, Va., radio operator; Staff Sgt. Robert R. McLeroy, Alvarado, Tex., radio operator; Tech. Sgt. Melvin G. Davis, Long Beach, Calif., gunner; Staff Sgt. Donald G. Traugh, Jr., Danville, Pa., gunner.

Lieutenant Neal, second pilot of the *Lucky Lady II*, was the pilot of the B–29 Superfortress *Lucky Lady*, one of the three Superforts which started on the round-the-world training flight previously.

Peace Through Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable article entitled "Peace Through Air Power," written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky and published in the Reader's Digest for February 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH AIR POWER

(Condensed from a chapter of a forthcoming book)

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

In a world that has not yet learned to dispense with force, our ardent hope is that our military strength will prevent war. The important question is, What kind of strength?

Mere quantity in armed men and weapons will not serve. If war comes, the enemy will have at his disposal teeming populations, and possibly vast resources of the whole Eurasian Continent. American strategy must therefore gear to quality rather than quantity.

Fortunately, we have within our grasp a strategy that meets this condition. It is uniquely suited to American genius and capacity. It is the strategy of air power.

But what kind of air power? The assumption that a lot of indiscriminate planes—a 70-group air force, a huge naval air arm, a tactical Air Force supporting an Army, Marine aviation, Coast Guard aviation—add up to air power is wrong. A country may possess swarms of aircraft, yet be deficient in air power, as Hitler and Tojo learned too late.

True air power means a strategic striking force that can rise from our own American Continent for direct assault against the industrial solar plexus of the enemy and return to its home bases. It means aviation freed from dependence on overseas bases.

The creation of such an aerial force is fully possible. It calls for no new inventions; the necessary aircraft are already in the skies, but we are not building enough of them. What is more, this air power can be created as soon as, if not sooner than, the mountains of equipment on land, sea, and in the air now proposed.

Instead of continuing to spread our limited man power and resources thin in all three elements, the proposed air strategy would concentrate on the decisive weapon for clean-cut superiority in the decisive element. By reducing sharply the roles of armies and navies, the fearful drain on men and materials can be stopped, the crushing burden of military expenditures can be eased.

With control of the air ocean enveloping the whole globe in our hands—the test and purpose of adequate air power—our position would be analogous to Great Britain's in the last century. A small island off Europe in effect gave mankind a century of peace, the Pax Britannica. It did this without militarizing or regimenting its people. This miracle was possible because Britain did not attempt to be strong on land and sea at the same time. Living in an era when water was the decisive medium for carrying destruction to enemies, Britain channeled practically its entire military potential into sea power, attaining command of the seas through an invincible fleet.

Today the air has become the primary medium of global power. An air force capable of commanding the skies can enforce its will on everything below. If we hold our effort on land and sea to a minimum and channel our resources into long-range air power, we likewise can be incomparably strong without the risk of military regimentation. When we muster the intellectual courage to face the new power equation, we can have a century of peace. Not a Pax Americana but a Pax Democratica, in partnership with all other free nations.

It sounds incredible today, but more than 2 years after the outbreak of World War II, and months after America was in it, bomber aircraft were still at the bottom of the priority lists. The men who were then—and for the most part are still—in charge of our military destinies looked on them as an unwarranted luxury. For these generals and admirals the unfolding struggle was merely a continuation, with modern trimmings, of the surface strategy of World War I.

That grim spectacle of stubborn inertia left airmen like myself no alternative but to speak out vigorously. I believed an enlightened public opinion could serve as a corrective on the natural conservatism of a great Military Establishment rooted in tradition. That faith was amply justified.

Today it is again a deep anxiety for the state of our national security that moves me to write. The moment is crucial because we are now in the first stages of a large-scale rearmament. The plans now being shaped up, if allowed to congeal, cannot easily be undone. They will commit us irrevocably.

It would be against nature to expect the elder services to make a strategy decision amounting to an order for their own demotion to secondary roles. It is the American people who must determine the military course through their Congress and their President. They must choose between the profligate land-sea-air strategy of the recent past and the interhemispheric air strategy opened up by modern aeronautics.

Winning nations tend to glorify the methods and weapons that brought them victory. France at the end of World War I, flushed with triumph in the trenches, proceeded to construct a supercolossal de luxe trench—the Maginot line. It was an engineering marvel, embodying all the latest scientific gadgets. But it was still a trench—a steel-and-concrete monument to the tragic belief that any new war would be as static as the last one.

True, a young officer named Charles de Gaulle foresaw the advent of mobile and motorized warfare that would nullify supertrenches. But would France listen? Its illusions of safety were confirmed by such newly haloed heroes as Foch, Joffre, Pétain, Gamelin. To question their military wisdom at that time seemed close to treason.

The implications of the Maginot line—a symbol of futility—have not been fully grasped. We Americans are at this very moment perpetrating a tragedy of the same order, for the same reasons, with the blessings of our own haloed heroes of recent victory. Having won the last war with triphibious task forces, Army-Navy-Air teams, we are proceeding to build supercolossal task forces which will embody all the latest technological innovations. Little gliders are being displayed by big gliders; tanks by supertanks. Assault barges firing primitive rockets are being replaced by superbarges firing V–2 rockets. Escort carriers are to be replaced by gigantic floating islands at a quarter of a billion dollars a throw. In America today, as in France a generation ago, legislators are overawed by the prestige of the five-star generals and admirals who delivered victory.

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession. Such air power was technically possible but had been arbitrarily brushed aside by surface-minded planners. The land-sea-air team was an emergency device for carrying short-range aviation step by step, island by island, within striking distance of the ultimate target.

Indeed, as the range of available aviation was extended, those steps could be stretched, bypassing intermediary islands where the enemy was entrenched. Every enlargement of range thus paid off in lives saved. In the final stage, our superforts were planted within direct striking reach of Japan proper. At that point their surface teammates became

in effect mere bystanders, as air power undertook the systematic demolition of the enemy sources of power.

Air power finished the job—and this is the key to an understanding of the events—with great Nipponese armies on the home islands and on the Asiatic mainland still intact, but impotent. Air power finished the job with a fantastic mass of American land and sea forces likewise intact and useless.

As late as June 21, 1943, General Marshall explained in a speech that "your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing, but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the Army." Fortunately, he was wrong. The knock-out blow was delivered by air power, sparing perhaps a million American and Japanese lives. Our actual invasion came after the surrender. A handful of American officers landed and took control of a country still possessing millions of fresh troops.

Most civilians could grasp the obvious lessons of this picture. But professional surface-strategists, innocent of the aeronautical facts of life, were bewildered. With few exceptions, they emerged from the war sold to the hilt on the triphibious team for securing outlying bases. They still remain blind to strategy based on victory without the orthodox showdown by foot soldiers on a battlefield. We are still witnessing the Maginot Line mentality at work. The current program of defense through balanced forces operating from a chain of bases means only one thing: the perpetuation of the methods of the last war.

Our projected 70-group air force is built around 20 groups of medium bombers of the B-29 and B-50 types—which is to say, around a 5000-mile flying range, or 2000-mile striking radius. (Striking radius is about 40 percent of total flying range.) It provides for only five groups of long-range B-36 bombers, which have an effective flying range of 10,000 miles—with current modifications promising 13,000 miles—enough to blast any target in Eurasia from our own continent. Why do we thus continue to put our faith in an old-fashioned and technologically outmoded air force?

The telltale fact about the 2,000-mile radius is that it requires an array of overseas bases. Bases in turn call for large land and sea forces to hold and supply them. The over-all military pattern thus remains unchanged. Whether we have 70 groups or 700, the complex set-up on the surface remains indispensable. The more air power of this limited reach, the larger the land and sea forces required to make it operative.

Before the last war we had built and flown 82-ton aircraft with a flying range of some 8,000 miles. Did we put them into production to fight the war? Not at all. Instead, we produced 20-ton aircraft with a flying range of 2,000 miles. Today we have a few bombers of 150 tons with a flying range of 10,000 miles. But what are we building? Seventy-ton bombers with a flying range of 5,000 miles (combat striking range, 2,000)—just short enough to rule out transoceanic offensives.

True, we are now resorting to air refueling and other tricks to extend the range of action. These will work under conditions of surprise, but I am convinced that sustained offensives cannot be maintained without planes of interhemispheric range. One can understand the present face-lifting improvisations by our Air Force. Its leaders have no alternative. Aircraft of inadequate range have been imposed upon them by military planners hell-bent on fighting from distant bases guaranteed by huge armies and navies.

The arguments advanced today for holding back the extreme planes are the same as those we heard when the 82-ton B–19 seemed extreme. The real explanation for freezing our strategy at the 2,000-mile radius is not technological but psychological. Military minds of the old stamp cannot admit the possibility of war without show-down land and sea battles, spearheaded by marines and supported by complex supply lines all over the world.

I do not hesitate to challenge the 2,000-mile radius restriction. It is destined to join the Maginot line in the limbo of outlived military notions. Even if a war should begin on this basis, it would inevitably be transformed into an all-out contest of interhemispheric dimensions before a decision could be scored. The logic of air power means an Air Force with enough range to strike from its own continent. The nation that is first in preparing for intercontinental aerial warfare will win the next war.

The United States should begin now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The advent of the atomic bomb does not alter this picture. The bomb is not a new military force, in the sense that the Army, Navy, and the Air Force are military forces. It is a new and horribly destructive explosive, as yet of finite scope. Before it can score a decision, it must be delivered, like any other explosive, by one or a combination of military forces to the right target at the right time. Thus it is not the stock pile of atomic bombs that will decide the issue, but superior means of delivery—and that means air power. Far from nullifying the art of war, the atom bomb puts a higher premium on correct strategy.

There are two possible strategies open to us. One, when air power can deliver the atom bomb only when provided with overseas bases. This demands a large Army and a great Navy. The national effort is split three ways so that none of the forces attains its maximum potential.

Two, when air power has sufficient range to deliver the atom bomb directly from this continent, without need of overseas bases. This reduces our Army and Navy to a minimum and allows us to put most of the national effort into the Air Force so that it attains its maximum potential.

There is nothing novel about the first strategic plan. That is how the last war was fought, and it is, unfortunately, the strategy underlying our present plans for national defense. But suppose that Soviet Russia possessed similar air bases in Cuba or Greenland—how long would they remain Russian after the start of hostilities? Obviously, we could kill them off by throwing against them the full weight of our bombing power. We would operate from the source of our strength and supplies, while the enemy could use only one segment of his and would have to depend on thousands of miles of vulnerable supply lines. The idea that Russia could hold Cuba or Greenland is fantastic.

But is it any less fantastic when we propose to hold bases on the periphery of the Eurasian continent? Our projected air outposts in North Africa, Europe, the Near East, and the Far East are within striking range of Soviet air power. Most of these bases could be attacked not only by long-range bombers but also by great masses of short-range tactical planes, a type in which quantity rather than quality is the vital consideration. And we know that Germany and Russian factories are now producing thousands of tactical planes. The Soviet leaders can be expected to use these planes ruthlessly, considering them as expendable as so many shells. Finally, to hold these bases and keep them supplied would also mean challenging the 300 divisions of the Red army.

The use of outer bases for initial surprise action is possible. But their permanent control for sustained strategic offensive is the stuff of dreams. Being within the orbit of the total hostile air potential, these bases will be captured or demolished, paralyzing the strategy dependent upon them. The ultimate decision will be postponed until we are ready to use long-range strategic aviation based on our own continent. Unless the enemy is ready with that kind of air power first.

Everything we have said about fixed bases applies a hundredfold to the floating bases called aircraft carriers. The only advantage they claim is mobility. But maneuverability reckoned in hundreds of miles becomes meaningless against aircraft covering thousands of miles. How a ship sailing 600 miles a day can evade detection by planes flying 600 miles an hour the admirals haven't explained.

In the last war carriers could not operate in the Mediterranean or North Sea within reach of the German Luftwaffe. Enlarging a carrier merely provides the foe with a larger target. The 80,000-ton floating islands on which our Navy has set its hopes are military monstrosities. They will be quarter-of-a-billion-dollar expendables, good at most for one limited sneak assault before they are annihilated. And their planes will be inferior to equivalent planes operating from the ground. I have no doubt that when military history is written these marine mastodons will be cited as a prime example of strategic folly.

If this strategy of carriers, overseas bases, and short-range aviation is allowed to stand, we would be called upon, in the event of war, to produce simultaneously the world's largest Army, Navy, and Air Force, while dividing our aeronautical effort between strategic and tactical planes, both in maximum numbers. Since our resources are not infinite, we could not hope for absolute superiority in any one of these forces. And, according to Government figures, we would be putting $10 into surface elements for every dollar put into the skies. We don't need a calculating machine to realize that we are here dealing with strategy which, if it is to have the magnitude for victory over the world's No. 1 land power, would bankrupt a nation 10 times as rich as the United States.

A recent press summary of the views of our high command stated that "the United States can develop overwhelming superiority in the air and at sea, but will find it hard to compete with Russia's land power." The allusion to sea superiority is frivolous. Soviet Russia, a self-contained and blockade-proof continent, has no navy, needs no navy, fears no navy. But if a contest on land is dangerous, if superiority in the air can be made overwhelming, why do we earmark a third of America's manpower and resources to face an admittedly superior land force and the near-certainty of defeat? Why allocate another third to futile and irrelevant sea power? Why not convert the whole potential to the force recognized as our realm of supremacy—the Air Force?

Let us have the intellectual clarity and daring to break with the past. For a small fraction of the cost of conquering, maintaining, and supplying bases for short-range aviation, we can buy long-range aviation that nullifies the need for those bases and the huge surface forces that go with them.

The Air Force stated recently that the possession of the B–36 will make it possible for us to operate against a possible aggressor anywhere in the world from bases on the North American Continent. Why, then, is the bulk of our money being put into 20 groups of medium bombers, while only five groups of the B–36 type are projected?

The answer is that our defense policy is shaped by men reared on surface concepts. Critics warn that the huge, unwieldy B–36 will be shot down. Of course some will. The medium-range bombers we plan to send from overseas bases will also be shot down. War without combat is a pipe dream.

We face today a crucial choice. Either we continue to divide our national potential three ways for land-sea-air operations tied to distant bases or we channel our strategy

boldly into the skies for direct operations, with command of the whole air ocean as the objective.

That is the only strategy that will serve as a real deterrent to aggressors. It is the natural product of our way of life. No one will be able to challenge that kind of force. In order to create it—and more important, to exercise it properly—the challenger would have to possess talents equivalent to ours, and to acquire those talents he would have to adopt our way of life. But if he adopts our way of life, there will be no need for war.

The change called for is a bold reversal of prevailing concepts. Nothing less than an aroused public opinion can accomplish this. The pressure of the American people on their Representatives in Congress can force revision of obsolete strategic plans.

The decision must be made quickly. Only the Nation as a whole can make it. Our people must choose between outmoded methods and an historic opportunity to win peace through air power.

Civil Defense, the Missing Link—Socialized Medicine a Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before a joint session of the Legislature of Vermont, in the house chamber, the afternoon of March 15, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the invitation extended to me to address this joint session of the general assembly.

Of necessity I shall be brief—and I can hear some of my friends say, "Let's hope so."

I do wish to direct your attention to three or four matters of general interest which are giving Members of Congress much concern.

As is well understood, I never have undertaken to advise the wisdom and virtue of Vermont, as here constitutionally assembled, as to the way in which they should legislate—and for two reasons. One is found in the fact that I have troubles enough of my own trying to represent you folks in Washington. The other reason is based on my many years' experience as assistant clerk and clerk and speaker of the Vermont House. I learned in those days that while the legislature is always respectful and courteous to visitors who come from Washington to tell the General Assembly of Vermont what to do, those visitors nevertheless leave at least a wrong impression, politically speaking.

I am still so old-fashioned or so conservative as to believe in the declaration of the founders of the State of Vermont, who said, with respect to fundamental principles and inherent virtues, that "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and keep government free; the people ought, therefore, to pay particular attention to these points in the choice of officers and representatives, and have a right, in a legal way, to exact a due and constant regard to them from their legislators and magistrates in making and executing such laws as are necessary for the good government of the State."

To that provision of our State constitution I have always endeavored religiously to adhere.

So here I come with what you friends of mine naturally expect me first to talk about; namely, reasonable and adequate military preparedness.

As we all know, of course, the National Military Establishment has been created under one head. A National Security Council has been provided for determination of policies. A National Security Resources Board has been set up to coordinate mobilization problems, both of manpower and matériel. A Munitions Board functions to assure production for the National Military Establishment. A Research and Development Board is taking the leadership in scientific research. Selective service has been enacted and other measures taken which may prevent aggression.

But the missing element—the missing link—in the defense structure is civil defense. Without a sound and effective system of civil defense, the people and the productive facilities of the country are unprepared to deal effectively with the results of an enemy attack on our country.

As has been suggested, if attack should come it might be by bomber squadrons dropping atomic bombs, incendiaries or gas bombs, or superexplosives on one or a score of our major centers. It might come via guided missiles from distant points, or from submarines off the American shores. Or it might come from within the borders of the United States, through saboteurs and fifth columnists.

However it might come, it could mean devastation and death at many points on such a scale that the tasks of rescue and restoration would be far beyond the present capabilities of the people and the communities attacked.

Our ownership of the atomic bomb undoubtedly engendered to a wide extent the mistaken sense of security and complacency which pervaded the public mind immediately after the war and which was in some measure responsible for demobilization.

The atomic bomb does not give us automatic immunity from attack, as some people would like to believe, nor does its mere possession guarantee victory if war should come. With or without the atomic bomb there can be no absolute security for the United States or for any other nation in the world until all nations agree to the regulation of armed forces and the substitution therefor of peaceful methods in the settlement of international disputes. It seems to me that such a day is still a long way off.

The American people need fear no military dictatorship so long as they recognize their responsibility to see to it that we are so adequately prepared as to make it suicidal for anybody to attack us. That is the answer in this world of men in which there is no peace. It is practical—harshly so—but, brutally, it is the truth and not to be successfully denied by theorists.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

I am opposed to socialism under whatever Mother Hubbard it hides its form. I am opposed, as probably every one of you knows, to socialized medicine.

The truth is, as I have said often before, Federal aid for medical care and socialized medicine are no more alike than a cat and a skunk. They may look alike, yet one is apt to regret it if he takes a skunk to his bosom, thinking it is a cat.

What the women of this country, particularly, and their husbands and brothers and sons, should realize is that the lives of the women under the bills as proposed and now before Congress are put under the control of the Surgeon General of the United States. Whether or not their unborn children shall live is put at a hazard for that they, the pregnant mothers, cannot be assured of any right to choose their doctor, or their hospital.

These matters will be handled from Washington. Regimentation personified.

When Vermont women, pregnant mothers especially, realize what is being attempted to be done to them under the cover of something-for-nothing, there will be a revolution. And what a revolution.

Socialized medicine, as proposed, is the beginning of the end of this republican democracy, and no sane woman should be for it who loves her family and her country and has any respect for her independence.

Of course she should be for a better public health, help from the Federal Government where the State cannot supply necessary aid, more hospitals, and so forth, but she should not yield up the control of her life and that of her unborn child to those who are really trying to take over this government under the subterfuge of humanitarianism.

The whole scheme of socialized medicine, believe me, my fellow Vermonters, is directed toward the furtherance of the socialist state in the United States. To that I am opposed and I, therefore, urge every one of you to consider well whether this is the form of government under which you can wish to live. Centralization of power; bureaucratic control of the daily lives of every citizen; centralization of funds in the Federal Treasury; relinquishment of local autonomy and individual responsibility—these are the steps to state socialism. If this is what the country wants, the voters and the representatives of the people should come out openly and say so. It is time to put a stop to pious declarations that we want a democratic form of government while simultaneously sponsoring legislation designed to Germanize America and deliver our citizenry to a powerful bureaucracy in Washington. It is obvious that socialized medicine is one of the best methods by which to gain control over all the people.

Now I repeat that I am unalterably opposed to each, every, and all attempts, by subterfuge or by any other approach, to perpetuate the socialistic trend in America by a continuation of the New Deal policy of promising everybody something for nothing.

I still believe in America—with liberty and justice for all; with its Government based on sound fundamental principles, yet sufficiently flexible to be readily adaptable to all essential and proper changes to meet the expanding and advanced new era of civilization.

I still take off my hat to those who founded and made it at so great cost; fought for it, bled and died for it; that we and our posterity may continue to live in, enjoy, and love our America. I have no use for those who are glad to live here so long as they can live off America.

SPENDING

My record is my evidence in substantiation of the fact I am opposed to wasteful and extravagant and ruinous spending of the taxpayers' money.

Do you realize that the United States owes over $250,000,000,000? Reduced to Vermont, this means that each family has hanging over it an invisible, though nonetheless real, mortgage on everything it has and owns to the tune of $6,000 per family.

In addition to the Federal debt of more than $250,000,000,000, other political subdivisions—meaning States, cities, counties, school districts, and so on—owe twenty billions. Twenty billions is practically one-twelfth of two hundred and fifty billions. If we owe $6,000 per family by reason of the national debt, add to that one-twelfth of $6,000, or $500, and you find that all each family in Vermont owns or has is mortgaged in the amount of $6,500.

The States, cities, counties, school districts all are under terrific pressure to provide more

services and greater benefits. All are having to boost taxes and borrow money to pour out to a never-satisfied public.

The popular idea is that these funds can be obtained from the rich and the big corporations—so that the majority of the people can have the benefits without paying the cost. But nobody gets anything for nothing. Everybody shares the debt. Everybody pays taxes—direct or indirect.

There aren't enough rich people to enable the Government to finance itself at their expense. If Government took all the wealth of the corporations, it wouldn't put the country on a sound financial keel. But it would put the corporations out of business and workers out of jobs. Meanwhile, all that the big companies pay to Government becomes a part of the cost of the goods they produce—an important factor in the cost of living for everybody.

Only wider realization of these basic facts can stop the tragedy that must eventually happen if the give-everything-to-everybody theory continues unchecked.

FREEDOM

I have been asked by the Daughters of the American Revolution to stress at every opportunity the fact that freedom is not bought for dollars.

So, in conclusion, may I emphasize the fact that it was through no act of our own that you and I were born Americans or have been kept free.

You and I have known nothing with which to contrast liberty.

We have known no thing by which to measure freedom's distance from the depths of tyranny. The dust of honored graves stirs restlessly these fateful hours, as troubled spirits rise to warn us that there is still time, but none to spare. We should dedicate our every strength against the gripping curse of communistic larcenists, guard our liberty, while we make sure we turn back those lustful men who would undertake to persuade us to close our eyes while they rob us of the things for which our fathers fought in order that we might have a chance to keep our children free.

"This is an hour to keep,
This is an hour to guard, letting no past
Or future moment make the present small.
Nothing except eternity can last,
And we must trust today to live at all."

For, as has been said, "Today, tomorrow, will be yesterday."

So let us hope—

"God sends us men with hearts ablaze—
All truth to love, all wrong to hate.
These are the patriots nations need.
These are the bulwarks of the state."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast entitled "A Four-Point Program To Break the Filibuster Against the St. Lawrence Seaway," which I made over Station WMAQ, Chicago, on March 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM TO BREAK THE FILIBUSTER AGAINST THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

ANNOUNCER. You, Senator WILEY, have gained the title of the unofficial leader of the forces in the United States Congress which have been working for the completion of the Great Lakes waterway project. During the Eightieth Congress, you served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which spearheaded the drive for the seaway, but which was defeated in a 52-to-30 vote. Now, in the Eighty-first Congress, you are once more leading the fight for the seaway on a bipartisan basis. What is your seaway program now, Senator?

BROAD COSPONSORSHIP OF BILL

Senator WILEY. I think I can summarize our approach to the St. Lawrence seaway during this Congress in the following points: (1) We are shortly going to introduce in the Senate a new Great Lakes waterway bill. Already, many Senators have asked to have their names put on the bill as cosponsors. Of course, these Senators represent both political parties. (2) At the earliest possible moment during this first session, we are going to seek hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the seaway bill. That committee is right now busily engaged in reviewing the proposed North Atlantic Pact and other foreign-policy matters. However, at the first opportunity, we are going to request the opening of limited hearings on the seaway.

ONLY LIMITED HEARINGS NECESSARY ON THE SEAWAY

ANNOUNCER. Why do you say limited hearings, Senator?

Senator WILEY. The answer to that is simple. It is because there is absolutely no necessity for exploring all of the old ground, rehashing all of the old arguments, hearing all of the old witnesses on both sides of the fence, and wasting the taxpayers' money. We have got virtually all of the facts that are necessary, and the only subjects that require hearings are a few relatively new phases. I refer, for example, to the phase of the new discovery of tremendous deposits of Labrador ore which will become available through the Great Lakes seaway.

COMBATING ANTISEAWAY LOBBYING

ANNOUNCER. Well, those are points 1 and 2 of your program. How about point 3?

Senator WILEY. Third, we are going to take vigorous steps to combat the vicious lobbying that was done against the seaway during the Eightieth Congress. We weren't licked on the floor of the Senate when the seaway bill came up the last time. Rather, we were defeated by the vicious pressures that were brought to bear outside the Senate Chamber. We were licked by the fears that were stirred up by a horde of well-trained lobbyists who descended in droves upon the Senate. We are going to rip the lid off the antiseaway lobbying by exposing the facts on it.

ANNOUNCER. How are you going to do that, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Well, as my listeners may know, I am a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which has a lobby investigation resolution before it right now. One of the things that definitely needs investigation is the antiseaway lobby. Of course, we recognize that there is a proseaway lobby too. It, however, has operated openly and consists principally of rank-and-file people throughout the Nation who happen to believe in the seaway, who brought no secret pressure to bear, but who simply expressed themselves in plain letters and telegrams recommending enactment of the seaway.

MIDWEST DEMANDS RECIPROCITY

ANNOUNCER. That makes three points in the program. What about point 4?

Senator WILEY. Fourth, we of the Middle West are going to make known in no uncertain terms that we are going to fight with all the vigor at our command against projects recommended elsewhere in our country unless those projects are merited and unless the sponsors of those projects are willing to work with us for development of the Midwest's seaway. Now, understand what I mean by that. I don't mean what some folks call logrolling. I don't mean that we are going to simply vote in favor of their projects if they vote in favor of the Midwest's project, whether or not their projects have any merit. As a matter of fact, my colleagues and I detest useless projects which waste the taxpayers' money and simply represent rat holes. There are, however, certain projects throughout the Nation in the far West, the Southwest, and elsewhere, that do merit careful consideration. None of them, however, is as important as the St. Lawrence seaway, which involves the destiny of 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes. Why then should we of the Middle West continue the policy of giving blanket approval to these projects elsewhere in our country unless we can get a little reciprocity, a little quid pro quo, as the professors say? We are not asking for anything that the people of our area don't deserve. All we are asking is simple justice.

MIDWEST HAS BEHAVED LIKE A CHUMP

ANNOUNCER. Hasn't the Middle West received its fair share of aid, Senator WILEY?

Senator WILEY. Unfortunately, no. For years now, the Middle West has been a chump—yes, a sucker to use a blunt term—and has paid no attention to its own needs while appropriating billions for the needs elsewhere in the Nation. It is high time that we secured necessary grants for our own needs. And, remember, it is a grant that will be repaid to Uncle Sam—every last dime, because this money we're requesting is only a loan. That, then, is my four-point program for the seaway.

ENDING THE TALK, TALK, TALK

ANNOUNCER. Well, Senator, in designating the subject for our broadcast you mentioned the title, "Breaking the Filibuster Against the St. Lawrence Seaway." Just what do you mean by that?

Senator WILEY. I will be glad to explain that title. You know there are filibusters and filibusters. During the last couple of weeks there has been a talk marathon in the Senate, so to speak, against the President's civil-rights program. That is one type of filibuster. But, to use the term a little more generally, there has for 30 years been a filibuster, a talk marathon, against the most important single unfinished project on the North American Continent—the St. Lawrence seaway.

ANNOUNCER. Just how has the seaway been filibustered, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Well, the opponents of the seaway haven't been talking continuously against it, but the net effect of their stalling actions has been the same. On those few occasions when seaway legislation has come up for a vote, opponents have thrown in enough delaying devices and tricks to force postponement of the completion of the seaway. Last year, for example, they had the bill recommitted to committee, for further study. That's a sample of their devious tactics.

ANNOUNCER. Getting specific, Senator, can you cite another illustration?

Senator WILEY. Well, the opponents of the seaway are perpetually asking for more investigations, more reports on it. But there are enough reports already on the St. Lawrence seaway to fill several warehouses. Moreover, as fast as we try to get the opponents the facts they say they want, just as fast they start inventing new questions, demanding new answers and new reports. It is an endless process. We can't satisfy all of the opponents, because they insist on stalling indefinitely, on talking, talking, and talking.

BAD FAITH OF OPPONENTS

ANNOUNCER. Do you mean that there is bad faith on the part of the opponents of the seaway?

Senator WILEY. I wouldn't want to accuse all of the opponents of the seaway as insincere or as acting in bad faith. On the contrary, many men in the opposition both inside and outside the Congress, sincerely believe that the Great Lakes waterway is not essential and they have arguments which they feel are sound against it. On the other hand, there is a considerable amount of the opposition which, with tongue in cheek, has utilized every shady trick in order to torpedo this project. They have filibustered and fillbustered against it through their delaying devices.

ANNOUNCER. Can you give us an example of just what you feel constitutes a shady device?

Senator WILEY. Well, take the matter of the new provision in the seaway bill which we set up which would provide that the cost of the seaway would be self-liquidating through tolls on shipping. When we worked on that provision 2 years ago, we were assured by many of the opponents of the seaway, by railroad officials, for example, that they wouldn't oppose the seaway any longer if we set tolls which would pay the construction costs to our Government. Well, we acted in good faith and inserted the provision. But, did that lessen the opposition of the railroads to the seaway? The answer is definitely "no." They broke their promises and in a neat doublecross, proceded to oppose the seaway more vigorously than ever before. Now, don't get me wrong. Ordinarily, I have a great respect for American railroads, for their officials and for their hundreds of thousands of faithful, hard-working employees who give us the best rail transportation system in the world. I am only referring to a few top railroad officers principally in the eastern lines who mistakenly feel that the seaway is going to compete with their lines and deprive them of business.

RAILROAD FOLLY

ANNOUNCER. Do you believe that they are wrong in feeling that way, Senator WILEY?

Senator WILEY. I definitely do. The railroads don't know their own self-interests any more than they knew their self-interests when they opposed the Panama Canal 40 years ago. In fact, some railroads have opposed every major waterway improvement that has ever been suggested. Actually, the Great Lakes waterway would help the railroads by building up midwestern industry. It would, moveover, help the East by providing necessary electric power through the St. Lawrence power project. It would help agriculture, industry, transportation, yes; just about everyone. It wouldn't harm a soul, not even the eastern or southern port interests which so blindly oppose us.

VALUE TO MIDWEST

ANNOUNCER. Now, specifically, Senator WILEY, just what will the seaway mean to the average man and woman in Chicago, Milwaukee, Superior, Duluth, Manitowoc, Madison, or anywhere else in the Middle West?

Senator WILEY. The answer to that is that the seaway will mean continued economic health and life in the Middle West, continued prosperity for business. It will mean prosperity to Midwest agriculture, too, because it will permit cheaper transportation of agricultural commodities. In terms of the businessman, it will make sure that the great heavy industries remain in the Midwest and don't have to move to the east coast in order to depend there on imported ores. Through the seaway, we will be able to get ore from Laborador and this will assure continuation of the very basis of the midwestern industrial economy.

ANNOUNCER. Well, what will happen to the Midwest, Senator, in the event the bill isn't passed?

Senator WILEY. The answer to that one is that the Midwest may become an economic wasteland. Already the Midwest has lost population to other areas of our Nation. We have seen how an entire region of the country can become arid, almost like a desert. The same can happen economically, and it can certainly happen to the Middle West unless we provide for continuation of its industrial economy.

ANNOUNCER. Well, Senator, since this project has been pending for over three decades now, and since it has been beaten so many times, do you feel that it is just going to remain one of those perennial projects that is perpetually discussed but never really acted upon favorably?

AMERICA WANTS THE SEAWAY

Senator WILEY. The answer to that is definitely "No." I think it was Napoleon who said, "We have been defeated and it is time to turn our defeat into victory." We don't ignore the fact that we have been set back on countless occasions. But we have every confidence that this time we are going to win. Every American President in the last 30 years has backed us. The people are with us in an overwhelming majority. You know, I recall a little verse which reads:

"Truth proclaims this lesson
In letters of living light,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right."

Well, the seaway bill is not going to be settled until it is settled right—meaning it is finally passed.

ANNOUNCER. Do you think, Senator, that the seaway opponents feel that you have got them on the run at last?

Senator WILEY. I definitely do feel that way. I think that they realize that the tide is at last turning against them. Most of the steel industry which used to be in the opposition has now come over to our side. Many other sources in Illinois and elsewhere which hitherto opposed us have now become at least "neutral," so to speak. In addition, President Truman is vigorously supporting us, and, too, the National St. Lawrence Association which has been spearheading the drive for the seaway has succeeded in developing new organizational roots throughout the Nation.

But there is no question that the seaway opponents will be fighting tooth and nail again. Moreover, they will be getting some of their trained seals to repeat the old arguments, rehash the old fears against the seaway. This time, however, I say to the seaway opponent, not only are you endangering your own self-interest by your continued blind opposition, but your selfishness is endangering the interests of all of the people of the United States. You know if anyone tried to blow up the Panama Canal we would consider that treason or sabotage against the United States. Well, those individuals who are trying to blow up the seaway project before it is completed, while they may be sincere and honest in their opinion, are actually saboteurs against the interests of the American people.

ANNOUNCER. Thanks, Senator, for discussing with us today over the WMAQ microphone the case and the prospects for the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

Senate Debate Limit Not Needed for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Debate Limit Not Needed for Security," written by Mr. Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE DEBATE LIMIT HELD NOT NEEDED FOR SECURITY—OTHER EFFECTIVE MEASURES COULD BE TAKEN TO INSURE UNITED STATES SAFETY

(By Gould Lincoln)

The argument that old-time freedom and unlimited debate in the Senate must be sacrificed on the altar of national security has a persuasive sound. It might occur to those who make the argument, however, that there are other, more effective measures which could be taken to insure national security without disturbing unlimited debate in the Senate.

For example, the establishment of a universal military training system, providing for a huge reserve force which under law might be called into service by the President the moment this country is attacked, would be far more effective than choking off debate in the Senate so that legislation could be quickly enacted to begin to train men for war.

Further, if this country is attacked, the President and the armed forces of the United States do not have to wait for congressional action to fight back. There is no slightest doubt that the armed services have perfected plans for waging effective warfare against Russia, or some other country, which would be put into effect immediately if Russia should attack this country. It would be a bold Senator who rose to filibuster against a measure for national defense after an attack has been made by an enemy on the United States. Indeed, the supposition that a Senator would follow such a course can be relegated to the category of suppositions contrary to fact.

POLITICAL MOTIVES

As has been pointed out in recent debate in the Senate over a proposal to make an ironclad rule to limit debate—and some have urged a majority cloture—the rule of unlimited debate has neither prevented attack on this country nor has it prevented immediate counterattack by American armed forces. A declaration of war by Congress has followed actual hostilities in two great wars of the last half century. And there has been no sign of a filibuster in the Senate after hostilities were under way.

The battle to break down the rule of free and unlimited debate springs, in the present instance, from political motives. Although opponents of unlimited debate and the filibuster argue that efficiency of government and national security are involved, there is no reason to believe the battle over the Senate rules would have been started at this time, or in this Congress, had it not been for President Truman's campaign pledge to put

through his civil rights program, including antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and pro-fair-employment-practices legislation, buttressed by similar promises made by the Republicans in that campaign.

The one time that national defense was in particular jeopardy on Capitol Hill was in the House of Representatives, where there are the strictest rules to bring an end to debate. That was in the summer before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, when the House by only the barest kind of majority was able to pass a bill continuing the Selective Service Act, then about to expire. That was the law which made it possible for this country to respond much more quickly to that attack.

NOT HELD UP BY FILIBUSTER

No filibuster in the Senate held it up. The national security argument against unlimited debate in the Senate seems a bit idle in view of the record. It is true that in piping times of peace—if they ever come again—a group of pacifists in the Senate might undertake a filibuster against a national preparedness measure. But if a majority of the Senate favored the legislation in peacetime, it would have the time as well as the inclination to break such a filibuster.

To give up freedom of debate, admittedly a weapon which may be used effectively by a minority to stall off legislation which they deem harmful to their State and constituencies, or to the country as a whole, in search of so-called efficiency of government does not add up to much. Nor does it seem more undemocratic for a third of the Senate plus one, or even for a smaller group of Senators, to veto the demand of the majority—especially for class legislation—than it is undemocratic for a single man, the President, to thwart the will of the majority as expressed by Congress when he vetoes a bill passed by both Houses.

A dictatorship may be more efficient than a democracy; but is that a good reason for urging measures which at least lead the way toward dictatorship?

Keep the Red Cross Flag Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keep the Red Cross Flag Flying!" written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the New York Journal-American of March 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP THE RED CROSS FLAG FLYING!

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

The fairest chaplet Victory wears is that which Mercy weaves.

All honor and glory to the American Red Cross, the glorious delight of the Republic. All honor and glory to the Red Cross nurses, the noble women who weave heavenly roses in our earthly life.

They are angels of mercy whose deeds of love are as lighted candles for vestal virgins to keep burning on the altar in the temple of fame.

In deepest reverence we stand together and salute the American Red Cross.

It is the light of civilization. It is the lighthouse in a darkened world. It is the embodiment of human tenderness. It is the flag of humanity.

The true story of the Red Cross is too vast, too sad, too full of human sorrow ever to be written in words.

The Red Cross was baptized in suffering. It was conceived by Clara Barton—God's angel of mercy on earth.

A million thanks to one, who hath a million plaudits won for deeds of love so many millions done.

The ARC is a typical American institution. It is a demonstration of the highest patriotism. It is a soul-stirring story of sincere service. It is a sunbeam in a dark corner.

It offers its friendship to all. It raises no barrier of wealth. It hears no political beliefs. It recognizes no creed save that of service.

Amidst the destruction, desolation, and despair, amidst the suffering, carnage, and death floats the banner of humanity—the banner of the American Red Cross.

Against this standard no arm is raised, and no gun is fired.

The ARC is founded on the noblest of principles, in the deepest needs of human nature, and in the enduring instincts of mankind.

The Red Cross is the greatest mother in the universe.

She is the representative of all mothers in our land. She is there with our occupation forces across the sea. She is there at the side of your son. She is there when the dream of mother floats upon the river of his thoughts.

Her smile is like a glowing sunshine. Her smile is sorrow's only balm. Her smile is a thankful hymn.

When the first rays of the sun kiss the waking world, it touches not the dew of the morning, but the tears in her angelic eyes.

When the drapes of twilight close part of the earth in slumber, and when the moon is moving in majestic effulgence across the skies she is ever at prayer by his side.

Her post is the open field between the bullet and the hospital.

Not all the heroes are in the Army, Navy, and Marines. They are also in the American Red Cross.

Not in the written records are their deeds engraved, but in the hearts of suffering humanity.

There on the tablets of memory their heroism is inscribed. There on the tablets of our hearts they will ever abide.

They will ever live heroic in the deathless songs of peace and of war.

Many times a year the people turn to the Red Cross. Once a year the Red Cross turns to the people.

The Red Cross is asking for a large sum, but the Red Cross is doing a gigantic job.

From neighbor to neighbor, from cottage to mansion, all must support the Red Cross.

Every hand must be outstretched to do its share.

None is too rich to give. None is too poor to give.

Let us remember those who stood as sentinels between the warring forces of humanity and inhumanity; who silently and swiftly fly to all scenes of disaster; who recognize no foe, no race, no color or creed, but extend the same red-chevroned arm to all.

Let us give as we are able. Let us give even of our poverty.

Let us demonstrate to all the greatness of the American heart.

Forgetfulness is injustice. Remembrance is a sacred duty.

Let us give gladly. Let us give generously.

Let us uphold the flag of loving sacrifice. Its color is red with the life of loving service. Its emblem is the cross.

Keep the Red Cross flag flying.

Eisenhower to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, within the past few weeks, several Members of the House have quoted or referred to a recent address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, to a group of students attending the first Columbia College Forum on Democracy. Reports of the address appearing in the newspapers have been fragmentary but the excerpts which have appeared appealed to me as they have to other Members.

It occurred to me that the message of this great man of our generation to a group of representative young Americans might well be presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only to preserve it for posterity, but also to make its full content available to young Americans generally. Accordingly, I wrote General Eisenhower and asked for a copy of the address and his permission to place it in the RECORD.

In his gracious reply, General Eisenhower says:

My little talk at Columbia University on February 12 was not made from notes, but I am sending you, herewith, a rough transcript. I have no objection to your using it as you may see fit.

The address is offered for the RECORD, accordingly, and I earnestly commend its complete reading by all who cherish opportunity and freedom.

Dean Carman, gentlemen, I think that the temptation to reminisce is very great when an oldster such as myself stands up in front of a younger generation. I shall take advantage of that habit to go back to my boyhood for just a moment, but I assure you I am not going to bore you with long tales of the Kansas prairies.

The feature of that boyhood I'd like to mention is this: I was of a big family of boys, six of us. And we were very poor, but the point is we didn't know we were poor. That's the point I want to make with you. The mere fact that we didn't do all the things that others in cities may have done made no impression upon us whatsoever because there was constantly held out in front of us, by everyone around us, until it was deeply embedded in our consciousness, that opportunity was on every side.

OPPORTUNITY, NOT SECURITY

In those days we didn't hear so much about the word security, personal security through life from the cradle to the grave, some kind of assurance that we were never going to have to go out with a tin cup or to sell apples on the streets. But there was constantly around us the right and the opportunity to go out and do better for ourselves than merely to follow the plow down through the field, or to work on the section gang, or anything else that we might do to make the extra few dollars in the summer that we always needed.

I believe that our confidence in opportunity came about because of the character of the country in which we were raised, and in which you are raised. I do not mean character in terms of cities or of vast resources, agriculturally and in every other

way. I mean character as determined by the system under which we live. It is a free system that gives to each of us, of any religion or of any location in that country, the right to do something for himself. He has the right, and the opportunity is always there.

I think that this morning it is important, rather than talking about any living man, to think a bit about the life of the man whose birthday falls today, Abraham Lincoln.

LINCOLN'S ATTITUDE ON POWER

I think that each of you has a very special reason for venerating his memory. We think of him always as the great American. One thing I like to believe about him is this: That he had the proper attitude toward power.

Lincoln finally came to be the President of the United States at a very special time—in war—when the power devolving upon the President of the United States is so great that if used evilly or to the disadvantage of his fellow citizens it can become a dictatorship. And that was especially true in the War Between the States, because the very life of the Nation was at stake day by day.

Yet there is nothing in Lincoln's life or in Lincoln's writings that could lead any of us to believe that he felt or believed that he himself was a source of power.

He was a director of power, a man who might give it a trend in a particular direction, but he had no ambition to associate the source of power with himself and, thereby, to rule others. He served others. That, to me, gave us an example of the true essence of liberty and of freedom.

A man placed in a position where he could have been arbitrary, unjust, unfair, could have done many things for his self-glorification, and he refused to do any of them.

He seems to have said: "I have been given a job to do for the United States. And I will serve in that job to the best of my ability. More I cannot do."

And more he could not do and still be true to the principles on which this country was founded and which he described so eloquently at Gettysburg.

Very naturally, when we talk about a man so great, of such overwhelming stature, the thought comes to us: "Well, what relationship has that got to us; we are not Lincolns?" But the principles by which he lived, the faith he had in freedom and liberty was exemplified, for example, in his very great act, in the emancipation of the slaves.

His passion for individual liberty of thought, of worship, for freedom to act, freedom of opportunity, is the virtue that each of us can emulate and, more than that, I believe, it is the virtue that each of us must emulate if we are to preserve to ourselves the opportunities which we in Kansas recognized in my boyhood and which I am certain that you young men see around you on every side.

TO PRESERVE OPPORTUNITY

The kind of dictatorship under which we may fall today is not necessarily brought off by means of a coup d'etat and a suddenly seized power, using the Army or the Navy and its guns to put us all in strait-jackets.

There is a kind of dictatorship that can come about through a creeping paralysis of thought—readiness to accept paternalistic measures from the Government, an acceptance that is accompanied by a surrender of our own responsibilities and, therefore, a surrender of our own thought over our own lives and our own right to exercise our vote in dictating the policies of this country.

If we allow this constant drift toward centralized bureaucratic government to continue, finally the governmental function will be expressed in terms far exceeding the necessary one of laying down the rules and laws for governing each of us in his daily actions to insure that we do not take unfair advantage of our comrades and other citizens. Government will be in the actual field of operation. There will be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that central government and finally you would have to have dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge and great organization.

I believe it is things such as that which we must watch today if we are going to be true to the standards that Lincoln gave to all of us.

THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

To come down specifically to today and to youth, I believe that opportunity is greater today—and I mean individual opportunity—than it has ever been at any time in our history, because opportunity, regarded in the sense that Lincoln regarded it, is this: opportunity to serve the society to which you belong.

And, frankly, when our democracy, with its system of free enterprise, is operating properly, then individual reward comes to you in the measure that you render service to others.

All about us is a changing economic scene, with concentrations of great labor groups in cities, with acute dependence of the farm and city each upon the other, and we are still unable to find ways in which they can get along together. There are problems of distribution, surpluses in one area and starvation in another, there are thousands of things to which you gentlemen can apply your talents with constant opportunity to do good for your great country and, by doing so, to receive greater rewards for yourself than has ever been the case in the past. And that, I honestly feel, gentlemen, includes even the days of the Revolution and of the War Between the States.

I cannot tell you how honored Columbia feels that this forum has been held here on our campus grounds. The purpose of keeping a brilliant faculty, teachers and facilities, here is merely to make sure that the Columbia of the future, pushing ahead, keeping abreast of our American culture, will be of as great service to a future free America as it is possible to be. And that we conceive to be also the ambition of every right-thinking American.

Thank you all very much for coming today and for giving me the chance to see you. This takes me back, I must tell you, at least 40 years.

National Health Insurance and Public Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following facts about the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act:

FIVE IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH ACT (H. R. 783)

This health insurance bill is not socialized medicine. Socialized medicine means that doctors are employed by government. This measure is a pay-as-you-go insurance program in the American way. It provides specifically that:

I. Patients have free choice of doctors.

II. Doctors have free choice of patients.

III. Doctors may choose whether or not to serve under the national health insurance plan.

IV. Administration would be on the local level. The bill provides that each State be subdivided into local self-governing areas to insure home control. The majority of doctors in each area may determine for themselves the method of payment. It may be on the basis of a fee for each service, a salary, or a per capita fee (so much for each patient under a doctor's care), or a combination of these methods. This definitely refutes the misstatement that "a Washington bureau (would) pay all the doctors in the United States to give free medical service to all the people in the United States."

V. Medical care would be based on the insurance principle. This measure provides insured persons with needed medical care as their right. It is not tax-supported charity limited to those willing to admit they are medically indigent.

TWENTY QUESTIONS ON THE HEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

I. How often are people ill?

1. Among 1,000 average people during a normal year 1 out of 3 will be sick once, 1 out of 7 will be sick twice, 1 out of 20 will be sick 3 times. In addition, there is unrecognized illness among many persons who consider themselves healthy.

2. At least 7,000,000 people—1 out of 20—are incapacitated by sickness or other disability in any 24-hour period. Half of these will remain disabled for 6 months or more.

II. How often does premature death strike?

In terms of people: 1,401,719 American civilians died in 1945; 1 out of every 2 was under 65; 5,668 mothers died in childbirth in 1945; 104,684 infants died before reaching their first birthday in 1945.

III. How much do maternity and infant death rates vary among the States?

1. Widely. The death rate among women at childbirth is three times as high in the five worst States as compared with the five best. In Connecticut, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Utah, 12 to 14 mothers died per 10,000 live births (1945). Compare this rate with 32 to 38 mothers dying in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, New Mexico, and South Carolina for the same year.

2. Infant mortality rates tell the same story. In the four best States (Connecticut, Nebraska, North Dakota, Rhode Island) 28 to 30 babies died per 1,000 live births (1945). In the four worst States (Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and West Virginia) 50 to 100 infants died in their first year.

IV. What do sickness and disability cost annually?

1. In terms of people: 25,000,000 people suffer from chronic disease or physical impairment. About 3,000,000 workers were incapacitated in this way during 1947. Over 40 percent of the Nation's selectees were unfit for military service. Many had remediable or preventable diseases or defects.

2. In terms of production: More than one and one-half billion man-days are lost annually. The average industrial worker is off his job about 6 days annually due to short-term illness, which includes all absences because of sickness or injury that last from 1 day to 6 months.

3. In terms of money $27,000,000,000 annually is the total cost of sickness and disability, including direct wage losses, direct business costs, plus hidden costs of loss of future earnings because of premature death and disability.

V. How many doctors do we have?

1. There were 198,246 registered physicians in the United States as of February 15, 1948.

2. The number of active private physicians was estimated to be nearly 145,000, including 45,000 who limit their practice to a specialty. This was about 1 active physician for every 1,000 potential patients. If we leave out specialists, there was only 1 active physician for every 1,500 people in the United States.

VI. How are doctors distributed among the States?

1. Doctors are not distributed evenly. In the three best States and the District of Columbia in 1940 (California, Massachusetts, and New York), there was 1 active doctor per 411 to 747 persons.

2. But there was only 1 active doctor per 1,565 to 1,784 persons in the 4 worst States (Alabama, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Mississippi).

VII. How are doctors distributed within the States?

There exist also differences in the distribution of active physicians within the States. The cities have more than their share, the rural areas less. In 1946, for example, 330 counties (10 percent of the total of 3,070 counties) had less than 1 active physician per 3,000 population. Seventy-five counties had no active doctor.

VIII. How much do doctors earn?

1. The average net income of doctors in 1941 was $5,047. In 1943 (latest year for which data are available) the average income of physicians rose to $8,688.

2. However, one doctor in four had a net income of less than $2,000. One doctor in eight had a net income of $10,000 or more. This was in 1941. There are no corresponding figures for 1943.

IX. Do we have enough hospitals?

1. There were 6,280 hospitals in the United States in 1946. Their capacity was 1,468,714 beds. Four beds per 1,000 population is a minimum standard. Judged by this standard:

a. Almost one in two counties fall below standard.

b. Only 1 in 10 meets it.

c. Four counties out of every 10 have no approved general hospital. Fifteen million Americans live in these counties with no approved general hospital.

X. What hospitalization do people get?

An average of one in nine persons in the United States was admitted to a registered hospital in 1946 (including maternity, industrial, eye-ear-nose-and-throat, children's orthopedic, isolation hospitals, convalescent and rest homes, etc.). Of these 15,153,452 patients, 14,782,502, or 97.5 percent, went to general and special hospitals; 271,209, or 1.8 percent, went to nervous and mental hospitals; 99,741, or 0.7 percent, went to tuberculosis hospitals.

XI. How many nurses are there?

There were 173,055 active registered professional nurses in 1941—an average of 1 per 760 people. The best State (Connecticut) had 1 nurse per 336 people. The worst State (Mississippi) had 1 nurse per 2,143 people.

XII. Is there a shortage of nurses?

Yes. The National Nursing Council's Committee on Statistical Research says we were short 41,000 nurses as of August 1946. Further, there were only 30,899 student nurses that year, compared with 56,567 in 1945.

XIII. Do we have enough full-time public health services?

1. No. Forty million Americans live in communities without a public health department. More than half of our counties have no full-time public health department.

2. There is a shortage of 45,000 public health nurses, based on United States Public Health Service standard of 1 per 2,000 persons. Our 1946 national average was only 1 public health nurse per 6,500 persons. There were only 21,171 public health nurses in 1946.

XIV. What do we spend on health compared with other things?

Item	Amount	Percent of national income, 1946
Medical care (including insurance and supplies)	$5,600,000,000	3.4
Alcoholic drinks	8,800,000,000	5.2
Tobacco	3,400,000,000	2.0
Jewelry	1,400,000,000	.8

It must be remembered that medical care is not a pleasure like tobacco, liquor, or jewelry. It is an undesired necessity.

XV. How much do we spend on medical research?

1. The Federal Government spends about $28,000,000 a year for research and development in medical and allied sciences.

2. By contrast, the expenditure for research in plant and animal diseases was almost $30,000,000 for one Federal agency alone (1947).

3. Business spends about $450,000,000 a year on industrial research.

XVI. Why do Americans need health insurance?

1. Every American may be hit any year by sickness costs ranging from a few dollars to hundreds or thousands of dollars. No one can predict in advance whether his sickness bills next year will be unimportant or crushing. Therefore, everybody (except the few wealthy) needs health insurance.

2. The people who have no incomes and must be supported by public or private charity must, of course, have their sickness bills paid for them. But Americans do not want to have to turn to charity as a way of meeting their sickness bills.

XVII. How many Americans cannot meet serious sickness costs without assistance?

1. Four out of every five persons—about 117,824,000. In 1939, the American Medical Association estimated that families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet the cost of serious illness. The present equivalent in purchasing power is about $5,000—nearly 80 percent of our families earn less than $5,000.

2. At the National Health Assembly held in Washington at the beginning of May 1948, the representatives of 17 national organizations agreed that: "The principle of contributory health insurance should be the basic method of financing medical care for the large majority of the American people, in order to remove the burden of unpredictable sickness costs, abolish the economic barrier to adequate medical services, and avoid the indignities of a 'means test'."

XVIII. How many people are covered by voluntary health or hospital insurance plans?

1. According to figures presented at the National Health Assembly, voluntary health or hospital insurance plans showed an apparent total of about 45,000,000 members at the beginning of 1948. This figure, however, includes an unknown number of persons who belong to more than one plan, and may be several millions too high.

2. Not more than about 4,000,000 of these persons were covered by comprehensive medical care plans, providing home and office care from physicians, as well as care in hospitalized illness.

3. Of the remaining persons, the majority—25,000,000 or less—have insurance for hospitalization only. The remainder have insurance for hospitalization and also have some of their doctor's fees covered, usually only surgical and obstetrical fees for care while the patient is in the hospital.

XIX. How would national health insurance compare with our present system of paying for medical care?

1. In 1946, over $5,600,000,000 were spent by the people of the United States for medical care, including medical and hospital services, medicines and supplies, and health and accident insurance. In 1941 the total amount spent on medical care was over $3,400,000,000.

2. The amount spent for medical care by families varies with the various income levels. For example, in 1941, the average family with a yearly income of $1,250 spent $43 for medical care. For an income of $2,500 the average expenditure was $74; for an income of $3,600, $143. These figures exclude expenditures for dentistry and home nursing.

3. The annual contribution proposed under the National Health Insurance Act would be 3 percent of earnings, but in the case of employed persons half of this would be paid by the employer.

Thus:

An employee earning $1,250 yearly would contribute $18.75.

An employee earning $2,500 yearly would contribute $37.50.

An employee earning $3,600 yearly would contribute $54.

4. Comparison with the above figures shows that the payments required of employed persons under national health insurance would be much less than these people spend at present for medical care.

XX. Do Americans want national health insurance?

1. A Nation-wide poll by the National Opinion Research Center in 1944 showed: 82 percent thought something should be done to help people pay for medical care; 85 percent thought social security should include doctor and hospital care; 58 percent were willing to pay a 2½-percent deduction for this care.

2. Public opinion polls in several States show 84 percent of New York State residents want health insurance (poll by New York State Commission on Medical Care, 1946); 70 percent of Washington, D. C., residents endorse national health insurance (poll by Washington Post, 1946); 50 percent of California residents favored some Government medical plan (poll by the California Medical Association, 1946).

Too Many Babies Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention to an article entitled "Too Many Babies Die," published in the Woman's Home Companion, March 1949 issue.

Here is another indication that we, with our tremendous resources, are neither in every respect the healthiest country among nations nor are we doing all that might be done with our unexcelled corps of health and medical personnel. I am convinced that we can learn something from other nations and still decide right here in the Congress on a plan to meet our health needs that is strictly American in principle and detail.

The article follows:

TOO MANY BABIES DIE

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

Within the next 5 minutes a baby will die somewhere in the United States.

Within the next 8 minutes another baby will be born—dead.

Why?

American medical care—the best of it—is unexcelled throughout the world. But in saving babies' lives three countries are ahead of us—New Zealand, Australia, and Sweden.

The reason is that in those three countries the best obstetric and pediatric care is available to practically everybody. Here it is still limited to far too few.

One hundred and eleven thousand American babies die each year during their first 12 months of life, according to the latest statistics. This does not include 65,000 stillbirths. During the war years more American babies died than soldiers.

Thousands of these infants succumbed because they took their first gulp of air in a rural rather than an urban area. Or in a backward rather than a progressive State.

True, we have made strides we can be proud of. American infant mortality is today the lowest in our history. We have cut the death rate in half during the last 25 years.

But should we be satisfied? No, according to Katharine F. Lenroot, head of the Federal Children's Bureau, who confessed to the international assembly of doctors at the recent World Pediatrics Congress, "We have far to go to measure up to what some of you have already achieved."

The international yardstick for measuring infant mortality is the number of babies out of each thousand born alive who die during their first year. According to the latest reliable figures for comparison (1946), our rate was 33.8, Australia's 29, Sweden's and New Zealand's—the latter long the world's pace setter—both only 26. Granted that smaller populations and geographical areas simplify the problem, the fact remains that a baby born in Stockholm, Sydney, or Wellington, New Zealand, has a better chance for survival than your child or mine.

Infant care in many parts of the United States is the finest in the world and services are constantly being extended to new areas. The maternity center for mountain women in Oneida, Ky., and for Negro mothers and babies, recently started in Tuskegee, Ala., are examples. Both projects were undertaken and are being maintained with Children's Bureau aid under the social-security program. Of our many hundred rural counties, Anne Arundel County in Maryland—where Annapolis is located—comes closest to furnishing the range of health services that mothers and children need, according to the Children's Bureau.

But in many other American communities facilities are limited and mothers are left largely to their own devices and finances. A visiting Dutch pediatrician recently observed: "In infant services your country has many peaks and valleys while we in Holland are like a plateau." Hazel Corbin, director of the Maternity Association of New York City, adds: "Our best is the best in the world. It's our average that needs to be improved."

The leading causes of infant mortality in the United States today are premature birth, pneumonia and influenza, congenital malformations, injury at birth and diarrhea. They acount for nearly three-fourths of all our baby deaths. Thanks to immunization, the new miracle drugs and purer water and milk supplies, the acute infectious diseases such as measles, whooping cough, diphtheria are less often fatal today. That is also true of the more chronic infections and of dysentery, tuberculosis, and syphilis.

Numerous doctors and public health officials freely admit that many of our babies who die—perhaps half—could be saved. "If all our States did as well as our best ones," a cautious Government official points out, "we could save almost 30,000 babies a year." Certainly we can do a whole lot better. Ideally, every American community should have all the facilities needed for safe obstetric and pediatric care. Not all the techniques of successful foreign countries would be suitable to our system of government, but whenever possible and practical we shouldn't be too proud to learn from others.

Here is what many of our own experts recommend as a good start toward cutting our infant mortality rate. Check them against the facilities your community now has for fighting infant deaths. If your community is failing its babies, organize a citizens' committee for safe infant care in cooperation with doctors, nurses, hospital and health officials to carry out as many of these recommendations as is humanly possible.

START MORE FREE PRENATAL SERVICES

Studies all over the world show that a woman with good prenatal care has the best chance of bearing a healthy full-term baby. Besides the routine checks such as urinalysis, blood pressure, weight, et cetera, when needed a chest X-ray early in pregnancy can detect tuberculosis; a maternal blood test can uncover syphilis; an Rh factor test can prepare doctors for the possibility of having to give a transfusion; an X-ray of the pelvis has proved valuable in predicting possible difficulties in delivery.

Yet thousands of American women have no prenatal care at all. They live in communities without free clinical facilities and cannot afford private obstetrical fees. In this land of abundance and medical enlightenment, three out of four of our rural counties still lack a regular monthly prenatal—or any kind of maternity—clinic. And many city health departments are as bad.

But any Swedish mother-to-be, whether she lives in the city or the country, can attend a government-sponsored prenatal clinic free of charge. There she is carefully examined during pregnancy, treated for any disorders not requiring hospital care, and, if necessary, hospitalized. The clinic is directed by an obstetrician or general practitioner who is assisted by a nurse or trained midwife. Attendance is voluntary but most prospective mothers—rich and poor—take advantage of this government service.

New Zealand also offers its women extraordinary prenatal and other maternal services. Much of the credit belongs to a private organization: the Royal New Zealand Society for the Health of Women and Children, commonly known as the Plunket Society.

The Plunket Society supervises the health of four out of five of New Zealand's mothers-to-be—free of charge. Its motto is "Help the mothers and save the babies." * * * Under New Zealand's national health insurance program the average woman has her baby at little or no cost.

Similarly most of Australia's expectant mothers attend free prenatal clinics or are visited at their homes by infant welfare nurses. Though as in New Zealand nearly all pregnant women have their own doctors, clinic nurses give them good advice on personal hygiene plus helpful suggestions about baby care.

Some of our prenatal services, of course, are as good, if not better, than any in the world, especially those attached to grade A medical schools or good teaching hospitals. But we simply do not have enough.

ASSURE EVERY MOTHER ATTENDANCE AT BIRTH, PREFERABLY IN A HOSPITAL

Much of a prenatal clinic's value is lost unless a woman has continuous care throughout the entire maternity cycle. That is why the Maternity Center Association has long crusaded for every mother to have medical care from the start of pregnancy until she can take care of her baby herself.

Even though a baby's first day on earth is his most critical, more than 175,000 babies are born in America every year with no medical attendant present. Occasional epidemics in some hospitals have unfortunately prejudiced some people against all hospitals. But a good hospital is unquestionably the best possible place for an infant to start life because emergencies and complications can be instantly met. Birth injuries, one of the chief causes of infant deaths, can be reduced by competent care at delivery. * * *

The proportion of our babies born in hospitals now varies sharply between city and rural areas, white and Negro population, and among the 48 States. In Connecticut, which had one of our best infant mortality records in 1945 (only 3 babies out of 100 died), more than 99 in 100 births took place in hospitals. In Mississippi, where only 33 out of 100 births took place in hospitals, the infant death rate is tragically higher.

By contrast, almost all babies in New Zealand and a large proportion in Sweden, Australia, and Switzerland are born in hospitals. National health insurance pays the bills.

Where hospitals and doctors are not available nurse-midwives can be of great help, as the Companion has pointed out (Babies—Special Delivery, May 1946). Many European countries have long used trained and medically supervised midwives. Though Sweden's city women almost always give birth in hospitals those in rural areas are often attended at home free of charge by the midwives. * * *

America too has nurse-midwives, graduating from three schools in New York City, in the Kentucky mountains, and in Santa Fe, N. Mex. The Maternity Center Association, which runs the school in New York, reports a record of 10 years with no maternal deaths among the women cared for and delivered by the nurse-midwives. If anything unusual arises obstetricians are available for supervision and consultation.

START MORE FREE BABY HEALTH CLINICS

These are also called child health centers, well-baby clinics (or conferences), baby health centers (in Australia), Plunket rooms (in New Zealand). At these clinics medical attendants examine and immunize babies and advise mothers on how to keep their infants well.

In Australia every community maintains a baby health center and all but 5 percent of mothers use them. Their cost is shared dollar for dollar by the Australian Government and the states with the municipalities where the centers are located. Trained sisters—as Australia's nurses are called—staff them. Sick infants are not treated but referred to doctors. Six years ago Australia also established a highly successful traveling baby center to reach rural infants. * * *

New Zealand has similarly effective baby health clinics, including traveling ones converted from wartime medical units. When notified of a birth, the Plunket Society immediately writes to the infant's parents—as is done in some parts of this country—offering free services and enclosing a stamped addressed card for the mother to use in requesting them. Four out of five mothers accept the offer. Until the child is several months old he is given weekly and then semimonthly check-ups at home by a Plunket nurse. After that, the mother brings the child to a Plunket room for examination. But if she is unable to do so because of poor health, bad transportation facilities, or too many small children to look after, the Plunket nurse will continue the home visits.

Sweden has an all-embracing network of baby clinics also—provided by the Government free of charge. Though attendance is voluntary, four out of five babies born each year are regularly examined at these clinics. Dr. Adolf Lichtenstein, pediatrics professor at the University of Stockholm, reports that this Government service has increased public interest in child welfare and private pediatricians are busier than ever.

In the United States only one in three of our rural counties maintains a baby health clinic with public funds. Some of these are doing outstanding work such as the one operated by the Olmstead County Health Department in Rochester, Minn., which is staffed with personnel from the nearby Mayo Clinic. But again—we haven't enough.

GIVE MORE AND BETTER INSTRUCTION TO MOTHERS

Classes for expectant mothers are now being held in many alert American communities, but they are not so widespread as they should be. Too many of our mothers still have no instruction before their babies arrive. Our 36-year old Children's Bureau, although continually pressed for funds, has rendered an outstanding public service with its trail-blazing booklets. Scoffed at in the beginning as the work of agitators and busybodies, it has since justified its stand that if

the Government can tell farmers how to feed their hogs, the Government can also tell mothers how to care for their children. Its pamphlet, Infant Care, is a best seller—nearly 22,000,000 copies have been issued.

* * * * *

Wherever there is a well-conducted baby clinic, mothers receive thorough instruction. New Zealand, for example, does an excellent job of mother teaching. Trained Plunket nurses instruct mothers both individually and in groups.

Australia has saved many rural babies' lives through its correspondence course for mothers. Raising-your-baby-by-mail was started by the Mothers and Babies Health Association of South Australia, but now the association sends its lectures to mothers in all of Australia's isolated areas. One "mail baby" has been successfully reared in a lighthouse off the coast where mail is received only once every 6 weeks—and then only if the weather allows a boat to land.

In the United States the Visiting Nurse Association, Red Cross, and many other organizations conduct excellent mothers' classes. The Clara Elizabeth Fund in Flint, Mich., has classes for mothers, fathers, and young people about to be married—a program that could well be adopted by other communities.

DO MORE FOR PREMATURES

The greatest single cause of infant deaths—more than 30,000 a year in this country—is premature birth. One in every twenty babies in the United States is born prematurely and about half of all who die during the first month are prematures. Any baby weighing less than 5½ pounds at birth is considered premature. Some under 2 pounds have survived. There are fewer prematures among women who are healthy, have good prenatal care, and who get the right diet during pregnancy.

Ironically, we have both the skills and the knowledge to save thousands of these tiny newborns. But the expense has discouraged many communities. Special equipment plus expert and continuous care is needed. Thirty-nine States now have public programs providing some services for prematures and eight are actually operating hospital centers. Illinois plans a network to blanket the State. Chicago's premature program, foreign pediatricians say, is the finest in the world. There, premature births must be immediately reported by telephone; ambulances, with special nurses, are on 24-hour duty to rush infants to centers. Denver, Baltimore, and Massachusetts also have good programs. While every community may not need a premature center, every baby should be within ambulance reach of one. * * *

New Zealand's facilities for prematures are as thorough and far reaching as its other baby-saving projects. France, whose celebrated prematures included Voltaire, Napoleon, Rousseau, and Hugo, pioneered in saving prematures. England, whose famous prematures included Newton, Darwin, and Churchill, has recently worked out a model scheme for the city of Birmingham.

EVERY STATE SHOULD REQUIRE PRENATAL AND PREMARITAL BLOOD TESTS

At this moment a million potential American mothers probably have syphilis. If their infection isn't discovered in time, at least five out of six will bear children with syphilis. Those are the facts according to the American Social Hygiene Association.

Though 38 States now require doctors to test pregnant women for syphilis, 10 States and Washington, D. C., still have no such law. Expectant mothers in these States—Alabama, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin—should visit a doctor or a clinic early in pregnancy and demand a blood test.

Connecticut, which, as pointed out, has one of the best baby-saving records, passed the first premarital examination law in 1935. If you live in a State lacking such a sensible law you should voluntarily seek a blood test before marriage.

Most States have laws aimed at protecting babies from being blinded at birth by gonorrheal infection. These laws require silver nitrate to be dropped into their eyes. * * * Everybody agrees something should be done to protect every infant from the possibility of lifelong blindness. Yet where births are unattended in this country the newborns don't get any such protection. In countries with fewer unattended births—New Zealand, Australia, Sweden—gonorrheal blindness is virtually unknown.

BETTER DIETS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN

Enlightened people have long understood the close connection between a pregnant woman's diet and her infant's health at birth. A recent study by the Boston Lying-In Hospital and the Harvard School of Public Health reveals that four-fifths of babies born in ill health are the offspring of mothers whose diet during pregnancy was poor. These women also tended to have more difficult labor with more major complications during delivery despite their infants generally being smaller. A Pennsylvania hospital survey of 2,000 expectant mothers indicates that if the poor diets of pregnant women could be corrected, thousands of babies who are stillborn or die in infancy could be saved. Nutrition Foundation studies point to the same conclusion. Experiments in Toronto and Birmingham, England, also show that what a mother eats helps determine how healthy her baby will be.

RECORD ALL BIRTHS

Getting births recorded in this country has been a long, slow process. Back in 1915 members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, working with the newly founded Children's Bureau and with the Census Bureau, rang doorbells as a beginning step toward establishing Nation-wide birth registration. At first records were available for only 10 States. By 1933 birth registrations were required throughout the continental United States. But not all counties comply. The National Office of Vital Statistics today estimates that 200,000 births remain unregistered each year in the United States.

Yet if the Federal Government, States, and communities are to plan the most effective public health programs, all births should be registered. However, births should be registered in a way that will not stigmatize children born out of wedlock. Registration is also extremely important for the child. For example, his proof of citizenship, right to enter school, work, inherit property, marry, hold office, and receive social security benefits may depend upon his having a birth certificate. Registration often gives a public health nurse the opportunity to tell parents about public facilities and services to which they are entitled, as for example, under the Federal-State crippled children's program.

Our New England States, closely followed by the Middle Atlantic, Great Lakes, and Pacific States, have been the most conscientious in recording births. Minnesota has the best record—it registers 99.7 percent of all births.

Of course, the outstanding countries I have cited are smaller and more homogeneous than the United States. But the important point is that the small countries are taking big steps on a national scale to save their babies' lives while we, under our States' rights heritage, leave the matter largely to local initiative.

* * * * *

The fact that the death rate for nonwhite babies is 63 percent higher than for whites—more proportionately in congested northern cities than in the south—is inexcusable. Negro mothers and infants—along with low-income whites—desperately need Government-subsidized medical care.

The largest Nation-wide maternal-infant public-health program we have ever undertaken was the unusually successful wartime emergency maternity and infant care program. Under EMIC, though women chose their own doctors, Uncle Sam paid the medical, nursing, and hospital bill for about a million and a quarter wives and new-born infants of servicemen in the four lowest pay grades. In addition this emergency "stork bill" furnished free medical care to over 200,000 babies who became ill during their first year of life. At the height of the program one out of every seven babies in this country was born under EMIC; in 1945, 92 out of 100 of these EMIC births took place in hospitals, compared to only 79 for the general population. Conservative doctors estimated that EMIC saved the lives of countless babies and mothers.

During EMIC an old granny midwife led a shy 17-year-old girl before a Texas county health officer, belligerently proclaiming: "She's a soldier's wife an' has a right to have her baby in a hospital and I'm here to see she does." A New England private whose wife and twin babies required prolonged hospital care costing $1,744 sighed, "I felt like living again when I heard I didn't have to pay that bill." A southern sergeant confessed, "I thought it might be like charity or being on relief but it wasn't. They took care of my wife and baby swell." EMIC taught many women to demand good medical care.

But EMIC has been discontinued. Children's Bureau officials warn we must not move backward. Aware that something must be done, the American Academy of Pediatrics is now completing a monumental 2-year million-dollar survey in cooperation with the United States Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau to discover what medical services children receive throughout the United States. Harvard's Dr. John P. Hubbard, director of the pioneer study, says that the findings will spotlight areas where children's medical services are now inadequate. An academy committee is already developing a program for action on these findings.

Some authorities say that if all our babies are to have a better chance we need compulsory health insurance—now in effect in all countries with better infant-mortality records than ours. Some cynics even argue: "Let's wait until we get national health insurance before doing anything more." To this Dr. M. Edward Davis, University of Chicago professor of obstetrics and gynecology replies: "That's like withholding bread from the starving people of Europe because we can't send butter and jam with it."

When the Children's Bureau was created in 1912 the great question asked it was, "Why do babies die?" Today the answer to that question would be: Babies usually die because neither they nor their mothers get the care they deserve.

No American mother should stand over a coffin that could have been a cradle. "I do not say the lives of all infants can be saved," says wise Dr. Martha Eliot, Children's Bureau associate chief. "But I do say it is wrong for a hundred babies to die when 50 could be saved. We know what is needed in health services for mothers and babies. We have the knowledge and skills. But we need to apply them far more widely. It's up to the people through Congress to decide when and how the job can be started."

Guamanians and Samoans Eligible to Naturalization Under H. R. 199

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MARCH 2, 1949.

MR. L. PAUL WININGS,
Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WININGS: I should like to have your opinion as to whether H. R. 199 would permit Guamanians and American Samoans to become naturalized citizens of the United States. If so, can residence in Guam and American Samoa be considered as residence within the United States for naturalization purposes?

Sincerely yours,
J. R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1949.

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: This will refer to your letter of March 2, 1949, addressed to Mr. L. Paul Winings, general counsel of this service, in which you made inquiry concerning the status of certain Guamanians and American Samoans should the bill H. R. 199, which passed the House of Representatives on March 1, 1949, become law. The general counsel's views concerning your questions, with which I concur, are hereinafter set forth.

You inquire whether the bill would permit Guamanians and American Samoans to become naturalized citizens of the United States. H. R. 199 will remove all racial restrictions upon the naturalization of any person as a citizen of the United States. This will be true whether such persons are aliens or nationals of this country.

I presume your main interest is in those Guamanians and American Samoans who are nationals of the United States but have previously been barred because of their race from being naturalized as citizens. No such bar will remain against them if H. R. 199 is passed. Furthermore, if they become residents of the continental United States, the Territories of Alaska, or Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, they may, if otherwise qualified for naturalization, include their previous residence in Guam or American Samoa in meeting the residence requirements of the naturalization laws. This provision in their favor is contained in section 321 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1178; 8 U. S. C. 721).

If any of the individuals in whom you are interested are aliens who have previously been barred from admission to the United States or from naturalization because of race, that previous restriction will be removed by H. R. 199. However, in those cases there is no provision by which previous residence in Guam or American Samoa may be included within the residential requirements for naturalization.

At the present time there is no way by which persons residing in Guam or American Samoa may become naturalized citizens of the United States. That is because there are no courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction in Guam or American Samoa. H. R. 199 would not change that situation.

Sincerely,
WATSON B. MILLER,
Commissioner.

Eightieth Congress and Public Power-Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion on the record of the Eightieth Congress, a Republican Congress, in appropriating funds for transmission lines for Government power projects. In order that the record may be clear and unmistakable, I asked W. G. Dewall, the clerk of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Interior bill, to give me a list of such appropriations.

The list is impressive and speaks for itself. I submit it for the RECORD at this point:

Bureau of Reclamation—Estimate of congressional appropriations for transmission lines and facilities

Project and feature	80th Cong. 1st sess.	80th Cong. 2d sess.
Boise-Anderson Ranch: Transmission line and switchyards	$91,000	$287,000
Boise-Payette: C line power supply	60,000	
Rio Grande:		
Las Cruces-Alamogordo Air Base transmission line	7,000	
Switching station, Las Cruces	5,000	
Substation, White Sands ordnance	3,000	
Substation, Alamogordo Air Base	15,000	
Substation, Alamogordo	37,000	
Alamogordo-Hollywood transmission line	73,000	
Substation, Hollywood	25,000	
Switching facilities, Elephant Butte	20,000	
Substation, Socorro	39,000	
Elephant Butte-Socorro transmission line	476,000	10,000
Socorro-Albuquerque transmission line	20,000	
Substation, Albuquerque	20,000	
Sierra cooperative substation	13,000	
Distance relays for Las Cruces-Alamogordo Air Base transmission lines	2,000	
Permanent improvements, employee residences		16,000
Substation and feeder lines		32,000
Total	755,000	58,000
Yakima-Roza:		
Transmission lines (FPC 340-1, 344-9)		248,000
Switchyards and substations (FPC 342-3)		94,000
Total		342,000
Shoshone: Transmission plant	194,000	204,000

Bureau of Reclamation—Estimate of congressional appropriations for transmission lines and facilities—Continued

Project and feature	80th Cong. 1st sess.	80th Cong. 2d sess.
Davis Dam:		
Davis-Kingman-Needles 69-kilovolt extensions	$65,000	
230-kilovolt Parker interconnection	902,000	$1,284,000
Second Parker-Phoenix line	9,000	17,000
Third synchronous condenser, Phoenix	5,000	90,000
Bank No. 2, Phoenix	6,000	218,000
Bank No. 4, Phoenix	61,000	30,000
Tucson-Deming interconnection	30,000	92,000
Second Phoenix-Tucson line	331,000	630,000
Phoenix substation additions	3,000	26,000
Wickenburg extension (Davis-Mesa line)	129,000	1,808,000
Second Parker 230-kilovolt transformer bank	7,000	281,000
Second Parker-Gila line	196,000	991,000
Improvements and extensions to Yuma 34.5-kilovolt system	28,000	192,000
Substations along second Phoenix-Tucson line	135,000	475,000
Davis-Hoover 230-kilovolts interconnection	60,000	1,600,000
Power supply to Wellton-Mohawk division of Gila project		4,000
Operation and maintenance basic magnesium facilities		72,000
Transmission plant:		
Structures and improvements	30,000	250,000
Station equipment	308,000	340,000
Total	2,305,000	8,400,000
Parker Dam power:		
Substations:		
Phoenix terminal: Air coding equipment, transformers operation and maintenance		22,000
Gila substation: Fire protection		23,000
Total		45,000
Central Valley:		
Transmission lines:		
Shasta-Tracy via Oroville and Sacramento	257,000	500,000
Keswick tap line	160,000	
Shasta-Tracy Nos. 2 and 3,230-kilovolt (west side)	1,500,000	250,000
Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt	118,000	
Tracy switchyard		1,400,000
Substations: Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio	48,000	12,000
Total	2,083,000	2,162,000
Colorado-Big Thompson:		
Completed lines on substations as of June 1946, and addition of overhead ground wires on existing 115-kilovolt lines	40,000	35,000
Estes-Flatiron-Greeley-Sterling 115-kilovolt (2 lines)	210,000	86,000
Sterling-Holyoke-Wray-Brush, 69-kilovolt line	188,000	60,000
Estes-Marys, Estes-Granby, 115-kilovolt line	26,000	37,000
Brighton-Longmont-Loveland-Fort Collins-Greeley, 69-kilovolt line	6,000	
Carrier current communication, relaying load and frequency control		10,000
Supplies and equipment on hand	150,000	
Estes Park-Foothills power system	200,000	
Columbia Basin: Pasco pumping plant power line	110,000	
Total	820,000	228,000
Fort Peck:		
Yellowstone River district:		
Glendive-Miles City transmission line	138,000	

Bureau of Reclamation—Estimate of congressional appropriations for transmission lines and facilities—Continued

Project and feature	80th Cong. 1st sess.	80th Cong. 2d sess.
Fort Peck—Continued		
Yellowstone River district—Continued		
Miles City substation	$36,000	
Transmission lines to distribution substations and distribution substations	42,000	
Missouri River district:		
Fort Peck-Williston transmission line	535,000	$990,000
Williston substation	119,000	
Wolf Point substation	64,000	
Transmission lines to distribution substations and distribution substations	55,000	
Milk River district:		
Transmission lines to distribution substations and distribution substations	7,000	
Milk River - West - Havre - Shelby transmission line	[1] 320,000	
Havre substation	[1] 174,000	
Rudyard substation	[1]	
Shelby substation	[1]	
Other items: power studies	10,000	
Total	1,500,000	990,000
Missouri River Basin:		
Phase A, region 6:		
Williston-Garrison Dam 115-kilovolt transmission line 499.1a	1,000	697,000
Williston substation	2,000	103,000
Beula substation	20,000	102,000
Heart River-Heart Butte substation	26,000	275,000
Heart River-Dickinson subunit	2,000	2,000
Transmission Lines, Yellowtail	29,000	
Transmission lines, Boysen	24,000	57,000
REA and irrigation pumping (tap line and substation)	48,000	177,000
Transmission lines, Canyon Ferry		3,000
Total adjustments		24,000
Total, region 6	162,000	1,440,000
Phase A, region 7:		
Transmission lines:		
Gering-Sidney		342,000
Sidney-Sterling	40,000	314,000
Sterling-North Platte	5,000	
Gering-Hot Springs	180,000	
Cheyenne-Sterling	100,000	
Fort Randall-O'Neil	40,000	195,000
Glendo-Lusk	10,000	103,000
Sterling-Ogallala		54,000
Gering-Alliance		175,000
Cheyenne-Pine Bluffs		140,000
Casper-Gering		543,000
Substations:		
Sterling	10,000	53,000
Ogallala	10,000	
Pine Bluffs and Kimball	50,000	
O'Neil	10,000	
Casper substation additions	35,000	180,000
Gering substation additions	29,000	245,000
Bridgeport	30,000	79,000
Lusk	8,000	42,000
Alliance, Chadron and Hot Springs	20,000	
Sidney		163,000
Pine Bluffs		50,000
Guernsey		3,000
Alliance		128,000
Contract hold-back		1,000
Total, region 7	577,000	2,810,000
Total, Missouri River Basin	739,000	4,250,000
Palisades: Power line	45,000	
Grand total	8,702,000	16,966,000

[1] Fiscal year 1949 appropriation act. Public Law 841, rescinded $560,197 of funds of these features to Treasury.

Appropriations for transmission lines made by the 80th Cong. to the Bonneville Power Administration, Interior Department

	Cash	Contract authorization	Total
1ST SESS., JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1947			
Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948	$6,096,400	$4,935,500	$11,031,900
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948	1,184,700	1,279,600	2,464,300
Subtotal	7,281,100	6,215,100	13,496,200
2D SESS., JANUARY TO AUGUST 1948			
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948	525,000	1,475,000	2,000,000
Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949	17,893,900	11,888,500	29,782,400
Subtotal	18,418,900	13,363,500	31,782,400
Total appropriated	25,700,000	19,578,600	45,278,600

Address by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale on the Occasion of the Observance of the Birthday Anniversary of Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "God's Man Edison," delivered by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale on the occasion of the observance of the birthday anniversary of Thomas A. Edison.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD'S MAN EDISON

(By Dr. Norman Vincent Peale)

Text: "I sought for a man among them." Ezekiel 22: 30.

The title of this sermon implies a superlative estimate of a man. In a deep sense every man is God's man for every person has a work to do in the world—God's work. Perhaps the real difference between success and failure in life is the degree to which we do the work for which God has ordained us.

In a special sense, however, it is the testimony of history that God selects from time to time certain colossal figures to do special projects for Him. When some great new development is ready to flower, Almighty God calls upon some outstanding man to bring this new phase into being.

Ezekiel stated it well in the prophetic word, "I sought for a man among them." (Ezekiel 22: 30.)

There is no special or mystical significance to the month of February but by some curious turn of events February is the birth month of three extraordinary human beings whom God called from among the masses of humanity. To bring to birth the great ideal of human freedom which at long last was ready to become dominant among men, God summoned a colossal figure in the form of the immortal Washington. Elevated, serene, and alone he stands. Forever enshrined in the annals of freedom is the form and figure of the Father of His Country.

When a new ideal of humanitarianism was ready to come into being, forged out of the terrible conflict between brothers, when the very foundations of the state were being rent asunder, God brought forth a rugged, indomitable, magnificent figure from the backwoods of this young Nation in the person of Abraham Lincoln. No American who ever lived so gripped the hearts of his countrymen, and indeed of men everywhere, as the mystic, lovable, towering personality of the rail splitter, emancipator. He is as American as the scent of burning leaves in autumn, as the odor of lilacs in spring. He is the living personification of American democracy.

When the time had come to tap the secrets of the universe and relieve man from the back-breaking drudgery under which he had toiled for centuries, when in the course of human events secrets long held by nature were ready to be revealed, when mankind was at last prepared for the greatest and most awe-inspiring revelation of the wonders of God, the Creator summoned a man and poured into him the same genius of creation which He, himself, possessed. He put into his hand a magic wand and said to him, "Even as I gave Moses the ability to tap the rock in the wilderness and bring forth water, so do I give you the divine ability to tap the universe and bring forth light and music and skills to astonish the imagination of mankind." So in February came God's third great man, the inventive, creative genius of all time, Thomas Alva Edison.

Washington, a deeply religious man, told us that often in the historic days when this Nation was being built he saw evidence of a great hand. He solemnly asserted on one occasion, "The event is in the hands of God." In the twentieth century, no less than in the valorous epochs of the past, God is still in the stream of history and Ezekiel's words are prophetically true, "I sought for a man among them." God needed a man and he sought and found one—God's man Edison.

What is the strange genius by which a few such men as Washington, Lincoln, and Edison become the immortal benefactors of the human race? Is it a particular ability? Obviously, yes, for in order to accomplish the great deeds which God requires, men must be big brained, big souled, big in spirit. He creates such men as giants in intellect, insight, and soul. Yet even they, with all their vast potential could be relatively ordinary men did they not in a very natural way become usable, yielded, and dedicated instruments of the divine will. This does not mean necessarily that they articulate their dedication in traditional pious phrase. But it does mean that in their hearts they had a sense of attunement with God and the unexplainable feeling of being God's chosen ones.

In the case of Thomas A. Edison, there is abundant evidence that this simple and yet profound attunement with God existed. It was my privilege to know the late Mrs. Thomas Alva Edison, a charming and gracious lady and a sincere Christian woman. Being interested in the phenomena of human

beings I constantly asked her for information and impressions of her great husband. On one occasion she told me that it always impressed her that Mr. Edison was "nature's man." She explained by saying that he would come to the house from the laboratory after long hours of labor and lie down upon an old couch which was his favorite resting place. He would go to sleep as easily and naturally as a child. He lay in perfect relaxation. When, after a sound sleep he awakened, it was without any of those contortions with which tense people emerge from their troubled sleep, but he would be wide awake, fully refreshed and rested. There was something about this simple process of refreshment and renewal which impressed her with the fact that he was really resting in God, a natural, unaffected, normal child of nature. The phrase intrigues the imagination, "He was nature's man."

One day after he had emerged from such a nap, Mrs. Edison asked him, "Where do you find all those wonderful ideas of yours?" She relates that the wonderful, old smile passed over his face and without a word he raised his finger and pointed upward. "I think I saw it all at that moment," she said. He was completely yielded in mind and spirit and soul as well as in body to the creative genius of God. The Lord used the marvelous mechanism of his mind as a medium through which to pour at the feet of men the wonders which he had created for His children. Such astonishing work could only be done through nature's man or as I prefer to state it, God's man.

Edison, himself, shared this view, not of himself, for he was too modest for that, but that there is a personal God operating through human minds and souls he had no doubt. The direct question on one occasion was put to him, "Do you believe in a personal God?" His answer was firm and confident, "Most assuredly I do. Nature and science both affirm His existence. Where the layman believes, the man of science knows." On another occasion he declared, "I can no more doubt the existence of an intelligence that is running things than I do the existence of myself."

Among the many important lessons taught by the life of Thomas A. Edison is the immense enthusiasm which one should have about life. Mr. Edison believed enthusiastically in the enormous benefits which nature can contribute to human welfare. To his dying day he was characterized by an infectious enthusiasm, insatiable curiosity, and profound interest. Life never palled on him. It was too romantic for that. He was in old age, as in young manhood, enthusiastically eager to find new things and develop them for the well-being of all men.

A series of three experiences left an unforgettable impression upon my mind. I spoke to an industrial convention in Boston and at the head table sat beside one of the greatest American research scientists. He described with burning enthusiasm the astonishing way in which American industry orders impossible machines. With a rather unscientific fervor he told me how science delivers to industry these selfsame impossible machines. He waxed eloquent as he described the possibilities of machinery, concluding with the assertion, "There is no limit to what you can do with a machine."

Shortly thereafter I spoke to the annual dinner of a chamber of commerce in Ohio. I sat beside one of the greatest American farmers, Louis Bromfield, an enthusiast about soils. He became very enthusiastic as he pointed out that basically there need be no such thing as unproductive land. He says that if we believe in the possibilities in the soil and bring to bear upon it modern scientific knowledge, there is no limit to what you can do with the soil.

The climatic experience was that of being invited on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison to witness the opening of his old roll-top desk at his West Orange laboratory. This desk, closed on the night Mr. Edison died, was kept sealed out of sentiment by his son, Gov. Charles Edison, until the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great inventor.

I happened to be standing by the desk with Mrs. Edison and I asked her how Mr. Edison felt about the possibilities of future scientific discovery; whether he had ever indicated the thought that perhaps the greatest discoveries had been made and what was to come might merely be a refinement of that which had already been invented. Her answer was, I believe, indicative of the creative, aspiring mind of Mr. Edison for she said, "Oh, no; my husband believed there is no limit to the possibilities of development in the natural sciences." Had Mr. Edison been permitted another 50 years of life, there is no doubt in my mind that his insatiable curiosity and indomitable energy would have produced wonders of which we can only dimly dream. But he had done his work. He had cracked open the secrets of the universe and had pointed the way for those who were to follow after him. He was without question the greatest pioneer of them all in finding and solving God's secrets. The only explanation of this man's genius is that God must have whispered in his ear. This is why I call him "God's man Edison."

However, one must come back at once to an emphasis upon hard work as an outstanding factor in the success of Mr. Edison. In this day and age when practically nobody emphasizes the value and discipline of hard work, when we have adopted the foolish idea that the less work we do the more humanitarian we become, it still remains that the only way anybody ever got anywhere is by diligent, unremitting, never-ending toil. When someone was ascribing genius to Edison, he vigorously denied it. He said, "Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration." Often he would work around the clock in order to solve some difficult problem and his perseverance is attested by the fact that in his search for a nickel-iron-alkaline battery he spent 10 years and performed 50,000 experiments before he was successful.

He never inquired as to how many hours he should spend. He never demanded overtime pay. In fact he never seemed much interested in pay. He had a job to do and he loved his work and he worked at it as the passion of his life. He is both a challenge and a rebuke to the modern, indolent philosophy that it is humanitarian to reduce the hours of labor so that man may have more hours of leisure in which to destroy his character and make him a weak and often neurotic being.

Mr. Edison is an example of the truth that this Nation was built up by men who worked and worked hard and as a result they not only succeeded materially but they also succeeded emotionally and psychologically. It was not until hard work became a social crime that men developed the widespread neurotic maladies which plague our time. It is said that all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy, but it is also true that too much play and soft work made Jack a neurotic. The scriptures say, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." That is to say, God works unceasingly in the constant creation of the universe and for the sustenance of mankind God works and God's men work also. Edison certainly could have said, "My Father worketh in creation. I work in bringing His creations to the use of mankind." Therefore one of the outstanding factors in the greatness of this man was the enormous ability to work and to love it.

The story is told of Mr. Edison's invention of a new type of storage battery. When he had conducted more than 8,000 experiments without any apparent measure of success, an associate asked, "Are you not discouraged?" "Certainly not," responded the inventor. "I have learned 8,000 ways the job cannot be done and I am, therefore 8,000 ways nearer my goal." Think of it, 8,000 failures but the result was not to cause him to throw up the effort in hopelessness and futility. He figured that despite all these failures he was making progress for he had written off 8,000 ways in which he knew it could not be done; therefore, his attainment was that much nearer.

Why did he not believe in failure? The answer is—he was God's man. God had sought for such a man and so the man knew down deep in his heart that through faith nothing shall be impossible.

Mr. Edison served God in his day and generation through his great belief in America and the American way of life as the greatest method of helping humanity. There is a doctrine widely preached today that humanitarianism consists of relieving men of the necessity for toil, assuring them of security, giving them material things, and making their government a source of material benefits for them. In other words, to be humanitarian, according to this philosophy, means to take care of people, to give them equally something for which they have not toiled nor ventured, nor struggled. Mr. Edison believed that such a method does not produce great people but on the contrary weakens and softens their characters and so is not Christian humanitarianism. Humanitarianism means the creation of great souls and great souls are developed only through labor, toil, struggle, suffering, pain, the conquest of insecurity, the realization of hopes. Real humanitarianism is to give a man opportunities and say "Here are the tools, here are the resources, here is a free land, where every man is held in esteem and respect. Go to work and make something of yourself."

This does not mean that evils in our society should not be corrected. This does not mean that the poor and the unfortunate and those who are defeated in life should not have the sympathetic concern and care of those who have been more fortunate. This is not to eliminate compassion for never was there a more compassionate people than those who have been developed under the system of free enterprise. The great men of America are almost without exception men who have come up from lowly beginnings. America has done more in the humanitarian development of great people than any modern nation and certainly more than those nations which have sought to depress all people as the servants of the state.

Mr. Edison believed thoroughly in our competitive system and he believed that due and honest profit is a good thing. He would never have subscribed to the innocuous and unsubstantiated idea that profit is unchristian. He said, "It is the competitive system, as much as any other thing, that has made us a great nation. We must depend on competition for the development of more and better products, and for better services at lower costs and thus increase our living standards. I need competition to keep me on my toes. So does my management. Competition is good for business." "Competition," he continued, "develops resourcefulness in our citizens. Competition is good for the individual."

In his life and work Mr. Edison showed the way to develop great humanitarian results. He did not whine and complain that there were no opportunities, that the frontiers had all been discovered, that opportunity had been exhausted. He was not one of those who complained that while in the past a young man could get ahead, could do something, that now all opportunity is gone. The frontiers, the prairies had been conquered and taken up, when he went to work but that did not deter him from achievement for he opened up limitless new frontiers. He developed the great electrical system of America. He brought into being the giant of elec-

tricity and as electrical America grew, new industries were born and with these new industries came jobs for millions of people. He did more to develop humanitarian values in this country by creating jobs than all of the agitators who have ever spoken on all the soap boxes in this country making speeches and nothing but speeches about the welfare of the people. They would have us adopt what they call the "welfare state." Edison produced a state of welfare by bringing millions of jobs out of his fertile mind to stimulate the American free-enterprise system.

He invented and devised the dynamos, conduits, insulators, fuses, sockets, and meters and the multiple-arc system of current distribution which made efficient, economical distribution of electricity possible. He brought light to the world. He developed the telegraph; the phonograph, too, which today brings music into thousands of homes. He developed the motion-picture camera which started a vast industry which gave jobs to more thousands and thousands of people as well as entertainment to the multitudes. It is said that the total of his inventions which created jobs for millions of men and women in hundreds of new industries produced capital assets in excess of $20,000,000,000. This is a conservative estimate of the direct results of Edison inventions. When you broaden these estimates to include industries which did not spring directly from Edison inventions but which would have been impossible without his contributions to industrial and scientific progress, the figures of his total work would represent an impressively large part of our national wealth.

The way to produce wealth for our people is not in the redistribution of wealth until we wear it out, until it is exhausted, but it is the constant creation of new wealth. The multiplication of jobs, the maintenance of the ideal of hard work and faith; this it is that will have the best humanitarian results for all the people. Had not Mr. Edison labored and dreamed and worked, the American free-enterprise system would not have attained its present high standard, the world today would be completely in ruins. It is the American system of free enterprise that today stabilizes the economy of the entire world. Were it not for our goods and our service the world would go down in chaos. Probably the one man who more than all others stands out as the benefactor of mankind in this connection is Thomas A. Edison. In fact, Edison did probably more than any other man to bring the people of the earth together. In a remarkable address reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Edison, the Great Liberator" the following quotation from an unknown source is made: "They are truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race nearer to the heart of human love."

He believed in the greatness of human nature and in the evolution of a better society. He once said, "We are groping on the verge of another great epoch in the world's history. The invitation to constructive thought is becoming irresistible to every branch of human effort. Creative thought," he continued, "will raise the human race to higher and higher standards."

He had an unshakable optimism about the future. God's men are always optimistic about the future because they walk with God and they know that God lives and that events are in God's hands. It is men who lose sight of God who are enveloped in darkness and are afraid. Men who walk with His word as a lamp unto their feet and a light unto their path do not stumble nor are they unable to see ahead. They know down in their hearts that if we keep on working and keep on believing and are brave in our hearts that we will come out of the shadows by and by into the light of a new day.

At his last public appearance before his death on October 18, 1931, Mr. Edison gave this prophetic word to his people, "Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

In this sermon I have spoken of Mr. Edison's quality of mystic insight. It was true to him at the last. On the morning he died it was noticed that he was attempting to give a message. His physician bending low heard Mr. Edison say faintly but distinctly, "It is very beautiful over there." These were his last words. What did he see? One can only dimly imagine. He reported that what he saw was very beautiful. One thing is sure, Mr. Edison was always a scientist. He would never have reported anything he did not see. He was always very exact in his description. He had brought beauty to the earth in the form of light and music and human happiness. He was now sighting that place which is prepared for all those who have been faithful. He was being called home and what he saw as he voyaged across the river entranced him with its beauty.

So passed from this earth, but not from the memory of the human race, God's man Edison.

Appointment of Louis Johnson as Secretary of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Johnson's Fight for Preparedness Is Found 'Startling' in Retrospect," written by Doris Fleeson and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH AND VISIONARY—JOHNSON'S FIGHT FOR PREPAREDNESS IS FOUND STARTLING IN RETROSPECT

(By Doris Fleeson)

As Secretary of National Defense, Louis Johnson has one main job: To find the weapons of the next war and build them without bankrupting the taxpayer. Its corollary is that he must make the brass cooperate.

For the first, Mr. Johnson will need vision; for the second, toughness. No one who has seen him in action doubts that he is tough. Because his appointment is an obvious repayment by President Truman of a political debt, there is less confidence that the President also looked for the vision necessary in what many feel is the second most important job in Washington.

A backward look at the Johnson record under President Roosevelt is startling even to those who recall vaguely that Mr. Johnson fought to prepare the Army until Mr. Roosevelt sacrificed him to political considerations. The new secretary's prophetic attitudes are the more remarkable since they came in the murky post-Munich period when few politicians showed vision and those who did, like Roosevelt, usually trimmed it to fit their political interests.

PLANNED RAIL EXPANSION

Mr. Johnson became Assistant Secretary of War in 1937. In September 1938, President Roosevelt made him chairman of a national defense power committee. Mr. Roosevelt heard its report, and then announced that the administration and utilities would make peace because in case of war power shortages might develop in industrial areas and, for lack of munitions, our forces might be defeated.

The New Dealers yelled murder, the pacifists ditto, but Jesse Jones refused to lend RFC money to the utilities to expand their facilities; so that was that.

Mr. Johnson surveyed the railroads and laid plans to improve and enlarge their facilities. He drew up an industrial mobilization plan. He urged upon President Roosevelt an expanded Air Force and passed him word that Goering had more men working in a single airplane factory in Germany than America had in its whole airplane industry. Mr. Roosevelt was impressed; he said the National Youth Administration would train 20,000 airplane mechanics and pilots. Mr. Johnson said he ought to make it 200,000. Mr. Johnson went on the Hill and admonished Congress to buy and store strategic materials like tin.

Meanwhile, he had routed Army officers from their comfortable chairs and dispatched them to 20,000 factories for a look-see. He then designated 10,000 of these factories for future war purposes and had them taught how to adapt their facilities to make shells, powder, and rifles.

SOUGHT MASS PLANE OUTPUT

He revived the Army's list of wants and came up with the famous 55-55 items that peacetime industry did not make and would not have the tools or experience to make in wartime. He demanded educational orders for these materials.

He began to press for a mass-production airplane industry and mass production of munitions generally. Crediting him with sincerity, a liberal weekly moaned: "He is honest; he only wants to build as many planes as Colonel General Goering. He is envisaging a war equal to World War I; he does not even exclude the sending of a great citizen army to fight in Europe or Asia."

By this time Secretary of War Woodring was writhing; the isolationists were furious. President Roosevelt, knowing the score, had determined to get rid of Secretary Woodring, and Mr. Johnson was to inherit. But trapped by time—1940, a Presidential year—Mr. Roosevelt sacrificed him. On the eve of the Republican convention he shrewdly appointed Republicans Stimson and Knox to War and Navy.

Mr. Johnson resigned. But he left his monument. The Congress he had educated fixed by statute the procurement powers of the Assistant Secretary of War. It was under this legislation that Robert Patterson so successfully operated throughout the war.

Discrimination in the District of Columbia Is a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution of the United States there is no room for discrimination toward any citizen because of external qualifications. Citizenship is absolute, and the

rights and privileges of citizenship cannot be taken away from any person except by due process of law as punishment for his own misdeeds.

Yet in actual practice in the United States, by one means and another, we deprive a tenth of our citizens of full rights.

The victims of legal and economic discrimination are invariably those of minority groups, and the victims of discrimination who suffer most are American Negroes.

It is an indictment of our understanding of democracy that discrimination exists anywhere in the United States; but it is an indictment of Congress itself that discrimination should flourish in the shadow of the Capitol, where, by constitutional provision, the Congress has exclusive legislative power.

I am introducing today a new bill aimed at the elimination of all legal discrimination in the District of Columbia—a bill which takes a new approach to the issue and proposes to make use of the basic police power of the Government in eliminating economic discrimination.

The text of the bill given below indicates the scope; and I am confident that, sooner or later, the Congress must see that this is an equitable approach to our national disgrace.

An act to declare the public policy of the District of Columbia to be opposed to the segregation of persons of different race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, to provide for the operation of the public schools of the District of Columbia on a nonsegregated basis, and to provide for the denial of business licenses to persons who fail to conform to the aforesaid policy

Be it enacted, etc.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Antisegregation Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. (a) In the Capital of the United States members of certain races and peoples of certain color are denied access to many of the institutions of higher education. Segregation, based on color and race, is practiced in the grammar and high schools. Hospital and housing facilities, with minor exceptions, are provided on a segregated basis, and the quality and quantity available to members of different races and colors is vastly unequal. Hotels, restaurants, theaters, stores, and other places of public accommodation are not available to all persons on equal terms.

(b) By these practices of segregation and exclusion the opportunity of full participation in American life is denied to many of our people. While the Nation loses the benefits of their potential contributions to the national welfare, the social and economic conditions resulting from these limitations tend to increase crime, disease, and social disorders.

(c) The failure to close this gap between the principles of democracy and the prevailing racial practices in Washington, D. C., in particular, materially impairs the leadership of the United States in the cause of a democratic world.

(d) Experience indicates that when people of different races, colors, creeds, national origins, or ancestry have had the opportunity of using places of public accommodation without segregation, they have done so with a minimum of friction. These experiences themselves have been an important factor in destroying the barriers of ignorance and prejudice.

(e) Therefore, it is declared to be the public policy of the District of Columbia to oppose restrictions, qualifications, or distinctions based directly or indirectly on race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in the admission of any person to, or the accommodation or service of any person in, any place of public accommodation, whether licensed or not.

(f) Places of public accommodation shall be deemed to include schools, hospitals, hotels, restaurants, stores, offices, office buildings, theaters, motion-picture houses, lecture and concert halls, parks, streets, and public transport facilities, but shall not include bona fide private social clubs operated on a nonprofit basis.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SEC. 3. (a) On or before September 1, 1951, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, acting through its Superintendent of Schools, is hereby directed to administer the public schools of the District of Columbia in a manner consistent with the public policy declared above.

(b) All provisions in the District of Columbia Code relating, directly or indirectly, to the establishment and maintenance of a segregated school system are repealed or modified to the extent necessary to comply with 3 (a) above, effective September 1, 1951.

BUSINESS LICENSES

Sec. 4. (a) On and after November 1, 1950, licensees under the following sections of the District of Columbia Code will be required to conform to the public policy declared in this statute: 47-2308; 47-2309; 47-2310; 47-2311; 47-2312; 47-2314; 47-2320; 47-2321; 47-2322; 47-2323; 47-2324; 47-2325; 47-2326; 47-2327; 47-2328; 47-2331; 47-2332; 47-2333; 47-2334; 47-2335; 47-2336; 47-2338; 47-2339; 47-2340; 47-2341; 47-2342.

Any license issued pursuant to the above enumerated sections is hereinafter referred to as a "4 (a) license."

(b) In addition to any other statutory or administrative requirement for the issuance of a 4 (a) license for use on or after November 1, 1950, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and their designated agents are hereby directed to require that the applicant, a sole proprietorship by the proprietor, a partnership by a partner, a corporation by its managing agent, execute the following certificate as a prerequisite to the issuance of the license:

"CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ANTISEGREGATION POLICY

"——— of ———, Washington, D. C., applicant for a 4 (a) license to engage in ——— pursuant to section ——— of the District of Columbia Code, after being duly sworn—in person—by the oath of a partner—by the oath of its managing agent (strike out the two not applicable) hereby asserts and certifies with respect to the public policy of the District of Columbia opposing restrictions, qualifications, or distinctions based directly or indirectly on race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in the admission of any person to, or the accommodation or service of any person in, any place of public accommodation as defined in section 2 (f) of the District of Columbia Antisegregation Act of 1949 as follows:

"1. That applicant has conducted the above business throughout the preceding license period so as to maintain the said policy.

"2. That if said license shall be issued, it is the intention of the applicant to comply fully with said policy in the conduct of the above described business so long as the license shall remain valid.

"Signed ——— ———,
"Applicant.

"(If applicable) "By ——— ———,
"Partner or Managing Agent of Applicant.

"Date ———."

The above certificate shall be subscribed and sworn to before any person in the District of Columbia authorized by law to administer oaths: *Provided,* That subscription to the paragraph numbered 1 shall not be required for a license which will expire on or before October 31, 1951: *And provided,* That subscription to the paragraph numbered 1 shall not be required for a license if the applicant has not had a license for said business at any time during the 12 months preceding the effective date of the license applied for.

(c) On and after November 1, 1950, applications under this section shall be filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agents at least 20 days prior to the effective date of the license applied for.

(d) Upon receipt of an application for a 4 (a) license to be effective on or after November 1, 1951; the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agents shall cause a notice to be posted in an appropriate public place in the offices of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Said notice shall be plainly titled "Notice of License Application" and shall include the name and address of the applicant, a true copy of its certificate of compliance with the District of Columbia antisegregation policy, and the building and room number where and the last day when protests may be filed as hereinafter set forth.

(e) Within 10 calendar days after the date of posting under 4 (d) above, any person may file a protest against the issuance of the license. Said protest shall be filed in duplicate and shall consist of:

(1) A verified statement by the protesting party which shall set forth the name and street address of the applicant, the allegation that contrary to its certificate said applicant has failed to maintain the public policy declared in the District of Columbia Anti-Segregation Act of 1949, a summary of each affidavit required by subsection 2 below, and a prayer that the present application be denied.

(2) Affidavits of two or more persons setting forth the personal knowledge of affiants of incidents separate and distinct as to time and as to the person or persons involved in which affiants state that the hereinbefore described public policy against segregation has not been complied with. Each affidavit shall set forth the full particulars of each such incident, including the approximate hour and day of the alleged departure from the said policy, a full description of the incident or incidents constituting a departure from the said policy and, insofar as practicable, the names and titles of the applicant's officers, agents, or servants involved.

(f) If no protest shall be filed within 10 calendar days after posting of notice as provided in section 4 (d) hereof, the license shall issue subject to other applicable statutory and administrative requirements.

(g) If a protest shall be filed within 10 calendar days after posting of notice as provided in section 4 (d) hereof, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agents shall cause to be served upon the applicant a copy of the protest and shall furnish the applicant and the protesting party with a notice of public hearing at a place within the District of Columbia not less than 5 nor more than 20 days after service of notice.

(h) The hearing shall be conducted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agents in such manner and according to such rules as will insure each side a fair and impartial hearing.

(i) At the conclusion thereof or within 5 days thereafter, the person or persons who have conducted the hearing shall file their written findings of fact. If they find that the applicant has maintained the public policy declared above in accordance with its certificate of compliance, the license shall issue

subject to other applicable statutory and administrative requirements. If they find that the applicant, contrary to its certificate of compliance, has not maintained the public policy declared above, the license shall be denied.

(j) Where in the first instance the hearing is conducted by agents of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, either the applicant or the protesting party may appeal to the said Commissioners for a review of the facts within five calendar days after filing of the findings. Where said Commissioners grant a review, it shall be conducted in a public hearing according to such rules and in such manner as will insure each side a fair and impartial hearing. At the conclusion of the hearing, or within 5 days thereafter, said Commissioners shall file their opinion affirming or reversing the findings below. The decision of said Commissioners on all questions of fact shall be final and conclusive.

(k) Where desirable to facilitate the operation of this section or to avoid hardship on an applicant while proceedings under this section are pending, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to grant temporary extensions of existing licenses not to exceed 90 days from the usual expiration date upon payment of the pro rata fee.

SEC. 5. Neither the provisions of sections 47–2344 or 47–2345 of the District of Columbia Code nor of any regulation issued thereunder nor any other existing statute or regulation shall be construed to exempt, directly or indirectly, any person or persons from operation of this statute.

SEC. 6. Section 47–2345 of the District of Columbia Code is hereby amended by adding the words "for failure to comply with the policy against segregation" immediately before "or for any other reason they may deem sufficient."

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Addresses on the Occasion of the Christening of the "Clipper America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 5, at 3:30 p. m., a new and greatly improved type of passenger airplane, the *Clipper America*, was christened at the National Airport in Washington, D. C., by the President's lovely daughter, Miss Margaret Truman. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the addresses which were delivered on that occasion.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JUAN T. TRIPPE

Mrs. Truman, Miss Truman, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests, in a few minutes Miss Margaret Truman will christen the *Clipper America*—the new queen of America's merchant air fleet.

Here in Washington 20 years ago Mrs. Calvin Coolidge christened the *Clipper Columbus*, which inaugurated international air service for the United States over the first overseas route between Key West and Habana. Fifteen years ago Mrs. Herbert Hoover christened the original *Clipper America*, now retired from service, which extended air operations under our flag to the countries of South America.

Here also 10 years ago Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt christened the *Yankee Clipper*. The *Yankee Clipper* and the *China Clipper*, both historic in the annals of American aviation, were the pioneers of over-ocean flying—the first to provide scheduled air services across the Pacific to the Orient and the first across the Atlantic to France and England.

Five years ago, however, the Clippers were still at war. There was no ceremony to mark the entry into war service of the Constellation-class Clippers which after the war inaugurated the first scheduled air service "around the world."

We Americans are proud, I am sure, that our flag moved from last to first place on the airways of the world during the 20 years since the christening of the *Clipper Columbus*. We Americans are thrilled that aircraft built in the United States, owned by American free enterprise, flown by American crews under command of American captains, and flying the Stars and Stripes, were first to provide scheduled air service for passengers, mails, and freight over both major oceans and around the world.

But all through these pioneering days our eyes were focused on a more important objective. The goal was not just to fly airplanes on schedule across oceans to all six continents and around the world. The goal was to carry people, cargo, and letters in great numbers—mass air transportation for the average man at fares he can afford to pay. That we felt was the opportunity—and the obligation—presented to international air transportation.

Some progress has been made already. The world's first low-cost tourist-class fare was authorized between New York and Puerto Rico on September 24, 1948. Tourist-class accommodations are less spacious. No hot aloft meals are served, but safety standards are not compromised. First-class service, of course, continues for those who can afford the luxury of first-class service.

In five short months, the number of scheduled air passengers betwen Puerto Rico and New York has more than tripled. Tourist-class air service is here to stay. The people want it. It is good business for the air lines. In fact, only last Tuesday, daily tourist-class air service was extended from New York all the way to Rio and Buenos Aires.

Late this summer, when the 19 new sister ships of the clipper *America* have been delivered, the capacity of our overseas air fleet will be increased by 40 percent. For the first time, sufficient equipment will be available to provide low-cost tourist-class service to Europe and to the Orient as well as South America.

Tourist class fares to Europe can be at least one-third below first-class rates. There is no reason, therefore, why a tourist-class air trip to Europe this fall should cost more than $225. That is our objective. That we will seek to do if foreign governments concerned permit, and we are very hopeful that they will.

American travelers already are spending a billion dollars a year abroad. Low cost tourist fares will add a great new flood of tourist dollars to the dollars American taxpayers are generously giving western Europe under the Marshall plan. Tourist dollars are not tax dollars. We Americans enjoy spending them for education and for pleasure. Other nations not behind the iron curtain seek and welcome tourist dollars. Most important, tourist dollars will not terminate with the Marshall plan.

In an era of mass air transport overseas our people and citizens of all peace-loving countries will benefit. With low tourist-class fares even the workman can leave his lathe and visit any part of the world in the course of his 2-week vacation. Air travel abroad will no longer be limited to a privileged few.

History will record for future generations that the *Clipper America* and her sister ships ushered in the era of mass travel abroad for the common man. This great aircraft was built at Seattle by many thousands of skilled Americans. We are happy indeed that William M. Allen, president of the Boeing Airplane Co., is here to speak on behalf of the men and women who built the *Clipper America*. Mr. Allen.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. ALLEN, PRESIDENT, BOEING AIRPLANE CO.

Mr. Trippe, ladies and gentlemen, Miss Truman will soon name this plane the *Clipper America*. I think that name is highly appropriate. Today's event is a great deal more than a milestone of an air line and a manufacturing company. It is a symbol of the kind of progress that has become synonymous with America. It is a milestone that makes us all sharply conscious of the tremendous strides that have been made in transportation, and their ever-increasing significance in the affairs of this shrinking world.

This new civil air liner has the same type of engine and the same type of wing that carried the B–50 nonstop around the world. Our military services have thus made a great contribution in developments which are adapted to commercial use.

We have designed this airplane to meet the expanding requirements of air transportation, which include greater speed, greater range, and the ability to carry nearly twice the number of passengers across the ocean as existing equipment. We have also met the air lines' desire for substantially increased passenger comfort by providing sufficient space to permit moving about the ship during flight, and by including air conditioning and pressurization for comfortable flight at extreme altitudes. Our engineers and workmen have devoted many years of effort to making these and other improvements possible.

We believe the *Clipper America* and others that will follow will further remove the barriers of distance that have kept the people of the world provincial. They will help to make us all world-conscious.

We congratulate Pan American Airways for the kind of leadership that made this program possible. Mr. Trippe, best wishes to you and your organization for taking another great step forward in the development of air transportation.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

We are meeting here today to participate in the christening of the largest and fastest air liner yet to be flown in commercial service on the airways of the world. It is an event that is significant in the history of transportation and in the development of aviation.

Each increase in transportation speed has resulted in opening up greater areas of the world to trade and travel. On such occasions, in all nations, transportation progress has been celebrated with appropriate ceremonies of christening. It was so with the camel caravans of the East that brought trade goods down to the sea from the deserts. It was true when Caesar's galleys developed the foreign commerce and national defense of the Roman Empire. It was true with the

golden ships of Spain and the huge merchant fleets of England.

It was true also, 100 years ago, when the United States launched the fastest sailing ships ever known. For a short period in our history these great clipper ships of the sea gave us our first and only leadership in international transportation.

But it was more important a century ago, to a new nation opening a great continent westward, to concentrate on national development. During the period that we developed the Overland Trail, and built and christened our first transcontinental railroad, our leadership in international transportation was lost. In the years that followed, American goods and American passengers, more often than not, have been transported internationally in the ships of foreign nations.

But today, as we stand here under the wings of the new *Clipper America*, we are participating in a ceremony similar to those attended by our forebears in the launching of our clipper ship fleets a century ago. We are again celebrating our active participation in international commerce. But this time we are stating boldly that we intend to continue participating in international commerce by maintaining our leadership in world air transportation.

It was only 10 years ago that the Congress of the United States gave American aviation its charter of operating authority known as the Civil Aeronautics Act. To carry out the mandates of that act Congress formed the Civil Aeronautics Board and directed the Board to consider the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense.

Since that time the foreign air-transportation system of the United States has developed, with assistance provided by the Federal Government, until today it serves all the continents of the world and is certificated to serve more than 178,000 route miles. It is significant of the growth of international air transportation to note that some 195,000 passengers were carried across the north Atlantic in 1947.

But it is even more important to note that 73 percent of these passengers were transported by American-flag carriers.

Today with the introduction of the new Boeing Stratocruiser-type transport international air commerce can be said to have entered a new era. The increased speed of this new air liner will make possible an increase in the frequency of schedules; the increased size of the aircraft will begin to open up markets of mass transportation by air. The Boeing Airplane Co. and Pan American Airways are to be congratulated for contributing to such development by producing and operating the *Clipper America*. And it must never be forgotten that a vigorous and dependable system of air transportation is at all times a major bulwark of our national defense.

I know all of you join with me in wishing Godspeed and happy landings to the beautiful *Clipper America* as it flies the airways of peace throughout the world.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Thank you, Mr. Trippe. On behalf of my colleagues in Congress who with abiding faith and excellent judgment have grubstaked and backed financially the aeronautical engineering genius of America, I thank you.

It has been and it is the policy of the Congress to foster and encourage the development of a sound civil aviation transport system capable of serving the air traveling peoples of all the world. Today we are privileged to witness the latest and best fruit of that progressive and constructive national policy.

Today, with the gentle assistance of Miss Truman, we christen another span in the bridge of world-wide friendship. This magnificent ship is not an agency of death and destruction. This ship was not built to spread fear and hate but to bless mankind. It carries no guns or bombs. It transports quickly loved ones to their friends and relatives and it carries messages of cheer in its mail pouches to lonesome and eager mankind in faraway places.

Beautiful in design, luxurious in its appointments, it soars through the skies, a breath-taking tribute to American venture and creative genius. I am very happy to know, Mr. Trippe, that you have 19 other ships like this on order and that three other American-flag air lines have placed orders which will give the United States a fleet of 45 such aircraft in the near future.

This ship will spread the spirit of good will toward all men throughout the world. When they see it glittering and gleaming in distant skies men will not tremble in fear; they will glow with pride and admiration.

This is the first of the great passenger ships to be designed since the war. Emphasis as it should be has been placed on safety, speed, and comfort. May it fly far and serve many.

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

During the last war people everywhere were stunned by the power of the airplane to create havoc on the earth. Today the airplane can and must become the most powerful messenger of peace. Peace is the true mission of civil aviation.

It is true that perhaps no other civil activity of our people bears any more direct and intimate relationship to our country's security than does our civil aviation. Providing an indispensable reservoir of men and machines at the same time as it helps maintain an industry that can be instantly converted to defense in the event of an emergency, it is an arm of our national air power.

It is part of our capacity to preserve the peace. But even more important, civil aviation actually helps to make and create peace.

The plain men and women of the world are their own best ambassadors. When they can stand face to face and talk things over, they can live together as friends, and misunderstandings will disappear. Until now, they have been unable to do this. Not many persons can afford more than 2 or 3 weeks away from the responsibilities of family and work. But with new planes such as this, a vigorous civil aviation with mass air transportation as its goal can enable our people to visit abroad—and people from foreign countries to visit us. Mass air transportation can bind men closer together by shortening the distances between their minds.

There is still another importance to our civil aviation. Directly and indirectly, millions of our people have a personal stake in civil aviation as an industry. It is an important and expanding part of our national economy.

Only in free countries where private enterprise remains unchained can aviation develop to such an extent. Only free minds can dream daringly and chart new courses. Slave labor may build but cannot be creative. Let us hope and pray that soon all the powers of the world will be able to devote their resources and genius to building for their people's comfort and improvement instead of weapons of destruction.

In christening the *Clipper America*, we are launching another wing for peace. We are sending forth into the world another symbol of the limitless scope of man's imagination and ability, of his skill in manufacture, and of his continuously pushing forward of the frontiers of knowledge.

The Menace of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Francis Budenz from Collier's magazine for March 19, 1949:

THE MENACE OF RED CHINA

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

(The Communist avalanche that's rolling across China will gain momentum, smash across the Pacific islands and cover the United States—all according to the Soviet plan. The American public's apathy to this looming disaster is also a part of the plan—exposed here by one who took part in the plotting.)

The Communist conquest of China, now dangerously near completion, long has been planned as a major milestone in Moscow's road toward creation of a Soviet America. Japan and Korea are next on the schedule, then Indonesia and the Philippines. Once in control of the western Pacific's vast manpower and vital rubber, tin, and oil resources, Russia hopes to be ready for the final showdown with the United States.

That is the blueprint, at least, of Soviet world conquest. It has been known to United States Communists since 1927, the year Earl Browder was sent to China to plant seeds of anti-Americanism there. His mission became a model, cited repeatedly at Communist meetings I attended, for the manner in which a true Bolshevik acts against the bourgeoisie in his own country.

Since 1927, every American Communist has been inculcated with the Soviet tenet that China is the master key to a Red White House.

In my 10 years as a Communist editor and party worker, no other indoctrination program was more important. Numerous United States Red leaders stated their belief that China's 463,000,000 people would be the decisive factor in sovietizing the United States. At a 1940 "educational meeting" of Daily Worker staff members, William Z. Foster, now the party's national chairman, stressed China's role in America's future.

"China's millions," he said, "will be a great aid to the Soviet Union in helping the American proletariat establish a Soviet America." Continuing, he pointed out that China was also "the key to Korea, Japan, and the Philippines."

Japan's scheduled role in the Soviet pattern of conquest was more recently outlined in the September 8, 1948, issue of New Times, weekly supplement of the Moscow newspaper Trud. An editorial in it predicted that "the insensate policy of power-drunk American monopolies" in Japan would "cost blood, the blood of the people." But, it concluded, "the national liberation movement in the Asiatic countries will drive the American imperialists out of all Asia, including Japan."

Significantly, on the very day of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's retirement, a Chinese Communist broadcast promised that "a new China * * * will assist in Japan's democratization and prevent the reemergence of reactionary forces." The same day, in Moscow, Pravda editor Pospelov denounced America's "mad imperialism," cited the great Communist victories in China despite United States aid to Chiang Kai-shek, and predicted "the twentieth century will be the century of the complete triumph of Leninism."

The tremendous potential of China's manpower and materials dominated many discussions at United States Communist Party headquarters while I was editor of the Daily Worker. Conferences with secret conspirators, spy, saboteur agents like J. V. Peters and the late Jacob Golos, always traced the route Asiatic operations would follow. China first, followed by Japan, Korea, the Philippines—and then Alaska and Hawaii.

Golos, one of the espionage chiefs, often outlined the vital urgency of organization on the west coast and Hawaii as vital links in the Asiatic chain, which would mean the ultimate defeat of American imperialism.

Peters, then as now a main cog in the Communist International underground, discussed plans with me for infiltrating Hawaii with our California undercover agents. Recent congressional revelations of a Red spy network extending from California to Alaska indicate that Peters did his west coast job very well.

Discussion leaders at our "educational" meetings were party theoreticians like Foster, Alexander Bittelman, Moscow-sent expert on Leninism and China, or Max Weiss, chief of the Young Communist League, later known as American Youth for Democracy. Always emphasized was the necessity of our joining the China struggle as a preliminary to the overthrow of our own bourgeoisie.

Yet it is a tragic irony that this gravest threat to our national security is a thing of America's own making. Most Americans, during World War II, fell for the Moscow line that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists. They firmly believed that Mao Tse-tung's soldiers were nothing more than agrarian reformers, plus a few democrats and liberals who couldn't stand the Kuomintang corruption and graft. To prove their contention they cited T. A. Bisson in Far Eastern Survey, who wrote that by no stretch of the imagination can this be termed communism; it is, in fact, the essence of bourgeois democracy, applied mainly to agrarian conditions.

And that is just what Moscow wanted Americans to believe. Even many naïve Government officials fell for it. So did several ill-guided newspapers and magazines. This deception of United States officials and public was the result of a planned campaign; I helped to plan it.

MAKING AMERICA A CAT'S-PAW

Its objective was to win American confidence so that the United States' foreign policy in China might be influenced to Moscow's own ends. The number one end was a Chinese coalition government in which Chiang Kai-shek would accept the agrarian reformers—at the insistence of the United States.

Among the unwitting American officials that I influenced in this operation were a United States Senator and a member of the House Rules Committee. The Senator, fancying himself an authority on China, lent a sympathetic ear to my "right slant" on Chiang Kai-shek. My contacts with both officials were on orders of Communist Chief Browder.

The classic example of naïveté, however, was a high Government official with whom I had become acquainted in the depression days. A defense of the WPA, that I had written while I was editor of the Communist Mid-West Record, had caught his eye and won his respect for my judgment. He communicated with me frequently.

He phoned from Washington one night in 1939 to get my opinion. What, his query went, did I think of the rumored aid by Stalin to Hitler? Naturally, I pooh-poohed the idea. He seemed satisfied. So was I, and so was Browder when I reported the conversation the next day. A few weeks later, the alliance of the twentieth century's two most infamous dictators was working at full speed.

The Asiatic assignment's chief contact man in Washington was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire and dilettante left-winger. His mission was to the State Department, where there were valuable channels through which to pour his propaganda that Mao Tse-tung's followers were merely agrarian reformers. But once the Chinese Reds gained the upper hand, Field changed his tune. In the July 1948 issue of Political Affairs, the Communists' official theoretical publication, he wrote:

"Our Chinese comrades are destroying American imperialism in the Far East. Let us, American antiimperialists, at least accept and make use of the historic contribution which they are making toward our own welfare."

This on-again-off-again policy toward Mao Tse-tung always shifted with the devious, opportunistic course of Moscow strategy. The first twist came in 1937. Earl Browder, then general secretary, called a China conference at party headquarters, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York.

Grouped beneath pictures of Lenin and Stalin in the drab ninth-floor office overlooking the street were 10 United States Communist leaders, among them: Alexander Trachtenberg, publisher of all Marxist-Leninist literature in the United States; J. V. Peters, the Communist International secret agent; Fred Brown, whose real name was Ferrucci Marini and who was a Communist International secret agent; Harry Gannes, foreign editor of the Daily Worker; Sam Carr, national organizer of the Canadian Communists; Carl Bristel, active in the Young Communist League; Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Browder, and myself.

Browder announced that he had received word that the followers of Mao Tse-tung have to be presented in a new dress. With a sarcastic grin and Kansas-imitated twang, he said our new objective was to picture them as a mild variation of plains State agrarian reformers. Up to that point they had been known simply as Chinese Communists.

We agreed that the change could not be effected immediately, since our recent emphasis had been on the revolutionary aspects of the Chinese Soviets. Then Field outlined an alternative. We could work through legitimate Far East organizations and writers that were recognized as oriental authorities. Field emphasized use of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This is not a Communist organization, but Field later succeeded in becoming secretary of its American council. Also chosen were the American League Against War and Fascism, and American Friends of the Chinese People, the latter a Red-front organization. Their publications Fight and China Today were to be used in the deception.

The agrarian reformers idea started from there. It took root in leading Far East cultural groups in the United States, spread to certain policy-making circles in the State Department and broke into prominent position in the American press.

Browder master-minded the new China policy. Having served 2 years in China as a Communist International representative, he was our authority on that country. Ostensibly, back in 1927, he was one of a three-man international workers delegation composed of himself, Tom Mann, of England, and Jacques Doriot, of France (Doriot later renounced communism). Actually, Browder's real job in China had been the undermining of United States prestige. He had shouted about the evils of the "dollar republic" (the United States of America) and how it was the exploiter of all countries. Those denunciations were incorporated in the 1928 Sixth World Congress declaration of war against all bourgeois democratic countries.

Significantly, Browder had arrived in China just after Chiang Kai-shek threw out the Communists who had tried to take over the Kuomintang. A raid on the Soviet Embassy in Peking a short while before had revealed conclusive evidence of a Comintern plot to use the Kuomintang for its own purposes of world revolution. Then, as well as now, China was the focal point for world revolution. And one of Moscow's agents in the Kuomintang central executive committee prior to the 1927 purge was Mao Tse-tung, the peasant leader who had helped organize the Chinese Communist Party in 1921.

But by 1937 Mao Tse-tung was just an agrarian reformer. This whitewash was a plot to get United States pressure on Chiang Kai-shek to agree to a coalition government. When the Japanese invaded China Mao proposed national unity arrangements to Chiang.

Chinese Communist cooperation with Chiang Kai-shek lasted until Stalin's 1939 pact with Hitler. Then, of course, Chinese Reds followed the Moscow lead again, branding the European conflict an imperialist war and breaking off relations with the nationalist government. Soon after Russia signed a nonaggression pact with Japan.

Mao Tse-tung, always a devoted Stalin disciple, didn't let patriotism for his invaded homeland stand in the way of Moscow's long-range strategy. He was too well drilled in the philosophy of Soviet policy. This policy was expressed best by Stalin in 1934: "The strategy of the party is not something permanent, fixed once and for all. It changes to meet historical shifts, historical turns."

Wartime Communist propaganda in the United States made much of the gallant fight Mao Tse-tung's armies were supposedly making against the Japs in China. Yet no party-line apologist has yet explained how 10 Japanese divisions moved from Manchuria to the Central China front in 1944, through Communist-held territory, without meeting any show of resistance. It was that Japanese force which eventually cut through east China and overran Gen. Claire Chennault's fourteenth United States air force bases.

CHOU PLEADS FOR COALITION

In the midst of the Stilwell crisis in October 1944 while Japanese troops from Manchuria were encircling United States air bases in Yünnan, the Chinese Reds issued another call for a coalition government; it was faithfully echoed by naïve Americans. Chou En Lai, political assistant to Mao and chief Red negotiator during the 1946 China mission of General Marshall, said: "In order to save China in this crisis * * * we propose that the government abolish (the present) one-party dictatorship and set up a coalition government." (Everyone remembers the advantages a coalition government gave Czechoslovakia.)

Just 6 months after Chou's statement—in April—the Communist duplicity was revealed, and by Mao himself. At the Seventh National Convention of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao made a special report on coalition government. Coalition, he said, was merely a slogan that would lead to the destruction of Chiang Kai-shek and the defeat of reactionary American imperialism. That revelation reemphasized this party resolution, adopted in 1944: "The cooperation of the Chinese Communist Party with the United States is a temporary strategy."

This policy of deceit began the downfall of Nationalist China in late 1945. Russia, after a phony 6-day war with the Japs in Manchuria, disarmed 625,000 Nipponese soldiers and turned their weapons over to the Chinese Communists. That Russian-donated booty enabled the Chinese Reds to drive Chiang Kai-shek's soldiers out of Manchuria, North China, and to eventual surrender at Nanking. Three months before Russia thus armed Mao Tse-tung's forces, Moscow had pledged friendship and support to Chiang's Nationalist Government in return for China's

forced agreement to Russia's claims in Manchuria.

There were many instances where the Communists were successful in impressing their views on the United States State Department simply by planting articles with the proper slant in such magazines as Far Eastern Survey, Pacific Affairs, and Amerasia. Both Far Eastern Survey and Pacific Affairs are publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

However, the institute is, as I said, not a Communist front. Most of the 1,600 members of the American section of its 10-nation Pacific council are patriotic United States citizens. But party members and apologists have infiltrated its most influential committees and publications. Their articles and speeches have been used as reference material by the Far Eastern Division of our State Department. Frederick V. Field, one of the institute's council secretaries, incidentally, attended the San Francisco Conference and at the same time served as correspondent for the Daily Worker.

The success of Amerasia's entree to at least some circles of the State Department is a court-proven fact. Its coeditor, Philip J. Jaffe, was indicted in 1945, charged with conspiracy to remove confidential Government records from secret files of the State Department and other departments. That was the first revelation of Washington's wartime stolen secrets, followed later by the Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers exposé.

Jaffe, whose magazine faithfully followed the Moscow line on China, pleaded guilty. After paying his fine, he entertained his codefendants (some whose indictments had been dismissed) and members of the Daily Worker staff at a party. Toasts were drunk that night to "the coming victory of communism in China and the defeat of American imperialism."

Soviet secret police in the United States first told me about Jaffe. They said he was a valuable friend. Later, through reports to the national committee, I learned Amerasia's main objective was establishment of State Department contacts which could prove helpful in stopping United States aid to Chiang Kai-shek.

CHIANG BRANDED AS FASCIST

Less than 24 hours after Japan's surrender, American Communists really turned the heat on their old foe, Chiang Kai-shek. He suddenly was labeled a Fascist. An editorial in the Daily Worker of August 15, 1945, declared that "not a single American gun, soldier, plane, or other war equipment must be placed at the disposal of the Fascist clique at Chungking."

Two days later a paid "message to President Truman" appeared in the Daily Worker. Its verbiage was substantially the same as the Daily Worker editorial of August 15. It was signed by 21 prominent Americans. Among them: Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Lawrence Salisbury, an IPR editor; T. A. Bisson, China expert to whom the Chinese Reds were "the essence of bourgeois democracy."

Later, the Daily Worker editorial was supplemented by a memorandum from the New York State Office of the Communist Party. The subject: Campaign of Struggle Against United States Imperialist Intervention in China. I still have a photostatic copy of it.

The memo ordered picket lines, mass meetings and congressional protest delegations in opposition to the Truman administration and Republican Party policies of imperialist world domination * * * and imperialist intervention in China. As a means to that end, it recommended the sale and maximum distribution of Mao Tse-tung's book, China's New Democracy. It didn't mention, however, that the United States version of Mao's book had been revised by Earl Browder and other Communists back in the late 1930's to edit out embarrassing references to the dictatorship (in the image and likeness of Stalin, of course) that he planned to establish once the Reds came to power in China.

The memo also suggested books by two American authors as reading material: Harrison Forman's Report from Red China and Gunther Stein's Challenge of Red China. That was not surprising. Both had pictured the Reds as agrarian reformers.

MAO'S ATTACK OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Forman's book was published in 1945; but the line had changed while the book was on the press. That year Mao Tse-tung openly declared himself with Russia and against the United States, telling the Chinese Communist convention that coalition government was a temporary expedient, one that would lead to the destruction of Chiang Kai-shek and American imperialism. Mao's attack on America was made while United States and Russian troops were still celebrating their linkup at the Elbe River.

At the Daily Worker office, we immediately realized that the honeymoon would soon be over. Mao's tip-off was followed on June 1, 1945, by a Moscow directive in the New Times.

On the surface, it was an innocuous article. Titled Patriotism and written by N. Baltisky, it declared that the highest patriotism consisted of subservience to Soviet Union. Comrade Baltisky added that true patriotism required the peoples of the world to stand with the Soviet Union against all imperialist ventures of their own governments.

To uninitiated, non-Communist eyes, that was no more than a harmless rehash of the propaganda line preached by the Soviets prior to the Comintern's dissolution in 1943. It meant something more to Communists, familiar with Stalin's technique of transmitting orders. It was the Kremlin's code method for rallying the world's Reds for the newly launched cold war—which Moscow still insists was started by the west. The date was 3 weeks after VE-day and 6 weeks before the Potsdam Conference of the victorious Big Three Allies.

The cold-war line, introduced by Mao Tse-tung and seconded by Comrade Baltisky, got its sanction from Stalin in October 1947. Moscow announced the formation of the Fourth International, postwar successor to the Comintern. Its manifesto said that world politics, since World War II, has crystallized into two opposite lines.

"On the one extreme," it read, "the U. S. S. R. and the democratic countries aim at whittling down imperialism and strengthening democracy. On the other side the United States and England aim at the strengthening of imperialism and the strangulation of democracy."

Presumably, imperialism was whittled down with the successful Soviet coup in Czechoslovakia, and democracy was strangled when the French Government defeated Communist efforts to overthrow it.

Now it's China's turn to get strengthened democracy, Soviet style. And American troops in Korea and Japan are exposed to another Bataan, flanked by numerically superior enemy forces on the mainland and open to submarine blockade from Soviet ports in Manchuria and Siberia.

Back in 1923, 5-year-old Soviet Russia saw China as its steppingstone to world domination, realizing well that as China goes, so goes Asia. It took a quarter of a century to reach the goal, which only proves that while the Communist pattern of conquest may deviate, it never dies.

Radio Broadcast of Jack Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Mr. Jack Bell's broadcast on the Elmer Davis program over Station WMAL on Wednesday, March 16, 1949:

At length, after misgivings, the State Department announces that Soviet delegations will be admitted to this country. They will use America as a platform for anti-American sentiments. The visas of 23 delegates from Russia and satellite countries have been granted to attend a 3-day conference at the Waldorf Astoria. It is thinly disguised under the high-sounding name of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. Since there is now no further use in seeking to get the Justice Department and the State Department to bar known Communists from this country—they have adopted a special rule, in this instance—I think, in fairness to the American public, that as much publicity should be given as possible about the antecedents of this outfit and its close connection with the Cominform. This meeting at the Waldorf, to begin on March 25, is a blood cousin of the so-called World Congress of Intellectuals, which was held last summer at Wroclaw, Poland. The American delegation, as I recall, was headed by Dr. Harlow Shapley, who is the head of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which is now sponsoring the Waldorf meeting. Dr. Shapley, a Harvard professor of astronomy, seldom lets a week go by without lending his name to some project which furthers Soviet interests. He belongs to more than 10 Communist-front organizations and is one of the defenders of Gerhardt Eisler. In Boston today, I note that Thomas Forgan, clerk of the Suffolk County court, invited Shapley to resign, because he consorts with Communists. Vice chairman of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is Max Weber, an artist, who has supported Communist Party candidates for office. This National Council has recently condemned President Truman for not having accepted Stalin's invitation to go abroad and meet him. It defended the so-called Hollywood 10 and has raised a fund of $25,000 to back up American teachers who have been discharged for disloyalty. I leave it to you to judge from these citations what its political coloration is.

The same troupe of performers, which will be on view at the Waldorf meeting tomorrow, went through its paces last summer at the Wroclaw congress of intellectuals. It was run by and for the Cominform. The chief speaker was one Faydeyev, who is the Soviet commissar of literary production. He made an incendiary attack on America, for its cultural "filth," which he said was overspread by the dollar sign, and then went into the real meat of the coconut—attack on American foreign policy. He was cheered to the rafters and followed by speaker after speaker, echoing the same line. Faydeyev is one of those coming to the Waldorf-Astoria conference.

At least one American, attending the Wroclaw conference—Bryn J. Hovde, president of the New School in New York—got mad clear through and got up and made reply, saying

that true democracy in government was the hope of the world. He said later he never saw anybody get a colder reception. Only a handful of Americans and British applauded. Mr. Hovde came to the conclusion that the purpose of the Wroclaw meeting was to get ammunition from so-called intellectuals, the world over, which could be used by the Soviet Union in the cold war—to place the blame for war, when it came, on the west.

If we get full reports from the press and radio on this Waldorf conference, I think undoubtedly you will see the same line emerge. Undoubtedly a great many Americans will be taken in by the names and the great air of respectability. The name of Shostakovich, the Russian composer, will attract its share of people who admire his music. They should remember that his best music has been condemned by the ideological censors of the Soviet Union as being too servile to the west. He suffered something of a cultural purge a few months ago and had to bend the knee and admit that "he had not fought hard enough" against this corrupting influence. He is a pawn in this world game of influencing others, on the outside, even while his music was the subject of official attack on the inside of Russia.

The State Department demonstrates that it knows what the score is. George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, who made the announcement that the Communist representatives would be admitted, said, "The American Government entertains no illusions as to the manner in which the Communists will attempt to use and manipulate the present conference." He went on to say that the Soviet Government had frequently failed even to answer visa applications of high American officials who had sought to enter the Soviet Union. The United States had decided, he said, to admit the delegates "because of its unswerving devotion to freedom of information and speech on any issue, however controversial it may be."

I think the matter is now in the hands of American intellectuals—scientists, artists, and professionals—if they can get the floor, to show up this conference for what it is from the floor. Surely there must be some such in the United States who are true liberals and not "totalitarian liberals." We ought to be able to show the world that—even if we are slow about it—we finally catch on.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. This great national organization born in a period of confusion and turmoil at the close of World War I is now completing three decades of outstanding contributions to the American way of life.

Starting in 1919 with the organization of its National Service Bureau which worked with State service bureaus and others to assist veterans in hospital treatments, vocational training, and war-risk insurance problems, the American Legion has established an enviable record of achievement.

During this 30-year period the Legion successfully campaigned for establishment of the United States Veterans Bureau and its subsequent reorganization and fought continuously until the eventual creation of the Veterans Administration.

All the outstanding contributions to the Nation's welfare culminated in the acceptance by the Congress and the president of the Legion-sponsored GI bill of rights—the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944. Drafting of this legislation has been called the greatest single feat of statesmanship in the Legion's career.

The accomplishments of the American Legion that I have mentioned are but a very few of the high lights of this organization's outstanding record. Time does not permit my enumeration of accomplishments in the fields of labor and general social service. Time forbids a discussion of accomplishments in the fields of education and foreign affairs. Let me point out that the Legion has never rested on its laurels but is fighting and will continue to fight the battle for a better Nation and world while always holding aloft the torch of democratic ideals.

Allow me to express my heartfelt personal congratulations to the active membership of the American Legion upon this anniversary of 30 years of outstanding accomplishment.

Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from an article by Tris Coffin in the Washington Times-Herald of March 13, 1949:

MANGANESE RACE

A toughening-up metal is giving the Munitions Board headaches that aspirins won't cure. It is manganese—14 pounds go into every ton of steel to harden it. This metal is the one thing the Russians have that we need like sixty.

This is the pitch: The United States eats up about 1,500,000 tons of manganese a year, and produces around 130,000 tons annually. It is especially needed for the hard, tempered steel that goes into armaments. There is no publicly known substitute. Our stock pile is little more than a year's normal supply, or less than a fourth of a security supply.

Russia is the big manganese producer. Her low-priced manganese dumped on the world market forced many American producers out of the game 20 years ago. The other producers—and they haven't come within shooting distance of Soviet production yet—are the Union of South Africa (hundreds of shipping miles away), India, the Gold Coast, Brazil, and Mexico. The United States grabbed a million tons of manganese ore from Cuba during the war, but those deposits are now exhausted.

A scary statement on the manganese shortage was made by Elmer Pehrson, the Bureau of Mines chief economist. He was asked what the score would be if our stock piles were exhausted, imports were shut off, and we had no production at home. He answered soberly, "I feel if we ever get to that stage, and if we're in a real war, we might just as well acknowledge that it's over."

The answer, according to WILBUR MILLS, the young Arkansas Congressman, is to subsidize manganese mining. He has it from those in the know that there is enough ore in this country to last two centuries or more. But it is ore that will cost plenty of bucks to get out and process. Mills has a bill to get Uncle Sam to buy domestic ore at a price that will get mining interests at work digging.

Why Ireland Is Not Joining Atlantic Security Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address being delivered by me over radio station WLW, Cleveland, this evening:

Fifteen hundred years ago, a civilization was dying. The great Empire of Rome still wore the insignia of power and glory, but its heart was gone. From the north and east the barbarian tribes were battering at the walls of the Empire, and the walls were crumbling.

In those years a young slave escaped from Ireland to France. Historians dispute about where the young slave, Patrick, was born and where he was captured. But beyond that, Patrick has left historians little to dispute about. He found Ireland pagan and left it Christian. He made it the isle of saints and scholars; so that when the Roman Empire finally went down and Europe was sunk in spiritual darkness, it was from Ireland that the light came to illumine it again. There is no need for me to rehearse here a more than twice-told tale. I would rather stop and ask what Ireland means for us in the world of today. Has she any light to cast on our problems? The shadow from the east is again over Europe and men are talking of the possible end of our civilization. On this St. Patrick's Day of 1949 why do we look to Ireland?

Tomorrow the world will be given the details of the Atlantic security pact. Ireland has been asked to be a party to that pact and has refused. The Irish Government has said that it cannot be a partner to the pact so long as its six northeastern counties are partitioned off by the act of the British Government. Now, the Irish Government does not expect that its actions shall be immune to criticism, but it has a right to expect that if they are criticized, the criticism be intelligent. It has a right to expect that people become acquainted with the facts in the case before they judge.

This refusal of the Irish Government to take part in the Atlantic Pact should not be looked on as just the attitude of a sulky child nursing old grievances. Let us look at the facts. Six of Ireland's 32 counties were partitioned off by the British in 1920

and given a separate government. Shortly after coming into existence in 1921, the northern government declared a state of emergency and suspended all civil liberties. The emergency has now lasted nearly 27 years. I think an emergency like that calls for explanation.

The territory of northern Ireland was carefully chosen so as to be big enough to make it possible to exist under a separate government, but not big enough to enable the most vigorous minority ever to attain a majority. You may get an idea of the way the division was carried out when I mention that Malin Head, in Donegal, the most northerly point in Ireland, was placed in southern Ireland.

Under the Special Powers Act, Irishmen can be taken from their homes in the dead of night and interned indefinitely without charge or trial. To make assurance doubly sure, the northern government has gerrymandered on a grand scale. Indeed, the Irish have a new word for it, "Derrymander," taken from the example of the city of Derry. In that city 27,000 members of one group can elect only 8 city officials, while 18,000 recognized supporters of the other group can elect 12. Cookstown, county of Tyrone, illustrates the unfairness of representation of the minority. Fifteen hundred of the minority group can elect no representative to the Urban District Council, while 2,000 of the majority can elect 12.

Let me give you an evaluation of the Northern Irish Government, made, not by Irishmen but by Englishmen. In 1935 there was a series of riots in Belfast, in which over 500 families were driven by violence from their homes, many of their homes being burned by mobs. A British organization, the National Council for Civil Liberties, sent an observer to Belfast to report on affairs there. One thing he observed was that a large force of police, numbering about 100, backed up by armored cars and machine guns, did not seem able to control a mob bent on wrecking houses. The Council for Civil Liberties had this to say of the Special Powers Act, under which the northern government operates:

"Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. The abrogation of the rule of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedom of the subject into contempt.

"The Northern Irish Government has used special powers toward securing the domination of one particular political faction and, at the same time, toward curtailing the lawful activities of its opponents. The driving of legitimate movements under ground into illegality, the intimidating or branding as lawbreakers of their adherents, however innocent of crime, has tended to encourage violence and bigotry on the part of the Government's supporters.

"The Northern Irish Government, despite its assurances that special powers are intended for use only against lawbreakers, has frequently employed them against innocent and law-abiding people, often in humble circumstances, whose injuries, inflicted without cause or justification, have gone unrecompensed and disregarded."

That is the report of the observer sent from London by the British National Council for Civil Liberties. The observer was not reporting on Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia, but upon the six counties of the north of Ireland. The northern government has been operating on the Fascist model for 27 years; and the British Government, which set it up and which supports it, has not lifted a finger to do anything about it. Do you not think that the Irish Government has a case for refusing to join the Atlantic Pact while one of the signatories to the pact maintains such a monstrosity of a government in the north of Ireland?

Why do I bring all this out? Because it is going on right now, because it has gone on for 27 years, and Britain has not once taken action to stop it. The Irish Government is not nursing an old grievance. It is affronted at a continuing grievance. The Irish Government, if it enters the Atlantic Pact, has the right to expect that its partners in the pact shall deal fairly with it. If this is a pact designed to save peoples from dictatorships, Ireland has a right to expect that Britain shall do something about a dictatorship which began before Mussolini marched on Rome, before Stalin came to the Kremlin, before Hitler became Chancelor of the Reich. Ireland sees a part of its people taken from it, and subjected to oppression and persecution; and do we expect that its Government shall sit down with the Government that is the cause of this and say nothing about it?

Perhaps it may be urged that, considering the imminent peril to Christendom from the encroaching menace of Moscow, the Irish Government should take the attitude that it will waive the partition question in the face of a common danger. There are a couple of comments I would make on that. First, it is not just a grievance of the Irish Government, not just a territorial question that can wait for solution. Nearly half a million Irishmen are suffering persecution in the north. Can the Irish Government just brush them off? Is the Atlantic Pact based on respect for human rights or is it not? There is no government in the world that shows more regard for human rights than does the Irish Government. Would it be true to its principles if it let the human rights of its own fellow Irishmen go by default?

My second comment is this: If there is a moral obligation on the Irish Government to take part in the Atlantic Pact, irrespective of the treatment of the minority in the north, there is a double obligation on the British Government to do something about the northern situation. The northern government could not last a month without British support. The British Government must bear its share of the blame for keeping the discriminating government of the north in power. No one therefore can fairly demand that the Irish Government join the pact without at the same time demanding even more strongly that the British Government take steps to end the injustices it is condoning and supporting in the north.

If Ireland is asked to join the pact, it has a right to some proof of the good faith of its associates. What proof can the British Government offer so long as it continues to maintain in power the government that persecutes a minority?

No one who examines the map of the Atlantic can fail to see the commanding position that Ireland holds in any scheme of Atlantic defense. By its geographical location, Ireland holds a key position in guarding the approaches to Europe. It is to our own advantage, here in the United States, to help Ireland to take its part in the defense of the west. I hope that I have made this much clear: we cannot fairly demand Ireland's adherence to the pact without at the same time demanding that Britain do something to remove the continuing injustice which, for nearly 30 years, British-supported partition has inflicted upon Ireland. The member states should come into the pact with clean hands.

It would be strange, indeed, if the Government of Ireland were to be thought of as lacking in international understanding. Its record is, in fact, well above average when it comes to international understanding. Listen to these words of Mr. De Valera before the League of Nations, September 16, 1935, when the League was considering Mussolini's aggression against Abyssinia:

"The final test of the League and all that it stands for has come. Our conduct in this crisis will determine whether the League of Nations is worthy to survive, or whether it is better to let it lapse and disappear and be forgotten. Make no mistake, if on any pretext whatever we were to permit the sovereignty of even the weakest state amongst us to be unjustly taken away, the whole foundation of the League would crumble into dust. If the pledge of security is not universal, if it is not to apply to all impartially, if there is to be picking and choosing and jockeying and favoritism, if one aggressor is to be given a free hand while another is restrained, then it is far better that the old system of alliances should return and that each nation should do what it can for its own defense. Without universality the League can be only a snare. If the Covenant is not observed as a whole for all and by all, then there is no Covenant."

That was in 1935. Rarely has a prophecy in political affairs been so swiftly and so terribly fulfilled. Can we say that Ireland's stand is unreasonable today if it refuses to take part in an Atlantic Pact while one of the chief partners in the pact is engaged in active injustice against Ireland itself? Should we not rather take the Irish Government's stand as a warning against repeating in 1949 the folly of 1935?

Ireland's strength in its centuries-long struggle for freedom was mainly spiritual. Man for man and weapon for weapon, the oppressor was immeasurably stronger. But Ireland had what cannot be measured, the will to survive of a people determined to be free. The Irish never lost their faith in the things of the spirit. And their warning to us today is that we underrate spiritual values. When we sacrifice them to immediate, short-term material gains, we come out losers in the long run. Nothing can help us in our present struggle for men's souls so much as rigid adherence to justice, fair dealing, and the strictest respect for the rights of all men. Unless we hold by those, our victories will be pure illusion, for we shall be giving away the very things we are fighting to preserve.

Standing firm on its spiritual heritage, the Irish nation has in our own times achieved a new birth of freedom. One does not have to be very old to remember when such a birth of freedom for Ireland seemed the most remote and impractical and hopeless of fantastic dreams. Yet it has happened. We have seen it with our own eyes. If we can bring to the solution of our present seemingly hopeless world problems the courage and faith, the understanding of the human spirit and its needs that inspired Ireland's leaders, then we, too, may hope to see a new birth of freedom in this heartsick world.

Shipments of Manganese From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Tony Smith from the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1949:

HAS RUSSIA ALREADY QUIT SHIPPING US MANGANESE?

(By Tony Smith)

Russia may already have halted its shipments of vital, steel-making manganese to

this country, Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, said today.

Approximately 70 percent of this critical material comes from Russia.

The move has been rumored and reported for several weeks.

It was strongly indicated in the February import figures. They were 70 percent below the peak month of 1948 and considerably below average.

Representative MILLS, who comes from a minerals-producing State is sparking the drive in Congress to find domestic sources of manganese so that the country can be self-sufficient.

The House Public Lands Committee is considering one of his measures for that purpose, and an Armed Services Committee will take up another Mills bill as soon as Public Lands finishes.

CONGRESS WAS WARNED

Moscow's attempt to throttle the tremendous steel-producing machinery of the United States was inevitable after this country reduced its shipments of steel products, machine tools, oil, and other products Russia needs, to the vanishing point, according to Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

That action was taken over the vigorous objections of the State Department. Time and again in 1946 and 1947 representatives of Gen. George Marshall, former Secretary of State, warned Congressmen who wanted to raise the roof because they'd seen a Russian oil tanker loading up at a time of domestic shortages here.

State Department aides argued the oil going to Russia was only a drop compared with our total annual production. They said it was a small but important part of the price we were paying for vital strategic metals such as chrome and manganese.

Opinions differed widely on the effect of Russia's action. Iron Age, a publication put out by the industry, angrily accused the Soviets of trying to blackjack the United States into lifting its embargo on machine tools and steel.

"But the Red threat won't work," Iron Age said. "Government and industry have been aware of this possibility for nearly a year. They are prepared. * * * Supplies may be tight for awhile, but steel making will not suffer one iota."

The national metalworking weekly claimed Government stock piles could supply the industry for as long as 5 years.

OR SERIOUS SHORTAGE?

This view runs contrary to that of two Congressmen studying the situation. Representative MILLS estimated 1,300,000 long tons of manganese is stock-piled in the hands of private industry for the Government. He said this wouldn't be enough for even one full year at the present rate of production, which requires 1,700,000.

Representative CARL T. DURHAM, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Materials, agreed with Representative MILLS' estimate.

He said Russia's action has created a shortage of manganese in this country. Pointing out that steel can't be produced without it, Mr. DURHAM said it has placed the Nation in a "precarious condition."

"Not only because the need for steel in defense industry," he added, "but because of its importance to the entire national economy. When you consider how dependent this mechanized society of ours is on steel products, you'll see that any material essential to its production is the cornerstone."

Representative MILLS said the Russian cut in exports to this country came sooner and went deeper than expected. The intent was known here, but most officials thought the slow down would be more gradual.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, to our American people of Irish blood and ancestry, March 17 is more than a festive day of genial comradeship, or an occasion to sport a green tie or pocket handkerchief. It is a memorial to the gallant spirit and undaunted religious faith of a people who resisted oppression.

In our world of today, we see about us on every side many forces striking at the very roots of our independent existence. The philosophies are many which are advanced in our times to minimize our cherished spiritual beliefs. We see the religious of all faiths and creeds an ever-increasing target of attack. These men and women whose altruistic motives best exemplify man at his best, are badgered, tortured, and imprisoned for seeking to instill recognition of our dependency on God, rather than the state.

It should be heartening to all that the mind, despite the trials of this life, can triumph over the sword and the lash. We should be comforted in these days of worry over world crises, that we will triumph over the powers threatening our security, just as surely as did the valiant sons of St. Patrick.

Contribution of the Irish to the Development of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the world men and women of Irish blood are pausing to pay tribute to the great patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick.

On this great day it is well to dwell for a moment on the contribution of this great race to our Nation. The true contribution of the Irish can never be measused; the blood of their sons has enriched every battle ground. They fought gallantly in the War of Independence. They fought, too, for the preservation of the Union. They were at the Alamo in Texas and at Custer's last stand. The casualty lists of World War I and II contain the names of thousands of Americans of Irish descent who valiantly gave their all for a better world.

In every field of endeavor the Irish-American has left an indelible imprint on American life: in the arts and sciences, in the field of business, in all the professions, in the Halls of Congress, and every legislative chamber in the land.

It is impossible to enumerate the countless Irish-Americans who have individually contributed so much to the development of our Nation. Their names will be forever enshrined in the heart of America.

The amazing thing about it all is that the small nation known as Ireland should produce so many capable people who could contribute so much to our Nation—so much beyond what could be expected when considering numerical strength.

Gentlemen, I believe that the answer to it all is faith—an abiding faith unparalleled in history. No people have ever exceeded the loyalty and faith of the Irish and their burning love of liberty. This faith was handed down by the great St. Patrick. Fifteen centuries have failed to dim the devotion of the Irish to the heritage of the great apostle.

I believe it would be well for us all on this day to rededicate ourselves to the teachings of St. Patrick as exemplified in the Irish as a race.

Fidelity to God, devotion to liberty, preservation of human rights—the teaching of St. Patrick—the belief of the Irish should be ever in our hearts.

The Clarkson Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by Prof. Andrew S. Ormsby, of Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y., because it deals directly with Senate bill 249. The approach that Professor Ormsby takes is, I think, a rather unusual one and one which has not been discussed too much in consideration of this legislation. He writes from the point of view of the effect of the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act on the worker himself rather than upon the employer or upon the union organizer.

Professor Ormsby, before joining Clarkson as head of the department of business administration, was director of industrial relations for Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp.'s seven plants. Prior to that he served as general counsel for Bendix-Westinghouse Co., and as staff assistant in charge of industrial relations for Bendix Aviation Corp. During the recent war he served as industry representative on the National War Labor Board. Educated at Pittsburgh, Xavier, and Columbia Universities, he brings a wide background of academic training and professional experience to bear on the consideration of currently proposed labor legislation.

The article appears in the April-May issue of Clarkson College's publication, the Clarkson Letter:

WHAT CONGRESS WOULD DO TO AMERICAN LABOR

(By Andrew S. Ormsby, professor and head, department of business administration, Clarkson College of Technology)

If Congress passes the proposed Senate bill 249, regarded as the administration bill, aided and abetted by officials of union-labor organizations, there will be perpetrated a rank injustice against the American worker. If this bill passes, it will take away from employees freedoms they now legally have. These freedoms are greater than they have enjoyed at any time during this century.

DO FOR YOUR EMPLOYEES

In the very early twenties some executives tried to recapture their individual contacts with employees through welfare schemes, employee-representation plans (company unions) and other paternalistic ideas. There evolved the philosophy of "Do what you must for your employees and fight the labor leaders wherever you find them with every conceivable device or method, whether that method or device be fair or foul."

In this battle some managements went pretty far. This made the union officials pretty angry. The union officials, having governmental support, did a masterful job and succeeded in having the Wagner Labor Act passed.

The Wagner Act outlawed the company union, especially where it was found to be company supported or dominated. The act contained many features which strengthened the union organizers' position. In addition, those selected to administer it definitely favored the union officials. Through the enlarged powers brought about by the act and its administration some union officials became very dictatorial.

Managements, in many cases, realized their impotency in the field of labor-management relations. In taking stock of the situation they yielded to many demands; the purposes of which were to build the hierarchy of the unions, often to the detriment of their own workers and supervisors. Managements in some cases made deals and agreed to the building up of the prestige of union officers through such things as superseniority for union officers and stewards. In such instances, union officials had greater employment-security privileges, in the event of lay-offs, than did employees having much longer records of service. In other cases, union officials and stewards were granted privileges of going anywhere in the plant—under the guise of investigating grievances—and were paid by the company. In still other instances, the companies gave privileges to the union hierarchy far greater than they gave to their own foreman. In one company's contract, the foreman was required to introduce new workers in his department to the union steward for an indoctrination before the man could go to work.

DO FOR THE UNION LEADERS

This tendency to curry the favor of the union officials was leading to the philosophy of "Forget the employees, let's do all we can for the union leaders." The workingman saw this and he didn't like it. He didn't like being herded into a union by the negotiations of his employer and the union leaders. He realized that in order to be able to work he was required to submit to the control of the labor leaders. Frequently his employer had helped to bring this about. He didn't like having his whole economic existence placed in the hands of the union bosses any more than he liked having it subject to the whims and caprices of the management.

He saw that because of the closed shop, union shop, or the maintenance-of-membership shop, his fellow workers who spoke out against some of the situations which appeared to him to be wrong were charged with conduct unbecoming a member, suspended from the union, and dismissed from their jobs. He learned that to secure a job, in some cases, he had to pay money to join a union or obtain a work permit for a fee, before he could even apply for work. He saw instances where the union officials did not pay much attention to the grievances of the workers, and that he couldn't do anything about it. He didn't like these conditions—and as a result, he talked to some of his friends in political positions, very cautiously and fearfully lest he suffer reprisals, but he talked to them nevertheless.

Some political leaders listened, and as early as December 1941 a bill to amend the Wagner Act was passed in the House, but it was pigeonholed when it reached the Senate. Things grew worse. Power begot power. Abuses became greater.

DOWN THE MIDDLE

Finally, in the last session of Congress and in many State legislatures, laws were passed which freed workers from many of the abuses that they had experienced. On the Federal level, the workers gained this freedom through the Labor-Management Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act of 1947. As a result of this law, employers had to review their philosophy in dealing with their employees and there began to emerge a pattern which can be expressed as "Do what you can for your employees and get along with the labor leaders." This law, having curbed the absolute power of the union officials and having restored to the American worker freedom such as he has not had in this century, was appreciated by many of the rank-and-file employees.

Let us make no mistake about it, workers want their union, they want the advantages of such affiliation but they do not like being pushed around by any group, be it the employers, the union leaders, or the politicians.

What are the freedoms which I assert the American worker now has by law that would be lost to him if the proposed S. 249 were passed as written?

WILL WORKERS LOSE THESE FREEDOMS?

1. His right to determine for himself, without threats, intimidation, or coercion from any source, what union, if any, he wants to represent him as the collective-bargaining agent. Those who have seen organizational drives in process can well understand what this means. To free themselves from such threats and coercion many workers joined and had union cards of several unions in their pockets during such campaigns.

2. It would take away from the employee his freedom to look for work without having to join any organization or pay for a working permit, even before he applies for work. It might be well to add that the railroad brotherhoods have grown into a powerful union, without the necessity of a closed-shop provision.

3. It takes away from him the democratic freedom of expression if he doesn't like what is going on in his union. He would again have to be subservient to hold his job.

4. The proposed law takes away the right of the worker to decide how he wishes to pay his union dues. Now he can pay them the same as he pays all other bills, after he receives his check or, if he agrees to it, the employer can deduct his dues from his pay and turn them directly over to the union. Note that it is the worker, and he alone, who decides the method.

If the present bill is passed as written, he no longer will have that right—the employer and the union will decide it for him.

The Railway Labor Act prohibits the check-off, even if an employee wants it.

5. This proposed bill takes away the right an employee now has by law to determine whether he prefers to work under a union shop or a maintenance-of-membership shop. He has a right to vote on the matter.

The theory of the law being that the union is the bargaining agent of the workers, why shouldn't the worker (the legal principal) have a right to say under what conditions he prefers to work.

6. Following this one step further, why shouldn't the worker (the legal principal) continue to have the right of removal of the union (the legal agent) if the union is not doing the kind of job the worker thinks it should? In the proposed bill that right of decertification of the union is taken away from him.

7. Why should the worker's right to process a grievance without the aid of union officials be taken away from him? Is he not the principal? Why should he have to ask his agent to do it, if he doesn't want to? The union, under the present act, is already amply protected.

8. Why should the workman lose the right he now legally has to know how his money is used? Why shouldn't his agents account for its expenditure? He has this right in other organizations, why not in the union which is his?

9. Why not keep his home free from attachment in satisfying a judgment against a union in a damage suit? Workers' homes have been sold in the past to satisfy damage suit judgments. The law as it is now protects the worker—why not continue to give him that protection?

10. Why not retain for craft and professional workers their present right to determine whether they want to be separate or included with a larger group in which there may be little or no community of interest?

11. Why not permit workers to continue to enjoy the rights they now have by law to go to the National Labor Relations Board and file charges against a union or an employer for an unfair labor practice?

S. 249

The American worker now having by law certain rights and freedoms should not have those rights taken away from him as is proposed in S. 249, because in doing so the administration and the Senate, aided and abetted by the union officials, will do the American worker a gross injustice. Certainly there has been no evidence that the American workman does not know how to use these rights, nor that he has in any way abused them.

What Atomic Energy May Mean to Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Atomic Energy May Mean to Industry," by Mr. Walker L. Cisler, the executive vice president of the Detroit Edison Co. I made the request on March 16, neglecting to obtain the appropriate estimate. I now have the estimate of $195.25. I resubmit the request with the estimate. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The full significance of what atomic energy may mean to industry can only be answered by prophets. And I am no prophet. However, I shall try to describe some of my own impressions of the atomic energy enterprise. These impressions may afford clues which will enable you to form your own ideas about future prospects.

During the past 2 years I have had a number of intimate contacts with atomic energy affairs. For a period of many months I have served as a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission and have been deeply interested in what it is attempting to accomplish in the industrial field. The first work of this kind was to help in devising a control system to regulate traffic in equipment useful in the production of fissionable materials. The regulations for this purpose were authorized by the McMahon Act. They were designed mainly to prevent any unfriendly country from getting apparatus from our manufacturers that would help in a rival atomic project abroad.

I should say here that our experience in the War Production Board was extremely useful in developing these regulations for the Atomic Energy Commission. In WPB days, you remember, our whole economy was regulated by orders of this character, and formal and informal industry advisory groups were used very freely to assist that Federal agency in its work. These groups gave the Government the benefit of industry experience; the Government in turn used the committees to get its point of view across. Finally, in the actual administration of the control orders, these industry representatives helped keep things running smoothly and fairly.

The Atomic Energy Commission is following this tested and proven method of handling its difficult regulatory work. It is very reassuring that the Commission finds it possible to maintain this conventional system of Government-industry relations in spite of the secrecy and other very special conditions affecting atomic energy.

More recently, I have had some part in the work of another kind of advisory group. This one was concerned not with regulatory matters but with the more general question of industry's role in the whole broad field of nuclear development. It was the committee set up by the Commission under the chairmanship of James Parker, president of my company, and it included such distinguished industrialists as Isaac Harter of Babcock & Wilcox, Robert Wilson of Standard Oil of Indiana, and others.

As you may know, this industrial advisory group spent the better part of a year on a study of the Atomic Energy Commission. Its report on the subject of industrial participation in the development of atomic energy was made public last December. Copies of that document can doubtless be obtained from the Commission, and I was pleased to learn the other day that it is also reprinted in full in the March issue of Mechanical Engineering—the publication of one of our great professional organizations, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

That organization, by the way, is attempting to do a job in connection with atomic energy which in my opinion other technical professional societies ought to be doing for their members. Through its nuclear energy application committee, the ASME is planning a vigorous program to keep its members in touch with technological developments, to make special studies of interest to them in this field, and to try to develop useful working relationships with the Government agencies. These are not easy tasks as I think will become clear to you as we go along this evening.

Getting back to the question of what atomic energy may mean to industry, probably the best introduction can be obtained by studying the Parker committee report. Along with it you should read the Commissions's excellent fifth semiannual report to the Congress which appeared in January.

At any rate, as a result of the long period of my consulting service with the Commission and the more recent work with its industrial advisory group, I have personally had an unusual opportunity to see the atomic-energy project at first hand. It has been an absorbing experience. When you once get a close-range exposure to the atom, the subject very quickly becomes a preoccupation, and that is the way it has been with me.

While engaged in these two Commission assignments, it was necessary for me to visit and inspect the major installations at Oak Ridge, Hanford, Los Alamos, the Argonne, and elsewhere. It was also necessary for me to talk with leading scientists and technicians who are associated in the Commission's activities. In the course of my work, therefore, I have been privileged to observe the chief activities of the Commission, and to get a personal look at many of its problems.

Without that experience, I am sure that I would have only a very confused and sketchy conception of our atomic-energy enterprise. Because of it, I believe that I have a fairly clear picture of it. The information that I have acquired is, of course, subject to security restrictions which means that I can only discuss that part of it which is not secret.

My experience as an individual, however, is to be contrasted with that of industry. Up to now industry generally has not been able to get a broad, intimate knowledge of atomic energy. In this connection I should like to describe the experience of my own industry—the electric utilities, a term which in my thinking includes both the privately and the publicly owned electric systems.

Shortly after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Japan, members of the electric-utility industry realized that in time this new source of energy might very well revolutionize the production of power. A number of leading utility engineers and executives, therefore, formed a committee—this was back in 1945—to make an intensive investigation of the new field of technology. This group made many attempts to carry on the inquiry. It sought out the scientists and technicians who had worked on the project during the war. It talked to Government officials. But it never got very far.

So, as soon as Mr. Pike and his associates organized and started to work in 1947, that utility group asked to meet and talk with the Atomic Energy Commission. On that occasion, not quite 2 years ago, these members of the industry had a long session with Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. Pike, and their fellow commissioners. They described to these officials the futile efforts of our industry to study atomic energy. The Smyth report—published right after the first bomb—had given just enough information to show that the subject was of vital concern to the electric utilities. Beyond that there was everywhere a wall of secrecy.

It was very difficult for people who had been brought up in the power industry to resign themselves to these conditions. In the past, the electric utilities have always had an important part in the development of the equipment which they use to generate power. Progressive utility systems customarily work closely with such manufacturers as General Electric, Westinghouse, and Allis Chalmers, and the scientists and engineers employed by them. In that way, we who buy and use the equipment collaborate with those who produce it. The complementary skills and experience of manufacturer and user thus combine to promote research and development in new and better types of machines and facilities.

One has only to compare the efficiency of today's electric generating equipment with that of a quarter century ago to observe the benefits of this collaboration. America's phenomenal war production, the atomic energy project itself, and our remarkable postwar output—including support of the Marshall plan—owe much to the efficiency and adequacy of our electric-power supply. It is no exaggeration to say that the cooperation between maker and user of electrical equipment has been a prime factor in giving us this rich resource of power.

Now, of course, I would not press too far the analogy between development of conventional electric-power equipment and atomic energy. Nuclear energy is quite a different thing from ordinary sources of energy, namely, thermal energy from gaseous, liquid, and solid fuels, and hydraulic energy from falling water. It involves a radically new technology. It is surrounded by considerations of national security and necessary secrecy for which we seem to have no precedent in our political or industrial history.

At the same time the two subjects have some things in common. Various official sources have predicted that it is only a matter of years before we will be able to produce electric energy from atomic fuel. Just a few weeks ago, Commissioner Bacher, in the most impressive paper that has thus far appeared on nuclear reactors—these are the plants that burn atomic fuel—suggests that within 8 or 10 years we should have such a reactor. He points out, however, that for nuclear energy to have any significant impact upon the country as a source of electrical energy would take much longer, even granting economic feasibility.

But the point that I wish to emphasize is this. These matters are of the greatest interest not only to the utility industry, but to every industry that uses heat and power.

Indeed, all industry has an interest in such questions as:

When will heat-power reactors in fact be a practical reality?

What will be their relative economy as compared with other sources of thermal or hydraulic energy?

What will be their first commercial application?

What will be their relative safety?

Will they be exclusively in Government hands or under license to private enterprise as well?

The way in which these and a host of other questions are answered may well depend on the degree to which industry is permitted to work with Government during the research and development phase through which we are now passing. For example, whether results are achieved speedily or only slowly may well depend on the extent to which interested segments of industry are permitted to help.

All of this may seem a rather lengthy digresson from that meeting with the Commissioners to which I referred. At that meeting—nearly 2 years ago—between representatives of the utility industry and the Atomic Energy Commission, the industry people presented their problem. They explained that ever since the Smyth report, the industry had been endeavoring to study atomic energy. They said that they were trying to determine what opportunities it held; that the utilities hoped to be able to take a healthy part in furthering the development of nuclear energy just as in previous decades they had had a share in perfecting equipment in the field of steam and water-power generation. But, they explained, they had not been able so far to find out enough about atomic energy to make any significant progress.

Observing that one of the stated purposes of the McMahon Act was strengthening free

competition in private enterprise, the utility representatives asked the Commission whether a way could not be found to open this field to our industry. In response, the Commissioners cited the overriding objectives of the McMahon Act to assure the common defense and security. Obviously, secrecy restrictions would be necessary as long as the world remained in its present troubled state. But the Commission also expressed the hope that a way could be found to reconcile these seemingly conflicting objectives of industry participation and secrecy.

Much valuable time has passed. Since then the utilities have pretty much had to stand still as far as this subject is concerned. This observation is not a criticism of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is merely a statement of fact. The hard fact is that insofar as reactor development is concerned, the power industry, which is so vitally interested, has practically no more first-hand knowledge now than it had 2 years ago. It has been left in a state of wonder.

Again let me emphasize, this is not said in criticism of the Commission. But in attempting to judge what atomic energy may mean to industry, it is very important to bear this in mind. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for atomic energy to mean very much to industry unless industry can know what the developments are when they occur—not afterward, can have some direct part in them, and can employ industrial ingenuity, resources, and organization in contriving ways to promote new developments and to make use of them.

It is, of course, true that in one sense atomic energy already has a considerable immediate importance for business. The Government is spending nearly a billion dollars annually on its atomic program. Much of this sum is spent directly with industry, through the thousands of contracts which the Atomic Energy Commission has with various private concerns.

But most of this contract work does not really let industry in on atomic energy. A good deal of it is straight procurement; that is, contracting for the equipment and supplies which the Atomic Energy Commission needs. Much of it is in construction contracts. Some goes to the industrial concerns which run the Government reservations at Oak Ridge and Hanford and Los Alamos—a kind of company-town arrangement. Another portion goes to the companies which operate the Government's production plants at these locations.

In short, as Fortune magazine said in a recent article on the Commission, a large part of the billion-dollar annual budget is spent under contractual arrangements which make industry a hired hand of government.

Now, it is a very good thing that industry is the hired hand in these undertakings. The Atomic Energy Commission has everywhere been commended for its practice of doing its work through contractors, rather than through the building up of an immense Government force. But when the question is asked, "What part may industry have in atomic energy?" there is obviously the hope that there will be more to the answer than, "Hired hand."

Up to now the prospect that industry might be something more than a hired hand in the important aspects of atomic energy has not been too bright. In a few areas, industry has been given an opportunity to operate more or less on its own. This is true in the manufacture of compounds containing radio isotopes. It is true in the general use by industry of radio isotopes for industrial research and for industrial controls. And a rather thriving little industry has sprung up in the postwar manufacture of radiation-detection instruments.

The Government has also been able to give industry a pretty free hand in the mining, milling, and processing of the essential raw material—uranium. In fact, earlier this month, Mr. Pike spoke to a meeting of the Colorado Mining Association and pointed out some very promising opportunities for enterprising miners. At the conclusion of that address, he expressed the pious hope, as he put it, that 5 years from now some of you will be coming to these meetings in gold-plated limousines to be greeted as the new kings of uranium. Such is the spirit of free opportunity which has helped to make our country so great.

Personally, I know Mr. Pike to be a sound and honest merchant and I am satisfied that he was not overselling the Colorado miners. It's good to reaffirm that spirit.

So there are some places in the atomic-energy picture where private concerns, which are qualified to do the work, can make an effective, competitive attempt to take part. All this is healthy. But it is very important to remember that these are the only areas in which something like free enterprise is functioning in connection with the new activities which atomic energy has stimulated.

It has frequently been suggested that in one of these presently open areas—the use of radio isotopes—there is the most promising opportunity of all for rich new developments. These are as yet largely unidentified and undefined, although they are confidently predicted. For my own part, I think that in this direction industry has much to look forward to. These developments, however, will not be necessarily connected with atomic energy: they will rather be a by-product of the new research tool, radio isotopes. Radio isotopes are expected to father multitudes of new discoveries, just as the microscope did.

In the field of atomic energy itself, the main hope for developments of interest to industry resides, of course, in the application of atomic energy to the production of heat and power. This is what the electric utilities are naturally most interested in. Because of the nature of the technological problems and opportunities, a lot of other important industries are also vitally concerned. Notable among these are the chemical, petroleum, and heat transfer equipment, metallurgical and instrument industries.

One of the large unanswered questions about reactor development is: How much opportunity will industry get to take part? The Commission tells us that next year it will spend more than $100,000,000 on its reactor program. That is a big program, and the application of atomic energy to the production of heat and power on a large scale hinges on the success of that program, which will require a period of years to produce substantial results.

My faith in the American industrial system makes me bold enough to believe that the success of that reactor program in turn depends on how well we bring to it the lessons of our long and brilliant record of technological progress in other fields.

At present a few industrial concerns are importantly engaged in working on reactors. General Electric, a main contractor for the Commission, is scheduled to construct and operate one of the four new reactors which constitute a central part of the Commission's program for the next few years. Another of the new reactors is to be in charge of Westinghouse which will have a Commission contract for this purpose.

But it is not clear whether and to what extent other industrial concerns and other interested industries will be permitted to take part. Even more important, it is not clear whether they will be permitted to keep intimately abreast of developments. As I have already tried to explain, atomic energy cannot come to mean very much to American industry, as we know it, unless American industry is enabled to have an integral part in developments as they occur. Only in that way can industry take benefits from and contribute benefits to atomic energy developments.

This point was made very emphatically in the report of the Parker industrial advisory group. After describing some of the Commission's more important unsolved technological problems—including that of reactor development—the report went on to say:

"Success in finding solutions for comparable problems in other fields of technology has come about through energetic attack by many competing firms and individuals rather than by any select group. The Commission's contract system—though it includes some of the country's ablest industrial organizations—is not by itself a real substitute for this process."

Then the report attempted to explain more concretely just how the right process worked:

"An illustration of the process in miniature can be observed in the experience of our own small group. In the course of our survey we, that is, the industrial advisory group, were consulted informally by the Commission or its contractors on problems with which they were confronted. One or another of our number, drawing upon his particular industrial background, was able more than once to suggest a helpful new approach toward solution. The suggestions reflected no superior talent but merely the fact that occasionally the specific background of certain individuals furnished a different clue from those discerned by the men already at work on the subject."

From these first-hand experiences, the advisory group then drew conclusions in the following terms:

"The need, as Mr. Lilienthal has said, is to bring the resources of industry to bear on atomic energy with maximum effect. This means that all those industries which are potentially interested must somehow become broadly and deeply involved. The suggestions that a few industrialists may make on casual contact are obviously insignificant as compared with the possible contributions that all these industries could make if the opportunity were available to them."

The Parker group makes it perfectly clear, however, that the process is two-sided. Potentially industry has much to give in developing this new field. But it should also have much to gain. And later on in the report there is this account of an experience which illustrates the other side of the coin:

"One of our number is at present in charge of an important specific industrial research and development project. Among the knotty unanswered questions in his project is one relating to the type of coolant to be used. During our survey (of the Commission), he observed, first hand, a unique process that was being worked on in one of the Commission's laboratories to solve a problem which also related to coolants. The Commission's work immediately suggested to him a new avenue of approach to his own special-research problem. He remarked at the time that even had he read about the Commission's investigation in the technical journals the chances are that he would have missed the connection with his own investigations. Direct personal contact with the work in the atomic energy laboratory gave him the concrete experience necessary to see a relationship that he would otherwise have missed."

The lesson in this example should also be clear:

"The experience just described (the report continues) is in itself a rather trivial incident. Yet it is out of a multitude of such trivial incidents, experienced by many people, that the massive forward movement of technology takes place. It is for this reason that we emphasize that the most comprehensive and competent reporting by the Commission will fail of its purpose unless it is complemented by extensive individual, personal contacts between qualified technologists, industry leaders, and Commission personnel and work."

These, I think, are very forceful statements of the need for establishing extensive con-

tacts between our atomic-energy developments and the industrial world. But what about the requirements of secrecy? Reactor development—the field of most vital interest to industry—is also an area where requirements of Government monopoly and secrecy appear to be very strict.

We get back, therefore, to that dilemma which confronted the Commission and the utility people at their meeting 2 years ago: How to reconcile a healthy competitive industrial participation in atomic energy with the admitted necessity for some Government monopoly and much secrecy.

Perhaps the most important feature of the report of Mr. Parker's industrial advisory group is its hopeful exposition of a number of ways by which the objective of wider industrial participation could be fitted in with these requirements.

The industrial advisory group report contained enthusiastic approval of the progress which the Atomic Energy Commission has made along many lines. It did suggest, however, that the Commission should make a still more strenuous effort along several fronts for the purpose of encouraging and promoting industrial participation. And it set forth the preconditions for such participation essentially as follows:

1. Industry must be given more knowledge of the subject;

2. It must have more—much more—direct contact with the developmental work; and

3. It must have much more involvement in that work.

These are the roads that must be opened up to industry if it is to recognize and take advantage of opportunities to participate and to help.

To this end, the report urged the Commission to increase the publication of information about atomic energy in a form useful to industry. It urged the Commission to develop a program by which engineers, technicians, and executives in industries which have a legitimate interest in the field can be brought directly in touch with the atomic-energy enterprise. It urged the Commission to expand its system of industrial advisory committees, thus emulating the practice of the War Production Board. As I observed a while ago, that agency used these committees with great effectiveness, both to educate industry about the war-production program and for the purpose of obtaining advice from industry.

None of these proposals need cause any conflict with the requirements of secrecy or limited Government monopoly.

During the past year the Commission has itself found it possible to step up declassification and publication of nonsecret data. Recently there has been a considerable acceleration in this activity. The fifth semiannual report to Congress is in itself a notable example of publication of material which should be of use to industry in keeping abreast of atomic-energy developments. Dr. Bacher's paper on reactors is another. The announcement that in the near future a comprehensive Commission report on reactor developments will be published is even more important.

All these efforts on the part of the Commission seem to me deserving of highest praise. I think they are calculated as time goes on to promote more and more industrial participation.

It should also be possible—as the Parker group urges—to permit a good many more representatives of interested industries to have personal access to the atomic energy work. These people would be subject to the same security checks and obligations as the AEC contractors and consultants now are. With such safeguards, their intimate contact with the program should not imperil necessary secrecy in any way.

It can be inferred from the Commission's response to the industrial advisory report, that it now has under active consideration a number of additional measures more or less in line with the recommendations of the Parker group. But this welcome initiative on the part of the Government will not alone produce results. Industry will never attain a more significant role in atomic affairs unless industry, too, contributes a considerable amount of initiative and enterprise.

Experienced newspapermen will tell you that despite the barriers of secrecy which surround atomic energy, it is nevertheless possible to do a good job of reporting on atomic energy events. But these journalists will also tell you that in order to do a good job in the face of these barriers, they must be willing to work two or three times as hard. They must be willing to spend two or three times as much time in getting a story as they would in the case of a more conventional subject.

I think the same ratio will hold true for industrial rewards in this field. For example, it will take a great deal of work on the part of industry to make use of the additional material which the Atomic Energy Commission is now publishing. The Commission is obviously endeavoring to put the information out in a form that will be clear and useful to industry. But the subject matter is unfamiliar and difficult. Until industry acquires a background, therefore, it will have to make a special effort to digest and understand what the Commission publishes.

The proposed program to bring more outside industrial technologists and executives into direct personal contact with atomic energy work would also be full of difficulties. The program would not be feasible at all unless our leading industrialists pitch in energetically to cooperate with the Commission in setting it up and in making it work.

The same thing holds true for industrial advisory committees. If and when the Commission begins to use them more widely, they will only be useful if interested industrial concerns make their most competent executives and engineers available for membership.

But in my opinion, it is essential that industry be alert to opportunities for making such a special investment of time, effort, and talent in atomic energy affairs. Industry should not expect that by following this course it will secure quick or spectacular results. Atomic energy is likely to be an increasingly important force for peace as well as war. But results will come not suddenly but gradually. During the present developmental stages industry must be prepared to get into the work without the inducement of immediate rewards. Unless industry does this now—and this is the point that needs to be emphasized most strongly—it is not likely to have an important voice in atomic affairs later on.

The prospects for industry in atomic energy have thus far been somewhat dim. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, is making a special effort to bring industry more actively into the picture. It is apparently prepared to make still greater exertions in this direction. If industry will respond—with initiative, energy, and aggressiveness—then I think the prospects for industry can become very bright.

Domestic Economic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chester, Pa., on March 17, 1949, before the Manufacturers' Association of Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to come to beautiful, historic, and industrial Delaware County.

Here the first permanent settlement in Pennsylvania was begun by the Swedes in 1643, 40 years before the arrival of the Quakers.

Here was established the first seat of the government of Pennsylvania, where William Penn presided. Your historic courthouse in Chester is the oldest public building in our State.

Revolutionary battles were fought on the soil of Delaware County. It is the last resting place of Gen. Anthony Wayne, one of America's greatest soldiers. It is the birthplace of Benjamin West, the famous painter; John Bartram, the noted botanist; and of John Morton, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Delaware County's famous colleges—Swarthmore, Villanova, and many others—and its strongholds of religion have given your people high cultural and spiritual attainments.

Industrially, your county is highly developed for peace and war work. Your annual production in shipbuilding, oil refining, textiles, locomotives, paper, electrical-equipment machinery, steel castings, and many other lines of manufacture, reaches the enormous peacetime total of nearly $800,000,000. These industries give gainful employment to about 100,000 people.

Mineral products and the yield from your 25,000 acres devoted to agriculture add more millions to your balanced economy. The total is considerably greater than the total of many States of the Union.

The splendid material, cultural and spiritual development of Delaware County is a typical example of American progress and achievement. It is the success story of American enterprise, initiative and industry, working, saving, investing and prospering in an atmosphere of freedom. Thus the general welfare has been advanced through the years.

This pattern, repeated thousands of times in large and small communities is responsible for the greatness of America. It has given our country a foremost position among the nations of the world.

Delaware County people are interested in good, clean, economical and forward-looking government.

In America the people are the government but they must take a sincere and active interest in the affairs of government if they are to control it.

The people must fully understand and give unselfish consideration to every proposal if they are to continue to direct their government. Otherwise the Government will direct them.

I think the following will be accepted by all of us as self-evident truths:

1. The American system of government has produced more of the good things of life for more people than any other government ever established.

2. Our greatness as a Nation rests upon the freedom and dignity of the individual. These are God-given rights. Our mightiest secret weapon during war is our freedom. In peacetime freedom gives us the right and the opportunity to pursue our own happiness and security.

3. Americans can preserve individual freedom only by constant vigilance. We cannot be free unless we appreciate the blessings of freedom and accept the obligations it imposes.

4. An America, divided into sections, groups, and races, will be destroyed. We

cannot survive if we are divided by jealousy, hatred, and prejudice. We are weakened if one section, group or class profits at the expense of another.

5. Governments that spend beyond their means can go broke, the same as individuals.

With these truths in mind let us consider briefly some of the things endangering our way of life.

In America today a great war is in progress. The outcome of that conflict will decide whether we are to continue as a Nation of individual freedom and self reliance under free enterprise or whether we are to live under the Socialistic domination of an all-powerful government.

The opposing forces in this struggle represent two widely separated philosophies of government. One proclaims that America can achieve greater progress through centralization of government at the Federal level. Its followers believe in the concentration of power and authority, supported by high taxes and the unlimited expenditure of public funds under the direct control of the central government.

The other army is composed of those who advocate prudent and economical government within the framework of the Constitution. They believe that local government should retain control of those functions which have been traditionally recognized as matters for local determination at the local level.

The opposing camps are not divided along strict political lines. The fight for higher taxes, bigger spending and encroachment upon individual freedom is being waged by some Republicans as well as the Democratic Party now in power.

I am glad to say that there are some Democrats like Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and his supporters, who are battling on the side of economy, lower taxes, and constitutional government.

The Eighty-first Congress is the battleground in this conflict. As you are well aware, those believing in unrestricted spending are in control of the national purse-strings.

Unfortunately, we have witnessed in the last 2 decades a change in the whole thinking of millions of our people. They have been misled by false promises into believing that hard work and thrift are outmoded virtues. They have been taught that government is the source of everything that is needed to make life comfortable and secure.

No more dangerous theory has ever threatened our national existence.

In all history every demagogue who has sought to enlarge and perpetuate selfish power has posed as a friend and benefactor of the people—and has pretended, for selfish motives, to be the protector of every minority group.

Every demagogue has been loud in his promise to give something to the people but has concealed his real purpose to take precious liberty away from the people.

The tragic fact remains that the trend toward a socialistic form of government is interwoven with the false notion that government is better able to do things for the people than they can do for themselves.

Too many of our people have accepted the idea that governments, State and national, have inexhaustible sources of revenue. They seem to think that money spent by the Government does not cost the individual citizen anything.

The result has been a mad scramble for higher taxes all over the country. New ways and means of increasing taxation are being devised in order to provide funds for bigger Government spending. Every level of Government is involved in this move to dig deeper and deeper into the pockets of the wage earner and into the resources of business and productive industry.

Tax and tax, spend and spend, has become the slogan in so many places all over the Nation.

The statistics of the rapid increase in the cost of Government and the heavily increased burden of taxation and debt reveal one of the most shocking stories in American history.

It is not my purpose to bore you with a recital of all the figures, but I would like to point out some of the things that indicate clearly how dangerous the present tendency has become.

In 1930 the cost of operating the Federal Government was less than $4,000,000,000.

Ten years later it had more than doubled to $9,000,000,000. Our current bill for Federal Government is more than $42,000,000,000 a year.

In 1940, only 8 years ago, tax collections for all levels of Government were only $14,000,000,000. That was nearly 19 percent of the national income or $109 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In 1948 the total tax collections had skyrocketed to above 55 billion, 26 percent of the national income or $377 for each individual man, woman, and child.

Every time $1,000,000,000 was added to the cost of Government, the tax bill went up $7 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, or $28 for the average family of four.

Spending by the Federal Government alone is now greater than all the money spent for food by all the people of all the 48 States.

Let us now consider the debt which must be paid.

In 1930 the Federal debt was only $16,000,000,000. In 1940 it had climbed to nearly $43,000,000,000, and today we owe approximately $253,000,000,000.

That is about $1,800 per capita, or $7,500 for the average family.

In other words, the Federal Government owes $15 for every dollar it owed 18 years ago.

Let us look at the debt from another angle.

In 1930, the total debt of all levels of government—plus the private debt—was $188,000,000,000.

That was 44 percent of the national wealth, which then amounted to $428,000,000,000.

Today the same public and private debt has shot up to almost $444,000,000,000, or 71 percent of the present national wealth of $620,000,000,000.

Is it not plainly evident that at the rate we are going it will not be long before the debt of our country will be greater than our national wealth?

Yet, in spite of these cold, stark, ugly facts, the President has recommended new spending proposals that would add a minimum of $14,000,000,000 annually to the present tax burden if put into full operation.

With the expansion of big government, the number of civilian employees has increased from about 600,000 in 1930, to approximately 2,200,000 today.

In 1930 there were less than 500 separate units in the Federal Government. Today there are more than 1,800 boards, bureaus, agencies, and commissions.

Is it any wonder that the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, testifying before a congressional committee on January 24 of this year said:

"The present Government structure is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies. * * *

"It is an ideal system for tax-eaters and for those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public pay roll—but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill."

We have been told how part of the burden can be lifted from the backs of the taxpayers. The Hoover Commission has estimated that reorganization of the Executive Department alone would result in a saving estimated at $3,000,000,000 a year.

I cannot take your time to discuss the continually increasing spending, taxes, and debt at the other levels of government, but the figures show that the same infection is spreading through State and local government all over the Nation.

What does all this mean?

It means, first of all, that unless we stop this drunken spending spree we will soon find ourselves at the end of the road we have been traveling—the road to bankruptcy.

All the elements of American greatness will be destroyed. A socialistic pattern of government dictatorship will seize control. The freedom of the individual will be lost. The free-enterprise system will be wiped out.

The youth of America will be robbed of a chance to get ahead. Already we have reached a situation where the young man of today, starting from scratch and looking forward to a career in business, has little or no opportunity to establish himself in a small way. That is how many in this audience started and have succeeded.

I tell you that it is downright immoral to deprive our young men and young women of the opportunities that were open to every American in the past.

Undoubtedly, the man who will suffer most will be the man who works with his hands. Organized labor will lose all the legitimate rights that have been won through years of struggle. Labor unions will be outlawed, just as they have been in every country under the iron rule of socialistic dictatorship. Industry will be taken over by the government. The high living standards attained through the hard work of generations will disappear, never to be regained.

This threat of disaster is not something that may worry us in the distant future. It hangs over our heads at this very moment. We may see the tragic result within the lifetime of many in this room unless we turn about now and go the other way.

It would be most pleasing to Joe Stalin to see America in financial collapse. As long as the Communists carry on their cold war, we must strengthen our defenses. If at the same time we continue our program of reckless waste and extravagance, it will not be necessary for Russia to engage in a shooting war against us.

By our own hands we will bring destruction down upon us. That is the day for which the Communists are patiently and hopefully waiting.

That, my friends, is not a comforting picture. It is, however, the price that we will be forced to pay if through carelessness, indifference, wasteful spending, and excessive taxation we allow the liberty that is our sacred heritage to slip from our hands.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the present state of the Nation as a war to decide the destiny of the United States.

I repeat, it is war—a hard, tough war.

If we are to save America we must not be content with a weak or hesitating protest against the spendthrift policy of Government.

We cannot denounce socialism on one hand and at the same time support Socialistic experimentation under the deceptive guise of social advancement.

We must not join with pressure groups seeking Government hand-outs or special privileges.

I have had a great many letters from individuals and business organizations who expressed themselves vigorously in favor of reduced Government costs, reduction in taxes, a balanced budget, and sound fiscal policies.

They denounced increased spending. Yet those same individuals and organizations urged and demanded Government funds to finance their own pet projects or selfish schemes.

We cannot cut down the cost of Government unless everyone is willing to recognize the terrible danger and to put aside selfish interest for the good of the whole country.

We must go out and fight—and fight hard. We must train our heaviest artillery against every tax and spend proposal that would hasten us along the path to a welfare state, a police state, or any other form of statism.

High taxes result in state control. State control now dominates nearly all European countries. Increasing taxes was the key move in the nationalization of Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Socialist Britain.

In all these countries taxes were boosted sharply and public spending increased Private enterprise was weakened and finally destroyed. The government ceased to be a free form of government. The individual citizen lost his freedom. They first had what they called a leveling-off process. Then came the dole and finally servitude.

For 15 years government costs in America have rapidly increased. We are drying up the investment capital necessary for the expansion of our industries. No country can long survive when its people must pay more for government than they pay for food. That is what we are doing today.

In my career as a public official and as a soldier, covering 50 years, I have fought constantly to preserve and safeguard individual freedom. I do not propose, and I am sure you do not propose, to stand idly by while willful or unthinking men destroy the freedoms that have been bought by the blood of patriots and heroes in every generation.

I have been criticized many times because I have constantly preached economy in government and lower taxes. I shall continue to do so because I believe it is the most positive program that can be presented to the American people. It is the only program that will insure a future of freedom and opportunity.

I realize it would be pleasant and popular to advocate spending—a something-for-nothing policy—without regard for the future of America. But I assure you, with all the emphasis at my command, that I shall never engage in such a popularity contest. There is too much at stake for our country and the world.

In the present war the exponents of economy and decentralization of Government are fighting a rear guard action. They need recruits. They need thousands of Paul Reveres who will warn the countryside and the cities of the approaching danger.

As citizens, as businessmen, and as leaders in your county, your place is in the front line of defense.

Your manifest duty is to protect what has been built up through years of work and thrift.

But you have a greater obligation.

It is your job to spread the doctrine of Americanism, to make those who have been misinformed or misled aware of the peril to their jobs, their homes, and their freedom.

It is your job to point out that a free people are capable of administering their own welfare without an army of bureaucrats supervising their lives.

It is your job to join with the right-thinking men of labor and agriculture in keeping America solvent by demanding sound fiscal policies.

It is your job to talk with the boys and girls in your high schools, the young men and young women in your colleges and others just starting out in life. Tell them of the fundamental values that are embraced in freedom and the rewards that come from initiative, hard work, and thrift.

Impress upon them the lessons of our Nation's greatness—that this country was built by sturdy God-fearing men and women who depended upon their own efforts. They did not look to the Government for a handout when the going was rough.

They were willing to support the Government. They did not ask the Government to support them.

Fellow Americans, I have pointed out what seems to me to be our obligation and our responsibilities.

I do not mean to imply that human progress should be halted. I do not say that any of the essential functions of Government should be curtailed.

But I do say that we should advance in accordance with honest principles, sound fiscal policies, and within the limits of our ability to pay without danger to the over-all national economy.

In closing I ask that you remember that governments do not create anything; that Government spending cannot raise living standards; and that Government spending cannot make permanent prosperity.

Government cannot make the weak strong by making the strong weak. Our Government cannot be an influence for good in the world by destroying our financial structure.

Government left to chance may easily degenerate into dictatorship and slavery. Don't let that happen here.

This Government belongs to the people. It is our precious heritage.

Do not, through sheer indifference, let it slip through our hands.

America is the last remaining hope of a free world.

We can all help make that hope a reality. God grant that we may not fail. If we do—civilization may not have another chance in a thousand years.

Our National Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay entitled "Our National Flag," by Lt. Col. Arthur M. Edwards, United States Army, retired.

Colonel Edwards is a resident of Contoocook, N. H. He is living in retirement there after faithful military service to his country. Embodied in his essay are not only some splendid thoughts with reference to our national symbol but also specific instructions regarding the proper use of our flag. I feel that this work of Colonel Edwards is especially timely.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL FLAG

(By Arthur M. Edwards, lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army (retired))

The story of the origin of our national flag really begins with our Nation's history. From its many components arises the pattern of our Stars and Stripes which theme fades back into antiquity.

For the star is the ancient symbol of men and as a celestial goal for his sovereign soul points the way to eternally high ambitions and ideals. The stripe is a symbol of the rays of light shining in glory from the sun in alternate beams of red and white and lends itself to our flag symbolism.

A banner like the flag of the United States embodying both of these themes becomes a living thing breathing our national sovereignty for which loyal Americans suffer and die.

The first flags adopted by the different sections of our country represented the local features of a wilderness to be conquered and these banners served their purpose calculated to stir men to patriotic action in times of danger.

The first flag to resemble our present National Emblem was the so-called Grand Union Flag, conceived by a committee from Congress who waited upon Gen. George Washington in June 1775 after the first battles of the Revolution just after he had taken command in Cambridge, Mass., of the American Army.

The outcome of this conference was a colonial flag tending to unite the colonies but indicating more home rule than complete independence from Great Britain. It consisted of 13 horizontal stripes alternated red and white, 7 red and 6 white with red top and bottom, representing the union of the colonies, with a blue field or union in the upper left-hand corner where there was a design which blended the blood-red rectangular valiant English Cross of St. George with the pure white diagonal Scotland Cross of St. Andrew exemplifying the highest Christian virtues.

General Washington approved this banner and raised it on January 2, 1776, over the fort at Prospect Hill, Somerville, Mass., where he commanded the Army. In doing so he proclaimed, "We hoisted the Union flag in compliment to the United Colonies and saluted it with 13 guns." This flag had already been hoisted by John Paul Jones December 3, 1775, on the flagship *Alfred* of the small fleet of ships built by the Continental Congress and commanded by Commodore Esek Hopkins. This flag is also called the first Navy ensign and the Cambridge flag as there it was first raised by land forces.

As the Revolutionary struggle developed more desperate and bloody fighting with its consequent bitterness and our then mother country became more arrogant and tyrannical the idea was born of complete national independence and with it a desire for an appropriate national flag.

In the confusion of war, complete, authentic details of all incidents connected with the planning of our first Stars and Stripes are lacking. It is safe to say however that as Commander in Chief of the American Revolutionary Army, General Washington gave the final decision so that on June 14, 1777, Congress doubtless in deference to General Washington's wishes passed the following resolution: "That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." Thus, June 14 is a day to be solemnized as National Flag Day.

The arrangement of the stars was not specified by law but General Washingto approved for the Army the plan of a circle for the stars symmetrically placed in the blue field or union to signify a complete continuous harmonious union of the old 13 Colonies to be indestructible as long as the stars representing sovereign States were not polluted by treason or the bright effulgence of the stripes of the flag smeared with political infamy.

That General Washington helped design this banner pattern is shown by the fact that he declared "We take the stars from heaven to represent a new national constellation. We take the red badge of courage from our mother country separating it by white stripes showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

And we may well say a holy cause it is when its virtue ever keeps pace with its valor.

It is certain that General Washington personally had one of these star-circle flags made for his own property to carry on his campaigns. Besides the circle of stars in the blue union there were other designs executed. The first Stars and Stripes had

the 13 stars arranged as a group so planned that the lines of stars blended the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew. The Bennington flag which inspired the Green Mountain men to decisive victory over part of British Burgoyne's army had 11 stars arranged as an arch in the union with a star in the two upper blue corners. These starry flags were soon used in battle after the flag law passed.

The 13-star flag was legal until January 13, 1794, when Congress authorized the addition of two stars and two stripes on account of admission of Vermont and Kentucky into the American Union. The new flag had the stars arranged in five staggered lines of three stars each in the union.

This banner had an adventurous life for it upheld our valor, virtue, and sovereignty for nearly 25 years. It was the original Star Spangled Banner which inspired the noble appeal to love and honor our flag by Francis Scott Key who, as a prisoner of war, wrote our national anthem while he anxiously watched our flag all night from an enemy ship as it floated over Fort McHenry, Md., in 1814. It was the first American flag to be hoisted over an Old World fortress. It conquered the Barbary pirates, sustained Commodore Perry to a glorious victory over the British on Lake Erie in 1813, and it helped Gen. Andrew Jackson smash Wellington's English veterans who attempted to invade our country at New Orleans January 8, 1815, and cleave it in twain.

Fearing that too many stripes would spoil the true design of the national flag, Congress passed a law April 4, 1818, returning the flag to its original plan of 13 stripes and providing for a new star to be added to the blue field to take effect on the Fourth of July next succeeding the admission of the new State.

Since 1818 additional stars have been added to the blue union until now there are 48 in six rows of 8 stars each. Now the salute by cannon to our Nation on July 4 is 48 guns, one being fired every 10 seconds. As the stars increased with the addition of new States various designs were invented. At one time all the stars were arranged as a larger star in the blue field.

To emphasize the symbolism of the national flag we may say that under laws untarnished by license the white stripes represent righteous and helpful liberty and worthy freedom which helps to achieve all that is best in our national welfare. Well does the poet say:

"May peace and order and beauty draw
Round our pure symbol of light and law."

The red stripe symbolizes bravery, physical and spiritual, to combat enemies at home and abroad and to oppose mightily all social, political and economic evils in peace or war. May we never falter in any supreme duty.

Then the red and white stripes blend with the blue union which stands for profound and endless loyalty to our country. Blue is said to be the color of the great mother force in life, the power that cherishes all that is loyal and true.

In this blue union are five-pointed stars, each an ancient symbol for men. Thus each may represent a sovereign State throbbing with the sworn loyalty of its citizens. Therefore righteous liberty and undaunted courage with exalted union must forever unite us into a mighty nation always prepared for security and safety. May we not learn a lesson from each five-pointed star with the five ideals of honor, service, valor, virtue, and protection?

We start with the first star point of honor which is always uppermost. This quality includes honorable dealings among ourselves and with all nations maintaining a just peace as long as it is right and proper.

Service, loyal and persistent, to our own country while being mindful of our international obligations and the needs of Christian charity.

Valor, which stands for defense when necessary against all foes within and without our borders.

Virtue, which is the achievement of all those righteous ideals which should govern our public and private relations.

Protection, the fifth star point suggests that every loyal citizen protect by all proper means the welfare of this country and in return secure protection of all his rights and privileges as guaranteed under our Constitution.

When the fair components of our national emblem are so harmoniously blended they signify a sublime and vital unity for national welfare.

Therefore, I urge these flag lessons upon all. Be loyal and the loyalty that lies in other men though sleeping but never dead will rise in eagerness to meet thine own.

Let us memorize to repeat on appropriate occasions the following: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

At such a ceremony indoors, uncovered, the hand is placed over the heart as one faces the flag. Outdoors, men will then remove the headdress, holding same over the left shoulder with the right hand over the heart. Women have the right hand in the same position. Service people in uniform, covered or uncovered, will face the flag and give the military right-hand salute.

Other flag honors established by law and custom are: Always respect your national flag and show it proper courtesy. It is better to give too much than too little honor.

It should be raised, unfurled, quickly to the top of the flagstaff and remain there only between sunrise and sunset, except by special authority for patriotic purposes.

Even on Memorial Day, when the flag remains halfway down the flagpole until noon in memory of our honored dead, it should first be raised to the pole's top. All afternoon on this occasion, until sunset, the flag flies at full staff at the pole's peak.

Always lower the flag slowly and with dignity. On every occasion, handle it with due ceremony. Store it where it will not get soiled, injured, or neglected. Never place any object on or over the flag. Use colored bunting for decorations of red, white, and blue.

No flag is ever placed above our emblem, except the chaplain's banner with a blue cross on a white field in the Navy during divine service on shipboard.

In a group of flags ours is in the center and above the rest or, if in line, on the right of same at the point of honor following the idea in heraldry that the sword arm is on the right hand and is the point of danger and, therefore, of honor. It may be in front of the center of a line of other flags in marching or at rest.

The flag must never be used for advertising or any commercial or athletic purpose. Keep it sacred and supreme.

Never let the flag touch the ground or trail in the water.

Our flag is not flown in stormy weather, but should be displayed when the weather permits at authorized and specified times and places on public buildings and stationary flagstaffs and by everyone, if practicable, on the customary and lawfully specified holidays, including polling places on election days.

When displayed in the chancel or on a platform in a church, the flag should be placed on a staff at the clergyman's right; other flags at his left. If displayed in the body of a church, the flag should be at the congregation's right as they face the clergyman.

When the flag is on a staff projecting from a building, the blue union should go first to the peak of the staff. The union should always be right side up except when giving a sign of distress or danger.

When displayed over the middle of a street, the flag should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street and to the east in a north and south street.

During the ceremony of hoisting or lowering or otherwise officially placing the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention and salute. Those present in uniform should render the right hand salute. Indoors in uniform uncovered this is also given. Those men not in uniform remove their headdress with the right hand and hold it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Women and uncovered men indoors and out should always place the right hand over the heart.

The salute to the flag in a moving column is rendered as the flag passes.

When the flag is displayed in a manner other than by being flown from a staff it should be displayed flat whether indoors or out. When shown either horizontally or vertically against a wall or in a window the union should be uppermost and to the flag's own right as it faces you or to the observer's left as you face the flag.

The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally in a parade but aloft and free. It is never dipped to any person or thing. Accompanying flags of less importance should render necessary honors.

Our flag should never cover a ceiling nor be used as a receptacle for anything or marked in any way.

It should never be used as a covering in the unveiling of a statue or a monument but may form a distinctive feature in a proper manner separately.

When the flag is used to cover a casket at a funeral it should be so placed that the blue union is at the head and over the left shoulder.

The flag should not be lowered into the grave or to touch the ground but given to the next of kin.

When our national flag is worn out, destroy it with proper respect in a solemn public or private ceremony. It is customary on such occasions to cut the blue union from the rest of the flag. It is then no longer an official banner and the separate pieces may be burned as stated.

If but slightly soiled a flag may be carefully washed but preferably dry cleaned.

Do not drape the flag over the hood, top, sides or back of a vehicle or of a railway train or boat.

When displayed on a motorcar, the staff should be firmly fixed to the front of the car.

You do not need to salute every piece of red, white, and blue bunting you see draped in public and private or flags as they fly from flag poles on buildings or small flags carried promiscuously by individuals. If you are a loyal American citizen, however, you should salute flags carried as colors or mounted standards by marching organizations or at proper ceremonies representing official national allegiance to our United States of America.

When our national anthem is played and the flag is absent, all present should stand and face the music. Those in uniform give military salute from first to last notes of the music. All others stand at attention removing headdress. If an entire audience anywhere or a soloist sings our anthem all stand but do not salute. When a flag is displayed, the flag salute will be given.

For the future I am constrained to say: "On guard, America." By valor and virtue forever stand firm and loyal to God and country. We have enemies both without and within our borders. Whether it inspires us to battle or toward the cultivation of virtuous citizenship, I ask every loyal citizen to show proper respect to our beloved national flag on every occasion that requires it. Teach your children to love and salute it. There can be no reasonable objection to such action.

May we all enter into a new covenant with our souls by showing more love for our country and the welfare of its citizens and more earnest and correct respect for our matchless banner. Always remember national Flag Day, June 14.

In our recent war our armed forces on land, on the sea, and in the air, and even underseas have added illustrious new glory to our Old Glory.

If we follow the above principles we shall never fail the crucial hours that may come to our Nation. Let us not give aid and comfort to our potential enemies by lack of proper national preparedness for defense, for we should keep America inviolate.

I have written a poem for the celebration of Flag Day. It is approved by clergymen to be sung to the church hymn tune Mendebras with words beginning "O day of rest and gladness." It follows:

O flag of strength and beauty
O flag of freedom's light;
Through thee we learn our duty
To show that right makes might;
With thee our own dear country
Will strive her work to do;
O pure and sovereign banner
Our dear red, white, and blue.

Today on war-sick nations
Thy light of freedom falls;
To help all righteous nations
Thy trump of freedom calls;
Thy starry splendor glowing
Will pierce all dark clouds through;
Rich life the world is owing
To our red, white, and blue.

Thy stars were sent from heaven
Thy rainbow from the sky;
That right in thunder-riven
Might cause all wrong to fly;
With all the world more glorious
In freedom's conscious right;
Our dear homeland victorious
In thy thrice blessed light.

I now close this flag courtesy with words I have writen to the music of the Army bugle call To the Colors which is used to honor the flag with the field music when there is no band to play the national anthem. These words are approved by the War Department as a worthy vehicle of flag tribute. They are not meant to replace the national anthem but to promote flag loyalty on appropriate occasions.

TO THE COLORS

To our flag, to our flag, to the red, white, and blue;
To its stars and its stripes may we ever be true.
We shall fight for the right in the strength of God's might
And be faithful in our service to the red, white, and blue.
Hail the red, bravery; white, liberty; blue, loyalty
In thy purity, sovereign emblem, we live and die for thee.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before New York State Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, some days ago the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the New York State Bankers Association in New York City on January 24, 1949, was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent to have several editorial comments upon that address printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tacoma News Tribune of February 2, 1949]

WARNING BY FARLEY

James A. Farley, former postmaster general of the United States, won a great reputation as a wise and astute politician before he guided the campaign which elected Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency in 1932 and again in 1936. Farley is now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Corp., one of the big positions in the business world. He still keeps in close touch with political affairs in this country and has probably one of the widest acquaintances of any American now living. This he supplements by numerous trips abroad which keep him in touch with world conditions.

Hence, the Farley predictions of the future which are infrequently given, are read with interest. At a recent meeting of the New York State Bankers Association the former Postmaster General gave a warning, which is significant. He told the bankers that the ever-increasing services coming from the Federal Government will impost financial obligations which will ultimately destroy the American way of life unless the present trend is halted.

The last election means, according to Farley's interpretation, "that the country has determined that the Government must, to an ever-increasing extent, bring its services to all the people. There may be differences as to the forms and amounts of such services but in general the United States has long since given up the notion that all that can be expected of Government is the maintenance of an Army and Navy, a Post Office Department and a diplomatic service.

"Undoubtedly there are many of you," said Farley, "and I think I share your views on this subject, who fear that in the multiplication of service we shall load down our Government and taxpayers with financial obligations that will ultimately destroy the American way of life. The serious dilemma of a demand for increasing Government services on one hand meets the danger of excessive taxation on the other."

To meet this condition, which thoughtful people everywhere realize, Farley urged greater economy and efficiency in Government. "We must get more public service for every dollar the Government collects from taxpayers, otherwise business activity will slow down. This prospect for the coming year should constitute a serious warning to Congress and the President to consider carefully the implications of our present rate of spending."

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of January 28, 1949]

ADVICE FROM JIM

James A. Farley pointed out the other day that when the national income is rising by inflationary forces, as it has in the past few years, the return of the tax receipts rises relatively faster than the national income. When the trend of national income is reversed, however, even by a relatively small percentage, tax receipts fall at a considerably larger rate.

This is important, Mr. Farley pointed out, because the drop in tax revenues may come rather soon, and at a time when the demand for Government services is increasing.

This, he pointed out, will present a dilemma. Mr. Farley does not think the answer to the dilemma is to hike tax rates, for the yield will not thereby be increased. Neither does he advocate the elimination of all the special services demanded of Government by our complex civilization. What he urges is insistence upon greater efficiency and more public service for every dollar that Government collects from the taxpayer. Frankly admitting that no private business could continue to exist on the basis of waste and inefficiency with which many Government departments operate, Mr. Farley rises above partisan considerations, which usually add more heat than light to such questions. He says neither the President nor the Congress is directly responsible but that these things have grown from failure to systematically reconsider the value of various Government functions at reasonable intervals. On the Federal level he urges every American to join in the effort to have the major recommendations of the Commission headed by former President Hoover put into effect.

Here is a problem that is going to affect the smooth functioning of useful public service as well as the pockets of the citizens. Mr. Farley's advice that it be attacked on a businesslike rather than a political plane is the soundest we have heard. Not only on Federal levels but on State and local levels the public must exact from its servants increased efficiency and greater value for the tax dollar. That's more easily said than done. Political expediency tends to encourage inertia until the problems accumulate to such magnitude that public resentment brings demand for sweeping amelioration of the conditions. How much better it would be for all citizens, regardless of party, to cooperate in overcoming that inertia. If the effort isn't made, if trends are permitted to go their merry way with no concerted demand for full returns from tax dollars, we are likely to awaken one day faced with a governmental structure so badly dislocated that an almost convulsive effort will be required to set things right.

[From the Erie Daily Times of January 26, 1949]

FARLEY ON ECONOMICS

James A. Farley is a solid business executive. He is a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, an ex-Postmaster General. He is an unswerving partisan Democrat, though not wholeheartedly subscribing to all the isms projected by his party since 1940.

Mr. Farley, who is board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Co., is a realist. He says that the national income cannot stay forever at its present high peak.

He told a meeting of the New York State Bankers Association Monday that Government and business should prepare for lowered national income, because this factor never has been stable and it will not be in the future.

Mr. Farley, who knows his business, private and political, calls for reduced expenditures in Federal Government and sees hope in the fact that former Republican President Herbert Hoover and Democratic President Harry S. Truman were apparently seeing eye-to-eye in this regard.

Mr. Farley's advice can be considered expert, for he was sitting prominently in the political picture that saw the extravagant rise of bureaucracy and the swelling of the Federal pay roll. When he rebelled, he broke with bureaucracy's patron—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Farley sees neither a depression nor a serious recession, though it is possible for history to repeat itself and throw us into another depression—the hope of our communistic enemies.

That isn't probable however—if we remain a strong and stable Nation at home, he pointed out.

Advice from Mr. Farley can well be taken as sound counsel to the country. For after all—the self-made Mr. Farley is as astute a businessman as he was a political administrator—a rare combination.

[From the Financial World, New York, N. Y., of February 2, 1949]

FARLEY WARNS THE NATION

Speaking before the New York State Bankers Association, but in effect addressing himself to the country at large, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and one-time Democratic National Committee chairman, warned of the dangers of excessive taxation stemming from the demand for more and more Government services. He decried also the excessive cost of government and, speaking from his own experience, asserted that no private business could afford to operate under the conditions prevailing in most Government departments.

The present head of the Coca-Cola Corp. laid no direct blame on either Congress or the executive branch of the Government for the situation which, while long existing in the administrative establishment, has mushroomed in recent years. He attributed the situation partly to the excessive protections imposed by civil service, which render it virtually impossible for department heads to get rid of incompetents. He cited also the annual turn-over of 500,000 Federal employees a year, and the high cost of training replacements.

The demand for greater Government services, as Farley pointed out, means a vast increase in the cost of running the Government, particularly with so heavy a percentage of incompetents in departmental personnel. That cost can be held down only by efficient operation of the Government. Unless more public service is given for every dollar collected from the taxpayer, taxes will rise to the point where the whole structure of the country will be endangered. Mr. Farley urged that every American join in an effort to have the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission enacted into law and administrative practice.

Mr. Farley enunciated nothing that has not been said before by others. His views, however, add force to what others have said. His remarks and his endorsement of the Hoover Commission derive further interest because of the part he played in helping to oust Mr. Hoover from the Presidential chair and to install Franklin D. Roosevelt in his stead.

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of January 29, 1949

TWO EXPERTS

If we were to summon experts for a discussion of government, we should consider James A. Farley and Lindsay C. Warren as top-notch material.

Mr. Farley was long in Washington as Postmaster General, and Mr. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, has won a name as a Treasury watchdog there. The former has seen the wheels go around in the Capital from the inside. The latter has checked Federal expenditures for a long time.

Said Mr. Farley in a talk to a bankers' meeting, our Government should be organized for efficiency and for an end to overlapping and waste.

Said Mr. Warren to a House committee, the Federal Government is set up as a "hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies."

The former Postmaster General went on to point out how Federal costs are growing, and to urge that we "get more public service for every dollar that Government collects from the taxpayer."

The Comptroller General asserted that our system is "probably ideal for the tax eaters who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill."

The point of this to the taxpayers is that under Herbert Hoover a commission is pointing out ways to eliminate some of the waste and some of the unnecessary pay roll leeches. Congress, it is said, for patronage or other reasons, may hesitate to let the President clean house.

The people should be clear about the situation. Experts in both parties testify to the ratholes for some of our tax dollars. No party should dare bar any sensible move to remedy this loss of the people's money.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of January 26, 1949]

AN EXPERT SPEAKS

James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, has handled a great deal of patronage in his time.

"No private business with which I am familiar," he said the other day, "could afford to operate under the conditions that prevail in most Government departments."

That should come under the heading of expert testimony.

[From the Salamanca (N. Y.) Republican-Press of January 26, 1949]

FARLEY FOR HOOVER REPORT, DISCUSSES BUSINESS OUTLOOK

James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman and former Postmaster General, has joined President Harry S. Truman and other prominent leaders in both political parties in urging all Americans to unite in an effort to have the major recommendations of the Commission headed by former President Herbert Hoover enacted into law and administrative practice.

Mr. Farley threw the weight of his influence behind the Hoover Commisison in an address before the New York State Bankers Association in New York City Monday night, and also discussed the business and industrial outlook, as to which he is moderately optimistic.

"I do not anticipate depression or even a serious recession in business," said Mr. Farley. "There are too many factors supporting our economic system that are sound which were not present back in the twenties, to justify pessimism."

He pointed out, however, that "we cannot expect that our national income can always continue at the rate established last year," nor can we expect permanently and without interruption the volume of business that we have enjoyed in the years since the war. He noted that when the national income was rising as a result of inflationary forces, as it has been in the past few years, the Government's receipts from taxes rise relatively faster than the national income. By the same token, when the trend of national income is reversed, even by a relatively small percentage, tax receipts fall at a considerably larger rate. He urged, therefore, that the country be prepared for such a situation in the coming year, and argued against an increase in taxes, "because raising tax rates will not help much to keep us in the black, because the returns will be falling."

Under such conditions, Mr. Farley argued with logic, it is essential that through greater efficiency more public service be obtained for every dollar the Government collects from the taxpayer, and he declared: "No private business with which I am familiar could afford to operate under the conditions that prevail in most Government departments."

Neither the President nor Congress, he said, is solely responsible for waste and extravagance in the Federal Government. Activities and services have continued from year to year without any periodic reconsideration of the need or adequacy of the ways they are conducted. It was in this connection that he urged public support of the major recommendations of the Commission headed by Mr. Hoover, which has been engaged for months in the most thorough study of these matters that has ever been made.

UNESCO and the Development of International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "UNESCO and the Development of International Understanding," delivered by Walter H. C. Laves, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, before the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, February 18, 1949.

This address gives a very clear picture of the operations of UNESCO, and will be important in bringing about a clear understanding of the contribution this world organization is making to the cause of international peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNESCO AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

(Address given by Walter H. C. Laves, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, before the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, United States of America, February 18, 1949)

Mr. President and members of the institute, it is a very special pleasure for me to be here today. Reference has been made by the chairman to earlier meetings of the National Farm Institute. I recall particularly one which may well have been the first at which you had as guest of honor the then Secretary of State Cordell Hull. I attended that meeting as a minor guest, and on several occasions since have followed with interest the work done under the auspices of the National Farm Institute.

I recall these earlier sessions of the institute in relation to the subject of my address today because I think you have been carrying on activities which might very appropriately be labeled as of the UNESCO type. The kind of programs you have sponsored need to be carried on not only here but in all parts of the United States and throughout the world—east, west, north, and south. Efforts of this kind to get people to understand their immediate day-by-day, house-by-house problems in the perspective of the international world in which we live must be redoubled if we are to develop the kind of world consciousness that is required for living in this one world.

I had intended when I received your kind invitation in Paris to be present here today, to present to you a rather formidable document which was labeled on the front page of the last draft "Speech—National Farm Institute." It grew to be about 30 pages in length, as I was trying to tell you everything UNESCO means and does, but I didn't have time to write a short speech. Obviously, that speech will not come out today. Reading a speech to my many friends here anyway would be somewhat like reading her a letter when I visit my mother tomorrow in Chicago.

The thing I am interested in talking about is what UNESCO does. I would like to highlight certain of the activities which will give you the best sort of picture of what this organization of yours is doing. It is your

organization; it is one of the United Nations Organizations you as taxpayers are supporting; and if you do not know what it is and what UNESCO is doing, it is time one of us who is carrying on this work for you came and told you.

I shall emphasize program matters, but I wish I might have time to tell you something about the problems of building an international secretariat, starting from scratch without anybody, but with a large program consisting of resolutions adopted by the member states. The 46 member states have instructed us to implement the program resolutions, put them into operation, and pass forward in terms of action to the member states something they in turn can do toward international understanding.

It is a tremendous task to recruit people from long distances. Our headquarters from the beginning have been in Paris, but the people we need are in India, New Zealand, South Africa—all over the world. The task of getting in touch with them, bringing them over, organizing them, building morale, is a task that is time-consuming and sometimes heartbreaking. The joy in the work is that nearly everybody who has come has dedicated himself to do a job and is working with the sort of tempo which you knew so well during the last war. Victory then gave us the chance to do this job of creating the United Nations organizations.

I would like to tell you case histories of staff members—the problems of adjusting the work habits of a Chuck Weitz from Des Moines, Bill Purnell from Australia, and Leopoldo Monzon from Mexico—all of whom have to work together on common problems. Each has a different background, schooling, and outlook, but all agree on the end objective they have in mind. In UNESCO we are building international understanding among the secretariat members as some day common ends and common methods should contribute to greater international understanding throughout the world.

One might also say something about the techniques used by the Organization, including the holding of annual conferences in different parts of the world, thus making a special impact on the countries where we meet. Only 2 months ago we completed our third session of the general conference held in the Lebanon. Previous conferences were held in Paris and Mexico City. The effect of moving an organization into other communities of the world where otherwise there is no contact with the United Nations and its agencies is a difficult but important thing, no matter what the cost.

Now, what is UNESCO? I asked Harry Terrell that before lunch, and he said, "Why don't you ask the audience that question?" Well, it is one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations—an organization established by the member governments on the assumption that just as nations require domestic educational, scientific, and cultural institutions for promoting the general welfare, so the world community requires an organization which provides corresponding services to the world as a whole.

We are, in effect, an arm of the United Nations. The United Nations is in many respects a composite of legal, justice, legislative, police, and fire departments. A well-rounded world organization requires a series of specialized agencies like UNESCO which are looking after specific phases of the general welfare, including health, transportation, finance, and education. So the task of UNESCO is comparable to that of the World Health Organization, which is concerned with problems of public health on the international level, the International Labor Organization, or the World Bank.

UNESCO means different things to people in different parts of the world. Some are most concerned about reconstruction, some want access to scientific information, others seek first of all the achievement of literacy among their peoples. Different needs create different demands. Similarly, the national base for UNESCO differs according to different countries.

You have in the United States a national commission for UNESCO. It is a national organization which has 100 outstanding American citizens in it. In addition, there are numerous local, State, and community groups, which are carrying forward the ideas of UNESCO in the community in terms of building for peace through education, science, and culture.

This is as it should be, if the ends of UNESCO are really to be attained. We have a long way to go in the building of international organizations before they will even begin to do internationally the jobs that are now done by the national governments and local communities. In the constitution of UNESCO, the member states, including the United States, recognize this fact in the emphasis on the role of national commissions. In the constitution, the member states have accepted certain principles and certain objectives which they want established in the world. They want, for example, to insure that there is educational opportunity for everyone in the world irrespective of race, religion, or economic status.

Now what can an international organization do about that if the national member state of UNESCO does not itself provide educational opportunity? Nothing more than stimulate, encourage, occasionally provide publicity, technical assistance, or educational missions if requested. The real job of carrying out international obligations of this kind is the job of the member states. It is ultimately upon the people, you and your organizations, that the real responsibility falls.

That is why I say that the holding of the National Farm Institute is the kind of community action and activity that has to be undertaken all over the world in order to bring home to the people of the world how one acts in one world. We live in one world, and the furtherance of the general welfare depends upon thinking in world terms. The necessary world consciousness or ability to live as world citizens has not yet been developed.

I may sound at this point as though there is not much use having the UNESCO organization, but that is not true. Let me give some illustrations of what UNESCO, as an organization, does to help in attaining these ends. For the sake of this discussion, let me suggest that there are four principal kinds of things being done.

First, we are pressing to help reconstruct countries devastated by the war. This job is not yet over. I know many of you have had a chance to go to Europe in the course of the last 2 or 3 years. Some of you were there within the last few months. You have seen the condition of the war-devastated countries, the condition of schools, colleges, universities, the shortage of teachers, of school materials, books, buildings, roofs, tremendous shortages of scientific laboratory equipment. These resources have to be reestablished, and quickly, if the people of these countries are once more really to have opportunities for working in the world system.

One of our field workers came in the other day—he had been in Greece making a survey of the educational needs at the primary-school level. I said, "I guess things are going well in Greece now; lots of help has been going in there." "Yes; I suppose quite a lot has," he said, "but the picture I can't get out of my mind is the last school I visited. Two walls were left, no roof, no rooms, no floor, and, of course, there were no desks or chairs, no pencils or paper, but the kids were learning fast." I said, "How do they do it without the equipment?" "Oh, they were lying flat on their bellies in the sand; the teacher was saying, 'Four times two equals eight'; they would scratch it in the sand, wipe it out with their hands, and write, 'Five times two equals ten.' That is the way they did spelling and arithmetic. It was a slower process, and they are getting along. But it is not an efficient way."

The reconstruction job is a tremendous job, and here in the United States through the Commission for International Educational Reconstruction you have done a tremendous job in collection of materials and sending them over. You can't imagine the flood of letters and expressions of gratitude that come from these countries to which materials have gone. The important thing is to see this reconstruction work against the background of our wish to build a world in which there is understanding between peoples. To achieve this you must be sure the people have opportunity to learn enough to be able to understand. In war-devastated countries to date they don't have that because the school and college and university facilities are still lacking. UNESCO places reconstruction in the highest priority class.

The second kind of job is that of promoting the raising of standards of education in the under-developed parts of the world. In part this is a mattetr of combating illiteracy. You know that nearly one-half of the world's population is completely illiterate, and that proportion of the world's population cannot be forgotten. In that proportion of the population, people get hungry, have ambitions, have desires, want power, want to take care of themselves, want to improve their conditions just as do the literates. Until the illiterates have some measure of literacy, there is little likelihood of bringing them effectively into the work of the United Nations or of a peaceful world. Therefore, one of the principal tasks which UNESCO has been asked to give attention to is the development of fundamental education programs or campaigns against illiteracy. Here we are fortunate in that the new Director-General of UNESCO, though most recently foreign minister of Mexico, is especially well known in the world because of the great campaign he carried on in Mexico against illiteracy.

The task, however, is broader than teaching A, B, C, or 1, 2, 3. It is also a matter of combating illiteracy in living—including matters of health, nutrition, agricultural methods, civic education, improving the general welfare. In Haiti today, a combined mission of the United Nations, UNESCO, Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, is at work with the Haitian Government on a tremendous project involving a joint attack upon this many-sided problem of illiteracy.

In still other countries the need is for experts to improve existing educational facilities—classroom methods, teaching aids, teacher training, curricula, etc. As I speak here today, two UNESCO education missions, internationally selected and responsible only to UNESCO, are in the Philippines, and Siam for this purpose. Late this spring two others will go forth, one to Syria and one to Afghanistan.

The third kind of thing to which we are giving attention under request from member governments is the reduction of barriers to the flow of information and knowledge around the world—barriers which are partly due to traditional habits and channels of thought, or partly to currency difficulties and commercial obstacles or to other causes.

Let me give some concrete illustrations. We have four scientific offices outside of Paris—Montevideo, Cairo, New Delhi, and Shanghai. The purpose of these offices is to provide a place in a scientifically less developed part of the world to which the people can go and ask for information or about sources for information about the developments in the field of natural sciences which

will help individual research needs or community and national needs in, for example, health, agriculture, or pure science. The purpose is to prime the flow of technical knowledge from where it is to where it is most needed.

Then we have the UNESCO book coupon scheme to overcome currency barriers to the purchase of books. UNESCO sells coupons which are redeemable in hard currency. After they have gone from us to a soft currency accredited agent, they are sold for soft currency to a would-be book buyer. He sends the coupon to the book dealer in a hard currency country who sends the book to his soft currency customer and the coupon to UNESCO for redemption in hard currency.

Ideas and information are found in people and there are barriers to the movement of people. We have a limited number of fellowships to award to technicians, people in government or professions, or students. We provide fellowships which give them an opportunity to go for 6 months to another country to study. In addition there are hundreds of fellowships available, in the administration of which we are giving assistance, trying to get the movement of people where they are to where they ought to go, rather than on a helter-skelter basis.

The fourth principal way in which we are trying to carry out the program of the Organization is to try to promote positively this thing vaguely referred to as "international understanding." Here, first of all, there is the task of getting the member countries' attention as to what is being taught in the schools, which depends on what is in the teacher's mind and what is in the textbooks. An effort is being made to get countries to examine textbooks to see what is being developed in the minds of the children today which will influence their actions tomorrow.

Seminars of teachers and educational administrators have been held under UNESCO auspices to give an opportunity to these people from different countries to compare notes on the best methods to teach international understanding and world-mindedness. One such seminar was held in Paris in 1947, another in New York in 1948 and two related ones in Czechoslovakia and Great Britain. Material for the use of teachers when they returned to their homes and jobs were prepared and we understand that in several countries they are in fact already in use. Two seminars will be held in 1949—one in India on fundamental education and one in Brazil on illiteracy.

Finally, UNESCO has stimulated social scientists in a dozen countries to examine the factors and influences which condition the child's mind to respond as it does when mature to the various factors of nationalism and internationalism. Thus important raw material of knowledge should be discovered which will guide us in taking more positive steps for furthering international understanding through the educational and comparable means at our disposal.

Mr. Chairman, you still have a long program ahead of you this afternoon and I should not go beyond the 30 minutes allowed me.

I have wanted in this brief time to give you both a bird's- and a snail's-eye view of UNESCO. There is a dual danger in quick discussions of this kind—they can be so general as to leave no sense of reality or of the task to be done by the audience. Or, they can be so detailed as to hide from the listeners the greater potential in the idea which underlies all the Organization's activities.

UNESCO can be summarized at this stage in the following manner—UNESCO as an idea is but the latest development in a long history of freedom and the growth of democratic institutions.

UNESCO as a charter is a commitment by the governments and people of 46 states to work toward the achievement of the international common denominator there set forth.

UNESCO as an organization is an annual conference, an executive board and a secretariat whose function it is to promote, assist, stimulate and encourage work around the world on the implementation of the constitution found in the program adopted by the Conference.

UNESCO as a reality is the composite of effective work done in all member states by people and voluntary associations of every kind for the purpose of putting into practice at home the objectives in UNESCO'S constitution to which every member state has subscribed.

Shall America or Russia Rule the Air?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered November 4, 1948, by Col. Roscoe Turner at the national meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers at Tulsa, Okla. The title of the address is "Shall America or Russia Rule the Air?" and I commend the address to the consideration of all Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL AMERICA OR RUSSIA RULE THE AIR?

(Speech by Col. Roscoe Turner, November 4, 1948, at the Society of Automotive Engineers national meeting, Tulsa, Okla.)

My fellow Americans, the last half century has witnessed the meteoric ascendancy of the United States to its present unparalleled position of world leadership. Gloriously victorious in two great world wars, this Republic has arrived at a place of influence, prestige, and power never before equaled by any nation in all the annals of human history. It is our duty to a struggling humanity to continue to exercise in this postwar period the same high quality of leadership that we have displayed against the cruel and barbarous onslaught of aggression and tyranny in the two world wars. We are living in a crucial period. The decisions to be made by the United States in the immediate future will determine the course of civilization for many succeeding generations. The challenge of this is to create permanent peace so that all mankind may dwell without fear of enslavement and death, but live in an environment of friendship and freedom. A strong and powerful United States is the surest guaranty for the perpetuation of a society of free nations. Air supremacy is the only way in which we can ever hope to lay the foundations for a permanent peace.

There are in our midst, influences that would deprive us of this leadership that has made ours the greatest form of government in the world. They are sowing discontent in our shops, factories, mills, schools, labor unions, our Government, and every walk of life. Without unity we can easily be conquered—economically, politically, and militarily.

We have never lost an armed conflict against the enemy because we have always united to defeat the foe, but we lost the peace after World War I and we may lose the peace after World War II because the minute we lay aside our shooting irons the politicians take over dividing us in our thinking, telling us only the pleasant things and keeping from us necessary information and vital facts that we should know. Between the politicians, bureaucrats, false labor leaders, and the Communists, we are being taken for a buggy ride from which we may never return.

We have more people on the Government pay roll than ever before. The bureaucrats are running things to suit themselves, regardless of the intent of the law. Our Government has Communists in many high places. Why can't we have loyal American citizens in all Government jobs? Why are we permitting war materials to be shipped behind the iron curtain? They are certainly going to give it back to us "red hot" right into the bodies of the American youth, just as Japan did to our boys in World War II.

How are we going to change it? Tell our Congressmen what we want done. Tell them to fire half the people on the Government pay roll. Tell them to reduce our taxes. Tell the State Department we want to know the truth about what is going on—no more of these private agreements by any individual—we want to look things over first. Tell our Congressmen that we want this country militarily strong enough to insure the peace and security of our citizens, their homes, and their businesses. The rest of the job we can do in our own free, democratic, enterprising way. Before we give a person employment, demand that he divest himself of all foreign isms, including communism. Help the labor unions divest themselves of all their false leaders. Again instill in the minds of the American people, young and old, the understanding that we must earn a day's pay each day we work if the employer is to continue in a position to pay. Featherbedding and loafing is just plain stealing from the employer and the consumer—and is un-American. Let's make democracy work by making it strong. To make it strong we must all work for full production in every line—on the farm, in the factory, in building, in transportation, in the mines, mills, and shops.

We must rebuild the desire to do things in the minds of the American people. As an example, the idea that laying 300 bricks in 1 day when the old master mason used to lay from a thousand to 1,500, or the carpenter who put up 50 boards when he could nail up 250, and the automobile boys that turn out 1 car in the time they should turn out 5, is all wrong and will destroy our country. The story is the same in all classes of work. We never received or achieved anything without working for it. Our way of life, our standard of living, is the finest in the world because of hard work of our forefathers.

We must cast off these false leaders that are telling us we can get something for nothing. It has been tried many times throughout the ages and it has always led its followers into slavery and despair. The Romans tried it under Caesar and wrecked the Empire. Now it is spreading again in Europe and these very countries who are trying it now are asking us to divide our dollars with them, plus the fact that we are short of everything we need, they want us to divide our production too.

What will be the answer? It is as sure as night and day. If we don't want to sink to their level of living and misery, we must go to work for full production, pick good leaders everywhere, think for ourselves some of the time and rebuild our military strength to insure the peace that we were promised in World War I and again in World War II.

We don't have a police force because we are crime-minded but to prevent crime and catch those that commit crime. We have a fire department—not because we are fire-

minded, but to prevent fires and put them out when they do get started.

We have our military forces—not because we are warmongers, but to preserve our peace and security. The stronger they are, the less likely we are to be challenged. A leopard will never attack a lion because he knows better. Human beings sometimes are not so smart, but if we are strong, the chances are in our favor.

We must have universal military training. The people who are against it are those who would keep us weak, or they are misinformed.

We must be supreme in the air. England ruled the waves and helped keep the peace for 100 years until challenged by Germany in 1914 and again in 1939. Without our help she would have lost in both instances.

We must rule the air to insure the peace because there is no one that can, or will, come to our aid in case we are attacked. Time will not permit. It will be fast and very destructive.

A little over 25 years ago a great soldier, aviator, and air prophet was in our midst crying as a voice in the wilderness for aviation and telling how it would change the world—our own Gen. Billy Mitchell. He gave up his career and died with a broken heart because our generals, our admirals, our Congress, and our people would not believe him.

It took World War II to vindicate him and prove his prophecies. The most horrible and costliest war in history. Germany and Japan heeded his words and built great air forces and only by the grace of God were they kept from conquering the world. If the Germans had followed up at Dunkerque, or the Japs at Pearl Harbor, the story would be different today. Time plus two oceans permitted us to take advantage of their errors and make up for our mistake of not heeding Mitchell's advice.

If Mitchell could appear before you tonight, you would shudder at the things he would tell you that are to come unless we awaken, because you would believe him this time. Having been an officer under his command in World War I, I am going to be so presumptious as to speak for his spirit here today. With the help of all, we think we can get the story over this time. He was no warmonger, and neither am I, but I am going to give you some facts to think about.

If Mitchell could have put his story over, we would have never had World War II. I will further verify this by the fact that in 1936 the French Air Force and Army were the strongest in the world. When Hitler ordered his troops into Rhineland, he knew France could crush them and he told his commanders to withdraw if France started to mobilize.

Why didn't France move? France wanted to balance the budget, and, furthermore it would be politically unpopular. Next, the Communists started to work with greater effort to undermine the Government of France, their army, air, and naval forces and their industry, while Hitler was awaiting the result.

My friends, we are following down the same road—time is running against us. We are now down to a second-rate air power, and Russia is working day and night on the atomic bomb. She is building her air power to bring them to us.

We, as people, dislike unpleasant things so we dismiss them from our mind. We just don't want to believe them. We have never suffered physical pain as a nation. We even forget those who have gone to foreign lands and suffered and died for us so that we might still enjoy this country of ours.

Our trouble is, we will not move until we are mad or scared. Pearl Harbor made us mad. Submarines popping up on our coasts scared us. So we, with the help of time and two oceans, got into high production and practically smothered the enemy with materials of war—and I am not discounting our boys who threw it at them.

Here is what we could have done if from 1921 to 1941 we had spent on air power $1,000,000,000 a year for each year, a total of twenty billions. We would have had the greatest air power in the whole world. Then Mr. Hitler and Hirohito would have tended to their own business.

This war has cost us already over two hundred and forty billions and we are still paying. So, we would have saved two hundred and twenty billion in cash, plus over a million casualties of our own, including over 300,000 that didn't come back—plus a bankrupt Europe that we are asked to support and loan money to, to buy our goods, not to mention all their losses and sufferings. Have you forgotten what air power did? Poland fell in 3 weeks, Norway fell in 2 weeks, Holland in 4 days, and Denmark in 3 hours.

General Eisenhower stated that without our controlling the air, the Normandy invasion would have been impossible. Winston Churchill said to his people after Dunkerque, "So many owe so much to so few," meaning the Royal Air Force. To mention another, the Japs also took good care of England's two largest battleships out of Singapore. Remember how our Air Force sunk 14 Jap ships in the Bismarck Sea without any surface aid and didn't lose a plane?

The airplane, plus the fire, the high explosive, and atomic bomb, saved us from having to invade Japan, thereby saving thousands of our boys and several billion dollars. High German officers testified that our air power defeated them. Need I go any further?

Our next Pearl Harbor will be the industrial center of the United States. Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur have both stated that future armies will travel through the air.

There are only two great powers in the world today. One a peace-loving, capitalistic United States; the other a ruthless, communistic, absolute dictatorship more horrible and ruthless than Hitler ever thought of being. Even in the Dark Ages, they never equaled Stalin's prison camps and forced labor. There are 14,000,000 in them right today.

Let me remind you that Russia has one of the largest airfields in the world just 4 minutes from our own soil—Alaska. She can launch from there 1,000 bombers and 1,000 airplane troop carriers of 300 fully equipped soldiers to each carrier. The bombers would burn our industrial cities to the ground. The troop carriers would land in Chicago and St. Louis, take our two largest rail centers, and cut the country in half. We only have 17 railroad bridges across the Mississippi and it is not like throwing up a bridge across the Rhine or Moselle River in Europe to put a railroad bridge over the Mississippi.

Even after all this has happened and if we are able to liquidate this force, provided our ground forces are trained and ready to fight, we must have air power to stop more from coming—but our production capabilities will be cut in a most serious way.

Don't misunderstand me. We must have a strong Army and Navy, a well-trained National Guard and Reserve; every citizen must have some coaching or training for their own protection because there will be no front line as in days gone by. War will be in every front and back yard, on every farm and in every factory—it will be everywhere.

There will be no surface invasions in future wars. A country or an objective will be destroyed and its ability to fight made impotent so that our surface forces will become occupying forces. This was the pattern followed by us with Japan in the close of World War II after the atom bomb.

But, we must still have a strong, well-trained Army and Navy—but with limitations on spending money, because they will fortify the moon as long as we give them the money. Every time there is an appropriation for the air forces, the Army and Navy wants a new appropriation for their respective services. The big question is, how can we pay the bill for this type of thinking and duplication of experimental and development work in both planes, rockets, and guided missiles.

We now have two Air Forces—United States Air Force and the Navy Air Force—both arguing who is to do the long-distance bombing. The thought is also advanced that competition between the two makes for better development. Do we have two atom-bomb plants? No; because we cannot afford it. Then why have two branches of our defense in competition with each other? Some high-ranking officers say that we must have competition to get the best out of the services. If that is true, why not two Presidents, two Secretaries of State—two of everything? Does a big manufacturer have to develop two laboratories to get the best possible product? No. He gets all the brains he has on the pay roll around the table and tells them to produce. Our military services cannot play with our security as if it were a ball game—a contest between them to see which one is going to get to the enemy first. No; we cannot stand the cost for this kind of competition. We must demand of Congress that our military brains be made to work together for our security.

I will tell you where the trouble is. No. 1—it starts at West Point and Annapolis and they never get over it. We should turn both of these schools into postgraduate schools for professional officers after they have learned a little about the economic side of our country in our regular universities and colleges. The best example of this is Texas A. & M., who has turned out more officers than West Point.

No. 2—stars and gold braid cannot be added to unless they keep getting more men to command. Of course, there are exceptions to be found everywhere. There are always men who rise above selfishness, and here is one I will quote. As far back as 1915, Admiral Peary said, and I quote, "In no way can we as a nation stand so effectively for forcefulness, for strength, and for world influence as by command of the air. Great and important as is a sufficient Navy for our safety, I speak advisedly when I say that our air service of the near future will be more vital to our safety than our Navy and our Army combined."

Another admiral, William B. Shoemaker, on reading the report of Billy Mitchell's bombing experiments in 1923, said, and I quote, "It's true, every bit of it—but, my God, we can't let this get out or it would ruin the Navy."

There is much pro and con on the subject of air power but we must demand that the services work as a team and not as kids with their toys. Just because the Air Forces have B–17's and 24's, why should the Navy have them, too? They did during the last war and they would not take the standard production model the Army bought—they spent millions more changing them. They almost got B–29's, but Arnold set his foot down and they didn't get them. The Navy must have carrier-based planes and when a big bomber is needed, a radio call should get them to work with the carrier forces. With the present requests for money from each of the services, we could bankrupt the country. Then, Stalin could take over without firing a shot. However, if we are supreme in the air, we can keep them away from our own homes and take it to their doors.

Now, let me define air power. Air power is not only military aviation, it is also civil aviation—the aviation potential of a country. The Air Force is the military part of air power, the force that can be applied directly against the enemy, but all other aviation supports it. So, any program which increases flying in the United States, which

supports its civil air lines, which increases air consciousness, is helpful to air power. If war comes, we will use our civil air transport to the maximum and it will not be enough. So, it will have to be expanded. The more it is supported and the more it is encouraged in national and international commerce, the less we will have to expand and the more nearly ready we will be.

Now let me further stress the commercial side. The more flying, the better. Do you know that our being so advanced in commercial aviation saved the day for us in World War II? When President Roosevelt asked for 50,000 planes, the military asked, "Where are we going to find the pilots and ground crews?" They didn't think it could be done and our enemies were sure we couldn't do it—but we did.

You will remember the old CPT program. Mamas and papas just raised the devil with the schools and colleges when it came out. They said it was a waste of taxpayers' money and going to kill and injure their boys. But thanks to the vision and foresight of three or four people in the Department of Commerce, it was an educational program both for students and public. It wasn't long until mama and papa did an about-face. When the quotas were full, they started writing their Congressmen, not only to get their boy in flight training but their daughters, too.

Then we got into war. Civilian pilot training program was changed to war training service. We added to this training and made instructors out of these boys and girls. Then, our next orders were to pick up everyone we could find with 200 hours or more of flying time and put them through an instructor's course. The net results were, we produced enough instructors on civilian planes to help train the pilots and mechanics by the time the military planes were rolling off the line. Therefore, with the help of civilian aviation, we did the impossible—help build the greatest air force the world has ever seen in a length of time thought impossible. I will not discuss how much the air lines contributed to the program because it is well known by you. We are now starting to build back our commercial and private aviation. The more air lines, the better. Let's demand feeder-lines for every community that will support them. They will pay their own way with proper management, in reasonable time. Let's look back to the beginning of the transcontinental air mail with the old modified Army planes. We never hoped to make them pay and they never could have paid their way, but that was the beginning of our great airline industry, both from a manufacturing and operations standpoint. Let's insist CAB and CAA cut out so much red tape and rules and regulations so you don't have to have a lawyer to interpret for you and a bookkeeper to fill out forms before every flight.

Now let's look at private aviation again. In addition to all our municipally owned airports, there are an equal or greater number of privately owned airports. If someone wants to start an airport and as long as it meets safety requirements, the development should not be obstructed by unreasonable laws, rules, or regulations—city, State, or national.

This brings one more point to mind—the surface carriers trying to enter the aviation field. All forms of transportation should remain competitive if the public is to enjoy the maximum benefit for them. As an example, the Pennsylvania Railroad has invested in its system a billion nine hundred million dollars. Our biggest domestic air line, the American, has twenty-five millions invested in its system. Taking from an old quotation, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." No railroad expects to press the development of aviation. They just want to hamstring it so it will not cut in on their traffic too much—just like they did the river traffic, trucking and bus business. They stopped at nothing in this battle, pushing through both State and Federal laws. They are now trying the same thing on aviation. Every State legislature in the last 4 years has had a railroad sponsored bill to put aviation in each State under the public service commission who know nothing about aviation and most of them afraid to fly. We have defeated them in every State except Montana, Mississippi, and New Hampshire. They are going to continue this because just last month in Indiana the transportation committee called a meeting to see about putting economic controls on under the public service commission. Aviation is fighting for its life and your life, perhaps—and our country's future liberty.

We are living in a new age—an aviation and atomic age. Are we capable of meeting the challenge? Has World War II been fought in vain? Are we to lose our liberties, our freedoms, our schools, and our religions to atheists? Are we going to see our cities leveled to the ground and the enemy walk into our houses and shove bayonets through our loved ones? It was done to others in World Wars I and II and will be done in world war III. We hold in our hands not only our own fate but the fate of the world. We could be headed for a second dark age here on this earth.

Let us keep faith with those who have died trying to help keep us free. We will accept the challenge. May God give us the wisdom, strength, and courage to throw out of our way all obstacles of selfish cliques and elements in our path so that we may build the world's strongest air power to preserve the peace—so our beacon of light and hope will shine throughout the world and we must rule the air.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons," from the Eau Claire Leader for March 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin Republican, is championing the cause of thousands of displaced persons in Europe whose only hope in life is to gain admittance to the United States.

We commend the Senator for his sincere efforts to remove misunderstandings and differences which have developed over this law. We trust he will not only be successful in securing endorsement of an amendment he recently introduced, but in including later his sound ideas on further changes.

Senator WILEY's amendment would revise the cut-off date of the displaced-persons law from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. The new cut-off date means that displaced persons, many of them refugees from Communist-dominated countries, would be benefited by the Displaced Persons Act along with the displaced persons who have been in camp for nearly 10 years.

"This issue should be above partisan politics," Senator WILEY said. "Above the question of personalities. It is a topic meriting our highest, cleanest, most sympathetic thinking and action."

The Senator's amendment is heartily endorsed by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, as well as other proposals for changes in this law outlined by Senator WILEY in a recent statement. These include:

1. Increase the number of DP's to be admitted to 400,000 over a 4-year period from the total coverage under the act, which is now 205,000.
2. Repeal the provision mortgaging future immigration quotas.
3. Eliminate requirement for job and housing assurances and substitute adequate provision for DP not to become a public charge.
4. Elimination discrimination because of race, religion or national origin in current DP law.
5. Increase number of war orphans to be admitted and raise age from present 16 years.
6. Adequate provision for political and religious refugees fleeing from Communist countries.
7. DP's in and out of IRO camps should have equal opportunity to be admitted.
8. Eliminate Baltic groups preference provision of present law.
9. Repeal rigid 30 percent priority for agricultural workers.
10. Give the Attorney General full authority to regularize status of DP's already in the United States without congressional approval.
11. Loan arrangements should be made for inland transportation of DP's.
12. Expellees shall be admitted without competing either with DP's or with persons normally eligible under the German and Austrian quotas.
13. Screening to eliminate those who favor overthrow of the Government along with those who had participated in political, racial or religious persecution.

Senator Wiley, who was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee last year says that the present statute was only a compromise stop-gap mechanism. "Now the time is overdue for an overhauling of this mechanism along the lines laid down above," he declared.

We agree with him.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time to answer the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] on the question raised in his 1-minute speech, because I want to talk about a project that means more to the people along the Ohio River than any other one of its kind that has ever been proposed. I refer to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, which was authorized by both Houses of Congress more than 2 years ago. It passed the House by a substantial majority, passed the Senate by a vote of 44 to 21, and was signed by the President. All we need now is an appropriation to begin work on it.

We are asking that funds with which to begin its construction be included in the civil functions appropriations bill.

It will mean the savings of untold millions, yes, hundreds of millions, of dollars to the people along the Ohio River, the Illinois River, the Mississippi, the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the Wabash, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Tombigbee, the Arkansas, and all of their tributaries—as well as to the people along the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico.

It is the most important project of its kind now before Congress. As, I said, it is already authorized by law, and should be constructed without delay. The Army engineers say that it is the only project that can be developed anywhere on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

It is 869 miles from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, La., down the Mississippi River. It is the finest inland waterway on earth for downstream traffic, and probably the worst one for upstream traffic, owing to the swift current of its majestic flow.

We have a protected intercoastal waterway from New Orleans to Mobile, 156 miles. It is protected by a long range of partially submerged islands that holds back the turbulent waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

It will be 481 miles from Mobile to the Tennessee River up this slack-water route along the Tombigbee behind 18 locks and dams. It is 215 miles from the point where this project enters the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, downstream—mind you—downstream—on the Tennessee River to where that stream enters the Ohio River at Paducah. Then it is downstream 47 miles on the Ohio from Paducah to Cairo.

The round trip is 1,768 miles of which 1,131 is downstream on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Tennessee Rivers, and the rest of it is slack water. It is equal to a slack, or still, water route from the Gulf to St. Louis, and at the same time it saves the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Now let me show you what that will mean to the shippers throughout the entire Nation.

I am placing a map of this project out in the hall where every Member can see it. On that map there are photographs, which were supplied me by the Army engineers, of barges carrying 14,000 tons going down the Ohio, the Illinois, and the Mississippi. One of them is loaded with automobiles which probably came out of Detroit, another is loaded with steel and machinery from Pittsburgh, and the other one is loaded with various materials, probably coming out of St. Paul or Minneapolis.

When those barges reach the Gulf of Mexico, they are usually loaded up with oil, timber, bauxite, cottonseed, cottonseed meal, tropical fruits, and other raw materials.

Here is a table, prepared by the Army engineers, showing the cost per ton for shipping material back up the Mississippi, and the cost per ton to ship it by way of this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, the savings per ton and also the savings per tow of a barge carrying 3,500 tons and also that of one carrying 14,000 tons:

	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
From New Orleans, La., to—							
Cairo	$2.02	$7,070	$1.32	$4,620	$0.70	$2,450	$9,800
Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
From Mobile, Ala, to—							
Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
From Port Birmingham, Ala., to—							
Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
From Demopolis, Ala., to—							
Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,330
From Columbus, Miss., to—							
Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
From Aberdeen, Miss., to—							
Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
From Fulton, Miss., to—							
Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

SAVINGS ON TRAFFIC TO POINTS ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI, THE MISSOURI, THE ILLINOIS, AND ALONG THE GREAT LAKES

You will note that a barge load of 14,000 tons going from New Orleans to Cairo would save $9,800 on its fuel bill alone, which is more than the profits the operator of such a barge line now realizes from a round trip.

One of these 14,000-ton barge loads going from Mobile to Cairo would save $20,160 on its fuel bill alone.

One going from Birmingham or Demopolis to Cairo would save $28,140 on its fuel bill alone.

Going from Columbus, Miss., to Cairo, it would save $32,480 on its fuel bill alone, from Aberdeen, Miss., to Cairo it would save $33,880 on its fuel bill alone, and from Fulton, Miss., to Cairo it would save $38,280 on its fuel bill alone.

That means that these savings would apply to every barge, and every vessel, going from any one of these points to Cairo, Ill., or to St. Louis, Mo., to Minneapolis or St. Paul, or to any other place on the upper Mississippi; or to Kansas City, Omaha, or Sioux City on the Missouri; or to Chicago or any other point on the Illinois, or any other place along the Great Lakes.

SAVINGS ON TRAFFIC TO POINTS ALONG THE OHIO AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Now let us take the Ohio River and see what the savings would amount to along that majestic stream and its tributaries including the Cumberland, the Monongahela, the Allegheny, and the Wabash.

A 14,000-ton barge load going from New Orleans to Paducah, or to any other point on the Ohio River, including Cincinnati, Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and every other point on that stream, as well as every point along the Cumberland, the Wabash, the Allegheny, and the Monongahela, clear up into West Virginia, would save $11,680 on its fuel bill alone.

If it went from Mobile, Ala., to any point on the Ohio or any of its tributaries, the savings on its fuel bill would be $22,160.

If it went from Birmingham or Demopolis, the savings on its fuel bill would amount to $30,100.

Going from Columbus, Miss., it would save $34,440; from Aberdeen, Miss., it would save $35,840; and from Fulton, Miss., it would save $37,240 on its fuel bill alone.

As the Army engineers have pointed out, there is not another project on earth, or a place where one can be constructed, that would provide such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances with so much ease and so little expense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Now let us see what it will mean from a standpoint of national defense.

Every intelligent person knows that the greatest defense plant on earth is our atomic-bomb establishment at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Now let us see what the savings would amount to on materials being transported by barge or boat to Oak Ridge or to any other point on the Tennessee River above the place where this project joins that stream.

Going from New Orleans to any point on the Tennessee River above the place where this project joins the Tennessee, the savings on the fuel bill alone on 14,000 tons would be $20,020.

Going from Mobile, the savings would be $30,380.

Going from Birmingham or Demopolis, the savings would be $38,360.

Going from Columbus, Miss., the savings would be $42,940.

From Aberdeen, Miss., the savings would be $44,100; and from Fulton, Miss., $45,500.

That would be the savings on the fuel bill alone on a barge load of 14,000 tons.

In addition to that, it will give us an additional outlet from Oak Ridge to the sea, which may be vitally necessary in case of an emergency; and it will shorten the water distance from Oak Ridge to the Gulf of Mexico by approximately 800 miles.

I hope each and every Member of the Congress will study this map which you will find out in the hall back of the Speaker's stand, and study these figures which the Army engineers have worked out and support our amendment for funds with which to begin the construction of this great enterprise.

Remember this project is all American, and it will benefit all the American people. If it was in Europe, it would have been constructed long ago, or would be constructed immediately—at our expense.

I am just in receipt of a news dispatch from Paris, France, to the Atlanta Constitution, which says:

French and Italian interests, planning to construct a vehicular and railway tunnel beneath Mount Blanc to connect France and Italy by a direct route, expect to obtain Marshall-plan funds for the project.

There is no telling how many hundreds of millions, or even billions, of dollars that project will cost. Someone suggested that if this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland-waterway project could be moved to Europe, we might have less trouble in getting funds for its construction.

But I am appealing to you as Americans—Members of the American Congress—to support us in our efforts to construct this all-American project, which means more to the people you and I represent than any other one of its kind that has ever been proposed.

It is just as sure to be constructed as the night follows the day, and the sooner we get it started, the better it will be for all concerned. As I have shown, it is badly needed for transportation purposes, as well as for national defense. Let us not neglect it and thereby invite another Pearl Harbor.

In Stalin's Footsteps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how far can we go and yet preserve our constitutional government and free-enterprise system?

I have here an article written by Felix Morley, entitled "In Stalin's Footsteps," which reveals the shocking provisions of H. R. 2756, titled "Economic Stability Act of 1949."

The revelations in this article should be read by every citizen of the United States. To say that the provisions of H. R. 2756 now pending in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House are shocking is to put it mildly.

Mr. President, in order that these revelations may be widespread, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN STALIN'S FOOTSTEPS

(By Felix Morley)

The proposed Economic Stability Act of 1949 is at the moment resting quietly in the House Committee on Banking and Currency. But the import of this truly extraordinary measure is not minimized by the fact that it is currently receiving little publicity. Its sponsors do not want advertisement just yet.

A close reading of the bill, H. R. 2756, explains why the administration is not at the moment inclined to invite public scrutiny for this monstrosity of its own creation. The clear purpose of the legislation is to impose a centrally planned economy on the United States. Thus it is the keystone of the gateway to national socialism, climaxing the program of civil rights, restoration of the Wagner Act, public housing, social security, socialized medicine, rent control, and Federal command of education.

H. R. 2756 was introduced, without fuss or fanfare, by Representative BRENT SPENCE, of the Fifth Kentucky District, on February 15. Mr. SPENCE is a reliable Democratic wheel horse who has attained chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee by virtue of his 10 terms in Congress. This bill of his has no direct relationship to either banking or currency and has gone to that committee merely because a favorable pro forma report can be expected there whenever desired.

It is not impossible that Congressman SPENCE has read the bill which bears his name but he certainly did not draft it. The preparation of the measure is said to be the work of a small and zealous committee headed by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan. Hearings will not be requested until the Taft-Hartley Act is well on its way to repeal, and perhaps not unless the filibuster of the southern Democrats is broken. But, eventually, we shall see the Spence bill in the headlines.

Since H. R. 2756 runs to 42 printed pages, and is clever as well as unscrupulous, it is suggested that readers of human events request their Congressman, or perhaps Mr. Spence himself, to furnish them with copies. It is difficult to name another official document which more clearly reveals the intent of this administration to develop totalitarian government. It can also be said with assurance that the more attentively the Spence bill is examined, the less likely will be the chance of its passage, even by the Eighty-first Congress.

II

Really to understand the implications of this measure, one should be familiar with the way the great Stalin 5-year plan was put over in Soviet Russia. Consciously or unconsciously, our planners are following procedure utilized by the Russian Communists 3 years ago.

It is perhaps insufficiently realized that the U. S. S. R. also has a bicameral Congress, much like that of the United States, to which the Council of Ministers—under the chairmanship of Stalin—is at least nominally responsible and accountable. That is the wording in article 65 of the Constitution of the U. S. S. R., obtainable in an English edition from the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Article 67 of the present Russian Constitution states that: "Decisions and orders of the Council of Ministers of the U. S. S. R. are binding throughout the territory of the U. S. S. R." But it is to be remembered that this council is appointed by the supreme Soviet, which is in turn selected by those whom the Communist Party defines as "citizens." Although non-Communists are now allowed to vote, only loyal Communists can be candidates for office.

The point—for present purposes—is that a semblance of constitutional procedure is carefully maintained in Moscow, as in Washington. Therefore, when it was decided to inaugurate the great Stalin 5-year plan, an enabling act had to be adopted by both houses of the supreme Soviet, divided into a Soviet of the Union and a Soviet of Nationalities. These are respectively representative of voters by election districts and of voters as citizens of the various federated Soviet Republics—like our House and Senate.

So the present Russian 5-year plan was not just ordained by the Kremlin. First it was necessary for the supreme Soviet to adopt a law promulgating the plan, which was done on March 18, 1946. The Spence bill is the counterpart of that Russian law.

If one places the text of this Soviet law, of 3 years ago, side by side with the proposed Economic Stability Act of 1949 the parallelism in thought and even in wording, is seen to be extraordinary. It is difficult to believe that those who drafted the Spence bill were unfamiliar with its Communist prototype. It is certainly easy to see that the political objectives of the Kremlin bill of 1946, and of the White House bill of 1949, are identical.

III

The Soviet act pays tribute to "our great leader, Comrade Stalin," and authorizes him to delegate the necessary administrative authority to appropriate members of his Council of Ministers. The authorization which the Spence bill would grant is more impersonal than that of its Communist counterpart. Our pending bill says (sec. 104 (a)):

"The administration of this act is vested in the President, who may delegate any and all authority hereunder to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate."

As soon as the Soviet act for a 5-year plan was adopted Stalin and his advisers were free to enlarge, modify, or alter its provisions as they felt desirable. Let us note the parallel latitude which would be given to President Truman under the Spence bill.

Under section 104 (c): "The President may issue such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions * * * of this act."

Under section 201 (a): "* * * The President shall from time to time designate materials or facilities with respect to which he finds that a shortage * * * threatens to affect * * * the national security."

Under section 204: "Whenever the President determines that it is necessary * * * he may make loans * * * to State governments or subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof for the expansion of capacity and production. Such loans may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law and on such terms and conditions as the President deems necessary."

Under section 205 (b): "Whenever the President determines that it is necessary * * * he may * * * construct new plant facilities * * * for the expansion of capacity and production. Such contracts may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law and on such terms and conditions as the President deems necessary. * * * For the purposes of this section, the President is authorized to acquire real property * * * by purchase, lease, or otherwise, as he deems necessary."

Under section 302 (e) (1): "The President may * * * make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of any person, and make such

investigations * * * as may be necessary or appropriate in his discretion."

Under section 401: "The President may by regulation or order require sellers of any commodity which significantly affects the cost of living * * * to give up to 60 days' notice to the President * * * of any intended price increase with respect to any such commodity." This is followed by authorization to fix prices "in the judgment of the President." There is, however, one really humorous safeguard in section 402: "The President shall not 'establish maximum prices for a commodity' unless 'it is determined by the President' that 'the proposed action is administratively feasible.'"

IV

We have quoted only a few instances of the completely dictatorial power over the national economy which the Spence bill would vest in the uncontrolled hands of the President. Like its Russian counterpart of 3 years back, this pending legislation bases its case on "national security," on the "carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States"—whatever that may be—and on the more abundant life.

But the cold, grim fact is that the tyrannical implications of the Spence bill are worse even than those of the act passed by the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. 3 years ago. That legislation, at least, said with much precision precisely what steps Stalin should take to increase production in specific industries. Under the Spence bill, the blue sky is the limit. Whatever the President says—that goes.

There is, of course, plenty of eyewash in the Spence bill. It asks these emergency powers for only 5 years, and for a shorter time in the case of some provisions. A lot of sops are thrown to small business. Farmers are assured (in sec. 405) that they will get parity prices, regardless of price controls for industry. Labor is solemnly told (in sec. 406 (a)) that the purpose of the Economic Stability Act of 1949 is not to prevent wage increases "but rather to further the objective of preventing price increases which tend to destroy * * * the value of the wage-earner's dollar." It is even provided (sec. 406 (c)) that higher wages "may not be considered as an increase in cost of production for the purpose of adjustments in price ceilings * * * until 6 months after the effective date of the wage increase."

However, there is something doubly horrifying in this attempt to make farmers and labor and small business believe that their freedom will be preserved while free enterprise as such is struck down. As dictators move to assume power, they always argue that only the minority will suffer—that the majority will benefit—from the tyranny that is planned. So Stalin praised his own 5-year plan when he urged adoption of the necessary enabling law by the Supreme Soviet.

Guam Assembly Walk-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following information on the Guam situation was released March 8 by the Institute of Ethnic Affairs:

"I hope that Congress and the American people will understand the significance of the walk-out by the Guam Assembly at their meeting on March 5," John Collier, president of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, stated today.

"That walk-out, staged in protest against naval administration, dramatically indicates their desire for an organic act and civilian government.

"It should prompt the Navy and Interior Departments immediately to forward to Congress the organic acts they have had under consideration for many months.

"It should stimulate Congress to take action in defining the political status of Guamanians, a treaty obligation which has been neglected for 50 years."

"December 23, 1948, marked the fiftieth anniversary of military law in Guam," he continued. "For half a century Guamanians have been subjected to the arbitrary rule of naval governors, few of whom have stayed longer than 2 years. They have no constitution. They have no court appeal beyond the Secretary of the Navy. Until the last 2 years, the Guam Congress has had advisory power only. Though the full facts are not yet available here, it has been learned that the present walk-out was in protest to what Guamanians said was an attempt by the Navy to curtail their legislative authority."

It is significant that the last act by the adjourning assembly was unanimous approval of enactment by the United States Congress of organic legislation and civil rule. It is equally significant that the Guamanians feel they must go on strike to get the United States Congress to take an interest in their needs.

Citizenship, organic legislation, and civilian administration were recommended for Guam by an agreement of the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, communicated to Congress on June 18, 1947, by the President.

On February 11, 1949, President Truman addressed a letter to each of the four Secretaries, stating his intention, upon enactment of organic acts, to designate the Department of the Interior as the civilian agency responsible for the administration of Guam.

On March 3, 1949, Interior Secretary J. A. Krug stated that in his opinion a target date ought to be set for a transfer of administration on Guam.

(More than 350 leading residents of Guam are members of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs.)

[From the Washington Post]

NAVY ACTION PROTESTED BY GUAM ASSEMBLY

GUAM, March 5.—The Guam Assembly walked out in protest today against what it said was an attempt by the United States Navy to curtail its legislative authority.

The walk-out occurred after the Navy government refused to permit contempt warrants to be served on a civil-service employee charged with refusing to answer questions of a congressional committee. Assemblyman Carlos Taitano said the assembly would remain in adjournment until the United States Congress acts on a bill to give Guam organic and civil government.

Democracies Can Solve the German Problem by Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Press Scimitar. I do this because it expresses so clearly a very serious doubt which has been arising in my mind as to the tendency we are pursuing in our foreign relations of relying so heavily on armaments and alliances, and neglecting the political possibilities involved in our original intentions with regard to the United Nations and similar efforts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar of Wednesday, March 9, 1949]

DEMOCRACIES CAN SOLVE THE GERMAN PROBLEM BY ATLANTIC UNION

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

As goes Germany, so goes Europe and perhaps the world.

Hitler tried to conquer Russia and use her enormous resources to bring about Nazi domination of the world. He almost succeeded, but because of our help, Russia was able to throw out the invader.

Now Stalin would like to reverse the process. He would like to bolshevize all of Germany as he already has the eastern half and employ German know-how to effectuate Russian Communist rule of the world.

We were under the illusion during the war and in the period that followed immediately after, that Soviet Russia intended to cooperate with the western democracies to preserve the peace of the world and, in doing so, that the east would join hands sincerely with the west to keep Germany harmless. We soon found this was never the Communist intention.

We have no long-range plan to take the place of the east-west cooperation which we want, but can't have. We have only our day-to-day extemporization, such as the Berlin air lift, brilliant and brave, but only a stop-gap.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Is there something we can start, equally brilliant and brave, which will grow sounder and stronger through the years?

Yes; there is. We can unite the free Atlantic world in a permanent federation. Thus we can erect a power so great and so preponderant that it will be a great magnet which will attract Germany into it. Germany will be compelled to qualify as a democracy in order to gain admission.

Our occupation even of the western half of Germany cannot continue forever. We cannot afford to let Germany be conquered by Soviet Russia from without or fall prey to Communist plots from within. We cannot afford to see Germany become an entirely independent nation, free to go fascist or militarist again, throw her weight around, bargain cynically between east and west.

Federation of the free is good in itself. Twice in this century the free world has been attacked by an aggressor because the free world was divided and the aggressor thought he could successfully challenge one part of it. Each time the free world has slowly united—politically, militarily, economically—gathere its strength and thrown off the attack—but each time at tremendous cost, and with the aggressor's strength bringing the free world close to defeat.

For the third time an aggressor challenges the free world. Obviously, the way to discourage him from attacking is to unite the free world in time of peace. The pending military alliance is the necessary first step. We should plan now to follow it by permanent, unbreakable union.

As a byproduct of such an Atlantic federation, we shall solve the German problem.

For such a federation would be a mighty magnet which would attract the Germans into it.

COULD DO NO HARM

In such a federation, the Germans could do no harm, for they would have only a minority of votes in determining the policies—the proved nonaggressive United States, Canada, Britain, Holland, Belgium, Norway, etc., would hold the majority.

But the undeniable ability of the Germans in scientific, technical, mechanical, industrial and military fields would be at the service of freedom, building security and prosperity for us and for themselves.

Before the rise of Kaiserism and Hitlerism in Germany, Germans were decent, harmless, and spiritually close to England and the United States, and there was mutual admiration and trust between the Germans and the other Atlantic peoples. Through federation, this happy condition can be restored.

Letters Commending Francis Lloyd Jones and John N. Kostelnik for Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters written by the Yale Association of Washington State commending Mr. Francis Lloyd Jones, of Seattle, and Mr. John N. Kostelnik, of Renton, Wash., for their courage in saving the lives of Yale students who were victims of an airplane disaster last January in Seattle.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., February 7, 1949.

Mr. JOHN N. KOSTELNIK,
417 Grady Way, Windsor Hills,
Renton, Wash.

DEAR MR. KOSTELNIK: The members of the Yale Association of Washington extend to you their admiration and gratitude for your courageous action in saving the lives of the Yale students who were victims in the tragic accident of January 2, 1949, when a DC-3 transport plane crashed at Boeing Field.

Your gallant choice in entering the blazing plane and risking your life instead of retreating for your own safety was heroic. If you had not done so, the disaster would have been greater by additional casualties. Your unselfish conduct deserves the highest commendation. You will never be forgotten by the students or their families.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the boys who survived, to their families, to President Seymour of Yale University, to Mr. William Allen, president of Boeing Aircraft, and to Mr. Jacobsen, your supervisor at Boeing Aircraft.

Very truly yours,
TENNYS BELLAMY,
Vice President.

YALE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., February 7, 1949.

Mr. FRANCIS LLOYD JONES,
10855 Crestwood Drive,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. JONES: The members of the Yale Association of Washington extend to you their admiration and gratitude for your courageous action in saving the lives of the Yale students who were victims in the tragic accident of January 2, 1949, when a DC-3 transport plane crashed at Boeing Field.

Your unselfish conduct deserves the highest commendation. You will never be forgotten by the students or their families.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the boys who survived, to their families, to President Seymour of Yale University, to Mr. William Allen, president of Boeing Aircraft, and to Mr. Jacobsen, your supervisor at Boeing Aircraft.

Very truly yours,
TENNYS BELLAMY,
Vice President.

Nomination of Col. E. W. Palmer as Outstanding Business Leader of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to Col. Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of Dixie Business, by Lawrence J. Linck, executive director of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc. The letter is with reference to Col. E. W. Palmer, a native of Meredith, N. H., who is this year being nominated by Dixie Business as one of the outstanding leaders of the South.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND ADULTS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 16, 1949.

Col. HUBERT F. LEE,
Editor and Founder, Dixie Business,
P. O. Box 119, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR COLONEL LEE: I was tremendously pleased to receive information that Col. E. W. Palmer, distinguished president of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults for 8 years, has been nominated as one of the South's foremost business leaders for 1949. I do not believe that there is anyone among my Nation-wide circle of friends whose lifetime has been so full of devotion to humanitarian causes as has that of Colonel Palmer.

As secretary of this society I know particularly of Colonel Palmer's remarkable contribution to the development of services for handicapped persons throughout our country. For the 8 years he has served the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults as its president, and the many, many years before that, during which he was interested in the cause of the handicapped and served it in many ways, both nationally and in his own State where he has been president of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, he has made a great contribution to this program.

It is under his outstanding leadership and with his valued guidance that the national society has grown from a federation of some 20 State member societies to a truly Nation-wide federation, with State member units in every State, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. There are more than 2,000 local units active in this work at this time.

Colonel Palmer's vision of the needs of the handicapped of the country and his desire to see services extended to reach all of those who have physical handicaps has been an inspiration to those of us who have worked with him. He has been in the forefront of the all-important movement to spell out of the good work done for crippled children a realistic, practical program of services and employment.

Nor has Colonel Palmer's interest been confined to the handicapped. I know from personal experience that he has done a yeoman service in Rotary International, in community fund services, in Boy Scouts of America, and State and local planning with service bodies—to mention only a few of the many causes to which he has devoted himself; in addition to his almost unbelievably active life in connection with the development of the Kingsport Press to one of the most outstanding in the country and participation in State and local civic affairs. He also had a splendid record of service to his country in wartime.

I heartily second the nomination of Colonel Palmer as an outstanding man of the year. He is truly a man who has left his mark on his community, his State, and upon the writer.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE J. LINCK,
Executive Director.

Moral of the Inferior Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, first it was little pigs; now it is potatoes. What next?

This editorial from the February 25 issue of the Los Angeles Times should make every Member of Congress stop and think. With high prices, pressure for higher taxes, millions starving throughout the world, we should make it our business to find out why our Government, in order to keep the price of potatoes high for the benefit of the growers, spent last year $200,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to buy these fancy potatoes which they disposed of to processors who usually use low-grade potatoes, and then destroyed the rest; while as a result the American housewife was forced to pay ridiculously high prices for inferior potatoes which the growers had no difficulty selling due to the shortage of potatoes created by these enormous Government purchases.

The editorial follows:

MORAL OF THE INFERIOR POTATOES

Many housewives wondered last year, when they were ransoming those ill-favored potatoes from their grocers, why prices were so high when quality was so low. They had heard, of course, that the Government was destroying surplus potatoes, which did not square with the scarcity prices they paid, but they did not know the whole story, because it was not told. Here it is:

Last year the Department of Agriculture spent $200,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to keep the price of potatoes high for the benefit of the growers. The Department

fixed a support price of $2.92 per 100 pounds for the best grade of potatoes and $1.46 for inferior grades.

Potato acreage was smaller than it had been, but production methods were improved, and one of the greatest crops in history came to market. The farmers, naturally, sold their best potatoes to the Government for the fancy price of $2.92 per 100 pounds. (That's $1.75 a bushel.) The Government disposed of these fancy potatoes to processors who usually use low-grade surplus potatoes (for production of alcohol, starch, and flour) and to livestock feeders. Still there were good potatoes left, and the Government destroyed them.

The Government didn't have to buy the low-grade potatoes. By buying the best it had created a shortage, and the farmers had no difficulty in getting rid of their inferior product, generally at a better price than the $1.46 per 100 pounds the Government would have paid for them.

So the housewife was really gouged in three ways. In the first place, due to Government interference, she paid a higher price at the market for potatoes—any potatoes—than she would have paid if supply and demand could have come into balance. In the second place, her taxpaying husband was compelled to contribute a little of the $200,000,000 which the Government paid the farmers so that she would have to pay the higher market price. And in the third place, she was denied any choice among potatoes; she had to take the inferior ones and like it.

And she is not through with it yet. Support for potato prices was to have ended December 31, 1948, but Congress yielded to pressure when the price-support bill came up last June and agreed to maintain the old price level until the whole 1948 crop is marketed. After that there will be a little relief, unless the Eighty-first Congress decides to undo the work of the Eightieth.

This potato story illuminates the report of the agriculture task force of the Hoover Commission, which has just been released. The task force, headed by Dean H. P. Rusk, of the Illinois State College of Agriculture, opposes high, rigid farm price supports because they "expose the Government to large financial losses." It was not within the directive of the task force directly to consider the gouged consumer; it was concerned exclusively with Government efficiency and economy, with its eye on such items as the $200,000,000 spent on potato support last year, most of which was lost money.

The task force indorses the flexible (and lower) supports of farm prices in the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. The farm organizations are divided on the matter and there is much lobby pressure on the Eighty-first Congress to go back to the old short-sighted policy of guaranteed full parity prices in the market place.

The wiser farm leaders know, however, that parity, or 90 percent of parity, or any other fixed price can't be paid, particularly in a depression period, without rigid marketing control, dumping abroad, surpluses, and the sort of waste that occurred with the potatoes. They also know that farm income does not depend always on the prices paid. The amount of products sold is a factor also. If a farmer produces a Government-restricted crop at a high Government price, he may make less than he could get by producing an unrestricted crop at a lower price.

The Hoover Commission submitted the task force's report without comment, not desiring to get into the political brawl over price supports. But it has been made as one of the recommendations for better and cheaper Government. It is not hard to understand what the task force means after reading the story of the potatoes.

You Are Paying the Bill—Feeding the Cow That Gives the Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week you were told that the Federal Government paid out to States, under cooperative arrangements and for relief and other aid, exclusive of grants and loans, during 1932, $269,425,252. In 1948, for like purposes, it disbursed $5,551,054,046. Perhaps a very few wondered where Uncle Sam got the money. He got it from you.

Every individual, if he had been forced to pay his per capita share of the taxes collected by local, State, and Federal Governments, would, during the years 1932 to 1948, inclusive, have paid the following sums:

Per capita tax receipts of Federal, State, and local governments

Year	Federal	State	Local	Total
1932	$14.43	$15.24	$36.02	$65.69
1933	14.31	13.81	33.09	61.21
1934	23.03	15.76	34.84	73.63
1935	28.06	17.54	36.46	82.06
1936	30.23	20.57	35.78	86.59
1937	37.21	23.53	34.99	95.73
1938	41.94	24.31	35.44	101.69
1939	37.01	23.76	34.55	95.32
1940	37.52	25.31	34.34	97.17
1941	52.15	27.33	35.85	115.32
1942	92.33	29.60	34.49	156.42
1943	157.56	29.61	34.78	221.95
1944	301.05	30.64	34.96	366.65
1945	308.99	32.81	36.53	378.33
1946	274.40	37.72	38.71	350.83
1947	252.55	41.54	41.68	335.77
1948	263.99	47.75	45.58	357.32

Federal tax receipts increased on a per capita basis by 1,829 percent.
State tax receipts increased by 313 percent. Local tax receipts increased by 126 percent.

Change in pattern of tax receipts for selected years

Year	Federal tax	State tax	Local tax	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1932	21.90	23.30	54.80	100
1933	23.37	22.56	54.07	100
1943	70.98	13.34	15.68	100
1948	73.88	13.33	12.79	100

Note how, in 1932, the Federal Government took but 21.9 percent of the total tax you paid, but that, in 1948, it hit you for 73.88 percent of the total sum you paid for taxes. Your local tax rate dropped from 54.8 percent in 1932 to 12.79 percent in 1948.

The foregoing figures, if you care to analyze them, give you a very clear picture showing that the Federal Government isn't really giving you anything. It is just taking more of your tax dollar and, after shaving it for administrative expenses, handing a part of it back to you and, instead of letting you spend what it hands back as you wish, it tells you just how you are to spend it.

That kind of procedure, continued, means that ever-increasing taxes will be taken from you by the Government and, in the end, the Government will tell you how you are to live, in what business you are to engage—in short, we will have socialism—and if you want to know what that means, take a look, not only at Russia and her people, but at Great Britain and its Labor government.

That is the kind of a government that the CIO, which has recently taken over the Democratic Party in Michigan, intends to give that State.

Want to give up more tax dollars—and have Washington take more of each tax dollar?

Submarine and Antisubmarine Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

IMPORTANCE OF SUBMARINES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the significance of submarines in the event of another war cannot be too strongly emphasized. In fact, submarine and antisubmarine warfare is growing in importance. Any power attempting to operate over vast stretches of ocean must be able to control the sea lanes. The submarine is not only invaluable in destroying enemy shipping but it is rapidly developing into one of the most potent antisubmarine weapons. This weapon will be of inestimable value in clearing the waters of enemy subs if we are called upon to engage in extensive shipping.

Russia, which is not a great sea power, is very much interested in possessing an efficient submarine fleet with underwater craft of all types so that she would be able to sink the ships of any country endeavoring to send material and men overseas for the purpose of conducting military and naval operations. It appears that the Soviet Union is placing major emphasis on the development of an exceedingly efficient submarine fleet to prevent any country from operating its vessels within the coastal waters or in reaching the coastal waters close to the Soviet Union.

After World War I, and particularly since World War II, there have been major developments in submarine construction. At the present time both the United States and Russia are pushing the improvement and the construction of underwater craft as rapidly as possible.

RUSSIAN INTEREST IN SUBMARINES

Since the end of World War I in 1918 the Russians have evidenced concern in building an effective submarine fleet. The Soviet Union first acquired a sizable number of submarines from Great Britain and the United States, and between the two World Wars several additional submarines were obtained from various other sources. A few of the smaller types were manufactured in Russia. The Soviet Union is trying to insure the

country against an attack from overseas and therefore is concentrating on the building of submarines instead of other types of naval vessels. It is easy to understand why a large portion of the Russian submarines are of the coastal-defense type. If the coastal waters are kept clear of enemy shipping the invasion of Russia would be impossible. The Kremlin is pressing for the building of an excellent submarine fleet.

The planners in Moscow realize full well that should a conflict occur with the United States a submarine fleet would be of prime importance in severing the Atlantic and Pacific lines of communication. We well remember how for a considerable period of time in the last war we were losing the battle of the Atlantic as the German submarines sent to the bottom many tons of Allied shipping. In order to prevent an invasion of the Continent of Europe or of Asia, the Soviets are determined by the strength of their submarine fleet to control particularly the coastal waters. The Soviet Union lays particular emphasis first on her armies, then on air power, and then on submarines.

RUSSIAN STRENGTH AND CAPABILITIES

The Soviets have more than 70 very small submarines of approximately 200 tons each. These underwater craft are unable to operate more than 100 miles offshore. They would not constitute a threat of any magnitude against shipping and against naval forces unless the Navy were operating close to the Russian shores. This coastal submarine fleet is for the purpose of preventing the delivery of any equipment to any Russian territory or to contiguous areas.

MEDIUM-RANGE SUBMARINES

A significant number of the Russian submarines are of medium range, with a cruising radius of about 5,000 miles. They could not be expected to operate any more than 2,000 miles from their bases. With these medium-range submarines they hope to prevent any shipping from moving in the waters that would give a possible antagonist a chance to sail even close to the shores of Russia or Russian-dominated territory.

LONG-RANGE SUBMARINES

The Russians have approximately 75 long-range submarines capable of reaching our coasts in the Atlantic and in the Pacific. These long-range submarines give us concern because they can move across both oceans to molest our shipping anywhere between our coast and the coasts of Europe and Asia.

In addition to these they have an indeterminate number of type XXI German submarines. This is the snorkel. It is a Dutch invention which the Germans copied. The submarine is streamlined with increased battery capacity. It has a speed as high as 18 knots submerged for short periods of time.

In reference to this type, four were delivered to the Russians after the war and the Soviets took the parts for many more—perhaps as many as 20. It is possible that the Russians are assembling submarines from these parts. The actual number, of course, is not known. It is thought that should war occur within the next few years, only a few of these submarines would be encountered. The Russian preparations are clothed with great secrecy, and it is next to impossible to secure reliable information on the size of their submarines, the extent of their fleet, or their effectiveness.

It is a well-known fact that plans and possibly parts for the type XXVI submarine were captured by the Russians. This type submarine features the closed cycle power plant which permits submarines to operate below the surface and without aid of the snorkel. It utilizes hydrogen peroxide, which decomposes in the presence of a catalyst, giving up oxygen. Another closed cycle type uses liquid oxygen instead of hydrogen. A closed cycle engine operates without air. The Navy has reproduced both types.

With the XXVI the Germans contemplated reaching a submerged speed of 25 knots an hour for a very limited period. There are many technical difficulties which must be overcome before this submarine will become a practical operating unit. We may be sure that the Soviet Union is exerting every effort to make this submarine a practical underwater craft.

THE SNORKEL

The much-advertised snorkel is a breathing tube designed to supply air to Diesel engines. This permits the submarine to operate with the hull beneath the surface and only the tip of the snorkel exposed. The snorkel would be used not through choice but through necessity. A submarine on the surface for the purpose of charging batteries is vulnerable to aircraft. This drives it to use of the snorkel for protection.

While remaining submerged, the submarine is greatly restricted in its power to carry out its mission. As an illustration, its capacity to locate targets is seriously handicapped, but, in addition, it is restricted in its ability to navigate and to communicate with home bases or other intelligent sources. The Russian submarine fleet, as constituted today, could impose some restrictions to United States control of the seas and our use of merchant fleets and naval forces. This causes us grave concern since we do not know just how powerful and how effective is the Russian submarine fleet. Should war occur we could well run into serious difficulty in maintaining our shipping.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE MEASURES

To combat this growing fleet of Russian submarines, strong methods are imperative. We must not relax in equipping ships and aircraft with the devices and weapons needed in antisubmarine warfare. Most careful attention must be devoted to the training of adequate personnel to man these ships and aircraft.

The increased complexities of antisubmarine weapons and devices demand higher standards of training than were previously required. In addition to providing "live" submarines for training with the surface and air forces, a most serious problem of maintenance of equipments and weapons is presented. The maintenance of equipment is becoming a major problem of the Navy. It increases materially the cost of keeping antisubmarine forces in readiness for combat. Complicated electronic equipment is beyond the normal capabilities of operating personnel to maintain in working condition. This is leading to the necessity for more and more stocking of expensive packaged units.

Antisubmarine warfare is divided into four principal categories as follows:

First. Submarines may be destroyed at their bases, assembly yards, or anchorage by bombing.

Second. Submarines may be destroyed in their harbors and passages of egress to the sea by the use of mines. Mines may be laid by submarines, surface ships, or aircraft.

Third. Submarines may be attacked and sunk when encountered on the high seas by antisubmarine forces.

Fourth. The submarine weapon may be evaded or destroyed by surface ships.

THE SUBMARINE AS AN ANTISUBMARINE WEAPON

The submarine is rapidly being developed into one of the most effective antisubmarine weapons. In World War II, 70 Axis submarines were sunk by the submarines of the Allies. While it is true that antisubmarine warfare was not the primary mission of Allied submarines, it should be kept in mind that they were successful when encountering and fighting craft of their own kind. The future use of submarines for this work is extremely important.

The United States submarine fleet has as its primary mission the training of antisubmarine forces. It has been the experience of the Navy that in training there is no substitute for the "live" submarine. We have 80 underwater craft as part of our fleet, but antisubmarine training leaves very little time for any of the other types of operations. Many more submarines could be employed usefully for this purpose. It is necessary to provide sufficient funds to supply an adequate number of submarines so that there can be full training for the detection and destruction of enemy underwater craft.

Special types of submarines are now under development for evaluation, including the personnel transport, the cargo transport, the oiler, the radar picket, the guided-missile launcher, and the laboratory for testing new devices. The radar picket type is particularly significant for it may be employed either as a picket with a task force or used to establish offshore early warning stations to give information on approaching enemy aircraft. This could well be essential in the defense of this country against enemy air raids.

ANTISUBMARINE SHIPS ON THE SURFACE

In the active fleet, the Navy possesses 134 destroyers and 12 destroyer escorts in commission. There are 6 escort carriers and 2 light cruisers all equipped for antisubmarine warfare. By the end of the calendar year 1949, 1 escort carrier and 2 light carriers will be equipped for antisubmarine warfare in addition to what the Navy currently possesses. Anti-

submarine employment is the primary task of the destroyer, destroyer escort, and antisubmarine warfare carrier. These ships receive regular progressive training in antisubmarine warfare by drilling the attack teams on shore, on realistic training devices, and at sea on actual submarine targets. This is considered essential since past experience has demonstrated that skill in antisubmarine operations is almost directly proportional to the time and effort devoted to operational training.

Besides the active ships the reserve fleet comprises 210 destroyers, 217 destroyer escorts, and 12 CVE's of the 105 class. All are equipped with World War II antisubmarine devices. With trained crews and modern antisubmarine warfare equipment, these ships can be made as effective as the active fleet units. It must be realized and it cannot be too often emphasized that placing these ships in full commission and equipping them will require first funds and then time to accomplish.

There are available in the active and reserve fleets 384 miscellaneous types of ships fitted with antisubmarine equipment. Approximately half of this group is of the small coastal type of ship while the other half comprises types primarily designed for purposes other than antisubmarine operations. However, these latter ships could be employed in antisubmarine tasks if the demand should grow strong enough.

ANTISUBMARINE AIRCRAFT

Antisubmarine aircraft fall into two general categories: carrier-based and shore-based patrol types. At the present time there are nine qualified patrol squadrons which are specialized in antisubmarine warfare. It must be borne in mind that these squadrons consist of aircraft more specifically designed for antisubmarine warfare. They are not adequately equipped for all phases of convoy support and killer group operations.

As more of the highly specialized fighting equipment becomes available, it is planned to emphasize antisubmarine warfare in all multiengine squadrons except those designated for other special missions. This plan is designed to provide 29 squadrons of 10 planes, each trained and equipped for antisubmarine operations.

Two escort and one light carrier group are now operating our convoy support killer group. In addition, a light carrier group is being activated. These aircraft have the antisubmarine configurations but in the case of patrol squadrons have limitations as to the equipment carried. Replacement aircraft for both carrier patrol types have been prototyped and will be soon evaluated.

The primary mission of the aircraft will be to augment the surface forces in escorting convoys. Aircraft not so employed will be used for carrier/surface ship killer groups in the case of antisubmarine aircraft and for VP-killer groups in the case of patrol squadrons, teaming up with surface ships or submarines for the latter groups.

If the country is forced into war, the Navy will immediately be faced with the task of maintaining secure from enemy threat lines of communication on all the seas. As presently envisioned, the threat will come primarily from submarine attacks against Allied merchant ships and naval vessels. Studies indicate that our antisubmarine forces should be employed generally in the same manner as they were in World War II, at least in the initial phases of the conflict. It is most difficult to predict with any degree of accuracy and in any detail the antisubmarine techniques that the last analysis will be required since these measures will finally be determined to a great degree by the tactics of enemy submarines. The problem is under continuous study and review. The training of the operating forces of the Navy is being keyed directly to the results of these studies.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Future antisubmarine warfare development may be conveniently divided into the following categories: One, research; two, development; three, evaluation; four, procurement; five, installation; six, training; seven, maintenance. This applies to all the weapons that are being developed for the purpose of maintaining our shipping lanes and meeting the menace of enemy submarine attacks in another way.

RESEARCH

The Navy is experiencing difficulty in recruiting young scientists in undersea warfare research. It has become increasingly difficult to obtain experienced scientists to work on the many problems in the very specialized field of undersea warfare research. The reasons for the increasing difficulties lie in the fact that there are no commercial counterparts which deal in such matters as underwater acoustics, hydrodynamics, and many related problems.

It is imperative to have a long-range program established with sufficient funds to give hope to scientists that when they enter this field of endeavor they have a reasonable assurance that their employment has some degree of permanence. The scientists feel that time devoted to undersea warfare research places them at a disadvantage if after a short term of employment they are released from the Navy and are forced to seek employment elsewhere.

The problems peculiar to antisubmarine do not prepare these men for employment outside of the Navy. A policy of providing sufficient funds to give permanent employment to scientists in this work should at once be adopted in the interests of national security.

DEVELOPMENT

Some development work is being undertaken in the research laboratories. It is more usual, however, to have it carried on by the cognizant bureaus, that is Bureau of Ships, Bureau of Aeronautics, or Bureau of Ordnance. Development work with ships, weapons, or other devices used in antisubmarine warfare is expensive. The unit price is higher since the prototypes are limited to a few in number. It must be pointed out that a shipbuilding company, with its constant overhead, requires a volume of business in order to reduce unit prices, and that when plans for building ships call for reduction, the saving is not in direct proportion to the number of units canceled.

EVALUATION

After development, ships, weapons, and other devices are assigned to the fleets for evaluation. In a large program, the operational development force employs many types of ships, aircraft, and their associated personnel. The evaluation prior to delivery to the fleet is an important step in the development of tactics, techniques, and capabilities of the new devices.

PROCUREMENT

When the ship, weapon, or device has been evaluated and accepted, a considerable lead time is necessary for procurement of the ships and aircraft for the fleet. Procurement programs are from 1 to 4 years ahead of the actual installations.

INSTALLATIONS

The installations follow the procurement, but in a large program are carried on more or less simultaneously.

TRAINING

The most important part of the program is the training of personnel in the use of new equipment. Training methods must be employed which not only train our Naval personnel quickly and efficiently but are capable of training large numbers of new men upon mobilization. Training devices, although expensive, save a great deal of time for ships and aircraft by installing the systems ashore for instructing personnel before they become embarked, or have seen service.

MAINTENANCE

Throughout the entire program maintenance must be kept in mind at all times. Simplicity of assembly, packaging of units, and access for repairs are essential to continued effectiveness of the equipment.

FUTURE TRENDS

While it is difficult to predict the size and composition of future antisubmarine warfare forces, it is now quite clear that the submarine will play an increasingly important role—a role equally as important as aircraft. It is indicated that surface craft may be found to be less capable of protecting themselves against the submarine, and will become less useful as an antisubmarine warfare type. Aircraft of the Navy on primary assignment and aircraft of the Air Force on collateral assignment will always be required in large numbers to deal with enemy submarines.

In any future conflict, we must not lose sight of the fact that great quantities of shipping will be necessary and in order to protect the shipping lanes we would have to be in a position to destroy the enemy's submarine power. As the submarine itself develops into an antisubmarine weapon, it will play a major role in keeping the shipping lanes free

from danger. Warfare changes as scientific progress is made. It is perfectly clear that we must have an all-powerful Naval air arm and an all-powerful submarine fleet if we are to prevent the occurrence of another war. No power must be allowed to think that there is any possibility of defeating the United States by destroying its shipping.

The Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Pact," published in the Washington Post for March 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC PACT

Publication of the text of the North Atlantic Treaty confirms our feeling that the pact is more a defensive alliance of the old-fashioned type than a regional agreement conforming to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. Without a doubt some military agreement was necessary. Of that the facts of the world situation afford ample proof. The enforcement provisions of the Charter had become merely pious protestations as a result of Soviet sabotage. A new sense of security, in consequence, had had to be imparted to nations struggling back to their economic feet. The question lay in the means. A wiser and less complicated course than a comprehensive alliance of the nature that is now before the American people—assuming the need for comprehensiveness—would have been the plan suggested by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Armstrong had proposed that the Soviet-created gap in the Charter be filled by a new pledge of consultation and action in case the Security Council was veto-tied in enforcement.

This could have been worked out simultaneously with the development of the original Atlantic community. The Atlantic community, as we understand it, was initially to be limited to the five Brussels powers and North America. That is to say, it was to be strictly regional, providing security as the spur not only to recovery but also to unity. Who was responsible for enlarging the scope of the Atlantic community in the manner that is now announced? It is said that the British took the first move by suggesting that the pact be thrown open to the Scandinavian nations. The British wanted protection at the Skagerrack against Soviet submarine activity in the North Sea. There could be no argument against other entries when this opening was made; hence the admission of Portugal and Italy.

We have no doubt that other candidacies will be entertained as time goes on. Indeed, provision is made for accessions to the treaty by unanimous agreement. Or these other candidates might be brought into a Mediterranean pact in working relation to the North Atlantic Pact. In this way there will be built up a comprehensive military alliance on the very borders of Soviet Russia. This is the reason that the general reaction stresses the military aim. And this accounts for some of the misgivings expressed while the pattern of the Atlantic Pact was under discussion. "Our fellowship with the peoples of western Europe, and particularly of Scandinavia," said Mr. Dulles recently, "ought not to seem to bring United States military might directly to Russia's border."

A good motto for diplomacy is to "look to the end." In this context the question is, What will the Soviet reaction be? Will the Muscovites be intimidated or provoked into retaliation? Nobody can tell, though the present disturbances in Yugoslavia, Finland, and Iran are hardly indicative of Soviet acquiescence. Mr. Dulles says, "It would involve a high tribute to Soviet leaders to assume * * * they would exercise more self-control than would our people under comparable circumstances, as, for example, if the Soviet Union had military arrangements with a country at our border."

To be sure, there can be no going back to the original plan limiting the pact to the Brussels powers and North America. But the military accent of the present arrangement could be softened, and a new tack embarked upon simultaneously with it, if the United States were to take the lead in the promotion of a real partnership with western Europe. A plea is now before Congress to call an international convention for a federal union of the free nations. The appeal is sponsored by many enlightened Americans, including former Justice Owen J. Roberts, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton. We applaud the move. Favorable action upon it would restore statesmanship in the dominant role in the making of our world policy. It would harness a pro to an anti, and show the world that the maintenance of peace is as much the American goal as preparedness for war. This is the way to wage peace that Secretary Acheson insists is American policy.

Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article appearing in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, March 16, 1949:

DORGAN BLASTS HARVARD SAVANT—DEMANDS SHAPLEY QUIT BECAUSE OF RED SYMPATHIES AT ANNUAL EVACUATION DAY DINNER

Denouncing Prof. Harlow Shapley, of Harvard, as a Communist sympathizer, clerk of Suffolk Superior Civil Court Thomas Dorgan last night was roundly applauded by nearly 800 persons attending the annual South Boston Citizens Association pre-Evacuation Day dinner by calling on President Conant to fire Shapley from the Harvard faculty immediately.

CALLS ON HIM TO QUIT

Dorgan charged that Shapley has been consorting with Communists and Communist sympathizers and asserted, "I say to Professor Shapley, you resign from Harvard because the constitution of Massachusetts says you don't belong there.

"I call upon the citizens of south Boston—a section which has sent thousands of her sons forward to fight for liberty and democracy in all wars—to insist that Shapley be replaced on the Harvard faculty, and if he doesn't resign we should force President Conant to fire him."

Dorgan, one of the principal speakers at the annual pre-Evacuation Day dinner at the Hotel Vendome, was cheered to the echo as he demanded the well-known Harvard savant quit his post.

CHARGES VIOLATION

He charged that Shapley had violated every principle of his profession when he invited seven Communist educators from Russia to participate with him in a public program in New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, March 25, 26, and 27.

By his actions, Dorgan said, Professor Shapley also violated the constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which specifically states all preceptors of colleges, especially in the University of Cambridge (Harvard) must teach chastity, obedience, and love of country.

"In my opinion," Dorgan said, "he has failed in his duty—teaching love of country, as ordered by the Founding Fathers—when he invites Communists to speak against our Government, our culture, and our democracy in a public forum."

WORLD FIFTH COLUMN

"One of those so-called Russian educators only recently insulted every aspect of American democracy in a speech that was carried by the press and over the radio of the world. This man, who will be Professor Shapley's guest at the New York affair, described the Statue of Liberty—that symbol of our heritage—as nothing but a symbol of an organization of thieves and burglars. He described our culture as nothing but disgusting filth.

"Yet this man and six of his fellow Communists have been invited by one of our Harvard professors to share a public platform with him and speak on—of all things—world peace. In my estimation this is nothing but an international fifth column, engineered by the Kremlin."

SPEECH KEYNOTE

Dorgan's speech set the keynote for the annual dinner. His declaration that we should follow the lead of St. Patrick, who drove the snakes out of Ireland, and drive the Communists out of the United States was endorsed by several other speakers, including Mayor Curley.

While Mayor Curley confined himself to the over-all subject of driving Communists from our shores, Dorgan directed his attack against educators who help further the cause of the alien doctrine. He said the citizens of South Boston should awaken from their lethargy and stamp out this danger before it has a chance to overwhelm us.

"The first step should be to stop Professor Shapley," he said. "We just can't stand by and allow him to invite Russians to spread their lies and their propaganda from our public stages. We should demand—as I have demanded—that he quit his position. And, if he doesn't quit of his own volition, we—the citizens of South Boston—should start a city-wide movement to force President Conant to force the resignation of Professor Shapley."

REPORTED ILL

Professor Shapley, one of the best-known educators in the country and regarded as one of Harvard's leading faculty members, was reported by members of his household to be ill in bed last night. They said, however, that he "didn't wish to answer Mr. Dorgan again. He merely wants you to know he has no comment to make at this time."

Clerk Dorgan's electrifying address came after other speakers had warned of the danger of communism and had likened the present world situation to that of the era when St. Patrick, patron saint of Ireland, had gone forth from England to spread the doctrine of Christianity in a pagan world.

Mayor Curley, commenting upon this situation, said, "What we need in this world today is another St. Patrick to lead us back to sanity and to stamp out communism, which even now threatens to stamp out civilization as we know it.

"I happen to love America," the mayor said, "and it disturbs me to hear more and more people talking about communism every day. I think we should dedicate ourselves to the task of wiping that evil out before it gains a foothold. I think we should adopt the attitude that this is our country, and our form of government, and that we love it and cherish it above all else.

"If we hear people complaining about this America of ours and contrasting it to Russia we ought to say to them: 'If you don't love the country that gives you a living, if you don't love the country that guarantees you freedom, then get on the next boat and go and live in that country you profess to love so much. We'll be better off without you or your kind.'"

OTHER SPEAKERS

Other speakers on the program included assistant attorney general Lenahan O'Connell, who proposed that a monument be erected in South Boston to the memory of Gen. John Sullivan, whom General Washington designated as officer of the day when the British evacuated Boston on March 17, 1776.

"The greatest of all early Irish-American patriots hasn't even a marble or concrete column to memorialize his greatness. Surely in all of South Boston," he said, "there must be some small plot of ground upon which a memorial to General Sullivan can be erected."

Senate president Chester A. Dolan, former Senator Edward C. Carroll, who acted as toastmaster, and governor's councilman Patrick J. "Sonny" McDonough, also spoke.

No Mandate for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the title "The Election of November 2, 1948, Gave No Mandate for Socialism," by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., appearing in the Washington Post for March 21, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Monday, March 21, 1949]

THE ELECTION OF NOVEMBER 2, 1948, GAVE NO MANDATE FOR SOCIALISM

The President and those who support his legislative program have objected to the substance of my previous editorial, which appeared under this headline: "Now is the time to fight socialism in Washington."

In that editorial I explained how Washington is poised to follow the disastrous policy of forcing industry to skimp on new plants and new equipment. That policy landed Britain in the numbing embrace of the Socialists. I cited the experience of Britain to show how such skimping on industrial tools can bring a nation to economic stagnation—and socialism.

The President, in his recent Jackson Day speech, brushed aside this warning * * *. "They are again trying to frighten the people with the old worn-out bugaboo that socialism is taking over in Washington." Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS of Pennsylvania asserted that I was guilty of "warfare against any reasonable effort to keep our system of free enterprise working."

These criticisms may be sincere. But they are not well-founded.

I want to show why they are not well-founded by basing this editorial on Washington rather than Britain.

In Washington the administration has proposed a legislative program, the key parts of which would clearly put the country far on the road to socialism. Let us see how.

There are two steps in the process:

First. The Government, by its taxation program, undermines private industry so that it cannot provide itself with the necessary new plant and tools.

Second. The Government itself steps in to provide the plants and equipment that it has blocked industry from getting. That is socialism.

Here is how Washington is promoting socialization of the steel industry—and of other industries.

Steel has been expanding its capacity and improving its equipment chiefly by plowing back its profits. During the last 3 years it has spent $1,400,000,000 for new plants and new tools. That was more than the companies had available from their own earnings. But profits provided more than half of that money—more than $700,000,000. The remainder came from loans and from depreciation reserves set aside out of the earnings to replace worn-out equipment.

Profits must continue to provide the funds needed to pay for the bulk of the steel industry's necessary expansion. That is because private citizens, their income slashed by heavy taxes, have not been willing to buy steel stocks even at prices ruinously low for the companies and their present stockholders. The stock market currently prices the mills and other facilities of the Nation's principal steel-producing companies at far less than 50 percent of the cost of reproducing them.

Let us take another example. Profits are essential to expansion in the electric light and power industry also. This year private companies are planning to buy $2,000,000,000 worth of new plant and equipment. To do that without going overboard in debt, they must sell to the public some $300,000,000 worth of common stock. A squeeze on their profits would make that sale virtually impossible.

For tens of thousands of small-business enterprises profits afford virtually the only practical source of funds for new equipment and expansion.

In the face of these and many other examples that might be cited, what is the most effective way to prevent industry from reequipping itself and expanding its capacity to meet our essential needs?

Obviously, it is to cut down profits. And that is what the administration is trying to do. The President has declared that steel prices are too high, and is demanding that Congress raise taxes sharply on all corporations.

There you have the first step toward socializing industry.

Next comes step two. Have the Government supply the tools and equipment which, by taxation, it prevents industry from getting.

The administration has proposed legislation to carry out this second step. It is called the Economic Stability Act of 1949, for short, the Spence bill.

This bill gives the President the power to provide industrial facilities—in steel, power, or any other industry—where he finds that a shortage is hampering or is likely to hamper the economy.

True, the bill says that the Government is not to construct new plants if private companies will do it through Government loans, on terms prescribed by the President. That may be just one step short of complete socialization. But it is only a short step. And the Spence bill authorizes the Government to take that step.

By itself, the administration's Stability Act sounds harmless enough. It would have the Government build plants only as a last resort. But it provides also that if private enterprise cannot turn out all the goods the country needs, the Government can and should step in and provide the equipment to do it.

Now, take that power together with an administration tax program that undercuts the ability of private enterprise to supply the new plants and equipment it needs out of its own earnings. That combination promotes Government ownership and operation of industry.

And that is socialism.

The American people, of course, have the right to live under any system they choose—capitalism, socialism, fascism, communism, or what have you. But before socialism or any other ism is imposed upon us from above, the people should know the facts. If this editorial shall have contributed in some small degree to that end it will have served its purpose.

The election of November 2, 1948, gave no mandate for socialism.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

North Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., March 20, 1949:

NORTH ATLANTIC PACT MARKS A MILESTONE IN UNITED STATES HISTORY—SEEN AS GREATEST UNITED STATES MOVE SINCE MONROE DOCTRINE—WARNS REDS AWAY FROM FOUR CONTINENTS

(By John Griffin)

There has been quite a fanfare about the North Atlantic treaty, and there should be. For it is one of the most momentous agreements ever made and, for the United States, it is the greatest move since the Monroe Doctrine.

It means, in simple language, that aggressors have been warned away from a vast area. The Monroe Doctrine told them to stay away from the Western Hemisphere, and that policy has worked. It is now extended to

four continents and is supplemented by the established, though unwritten policy that guards a large part of the fifth continent.

So, all in all, it establishes a guaranty that aggression will be opposed by the United States in almost every part of the world, opposed by the armed power of the United States. Whether the extended policy will work is another question, for the protection of Latin America was accepted by other nations as a natural thing, inasmuch as the Western Hemisphere is remote from Europe and Asia.

ACCEPTED BY OTHERS

Geographically, the Monroe Doctrine covered a natural area and, to Europeans, appeared to carry the inference that so long as they observed America's position on this side of the world, America would refrain from interference on the other side.

Thus the North Atlantic treaty moves into another field in that it guarantees members against aggression in Europe and Africa. And in that respect there will be resentment on the part of some nations who are under the influence of Soviet Russia.

But the treaty is not a result of a sudden American determination to push its influence; it is more an outcome of the desire of the other member nations to obtain the protection of the United States. Their desire for American protection is as great as our wish to be in a position to protect ourselves.

It is easy to place too much confidence, however, in treaties. Many times in the past there has been a sweep of confidence as a result of agreements between nations. One was the lamented Kellogg-Briand Pact, in which the nations agreed to abandon force as an instrument of national policy.

In the first burst of enthusiasm that usually follows an agreement between nations, hope is high. Later, when national interests conflict with the general policy of treaty members, some excuse is usually found to circumvent the terms of the treaty.

COULD GO WRONG

And this new treaty doesn't necessarily insure against such a possibility in the future, and there is no guaranty that national interests won't again frustrate the hopes of the peoples concerned. It is much too early to believe that national interests, which are sometimes known as patriotism, won't be triumphant over treaty agreements.

But Americans ought to realize right now what this new treaty means, for it must receive the approval of the United States Senate before it can become effective. And there is going to be a lot said about it in the Senate before there is a final ratification or rejection.

It is a great departure from traditional American policy because it commits the United States to use armed force against any nation or combination of nations that attacks one of the treaty members.

Technically, there is no change in the constitutional provision in the United States that only Congress has the right to declare war, and so technically there is no break with the tradition that held in this country ever since it was organized.

But actually, as Secretary of State Acheson frankly explained, the United States would be bound automatically to counter an attack on any ally, perhaps even by the use of armed force.

OBVIOUS COMMITMENT

That is an honest and candid statement by the Secretary of State, and it is well that it should be clearly stated so that everyone will know just what the commitment is. And furthermore, it is perfectly obvious that there is such a commitment in the treaty, else it would be a weak and unworkable agreement.

If the United States is going to enter any defense agreement with other nations, it can hardly expect to offer only moral support. Moral support is a noble thing, but unless it is accompanied by real support, it can't do much in the world of today to assure peace and progress.

As a matter of fact, it wouldn't be honest for the United States to enter such a treaty with all sorts of reservations and expect other nations to go into it with the determination to give active support to one another. It looks very much as if this is an all or nothing situation.

So long as that is clearly understood, the process of getting Senate approval can follow our regular constitutional procedure. All the cards on the table, a full, free, and frank discussion and an honest determination to do what is best for the United States will result in a decision with which no fault can be found.

There is nothing sacred about our long-time policy of no entanglements with foreign nations. That policy has served for many years. If the American people feel that conditions have changed so much that it is necessary to reverse that policy and enter upon a new one, they can do so in good conscience.

MUST KNOW MEANING

What is imperative is that all the facts be known and all the possibilities examined by the proper authorities, in this case the Senate of the United States, so that the people may be properly informed as to the course they are taking.

All the evidence to date is that the Government officials concerned with drawing up the treaty are honest and open about it, and the Senate will have full opportunity to exercise its fundamental right to accept it or reject it.

If the Senate, which is supposed to be responsive to the will of the people, rejects the treaty, that is the end of it. If the Senate accepts it, there can be no withdrawing. This is a turning point in history.

The Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Filibuster," which I broadcast over the facilities of radio station KSL at Salt Lake City on March 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By the time this broadcast reaches you the Senate may be in one of its periodic filibusters. What is the philosophy behind a filibuster? It has its origin in a perfectly proper theory, which is that a group of Senators has the right to use all of the rules of the Senate to full advantage of any individual or any group. That sounds good.

Those who indulge in a filibuster maintain that liberty is preserved by protecting minorities. It is. There can be no protection for the individual unless the majority is restrained. The ideals of any democracy which operates on the theory of common consent must operate not only on the theory that the majority shall rule but also that the minority shall be protected. That is the essence of our Bill of Rights. Nothing shall be done outside of due process of law. No branch of our Government should act in an arbitrary way. Congress checks the President, the President in turn checks Congress, and the courts look after not only the welfare of the people but also see to it that neither Congress nor the President act arbitrarily or that together they destroy what we call liberty. Therefore, a filibuster seems justified. Right can never be measured by might, and it sounds as if liberty must be preserved at all times and at all hazards by a willful minority. Those are the reasons for unlimited debate in the Senate.

Common sense is supposed to be the rule, and most things are done by unanimous consent. But there came a time when Government itself was stopped because a willful minority talked so long that governmental action was prevented. This brought about the present rule of 1917, and cloture, for the first time, was imposed upon the Senate. This rule has seldom been applied, because, as I said, nearly everything is done by unanimous consent.

Let's think through this problem of a filibuster. We don't want to cut out debate, of course, but the Senate has, as a whole, some rights quite as much as any individual in it. Any government, and especially the American Government, whose Constitution leaves so much to common consent, can cease to exist any time a rule of reason is not followed. We can't remove from the President his power of discretion. There is no way for the President to force Congress to act. As for the Supreme Court, it can hand down decisions, but the power of enforcement rests with the executive branch of the Government. There is in the Presidency, in the Congress, in the Supreme Court, and in all of the bodies of government an inherent right to act to preserve their own identities. In a sense that right is reserved to the individual man when he says he has a right to self-preservation. When it comes to the Senate, the Senate not only has a right to self-preservation but it also has a responsibility imposed upon it by the law written in the Constitution. How long would our Government last if the Senate did not assume its full responsibilities and it should say, "Since the President needs money to carry on the departments of government and since we have the power to appropriate money, we just won't appropriate." That is a commonplace situation that arises from the provisions of most constitutions of the world. In practically every constitution I have studied where money is appropriated for government's use by a parliament, nearly always there is a provision in the constitution that, in the event the parliament fails to provide money for the continuation of government, the government will then use the budget of the year before. That provision in constitutions of other countries assumes the inherent right of government to continue even if one of its branches fails to assume its responsibility. But we did not go so far as to make that part of our constitutional law. We took it for granted that the President would act as a President should; that Congress would act as a Congress should, and that the courts would act as the courts should. Our Constitution was not set up with any idea that the Government, under the Constitution, would come to an end through failure of any counterpart of our Government to assume its duty and responsibility to the whole Government.

We have existed splendidly under our Constitution for 170 years. Yet, in our Constitution there isn't a single safeguard which assures and guarantees that all of the branches of our Government will fulfill the duties of those branches. In all of our 170 years of history we have only put one President on trial. The inherent powers of the President and Presidential discretion have both grown bigger and broader as our country and our country's activities have grown

bigger and become broader. We have learned to realize that common consent and common sense are very much more powerful than several other factors in the governmental framework. A comparison of our Constitution with the constitutions of a dozen other states shows that there are more safeguards, more guaranties in the constitutions of other countries than there are in ours. Yet those countries do not function as effectively as ours. That is why writers say it is the common sense of the American people that has made them what they are. That is, also, why jokesters in other governments say there is a special providence that looks out for the welfare of little children, drunken men, and the United States.

A filibuster brings up all of these questions. If you were President of the Senate, would you take a Senator off the floor who was not talking on the subject and who was definitely trying to make his talk last as long as he could and who was literally wasting the time of his 95 colleagues? A Senator has certain rights and if you try to take him off the floor, the discussion of those rights immediately takes place.

In the House of Representatives they have what is called the mace, which resembles the old Roman bundle of sticks with the old Roman eagle on top and symbolizes the authority of government. When a Member of the House becomes too disorderly, the Sergeant at Arms takes the mace and waves it in front of the disorderly man. He is supposed to get scared and desist; but the mace is never used that way once in a generation, and we get along entirely without one in the Senate. Members of various parliaments in the world have said to me more than once, "What! Don't you have a mace in the Senate?"

I said, "No."

"Well, how do you preserve order?"

I answered, "We don't. We don't have to preserve it. Our Senators are taught proper conduct and they live up to it."

The filibuster is within the rules. Some people say that our country has never been held back by a filibuster and that it has preserved liberty and has kept our Government from improper action. I do not agree with that. In fact, I know it is not a true statement. Generally a filibuster is against a bill. This time, though, we have a filibuster against an interpretation of a rule. There is a fear on the part of those carrying on the filibuster that if the rule is changed their rights will be impaired. Correcting a rule in the Senate does not in any sense change our constitutional methods. How ridiculous this argument to keep the Senate from changing a rule becomes when one realizes that the Congress of the United States can declare war by a simple majority vote. It can impose taxes. It may actually hurt people by a simple majority vote, but it must not change a rule by a majority or a two-thirds majority vote. That is the logic of the present situation.

The people of the United States condemned the old kind of filibuster by the adoption of the twentieth amendment. But, in spite of that, those who are now filibustering think that the heavens will fall if we decide that cloture shall extend to a motion dealing with procedure as well as the shutting off of debate when a law is being enacted. If we should win this filibuster in the sense of forcing those who are filibustering to give up, this is all we will have accomplished.

We have had cloture since 1917. But it has been interpreted that cloture could not extend to a motion in regard to procedure. Therefore, the commonest filibuster was one wherein a Senator moved to correct the Journal, and he did it by suggesting that the prayer of the Chaplain should be stricken from the Journal or some other such meaningless motion, and then the filibuster was started. The man from Mars would surely remark that our Senators are talking a lot about a very small thing.

The outcome I dare not predict. But, judging from the past, the odds are in favor of those who are filibustering. The filibuster is a unique American custom. The institution of a filibuster is like the word itself. It has been made out of whole cloth and is awfully hard to explain to anyone who is not an American.

Mr. Crossman's Political Fervor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before asking unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on Friday, March 18, 1949, I wish to call specific attention to certain features of the editorial. According to the editorial, the Hon. Richard Crossman, labor member of the British House of Commons, visited Atlanta last week and delivered an address before the Americans for Democratic Action, which, according to the editorial, modestly describes itself as a "liberal, non-Communist labor organization." In the course of the address, Mr. Crossman is reported to have said the conditions of the British working class are superior to the conditions of American workers. He proceeds further to say that housing is better in Britain, and that British farmers are more prosperous and under less government control than the farmers in America. "Such declarations," the editorial properly observes, "are, of course, ridiculous."

But nevertheless, Mr. President, it would seem that high British officials on their visits to America should cease utterances of this kind. Such utterances and others which have preceded it certainly give some pertinence to the concluding paragraph of the editorial, which says:

Perhaps instead of continuing to pour money into Britain the Congress should ask the Labor Government to help us out with that $3,000,000,000 budget deficit that's said to be causing concern in Washington.

I ask that the editorial in its entirety be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CROSSMAN'S POLITICAL FERVOR

It is unfortunate that Richard Crossman, Labor member of the British House of Commons, who was here last week, chose to belittle and deride the United States with what was reliably reported to us as "unbecoming malice."

The speech in question was before a meeting sponsored by the Americans for Democratic Action, which calls itself a liberal, non-Communist labor organization. No reporters were present. The audience was comprised almost solely of labor-union leaders and members. Evidently these circumstances led Mr. Crossman to feel safe in asserting that conditions of the British working class are superior to those in America—that they are better fed and better housed.

In Britain, said Mr. Crossman, workers can buy meat. In America they can't afford it.

Mr. Crossman should have qualified his statement. British workers can buy meat. They can get 4 ounces per week each. Prices are lower, it is true, but the difference is made up in government subsidy, a subsidy which constitutes a severe drain on Britain's financial resources, and which would not be possible without the assistance of the American capitalism which Mr. Crossman took so much pleasure in belittling.

That, however, was only part of the rosy picture Mr. Crossman painted of present-day Britain. Housing is better, he asserted, and British farmers are more prosperous and under less government control than those in America.

Such declarations are, of course, ridiculous. American farmers are not yet required to account for every egg, and houses built in this country are not restricted to a single bath. Neither do our farmers face a shortage of working animals because such a vast number of horses have found their way into the butcher shops.

The point is, however, if Britain is in such wonderful condition as Mr. Crossman said, the American Congress and the American people have been and are laboring under a terrific delusion. On the one hand we are told that Britain needs, in fact, must have for continued existence, the $980,000,000 in Marshall-plan aid now before Congress. And on the other hand a member of Parliament, high in Labor Party circles, boasts—at least before selected audiences—that the American workingman in effect enjoys a lower standard of living than his British counterpart. Presumably Mr. Crossman would say that is because the British workingman has a Socialist Labor Party to look out for him.

Perhaps instead of continuing to pour money into Britain the Congress should ask the Labor Government to help us out with that $3,000,000,000 budget deficit that's said to be causing concern in Washington.

Absence of Spain From Western European and North Atlantic Defense Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article with reference to Spain's absence from the western European and North Atlantic defense line-up, by William Philip Simms, appearing last week in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPANISH GNAT

(By William Philip Simms)

Spain's absence from the western European and North Atlantic defense line-up is widely regarded here as the most glaring of all existing international incongruities. The United States and Latin-American countries, at least, are expected to seek a remedy.

Portugal—invited to join the Atlantic defense treaty made public here today—has protested against Spain's exclusion on the

grounds that it not only weakens the pact as a whole but Portugal's position in particular.

Military experts agree that if Russia attacks, nothing short of the Rhine could stop her first thrust. With overwhelming land superiority, she should be able to overrun Germany and the Low Countries in a matter of days.

This makes France, Spain, and Portugal important. Spain and Portugal occupy more than half of Europe west of the Rhine, with 232,000 square miles as against France's 212,000.

Spain is ostracized largely because of Soviet objections. The Kremlin pretends to be horrified over Franco's collaboration with Hitler. Briefly, here are the records of Franco and Stalin:

Stalin, in August 1939, joined hands with Hitler to divide up Europe. Stalin was to have Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, half of Poland and other loot. Hitler could take the rest. The Nazis attacked Poland from the west, the Red Army from the east and met at a prearranged line about midway. Stalin and Hitler then announced Poland had been wiped from the map.

The Stalin-Hitler partnership continued until June 1941, when the two dictators fell out and fought over further division of the spoils.

Regarding Franco, Winston Churchill says in his newly published memoirs:

"He thought only of Spain and Spanish interests. Gratitude to Hitler and Mussolini for their help never entered his head. * * *

"We wanted not only an unmolested Gibraltar but the use of the anchorage of Algeciras for our ships and the use of the ground which joins the Rock to the mainland for our ever-expanding air base. On these facilities depended in large measure our access to the Mediterranean.

"Nothing was easier than for the Spaniards to mount—or allow to be mounted—a dozen heavy guns in the hills behind Algeciras (whence) they could at any moment be fired and our naval and air bases would become useless." Moreover, Franco "could have allowed Hitler's forces to traverse the peninsula, besiege and take Gibraltar * * * and occupy Morocco and French North Africa."

Yet, despite Nazi pleading and threats—since revealed in German records—Franco did none of these things. Instead—

"By subtlety and trickery and blandishments of all kinds," adds Churchill, "he succeeded in tiding things over and keeping Spain out of the war to the inestimable advantage of Britain."

The United States and other democracies—to Russia's advantage and not their own—now refuse to send their ambassadors to Madrid. On the other hand, they maintain normal diplomatic relations with Moscow and her satellites—that is, save where western diplomats have been summarily kicked out.

The incredible part about it all, however, as seen from here, is that while it swallows the Soviet camel with such apparent ease, the west strains so painfully over the Spanish gnat.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 18, 1949:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

It may be significant that St. Patrick, though he loved the Irish, was not, according to the available authorities, born in Ireland. In this he resembles most of the rest of us. But the Irish took St. Patrick to their hearts and he took them to his heart. There was warmth in him and warmth in them, and the combination has made St. Patrick's Day something more than was originally contemplated. The Irish haven't lost their saint, but a lot of other people have taken him on, people of many races and people of more than one religion. When the bands come along playing Killarney or the Kerry Dances, when the green badges flower in Fifth Avenue's early spring, who is there who doesn't want to cheer for the good and great man?

We may ask ourselves why St. Patrick has attained this position, and there may be any number of answers. He was serious, but the Irish made him gay, too. He was a crusader who wouldn't put up with paganism or any sort of wrongdoing, but he was human and understanding, too. The personality of him comes down the centuries, cheerful and lovable, and one believes he would have enjoyed the parade and the music and the sight of people having a good time. We like to think that the Irish are generously willing to share their day and their saint.

Economic Conditions in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this Congress will be called upon to make certain substantial appropriations for a great many things. I think we should always have before us the fact that we must have a high level of employment in the United States, and we must review all our programs in the light of that necessity. Bearing out that statement, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement in the form of a news report from the Labor Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, concerning unemployment compensation which is being paid in that State, and the extent of unemployment there.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE IN GRIP OF RECESSION, DECLARES EGAN—LABOR HEAD SEES NO INDICATION OF HALT IN RISING JOBLESS FIGURE

HARTFORD, March 5.—Connecticut's jobless roll has jumped more than 10,000 in the past month, and the State is now definitely in the grip of a recession, according to State labor commissioner John J. Egan.

Egan said he saw nothing to indicate a halt in the steadily swelling unemployment figure.

FIFTY-SIX THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED TWENTY JOBLESS

There were 56,120 Connecticut people on the jobless list February 26, according to the commissioner. This represents an increase of 10,567 since January, he reported.

New lay-offs include 650 who were indefinitely laid off at the U. S. Rubber Co. footwear plant at Naugatuck. Another 520 workers were laid off at the Waterbury Tool Co., which announced it would suspend operations indefinitely starting next Wednesday.

Commissioner Egan added a further gloomy note with the comment that there may be a buyer's strike in progress in Connecticut. Even persons with jobs are slackening their purchases, he said.

Egan pointed to the fact that lay-offs have principally been in consumer-goods industries, such as hats, shoes, clothing, tires, radios, toys, and silverware. So-called heavy-goods industries have not been so hard-hit.

CAUTIOUS MANUFACTURERS

The commissioner said some lay-offs were due to cautious manufacturers who are uncertain of future price trends. These men do not want to be stuck with large stocks produced at fairly high costs, he said.

In an attempt to avoid this, Egan said, a manufacturer will close his plant for a few weeks, as a precautionary move. If his stocks do not appreciably drop during this time, the plant will remain closed, a third, possibly a fourth week, and so on, until his inventory has been reduced.

NEW HAVEN LEADS

New Haven leads the State in the number of claims for unemployment compensation. That city's total of 9,172 claimants last week compares with 8,770 in Bridgeport; 7,073 in Hartford, and 6,274 in Waterbury.

New Haven's total represented an increase of 350 over the previous week. The latest total includes 275 workers at the Churchward boat yards in West Haven who have since returned to work, however.

While there were no large lay-offs in the New Haven area last week, there were numerous lay-offs by small plants.

Address of Mr. Howard Marshall to the Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Howard Marshall to the Mississippi Valley Association meeting in St Louis, Mo., on February 7, 1949:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Mississippi Valley Association, it is a great pleasure to be here today.

Perhaps I ought to start by saying that ever since I have been with the Ashland Oil & Refining Co., I have felt myself very much a part of the Great River Valley which is embraced by the Ohio-Mississippi system and its tributaries. Ashland itself is on the upper reaches of this river system and our principal refineries are located where Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky come together on the Ohio River. Because of our own intimate association with this river system, we know a great deal about the magnificent work which this association has carried on throughout the years and which has contributed in such an enormous measure to making that river system what it is today. It is, therefore, a particular privilege to be able to stand here and salute the work of this great association.

Your good executive secretary has asked me to talk on How the Inland Waterways are

of Value to the Railroads. Let me confess at the outset that after a week spent in the oil fields of Texas, I am not going to intrude upon you a prepared or formal address. Perhaps in the light of the topic that has been assigned to me, that is just as well.

I do not know exactly why an oilman was selected to talk about values to the railroads. It may be because the oil industry, of which I am a part, uses all forms of transportation. I have not looked up specific figures, but I know that the oil industry is one of the very largest users of transportation, including particularly the railroads. On the other hand, it may be that an oilman was asked to talk about transportation because the oil industry is a supplier of products to all parts of the transportation industry. Whether you or your goods move by air, rail, boat, barge, truck, or bus, that movement is always lubricated and more often than not powered by oil. Indeed, since the railroads themselves are one of the largest customers of the oil industry for lubricants, Diesel fuels, and fuel oils, the oil industry is vitally concerned for the continued success of railroad operations.

Still another reason for my appearance here might be that not being directly in the railroad business, it may be easier to see the forest for not looking too closely at the trees. Perhaps, and this is a perfectly human side of any business situation, since we in the oil industry are not concerned every morning with a particular piece of railroad track or a particular freight customer, we can afford the luxury of taking a long-range and possibly a somewhat impartial view.

Certainly, I cannot pretend to be an expert on railroad matters. Indeed, you may decide that I am no better informed on railroad matters than is the general public, who, according to a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, rush out to buy Seaboard Airline—a railroad—every time the aviation stocks run up on the New York Stock Exchange.

Actually, I approach a talk on how the inland waterways are of value to the railroads, with fear and trepidation. It might be charged that I am not unprejudiced. All of us who have lived a reasonably active business life come away with some competitive scars. I might as well be honest about some of mine. My mind runs back a few years to battles in the Oregon Legislature when I used to live on the west coast. Then the struggle was against certain railroads resisting a repeal of an Oregon law that made you unload big over-the-road transports, originating in Chicago, into a truck about the size of a small Ford pick-up when the load reached the Oregon border. We lost and probably you still have to put the load in the pick-up truck.

My mind also runs back to the battles during the war to build the Big Inch pipe lines. I remember, and again I confess not pleasantly, the effort on the part of some of the railroads to insist that the wartime demands for oil on the east coast and in Europe, with tankers being torpedoed by the dozens, could be supplied in the hundreds of thousands of barrels of daily requirements by dragging it across half a continent in tank cars carrying an average of 10 barrels per day. Of course, we must all salute the railroads for bringing some 200,000 barrels a day from Texas to the North Atlantic when they organized themselves to do it, but, a wartime problem running into many times 200,000 barrels could not and was not met by feeding oil into the east coast in 10-barrel-per-day eyedroppers. The larger problem was only solved by Federal legislation to get the rights-of-way to build the pipe lines to win the war, all of which illustrates the fundamental point that bulk commodities must often be supplied in larger units than a carload if demands are to be supplied.

Competitive scars such as I have recited, all of us acquire over the years. Yet, despite the scars, I do believe that, viewed in any reasonable perspective, conflicts in interest between the rail carriers and those moving commodities on the inland waterways are more apparent than real. That may seem to be a strange statement from someone who has confessed so much in his competitive background as I have to start this talk.

One incident caricaturing the manner in which competition can distort our perspective comes to mind from the early days of the war. Ralph Davies, then the Deputy Petroleum Administrator and formerly the executive vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, had a lovely dry sense of humor. One morning when we received a report that a Standard Oil tanker had rammed into the back of a Shell tanker while running in convoy at night, he looked at me and with a slight smile said, "You know, the boys ought to stop that kind of competitive stuff; don't they know we have a war on?" Today, in peacetime, between the rails and the inland water carriers, there is probably a lot of competitive name calling that we could well do without. And much of the past ought to be forgiven, forgotten, and buried.

After all, it is only natural for any transporter to rivet his attention upon a particular type of traffic or a particular customer that might be lost if some other method of transportation became available and then spend entirely too much energy rowing around about who is going to get appropriations from the Government, whether tolls are going to be charged on the waterways, whether or not railroad rates will rise in relation to barge rates, or whether truck rates will shift in relation to both of them.

These rows about particular pieces of business, particular appropriations or particular rates tend to make us forget that fundamentally we are all part and parcel of the transportation industry and that the thing that matters most of all to all of us, over any period of time, is the total volume of all transportation.

In recent months, we have all heard much of the pleas of the railroads for higher freight rates. For those of us in business, this is something that we can all understand and with which we sympathize. We all know how our own costs have mounted. We all know with what problems we are confronted in an effort to make both ends meet, to keep our costs down, and not price ourselves out of the market. We can understand the predicament in which the railroads unquestionably find themselves in connection with their rate structures. But to a railroad, as with most other business, although it is frequently not expressed, their actual interest and concern is not in rates alone, but in rates times volume. This is the fundamental theme of everything I have to say this morning. The financial problem of the transportation business, including both the railroads and the inland water carriers, is a function of rates times volume.

No man in his right mind is likely to stand up and argue to you or to railroad people that the wide development and improvement of the inland waterways is likely to cause any general increase in railroad rates. I certainly would not insult the intelligence of this audience by so arguing. What the inland waterways have to contribute to the railroads relates to volume—perhaps the most important part of the rates times volume equation.

How is this true? What is it that the waterways have to contribute on the volume side of railroad income? There are at least two ways. First of all, waterways cause the growth of new industry that would not grow without waterways. An example may serve to illustrate the point. This morning I have been sitting alongside one of the leaders of the Big Sandy Valley Association, which has for its purpose the canalization of the Big Sandy River in somewhat the same way as the Ohio was first developed, and as later the Kanawha River was developed from Charleston into the Ohio River. That association has compiled some very interesting figures which show that during the years after the development of both the Ohio and Kanawha waterways, total railroad revenues for all railroads that parallel those waterways increased by leaps and bounds.

While I do not doubt that when those waterways were first constructed, many a local railroad-traffic manager worried about the loss of a particular piece of business—a short-run effect, if you will—the end point over the long run was the development of great chemical industries, great manufacturing industries, great oil refineries, up and down the whole length and course of the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers and their tributaries.

Those industries would not have been located there; they would not have grown and prospered, had it not been for the development of those waterways, and while it is true that the rails may have lost some heavy bulk traffic, over the years this was more than counterbalanced by the in-bound movement of materials, supplies, and goods for the great communities that grew alongside these rivers, for the construction and the development of the industries that grew there and for the out-bound movement of vast quantities of high-rate manufactured and finished products which these new industries produced and shipped to consumers from the factories erected as a result of water improvement. In the light of such benefits to the rails, our plea to our railroad friends is for a long run rather than the short-term view.

There is still a second way in which the inland waterways and the inexpensive bulk transportation which they provide is of great value to the railroad industry. In the last analysis, the demand for most products is a function of its cost and a function of its price to the consumer. All of us as Americans have had the story drilled into us since we were schoolboys that one of the best features of a free American economy has been its emphasis upon low costs, low prices and high volume.

Obviously, if all bulk materials were compelled to move on long hauls by what is inherently a somewhat higher cost system of transportation, this tends to increase, or prevent the decrease in, prices to consumers and, thus, diminish the total volume of goods that might otherwise be sold. This inevitably reduces the total potential volume of transportation for the whole transport industry including the railroads.

Actually, in numerous places, inland waterways are today contributing to a more stable railroad rate structure. Let me use a simple example. The chairman of my board of directors is fond of remarking that it costs us less to ship a gallon of gasoline by barge from our refineries at Ashland, Ky., to Pittsburgh, Pa., a distance of some 400 miles, than it does to ship that same gallon of gasoline by railroad tank car from our refinery to the city of Ashland, a distance of about 10 miles. I hasten to point out that no implied criticism of the railroads is justified from these figures. Rather, they serve to illustrate a point. If our refinery were compelled, without the waterways, to secure its bulky raw materials—crude oil by the millions of barrels—from far down the reaches of the Ohio River and on down the Mississippi at Baton Rouge and New Orleans, distances of many hundreds and sometimes over a thousand miles, in tank car quantities at rates which would be profitable to the rails, then either we would never have started in business or we would have priced our products out of the market. In either event, we would not now be using the railroads at the higher freight

rates that exist today to move large quantities of petroleum products back into the many places from the rivers and from the terminals by rail to consumers.

The consumer's pocketbook, sometimes forgotten in the last 2 or 3 years, can only stand so much. It is only by providing low-cost transportation for long-haul bulk movements that a maximum amount of finished products can be produced within the price ranges at which most consumers will buy. And it is the maximum amount of buying which can provide the rails with the largest volume of traffic from river points back to inland points where the rails are the only efficient and satisfactory method of moving the commodity.

What is said here may become the more important in the light of the so-called basing-point decisions of the United States Supreme Court. I am sure most of you know in general terms what those decisions purport to decide. Somewhat oversimplified but probably not overexaggerated, those decisions, unless altered by Congress or other court or administrative rulings, require that much of American industry change its pricing methods from that of an f. o. b. delivered price to the consumer to an f. o. b. mill, manufacturing, or warehouse point.

In the past all of us have been able to average our freight costs over wide areas. We can take little more than the actual transportation cost close to our manufacturing plants and a little less than actual freight cost at points further removed from our plants and factories. It now appears that we may have to price all our products on a factory base. This means that over various vast areas we may no longer average out our freight costs. If this occurs, our waterways, often the only means of cheap transportation for bulk materials to widely dispersed factories, plants, and warehouses, are the more essential, not only for the manufacturer or the producer, but equally for the railroads. Given waterways, despite factory pricing, there will still be left enough room at distant points in the price-volume-demand equation to permit paying the kind of freight rates that the rails need and desire to sustain their own business.

Certainly this is true in my own industry. If all gasoline and all heating oils and all crude oils in the great Mississippi-Ohio River Valley watershed had to be priced on the basis of the cost of crude oil or products in the Southwest, plus all rail freight to destination, although the rate might look attractive to our friends in the railroad industry, I can assure them that the volume would shrink to a point where the total revenue would probably not yield a profit. We would simply have succeeded in pricing ourselves out of large segments of the market.

One further thought in this same connection in relation to the inland waterways. I have heard from the platform here this morning from our friend, the Congressman, a great deal about foreign trade. To me, it seems illogical, unreasonable, and not good for the railroad interests which serve the great interior region of the United States and which parallel our rivers to turn over to seaboard cities the sum total of industry and manufacturing that may relate to the inbound movement of raw materials from foreign sources.

Within recent years we have heard much of the gradual decline and using up of the rich iron ores of the Mesabe Range. In recent months we have heard that for the future much of America's iron ores will probably come from the Hudson Bay region and possibly from South America. One simple question: Is the iron and steel industry, in the absence of adequate inland waterways, to be moved to the east coast, to the Gulf coast, and to the west coast? Or are our inland waterways to be such that there is efficient and economical bulk transportation to the Middle West, to Pittsburgh, to the steel centers of the interior basin, so that we may have an opportunity to compete upon an economical basis with our coastal regions?

I could ask you the same question with respect to oil. If, as I suspect, we become increasingly dependent upon the importation of certain amounts of crude oil, and foreign crude oil tends to make the market for crude oil generally, as United States crude has up until now, then is most of our refining industry to be concentrated on the seaboard? Is this beneficial to our interior railroads? As sure as we are standing here, unless we have economical, cheap bulk transportation into our interior basins raw materials from abroad will be processed at the seaboard, and finished products, lesser in weight and smaller in volume, moved inland by the more expensive means of transportation.

Looking to the long run and viewing prices and their effect upon total demand and the total movement and exchange of all commodities, it is my firm conviction that the railroads in general and inland roads in particular will find it very much in their best interest not to oppose, but rather to support, inland waterways. For inland waterways frequently are the only economical way by which the rails in their turn can be provided with a sufficient volume of materials to move at rates under which they can prosper.

I suspect I could produce no more dramatic illustration of what I am trying to say than a page taken from the history of our own company. This I can do without embarrassment for during most of the period while these developments were in the making, I was not with the company. And the exceptional job that was done was the work of others and in which they can rightly take great pride. Back in the early thirties, our company's only refinery was located near the city of Ashland, Ky., close to the mouth of the Big Sandy River where it flows into the Ohio. It refined some 4,000 barrels a day of crude oil. It got that crude oil from the oil fields of eastern Kentucky, long since declined to the point where they no longer can possibly supply the needs of the region. It remained a relatively small refinery until the late thirties.

At that time, it took to the rivers. Starting in a small way with one tow boat, it rapidly expanded its river operations. Shortly before and during the war, it added four large tow boats which today, with modifications, provide about 9,000 horsepower. It added to its fleet of barges until today some 60 large-capacity barges are a part of that fleet. It added smaller tow boats for what might be termed, shuttle service.

The company expanded its sources of raw materials so that long since it has left the oil fields of eastern Kentucky as its principal source of crude oil. It still draws some 4,000 barrels of supply from that region but the balance of its supplies are drawn from the Ohio-Mississippi River system, from Owensboro, Ky., from Evansville, Ind., from Mount Vernon, Ind., from Buckhorn and Gibson Landings in Louisiana, from Baton Rouge, from New Orleans, and, upon occasion, even south of New Orleans, almost to the point where the Mississippi flows into the Gulf. Today, instead of the 4,000-barrel refinery of the early thirties, there exists at Ashland, Ky., a 40,000-barrel refinery.

Instead of railroad freight bills which in those early thirties aggregated for the year only a few tens of thousands of dollars, our railroad freight bills at the present time are approaching $3,000,000 a year. This benefit to the rails has occurred not in spite of but because of a jump in our river traffic from a paltry 2,300 tons per year to an actual 1,400,000 tons in 1948 and to an estimated 2,000,000 tons in 1949.

Here is a laboratory sample of what the waterways can do for the rails. Had it not been for those waterways, the Ashland Oil & Refining Co. at Ashland would not be there today and the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western and the rest of our connecting carriers would not have this $3,000,000 annual customer on their lines.

In conclusion, let me say that I do not want to ignore the fact that railroads and trucks and busses and deep water vessels and barges on the inland waterways are all to some extent competitors. The lines between what it is efficient to move by one means of transportation versus another means of transportation are not fixed things. They are not mathematical lines. These lines ought never to be fixed or determined by any over-all plan, policy, or governmental method for dividing up the business; rather, they should be fixed by competition.

This country should have competing groups within the transportation industry. This is the American way of finding out what is most efficient today and allowing the future to decide what is most efficient tomorrow. As a nation, we cannot afford to be dependent upon any one or two or three methods of transportation.

We heard some remarks here earlier today about John L. Lewis. Those of us in the oil industry, when we think of interindustry competition, often say that John L. is our best salesman. Certainly he has sold more fuel oil than any salesman who ever worked for the oil industry. Given competition between coal and fuel oil, no matter how strong any group or individual becomes in one industry, this Nation has an alternative. Measured in these terms, neither pipe lines, railroads, airlines, water carriers or highway transporters should ever be relieved of the necessity of competing with each other. For the national good, the development of all forms of transportation must be encouraged and assisted. Fundamentally, this is a question of each group constantly experimenting to find the means and methods for moving particular commodities at the lowest cost.

It is particularly essential in time of war to have many available forms of transport. Had we not had the rails, the waterways, the seaways and highways as alternative means of transportation, interweaving, interlocking, and holding this country together, the outcome of the last war might have been very different and the outcome of the next, if there is a next, even worse.

I would like to come back at the end with the beginning. I started by saying that the essence of any transportation business was not rates alone but rates times volume. To all of us in the transportation business, ourselves as well as the rails, let us resolve to focus our eyes more on increasing the size of the future transportation pie as a whole rather than focusing only on how big a slice we can carve out of a present pie which is far smaller than it will be and ought to be if we all go work on the whole pie.

Addresses at 1944 Memorial Day Services at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago today the Senate was deeply shocked by the announcement of the death of Senator Broughton, of North Carolina.

Senator Broughton never addressed this body, and so its Members never had the privilege of hearing his eloquence. During the remarks made by Senators in the Senate following the announcement of the death of Senator Broughton, mention was made of certain exercises held at Gettysburg, Pa., at which Senator Broughton addressed the assembly of governors and citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD introductory remarks made by myself at that time; and also the addresses made by Senator Broughton, then Governor of North Carolina; and by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], then Governor of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the addresses referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA—TAKEN FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE 1944 MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES AT GETTYSBURG

My fellow Americans, 81 years ago there was fought on this field one of the decisive battles of history. The men who fought on these hills and in these little valleys were the flower of American manhood.

They fought with the skill and courage that are the heritage only of freemen. The graves of their dead of July 1863 were—when November came—forever consecrated as the last resting place of all those who here made the supreme sacrifice for the right as they saw the right.

The causes of that war and the strategy of its campaigns do not concern us here. They belong to history.

We are now in a global war to determine whether freemen have the right to govern themselves and whether freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of action in the pursuit of human happiness must perish, perhaps forever, from the earth.

As a people and as a Nation we stand before the bar of history. This is our day of terror and pain, courage and wrath. It is our day of judgment.

This Nation is a Union of States. Each State is guaranteed sovereignty by a written Federal Constitution. The Governors of these States are assembled here on this hallowed ground. More surely than any other group, they know the tides of public sentiment.

They stand here pledging all the great power that is in their hands that this destructive war shall be fought to a successful conclusion and that peace shall be based upon the eternal principles of justice, freedom, and right. Only in that way can we have a lasting peace.

It is fitting and right that the Governors' Conference should observe this day dedicated to our soldier dead on this field.

One speaker is from the Old South and the other from the Old North. Representing the Old South is the Governor of North Carolina—a scholar, statesmen, and patriot—His Excellency J. Melville Broughton.

Representing the Old North is the Governor of Massachusetts—soldier, statesman, and patriot—His Excellency LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY HON. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA—TAKEN FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE 1944 MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES AT GETTYSBURG

We are assembled before a shrine sacred to the North and South alike. It is altogether fitting that these great sections of our Nation, once divided but now united, should in this momentous hour of world history join in a solemn pledge of unity and loyalty.

In his immortal Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln uttered a prayer for the preservation of government created by democracy. Today the world is engaged in a war in which democracy itself is challenged. Evil forces—Nazi, Fascist, and pagan—tauntingly have flouted democracy in all the earth and plotted its destruction.

Only future historians will be able to measure the narrow margin by which civilization was saved in those tragic days from Dunkerque to Tobruk. But we are the living witnesses of this redemption. So today, on this immortal site made forever sacred through the shedding of blood by our forefathers, North and South, we may humbly give thanks to Almighty God, not only that this government "of the people, by the people, for the people" has been preserved, but the right of democracy throughout the earth to establish and maintain such government has been victoriously asserted.

Gettysburg, more than any decisive battle in human history, marked a conflict of deep convictions. No conquest of territory was involved, no selfish ambition for leadership existed, no race or religious entanglements moved the opposing forces. Men of the same blood, all possessors of equal heritage of freedom and tradition, men whose forefathers had fought side by side at Yorktown and whose sons would later fight together in battles across the seas, opposed each other in mortal conflict because of what they believed. Thus Gettysburg has become not merely a historic battlefield, but a shrine. Victor and vanquished alike are honored. Spiritually, it is a memorial to American ideas as symbolized by two of the greatest Americans of all time—Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee.

Futile indeed would be any attempted addition or supplement to what has been said here with such perfection as to constitute one of the immortal expressions of all time. With propriety, however, the question can be asked: Has our Nation lived up to the heroism of those noble men who made the supreme sacrifice or to the ideals of the martyred President who sought to bind up the Nation's wounds?

Thrice since that memorable event has our Nation been challenged by foes from without. Each time our people responded with courage and unity worthy of our highest ideals. From the stirring victory of Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay to the historic defense by the men under MacArthur and Wainwright at Bataan and Corregidor, the valor of American manhood has shown with increasing luster. Midway, Guadalcanal, Bizerte, and Cassino are among the hundreds of triumphs on sea and land and in the air in which men of the North and South have joined to hold high an unsullied and undefeated flag.

More than this, it is possible to say that no unworthy cause has enlisted the might and power of American arms. We have engaged in no aggression, sought no territory, practiced no oppression. We seek only that men everywhere shall be free. We have been moved by the conviction that military triumph alone is no justification for war; that there must be the triumph of a worthy cause; that beyond the cross of war there must be for all mankind the glory of a new day, the peace of a better world, and freedom of the human spirit.

Those who are disturbed by our participation in world conflict and international affairs should restudy the words of the great Lincoln. On this very spot, made as memorable by his words as by the deeds of those whom he exalted, he pleaded with almost agonizing earnestness that liberty and democracy should not perish from the earth. Isolationists will find no support in the life or words of Abraham Lincoln. In a speech at Independence Hall at Philadelphia, on his way to his first inauguration, he exclaimed:

"I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. That was not a mere matter of separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but a sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the earth, for all future time."

In these great utterances there is the broad and true implication that without world freedom there can be no world peace; that oppression anywhere threatens liberty everywhere; that freedom of religion and speech cannot be limited by international boundary lines.

North and South stand united today. No economic, political, or religious differences threaten our unity. We are together determined upon victory in the great cause for which we fight. Our bond of friendship and loyalty is sealed by the blood of our sons who side by side are fighting at this moment on far-flung battlefields to preserve an America worthy of Washington and Jefferson, Lincoln and Lee.

Victory in this epochal conflict will be won. Whether soon or late, it will be complete.

In the spirit of our forefathers, in a manner worthy of our sons, ours is the high responsibility and the precious privilege of preserving here at home the heritage for which they fight; to resist indifference, complacency, and cynicism; to see that isolationism and reaction do not again break the heart of the world.

If we are faithful to our trust, we shall, when the victory is won, be able to give affirmative answer to the immortal inquiry:

"Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner still wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS—TAKEN FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE 1944 MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES AT GETTYSBURG

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced." So said Abraham Lincoln on this spot 81 years ago. They fought for the preservation of the Union, in order that our country might become a more secure and better place in which to live, to raise a family, and to find greater opportunities to get ahead in life. The Union was preserved and we have watched the United States become the best country on the face of the earth. We have profited by living under a system of government in which each one of us has his part to play. We have seen our land become a good place in which to work, to live, to acquire an education, and to raise our children. We have seen, through the skill, the imagination, the courage, the resourcefulness, and the perseverance of our citizens hundreds of amazing inventions become ordinary necessities of life. All have brought us more comforts and a fuller understanding of one another.

During the same period we have seen the world devastated by the two greatest wars in history. We have seen men attempt to place might over right. We have fought in both these vast wars to preserve the principle that right is always the master of might.

We are still engaged in the second of these wars. We here at home must do our utmost to help our boys end that war with an early and complete victory. At the same time, we must see to it that we preserve for them the freedom of opportunity and of life that we now enjoy, and thus uphold those principles which Abraham Lincoln so clearly advanced.

The handclasp here of North and South is proof that our country is no longer divided. The fact that the great-grandsons of the boys in blue and gray are fighting side by side in all corners of the world indicates the united spirit of that Union. What becomes of our country in the future rests largely in their hands. They will be the dominating force in civic affairs. We must give them the chance to complete their education, to be rehabilitated, and to be retrained so they may be employed in useful work. We must guide them and see that they assume their responsibilities as well as enjoy their privileges. They have become experts in war. It will be our fault if they do not become experts in peace.

The spirit of our soldier dead demands of us a united effort which no boundary lines can mark.

It demands a greater unity of purpose between the officers of government and people in business. A country cannot go forward where government seeks to destroy opportunities in business and business seeks to weaken the reasonable authority of government.

It demands more unity between those who manage business and those who work in factories. We must insist upon the willingness and ability of the labor leaders to cooperate with the management of our industries; to have the courage to make necessary readjustments in hours and wages in order that some industries may live; and, above all, to do their part within their unions to make it possible for returning soldiers to get employment. We must insist that management cooperate with labor. Management must recognize that unions are part of our national life and take them more into its confidence. Our stupendous war production comes from the team play among government and labor and industry. It is due also to plain, hard work and the inventiveness and skill of our workers. The fervor and unity of wartime effort must be continued in peacetime.

The spirit of our soldier dead demands more unity between those people who work in our great industrial centers and our citizens who work on the farms and feed those workers in industries. We must maintain equal opportunities for farmers and workers alike.

It demands more unity between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our coordinated system of Government. Each must use the authority and the powers given to it by our Constitution in a spirit of common understanding.

The spirit of our soldier dead demands of each one of us for the other a feeling of friendliness, whatever may be our religion or our color. Our boys fight side by side, whether they be Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, or whatever may be their racial descent.

It demands that we, by our actions at home, show our men in active service that we understand the problems, the dangers, and the tragedies that they are daily facing in our behalf. Too many of them are disturbed at what they read about us.

Today this invisible unity is our most pressing need—not only to speed the day of victory, but to lay a foundation for lasting peace. Long before the end of the Civil War, Lincoln saw the tremendous problem of effecting reunion. Today on a far vaster scale are emerging the problems of economic and social rebuilding.

The security of our country is our sole concern. But events have proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the future security of our country depends upon the stability of the world. We must assume our full share of neighborly responsibility. In doing so we must beware of any holier-than-thou attitude. We must assume a spirit of give and take. We must prepare ourselves by a better understanding of our neighbors throughout the world. There must be a closer meeting of our thoughts, our emotions, our beliefs, our goals. The all-important thing in the days to come is the will to cooperate, to understand each other, to work together here in the United States, and to get along with our neighbors elsewhere.

For this unfinished work we must pray for those qualities which Lincoln so clearly portrayed in his own life—his courage, his forbearance, his perseverance, his willingness to understand the other fellow, his capacity for hard work. Above all must we exercise the integrity of purpose in our private and public dealings that was so characteristic of him. We have come too much to assume that all good things in this world will be handed to us upon a platter. They come only by hard work and through the force of personality and character. Today, too, we need vision. We find ourselves in the present war because we lacked the imagination to foresee along what course the cross-currents set up by the last war were leading us.

In working for a greater understanding and more unity in our own country and with our neighbors throughout the world, we must always remember that the qualities needed for success are born in the hearts and minds of each one of us. The leaders of our country can succeed only if we each understand the problems that face us and are willing to contribute our share of the effort needed to solve those problems.

The words that Lincoln said here reached the hearts of men for all time because of their clearness of statement and their fullness of emotional and spiritual purpose. Let us here today dedicate ourselves to the principles that lead to a love of home and family, to simplicity in our way of life, to confidence in the future, and to faith in God. Let us remember today that our country has become a great Nation through unity of purpose and action. Let us here resolve in 1944, on the day dedicated by us to our soldier dead of all wars, that we shall preserve the heritage of the age that is past and hand it on in even fuller measure to the age that is waiting before.

President Truman Favors Action in This Session on Legislation Providing Statehood for Hawaii

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to A. T. Longley, Chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, under date of March 12, President Truman makes this statement:

I attach great importance to the enactment by the Congress at its present session of legislation to enable Hawaii to become a State. This measure has my unqualified endorsement and is receiving my personal attention and active support.

I call this to the attention of the House at the present time by way of expressing the very deep gratitude we of Hawaii feel to the President for the unqualified support he has consistently given legislation providing immediate statehood for Hawaii. His letter to Mr. Longley expresses his support with greater emphasis than any previous utterances.

President Truman recommended the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State in his message on the state of the Union at the opening session of the Eightieth Congress and again in his message on the state of the Union at the opening of the present session of Congress.

But at no time has he given as much emphasis to his support of this legislation as he does in this letter.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission, to whom the letter is addressed, was an agency created by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. Its mission is to support enactment of this legislation. Its membership consists of representative citizens of both major political parties. Its activities are financed entirely and exclusively from funds provided by the Territory of Hawaii.

The House Committee on Public Lands on March 8 voted to report H. R. 49, to enable Hawaii to become a State. I recommend strongly to the Members of the House that they read the report of the committee, House Report 254, which is now available in printed form.

The chairman of the Public Lands Committee hopes to obtain in the near future a rule for the consideration of this legislation and it is, of course, the very earnest hope of all of us of Hawaii that action will be taken by the House in the not too distant future.

The full text of the President's letter to Mr. Longley is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
Key West, Fla., March 12, 1949.

Mr. A. T. LONGLEY,
Chairman, Hawaii Statehood Commission,
P. O. Box 3775, Honolulu, T. H.

MY DEAR MR. LONGLEY: I wish to thank you for your letter of January 9, in which you express appreciation for the support I have given to the people of Hawaii in their efforts to attain statehood.

I attach great importance to the enactment by the Congress at its present session of legislation to enable Hawaii to become a State. This measure has my unqualified endorsement and is receiving my personal attention and active support.

I am aware of the important contribution which the Hawaii Statehood Commission has made toward the attainment by Hawaii of statehood. Please extend to the members of the commission my best wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Rent Control

REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to all my colleagues, I feel, to know the reaction of many of the people of Chicago to the passage by this distinguished body of a rent-control bill which did not adequately meet the serious problems of our large centers of population.

On March 16, the day following our action here, the City Council of Chicago

passed two resolutions which clearly reflect this adverse reaction.

A wave of resentment such as I had predicted is sweeping the metropolis. This should not be minimized. This resentment is especially keen among the thousands of our citizens who are permanent residents of hotels. It is also intense among those who are concerned with the growing gravity of the problem of financing the proper maintenance of municipal services, because to them it seems unfair that we in this Congress should act to place upon municipalities greater financial burdens in the matter of rent control.

I have received many letters voicing this resentment. The writers cannot understand why when northern, eastern, and western Democrats to a man join in overcoming reactionary opposition to TVA and other good works primarily in the interest of the plain people of the South the same understanding should not have been accorded by the distinguished Representatives of the South to the problems of the plain people of the urban centers. North, south, east, and west, the plain people everywhere in the Nation depend upon a united democracy to advance the cause of human welfare.

Mr. Speaker, human welfare is neither a sectional nor a partisan question, as I know all my colleagues agree; and I should like to believe that there is equal agreement that today adequate rent control is a pressing aspect of the human welfare of all our citizens and emphatically so in great urban areas such as the one a part of which I represent.

Certified copies of the resolutions passed by the city council of Chicago have been sent to the President of the United States and to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. Those resolutions officially reflecting the public opinion of the people of the city of Chicago I hereby bring to the attention of the House and ask the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. The resolutions follow:

Resolution protesting against proposal for local option in rent control, adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, March 16, 1949

Whereas rent control continues to be one of the major problems confronting every community in America, Chicago being no exception; and

Whereas recent reports emanating from Washington indicate the possibility that although rent control may be continued, provision is to be included granting so-called local option on Federal rent control; and

Whereas experience in the city of Chicago has indicated that local control is costly and involves extensive administrative detail and supervision; and

Whereas it would be unwise to place the expense and administration of rent control in the municipalities, creating dual supervision and control and added expense; and

Whereas the financial condition of Chicago and other municipalities is such as to deny it the opportunity to properly provide for the expenses of a rent-control commission and the administrative detail to make such controls effective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the City Council of the City of Chicago, and we do hereby recommend that if the Congress of the United States continues rent control, such control be retained exclusively in the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, thereby insuring a continuity of operation and permitting a full use of the experience gained by the Federal Government during the time rent control has been supervised and regulated by it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded by air mail to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, the two United States Senators from Illinois, and the Federal Rent Control Administrator.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Wednesday, the 16th day of March A. D. 1949.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 16th day of March A. D. 1949.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Resolution for inclusion of permanent residents in hotels in rent-control bill adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, March 16, 1949

Whereas existing Federal and State legislation imposing rent controls upon residential renting accommodations affords inadequate protection to the many thousands of Chicago citizens who are permanent hotel residents; and

Whereas the City Council of the City of Chicago has heretofore recognized the extreme hardships suffered by this group of tenants and attempted in the year 1947 to alleviate these conditions by enacting a rent-control ordinance under apparent authority conferred by an act of the General Assembly of Illinois; this ordinance afforded but temporary relief, the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois having declared said ordinance invalid for the reason that the enabling act excluded from the definition of housing accommodation hotels for the accommodation of permanent residents as well as for transient guests; and

Whereas permanent hotel residents are still in dire need of the same protection conferred by law upon tenants of other housing accommodations and the same considerations of public health, safety, and welfare are involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago, That this council respectfully urges the Congress in any new rent-control legislation it enacts to make clear that permanent residents of hotels are afforded the same protection from unwarranted and abnormal increases in rent as that given to tenants in other types of residential occupancy.

The city clerk is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Wednesday, the 16th day of March A. D. 1949.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 16th day of March A. D. 1949.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Welcome Address of John H. Connaughton, President of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, at Its Thirty-ninth Annual Banquet at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 9, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at a recent dinner given by the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia it was my privilege to hear the president of the Association, Hon. John H. Connaughton, deliver an address. Believing that this address is of public interest, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: We have reached another milestone in the life of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, and it is now my happy privilege to welcome you to our thirty-ninth annual banquet. Another year of progress has passed into history, and we face a new year of possibility.

Robert Browning, in his Summum Bonum, said:

"All the breath and bloom of the year in the bag of one bee;
All the wonder and wealth of the mine in the heart of one gem;
In the core of one pearl all the shade and shine of the sea;
Breath and bloom, shade and shine, wonder wealth, and how far above them;
Truth, that's brighter than gem,
Trust, that's purer than pearl;
Brightest truth, purest trust in the universe—
All were for me in the kiss of one girl."

So, we bid farewell to the old and look with confidence to the fortieth year of our existence with all its possibilities. Realizing that all our efforts may finally be summed up in one accomplishment, with all we hope to be; and imbued with the justice and truth of the thing we would do, we hope to perform it, so that our efforts may earn the plaudit "Well done." It may appear to us as we survey the accomplishment of the past that we feel that there is much that should have been done that is yet undone. That the effort which we have given has not produced its share of accomplishment. Yet life is not to be measured by the distance run or the figures on a dial, but by the manner in which we ran the race.

"You are beaten to earth? Well what of that? Come up with a smiling face.
It's nothing against you to fall down flat,
But to lie there—that's disgrace.

The harder you're thrown, why the higher you bounce;
Be proud of your blackened eye!
It isn't the fact that you're licked that counts;
It's how did you fight and why?"

It may be that in the past year and in other years, that we have not been victorious all the time, but we have kept our eye on the goal, and ultimately we shall succeed.

The present time in the history of the world is fraught with problems. It is now a

time that searches men's souls. It is a time for strong hearts and clear, clean minds that can think straight through the problems of a troubled and confused world. Never has the right been challenged as it is being challenged now. Never has there been more confusion in the hearts of men than at the present moment. It is the time for placing first things first.

So it is in the District of Columbia there are many problems to solve, and we assert now that these problems are our problems, and will have to be solved by us. They cannot be properly evaluated by those who are strangers to our relationships; nor can they be adjusted by abuse by those who do not know of what they speak. We claim the right of all people everywhere, not only in America but in all the world, to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. We believe that we know the conditions here, and know better than any nonresident how to reach the needed adjustment, if there be any adjustment to make.

Certainly our condition will not be improved by misstatements by nonresidents, nor by distortion of facts by self-appointed committees. The experience of the past year has demonstrated that these committees get themselves into a labyrinth of error, and are compelled to retract and restate, so that their contribution to the sum total of the problem is a mass of confusion.

The District of Columbia occupies a position in the organization of this Nation which is unique. Washington is a city set upon a hill which cannot be hid. Our status was fixed by the Constitution which gave life to this Nation; that status has not been changed in over 150 years of national existence, although many provisions of the Constitution have been altered during this time. It is true that within the Constitution a variety of governments could be constructed for the people of the District of Columbia. A number have been so constructed with varying experience. However, the people of Washington enjoy less self-government now than at any time in their history. We are the example of the superlative step child in government. We have problems that confront this commonwealth which exceed in population that of several of the States, and yet we have little voice in the solution of those problems. Every year the ever-growing budget of a rapidly growing city presents itself for consideration, and while it affects the economy of almost a million people, we have no official voice in its consideration, and about all the influence we exert in finding a solution for the fiscal problems of Washington is the still small voice of persuasion. We are faced with the question of supplying funds to pay the cost of operating a great metropolitan area, yet all we can do is plead for fair play.

We respectfully ask Congress to listen to the people of Washington when Washington problems are involved, and disregard such maverick groups as the committee of ninety, that functioned so inefficiently during the last year. Our problems of social relationships, fiscal affairs, and so forth, will be solved properly by the people of Washington, if nonresidents will keep their noses out of our business.

It is our considered opinion that Congress has never fully recognized that Washington is the Capital of the United States, and that it has been treated more as the Capital of the District of Columbia. This notion should be eliminated, and Congress should assume its fair share of the fiscal burden of the District of Columbia.

There is a growing feeling that unless a proper adjustment of the tax load is made between the people and the Federal Government, that more and more property owners will dispose of their homes and move to nearby Maryland and Virginia. This would create a condition that would not be wholesome, and would provide us with a deserted village to which we could point as the Capital of the Nation. The people of Washington and Congress should be interested in maintaining this city as a home for a satisfied people.

It should not be necessary to provide an exact figure or ratio, which should be designated as the portion which the Federal Government should assume, in providing finances for the operation of the District of Columbia. The problem of providing these finances should be assumed by Congress, as they have the entire control of the taxing power and the spending power. It is not fair to ask us to provide the funds, when we have no power of taxation, and when we have nothing to do with the appropriation of the money for spending purposes.

The duty to raise the money and the power to expend it should be assumed by the same agency. It is roughly estimated that the Federal Government owns and controls about 20 percent of the taxable area of the District, and that private owners and private business interests own slightly less than 50 percent of such area. The balance is owned by charitable, educational, and eleemosynary institutions that are tax-exempt. We are not objecting or complaining about this condition, but we say that it is entitled to a fair recognition by Congress, and that the tax load should be adjusted upon a basis of fairness to the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

Since the taxable property holdings of the District of Columbia are divided between the Federal Government and private interests on a ratio of two to five, then it would seem fair to us to consider this revenue-producing property by itself and divide the load between the Federal Government and the District in this proportion. This would allocate to the Federal Government about 30 percent of the fiscal requirements of the District of Columbia, and which in a budget of $100,000,000 would require the Federal Government to contribute to this budget about $30,000,000.

Under present conditions, the Federal Government pays much less than this amount, with the result that we are hard-pressed in Washington to find tax sources. Our real estate is bearing all the load it can carry, and any additional charge will result in impairment of values and also in removals. A proper comparison of our real-estate taxes with other jurisdictions will disclose that we are paying all the traffic will bear. A percentage comparison does not give us a fair picture, but a consideration of the amount paid per home unit will disclose a fair evaluation. Our real estate is valued at its fair value for tax purposes, while in many other jurisdictions it is valued at one-third and in some instances slightly more. A fair study will disclose that taxpayers of Washington are bearing their share of the load of governmental cost.

We are the victims of the condition that caused the Revolutionary War. Taxation without representation is tyranny. It may be that we need another Boston tea party to call the attention of the people of the United States to the condition here.

We realize that there is a constantly growing demand upon the part of citizens of the United States for a reduction in spending, and a consequent reduction in taxes. It is much easier to tax those who have no voice than those who participate in government. If Congress contributes more to the budget of the District of Columbia, this reflects in the Federal tax load, so it is easier to listen to the voice of the ballot than the voice of persuasion. Thus, they take the course of least resistance. That this condition asserts itself in all such instances was evidenced when the Hoover committee report reached Congress. One Congressman said, "Everyone is in favor of it, but there will be nothing done about it." When the shaving process begins, any group that is affected will cause their friends to put pressure on Members of Congress to save their jobs, and every other group will do the same thing, and a multiplicity of pressure groups involved will involve every reduction proposal, and nothing will be done.

When our problems are under consideration, there is no franchise involved to make our voice audible. However, it is gratifying to know that when the people of the District of Columbia are interested in their own problems, and make intelligent approach to their solution, we secure results that are gratifying. As an illustration of this result-producing activity, I want to call attention to the recent reduction in the budget of the District of Columbia, which was reduced in the approximate amount suggested by the spokesman of our fiscal-affairs committee, Mr. Clifford H. Newell, and along the lines suggested by him. Again I say, when the people of Washington become interested in their own problems, and make a proper study thereof, they find the proper solution.

In this connection, I know that the character of service that I am recommending to you, is one of self-sacrifice for the collective good of this place we call home. We have made progress in many ways, and have secured favorable action by Congress on District problems, which are the direct result of the work of the Federation of Citizens Associations and its affiliated bodies. This result has been made possible by the spirit of sacrificial service which our membership has rendered; and because we are the best cross-section of the citizenship of Washington. The Federation and its member bodies coordinate their activities, and cooperate fully with all that are interested in the same program.

IN UNION THERE IS STRENGTH

Then the thoughtless may say that it is not worth while to spend individual effort for the common good; that it seems that the fight is an endless one; and that defeat seems to be the portion many times of those who fight for the things that are worth while. It may seem, as it seems to many now that evil overwhelms us; that the foes of good are in the ascendency. This is not a new thought or condition; it has ever been true. Many years ago it was written—

"Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold rules the future,
And behind the great unknown,
Stands the God of our creation
Keeping watch above His own."

History of the past has convinced us that no efforts put forth for good are ever lost. It may be like the bread cast upon the waters which may not return for many days, but its return is sure. And the harvest will be an hundred fold.

So may I close by suggesting a homely little phrase as our guide in trying times, "Keep on keeping on." If we do so and do not become weary in well doing, we will find that we shall reap if we faint not. Life will be real, and worthwhile, and we can evaluate it with the poet, happy and content, in the realization of work well done.

"Tell me not in mournful numbers,
Life is but an empty dream,
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
And things are not what they seem.

"Life is real and life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal,
Dust thou art, to dust returneth,
Was not spoken of the soul.

"Not in pleasure nor in sorrow
Is the measure of our way,
But to live that each tomorrow
Finds us farther than today.

"Art is long and time is fleeting,
And our hearts though strong and brave,
Still like muffled drums are beating
Funeral marches to the grave.

"Trust no future howe'er pleasant,
Let the dead past bury its dead,
Act, act in the living present,
Heart within and God o'erhead.

"In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of life,
Be not like dumb driven cattle,
Be a hero in the strife.

"Lives of great men all remind us
We may make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

"Footprints which perhaps another
Sailing o'er life's weary main,
Some forlorn and shipwrecked brother
Seeing may take heart again.

"Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate,
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait."

Addresses by Senator McMahon and David E. Lilienthal on the Occasion of the Opening of Oak Ridge, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address I delivered at the ceremonies incident to the opening of Oak Ridge, Tenn., on Saturday, and also a copy of the address delivered by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lilienthal on that occasion. The Vice President also delivered a very excellent address on the subject. I do not have his manuscript, since he spoke without manuscript, but I hope to receive the record of his address from the transcript of the broadcast, and to insert it in the RECORD at a later date.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR BRIEN M'MAHON, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

We are here today to commemorate an historic event. We are opening the town of Oak Ridge. We are expanding the area of freedom. The fences which once surrounded this area and restricted the comings and goings of the people of this community are to be torn down. I congratulate you. You who live here are well aware, I'm sure, of what this will mean in your own lives, but the larger significance of this event in the face of world history may not be equally obvious.

Today, something is happening here which is contrary to the current of the times. While, everywhere throughout the world, the areas of freedom are contracting, here, in the least likely of places, the boundaries of freedom are expanding. While here at Oak Ridge you tear down the fences, as much as possible, almost everywhere else you look you can see new fences, new controls, new restrictions against thought, speech, and action. What you are doing here today is, of course, typically American, in the tradition of the independent far-seeing men and women who made the America we know and love by continually expanding, not only the physical frontiers, but the boundaries of human knowledge as well.

The atomic glare, which your gigantic plants helped to create, is lighting up the skies of the world. Those aggressors who otherwise might have nothing to deter them now pause before the might of the atomic bomb. And because they respect its power, we dare not let it fall into their hands.

Had the Soviet Union joined the rest of the nations of the world in accepting our just and generous offer to share the secrets of atomic energy under conditions providing for effective control, there would today be no need for us to lock up our secrets, or barricade part of our liberties. But that offer was not accepted, the strange peace became a war of nerves, the hard answer turned into the cold war. That is why we have had to weight ourselves and our free economy with a burdensome load of taxation to provide the protection which comes from strength. For the first time in our peacetime history, we have had to reach into our homes for the young men who can be trained to bear arms in the defense of their country. We have had to take from the schools and the basic research laboratories the inquiring minds of the scientists and put them to work on problems of national defense. For the first time in our history we have been forced to suspend freedom of knowledge. We have had to attach to certain fields of inquiry the sign "Verboten—except by permission."

Because we are aware of the dangers which surround us in this restless and fearful peace, we have been forced to do these things against our wishes, against our will, and against the day of possible aggression. We who have fought for freedom because we love it, now find ourselves curtailing our own freedom. Yet we, of all people, know that only when the mind of man—every man—is free to pursue truth to its uttermost extent, to acquire knowledge to the limits of its ability, is there real freedom. Where the gates have been shut on knowledge, there progress halts. To permit the creeping vine of secrecy to grow on the wall of science is to encourage the spread of the ivy over the entire surface, for all knowledge is necessarily related.

The man who is shut off from even one fact of knowledge lives in doubt, however small. He can only know that policies involving his life are being made by other men who may—or may not—have all the facts. Without freedom to know, he becomes less free to act. His participation in society becomes more and more restricted. More and more he is told what to do and what to think. And the end is not yet in sight. The trend is decidedly toward more armaments, more foreign aid, more taxes, more oppressive weights upon our free economy and our free society. That is the trend of the tremulous times in which we live.

Here at Oak Ridge, however, we are today at least, running against the tide. Here we confront a cruel paradox. We are opening this town—we are winning a small victory in the perpetual battle for freedom but, on other fronts, we are forced to retreat from our ideas and our ideals. To defend freedom, to protect our Nation, we are compelled to threaten the basic freedoms.

Yet we must continue to hope the day will come when through international control of atomic energy, all fences are removed from the city of Oak Ridge. We must continue to hope the day will come when the tremendous forces of atomic energy, harnessed in these plants, will work entirely for man's benefit. Meanwhile, we must cherish, more than ever, the ideal symbolized by the opening of this town today. We must continue to work and strive so that the spiritual forces of freedom may overcome the repressive forces of the iron curtain. The outcome of this struggle lies in some near offing of history that will set the course for man for ages to come. You here today will probably be called upon to help make that decision.

As the gates of this city open, let us dedicate ourselves to the duty, here symbolized and here crytallized, of reopening the gates of the free mind everywhere in the world, through the liberty which, in our day, can come only under effective international control of atomic armaments.

REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN DAVID E. LILIENTHAL, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

This is a strange celebration, probably the first of its kind in the United States.

Here in a small town in Tennessee are gathered thousands of people, a gathering honored by the presence of the Vice President of the United States, a number of Senators and Congressmen, the Governor of the State. What is the occasion of such a celebration?

This morning the gates through the fence surrounding the town of Oak Ridge have been opened, for good. After today it will no longer be necessary to carry a pass or to arrange to visit a resident in order to enter the Oak Ridge townsite.

The strangeness and uniqueness of this event lie not in the taking down of the gates, but in the fact that they were ever up in the first place. A visitor from Mars, seeing the high fence, the gates, the guards might wonder: Is this an American town, or is this a forced labor camp celebrating liberation?

It is not natural for an American town to be closed off from the normal free flow of people and commerce and culture. It is not natural and normal that Americans would be willing to consent to live behind barriers.

It is in this fact that lies the deeper significance of this occasion. For the young history of the town of Oak Ridge is a reassuring example of an old American trait; the ability to adjust to an emergency, without losing sight of our basic principles. Americans are individualistic, self-reliant people. But, when it is necessary, they will take effective measures of self-protection, even go so far as to live behind fences. But only when it is clearly necessary. It has to be justified in each case. This is the important thing.

The moment it is no longer justified by the facts, most Americans want no more of it.

More than 5 years ago the town of Oak Ridge was established in an immediate and serious emergency. This country had embarked on a daring program whose very existence we tried to keep secret. The town of Oak Ridge grew up behind fences and guards; its name never appeared in the Postal Guide, its telephone exchange was never listed at central.

But we move from fact to fact. There is no reason today why nearly 40,000 Americans should secrete themselves from public view.

But it is necessary to keep secret and to protect the very important work that goes on in these production plants over yonder. So a new, and very strong fence has been built around the plant area. By confining the guarded area to these essentials, the physical security of the plants has been maintained.

This business of constant reassessment, in the light of present facts and conditions, is symbolic of the whole problem of security and secrecy in the atomic energy program.

The paramount objective of the atomic energy program—a responsibility the Commission feels deeply—is to assure the common defense and security. How can that be best achieved?

First of all, we must always remember this: the American rule is freedom. Freedom is the rule of our way of life; secrecy is the exception to the rule. There are places—unhappy places—in the world where secrecy is

the rule and freedom the exception. Not with us.

It is through the open, free interchange, and movement of ideas and people that this country has thrived—to become the strongest, the most prosperous, and happiest Nation in the world.

It is this ideal of openness and freedom that is the heart and soul of America. This is what our huge national efforts and expenditures are designed to defend and to make secure.

There is also a very practical everyday reason to make sure that any departure from the traditional American way is clearly necessary.

Guards and fences and secret stamps on documents in themselves do not provide real security. If it were just a matter of fences, safes, and guardhouses, it would be a simple problem.

But genuine security has a positive as well as a defensive side.

What we are trying to do in the United States is maintain and increase our leadership in all phases of atomic-energy development. To do this, we need the best efforts and best ideas of many people—scientists, engineers, technicians of all kinds, management, and labor.

It is an open and competitive atmosphere that best calls forth the good new fresh ideas, and the best effort of men and women. But against this we must set the immediate, compelling fact that the state of the world is such that it would be naïve and imprudent not to try to conceal from others substantial areas of the atomic-energy program. And this the Commission is doing.

So the whole question of secrecy and security becomes a matter of balance, of weighing factors one against another, just as factors were weighed when the question was whether the town of Oak Ridge should come out from behind high fences.

It would be a gigantic delusion, and one that could cost the American people their freedom should we ever come to act on the belief that secrecy and security are always the same. They are not always the same. Sometimes secrecy is necessary and is the best way to further our security. In other cases secrecy impairs our own security, our own military and physical safety. The factors must be balanced, with a coolness of judgment and without jitters, in each particular case.

So where necessary we shall have to continue secrecy and guards and fences. But let us do it on a common-sense basis, only when it is necessary.

When Oak Ridge was first settled, it was distinguished for its rows of hastily built houses and huts set in a sea of red mud. But today it looks very much like an ordinary town. The more normal in appearance it becomes, the happier the Commission will be, and the happier the people of Oak Ridge will be, we believe.

But Oak Ridge is not, nor is it likely soon to become, a completely normal town. For while there are some 36,000 people living here, there are 150,000,000 people in the country who are concerned with this particular town. These are the people who put up the money to build it, the people in whose interest the plants are operating, the people to whom we are accountable.

What goes on in the town of Oak Ridge is of direct financial interest to the people of the United States, just as what goes on in the plants directly affects the national interest.

Now, does the fact the people of the United States own this town, all of the land, and practically all of the buildings mean that there is no room at all, in the development of the town, for individual initiative, for private enterprise, for local self-government?

The Commission believes there is a middle way. The manager here, as in Hanford, Wash., is working on ways to permit the leasing of land for commercial facilities. The Commission has authorized the sale of land to church organizations for religious or educational buildings to be erected at the expense of the church organizations. Other plans are being studied looking toward a more normal community in an economic sense.

This will take time and is not without difficulty, but it is worth the time and the effort.

Oak Ridge played a great role in days of war. May it perform even greater deeds in the building of a world at peace.

Under Modern Conditions, the Policy Which Government Follows in the Matter of Balancing or Unbalancing the Budget, of Increasing or Decreasing the Public Debt, Has Tremendous Influence on the Daily Life of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, never in history has our Government had to face the problem of managing the public debts that it faces today.

Fortunately, we have as Secretary of the Treasury in the personality of your good friend and my good friend, John W. Snyder, a man distinguished by the genius of his leadership as well as one who inspires the solid confidence of all of his fellow men.

No Nation in history has had to struggle more to manage a debt so huge that it taxes both the ability and the willingness of our people to meet it.

Enormous as was our indebtedness when we emerged from World War I, it still was insignificant as compared with the one that exists today.

By way of contrast the problems which faced our country then pale into insignificance.

Mr. Speaker, it is no disparagement to point out that subsequent to World War II and in May 1920, it was practically impossible for the municipalities and States of these United States to sell a single issue of bonds, even though they carried as much as 5 percent interest per annum.

The lack of confidence in the ability of the Treasurer of the United States to manage the debt of that day was so shattered—that a single break in Government bond prices carried United States Liberty Bond issues to discounts of almost 20 percent below par.

Billions of dollars were lost to the holders of all types of bonds, Federal, State, county, municipal, and other bonds, with the financial panic that then swept the country.

True understanding, and the real test of successful debt management is best expressed in the situation which exists today with respect to the value of all outstanding issues.

With more than two hundred and sixty billions outstanding, no one person has lost as much as a single penny. This has been due to the effectiveness of stabilization—the Federal bond program and the successful management of the debt. These are wholly and directly attributable to the understanding, will, skill, and ability of John Wesley Snyder—the greatest Treasurer this Nation has had since Alexander Hamilton.

It is indeed no happenstance that John Snyder was able to meet the the tremendous task assigned him by the President of the United States when he called him to serve as the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell you that John Snyder is no Wall Street tycoon. That he is no feudal baron called into office to serve the vested banking interests of our country—that he is now and has always been a true public servant.

When scarcely 23 years of age John Snyder entered the banking field as a bookkeeper for the First National Bank of a little city in Arkansas. In one aspect or another he has been in the banking business all of his life.

He knows the banking problems of the small-business man, the cotton, the peanut, the tobacco and the wheat farmer. He knows the fiscal problems of the cattle and the hog raisers and to my own mind, no man in the history of our country, with the possible exception of Hamilton, has had such a comprehensive experience and understanding of banking and currency as that possessed by Secretary Snyder.

His steady advancement in his chosen profession had so marked him among those of his profession in the Middle West that it is small wonder he was called into service by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States in 1931.

There, serving as the principal assistant to the receiver of banks, he conducted all administrative duties incident to the liquidation of a vast number of insolvent national banks subsequent to the world wide depression of 1930.

During the next 5 years, which followed his induction he proved himself to be probably the greatest administrator and authority on bank liquidation that this world has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, it was not until 1940 that Mr. Snyder was brought to Washington as special assistant to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board. To this duty later was added those of the assistant to the full board of directors of that mammoth fiscal organization.

It was here that his superb talents were directed to developing a program to provide for the building, the equipment and expansion of war defense plants, and from the inception of the War Plants Corporation, Mr. Snyder was installed as operational vice president and Director.

Within 1 year from the day upon which that huge corporation was founded, more than one thousand million dollars had been committed to the construction and equipment of stupendous industrial

plants in order to more successfully, economically and expeditiously prosecute the war effort.

By the end of 1944 commitments in excess of ten billions of dollars, covering aircraft, steel, machine tool, aluminum, magnesium, chemical and ordnance facilities were financed. With prudence, sagacity, economic and financial soundness and in wisdom—monies had been advanced for plants to manufacture synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline (facilities and pipelines) and the United States Defense Plant Corporation owned not alone nearly 1,000 new, huge, gigantic manufacturing concerns but had also financed the expansion of hundreds of privately owned industries in 46 States of the Union.

Outside of the continental limits of the United States, likewise, commitments had been made for the production of critical and strategic war materials in other countries which ran into the millions of dollars.

Over this vast banking operation John W. Snyder, war buddy, bosom friend, confidant, and beloved coworker of President Harry Truman—exercising full sway—presided as active administrative officer.

Was it to be wondered at that President Truman took a keen and personal interest and delight—when on May 14, 1947 and upon the recommendations of the War Department and of the Medal Awards Board—in presenting to his good friend and coworker, John W. Snyder, the Medal of Merit for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States."

While John W. Snyder served his country in the Fifty-seventh Field Artillery with distinction in World War I, he served his country with even greater distinction in the field of banking in World War II.

Upon the completion of his task in Washington he returned to St. Louis to take up his duties as vice president of the First National Bank, but his reassociation to the First National was short-lived, for, in April 1945, President Truman again called him back to Washington to serve now as the Federal Loan Administrator.

It was in this capacity that he took the first official steps looking to the return of a peacetime economy by the immediate elimination of all overlapping activities in the RFC.

It was on the direct recommendation of John Snyder that we in this House of Congress passed legislation whereby to consolidate and absorb all five subsidiaries into the main organization of the RFC.

He thereupon caused the abolishment of the War Damage Corporation and fostered and refueled the formulation and institution for a long-term program to aid all business, large and small, in order to meet the financial demands and impacts of reconversion.

Then, in July 1945, the President appointed him Director of the War Mobilization and Reconversion. He immediately initiated an action program to deal with major problems of production and employment and to implement all economic adjustments necessary to a transition from war to peace.

In preparation for VJ-day, he organized and held successive conferences with the heads of all pertinent Government agencies to map out procedure. This to to the end that when Japan sued for peace the machinery for a transition to a normal economy was all ready to be set in motion—the construction industry was freed from restrictive wartime controls, other limitations were eased or removed—labor difficulties were adjudicated and labor strikes in such essential industries as steel and coal mining were quickly settled with both minimum of delay and dislocation in the reconversion program.

Mr. Speaker, I know John W. Snyder. I have been knowing him good—and for a long, long time.

I know that there has been no problem out of the hundreds in Government to which he has put his hand but what he brought—order out of chaos—success out of failure—and profit out of losses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is a single man sitting on either side of the aisle or in both Houses of Congress that did not feel a glow of pride when, on June 25, 1946, John W. Snyder, with all of his great, proven talents and greater abilities, was called to serve by the President as the Secretary of the Treasury of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of that office has grown steadily and tremendously—year by year—since the time it was administered by Alexander Hamilton. The Secretary of the Treasury is today charged by law with the management of the Nation's finances. He superintends the collection of all the internal revenues of the National Government. He directs the form and keeping of public accounts, prepares recommendations for taxation programs and for the support of the public credit.

The Secretary of the Treasury determines methods and policies relating to the procurement of Federal supplies. Under his jurisdiction comes the Coast Guard, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, Customs and Internal Revenue. Through the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, he supervises the coinage and printing of all the money in the land.

Last, but not least, of all the stupendous tasks with which this eminently great public official is charged are all activities of the Bureau of Accounts and of Public Debt. An indefatigable worker, it is the latter single activity that keeps John W. Snyder at his desk until the late hours of the night in the conduct of transactions with respect to Government bonds and Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, one can never think of John W. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury apart from Harry Truman, President of the United States. There are probably no two men in our country today whose regard—one for the other—surpasses that of these two great, distinguished public servants.

They compliment one the other in their every expression and every public act. The Nation is justly proud of both President Harry Truman and John W. Snyder.

Mr. Speaker, on February 23 last, Secretary Snyder addressed the National Press Club with respect to the problems that confront our Nation in the matters of its fiscal policies and affairs.

It was such a profound talk, so full of solid, factually sound economics and business principles that in order to better absorb it I have myself read it not once but several times.

I found it so replete with human interest interwoven with fundamentals made applicable to the problem of debt management which now faces this Nation that I want to make it possible for every Member of this House to read it.

I am, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my fellows, submitting it as part of the proceedings of the Congress today. The speech of Secretary John W. Snyder is entitled "Confidence, the Keystone of Fiscal Finance."

CONFIDENCE, THE KEYSTONE OF FISCAL FINANCE

(Address by Secretary Snyder before the National Press Club, February 23, 1949)

Confidence built this Nation. Confidence wrote the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, and it armed the soldiers of the Revolution who made good that Declaration at Trenton, and Kings Mountain, and Yorktown. Confidence drove covered wagons, laid the steel of our transcontinental railways, and set up the assembly lines from which come our automobiles, refrigerators, radio sets, and every other expression of our national progress. It has turned back every military challenge to America, and it has animated all our great endeavors to build for freemen society and an economy to which we may look for ever-increasing spiritual, social, and material welfare.

National confidence is not made up of any single element. It embraces such diverse factors as the confidence of people in the security of their homes and families, in the permanence of their jobs, in the safety of their investments. It includes confidence in the efficiency of their economic system, in the soundness of their banking structure, in the integrity of their lawmakers, and in the impartiality of their courts.

Above all, national confidence depends on the financial soundness of the Government.

Time was when changes in Federal fiscal policy had relatively slight effects on our national life. But, under modern conditions, the policy which Government follows in the matter of balancing or unbalancing the budget, of increasing or decreasing the public debt, has tremendous influence on the daily life of American citizens.

If we look back at the period since the final victories of World War II, we can look with satisfaction on the way in which our economy has progressed. We have had no postwar slump. It is true we have had a rise in prices. But this has not been accompanied by violent speculative booms nor has it been accompanied by a great dislocation of production or scarcity of goods. On the contrary, goods are now flowing on the market in increased volumes and so are tending to restore the normal conditions under which healthy competition can prevail in industry, with sellers looking for buyers and not the customers bidding up prices on a black market.

The favorable situation today contrasts markedly with the lack of financial confidence during a critical period after the First World War, when the great speculation boom in commodities and in goods of all kinds reached its peak.

In May 1920, 91 issues of municipal bonds offered on the market remained unsold. Most of them were small issues, but important cities like Cincinnati, Columbus, and Syracuse received no bids whatever for bonds offered at a 5 percent interest rate.

Financial confidence at that time had been severely shattered by a break in Government bond prices, which carried the Liberty bond issues to discounts of almost 20 percent below par. With financial confidence severely damaged, with business inventories greatly overexpanded, and with heavy speculative commitments in the commodity markets, the stage was set for the historic price decline of 1920.

The situation today is sharply in contrast. For example, last week the city of Memphis, Tenn., sold a $4,500,000 bond issue for general city improvement purposes at a net interest cost of less than 2 percent. Last week, also, Duke Power Co. readily sold a $40,000,000 30-year bond issue at an interest cost of just over 2⅞ percent.

I do not mention these as particularly outstanding issues. The 2-percent yield on the Memphis bonds is a common yield today on municipal issues of this type and quality, while high-grade utility bonds commonly sell under 3 percent.

I mention them as concrete examples of the favorable terms on which our cities and corporations can meet their capital requirements, and can carry out their projects for improvement and expansion, when the Nation's financial structure rests on a sound foundation of confidence. If we look at certain of the countries of the world we can see that the fiscal policies which some of them have pursued in the war years and in the period following, have undermined popular confidence in the integrity of their country's money, and in the security of the debts which their governments owe to the individual citizens.

The relative stability of our own financial markets has resulted from the policy which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have developed in maintaining the stability of Government bond prices. We have carried out a policy of restraining undue advances or declines in prices of Treasury bonds.

To those businessmen who are haunted by memories of the 1920 price decline, I should like to emphasize that the situation in the Government bond market now is infinitely stronger. In place of the marketable Liberty bonds which so many investors sacrificed at wide discounts, we now have savings bonds which can always be redeemed at their specified values. In place of the laissez-faire market policy of that day, we now have the benefit of a firm stabilization policy.

In place of the great loss of confidence in the bond market in 1920, we now have a strong market trend which shows every evidence of continuing confidence. This is apparent also in the current sales of savings bonds, which have exceeded redemptions in every month during the past year. The total value of savings bonds outstanding is at a record level, as is also the total for series E bonds alone.

The effectiveness of our bond-stabilization program and the success of our Federal-debt management policies to date should not give rise to a feeling of complacency. This would indeed be a grave mistake.

The Second World War has left the United States with the burden of a huge national debt—a debt which now exceeds $253,000,000,000, and which compares with a debt only one-tenth as large—$25,000,000,000—in 1920. Some $50,000,000,000 of the debt must be refunded each year. And the handling of the refunding operations and the retirement of the debt have an important bearing on investor confidence.

The Federal debt now constitutes some 55 percent of the total debt of the Nation, both public and private. It has become the dominant factor in determing interest rates on private debt and the return on private investments. Of the bonds and other securities which represent the Federal debt, one-third is held by the banking system, one-fourth is held by individuals, largely in savings bonds; another one-fourth is held by insurance companies, business corporations, and other nonbank investors, and about 15 percent by Federal agencies and trust funds.

With the debt so widely held, and so important an influence on our financial and economic structure, I have considered it essential to enlist the cooperation of many groups, whose advice I seek in working out problems relating to debt management and Government financing. The representatives of banking, insurance, and industry have set up a number of advisory committees to work with the Treasury Department on matters of mutual concern. In addition to these regular committees, various groups are consulted from time to time in working out details of our fiscal program.

Encouraging progress has been made in reducing the debt, until the present fiscal year. As a result of the 1948 tax reduction, however, the prospect is for a budget deficit of $600,000,000 in the current fiscal year, and for an even larger deficit next year. By every standard of sound business practice, to run the Government at a deficit during the most prosperous year in our history does not seem to me to make good sense.

No business would have confidence in a corporation, heavily encumbered with both long-term and short-term debt, if it did not make provision for a systematic reduction of its debt during years of high prosperity. Only through such a policy can full confidence be maintained in the financial soundness of the United States Government.

I well realize that a tax increase is never popular. And, believe me, it takes a good deal of moral courage to advocate a tax increase at any time. But if we cannot pay our current expenses, and if the debt cannot be reduced during the height of peacetime prosperity, it is difficult to picture a time when it can be reduced with less inconvenience.

The interest cost of the Federal debt will be with us year after year, regardless of whether the income to pay it may be low or high. At nearly $5,500,000,000 annually, it now amounts to 13 percent of total Federal expenditures.

There has been some tendency recently to argue that reduction of the debt should be postponed until the business outlook becomes clearer, in view of recent downturns in prices and a falling off in certain lines of business.

But, every winter since the end of the war, a wave of business apprehension has swept the country. None of the earlier fears have materialized to any important extent. However, they have been highly beneficial in taking up business slack. They have put a damper on many speculative projects. They have led to cautious inventory policies in nearly all industries. They have encouraged bankers to adopt conservative loan policies. In short, by impelling everyone to prepare for a recession, they have protected the country against such a recession.

Now, in this fourth postwar year, we have reached a stage where the wartime accumulation of demand has begun to be satisfied.

We did not reach this condition all at once, however. Under cover of the continued strength in the heavy industries, the soft goods lines have for some time been making their readjustments to normal buyers' markets. Various luxury goods completed their readjustments earlier. This is another important contrast to the situation in 1920, when the unprepared-for price decline caused a simultaneous slump in almost all lines of business.

These developments have represented, for the most part, a return to normal buyers' markets and normal competitive conditions. They are part of the essential process of maintaining the economy on a sound basis.

The return of buyers' markets means that we are approaching those conditions which are normal to this country, wherein private enterprise functions to its fullest extent, and competition becomes most effective. Under such conditions, we get down to the most efficient production methods, we turn out the most attractive merchandise, we devise more economical distribution methods. In short, we shall get back in full stride to produce better goods at lower prices, which has been the basis for our rising standard of living.

The return to buyers' markets has been accompanied by a considerable decline in prices of agricultural products. The decline has been shared by food prices, and living costs have decreased slightly.

The drop in farm and food prices is attributable to normal demand and supply factors—a steadily improving supply of farm products throughout the world.

It has not been caused by any heavy liquidation of speculative holdings, as was the case in 1920, nor is it likely to be prolonged, as in that instance, by any important liquidation of inventories.

One proof of the latter statement can be seen in the trend of commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans, which are used chiefly for carrying inventories. In 1920, as in all other economic contingencies in which stocks of goods have backed up in trade channels, the holders were obliged to carry them by substantially increasing their bank loans.

This year, in contrast, loans have declined noticeably in the past 2 months, instead of increasing. In fact, they have been leveling off for some months, which is further evidence of a healthy inventory situation.

The return to buyers' markets has also been accompanied by an easing of the wartime pressure for continuous capacity operation of factories, even during the winter months. In many industries this year we have returned to the prewar seasonal pattern, when production was eased up during the unfavorable winter weather, railroad operations were slackened, and unemployment was somewhat increased.

In the steel industry, and a number of others, however, the wartime pressure for continued capacity operation still prevails.

Despite these various cross currents, the tide of basic national confidence continues as the dominating feature of the business situation.

There is good reason for this basic confidence. While unemployment showed some increase in January, the important news was that total civilian employment reached the highest level of any January on record.

While retail stores in recent months have found more difficulty in selling goods, the important fact is that total personal incomes in both November and December rose to new record levels. There is a vast difference, of course, between unwillingness to buy goods and inability to buy.

While residential construction has slackened recently because of the high price of houses, the volume of heavy construction awards in January exceeded all previous records for the month.

One reason for the continued boom in heavy construction is the great accumulated demand for new public construction projects of States and municipalities. Because of this factor, the volume of all types of construction this year is expected to reach a new high level, $1,000,000,000 higher than in 1948, according to estimates of the Department of Commerce.

The great shifts of population during the war years, and the 17,000,000 growth in population during the past decade, in fact, have created such a need for expansion of public and private utility services, schools, hospitals, highways and other public construction, that this factor alone will be a powerful business influence for several years to come.

The greatest support to business activity in the years immediately ahead, I believe, will be new developments in many kinds of consumer goods. These, together with the development of new factory equipment, new production techniques, and the rapidly broadening use of new synthetic materials, offer the essential foundation for an incomparable era of prosperity in the years ahead.

I think it reasonable to expect that this period of prosperity will continue, but it is not likely to be realized automatically. It will require constant watchfulness on the part of all groups to prevent the development of unbalanced conditions. We must guard against overbuying by business in excess of normal needs, by consumers in excess of ability to pay from current income, and by speculators.

On the other hand, we must guard against underbuying, for that also contributes to economic instability.

I pointed out earlier that confidence had been a very important ingredient of the forces which built America. And the same confidence that helped accomplish so much for us in the past will help accomplish much more for us in the future.

Confidence is self-reliance plus great expectations. It is not something occult and unreliable; when its foundations are sound, it is as understandable and dependable as muscle and machinery.

Its dependability increases with the weathering and testing of experience. If our confidence has seemed to fail us briefly in times gone by, we know now what economic mistakes paved the way for those failures by undermining the foundations. Knowing those mistakes, we can see to it that they are not made again. And that is precisely the goal at which Federal fiscal policies are aimed.

But as important as is the balancing of our dollar values, there is always the equally important responsibility for balancing our human values. In the ultimate solution of our economic and political well-being, we must find a common denominator upon which to build a careful balance of social and material welfare. We must find the wisdom, the resources, and the resolution to create a spiritual purpose and aim that will keep us moving progressively forward along the road of better living.

Are We Headed for Military Dictatorship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Pageant for April 1947:

ARE WE HEADED FOR MILITARY DICTATORSHIP?

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Will the military destinies of America be put into the keeping of a single individual vested with almost dictatorial powers? Will his personal prejudices and strategic blind spots become the main factors in formulating plans for national security involving the very survival of our country? Will a straitjacket of regimentation be put on our Military establishment under the pretexts of efficiency and economy?

To all these questions the answer is "Yes"—unless the American people and their Congress recognize the menace in due time and act to head it off.

They are under terrific propaganda pressure to give one man, the Secretary of National Defense, unlimited authority to enforce unity and discipline at the highest military levels. If that organized pressure succeeds, it will mean that military concepts will be frozen at a time when drastic changes and revaluations are called for.

Because of the advent of new weapons, the world faces a revolution in methods of human conflict. We shall be sunk, militarily speaking, if we do not have a defense setup that permits the full exploration and development of new ideas. As in all other branches of a nation's life, there are diehards obsessed with the true and tried, alarmed by innovation. They are pulling for the kind of bureaucratic controls which stack the cards for orthodoxy and military reaction.

A furious struggle is under way among the three services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—over so-called missions and appropriations. The public watches from afar in growing bewilderment. The danger is that in sheer exasperation we may accept the solution being offered—power of final decision lodged in the Secretary—without understanding the implications of this step.

The impression has been spread that the differences involved are mere bickerings; the kind of pettiness that can be ironed out by a strong administrative hand. This is not only untrue but unfair to our military leaders. Each of them is fighting for his innermost strategic convictions, sincerely certain that his answer is the proper one. The disputes are not petty but refer to the most fundamental strategic problems. They are matters of life and death for our Nation.

Shall they be resolved in the democratic fashion, with the people making the vital decisions? That is the issue, the concealed issue, in the current to-do about military organization.

No one denies that tactics and weapons are the concern of military experts and must be kept secret. But strategy—the over-all plan of war—is another matter. That involves the investment and deployment of our whole national effort. It cannot be concealed from the world; for it announces itself clearly anyhow in the industrial set-up, in foreign policies, in the nature of the training program for youth and in a lot of other ways. It should not be kept secret, for if our security program is to serve as a deterrent upon would-be aggressors, they must know what awaits them if they precipitate war.

The memorable congressional battle over the 70-group Air Force in 1948 brought a major dispute into the open, where it belongs. The first thing to be noted is that it was not trivial but went to the heart of our security plans. The second and most significant fact is that the answer by Congress at that time was almost unanimous for the "insubordinate" Secretary of Air, overruling the views of the Department head.

Suppose that appeal to public opinion had been forbidden, or that we did not have an Air Secretary as courageous and patriotic as Mr. Symington. The air power argument would, in that case, have been suppressed. Our people would not even have known that a conflict in basic strategic concepts existed.

Yet the present trend is toward sealing off further democratic appeals by endowing the same Department head with total authority. Congress and the President would no longer choose among alternative military programs. They would be limited to confirming a single view, without knowing whether it had been arbitrarily imposed and whether it really represented the consensus of military thought.

The right of the various services to appeal to the President, to explain their respective concepts to Congress, was not thoughtlessly inserted into the National Security Act of 1947. It was the core of the compromise reached by the services in shaping up the so-called unification law. Its purpose was to preserve popular control over major strategic planning and prevent arbitrary decisions by the Defense Secretary.

It is precisely that right the advocates of more power for the Secretary would abrogate. If they have their way, the most important result will be the disciplining, which is to say, the muzzling, of proponents of any strategy but the one chosen by the Secretary and his favored advisers. That is the underlying purpose of the campaign for unity; everything else is trimming or double-talk.

The elder services, backed by vested industrial interests, already have a stranglehold on strategic planning. At the head of our military set-up, at this writing, stands a man whose pro-Navy bias is notorious. His voice prevails in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is composed of two admirals, one ground general and one air general. Only the possibility of carrying its case to the people saves the Air Force from complete subjection to the surface services.

The pressure for one-man domination has been an organized public-relations campaign, obviously under the direction of the office of the Secretary of Defense. The same pattern of arguments, sometimes the same wording, leave little doubt on this score. The drive was spearheaded by an array of inspired articles repeating the theme song of more power for the Secretary.

After public opinion was sufficiently prepared and softened, came the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Subcommittee on Military Establishment, headed by Ferdinand Eberstadt. It echoed the same song. This was hardly a surprise; Mr. Eberstadt, like Mr. Forrestal, has long been a partisan of the naval viewpoint.

Finally, on the eve of 1949, Mr. Forrestal released his first report on the National Security Establishment. The crux of the document was a demand for full authority on all disputed strategic questions.

The thinly disguised objective of this drive is the elimination of Congress and the President as real factors in making primary military decisions. Disagreements, no matter how fundamental, would be treated as family affairs. Conflicting views would be reconciled, public relations would be coordinated, the inevitable differences over internal policies would be kept from becoming topics of public debate.

At a number of points, it is true, the Forrestal report gave lip service to democratic discussion. But these generalized privileges will mean exactly nothing if, in the concrete, conflicts will be kept secret to give an illusion of harmony; if irreconcilable differences will be resolved by one man and his single view presented to Congress as if it represented the combined expert military opinion.

One of the inspired build-up articles made proposals which would give the Secretary of Defense exclusive power to draft military budgets and full authority over their presentation to Congress; power to require the services to speak with a single voice and summarily to discipline those who speak out of turn.

In short, the kind of power that would preclude the possibility of another Gen. Billy Mitchell taking his minority view to the country; or of a Symington openly challenging decisions he might consider calamitous for the national defense.

In an article of his own, Mr. Forrestal followed up with a demand for the right to hire the Secretaries who head the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In that article he described the National Security Council as the most important instrument ever developed for welding the Nation's military and foreign policy. Its permanent members, under the chairmanship of the President, are the Secretaries of State, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. With three of the seven members being both hired and fired by the Defense Secretary, he would, in effect, control four votes, a clear majority. His demand amounted to packing the all-important Council.

Perhaps because the public reaction to his idea was so sharply unfavorable, Mr. Forrestal took a different tack in his year-end report. He now proposed that the Secretary of Defense shall be the only representative of the National Military Establishment on the Council. But that, again, would make him the dominant personality in that body. As sole spokesman for the entire military set-up, at a time in history when military considerations are paramount, his views would of necessity prevail. Foreign affairs, national economy, nearly everything is today so intimately bound up with strategy that his voice would drown out all other voices.

Unhappily the Eberstadt subcommittee yielded completely to the spurious logic of efficiency and economy stressed in the public-relations build-up. Somehow the committee bypassed the central problem of this period which is reorientation of strategic thinking. A smooth-running machine will hardly serve our best interests if it is running in the wrong direction; if its boldest strategic thinkers are efficiently gagged.

The crux of the problem is in the search for a proper strategy. And in this connection, I am convinced, the drift toward centralization of authority is dangerous. It must be arrested and reversed. Under modern conditions, the conditions of total war, strategy affects a nation's economy, industrial set-up, education, standards of living, foreign policy. It is reflected in our political system and our very civilization. In effect we would therefore be installing a fuehrer, his arbitrary power tempered only by congressional control of the purse, which, unfortunately, can control only the size of our fighting forces but not the nature of the strategy they implement.

We face a momentous choice between democratic and totalitarian methods in the all-important military domain. Shall competing military concepts be subjected to public scrutiny and appraisal? Shall the people, through Congress and the President, surrender the right, heretofore unquestioned, to know, to judge, to give the final verdict on fundamental military decisions?

Advocates of regimentation insist that Congress, being a bunch of civilians, is not qualified to make strategic choices; that the matter is too technical. This is a dangerous theory, and one that denies our whole philosophy of self-government.

If the bunch of civilians is unfit to explore and decide over-all strategy, then it is equally unfit to decide atomic-energy policy, foreign policy, and other highly complex and specialized phases of national life. These, too, are technical. Yet Congress, after studying conflicting views and claims, has always laid down the main lines of policy.

We have flourished on this basis. Therein lies our greatness and invincibility. In the last war the democratic way proved that it had the telltale advantage of flexibility. It could force needed changes. It could unfreeze mistakes. A lively and enlightened public opinion was able to break through tradition and vested military privilege. The totalitarians, by contrast, were stuck with their mistakes. There was no public sentiment that could challenge the entrenched stupidities of a leader.

I have long believed that the chief reason for Germany's defeat was the regimentation of its military machine at a time when scientific advances demanded basic changes. My judgment was fully confirmed by Hermann Goering, head of the Luftwaffe, immediately after his capture. When I interrogated him, he talked frankly as one airman to another. The gist of his story was that the myth of an all-knowing fuehrer stopped the creation of strategic air power after the loss of the Battle of Britain showed the need.

Hitler was in effect his own secretary of defense. He exercised precisely the kind of single dominion over strategy which we seem foolishly minded to assign to our own Defense Secretary. Goering and others who understood this blunder could not appeal to the German people. His efforts to build a real bombing fleet, Goering complained, were hopeless. His "beautiful bombing fleet was used up in the miserable role of freight cars carrying shoes, blankets, and mittens to Hitler's ground forces."

As he talked, I thought of the immense advantage of our free life. We, too, entered the war with the wrong kind of aviation and strategy. We had ignored and discounted air power. We tried to bomb Germany without escort fighters. But our public opinion intervened. In due time, strategy was revised to meet new technological realities, planes were redesigned, escort fighters were provided. Our high command was obliged to reckon with a ground swell of popular resentment even in time of war.

In the final analysis it was democracy that gave us a winning edge over totalitarian foes. But the kind of centralized power, immune to democratic curbs, that licked Germany seems to be sneaking up on America. We have need for vigilance.

I have a high regard for the abilities and patriotism of Mr. Forrestal. But like every other official, he is the product of his biography. A naval lieutenant in World War I, Secretary of the Navy in World War II, he was the most energetic opponent of unification.

It would be a miracle if regimented power in his hands did not condemn our military program to a strong naval slant—this at a time when navies have lost their old strategic functions and have been largely turned into a supply service. The effect of an omnipotent sailor upon American military thinking could be as disastrous as the effect of an omnipotent corporal proved in Germany.

This is not a criticism of Mr. Forrestal. He would be untrue to his conscience if he did not work zealously to promote his honest convictions. The proposed centralization must be judged in principle, whether he remains at the helm or is replaced by another Secretary. We are in the midst of formulating a national strategy; the fate of America, and in a sense of the whole world depends on the decision. To vest total power in this transitional stage in a single person—sailor, soldier, or airman—is contrary to the very principles of American society.

Sooner or later the American people, by democratic process, will decide whether ours is primarily a land, sea, or air-power Nation. The sooner that decision is reached the better; the world situation is too critical for excessive delays and fumblings. Personally, of course, I consider it inevitable that the decision will be to rest our strategy on air power, with land and sea forces as supporting elements.

But whatever the choice, the Military Establishment will then be revised accordingly. At the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff we shall place a land, sea, or air specialist (as the case may be) who, as the chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will assume responsibility for basic strategy. Above him we shall still need an unbiased, open-minded civilian Secretary of Defense, representing and accountable to the people. He would be the intermediary between the military set-up on one side, Congress and the President on the other side.

The unified Department will then correspond to the reality of a unified strategy. But pending such a democratic commitment, at a time when strategic concepts are still contending for primacy, it would be strategic suicide to give any individual the decisive voice. The great military debate cannot be settled by arbitrary edict. To order military planners to compromise on their sincerest convictions solves nothing. Indeed, it amounts to a guaranty of dispersed and unrealistic planning.

We must grasp the fact that in such things there can be no true compromise. A strategy is either right or wrong—and we can't risk being wrong. Three separate strategies are worse than none; they can only dissipate our economic substance and make sure that none of them will attain the momentum for victory.

Let me give a homely comparison: Suppose a river is to be crossed and three experts—a bridge builder, a ship designer, and a tunnel specialist—were called in. Each man will insist that his own method of crossing the river is the most sensible, economical, and efficient.

Would it make any sense to lock them in a room like a hung jury until they reach a compromise verdict? Since no single structure can be devised to embody the principle of all three river-crossing methods, a compromise is impossible.

In the end those who hired the specialists, having heard the three sets of claims, would order the one they deemed most desirable, placing the particular specialist in charge of the project, with the others cooperating. The employers wouldn't have to be engineers to do this—simple logic, common sense, is enough.

The same holds true in choosing a strategy, providing all the contending specialists have a full chance to defend their claims. The ultimate choice must remain with the American people.

World War II ended on the threshold of the most far-reaching changes in the history of warfare. Inventions promising to recast the whole pattern of war-making emerged, some of them in the very last stages of the struggle.

Guided missiles, rocket artillery, radar, jet propulsion, supersonic speeds, and global range of aircraft, new fuels, the atom bomb and atomic energy—a partial inventory indicates the scope of the change and the challenge. Accepted military notions must be overhauled. The whole foundation of the World War strategy was obsoleted overnight. The ability to carry decisive destruction to the heart of an enemy nation at immense speeds over global distances through the skies canceled out most military assumptions of the past.

But precisely in this period of transition a drive is under way to impose in the military sphere conditions that will give political advantage to the old ideas and will discipline the new ones into impotence.

The Defense Act was a sorry compromise imposed by naval obduracy as the price of giving air power the equality it was entitled to in any case. Like all laws which run contrary to democratic logic—witness the prohibition experiment—it can be enforced only with the tools of regimentation.

The very fact that the Secretary of Defense insists on the power of final decision should serve as a warning that the law is unreasonable. The determination to enforce it by giving him more authority can lead only to revolts within the Military Establishment, followed by disciplinary sanctions against

rebels and the loss of vital military brains to the country.

Until the American people have made up their minds about the one stategy for their country, we must give the three services the largest measure of autonomy within the framework of the unified organization. Far from increasing the Secretary's grip on strategy, it must be relaxed. His rule must be that of a truly impartial umpire; of an interpreter of the opposing theories for the President, Congress, and the public.

Enjoying real autonomy, each service will be in a position to present its case fully and without interference. The central issue of strategy will then be resolved, like all vital issues in our Republic, by democratic means. The people will know all the facts as a basis for intelligent action.

The thinking airmen of the Nation, convinced that a department geared to air power is inevitable, welcome open competition of ideas. They believe it will shorten the period of transition. The attempts to conceal strategic conflicts, to keep them a family affair, have orginated almost entirely with the diehards.

The most vital question facing our people is whether the United States shall be a land-, naval-, or air-power Nation. War or peace, victory or defeat, liberty or subjection—all depend on the right answer at the right time.

The one certainty is that we cannot be all three at the same time. In relation to our potential enemy, we are a have-not Nation in manpower and resources. If we continue to build indiscriminately, we shall not only wreck our economy but endanger our free way of life. If the proponents of centralized power for the Secretary of Defense succeed, we shall be pinned down indefinitely to the profligate three-way strategy.

Our only safety is in deciding upon one strategy and putting all we have behind it. But such a decision in the nature of the case cannot be made by admirals, ground generals and airmen who are committed to their respective traditions. The people must make it. I am confident that if the democratic channels are not tampered with, the choice of the people will be air power.

My Native State of California Observes California Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous permission heretofore granted me, I take great pleasure and pride as a native son of California to present for the information and record of those who hear and those who read the outline of the observation in California of the California centennial celebration now in progress.

It is said that the native-born, in the State of California, are unique amongst the citizens of other States because many years ago there were organized two democratic, nonprofit groups of citizens, composed of citizens born in the State of California, to wit: The Native Daughters of the Golden West and the Native Sons of the Golden West. These two groups have as their chief objectives the preservation of historic landmarks of California and the perpetuation of the California tradition of the pioneer spirit. Needless to say, these two important organizations, within the geographical borders of the State of California, have done outstanding work in the protection and preservation of those natural resources and monuments which might otherwise be lost sight of or have fallen into decay. I am proud to be numbered amongst the members of the Long Beach Parlor, No. 278, Native Sons of the Golden West. The entire citizenry of California and the Nation owes much to the Native Daughters and Native Sons of the Golden West.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I am not only very proud of the fact that I came to the light of day in the great State of California, but I am deeply grateful for the privileges which have been extended to me as a resident of my native State of California. Then, too, I have benefited throughout the public schools of this State, in my educational processes, before attending the University of Southern California where I met and later married a native Californian. Mrs. Doyle and I are the proud parents of three native-born Californians, to wit: a son and two daughters. My grandson, also a native of California, is the only child of my youngest daughter.

The California Centennials Commission has recently issued a very appropriate booklet entitled "California Centennial, 1948–49–50," which gives a brief picture of the said centennial observance. Without undertaking to diminish in your esteem your own loyalty to the State which you represent, I am certain that you and each of you will find pleasure and benefit in reading the following record of California's centennial:

THE GREAT SEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The great seal of the State of California was introduced in the convention which framed the constitution of the State of California September 29, 1849, and adopted October 2, 1849.

Around the bend of the ring are represented 31 stars, being the number of States of which the Union will consist upon the admission of California. The foreground figure represents the Goddess Minerva, having sprung full-grown from the brain of Jupiter. She is introduced as a type of the political birth of the State of California, without having gone through the probation of a territory. At her feet crouches a grizzly bear feeding upon the clusters from a grapevine, emblematic of the peculiar characteristics of the country. A miner is engaged with his rocker and bowl at his side, illustrating the golden wealth of the Sacramento, upon whose waters are seen shipping, typical of commercial greatness; and the snow-clad peaks of the Sierra Nevada make up the background, while above is the Greek motto "Eureka" (I have found it), applying either to the principle involved in the admission of the State, or the success of the miner at work.

THE CALIFORNIA CENTENNIALS COMMISSION

As authorized by legislation enacted to further the centennials celebrations, Gov. Earl Warren appointed a five-man California Centennials Commission on September 15, 1947. The Governor also designated members who serve as the legislative committee—Senator Fred D. Weybret, of Salinas, and Assemblyman Thomas J. Doyle, of Los Angeles—and named the 25 who serve as the centennials advisory committee.

One of the first steps taken by the commission was to provide itself with a staff adequate to assume the great volume of detail which grows out of a project of this nature. Two offices were established. The San Francisco office, located in the Ferry Building, is directed by George Heinz, executive secretary of the commission. As southern California manager, Lloyd D. Mitchell is in charge of the Los Angeles office at 1212 Wilshire Boulevard.

While each office functions separately to serve its respective area, the work of both is coordinated. On the staff are competent administrative and field personnel. Acting under the direction of the commission, they assist in carrying out the provisions of the centennials legislation, counseling with groups throughout the State in the planning of centennials activities.

In one of its first meetings, the California Centennials Commission adopted certain tentative policies, to define the scope of the commission's activities. As the requirements of the program become known, the commission may revise these policies for a more effective administration of centennial plans.

The commission has defined the qualifications for eligibility to receive State financial assistance within the meaning of the legislation which created the program. First, such centennials celebrations should be commemorative of some historical event of particular significance to the State or locality. Second, they must be of public interest, and third, they may not be commercialized.

As to the extent of State participation, it has been determined that funds will be allocated on a matching basis: The State will meet half of the approved expenses, with an equal sum to be guaranteed by the locality sponsoring the event.

As for the other phases of the centennials program, the commission encourages the suggestions of all interested parties. It recommends that localities stimulate an interest in California history by marking and preserving historical landmarks, reenacting historic events, and by other means. The commission also recommends that public-spirited organizations adopt centennial motifs and themes in their advertising and publicity and that producers of public attractions present programs representative of the centennial period. In fact, it is the general purpose of the commission to stimulate interest in the centennials in every way possible and to encourage a wide participation.

CALIFORNIA'S CENTENNIALS CELEBRATIONS

By reenacting the thrilling events of early California we gain a more intimate knowledge of the pioneer spirit which brought our State into the Union; we acquire a broader appreciation of its traditions and romantic background; we enjoy looking behind the scenes of history, to see the beginning of our great agricultural endeavor, our industries, mineral production, lumbering, fisheries, the development of recreation and travel and the expansion of our world trade.

California has an amazing story; it has a part in the chronicle of many nations and the Gold Rush made the State symbolic of a promised land of plenty. A century ago tens of thousands of adventurous souls traveled from all parts of the world to seek this western paradise. It was an Odyssey of heroic mold. Many found their hopes realized, some in the golden sands of the Mother Lode, others in fields which proved even more profitable. They were the builders of the foundations of our great Commonwealth. In recalling their courage and vision we may find a new inspiration for the future.

But, apart from the thrill and interest in reliving the dramatic scenes of early California, there is a splendid opportunity for the development of a greater community

spirit throughout the State, a neighborly cooperation which will make us better citizens—more aware of the heritage of the past, more appreciative of the abundant resources of the land in which we live, more adequately prepared for the glorious destiny that lies in the century ahead.

"California, land of gold * * * at the right hand of the Indies * * * close to the terrestrial paradise."

So wrote Ordones de Montalvo, Spanish teller of tales, in a chivalric romance of the fifteenth century. Thus a myth came into being which was to be transformed into reality.

Hernando Cortes seized the Aztec kingdom of Mexico in 1521 and sent our troops in search of further spoil. An expedition, led by Fortun Jimenez, crossed the gulf and discovered the peninsula of Lower California. Jiminez was slain by Indians but his followers returned with tales of a new land of high mountains and rugged coasts which they believed to be that fabled country of which Montalvo had written, California, the land of gold.

In 1542 came Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo who sailed up the coast of Lower California and discovered a port which he called San Miguel (now San Diego). He continued northward, paused at the Channel Islands and Santa Barbara, but failed to find harbors of consequence beyond Point Concepcion.

In 1579 Sir Francis Drake, commander of the *Goulden Hinde*, landed on the northern coast of California on his voyage around the world. He was hospitably received by the Indians and, in solemn ceremony, took possession of the country in the name of Queen Elizabeth of England. He called the white-cliffed harbor New Albion and returned to Britain with glowing reports of a new empire where "there is no part of the earth to be taken up, wherein there is not some likelihood of gold or silver."

Sebastian Vizcaino led a Spanish expedition in 1602 which founded San Diego and Monterey and, late in the eighteenth century, came Father Junipero Serra, Gaspar de Portola, Juan Bautista de Anza, Juan Manuel de Ayala, and others, all seeking to extend the conquest of church and state in the New World.

Missions were soon established along El Camino Real, "The King's Highway," one day's march apart from San Diego to Sonoma. Presidios were built to guard the many harbors and the air of old Spain clung about the rambling adobe walls of the haciendas. The early explorers were disappointed in their search for the fabled gold and precious stones with which the western wilderness was said to abound but many a settler found life easy and profitable in raising cattle and sheep and in various forms of agriculture.

The years from 1782 down to the time of the American occupation have been called by historians, the romantic period of California. This was the era of the dons, great landowners, whose Castilian hospitality was a byword. It was the day of hidalgo and vaquero, caballero, and conquistador, of thrilling rodeo and gay fiesta. It was during this period that other nations began to take a greater interest in California. Russians, who had established trading posts in Alaska, secured a tract of land on the Sonoma coast and constructed a settlement known as Fort Ross, which consisted of a stockade enclosing a church and several other structures, and a number of buildings located outside the enclosure. For 30 years they remained, but hunting and trade finally ceased to be profitable and they disposed of their holdings to Capt. John A. Sutter (later referred to as general), George Vancouver, English explorer, on his visit to California, revived the claims of Drake. Ships of many lands called frequently at the ports of the western coast.

Across the Rockies, too, there was a growing curiosity about the West. Trappers had found wealth in the fur trade; merchants from Boston had come around Cape Horn. John A. Sutter of German birth but a Swiss national, reached California in 1839 and received permission from Governor Alvarado to establish a colony and build a fort on the Sacramento River. He gave it the name of "New Helvetia. Fremont describes the fort as a quadrangular structure of adobe, mounting 12 pieces of artillery and capable of admitting a garrison of 1,000 men; this at present consists of 40 Indians in uniform, one of whom is always on duty at the gate. The whites in the employ of Sutter numbered 30 men. The inner wall is formed into buildings comprising the common quarters, with a blacksmith, and other workshops, the dwelling house with a large distillery, and other buildings occupying more the center of the area.

On April 11, 1822, Spanish rule in Alta California had some to an end. Mexican governors replaced the Spaniards, the missions were secularized and gradually fell into decay. By 1840 there was an increasing influx of immigrants from the States and organized parties braved the hardships of the plains and mountains to seek out this new land of promise.

The United States Government sent Lt. Charles Wilkes and John C. Fremont to explore the country. President Andrew Jackson sought to acquire both Texas and California by purchase from Mexico, without success. President John Tyler continued these efforts. In 1842 Commodore Thomas Jones, commander of the Pacific squadron of the United States Navy, was anchored in Peruvian waters when he received word that war had broken out between Mexico and the United States. Fearful that some foreign power might take this as an excuse to seize California, Commodore Jones sailed to Monterey Bay and called on the port authorities to surrender. The American flag was raised only to be lowered when it was found that the war rumor was false.

Meanwhile Daniel Webster, Secretary of State in Tyler's Cabinet, had proposed a three-point plan which included the acquisition of California, the satisfaction of claims of American citizens against Mexico, and the settlement of the Oregon boundary dispute with Great Britain.

As overland migration from the States rapidly increased, the Government at Washington felt the need of a source of information on the development of political matters in the West. President Tyler therefore appointed Thomas O. Larkin, a Monterey merchant, as American consul. Larkin had come to California in 1835. The new consul did his work well, keeping Washington informed on the activities of the Mexican leaders and supplying eastern periodicals with an abundance of material on the opportunities for settlers on the Pacific coast.

President James K. Polk was inaugurated in March 1845, and immediately began the renewal of negotiations for the purchase of California. When these attempts again failed, Consul Larkin was advised:

Whilst the President will make no effort and use no influence to induce California to become one of the free and independent States of the Union, yet if the people should desire to unite their destiny with ours, they would be received as brethren, whenever this can be done without affording Mexico just cause for complaint.

Larkin proceeded to win the cooperation of leading citizens in the cause of California's independence. Among these were Gen. Mariano Vallejo and Gen. Jose Castro, Jacob P. Leese, of Sonoma, J. J. Warner, of San Diego, and Don Abel Stearns, of Los Angeles. There were other forces at work, however, seeking the same objective. John C. Fremont, on a Government exploring expedition with a considerable army of followers, was also eager to play a part. On June 14, 1846, at dawn, a small band of American settlers under the leadership of Ezekiel Merritt, surrounded the house of General Vallejo at Sonoma and the General soon found himself a prisoner of war. To whom are we to surrender? asked the wife of General Vallejo. Then it was found that there were no definite orders from Fremont and many wished to back out of the affair. Benjamin Ide, however, stepped forward and assumed the leadership. The bear flag, symbol of the independence of California, was raised, and Vallejo and his companions were sent in custody to Sutter's Fort.

William L. Todd, a member of the revolutionary party, later described the making of the bear flag: We procured in the house where we made our headquarters, a piece of new unbleached cotton domestic, not quite a yard wide, with stripes of red flannel about 4 inches wide * * * on the lower side of the canvas. On the upper left-hand corner was a star, and in the center was the image made to represent a grizzly bear, so common in the country at that time. The bear and star were painted with paint made of linseed oil and Venetian red or Spanish brown. Underneath the bear were the words "California Republic."

Whether Fremont was responsible for the uprising is a matter of historical debate, but at least he accepted the result and turned over the prisoners to a member of his company with explicit instructions on their care:

"You will retain Messrs. Vallejo, Preuxdon, Leese, and Carillo at the fort of which you are hereby placed in full command. * * * Iron and confine any person who shall disobey your orders—if necessary, shoot any person who shall endanger the safety of the place."

The California Republic was short-lived, for, on July 9, Fremont received word by courier that war with Mexico had been declared and that Commodore John Sloat had raised the American flag at Monterey on July 7.

The members of the Bear Flag Battalion were immediately sworn in as volunteers in the United States Army, and Fremont was given a major's commission. San Diego and Los Angeles were occupied, at first without opposition, but later the native Californians rallied a small body of armed men, and skirmishes ensued in which many were killed and wounded. American forces reoccupied Los Angeles on January 10, 1847, and 3 days later Fremont and Andres Pico signed the Cahuenga Capitulation, which ended hostilities. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ceded California to the United States and officially ended the war, was signed a year later on February 2, 1848.

Only a week before James Marshall, who was constructing a sawmill for John A. Sutter on the South Fork of the American River, had found some shining metallic particles in the mill race. He gathered about 3 ounces of the substance and hurried to Sacramento, where he and Captain Sutter tested it and decided that it must be gold. They tried to keep the discovery secret, but the news spread and the trails were soon crowded with the rush of prospectors bound for the treasure area.

It was not long before the whole world learned of the new El Dorado. Immigrants set out by the tens of thousands. Some came by sea around Cape Horn and others across the Isthmus of Panama; still others came by oxcart or horseback across the plains. Many met death at the hands of the Indians or in the snow-clad Rockies and Sierra. Disaster had befallen the Donner party in 1846 and struck again as the Manly expedition toiled over the barren wastes of Death Valley in 1849. But the crowds still came in ever-increasing numbers, all seeking a land of promise where the stream-beds were said to be lined with gold.

From 1846 to 1849, California had almost as many "governors" as under Mexican rule. Commodore John D. Sloat, who had assumed command with the seizure of Monterey of July 7, 1846, resigned and Commodore Robert F. Stockton took over the administration. In January 1847, Stockton appointed Captain John C. Fremont as military governor. Fremont was replaced in 60 days by Gen. Stephen W. Kearney, who 60 days later was succeeded by Col. Richard B. Mason. Mason served until the appointment of Gen. Bennet Riley on April 12, 1849. The government during this period was described as "part military and part civil and part no government at all—the laws were most variant and variously conceived—and the courts were as unique as the government and the laws. They were American-Mexican, military-civil, with a good degree of the vigilante."

Meanwhile Congress delayed organization of a territorial government until the citizens of California took matters into their own hands. Brig. Gen. Bennet Riley, the military governor, called a general election for a State constitutional convention. The delegates met on September 1 in Colton Hall, a Monterey schoolhouse, and, on October 13, 1849, the convention completed its deliberations. A month later the constitution was ratified by 12,000 votes.

More delays ensued while Congress debated but finally a bill for the admission of California into the Union was passed and President Millard Fillmore affixed his signature to the measure on September 9, 1850.

So the myth of the fifteenth century had become a reality. California entered into statehood and a century of progress, to fulfill her destiny as "a land of gold, near the terrestrial paradise."

How the Communists Behave in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the March 19 issue of America. It should dispel some of the myths that the Chinese Communists are not the same as Communists everywhere else, which myths have been so carefully and successfully cultivated by American Communists and fellow travelers and their dupes in this country.

RED CLOUD OVER CHINA—THE FLYING TIGER SPEAKS HIS MIND

(By C. L. Chennault, major general, retired, U. S. Army)

As the red cloud of Communist aggression pushes steadily southward over a war-weary, devastated China, both the American and Chinese press are flooded with speculation and surmises concerning the significance of the advance. As usual, Red propaganda—aided by the sometimes unwitting apologists among our own ranks—is capitalizing on the indecision and uncertainty of the resistance forces. The tried-and-true method is to conquer by division, to gild the uglier features of the Red pestilence with a shiny coat compounded in equal parts of agrarian reform and liberation of the people. But underneath the varnish are unmistakable indications of the same mad lust for power and the same ruthless disregard for human rights that have characterized Soviet communism the world over.

Mao Tze-tung, Li Li-san, Chu Teh, Lin Piao, Chou En-lai, and the other lesser Chinese Communist leaders have been disciples of Marxism almost as long as Stalin himself. Communist propaganda finds it expedient to suggest that Commissar Mao might just possibly turn out to be a nationalist first and a Communist second. Such suggestions become ridiculous when viewed in the light of everything Mao has spoken and written in recent years. He has repeatedly stated his unequivocal adherence to the principles of communism, his loyalty to the Cominform program of world domination, his abhorence of America and all America stands for.

All the Communist propaganda methods of slander and falsehood are being employed. When the Government imposes food taxes to support its armies, the Communists scream "The people are being starved." The Communist troops, carrying out food-foraging expeditions even more ruthlessly, suggest that this is a people's food committee program. If the government executes a Communist spy, the Reds roar that they'll get the war criminals responsible. For their own part they think nothing of exterminating whole villages if the latter do not properly cooperate with their liberation.

Other choice bits of Communist propaganda have been ladled out to Chinese and foreign observers. Before the capture of Mukden it was suggested that foreign businessmen should remain in the city, presumably to participate in an early resumption of international trade. The latest information seeping out, not through a free press but by word of mouth from refugees who managed to escape liberation, tells that Americans are held incommunicado, that the only businessmen getting any trade are Russians.

During the siege of Tsinan and after the capture of the city, foreign missionaries were invited to remain and assured of noninterference. For a short time, but long enough for Communist radio stations to publicize their reactions, many missionaries were enthusiastic about conditions. Lately an ominous silence has descended over their gullibility. Reports tell of hospitals and schools permitted to operate only as Communist institutions, teaching and practicing Communist principles.

As of this date, March 1, 1949, foreign and Chinese business and professional men in Shanghai and Nanking are receiving the same soothing-syrup promises of fair treatment and freedom of operation—the same promises so easily given and broken in Tsinan, Mukden, Tientsin, and Peiping. It is strange indeed that many still choose to believe these promises despite house arrests, suppression of missionary efforts, restriction of free travel, and heavy censorship of non-Communist news dispatches from occupied cities. Communism can no more change its methods than a leopard his spots. Ingrained in the Communist creed and upbringing is the doctrine that the end justifies the means. A Communist has no normal sense of moral responsibility nor any individual sense of honor. His tools of trade are murder, pillage, and outrageous falsehoods repeated so often that the more gullible begin to believe.

It is unfortunate that the American people have been so completely confused as to the aims and methods of Chinese communism, thanks to the wide publicity given to the writings of American journalists, well known among their fellow correspondents as Communists or fellow travelers. One such correspondent recently published a book purporting to outline the changes that have taken place in China since the end of the war. That correspondent had not been in China for even a single day since 1944.

In view of the confused thinking of our own State Department, it is no wonder that the American people themselves are confused. Our people have been told about agrarian reform, people's armies of liberation, etc. Actually there is only one real issue: Is or is not an alien communism being forced down the throat of a people who do not want it? Even our State Department knows there can be only one answer to that question; that a small group of native traitors, supported and armed by Soviet Russia, is conducting a successful and aggressive attack on a free China that has traditionally extended the hand of friendship to our country and its people.

In recent years such "pinko" reporters as Teddy White, Harold Isaacs, Annalee Jacoby, Darrell Berrigan, Harrison Forman, Edgar Snow, and Anna Louise Strong have won a wide audience in America. It is interesting to note that those few among them who have chosen to return to China visit the areas of free China, where they travel as they please, write as they please—not the Communist areas they so greatly admire. In Communist China, as is now being proved, correspondents have no freedom of movement, no freedom from censorship, no right to investigate or inquire.

There is no such thing as the perfect Nation in this imperfect world, and I would be the last to claim that present-day China is the answer to man's troubled existence. But like the great majority of the world's people, I hate communism for its vicious abridgments of human freedom, for its blood lust, and its lording of the state over the people. Communism, like any sprouting, living organism must grow or die. Democracy, as we know it, and communism cannot live in harmony side by side. The spirit and soul of those among us who are free cannot rest or be oblivious to the enslavement of millions. Christianity cannot tolerate such indifference.

It is high time that Americans grasped the true facts of Soviet Communist expansion in China. Every step of the Communist tide shows evidence of careful, Moscow-planned direction. The mere fact that for over 20 years the small groups of Communist bands were confined to the hills of remote northwest China, only to burst forth in a flood since the World War, is absolute proof of suddenly acquired outside aid and direction.

As I write today, communism has already achieved a main objective. By pushing to the northern bank of the Yangtze, it has virtually secured Russia against any possibility of air attack on her vital Ural region or trans-Siberian railroad from Asia. With her back door firmly secured, Russia is now free to go ahead with her aggression against Europe, shoving the Western Powers ever deeper and deeper into the impossibility of winning what must be a defensive war.

Every diplomatic move we have made since VJ-day has added another link to the chain which will bind us to the defense of a shrunken Europe—where we cannot hope to win. Instead of organizing and supporting the freedom-loving peoples of all the world, peoples of all races, religions, and creeds who are opposed to communism, we stand by with folded hands while our friends and potential allies are being submerged, one by one, in Asia. With Asia communized, a war for survival will be inevitable.

Grave as the situation is today, I do not believe we have lost the final battle yet. We still have a chance, if the freedom-loving peoples of the world will look the facts of Asiatic Communist expansion in the face. We can still supply the small amount of needed military and other help, together with supervisory personnel, to turn the Red tide.

Basing-Point System Automatically Results in Identical Prices—No Chance for Buyer To Receive Competitive Prices—Moratorium Should Not Be Granted by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the iniquitous results of the basing-point system is the absolute identity of prices, down to the ten-thousandth of a cent. Under the basing-point system, destination prices to any given customer are exactly the same from all sellers. Differences in manufacturing costs among the various sellers, differences in transportation charges, differences of every kind are all wiped out. No competition—just pay your money, for you have no choice.

That the basing-point system does result in the absolute identity of destination prices, is proved by data revealed in sealed bids to governmental agencies. Lower prices can appear only when some member of the basing-point group makes a mistake in applying the system, or when some recalcitrant supplier deliberately competes and thereby violates the system. Higher bids are a convenient method by which any supplier may effectively eliminate himself, while offering a semblance of competition.

The following table presents data on identical bids in the cement industry over a period of more than 10 years and computed from specified bids submitted to State and Federal purchasing agencies. The figures clearly reveal how perfectly the basing-point system automatically destroys competition and makes the buyer the victim of this collusive and monopolistic system.

Cement—Manufacturers' destination prices bid to Government agencies

Year	Barrels	Number of destinations	Number of manufacturers bidding [1]	Total number prices bid	Bids at formula prices		Bids above formula prices		Bids under formula prices	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1927	[2] 453,545	129	15	1,359	1,355	99.70	2	.15	2	0.15
1929	[2] 9,035,027	579	77	7,713	7,342	95.19	237	3.07	134	1.74
1930	[2] 9,050,435	558	59	4,662	4,553	97.66	60	1.29	49	1.05
1934	[3] 2,900,000	4	12	[4] 38	38	100.00				
1935	[3] 1,000	1	8	8	7	87.50	1	12.50		
1935	[3] 10,000	1	3	[5] 6	6	100.00				
1936	[3] 8,000	1	18	18	18	100.00				
1936	[3] 500	1	14	14	14	100.00				
1936	[3] 6,000	1	11	11	11	100.00				
1937	[3] 1,200	2	15	[4] 29	29	100.00				
Total	21,465,707	1,277	222	13,858	13,373	96.50	300	2.16	185	1.33

[1] Includes duplications where the same manufacturer bid on more than one invitation.
[2] Bids to State highway commissions on numerous projects.
[3] Bids to Federal agencies on individual projects.
[4] Some manufacturers did not bid for all destinations.
[5] Counting as separate the bids by individual manufacturers for cement in bulk and in bags.

These figures were based on investigations of the Federal Trade Commission in its price bases inquiry (1932), and in its *Cement Institute case* (37 F. T. C. 87). The 1927, 1929, and 1930 bids were all to various State highway commissions for shipment to more than 1,250 destinations in the nine States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. The general showing is that, by years, from 95 to 99.7 percent of the bids were identical with the basing-point destination price. In no year did the number of bids which were at a less price amount to as much as 2 percent of the total number of bids. Or, to put it another way, the basing-point system produced approximately 99 percent uniformity in price.

For the smaller number of bids to Federal agencies during the years 1934 to 1937, inclusive, the showing of uniformity of bid prices is even more striking. For six of the seven individual projects covered, 100 percent of the bids carried identical prices. For the seventh project, seven of the eight bidders named prices strictly in accordance with the basing-point system. One bid higher destination prices, thereby indicating a probable lack of interest in the business.

Taking all of these bids together, we find that out of a total of 13,858 prices bid for shipment to 1,277 different destinations, only 1.33 percent were at prices less than required by the system.

Any moratorium would in effect set aside the decision of the United States Supreme Court outlawing the basing-point system. This is the system that resulted in 99 percent uniformity of price, as the above table shows, and which is not competitive but collusive and discriminatory, as the Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision found it to be.

Russian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an important article has just come to my attention. It deals with the problem of Russian communism. It appeared in the Ukrainian Quarterly, volume III, No. 4, 1947, and was written by Dr. Roman Smal Stocky, now professor of modern languages at Marquette University, and formerly a professor at Warsaw University. During the last war Dr. Stocky was imprisoned by the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to is entitled "The Promethean Movement." Dr. Stocky has revealed in a concise and forceful manner the struggle of the subjugated nations in the Soviet Union for freedom. Too few people in the United States realize that these small nations are actually fighting Red Russia against what appear to be terrific odds. Ultimately they will prevail because they have God and right on their side, but it may take a long, long time. We in this country must always support the cause of right, and if the principles of the United Nations mean anything we must speak out now against godless communism, which has pressed its iron heel upon liberty-loving people

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stocky says in part:

The American public has not yet grasped the fact that all the problems which now confront the United States in world policy, especially in Europe, have their roots in the mistakes made after World War I.

Then follows an enumeration of the errors which, in the writer's opinion, caused World War II:

(a) The responsibility for World War II:

"The methods of dictatorship over peoples which were first applied by Czar Ivan the Terrible and then extended and improved by Lenin and Stalin with police terror, arbitrary shootings, mass exile to concentration camps at hard labor, the annihilation of the freedom of thought, faith, word, press, social organizations, and courts—found their imitators in Italy and Germany.

"The application of these Soviet Moscow methods—which were tolerated through long years by the League of Nations against the subjugated nationalities—to Ethiopia, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Albania led to World War II.

"At the true source of the war was that anarchy and lack of consciousness of law in international relations which was caused by the methods of the totalitarian dictatorship of Soviet Moscow. The creator of this dictatorship is Stalin. He and the totalitarian dictatorship of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union with its immoral, inhuman views and methods are the real causes of World War II, which brought terrible bloodshed and disaster to the whole world."

(b) The accusation of Stalin:

"We, the peoples enslaved by Soviet Moscow, accuse Stalin before world public opinion of these crimes:

"(1) In August, 1939, he concluded with Hitler the nonaggression pact and the secret treaty concerning the partition of Poland and the annexation of western Ukraine. Thus, through his friendship and collaboration he guaranteed for Hitler security in the East and gave him the opportunity to start World War II.

"(2) He violated the Briand-Kellogg Pact of August 27, 1928, signed by the U. S. S. R. in London.

"(3) On September 1, 1939, he violated the nonaggression pact previously concluded with Poland and by means of his armed aggression—the invasion of Poland from the east—he helped Hitler to defeat Poland.

"(4) Afterward he violated the right of self-determination of the population of western Ukraine by annexing it.

"(5) After the Red army occupied western Ukraine, he forcibly removed hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and Poles into concentration camps in the north, in Siberia and Turkestan. Then he introduced the regime of the Communist dictatorship in western Ukraine and his NKVD physically liquidated the democratic Ukrainian parties and deprived everyone of all basic human rights.

"(6) He violated the right of self-determination of the Ukrainian population of Bukovina by the annexation of their territory and enslaved them by the same methods.

"(7) He perpetrated the greatest single mass murder known to the civilized world by exterminating in the forest of Katyn more than 10,000 prisoners of war.

"(8) From September 1939 until June 1941 he sent to Hitler over 1,000,000 freight cars of corn, manganese, iron ore, and other raw materials which he had stolen from the unhappy population whom he was oppressing. Thus, he is guilty of participation in the criminal aggression on Belgium and the Netherlands by Hitler and the further catastrophical rout of France.

"(9) He violated, despite nonaggression pacts, the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and, by armed aggression, occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and established everywhere the regime of totalitarian Communist terror and annihilated the whole intelligentsia of these nations.

"(10) By means of armed aggression he violated the independence of Finland with whom he had also a nonaggression pact and tried to occupy it.

"(11) Finally he violated the right of self-determination of Carpatho-Ukraine, annexed its territory, enslaved its population, and murdered its legal President, Monsignor Woloshyn.

"All willful actions of aggression, brutality, and banditry are war crimes. Stalin and his collaborators must be prosecuted as war criminals before the International Court, taking into account the definition of aggression of Soviet Foreign Commissar M. Litvinov (declared at Geneva, September 21, 1937): 'An aggression remains an aggression whatever the formula beneath which it is disguised. No international principle can ever justify aggression, armed intervention, the invasion of other states, and the violation of international treaties which it implies.'"

(c) The progress of World War II in eastern Europe and its result after the struggle of the subjugated nations against Hitler and Stalin:

"The course of affairs of World War II in eastern Europe showed clearly that quest for national liberation of the peoples enslaved by Moscow is the basic problem in this part of the European Continent. There will exist neither order nor quiet there until these problems are solved.

"It is historically proven that Hitler's armies continued to advance toward the east as long as he could conceal his aims and his policies concerning these peoples. Having used deceitful propaganda and provocative promises, Hitler succeeded from the first in attracting some of the youth of the oppressed peoples for the common struggle against the Red terroristic Moscow. The moment it became clear that Hitler had no intention of respecting the right of self-determination of the people of Ukraine, the Baltic states, White Ruthenia, the Don and Kubania, a powerful guerrilla movement for national liberation broke out in his rear. Even those young men who formerly had been deceived by Hitler's propaganda embraced then the idea of the armed struggle against Hitler's totalitarianism and the Nazi occupation. Many leaders of the young men and thousands of patriots paid for their struggle against Hitlerism by being tortured and shot by the Gestapo or by imprisonment in concentration camps as enemies of the Third Reich.

"The victorious procession of German armies in eastern Europe was stopped, not by Stalin, but by the fighting of the national partisans of the Ukrainians, White Ruthenians, and Lithuanians who aimed at liberation. Stalin understood this very well when at the critical moments of the battles near Moscow and Stalingrad he tried to save himself by broadcasting proclamations of true national liberation. He also made different tactical concessions in an effort to calm the national and religious feelings of the peoples living in the U. S. S. R.

"He accepted even and signed solemnly the Atlantic Charter. The peoples oppressed by Red Moscow did not believe even for a moment that Stalin was sincere in this acceptance, but they believed the United States and Great Britain, who acknowledged and understood this signature as an obligation of Stalin regarding all the oppressed peoples.

"After sacrificing millions of human victims and suffering enormous losses of their property during this war, the peoples oppressed by Stalin believe that they have an indisputable right to demand that the United States and Great Britain protect their interests and compel the unlimited dictator Stalin really to fulfill his promises as to the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter in the U. S. S. R.

"A year has passed since Hitler's Germany surrendered to the democratic states, but, unfortunately, the United States and Great Britain have not obtained Stalin's agreement to maintain the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

"Thus the results of World War II have given no freedom to the nationalities oppressed by Stalin. Moreover, Red Moscow has used the same technique of aggression that formerly was employed to enslave Ukraine and Caucasus, to deprive of freedom also Poland, the Baltic states, Finland, and the Balkans. The turn of Czechoslovakia will come. The war started by a small Munich compromise with the dictatorship of Hitler and finished with the grandiose total compromise with the dictatorship of Stalin.

"World War II ended with the establishment of a new League of Nations—the United Nations. But the same Stalin who unmercifully destroys all peoples whom he oppresses by depriving them of every human right and turning them into slaves of the totalitarian Soviet regime has been given the opportunity to underwrite the democratic statutes of the United Nations."

(d) Warning of Stalin's world war III:

"We, the nations oppressed by Red imperialistic Moscow, now warn the public opinion of the world. Stalin's provocative and aggressive methods led to World War II. If the United States and Great Britain do not oblige the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics really to carry out the principles of the statutes of the United Nations regarding the peoples enslaved by Stalin and thus allow the Soviets to apply their methods of provocation and aggression in international relations—we will face world war III.

"We must acknowledge that Stalin does not want and cannot live without his methods of aggression, penetration, compulsion, and removal because he wants to take advantage of the present moment, when all European peoples are weakened, to realize the Communist Stalin doctrine demanding the whole of Europe and Asia, including the Middle East and the Suez Canal, to be his sphere of influence—the last step to the communistic world revolution.

"Instead of the fallen Hitlerism, a still more dreadful totalitarian Stalinism is threatening all the free democratic nations—Stalinism, the old root and organizational prototype of fascism and nazism. Besides the Promethean nations already oppressed by Soviet imperialism, there are new victims of the Bolshevik aggression suffering now under Stalin's yoke: the Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Finns, and the peoples of Central Europe: Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Austrians, Bulgarians, Romanians, Albanians, and Yugoslavs. Soviet aggression is openly threatening Korea, Manchuria, China, Turkey, and all the peoples of the Near East. * * *

"In the course of the past 25 years, since the Promethean League was organized, we have warned constantly the free nations of the world of the coming danger of Moscow's imperialism to all mankind. Now we appeal to all the peoples again, calling them to protect themselves against the mortal danger hanging over the world and to defend the humanitarian foundations of human existence, living in the soul and nature of men and given them by our Lord, to defend themselves against this terrible danger of conquest by propaganda and aggression of the international satanists.

"The responsibility for the disaster of the new war would fall on the Stalin dictatorship and also, in the same degree, on the unprincipled opportunism of the United States and Great Britain which allows the Soviet Union again to break all the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the United Nations as regards internal and foreign politics."

(e) Atlantic Charter, United Nations—appeal to the public opinion of the United States of America, and Great Britain:

"Faithful to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Promethean League of the peoples subjugated by Soviet Moscow from now on takes the name Promethean Atlantic Charter League and calls upon all American and British citizens to organize corresponding leagues of the friends of our cause for the moral support of our legal demands and for the security of a just and lasting peace.

"Let them, the free citizens of the western democracies, help us to explain to the world that the best democracy of the world, as shown by Communist propaganda using all the methods of Goebbels, is really a disgusting dictatorship of the Bolshevik Party with its concentration camps and its NKVD; that the attained socialism in the U. S. S. R. proclaimed solemnly by the same vociferous propaganda is in reality a state capitalism of the worst kind, based on the compulsory labor of slave workers; that there is no fundamental difference between bolshevism, nazism, or fascism; no capitalist class in any country is able to exploit the workers to such a degree as the Communist bureaucrats and commissars are exploiting them in the Soviet Union. Let them explain to the world that the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union proclaimed by Red Moscow by the creating of the so-called independent republics is a fiction and deceit by which Moscow systematically annihilates and Russifies the individual, separate, subjugated peoples.

"Therefore the peoples oppressed by Moscow will always and everywhere support the principles of the United Nations and of the Atlantic Charter, because only their fulfillment can save the world from world war III, which is being prepared by Stalin's new 5-year plan. Our task is hard, because the Soviet Union as a member of the United Nations will constantly and consciously sabotage all efforts toward democracy and peace."

Mr. Speaker, the right of self-determination is a principle that must not be abandoned. Our silent dead of two world wars will not rest if we are derelict in this important matter.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "This Is Worth Our Best," by Prof. Howard W. Odum, which appeared in the January 1949 issue of the Southern Packet.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS WORTH OUR BEST

(By Howard W. Odum)

From all walks of life in the South—old and young, men and women, white and Negro, rural and urban—people are asking, as never before, soul-searching questions about what is best for the South to do in this time of crisis and conflict in the Nation. They are searching with equal earnestness for responsible answers to their inquiries as to what are the actual facts of this staggering dilemma and what is the relation of these facts to the inescapable issues to be faced. They not only want answers, but they want to have a part in determining the right answers.

So, too, all over the country, in all the other regions, millions of other people are asking the same questions and insisting on having a part in answering them; for, after all, the participants and the programs of action are broadly regional and national, rather than narrowly sectional and partisan.

The reason for this intensification and broadening of concern, in addition to the normal effects of a changing South, a changing Nation, and all-world civilization, are mainly fivefold. In the first place, the South's distinctiveness in its tradition, practice, and legalization of segregation and its Negro-white caste system is in the spotlight as never before. In the second place, the South itself has long been trying to find ways out of its multiplying dilemmas. In the third place, the South must face the rulings of the Supreme Court that many of its practices are unconstitutional. In the fourth place, the Presidential election of 1948 clearly reflected a mandate from the American people for the application of the civil liberties principles to all Negro-white relationships. And finally, the social pressure from national agencies for leadership and communication is so intense and uncompromising—and the difficulties of resolving differences are so great—that rare maturity and wisdom are needed to avoid tragic consequences.

Our regional approach, therefore, constitutes in reality an appeal for the creative South to work out its own positive, practical adjustment to today's crisis rather than to be driven, coerced, and politically patronized into a negative defense to meet the letter of constitutional decisions. The appeal is for scientific and statesmanlike ways of achieving a powerful and enduring reconversion program within the framework of a stable culture, a sound economy, a just morality, a changing folk psychology, a workable political democracy, and all set in the framework of an America of sanely balanced natural geographical regions.

This is an extraordinarily difficult task, worthy of any people and worthy of the challenge of world dilemma in which survival and welfare are at stake. Yet the challenge for the creative South to achieve such mastery is more specific. Here it is not only the hope for positive and noble attainments but for the emergence of an articulate South that will substitute for much of its fears and frustration a new faith in itself. It promises to make the South a more useful part of a great nation.

And it is an appeal to the Nation for a larger measure of understanding, sympathy, and wisdom and a willingness to reconsider some premises of its crusade which have special sectional meaning.

Below we give one set of answers. This is a sort of agenda with which the South may well begin the second half of an epochal century. Here are things to be done after the manner of the age-old formula, "God helping us, we can do no other." Can the South achieve so great a mastery? How long will it take? What are the costs of success and the penalties of failure? How much can it depend upon a mature and wise nation to cooperate? What are the alternatives and the cost of each? What else is better or wiser or surer, and what else will happen? And do we want it to happen? Have we cataloged too much or too little, or just about the right goals?

DR. ODUM'S 21-POINT GOAL FOR THE SOUTH AND THE NATION

1. First, to abide by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court on these matters as on all others.

2. To adjust our culture and economy to national civil-rights legislation for which apparently a clear majority of the people of the United States have voted and to do it in such ways as to reduce outside interference to the minimum. This is a democratic America, governed by majorities through geographic representation to safeguard against the tyranny both of majorities and minorities. The democratic way is to try it.

3. To stop, at all costs, prevailing lawlessness by violence and by evasion. This means in every community and in every State sharp warnings, strict law enforcement, severe penalties within the law.

4. To continue the sure and steady progress which the South has made toward increasingly greater opportunity for all people to have access to resources and work in the South or to migrate to other regions where nearer equal opportunities may be guaranteed.

5. To accelerate the prevailing southern processes of improving race relations and of increasing and equalizing educational facilities for all the people.

6. To provide professional and higher graduate instruction for qualified individuals of both races in the same institutions.

7. To continue progress in agricultural, economic, and industrial development and in the conservation and use of resources.

8. To continue progress in public services, as in public education, public welfare, highways, conservation.

9. To help all southerners see the justice of today's normal wants of Negro people.

10. To help the whole Nation understand the problems—human, political, and economic—in changing a biracial civilization rooted in two centuries of growth.

11. More specifically, to convert from segregation to nonsegregation in many practicable areas such as transportation and other public services.

12. To guarantee opportunity for all citizens to vote without hindrance, and to eliminate the poll tax.

13. To work for effective legislation toward the sure elimination of lynching.

14. And to do all of these things calmly in climate of what the Alsop brothers and others accurately describe as "The hatred of southern influence in Congress" and of the accelerated propaganda, interregional conflict, regional libel, and name calling currently prevailing.

15. Again, to undertake a comprehensive and a scientific inventory of the South and the Nation so as to provide specifications for the future, in which the promise and costs of conversion from general segregation to attainable programs of nonsegregation may be examined, revised, and adopted.

16. And finally, this calls for a greater degree of cultural and political maturity than the South now has, and by the same token a striving for that maturity which is the goal of the good society.

17. Still more, willingness to reexamine the basis of the southern credo as a substitute for protest, bitterness, and secession-mindedness.

18. In the face of bitter attack and vested frustration by many irresponsibles, isolated from the reality of living democracy, to protect the great mass of Negroes from outsiders who would weaken or destroy their extraordinary systems of schools, churches, industry, and self-developed programs which have amazed the world by their mastery and by the effectiveness of their training grounds for progress and leadership.

19. In this transitional era to stop, through wholesome methods, the almost universal trend toward frustration of Negro youth growing from ideologies of despair, bitterness, hate, and aggression; and through interracial cooperation to substitute hope based on both promise and actuality.

20. To stop being afraid of democracy. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of southerners are saying in substance, "Let's try some of these things out; maybe they will work, but if not we will keep on trying."

21. And finally, somehow to stop this intersectional bitterness and to do the job before us in spite of all the complexities and cultural immaturity of many groups; to take the controls away from partisan extremists; to guard against those ideas and acts which seek to inflame and divide the people through irresponsible agitation and violence.

Something besides words

These tasks call for work more than words. Certainly it would appear that argument and debate are largely futile. We all agree that practically everything that is said is true anyway. But what else is true? It is provincial to argue segregation when the Nation outside the South has made up its mind that it will not even consider negotiations on any basis except that of the elimination of segregation, and the South insists that this is not even subject for debate.

The southern Dixiecrats reflected immaturity when they set up as a standard of judgment for voting for a President of the United States the index of his favor to the South and his agreement on racial segregation.

Some of the Nation's intellectuals are so immature as to assume that age-old race prejudice and religious folk conflicts have been purposely put on like a garment—and that a simple edict from Congress will cast off the garment and make all people over.

Many southerners are so naive as to assume that the southern regions can continue in an isolation which takes pride in its segregation economy in a changing world! So, too, those southern folk who, hot headed and lawless, retard progress in all aspects of regional development, are often matched by those who, crying for peace and brotherhood, set the stage for war with fighting words and class conflict.

Besides the ingredients of hard work, endurance, and maturity, these tasks call for giving up something rather than trying to

get more: for resolving differences rather than for the shedding of blood; for bridging the yawning chasm of distance and difference with strong structures, rather than breaking through weak timbers into a flooding stream of revolution or plunging to destruction in too short a leap.

Know the facts—and face them

Less dramatically and more realistically our tasks call for knowing the facts and facing them; for a better understanding, by all, of the practical situations involved, and, by opposing groups, of each other. Of the general facts and situations basic to next steps, the understanding of changes going on in the South currently will help clear the way for southern action and interpret the situation to South and Nation. Of these changes, four appear fundamenal for our purposes.

The first of these is reflected in the larger area of social and economic development, including population changes from rural to urban, agricultural and industrial development, economic structure as well as technological advances and fiscal matters of public services. Here the rate of recent change in the South has been greater than for the Nation as a whole. The second has to do with changes that have taken place among the Negroes in the South, in which there has been almost a complete change in many aspects of Negro life and culture and especially in ideologies and attitudes. The third has to do with ideologies and attitudes in the white South. Here there has been little change, except in the case of individuals, smaller groups, and leaders. On the other hand, at least temporarily, there appears to have been a solidifying of the protest defense attitudes. The fourth change reflects an extraordinary acceleration of the trend toward coercing the South to conform to the national ideology of equality of peoples.

All these changes have resulted in increased tensions, in the rise of the Dixiecrats, in the seeming futility of southern leadership, and in retarding progress in much of the total structure of the South's present-day society. They have also challenged the South to take stock of itself anew and to move forward. These assumptions may be tested by a further glimpse of example of these changes.

FOUR CHANGES IN THE SOUTHERN PROFILE

I. Standards of achievement

Changes seem to be in the following areas in the increase of wealth and of income; in the rise of the general standard of living with considerable improvement in rural living standards, in urbanization and therefore the bringing about of a better balance between the country and the city; in increased balance between agriculture and industry, and in a balanced agriculture; in increased mechanization of agriculture; in an awakening to the meaning of conserving resources; in great strides in technology, such as research, specialization in manufacturing, transportation, communications; in increase in public works and special public social services; and in increase in public education and public recreation. These changes, greater than in the total nation, reflect an extraordinary transformation in the total southern economy and culture.

II. The new Negro

With reference to the Negro, the main changes seem to be in the following area: a large migration out of the South, and therefore a decreasing ratio of Negro people to the total population of the South; the increasing articulation of the Negro in national affairs and politics and the consequent backwash of influence upon the Negro in the South; a large migration from the rural South to southern cities, tending to make the Negro an urban rather than a rural people; a very considerable increase in educational opportunities and especially in high-school and college enrollment; a rising standard of living, the rise of a middle- and upper-class Negro; changes in the Negro worker, especially the woman worker; the rise of the "new Negro" and especially a "new" Negro youth; the development of an extraordinarily able Negro leadership; an aggressive attitude toward segregation; an increase of frustration and aggression. Perhaps the simplest way to emphasize the change is to point to the almost complete newness of the Negro with the "oldness" of the whites and to sense the near pity which the new intellectual Negro has for the southern whites who are called liberal.

All these changes, often little known and understood by the white South, manifest a significant change in race relations and in the ratio of the Negro to the total cultural South. For it is not only that the Negro has developed important upper and middle classes; it is not only that he has developed a magnificent leadership, and that thousands have taken advantage of higher educational opportunities; it is not only that Negro youth, sensing the epochal spiritual change in racial attitudes and led by Negro leadership of the Nation and South, is willing to experiment with every type of equal opportunity; it is all this and more. It is as if some universal message had reached the great mass of Negroes, urging them to dream new dreams and to protest against the old order.

III. The white South

The third current of change, namely, the ideologies and attitudes of the white South can be understood only in relation to the social pressure from outside which is discussed in the next paragraph. In general there has been an increase in sectionalism and the recrudescence of the North-South concept; in the light of improvement in most everyday aspects of Negro life and of great progress by the Negro, a tendency on the part of the white South to insist on having credit for these changes and for the continuing improvement within the framework of segregation; a freer discussion than formerly; but in reaction, a sharpening of resistance and a reinforcing of opposition to changes in segregation practices; an increase in thought and talk about racism; revolt against the Supreme Court decisions with reference to voting and higher education; and more articulate opposition to Federal legislation affecting the South; the still solid South with minor threats of secession from the Democratic Party; some progress in southern organizations for civil rights; a relatively large number of young college students and returned GI's advocating a more liberal practice with reference to race relations; considerable progress in organized labor advances; strong reaction against change by the young people who work on farms, in factories, and who operate the trucks and taxis; some recrudescence of the Ku Klux Klan.

IV. The South's reaction

With reference to our fourth level of change, namely, the accelerated trend of outside pressure for complete transformation of the southern segregation pattern, it helps us to understand the situation if we look at these pressures in the light of the South's unchanging attitudes as described above. But it also reminds us that today and tomorrow are not yesterday.

The intensity of the South's reaction, seemingly so difficult to interpret to other regions, is after all an inevitable and logical product of the folk process. In the first place the extremity of Southern reaction is often matched by the extremity of attack, as when notable authorities would ascribe age-old race prejudices to the perversion of southern whites. The South, of course, considered it the other way around. Yet, the South is the only major regional culture I know of in the world where the segregation and exploitation of the Negro is considered as a part of virtue in preserving western civilization.

Although the South's convictions are based upon cultural traditions and frontier heritage, they are present-day realities. The South explains them as elemental.

The Past Colors the Present

First, there is the universal law of differences, such that no two individuals are alike, thus resulting in a wide variation of personality. There is then, by the same token, the age-long differentiation of ethnic groups, commonly assumed to be races, the most liberal characterization of which is that they are the product of cumulative differences over long periods of time in the framework of different environmental pressures. Nevertheless, throughout the world of all time and spatial relations, the mode of the world's collective behavior has reflected more different ethnic groups than have ever been counted.

Third, there is the assumed verdict of the old school of biologists that heredity is an important factor in all human aggregations as well as animal aggregations, and it has been the common assumption of traditional ideologies that races differ, in terms of certain measurable traits such as cephalic index, texture of skin and hair, color, and certain other traits used primarily for identification and differentiation. The South has been accustomed to cite this as scientific sanction for the policy of separation.

There has been the assumption that, in the great religions of mankind, class distinctions and ethnic groupings have constituted a part of the basic structure of the cultures of which those religions are the primary index. This, from the southern viewpoint, was no less true in the great Hebrew tradition, both in the Old and New Testaments, in the earlier assumptions of hewers of wood and drawers of waters and the later assumptions of servant and master. This became one of the major trends in the fabric of southern folkways and mores with reference to the Negro.

There was, then, the more specific tradition of the South set in the total framework of slavery.

There was next the abolition of slavery and the epochal experiment and trial of making the slave a freeman under terms of the reconstruction.

To the other traditions were then added the powerful structure of caste based on sex and race and the intensification through discussion, trial, and error of certain of the principal southern folkways and mores.

There was still again a rationalization by the South of what was idealized as Americanism. Not only in the old days, but even up to yesterday the American goal has often been set as "the preservation of American man and western culture." The South has always assumed, and backed its assumptions with the intensity of all its institutions, that the American way was different from and better than the European or oriental and that the South itself was a bulwark of Americanism.

There was the final consideration involved in the structure for American democracy, namely, its geographic representations and its Constitution through which the Nation derives its permits and power through the States and through majority rule. And that majorities as well as minorities have a right to choose how they will be governed.

To all these were added the day-in-and-day-out accusation that the South can do nothing well, enjoy no rich life, achieve no value, because it sins in segregation. Springtime and seasons may come, love and romance may abound, great achievements may be recorded, but they are as sounding brass and

tinkling cymbals, until the South has satisfied the world on the issue of segregation.

Now, the trend of outside pressure literally to ignore all of these basic conditioning influences is so complete a change that much of the South is caught up in the twofold dilemma: first, of catching its breath from such an overwhelming and startling challenge, and, second, of resentment and emotional demagogic reaction.

We must work for the right ways

Now, since this is a major problem of American democracy—the failure to meet which might very well destroy the soul of the South and cripple a great Nation—manifestly it deserves the best that social science and political strategy can achieve; the same sort of basic inquiry which was undertaken in the statesmanship which was made articulate by the founding fathers rather than being relegated to a simple moral or a complex emotional issue, or left to vested frustration, political demagogery, or intellectual exhibitionism. It would be unbelievable, if it were not true, that the South and the Nation, facing their greatest domestic dilemma of the century, would not set up means and procedures for the same statesmanlike inquiries as are assumed in other major situations.

What we propose, therefore, is to continue this American way in a reasonable and radical departure from our present and past strategies. This means that we begin now on the agenda which we have listed, but also that in this critical stage we must undertake such comprehensive inquiry, through new research and inventory, as will make possible through conference, legislation, and planning, a statesmanlike and workable blueprint for an enduring program of reconversion. There are four main steps involved.

The first of these is a new and comprehensive appraisal of the South's resources and people in all their traditional and historical backgrounds and in the light of the most complete 1950 census inventory possible. This would be the new southern regions projected into the decades ahead.

The second is a reappraisal of the structure of American democracy, with its organic elements of geographic representation, State participation, and judicial structure, with all the hazards of majority and minority rule and the ideals of American democracy. This is a test for judicial and legislative adaptation to the modern world.

The third is a complete appraisal of the total segregation picture of the South and of the Nation with inventory as it relates to the total structure of American society.

The fourth is an appraisal, in terms of actual programs, of what, in priority schedules and total costs, will be involved in the enactment of changes demanded by constitutional specifications and human progress.

Two Ways Forward

We must begin, as indicated; and we must continue with more knowledge and maturity than we now have.

A Hedge Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events:

A HEDGE AGAINST CONFISCATION

(By Frank Chodorov)

When Henry Adams was learning the trade at the American Embassy in London (he tells the story in his Education), he made the discovery that political ethics and private ethics are at opposite poles. Adams remarked upon this to an older hand at diplomacy and naively asked whether all politicians are dishonest. To which query he received this reply: "I should not advise a young man to begin his career by thinking otherwise."

To ordinary mortals, like you and me, this cynical observation on political integrity may be shocking, but that is because we assume that politicians are ordinary mortals, which they are not. Men placed above the common herd cannot be circumscribed in their behavior by the rules of conduct prevailing below. What is honest or dishonest in the realm of principle may be just the reverse in the rarefied air of political expediency.

When, therefore, the residents of Mount Olympus do behave in human manner, the matter is worthy of mention. Take the British Labor Party. For decades it had been telling the people of England that, come their innings, labor would nationalize industry. There was no question as to the intention. Through such articulate representatives as the late Mr. and Mrs. Webb, and the current Mr. Laski, they made it quite definite. If, in 1945, the British electorate did not know what they were voting for, they could blame only their ignorance, no charge of duplicity could be brought against the British Labor Party.

Mr. Truman and the Democratic Party leadership, on the other hand, are running true to the traditions of their trade. It is dishonest, if we insist on judging their actions by copybook standards. For, they are promulgating a political program completely unrelated to the historical pronouncements of the party. True, during the past 15 years much was done by its dominant section to indicate a strong inclination toward the socialization of industry. But most recommendations were in the name of emergency—suggesting temporary measures called for by a passing condition. At no time was it specifically announced that the party had abandoned Thomas Jefferson in favor of Karl Marx.

Nor were we told by Mr. Truman during the recent campaign that in voting for him we would be voting for out-and-out socialism. His strong espousal of New Deal economics suggested to many that his return to power would herald the end of private enterprise in America. That, however, was only an inference. He did not say so. His platform did not say so. What he did say and what he is now undertaking are at odds, and by the standards prevailing in private life, veracity is strained.

II

This observation is sharpened by the Spence bill, carefully analyzed in the last issue of Human Events. Since this legislation was drafted by a Cabinet committee, headed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and is sponsored by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the bill must be considered as an official pronouncement of administration intent. This, then, is a part of what Mr. Truman seeks:

1. Authority to set maximum and minimum prices for commodities and manufactures at Presidential pleasure.

2. Authority to make loans and direct the expansion of facilities for increased production, or to build and operate such plants, at will.

3. Authority to make mandatory allocations of priority for the use of scarce materials, also at untrammeled executive discretion.

4. Authority to nominate a coordinator of economic affairs. (Hinting at an office similar to that occupied by the British "economic dictator," Sir Stafford Cripps.)

Well, there it is. Regardless of preelection statements, Mr. Truman now proposes to move in on industry, by putting overseers in plants of his selection, or by buying up the management with subsidies, or by opening (with our tax money) plants which—with the help of tax-supported subsidies—will drive efficiency to the wall.

That Mr. Truman will get his way seems probable to me. There will be a lot of jabberwocky before he does, but since the opposition party seems almost equally without principle, or equally liberal, the march toward socialism will be unimpeded. You can be sure that when the propitious "emergency" arises, when the hobgoblin of war frightens us out of our wits or the fear of unemployment further depresses the value of liberty, the rats of bureaucracy will infest the hold of American business. Ultimately, of course, the ship will sink, but in the meantime there will be cheese for all.

There is no use frothing at the mouth at the turn of events. Silly, indeed, is the pointing of a Sunday-school finger of scorn at political duplicity. As with young Henry Adams, any expectation of something else is due to misunderstanding of political standards. Nor need you worry about the future of America, for the coming generation will find comfort in the conditions to which they were born and trained; it has always been so.

Only you and I, because we have known better times, have a problem on our hands. Our habits of thought and behavior will make it difficult for us to slither into the slough of national socialism. But, precisely because of our experience in self-reliance, we should not find it too difficult to devise some hedge against what we know we must endure during the rest of our lives.

III

The first hedge that suggests itself, because it seems easiest to accomplish, is to find a place in the new hierarchy. No doubt, many lieutenants of industry will do so, for one must live, and if one can live only by pushing one's snout into the public trough, so be it. Besides—the reasoning goes—the big shots have always run the national show, and now that the arena is so vast and the mob scenes so colossal the politicians will not be able to do without managerial skill. Perhaps.

In the transition from private enterprise to socialism, however, there is a hedge that might furnish a little temporary relief for those who are uninterested in the Federal pay roll. In this country the ownership of capital is so widely decentralized that nationalization cannot be accomplished in one fell swoop, as in Russia, but must take the course of purchase, as in England; therein lies the bit of protection.

There are indications that this hedge is already taking shape. Shortly before the introduction of the Spence bill the United States Steel Corp. declared an extra dividend and announced its intention to split up its common shares. Soon afterward, General Motors voted an extra dividend, and then came news that such large corporations as American Telephone & Telegraph and Du Pont de Nemours are planning to increase their issues by variations of the split-up method.

Now, the reason for splitting up stock is simply to induce wider public participation in the ownership of the corporations. And the obvious question is, Why do the directors seek wider distribution of ownership at this time? What is the urgency? According to reports, there are now upward of 5,000,000 holders of listed securities. Is it not reasonable to infer a desire to build an even more formidable pressure group against possible confiscation?

Intent, as every lawyer knows, is most difficult to prove, and where so many directors are involved even the intimation of a concerted purpose would be ridiculous. But the fact remains that the more widows and orphans who hold stock, the more difficult it would be for the State to move in ruthlessly on the corporation—or, the more likely that the State will pay generously for what it confiscates.

And the price must move up as the number of bidders increases. Not only will the splitting of the stock attract more buyers, but so will the payment of higher dividends. The two moves cannot be disassociated, particularly when they are simultaneous.

Especially telling is the payment of higher dividends at a time when business is experiencing a drop in sales and prices in general are tending down. It would seem the part of wisdom now to build up larger reserves against indicated contingencies. What, then, is the reason for the distribution of capital?

There is also the tax situation to be taken into consideration. If and when Mr. Truman has his way, levies on the funds of corporations will be increased; in fact, his program of socialization will compel such a course. Distribution of earnings to stockholders, then, could be an anticipatory measure; since the tax collector will get it anyhow, why not pay it out and let the stockholders bear the brunt?

IV

As Will Rogers used to say, I know only what I read in the papers. I do not pretend ability to predict stock-market quotations; that is something for soothsayers only. But, putting together the known facts, and mixing in the known inclinations of the normal human being, one comes to the conclusion that Mr. Truman's socialistic proposals have been anticipated in Wall Street. If that is so, the market offers a hedge against the confiscation of property in the offing.

It is at best, as said, a very temporary hedge. If you should contemplate it, please remember that. You cannot escape the vise of socialism. Whatever you may gain by market operations will soon be wiped out by taxation and depreciated currency.

England is buying out private industry with bonds. In spite of ERP, these British bonds can now be bought on the New York market at a considerable discount. The British bondholders are willing to take a hefty loss in order to get dollars which will fetch them something. They thought they took a good profit when they sold their industries to the state, but now they know, like Faust, that you cannot win when you make a bargain with Mephistopheles.

Italy, Portugal, and the Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which will appear in the national Catholic weekly, America, in its March 26 issue, on the subject of Italy, Portugal, and the pact:

ITALY, PORTUGAL, AND THE PACT

Now that the debate on the Atlantic Pact has begun, we hope that the State Department will answer the questions about it that are puzzling and public. One of them is: How can Italy and Portugal, which are not members of the United Nations, be legally eligible to join a regional defense arrangement within the framework of the UN? In a remarkable press conference on March 9, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, after admitting that the ideal of an effective universal security system is not attainable at the present time, declared in the next breath that this does not mean that the treaty is unfaithful to the United Nations. In every word and in every thought, it abides by the structures of that organization.

We have not, however, seen any official State Department reply to the question we noted above. At the risk of seeming presumptuous, we suggest that the following considerations might help toward the answer.

Articles 51 and 52, which are cited as the legal foundations of regional defense pacts, do not consider the question whether UN members may exercise the collective right of self-defense in company with nonmembers. Nor is there anything in these articles which specifically prohibits member states from entering regional arrangements with nonmember states. Since there are no specific prohibitions, it appears that members of the UN and nonmembers may join in regional defense pacts.

Such a move, while not violating the letter of the Charter, would not contradict its general spirit either. The right of self-defense, whether individual or collective, is so fundamental a right of states, as of individuals, that it seems untenable to hold that UN members could not undertake collective treaties for self-defense with nonmembers.

Moreover, article 52 specifically states: "This article in no way impairs the application of articles 34 and 35." Article 35 declares in part:

"A state which is not a member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter."

These obligations of pacific settlement are enumerated in article 33, and include "negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." In view of this obligation on the part of nonmembers to resort to regional arrangements, it is arguable that the Charter permits members and nonmembers to join in regional arrangements. Since the Charter does not specifically prohibit members and nonmembers from joining in regional pacts, and since there is a strong presumption that it actually permits such arrangements, there seem to be no legal obstacles in the way of including Italy and Portugal in the Atlantic Pact. Why not tell the American public that officially?

He That Ruleth His Spirit Is Greater Than He That Taketh a City

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are not Irish join with them in rejoicing in their festivities, but in these days of apparent unrest and threatened change and with reference to that which has taken place during the present Congress and especially on yesterday, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to one phrase in the greatest Book that has ever been written:

He that ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city.

What World Thinks of United States—Report on a 3-Year Tour—Our Approach to World Problems Is Called Outmoded—State Department Upholds Status Quo Against Asia's Grass-Roots Revolutions—America's Prestige Has Dropped Since War—An Interview with Joseph Fromm, Far Eastern Editor, United States News and World Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a most interesting and enlightening interview that appears in the March 25 issue of the United States News and World Report.

Mr. Joseph Fromm, far eastern editor of United States News and World Report, has just returned to America after 3 years of reporting that took him around the world.

During his travels, Mr. Fromm watched the beginning and the growth of the American occupation in Japan. He was in China when the Communist sweep began, and he foretold the collapse of the Chiang Kai-shek government's control over millions of Chinese. In the last year, Mr. Fromm has been on hand for the fighting in Indonesia, the revolution in Indochina, the pro-Communist uprising in Malaya, the warfare in Palestine and elsewhere. He has covered the cold war from Korea, through the Middle East, to Spain. Mr. Fromm is in the United States for a vacation before returning to his post in the Far East.

The editors of United States News and World Report sat down with Mr. Fromm in their conference rooms to discuss his impressions of the trend of world events. His opinions appear below:

Question. How does it feel to be back, after all that traveling, Mr. Fromm?

Answer. Fine. This country looks good.

Question. What impressions did you get overseas? Do people think there is going to be a war?

Answer. I found very little feeling of a prospect of war most places I went. That is true in Spain, for example. And it certainly is true in China. There is little feeling out there about a war between America and Russia.

Question. What about Iran?

Answer. In Iran I found generally that the people didn't think there would be a war. They were jittery, all right. They recognize that if there is a war any so-called containment policy won't contain anybody there. As far as effectively checking the Russians, that isn't even a prospect.

We've been putting in $100,000,000 worth of military equipment—so-called surplus—and we gave it to them with a $10,000,000 credit. They started trying to develop an Iranian army. One of the men who is active in it told me that if the Russians marched into Iran the Iranian Army would run to the south. The only effective resistance might be guerrilla warfare.

Question. What is the biggest impression you got, over-all?

Answer. I think the outstanding impression concerns America more than anything else. People everywhere seem to think the American approach to world problems is out of date. From the representation of the State Department I got the impression, as I talked with them at embassies and such places, that the United States is playing with the world as though the countries were just chess pawns and there were no human beings involved. Lots of times the people don't seem to be taken into consideration at all.

There seems to be a tendency to think you can buy nations. You can pour $2,000,000,000 into China, but you're not going to buy China. There is a revolution going on throughout Asia. It's a popular, mass revolution—right from the grass roots. But our policy, much of it, anyway, is still based on the prewar status quo. That is the impression of lots of people in Asia.

AMERICA'S LOST PRESTIGE

At the end of the war I was flabbergasted at the amount of American prestige. In Malaya, in Indonesia, people would pick me up and throw their arms around me. In Indochina it was the same thing. They expected America to be the champion of nationalist movements.

You can imagine the terrific letdown of these people when they decided America was on the side of the colonial powers. For instance, the first Prime Minister of the Indonesian Republic told me: "America has betrayed us. America is supporting the Dutch." I ran into the same thing in Indochina, where the people are fighting the French.

The Communists always are on the side of the nationalist movements. In Indonesia, the Communist line is: "The Americans have betrayed us. The Russians have agreed to trade with us. So you see who our friends are."

Question. The Russians are trying to take advantage of the situation out there?

Answer. I'd say, rather, that they have taken advantage of a historical situation and we have not. I don't credit their intelligence. I think the United States just failed to sense an opportunity.

Once in Saigon I had a conversation with three young men who are fighting the French. I asked one of them: "Why do you follow Ho Chi Minh. He's a Communist. Don't you realize what might happen to your country?"

They were amused. The man I was talking to laughed at me and said: "You mean Ho Chi Minh is a nationalist. The French have destroyed every other nationalist organization here. We would rather have Indochina ruled by a native Communist than an Indochina ruled by the French."

COMMUNIST ARGUMENTS IN CHINA

Question. Where do they get the money and the instruments to spread this communism?

Answer. The point is, it doesn't take much. Take the little farmer in China who gets up at 5 in the morning and works until dark and after. He pays 50 to 60 percent of his crop in rent, another 20 percent in taxes, and then the Army comes along and takes 10 percent more. He sees no chance of a change.

Then the Communists come along—with no money whatsoever—and merely say: "Look. Why are you doing this? Why don't you join us and fight for your rights here?" You don't need money to mobilize that.

Another thing, in China the Communists got a lot of free guns and ammunition. It was Japanese stuff the Russians neglected to turn over to Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists. That lasted a few years.

Now, though, I would say that 70 percent of the Communist equipment is American. I know of one case where the Communists trapped a Nationalist Army and got the equipment of 50,000 men. In Mukden, everybody knew that the Nationalist troops and officers were selling their guns on the streets. In Tientsin lots of guns were smuggled to the Communists.

Question. What's going to happen in China now?

Answer. I think the Communists are going to set up a coalition government.

Question. Dominated by Russia?

Answer. To this extent: In international affairs. Communist China is going to cooperate with Russia because, after all, they probably reason that if there is a war and Russia is defeated then they lose too. But I think on internal affairs, the Communists will not let Russia say: "Now, you will do this."

Question. Could the United States have kept China? Or was the allegiance to Russia so strong that nothing could be done?

Answer. In the first place, I certainly think there was a possibility of preventing the Communists from taking over all of China. General Marshall, during his mission out there, felt that the Communists dominated maybe a fourth of the country at that time and the Kuomintang—the Chiang Kai-shek government—had three-fourths. General Marshall brought them together, but a lot of people think that the Kuomintang didn't want a coalition.

People out there say General Marshall did a marvelous job. But, unfortunately, he had to leave at a critical period and the whole thing blew up. I think our policy after the Marshall mission was based on the idea that it was possible to crush the Chinese Communists. But, actually, I don't think we could have done it. They have too much popular support. They are too strong.

Question. How important is China from the standpoint of peace in the world?

Answer. Industrially, China is so backward that I can't think the country itself is any threat to peace. If one is thinking in terms of war, the fact that the Communists are taking over means Russia's Asiatic flank is safe. But I don't think anybody is thinking about invading Russia through China.

Politically, the situation might have the effect of heartening a lot of people in Asia. The people in Indochina, for instance. They may say: "Now we have a big brother to the north." Many people who weren't Communists before are going to think it might be a good idea to become Communists.

Question. Will it have any effect on India?

Answer. India is pretty remote from all this. I think it will remain neutral. One thing, though—the Communists in India seem to have learned some lessons from the Communists in China. They've gotten into the labor unions, and they are pretty strong there. But I think they are counting on rural India to be the strength of their movement, as it was in China.

DOUBTS ABOUT JAPAN

Question. What about Japan?

Answer. Our new policy seems to be to forget about reform and put recovery first in Japan. It seems to me the primary objective of United States policy in Japan is, first, to get Japan off the American dole and, secondly, keep down the Communists.

But almost everybody recognizes that a self-sufficient Japan requires the cooperation of the countries of Asia, particularly Manchuria. That is the main source of soybeans, coal, iron ore, cotton and wool. The whole Japanese economy in the past—Manchuria was the backbone of it.

Manchuria is Communist now. They aren't going to trade with Japan. And the Chinese Communists aren't going to cooperate in trade with Japan if there is any hint that America is building the place up as a military power. The same thing is true in the Philippines. It is political suicide there to advocate trade with Japan.

The President of the Philippines was upset about it when I talked with him. He said: "You're building up a reactionary Japan as a base against Russia. You're buying dubious allies. We fear a resurgent Japan far more than we fear Russia."

I think these reactions are largely a result of our shift in policy during the last 18 months.

SHIFT IN UNITED STATES POLICY

Question. Shift in what policy?

Answer. The United States policy in the occupation. During the first year the main theme was that Japan had to be democratized. That was the basic policy. The breaking up of the zaibatsu (big monopolies) was one of the major things. But now I think we've scrapped the whole policy of zaibatsu dissolution.

Question. There have been almost no reparations?

Answer. That's right. Certainly it has been to a large extent Russia's fault. But also on our part, we haven't desired to have reparations.

There is a great conflict in our policy. On the one hand, the State Department says our only objective is to make Japan self-sufficient. But then a committee of engineers hired by the Army made its Report on Reparations and Economic Reconstruction, and people in Asia were flabbergasted. This report came out and advocated the retention of practically all prewar Japan's industrial capacity—a capacity that the United States, in early policy, admitted included a tremendous amount of what they call obvious excess capacity.

And people out there began to wonder. If, as we had said before, so much industry was obvious excess, why was it suddenly necessary to retain it in Japan if our policy is only to develop a self-sufficient and democratic country?

Question. Is it possible the events in China have caused a policy switch in Japan?

Answer. Yes. I am sure that we have switched the emphasis in Japan as a result of that. Apparently we haven't decided yet what we want to do. In other words, one branch of the Government says we want Japan to be self-sufficient, and then the Army indicates we want Japan to be a military base.

We've got to decide whether we want Japan as a military base. If we do, then I think we'll have to subsidize the economy indefinitely. Because, if that is United States policy, we won't get the cooperation of China, or the Philippines, or Australia. They are are not going to assist in the development of a militaristic Japan.

JAPANESE AS ALLIES?

Question. In case a war came, would the Japanese people be America's allies?

Answer. I would say the way the political trend in Japan is going now, that in 5 years you will see the working class violently opposed to America, and the small group of politicians and former war lords on the side of the United States. Whether the Japanese people would fight for us, I would say, is extremely questionable. Anyway there would be a very effective fifth column, because the Communists have some extremely capable leaders and they are well organized.

We've already seen the results of the recent elections there, in which the Communists made a relatively spectacular showing. That trend started quite a while ago. There was one case where a tax was imposed. It hit the workers pretty hard. The result was that

there were strikes—which were banned—and the Socialists who had to apply the tax were accused of being antilabor. Feeling was such that a lot of workers turned to the Communists.

One of the Communist leaders used to tell me: "Every time General MacArthur bans a strike we make votes." Of course, the Communists want to make the situation appear: the Americans against the workers and the Communists, and I am inclined to believe they have pretty well succeeded. That is demonstrated by the election results. I think the trend of United States policy now will start pinching the farmers, so that in the next year or two the farmers will feel that they have no one to turn to except the Communists.

Question. Are the Russians mixing into the Near East-Palestine business?

Answer. Not very much. The Russian, for the last 25 years, have had a consistent policy in the Middle East. They've changed tactics, but the ultimate objective always has been the same: to dislodge the British and the French from the position on Russia's flank.

Palestine showed that up. First, the Russians supported the Zionists, then they opposed them. They supported the Arabs, and then they supported partition. They always looked at it against the background of what the British were doing at the time. Their idea has been to get Britain out, wherever possible.

Question. Is there much Communist infiltration in the Near East and Middle East?

Answer. Not a great deal. In Israel you have a small Communist Party. Of course, I have read stories that the Russians are sending a lot of spies and such things, but I am very dubious of that.

I would say that there is less prospect of communism in Israel than any country I have visited. There is less class conflict, for one thing, less social conflict. Labor relations are excellent because the unions are part of the government. The workers have a very strong position already, so the Communists have nothing to offer these people.

I talked with a lot of people there. By supporting Israel consistently, the United States has achieved a position where the Israeli Government is pointed very much in the direction of America, both politically and economically. The party that controls the Government favors what its spokesmen call "neutrality." In other words, they want to be friendly both with Russia and America, and deal with them. I would call it a pro-American neutrality.

Question. What about the Arab countries?

Answer. Practically all the experts I talked with said there is less prospect of real communism throughout this whole area than anywhere else. Among the Arabs, the real bar to communism is the feudalistic, religious barrier.

From Russia's point of view, she didn't have to be worried about adopting an all-out pro-Israel policy. She probably didn't care if she embarrassed all the Communists Parties in all the Arab countries. For 25 years they haven't been able to do anything, anyway.

The Communists are working along the lines of Russian foreign policy to get rid of foreign powers in the Middle East. That means Britain, France, America, etc. So you find the Communists collaborating with nationalist groups. You find them very active with the violently antiforeign movements.

So far as United States policy is concerned, we don't have to worry about the Arabs cutting off the oil. As it has worked out—and as most of the people who have spent a lot of time there point out—the Arabs need us more than we need them. In Saudi Arabia, King Ibn Saud gets a lot of American dollars for his oil. He wasn't going to cut off the oil and bankrupt his country to fight over Palestine.

I think the effect of the United States policy in taking a position that was against the Arabs, or at least a position backing Israel, has put our relations with the Arab countries on a very realistic basis. As far as the ordinary people of those countries are concerned, America's attitude doesn't mean a great deal. There isn't much popular opinion in those places. The Arab countries are far more backward than any others in Asia.

And our policy in America has shown the people who run the Arab Governments that they have to watch their step more than we have to watch ours. In other words, they need our economic assistance, our trade and our purchase of their oil. And they know it. The friendship of Israel is probably as important as the friendship of all the other states, collectively. Israel is obviously there to stay. It is going to be the most dynamic country in the whole Middle East.

Question. Did you get into Greece?

Answer. Just for a day or two, on my way to Italy.

Question. Then you wound up in Spain?

Answer. Yes. Madrid was my last long stop.

Question. After all that, what is your impression of United States policy? Are we playing a lone hand in foreign relations? Or are we following the British? Just what are we trying to do?

Answer. In the Near East, at one time, we followed the British. Now we are pretty well playing our own hand.

In Asia we just don't seem to have any consistent policy at all. People I've talked with feel it is a sort of policy of compromises, of half measures. This doesn't apply to western Europe, maybe. But in Asia, the Middle East, and in Spain, American policy has been negative almost universally.

Question. We're putting up a lot of money, aren't we?

Answer. That's just it. America is spending billions, apparently with the idea that we can buy world support with our money. But the chances are it will mean spending money indefinitely because the people themselves are offered nothing very dramatic.

For instance, a worker in Italy has been getting 200 grams of bread a day. If we didn't go in and help, he would be cut to 150. But he isn't much impressed with the fact that he still gets 200 grams. That isn't going to turn him against communism.

What is going to turn him against communism is if he gets 300 grams of bread a day and has a reasonable tax system or a reasonable land system—that's the sort of thing that will persuade him.

CASH VERSUS PERSUASION

Question. That costs, too, doesn't it?

Answer. Yes. My point is nothing is being done to persuade the people. One might say that the United States bought off Italy last year in the election over there. But the fact remains that nothing has been done yet to persuade the 30 percent of the people or so who voted Communist to vote against the Communists next time. So, to make any headway, we have to buy them again.

Question. If we didn't put dollars in China, in Italy, and Greece—if we gave nothing but moral support to the people who are opposing Communists—could these anti-Communists win? Some people in the United States get frightened every time the Communists make the slightest gain.

Answer. That's it. It seems to me the great danger is that the United States will get so terrified as its policies backfire in some parts of the world and the Communists take over, that we might do things that are audacious to the point where they will be provoking.

The Russians go in and back the Communist Party whether the Communists are in power or not. They go along with the revolutionary movement. Most people today are a great neutral mass. They can see no reason to support America and no particular reason to support the Communists. They are not going to fight Communists if they come in, and they are not going to fight on America's side to throw Communists out.

Question. What do you think about Spain?

Answer. Franco is wooing us now, but it is on his terms. I calculate it would mean an expenditure of $2,000,000,000 to make Spain an effective ally, and what would you have after you spent the $2,000,000,000?

Anybody who goes in to help Franco now has to take Franco as he is. When we suggest reforms, people in his government always say: "Our economic situation is so delicate that if we do anything it might cause unrest and we would have nothing to fall back on. But if you came over with $200,000,000 or $500,000,000, then we would be able to consider these things."

The idea seems to be that once you're in you can't get out. And once you're in they don't have to do anything to keep you in. Some of the men over there are talking themselves into a conviction that, if we don't give them economic assistance, there will be riots and the Communists will take over.

I just don't believe it. I have not found a single well-informed member of our Embassy staff there who sees any prospect of a civil war in Spain. They say in the whole history of Spain there has never been a revolution as a result of hunger.

COST OF AID TO SPAIN

As far as Franco being an ally, I think what the United States would wind up with is this: We would spend a lot of money to build up his economy. But the economy obviously couldn't support a country that was on the alert for war. Therefore, we would constantly be required to subsidize Spain's domestic economy indefinitely. It wouldn't be a 5-year program. It would be a 10-year program, or 15. Even so, what would we wind up with?

The Spanish people still, despite the absence of a more positive American policy, are very definitely pro-American. Many of these people do not like Franco. They have no hope whatsoever of getting any aid. Therefore, any aid you put in—even though it might prevent the wheat ration from being reduced—wouldn't have enough dramatic effect to convince the people it was good, because they price they would be paying would be their last hope of getting rid of Franco.

The hope of getting rid of Franco stems from the prospect that the Spanish economy will deteriorate to the point where the people around Franco will decide that American aid is so imperative they will compel him to step down. It's difficult to predict whether this pressure would force Franco out. It is a very distinct possibility, but Franco's retirement would not really solve the Spanish problem.

Question. One thing is clear, anyway. The world really seems to be in a mess doesn't it?

Answer. That's right—quite a mess.

Labor's Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress is interested in the fight being waged by labor against the spread of communism. The following item which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 17,

1949, is a most enlightening article on the subject:

THE SPLIT IN THE WFTU—COMMUNISM PREPARES AN OFFENSIVE FOR LABOR CONFLICT ON A GLOBAL SCALE

(By William J. Humphreys)

PARIS.—No matter what course Soviet diplomacy takes in the future, it is certain there will be no Communist peace offensive on the international labor front. A pattern for social conflict has been drawn on the east-west lines already familiar in politics; opposing forces are rallying supporters; all signs indicate the battle will be fought on a global scale.

This prospect of universal struggle was brought sharply into focus by the split in the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Non-Communist trade unions recently withdrew from this intended foundation of worldly understanding in a belligerent mood. They walked out determined to reorganize themselves into a new labor international that could challenge the WFTU for leadership.

There was no alternative to this decision, according to its authors. They say that for 3 years they had been cooperating with Communists in an effort to create a fraternity of trade-unions of the world, irrespective of considerations of race, nationality, religion, or political opinion. This was the forum prescribed by the WFTU constitution, adopted October 3, 1945.

But what non-Communists got for their pains was expressed in the leave-taking charge leveled at the WFTU. This labeled the organization as a Communist monopoly. In greater detail this charge meant Communists had exploited the WFTU's funds and world-wide machinery to set down Soviet propaganda wherever there was a trade-union affiliate.

The charge meant finally that the non-Communists—who were a helpless minority witnessing these operations—had to jump overboard to save themselves. Those now in the water admit it will be a long, hard swim to win solid ground.

The principals pulling for the shore are the American Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), the British Trades Union Congress (TUC), and the Dutch Trade Union Federation. The three were the representatives of the non-Communist minority on the WFTU's executive bureau. They tried first to have the bureau suspend all WFTU activity for at least 1 year. When this face-saving attempt was overruled they jettisoned themselves as a last resort. Their action was a signal for all non-Communist affiliates to follow their example. Once all sympathizers have withdrawn there will be reorganization.

In the interval time is being lost. The WFTU split occurred January 19. In the intervening weeks the Communist leaders now in undisputed control of the organization have been making time count. Moreover, they have shown themselves willing and confident to meet the non-Communist challenge. There are obvious factors to buoy their feelings about undertaking social welfare on the round-the-world basis.

In the first place numbers and organization—including the political support of Communist parties everywhere—are on their side. The non-Communists, on the other hand, will have to build a new international secretariat, and they will retain only about 25,000,000 of the WFTU's original 70,000,000 members.

Secondly, the Communist trade unionists have the advantage of working in media they know how to exploit. The media are the familiar surroundings of discontent. Underprivileged workers in western Europe cradled Marxism. The main lines of Marxist propaganda since then have not changed. Outside the motherland of the Soviet Union communism's present expansion has ridden the crest of unrest spread and accentuated by the economic ruin of the Second World War.

In the purely speculative field there are many European observers who think the Soviet Union, possessing an ally like the far-flung WFTU, never would go to war until she had exploited this agency to the fullest. Their reasoning is that there is no risk to Soviet security in having millions of non-national trade-union sympathizers to carry out a campaign of obstructionism against the Marshall plan, or American aid in other parts of the world.

Immediately after the western reactionaries quit the purged WFTU directorate outlined a program to play its trump cards. Acting like a giant Red Labor Internationale—which, in fact, is what it is—the Communist executives and their willing fellow travelers laid down a program to exploit worker unrest in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In Europe the Communist Parties and the Communist trade-unions are counted on to execute their part with a minimum of direction. It is in Asia and Africa, where the western democracies have their colonial holdings, that the Communist trade unionists intend to use most of the WFTU'S prestige and resources.

The first manifesto after the purge called the Communist shot in this direction. The new directorate in this communiqué promised to support "all colonial and semicolonial peoples who are fighting for their independence and standard of living." This departure from the nonpolitical provisions of the constitution to agitate for independence provoked no opposition. If it is true western society and economics are weakest in the colonial territories of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Portugal, it also is true the Communists know where to concentrate their attack.

The colonial drive—already making itself felt on the French Ivory Coast—is one phase of the new campaign designed to expand rather than hold the present WFTU lines. There are four other specific phases that demonstrate the WFTU can work where it would please Moscow most.

First is the far eastern trade-union conference planned for May in Peiping. This meeting is intended to mobilize delegates from India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, and Indochina, as well as to give the WFTU an extending footing in China, the host state. The conference, as non-Communists see it, is an answer to the recent southeast Asia gathering, sponsored by Pandit Nehru, at New Delhi. From the Peiping meeting is expected to come denunciations not only of all European or white authority, but also of all native bourgeoisie.

Secondly, the WFTU has decided to expand its membership by admitting Japanese and German trade-unions of Leftist persuasion. Opposition by western occupation forces would be countered by charges that democratic rights are being violated.

Thirdly, the WFTU is going to try to recapture the following of the international trade secretariats. These are the directorates of the professional unions, like railway men, public-utility workers, and school teachers—the sort of organizations that are associated with the American Federation of Labor. The international secretariats never joined the WFTU. They were afraid of its Communist majority. Now they have been told to come in or prepare for a fight.

Fourthly, the WFTU has entrusted Vincente Toledano, the Mexican trade unionist on its executive bureau, with the preparation of a favorable climate in the Latin-American countries. The project calls for a conference either in Cuba or Mexico of men who are ready to echo the pro-Communist slogans of the WFTU in the Western Hempishere.

And the counterattack? Observers outside international trade-union activities say one of the greatest handicaps for the non-Communist forces is a lack of dynamic leadership. Communist leaders, on the other hand, are credited with an intense understanding and appreciation of the stakes involved. Moreover, the Communists, thanks to the first party principle of discipline, are never worried about shades of opinion and attitudes struck by prima donnas—of which trade-union activity has its share.

What is said to be required of the non-Communist forces is a new sense of urgency about their responsibilities and a willingness to submerge personal differences. A problem on the latter score is the position of the A. F. of L. vis-à-vis the CIO. The former never joined the WFTU because it maintained the point of view no one can collaborate with the Communists. The CIO now admits that in principle but says just as conscientiously that collaboration had to be tried. Not to have tried would have made world labor skeptical: Socialist and Social Democratic opinion could have thought here was a purely capitalistic isolation of the Communist states.

But Walter Schevenels, a veteran trade unionist and former assistant secretary-general of the WFTU, thinks the fight can be won, and fairly so.

A Belgian who was the secretary-general of the non-Communist International Federation of Trade Unions—which the WFTU supplanted—Schevenels thinks Communist gains have been made at the expense of the Socialist and Social Democratic Parties because these laborite organizations first collaborated with and later were "hampered and paralyzed" by Communists. None of the moderate labor organizations could, in principle, denounce communism without denouncing trade-union principles.

"We should not be afraid," Schevenels says. "Our democratic way always is faster and finally brings a greater measure of well-being for people than the Communist method. Moreover, we don't destroy human values and the individual. Labor all over the world will understand this once we start to talk back.

"We are changing the world for the better more quickly than the Communists with our existing political systems. These systems are no more capitalistic today than the Russian system is socialistic."

But, Schevenels says frankly the Russian system is off to a head start among millions of workers and peasants.

Organized Labor and the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Union Register of Portland, Oreg., official publication of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers, AFL, dated February 25, 1949, and entitled "Labor Fares Well Under the TVA Plan":

LABOR FARES WELL UNDER TVA PLAN

With the League for CVA receiving the support of State federations of labor, and the League itself launching an educational program, let's take a look at labor relations under the TVA, described in a recent news release as relatively free of strife during the Authority's 15 years of life.

A recent special edition of the Bonneville Power Authority's Currents tell us that unions representing various crafts in the trades and labor field were recognized by TVA in collective-bargaining relationships from the beginning.

Wage rates are determined through negotiation at an annual wage conference. Other related questions confronting management and labor are worked out through joint procedures. As experience has matured machinery and procedures for carrying on these relationships have been strengthened.

In 1937 the American Federation of Labor unions, which had locals with TVA trades and labor employee membership, joined together in the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council to coordinate their activities. in 1940 TVA and the council negotiated a written agreement.

It does not set up a closed shop, but does provide that employees will be encouraged to participate in employee-management relationships through membership in the unions affiliated with the council.

TVA and the Trades and Labor Council jointly conduct and administer apprenticeship programs, both craft and industrial. In addition, a system of joint cooperative committees consider suggestions, from both labor and management, concerning the efficiency of the job and technical improvements that might be made. They also consider matters of mutual interest, such as absenteeism, welfare, job conditions, safety activities, and training programs. The joint classification committee reviews and acts upon all requests for changes in the trades and labor classification system.

With this kind of a labor-relations program in action we can readily see the reason for a recent press release stating: "Labor leaders have grown to trust TVA, it was reported last week, and TVA authorities have learned they can rely on the labor leaders."

Can Rent Control End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to find any ground upon which I could in good conscience justify a vote for an extension of rent control since the cessation of hostilities and in this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to my colleagues the reading of an editorial from the Boston Herald of March 19, 1949. If we must have continued control, I very much prefer it be done by the States rather than by the Federal Government. I am satisfied that if we really want to help the shortage of rental houses we should put an end to this unjust rent-control law. The editorial follows:

CAN RENT CONTROL END?

In June 1947, Congress wrote a rent-control law to permit the abandonment of control by February 1948. In February 1948, it wrote another bill to permit the abandonment of control by March 31, 1949. It is now writing a law to permit the abandonment of control by June 30, 1950. The more we approach the end, the farther the end recedes into the distance.

Dubious Congressmen put the question to some of the control proponents in committee hearing a few days ago: "Was this to be the last bill Congress would have to write, or would there be another and another?" And the candid answer was, no one could tell.

By this time it must be obvious that rent control is a self-perpetuating device. And it is bound to be. If you hold the price down on something, you have a shortage, and as long as there is rent control there will be at least an apparent housing shortage such as to make the lifting of control look perilous. So perilous that Gov. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, a controller from way back, is certain rioting will ensue.

Theoretically the transition to a free rental market could be done by gradually easing the controls. The House has attempted to do that by a bill to guarantee a fair return. The Senate is considering a bill in which some increases might be allowed.

But practically the fair-return provision is administratively unworkable, and the Senate increases are too restrictive. If this were all that could be offered, Congress would do better to adopt the Republican stopgap 90-day plan and see what the next few months will do to our economy.

There is, however, a provision in both bills to permit the States to take over rent control, and it is here that the best hopes lie. Apartments are not a commodity in interstate commerce. Except in a war emergency, rents ought never to be adjusted by a Federal agency. The arguments for governmental decentralization are particularly effective in this field.

We may not get better rent-control laws from the State house than we have been getting from the National Capital. Indeed, the Dever administration's handling of the MTA is a sad augury. But at least the legislature is closer to us than Congress and is more able to measure and conform to the needs and opinion of Massachusetts. Outraged landlords and perturbed tenants would have a much shorter trip to air their views. If rent control can't end, at least it can be our rent control and not Washington's.

Amendment to the Wage-and-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Messrs. D. R. Boozer and Ray Henson, of the Millersbend Lumber Corp., of Pine Hill, Ala., under date of March 4, 1949:

MILLERSBEND LUMBER CORP.,
Pine Hill, Ala., March 4, 1949.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: We don't bother you often, but we are runing into a serious situation that compels us to write you and give you our views and ask you to help us because we need it—and bad.

We have been in the lumber business, livestock, naval stores and cattle business just about like you have practically all of our lives, except the time we spent overseas in World War I. I was wounded, but I am thankful to say I struggled through and returned home and have been able to make a living by working hard and with our mutual friends here in the First District of Alabama.

We employ about 263 men. We are operating 3 sawmills, planing mill, and veneer mill, and our men are more than satisfied. We have talked to our men, and without the exception of any man, they have told us, and we are telling you, these men want to work and need to work. We live here in the country where the men have their homes, their livestock, their gardens, and their fields, and they have to have the pay roll we have every Saturday to make a go of it. They are very anxious and glad to go along at from 60 to 65 cents. The minimum wage was 40 cents. We are not paying anybody as low as 40 cents, the minimum wage, but we are paying everybody 50, 55, and 60 cents, and skilled men up to $1.75 an hour. We do not believe it is best, with the conditions the country is in at this time, to jump wages from 40 to 75 cents an hour, which is almost a hundred percent, especially when the product that we are manufacturing has fallen 33⅓ percent. It just doesn't make sense.

We are advised that the Government bought about 7,000,000 feet of pine lumber in Charlotte, N. C., 2 weeks ago. This was lumber that had gone through the dry kiln and planing mill at a cost of about $50 a thousand. The Government bought the 2 x 4's for $30 per thousand or a loss of about $20 per thousand.

If you put on a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour at this time you will shut down every small sawmill operator in the South—not only shut him down but break him and throw all of the people out of work.

Does the Government have to tell us from Washington what we are to pay the people that work for us? We are paying all we possibly can, and are paying from the above scale higher than the minimum wage, and why jump it practically 100 percent at one time. Why not take it in even steps and not throw everything out of balance down here? These people need this work.

I do not believe we are going to be able to pay our income tax this year because every time we take in a dollar or cut a stick of lumber we pay the Federal Government alone at least 25 percent. For instance, if we take in a thousand dollars or sell a thousand dollars worth of trees or stumpage, we pay the Government $250. Then we have a State income tax that we have to add to the above pay. Then we have to pay social security and unemployment compensation, and also a severance tax. Every time we cut a tree down we pay the State 20 cents a thousand.

When you spoke here last year you told us about the great leaders there. You particularly told us about Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, from Texas, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK from Massachusetts, Congressman BOB DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, and Congressman WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, and we had a regular feast. You told us that you had just talked to the Speaker over long distance telephone in Texas, and that the Democrats would win the House back and he would be our Speaker. You told us he understood all of our problems, lumber, timber, cattle, manufacturing, and farming business. Can't you get him to help us, and can't you get all of the leaders there to understand that this just won't do at this time? Things have and are slipping bad here and unless the brakes are put on, we are going into a terrible slump that many people will never survive.

The people that work with us are satisfied. Can't you leave them and us alone and let us struggle with our own problems? We will send the tax money there if we can operate, but we can't operate under the conditions we hear we are going to have. We know you understand the situation here thoroughly. Can't you explain it so they will understand it?

I do not believe our party wants to put us out of business, but, of course, if they

do, that is a different thing. Let's use some common sense. Any experienced businessman will tell you we are telling the truth.

Frank, put this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where our friends can see it.

The people here know how close we are to you and about our friendship since we were boys, and they have asked us to tell you these things, and get you and the other fair-minded men there in Congress to be sensible and reasonable and not listen to some bureaucrat that does not understand and has never made a pay roll. Do not let them ruin our business.

We will be perfectly willing to go to 65 cents at this time but then we won't make enough profit to live on.

Please let us hear from you. We are depending on you.

Sincerely your friends,

MILLERSBEND LUMBER CORP.,
By D. R. BOOZER, *President*.
RAY HENSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Hon. Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy delivered by Dr. Herbert S. Goldstein at the funeral services held at the West Side Institutional Synagogue for our beloved former chairman, the Honorable SOL BLOOM:

To the honored dead, SOL BLOOM, his devoted daughter Vera, mourners, relatives, and friends: We are gathered here this afternoon to pay a most deserved tribute to an American patriot and a prince in Israel. Words are too feeble for an occasion of this kind, especially when one is eulogizing a friend of 42 years standing.

SOL BLOOM was the product of an immigrant Jewish home. He was an illustrious example of the son of poor immigrants who rose from lowly surroundings to extreme heights. In no other country but the United States could we find this experience. Emerson said, "America spells opportunity."

Congressman BLOOM was appointed Director General of the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration. He threw himself into that task with matchless zeal. In every city, town, village, and hamlet, he revived the spirit of the founding fathers, by bringing the life story of Washington to the fore. As Chairman of the United States Constitutional Sesquicentennial Commission he wrote a book on the Formation of the Union. This volume was 1 of the 10 books that the late lamented Franklin Delano Roosevelt kept on his desk for ready reference. Here was a man who had just 1 day of formal public-school education, and yet he was the author of a number of well-written books. In them he displayed a profound understanding of our country, these blessed United States of America. More recently he wrote a book on Our Heritage which is an outstanding source for modern American history.

I think the book he liked best, was his smallest one entitled "One With God Is a Majority." SOL BLOOM was a God-intoxicated Jew. He could truly say, "This is my God and I shall glorify Him." No day passed in his life without his saying prayers. He would walk with me on the street and he would occasionally stop, leaning on the cane he sometimes used, look up to heaven, and offer a prayer of thanksgiving for the goodness of God and for the opportunities extended to him for service. SOL BLOOM was an orthodox American and a devoted Jew. Those titles are generally synonymous. The better the Jew, the better the American. Every Friday evening of his life, he sanctified the Sabbath. He sang the Kiddush, the prayer of sanctification, ushering in our Holy Sabbath. He broke bread and uttered the prayer of thanksgiving to God Almighty for His bounteous gifts. I remember when we met in San Francisco. He was the United States delegate for the United Nations Charter meeting, and I the representative for the Synagogue Council of America for the State Department. My good wife, and I went over to visit him at the Fairmont Hotel one Friday afternoon. He opened a closet and said "Look, here are two candles which I shall light tonight in honor of the Sabbath. Here are two rolls that will act as my chalah, my Sabbath bread, over which I shall pronounce the Kiddush." SOL BLOOM never smoked on the Sabbath, though he was a very heavy smoker. When he attended services, he would come early and stay to the very end, particularly on the Day of Atonement. The wisdom preacher, King Solomon, after whom SOL was named, declared, "Those that are wise of heart seize the opportunity to do good deeds." SOL BLOOM was not only a smart man, but a wise man. He was a religious humanitarian. I never heard him say "No" to any call that was made upon him, whether it was Christian or Jewish. Yesterday Dr. Gabel, the superintendent of the Home for Hebrew Convalescents called me up to say that on Monday he had received a check from the Congressman to have the inmates of the home have a dinner, in honor of his birthday. Every year on his birthday he would either go personally or send his check to the Catholic Orphan Asylum in Washington to have the children made happier on that day, by a special treat. I can personally tell you that there were hundreds of requests that I have made of him in behalf of displaced persons, of refugees, of those who lived behind the iron curtain, and he always saw to it that the door to the State Department and the offices of the Ambassadors involved, were open to me.

He was an envoy for good deeds. I was very close to SOL BLOOM, but I do not think there was a man or a woman who knew him, that did not feel the same way. There was something about his personality that found its way into your heart. One always felt that here was a man, who tried to be a close friend.

I do not think it is my function to speak of the political and international activities of the Congressman, except to say that there too, he was dominated by his religion, because, as he would often point out that the Hebrew word for greeting is shalom "peace." Our prayers every day, three times a day, close with the prayer for peace.

SOL BLOOM died on the 7th day of Adar, which is the day of the death of Moses. Like Moses, of old, he died seeing the horizon of the promised land of peace, but he was not privileged to write the documents for world peace. As far as Palestine or Israel is concerned, Congressman BLOOM did more than any other Jew to help in urging the nations of the world to partition Palestine into a Jewish and Arab state.

Never did he flag in his zeal for Palestine, not only politically but spiritually and religiously as well.

The greatest influence in his life was his mother. Whenever he spoke of his sainted mother, tears would well up in his eyes. I would like to say to mothers that the heart of a real mother is the schoolroom of the child. I know of no other woman of whom this can be said more fittingly than SOL BLOOM's mother, because SOL BLOOM's formal schooling was only 1 day in duration. The rest of his schooling he received from his mother's wisdom and faith.

SOL BLOOM was a marvelous husband. No matter where the mission was, he would never go without his wife.

To Vera, his daughter, he looked for erudition and companionship. I should like to say to Vera, whom I have known from her early childhood, Vera, you are freighted with a heavy responsibility to carry on father's religious, civic, and patriotic work. When Lincoln drew his last breath, Stanton, who was at his bedside said, "Now he belongs to the ages." In a similar vein we can say of SOL BLOOM, "Now he belongs to the annals of history." I pray to God that the soul of SOL BLOOM may be gathered unto his eternal resting place, and that he may serve as a guardian angel to his beloved daughter. May he serve on high as a guiding star to America, for peace and for justice. Amen.

Northwest Feeling on the Columbia Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, the Washington Post published a lengthy article about the proposed Columbia Valley Authority by Mr. Tom Humphrey of the Oregon Journal. This article, which I believe to be distorted and biased in its emphasis on the opposition to CVA, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on two separate days, March 14 and 15. Because of the one-sided character of Mr. Humphrey's article, I have written a reply, published in the Washington Post of March 19, which I include as a part of my remarks:

NORTHWEST FEELING ON THE COLUMBIA VALLEY

(By Representative HUGH MITCHELL, Congressman from Washington)

Mr. Tom Humphrey's lengthy article, TVA-Type Proposal for Northwest Marshals Formidable Array of Foes, published in your issue of March 13, merits a reply. Mr. Humphrey writes with the heavy hand of bias against a Columbia Valley Authority. As associate editor of the editorial page of the Oregon Journal, Portland, he comes to his task with the preconceived editorial opposition characterizing that paper. By his own assertion that the newspapers of the Northwest do not favor a CVA, it can be inferred that he fancies himself one of the formidable array of foes.

Mr. Humphrey tries to convey the impression that except for myself and a little band of CVA advocates, the weight of Northwest opinions is heavily on the other side. He passes over quickly, with disparaging remarks, groups or persons known to favor CVA and devotes the greater part of his extended article to quoting CVA opponents and presenting their arguments.

By using this technique in reverse, had he been so minded, Mr. Humphrey could just as easily have described CVA's formidable array of friends. The point is that Mr. Humphrey is using your newspaper to editorialize against CVA rather than to write a balanced and responsible report of developments in the Pacific Northwest attending the proposed legislation. Avowed and bitter enemies of CVA are already giving Mr. Humphrey's article considerable publicity.

Widespread support for a CVA by Northwest farmer and labor organizations is dismissed by Mr. Humphrey in these slighting words: "Grange masters of Oregon and Washington, who will buy anything with a public power label on it, are whooping it up. Several labor leaders have climbed on the bandwagon."

To put the facts in better perspective, it should be noted that Grange and labor leaders have given long and careful study to CVA legislation. The League for CVA, which has been in existence since 1945, when I first sponsored CVA legislation in the United States Senate, includes among its officers and directors representatives of the Washington and Oregon State Granges; Washington and Idaho State Federations of Labor; the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and the Oregon, Idaho, and Montana Farmers' Unions. Upwards of a million persons are represented in these organizations.

Mr. Humphrey writes that "approximately 100 agricultural, industrial, and promotion groups" in the Pacific Northwest are opposed to CVA and later cites as the authority for this statement the Pacific Northwest Development Association of Portland, Oreg. That organization is dedicated primarily to fighting CVA and so the reliability of its assertion should be suspect from the start.

Some weeks ago the association released to the local press a story that 75 organizations were opposed to CVA, a few of which were listed in the news account. A Spokane resident, who was acquainted with the manager of one of the business groups mentioned in the news story, called him on the telephone and discovered this interesting fact: the listing of his organization as opposed to CVA had never been authorized. This manager, a responsible business executive, did not oppose CVA in principle, although he had some idea of his own about the composition of the CVA board.

From personal knowledge I can say that many businessmen of the Northwest are positively interested in CVA legislation, particularly those in smaller businesses that look to CVA for technological assistance. The more progressive chambers of commerce in the region do not go along with the staid and stuffy leadership of the older groups in a few cities.

Whatever the extent of the business opposition cited by Mr. Humphrey, certainly more careful inquiry and evidence are needed than an unverified and one-sided report of the Pacific Northwest Development Association.

Mr. Humphrey writes that "Every major newspaper and more than 85 percent of all newspapers in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are on record against CVA, strong as they are for development of the Columbia Basin." Even if this be true, editorial opinion is not a very good index to the views of the average citizen, as our recent experience in a national election so convincingly demonstrates.

That the more conservative dailies of the Pacific Northwest editorial-wise are sadly behind public thinking is generally well known. The Seattle Times is one of the largest in this class. A typical Seattle Times anti-CVA editorial under the horrific title "Grasping Tentacles of a Valley Authority" turns out to be an abridgement and rehash, with only minor changes in wording, of a statement in a brochure distributed by P. L. Smith, high-paid lobbyist for the National Association of Electric Companies. There are sufficient reasons to believe that the views of the private power lobby, no matter how well received by some editorial writers, are quite unacceptable to the majority of citizens in the Pacific Northwest.

Actually the newspapers of the Northwest are not so adamantly opposed to CVA as Mr. Humphrey tries to make out. The Seattle Times in its better moments, the Portland Oregonian, and other papers, daily or weekly, large or small, have called attention to the need for a more efficient and more comprehensive program of Columbia River development. The Wenatchee World, under the direction of Rufus Woods, has long been a pioneer in this field. Doubts or reservations on particular points of proposed CVA legislation, expressed by some newspapers, are not the same as the blind and die-hard opposition which characterizes papers like the Spokane Spokesman-Review.

Mr. Humphrey also stretches the point when he places municipal-power agencies, including Tacoma and Seattle City Light, into the category of strongly opposed. These municipal agencies which have a long and outstanding record of performance in the public-power field, naturally want to know how they will fare under CVA and they have raised pertinent questions. Full protection of municipal-power interests will be provided in CVA legislation.

Of the seven Governors in States involved in the Columbia Basin, Mr. Humphrey identifies five on record in opposition to valley authorities, but he omits to mention the relevant fact that four of these five are Republicans. The intemperate haste with which the Republican Governors of the Northwest States greeted President Truman's CVA proposal suggests the narrow partisan character of their opposition.

Governor Langlie, of Washington, for example, had pledged in his opening message to the newly assembled State legislature "to examine, critically, any proposed Federal legislation which would subject our power and irrigation resources to further national control," but a few hours after the President's announcement calling upon executive agencies to draft new CVA legislation, Governor Langlie expressed his unqualified (and uncritical) opposition.

The Republican Governors of Oregon and Idaho also made immediate protest. Subsequently, when aides of the President went to the Northwest to confer with the League for CVA on positive legislative recommendations, Langlie complained with ill grace that he had not been consulted. Other opponents of CVA took up the hue and cry. It is obvious that Langlie & Co. are attempting to make a partisan issue of a proposal that has adherents and advocates in both parties.

Adding up his formidable array of foes, comprised mainly of Republican, State, and congressional leaders, the more conservative newspapers and business groups and private power companies, Mr. Humphrey concludes that most of the people of the Pacific Northwest reject the CVA method of regional development. This is a curious kind of arithmetic. More suggestive is the vote of 71 to 26 by which the newly elected house of representatives in the State of Washington passed a memorial endorsing CVA. I daresay this comes closer to portraying public sentiment in the Northwest than Mr. Humphrey's formidable array of foes.

The Plight of Our Elderly Citizens Is a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, hearings are now in progress before the House Committee on Ways and Means regarding the liberalization of the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Last week I submitted my views to the House Committee on Ways and Means and under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am inserting my remarks at this point:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of the committee to discuss the importance of broadening and liberalizing the Social Security Act.

All of you are familiar with the efforts I have been making since I first came to Congress, to liberalize the provisions of the Social Security Act. On various occasions I have introduced amendments to the Social Security Act and made every effort to have them considered by Congress.

In addition, I have joined with groups such as the Townsend Plan, American Pension Plan, and others in support of legislation to provide an adequate old-age pension for the benefit of millions of Americans who are in the twilight of life and dependent upon old-age assistance or other forms of social security benefits.

Time and time again statements have been made on the floor and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of impassioned pleas for action by the House leadership with respect to improving benefits under the Social Security Act. The present plight of elderly citizens is a national disgrace and has existed for the past several years.

It is a known fact that social security is here to stay and that it is intended to provide elderly citizens with a means of livelihood in their declining years. Yet we seem to forget, in viewing earned social-security benefits, that the formula used in computing them has never been changed since the law was first passed. Meanwhile, the cost of living has soared to the point where it has doubled itself. Since 1933 the cost of living index has increased considerably. It is common knowledge that persons gainfully employed are having a difficult time in making both ends meet.

The Congress of the United States has ignored the elderly citizens of America, who, by their labor and taxes, built this great Nation. Yes, we have forgotten them in turning our attention to world problems. Hardly a day passes that we have not heard on the floor of the poor unfortunate people abroad. When you pick up your daily newspaper it is not uncommon to find full-page advertisements directing your attention to the needs of millions of persons abroad. This week the House approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute displaced Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. But there is not one word said in defense of millions of our own American citizens who are on starvation diets and restricted in many instances to one scanty meal a day.

Let us examine, for a moment, the amount of financial assistance we have given to the peoples of the world. According to the United States Department of Commerce, from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1946, in the form of lend-lease aid alone, the American taxpayers contributed $50,243,996,159. In addition we have contributed toward world recovery since July 1, 1945, the sum of $25,495,052,923 which has been allocated as follows:

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation	$2,700,000,000
United Nations Organization	41,426,162
Lend-lease (postwar)	2,163,000,000
International Monetary Fund (authorization)	2,750,000,000
International Bank	635,000,000
Export-Import Bank (loans authorized)	2,258,300,000
Loans to Great Britain and Philippines	4,390,000,000

War Department, grants for relief	$1,771,926,293
Surplus property sales (credits extended)	1,148,000,000
Greek-Turkish loan (authorized amount)	400,000,000
Relief in occupied area (Army)	2,230,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
International Refugee Organization	182,327,468
Economic Cooperation Administration	4,754,000,000
Other appropriations for foreign or international objectives by Eightieth Congress	300,000,000
Total	25,495,052,923

With the passage of the Marshall plan by the Eightieth Congress, we have obligated ourselves to spend what may amount to more than $17,000,000,000 which no doubt will be only a starter in bailing out Europe from its financial mess.

When you add together all of these sums for foreign aid you have the almost unbelievable total of over $90,000,000,000 being sent abroad to help foreign nations.

In other words, since this Nation was founded in 1776 until 1933—a period of 157 years—we spent, in conducting the affairs of Government, less than $90,000,000,000. Yet, in 7 years we have sent abroad over $90,000,000,000, which should not be such a bad record in the eyes of foreigners for a nation that has been called repeatedly a "race of Shylocks."

Let us recognize the fact that all groups in America have received some recognition with respect to the increased cost of living. Virtually all employees in Government and industry have received wage increases. Yet, little attention has been given to the plight of our elderly citizens receiving old-age assistance and no attention has been given to those who earned retirement benefits under the Social Security Act.

For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1948 the minimum figures for bare existence of an individual amounted to $20 for food, $4 for clothing, shelter maintenance $25, and incidentals $4, or a total of $54.

The cost of living in Pennsylvania is typical of conditions in the United States. Yet in Pennsylvania in 1948 the average old-age assistance paid was $23.52 per month. At the same time, retired employees under social security received an average monthly benefit of $25 with $13 additional if married or a total of $38 monthly.

In some States many recipients of old-age assistance receive $10 to $15 a month and are told to live on such an allowance. Yet at the same time Great Britain has been paying, by comparison, $33 monthly to each needy person. Our gifts to the British Socialist Government in recent years have averaged $1,500,000,000 annually; and in dispensing money under the European recovery program Great Britain will receive approximately one-third of the money that American taxpayers are contributing to support the so-called Marshall plan. It is a ridiculous situation to realize that American taxpayers are doling out billions of dollars to foreign nations and permitting them to pay to the needy nearly three times the amount we expend for our own elderly citizens.

Even though we approved legislation to enable States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly, is there anyone in the United States that when he reaches age 65 can be expected to live on $12.75 monthly, $25 monthly, or $38 if married? The answer is so apparent that it is an insult to question one's intelligence to even ask such a ridiculous question. Yet that is exactly what we have been asking the elderly citizens to do the past several years.

I feel it is needless for me to continue to describe the plight of the elderly citizens of this Nation.

You have listened to the testimony of Mr. Russell Saville, of the American Pension Plan, Inc., and to Dr. Francis Townsend and his son, Robert Townsend, who explained the merits of the Townsend plan. Other pension leaders have added their voice in pleading that something be done for our aged and without further delay.

Members of Congress like myself have introduced legislation for the American pension plan and for the Townsend plan. We are serving as members of the congressional steering committee for both groups. We are giving our time and devoting our efforts toward securing some relief for our elderly citizens.

Before coming to Washington for this session of Congress I talked with honest, God-fearing Americans whom I know personally and in whose homes I have visited. I learned of their poverty and the fact that the very roof over their heads is mortgaged to the State in return for the paltry sum they receive in the form of old-age assistance.

Mr. Chairman, there are many Members of Congress who share my belief that something must be done to relieve the want and suffering of our aged.

At this very moment Congress is showing great effort to hurry through the Senate and House an appropriation of nearly $6,000,000,000 for the relief of the people of Europe. Petitions are in circulation asking relief for the people of China. As I said previously, this week we approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute Arabs and Jews.

Why not apply the same concern and attention to the plight of our own American citizens?

All I ask is action by this committee in getting to the floor of the House a bill that will bring relief to our own American people who are victims of neglect by their Government.

Give Man a Chance To Grow as God Intended and Not Seek To Make Him Economy Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following column which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of March 17, 1949:

(By Robert M. Grannis)

The average man comes into this world with only the standard equipment. There are never any de luxe models with fog lights, heaters, and radios. Thanks to modern medical science his life expectancy is pretty high and our educational system puts the right words in his mouth and urges his brain to maximum effort. What he does with the balance of his life as long as he doesn't murder his mother-in-law or get caught with his hand in the boss' till should be his own business.

Give him a copy of the Bible and an admonition to read it whenever he gets a chance and give him some incentive for working his fool head off and chances are he will turn out to be a pretty good Joe. And maybe he'll end up as a de luxe model and other folks will look at him and murmur, that's for me.

But there is a catch. We are so darned enlightened that we—that is the professional perfectionists among us—are forever sticking poor homo sapiens under a glass and telling him what a bum he is. After a while he begins to believe it himself and lives accordingly. Modern technology is determined to eliminate the human element in everything and professional do-gooders are equally determined to make every citizen eligible for a mail order halo. And the politicians! With certain few exceptions they are a race of skywriters in mad pursuit of a Utopian state where the individual can live by merely sticking his hand out the window like a dispatch hook alongside a railroad track. A complete lifetime with all the basic necessities is put in a bag with every one's name on it.

Life in the future at our present rate of progress threatens to become a pain in the neck for anyone over the grade of a moron. If I ever live to see the day when this grand and dizzy country of ours becomes perfect I'm going to get me a sleeping pill and curl up somewhere until the pendulum swings back to sanity.

I'm all for improving the lot of the human race but I resent the idea there are supermen who know all the answers and can wind up the job overnight. The imperfections are what make life interesting and what make one man different from another man. You can dream all you want but the day always comes when your pet dog bites you, your neighbor calls you a nasty name or your favorite newspaper prints your picture upside down or spells your name wrong. But none of these incidents mean that dogs, neighbors or newspapers need immediate or complete reformation.

Take me and rabbits for instance. The other day I started making out an order for seeds. After all, Spring is next week. And like the actors in Harvey, I had an uneasy feeling all the rabbits on Long Island were peering over my shoulder. They couldn't wait for the tender shoots to show. Well, every year I strengthen the fence around my garden and say, there now, no rabbit is gonna get through that. But a few do. Yet I can't feel too mad because the critters have to live and I get my share. I hope I never build the rabbit-proof fence, because some of the fun and the hazards of gardening would be taken away and I'd hate to think the average American rabbit was just a dumb bunny.

Anyway let's take it slow and easy and give a man a chance to live and grow as God intended he should and not seek to make him an economy size model—one just like another all in neat rows, all with labels and all without sin, without hope and without the joy of being different when the spirit moves him. I have a hunch St. Peter hands out halos on a percentage basis and when a perfect man steps up he probably says, "Go away, you never really lived."

Veterans' Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that on tomorrow the veterans' pension bill

will be called up for consideration in the House. It is no secret that I am opposed to this particular piece of legislation. My opposition, however, does not stem from any belief that pensions and compensations now paid to veterans and their dependents are just and equitable. I believe there is ample room for correction of certain inequities that now exist. However, Mr. Speaker, the bill to be considered tomorrow should be returned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for further study, and I hope that is done.

I have today introduced a resolution directing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of existing programs providing monetary benefits in the form of compensation or pensions to the veterans of World Wars I and II.

That resolution reads as follows:

Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study the Federal compensation and pension system for the veterans of World Wars I and II

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of existing programs providing monetary benefits in the form of compensation or pension to the veterans of World Wars I and II with the view of recommending which, if any, of such programs should be revised or expanded and of recommending the policies and procedures that should be followed with respect to such program in order to place them on a sound and equitable basis.

That the committee shall fully examine the relationship between existing or proposed compensation and pension programs for veterans and other Federal programs providing monetary or other benefits for veterans or for veterans and other citizens alike, the present and projected cost of present and proposed compensation and pension programs, and the effect of such cost upon the present and future economy of the Nation, keeping in mind the special obligation of the Nation to the welfare of the veterans and their stake in the future economic stability of the country.

That the committee shall solicit the testimony of outstanding citizens from public and private life, Government agencies concerned with veterans' affairs, fiscal policies, economic conditions, and welfare programs, and representatives from veterans, civic, and educational organizations.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or after the 10th day of December 1950 the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The Proposed Atomic Nuclear Reactor Plant Should Be Placed in the Vicinity of Fort Peck-Glasgow, Mont., Area

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since February 18 of this year I have been in touch with the Atomic Energy Commission urging them that they place their proposed nuclear reactor plant in the vicinity of Fort Peck and Glasgow, Mont.

I feel that in view of the natural advantages it would be an ideal site for the Atomic Energy Commission to build and operate the experimental pilot plant that they have in mind. We have the necessary land. We have good weather conditions. We have people who are all out in behalf of this project and will do everything in their power to have it located there. Not only have I seen Mr. Lilienthal personally in behalf of this project for the Glasgow area but I attended a meeting last Tuesday, March 15, at the Atomic Energy Commission Office with Senators Murray and Ecton and Mr. Gerald Skibbins, who is back here representing the Governor of Montana and interested people in the Fort Peck area.

At that conference certain points were brought out; notably, one having to do with the drainage nature of the ground in that vicinity, which was entitled to serious consideration. However, since that time, this situation has been brought to the attention of the people of northern Montana and they are very much in favor of this particular project being built in their locality.

On Saturday last the Governor of the State of Montana, John W. Bonner, arrived in Washington in behalf of this project and had a meeting with Senator MURRAY and me on that date. On that date I also called up the office of Mr. Lilienthal and asked for an appointment at the earliest possible opportunity so that the Governor of Montana could know all the facts and be able to report the full story directly to the people on his return home. This morning I was informed that Mr. Lilienthal will meet with the Governor and me tomorrow at 11:15 and I have asked Senators MURRAY and ECTON and Congressman D'EWART to accompany us to this meeting with Mr. Lilienthal and members of his staff.

It is of great importance that Montana, which has had no new industries in years and is only now getting started in the western part of the State, should be given consideration in this proposal for an atomic-energy plant in the Glasgow-Fort Peck area. Sufficient power can be made available from Fort Peck for the use of this proposed plant and it is my sincere hope that the Atomic Energy Commission will see all these things which are in Montana's favor and give to our State this plant which we want and need so badly.

With the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam and the building of transmission lines in western Montana, we are on the threshold of being able to use that power for our own development. The proposed 230-kilowatts transmission line from Kerr Dam or Hot Springs to Kalispell will be used for the development of Montana resources in that particular area. The proposed transmission line from Hot Springs or Kerr Dam to Anaconda will be used for the development of plants to fabricate our manganese and phosphate deposits in that area which, at the present time, is shipping its raw phosphate to British Columbia for processing. The proposed extension from Kerr Dam or Hot Springs to Spokane will mean that Montana will get more power in return on a steady yearly basis from the Hungry Horse than she would have were Hungry Horse to remain an isolated unit. These transmission lines are necessary for the development of western Montana because if Hungry Horse unit operates only as an isolated project, it will mean that western Montana will have the use of less than one-half of the power potential of Hungry Horse which could be used in western Montana if these transmission lines were not built and made a part of the Bonneville grid system. Because of the different water seasons, the grid could be regulated in such a manner as to make sure that western Montana at all times receives the largest possible amount of power. In other words the building of these transmission lines is necessary if western Montana is to get the maximum low-cost power benefit out of the Hungry Horse Dam.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to do everything in my power to see that the proposed atomic energy plant is located in the Glasgow-Fort Peck area. I know that I speak for the full Montana delegation when I say that they too are wholeheartedly for this project. Montana, and especially the Fort Peck-Glasgow area, is entitled to this consideration in this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that arrangements have been made to meet with President Truman on this proposed atomic-energy plant tomorrow morning. In view of the fact that the House meets tomorrow at 11 o'clock for a vote on the 70-group air-force bill—H. R. 1473—I will not be present but I do want to record that I am in favor of this bill and support it wholeheartedly.

After the vote on H. R. 1473, the Rankin bill providing pensions for veterans—H. R. 2681—will be brought up. I will try and be present for the debate and vote on this measure but first I will attend the conference with the President, then the conference with Lilienthal in support of an atomic-energy project for northern Montana and then I will return to the House.

Responsibility of the Use of the Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at the thirty-ninth annual banquet of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, held at the Mayflower Hotel on March 9, 1949, our former colleague the Honorable Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, was the principal speaker. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Randolph's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

(Excerpts from an address by Jennings Randolph, assistant to the president, Capital Airlines)

We are in danger of losing democracy by default in the United States if we continue to disregard the responsibility of the use of the ballot. There is a shocking shrinkage in the total number of votes cast in this country as indicated by the figures over a period of years.

In 1896 there were approximately 83 out of every 100 eligible voters who went to the polls and cast their preference for either William Jennings Bryan or William McKinley. In that year, 17,000,000 Americans were of voting age. Twenty years later when Woodrow Wilson defeated Charles Evans Hughes for the Presidency, almost 72 percent of the eligible voters exercised their franchise. It is estimated that in 1916, there were 26,000,000 individuals eligible to vote.

In 1936 there were 80,000,000 eligible voters in this country and 57 out of every 100 cast their votes for either Franklin Roosevelt or Alfred Landon. Twelve years later, in the election of last November between President Truman and Governor Dewey, it is believed that only approximately 51 out of every 100 eligible voters went to the polls. There were about 96,000,000 potential voters in the country.

This definite downward trend in voter participation is a clear-cut challenge to citizens, regardless of party. Why do people fail to vote? Thoughtful men and women must determine the answers because a failure to do so may conceivably find our free elections turning into a rule by the minority instead of the majority.

It appears that the American people are not participating to the extent that voters are in England, Canada, Italy, and France. In recent elections in Australia and New Zealand, 95 percent of the eligible voters in those countries expressed themselves. In the 1948 election in Korea, 90 percent of the registered men and women were at the polls.

It is entirely possible that we have too many so-called outside interests in these days which divert Americans from a keener understanding of their responsibility to vote. There are those who also feel that their votes do not count for much and so they say to themselves, one more vote, more or less, is not important among the millions cast. Other individuals declare they are disgusted with politics. Still others say I am confused about the issues so I'll let John Smith and Mary Jones do the voting.

The reasons set forth for their not voting are certainly not valid but they do exist. We must accept them and set to work at once, before it is too late, to remedy an admittedly bad situation. Individually and collectively, Americans must wage an all-out campaign to increase the interest in voting. Although it may sound farfetched, there is the possibility that almost overnight we may lose our democratic rights because of our failure to use the instruments which have been given to us through generations of devoted men and women who practiced, as well as preached, the system of government which we now inherit and enjoy.

It certainly comes with ill grace for us to continually point the finger of carping criticism at certain peoples and nations as being dictatorial and ruled by small cliques. We cannot expect men and women of other countries to embrace our way of life if we fail to embrace it here at home.

In the District of Columbia nonvoters do not contribute to this franchise delinquency because there is no right of the ballot extended to those eligible men and women who cannot establish legally and properly a bona fide residence in one of our States. Tens of thousands of persons born here, now of voting age, should not be denied the right to vote.

The United States must build now the world's greatest air power, not to win a war, but to prevent it. Russia, or no other country, would dare attack America if it were known that we have ready the unequaled air supremacy to be used for offense as well as defense. Communist leadership is seeking widened circles of domination, but the Soviets will stop short of shooting if they realize that we mean to eliminate appeasement and replace it with strength.

The men in the Kremlin have not moved hastily toward a new war, because the United States is making a success of the Berlin airlift. We must avoid any show of weakness.

We cannot take a backward step. If we do, the harassment we suffer today will become something far more terrible. In the event of another war, those modified versions of the B-29 bomber which we know the Russians possess, will drone the 4,000 miles over the roof of the world.

In our present condition, if war came, the front yards of this Nation might become the front lines. Strategically important centers of population and production would be the targets—not for months after fighting started but for the opening hours or days of battle. Air power means not only fighting craft, with emphasis on long-range bombers, but also industrial and commercial aviation.

The concentration of power in nazism and fascism were as nothing, in comparison with the power wielded by the 12 men of the Kremlin, with Stalin at the top. We've heard it said that the masses of people in Russia don't want war. That's true. The masses of all countries are against war—they're tired of blood, poverty and tyranny.

But when those 12 men and Stalin decide on war, the masses will have had nothing to do with the decision. Their wishes and hopes will not be consulted. Communism is not a political party. It is conspiracy. It operates through treason. No negative attitude can stop it. We must present an affirmative program on every front.

We've also heard it said that there'll be a bust-up in Russia. Was there any break-up when Lenin passed on? The power passed to Stalin. And when Stalin dies someone else will take over.

We must remember that there are many more dues-paying Communists outside of Russia than there are inside. Just 30 years ago communism was fighting a last-ditch battle to hold a small bit of ground. Today, 30 years later, the Communists hold power over one-quarter of the earth's population, and they hold dominion over one-fifth of the world's surface.

The job the United States has in front of it is that of helping to eliminate the breeding spots of communism. Communism does not thrive on freedom, plenty, and security. At least 70 percent of the people in the world are in varying stages of poverty.

Our job, collectively and individually, is to see that such conditions are eradicated and our good economic and political freedom understood around the earth.

World war III is preventable in the degree to which our people are realistic and make an all-out frontal attack on the basic causes of war, as we courageously undertake the challenging task of world leadership for peace and mutual respect. The plain people of Russia do not want war, especially with the United States, and if we vigorously use the press and radio and motion picture—and every legitimate means of information and communication—men and women in other lands will ultimately lift the iron curtains themselves, and individual freedom will replace controlled dictatorship.

But we must have the necessary cushion of time in which to do this job—and that can be gained for us with the air power and the complements of land and sea units—plus a top production attainable by the absence of strikes and the clash of one pressure group against another.

America was great enough to possess the leadership for winning two world wars. Now we must work and pray to be given the determination and the goodness to win the peace for the weary peoples of the earth. It is an individual and collective responsibility which all true Americans share—whether native born or naturalized.

In World Wars I and II we had not only manpower and productivity, but also time and distance on our side. If world war III comes, we might have the first two, but the latter two elements would be gone. A pilotless plane flies 5,000 miles in about 20 hours. Germicidal warfare is ready to be used, and atom bombs are 50 times more destructive than when first dropped by this country from planes over Hiroshima. A jet-powered plane streaks across the continent from Washington State to Washington, D. C., in 3 hours and 46 minutes. Giant planes, fueled in flight, fly around the world—23,452 miles, in 94 hours and 1 minute.

This country is far in advance of any other, partly because of unprecedented transportation developments. First it was the waterways, and Federal funds in the amount of more than $5,000,000,000 have been spent in this task. Next came the railroads with the Government giving in outright land grants more than 155,000,000 acres, that the tracks might open up new empires for trade. Highways were the third method, and more than $8,000,000,000 of national money has gone into the effort for the finest road system in the world. Now airways are being fashioned—with airports and planes and personnel doing a magnificent work in civilization's onward and upward flight. Funds spent on transportation are usually returned 100 percent with a dividend in better living as well.

Our growing air transport industry, now possessed of more than 1,000 planes, is a vital segment of strength. Scheduled domestic air lines carried approximately 3,000,000 passengers in 1941. Following the war in 1945, the figure was raised to about 6,000,000. In 1946 it had jumped to 12,000,000, and last year, with the national travel trend by rail and bus being down, the air lines handled slightly less than 13,000,000 individuals. In 1948, it is believed that more than 13,000,000 passengers were carried in the United States, and an over-all world figure of 25,000,000.

A hundred years ago, it took 25 to 30 days to make the trip from the east to the west by boat. Ten years later a combination mail coach and train service was established with

about the same time requirements. In 1861, the first pony express-rail combination was used to cut the time to 12 days. In 1860, the first transcontinental train service was inaugurated with 7-day schedules. The first transcontinental air mail services came in 1921 with flight time of 33 hours. Six years later, the first commercial air travel service was furnished with 35 hours of flight time.

It now requires a motorist 10 days to travel from coast to coast driving 10 hours a day at an average of 45 miles an hour. The fastest transcontinental buses require 5 days, and the best trains 2½ days. The nonstop time for transcontinental air-line flights for scheduled air carriers is 11 hours.

St. Patrick and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said in jest that the only difference between the sons of Erin and the sons of Aaron is in the spelling of the names. The following column which appeared in the New York Post on March 17, 1949, further evidences how well people of diverse origin can get along together:

ST. PATRICK AND ISRAEL

(By Frank Kingdon)

Here is a story out of Israel that I have been saving for St. Patrick's Day.

The Republic of Eire knew by experience the difficulties that Israel faced when it began its fight for independence.

It decided to offer what aid it could. Accordingly it notified Israel that it would provide several hundreds of tons of beef. Israel was only to glad to accept. Thus Eire gave beef to Israel.

A problem arose. Not all the people of Israel nor all those who seek admission are strict adherents of the kosher dietary laws. But some are, so any beef provided for general distribution had to be kosher.

Israel told Eire its difficulty. The trouble was quickly overcome when Eire agreed to have a rabbi come to supervise the killing of the beef creatures. A rabbi went to Dublin.

He did the best he could but too much meat was on its way for him to give attention to all of it. The result was that additional rabbis had to go to help him.

Thus there developed quite a colony of rabbis in Dublin.

They were accepted without difficulty. There is no anti-Semitism in Eire. They are not unattractive men. Some colleens have found them positively attractive. There is romance in the air.

The rabbis and the butchers have worked faithfully. The flow of this beef to Israel and to Jewish agencies throughout Europe has been steady.

It has been put to good use.

I have seen refugees boarding ships at Marseille, airplanes at Munich, a ship at Cyprus.

As they board these ships and planes which carry them to Israel each one is given a loaf of bread, a pound of meat, some cigarettes and fruit.

In every case that pound of meat comes from Eire. So every refugee starts for Eretz Israel with a pound of Irish kosher meat under his arm.

Marcella says: St. Patrick proves himself a Christian still.

Hon. Thomas P. Gore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial tributes to a great Oklahoma statesman who died in Washington this week:

[From Washington Daily News of March 17, 1949]

THERE WAS A MAN

No one who knew Senator Thomas Pryor Gore will ever forget him. He was a remarkable man, great of mind and heart. In a time when there were giants in the United States Senate he towered among them.

Here we are using clichés, something Tom Gore never did. His ready tongue could always deliver new and colorful phrases. He liked to quote Talleyrand: "It's worse than a crime; it's a blunder."

He was a scholar of restless curiosity, a historian who knew the why and when of everything that had been tried before and failed in Babylon or Athens or ancient Rome. He thought America should stay out of World War I and voted against all measures leading up to our entry, well knowing that the voters of his State would defeat him for it, which they did. He did not believe in the New Deal philosophy that the Government owed voters a living, and opposed that after he was returned to the Senate in 1930, knowing that the voters would defeat him again, which they did. And when he was beaten, he said: "The law of evolution is adapt or die, and I didn't adapt."

Totally blind since childhood, he was fortunate enough to have a devoted, helpful wife. With her aid and through his own tireless efforts, he rose above his physical handicap, and he did not believe the Government should feed or pamper anybody. When Senator WAGNER'S social-security law provided aid for the needy blind, Senator Gore observed: "You will find that this legislation will have a very bad effect upon the eyesight of the Nation."

If there is a Valhalla to which brave old Senators go, Tom Gore of Oklahoma sits there today, swapping yarns with John Sharp Williams, Ollie James, Jim Reed, Bill Borah, and old Bob La Follette.

[Editorial from the Washington Post of March 18, 1949]

THOMAS P. GORE

The career of Thomas Pryor Gore, the Oklahoman who became the first blind member of the United States Senate, was an inspiration to the afflicted. In childhood Mr. Gore lost the sight of both eyes in two successive accidents. It was an extraordinary mischance, but, far from embittering the young Gore, it seems to have released a store of grit and ambition which landed him in the front rank of the legal profession and then put him in the Senate. Nor did his success seem the result of conscious compensation. If there were any compensation for the hard blow that life had dealt him, it came in the woman he married. Their life together was a long and enduring and enriching companionship. Gore had a serene disposition, a disposition that may indeed have been sweetened by his adversity. Nevertheless he had his own brand of ruggedness, expressed in his isolationist and free-enterprise convictions. If, as Mr. Churchill has said, a man ought to be judged by his sincerity, Mr. Gore passed the test with honors. He never let the sweets of preferment influence either his judgment in the Senate or his appeal to the electorate. He was rejected by the people because he refused to allow himself to be swept along by the New Deal tide. Mr. Gore remained philosophical as he went back to his law practice. He was one of the best-read men in the Senate, an accomplished orator who had a Taftian knowledge of the facts about any matter on which he spoke, and he had a handsome presence. It is a question for the psychologists whether he would have attained his laurels without the spur of his disabilities.

Thoughts on the One Hundredth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there are few and perhaps no comparable areas that has as many scenic attractions set apart as national parks and monuments as has northern Arizona. The people of Arizona are duly appreciative of that fact and invite the rest of the world to come and enjoy these great natural features and along with them the man-made evidence of prehistoric past. All this is indicated by editorials in the Arizona Daily Sun of Flagstaff, Ariz., early this month on the occasion of the one hundredth birthday of the Interior Department.

While the editorial criticizes the Government in certain respects, it has high praise for the Park Service and regards that great Service as having done an outstanding piece of work, although it is often regarded as a stepchild in the great Department of Interior. A part of the editorial pertaining to the National Park Service is as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HAS A BIRTHDAY

This stepchild of government has done an outstanding job in the face of a chronic lack of funds.

Employees are poorly paid (in comparison with the pay for highly skilled work in other fields) but for some unaccountable reason those same workers have probably the highest service morale to be found in any governmental organization with the possible exception of the Marine Corps.

Perhaps this is because people who work for the National Park Service are not there for the money (!) but because they love their jobs and choose to work at what they like in spite of the lousy pay scale.

Few areas in the Nation benefit from the activities of the Park Service to as great an extent as does northern Arizona, with its many monuments and parks.

We wonder how many of our residents, including those whose income may be traced directly to the tourist business, realize the value of the Park Service in maintaining and protecting these wonderful attractions.

Frankly, if the areas were not protected, it goes without saying that they would long since have been destroyed with the exception, probably, of the Grand Canyon, which is a little too big to be messed up even by those strange people who go about tearing up, marking up, initialing, and otherwise spoiling public attractions and conveniences.

If the figures were at hand we would discover, we believe, that the money spent in northern Arizona by visitors brought here by our parks and monuments represents the most important single factor in the economic life stream of the area.

And so, on this birthday of the Department of the Interior, we say congratulations to the National Park Service and its loyal, enthusiastic, hard-working employees. And it is our sincere wish that the good Lord and a more benign Congress will look with kindlier eyes on the National Park Service in the years ahead!

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, Supports Veterans' Hospital Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit the testimony of Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, relative to proposed curtailment of the veterans' hospital construction program that was presented on March 18, 1949, to a special subcommittee, composed of Senator PEPPER, chairman, Senators HUMPHREY and MORSE, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Gentlemen, the recent action of the Veterans' Administration canceling a portion of its proposed construction program deleted two hospitals planned to serve Michigan veterans—one a 200-bed general medical and surgical unit at Grand Rapids and the other a 500-bed tuberculosis sanatorium at Detroit. Announcement of this decision led me to investigate the adequacy of all hospital facilities for veterans in Michigan.

My investigation reveals that Michigan has 1 veterans' hospital bed for every 197 veterans, whereas the national average is 146. On the basis of this information and further information which I am submitting, I am thoroughly convinced that the cancellation of the above two projects would be a distinct injustice to the veterans of Michigan and I urge this subcommittee, as strongly as I can, that every step must be taken to give Michigan veterans justice in this matter.

Michigan's population has grown tremendously in the past decade; the 1948 official estimate shows a total of over 6,000,000 persons of whom approximately 15 percent are veterans. This is well above the national average. The latest estimate of the number of veterans in Michigan is 885,000, of whom 648,000 are veterans of World War II and the remaining 237,000 served in World War I or other wars.

The Veterans' Administration has the following facilities in Michigan for treatment and care of veterans:

1. General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Dearborn, 1,100 beds.
2. Marine Hospital, Detroit, 175 beds.
3. Percy Jones Hospital, Battle Creek, 200 beds.
4. Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Battle Creek, 2,148 beds.

Making a grand total of facilities now in operation, 3,623 beds. In addition, the following facilities are under construction:

General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Iron Mountain (open September 1, 1949), 250 beds.

General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Saginaw (open January 1, 1950), 250 beds.

General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Ann Arbor (open January 1, 1950), 500 beds.

After these hospitals are completed, the total number of beds available under the Veterans' Administration hospital program will be 4,623.

That number will represent 1 bed for every 197 veterans domiciled in Michigan. Every adjacent State has a much larger number of veteran hospital beds available, in relation to population.

After all projects now under construction are completed, the Veterans' Administration reports ratios of beds to veterans as follows: Wisconsin, 1–134; Illinois, 1–135; New York, 1–141; Minnesota, 1–138; Indiana, 1–158; and Ohio, 1–175.

Throughout the Nation there will be one bed for every 146 veterans.

Present facilities, including those under construction, plus the two additional veterans' hospitals requested at Detroit and Grand Rapids, would provide only one veteran hospital bed for every 168 veterans in Michigan. This would still leave Michigan far short of the national average.

Perhaps one reason for the failure of the Veterans' Administration to provide adequate bed space for Michigan voters is the fact that this State is making unusual efforts itself to provide for the welfare of its veterans. At Grand Rapids we have the Michigan Veterans' Facility furnishing domiciliary care and temporary hospitalization for veterans and their wives or widows. It has a rated capacity of 1,050 beds, of which over 850 are currently filled although the newest wing was just recently completed. Less than half the cost of operating this facility is reimbursed from the Federal Treasury.

In addition to services at the Michigan Veterans' Facility, the State provides many other benefits for its veterans. These include a newly-constructed Veterans' Readjustment Center at Ann Arbor providing medical, psychiatric, and vocational assistance to more than 500 veterans per year and the Veterans' Vocational School near Kalamazoo, which is a rehabilitation center serving at least 200 veterans per year. The Michigan Veterans' Benefit Trust Fund also provides funds for emergency hospitalization and other assistance to World War II veterans, administered through local veterans' committees. In addition, the State has 140 veterans of World War II and 147 veterans of earlier wars who are patients in State-supported hospitals for the mentally ill. Because no Veterans' Administration facilities are provided in Michigan for tubercular veterans, our State has had to assume a large portion of the financial responsibility for the care of approximately 600 veterans now hospitalized in State, county, or private sanatoria. I will later discuss this particular phase of the problem in greater detail.

Michigan faces a serious crisis in the matter of providing an adequate number of hospital beds for its citizens—nonveterans as well as veterans. I am firmly resolved to do all in my power to press forward with new hospital construction on every front—hospitals for the tuberculous, for the mentally ill, for the aged and for children, and for the general medical and surgical care needed by our citizens. Especially, I am determined to push ahead with the State's own hospital construction program, including one new mental hospital and additions to another, and the construction of a tuberculosis sanatorium at Houghton on the upper peninsula.

One of the factors contributing to the seriousness of our situation has been the failure of the Veterans' Administration to provide a sufficient number of hospital beds for our veteran population. This failure is apparent in the unfavorable ratio of 1 bed to 197 veterans to which I previously referred.

Existing Federal statutes provide that all veterans having service-connected disabilities are entitled to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities. However, the Veterans' Administration maintains no facilities for the treatment of tuberculosis in Michigan, and as a result there are 150 service-connected cases recognized as such by the Veterans' Administration but hospitalized in State, county, or other sanatoria within the State. There are 200 other cases on which claims for service connection are pending. There are an additional 250 veterans whose claims have been denied and who are in tuberculosis sanatoria in this State. Some of these cases are being appealed, but at the present time the total cost for approximately 400 tubercular veterans is being paid by the State of Michigan. It is to be regretted that many veterans who are residents of Michigan are of necessity being treated in Veterans' Administration facilities in several other States. The nearest VA facilities for tubercular patients are at Dayton, Ohio, or Milwaukee, Wis. The total number hospitalized outside the State is about 450; and when these are added to the 600 who are in nonveteran hospitals in Michigan, it appears that we have a total of 1,050 tubercular Michigan veterans for whom no Veterans' Administration beds are available within the State. This number does not include the many veterans needing tubercular care who have refused hospitalization because it required separation from their families for a long period of time and at a considerable distance from their homes. It is also known that many of those who do go to out of State facilities do not stay for the full time required, but return home before being completely cured.

This situation is particularly significant in southeastern Michigan (including Detroit and Wayne County), which is one of the three areas in the State deficient in facilities for the treatment of tuberculosis. Because of its rapid industrial growth, crowded urban-living conditions, and the shortage of facilities, this area has 50 to 60 percent of the total number of cases in the State and the death rate has been more than twice that of the remainder of the State.

To further substantiate my request that the 500-odd tuberculosis hospital at Detroit be restored to the construction program of the Veterans' Administration, I would like to point out that figures just received from local officials show that at the present time there are 415 tubercular veterans from Wayne County alone who are hospitalized in Michigan, of whom 62 are service-connected cases for which the Veterans' Administration is paying the charges. On the remaining 353, service connection either has not yet been determined or has been denied, and the State is paying all expenses. While no definite records are available, representatives of veterans' organizations and the Michigan Veterans' Benefit Trust Fund have knowledge of a large number of veterans in the Detroit and Wayne County area who are not at present hospitalized for the reasons stated previously.

There are at the present time 2,200 tuberculosis beds operating in Wayne County, with 75 more to be opened immediately. Nevertheless, the area has an urgent waiting list of 125 nonveteran cases. To these should be added many other cases needing hospitalization but not reported. Removal of veterans from existing facilities in the area would make it possible to care more adequately for the nonveteran population. I cannot urge too strongly that full consideration be given to all these factors and that the 500-bed hospital for tubercular veterans be reinstated at this time.

The 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital at Grand Rapids is also a very badly needed facility. For many years, until 1935, there was not a single general medical and surgical hospital bed for the 196,000 veterans then in the State. Michigan was given the

first hospital of this type with the erection of the Dearborn facility, where medical care can now be given to 1,200 veterans. The additional facilities now under construction will serve the eastern Lower Peninsula and the Upper Peninsula. Unless the Grand Rapids hospital is built, no facilities will be provided for approximately 200,000 veterans now living in the 30 counties of Western Michigan. At present, many veterans from this area are sent to Illinois or Wisconsin for needed medical care. This situation is made more acute by the lack of a sufficient number of hospital beds for the general public, as shown in the Michigan hospital plan prepared in accordance with the Federal hospital construction act.

I firmly believe the above facts completely justify the reinstatement of this project.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I wish to assure you that Michigan is only interested in its just needs. As I have pointed out, our ratio of veteran hospital beds to our veteran population is only one bed for 197 veterans under the present schedule, and will be only one bed for 168 veterans if the two canceled hospitals are reinstated in the construction program. On the other hand, the average for the Nation is one bed for each 146 veterans.

Michigan, as a relatively high-income State, contributes a larger than average percentage of total Federal tax revenues. In return all that the people of Michigan ask is that the benefits they receive be proportionately the same as in other States.

Although these figures fully justify our claim to the additional facilities, I would not ask that they be reconsidered unless there were a real need for them in the areas they would serve. I believe that the foregoing information demonstrates the importance of these two projects to the Detroit and Grand Rapids areas.

The need is substantiated; the citizens of Michigan expect the support of the Veterans' Administration in providing for the veterans of Michigan hospital service equal to that given to veterans in other comparable States. I strongly urge reinstatement of these two essential projects.

A Strong Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Boston City Council:

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Boston, in meeting assembled, hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, a strong Atlantic Pact with teeth in it, taking full advantage of every provision in the Constitution of the United States for the peace and security of the people of our own land, and the peoples of every other land who are now in danger of losing their God-given rights because of the machinations of the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Boston favors enactment of appropriate legislation which will curb the treasonable activities of the Communist Party and its members, and its sympathizers, in our land, to the extent of outlawing, if necessary, the existence of said party within our shores.

In city council March 7, 1949, adopted.

Pittsburgh Promotes Progress—Plant Expansion Leads in Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the New York Times of March 20, 1949:

PLANT EXPANSIONS LEAD IN PITTSBURGH—BUILDER COMPARES PROGRAM WITH 6½-YEAR BACKLOG TO COST $43,780,000,000

In the record business expansion and civic development under way in Pittsburgh, more than two-thirds of the almost $1,000,000,000 worth of plants and facilities are represented by industrial and commercial construction. For two of the largest individual projects the Turner Construction Co., of New York, has been selected. More than 25 large industrial expansion programs are under way in the greater Pittsburgh area at this time, according to the Pittsburgh Industrial Development Council.

The grand total of improvements newly completed or scheduled for construction in the Pittsburgh area, included in the active list of the PIDC, amounts to $924,521,000. These projects are providing more than $25,000,000 in new office buildings, more than $211,000,000 in civic improvements, more than $36,000,000 in expansion of educational facilities, and $652,221,000 in industrial-plant expansions.

In commenting on the significance of this report, J. P. H. Perry, vice president of the Turner Construction Co., said that a tabulation he had received in February showed the national backlog of proposed construction at $43,780,000,000. Even with construction activity declining slightly, he continued, this backlog represents probably 6½ years of construction at the present annual rate.

He called attention to the fact that in spite of the general belief that industrial building construction has passed its volume peak, industrial building activity recorded the greatest gain of any type of construction in the backlog of 1948 compared to 1947.

TYPES OF BUILDING SHOWN

The Pittsburgh report for the first time shows a cross-section of details of the kinds of industrial construction programs now being pushed. Steel, chemical, food, and automotive manufacturers appeared foremost in volume of construction in the projects in the Pittsburgh area.

In a recapitulation of steel-plant expansions, PIDC cited the following:

Allegheny Ludlum Corp. is carrying out a 5-year expansion program amounting to $31,000,000.

American Cladmetals Corp. has taken over a steel plant in Rosslyn for $500,000 and will produce a new clad metal of copper sandwiched between sheets of stainless steel.

Crucible Steel Co. of America has planned a $30,000,000 expansion program which will include a new hot-strip mill.

Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. is spending $210,000,000 on improvements, mostly in Pittsburgh areas.

Pittsburgh Steel Co. has spent $10,000,000 on expansion since the war.

Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Corp. bought a Government-owned plant at Glassport for $1,250,000.

United States Steel is reported spending $135,000,000 on construction and equipment, but isn't certain what totals will be spent in Pittsburgh.

Taylor Forge is reported to be establishing a $200,000 plant.

Superior Steel Co. has installed a new 20-inch continuous hot strip mill at Carnegie for high-luster steel.

CHEMICAL EXPANSIONS

In the chemical industries, the following expansions were cited by PIDC:

Consolidation Coal Co. has built a $500,000 pilot plant for the carbonization and gasification of coal.

Koppers Co. bought 129 acres of the 350-acre Government-owned plant at Kabuta and is using its part of the plant and a $2,000,000 addition for the production of plastics chemicals.

Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp. plans to build a million-dollar distillation plant.

Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Corp. has built a $2,000,000 new unit at its Neville Island plant.

In the food industries, PIDC cited the following plant projects as significant:

H. J. Heinz Co. will begin a $15,000,000 building program of four buildings and extensive improvements in existing buildings.

National Biscuit Co. has a $5,000,000 expansion in East Liberty, to include a new cracker bakery covering 326,000 square feet and complete remodeling of an old building.

Rieck-McJunkin Dairy is planning a new $1,000,000 ice-cream plant.

In utilities, West Penn Power Co. is in the midst of a 5-year expansion program reported by PIDC to involve about $85,000,000. Sanderson & Porter, New York consulting engineers, have been active on parts of this program. Duquesne Light Co. has an $80,000,000 expansion program under way. When completed, this will include two new 81,000-kilowatt generators at the Phillips power station and expanded distributing facilities.

Among automobile plant expansions, leading projects include two new General Motors plants involving an estimated $20,000,000 and to employ about 2,700 employees.

The Cheap Way To Effectively Combat the Devastating Spread of Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is embarking upon a program of spending approximately $17,000,000,000 to assist the European nations on their program of recovery.

One of the principal reasons and purposes that causes this Government to tax its people to furnish the money for such a program is the hope and belief that it will assist European countries in resisting the spread of communism.

In addition to this program, we are now beginning to seriously contemplate furnishing the money to rearm certain European countries and England; and if we embark on this program, several billions of American dollars will be expended in addition to the $17,000,000,000 required over a 5-year period to complete the European recovery plan, ordinarily called the Marshall plan.

I do not wish to discuss in Congress of the United States at the present time the merits or the necessity of either of these programs. What I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress, whose obligation it is to preserve the American way of life, and to secure this country from our enemies is this: Without spending a dollar we can place laws on the statute books of this country that will go a long way toward locating, identifying, prosecuting, and convicting the enemies of our country that live among us. The laws which we have at the present time are wholly inadequate to meet the menace of communism here in America. For more than 4 years this country has been a prey to hundreds of thousands of Communists that live in America and who take orders from and owe allegiance to Moscow. While we have learned of some of their traitorous acts, the story will probably never be told fully, as to the great damage that these parasites and termites have done to the American people, and up to this good hour we do not have adequate laws to protect ourselves from them.

The ancient law against treason is so circumscribed and limited as to be inadequate to meet the many crimes that are being committed by people who live in America and who have been awarded citizenship here, in times of peace. The law against treason was primarily to catch national criminals that commit the act of treason and try to overthrow this Government in times of war. For 4 years we have had a war going on. While it is not a shooting war and is referred to as a cold war, yet the devastating effects of the present war may be as bad as if it were a shooting war. If we have no adequate laws in America that will mete out just punishment to the traitors who live among us and apply their trade in peacetime, we cannot protect this Government. The thieves and traitors that have honeycombed our Government, stolen secret plans and military data, not only on the atomic bomb but including much other material that is vital to the very existence of this country, is well known to the American people. If we have a shooting war which we all hope and pray will not occur, the damage that has already been done by these traitors that live among us may cost a million American lives.

We are existing under a set of laws that does not furnish adequate punishment in peacetime for these high crimes. We are confronted by a situation where every State in the Union and the National Government have, through long experience, built up a great wall of protection for our people against ordinary crimes. If the crime of murder is committed anywhere in the United States, adequate laws exist to punish the criminal and deter other potential criminals from committing the same crime. Yet, crimes are being committed among us that may cause the murder of tens of thousands of American citizens and in peacetime we have no adequate law to protect ourselves. Furthermore, some of the laws that we have against espionage and sabotage have statutes of limitation attached to them where the lapse of time constitutes a perfect cloak of protection for the men and women who commit these crimes. If it happens that they commit these crimes and are not discovered within a comparatively short period of time, then after exposure and apprehension they can plead the statute of limitation and go scott free. In addition to our inadequate laws against these high crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the committees of Congress, in the past 4 years, have discovered that there are more than 100 subversive communistic organizations of people living in America and who go about day after day spreading propaganda by word of mouth and through the mails to corrupt and destroy our people. These traitors who are organized and banded together under many names and titles are under the direct command of Stalin and Moscow. Our Federal Constitution which we all hold sacred gives to these Reds a certain amount of protection but it is my belief that we can place laws on the statute books of the United States within the limits of the Federal Constitution that will identify and expose these organizations so that the American people may know who they are and so that the American people, when they receive letters through the mail with this subtle Red propaganda in them, will know from whom these letters and this mail comes.

These Communists are busy undertaking to stir up strife all over America. They seize upon every opportunity to create class hatred. They sneak in the back door of our great colleges and universities with cunning literature that corrupts the youth and future leaders of America. They stimulate race hatred. They have been smart enough to induce many good American citizens to join their ranks not knowing that buried beneath their polished language, their subtle approach, is the monstrous design of Moscow to destroy America. We ought to protect our mails insofar as the Constitution will permit us under the free-speech clause and when the mails of this Government are used by a band of Communists for this purpose a law could be enacted to require that the envelope or the outside wrapper of this mail coming from a Communist organization have plainly marked on it that it is coming from Communists. This will let the people who get this mail know that even if it reads good, it is coming from the enemies of America.

A law ought to be passed within the bounds of the Federal Constitution making it a felony to use the mails for subversive purposes. We now have statutes which protect the people of America from the use of the mails for fraudulent purposes or for the circulation of obscene literature. Our Pure Food and Drug Act protects the people of America from false and fraudulent advertising. Why can we not protect the people of this country by requiring the Communist organizations and the Communist individuals who use our mails to distribute their subversive literature to plainly identify themselves on the outside of the mail so that our people will no longer be deceived by them?

There is a great field lying open to this Congress where we can place protective laws that will not cost America a cent and that will go a long way toward stopping the various Communist movements in America from making victims of tens of thousands of our people and which will go a long way toward protecting the security of our Government. I think that the Members of this Congress, regardless of politics, should be greatly concerned about improving our body of laws on this subject. Members of Congress who are experienced lawyers should give their combined effort to writing laws that will protect America from the evil that is running rampant and wide open among us.

I sincerely hope that we may, before it is too late, identify these scoundrels for what they are and enact a body of laws that will enable us to apprehend, try, and convict them, for the crimes they are committing every day.

Increase in Price of Central Valley Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ruth Finney, the Washington news staff correspondent for the San Francisco News:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT WATER PRICE TREBLING IS FEARED—STAND TAKEN BY CALIFORNIA OFFICIALS IS HIT HARD BY WELCH, STRAUS

(By Ruth Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 9.—The price of Central Valley water will treble, not double, if California officials have their way and prevail upon Congress to forbid the Interior Department to use the power interest component to help pay out Central Valley project. This was disclosed in testimony here before the House Public Lands Committee. Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, after studying the testimony of the California officials, questioned Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus on the effect of amendments they sponsor.

The three officials are Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., an assistant attorney general of California who appeared as spokesman for the Irrigation Districts Association of California; Edward Hyatt, State engineer and executive officer of the Water Projects Authority of California, appearing at the direction of C. H. Purcell, chairman of the authority; and Northcutt Ely, special counsel for the authority, who testified for the Colorado River Board of California.

STATEMENT CITED

At a hearing, called 2 days after these Californians had testified, Representative WELCH read this much of the Hyatt statement:

"The interest component of revenues, including the power revenues, should not be assigned or otherwise applied to repayment of capital or other costs, but should be ac-

counted for and paid as compensation for use of the funds advanced. When costs allocated to irrigation have been assigned for repayment from net power revenues and net revenues from municipal water supply, or miscellaneous purposes, such net revenues should be reasonably apportioned each year so as to apply to the annual payment required for such assignment."

Representative WELCH: "May I ask of Commissioner Straus: If this aid were removed, and irrigators in Central Valley required to pay directly the full amount of the capital investment allocated to irrigation, is it not a fact we would have to pay approximately three times as much for water?"

REFERS TO REPORT

Mr. STRAUS: "I think the answer to that is generally 'Yes,' and I would like to explain the basis. There is before the Congress, and there has been since 1947, the allocations report of the Secretary of the Interior on the CVP, known as House Document 146. That clearly sets out the allocation to power and to irrigation; the amount that will have to be repaid by irrigation, the amount that the irrigators will be expected to pay directly, and the amount that in behalf of irrigation will be repaid by the power revenues in the CVP, and will be repaid by the application of the interest component in the CVP.

"As I recall that document, the amount to be repaid directly by the irrigation on the amortization for irrigation in the CVP is approximately $55,000,000, which is only a small part of the amount that will have to be repaid on the irrigation investment, an additional amount being repaid by the application of the power-interest component.

"The additional amount to be repaid in behalf of irrigation by the application of the power-interest component * * * is approximately $110,000,000. So power is paying through the application of the interest component, in behalf of the irrigators, approximately twice what the irrigators are paying directly.

"ADDITIONAL BURDEN

"If the power component was not to be so applied—if the power-interest component was not so applied, the irrigators would have to carry that additional burden, which would mean that in their repayment of the capital investment allocated to irrigation, they would have to repay directly a total of about three times as much as they do under the present allocation procedure and under the present law."

Representative WELCH: "Mr. Commissioner, is it not a further fact that this is the first time that a high California State official has publicly recommended such an enormous increase to the water user and reclamation farmer in the Central Valley?"

Mr. STRAUS: "I am not personally familiar with any instance in the Central Valley or in any other of the 17 Western States in the course of a good many negotiations where any representatives of irrigators has been desirous of paying a larger amount than required."

Representative WELCH: "The water commissioner, Mr. Hyatt, was addressing himself principally to the great Central Valley. That was the reason I applied my question to the Central Valley."

HOW COULD THEY PAY?

Representative D'EWART: "I would like to know how the irrigators of the Central Valley could pay three times as much under the irrigation law as they are now paying, when they are required right now to pay according to their ability to do so."

Mr. STRAUS: "I do not think they could pay three times as much as they are now paying. That is why the Congress has provided, and the administration has provided, that they be relieved of this burden by the application of the interest components from power revenues. Perhaps they could, but the rate now is, on the CVP at canal side, including the annual O. and M. charge, $3.50. That is not a high charge as compared to some existent charges, but I could not recommend, with respect to the congressional policy of not setting up projects that impose an intolerable or unbearable burden beyond the irrigator's ability to pay, any large increases. The policy of the Bureau of Reclamation, of course, is to figure the costs so as to provide the return that the law requires obtained, but not to operate it on a what-the-traffic-can-bear philosophy."

INFEASIBLE PROJECT

Representative D'EWART: "You are saying that even though this interest component on power investment was not applied on irrigation, that they would not have to pay three times as much, because it would still be based on their ability to pay."

Mr. STRAUS: "I think you would just have an infeasible project. Of course, the other alternative is that you could extend the time a tremendous amount."

Representative D'EWART: "But not under the present law."

Mr. STRAUS: "That is right."

Representative WELCH: "If the aid were removed, is it not a fact that irrigation would either have to pay or go without water?"

Mr. STRAUS: "That would be the end result, because it would be an infeasible project."

The Interior Department based its CVP allocation on an opinion of its Solicitor that the power-interest component could be so used to aid irrigation. That was the start of the present attack on the reclamation law and reclamation officials.

GOP OVERRIDES WELCH

In the Eightieth Congress, the Rockwell bill was introduced to forbid use of the interest component in this way. Representative WELCH didn't let the bill come out of his committee until this was taken from the bill. But on the floor of the House, A. J. Elliott, aided by Republicans Forest Harness and Ben Jensen, and the House Republican leadership, put it back in.

This year's reclamation bill, now before the House Public Lands Committee and drafted jointly by the National Reclamation Association and the Bureau of Reclamation, leaves the Solicitor's opinion and the interest component untouched. Representatives SHEPPARD and PHILLIPS, of California, introduced bills to forbid use of the power-interest component to aid irrigators. Arvin B. Shaw brought before the committee a series of amendments which, if adopted, would make the pending bill resemble the Sheppard and Phillips bills. And Mr. Hyatt and Mr. Ely testified they favored forbidding use of the interest component to aid irrigators.

SHAW IS ALONE

The Public Lands Committee concluded its hearings with a statement from Clifford H. Stone, head of the NRA's legislative committee, that Arvin Shaw is alone, in the committee, an advocate of his amendments.

Mr. Speaker, there is a large number of new Members in the Eighty-first Congress. It might be well at this time to give them an idea of the size of the great Central Valley. The Central Valley is as large as the State of Massachusetts, the State of Connecticut, the State of Rhode Island, and one-half of the State of New Jersey.

It is an empire in itself with two great navigable rivers, one running from the north and one running from the south into the Bay of San Francisco, which is an arm of the Pacific Ocean.

Moses Austin and the Lure of Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Adella Breckenridge Moore:

MOSES AUSTIN AND THE LURE OF LEAD

(By Adella Breckenridge Moore)

Moses Austin was born at Durham, New Haven County, Conn., on October 4, 1765, and died at the home of his daughter, Emily, the wife of James Bryan, who lived on a farm which bordered Hazel Run on the east, in St. Francois County on June 10, 1821. He was the son of Elias and Eunice Austin and was the youngest of 10 children.

His mother died when he was 10 years old and for a period of weeks or months he lived, as also did the two children nearest him in age, in the home of my great-grandfather, Daniel Phelps.

Of those days the story has been handed down in my family that my great-grandmother, Elizabeth Greene Phelps, was forced to take extreme care in making her biscuit with butter instead of lard for the lard used for shortening would nauseate the older brother extremely. It was this Daniel Phelps, who became very dissatisfied to remain in Connecticut after the drowning of his wife and baby daughter, Ruth, for which he blamed himself and followed Moses Austin to Mine-a-Breton in the very early days of the past century.

He had spied out the land and was returning to Connecticut to settle up his business affairs there preparatory to going into business in Mine-a-Breton in 1804. Moses Austin took the opportunity to send his son Stephan F. Austin, then a lad of about 12 years, to Connecticut to be placed in a school of Phelps' choosing, which was Colchester Academy, where he remained 3 years. Daniel Phelps lived to know that Stephan F. Austin was carrying out his father's wishes in Texas.

It is known that Moses Austin spent his early and formative years in Connecticut. A part of it was spent at Middletown, where there was a lead mine which furnished lead to help win the Revolution against the British. In 1783, in Philadelphia, he was a member of a drygoods importing firm and married Maria Brown. In 1784 this firm had expanded enough to send him to Richmond, Va., at the head of a branch firm. It must have been in these years that he visited Europe to buy goods, and while there took some side trips to visit lead mines and inform himself as to the most improved lead machinery of that day. From things read in his printed letters I believe Moses Austin to have been a Mason and it might have been that on some of his trips abroad he was made a Mason in London, where there were strong Masonic lodges in that day.

It seems that it was this drygoods firm in Richmond that acquired the Chiswell lead mine in Wythe County, Va. Here he moved with his family and his brother, Stephan Austin, in 1791, and here his son, Stephan F. Austin, was born. That there were others Austins at the Chiswell mine is proven by the fact that there one James Austin became the first postmaster at Austinville, Va. There were vast supplies of lead there and also zinc. The St. Joseph Lead Co. is known to own shares in a zinc mine there. The James Austin who was the first postmaster there was probably

the first postmaster of Ste. Genevieve and rendered his first account as January 1, 1805. The Ste. Genevieve post office was the second established in upper Louisiana, being established very soon after St. Louis. And this was probably the same James Austin who was one of our first county judges of St. Francois County.

It was while living at Austinville, Wythe County, Va., that Moses Austin was associated with my Breckenridge ancestors. We quote from the Calendar of Virginia State Papers: "One John Bullett had been kept in jail all winter without any fire and broke jail. Mr. Austin, William Breckenridge, and 86 others signed a petition to Gov. Henry Lee for reprieve. Date on margin, October 12, 1793."

By 1796 the lead from Austinville was probably meeting the lead from upper Louisiana in the fast settling up of the present State of Kentucky. This fired the spirit of Moses Austin and he set out in December with a lone companion, Josiah Bell, traveling westward to the mine of Mine-a-Breton. He was sent to the commanding officer at Ste. Genevieve, but before he decided where to locate his grant he, with John Rice Jones, later one of the first supreme court judges of Missouri, left Ste. Genevieve in a buckboard on January 21, 1797. They traveled over a good wagon road and reached Mine-a-Breton on the second day out. We are told that they spent 2 nights and 1 day in investigating the lead situation there. They wanted to have stayed longer but a January thaw was on its way and they hurried back to Ste. Genevieve while the road was frozen.

Again lead was calling M. Austin (many of his letters and other papers were signed M. Austin). As soon as the necessary papers were signed, he set out on his return trip to Austinville. The first part of the Austin grant was consummated in May 1797. In June, Austin relinquished his holdings in Austinville to his brother, Stephan. Then we find the following record: "On the 8th day of June 1798, Moses Austin and family, consisting of Maria, his wife, Stephan F. Austin, his son, and Emily M. B. Austin, his daughter, together with Moses Bates and family and others, whites and blacks to the number of 40 persons, 9 loaded wagons and a coach, and 4 horses, left Austinville and took the road for Morrises Boat Yard on the great Kanhawa, and on the 4th of July entered the Ohio and arrived at Kaskaskia September 8, 1798. Mrs. Bates and Parson Bates paid the debt of nature and Henry Bates unhappily was drowned passing the falls of the Ohio. The first wife of Moses Bates was my (Austin's sister. She died at Middletown, Conn. Parson and Henry Bates were her children as was also Elias Bates who arrived in the Province of Louisiana the spring before. On September 20 Moses Austin and family passed the Mississippi and took residence in the little village of Ste. Genevieve, until 1799 when his family removed to Mine-a-Breton."

At this time the Mine-a-Breton as well as all the district of Ste. Genevieve was a wilderness except the village of Ste. Genevieve, which contained about 120 families, and on the Saline four or five families had commenced a settlement within 8 miles of the village.

Goodspeed's history tells us that the consideration on which the grant was made to Austin was that he should erect a furnace and other works for mining and smelting lead and build a shot tower. Soon he erected a shot tower near the creek, about a mile northwest of now Potosi, and about the same time Elias Bates manufactured sheet lead near. A little later he sunk the first deep shaft in what is known as cap rock with such success that the mining character of this region was firmly established. And Moses Austin became the "father of deep lead mining west of the Mississippi River."

After March 10, 1804, the American flag floated over Louisiana and the President of the United States asked Austin to make a report of the mines in the upper Louisiana territory. This report is found in the American State papers and covers many pages. In describing the Mine-a-Burton (note spelling), he says: "Perhaps no part of the world furnishes lead ore in greater quantity and purity. No country yet known furnishes greater indications of an inexhaustible quantity of lead and so easily obtained. It is also evident that there are valuable discoveries yet to be made. Thus situated, the time cannot be far distant when the country will furnish lead sufficient not only for the consumption of the United States but of all Europe, if moderate encouragement is given by the Government and protection against the Osage Indians, who yearly plunder the inhabitants. The mines on the waters of the St. Francois River are capable of furnishing vast quantities of lead. The Mine-a-la-Mott has been styled the 'gold mine,' as descriptive of its wealth, and if under proper management would verify the observation."

On February 6, 1811, the post office of Mine-a-Burton was established, with Moses Austin as its first postmaster. The Austins were interested in a tower at Herculaneum and were promoters of the town of that day. On October 1, 1811, Charles A. Austin was ready to render his account, as first postmaster, to the Government. But the War of 1812 began to paralyze the business interests of Moses Austin. Instead of the people going into new business as the resources of Louisiana would allow, they were crossing to the east side of the Mississippi for more protection to their families from the Indians. Some of them never returned to Louisiana to live. Business was in a chaotic condition.

On April 20, 1816, Moses Austin and family gave up Durham Hall, Negroes and plantation, together with lead mines and furnaces, to his son, Stephan F. Austin. And then Moses Austin began to describe himself as of St. Louis County, but this was probably because Herculaneum was in St. Louis County until Jefferson County was organized in 1818. His going to Texas and getting permission again from Spanish authorities to make settlement, this time with 300 families, belongs to Texas history. This was another trip of extreme exposure for Austin in the saddle.

Mrs. Austin in her letters to her son, Stephan F. Austin, tells us that on his return from Texas he went first to St. Louis to settle up with the failed bank. This took 6 weeks of worry and uncertainty. Then he came in to Potosi to make arrangements with his creditors there to move to Texas. He was already weak from the hardships of his Texas trip and realized that he must reach the home of his daughter, Emily, at Hazel Run, St. Francois County, as soon as possible.

His first stop was at the home of his friend and follower from New England to Louisiana, Martin Rouggles, who lived on a farm now owned by Martin Montgomery, 2 miles north of Caledonia, on Highway No. 21. They urged him to stay longer and rest up, but on the third day he pushed on and stopped that night with the family of my great grandfather, Squire Robert M. Stevenson, who lived then on the farm now owned by E. C. McMullin near Rest-Awhile-Lake, on the road from Bismarck to Caledonia.

Mrs. Austin does not tell us, but from other sources we learn that the last night before he reached his daughter was spent at the home of Salmon Ruggles, who had built a mill on Flat River near the present town of Flat River.

Just when his wife was expecting him home to Herculaneum, a messenger came to take her to Hazel Run to the bedside of her dying husband. There he died on June 10, 1821, and was buried on Bryan farm. How long did his remains stay a part of St. Francois County soil? Judging from a train of circumstances, we should say about 10 years. It is supposed that Mrs. Austin then came to her daughter's home as her letters from then on are headed Hazel Run.

From the St. Francois County records we learn that Bryan died before August 20, 1823. Then the talk between mother and son on paper is that the entire Austin family should go to Texas and there was talk interchanged on paper as what to do with Moses Austin and there was some thought of taking the remains to Texas. But on January 8, 1824, Maria Austin died and her body was laid beside her husband on the Bryan farm at Hazel Run.

It must have been only a few months later that the rich bachelor of Potosi, James F. Perry, came to Hazel Run a wooing and won the hand of Emily Austin Bryan and took her and her three Bryan sons to Potosi to live. Then Stephan F. Austin wanted the Perry's to come on to Texas, but at first Perry was not favorable to the idea. Then Stephan F. Austin wanted his parents remains removed to some enclosed burying ground and there was nothing of the kind at Potosi, and he mentioned St. Louis. One of the printed letters suggests the proposed epitaph for their graves which closes with the words: "In 1820 he opened the door for the settlement of Texas for North American emigrants. He was distinguished for enterprise, liberality, and an honorable character. She by all of the virtues of an affectionate wife and mother."

Then we find a note to the effect that on June 7, 1831, James F. Perry and family left Potosi for the Province of Texas and arrived at San Felipe de Austin, the capital of Austin's colonies on August 14, 1831. Then Goodspeed's history tells us that in this same year William Milam, the then owner of at least part of the Austin grant, proposed to donate to the citizens of Potosi a lot between Breton and High Streets for a cemetery.

A subscription was at once commenced to raise funds to clear and fence the lot. Only one man signed to give more for the work than James F. Perry. When the remains were first brought to Potosi a rock wall was built around the spot with an inscription on the side and a cherry tree grew up within the enclosure. Then about 1,900 Texans asked for the remains but Potosi refused to let them go.

At the time the rock wall was torn down and a concrete flat topped tomb built standing about 5 feet high. The original inscription was effaced in some way and the only wording on the tomb is Moses Austin—1820. So far as I know those simple words are all there is to show within the State of Missouri that Moses Austin, "The father of deep lead mining west of the Mississippi," lies buried there. After the last attempt to secure the remains of Moses Austin, the State of Texas erected a beautiful five-faced monument to his memory at San Antonio.

MOSES AUSTIN IN TEXAS

How long Moses Austin had a vision of colonizing Texas definitely in mind is hard to determine from the evidence on hand. Stephan F. Austin must have left Missouri Territory for the Red River country in 1817, and Moses Austin about the same time describes himself as of St. Louis County. The next year he describes himself as of Jefferson County, which is explained probably by the fact that Jefferson County was created out of St. Louis County in 1818. Herculaneum was probably as close as he ever lived to St. Louis.

It would seem that the plan was discussed between father and son in 1819 after the signing of the Florida Treaty and the son's farm on Red River in Arkansas was considered as a base of supplies, resting place for emigrants on the long journey to the Spanish country. After the father's death and the entire responsibility rested on the younger man he became convinced that the Red

River farm was too unhealthy and decided in favor of the route through New Orleans or Natchitoches. In 1820, the Austins met at Little Rock. They agreed that the elder Austin should go to the capital of Mexico and apply for permission to establish a colony while the younger should go to New Orleans to prepare for the transportation of families, if the petition was granted. In the same year, Moses Austin requested a friend at Washington to obtain for him a copy of the passport that he carried to Missouri in 1797. It was in November or December, 1820, that he set out from Little Rock for Bexar with a gray horse, a mule, a Negro man, and $50 in cash—a total of $850—for which he was to account to Stephen F. Austin or return them. On November 27 he was at McGuffin's establishment about halfway between Natchitoches and the Sabine River.

Two days before Christmas, 1820, he reached Bexar and was subjected to a searching examination. He answered that he was 53 years old, a Catholic, and a former subject of the King of Spain—as was proved by his passport of 1797, that with his family he wished to settle in Texas and cultivate cotton, sugar, and corn, and that he had brought with him no goods to trade, having only a pistol, two horses, some clothing for personal use, and the necessary traveling funds. There was some additional information to the effect that he was a native of Connecticut and a resident of Missouri, that he was moved by the reestablishment of the liberal constitution in Spain to request permission to settle in the empire, and that he represented 300 families who also desired to carry out the same object and thereby fulfill the King's intention at the time of the sale of Louisiana to allow his subjects to move into any part of his remaining dominions.

It was a cool reception that Governor Martinez gave Moses Austin. Without examining his papers he ordered Austin to leave Bexar instantly and the province as soon as possible. But fate decreed otherwise. At Bexar was Baron D. Bastrop, a former acquaintance of Austin. By chance they met on the plaza.

The baron himself took the Austin credentials to Governor Martinez. A second interview was allowed. After 3 days' deliberation, Martinez agreed to forward Austin's application to the commandant general and recommend its approval. Austin's Spanish citizenship must have turned the trick. So on the chance meeting of a friend hung Moses Austin's greatest claim to fame.

Texas was at the time one of the four eastern interior provinces of New Spain. The commandant general was Joaquin de Arredondo. He had both civil and military jurisdiction over the four provinces. There was a sort of federal council representing the four provinces which advised the granting of the application on January 17, 1821.

Moses Austin, with characteristic Yankee grit, spent no time in waiting to hear the outcome of his petition but pushed back to Missouri to attend to personal business affairs and rally a sufficient number of colonists to make the move. He was again at McGuffins on January 15, and made a note to the effect that the total expense of the trip for himself and his Negro man Richmond had been $25.78.

Being determined to settle in the province himself whether his petition was granted or not as soon as possible, he asked Bastrop to obtain permission for him to land tools and provisions for some 15 hands at the mouth of the Colorado River. He pledged himself to be responsible for the 15 hands and felt that such number of men could protect themselves from the Indians.

For some reason the hardships of his return trip were terrible, for he wrote, "I have returned from San Antonio in the Province of Texas—after undergoing everything but death." The Negro man, Richmond, became so exhausted that he had to be left at the Sabine with Douglas Forsythe. He reached his home on March 23, 1821.

Austin's grant was for 200,000 acres of land on the Colorado River. First he wanted the land surveyed in parcels and had selected 25 men who were to go to Texas at once and begin the work of surveying. These men in exchange for transportation and living expenses until January 1, 1822, were to build a house, enclosure, stockade, and blockhouse, and to fence and cultivate "a piece of untimbered land in corn" and to gather the crop into corn houses. Each man was to furnish his own gun for protection and pledge himself to respect the King and Government of Spain. Austin was to provide farming tools, mules, and oxen, and at the end of his service would give each man 640 acres of land and 5 bushels of corn from the storehouses.

During April and May he worked hard in preparation for the expedition, but his recent exposure and hard work was gradually overtaxing his strength. In his weakened condition he made an effort to reach the home of his daughter Emily Bryan, wife of James Bryan, who lived at Hazel Run, near the present town of Bonne Terre. Night overtook him at the home of Salmon Ruggles who had left Bellevue Valley and built a mill on Flat River near the present town of Flat River. His nights on earth were numbered. When he reached the home of his daughter, young Dr. John Bernhisel was called. He was said have been in medical thought and practice, a follower of Dr. Physic, of the University of Pennsylvania. According to rule he duly blistered and copiously bled but relief was only temporary. On June 10 he died, and his wife wrote thus to her older son, Stephen F. Austin: "He called me to his bedside and with much distress and difficulty of speech, begged me to tell you to take his place and if God in his wisdom thought best to disappoint him in the accomplishment of his wishes and plans formed for the benefit of his family, he prayed him to extend his goodness to you and enable you to go on with the business in the same way he would have done." So Moses Austin could plan as well as wait and work.

Dr. Eugene C. Barker, professor of American history at the University of Texas at Austin and who is conceded to be the best authority on Texas history living or dead and from whose writings much of this information has been compiled says: "Moses Austin was enterprising, industrious, and of indomitable energy, but it is doubtful whether he could have accomplished the task to which he set his hand. It required deliberateness, patience, tact, ability to make allowances, diplomacy of a high order. He was as we have seen, impetuous, irascible, belligerent, even litigious in defense of his rights—all of which would, on the one hand, have kept him in a state of perpetual warfare with the frontiersmen of similar qualities who formed the colony, and on the other hand have rendered him entirely unfit to pilot the settlement successfully through the labyrinth of Mexican suspicion and jealousy." See Readings in Texas History edited by Eugene C. Barker, page 63.

However, Moses Austin could pray.

THE LAST DAYS OF MOSES AUSTIN

Maria Austin to Stephen F. Austin

HERCULANEUM, August 25, 1821.—This day's mail brought my dear son's welcome letters of the 13th and 14th of July, which afforded me much real satisfaction. I had received one from you dated the 7th ult, but as you had not heard of your dear father's death I postponed answering it until I heard from you again. Yes, my dear Stephen, this unexpected stroke of Divine Providence must have afflicted your affectionate heart most sensibly. Even at this time, when more than 2 months has passed away in sadness and sorrow, I can hardly realize the reality of the melancholy event, to have him taken from us at a time when his prospects appeared so flattering and his expectations of future happiness and prosperity raised to the highest pitch. Oh, what a lesson for those he has left behind to struggle a few years longer in this vale of tears. My dear Stephen wishes to know the particulars of his father's death. I wrote you soon after it took place and sent the letter by Mr. Bruffey to Orleans, what he did with the letter I have not learned, but at least they never reached you. I will again give you a short detail. Your dear parent was in very bad health when he returned in March and was but a shadow of his former self but such was his anxiety to arrange all of his business in this quarter, I could not prevail on him to attend to his health and take those medicines necessary to restore it.

As soon as he was able to ride he went to St. Louis, where he was detained 6 weeks settling with the directors of the bank. This might have been done in 1 had they been disposed to do him justice. At length, one generous and disinterested man, a lawyer, stepped forward and volunteered his services to your persecuted father. He said the sale of the lead mine estate was an illegal one. That he would undertake to recover it and not receive $1 till he had gained it. He stated this to the board of directors which brought them to a compromise and your father, after the greatest perplexity and delay, at length, obtained a full receipt from the directors, exonerating you and J. B. (James Bryan) and bringing the bank $5,000 in his debt. He returned home, spent and exhausted with fatigue but he would take no rest. (He) started in 4 days to Potosi to make a finish of business there. I felt greatly alarmed and did all I could to prevail on him to postpone his journey a few days. You know his determined and perservering disposition. He had fixed the 25th of May for leaving this country and he had not a moment to lose. He lay sick at Dr. McGready's several days, then finished his business and started to Bellevue, laid 2 days to Squire Stevenson's and finally the 7th day after he left the mines arrived at Hazel Run (the home of his daughter, Mrs. James Bryan, who lived near where Bonne Terre was afterward located) so ill he had to be helped off the horse. This was the 2d of June, he appeared, even then, very unwilling to give up. The next day commenced settling his accounts with James Bryan and thought that he would be able to ride to this place in 2 days. All of this time the disease was gaining fast on his system. The day I expected him home an express was sent for me. I took Dr. Bernhisel with me. He is from Philadelphia and came highly recommended. He said his disorder was a violent inflammation of the lungs. He bled and blistered—stayed a day and night and pronounced him out of danger. I watched by his bed day and night, gave him his medicine every hour and for 2 days we all thought him on the mend. My sister and a young man who was to go with him had sat up Thursday night. His fever was higher on that night than it had been. At 4 o'clock I discovered that St. Antony's fire was all over his face and he had great difficulty in breathing. We sent instantly for Dr. B., and I asked him if he did not wish McGready sent for. After considerable exertion to speak, he drew me down to him and said that it was too late; that he was going; that he would not live 24 hours.

Tell dear Stephen that it is his dying father's last request to prosecute the enterprise he had commenced; that he had set his heart too much on it but for some wise purpose, God had prevented his traveling the road he had planned out. He had opened and prepared the way for you and your brothers (brother and brother-in-law) and that he felt a conviction you would be successful and independent in a few years. He begged that

I should soon follow him. He said that he had done all that he could do for his family. He saw his errors when it was too late. It had been the first wish of his heart to make his family happy and independent. He had lost them a fortune and fully expected he would be permitted to make another one for them. The all-wise God had in His infinite wisdom thought proper to call him from the scene of action and he submitted to his will. He continued in his senses and though his sufferings were greater than I ever saw any human being he never murmured or complained, but left this troublesome world with an assurance of never ending felicity in the Kingdom of Heaven where he should sooner or later meet his dear family to part no more.

I can say no more at present. If you receive my other letters together with this hasty communication it will satisfy my dear son that his father died like a man and a Christian.

Farewell, my dearest son, may guardian angels watch and protect you by day and by night and hasten the period that will restore you to the anxious arms of your affectionate mother.

MARIA AUSTIN.

Twelve o'clock at night.

(Addressed: Mr. Stephen F. Austin to the care of Dr. J. Sibley, Natchitoches Mail.)

NOTE.—Maria Austin died January 8, 1824, and never saw Stephen before she died.

NOTE.—It is a tradition that Moses Austin spent the last night before reaching the home of his daughter on Hazel Run at the home of Salmon Ruggles who had left Bellevue some time previous and built a mill near the present town of Flat River. Flat River would be on his way from Bellevue at Squire Stevenson's to Bonne Terre.

A Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter, dated February 11, 1949, addressed to the President by Mr. H. George Constantine, Jr., 210 Fifth Street, Chickasaw, Ala.:

MOBILE, ALA., *February 11, 1949.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is only after long hesitation can I bring myself to write. Partially because the subject is profoundly delicate. However, for points of shocking realism, I intend to deal bluntly and crudely with them. My deep respect for the high office you successfully hold, makes me feel conspicuously inferior. The thought that I might suggest something of national concern which you had not already deeply considered, has the outward appearance of conceit, or a form of scholastic insubordination. If this be so, sir, or if by any manner, I seem crude or unmannerly in what I write, it is only that I am respectfully submitting my point of view in a suggestive way, to be scanned for what small values may be found therein. But do me the courtesy, sir, though I be bold to ask, of reading this through and weighing what I write, for I think when you have finished, you will view with a graver concern the depth of the racial problem confronting you and me.

For a rough sketch of the writer—I am a machinist by trade, a supervisor of a steamship company by present occupation, and a cattle breeder by hobby. I am not a member of any southern racial block, I am not anti-Negro, anti-Jew, anti-Mexican, or anti-anything else; except, I am opposed to communism or anything that might deride this country in which I was born, or the perpetuation of the race to which I was born. I am white. The responsibility to my country is self-evident. To my foreparents and my God, I am responsible that the race to which I was born will be perpetual in its original form.

In cattle there are many breeds; as in horses, dogs, or any other animals; including human beings. In beef cattle, the Herefords are a distinctive and fine breed. Their white blaze face and low, square, stocky body are a symbol of fine beef. They are a hardy and intelligent breed (if cows can be called intelligent). They can stand the blazing hot sun of a summer desert, and stand the extreme cold and privations of winter. Evidence the fact, this is the breed that has been enduring the blizzards of the Middle West for these many weeks. Crossbreeds would have long since perished. A "piney woods" cow, crossed up and bred with cows of "come what may" would have died the second day. It takes a thoroughbred for stamina—stamina of the kind you exerted in your recent campaign—when the experts predicted you had lost.

There are exceptions to the rule, sir, but these are exceptions, not the rule. The winning horses in racing, as well as all horses in a racing stable are thoroughbreds. There is an old saying, but very true, "you can't make a race horse out of a mule." When you cross breeds you are breaking one of the fundamental laws of God. Now these animals know not the laws of God. Man is the only animal supposedly possessed with concepts of spiritual beings and their rules, endowed with a conscience, and a knowledge of right from wrong as devised by himself or others. The animal knows not of the man-made and God-made rules. He acts solely on the laws of nature, his inborn instincts, the traits of character he inherits, and the qualities controlling his hormones inherited from his parents. So would a man, except for his teachings. For most of man's desires are spurred by instinct and held in check by his teachings.

Now the first law of nature, so they say, is self-preservation, I feel this needs no illustrating, but permit me—a thoroughbred race horse would kill himself in running for the gratification of excelling. A mule never would. The thoroughbred, desiring to "out do," might run beyond his designed limits. Feeling the laws of nature demanding of his tiring legs to slow down, this he would ignore and race on and on.

A soldier may be secure in a trench. A law of nature tells him to preserve himself by staying there. Yet his knowledge of the game tells him he should advance into a personal danger for a fine and noble cause; which drives him on against his fears. How fine it is to be able to overcome the many laws of nature. To compel ourselves to do our mind's bidding as designed by man and God.

Most of the Ten Commandments were written to establish a standard whereby we might overcome some of the natural laws of nature and elevate ourselves above other forms of animal life. Were it not for the man-made rules and customs, and those of God, most of the laws of nature would be as compelling in us as in animals. I have a registered double standard polled Hereford bull yearling. I have also a Black Augus heifer. The bull does not know of his pedigree—nor does the heifer (she incidentally has none). He knows nothing of the opinions of society or the rules of man. His desires for the heifer are keyed by a law of nature alone—"reproduction"—second only to "preservation." So strong is this law that he will fight and die because of it, as will all members of his gender—including man. The latter alone can bring himself to subdue his passions and abide by the rules of man, of God, and of society, if he chooses; and then but reluctantly.

A thoroughbred mare will take a jackass to stud and jump a 5-foot fence to get to him when nature calls. The offspring may be a big animal, but a far cry from the mother. But this union is too much for God or for nature, and the offspring can't reproduce. To keep the white face bull from the black heifer, a good strong fence is needed—too high to jump and too strong to break.

Sir, if I seem farfetched, or writing in riddles, please bear with me, as I am leading to very pointed and undeniable facts.

Originally in nature, had not man brought dissimilar animals of the same species together, they would have had a natural fence; such as oceans, mountains, etc., to separate them. Of all the animals of the jungle, to my limited knowledge, none will interbreed unless brought together by man or other conditions, are very compelling. Man being the only exception—the fence constructed of the materials of social opinion, rules of God and of man, is the retainer in his case.

In the history of white man's vast travels his many exploits have cast him together with many races. When the natural law reproduction outweighs those of man-made morals, rules of God, etc., he seems to forget race and color quite as quickly as does my white-face bull.

With absolutely no disrespect intended to the armed forces—for they are to be held in the highest of esteem—what of the soldiers and sailors when in China, Japan, or the South Seas? They are men of this time. But go back a hundred or so years to the mutineers of the *Bounty* who each took themself a native wife.

Several months ago Life magazine published pictures of little half-black babies born to English girls, supposedly fathered by colored American soldiers. This is only the result of a natural function compelled by one of the strongest laws of nature, wherein no barriers or fences existed. Sir, though I be a southerner and I find it difficult to repress a feeling I can't even name in viewing this, I hold no malice, feel no ill will, and only a profound deep feeling of sympathy for the little cross-breeds.

I have heard it reported, some of the white French girls preferred the colored American soldiers to the white soldiers. They had a hotter rhythm for jitterbugging. Be this true or false, I don't know, but I have seen pictures of them together. (My black heifer also lets instinctive pleasure override reason.)

Sir, if you lower the fence of man's rules, opinions of society, and so forth, just one bar, interbreeding will surely result. With fear of reprisals, retaliation or the silly tommyrot of our southern extremist, deeming it cause for social outcast, or lynch codes (the latter of which I do not condone), these and many other things go together to prevent fraternization, intermingling, intermarrying, or anything, however trivial, that may eventually lead to blending the colors.

Over a period of 6 or 8 generations the South for a number of reasons (some of them selfish) has established certain customs designed always to keep the races apart socially. A fence built between them in all things social. Every possible feature to prevent fraternization in any capacity has been carefully guarded. While throughout the rest of the Nation where the colored race has been very small by percentage these things have been completely ignored.

I hold that if the two races are to be retained separate in blood lines, they may work together in harness, but, they must graze in separate pastures, and the fence to be stoutly maintained. Isolation is not necessary, sir, but the removal of zoning restrictions for races and the breaking down of features classed as discrimination, and so forth, is surely paving the road to interbreeding. Herein we are confronted with a technicality, breach of the good American prerogative. To be able to buy, rent, or live in, or go anywhere, as long as we have the means to pay for it; regardless of color.

The race issue is pierced in many places by the privileges of our democratic heritage. The truly democratic way to accept the colored race would be to remove all barriers between the races. Remove those established by society, by public opinion, by the church, by our morals, and our man-made rules. Resort ourselves to fundamental natural laws only and the white race of America would wind up in another six generations like the Panamanians, the Hawaiians, or any of the several Mediterranean countries that cast aside racial barriers. There would be few pure whites and no colored.

Portugal, in the seventeen hundreds, imported slaves, and in 100 years they had completely assimilated the race. And Portugal, the country that gave to the world men like Magellan, has never given another since. The depth of their present illiteracy, stagnation, and degeneracy is appalling. Mayhap this be a just and fitting end for a people, who in their might, had forced man into the bonds of slavery.

Of course, sir, in another generation you and I will be gone, so to us the realistic effects are ineffectual. I to be forgotten that I had feebly attempted the retention of the breed. You, sir, to be honorably remembered for all posterity—to go down in history as a supreme executive of our great and glorious nation. The serving of an unexpired term of a former massive politico left few spots wherein to excel, but now, sir, you have a term of your own—gallantly fought for, almost alone, against great odds; and a chance to carve history. You have the full power of the Congress, the good will and best wishes of the masses, including myself. There is, sir, now a chance for you to make a mark in history. It is a chance to perform the second step to right a great wrong which was brought on a race of people by my forefathers. Mr. Lincoln freed the darkey's body from slavery; by law and war, but his untimely end prevented his engineering the abolition of discrimination. For the removal of the mass inferiorism, to oversee the long painstaking task of uplifting the colored race and other minority groups, socially, culturally, and economically. This is a far greater task than that accomplished by Mr. Lincoln. It should be done, and can be done by you. Sir, your's is now the chance to be a second Lincoln. But if you please, sir, without wrecking the fences that preserves the black and white races in their original pure strains.

I regret very much to see the progressive State of California repeal the act of legislation prohibiting interracial marriages. If my little white-face bull wants the little black heifer, let him have her (they think). It's his constitutional right. But what of the rights of the unborn?

Little more than a hundred years have passed, four to six generations, since the blacks were led down the gangways of slave ships, their shackles cut loose and led to the tobacco and cotton fields. What culture did the savage blacks bring with them? What beyond their natural instincts; a knowledge of mumbo jumbo and a gift for rhythm? What of their economic status in the lands from whence they came? Did they bring a knowledge of how to build an arch bridge, or to fit stones in a building? What of their dress or customs? A substantial number of the tribes they came from in Africa have not to this day learned to domesticate animals or to till their soil. They have not adapted or learned the use of the simplest conveyance—the wagon—though they have seen those of travelers. Few have evoluted beyond the mud and thatched huts. Few have any ambition, push, or desire to go farther. The only ones that have, have done so under the compulsion or dominance of other races in or around coastal towns, or other upper fringes of their continent bordering on the Mediterranean. Here they have been influenced by whites and others for a few thousand years, but the effects have failed to penetrate into the Dark Continent. Even though their continent fringes the very cradle of civilization, the radiation from same seems to have left their minds as black as their skins. How many thousands of years have passed since the forerunner of the white race on the European Continent was in a similar state of cultural and intellectual metamorphosis in which a black man of the African Continent finds himself today? It may have been 20,000 years since a European was a savage.

For a comparison, sir, examine any of the other of the five human races for their speedy advancement, intelligence, push, or in any way you choose. The yellow race—the Japanese—in the late eighteen hundreds our Commander Perry barged in on their island kingdom with gunboats and they met him in ancient war canoes. He compelled them to participate in world commerce. They were alert, intelligent, though completely lacking in knowledge of his warships. Yet in the short span of time from then until 1941 they had converted their war canoes into battleships, learned the white man's method of waging war, and nearly drove our fleets from the Pacific. In a hundred years they had become a world power.

The red race of the American Continent developed beautiful architecture, cities, pyramids, temples, of the highest of culture and fine civilization throughout what is now Mexico and Central America, Peru, and other countries. The same climatical and geographical conditions prevailed as on the African Continent.

Equally outstanding traits can be named in connection with the brown race, and, of course, civilization of the whites bear testimony of their worth.

So, sir, it seems as though the only intelligent view to take is the rather crude one I started with—as though we are all animals. By cross-breeding you might result in a breed with improved size, a little hardier physically, a different skull structure; but never can you get the desirable features of stamina, intelligence, determination, and all of the features for which straight breeding or thorough breeding is maintained.

The next time you look at a colored man with predominant African features remember you are looking at a man who after 20,000 years of utter stagnation has made tremendous advancement in 150 years. Help him all you can to advance farther. It is a duty to God to help a fellow human to advance himself—but in so doing avoid anything, however trivial, that might lead to fraternization and eventual interbreeding as a means of advancing him. Lowering our blood lines does no good to either breed. It does, in fact, do harm to both.

I like to think of the good old average American as pure red, pure black, pure white, pure brown, or pure yellow; not a mixture of all.

Respectfully,

H. GEO. CONSTANTINE, Jr.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and copy of resolution passed by Lorain (Ohio) City Council, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress:

THE CITY OF LORAIN, OHIO,
March 11, 1949.

HON. WALTER HUBER,
United States Congressman, Fourteenth Ohio District, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Enclosed please find copy of resolution passed by Lorain City Council at its regular meeting.

Your consideration and support is expressly solicited.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY VAZZANO,
Clerk of Council.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day Resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Lorain and State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States,

the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Ohio.

CERTIFICATION

I, Anthony Vazzano, clerk of of Lorain City Council, hereby certify that the above resolution was passed by Lorain City Council at the regular meeting held February 7, 1949.

ANTHONY VAZZANO,
Clerk of Council.

Capitol Watchtower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Tom L. Munger:

CAPITOL WATCHTOWER

(By Tom L. Munger)

WASHINGTON—It was told here previously how by limiting acreage allotments under the farm price-support program the Democratic administration will put an end to exceptionally high farm incomes, even while it is increasing price-support payments to a flat 90 percent of parity. This is a direct though partially concealed repudiation of President Truman's campaign promises to farmers.

Now it will be shown how by the same means the Democratic administration is proceeding indirectly to repudiate the President's campaign promises to organized labor. Indirectly, it is true, but just as effectively as if done right out in the open.

President Truman promised farmers high prices for things they sell and low prices for things they buy. At the same time he promised organized labor high wages and low living costs, in which food prices are the dominating factor. All basic foods are products of the soil. Thus, the insuperable inconsistency of the President's campaign to rope in the votes of special-interest groups stands revealed.

Manifestly high farm prices tend to create high living costs for industrial wage earners, while low prices for things farmers buy necessitate low industrial wages. By the same reasoning, low living costs necessitate low farm prices, while high industrial wages tend to create high prices for things farmers buy. None but a politically inspired government economist would attempt to deny these statements. Here is their significance in respect to the President's campaign promises to organized labor.

It has been intimated here that farmers will get larger price-support payments on crops raised under the price-support program, but payments will be on harvests from drastically reduced acreages. This because of the administration measure enacted by the present Democratic Congress prohibiting use of 1949 plantings of basic crops in determining future acreage allotments. Farm incomes generally will go down.

Several things may be expected to happen as a result of this cut in farm production and hence in net farm income. And here is where repudiation of President Truman's campaign promises to organized labor comes in.

Farmers will have less money with which to buy output of industrial plants. This in some degree will reduce demand for industrial labor; fewer jobs, in other words, and fewer hours of work for those employed. Less income for industrial workers.

Smaller industrial output will tend to increase costs and hence prices of things farmers buy. Industrial stockholders will suffer because consumer resistance to high prices will narrow profit margins and hence reduce dividends.

The cut in farm production will be reflected in lesser available supplies of food in retail stores, causing excessive price markups. With respect to agricultural production and resultant food supply for industrial and other city populations, the country will tend to operate again under an economy of scarcity instead of an economy of plenty.

These things add up to a situation wherein everybody loses. Reduced farm income will adversely affect incomes of industrial wage earners, industrial stockholders and, of course, small-business men and white-collar workers, who always are caught in the middle by Government tampering with any segment of the national economy.

Nobody in the cities, and especially people in the labor category, will have quite so much money with which to buy the food products of the soil. But at the same time, larger price-support payments on reduced farm production will maintain food prices at high levels. This in spite of the fact farmers will have less money wherewith to buy industrial output. A vicious circle, indeed.

The only alternative to this situation, as it appears to be shaping up, would be one wherein farmers planted extensive acreages outside of the farm-price-support program. As good Americans, and as men who prefer to make one additional dollar instead of two rather than no additional dollar at all, many of them will do this. But the over-all situation is likely to remain unchanged. Less money and higher prices for everybody.

There are those who insist that food exports by the Economic Cooperation Administration and world food shortages in general will take care of everything. But crop production is increasing in nearly all countries abroad, and those countries will lack dollars wherewith to buy extensively in the United States after the ECA shipments cease 2 or 3 years hence.

The failure to negotiate a satisfactory international wheat agreement is proof enough of unrealistic farm prices in the United States with respect to the world market for products of the soil. That is, unless American taxpayers, like the woman in the adage, continue to pay and pay and pay.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that the present Hope-Aiken Act, passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress and signed by the President, and which the Chief Executive promised to have repealed, is the best answer thus far conceived to the farm price problem.

Its sliding scale price support payment system is apparently the nearest possible approach to an application of free marketing to controlled farm production. The more the farmer produces, the less he gets in proportion to parity, but he is free to produce at the peak of his ability. He gets less for more, instead of more for less, but in the end he is better off.

An economy of plenty makes available more food for everybody. Prices tend downward, but farm incomes stay up in proportion to the cost of living for those willing to do their share for the common good. Henry Ford got rich, it should be remarked, by cutting unit profits and increasing production. Nearly everybody got an automobile, too, at a price he could afford to pay.

All that has been said, of course, is merely a restatement in many words of the oft-repeated fact that farm prosperity means national prosperity, and vice versa. But saying it here serves to reveal the almost certain result of the frantic efforts by the Democratic administration and majority in Congress to fool both farmers and organized labor into believing that campaign promises are being kept.

Address by the Honorable Louis Le Baron, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to your attention the following address of a most distinguished jurist on a memorable occasion at Honolulu. His appropriate words formed part of a Nation-wide observation of memory of one of our national inspirations:

(Address by the Honorable Louis Le Baron, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, to the Democratic Party of Hawaii at its Jackson Day dinner on February 24, 1949, in Honolulu, T. H.)

For the past 20 years since the founding of the Jackson Club, it has been my ambition to address the Democratic Party of Hawaii in memory of Andrew Jackson. This ambition was nurtured on family history. My great-grandfather, William Taylor Barry, was a lifelong friend of Andrew Jackson, and as a tribute to that friendship named his firstborn son Andrew Jackson Barry, who grew up to become my grandfather. My great-grandfather had been chief justice of the Supreme Court of Kentucky. He was Kentucky's secretary of state. He delivered his State to Jackson in the Presidential campaign of 1828, and served in Jackson's Cabinet. In my home today is a pair of silver sugar tongs made from various coins which Andrew Jackson had from time to time tossed to his little namesake, Andrew Jackson Barry, on his many visits to the boy's home in Kentucky. The molding of those tongs is symbolic of my family's continued admiration of the sterling qualities of its beloved Old Hickory.

There could not be a more fitting time to do public honor to the memory of Andrew Jackson, coming as it does so soon after the great victory of 1948, when Harry S. Truman was first elected President of the United States. That victory has but one parallel in American history. It is the victory of 1828, when Andrew Jackson was first elected President of the United States. During the campaign of 1828 every newspaper, college professor, banker, and other intelligent person in the know predicted that Adams would be elected to the Presidency—as their prototypes a hundred and twenty years later predicted that Dewey would. The parallel, however, does not stop there. Both victories were victories of the people themselves over those who feared and distrusted them. In short, both were victories of the Democratic Party which, both nationally and locally, has steadfastly held to the Jeffersonian principle that "nothing is unchangeable but the inherent and inalienable rights of man" and consistently believed that it should identify itself with the people. have confidence in

them, cherish and consider them the most honest and safe, although perhaps not the most wise, depository of the public interests.

Jackson, like Truman, believed this fervently. During the short 8 years of his Presidency, Jackson put that principle and belief into practice. He threw down the bars that hedged the people from effective participation in the conduct of their own Government. He destroyed the sinister alliance between politics and finance that was swiftly reducing the people to economic serfdom. He became a veritable sword against disunion and shattered the nullification movement, which had brought the people to the brink of civil war, thereby postponing for some thirty-odd years the day when a half-million Americans had to die to preserve the Union. In his proclamation against the acts of nullification taken by his former home State, Jackson declared that "armed disunion is treason," and that powerful stand pointed the way to Abraham Lincoln when he subsequently entered upon his task of holding the United States together.

Jackson is one of the finest symbols of a free man who ever lived in a free climate and moved in a free society. No other land than America could have produced him. His parents were immigrants—his father a linen draper from Belfast, Ireland, who died a few months before his son Andrew was born on the western frontier of North Carolina. Shortly thereafter Andrew Jackson's widowed mother took her three small children to South Carolina where she reared and supported them by working as a housekeeper in the home of relatives. Young Andrew faced a rugged world and fought for every advantage from the time of birth to the day of his death. His was a roaring career—resounding to the roars of cheering multitudes, of musketry, of artillery. He was a great duelist, a great soldier, and a great statesman. He was fiery, quixotic, honest, and loyal, but withal a man who had a code and lived up to it. But he did not cringe; he did not fawn; he did not carry water on both shoulders. When he lost—and he lost heavily and frequently—he paid without whimpering. He loved a woman and lost her and, of all his innumerable wounds, that hurt the worst and longest. Even a superficial examination of the record of his life reveals that few men who have figured largely in public affairs have exhibited more conspicuously the traits common to all humanity.

Thomas Jefferson envisioned that a free society of freemen would be the strongest government on earth—an example toward which the whole future of man would gravitate, but Andrew Jackson demonstrated that that experiment worked. When Jefferson acquired the great Louisiana Territory and increased the domain of the United States by 140 percent, there were many who wailed in despair. They said that our country would be too big for Union, too sordid for patriotism, too democratic for liberty, and that the weight and importance of the Eastern States would be destroyed. They merely voiced the old fear and distrust of the people on the theory that the greater their number the greater the danger. They particularly feared the rough and tough denizens of the western plains, the descendants of whom easterners in later years contemptuously dubbed "the sons of wild jackasses." The momentum of Jefferson's empire of liberty, however, was too great to be so contained and fenced within the original States. In step with the Nation's destiny of world leadership, Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans repelled foreign invasion and in the White House proved to the world that democracy was a growing and vital force. Since then new stars out of the West have been added to the flag and the empire of liberty has rolled across and beyond a vast continent. Hawaii is a part of that empire and today stands at the threshold of statehood awaiting its opportunity to assume the responsibility of a State as a sister to the other 48 States of the Union. The empire of liberty is thus acquiring its full stature and its fruits are strengthening democratic nations everywhere. Jefferson's dream has become a reality and the burdened and oppressed throughout the world know that America's free society of freemen holds the answer to their problems. We must keep faith. We cannot falter.

So long as truth prevails over falsehood, the foundation of this Nation will be secure. The potency of America's faith rests on the proposition that its people shall know the truth and the truth shall make them free. The strength of America lies in the righteousness of its people and an enlightened public opinion expressed in free elections and by secret ballot. Keep the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson alive and democracy will always flourish like the green bay tree, to which no subversive parasite can attach.

What American would trade his glorious heritage for a system where the sons of darkness can torture men of God and enslave the workingman? What American would give comfort to an agent of a malevolent foreign power who insidiously attempts to destroy our people as a nation, whether that agent acts wittingly or unwittingly? No real American would do so knowingly, no matter what glittering promises are held out to him. Truth alone swings wide the door to freedom, which is nothing more than truth in action. It has been said, and truly, that while it is possible to send a message around the world in a fraction of a second, it requires generations to drive an idea through a quarter of an inch of human skull. Thank God that the idea of a free society of freemen has penetrated the present-day American skull and that there can be no iron curtain in this land. But every American has the personal concern not to be deceived where the public order is at stake and to be distrustful of those of doubtful loyalty and of those who dare not deny allegiance to a God-hating ideology of an alien government. Every American has the solemn obligation to welcome the truth and help hold its torch high so that the vile things which thrive in the darkness may be clearly seen for what they are. The satisfaction of this reasonable service is all that is necessary, and that is the American way.

The victory of 1948 being comparable to that of 1828, let us pray that its gains may be preserved—that Almighty God guide and strengthen His servant—Harry S. Truman—against the Nation's enemies, both foreign and domestic—as He guided and strengthened His servant—Andrew Jackson.

In revering the memory of Andrew Jackson, we do not purport to live in the past, but are dedicating our lives to the living principles which make our Nation the greatest on earth, and by which that Nation may solve the problems of the present and prepare for the future. The immigrant linen draper's son touched the height of human glory by never attempting to win freedom by appeasement, but fought for it with fearless and unswerving loyalty—giving no quartre and asking for none. This Nation through a revitalized Democratic Party must do likewise.

"For no man escapes
When freedom fails,
The best of men rot
In filthy jails;
And they who cried:
'Appease, appease,'
Are hanged by men
They tried to please."

The Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "Michigan Men Fight To Save Marine Corps," from the Michigan Veteran Review of February 12, 1949, the official publication of the Michigan Consolidated War Veterans' Councils.

This article is significant for some very important reasons: It pointedly demonstrates the intense interest and alarm with which veterans view efforts to humiliate and destroy the Marine Corps. I can assure the Members of this House that disclosures made in the recent article in the Saturday Evening Post by Richard Tregaskis, and referred to in this story from the Michigan Veteran Review, have been cause for grave apprehension by American citizens, and particularly our veterans. They do not look favorably upon the activities being conducted against the leathernecks, and they will not permit opponents to wield a pruning knife on the Marine Corps.

This article is also of significance because it tells of the important role played by Mr. Merle E. Hopper in the battle to save the corps from the destruction planned for it by the Army and Air Force. Mr. Hopper is a past commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Michigan. He is at present a member of the national legislative committee of the VFW, in which capacity he has continued his lifelong interest both in the welfare of veterans and matters of national security. Mr. Hopper's activities in the protection of the Marines constitute another example of the alertness and fair-mindedness he has so consistently demonstrated as a State and national leader of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Also, I wish to invite attention of Members of the House to the fact that this article indicates a wider appreciation of the manner in which the former chairman of the House Expenditures Committee, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, fought against efforts to eliminate the Marine Corps as a combat force. Michigan is proud of the combined efforts of Representative HOFFMAN and Mr. Hopper, who, along with numerous others from all parts of the Nation, were determined to protect the Marine Corps from those who sought to destroy it.

Should such efforts against the Marine Corps continue, I firmly believe that the Armed Services Committee should determine what elements of the armed forces, if any, are more interested in warring against the leathernecks than preparing for the defense of our Nation. Such an investigation could be very profitable from the standpoint of our national security.

The article from the Michigan Veteran Review is as follows:

MICHIGAN MEN FIGHT TO SAVE MARINE CORPS

Two Michigan men—Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Allegan, and Merle Hopper, of Charlotte, past department commander of the VFW—put up a valiant fight in the Eightieth Congress to save the Marine Corps from being reduced in status, prestige, and numerical strength.

It is expected the battle will be renewed in the present Congress, as top brass in the Army and Air Force are expected to support the bill introduced by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, to provide for a stronger centralized control of the armed forces, with the Marine Corps pushed to the sidelines.

The Morse bill reached the Senate too late for action last year but is slated for reappearance.

Referring to the battle in the previous Congress, it is related by Richard Tregaskis in February 5 issue of the Saturday Evening Post: "Two men on the national legislative committee of the VFW, then meeting in Washington, became exercised about the Marine Corps. They were a burly ex-marine sergeant of World War I, Merle E. Hopper, and, strangely enough, a former World War I second lieutenant in the Army, J. R. Klawans."

The article states that shortly after, the VFW legislative committee passed a resolution declaring it the official VFW policy to protect the interest of the Marine Corps before Congress. Louis E. Starr, then national commander of the VFW, declared himself a strong supporter of the Marine Corps.

The bill to unify the armed forces was referred to the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, of which Congressman HOFFMAN was chairman. He had been tipped off by Hopper and some others, including another VFW man from Michigan, on the stunt the Army brass was trying to put over at expense of the Marine Corps.

The lid was blown off the Capitol Dome with some sharp questioning by HOFFMAN of General Eisenhower, the then Chief of Staff, who supported the unification bill but denied he had any thought of eliminating the marines.

A long battle ensued in which General Vandegrift, Gen. "Lucky" Gates, and "Red Mike" Edson battled to save the marines from the pruning knife that the Army and Air Force had up their sleeves.

Eventually "Red Mike" felt it necessary to apply for retirement from the marines so he could continue the fight as a civilian.

General Gates makes a point that "a marine is not only America's best shock trooper but the cost of maintaining a marine is just a little more than half the cost of maintaining an Army man."

Idaho Farmers Oppose a CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution sent me by John Lee, secretary of the Upper Snake River Valley Protective Union. This resolution was passed at a meeting of 200 directors and officers of canal companies who use water for irrigation from Snake River in southeastern Idaho. These 200 directors and officers represent several thousand water users and present their position on this highly controversial issue—the CVA.

The proponents of a CVA have repeatedly accused the opponents of CVA to be private power lobbyists and tools of the private power companies. This accusation is without foundation and represents willful misrepresentation of the picture. It appears this approach is being made to prejudice the public in favor of CVA. The farmers in Idaho oppose the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority, as shown by the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE FARMERS OF THE UPPER SNAKE RIVER WATER USERS PROTECTIVE UNION

Whereas the farmers, at a meeting held at Idaho Falls, February 28, 1949, desire to express their conviction that the principle of State's rights should prevail throughout Idaho in all matters involving public resources; and

Whereas legislation which runs counter to this principle will be pending in Congress; and

Whereas the pending legislation to create a Columbia Valley Authority, proposes to invest in Federal agencies authority to control the resources and economy of the State of Idaho that should remain with the people of the State; and

Whereas we believe that these rights can be best preserved by cooperation between the present agencies, and State reclamation engineer of the State of Idaho, and the executive department of the State, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the United States Corps of Engineers, and other agencies now in existence; and

Whereas the proposed Columbia Valley Authority will supersede these agencies and interfere with and delay the present plans of development in Idaho; and

Whereas no provision has appeared in any of the so far proposed legislation which will adequately safeguard the State or protect vested water rights under the laws of the State: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby voice our opposition to all proposed legislation for creating a Columbia Valley Authority by act of Congress, and express our approval of the development of the resources of the State of Idaho, through the present State and Federal agencies; and propose that if a change is needed, no authority be created, and that this resolution be a part of the minutes, and that copies be sent to our Senators and Congressmen in Washington, D. C.

JOHN LEE, *Secretary.*

Alternative to Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's for February 26, 1949:

CALIFORNIA CALLS THE DOCTOR

(By George Creel)

On December 1, 1946, a fairly young and seemingly husky workingman walked into the San Francisco office of the California Physicians' Service, an organization of doctors formed to provide people in the lower-income brackets with cheaper and more adequate medical care. He paid the girl at the desk $7.90, and agreed to pay a similar amount each month in return for a guarantee that he and his wife and four children would be given complete health protection.

Fearful that it might turn out to be anotherfake insurance scheme, he was not overly enthusiastic, but that was not for long. Within a month he developed a brain tumor. The X-rays, laboratory work, operation, and home visits cost the CPS $509.50. His hospital bill was paid in full for 21 days at $9.50 a day, after which the CPS stood 50 percent of the expense for 76 days. A total of $1,298.25 for that man alone was paid out by the CPS.

In September 1947 his wife became pregnant and when the baby was born, a Caesarean had to be performed. The operation, hospitalization, and necessary care came to $260. Meanwhile the four children had an unhappy succession of troubles of their own.

Eventually this family cost the CPS exactly $3,565.75. The dues for the period were $150.10.

Fortunately for the CPS, not all of its 750,000 dues-paying members suffer the hard luck of this family. Nevertheless, the cost of service in any one case is not a consideration. Once a man has signed up for himself and his dependents, he is entitled to the best in medical and surgical care and hospitalization, regardless of the total expense to the organization.

It all started back in the late months of 1938, when the California Medical Association called a special meeting to consider a measure for compulsory health insurance then being pushed by a liberal governor. Discussion on the floor revealed overwhelming sentiment for some sort of positive program, and out of the conference came the California Physicians' Service. It was a voluntary plan, and under private control, but it was frankly committed to immediate reforms in medical and surgical practice.

The CMA authorized a loan of $37,000 to take care of initial expenses, but for a long while failure threatened. Many doctors did not like the idea of fee fixing. They were afraid it meant regimentation and reduced incomes. And wage earners were inclined to regard it as some new kind of gyp.

But today, after 10 years of struggle and experimentation, the CPS has a panel of 9,500 physicians ready to minister to the ailments and injuries of over 750,000 dues-paying members. This figure does not include the 10,000 to 12,000 ex-servicemen handled each month through an arrangement with the Veterans' Administration. The CPS confidently expects to have 1,000,000 members by the end of this year, a goal that would seem to be justified by the plan's steady increase in popularity.

Far from being a grab bag, the panel includes every top-flight surgeon, specialist, and general practitioner in California, and their services are on call at a cost ranging from $37.80 a year for individuals to $94.80 for families of three or more. These might seem to be comparatively small amounts, yet the CPS makes an annual disbursement of $12,000,000 to its physician members, and an additional $3,500,000 to doctors and laboratories through its contract with the VA.

The plan, to be sure, does not take in the State's population as a whole, for it is not concerned either with the well-to-do or the indigent. At the outset the trustees picked as their particular field the large group of workingmen and workingwomen whose incomes do not exceed $3,000 a year and who, therefore, are neither sufficiently hard up to receive free treatment nor rich enough to meet sizable doctors' bills.

In an effort to fit charges to lean purses, the plan started off with dues as low as $1.70 a month for individuals. This was a

blunder that nearly wrecked the venture. Physician members very naturally voiced their dissatisfaction when they found themselves getting as little as 50 percent of their fees. The dues were upped in 1944, but it was not until 1946 that actuaries worked out the following rates as essential to a firm financial basis for the venture:

	Per month
Single male	$3.15
Single female	3.90
Two-person family	6.15
Three or more	7.90

For their dues, members are guaranteed the last word in medical and surgical practice. A full surgical team is on hand for all operations, and hospitalization includes laboratory tests, complete X-ray examination, radium, cardiographic equipment, nurses, and medical supplies.

The California Physicians' Service pays all expenses for 21 days in a room of three or more beds, and if a longer stay proves necessary, it stands 50 percent of the cost for a full year.

LIMITATIONS OF THE SERVICE

There are, of course, certain exclusions. The CPS, for example, does not provide dental services and will not take workmen's compensation cases or cover quarantinable diseases and congenital malformations. Chronic ailments and recurrent conditions are not rejected, but treatment is limited to 90 days, after which the patient must make his own arrangement with the doctor.

Bitter experience has resulted in adoption of certain other restrictive rules. Operations for hernia, hemorrhoids, and varicose veins are performed only after dues have been paid for 12 months because many persons waited until they were ready for surgery before joining up. For much the same reason, maternity care is provided only after 10 months of continuous membership.

The CPS is not a charitable organization. While the fees paid doctor members are far below what would be asked of the well-to-do, they are close to what the average physician has been in the habit of charging people in the $3,000-a-year income group. The large majority run from $5 to $100, but as much as $200 is allowed for some 22 major operations, such as those for spinal fusion with bone graft, laryngectomies, kidney incisions, and other difficult procedures that call for top-flight skill and experience.

But physicians may not collect the full amounts set down in the fee schedule. Because the Californians had the advantage of being able to study the fate of similar plans in other States, they have learned what not to do. Having noted that many of these plans went broke by guaranteeing doctors a fixed sum, the CPS limits its obligations to current funds.

At the end of each month all receipts are divided into two parts: one to take care of administrative expenses and the other for service rendered. If the total of the latter is not sufficient to meet medical and surgical charges, the doctors get only their pro rata share of the money on hand.

This policy gives the CPS its firm financial foundation.

In the 10 years of the organization's existence its doctor members have collectively taken losses in reduced fees amounting to $3,000,000. At first there was a good deal of complaint, but now the doctors have come to realize that they are actually ahead of the game when everything is considered. The plan does away with collection costs, and in general practice 25 percent of patients' bills are never paid anyhow.

The CPS is blessed by a lack of red tape. Neither a physical examination nor a health statement is required for membership, and there are no complicated forms and claim blanks to be filled out. When ill or injured, a member simply goes to a doctor and presents his identification card. At the end of the month the physicians and hospitals send in their bills.

As the method of recruiting members and collecting dues that would be quickest and require the least bookkeeping, the CPS started out with the requirement that any group of employees wishing to join had to be composed of a minimum of five persons.

Now that a sufficient enrollment has been reached, the plan is experimenting with individual contracts, with certain restrictions. If this idea proves practical, a drive will be made for every Californian in the $3,000 income bracket.

LABOR HOSTILITY OVERCOME

Meanwhile, a force of 72 trained salesmen travel the length and breadth of the State, not overlooking small shops and stores but concentrating on large-scale employers. Organized labor, hostile at the outset, has been won over through the work of a labor-relations division headed by a former high union official, who goes from local to local, explaining and exhorting.

Industries and metropolitan areas, however, are not the sole concern of the CPS. Even in early years the trustees gave thought to the rural districts, but it was not until 1945 that they felt able to approach the California Grange with an offer of health protection for its farmers and their families, representing a total of 75,000 persons. Today, adequate medical care is available to the most remote mountain ranch.

Signing up the powerful farm organization was a long forward step, but the biggest boost for the plan has been its contractual arrangement with the Veterans' Administration. This came about as the result of a situation that had been burdening the VA with heavy and seemingly unnecessary expense, and working a hardship on every ailing veteran. As the law made no adequate provision for home-town treatment, even in cases of minor illness, ex-servicemen were compelled to journey to a veterans' hospital. Since there are only eight in huge California, the travel distance was often as much as 250 miles.

Eager to remedy this, Dr. Paul R. Hawley, then the able chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, decided to take a look at the California Physicians' Service, and after thorough study was sufficiently satisfied to draw up a contract.

Under its terms the CPS handles all cases not requiring surgery or hospitalization, so that veterans are now treated in their own home towns, and by their own physicians.

UNFAIR TAX RULING DEFEATED

What makes the growth of the CPS the more remarkable is the rocky road that it has had to travel. As if birth pains were not enough, in the very first year antagonistic State officials ruled that the plan was just another insurance scheme, and therefore subject to a tax of 2.6 percent on total income. The legal battle raged until 1946, when the Supreme Court of California held that the service was truly a nonprofit medical and hospital plan, and not taxable.

From the moment that its success was assured, the CPS turned its attention to the national medical-service problem and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. CPS trustees realized that socialized medicine would remain a constant threat unless the medical profession, as a whole, put itself behind a countermovement that would work for necessary reforms. In the early months of 1946, therefore, California, together with eight other States that had well-established plans, went before the American Medical Association with a plea for aggressive action.

The AMA decided, in a resultant resolution, to proceed as promptly as possible with the development of a specific national-health program with emphasis on the Nation-wide organization of locally administered prepayment plans sponsored by medical societies. The sum of $25,000 was advanced as a promotional fund, whereupon the nine States formed the Blue Shield plan and set about selling the idea from coast to coast.

Today 42 States have prepaid medical-service plans that provide for treatment, surgery, and hospitalization on a strictly voluntary basis at a cost well within the means of the average wage earner, and it is only a question of time before the other 6 States will fit themselves for membership.

Already the Blue Shield is compiling statistical data on actuarial experience, and standardizing contract provisions, enrollment regulations, rate structures, and other details of operation. When the goals of uniformity and reciprocity have been reached, large-scale employers with branches in every State will be able to purchase prepaid medical care for their employees without being forced to reconcile varying procedures, and membership in one plan will entitle the wage earner to the benefits of all.

Whatever the outcome, from now on the proponents of socialized medicine are in for a battle up and down the line. With a voluntary plan in operation in every State, the medical profession will meet the issue with a solid formation—a set-up vastly different from the old disorganized reactionary force that championed the outworn traditions of a vanished day.

Keyserling Defends Economic Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article by Leon H. Keyserling, in the Washington Post of March 18, 1949, and entitled "Keyserling Defends Economic Platform."

Also an editorial appearing in the Washington Post, entitled "Behind the Times," in answer to the above-cited article.

KEYSERLING DEFENDS ECONOMIC PLATFORM

(By Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman, Council of Economic Advisers)

I should like to comment on your editorial of March 14, Behind the Times. Our country's vital interests require that men of good will, even when they disagree on some points, should strive to broaden their areas of agreement so that workable policies may be achieved. Exchange of views, including objective criticism, should contribute toward this end.

Your editorial surprised me somewhat, in view of an earlier editorial in the Washington Post on January 8, dealing with the economic report of the President. That earlier editorial seemed, indeed, to support the President's stabilization program, saying that "the President's program is based on expert analysis of economic conditions and prospects by advisers with a reputation for conservatism whose chief aim is to stabilize the economy of free enterprise. There is nothing revolutionary, nor even radical, in requests to extend existing emergency controls and to authorize resort to mandatory controls over allocation and prices of scarce commodities, to be employed only if needed."

True, there have been changes in the price situation since January. But these changes have not been as sensational as those attendant upon the commodity price break in early

1948 which led many to feel that all danger of rising prices was over; and reports thus far for March 1949 show the wholesale price index for all commodities and for farm products in particular moving generally upward from the February level.

One may wonder whether, in view of ambiguous trends and outlooks, the stand which the Post took in January is not still valid today, or at least not sufficiently disproved to justify questioning the motives of those who still hold that the Government should be prepared on a stand-by basis for alternative contingencies.

Your ostensible change of position seems based upon the conclusion that the economic situation has changed radically since January. In this connection, you say that the President was evidently not abreast of price developments at a news conference on March 3, where you report the statement as having been made that "lead, zinc, iron, and so forth, are on the same old upward spiral." At the time of the conference, the most recently reported facts, in brief, were these: "The price index—on a June 1946 base—for lead was 262.2; for zinc, 209.2; for iron and steel, 153.6; for brick and tile, 133.9; and for farm machinery 139.7, and each of these figures represented an all-time peak. For metals and metal products as a whole, the price index had reached an all-time peak in December 1948, risen a bit higher in January 1949, and risen still a bit higher, according to the last weekly report for February 1949 (the full monthly report for February was not yet available).

According to figures made available after the conference on March 3, the commodities specifically enumerated above have not decreased in price except for lead, which is down 2 cents a pound but still about 30 percent higher than a year ago. The wholesale price index for all commodities other than farm products and foods, which declined slightly in February from the January level, increased slightly during the first two reported weeks in March to within less than 1 percent of the all-time peak.

Any brief discussion of price trends is likely to be selective and not to present the whole picture. For example, on the same day that your editorial of March 14 cited some falling prices, both present and prospective, a feature story on the front page of the Washington Post was headed "Commodity prices stage come-back."

My detailed analysis before the joint committee on the Economic Report on February 8 did not rest upon any claim of inflationary price developments throughout the economy or fail to take account of falling as well as rising prices. I said: "Continued and disproportionate price increases are now an even greater danger to the economy at a time when soft spots are beginning to show in other areas than they were when the pulse throughout the economy was uniformly strong.

"The economy contains a mixture of trends. Some prices are too high and rising too fast, and some activities are too hectic, and these have an inflationary cast. Other prices may be too low or falling too rapidly, and some activities are softening too much or not expanding rapidly enough, and this has a deflationary cast.

"We need a discriminating and selective combination of policies, to deal with the inflationary cast and the deflationary cast at the same time, and we should not look for the all-out one-way solutions called for during a period of galloping inflation or paralyzing deflation. The best time to act is before we are caught in either of these extremes, and if we act in time we can prevent them both."

I think that these comments are still valid today.

I have been careful not to rely on forecasts which you consider unrealistic. In my February 8 statement, I said: "The main task of economic policy under current conditions is to address ourselves vigorously to trends that have already appeared and facts that are already known. This gives us a sound foundation on which to stand, and if we are both clear and courageous in dealing now with the situation confronting us now, we may with some confidence rely upon our ability to deal with any changed situation which may appear later on. But if we underestimate the importance of what we know has happened, and overestimate the importance of what we think is going to happen, our perspective may become distorted and our decisions unsafe."

More careful scrutiny of my available statements should dissuade anyone from saying, as your editorial does, that my argument for expanding certain industrial capacities rests upon failure to perceive that some demand may be falling off. My view has been clearly stated that our national and international interests require us to make maximum use of our productive potential by working toward the effective operation of our distributive system, instead of allowing supply to scale downward toward a decreasing level of demand. The latter course is the road first toward a stagnant economy and then toward depression. Even in 1932, the supply satisfied the demand—but what was the level of demand?

Your editorial also undertakes to undermine my analysis by stating that my record in helping to shape and administer regulatory legislation indicates a bias in favor of Government intervention. The only program that I have ever helped to administer prior to my present work was the housing program, which is not regulatory; and for at least 14 years the Post has vigorously supported the analyses I have voiced and the proposals I have advocated with respect to housing.

I was also closely interested, during the thirties, in proposed legislation relating to public works, social security, labor relations, and railway pensions, as well as in the Employment Act of 1946. Aside from the Labor Act, these measures were not regulatory and I believe that the Post now regards most of them as timely when proposed and now advocates the extension of some of them.

As for the labor act, most people now say that while some abuses occurred in its administration and some amendments were needed from time to time, the original act represented in the main a step overdue when taken. Thus far, most of the trade papers which have censured my comprehensive statement before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report last month have shrunk from endeavoring to answer either the facts or the analysis presented, but instead have sought to prove that I am wrong by calling me a New Dealer.

The Washington Post has, according to my observations, a 99-percent good record of dealing carefully with the merits of public issues instead of using smear techniques, and I hope that it may make its record 100 percent perfect by including me within the rule. I would be the first to welcome constructive criticism directed to the substance of anything I have said.

I recognize that all fair-minded analysts will not agree on the current necessity for the President's economic stabilization program. I hope that this communication may serve to dispel some of the misimpressions which may interfere with its objective consideration.

BEHIND THE TIMES

The communication on another page from Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, says that our position in regard to authorization of stand-by controls over allocation and prices of scarce commodities has changed and that our shift of position seems to be based on the conclusion that the economic situation has changed radically since January.

To be sure, price declines since early January have, we believe, weakened the administration's case for an extension of stand-by controls, although these might still be a useful weapon to hold in reserve against a possible flare-up of inflation. However, this was not the point of the editorial to which Mr. Keyserling refers. The criticism that brought forth his communication was directed at the President's assertion that only farm prices had dropped and metal prices are still spiraling. Evidence to the contrary is there for all to read in daily news reports. In an effort to bolster the President's position Mr. Keyserling cites an over-all index of metals and metal products that is not up to date, while omitting all mention of the declines in premium prices for metals and other indications of a softening of the metals-price structure, not reflected, as Mr. Keyserling well knows, in market quotations.

Of course, the present price trend is mixed. But there is no inconsistency, as Mr. Keyserling implies, between a Post news story headed "Commodity prices stage a comeback" and the editorial in question that appeared the same day. The former dealt exclusively with agricultural prices and merely pointed out that prices of wheat, corn, cotton, etc., had recovered somewhat from the low levels of February 8, but were still far below recent tops. The editorial, on the other hand, discussed the current downward trend of certain nonagricultural prices and cited those declines as evidence that the President was not up to date on price developments.

The President's failure to look at the facts as well as Mr. Keyserling's attempt to minimize the significance of the declines that have recently occurred in prices of basic metals is most disquieting. Presidential requests for stand-by controls have been supported by this newspaper on the assumption that such controls would only be invoked in case of need as demonstrated by an objective study of business conditions and price trends. The assumption itself is now open to question. We agree heartily with Mr. Keyserling that the country needs a discriminating and selective combination of policies to deal with the inflationary cast and the deflationary cast at the same time. But what assurance is there that policies will be discriminating when the President emphasizes the dangers of spiraling inflation at a time when prices of many industrial products are declining and workers being laid off, while one of his chief advisers, Mr. Keyserling, insists that industrial capacity expansion is required far in excess of that indicated by current or revealed business plans?

Quite aside from the fact that actual demand now and for the foreseeable future far exceeds supply in those critical areas where capacity expansion is most needed, the proposition that our national output should be reduced downward to meet falling demand is a defeatist rejection of the central purpose of the employment act, accrding to Mr. Keyserling. Evidently he has already prejudged the issue raised by the President's proposal to Congress to conduct an investigation to determine the adequacy of productive facilities for making steel and other vital commodities. The Washington Post supported the request for an impartial inquiry of this sort, but it certainly does not concur with Mr. Keyserling's view that the best way to avert a depression is to expand productive capacity in the face of declining demand. Nor do we think it makes sense to advocate further wage increases as a means of keeping purchasing power high and forestalling a depression. We are still of the opinion that this kind of analysis is unrealistic—that it is designed to support demands for price con-

trols and Government-financed expansion of steel and other basic industries. Incidentally, we never said that Mr. Keyserling's argument for productive expansion rested on a failure to perceive that some demands were falling off. However, the Keyserling thesis that production should not be limited by a confession of inability to find markets for what we can produce is one that leaves us speechless.

What Has Happened to the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Richard Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, is an independent, courageous editor whose editorials are always thought-provoking and inspiring to those who believe in the American way of life. Such an editorial appeared in the Tulsa Tribune on Saturday, March 12, and I desire to include it as part of these remarks in order that the Members of Congress and the people of the country may have the opportunity to read a courageous statement in answer the the question, What has happened to the United States?

WE GIVE AID AND COMFORT TO OUR FOE
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What has become of the United States? Congressman DANIEL A. REED, of New York, recently said, "Sometimes I wonder whether the United States as such still exists. It is a rare thing to hear any person express the slightest interest in anything but the philosophy of spending the taxpayers' money." And Congressman RALPH W. GWINN, of New York asks, "What ails America? Have we the political poisons so evident in the rest of the world?"

Another said, "It is now bad taste to expose the fact that Government documents of great importance are being stolen."

What has happened to the United States? We are no longer the land of the free and the home of the brave, as we used to sing. It has become fashionable to question the nobilities of our Republic.

It has become fashionable to be a liberal. That word liberal has degenerated through academic abuses into meaning a largeness that allows for no love of our country. People who affect an intellectual largeness, and little people always do, join up with fellow travelers who would put us under Russian rule. They became pink. And a pink is an intellectual punk. And it has now come to pass that it is no violation of citizenship to be a Red. And the Red is committed to the destruction of this Republic.

To give aid and comfort to our enemy is treason. And the evidence of treason talks through our courts.

The capitol of Illinois was filled the other day with University of Chicago students who traveled to Springfield to protest a bill designed to apprehend those guilty of the subtle acts of treason. College students brazenly defending treason and we are no longer even shocked.

We have so far lost our devotion to our country that the President of the United States insists that any attempt to apprehend our enemies is just "red herring."

Contrast Truman with George Washington. Go back to the time when Benedict Arnold was found to be a traitor. George Washington did not request that the loyal Colonists lay off. George Washington did not seek to get and conceal the evidence against Arnold. But just that is being done today. It is being done with our President's sanction and aid and with all the procrastinating help our courts can give.

We have a President now, and the one before him, who with the approval of our so-called liberals tried to kill the congressional committee that is investigating the activities of our enemies here at home. Communists on the witness stand refused to answer proper questions on the constitutional ground that their answers might incriminate them. They were confessed cowards. They were afraid of truth. They were defended by American lawyers. There were no American lawyers defending Benedict Arnold. Our lawyers today have failed us.

What has happened to the United States? The American Bar Association is supposed to be dedicated to the Constitution of this Republic, but it finds nothing unethical or disturbing in the American lawyers who refuse to state whether they are for or against our country. If the American Bar Association is American it would declare that every such lawyer is unfit to practice in our courts. It would disbar them. But it doesn't care.

What has happened to the United States? Even some of our courts have fallen so low in their comprehension of duty that they have held that no lawyer, nor his client, can be disciplined for refusing to declare whether he is foe or friend of this country. All puffed up like pouter pigeons too many of our judges in their court ponderosity have lost their patriotism.

What has happened to the United States? Every soldier who enlists in our armed forces is compelled to take his oath to support our Republic and defend its flag. Until recently it was never suggested that such a thing is necessary with our teachers. But now concerned citizens demand it. And why not? Such a simple thing to do. Something is wrong when teachers hesitate.

Something has happened to the United States when a college like Harvard, once famous for its crusading culture and its lofty consecrations, has so far lost its comprehension of America that it trains indifference to and contempt for the highest altitude of civilization.

The New Deal departures from the American way of life were born out of Harvard's repudiation of its own rich traditions. Recently one of its teachers, one A. M. Schlesinger, with a group of alleged historians of his selection, announced to the Nation that the promoter of our national debauch was in the class with Washington and Lincoln.

The ant can see its hill, but it cannot see the mountain. History will appraise these alleged historians whose eyes can focus on little sins but cannot see monumental corruptions. Such little chaps, whatever their scholarship presumptions, would have been total strangers in the presence of Washington or Lincoln, of Webster or Clay, Hamilton, Jefferson, or Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, or any of the great men in our country's story.

Something has happened to the United States. When our Republic was young communities built town halls in which town meetings discussed ways to make our country better and our freedoms secure. But no one ever dreamed of debating such an issue as: "Shall the Republic live or die?", or "Shall we hire our enemies to teach us?"

A one-time theatrical player by the name of George V. Denny, Jr., saw in the old town hall idea the possibilities of dramatic entertainment. He organized the Town Hall of New York. He staged debates. It became a dramatic attraction. Recently he staged a debate on the question: "Should Communists be allowed to teach in our colleges?"

His Town Hall audiences, by the demonstrations of their enthusiasm, have pretty well established the impression that at least a considerable number are citizens who haven't the faintest idea what America is, and his debating shams are not designed to teach them.

The Communist is an enemy of this Republic. Should the enemy of America teach the youth of America?

Something has happened to these United States when any Denny can find any college president to defend the idea that the enemies of our country should teach our youth. "Should the police or the gangsters prevail?" Just as good a subject as the one Mr. Denny used. Mr. Denny has the genius to attract listeners who applaud contempt for our country.

Had Mr. Denny, with his present-day practices, operated a Town Hall in Washington's time he would not have dared debate, Should We Hire the Tories to Teach Us? Prof. T. V. Smith, of Syracuse University, answered bluntly the silly and seditious issue Mr. Denny raised by saying, "We can well do without those who cannot do with us."

Denny is a showman. He does not appear to be an advocate of consecrated devotions to the security and the refinement of this Republic. The early Town Hall never debated Shall We Have America or Something Else? Denny does that.

Something has happened to the United States. Great minds have great convictions. Great minds know right from wrong, the true from the false, the difference between slavery and decent living, the difference between corruption and a decent public and private life. Are we to allow ourselves to lose the last best hope on earth?

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., called attention to a resolution adopted by the senate of the State of California. The resolution asked that the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico be continued.

We of the California delegation are in full sympathy with the importance of continuing this work and we appreciate the interest in the matter by the gentleman from Louisiana. We have not been asleep regarding the constant threat to our own livestock industry of the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in our neighboring country.

About a month ago a group of California Congressmen met with several State senators from California to hear an up-to-the-minute report on conditions in the Republic of Mexico regarding this disease and to discuss the need for further action.

Since that time I have been in close contact with the Department of Agriculture and I am satisfied the work of the joint commission for the eradication

of the disease in the Republic of Mexico is continuing satisfactorily.

At the present time there are sufficient funds to carry on this valuable work. Additional requests for appropriations will probably be contained in a later deficiency bill at which time we shall seek the cooperation of the entire membership of the Congress in seeing that no stone is left unturned to eliminate the existence of foot-and-mouth disease.

Blacksmith's Wife Puts Communism on the Anvil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most edifying reply from an ordinary citizen to a letter written by an adherent of communism.

Mrs. Santi, in her letter to the editor of the Waterbury American published on March 15, outlines a true conception of the differences inherent in the communistic and capitalistic systems of government.

I commend this letter to my colleagues and to citizens everywhere for its pithy context.

The letter follows:

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

To the EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN:

What a perfect description of communism, Mr. Kinch: "A social evil dressed in the raiment of the guardian angel."

Yes, I am a capitalist. My husband will sharpen all picks or chisels in competition with any other blacksmiths both as to price and quality of workmanship.

I am also bringing my children up to be capitalists; my 12-year-old son buys "Waterbury Americans" for 21 cents a week, delivers them to his customers for 30 cents and everyone is happy. What is more, I tell him and his sister that nobody owes them a living. When they complete their education they will have to go out and get a job. If there is none to be had they will have to create their own.

In all world history the men or women who have contributed most to world progress are the ones who have created their own jobs.

On the positive side there are the Benjamin Franklins, Henry Fords, and Thomas Edisons of every nation who have created jobs, not only for themselves, but for millions of others without any real cost to anyone of their liberty—taking no lives, bringing tangible benefits to all mankind.

On the negative side there are the Lenins, Stalins, Hitlers, and Mussolinis who also created their own jobs, first by murdering thousands of people, confiscating wealth, then making more new jobs by turning the administration of that wealth over to faithful party members, who of course always turn out to be incompetent opportunists like themselves, so that it takes at least two men in their country to produce as much as one in capitalist America.

Now, as to "either war or depressions," let's get the record straight: Socialist Germany, Communist Russia, and Fascist Italy were keeping their workers fully employed all through our last depression making instruments of war; the first two together marched in an aggressive war against Poland before capitalist America even seriously considered converting the major part of its great industry to war production.

While this Marxist honeymoon lasted, the English held on by the sterling quality of their nerves alone, for, being capitalist, they were not prepared for war, either.

When the two major dictators turned on each other they both had a great military establishment so that they were able to pound each other for 2 years, giving American and English industry time to build and train for the final blow that brought victory to our side, which, unfortunately, also meant victory for Red fascism and defeat only to the brown and black varieties.

Capitalists, like men everywhere, make many mistakes. They are usually quick to correct when those mistakes are recognized. Marxism admits no mistakes, so if some corrections become imperative they must be made by accusing someone of divergence from the Marxist line, make it sound good, and purging the unfortunate individual. That is why it can never be truly progressive, even if a theory 100 years old could be progressive today.

It would take volumes to answer your letter in full, so this must do.

THERESA SANTI.

WATERBURY, *March 13, 1949.*

What Labor of the Largest Local in the World Thinks About the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the largest local in the world:

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman House Labor Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the interest of the 60,000 members of local 600, UAW-CIO, the largest local union in America, we are paying extremely close attention to the discussion currently taking place in the House Labor Committee relative to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The coming of the Taft-Hartley Act, with its oblique view of labor unions and its utterly blind disregard of the enormous benefits that organization has brought to millions of workers (union members and nonunion members alike) and their families, has aroused the keenest kind of resentment among workers since the days of the yellow-dog affidavits.

The position of local 600 on this question is that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed immediately and that the Thomas-Lesinski bill, S. 249, should be enacted into law, without further amendments.

The history of the union labor at Ford's is one of orderly and responsible recognition of contractual agreements. When differences of opinion on policy, procedure, and other issues have arisen between union and company, they have been discussed and resolved at the collective-bargaining table, and when final decisions have been reached, the union has honestly respected them.

The first contract ever signed between the Ford Motor Co. and a labor union was the one signed on June 20, 1941, with the UAW-CIO. In that contract and in every subsequent contract, including the current one, an important feature of the contract was the inclusion of a union-shop clause.

Under the union-shop clause, the irritations that can arise out of situations in which membership or nonmembership are involved, have been entirely eliminated.

Within 6 months after the date of the signing of the first UAW Ford contract, Pearl Harbor was attacked, and America was at war.

The production-for-war record of Ford workers won high and well-deserved praise. P. & W. motors, airplane parts and sections, jeeps, tanks, trucks, and many other essential items were produced in amazing quantities and of unmatched quality.

Bond drive after bond drive went over the top. Blood banks overflowed with patriotic outpourings. A score of committees were formed and maintained throughout the war to keep contact with the 20,000 members of local 600 who entered their country's service. Men from local 600 fought on every front where Americans were engaged and every service cemetery has its quota of our union's dead.

The men who worked so loyally and well, who bought the bonds, donated their blood, and helped fight the Nation's battles were the same men who, in the difficult depression years, planned, fought for, and eventually organized the union that freed them from a despotic industrial system that would have men be mere, meek robots, without individual human rights or dignity.

The UAW-CIO is patriotic, practical, and constructive. It lives, breathes, and practices true democracy. It brooks no intolerance. The rights of every man, irrespective of race, creed, color, or station is respected and protected.

In the councils of the UAW at local 600, as elsewhere in CIO, the most obscure worker, when the chips are down, has a vote in deciding the policies of his union, equal to the vote of the president of local 600's 60,000 members.

Through the years, since the first contract was signed, the Ford Motor Co. has never seriously disputed the merit of the union-shop clause. It remained for the Taft-Hartley Act to make it an issue and to force an expensive election to determine whether the clause should be deleted or retained in the contract.

As the Taft-Hartley Act became better known and its antiunion design became more and more apparent, there arose from Ford workers, a spontaneous outburst of indignation. Men who formerly appeared apathetic and complacent joined in the anger of their fellows and vowed their determination to defend their union.

The election on the issue of the union shop was held in July 1948. It was conducted by the NLRB. Young workers, old workers, cripples, and people who lived many miles away from the election place came to vote.

The election attracted Nation-wide attention. Newspaper and newsreel services covered the event extensively. Radio commentators featured stories of the election on their broadcasts.

The election occupied 5 days, from 6 a. m. to 8 p. m. each day. When the votes from all Ford plants throughout the country were heaped together on the sixth day and the count was completed the results showed a 98.64 percent in favor of the union shop. (And it should be pointed out that the peculiar reasoning of the Taft-Hartley Act requires that the votes of those who do not cast a ballot, whether because of sickness, at home or in hospital, or away on vacation, or for any other reason, are all counted as votes against the union.)

Truly Ford workers had demonstrated their intention to protect their union against the insidious designs of Taft-Hartley or any other such antiunion acts or circumstances.

As the elected officers of Local 600, UAW-CIO, we are proud of the forthright loyalty of our union membership. And, speaking, as we do, for our local's 60,000 members, we say to the honorable members of the House Labor Committee, that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed and the Thomas-Lesinski bill, S. 249, without further amendments, should be reported out of committee and passed by the Senate.

Surely 98.64 percent of Ford workers cannot be wrong.

We remain,

Respectfully yours,

Thomas W. Thompson, President; Lee Romano, Vice President; William R. Hood, Recording Secretary; Paul Good, Financial Secretary; Joe Rivers, Guide; Andy Dewar, Sergeant at Arms; Manuel Guardado, Jr., Trustee; Walter Connors, Trustee; Godfrey Franklin, Trustee.

Atlantic Pact Must Be Ratified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from New Orleans States:

ATLANTIC PACT MUST BE RATIFIED

Now that the text of the proposed North Atlantic security alliance has been made public the paramount question to be held in mind in examining its 1,040 words is: Will the alliance provide effective security against Russia?

This Nation's chief concern in groping through a welter of words following yesterday's release of the document must be in the results to be implemented through it.

It is natural that major interest should be focused on the alliance's article 5 and whether it would bypass Congress in marching the United States off to war. In part, the article sets forth this:

"The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

What action the United States deems necessary would rest in the hands of the Congress. Moreover, article 11 stipulates: "This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

In explaining the treaty, Secretary of State Dean Acheson underlined that it would obligate the United States to resort to arms only if that were the judgment of the Government—meaning the Congress. Such an explanation has already been accepted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in giving informal approval to the pact.

The principle of guaranteeing collective international security follows a trail blazed as long ago as the Monroe Doctrine and traversed again 2 years ago in the inter-American treaty for continental defense signed at Rio.

The antidote for force is force, and the greatest single force against totalitarianism today is the United States. It could have been, too, back in 1939 and the course of history would have been different. There are those who say bluntly, and not without merit, that we brought on World War II by refusing to be actively arrayed against aggression in those momentous days. Hitler's calculations were based on victory before the United States could switch from neutrality to a militarily powerful nation.

The same reasoning applies well a decade later. If the side of democracy is strong, not puny, it commands the respect even of world revolutionaries. It is not enough that the United States shall have identified itself on the side of peace and justice by committing itself to economic rehabilitation of war-torn democracies.

It must supplement its efforts with the security which can come from a North Atlantic insurance policy.

Norwegian Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 17, 1949:

HARSH AUSTERITY MARKS DRIVE OF NORWEGIANS FOR RECOVERY—CONSUMPTION STANDARDS ARE LOWEST, NEXT TO GERMANY'S, OF ANY NON-SOVIET COUNTRY

(By William H. Harrison)

On February 11, in a statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Augustus E. Staley, Jr., chief of the special Economic Cooperation Administration Mission to Norway, made a point of emphasizing that the Norwegian people were living at an austerity level that Americans would find almost unbearable.

Mr. Staley did not exaggerate. In prewar days, Norway enjoyed one of the higher standards of living in Europe, but that changed with the German invasion in April 1940. From then on, the country was systematically looted, and not long before VE-day it was laid waste in the north during the Nazi scorched-earth retreat from the Russians.

Counting its losses as peace came, it found that about half its 4,800,000 tons of merchant shipping had been destroyed in serving the Allied cause, and that it was poorer, all factors considered, by about $2,000,000,000—a staggering sum for a nation of little more than 3,000,000 people.

After what they had gone through during the war, it would have been understandable if the Norwegians had decided to forget the future and treat themselves to some creature comforts. But they did not do that. Instead, with the future in mind, with long-term recovery in mind, they tightened their belts even more, and there has been no loosening since, nor is there likely to be, to any marked degree, in the next 3 or 4 years.

STORE SHELVES ARE EMPTY

The biggest department stores in Oslo, the capital, and in the historic city of Bergen are largely full of empty shelves. Leather-soled shoes are practically unobtainable. If a man buys a pair of sheets for his home, he must surrender 6 months' clothing rations. He can get one suit and one shirt a year, but if he does get them, he will have no coupons left for underclothes. Comparatively, the Swedes, and to a somewhat lesser extent the Danes, are living amid plenty.

As for food—not to mention fuel for domestic use—hotels and restaurants do not require ration coupons and are equipped to serve the tourist trade adequately, but the Norwegian at home, though his calorie intake is about as good as ever, has to put up with a decidedly dull diet made up chiefly of fish and potatoes. If he lives in a city he is lucky if he receives slightly less than a pound of meat a month. He can have 2½ ounces of coffee and 7 ounces of sugar every week, and he is entitled to 40 eggs a year, though he seldom gets that many. On top of all this, he is taxed heavily, and if he has a wife and two children and owns a six-room house, he can be sure of only three rooms, for the government can requisition the rest to cope with the housing shortage.

In fact, according to Erik Brofoss—Norway's impressive Minister of Commerce, who seldom has anything but fish and potatoes for an evening meal and who pays a 30-percent tax on his $4,800 salary—Norwegian consumption standards are the lowest, next to Germany's, of any country west of the iron curtain. They are that by deliberate choice.

Rather than invest in imports calculated to make life more comfortable right away, Norway has determined to invest in the essentials needed for long-term recovery—to rebuild and enlarge its merchant marine, which in prewar days earned enough to finance a third of the country's total purchases abroad; to repair and modernize the whaling and fishing fleets, which are vital to the Norwegian economy; to develop new hydroelectric plants, and to increase production in the wood pulp, electrochemical, metallurgical, mining, and other industries.

PROGRESS TOWARD RECOVERY

With the $104,000,000 allotted to it by the ECA for the 15-month period from April 1948 to next July 1, Norway has surmounted what would otherwise have been a grave national crisis caused by a lack of dollars desperately needed for indispensable imports. With that aid, it has made definite progress toward recovery, and with continuing help on a descending scale, it hopes to achieve economic equilibrium by 1952–53.

The hope, however, is based on several assumptions, including the assumption that there will be a healthy revival of trade with Britain and Germany, Norway's most important suppliers and customers before the war. Without that revival, of course, the Norwegians, like the Swedes and Danes, will be hard put to get back on their feet before the Marshall plan expires.

As set forth and administered by the Labor government in Oslo, the long-term recovery program has not escaped criticism, though there is general agreement that it is essentially very good. What is objected to in many quarters is the mass of regulations and controls involved. Most of these are considered necessary, but some—including the tax laws—are being attacked as excessive and harmful to the individual initiative and incentives required for greater production.

Another objection is that certain of the goals set up for attainment by 1952–53, though desirable, are overambitious and call for too great an investment in too short a period. One of these is a road-building project in remote areas. According to the critics, the money could be more productively spent—in terms of acquiring dollar exchange—on expanding hotel and other accommodations. With its fjords and mountains, Norway is one of the world's most magnificent scenic spots and the Government itself agrees that more needs to be done to increase the tourist trade.

But of all the doubts voiced in connection with the long-term program, the biggest is that having to do with austerity. The Norwegian people have been denying themselves now for almost 10 years and the question is whether it is humanly possible for them to keep on that way, without any appreciable relief, for another 3 or 4 years.

Some fear that a continuation of the present severe rationing will undermine incentives to greater production. Others suggest that it may play into the hands of the small but aggressive Communist Party, which currently is harping on the potentially effective propaganda line that there should be butter before guns and that life would be a lot better in Norway if the government spent less on defense and refused to have anything to do with the North Atlantic security pact.

For its own part, the Oslo Government is not deaf to criticism, nor is it unaware of the risks involved in too much austerity. Accordingly, thought is being given now to the possibility of lightening the tax burden and also of relaxing rations, at least as regards clothing and shoes. At the same time, however, there is unyielding determination to spare no effort to get back to real economic health by 1952–3, and it is a determination that seems to prevail among Norwegians generally. In his statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Staley effectively summed up the situation with the following words:

The Norwegians are a proud, independent, and fearless people * * * true friends of democracy. They are willing to fight for it. To defend it successfully, they need the hope of a better tomorrow, the imports necessary to rehabilitate their economy and the strength to enable them to resist any aggression designed to impair their freedom.

A continuation of ECA assistance will provide the hope, the needed imports and the strength for a successful defense. American aid and American dollars have produced and will continue to produce results in Norway.

Executive Council of Nebraska State Bar Association Condemns the Picketing of Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the executive council of the Nebraska State Bar Association. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE NEBRASKA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

That the executive council of the Nebraska State Bar Association condemns the picketing of courts, Federal and State, as an interference with and obstruction of the administration of justice, the purpose of which can only be to influence, intimidate, and coerce the courts in connection with matters, prospective or pending, before them;

That ours is a government of laws and not of men; and that in the orderly administration of justice it is necessary that our courts be impartial and independent in the application and construction of the laws and thus free from any interference or acts which will result in a disrespect for law and constitutional government under law; that such picketing constitutes a clear and present danger and may constitute a threat to the integrity and independence of the judiciary and our form of government.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with the request that this matter be brought to the attention of the judicial conference of the United States; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Representatives of this State in Congress so that should additional legislation become necessary in order to protect the integrity of our Federal courts, such representatives will know the attitude of the bar of Nebraska with respect thereto.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for H. R. 1731, a bill to extend until June 30, 1950, certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The problem of rent control is a difficult one.

It is argued by those who oppose it that more rental units will be available if rent controls are removed since with rent controls in existence many people do not find it worth while to go to the expense of converting a dwelling for rental purposes. It is argued also that there is at the present time more residential floor space per capita in this country than ever before. It is argued that vacancies in rental properties increase almost proportionately as the national income decreases. It is argued that rent control creates slums since owners cannot afford maintenance and improvements. It is argued that rent controls constitute an interference with property rights and a deterrent to savings.

Surely, most of us look forward to the time when rent controls will no longer be necessary; when, because of decontrolled new construction, there will be enough rental housing to satisfy the demand; when, in an open market, owners can get a fair return on their investment and the people who desire to rent can find rentals at a reasonable price.

In the meantime, however, I believe that rent controls in the modified form contained in H. R. 1731 should be continued.

I take this position because while the bill for which I voted contains certain shortcomings the measure was substantially improved on the floor of the House and a rental emergency still exists in certain parts of the country. I voted for this bill also (1) because if rent controls were suddenly removed many rentals would rise exorbitantly; (2) because it is quite likely that the removal of rent controls would result in another round of wage increases; (3) because there are an increasing number of unemployed in Connecticut and in other parts of the country, and I believe, particularly at this time, that these people should be protected against the additional burden of increased rent; and (4) because while there may be more residential floor space in the country at large than heretofore (A) most of it is not rental housing; and (B) most of the balance is not within the financial means of those who need it the most.

The fact of the matter is that although rent controls are an interference with property rights, property rights have traditionally been interfered with when the public interest is involved. Surely the public have an interest in providing adequate rental housing for those many families who, because of the increase in our population and the postwar shortage of rental housing units within their means, are living under adverse conditions. Surely the general welfare of the country—the public interest—requires that young American couples should be able to start their family lives under auspicious conditions.

The fact that new construction is still decontrolled will, I believe, gradually reduce the need. An increasing number of rental units are being decontrolled as the need diminishes.

Furthermore, an amendment for which I voted and which was adopted on the floor provides that Federal rent control lapses with respect to any given State or community 15 days after that State or community determines that there is no further need for Federal rent control. In my opinion, this is a highly salutary arrangement, providing as it does for a maximum of local control.

I also voted for an excellent amendment which was adopted on the floor and which provides that landlords, many of whom are widows and old people, dependent entirely on the rent which they receive, shall receive a fair return on the rental property which they own. This is not only just; it is in the ultimate interest of the tenants since otherwise these rental units would eventually become slums.

I believe that on balance the rent-control bill for which I voted is in the public interest.

Gangway, Gangway, Here Comes the Elephant—Dead or Alive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that at this time it is quite opportune for the Members of Congress, and the people of the United States generally, to give serious consideration to the following matter:

Ever since the fifth day of creation when God according to chapter 1, verse 25, of Genesis, made the cattle and creeping things, and the beasts of the earth according to their kinds we have been either blessed or cursed with ele-

phants. Also I rather fancy, that from the twilight years of antiquity up to the very present, elephants have been front page news for the most enlightened brains, as well as for the most befuddled and benighted of the back street, and the back roads, minds. Most all of those possessing inquiring intellects have, I dare say, wondered perhaps what the elephant really was, and what he stood for, what he was thinking about, and most of all, what he was about to do presently, and thusly they have wondered, and they have wondered, and still their wonder has grown.

Many yesteryears ago, in Omaha, Nebr., there resided a veritable old ponderous hulk of an Irishman, who laid off from his packinghouse work, one bright summer's day, to go for his very first time to see the Barnum and Bailey circus, and while roaming through the menagerie, he chanced to come upon old Jumbo the biggest elephant in all of the world—at least in captivity. As these two peers, in their respective created classes, met and stood gazing, intently and wonderingly, at each other, Mr. Egan shook his head sadly and said "Youse is nather a harse nor a cow, as you stand there throwin' hay in your face wit' your tail. You're a big rubber bull." In those far-off days it was considered a great zoological joke on Mr. Egan, but maybe Mr. Egan, in the light of this year's happenings, in this same Omaha, Nebr., unconsciously but certainly expressed a great present-day truth.

The perplexities increase as we read fables, stories, poems, and even the more factual things concerning the elephant. He is now, and was always I dare say, the enigma of all of the known enigmas, political or otherwise. He is enigmatism personified.

In order to convince you and in order that I may in passing lay some small claim to being smatteringly literary, and also in order to help to throw light and not heat upon the various elephant problems of today, I wish to furnish you for mental browsings only, the following poem by John G. Saxe, entitled "The Blind Men and the Elephant," the original thought having been derived from a very old, old fable:

THE BLIND MEN AND THE ELEPHANT

(By John G. Saxe)

It was six men of Indostan
  To learning much inclined,
Who went to see the elephant
  (Though all of them were blind),
That each by observation
  Might satisfy his mind.

The first approached the elephant,
  And happening to fall
Against his broad and sturdy side,
  At once began to bawl,
"God bless me! but the elephant
  Is very like a wall!"

The second, feeling of the tusk,
  Cried, "Ho! what have we here
So very round and smooth and sharp?
  To me 'tis might clear
This wonder of an elephant
  Is very like a spear"

The third approached the animal,
  And happening to take
The squirming trunk within his hands,
  Thus boldly up up and spake,
"I see," quoth he, "the elephant
  Is very like a snake!"

The fourth reached out his eager hand,
  And felt about the knee.
"What most this wondrous beast is like
  Is mighty plain," quoth he;
"'Tis clear enough the elephant
  Is very like a tree!"

The fifth, who chanced to touch the ear
  Said, "E'en the blindest man
Can tell what this resembles most;
  Deny the fact who can,
This marvel of an elephant
  Is very like a fan!"

The Sixth no sooner had begun
  About the beast to grope,
Then, seizing on the swinging tail
  That fell within his scope,
"I see," quoth he, "the elephant
  Is very like a rope!"

And so these men of Indostan
  Disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion
  Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right,
  And all were in the wrong!

(Copied from Anthology of Children's Literature, Johnson & Scott.)

They say that history ever repeats itself, and perhaps in Omaha, Nebr., when the Republican Party met recently in solemn conclave on elephant business, who knows but that some of the lineal descendants of those same six wise men of Indostan were there in goodly force, or perhaps it might have been a family reunion of the blood lines of those same six wise men from staid old Indostan.

I understand that at the Omaha conclave, they, too, debated loud and long about how the little, big man, of the strong adjectives and nouns fame, was not throwing the bull but was throwing elephants on last election day and thusly demonstrated to the world that Paul Revere could ride again—

And spread the alarm
  Through every Middlesex village and farm,
For the country folks to be up and to arm.

And that political gladiators have not been bred out entirely, in the United States of America, as far as the Democratic Party is concerned, because of the fact that we have been living in a soft, decadent Republic on a supersoft national manna.

But getting back to Omaha, that great city of the plains, where the reception which is given to a President of the Republic is numberless, yawning, gaunt, empty seats, cometh the elephant, and the best mahouts of the legions of wealth to discover all of the rest of the numberless whys and the wherefores concerning the smarting question of the hour, as to why the elephant comes so politically empty, too, back to the town of the empty seats, with such a vast horde—according to the versions of many—of political empty heads. And, oh, yes, so that the refrigeration would be perfect to preserve the status quo, Nature also sent the Nebraska infantries of snow and the cold and the sleet, and the ice, and the cavalry of the wild blasts to harass and to scatter and whip about the Republicans and the other remaining real withered leaves, to bear these great wayfarers from hither and yon, near and far, sweet company.

From the foregoing you may well glean that when one finally gets down to brass tacks, as one always eventually must, the whole thing was a wet, cold, windy and empty affair in the town of the empty seats.

Some of the more hopeful were of the decided opinion that the elephant was not dead, and that the head mahout was not at fault, while others contended that the sweeping kicks of the elephant, which Captain Harry had rendered hors de combat, were not signs of life at all, but a purely natural phenomenon called reflex action following rigor mortis. Of course neither the Omaha wake, nor the Omaha autopsy, disclosed anything, except that the leaders, even in "that great party of the better minds, and the better people" of the United States of America, all too humanly, yes, too humanly, also—

Love to anticipate, squander, and dissipate, all that old busy pate hoarded with care.

even if old busy pate was symbolized as an elephant.

But anyhow finally might triumphed again and right trekked home snivelling once more.

Since the Omaha fiasco much has been said publicly and privately about how to rejuvenate the elephant, and out of the political gloom came, a Bethlehem-like gleaming intellectual ray, from none other that the peerless editorial writer of the Omaha World-Herald, democracy's strong friend and ardent supporter of bygone days, the Honorable Harvey Newbranch, who contributed to journalism and to the political gladiators, and the vestal virgins and the populace, that masterpiece "God Hates a Coward" which is now to be found in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A986, having been inserted by the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, on the 21st day of February 1949, and which editorial because of its previous, wide publication in many newspapers throughout the land as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD need not be repeated again here.

If there is anything that Omaha has more in profusion than empty auditorium seats for a Democratic President, it is good newspaper men, and among them verbal cuffings are the order of the day—a real pastime.

In Omaha, both sides of almost every question is presented in some way or another, even if sometimes we Democrats might have to go to Council Bluffs, Iowa, to do it.

I now wish to present for your consideration the following editorial from the February 3d issue of the Farmer-Labor Press, written by my dear and true Democratic friend, the Honorable George Woodward, Sr., of Omaha, Nebr., and presently, and for some past months the editor of the aforementioned newspaper:

A MASTERPIECE

Everybody likes to read an editorial with plenty of pepper, spice, and high-priced words dropped with precision in their proper place, even though the writer chooses for his subject the resurrection of an organic group as dead as the dodo bird.

The leading editorial in the Omaha World-Herald January 26, written by Harvey Newbranch, was a masterpiece. It was a wonderful display of literary ability, and unless he went back 16 years and thumbed through the files for data when the World-Herald was a forceful Democratic organ

under its founder and publisher, the late Gilbert M. Hitchcock, and it was his (Harvey's) job to lambast the Republican Party from hell to breakfast in every issue, his article God Hates a Coward proves that age has not affected his mental faculties but has really improved his emotional impulse and keen wit.

One thing we can say for Harvey Newbranch: He has always been on the side that needed his help. His valiant assistance in the Democratic Party in its effort and final success in pulling the farmers out of the Hoover mudhole, and his long, fearless, and tireless battle to rescue labor and the common people from the cruel, merciless heel of despotism of the Republican Party under the supervision of the all-powerful trusts and monopolies is highly appreciated and will never be forgotten.

Of course, the able and talented support of Harvey Newbranch is not now needed in the Democratic Party. But we were, and are, sorry to lose him—sorry for his own sake that he abandoned the party just at the time, with his noble and courageous help, the Democratic Party wrenched the Government from the hands of organized wealth and gave it back to the people. Just after big business had swallowed up all the national resources and beginning to devour each other, and, on bended knees at the feet of the deliverer, the new President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, begged him with real, humble tears of agony to save them from themselves and preserve human dignity; to save the Nation. What an immense share in the glory of liberating the millions of starving people Harvey could claim had he remained with the party to enjoy it. What a pity it is to lose such a brilliant mind to speak for humanity. But the loss is not to the Democratic Party, or gain to the Republican Party. The loss is to Harvey Newbranch himself and to himself alone. The new trail laid for him to follow led him into political exile, and may God (who hates a coward) have mercy on this political outcast.

If the Democratic Party had swung so wide from the traditions he so highly respected, instead of leaving the ship, why did not Harvey Newbranch use his great influence in piloting it back to its moor? Either he was an imposter in, or traitor to, the Democratic Party all the years he served as editor in chief on the World-Herald under Hitchcock, or his efforts now to keep his place and earn his way is well and cleverly concealed hypocrisy. I should rather believe the latter is true. Read the fourth paragraph of his article:

"But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the fleshpots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty, to stand up for the free Republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Due to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional, glorious creed. And it finds the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling."

No one but with the soul of Harvey Newbranch could have written that paragraph, and no one but a knave would risk his readers' contempt by trying to hide the significance of the advocacy of adherence to tradition, and its long-attended misery, in the bowels of a well-written paragraph.

After all, what is the American creed? What is the traditional, glorious creed for which Mr. Newbranch can find no champion in his newly adopted Republican Party? I've been plodding along, following the tradition of doing as I please, most of the time (the only American tradition that really appeals to me) and doing the things I am told to do, some of the time (following the American tradition most repulsive to me), for as many years or not quite, or more, than Harvey Newbranch, and, I confess, I do not know what the glorious American creed is. If there be a glorious American creed, to me it means all the blessed sacred creeds working for God and the brotherhood of man rolled into one and not the single creed of a political party to build an insurmountable wall betwixt the rich and the poor and designating the rich as the true representative of the dignity of man.

The great advancement in science and industrial progress was not required to follow any precedent or tradition, while Harvey's Republican Party is always throwing sprags in the wheels of Government progress by demanding that we follow the traditions of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and none of those illustrious dead men were better equipped to cope with the complicated affairs of government in this day than would a modern school teacher.

Under democratic supremacy the United States Government has advanced further in catching up with industry in the past 16 years than in all the previous years of its history, and still it has some catching up to do.

Another paragraph in the splendidly written article by the Republican convert, Harvey Newbranch, follows:

"Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls—and trails its flag."

If allusion to Pendergastism is an intended insult to our President, it is also a boomerang to any and all the aspirants to the Presidency on the Republican ticket. The election of Harry Truman proves, conclusively that the people, by long experience, have learned that any President elected on the Republican ticket is obligated and hogtied to big business and answerable to the dictates of big business as they always have been. It proves that, having renovated the atmosphere from the corruption and stench accumulated by Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, the people are going to keep it that way.

Be not alarmed, Harvey. Whatever ism that frightened you into writing that article for the benefit of the Republican pow-wow in Omaha last week, the Democrats will not drag you into totalitarianism. Freedom of the press to accept the direction of its policies by big advertisers will not be disturbed.

Representatives of the Republican Party, for the past 16 years, have done nothing in Washington, in peace and war, but obstruct proposed constructive legislation. They voted against lifting of the arms embargo; against lend lease; against rationing, and against every war measure introduced. Their antilabor, antifarmer, antieverything attitude against everything but capital and big industry since the Republicans slid into control of the House and Senate 2 years ago is an outstanding example of their favoritism to the giant corporations at the expense of the farmers, small business, and labor. Fortunately, the demonstration was made in time for the voters to frustrate their intention to turn back the clock to the time of the late President William Howard Taft, and the Democrats elected the President and regained control of the House and Senate.

The Republican Party is all washed up. It cannot find a substitute for the Democratic program agreeable to the voters. There is none. As a political organ to govern at Washington the Republican Party has played its last tune.

I think you will find that proverb, "God hates a coward," originated at the gambling table, and is not supported by gospel truth.

One-Way Trade Won't Work, an Article by Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by our late colleague, Hon. Sol Bloom, who at the time of his passing was chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The article, entitled "One-Way Trade Won't Work" appeared in This Week, a magazine section of the Washington Sunday Star published March 13, 1949, a few days after Mr. Bloom's untimely death. It is no doubt the last of many other contributions on public affairs made by the distinguished statesman during a long life of service to his country. The article follows:

ONE-WAY TRADE WON'T WORK
(By Sol Bloom, chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee)

The world outside of the United States is running out of dollars. And unless we do something about it we are going to be running out of prosperity.

What it simmers down to is that we are enjoying the biggest business boom in our history because we have the largest foreign market we have ever had. If we let ourselves get mouse-trapped into losing that foreign market, it's going to be the 1930 depression all over again.

In 1947 we sold $14,000,000,000 worth of goods to the world, but we only bought $6,000,000,000 from the outside. At that rate, in spite of the Marshall plan, whatever dollars there are in the world must inevitably come home to roost in the United States. When that happens, other nations will have nothing left with which to buy our goods—and that will mean unemployment and depression. One-way trade just won't work.

The only way we can keep what we have now is by making sure that other nations can sell to us so they can get the money to buy what we have.

If it means a sacrifice here and there along the line, we are going to have to make it, because, bluntly, we can't live in heaven while the rest of the world is living in hell.

THE GOLDEN EGG

The last Congress, by limiting our reciprocal trade agreements to 1 year and setting up a complicated tariff commission, did a fine job of whetting the ax to kill the goose that is laying the golden egg.

The big job the Eighty-first Congress is going to face is amending that legislation so that we can do something about it before it's too late.

Tariff is a funny word. Most people imagine it is something concerned solely with high finance and the importing and exporting business. Forget it. Tariff concerns every man, woman, and child in the United States. Tariff is a wall; foreign goods climb it by paying a tax.

In countries where industrialization is in a primitive state, tariffs are necessary to give the home team enough of an advantage to let it stay in business.

In industrial countries like the United States, where mechanical advantages offset cheap foreign labor, high tariffs are red-hot dangers. If foreign goods can't sell here, foreign nations won't have the money to buy what we sell.

One of my constituents is a clothing manufacturer. He makes 100 suits a day, which provides a reasonable return on his investment. Seventy-five percent of these he sells here in the United States; the rest go abroad. If Europe can't buy those other 25 suits, his factory is going to shut down in part. And to continue to make a profit, he is going to have to add part of the cost of the 25 suits he doesn't make to the 75 he does. Result: the price of suits goes up.

The trouble with tariff is that we have too much politics in it and not enough statesmanship.

That mistake is caused by the writing of a tariff bill from the floor of the House on the basis of "you vote for me and I'll vote for you."

Australia is the world's biggest wool producer. We are the biggest wool consumers. We don't grow enough for our needs, yet we have a restrictive tariff on wool that keeps Australia's crop out of our market or lets it in at such a cost to the Australians that they can't buy our goods. A special interest in the United States has been served and the rest of the country has had to suffer.

FAR-REACHING RESULTS

In 1930, when the Smoot-Hawley tariff went into effect, it made us the most heavily protected country in the world. You know the result. A stock-market crash that might have been a localized depression swept the world and finally helped produce a war from which we haven't recovered.

Since 1934 we have been whittling at that tariff by reciprocal trade agreements. These say, "If you let my goods in your country, I'll let your goods in mine." Over a period of years we managed to get some sort of sense into foreign trade.

Then last year when the tariffs came up for renewal, the Gearhardt bill passed, stipulating that instead of making agreements for 3 years with other countries, as we had been doing, the agreements were made for only 1 year.

World businessmen, no matter how badly they needed dollars, were scared off. They had lost the guaranty of a stable business. European manufacturing for export went into a slump. Some of the protariff people have tried to throw a smoke screen around the question by saying that labor is dead set against tariff reductions because cheap foreign labor can produce products we can't undersell.

The best way to answer that is to tell the story told me by a labor leader about the factory that one of the automobile manufacturers built in India to get cheap labor. The labor was cheap enough, all right. But after they had added and subtracted and done a few other things they found it cost more to produce a car in India than it did in Detroit. The reason is that we have become so skilled in mass production that no matter how cheap the labor we compete against, we can still show a profit.

We may have needed protection back in the days when our infant industries were just getting started, but today we have grown to such a stature that protection of that sort is about as much use to us as a pair of white duck pants at the North Pole.

NO DOLLARS, NO BUSINESS

The dollar situation is the crux of the matter. The dollar is now the international medium of exchange. If you have dollars you are in business; without them you must resort to barter.

If Bolivia has an item like tin, which we need, and they need American goods and have no dollars, let us make it as simple as possible for them to exchange their tin for our goods.

Russia, of course, is in the barter business. Some of the nations now in the Russian orbit would very much like to do business with us. If they could I am sure that they would not remain in the Russian sphere of influence very long. But we must make it attractive to them to trade with us. We can't do it if we have a tariff wall they cannot climb.

Right now, Canada is our best customer. They have 13,000,000 people and we have about 11 times as many, yet we have a tariff wall that is supposed to protect us from them. Somehow I don't see it. I don't see little Canada taking any important slice of world trade away from us. But because of last year's tariff revision, Canada had to cut down on her imports of American goods, the trouble being, of course, no dollars.

ALL TOGETHER

We have an unprecedented prosperity now, but that doesn't mean it's going to continue indefinitely. We have prosperity because of world trade. The only way we can keep it is by making our tariff laws work the greatest good for the greatest number. Special interests must be subordinated and their privileges curtailed. The world is going to get well all together or not at all.

A lot of people don't seem to see that. The other day a man came into my office. "Look," he said, "that tariff cut is going to cut the national income about $1,000,000 a year."

"Yes," I said, "that is true. Since we have 147,000,000 people here, your share is a little less than a penny. However, I'll make up the difference. Here's a penny." I handed it to him. And do you know, he took it.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include therein a resolution passed by the General Shields Council, Knights of Columbus, Ottumwa, Iowa, on the Federal aid to education bill:

IOWA STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Ottumwa, Iowa, March 14, 1949.

Hon. KARL LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am attaching resolution passed by our council representing our 600 members at a recent meeting.

I feel that we are entitled to expect the same consideration for our Catholic children regardless of whether they attend public or parochial school. We will appreciate favorable action on your part when the Thomas bill (S. 246) comes up for consideration by the Eighty-first Congress.

Yours very truly,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
A. F. BLAKE,
Grand Knight.

RESOLUTION

OTTUMWA, IOWA.

At a recent meeting of our council, General Shields Council, Knights of Columbus, a discussion of the Federal aid to education bill came up. It was the understanding of the members that at least the safety and health benefits for the school children are not sectarian and only indirectly educational. It is true that they can best be administered through the school system but if this method of administration excludes any children because of color, creed, etc., then some medium other than the school system ought to be found so that all our American children can benefit equally.

With this thought in mind our council drew up the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Federal aid to education bill be formulated so as to include the well-being of all our children, regardless of race, color, or creed; that the Federal aid include, as a basic requirement, health and safety benefits for nonpublic school children; that this aid be administered without discrimination as is the National School Lunch Act of 1946."

Rev. T. C. DONOHUE,
H. H. KAMERICK,
J. D. VAUGHAN,
A. J. SCHWARTZ,
Committee.

General Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with instructions of the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives from Massachusetts to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of resolutions, petitions, and memorials, which may be sent to the entire membership of that delegation, and, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now insert a resolution of the City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass., petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Worcester and State of Massachusetts:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

Approved March 10, 1949.

CHARLES F. JEFF SULLIVAN,
Mayor.

Pensions for Elder People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. Chairman, as one who has always expressed strong feeling in favor of increased benefits to our elder people, I am glad to appear before your committee to testify in favor of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136.

It is my hope that such a measure will be soon reported to the whole House in order that I may have the opportunity of voting for legislation I promised to fight unceasingly for when I first come to Congress in November 1939.

During these past 10 years, the subject of adequate pensions for the aged has become so prominent, I dare say it is now the foremost issue before the country and the Congress.

A decade ago, I can well recall, this subject was considered in hush-hush tones. It was taboo. Today, our citizens in all walks of life openly clamor for its early acceptance by Congress and more than that, look upon us to make it a reality.

In my opinion, citizens who reach the age of 60 are as much entitled to the benefits of our Constitution as those not as old. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness must not end at any fixed point in life, so long as life sustains.

Unfortunately 9 out of 10 persons find themselves without sufficient means to survive when they reach their later years. Often they cannot find employment, and are bereft of all income.

This presents a most forlorn picture and one which clearly points out how much the senior citizens of this great land are deprived of our Constitution's privileges, supposedly guaranteed to all the people.

Of course, the argument is immediately raised whenever a voice speaks out for pensions, that our social-security system is gradually being perfected and will take care of the retired.

To be perfectly frank, I do not feel that social security will ever be adequate the way it is now conceived. In the first place, only a segment of the people is covered. True, much progress has been made in blanketing more and more under it. But we are moving too slowly.

Referring back to the Bill of Rights, all our people should be able to expect equal basic treatment. The pursuit of happiness ought to be fair for all. You cannot limit fundamental American rights to a group here and there. Respectable retirement ought to be a fundamental privilege and it ought to be available to all.

A universal old-age pension plan geared to the basic economy is what the citizens of the United States should be able to look forward to.

Why should John L. Lewis crack the whip and gain $100 a month for a handful of coal miners when millions of the rest of us are left out in the cold?

Why should a comparative few who happen to be fortunate enough to work for Federal and State Governments enjoy comfortable retirement while the great masses have no income after they leave productive employment?

Why should other pressure groups descend upon Washington, calling vociferously for their followers to benefit from piecemeal pension programs while there are still a majority left unaided after their schemes are approved by Congress?

There is only one answer to all these questions. We owe it to America to devise a plan which assures every citizen the same opportunity to participate in a basic old-age pension plan.

Since the gross income tax proposed in H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136 would gear the benefits to our basic national economy, and since it would provide the beneficiaries with an income level which in times like the present would approximate the level that the new studies of the minimum wage have clearly shown to be necessary for decent living by individuals throughout this Nation, therefore, I believe these bills embody just such a plan. I am urging the adoption of this proposal.

Excise Taxes on Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 12

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, during the recent wartime emergency, imposed an excise tax on transportation in the amounts of 15 percent of carrier charges for transporting persons and 3 percent of carrier charges for transporting property; and

Whereas such taxes were added to the regular tariff charges of the carriers and collected from passengers and shippers, thereby increasing their transportation costs by the amounts of such taxes; and

Whereas such excise taxes, based as they are upon flat percentages of transportation charges, impose an unfair burden on long-distance shippers and long-distance travelers; and

Whereas this unequal burden places Oregon producers at a disadvantage in competing with others located closer to consuming centers of the East; and

Whereas the emergency which caused the imposition of such excise taxes has passed and there is now no good reason for continuing this unequal and discriminatory burden upon the people of the West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to repeal the acts imposing such excise taxes; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by senate, March 5, 1949.

WILLIAM E. WALSH,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by house, March 11, 1949.

FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
Speaker of House.

Spain and the Mediterranean Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following excellent explanation of the testimony of wartime American Ambassador to Spain, Hon. Carlton J. H. Hayes, now restored to his post as Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University, New York City. This exposition, worthy of deep consideration, has been prepared by one of my valued friends, a Catholic priest who for five successive years has given the invocation in the House of Representatives on Pan American Day, April 14. I refer to Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, who received from the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, the only honorary doctor of divinity degree ever bestowed by that university upon a citizen of the United States of America. Having in mind the national interest of our country, the statement of this outstanding scholar and educator may be recommended for study to every Member of the Congress.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

One of the ablest correspondents of the New York Times, Mr. Raymond Daniell, in his piece for the Sunday, March 6, edition, wrote as follows:

"To omit Spain from a Mediterranean pact, in the view of military and naval men, is to leave as dangerous a hole in it as the absence of Eire leaves in the Atlantic Pact. Yet the last war was won by the Allies without any aid from Eire or Spain and, so far as the latter is concerned, with ill-concealed hostility."

How much time, if any, Mr. Daniell spent in Spain during World War II, I do not know. I am aware, however, that a trained historian, Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, was an eyewitness of the events which are alluded to in the above paragraph. Moreover, he was appointed by the late President Franklin D.

Roosevelt United States Ambassador to Spain, not to promote the best interests of that country, except where they coincided with our own, but in order to provide for our own security and welfare in a war with a dangerous, treacherous foe. Unless I am mistaken, the factual reports of this scholar, who was on the spot, merit at least equal consideration with those of a correspondent who now asserts that Spain acted toward us, with ill-concealed hostility.

May I suggest that Mr. Daniell's version of history be compared, chapter and verse, with the most recent rehearsal of fact by wartime Ambassador Hayes? This important document is now available, thanks to the initiative of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 21, 1949. Although the entire report is newsworthy, it may be sufficient to quote one paragraph, a masterpiece of historical condensation. This reads as follows:

"Under Spain's Foreign Minister (now Ambassador at Large Don José Félix de Lequerica in the United States), as well as under his predecessor, Count Francisco Jordana, the Spanish Foreign Office, with the obvious approval of the head of the Spanish state, granted us more favor than did any other neutral government, whether Sweden, Turkey, Switzerland, or Portugal. Not only did the Spanish Government pledge itself not to interfere in any way with our fateful landings and campaign in North Africa. Not only did it assure us as early as February 1943 that it would join us in war if the Axis should attempt an invasion of Spain. Not only did it permit us to use Spain as the base for invaluable espionage of Axis activities in France and the Mediterranean, it also accorded us important positive favors. It allowed us to get over 1,200 American airmen safely across the peninsula, without any internment. It permitted the transit and exit of over 25,000 members of the French resistance movement as reinforcements for the Allied armies in North Africa. It choked off export of strategic war materials to Germany before any other neutral had done so. Spain, too, was the first country to conclude a permanent air agreement with us, and one whereby we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes. In the light of all such facts, it is simply hypocritical to countenance the notion that Spain has been hostile to us and should therefore be treated as a pariah among the nations. It certainly belies the solemn assurances which President Roosevelt gave to the head of the Spanish state in writing in November 1942."

It is very unfortunate, as Senator MURRAY has helped to emphasize, that propaganda of the Soviet Union, and its conscious or unconscious apologists and appeasers in this country, has served, especially during the last 3 years, to conceal from the American people the signal services which Spain rendered us in the critical war years of 1942 to 1945, and to induce our Government to adopt toward Spain a policy which can only be regarded as contrary to American interests and derogatory of American honor.

The good counsel of Dr. Hayes, now restored to his post as Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University, may be taken to heart by all commentators, columnists, and newspeople, including the usually accurate Mr. Daniell. The exact words of Professor Hayes read as follows:

"Our fellow-citizens should be enlightened, not deceived, about the actual facts in the situation."

Finally, I should like to make clear that neither former Ambassador Hayes nor I myself, who have always been uncompromising foes of racial or religious bigotry, would say a single word to favor alliances with openly Fascist states. And I am confident that my friend, Carlton Hayes, would agree that any distortion of the record, with respect to the role of Spain in World War II, "plays into the hands of Soviet propaganda."

Additional Comments on Proposed Uniform Military Justice Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 8, 1949, I inserted in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a newspaper clipping relating to the military-justice code.

I am now, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, inserting some additional comments on this subject written by Paul S. Davis, major, JAGD Reserve:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON PROPOSED UNIFORM MILITARY JUSTICE CODE (H. R. 2498) (SUPPLEMENTING COMMENTS IN LETTER TO WASHINGTON STAR OF FEBRUARY 22, 1949)

(7) The statute of limitations would cease to run on the receipt of charges by any officer exercising summary court martial jurisdiction (proposed article 43 (b)). Under the present law the statute ceases to run only upon arraignment, unless the accused, by reason of escape or otherwise, is not amenable to military justice. This provision would be susceptible of grave abuses, since the accused would have no means of knowing when the statute stopped running. Charges might be back-dated or filed in desk drawers to be used if desired many years later. The purpose of the statute of limitations is to lay ancient charges at rest and provide protection for an accused from a trial on stale charges. Enactment of this proposed provision would substantially impair the salutary purposes of a statute of limitations.

(8) Notwithstanding the announced purpose of the bill to create uniformity between the services, the proposed law in article 17 (b) would create potential conflicts and frictions not now existing where a common or joint trial occurred involving personnel from more than one branch of service, who may in some circumstances be tried together under present law. For example, marines when detached for service with the Army may now be tried by an Army court martial (AW 2 (c)). As the law now stands, records of such trials, when held by the Army, are reviewed in the same manner as other Army court-martial records. Under the proposed bill, such records, if involving trials of both Army and Marine Corps personnel, for example, would have to be given two separate departmental reviews by each branch of service. It would seem that if it is desired that one service exercise broader jurisdiction to try personnel of another service, such result could be much more simply attained by brief amendments to the existing Articles of War and Articles for the Government of the Navy, providing that personnel of any branch of the service under the command of an officer of another branch would be subject to the court-martial jurisdiction of the latter branch.

(9) The definitions of the punitive offenses have in many cases been unnecessarily complicated. The present Articles of War have worked well in not attempting specific definitions but rather relying on the well-established rules of the common law; the elements of each offense are summarized to the extent deemed appropriate in the Manual for Courts Martial. There would seem little justification for the attempt to set forth at length in the statute the elements of common-law offenses, and doing so not only leads to confusion but involves risk of misstating the law. For example, the proposed article 119 on manslaughter covers only cases of killing "without a design to effect death." This would seem to limit the offense to involuntary manslaughter, although the reference in the same section to the "heat of sudden passion," and the commentary of the draftsmen, apparently indicate that they contemplated including also the offense of voluntary manslaughter notwithstanding the express language to the contrary. Conversely the definition of larceny is so broad that it would even cover any temporary taking or borrowing of property without permission, such as automobile "joy riding." The latter offense certainly should not be treated as larceny, since soldiers guilty of such an offense should not necessarily be placed in the same category with and branded as common-law criminals.

(10) The review provisions (arts. 66 and 67) are too complicated for complete treatment here. These seem undesirable on several grounds. First, the extent of review is dependent in large part upon the asiduity of defense counsel in prosecuting appeals, a scheme unlike the present Army system where each case having the same type of punishment secures equal review irrespective of whether the accused is able to employ counsel in a position to prosecute his case before higher authorities. Another grave defect of the proposed system is that those having final reviewing powers (both the proposed boards of review and the Judicial Council) might be civilians wholly without experience in military or naval justice. They are not, however, in the position of Federal judges, since their tenure is indefinite and they are subject to removal at any time. Thus, they have neither the military background required of present members of the Army Judicial Council nor the judicial or independent background of members of the Federal judiciary. In addition, the independence of the board of review would be reduced since the Judge Advocate General, if not satisfied with the decision of one board, could refer it to another one (art. 66 (e)).

(11) The requirement that the trial judge advocate and defense counsel in every case be attorneys (arts. 27, 38) would appear to be impracticable because of the limited number of available legally trained personnel. While lawyers are now and should be used as counsel in the more difficult and complicated cases, an attempt to require them in every routine case would probably so burden available legal personnel as to result in unnecessary delays before cases could be brought to trial.

(12) The scope of rehearings would be unduly limited. They could no longer be authorized where findings are disapproved for lack of sufficient evidence in the record, even though there might be other evidence which had not been introduced at all (art. 63). This might frequently result in miscarriages of justice.

(13) Where a bad-conduct discharge is adjudged the proposed code would eliminate the review now required to be made by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction (art. 65). This would take away the protection now afforded by the review of the trained staff judge advocate, who if he finds the record insufficient will now recommend disapproval of the bad-conduct discharge in the field and thereby obviate the delay and expense of further review by higher authority.

(14) The prohibition against peacetime trials within the United States for murder or rape, now contained in AW 92, is eliminated in the proposed code (arts. 118–120). The present provision has worked well both in maintaining the functions of the civil authorities and in assuring jury trials in these two capital cases for essentially civilian crimes, and there would seem to be no occasion for changing them.

(15) The proposed code (art. 140) gives the President extremely broad powers of delegation and subdelegation, which might conceivably be construed to authorize delegation by the President, to any lower commanders, of his important power to make rules of evidence and of his confirming power over death sentences.

What You Owe Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important articles coming to my attention in a long, long time is the one by our Chief of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, entitled "What You Owe Your Country," appearing in Collier's magazine on February 26, 1949. It is to be commended to the thoughtful reading of every American citizen and, for that purpose, it is my pleasure to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT YOU OWE YOUR COUNTRY

(By Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, U. S. Army)

Even in June the Channel waters were icy as I splashed through the life-belt-littered surf and scrambled aboard the landing craft. Its Diesels shuddered as the helmsman—a stocky, frowning youngster in wet-weather gear—coaxed his clumsy boat from the beach and headed toward the line of ships offshore.

By noon on this second day on Omaha Beach, we had cracked the German crust and were pushing into the hedgerows. Now, with a marked map under my arm, I was hitching a ride back to headquarters. Offshore in deep water a thin-skinned PT boat waited to carry me out to the cruiser *Augusta*.

On the wet open bottom of our tiny craft a dozen litters had been loaded. And on those litters a dozen wounded youngsters lay wrapped in blankets already soggy from the spray. All of them in their raw twenties, they lay quiet, uncomplaining, awaiting transfer to a hospital ship.

Ten years before, when the German guns that had torn their bodies were being heralded by the booming mobs of Munich, those 12 youngsters were in knee pants, wandering through a depression toward their rendezvous on Omaha Beach. And while their parents struggled uncomprehendingly through the fear and uncertainty of that economic storm, their generation was being rudely hustled from adolescence into a war.

There I remember, in the pitching bottom of that nameless craft lay the fragments of a generation rashly condemned for having been corrupted by the ease of democracy and debased by the luxury of freedom. But those 12 men had learned on D-day—as hideously as man can learn—that freedom is not free, that democracy can exact stern repayment from those who share in its bounty.

In time of war, the competitive struggle that powers a free society such as ours is enveloped by common danger. Just as life is held most dear by the man who faces death, so are the institutions of a free nation cherished most jealously when they are threatened by aggression. Confronted by war, the American people scamper hastily home to the fundamental realization that it shall profit a man nothing to gain possessions, knowledge, and power if he loses the freedom in which they are rooted.

But when danger has passed and our enemies at last lie crushed, the individual once more asserts his priority claim to self-interest. The right to profit, the right to get more, obscures the war-born realization that an individual's welfare is plainly tied to the welfare of his nation. We quickly forget that if freedom is to produce security as well as the bountiful life, then its roots must be continuously nourished by sacrifice, devotion, and service.

Because of the exaggerated emphasis we have attached to the omnipotence of the dollar, too many of us have already accepted the dangerous illusion that we can buy off our responsibilities as citizens in the payment of taxes.

A nation's strength is not to be found in its treasury statements. It lies instead in the national character of its people, in their willingness to sacrifice leisure, comfort, and a share of their talents for the welfare of the nation of which they are part.

Self-government is not a luxury on which men may grow fat and indulgent. Rather it is an instrument by which men can—if they have the wisdom—safeguard their individual freedom and employ that freedom in pursuit of happiness and fair reward for their ingenuity, labor, and intellect. Because self-government is an instrument which demands unceasingly the services, the energies, the participation of those who would benefit by it, self-government is weighted as heavily with obligation as it is with privilege.

Our democracy is much like a tall stand of timber. We cannot cut from it more than we plant in it without periling its survival. And forests—like gardens—cannot be bought. They must be cultivated by toil and nourished by the sweat of those who would keep them.

If we dare look on our Government simply as a legacy left to us for our benefit, enrichment, and ease—then we shall someday awaken to find that our Nation has rotted as quickly as our character has decayed. Democratic self-government tries its people with a sterner challenge than any other system in the world. Scorning the brutal coercion of totalitarian states, it asks generosity and brotherhood of its people. It asks that they cooperate willingly and voluntarily for their common welfare in order that each may benefit equitably according to his merits.

And while the imperfections of our democratic government—like all man-made institutions—have brought injustices to some, advantages to others, it nevertheless has helped us to achieve greater personal dignity and more material wealth than any nation in the world.

At a time when peoples throughout the world are being courted by an aggressive stateism that would have them abdicate their personal share in government and entrust their welfare to rule by clique, the American people must put their faith in not less, but more, personal responsibility in the affairs of their community and Nation.

Because personal freedom does not grant to the individual, license to trespass upon the rights of others, a democracy must protect by regulation the common welfare of its people against transgressions by special interests. And as our American economy matures, we have found it necessary to insure greater equality of opportunity by the wise intervention of Government into the enterprise of individuals. The depth of this invasion into the freedom of the individual, however, must be limited by compromise. For in our effort to provide equality of opportunity through sufficient government, we cannot abuse this power lest we stunt initiative through too much government.

While in the Veterans' Administration immediately after the war, I was several times chided by hard-shelled friends for justifying the enormous social desirability of the GI bill. To same mossbacks who had plunged profitably into the production tasks of the war, even our readjustment program was viewed suspiciously—and secretly with alarm. I am reminded of one entrepreneur who made a wartime fortune in wheat. Although he conceded the need for some Government aid to veterans on their return, he still blandly contended that I was spending money on just another Washington handout to make Government wards of these kids.

Few Tories went that far. But even while they enthusiastically accepted the GI bill and most of the social advances made in the last two decades, many men of good will today admit to a fear that our wartime generation has become too dependent upon government, that initiative has waned, and that too many of us are inclined to see Washington as the source of the bountiful life.

Apart from its economic implications, this habit of turning to Washington with our troubles conceals a political danger as well. For, once we make a crutch of government, we are on the way to becoming political cripples.

If we look to government purely for its benefits and deny it our obligations, then we shall be poorly prepared to assert the superiority of democratic government over the absolute powers of statism. Overdependency on government is the road to enslavement.

When men become so addicted to the benefits of government that they lose sight of their responsibilities, then that government is in danger of being seized by any leader or minority group that can promise greater benefits to the people in return for abandonment of their rights. Or when men become so intent upon selfish exploitation of their rights that our majority interests are sidetracked in favor of a greedy minority, then also is our freedom threatened. For only so long as freedom remains a force for the welfare of all our people will men cherish it in their hearts and defend it with their lives.

Our earlier insistence on opportunity for enterprise has given way to a demand for economic security. And ruefully though the older generation may view this cautious shift in interest, it has no one to blame but itself. For it was the freebooting business anarchy of my generation that brought on the great depression. And it was largely that depression which stimulated this passion for security we find among young men today. During the early 1930's, when the Nation showed its fear, the mark of that panic was stamped upon the memory of our World War II generation. First, during the depression, and, afterward, in the war, they were steadily the victims of error and default on the part of their parents.

On the other hand, the youthful postwar soldier—his average age is 22—is clearly a product of prosperity. A youngster of 12 when war broke out, he romped through adolescence during the frenzied period of war production with considerably more money and less parental supervision than his brother before him. He came of age in an era of full employment when employers were bargaining for men. Frequently he was the child of itinerant parents, raised on time-and-a-half overtime wages in the shadows of shipyards and aircraft plants.

Like his depression predecessor—he too, is the product of his times. But what vastly different times they were.

While exploring a human-relations program for the training of these recruits, we in the Veterans' Administration went first to an eminent psychologist to learn what manner of man was coming into our ranks. The scholar's verdict was a harsh one—harsher perhaps than these youngsters deserve.

"The postwar soldier," he said, summarizing his observations, "is younger than his

wartime brother, healthier, better schooled, and more adept at learning."

But with an estimate that alerted us to the size of our job, the professor added, "He is also plainly undisciplined, jealously aware of his rights but not of his responsibilities. Moreover, he is mercenary and antagonistic to authority in almost any form."

The conclusion we drew was an inevitable one.

Not only was the Army challenged to make soldiers of these men, but it was also faced with the task of first making them better citizens, making them aware of the responsibilities that accrued to them as adult Americans.

For most of them, service in the Army is an initial payment on the privileges they have already enjoyed in growing up, privileges they shall have to balance with obligations the rest of their lives.

At Fort Myer, where I have my home, I sometimes slip down to the tiny post movie. Dressed in a tacky prewar civilian suit I am treated to soldier talk, especially when the lights are out. One evening, several months ago, an 18-year-old youngster, who let it be known he was a 1-year volunteer, complained to his companion that he had put his neck in the noose when he came willingly into the Army.

"What's it going to get me?" he asked. "Not even the GI bill. My old man was in the First World War—and what did he get out of it?"

By some standards, the young man was a realist. He was simply asking the question it is the fashion to ask today:

"What's in it for me? How do I come out?"

It is time we provided the answer for that youngster and thousands like him, time we reminded him—as well as ourselves—that freedom is not a prize to be given a man for his distinguished achievement in having been born an American.

If we are delinquent in the business of being good citizens—and there are many who contend that we are—then we must learn why it is we believe democracy has become a free ride without the need for earning our way.

Probably the greatest single cause for delinquency in citizenship can be traced to our declining sense of responsibility in the home, the church, the school, and the community in which we live.

While most delinquents turned remorseful suddenly feel the need for doing more for democracy and turn their eyes toward the mountainous issues that crowd our national scene, few have the humility to start down where citizenship counts.

Because the family is the basic unit of our society, it is there that responsibility begins. Unless the young man of this new generation can feel that the security, the well-being and happiness of his family is in part a responsibility of his, there is no hope in tutoring him later on his broader obligations. For citizenship is a progressive education that starts in the home and works its way toward the dizzying heights of national and world responsibility.

Much as we welcome the leisurely comforts of indoor plumbing, oil heat, electric lights, and the family car, we nevertheless lost a primary lesson in good citizenship when the twentieth century city convenience rendered the tradition of chores old-fashioned. The necessity for doing one's daily round of little jobs made a youngster of earlier generations feel part of the household and planted in his young mind the seed of responsibility to someone other than himself.

Back home in the flat farmlands of Missouri, life on a schoolmaster's wages was not calculated to make one rich or idle. But however busy his modest life might be, still my father had time to take me through crisp cornfields hunting coveys of quail when I was a youngster of 7. And by the time I had grown to 12, he had given me a shotgun of my own.

Even at that time our life was an itinerant one. My father rambled from schoolhouse to schoolhouse, first in the soft-coal fields of Randolph County, then in the rich farm lands of Fayette. At the end of each short 6-month term, he took an interim job. Sometimes we lived on a farm, sometimes in town, where Dad ran the mutual telephone exchange.

For a period of several years we farmed 200 bottom-land acres. During the school year, Dad would set off each Sunday afternoon and walk 8 miles to the family with whom he boarded nearest the schoolhouse. And each Friday afternoon when school was out, with a book under his arm, he would walk 8 miles back to our farm to work on the week end with mother and me.

My chores were neither painful nor unpleasant. Each morning I filled the woodbox with chips and kindling for the big kitchen stove. I kept the buckets filled with water from the deep well out in back. When there were cows in the barn, I helped with the milking. And during the years we kept 200 chickens, I helped mother feed them, kept the hen house clean, and counted new records in fresh white eggs. Once a week we went together to town carrying a great tin bucket of those gleaming eggs. They fetched 10 cents a dozen.

At the end of each summer I sharpened my knife and ran through the woods in search of bee trees. Whenever I found a busy beehive concealed in a hollow tree I would mark it carefully in my mind and run off to the farmhouse to ask permission to cut the tree down.

If the farmer agreed—and they always did—I would scamper happily back to the tree and scar its bark with a great gashing cross. That was my sign of a claim and there the tree stood safe from other bee seekers until we returned to cut it down. One August I put down, in the great earthen crocks mother gave me, 200 pounds of that wild bee honey.

Throughout the time I was growing up, I knew that if there was no wood by the stove, no water in the kitchen, there would be no breakfast of home-cured ham, warm milk, and bright yellow-yolked eggs. If I didn't find the bee trees, there would be no honey-bread after school. And if I didn't help mother clean the lamps, there would be no light for the evening.

The advent of apartment dwelling and the modernization of our living habits has made too many of today's youngsters look upon their home as a shelter, a meal ticket, a refuge during their period of adolescence. A family is no longer a group whose members depend on one another for companionship and association. Their leisure time is divided. In cities neighborliness has all but disappeared, a relic of the suburbs and the country.

Even the integrity of the family has been damaged in the rising rate of divorce. The urge of each individual in the family to pamper his own wants, to seek leisure-time companions of his own choice, but put the emphasis on selfishness and suffocated the instincts of good citizenship at the very source.

The church, too, has suffered in our automobile age. No longer is it the civic and social center of the community. Today it must compete with a score of diversions within range of our driving. The impermanence of transient family groups has denied to millions a family church in which they can take a share of responsibility in its activities and problems.

A friend only recently told me of the small congregation to which he belongs. During the depression, when the church was hard pressed by mortgage payments and too poor to keep a janitor, each member of the vestry devoted one Saturday each month to cleaning and scrubbing the building for the Sunday service. Because the church required sacrifice those who loved it best worked the hardest and loved it all the more.

Today that church is fully paid for, the mortgage burned, and a janitor paid to keep it clean. The congregation contributes far more liberally than it did before because now it can afford to. But the devotion of its members has faded with a waning of their obligations. Two dollars in the Sunday offering has replaced those Saturday afternoons. And another of the compelling obligations which produces a sense of responsibility in that community is gone.

Like many another speaker who is called upon too often, it is difficult for me to avoid occasional comment on education. When I recall the political illiteracy of our young troops at the start of the war, I am moved to charge education with gross dereliction in its responsibility to teach knowledge of the human values at issue in the world.

When the Army struggled through the summer of 1941 with rebellious and unhappy soldiers who muttered constantly of their raw deal, it became apparent that the fault lay not with the Army but with the failure of the American people to grasp the significance of the Second World War.

PUBLIC APATHY IS TO BLAME

Unlike too many critics of education, however, I cannot lay the blame on the doorstep of education alone. Rather it must be shared with the people as a whole. Their shocking apathy to the condition of their schools and the sterility of their curricula is responsible even today for the political immaturity, the economic ignorance, the philosophical indifference, and the spiritual insolvency of so many young men.

Throughout Europe, wherever our armies were stationed, the people were bewildered by Americans who appeared indifferent to the political and philosophical origins and nature of the most powerful and progressive nation in the world.

Unhappily, when driven into a corner intellectually, our soldiers were forced to fall back on our wage scales, our automobiles, our refrigerators—and eventually and triumphantly to the American bathroom—for their defense. Here is an indictment not only of American education but of the irresponsible indifference of citizens who have permitted this vacuum to remain.

Recently when I charged education with these derelictions my audience of first citizens nodded comfortably and agreed. I turned on them.

"How many of you," I asked, "are members of a school board?"

Of the more than 60 men in the room, not one raised his hand.

"How many of you," I continued, "know the name of your child's teacher?"

There was a showing of a scant half dozen hands.

"How many of you," I pressed, "have ever asked your child's teacher home to dinner to measure her worth for yourself?"

Not a single hand went up.

Here then was an audience of successful business and professional men, too busy each in his own daily affairs to determine for himself the character and quality of education furnished his sons and daughters.

Victims of the check-book habit, each was quite content to let it go simply by paying the bills.

This is citizenship by the dollar sign; it cannot and will not work.

UNDER PSYCHOLOGIC HANDICAP

Until the American people shake themselves out of this appalling lethargy and make their schools—together with the selection, the welfare, and rewards of their teachers—a matter of their personal and intimate concern, we shall go forth to do battle psychologically with the aggressive legions of stateism woefully trained and poorly equipped, handicapped from the outset.

To those military-minded men who are militarists by instinct rather than profession and who say that our weaknesses result from a failure of discipline in our young men, I must reply with this vigorous denial.

Men cannot be impressed into good citizenship. If they are to cherish the freedoms that come to them under democratic self-government, they cannot be disciplined into devotion. Instead they must be taught to value the great spiritual possessions to which they are born, by assuming from childhood a share of responsibility for safeguarding those possessions. Good citizenship springs from an appreciation of the great values of our institutions from active participation in them.

It is immoral for us to claim freedom of the ballot unless we are ready to share that freedom with every other American. It is ungodly for us to claim freedom of religion, unless we are prepared to be tolerant of all beliefs that differ from ours. It is hypocritical to insist upon freedom of opinion unless we grant equal freedom to those who oppose us. And it is fraudulent to insist upon freedom of the press if we deny that right to others.

Democratic institutions will continue to prosper and flourish only so long as they are fed on freedom for all, not on abridgment for some.

We are engaged in a contest today over the integrity of the individual versus the integrity of the state. It is a contest as startlingly dramatic as the air lift into Berlin, as obscurely insignificant as the attitudes of a single man. It is a contest in which ideas are as important as the atom bomb. It is a contest that can conceivably last to the end of our lifetime.

Theoretically the odds lie with us.

For where the state is an instrument of government employed by individuals for their common welfare, the progress of the state is propelled by the progress of the individual. And there can be no doubt in our minds that a free people—unfettered by fears, threats, and terror—will advance farther and faster in spiritual truths, social improvement, and material reward than any slave people, irrespective of the lash under which they labor.

WHEN THE STATE IS SUPREME

The state is an invention of men. It has neither intellect, nor conscience, nor morals. It is an inanimate machine. And where the machine is master of the man it is simply fueled by his obedience, his fatigue, and his terror. Its laws are the creature of dogma rather than the letters of justice. Its philosophy is spurious because it lives not on the spirit but on the oppression of its people.

A democracy such as ours cannot be defeated in this struggle; it can only lose by default.

It can only lose if our people deny through indifference and neglect their personal responsibilities for its security and growth.

Our danger lies not so much in a fifth column whose enmity is avowed. It lies in a first column of well-meaning American citizens. A first column of unconscionable men who are 100 percent Americans in their daily protestations and 10 percent citizens in their daily routine of neglect.

Automobiles for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of the Congress to a proposal that I have today introduced to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes. Under present law, the Veterans' Administration cannot pay in excess of $1,600 for an automobile or other conveyance, including the special equipment found necessary by the Administrator.

My bill would allow the Administrator to pay in addition to $1,600 the amount of tax which the Government collected on the sale of the auto by the manufacturer. For example, if Federal tax of $100 was imposed upon the manufacturer on sale of the car, the Veterans' Administration could, under this bill, pay up to $1,700 for the car. In other words, the Government providing the car to the eligible veteran, would also, in effect, provide the vehicle tax-free.

There is no retroactivity attached to the proposal but I do not see a single reason why the physically handicapped World War II veteran should not be entitled to this much-deserved appropriation. The proposed bill submitted today is as follows:

A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance, by paying the amount allowed under section 2 on the purchase price of such automobile or other conveyance, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for any of the following:

(a) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet.

(b) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands.

(c) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20 degrees in the better eye.

SEC. 2. The benefits provided by section 1 shall be accomplished through the payment by the Administrator, under regulations prescribed by him, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing the automobile or other conveyance, of so much of the total purchase price of the automobile or other conveyance (including special equipment deemed necessary by the Administrator) as does not exceed the sum of $1,600 plus the amount of the tax which was imposed under section 3403 (a) or (b) of the Internal Revenue Code upon such automobile or other conveyance when it was sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer.

SEC. 3. The benefits of section 1 shall be granted under the following conditions:

(a) The United States shall not be liable for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any automobile or other conveyance provided under the provisions of the first section of this act and shall not be liable to any person by reason of any damage caused by the use of such automobile or other conveyance.

(b) No veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act; and no veteran who has received or may receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act.

(c) The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after the effective date of this act, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge from the armed forces if the veteran shall not be discharged until on or after said effective date.

Resolutions Memorializing the President and Congress Relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the Several States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with instructions of the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives from Massachusetts to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of resolutions, petitions, and memorials, which may be sent to the entire membership of that delegation, and, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now insert resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States:

Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the National Guard of the United States and of the several States

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering proposed legislation which profoundly affects the civilian components of the armed forces and, particularly, the National Guards of the several States and the National Guard of the United States; and

Whereas much of this proposed legislation is based upon the so-called Gray board report issued recently by the Committee on

Civilian Components of the Secretary of Defense, or is based upon other similar recommendations of the Regular Military Establishment; and

Whereas this proposed legislation is largely directed toward the disestablishment of the National Guards of the several States, beginning with the Air National Guard, in favor of Reserve forces wholly under Federal control, thereby contravening the language, spirit, and intent of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas many noble traditions of this Commonwealth, together with her sister States, spring from the military services our militia and National Guard have rendered in the cause of liberty from the beginnings of our country down through the years; and

Whereas the national economy cannot sustain a Reserve force program, estimated to cost $33,000,000,000 during the next 20 years, which cost would be additional to the $15,000,000,000 now annually budgeted for defense purposes; and

Whereas it is unthinkable that the excellent reserve forces now in existence, the National Guards of the several States, which sent 18 well trained and equipped National Guard Divisions into the field during World War II and provided 12 combat groups to the Air Force, should be absorbed by another component: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the General Court of Massachusetts that our present dual system of Federal-State organization and jurisdiction for the National Guard is a tested and proven instrument of military policy which has demonstrated historically the foresight and wisdom of those who framed our Constitution, and that the President and Congress of the United States should, therefore, disapprove legislation which would in any degree vitiate this system of National Guard organization and jurisdiction or would adversely affect the rights, privileges, or emoluments of National Guard members; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States direct the National Military Establishment to provide more effective cooperation and support for the National Guards of the several States and of the United States, in order to provide properly balanced, trained, and equipped National Guard forces for service in time of emergency, either local or national; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 7, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Senator Irving M. Ives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following report by Thomas DeYulia which appeared in the Postal Record regarding Senator IRVING M. IVES:

At our last meeting I was mandated to pay tribute to Senator IRVING M. IVES in this magazine for his interest in the postal workers throughout the country.

It is a pleasure for me to comply with this request, not only because Senator IVES has been with us on past legislation but he is wholeheartedly now in favor of a $650 raise and 26 days' vacation and 15 days' sick leave for us.

We met with the Senator recently on the occasion of Syracuse University's graduating exercises. He delivered the commencement address and received an honorary degree of doctor of laws. He told us at that time we were deserving of more money and a better vacation and sick leave.

Last October, when we held a dinner in his honor for voting in favor of the pay raise and the retirement bill, we were impressed with his sincerity and concern relative to our problems. He convinced us then that he had a warm spot in his heart for all postal employees.

Recognized by his colleagues in Congress as an authority on labor legislation, Senator IVES has an enviable record in public service. As a member of the New York State Assembly, he coauthored the famous Ives-Quinn bill which saw our State take the lead in fighting employment discrimination. Since then New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts have adopted similar legislation.

Prior to his election to the United States Senate, he set up the School of Industrial Relations at Cornell University and became the first dean. A comparatively young man, Senator IVES is a public servant of high caliber and seems destined for a brilliant future in Washington. We in Syracuse know we have a good friend in Congress in Senator IVES. We'd like the half million postal employees across the country to know it, too.

THOMAS DEYULIA.

Slum Clearance and Low-Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with instructions of the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives from Massachusetts to insert in the appendix of the RECORD copies of resolutions, petitions, and memorials which may be sent to the entire membership of that delegation, and, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now insert resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass legislation providing for greater allocation of funds for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to provide for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects.

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing for greater allocation of funds for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 8, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 14, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Honor to Whom Honor Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include an article carried in this week's issue of Alabama, news magazine of the deep South, commenting on the life and work of a man known to every Member of the Congress, one of the best-loved men in the Nation.

Ed O'Neal has probably contributed more to the progressive development of American agriculture and to the stabilization of an adequate farm income, as well as to the welfare of the average farm family than any other one man in the history of the industry.

I take pleasure in submitting for the RECORD the article on Alabama's famous son appearing in the February 18, 1949, issue of Alabama, as follows:

A FAMOUS SON

Edward Asbury O'Neal III, one of the most influential figures ever produced by Alabama, top man for American organized agriculture for 17 years, confidant of five United States Presidents, is enjoying retirement in his native Florence by keeping up with national affairs and watching the benefits of his long service to the farmer materialize.

When Ed O'Neal graduated in law from Washington and Lee in 1898 his Alabama friends expected him to enter politics. His grandfather, Edward Asbury O'Neal I, had been Governor of Alabama from 1882 to 1886; his uncle, Emmet O'Neal, was a politician who became Governor in 1911. Edward II had died shortly after his son's birth in 1875, and Alabamians naturally looked to Edward III to carry on the family's political tradition.

But young Ed's interest in public affairs did not encompass the holding of office. Instead, he became in time a veritable power behind the throne, undisputed spokesman for the American farmer in poltical and legislative matters. During his long years as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington news observers often referred to him as the Capital's most potent lobbyist.

Under the O'Neal leadership, agriculture enjoyed its golden years, legislatively speaking. The long fight for equality of treatment and parity in the prices paid for his products was won by the American farmer. All sorts of safeguards were set up to lessen the farmer's financial risks. Through the

extension services and various other aids carried on by the Department of Agriculture, there grew up in the United States the world's greatest agricultural educational system. Ed O'Neal had always felt the farmer's back was already strong enough; that what he needed was more brains. By the time his job was finished, farmers everywhere were getting the benefits of scientific agricultural knowledge.

IDEAL FOR THE JOB

Ed O'Neal was the perfect representative for the farmer because of two factors: his persuasive personality and his passion for his cause. He was equipped with all the attributes of the traditional southern gentleman: well educated and articulate, distinguished in appearance and friendly in manner, logical in his viewpoints, resourceful, persistent without being offensively obstinate.

He was intensely practical in his approach to political-legislative problems. He now recalls: "When we had to make out a case before a certain committee, and we needed the vote of a certain member of that committee, and that member came from Texas, let us say—well, we would bring up a key farmer from Texas and let him testify. The committeeman usually was impressed." It has also been said that he knew how and to whom to serve a drink. (The late Senator Norris once told the Nebraska Legislature, after having visited Muscle Shoals with a number of other Congressmen and been entertained by the O'Neals: "The liquid and solid refreshment given me on Ed O'Neal's farm was the birth of TVA.")

Ed O'Neal knew the farmer's problems—and potentialities—intimately because he himself had been a farmer, and a good one. For a quarter of a century, from 1898 to 1923, he operated the big plantation near Florence, which he inherited from his mother. He kept constantly on the lookout for improved farming methods. As early as 1912 he attended a short course at Auburn and learned how to use limestone and phosphate as fertilizer for alfalfa. Soon he was growing such lush crops of alfalfa that farmers came from 100 miles around to study his methods. He is still proud of wheat crops that ran as high as 55 bushels to the acre, and his corn which sometimes reached 100 bushels per acre.

HIS WATCHWORD—UNITY

Early in the twenties he went to Illinois to study the work of the Farm Bureau. Observing the close cooperation there between the bureau and the University of Illinois, he returned with an intensified belief in the value of organization and extension education for farmers.

In 1923 Mr. O'Neal became president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, which had been organized just 2 years earlier. The Florence master farmer headed the State bureau for 8 years. In the meantime (in 1924) he was made a vice president of the national bureau and became increasingly active in its work.

Because he had engineered a progressive program for the Alabama bureau, and because he held a truly national viewpoint on agricultural problems and had already done outstanding work in promoting Federal legislation, Ed O'Neal was elected president of the American Farm Bureau Federation in 1931.

In this job he strove for unity among all American farmers in their struggle for economic equality. By overcoming sectionalism and putting steadily increasing power into the farmer's voice in national affairs, he soon began getting results. Consequently, until his retirement in 1948, he never had opposition to reelection as bureau president. During his long tenure membership rose from 276,000 to 1,260,000, and the bureau's cash balance from $40,000 to $1,250,000.

CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS

Ed O'Neal appeared before numerous congressional committees, made many speeches at farm gatherings, otherwise was continually busy on farm matters either in Washington or at the national bureau's office in Chicago. It is no wonder, then, that he trod on some toes in those hectic New Dealing years.

Although keenly aware of the Federal Government's role in raising the economic level of the people, Mr. O'Neal was never a defender of the bureaucrat. In 1942 he told the annual convention of the national farm bureau:

"I feel that Congress is the hope of the people. I have confidence that Congress can be relied upon to curb bureaucracy when it runs wild."

Though retired, and bearing the burden of 74 years, Mr. O'Neal is still making an occasional speech. Last month he visited several Tennessee county farm bureaus and addressed each of them. One of the speeches he loves to make to organizations in the Tennessee Valley traces the history of Muscle Shoals from the days of the Indians right up to TVA. The swift power-laden currents of the mighty Tennessee flowed within sight of Ed O'Neal's farm, and he felt a keen early interest in developing the shoals, not for its hydroelectric power alone but for its potential as a fertilizer producer.

When President Wilson in 1917 sent four Cabinet members to look at the shoals as a site for a munitions-fertilizer plant it was Ed O'Neal who met them. One member of the group was Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, who had been O'Neal's fellow student at Washington and Lee; he was entertained in the O'Neal home. From this visit grew Wilson Dam and its nitrate plants.

Again in 1921 Mr. O'Neal sought to put the shoals to work. The farm bureau was strongly in favor of the Government's leasing the dam and plants to Henry Ford. When Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Edison, and Mr. and Mrs. Edsel Ford came to Florence to look over the shoals it again was Ed O'Neal who entertained them.

President Hoover appointed Mr. O'Neal to his Muscle Shoals Commission, but its recommendations for turning the nitrate plant over to a farm cooperative for the manufacture of fertilizer were turned down. When Roosevelt became President Mr. O'Neal and other farm leaders visited him in Albany and strongly urged development of the shoals. A few months later, TVA was created.

HE STAYS INFORMED

Now Edward Asbury O'Neal III looks back on all this from the dignified comfort of his Florence home (his mother's house, built in the 1830's, now restored and redecorated). He still owns his nearby 800-acre farm, but has little to do with its operation. He reads a lot—newspapers, national magazines, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Once or twice a week he calls in a stenographer to whom he dictates letters or memoranda for his occasional speeches. Old friends—men who still are among the Nation's leaders—keep in touch with him. And every so often, especially during the tourist season, an auto from Iowa, or perhaps from California or Pennsylvania, will stop in front of the stately old home, bearing acquaintances from farm bureau days who want to say hello again to the grand old man of American agriculture.

Five Presidents sought—and got—advice from Ed O'Neal on farm matters (Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman). Shortly after Mr. Truman succeeded to the Presidency in 1945 he asked Mr. O'Neal to bring a group of farm leaders to the White House for a conference. As the meeting broke up the President called the American Farm Bureau Federation chief aside and said: "Ed, you've been around a long time; you've watched a lot of Presidents; you've watched me work in the Senate. Now, what advice would you give to a man who wants to be a good President?" As a press photographer came up and took a picture, Ed O'Neal was saying: "Mr. President, you've got the ability; what you need to develop is the guts."

After Mr. Truman's election last November, Ed O'Neal wrote to him: "Your campaign showed you've developed the necessary guts."

Address of Hon. T. Vincent Quinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Congressman T. VINCENT QUINN made at the twelfth annual communion breakfast of the Pasteur Guild of the Department of Hospitals at the Hotel Commodore, New York, on Sunday, March 20, 1949:

THE HERITAGE THAT IS OURS

We in America are indeed fortunate that we live in a country that still can be called the land of the free and the home of the brave.

In America we believe that the individual is supreme and that the State exists for the individual. The Communist believes that the state is supreme and that the individual exists for the state.

We believe that the individual was created by God—to love Him and to love our neighbor because we see in our neighbor the image of Almighty God.

Let us contrast this philosophy with the philosophy of Anatole Lunacharsky, former Commissar of Education in Soviet Russia.

"We hate Christianity and Christians," this Communist proclaimed in 1935. "Even the best of them must be considered our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbor and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with love of our neighbor! What we want is hatred. We must know how to hate. Only thus will we conquer the universe." (Quoted in Izvestia.)

Another man like Lunacharsky, once wrote of hate: "Look at these young men and boys!" wrote Hitler in his Mein Kampf. "What material! I shall eradicate the thousands of years of human domestication. Brutal youth—that is what I am after—I want to see once more in its eyes the gleam—of the beast of prey. With these I can make a new world—and create a new order."

What Hitler plainly meant was that the Christian concept of the dignity of man, made, as he is, in the image and likeness of God, must be forever banished. For love of God he would substitute the material. For love of God and the love of man for his neighbor, he would substitute the gospel of hate.

What Hitler knew—and Stalin knows—but which far too many good people do not yet

realize, is that if there is no morality, there can be no law other than that of force.

The Communists find no ethical contradiction when, for example, they extend a friendly hand to religion one year and the next year persecute it; or when they ally themselves with democracy at one time, and the next time seek to overthrow it; or when they sign a treaty with nazism and then fight against it. When conditions change, new techniques must be developed, but all are equally true and moral to the Communist as long as they further the revolution. But is there any limit to chicanery, duplicity and deviltry? Absolutely none.

As Lenin said: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth."

Stalin added approvingly: "Dictatorship means nothing more nor less than the power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules."

How can any individual who believes in the existence of God agree with the Marxian theory that religion is "the opium of the people."

Marx argues that man has been alienated from himself in two ways: by religion and by private property. Religion alienates a man from himself by subordinating man to God; private property alienates a man from himself by subordinating man to an employer. It therefore follows that if a man is ever to be restored to himself, both religion and private property must be destroyed. But though communism denies our God, it affirms another god—the Communist collective before which men must prostrate themselves, to whose new shrines, the factories, they must make their pilgrimage; to whose will, expressed by the dictator, they must make complete abandonment of self; before whose secret police, as the new priesthood with unholy orders, they must take their brew of propaganda, and though they have not an empty tomb of the risen God to give them hope, they still have the cadaver of Lenin, periodically injected with embalming fluids, to give the appearance of life where there is only death and decay.

Man, according to Communist philosophy, has a value only, because he is a member of the revolutionary group; when he ceases to be a member, he ceases to have value. Liquidation, transfer of populations into Siberia, the denial of suffrage, concentration camps and all the other paraphernalia of communism follow in the train of this degraded concept of man. That is why communism speaks of the proletariat, but never the poor; the proletariat serves the revolution; the poor serve nobody, they stand in need of service. A Christian will help a Communist in need and there are many Christians who have; but no Communist would help a Christian in need, unless he promised to aid the party. As Molotov said: "Bread is a political weapon"; which means that only those who think his way may eat.

In America man has rights which are God-given. To repeat the words of our founding fathers:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident:

That all men are created equal;

That they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights;

That among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;

That, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Finally, to repeat the words the men who founded this Republic used in closing the Declaration of Independence:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

These men dared everything to win the God-given heritage which is ours today. Let us always keep in mind that a man is more precious than the universe, that the universe exists for man, that society can use some human functions, but never at the cost of absorption, and that even in his evil moments man is worth addressing in the second person singular, as Our Lord did the thief in that beautiful affirmation of democracy on the cross:

"This day thou shalt be with Me in paradise."

England's Free Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we will very soon be concerning ourselves on the floor of this House with a national health insurance plan. Much will be said about it with reference to the operation of a similar plan in Britain. The Brooklyn Eagle has been running a series of articles giving all of the facts with reference to the British plan. I think they will prove of considerable interest to the Members of this House. The following is the first of the series:

FORTY-ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION ENROLLED IN ENGLAND'S FREE HEALTH SERVICE—COSTS AT RATE OF ALMOST A BILLION A YEAR

By E. J. Delaney

(First of a series)

LONDON, March 17.—England's free National Health Service providing everybody in this country, even casual visitors, with anything and everything they may need for their physical and mental welfare definitely is here to stay. That is, if the national and local public treasuries can carry the heavy financial burdens that result.

The plan has been in effect for 9 months now, and 41,500,000 people are enrolled in it. That's 93 percent of the population. The cost so far, to the National Government, has been at an annual rate of $988,000,000. That would mean in the United States an annual Federal cost of $3,145,000,000, if the same kind of service, at similar rates, should be provided for the same percentage of the population.

The general popularity of the National Health Service best is measured by the high praise the political parties pour upon it. They all are for it and all claim it as their own brain child. The Conservatives announce in the House of Commons, regularly, that if and when they return to control of the Government they will not abandon the health service.

Even guarded criticism of the management of the plan or charges that much waste is obvious in its operation bring retributions. It is believed by much of the public, as well as by well-informed political observers, that a complaint by the Conservatives of fiscal mismanagement in health work cost the Conservatives a parliamentary by-election in Hammersmith 3 weeks ago.

That doesn't mean everybody approves of all that is going on. There are many protests over details. The government and medical spokesmen agree there have been abuses both by members of professions and by the people themselves. A drive is on to block exploitation and to cut costs.

The average working man and his wife are delighted. They say they now can secure medical and dental care they couldn't afford in the past. They declare that the factory hand and the mechanic are having their day and they are not concerned about what the professions or the upper economic groups are thinking.

FEAR POOR SERVICE

In the professions and among white-collar groups who study the over-all situation there is great worry. These people wonder just where all this will end. They have a feeling this scheme is leading the way to something undesirable, that eventually they will have poor medical and dental services. They refuse to give unreserved endorsement to the idea.

Actually the chief amazement in the medical and dental profession is the absence, thus far, of domination by bureaucrats. Doctors and dentists admit that their freedoms have been affected hardly at all, but they point out they had to wage a long and hard fight with the Health Ministry to avoid regimentation.

The professions still harbor deep suspicion of the ultimate intention of the Government and there is no relaxation in the vigilance of their leaders and committees formed to protect their positions and their liberties. They foresee an unending struggle against complete nationalization.

WAITING IS THE CUSTOM

Of course there are not enough physicians, dentists, surgeons and hospital facilities to give all the care that an unleashed demand requires. Waiting is the custom of the day. Those actually ill and in need of immediate attention are given priorities, others are served as soon as possible, which may be in 2 weeks or a month or even longer. A varicose veins operation may be delayed a year.

Everyone has to pay something every week toward the cost of the service, but it is a nominal amount. The charge against most workers is 15 cents a week which is deducted from their pay, along with the regular social security, old-age pension and unemployment compensation assessments, which total about 80 cents a week.

The contribution of 15 cents a week gives the people an assurance that they are helping to pay for their health service, even though it is only a small part of the bill. Some, not many, are demanding. Most beneficiaries are entirely reasonable in their approach.

Such great participation by the public has forced most professional men to enroll in the plan. Whether they do or not is optional, but they have found private practice does not produce sufficient income. They are engaged chiefly in the health service and have a little private work in addition. A few, mostly middle-aged or elderly men who have acquired modest fortunes, remain in private medicine because they do not feel able to perform the great volume of tasks that the health service brings into an office, a surgery, they call it here.

Mystery of the Three Dots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the President has said that the proposed billion dollar Central Arizona project is not in accord with his program.

This statement of the President was deliberately omitted from the Interior Department report on the Arizona project now before the Congress.

The Interior Department report was sent to the Congress with the approval of the Budget Bureau.

Was it emasculated after it left the Budget Bureau? Was the operation performed on a high administration level? Was it done with the knowledge of the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior? Was this the work of a single official whose intention it is to deceive and confuse the Congress?

These are questions which should be answered.

Let me quote from the Interior Department report, which is dated March 18, and signed by Acting Secretary Oscar L. Chapman.

The second paragraph of Mr. Chapman's report says, beginning with the third sentence:

> By letter dated February 4, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised me that he had been instructed by the President "to advise you . . . that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy."

Here instructions of the President are being stated. But not all the instructions of the President. What did the President say where the three dots now appear in Mr. Chapman's letter to the Senate?

This is the statement in full:

> The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement (Central Arizona project) is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy.

That is what Budget Director Frank Pace, Jr., wrote to the Secretary of the Interior on February 4, 1949. Why were these positive and direct instructions of the President omitted from Mr. Chapman's report now before the Senate committee?

What is this project that the President says is not in accord with his program?

It is one that calls for the expenditure of more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. The highest Government officials have stated it is not feasible, is not practical, and would have to be paid for by people other than the few Arizonians who would benefit.

And another fact which undoubtedly influenced the President in his decision is this:

There is no assured water supply for the proposed project. There is a controversy between California and Arizona over division of the waters of the lower Colorado River.

Secretary of the Interior Krug and Reclamation Commissioner Straus have admitted that without settlement of the Colorado River controversy there can be no assured water supply for the proposed Arizona project. Four times this admission appears in the Reclamation Bureau's complete report on the Arizona project issued last year.

So, President Truman has instructed the Budget Bureau and the Interior Department that the proposed Arizona project is not in accord with his program. And the President has called for a prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy.

Why, and by whose authority, were these clear and unqualified instructions of the President replaced by three little dots in Mr. Chapman's report to the Senate?

Free Mailing Privileges for Wounded War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved by an article written by Mr. Roger Treat, which I read recently in one of Chicago's great daily newspapers, the Chicago Herald-American.

In his article Mr. Treat calls to the attention of the American people that we fail to provide free mailing privileges for our wounded war veterans in our service hospitals. Mr. Treat went on to say that—

> some day perhaps he shall be able to visit a service hospital and not go away with a heart full of explosive rage—some day perhaps I can have some feeling of respect for the men in high Government circles.

All of whom to his way of thinking are partly responsible for filling these hospitals with the broken remnants of fine young men.

Mr. Treat continues, and I quote:

> Remember 5, 6 years ago? Bands playing, Hollywood cuties swarming around, and the windy blasts about our brave boys? Haven't heard it lately, have you? Our brave boys have gone back to civilian life. They go to work, get married, have families, get fired, get drunk, get lucky, just like nothing ever happened. Most of them do—but not the ones at Hines, nor the scores of other service hospitals where thousands of men try to keep smiling despite the certain knowledge that they are dragging through a living death—that they will never leave those lonely wards and rooms alive. Some may go back to partial life on the outside; some may be of such strong faith and glorious courage that they can remodel their lives into something of contentment but think of the days and nights which drag by in the loneliness of despair. You can't beat those fellows. Their Government would just as soon not hear about them any more. They get the bare essentials of existence, medical care within the budget. Sometimes people come out and try to entertain them.

Mr. Treat continuing, and I quote again:

> Listen to this—their Government, which is so eager to send billions to other countries, which orders billions of dollars' worth of new fighting planes, which spends more billions building a stock pile of atom bombs—that Government doesn't care enough about our brave boys to give them free postage any more. Say it again—not even a penny post card to write a message home. Doesn't that make you a little sick? And many of them are broke.

Many of our people who have visited Hines Hospital, which is situated within the boundary lines of the Tenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, can testify to the validity of Mr. Treat's remarks.

Let us stop for a moment and think about the thousands of war veterans paying the price today in our veterans' hospitals for the unselfish service they gave to this Nation. What could the people of this country—grateful for that service—do for these men that they would really appreciate. It seems to me that so small a thing as allowing them to use the United States mail without the paying of postage is much more vital to the happiness and well-being of these men, their families, and friends, than many measures which bask in the limelight of newspaper headlines. When they were uniformed during the stirring days of the war, these men were privileged to write home to their loved ones without worrying about paying postage. Is it not ironic that now, as Mr. Treat states, while we are spending today billions, we should overlook those who suffered most as a result of wars?

There is certainly no atonement we can offer that will repay adequately their sacrifices. Many of them will never leave their hospital beds alive. I am told that some of them cannot write to their loved ones and friends simply because they do not have the money. What kind of a payment is this for what they went through and what they are going through now? The franking privilege—which the Members of this Congress enjoy—is a pittance indeed for this comparative handful of our boys in hospitals throughout the land. But small as it is, this is one thing we can do without appropriating millions, setting up administrative agencies and putting additional people on the Government pay roll.

I am today introducing a bill which if enacted by the Congress will rectify this situation. This measure provides for free mailing privileges to veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals and to servicemen in hospitals maintained by the armed services. This bill affords a wonderful opportunity for our Government to add to the pleasure and comfort of those veterans and servicemen who are helpless in hospitals and too often without funds. With much of our relief to foreign countries dispensed

with a spirit of merely hoping it will be of benefit, here is an opportunity to assist in a practical manner those we know to be deserving and whom we know will be exceedingly grateful to our Government for its generosity. In our endeavors to repay veterans for all that they have done for us, there is one thing on which we are all agreed and that is that nothing is too good for the disabled. Let us show these men that we have not forgotten. That our hearts are moved not only by the cries of help from abroad, but even more by the needs of those here at home.

Congress Reasserts Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by the noted columnist, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, which appeared in a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and which was called to my attention by our esteemed former colleague, the Honorable William J. Crow. I commend Mr. Brown's observations to all those who recognize the issue as now joined between the advocates of state socialism and those who believe that this is a Republic of sovereign States. His article follows:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—An average American, looking down from a gallery, probably would consider a Senate filibuster to be one lone man with a hoarse voice completely surrounded by 95 vacant chairs.

This would be entirely superficial. The one Senator reading a dull speech to empty benches is merely holding the fort.

The real filibuster is going on in secret meetings to which the visitor has no access, and the existence of which he does not suspect.

Yet to the perplexed and probably disillusioned average American, this particular Senate filibuster is of the most vital importance, for upon the outcome will be determined, 5, or 6, or maybe 10 years hence, whether he is to remain a free American, in a free-enterprise system of a free country, or become the proletarian stooge of a totalitarian socialistic dictatorship.

That's exactly what this particular filibuster means, and you may lay to that.

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that the conservative men who have thrown up this parliamentary road block ahead of the Truman extension of the British Beveridge plan—which itself has been extended from nationalized social security and medicine into the field of nationalized industry—have not frankly informed the country of their true motives.

These men, mostly southern Jeffersonian Democrats, having no relationship whatever with Roosevelt-Truman New Dealism, are looking ahead as much as 10 years.

They are seeking to preserve the constitutional system of checks and balances.

President Truman is backing a program of state socialism which, if adopted, would destroy the whole American concept of local self-government, with a concentration of all government in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy in Washington.

The most effective remaining check upon the steady usurpation of Executive power, which began under Roosevelt, is the Senate. The fight over the rules is the Senate's expression of determination to maintain its check upon the President. That's all there is to it.

The issue unhappily has been presented as a minor squabble over an obscure technicality.

If it had been explained to the people as a fight to prevent the further extension of socialism in the United States the people would have been able to get a better grip upon the fundamental principle involved.

When a Senate committee refused to recommend the confirmation of Mon Wallgren to a vital national security post, notwithstanding he is a former Senator himself, and a pal of the President, it was a conscious and deliberate exercise of the "check and balance" ideal of the Constitution.

But the Senate is not the only check upon the President. The whole of Congress is now in revolt against Trumanism.

The Senate filibuster has reinspired the old American tradition of States' rights all along the line. That's why the House this week rebuked the President on continued Federal rent controls, and returned this power to the States.

This is more than recalcitrancy. It is rebellion by a Congress predominantly New Deal in name only, against a President elected in November on a coalition ticket.

Less than 5 months ago the country was being congratulated upon having chosen a President and a Congress of the same party.

But the President's party in the Senate is at open warfare with him. One hoarse orator, and 95 vacant seats.

We have a Senate in the doldrums, a President in the Gulf Stream, and a House completely at sea. But is this bad for the country?

Not at all.

It is an inspiring sign of a reviving spirit of congressional independence. The good record of this Congress is being written in terms of what it will not do.

Address of Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an address made by Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor, United States district judge for the southern district of California, former Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, and former vice chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, delivered at a testimonial luncheon given by the leaders of southern California to Hon. Fletcher Bowron in Los Angeles at the Biltmore Hotel on September 26, 1944. Many Members of the House came to know Judge O'Connor when he was Comptroller of the Currency, and no doubt will read this address with interest. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, your honor, and friends, I am exceedingly happy the mayor was advised of this meeting. It would have been embarrassing had he been overlooked. While I appreciate the honor the committee on arrangements has done me in asking me to speak, I am conscious of my limitations and inability to do justice to the subject: The mayor of Los Angeles.

In this great gathering there are many more experienced and more eloquent than myself. What I lack in these qualifications, I shall try to overcome in the brevity and sincerity of my remarks.

A city—a beautiful city—of more than a million and three-quarter souls hesitates for an hour to pay its tribute to its chief executive. Such thoughtful expressions of commendation are, unfortunately, generally left until the recipient cannot hear the words of praise, or feel the touch of a living hand. Why must words of cheer and expressions of good will be locked in the heart until, if uttered, they bring no cheer, and become purposeless in the saying?

My presence here is twofold. First, to pay tribute to the chief executive of my city; and, secondly, to approve the inspiration which found its fruition in this magnificent gathering. Some years ago I spent a day in Minneapolis. On the inside of the afternoon paper near the foot of the page, an item attracted my attention. It occupied about 2 inches with a single line reading "W. Bourke Cochran dies." On the front page in large type all across the front: "Pola Negri Jilts Chaplin." Cochran, for over 20 years, had been a Member of Congress of the United States; he left his imprint on every piece of important legislation in his day. He was without a rival in oratorical brilliance, and scholarly attainments. To listen to him, as was my pleasure in my school days, the picture of Calhoun replying to Wayne; Webster pleading for the life of Dartmouth College, and Edmund Burke defending America on the floor of the English House of Commons, flashed like livid realities before my mind; and yet, his accomplishments, his attainments, his contribution to the economic and political thought of his day were not as importart as the fact that Pola Negri jilted Chaplin.

In honoring a man in the midst of his work, who deserves honor, we honor ourselves, but we do more; we encourage others heavily laden with official responsibilities to know their efforts are not unappreciated by their fellowmen. The reward of those who serve in public office is not found in the compensation they receive, but rather in the satisfaction of work well done, and in the warm, sincere, and expressed appreciation of those served. The arrows of criticism are ever pointed toward those in public office; the higher the office, the more deadly the arrows. Did any man ever receive greater and more unjustified criticism than Abraham Lincoln? Yet, where is the man worthy to stand in his shadow?

The Czar of Russia returned to his palace following an attempt on his life, and his valet expressed surprise that he was so calm. "Part of my business," said the Czar, brushing the bullet-torn coat, "is to be shot at." That can be said of every public official.

Rudyard Kipling, the poet laureate, expressed my thought:

If you can keep your head when all about you
  Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
  But make allowance for their doubting too;

If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or, being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good nor talk too wise.

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue.
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;

If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run—
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son.

Six years is a long time to stand in the piercing rays of the searchlight of public opinion. Six years of sincere service, of exceptional accomplishment, of faithful devotion to duty, of impartial enforcement of the ordinances, of just treatment of the poor and rich alike, has characterized your administration, and this great gathering, Mr. Mayor, is far more eloquent tribute to your achievements than any words of mine.

Los Angeles is near the top among the great cities of the United States, and the time is not far distant when it will be known not only as the City of the Angels but the queen of all American cities. To govern a city increasing in population as fast as Los Angeles is a challenge never before thrown at the feet of any man. The ordinary civic problems are sufficient to test the administrative ability of any executive; add to these an increase in population in 6 years of 380,000; the building of over 130,000 new homes in city and county; the numberless factories, representing many millions of dollars, and at once comes the problem of electric light, sewerage, water-main extension, new streets, additional police protection, and many other attendant challenges. The war imposed many of these burdens and brought many for which there was no precedent. The black-out—no one ever dreamed the bright lights of our gay city would blink out—no one ever dreamed huge searchlights would glow from our peaceful hills to search the heavens for enemies with messages of death. Under the direction of our mayor and his citizens' committee, the whole city was organized to take care of any emergency. Thank God we were spared the horrors, the death, and destruction of other cities.

To the solution of these problems, Mayor Bowron brought his experience as an outstanding lawyer, the earned reputation of a fair and impartial judge while serving on the superior court, as well as Nature's gift of good, common horse sense. Men of honesty, integrity, capability, and devotion to duty have been appointed to office by our mayor. The civil-service commission has won the confidence and approval of the whole city. Every employee must know that his promotion rests upon his own efficient work and not upon any outside influence. The police department will not suffer in comparison with any city in our country. Chief of Police C. B. Horrall has won for himself a national reputation; a man of courage, experience, and ability directs our police force, which protects our people and our property; he is the nemesis of the gangster and the friend of the underprivileged boy.

The city planning commission appointed by our mayor has done an outstanding piece of work. It has redrafted the entire zoning ordinances, and placed in one instrument the many ordinances scattered in various places. Under its direction, the city and county have agreed on a master plan for the civic center and coordinated the superhighway system with local development, as well as making the shore line a contemplated spot of beauty and a joy for millions in the future. Sevard M. Mott, director of the urban land institute and former director of the Land Planning Division, Federal Housing Administration, after a canvass of all American cities, said Los Angeles led the Nation in home building and in preparation for war emergencies. Mayor Fletcher Bowron's plan for future city building, presented at the national conference of city mayors has attracted the attention and won the admiration of every forward-looking city builder. Our mayor holds a nonpartisan office; were it partisan the ethics of the bench would prevent my presence here today. Men and women of all parties, of all faiths, of all creeds have been called by His Honor to help in the vast program he inaugurated, and deserve much credit for its success. What should be the qualifications for all office holders in our Government, from the highest—I hesitate because there is no lowest office in a truly representative form of government—President Monroe, when he retired as Chief Executive of our Nation, was elected justice of the peace and served until death. His friends were reluctant to present the request; his response was, "Any office under the Constitution and laws of our country is an honor to hold." What should the qualifications be? Each individual has his own blueprint. Would you agree with these? First: Absolute honesty, not only in financial matters, but intellectually. Second, ability to do the work; third, application and devotion to the duties assumed; fourth, impartiality. Without honesty, the greater the ability, the greater the danger to the public. The first is the main qualification; lacking in this respect, the others need not be considered. Our mayor possesses all these qualifications. It is not possible to give credit or mention the work of the many other boards and committees—the work of the city council must be left for another day and abler hands.

Provincialism has never narrowed the vision of Mayor Bowron—he has visited the islands of the Pacific, Asia, the Republic of Mexico, and other South American Republics. He has fostered the good-neighbor policy with our sister republic south of the Rio Grande. He realizes that our city has world influence. In being well known all over the world, Los Angeles ranks with New York, London, and Paris. Like ribbons of light, the motion pictures made here go into every city, town, hamlet, and crevice in the world.

This is the city, Mr. Mayor, you have presided over as chief executive for 6 years. Into its growing body you have infused new life and, better still, a new spirit. Your foresight will be better appreciated by the unborn generations—your honesty and fairness an example to the mayors throughout our land; your unselfish service finds its approval in this outstanding gathering.

Los Angeles, your sons and daughters, native and adopted, have gathered to honor your chief executive. He has brought no blush of shame to your cheeks, nor caused your proud head to bow in sorrow. New York is justly proud of her famous bronze statue, the gift of another nation, which greets the incoming and bids farewell to the departing boats—but here we have a living, dynamic queen, her background the high Sierras, her feet marking the last American frontier, her head high, her fingertips on the outstretched arms touching the stars, her brow cooled by the gentle zephyrs of the Pacific, her untarnished robes gently flowing in the breeze, her heart so filled with love there is no room for hate—and this is your Los Angeles and my Los Angeles.

Excerpts From the Report of James E. Curry, General Counsel of the Congress of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the report of James E. Curry, general counsel of the National Congress of American Indians, to the convention of the congress at Denver on December 12, 1948:

Whoever witnesses individual acts of bravery, strength, or merit shares with the one who performs them the exaltation that such acts evoke. To see a Lindbergh fly the ocean or a David fight a Goliath or even to witness a farmer plowing a furrow well or a good fiddler playing a pretty tune thrills the spectator as well as the performer. Our admiration of accomplishment is increased if the deed performed is one of moral merit or self-sacrifice, as when a soldier fights or dies for his country or for his principles.

However, for me, there is an occasion that heightens the emotions even more. Nothing calls forth greater admiration in the spectator than a group of weak men and women banding together to make themselves strong and performing acts of self-sacrifice and devotion for the benefit of their community or their children. It matters not against whom their contest may be waged. The heart of the world is touched by their effort.

A few years ago that heart was touched by a group of indomitable friends of freedom in Ireland known as Sinn Feiners. Sinn Fein took the British lion by the tail and refused to let go until the rights of Ireland were recognized. In the less distant past all nations looked in awe at the brave struggle of the Finns against the Russian armies of conquest. At this very moment we are cheering the fight of the Jews in Israel to create and protect a homeland for themselves. Coming closer to home, everyone recalls the struggle of working people in their unions during the great depression, and the farmers in the West, through their cooperatives and unions, have carried on similar struggles and have gained public sympathy.

The glory that accrues from these struggles attaches to every member of the group. The eyes of the world are on the Finns, the Irish, and the Jews, and so the eyes of America today are beginning to turn upon the formerly despised minority of American Indians.

The individual Indian has always been admired—sometimes feared—for physical feats of valor. But this admiration is, and will be, intensified by the organized action that is now in progress. Everybody admires every member of any community of people that goes out and gets things done. During the last year the Indians of the United States through their organization, the National Congress of American Indians, have gone out and gotten things done—things that are important for the Indians and for their children. In this report I will tell you about some of the work accomplished during the past year in which I have been honored to participate.

At this convention the Indians will again demonstrate their ability to organize, to agitate, to press and to fight for what they think is due to them and to their children. Now, there may be people of Indian ancestry who would prefer to have it left unmentioned. I am confident that their number has diminished during the past year—their pride in their race has increased as a result of the group action taken by this organization. The number of those ashamed to admit their Indian blood will become even fewer in the years to come. In the very near future we will see Indianhood become a universal badge of honor.

THE ALASKA NATIVE BROTHERHOOD CONVENTION

I have just experienced an example of the sort of spirit that will win this war for Indian rights, the spirit that has already won its initial battles. I have just returned from the beautiful little city of Sitka, Alaska, where I attended the 6-day annual convention of your affiliated organization—the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the Alaska Native Sisterhood. I am sure you would be delighted by the fraternal affection and cordial good will that these far-off brothers and sisters of yours have expressed for you.

The National Congress of American Indians can take a leaf from the book of the Alaska brotherhood. From some 17 poverty-stricken villages, a total of 93 enthusiastic delegates attended the meeting. It lasted for 6 days, including sessions that continued to all hours of the morning. Most of the delegates were housed and fed at the homes of Indians in Sitka. Many of the delegates gave up opportunities to earn at fishing the money their families badly need, in order to come to the convention and help families of other Indians. The deliberations were dignified and energetic. The resolutions were well considered and carefully drafted. The program for the coming year is an aggressive and solid one. It will involve heavy sacrifices of time, money, and effort not merely from officers but from all members of the brotherhood. In referring to the Alaska Native Brotherhood, I have no desire to belittle the accomplishments of the national congress. To the contrary, I can add my personal appreciation to the deep gratitude of the brotherhood for the work of the national congress. The brotherhood is grateful especially for that part of the work which is for the direct benefit of the Indians of Alaska.

THE ALASKA LAND-TITLE PROBLEM

I am in an especially advantageous position to speak on this subject because I have worked on it in three different capacities—as attorney for the Indian towns, as senior attorney for the Alaska Native Brotherhood, and as attorney for this National Congress of American Indians. This arrangement gives me an opportunity to speak in Washington with a force that I, as an individual, would not possess. It gives me the ears of people who would not listen to me alone. The Territorial Delegate from Alaska to the Congress of the United States, BOB BARTLETT, stated to the Alaska Native Brotherhood convention that the council fires of Sitka are clearly visible, thousands of miles away at Capitol Hill in the city of Washington, D. C.

This remark of his made me think of the time, a couple of years ago, before Mrs. Ruth Bronson, your secretary, made her first visit to the Territory. Then very little consideration was given to the views of Alaskan Indians even by those administrative officers who were supposed to represent their interests. One of the reasons why those views are now respected, why those council fires are seen where they never were seen before, is that men of political influence in the National Congress of American Indians have helped clear the air in Washington on the subject of Indian rights.

More than 2 years ago, after due public hearings and investigations the Interior Department defined the area of land that the Tlingit and Haida Indians and their ancestors have occupied since time immemorial and of which they are now the lawful owners. But the Forest Service and other Federal agencies and even the Interior Department itself disregarded this official finding and obtained passage of the Tongass Timber Act authorizing sale of the land and of timber on it without the Indians' consent. This law was admitted by its very sponsors to be unconstitutional. Yet, under it the Forest Service is now attempting to sell the Indians' timber, without their consent, to giant corporations engaged in the production of newspaper pulp.

The Secretary of the Interior is supposed to represent the Indians' interests. But for years he has delayed using his power under the Wheeler-Howard Act, as amended, to make a final settlement of the Indians' rights.

Last year there was great pressure on him to make a settlement by creating reservations under complete control of the Indians. Congressmen expressed impatience with his delay and a bill was introduced to repeal his authority under the Wheeler-Howard law. He said he was squeamish about creating reservations while that bill was pending. We fought the repeal bill for months. We did it because Secretary Krug allowed us and the committees of Congress to understand that if he were free to act under existing laws (i. e. the Wheeler-Howard Act) he could settle the Indian land question quickly.

This attempt by representatives of large-business interests to destroy the only law under which Indian rights in Alaska might be protected, was one of the dirtiest fights that the Halls of Congress have ever witnessed.

I told you last year how the four delegates, Senator Frank Peratrovich, of Klawock, Representative Andrew Hope, of Sitka, Representative Frank Johnson, of Kake, and Mr. Fred Grant, of Hydaburg, came from Alaska to Washington. I told you how they were followed by cabled threats of persecution from white political leaders in the Territory. This was in 1947, when the Tongass timber bill was before Congress. The tactics of personal character assassination were continued throughout 1948.

At last, after lengthy hearings, the bill to destroy the reservation power was reported out. The committee reported that it should pass. The bill was defeated. But the battle was not yet won. In spite of the promises he had made, the Secretary did not proceed promptly to settle the Indians' rights. First, he said, he had to send teams of bureaucrats to Alaska to make surveys. The teams went. Months later the teams returned. Still no action.

In my opinion the time has come when Julius Krug should do one of two things—either sign the Alaska-reservation proclamations that lie upon his desk or else admit that he has less regard for his suffering Indian wards and their interests than he has for the interests of the pulp operators and Forest Service bureaucrats.

But the Secretary has no such frank approach to his obligations. Instead of that, private information leads us to believe that a new, more artful, more effective subterfuge is being invented. Unless Krug is dissuaded, the public will soon be told that he still cannot act unless he gets new legislation. He will say that he needs to have confirmed, reiterated, implemented, or corroborated by Congress the power granted to him in 1936. This statement will be made in the face of his Department's statement to Congress in 1948 that the legal power then existing was adequate.

I hope that no friends of the Indians and no Indian will permit himself to be fooled by this poppycock. I hope he will not permit it to divert his attention or energies. We should spurn any suggestion that we join Krug and his subordinates in a campaign for new legislation. Such legislation is unnecessary and such a campaign would only provide Krug with a plausible excuse for not doing his duty under present law.

This newly invented excuse may be very attractive to those people who would like to befriend the Indians and other minorities but who want to avoid doing anything substantial for their benefit or anything that might injure or offend powerful interests.

We shoud insist that Secretary Krug quit stalling and sign the reservation orders that are on his desk. We should make it entirely clear that we will treat as an evasion any statement that further laws are needed. This is a matter of considerable urgency, and is being discussed at this very moment with Governor Gruening, of Alaska.

Alaska fish-trap abolition: There is another phase of the Alaskan Indian struggle, the fight against fish traps. Most of the people of Alaska make their living in the fishing industry. For every 5 or 6 breadwinners in each village, one is the owner of a small boat, used by him and his neighbors for seining.

This is a hard way to earn a living. There is an easier way to catch fish, by the use of fish traps, which catch lots of fish cheap but which, if improperly regulated, result in ruthless destruction of the fish supply.

There are only a few places in Alaska where such fish traps may be anchored and these sites are controlled by the Fish and Wildlife Service, also under Secretary Krug's direction. Since the Service is supposed to conserve the food supply, one would expect them to limit or eliminate traps. Since they are supposed to represent all the people, one would expect them at least to make this easy method of catching fish available to local people or to communities of fishermen. But to the contrary, their policy over the years has generally put these sites at the exclusive disposal of the great corporations of Seattle and Chicago, allied with the monopolized food industry of the United States. These corporations use the cheap fish caught in the traps to beat down the price paid to fishermen, and they overuse the traps to such an extent that the supply of fish in the waters of Alaska is nearing exhaustion.

So the Indians and the white people of Alaska have learned to hate fish traps as a menace to their source of livelihood. A movement has been on foot for years to abolish fish traps by law. By hook or by crook, by various forms of bribery, these efforts have been thwarted.

But last year's session of the Territorial legislature was incorruptible. For one thing, it included two representatives and one senator who are Indian members of this organization. Under the sponsorship of one of these Indian leaders, Frank Peratrovich, of Klawock, a bill was passed submitting to a referendum of the people the question whether the fish trap should be abolished.

This frightened the financial interests. They ran in frenzy to their friends in high places, and a bill was introduced to grant 15-year permits to the companies for the use of the fish-trap sites, in place of their previous 1-year permits. This action would have been a death blow to the movement to abolish fish traps. For constitutional reasons, the 15-year leases would have given the companies a valuable property right. Any attempt to take this right away without compensation would have been unconstitutional. The bill proposed also would have amounted to an outright gift from the Public Treasury of millions of dollars of public property.

There followed a fight in Congress that can best be described in the words of Tris Coffin, a radio commentator, who told the story

over a Nation-wide hook-up. He said in part:

"This is a rough story of adventure and conflict in a pioneer land. All through the story is the raw smell of scandal like wild onions in a flower garden. It was a tug of power, of men unused to the niceties of Washington lobbying. This was plain on their faces, in the long looks of contempt and anger they gave each other. Those men in the several rows of straight folding chairs were not the bored polite gentlemen of Washington. Instead they had an independent cut about them—big men with a rough grace, a straight look in the eyes, broad shoulders, a hearty friendliness, but the two sides watched each other with a cool, steady anger. Time had worn away the bright fire of hate.

"Those men were from Alaska. They were involved in an untamed fist-swinging, money-passing battle that has been going on for 30 years. It is a struggle of city slickers with money and political power against country jakes, a fight between an efficient monopoly and small operators. A battle between the rugged outdoor men who pioneered Alaska, and the great fishing companies that exploit its resources—the prize, the silver, shining salmon.

"Five big fishing companies with headquarters in the State of Washington in effect control the Alaskan salmon fishing. They monopolize the traps dropped into the water to catch the fish as it plunges through the streams. Now, with Alaska reaching for statehood and control of its own waters, with Alaska holding a popular referendum on abolishing traps altogether, the Department of the Interior suddenly asks Congress to pass a law giving the monopoly a 15-year lease on traps. Why?"

Mr. Coffin goes on from that point to describe what was done by Miss Lopinsky and my staff in behalf of the National Congress of American Indians. About our statement to Congress, Coffin said:

"There was nothing wishy-washy about it. It came right out and said bribery, corruption of Federal fishery officials leading to the gift of millions of dollars worth of salmon fishing grounds to favored corporations. The charges were: first, the Interior Department suppressed the secret FBI report revealing wide-scale bribery and corruption of responsible officials. Second, lobbyists for the big companies paid $250 and $200 a day, wrote the bill submitted by the Department of the Interior. Third, if the leasing act went into effect, the monopoly would raise the price of salmon."

The result of this battle, in which we fought alongside with white fishermen's organizations, was that the bill could not be forced through Congress. The referendum was held and the people voted 8 to 1 to abolish fishtraps.

But this fight is not finished either. The fish companies challenged the power of the Legislature to abolish traps regardless of the wishes of the people. And if the Legislature lacks the power, it may be very difficult to get a bill through Congress for that purpose. On the other hand the Secretary of the Interior has it within his present power to abolish them by administrative action. By signing appropriate regulations he could put the will of the people of Alaska into effect tomorrow. But, as in the case of reservations, he will probably hedge and delay and try his utmost to avoid doing his duty. At the very moment that I am making this statement, Miss Lopinsky is filing a brief before the Fish and Wildlife Service urging gradual abolition of the traps by the Secretary of the Interior. It is an uphill fight, but we never give up hope. We are sure that, in the end, we will win this, like all of our other battles, in behalf of Indian rights.

THE INDIAN VOTING CASES

I have mentioned the Alaska work first because it has happened that the first line of defense of Indian rights is in Alaska. But that does not mean that we have neglected our members in the various States. Our greatest victory this year was achieved not in Congress but in the courts of law.

As reported at last year's convention, the Indians of Arizona and New Mexico have always been excluded from the ballot. In Arizona they were refused the right to vote on the ground they are "persons under guardianship." In New Mexico the State constitution forbade the vote to "Indians not taxed."

Our office made a careful study of these State constitutions. We came to the conclusion that the Indians were not properly defined as "persons under guardianship" at all. It is only their property that is under such guardianship, in the legal sense. To say that the Indians were persons under guardianship would be the same as to classify them with little children or insane people.

We also studied the New Mexico law, and decided that the Indians should be permitted to vote for two reasons. First, they are not "Indians not taxed," as that word is used in the New Mexico Constitution. They do pay taxes on their income and on their purchases and many other taxes. They are exempted only from taxes on their trust lands. We also felt that even if the Indians were "not taxed" the provision against their voting should be set aside as a violation of the Federal constitutional provision against racial discrimination.

Our plan was to file suits in both States in the Federal courts. I made a trip to the two States for purposes of this litigation. All the necessary papers were prepared in my office and corresponding attorneys were contacted in both States.

At about this time another friend of the Indians intervened in the State of Arizona. This friend was former Congressman Harless, who filed his own case in the State court. We didn't expect this case to succeed because the State supreme court had already given a decision against the Indians in a previous case. So, after consulting with Mr. Harless, we filed another suit in Federal court in the name of other Indians.

So we had, as you might say, two strings to our bow, one in the Federal court and one in the State court. The case was lost in the lower court of the State and appealed to the supreme court. With the consent of Mr. Harless we appeared in his case and filed a lengthy brief.

The supreme court surprised us all by overruling itself and issuing a very strong opinion supporting the right of the Indians to vote. This made it unnecessary for us to continue with our case in the Federal court.

We then went over to the State of New Mexico, and within a month we had a suit filed in the Federal district court. The attorney for the Association on American Indian Affairs had previously filed a suit in the local court, where it was decided against the Indian and was on appeal. In our case, a special three-judge court was appointed which gave a prompt decision in favor of the Indians' right to vote.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIANS

Another battle that is now in progress is the battle to get social-security benefits for the Indians of New Mexico and Arizona. The Indians who are present from those two States will remember that your secretary, Mrs. Bronson, was the first to start working on this problem. In cooperation with Federal social-security officers, she compiled the information upon which complaints by the Federal agency, or by the subordinates of that agency, were made against the discriminary practices of the two States.

A lawsuit has been filed in the name of Indians of New Mexico and Arizona and of a number of tribes that have authorized me to represent them. We allege in our complaint the custom and usage of the officials refusing to consider payment of any application made by any Indian living on a reservation of the social-security benefits payable under the statutes to dependent children, or needy aged or blind persons, regardless of need and regardless of the satisfying by such applicants of all conditions imposed upon white persons; that this has been the cause of much suffering and more than 82 deaths from starvation or malnutrition among the Indians of these two States. We allege that officials of the Social Security Board (the subordinates to whom I have referred) have announced that continued discrimination would necessitate withholding of Federal-aid grants amounting to more than $10,000,000 per annum. We allege that the defendants Interior Secretary Krug and Security Administrator Ewing agreed and conspired to prevent the Board from issuing a notice to the States of New Mexico and Arizona, instructing the Social Security Board to postpone its promised hearing. We state that the means employed in this said conspiracy include misrepresentation, misappropriations or threats of misappropriations of public funds, and interference with the normal administrative procedures of the Social Security Board. This lawsuit is now pending in the District Court of the District of Columbia and will be up for argument in a few days. It would be improper for me to comment at length on it. We will report to you after we get a decision.

LEGISLATION IN GENERAL

Our score on legislation this year was much better than it was the year before, when we suffered a major defeat in the passage of the Tongass Timber Act. At the request of members of NCAI, my office has analyzed and kept members generally informed as to the effect and status of all bills affecting Indians, including the false emancipation bill, which was H. R. 1113; the bill numbered H. R. 4725, which would have placed all laws and orders on Indian reservations in the control of the States without reference to the wishes of the Indians concerned, and, of course, House Joint Resolution 162, which would have robbed the Alaskan natives of the last vestiges of their rights.

Miss Lopinsky in the course of her work discovered that the Indian Claims Commission Act was in danger of being repealed. She gave the information wide circulation and demanded that an NCAI witness be heard by the committee which was about to report the bill favorably. The right to be heard was granted, but the hearing was never held and the repeal bill died in committee. This I believe, was a direct result of our action, especially of the series of protests sent at our request by members of the NCAI.

INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS

There is one important job that we have hardly started. That is the invalidation or repeal of the discriminatory Federal Indian Liquor Laws.

These laws were condemned almost 3 years ago by your convention and your President prepared a bill to repeal them. The bill has not moved forward because we have been engaged in a desperate defensive battle in the city of Washington. We have not had the time, resources, or money to attempt more new gains.

We have the support of important people in all walks of life. Father Clementine Wattle of the Catholic Indian Center in Gallup recently said, in a statement to the New Mexico papers, that the liquor laws should be repealed. He said: "Give them a chance to drink normally as other people do and there will be no trouble. Then it will be the State bureau of revenue that is responsible to enforce regulations on bartenders which require them to refuse drinks to anyone approaching intoxication. This would be a much better situation than is the present one where the Indians are the victims of unscrupulous bootleggers."

I have a letter from the Bureau of Legal Medicine and Legislation of the American Medical Association, J. W. Holloway, director, in which he quotes a report of a special committee which reads in part as follows:

"The excessive use of alcohol is a menace to both physical and moral health and a serious obstacle to progress. Temptation to illegal use of liquor and difficulties in procuring it act as incentives to its use. The laws prohibiting sale of alcoholic beverages to Indians are so easy of circumvention that they are worthless and it would be much better to abolish them."

I am not permitted at this time to quote him directly, but I can say that I have talked this matter over with one of the principal leaders of the Protestant clergy in this country and feel assured that he will take a position at least as strong as that of Father Wattle.

This year the national congress filed its second brief, in the Supreme Court of the United States. The first, you will remember was when we filed as a friend of the court on the side of the Quileut Indians in the Alcea case. The Quileuts won the case, and all Indian tribes whose aboriginal land claims had not been settled were put on firmer legal ground. In the present brief, involving the right of Alaskan natives to enjoy exclusive fishing privileges, the NCAI joins the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the American Civil Liberties Union in filing a brief as a friend of the court on behalf of the natives of Karluk, Alaska. If the Supreme Court rejects the arguments of the big salmon-canning interests and upholds the order of the Secretary of the Interior, setting apart certain waters as part of the Karluk reservation, natives all over the Territory of Alaska will benefit.

CONCLUSION

It has been a real pleasure and privilege to work with all of you during the past year and during this convention. I want to express most emphatically and especially my gratitude to Mrs. Bronson for the inspirations she has furnished to me and Miss Lopinsky. I hope the coming year will be even more productive of good things for the Indian people. I am sometimes asked why I, a non-Indian, devote so much time to the work of helping Indians with their legal problems. As I told you in the beginning the whole world admires and wants to help an underprivileged group that keeps fighting against heavy odds and in spite of discouraging set-backs.

I think the National Congress of American Indians is fighting the good fight under trying circumstances and against heavy opposition, and that it is fighting energetically and well. I know it is going to win that fight. I hope to be invited to the celebration of victory when it is won. And however far off that victory may sometimes seem, however hard may be the path we must traverse to reach it, I want you all to know that I will be with you and will help to the limit of my strength, ability, and resources.

By working and fighting together as we now are, you can give your sons and daughters the right to say with pride "my mother, my father, my grandparents, great grandparents, were Indians."

At last year's convention, I asked one of your leaders a question "I wonder," I said, "what will be the social status of the American Indian a hundred years from now. Will there be any traces left of the days when he was a despised pariah, a segregated second-class citizen? Will he ever achieve the equality to which he is entitled?"

This Indian leader who is in the audience now, answered that he thought all this could be accomplished in another generation or so. "But," I asked him then, "what will happen to this organization of yours—the National Congress of American Indians? It is set up now to fight for the rights of Indians. What will it do when the Indians get those rights?"

His answer was that the organization that is now fighting the Indian cause will continue in existence after that cause is won, as an expression of its members' pride in the ability of their fathers, and mothers, and grandfathers, to win the good fight in which we are now engaged. He said that the congress, a hundred years from now, would be comparable to what the Daughters of the American Revolution are today.

These groups now say proudly, "My forefather fought in 1776." Perhaps they say it too proudly. In the year 2048 I hope that the then members of the National Congress of American Indians will say with the deepest pride "My father, my grandfather was an Indian. My father took part in the struggle that saved the Indians' lands. My father helped us to get the right to vote. My father saved for me the proud position of respect and honor that I as an Indian now enjoy."

Wisconsin Firsts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 29, 1948, the State of Wisconsin celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of its statehood. Recently a great newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, published in its March 19 issue a reprint of a significant statement from the Badger History Magazine. This reprint listed a series of dates of Wisconsin "firsts"—dates of tremendous meaning in the history of the Badger State, and in many instances of the Nation. I believe that this reprint will be of deep interest not only to Wisconsinites but to folks throughout the Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FIRSTS

STATE PLAYED A PATHFINDING ROLE IN INVENTION, EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT, AND OTHER FIELDS, A LISTING OF NOTABLE DATES INDICATES

(From Badger History magazine)

First kindergarten in America established at Watertown, by Mrs. Carl Schurz, 1856.

First practical commercial typewriter invented by C. L. Sholes, Carlos Glidden, and Samuel Soule, Milwaukee, 1868.

First State to ratify the nineteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, so women could vote.

First Christian Science church (in world) built at Oconto, 1886.

First kodak patented by David H. Houston, Cambria. He later sold patent to George Eastman.

First official library and bill-drafting bureau in the United States organized by Charles McCarthy. It helps legislators.

First American flag to appear over a building in Wisconsin raised by Gen. William Clark over Fort Shelby, 1814.

First American flag seen in Wisconsin, brought by Lt. Zebulon Pike from St. Louis, 1805.

First Wisconsin capital building was near Belmont, Lafayette County.

First Madison meeting of the legislature was in the basement of the old American House, November 26, 1838.

First commercial cheese factories built at Ladoga, Fond du Lac County, and near Plymouth, Sheboygan County.

First company to construct a railroad in Wisconsin was the Milwaukee & Waukesha Railroad Co., chartered 1847.

First Federal court session in present Wisconsin held at Prairie du Chien by James D. Doty, May 10, 1824.

First fort in interior Wisconsin built by Daniel Du Luth at the Brule-St. Croix portage in Douglas County, 1683.

First building on the University of Wisconsin campus erected by a grant from the legislature was Ladies' (now Chadbourne) hall, 1871.

First Territorial Governor, Henry Dodge, 1836.

First State Governor, Nelson Dewey, 1848.

First Governor to occupy the present governor's home was Jeremiah Rusk.

First United States Secretary of Agriculture, under President Benjamin Harrison, was Jeremiah Rusk.

First hydroelectric power station in the United States built at the Fox River rapids in Appleton, 1882.

First territorial legislature called to order by Governor Dodge in building near Belmont, October 25, 1836.

First mass in interior Wisconsin on shore of Lake Winnebago near Oshkosh celebrated by Father Allouez, April 20, 1670.

First Wisconsin missionary, Rene Menard, 1661.

First native Wisconsin governor, Robert M. La Follette, January 7, 1901.

First newspaper was the Green Bay Intelligencer, 1833.

First paper mill in Wisconsin built by Ludington and Garland at junction of Milwaukee and Menomonee Rivers in Milwaukee, 1846.

First permanent mining settlements in Wisconsin at New Diggings in Lafayette County and Hardscrapple, now Hazel Green, in Grant County, 1824.

First railroad depot in Wisconsin built at the foot of Second Street, Milwaukee, 1850.

First sawmills on record in Wisconsin built at De Pere on the Fox River, 1809, and another near Green Bay, 1814.

First sawmill in western Wisconsin built by Col. John Shaw on the Black River, 1819.

First sawmill at Chippewa Falls built by Jean Brunet, 1836.

First State to end capital punishment; Leonard J. Farwell was governor.

First steamboat to visit Wisconsin was a small sidewheeler, *Walk-in-the-Water*, which visited Green Bay, 1820 and 1821.

First ship in Wisconsin waters was the *Griffon*, sailed into Green Bay with Robert Chevalier Sieur de la Salle, Henry de Tonty and Father Hennepin, 1679.

First twine binder perfected by John F. Appleby at Beloit, 1877.

First malted milk made by William Horlick at Racine.

First announcement by Dr. Stephen M. Babcock of the discovery of his famous test for butterfat, 1890.

First Wisconsin cheese makers' association organized, 1893.

First attracted Nation-wide attention for a series of progressive legislative measures, many of them the first to be enacted in the United States. Among them were: The primary election law; the income and inheritance tax laws; the workman's compensation measure; creation of the industrial commission; 1905–11.

First Socialist Congressman elected in the United States, Victor L. Berger, 1911.

First State to set up cooperative crop reporting organization jointly with the Federal Government.

First announcement by Dr. Harry Steenbock of the process of adding new vitamins to milk by irradiation, 1927.

First State to pass an unemployment compensation act, 1932.

First State normal school established at Platteville, 1866. Opened in the old academy building, built in 1853.

First fur trader situated at Green Bay, Nicholas Perrot, 1665.

First white men to go over the Fox-Portage-Wisconsin River route were Joliet and Marquette with five Frenchmen, 1673.

First Protestant sermon in Wisconsin preached at Prairie du Chien by Rev. Marshall Mann, 1818.

First steamer to come up the Mississippi to Prairie du Chien was the *Virginia*, 1823.

First successful gasoline automobile in America designed by Gottfried Schloemer and Frank Toepfer, Milwaukee, 1889.

First vocational school in Wisconsin built in Menomonie by James H. Stout, 1895.

First white men's habitation in Wisconsin built by Radisson and Groseilliers near present Ashland.

First white man to mine and smelt lead on a large scale in southwestern Wisconsin was Julien Dubuque.

First white settlers of Madison were Eben Peck and family, April 15, 1837.

St. Lawrence Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Prospect," concerning the St. Lawrence development, published in a far-sighted Virginia newspaper, the Alexandria Gazette, of March 18, 1949, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of March 18, 1949]

ST. LAWRENCE PROSPECT

The opinion seems to be spreading that there is more possibility now of congressional approval for the St. Lawrence seaway proposal than there has been at any other time in the 50 years since it was first envisioned.

There are various reasons for this conclusion. Among them are the general atmosphere now prevailing in Washington, and the possibility that within the foreseeable future the Government will be looking for sound public-construction projects. There are many such to be found, and the seaway is one. A new factor, one which might tip the balance, is the changing viewpoint of some transportation and industrial interests which have traditionally opposed the project. This is largely because it now seems certain that before many years the principal source of high-grade iron ore will shift from the Lake Superior region eastward to Quebec and Labrador, beyond the rapids of the St. Lawrence from the great steel centers of Pittsburgh and the Great Lakes.

Thus there is beginning to be revealed to others now what many wise men saw years ago. This is the fact that the seaway project would benefit the entire country, and so in the end would also benefit most of the individual interests which have thought they would be hurt by it. So it is with most projects to develop natural resources on a large scale; some persons always think they would lose, but in the long run they usually gain by any development which helps the public.

Air Power Enthusiasts Mislead People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

ZEALOUS ENTHUSIASTS OF AIR POWER SEEN MISLEADING PEOPLE—PROPAGANDA DECLARED ENDANGERING FUTURE OF AMERICAN DEFENSE

(By David Lawrence)

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and perhaps the greatest military strategist in the world today, has told Congress that a strategic air force and the atomic bomb cannot be relied on to defend the United States.

This simple statement would not have been thought necessary if the American people were not in process of being misled and confused as to the true state of their defenses and the manner in which the next war will be fought if it comes in the immediate future.

A propaganda is being carried on by zealous enthusiasts of air power which is giving millions of people the impression that airplanes, flying from the United States as a base and carrying the atomic bomb, will win the next war in a matter of weeks.

In all fairness, it must be said that nobody high up in the armed services or in any branch of it believes any such thing. But on the fringe of the debate are retired officers and propagandists who honestly think that most of the money usually allocated to ground armies or to the Navy ought to be spent on more planes.

Unfortunately, such thinking does a disservice to the real potentialities of air power and tends to weaken the branches of the armed services which must support aerial warfare or else airpower is itself impotent.

"BUCK ROGERS" PHILOSOPHY

Much of the misunderstanding is due to the fancifulness of the "Buck Rogers" philosophy in relation to future wars. Thus, airplanes can fly across oceans and around the world by refueling, but sustained day-in-and-day-out bombing on that basis is still too expensive in raw materials and manpower to accomplish. It is not feasible to send across the ocean and back 1,000 long-range bombers every 5 or 6 hours every day for weeks and months at a time and to load them with bombs for each mission. Sustained bombing from bases nearer the target and protected by relatively short-range fighter planes is still much less expensive and is far more certain of achieving objectives, whether such planes are launched from fixed or floating bases.

In the first place, while no official information has ever been divulged as to the number of atomic bombs that have actually been manufactured, it is public knowledge that the United States after an expenditure of nearly $2,000,000,000 used less than half a dozen bombs—one for a test in New Mexico, two over Japan, and two at Bikini. If a lot more have been made since the war, this fact has not been revealed, but the amount of money appropriated annually for atomic warfare doesn't indicate that very much is being spent, relatively speaking, for quantity production of atomic bombs, even if this is as yet feasible.

The big point about the atomic-bomb problem is that it costs a good deal of money to make them and that for a long while they will not be so plentiful that squadrons of planes can take off from America, all loaded with atomic bombs, and fly to Europe followed by another and another group of planes doing the same thing every few hours.

PICTURE GIVEN BY ZEALOTS

Yet this is the picture of air power which the American people are being given by zealots who think Congress will not authorize enough money for air power. Congress is air-minded. There is not the remotest chance that air power will be neglected. The Navy has been transformed so that it operates with air power as the spearhead of its plans and operating techniques. The Army works with tactical air power, which is today the eyes of a ground army. Strategic bombing of factories and plants by an air force devoted solely to that purpose is accepted now as an integral and explicit part of our national strategy and is written down in terms that are fully comprehensible.

Problems of how to assign duties to each service have been settled at the top level by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Some differences of opinion still exist as to whether the Navy should carry on any long-range bombing from the decks of aircraft carriers or whether this method of attack shall be abandoned altogether because the Air Force says it is unnecessary. For the safety of the United States, it is not so important how many blows are struck at the enemy from this or that direction, but that as many blows be struck from as many directions as possible at the same time.

There remains much work to be done in eliminating duplication in buying, in ground facilities, and in transportation, but these are only incidental to problems of logistics and strategy and present no insuperable difficulty. It is on broad strategy that the Nation is being told—and Congress is being urged to believe—that one air force will win a war in 30 days and hence money need not be spent on ships or ground armies. No greater danger to the future of American defense exists than in the propagation of such fantastic doctrine. Small wonder that General Bradley felt compelled to speak out so plainly to Congress.

What Oils Are Used in the Manufacture of Oleo?—Are You Allergic to Lard?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official table was prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture:

Oleomargarine: Percentage contributed by principal items to the weight of fats and oils used in manufacture, United States, 1937–48

Item	Average, 1937–41	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	January–October, 1948
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Cottonseed oil	47	48	51	45	51	48	53	60
Soybean oil	21	38	40	44	41	43	38	35
Other domestic vegetable	1	1	3	5	4	4	4	3
Total, domestic vegetable	69	87	94	94	96	95	95	98
Oleo oil	5	7	3	3	2	1	1	1
Oleostearine and oleo stock	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	(1)
Neutral lard	1	2	2	2	1	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total, domestic animal	8	11	6	6	4	2	2	1
Coconut oil	18	1	------	------	------	3	3	1
Other foreign	5	1	------	------	(1)	------	------	------
Total foreign	23	2	------	------	------	3	3	1
All fats and oils	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Computed from reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

You will note that before the war 23 percent of the imitation butter was made from foreign oils. You will note that by 1948, 60 percent of the imitation butter was made from cottonseed oil and 35 percent was made from soybean oil. And you will note that foreign oil constituted 3 percent of the oil used in imitation butter in 1946 and 1947, but was only 1 percent of the oil used in 1948. Are you allergic to lard?

If the Granger-Andresen bill is passed, each State will decide on the kind of oil to be used. If the Rivers bill is passed, the use of coconut oil may or may not be increased. Who knows? Is the substitution of domestic oils for foreign oils a permanent change of policy? Or will the foreign oils again become favored once the Rivers bill is passed?

The Late Honorable Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American of March 19, 1949:

[From the Gaelic American of March 19, 1949]

A FRIEND OF IRELAND

Representative Sol Bloom is dead. He was a stalwart American, a Jew, who rose from poverty to greatness. He was a humane man, an understanding individual, a tolerant man, whose life was an eloquent story of America's unlimited horizon of opportunity to men of good will, imagination, patriotism, whose name will forever be etched high on the roll of honor of the United States.

Sol Bloom had 1 hour of actual schooling. His parents were too poor to buy books for him to get an education. Yet, he died a recognized scholar, an authority on the life of George Washington, was the author of several books, and the possessor of a vast fortune which he obtained through hard work. He sat with the mighty of the universe. He headed the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House before and after World War II where he proved himself a brilliant statesman.

Mr. Bloom was a kindly man who hated injustice. A couple of weeks ago, a delegation from the American League for an Undivided Ireland appeared before his committee to protest the further sending of Marshall-plan funds to Britain while that country held captive the six counties of Ireland. He listened intently as the Irish-American delegates presented their arguments. That he was impressed was apparent and reflected in his inquiries for additional information. He was shocked that the money of American taxpayers should be used to partition a friendly nation which has contributed so much to the upbuilding of his beloved America.

As the speakers concluded their presentation of the facts, he said:

"I'm with you 100 percent."

He later added:

"Well, you've convinced me."

Injustice was revolting to this great American. He had long been a friend and admirer of the Irish. Many of his best friends had Irish blood and the idea that the country of their nativity should be the victim of such savage treatment in the hands of a medicant nation that we are supporting on a dole was shocking to him. His untimely death, at this time, was most unfortunate and caused much genuine sorrow among our people. We pray that the noble soul of our friend, Sol Bloom, American statesman extraordinary, shall rest in peace.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association's effort to assess all doctors $25 to raise a $3,500,000 lobby fund for fighting President Truman's health-insurance legislation has backfired—backfired so seriously that the net effect may be to help enact the legislation.

Members of Congress, I am sure, have noticed the resentment spreading among doctors throughout the country against this proposal to throw a professional and scientific organization into a political battle. Some of the top doctors have rebelled and two of the AMA's biggest constituent units have refused to levy the assessment. Others have refused to make it compulsory as the AMA originally intended.

The AMA, however, has not given up without a fight—and this fight, too, may contribute to the cause of national health insurance. In Brooklyn, N. Y., the King's County Medical Society twice voted against the assessment—the second time in a secret vote which was the biggest in the association's history.

But not satisfied, the president of that society, probably because of pressure from the AMA, decided to circulate a third ballot and ask the doctors to sign their names. This has created wide resentment among the doctors. I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement issued by Dr. George Cannon, secretary of the Physicians' Forum, a group of doctors supporting health insurance, attacking this third ballot.

Dr. Cannon forecasts that the high-handed tactics of the AMA in raising this so-called educational fund will do more to educate doctors in what this fight for health insurance is really all about than anything else.

STATEMENT BY DR. GEORGE CANNON, SECRETARY OF THE PHYSICIANS' FORUM, ON THE RECENT ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE KINGS COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY IN THE MATTER OF THE AMA'S $25 ASSESSMENT

Morris Fishbein has stated that 85 percent of the doctors are in favor of the AMA's position on health insurance and will pay the assessment to fight against it. In reality, wherever there has been democratic discussion of the matter permitted in the medical societies the doctors of this country have shown themselves nearly 60 percent opposed, not 15 percent, as Fishbein wishfully states.

But Kings County is evidently out to produce a "Ja" vote for Dr. Fishbein, even if the president of the Kings County Medical Society, has to pay for it himself. In two authorized previous votes on this matter the Brooklyn physicians showed themselves 53 percent opposed to the assessment—in New York County last week they were 57 percent opposed—with 1,600 doctors voting. Dr. Siris' decision to take a third vote was not authorized by the society, and hundreds of Brooklyn physicians refused to participate in the poll, which required that their names be signed, in the belief that this was an effort to set up a blacklist. Since Dr. Siris' action was unauthorized and since the results can hardly be considered representative, Dr. Siris is said to have announced his intention of paying the costs of the ballot himself rather than out of the funds of the society.

It is certain that the high-handed tactics of the AMA in this fight have already caused them a good deal of trouble with the rank-and-file doctor, for whom this is a very valuable educational experience. I predict the so-called educational fund the AMA set out to raise in November is going to educate more doctors in what this fight for health insurance is really all about than the AMA ever bargained for.

Freedom for All Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we celebrated a feast day that is universally hailed by all the Irish, St. Patrick's Day. I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to a piece of legislation which I have recently introduced. It is H. R. 3226, a bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

My purpose in introducing this legislation was to make certain that the administrator of the Economic Cooperation Act should require that any country which participates in the benefits of that act should also uphold the expressed policy and the objectives of that act. In the declaration of policy, the following statement appears in the act: "The restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the establishment of sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships, and so forth."

The declaration of policy also states:

It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation.

By the terms of my bill, there would appear in the act immediately following the last-quoted declaration of policy, the following provision:

Provided, That no assistance shall be granted to any participating country so long as it denies to its citizens or to citizens in any dependent area under its jurisdiction, the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence.

The insertion of this language in the act will make it evident that in setting out our policy we are not merely mouthing words, but are eager to bring to other peoples and other nations throughout the world the same liberty, freedom, and independence which we ourselves enjoy.

Unfortunately that freedom is not enjoyed today in the six counties of Northern Ireland, where a government exists subject to the domination and control of Great Britain, and contrary to the expressed wishes of the vast majority of the Irish people. No part of a nation should be allowed to cut itself off from the rest of that nation without the consent of the majority of the people of the entire nation. Even more so, no part of a nation should be cut off from the rest of that nation by reason of the legislative enactment of some foreign government and the force of arms and the military compulsion of that foreign government. Yet that is exactly what was done to the northern section of Ireland when the British Parliament passed the so-called Government of Ireland Act in 1922 whereby six counties were severed from the rest of Ireland, and a British-controlled government established in that area.

Despite the presence of British troops in Northern Ireland, and the complete domination of that section of the country by the six-county Government, through spurious elections and an all-powerful police force, nevertheless the Stormont government admits that it is not even able to control its own followers and supporters, much less provide an appropriate government for the area. This is evidenced in the very recent announcement that there could be held in Londonderry no assemblies or processions on St. Patrick's Day, because there would be "apprehension of grave disorders" if they were allowed. Yet, if there were to be grave disorders, disturbances, or riots they would not be caused by those attending the assemblies or marching in the parades, but by the nonparticipants, who are the known supporters of the six-county Government. It is a sad commentary on the efficiency of the six-county Government that a peaceful assembly cannot be held nor a St. Patrick's Day parade enjoyed without the danger of grave disorders.

This lack of ability to control their own supporters is indicative of the fact that this six-county Government is not a representative government of the people of that area, nor is it a popular government, freely chosen by the people in democratic elections. Instead, it is a government that has been forced upon the people of those six counties and is maintained by British subsidies and British force of arms. It is the purpose of my amendment to end this betrayal of liberty in the six counties and to bring about a reunification of these counties with the rest of Ireland, where they belong.

So long as Great Britain can afford to spend money in financing the six-county Government in Northern Ireland and can afford to maintain a large body of troops there, then to that extent at least, she can afford to do without additional aid on our part. Certainly we should not be helping, through the Marshall plan, to continue this violation of the very policy which we have set forth in establishing that plan. Moreover, Great Britain continues to impair her own economic recovery and to retard her own financial stability so long as she continues to expend her funds or employs her commodities or services in maintaining and subsidizing an uneconomic dependent area in this fashion. The recovery of Great Britain will be faster and will rest on more sound foundations if she were to sever her relations with Northern Ireland and permit this area to return to the community of the Irish Republic, where it naturally belongs.

My bill makes provisions for this situation by directing the administrator of the act to withhold funds, where a participating country is impairing its economic recovery in this fashion. By the enactment of my bill the economic position of Great Britain would be materially improved, the undemocratic regime in the six counties would be eliminated and the policy of the act would be carried out through the establishment in all of Ireland "the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence." Moreover, a new era of friendship and good will would be created between Great Britain and Ireland, whereby "sound economic conditions" and "stable international economic relationships" would be established, which would tend greatly to promote the well-being of these countries and the peace of all Europe.

Hitler Touch in New Rash of Soviet "Peace" Rallies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which appeared in the New York Post on March 21, 1949:

HITLER TOUCH IN NEW RASH OF SOVIET PEACE RALLIES

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Have you heard about the World Peace Congress?

Probably not. There hasn't been much in the papers about it so far. But there will be quite a little from now on. It's due to be called sometime in April.

It's the latest Soviet propaganda stunt. It will develop from the various congresses and councils which have been held here and there during the past few months, such as the World Congress of Intellectuals, held in Wroclaw, Poland, in August of last year, and the International Democratic Federation of Women, which met at Budapest, Hungary, early this year.

Another example of this type of preliminary gathering is the so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, to be held here in New York on March 25–27, which is to be attended by a Soviet delegation including the composer, Dmitri Shostakovich, and Alexander Fadeyev, secretary-general of the Soviet Union of Writers.

Perhaps it will be more useful to you in forming your opinion of this whole affair if I let the authors of the coming World Peace Congress, for which the above-mentioned gatherings are to prepare the way, speak for themselves. So I quote Comrade Melnikov, the well-known Soviet radio commentator, speaking over Radio Moscow on the Soviet Home Service network, at 11 a. m., March 12.

"The movement for calling the congress of supporters of peace is growing in all countries of the world from day to day.

"Workers of the Soviet Union, fully supporting the democratic and peace-loving policy of the Soviet Government, warmly welcome the appeal for a congress of the supporters of peace. The Soviet Union,

which heads the democratic and anti-imperialist camp, is the most consistent and determined defender of peace, the mightiest and most reliable supporter of the movement for peace.

"Loud was the voice of Soviet writers giving their unanimous support to the appeal for the congress of supporters of peace. * * * Soviet scientists, too, unanimously support the appeal.

"This great movement assumes particular importance at present while the aggressive intrigues of the Anglo-United States instigators of a new war, pressing for world domination, are being intensified. It is to achieve their aggressive aims that American and British monopolists are forming the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, are waging the so-called cold war against the Soviet Union, are organizing the armaments race and fostering the atomic frenzy.

"The session of the Eighty-first Congress of the United States is being held in an atmosphere of militaristic and war preparations. The main bills submitted to Congress concern further militarization of all aspects of life in America. War hysteria is likewise a characteristic of all countries of western Europe. * * *

"The supporters of peace—the ordinary people, women workers, housewives, and representatives of culture—must cause the warmongers to retreat."

Boil all this down, cut out the double-talk, and what do you get? A concerted movement to disarm the United States and the other western states, to break up the North Atlantic Pact, to leave the western world defenseless and disunited before the Soviet power, by mobilizing a lot of people to talk about the beauties of peace without thinking too much about how to establish a really secure peace and to maintain it.

Of course all this propaganda won't really produce these results. It may weaken and delay the security measures which the western powers are taking, by undermining some sections of public opinion in this and other countries. If that were the only Soviet purpose, perhaps the net result wouldn't be worth all the effort. But the fact that the drums of propaganda are being beaten so loudly for this peace congress on the Soviet home radio (every day, in one form or another) suggest quite strongly that the main Kremlin idea is to convince the Russian people that their government is struggling manfully for peace in a world in which it is surrounded by enemies.

This is a dangerous symptom. It has a tinge of desperation about it. It is what Hitler used to do when he wanted the German people to go along with him in some new military adventure. The flames of hysteria are being fanned. We have been burned by such flames before.

Industrial Ingenuity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the news column of the Chelsea Evening Record of Chelsea, Mass., in reference to one of the outstanding industries located in that city. It is interesting to know that this concern is keeping abreast of the times and is carrying on remarkably in spite of the keen competition in the watch and clock industry.

INDUSTRIAL INGENUITY

The story about the Chelsea Clock Co. equipping the new Pan-American stratoliners with their new ships' clocks, is an example of what a modern, live and progressive industrial firm can do.

The firm couldn't keep up with the mountains of orders during the war for our Government for clocks. With the ending of the war that market dropped. The firm changed with the times, made other clocks and other lines and is now making special clocks for airplanes.

This is fitting, too, for the planes ar called ships, just as are the ocean liners. So now, Chelsea's famous ships' clocks, which have told the time on the seven seas, are now keeping time in the air for pilots and patrons of the air lines.

Unemployment Situation in Waterbury, Conn., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a statement and a table relating to the unemployment situation in the Waterbury, Conn., area.

Both have been prepared by the Connecticut State Employment Service and point up the necessity for action by the Congress to stem rising unemployment. Social legislation is beneficial and desirable, but the primary concern of our citizens is employment at a suitable wage. If the administration will cease browbeating business and attempt to effect a cure for its ills, the Nation's No. 1 problem will be solved.

The Waterbury labor market letter follows:

MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT TAKES DROP IN FEBRUARY

Manufacturing employment dropped by 1,400 workers in mid-February from January totals. Employment has now dropped for five consecutive months and the February total of 40,930 is 4,270 below the 1948 peak of 45,200 reached in September. In addition to lay-offs, there was a general reduction of hours throughout the area. No sizable firms are working over 40 hours a week and many have reduced their workweek below that figure.

BRASS AND CLOCK LAY-OFFS LEAD MACHINES

Heaviest lay-offs in the past month were in the brass and the clock and watch industries. In brass, lay-offs totaled 420 from mid-January to mid-February after employment had held up well for the past year, although hours had been cut during the latter part of 1948. The clock industry continued its lay-offs, which started last September and totaled 430 for February. Employment in this industry is 3,160 as compared with 6,320 last August. Other manufacturing industries showed declines of lesser amount, except for the printing and measuring and controlling instrument groups which reported small increases.

LABOR DEMAND ALSO DECLINES

Following the decline in industrial employment, the demand for additional workers hit a low in February. Job openings on order with the local employment service office, which are indicative of general-worker demand in the area, dropped to 135 at the end of February. Only 19 of these were for jobs in manufacturing industries and these were for selected skills. On January 1 there were 206 manufacturing orders on file. Nonmanufacturing businesses are becoming increasingly important as a source of new jobs.

UNEMPLOYMENT RISES

The number of job seekers in the area rose to 6,300 in mid-February from 4,900 in January and 2,100 a year ago. The increase in the number of women unemployed from January was 800 and men increased by 600, including 300 veterans. Women now comprise 56 percent of the total job seekers as compared with 33 percent a year ago. More than half of the unemployed are factory workers, although a substantial number are construction workers waiting for the seasonal rise expected to start toward the end of March, and trade employees laid off following the Christmas season, a number of whom are expected to be rehired for the pre-Easter seasonal rise in trade.

Private nonagricultural employment—Waterbury area, February 1949

Industry	February 1949	January 1949	Percent change February over January	February 1948
Total	56,920	58,480	−2.7	60,430
Manufacturing	40,930	42,320	−3.3	45,170
Food	1,150	1,260	−8.7	1,380
Textiles and apparel	1,340	1,330	+.8	1,290
Printing	670	680	−1.5	640
Chemicals and rubber	6,710	6,750	−.6	6,330
Brass	15,040	15,460	−2.7	15,360
Foundries	680	710	−4.2	790
Metal fabricating	4,770	4,800	−.6	5,120
Machinery	2,200	2,240	−1.8	2,170
Clocks and watches	3,160	3,590	−12.0	6,440
Measuring and controlling instruments	1,130	1,120	+.9	760
Other manufacturing [1]	4,080	4,380	−6.8	4,890
Nonmanufacturing	15,990	16,160	−1.1	15,260
Construction	1,450	1,500	−3.3	1,410
Transportation (including railroads)	1,500	1,520	−1.3	1,130
Communication and utilities	1,110	1,100	+.9	1,060
Trade	8,400	8,520	−1.4	8,270
Wholesale	(1,480)	(1,490)	−.7	(1,460)
Retail	(6,920)	(7,030)	−1.6	(6,810)
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,150	1,130	+1.8	1,080
Service	2,380	2,390	−.4	2,310

[1] Other manufacturing includes clothing accessories, plastics, paper, stone, clay, and glass, and other minor groups.

Unemployment in the Waterbury area

Midmonth	Total	Men (all)	Men (veterans)	Women
February 1949	6,300	2,800	1,200	3,500
January 1949	4,900	2,200	800	2,700
December 1948	3,900	1,600	600	2,300
August 1948	2,100	1,200	750	900
February 1948	2,100	1,400	700	700

What You Don't Know About the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT H. MILLER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What You Don't Know About the South," written by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and published in Collier's magazine for March 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE SOUTH

(By JOHN C. STENNIS, United States Senator from Mississippi)

SMARTING UNDER SMUG ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE SOUTH FROM THE REST OF THE COUNTRY, A SOUTHERN SENATOR TALKS BACK AND LAYS SOME OLD MISCONCEPTIONS LOW WITH STARTLING FACTS AND FIGURES

Lack of knowledge among my fellow Senators of the truth about the South was the most startling thing I noted when, 2 years ago, I came to the United States Senate from Mississippi. Such ignorance—a reflection, doubtless, of prevailing northern opinion—seemed to me to have in it more possibilities for evil than for good for all of us, North and South.

To help as best I could to set the record—and perhaps the thinking—straight, I began, more than a year ago, to assemble the facts. Officials of every Southern State and many private organizations eagerly cooperated. Hundreds of individuals, when they heard of my inquiries, sent in facts, figures, and illustrations.

The result is no whitewash. The South, as every intelligent southerner knows, still has a long way to go. But the evidence shows that we are on our way and going as fast as—or, I believe, faster than—other parts of America.

Here, out of the current record, are a few typical facts and illustrations of what's happening in the South, which, if you are no better informed than many United States Senators, you never heard about or imagined.

An Arkansas plantation owner is providing college scholarships for the children of his tenants. To every qualified Negro who applies the State of Mississippi provides an all-expenses-paid medical scholarship. Negro farmers in Georgia, learning from their children through the 4–H Club program, have completed 60,000 home-improvement projects.

In 13 southern States, more children in rural areas are transported by bus to modern, consolidated schools than in all the rest of the country combined. In Florida, due to better living conditions and health education, the mortality rate among Negroes is decreasing four times as fast as among whites. In Alabama, 90 percent of the expectant mothers helped by the prenatal clinics maintained by the State Public Health Service are Negroes.

These are not isolated incidents. They are part of the story of the daily progress of our Southern States as they fight their way back toward the economic equality with the rest of the Nation from which they were barred, almost 90 years ago, by the War Between the States.

They are evidence that the spirit and attitude of the South are no longer chiefly defensive. The best defense is an offense and, for the solution of our age-old problems, we have begun to take the offensive. Generous outside aid will help—as it has helped in the past—to speed up the South's progress. But the South's real job is, as it has always been, an inside job and there is now abundant proof that insiders have the courage and vision to do it.

Progress in any area is measured by many yardsticks—among them per capita income, health and educational status. By all those standards, the South is making great strides. Since it is still essentially a rural area, a major part of our economic effort must be to better the way of life for the farmer. Here, and particularly among those who have had the least to start with, the South's progress has been most notable.

In many areas, agricultural extension work, financed jointly by local, State, and National Governments, has brought a wholly new way of life to our rural areas. The 60,000 home-improvement projects carried out by young Negro members of the 4–H Clubs in Georgia are a large sample of what is happening in every Southern State. In several States, a highly practical, State-run adult education program is annually teaching thousands of rural Negro men and women to read and write. Arkansas has proved, on a State-wide basis, the practicability of ham-and-egg shows in teaching the better production and preparation of basic farm foods.

A Memphis, Tenn., newspaper, the Commercial Appeal, has provided one of the best incentives for living on the farm through its plant-to-prosper competition for farmers. Extension officials in Tennessee tell me that on hundreds of farms, white and Negro, a greatly improved standard of living can be traced directly to the stimulus provided by this contest. I have heard similar reports from other States. More than one farmer who originally entered this competition as a sharecropper is now, as a result of what he learned, a prosperous landowner.

CHALLENGE TO A REPORTER

Frank Wheeler, the Arkansas plantation owner who provides college scholarships for the children of his tenants, tells the story of a big-city writer who called on him for information about the downtrodden tenant farmer. Mr. Wheeler made him this proposition:

"You get in the car with me and we'll take a ride. Every time we come to a tenant house that does not have a radio inside and a car outside, I'll pay you $25, if you'll pay me $5 for every house that does."

The proposition wasn't accepted.

Not many years ago, in Kemper County, Miss., where I was born and raised, hardly an acre of land was owned by Negroes. Today there are sections of that county, some of them 10 to 12 miles square, where every farm is Negro-owned. Nearly every one of them is paid for. And every year, on those farms, there are fewer mules and more tractors.

In the famous Mississippi delta country, Negro farmers have gone beyond the small-farm status and are successful on what might be called the planter scale. Among these is 52-year-old Johnnie Brown, of Issaquena County, Miss. He owned one mule when he bought his first small tract and had to borrow a second mule from a neighbor in order to break the land. Today he owns about 5,000 acres and is partner in the ownership of nearly 2,000 more. He owns a cotton gin and general store. During the past cotton-picking season he bought his first mechanical picker.

When George Hull arrived in Indianola, Miss., he had 60 cents, a wife, and a suitcase. Today, he averages bale-to-the-acre production on his 1,700-acre plantation and has branched out into other successful businesses.

Jesse B. Hearin, a white man, is the president of the Production Credit Corp. of New Orleans, one of the principal sources of farm credit in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Reviewing the experience of himself and his company with colored people, Mr. Hearin writes:

"We have loaned money to thousands of Negroes—both tenants and landlords. It may be of interest to you to know that after 15 years' experience, during which time we have loaned money to five or six thousand Negroes each year, we have never lost a dollar to a Negro landowner and have had practically no losses from Negro borrowers generally."

AFTERMATH OF THE CIVIL WAR

The War between the States left virtually the entire South bankrupt. Various factors, running the gamut from one-crop agriculture to discriminatory freight rates to absentee industrial ownership, have worked to keep the region from emerging into a prosperity comparable with the rest of the Nation. And humanitarian enterprises have had to take second place to the all-important struggle for the bare necessities of existence.

Now, however, the tide has begun to turn. The figures on income compiled by the United States Department of Commerce make it clear that no other region of the country has had a greater relative improvement in income position than the South during the period from 1929 to 1947. In that period, the share of the 11 States of the Southeast in the national income rose from 10.5 percent to 13.6. No other area made such an advance. In the same States, during this period, the per capita income rose from 51 to 67 percent of the national average. This, too, was a gain unequaled by any other section.

Impressive as these figures are, they make it clear that there is still a big job ahead of us. Our aim is to reach at least an economic par with the rest of the country. Until we do, the citizens of the South will have to pay a larger share of the tax cost of government services than their neighbors in other sections of the country. But the progress of these recent years is, I think, a heartening portent of even better days ahead.

Our progress is much more than a matter of economics. Public-school programs for both white and Negro children have been expanding in the South on a broader scale and at a faster rate than anywhere else in the country. Virtually every Southern State is today contributing a larger share of its tax income to the support of schools than the national average for all States.

In sparsely settled, tax-poor areas of the South, the school situation has been vastly improved through rural consolidation combined with school bus transportation. The first school bus is believed to have been used in Massachusetts, but the South was the first area to use busses as a means for school consolidation. In my own State of Mississippi, in fact, school wagons were used, long before busses, to transport children to consolidated schools.

When I was a boy in Kemper County, prior to World War I, none of the neighborhood elders considered it a reflection upon the community that the Stennis children had to walk 2 miles to the Kipling-crossroads one-room school. Today there is a general realization throughout the South that consolidated schools are the only feasible means of providing proper education for rural youth.

In Mississippi, as in most Southern States, bus transportation to such schools is now the second largest item in the school budget, ranking only behind teachers' salaries.

During the school year 1945–46, in the 13 States of the South, 2,415,000 boys and girls were furnished free transportation to consolidated schools. This year—1948–49—the total will be well over 3,000,000—more than all the rest of the country combined. The one-room, one-teacher school is fast disappearing from the South and, whatever the sentimental attachments, we are all the gainers by its going.

This progress has included Negroes as well as white—and at all levels of education. Opportunities for college education for Negroes in the South have expanded rapidly during the past generation. More than 100 colleges and universities with an enrollment estimated at approximately 75,000 are now in operation. In 1916 there were 33 institutions with only 1,643 students.

Today's Negro colleges are far better, educationally, than those of a generation ago.

The Southern States are now in the process of ratifying a regional educational compact, developed from the regional education program of the Southern Governors' Conference. This program will establish regional schools for graduate instruction for white and Negro students. Adequate facilities are lacking at present because individual States are unable to finance the projects alone. But I am confident that the regional schools which will be developed under this program will compare favorably, in their particular fields, with any elsewhere in the country.

One of the important recent educational developments in the South is the widespread adoption of the teacher-certification plan. Under this plan, all teachers, white and Negro, are placed on an equal competitive basis for salaries—which are determined by the grades they make on national teacher examinations and on their years of educational preparation and experience. One result of this plan has been that in North Carolina the salaries of Negro teachers average slightly higher than those for whites. This is true because the system has provided incentives for the best qualified Negro instructors to make teaching a lifelong career, gaining seniority and postgraduate degrees through summer training.

Health is another major southern problem. The shortage of physicians that confronts every area of rural America has caused much hardship in the rural South. The situation is acute in Mississippi where there is only one active physician to each 2,500 of our rural population, and with more than half of these rural doctors over 60 years of age.

My State has begun to work actively toward a solution. Under a State law, enacted in 1946, a medical scholarship program was established to finance the medical education of students who could not otherwise afford it. Students are allowed to attend any accredited medical school to which they can gain admission, and they receive the assistance of the medical education board in securing admission in cases where there is difficulty.

In return for this assistance, the medical student signs a contract with the board in which he promises, upon completion of his internship, to practice medicine in some rural area of the State. If the graduate doctor fails to meet the terms of the contract as related to rural practice, he is required to pay back the money advanced, with interest. The program made such a successful start that in 1948, the legislature appropriated $350,000 to expand it.

Ambitious young Negroes have taken excellent advantage of the opportunity thus afforded. Officials of the medical education board report that every qualified Negro who has applied for a scholarship has been accepted.

Disease germs have no respect for race, creed, or color, and public health departments in the South have traditionally offered their services equally to all groups. Evidence of the good result of this work is available in the over-all compilation of southern health statistics by the United States Public Health Service, which reveal that the percentage of increase in expectation of life within the past two decades has been more than twice as large in the Negro as in the white population.

Communicable diseases among Negroes have been so greatly reduced that it is now possible to shift emphasis to preventive work in the organic diseases that now take the greatest tolls among the general population.

MODERN HEALTH SERVICES

Southern States have long been the leaders in organizing efficient, productive public health services. The program in Mississippi has been studied and adapted to meet local conditions by at least a dozen States outside the South. Florida alone has more organized, modern county health departments than all of the Eastern States north of Maryland and east of Ohio combined. There are still many improvements that could be made in the program throughout the South, but in the main these are occasioned solely by the relatively limited tax incomes of the States which support them.

Mississippi was the first State to take advantage of the hospital-building program made possible through the Hill-Burton Act. A 5-year program of hospital construction is under way, designed to add 5,732 beds to the total hospitalization available in the State. This goal will provide for Negroes four beds per thousand population. This ratio is in accordance with accepted national standards for hospitalization.

All these are facts about the South which every American ought to know. They are an encouragement and a challenge to every right-minded southerner. They indicate that the South is moving steadily toward the solution of those primary problems from which have sprung so many attendant controversies that are the symptoms rather than the source of disease.

What southerners now ask from the rest of the Nation is understanding of our problem and adequate recognition of the progressive accomplishments we are in process of achieving. These achievements have been no easy matter in a region still burdened by excessive poverty. But we are confident that when the Nation as a whole understands our real problem and learns what we have already accomplished we will have new and sympathetic cooperation as we go on to remove the remaining obstacles to our progress.

A Black Velvet Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Boston Sunday Post, March 20, 1949:

Between a proper Bostonian traveling to Florida last week aboard a supertrain out of New York and the publication of the terms of the North Atlantic Pact, there would appear to be no connection.

The Bostonian was going South to be winterized in the tropical air and tropical waters of Florida. The Atlantic Pact was being promulgated so that the world would become aware that henceforth there would be two worlds and those poles apart.

For a considerable time now there have been two such worlds. Yet it was not made official until the courageous Winston Churchill, a stateman who speaks his mind no matter what the personal consequences, in his ringing speech at Fulton, Mo., in 1946, gave mankind the picture in three little words—"The iron curtain."

Yet to Russia it was and is more than a curtain to cut herself off from capitalism, and to serve as a wall if the day ever came when the democracies could stand no more goading.

It was and is likewise a cover to conceal her machinations against nearby countries like Germany, France, Italy, and others she would like to envelop.

It is against that cover—drawn taut, secretive, furtive, and threatening—that the Atlantic Pact was drawn. Against that cover, by that pact, no longer will the olive branch be outstretched. Henceforth there will be handy spears to grasp if the curtain is ever raised and the Red armies dare to overrun the rest of Europe.

None of the countries signing that pact want that kind of a world. But Russia made it so and if today she squirms in mock anger, she is responsible for it.

But what of the man bound for Florida, vacation-bound? He who should be happy about his journey was disturbed. For train-bound he saw another kind of a curtain. To a Boston friend he wrote:

"On the way down here, entering the dining car, I saw a black curtain. It was made of black velvet. Behind it was a dining table. At the dining table sat a colored man and his family, eating.

"Those folks were obviously northerners. They, too, were going South, vacation-bound, perhaps, as I was. The man was fine looking—maybe a lawyer, a businessman, or a scientist. He appeared prosperous.

"I couldn't help thinking. He was evidently born in America and no doubt as much of an America as I was. He may have served his country in the recent war and, for all I know, been wounded in action. What has he done to deserve this?

"There he calmly sat with his wife and children, eating the same food as other passengers, talking about the same things and when the meal was over, paying as much money with the same kind of money as the other people in the dining car.

"The others were not curtained off. They sat in the open because they were white people. Passing through the South, I wondered how many of them reflected and were tempted as I was tempted to tear that curtain down.

"It could have readily happened and I am sorry it didn't. Most of them were northerners who believe in equal rights which the Constitution supposedly guarantees. And, with that black velvet curtain up in the train, incongruously shutting off the colored people, the white people were being served their meals by colored waiters.

"I don't like the iron curtain in Europe. I do not like the velvet curtain in our South. Time has a way and God in the end rights all things. Our velvet curtain, too, will pass."

The date on the letter was important. It was written the same day that die-hard Dixicrats and die-hard GOP conservatives won their famous filibuster victory over President Truman—just 3 days before the Atlantic Pact was announced. The Bostonian ended his letter with the note, "It doesn't make sense." It doesn't.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with rent control. One is entitled "Reasonable Return," published in the Washington Post of March 19, 1949; another is entitled "Getting Ready To Hand Rent Control to States," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 19, 1949; and the third entitled "A Better Rent Bill," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 19, 1949]

REASONABLE RETURN

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee's compromise rent-control bill is probably as workable a plan as can be devised for giving landlords a fair return without removing the lid. A number of progressive-minded Senators struggled with the House version calling for reasonable return on reasonable value and finally concluded that it was administratively unworkable. It would take a battery of experts to determine reasonable returns in each individual circumstance, and Congress now seems wholly unlikely to provide the Housing Expediter with such a staff.

As in most compromises, the Senate plan for two separate 5-percent rent increases spaced 6 months apart will perpetrate some inequities. The blanket raise will confer windfalls on some landlords who have benefited from full occupancy and have experienced no hardship. It may tend to boost living costs slightly when the general trend is toward stabilization. But it will facilitate adjustments for small landlords, many of whom have not gone through the red tape of obtaining hardship increases. The fundamental tenant protections are continued and strengthened, and while the technical duration of the bill is 12 months, actually most safeguards would be extended for 15 months. If this is not the most the administration hoped for, neither is it a major defeat of its program.

The Senate bill avoids one important defect of the measure passed by the House. Whereas the Senate bill permits State legislatures to take over or end controls, the House would confer this power on local governing bodies. In theory, of course, it is the individual's responsibility to protect his own interests. But the practical effect of the House provision would be to subject city councils and county supervisors to all sorts of organized pressure from real estate boards, chambers of commerce, and entrenched property interests which wield local political and economic influence. A measure of what could be expected is the volume of mail inspired by the real estate lobby that has swamped Congress.

The aim of rent control ought to be to facilitate the construction of more housing so that control can be progressively liquidated. Scarcity is particularly acute in low-rent units, and Members of Congress who are anxious to end controls could speed the day by pushing low-cost housing. For Congress to yield to the pressure of local option, however, would merely create more hardships. Local rent boards are already in a position to advise the Housing Expediter of local conditions. If there is to be any national rent control at all, it ought to be according to uniform standards that would prevent gross disparities between areas.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 19, 1949]

GETTING READY TO HAND RENT CONTROL TO STATES

The version of a rent-control bill produced by the Senate Banking Committee eliminates some of the impracticalities contained in the House proposal, and for that reason is a more desirable measure. Debate on the floor of the Senate will start Monday, and further changes may be made prior to passage.

A very questionable provision of the House bill calls for a reasonable return to landlords on a fair value of their properties. This formula, no matter how attractive it may sound to landlords, would be difficult, if not impossible, to apply.

The Senate, instead, would permit across-the-board rent increases of 5 percent each 6 months of the extended period of rent controls, except in cases where tenants have already agreed to the voluntary 15-percent rise above the rents of June 30, 1947.

Both Senate and House bills, in varying degrees, show a decided congressional tendency to ease off Federal controls of rents. The Senate would establish, after expiration of another year of controls, a 3-month period of grace preliminary to Government withdrawal from the field, during which tenants could negotiate for any rental they desired.

The House would bring home rule into the matter by permitting not only any State, but any political subdivision of it, to throw off all rent regulations.

The Senate committee proposal would avoid the confusion implicit in the House provision by permitting State legislatures to lift Federal controls from all or any part of their jurisdiction and authorizing governors, if and when State controls are ready for substitution, to notify the Housing Expediter to that effect and have the Federal law superseded.

It is becoming increasingly evident that if the individual States want rent controls continued beyond next year they should be prepared to administer them themselves. New York and several other States have stop-gap control laws. Pennsylvania does not.

The governor and the members of the legislature, while the latter body is still in session, should carefully examine the new Federal control law, in the form in which it finally passes, and take whatever protective action is found necessary for Pennsylvania tenants.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, 1949]

A BETTER RENT BILL

The Senate Banking Subcommittee offered a far better rent-control measure than that passed by the House of Representatives on Tuesday. It provided, for one thing, that the voluntary 15-percent increase permitted last year be applied by easy stages to all tenants. An across-the-board rise uniformly applied seems to us the fair way to meet landlords' claims to a reasonable increase to meet higher costs. The subcommittee proposal called for a 5-percent rise on October 1 next, a second 5-percent rise 6 months later, and still a third in October 1950. Rents for those tenants who already have agreed to the voluntary 15 percent above rents of June 30, 1947, would not be further increased.

The Senate group has rejected the formula adopted on the floor of the House, designed to insure a reasonable return to landlords based on property values. These Senators, wisely, we believe, regard any such formula as too difficult to write, understand, or apply. We like the subcommittee's provision for decontrol of one-family housing accommodations renting for $290 or more a month, that figure to be lowered at the Housing Expediter's discretion in areas where he finds it warranted. This provision is in line with the suggestion made to the committee by Robert W. Dowling, of this city. Mr. Dowling argued that decontrol by rental-unit classifications, beginning with the large luxury apartments and gradually working downward, provides a fairer and more certain means of eventually lifting rent controls than does the current system based primarily on geographic areas. The subcommittee, however, has not accepted the formula in full. We should like to see it given further consideration by the committee or on the Senate floor.

Mr. Dowling made another sound recommendation—that controls be extended for a 2-year period to make possible maintenance of an expert staff and insure continuity of administration. The fact that the Senate proposal gives wide discretion to the Housing Expediter in regulating evictions, for example, enhances the need for expert and stable administration. The subcommittee, however, left it to the full Banking Committee to decide whether to recommend extension controls for 1 year, or for 15 months as provided in the House bill.

The proposed Senate measure rests on generally sounder ground, in our judgment, than does that requested by the administration, which would make no concession to landlords' claims, or than the watered-down House version, which makes dubious concessions.

Overnight Flights Do Not Bring Europe Nearer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article captioned "Overnight flights do not bring Europe nearer," written by Anne O'Hare McCormick and published in the New York Times of March 21, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERNIGHT FLIGHTS DO NOT BRING EUROPE NEARER

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Looking back from here to there, the distance to the other side of the Atlantic is more impressive than the nearness. Europe is not so close to America as an overnight air flight suggests. The wonder of dining one night in New York and lunching next day in Paris actually accentuates the differ-

ences in the cuisine—and all those larger differences that never broke on you so startlingly when the journey was longer. You expect to find the old differences disappearing, now that the two continents are tied together by the Marshall plan, a common-defense plan, and a constant shuttle of advisers, auditors, and diplomats comparing balance sheets and generally minding one another's business.

In some respects they are disappearing. Even without the pact that makes it official, an Atlantic world has developed out of the common interests and fears of the nations living on its northern shores. In all these nations the headline news is the same.

In other respects, however, the contrasts seem sharper than they were. Western Europe is not more like the United States because we are there more pervasively than ever before. An extraordinary number of Europeans complain that we do not use the power of the purse to change traditional customs and methods, particularly in the economic field. Actually industrial techniques and business routines are changing under American influence. Italian agriculture, French couture, British manufacturing, profit by American ideas as well as American dollars. But ways of life and habits of thought, the stubborn characteristics that distinguish the Germans from the French and the French from the British, are almost untouched by ERP. The Atlantic pact will not turn us into one happy family.

CONTRAST STILL STRIKING

Nor is the United States more like Europe because we have established a new and intimate relationship with our trans-Atlantic neighbors. The contrast in background, atmosphere, and mentality is as striking today as it ever was; more so, perhaps, because it persists despite overnight flights to Paris and a common preoccupation with identical problems.

The truth is, of course, that only a tiny minority hops across the ocean. Fewer persons cross any frontier since rapid transit has become a commonplace. Travel and communication were never so restricted as in these postwar years when the world is geared to instant intercourse, physical and intellectual, between nations and individuals.

Today every man is more likely to be an island than a continent. This insularity is in large part the result of the war and the new controls of movement and money that followed. But also it comes from the impulse of a great many people to close their minds to propaganda of all kinds. This year the Voice of America has a much larger audience in Europe than in previous years. It is widely quoted. But the effect first of the Nazi and then of the Soviet radio has been to make people so allergic to Government broadcasts that it takes a long time to restore not only confidence in but recognition of truth.

The Atlantic pact, like the Marshall plan, will run into this new isolationism. The thing that strikes one most in Europe today is that ERP is so spectacularly successful and so little understood by the people it benefits. Political and business leaders know what it's doing, but their knowledge does not percolate to the farmer, the mechanic, or the housewife. Half the effect of the program is lost because it has not been properly publicized.

If Secretary Acheson's clear explanation of the Atlantic treaty could be repeated, not once but many times, in every European country, it would go far to answer elementary questions and counter Soviet misrepresentations. It is all very well for Mr. Bevin and Mr. Schuman to hail the pact as the greatest defensive instrument since 1914, but it cannot be forgotten that the people of Europe live in an atmosphere of suspicion, suspense, and inner turmoil. Our motives and objectives, the philosophy behind the break with our dearest tradition, are perfectly obvious to us, but we have to spell them out in words of one syllable.

TWO ESSENTIALS

The theme Soviet propaganda will harp on in fighting this treaty is already clear. It is a move toward war as opposed to Russia's crusade for peace. This is a grotesque inversion of the facts, but truth has to battle through a fog of lies in the murky climate of Europe. It has to battle the haunting horror of war, and Moscow will exploit the desire for peace to divide Europe as ruthlessly as it exploits the desire for unity to divide the Germans.

To counter this propaganda two things are essential. One is to understand the background and state of mind of the other nations whose dangers and destiny we share. The second is to make ourselves understood. The job of education that has to be done to bridge the mental barriers between the supposedly "like-minded" peoples we are aiming to unite in a community of prosperity and power gives point to the premise laid down by Lester Markel in the opening chapter of a symposium on Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations. The premise is: "Unless we educate public opinion at home, we shall not be impelled to do the job in foreign policy that needs to be done; unless we make ourselves understood abroad, no matter how good our intentions, we shall fail."

Condition of New York State Voluntary Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hospitals in State Warned of Future," the subheading being "Columbia study finds funding, now uncertain, would be precarious in depression," written by Lucy Freeman, and published in the New York Times of March 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALS IN STATE WARNED OF FUTURE—COLUMBIA STUDY FINDS FUNDING, NOW UNCERTAIN, WOULD BE PRECARIOUS IN DEPRESSION

(By Lucy Freeman)

The voluntary hospitals of New York State do not face an immediate emergency but there is great uncertainty as to their financial future and should there be a depression they would be in a precarious financial situation.

This is the conclusion drawn in the interim report of the New York State Hospital Study being made by Columbia University under contract with the State. Its acceptance was reported yesterday by Dr. John T. Bourke, executive director of the New York State joint hospital survey and planning commission, to whom the report was made by the director, Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University.

UNCERTAINTY OF FINANCIAL BASE

This comprehensive pioneer study is expected to have far-reaching implications in the medical, educational and social welfare fields. Leading health and welfare organizations of the country are cooperating by making available both detailed information and their expert staffs for consultation.

In an interview in his office at Columbia University, where he is associate professor of economics in the school of business, Dr. Ginzsberg elaborated on his findings and particularly on the final statement of the report, which read:

"It should be stressed that the finding of no emergency at this time in no way implies a belief in the soundness of the underlying financial structure of the voluntary hospital. Indeed, the presumption is definitely to the contrary; the data and evaluations submitted to us reflect great uncertainty as to the financial future of the voluntary hospital."

The conclusion that no emergency exists means that conditions in 1948 were not substantially worse than those prevailing in 1947 and that the financial situation is not so pressing as to warrant immediate stopgap governmental assistance, he reported.

ECONOMIC CHANGES SINCE 1940

But he pointed out that if a depression occurred fewer persons might use the hospitals, medical costs could not be reduced, and patients would not only pay their bills more slowly but would also use the cheaper accommodations. At the same time nurses and other personell, who still consider themselves underpaid, would try to maintain at least present salary levels, he added.

Up to 1940, he recalled, most of the hospitals got along on the basis of their endowments, contributions, and payments by private patients and their costs were kept low by underpaying personnel.

Since then, however, three major developments have changed the economic picture, he said, listing them as advances in medicine which have increased the dollar cost per day; increase in personnel salaries, the largest item in any hospital budget, and reduction of the value of the dollar because of inflation, which means that money from gifts and bequests buys less.

The only developments that have saved the lives of the hospitals, he said, have been the expansion of the voluntary insurance plans, which have enabled more persons to use hospitals, and the ability of patients to pay promptly because of general economic prosperity. Increased allowances have also been given by the State and localities to pay for the medically indigent but these still fall short of the actual cost, he added.

As we look to the future, it is the labor costs that loom the largest, Dr. Ginzberg declared. Food costs have begun to level off, but underpaid personnel will continue to ask for higher salaries and shorter hours.

It is unlikely, he said, that to meet costs hospitals can charge private patients any more "without pricing themselves out of the market" and the insurance plans cannot increase rates if they expect to reach more subscribers.

Because of continuing medical advances the daily cost of treating patients will continue to rise, and hospitals face additional financial diffculties in that they have been living off capital and not been able to put aside money for depreciation and modernization, he added.

The final study will contain recommendations as to the proper responsibility of Government, private charity, the voluntary insurance plans, and the individual in financing voluntary hospitals, he said.

It will also consider the obligation of hospitals to all doctors in the community, including those who do not have staff appointments, the more efficient use of diagnostic facilities to patients not needing bed care, the development of less expensive beds for chronic and convalescent patients and greater regional control over expansion of hospitals to prevent overbuilding that would intensify the financial plight in a depression.

Dr. Ginzberg and his staff at Columbia are holding a series of regional meetings to become acquainted with the local hospital problems over the State before formulating final recommendations.

St. Patrick's Day on the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein one of the finest articles that I have ever read on the qualities and the spirit of the Irish people and the history of St. Patrick written by Charles H. McGlue, an able and capable attorney and one of the most conscientious students of history and government in Massachusetts. Mr. McGlue has prepared many interesting and excellent writings on matters of public interest and especially has he made considerable research into the history of Ireland and its people. An outstanding leader in the Democratic Party, he has worked untiringly and unceasingly in the interest of the principle of our form of government, and his statements on this subject matter have been most educational. His article appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., March 20, 1949.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ON THE ALAMO

(By Charles H. McGlue)

"On the Alamo, where the moon swings low,
In a garden fair where the roses grow;
In all my dreams, there I seem to go,
Where the moon swings low, on the Alamo."

—*Popular American Song.*

CEAD MILE FAILTE, GLENN

And shure it was a great day for the Irish on last St. Patrick's Day on the Alamo. And it was so just because a real, red-blooded Irishman by the name of Glenn McCarthy was doing things in such a big way as to make many of his contemporaries as well as his predecessors really green with envy, and this on St. Patrick's Day.

AND THEREIN LIES A TALE

It's a tale about a fabulous Irishman, and a multimillionaire at that, who is not ashamed of his Irish heritage. God be good to him. The hero of this tale is none other than Glenn McCarthy, who was born 41 years ago at Spindle Top oil field, just outside of Beaumont, Tex. Glenn's grandfather was born in County Cork, Ireland, but came to the good old U. S. A., like so many other courageous Irish prospectors, to seek gold, silver, oil, and other much-sought-for riches.

Glenn's father was an oil driller at Spindle Top oil field when Glenn greeted the world on an Irishman's dream of a birthday, Holy Christmas Day.

LOYALTY AND GRATITUDE

Glenn McCarthy is an Irishman with a mission and a memory. He remembers the struggles of his people for recognition and for a place in the sun. He appreciates the hardships undergone by his grandparents and parents in order to bring riches out of the ground so that he and others may enjoy the comforts and luxuries of life. He possesses the two great attributes in life—loyalty and gratitude.

MONUMENTS TO MEMORY

So on last St. Patrick's Day the loyal and grateful Glenn McCarthy, an independent oil operator with 17 corporations, 16 neighborhood newspapers, and a radio station under his ownership and control, dedicated to the memory of his forebears the biggest, newest, and most luxurious hotel in all the Southwest. It is an 18-story 1,100-room hotel in Houston, Tex., that cost $20,000,000 to build. Rent of rooms starts at $6 a day; and if you are flush, you may rent the lavish penthouses at rates ranging from $500 to $1,000 a month. All modern conveniences are available, including a palm-lined swimming pool 165 feet long and 142 feet wide.

Did Mr. McCarthy give it the usual name that you might expect in this former part of the Mexican Empire, such as Casa Manana, Copacabana, El Capitan, Casino Mexicano, El Hotel Trocadero, and so on. No; he christened it the Hotel Shamrock and wanted it baptized on the day that commemorates the memory of Ireland's patron saint, St. Patrick.

AMONG THOSE PRESENT

Of course as one might expect, the fabulous McCarthy does things up brown, or should we say green. He sent an invitation for the opening of the Hotel Shamrock to President Miguel Aleman of the Mexican Republic and the invitation bearer was Paul Mantz, winner of the Bendix air race, whose plane broke all air records between Houston, Tex., and Mexico City, the home of the Alemans. Mrs. McCarthy, as a consequence received some Mexican-grown orchids of presidential nurture, for the grand opening. Orchids and shamrocks go well together.

A trainload of luminaries from Hollywood, 175 in all, accepted the Irishman's invitation to dedicate the Hotel Shamrock and also to stay over until Friday the 18th, in order to attend the premiere of Glenn McCarthy's first movie (he's a movie producer, as well). And what might you suspect the name of McCarthy's first picture would be? Well it would be difficult for you to guess, but here it is: The Green Promise. Isn't that just perfect?

STARS FROM HOLLYWOOD

In the popular songs of not long ago, the stars that were associated with Old Erin were those that fell from Heaven to make the lakes of Eire, but this week in McCarthy's wonderland, it was a galaxy of stars from Hollywood who graced the occasion in order to make it epoch-making and everlastingly green in every American's memory.

In the caravan of stars were such luminaries as Walter Brennan, Pat O'Brien, James Cagney, Joan Caulfield, Laurel and Hardy, Errol Flynn, Sonja Henie, Dorothy Lamour, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Hedda Hopper, Paul Mantz, Marguerite Chapman, and Robert Paige. The incomparable Bing Crosby dedicated one of his songs on his program to McCarthy's Hotel Shamrock. All in all, it sure was a great day for the Irish and for a great Irishman.

"COME BACK TO ERIN"

So the parade goes on. The haunting melody of Come Back to Erin lingers on. Whether the "Auld Sod" be called "Erin" or "Ireland," or "the Emerald Isle," or "Inis Fail," or "the Island of Destiny," or "Agygia," or "Hibernia," or "the Land of the Saints (and Sinners)," or "Fola," or "Banba," or "Eire"; to all Irishmen all over the world, it means the home of heroes in all ages.

SPIRIT OF THE IRISH

What St. Patrick's Day means to the Irish wherever they are was best stated by the Honorable James A. Farley in a most felicitous address delivered by him at the Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo., on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1944. May I quote?

"The Irish spirit has manifested itself in many ways to the no small gain of all who have come into contact with it. But there has been no more characteristic manifestation of that spirit than a consuming urge to political independence, a fierce and unyielding determination that no man, or group of men, or, indeed, any nation, shall rule others to any greater degree than the moral law requires—in other words, beyond their consent, because the instinct of man always leads him to consent to be ruled as far as the law of his nature makes necessary.

"Nowhere in geography or history will you find another people as blessed as the Irish with this almost miraculous combination of qualities—the instinct for good society, devotion to the Author of society, and hatred of oppression. And there you have the secret of history's greatest paradox. Neither Rome, which held her legions like a whip over Asia, Africa, and most of Europe, nor Britain, whose writ runs with the sun, ever subdued Ireland. Britain, God knows, tried hard enough, and even an Irishman must admit that the Saxon has few peers when it comes to persisting in an effort.

"The Irishman, in other words, knows better than any one else where the rights of rulers begin, and where they end, and why. That is to say, he above all knows what things are Caesar's. And when you try to exact from an Irishman something more than the lawful coin of the tribute, you've got a raging tempest on your hands.

"All that I have said so far has a direct bearing on the record of the Irish in America, and on the salutary influence which the Irish can be and ought to have on American public affairs now and in the future."

SPIRITS OF SPANISH ERA

So while we dwell on the spirit of the Irish, it might be well for us, while we are in the Lone Star State, to think back to those great Irish spirits who fought so valiantly for freedom and liberty in the various Latin-American republics during the Wars of Liberation.

BERNARDO O'HIGGINS

In the chief square of Santiago, capital of Chile, stands a statue of Bernardo O'Higgins, the Liberator of Chile. O'Higgins' second brigade was led by General Mackenna, another fighting-for-freedom Irishman. O'Higgins' good right arm in political matters was another Celt by the name of John McNamara.

His father, Ambrose O'Higgins, was born in County Meath, Ireland, and was appointed viceroy of Chile and Peru by the Spanish king.

In 1814 a movement for the complete independence of Chile was headed by Bernardo O'Higgins, who had been in London some years before, and while there had come under Miranda's influence. Miranda was a Latin-American revolutionist.

In October of 1814, the Chilean insurgent forces were badly defeated, and a portion of them fled with O'Higgins to Mendoza, the capital of Cuyo. Here they were cordially welcomed by Jose San Martin, the ablest commander produced by the struggle for independence in the southern half of the continent.

AID TO SAN MARTIN

San Martin routed the Spanish forces near Chacabuco. A cabildo abierto was held in Santiago, the Chilean capital, and San Martin was unanimously elected governor of the country. His task of independence was not finished and so he declined the office. It was then given to Bernardo O'Higgins, who had been one of the chief officers of the liberating army.

Bernardo O'Higgins was made "supreme director" of Chile in 1818. O'Higgins (Spanish-Irish) with a British education, had had wide experience, could think clearly, and was well aware that the Chileans were not ready for democracy. He felt however that popular rule was an ideal toward which leaders should work. With the special aim of train-

ing for democratic government, he gave much attention to education.

AID TO SIMON BOLIVAR

In the fight for the independence of Colombia, its leader, Simon Bolivar, was greatly aided by Irishmen, one of whom was none other than the son of the great Irish patriot, Daniel O'Connell. Daniel O'Connell's wife presented a tricolor to these Irish expeditionnaires. In fact, Simon Bolivar's own aide-de-camp was named Daniel O'Leary. In the capitol at Bogota a historical painting of him still hangs there for all Colombians to remember the debt they owe to the spirit of the Irish.

GAELS IN THE ARGENTINE

Amiral Brown, born in County Mayo, Ireland, has often been called the savior of Argentina. Messrs. Brown, Morris, Fleming, Gahan, and Shannon were among the many Irishmen who contributed much to the liberation of Argentina.

If one is interested in Irish patronymics, you can find constant outcroppings of Gaelic nomenclature throughout the history of Argentina from the date of its liberation, July 9, 1816, down to the present day.

For example, in 1863, Dalmacio Velez Sarsfield (a fine Irish name) was Minister of Hacienda during the administration of President Bartolome Mitre, one of the strong men of the Argentine.

Juan Martin Pueyrrdon was the first Supreme Director of the Argentine Republic in 1816, and Honorio Pueyrrdon was the Argentine Ambassador to the United States in 1928.

Although Pueyrrdon may not sound Gaelic, nevertheless, when spoken, it sounds almost like Purdon, and, as we well know, some of the Purdons came from County Clare, Ireland, where the River Shannon flows.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY GAEL

Even in very modern times, even as late as 1945, the President of the Argentine Republic was Edelmiro Farrell. Señor Farrell was Vice President under President Pedro Ramirez. Under the leadership of the then Col. Juan Domingo Peron, a political coup which made Farrell President in February 1944 was engineered by the Grupo Oficiales Unions, an army officers' clique. President Farrell thereupon appointed Juan Peron Minister of War, and later he became Vice President. Today Peron is President, undoubtedly the strong man of the Argentine, and the most controversial figure in the public life of all the 21 Latin-American Republics.

PERU AND COLONEL O'CONNOR

Although the Republic of Peru is high, high up in the Andes, and probably contains a higher percentage of Indians in proportion to population than any other South American Republic, nevertheless, it was not so inaccessible or foreign in the days when the fight for Peruvian independence was on but what a Colonel O'Connor could become one of the great Peruvian heroes.

MEXICO AND THE ALAMO

As we leave the history of Chile, Argentina, Colombia, and Peru, and move north toward Mexico and the Alamo, we will find that the very last Viceroy of Mexico to serve in that capacity was named Juan O'Donoju (John O'Donahue in Boston).

Viceroy O'Donoju arrived in Mexico from Spain in 1821, but he was intercepted at Cordova by Agustin de Iturbide, whereupon he signed a treaty of peace. Iturbide, a retired officer of the royal army, had fought against Hidalgo. Upon the signing of the treaty of peace with Viceroy O'Donoju, Iturbide led the revolutionary forces toward the capital, and on September 27, 1821, he entered Mexico City, where he was hailed as the father and liberator of his country.

GREAT MARCHING SONGS

The United States Marines have a stirring marching song which goes like this:

"From the Halls of Montezuma, to the Shores of Tripoli,
We fight Our Country's Battles" etc.

The fighting Gaels of Latin-America could very well paraphrase it by using such words as:

"From the Council of the Indies, to the Act of Chapultepec.
We fought other countries' battles," etc.

And so in memory, we march with the ghosts of the galloping Gaels that fought their way through two continents, in order that all people everywhere might enjoy freedom from oppression and liberty to enjoy life as their Creator intended.

In 1836, they died in the old Spanish mission known as the Alamo near San Antonio. They marched with Gen. Sam Houston against the armies of Mexican President, Santa Anna, and joined in the defeat of the Mexican Army at San Jacinto on April 12, 1836.

They marched with Gen. Stephen Kearney and his Missourians over the Santa Fe Trail in 1846. They marched with Gen. Zachary Taylor through Texas and Mexico as far as Monterey in 1846, and on February 23, 1847, they were in the United States Army that routed the Mexicans at Buena Vista. Under the leadership of Gen. Winfield Scott, they landed at Vera Cruz, Mexico, and on September 14, 1847, they marched victoriously into Mexico City, and thus the States of New Mexico, California, Nevada, Utah, most of Arizona and portions of Colorado and Wyoming became a part of the United States.

MEMORIES THAT BLESS

So today, Senor McCarthy, you epitomize the heroic struggles of your people everywhere. You truly personify those great qualities of heart, mind, and soul that give the Irish spirit its lift and resiliency.

In the grandeur of your magnificent Emerald Room of Hotel Shamrock, you may sink into the soft downy cushions of a luxurious lounge and there dream of the great treasures of Erin: The famous Book of Kells with its exquisitely illuminated and colorful illustrations of the gospel, all the handiwork of Irish monks in the eighth century; St. Patrick's bell which he used to summon people to mass; the famous Moone and Cong Crosses; the Gospels of the Shrine of St. Molaise, the Kavanagh charter horn; the crucifixion slab from St. Cuan's well; or St. Brigid's crosses; or maybe you may dream of banshees, leprechauns, fireflies over the bogs, and one or two of the "little people" that used to meet your ancestors in days of old in Old Erin.

Or possibly because of Spanish surroundings for generations now, your thoughts may roam in a Latin atmosphere. You may see the spirit of the carnival with its traditional farolas to highlight the processions during the festivities. The gaiety of the fiestas in the central plazas may entrance you. Out of the maze of comedy, opera, and balls may come a queen to be crowned for her beauty.

All the patron saints, including your own St. Patrick, may be there to participate in that old Latin custom that the last will and testament of Judas should be read publicly in the Plazas, and if it serves any good purpose, it should be chained in effigy. You will doubtless enjoy the burlesquing in comics and pantomime of all the sinners and the irreligious. May God save them!

CIEN MIL BIENVENIDAS!

As we said in the beginning in Gaelic, "Cead Mile Failte, Glenn McCarthy!" so we in conclusion say in Spanish, "Cien Mil Bienvenidas, Senor Glenn McCarthy!" ("A Hundred Thousand Welcomes to You, Glenn McCarthy!")

In the same Spanish vein may we end with this wish to you: "I Que El Exito De Su Hotel Shamrock Y Su Pelicula, 'La Promesa Verde' " Hagen Crecer Mas Verde, Los Ojos De Los Envidiosos! (May the success of your Hotel Shamrock and your movie, "The Green Promise," make the eyes of the envious grow greener!)

So the top of the morning to you!

Adoption by Town of Ronceverte, W. Va., of a Displaced Latvian Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of March 20, 1949, concerning a displaced Latvian family which has been adopted by the town of Ronceverte in West Virginia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATVIAN FAMILY, DISPLACED BY WAR, DISCOVERS FAITH, HOME, AND OPPORTUNITIES IN NEW LIFE AT RONCEVERTE—SIX OF SKUJINS CLAN AMAZED, GRATEFUL AFTER FRIENDLY RECEPTION HERE; LANGUAGE BARRIER TOPPED

(By Neil P. Boggs)

RONCEVERTE, March 19.—This prosperous Greenbrier County community is helping mold a new life for a displaced Latvian family it has adopted.

After nine nightmarish years, beginning in 1940 when the Russian Army swept over the tiny Baltic state, the family of Romanis Skujins (pronounced exactly as it's spelled) has found peace and a renewed faith in humanity.

The six Skujins—the father, mother, and four young children—arrived in Ronceverte 2 weeks ago, penniless and without any friends or knowledge of the English language.

Their only possessions were six pieces of luggage, an address scrawled on a slip of paper, and the determination to piece together a shattered life.

And already the family has a 20-acre farm, a comfortable six-room home, a job for the father, and a wealth of new friends.

All this came about after a Ronceverte druggist, Charles A. George, and his wife, Sara, noticed an announcement in a church publication 2 years ago.

The Church World Service, Inc., of New York City, was asking for sponsors for displaced European families which had lost everything in World War II.

The couple wrote the church organization, but it was not until early this month that they learned that their family was on its way to America.

The Skujins family—Romanis, the father, 44; Ludmila, the mother, 35; Roman, the oldest son, 13; Juris, 9; Mara, the only daughter, 6; and Ojar, the youngest son, 3—arrived in New York March 3 after a 12-day ocean voyage from Hamburg aboard the steamship *Marine Shark*.

Twenty-four hours later, after a speedy trip from New York aboard a special displaced-persons train, the family was standing on the platform at the C. & O. station here, the realization of a decade-long dream at hand.

None could speak English, but Mr. Skujins had a piece of paper on which was written "Charles George, Ronceverte, W. Va." The druggist was called, and within a few minutes the family was inspecting its new home, loaned by Mr. George.

Townspeople had furnished the frame dwelling with essential items of furniture, while stores sent supplies of fresh food. Housewives had donated their time to clean the house and make it more livable.

Only one obstacle remained. The Skujins spoke Russian, German, and Latvian—but no English.

That barrier soon was eliminated, however. Another Ronceverte resident, Fred Richter, came from Germany 23 years ago, and still speaks fluent German. He was the key to the Skujins family's conversational difficulties.

He acts as interpreter, and at the present time is teaching the family to speak English.

The Skujins had been shoved all over Europe during the past 9 years.

In 1940, they were living on their prosperous 200-acre farm in the heart of the Republic of Latvia, one of the three Baltic states in northeastern Europe.

That year, the Russians took the farm, which had been in the Skujins family for generations, as they made their big sweep over that section of Europe.

A year later, in 1941, the German Army grabbed the farm, along with hundreds of others in the country's rich agricultural belt, as they drove over the Russian border.

As the Red army fled, the soldiers took nearly everything of value, leaving only the buildings standing.

The German soldiers took what remained, burning everything they could not use.

And the Skujins family was herded off to a prison camp. During the next 4 years, they were moved dozens of times.

The daughter, Mara, was born in a prison camp, while her youngest brother, Ojar, was born in a displaced-persons colony.

Then, when Europe was liberated the family was shuttled off to a DP camp in central Germany, where they remained until February.

Romanis Skujins, his worry-lined face and frightened eyes telling a story of horror that could not be expressed in words, explained how his brother and sister-in-law were dragged away by the Germans, never to be heard from again.

His brother's oldest son, however, now is working in a coal mine in Belgium, and expects to come to the United States next year.

Romanis doesn't let his inability to speak English stand in the way of making himself understood. He's developed a special technique.

He carries a catalog, and points to pictures which tell what he wants to say.

Neighbors, who are frequent visitors to the Skujins home, carry on conversations via Sears and Roebuck.

For instance, if Mr. Skujins wants a plow for the farm, he finds a picture of a plow in the catalog and shows it to Mr. George, who tells him what it's called in English.

The father was astonished at the reception his family received in the United States.

"I was told in Europe," he said through his interpreter, Mr. Richter, "that the American people were not friendly. But I changed my mind right away. They are the best people I have seen anywhere."

Romanis and his family plan to take out citizenship papers as soon as possible, and his children will start to school next September.

Ronceverte residents are having a hard time trying to convince the Skujins, who have become accustomed to doing without everything but bare essentials, that America truly is the land of plenty.

Mr. George suggested the family chop down a tree which had been shattered by lightning and use it for stovewood.

The Latvian family became very indignant. "There's no use burning a good tree that can be used for lumber," they protested, and began gathering twigs and small branches instead.

The same situation arises at meals, neighbors said. The Skujins seem reluctant to eat all that is prepared for them, always saving half of what they have for the next meal.

Skujins is working 24 hours a week in Mr. George's drug store, and spends the rest of his time getting Mr. George's farm ready for spring planting.

During that time, he and his family are living in Mr. George's farmhouse without paying rent.

"They should be self-supporting by next year," the druggist explained.

Skujins plans to sow barley and wheat on a large scale, and will raise vegetables for sale at local markets during the summer months.

The family, Lutherans in their home country, has decided to join the Presbyterian Church in Ronceverte, since there is no Lutheran Church here.

With tears in her eyes, Mrs. Skujins, a tall, wiry woman with prematurely gray hair, hugged her children and wondered "why Americans are so good to people they don't know."

A Commemorative Stamp Honoring Frederick Douglass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, next June 9 will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the unveiling of a monument erected in the city of Rochester, N. Y., to the memory of the great Negro-American Frederick Douglass. I propose today a bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in commemoration of this great author and public speaker, who served the cause of freedom for his race with such courage and devotion and was one of the first Negroes to receive recognition by the Government through designation to hold high public office.

Frederick Douglass, born in slavery in 1817, was 21 years old when he escaped and went to New York City and from there to Massachusetts. For the next 7 years he devoted himself to a relentless attack on slavery throughout the New England States from the lecture platform and through the press. When he was 28, he visited England and Ireland as well as the continent, where he lectured for 2 years and was finally presented by English friends with the funds with which to purchase his freedom and establish a newspaper. Upon his return to the United States, he selected the city of Rochester, N. Y., as the community where he would found his paper named the North Star, subsequently renamed the Frederick Douglass Paper. He continued his work as an editor and lecturer until 1852, when he began an active participation in the political field. He was elected in that year as a delegate from Rochester to the National Convention of the Free Soil Party at Pittsburgh, where John P. Hale was nominated for the presidency. His entry into political life brought him into increased prominence as a speaker, leading to his delivery of the commencement address at Western Reserve University when he was 37, followed the next year by an address to the New York State Legislature, both events a significant recognition of his attainments and stature.

At age 39 he affiliated himself with the Republican Party, realizing that its principles and ideals presented to the people of his race at that time, as indeed they do today, the greatest hope for a future. Two years later he established a monthly magazine, continued his active militant opposition to the institution of slavery and in 1816 actively campaigned in support of Mr. Lincoln for the Presidency. He was instrumental in 1863 in the recruitment of the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Regiments of Massachusetts and as a result was invited to visit President Lincoln, for whom he again vigorously campaigned when the immortal Lincoln was a candidate for reelection.

After considering Rochester as his home for 22 years, he moved in 1869 to Washington, where he established another magazine, the New National Era. The following year he was appointed Secretary to the Santo Domingo Commission by President Grant. In the following Presidential election, he was elected a Presidential elector for the State of New York and was chosen by the electoral college to carry the vote to Washington.

In 1876 he delivered the address at the unveiling of the Lincoln statue in Washington and the following year was appointed Marshal for the District of Columbia by President Hayes.

Four years after that he was named Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia.

He later served as United States Minister to the Republic of Haiti. His distinguished career ended in 1895 when he died and was laid to rest in the city of Rochester, N. Y., which has always been honored by its association with the name of this illustrious American.

Hope for a Non-Communist Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

SUCCESSFUL SOUTHEASTERN ASIA CONFERENCE THE BEST HOPE FOR A NON-COMMUNIST ASIA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Southeastern Asia, already threatened by Soviet communism, may yet save itself by its

own efforts. For the first time in thousands of years, perhaps in all human history, the peoples of Asia and the Pacific islands plan to act together. Not, mind you, as exploited colonials but as free nations.

This is not a revolt of color, either. At the coming conference of the governments of southeastern Asia brown men from India and the Philippines and white men from Australia and New Zealand will sit down together on a basis of equality.

Their common aim will be to organize an Asia that will be at one and the same time free, prosperous, and anti-Communist.

The decision to try to create an organization embracing this whole area was taken at the recent conference held at New Delhi last January. The New Delhi meeting coincided with President Truman's inauguration, diminishing the amount of outside interest focused upon the Indian capital.

Moreover, since the chief conference topic was the conflict between the Dutch and the Javanese Republic of Indonesia, not too much attention was paid at the time by the outside world, and perhaps by many of the delegates, to a decision of the participating governments to explore ways and means for creating a regional pact for a common defense.

CONFERENCE MAY BUCK UP CHINESE NATIONALISTS

Yet this radical decision, curiously hidden in the intricate wording of a so-called third resolution, may turn out to be all-important. It may take its place with the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic security pact as a great defeat for the U. S. S. R.

For if the many peoples of southeastern Asia do come together on a free, anti-Communist basis, they will be able to prevent any Soviet control outside the Red-conquered areas of China and eliminate Communist influence from places where it is already strong, such as Indo-China and Burma.

Furthermore, they may be able to galvanize the disspirited National Chinese into new resistance. For should they again feel the presence of friendly peoples behind them, these whipped divisions might recover the courage that made them for years more than a match for the Chinese Communists.

Stopping the Red flood at the Yangtse River would obviously be a deed of the first magnitude.

But this might be the outcome of a southeastern Asiatic pact.

The New Delhi move was the more remarkable since it was undertaken in the face of American apathy. Washington had permitted the Chinese Nationalists to be routed without lifting a finger to save them. Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall blurted out that United States forces might not even try to defend Japan. Maj. Gen. Albert M. Jones, of the United States Army, bewildered and depressed the Filipinos by stating that their American ally would not even try to defend them.

UNION BEST HOPE FOR NONCOMMUNIST ASIA

Yet in the face of this spectacle—the mighty United States of America acquiescing in one-power domination of Asia, which was one of the reasons it fought Japan—or perhaps even because of this incredible sight, the Asiatic governments went ahead and took the first step toward uniting for common defense against the new aggressor.

Credit for this goes in the first place to Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, and to Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines. These two men understood each other.

They not only agreed at New Delhi that southeastern Asia must unite or be submerged, they saw that such a unit must not be anti-American or even anti-European. Both men understood that without American assistance and European good will, the organizing of all southeastern Asia is probably impossible. The immediate outlook for assistance from America did not seem too good. Certain American diplomats even warned the New Delhi participants against seeking a regional pact. Yet Nehru and Romulo felt that in the last analysis, Washington and the European capitals must see in such a union of free Asiatic peoples their own best hope for a non-Communist Asia.

When they do, they will immediately give the new effort their political blessing. They will then explore the opportunities for the economic development of the area according to point 4 of the Truman inaugural address. They will repeat the promise of military assistance against unprovoked attack already contained in the UN Charter.

And thereby freedom in Asia will be buttressed.

Free Men in America or Taxpaying Serfs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is being asked, not the ECA, to buy and pay for, then send abroad the following items:

Aloes, aluminum, apples, athletic equipment, autos, bandages, beans, boilers, boneless beef, books, boxes, brushes, busses, candies, cane sirup, canned fruits, vegetables and meats, canning machinery, carbon black, castings, ceramics, citrus fruit, clocks, clothing, coal, cocoa beans, coffee, concrete block machines, construction work, cookies, corn, cotton, cotton goods, dairy products, dress snaps, dried foods, drugs, farm machinery, fats and oils, feathers, fiber, fire pumps, fish, fishing vessels, flour, fuel oil, fruit trees, garden tractors, glassware, handles, heavy-duty jacks, horses, horse-fly netting, ice cream mix, industrial chemicals, industrial supplies, insurance (marine), jams and jellies, laundry bluing, leather and leather products, liquor, livestock, locks, machine tools, miscellaneous machinery, malt, mules, music, nuts, oilseed meal, paper and paper products, peanuts, pears, peppermint oil, pickles, pipe and tubing, popcorn, port facilities, prefabricated houses, pressure cookers, pulpwood, radios, rice, rubber goods, sewing machines, shipping, shoes, soap, soft drinks, soya beans and oil, steam locomotives, steam shovels, textile machinery, textiles, tires, tobacco, toys and games, trucks, tung oil, vitamin tablets, watches, weed sprays, wheat, wire screening, woolen goods, wool rags, zippers.

This is only a chicken-feed list for which our taxpayers are asked to pay and send to all corners of the globe.

It is because of the automobiles, trucks, steel, cotton, tobacco, dairy products and innumerable other items paid for by our taxpayers and then given away to foreign countries that prompts President Truman to demand more taxes.

Now when we fortify the foreign countries, arm them at the expense of our taxpayers, the present tax burden will seem light when compared with what is to come.

Shall it be free men in America or just taxpaying serfs?

Address by Mayor D'Alesandro, of Baltimore, Before United States Conference of Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, major problems facing the municipalities of the country have been presented in forceful manner to municipal officials attending the United States Conference of Mayors, which is being held here in Washington, by Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., the outstanding and capable mayor of Baltimore, who is also chairman of the conference's standing committee on legislation.

Enactment of the slum clearance and housing legislation now pending in Congress would afford solution to one of the most pressing and serious problems facing the major American cities today, Mayor D'Alesandro declared. He also called for revamping of the present Federal Highway Act and program to give more consideration to urban area problems, urging that at least 50 percent of Federal funds in this field be earmarked for relieving congestion and traffic bottlenecks in the cities.

He also recommended legislation providing for Federal aid to school construction, which he termed just as important as proposals for Federal aid to education.

Because of the peculiar serious problems demanding attention by the cities of the country today, Mayor D'Alesandro's broad-gaged and well-reasoned address is deserving of the utmost attention by not only State and Federal authorities but by the population of the country generally inasmuch as the mayor of Baltimore is well-experienced and qualified on these pressing problems. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mayor D'Alesandro be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a supplement to my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

This is my second annual report to you as chairman of your standing committee on legislation. The report is brief and to the point, and I will only refer to the high lights of our activities. All of you have been kept fully informed during the past year by our president and our executive director. And from time to time I have transmitted special bulletins to the full membership of the conference.

Let me say again that it has been a genuine pleasure to have served the cities this past year. Fortunately, Baltimore is just a short distance away from Washington so that it is possible to run over on short notice to appear before congressional committees and to confer with Government officials on our common and mutual problems.

From my experience as a Member of Congress for 10 years, and especially my service on the House Appropriations Committee, I

know the value and usefulness of a cooperative and united front on legislation involving the Federal Government and the cities. All of the congressional committees welcome the views of the heads of our municipal governments, because they appreciate we represent no vested or selfish interest; we simply represent the welfare of the millions of citizens who choose to live in organized communities. These congressional committees likewise know we are not subsidized by anybody or by any private agency or agencies. Congress is very much alive when it comes to appraising and evaluating the testimony of groups which are completely public in character.

HOUSING

Our biggest disappointment for the second successive year, of course, was the failure of the Congress to establish a national housing policy and program. Such failure can be attributed largely to the delaying and obstructionist tactics of a few members of the House Banking and Currency Committee in the first instance, and secondly, the undemocratic action of the House Rules Committee in refusing to grant the House membership an opportunity to vote on the issue. I am confident that if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general-housing bill which passed the Senate last April had been voted on in the House, the measure would have become law during the Eightieth Congress.

Last December, prior to the convening of the new Congress, your officers conferred with President Truman and administration leaders for the purpose of presenting our recommendations with respect to a long-range housing bill. Our recommendations were graciously received and largely reflected in the bill subsequently introduced.

Last month we appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of the new bill (S. 138). In addition to my own testimony as your chairman, Mayor Murphy, of Newark; Mayor Zeidler, of Milwaukee; and General Farrell, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, representing Mayor O'Dwyer, submitted statements to the committee. It goes without saying we shall also be represented when hearings are held on the House side.

Housing has probably been the most investigated domestic problem of all time with the same conclusions arrived at with monotonous regularity. It appears at long last that Congress will do something about it. The pending measure, in addition to providing aids and incentives to the private construction industry, would establish a national housing policy under which the low-rent housing program initiated under the United States Housing Act of 1937 would be continued and expanded. A start on the eradication of slums and urban blight would become a reality under the urban-redevelopment provisions of the bill. In short, a solution to one of the most pressing and serious problems facing the major American cities today would become possible with the enactment of this legislation into law and with subsequent adequate appropriations to do the job.

In addition to the broad objectives of the bill, I wish to mention two specific provisions of extreme importance. One was the proposal to subject municipal housing authority bonds to Federal-income taxation—a foot in the back-door technique apparently conceived by the Treasury Department with the taxation of all municipal securities as the real and ultimate objective. Immediately following introduction of the bill your executive director had a number of personal conferences with the sponsors and you were advised of their quick decision to withdraw this particularly obnoxious and controversial provision from the bill. Similar action was taken on March 7 by Chairman Spence of the House Banking and Currency Committee who is sponsor of the companion bill in the House.

Two years ago the Congress first wrote into law by a rider to an appropriation bill a prohibition against any payment in lieu of taxes on public low-rent housing projects in excess of the amount provided for in the original contract. The result has been the creation of an extremely inequitable situation whereby payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities range all the way from nothing to 10 percent of shelter rent. As you know, we were successful in having the bill amended by the Senate committee so as to provide for a 10-percent payment and we will press for acceptance of that provision when action is taken on the Senate floor and in the House.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Another matter on which the conference took formal action last year was the extension of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 which for the first time made mandatory the expenditure of a portion of all Federal-aid highway funds on city-street projects. The Conference of Mayors worked actively in behalf of this legislation for several years prior to its enactment. The authorization contained in the 1944 act provided for a 3-year program expiring June 30, 1948, with annual appropriations of $500,000,000 of which $125,000,000 was earmarked for urban projects.

In accordance with action taken at our last conference, I conferred with members of the House Committee on Roads during March of last year to urge an extension of the program. Favorable action was taken by the House in April and the bill was finally approved during the closing hours of the last Congress. I wish to note here that if it had not been for the concerted action of the members of this conference in urging passage of this bill prior to adjournment of the Congress, I doubt seriously that we would have been successful.

The bill extending the 1944 act authorizes the appropriation of four hundred and fifty millions annually for the next two fiscal years and continues the requirement that 25 percent of the funds apportioned to the States must be spent on urban projects in the Federal highway system. May I just mention here that we have already taken action looking to a revision of this formula so as to provide for the expenditure of a larger proportion on urban projects. It is our feeling that the increasingly serious traffic problems with which every major city is faced today will become only more serious unless something along this line is done. Cities, out of their own financial resources, cannot do the job alone.

From the facts developed it is our belief that certainly at least 50 percent of the Federal program should be allocated to urban requirements. Within the next few days I intend to confer with the chairman of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, whose district is within the city of Baltimore, and urge introduction of appropriate legislation if our 1949 annual conference takes action by appropriate resolution.

EDUCATION

A critical situation has arisen in the field of education throughout the United States. Last year we went on record in support of the bill to equalize educational opportunities between the States. This bill was never enacted and similar legislation is under consideration at the present time with eventual passage anticipated.

Also pending is equally if not more important legislation, in fact it is more important insofar as the larger cities are concerned, providing for Federal aid for school construction. American cities are unable, out of their own resources, to provide the number of schools required by the mushrooming school census that has occurred since the war. As an example, in New York City facilities will have to be provided for an additional 254,000 children in 1954. It seems most imperative that a Federal program for aid in the construction of schools be undertaken. We have left with President Truman personally our views on this and if such a program is undertaken we feel that it should be administered along the lines of the old Public Works program under which grants and loans were authorized direct between the Federal Government and the local communities without any intermediary State agencies involved.

AIRPORTS

Funds were provided for the continuation of the national airport program and for the first time we had no controversy over responsibility for the operation of airport traffic control towers. Funds were appropriated for the operation of approximately 153 towers throughout the country, and this list will undoubtedly be added to as traffic volume increases at airports not now included.

Municipal opposition was recorded with the House Banking and Currency Committee to a bill sponsored by the commercial airlines which would have prohibited cities receiving Federal airport construction grants from imposing certain airport service charges on these airlines. Committee hearings were held but no action was taken by the Congress.

The present Congress will carry forward the airport construction program with added emphasis on those larger city airports which provide the bulk of service to commercial aviation.

RENT CONTROL

At our last annual conference a resolution was adopted calling for the continuation of fair and adequate rent control until such time as the demand for housing had been reasonably met. A few weeks later I conferred with the chairman and most of the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee for the purpose of acquainting them with the official position of the Conference of Mayors on the matter of continuing rent control. As you know, affirmative action was taken by the Congress extending controls for 1 year.

We are now in the midst of congressional debate on a further extension. Just a little over a week ago Mayor O'Dwyer testified before the Senate committee having the pending bill in charge.

Until such time as the existing shortage is alleviated, it is clear that some protection to the millions of families who are tenants must be given. It would be most appropriate for this annual conference to again give consideration to this matter.

NATURAL GAS

One of the most important laws which this organization has sponsored is the Natural Gas Act of 1937. Under this act, natural-gas consumers in our cities were for the first time provided with protection against arbitrary and unregulated rate adjustments by the gas utility companies. The law has worked well over the years for all except those whom it regulates. It is only natural, therefore, that those interests would seek to weaken the law, and their efforts resulted in the introduction of a bill which would have taken from the Federal Power Commission the power to fix natural-gas rates. If successful, the cost to consumers was estimated at $56,000,000 a year in the form of rate increases by only 11 companies. This bill was passed by the House, but we were successful before the Senate Commerce Committee, where the measure was pigeonholed last May by a vote of 9 to 4.

STREAM-POLLUTION CONTROL

Adequate facilities for the sanitary disposal of sewage and other wastes has long been a major and expensive problem for cities and other units of government. The Federal Government has recognized through enactment of the Stream Pollution Control Act in July 1948 that there is an element of Federal responsibility for the correction of conditions leading to the pollution of our country's waterways. The 1948 act authorizes a 5-year program with appropriations of twenty-two and one-half millions annually for loans only at an interest rate of 2 percent and with a ceiling of $250,000 in Federal funds on any one project. Grants up to $20,000 on each project are authorized for planning purposes. Some of the smaller cities may benefit under the act with these limitations, but it is extremely doubtful if the present law will provide much stimulus in getting a national program under way. The bill as originally introduced contemplated Federal grants of 33⅓ percent for construction purposes. If it is the concensus of this conference that the law should be amended—and it is my opinion that it should—we shall, of course, direct our efforts to that end.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

For the third successive year Congress will approve continuance of the hospital-construction program. Appropriations have been approved by the House and the bill is awaiting Senate action. To date approximately 650 individual projects, with a total estimated cost of about $366,500,000, have been approved.

The bulk of the projects, of course, are in areas not now having hospital and health center facilities, but the larger cities and the metropolitan areas will receive substantial indirect benefits resulting from a decrease in nonresident use of existing facilities.

OTHER MATTERS

We are continuing our efforts to have the Federal Government repeal the admission tax so that this source of revenue may be open to imposition by cities if so desired. As you know, the administration has introduced its social security expansion bill which contemplates extending the Federal retirement program to municipal officials on a voluntary basis. This is primarily of interest to cities which do not now have retirement systems for their employees. There is also, of course, the annual question of Federal payments in lieu of taxes on Government property located within our cities. We are hopeful the President will initiate action on this soon.

President Welsh will indicate several other matters of interest, generally, to all cities.

In conclusion, let me emphasize just one thing. With few exceptions the Members of Congress are a highly intelligent group of men. Too often, however, they are not sufficiently informed with respect to the conditions in our cities and the problems we face. Therein lies a job for you and me—to keep our own congressional representatives continually and fully advised on all matters of mutual concern to the Federal Government and our cities. I cannot urge too strongly the importance of doing this, for isolated appeals to Members of Congress to get this done, or not to do that, carry very little weight when any final decisions are made.

During the coming months your interest and views, as reflected in the formal resolutions of the conference, will be presented to the committees of the Congress as the occasions arise. This job is made easier by the fact that the Members of Congress recognize the United States Conference of Mayors as the voice of the larger cities of the country. On questions of major issues we do not have to appear with a division of views in our own ranks. By the very nature of the organization we are enabled to present a united front free from influences not directly concerned with the welfare of our cities and our people and without the necessity of juggling matters of policy so as to assure that no segment of our membership is offended or gets hurt.

I want to say that you will all be called upon to assist in carrying out the policies adopted by the conference. I know you will respond. My own city of Baltimore has played an active part in the organization for nearly 20 years, and it will continue to do so. I know of no other medium through which our interests on the Federal level can be better or more effectively expressed. It has been a great pleasure and experience to have served as chairman of your legislative committee, and I shall be happy to be of any possible service to the organization during the year ahead if you all so desire. Thank you.

A Letter to the American People Upon Their Duty To Make Themselves Known—View of French Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present, herewith, a translation of an article from Illustration by Andre Maurois, which was brought to my attention by a former Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, Victor S. K. Houston.

The translation of the article, which appeared in the January 15, 1949, issue of the publication, follows:

A LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE UPON THEIR DUTY TO MAKE THEMSELVES KNOWN

Once again, I have returned from your country, which I have completely covered in a few weeks, from East to West, and from South to North. Again, I found it as I had left it before, not completely happy (that would be against human nature), but happier than the rest of the world. Your political system functions well, your economic institutions adjust themselves as time goes on to new circumstances; your culture is moving along; the American ideal is a living thing.

Hence you have a favorable balance to show, and if in fact an intellectual and sentimental campaign were to be initiated for the conquest of the European heart, as between two ways of life, you could enter upon such an enterprise under favorable conditions, for the spectacle of your society is both noble and beautiful. But what is strange, is that you allow others to be ignorant of this spectacle. You allow legends of the most absurd character to be circulated about you, and you scarcely react to the situation. You, the country of tremendous publicity, are the one nation in the world, whose publicity is badly done. You export your scandals, and your silly happenings, instead of the reports of your virtues and your successes. Because you feel yourselves strong you no longer fear criticism, and you are right. You make light of hostile books and articles.

WHERE ARE THE ANSWERS?

That's all very well, but where is the counterbalance? Which of your writers has told, in a form easily accessible to the foreign public, that which makes for the solidity and the charm of your country? Not one. You are accused of being reactionary. Who answers? Who proclaims urbi et orbi the American ideal? Who recalls to mind that America was founded by rebels, who were enamored of liberty, and that it remains above all the land of righteousness? No one. And yet * * *

And yet the task would be an easy one. Your political life is, as in England but in a different way, a miracle. You have succeeded in combining democracy and stability. Democracy, of that there is not the slightest doubt: it is the people, it is public opinion that leads your country. It is said that the great capitalists, through the newspapers and the radio, can mold this opinion. What nonsense. The press was unanimously against Truman, and he was elected. The radio is available to all who wish to buy time, and the labor unions have for that purpose quite as large funds as the capitalists. They say that the President of the United States, once elected, is a dictator for a period of 4 years. What a mistake. The President lives with his eyes glued to the barometer of public opinion; he acts as the people wish him to act; he tries to guide it, and not to wound it.

DEMOCRACY WITH STABILITY

Hence democracy, but also stability, because political battles with you do not, after the electoral campaigns, carry with them rancor and hate. The results once proclaimed, Dewey sends a telegram of felicitations to Truman, and declares his readiness to work with him. Truman, a Democrat, asks Dulles, a Republican, to preside over the American delegation to the United Nations, and asks Hoover, a Republican, to draw up the plans for administrative and budgetary reforms. How is such moderation possible? It is due: (a) To civic training which is the best part of the American educational system; (b) to the certainty of the minority party, that the majority in power will respect the Bill of Rights, and furthermore that the Supreme Court will see to it that such rights are respected; (c) to the fact that the two major parties do not represent two classes, two different ideologies, but groups of interests and historical ideals of great complexity. An American newspaper once proposed the following competition: "Tell in one phrase what is the difference between Republicans and Democrats." A child answered: "There is no difference." The jury awarded the prize to the child. That is one of your secrets.

LIBERTIES THREATENED

Are not the liberties in your country also threatened? Of course, quite true. Liberty is a possession that must be fought for all the time. The Committee on Un-American Activities has unmasked some weaknesses and perhaps some treason, but it has also unjustifiably troubled some honest people, who had committed no other offense than to have spoken unwisely. It has brought about amongst officials and professors a feeling of fear and prudence, which is essentially un-American. Its only excuse was the excesses that impunity had engendered. Every liberty, yes, but not against the Nation. That established, one must put a brake on all tendency toward intolerance. Your Government is paying attention to

this. The Leagues for Civil Rights watch over it. The President wisely makes light of certain police fanciful stories. With you as elsewhere, the pilot cannot always guarantee that the vessel will not run off its course. There are winds and currents. But when all is said and done, the excellence of your mental gyroscope is shown by the fact that recovery is rapid.

MUCH TO DISCOVER IN ECONOMIC LIFE

As for the economic life, you have much still to discover. The speed of production, new industries, the fall of foreign-money values, have presented problems which have not yet been resolved. But it must be admitted that you are seeking the solutions with efficiency and in good faith. You are attempting to reconcile the virtues of free enterprise with the security of regulation. It looks as though you would succeed. Against the great crises of unemployment, you have set up State apparatus. You are beginning to catch sight of what might be a scientific economy; you know that it must take into account human nature, which is one of the elements of the problem. You will not avoid the minor fluctuations of business; but henceforth, I believe that you will know how to escape catastrophic crises. That's the essential.

RELATIONS BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND LABOR DIFFER

With you, relations between management and labor are different than they are elsewhere. At least, on the one hand, you have succeeded in eliminating resentment. Not completely, to be sure. In certain industries the laboring class has kept a bitter memory of the way it was treated when there were no unions to defend it. Hence their attitudes with respect to certain somewhat ridiculous regulations. But little by little the inferiority complexes will simmer down. Already they are much less strong. The leveling process works fast in America. The way of life of the masses has improved prodigiously. The thousands of motorcars at the gates of the factories, the clothing of the workers who leave the establishments, are concrete proof. Above all, equality of manner and tone has been realized. The secretaries of the large labor unions are forceful and cultivated men, realists, who discuss as equal to equal with the heads of industry. Hence a familiarity which generates common sense. John L. Lewis, president of the miners, calls the young owners of the mines by their first names. In some of the industries management and workers together appoint an impartial chairman who, as a permanent arbitrator, prevents conflict to the great benefit of the two parties. The breach, dug by the scandalous exploitation of the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century, has not been entirely filled up, but it is no longer so deep. America is driving toward a classless society, which, however, nowhere implies a society without a hierarchy.

INFLUENCE OF CULTURE

Culture provides as between groups of human beings a marvelous means of getting together. To love, to understand the same works is the beginning of understanding and loving each other. Already on this score you have made great progress. Today, you are the country whose masses best understand music, and I mean good music. Your museums are not only rich, which for you is easy, but are directed by men, whose purpose it is not only to attract people, but also to instruct them, which they do. Your universities are widely open, and except for a few exceptions absolutely democratic. Your libraries, even in the villages, are admirable, and whoever, in the United States wishes to better himself, finds ready means at hand. This respect for the arts and letters, this desire to participate in universal culture has begun to produce great results. You have a powerful and new literature, which Europe admires; your scientists lead the world effort. You now occupy as large a place in the domain of the intellect as in the circles of industry.

THESE THINGS MUST BE TOLD

All of which is admirable, and you may well be proud of the results, and we your friends rejoice with you. But these things must be told. Else who will know them? Above all it must be proclaimed that you place all of your new forces at the service of the old American ideal, which was fraternity amongst peoples, equality of man, and liberty for all. To this ideal, in fact, you remain faithful. You accept the sacrifice of a large part of your revenues to help reestablish people whom the hazards of war have treated less fortunately; you are by instinct, and in all countries and under all circumstances, for the downtrodden. But that also, you must let the people know about. Because of your silence, because of the noise of others. and some false maneuvers, some very honest people have concluded, in all conscience, that you are anxious for political and economic conquests, and that you were supporting a little all over the world the forces of reaction. That is false, but it is necessary that people should know that it is false, that you remain the champions of liberty and of those, whom it is wished to deprive of it.

It is as a liberal power that you have grown and triumphed. Let the world know in time that you are the country of Jefferson and Lincoln. More and more within your own country, give an example of tolerance and equality. With an open hand invite our students, our workers, our farmers to come and take note of your progress. I know better than anyone else by experience, that when one gets to know you, one loves you. But make people know you.

The Great Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

THE GREAT ADVENTURE—IN MEMORIAM TO SENATOR HERBERT W. SLATER

(By the Old Philosopher)

They pass by, with problems in daily strife
To see, to feel, and to report on life;
This is a timely work, my constant joy
"Do unto others," to aid, I will employ.

My fellow men need me to serve them well
Heal the saddened heart, with fears to quell;
The Golden State, its laws, I will help frame
For California, more lustre to her name.

Life to be even, must afford fair chance
The needy, the infirm, their lot to enhance;
Lift high the torch, that men may truly see
Our land shall preserve liberty for the free.

Riches vanish, trials and errors do pass
Yet, in the heart, one's soul, forever cast;
Love of friends, to all mankind we assure
Immortal will be—the great adventure.

Selection of Juries in Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend in the RECORD my own remarks on H. R. 3207. This bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee No. 4, for open hearings, notice of which will soon be announced by the chairman of the committee.

House bill 3207 provides for the drawing and selection of jurors in the Federal district courts.

The main purpose of this bill is to appoint jury commissioners, who shall have jurisdiction of this subject.

It amends sections 411 and 412 of title 28, United States Code.

Section 411 is so amended that those selected for jurors must be able to speak and understand the English language.

Section 412 is so amended so that all jurors, grand and petit, must be publicly drawn from a box, containing the names of not less than 1,000 persons, possessing the qualifications prescribed in section 411.

Subsection 412 (a) authorizes the judge of the Federal district court, prior to the 1st day of July in each year, to appoint two persons of opposite politics, to serve as jury commissioners. No such jury commissioner shall be eligible for reappointment for at least 2 years after the expiration of the year for which he was appointed. This section further provides that such commissioners shall have a fee of $10 per day for each day employed together with mileage of 10 cents per mile for his traveling expenses.

Subsection 412 (b) provides that the clerk of said court shall notify each commissioner of his appointment. It further provides the form of oath such commissioner shall subscribe to before performing any duties as such commissioner, and one provision of such oath requires such commissioner to "select none whom he may have been requested to select."

Subsection 412 (c) provides that such jury commissioners shall meet on the first Monday of July in each year, at a place within the jurisdiction of the district court, at a place named by the judge, for the purpose of making a list of persons to serve as jurors for the ensuing year.

Subsection 412 (d) provides that such commissioners must select all jurors from the last list of qualified voters of the various countries embraced in each district court of the United States.

Subsection 412 (e) requires the jury commissioners to keep in a well-bound book a record of the proceedings, to be preserved by the clerk of the court in his office. It further provides for removal from office of such commissioners for neglect of duty, and so forth, and for filling vacancies by the judge of the court.

Subsection 412 (f) provides that a list of the persons selected by said commissioners, to serve as jurors, shall be prepared by said commissioners and be delivered to the clerk of said court and by him safely kept. Such list shall be subject to inspection only by the judge, clerk of said court, and the jury commissioners. It further provides that the judge or the jury commissioners, may strike from such list the name of any person who has been convicted of any scandalous offense, or been guilty of any gross immorality.

Subsection 412 (g) provides that at the time of making such jury list, the commissioners shall cause all the names of jurors to be written, each on a separate paper, so as to resemble each other as nearly as may be, so the name shall not be visible on the outside, and deposit the ballots in a secure box prepared for that purpose, which shall be known as the "jury box," and shall be safely kept by the clerk of said court, and shall be opened only by the order of the jury commissioners.

Subsection 412 (h) provides that all jurors required for the trial of cases, including felony, shall be selected by drawing ballots from the jury box, and the persons whose names are written on the ballots so drawn shall be returned to serve as jurors.

Subsection 421 (i) provides that it shall be the duty of the jury commissioners, upon notice served by the Federal marshal of the district court, signed by the clerk, to attend on a day designated in said notice, at the clerk's office of the district court, and in the presence of the clerk of such court, to draw the proper number of jurors from the jury box.

Subsection 412 (j) provides that if either, or both, of the jury commissioners fail to attend as required by such notice, the clerk of the district court shall appoint a special commissioner or commissioners, having the proper qualifications as required by the act, to act in his or their stead, and jurors shall be drawn by such commissioners, and the clerk of the court shall place a list thereof in the hands of the Federal marshal of the district, at least 3 days before the return day summoning said jurrors to appear at the time and place mentioned in the summons.

Subsection 412 (k) provides that when jurors are to be drawn as aforesaid, the ballots in the jury box shall be shaken and mixed together by one of the jury commissioners, and the other jury commissioner shall openly draw therefrom as many ballots, without inspecting the names written thereon, until the proper number shall have been drawn, and if any person, whose name is drawn, is unable, by reason of sickness or absence from home, or other cause, to attend as juror, his name shall at the conclusion of the draft be returned to the jury box; or he be exempted by law, stricken from the list, and such ballot shall be destroyed and another shall be drawn in his stead.

Subsection 412 (l) provides that when any person is drawn and returned to serve as a juror, the jury commisssioners shall endorse on his jury ballot his name and the word "drawn" and place it in another box to be kept for that purpose in the custody of the clerk, and opened only as prescribed by this act, and the date of the draft shall be entered on the list of jurors opposite his name.

Subsection 412 (m) provides that the court, in term time, may require other jurors to be drawn by the clerk in the presence of the court whenever it shall be necessary for the convenient dispatch of business.

House Resolution 2050 recites that its purpose is to amend sections 1864 and 1865 of title 28 of the United States Code. It seems that its purpose is to amend the sections 411 and 412 of the present arrangement of title 28 of the present Code of the United States Statutes.

It is my understanding that this bill was recommended by the judges of the Federal court of the United States, serving in the State of New York. There seems to be no doubt that this action on the part of these Federal judges, was to sustain hereafter the methods of selecting jurors, as used and prescribed by one of their number.

This bill, in section (a) like the present law, provides for the appointment of one jury commissioner to serve during the pleasure of the court.

It further provides that each commissioner shall be a member of the principal political party opposing that to which the clerk is a member.

Section (b) prescribes that the compensation of such commissioners shall be $10 per day for each day, not to exceed 5 days in any one month, when such commissioner is actually engaged in his official duties.

It further provides however, that the judge may appoint one or more such commissioners to full-time duties and pay, with the approval of the judicial counsel, at a salary not to exceed $5,000 per annum, with traveling and subsistence expenses within the limits prescribed for clerks.

Section (c) provides that the clerk of the district court and the commissioner or commissioners shall constitute the jury commission for the district. If more than one commissioner has been appointed, the clerk and that commissioner, who has been designated to serve in a particular part of the district, shall constitute the jury commission for that part of the district, who shall act subject to the instructions of the judge of said court.

It further provides that the commission shall have power to transmit to prospective jurors, questionnaires approved by the judge, to determine whether any person is qualified to be selected as a juror.

It further provides that if any person refuses to answer any question propounded to him, he is subject to punishment for contempt of court.

It will be noted that there is no limitation as to such questions. The only limit is the restraint of the commissioner. Is this unlimited power constitutional?

Section (d) provides for the drawing of the jurors. This is to be done on the order of the court; the names to be drawn from a box or a wheel; 300 persons will be selected, as provided by subsection (c); names to be drawn publicly by the clerk and jury commissioner, or by a judge and jury commissioner, or by a judge and a clerk.

This bill would legalize the discretionary system of selecting jurors, as perfected by presiding Judge Knox of the southern district of New York, who because of his life tenure in office, is not subject to control or curb of his activities by any department of government.

This bill empowers the judge himself to hand-pick and select every juror, and may act as district attorney and a jury commissioner, whenever, in his opinion, he is not restricted to the duties of a judge.

Furthermore, there is nothing in this bill to prevent the appointment of a hand-picked clerk and hand-picked jury commissioner, who also are assured of good jobs for life, so long as they obey their master's voice and continue to hand-pick jurors at his request.

Congress during the past 150 years, has failed in its duties to guarantee in Federal courts, fair and impartial trials to defendants. It is the duty of Congress imposed upon it by the Constitution. It is a duty Congress cannot delegate to others without endangering the very precious liberties of the people.

To permit the judges of the Federal courts to hand-pick jurors, and then permit the judge to tell these same jurors that he believes the evidence offered in any case is, in his opinion only, sufficient to convict, is contrary to every law in every State of the Union.

What can you expect? What do you get?

A court-directed verdict of conviction, without the court running a chance of reversal, because an appeal does not lie for the failure of the judge to truly comprehend the evidence, is certainly contrary to the established law of the States.

How is the list of possible jurors compiled in Federal district courts? No one ever knew, or was ever told until recently by Judge John C. Knox, of New York, when he admitted that he selected his jury after consulting the "social register, Who's Who in New York, lists of college alumni, and lists submitted by large business firms." No effort was made to secure a jury that would represent a cross section of his district, but every effort was made to secure a jury that would have the same view of government and evidence as directed by him. Does anyone but this judge himself believe justice can be administered in this prejudiced manner?

Americans love their courts. Many Americans fear the district courts of the United States. State courts do not participate in the empaneling or selections of jurors. State court judges are precluded from expressing any opinion to the jury upon the weight of the evidence.

Federal courts express and argue to the jury, under guise of instructions, their opinions on the weight of the evidence.

Federal judges interfere and direct the empaneling of jurors, and select jurors that do not represent a proper cross section of the community.

What chances does a man have for a fair and impartial trial, in a court where the judge may argue the evidence before his own hand-picked jury.

State legislatures have provided by statute, in every State of the Union, against such conduct and performance on the part of their judges.

There has been introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 1423, that will prevent Federal judges from arguing before the jury and expressing their views of the evidence in civil and criminal cases. In other words, it will prevent the judge from acting as attorney for one side or the other.

H. R. 3207 will prohibit the judge from interfering in any manner with the jury commissioners in their duties of selecting and designating the persons who shall serve as jurors in the Federal courts, and will take from the judge the power to act as jury commissioner extraordinary.

I hope the Members of Congress will see fit to throw around the practice in the Federal courts the same security that State legislators have been wise enough to insure the people of their State, whenever they are required to commence or defend action at law therein.

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, dated respectively March 3 and March 7, 1949.

These editorials discuss the failure of the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin and the need for a single coordinated program such as the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 3, 1949]

RIPE TIME FOR MVA

As Senator MURRAY and 12 colleagues introduce the fourth MVA bill, the moment is propitious.

The Pick-Sloan plan, with which the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau have tried to forestall MVA, has discredited itself more quickly and more thoroughly than anyone could have hoped.

Its failure to win the respect of the people of the valley themselves was shown recently when the Nebraska Legislature rejected an appeal by the Army engineers for a vote of confidence. It was shown again when the North Dakota House voted to ask Congress for MVA and the North Dakota Senate came within two votes of doing the same thing.

In the Tennessee Valley, for either chamber of any State legislature to reject TVA, or to come as near doing so as did the North Dakota Senate, would be unthinkable. It would be political suicide for a member to vote that way, so thoroughly has TVA won the support of the people among whom it works.

In the Missouri Valley the contrast is striking. In four brief years, although it has succeeded in getting better than a billion dollars out of Congress, the "fake MVA"—the Pick-Sloan plan—is on the down grade in popular esteem. When it is further considered that the Interior Department, one of the Pick-Sloan participants, has recommended the valley-authority method as superior, and a Hoover commission task force has branded Pick-Sloan "a costly failure," there can be little doubt that something a good deal better is demanded.

The better method is available in the Murray MVA bill. Its sponsorship is impressive—from the Missouri Valley, from the Tennessee Valley, and from elsewhere in the country from Rhode Island to Florida. Because of the national importance of the issue it presents, because of the large and growing demand for MVA in the Missouri Valley, because of its broad and impressive sponsorship in the Senate, it deserves a respectful, fair, and thorough hearing by the Eighty-first Congress.

Because this Congress bears the mandate of last November 2 for progressive legislation, it owes it to itself to give the new MVA bill such a hearing. And such a hearing the two preceding MVA bills never had in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. Both committee hearings given to it were conducted by the late Senator Overton, an Army engineer partisan who hated MVA sight unseen and who did everything in his power to prevent consideration of the measure on its merits. These Congresses refused to conduct hearings in the Missouri Valley and ascertain what the people themselves want in contrast with what small but loud special-interest lobbies have been saying they want. Valley-wide hearings are another obligation the Eighty-first Congress owes to the country.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 7, 1949]

PICK-SLOAN'S HUGE ONE-SIDEDNESS

Few people perhaps realize that the Federal Government has already spent one and a fifth billion dollars on the Pick-Sloan plan and its predecessor works for the development of the Missouri Valley.

It is an enormous amount to be spent under any conditions, and a truly appalling amount to be spent in advance of any coherent plan for spending it or for making certain that the structures it provides will be useful after they are built. Yet that is what is happening. The only "plans" are two conflicting programs which the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau drew up in an attempt to forestall each other, and which they then put together and called a "unified" plan in an attempt to forestall MVA.

How one-sided is the present unplanned development was shown by figures in Richard G. Baumhoff's report in the Sunday Post-Dispatch. Analysis of these figures shows the disparity in the treatment which the dominant agency, the Army engineers, is getting for itself, and the treatment which submerged agencies like the Soil Conservation Service are receiving.

The Army engineers, with 19 percent of the program, has obtained 41 percent of the appropriations, while the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service, with 9 percent of the program, have received 1.6 percent of the appropriations. Proportionately the Army engineers have done eight times better for themselves! And this is the record of the "plan" which the Army engineers represent as giving appropriate emphasis to every phase of the development.

While there is still time—before error on a mammoth scale has been built into the Missouri Valley for generations to come—this region deserves better treatment at the hands of Congress by enactment of an MVA.

Beef and Veal Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a careful study of the agricultural program will indicate that the administration is subsidizing the production of soil-depleting crops, and at the same time subsidizing exports of soil-depleting crops. This hardly fits in with our soil-conservation program.

The administration program has reduced the total number of sheep in the United States to the lowest number in 50 years, and this has been accomplished in a 5-year period.

The livestock industry is in constant jeopardy because of our trade agreement programs. Livestock farming is closely associated with soil conservation and also with a desirable farm economy. I want to point out that the records of the Department of Agriculture will show we have been on a beef-import basis ever since the Underwood tariff days, except for two short periods during World Wars I and II. The duty has been reduced time after time on livestock products. The report will show that peanuts, rice, and tobacco still have the much criticized Smoot-Hawley tariff protection. In addition an embargo has been placed on cotton importation.

If beef imports were given the same duty protection enjoyed by cotton and some of the other soil-depleting crops, the American beef market could and would be supplied by the American farmer. It should be borne in mind that about 40 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation is derived from cattle kept for milk.

Mr. Speaker, take the matter of the so-called section 32 funds as they relate to agricultural products. These come mostly from the imports of livestock and livestock products. Wool is the principal agricultural import. Now the section 32 funds have been used to subsidize cotton exports and also to subsidize the domestic use of cotton. These funds are also used to subsidize tobacco exports and even to the extent of subsidizing the tobacco which is ground up for fertilizer and insecticides. In other words, we have a program in which the section 32 funds, which are obtained by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts and setting them aside to be used to dispose

of agricultural surpluses are actually being used, not for the purpose intended, but to subsidize soil-depleting crops, particularly cotton and tobacco. It just does not seem as though the Agriculture Department was really interested in protecting the industries in this country which actually provide real soil fertility. The livestock industry helps to keep up our soil fertility.

A table showing imports of beef and veal follows:

Beef and veal: United States imports for consumption, by kinds, by principal sources, 1948 [1]

Country	Fresh chilled, or frozen				Prepared or preserved				Total beef and vea.	
	Beef		Vea.		Canned beef and corned beef		Beef and veal, pickled or cured			
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Pounds		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Argentina					83,343,146	$26,151,196	427,197	$109,173	83,770,343	$26,260,369
Canada	66,690,604	$20,832,809	4,943,664	$1,665,621	182,702	78,206	935,398	359,916	72,752,368	22,936,552
Uruguay					21,198,378	7,484,863	2,157,684	493,354	23,356,062	7,978,217
Brazil					22,230,284	7,024,316			22,230,284	7,024,316
All other	3,774,402	693,049	100	35	2,137,185	634,432			5,911,687	1,327,516
Total, all countries	70,465,006	21,525,858	4,943,764	1,665,656	129,091,695	41,373,013	3,520,279	962,443	208,020,744	65,526,970

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce (U. S. Tariff Commission, February 1949).

Beef and veal: United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1948 [1]

Kind	Quantity	Value
	Pounds	
Beef and veal:		
Fresh or frozen	3,735,034	$2,338,171
Pickled or cured	6,593,795	1,817,080
Beef, cured	5,076,911	2,309,176
Total	15,405,740	6,464,427

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce (U. S. Tariff Commission, February 1949).

This chart boiled down shows over 208,000,000 pounds of beef and veal imported—our exports 15,000,000 plus pounds. It should be noted that the above tables are for boned meat and does not cover the additional 419,000 head of cattle which were imported from Canada in 1948. It does not include the nearly 150,000,000 pounds of canned meat, representing 700,000 head of cattle, which we are obligated to take from Mexico.

If the United States were self-sufficient in beef and veal, millions of dollars could be saved from the amount being spent in storing grains and millions more could be saved by making export subsidies on soil-depleting crops unnecessary. If we are to continue the importing of such huge amounts of meat and the present antilivestock attitude is to prevail, we will certainly want to increase the size of our elevators and corn cribs in order to store all of these grain surpluses. It is my opinion that as the imports of livestock and livestock products increase, the greater the need will be for facilities to store our grain.

If the United States supplied the wool needed and used, our meat prices to the consumer would be lower, and meat would be more plentiful. If we replaced the acreage of unneeded soil depleting crops with crops used in livestock farming, untold millions could be saved the taxpayers because we would not need to subsidize the production of the soil-depleting crops and would not see the public funds used to subsidize the exports of the soil-depleting crops. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it seems that our present agricultural program is upside down. This is apparent when one realizes that in 1948, there was the largest importation of beef and veal in the history of our country.

Big Business Wants Basing-Point System Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the National Union Farmer for March 1949 includes a leading article on continuing efforts being made to nullify the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing-point system. The article follows:

MONOPOLY GAINS POINT IN BASING-POINT FIGHT

WASHINGTON, D. C.—That big business is still able to operate in the Nation's Capital despite the result of the election is shown by the action of a House committee the first of this month.

The House Judiciary Committee reported favorably on bill H. R. 2222 which in effect negates a recent Supreme Court decision which outlawed the base-point price system long used by monopolists to crush competition and prevent industrial development of the South and West.

Specifically, the bill would legalize freight absorption, phantom freight, and uniform methods of pricing which had been used for years by United States Steel, the Cement Trust, and other business groups to effectively strangle competition.

PATTON OBJECTS

Farmers Union President Patton protested the favorable action of the House committee in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN.

"The approval of this legislation," said Patton, "without public hearings is particularly obnoxious because the bill threatens our economic and political democracy."

Patton pointed out that this action of the House Judiciary Committee was part of a pattern which has developed in the last year as a result of the campaign put on by the monopolists found guilty by the Supreme Court.

He said, "I want to emphasize the fact that outlawing freight absorption when it is used to stifle competition in no way prevented businessmen from absorbing freight when necessary to meet competition.

"No new legislation is needed at this time. The whole campaign is designed to weaken and undermine our antitrust laws and pave the way for monopoly."

Helping Our Teachers Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, published in Manchester, N. H., under date of March 22, 1949, entitled "Helping Our Teachers Combat Communism":

HELPING OUR TEACHERS COMBAT COMMUNISM

The announcement of the education policies commission of the National Educational Association that it will publish recommendations in the near future to help teachers meet the challenge of communism in our schools is immensely important.

These leaders predict that the cold war against the Soviet Union will probably continue until children in the grammar schools have grown into adulthood—an outlook that places a tremendous responsibility on the American teaching profession today.

A good deal of effort is being directed in various parts of the country toward weeding out Communist propagandists from our high school and college faculties. This work is highly important. Checking the process of subversion in our schools by eliminating Communists and Communist stooges from our teaching staffs should be pressed without any equivocation.

But necessary as this process is, it constitutes a negative approach. In addition to stifling Communist propaganda, there should be some positive effort to present the defects and dangers of communism so as to create a definite understanding on the part of our young people concerning the menace facing all free peoples today. And this effort should begin with younger pupils in our

grammar schools and not be left to schools of higher education.

The education policies commission of the NEA has not outlined in detail just what form its program of guidance to teachers will take. A final draft will not be made until a rough outline has been circulated among the members of the association, and been given their approval. But in a general way, the program would be designed to present the real facts about communism—its repression of freedom, its complete subjection of the individual to state control, the fallacy of its economic pretensions, and its program of world domination. To which would be added, by way of contrast, a survey of the benefits of American free institutions.

A program of this kind is essential to American education today. The soundness of the movement for its adoption is evidenced by the caliber of the leaders who have it under advisement, which include such men as General Eisenhower, president of Columbia University; William Jansen, superintendent of schools for New York City; and O. C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Mustangs Promoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was announced that two distinguished officers of the Marine Corps, Brig. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn and Brig. Gen. R. A. Robinson, had been selected for promotion to major general. Aside from the fact that these officers are highly deserving of such an honor, their selection to two-star rank has an added significance. Brigadier Generals Silverthorn and Robinson both began their service careers as privates, and have steadily progressed through the enlisted and commissioned grades. Consequently, I believe that members of this House who are interested in preserving equal opportunity for promotion for all members of the armed services will be gratified by this example of how the Marine Corps assures unrestricted opportunities for able enlisted men to achieve general officer rank.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Army and Navy Journal of January 22, 1948, giving pertinent information on the careers of Brig. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn and Brig. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, of the Marine Corps, who have recently been selected for promotion to major general:

General Silverthorn, currently on duty in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, was decorated with the Legion of Merit and the Distinguished Service Medal for his wartime services as Chief of Staff of the Third Amphibious Corps.

Born in Minneapolis on September 22, 1896, General Silverthorn attended the University of Minnesota before enlisting in the Marine Corps on April 27, 1917. Less than 3 months later he sailed for France, and the following year was commissioned a second lieutenant. In France he participated in a number of major campaigns, was wounded twice, and earned several decorations including the Navy Cross and the Distinguished Service Cross.

During the early months of World War II General Silverthorn served as a member of the United States Joint Strategic Committee, and later as Chief of the Amphibious Warfare Section, Army and Navy Staff College. In 1943 he became Chief of Staff of the Third Amphibious Corps and participated in the invasion and capture of Guam, where he was awarded the Legion of Merit. While still serving in this assignment, he earned the Distinguished Service Medal for his conduct during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the southern Palau and Ryukyu Islands. From July 1945 until September 1946 he served as Chief of Staff of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific. Before reporting to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations he commanded the Troop Training Unit, Training Command, Amphibious Forces, Atlantic Fleet, for 1 year.

In addition to the medals mentioned, General Silverthorn also holds the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, the French Fourragere, the Purple Heart, and numerous others.

General Robinson, Director of the Division of Plans and Policies, also entered the Marine Corps as an enlisted man and served in both World War I and II.

Born on July 1, 1896, in Los Angeles, General Robinson enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1917 and, just subsequent to completion of his recruit training, was commissioned as a second lieutenant. He served in France in 1918–19 with the Thirteenth Marine Regiment.

During World War II he served as Chief of Staff of both the Third and Fifth Marine Divisions, and later as Assistant Division Commander of the Fifth. In March 1946, he was named Fleet Marine Officer on the staff of the Commander in Chief of the Pacific and Pacific Ocean area, and the following September became Chief of Staff, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific. In August 1947 he assumed his present duties as Director, Division of Plans and Policies, Headquarters Marine Corps.

General Robinson holds, among other decorations, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star, the Bronze Star Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation with two stars, and the Navy Unit Commendation with Bronze Star.

Using Taft-Hartley To Perpetuate a System of Industrial Feudalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the folowing article by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, which is a case history of one instance in which the Taft-Hartley Act was used literally to enforce industrial feudalism:

MAN TO MAN
(By Harold L. Ickes)

As members of the Fair Deal Congress have been doing figure-skating on that patch of thin ice known as the Taft-Hartley Act, I have been expecting every day to see some soul, hardier than the rest, do an exhibit labeled "Di Giorgio." A long-drawn-out strike of farm workers against a corporation operating a fruit ranch covering 14 square miles in Kern County, Calif., throws an extraordinary light on how the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law can be used to protect and maintain a system of industrial feudalism.

Several times I have called attention to this struggle of farm workers to better their condition, and twice have had held over me a threat of legal action. The notorious Associated Farmers of California with which the Di Giorgio Corp. is affiliated, has even gone so far as to reprint one of my columns in full (despite the fact that it was copyrighted) in an expensive brochure which, by one less tolerant than I, might have been regarded as an attempted smear. As for my involuntary contribution to it, I heartily recommend it as a concise statement of the essential facts back of the Di Giorgio strike.

The walkout occurred on October 1, 1947, when company officials turned down the workers' request for a hearing of their grievances. They had organized in the preceding spring, and had been chartered as a local of the National Farm Labor Union, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

Mediation efforts of the Kern County Central Labor Council having failed, a direct appeal was made to Joseph Di Giorgio, head of the farm corporation. Mr. Di Giorgio had won respect by his amicable dealings with other A. F. of L. unions, and an open-minded hearing by him had been confidently anticipated. But no reply came, and 1,100 of the 1,345 Di Giorgio farmers stopped work. Picket lines were set up around the ranch, and the longest strike of farm workers in American labor history was under way.

At first the company tried to smother the strike with imported labor. The union has charged in hearings before the United States Senate that it even went to the extreme of hiring, in defiance of law, Mexican nationals smuggled across the border in the dead of night. Strong-arm methods failed to choke off a flow of supplies contributed to the strikers. The more bitter the company attack, the more solid became the support of the A. F. of L., whose President, William Green, made personal appeals on behalf of the strikers.

An attempt to smear the striking union as "Communist-led" was exploded in hearings by State authorities and the union was given a clean bill of health. During this phase some gunman, whose identity is still unknown, shot through a window in an attempt to murder the president of the striking union, and very nearly did so.

The events leading up to the farm corporation's resort to the use (or misuse, according to the point of view) of the Taft-Hartley law, were summarized in a statement recently made to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by President H. L. Mitchell of the National Farm Labor Union:

"Between raids by the Immigration Service," he said, "which apprehended aliens on the ranch, the Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. managed to produce a crop with scab labor, and began shipping it to market. Union pickets followed the trucks and rode tanks of wine to their destinations, and there appealed to other A. F. of L. union members to refuse to handle the products."

It was at this point, its own efforts to crush the strike having failed, that the Di Giorgio corporation fell back on the Taft-Hartley Act. Charging a secondary boycott, it appealed to the National Labor Relations Board for an injunction. Its lawyers argued that although farm workers are denied any benefits under

the law, its penalties apply to them. Ironically, from the workers' viewpoint, it was on Independence Day of last year that the striking farmers were notified that the Federal court in Fresno, Calif., had issued an injunction forbidding them to secure the help of other union men and women through the refusal of the latter to handle Di Giorgio products.

Since then, the story has been chiefly one of litigation. Meantime, the strike goes on, with the farm worker seemingly at the short end of a grotesquely un-American doctrine "made in California," that while he is subject to the restrictive provisions of a law, he is ineligible when it comes to those which would protect him. At this distance, so far as the striker is concerned, it looks like a case of "Heads you win, tails I lose." A shell game by comparison would seem altruistic.

In view of the great respect for the law so far evidenced by the Associated Farmers of California, I hereby waive the protection of my copyright, and would be glad to have that group of liberty-loving Americans reprint this column in another brochure.

The Chickens Come Home to Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at the Government reports on poultry and eggs. The 1948 imports of poultry meat were the highest in 14 years of record, and almost tripled those of 1947.

The report shows that there were 34,000,000 pounds of dressed chicken imported in 1948, as compared with 12,000,000 pounds in 1947. The 1935–39 annual average was 2,000,000 pounds.

There were 6,000,000 pounds of dressed weight turkey imported. This compared to 2,000,000 pounds in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Government took 12,000,000 dozen eggs off the market. Since May of 1948, the Government has bought more than 1,500,000,000 eggs. These eggs were shelled, dried, and added to the Government's huge stock pile of egg powder. In 1948, the total domestic supply of eggs was about 395 eggs per capita. The civilian consumption was 388 eggs.

It is my understanding the Government is supporting egg prices throughout the country. They offer to buy eggs from Midwest egg dryers who pay producers a minimum of 35 cents a dozen. When the Midwest producers cannot get that price from egg handlers and shippers, they can sell to the processors and the Government gets another load of eggs. The support price for eggs in the Midwest is about 35 cents a dozen. It reaches 55 cents in Maine.

Now let us look at the imports of eggs—about 2,000,000 dozen compared to only 1,000,000 dozen in 1947. Most of these eggs come from Canada.

At the Geneva Tariff Conference, the duty on poultry was reduced from 4 to 2 cents a pound. The dressed poultry from 6 to 3 cents a pound. Dried eggs from 27 to 17 cents a pound, and fresh eggs from 10 cents to 3.5 cents per pound. This 3.5 cents per pound is not even a 10 percent ad valorem duty. There are many producers of eggs and poultry in the Midwest who are unable to get the support price for their products. At the same time we reduced the tariff on poultry and eggs, so as to make it more and more difficult to get a support price. If the administration intends to continue to reduce the duties on agricultural products, they will certainly invite larger and larger imports of these products into the United States. It will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to support the price of the product in this country, on which the same administration invites large exports from other countries. Does this make sense?

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that some of the agreements made at the Geneva Conference, not only on eggs, but many other agricultural products will soon place our agricultural economy in a precarious condition. Our present agricultural program, when you compare it with the reduction of tariffs really means that we now propose to support the agricultural products all over the world. If that is done, these agricultural products, under our lowered tariff, can flood the American market for our Government is obligated to support the price on these markets. This must be done in competition with cheap labor and other production methods in countries all over the world.

Not Among the Ruined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years of Democratic leadership of the Congress and of the Nation, it has been argued that the New Deal has destroyed free enterprise. You continue to hear it in relation to President Truman's Fair Deal. I submit that we could fill the RECORD for many weeks by citing one example after another of the wonderful progress made in this country since the Democrats took control of the Federal Government in 1933.

Because of the frequent criticism lodged against the Democratic administration by the Chicago Tribune, I take this opportunity to extend my remarks and enclose an editorial which appeared in the March 20, 1949, issue of the Journal and Sentinel of Winston-Salem, N. C., showing that this newspaper has faired pretty well:

NOT AMONG THE RUINED

Ever since the Democrats took over the Federal Government back in 1933, the Chicago Tribune has been predicting economic disaster for the United States. In every election for the last 16 years that leading organ of the Republican Party has appealed to the voters to save themselves and the country from the awful financial catastrophe the Democrats were sure to bring upon them.

But now it turns out that during all these frightful years the Chicago Tribune has been thriving and prospering as never before in its history.

In a page advertisement in a New York newspaper the Chicago Republican organ gives some amazing figures. These figures reveal that in 1933, the year the Democrats started the country toward disaster, the Chicago Tribune carried only 15,801,051 lines of advertising. But during the next 5 years, while the Democrats were ruining the country, its advertising business was boosted to 19,206,873 lines in 1938. And in the next 5 years of Democratic inefficiency in Washington, the Tribune's volume of advertising business jumped to 24,263,295 lines. That was in 1943.

But the big news is yet to come. In spite of all the Chicago paper could do, the Democrats continued in power for another 5 years and by the end of that period of ruin the Chicago Tribune's advertising volume had climbed to the unprecedented total of 42,681,608 lines in 1948.

And now the Tribune boasts that in 1948 its advertising business was "the largest ever placed in a year in any newspaper—or any other publication in the world." With its millions of new income as a result of better business under Democrats than it ever enjoyed under Republican administrations, the Chicago Tribune certainly is not among those who have been ruined by the Democrats.

Speaking of Pyramid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration has set an example in pyramiding which perhaps has stirred the passion of the people to try a hand at the game.

Our national debt has been pyramided. The Federal expenses has been pyramided. The Federal pay roll has been pyramided. The President's salary has been pyramided. Federal taxes are to be pyramided. But, lest the people are tempted to go too far in this losing game, I am inserting a warning arising out of an old case of gambling in the State of Tennessee, together with the opinion of Judge Catron.

An act of Tennessee, passed in 1817, declared that any person convicted of gaming or betting upon any games of hazard should be disqualified to hold any office of trust or profit. Smith had been convicted of gaming by lottery and had been fined only $5. The attorney general of Tennessee had moved for a writ of error on the ground that disqualification would be added. In the opinion delivered by Judge Catron in this case,

he thus condemned the practice of gambling:

Like other passions which agitate the great mass of the community it lies dormant until once aroused, and then with the contagion of pestilence it sweeps morals, motives to honest pursuits, and industry into the vortex of vice; unhinges the principles of religion and common honesty; the mind becomes ungovernable and is destroyed to all useful purposes; chances of successful gambling alone are looked to for prosperity in life, even for the daily means of subsistence; trembling anxiety for success in lotteries, at the faro bank, or loo table, exclude all other thoughts.

Expectation is disappointed; more losses are sustained; the highly excited desperate feelings are kindled by drunkenness, from which arises a wretch, with a recklessness and desolation of feeling, that the genius of a Shakespeare or a Milton could not, nor can any man, describe. Swindling, forgery, theft—every crime that extreme necessity and outcast desperation can suggest to a man, lost to all the moral ties, though guarded against, are likely shortly to follow in the train. We ask him who has known the world and the ways of men as they are, not as they should be, are these not truths? Have you seen the poisoned arrow pierce the devoted victim? Have you seen him driven to desperation, and end his misery in self destruction? Have you yourself felt the sting of this deadly poison? If you have known and felt these, you can, and do understand us. Who that has gambled much, and to excess, has not partly seen and felt in a thousand shapes the picture of misery here sketched, presenting instance of mental degradation and agony, melancholy as any with which offended heaven has ever permitted the mind of man to be afflicted?

He who imagines this to be extravagant fancy has never sat at a loo table, dealing at then dollars and forfeiting a hundred for perhaps a week together, or a half week, without sleep or ceasing to play. If he has, when young, he will appreciate the feeling (should his head now be gray) that induces him to look back with awe upon the vices and misfortunes of his youth; he may be marked as the earnest advocate of highly penal statutes, to deter his son from similar outrages upon the laws of God, and the laws of this, and, we could hope, of every civilized land.

Judge Catron served on the Supreme Court of Tennessee from 1824 to 1836 .He served as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court for 28 years.

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of this legislation the question arose as to the discharge requirements for eligibility. I believe that the phrase now in the law and in the bill as reported "other than dishonorable" is the best language, and the language which will permit the greatest equity to be done each individual veteran. Under this language the Veterans' Administration can review those discharges about which there is a question and make a decision on each individual case on its merits. In order that we may have the fullest information on the subject for future record, insert excerpts from the House committee report on the GI bill of 1944 dealing with this subject, as well as pertinent debate in the Senate, together with excerpts from House Report 1510 of the Seventy-ninth Congress dealing with the subject of blue discharges, as well as the present criteria for discharge in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The matters referred to follow:

[H. Rept. 1418, 78th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 1767 (GI bill of rights), May 5, 1944]

Section 1503 amends section 1603 as passed by the Senate and, as amended, requires a discharge or release from active service under honorable conditions as a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under this act or Public Law 2, as amended, but adds a liberalizing provision to the effect that, except as to persons dishonorably discharged, benefits to which a person otherwise would be entitled but for a discharge under other than honorable conditions may be awarded if his service is shown to be otherwise meritorious, honest, and faithful. It is the view of the committee that generally a discharge under honorable conditions should be required as basic entitlement to benefits; but it was shown by testimony of representatives of the service departments, veterans' organizations, and of the Veterans' Administration that instances occur where after long and faithful or otherwise extremely meritorious service a person may receive a discharge other than honorable because of some infraction of the regulations or rules, perhaps in a period of furlough immediately prior to discharge—perhaps a civil offense rather than military. If such offense occasions dishonorable discharge, or the equivalent, it is not believed benefits should be payable. Except upon dishonorable discharge, it is the view of the committee that recognition should be given of meritorious, honest, and faithful service.

[Permanent volume, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3076, March 24, 1944]

SENATE DEBATE ON S. 1767 (GI BILL OF RIGHTS)

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a short time ago I gave the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. CLARK] a letter which I received from Admiral Jacobs, head of the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy. In his letter the admiral called attention to the fact that the language in this bill permits the benefits under it to be extended to persons in the Army and the Navy and the Coast Guard who have been bad conduct dischargees and undesirable dischargees, and he objects to that class of dischargees being given the benefit of this proposed legislation. Will the Senator from Missouri explain why these groups are included in the provisions of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say that I am very familiar with the objections raised by Admiral Jacobs. In my opinion, they are some of the most stupid, short-sighted objections which could possibly be raised. They were objections which were considered very carefully both in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Finance Committee and in the full committee itself. The issue revolves around the question whether we should say, as Admiral Jacobs recommends, that a man must have received an honorable discharge or whether we should say, as the Senate bill provides, "under conditions other than dishonorable conditions."

The point to the whole matter is that in the Army there are what are known as blue discharges, discharges without honor. Such a discharge is not an honorable discharge. It may be issued to men who have had no particular fault other than except, for instance, misstatements about age. A boy may have lied a little about his age, in order to get into the Army. He may have said he was 18 years old, when as a matter of fact he was only 16 or 17 years old. If his father or mother come to the Army and say, "You cannot keep this boy; he lied about his age in order to get into the Army," the commanding officer has no recourse other than to discharge him. If he discharges him, he cannot give him an honorable discharge. Under the regulations, he is bound to give him what is called a blue discharge, a discharge without honor.

In the present war, contrary to what occurred during the last war, I understand that in many cases the Army is giving blue discharges, namely, discharges without honor, to those who have had no fault other than that they have not shown sufficient aptitude toward military service. I say that when the Government drafts a man from civil life and puts him in the military service—most of the causes we are now discussing as to aptitude involve older men—and thereafter, because the man does not show sufficient aptitude, give him a blue discharge, or a discharge without honor, that fact should not be permitted to prevent the man from receiving the benefits which soldiers generally are entitled to.

* * * * *

Mr. President, in the committee we amended this provision in order to give the Veterans' Administration some discretion in the matter. The Veterans' Administration pointed out that as the bill was originally drafted, in the use of the words "other than dishonorable discharge," we opened up the opportunity to such persons as fellows "going over the hill," and those who had been absent without leave, and those who possibly had been guilty of desertion, or who have committed larceny or murder or some other crime, and who had been picked up by the civilian authorities and subsequently convicted of some crime, or possibly sent to jail or to the penitentiary, or who did not receive an honorable discharge for other reasons but were given a blue discharge merely because the Army wanted to get rid of them and did not want to take the trouble to court martial them and give them what they deserved—a dishonorable discharge.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that what we did was to amend that provision by using the words "under other than dishonorable conditions." That does not say "with a dishonorable discharge." That means that under this provision the Veterans' Bureau, if a man's service has been dishonorable, if he has been convicted of larceny or any other crime or has been convicted of chronic drunkenness or anything else one might think of, the Veterans' Administration will have some discretion with respect to regarding the discharge from the service as dishonorable, and that therefore the man involved will be entitled to the benefit of that discretion.

* * * * *

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before we leave this point, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. I wonder if the Senator would not desire to have in the RECORD at this point the statement that the language "conditions other than dishonorable" is not strange language in such legislation? We have used it in some other bills during the present session of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. These are practically the same provisions as the provisions with respect to eligibility in the mustering-out-pay legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The language was drafted by the general counsel for the Veterans' Administration, and the Veterans'

Administration advised the committee that that language had been used in several bills which had been reported from the Military Affairs Committee. It is a well-understood term, and a term which they regard as the most desirable term to use in this situation.

[H. Rept. 1510, 79th Cong.]

CASES IN WHICH BLUE DISCHARGE IS GIVEN ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS

Under existing Army regulations, a discharge of the third type may be given in the following cases:

1. Misconduct: Fraudulent entry into the Army (sec. I AR 615-366, as amended by Changes No. 1, July 24, 1945).

2. Misconduct: Desertion or aggravated absence without leave bordering on desertion, plus physical unfitness for military service (sec. II, AR 615-366). As here used, the term "physical unfitness" means medical or surgical conditions that permanently incapacitate for military service or mental deficiency and constitutional psychopathy that obviously cannot be adapted to military service; but does not include a physical disqualification that is temporary and curable within a reasonable time or a lack of capacity to distinguish between right and wrong.

3. Misconduct: Final conviction by a civil court of an offense the nature of which clearly indicates that the individual is not a suitable person to associate with enlisted men, or of one of the heinous crimes of treason, murder, rape, kidnaping, arson, sodomy, or pandering, or of any crime of sex perversion, or of prostitution, or of any illegal dealing in narcotics or other habit-forming drugs; or imposition by a civil court, upon conviction of any offense, of a sentence for a period in excess of 1 year in a prison or penitentiary (sec. III, AR 615-366).

4. For the convenience of the Government: Where the enlisted man at the time of induction was an alien of any enemy country or a country allied with the enemy, and prior to such induction objected in writing to service in the Army of the United States, and is unwilling to serve in the Army in any capacity (par. 3d, AR 615-365). In this type of case a blue discharge is mandatory.

5. Upon approval by the appropriate authority of the recommendation of a board of officers, convened for the purpose, that the enlisted man be given a blue discharge because of undesirable habits or traits of character (AR 615-368). Under these circumstances, a blue discharge is mandatory. "Undesirable habits or traits of character" are those which render the individual's retention in the service undesirable and because of which his rehabilitation is considered impossible, after repeated attempts to accomplish the same have failed; or those which evidence a psychopathic personality, manifested by antisocial or amoral trends, criminalism, chronic alcoholism, drug addiction, pathological lying, or homosexuality during service, and because of which the individual cannot be rehabilitated to render useful service.

6. Upon approval by the appropriate authority of the recommendation of a board of officers, convened for the purpose, that the enlisted man be given a blue discharge because his service has not been honest and faithful and he is not entitled to a character at least "good" (par. 4 b AR 615-360). Under these circumstances, a blue discharge is mandatory. An enlisted man—otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge because of physical disability (par. 10, AR 615-361, as amended by Changes No. 2, Mar. 1, 1945), or because of minority (sec. II, AR 615-362), or because of dependency (sec. III, AR 615-362) or for the convenience of the Government (AR 615-365), or upon a writ of habeas corpus (AR 615-367)—will be given a blue discharge if the approved proceedings of a board of officers, convened under paragraph 4 *b*, AR 615-360, determines that this service has not been honest and faithful and he is not entitled to a character at least "good." Although paper of a blue color was not employed until 1918, the practice of issuing discharges of this character is one of long standing in the War Department. Blue discharges to the number of 51,936 were issued from December 7, 1941, to June 30, 1945.

With a view to rectifying the mistakes and injustices which can so easily arise in connection with Army discharges, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provided for a Discharge Review Board to be established in the Office of the Secretary of War. To this board appeals may be made, and the board has authority to alter the type of discharge in any case upon which it passes except when a dishonorable discharge is directed by a court martial. How completely the establishment of this review board solves the problem involved will be discussed later.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH AN ENLISTED INDIVIDUAL MAY BE AWARDED A GENERAL DISCHARGE

AR 615-360, May 14, 1947, as amended by Changes No. 1, October 27, 1948:

"The effects of an honorable discharge or a general discharge are identical and entitle an individual so discharged to full rights and benefits. * * * Individuals not qualifying for an honorable discharge will be furnished a general discharge, except as otherwise provided * * * in Army Regulations."

AR 615-361, Medical:

Paragraph 10 (C3 February 23, 1949): "An individual discharged for disability will be furnished either WD AGO Form 55 (honorable discharge) or WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge) in accordance with criteria established in paragraph 1, AR 615-360, except that when disability is because of his own misconduct, a Form 53-58 will be furnished."

Paragraph 24a (May 14, 1947): "An enlisted woman discharged under the provisions of this section (pregnancy) will normally be given a WD AGO Form 55 (honorable discharge) or a WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge). However, nothing in this section shall be construed to make mandatory the honorable or general discharge of an enlisted woman who is not entitled to such a type of discharge."

AR 615-362, Minority and dependency or hardship:

Paragraph 22 (May 14, 1947): "WD AGO Form 55 (honorable discharge) or WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge) will be given in accordance with par. 1c, AR 615-360, notwithstanding the enlistment may have been obtained by misrepresentation as to age or consent of parents or guardian."

Paragraph 31: "WD AGO Form 55 (honorable discharge) or WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge) will be given in accordance with par. 1c, AR 615-360."

AR 615-365, Convenience of the Government:

Paragraph 5a (Oct. 27, 1948): "Unless otherwise directed, WD AGO Form 55 (honorable discharge) or WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge) will be given."

AR 615-367, Resignation:

Paragraph 3d (unconditional resignation): "An unconditional resignation * * * will be accepted under honorable conditions. The individual will be furnished an honorable discharge certificate (WD AGO Form 55) or a certificate of general discharge (WD AGO Form 53-58) depending upon the character of the service rendered."

Paragraph 4a (resignation in lieu of board action): "When recommendation for board action is based upon inaptitude or unsuitability under AR 615-369, the resignation * * * will be accepted under honorable conditions and the individual will be furnished either a certificate of honorable discharge (WD AGO Form 55) or a certificate of general discharge (WD AGO Form 53-58)."

Paragraph 4b: "When the recommendation for board action is based on unfitness under AR 615-368, the resignation will ordinarily be accepted under conditions other than honorable, and the individual will be furnished a certificate of undesirable discharge. The resignation may be accepted under honorable conditions if mitigating circumstances and the character of service so warrant, and a certificate of general discharge (Form 53-58) will be furnished in in such cases."

Paragraph 5a (resignation in lieu of reduction for misconduct or inefficiency): "The resignation will ordinarily be accepted under honorable conditions and the individual will be furnished a certificate of general discharge. In meritorious cases a certificate of honorable discharge may be furnished."

AR 615-368, Unfitness:

Paragraph 1d: "Discharge, if recommended, will be for unfitness, except that discharge because of unsuitability (under AR 615-369 without referral to another board) may be recommended in border-line cases if military circumstances and the character of service rendered by the individual during his current period of service so warrant. As examples, such circumstances would apply where the cause of unfitness has been minor, relative to the length of efficient service or where there has been a definite effort at self-control, or where an individual has, during his current period of service, distinguished himself by an act of heroism which in itself reflected great credit on the individual and the military service."

Paragraph 5: "When discharged because of unfitness, WD AGO Form 53-59 (undesirable discharge) will be furnished. When discharged because of unsuitability WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge) will be furnished."

AR 615-369, Inaptitude or unsuitability:

Paragraph 7: "An individual discharged for inaptitude or unsuitability will be furnished a WD AGO Form 53-58 (general discharge)."

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH AN ENLISTED INDIVIDUAL MAY BE AWARDED AN UNDESIRABLE DISCHARGE

AR 615-365, Convenience of the Government:

Paragraph 5a (October 27, 1948):Only when directed by the Secretary of the Army.

AR 615-366, Misconduct:

Section I. Fraudulent entry into Army; paragraph 6 (December 17, 1948): "An individual who is to be discharged for the commission of a fraud will be given a WD AGO Form 53-55 (undesirable)."

Section II. Physically unfit deserters and absentees, paragraph 10 (December 17, 1948): "Form 53-59 (undesirable) will be used for all discharges under the provisions of this section."

Section III. Deserters from Spanish-American War, World War I, or peacetime deserters in whose case the statute of limitations is applicable, paragraph 14 (December 17, 1948): "Form 53-59 (undesirable) will be used for all discharges under the provisions of this section."

Section IV. Conviction by civil court, paragraph 17 (December 17, 1948): "An individual discharged on account of conviction by a civil court will be given a Form 53-59 (undesirable)."

AR 615-367, Resignation:

Resignation in lieu of board action, paragraph 4b (September 13, 1948): "When unfit under AR 615-368, the resignation, if accepted by the Secretary of the Army, will ordinarily be accepted under conditions other than honorable, and the individual will be furnished a certificate of undesirable discharge, WD AGO Form 53-59 (enlisted record and report of separation—undesirable discharge). The resignation may be accepted under honorable conditions if mitigating circumstances and the character of service so warrant, and a certificate of general discharge (Form 53-58) will be furnished in such cases. A certificate of honorable discharge (Form 55) may be furnished only in exceptionally meritorious cases."

Resignation in lieu of reduction for misconduct or inefficiency, paragraph 5 (September 13, 1948): "If the circumstances of the case and the record made by the soldier in current enlistment so warrant, the resignation may be accepted under conditions other than honorable, and a certificate of undesirable discharge (Form 53-59) furnished."

Resignation for good of service, paragraph 6a (September 13, 1948): "Such resignation, if accepted by the Secretary of the Army, will ordinarily be accepted under conditions other than honorable, and the individual will be furnished a certificate of undesirable discharge (Form 53-59)."

AR 615-368, Unfitness:

Paragraph 5 (October 27, 1948): "When discharged because of unfitness, WD AGO Form 53-59 (undesirable discharge) will be furnished."

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH AN ENLISTED INDIVIDUAL MAY BE AWARDED A BAD-CONDUCT DISCHARGE

An enlisted person will be discharged with a bad-conduct discharge pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general or special court martial imposing a bad-conduct discharge.

DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE

An enlisted person will be dishonorably discharged pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general court martial or military commission imposing dishonorable discharge.

Department of the Navy

[The purpose of this chart is to show the effect of the type of discharge upon possible eligibility to various rights and benefits. No attempt is made to set forth other requirements of eligibility which must be met]

[Guide to chart: Y=yes; N=no]

Rights and benefits of Navy enlisted dischargees	Reference	U. S. Navy Travel Instructions	U. S. Navy Travel Instructions	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. C-10315 (3)	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. C-10315 (1)	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. C-10315 (2)	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. B-2108	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. B-2107	Bu. Pers. Manual, art. C-10503	P. L. 225, 78th Cong.	P. L. 801, 76th Cong.	P. L. 16, 78th Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 783, 76th Cong.; P. L. 759, 80th Cong.	P. L. 359, 78th Cong.	State statutes	Vet. Reg. 1 (A) and P. L. 144, 78th Cong.	Vet. Reg. 1 (A) and P. L. 313, 78th Cong.	P. L. 2, 73d Cong.	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 2, 73d Cong.	P. L. 144, 78th Cong. and Vet. Reg. 1 (A)	P. L. 144, 78th Cong.; P. L. 433, 78th Cong.	Vet. Reg. 9 (A); P. L. 866, 76th Cong.	P. L. 166, 76th Cong.; Vet. Reg. 9 (A)	24 U. S. C. 279	P. L. 346, 78th Cong.	P. L. 526, 80th Cong.	43 U. S. C. 279	State statutes	P. L. 601 79th Cong.
	Benefit	Travel allowance	Transportation in kind	Cash allowance	Issue suit of civilian clothes	Retain and wear uniform	Honorable discharge button	Honorable service lapel button or pin	Certificate of satisfactory service—Navpers 554	Mustering-out pay	National service life insurance	Federal vocational rehabilitation	Apprentice training	Educational rights (GI bill)	Loan guaranty (GI bill)	Employment assistance (GI bill)	Readjustment allowance (GI bill)	Reemployment rights (Selective Service)	Civil service preference, Federal	Civil service, State	Compensation, service-connected disability	Pension for disability not service connected	Hospital care in Veterans' Administration facility	Medical care and prosthetic appliances	Domiciliary care, Federal	Compensation for death due to naval service	Pension for death not due to naval service	Burial allowance, Federal	Burial flags	Headstone or grave marker	Review of discharge	Burial in a national cemetery	Special veterans' rights in homesteading	State bonus	Correction of naval records
Type of Discharge		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
Honorable discharge:																																			
Expiration of enlistment		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Convenience of Government		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dependency		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minority		Y	N[8]	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disability		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
General discharge, under honorable conditions:																																			
Expiration of enlistment		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Convenience of Government		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dependency		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minority		Y	N	Y[6]	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disability		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y[5]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Unsuitability		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Inaptitude		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Undesirable discharge:																																			
Unfitness		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y	N	N	Y[4]	Y
Desertion without trial		N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	N	N	Y[4]	N	N	Y[2]	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y[4]	Y
Fraudulent enlistment		N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y	N	N	Y[4]	Y
Trial and conviction by civil authorities		N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y	N	N	Y[4]	Y
Bad-conduct discharge:																																			
Awarded by summary court martial		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	Y[2]	N	Y	N	N	Y[4]	Y
Awarded by general court martial		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	N	N	N	N	Y[3]	N	N	N	Y[4]	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N[7]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[7]
Dishonorable discharge:																																			
Awarded by general court martial—Sentence immediate or violation of probation		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	N	N	N	N	Y[3]	N	N	N	Y[4]	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N[7]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[7]
Awarded by general court martial—After prison		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y[1]	N	N	N	N	Y[3]	N	N	N	Y[4]	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N[7]	N	N	Y[4]	Y[7]

[1] National service life insurance is forfeited only when the insured is guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion or when because of conscientious objection he refuses to perform services or wear the uniform (P. L. 801, 76th Cong.).

[2] Determination in doubtful cases as to whether the character of discharge is a bar to entitlement is made by Veterans' Administration or other agency administering such benefit. Veteran is eligible if conditions of discharge or release were other than dishonorable.

[3] Such veteran may apply at any State employment service office for assistance in securing a job, but is not eligible for special veterans' services.

[4] In general, a discharge under dishonorable conditions is a bar to State benefits. Details concerning eligibility for this and other State benefits may be obtained from the appropriate State veterans' commissioner.

[5] Veteran forfeits benefit if such discharge is awarded as a result of his own misconduct.

[6] No, unless due to own misconduct, then yes.

[7] Board for the correction of naval records reviews general courts-martial discharges.

[8] See U. S. Navy travel instructions for exceptions.

Source: This chart prepared by: Civil Readjustment Branch, Separation Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, Washington 25, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

TYPES OF DISCHARGE CERTIFICATES FURNISHED TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE AIR FORCE

Honorable discharge, WD AGO Form 55: This form is white in color, and is given when service has been excellent. WD AGO Form 53, Enlisted Record and Report of Separation, which is printed on the reverse side of other discharge certificates, is issued as a separate form, and the reverse side of the Form 55 is left blank.

General discharge, WD AGO Form 53–58: This form is white in color, and is a discharge under honorable conditions. It is given when service is satisfactory, but not excellent. This certificate entitles a veteran to the same veterans' benefits as the Honorable Discharge.

Undesirable discharge, WD AGO Form 53–59: This form is white in color, and is given under conditions other than honorable, where a Bad Conduct or Dishonorable Discharge cannot be given.

Bad conduct discharge, DA AGO Form 53–60: This form is yellow in color, and is given under conditions other than honorable. It is given pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general or special court martial imposing a bad conduct discharge.

Dishonorable discharge, WD AGO Form 53–57: This form is yellow in color, and is a discharge under dishonorable conditions. It is given pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general court martial or military commission imposing dishonorable discharge.

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader, published in Manchester, N. H., under date of March 19, 1949, entitled "The North Atlantic Pact":

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

After 8 months of negotiation, the text of the North Atlantic security alliance has been made public simultaneously in Washington and the capitals of the other participating republics. While the precise provisions of the treaty have been wrapped in secrecy from the start, the general speculations as to the content of the pact have been correct.

The new treaty, marking a significant turning point in American foreign policy, seems destined to rank with the Monroe Doctrine as an historic declaration of this Nation's position in world affairs. In effect, it joins the United States, Canada, and the countries of western Europe into a united front against the expanse of communism and a potent instrument for guaranteeing world peace.

The pact, which must still be approved by the governments of the participating nations, would involve the United States for the first time in peacetime military commitments outside the Western Hemisphere. Its American sanction would mean the end of our traditional antipathy toward international entanglement.

It is expected that the alliance will win ready acceptance by our Senate. The strongest objection was eliminated when Secretary of State Acheson had inserted in the agreement that, while the United States would aid western Europe in repelling aggression, it would take "such action as it deemed necessary, including the use of armed force."

Inclusion of the phrase "such action as it deems necessary" provides the means by which the United States can become a participant in the alliance without relinquishing the constitutional right of Congress to declare war.

Final acceptance of the North Atlantic Pact will mean that the free people of the western world have implemented the documentary agreement their unwritten alliance necessitated by Russia's refusal to cooperate in the maintenance of peace and protection of human rights.

Government Security

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would advise you to take a look at, and read carefully, the Eberstadt report which was made to the Hoover Commission. This is a part of the report that was kept under wraps by the Secretary of War and other governmental agencies, because it was rather critical. It should cause some red faces, and the report could well call for further investigations by Congress.

This report points out that all has not been well in our armed forces and lacks the coordination we had expected to get. I would particularly call your attention to the Central Intelligence Agency that seems to be the most critical in the report.

The National Security Council is the key agency in the entire security structure and on its proper and effective operation depends the whole success of the plan. It has not yet measured up fully to the needs of the Nation. It has not produced a comprehensive statement of current and long-range policies, although there was before the Council, as of November 1, 1948, a paper dealing with the threats that now confront this country, and our objectives with respect to those major threats.

The National Security Council, in its early months, did not grapple with many of the problems that seemed to come squarely within its jurisdiction. The Council was not consulted in the matter of Palestine. While the President has never refused to accept the views of the National Security Council, he has often failed to ask for them. The Council, not being asked for advice, cannot be very effective.

In many instances the different departments of Government seem to undermine the prestige and authority of the National Security Council, not only with the public, but with the other governmental departments by making it seem primarily an organ of the military.

The first step to forming a Central Intelligence System was taken in July 1941, when the Office of Coordinator of Information was established by Executive order, and authorized to collect, analyze, and make available to the appropriate officials, all the information relating to national security. It will be remembered that the National Security Act of 1947 abolished the National Intelligence authority and transferred the functions of the Central Intelligence group to the President's Central Intelligence Agency, generally referred to as CIA. The CIA has great power, great authority and great hopes of being able to coordinate the activities of the other agencies. It has tried to establish working relationships with a new and ambitious State Department Intelligence Branch.

At one time the FBI investigated all prospective CIA employees for security, but due to the pressure of this and other commitments, the FBI has felt obliged to discontinue this service. The FBI, however, cooperates with the CIA on other requests and on special security checks. It seems to me that there ought to be a very close relationship, and a thorough checking of anyone who wants to get into the Central Intelligence Agency, which is a highly secretive and sensitive part of our protection here in the United States.

It will be recalled that there has been much newspaper, some official, and much unofficial, criticism of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA is spread around in 22 separate buildings, including warehouses, all of which must be maintained and serviced separately. Moreover, CIA maintains a large number of field stations of one sort or another in various parts of the United States and abroad, which are supplied by the administrative divisions. It would seem that a reduction in the administrative overhead is possible and desirable. There is some evidence of interference of administrative functions in matters of primarily operational concern. A certain amount of such interference is inevitable due to the fact that the Director will tend to entrust the enforcement of budgetary controls to his immediate administrative representatives. Too much of this interference is undesirable and this is an administrative problem which must be solved internally. The Central Intelligence Agency has fallen short of its objective. While it has made some progress in organization and equipping itself, its work, however valid, does not presently enjoy the full confidence of the National Security Council. It does not enjoy the confidence of other agencies it serves and has not, with the exception of a few encouraging exceptions, played an important role in the administration of the National Security Council.

The committee recommended that it was properly located under the National Security Council; that its organization needs continuing careful attention, and that better working relations with other agencies must be established.

The committee emphasizes a truism, that good intelligence depends upon good personnel. CIA must have imaginative and vigorous supervision. The committee is certain that the Director of the CIA must have continuity of tenure and should be selected primarily on the basis of competence, but that other things being equal it would be preferable he be a civilian.

There does not seem to be a very close relationship between the CIA and the field of scientific, including medical, intelligence. In order to make it work successfully, there must be skilled and experienced personnel in the Agency. In the selection and placement of new personnel, this has been extremely haphazard. In one of the services, intelligence systems, and headquarters in Washington no Russian linguist is now permitted to be permanently employed. In Germany the conduct of the Army's counterintelligence corps, a highly important part of intelligence work, became notorious. The personnel assigned to it had no qualifications for the work and was often of inadequate caliber. The Army's remedy for this situation was not to improve personnel selection and training, but to order all CIA personnel to wear uniforms, live in barracks, and report for regular Army meals. Under such a regime they were expected to keep in contact with the local population and to catch spies. Of course, that is ridiculous.

It seems, from the report, that choice intelligence berths in the services have often been assigned to officers, not particularly wanted by other arms or branches. The capable, experienced, and thoroughly qualified and devoted personnel, who have specialized in intelligence, have too often seen their organizations and their systems ruined by superior officers who have no experience, little capacity, and no imagination. In the committee's opinion it is highly important that an intelligence corps be provided by the services and good training be established.

While it is to be assumed that intelligence can best flourish in the shade of silence, if it is not subjected to scrutiny it can easily stagnate. This service ought to be examined every 2 or 3 years, either by a congressional watchdog committee or by some other group.

The committee reports that the greatest need in CIA is an establishment, at a high level, of a small group of highly capable people, free from the administrative detail, to concentrate upon intelligence evaluation. The Director and his assistants have had to devote so large a portion of their time to administration, that they have been unable to get sufficient time to analyze and evaluate reports. A small group of mature men, of the highest talents, having their full access to all information, might well be released from routine and set to thinking about intelligence only. Many of the greatest failures in intelligence, has not been failure in collection, but failure in analyzing and properly evaluating correctly the information made available.

Vigorous action is imperative to improve all facilities for evaluating and stimulating the collection of scientific intelligence. Outside the field of atomic energy this must be done by increasing the authority and support given by the officials responsible for scientific development within CIA.

The CIA and the FBI and all intelligence services have suggested revision of the Nation's espionage laws to reduce the difficult legal burdens of securing convictions under present statutes, and I hope that Congress takes some action relative to this weak link in our present legal handling of Communists and other espionage activities. Detailed suggestions for revision of the present law, which would permit conviction, irrespective of proof of intent to injure the Government, probably will be presented some time during this Congress. I am of the firm opinion that there must be major improvements in all of our intelligence services if this country is to have proper protection. This cannot be achieved overnight. Time is required to build a good intelligence service. A proper selection of personnel and a well thought out program for their assignment and travel are essential.

Now a word about the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This group is going through some remodeling and overhauling under the direction of General Eisenhower. It seems to me that if America is to have proper protection, there must be closer coordination of all of its activities, including its publicity releases. It was rather interesting to note that just recently the Secretary of Defense has designated a single individual to handle all of the news releases that might go out. The country knows that some releases went out, showing detailed secrets of the atomic bomb, and detailed information about some of the other activities being carried on by one branch or another of our services. It does seem to me there ought to be a close strategic planning if the various agencies designed to protect our internal security are to perform the roles and missions which Congress assigned to them.

It is my opinion that the work already produced by the Central Intelligence Agency is by no means adequate to our Nation's safety in the age of cold war and of the atomic bomb. It seems to me that the physical organization of the country's intelligence system should be made effective. I can understand why the Secretary kept the Eberstadt report from being made public because it was very critical of what has been presently going on in the several branches of the Government.

The report stated that in Germany the conduct of the Army's Counterintelligence Corps was almost notorious, partly because of the inadequate personnel which had been assigned to this service. There were men of inadequate caliber; they had no special qualifications or training, and certainly a highly sensitized and developed agency as a central intelligence agency must have the finest men available. You cannot assign the choice berths in an intelligence agency to officers not particularly wanted by other branches of the service. We ought to be concerned over the inadequacies of our intelligence service. The vital importance of reliable, up-to-date scientific information is such as to call for far greater efforts than appear to have been devoted to this need in the past. Scientists in general have expressed considerable distress at the difficulty and the lack of information available, and the relationship between science and the Agency do not seem to be good.

I come to these conclusions because of my recent visit to Panama Canal. I had felt that our Central Intelligence Agency, and the other agencies, while they had joint meetings and were apparently working together, it was rather difficult to analyze and get the information channeled through so that it would be reliable and definitely understood. Mr. Hoover, in his report, recently pointed out that war almost came into being a few months ago because of some inaccurate reporting by the intelligence agencies overseas; that a great catastrophe could have taken place had we relied upon one intelligence report given at that time.

The Commission said it is of the opinion that there must be improvement in all intelligence services. So I am hopeful that with the regulations and the new bills which we pass and the further consolidation of the military activities we will be in a position to see that all intelligence agencies are properly coordinated so that the people of this country may get the protection they deserve. Take the old question of Pearl Harbor. Apparently our agencies were not working together at that time. At least, the information was not properly evaluated. It is past history, but we ought to profit by the mistakes that have been made. So I am hopeful that Members of Congress will read this Eberstadt report and become familiar with the workings of our Intelligence Department in this country and support legislative measures which will make these departments more effective. We can then get more for the dollar we are spending in the protection of our country.

Wood Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, since entering Congress I have consistently urged the spending of Federal funds to employ chemists and scientists to search for new uses for wood waste.

Today, 57 percent of the wood in all trees that are cut down by loggers goes to waste, either in the woods or in manufacturing and milling processes. The amount of wood that goes to waste annually, according to the United States Chief Forester, amounts to 109,000,000 tons. This is the equivalent of 2,500,000 carloads. If we can find commercial uses for this wood waste, hundreds of thousands of new jobs will be created in American forest-product industries, thereby adding greatly to employment and national prosperity.

It seems to me good business for the Federal Government to spend reasonable sums of money to discover new products that will create new pay rolls, for out of increased pay rolls will come greater prosperity and enlarged sources of Federal taxes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by E. M. Hockensmith from the Elks magazine that tells how

chemistry is creating new products out of waste wood. The article follows:

THE CHEMIST CRIES "TIMBER!"

(By E. M. Hockensmith)

The cry of "Timber-r-r!" no longer heralds the crash of giant trees, the salty lore of lumberjacks, the scream of saws.

Wood has moved into the orbit of the chemist and has begun to reveal secrets which prove that the most abundant and the most wasted raw material in the world is likewise the stuff with the most amazing possibilities.

You can now eat and drink wood, wear it in the form of a wool coat or felt hat, rayon dress or stockings, and make blankets and curtains from it. From wood comes synthetic rubber, plastic radio cabinets, high-octane fuel for cars, vanillin flavoring, explosives, photographic film, cellophane, and lacquer.

The list seems almost endless. An estimated 4,500 different products are now created from wood. During the war, wood disappeared daily into weird chemical digesters and emerged as Army clothing, gunpowder, glycerine, plastics, alcohol, linings for gasoline tanks, cord for heavy-duty tires, and light-weight paratrooper uniforms.

While wood has been playing these radically new parts, it has also been taking seven-league strides in its old role as furniture. When little Johnny finds a sharp nail and tries to draw a picture on mamma's gleaming table, not a scratch will show. Soft wood can now be made far harder than the hardest oak or maple. Other chemicals make wood resistant to fire, termites, water, acid, or alcohol. By impregnating wood with certain chemicals, it can be permanently and solidly infused with any beautiful color to match rugs, draperies, or walls.

Housewives need never again become irritated because doors and drawers stick in damp weather or rattle during dry spells. The new transmuted wood retains its shape regardless of humidity. A special treatment softens wood to a rubberlike state so that it can be bent into any shape, tied into knots, or kneaded like bread dough. When it dries, the wood is as hard as iron.

In tomorrow's houses, public buildings, and factories, nearly everything from walls to kitchen sinks may have wood both as veneer and base material. Thin sheets of wood, no wider than one forty-eighth of an inch, can be cemented to steel, aluminum, or other sheet metal, and the combination bent, cut, and stamped.

You will see this woodfaced metal in paneling for walls in offices and homes, airplane cabins, streamlined trains, and even automobiles. And, to reverse the process, a thin, stainless steel glued to a birch plywood base can make a modern kitchen sink that will be dentproof and lighter than the usual sort at about three-fifths the cost.

These magical transformations of wood are achieved by various devices. To prevent doors or drawers from sticking or shrinking, the trick is to combine with the natural wood one of the new kinds of plastics, also often made from wood. This material, known by the jawbreaking title of methylolurea, is really very simple. It's a white solid, soluble in water, and is made of ammonia (the ordinary kitchen cleaner), carbon dioxide (which you exhale every few seconds), and methanol (the nondrinkable wood alcohol as it used to be when it was made from wood). Incidentally, don't confuse alcohol made from wood and wood alcohol. They are two entirely different products.

When wood is soaked under pressure in a solution of this methylolurea, there is formed within it hard and water-insoluble resins which take up residence in the wood cells and even in the cell walls. Heated at this stage, the wood can be twisted and bent into any shape desired, which is held permanently when cooled.

One of the most astonishing things about all this is that nearly all of these new products come from wood wastes. We can have our cake and eat it too, or, more accurately, we can have our lumber and all these other things also. The amount of wood waste we have been happily tossing into the trash can is enough to make one gasp. Here are the figures:

Loss from forest fire and disease, 15 percent; logging and fuel waste, 24 percent; manufacturing waste, 34 percent. This makes a total waste of 73 percent and leaves only 27 percent as finished products.

"The chemist," said Mr. Chapin Collins, of the American Forest Industries, Inc., "is the man who deserves the credit for these new wood miracles. To a chemist a tree is much more than leaves, bark, and wood. He knows that a tree is composed of two main substances: First, cellulose, consisting of long hairlike fibers which make up 60 to 80 percent of the wood. The second is lignin."

If you don't know what lignin is, think nothing of it—the best chemists in the world don't know either. They say that lignin is a mysterious element which holds the fibers of the cellulose together and gives to wood its woodiness. Every year, for many years, more than two million tons of lignin dissolved in 5,400,000,000 gallons of dark briny-looking liquid were flushed out of the mills and sluiced into the nearest rivers and streams. Now, every effort is being made to conserve this valuable, mysterious substance.

Although we haven't found out what the darned stuff is, we have gone right ahead using lignin as a valuable rubber extender, in plastics, and as a mix for commercial fertilizers. From a ton of wood waste can be made 50 to 60 gallons of ethyl alcohol (seriously needed for synthetic rubber).

Cellulose, less mysterious than its twin sister, lignin, has for some years been extracted from wood and transformed into molasses, rayon, cellophane, imitation leather, sugar, and paper. An acre of yellow pine trees will produce five times as much cellulose as will an acre of cotton, even though the cotton boll is almost pure cellulose. The paper of this page was made from wood cellulose.

Now we get around to the idea of eating wood. In the past, if wood was considered in terms of food it was dismissed as nothing more than a tasty dish for termites. Not so today. Now, human beings eat wood both as carbohydrates and proteins.

Corn syrup comes from wood sugar. Wood sugar can also be refined into sugar granules, used as molasses, or fermented and distilled into grain alcohol. Some German schnapps and much of Sweden's famous aquavit started life as wood.

Wood glucose makes yeast which, in turn, can be converted into a wood "steak"—common fare in Swedish restaurants.

The process of changing wood into food is relatively simple. When certain acids are applied to wood they have the effect of separating the lignin from the cellulose and transforming the cellulose into wood sugar. They call this hydrolysis.

Wood sugar in its natural form is the kind of glucose (a sweet compound not quite as sweet as cane sugar) which may be changed into practically any other carbohydrates, which are basic energy foods, from starch to solid or liquid fuel.

Protein, in one of the most concentrated and durable forms, is obtained by producing yeast from wood glucose. This yeast contains 55 percent pure protein—as much as good beef.

Proteins, as everyone knows, are a vital element in human and in most animal nutrition. Lack of them results in flabby muscles and lowered resistance against disease. This is the chief reason why in every war the tuberculosis death rate rises sharply.

Germany, forced by lack of raw materials, has led the way in production of wood protein. Her annual production prior to VE-day was more than 100,000 tons, enough for the protein ration for the entire German Army. And it was swiftly being increased to care for the nutritional needs of the working population drafted from farms to the munitions factories.

Although our chemists have now forged ahead of all others in the world in this business of transforming wood into food, at the start of World War II European factories were far in the lead with more than a score running full speed in wood hydrolysis. All over Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, central Europe, and the Balkans, factories had been built and were producing sugar from wood waste, chiefly sawdust. That old phrase "tasteless as sawdust" has lost its meaning.

The use of wood as cattle food is probably one of its most valuable services, current world shortages being what they are. Not only does raw sugar, molasses, and protein yeast manufactured from sawdust enrich straw and other low-grade animal fodders, but it has been found that overcooked wood cellulose forms a white powder almost equal in nutritive value to oats. More than 1,000,000 tons of such ersatz fodder were manufactured last year in Scandinavia, replacing some 40,000,000 bushels of imported oats.

Almost as fantastic as the idea of eating wood is the proposition of wearing it. Nevertheless, a Cinderella of the forests may be lurking in the coat or felt hat you are wearing. That grim old witticism about wooden overcoats is as out of date as a hoop skirt. Fibers fully as good as the wool from sheep can now be obtained from trees.

In the bark of some of the giant redwoods or Sequoia trees of California there is fiber that can be used to replace 15 to 60 percent of the wool used in some fabrics. A combination is frequently used, as the short, kinky redwood fibers blend readily with sheep wool.

The newest project in this field is rayon wool, which of course was stepped up by the tremendous military demand for wool. The main problem the chemists ran into was to duplicate the crinkliness and elasticity that form the air pockets and make wool such a good insulator. Their next worry was to develop a resilience that would restore itself after the wool had been laundered. Both difficulties were successfully overcome.

Wood rayon has made swift progress and can now be spun in dozens of forms which do a better job than any other fibers ever have in such useful articles as linings, self-sealing gas tanks, and tire fabrics that save 30 percent of the rubber.

Turning from the chemical miracles to the physical conversions of wood, we discover that a whole new vocabulary has sprung into being as a result of the new processes of wood. Compreg, impreg, papreg, staypak, sandwich wood, plywood, and laminated wood are among the new words we will be hearing more and more often in coming months.

Up to now we've heard more about plywood, because of its great success in the manufacture of airplanes. Plywood is made by sandwiching sheets of wood together, each sheet laid crosswise to the grain of the one next to it. Bound together with water and weatherproof synthetic resin, plywood can be molded into all kinds of shapes—from hinges, lighting fixtures, and all-wood washboards to furniture springs, car bumpers, mail boxes, and wood culvert pipes for roads.

The secret of plywood's incredible strength is redistribution, which makes plywood vastly

superior to plain wood of the same dimensions. Wing materials for Mosquito bombers and hulls for PT boats were made of plywood because under fire of machine guns and even larger weapons, the adhesion of the layers is so strong that they do not separate.

One thousand freight cars of plywood, lighter than conventional steel frames, were constructed by the Great Northern Railroad to carry wartime traffic. These cars weighed 2 tons less than all-steel cars and they also permitted the operation of trains at considerably higher speeds. Plywood tubing or pipe conducts chemicals which would corrode metals. It is used for radio masts because of its lightness and strength.

Housewives are sure to bless "compreg," which is a processed wood with a shining, extremely hard surface. Spilled cocktails, that bane of existence for many hostesses, cannot harm compreg. You will soon see it in fine furniture, tables, the tops of bars, and flooring.

"Compreg" is made by compressing or squeezing together layers of resin-impregnated wood. The raw resin actually penetrates the wood cells—a feat that chemists worked long and hard to master. At this point it's called "impreg" and is practically swellproof, shrinkproof, and decay proof. Sheets of this "impreg" are stacked together and made into "compreg" by being compressed before the resin has set. The result is a hard, dense, dark substance with a beautiful grain showing through a permanent gloss like that of polished marble.

"Compreg" is perfect for airplane propellers because it can be made to give a balance which is impossible in a metal part. It stays exactly "as is" even when it's been under water a long time.

Laminated wood is an especial boon to shipbuilders. It's made by gluing together layers of wood with the grain of all layers running in the same direction.

Before laminated wood made its welcome appearance, shipbuilders had to hunt through the forests until they found a tree big enough to make a beam as large as they needed. No longer is wood-ship design limited by the size of trees. By lamination a large beam can be formed by joining a number of small pieces. Wood laminating, using small pieces of lumber, permits the building of keels, stems, and stern members all in one piece, bonded together as strongly as the natural wood itself.

Churches and other monumental structures are using it also, because everything from straight beams through gracefully sweeping curves to pointed Gothic arches is possible and practical in laminated wood.

"Papreg" is laminated paper which is lighter and stronger than most metals. Besides its great strength, it resists moisture and denting. Householders are soon going to find it serving them in many ways, especially in insulating their refrigerators. It's a better insulator and takes up much less space.

"Sandwich wood" gets its name from the fact that one kind of wood is used for the core and another for the surface. Our bombers, which gave Japan such a drubbing prior to VJ-day, were made of sandwich wood.

Strange things go into the glues which hold these woods together. The dried casein of milk, which is water resistant, and blood albumins are the main items of the development of gluing techniques. These are mixed with synthetic resins.

"It is easy to see that we are standing on the brink of an immense industrial development of wood waste," says M. O. Chenoweth, representative of the American Forest Products Industries. "For a long time, virtually every manufactured product was made out of wood. It is the oldest utilitarian product known to man. Then in recent prewar years, the lumber industry had to take a back seat because of the sharp competition of steel, concrete, and other manufactured materials.

"Wood waste was taken for granted because forests were thought of as inexhaustible. Forest fires were actually hailed at one time in our history as God's way of clearing farm land."

And yet, despite all our prodigal waste, we still have nearly 462,000,000 acres of forest land, of which Uncle Sam owns 26 percent, farmers 30 percent, small industries 29 percent, and large industries 15 percent.

The Federal Government is encouraging a program of reforestation and skillful logging to see to it that lumber supplies become constant, and tree growth is actually on the increase today for the first time in history.

Out of these great forests, via the fabulous magic of the test tube, a new industrial miracle is definitely on the way. This new industry will not be lumber, nor plywood, nor paper, nor chemicals. Rather it will be the welding of them all into the greatest forest industry that has ever been known. And the wonder of it will be that the waste of one will be the raw material of another, until virtually every atom of the tree will emerge as a useful product.

Veterans' Pension Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution of the Tacoma Post, No. 1, AMVETS:

Whereas legislation is now pending before Congress that would provide generous pensions to all veterans of certain age without regard to their physical or financial status; and

Whereas cost of this pension bill over the years has been estimated to be in excess of $100,000,000,000; and

Whereas we believe such legislation not to be in the best interest of the Nation or its veterans since its tremendous cost would gravely impair the Nation's economic and financial structure; and

Whereas we believe the passage of this legislation would greatly impair the enactment in the future of any legislation that may be needed by veterans at that time; and

Whereas the national executive committee of our organization has strongly denounced this measure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Tacoma Post, No. 1, AMVETS, in meeting assembled this 16th day of March 1949 do hereby oppose the passage of this veterans' pension measure and declare it to be inconsistent with the best interests of our country and our veterans; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Member of Congress from the Sixth District of Washington, and to our Senators, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and the Honorable HARRY P. CAIN, and to our AMVET national headquarters.

Adopted March 16, 1949:

KITTY FLETCHER,
Adjutant, Tacoma Post, No. 1,
AMVETS, Tacoma, Wash.
By H. R. KESTER.

Save the Soil by Which We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1949, I introduced in the House of Representatives the Soil Conservation Act of 1949. This new bill, H. R. 2368—a revised and improved soil-conservation program based on H. R. 4417, which I introduced in 1947—provides for lasting benefits to the farmer and to every American.

This legislation provides a national land policy, and the legislative framework for the effective administration of a United States Department of Agriculture soil-conservation program that will assist our farmers and ranchers to conserve and make proper use of their soil and water resources—and will get the job done in the shortest possible time.

In addition, there are provisions which will help to correct the problem of surplus in certain crops. Land-use-conversion payments will encourage farmers to use some of the land contributing to such surplus for the production of crops for which there is greater demand, such as grass for meat and dairy livestock and timber. When the proper and necessary changes in land use are made I am sure there will be no need for acreage allotments. In bringing about a balance in agriculture production the Government will be better enabled to support farm prices permanently at a full 90 percent of parity.

By using about $100,000,000 annually of the funds now being used for soil conservation payments, for land-use-conversion payments, as provided in my bill, 24,000,000 acres of land could be converted from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops in the next 6 years. This would bring our food, feed, grain, fiber, and meat production into better balance, and greatly assist in flood prevention, and soil, woodland, and water conservation.

Conservation payments and grants-in-aid are provided in such manner that the taxpayer can be assured that the Nation will receive a dollar's worth of benefits in true, effective soil conservation for every dollar spent. Farmers receive more responsibility in administering their own national soil and water conservation program. No new agencies are established. The Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Production and Marketing Administration are each given more responsibility and without duplication.

If H. R. 2368 becomes the law of the land it will begin to bring "soilicide" to an end, the crime too often committed against the priceless topsoil of Mother Earth. It will insure a more stable income for our farmers, which in turn will insure an adequate and stable income for workers, business, and industry. It

will be an effective program to help reduce price-depressing surpluses; increase the speed and quality of soil-conservation work in the Nation, while strengthening the farmer-managed institutions engaged in such work; keep more rainfall on the land where it falls, and thus lower flood crests and reduce reservoir sedimentation; give better protection of our rich agricultural uplands and bottom lands, human lives, livestock, and buildings; save the taxpayers'—your—money through a more efficient and effective farmer-managed water, woodland, and soil-conservation program; provide the legislative and administrative framework to put our agricultural house in order—for any national or international emergency.

NATIONAL LAND POLICY

A productive and prosperous agriculture is a must for the Nation's prosperity. The wealth of our Nation is wholly dependent upon the productivity of our soil. As the topsoil is destroyed or weakened through erosion or overuse, the productive capacity of that land is lowered. Food costs rise and a lowered standard of living results. This legislation provides that we use our agricultural land within its capability for safe production, and that we treat each acre in accordance with its needs.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION SURVEY

Early completion of a Nation-wide survey of our farm, ranch, and woodlands to determine the productive capacity and conservation needs of each acre is provided. A land capability map shall then be made available to each landowner, showing how each acre should be used according to its capabilities for safe production.

CONSERVATION TIMETABLE

A conservation timetable shall be developed as a guide to the Nation in determining the speed with which our farm, ranch, and woodlands should be treated to prevent further extensive damage.

SOUND FARM UNITS

H. R. 2368 will assist landowners in acquiring acreage to complete a profitable farm, and thus reduce much land overuse resulting from uneconomic-size units.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical help for effecting proper land use and conservation treatment shall be made available to all farmers. Inside conservation districts, technical help shall include on-site assistance to plan and apply a properly coordinated conservation program. Until a district is organized, such help shall be limited to helping farmers carry out the more simple but effective conservation practices.

CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

To encourage proper use and conservation of our agricultural resources, land-use conversion, soil conserving, and soil-building payments and grants-in-aid shall be made available.

Class A: To avoid surpluses resulting from overuse of the land, payments shall be made to assist farmers in converting the use of land that has been for the previous 2 or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops. This will encourage a balanced production of food, feed, grains, and fiber, and promote a greater production of meat and dairy livestock, and timber crops.

Class B: Payments shall be made to help farmers defray the cost of applying certain permanent or semipermanent soil and water conservation measures. Generally, such payments shall be made only once.

Class C: As an added incentive to encourage farmers to hold their topsoil through proper land use, and other soil and water conservation practices, class C payments may also be made annually for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility.

LOCAL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND FARMER COMMITTEES

This legislation recognizes that farmers themselves are best qualified to administer their own national conservation program on a local and community level. Farmer-voted conservation districts organized under the laws of respective States and directed by their respective boards of soil-conservation commissioners and supervisors, and county agricultural conservation association, and State Production and Marketing Administration committees shall be the principal farmer-managed organizations through which the Government shall assist farmers with their soil and water conservation problems.

AGENCIES TO BE USED

Primarily, three governmental agencies shall carry out the provisions of this act. Each is well schooled in the art of doing its part in soil and water conservation.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Because it is impractical to separate the technical, conservation payment, and grants-in-aid assistance in soil conservation, erosion control, drainage, irrigation, water-conservation development, and flood prevention on farm and ranch land, the Soil Conservation Service shall be responsible for all such provisions of this act, except for the specific responsibilities of County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production Marketing Administration committees.

EXTENSION SERVICE

This legislation provides for the needed personnel for county extension staffs for educational work in conservation districts and in areas critically in need of conservation treatment not now in conservation districts.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production and Marketing Administration committees shall be the agents of the Secretary of Agriculture in making all class A, B, and C conservation payments.

FEDERAL LANDS

With cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction, all of the conservation survey, timetable, and technical assistance provisions of this act may be made available for the conservation of federally controlled lands.

We must save the soil by which we live. Rich productive soil will insure the survival of America.

The Phony Culture Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

THE PHONY CULTURE CONFERENCE
(By George S. Counts)

For some days the newspapers have carried dispatches announcing a Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace to be held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City March 25–27. The conference is sponsored by the National Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and is called in the name of Prof. Harlow Shapley, eminent Harvard astronomer.

On the surface it would seem that this conference should be welcomed by all men and women of good will. The words are well-chosen. Who but the most benighted could object to a meeting of the representatives of culture and science from many countries dedicated to world peace? And a great scientist could not go wrong in any field, however remote from his sphere of professional competence.

But if one looks beneath the surface, one sees much more than meets the eye at first glance. First, one sees that the conference is sponsored by the National Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, an organization having a long record of following the Communist Party line and of springing to the defense of Soviet foreign policy on every occasion.

Second, one sees that the most distinguished representatives of American art, letters, science, and philosophy have been overlooked in the organization of the program. It would seem that political rather than cultural and scientific qualifications might have governed the selection of speakers.

Third, one hears that a Soviet delegation of five, headed by Alexander Fadeev is to be invited. At this point, one is reminded that the World Congress of Leaders of Culture in Defense of Peace which met in Wroclaw, Poland, last August was dominated by the Communist parties of the world, and was addressed on the first day by this same Alexander Fadeev, who spoke on the subject Science and Culture for Peace, Progress, and Democracy. According to the account in Pravda, the speaker was frequently interrupted by the tumultuous applause of the delegates. In its regard for truth, this address was a perfect specimen of party literature and set the tone of the gathering from the first day to the last. The congress itself constituted an effort to create the most gigantic Communist front in the history of the party.

Except for window dressing provided by a number of wholly innocent and eminently respectable American citizens, the projected conference in New York appears to be a continuation of the Wroclaw Congress under superficially changed auspices. The Congress was neither representative of the intellectuals of the countries involved nor devoted to the cause of peace, except on purely Soviet terms. In fact, it was Communist inspired and dedicated to a bitter attack on the United States and the glorification of everything Soviet. The American people, therefore, should have this gathering recalled to their minds at this time.

Alexander Fadeev is the general secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers. He was elevated to this post in 1946 as a result of a

savage attack on Soviet literature and literary writers by the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party in a resolution issued on August 14 of that year. This resolution was followed by others which purged the entire cultural life, from humor to science, of all cosmopolitans and antipatriots and of the last vestige of friendly attitude toward the west in general and the United States in particular. Mr. Fadeev, known for his ruthless adherence to the party line, is the symbol and the agent of this policy. He is undoubtedly an anticosmopolitan and patriot of the most extreme type.

In his address in Poland he delivered an attack on America which in falsehood and invective surpasses the best efforts of Molotov and Vishinsky. The 32 American delegates, except for a few sublimely courageous souls, applauded the speech and subsequently played an active role in organizing the conference to be held in New York. Among those few who dissented and who expressed their dissent at the time, President Bryn J. Hovde, of the New School for Social Research, merits the plaudits of honest men everywhere.

Those who are organizing, sponsoring, and participating in the conference at the end of March should be asked to reveal their stand without equivocation on the speech by Fadeev and the entire proceedings of the congress. If they know nothing about these events, they are innocent far short of the call of the duty of an intellectual who mixes in world affairs. A few excerpts from the speech, as published in the August 29 issue of Pravda, will make clear the propriety of such a request. In the following passages Mr. Fadeev, amid "tumultuous applause," pins the Fascist label on the Government of the United States:

"And now, only 3 years after the defeat of Hitler's Germany, we scientists, writers, and artists are obliged to gather again, troubled by the activity of the warmongers. The imperialists of that country, whose facade by the irony of fate is adorned by the Statue of Liberty, have taken upon themselves in great haste the role of conspirators and organizers of a new war. * * *

"After the Second World War, the entire world was divided into two camps: the democratic, antifascist, antiimperialist camp led by the Soviet Union, and the antidemocratic, reactionary, imperialist camp led by the ruling circles of the United States of America.

"The geographic map gives no semblance of a correct conception of these two camps, because the line of division passes through the interior of each of the capitalist countries, through every city and village—through New York as well as London, through Paris as well as Rome, through Brussels as well as Rio de Janeiro. Each camp has its own program, its own aims and tasks."

In this last paragraph the speaker was undoubtedly uttering the literal truth. At any rate, wherever a cell of the Communist Party exists, the Soviet Union has loyal citizens. The recent professions of such loyalty by Maurice Thorez, Palmiro Togliatti, Harry Pollitt, Otto Grotewohl, Eugene Dennis, and William Z. Foster should make this clear even to the members of the National Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and above all to Professor Shapley.

In his attack on America, Mr. Fadeev employs the device of quoting from unnamed persons. The following judgment attributed to a Swedish journalist, he says, "can be acknowledged as entirely just":

"Patented religions, standardized literary ideals, theater, and moving pictures, sport jargon, endless novels, and street songs all beginning with Christian doctrine and ending with shivering American swing—this modern Saint Vitus dance is all, absolutely all, we get now from America."

Mr. Fadeev quotes approvingly an account of the condition of civil liberties in America by one of the prominent leaders of American culture who is obliged to conceal his name:

"Men whom we call the staff of big business have thrown all their forces against us; and after 2 years of savage propaganda unequaled as yet in any other country of the world, the American intelligentsia finds itself facing the threat of cold terror. * * * Henceforth in the United States the expression of any thought which might be regarded as dangerous will be punished with 10 years in prison, a fine of $10,000, and deprivation of American citizenship. * * *

"A writer who writes anything dissenting from the official policy of the Government of the United States is also threatened with 10 years in prison. This rude violence, this mad effort to impose fascism on America by legal means, is the answer of reaction to the growing strength of the people's movement in our country."

Morris Ernst, a distinguished American lawyer who has given much of his life to the defense of the civil liberties in the United States, gives the following professional opinion on this statement:

"There is absolutely no truth in the statement that 'expression of any thought which might be regarded as dangerous will be punished with 10 years in prison, a fine of $10,000, and deprivation of citizenship.'

"I am quite clear that there has never been any sanction imposed such as indicated in the quote. Furthermore there never has been a law permitting the deprivation of American citizenship except on the ground that the citizenship was obtained through fraud.

"I don't know how to answer the statement that a writer who writes anything dissenting from the official policy of the Government is threatened with 10 years in jail. I assume this thought occurred to Fadeev because he cannot believe that in a democracy like ours, there can be no single governmental defined policy. Needless to say, there has never been a statute in our history which places in a penal area anyone dissenting from the official policy of the Government."

Mr. Fadeev places Eugene O'Neil, Henry Miller, John Dos Passos, and other American and European writers in the "motley literary crew of reaction" of the warmongers. Then in the language of party literature he proceeds to summation:

"German Fascists needed beasts. American monopolists find beasts indispensable for the realization of their plans for world domination. Reactionary writers, scientists, philosophers, and artists are ready to serve their masters. They place on a pedestal schizophrenics and drug addicts, sadists, and pimps, provocateurs and monsters, spies and gangsters. These beast-like creatures fill the pages of novels, volumes of poetry, casts of moving pictures. They are presented as heroes to be emulated, as examples to be followed.

"If jackals could learn to use the typewriter and hyenas could master the fountain pen, they no doubt would write just like Henry Miller, Eliot, Malraux, and other Sartrists."

The general secretary of the union of Soviet writers endeavors ingratiatingly to identify two distinguished American writers with Soviet aims and methods without their consent. These two men, Sinclair Lewis and Upton Sinclair, have devoted their lives to the exposure of stupidity, injustice, and cruelty in their own country, something that no Russian writer would dare to do for the Soviet Union.

Mr. Fadeev quotes approvingly, and with the suggestion that it supports Soviet practices, the following statement from Mr. Lewis: "An artist or a scientist must know and loudly declare whether he stands on the side of tyranny, cruelty, and mechanical obedience, or on the side of the people, of all the people."

When given an opportunity to read the Fadeev address, Mr. Lewis acknowledged the substantial correctness of the quotation and then added: "But, of course, it places me not as standing for the Soviet Union and its hysterical crusade but against it and its 'tyranny and mechanical obedience.' "

Mr. Fadeev included Mr. Sinclair in a list of the finest writers, artists, and scientists of the capitalist world who invariably have become friends of the USSR—the whole flower of world culture. After reading the entire address, the American writer asked that the following response be published without deletion:

"Either Mr. Fadeev has not read my books, or they have been incorrectly translated in their Russian editions. For 47 years I have been advocating free, democratic socialism, to be obtained by the method of education and persuasion under our American system of government by popular consent. I defended the right of the Russian people to choose their own form of government, but that was when I believed that they would be given the right to choose. I accepted Lenin's promise that the state would wither away; but it hasn't. It has become a reactionary nationalist imperialism, telling the Russian people even what music they shall listen to and what they shall believe about the inheritance of acquired characteristics. The rape of Czechoslovak democracy destroyed the last trace of hope I had of any good to come from the Soviet Union. If I have any influence with the Russian people, I will use it to tell them that the present party line is bound to lead to another world war, many times more dreadful than the last."

Mr. Fadeev quotes from a number of American journals and books to prove that the United States is in the grip of war mongers and is planning an aggressive atomic war against the Soviet Union. The only solid work among his references is The Absolute Weapon, prepared by the staff of the Institute of International Studies of Yale University and published in 1946. He states categorically that the authors advocate the launching of an atomic war against the U. S. S. R. and are a disgrace to science. An examination of the volume illuminates the ethical standards of this Soviet leader of culture and of party literature generally.

The discussion of the question is found in the third chapter of the volume under the title of "The Atomic Bomb in Soviet-American Relations." If a sober and temperate treatment of the issue is to be found anywhere in the language, it is to be found here.

Prof. Arnold Wolfers, author of the chapter, writes that the idea of a preventive war is so abhorrent to American feeling that no government in this country, to judge from the state of public opinion today, could hope to gain popular support for such a venture. Further on he says that the whole idea of an offensive use of the bomb during the period of our monopoly can safely be laid aside as utterly impracticable.

In discussing lines of defense, he argues that the first line consists in proper efforts on our part to settle our disputes with the Soviet Union peacefully and to avoid adding new ones. He believes that wise statesmanship will have to seek a mode of conduct which will neither tempt the Soviet Government to overstep the limits we can in safety and decency concede nor provoke it to undertake actions out of sheer resentment or suspicion of our intentions.

Professor Wolfers strives generously at every point to view the issues from the Russian standpoint. He even defends the veto on the ground that the Soviet Union has good reasons for believing that the veto constitutes an essential element of her security. Obviously the general secretary of

the Union of Soviet Writers should read this book.

Toward the end of its session the World Congress of Leaders of Culture in Defense of Peace adopted a strongly worded resolution endorsing the Soviet position and created an international committee with headquarters in Paris. Three Americans, renowned for their support of Soviet policy, were appointed to the committee: Howard Fast, Albert Kahn, and Paul Robeson. The names of these men appear prominently in the calling of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace in New York City March 25–27. Harlow Shapley was appointed to the committee in absentia, but declined to serve.

In his closing remarks as chairman, Mr. Fadeev said that the work of the congress is only beginning.

The American people are entitled to know whether the conference is in any sense a continuation of the congress. Then in the spirit of democratic freedom the meeting should be permitted to take place. Mr. Fadeev should be requested to repeat his address in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty and a full discussion of the proceedings of the congress at Vroslav by competent scholars selected by our learned societies should of course be placed on the agenda. Also in the spirit of fair play and in the interest of good will between peoples John Dos Passos, Morris Ernst, Sinclair Lewis, Upton Sinclair, and Arnold Wolfers should certainly be invited to speak. This session might be chaired very fittingly by President Bryn Hovde.

Visas Granted to Delegates to World Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to the Honorable Dean Acheson by Mr. William H. O'Neill, commander, Queens County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans, New York City:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
QUEENS COUNTY CHAPTER,
New York, March 18, 1949.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was with a great deal of disappointment that we noted that our State Department granted visas to 23 delegates from the Soviet Union and satellite nations in order to attend the so-called world-peace conference under the auspices of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions on March 25, 26, and 27 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

Being an organization of loyal American Catholic veterans, we are unalterably opposed to communism, and we feel that no compromise whatever can be made with it. We consider the granting of visas to these foreign intellectuals a compromise with communism and that their entry can serve no worth while purpose other than the furtherance of Communist aims in this country. There is no doubt that they will follow the dictates of Moscow at this conference as they do in all undertakings.

We would, therefore, respectfully urge that you investigate this flagrant use of our State Department's visa powers and find out why they were granted so readily and, if it is not too late, to recall these visas and not allow any further indoctrination of foreign Communist ideas to be fostered upon our beloved land and its people. We further respectfully remind you that we know if the situation was reversed that a similar number of delegates from this country would be refused admittance to Russia. These steps of guarding our shores become more persistent in light of recent uncoverings of un-American activities and the further flagrant statement of Mr. Foster that in case of war (God forbid) between the United States and Russia, they would pledge allegiance to the latter.

With every good wish for your continued good health and a prayer that God will bless your every act and our beloved Nation, I am,

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM H. O'NEILL,
County Commander.

There Is a Real Shmoo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Al Capp, one of the best-known comic-strip artists, draws Li'l Abner, which appears in 600 American newspapers and many others all over the world. He recently became famous all over again when he invented the "shmoo," the remarkably beneficent little animal some of whose history is told in the article below. Capp's book, The Life and Times of the Shmoo, has sold very widely. The following article, which is a slightly modified version of his recent address on Town Meeting of the Air, appeared in the New Republic of March 21, 1949. I wonder if certain of my colleagues will get the point:

All I know about modern capitalism, I learned from the shmoo—that little animal which lays eggs and gives milk, both grade A, of course. The shmoo, himself, when fried tastes exactly like chicken and when broiled comes out steak.

A shmoo's eyes make splendid suspender buttons, and his whiskers make the finest grade of toothpicks. When you look at one, as though you'd like to eat it, it dies out of a sheer will to please you. It's a perfectly ordinary little animal, but I learned a lot from it and this is how.

You may find this hard to believe, but in many ways cartoonists are like people. They have a lot of things to be thankful for, but on the other hand they have relatives. I want to tell you about some of mine. It isn't generally known that they're related to me, because while for certain reasons too embarrassing to mention here, I changed my name to Capp, they kept the old family name of Capitalist. I changed mine in 1929, during that great wave of persecution, here in America, of those of us who clung to our faith in capitalism, the simple faith of our forefathers.

One of these relatives is an uncle of mine, J. Parnell Capitalist. He's a fine, upstanding, red-blooded—I mean full-blooded—chap. J. Parnell is as honest as the day is long. He doesn't really have anything against foreigners; he just feels that it'd be safer to shoot anybody who isn't his kind of an American.

His wife has entirely different ideas. She doesn't really despise everything American; she merely feels that our way of life can't ever be truly 100-percent American until we make it 100-percent Russian. We call her Auntie Capitalist, naturally.

Now, with them there lives my cousin, Harry S. Cousin Harry was a good-natured, confused, well-meaning little chap who was always messing around in his cellar laboratory—that is when he wasn't picking out tunes on his mandolin. (The queer thing about this Harry is he couldn't play the piano.) Well, one day Cousin Harry rushed excitedly up from the cellar holding a fat, squirming little creature in his arms.

"What's that you've got there?" asked Uncle Parnell, looking up from the book he was reading, The Immortal Orations of Alf Landon.

"It's a shmoo," cried Cousin Harry. "Not one of those foolish pictures your no-good nephew Al Capitalist draws, but a real, live shmoo."

"How'd you whip that up?" asked Auntie Capitalist, looking up from her favorite newspaper, the Daily-Arise-Ye-Prisoners-of-Starvation - and - Crush-the-Bloated-Bosses News.

"Oh, it was easy as pie," chuckled Cousin Harry. "I mated a pool ball with a duck and 20 shares of National Dairy common stock, and now that we've got one shmoo, there'll be plenty of them. They're wonderful little creatures. Just put one in a warm spot and pretty soon there'll be two, and everybody knows, once there are two shmoos, in no time at all there'll be millions of them—they're very affectionate. All our troubles are over; now every American can have a shmoo."

"Just a minute, buddy," cried Uncle Parnell. "I don't know much about these here shmoos, and anything I'm ignorant of I'm against."

A suspicious look came into his little red eyes—I mean his little red, white, and blue eyes. He grabbed the frightened little animal, shook his big hairy fist in its trembling face, and roared, "I'm going to give you a loyalty test, shmoo. So you give butter, milk, and eggs for free, do you?" He snarled, "Well, what's going to become of every American's right to be gouged by his fellow American if you do that?"

"That isn't the worst part of it," screamed Auntie Capitalist, as she snatched the quivering little shmoo away from her husband and yanked it over to where she sat on the extreme left. "How can the starving workers revolt against their fat, well-fed bosses if they become just as fat and well fed?"

"Ah, give me a crack at that rat of a shmoo," cried Uncle Parnell, yanking the little creature back and punching its trembling little nose. "By providing everybody with the basic necessities of life, you shmoo, you rob free enterprise of its right to freely hijack the whole Nation with murderous prices, and that's un-American," he roared.

Now Auntie Capitalist kicked the shmoo in the teeth and screamed, "By making life happy and peaceful for the masses, you're robbing them of the incentive to overthrow their government." Then she bellowed, "You're counterrevolutionary, shmoo, and you know how us comrades treat comrades like that."

Cousin Harry tore the two apart.

"Don't fight over the shmoo any more," he said quietly. "The little fellow is dead. You killed him."

But don't cry, kiddies, there is a real live shmoo. This big earth itself will give us everything we want, just as the shmoo does, if only we'd let it alone—if only, in our passion and hatred and intolerance, we don't tear it apart.

Bulwark in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the New York Times of March 13, 1949:

BULWARK IN ASIA—ROLE OF UNITED STATES OUTLINED IN COMBATING COMMUNISM

(The writer of the following letter is president of the India League of America.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

James H. Mysbergh's letter which appeared in your paper of February 27 deserves careful consideration at the hands of all those who are interested in putting a halt to the ever-increasing influence of the Communists in southeast Asia.

Mr. Mysbergh rightly states that the Dutch military action in Indonesia "has led to a new and critically important phase" in the relationship between the United States and the southeast Asian countries, and "today these countries—particularly in view of current events in China—are faced with a choice of political kinship to communism or Western democracy."

On the basis of these and other cogent reasons mentioned in his letter, Mr. Mysbergh suggests that, before it is too late, the Southeast Asia League should be formed, perhaps with the cooperation and help of the Governments of those countries. It is further suggested that this league should have "a regional production pool" which will initiate "collective bargaining for the disposition of raw materials on the world market and command power as a strong voice in the United Nations."

UNITING LIBERALS

This is excellent. But there is something that the people of the United States can do, too. I suggest that a Southeast Asia League of America should be formed in the United States. This league should consist of all progressive and liberal elements who desire, not merely to have a negative approach—of being just anti-Communist—but to have a dynamic positive approach of encouraging and standing by democratic forces in the whole of southeast Asia.

The objects of this league should be, roughly:

To help foster and encourage a non-Communist left movement in the whole of southeast Asia.

To keep the American public informed of political and other developments in these areas through all media of information.

To impress upon the United States Government and the Governments of western European countries that if it is important to create a North Atlantic Pact as a bulwark against the spread of communism, then it is equally important to create a non-Communist left movement as a bulwark against communism in southeast Asia.

To request the American Government and farseeing American businessmen to give economic and technical aid for the rehabilitation and industrialization of these countries.

To sound a clarion call, that the American people will give moral and economic support to all Governments and parties in southeast Asia who will fight against totalitarianism—both of the right and of the left.

It is needless to say that the whole world looks to the United States.

TO COUNTERACT PROPAGANDA

I have stated above that the Southeast Asia League of America should foster a non-Communist left movement in southeast Asia. That is most important. Ideologies have to be fought with ideologies. Among the starving millions of southeast Asia only leftist slogans and leftist programs can counteract Communist slogans and Communist programs. A non-Communist left movement is the only weapon which will go to the roots of the Communist evil.

A forthright declaration of the American people that they will support such a movement will help those who are undecided and are wavering.

Practically every country in southeast Asia has democratic leaders—some in the government, some outside of the government—who are being opposed by totalitarian elements, both of the right and of the left. It is these leaders who should be supported and backed by the American people.

The first thing the proposed Southeast Asia League of America would have to do would be to insist upon a settlement in Indonesia, on a democratic basis. American opinion would have no weight or prestige in Indonesia, or for that matter in any other part of southeast Asia, if the peoples of those countries were to come to the conclusion that America was siding with European nations still pursuing imperialist policies. The peoples of southeast Asia would shy away from the United States and would inevitably fall into the lap of the Communists. No amount of warning against the dangers of communism would then avail.

POSITIVE APPROACH

To expect that the non-self-governing peoples of southeast Asia can be won by a negative approach is to deceive ourselves. However, they can be won by a positive approach. They can be won by the American people shouting, without restraint and fear, that it is the birthright of all southeast Asian peoples to be free.

I am not against the proposed North Atlantic defense alliance. I think it is a move in the right direction. But if for the sake of this alliance the imperialist nations of Europe have to be appeased at the cost of freedom, prosperity, and happiness of the peoples of southeast Asia, then history will record the fact that the United States backed the wrong horse.

The United States has a splendid opportunity of taking the moral leadership at this crucial period in human history. I hope it does not miss the boat.

J. J. SINGH.

NEW YORK, *March 2, 1949.*

Report From a Freshman Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a timely and instructive article entitled "Report From a Freshman Senator," written by our colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which appeared in the New York Times magazine of March 20, 1949, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM A FRESHMAN SENATOR

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

WASHINGTON.—There is a moment on election night when a new Senator feels himself to be a new Adam, the first of his breed. But on that score, as on a number of others, he begins to change his mind when he comes to the Senate. For one thing, he senses that giants like Clay, Calhoun, Benton, Webster, Stephen A. Douglas, Davis, Sumner, John Sharp Williams, "Fighting Bob" La Follette, and George Norris have been there before him.

For example, I am now filling the identical Illinois seat occupied a century ago by the "little giant" who bore the name of our clan, Stephen A. Douglas. The realization of this tradition humbles a freshman at first. In time it should prove a source of strength and reassurance.

For another thing, a freshman Senator learns that the sense of a living tradition is perhaps one of the reasons for the almost exquisite courtesy which prevails in the dealings of Senators with each other. Our political campaigns are indeed rough and a candidate has to develop a tough hide to withstand the poisoned spears which are driven into him. But on the floor of the Senate, however much Senators may differ, they behave like gentlemen. In a world of sharply differing interests and ideas, this is no mean achievement. This, also, makes the freshman anxious to be worthy of his fellows, the many able men of both parties now in the United States Senate.

Before I came to Washington I thought I knew what I would be up against because my wife had previously served a term in Congress and because, in addition to my experience in local government, I had frequently testified before congressional committees. But only the toad beneath the harrow can really feel the sharpness of the prongs. One must live the life of a Senator to know its pains. It is relatively easy to offer advice. But it is a soul-trying experience after weighing evidence and conflicting claims and interests to be compelled to decide what is best for the people of the United States and then, as one must, to assume full responsibility for that decision. And the strain is intensified by the fact that one is forced to make many such fundamental decisions in the midst of a crushing burden of routine work.

The Labor Committee, for example has been holding two and three hearings a day on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and this in itself has taken from 5 to 8 hours of my time each day. Then there are the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on which I am also serving, and where I am trying to pull a laboring oar. But in addition to all this, I must also help to answer the mail which now averages over 700 communications a day, and which one morning reached 1,700, and meet callers and delegations. Let me chronicle a fairly representative day when the Senate was not in session:

7–8:30 a. m.: Rise, breakfast, read two morning papers and study memoranda for hearings.

8:30–9:30 a. m.: Look over mail, answer some of the most important letters and block out today's policy with the staff.

9:30–11 a. m.: Hearings on the Taft-Hartley repeal.

11–12: Hearings on the housing bill.

12–1 p. m.: Work on correspondence and see vistitors.

1–2 p. m.: Lunch with constituents.

2–2:30 p. m.: See delegations and telephone Government departments.

2:30–5 p. m.: Hearings on the Taft-Hartley repeal.

5–6:30 p. m.: Sign 250 pieces of mail, send telegrams on pressing matters of business.

6:30–7:30 p. m.: Dinner with group which wants to consult on legislation.

7:30–10 p. m.: Hearings on the Taft-Hartley repeal.

10–12. Read two evening papers and several weekly journals. Clean up correspondence and study more material on Taft-Hartley law and housing problems, block out radio speech for next day.

12:30 a. m.: Go to bed.

I am frank to say that I do not know for how long a man can keep up such a pace. Thus far, it has not seemed to slacken. I thought I had reached the ultimate in work when I ran for election in a way which I described last fall in this same magazine. But the job of serving as a Senator is no less strenuous than running for the office.

It is not merely work, however, but also worry which characterizes a Senator's life. One feels the tug not merely of conflicting forces but also of sharply opposing ideas, in each of which one recognizes some element of truth. On which side does the greater merit lie? Is there a way of resolving the sharp and bitter conflicts into some higher synthesis which will enable the national life to proceed upon a higher level, and if so, how can it be found and put into effect?

Interspersed with these worries there come the reproaches of old friends who feel neglected by decisions which I have had to make concerning appointments and patronage; the criticisms of home newspapers who do not like my votes, and the irate letters of citizens who disagree with my real or fancied opinions and acts. Is it small wonder, therefore, if beneath the surface of a Senator's life there is a deep loneliness and also many inquietudes which at night interferes with sleep, and which, were it not for the reassurance of my wife and friends, would seem overpowering? Never does a man realize the need for fellowship, for religious faith, and for a sense of humor more than when these worries and decisions pour in upon him as a Senator.

A Senator is not suffering from a persecution complex when he recognizes the sober fact that he has a multitude of enemies who are not only ready to shout to the world when he slips on a banana peel, but who are quite capable of strewing them in his path. And there are also a certain number of correspondents who, with the best will in the world, nevertheless regard a freshman Senator as fair game to fill their columns.

In all innocence I have already stumbled into one such booby trap. I was asked by a small group of reporters whether I thought the Labor Committee could complete its hearings on the new labor bill within a set period of time. "Yes," I said, "if the Senators would only work late afternoons and evenings and forego the cocktail hour." And then I innocently added that I thought Washington cocktail parties were too time-consuming.

These words were no sooner spoken than the air was filled with debris and the scent of cordite. From somewhere behind a pall of smoke I heard shrill voices tell me through the press that if I didn't like the Washington cocktail hour, all I had to do was to say, "No, thank you; I can't come today." And to this moment I cannot understand why a few sentences about the schedule of labor hearings should have set off such a hubbub in which everyone purged themselves of bile on a lot of irrelevant subjects. But that is what happened. It is why, when I am now asked what day of the week it is, my instinctive reply is "No comment."

The whole of this trivia summons to my memory Shakespeare's observation that "Honor alone doth not make a good surgeon." Neither, I add, doth it make a good Senator or keep him out of trouble. Something more—and a great deal of it—is needed; something in the way of caution, physical endurance, a sense of selection, a sense of maneuver, and the inner tinkle of a bright "hell's-bells" air. Some of these traits may be inherent in a person prior to his induction into the Senate. Some of them can be absorbed from the memories which hover in the place. And some of them can be acquired through the senior-junior tutorial system.

Let me say here that I had arrived in Washington full of misgivings about the Senate's seniority system. Yet the operation of that system, as it has unfolded in the committees to which I have been assigned, has brought home some of the practical ends which it serves. Stated negatively, I am convinced that no new Senator can or should be the chairman of a Senate committee, even if that unlikely prospect were ever opened to him. Outside of the Senate, he may be the world's foremost expert in a particular field of interest, but knowledge for its own sake, and knowledge woven into a policy of legislative action are, unfortunately, two different things.

The seniority system provides the Senate with a steady flow of leaders who know the past record of the legislative proposals under their jurisdiction, why they were accepted or rejected, who advanced them or blocked them, who testified on their behalf or remained silent, who gave way and compromised and who stood firm under fire. And though the junior Senator can applaud himself for the splendid purity of a scheme he had once devised to remove at least one of the Nation's ills, the older hands around the place may know that this same scheme has been examined in detail before, and for very practical reasons was turned down flat. In all these matters, the senior Senator or the senior member serves the junior as a file of memories dealing with the whole catalog of legislative cunning.

For all their wear and tear, the committee hearings themselves are of incalculable importance to a new Senator. These hearings are indeed one of the principal means by which a new Senator can educate himself.

If one reviews the senatorial day, it becomes evident that there is not much chance for a Senator to undertake a profound or cloistered study of a problem. The research personnel in the departments may be of some help to him. His own staff will be of greater help. But in the final analysis, he must learn for himself what is true or false. And he can only find that out in the committee hearings. Here, he must argue out his thoughts publicly even as the facts on which they are based are presented to him. Sometimes, he gets tripped up by his improvisations in committee sessions and feels like a fool because of it. Sometimes, his head spins under an attack from an unexpected quarter which tramples down his hastily built defenses. But once his injured pride is mended, the net result is both self-education and a more enlightened public opinion.

What, then, about the effect and conduct of lobbies in shaping legislative decisions? I regard it as my duty to listen both courteously and with a judicial mind to the representatives of every responsible group. For every group in a democracy has the right to present its case, both to the public and to the legislature. To this degree lobbies are of distinct aid. But it is a very different thing for a legislator to vote with a pressure group either because of fear or because of favors he has allowed himself to receive.

Even a brief experience with the lobbying of special interests makes a Senator wish, however, that the members of these groups would practice a greater degree of self-restraint and a lesser degree of group selfishness. Not only do groups ask for more than they expect to get, but even the sum of all their bed-rock demands amounts to far more than the country can afford. It is properly the job of Congress to select the most urgent of these needs and to discard those which are less acute.

There are, of course, a number of questions which a Senator, new or old, can only answer by seeking the inner light of conscience. They may involve such matters as the obligations one owes to one's party as against those which are owed to personal convictions. Or they may involve such questions as a reconciliation of the national interest with a State interest.

As to the first question, my tentative answer takes this form: Support one's party in all procedural matters everywhere. Argue substantive programs within party councils in the hope of gaining a majority within the party. But when the chips are down in the Senate, a Senator should vote his profound individual convictions on substantive matters regardless of who is with or against him. Fortunately, I do not expect any sharp conflict between my conscience and party policy, since I believe in the principles of our Philadelphia platform and in the general foreign and domestic program of President Truman.

As to the second question, the answer to it demands that the Senator try to become a teacher, instructing the State as to its function in the Nation, and instructing the Nation as to the nature of at least one of its States.

One further point: Edward Everett Hale is known to present-day Americans as the author of The Man Without a Country. But at the turn of the century he was also known as the wry-tongued chaplain of the United States Senate. One day, as he walked to the Senate Chamber to do his duty and offer his noonday prayer, one of his friends fell in step with him and said, "I suppose, Mr. Hale, that you first look at the country and then pray for the Senate." "On the contrary," Hale replied, "I first look at the Senate and then I pray for the country."

In the day when this barb was first voiced, the Senate seemed little more than a millionaire's club whose Members used it as though it were a board of directors' room for the corporations which they served. As against what happened in Hale's day, the private vocations of todays Senators offer no clue as to where any one of them will stand on any public issue. The lawyers still hold a comfortable majority of the Senate seats, with former university professors in second place, and a scattered assortment of businessmen, newspaper publishers, doctors, and farmers sharing third place. Some of these men are rich. Some of them have no more wealth than is represented by their Government pay. What marks their conduct as a group is their relative independence from the pat views which are commonly identified with fixed classes.

For all the seeming petty bickering, the vying for partisan advantage and even filibustering, the present Senate has a great sense of its function as the supreme forum in the world for free discussion.

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 I placed in the RECORD the first of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 18, is the second of the series:

FULL-SCALE OPERATION OF BRITISH HEALTH PLAN SCORED—PREPARATION WAS LACKING, SAY EXPERTS

(By E. J. Delaney)

LONDON, March 18.—The impossibility of providing the people with the care offered to them by the National Health Service proves the complete plan should not have been started last July in one stroke. Thus speak the leading medical men of England today.

They point out their profession always has approved the general idea of a complete health service for everybody regardless of income, but they repeatedly have warned against trying it on a broad scale without necessary preparations. They say the conditions that exist establish positively that they have been correct in their views.

The physicians, through their association, suggested that means of expanding the memberships of the medical and dental professions first should have been arranged. More nurses should have been trained and new hospitals constructed and staffed. However, now the scheme is an actuality, the profession is exerting itself to make it as successful as possible under the handicaps.

BETTER PREPARED THAN MANY

Great Britain really is better prepared than many countries to undertake a program of such magnitude. For 37 years all workmen who have earned less than $1,600 a year have been entitled to almost free care by a physician, and free drugs, too, under a Government-financed plan labeled "Health insurance."

Only the workman himself received this benefit, not the members of his family. There was no hospitalization and no dentistry included in it. But 14,000,000 out of a 40,000,000 population did qualify under that test. That means physicians have had much experience in handling a form of state medicine for a long while. To them the grant of complete care to all the population was not as bewildering as it would be in other lands without any experience in the field.

The Ministry of Health and the professions arranged a method for the people to make use of the new National Health Service that is so simple the citizenry is encouraged to do so. The professions may have some red tape to bother them, but the people hardly need do anything except what they were accustomed to when they wanted private medical or dental care for which they were paying.

FAMILY HEADS HAVE CARD

To start with, the head of every household has a National Health Service card which is all that he needs to secure treatment for himself and all his dependents.

A doctor is also allowed some extra fees, such as $29.40 for delivery of a baby. He is permitted to take 4,000 public patients plus any private patients he desires.

A physician with the maximum number of public patients has a gross income from the National Health Service of $14,400, which might be increased by the special fees and whatever private practice he undertakes.

The names of the physicians and dentists who have registered with the service are posted in public buildings. The cardholder looks at the roster, selects a physician, and goes to his office. He displays his card and asks if he and his family can become patients of the doctor. The latter accepts, takes the card, puts the family on his own list, and sends the card to a local health committee. The committee credits the doctor with the members of that family as patients and puts him on the pay roll for them. The card is mailed back to the head of the family.

WHAT DOCTOR GETS

The physician now will receive $3.60 a year for taking care of each member of the family. If there are four, husband, wife, and two children, the doctor will receive $14.40 a year whether he sees any one or all of them, once, 50 times, or not at all. This is called a capitation fee arrangement and is accepted as the most fair to all concerned. A small mileage addition is granted sometimes, when warranted.

Usually the physician picked by the husband has the entire family as patients. But, if she desires, the wife can have a different doctor for herself. And if the parents choose, still a third physician may be found for the children. The family can change doctors without notice and the doctor can abandon care of any patient or family by giving a reasonable notice to them.

In private practice everything revolves around the general practitioner, the family physician. That is true under the National Health Service, only more so. He is a very important person in this plan and really is the backbone of the whole movement. At present he feels he is not getting a fair deal and conferences are in progress between the Health Ministry and his representatives to smooth things over.

Once the family physician is chosen and settled upon, relations are same as of old when the patient paid the fees. When sickness comes, the patient visits the doctor's office or asks him to come to the home. If medicine is needed, the doctor writes a prescription which someone in the family takes to a drugstore that is cooperating with the plan and it is filled. The Government pays the cost.

If the doctor thinks the sick person needs the attention of a specialist, he fills out a form that provides one. If hospitalization or an operation seems advisable, the doctor takes another form and starts that process in motion.

Eyeglasses, hearing aids, wigs, and every possible device that can help a handicapped or a crippled person are to be had for the asking. If the doctor thinks a person needs a change of scene to speed his recovery from a severe illness, or an operation, and he fills out the correct form, the patient will go to a seaside convalescent home, everything free, and with sick leave pay while he is away.

Those alleging waste of public money choose the wig deal as their favorite topic. They point out that tens of thousands of bald men have been provided with two free wigs. Why two? That's so a man will have one to wear while the other is being cleaned and kept in good condition at a shop that gives such service at Government expense.

When all these circumstances are considered and there is a reflection upon the vast amount of publicity that has been given National Health Service for 2 years, no one should be surprised that the English people have become extremely health-conscious.

Those who helped originate the plan expect an improvement in the health of the people to become clearly evident within a short lapse of time. The most enthusiastic of the sponsors announce, without a trace of a smile, that untold millions now will live to such old ages that the nation will have to construct special homes for them all over this island.

Hawaii-Alaska Statehood Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a memorandum by the Honorable William M. Chadbourne, of New York. Mr. Chadbourne is a distinguished citizen whose views are entitled to serious consideration:

MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO THE ADMISSION OF HAWAII AND ALASKA AS STATES

To the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America:

The following reasons are respectfully submitted to your honorable body in urging that Hawaii and Alaska not be admitted to the Union as States. If Hawaii and Alaska are so admitted, the precedent will have been established whereby Puerto Rico should likewise be admitted, and the people of Puerto Rico will undoubtedly be rightfully indignant if Hawaii and Alaska are admitted as States and admission is refused to Puerto Rico. Accordingly, this memorandum addresses itself to the advisability of admitting as States all three territories.

1. The following statistics with respect to Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico are pertinent:

HAWAII

Area: 6,454 square miles.

Population as of July 1, 1948: 540,500. (The figures given are supplied by the Bureau of Health Statistics, Department of Health, Territory of Hawaii.)

The racial origin of the population is estimated as follows:

Race	Citizens	Aliens	Percent of total
Hawaiian	10,650	----------	2.0
Part-Hawaiian	70,110	----------	13.0
Puerto Rican	9,820	----------	1.8
Caucasian	177,580	2,900	33.4
Chinese	28,180	2,350	5.6
Japanese	144,640	31,640	32.6
Korean	5,570	1,750	1.4
Filipino	18,350	35,290	9.9
All others	1,580	90	.3
Total	466,480	74,020	100.0

ALASKA

Area: 586,400 square miles.

Population: Nearing 100,000 (the figures as to the population and its constitution are taken from estimates made by the American Geographical Society as of December 1946).

The population is approximately evenly divided between Caucasians on the one hand and Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians on the other hand.

PUERTO RICO

Area: 3,435 square miles.

Population: 2,113,053 (the figures given, taken from the Statesmen's Yearbook, are as of July 1, 1947).

The racial origin of the population is stated to be as follows:

	Percent
Caucasian	76.5
Negro	23.5

2. The present States of the Union are compact in area and contiguous. The population is homogeneous and since it has become usual for many Americans to motor from one end of the country to the other, the people of each State have come to know and respect the people of the other States.

3. The people of each State understand and generally respect the political institutions of the other States. Even in such a year as 1916 when the choice of President depended upon a close vote in California and the returns from remote counties were delayed as long as 3 or 4 days, the people throughout the country patiently awaited and accepted the final returns.

4. It may well happen that the choice of a President will depend upon the electoral vote of Hawaii or of Alaska or of Puerto Rico. If the vote were close in Alaska the official elec-

tion returns from remote areas would not reach the capital of Alaska for several days or even for a week or more. Undoubtedly, charges of fraud would be made on both sides. Is there not serious danger that under such circumstances the political structure of our country might be shaken from top to bottom, especially if the candidates for President held radically differing views on issues which the people thought vital?

5. The same problems would arise if the ratification of a treaty were dependent upon the vote of a Senator from Hawaii or a Senator from Alaska or a Senator from Puerto Rico. Decisions of the Senate have been accepted even though a Senator from New York represents 6,700,000 people and a Senator from Nevada represents only 55,000 people. Would Senate decisions be accepted as readily in the case of a Senator representing a population such as that of Hawaii, which is very different in composition from that of the present States, or a Senator representing a sparse, widely scattered population such as that of Alaska or a Senator representing a population as diverse as that of Puerto Rico? Might not a serious demand be made for a drastic revision of our Constitution?

6. The issue is not whether the residents of Hawaii or of Alaska or of Puerto Rico are better or worse than those of the present States. The issue is whether the people of the present States would accept decisions which turn upon the votes of Hawaii or of Alaska or of Puerto Rico as they now accept decisions which turn upon the votes of the people of the present States.

7. Today America is by far the most powerful country in the world. Hence, the peoples of other lands are struggling to secure our support and warring ideologies are clamoring for our favor. At the moment, there is on a knock-down and drag-out fight in this country between the ideology of the Communists on the one hand and the ideology of the democracies on the other hand.

This is the most serious struggle, having to do with foreign matters, which has taken place since the early days of the Republic when, in a fight to the death, the forces of revolutionary France and the forces of Britain sought to influence the course of our country. It then became necessary for our country to take the drastic step of expelling citizen Genet, the representative of revolutionary France. Are we not on the brink of a similar struggle in this country between those who favor democracy and those who favor totalitarianism?

8. Why not postpone the consideration of the admission of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, as States, until the time when the world is at peace, and the democratic forces for which we stand have overcome the invading forces of communism and totalitarianism.

9. The real issue is not what the people of Hawaii or Alaska or Puerto Rico want. The real issue is what is best for the United States as a whole and thus for the world. May it be added that there is no reason to suppose that, if Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico were admitted to statehood, the local governments would be better administered than they are today. If the people of these areas seek more by way of home rule, why would it not be wiser at this time to ascertain their wishes and, by granting them additional home-rule powers, to seek to satisfy their aspirations?

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM M. CHADBOURNE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 1, 1949.*

Keeping America Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., before the Executives Club of Chicago, February 18, 1949:

KEEPING AMERICA STRONG

Members of the Executive Club of Chicago and guests, it is a great pleasure to be here with you today, and I am honored indeed to have been invited to talk to you.

As one who shares with you the responsibilities of executive work, I am keenly aware of the many problems and difficulties which we all face in these troubled times of cold wars and hot words, of unsettled conditions at home and international tension abroad, of shortages of goods in some lines and surpluses in others.

Today, however, I want to talk to you about a subject of far greater fundamental importance than the irritations and annoyances which beset the daily lives of business executives. I refer to the necessity of keeping America strong by preserving and defending the very source of her strength.

What is the source of America's strength? The tremendous abundance of our natural resources, the superior intelligence and transcendent skills of our people, our democratic form of government and the absence of powerful neighbors that might threaten our security have all been important factors in making and keeping America strong. But many other countries possess these same advantages to a greater or less degree. Surely, then, the great source of America's strength lies in our economic system, which we call individual competitive free enterprise. And that is what each and every one of us must intensify our individual efforts to preserve and defend.

Our country has been forced by circumstances into a position of world leadership. All eyes are upon us. What we say and what we do influence the whole world. We are the chief proponents of the individual competitive free-enterprise system. If we weaken our support of this successful economic system, all the other free nations of the world will crash with us. But if we remain strong economically, if we not only defend but also extend free enterprise, we shall keep our country so strong that none will dare to attack us or those who stand with us on the side of freedom. Therefore, it is apparent that the peace of the world, perhaps even the fate of the world, depends upon the efforts we make to keep America strong.

If we have any doubt that America's system of competitive free enterprise is the real source of her strength, we have only to think back to the early days of American history. The early colonists knew before they left Europe that they would literally have to hack their new homes out of virgin forests and that they would be greatly outnumbered in fighting the savage and merciless red men. They knew that they faced years of back-breaking toil and constant danger before they could establish themselves. Nevertheless, they came, because they could no longer tolerate the tyranny and oppression of the Old World.

Some came to worship God in their own way. Others came to escape political punishment. Still others came to seek their fortunes. But, whatever their motives, all came to gain freedom of one kind or another. Consequently, it is not surprising that they valued above all else their right to personal liberty. They had an unshakable belief in the power of individual initiative.

To our forefathers freedom was a heritage so precious that without it life was not worth living. So firmly did they implant this idea into the minds and hearts of their descendants that many years later, when the United States took its place among the nations of the world, safeguards for human liberties were woven into the very fabric of the law of the land. They established a republican form of government. And they laid down the rules for its operation in a living document called the Constitution. They laid the cornerstone of a new economic system, based upon individual competitive free enterprise. The rules for its operation were recorded in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which we call the Bill of Rights. In effect, they made it possible for every person to go as far as his will and his skill permit, provided that he does not deprive his fellow man of the same right.

As the years passed and as the United States grew stronger politically and economically, people in other countries regarded America as a land of opportunity. They saw over here a country in which individual initiative was fostered and encouraged. Millions upon millions of them left their homes in foreign lands, where life was regimented and opportunities restricted, and came to our hospitable shores. And, today, millions more wish with all their hearts that they were over here instead of over there.

Yes, the great source of American's strength is our system of competitive free enterprise. We know it, but so do our enemies. And, as you would naturally expect, those who seek to destroy our power and our prosperity are concentrating their attacks on this keystone of our success. They knew that if it collapses, the entire structure will fall.

Today, one-third of the cost of Government is being spent for national defense. For the next fiscal year, the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force are asking for a minimum of $15,000,000,000. I cannot tell you whether this huge sum of money is too much or too little. But I can tell you that no army, no navy, no air force, however large and efficient it may be, can protect the minds and hearts of the American people against the poisonous propaganda which is being fed to them. The only protection against this form of attack is a determined and continuous counterattack, a barrage of truth which will completely nullify the bombardment of falsehoods to which the American people are being constanly subjected.

We in America must guard against taking liberty for granted and regarding it as a natural state of man. We must face the fact that there are forces at work which are striving to deprive us of those fundamental rights for which so many brave men have fought and died. They seek to return us to those dark days when our people were subject to the whims of tyrants.

The origin of these forces lies in foreign lands where people live in poverty, in misery, and in fear. They come from countries which call themselves democracies, but where a citizen may not own land or select his own job. He may not be tried by a jury of his peers. He may not stay away from work without good and sufficient reason. He may not employ anyone to work for him. He does not have freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, or freedom of religion, and his press and radio are censored by his government.

Surely, with a knowledge of these facts, the American people are too wise, too alert, and too intelligent to be taken in by the promises and propaganda of alien doctrines, no matter how subtle or clever they may be. However, this belief in our strength may, in fact, be our weakness. Many of our people simply do not realize that liberty is not a permanent possession but must be cherished and protected.

We must always remember that an integral part of the American character is forever to seek improvements. Americans are never satisfied. They are always looking for ways and means to improve their lives, their fortunes, their jobs, and their Government. That is one reason why we have been such a progressive and successful nation. But, on the other hand, this same restless spirit may make their minds susceptible to the false promises which are so lavishly made by the disciples of economic systems that seem at first glance to offer greater benefits to a greater number of people.

Unfortunately, many Americans do not think about the source of these promises. They do not remember that these highly-touted economic systems have failed miserably in the past in countries where they have been tried. They do not realize that the security which these systems allegedly offer must be paid for by giving up many of the privileges which we Americans believe are the basic rights of man.

Nobody in this world is more secure than a man in a penitentiary. He is fed, clothed and housed. But he is not free to go and come as he pleases. He is watched, guarded, and disciplined. There are millions of people in other lands who have that same kind of security. But we Americans have always believed that the only real security lies in liberty and opportunity.

In recent years, the propaganda mills abroad have been grinding out misleading promises which have been picked up and spread over here. As a result, an increasing number of people are led to believe that we should have a paternalistic form of government on which they can lean for security. This is a challenge to business, and it is the high responsibility of business to give convincing evidence that real and lasting security can be more soundly acquired through the American system of competitive free enterprise.

Frankly, I did not come here today to convince you of the worth of our competitive system of free enterprise, or of the superiority of our American way of life. As business executives, I know that you already believe in both. Rather, my purpose is to urge that you personally carry on a crusade to keep America strong. Each one of us should use every means at our command to remind the people of the United States that no other economic system can compare with our American way in providing more of the good things of life for more people.

Now, I have no doubt that you will ask: "What can we do about it?" I shall try to answer that question.

Primarily, it seems to me that we waste entirely too much time selling each other on the superiority of competitive free enterprise. With whom do we usually discuss the subject? The chances are that we talk about it principally with our fellow club members and our friends and associates whose lives run parallel to our own. But do we try to get our ideas over to our employees? Do we talk them over with our children, with Boy Scout troops, with YMCA members or with farm-youth organizations? Do we meet and talk with women's clubs, with the teachers of our children and with church leaders? If we are not doing all these things, and more, we are not helping to keep America strong.

The next question which you will probably ask is: "What shall we tell them?" Frankly, there is much to tell.

First. The United States, although it is a relatively new country, has a higher degree of culture than any other nation. This is exactly contrary to the propaganda which is being poured into the minds and hearts of our people so forcefully and so relentlessly. But the facts are that with less than 7 percent of the population of the world, we have more young people in high schools and colleges, more musical and literary organizations, more libraries and more distribution of the written and spoken word than all of the other 93 percent combined.

Second. We have the highest standard of living in the world. We are better fed, better clothed, and better housed than any other people on earth. Our health as a nation is unparalleled and it is constantly improving. Our life span grows longer every year.

Third. We hold a position of moral and spiritual leadership. We have more hospitals, more charitable institutions and, probably, more churches per capita than any other country. After fighting and winning two world wars, which cost hundreds of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars, we gained neither additional territory nor domination over any other country. On the contrary, we helped friend and foe alike to regain political, economic, sociological and spiritual health wthout asking any favors in return. Can any other nation match this record of generosity and understanding?

Fourth. From a standpoint of material possessions, we Americans have more luxuries, more comforts and more conveniences than anyone else. Free-enterprise America has one automobile for every four of its citizens. Socialist Great Britain has one for every 22. Communst Russia has one for every 252. Under free enterprise, there is one radio for every three Americans. Under socialism there is one radio for every five Britons. Under communism there is 1 for every 45 Russians. One out of every 5 people in free-enterprise America has a telephone, compared with 1 out of 155 in Socialist Great Britain and 1 out of 188 in Communist Russia. Even more startling comparisons could be made in such commodities as washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, electric lights, food, clothing and almost any other item which contributes to the happiness or welfare of mankind.

Fifth. Let us point out that America's system of individual competitive free enterprise is tried and proven successful, whereas other systems are either untried experiments or downright failures. During World War II, free-enterprise America turned out more war materials than all the rest of the allied nations combined. Under the impetus and incentive of war, companies which fought each other in good old-fashoned sales competition in peace time, pooled their resources and worked together as a well-integrated team to multiply the output of war materials. Compare that system with the methods used in totalitarian countries, where government control of production restricts the number of enterprises and, consequently, results in a shortage of industrial capacity in time of emergency. It was America that furnished much of the materials for our allies, as well as for our own armed forces. Without those materials, the nations united with us might have been conquered by our common enemies.

Sixth. Let us set somebody straight about the matter of profits. Let us correct the idea which has been spread by soapbox orators, wily subversives, and well-meaning but misled reformers that the workers get the smallest share of the income which manufacturing produces and that the owners get fabulous amounts. Let us tell them that, actually, out of every dollar of sales made by manufacturer, 47 cents go for materials and supplies, of which 35 to 45 cents go to the workers who produce those materials. Nine cents go for taxes, of which 4 cents are paid to Government employees. Six cents go for depreciation, maintenance, repairs, and interest, 2 cents for advertising, and 1 cent for research. That leaves 35 cents from the sales dollar of which the employees get 29 cents. The remaining 6 cents are profits, of which 3 cents are set aside for tomorrow's jobs by reserves to buy new machines and to expand the business. The remaining 3 cents are paid to the stockholders, who are the owners of the machines, the tools, and the factory buildings which are used by the workers to increase their earning power. All told, approximately 85 cents out of every dollar of sales by manufacturers go for salaries and wages.

Seventh. Let us tell the real facts about who owns American business. Let us correct the impression that it is owned by a mere handful of individuals. Let us point out that under some other economic systems, industries are owned by the government. Over here, industries are owned by the people. Every one of the 50,000,000 Americans who has a savings account, each of the 54,000,000 who has a life-insurance policy, and each of the 14,000,000 who has shares of stock or industrial bonds, owns directly or indirectly a part of American industry. All of them have a stake in American business and they should be among the first to insist that business concerns make profits. Otherwise, their savings accounts, their life-insurance policies, and their securities will be of little value. Anything that hurts business hurts them, personally, and individually, because they are an integral part of business.

How necessary it is to get this story over is shown by a recent survey among teachers of social studies and clergymen of various faiths throughout the Nation. The members of these professions believed that only about 70 percent of the wages and salaries and 30 percent of the income from dividends, interest, and rents were paid to people who earned less than $5,000 a year. On the contrary, a national-income study made by the bureau of economic research of the University of Notre Dame, shows that 90 percent of all wages and salaries, nearly 70 percent of dividends and interest, and 83 percent of income from rents were paid to those earning under $5,000 a year.

This same study shows that, after payment of Federal taxes, only 5½ percent of wages and salaries, 17 percent of all dividends and interest, and 9½ percent of income from rents goes to those earning more than $5,000 a year. If people with above-average education, such as teachers of social studies and clergymen, can be so far wrong, imagine how completely misinformed the average American must be about this all-important distribution of national income.

Eighth. Let us be realistic. Let us stop talking about the good old days, which really may not have been as good as some thought they were. Let us try to win friends and influence the people who really count. Let us stop telling each other how good our economic system is and start telling those who do not already believe it. Let us show them that we are all playing on the same team, the freedom team, and that we and they must work together if we are to win the all-important game of survival in which our individual, personal liberties are the stakes.

Finally, let us ask the critics to take a long and searching look at the rest of the world and to ask themselves this question: "Is there any other country where I would be better off than here?" If the answer is

"Yes," then remind them that they are free to go and live in that country. If the answer is "No," then warn them that they should take a more active and personal part in stopping the efforts of those who are trying to import some other country's way of life and impose it on us.

We have all got to realize that we are living in a new and different kind of world. We have never before found it necessary to take an active personal part in defending our way of life, because until a relatively few years ago, the American way was accepted by all our people. Until recently, it was not under attack by false disciples of foreign doctrines.

But times have changed. Today we must reinforce the faith of our people in the American way of life. We are faced with the greatest competitive battle in history. It is a battle between those who believe in the American way of life and those who seek to destroy it. But competition is no stranger to us. We thrive on it. It is the very lifeblood of free enterprise. All of us in this room, and thousands more like us, know how to fight and win against competition. Consequently, the only thing we have to guard against is that we shall be lulled into a false sense of security and that we shall fail to realize the necessity of joining in this crusade.

If individually we devote the same thought and energy toward waging and winning this battle of economic principles as we have in the past devoted to winning the battle of business survival, I say to you that there is no power on the face of the earth that can destroy the American system of individual competitive free enterprise. By each doing our part, we can and we will succeed in keeping America strong.

Delayed Pilgrims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 13, 1949, several members of the Committee on the Judiciary traveled to New Orleans to witness the arrival of *General Sturgis*, the first refugee ship to dock in the port of New Orleans. The committee members who were present are: FRANCIS E. WALTER, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, FRANK L. CHELF, ED GOSSETT, KENNETH B. KEATING, EDWIN E. WILLIS, and myself.

The *General Sturgis* brought 843 displaced persons to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act. The *General Sturgis* chartered by the IRO which pays for the passage of the displaced persons to new homelands was the last of seven ships to leave north German ports in February.

The final destination of the displaced persons were: Louisiana, 251; Illinois, 211; California, 72; Iowa, 65; North Carolina, 45; Missouri, 37; Texas, 29; Indiana, 24; Tennessee, 20; Arkansas, 15; Kentucky, 11; Kansas, 10; Georgia, 9; Nebraska, 9; Oklahoma, 7; District of Columbia, 6; South Carolina, 4; Ohio, 3; Wisconsin, 3; Minnesota, 2; Florida, 2; West Virginia, 2; Delaware, 2; Oregon, 2; Colorado, 1; and New York, 1.

Among the immigrants are 197 families, with 115 children under 6 years of age and 128 between the ages of 6 and 16. The largest family group is the nine-member Polish family of Mr. and Mrs. Stanislaw Matuszewski who were bound for St. Michaels Parish, West Memphis, Ark. Sponsored by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Matuszewskis have seven children ranging in age from 16 months to 18 years. Three of the youngsters were born in Germany where their parents had been brought for slave labor.

Farm families aboard the *General Sturgis* totaled 79, representing 279 family members. In addition, 23 single men were listed as farmers.

Other occupational groups included skilled workers, 177; clerical, 39; professional, 33; personal services, 27; and unskilled labor, 17.

I appreciated keenly this opportunity to see these people who were to become Americans. I was deeply impressed with them, and I say this without reservation. I felt certain they would add immeasurably to the welfare of the country because of the appreciations and democratic ideals they brought with them in addition to their special skills and professions.

Their joy at landing in the United States was unmistakable, and it was a moving sight indeed to watch these "delayed pilgrims," as I call them—to watch the repressed fervor after these long years of suffering and deprivation with which they greeted the new and promised land.

Considerable space in all the New Orleans newspapers was devoted to the arrival of the displaced persons. From the wide selection I have taken some typical examples which indicate the welcoming attitude and warm reception of the people of New Orleans. A news story and two editorials follows:

[From the New Orleans Item of March 14, 1949]

EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHT DP'S ARRIVE HERE—251 TO MAKE THEIR HOMES IN LOUISIANA

The day couldn't have been worse.

Fog shrouded the ship and it was raining like all get out.

But not one of them stayed below. The whole group, there were more than 800, crowded the rail to get a glimpse of the United States of America.

There were Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians, Latvians, Hungarians, refugees from iron-curtain countries, and eastern Europeans.

Few of them spoke English. But you didn't need to understand their language to know what they were trying to say.

Two words summed it up: "Thank God."

That was how 848 displaced persons landed in New Orleans today.

DOCKS AT 8 A. M.

Their ship, the *General Sturgis*, landed at the Poland Street wharf a few minutes before 8 o'clock.

They had a royal reception. Bands were playing. People crowded the wharf. Several Congressmen, officials, and the mayor were there to greet them.

The welcoming ceremonies were lengthy. But not one of the DP's seemed to mind. Alternately, they laughed and cheered as the speakers were heard.

Mayor Morrison said "it is significant that you landed at the Poland Street wharf because many of you are Polish."

GREAT EVENT

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, said "it is a great event for New Orleans to be chosen to receive this ship. It is a symbol as a haven for those oppressed."

Others welcoming the DP's were Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, Representative MICHAEL FEIGHAN, of Ohio, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, Representative FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, and Representative EDWIN WILLIS from St. Martinville in Louisiana. Also present were Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of Immigration from Washington, and Ugo Carusi, chairman of Displaced Persons Commission.

Aboard were 848 persons, 251 of whom are destined to settle in Louisiana, the rest to be scattered to every section of the country.

Every one has a guaranteed home and job waiting under the displaced persons' resettlement plan.

Most of them are farm workers from Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia.

Many are married couples, seeking homes for their families, uprooted by Hitler's ruthless armies. Two hundred and forty-three children, ranging from less than a year old up to 16, are in the group.

Of the 251 immigrants to Louisiana, only four will remain in New Orleans.

They are four Polish women who will be given work at the Ursuline Convent, 2635 State.

The rest of the Louisiana settlers will go to sugar and cotton plantations throughout the State where homes for them and their families have been offered.

Only a few professional men and women—some teachers, several doctors, one musician, and an optician—and a light sprinkling of industrial workers are aboard. All of these are going to jobs in the North and on the west coast.

The rest are bound for farms, mostly in the South and the Middle West.

CORDIAL WELCOME

On hand at the dock were representatives of each of the national agencies acting as their sponsors in their new country. Many individual sponsors were there to greet them in person.

There was also a well-organized battery of volunteer interpreters, motor-corps chauffeurs and canteen assistants ready to help them through the confusion of their first day. They saw them aboard trains or buses or to emergency lodgings, to serve them coffee and doughnuts and regular meals.

The welcoming ceremonies were scheduled to be opened by H. Vance Greenslit, chairman of the New Orleans committee.

BAND TO PLAY

There was music by the Jesuit High School Band, brief addresses by Representatives CELLER and WALTER and by Senator Guy J. D'Antonio, representing the State, and Mayor Morrison, representing the city.

All three religious faiths were represented in the ceremonies, the Catholic by Archbishop Rummel, the Jewish by Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger, and the Protestant by Dr. John S. Land, president of the New Orleans Council of Churches.

Each immigrant will find plenty of help, according to Mrs. Jean L. Benson, of the Council of Social Agencies, which has coordinated the plans of the local volunteer groups.

Each individual or family is sponsored by one of the six national resettlement agencies which will all have representatives at the docks.

Interpreters, recruited through the churches in New Orleans, were helping them through the formalities of disembarking and acting as guides.

Those who are to catch trains or busses immediately found a fleet of cars ready to take them to the proper stations, and those who had more than a few hours to wait were given accommodations either at the port of embarkation aboard the ship, or—in some cases—at the Jewish community center.

FIRST AID

The Red Cross had a first-aid station in operation on the dock and will also have a canteen unit there to serve coffee and doughnuts all day and hot soup at noon. The canteen unit will also serve a hot supper in the port of embarkation cafeteria for any who must wait overnight.

A special train has been scheduled to take the group bound for Illinois and the Middle West to Chicago.

National agencies sponsoring the immigrants include the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, United Ukraine-American Relief Committee, International Rescue and Relief Committee for the Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons, the National Lutheran Conference, and the Church World Service.

Assisting with transportation and travel problems will be the Travelers' Aid Society.

The *General Sturgis,* which sailed from Bremerhaven, Germany, February 26, is the fourteenth ship to bring refugees out of Europe under the Displaced Persons Act. The others have docked at Atlantic seaboard ports.

Another DP ship, the United States transport *General Black,* is scheduled in New Orleans April 13.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]

IN THE LAND OF THE FREE

Monday morning, here in New Orleans, Mme. Janina Karczewski, of Poland, led 842 other emigres from central and eastern Europe down the gangplank of the United States Army transport *General Sturgis.* She stepped onto the soil that now becomes her own in the same way that America for over three centuries has become the home of those from other lands.

It was an occasion of intense joy mingled with sorrow. For those who now realized their dreams, the moment was saddened by thoughts of the many who were not so fortunate: Those who had perished miserably in Nazi and Russian concentration camps; those who are still enduring serfdom, terror, and torture under the Communists; and those still awaiting their chances to emigrate to a new country.

The past sufferings of these new residents, who one day we hope will become our fellow citizens, have forced them to become Americans the hard way. There should be no doubt that they will appreciate and value many aspects of our way of life much more highly than we who take much of our life for granted. We have so many liberties and so many inalienable rights that we fail to sense the extraordinary worth of our social, economic, and political systems. These new Americans-elect, on the contrary, know fully the splendor of what we have because they have experienced what it means to be without these liberties and rights.

Americans, as many foreign observers have pointed out, are adept at counting their material blessings, but not so capable of appreciating nonmaterial advantages. Certainly our unique standard of living is impressive to all newcomers. But these refugees from the anguish and horror of Red and Nazi despotism will be much more inclined to estimate as priceless the freedoms we have enjoyed for so long that we never think of them.

From this very group of newcomers may come men and women who by their accomplishments will swell the list of illustrious refugees to this country during the past 10 years: Twelve who have received Nobel prizes, 103 listed in Who's Who in America, and 200 included in America's Men of Science. But we shall gain from the worthy actions and work of each of these people whom we welcome to our Nation and to the chance of one day becoming citizens of the United States of America.

[From the New Orleans Item of March 14, 1949]

NEW ORLEANS GREETS THE DP'S

No great bronze statue with torch upraised stood at the harbor's mouth to greet 843 former displaced persons as these entered the United States of America at New Orleans this morning aboard the U. S. S. *General Sturgis.* But in the brown current of the river they breasted when passing inland from the sea, was water from some 30 States of this great Nation—from the Montana mountains where men delve into the earth for copper and other metals, from the coal fields of Pennsylvania, from the cattle ranges of New Mexico, from the industrial centers of Ohio or New York State, from the peach orchards of Michigan and the cotton plantations of Georgia, from the timberlands of Minnesota and the wheatfields of Kansas, from Kentucky's blue grass and the farms of the Illinois corn belt, from Wisconsin's dairy land and the Louisiana sugarcane fields.

No matter whence they came, no matter what fields they made fertile, what mill wheels they turned, what cargoes they bore, what turbines they whirled into productive power—here where displaced persons from an Old World today enter a new home those droplets of water are united and indistinguishable from one another in a river whose might is derived from their union.

That river, then, is as eloquent a symbol of what waits those newly come to this land as any piece of man-made sculpture could provide. For it welcomes them to a Nation made up of particles from every country, race, creed, and clime on earth. No matter what they were at the source of their migration; no matter what factory machines they tended, farms they tilled, mines they worked, or schools they taught; no matter at what altars they worshipped, what languages they spoke, or clothing they wore; whether they came from mansion or hovel, mountain or plain, teeming city or lonely wilderness—

Here in this land of their journey's end they can become one with their fellows in a stream that is mighty because of its unity. At the point of the great river's united might we greet today new arrivals, many of whom will settle among us in Louisiana, while others journey still farther among the 48 States of the Union. Whether they reached our shores from Lithuania, Czechoslovakia or Poland is of no consequence. Only their will to join with us in working unitedly for the proud freedoms that generations of freemen secured and perpetuated for all who might come after them can condition their future.

That these newest of Americans debarked in a dreary downpour of rain is regrettable of course. Yesterday morning's warm sunshine would have brightened the rippling banners and the new greenery of a springtime landscape. But it could not have made the greeting extended to the newcomers any more hearty. Sunshine or rain, it is with full confidence that they will make the shining best of the opportunities awaiting them here that we bid them welcome to what is henceforth to be their cherished homeland as well as ours.

The North Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Felix Morley which appeared in Human Events under date of February 16, 1949. I recommend the reading of this article to every Member of the House, so they may have the benefit of the thinking of this outstanding journalist.

THAT NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

(By Felix Morley)

In his statement of February 9, condemning the vicious persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, Secretary of State Acheson took occasion to attack all governmental procedures in Communist Hungary.

Mr. Acheson noted that in Hungary: "Parliamentary opposition, an element indispensible to the democratic process, has been ruthlessly eliminated." Then he added: "The people of the United States * * * are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere."

There is no question that the American people are sickened and horrified by the actions of the Communist tyranny in Hungary and elsewhere. But a good many Americans also remember that it was our own Government, with Mr. Acheson even then prominent in its councils, which acquiesced in the Soviet occupation of Hungary, to say nothing of Communist infiltration of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and much of Austria and Germany as well.

So it is somewhat naïve, to say the least, for Mr. Acheson, who served the Roosevelt administration well, to be critical now of the results of our earlier ardent flirtation with communism. It is only a little over 5 years since President Roosevelt, on December 24, 1945, told the American people that "I got along fine" with Stalin. This "stalwart" Communist dictator, Mr. Roosevelt said further "is truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia; and I believe that we are going to get along very well with him * * * very well indeed."

It is not Stalin who has changed in the interim. In 1944, as 20 years earlier when he pledged himself to the cause of atheistic world revolution at Lenin's bier, Stalin was working to destroy all democratic processes. And if Secretary Acheson is really surprised by the present logical application of Stalin's philosophy in Hungary, the blame for retarded education cannot fairly be placed on the Kremlin.

II

Short of another war—this time to destroy Soviet Russia and rebuild a powerful Germany—there is little we can now do to save the helpless millions of people whom we have turned over to the tender mercies of communism. But Secretary Acheson, however short-sighted in the past, has currently made an observation of great cogency. It is his statement, already quoted, that: "Parliamentary opposition [is] an element indispensable to the democratic process."

The Secretary of State thereby passes much-needed criticism on the so-called bipartisan foreign policy, which has so far meant in effect that parliamentary criticism in this field is eliminated here as completely as in Communist Hungary. Mr. Acheson is

to be congratulated for thus indirectly denouncing the pusillanimous Republican leadership in Congress. And it may be hoped that the words of the Secretary will encourage the most careful congressional scrutiny of the so-called North Atlantic defense pact, now under preparation in the Department of State.

The precise content of this projected treaty, on which the great minds in the Department of State have been working for months, is still a carefully guarded secret. These officials are quick to denounce infringement of "the democratic process" under the Soviet tyranny. They are much more cautious about "open covenants, openly arrived at" when it is a matter of upholding the democratic process at home.

The Department of State, however, has prepared the groundwork for this treaty carefully. It bases its legal case on two earlier governmental actions. One of these is the adoption of the United Nations Charter, in which it is stated (art. 51):

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

A second justification for the projected North Atlantic treaty is found in the so-called Vandenberg resolution, adopted by the Senate on June 11, 1948. In principle this endorsed "association of the United States by constitutional process" in collective security arrangements within the United Nations framework. In debate on the resolution (May 22) Senator VANDENBERG assured the Senate that no European alliance would be underwritten without specific congressional approval.

The Department of State is trying manfully to turn the Vandenberg resolution, and article 51 of the Charter, into two pillars for the support of the North Atlantic treaty. It can only be done by a tour de force. The projected treaty is clearly designed as a military alliance of some members of the United Nations directed against other members (the Soviet bloc) of the United Nations. And to assert that the UN Charter ever contemplated such a travesty is absurd on the face of it. The Vandenberg resolution, on the other hand, specifically stated that subsequent treaties must be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and that provision undermines the contemplated alliance.

III

Among the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution is that of declaring war. Section 8 of article I says flatly: "The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war."

From the viewpoint of an autocratic administration, willing to make war an instrument of national policy, this is a most unfortunate provision. One of the great assets of a dictatorship is absolute control of foreign policy, including the right to declare war at what seems to the dictator the correct psychological moment. That comes when people have been so conditioned by governmental propaganda as to believe that an act of aggression by their leader is really an act of national self-defense. This was the Hitler-Goebbels technique, and they were good at it.

The Constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war is not very much of a safeguard against the will of a President determined to go to war, as we learned in 1940–41. But it does raise difficulties. It means that a state of war cannot be imposed on the American people automatically, and to that extent it hampers the executive will. Naturally enough, the other parties to the projected North Atlantic alliance are not interested in the liberty of the American people. If we cannot preserve self-government it is not the business of others to give us lessons on the subject. So Great Britain and France have stipulated, very naturally, that in the proposed military alliance we should go to war automatically if they are attacked.

That request is currently causing headaches for the Department of State. It is a reasonable enough request, under the age-old pattern of European thinking. The very essence of the European alliance system is that if one ally goes to war, the others automatically become belligerents. But the men who wrote our Constitution had the temerity to despise what George Washington called entangling alliances. So they put into the Constitution that awkward little provision about Congress. Secretary Acheson, believing as he does in the desirability of congressional opposition, can scarcely wish to circumvent it.

IV

But Secretary Acheson, with the enthusiasm of a new appointee to a post of command, has been making his difficult job even harder than it needed to be. It wasn't easy to work out a binding military alliance confined to ourselves, Canada, Britain, France and the Benelux nations. The Dutch, for instance, have pointed out that if the Netherlands decides to smash the Indonesian Republic, and if we are an ally of the Netherlands, then we too should line up against those aggressive Javanese natives.

All that has been tough for the Department of State. Yet Mr. Acheson has proceeded to enlarge the problem. Even before the alliance in its original design was concluded he sought to bring the Scandinavian countries into it. And where he has met a diplomatic defeat which would seem crushing if our diplomacy were not so well accustomed to reverses.

The obstacle encountered by this diplomacy, when it sought to bring Scandinavia into the projected alliance, was the traditional neutrality of Sweden. The hard-headed Swedes, like the Swiss, successfully sat out the last two wars. They are perfectly willing to sit out a third in the series. And it is difficult for us to tell the Swedes that since the establishment of the United Nations, the concept of neutrality is meaningless. The obvious retort is that the United Nations, as our diplomacy set it up, has even less meaning. Only Americans are fooled by our feverish effort to build an alliance against Russia within the framework of the United Nations.

The wholly intelligible Swedish plan is for a Scandinavian neutrality pact, embracing Norway and Denmark. If we could offer the Norwegians and Danes an automatic guaranty of military aid, we might be able to seduce them from the side of Sweden. But section 8 of article I of the Constitution prevents. And—again thanks to Mr. Roosevelt's trust in the stalwart Stalin—both Norway and Denmark are far too open to Russian occupation to invite that fate without even a moral commitment from us.

Secretary Acheson is not unique in sketching out policies which look magnificent, but wither away before the cold winds from Russia. Where Mr. Acheson differs, from his immediate predecessors at the swinging tiller of the Department of State, is his frank tribute to the value of that parliamentary criticism which he rightly calls indispensable to the democratic process.

It now seems certain that the State Department planners will get this criticism, and nobody is likely to call it premature. Of considerable significance in domestic politics is the fact that the first real rumblings of opposition to the proposed North Atlantic alliance come from Senator TOM CONNALLY, the old-fashioned Democrat who now sits as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Pennsylvania Must Make Her Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by David H. Stewart, president of the Pennsylvania State Education Association, at the legislative dinner, western convention district of the Pennsylvania State Education Association, Pittsburgh, February 26, 1949:

PENNSYLVANIA MUST MAKE HER CHOICE

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and fellow teachers, I welcome the opportunity to discuss the program of the Pennsylvania State Education Association tonight. Present here are representatives of these groups, Members of the National Congress, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, school boards, parent-teacher associations, Federation of Women's Clubs, other service and civic groups, and teachers in the classrooms of Pennsylvania. These groups determine the destiny of the public schools, and if they could be made to realize the serious plight of our schools, I am confident, the necessary measures would be taken to rehabilitate and improve our schools.

Now if teachers were the only ones lamenting the situation of our public schools, our opinion might be suspect as that of prejudiced witnesses. But current magazines, the daily press, the radio, and books written by impartial observers paint a more alarming picture than we do. Time will not permit a complete recital of these witnesses but may I cite a few. After a very careful survey Mr. Benjamin Fine published his findings in a book, Our Children Are Being Cheated. The September 1948 Kiplinger Letter is entitled "Our Poor Schools." The February 1949 Atlantic Monthly publishes an address before the United Parents Association of New York City by Miss Agnes Meyers entitled, "Are Our Public Schools Doing a Good Job." The September 9, 1948, Pathfinder published the results of a survey of the schools in every State under the title, "How Good Are Our Schools." Dr. Harris, an economist of Harvard University, published a book, "How Shall We Finance Education," in which he carefully examined the problem.

In general, the conclusion of all these is that our schools are in a serious condition because teachers are underpaid and teach in overcrowded classrooms and that buildings and equipment are not what are needed for today's children. The situation is becoming more serious because there is already a marked increase in elementary enrollments due to the high birth rate of the 1940's. Something must be done to retain in and attract to the teaching profession capable men and women in larger numbers. The conclusions of these observers are that salaries must be increased, retirement provisions liberalized, and the status of the teacher improved.

The program of the PSEA is designed to correct this situation in our State. What is the situation in Pennsylvania? According to our own State department of public instruction our elementary enrollment will increase approximately 270,000 in the next 6 years. This will require 1,500 more teachers per year, or a total of 9,000 in 6 years, and almost that many more classrooms. The normal replacement demand is 3,000 elementary and 2,000 high-school teachers to replace those who withdraw from teaching or retire. Add the

1,500 elementary teachers to take care of the increased enrollment and we will need 4,500 elementary teachers and 2,000 high-school teachers each year of the next six. In the year 1947 there were graduated about 550 teachers prepared for the elementary grades and 3,000 for high-school grades. There will be an over supply of the latter until about 1953, when the crop of war babies starts arriving in our high schools. Thus it is easy to conclude that unless something is done, and that quickly, the children of our veterans for whom we want to do so much will go to an over-crowded school taught by an overworked teacher. I predict that our veterans will wonder what they fought for if their children have not adequate school opportunities.

To attract capable young men and women into the teaching profession we have had introduced legislation making the beginning salary for a teacher with 4 years of college training $2,400 with 10 annual increments of $200, making the maximum mandated salary for the classroom teacher $4,400. So long as other occupations offer better beginning salaries and higher potential maximum salaries we cannot expect to attract young people of quality in sufficient numbers. A recent survey gave the average teacher salary in New York as $3,652, District of Columbia, $3,480; Maryland, $3,440; New Jersey, $3,118; Ohio, $2,800, and Pennsylvania, $2,675. It is easy to understand why Pennsylvania's young people prefer to teach in these neighboring States. According to the September 8, 1948, Pathfinder, Pennsylvania ranks twenty-first among the States with an average salary of $2,450.

Under the present retirement system, a teacher must be 62 years old and have 40 years of service to retire on slightly less than half pay. Of the approximately 8,000 on the retired rolls, about 1,600 receive less than $500 per year and 3,200 from $500 to $1,000. We have had introduced legislation which, if enacted, will permit a teacher to retire on half pay after 35 years of service, to guarantee each teacher with 40 years of service a minimum of $100 per month, and to grant an additional allowance to those now on the retired rolls to increase the allowance of those with 40 years of service to a minimum of $100 per month. The actuary of Pennsylvania's system in a speech before the education congress stated that we have one of the most, if not the most, conservative retirement systems in the country.

The purpose of a retirement system is to enable those teachers who have worn out under the stress and strain of teaching to retire when they are no longer able to render a high quality of service. The purpose is to see that there is an alert and physically fit teacher for every child. If the State has an attendance law compelling parents to send their children to school, the State has a responsibility to see that each child has a capable teacher and goes to a suitable school.

We have also had introduced subsidy legislation whereby the State would pay its share of these increased costs. Good schools cost money and this fact must be faced. Either our schools will continue to deteriorate rapidly or enough money will be supplied to have good schools. If the general assembly finds it necessary to enact tax measures to finance this program, our association is pledged to support this legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that the PSEA has a program to improve teachers in service; to challenge young people to enter the profession; to improve the materials and methods of instruction; to improve the ethical conduct of our members; and to give relief to worthy ex-teachers who are in need to whom we contributed last year, $18,000. I wish I had time to go into more detail about our professional program because I am convinced that many people, including some of our own members, do not know that we have more committees and members working on professional programs than we do on salaries and similar matters.

It is our considered judgment that this package of salaries, retirement, and subsidies is a must for the 1949 general assembly if good teachers are to be retained and if enough young people of ability are to be attracted to the profession. Unless we improve conditions at the teacher-pupil level, there will be little permanent improvement in our schools. We must act and act promptly. Unless the measures we advocate are enacted into law, the effect will be felt in the 1950's more than this year. Teachers cannot be educated and prepared on short notice. Teacher preparation is a matter of long-time planning. Pennsylvania must make her choice.

Next to being proud that I am an American I am proud of being a Pennsylvanian. I was born in this State; Pennsylvania has been good to me. I am proud of Pennsylvania's position and program on highways, on stream pollution and for mental hospitals. I hope the day is not far distant when my State will take her rightful place among the leaders in the field of education, so I can say with equal pride, educationally I am a Pennsylvanian.

Washington Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's copy of the Washington Letter, mailed weekly by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] to his constituents in the Sixteenth District of California. In this exchange of correspondence between Mr. JACKSON and the California CIO Council, I feel that Members will find much of interest with respect to pending labor legislation in the Congress. Mr. JACKSON has, in his usual courageous manner, set forth many of the points in contention, and I recommend the following to my colleagues, not only in the committee, but others on both sides of the Congress.

THE WASHINGTON LETTER

(By DONALD L. JACKSON, Representative in Congress, Sixteenth District, California)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 11.—One of the hottest topics on Capitol Hill and throughout the Nation generally these days is the problem of writing new labor legislation. Since the Eighty-first Congress convened more than 2 months ago, the respective committees of Senate and House have been struggling with the thorny problem of labor-management legislation.

PRESIDENT PROMISED REPEAL

One of the principal promises made by President Truman during the course of last summer's campaign was his pledge to seek immediate and outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act if reelected. To the joy, consternation, amazement, concern (depending on your political philosophy) Truman was reelected, and the drive was under way to put the Taft-Hartley Act in permanent legislative camphor in favor of the old Wagner Act, which measure organized labor has long considered its Magna Carta.

BOGS DOWN

However, the passing months have disclosed that it is one thing to make a promise, and quite another thing to redeem it. Both the proponents and the antagonists of Taft-Hartley have gone "all out" in their attempts to retain the measure on the one hand, and to repeal it on the other. An estimated 400,000 (to date) have sent answers to the General Electric-Fulton Lewis, Jr., poll to Members of the Congress, demanding retention. On the other hand, organized labor has branded the poll misleading and half-truth, and have urged their supporters to write demanding full and immediate repeal of the Taft Hartley Act.

CIO GOES TO WORK

This week the California CIO Council, with headquarters in San Francisco, dispatched long letters to members of the California delegation in the House (and presumably in the Senate). The letter is of sufficient interest to reproduce in part this week instead of the usual content matter of the letter. In order that your Representative's stand on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act may be clearly understood, we are publishing our answer to the CIO Council.

CIO LETTER

Letter is addressed to Hon. D. JACKSON, United States Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and reads, in part, as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: Upon unanimous instructions of the California CIO Council Executive Board, meeting in regular session February 25–27, I am communicating with you regarding the following legislative matters:

"The election results of last November proved conclusively that the American people were not in accord with the repressive legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress. The most important single issue in the election was repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The results of the election proved the American people desired immediate and outright repeal.

"For 2 months, a studied campaign has been going on, launched by the proponents of oppressive labor legislation, to thwart the will of the American people on this No. 1 election issue. The failure to enact repeal to date is looked upon by working people and their families as a continuation of the attack by the Eightieth Congress upon the standards of the American people.

"The Taft-Hartley Act, after 18 months of operation, has proved itself unworkable. It was a main contributing factor in the growing unemployment and the drying up of purchasing power which now threatens our economy.

"The members of the CIO in this State are not misled by the fumbling and procrastination taking place in congressional committees on this issue. They realize that the interests for whom Senator TAFT is the spokesman are playing for time by shifting from one phase of the act to another, prolonging debate and citing isolated horrible examples as justification of the act, in order to give big business propagandists more time for their attempt to stop the election mandate of the American people.

"We are informed that pressure is being exerted upon the House Labor Committee to hold up action upon the Kelly resolution, H. R. 237, passed by the subcommittee of which he is chairman. This resolution, calling for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and full restoration of the original Wagner Act, is what the people voted for and what they still demand.

"The executive board of our State organization urges you to support this resolution in every way possible, and requests that you make known your support of the Kelly reso-

lution to Majority Leader Congressman RAYBURN and to the chairman and members of the Labor Committee."

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The paragraphs having to do with the Taft-Hartley Act are followed by a number of other recommendations on pending legislation, which are omitted because of space limitations. Your Representative has today sent the following reply to the CIO council:

"Mr. PAUL SCHLIPF,
Legislative Representative,
California CIO Council,
San Francisco, Calif.

"DEAR MR. SCHLIPF: This will acknowledge receipt of your long and interesting letter of March 4, setting forth the position of your organization with respect to proposed labor legislation and requesting the support of the undersigned in seeking immediate repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, more commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. I am very happy to have your opinion and recommendations in this connection, although the stand of your organization was made very clear during the course of the last election when your group gave its unqualified support to my opponent, Mr. Ellis E. Patterson.

"Several contentions set forth in your letter are not, in my opinion, substantiated by facts. Your statement that the election results of last November proved "conclusively" that the American people were not in accord with the "repressive legislation" passed by the Eightieth Congress does not, for example, coincide with the opinions expressed by many political economists and capable analysts. While I acknowledge that you have every right to the opinion that the leaders of organized labor were the spearhead in the defeat of the Republican Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, I am personally convinced that Republican failure to stand toe-to-toe and fight out the issues raised by Mr. Truman was the prime factor in that defeat.

"Throughout the course of the campaign in the Sixteenth Congressional District specific answers were given to specific questions asked. When the voters of my district went to the polls on November 2, last, they knew exactly where both my opponent and myself stood with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act, socialized medicine, socialized housing, continued Federal rent control, price control, and rationing, and any other questions having to do with the creation of an American socialized state. If they did not know, it was simply because they had not followed the newspaper accounts of my public debates with Mr. Patterson.

"I agree with your contention that one of the most important, if not the most important issue in that campaign was the question of Taft-Hartley repeal. That issue was made a matter of prime interest by President Truman and by your organization during the course of the preelection campaign. It remains today an unfulfilled promise, but it does not stand alone in that category. The committees of the House and the Senate are jammed with legislative measures which were promised early passage by the President and by the leaders of the Democratic Party, and no amount of Republican opposition could stop a determined and sincere effort on the part of the Democratic leadership to report the measures out for floor action.

"I am sorry that I cannot agree with your assertion that 'the Taft-Hartley Act, after 18 months of operation, has proved itself unworkable. It was a main contributing factor in the growing unemployment and the drying up of purchasing power which now threatens our economy.'

"I have at hand some very pertinent statistics with respect to the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act on unemployment in the metropolitan area of the city of Los Angeles, figures which I am certain will impress the objective analyst with the inescapable fact that Taft-Hartley has actually resulted in more employment rather than less, and that the operation of the act has resulted in retaining for the workers in a great many unions the fruit of their labors to the extent of millions of dollars in one city alone. It is to be hoped that the figures will make an impression upon the average working man and woman.

"During the course of the 19 months immediately preceding passing of the Taft-Hartley Act there were 441 strikes in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, involving groups of union workers ranging in size from 1,324 in a December 1945 walk-out to a strike which called out 26,003 employees during May 1946. During the 19-month period a total of 186,539 workers were on strike at one time or another, with a total man-days lost figure of 2,521,623.

"During the 19-month period immediately following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act a completely changed situation was reflected in the statistics. In the period covered there was a total of 215 walk-outs, ranging in size from a small strike in July of 1948 involving a total of 437 workers to the largest strike during the period in question, one which involved a total of 14,010 workers in November 1948. In all, a total of 95,353 union members were called out in strikes which resulted in a total of 1,531,426 man-days lost. Without respect to the merits of the many disputes, the irrefutable fact remains that during the course of the 19 months immediately preceding passage of the Taft-Hartley Act workers were out of pocket in excess of $10,000,000 lost in idle man-days. Add to this figure the amount of savings expended by the workers during the period when they were out on strike, and it is reasonable to assume that another sizable sum might well be added to the grand total lost to working men and women. In addition, and contrary to early claims that the Taft-Hartley law was designed to wreck unions, membership in organized labor has experience a healthy increase.

"There is nothing to indicate that those workers who were called out on strike following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act were in any way deprived of their constitutional rights to strike, guaranteed in both the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wagner Act. Slaves do not have the privilege of striking, but these free Americans struck of their own volition, or at the behest of their unions. Incidentally, and in passing, the right to strike is fundamental and must be preserved in whatever labor legislation is finally passed by the Congress. There is no disagreement on that score among labor leaders and the Members of Congress, and the undersigned is happy to pledge his utmost support to the preservation of that right.

"You state that the members of CIO in this State are not misled by the fumbling and procrastination taking place in congressional committees on this issue. Neither, I may add, are the American people, nor the members of the Republican minority in the Congress. The fumbling and procrastination is as repugnant to the undersigned as it is to any member of the CIO. The majority of members on the committees having Taft-Hartley repeal under consideration at the present, have the power to vote out a repealer at any time and on an instant's notice. These are Democrat-controlled committees, and a better appraisal of the situation would indicate that they realize outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley act is impossible in the face of public opinion throughout the country at this time. Only last week seven Democrats joined nine Republicans in refusing to consider a motion made by Representative KELLEY to vote out immediately a Taft-Hartley repeal measure. The Republicans were in no way pledged to repeal of the act, but if your contention is correct that Democrat victories were achieved because of the support of organized labor, it might be well to ask yourselves just who is double-crossing whom?

"For my part I should welcome an opportunity to cast my vote on a legislative measure designed to repeal in toto or to retain in toto the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. That was the promise made to labor leaders by President Truman during the course of the election, and again we are in a full and complete measure of agreement on the course to be taken.

"But that course will never be taken. Those in control of the legislative machinery here in Washington are probing for a face saver, for some measure that will pull the sting out of the tail of the Taft-Hartley Act without pulling them out of office at the same time. The somewhat beclouded mandate of last fall is becoming no clearer as the days and weeks of inactivity go by. A vote today on the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which requires union officials to sign non-Communist affidavits would reinstate that provision by a voice vote, although I see no logical objection to requiring the same affidavits to be filed by those in positions of management. The Democratic-controlled committees now at work on labor legislation have a wild bull by the tail and I should not care to hazard a guess on the outcome.

"In short, the undersigned voted for the original Taft-Hartley measure in the House of Representatives, and for the House-Senate conference report which sent the bill to the President who vetoed it. I cast a third vote to override the veto. My campaign was conducted largely in defense of the major provisions of the act, and my district returned me to Congress with a vote that exceeded by many thousands the margin by which President Truman carried the State of California. Consistency is not generally considered to be a political virtue, but in the present instance failure on my part to support the major provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act would be a breach of faith not only with the people who sent me to the Congress, but with thousands of laboring men and women in the organized labor movement who have regained a measure of personal dignity and freedom of action under the provision of the much-maligned act, and whom, in many cases, have notified Members of Congress of their complete satisfaction with the major provisions of the act.

"Important as are the rights of labor and the rights of management, I consider the welfare, the health, and the security of the majority of the American people to be the paramount consideration in any legislative device accomplished for the regulation of labor-management relationships. If my legislative acts are at variance with that concept of my sworn duty, I cease immediately to represent the people of my district as a whole and become instead the agent of special management or labor interest. This I do not propose to do.

"As indicated elsewhere in this letter, several changes might well be made in the Taft-Hartley provisions. These changes I shall support, but in the main it is my intention to oppose outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and to support, paragraph by paragraph, amendments which will be offered on the floor of the House seeking to reinstate important features of the present bill in the proposed administration measure.

"I shall give your other legislative recommendations the fullest measure of consideration during the course of committee hearings and later on the floor of the House.

"Thank you for communicating with me, and while we are not in agreement in the present instance, I appreciate your interest."

Voice of Alameda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alameda Times-Star, one of the home-owned independent papers on the Pacific coast, has recently published an editorial that I commend to my colleagues.

The people at home are dissatisfied with many of the things that we do in Congress. They have grounds for their attitude toward us.

Perhaps it would be well if we stood back from the picture so that we could view it in its proper perspective.

To my thinking, the filibuster is outmoded and its use repulsive to a great majority of the people of the United States.

The editorial contained in the issue of March 18, 1949, reads:

VOICE OF ALAMEDA

Some 42 Senators the other day cast votes that completely thwarted, at least for the time being, the attempts of the balance of the Senate to do away with the filibuster.

In our opinion they struck a heavy blow for communism.

Regardless of the fact that the filibuster is a hoary American institution, its history has not been honorable or glorious.

The filibuster is nothing other than a weapon designed for use by a minority in preventing the exercise of the majority's will.

As such, it is not in accord with the principles of the brand of Americanism that we have had held up to us as uniquely admirable among all the various isms that infested the earth since the discovery of the Western Hemisphere.

But to say that the filibuster is not in accord with our highest type of Americanism is not enough to explain how those Senators in thwarting its end did the Communists a favor.

That requires a little more explanation.

The prerequisite to a successful Communist revolution is a condition of society in which a large portion of the people are thoroughly discontent. The reason for that is obvious. No person who has a good job, for example, will be inclined to upset the State under which he lives.

Given the large discontented section of the populace, the Communists then proceed with their agitations in order to increase the discontent to the point where an actual revolution can be brought about.

They accomplish their agitation by the simple expedient of calling for reforms, thus giving themselves the appearance of benefactors of the depressed and discontented.

But though they call for reforms, they do not wish the reforms to be effected by the government in power.

Obviously, if the reforms were instituted, the cause for discontent would be lost, and the Communists would then have to root around for other subjects of agitation with which to start their cycle over again.

Well, the case of the filibuster is a case in point.

If the filibuster were either done away with or vitiated, the way would be cleared for passage of the civil-rights bill, the anti-lynching, and anti-poll-tax bills, as well as various other pieces of legislation that cannot hope for passage so long as the present legislative set-up permits the filibuster.

The passage of such bills as these would immediately mean a tremendous relief to the Negroes and other discontented minorities.

The Negroes and these other groups, such as Americans of Mexican ancestry, would then become comparatively poor material for Communist agitators to work with.

One of the most important, if not the most important, positions on which the Communists stand in making their bids for leadership in this country would then be so completely undermined that they would be compelled to look elsewhere for another to replace it.

The above is the stark and naked truth as any person of intelligence can see who takes the trouble to read the writings of Lenin and Stalin, to say nothing of Karl Marx.

It is as elementary as the alphabet for a professor of English literature.

And so, among intelligent people, there can be no doubt that those Senators who have opposed so successfully the end of the filibuster have done as satisfactory a job, from Stalin's point of view, as if they were all working like beavers to make themselves eligible for the order of Lenin.

New York and the German Industrial Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append a temperate and well-thought-out presentation of the situation in New York behind the opposition to the German Industrial Fair. New Yorkers want to be sure that democracy, love for peace, and respect for neighbors are firmly rooted in the German mind:

POSTPONED THIS FAIR

Someone in our military government blundered in deciding to hold a great German trade exhibition in New York, of all places, next month. The purpose of the exhibition, according to the monthly bulletin of the United States-German Chamber of Commerce, was "to extend and strengthen trade relations between the United States and Germany, which were formerly so extensive and valuable." The sponsors intended to emphasize the need of swift economic recovery in Germany to ease the burden on American taxpayers. For this purpose our unimaginative and insensitive authorities named a Duesseldorf firm to handle the arrangements, put a committee of 11 German industrialists in charge and planned to admit 240 German businessmen to New York to advertise their products on the spot.

The project has run into difficulties that could easily have been foreseen. One of the committee of 11 turned out to have been a leading Nazi propagandist and was dropped from the list. Another, not yet dropped, held a title bestowed by Herman Goering upon Germany's most highly dependable industrialists. The architect appointed to design the exhibit proved to have been a Nazi Party member from 1933 to 1945. Altogether 102 Germans have been banned out of 231 exhibitors or salesmen whose applications for a trip to New York have been screened up to now.

This is only a faint foretaste of the troubles that are sure to arise if and when this contingent of German businessmen sets up shop in Rockefeller Center. Millions of New Yorkers will be affronted, rightly or wrongly, by the effort to peddle cuckoo clocks and optical goods in their midst and to advertise the pleasures of travel in Germany. It shows about as much understanding as to have set up a flashy show of German goods in the destroyed areas of Rotterdam or Warsaw. Certainly the American people, like all Allied peoples, will have to accustom themselves to buying German and Japanese goods once more; nations cannot be penalized forever for their past misdeeds. But it is neither good business nor good statesmanship to try to sell German goods with all this fanfare, and in the one American city, above all others, where the recent past is not easily nor quickly forgotten. The project should be postponed indefinitely, and German exports should be encouraged by other and less blatant methods.

Welfare, Garrison State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

WELFARE, GARRISON STATE

In an address at the University of Chicago, M. S. Szymczak, Federal Reserve Board member, said the country was in danger of slipping "into a policy of chronic deficit financing. * * * If tension in the international situation persists, no retrenchment from high military budgets will be possible. At the same time a considerable expansion of the welfare activities of the Government is probable."

The danger is real, the warning timely.

The condition of chronic deficit financing which the Federal Reserve Board members fear, existed, as a matter of fact, throughout the 1930's and until the end of the war. It threatens again because in the years that have passed since the end of hostilities we have not only failed to bring expenditures under control, but have been committed to a variety of new and additional expenditures at home and abroad.

It is time thoughtful consideration were given in high Government circles to the answer to this question: What can the American economy afford in taxation and expenditures?

In his campaign last year President Truman traveled about the country promising more and more in the way of welfare expenditures. At no time since he succeeded to the Presidency has Mr. Truman voiced the obvious fact that the economic stability which is a major objective of his program can be realized only as the budget is balanced. With all his expressed concern regarding inflation he has seldom connected the inflationary danger with the Government's imprudence in spending and taxation.

From the reports of the Internal Revenue Bureau at the beginning of the month it appears that the deficit financing that Szymczak fears may have to be resumed before the end of the present fiscal year. In the light of this evidence it becomes increasingly clear that the Treasury will definitely be in the red in fiscal 1950 since revenues are almost certain to diminish, assuming no increase in taxes, and expenditures to increase.

President Truman and his advisers seem to believe that it will be possible for them in the late 1940's with budgets well in excess of forty billions annually to pursue the same broad policies, political and economic, which prevailed under Roosevelt when the average annual budgets were less than one-fourth as great. They seem to take no cognizance either of the tremendous difference between annual expenditures of ten billions and forty billions, or of the implications of a public debt of two hundred and fifty billions for the soundness and stability of the national economy.

By the same token they seem oblivious of the effects of extremely high taxation over a period of many years on incentives, capital creation, and other major ingredients of a dynamic economy.

It is true, doubtless, that we face dangers that cannot be averted if we go forward with extravagant spending and turn again to chronic-deficit financing. It is also true that the time is at hand when we need to appraise the broad policies to which as a Nation we are committed lest, in our zeal to insure welfare and security, we undermine the bases of both.

Communists Should Be Forbidden Entry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Life of March 20, 1949:

COMMUNISTS SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN ENTRY

According to report, as this is written, the State Department has not refused to sanction the entrance into this country of six members of a Soviet delegation to attend what is euphemistically called the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, scheduled to be held at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York the latter part of this month. It is reported the Department has not raised any objection to this gang visiting this country but has left the matter up to Attorney General Clark. Under our immigration laws Communists are not permitted to come here, but the Attorney General has some discretion in the matter and can admit them under conditions he lays down. We are spending billions to combat communism abroad but never seem willing to curb them here. This does not make sense.

ALL GOOD COMMUNISTS

The Communists who seek to attend this conference include Dimitri Shostakovich, the composer who, it will be remembered, crawled around practically on all fours in complying with the edict issued by the Soviet authorities demanding his music conform to Soviet ideas. He confessed his sinful crimes and promised to keep from offending in the future. That is how free Shostakovich is. The rest of the delegation includes Peter Pavlenko, prize-winning novelist; A. I. Oparin, biochemist; Sergei Gerasimov and Mikhail Chiaureli, motion-picture producers; Ivan Rozhansky, secretary of the delegation, and the man who heads it, Alexander Fadeyev, secretary-general of the Union of Soviet Writers.

Probably Fadeyev is the best known here, aside from Shostakovich, and that which brought him prominently into general knowledge should win him no encomiums in this country, much less getting him entry. It was this man who indulged in an ill-tempered outburst, so characteristic of the Russians, at the World Congress of Intellectuals held at Wroclaw in Poland last year. This congress was bitterly anti-United States, and while Reds can change their line faster than a chameleon can change his spots, one wonders just why Fadeyev would soil his shoes with the dirt of a country he holds in such contempt. We should be very wary of letting him into our land, and particularly under the conditions asked for by the Moscow Foreign Ministry.

SEEK DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

This embassy sent a note to the American Embassy requesting diplomatic visas for six members of this delegation, and with the note were diplomatic passports for them and a special passport for the secretary. The note also requested laissez-passer for the members of the delegation. All this means that American visas stamped in the six submitted passports would give the holders diplomatic immunity in the United States. So these Communists could go freely about this country with none to say them nay and not at any time subject to any one of our laws. Issuance of laissez-passer would exempt them from customs examination.

In short, they could bring almost anything into this country, and no one would be the wiser because of the protection this course would afford them. We say it would be just about the most foolish thing in all the world to grant such wide and sweeping privileges to avowed enemies of this land. They are ordinary Russians, not diplomats in any sense of the word, although, of course, they are Russian agents, as is every other member of the party. There is no reason on earth why they should be permitted to enter in the first place. This idea they will do anything to promote peace is about as phony as anything could possibly be.

OUR CULTURE "FILTHY"

Fadeyev stated his position in respect to the United States and how he regards this land at Wroclaw. He stated that behind the facade of the Statue of Liberty, America is producing the plotters and organizers of a new war, taking up where fascism left off in their hurry to start a new shambles. He also called American culture disgusting filth with the dollar sign on it. We could tell him we suspect some so-called American exponents of culture have something worse than the dollar sign on them, in shape of the hammer and sickle. It is our idea we should not permit such a creature as Fadeyev ever to get into this country, and particularly under diplomatic immunity. He should be held fully responsible for his deeds and utterances while in our country if we are as foolish as to admit him.

As many see it, this conference, to be held in such an aristocratic place as the Waldorf-Astoria, and how is it the comrades can stand to meet in such an atmosphere, is merely an American offshoot of the Cominform-dominated world congress of intellectuals at Wroclaw. One wonders just who adjudged them intellectuals, and to what ends do they apply their intellectuality, if any. It is just one more Communist-front camouflage and it is put forward in the name of peace. Never was so desirable a condition put to such subversive ends as has the cause of peace by the Communists and their fellow travelers. Its aim is to disseminate Soviet foreign policy and to seek to gain support. How Americans even at the moron level can fall for such bait is beyond understanding. We are sure the term intellectuals is a pretty bad misnomer where those who attend such a conference are concerned.

HENRY IS TIP-OFF

The fact that Henry Wallace is to attend to speak is just about enough to erase the intellectual stamp. Paul Robeson is another of the sponsors of this session which also should place it in the exact category where it belongs. The conference lists some 280 sponsors in all and on the list are many other known Communists and sympathizers. It is going to oppose the European recovery plan and it intends to pin down the responsibility for the cold war on this country. You may be sure that every possible step to stir up trouble and dissension here will be taken if our authorities are as blind as to permit the Kremlin to get away with any such activity right inside our own borders.

It is not too reassuring to note that among those to speak at the meeting are Dr. Sarah G. Blanding, president of Vassar, and Dr. Herbert John Davis, president of Smith College. We have heard a great deal lately of the infiltration of Communists and Communist sympathizers into the colleges and universities and the fact that presidents of two of the leading colleges in the country are willing to be connected with any such occasion as this is not at all reassuring that the allegations are not correct. We have come to the conclusion that the two classes in our public life today most easily befuddled and led up the garden path are ministers and educators.

WHY ATOMIC SCIENTISTS?

It is even more disconcerting to note that three persons connected with atomic matters are also on the list of speakers as announced by Dr. Harlow Shapley of Harvard. They are Dr. Lyle Borst, chief of the atomic pile at the Atomic Energy Commission's Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, Long Island; Dr. Philip Morrison, Cornell atomic scientist; and Dr. Victor Weisskopf, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Perhaps the investigations into the workings of the Atomic Energy Commission and its head, David Lilienthal, have not gone nearly far enough. Just what are these men going to impart to our Russian friends? Does anyone think their choice as speakers was haphazard? We do not. We think the State Department, the Attorney General, and the immigration authorities should think more than twice before admitting these seven Communists into this country. They are certainly a greater menace to our security than are a few photographers taking pictures of the President lazing on vacation when he should be in Washington attending the Nation's business.

A Protest Against Invitation to Grand Mufti of Jerusalem To Attend United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was startled to learn that our member of the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission, Mark Ethridge, who is also Chairman of the Commission, felt that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem should be permitted to be heard at the hearings of the Commission, because of its established policy to accept cooperation from any group desiring to assist the United Nations General Assembly resolution for peace in Palestine. What kind of cooperation and what kind of peace can one expect from this Hitler stooge? The

Mufti did all in his power in his broadcasts from Berlin at Hitler's side to stir up the Arab world against the Allies and particularly against the Jews. He should have long since been tried as a war criminal. The files in our State Department contain pounds of evidence indicating his thirst for Jewish blood and of his guilt as a tool of Axis Powers.

Under no circumstances should the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission grant a forum to Haj Amin el Husseini, the exiled Mufti of Jerusalem, within which to sound off his anti-Jewish poison.

Reforms or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of March 19, 1949:

REFORMS OR ELSE

A shrewd observer of the political scene the other day smiled ruefully and said: "You know, the Hoover Commission is doing a tremendous job, but its reports probably will be ignored like many other good reforms."

His pessimism was not unfounded, for the Hoover studies are but the latest in a 40-year series, and undoubtedly will be followed by others over the next 40 years. In 1910, President Taft appointed an Economy and Efficiency Commission, but 2 years later the House cut off its appropriations.

In 1932, President Hoover, the overseer of the present study, submitted to Congress a regrouping of 58 executive agencies, but he had been defeated for reelection, so the incoming Democrats ignored his recommendations, maintaining that the incoming President should not have his hands tied. The subsequent New Deal period of taxing the spending probably would have bypassed those reforms anyway.

At any rate, the mistakes and the oversights of the past should remain with the past. Even though previous reports on governmental organization have been ignored, there is no excuse for Congress to shunt aside the present studies. The bitter truth is that the Nation cannot afford to do so, because the costs of government are rising at a rate that threatens the entire economy. A way must be found to improve efficiency, eliminate overlapping duties and reduce needless personnel or some day the Nation may awaken to a bankrupt Government.

The Hoover Commission studies show how these reforms can be made. Already the Commission has surveyed a number of agencies; last week it came forward with recommendations for improving the Department of Commerce, the Treasury and the regulatory agencies; Thursday it reported to Congress on steps needed to streamline the Interior Department, and now it proposes the establishment of a Department of Public Welfare and Education and the merger of Federal medical care under one agency. Logic certainly calls for the latter; medical services are scattered among 40 Federal offices. Yet this sensible consolidation already has drawn stiff opposition. Its critics resemble some Congressmen who cry for greater governmental efficiency, but who wince and draw away when it becomes apparent that they might lose patronage or some of their friends might be affected by it.

In all its reports there is a recurring theme: Reorganization of each major department along functional lines—transferring agencies whose activities are not part of the Department's major purpose. The Treasury Department, for example, "should again be made the real fiscal center of the Government," the Commission asserts. It recommends transferring the Coast Guard to the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Narcotics to the Department of Justice.

The Interior Department, it sensibly decides, should be given more clearly the mission of development of subsoil and water resources. And since these activities require large public works, the Commission feels that "other public works also should be managed by this Department."

The Commission recommends similar transfers for all the departments, correctly reasoning that many "disastrous conflicts and overlaps" in both policies and duties will be eliminated.

It should be evident that the Nation will save billions if these recommendations are carried out, and it should be equally plain that unless they are carried out there is a serious risk that the Government could collapse from its own weight. Government, no less than business, cannot forever escape bankruptcy if it persists in a senseless course of overspending on hopelessly entangled administration.

Local Control of Rent Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body, in considering rent-control legislation, passed a modified version of the amendment adopted by the House providing for State and local control. It is difficult for me to see how this can be objected to, except on the dangerous theory that the people back home have no wisdom or intelligence, and are not fit to deal with their own problems, and everything in order to be properly done must be done by this great sprawling bureaucracy in Washington. A timely editorial on this subject was recently published by the Atlantic City Daily World which follows:

LOCAL OPTION ON RENTS

The bill passed recently by the House of Representatives to allow each community the option of ending or continuing rent controls was received with favor here in the resort by local realtors.

As one realtor stated "it is impossible for an individual in Washington to possess the information and facts necessary to regulate the housing of 150,000,000 people."

Each community is faced with its own individual problems concerning housing and rentals and it seems that the only sensible approach is to allow each municipality to regulate the situation according to its needs.

This does not sit well with those who believe in bureaucracy and a strong central government, and the bill is probably due for some rough sledding before it gets through the Senate.

But a resort community such as Atlantic City where one of the principal means of livelihood for many of our residents is the renting of their homes to summer tenants have problems that are decidedly different from a community where rentals are on a year-round basis.

Therefore, to administer and regulate rent controls to the fairness of all concerned it should be left up to local option and not put into the hands of a Federal office in Washington.

The Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said recently here in the House and by some of the newspapers regarding the Eighty-first Congress, and our distinguished whip, the gentleman from Tennessee, who a few days ago did a splendid job in the defense of the Eighty-first Congress.

Last Sunday there appeared in the Indianapolis Sunday Times an article by Dan Kidney, who is recognized as one of the best political writers of this country, which helps express some of the views expounded by Mr. PRIEST. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this article, as follows:

DEAR BOSS
(By Dan Kidney)

HALLECK LEADS HOUSE REVOLT—PREDICTS TRUMAN'S FAIR DEAL PROGRAM WILL NOT PASS

WASHINGTON, March 19.—DEAR BOSS: Harry S. Truman has a right to squawk when he has a Democratic Congress in which a Republican minority leader in the House—CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Rensselaer—wields more power than the President of the United States.

Our CHARLEY is one of the principal chefs who cooked up the GOP coalition with the southern conservative Democrats which is strong enough to cause him to openly predict that the Truman Fair Deal program will not pass.

When this coalition kept the filibuster alive in the Senate, until they were ready to compromise and quit, freshman Democrat Representative JOHN R. WALSH, of Anderson, cried out in anguish—

"The common man's mandate of the last election—to enact legislation that would benefit all rather than a privileged but articulate few—was cynically ignored * * * the Tories and Dixiecrats will block civil rights, Taft-Hartley repeal, extension of rent controls, a higher minimum wage, universal coverage of social security, increased social-security benefits, crop price support measures, much-needed housing laws, inflation control and health legislation."

READY TO STOP TRUMAN

To such a tirade, Mr. HALLECK might well shout "Amen" and mean it literally—"so be it." Nothing would suit him better. He still thinks the Eightieth Congress—which President Truman termed "do-nothing"—was among the greatest in United States history.

It was a Republican Congress and Mr. HALLECK was the majority leader. Right now he is willing to settle for the sort of coalition which checkmated the Truman program in

the nominally Democratic Seventy-ninth, however.

While laying his roadblocks, Mr. HALLECK takes enjoyment in taunting the administration leadership for its failure to get the Truman program passed. He took the House floor and answered a defense of the congressional slowness made by Representative PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, majority whip, like this—

"In my opinion this attempted apology for the record of the Eighty-first Congress to this date is nothing more than a smoke screen to cover up the fact that none of the pledges made to the people in the last campaign, as to what would be done in this Congress, have as yet been carried out.

"I hazard this prediction, from what I have been able to see around, that very few of those pledges are finally going to be enacted into law."

ADDRESSED DIXIECRATS

Just to help see that they will not be, Mr. HALLECK flew down to New Orleans this week and addressed a group of Dixiecrat businessmen warning them that the Truman program means socialism if not communism. They ate it up.

"The basic conflict today is not the historic differences between the Democrat Party and the Republican Party over details of government," he told the southerners.

"The basic conflict today is between two distinct philosophies of government. The one emphasizes the government, the other emphasizes the individual. The one advocates more government control and regulation, the other advocates more freedom and opportunity for the individual. The one is a philosophy of state socialism, the other a philosophy of real Americanism.

"Whether we are Republicans or whether we are Democrats, whatever our political faith, our creed, our race or religion, above all else, we are Americans (exclamation point)."

A COMMON LOVE

"Whether we are from the North or the South—from Louisiana or Indiana—we have a common love and devotion, and that is to these United States and to the principles of freedom and justice for which she stands. And we have a common task. That is to preserve and to make secure those cherished principles that make this country the one great hope of liberty-loving peoples everywhere."

During the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans and antilabor Democrats were passing laws the CIO and Americans for Democratic Action didn't like, Mr. HALLECK would say that the Congress had been given a mandate to do so. He constantly called the Congress "the real representatives of the people" and indicated that President Truman was just a political accident.

With President Truman elected entirely on his own and the Eightieth Republican Congress replaced by the Eighty-first Democratic one, Mr. HALLECK takes a dim view of that mandate now. Hooking up with the southerners, he feels that the GOP job is to try and prevent President Truman and his Democrats from doing anything they promised. Then he will campaign on the failure he has helped cause.

Local Option on Rents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 17, 1949:

LOCAL OPTION ON RENTS

Some of the critics of the House decision to put future rent control on a local-option basis are in danger of being carried away with excitement.

They say that this provision would gut the bill extending rent control for 15 months, and would result in confusion thrice confounded. That is good free-swinging language, but it is less than helpful to anyone who wants to know just why the States or political subdivisions of States should not be permitted to terminate rent controls in their own areas if they want to do so.

At the present time Federal rent controls are in force in about 1,100 counties. Why are not the elected officials of those counties just as competent, if not more competent, than some Federal officer to determine whether rent controls should be retained in their communities? Are the local officials less cognizant of local conditions or less responsive to the needs and wishes of their local constituents?

The chances are that the furor which has been "kicked up" over the local-option provision is simply another manifestation of the big Government complex which seems to be taking possession of a good many people. There are those who think the function of the Federal Government is constantly to assume new responsibilities and never surrender any of its old ones. If they had their way more and more of this country's affairs would be run from Washington, even though in many cases the people in the local communities can do a better job. Rent control is a case in point. Sooner or later the Federal Government will have to let go of it, yet the longer it holds on the harder it seems to be to turn loose.

Perhaps the House-approved bill, if finally adopted, will help this releasing process along. Tighe Woods, the Housing Expediter, who does not share the alarm of some of the critics, predicts that not more than 10 percent of the controlled counties would be decontrolled under local option. That would be 110 counties. He said the other day that he would decontrol 100 areas now himself if he had authority to recontrol, which, incidentally, the House bill gives him. So it seems not unreasonable to suggest that the critics are unduly excited. They ought to be willing to give the local authorities a chance. That would be something of a novelty, and perhaps they might do a surprisingly good job.

Books on Fascism in Action and Communism in Action Available Free Through Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Senate on yesterday approved the House concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 100,000 copies of House Document 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action." The House had previously passed this same resolution.

The Congress has heretofore authorized the printing of aproximately 600,000 copies of Communism in Action to be distributed free by Members of Congress. This resolution for the printing of the book on Fascism in Action represents the first action on the part of Congress to make available this important book free in the same way and manner that the book on "Communism in Action is made available.

Anyone who desires a copy of either one of these important books should make a request to a Member of the House or the Senate.

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recently had this to say concerning both communism and fascism:

> There is as much danger in moving too far to the right as there is in swinging too far to the left. There is little choice between fascism and communism. Both are totalitarian, antidemocratic and godless. Both use the same means of treachery and deceit to accomplish their goal of tyranny and oppression. In our fight against communism we have no place for the political police that have dominated Fascist and Communist countries.

We must continue to be on the alert against either communism or fascism. There is no better way than an informed citizenship. Anyone reading the book on Fascism in Action and becomes acquainted with the methods used by the Fascists in Italy, Germany, Spain, and Japan will very quickly discover the earmarks and footprints of fascism in many of our organizations here in the United States of America.

Trusteeship of Italian Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I wish to extend my remarks as follows, and to include therewith resolution of the Federation of Italian-American Societies of Buffalo, N. Y., adopted at a regular meeting held on February 22, 1949.

In April the question of the disposal of Italy's African possessions will come before the United Nations for a final decision. I urgently appeal to every Member of Congress to do everything in his power to have our Government take the initiative toward having the UN assume the trusteeship of the Italian colonies and assign Italy as the trustee of these territories.

To date, about $1,000,000,000 of Italian money has been invested in improving these African lands. Hundreds of thousands of Italians have had administrative and agricultural experience in these areas. Italy alone of all the democratic nations has the necessary available manpower, the vitally important geographical proximity, and the adequate technical skills and intellectual capacities to serve as the UN trustee, improve the material conditions of the natives, and systematically prepare them for their eventual national independence. By giving democratic Italy an opportunity to discharge

this great humane responsibility, we will be strengthening her prestige and prowess as a force for international security. The contemplated Atlantic Alliance would be useless if strategically placed Italy were kept out or kept weak. America alone cannot defend the entire free world. We need help from our friends. Our friends should be strengthened. To pursue any policy in Africa, Europe, or elsewhere which would weaken any of our friends would mean simply piling more heavy burdens on the American people. Our national welfare and security demand a different course.

Moreover, we will also thereby help Italy ease the terrific pressure of her surplus population. Impoverished Italy has a population density of 140 to the square kilometer—almost double that of the naturally wealthy France, which has only 76. Through granting Italy this outlet in Africa for her surplus population, we will be strengthening her economy by thus reducing the number of unemployed. Otherwise, our entire economic aid program to Italy will tend to be a policy of patching leaks and scurrying for pans in order to catch the dangerous and continuous drip caused by the heavy excess of population.

I earnestly plead with you to do all in your power to have the full weight of our Nation's moral prestige and material prowess placed on the side of justice for the talented, industrious, and peace-loving people of Italy. The greatness and strength of our country can and must assure democratic Italy the UN trusteeship of her former African possessions.

RESOLUTION OF FEDERATION OF ITALIAN-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, at a regular meeting duly called and held on February 22, 1949, at the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the following resolution was adopted by the unanimous affirmative vote of the Federation of Italian-American Societies of Buffalo, N. Y.:

"Whereas the territories of Libya, Eritrea, and Somaliland have been, for scores of years, under legitimate Italian sovereignty, under which these territories, for the first time in their history, enjoyed the benefits of civilization and especially a sound political economy, which guaranteed to their inhabitants progressive social advancement; and

"Whereas Italy, although poor in capital, but rich in labor, has invested in Libya, Eritrea and Somaliland years of hard work and industry, requiring a high toll of sacrifice through decades, thus making it possible to develop these areas which originally were little more than desert lands; and

"Whereas many generations of Italians have established large and flourishing communities, have established their homes and centered their interests in these territories to the extent that they have become permanent inhabitants therein, resulting in vital ties between these territories and Italy, which cannot be broken without irreparable damage and grave danger to the welfare of all concerned; and

"Whereas Italy is able, ready and willing to undertake its moral and spiritual obligation to continue and further the economic and social progress in these African territories as the virtual mother country of these territories, or as trustee within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, and in the furtherance of the humanitarian ideals which inspired this world organization; and

"Whereas this crisis of overpopulation is a constant threat to Italy, which vitally needs a political and economic tie with these territories in order to reconstruct itself as a peace-loving member of the world of nations; and

"Whereas according to article 23, annex 11, of the Italian Peace Treaty, the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were bound jointly to determine within one year from the date of the said treaty, i. e., by September 14, 1948, the final disposition of Italy's former colonies in Africa; and

"Whereas, since the four powers involved were unable to agree within the prescribed term, this subject matter was referred to the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

"Whereas over 46,000,000 Italians and millions of friends of Italy in America and elsewhere in the world, are, at the present time, focusing their attention and hopes on this situation, confident that the friends of Italy will once more lend a helping hand to Italy, in which so much recent interest was shown in the large national elections in that country, wherein a true freedom-loving and peace-loving administration was elected to office; and

"Whereas great moral and political strength will be invested in the Italian Democratic Government, which is presently a bulwark of strength in the democratic world in which the United States of America enjoys the pride and responsibility of leadership: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Libya, Eritrea and Somaliland be returned to Italy as its colonies, or, in the alternative, Italy be declared the trustee of these territories within the framework of the United Nations Charter."

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Erie, City of Buffalo, ss:

I have compared the foregoing with the resolution duly adopted by the Federation of Italian-American Societies of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., at a meeting regularly called and held in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., a quorum being present on February 22, 1949, and I hereby certify the foregoing to be a correct copy of said resolution so adopted, and of the whole thereof, and that the same has not been revoked or rescinded.

ANGELO GALTI, *Secretary.*

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. WOOD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 26, and 27 there will be held in New York City a so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by an organization known as the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I should like the Congress and the people of the United States generally to know the background, purposes, and real nature of this gathering.

This conference is being held as a follow-up to a similar gathering on a world scale called the World Congress of Intellectuals, which was held at Wroclaw (Breslau), Poland, in August 1948. One of the delegates to the latter meeting was Bryn J. Hovde, of the New School for Social Research. His description of the Wroclaw congress gives a foretaste of what we may expect from the New York meeting:

> Every speech insulting the United States and glorifying the Soviets was wildly applauded. * * * After the first speech by the Soviet novelist, Fadiejew, a speech which for vituperation was never excelled and which set the tone for the Congress. * * * I wound up with a strong statement of democracy as the only basis for peace. No speaker at the Congress got a colder reception. * * * Speaking was like throwing flat stones on an icy lake.

I note among the international guests listed on the program of the March 25, 26, and 27 conference the same A. A. Fadeev (Fadiejew), secretary-general of the secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers.

Among the sponsors of the New York meeting are the following participants in the Wroclaw Congress: Jo Davidson, Harlow Shapley, Albert Kahn, and Howard Fast.

In a series of radio broadcasts from behind the iron curtain, from Moscow, Prague, and other centers there is a steady stream of propaganda urging the calling of a world peace congress to rally support for the Soviet Union and create hatred toward the United States.

The New York meeting is clearly a preliminary to this world congress aimed primarily to counteract and destroy the Atlantic military pact.

What is the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which is sponsoring the New York meeting? What is its background? Who are its supporters?

The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is a descendant of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which was repudiated in 1946 by Harold L. Ickes, its chairman, because of its Communist character.

In August 1945, June Hoffman, representing the cultural section of the Communist Party at its New York State convention, declared proudly:

> We built the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and it is a great political weapon.

At that same meeting Lionel Berman, husband of Louise Bransten, a known contact of Soviet espionage agents, was praised by the cultural commission of the Communist Party for his role in setting up the ICCASP—Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This organization is listed incidentally as a Communist-front organization in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947. Among the leading members or supporters of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions who played a similar role in the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions are the following: Louis Adamic, Franklin P. Adams, Leonard Bernstein, Walter Bernstein, Ernest Boas, Henrietta Buckmaster, Rufus E. Clement, Aaron Copland, Norman Corwin, Jo Davidson, Olin Downes, Albert Einstein, Philip Evergood, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Howard Fast, Jose Ferrer, Lillian Hellman, Langston Hughes, Howard Koch, Isaac M. Kolthoff, Leon Kroll, Canada Lee, Linus

Pauling, John P. Peters, Walter Rautenstrauch, Anton Refregier, Paul Robeson, Harlow Shapley, Herman Shumlin, Max Weber.

Let me add that on August 2, 1948, Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, testified before the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as follows:

The Independent (Citizens) Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was worked out originally in my office in the Daily Worker. It was worked out by the cultural commission of the Daily Worker, of which Lionel Berman, of the cultural section, organizer of the party, was a member, and he was entrusted not only by that meeting but by the political committee, as the result of these discussions, with the task of forming the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

In 1932 a League of Professional Groups was formed in support of William Z. Foster, Communist candidate for President, a man who has openly avowed his intention to establish a Soviet America and to support the Red Army in the event of a conflict with the United States, together with James W. Ford, Communist candidate for Vice President. The following present sponsors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions were included in this Red league: Adolph Dehn, Langston Hughes, Matthew Josephson, Alfred Kreymborg, Edwin Seaver, Frederick L. Schuman, Ella Winter.

In 1936 the Communist Party ticket included Earl Browder for President and James W. Ford for Vice President. A committee of professional groups for Browder and Ford included the following present sponsors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Marc Blitzstein, Robert M. Coates, Aaron Copland, Langston Hughes, William Gropper, Edwin Seaver, Max Weber, Ella Winter.

On December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, Attorney General Tom C. Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as a subversive organization. On September 2, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities in a special report stated that the Civil Rights Congress was dedicated "specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party." Today the Civil Rights Congress is in the forefront of the fight for the defense of the 12 Communist leaders who have been indicted by a Federal grand jury. Among the leading supporters of the Civil Rights Congress who are sponsors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions are: Louis Adamic, Thomas Addis, Leonard Bernstein, Marc Blitzstein, Henrietta Buckmaster, Lester Cole, John W. Darr, Olin Downes, W. E. B. DuBois, Philip Evergood, Howard Fast, Henry P. Fairchild, Lion Feuchtwanger, William Gropper, Uta Hagen, Dashiell Hammett, Pearl M. Hart, Marion Hathway, Howard Koch, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Ray Lev, Jack R. McMichael, Arthur Miller, Clifford Odets, Paul Robeson, Harold J. Rome, Frederick L. Schuman, Agnes Smedley, Dalton Trumbo, Harry F. Ward, Coston E. Warne, Max Weber.

Earl Browder, former general secretary of the Communist Party, was convicted in 1940 on a charge of passport fraud. A Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was formed under Communist initiative. Among the supporters of this committee were the following sponsors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Howard Bay, Marc Blitzstein, Edward Chodorov, W. E. B. DuBois, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Dashiell Hammett, Mary Van Kleeck, Ring Lardner, Jr.; Kenneth Leslie, F. O. Matthiesson, Albert Maltz, Carey McWilliams, Paul Robeson, Ira DeA. Reid, Harlow Shapley, Harry F. Ward, Max Weber, James Waterman Wise, James H. Wolfe.

The National Council of American Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive by Attorney General Tom C. Clark on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, and previously by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. Among the supporters of this organization we find the following sponsors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Louis Adamic, Aaron Copland, Norman Corwin, Jo Davidson, Albert Einstein, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Lion Feuchtwanger, Langston Hughes, Corliss Lamont, Emil Lengyel, Robert S. Lynd, Arthur W. Moulton, Clifford Odets, John P. Peters, Anton Refregier, Paul Robeson, Guy Emery Shipler, Herman Shumlin, Donald Ogden Stewart, Oswald Veblen, Max Weber, Mary Van Kleeck.

Recently Maurice Thorez, leader of the French Communist Party, declared that the French people should welcome the Red army in the event it entered France. The same treasonable sentiment has been echoed by Communist parties throughout the world, including the Communist Party of the United States, through its spokesmen, William Z Foster and Eugene Dennis. It is clearly incumbent upon each delegate and supporter of the so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference being held in New York on March 25, 26, and 27 to state unequivocally exactly where he stands in reference to this official position of the Communist Party. This issue will furnish a clear-cut acid test of the character of this conference.

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace has more than 500 sponsors. Included in this list are numerous persons who have been exposed as Communists by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Included in this category are John Howard Lawson, Ring Lardner, Jr., Lester Cole, Albert Maltz, Dalton Trumbo, and Richard O. Boyer.

The committee has proof of the Communist Party membership of additional sponsors which at this time has not been placed in the record. Of the 524 sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, it is interesting to note that 291 have associated themselves with Communist-front organizations. Fifty-five of the sponsors have associated with 20 or more Communist fronts, 50 others have associated with from 10 to 19 Communist fronts, and 61 others have been associated with from 4 to 10 Communist organizations.

Now let's take a look at the guests from foreign countries who have been invited to this conference. The committee has information concerning 54 persons who were invited to attend the World Peace Conference from the following countries: Canada, Czechoslovakia, England, France, French West Africa, Hungary, India, Italy, Norway, Poland, Puerto Rico, Rumania, Russia, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Bolivia, and Ecuador. Of the 54 persons invited, 15 of them have been reported to our intelligence agencies as being members of the Communist Party. Eleven of these foreign visitors are classified as fellow travelers of the Communist Party. These last two categories do not include or take into consideration the seven visitors from Russia. One of the visitors from Russia has been reported as a member of the MVD formerly known as the NKVD, commonly referred to as the Russian secret police.

I am greatly concerned that among the sponsors for this conference are many professors from our leading universities and colleges. An examination of the list of speakers scheduled to address the conference shows that professors from such well-known institutions of learning as Howard, Smith, Cornell, Amherst, Illinois, Michigan, Columbia, Sarah Lawrence, Haverford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, North Carolina, Yale, and Williams, are scheduled to address the conference. There are 83 sponsors of this Communist-conceived conference who have the title of professor. There are also numerous persons bearing the title of doctor who are teaching in our American universities and acting as sponsors of this conference.

I am also greatly concerned that there are 35 representatives of the clergy listed as sponsors of this Communist conference.

I also note in the list of sponsors that there are several persons whose names appear in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities as close acquaintances of persons presently under investigation by the committee as Soviet agents. One of the sponsors is known to have been removed from an important post in the United States Government because he furnished information to a Soviet agent who will be called before the committee in the near future.

Several of our atomic scientists are also listed as sponsors of this Communist peace conference.

I can only view with alarm the fact that here in this country we permit lace-curtain Communists to hold a conference that could not be held in an iron-curtain country, although the conference's main purpose is to create sympathy for the foreign policy of the principal iron-curtain country, Soviet Russia.

No, Thank You, Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the

House, I include in my remarks an editorial by Beatrice Hancock Mullaney, of Fall River, Mass., entitled "No, Thank You, Mr. Truman":

NO, THANK YOU, MR. TRUMAN

(By Beatrice Hancock Mullaney)

When you were elected, Mr. Truman, even though I didn't vote for you, I was prepared to accept you as the choice of the majority of my countrymen and to keep my gripes to a minimum. After all, when a person is numb with defeat it isn't too hard to accept that theory about that guy in the White House away off in Washington not affecting one.

I forgave you for that State of the Union speech wherein you declared that you found the country in splendid condition. Of course, you had just finished telling the people of this country that the Eightieth Congress had about ruined the country and that we were on the verge of disaster, but I was willing to call that sales talk. I even forgave you for capitalizing on the Taft-Hartley bill. You didn't fool me, like you fooled a lot of people, Mr. Truman, because I have seen too many statistics about strikes decreasing; improved conditions for employees; the wholesale purge of Commies from top union jobs; but there were three or four sections of the bill that should be changed; Taft said so himself. Yet, four bad sections in a law that has over 20 sections and that provides for its own amendment, that's a good average, Mr. President. But the Eightieth Congress failed to change those dubious sections; they also failed to sell the other 18 sections including the several that protect the public. Like the section you used several times to avoid national emergencies, Mr. Truman, your memory was conveniently short on how the Taft-Hartley bill helped you and the American public. But, as I said, I forgave you all that because you won that argument by default.

But now we come to the budget that covers your plans for our country for the next year. Let me state here and now that if the housewives of this country (well, the good ones, anyhow, who live within their incomes), ran their homes the way you are running this country, their husbands would go bankrupt, they would fill the poor debtor's court every day, and every child would be born into such homes with the debts of his parents for his birthright.

I have read every analysis of that budget that I could get my hands on and I think that even now I'd forgive you the immensity of it; the waste of it; the maximum estimate features of it if I could ignore the moral implications of it. But your kindest critics, your apt pressmen, your closest pals all call it the same thing, a budget composed for international and domestic planning; two-thirds of it to continue the cold war with Russia and the other third? For your welfare state, Mr. Truman.

That big-two-thirds item doesn't bother me at all, in spite of all the news stories about our lend-lease materials rotting on docks; of European countries selling what they get from us to Russia; or black-marketing by our own foreign supervisors. I can swallow all that if the plan helps the starving and the homeless and averts war with Russia. But your welfare state budget.

Is this America, the land of freedom and opportunity? Is this America, where today's laborer is tomorrow's owner and manager? Is this America, where anyone with a good idea, a special talent, willing to work and willing to risk a few hundred might be tomorrow's millionaire? Is this America, to which our fathers and forefathers fled and to which refugees still come to escape being told how to worship, where to work, where to send their children to school?

Don't get me wrong, Mr. President, the plodder who stays at a job all his life and who wants to save through social security should be able to do it; Mr. Dewey would have done just what you are going to do, extend form of saving.

And don't think that I'm against the Government going into low-cost housing that eliminates slums with their costly crime and poverty element. The Lord said we'd always have the poor with us, so we have to do something about them, but He did not say anything about treating everybody as if they were poor. If one of my sons wants to be a contractor I hope he does not have to compete with the Government and I hope that he won't have to know the right guy in Washington to stay in business.

As for your socialized medicine, there's no point in telling my son at medical school to work hard and distinguish himself, is there, if how far he gets depends on whether my Congressman knows the top man? England just asked us for $9,000,000,000 (yes, nine billion) more to keep her socialistic schemes in operation for another year. What country are you planning to get help from, Mr. Truman, when your welfare state really gets along?

I'm just a housewife who, like millions of other housewives over this country, have preached to my children of their glorious heritage. I've taught them that how far they go in life will depend on how hard they work, how courageously they tackle the normal hardships of life, and that they have the means within themselves to achieve their goals. I hope that I have taught them that to run to the Government for every little problem expecting relief is an illusion, because they themselves are the state and that they pay one way or another for everything the state hands out.

I've taught them to be thrifty and self-reliant and that there is nothing evil about saving their money and buying stock or investing in a business, and if there is anything evil about such things, there are plenty of wrongdoers in this country who saved when they were young and worked hard to provide for their own old age. And contrary to what you made the people think, Mr. Truman, there are as many Democrats among this crowd as Republicans. I might add that most of the Republicans I know have only clipped the type of coupon which, if sent with a quarter, gets them a silver-plated spoon or a sink brush.

Have I been all wrong in this outlook for future American citizens? Have I got to change these ideas and start teaching that the state is a kind of superman who holds their destiny in his hands and takes his tribute in taxes for a welfare state? This is what you seem to imply with your budget. I hope the rest of the women of this country are as indignant about your offer as I am. No; thank you, Mr. Truman, I do not want any part of your welfare state. As a good citizen, I will have to bear my part of the expenses of it, but consider this a formal notice that I will work as hard as I can to change it.

The Inaugural Story—Historic Film Record of a Great American Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding film—a color motion-picture recording of the Inauguration Day ceremonies—produced by an enterprising motion-picture company, the Sherman Plan, Inc., of Washington, D. C.

This film, produced with sound, marks the first time in motion-picture history that a Presidential inauguration has been recorded in full color. As we all recall, January 20 was a beautiful, sun-drenched day, and this picture has captured the spectacular pageantry of a colorful occasion.

The high lights of the day are dramatically pictured, although the film is much too brief. I feel that The Inaugural Story is a motion picture worthy of high praise. It deserves a prominent position in the film libraries of American schools and organizations. It is truly a patriotic delineation of an event that transcended party lines and is worthy of the attention of all who are interested in seeing, on the screen, a vivid and stirring picture of democracy as it is practiced in our great Nation.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append the following resolution relative to General Pulaski's Memorial Day recently passed by the Board of Aldermen of Melrose, Mass.:

Resolution relative to the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Melrose, Mass.—

1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to

pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of Massachusetts, and to the Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts.

Clinton Rider Holds Twentieth St. Patrick's Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article from the Worcester, Mass., Telegram describing the twentieth one-man St. Patrick's Day celebration in my home town of Clinton.

The rider, my good friend, Mr. John Fitzgerald, who has been celebrating the Irish patron saint's day in this manner for the past 20 years, was properly costumed for the occasion. There is, of course, a much larger celebration in Clinton to mark this festive day at which large numbers of people gather to pay tribute, but there is certainly none more colorful or inspiring than that of the single rider dressed in Irish costume who traverses the streets of the town as his own tribute to St. Patrick.

CLINTON RIDER HOLDS TWENTIETH ST. PATRICK'S PARADE

CLINTON, Friday.—The one-man Hibernian horse brigade, John Fitzgerald, paraded through the streets of Clinton yesterday for the twentieth successive year in observance of St. Patrick's Day.

Thousands turned out to watch as Fitzgerald's horse carried him to all corners of the town.

John was dressed in Kelly green with top hat, Prince Albert coat and trousers.

His horse, too, was dressed for the occasion with green ribbons in his mane and green blanket marked with gold lettering "Erin Go Bragh."

Nor was the march without incident. When it arrived on High Street, the main thoroughfare, it headed into a crowded food market and drove out the patrons, including Michel E. Kelly, chief of police.

THRILLS PATIENTS

When the march arrived at the hospital on Greely Hill many patients went to the windows.

Traffic was stopped on Mechanic Street when the parade passed the high school and the students poured out and swarmed about the one-man brigade. A photographer mounted a stepladder in the middle of the street to take pictures.

The idea of a St. Patrick's Day parade for Clinton first occurred to Fitzgerald two decades ago when he joined the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

He said yesterday, "When I joined the organization I felt that the thing should be done right and an Irishman should march on St. Patrick's Day."

ALWAYS SAME ROUTE

Since that day Fitzgerald has covered the same route each March 17 for 20 years. He starts at High and Water, goes up Water street to Cedar Hill, over Chestnut street to the Acre; back down the hill again along High street and then up Burditt Hill; back down Burditt Hill to the north end and up Greely Hill to the hospital where the march comes to a weary end.

At first the parade was on foot, but for the past 10 years the cavalry took over.

At first Fitzgerald paraded around town with his green top hat, but as the years rolled by and he became an institution his attire has become more elaborate.

COSTUME DONATED

This year his green Prince Albert coat was contributed by Rev. James Tunney, of St. John's Church. The horse was clipped by Jim Watson, the green trousers were given by Carl Strunz, and the horse's blanket made by Strunz's wife, Flora.

The fame of the one-man parade has spread throughout the State and each year Fitzgerald receives letters of admiration on St. Patrick's Day from all over signed "Secret Pal," "An Ardent Admirer," and in the like manner.

An invitation to participate in yesterday's parade in South Boston was turned down by Fitzgerald in order to preserve the tradition that has been established in Clinton over the past 20 years.

To top off yesterday's festivities the one-man parade was invited to attend the annual police ball and entertainment last night at Fallon Memorial Auditorium—but without his horse.

Transfer of C–4 Vessels to Army Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a letter addressed to President Truman regarding the transfer of C–4 vessels to Army operation:

MARCH 22, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Within the last week I have received letters from over 50 of my constituents who are now at sea employed aboard C–4 vessels operated by the Maritime Commission.

These seamen are among the 2,000 union seamen now employed aboard the 9 vessels operated by the Commission in the transportation of displaced persons who will be unemployed by April 1, 1949, unless you rescind the directive transferring these vessels to Army operation.

There are over 25,000 union seamen now unemployed. The average seaman is waiting 2 to 6 months for a job. The lay-off of 2,000 union seamen by the transfer of these vessels to the Army will heap added hardships and suffering on these workers and their families.

The prospective transfer of these vessels will extend the control of the Army to more than 220 merchant vessels and to over 15,000 maritime jobs. Army control of these jobs means loss of union protection acquired by years of struggle, loss of unemployment-insurance rights, and loss of old-age-insurance rights.

On behalf of these seamen, I urge that you rescind the directive transferring the C–4 vessels to Army operation.

Sincerely yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Is It Too Late in China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a great admirer of people who present their case on the basis of real facts and hence who speak with the authority that can come from intimate knowledge of their subject. I have had such a presentation sent me on the subject of what the United States, even at this late date, might do to help China to help itself in the world-wide crusade to keep the ideals of democratic government from being submerged by Communist assault.

The United States in recent years has spent tremendous sums in that undertaking but, particularly in China, has not done well. Our governmental experts in the State Department and elsewhere have produced no miracles, to put it mildly. Despite the millions that have been voted out of the pockets of American taxpayers for aid to China, chiefly to prevent spread of communism in a part of the world where ultimately this spread might be most serious for our own future, despite our terrifically lavish expenditures, we have obtained little in the way of hard-headed results. As a government we stand bewildered today as to what to do.

In view of the frustration of the policy-making Government experts, I have been particularly interested in this statement which I am about to include. It was prepared by A. L. Burridge, Jr., captain in the United States Marine Corps air forces, during World War II, in the Far East theater, who since the war has been one of Gen. Claire Chennault's chief assistants in operating the China air transport. Captain Burridge, who is supervisor for certain sections of China Air Transport, suggests a definite plan which he feels could be profitably followed by the United States in helping the Chinese people to win the struggle of democracy versus communism. In view of the investment we already have, naturally he dislikes to see us sit on the sidelines, even at this late date, and have that battle go to the forces of communism by default.

Captain Burridge's statement is full of conviction and is refreshing in that there are no diplomatic niceties in his directness of comment. He feels the situation there, despite the rapid Communist advance in recent weeks, is far from hopeless. He feels what is needed principally

is a concept of what actually can be done, starting in one area, to show that democratic methods can and will win out over Communist despotism whenever put to a fair and equal test.

Captain Burridge never intended nor expected that his statement would reach the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He wrote it merely as an outpouring of his own convictions in a letter to his family, Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Burridge, Sr., of Cadillac, Mich. It happens that Mr. and Mrs. Burridge, Sr., are long-standing friends of mine, but even so I possibly would not have seen Captain Burridge's comments had they not been printed in the March 10 issue of the Evening News, daily newspaper published at Cadillac by T. O. Hackle and his son Earl Hackle.

Here is Captain Burridge's analysis which I hope all of you will read:

At the rate things were going it looked like North China was about finished and I could complete the evacuation of Tsingtao and take my long-delayed vacation before taking over my new area, which is to be the West China-Indochina-Burma area with headquarters in Kunming.

However, events have turned a little different. My area has been increased to include Shanghai and Nanking in addition to Tsingtao, Taiyuan, Ninghsha, Paotou, Kweisui, and my caretaker staff at Peiping and Tientsin with whom I am in contact but doing no business at present. The number of stations are fewer than I had last year at this time but they are bigger and the area is much larger. I am keeping two offices, one in the north at Tsingtao and the other for the southern half at Shanghai. Am trying to administer it by flying back and forth, spending 3 days a week in the Tsingtao, northern half, and 4 days a week in the Shanghai, southern half.

There is no Communist activity whatsoever near Tsingtao but that does not preclude the possibility of warfare starting in the next few weeks but does mean any evacuation, at present, is premature. Tsingtao is still the only practical means of supply for Taiyuan, which lies 600 miles west. Though it can be done from Shanghai the distance is nearly twice as far and of course the net result is twice as expensive. Our job right now is to get 200 tons of food flown in there each day, rain or shine. This may sound easy when compared to the Berlin airlift but in Berlin the flight is less than 2 hours and you can land at your destination. This Taiyuan shuttle is a 9-hour nonstop round trip from Shanghai and 6 hours from Tsingtao. Due to the fact that all 11 airfields there are being shelled you cannot land and the Reds hold all the area in between so you have to make it both ways without trouble—or else. There are no facilities for navigation or emergency between either of the two points so that also is a little rough.

IN RICH VALLEY

Taiyuan itself is located in a valley surrounded by very ancient mountains which are rich in minerals, especially coal and iron ore. Yen Hsi-shan has been governor of the province (Shansi) since the imperial days. He is in his thirty-sixth year now, which makes him the last of the warlords to retain his domain intact. He has seldom stirred from the province and fought anyone who tried to force him out. In the last 20 years he has had battles with the National Government, Chiang Kai-shek, Japanese, and Communists. He established a rather benevolent dictatorship in which he ruled from the bottom with his absolute veto remaining at the top.

At many times he used a hard hand but usually his results proved his method. During the 35 years he has taken this isolated area of 3,000,000 people and built it up to the point where it manufactures steel, glass, dyes, iron, woolens, cotton cloth, cigarets, cement, and all the byproducts of these industries. In spite of the 12-month blockade by the Reds every one of these industries is still producing, due 90 percent to his foresight in stock piling raw materials and 10 percent to the products we fly in. This winter the biggest difficulty has been the food question which is our entire duty there now. It takes 200 tons daily to feed the people. In the last year he has built nine airfields to expedite our deliveries, but each has been captured at some time or another. Last August every one was occupied and he didn't even hold an area within 2 miles of the city's perimeter. Everyone in China gave him up then but Chennault. We redoubled our airlift, which all had to be dropped then, and in 2 weeks he had fought out and taken back three fields. Today he holds all 11 airfields, but we have been shelled every time we landed on any but 2 of them. The Reds figured he was a pretty hard nut to crack along in December, and holed into the mountains for the winter, so except for shelling our planes when we try using the strips, it has been fairly quiet. Meanwhile, his factories are going full blast turning out everything from mortars to 105 howitzers, with which to blast them out of their boots in the spring.

His independent nature (once battled with the Gimo) kept him from receiving much ing the way of support from the Central Government which generally bothered him not a whit until when, in a state of siege, the assistance of the Gimo in procuring rice and allotting foreign exchange for gas was essential. He was given second place after Mukden but when Mukden fell, and he surprised everyone by holding out after the big Red fall push, he was given more active support.

Though the strategic value of Taiyuan no longer remains, it and Tsingtao must be held if any resistance to communism is to persist north of the Yangtse. Tsingtao and Taiyuan are working to provide the people with a government which they will support and defend if necessary. If this is successful they will both stand out as a contrast to the Communist areas around them which are already stiff-necked with the controls of the Reds.

NO TERRORISM—YET

Red treatment is not the terrorist system of its earlier days but is now evolving into a smart, aggressive government slightly surprised at its success but laying seeds for its failure with restrictions on personal liberties the people may obey but will never approve.

If the United States would only realize that the Chinese are interested only in freedom and personal security they would aim at those two things in an aggressive manner which would give us a China which would be the bulwark against communism that it should be.

Friends of mine in the State Department here have a tendency to feel either "Let the Chinese help themselves first," or "Communism can never work here any better than anything else has been able to." Both these viewpoints I could condone if directed at nearly any other country in the world but not for China.

In the first place the "Let China help herself" school overlooks the fact that though China may be one of the world's oldest countries she has been governing herself less than 40 years which makes her a youngster at self-government. It seems to me like telling a 5-year-old child to educate himself. He would probably develop knowledge all right but heaven only knows what tangent he would take and he would always be a ripe plum for anyone who wanted to direct his education for their own interests. I believe that is the trouble today and also the reason communism has taken a foothold.

We gave China the idea of democracy without the ideal of democracy. We told her how we did it and said now "you do it." As soon as she makes a mistake we start berating her without sufficient firmness and sensible assistance to get her back on the path. We never did take the problem to the people of China and ostriched ourselves on every issue, letting the wheels of China carry the ball on the slippery questions and then raised holy cain when they got into trouble, which our own advice had probably caused. I have personally seen this happen a few times and it is a sad sight to see the disillusionment in their eyes when they suffer from their trust in our advice.

I do not say we have been all bad nor do I mean to intimate that we did not try, but most of the time we have been too late, too little, and too easily defeated in our purpose.

CHINESE ARE PROUD

It is my contention that the situation gets better the worse it gets. The reason for this is that Chinese are just as proud and stubborn as Americans but when in a tight spot they are more prone to take advice and follow it to the letter as well as make concessions which would involve a loss of face under other conditions.

Therefore enough of "let China help herself" as she is only going to get into trouble that way. She must be aggressively assisted and directed and backed and pushed and propped and cleaned up and cleaned out and educated and above all understood and tolerated with a parent's patience. She has the will now, more than ever before, to clean her house and redeem her people. She does not have the resources she had 2 years ago, nor the production. We must assist to furnish the food, the advice, and the cane when needed. A folded-arms complacency will find us looking down the barrel of Junior's shotgun wondering how he got the darned thing and why he wants to bump off his papa.

As for the communism-can't-work-here school of thought, this is harbored by the businessmen (except those in Peiping and Tientsin) and some of the State Department people who feel that this is just an agrarian movement of revolt against upper classes and official oppression. This is true, as far as some of the seeds of this thing go but wait till you see the fruit. Generally they feel it won't work because every sort of business, reform, revolt, and government seems to have been tried here at some time or another but all fail to hold their identity and fall back into something rather lackadaisical, but in the old pattern. That thought is the most deadly form of Communist propaganda.

The very nature of the Chinese people makes them very easy to mold if a firm hand is used, leaving a margin of freedom for minimum sustenance. The Communists have taken up every point at which we failed and developed it to the utmost. Roughly, they fall into simple classifications: Propaganda, controlled economy, firmness of purpose. That is why, once instigated, communism will work. The people will be given just enough freedom to keep them content. They will be under a rigid economy, subsidized where necessary and drained where plentiful. They will be propagandized until only the Red system seems logical. They will be treated with a firmness not to their liking but less than that which would cause revolt. A man will have freedom from hunger in the end but that is a big thing here and we must realize it is sufficient to insure the success of the Red plan. Within a period of time Red China will be molded into a union dominated by the Comintern and can be held in that union because the propaganda will be simple and believed. There will be food for the first time in years and the peace that goes with it. There will be a firm government that will give a feeling of

security. The loss of their beloved freedom will be slow and except for the very old, little missed. We will have a hard time cooperating with the child of that school.

FOOD IS BIGGEST PROBLEM

In short, then, communism will work because it has the qualities that made other systems fail. It has the discipline that will not allow opposition. It has a minimumness that China, whose biggest problem is its belly, will overlook for the rice bowl and temporary peace it offers. It has the propaganda that will sell it as it evolves from its waitress to its jailer stage.

Perhaps this sounds as though things are hopeless for us, then. On the contrary, take a chapter from Yen Hsi-shan or from the Reds themselves and fight fire with fire but add that extra ingredient they cannot offer—freedom.

Therefore we have propaganda, controlled economy, firmness of purpose, and freedom with which to make our cake. If you look at those closely, you will see that that is about what you need to raise a child properly, and therein is our approach.

Take China as a child and put just half the effort we put into the Berlin air lift. Put just a fraction of the expense of our European propaganda to work here. Give ECA aid in proportion to population where needed. Give and demand freedom in decision. Assume the responsibility of development where it will show.

Take the area nearest the Communists. I would suggest Tsingtao, because of its year-round port and fine facilities, as well as its easily defendable terrain. I would declare this city and an area within 80 miles a nonbelligerent area. The armies would be to protect its borders and no more. They would not advance and would not retreat but would maintain order and guarantee safety of the area inside that perimeter. They would be trained and educated and financed to the highest practical degree. That would give us raw products to keep all the local industries going, cotton, coal, and tobacco in great bulk as well as salt, fish, and a hundred smaller products.

This area would be put under intensive development with all the aid possible on the most businesslike basis possible. This aid would be administered with a firmness that would absolutely guarantee results. To begin with, everyone must be fed, not just enough to exist as now, but enough to work productively to halt erosion, increase housing, utilities, and restore farmland. The port would be unrestricted to all who wanted to do business there. Citizens of Red area would be free to enter peacefully and free to trade but would not be allowed to be residents until a quota was available.

I would start at the top of the government and work through every department to establish a livable wage in accordance with the state of the office. An accounting and police system would be established to assure public accounting for public funds. A tax study and enforcement bureau would be established to protect business from tax strangulation while at the same time assuring ample Government revenue for essential expenditures. This difference the United States should make up until it could be borne locally.

WOULD TEACH DEMOCRACY

Give every facility toward development of private and free enterprise which is the foundation of democracy.

Educate as we have never done it before, teach government, economics, and freedom, for to have one you must have the others.

We would spare nothing in patience, investment, labor, arms, or sacrifice to make this tiny experiment a success.

We would demand a free hand in government organization and procedure to get the thought and purpose of government back to the welfare of all the people, not just a favored few.

Once we had an economic possibility established with a popular support it would make no difference what the Reds did, they could not intimidate it. Then there would be established an ideal that could be defended with a purpose and a will. These people could do that till the end of time. Right now democracy is an empty promise but with an example to place on the shelf beside communism there is not one of the 400,000,000 who would not recognize the better buy.

On the other hand we are allowing ourselves to be driven to the gates of San Francisco without a battle or an argument. Surely now is the time for test. If we cannot make our system work and receive voluntary support by comparison, now is the time to find out.

If we cannot make Tsingtao a model why sprinkle millions over Asia?

We must put forth the ideal of democracy but we must first give that ideal a place to work. Surely 400,000,000 supporters are worth the effort.

I hope we can take Junior out of the reform school and with a new resolve to prove the truth of our convictions start anew to prove by example and determination that democracy is not hopeless here or anywhere else.

What Should We Do To Win the Cold War With Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following radio broadcast of Town Meeting, December 21, 1948, from Kellogg Auditorium, Battle Creek, Mich., over the ABC network:

WHAT SHOULD WE DO TO WIN THE COLD WAR WITH RUSSIA?

Moderator DENNY. Good evening, neighbors. The last time we were here in Battle Creek, we discussed the question, What Are the Basic Differences Between the United States and Soviet Russia? Since that time, the basic issues have become so clear that nearly everyone throughout this country and the world understands them.

Using the Marxian philosophy of communism as a spearhead, the small group of men in the Kremlin have spread their absolute control over the lives of 300,000,000 people in Russia and eastern Europe.

In China, the Chinese Communists are now seeking control of the country of 450,000,000 Chinese, and this week, they appear to be within striking distance of success.

Observing Russia's ruthless swallowing up of neighboring states, the United States in 1947 set out to check this so-called peaceful conquest by military aid to Greece and Turkey, economic aid to western Europe, and a firm policy in Germany, particularly in Berlin.

In the meantime, the Soviet leaders announced the establishment of a new Cominform consisting of the nations under their influence in eastern Europe, with the avowed purpose of fighting the Marshall plan and spreading Communist doctrine throughout the world.

These advances, fostered by Moscow, and the attempt to check them, by the United States, constitute what is known as the cold war.

The question, then, uppermost in the minds of most of us today is: Are we winning or losing the cold war with Russia? So, we're asking our experts tonight to come to grips with the question, What should we do to win the cold war with Russia?

Will a conference between Stalin and Truman help?

Are further compromises possible?

Will any agreement between us and the leaders of the Kremlin be of any real value?

What should we, the people of the United States, through their Government, do now?

We are to hear from Congressman DEWEY SHORT, Republican, of Missouri; Arthur Gaeth, foreign correspondent and ABC commentator; Louis Fischer, foreign correspondent and author; and Dr. Daniel Q. Posin, professor of North Dakota State College, of Fargo, N. Dak.

We will hear first from Congressman DEWEY SHORT who has represented his State in the House for 16 years, is ranking Republican on the House Committee on Armed Services, and has just returned from a tour of Europe inspecting our military resources there. Congressman SHORT. [Applause.]

Congressman SHORT. We have won two world wars in our generation, but have not yet won the peace. We knocked off Hitler, but raised up Stalin. One dictator has been substituted for another.

The Communist state is as totalitarian as was the Nazi. It is obvious from Russia's greedy and ruthless expansion in both Europe and Asia that her aims are incompatible with our way of life.

Her cruel domination of the peoples behind the iron curtain and the satellite governments which she has set up in these nations proves that her whole policy is one of world conquest to destroy the property-owning classes everywhere and to set up mob rule by the masses in all countries with political and religious liberty destroyed.

We ourselves are largely responsible for the Soviet's present position. Not only because of lend-lease and UNRRA aid, but because of secret deals of a stupid diplomacy.

Since the close of the shooting war, Russia has carried on a ceaseless propaganda against the United States, hoping and working to bleed this country white to bring on a severe depression with vast unemployment.

Though she joined the United Nations, Russia has repeatedly and constantly used the veto power to thwart the efforts of that body to bring about world peace. Until the United Nations becomes more firmly established and has an international police force, to carry out its decisions, the United States must, of necessity, and in sheer self-defense, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air.

The Russians may be more or less of an enigma, but they are a very practical and realistic people. They understand clearly only one language—that of force. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness.

If we are wise, we shall support strong defense measures, particularly in this troubled and uncertain world. The Congress voted $15,000,000,000 for national defense in the last session and will vote, perhaps even more in the next.

The fact that we have fought two world wars at an enormous cost to ourselves and won both without asking for an acre of territory or a dollar of indemnity should be convincing proof to all reasonable people that we are not pursuing an imperialistic or militaristic policy around the world, but that we are sincerely and earnestly striving, at great sacrifice, to promote peace and good will among all nations and peoples.

I know of no terms or concessions which we could make to Russia that would satisfy the dozen or 14 men in the Kremlin who are drunk on power. Already we have had too much appeasement of the Soviet at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

If Russia does not wish to join a world federation or to cooperate with the other great powers in the United Nations, then we should go ahead without her and leave her alone to paddle her own canoe.

If Prime Minister Stalin wants to confer with President Truman, then let him come to this country or the Western Hemisphere. We already have traveled too far and given away too much to be insulted again.

Russia has been winning battles in the cold war without firing a shot. While she has vast potential possibilities, her present strength has been grossly exaggerated. The masses are still backward; she has not the oil, steel, or rubber with which to fight another world war.

Our air lift into Berlin, which I saw the other day in action, is a miracle of our modern age. Our Navy is still by far the largest and best in the world. We have the atomic bomb and the greatest industrial output of any nation in all history.

Russia realizes where she would have been without our aid at Stalingrad. Her leaders know that her own economy is bad, their standard of living is low, and that there is much misery and unrest not only in the subjugated countries behind the iron curtain, but also inside of Russia herself.

We need to build a strong centralized intelligence to take advantage of these conditions. At least two out of every five Communists outside of Russia are Communists because of the terror and fear that Russia instills, not because of free choice.

We can win this cold war, not merely with bread and bayonets, but we should employ every legitimate and honorable means in order to destroy this world menace. Communism is doomed because it is based upon deceit, tyranny, injustice, and fear.

For these reasons, we should do everything in our power to win the cold war with Russia, not only with economic and military might, but also with ideas, better understanding, and a more effective psychological warfare, always striving to make our own Government better and to prevent conditions here at home in which the seeds of communism can take root and grow. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Congressman DEWEY SHORT. Veteran newspaper correspondent, writer, and lecturer Arthur Gaeth, has spent a great deal of his adult life in Europe, which has given him invaluable background and first-hand information about many of the complex riddles of European power politics. His Views on the News are heard on this network on Monday nights at 10 o'clock, eastern standard time. Mr. Gaeth, may we have your ideas on what we should do now to win the cold war with Russia. Arthur Gaeth. [Applause.]

Mr. GAETH. I do not accept Congressman SHORT's description of World War II's international conferences as secret deals of questionable repute or appeasement. I do not think Roosevelt fostered an appeasement policy. He took cognizance of the realities in our own military positions and tried to lay foundations for the future.

Lend-lease helped the Russians at Stalingrad, loss of their blood saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys and helped sap the flower of the German Army.

I have no apology for Russian actions. I question them, but I don't think we've been on a one-way street since 1945.

First of all, we cannot let this cold war turn into a hot war. We're in no position to win a hot war in Europe or in Asia. We do not have one dependable ally on either continent, not in France, Italy, Germany, or China.

After another war the world would be even worse off than now, with the same problems unsolved, so we cannot win the cold war against the Russians by turning it into a hot war.

Any basis for world conflict today lies, not in the danger that our capitalistic system is to the U. S. S. R. or that communism is to the U. S. A.; it's to be found in the endeavor of the Russians and Americans to influence people in other nations which are in the process of political and economic change. Three-fourths of the nations of the world are. There the Russians have been vying for position to influence world revolution toward communism.

We mostly have been obstructing. Unless we really support democracy, economic as well as political, we cannot maintain our world position. That's where the little people enter the picture. We haven't been reaching them. We've had little to offer them. Our policy needs reorientation.

We've poured billions into China, but apparently little of that got down to the people. Today it's beyond our economic capacity to alter the economic and social morass China is in. If we support the whole rotten past in China, we will be shutting ourselves out of Asia for the future. Communism will become the dominant influence.

Guns and dollars won't change the tide. There must be a new program—one that will free work slaves, bring peasants out of their dirt, and give the great undeveloped land a new life. Chinese and Asiatics are going to have to make that program—not foreigners.

In the cold war in Europe ERP needs redirection. Today it's solely a business operation by businessmen and financiers backed by the military.

ERP largely is recovery for feudal landlords in Italy who own 75 percent of the land, for the owners of cartels and trusts in the Ruhr in Germany, for the moneyed cliques of France. True, some of the benefits finally trickle down to the people.

How do you get to the common people? Not by insisting that the aid flow through reopened channels to the trusts and cartels; not by giving the impression that the dependent governments must follow the patterns in our republican past.

Instead, we clamp down on expensive, private profits made out of ERP. We encourage basic economic reorganization which places no onus on a planned economy, if that is what is necessary.

We show no opposition to expansion of cooperative enterprise, public-power projects, the production for use, not merely for profit. We embrace no government merely because it is anti-Communist, but give it to understand it receives our blessing when it produces a program that expands the benefits of economic and political democracy to the common people.

If our aid program permits the people to make their own choice, to plan their own economies, which they must do after a consuming war, then we have a chance to win grass-roots consideration.

If we get down to the grass roots, we add to our support for negotiations with the Russians. We'd better get the militarists out of those negotiations. Let diplomats resume and permit United Nations to be more than just a tool for the great powers.

Herbert Evatt and Trygve Lie both seem to think we could have settled the problem of Berlin. There was a growing impression, when I was in Europe last summer, that we Americans were trying to avert real give-and-take negotiations, because in struggling for balance of power, we believed the Russians had the advantage with strong Communist Parties in so many countries. We must negotiate settlement in that German mess.

Our present foreign policy is merely an anti-Communist one. As long as we pour in guns and dollars, we may hold some semblance of a position, but we will not win anything, and we will not end the cold war.

We bragged about our achievements in Greece. What success have we had? We're no longer voluble about China. We herald ERP, but no basic reforms are being produced except in Britain and there we may even be hindering.

If we follow our present procedure with a military program to divert strength from reconstruction, we may even push the countries over the brink to war.

Our foreign policy hopes for world stability and a chance for peace, unrealizable unless we can give the millions of little people something for which to live. Fundamentally, they seem to want economic security first, and at the expense of their monopolies, trusts, and feudal landlords, with more socialization, and a planned economy.

Our chief aim seems merely to stop communism by preserving some form of private enterprise. We can hold up our end and end the cold war by gaining the support of the common people. We can back the vested interests, but if we do, we'll end up bankrupt or in war. In both latter cases, we will be sunk. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Arthur Gaeth. Louis Fischer has had unusual opportunity to learn and know Europe well. As a journalist, he roamed Europe and Asia and the Middle East, as well as western Europe. He's one of the outstanding authorities on Russia, where he spent 14 years of his life. His latest book, Gandhi and Stalin, paints these two as they embody the two conflicting concepts of democracy and dictatorship in the world today. Perhaps his best known and most influential book is an autobiography called Men and Politics. Mr. Louis Fischer. [Applause.]

Mr. FISCHER. The cold war is a very good thing. It is the best way to prevent a hot shooting war. The cold war is a means of blocking further Soviet expansion by strengthening the countries which lie in the path of a possible Russian forward push.

If we stop waging the cold war, Russia would simply have a free field. The cold war is the Marshall plan, the western European union, the Berlin lift, our aid to Turkey and Greece. Without these measures, Russia would be a greater menace and war would be nearer.

To work out a strategy of victory in the cold war with Russia, we must first understand what Russia is up to. Soviet expansion started in 1939. It reached its height before the atomic bomb was developed, and while the United States of America and England were supplying Russia with billions of dollars in lend-lease.

Soviet imperialism, therefore, is not a product of western hostilities. The war aftermath simply offered Stalin an opportunity to grab weak countries and he made the most of it.

Many people, and, perhaps Mr. Gaeth as well, tend to forget that the Kremlin is not just another government. Russia is a cruel, ugly dictatorship. A dictatorship needs enemies. It must be able to say to its subjects that their privations are necessary, and the terror is necessary, because enemies threaten the state.

During my 14 years in Soviet Russia, I saw one enemy succeed the other as the official excuse for continuing the dictatorship. But the alleged domestic enemies have been liquidated and Germany and Japan have been crushed. If Russia now established friendly relations with America and England, there would be no enemies, and the main reasons for the terror, the labor speed-up, and the lack of consumers' goods would disappear. That would be a threat to the Soviet dictatorship.

The Soviet Government wants either victories abroad in order to glorify the dictator-

ship or tension abroad in order to justify the dictatorship.

Moscow actually does not want friendship with the West. That is why it rejected the Baruch atomic energy plan, the Marshall plan, the agreement which we had already reached in Moscow over the introduction of Soviet currency in Berlin. That is why it doesn't cooperate with the United Nations.

Mr. Gaeth just said that we Americans are trying to avert real give-and-take with Russia. He could not prove that. For years there was give-and-take between us and Russia. We gave and the Russians took.

If we examine scientifically all the wartime and postwar negotiations between Russia and the Western Powers, we will find that where there was agreement, it resulted from an acceptance by the West of all or some of Stalin's demands.

Where there was disagreement, it resulted from the West's refusal to accept Russia's demands. But no agreement, not one, resulted from Stalin's readiness to compromise, and to reduce Russia's power beyond her frontiers.

I have learned that some months ago the United States Government offered to send a battleship to a Soviet port and bring Joseph Stalin to a mid-Atlantic position where President Truman would meet him. But Stalin rejected the proposal. He wants Truman or Vinson to travel to him so that he could boast to his people that the whole world must come to Moscow. He would, therefore, be strengthening the dictatorship.

Stalin does not want war because he cannot afford it now. But neither does he want peace. He prefers his cold war, which consists of producing chaos, economic distress, and civil wars in the non-Soviet world.

Moscow is afraid of one thing above all: That a prolonged period of peace would enable the western democracies to demonstrate their economic, technical, political, and moral superiority over communism. This would be the end of communism. That is why, as their part of the cold war, the Communists throw every possible monkey wrench into the life machine of the democracies.

Meanwhile, Moscow keeps its iron curtain down, lest its citizens learn the truth about western superiority. In this, thanks to the Voice of America, Moscow does not always succeed.

The more democratic we are, the more likely we are to win the cold war. We must fight dictatorships within the democratic world, like Franco in Spain and Peron in Argentina, else how can we say that we want to fight dictatorships?

Neither we nor the British should bolster up the rotten feudal Arab regime. We must keep ex-Nazis and pro-Hitler German industrialists out of power, else how can we expect the German people to recognize us as democratic?

What is needed to win the cold war is a more perfect union of more perfect democracies. This is not merely a struggle, as Congressman DEWEY SHORT seems to think, between capitalist America and Communist Russia. With us against Russia, Mr. Gaeth, please note, are British and other European Socialists, more fiercely anti-Communist than even DEWEY SHORT himself. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Louis Fischer. Our fourth speaker, Daniel Q. Posin, was born in Russia, in Turkestan, but fled from there with the coming of Russia in 1914. He spent his life in science and mathematics, and did important war work in the radar radiation laboratory at MIT. He is the author of Mendeleyer, a novelized biography of the great Russian scientist, and is now chairman of the physics department of North Dakota State College in Fargo, N. Dak. Dr. Daniel Q. Posin. [Applause.]

Dr. POSIN. Congressman SHORT believes that we can win the cold war by building a strong military machine. That won't do it.

Mr. Gaeth believes that we must build democracy throughout the world, including our own land. That's certainly a large part of the right answer

Mr. Fischer believes in strengthening democracy, but in addition he believes that the Russians, and they alone, are to blame for the crisis of the world. This is not a fact, so he has no answer.

Now, in the first place, in my opinion, the cold war must be won in such a way that everyone wins—all nations, all people. To spend time blaming Russia is to waste precious time and to arouse further hatred.

Besides, any scientist knows that there is more than one side to a problem. There is also a principle in physics which states that action and reaction are equal and opposite, and if you really want to find out who started it all, you'll have to go back and back with this until Adam and Eve. Even then you might have a hard time figuring out who was really guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that science offers us an indication of what we must do. Think with me of the earth for a moment. It is moving around the sun. The sun moves toward a certain star. That star moves relative to another star, and that one relative to this, and everything moves relative to something else.

That's all we know. That's all we have—relative motion and nothing standing still in the universe; no central point, no hitching post in the universe where you can tie your horse and say, "This it is. This is really the place above all places."

So it is with the affairs of men. There are only relative values. No nation is really the nation, the hitching post, the ego center on this earth.

All men must be regarded as brothers. So the people of the United States must offer to the people of Russia, of France, of Britain, to all people a chance to jointly write a genuine charter of brotherhood, a world constitution for a world government, world president, world supreme court.

Oh, I know it is true that first it may be necessary to ease the tension in the world! If the Russians won't do it, then we must. This is no time for trivial considerations of "saving face." Why, we must save our entire heads.

Therefore, in Berlin we must be willing to say, "All right, you run the economics of the city. Go ahead, establish your currency," and then our boys come down from the skies and resume the motor transport and the blockade is over.

But this is not the end of the so-called cold war and no appeasement will end it either. The moment that the Berlin tension is eased, we must make the genuine offer of world federation.

Even if I were to grant that many of the things that have been blamed upon the Russians were true, it would all go to prove my point that in a world of independent nation states, that's what you must expect—preparations for war. That's what we've always had, long before there were any Communist nations. Why, we've had wars for centuries among the capitalist nations, and I have no doubt that we will have wars among independent Communist nations, too.

Of course, the Russians are doing nothing toward establishment of a world federation, but neither are we. The Marshall plan uses food to influence western Europe politically.

Remember the case of Italy. A few weeks before their election we announced that we were sending food. Yes, but they must vote our way.

The Marshall plan is being used to win us allies for the coming war. The Marshall plan is a glorified bribe; it does nothing about doing away with war. Economic aid to the world ought to be dispensed by an agency like the International Red Cross or a strengthened United Nations.

But as things are now the United Nations is achieving little of vital value, and this is because it is a mere assembly of nations without any superior law. It is a kind of gentlemen's club where frequently some of the members forget that they are gentlemen.

Let the United Nations admit Israel; let it condemn the Netherlands, and pull them off the backs of the unfortunate Indonesians.

The United Nations does not operate under world law. It is, therefore, handicapped.

Nor will the Atlantic union win the cold war. It is a mere bloc—a military alliance which will enable us someday to kill more human beings than some other nations will kill. No, a mere ganging-up will not win the cold war. There will be no winners in the hot atomic war of atomic bombs, atomic clouds, and radiation sickness.

If you think that the Russians will not be interested in a genuine world federation, you might be mistaken. Or, I admit—I admit, you might be right. But in science we do not make a conclusion before we perform the experiment.

We must perform the experiment, we must demonstrate our own genuine interest in brotherhood, or world federation, and then we must make an honest offer of federation.

Let us be scientists in this critical atomic age; make the experiment. We are at the crossroads—to the right, world federation and atomic energy for peace; to the left, nations arming for massacre and atomic energy for killing. Somewhere—where was it that I have read—I do not recall the exact words, but the meaning I certainly do remember—"I call heaven and earth to witness that I have given you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore, choose life so that thou and thy seed may live." [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Dr. Posin. Now you've heard four distinct points of view on this important question. I understand the last time we were here in Battle Creek that one member of the audience said, after hearing this complex problem discussed and no decision arrived at, that she would never again listen to Town Meeting because we didn't solve the problem.

Well, we're not going to solve the problem tonight, but we're going to continue to discuss it. I'm going to ask the members of the panel to step up here around the microphone now and carry on their discussion for a little while before we take the questions from this representative Battle Creek audience. Congressman DEWEY SHORT, have you a comment?

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Denny, in order to keep the record straight, Dr. Posin stated that I said in my opening statement that we could win the cold war by building up strong military defenses.

On the contrary, I specifically stated that we could not win the cold war with bayonets and bullets alone, but that, in addition to economic and military might, we should use ideas of better understanding to carry on a psychological warfare through the Voice of America and those other instrumentalities—organizations like the OSS—behind the iron curtain in order to sell Russia a better philosophy than they now have.

Mr. DENNY. All right, thank you. Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. GAETH. Congressman SHORT, you're a member of the Armed Services Committee. How much should we militarize in the United States? How sizable should the Army be?

Congressman SHORT. We are not militarizing in the United States, and I might say to the gentleman that I have opposed peacetime conscription. I have even fought universal military training. I don't think it's necessary in this country. However, I do

believe on voting adequate funds to build up a mighty Navy, Army, and Air Force second to none in all the world.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. I'm asking this question of Congressman SHORT because I know he can take it. What would you do about Franco, Congressman?

Congressman SHORT. I'm awfully glad, bebecause much as Mr. Fischer and I agree on the great fundamentals in this debate, I differ with him violently on the question of Spain.

I think we are absolutely foolish not to admit Spain to the United Nations. Here we are fighting communism with everything we've got, yet we refused to let the one nation that first fought communism—perhaps the most anti-Communist country in all Europe with the exception of Switzerland and Turkey—join the United Nations. And from a strategic point of view, God knows we need the Iberian Peninsula below the Pyrenees Mountains in order to control the Mediterranean. [Applause.]

Mr. FISCHER. Congressman, I would like to say that we're not only fighting communism; we're also fighting fascism and all form of dictatorship. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. GAETH. Mr. Fischer, if I understand your thesis correctly, it is that since 1939 Soviet policy changed into one of nationalist expansion. Are you implying that the Russians actually physically occupy such countries as Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia? Or, are they dominated by local Communists supported by the Russians, and therefore, these countries find themselves in the Soviet sphere.

Mr. FISCHER. In the Soviet empire, Russia has helped to establish Soviet regimes. There has not been a revolution in any one of the satellite countries. They were occupied by Russian troops who then set up Communist dictatorships. May I ask a question of Dr. Posin?

Mr. DENNY. Dr. Posin has a question first, and we haven't heard from him for a while.

Dr. POSIN. I'm the smallest and that's why they push me around so much. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENNY. Yes, but I pushed you up here.

Dr. POSIN. You stand over here next to me, Mr. Denny; I'm a little nervous. [Laughter.] Now, let's see. Mr. SHORT just now said to me that I accused him of finding a military solution alone. I only said that because it seemed to me that his emphasis was on the military, but if he wants to come forward with ideas on democracy, why, I welcome him—I'm very happy about that.

On the other hand, all of a sudden he says we need Franco because he't got a lot of soldiers, so now he's got me all mixed up again. Where are we here, anyway?

Now, may I have another moment, because I'll never get in here again, to talk to Mr. Fischer. He says that the Russians refused the Baruch plan on the atomic bomb proposal because they're just ornery, these Russians, but that's not why they refused it. One has to understand the physics of the thing. You see, what we wanted to do is to have the Russians allow inspection of everything they have—all their armaments, everything—and then we can inspect everything and they could inspect everything that we have, but meanwhile we keep the bomb.

You know, we want to put all the cards down but we want to hold the gun. They don't play poker that way in Russia, I guess. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISCHER. The answer to that is that anybody can inspect in this country and everybody knows where our atomic plants and laboratories are, but you can't inspect in Russia.

Now, I would like to ask Dr. Posin a question. Were you so sweetly reasonable about the Nazi dictatorship? Did you talk about it in relation to the sun, moon, and stars, or did you condemn Hitler? And then why don't you condemn the Soviet dictatorship? [Applause.]

Dr. POSIN. I am a firm believer in world federation, and I would offer world federation to the Nazis, to Franco, to Stalin, to everyone. We must make the experiment. Someone may take us on it.

Mr. FISCHER. May I say that, as a scientist, he ought to get down to the facts? I read the Soviet newspapers and magazines. They regularly attack the very idea of world federation. They are fiercely reactionary and nationalistic, and have not cooperated even with the UN. They said they won't join a world federation. Reluctantly, therefore, I, who am in favor of world government, have come to the conclusion that the only thing we can aim for is a world government of the democracies, and we had better get it soon before the Russians get the atomic bomb, else then they will be able to break off one country after the other. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. GAETH. Mr. Fischer has given us a picture of the oppressive Soviet empire dominated from Moscow. Now, we have had about 5 years of that in all. If these countries are actually tied to the Soviet Union the way he describes they are, then how is it that the first time one of these new converts in Yugoslavia breaks away from the mother church, the Soviets do not use force to bring the convert back? Seems to me you have to qualify your charges of Soviet imperialism and expansion.

Mr. FISCHER. That's fine. Certainly I qualify them. Yugoslavia was the one country not conquered by the Soviet Army. It is strong enough, therefore, to break away from Stalin, and that's the proof.

Russian imperialism is nationalistic and in Yugoslavia it collides with Yugoslav nationalism. This is the reason why Russia cannot solve the problems of Europe. Nationalism won't solve it. You need internationalism and Russia hasn't got it.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. It's too bad there isn't more time, but now while our speakers get ready for the question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

ANNOUNCER. You are listening to the five hundred and thirty-ninth broadcast of America's Town Meeting originating tonight in Battle Creek, Mich. We are about to take questions from the audience.

For your convenience, Town Hall prints each week a complete text of each Town Meeting, including the questions and answers to follow in the Town Meeting Bulletin. Copies of tonight's program, as well as past and future programs, may be secured by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., enclosing 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. You should allow at least 2 weeks for delivery. If you would like to subscribe to the Bulletin for 6 months, enclose $2.35, or for a year send $4.50. Or, if you would like a trial subscription, enclose $1 for 11 issues.

The question period which follows is completely spontaneous and unrehearsed. In order to discard irrelevant and useless questions, members of the audience are asked to write their questions of 25 words on a card and send them back to an assistant moderator by one of the ushers. If the question is approved, the usher returns it and during the question period the questioner holds up one, two, three, or four fingers to indicate to the moderator the person to whom his question is directed. This is to keep from having too many questions for the same person.

Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. DENNY. Now we're ready for our question period in the W. K. Kellogg Auditorium, here in Battle Creek, Mich. We'll start with the gentleman over there on the front aisle.

MAN. I'd like to ask Congressman SHORT: From your personal observation while in Europe, do you not believe there is no intention on the part of Russia to bring about a peace except at her own dictation?

Congressman SHORT. I can answer that very quickly and emphatically in the affirmative. I agree with Mr. Fischer that Russia doesn't want an agreement with the Western Powers; that her sole policy and purpose is world-wide domination by destroying the property-owning class and setting up the rule of the proletariat.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Mr. Gaeth has a comment on that.

Mr. GAETH. I don't think Trygve Lie and Herbert Evatt were quite as positive about the assertion that the Congressman just made as he was.

Mr. FISCHER. Yes, but after they tried, they failed, and there was no agreement on Berlin.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Congressman, come on in.

Congressman SHORT. I might say this to Mr. Gaeth, about his opening statement when he referred to the secret diplomacy. I wonder if he sanctioned all the agreements that were secretly arrived at and made at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam; if he favored withholding our armies out of Berlin and Prague and Vienna to allow the Russians to go in first and pick off the best sections, not only in those cities but of the country. Russia got the agriculture, Britain got the industry, France got the mines, and we got the scenery. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. DENNY. All right; thank you, Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. GAETH. That's a very long, complex question, but let's begin at this end first. General Eisenhower seems to indicate in his book, Crusade in Europe, that all was on the up and up with regard to the manner in which the leading cities, the capitals of the central European countries were taken.

Congressman SHORT. I would suggest that Mr. Gaeth reread, if he has already read, The Great Globe Itself, by William C. Bullitt, Mr. Roosevelt's own Ambassador to Moscow and later to Paris.

Mr. GAETH. Yes; but Mr. Bullitt isn't the authority that General Eisenhower is for my money. [Applause.]

Congressman SHORT. And Mr. Gaeth was the man who wanted to get rid of these militarists and have diplomats run the show.

Mr. GAETH. But I was talking about military affairs and not diplomacy. The general was in military operation.

Mr. DENNY. All right, Dr. Posin.

Dr. POSIN. I'm going to talk not about a military man, but an educator, President Eisenhower of Columbia University. He said that we had to stay away from Berlin and take a different route for military reasons, so that we would lose less American lives.

Mr. DENNY. It looks like we're not going to get any more questions here. All right, Mr. Fischer, come in.

Mr. FISCHER. Instead of quoting authorities who may differ, I think we ought to get down to history, and I have asked this question: Is there one agreement that came about as the result of Russia's readiness to compromise, or to give away anything?

Mr. DENNY. All right, Mr. Gaeth, that's directed evidently to you. Oh, Dr. Posin, are you going to tackle that one? All right.

Dr. POSIN. Yes, before I answer that I want to say that when a principle is announced in science, if there is one violation, that principle is no good. Mr. Fischer is asking for one single instance which will show that the Russians did not have bad faith all the time. Here is an instance.

Mr. FISCHER. I said where the Russians gave up power—something that they had—in order to reach a compromise.

Dr. POSIN. Exactly, and when I finish telling this thing, which is an exception to your law, you must stand up and admit that it's

no good—we do that in science. Now, in the Foreign Ministers meeting in September 1945, the Russians wanted to have only the Big Three decide on the peace treaty. The Americans fought them on this, and a few months later in December, the Russians said, all right, you win, we will now have all nations who took part in the war, take part in the peace treaty. Therefore, you lose. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISCHER. Isn't that terrific! The Russians admitted France to the negotiations and then what happened? The negotiations were about the Balkan countries. Stalin kept the Balkan countries; where's the compromise? Where did he give up anything?

Mr. DENNY. All right, thank you. Mr. Gaeth.

Mr. GAETH. Offhand, I recall that we sent Harry Hopkins over in 1945 to get some concession in connection with UN and he came back from a visit to Stalin with the necessary commitments. In the Moscow meeting in December 1945 we found Jimmy Byrnes satisfied with the results in a give-and-take basis. It seems to me that in the winter and spring of 1945 we got definite commitments for a big-scale offensive; it was mammoth in size. Seems to me that late in 1945 we were taking the attitude that everything the Russians did was wrong. We made no concessions and neither would they after that time.

Mr. FISCHER. You still have not given me a single instance where the Russians gave up something that they had in order to reach a compromise.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now, we've got to get back to the question period. I'm going to take a question from a lady up in the balcony who has a question for Dr. Posin. I think we'd better abandon the discussion here on the platform and take questions for the few minutes that are left.

LADY. Dr. Posin, if Russia refuses an offer of world federation, should one be formed without her, or would this lead to a hot war?

Dr. POSIN. In the first place, you are jumping far ahead of the game. Why should you put the point on Russia if they refuse? In the first place, we haven't offered this yet. We have to educate ourselves to this problem. We haven't offered this yet. But I'll go along with you. Very well, if the offer is a genuine one like a world federation which springs from a people's constitutional convention, with delegates coming, like that which happened in our country in Philadelphia in 1887—Russian delegates, American delegates, French delegates, with scratch paper—and if they draw up a world constitution there, that would be a measure of success. If they don't want to do this, then we federate without them. But you make the experiment first.

Mr. DENNY. All right, thank you. Gentleman on the second row.

MAN. My question is directed to Mr. Gaeth. Do you believe that an agreement could be reached between the United States and Russia, whereby we might stay in Berlin, without showing them we had the force to back that agreement up?

Mr. GAETH. Well, of course, we have the force to back agreements up. We have actually in the Berlin situation gotten ourselves in a mess because in settling the currency problem, when we first began to think in terms of currency reform, we were not cognizant of what might develop inside Berlin.

Our currency reform produced a currency reform on the part of the Russians which was natural. They had their Berlin sector directly attached to the Russian zone. Their currency reform went into the Russian zone. We came in with a counter-currency measure. That produced the scrap around currency.

I was in Berlin on the 6th and 7th of September when the meeting between the four governors—the military governors of Berlin—actually was recessed. At that meeting, General Clay told Sokolovsky that this was only a recess—they had to send reports back to their governments—France, Britain, and the United States. But that meeting never reconvened because the Western Powers took it to Moscow instead of sending it back to Berlin where General Clay implied there might even be agreement, because the Russians had been making some concessions contrary to the opinion of Mr. Fischer. Then, of course, in Moscow, the thing blew up because the Russians wouldn't back down on their own general, or governor, in Berlin.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now the gentleman in the second row, there.

MAN. My question is addressed to Mr. Fischer. Do you think there is any chance of Russia cracking from within, say by reason of political trouble in the cabinet, or death of Stalin, or some other weakness cropping out?

Mr. FISCHER. I try to refrain from prediction and prefer to analyze. I would say that it's very difficult to overthrow a dictatorship from within. I believe that the dictatorship may grow weak as a result of proof that western democracy is supreme—or better.

What I plead for is demonstration by the democracies that we are better—that we can give more to the individual—more freedom. That will trickle through to the Soviet people and ultimately—maybe 10 or 20 years from now—that will bring about a change in the Soviet regime. First, Russia will lose her satellites and, ultimately, we may get democracy in Russia, but I do not look for a violent overthrow.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Congressman SHORT?

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Denny, I am very happy that question has been asked. I do not know Russia as Dr. Posin or as Mr. Fischer know it. However, in 1931, I did visit European Russia. I know they are the most suspicious people in the world. I do know that they have repeatedly used their veto power to obstruct progress in the United Nations, that they've had opportunities to cooperate and have absolutely refused.

Now, the question that the gentleman asked was whether or not there was any likelihood of a break from within. With a pistol to your temple and a bayonet to your back, it's hard to oppose. But I want to remind you that following the First World War, the million Hindus brought from India by Britain to western Europe to do the housekeeping job for the Allied armies got a taste of western life—they saw it for the first time. Each one returned to India following the close of that war, became a personal ambassador, and today India has her independence.

In this last conflict, thousands of Russian soldiers, for the first time, left Russia—got outside of their own country—and in spite of the devastated areas they visited, they saw that many of the poor peoples in eastern Europe, in Hungary, in Rumania, and Poland, and East Prussia, were living much better than the Russians had ever lived, so there is a lot of unrest and uneasiness inside Russia. Should there be a fighting war soon, it will be because Russia will be forced to fight in order to keep down the chaos at home.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The lady there in the center of the house.

LADY. This is for Mr. Gaeth. Don't you think that our position and that of the European people would be much better if we negotiated to get the Russian troops out of Europe now?

Mr. GAETH. At the present time, it seems to be the State Department policy that we're not anxious to negotiate withdrawal, for example, from Germany because we feel that the Russians hold the stronger position. Because it's a balance-of-power situation, we do not want to move at the present time. We are aiming, of course, to use Germany, or western Germany, in the reconstruction of western Europe.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now the young lady in the balcony.

LADY. Congressman SHORT. "Making more arms" is the statement he made in his speech. How would this help the cold war? It would only make Russia more and more want to control to be safe from us.

Congressman SHORT. Russia is very realistic and very practical. I repeat what I said in my opening statement—that the only language she understands is force. She respects strength and has contempt for weakness. Only because of our present military might, our great industrial output, and our possession of the atomic bomb plus the demonstration we have given by our airlift—that and that alone, in my opinion, has kept Russia from taking all of Europe by this time. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The gentleman down here—second row.

MAN. I am directing a question to Dr. Posin. What do you think about student exchange with Russia and other communistic countries?

Dr. POSIN. Why, yes; that's a very nice, intelligent question. I am, of course, in favor of all that. However, that's a long-range problem and I am worried. I would like to ease the tension in Berlin and make a people's constitutional convention to draw up a world charter—do that right away; it can be done very rapidly—for world government.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. How can you expect the Russians to participate in a world parliament of which Dr. Posin spoke when they don't have free elections of their own parliament? [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Dr. Posin? Just 15 seconds.

Dr. POSIN. The Russians will participate, as any nation would, in a world federation for world government. The only question is: What kind of world government? This remains to be answered at the constitutional convention at which you arrive with pencil, scratch paper, and begin to draw up the document—the over-all settling document for humanity.

Mr. FISCHER. They don't even cooperate with the UN, which is much less than a world government.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a special message of interest to you.

ANNOUNCER. More people are writing in asking for Mr. Denny's pamphlet What Can You Do? Mr. Denny prepared this small, pocket-sized pamphlet to answer the question asked by so many Town Meeting listeners, "What Can I Do?" It tells you simply and directly how to be an active citizen, how you can play your part in making this democracy of ours work. It also tells you about the various activities that take place in this world famous Town Hall.

You may secure your copy by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., asking for the pamphlet entitled "What Can You Do?

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion here, is Mr. Denny.

Mr. DENNY. Now for our first summary, here is Mr. Louis Fischer.

Mr. FISCHER. I think that Russia is losing the cold war and cannot win it, because Russia is nationalistic, reactionary, and antiscientific and antimodern, witness music, arts, and science.

I think we could win the cold war if we were actively engaged in fighting for democracy everywhere; for instance, now in Indonesia, where the Dutch must be stopped from destroying Indonesian independence, else there will be a threat of communism in Indonesia. That's the way to win the cold war. Fight for democracy everywhere [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you, Mr. Fischer. Now, Mr. Gaeth.

Mr. GAETH. Times like these when there is a clamor for change have happened before in world history. Two great peoples are in a lather about the economic and political faiths of representative democracy and communism. Let's get out and proselyte for democracy, but let it be a message of salvation for the here and now, not for the hereafter. If it possesses the redeeming power, it will win converts.

If we don't make of it what it's cracked up to be, the little people of the world will turn to another faith. Up to now what had been proclaimed in Europe and Asia as the great doctrine for the West, they have not wanted.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now, Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. To win the cold war with Russia, we should:

1. Arouse the American people to the real dangers of communism both abroad and at home. It is certainly something more than a red herring.

2. Maintain the biggest and best Navy, the most modern and efficient Air Force, and build up our Army through scientific research and technological development.

3. Continue aid to those people who believe in our way of life, but not bankrupt ourselves. It should end as soon as possible. We must have a sound economy and healthy industry at home.

4. Wage an aggressive psychological war and exert moral and economic pressures.

5. Remain patient a little longer, but if necessary, sever all diplomatic and trade relations. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you, Congressman SHORT. Now Dr. Posin.

Dr. POSIN. 1. The cold war must be won by all people.

2. All nations are guilty.

3. Science indicates that world harmony comes only from world law.

4. World government is possible, and I, for one, will work with all my strength for it. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you, Dr. Posin, Congressman Short, Mr. Gaeth, and Louis Fischer.

Nevada Asks Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a copy of the Assembly Joint Resolution 27, adopted by the Assembly of the State of Nevada, asking statehood for Hawaii.

The resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 27

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend full statehood to the Territory of Hawaii

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has no congressional representative and is limited to one Delegate who does not have a vote; and

Whereas the people of this great and wealthy Territory through their service to the United States in time of war have proven their fitness for statehood; and

Whereas the legislature of the State of Nevada believes that full representation of this Territory should be granted by establishing a State thereof; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to extend to the Territory of Hawaii full status of a State of the United States, thus assuring full representation in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

Federal Excise Tax Is Not Luxury Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mercer County (Ohio) Chronicle of March 18, 1949:

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX IS NOT LUXURY TAX

Time was when the phrase "women and children first" sounded the spirit of chivalry. But in today's America the same phrase ironically designates the group which bears the rudest brunt of the tax on toilet preparations.

Consider the one-sided budget strain in a typical family of moderate means. The mother keeps her children looking healthy and clean with the aid of simple baby oils and talcum powder—on which she pays 20 percent luxury tax. She keeps her own appearance by using shampoo, hand lotion, cold cream, and face powder—all of them subject to the same 20-percent excise tax. Her husband, on the other hand, uses dentifrices, shaving cream, razor blades, and hair tonic to look well-groomed. But he pays not a single cent Federal tax for any of them.

The fact is that the excise tax on toilet preparations originally was regarded as a wartime luxury levy. As such, while hostilities continued, women consumers made no complaints about it. But in January 1947, after the President proclaimed the end of hostilities, Congress reenacted the levy, and it was then that American women started to register their justified resentment. They were happy as anyone to see millions of men being mustered out of the armed services. But they still wanted to know why their budgets were kept on a wartime basis.

Since reenactment of the tax there have been no less than 11 bills calling for its repeal. There is also in the congressional file a 747-page report reviewing these bills and recommending that at least one of them be passed. To date, there has been no action on any of them. And women continue to ask why the legislators consider it a luxury to be well-groomed.

The idea of classifying essential toilet preparations as luxuries just doesn't make sense. Even during hostilities, the War Production Board listed cosmetics among toilet necessities and allocated critical materials for their manufacture. And the OPA placed cosmetics in the category of cost-of-living necessities.

Personnel officials can give you very definite answers to the question of whether ordinary cosmetics are essential in the life of women. They'll cite the situation of two girls with parallel ability and experience seeking the same position. They'll ask you to suppose that one girl looks pallid and uncurled while her competitor, thanks to the intelligent use of wave lotions, lipstick and face powder, makes a much better appearance. Invariably, the second girl is the cne who will get the job. It is unfortunate that, in some cases, the other girl may miss getting it because she can't afford that 20 percent tax on the little things that make the big difference.

The bills asking repeal on these taxes will be reviewed by Congress some time this spring. Any action taken on them can be influenced importantly by letters which budget-weary women write to their congressmen. And the husbands, who ultimately foot the family bills anyway, will do well to join their voices to the protest.

Isn't it about time, in this postwar, twentieth century America, that well-groomed ladies and unchafed babies cease to be considered marks of the luxury class only?

The Federal luxury tax on such essential items as luggage, billfolds, watches and clocks could also be dispensed with or reduced considerably.

A Walk in Naples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catholic Worker:

A WALK IN NAPLES

"See Naples and die." I heard the phrase first when I was still in high school. We decided to walk around, and for the next 4 hours we kept at it. I don't think I'll ever forget that walk. And, remember it took place in 1949, more than 3 years after the war ended. Someone walking around the city tonight will see the same sights. It was just an ordinary Sunday evening in postwar Naples.

Most of the Neapolitans who don't have seaside villas seem to live in crowded, smelly tenement houses of the kind that are to be found on the Lower East Side of Manhattan. Maybe that is why they escape to the streets at all hours of the day and night. As soon as we left the opera house we melted into a crowd of them pushing its way aimlessly up and down the streets. I say melted. Not exactly. Everywhere, we were recognized as Americans. Maybe it was the plaid shirts; more likely, something more basic. Whatever it was, I don't think we missed a black marketeer, a pander, or a shady proposition abroad in Naples that night.

They came at us from all sides, sometimes literally running down the street through the thick crowd, arms stretched out like a football player's, to catch up to us. They offered to sell us everything from Rosary beads blessed by the Pope to their 15-year-old sisters. Then when they had finally accepted the fact that we weren't in the market for anything, they pestered us to sell something to them: American cigarettes, watches, fountain pens. Some of them were slick young characters straight out of the gangster movies. But others were only raggedy kids with a little English who had been sent out by their parents, they admitted, to bring back business for the adolescent daughters in the family.

Neither of us at this stage of the game is easily shocked. We had both run into prostitution before—in the tenderloins of American cities, in wartime London, even in postwar Germany. But to be approached

10 times in a single block, and in every block. This was not the canny business, the professional hariotry of Piccadilly, the Pigalle, or North Clark Street, but the prostitution of poverty. The skinny kids marketing their sisters should have been home in bed, getting enough sleep to go back to school in the morning. But these kids don't go to school. Their sisters themselves are at the age when, normally, they would be having innocent crushes on movie stars and be busy electing class presidents. But they, too, are still displaced persons. And their parents? God forgive them. Who that is not as poor as they will throw the first stone?

We were not the only Americans in Naples that night. A big American aircraft carrier stood out in the bay. Its crew had shore leave in the city. At the opera house we had seen an American car drive up, two official stars marking it off as command. But the young sailors were not at the opera. They were wandering up and down the streets of Naples, pursued as avidly as we were. Most of them, it was obvious, had come a long way since graduation from high school last June or the June before.

As the night wore on, there were more and more drunken American sailors to be seen staggering out of bars, and more and more being led away from the center of town by the sleek young men and the ragged kids with a little English. Here was the corruption that war and poverty have brought to Italy reaching out to the youth of full-bellied United States. But it is fair to say, too, that the drunken sailors were in the minority. At midnight, most of the American gobs were still wandering aimlessly and indecisively, as servicemen are forever doing in the loneliness of leave in a strange city. Some of them, arms loaded down with cheap souvenirs, were already on their way back to the ship. For these, every step of the way involved of necessity a "Begone, Satan." There was no let-up in flesh peddling as the night wore on.

The innocence of some of the little kids mixed up in this business hit us when one of them, after offering to bring us to his sister, refused to leave when we sent him away. Instead he stared worshipfully for a silent minute and then tagged along beside us, an obedient puppy. Finally we found out why. "You camboys!" he said. "Bang-bang! You bang-bang Indians. I never see camboys, only in cinema. Now I see you. You show me gun?" Those shirts again!

On the way back to the hotel, along the quieter streets, we saw dozens of the homeless children of Naples.

One little boy about 8 or 9 was propped up, asleep, against the side of a building. He wore a picket's sign over his shoulder which told his story in emotional Italian. According to the sign (a homemade invention of brown wrapping paper and bright water-colored letters) he was a war orphan who had no home and depended for food on the lire given him by "the good Christians" who passed him on the street. The very sign itself betrayed a professional hand somewhere. But the fact remained that here he was, after midnight, curled up on the street.

In a doorway, we found two more children, a boy 6 or 7 and his little sister, 4. The girl was sound asleep, but the boy heard us coming. He got up right away, holding the 4-year-old in his skinny arms before us, like a priest lifting up a paten. Then he spoke in rapid Italian. We didn't understand a word he said. But he might have been saying: "Look, this little thing is your responsibility, too." We understood, of course, that he was making an appeal for lire. The sleeping child never stirred through all this. God knows how many times before morning the boy picked her up and held her, accusingly, before the eyes of passers-by.

In still another doorway there were three little ones mothered by an incredibly filthy girl about 12 years old. The girl had the instincts of an overly dramatic actress. She stood before us and pantomimed wildly and shamelessly to spell out their needs. All the drama in her situation was exploited with a recklessness that belonged only on the operatic stage. She even went so far as to stretch out her arms like one crucified and cast her eyes, saintlike, toward heaven. For several minutes she kept at it furiously while the little ones gazed in wonder, first at her and then at us. Again, despite the stridently false notes, the facts were on her side. Here were the ragged little kids for all the world to see, and she alone with them.

There were others, too, usually huddled together in a doorway, clutching each other for warmth and comfort. Sometimes we would pass a lone child spread out flat on the sidewalk, dead to the world. Most of them did not wake up. In time we found ourselves whispering and tiptoeing carefully when we passed, as if we were going through some weird nursery after hours.

When we talked about the walk in Naples later, we heard many things. We heard that the Neapolitans "have always been that way." And it is true that we saw nothing like it in Rome or Florence. We heard that in Naples the very infants in the cradle are already crafty little beggars who know how to wring a couple of lire from an innocent stranger. We heard all kinds of explanations. But we heard nothing that could explain away the sights that sent us back to that hotel room, finally, with no words that made sense but only a deep, burning shame.

JOHN COGLEY,
9 rue Jordil, Fribourg, Switzerland.

"Truman's Ride," Coming Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Truman's Ride,' Coming Up," from the Indianapolis Times of March 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TRUMAN'S RIDE," COMING UP

"I may even get on the train again and make another tour around the country"—President Truman.

Shades of little Phil Sheridan and his famous ride of 1864—when he galloped 20 miles up the Shenandoah Valley to stem the rout of his army by the special interests.

Sheridan, the doughty and likewise cocky Union leader, had been in Key West—no; it must have been some other place—away from his troops. Taking advantage of his absence, a southern coalition under Gen. Jubal Early struck a sudden blow and the administration forces were in full retreat.

On his way back to the front, Sheridan had reached Winchester when he heard sounds of the battle from afar. Leaping upon his trusty charger, he dug in his spurs and raced up the Valley. To his disorganized soldiers he shouted, as he flashed by on thudding hoofs, these immortal words:

"Face the other way, boys. We're going back."

Thrilled by his dramatic appearance, the crestfallen troops rallied and re-formed. A few hours later Sheridan attacked brilliantly and swept Early's men from the field, recovering the ground that had been lost. Strong men wept, and poets wrote flaming verse to memorialize Sheridan's ride.

Well, a man can dream, can't he—under that Florida sun?

Labor-Relations Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] delivered a very able address on labor relations legislation before the Third Annual Bulletin Forum at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, in Philadelphia. In his address the Senator from New York outlined in a very able fashion the major principles of the amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. It is about these principles the Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Oregon have been in conference, and I wish to express my sincere compliments to the Senator for his very able address, and I ask to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my pleasure and privilege tonight to outline for you my personal views concerning the essential content of labor-relations legislation which is scheduled soon to be before the Congress for decision.

As you know, there is much speculation nowadays concerning the nature of this particular legislation, which will emerge finally from the present Congress. This speculation ranges all the way from slight amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act to complete repeal of that act and the substitution in its place of the former Wagner Act with slight modifications, as has been proposed by the administration. I do not subscribe to either of these extreme courses of action.

As one who recognizes the field of labor relations to be dynamic and volatile, affected constantly by changing conditions, procedures, and techniques, I have never regarded any labor-relations statute as final. Over the years this has been a grave mistake of those who were the chief supporters of the Wagner Act. In the case of the Taft-Hartley Act, I regarded it not only as a temporary expedient, but as a statute containing serious imperfections which should be remedied by the Eighty-first Congress. It was, however, the best product which could be evolved by the Eightieth Congress, plagued as that Congress was by conflicting personalities and interests which prevented agreement upon any completely reasonable and sound statute of this nature. The Eightieth Congress nevertheless recognized the basic unbalance in the Wagner Act and sought to correct that unbalance by a new and more equitable statute.

It should be remembered that the main objective in writing the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was to bring the relationship between labor and management into a condition more nearly approaching equality than had been possible under the Wagner Act. In this effort, because of circumstances I have cited, a wholly desirable legislative product was out of the question.

In part because of political vicissitudes, in part because of the natural course of events in which the Taft-Hartley Act has been given an opportunity to demonstrate its strength and weakness, its wise and unwise provisions, the time has now come to write a new labor relations statute. Moreover, this statute should be, not a mere series of amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, but a brand new approach to the solution of problems inherent in the field of labor relations.

To this end, the Taft-Hartley Act itself should be repealed and, simultaneously with its repeal and as a part of the repeal measure, a new act, based on experience under the former Wagner Act and under the Taft-Hartley Act, should be formulated and enacted. Furthermore, in the writing of this new act, the Congress should not be prejudiced by allegations and charges which have been falsely made against the Taft-Hartley Act. Never, to my knowledge, has so important a legislative measure been so maligned, misrepresented, and misunderstood because of hostile organized propaganda calculated to make it unpopular.

In its form and construction, the new statute should contain, both in the language of finding and policy and in the core of the law itself, the principle that the right of collective bargaining and opportunity for workers and employers to enjoy the full and unimpeded exercise of this right is fundamental and should be held inviolate. In addition, the obligation of both labor and management to bargain collectively in good faith and their common responsibility to the public and for the public welfare should be not only recognized, but required, as a prerequisite to collective bargaining rights. Free collective bargaining directly between management and labor should be assured the fullest play, with the Government stepping in to settle disputes only as a last resort to protect the national health and safety.

It is indeed regrettable that partisan politics has been dragged into the midst of our consideration of labor-relations legislation. It seems to me that this is one field where there should be no partisanship and where all Americans, regardless of political party, should work together in a common endeavor to attain a common objective. The fact that the administration has submitted to the Congress what would appear to be a piece of "must" legislation dealing with this subject is truly deplorable, and it is discouraging to many of us who are seeking to resolve the question by conference and discussion and objective approach.

I might utilize the remainder of my remarks by criticising the so-called administration bill. To me, however, such a course on my part would seem neither creative nor constructive. Rather, I shall briefly outline what seems to me to be the more essential substantive requirements for a sound labor-relations statute.

I have indicated already that the right of collective bargaining itself is basic. It would appear, therefore, that the new act should be written around the original Wagner Act and should include, above and beyond the provisions of the Wagner Act, additional provisions which will insure by statutory enactment the establishment of a true and necessary balance in the relationship between labor and management which the Wagner Act alone did not possess and which the Taft-Hartley Act failed satisfactorily to achieve.

Such a statute should protect workers, employers, and the public both against coercion from among themselves and from unfair and harmful activities on the part of any one of them.

It should afford adequate protection to the Nation in the case of a national emergency, occasioned by a labor-management dispute in any area of our economy. Here delaying and cooling-off procedures similar to those in the Railway Labor Act, may well be adopted, and the President should be given greater specific authority and responsibility to act. Finally, in the event all other efforts will have failed, an especial obligation should rest with the Congress to take whatever action the crisis may demand.

Far more equitably than is provided in the Taft-Hartley Act, this new act should make provision for the settlement of unwarranted jurisdictional disputes and for the prohibition of unjustified secondary boycotts. Morever, it should provide a suitable means by which innocent victims of this kind of jurisdictional strife or secondary boycott may recover damages.

It should permit freedom of speech as much to employers as to employees, insofar as the exercise of free speech may not include threat, intimidation, coercion, bribery, or other undue influence.

It should insure the sanctity of the labor contract which should be binding equally upon both parties to the contract.

It should require as a prerequisite by which labor organizations and employers are empowered to utilize the processes of the National Labor Relations Board, that officials of both unions and employers take what is commonly called the Non-Communist Oath, and affirmatively repledge their allegiance to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. I make this statement as one who opposed the non-Communist affidavit provision in the Taft-Hartley Act and who readily recognizes the loyalty of the vast majority of labor leaders and employers. But I feel strongly that, with the threat of communism as it is today, this is no time to abandon measures aimed to help safeguard our country against subversive activity, and it is no time for loyal Americans to quibble about the propriety of subscribing to an oath of allegiance to our country.

This new act should provide that welfare funds be regarded and administered as trust funds for the benefit of the beneficiaries and for the proper purposes for which these funds are created. To make this provision workable and effective, moreover, the establishment and operation of welfare funds should be subject to the approval and supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

If possible, the new act should permit the closed shop, at least, in those areas where historically the closed shop has been an accepted institution; and simultaneously it should provide legal machinery for the prevention of abuses which may occur under such legalization. At the present time the Taft-Hartley Act's prohibition against the closed shop is being violated in spirit, if not in the letter, in certain important instances where it is clearly unworkable, and these conditions should be met realistically.

The new act should require that labor organizations furnish to the Secretary of Labor and to their membership detailed financial statements and such other information as may be pertinent to their functioning and operation.

By the terms of this new statute and in line with the status of all other administrative agencies, the National Labor Relations Board should function as an administrative agency under the Administrative Procedure Act, by which its functions would be appropriately separated.

The new act should provide that the Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to be a separate and independent agency of Government and shall continue to be able to act as a truly neutral and impartial force in aiding the voluntary settlement of disputes and controversies between labor and management.

Time does not permit me to make a complete enumeration of those provisions in a labor-relations statute which seem to me essential, if it is to provide a satisfactory balance between management and labor and, at the same time, safeguard the public interest. The suggestions I have made will indicate the type of act I advocate.

By and large, any legislation dealing with labor relations should recognize that organized labor has been one of the mightiest forces in our economy by which we have been able to preserve a free capitalistic society. It is altogether probable, moreover, that the elimination, or even serious impairment, of trade-unionism and the trade-union movement would contribute more than anything else to the destruction of freedom in America.

Let us ever remember that in our political life our forebears gave us a balance of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary. In our economic workaday life let us evolve a similar balance of powers between organized business, organized labor, and the national general interest. Let us seek that balance impartially, persistently, and above all confidently, knowing full well that the inner light of American institutions cannot fail.

Shall the Generals Run Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 23 issue of the Christian Century:

SHALL THE GENERALS RUN OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

Every thoughtful American knows that enactment of the North Atlantic defense alliance will mean that the United States has cast aside a principle of foreign policy which it has observed ever since George Washington was President. As the bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association has said, in the past the United States has made a few temporary alliances to deal with temporary emergencies. But ever before has this Nation seriously considered entering a permanent military pact. Washington's parting advice to stay out of entangling, i. e., permanent, alliances with the nations of Europe has hitherto been the foundation stone of our foreign relations. President Truman is the first chief executive to dare propose that it be replaced.

Of course, the mere fact that Washington—and Jefferson after him—warned against permanent alliances does not prove that this particular alliance should not be established. After all, Washington and Jefferson lived a long time ago; our world is a very different world from the world they knew, and the United States is a very different country. American interests range far abroad nowadays, and the requirements of defense within a generation have involved us in two gigantic wars fought in Europe, Asia, Africa, Greenland, Iceland, and the isles of the Pacific. In today's world, with our national interests so vastly enlarged, perhaps the time has come to abandon the old policy and adopt the one soon to be pressed on the Senate.

Our military men insist that the time for such a change is here. They are pushing for this military alliance with European nations because they say our security is at stake. That is the ground on which the State Department, in its brief for the alliance, Building the Peace, asks for ratification. "Our own security," it insists, is endangered. To

be sure the Russian threat looks like much more of a present danger to the security of France, or Italy, or Britain, or Norway, or the Low Countries. But the argument is that a threat to the security of any of those nations is a threat to our security. The way to neutralize this threat, to offset it, to stop it in its tracks, so the argument continues, is to make a permanent military alliance with the nations immediately in the Russian path.

This is a military policy. It has been conceived by military minds, and it is the sort of foreign policy whose wisdom seems self-evident to military minds. If communism must not be allowed to move farther westward in Europe, and if the western European states are too weak to lick the Russian Army, then make the armies of those western states larger, give them better equipment, and a hard-and-fast promise of American fighting support—and the Russian threat will be contained.

The gentlemen in the Pentagon Building don't understand how anyone can even question the correctness of the conclusion. This paper does so, because we think that the size of armies by no means settles their fighting worth. The French and Italian armies showed that 10 years ago; the improvised forces of the Israelis have just shown it again in the case of the Egyptians. Of the whole lot of potential allies in the proposed North Atlantic defense alliance, the only ones we wouldn't regard as liabilities in case of war with Russia would be the Canadians, the British, and the Norwegians. And Norway would be a geographical liability.

But this is not the ground we wish to examine in this editorial. Here we wish to point out not only that the North Atlantic defense alliance is a military conception, a major departure in American foreign policy being pushed by military pressure, but that, if it goes into effect, it will hand over to the military services actual control of the foreign policy of the United States for as long as the alliance remains in force. Establishment of the alliance means that the relations of the United States Government with the rest of the world will be in the hands of generals, admirals, and the Secretary of Defense.

Here is something for Congress and the Nation to stop and think about. No development in American Government since the end of the war has been more marked than the growth of public apprehension at the increasing influence of the military. As generals and admirals, former generals and admirals, retired generals and admirals took over post after post traditionally held by civilians, public murmurs of anxiety began to mount until they became a Nation-wide roar of protest. Without regard to party affiliations or sectional or other groupings, the American people generally came to feel that it just was not wise to have the military mind in such positions of power. Who has not heard, since last November, the hope expressed that now Mr. Truman had won the Presidency in his own right he would return our government to civilian control?

That well-informed Washington weekly, the United States News, threw a revealing shaft of light which reflected this widespread feeling at the time Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State. It reported that before he accepted the office, he secured a promise from President Truman that civilian control of foreign policy would be restored, especially by ending the military domination of the National Security Council in which, Sumner Welles says, foreign policy has recently been formulated. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of the report by the United States News. It sounds reasonable, however, for during his previous service in the State Department, Mr. Acheson was known as an opponent of the military clique. His principal achievements were the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which induced Congress to take atomic energy control out of the hands of the Army, and his Cleveland, Miss., speech which adumbrated the Marshall plan for economic, rather than military, aid to Europe.

Whatever the private terms on which Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State, he inherited the North Atlantic defense-alliance scheme in the final stages of its negotiation, and now he must defend it. Possibly he does so without seeing how, if the alliance is formed, actual domination over foreign policy will permanently pass to the armed forces. But the prospect should become clear to anyone who will analyze what the situation will be from the day the military pact goes into effect.

From that day on, for as long as the alliance continues, the central interest of American foreign policy must be the alliance. The alliance must be held together; it must be kept strong; if it seems to be developing weaknesses (and it will start out with the European end nothing much but weaknesses) its strength must be built up. So far as America's overseas interests are concerned, these are then bound to be the dominant, the overriding issues. No important decision in foreign policy will be made save in the light of these considerations.

But now note: Every one of these involves a military problem. On every question of the sort that arises the President, the Secretary of State and the Congress will have to go to the Pentagon for the answers. Even on the supposedly civilian matter of the amount of money to be spent to keep the alliance strong and vigorous, the Pentagon will rule.

The Pentagon will rule, not because the armed forces are always grasping for power (though they seldom prove backward about taking it when the chance offers), but because in a matter of this sort it just cannot be any other way. It has to be the army staff of France, for example, which reports to Washington on the needs of the French Army if the Russians are to be held in line. It has to be the Pentagon which receives and analyzes the report. It has to be the Pentagon which draws the conclusions concerning what needs to be done and goes either to the President or to Congress to demand that they do it. It has to be that way, for no other policy of dealing with the problems and demands that will come up under a military alliance would make any sense.

In other words, from the day the pact goes into effect the foreign policy of the United States will be controlled in the Pentagon Building. This is certain to be so because the North Atlantic defense alliance will be the heart of the policy, especially now that the effort to contain communism in China has been written off the books. The President and his Secretary of State may try to modify Pentagon decisions and demands. Army and Navy top brass will probably avoid being too high-handed; they won't hunt for unnecessary trouble. But that will not, because it cannot, change the essential nature of the situation. When administration of a military alliance becomes the central core of foreign policy, that is the job of military men. And that means military men hold in their hands the actual control of the Nation's international relations.

So when the wisdom, or otherwise, of this departure from America's historic policy comes before the Senate, we hope the Senators will see that there is more at stake than any question of the inerrant inspiration of Washington's Farewell Address. Just possibly Washington (or Hamilton, or whoever wrote it) had more reason for warning against such permanent military alliances than a timorous and selfish desire to grow fat on the fruits of isolation. Just possibly he wanted to keep control of the Nation's foreign policy in civilian hands, where it belongs.

Truman's Program Bogged Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks I include the following broadcast:

TRUMAN'S PROGRAM BOGGED DOWN

(Broadcast between Walter Cronkite representing KWK, St. Louis, and KMBC, Kansas City, Mo., and Hon. DEWEY SHORT, Representative in Congress, Seventh Missouri District)

Question. Basically, Congressman, what do you think has happened to the Eighty-first Congress? Why, with a large majority in the House, and what should have been a comfortable majority in the Senate, has the administration program been delayed up to now?

Answer. Mr. Cronkite, the program is not only delayed but bogged down. The chief reason is that it is basically unsound and fundamentally wrong. In the hour of hysteria, when no one, including the President himself, thought he could be reelected, he promised everything to everybody—which is impossible of fulfillment. Of course, the present administration cannot deliver on false promises, and many thousands who voted for, as well as against, the President, now know it.

Question. It is hard to understand why, even with those factors, the administration should fail in pushing its program through. The Democrats don't seem to be lacking in skilled, veteran leadership—Vice President BARKLEY, CARL HAYDEN, ED JOHNSON, and others Senators, and SAM RAYBURN and a host of others on the House side—all of whom, during the Roosevelt administrations, have had plenty of experience in dealing with recalcitrant Congresses? Why do you think they should have succeeded in the part, and failed so far in this session to get the Democrats in Congress to work together?

Answer. Lincoln once said, "You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time."

I agree with you that the Democrats have skilled, veteran leaders in the Vice President, the Speaker, and others whom you have mentioned—but at long last the American people are beginning to realize what a dreadful mistake they have made. The reason the Eighty-first Congress has failed is that the promises the New and Fair Dealers have made are fantastic and impossible and the stand they have taken is fundamentally wrong. In spite of the able leadership in both Houses, the rank and file of our citizens now feel that they have made a miserable mistake. This is my impression after having recently spoken in Minnesota, Missouri, and Ohio, and from my mail from several other States.

Question. Do you have the feeling at all, Congressman, that this reluctance on the part of many of the Democrats to go along with the administration program—or, at least, not to rush the program too much—do you think this attitude might be prompted by indications that the folks back home aren't as solid behind the administration program as people might have thought last November?

Answer. This question already I have answered to the previous one. Congresses may be recalcitrant and oppose the administration in power but every Congress pretty well reveals the true feeling of the people. I am

convinced that the majority of our people do not want the program laid down by the administration and that is why it is not pushed through. After all, my fellow Missourian, Mr. Truman, was elected by less than half of the voters casting their ballots in the last election. And remember, only two-thirds of the eligible voters cast their ballots. What a sad commentary on our vaunted democracy.

Question. Where would you say that the administration has failed in capitalizing, in cashing in, on that so-called mandate of last November? Certainly there was a lot of enthusiasm for the President's program among the Democrats when Congress first convened in January. What has caused the dissipation of that enthusiasm?

Answer. It is only natural for any party to be flushed by enthusiasm and carried away by excitement over victory—especially unexpected victory. The happiest and warmest hours of Harry Truman's Fair Deal was at the inauguration. Since that Belshazzar's feast and bacchanalian revelry the heat has turned to cold and rejoicing has given way to weeping.

I repeat, sir, that only about two-thirds of the eligible voters of this country cast their ballots; less than one-half of those who voted were for Mr. Truman, so the election cannot be interpreted as a mandate by anybody. The Democrats did not win, but the Republicans lost—throwing the election away by our weak, timid, pusillanimous, and indefensible tactics by failing to join an issue. I do not blame the Democrats or New Dealers for our defeat, but the cowardice of some of our own professed Republicans. We lost; they did not win.

Question. Congressman, here's a rather difficult question. It is based on frequently recurring reports that the Republicans are pursuing a policy of sabotaging the Eighty-first Congress—to make it look as bad as President Truman said the Eightieth Congress was. From your observations, would you say that such is really a considered policy of the Republican Party?

Answer. Definitely no. Two wrongs do not make a right, and no party should win an election because of the mistakes of another. Personally, I want to cooperate with the President because he is from my State, and I have always gotten along with him personally, and, in spite of his unwarranted, maligned, and inexcusable charges against the Eightieth Congress, I think it will long be remembered with gratitude after the present ignoble Eighty-first is forgotten. I am tired and disgusted with our present performances.

Question. Do you see any possibility that President Truman and other administration leaders will be able to pull this session of the Eighty-first Congress out of the hole?

Answer. Of course, all things are possible in war, politics, and love. If President Truman will listen to his real, genuine, and proved friends—and not to a few wild-eyed, radical left-wingers—I believe he will still be able to pull this session of the Eighty-first Congress out of the hole. Certainly, I hope so. Frankly, I do not believe it will happen.

Question. What, in your opinion, will it take on the President's part to pull off this recovery?

Answer. It will be most difficult because of the many conflicting interests and contradictory elements that now make up the present administration. Definitely, it is not the Democratic Party; it is not even the New Deal Party; it is not altogether the radical party, but it is a conglomeration of heterogeneous elements which the most skillfully trained lawyer, highly educated scientist, and profound philosopher could begin to comprehend. Mr. Truman, or any other man, would find it most difficult to reconcile all these discordant elements or to bring peace out of such a welter and confusion of babbling tongues. I feel sorry for any President of the United States, most of all Harry S. Truman. He is more to be pitied than censured.

Question. In view of all this, Congressman, what do you think the prospects are for the basic legislation in the President's program—for instance, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, civil rights, housing, and anti-inflation legislation, increased taxes, and expansion of social-security coverage?

Answer. Mr. Cronkite, you certainly do not overlook any point in the program. We could spend all night discussing any one of these pieces of legislation, but, to be brief, I will say that I believe the Taft-Hartley law will not be repealed—some amendments will be adopted, which are acceptable to all, but the substance of the law will be kept. Experience has shown that it is fair and acceptable in the main to employer, employee, and the public.

Some civil-rights measures might possibly be passed, though I think most or all of them will be defeated. Many crimes have been committed in the name of civil rights. Most of our people still believe in the Constitution of the United States and are against communism in all its forms.

Housing and anti-inflation legislation—more of a sop to get votes than anything else—will likely fail of enactment. Government largess and dishing out of doles cannot take the place of individual initiative and private industry and thrift.

To own property is an honor and not a disgrace. To receive a just reward on honest investment is not a crime. Good-by rent control.

Increased taxes are out. The House perhaps will pass the bill but the Senate will not. Our budget is now four times larger than any peacetime budget and we simply cannot add further to the load of the overburdened taxpayer of the Nation. A Nation like an individual cannot spend more than it makes without getting into serious trouble. We cannot spend ourselves into prosperity. Stop deficit financing, balance the books and end the year with a surplus.

Social-security coverage may be expanded but it will be done in a limited and a careful manner. Wholesale pensions or the granting of security to everybody as the President has planned is laudable in purpose but impossible of fulfillment. Such a careless and indiscriminate philanthropy would lead us to an inevitable bankruptcy and ruin. Nevertheless, I believe we should give less to foreign countries and more to certain classes of our veterans and old people at home. Even Mr. Truman's own Congress, the Eighty-first, will not do a job as good as the Republican Eightieth Congress which he bitterly condemned. Sad, but true.

Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the controversial question of the Columbia Valley Authority, written by Mr. Tom Humphrey, and published in the Oregon Journal of March 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE OF SEVEN WESTERN GOVERNORS QUESTION VALUE OF CVA PROPOSAL

(By Tom Humphrey)

The proposed Columbia Valley Authority, modeled after TVA, may look like Miss Glamorpuss of 1949 to Representative HUGH MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, and his CVA league. But it doesn't look that way to the governors of five of the seven CVA States, or to Oregon Congressmen or Oregon newspapers or to approximately 100 agricultural, industrial, and promotion groups of the Pacific Northwest. On the contrary, they're asking:

"What's TVA got that we haven't got?" And they're prepared to make their case and fight it out in the region and in the Congress.

The CVA leaguers have been having a field day since President Truman made his surprise CVA declaration the other day and asked a five-agency committee to come up with legislation to implement it.

They have only a general idea concerning the CVA bill the President's committee will offer, but they're rallying around Representative MITCHELL who has tried repeatedly and unsuccessfully to interest the Congress in an imprint of TVA for Columbia Basin. They figure now's the time, with a Democratic Congress, with the President back of them and all. They figure what's good for Tennessee Valley would be good for this region. And they're saying that with a CVA this region will get more Federal money, with a CVA there'll be no more floods like those of last year, and with a CVA there would be no power shortage.

Grange masters of Oregon and Washington who will buy anything with a public power label on it are whooping it up. Several labor leaders have climbed on the band wagon. Representatives MITCHELL and JACKSON of Washington and Senator TAYLOR, of Idaho, radical third party running mate of Henry Wallace, simply can't wait for Mr. Truman's five-agency committee to report. They're for introducing their own CVA bills. And Senator MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, is going to make another pitch for his Missouri Valley Authority bill, even though it isn't welcome in the Missouri Basin and President Truman has said he believes existing agencies can do the job there.

Finally Bonneville Power Administrator Paul Raver, strong advocate of coordinated development of Columbia Basin but lukewarm advocate of CVA, went to Washington, D. C., talked to his boss, Secretary of Interior Krug—former power manager for TVA—then came out wholeheartedly in favor of a regional agency in the nature of a CVA.

And right there the opposition came to life.

Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, demanded: "What's the matter with the way we're doing now?"

"I cannot agree with any plan for a Columbia Valley Authority under which the States surrender their autonomy and our natural resources pass into complete control of Federal bureaus," he wired President Truman. Governor McKay told the President that he could do a great service to the region if he permitted the Army engineers to complete development of the power, navigation, flood-control, and navigation projects outlined in their master control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, said: "On the basis of past performance of knowledge both special and general of the entire area, it is my belief that existing agencies can best develop the Columbia Basin. Authority development and control, I believe, would invade the area of sovereign rights of the States."

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, started his own backfire against CVA by sponsoring a Senate bill giving his State authority to go into the power business at the wholesale level. He declared it would protect the State against the "overpaternalistic interest of Federal Government."

Governor Langlie also warned that "if the people of the State don't run their own power business today the Federal Government is going to come in and do it for them, and we are not going to have local control. Control of our resources and economy will come from Washingtn."

Gov. Vail Pittman, Democrat, of Nevada, and Gov. C. A. Crane, of Wyoming, parts of whose States would be in the proposed 279,000 square-mile Columbia Valley Authority area, also oppose it. That makes five out of the seven Governors on record against valley authority proposals. Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah, is expected to clarify his position soon, and Gov. John Bonner, of Montana, ran on a platform of "Montana water for Montana people."

Former Governor Ford, of Montana, was a strong opponent of CVA and MVA, being a leader in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, which, like the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, works for basin-wide development on a coordinated interagency Federal-State basis.

That isn't all. Heads of the three outstanding municipal power agencies of Oregon and Washington strongly oppose CVA.

E. R. Hoffman, superintendent of Seattle City Light, and C. A. Erdahl, commissioner of public utilities, Tacoma, the latter chairman of the Northwest Utilities Conference of Public and Private Power Agencies, say they think satisfactory progress can be made in the development of power on the Columbia River and its tributaries by existing agencies if given a free hand.

"I should be most unhappy to see any major part of this immediate [power development] program caught in the rip tides of politics," Commissioner Erdahl said. "I doubt the wisdom of any serious attempt in this session of Congress to upset present controls."

J. Frank Ward, superintendent of Tacoma City Light, former Bonneville engineer, added: "Coordinated development is desirable, but not so desirable that the people of the Northwest can afford to lose control of the development of their own area. I feel that will be the inevitable tendency of a large authority unless it is made very responsible to the people of the Northwest."

And R. R. Boals, general superintendent of the Eugene, Oreg., water and power board, said: "I very much object to a Columbia basin authority or to any other authority so far proposed."

Oregon congressmen are almost unanimously opposed to a TVA-type CVA.

Senator GUY CORDON who as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee has waged a successful fight for funds for McNary Dam and other Army engineer projects, strongly opposes CVA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, progressive Republican, says: "I am anything but convinced that we in the Northwest want any government agencies in control of our rivers based upon the Tennessee Valley pattern. Our economy is entirely different and our people are strong believers in a maximum of local self-government."

Representative LOWELL STOCKMAN actively battles CVA. And Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH indicates that he may offer an alternative river development bill. Meanwhile his newspaper, the Roseburg, Oreg., News-Review, is campaigning for all it's worth against CVA.

Senator CAIN of Washington and Representative ANGELL of Oregon are withholding comment until they see the final draft of the proposed administration bill, but Senator CAIN is not expected to go along with his authority-minded Democratic colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, when the chips are down. And Senator ECTON of Montana appears to be just as strongly opposed to CVA and MVA as Senator MURRAY is for them.

Almost every major newspaper in Oregon, Washington and Idaho are on record against a TVA-type CVA, strong as they are for development of the Columbia and its tributaries. Every power company president in the region, while favoring McNary Dam and other Federal power projects, is actively antagonistic to CVA, remembering, no doubt, that TVA has elbowed 32 privately owned electric utilities out of the picture in Tennessee Valley, either in part or in toto. Every major chamber of commerce, including Portland, Seattle and Spokane, is on record against CVA, recalling that TVA engages in 30 different business enterprises in competition with private enterprise.

And while Oregon and Washington State Grange leaders are plugging CVA, other farm groups are adamant in their opposition. Among them are:

The Oregon State Farm Bureau Federation, the Idaho State Grange, the Washington and Idaho State Reclamation Associations, the Western Montana Fish and Game Association, the Wyoming State Planning and Water Conservation Board, the Conference of Northwest Reclamation Associations, the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Yakima Valley Farm Council, the Columbia Basin Resources Commission, the Northwest Mining Association, the Western Forest and Conservation Association, and the Washington and Idaho State Cattlemen's Associations, just to name a few.

These organizations declare in forthright resolutions and statements that they want no superstate to endanger their State water and mining rights and to supersede existing Federal agencies, such as the Army engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation and Forest Services, with which they have dealt satisfactorily for years and which are susceptible to local wishes.

The Pacific Northwest Development Association of Portland says there are almost 100 farm, industry, and promotion organizations on record against a Columbia Valley Authority. Even the tribal council of the Warm Springs Indian reservation of Oregon is against CVA.

The reasons are obvious.

The Northwest is one of the most progressive and prosperous regions in the United States, in marked contrast to Tennessee Valley States. It has the highest per capita income, while TVA States have only 60 percent of the national average, despite 15 years of TVA. Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are among the top eight States in rural electrification, while Tennessee is forty-fourth. This region has cheaper power than TVA, the domestic rate in Portland under private-company operation averaging 1.28 cents per kilowatt-hour, while the average under the vaunted TVA is 1.58 cents.

Working through the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Northwest has developed within 10 percent of as much power at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other Federal projects as TVA has developed at 28 dams—and for less than half the cost. The Army engineers have provided ocean-steamer navigation as far up the Columbia as The Dalles, 200 miles from the sea. And the Bureau of Reclamation is developing at Grand Coulee the largest reclamation project in America—the 1,200,000-acre Columbia Basin project, Washington. And Bonneville and Grand Coulee are repaying every cent they cost, with interest, in 50 years—something TVA isn't doing and cannot do.

The Northwest is short of power, all right. The fastest growing region in America, it needs at least 6,000,000 kilowatts more power in the next 10 years to keep pace with its needs. But it has 40 percent of the Nation's hydro sites, and the Army engineers have just completed comprehensive plans for basin development. If they are approved, it can supply its power needs through Federal, municipal, and private company projects.

The Northwest has a flood-control problem, too, but again the Army engineers have plans that will cut flood damage to 10 percent of last year's figure.

On the other hand, TVA has a power shortage, too. In fact, it has stirred up a national controversy by asking the Congress for $54,000,000 for steam plants.

And TVA still has floods, too, plenty of them, despite some $165,000,000 allocated to flood control. In fact, its 28 dams permanently flood more productive land than seasonal floods ever covered. And while the 1948 report of TVA boasts that its flood-control program has averted $13,000,000 worth of damage in the Chattanooga area, the fact remains that the people of Chattanooga appealed to the Congress to authorize the Army engineers to provide flood protection TVA hasn't supplied.

Thus, the difference is that most of the people of the Northwest believe that the Army engineers, the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, and the Bureau of Reclamation have done and can do a better job for this region for approximately $350,000,000 than TVA has done in Tennessee Valley—despite the expenditure of almost $1,000,000,000.

All this and freedom, too.

Change of Method of Counting Electoral Vote for President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in furtherance of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which proposes a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college and counting electoral votes for President and Vice President in proportion to the popular vote, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain statements made by Mr. Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, together with my answers thereto.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1949.

Hon. BERT H. MILLER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 9, 1949, Mr. Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford Standard Times, a Massachusetts newspaper, appeared before your committee in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 2. At the conclusion of Mr. Brewer's testimony, your committee kindly expressed a willingness to receive from me, as part of the record of hearings, a written reply in rebuttal to Mr. Brewer's argument.

Let me say at the outset that Mr. Brewer made many statements with which I am in complete agreement. When, in referring to the proper congressional attitude toward amendment of the Constitution, he observed tbat "we should not only proceed slowly and carefully but humbly, and even prayerfully,"

he expresses a basic policy with which I wholly sympathize and which I ever sought to practice.

When Mr. Brewer said that the founding fathers "knew the Constitution must provide within itself the means for change necessary to meet new conditions and to reduce the minimum temptation to violate its provisions," he recognizes, as I do, that the Constitution is not a dead letter, perfect at the time of conception, but is susceptible to improvements which experience and history prove utterly necessary.

I subscribe entirely to Mr. Brewer's conclusion that "you cannot destroy the Republican Party without destroying the two-party system." Indeed, it is my steadfast belief in the strength and validity of our two-party system which prompts me to urge every possible means available to strengthen and buttress it.

And I also agree with what Mr. Brewer had to say regarding the undesirability of multiple party government.

But Mr. Brewer made many statements and drew many conclusions with which I cannot agree and which I am impelled to challenge.

Permit me to comment on these statements and conclusions in the order in which they appear in Mr. Brewer's testimony.

1. Mr. Brewer stated: "I am astonished to find the Congress in process of considering changing the electoral system of the country without thorough study of its implications."

This observation assumes that the proposal to reform our procedure for electing the President and Vice President is some new idea to which Congress has given scant attention. History proves otherwise. The idea of abolishing the electoral-college system is almost as old as the Government itself. In fact, as long ago as 1798, a Senator of that day observed: "I have been unable to comprehend the motives which influence the Federalists to neglect the infinitely important subject of electing the President and Vice President. The defect of the Constitution in this particular is so obvious, and the inconvenience and absurdity of it so much felt, that I should imagine a proposition to amend it could not fail of success."

Senator Benton, of Missouri, agitated the subject in the 1820's and for two decades thereafter. In the 1870's, Senator Morton, of Indiana, made it one of his chief legislative preoccupations and submitted a very able and convincing committee report and recommendations. Congressman DeArmond, of Missouri, in the 1890's, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, submitted another and similar report. In the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses, House committees unanimously reported resolutions calling for the abolition of the electoral college, sponsored by Congressman Lea, of California. In 1934, the Senate twice voted on a proposal by Senator Norris to do away with electors. The first vote was 42 to 24; the next vote was 52 to 39. In the Eightieth Congress, the House Judiciary Committee held extensive hearings on this proposal, followed by a unanimous favorable committee report. Likewise, during the Eightieth Congress the Senate Judiciary Committee submitted a favorable report. During the Eighty-first Congress, the House Judiciary Committee has conducted extensive hearings on House Joint Resolution 2, which is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 2.

It seems to me that Mr. Brewer's charge that Congress has given this proposition but a fleeting and superficial examination is not supported by the facts.

2. Mr. Brewer stated: "This is the election machinery which on the whole has worked well for 150 years."

The contention that the electoral college procedure has worked well during the term of its existence has been so thoroughly refuted over the years by historians, students, lawyers, experts in political science, journalists, statesmen, and the plain facts of history that no useful service would be served be reviewing all the manifest defects of the system here. Suffice it to say that the witness is most definitely in the minority in his expression of satisfaction with the way our indirect system for electing the Chief Executive has operated over the years. Whatever disagreement may exist with respect to the best way of reforming this system—be it direct popular election, popular selection of electors by congressional districts, or splitting the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote—the record shows virtual unanimity in the sentiment that the electoral college idea is obsolete, inaccurate, uncertain, frequently unfair, potentially dangerous, and undemocratic.

In the very brief time that the present sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2 have been putting it forward, there has come the wholly unsolicited support of such weighty authorities as Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, of Harvard, Rev. William J. Lucey, of Holy Cross College, President Harold W. Dodds, of Princeton, editorial support in newspapers from coast to coast, and that towering authority on governmental questions, the Brookings Institution—all of whom point to defects in the present system.

3. Mr. Brewer asked: "Should it not be the duty of Congress to make the most searching investigation into the future implications, as well as the immediate effects, of proposals as fundamental as this?" And immediately afterward Mr. Brewer said: "Senator LODGE's statements in behalf of his amendment are full of inferences and speculations."

Frankly, it is somewhat difficult to reconcile these two propositions. In one breath, the witness calls for future implications and in the next breath chides the sponsor of this amendment for doing that very thing.

We have always advocated and will continue to advocate searching investigation into this question. The more thorough and exhaustive the discussion and study of this reform, the more it will please those who believe, as I do, in the validity of this proposal. We have done everything possible in the past to promote this type of discussion. There is no disposition on the part of the sponsors of this reform to bypass complete and minute scrutiny or to place any obstacle in the way of deliberate investigation. As indicated above, it is contrary to the fact to assert that this proposal has not received conscientious and faithful attention in the past. We strongly approve of every effort to continue the investigative process until light has been cast in every corner and every possible objection has been fully met or corrected.

Respecting this matter of inferences and speculation, no apologies are offered. After all, the whole Constitution of the United States was an attempt to project what was frankly conceded to be an experiment into the future. The true art of statesmanship consists in large part of looking into the future—the art of inference and speculation. Webster's Dictionary defines "speculation" as the "faculty, art, process, or product of intellectual examination or search; a conclusion, opinion, or decision reached as a result of thought and reasoning." The word "inference" is defined as "a truth or proposition drawn from another which is admitted or supposed to be true; a conclusion; a deduction."

Not only was the Constitution itself founded on inference and speculation; our whole foreign policy, our decisions in military campaigns, decisions in our individual daily lives, almost every piece of legislation passed by Congress and by State legislatures, administrative policies, political campaigns, even the business and editorial decisions of newspaper publishers—are all the end results in the last analysis, of inference and speculation. No less must we speculate when we seek to reform our procedure for electing the President of the United States.

Indeed, when the purpose suits his argument, Mr. Brewer appears to be not reluctant himself to draw inferences and to speculate. In one place in his statement, for example, he infers and speculates that the proposed reform would encourage a proliferation of splinter parties, but he concurrently refuses to speculate or infer any resulting change in the voting habits of the American people which this reform would certainly foster. This inconsistency of approach, apparent throughout so much of his testimony tends, in my opinion, rather to taint the validity of the whole.

4. Mr. Brewer stated: "Senator LODGE says that Senate Joint Resolution 2 will reduce or eliminate the possibility of a candidate getting an electoral majority despite receiving only a minority of the popular vote. On the contrary, his amendment would make this possibility, which has occurred only three times in the Nation's history—in 1824, 1876, and 1888—a probability, if not a certainty."

The witness here indulges in an inference and a speculation, but because he failed to produce a single argument or fact to support his assertion that the proposed amendment would create a probability, if not a certainty that a Presidential candidate would be elected without at least a plurality of the popular vote, the task of rebuttal is made rather difficult.

It would be interesting to have for the record some disclosure of the basis for the speculation that the proposed system for making the electoral vote more exactly reflect the popular vote would make a certainty of minority Presidents.

The witness' inference is certainly at diametrical variance with the conclusion drawn by the Brookings Institution in a letter to me dated May 27, 1948, where the conclusion was drawn that the proposed constitutional amendment "will practically eliminate the chance that a President will receive a majority of electoral votes despite the fact that his opponent polled a majority of the popular vote."

An extended analysis of the reasons supporting this conclusion appears in my reply to question No. 5 raised by Senator FERGUSON.

"But Senate Joint Resolution 2, by increasing a popular participation in all the States, will measurably decrease apathy and absenteeism.

"This introduces a further factor—in addition to the two-vote bonus—which makes it theoretically still possible that the decision of the popular vote and that of the electoral vote will be different. Under Senate Joint Resolution 2, however, the possibility is reduced as much as is possible while still leaving control of election laws in the hands of the States."

5. Mr. Brewer stated: "(This constitutional amendment) will destroy the Republican Party * * * and the two-party system."

I must most vigorously dissent from both of these speculations.

The whole question of the effect of this proposed amendment on the two-party system is covered in my answers to questions Nos. 3, 4, 7, and 8, propounded by Senator FERGUSON.

Regarding its effect on the Republican Party, I believe that some supplementary observations are in order here.

Assuming no change in the voting habits of the American people—an assumption which I believe to be unwarranted by any reasonable prediction of human and political behavior—and applying the counting formula proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 to the 1948 elections, we find that the outcome in electoral votes would have been 258 for President Truman and 221.4 for Governor Dewey (the actual count having been 303 for Truman and 189 for Dewey). These figures do not indicate that the Republicans would have lost anything; indeed it shows

that the Republicans would have made a net gain of 32 electoral votes. For the life of me, in the face of these statistics, assuming that people would have voted the same way and in the same numbers, I cannot see the logic or common sense in the assertion that this method of reflecting more accurately the popular will would destroy the Republican Party.

The contention that under this reform the Republicans would make a very small gain in the South which would be much more than offset by the loss of so-called Republican States in the North like New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois would be a very strong argument indeed from the Republican standpoint if it were based on fact.

Actually, however, no one aware of the facts can possible say that New York or Pennsylvania or any of the other States with a significant number of electoral votes are sure Republican States. President Roosevelt carried most of them in the elections of 1932, 1936, 1940 and 1944 and if Mr. Wallace had not been a candidate, Governor Dewey certainly would not have carried New York and New Jersey in 1948. This is certainly not what one normally expects of sure Republican States. They may have been sure Republican once, but only those who think that the politics of the future are going to resemble the politics of the McKinley era can possibly believe that they are going to be sure Republican in the future simply as a matter of inertia and without a new and imaginative effort by the Republican leadership.

It must, of course, be set down that if the present system is wrong, dangerous, and unfair—which I believe it to be—then it should be reformed regardless of party advantage. There are many people today who believe that our political parties give altogether too much thought to the political advantage which accrues to a party organization and not enough thought to the fact that our parties exist to serve the people and have no other excuse for being.

I could give this as the complete answer, but I do not. I submit that the proposed constitutional amendment will not only not hurt the Republican Party; it will, I believe, give the Republican Party the greatest chance it could possibly have for a real rebirth. If we can be assured that votes cast for the Republican Party in the South will actually be counted and added on to the Republican votes which are received elsewhere, we will have an incentive for making our campaign on the issue of civil rights and individual liberty. This is the issue which brought the Republican Party into existence in the first place. It is the issue (as contrasted to economic questions) on which all Republicans can unite. It is, moreover, an issue of utmost urgency to millions of people in all the States of the Union who feel strongly that there is no place for second-class citizens in America and that all people must be treated and recognized on their merits, regardless of any consideration of race, color, or creed. Far from fatally penalizing the Republican Party, the proposed reform could, if we had the imagination and vision to rise to the challenge, result in the remaking of the Republican Party and thereby give new validity, force, and scope to our great two-party system.

6. Mr. Brewer stated: "Each electoral vote won in the South represents an average of 40,000 popular votes against an average of 110,000 votes per electoral in the remaining 37 States of the North and Central States. To all practical purposes, this will make a Republican Presidential victory impossible as long as the Solid South remains solid in its voting habits."

As indicated in my comments on Mr. Brewer's previous statement, this is a fundamental point upon which he and I are at complete variance. He refuses to recognize that a procedure by which every vote would count would inevitably, by every rule of predictable political behavior, change the voting habits of the people in the South.

In this connection, I invite the committee's attention to the following extract from an article written by an eminent southern student of political science, Mr. C. S. Potts, Dean Emeritus of the Law School of Southern Methodist University. He writes:

"Finally, the present writer is convinced that the electoral college is largely responsible for keeping the Solid South solid. As just pointed out, the existence of doubtful States concentrates the educational value of the national campaigns in those States that are never visited by candidates or campaign speakers. Is it a matter of wonder that States that are never visited by candidates and campaign speakers, States to which no literature or campaign workers are ever sent, continue to vote with the same party from year to year, even from generation to generation? What influence is ever brought to bear upon them to change their political allegiance? The politicians in these States are active and the masses of the people are sometimes mildly excited until the national conventions have been held and the rival candidates are placed in the field. But from that day until the November election, the solid States only catch faint echoes of the great struggle that is going on in a narrow belt of States farther North, and the citizens of these States are almost as completely idle spectators of the contests as are the people of Mexico or Canada. The only part they have in the campaign is to be called on from time to time to contribute money to help pay the expenses of the campaign, but no part of the money is ever spent within their borders. It is safe to say that south of Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri there are 6,000,000 voters who have never heard a campaign speech delivered by the Presidential candidate of either of the two great parties, after their nomination for office.

"The writer believes that the abolition of the electoral college would work the political readmission of the Solid South to the Union. When votes in Georgia are worth just as much as votes in Indiana, Georgia will be cultivated by the parties just as assiduously as Indiana is now cultivated. As it is now, the voter says to himself, 'What is the use of my going to the polls in November? There is no chance that my vote will do any good, for everybody knows beforehand that Georgia will give her electoral vote to the Democratic candidate.' The result is that there is an enormous stay-at-home vote, alike of Republicans and Democratic voters. Not only so, but the Republican Party finds it impossible to win new recruits among the native southern population or to hold its members who move into the Solid South from elsewhere. The voter realizes that as a Republican his vote is utterly worthless so far as the result of the national election is concerned, but by becoming a Democrat he can go into the Democratic primaries and have a real share in settling State and local matters. Hence, we find that most Republicans, upon moving into the Southern States, soon cease to affiliate with their party and vote the Democratic ticket."

Because, as so forcefully indicated above, the voting habits of the people in solid States would change, it is my conclusion that the present divergence between electoral votes and the number of voters would be substantially narrowed. So long as States retain the two-vote bonus regardless of population and so long as outside influences (weather, interest in local issues, personalities of candidates, etc.) affect the size of the vote, there will always be some inequality between the weight of an electoral vote in one State as contrasted with its weight in another State. This is one of the prices we pay for our Federal system and our indirect way of electing the Chief Executive.

7. Mr. Brewer stated: "In the functioning of democracy, no vote properly marked and cast is ever lost, whether or not the party voted for wins."

The witness here refers to the contention of the proponents of this constitutional amendment that in effect literally millions of American voters are disfranchised in every Presidential election.

I believe that this contention is more than a mere figure of speech. It is an actuality. It arises, of course, from the fact that Presidential electors are voted for as a unit and the party that has the largest vote in a State wins all the electoral votes to which the State is entitled.

In the 1948 elections, Governor Dewey received in the 16 States that he carried 8,644,000 votes. These States gave him a total of 189 electoral votes. But in the 32 States that he failed to carry, he had a total of 13,326,000. This great mass of votes gave him not a single vote in the electoral college. These votes, remember, were cast for Governor Dewey—and yet they were of no more effect than if they had never been cast at all. Mr. Brewer's additional comment, therefore, that "in every election where one man is concerned, such as the election of a President, no votes cast, except for the winner, count, and all others are in the sense 'lost' " misses the point completely. It confuses a direct-election procedure, as for a governor or Congressman, with the indirect procedure we use in electing the President.

Under the unit, or all-or-nothing, system of counting electoral votes, not only are the votes which are cast for the candidate failing to command a plurality in a given State lost; they are—what is worse—taken from that candidate and credited to another. The proposed constitutional amendment completely cures that defect.

9. Mr. Brewer stated: "This is something for future generations to worry about, if not ourselves—minority elections, minority parties, splinter parties, coalition government—the face of western democracy looking east."

I respectfully dissent. I believe this to be something which this generation must definitely worry about. Because, in the words of the Brookings Institution, "the proposed constitutional amendment will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, Presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in pivotal States." I hold that our present system fosters an evil which we of this generation are obligated to correct.

10. Mr. Brewer stated: "The Lodge-Gossett bill starts proportional voting at a high level, the highest office in the country * * *"

To be completely accurate, it must be stressed again that the Lodge-McCarran-Fulbright - Sparkman - Stennis-Neely-Kefauver-Smith - Morse - Flanders - Gossett resolution does not introduce proportional representation, in the commonly accepted meaning of the term. Because this distinction between proportional representation in the election of a body like a legislature and the counting procedure proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 has been already discussed at some length, no useful purpose would be served to repeat it here.

Mr. Brewer's statement is extremely well phrased and it enunciates general principles regarding our system of government which I applaud. But I am constrained to set down my firm belief that his opposition to the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is fallacious.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

In Boston, Not the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Arkansas Democrat of March 17, and I call it especially to the attention of some of my northern friends.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN BOSTON, NOT THE SOUTH

You've read the pitiful news stories out of Boston about the 13-year-old boy whose mother had imprisoned him in the house since babyhood, because of her own secret sin. It is a thing that would move any heart not actually petrified.

Apparently the youngster is bright, quick to learn, and affectionate to a degree which touches all around him. How his mother could have treated him so is a mystery which passes understanding.

If the like had happened in Arkansas, the sensational press of the North would be holding up its hands in pious horror. It would have editorialized on our backwardness in a style somberly colored by misterpreted statistics, hillbilly shows, and ancient myths. It would have run pictures of share-cropper cabins, which, however shabby and mean, are at least out in the clean air, and far preferable to a big city's unsunned, frowzy slums.

Well, let's not judge the North by its scavenger publications. It has lots of good people—witness the Republican backing given our southern boys in the Senate on the filibuster question. So let us judge this Boston incident charitably.

Everywhere a few persons get strangely, madly twisted in their emotions. That seems to have been what happened to this Boston mother. He was a wise man who said: "To know all is to forgive all."

Improvement of Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of Senate bill 810, which has for its purpose the improvement of intergovernmental relations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Mayors and Money," published in the New York Times of March 23, 1949, and the other entitled "Sprouting Seed," published in the Newark Evening News of March 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 23, 1949]

THE MAYORS AND MONEY

The United States Conference of Mayors, meeting in Washington, has heard an unusually impressive list of speakers, including the President and some elder statesmen. The mayors have been brought up to date on international and national issues. Finally and inevitably, however, the talk always gets around to the painful subject of money and taxes.

Except for certain large, key problems, which cannot be dealt with wisely on the lower level, we think there is a growing and refreshing tendency to question the wisdom of carrying municipal problems to State capitols for solution, and for the States and cities also to go to Washington. The current session of the New York Legislature supports that view, for there has been a noticeable abstention from wholesale, undiscriminating demands upon the State treasury. General Eisenhower and Bernard Baruch both advised the mayors in Washington against depending too much on the Federal Government. "Everybody wants to lean upon the Central Government," said Mr. Baruch, "but who is the Government to lean on but the people?" General Eisenhower commented upon the temptation to "pass things unnecessarily to the Federal Government because thereby they (local officials) escape the necessity of levying locally unpopular taxes which may be hard to explain to the voters."

While various factors are at work which warn against too sweeping a generalization, it is instructive to note that as a rule the farther government gets from the people the larger is the tax increase. Federal tax collections rose from $3,300,000,000 in 1929 to $40,000,000,000 in 1948; States' tax collections rose in that period from $2,000,000,000 to about $7,900,000,000, while local tax collections increased from $4,800,000,000 in 1929 to roughly $6,000,000,000 in 1948. Everyone is well aware to what extent the military and European recovery budget accounts for the Federal Government's heavy demands on the taxpayer. Yet, with the Federal Government taking 75 cents of every tax dollar, it is obvious where economies must be made if they are to return any substantial benefit to the taxpayer.

The problem of overlapping taxes will not be solved until it is approached on a national scale, with Washington, the States and cities sitting down together. President Truman brought to the mayors' conference the good news that the Secretary of the Treasury will soon invite State and city officials to meet with him and other Federal officials to devise a program to bring some order out of the tangle in the field of taxation and financial relations.

This will not be easy. The Federal Government has reached more and more into the local field; meanwhile two-thirds of the States have taken up the income tax, and cities are increasingly adopting it or the pay roll tax. The Federal Government has not set a good example to the States, either in multiplicity of taxation or economy of operation. As a result, to a certain extent, States and cities have unfairly become the whipping boys of the public because of Federal extravagance. The taxpayer will feel more liberally disposed to his State and city governments when the costliness of the Federal establishment is reduced.

[From the Newark Evening News of March 22, 1949]

SPROUTING SEED

The campaign to end duplication of taxes by Federal, State, and municipal governments, in which none has been more energetic than Governor Driscoll, is beginning to show results.

In his speech yesterday before the United States conference of mayors, President Truman announced that the Secretary of the Treasury will soon call a conference to work toward a program for action in this field.

Mr. Truman admits that financial relations among cities, States, and the Federal Government are a tangle and that bringing some order out of it is one of the most important first steps toward solving local government problems.

That's what governors have been saying for years. Mr. Driscoll has repeatedly called attention to Federal encroachment on State revenue sources, notably its taxation of gasoline and alcoholic beverages. In addition, there are numerous excises on nonluxury items which duplicate local sales taxes. Governor Driscoll has argued the States' case in Washington conferences and referred to the problem at his recent meeting with the President. Apparently Mr. Truman listened.

On other matters, President Truman told the mayors little that they didn't already know. Undoubtedly they were pleased by his statement that they represented the form of democratic self-government which is closest to the people. They are fond of saying that themselves. Then the President told them that the Federal housing program, when adopted, would increase their responsibilities. He reminded them that early failure to regulate urban growth has created slums which must be eradicated, and manifold problems which can be solved only at great expense. He admitted their revenues are insufficient to meet all the demands on them. It was a familiar catalog of city hall difficulties.

But all this was less important than the promise of an effort to redraw the lines of tax areas. He nailed the promise down with this statement:

"Back in 1928 when I was an executive officer in the biggest county in Missouri, I wrote an essay on tax distribution between the Federal, State, and local governments. I reread it the other day and it's just as good now as it was then."

Perhaps he'll let the Secretary of the Treasury have a copy.

The North Atlantic Security Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the North Atlantic Security Pact, written by George Sokolsky and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The North Atlantic Pact, like all other treaties, is only as strong and effective as the nations which accept it. This is a military offensive-defensive alliance designed to produce unity in war and in the preparation for war. It rests on the broad base of American aid to western Europe—monetary and military aid.

Western Europe is a small, densely populated area of about 270,000,000 people and includes what in our civilization has come to be known as the principal countries on earth.

They have produced the culture of our times and a standard of living higher than all other peoples except the United States, which is composed principally of Europeans who migrated from Europe to America.

Although we speak of a European civilization, 2,000 years of history have broken Europe into a large number of small countries, economically dependent upon each other.

From the time of Charlemagne to the present day, two conflicting movements have been apparent in Europe, namely, a movement to build a universal western European state and a movement for the breaking up of western Europe into small nationalistic units.

The Holy Roman Empire, Napoleon, and Hitler represent three phase of one side of the paradox; the wars and revolutions since 1815 represent the nationalistic effort.

The League of Nations and the United Nations mark the most current attempt to merge these conflicting ideas into a workable unity. The North Atlantic Pact is another.

For purposes of unity, no western European nation may remain out of the North Atlantic Pact, if it is to succeed at all. That means that Spain, Eire, and Sweden must be in it.

In fact, the pact would be strengthened if the countries that seceded from the Austro-Hungarian empire were in it.

Perhaps the problem might be stated this way: The current struggle in Europe is between Christianity and Marxism.

The power of Marxism is symbolized by Soviet Russia, a universal state of 500,000,000 or 600,000,000 people, ranging from the Elbe in Europe to the Pacific on the edge of Asia, most of whom have been conquered and are, in effect, enslaved.

The power of Christianity is symbolized by the free countries of western Europe, North and South America, and the English-speaking British dominions.

Marxian countries reject western civilization in its economic, social, and theological manifestations.

The impact of such a departure from 5,000 years of human development on so vast a scale is disturbing human relationships beyond anything that has ever before been experienced in human history.

It is possible that the conflict of ideas and aims can only be resolved by war. The North Atlantic Pact is designed to meet that situation.

The theoretical essence of the pact appears in this sentence:

"They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

This clearly is anti-Marxian and leaves no loopholes. Communist Russia cannot safeguard freedom because it rejects freedom. It cannot associate itself with democracy or individual liberty because both are abhorrent to Marxians.

Article 5 contains the effective heart of the pact:

"The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

This article conflicts with the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution grants to Congress the power to declare war. When the Senate shall have ratified this pact, war becomes automatic.

Should, for instance, a Communist country attempt to seize Algeria, a French colony, the United States would automatically be at war, no matter what the circumstance.

There are two ways of arguing about this: One is that we shall have to go to war anyhow. We entered World War I because Great Britain was imperiled by the rising power of Germany; we entered World War II for the same reason.

On the other hand, there is the argument that a treaty ought not to amend the Constitution. My guess is that the pact will be ratified even though it amends the Constitution—and that will be another milestone on the path of altering our form of government by a whittling-away process.

Local Rent Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include therein an article from the New York Times dated March 24, 1949:

MAYORS DENOUNCE LOCAL RENT RULE—THEY SAY CITIES AND STATES LACK ADEQUATE MACHINERY TO ADMINISTER CONTROLS

The United States Conference of Mayors adjourned a 3-day meeting here today after the municipal leaders endorsed several points in President Truman's legislative program, including extended and strengthened Federal rent controls.

In their resolution the mayors recommended that Congress extend, strengthen, and improve existing rent-control laws until the present housing shortage is alleviated.

MACHINERY HELD INADEQUATE

The resolution called Congress particular attention to the fact that State and municipal governments are ill-equipped to administer rent controls in a form which would give adequate protection to the people of our cities, and any such provisions should be eliminated from the bill.

Civil-Rights Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 21, 1949. This short editorial on the recent filibuster fight puts the blame where it rightfully belongs.

DUBIOUS HONORS

Partisan blowing in the wake of the recent filibuster is almost as noxious as the big wind itself. Truman Democrats and Republicans are engaged in a futile debate as to who came off with the honors. It seems to us a hollow argument.

Certainly the Truman Democrats lost the filibuster fight. The victory, if it may be called that, went to the southern Democrats, who succeeded in sidetracking the President's civil-rights program for the time being if not for this session of Congress.

They would not have succeeded to the extent they did, however, had it not been for the coalition they were able to form with many hypocritical Republicans who pretended to oppose the filibuster and stand for civil-rights legislation.

The turning point in the administration's effort to change the Senate rules and curb the filibuster came when Vice President Barkley ruled that cloture on a motion could be invoked by a two-thirds vote of those present. Had the Republicans backed Truman Democrats on that ruling, the filibuster could have been halted and rules limiting debate could have been changed as the administration proposed. Then there would have been some chance for civil-rights legislation.

But 23 Republicans chose to ally with southern Democrats to overrule Mr. Barkley by 5 votes and continue the filibuster. The result was that the southerners were able to force a compromise giving them a stronger position than they would have enjoyed had the Republicans gone along with the Truman Democrats.

Thus 23 Republicans must share with southern Democrats the onus for deferring civil-rights legislation. But there is a big difference between them. The southerners never sought to deceive anyone as to where they stood. Now the Republican challenge to the administration to bring on civil-rights legislation has the unmistakable ring of hypocrisy.

New Jersey Civil-Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, supporters of civil-rights legislation who are disheartened over the recent bitter Senate filibuster may be encouraged by the fact that during the same period the New Jersey Senate unanimously passed a civil-rights bill with the most liberal provisions in the Nation.

This bill, A65, was sponsored by Assemblywoman Grace M. Freeman, of East Orange, in the Eleventh Congressional District, and its passage climaxed a long and valiant struggle by her to obtain the enactment of civil-rights legislation in the State. For every reason of decency, fair play, and democratic ideals, racial discrimination should be eradicated. To discriminate against an individual because of race or color is to deny the fatherhood of God, the creator of all mankind. The Freeman bill implements the noble concept of the founders of American democracy that men are created equal, with equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Following is a letter from Mr. Seldon M. Kruger, president of the Jewish Youth Council of Essex County, which supported the Freeman bill. Also included is an article from the Jewish News of Essex County of March 4 concerning the presentation of a scroll to Miss Freeman by members of the council:

JEWISH YOUTH COUNCIL
OF ESSEX COUNTY,
Newark, N. J., March 17, 1949.

Hon. HUGH ADDONIZIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Assemblywoman Grace Freeman on February 27, 1949, addressed the general assembly of the Jewish

Youth Council of Essex County, a coordinating body for 55 youth organizations in Essex County, on the Freeman civil rights bill. As you know, Miss Freeman is the sponsor of the legislation and has won the support of 65 organizations in the State of New Jersey. Yesterday, March 16, this bill became law.

I am sure that you join with us all in congratulating Miss Freeman on behalf of her efforts in the field of civil rights. Her endeavors truly represent the best interests of the youth of New Jersey. It truly was a hearty sign to see both houses of our State Legislature pass her bill unanimously; without the usual party vote.

With my best wishes, I am,

Always sincerely yours,

SELDON M. KRUGER, *President.*

MISS FREEMAN IS LAUDED BY YOUTH

Assemblywoman Grace M. Freeman is anxiously awaiting the fate of her civil-rights bill when the State legislature reconvenes this week. To help her morale she has a scroll presented to her by members of the Jewish Youth Council, of Essex County, to show their appreciation of her fight for civil rights in New Jersey.

"Don't relax your efforts because the bill passed the assembly unanimously—we still have to get it out of senate caucus," she told the young people at their general assembly at the Newark Jewish Center on Sunday.

"When I was teaching school in Montclair we used a simple chart to show how a bill is passed. I wish I could go back and teach students that it isn't so easy," she said. A similar Freeman civil-rights bill was defeated in the senate caucus last year.

"If we are to have international peace, we must first have national peace," Miss Freeman said. "We are spending millions on the European recovery plan to teach other nations our form of government. Then we look in our own backyard and find we are frequently not practicing what we are trying to sell others."

SECRET OPPOSITION

She said much of the "secret opposition" to the bill in rural and resort areas came from a lack of understanding of its contents.

The Freeman bill, A65, would outlaw discrimination in places of public accommodations such as hotels, theaters, and restaurants.

"It has been interesting to see so many organizations—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—working together in support of civil rights," she concluded. "After the bill is passed, we will still have to work to see that it is practiced."

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll telegraphed the Youth Council that he joined with them in spirit in honoring Miss Freeman. The telegram read: "Miss Freeman's bill, Assembly A65, implementing the objectives of the Governor's committee on civil liberties, has my wholehearted support. We now have a great opportunity to establish the basis for a new and practical concept of our civil liberties."

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I want to say that I deeply resent the unwarranted insults which certain Members of this House on yesterday directed against the American Legion, which is composed of over 2,000,000 patriotic American veterans of World War I and World War II, who have pledged their devotion to God and country, and who have for the past 30 years rendered loyal, untiring service to their community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker it is a sad commentary for Members of this House who have voted for every needless expenditure proposed by the great spenders in power, now to hear those same Members rise on this floor and say we cannot afford to pension our old soldiers. Now I ask them just when did they begin worrying about the financial condition of the United States Treasury? You have heard a number of these reckless spenders here accuse me, even insult me, for opposing requests for great sums of the taxpayers' money, which in my studied opinion would be wasted, but no man will ever have cause to say I brought the pruning ax of economy down hard on veterans, especially our disabled veterans and widows and orphans of deceased veterans or the old soldiers of any war.

Our Nation has always given fair treatment to its fighting defenders and because of that our peacetime volunteer system has worked wonders in times of emergency. Many nations of the world whose veterans were not fairly treated were forced to maintain a great standing army by the compulsory system at staggering cost compared to our traditional system.

The future welfare of America can best be served by giving old soldiers their just dues.

Purposes of H. R. 3272

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3272, which has as its title: "A bill to mitigate the effect of double taxation of corporate income by allowing a limited credit against the income tax of the shareholder receiving dividends."

The general effect of H. R. 3272 is to provide a tax-credit equivalent to 20 percent of the amount of dividends received by individuals in determining Federal income taxes. The tax credit is, however, limited to a maximum of $400 in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, a return by an unmarried individual, or a return by an estate or trust. In the case of a separate return by a married individual, the amount of the credit is limited to $200.

The general purpose of the legislation is threefold: First, to mitigate the effect of present laws taxing dividends in the hands of individual shareholders when such income has already been taxed in the hands of the corporation.

Second. To open up a reservoir of equity capital.

Third. To encourage an interest and participation by lower and middle income groups in American business enterprise.

In spite of the inequities involved, it seems quite apparent that the complete elimination of double taxation of corporate dividends is not a possibility at the present time. This situation can be attributed to a recognition of the loss of revenue involved as well as to political considerations. House bill 3272 is, therefore, designed only as a step toward mitigating the effect of double taxation.

The 20-percent credit is used because it approximates the present effective corporate tax rate of 21 percent on the first $5,000 of taxable income. It also approximates the first bracket of individual taxes. Justification, therefore, can be based on the theory that the corporation has already paid a tax in excess of 20 percent and also in excess of the first bracket rate on individual incomes. Section 36 (a) is in keeping with this theory. The fact that the 20-percent figure lends itself to simple calculation is a third factor.

Since the 20-percent figure represents an amount slightly in excess of the first bracket individual tax rate, provision is made in the bill so that the credit will in no case be greater than the total tax due. (See section 36 (b) (2) and (3).) This will avoid refunds resulting from the difference between the 20-percent tax credit and the first bracket tax rate.

As a practical matter, it is highly probable that any loss of revenue to the Government by adjustments in this field of taxation must be limited to an amount that can be offset by a reasonable increase at some other point. House bill 3272 limits the application to dividends up to $2,000 per year, and the loss of revenue with such a limitation is estimated at $605,000,000. This loss can be recovered by a 2-percent increase in the corporate surtax rate. An increase in corporate rates by more than 2 percent might well produce results which would more than offset the anticipated beneficial effects of the dividend-received credit. This has dictated the limitation established in the bill.

The amount of credit is limited to $200 in the case of separate returns by married individuals in keeping with those provisions of the Revenue Act of 1948 devoted to the geographical equalization of individual income taxes. The dividend-received credit is thus accorded the same treatment as the standard deduction and the deduction for unusual medical expense.

There are many and varied proposals designed to eliminate, mitigate or shift the burden of double taxation of corporate dividends. One of the chief advantages of that proposed by H. R. 3272 is its administrative simplicity. It is easily understood and should raise no real administrative problems.

The procedure would be thus: The stockholder would include his dividends

in his taxable income. After computing his tax, he would take a credit on account of the tax paid by the corporation with respect to his dividends up to a maximum of $400. This credit would be calculated by multiplying his dividends by 20 percent.

An important consideration is the need for opening up a source of equity capital. It is generally admitted that there is a great need today for a source of equity capital for businesses, large and small. The present state of the stock market is evidence of this need. As pointed out recently by William Miller in Life magazine, many companies today are worth more dead than alive because former customers for stock no longer have money to invest. So far as small-business enterprises are concerned, the situation is even more acute. Today, the smaller the business, the harder it is to get equity funds. If the American economy is to expand, and all agree it must if the Nation is to meet the huge political and economic demands upon it, investment capital must be found for the expansion of present productive facilities and the creation of new industry. The present tendency to shift from equity financing to debt financing has the effect of aggravating economic instability.

Some 47,000,000 individual income-tax returns are expected for 1948. Forty-five million will appear in the income brackets of $5,000 per year or less. An additional one and a half million will appear in the $5,000 to $10,000 per year bracket. It is estimated that of a total personal income (after deductions but before exemptions) of $138,000,000,000, about $120,000,000,000 will be accounted for by persons in the brackets of $10,000 or less per year. This group will receive better than 86 percent of the net taxable income of individuals. Here then are the people who must be relied upon to supply the investment capital that is so badly needed. H. R. 3272, by reducing the tax discrimination against equity financing, will lend material encouragement to the investment of this reservoir of American capital in business enterprise.

The proposal will make possible a return to equity financing. It will be of particular assistance to small and new businesses in obtaining capital.

Investment by the low- and middle-income groups in the future of American business will be the greatest possible insurance for the continuance of American economic and political institutions. As the number of people who own a stake in corporate enterprise increases, the number of people who want business to flourish and prosper will increase. They will want to maintain a political and economic environment in which it is possible for business to prosper.

The effectiveness of attacks upon business profits which have produced socialism and semisocialism in other countries would be lessened.

What we need today are many new small capitalists, people drawing dividends as well as wages. That is an objective of H. R. 3272.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to the editor which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Tuesday, March 22, 1949:

LEGIONNAIRE THINKS MAJORITY OF VETS ARE AGAINST PENSION

I am an active member of Broadview Post, No. 626, American Legion of Broadview, Ill., and wish to go on record as vigorously opposing the veterans' pension bill now pending before Congress and supposedly backed solidly by the American Legion.

The national office of the Legion is making many public utterances that are not only misleading, but somewhat tainted with untruths.

To say the American Legion, 2,800,000 strong, is 100 percent for the pension is an obvious bit of imagination. The truth of the matter is the rank and file in the individual posts were never polled to determine exactly how they felt about this $90-a-month handout at the age of 65 to every honorably discharged vet with at least 90 days' service. This bonanza was high-pressured through the national convention at Miami last fall by the potent old guard and was not given a fair and open hearing before the general Legion membership at the post level.

It is my opinion that if a free vote would be taken within the Legion itself, on this pension bill that our organization is supposedly supporting, the majority of Legionnaires would vote against it. Opposition is especially strong in the ranks of World War II veterans although I have talked to many World War I vets who also realize this program is sheer nonsense.

There seems to be a dangerous philosophy sweeping our country—one that is a complete about-face from the American system as established by our forefathers. This philosophy of "let Uncle Sam take care of me" seems to have invaded the smoke-filled room of the top Legion brass when they designed this Christmas-tree handout bill.

To disabled veterans of all wars and to those needy families whose living has been curtailed because of war casualties, I say, give them help and more help, but to give every GI of both wars $90 a month when he reaches 65 until he dies, as a reward for faithful service to his country when she was in trouble, I state is not only discriminatory, but entirely undemocratic.

We Legionnaires should never forget that we are citizens of the Nation first and members of the American Legion second. And that goes for the top brass too.

GILBERT J. MCEWEN.

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the New York Times of March 24, 1949, entitled "About-Face in the House":

ABOUT-FACE IN THE HOUSE

No medal for courageous conduct under fire will be pinned on the collective chest of the House of Representatives for its performance of the last 2 days on the veterans' pension bill. So long as the Members of the House could vote their own convictions on a secret ballot, so long as no one was there with pencil and pad to take down their names, they showed by their votes that they recognized this bill for what it is: a proposed raid on the United States Treasury to the tune of many billions of dollars and the introduction of a new kind of social-security system in this country, under which war veterans would be established as a specially favored class at the expense of the rest of the American community. But when it came to a recorded vote on this same question, a vote taken under the watchful eyes of the great veterans' organizations, which, to their discredit, have lobbied for this legislation, these same gentlemen ran rapidly for cover. It is our duty to report that in this face-about the Republicans, who have so often and so bravely denounced the philosophy of spend and spend and elect and elect, ran even faster and harder than the Democrats.

The veteran of either World War who was injured or disabled in war service deserves and at all costs should have the generous and unremitting care of a grateful people and their Government. But that is not the purpose of the legislation which the House has been debating. This is, instead, a plan to pay pensions indiscriminately to veterans, upon their reaching a fixed age, regardless of whether or not they were injured or disabled in war service and whether or not they were ever engaged in combat.

Various amendments, somewhat limiting the scope of the bill and reducing its tremendous cost, have now been adopted tentatively. But the bill remains, despite these amendments, special-interest legislation, pure and simple. A final vote on it will come today. We shall see then whether the balance of power in the House is held by men who will vote against their own convictions because they haven't courage encugh to stand up for them.

Propaganda and the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda and the Nation's Health," by Marquis Childs, which appears in the Washington Post of today. It seems to me to contain so much down-to-the-ground common sense that I think it is well worth printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA AND THE NATION'S HEALTH

(By Marquis Childs)

The most effective propaganda is to make use over and over again of a few scare words. Hitler knew that. So do the Russians who

scream "imperialist war monger" a thousand times a day.

So, too, do the propagandists in this country who incessantly attack the program of social reform on which President Truman campaigned last fall. The scare word they use is "socialized."

The attack is concentrated with particular fury on the proposed Federal health-insurance system. Certainly, that system proposes a radical innovation to raise present standards of health which are too low for a country with the wealth and the resources of the United States.

Whether it would actually raise those standards is, in my opinion, highly doubtful. My doubts of a Federal health-insurance system are chiefly on two points:

1. The excessive cost of the bureaucratic apparatus necessary to administer such a system on a Nation-wide basis. Allied to this is the question of medical standards under an act that would almost surely make concessions to administration by the separate States.

2. The net effect of a Federal health-insurance system might well be merely to spread even thinner the existing facilities for medical care. The problem is to increase facilities rather than to disperse what already exists.

But those who attack health insurance with the word "socialized" are even more vulnerable than the proponents of the system. They talk as though defeat of the Federal proposal were an end in itself. Behind much of what they say is the implication that we can let well enough alone. That is the tone of many of the letters that have come to me in response to a previous column on this issue.

This is not, to be sure, the view of those who have looked at the facts with some objectivity. There are glaring weaknesses in health standards, in hospitalization, and in medical care in this country.

One thing the Federal proposal has done is to stir widespread discussion of health and medical care. In my opinion if it had done nothing else it would have been enormously worth while. Complacency and smugness cannot be tolerated if the American system is to meet the challenge of communism.

Two stimulating and provocative proposals have been put forward in place of the Federal insurance system. One comes from Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, in charge of medical care in the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Magnuson says:

"As a professional medical man, I am distressed to hear the emotional arguments used by those, on the one hand, who favor compulsory health insurance and by those, on the other hand, who blindly oppose every proposal to meet the problem of national medical care. It seems to me that the proponents of both extremes miss the point—the heart of the problem is the lack of diagnostic and public-health facilities."

Dr. Magnuson proposes diagnostic clinics accessible to all the population, equipped with the most modern facilities for complete health examinations and staffed with the highest-type medical and professional personnel available. Financial support would come from the Federal Government, State and local governments, and private contributions.

The second proposal comes from Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, who agrees with Dr. Magnuson that one of the chief problems to be solved is protection for low- and middle-income families who often find themselves ruined by a long illness. In a speech in Pittsburgh, Senator TAFT advanced a four-point program calling for a wide range of Federal assistance to raise standards of medical care.

Senator TAFT gets at a basic weakness—the shortage of doctors—in his recommendation that the Federal Government subsidize medical students or medical schools, or both. To remedy the acute shortage in rural areas he suggests a Federal subsidy to the States which would in turn underwrite medical care in poor districts.

In all this, discussion is the base for concrete, constructive action that cannot be considered as violating American principles. The time for such action is overdue.

The danger is that the propagandists will so becloud and confuse the whole question as to produce stalemate and a futile sense that nothing can be done. That is the strategy of those who would block any social change whatsoever. In a democracy that is a dangerous strategy.

Declaration of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on page 1 of the New Orleans Daily States of Monday, March 21, 1949, there appears the following notice in a two-column space:

WHERE DO WE GO?

The Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations is a far-reaching document the implications of which you, as an American, should know and think about. The first of a series of six editorials on this declaration appears today on the editorial page.

Today many Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives received the following letter from Judge Leander H. Perez, one of Louisiana's most distinguished and influential citizens:

DALCOUR, LA., *March 22, 1949.*

DEAR SIR: The New Orleans Daily States will publish a series of about seven editorials analyzing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and how it can become our supreme law as part of a plan for world-wide socialism.

Since so little has been publicized about Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's works in this matter, which ultimately will be submitted to Congress for approval, these articles should be highly informatory.

Therefore, the New Orleans Daily States will be sent you during the next couple of weeks so that these articles will be available for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

L. H. PEREZ.

Now what is this all about?

It is about what many of us in this country have been fighting for a long time.

Not fighting simply during election periods in an effort to garner the votes of various groups, minorities, and organizations.

Not fighting on the eve of elections in an appeal to the hates, prejudices, and bias of minorities.

Not fighting from the platform of the demagog expounding catch phrases and attractive words for the sole purpose of winning an election.

This is not about that at all. It is about something which compels us to fight day in and day out. It is about something which demands our full attention at all times. It is about something which strikes at the very core, the very heart of the foundation upon which this Government is builded.

I am not interested about what names we are called—Democrats, good or bad, Dixiecrats, States' Righters, or what not. I am interested in the way we think and in what we fight for. That is the important thing.

The trend of Government today has been called creeping paralysis by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and creeping socialism by the chairman of the National Republican Committee which opposes this administration. Regardless of what it is called it is definitely a trend away from what most of us believe to be the philosophy upon which this Nation was founded and builded. That is the important thing.

It is tragic that we realize only too late what has happened.

It is because we do not want that to happen now that this matter is being brought to your attention in this manner.

What appears on the surface to be a laudable and sincere effort in the direction of humanity is in reality an insidious and destructive force, which, in the ultimate, will destroy the very thing we seek to preserve—our American way of life with its constitutional guaranties and protections and assurance of self-government and the sovereignty of the individual States.

Disaster lurks near us.

It is important that we be made fully cognizant of that impending disaster.

That is why the New Orleans States announces its series of editorials on the so-called Declaration of Human Rights.

The New Orleans States is one of the Nation's great newspapers. It looks forward to its centennial in the not very distant future. It has a record in the area for public service and for courage in journalism.

It was my privilege at one time to be the city editor of this newspaper. I came to this body from the city desk of that newspaper.

Since my political baptism I have not always agreed with the policy of the New Orleans States in its local political affections and affiliations but I have never disagreed in its approach to national and international problems. As far as I know we have been in almost complete accord. Our Nation's safety is of far greater importance than a transitory local political condition or situation.

The New Orleans States is a newspaper of great influence in the community. I take this opportunity of congratulating its editor, William H. Fitzpatrick, on this editorial series. It is timely. It is to the point. It is important. It sounds a warning that everyone of us must heed—lest we be destroyed.

It is of more than passing interest that Judge Perez has made it possible for the Members of this Congress to receive the several editions of the New Orleans States in which these editorials appear.

Here again is a splendid example of the security of the Nation and the protection of our accepted way of life, rising above all other considerations. In Louisiana Judge Perez is regarded, and justly so, as the possessor of one of the most resourceful and fertile political brains in the State. His differences with the New

Orleans States on local political matters have been shared by me from time to time. Judge Perez is a strong and determined man. His strength of character and his determination to carry the fight for the principles in which he believes is evidenced by his action in this instance. He joins hands with the New Orleans States in bringing to the attention of the elected representatives of the people of this country the dangers which lurk at our side. I direct your attention to these matters in order to emphasize the importance of this fight and the advisability of reading these editorials.

While this subject matter is something which directs itself to the conclusion of the Senate, it is nonetheless important to the Members of the House.

I shall not attempt to discuss the issues involved but I do urge each one of you to not only read but clip and file these editorials.

For my part I shall do more than bring this matter to your attention. I shall collect these New Orleans States editorials and when they have been completed I shall insert them in the RECORD in order that they may become a permanent part of this Congress' deliberations and records. I want them to have that degree of permanency and I want them to remain at all times available to those who might want to see and learn for themselves.

When you receive your copy of the New Orleans States for the next several weeks turn to the editorial page and read these enlightening editorials on the "Declaration of human rights" which affect each and every one of you today and the lives of those who are yet unborn.

Meaning of the Truman Victory—Mission of the Democratic Party—and the Responsibility of the Democratic Party in Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when we find so many southern Democrats joining unholy hands with ultraconservative Republicans to frustrate and defeat the program as outlined in the last Democratic National Platform, and presented to the American people so forcefully and ably by President Harry S. Truman, it might not be amiss to pause a few minutes and take stock, so to speak, in the vain hope that something might be said and done to bring these recalcitrant Southern Democrats back to their usual good political sense and action.

In an effort to accomplish this purpose I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the finest political speeches which it has been my privilege to listen to in recent years.

This speech was written and delivered by my true friend, and ever loving Democrat, Nelson G. Kraschel, former Democratic Governor of Iowa, and at the time of its delivery he was the General Agent of the Farm Credit Administration of Omaha, Nebraska. Without doubt Governor Kraschel was the only Democrat in high position, in either Nebraska or Iowa, who really extended himself to help President Truman, and the Democratic ticket in the last election, yet strange as it may now seem, in spite of Governor Kraschel's loyal, unselfish work he was the first fatality of an alleged economy plan, and was relieved of his position, while the fawning Wednesday Democrats held their jobs, as is usually the case in politics, so that in the future, I guess, they might again be able to demonstrate that they can grow into bigger and better double-dealers, double-crossers and undercover Republicans. Men who are not a credit to either party—mere professional opportunists.

If the Fair Deal has made any mistakes thus far it is that it has permitted politically faithless Democrats and others to remain in high positions in and out of the councils of the party, and on committees, and other important places, and has discarded the faithful for the faithless, proving again that the more you do for a political cause the less is thought of you, and that right, like truth, "is forever on the scaffold and wrong forever on the throne."

The second mistake which possibly the Fair Deal is making is that propositions of great pith and moment sometimes do not seem to be thought through very well by the leadership, and consequently Members of Congress, who are anxious, ready, and willing to be cooperative feel that they are required to leave the leaders for the moment.

By way of example the Democratic platform called for a repeal of the tax on oleomargarine and up comes a bill to not only repeal this tax but to permit oleomargarine to be colored yellow, as most butter is colored now. This effort to do more than the party platform required has been very bad. I with other Democrats have been forced to be against this "overflowing measure plan" for the rich and powerful foreign and domestic oleomargarine manufacturers. The southern Democrats and administration leaders are for permitting oleomargarine to be colored yellow. You can see quite readily that I must represent the people, and the real interests of my district and not England's Lever Brothers and Unilever, and others. Omaha is one of the largest butter producing centers in the United States, and perhaps the world, and my district, has in it many farmers who rely in part upon milk cows for their livelihood. I cannot turn my people down for the interests of southern Democrats, and so forth. I must stand with two and one-half million farmers and Omaha creameries against this big and powerful domestic and foreign combine which would give us a synthetic product for the real thing.

Also the platform of the Democratic Party is opposed generally to sales taxes, yet when the District of Columbia bill came up the leadership was for it on the theory that the Democratic platform was against a national sales tax only. Of course the sales tax for the District of Columbia was the entering wedge for a national sales tax, and I could not go along and still claim to be at least farseeingly consistent as well as shortsightedly consistent. Of course it was and still is the desire of the rich property owners of the District of Columbia, who pay only $2 per hundred on the low assessed value of their real estate, to have a sales tax bill passed saddling their burden on the people generally, instead of bringing their property tax up to the figure obtaining in the other 48 States. They wanted special handling, but Congress on the last try-out refused to put this selfish makeship interpretation on the platform plank which denounces sales taxes—period.

Lest I forget entirely my purpose in making these remarks, I now introduce to you the speech which I appreciated so much, and which real Democrats I am sure will prize very highly, and freely use in the future.

ADDRESS OF NELSON G. KRASCHEL

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, President Roosevelt once said: "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny." The impact of succeeding events has fulfilled his prophecy.

During the last 15 years, we have seen man's struggle for freedom reach a great crisis. All the basest and most sublime emotions of man were unleashed in a holocaust such as this world had never seen before. World problems that had been accumulating for ages exploded with a violence never before experienced. The clash of opposing ideologies drew the entire world into horrible war. Statesmen were discredited and governments fell; and science invaded uncharted realms with results still unforeseen.

Throughout this turmoil and darkness and despair, only one beacon light remained shining aloft as a symbol to mankind of those ideals of the dignity of man, Christian tolerance and stability of governments. That shining light was—and is—the United States of America. And during all this period our Government has been guided and directed by the principles of the Democratic Party under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

We meet tonight to celebrate a Democratic Party victory. It was a victory that authorized the continuance of the policies that brought America to world leadership—policies which place human rights above and beyond the power of greed. It was a victory of the people—little understood at the time, but now interpreted as a rededication of America's faith in the ability of man to govern himself. It proved that the American people cannot be stampeded into an unwise political decision—no matter how smooth or slick or high-powered the would-be stampeders. The victory was a veritable vote of confidence in American democracy. On the world scene, it reestablished confidence and hope in the hearts of all mankind. It strengthened America's leadership in world affairs.

This victory dinner will not be devoted to arrogant gloating or silly bragging. It is intended as a sincere and humble tribute to those who had the courage to lead and the ability to win.

My remarks are divided into four parts:

1. The meaning of the Truman victory.
2. (Deleted because of natural modesty of Congressman offering article for printing in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)
3. The mission of the Democratic Party.
4. Our responsibility in government.

THE MEANING OF THE TRUMAN VICTORY

On the subject of Truman's victory, it would be both gracious and revealing to await all the apologies of pollsters and newspapers that so confidently predicted his defeat. The more they explain, the more evident it becomes that the opposition to Mr. Truman was a highly publicized campaign diabolically conceived by the captains of greed to deceive American voters. The administration which they sought to establish in Washington could not survive an honest exposure of its purpose. They knew that the public would never accept an administration that proposed a continuance of the Eightieth Congress, with all of its sins. There was but one course open to them, and that was to admit nothing and claim everything.

Louis Bromfield, the columnist, admits in an Omaha World-Herald article that perhaps, after all, the results of the election were best for the country. He says that by its smug complacency the public gives him the impression that it has licked a bunch of city slickers.

As time goes on, more of them will turn State's evidence and tell the truth.

There were many amusing incidents of the campaign that deserve repeating. They deserve repeating, not because their comedy amuses us, but rather as an object lesson to the voters in the future.

Governor Dewey's opening speech of the campaign at Des Moines sealed his fate. He failed to offer a single sound reason for his election. The following day the Council Bluffs Nonpareil headlined his speech as follows:

"Dewey begins campaign to unite America." The Nonpareil also stated: "Dewey ignored President Truman's contention 2 days previous at Dexter, Iowa, that 'gluttons of privilege' were out to take control of the Republican Party."

Mr. Dewey's proposal to unite America was one statement that confused me.

In 1933 when President Roosevelt took over the reins of government, America was disunited. Bread lines existed in every major city. Farmers were bankrupt because their crops would not bring the cost of production. Our banks were closed. World trade had been stagnated by the Republican high tariff, and our Nation could scarcely claim a friend among the other nations of the world.

In the ensuing years, remedial legislation corrected the economic injustices of the Republican era. The wheels of industry began to turn, farmers produced at a profit, and production restored jobs for the unemployed. Despair soon changed to hope.

When the war burst upon us, all the people of our Nation rallied to its defense. Farmers, short of help and short of equipment, labored until late at night. Laborers gladly left their comfortable homes to live in trailer camps where the war industries were located. Over night, industrialists converted their factories to the production of war material. We all submitted to price controls and rationing of strategic material. We were united.

And yet, this self-appointed messiah had the unadulterated gall to come before the American people and say he is going to unite them. Whether he knows it or not, his phony campaign of unity served only to unite the American people more solidly behind Truman and the Democratic Party.

One of the early moves of the new candidate (after "blitzing" the Republican Convention at Philadelphia) was to call a conference of all farm editors at his palatial farm home at Pawling, N. Y. The farm editors' report of that "rugged farmers' conference" is somewhat like the polls of 4 months ago. You should read them again. One of the farm editors of a neighboring daily newspapers wrote as follows:

"Mr. Dewey can rightly be called a farmer. He talks like a farmer. He acts like a farmer. He thinks like a farmer. During his entertainment of midwestern farm editors, he displayed a complete disregard for his gubernatorial shoe shine and my best britches, as he took us about his farm.

Continuing, he said:

"Mr. Dewey has not decided who will be Secretary of Agriculture."

The farm editor also said:

"Dewey does not just talk farming, he demonstrates it. He took us right into the bottom of his silo to examine its content and discuss its operation."

Well, I have visited thousands and thousands of farms and ranches throughout the United States and Canada, and I have never yet encountered a farmer or rancher who attached much importance to a shoe shine. And I have seen thousands and thousands of silos, but I have yet to have a rancher or farmer invite me down into the bottom of his silo to explain how it works. The voting record of farmers indicates that the deluxe conference of rugged farmers at Pawling, N. Y., deceived no one but the candidate himself and his invited guests.

Dewey's discussion of the Taft-Hartley labor bill, the Eightieth Congress, and his refusal to be specific on anything will long be remembered as America's greatest exhibition of shadow boxing during a political campaign. He talked of uniting America; he talked of going forward together; and, on one occasion, he actually came forth with the profound statement that America's future lies before us.

Mrs. Kraschel, who is an excellent bridge player, tells me that an intelligent player takes into account the losing tricks before bidding, and this the Republicans failed to do before nominating a candidate.

While all this dramatized comedy was being accepted by the pollsters and the newspapers as conclusive evidence of a Dewey victory, Harry Truman, the rightful successor to Roosevelt, was traveling up and down the country, and in plain, understandable language was telling the people all the truth. He was telling them what had happened. He was telling them what he would do if reelected. He was specific; he was honest. Truman's record reveals that from the fateful hour of April 12, 1945, when he grasped the torch of liberty from the still hand of Roosevelt, he had been true to his trust and to the principles of the Democratic Party, and his courage and his defense of these policies had never wavered. Because Roosevelt asked his party to place Truman in position to succeed him, we now have a greater respect for the wisdom and foresight of the immortal Roosevelt.

The clean-cut issue in 1948 was one between a phony campaign of negation and an honest defense of Democratic principles as laid down by Roosevelt and Truman. The people knew that if these principles were denied life under Truman and his successors, they would be buried at Hyde Park.

The Truman victory, therefore, means:

1. Absolute confidence in Truman and Barkley—the men.

2. Absolute confidence in true Democratic principles of government.

3. A repudiation of the Republican Party principles and its leadership.

4. A distrust of any party or candidate who opposes the Democratic Party without endorsement of, or a proposal to improve on, the protection now given to human values.

And the Truman victory has further significance:

5. It means an end to abortive attempts to found new political parties.

6. It means that the two-party system is more firmly assured than ever before in our history.

7. It means that the Democratic Party has been purged of radicals of the right as well as the left.

8. It means that until the Republican Party purges itself of the leadership which represents the captains of greed, it will not attract the support of young men and women whose careers are ahead of them.

9. It means a great future for our two-party system, and it is a definite warning to the management of both parties that whenever they fail to provide constructive leadership, they are doomed to defeat.

10. It means that politics, contrary to common belief, is accepted by the average citizen as a serious business and not just a game.

MISSION OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The Democratic Party has a great mission to perform in America. It has a brilliant record. Unfortunately, it has been called into service only in times of emergency, and not until the November 2 election has it appeared that the American Nation is ready to accept the philosophy of the Democratic Party as its fundamental principles of government.

Our dictionaries define a Democrat as one who believes in social equality. In my years of association with the Democratic Party, I have found that the party is made up of congenial and tolerant people with a single objective—that of solving the practical problems of American life. I have found that the Democratic Party rejects the plea of selfish forces who seek special privileges. The most humble citizen can be heard in its councils. It is a haven for distressed and troubled citizens, and it is the party to which our Nation turns during a crisis. Blind partisanship is not a Democratic trait. We could win more elections if we were more enthusiastically partisan, but for my part there is little satisfaction in winning an election unless our candidates and our policies are clearly entitled to public support. To be accepted as an active member of the Democratic Party is a privilege because it offers the average citizen his best opportunity for public service. Membership in this party should be looked upon as an opportunity to serve—it should not be regarded as a license to receive personal benefits.

Under Woodrow Wilson, from 1912 to 1920, the Democratic Party rendered a great service to the Nation. During that period, women were given equal status with men, the Federal Reserve Banking Act was adopted, and the Federal land bank was established. President Wilson rapidly advanced to a position of world leadership, but the captains of greed, working through the Republican Party, were strong enough to sabotage his efforts. In the campaign of 1920, the American people fell victim to the campaign slogan of Back to Normalcy With Harding and Coolidge, which was the beginning of 12 years of Republican rule.

During that period, the Republican philosophy of government was given a fair trial. It ended in complete chaos. Our economy was wrecked. Our Nation stood friendless among the nations of the world. The Republican foreign policy, and particularly its high-tariff policy, had brought on stagnation of world trade. Depressions, accompanied by social disorder, prevailed in many countries. Totalitarian forms of government sprang up everywhere.

But the American people, having had recent experience with democratic principles during the Wilson administration, had not forgotten. So in the elections of '32, while the earth shook with marching feet (many of them goose stepping under dictators), our people were marching to the polls to reestablish, under Roosevelt, the democratic philosophy of government that had served us so well in the past.

In the 16 years that have elapsed since the eventful campaign of '32, the American people have enjoyed the blessings of a government that believes in the dignity of man. The reforms that have been adopted during

this period are necessary to implement the Democratic Party's philosophy of government.

I shall enumerate only a few of the agencies and measures:

Security and Exchange Commission.

Guaranty of bank deposits.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation—loans to banks and business enterprises.

Farm Credit Administration—loans to farmers and ranchers.

Price support for farm commodities.

Commodity Credit Corporation—market stabilization and loans to farmers.

Collective bargaining for organized labor.

Old-age pensions.

Unemployment compensation.

Abolition of child labor.

Reciprocal trade treaties.

Soil conservation—timber, range and water resources development.

Development of river resources—power, irrigation, transportation, and flood control.

Rural electrification.

Each and every one of these reforms, together with many more not listed here, is a part of a broad plan to insure the people more liberty and more security.

During this 16-year period, the Republican opposition made a frantic effort to deny the people their new-found freedoms and privileges in order that the captains of greed could continue to exploit the public. The Republican propaganda has, in great part, been dishonest and unfair. The Republicans have sought to disturb the people by claiming that we were surrendering personal rights and privileges to the Government. They have charged us with destroying the free-enterprise system. The truth of the matter is—we have never had a completely free-enterprise system in this country. We have a protected private-enterprise system. From the very beginning, every major industry of this land had been subsidized in some way or another.

Grants of land to railroads, mail subsidies to railroads and steamship lines and air lines, high tariffs on imports to protect domestic manufacturers, patent laws for the protection of industry, special freight rates—these are only a few of the subsidies, direct and indirect, which the Government has provided to protect private industry.

The laws of our land protect the investment dollar and the investor. Property rights have never been questioned. We sought, and achieved, under the Democratic Party program, comparable protection for human rights. I have never been able to understand why the proponents of the Republican theory of government had failed to recognize that in the period from 1920 to 1932, their philosophy of government wrecked the economy of the people, and thereby destroyed the buying power necessary to maintain a prosperous national economy.

The Democratic program, in the past 16 years, has built solidly from the ground up. The farmer, the laborer, the clerk, the small-business man, and the professional man have been established on a sound footing; and this means that all business has a greater opportunity to prosper. The regulatory measures for the control of business are designed to maintain a proper economic balance between all segments of our people. This is a necessary procedure unless we wish to return again to the law of the jungle and permit the strong to override the weak.

I yield to no man in America in a desire to protect and improve the capitalistic system. I want enterprise as free as possible. An opportunity for financial independence, yes. An opportunity for job security and job advancement, yes. A proper reward for initiative and ambition, yes. But an opportunity for unbridled greed, no.

The Democratic Party believes in implementing in a practical way the teachings of the Golden Rule. We believe that the coming of man to this planet is a part of the Divine plan. We know that his sojourn on earth is short, and that it is merely a period of preparation for eternity. We are grateful for the bounteous resources of earth which are provided for the sustenance and pleasure of man, and we do not intend that these resources should be dissipated by greed. If man's purpose on earth is to be accomplished as intended, he must learn to govern himself. He must discipline himself or he must be disciplined by society in the light of the common good. The Democratic Party believes this to be the duty of government. It believes in free elections in the formation of all governments. It believes that the preservation of the dignity of man should be the prime objective of government.

All governmental problems (including world stability) could be solved instantly if we could apply the principles of the fellowship of man and the fatherhood of God. The mission of the Democratic Party is to give life and action to these priceless principles. Idealistic, you say. Yes. But we dare not tolerate anything less than this ideal in the most powerful government on earth.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT

The responsibility of our party in the management of our Government is tremendous. We have a mandate from the people to direct our Government for another 4 years. This will complete a 20-year span of Democratic rule. During this era, we have broken the shackles of isolationism and established ourselves as a great world power, with interest in and obligations to every nation. We manifest a deep concern in mankind everywhere and have become a champion of world democracy: a philosophy which is now locked in a death-grip with communism. The foreign policy of our Government is nonpartisan. It is the policy of the American people. We are merely entrusted with its direction. If we succeed, it will mean peace, contentment, and progress throughout the world.

The adoption of a bill of rights for the world was announced last week by the United Nations. In the words of Eleanor Roosevelt, who for 2½ years has sponsored the movement within the United Nations system, "This is a Magna Carta for the world." It is a glowing tribute to our philosophy of government. It is an accomplishment of the United Nations, the instrument of world order, growing out of the idealism of America.

Our responsibility in the days to come will include all the practical duties of government and the defense of high ideals. It will include the practical problems growing out of industrial expansion, investment profits, prices, wages, and the stabilizing of agriculture and transportation. We have the responsibility of protecting the capitalistic system by maintaining economic equality between all groups. It will be our responsibility to protect and improve all our natural resources, including the land itself.

In maintaining the high ideals, it will be our purpose to convince every person who enjoys the rights and privileges of an American citizen that he has a corresponding responsibility. The right of free speech certainly carries with it the responsibility to listen. The freedom of worship certainly implies that we do worship. Freedom of peaceful assembly would be a dangerous procedure if the public did not discharge its community obligation by taking part in all public meetings. We neglected this obligation but a few years ago and, as a result, many of our citizens were corrupted by the German-American Bund, America First Committee, and the No Foreign Wars Committee.

We must remember all these things—in our hearts and in our actions—as we fulfill the mandate given to us again by the American people.

It is as true today as it was that day 16 years ago when Roosevelt said: "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

To keep the faith, we shall require courage and strength, even though, God forbid, the path of righteousness may again lead us across battlefields. It is our responsibility to maintain a government with a soul. The dignity of man at home and abroad must be maintained. Human rights must be protected from those whose greed knows no reason. In this way, and in this way only, can we, by example, prove to the world our fitness to lead. It is the righteous course. It is the will of God and it is the only course that leads to peace on earth and good will among men.

"Tap" Rodgers—50 Years to News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, not too many round out 50 years of service in any profession, and I want to pay tribute to a veteran publisher of my district who has completed 50 years of newspaper activity in northwestern Ohio. He began as a newsboy and with faithful devotion he became one of the leading publishers in Ohio. He is a genuine person which his card bespeaks and I want to pay my respects to this veteran of the press on his golden anniversary in the profession which has helped to keep America a Nation of free peoples, I include his card along with the tribute of his fellows of the Advertiser-Tribune, Tiffin, Ohio:

[Card]

E. T. Rodgers, president, general manager, publisher, the Advertiser-Tribune, Tiffin, Ohio, United States of America.

Single-liver; dance; take a drink; no cards; sees everything; tells nothing; call me "Tap."

Have toured:

Countries: United States of America, England, France, Spain, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Germany, Italy, Australia, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Mexico, Guatemala, Salvador, Panama, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Canada.

Islands: Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti, Puerto Rico, Nassau, Madeira, Canary, Hawaii, Samoa, Fiji, New Zealand, St. Helena.

African cities: Casablanca, Cape Town, Kimberley, Johannesburg, Dakar, Durban, Mombasa, Nairobi, Omdurman, Khartoum, Port Sudan, Luxor, Cairo, Algiers.

TIFFIN PUBLISHER HONORED AT ANNIVERSARY GATHERING

Business associates and personal friends from Tiffin, many Ohio cities, and from points as distant as Los Angeles and New York joined here Saturday afternoon and evening in complimenting E. Tappan Rodgers, Advertiser-Tribune president and general manager, on the fiftieth anniversary of his entrance into the newspaper business.

The celebration, which began with a reception at 3 p. m. Saturday and was climaxed by a banquet for approximately 120 guests at 6:30 Saturday evening, concluded with a breakfast for out-of-town guests and Advertiser-Tribune executives at 10 a. m.

Sunday. All affairs were held in the Hotel Shawhan.

Guests at the reception and banquet included Advertiser-Tribune employees and their wives, newspaper publishers from many Ohio cities, newspaper service representatives, groups with which Mr. Rodgers has been closely associated, and other personal friends.

Miss Cora B. Fiege, a former newspaper coworker with Mr. Rodgers for many years, was the principal speaker on the program which followed the banquet. She reviewed in most interesting fashion the story of Mr. Rodgers' early life in Tiffin which led to his entrance into the newspaper business as circulation manager of the Daily Advertiser. She also recounted many interesting high lights of his newspaper career. She concluded her talk with a splendid tribute to Mr. Rodgers as a newspaperman, a citizen, and a friend.

ASSOCIATES PAY TRIBUTE

Others who spoke for various groups and organizations with which Mr. Rodgers has been associated were John W. Cullen, Jr., of Cleveland, of the John W. Cullen Co., national advertising representatives for the Advertiser-Tribune; Alva Bachman, Bowling Green, member of the board of trustees of Bowling Green State University of which board Mr. Rodgers is president; Robert E. Hall, cashier of the Tiffin Savings Bank; Howard W. Smith, business associate and companion on some of Mr. Rodgers' trips abroad; Joseph Rawlinson, Toledo member of a group with which Mr. Rodgers has camped each summer for several years at Swimming Deer Lodge in Michigan and who presented Mr. Rodgers with a handsome gold plaque in commemoration of the anniversary; Congressman Alvin E. Weichel, Sandusky; Frederic Ball, Advertiser alumnus and now a prominent Washington attorney; Clarence Seaman, Cleveland, of the Imperial Type Metal Co., with which firm Mr. Rodgers has had business relations for almost 50 years; Paul B. Parkin, postmaster and chamber of commerce director, who nominated Mr. Rodgers as an outstanding citizen; and Miss Julia Rodgers of Los Angeles, Calif.

GIFTS PRESENTED

At the conclusion of this portion of the program, Mr. Rodgers was introduced. He expressed sincere appreciation for the compliments which had been bestowed upon him and recounted some of the outstanding events of his half-century in the newspaper field. He spoke particularly of his entrance into the business and of his acquisition of his first interest in the old Advertiser company. He paid sincere tribute to those who helped him in various ways in his early days in the business.

Following Mr. Rodgers' address, Ivan R. Hesson, assistant general manager of the Advertiser-Tribune, speaking for all of the firm's employees, presented Mr. Rodgers with an appropriately engraved solid silver bowl and gold pen and pencil set.

Guests at the dinner were introduced at the beginning of the program by Ralph H. Keller, associate editor, who was general chairman of arrangements for the celebration, Mr. Hesson, and John H. Thompson, who presided as toastmaster during the speaking program.

Each guest at the dinner received a gold pencil as a memento of the occasion. Cakes which formed a portion of the dessert course were cut by Miss Fiege, Mrs. Ralph H. Keller, Miss Julia Rodgers, a niece of Mr. Rodgers, who flew here from Los Angeles to attend the celebration, Mrs. Victoria Abbott, and Mrs. John H. Thompson.

An impromptu feature of the dinner program was a salute to C. A. Krout, who celebrated his eighty-seventh birthday Saturday.

Music during the reception and dinner was provided by Roland Miller, accordion virtuoso.

Small four-page facsimiles of the Advertiser-Tribune marked the dinner places for the guests.

The tables were decorated with yellow roses combined with acacia, and ivory candles tied with gold. Outlined against the wall in back of the honor guest's table was an anniversary message in gold script. A basket of red roses, topped with golden numerals, and ivory candles in crystal candelabra formed the table centerpiece.

OUT-OF-TOWN GUESTS

Guests from a distance who attended some or all of the anniversary functions included: Mr. and Mrs. Walter D. Wall, Columbus; Dr. Frank J. Prout, president of Bowling Green State University, and Alva W. Bachman, Bowling Green; Carl H. Schwyn, Cygnet; E. F. Schmidt, James B. Watters, George Schoonmaker, Joseph F. Rawlinson, Toledo; A. A. Armbrust, Lancaster; Frederic Ball, Washington; George A. Dickey, Detroit; Howard T. Baker, Clifton Forge, Va.; S. T. Allen, John W. Cullen, Jr., Clarence Seaman, Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Walker, C. R. Borckardt, James G. Hill, Cleveland; James Downing, Columbus; John W. Vermont, Harry B. Gramm, New York City; George Gilbertson, Chicago; Edgar Koehl, Sr., Ashland; George T. Culbertson, Mount Vernon; Will P. McKinney, Frank B. McKinney, Marietta; Frank J. Daubel, Don Daubel, Fremont; Mr. and Mrs. Frank W. Spencer, Newark; Fred M. Hopkins, Edmond Hopkins, Fostoria; R. L. Hemminger, Findlay; E. S. Rutledge, Kenton; Ray Dix, Wooster; Mr. and Mrs. A. V. Dix, Martins Ferry; Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Ridenour, Piqua; Dudley A. White, Norwalk.

TELEGRAMS AND FLOWERS

Congratulatory telegrams came to Mr. Rodgers from friends and organizations in Tiffin, New York, Sidney, Cincinnati, Toledo, Bellefontaine, Warren, Lancaster, Ashtabula, Cohasset, Mass., Phoenix, Ariz., Washington, D. C., Honolulu, Hawaii, and Seville, Spain.

Floral tributes were received from members of Mr. Rodgers' Columbian High School graduating class, the class of 1898; the Republican-Courier of Findlay; Mr. and Mrs. Clark Stoner, the Whitaker Paper Co., Cincinnati; Kenneth Kerr, Lancaster, the Ohio Select List of Newspapers, the Dix newspapers, and the Tiffin Savings Bank.

Belasco Theater—Bring the Theater Back to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses made at a meeting of the Washington Art Center Association, held at the Smithsonian Institution on March 23, 1949, together with newspaper comment:

ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

BELASCO THEATER—BRING THE THEATER BACK TO WASHINGTON

There has been a legitimate theater in Washington almost since the day our great Government was founded. Back in 1800 when the streets of our city were muddy and unpaved, and travel presented tantalizing problems for the ladies and gentlemen in their coach-drawn vehicles, there was a theater to entertain them. It bore the impressive title, United States Theater. There have been legitimate theaters in Washington all through the years, up until the fall of 1948. When I was first elected and came to Washington, there were, I believe, four theaters producing plays: the Belasco, Poli, National, and Columbia.

It is almost incredible that in this era of enlightenment and discovery, in this city surrounded as it is by some of the greatest expressions of cultural wealth the world contains, that there should come a time when the brilliant world of the theater should have its doors shut in the Nation's Capital. I have heard the concerts given by the Library of Congress compared in superlative terms to the finest chamber orchestras in the world. We have concerts at the National Gallery of Art every Sunday evening, and a concert season each year given by the National Symphony Orchestra. We have recitals and dance performances which play to enthusiastic audiences at Constitution Hall. Architecture and science and art are generously represented everywhere, and the physical beauty of our city brings to us the dignity and distinction which the greatness of our Nation demands. But the living theater, the art which has delighted the peoples of every age and every country, the art which has given us the great plays and the great actors and actresses of the past and of the present—that art has been closed to us.

Looking toward the White House, right on Lafayette Square, the Belasco Theater stands, now a dark, dreary warehouse for Treasury documents, where once Sarah Bernhardt, Eleanora Duse, Otis Skinner, Julia Marlowe, Frances Starr, Helen Hayes, Ina Claire, Katherine Cornell, William Gillette, and many, many other theater great too numerous for me to mention, played their stellar roles. New York, Boston, Philadelphia can witness the pathos of A Streetcar Named Desire, the frustration of Edward, My Son, the sensitivity and earthiness of Mister Roberts. But in Washington they are verboten. Thinking on this conundrum and remembering the years when three and four theaters played to full houses simultaneously in Washington—years when the population was almost half what it is today, I decided that something must be done to right the situation. On writing to the Public Works Administration, in whose safekeeping this property was entrusted, I found a tangle of legal obstacles no commercial producer could possibly be expected to unravel. Because so much damage had been done to the property as a theater, a reconstruction and remodeling process would naturally be necessary. But, and here we come to the impossible strain, no producer could be given a lease that would guarantee him more than 1 year's occupancy under the law. Many theater people have spent months of energy and effort in their eagerness to lease this most desirable property for the purpose of displaying legitimate productions. There has been no dearth of interest and hope that this project should become a reality. Unless, however, a change in the legal process could be granted, it seemed as though the cause were indeed a lost one.

It was at this point that I felt an answer could be found. Since no producer in the commercial field could be expected to take impossible risks, it seemed that the United States Government, proud as it is of its heritage and of its Capital, the center of world thought and progress, should lend a helping hand, and take at least the initial burden of the cost of reconstructing this enormously valuable property, away from the commercial producer. This done, the professional theater could be expected to play out its role. Legislation loomed up as the only answer, and I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to accomplish this purpose.

The number of my bill is H. R. 3038, and because its text is so short, I am going to take the liberty of reading it to you. It goes as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That any law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to offer for public letting within 90 days after the enactment of this act the property known as the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Place, Washington, District of Columbia, for the performing arts. The said lease shall be on such terms and on such conditions as may to him seem reasonable, but such terms and conditions shall be consistent with a reasonable profit to be made by the lesee regardless of any loss to the Government.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall, without cost to the lessee, remodel and reconstruct the said building to permit the performance of theatrical productions and ballet. Nor shall such cost be reflected in the rent to be charged. Said lease shall be for a period not exceeding 5 years.

"The name of the building shall be the Belasco Theater."

Since February 28, 1949, the date on which my bill was introduced, I have been overwhelmed by the support which immediately rallied to it. I want to take this opportunity to thank the theater conference held in New York at the beginning of this month, comprising all segments of the theatrical profession, for its approval and endorsement of my bill. I wish to thank Clarence Derwent, president of Actors' Equity Association for advising me so quickly of that organization's endorsement. I wish to thank C. Lawton Campbell, chairman of the board of directors of the American National Theater and Academy which was chartered by the Congress in 1935, and has been so active in keeping the theater alive all over the country, for its endorsement of my bill. I wish to thank the local District Democratic Central Committee for its promise of support and approval. I wish to thank Mr. Harold Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, for his endorsement, and my heartfelt gratitude goes to each of the sponsors of this meeting and particularly to Mr. Frain and the Washington Art Center Association, for their constant vigil on behalf of my bill and for their efforts in arranging this splendid meeting at this historic landmark tonight. Also, I wish to thank the many individuals who have written to me expressing their firm hope that my bill will indeed bring the legitimate theater back to Washington. And my humble gratitude goes to the newspapers for their excellent reporting on it. To Father Hartke director of the drama department of Catholic University, who has so kindly consented to act as the chairman of this meeting, may I extend special thanks. I can think of no more perfect choice for such a task.

All of you attest to the truth that our great city deserves the honor and the splendor that the artists of the theater can bestow upon us. I sincerely hope that you will continue your efforts until the end we desire is achieved.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, to which H. R. 3038 has been referred in the House of Representatives, has informed me that he has requested reports on the bill from the appropriate agencies. That is the beginning of action on the bill in committee. Soon, I trust hearings will be held so that further action can be taken. I urge all of you to advise the members of the committee of your support, and hope that you will use your energies further, as will I, to see to it that the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square may once again be the center of illumination both within and without, that it has been throughout the years of its admirable life.

ADDRESS BY MELVIN D. HILDRETH, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The commendable effort of the citizens of Washington to bring about the restoration of the Belasco Theater, recalls that for 150 years the windows of the White House have gazed on the drama of Lafayette Square. Even as early as 1793 George Washington, as President, there joined the members of Masonic Lodge No. 15 before proceeding to Capitol Hill for the purpose of laying the cornerstone. In 1814 Dolly Madison dashed across the square, then a cow pasture, with the silver service from the burning White House fired by the British. In 1820 Stephen Decatur, hero of the hour because of his exploits in the war with the pirates of Tripoli, left his house on the northwest corner of this square to fight his fatal duel with James Barron on the famous old dueling grounds at Bladensburg, a few miles from our city; a scene from which he returned to die. From the same house Martin Van Buren commanded the favor of Andrew Jackson and subsequently obtained the Presidency by being friendly to that awful Mrs. Eaton.

So, too, the White House and the square witnessed the tragic end of Philip Barton Key, son of the author of the Star-Spangled Banner, when Gen. Daniel Sickles discovered his wife, a native of Spain, signaling from her home with a handkerchief to the young Washington district attorney.

In the house in which Key died, after being shot by Sickles, William H. Seward, Secretary of State under Lincoln, resided during the Civil War. On April 14, 1865, the night Ford's Theater echoed to a shot from an actor-assassin's pistol that resounded around the world and left Lincoln lifeless, a young man by the name of Payne, co-conspirator with Booth, came on horseback to the home of Mr. Seward, pretending to be a messenger with a package of medicine for the sick Secretary of State. The servant attempted to prevent Payne from going upstairs and in the ensuing struggle young Seward was shot, the nurse wounded, and Secretary Seward stabbed repeatedly in the throat.

And on the site of this home, where so much real drama, romance, and adventure has occurred, a theater was erected. These great events, marking successive steps in the history of the Nation, were real, and now, in the very place where they once attracted world-wide attention, comedy joined with tragedy under a theater's roof; a theater which even today contains several of the original windows of the old mansion that housed Blaine as its last great stateman and after his passing gave way to the present domicile of drama. From out of these same windows for the past 50 years has been witnessed the pageants of a nation, the carriages of kings, queens, and princes passing in review, the inaugural processions of the Roosevelt era, the profound sorrow as the Presidential funeral passed by contrasted with the waves of happy hysteria upon the ending of the world wars, and the gay cheers greeting the Truman inaugural parade.

The same White House windows which looked out upon the drama of Lafayette Square years ago, in more recent times have gazed at the successes and failures of the American stage as the announcements of plays, good and bad, season after season, appeared over the threater portico.

This theater, the only one in the world to have faced the home of a nation's executive and located with an eye for the beautiful, as few indeed were, was first called the Lafayette Square Opera House, and later was known as the Shubert-Belasco Theater. It was erected in 1895 by Uriah H. Painter, a wealthy engineer, and it was notable at that time as being the first fireproof theater to be erected. For many years it was the theater selected by many of New York's leading producers for the premiere of their productions.

It would seem proper that this, the oldest of the Capital's legitimate theaters, ideally located on such a historic site, should be further utilized for the presentation of plays. It was one of America's most beautiful theaters. The walls of old gold were relieved by quotations from the classics and soft-shaded tapestries gave dignity to the boxes associated with those who have made American history for the past five decades. It was a theater of atmosphere. It was a friendly theater.

Little wonder that scores of Washingtonians loved this playhouse. It is to be hoped that the Congress can find a way to relight the electric sign as a nightly reminder that this cherished theater again holds the mirror up to nature; a shining contrast to the world drama staged around President Truman's Cabinet table across the square, whose mahogany teems with thrills known but to a favored few.

[From the Washington Post of March 22, 1949]

ONE ON THE AISLE—BELASCO PROJECT LOCALLY BACKED

(By Richard L. Coe)

Tomorrow night's public meeting to discuss the plan for bringing the Belasco Theater back to life has one facet that deserves strong emphasis.

It is being sponsored by residents of Washington who are interested in the theater, either professionally or as observers.

In endless talks with theatrical bigwigs in New York I've found the criticism that perhaps Washington is not interested in having a theater; that if its residents really want to bring the living theater back they should "do" something about it. "Do" precisely what, the bigwigs have been pretty vague, but tomorrow night's meeting and its sponsors should certainly put our town on record as more than just interested.

The meeting will be held at 8:15 in the Natural History Building of the Smithsonian Institution, Constitution Avenue and Tenth Street NW.

Chief speaker will be Representative EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat, New York), who has introduced a bill providing that the Treasury remodel and reconstruct the Belasco Theater and lease it "consistent with a reasonable profit to the lessee regardless of loss to the Government." Representative CELLER has been in Congress since 1922 and can certainly be reckoned as a Washington resident of long, respectable standing.

The Celler bill is now before the House Committee on Public Works, chairmaned by Representative WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON (Democrat, Mississippi). One member of this committee, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, Minnesota), will address the meeting. A veteran of the recent war, Representative BLATNIK is expected to explain how a National Capital without the living theater strikes a man from the Midwest.

Another prominent Democrat will take part, Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia. Virtually a lifelong resident of the District and the Nation's No. 1 circus fan, Mel Hildreth knows the story of the Belasco—once the Lafayette Square Opera House—and tells it with a fondness his audience will relish.

NOTABLE RESIDENTS

Chairman of the meeting will be Father Gilbert V. Hartke, director of Catholic University's speech and drama department. A leading figure in the Capital's ecclesiastical and theatrical circles for the past decade, Father Hartke is a man whose words and works command national respect.

Although New York and Chicago have their claims on her, actress Frances Starr is another Washington resident of long standing on the list of rally sponsors. As the wife of the late Robert G. Donaldson, Miss Starr lived here some years as a private citizen and devoted her energies to the more playful ways of social living. Between her plays nowadays, home to Miss Starr is Kalorama Road, and while she'll probably be asked to speak about David Belasco, whose bright star she was for so many years, her true value tomorrow night lies in her role as this city's leading professional actress.

Mrs. Francis Biddle is on the panel, too, the wife of the former Attorney General, a playwright in her own right who last year had the curious experience of having a play running in New York which couldn't find a stage in her home city.

Nelson B. Bell, who for so many years covered the theater for this newspaper, is another long-time resident whose name as sponsor should mean much to Capital residents and the New York theater circles.

Prominent socialites who've missed the theater's relaxing entertainment and cultural stimuli are on the list, among them Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Mrs. Lawrence A. Baker, Mrs. Louise Noonan Miller, and Mrs. Edgar Ansel Mowrer.

FOR THE FUTURE, NOT THE PAST

The city's leading theatrical figures are all represented—Bess Davis Schreiner, of the Theater Guild; Evelyn Freyman, of the Olney Theater; Edward Mangum, of George Washington University's staff and players; Horton Foote and Vincent Donehue, of Productions, Inc.; Owen Dodson, the poet-playwright of Howard University; Constance Albright Snow, the concert manager; Patrick Hays, her charming rival in the music field; Mary Stewart French, the American National Theater and Academy board member resident in Washington.

Organizing the public meeting has been the Washington Art Center Association, of which Lawrence J. Heller is president and J. G. Frain the indefatigable executive secretary.

One thing I hope about tomorrow night's meeting is that it will confine itself to the immediate problem of reviving the theater in this city. The discrimination issue is a thing of the past. Both the playwrights and the actors have stated they will not work in the National Capital unless all Americans can see their work.

The position has been taken, it exists, and it is up to the meeting not to reopen old wounds but to discuss how the situation as it is can be resolved. This is a chance to look at the present and the future, not the past.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1949]

THEATER FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SEEMS TO BE UP TO THE 20

(By Tom Donnelly)

The turnout was small, but the enthusiasm was large. Some 135 Washingtonians met last night in the Smithsonian's Natural History Building to consider ways and means of getting the Nation's Capital a theater.

Several of the speakers warned that in another year or so the city's theaterless condition might be accepted as a natural state of affairs, and since this obviously must not happen a committee of 20 was formed, with instructions to hold a meeting as soon as possible and see what can be done.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, was the principal speaker, and the talk naturally turned on the hope that something might be done to reclaim the Belasco (where Bernhardt, Duse, and Cornell once demonstrated the bright art of the drama) from its present dark status as a warehouse for musty Treasury documents.

Mr. CELLER cited the damaged condition of the auditorium, and the legal difficulties which must be surmounted, and read his bill (H. R. 3038) which provides that "the Secretary of the Treasury repair and remodel the Belasco and rent it out to the performing arts."

Melvin Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia, pointed out the incontrovertible fact that the Belasco is the only theater in the world which looks out upon the same park as the White House.

Actress Frances Starr, who is indelibly identified in the public mind with that venerable shocker, The Easiest Way, admitted she was surprised to discover that the Smithsonian was not in another part of town, as she had always supposed, observed that she had appeared in the Belasco's first play, Rose of the Rancho (or maybe it was her first play), and went on to say that the past of the Belasco is important but that the future is more important still.

Patrick Hayes, head of the Hayes concert bureau, who came up with the most practical suggestion of the evening, thought it might be possible for someone to buy up the lease of the National. In any case, he said, theater-conscious Washingtonians should work on every possible angle at once: the Belasco, auditoriums like the one at Roosevelt High School, and that National lease.

Largely due to Mr. Hayes' urgings, the meeting got down to business and nominated a committee (possibly to be called the Citizens Committee for Theater in the Nation's Capital) which will meet, whenever Mr. Hildreth sets a date, to discuss ways and means, and to examine proposals offered by Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, to the effect that Congressmen should be written to, community groups aroused, and so forth.

The Reverend Gilbert K. Hartke, director of Catholic University's drama department, presided. He asked the audience to take a tip from the embattled pyramid clubs, and tell two friends who would tell two friends who would tell two friends to get behind the bring-back-the-theater movement.

The committee members, all connected with the theater or with interested civic groups, are Hazel Markel, Bess Davis Schreiner, Owen Dodson, Lawrence Heller, Mrs. Carolyn Hill Stewart, Mrs. Frances Nash Watson, Mrs. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Horton Foote, Edward Mangum, Mrs. Constance Snow, George Vivian, Mrs. Edward Sturdevant, Mrs. Doris G. Foster, Miss Charlotte M. London, Richard L. Coe, George Frain, executive secretary of the Washington Art Center Association, Inc., which sponsored the meeting, Mr. Hildreth, Miss Starr, Father Hartke and myself.

[From the Washington Post of March 24, 1949]

WILL FIGHT FOR CELLER BILL—COMMITTEE OF 20 FORMED HERE TO BRING BACK LIVING THEATER

(By Richard L. Coe)

A citizens' committee of 20 to bring back the living theater to Washington was formed last night at a public meeting in the Smithsonian Institution.

The meeting was called to discuss means of getting support for the Celler bill, designed to renovate the Belasco Theater and lease it to private producers.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, outlined his bill by pointing out the tangle of legal obstacles that have kept private producers from leasing the theater as it now stands. Under its present condition, he stated, no producer could hope to take over the theater. His bill provides that the Government recondition the theater and then "it would be up to the theater people to run it."

By a vote of the audience—of no more than 150—Melvin Hildreth, Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia, and one of the evening's speakers, was elected chairman. Hildreth said he hopes to have the rest of the committee, all elected by last night's spectators, meet formally some time next week.

Speakers included Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, who told the audience the future of the theater is up to the Washington public.

The Celler bill is now before the House Committee on Public Works, chairmaned by Representative WILLIAM WHITTINGTON, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Others who addressed the gathering and urged that Washingtonians write letters to the committee chairman showing their interest in the Celler bill (H. R. 3038) included Miss Frances Starr, the actress; Patrick Hayes, the concert manager; Louis Simon, executive secretary of Actors' Equity; and the Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke, chairman of the meeting and director of Catholic University's speech and drama department.

Nominated to the committee were Mrs. Hazel Markel, Mrs. Edgar Mowrer, Constance A. Snow, Charlotte London, Mrs. Edward W. Sturdevant, Carolyn Will Stuart, Bess Davis Schreiner, Frances Starr, Frances Nash Watson, Father Hartke, Tom Donnelly, George Vivian, Horton Foote, Lawrence Heller, Edward Mangum, George Frain, Owen Dodson, Patrick Hayes and Richard L. Coe.

Miss Violet Heming, a resident member of Equity, a lifelong actress and the wife of Judge Bennett Champ Clark, was nominated to serve although not present at the meeting, the audience expressing the hope that she will accept the assignment.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1949]

GROUP FORMS TO BRING LEGITIMATE THEATER BACK TO CAPITAL

A newly formed committee of Washington residents will meet soon under the chairmanship of Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia, to chart efforts toward providing Washington with a legitimate theater.

Suggested by Patrick Hayes, concert bureau head, the committee was named last night at a meeting of citizens in the National Museum, called by the Washington Art Center Association.

After talks and discussion on the question of bringing back a living, professional theater to the District, the gathering decided to charge a committee, to be known as A Citizens' Committee for Theater in the Nation's Capital, with responsibility for promoting legislation and other measures toward that end.

MEMBERS NAMED

Mr. Hildreth announced he would communicate with the members as to the time and place of the first meeting. The members include Miss Frances Starr, the Rev. Gilbert Hartke, Richard Coe, J. G. Frain, Mrs. Hazel Markel, George Vivian, Mrs. Bess Davis Schreiner, Mr. Hayes, Mrs. Carolyn Will Stewart, Owen Dodson, Lawrence J. Heller, Mrs. Frances Nash Watson, Miss Charlotte M. London, Mrs. Edgar Mowrer, Horton Foote, Mrs. Doris G. Foster, Edward Mangum, Mrs. Constance A. Snow, Mrs. Edward Sturdevant and Tom Donnelly.

One piece of legislation the group will work to put over is a bill sponsored by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to remodel and lease the old Belasco for the theater purposes, consistent with a reasonable profit to the lessee, regardless of the loss to the Government.

SUGGESTS PYRAMID

Father Hartke suggested a sort of pyramid club program for letting the House Commit-

tee on Public Works know of citizen reaction toward the Celler bill, with each citizen interested recruiting two others to write Chairman WHITTINGTON.

But the correspondents should be enlisted for supporting the bill only if they mean it, he stressed, not just to jam up the busy mail box of the Congressmen.

Speakers included Representatives Celler; Javits, Republican, of New York; and Blatnik, Democrat, of Minnesota; Mr. Hildreth; Mr. Hayes; Louis Simon, new executive secretary of Actors' Equity; Miss Starr; and Father Hartke, moderator.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 24, 1949]

GROUP WILL SEEK THEATER FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic National committeeman for the District of Columbia, last night was named chairman of a citizens' committee to press for restoration of a legitimate theater to Washington.

The Citizens Committee for Theater in the Nation's Capital, a name suggested by Patrick Hayes, District concert bureau head, was formed at the close of a rally held by the Washington Art Center association in the National Museum.

Speakers at the rally, who urged support of the Celler bill which orders the Treasury Department to lease the old Belasco Theater to a private firm for use as a legitimate theater which the Government would furnish and subsidize, were:

Representatives Celler, Democrat, of New York, author of the bill now before the House Public Works Committee; Javits, Republican; and Blatnik, Democrat, of Minnesota; Frances Starr, Washington actress; Louis Simon, executive secretary, Actors' Equity of New York; Hildreth and Hayes.

The Reverend Gilbert Hartke, head of the Catholic University drama department, presided.

Those elected to the citizens' committee were Hayes, Miss Starr, Hartke, Hazel Kenyon Markell, Bess Davis Schreiner, George Vivian, Carolyn Hill Stewart, Owen Dodson, Howard University English professor; Charlotte M. London, Mrs. Frances Watson, Mrs. Edgar A. Mowrer, Horton Foote, Edward Mangum, head of the George Washington drama department; J. G. Frain, executive secretary, Washington Art Center Association; Mrs. Constance Snow, Mrs. Edward Sturdevant, Tom Donnelly, and Richard Coe.

British Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, there can be little remaining doubt about the attitude of the British people toward their medical program, despite the propaganda regarding its alleged failure distributed so widely in this country by certain elements in the American Medical Association.

Almost every account from American reporters abroad testifies to the popularity of the British program. One of the most recent reports, written by John W. Vandercook, the well-known American correspondent, appears in the March issue of Harper's magazine. Mr. Vandercook's article dealt with many other issues. Included here is only that part which touches on the British health-insurance program:

The most intense enthusiasm, all but un-British in its articulateness, is reserved for the last, latest, and greatest experiment of democratic socialism, the National Health Service, instituted last summer.

Its working, too, is simple. You choose your own doctor. If he accepts you as his patient, your name goes on his list. (If you don't like him, you can change.) Unless you wish such additional comforts (rather than necessities) of medical treatment as a private room in a hospital, you pay for nothing, except insofar as you are helping to pay your bills and those of everyone else through general taxation.

Both office visits and visits to the patient's home are free. Medicine, surgical operations, anaesthesia, the attention of specialists, X-rays, biological tests—even eyeglasses, hearing aids, and artificial limbs—all are free. Complete dental attention is included.

British dentists are already flirting with nervous collapse from overwork because there are not nearly enough of them to go round. The reason there are too few in that profession is that a literal majority of the British population has previously stayed away from dentists because it could not afford them—and has suffered torture, disfigurement, and infection as a result.

One need only imagine with what a gasp of incredulous relief such a colossal bounty would be met by millions of people of the United States to reckon the even deeper gratitude, the sharper emotion it has produced in immeasurably poorer England.

General practitioners under the scheme may earn as much as $12,800 a year. Specialists may make even more. They now have, they discover, the advantage of having their patients come to them at once, instead, as has too often been the habit of the poor, as a last desperate resort. Hundreds of thousands are seeing clearly through properly fitted glasses for the first time in their lives—and, not remarkably, have overnight become more skillful workmen. Not the least beneficiaries of the scheme have been people of small fixed incomes, for whom going to the doctor used to be an extravagance.

Whether under the plan incompetence will thrive and corruption flourish time must tell. Government, people, and the medical profession are together breaking new ground. The territory is unexplored. Predictions—all but one—are unsafe. The one exception is a prediction that whatever modification may be necessary, the British will never go back to the old way. If you doubt this, you have only to listen, on the underground, in queues:

"* * * You know that 'eadache ma's always 'ad? It was just her eyes. It's gone right away. Bright as a lark, she is."

"George 'asn't been able to chew solid food these 12 years or more. They're making a whole new set of teeth for 'm. Can't think what it would have cost. * * *"

"Extraordinary sense of relief it gives one, doesn't it? I'd always rather opposed the scheme. But to know a great lot of doctors' bills won't wipe out completely everything one's managed to put away. * * *"

For all practical purposes the doctors, after long opposition, have capitulated. Ninety-three percent are cooperating. Hospitals which in a period of rising costs and declining fortunes have, almost impossibly, been trying to live by charity, have cast their financial burdens on the Government; and have promptly seen their costs diminish as free clinic patients have taken their minor ailments where they always should have taken them, to general practitioners.

The Panama Canal and Nuclear Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been studying the Panama Canal proposals which are now before the Congress, especially from the military and national security viewpoints.

Earlier, during this session of Congress, I included, in extensions of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, informative and authoritative articles on the subject of the atom bomb, the first by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, at page A169, and another by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, at page A755.

Another similar article, dealing with nuclear weapons, by Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, was published in the March-April 1949 issue of the Military Engineer. Under unanimous consent accorded, I am now including its full text in this extension of my remarks.

These three articles, all written by members of the Corps of Engineers, supply a fine background of information that is extremely pertinent to the Canal questions now before the Congress. A study of them—I respectfully submit—must inevitably lead to a single conclusion, viz, that any type of canal at Panama, or elsewhere, will be fatally vulnerable to atomic attack. These papers all emphasize that there is no adequate protection against the atomic bomb short of preventing its delivery.

Under these circumstances, I desire to state again my earlier views that the only security that can be attained for the Panama Canal, or any other similar waterway, must depend, for its strength, on the combined political, industrial, and military strength of the United States and not on its features of construction.

The article follows:

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By A. W. Betts, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers)

In spite of the fertile imagination of the cartoonist who pictures the atomic bomb as a tiny box which can be carried in a handbag, it is highly improbable that a bomb of the present basic type can ever be made arbitrarily small. To understand this and appreciate the reasons for it, one must know in general what makes the bomb explode and the meaning of a critical mass.

ATOMIC STRUCTURE AND ASSEMBLY

First, the general structure of the atom and relative size of its components must be visualized.[1] The atom is made up largely of space, not mass. To help visualize the relative amount of space in an atom, picture a magnified atom with a 1-inch-diameter sphere fixed in space representing its nucleus. At a distance of approximately 5,000 inches from this central mass, or about one-twelfth

[1] See Technical Aspects of Atomic Power, by Col. Lynn W. Pine in the Military Engineer for March 1946.

of a mile in radius, picture a spherical envelope of surrounding electrons. Between the central mass or nucleus and the envelope of electrons there is nothing but space. If you assume that this particular atom is adjacent to another similar one, this will place 10,000 inches of space, or about one-sixth of a mile, between the two nuclei of about 1 inch diameter each. Of course, this is an extreme magnification of an atom, which actually is only about one ten-millionth of an inch in diameter, but the relative size of the nucleus to the envelope of electrons is the same.

The most important component of the atom is its nucleus, which is made up of protons, each of which carries a positive charge; and neutrons, which are without charge. The other component of an atom is its surrounding envelope of electrons which has little or nothing to contribute to the understanding of a critical mass. Each electron carries a negative charge. For every electron in the envelope of a given atom there is a corresponding proton in its nucleus. Since the protons and electrons are of equal and opposite charge, lack of charge of an atom can only be achieved by having equal numbers of each.

It was the discovery of neutrons, and the fact that a lack of charge made them most useful as bullets for bombarding the nuclei of atoms, that led to the eventual discovery that these bullets can create fission or splitting of the nuclei of atoms of certain elements. These elements are referred to as active materials. Uranium 235 and plutonium are such materials.

Going back to the picture of the structure of an atom, multiply the number of these atoms to imagine an unlimited volume of mass of active material basically composed of so little mass but of so much space. This should indicate how difficult it would be for a stray neutron bullet to strike the nucleus of any one of these atoms. Since the distance between the nuclei is approximately 10,000 times the diameter of a particular nucleus in a single layer of atoms, comparison of the relative areas will show that a neutron would have about one chance in 100,000,000 of directly striking a nucleus. In other words, a neutron would have to pass through the space filled by 100,000,000 atoms in order to have a probability of directly hitting the nucleus of one of the atoms.

It is this basic concept which accounts for the fact that a considerable mass of active material must be assembled before a nuclear explosion is possible. The energy release of such an explosion comes from the fission of individual atoms that have been struck by a neutron and split into fission fragments, which are merely radioactive isotopes of elements near the middle of the periodic table. In the process of this splitting, more than one neutron is released for each one used in fission. These neutrons in turn fly off and strike other atoms, creating further fission. If, on the average, at least one neutron released in each fission creates a new fission, then a chain reaction will occur.

There are reasons, such as the capture of neutrons in impurities without fission, and the escape of neutrons from the mass of active material, that reduce the assurance that at least one neutron from each fission will create a new fission. It is apparent that a considerable mass of atoms must be present to minimize the escape of the neutrons from the active material to assure the continuance of the reaction. As a mass of active material is built up, a point is reached where the multiplication rate of neutrons (a measure of the number of neutrons being developed by fission for each neutron that induces fission) reaches one and above which point the multiplication rate begins to increase rapidly. From the point of view of a nuclear reactor, or so-called pile, it is the mass that must be developed before sustained nuclear reaction occurs. From a weapon standpoint this is only the beginning. More than such a critical mass is needed for the atomic weapon. Obviously, the larger the mass, the greater the percentage of atoms in that mass that will be struck by neutrons released in its interior. The weight and general size of a critical mass of plutonium or U-235 cannot be disclosed at this time. It is a mass of some magnitude (between 1 and 100 kg., according to the Smyth Report).

This leads to the question: How is a nuclear weapon made? Following the suppositions advanced by the Smyth Report and other releases on the subject, the least cumbersome mechanism imaginable and perhaps the most absurd would be to have a suicide volunteer clap together two subcritical masses that would create something over a critical mass. Not the least among many reasons why such a solution is absurd is the fact that stray neutrons, always available from a cosmic ray background, would start the fission process when the system is just entered and before the material has reached the most advantageous state of assembly. As a result then, the assembled masses would reach a very high heat, expand and lose their shape, thus permitting escape of neutrons and causing a shut down of the chain reaction before an appreciable explosion could be developed. This is called the problem of predetonation, that is, the detonation takes place before the geometry of the critical mass is in the shape desired by the bomb designers.

It should be pointed out that the time factors to be considered are in the order of a small fraction of a second, and whatever assembly methods are devised to create a critical mass must be so rapid that the assembly from just critical to the desired supercritical condition can be completed in a time interval of that order. It is apparent, therefore, that a mechanism of considerable complication must be developed if two very heavy pieces of material are to be brought together in so brief a time interval.

A possible solution of the assembly problem is to place two subcritical masses of active material at opposite ends of a tube with a propellant behind one of the masses. Upon firing the propellant charge, the masses would be brought together with tremendous velocity. The masses are arranged so that when they are assembled in a supercritical arrangement, they are surrounded by a dense tamper or neutron reflector. The tamper turns back into the active material neutrons near the surface which might escape without creating fission. It should be quite possible to make a bomb in this fashion once detonation timing and problems akin thereto have been conquered.

Obviously, the solution or solutions developed by the scientists at Los Alamos may not be disclosed. The procedure suggested should indicate that the bomb is not a simple device that can be delivered by a bazooka or jeep-mounted rocket launcher.

It should not be presumed, however, that it is not within the realm of development possibility to decrease the size and weight of the present bomb; moreover, it is not beyond the realm of possibility to increase its present size. The nature of our delivery problem must dictate whether we design a larger bomb in order to increase its yield or a smaller bomb with decreased yield in order to simplify its delivery. The scientists are capable of solving the problem in either way, but they are not in a position to know what balance should be established between the expenditure of very scarce and valuable active material and the bomb's adaptability to a particular form of delivery. This question can be answered only at the highest policy level.

UTILIZATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Further consideration of the nature of the weapon raises a second point of interest. Can it ever be made simple enough and be produced in such quantities that these weapons can be issued to each echelon in the field army? Though some day this point may be reached, it certainly cannot be done today. In the first place, active material, plutonium or U-235, is an extremely scarce and expensive item. Because of the difficulties of production and because of the not unlimited supply of uranium ore from which these materials are produced, it can be stated with reasonable assurance that these bombs will not be abundant and cheap in the foreseeable future. Only the highest levels of command should decide when and where to use them.

Nuclear weapons involve materials and sciences with which the average officer, enlisted man, or technically trained individual is not very familiar. Such weapons are neither simple nor inexpensive. Therefore, it is highly probable that these weapons will be issued only to specially trained units. The time necessary to train officer and enlisted personnel is appreciable, and such key personnel must have an extensive technical background. In time of war, it may be possible to shorten the length of this training period by our ability to bring in scientific personnel of considerable civilian experience for this work.

The design problems connected with nuclear weapons are complicated by the obvious need for accurate fusing and firing. The time of the detonation (and assembly) must be extremely exact to assure explosion at the exact altitude computed to produce maximum effect on a particular target. Since the weapon is dropped from a very high altitude in order to permit the delivering airplane to avoid destruction, there are many complications that enter into these problems. These complications are sufficiently serious to demand a team of considerable educational background plus a long training period in this particular operation. We must minimize the possibility of dropping a dud, not only because of the danger inherent to its falling intact into the hands of the enemy but also because of the value of the active material.

PROTECTION AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A third point of concern to military personnel is the nature of the protection we can afford troops and civilian populations against attack by nuclear weapons. No specific means of protection are known to have been developed to date. Obviously, dispersal of remunerative targets[2] is the best defense against a weapon of so great a potential destructive power, but the sort of dispersion that would be effective would be highly impracticable in many of our major industrial communities. In Japan, there were almost no survivors in a radius of about a half a mile of the explosion and, in a radius of about a mile, only those who had considerable protection survived. Many casualties were caused outside the mile radius by fire and falling debris.

A possible means of protection might be to go underground with our strategically important industries, but here again the time and expense involved in such a procedure appear beyond our capability at the present time. Moreover, there is no assurance that a nuclear weapon could not be made to penetrate 40 to 50 feet underground, which would probably make untenable any structure that did not have several hundred feet of earth covering, or comparable structural protection.

It is apparent that the best means of protection against this weapon is to prevent its delivery. Here also prospects are discouraging. It should be possible to develop long-range rockets or pilotless aircraft, which

[2] See Industrial Vulnerability to Bombing, by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson in the Military Engineer for January–February 1949.

might have nuclear warheads. It must be remembered that during World War II no V–2 rocket was shot down by our forces. Furthermore, it appears possible to deliver this weapon by means of saboteurs carrying the bomb in small pieces and assembling it in some strategic center. Such possibilities give some appreciation of the problem involved in defense against attack by nuclear weapons.

Military medical personnel are presently being trained to deal with the physiological and psychological effects of radiation. They will not be able to prevent the initial damage that would be accomplished by a successfully delivered atomic bomb, but this education, together with proper organization of our cities, should make it possible to reduce the complete disorganization that was present in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which resulted in a considerable loss of life not directly caused by the blast itself. For example, in both of those cities fire-fighting apparatus was almost completely immobilized by the destruction caused by the bomb. It would appear sensible in the future to locate fire-fighting equipment on the outskirts of a city so that it would not be destroyed by the initial blast. It might also be possible to develop some means of fighting major fires from the air when streets are completely blocked by debris. Planning to cope with the catastrophic effects of nuclear weapons will require a great deal more thought than has been given to disaster control and relief in the past.

Our people should be informed of the nature and extent of residual radiation present after an explosion so that they will realize whether it may or may not be advisable to evacuate the target area. Personnel of the civilian defense organization should have available radiation detectors, such as the Geiger counter and similar equipment, and should be instruced in their use. These problems of protection must be solved, and thought should be given to them at the earliest possible time. Plans should be developed now that can be implemented prior to attack.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

A fourth point of general interest is the possibility in the future that nuclear weapons may be developed in other shapes and for other purposes than that of a bomb.

It will not always be easy to deliver atomic bombs. They do not lend themselves readily to delivery by massed aircraft, unless the mass is sent in at a very great altitude, because of the danger of losing some of the aircraft in the turbulence created by the bomb. Moreover, it should be remembered that our forces had complete control of the air over Japan when the bombs were delivered that ended the war. It is highly improbable that such complete control of the air will be ours in the early stages of a future war—when we should be most interested in making the bomb effective. This leads to the conclusion that every effort should be made to develop either a rocket or a guided missile to carry the nuclear warhead. For defensive purposes, the possibility should be investigated of using this warhead in an antiaircraft rocket which, if successful, might make massed bombing raids a thing of the past, and might itself be a specific defense against the atomic bomb.

The results of the second bombing at Bikini have demonstrated the remarkable efficacy of an underwater explosion of a nuclear weapon. It is not unreasonable to suppose that it should be possible to deliver the weapon to the enemy's harbors by means of a submarine, controlled by a crew who could escape before a time mechanism set off the bomb. A well-placed bomb in some of the more congested harbors might deny the use of that harbor for a period long enough to be decisive in any particular operation. It is also possible, if the targets are sufficiently remunerative, to place this bomb in a controlled mine, although the successful use of the weapon in this fashion is not easy to foresee. It can only be assumed that the problems involved in the use of nuclear weapons are being investigated by the various development agencies concerned. The purpose here is merely to point out that thinking should not be limited to the idea that this tremendous release of energy is only available for use as an aerial bomb.

POWER BY NUCLEAR ENERGY

Though authoritative quarters do not foresee immediate development of nuclear energy for power purposes, it will some day be available, and if the installations needing power can be sufficiently large, this potential use may not be too far in the future. The use of this power for such things as rockets, airplanes, or automobiles, however, is sufficiently far in the future that it need not be of immediate concern. It may be feasible in a relatively short time to develop power sources for battleships or to develop underground central power plants for the production of electricity that would insure unlimited sources of energy in a future war.

The pessimism in this field grows out of two factors which can readily be understood. The first is that fission products formed in an atomic pile do not go anywhere; they remain in the pile and before very long begin to interfere with the fission process. Since they are highly radioactive, the chemical process of removal of this material from the active material that makes the pile work is not a simple matter, and much research will be necessary before this problem can be considered solved. The second factor, a more immediate deterrent to power development, is the fact that there is no known material that will stop neutrons and gamma rays in a very short distance. Present atomic piles are surrounded by concrete masses many feet thick and weighing many tons. Obviously, the power developed in the pile is not sufficiently collossal to overcome this handicap in developing power for a vehicle of reasonable size.

SUMMARY

It is emphasized first that because of the necessity for assembling a critical mass in a time interval of the order of a small fraction of a second, it is highly improbable that a nuclear weapon can be developed which will be small enough to be manhandled. Second, the methods of detonation and the fusing problems of the bomb are sufficiently complicated to demand a level of training higher than that previously required of members of the armed forces. Third, there is at present no adequate protection against the bomb short of preventing its delivery. Fourth, nuclear weapons have not reached their maximum size in the present type bomb, and new types may come into being which will be considerably more powerful than present models; moreover, they are not confined to bombs but, subject to size, may be made as warheads for almost any type of delivery in use today in modern armies; and last, that the development of nuclear power for military vehicles is not "just around the corner."

Honor in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which will appear in the national Catholic weekly, America, in its March 26 issue, entitled "Honor in Israel":

HONOR IN ISRAEL

(By Edward Duff)

In the spring of 1947 the statesmen of the world were feverishly seeking a solution to the tormenting Palestine problem. Pan-Arabism and Zionism were locked in menacing debate over their conflicting claims to what Hilaire Belloc called "the battle ground" of history. While the statesmen and lawyers and propagandists toiled at Lake Success, the Catholic Near East Welfare Association reminded the Secretary General of the United Nations on May 8 of an almost forgotten factor in any just settlement of the problem. Disputing the claims of neither side, prescinding wholly from all political considerations, its statement, the Christian Factor in the Palestine Equation, outlined the Christian stake in the Holy Land and indicated certain guaranties regarded as indispensable for the protection of Christian interests.

Events seem to have obscured memory of the Christian factor in the Palestine equation. Partition was voted; a bitter war followed; shells desecrated the Holy City; the Zionists triumphed in a determined and resourceful display of arms; Israel was established as a sovereign state, fulfilling the ancient aspirations of the Jewish people. Today an armistice is being discussed and the provisions of the UN settlement are being reviewed.

It is time to assert once again that there are factors that transcend political considerations, issues that must be respected.

There is the matter of justice for the Palestinian refugees. There is the matter of honoring the commitments of the UN settlement that provided, among other things, for the internationalization of Jerusalem and the holy places and the freedom of religious organization.

Both Israel and the Arab states must accept the verdict of world opinion. If these reminders fall particularly on Israel, it is because victory imposes its own restraints. The public policy of the state of Israel must be subject to scrutiny without the easy retort of "anti-Semitism"—a slogan which stultifies discussion and betrays either an utter irresponsibility or an obtuseness to the expectations of the world community.

The Jewish attitude on the refugees was stated, in what can scarcely be less than an official answer, in a letter in the New York Times of March 15 from Mr. Harry Zinder, press adviser of the state of Israel mission. The tide of history cannot be turned back, is Mr. Zinder's ultimate verdict on the situation. Palestine, he explains is a different country since the refugees fled over the borders. What's done, can't be undone. Let them, therefore, migrate to some other country.

The voice of the world's conscience replies to such a casual and even callous solution of the fate of nearly a million persons in other tones and in accents of growing impatience. Whatever the alleged reasons for the hurried exodus of the refugees, they have claims that cry for recognition.

They have claims, first of all, to sheer preservation. At present they are dying at the rate of a thousand a day. The UN's Disaster and Relief Committee, appointed last November, began operations February 1 with a fund of $32,000,000, half of which the American Government is committed to contribute. Even if efficiently administered, the money would underwrite merely the cost of food for the refugees for less than 8 months. Voluntary agencies must be employed to supplement official UN relief. On March 9, Lessing Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism, wrote the leaders of all religious faiths in the United States:

"To avert a major human catastrophe, elementary justice requires that in addition to

adequate relief there must be early repatriation, resettlement and social rehabilitation of 750,000 refugees from the recent hostilities."

It is unfortunate that the UN committee did not see fit to utilize adequately the voluntary agencies composing the American Appeal for Holy Land Refugees. It is particularly unfortunate that UN reports obscured the contribution of the Catholic effort in aiding the refugees. For the Catholic effort in this humanitarian endeavor illustrates the fact that the Palestine problem is not bipartite but tripartite. There is a Christian stake in the Holy Land.

True, only 150,000 of the war sufferers are Christian, and of these only 55,000 are Catholics. On hand, however, to expend their energies in an all-encompassing charity are 2,000 priests and nuns. They came to Palestine many years ago from all parts of the Christian world. Long before governments began to assist in the present emergency, our Catholic parishes were feeding and sheltering many thousands of refugees in their parish halls, in their church yards and schools. The Catholic Church has been associated with all the problems of the Near East since the birth of Christ. The purposes of our Catholic personnel, native and missionary, are nonpolitical. That Catholic missionaries remained through the fighting, that Catholic institutions continued to care for the homeless and helpless, is proof of their nonpolitical purpose. It is proof, too, that they expect their rights to be protected and, where infringed, restored.

There is scarcely a religious house in Palestine that is not sheltering refugees. The officials at Tel Aviv know this. Someone in the office of Moshe Sharrett, Israel's Foreign Minister, might well send word to Mr. Zinder in Washington that Jewish officials are well posted on the job the missionaries are doing. They know of the tireless work of the Sisters of Charity, for example, who care for hundreds of feeble-minded children in an overcrowded home in Jerusalem.

At every Mass on Laetare Sunday, March 27, American Catholics will contribute to the Bishops' Emergency Relief Fund. The whole world's anguish calls upon America for alms. Though irresistible pleas for aid were coming from the needy in Europe and Asia, the bishops last year set aside a portion of that collection for relief in Palestine. Other subsidies sent the missionaries there by generous Catholics throughout the world are being ungrudgingly siphoned off to care for 200,000 homeless and the hungry. The week after Cardinal Spellman blessed a shipment of supplies on February 8, valued at $200,000, the National Council of Catholic Women announced that they had collected 150,000 children's garments for distribution to Holy Land sufferers without reference to race or creed. Monsignor Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, has just returned from 4 months on the scene, supervising operations. His findings are striking evidence of the third factor, the Christian stake in Palestine.

What is the future of these victims of the Palestinian struggle? With the guns muted in the land of the Prince of Peace, can Israel afford to affront the conscience of the world by sticking to a convenient official assumption that these people do not want to be repatriated? Can Israel win confidence in its political maturity if it suggests that the refugees don't want their preferences discovered in a democratic plebiscite, that the homeless would spurn payment for their land? Whatever the political claims of Jew and Arab, there are requirements of "elementary justice" involved—to use the language of Mr. Rosenwald.

There remains—as UN was reminded on May 8, 1947—a Christian factor in the Palestine problem. Jesus Christ must not be exiled by political maneuver or military coup from the land that bears the indelible mark of His sacred footsteps, from the scenes filled with sanctuaries of His precious life and life-giving death. The Christian world had no partisan position in the partition solution voted by the General Assembly on May 29, 1947. The internationalization of Jerusalem was included in the UN settlement as a dispassionate recognition of the nonpolitical factors in the problem, as evidence of equally historical claims of Christians. While Arab and Jew haggle over the division of the Holy City across the armistice table, the Christian world repeats anew its insistent demand that the decision of the world community, working through the United Nations, be respected. There is, of course, reparation to be made for the destruction and desecration of Christian property. Essential, however, is the guarantee of the freedom of religious organization and the internationalization of the Holy City and of the holy places—Nazareth (in Jewish territory), for instance, and Bethlehem (in Arab hands).

America reported the disappointment the Christian world felt at the proroguing of the United Nations session at Paris last December without coming to a definite conclusion on the future of the holy places in Palestine (America, December 25, 1948, p. 306). The United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in its final report to the General Assembly recommended that an impartial system for preserving the special character of the holy places should be devised. Similar recommendations were made by the General Assembly's partition resolution of November 29, 1947, as America reminded its readers last fall (America, November 13, 1948, p. 145). The encyclical letter of Pope Pius XI, issued on October 23, evoked America's editorial judgment that the internationalization of Jerusalem is the only "feasible escape from this intolerable situation" (America, November 6, 1948, p. 120).

The Christian conscience, nonpolitical in its aims, today renders with larger evidence the identical judgment on the Palestine problem expressed in the statement of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association to UN's secretary general:

"We demand adequate, factual, implemented guarantees to the effect (1) that all our sanctuaries will be respected and continuously and unconditionally accessible, and (2) that the Christian majority will actually enjoy, not merely the vague, frequently distorted and facetiously neutralized right of freedom of religion, but also freedom of religious assemblage, freedom of religious organization in conducting schools, hospitals, orphanages, and other institutions of welfare and mercy, and freedom from civil, social, and economic discrimination."

Anything less will cost Israel and the Arab states the respect of the Christian world.

Mr. Churchill's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the present and has-been statesmen of the universe will swoop down on us and make us friendly visits. I have seen this before and I am sure I know what is brewing. These countries want some more money and they are arriving here now in bunches. I see Churchill arrived yesterday and I can guess what he is up to.

During the early part of the last war and before we got into it, Mr. Churchill came here and addressed both Houses of Congress. He wanted war materials and a token force of men to just show the world we were with them. He said they would do the fighting but this token of a small United States force would be a great boost for Great Britain.

When, later, the question of forcing his ministry to a vote of confidence came up, Mr. Churchill made a very short speech. He said in substance, "Through my efforts and mine alone, the great Republic of America came in with us with billions of cash, war material, and 14,000,000 men" (that was his token army) and when he had finished saying this he sat down. The House of Commons roared their approval and his ministry was not further challenged.

Just what he is up to now is hard to figure out, but in a few days it will be plain enough. Maybe he wants us to tighten up on loans to Great Britain. Our money is going into state ownership enterprises, like railroads, banks, telegraph lines, mines, shipping, and all other economic endeavors of a Socialist government headed to Attlee. Maybe Churchill wants to get back in power and head off this Socialist movement. Anyway you look at it he is over here after something. Maybe he sees world war III resulting from the North Atlantic Pact.

France, Italy, Greece, and every other country will be here with their representatives to get money, as we have organized the North Atlantic Pact and of course not a country on the list has a lead nickel except the United States. We are due for another $100,000,000,000 gift loan to every country lined up in that pact, if not more.

We have strayed a long way from George Washington's advice to avoid foreign entanglements. We are tangled up so tight in this European mess that we cannot get out. I hear Washington's Farewell Address delivered here every year and I am wondering why that is done when those who plan this George Washington's Day pay absolutely no attention to what he said. I presume they are determined to show Washington was wrong and since he isn't here to defend his position, they (the opponents of his ideas) rake up this speech every year and hope in time to wear out the effects of it.

When these gift loans come up in Congress for consideration, they will pass with a whoop, as they did before. Compare that with our action yesterday in trying to legislate a pension for needy soldiers. They have carved and cross-carved the bill until there isn't much left of it except the title and we had to have a roll-call vote to save that much of the bill. The whole howl was that it costs too much to pay these pensions. Too much, too much, and those who hollered the loudest of "too much" will vote for foreign armament without one single word of protest.

On this question, as on all others of direct interest to the people, there are no party lines. Democrats and Republicans alike will march down the aisle

arm in arm chatting in the most congenial manner while they give away more billions to foreign countries and unite in a determined stand to let our own people in distress and soldiers of Churchill's token army make their way through their remaining years the best way they can.

Extracts From the Problems of Postwar Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include extracts from a lecture by M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C.:

THE PROBLEM OF POSTWAR MONETARY POLICY

Since the end of the war, monetary policy has had to cope with more or less continuous inflation. Effective demand, until recently, has consistently exceeded the available supply of goods largely because spending from current income has been substantially supplemented by drafts on accumulated liquid savings and by rapid expansion of private credit. This condition of excessive demand has inevitably placed an upward pressure on prices. Advancing prices accompanied by expanding money income, leading to further price increases, is the spiraling process of inflation with which we are now all too familiar. As a result, between mid-1946 when price controls were initially terminated, and August 1948, wholesale prices rose 50 percent, consumer prices 31 percent, and total personal incomes expanded by 24 percent.

Basically, our postwar inflation is the product of our wartime financial policies. The war cost around $320,000,000,000. This huge volume of expenditures was financed in part out of our current income, tapped through taxation and sales of securities to the public; and in part through expansion of the money supply brought about by borrowing from the banking system.

It was not reasonable to expect our expenditures for war to be financed entirely through taxation. There are serious obstacles, essentially nonmonetary in nature, that place a definite upper limit to the tax burden that can be imposed even in wartime. As the tax burden grows, particularly when it grows rapidly, the interrelated problems of administrative feasibility, equity, and incentives become increasingly difficult to handle. More safeguards against widespread evasion and its generally demoralizing effects have to be devised. Numerous special adjustments are required to maintain a general consistency with the community's standards of fairness, without which no tax system can long survive as an effective instrument of policy. And, finally, a rapid stepping up of the tax bill may, at least in the short run, have adverse effects on effort incentives and thereby interfere with achieving a maximum wartime output.

Just where that upper limit of taxation is, cannot be determined exactly, but it is safe to say that we fell short of it by much too wide a margin. Less than one-half of the funds raised by the Treasury between the middle of 1940 and the end of 1945 came from tax sources.

Not only did we rely much too heavily on borrowing, but we relied on borrowing of the most inflationary kind. Of the total amount borrowed by the Treasury from mid-1940 to the end of 1945 more than two-fifths came from the banking system including commercial banks, Federal Reserve banks, and mutual savings banks. Thus, in our war finance we made the twofold mistake of taxing too little and borrowing from the banking system too much.

As a consequence, then, of our wartime financial policies we entered the postwar period with an economy characterized by an excessive degree of liquidity. Government securities held by commercial banks—their highly liquid secondary reserves—grew from seventeen billion in June 1940 to ninety-one billion by December 1945. They constituted the bulk of total bank loans and investments. It is estimated that over the war period the stock of liquid assets—currency, bank deposits, and Government securities—held by individuals and businesses, including insurance companies, increased approximately threefold while over the same period the gross national product only about doubled. Combined with a heavy backlog of unsatisfied real demands, this high degree of liquidity meant that strong inflationary pressures would inevitably develop, particularly if the wartime controls were prematurely removed.

But our wartime policy of heavy reliance on borrowing held yet another implication for the problem of stabilization in the postwar world. Our national debt grew during the war to a peak of $275,000,000,000, a figure of astronomical proportions by prewar standards. Its ownership was widely distributed and its interest pattern had become integrated into the whole asset and liability structure of our economy. Confidence in the market value of the public debt was almost synonymous with a stable financial organization.

Clearly, no realistic conception of the problem of postwar stabilization could afford to ignore these facts about the public debt. Yet to take them into account enormously complicated the role that monetary policy was called upon to play in our postwar economy. For it means that no measures could be undertaken to control an expansion of credit and the money supply that were inconsistent with the objective of maintaining an orderly and stable market for Government securities at all times.

To maintain public confidence in the stability of the Government security market, the Reserve System undertook the role of residual buyer. This placed severe limitations on the usefulness of traditionally powerful techniques for controlling the volume of credit and deposit expansion. As a residual buyer the Federal Reserve System became a source of reserve funds which commercial banks could tap at their own volition by offering Government securities for sale. Banks also received additional reserve funds involuntarily whenever nonbank investors sold securities to the Reserve banks. And with a fractional reserve banking system, each dollar of reserve funds provides the basis for manifold expansion of private credit and the money supply.

Moreover, because of the abundant security holdings that the banking system acquired through the processes of war finance, commercial banks no longer had extensive need for borrowing funds from the Federal Reserve banks. Adjustments of reserve positions could be achieved instead through security sales in the supported market. As a result, except for whatever psychological impact it might have, the rediscount rate lost its effectiveness as an instrument of credit control.

Finally, sales from their holdings of Government securities offered an easy means by which banks could offset in some measure pressure that might be brought to bear on their reserve position through a rise in reserve requirements. In consequence, relatively small changes in reserve requirements could not be relied on to have severely restrictive effect. And while larger variations in requirements could be an effective weapon, they have not been available to the Federal Reserve during most of the postwar period because of practical exhaustion of statutory discretion on the upward side.

Thus, under the circumstances that have existed during most of the period since the close of the war, the traditional instruments available to the Federal Reserve for influencing money and credit developments in this country were either ineffective, inoperative, or near exhaustion. Meanwhile, the volume of credit extended to private borrowers during this period underwent a considerable expansion. From the end of 1945 to the end of 1948, commercial and industrial loans of all insured commercial banks almost doubled, which represented an absolute increase of approximately $9,000,000,000. Agricultural loans of these banks rose by one and one-half billion over the same period, while real-estate loans increased by approximately six billion. Finally, the increase for the period in the consumer loan category of insured banks amounted to almost four and one-half billion dollars.

I do not mean to suggest that our postwar monetary policy has been a failure. There have been significant elements of restraint, without which the situation would have been decidedly worse.

The most important factor of restraint in the postwar period has been the Treasury cash surplus. For the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, Treasury receipts from taxes and other sources exceeded cash outlays by a total of about $14,000,000,000. This surplus has exerted a powerfully contractive effect directly on the expenditure-income stream and on the supply of credit and money. Without it the upward pressure on prices would unquestionably have been more severe.

Further, a substantial portion of the surplus has been used to retire debt held by the Reserve banks. This disposition of the surplus is the one most consistent with a policy of monetary restraint; for it results in a withdrawal of funds not only from the general income stream, but from the commercial banking system as well, thereby bringing pressure to bear on the reserve position of commercial banks. The Treasury also exerted a similar pressure on bank reserves by drawing down the deposits that had been permitted to accumulate previously in the war-loan accounts of commercial banks.

The System has vigorously used its relatively modern accessories—control over stock-market credit and control over consumer-installment credit. Since the end of hostilities in mid-1945, margin requirements for extensions of credit on listed securities by banks and by brokers and dealers have not been below 75 percent, and for the year ending January 1947 were at the level of 100 percent. Bank loans for purchasing and carrying securities other than United States Government securities amount to only about a billion dollars today.

Regulation of consumer-installment credit, in the periods it has been in force since the war, has also been an influence in restraining the increase in this type of credit. As you know, Congress, in mid-1947, terminated this authority effective November 1, 1947. Subsequently expansion in this credit went forward at a sharply increasing rate. Since September of 1948, when the regulation was reinstated on the basis of authority granted in the special session of Congress, consumer-installment credit has increased only moderately, although prior to that action it had been expanding at a rate of nearly $200,000,000 a month. Only a few days ago, as you know, the Board modified somewhat the

September terms of consumer-installment credit.

The System has also used carefully its influence over interest rates. To raise the cost of reserve funds to the banks, and also to encourage banks and nonbank investors to hold on to the short-term Government securities they own and to buy more rather than to unload them on the System, short-term market rates and Federal Reserve discount rates have been permitted to rise. Rates on Treasury bills have risen from ⅜ of 1 percent in mid-1947 to more than 1 percent today. Yields on 1-year certificates have increased from ⅞ to 1¼ percent, while the Federal Reserve banks have raised their discount rates from 1 to 1½ percent.

The System has applied more vigorously than the banking community has desired available statutory authority to regulate member bank reserve requirements. Prior to the legislation enacted in August, increasing member-bank reserves was a possible course of action only for the New York and Chicago banks, since for all other classes of banks requirements were at their legal limit. In January, and again in June of last year, the Federal Reserve Board raised by 2 percentage points the reserve requirements on net demand deposits at New York and Chicago banks. On the basis of the temporary authority granted by the Congress in August, the Reserve Board raised reserve requirements by 2 percentage points on demand deposits and 1½ percentage points for time deposits early last fall.

Finally, the System has used its informational resources to urge upon Congress and the public the importance of restraint in credit expansion and of the need for a strong fiscal policy.

The American Bankers Association has cooperated in this program by urging bankers to practice self-restraint in their own as well as in the national interest, and some other lenders have taken a similarly enlightened view of the need for self-restraint in lending.

The fact that despite a vigorous application of those powers which could be used under existing circumstances, we nevertheless experienced considerable postwar inflation has, it seems to me, one very clear implication: There is a basic need for strengthening our monetary powers.

Monetary authorities should have at their disposal at all times adequate means for checking growth of the money supply without endangering the Government's credit. To this purpose the System needs to be given authority to prevent or restrain credit expansion by an increase in reserve requirements of banks. By this authority the System could absorb or immobilize additional reserves acquired from a return flow of currency, from gold inflow, or from sales to the Reserve banks of Government securities, either by banks or by their depositors. Furthermore, on grounds of fairness as well as on grounds of making the requirements more effective, the authority ought to be extended to all insured banks.

As a supplement to quantitative controls over bank reserve positions, selective-type controls need to be developed further to strengthen the system's influence over monetary and credit developments. Experience with controls over stock-market and consumer-installment loans has demonstrated the helpfulness of operating directly on the demand side of the credit market. The Board strongly believes in the continued usefulness of both of these controls for achieving greater economic stability, and has recommended to the Congress enactment of legislation which would replace the present temporary authority to regulate consumer-installment credit with a permanent authority.

Recently we have had an interruption of the inflationary course. Indicative of the changed situation are the recent declining prices, the moderate slackening of investment in producers' goods and business inventories, and the increased supplies of goods, many of which were in tight supply a year ago. Though employment has continued at generally very high levels, there have been recent declines.

Notwithstanding these developments, I strongly emphasize the need for making the system's authority adequate to cope with inflation. I certainly hope that there will not be further inflation. My emphasis rather reflects my concern that our system at all times be equipped to cope with whatever monetary problems we may be facing.

The Reserve System today is far better equipped than ever before to help offset deflationary forces should they actually develop. A major deficiency of the banking system that has aggravated business contractions in the past—the inability of the central bank to provide adequate funds when needed by the market—no longer exists. The System has virtually unlimited means of supplying the market with additional reserves through purchase of Government securities. The Reserve banks at present hold $23,000,000,000 of gold-certificate reserves, and, on the basis of existing legal gold reserve requirements, the System could more than double its outstanding note and deposit liabilities. Moreover, as a result of the liberalized lending authority provided by the Banking Act of 1935 advances can now be made on any assets of member banks that are acceptable to the Reserve banks as security. Thus the supply of funds will not be undesirably restricted by the need to adhere to eligibility rules. Further, when other lenders are not available, the System is empowered to make direct loans to business firms for working-capital purposes. Finally, the System can always contribute to monetary ease generally by a reduction in reserve requirements and in special areas through relaxing installment credit and margin requirements.

Monetary policy must also be adequately forearmed to cope with expansive forces in the economy whenever they occur. Only if the System is forearmed can we have the full advantage of the stabilizing potentialities of action in the monetary sphere. It is my conviction that monetary policy, along with coordinative action in the fiscal area, can contribute a great deal to curbing the effects of unstabilizing in our economic life.

In conclusion, I would like to say that my interest in this general monetary approach to economic stabilization is based not only on my optimism with regard to its results. My interest is also based on the conviction that this is a good approach for a free competitive economy. It calls for no great expansion of the allocative powers of Government over the Nation's resources. It calls for no proliferation of Government directives—the mechanism of a regimented economy. Rather, it promises both economic stability—which we somehow have to achieve—and economic freedom—which we dare not give up.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Msgr. Henry M. Hald, associate superintendent of Catholic schools, diocese of Brooklyn, N. Y., enclosing copy of a letter he wrote to the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI with respect to Federal aid to education:

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS,
DIOCESE OF BROOKLYN,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 18, 1949.

Hon. L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I hope you will be interested in the enclosure which voices our opposition to the Thomas bill and our support of the Fogarty bill.

Truly yours,

HENRY M. HALD.

MARCH 18, 1949.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written to express our disapproval of the Thomas Federal-aid-to-education bill—S. 246—and to urge you and your committee to support the Fogarty bill—H. R. 1570. The Thomas bill is discriminatory against non-tax-supported schools.

We take this stand because—

1. Students in non-tax-supported schools are children of Amercan citizens and they should not be treated as second-class citizens.

2. All Americans, regardless of the schools they attend, should be sharers in welfare legislation.

3. Under constitutional guaranties, parents have the right to send their children to any school, public or nonpublic, provided the school meets State requirements.

4. Nonpublic schools are exponents of knowledge as well as the public tax-supported schools.

5. Parents follow their conscience in sending children to the nonpublic schools and they should not be penalized for such action. The Federal Constitution guarantees them freedom of conscience and freedom of religion.

6. Nonpublic schools perform a public service with a saving to the Government of an estimated $400,000,000 annually.

Trusting that you and your committee will give serious consideration to this protest against the Thomas bill and that you will find it possible to support the Fogarty bill, I am, sir,

Truly yours,

Right Rev. HENRY M. HALD,
Associate Superintendent, Catholic Schools, Diocese of Brooklyn.

Amendment of Employees' Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

TIME FOR CHANGE

A few months ago, at Bowling Green, Ky., William H. Osborne, a young substitute mail carrier, lost both hands and the sight of both eyes when a bomb which some fanatic had placed in the mails exploded. If there ever was such a thing as "permanent and total disability," it is the loss of both hands and the sight of both eyes, and this young man

has a wife and baby. Under the present provisions of the United States Employees Compensation Act the maximum compensation that Osborne can expect to receive from the Government is $116.67 a month, which certainly is not enough to sustain a family of three in these days.

Just a few days ago employees of the Cincinnati post office contributed nearly $1,000 as their part of a Nation-wide fund being raised by post-office employees for the Osborne family. If other post-office workers throughout the country are as generous, the completed fund will exceed $50,000. This is a fine gesture on the part of Osborne's fellow workers (who, by the way, are none too well paid themselves), but it is one that they should not be called on to make. This is Uncle Sam's obligation.

And this brings us to the fact that the present Congress has before it a bill (H. R. 1236) which would correct a situation which should have been corrected long ago. The present disability allowances were fixed in 1925, and have not been changed since, although Congress must surely be aware that what might have been regarded as a subsistence income nearly a quarter century ago is no longer sufficient to provide the bare necessities of life.

There will be other tragedies befall Government employees in line of duty such as the terrible thing that happened to William Osborne. When these things do occur, it is the duty of the Government to provide adequately for the victims of these tragedies. The Compensation Act of 1925 surely needs revision after 24 years.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1236 has been superseded by H. R. 3191 and improved the version of amendments to the Compensation Act. I understand that H. R. 3191 has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and likewise the Employees' Compensation Commission. It also has the unanimous approval of all employee organizations within the Federal Government.

Extracts From Contemporary Monetary Policy and Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert extracts from a lecture delivered recently at the University of Chicago by Hon. M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on contemporary monetary policy and economic stability:

CONTEMPORARY MONETARY POLICY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY

How to prevent the recurrence of large-scale unemployment was a dominant question in all early discussions of postwar policies. From these discussions it became clear that public economic policy (including monetary or central banking policy) would have to assume a great postwar responsibility for the maintenance of high levels of employment. There is no better testimony to the intensity of concern over this issue than the Employment Act of 1946, which was passed, incidentally, by a conservative Congress.

But the goal of high-level employment was not to be pursued at all costs. For example, "full employment" through inflation was recognized as an undesirable long-run solution. Resort to wasteful, "make-work" projects was considered unacceptable. And, of course, all policy measures were expected to meet the general requirement of consistency with a free private enterprise system.

Not high employment alone, but economic stability at high levels of employment and output, achieved within the framework of a free private-enterprise economy, became the emerging conception of the primary purpose of all public economic policy. The part which monetary policy was to play in realizing this conception was not entirely clear. But that its responsibility was to be a large one there can be no doubt.

I want to state at this point that wartime and early postwar thought regarding the future role of monetary policy was not neglectful of the international aspects of the money problem. The fruit of this thinking, as you are aware, was the international agreement reached at Bretton Woods providing for the establishment of an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank. It was felt that the first of these cooperative institutions—the Monetary Fund—could adequately assure relative stability of international exchange values, and that the second agency—the bank—could contribute to the progressive expansion and balanced growth of world trade.

The new agencies were not expected to be final answers to the international monetary problem. On the other hand, there was a conviction that success in the experiment of continuous international consultation and cooperation through these organized channels would give the world a better monetary mechanism internationally than had been provided by any former gold-standard system.

Such then is the postwar conception of the objectives of policy in the management of money, and, as I have said, the goal of a stable but progressive private enterprise economy puts a very heavy responsibility on monetary management.

COMPLEX STRUCTURE OF THE MONEY SUPPLY

For monetary policy to do its part, it must provide the economy at all times with a supply of money consistent with the needs of a stable and expanding economy. This is easier said than done, for the term "money supply," at least in our own country, is a highly complex concept.

We have currency money issued by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks. We have the demand-deposit money created by the commercial banks. We have a large amount of other liquid assets in the form of time deposits and savings accounts, building and loan shares, and the cash value of readily convertible insurance policies. We have an even larger volume of other liquid assets in the form of Government securities, exchangeable into money at par, by redemption or sale. We have still other assets, e. g., corporate bonds and obligations of State and local governments, that are very high in liquidity, and therefore by nature close to money. Some of our money moreover, when lodged in the reserves of Federal Reserve banks and commercial banks, possesses the property of multiplying through loans and investments into still more money. These bank reserves have correctly been called high-pressure dollars.

The significance, from the standpoint of monetary policy, of this complex money structure becomes even greater when we realize that the ultimate concern of monetary policy is not with the money supply itself but with the flow of money through the economy. The active-money flow in the economy bears the impact of changes in the money supply and of the activation or deactivation of existing money stocks. In our complex money system, both of these types of monetary change reflect the independent decisions of many individuals and institutions, as well as the decisions of the monetary authorities.

In view of this complexity of the monetary structure, it is not surprising that the total monetary flow will at times reveal a tendency to become excessive, producing the symptoms of a general price rise, or that at other times it will show an opposite tendency, producing price declines and unemployment.

Ideally, monetary policy should completely forestall either tendency and maintain a total monetary flow that is at all times perfectly adjusted to the stability needs of the community. But the limitations on our ability to forecast economic behavior are themselves sufficient reason to suppose that such an ideal is impossible of attainment in the near future. At present the most that we can feasibly aim for is to achieve an approximation to this ideal.

NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY IN FORMULATING POLICIES

Such an approximation is by no means an unambitious goal. It requires all the foresight, knowledge, and judgment that we can muster. One cardinal virtue to be cultivated is flexibility both in thought and in action. No rigid policy, no matter how well thought out in advance, will enable us to cope adequately with the problems of an uncertain future. Nor can monetary authorities expect to avoid mistakes that will require remedial action. Improvisation and reversibility should be included in a proper concept of flexibility.

We must not overlook the risks of flexibility in the making of public policy, not the least of which is that flexibility can itself become a source of economic instability. A well-functioning private economy requires stability in certain areas of public policy as much as it requires flexibility in others. An important part of wise policy making, as I see it, is to recognize and adhere to the boundaries of each of these areas. The importance of this aspect of policy making is reflected, I think, in the considerable recent popularity of what has been termed built-in, or automatic, flexibility—a concept to which I shall refer again in a few minutes. Essentially, this concept undertakes to compromise the advantages of flexibility and stability in economic policy.

STRATEGIC FACTORS IN THE MONEY FLOW

Major changes in the economy's money flow are heavily dependent on certain strategic forces such as capital formation by private business, consumer expenditures for durable goods and housing, and international trade. To a greater or less degree each of these forces is subject to influence by the monetary authorities through the terms and conditions on which new money is available to borrowers. However, their susceptibility to such influence is qualified by the fact that these forces are in turn heavily dependent on nonmonetary factors.

The volume of business capital formation, for instance, is affected by current expectations of future business activity, and investment plans are subject to expansion, modification, postponement, or withdrawal as the economic outlook changes. Demands for consumer durable goods stem from wants that are deeply imbedded in the American standard of life. The state of international trade is a reflection of world political tensions as well as the product of reciprocal needs among nations for goods and services. In general, policies operating through the cost and availability of money—the major ways in which the monetary authorities can influence developments—are apt to meet with greater success when it is a matter of restraining rather than stimulating monetary expansion.

TIMING OF TREASURY SURPLUSES AND DEFICITS

The monetary flow through the economy is also affected strategically by Treasury surpluses and deficits. Whether considered

within the scope of monetary policy proper or viewed as a separate area of public policy, the fiscal operations of Government cannot be ignored in any consideration of contemporary monetary problems.

A current surplus on a cash basis means that the Government's outlays are running less than its income, and it is therefore having a contractive effect on the total money flow in the economy. A current cash deficit means that outlays are running in excess of income, and that the net effect of Government's fiscal operations is to have an expansive effect on the current monetary flow. Consequently, under a stabilizing economic policy, surpluses should be accumulated whenever there is a tendency for the monetary flow to become excessive, and deficits ought never to arise except when it is desirable to expand the monetary flow.

This principle of fiscal policy is, or ought to be by now, a thoroughly elementary notion. Though I cannot speak with the authority of one who is directly concerned with making fiscal policy, it seems to me that a much more relevant and difficult problem is how to provide for Government surpluses and deficits of the right amount at the right time. In other words, to me, the really crucial problem in developing an adequately stabilizing economic policy is that of providing proper flexibility in Government finance.

FLEXIBLE FISCAL POLICY

A certain amount of flexibility in Government fiscal policy can be provided on an automatic basis, that is, without requiring deliberate and specific action by either the Congress or the Executive. If the structure of tax rates remains unchanged, revenues will rise as the monetary flow expands, tending to reduce a deficit or increase a surplus. As the monetary flow contracts, revenues will fall, tending to reduce the surplus or create a deficit. With no opposing changes in expenditures, this automatic ebb and flow of revenues will itself exercise a stabilizing influence on the monetary flow. Such stabilizing influence may be supplemented, of course, by equally automatic fluctuation in the volume of outlays made on behalf of such items as unemployment compensation.

A stabilizing fiscal policy achieved through automatic devices is an undeniably appealing approach to the problem, and its potentialities are well worth stressing. But I suspect that its potentialities can never be great enough to preclude entirely the need for specific tax or expenditure adjustments as well. Just what tax or expenditure adjustments ought to be a part of a program of fiscal stability, I am not prepared to discuss in detail. In general, my preference is for relying on the tax rather than the expenditure side of the budget.

LONG-RUN "NEUTRALITY" OF FISCAL POLICY

The problem of stability at high levels of employment, insofar as it depends on fiscal policy, may involve resort to deficit financing, but only on a temporary and not on a permanent basis. A belief in the need for a chronic Government deficit to attain stability reflects, it seems to me, a lack of confidence in the viability of our economy. The long-run fiscal objective of budget neutrality—i. e., of a balanced budget—is, in my outlook, entirely consistent with the achievement of stable and high levels of employment and output.

From the point of view of stabilization needs, our real danger may be that we will lapse into an excessive use of deficit finance. If tension in the international situation persists, no retrenchment from a huge military budget will be possible. At the same time a considerable expansion in the welfare activities of the Government is probable. In this situation, the temptation—and the danger—is to slip into a policy of chronic deficit financing. Should we default on our fiscal-monetary obligations in this way, the result may be to create a demand for comprehensive direct controls in order to combat a chronic condition of inflationary pressures.

MANAGEMENT OF SURPLUSES AND DEFICITS

The implications for monetary policy of a stabilizing program of Government finance are not confined alone to the timing of surpluses and deficits. They extend also to the way in which a surplus is disposed of or a deficit is financed. Differences in disposing of a surplus and in financing a deficit will be reflected in different effects on the money supply. Broadly speaking, their significance will depend on such factors as the nature and strength of the demand for investable funds and the reserve position of commercial banks.

To illustrate my point, a surplus might be used to retire debt held by the nonbank public. In this case, the process of accumulating and disposing of a surplus would not in itself result in any reduction in the money supply; it would only shift the ownership of money from taxpayer to security owner. On the other hand, if a surplus is used to reduce debt held by the commercial banks, a portion of the money supply will be extinguished, while the immediately available supply of bank reserves for new money creation will be increased. If a surplus is used to retire Federal Reserve held debt, bank reserves as well as the money supply will thereby be reduced. Clearly, this last disposition of a budget surplus is the one that will make a maximum contribution to a policy of monetary restraint.

A similar type of analysis applies to the financing of a deficit—leading to a similar conclusion, namely, that if the deficit is to make a maximum contribution to monetary expansion it should be financed to the extent that it is feasible to do so through borrowing from the central banks—in our own country the Federal Reserve banks.

OTHER ASPECTS OF GOVERNMENT FINANCE

In addition to the management of budget surpluses and deficits, Government finance affects monetary policy through its management of outstanding public debt. Aspects of debt management, such as methods of refinancing, maturity, distribution, and of course the pattern and level of rates, must all be comprehended in, or related to, modern monetary policy. The principal objective of debt management from the point of view of monetary stability is easy enough to state: During inflationary periods when the monetary flow is excessive, it is desirable to attract investors' funds into public-debt holdings and away from private investment expenditures, thereby reducing the active money supply. During deflationary periods, it is desirable to induce an exchange of public-debt holdings for cash, thereby increasing the active money supply.

In this area of debt management more than anywhere else in the monetary and fiscal field, it seems to me, we are limited in the development of stabilizing policies by the incompleteness of our knowledge. With a debt of the magnitude of $250,000,000,000, with a stable level of long-term interest rates held long enough to permeate the entire asset and liability structure, and with a tense international situation, we do know that monetary policy must maintain orderly conditions at all times in the Government securities market.

But within this limitation, how much can be done? Are there changes to be made, through refinancing operations, in the maturity and ownership distribution of the debt that would improve it from the point of view of monetary stabilization? During inflationary periods, is some flexibility in the prices of Government securities compatible with maintenance of orderly market conditions? What would be the sure effects of such flexibility? Would these effects compensate for the known advantages of certain confidence in the orderliness and stability of the Government securities market?

Firm answers to questions such as these are prerequisite to development of debt management policies. Yet, even with much more intensive thought than this matter has thus far been given, the answer will be slow in coming. We have, after all, only acquired our present huge public debt within the past decade. We will need to proceed cautiously in building up our experience in improving methods for its management.

No ERP Guaranties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the racketeers who are selling goods to ERP to be paid for by our taxpayers and given away to people abroad are not satisfied with their high profits. Now they want the taxpayers to finance their foreign investments and have our Government guarantee the investment, which, after all, is another way of having our taxpayers foot the bill if the foreign investment goes sour.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 24, 1949, as follows:

NO ERP GUARANTIES

In its drafting of legislation to govern a second year of the European recovery program the House Foreign Affairs Committee has made a serious blunder. It has voted to authorize our Government to extend certain guaranties to American investors in Marshall plan countries. This newspaper has said and insists that if private capital cannot go abroad except on Government crutches, it should not go at all.

The House bill we are discussing only authorizes money action on behalf of ERP. It makes no appropriation. The Appropriations Committees of the two chambers can yet give it a going-over.

As reported out of committee, the House bill provides that, within a total liability of $300,000,000, the Government may protect investors in western Europe not only against blocking of their profits from operation (as the original ERP law did) but also against loss of principal through war, domestic violence, or Government decree—the latter presumably including nationalization.

If such a provision becomes law the Government of the United States will have started out on a road of which it cannot know the route or final destination. These guaranties will either fail to encourage any substantial foreign investment or, if they do succeed, are more than likely to call for a greater commitment than the $300,000,000 the House committee proposes. The original guaranty—of convertibility of profits from local currencies into dollars—was wrong in principle. To extend this insurance over what now look like the most serious hazards to the investment itself aggravates a violation of sound fiscal policy.

Government-guaranteed foreign investments cannot be classed as soberly considered ventures of private capital. If they are made they will be essentially Government loans of public funds. One provision of the House committee bill is that if something

goes wrong with an investment, so as to bring the guaranty into effect, our Government takes title to the profits or property involved. This is said to insure that negotiations at the Government level will follow. At that stage, if it is reached, the erstwhile private capital investment has become an outright and acknowledged Government loan in default, to be salvaged as best it can be.

We think it is simple realism, not cynicism, to believe that Government guaranties extended to putative private investments may encourage some foreign governments in, let us say, careless treatment of American capital invested in their domains. If foreign capital comes in, relying not so much on its treatment by its hosts as on the financial paternalism of its home government, the political authorities of the recipient country may be expected to act accordingly.

Visitors From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

VISITORS FROM MOSCOW

Seven visitors from Moscow are due to arrive at La Guardia Field this afternoon. They are on their way here to attend the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace which will meet in this city on Friday. They are coming to present the argument that world peace is readily obtainable through friendly and trustworthy cooperation, which, of course, is true. But they are also coming to tell us that such cooperation is the objective of the Soviet government of Russia. And this we will not find easy to believe, in the light of the written record of Soviet policy and action: the sabotage of the Marshall plan, the coup d'état in Prague, the conquest of the Balkans, the blockade of Berlin, the thirty vetoes in the United Nations, the defiance of the Security Council in Korea, the slap in the face to the Assembly over Greece, the wrecking of the plan for international control of atomic energy that had the approval of every other nation represented in this undertaking, the tireless fifth-column activities that are directed from Moscow against the stability and authority of every democratic government in the world.

The Soviet propaganda line has become so easily identified and so thoroughly discounted, the Soviet practice of standing words on their heads so that dictatorships become democracies and aggressive moves become peaceful intentions is so generally recognized for the sheer nonsense it is that we do not think these Moscow visitors will make much of a dent upon American opinion. In this respect we do not share the apparent concern of our State Department that if certain prospective visitors from non-Communist countries were also permitted to attend the conference it could be used as a successful sounding board for Soviet propaganda. We would let them all come, and all talk, and all do their best to convince us that counterfeit words speak louder than explosive actions.

There is so little chance of their doing this that we think our Russian visitors are about to waste their time. We wish, in fact, that they were coming for a more worthwhile and potentially profitable purpose. We wish that they were coming here to learn something for themselves instead of to tell us a bedtime story written in the Kremlin. We wish that they were here to see how an average American workingman's family lives, what this worker earns and what his money buys. We wish they were taking in a debate or two on Capitol Hill to see how the two-party system works in practice. We wish they were dropping in on the Federal courts to see how a patient judge leans over backward to give a scrupulously fair trial to a group of their own fellow-Communists. We wish that they were here to take a close look at the whole American scene and that their purpose was to carry back with them to Moscow as accurate and as candid a report on it as possible. For the first condition of peace is understanding. And understanding does not prosper under the censorship of the police state and behind the iron curtain.

Will We Forfeit Self-Government by Default Through Failing To Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the United States stands in the world today as a lonely symbol of that principle of government embracing free enterprise, free press, speech, and religion; and freedom of the citizens to elect for themselves the officials who administer the affairs of State—the Government under which the people live.

There has been a gradual whittling away of fundamentals incorporated by the founders into our form of government. This unfortunate development has been accompanied by a dwindling of interest, on the part of the citizens, in their Government and the men who run it.

Such a development holds in it the prospect that we will lose our constitutional republican form of government by default. Those interested in sound government need not go beyond their own backyard to learn why our present day social schemers with their nostrums are receiving so much encouragement and political support as they concoct new brews which will eventually, if not checked, make their leaders drunk with power and the citizens slaves of the State.

If, for instance, we, though OPA meddled into the private affairs of the citizens, wait until the bureaucratic quacks get control through socialized medicine and we will see how certain matters of family life, formerly a sacred and confidential trust between the family and the doctor, become a part of the Government records, first here in Washington, and secondly, to be spread out over the country to be used by the local political hacks to influence votes in general elections.

SHRINKAGE IN TOTAL VOTES

Let me repeat that we need not look beyond our own backyard for the fault. A shocking shrinkage in the number of votes cast by our citizens gives the answer to why socialistic visionaries are moving into our Government with the same quack pap that has caused the decline or downfall of other countries. They are seeking to replace the fundamentals which kept our Nation great and sound for over 150 years.

A half century ago—in 1896 we find 83 out of every 100 eligible voters in this country went to the polls to participate in a Presidential election. Twenty years later, 72 percent of the eligible voters took part in a Presidential election. In 1936, with 80,000,000 registered voters, 57 out of every 100 eligibles cast their ballots.

In this last Presidential election it is estimated that approximately 51 out of every 100 eligible citizens voted and then the successful candidate was elected by less than a majority of the total vote of those who participated in the election—this paradox being due to the rules governing the electoral college.

IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Bringing this down to our own back yard in Michigan and the Eighth Congressional District in particular, I find a survey of statistics of the 1948 election proves an appalling lack of citizen interest—if the yardstick of votes is to be used.

In the six counties comprising the Eighth Congressional District there were 13,778 fewer votes cast for all Presidential candidates than in the Presidential election 4 years earlier. Why did these 13,778 persons stay away from the polls and fail to exercise their duty as citizens and thus say how they wanted their Government conducted? And especially, under the most appalling conditions governing throughout the world today.

With 13,778 persons staying away from the polls in the Eighth Congressional District, I find the Republican candidate for President received 10,259 less votes than he received 4 years earlier and this loss for the Republican candidate is not reflected in a gain for any other candidate.

I am not talking partisan politics because fewer Democratic votes were also cast in five of the six counties although the percentage of absenteeism was not nearly as great in that party. Neither are losses of the two major parties reflected materially in figures for any of the so-called third-party groups since they are inconsequential in this district.

The decrease in the total votes cast for all parties, comparing 1948 with 1944, is broken down as follows: Saginaw County 7,669 less votes cast, Shiawassee County, 1,461 less, Gratiot County 1,217 less, Clinton County 793 less, Montcalm County, 1,455 less, and Ionia County, 1,183 less. These are all losses in the total votes cast.

REPUBLICAN ABSENTEEISM

Statistics for the last election for the Eighth Congressional District indicate Republicans are staying away from the polls in far greater numbers than are members of other political groups. The rate in one county is as much as 90 Republicans missing at the polls in 1948 for each 1 absent Democrat.

Losses in total party votes for respective Presidential candidates in the Eighth

Congressional District, arrived at by comparing their 1948 total votes with the 1944 vote for the same office, follow: Saginaw County, 4,366 less Republicans and 3,388 less Democrats; Shiawassee County, 1,224 less Republicans and 440 less Democrats, Gratiot County 952 less Republicans and 501 less Democrats, Clinton County 912 less Republicans and 10 less Democrats, Montcalm County 1,444 less Republicans and 169 less Democrats, and Ionia County 1,361 less Republicans. This last county was the only county showing a gain for either party, the Democrats polling 13 more votes for President than they did in 1944. Of course Republicans carried all of these counties.

With the next Presidential election nearly 4 years away there will be many State and local issues to be settled at the polls in the meantime; while only 2 years until a congressional election will be here.

Good government begins at home and this spring and fall there will be many local elections of importance throughout the country. Unfortunately, the falling off of voter interest in strictly local elections—both partisan and nonpartisan, is much greater than it is in national elections.

LOCAL ELECTIONS IMPORTANT

In the coming weeks many townships will elect their supervisors and other local officers; some cities will elect council members and other officials. Some State officers will be elected too.

It is difficult to answer why so many people are failing to vote, irrespective of party. Thoughtful citizens of all parties must give this serious thought if we are to maintain free elections and rule by majority. The city of Saginaw, Mich., recently witnessed a demonstration of CIO's answer when pickets paraded in front of the office of a State agency of Government in what their leader said was "an attempt to educate the people to vote." It concerned an issue in which the CIO was interested.

Picket lines may be CIO's answer to getting people aroused over elections but voter lines at the polls on election day are actually what count for the results. Wishful thinking will not do it.

Yes, good government begins at home, but it does not begin by remaining home on election day. This means going to the home-precinct polling place and casting a ballot on election day.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, typical of the communications I have been receiving with reference to the Rankin pension bill is that which came to my desk this morning from a resident of my district.

The following excerpts are apropos:

As a veteran of World War II and a fellow Democrat I was shocked at the display of "statesmanship" in the House today on the pension bill.

A majority of my World War II veteran friends have the same opinions as I, i. e., the proposed pension bill is a boondoggler's dream and a national holdup.

We do not particularly relish the idea of paying higher taxes for 35 years in order to be eligible for a few dollars at age 65. Secondly, a man's life expectancy today is age 62.

The time devoted to the general debate of the bill and the discussion of the various proposed amendments, those we agreed to as well as those we rejected, confirm what I said originally about this bill. That is that it should be referred back to the committee. The committee should conduct full and proper hearings upon the entire subject, giving all persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard, and a proper pension bill developed in committee and then brought before the House for action, where I am sure it will receive the overwhelming support of the Members of this House.

Pensions for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to be on record as a legislator and veteran that in my opinion our vote here today is not a vote for or against a sound pension plan for deserving veterans. Instead, we have before us a bill which never received the proper consideration of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and which here on the floor has been so confusedly amended that the Members are now in doubt as to the exact provisions remaining. The circumstances call for reason and sense so that our country and its veterans will benefit.

I will vote for a pension bill which is reasonable and equitable. I will not support a measure failing to meet those qualifications, for to do so would be an injustice to the veterans themselves and a betrayal of the trust imposed in me.

H. R. 2681 was presented to the Veterans' Affairs Committee one morning by its chairman, Mr. RANKIN, and until that time the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee had never seen the bill. Approximately 15 minutes of consideration was then given H. R. 2681—15 minutes consideration of a bill involving an estimated over-all cost in excess of $100,000,000,000. The bill was then reported out, not by a majority of the committee, but by a majority of the members present that day—as seven had walked out in protest.

The bill presented to us would give the same benefits to bad-conduct discharges as it would give those who had faithfully served their country and been honorably discharged. A man with a bad-conduct discharge would receive $15 a month more than the widow of a man killed in battle. This bill was written with so many obviously inherent defects that even its proponents have recommended that it be amended from the floor.

Consequently, in the last several days we have seen amendments, motions, and parliamentary maneuvers of every sort as the Members of the House have endeavored to write a just and sound pension bill. But orderly and wise legislative procedure requires that important legislation be written by a committee where there is opportunity for hearings so that some evaluation can be made of the implications and consequences of each proposed provision.

We have arrived at a point in this debate where confusion and chaos have displaced reason and order. We should return this bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs so that its members can prepare a fair and just pension plan for the veterans. The obligation which this Congress owes the veterans dictates that the benefits extended them be equitable and on a sound basis. Our veterans deserve more than hastily drawn, unstudied, and defective legislation.

Freedom on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have read a great deal about the trial and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. It has been the subject of discussion and protest on this floor. I have not, however, happened to see anywhere an account of a public demonstration such as took place recently in one of the cities of my congressional district. The meeting was a serious and solemn protest against the treatment of the cardinal, and the denial of freedom of religion. It was attended by more than 700 people of all faiths. It was inspired by two articles by Ethel Gillett Whitehorn which appeared in the Desert Sun of Palm Springs. The articles are entitled "Freedom on Trial." I have asked unanimous consent that they be reprinted here, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Whitehorn is the daughter of James N. Gillett, a former Representative in the Congress and a former Governor of California.

Article 1 appeared February 25, 1949, as follows:

American women are natural crusaders. They possess the intuitive power to recognize attacks on principle, honesty, and justice. They never hesitate to campaign vigorously against a public evil, nor do they fail to act promptly for the good. Oftentimes, women are criticized for applying more emotion than intelligence to public and political affairs. Even their own sex participates in these criticisms. The truth is that women crusade directly from the heart, and where the heart is involved, there lies freedom from pretense or deceit.

An illustration of the aptitude of American women to carry on a successful crusade is the historical campaign to win the right to

vote. This battle started in 1859. It lasted till 1920 when the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution granted Nation-wide suffrage to women. Never once during those 51 years did the suffragettes fail to keep their objective prominent in the minds of both legislators and the public. The leaders were frequently imprisoned; many of them had recourse to a hunger strike. Today, after almost 30 years of participation in governmental affairs, America's women have proved how right they were to take up the cudgels in 1859 and fight for principle.

Now, in this mid-twentieth century, the women of this Nation must open their hearts to a second great crusade which beckons them. This is the battle of freedom of religion versus atheism, the denial of God. Places of atheism have been rare until recently: It flourishes in Soviet Russia and her satellite, enslaved states. Fifty-one years cannot be devoted to the winning of this crusade * * *. Tyranny—ruthless, wanton tyranny—that strikes at the basic fundamentals of all mankind, strikes with the speed of a rattlesnake. The mentality of mankind can outwit the serpent, when and if it is properly used.

The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with protests from shocked organizations and citizens in all parts of the country, regarding the ruthless trial and the imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. And now—to his tragic experience—more will be added. For the attack has been extended against good men of Protestant faith, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, and Lutherans.

What will the President do? What will the Congress do. They will act when an aroused citizenry demands that this war against religion must be brought to an immediate end. Never have the women of American been given a richer opportunity to prove what they can do in time of stress. Therefore The Desert Sun of Palm Springs, California, its publisher, Mr. Oliver Jaynes, and this columnist appeal to all national women's organizations to form and pass resolutions and mail them on the earliest possible date to the President of the United States; to their various congressional representatives, and to the governors of States.

Let us not forget this week we Americans are celebrating George Washington's birthday. It was he who said in an address before the general committee representing the United Baptist Church in Virginia: "I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution—for you, doubtless, remember that I have often expressed my sentiment that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Article 2 appeared March 1, 1949, as follows:

Thousands of words, sharply condemning the slave philosophy of Soviet Russia and her satellite countries, continue to fill the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Words spoken by horrified Congressmen; editorials reprinted from newspapers in every section of our land; magazine articles written by leading authors; sermons by ministers of all creeds; resolutions passed by State legislatures and national organizations urging the administration and Congress to carry the Hungarian attack against religion directly to the General Assembly of the United Nations—this, as well as many letters from shocked citizens to their Congressmen, reveals that America is on the march against the tyranny of communism.

Last week, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS of Maryland made a brief statement to his colleagues in which he summed up the entire situation. He said: "The trial and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty makes one of the darkest spots on the pages of history: It is a throwback to barbarism; to human slavery of both the mind and the body.

"Freedom of religion was put on trial, and one of the world's leading church figures was humiliated because of the exercise of this God-given right.

"Freedom of religion was put on trial, and the prelate was condemned because he would not renounce his God.

"Freedom of conscience was put on trial, and this pillar of the church was humbled because he would not barter away his sense of right and wrong.

"Cardinal Mindszenty made the decision to be a free man of God rather than a cog in an evil machine; to be a proud patriot rather than a slinking traitor; to be a martyr rather than let the dark night, with its human bondage, fall upon his people unchallenged.

"Before the jury of the civilized world, he stands forth as innocent. In the eyes of the world this courtroom in Hungary will be known, not as a temple of justice, but the temple of shame." So spoke Senator TYDINGS.

This question is asked frequently—"How can Hungary be censured by the United Nations when that country is not a member." This is the answer given by diplomats and Members of Congress. There is a Hungarian peace treaty agreed to by the Big Four—the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia, under which all people are entitled to democratic justice. The freedom-loving people of Hungary didn't break that treaty. Russia has broken it—Russia, one of the signatories, who pledged to all nations their right to foster and enjoy every human freedom. Russia has broken her trust by taking over Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria—body and soul—and placing at the head of these governments Soviet-controlled Communists.

Hungary must carry the brunt of all censure and reproach. But in the final analysis it will be Russia who will pay the bill.

At the meeting a resolution was prepared and signed by representatives of the churches of Palm Springs and the various organizations of the city. It follows:

Whereas Russia-controlled Hungary and Bulgaria have shocked and corrupted the conscience and the moral sense of all freedom-loving people throughout the world because of their imprisonment, trial, and sentencing of ministers of all religious faiths, whose only offense is their God-given right to prevent religion from being crucified on the altar of freedom; and

Whereas it has been revealed that a definite pattern has been set by Russia and her Communist-controlled satellite nations to not only eliminate but persecute all religions; and since the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations pledges "to affirm faith in human rights;" and since Russia is one of the signatories to this charter: Be it

Resolved, That our Government zealously explore all channels through which remedial action may be taken in behalf of the innocent victims of this travesty on justice, and again assure the freedom-loving people of all the world that their human rights as described in the United Nations Charter are a reality and not a mockery; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Hon. John Phillips, Congressman of the Twenty-second Congressional District, California; and the Honorable Senators, Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland, California.

Signed this 13th day of March, at Palm Springs, Calif.: Rev. Michael O'Connor, pastor, Our Lady of Solitude, Palm Springs; Rev. James Blackstone, Jr., Community Church, Palm Springs; Rev. William Clavin, pastor, St. Theresa Church, Palm Springs; Rev. T. H. Reagans, pastor, First Baptist Church, Palm Springs; Rabbi Samuel Chomsky, National Jewish Welfare Board, Los Angeles; Indian Reservation Church, Palm Springs; Palm Springs Woman's Club; Daughters of the American Revolution; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary; Palm Springs Girl Scouts; Junior Chamber of Commerce, Palm Springs; Welfare and Friendly Aid Association; Palm Springs Hotel and Apartment Association; Youth Center Committee; Catholic Altar Society; Masons of California; DeMolay; Palm Springs Business Women's Club; AMVETS; American Legion, Post 519; American Legion Auxiliary, Unit 519; Jewish Community Center, Palm Springs; Oliver Jaynes, publisher, Desert Sun; W. Rashall, journalist; Lee Bering; Ethel G. Whitehorn; James Kehoe, California State Commander, AMVETS; Max Royer, Placentia Rotary Club; J. W. O'Sullivan, past commander Los Angeles County, AMVETS.

It is a good sign when people meet in this way to discuss world situations. It would help prevent those things happening here which we think cannot happen here.

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I placed in the RECORD the second of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 20, is the third of the series:

FREE BRITISH HEALTH PLAN HAILED AS BRILLIANT SUCCESS—PROGRAM OVER ROUGH SPOTS, SAYS BEVAN

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Third of a series)

LONDON, March 19.—Aneurin Bevan, former rugged Welsh miner, now Minister of Health and fighting Labor Party leader, declares unequivocally that the new free British National Health Service is a brilliant success. He brushes aside criticisms of management and cost and says: "Human comfort and happiness are not extravagances we cannot afford."

"Selfishness is not good medicine," the Minister affirms, "and we are eliminating it insofar as is possible. Many people are getting relief and easement from pain and their lives are being transformed from a dull drabness to unexpected happiness."

Recalling the early and vivid clashes with the medical profession when the plan was in process of arrangement, Mr. Bevan pointed out that the "creation and establishment of National Health Service was not easy with the professional hostility to it that prevailed. However, the transition has been much smoother than we thought possible, virtually 100 percent of the people are registered in it, and more doctors are cooperating than we anticipated."

MET UNEXPECTED FACTOR

"We did meet an unexpected factor," he says, "we did know there was a concealed demand for health services, but we did not

know how much. We have learned of a great desire for spectacles and dental treatment, much more than we dreamed existed. To us, all this is clear evidence of the great need that has existed and certainly is not evidence against the health service."

"We are not frightened," he states, "we soon will be over the hump of demand and will settle down to a normal consumption of all the medical aids that so many now are securing through this legislation."

The Minister of Health finds the relationship between the family physician and his patients is on a higher plane than ever. He emphasizes this point because this relationship is one of the prime subjects of debate whenever a popular health service is at issue.

CLASHES ELIMINATED

"We have transformed the relationship between the doctor and his patient, now there is no cash involvement between them," Mr. Bevan remarks. "The doctor now can confine himself wholly to doctoring, he can turn all his attention to the needs of his patients because he is assured of his payment."

The rush of much of the public for some of the benefits has evoked comment here and Mr. Bevan realizes it fully. He admits that everything has not been perfect.

"We do not deny there have been abuses by some people," he says, "but all that kind of trouble can be eliminated by good administration and it is taking place now."

"When something is free," he continues, "there is a human tendency for people to try to get it, but people cease to snatch at things when they come to know they will be there all the time. They really snatch only when they are not certain about the future availability of those things they desire."

The minister is well informed on events in public affairs in the United States and daily receives résumés of proposals, comments, and action on everything pertaining to health that appears in American newspapers. With regard to present proposals for a national health system in the United States, Mr. Bevan says: "Some of my good American friends alarm me by their approach to national health. It will be a mistake to adopt any contribution form. If everybody is in, it is not insurance, it is public welfare."

"I say it is a mistake to put national health on a contributory basis," Mr. Bevan asserts, "because we cannot have first-class, second-class, and third-class operations. If a man is suffering from cancer, we cannot refuse him aid because his contributions are not paid up fully."

In response to a query whether, if he were starting all over again, he would do anything that was not done, or would avoid something which was done, he said:

EDUCATION NEEDED

"If I were to start on this activity all over again, I would proceed on the assumption that the professional man is so preoccupied with his work, so cloistered, that he is cut off from many of the ordinary phases of life. I would commence with a campaign of education of the professional man in the principles of this plan of public service, I would operate such a campaign in a big way.

"We underestimated the sophistication of the medical profession. We found they were being stampeded into opposition to principles that were not present in the plan at all. They accepted the plan when they came to know their fears were not justified.

"You will find in America that they will fight the national health program with the same slogans. The first task there is to educate the doctors themselves and to convince them that their wholly honest fears are not justified."

Turning to the question whether there remains freedom of choice in the health service, Mr. Bevan maintains "the free choice of a doctor is not impaired. Doctors are not made slaves of the state. They are not civil servants. Their professional freedoms are not interfered with in any way. We merely are putting into the doctor's hands the power to use all the apparatus of medicine for the welfare of his patient as he may see fit."

Observing that in the United States there is talk of several ways of paying a doctor under national health, the Minister of Health reviews the experience in England of various systems. He is very strongly convinced that payment of fees per visit is highly undesirable and that the so-called capitation payment is far preferable. Under the capitation system used here, in the main, a doctor receives a fixed annual sum for every patient he treats, regardless of the number of consultations or treatments that takes place.

On this angle, Minister Bevan says: "I must be careful not to attempt to say what America should do. I will venture to state, though, that if they should adopt a system of paying fees per visit, every doctor indeed will have a very fast motorcar. That is not a good way.

FREE WILL EXERCISED

"The capitation fee system is proper," the Minister avers. "Under it a doctor can refuse to have anyone as a patient and a patient can choose and change doctors at will. The doctor will know what his income will be by the size of his list of registered patients and the size of that list will represent the number of people who want that doctor to take care of them. In this way, it is obvious, payment by capitation, on the basis of a list, preserves sufficient competition among doctors to prevent any relapse into slackness."

The Minister finds there must be a distinction between the various kinds of medical practices. The rural and the urban areas offer entirely different problems. Concerning this, he explains, "In the rural areas we have to make up for the disadvantages under which the doctor works by paying him more mileage. His patients may be widely scattered, but this added mileage will make up for him the difference between his income and that of the urban doctor."

CAUSES MUCH CONFLICT

The full-time, entirely salaried medical service has been the cause of much conflict in England. The British Medical Association has fought it fiercely. It is the central point of disagreement in the entire subject matter. Minister Bevan enters into this field of thought in his contemplation of the rural-area physician. He exclaims:

"It may be found that the country doctor's district is so spread out that the only fair and reasonable way to deal with him is through a salary. Full-time salaried medicine is perfectly all right, we have had it in the highlands of Scotland and Ireland and it has worked out satisfactorily.

"A salaried service for the profession is not acceptable at this stage because it would interfere with the choices of both the doctor and the patient. We have given the professions a guaranty that no attempt will be made to impose a full-time salaried status upon the professions in general without an amendment to the Health Act."

AID YOUNG PHYSICIANS

"Of course, you must have a basic salary to help young physicians to live while they are establishing their practices and we do give them $1,200 a year."

Opponents of national health often ridicule the provision that visitors to this country can receive free health service. There has been gossip that people have been crossing the Channel from France and having operations performed and dentures made at British expense. The Ministry says, however, that no concrete proof of such occurrences has been offered by anyone and challenges the statement. It points out that the wait would be so long for services that it would be uneconomic for the patient.

Mr. Bevan, in his interview, takes up the service-to-visitors matter. He declares:

"This service has an international character. We have been criticized because under the National Health Service any visitor can receive free medical care. Our answer is that fundamental medical habits should come abreast of social habits.

"Further, our health depends upon the health of our neighbors and it positively is not wrong to take care of the health of a visitor. If you neglect his health you actually may be neglecting your own health.

"We hope we shall pioneer the way for reciprocal action in other countries, then when our own people are traveling abroad they will be able to secure free medical care, just like at home.

"One European country, whose identity I would not want to disclose at this moment, has approached us to learn what reciprocal action they may be able to take.

"Our over-all primary thought on this public health subject is that selfishness is not good medicine."

Strikes and the Selfish Demands of Organized Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter received from a constituent that will well repay the reading:

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I recently received the attached folder and questionnaire from the General Electric Co. Unfortunately, I must confess that the closest kinship I can boast with this concern is the fact that I do own one of their well-known electric sweepers. This fact, I believe, will not brand me as a member of the vested interests. Neither should the fact that I am a salaried employee brand me as being a union sympathizer. As a plain, average, everyday American, I believe that this General Electric folder is an excellent idea and I am checking my views and forwarding them to you in the hope that as a representative of my district, you will know how one small voice feels about this very important matter.

My answers to these questions are based on firm convictions—convictions backed by the following reasons:

Frankly, Mr. Congressman, I am sadly discouraged at the trend that today is spreading through America—the loss of initiative; the loss of pride in individual accomplishment; the loss of teamwork and cooperation that made this country great; the lack of good neighborliness; and the tremendous growth of factional strife and narrow-minded selfishness. The self-starter of man's ambition is today being replaced by a free-wheeling gadget that permits unlimited coasting. And, unfortunately, the free-wheeling is being encouraged by our own Government.

I am alarmed at the way modern legislation is increasingly favoring the loudest, but not necessarily the largest, segments of American population—those who sponsor the slickest, most versatile lobbies, and press-relations men. I think, Mr. Congressman, that it's time that the plain ordinary Joes in this country remind our Washington representatives that our voice—simple and quiet

though that voice may be—is every bit as American and deserves every bit as much consideration as the Shakespearean rumblings of a John L. Lewis or the well-intoned phrases of an Eric Johnston.

It happens that this is the first letter I have ever written to any governmental representative. It will definitely not be my last. It is time, I believe, that individuals like myself—no strong member of any particular party; neither union member nor employer—do something to offset the incessant demands and selfish mouthings of the all-too-vocal organized minorities.

So, Mr. Congressman, while the president of the American Federation of Labor and the president of the American Manufacturers Association get personal invitations to Washington to broadcast their invective, how about letting a plain ordinary fellow express his views, too—a fellow who finds regretfully that the America he lives in today is not the same wonderful America he fought for only a few years ago.

I am sick and tired of opening my paper night after night and reading the same monotonous headline "Strike." Frankly, I don't know who is to blame, but the whole business of strikes is now a pathetic farce—a disgrace to the unions for the foolhardy irresponsible way in which they are carried on—a disgrace to our legislators who tolerate such procedures—a disgrace to the intelligence of the American people. The recent Philadelphia transit strike, for instance, is the perfect example of the will of a few causing unlimited inconvenience and financial loss to millions. That, Mr. Congressman, is not the kind of democracy for which I fought.

I am fed up with that all too typical sight of "goons" and morons parading with picket signs in front of every other shop along the street—pickets who chant crude, disparaging remarks about the institution. It's strange, Mr. Congressman, but if I—a respected citizen—were to make those same remarks, I would instantly be jailed for libel.

I am weary of reading charges and countercharges about the union feather-bedding that is skyrocketing the cost of that home I'd like to buy, or boosting the prices of my railroad ticket. I am disgusted at the thought of a Petrillo who demands that sit-by musicians be hired at fancy salaries to sit twiddling their thumbs—that high-school musicians be kept off the air because they don't belong to Caesar's union. If these charges are true, Mr. Congressman, then don't you agree that the unions need a big stick applied vigorously where it will do the most good? And if the charges are false—if there is no such thing as feather-bedding, and if the unions aren't trying to limit the maximum daily production of their members—then just as assuredly, Mr. Congressman, shouldn't the management executives who spread these false tales also feel the big stick properly administered?

Furthermore, I am disgusted at those shady characters who hide behind the skirts of constitutionality and refuse to answer the question: "Are you a Communist?". Personally, I don't know whether the question is constitutional or not. I don't care. I only know that I am proud and willing—in fact, eager—to proclaim to any and all that I am not a Communist. Any real American should feel the same way.

Those, Mr. Congressman, are my reasons for the answers on the attached form. I repeat—I am not an employer, not a member of a labor union. But I am an American who each month sees a terrific portion of my monthly pay check snatched away by an all-too-expensive Government. In view of our present excessively high tax rate, Mr. Congressman, I don't think I am unjust in asking for greater efficiency * * * greater integrity * * * and a whale of a lot more of the Golden Rule.

Yours truly,

EMORY WARD.

The So-Called Rights of Communists and Atheists Under the Constitution of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there have been from time to time discussions on the floor of the House of the alleged rights of Communists and other subversive organizations under the Constitution of the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject, I include the following article written by Charles Hall Davis, a prominent citizen and attorney of Petersburg, Va., in my congressional district, whose views on the question, I believe, will prove of interest and value to the Members of Congress in their consideration of the problem:

THE SO-CALLED RIGHTS OF COMMUNISTS AND ATHEISTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Charles Hall Davis, of the Virginia bar, Petersburg, Va.)

Query: Does the Constitution of the United States guarantee to safeguard the free exercise of irreligion, or of atheism (or of communism, which is based on atheism) in this country?

Can the Communist claim the right to be safeguarded in his efforts to undermine the spiritual foundations of Americanism and to destroy the American Republic, under the constitutional provision forbidding the Congress to pass any law "Prohibiting the free exercise of religion; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press"?

The Federal Constitution forbids the Congress to pass any laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion; but Congress is not forbidden to pass laws prohibiting the free exercise of irreligion, or of atheism; and the National Constitution imposes no limitations on the exercise by the respective States of their reserved powers in reference to religion.

THE WORD "RELIGION" APPEARS ONLY ONCE IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The word "religion" occurs in the Constitution of the United States only once; namely, in the first amendment (the first section of the Federal Bill of Rights) the first clause of which reads as follows:

"Amendment I: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

NEITHER THE WORDS "RELIGIOUS FREEDOM" NOR "FREEDOM OF RELIGION" OCCUR ANYWHERE IN THE CONSTITUTION

Nowhere in the Constitution do the words "freedom of religion," or "religious freedom," or any phrases of similar import, occur. The only constitutional guaranties of freedom of religion are embraced in these words of the first amendment, which do not positively guarantee anything to the individual citizen, their only significance is that they forbid the Congress to do either of two things, namely:

"Congress shall make no law (a) respecting an establishment of religion, (b) or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These words impose limitations on the powers of Congress. By reason of these inhibitions, Congress cannot enact any law creating an "established church," such as exists in England where the Anglican (Episcopal) Church is supported by the state; or in many European countries where the Roman Catholic Church is similarly supported by the state. Similarly, by reason of these limitations on the powers of Congress, it can make no law "prohibiting the free exercise of religion."

There is no inhibition on the Congress about passing any laws that it may deem proper and necessary prohibiting the free exercise of "irreligion," or of any belief which, if allowed to be freely exercised, might undermine the spiritual foundations of Americanism, or which might tend to destroy the Republic.

AMERICANISM IS BASED ON A BELIEF IN GOD

The Declaration of Independence, which, as the Supreme Court has said, laid the foundations of American government, declares that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," and "that, to secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Under Americanism, human rights are the direct gift of God; and being derived from this supreme source, human beings cannot be justly deprived of them by any human institution—government or other—but just government must secure them.

Hence, under Americanism, government cannot prohibit the free exercise of religion, or of a belief in God; but while, under Americanism, a man can believe whatever he pleases, and has the right to believe that there is no God, yet he cannot be permitted to so exercise his disbelief in the existence of a God as to openly attack and seek to destroy the idea that there is a God, and thereby deny the existence of the divinely bestowed rights on which Americanism is based, and on the existence of which rests his right to believe what he pleases.

Americanism forbids the Congress to prohibit the free exercise of religion. An American citizen can worship such God as he pleases, and freely exercise his religion; because God has given him the right to do this. But he cannot deny the existence of any God, and so exercise his disbelief as to wipe out the individual God-given inherent rights of himself and of all other American citizens, and thus destroy the foundation principles on which the entire structure of Americanism has been reared.

American Government is not in any way committed to the protection of any citizen in efforts to destroy the political theory and plan under which he claims the right of individual and political liberty. He cannot assert his right to freedom, and at the same time deny that the being through whom he claims the right, does not exist, and never has existed. Americanism guarantees absolute and unlimited freedom of belief and opinion to all its citizens; but it does not guarantee unlimited freedom of action in the exercise of those individual beliefs, if that freedom of action or exercise is to be used to defeat the very rights which are asserted. Unrestricted exercise of any right is license and not liberty.

The right to believe what one chooses is unquestioned. But the exercise of that right must not be such as to defeat the similar and equal rights of others; nor may it be so exercised as to jeopardize the existence of government and the safeguarding of the equal rights of others, or to undermine the entire structure of liberty on which the existence and protection of human rights is based. Government's duty is to protect and preserve its own existence; and it owes no obligation to protect any one in such exercise of his alleged rights as will destroy the very government under which he claims the authority to exercise those rights.

THE WORD "RELIGIOUS" OCCURS ONLY ONCE IN THE CONSTITUTION

The word "religious" occurs only once in the Constitution of the United States, namely, in the third clause of article 6, reading:

"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification in any office or public trust under the United States."

When we speak of national guaranties of religious freedom we must therefore understand that there are no positive guaranties of freedom of religion in the Federal Constitution; but only negative guaranties in the shape of limitations or restraints or inhibitions on the powers of the national legislative body (the Congress), forbidding it to do three things, namely:

Under amendment I:

(1) "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," or (2) "prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Under article VI, clause 3:

(3) "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

THE SAFEGUARDING OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES IS LEFT TO THE RESPECTIVE STATES

As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that the Constitution of the United States makes no provision for safeguarding the citizens of the respective States in their religious liberties; that being left to the respective States.

All that the National Government is obligated to do in this connection is in the shape of certain limitations or prohibitions imposed on the National Congress. It is forbidden to do any of the three things above specified. It is not positively required to do any specific act in the way of a guaranty of individual freedom of religion.

Nor does the Constitution of the United States impose any limitations on the reserved powers of the respective States in respect to their authority over religious liberty (unless some limitations on those powers were imposed by the fourteenth amendment, adopted on July 28, 1868, and commonly referred to as one of the three slavery amendments—about which there is serious question).

Thus, in the case of *Permoli* v. *Municipality of the City of New Orleans*, decided in 1845, and reported in Third Howard, at page 609, Mr. Justice Catron, delivering the unanimous opinion of the Court, said:

"The Constitution makes no provision for protecting the citizens of the respective States in their religious liberties; this is left to the State constitutions and laws; nor is there any inhibition imposed by the Constitution of the United States in this respect on the States."

THE FEDERAL BILL OF RIGHTS (THE FIRST 10 AMENDMENTS) IMPOSED RESTRICTIONS ONLY ON THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, AND NOT ON THE STATES

As to the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States (known as the Federal Bill of Rights), the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that these amendments applied only to the Federal Government, and did not apply to the States.

In the case of *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542), the Court said:

"The first amendment to the Constitution * * * like the other amendments proposed and adopted at the same time—including all of the first 10 amendments—was not intended to limit the powers of the State governments in respect to their own citizens, but to operate upon the National Government alone."

"* * * The scope and application of these amendments are no longer subjects of discussion here."

"They left the authority of the States just where they found it, and added nothing to the already existing powers of the United States."

In the case of *Brown* v. *New Jersey* (175 U. S., p. 174), decided in 1899, the Court said:

"The first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution contain no restrictions on the power of the States, but were intended to operate solely on the Federal Government." and the Court then proceeds to refer to 11 other decisions made by it maintaining this view.

In certainly as many as a dozen decisions the Supreme Court has reiterated this opinion, and hence it may be declared that the United States has no authority under the first or under any of the first 10 amendments to control any of the States in their legislation regarding freedom of religion.

In the case of *Bolin* v. *Nebraska* (decided in 1900) (176 U. S., at pp. 88–89), the Supreme Court said:

"This Court has also repeatedly held that the first eight amendments to the Constitution applied only to the Federal courts, and it certainly could never have been intended that these amendments should be imposed upon Nebraska, and thereby a hard and fast rule made for that State that would forever preclude amendments inconsistent with the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution, and which this Court has held to be applicable only to the Federal courts."

"As we have repeatedly held, the fourteenth amendment was not intended to curtail the powers of the States so to amend their laws as to make them conform to the wishes of their citizens, to changed views of administration, or to the exigencies of their social life."

"It may be readily supposed that the inhabitants of each State understand perfectly their own local needs and interests, and, with the facilities with which the constitutions of the several States may be amended, it is scarcely possible that any evil which might be occasioned by an improvident amendment would not be readily redressed."

CONCLUSIONS FROM THESE PROVISIONS AND DECISIONS

From these provisions of the Constitution, and from the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the same, it is evident that:

1. The Federal Constitution does not guarantee individual freedom of religion but only imposes certain inhibitions on the powers of the national Congress—such as that "the Congress shall pass no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion." Freedom of religion is secured to the citizen of a State by his State constitution and by the laws of his State. The inhibitions imposed on the Congress by the Federal Constitution do not apply to the States.

2. Nothing in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States prevents any of the States from passing laws "respecting an establishment of religion," or from "prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

3. The first amendment does not forbid the Congress to pass laws prohibiting the free exercise of irreligion or of atheism. Nor is there any other provision of the Constitution forbidding Congress to do this.

American personal liberty imports an absolute and unlimited individual freedom of thought and belief; but a restricted freedom in the individual exercise of those beliefs.

Congress can properly impose such limitations on their individual exercise as will prevent any impairment or defeat of the similar and equal rights of others, or any defeat of, or interference with, the administration by government of its entrusted authority to maintain the public safety, health, morals, and welfare.

Personal freedom does not mean unbridled license, but it means ordered liberty under general laws.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "RELIGION" AS USED IN THE CONSTITUTION

Just what is the meaning of the word "religion" as used in this first amendment to the Constitution?

Webster's New International Dictionary defines religion as:

"The outward act or form by which men indicate their recognition of the existence of a god or of gods having power over their destiny, to whom obedience, service, and honor are due; the feeling or expression of human love, fear, or awe of some superhuman and overruling power, whether by profession of belief, by observance of rites and ceremonies, or by the conduct of life; a system of faith and worship; a manifestation of piety."

In Words and Phrases, volume 7, page 6063, religion is defined as:

"Religion is morality, with a sanction drawn from a future state of rewards and punishments." (*McAllister* v. *Marshall* (Penn.), 6 Bin, 338, 350; 6 American Decisions, 408.)

"In all Christian countries the word 'religion' is ordinarily understood to mean some system of faith and practice resting on the idea of the existence of one God, the Creator and Ruler, to whom His creatures owe obedience and love." In re Knight's Estate (28 Atlantic, 303; 159 Penn. 500).

COURT DECISIONS AS TO THE GOVERNMENT'S POWERS OVER THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION

In the case of *Davis* v. *Beason* (133 U. S. 333), decided in 1890, the Supreme Court of the United States, in construing the meaning of the word "religion" in the first amendment, said in an unanimous opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Field:

"The term 'religion' has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for His being and character, and of obedience to His will.

"It is often confounded with the cultus or form of worship of a particular sect, but is distinguishable from the latter.

"The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof, was intended to allow everyone under the jurisdiction of the United States to entertain such notions regarding his relations to his Maker and the duties they impose as may be approved by his judgment and conscience, and to exhibit his sentiments in such form of worship as he may think proper, not injurious to the equal rights of others, and to prohibit legislation for the support of any religious tenets, or the modes of worship of any sect."

"The oppressive measures adopted, and the cruelties and punishments inflicted by the governments of Europe for many ages to compel parties to conform in their religious beliefs and modes of worship to the views of the most numerous sect, and the folly of attempting in that way to control the mental operations of persons and enforce an outward conformity to a prescribed standard, led to the adoption of the amendment in question."

"It was never intended or supposed that the amendment could be invoked as a protection against legislation for the punishment of acts incident to the peace, good order, and morals of society."

"With man's relation to his Maker and the obligations he may think they impose, and the manner in which an expression shall be made by him of his belief on these subjects, no interference can be permitted, provided always the laws of society, designed to secure its peace and prosperity, and the morale of its people, are not interfered with."

"However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the criminal laws of the country, passed with reference to

actions regarded by general consent as properly the subjects of punitive legislation."

In the case of *The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints* (*The Mormon Church*) v. *The United States* (136 U. S., pp. 1–68); the Supreme Court fully considered the meaning and extent of the limitations imposed on the power of Congress in reference to religion by the first amendment; and held that—

"The State has a perfect right to prohibit polygamy, and all other open offenses against the enlightened sentiment of mankind, notwithstanding the pretense of religious conviction by which they may be advocated and practiced."

And the Court further held that "since the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has persistently used, and claimed the right to use, and the unincorporated community still claims the same right to use, the funds with which the late corporation was endowed for the purpose of promoting and propagating the unlawful practice as an integral part of their religious usages" the State, through the courts, had the right to take possession of the property of the church which had been devoted to a public or charitable use which was illegal, and to devote that property to some other like purpose that was legal.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN A RIGHT AND THE EXERCISE OF THAT RIGHT

There is a marked difference between a God-given right, which is admitted to exist, and which is admittedly vested in each human being in equal measure as an incident of the equal humanity of each, and the freedom to exercise that God-given right according to the wishes of the individual.

The American concept of individual liberty regards the individual human being as being divinely endowed with absolute and unlimited individual freedom of thought and of beliefs; but with a limited and restricted freedom in the individual exercise of those individual beliefs.

The American theory, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Bill of Rights (and the bills of rights of the several States) is that each human being, by virtue of his humanity, has been directly and equally endowed by the Creator with certain individual and unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, freedom of religious belief, free speech, a free press, and many others.

But the individual's exercise of each of these rights must be subject to the condition that through such exercise, he does not defeat or impair the similar and equal rights of all other individuals; and, in a politically organized State, this individual exercise of inherent rights must be carried on in such a way as not to defeat or violate the general laws enacted by the community will in order to safeguard and maintain the public safety, health, morals, and welfare.

The State cannot justly prohibit or restrain the exercise of the right according to the will of the individual, except to the extent necessary to assure that the individual, in so exercising his right along the lines of his own choice, does not defeat or impair the similar and equal rights of other individuals and does not violate the laws enacted by the community for the preservation and safeguarding of the public safety, health, morals, and welfare; which laws must be general laws applicable to all alike. This is what is meant by the orderly exercise of individual rights.

Thus, while each individual has the inherent right to worship such God as he chooses, in such way as he deems proper, he cannot conduct his public worship in the midst of a crowded public thoroughfare, and thereby impede traffic. Nor can he offer human sacrifices as a part of his worship; for to do this would impair the right to life of those so sacrificed. The primary aim of Americanism is to secure an equality of inherent individual rights and an equality of opportunity for the orderly exercise of those rights according to individual choice, to every human being subject to its jurisdiction.[1]

EVERY HUMAN BEING CAN THINK OR BELIEVE WHAT HE PLEASES

In the United States, every human being has an inherent right to worship such God as he chooses, or to deny the existence of any God. He has an inherent right to believe that there is no God—just as he has an inherent right to think that the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force and violence.

He has a right to think what he pleases; and government has no delegated authority authorizing it in any way to control his thinking or his beliefs.

But when he commits an overt act as a result of his thinking or of his belief, and when that overt act defeats or impairs the similar and equal rights of others, or violates any of the regulations enacted by government for the maintenance of the public safety, health, morals, or welfare (provided that such regulations are within the delegated powers of government), then government can interfere with, and restrain, his exercise of his individual rights, so as to safeguard the similar and equal rights of others, and so as to protect the Government in the exercise of its entrusted authority.

If an atheist believes that there is no God, he has a complete and unquestioned right to hold this view. But if he attempts to propagate his faith or lack of faith, to urge others to become atheists, and as a part of their belief that there is no God, to deny the existence of inherent individual rights bestowed by God to each individual in equal measure, and to urge that force be substituted for justice, and that the Government under which the existence of inherent rights is recognized and safeguarded be overthrown by force and violence, then the Government has the right and the duty to prevent his exercise of his alleged individual rights in this effort to impair and defeat the similar and equal rights of others, and to defeat the administration by government of its entrusted authority.

[1] In a "Note" attached at the end of the case of *Davis* v. *Beason* as published in Book 33 of the Lawyer's Cooperative Publishing Co.'s Edition of the Reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, at page 642 of that volume, it is stated:

"NOTE.—The Constitutions of several States, in providing for religious freedom, have declared expressly that such freedoms shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.

"Thus, the Constitution of New York of 1777 provides as follows:

"The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed, within this State, to all mankind: *Provided*, That the liberty of conscience, hereby granted, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this State" (Art. XXXVIII). The same declaration is repeated in the Constitution of 1821 (Art. VII, sec. 3) and in that of 1846 (Art. I, sec. 3), except that for the words "hereby granted" the words "hereby secured" are substituted.

The Constitutions of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, and South Carolina contain a similar declaration.

The government established to secure the inalienable, individual, God-given rights of all its citizens; to secure the equality of such rights and an equal opportunity to each and every citizen for their orderly exercise; cannot condone or justify any overt acts by any one citizen, designed to destroy the very government which safeguards those rights, or to deny or defeat the very rights which the atheist vouches as justifying his actions.

ATHEISM IS BASED ON A NEGATIVE

Atheism is a negation of the existence of a God. It is not a religion; it is a repudiation and denial of all religion.

Webster defines atheism as "disbelief in, or denial of, the existence of a God, or supreme intelligent being."

He defines an atheist as "one who disbelieves or denies the existence of a God, or supreme intelligent being."

Words and Phrases, volume 1, page 615, defines atheist as:

"An atheist is one who does not believe in the existence of a God." (*Gibson* v. *American Mut. Life Ins. Co.* (37 N. Y. 580, 584).)

"An atheist is one who disbelieves in the existence of a God, who is the rewarder of truth, and an avenger of falsehood. Such a person is incompetent as a witness." (*Thurston* v. *Whitney* (50 Mass. (2 Cush.) 104, 110); (*Commonwealth* v. *Hills* (64 Mass. (10 Cush.) 530, 532).)

"Atheists differ from all other people in owning no religion." (*Hale* v. *Everett* (53 N. H., 9, 154; 16 Am. Rep. 82).)

Communism is based on atheism, on the denial of the existence of a God, and on pure materialism.

Americanism is based on a belief in God and on spiritual foundations.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that:

"No purpose or action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State, or nation, because this is a religious people. * * * This is a Christian nation."

Communism and Americanism cannot coexist in the same country; nor can Communist principles be grafted on Americanism without destroying it.

ATHEISM IS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF COMMUNISM

As a matter of fact, atheism is an essential element of communism.

Frederick Engel said in his Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, 1901, English edition, at page 19:

"Nowadays * * * there is absolutely no room for a creator or a ruler."

August Bebel, who was one of the leading German Socialists, declared in the Reichstag on September 16, 1878:

"Gentlemen, you attack our views on religion because they are atheistic and materialistic. I acknowledge the correctness of the impeachment. I am firmly convinced that socialism finally leads to atheism."

Karl Marx wrote of socialism:

"We shall have deserved well of it if we can stir up hatred and contempt against all existing institutions. We make war against all prevailing ideas of the state, of country, or patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, equality, and culture is atheism."

The A. B. C. of Communism, page 37, states that:

"In practice, no less than in theory, communism is incompatible with religious faith."

Leibnecht said:

"It is our duty as Socialists to root out the faith in God with all our might. Nor is anyone worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of atheism."

Bebel said:

"Christianity and socialism stand toward each other as fire and water. Christianity is the enemy of liberty and civilization. It has kept mankind in slavery and oppression."

Bakunine said:

"We declare ourselves atheists. We seek the abolition of all religion and the abolition of marriage."

Comrade Yaroslavsky said:

"We are against God, we are against capital. We are for socialism. We are for a world union of toilers. We are for the Communist International."

The Atheist at His Bench, an organ of the Moscow Committee of the All Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviki, printed at Moscow, in its issue No. 8, 1928, said:

"The central committee of the All Russian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviki) decided that the most important task at hand for the party must be the most attentive consideration of the problems on the program of the VI Congress, and the most important question of the program for the Communist International is the militant demand, the fight against religion."

THE SPIRITUAL FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICANISM

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Ry. Co.* v. *Ellis* (165 U. S., 159–60), said:

"The first official action of this Nation declared the foundation of Government in these words: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"The latter (the Constitution) is but the body and the letter of which the former (the Declaration of Independence) is the thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the Constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence."

In the *Slaughter House Cases* (111 U. S. 740), Mr. Justice Field described the Declaration of Independence as "That new evangel of liberty to the people."

In the case of *The Church of The Holy Trinity* v. *United States* (decided in 1892) (143 U. S., 457), Mr. Justice Brewer, delivering the unanimous opinion of the Court, said:

"No purpose or action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or nation, because this is a religious people. This is historically true. * * *

"Many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations that this is a Christian nation."

Our entire political theory and governmental plan is based on the assertion of the existence of a Creator or God, from whom we derive all of our human rights; and that, as these rights are the gift of God and are equally conferred by Him upon each human being, as incident to the equal humanity of each, it is the primary duty of government to secure these rights equally to all human beings subject to its jurisdiction.

If and when we deny the existence of a God, we thereby repudiate the entire idea that human rights are derived from so supreme a source that government cannot justly deprive any individual of these rights—we thereby abandon the idea of divinely conferred human rights, and substitute therefor the idea that our so-called rights are either concessions from the majority (which majority can at any time withdraw those concessions), or are privileges extended by government, which can at any time revoke the same, so that might makes right, and the people must depend for their liberties on the will of the temporary majority or the whims of their rulers.

We cannot deny the existence of God, or repudiate the idea that individual human rights are a gift from Him, without thereby wiping out our entire structure of liberty. The existence and recognition of a God are essential to the maintenance of human freedom. If there were no God, it would be necessary to assume one, in order to establish a permanent and dependable structure of individual and political liberty.

THE MATERIALISTIC FOUNDATIONS OF ATHEISM AND COMMUNISM

Atheism and communism deny the existence of any God from whom such individual rights could have been secured and hence deny the existence of God-given rights. The Communists are today preaching and spreading this atheistic doctrine in the effort to destroy Americanism to abolish human liberty, and to make the people the subjects and slaves of their rulers.

They boldly claim that they have the right to do this in this country, because the United States Government is forbidden to pass a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, and yet they deny all religion. How can the inhibition against passing a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, confer any authority to anyone to deny all religion? Communism does not desire freedom of religion, but rather demands that our Government protect it in its efforts to wipe out all religion, and thereby to wipe out all claim to the free exercise by the individual of his God-given rights.

WHY AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IS LIMITED IN ITS PURPOSES AND POWERS

The reason why our Government is forbidden to pass such laws is that we hold that these rights to the free exercise of religious belief, to freedom of speech and of the press, are the gifts with which the Creator (God) has directly endowed each human being. Because God gave these rights in equal measure to all human beings, as incident to the equal humanity of each, it is the duty of just government to secure this equality to all alike. To that end, just government must impose on the individual exercise of each and all of these rights such restraints as will prevent the defeat or impairment of the similar and equal rights of others; and as will prevent interference with the exercise by government of the authority entrusted to it by the people for the purpose of securing to every human being subject to its jurisdiction an equality of such rights and an equal opportunity for their orderly exercise along lines of individual choice.

The authority exercised by government must be limited so that its entrusted powers cannot be exercised so as to secure greater rights, or greater opportunity for their orderly exercise, to any individual or group than is accorded to all other individuals or groups. Hence just government must be limited government. There can be no individual or political liberty, where government is granted unbridled power; or where governmental restraints on the exercise of individual rights are not equally applicable to all.

THE ATHEIST DENIES THE EXISTENCE OF GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS

The atheist denies the existence of God, and hence denies the existence of any God-given rights—which are the only rights which American Government was established to secure. Curiously enough, the atheist occupies the position of claiming to have a God-given right to deny that God ever gave any rights to him or to anybody else; and he further claims the right to exercise his alleged rights so as to defeat or impair all of the rights of others and of himself as well.

He denies that there is a God; and hence he must deny that God ever gave to him the right to deny that God exists, or ever gave to him or to anybody else any rights of any kind. In denying that he has any rights received from the Deity, he must claim any rights that he attempts to exercise as having been derived by concession of the majority or by gift from the Government—and yet he resents any attempt of either Government or of the majority to regulate the exercise by him of any rights that he must claim exist by virtue of concessions or grants from the majority or from the rulers.

He claims the protection of government in his exercise of his alleged right to deny that he has any rights which government should protect, and in his claim that others have no such rights as he asserts, and that those others are not entitled to protection in the exercise of similar and equal rights to those which he asserts.

His claim is in itself a contradiction in terms. The atheist asserts a title to rights, while at the same time he denies that any such rights as he claims ever existed, because he denies the existence of the grantor of the rights. He asserts the right to deny the existence of a God, states that he is against God, and that his purpose is to "Root out the faith in God" and that he seeks "the abolition of all religion."

The impudence of the Communist in asking the intended victims of his efforts to protect him in his assaults upon their liberties is equaled only by the gullibility of those potential victims whom he seeks to destroy, in listening to, and even supporting, such specious arguments. Those arguments cannot be justified by reason, logic, justice, expediency, or common sense.

Under the American theory the Communist can think and believe what he chooses. But he cannot claim any part of a heritage, when he denies that the party from whom he claims this heritage ever existed; nor can he use his claimed portion of that heritage to defeat the shares of others in the same. It is a recognized principle of law that a man cannot assert a claim to the title of property, and at the same time deny the existence of the grantor under whom he claims.

There is a lot of nonsense talked about the inherent rights of Communists and Atheists; while little attention is paid to the rights of others which communism seeks to destroy.

Atheism attempts to prove a negative, which is impossible. It thrives on controversy, and hence it welcomes attack; for when the attack is made, it immediately insists that the attacker prove every statement that he makes, while the Atheist does not attempt to prove his claims, but supports his case by criticising and attacking the opposition.

Neither communism nor atheism can justly claim constitutional protection in the exercise of its principles and beliefs; because the exercise of communism and atheism is basically an attack on the entire theory of individual human rights, and is directed to denying and wiping out the very rights which the Communist and Atheist invoke as justifying their attacks.

Atheism is not a religion, but is a denial of all religion.

The Constitution forbids the Congress to pass any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion; but how could a law prohibiting or regulating the free exercise of atheism be construed as a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, when atheism is a direct negation and denial of religion itself?

Is not atheism (or a denial of the Holy Spirit of God) a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost which Jesus described as the unforgivable sin?

Should Americans in any way condone or temporize with any such blasphemy?

THE UNFORGIVABLE SIN—DENYING THE HOLY SPIRIT

There is a striking passage in the New Testament which seems to have a direct bearing on this problem of whether anyone is entitled to protection in the free exercise of atheism.

In Luke 12: 10, Jesus said:

"And everyone who shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven."

In Matthew 12: 32, Jesus said:

"Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."

In Mark 3:28–29, Jesus said:

"All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin."

Here Jesus states that men may be forgiven for rejecting Him or any other specific God; but they will not be forgiven for denying or speaking against the Holy Spirit (the Spirit of God). They can be forgiven for refusing to accept and reverence and obey a specific God; but they cannot be forgiven for denying that there is a God—for denying and attacking the Spirit of God—the consciousness that there is a God, which consciousness has been implanted in each human being as an incident to his humanity, and as a part of his Godlikeness.

What is blasphemy?

The Century Dictionary states that blasphemy is—

"In Old Testament usage, any attempt to diminish the reverence with which Jehovah's name was invested as the sovereign king of the Jews, or to turn the hearts of the people from their complete allegiance to him."

Blasphemy, cognizable by common law, is described by Blackstone to be—

"Denying the being or providence of God, contumelious reproaches of our Saviour Christ, profane scoffing at the Holy Scriptures, or exposing it to contempt or ridicule."

It is described by Kent as "maliciously reviling God or religion"; and

It is described by Chief Justice Samuel Shaw as "speaking evil of the Deity with an impious purpose to derogate from the Divine Majesty, and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God."

Words and Phrases, volume 1, page 807, says of blasphemy:

"Blasphemy consists in speaking evil of the Deity with an impious purpose to derogate from the Divine Majesty, and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God.

"It is purposely using words concerning God which are calculated and designed to impair and destroy the reverence, respect, and confidence due to Him as the intelligent creator, governor, and judge of the world.

"It is a willful and malicious attempt to lessen men's reverence of God, by denying His existence or His attributes as an intelligent creator and to prevent others from having confidence in Him as such."

Blackstone defines blasphemy as denying the Almighty's being or providence (*Commonwealth* v. *Kneeland* (37 Mass. (20 Pick.) 206, 213)).

"Blasphemy consists in maliciously reviling God or religion" (*People* v. *Ruggles* ((N. Y.) 8 Johns 200, 292, 5 Am. Dec. 335)).

SATAN'S REVOLT AGAINST GOD

It is also well to remember that Satan was an angel in Heaven, who revolted against God and was cast down out of Heaven in consequence. (See Luke 10, 18; 2d Peter 2, 4; Jude 6; Rev. 12, 9, 13.)

As an angel, the devil had been endowed by the Creator with the rights of free will and free choice. He had an inherent right to worship the God who created him, or to refuse to worship Him—to obey Him, or to refuse to obey Him. God never questioned the possession by Satan of this inherent right. (Job 1, 6–12.) But God did hold Satan responsible for his exercise of this inherent right of choice.

When Satan exercised his right of choice by revolting against God, the Lord did not withdraw from Satan the power to continue to exercise his power of choice. But God did decree that Satan should be punished for his voluntary and willful misuse of his right of choice. He was cast out of Heaven, sentenced to ultimate defeat and to final punishment. (Rev. 20, 1–3; 7–10.)

MAN MAY REJECT A SPECIFIC GOD AND BE FORGIVEN, BUT DENIAL OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE DIVINE SPIRIT IS UNFORGIVABLE

The God of the Christians desires no followers who can be retained only by force. The Christian must be a voluntary worshipper. Even if a man rejects Jesus, he can be forgiven in the future. But if a man denies the Spirit of God, and blasphemes against that Spirit, if he denies and blasphemes against the existence of any God, then, according to the Scriptures, he has committed the unpardonable sin, for which there is no forgiveness.

God admits that each human being has been endowed by Him with the right of free will and free choice, so that each has the right and the power to deny that God exists, and to thus blaspheme against the Holy Spirit; but He says that, if a man so uses his God-given power of choice, and denies that the Deity has endowed him with a portion of His Divinity—making man in "the image and likeness of God"—then that man has committed the unpardonable sin, for which there is no forgiveness, either here or hereafter. The Communist or Atheist who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, by denying its existence—who denies that there is such a thing as Holiness or Divine Justice—cannot demand the enforcement and protection of any right derived from the Deity whose existence he denies.

THE GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS WHICH AMERICAN GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES TO SAFEGUARD

Americanism is based on a belief in God, and on an assertion that each human being has been directly and equally endowed with certain unalienable and individual rights, which American Government was established to secure. Every American citizen has an inherent right to deny the existence of a God, if he wishes to do so, because God gave him this right. Each citizen can think and believe what he will. For his thoughts and beliefs he is accountable to the Deity, and not to human government. American Government does not attempt to control or punish free thought or belief.

But, when the citizen attempts to carry his thoughts and belief into action, then the government has the authority and the duty to so regulate the exercise of individual right that it will not defeat or impair the similar and equal rights of others, and will not interfere with or defeat the administration by government of the authority entrusted to it to be exercised to maintain the safety, health, morals, and welfare of the community.

If and when the individual citizen, in the exercise of his attributes of free will and free choice, commits any overt act that defeats or impairs the equal rights of others, or interferes with the administration by government of its entrusted authority, he must be restrained. In that case, he cannot invoke the protection of the government in his unlawful efforts to defeat the ends for which that government was established.

When the citizen exercises his rights of thought and belief in an effort to induce others to deny the existence of a God, and thereby to deny the existence of the God-given rights of freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press; then he cannot claim that he is taking this action by virtue of his rights of freedom of religion, of speech, or of the press; for he is denying that any such rights exist.

It is then not only the right of government, but its duty, to restrain such action by the citizen, for the purpose of maintaining the government itself, and for the purpose of safeguarding the rights of its other citizens.

The government must admit that the individual has been endowed by the Creator with the rights of free will and free choice; but at the same time, the government should restrain any exercise of these rights which will defeat or impair the structure of ordered liberty under which these rights are secured to all citizens alike. It should punish any such exercise of these rights, and should deny to the offender the power so to exercise these rights to the detriment of others and in the effort to destroy the government which guarantees the preservation of these rights.

The Communist or Atheist who so seeks to misuse his inherent rights and to exercise them so as to destroy our entire structure of individual and political liberty, places himself outside of the pale of governmental protection; and those who assist him in such an effort cannot claim that they are entitled to take such action because they are divinely endowed with the rights of freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press.

The Communists and atheists openly proclaim that they have no religious belief, that they are opposed to all religion, and seek to destroy it. They have no religion to be protected by maintaining the principle of religious freedom. They deny the existence of a God, and certainly there can be no religious beliefs where there is no God to be worshiped and honored. Government can no more be expected to safeguard the Communist and the atheist in their attempts to overthrow the Government which was established to safeguard his God-given rights, than could God Himself have been expected to safeguard and aid Satan in his revolt against Him, and in Satan's attempt to seize control of Heaven.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT DOES NOT GUARANTEE THE FREE EXERCISE OF EITHER COMMUNISM OR ATHEISM

The Constitution of the United States forbids the Congress to pass any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion; but it does not forbid it to pass laws prohibiting the free exercise of atheism; or prohibiting the public denial of all religion, or the public denial of the existence of a God. No government can be expected to safeguard the exercise of any right by any of its citizens, when that exercise of the asserted right is directed toward the undermining and ultimate destruction of the government which is expected to provide the safeguards.

Congress should pass laws prohibiting the free exercise of communism and atheism; because both are being exercised in an effort to wipe out and destroy all the inherent rights of American citizens, including the rights of freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press—to destroy the American structure of human liberty, and to make government the master of the people.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wapakoneta (Ohio) Daily News of March 17, 1949:

LITTLE DIFFERENCE

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of the faculty of medicine at Columbia University, recently said that there is little difference between a doctor under socialism and a doctor under fascism. All socialized medical

plans, he added, lead toward mediocrity and ultimate destruction of medical education and practice.

There are wide theoretical cleavages between fascism, communism, and socialism. But, in practice, the end result is the same. The individual is subjected to rigid regimentation and dictatorship. Every calling is bound with bureaucratic red tape. A rule book takes the place of expert judgment.

This is true of medicine as of everything else. Objective reports and experiments with government medicine in England and elsewhere show little variance in the pattern. Doctors are required to treat an impossibly large number of patients, and an inferior system of assembly-line medicine results. An excessive amount of the doctor's time is taken up with filling out reports and satisfying the bureaucratic bosses. There is little money or leisure for research and experiment.

It has been said that under this sort of system the masses of people become second-class patients—patients who get second-rate attention, because of the impossibility of the job confronting the doctor. That accurately sums up the case against socialized or government-dominated medicine.

REA Housing Bill Endorsed by the Cooperative League's Director of Washington Office — Differences Between Pending Housing Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Carson, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League, in the following letter, has endorsed H. R. 2811, the REA housing bill which I introduced some time ago:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1949.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: When it seems that most of the pressures in our country tend toward the concentration of economic forces, and to the creation of the proletariat, it is encouraging and inspiring to hear your cry for home ownership as voiced in your REA housing bill, H. R. 2811. It is entirely true, I believe, that the greatest protection for our freedoms and our democratic way of life is to be found in ownership, widely distributed among our people, and particularly in home ownership.

You may know that a few of us began some 8 or 10 or 12 years ago to talk about cooperative-mutual housing. You may know that some cooperative-mutual projects were built during the early pre-war days and that the record made in those projects constitutes a challenge to everyone interested in housing developments. Your REA housing bill offers us an opportunity now to extend those programs.

I am writing, personally, and not in my capacity as director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. Until a matter is presented to our board of directors and it is approved, we have no authority to do anything which would imply that it was the league acting. I can only tell you, therefore, what I think about your REA housing bill and what I shall report to our millions of families throughout the country who are the member-owners of the league. There are some amendments which, I am sure, we would want to present and which I suspect you would be happy to have presented, for discussion, at least. But I cannot think of any reason why anyone who was sincerely interested in cooperative housing would not be enthusiastic about your bill, particularly if they had had any experience in the field of cooperative housing.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON,
Director, Washington Office.

I am also inserting the following statement prepared by Ivan Carson, former national rent director, concerning the differences in the different housing bills pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House:

ANALYSIS OF BILLS PROVIDING FEDERAL AID TO MUTUAL OWNERSHIP AND COOPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS

There have been introduced by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and the House a number of bills which would extend Federal aid to mutual ownership and cooperative housing projects. From the number of such bills there appears to be a general and bipartisan recognition of the fact that the development of nonprofit housing cooperatives should receive Federal assistance as an effective means for helping correct certain maladjustments in the present housing situation and for producing housing in volume at lower costs.

H. R. 1938 introduced by Congressman SPENCE and S. 712 introduced by Senator MAYBANK, chairmen of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, respectively, contain provisions relating to mutual ownership and cooperative housing projects in addition to suggested amendments to legislation governing the insurance of mortgages by FHA. These bills (H. R. 1938 and S. 712) are Administration measures and represent the thinking of officials of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Consideration of S. 712 was included in the hearings recently completed by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on general housing legislation. However, the report of the committee (Senate Rept. No. 84, 81st Con.) does not discuss S. 712. In other words, the action of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to date has been confined to reporting out favorably S. 138 with amendments as S. 1070, which was introduced by Senator ELLENDER for himself and a group of 21 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, on February 25. In addition to a declaration of national housing policy, S. 1070 contains titles concerning slum clearance, low-rent public housing, housing research, and farm housing. Apparently, it is the committee's plan to consider separately suggested amendments to FHA legislation and cooperative housing.

The significant differences between various bills introduced as they relate to mutual ownership and cooperative housing projects may be grouped under the following: Methods of administration, the extent and the manner in which Federal aid should be extended in the financing of housing cooperatives, the methods of extending veterans' preference and the limitations placed on the organization of cooperative housing associations within fixed-income groups in order to qualify for Federal aid.

METHOD OF ADMINISTRATION

Three proposals are made for the administration of Federal activities in this field: (1) By a separate constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. R. 2811 introduced by Mr. PATMAN, H. R. 1973 by Mr. JAVITS, 1833 by Mrs. BOLTON, 1944 by Mr. TOLLEFSON, and 1974 by Mr. LODGE); (2) by the Director of a new division, the Housing Loan Administration, to be established in the office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Director to be appointed by the Administrator (H. R. 2738 introduced by Mr. BUCHANAN and H. R. 2516 by Mrs. DOUGLAS); and (3) by the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration (H. R. 1938 and S. 712).

The proposal to set up the Cooperative Housing Administration, a constituent unit, on a par with other units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as provided in the Patman bill, is accounted for by the much broader conception of the job to be performed by the Federal Government which this bill envisions. If developed to their maximum, housing cooperatives can contribute substantially toward overcoming today's critical housing shortage. Through this medium, lower-priced housing in volume can be produced, and many thousands of American families who can't buy homes of their own today will be able to become home owners. The accomplishment of these worth-while objectives will be a full-time job for a Government agency. The potentialities of the program for good are far too great to trust the responsibility for carrying it out to an adjunct of another operation which has many other duties and functions to perform.

REA's success demonstrates that a program of this nature and as broad in scope requires that it be administered by a separate unit set up to do that job alone and charged with the sole responsibility of seeing to it that the program's objectives are accomplished. To make the administration of the cooperative housing program a part-time job of FHA would be unfair to FHA and to cooperative housing.

EXTENT AND METHOD OF FEDERAL FINANCING AID

One group of bills of which H. R. 1973, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, is typical, would authorize direct loans by the Federal Government as the sole method for extending Government aid in the financing of housing cooperatives. FHA mortgage insurance would not be utilized for this purpose. The bills in the other group (H. R. 2811, 1938, and S. 712), on the other hand, contemplate that financing aid will be extended by the Government primarily through the insurance of mortgages by FHA.

It is true that the bills in the latter group would authorize direct loans by the Government to cooperatives. The significant difference lies in the emphasis placed on Government lending. H. R. 1938 and S. 712 provide that direct loans may be made by the Federal National Mortgage Association, and, while not expressly stated, the intent appears to be that direct loans by the Government would not be the chief means of financing. The Patman bill makes this intent clear by stating that direct loans will not be made except where an association presents evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that private financing is not available. In other words, loans would be made by the Federal Government only if necessary to enable the program to get under way or to keep it from bogging down.

The bills which provide for the financing of cooperatives by the Federal Government provide that interest on such loans shall be "at a rate not less than the going Federal rate of interest at the time the loan is made plus one-half of 1 percent." In addition to this low rate of interest a number of bills in this group, including H. R. 1973, 1938, 1944, and 1974, would authorize Government loans up to "the development or acquisition cost"—100-percent loans. H. R. 2738 and 2516 would fix a ceiling of 95 percent. All these bills would permit the period of the loan to be as long as 60 years. In short, the bills in this group would put the Federal

Government squarely in the mortgage-lending business directly in competition with our insurance companies, banks, and building and loan associations.

While H. R. 1938 and S. 712 do not specify terms, period, or interest rate of direct Government loans made to housing cooperatives, the assumption appears to be warranted that the intent is that such loans would be made on the same terms, at the same interest rate, and for the same period as private loans insured by FHA.

There is no question about where the Patman bill stands on the issue of Government mortgage lending against private mortgage lending. The bill states specifically that the Commissioner is authorized to make loans on mortgages "determined by him to be eligible for insurance." Therefore, in addition to stating that direct loans may be made by the Government only as a last-resort measure, the Patman bill provides that the interest rate, 4 percent, terms, and period shall be the same as private loans insured by FHA.

The objective of the Patman bill is to encourage the investment of private funds in mortgages secured by homes built and owned by nonprofit mutual ownership housing cooperatives and thus produce housing at lower costs and within the reach of the pocketbooks of the great mass of our people. This can be accomplished with the assistance provided in the Patman bill and it is not necessary for the Federal Government to invade the private mortgage lending business.

Development loans: H. R. 1973 (JAVITS) and its counterparts in the House do not grant specific authority to the Commissioner to make preliminary advances in the form of loans to cooperatives. This authority may be read into the language of section 503 (b), "Such loans ('for the purpose of assisting the development or acquisition of housing projects') shall not exceed the development or acquisition cost of such projects." This however is open to doubt. H. R. 2738 (BUCHANAN) and H. R. 2516 (Mrs. DOUGLAS) grant the Commissioner authority to make advances in the form of loans for development purposes; however, no such loan may exceed 1 percent of the estimated development cost. This is too restrictive. The maximum should be 5 percent, which is the customary amount expended for necessary work in the early stages of building projects. The Patman bill would grant authority to make loans for development purposes and preliminary expenses up to 5 percent of the estimated cost of the project when completed. Such loans would be consolidated in the mortgage.

In every building project there are preliminary steps which must be financed, such as securing architectural plans, legal expense, and land acquisition. It should not be necessary in all cases to make advances for these purposes; however there will be cases where some financial assistance in the early period will mean the difference between success and failure. This whole effort is directed toward helping the average American family obtain a home and the Government should stand ready to give every reasonable aid to groups which are serious in their desire to have homes of their own by forming housing cooperatives and which offer substantial promise of carrying their plans to a successful conclusion, but do not have the ready cash to finance the project in its early stages and before mortgage loan funds or commitments can be obtained. Obviously, serious and unnecessary limitations will be placed on the extent to which the program will be able to help thousands of American families become home owners and help solve our critical housing problem unless authority is granted to make development loans and in amounts large enough to accomplish the intended purpose.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

The Javits bill, H. R. 1973, and its counterparts, and H. R. 2738 and 2516 would extend preference to veterans of World War II only if veterans and their families apply to rent units in a housing cooperative. The bill does not state the extent of the aid to be extended to would-be veteran tenants except that "such corporation in selecting tenants shall give preference, as among applicants eligible for occupancy of the dwelling and at the rent involved to families of veterans and servicemen." No preference is provided for veterans who want to become home owners.

Under the provisions of H. R. 1938 and S. 712 veterans would be granted preference only if 80 percent of the membership of a cooperative consists of veterans of World War II. Under these circumstances 100 percent of the loan would be insured.

The Patman bill, on the other hand, recognizes our debt to the veteran in a much more democratic way. Under this bill one veteran, or a dozen or a hundred veterans, could be granted preference. In other words, preference is granted to veterans as individuals irrespective of the number of veterans who are members of a cooperative. Not only is this plan more flexible but under it we can be certain that the benefits of preference would be extended to a larger number of veterans.

In addition to giving veterans preference in the renting of units, the Patman bill would increase the percentage of loans on units which veterans purchase by 10 percent. In other words, if the value of the unit purchased by a veteran is $8,000 or under the loan percent would be 100 percent; if the percent of loan on a unit sold to a nonveteran is 85 percent—the percent on the value of the veteran's unit would be 95 percent and so on in accordance with the graduated loan percent proposed in the Patman bill.

There does not appear to be any particular virtue or any benefit to be derived from requiring veterans to join together on a fixed percentage basis before they can obtain preference. The veteran earned his right to preference as an individual, and he should be able to exercise it as an individual. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that cooperatives representing greater diversification will have greater promise of success. The Patman bill for these reasons does not set up any limitations on the utilization by veterans of the preference granted. A cooperative made up of any number of veterans up to 100 percent, if otherwise qualified, would be able to obtain the benefits of the bill and the individual veteran stockholders would be given preference. Thus, if a cooperative is formed and only one member is a veteran, he would be given preference and would not have to seek out a cooperative made up of 80 percent of veterans.

Aside from the above reasons why the treatment of veterans' preference in the Patman bill is better for the veteran and for the cooperative, the requirement that the number of veterans must be a fixed percentage of the whole is certain to raise many difficulties. Suppose, for example, the proposed cooperative has only 70 percent veterans, or 79 percent. Further, this requirement is certain to encourage evasion by making it possible to use veterans as dummies in order to qualify for 100-percent loans. Such problems will not arise if preference is extended to the individual veteran who becomes a stockholder and the occupant of a particular housing unit.

REQUIREMENTS AS TO INCOME GROUPS

Those bills under which cooperative housing projects would be financed altogether by the Federal Government would limit the scope of the program to lower-income families. Apparently this is done to justify the subsidy granted in the form of Government loans at the going Federal rate of interest. An attempt is made to define "lower income families" in the following language: "This title contemplates that the housing produced with this liberalized credit shall limit admissions to families whose incomes are below the level where they can afford to obtain housing currently made available under the FHA mortgage system or other existing aids to housing undertaken by private enterprise." The Commissioner would be required to review and approve the income limits for the acceptance of families fixed by cooperatives and each contract for a loan must provide that "the families accepted for occupancy of such housing shall be limited to those whose net income at the time of acceptance does not exceed five times the annual rental or housing cost (including the value or cost to them of water, electricity, gas, other heating and cooking fuels and other utilities) of the dwelling to be occupied by such families, except that in the case of families with two or more minor dependents, such ratio shall not exceed 6 to 1."

No attempt to create classes of people either by segregating families into income or veteran groups is made by the Patman bill. The principle on which the Patman bill rests is that American families who want to have homes of their own should be permitted to join together in a nonprofit organization regardless of how much or how little they make and obtain the same aid which the Federal Government extends to speculative builders. Moreover, families who wish to reduce their housing costs and devote their savings to other purposes, such as to insurance or to the education of their children, should be permitted to do so by joining together in a housing cooperative with other families of a like mind. Furthermore, this plan affords greater diversification of risk and for that reason is sounder economically.

Through the Patman bill we can develop a home ownership housing plan on a firm and solid basis. Under its provisions cooperative housing associations can be formed which will demonstrate that they can handle the financial problem so it will not be a burden to the Government. Not only is the plan proposed by the Patman bill based on sound financial principles but it recognizes that any attempt to segregate people into classes is repugnant to our American way of life.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this House, for the past 43 years, I have voted consistently for all pension bills. The only time that I ever voted to pass a bill over President Roosevelt's veto was on the adjusted compensation or so-called bonus bill. A fair, equitable and just bill is what I strive for and expect to support, and I endeavor to see that such a bill receives favorable consideration on the other side of the Capitol as well as by the President.

However, when former Republican leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated on the floor, and I quote:

There has been a lot of talk and confusion here today. I have seen things called confusion hithertofore in the House of Representatives. This time, however, I think it

ought to be in the RECORD that much of this alleged confusion is the result of nothing more nor less than the attempt by opponents of this legislation on the Democratic side to sabotage its accomplishments.

I started to realize that his interest in this pension bill is far from a genuine interest, for in his shrewd way he attempted to show that the Democrats are not in favor of a decent pension bill. I am satisfied that this statement, together with the general action of the Republicans on this bill, indicates that the sole purpose behind their support of this bill is an attempt to undermine the efforts of the administration and the Democrats to pass a broader social-security law which would extend the scope of the present law to include some 20,000,000 now exempted people.

I feel that under the social-security bill now under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, as I have been informed, the veteran will receive special consideration in order to properly recognize the services and sacrifices which they have rendered to our country. In this connection, I wish to embody extracts from a communication which I received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., which I am satisfied, contains also the views of the President who has the interests of the veterans at heart always, and who feels that the pension bill, as originally reported, would not be for the best interests of the ex-servicemen or the country:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. SABATH: This will acknowledge your request for the views of this office on H. R. 2681, the veterans' pension bill. * * *

An appropriate focus for an appraisal of H. R. 2681 was given in the President's recent budget message to the Congress. His statement read in part as follows:

"The program of veterans' services and benefits should reflect the fundamental fact that our primary long-run obligation is to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes and to veterans disabled in the service. In the fulfillment of these obligations we have two basic purposes. The first is to alleviate financial hardship to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes. The second is to help veterans surmount the physical and economic handicaps of their service disabilities. At the same time, we should preserve and stress our basic objective of assisting the recipients of these benefits to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of our society.

"The necessity for new or extended benefits for veterans without service disabilities should be judged, not solely from the standpoint of services in our armed forces, but in the light of existing social-welfare programs available to all, veterans and nonveterans alike. In recent years social-security protection, including unemployment and old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance, has been made available to a large percentage of our general population. Prior to World War I the lack of such general benefits was, of course, one of the main reasons for the enactment of special benefits to veterans. At the present time we seek to broaden and extend these social-security programs and to enact a comprehensive national health and disability insurance program for all our people, including veterans, who with their immediate families will soon constitute 40 percent of the population."

Our present programs to which the President has here referred include compensation for service disabilities and pensions and hospital care for veterans who are in need of special consideration, although their disabilities were not incurred in service. These programs will cost approximately $3,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year, and we expect their cost to exceed or equal this figure each year for the balance of the century. * * *

To provide these new pensions will commit the Federal Government to billions of dollars of expenditures until the end of this century and well into the next. The cost of H. R. 2681 has been reported to be only $62,000,000 for the first year after enactment, but this is an incomplete estimate. It omits the increased cost of survivors benefits. Moreover, the first year would only begin a steeply rising curve. Ten years from now, expenditures due to the bill would reach $1,200,000,000 or more annually as more of the veterans of World War I reach age 65. Expenditures would continue to increase and would reach an annual rate of at least $5,500,000,000 by 1990 when the veterans of World War II reach age 65 in large numbers. * * *

You are no doubt familiar with the main features of the expanded social-security program. It would provide nearly everyone with old-age benefits and insurance against temporary and permanent disability. These proposals include an extensive system of benefits for survivors of insured persons. Since this is an insurance system, benefits would be based, in large part, on contributions by those insured and would be related to the length of time during which contributions had been paid in. In general, the upper limit of benefits would be set in relation to the 5 years of highest earnings by the beneficiary.

Most veterans will have been employed for sufficiently long periods to entitle them to full coverage and to benefits which would compare very favorably with the pensions proposed in H. R. 2681. * * *

Under all of these circumstances, enactment of H. R. 2681 could not be regarded as in accord with the President's program. The President's perspective on this problem, as presented in his budget message, seems to me to furnish the key to the appropriate course for this Government to follow.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

It must be admitted that the President is continuing to demand, as he has in the past, beneficial legislation to aid the ex-servicemen in every conceivable way; namely: housing, hospitalization, GI bill of rights, and so forth.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are not in complete accord with this bill. They favor amendments to the bill to gear the pension program to age and incapacity based on needs. At this point I wish to insert a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which fully states the views of this organization on the pension bill:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1949.

To All Members of the House of Representatives:

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: On Tuesday, March 22, according to announced plans, the chairman of the House Committe on Veterans' Affairs, under a privileged rule, will bring up for consideration a bill identified as H. R. 2681, commonly referred to as the Rankin pension bill. The bill, under the rule, will be subject to amendments. The real issue before the House will be whether the traditional policy of a modest pension for aged and incapacitated war veterans shall be continued or whether that traditional policy shall be abandoned in favor of uncertain benefits under social security.

The undersigned, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, respectfully urges you to support the traditional policy of a modest pension for aged and incapacitated war veterans rather than leaving them in an uncertain position under social security. If you don't like the Rankin pension bill, please remember that it can be amended.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is not in complete accord with H. R. 2681 in its present form. We strongly advocate a continuation of our Nation's traditional pension policy, but we have proposed certain amendments to the pension bill which we believe will reserve the benefits to those veterans who are desperately in need of assistance from their Government. The proposed amendments would gear the pension program to age and incapacity, based on needs. The cost, while initially more, would be considerably less over the years.

We are advised that Representatives WALTER B. HUBER, of Ohio, and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, in a bipartisan approach, will offer amendments to the pension bill which are in accord with VFW recommendations. In effect, these amendments would liberalize pensions now payable under existing laws to non-service-connected disabled war veterans and certain widows. Consequently, the bill would not be a radical departure from present pension laws. Your careful attention and favorable consideration of these amendments are invited.

Whether you agree with these amendments or not, may we count on you to support the traditional policy of special pension consideration for the aged and incapacitated defenders of our Nation?

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The American Veterans, composed solely of World War II veterans, are not at this time in favor of a pension.

The American Veterans Committee, composed of World War II veterans, is opposed to a pension, and I submit excerpts from various communications on this subject from Gilbert A. Harrison, national chairman of the American Veterans Committee:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1949.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I am informed that no person other than a Member of Congress is permitted to present testimony before the House Rules Committee on legislation before that committee. I therefore take this extraordinary means of laying before you the reasons why the American Veterans Committee trusts the committee will disapprove H. R. 2681, known as the Rankin bill. The provisions of that bill are of so dangerous a character that I would not feel I had performed my duty as chairman of a national organization of veterans of World War II did I not now send to you and to each member of your committee the attached brief explaining our opposition.

Copies of this brief are also being sent to the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and the House and Senate Press Galleries.

If professional veterans and their lobbyists suceed in persuading the honorable Members of the Eighty-first Congress to vote for so irresponsible a measure as H. R. 2681, the real interests of the great majority of ex-servicemen will have been betrayed. We

did not help defend our country for a pay-off of this kind which would weaken our entire economic structure and endanger legitimate expenditures which the Federal Government must today meet.

I hope, sir, that you will give thoughtful consideration to this brief and that when the votes are taken in the Rules Committee there will be found more than a bare majority who will vote for the veteran and for the national welfare by voting down H. R. 2681.

Sincerely,

GILBERT A. HARRISON,
National Chairman.

BRIEF TO MEMBERS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE RANKIN BILL, H. R. 2681, SUBMITTED BY GILBERT A. HARRISON, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE

It may be considered strange by some that the American Veterans' Committee, whose membership is limited to the veterans of World War II and whose efforts are devoted to furthering the veterans' welfare, should submit this brief in opposition to the old-age pension provisions of H. R. 2681. We do so after much reflection on the unfortunate effect this measure would have on the entire veteran population.

In summing up our testimony against this bill before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee recently we said, "The average ex-serviceman is not a professional veteran. He is a citizen, interested in assuring that his Government gives consideration to the problems of all citizens who need the protection of government in illness, in old age, in the absence of employment. His reward is a prosperous, free America and a stable world."

We want to underscore these words as a preliminary to this brief. Those who put pension or bonus price tags on the patriotism of veterans dishonor these veterans.

The members of AVC in every State and Territory know, though the fact may be temporarily kept under wraps, that the piper will have to be paid, and that the billions this bill would cost will be extracted in large part in the coming years from the pockets of veterans and their families. They represent about 40,000,000 of the American people. Veterans today are no small class which can profit at the expense of the Nation. H. R. 2681 is as obsolete in its approach to veterans' security as a musket would have been at the Remagen bridgehead. Veterans' benefits in 1949 are not the same problem as they were after the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, or World War I.

The first year's outlay for the Rankin bill would be, in comparison with the total cost, insignificant. The expenses would mount year by year and would, according to our conservative estimates, not fall below $150,000,000,000. It must be remembered, further, that this staggering burden will not be carried, as in the case of social-security payments, by taxes through the years from employers and employees plus a modest contribution by Government. It will be paid for in full by all the people.

AVC does not belong to that jittery band which cries "danger" whenever someone proposes an increase in Federal expenditures. Even so, the costs of this measure are outrageous. Equally serious, however, is the fact that the expenditure involved could not only result in the sacrifice of other expenditures of supreme importance to the veteran. We refer to the priority demand for housing, a minimum wage which can assure younger veterans a reasonable standard of living, national defense, and economic and military aid to free nations abroad.

H. R. 2681 directs itself in part to the problem of old-age benefits. AVC does not disregard the importance of that problem and submits that the answer lies in broadening the present social-security system so that all citizens who have reached the age when they can no longer support themselves receive reasonable assistance from Government.

There have been references in the press to a "veteran vote." We have yet to discover one. AVC would not insult our representatives in the Congress by suggesting that the existence of any so-called block of votes would influence the judgment of Congressmen on any issue such as this which would so directly and disastrously affect the national welfare. But we would be surprised indeed if any legislator permitted his decision to be determined by a "vote" which we are certain is mythical.

We have endeavored in AVC to live up to our motto of "Citizens first, veterans second." We believe that motto reflects the attitude of most ex-servicemen. The average veteran is not standing around with his hat in his hand. He knows he has not been neglected. Over $6,000,000,000 a year is now going for Federal veterans' benefits. Nearly another $2,000,000,000 is being paid to veterans this year in bonuses by the States. We are willing to predict that in any national poll that might be taken of veterans, it would be found that at least 9 out of 10 would prefer to have Federal funds spent first of all on adequate medical care and pensions for those who were disabled by war and for the widows and orphans of servicemen.

Finally, we make this plea to the Rules Committee of the House to stop the Rankin bill because we are convinced that this bill is only the beginning. If any encouragement is given those who are trying to pressure this Congress for unjustified hand-outs for the entire veteran population, they will be back asking for more not long after, and for more after that. The time to say "No" is now.

* * * * *

I do not believe that any person who appeared before your committee is more honestly concerned than AVC over the needs of the aged in our population. We do not think, however, that the problem of security for those who have passed the age when they can support themselves should be confused with the problem of legitimate veteran benefits. We have consistently urged early congressional consideration of extended coverage by social security of all groups in the Nation. The passage of the Rankin bill, I think you will agree, could well jeopardize this necessary, broadened social-security program.

Respectfully,

GILBERT A. HARRISON.

The Disabled American Veterans are interested only in legislation beneficial to disabled veterans and have thus not taken a stand on the present pension bill.

Furthermore, of all the veteran organizations, the American Legion is the only one that is completely in favor of this pension bill. This organization represents about 15 percent of the total 20,000,000 veterans in this country, or approximately 3,250,000 veterans.

I am personally in favor of doing everything possible for the deserving ex-servicemen of America, but I do believe however, that we should restrict the benefits to those who are in actual need and deserving of the same. I voted to recommit this bill to committee with the hope that they will take into consideration the views of the majority of the veterans in order to be fair and just, and at the same time not minimize our aims in passing a broad and liberal social-security program. Of course, the interests represented by the Republicans do not favor broadening the social-security program because they will be called upon to contribute a higher percentage, the same as the employees in order to realize broader benefits. The Republicans would rather unload that burden upon the Government itself in order to satisfy their selfish interests.

Veterans' Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by George A. Mead, director of the New York Department of the American Legion, enclosing copy of a statement offered in opposition to the proposed cut-back in VA hospital construction.

The letter is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., March 22, 1949.

Hon. L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEMENTE: I am enclosing herewith, copy of testimony prepared by Joseph P. Piccirillo, deputy commissioner of public welfare for New York City and chairman of the department rehabilitation committee of the American Legion, and the undersigned on behalf of the members of the American Legion of New York State, in opposition to the cut-back program in VA hospital construction as proposed by the President in his budget.

This program is now being considered and hearings are being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare composed of Senators PEPPER, MORSE, and HUMPHREY. The hearing will terminate on Saturday, March 26, 1949. Mr. Piccirillo and the undersigned appeared before the subcommittee on Monday, March 21, and presented oral testimony in addition to the enclosed.

The officers and members of the American Legion of the State of New York, and especially those charged with the responsibility of seeing that our disabled veterans are properly cared for, will be very grateful to you if you will, after careful perusal of the enclosed testimony, join with us in opposing this cut-back. May I suggest that you file your opposition in writing with the committee secretary, Mr. Philip R. Rodgers, room F-42, Capitol Building, and advise me of your action.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE A. MEAD,
Director.

TESTIMONY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED CUT-BACK IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION NOW BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE

By order of the President of the United States, the Veterans' Administration is planning to cancel the construction of 24 new hospitals and to reduce the size of 14 others, a total of 16,000 beds. One of the 24 hospitals to be eliminated was to be located in New York City (Queens County), and a 1,000-bed hospital approved for Syracuse, N. Y., is ordered reduced to 500 beds.

At present we have in New York State, for a veteran population of 2,047,000, seven permanent Veterans' Administration hospitals; three for general medical and surgical cases with a bed capacity of 2,217; two for neuropsychiatric cases, with a capacity of 4,025, and two for tuberculosis cases with a capacity of 1,177 beds. In addition to this the Veterans' Administration has two temporary hospitals in operation with a bed capacity of 1,900, and the use of 145 beds in one State and one Federal hospital, total, 2,045. Total bed capacity of all—permanent and temporary—9,368, broken down as follows: General medical and surgical, 4,167; neuropsychiatric, 4,025; and tuberculosis, 1,177.

Under the construction plans approved prior to this cut-back, New York State was allocated seven new hospitals with a total bed capacity of 7,975. This figure combined with the total number of beds now in operation, minus the 2,045 temporary beds, would have given this State a total of 15,299 beds for its veteran population of 2,047,000, which is approximately 11 percent of the total veteran population of the Nation.

The revised plan proposed by the President which eliminates one hospital, reduces another and increases another by 250 beds, if carried out, will reduce the total number of beds in New York State to 14,049, or one bed per 146 veterans. In 1945 with a veteran population of 699,000, the Veterans' Administration had a total of 7,294 beds in operation, or one bed for each 96 veterans. As of January 31, 1949, there were 10,632 veterans hospitalized in New York State by authority of the Veterans' Administration, distributed as follows:

In Veterans' Administration hospitals	9,190
In Federal hospitals	452
In civilian hospitals	791

As of February 3, 1949, there were 3,224 eligible veterans awaiting hospitalization as follows: General medical and surgical, 1,108; neuropsychiatric, 1,644; and tuberculosis, 472. A very large proportion of these are service connected, especially the neuropsychiatrics. In addition to the total of 3,224 there are between 3,000 and 3,500 veterans presently hospitalized in State and county mental and tuberculosis hospitals, a charge on the local taxpayers. We feel that these veterans should be in a Veterans' Administration hospital because many of these cases could and should be classified as service connected.

The Government, after long and careful study by experts in 1940, agreed on a program of hospital construction that would have provided 100,000 beds by 1950 for some 4,000,000 veterans of World War I. That program was approved.

Today, upon the advice of some groups which we question as to their sincerity, the Government feels that 129,000 beds by 1960 will be sufficient for 18,800,000 veterans. We believe that the Government was right in 1940, and that it is wrong today, and that if the proposed program is carried out, the veterans of World War II will be deprived of their rights to adequate care. The fallacy of the Government's policy of cutting back the VA building program on the grounds that additional beds are not needed is shown by the critical civilian sick bed shortage which everyone appreciates, the Hoover Commission report notwithstanding. It is our considered opinion that the President was ill-advised and was given an erroneous impression as to the needs.

Those in favor of the cut-back present a distorted picture showing that the great majority of cases now in VA hospitals are nonservice-connected. According to VA standards in rating cases, this appears correct. But, we who are actively engaged in this work, know that a great many of these cases are of service origin but under present strict requirements, and lack of medical records cannot be proved. Further, the large majority of so-called non-service-connected cases in VA hospitals or awaiting hospitalization are either NP or TB cases, and that because of the length of hospitalization required, must, because of economic reasons, be cared for by the taxpayers, either through local, State, or Federal taxes. As veterans, who, were it not for the striot rating standards, and lack of medical records which in many cases make it impossible to service connect, we feel they should be taken care of by the Federal Government.

The American Legion is opposed to this cut-back and sees no justification for the $280,000,000 slash in the hospital building program of the VA. As representatives of the American Legion in New York State, we strongly urge that the proposed cut-back program in VA hospital construction now before the Congress be disapproved and that the original plans be carried out. Further, it is recommended by the American Legion, Department of New York, that in order to meet the requirements of the veterans of this State for hospital care, that the Veterans' Administration purchase the Halloran Hospital on Staten Island from the State of New York and continue it as a permanent hospital of the VA. It is now used as a temporary hospital by the VA with 1,500 beds available. The capacity of the hospital is 3,500 beds. It is also recommended that the 400-bed hospital located in Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, known as Manhattan Beach, be transferred from the Public Health Service to the Veterans Administration for use as a permanent hospital. It is now being used by the VA.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH P. PICCIRILLO,
Chairman, Rehabilitation Committee.
GEORGE A. MEAD,
Department Rehabilitation Director.

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Alonzo F. Dexter Post, No. 101, Department of Kansas, the American Legion, at Clay Center, Kans.:

Whereas the American Legion is a patriotic service organization believing in service to the sick, disabled, and other unfortunate comrades of World War I and World War II and their dependents; and

Whereas it is a matter of history that the United States has in many instances heretofore recognized the justice and equity of the care of its disabled and aged veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas there is at the present time organized opposition to such plans as are advocated by the Veterans' Societies of the United States for the care of aged ex-service persons, disabled ex-service persons, and their dependents; and

Whereas these rights and benefits have been earned by the veterans of the country through their unselfish service to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Alonzo F. Dexter Post, No. 101, Department of Kansas, the American Legion, That we call the following situation to the attention of our State headquarters, our national headquarters, our Representative in Congress, our Senators in Congress, and to such other persons and organizations as our executive committee may direct:

1. We believe that H. R. 2681 should receive favorable consideration and should pass the Congress. We could give a very long explanation of why such bill should be enacted, but we particularly refer to report No. 132, submitted by the Honorable JOHN RANKIN, as our argument in favor of this bill.

However, we desire to call to the attention of Congress that section 3, paragraph (c), should be further amended so that a dependent paying burial costs of a veteran would have the right to deduct such expenses of last illness and burial from income and that all life insurance received by a dependent account of the death of a veteran should be excluded and not considered as income, no matter from what source such life-insurance proceeds are received.

It is our opinion that the paragraph abovementioned does not even exclude Government life insurance nor NSL insurance from being counted as income, and that is a step backward instead of a step forward.

2. We are opposed to the idea that there should be one great Federal medical program or plan that takes in medical service and hospitalization for veterans along with the indigent and others.

3. We are opposed to any scheme or legislation that puts veterans—disabled or otherwise—as veterans, under social security for pension purposes and takes them out from under the Veterans' Administration's care and supervision and includes them with indigents and others who are nonveterans, for pension purposes and things of that sort. Of course, veterans, as workers entirely aside from the fact that they are veterans, should have all the rights of any other workers under the laws governing social security.

4. We note that it has been recommended that the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration be set up as a separate Government corporation. We are opposed to any such change. It is better that the faults that now exist in the present set-up of the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration be eliminated and that all Government agencies (insofar as it is possible) that have to do with the care, hospitalization, insurance, and other matters affecting veterans, their widows and dependents, be kept all in one Government organization. With all its faults, the present Veterans' Administration, as one agency through which veterans can do business with the Federal Government as veterans, is much better than having a set-up that would force veterans to deal with many different agencies. We realize that there are faults in the present Veterans' Administration—but let's correct those faults instead of making four or five different agencies for veterans to deal with separately.

5. We feel so strongly on the matter of income limitation as a bar to pensions for veterans, their widows and other dependents—that we desire again to emphasize that we feel that life insurance from any source should not be counted as income to a veteran, his widow or other dependents, when considering pensions that might otherwise be due.

We feel that if there must be an income limitation, it should be set at not less than $2,000 for a veteran or veteran's widow without dependents, and $3,500 if they have dependents—with life insurance from any source not being considered as income.

These resolutions were authorized, after discussion, at a regular meeting of Alonzo F. Dexter Post 101, Department of Kansas, (The American Legion, at Clay Center, Kans. (composed of 358 paid-up members), with only one dissenting vote.

ELMER ANDERSON,
Commander.
RALPH CHRISTENSEN,
Adjutant,

America Unafraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two newspaper editorials, one from the Morning Herald and the other from the Evening Standard, of Uniontown, Fayette County, Pa., as follows:

[From the Uniontown (Pa.) Morning Herald]

AMERICA UNAFRAID

The State Department's willingness to allow 22 delegates from Russia and other Communist-dominated countries to come here for a Leftist peace conference in New York has been promptly condemned by Republican Senators. Senator MUNDT says the least the State Department should do is insist that American citizens be allowed to attend a similar conference in Russia, and Senator FERGUSON says that we should treat them just like they treat us.

Russia, of course, has consistently turned down requests of American congressional committees and individual lawmakers, including Senator FERGUSON, to observe the Soviet way of life, and there, obviously, lies the whole point in the action taken by the State Department. In granting visas to 22 Sovietized visitors the State Department is proving that this country does not behave like the Russians, and that is a point well worth proving.

The 22 incoming visitors are speaking here as strict adherents of the Soviet party line. Surely the structure of this Republic is strong enough to withstand the effects of whatever they may say. In fact, most enlightened Americans take the attitude that there is little to fear in what any Communist has to say, as long as he stands up and identifies himself—or is identified—for what he really is.

The State Department has turned down Russia's request that its representatives to the conference be given diplomatic visas, which would give them freedom from customs inspection of their baggage and other special privileges, so there is little likelihood that the 22 visitors will be in position to do much except spout their usual propaganda line. And it can be safely assumed that the Government will see to it that all 22 of them adhere to security regulations.

As for the suggestions that the Russian delegates may change their minds about the United States after seeing it at first hand, there is very slim chance that anything of the sort will occur. The Russians will undoubtedly be hand-picked party members and will see this country only in the light of their preconceived notions, just as the visiting Russian newspapermen did a few years back. That is to be expected and should not deter this country from exhibiting its faith in free speech, even though it is bound to be a futile exhibit as far as the Russians are concerned.

[From the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard]

PICKETS FOR SHOSTAKOVICH

If there is any consistency in mass indignation, the people who picketed Walter Gieseking, the German pianist, should now be getting ready to picket Dmitri Shostakovich, the Soviet composer. For Shostakovich's sins seem as grave as those that caused Gieseking to cancel his first postwar American tour and return to Europe without having played a note.

The pickets charged Gieseking with supporting and toadying to the Nazis, and with giving private performances for Nazi officials. He was not charged with taking part in the concentration camp mass murders. But, as a pro-Nazi, he was charged by the pickets with condoning those murders. So their placards linked his name with the name of Ilse Koch.

Shostakovich's public statements and behavior put him down as pro-Communist. He probably has given private performances for Soviet officials.

We don't expect to read that the same people who picketed Gieseking turned out to boycott Shostakovich on his arrival in New York for the left-wing Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. But we shall not be surprised to learn that others took their place. For such action has been threatened since the Soviet musician's invitation to the conference was first announced.

If this were wartime, Shostakovich would get a welcome usually reserved for movie stars. No question about it. Shostakovich, excused from military duty, refused to seek safety during the siege of Leningrad, though he could have done so. He divided his time in the beleaguered city between composing and helping put out the fires set by Nazi incendiary bombs. When the symphony that he began during the siege was finished, there was high excitement in this country. The score was photographed on microfilm and, amid fanfares of publicity, flown to this country for performances attended by cheering audiences.

That was the same Shostakovich who is coming to America now. No doubt he believes all or most of the horrible things he has heard about us. Communism is the only government he has known since the age of 11, and this is his first journey beyond the iron curtain. So he may join in the denunciations of American policy which are expected to feature the leftists' conference.

If he does, why not give him a better illustration of free speech than picket lines? Let Dmitri Shostakovich and the other Soviet delegates look around and discover the falseness of the Kremlin's fables. Let them see that America knows the difference between talk and espionage, and that the country of free speech neither fears nor suppresses talk, even when it is untrue or insulting.

Let them take back an illuminating memory of a free and peace-loving country. Let them understand that our quarrel it not with the Russian people but definitely and firmly with their government's aggressive policies. Shostakovich can read a clearer message of freedom and fearlessness and strength in the American scene about him than he can in any pickets' slogans.

I Support the Traditional Policy of Special Pension Consideration for the Aged and Incapacitated Defenders of Our Great Nation, but H. R. 2681 Not Adequately Considered and Badly Managed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I sat through every minute of the proceedings and the debate these 2 days relating to H. R. 2681, commonly known as the Rankin bill, which purported to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II, based on non-service-connected disability and attained age and for other purposes. In connection with this proposed bill and the debate thereon, I desire to state as follows:

Having read the hearings before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs relating to pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, I have found no reference to this bill or the specific provisions thereof, as set forth in H. R. 2681 for passage by this House of Representatives. Granting that most of the hearings referred to or related to the subject matter of veterans' pensions, I, personally, regret very much and feel it a distinct loss and disadvantage to not have the expressed opinion of any of these distinguished witnesses on the exact language of any of the sections of this bill before us these 2 days. Why was it? Why could we not have the benefit of having the witnesses who testified before the distinguished Veterans' Committee of this House testify on the text or substance of the text of this bill as it is before us? It is one thing to testify on broad principles, and then it is quite another thing to be specific on specific proposals which involve billions of dollars as well as which involve the pension welfare of millions of veterans.

So that I find myself with what I conceive as a very inadequate supply of essential material facts and information which I felt I needed before I can intelligently vote for this pension bill. The fact that the Veterans' Committee itself does not deny that the text of this bill, H. R. 2681, had only about 15 minutes' consideration of the committee is, of itself, concrete evidence of a gross lack of time taken to consider this most important and lasting legislation. Without criticizing the Veterans' Committee of this House, yet, as a Member of the House, I feel the committee did not bring this bill to the floor of the House with sufficient facts and evidence and documents sufficient to enable me, as a Member of the House, to pass informed, intelligent judgment on the bill itself.

This is not good. It is never good to have that condition existing on the floor of the House, and a very large number of my colleagues on the floor expressed the same regret to me. Veterans' pensions is somewhat of a technical subject on which there is a vast volume of information and evidence. At least the substance of that information and evidence, resulting from experience in the past as well as anticipated future, should be concretely and clearly in our hands before we vote. It was not.

Having practiced the profession of law for many years in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., I feel that being a Member of Congress and sitting on a committee to discuss and debate important bills is similar to being a member of a jury in a civil case. And one of the simplest and yet universal rules to be answered as a juryman is that you must have no preconceived notions about the case and must at all times keep an open mind and hear the evidence adduced for or against. This, then, is the attitude of mind which I try to habitually carry with me to the floor of Congress as I listen to the debates

and as I make my decisions. But, in this case there was an almost utter lack of clearly gathered and assembled facts and evidence to help us make a decision.

The RECORD shows that on both sides of the aisle—both Republicans and Democrats—frankly stated they were much confused. It is no wonder, when a bill has so little analysis and consideration in the major committee of Congress bringing it to the floor. Take the statement of the distinguished gentleman, Mr. BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts, who, I believe, has five veterans in his immediate family, wherein he pleaded in the House to send back the bill to the Veterans' Committee for further study. He frankly stated he was confused, and other Members on the Republican side of the aisle agreed with the many Members on the Democratic side of the aisle that they were all confused. I was confused, too, for I found it practically impossible to get at the facts. That is true because the facts were not present in available form on the floor of the House.

For instance, the RECORD will show that, when one of our distinguished colleagues asked a member of the Veterans' Committee a specific question, the member of the Veterans' Committee made a definite answer thereto. Then the Member asking the question frankly told the Veterans' Committee member that he was wrong; that his answer was not founded on fact. This is not good. The member of the Veterans' Committee was evidently in error when the fact is that he should not have been in error when he was undertaking to give the House accurate information. This is one illustration of the sort of confusion and controversy that was ever present.

Then, again, when our distinguished colleague, Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, presented and argued for his amendment that a veteran disabled to the extent of 75 percent should get $75 a month, and the veteran 100 percent disabled should get $100 a month, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts specifically called attention to the obvious fact that the present law provided that any man arriving at the age of 65 and who is at least 10 percent disabled is entitled to $72 a month if he is unable to follow substantial employment for gain. Nor did any member of the Veterans' Committee disagree with Mr. BATES, Republican, from Massachusetts. It was frankly admitted that it was evident that the members of the Veterans' Committee either did not know what the present law was or overlooked giving the Members of the House the benefit of their knowledge as to what the present law provided. In either event, it caused additional confusion and uncertainty.

All around us was confusion, lack of information, and no opportunity to promptly get information. Under such unhealthy and unnecessary legislative conditions, it is suicide, so far as the best interests of the veterans are concerned, to rush or crowd through this ill-considered, ill-prepared proposed bill.

Several Members, especially on the Republican side of this great House, have made claim that the opponents of this bill are opposed to it because they want to spread out the program of social security. I desire to frankly state that I consider it a compliment to be in favor of the extension of social security. This does not mean I am opposed to veterans' pension legislation, for I am not. I am strongly in favor of it. I call attention to the fact that the platform of the Democratic Party, made at the Democratic Convention at Philadelphia, July 12–14, 1948, had the following provision in it:

> We favor the extension of the social-security program established under Democratic leadership, to provide additional protection against the hazards of old age, disability, disease, or death. We believe that this program should include increases in old-age and survivors' insurance benefits by at least 50 percent, and reduction of the eligibility age for women from 65 to 60 years; extension of old-age and survivors' and unemployment insurance to all workers not now covered; insurance against loss of earnings on account of illness or disability; improved public assistance for the needy.
>
> We favor the enactment of a national health program for expanded medical research, medical education, and hospitals and clinics.
>
> We will continue our efforts to aid the blind and other handicapped persons to become self-supporting.
>
> We will continue our efforts to expand maternal care, improve the health of the Nation's children, and reduce juvenile delinquency.
>
> We approve the purposes of the Mental Health Act and we favor such appropriations as may be necessary to make it effective.

And, if any of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are now claiming that Members on the Democratic side of the aisle are too social-minded when it comes to social security, I call attention to the fact that the Republic National Convention at Philadelphia, June 21–25, 1948, enacted a platform wherein it was provided:

> Consistent with the vigorous existence of our competitive economy, we urge extension of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program and increase of the benefits to a more realistic level; strengthening of Federal-State programs designed to provide more adequate hospital facilities, to improve methods of treatment for the mentally ill, to advance maternal and child health, and generally to foster a healthy America.

How, then, can Democrats in this legislative body be justly criticized by Republicans in this legislative body for emphasizing in legislation the national platform of the political party as a member of which they find themselves elected to this House?

Under our system of legislative procedures whereunder we rely upon major committees to study thoroughly and adequately legislation before it comes to the whole House for consideration, there is no other way provided whereby the full membership of this House can intelligently legislate. We simply must be favored with and furnished by the appropriate legislative committee reporting any major bill the fullest available facts and information. In the absence of being thus aided in our legislation, I feel sure we should return the bill to the Veterans' Committee with instructions to bring back to the House a bill supported by more than 15 minutes' consideration of the committee and with direct evidence relating to its provisions and with ample proof to support its recommendations.

Why should a Member of Congress be criticized for having an inquiring mind? I am not afraid of the facts, and I am sure my colleagues are not. Let us then have the facts appertaining to this important major legislation. The past history, the present needs, and the future history and needs of the veterans of our Nation demand that any present legislation enacted should be most thoroughly considered. Anything less than that will be a disservice to the veterans' cause.

Nor are the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through their national legislative service, complimentary of this bill, nor do they feel it is adequate. They recognize that amendments must be made. Yes, they even recommend a substitute or a compromise bill. To illustrate, on February 26, 1949, I received from the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D. C., a letter which stated, in part, as follows:

> The only advantage of the Rankin bill over the present law which grants nonservice connected pensions to World War I and II veterans is that the Rankin bill would pension a group of veterans who reach the age of 65 and who cannot now qualify for pensions because of good physical condition or substantial income. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has proposed a bill identified as H. R. 2512, by Mr. RANKIN, and H. R. 2379, by Mr. VAN ZANDT, which was a compromise between the most expensive bill which had been introduced, H. R. 1693, on which hearings were held, and the Rankin bill, H. R. 2681, which has been reported favorably.

This great, patriotic organization of veterans who have served our beloved Nation with distinction, as well as the members of all other patriotic units of veterans, one and all, are vitally concerned with this present proposal. But the debate to date clearly shows that there is no concert of agreement or opinion on the effect of many of the proposed amendments.

The bill, as already amended in one instance, would, in my judgment, entirely disrupt the theory of the proposals with which our distinguished colleague, Mr. VAN ZANDT, has concerned himself as being approved by the VFW. I would like to be able to have an opportunity to vote upon a bill of substance and content, approved by due consideration of this great organization along with others.

I have not been and am not now opposed to the fundamental principle of special consideration of pensions for the disabled and incapacitated and aged defenders of our beloved Nation, for I feel that the veterans of our wars are special citizens, for they have risked their lives for our safety and security. Thousands and thousands of them are crippled and maimed for life as a result of their defense of our security. There is no other comparable group in our Nation, for there is no other service in our Nation comparable to serving in its defense. In time of war that might mean death, so I would say it is almost on a par with actual giving of life, for it is the willingness to give life. Thank God not more

have been called upon to actually give life.

Within a few weeks after this bill is recommitted to the Veterans' Committee, I am satisfied the Veterans' Committee could come back to this floor with an adequately considered bill which will have the respect and thorough approval of the Members of this House. Let it be so. And I feel that the expressed interest of the distinguished Chairman of the Veterans Committee in the veterans' welfare, and the other members of the Veterans' Committee will call upon them to forthwith diligently and thoroughly study and settle their differences and compromise the same and bring back to the floor a bill which, if not accepted in its entirety, can be intelligently amended without the destructive confusion and contradiction which has been manifestly present throughout this debate.

The fact that almost 100 percent of the Members of this House who are veterans in their own right express opinion that this bill should go back to the Veterans' Committee for further study is, in itself, to me pretty clear evidence that this bill, as already amended, is not a bill which is in the interests of the veterans themselves. What better proof could we have of this being the case than that these colleague veterans of ours take this frank position and ask that it go back to the Veterans' Committee for further study and report back to the House.

Veterans' pensions are not dead if this bill goes back to the Veterans' Committee for revision and return. It is not true that all of us who vote to recommit to return to the committee this bill are opposed to veterans' pensions or want to kill the bill. I am for the principle of veterans' pensions on the principle which I have heretofore declared, and I am not for the bill being killed, and I believe most of my colleagues feel as I do.

In support of this bill, I have received two telegrams from posts of the American Legion in the Eighteenth District. But that is all the communications from any American Legion post. From several individual members of VFW, I have received written communication, of which the following portions will be illustrative of the total content, to wit:

Congressman DOYLE, my hope is that you will advocate an amendment to the Rankin bill which will include the idea of need as a basis of eligibility. * * * So many veterans take the position that because they spent more than 90 days in the armed services, that our country owes them a living. I am against any plan that gives a veteran a pension carte blanche without any showing of need; however, on the other hand, our hospitalized and disabled veterans are certainly entitled to an increase in the amounts they are now receiving, particularly those veterans that are totally disabled, and I take the position that our country does owe a living to veterans who are totally disabled or nearly so.

And then another:

I have talked to a number of people in many walks of life in the past few weeks in regard to the Rankin pension bill, and they are in accord, in the majority, that the Rankin bill must come to the floor and pass even if not in its present form. We members of veterans' groups are not entirely satisfied with the bill in its present form, but be assured that we, too, feel that if the bill is brought on the floor of Congress that amendments beneficial will be injected in the bill of the type that will be satisfactory to everyone.

I received no telegraph or written communication from any post of the VFW from the Eighteenth District, asking me to vote for the Rankin bill. But I did receive written communication from one of the most distinguished veterans of VFW from which above quotation was made.

But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate fact has been and is that this House, in its manifest confusion and contradiction, is not having an opportunity to vote upon any compromise or bipartisan approach to this important problem. On account of the uncertainties, contradictions, and confusion surrounding this legislation, we have not had an opportunity to vote upon any compromise bill which has already had the approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion and other veterans' groups. The bill now pending before us from RANKIN's committee has already been so badly mangled and damaged by amendments that, in the event of its passage, it could not help but be destructive of the best interests of the veterans themselves and of their families and dependents. I, therefore, ask that the bill go back to the Veterans' Committee and that, as promptly as possible, a bill come from that committee which has been adequately and fully considered; and that with such different bill there come to the floor of this House the fullest possible factual and evidentiary information and content so that we of this House may know what we are voting upon. Nothing less than this will be, in my judgment, determinative of supporting the traditional policy of special pension consideration for the aged and incapacitated defenders of our beloved Nation.

I take pleasure in including in my remarks a splendid letter, dated March 21, 1949, from Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which great and unselfish patriotic organization has been frequently mentioned during this debate:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1949.

To All Members of the House of Representatives:

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: On Tuesday, March 22, according to announced plans, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, under a privileged rule, will bring up for consideration a bill identified as H. R. 2681, commonly referred to as the Rankin pension bill. The bill, under the rule, will be subject to amendments. The real issue before the House will be whether the traditional policy of a modest pension for aged and incapacitated war veterans shall be continued or whether that traditional policy shall be abandoned in favor of uncertain benefits under social security.

The undersigned, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, respectfully urges you to support the traditional policy of a modest pension for aged and incapacitated war veterans rather than leaving them in an uncertain position under social security. If you don't like the Rankin pension bill please remember that it can be amended.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is not in complete accord with H. R. 2681 in its present form. We strongly advocate a continuation of our Nation's traditional pension policy, but we have proposed certain amendments to the pension bill which we believe will reserve the benefits to those veterans who are desperately in need of assistance from their Government. The proposed amendments would gear the pension program to age and incapacity, based on needs. The cost, while initially more, would be considerably less over the years.

We are advised that Representatives WALTER B. HUBER, of Ohio, and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, in a bipartisan approach, will offer amendments to the pension bill which are in accord with VFW recommendatons. In effect, these amendments would liberalize pensions now payable under existing laws to non-service-connected disabled war veterans and certain widows. Consequently, the bill would not be a radical departure from present pension laws. Your careful attention and favorable consideration of these amendments are invited.

Whether you agree with these amendments or not, may we count on you to support the traditional policy of special pension consideration for the aged and incapacitated defenders of our Nation?

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Not a Vote Against the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, no doubt there will be some who will ask me why I voted today to recommit the veterans' pension bill known as the Rankin bill. My reason for this vote today was the same as when I voted to recommit it on March 22. Twice this week I have voted to recommit this bill to the Veterans' Affairs Committee for the full and adequate consideration which such a bill needs and merits and which I think this bill has not had, in view of committee dissension on it.

While it is true that a bill once recommitted is sometimes not brought forth in an improved form, it is not necessarily ended by an affirmative vote to recommit. My vote on these two roll calls is not a vote against veterans' pensions, but it is a vote toward improvement of legislation favorable to veterans. It is entirely up to the committee if a recommitted bill is killed. The purpose of recommitting a bill is that more careful analysis of it may be made, and necessary and desirable amendments or changes made. Such amending or changing, involving as it does careful consideration of the significance of each change, cannot properly be made on the floor of the House, as we all know.

I have been distressed that the Rankin bill, H. R. 2681, was brought to the floor under such extraordinary circumstances,

and, according to comments we have heard here on the floor, without what some committee members and others have apparently felt were proper and adequate hearings and due consideration. However, I did not want this bill killed, as my vote of March 22, or roll call No. 41, plainly indicates. On roll call No. 41, a motion to strike out the enacting clause and thus kill the bill, I voted "no."

The bill has been before us 2 days since that other vote to recommit failed, and we have struggled to improve it. However, the bill was terribly confused and muddled at the close of the session yesterday, with contradictory amendments even having been adopted, and it seemed to me that we were not going to succeed in writing a good bill on the floor of the House. Hence, the only thing to do in order to save the bill was to recommit it with the hope that the committee can hold adequate hearings on this momentous measure and bring us a bill that we can support in full confidence that it is what is fair and just for the veterans and for the entire country.

University of Melbourne Confers Doctor of Laws Degree on Myron Melvin Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is always a source of great satisfaction to note the recognition of excellent services of American officials, especially those in foreign service. It was, therefore, particularly pleasing for me to note that a distinguished American and New Yorker who has been serving his country for a relatively short time as our Ambassador to Australia has been recognized by that country. The University of Melbourne recently conferred upon Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. It is my information that it is but the seventy-seventh honorary degree conferred by the university since 1851 and the first conferred upon an American citizen. Mr. Cowen will shortly assume his post as Ambassador to the Philippines where he will in the opinion of those who know him continue to render invaluable service to our country.

The citation of the honorary degree is as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

Mr. Chancelor, the highest distinction which it is in the power of this university to bestow upon those whom it desires to honor is the degree of doctor of laws conferred honoris causa for distinguished public service.

Both in his person and in his office Mr. Cowen amply fulfills the necessary requirements. He is distinguished as both diplomat and lawyer. During his all-too-brief stay in Australia he has by his particular personal efforts forwarded fulfillment of negotiations between the Australian and his own Governments which will shortly result in the bringing into operation of the provisions of the Fulbright Act as affecting Australia. This will be an important event both in the history of Australian universities and in the history of the relationship between our two countries. We think it very fitting that Mr. Cowen should be honored in this connection, though we wish he could have stayed here to help in working out the detail. We honor him also in his capacity of representative in Australia of the Nation to which we owe so great a debt of gratitude. What we did together in war we must continue to do in peace, for it is only by creating and preserving understanding between our two peoples that we can make our fullest contribution to the future of the Pacific area and, through that, of the world.

Mr. Chancelor, I present to you for admission to the degree of doctor of laws honoris causa, Myron Melvin Cowen.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Keith County News, Ogallala, Nebr., on March 17, 1949. Much has been said in favor of the reentry of the Federal Government into the business of constructing homes. Too little has been said about the extravagant costs of public housing and in defense of those who must bear the burden. The case for the taxpayer is well stated in the following editorial:

CAN'T AFFORD HALF AS MUCH

No matter how much they might want it, comparatively few families have ten or fifteen thousand dollars with which to build a new home. They won't even attempt to finance building at those figures, knowing they cannot or might not be able to make the payments. They are good citizens and by all standards have good incomes, but they just can't afford it.

These same families, under our fast-changing form of government, however, are being called upon by the force of law to help finance homes for other families. They pay income and excise taxes so the Federal Government will have enough money for public-housing projects. None of this money is returned to the taxpayers, and they get no personal benefit from it. They can't afford to build new homes for themselves, but must help build homes for others.

It is true, generally speaking, that we don't need homes costing from ten to fifteen thousand dollars. The average sales price of homes produced by private industry is about $8,000. That is still too much money for the vast majority.

But when the Government builds homes with taxpayers' money or credit, it's a different story. Even ten and fifteen thousand dollar homes are substandard in Federal planning.

Public-housing officials in the Federal Government currently are asking for the right to spend $17,000,000,000 to construct a million and fifty thousand public housing units in the next 3½ years.

The cost, a little figuring shows, is well in excess of $16,000 per housing unit and that does not include the cost of land, or the architectural and other fees.

And people who can't afford homes costing half as much are expected to help pay the bill.

The Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication:

MARCH 22, 1949.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The Greater Lawrence Joint Board, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, earnestly requests your support of H. R. 3190 which would improve the Fair Labor Standards Act. As you know, a major provision of this measure, would be the establishment of a national wage minimum of 75 cents an hour for those industries engaged in interstate commerce.

Our organization, representing 14,000 textile workers in the area, feels very strongly on the subject of H. R. 3190. We solicit your outright support of H. R. 3190 and look for you to oppose any weakening amendments that may be offered. We believe that passage of this measure could go far toward ending some of the problems which industry in the North, particularly the woolen and worsted industry, is facing.

Any veteran textile worker in this vicinity can recall the exodus of once-thriving industries from the banks of the Merrimack to the South where for one reason or another their prospects seemed brighter. Today, happily for this vicinity, there is not as great an inducement for industries to forsake these parts. A far greater degree of unionization in the South has narrowed to within a few cents what was formerly a wide differential in the wages paid on either side of the Mason and Dixon's line. We contend that the most imminent threat to the woolen and worsted industry in this vicinity does not come from foreign imports but from the competition of materials produced in the low-wage areas of our own great Nation. In many sections of the South a 40-cent minimum is still the prevailing wage for textile workers. These blights on the Nation's economic picture must be removed and raising the minimum to 75 cents an hour will go far toward this end.

Our contract with woolen and worsted plants hereabouts call for a minimum of $1.05 an hour. That standard, set through years of patient negotiations, must not be allowed to deteriorate because another section of the country refused to come face to face with the facts of economic life. That standard was evolved through the sincere application on both sides to the principles of collective bargaining. In areas where no such standards exist, there is a moral obligation for all of us to create them for the protection of our own people, for our industries and for the future economic betterment of the entire country.

The Fair Labor Standards Act now on the books was passed in 1938. By any present-day criteria it is as obsolete as an automobile of 1938 vintage. The present standard of 40 cents an hour, effective since 1940, is

totally unrealistic as a safeguard against unfair competition from low-wage areas. That minimum is likewise completely inadequate in the light of the unquestioned rise in living costs.

The Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, in the Greater Lawrence area can conceive no more concrete manner in which you can help preserve our present standards and elevate those of millions of others than by your complete support of H. R. 3190.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR W. BROWN,
Director, Greater Lawrence Area.

Labor Unions in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent tendency of certain labor-union officials to draw American labor unions into the international picture, there is printed herewith an article from the March 26, 1949, issue of Labor, the official publication of 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations:

LABOR GROUP TELLS WHAT LIFE IS LIKE IN RED PARADISE—NORWEGIANS FIND STRIKES ARE BANNED AND TRADE-UNIONS HAVE NO FREEDOM—WAGES SHOCKINGLY LOW—WIVES MUST WORK TO MAKE ENDS MEET, CLOTHES SHABBY, MEAT IS LUXURY

A graphic picture of what working and living conditions are like in Soviet Russia is contained in a document received this week by the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

It's a copy of a report which a delegation from the Norwegian Federation of Labor made after completing a tour of the Soviet Union. The Norwegians went there at the invitation of Russian trade-union leaders; they were wined and dined, but that didn't swerve them from presenting the facts as they saw them.

Labor recently carried a few high lights of the delegation's findings. These were made available by another Norwegian labor group, which visited this country to get a first-hand view of how workers fare under American democracy.

However, the full report of the delegation that went to Russia carries many more illuminating details.

SPEED-UP SYSTEM, NO STRIKES

For example, the report discloses that the trade-union movement of Russia is largely an appendage of the government and has none of the freedom which labor organizations enjoy in democratic lands.

A typical collective agreement between a union factory committee and works management, the report explains, prescribes the duties of the wage earner to perform as much or more than required under the plan of production; in other words, to turn out what the government agent demands.

The Russian unions cannot engage in wage disputes, the report stresses. That is, they can't strike for higher pay, since the entire wage basis is prepared by the economic planning of the government. Wages are all set on a piecework basis and this produces tremendous variations in earnings.

Having no power to strike, the trade-unions and their funds are concentrated to a considerable extent on social, sanitary, and cultural activities, the report reveals. Real collective bargaining is nonexistent.

HARSH LIVING STANDARDS

"It is clear the general average wage is only sufficient for purchasing the absolute necessities for the maintenance of life," the report adds.

"The ordinary family can hardly live on the wage earnings of the husband alone, and women are driven into occupational life to an extent unknown in Norway. They can be seen in large groups engaged in street and construction work, as heavy workers on building sites, as dock hands, and in the factories."

Rents are low but "the shortage of housing is frightful, and therefore the majority of the population can draw no great advantage from low rents."

FEW EAT MEAT

For food, most workers must subsist on bread, potatoes, and vegetables, since "the prices of meat, meat products, butter, cheese, fish, canned foods, etc., are so high compared to wages that only the very few can include such goods in their daily nutrition." Also, the workers are "badly clothed and their footwear, generally speaking, is poor."

Though Norwegian standards are austere, because of damage and disruption caused by the war, nonetheless the delegation concludes that "if the Norwegian living standards is put at 100, the Russian cannot be put at higher than about 60."

A final point stressed by the delegation is the presence of masses of soldiers and police. "In the large towns," the report declares, "they are to be seen everywhere and in large numbers, at public buildings, on squares and streets, in museums, at every subway station, at the railway stations and even at football matches."

Science and the Spirit of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a speech made by Mr. David Lilienthal, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, which was delivered recently at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.:

SCIENCE AND THE SPIRIT OF MAN

We meet today upon a campus famous the world over for the men Lehigh has trained, for the additions to knowledge Lehigh has made and has nourished. Wherever science and engineering are known and respected, Lehigh and her teachers and graduates are known and are respected.

Science and technology were once matters that concerned only those with special technical knowledge; today they are front-page news, affecting men's daily lives and daily decisions. Whether millions of human beings shall go hungry or be fed, shall suffer disease or enjoy good health, be condemned to drudgery or use machines to relieve their toil—more and more such human questions are determined by modern technology. Even more than this: technology and the machine have become central figures in the perilous struggle to safeguard the free spirit of man and to establish a peace that is a true peace.

This was made plain by the President in his inaugural address a fortnight or so ago, an address directed to the people of the whole world.

"We must," the President declared, "embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. * * * More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. * * * For the first time in history humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people." He continued, 'The United States is preeminent among the nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life." Such a program as this can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living. "Democracy alone," the President said, in a challenge to other systems of the left and right basically in conflict with our own, "can supply the vitalizing force to overcome the ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair."

Thus did the American people once more assert and strengthen their historic role of maintaining the offensive in the ceaseless contest for men's minds and loyalties, with the most potent weapon ever devised, a weapon that makes the atomic bomb seem a firecracker by comparison: an idea. That idea is this: that technology applied for human welfare can bring not only material well-being but can also nourish the free spirit of man.

The towering place of the machine, of science and the technical skills that create the machine, are among the dominant facts of the turbulent times in which we live. The President's new bold program, the activities in our atomic laboratories, the new advances in medicine, in the production of food by scientific methods, in the design of new scientific weapons of vast destructiveness—these and many other instances can be cited of the predominant position of science and engineering today. And from such facts the great issue of our lifetime emerges. It is an issue with which you and I and all the peoples of the world will be at grips, day in and day out, for the rest of our lives. It is this:

Are machines and science to be used to degrade man and destroy him, or are they to be used to augment the dignity and nobility of humankind? How can men use science and the machine to further the well-being of all men and the flowering of the human spirit?

From this issue no one who lives today can escape. It reaches into the lives of everyone of us, old and young, rich and poor, you who graduate today and you who are freshmen. It concerns the housewife, the librarian, the chemist; it must be faced by the clergyman, the professor, and the physician no less than by the businessman and public official. For this is the kind of world we live in—the world of the machine—and this is the struggle of our time.

Standing always at the elbow of each delegate at the United Nations Security Council meetings, always present at the conference tables of this troubled world is this same issue: how is technology to be used? Cross the seas and the shadow of this question has preceded you—to the valley of China's Yangtze River, to the rising factories of Bombay, to the oil fields of Iran, the tractor-powered wheat farms of the Ukraine. Geography and language differ, but the question and the struggle are everywhere in essence the same.

Men ask themselves: Is our advancing technology good? Is the evermore important machine good? Or are they evil?

To some people modern technology is plainly evil. To them the more gadgets the

more unpalatable is life. The more things we produce, the faster we can travel, the more complex the machines we invent the nearer—they assert—we move to the edge of a bottomless pit. They ask: "Is not scientific warfare the inevitable fruit of technology? Are not evermore devastating atomic bombs the ultimate proof that modern applied science is a curse, an unmitigated blight?" Even great figures are heard to say: "Let us cease learning more of the world, let scientists declare a moratorium in their ceaseless prying into Nature's secrets." They are homesick for that simpler life, before the days when man produced so much and knew so much. They want to flee. But where and how? They cannot say. They cry out against science and the machine and call them evil; but their voices are the voices of despair and defeat.

There are others of our contemporaries who have an almost opposite view of the machine. You will find them all over the world. What they say is exuberant and uncritical. "Of course technology is good," they say, "for it produces more and more things; and isn't production the answer to everything?" They are usually skeptical of God, but they openly worship the machine.

"Of course the machine is good," they say. "When assembly lines cut costs, when production curves are upward or when 5-year plans are fulfilled—those are the important things; let's not agonize over the effect of the machine on the freedom of men."

Technology, they seem to say, is good as an end in itself. If the spirit of man balks, if the yearning to be human increases cost of production or requires coercion—well, man must be redesigned to fit the assembly line, not the assembly line revised for man. The supertechnologists of the world are quite prepared to recreate man in the image of the machine.

I venture to say that neither of these views—of the defeatist or the technolator—will appeal to most Americans.

The machine and technology are neither good nor evil in themselves. They are good only when man uses them for good. They are evil only if he puts them to evil purposes.

The machine can, of course, be so used as to degrade and enslave man. It can be used to exhaust the land and with it the human dignity of those who live on the land; it can poison the air; foul the streams, devastate the forests, and thereby doom men and women and children to the spiritual degradation of great poverty. But it can also open wider—and it has so opened—the doors of human opportunity; it can nourish the spirit of men. Technology can be used to eliminate filth and congestion and disease; to strengthen the soil; to conserve the forests; to humanize man's environment.

The machine can be so used as to make men free as they have never been free before.

We have a choice—that it seems to me is the shining and hopeful fact. If we are wise enough, if we follow our democratic precepts, we can control and direct technology and the machine and make them serve for good.

I believe in the great potentialities for well-being of the machine and technology; and though they do hold a real threat of enslavement and frustration for the human spirit, I believe those dangers can be averted. I believe that through the methods of democracy the world of technology holds out the greatest opportunity in all history for the development of the individual, according to his own talents, aspirations, and willingness to shoulder the responsibilities of a freeman. I believe men can make themselves free. Men can direct technology so that it can carry mankind toward the fulfillment of the greatest promise for human life and the human spirit in all history.

But this result is by no means inevitable. It is equally possible that technology may yield a harvest of bitter fruit.

More huge cyclotrons and nuclear research reactors are not enough. More fine laboratories, more extensive projects in physical and social research are not enough. More use of technology, more factories, more gadgets, whether in this country or in the undeveloped reaches of Africa and Asia and South America is not enough. Those who encourage a contrary belief are playing a dangerous game or are quite blind to the realities.

I say to you that unless the applications of research and technology are consciously related to a central purpose of human welfare, unless technology is defined and directed by those who believe in people and in democratic and ethical ends and means, it could be that the more research money we spend the further we miss the mark. It is like driving in an automobile that is going in the wrong direction; the faster and faster you drive the farther away from your destination you will be.

The guiding of technical activity is safe, in terms of the human spirit, only when it is in the hands of those, in private business and in public agencies, who have faith in the individual human being. It is only safe when it is carried on by methods that are in furtherance of that faith, and methods that insure accountability to the people for the results.

This is not always the case with modern technology. There are times when these matters are controlled by men who lack a faith in people. People, to them, are only a market. They are a market to whom to sell new gadgets; a labor market with which to make the gadgets; a political market to be cajoled and organized and voted and coerced. Technical development under such direction will not further freedom or will do so only by accident, by sheer coincidence.

We know what amazing things applied research can do to increase the destructive powers of armies and navies and air forces—our own, or a potential enemy's. But we still must ask: What can technology do to nourish and strengthen the human spirit? What can technology do to safeguard and strengthen men's freedom?

That modern man can completely change his environment is a matter of common observation. Perhaps as widely known an illustration in other parts of the world is afforded by the development in the Tennessee Valley.

In a single decade the face of a region larger than England was substantially altered, a region comprising parts of seven Southern States. The great Tennessee River has been changed: more than a score of huge dams make it do what men tell it to do. The farming land is changed—millions of acres—and the forests and woodlands. New factories, large and small, barges on the new river channel, and yards building ships; fields once dead and hideous with gullies now fruitful and green to the sun, secure with pastures and meadows; electric pumps in farm yards; new local and regional libraries; State parks and county health facilities—these and many other changes make it a new valley today. The job of development is not done, of course—such a task never is—but it is well on the way. It is one more demonstration that modern technical tools and managerial skills can control nature and change the physical setting of our life in almost any way we choose—there is the point—in whatever way we as a people choose.

These changes in that valley—these physical changes—strike the eye. They are unmistakable evidence of what can be done. Equally impressive are the evidences of increased production of farm and factory, of rising individual income among people who have suffered under shockingly sparse incomes. But most important of all the changes is the change in the spirit of the valley's people. One of Alabama's younger leaders described it in these words: "We can write of great dams * * * of the building of home-grown industry and of electricity at last coming to the farms of thousands of farm people in the valley. Yet, the significant advances have been made in the thinking of a people. They are no longer afraid. They have caught the vision of their own powers. They can stand now and talk out in meeting." And they do.

The real significance to many observers of what has taken place in the valley of the Tennessee is this: This American experiment has fortified confidence that men need not be chained to the wheel of technology. If their purpose is firm and clear, and if they insist upon ways and means to make that purpose effective, man can use the machine in the interest of human welfare and the human spirit.

A great many men and women from foreign countries have come to study the TVA. They have come from more than 50 countries, and in particular from the technically undeveloped regions of the world, and from areas in which unsparing and unwise exploitation threatens their natural resources with utter exhaustion. These visitors have not only seen new life come to a dying soil; they have also seen how a new hope and faith return to people living on that soil, have seen men's pride and their human dignity strengthened as their soil was strengthened. They have not only seen the once wasted energies of a great river turned into electricity but they have also seen the way that electricity has put an end to degrading drudgery in tens of thousands of homes. They have seen businessmen, farmers, laborers—all kinds of men and women—joining together to apply the lessons of science and technology to the building of their region, and in the very act of joining together for that common purpose have seen many of them become better neighbors, kinder and more generous and more cooperative human beings.

These hundreds of foreign visitors see with particular clarity that the new Tennessee Valley speaks in a tongue that is universal among men, a language of things close to the everyday lives of people: Soil, forests, factories, minerals, rivers. No English interpreter is needed when a Chinese or a Hindu or a Peruvian sees these products of a working technology, sees a series of working dams, or a hillside pasture brought back to life by phosphate and lime and an understanding of soils. For it is not really Fontana Dam on a North Carolina stream or a farm in Kentucky that he sees, but a river, a valley, a farm in China or India or Peru.

Because it is an illustration with which I am familiar, I have pointed to the Tennessee Valley as one bit of American evidence that it can be done, that men can use science and technology in the interest of the human spirit. It does not make the demonstration less relevant that only a beginning has been made in that valley, that the people of the valley realize what a long, long way there is yet to travel. And it should surely not be necessary to utter the warning that no one should regard the TVA, or any other one effort in this direction as a single way out. The paths are many, and TVA is but one of the many moving toward the same goal.

We have a choice. We can choose deliberately and consciously whether the machine or man comes first. But that choice will not be exercised on a single occasion, surrounded by spectacle and drama. We will move from decision to decision, from issue to issue, and as I said to you at the outset, you and I and all of us will be in the midst of this struggle for the rest of our days.

We cannot master the machine in the interest of the human spirit unless we have a faith in people. This is the foundation of everything. The rock upon which all these efforts rest must be a deep and abiding faith in human beings, which is a faith in the supreme worth of life. The machine can only add to the dignity and integrity of human existence if it is deliberately used in furtherance of such faith in people. It is the purpose for which the machine is used, and particularly the methods pursued in carrying out that purpose that determine whether technology is likely to further human well-being or to threaten it.

Let me restate: We do have a choice. On the one hand, it is clear that science in the hands of those seeking arbitrary power over men can make us slaves—well-fed perhaps, but more pathetic for that fact. On the other hand, it is plain that men can use technology and the machine to further human freedom and the development of human personality.

How the machine shall be used will be determined by choices made by the people. But those choices are genuine choices only if the people make them with a knowledge of the facts, with a knowledge of the alternatives that are open to them. The means whereby the people make their decisions depends upon a sacred and inviolable process—the dissemination of knowledge.

One such recent choice was the decision of the American people, through their elected representatives, in favor of civilian as distinguished from military direction of the scientific and technical development of atomic energy. After months of hearings and extended public discussion, Congress decided that although atomic energy is of central importance to the national defense, it also holds such broad implications for our health, agriculture, industry, education—in short, our whole way of life—that it must be fitted into the democratic scheme of civilian self-government.

That was an important decision. But many other questions concerning atomic energy are before this country today, and many more will arise in the months and years ahead.

These questions concern every last one of us. They include such questions as these: What kind of Army, Navy, and Air Force do we now require, in the light of these new discoveries? What are safe and what are unsafe methods of international control of atomic energy to prevent its use as a surprise weapon? How extensively should the American people support medical research in this field, and similarly research in nutrition and in increasing the production of food by novel methods opened up by these new developments? What should be the place of private corporations in this brand-new technology, an industry that, unlike anything the world has ever seen before, was a giant at birth, and wholly Government-owned? How do the people see to it that our universities and research institutions shall remain free of Government or military control when it is necessary that such vast sums for research and development be provided to them by the Federal Treasury? How can the people see to it that narrow politics and pork barrel methods are kept strictly out of this huge scientific, industrial, and educational enterprise? How can we maintain essential secrecy without drying up the very well-springs of scientific and technical advance, which flourishes not in secrecy but in openness and free discussion?

The questions are manifold. The answers, the decisions, will affect directly the future well-being of the 145,000,000 stockholders in this atomic enterprise, that is the people of the United States. They will indeed affect every human being on the globe.

Those decisions to be genuine democratic decisions require facts in the hands of the people. Indeed facts and the dissemination of knowledge are the very foundation of self-government, are the very foundation of any effort to direct technology toward the production of the free spirit of man.

Because of its military aspects and the present unhappy international situation, it is not possible to make the whole atomic energy field subject to public scrutiny. But as we on the Commission have studied the matter, we have found that much of what is going on in this strange new enterprise can with safety be publicly reported and publicly discussed. One such report was issued last Monday. More reports, ranging from an atomic primer to an atomic weapons' effects handbook, are in preparation.

Wide dissemination of facts and broad public discussion in this field must continue and must increase. For unless the people have the essential facts about atomic energy they cannot act wisely nor can they act democratically.

It is well that we recall our basic tenet: That this democracy of ours is founded upon a faith in the judgment of the people as a whole. It is founded upon a belief that when the people are informed—honestly and clearly informed—their conscience and their common sense can be relied upon to carry us safely through any crisis. The direction of applied science and the machine by the judgment and conscience of the people as a whole requires that we be an informed people.

Faith in the people must have as its corollaries faith in the facts, faith in the power of knowledge, faith in the free flow of ideas, and hence faith in education and the processes of education. These are the very pillars of our free society.

Strategic Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following script of a radio broadcast delivered by Chester Huntley, CBS commentator, in Los Angeles on March 3, 1949:

STRATEGIC BOMBING

Good afternoon. This is Chet Huntley with an analysis of some of the day's news.

This may be the point where some beautiful friendships terminate, but with that calculated risk there's something in the news that almost cries out for analysis—for a backing off to look at the situation in its proper context. This reporter has some splendid friends in the Air Force, but there are some strong and impelling reasons why the Nation cannot go along with them, as yet, in their claims of what the Air Force can do.

Yesterday, the Air Force turned in a performance that captured the headlines of the Nation, the applause of a good share of Congress, and the imaginations of most of us. He would be a complete die-hard who would attempt to take anything away from the Air Force or the personnel who had anything to do with the planning or execution of that round-the-world, nonstop flight of the B–50 bomber. It was a great performance. It deserves the applause of the Nation.

However, it does not deserve the slightest tendency on the part of the people or the Congress to issue the Air Force a blank check or to accept the dangerous and fallacious idea that air power alone can give this Nation the military security it wants and which it deserves to have.

When the crew of the *Lucky Lady* climbed out of the plane yesterday morning, Secretary for Air Symington made a sober enough statement. He said this proves that our medium bombers (notice that the B–50 is now a medium bomber) has an international reach and striking power. But you may have wondered if the statement of Gen. Curtis Lemay, Chief of Strategic Air Forces, was either wise or of temperature becoming one with such responsibility. He said the flight proves that we can carry an atomic bomb to any place in the world that needs bombing.

There's a general talking about dropping the atomic bomb again. This question comes up: Just what reputable atomic scientist has told General Lemay that we can drop atomic bombs with such gay and reckless abandon without signing our own death warrants? Does anyone know, for certain, whether or not there's a saturation point for atomic bombs—a point beyond which the atmosphere of the planet becomes lethally charged with radioactive elements?

And then General Lemay made a great to-do about how this round-the-world flight had been kept secret—how the newsmen hadn't found out about it. Well, that's a small thing. But someone might remind the general that during the war newsmen were taken into the confidence of scores of generals, admirals, and Chiefs of Staff and that self-censorship worked with only one notable exception. That was when the Chicago Tribune broke a story that might have tipped off the Japanese that we had broken their secret code. And, furthermore, it's difficult to understand why the general should taunt the newsmen to that degree, because many of the newsmen are the stanchest and most useful allies the Air Force has.

It may be redundant to remind you that a deadly and extremely important contest is going on now between the Air Force and the Navy, in particular. The Army is more or less on the sidelines. There is a certain amount of blame to be laid at the doorstep of each for an unwillingness to compromise and for allowing a spirit of friendly rivalry to creep over into the atmosphere of downright enmity.

That's the chief reason General Eisenhower has been called back to active duty—to act as a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and attempt to resolve the dispute, which has to do mainly with strategic bombing.

I am here oversimplifying it, to be sure, but for the sake of brevity it goes like this:

The Air Force is demanding that it do all strategic bombing. Strategic bombing, you understand, is that kind which strikes at the enemy's hinterland, at his factories, transport, industries, and cities. The other kind of bombing is tactical bombing, which is employed against enemy troops and in support of our own land or sea forces.

Now the Air Force is saying, in effect, wipe out the Navy with the exception of destroyers for convoy duty, the submarines, and a few other vessels and we'll take care of everything else. The Air Force quite glibly says, in effect, we can deliver bombs anywhere the Navy can deliver them, we can do it cheaper and with better results because we have specialized in long-range strategic bombing.

Now the Navy does not say, in return, we want all the strategic bombing. But the Navy does say that the Air Force can't prove its claims about delivering bombs anywhere, better, and cheaper. The Navy questions the wisdom of putting all our eggs in one basket, lest in the stress and crucial test of battle that basket proves to have a false bottom.

For example, just before the war, the Army Air Force decided that the liquid-cooled in-line engine was the only thing. It decided

to virtually junk the radial, air-cooled engine. But the Navy stayed with the radial engine; spent much of its precious appropriations on research and development of the radial power plant. Well, it's interesting to note that the engines which drove the *Lucky Lady* around the world in a nonstop flight were radial, air-cooled engines. The Navy asks, where would the B–29's and B–50's be today if it hadn't been for the continued development of the radial engine.

I have before me an item from United Press. This is the lead: "American-based heavy and medium bombers could roam the globe at will in a war without much fear of fighter interception or antiaircraft guns. The leadership of the United States Air Force is positive on this point today, following the dramatic flight of the B–50 bomber, etc."

So like that, with a magic wave of the wand somewhere in Washington, all enemy intercepter strength, all enemy jet fighters are swept from the skies to graciously make way for our medium and heavy bombers. True, the jet intercepter may lose much of its efficiency at the 40,000-foot level, but will it continue to do so. And can the Air Force prove that its bombing efficiency is what it should be at 40,000 feet.

On January 23, Marshall Andrews, a reliable reporter, had a byline story in the Washington Post. Andrews says the Air Force has let it be known that it plans to use its funds to build up a strategic air force at the expense of other elements of air power, which it's specifically ordered to maintain. He says the Air Force is doubling the number of B–36 bomber groups while cutting back fighters, troop-carriers, medium bombers, reconnaissance and service units; and he adds that the Air Force has taken this decision arbitrarily and without regard for the needs of the other services or for national security as a whole. Andrews says this may well be a stubborn insistence on going ahead with its own private concepts of warfare and be damned to everyone else.

Apparently the Air Force strategy is to come to Congress at a later date and say, "Look, Mr. Congressman, we went ahead and spent all the money you gave us for B–36's and now we've got to have some fighter craft. So how about it?"

Andrews says that if the Air Force is arbitrarily junking tactical combat, reconnaissance, and transport aircraft then the Secretary of Defense should promptly hand those elements over to the Army and divorce them from the Air Force.

Now there's nothing in the book or the manual or anywhere else by which the need for tactical aircraft, troop carriers, and reconnaissance craft can be minimized. At the close of the war, when Army commanders finally had command over tactical or supporting aircraft, the combination of ground forces and tactical air was devastating. But the Air Force is calmly waving aside tactical air power to concentrate and win its point on strategic air power.

In this last war, it can by no means be proved that strategic bombing was the perfect choice. In lives, resources, and time strategic bombing was costly to the point where its achievements can be questioned. Under strategic bombing German arms production rose until in mid-1944 it was more than three times what it was in 1942. It wasn't until tactical bombing arrived on the Continent that German production began declining.

In the Pacific, troops went in over the beaches, supported by tactical Navy and marine airpower, to take islands from which the Air Force later operated with strategic bombing.

But the Air Force says it doesn't need these bases any more. That it can operate from the continental United States and strike any target in the world. Yet, in four places around the world the *Lucky Lady* had to be refueled. Again the question arises, can strategic air power defend and hold those bases from which tanker craft would operate and refuel the long-range bombers.

Again in the Pacific during the war, strategic bombing can take little credit for the defeat of Japan. Land-based aircraft contributed less than 1 percent to the destruction of the Japanese fleet; 19½ percent to the destruction of the Japanese merchant fleet.

As Andrews points out in the Washington Post, war is an instrument of national policy; and it's entirely possible to win a military victory without having carried out the national policy. For instance, to what extent is our victory over Germany becoming a somewhat hollow victory, when strategic bombing so blasted the nation apart that we have to support that defeated nation for the next generation or so. We should seriously ask ourselves if there isn't some way to make victory less costly.

Have the champions of unlimited strategic bombing ever proved that it was necessary to literally level a German city in order to get at a couple of factories. We know that it didn't do anything to the population; that they still climbed out of the cellars and went to work the next morning with a burning hatred of everything we stood for.

Congressmen yesterday and today frankly declared that the flight of the *Lucky Lady* should make the Russians shiver in their shoes. That's open to question. The Red military is primarily a tremendous ground army supported by tactical air power. Does the Air Force argue that we could defeat Russia blasting her cities? In the meantime what happens to the Red army? Does it end up in Chicago and Seattle while we still bomb Kuibishev and Stalingrad?

Frankly, this reporter has been impressed with the quiet efficiency of the Navy, its surface, submarine, and air arms. The Navy isn't defending battleships and heavy cruisers. But it is defending the principle of varied and multiple approaches to problems so that if one is found wanting the chances are the other will work. It was demonstrated last year that the Air Force can influence Congress and it's about to do it again. The Air Force presents a romantic appeal to the popular and congressional imagination: the business of flying through the wild, blue yonder, the radio program for the Air Force, and colorful spokesmen. But the Navy flies through the wild, blue yonder, too, and actually the question arises should the Navy and the Army have some songs written, retain Admiral Halsey as a spokesman, get a radio show, and compete?

This reporter has purposely taken more or less of a one-sided stand on this issue today in order to provoke your thinking about it. I am certainly no military strategist. But this reporter is aware that this question is too important and too grave for it to be settled without further debate and much deeper thought.

Truth About Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the brilliant commentary of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, who is known throughout the American Republics for his devotion to truth, freedom, and democracy. Dr. Thorning, in the pages of the national weekly America, was the first scholar in the United States to make a thorough analysis of Hitlerism; he is no less active now in exposing the Soviet maneuvers to use Spain in order to create confusion and chaos in democratic ranks. Fortunately, Dr. Thorning's splendid contributions to contemporaneous history are bearing rich fruit. Not only the general public, but also the Government of the United States are now persuaded that the resumption of normal, friendly, diplomatic relations with Madrid is in the national interest as well as in keeping with the dictates of honor, as wartime Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes has frequently emphasized. It was a master stroke of diplomacy that led President Franklin D. Roosevelt to designate Dr. Hayes as the Ambassador of the United States to Spain. It is a tribute to the intellectual honesty and courage of Prof. Carlton Hayes that he continues to exhort all loyal Americans to remember the promises which President Roosevelt made, in writing, to the head of the Spanish State. The statement of Dr. Thorning follows:

Those who edit and write for the Nation are entitled to their opinions about the policy of the United States with respect to Spain. Liberty of thought and freedom of expression, within the framework of truth, are precious American rights. Consequently, when Mr. Robert Bendiner voices his distress that a splendid liberal, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, should exercise his privilege to insert one of my speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he is merely recording his impression of the propriety of the Senator's gracious action. (The Nation, March 19, 1949.)

On the other hand, Mr. Bendiner has no right to misrepresent me, or anyone else. Neither is he authorized to falsify the record. If he had studied the speech in question, he would have noticed that, nowhere, did I mention the name of the head of the Spanish State. My sole interest in Spain is the welfare and the rights of 28,000,000 people who, for the most part, are now working together for peace and unity. Therefore, I have been the first to advise all true friends of the spanish people not to personalize or to personify the country, when, actually, all the members of the Cabinent, including Foreign Minister Alberto Martin Atajo, share responsibility for the decisions taken in Madrid.

Indeed, I don't believe in identifying any nation with a single individual, although I admit that it would be refreshing, occasionally, to find the editors of the Nation writing about Tito's Jugoslavia, Josef Stalin's Soviet Union, Ana Pauker's Rumania, Georgi Dimitroff's Bulgaria, Jakob Berman's Sovietized Poland, and Klement Gottwald's Czechoslovakia. In that case, one could recognize not only intellectual honesty, a virtue which should rank high in the Nation's hierarchy of values, but also a definite measure of editorial consistency.

Almost every word, suggested by the chairman of the United States Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was taken verbatim from a communication of wartime Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes, an appointee of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Senator MURRAY, as a friend and admirer of President Roosevelt, has the right to vindicate the latter's honor.

Loyalty to the pledged word throughout the United States is regarded as the most important single virtue for a man in public life. Dr. Hayes emphasized that principle in

the letter which Senator MURRAY recommended for careful study. The same scholar, a most respected former chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, declared that both American honor and American interests were at stake in our attitude of friendship toward the present Spanish Government. The judgment of the gentleman who holds the Seth Low chair of history in Columbia University is one that millions of citizens—Protestants, Jews, and Catholics—will continue to respect. In fact, he is as much entitled to his opinion as Mr. Robert Bendiner.

Inasmuch as the latter, in his article Notes Not in the News, has been a slovenly reporter, I would like to remind both him and you that there is the commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

It is demonstrably untrue that virtually every other non-Catholic was hostile to the Nationalist movement in Spain. Among the prominent non-Catholics who spoke and wrote in favor of Rightist Spain and against the Secularists of the Left were the following:

The Honorable J. Ogden Hammond, one-time Ambassador to Spain.

The Honorable W. Cameron Forbes, former Ambassador of the United States and one-time Governor General of the Philippines.

The Honorable Irwin Laughlin, one-time Ambassador to Spain.

Dr. Ellery Sedgwick, former editor of the Atlantic Monthly.

Dr. Alexander Hamilton Rice, of Harvard University.

Mr. Gault MacGowan, of the New York Sun.

The Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, now majority leader of the United States Senate.

The Reverend Dr. Charles MacFarland, general secretary emeritus, Federal Council of Churches, and many other patriotic citizens. They were all members of the Keep the Spanish Embargo Committee. Fortunately, they won the victory in the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by an overwhelmingly decisive victory, 18 to 1. The majority of the committee were non-Catholics. Have the editors of the Nation, Mr. Robert Bendiner, and some others forgotten who the lone Senator was? The individual who could not persuade a single one of his own colleagues to vote in favor of his motion is no longer a Member of the United States Senate, having been defeated for renomination in the next elections. The name of this gentleman may as well be brought to the attention of the readers of the Nation, it is ex-Senator Gerald P. Nye.

At the head of this stationery, you will see the name of Dr. Philip Marshall Brown, honorary president of the oldest peace society in the United States, professor emeritus of international law in Princeton University. During the civil war as well as in the present crisis, Dr. Brown, another distinguished non-Catholic upholder of truth and righteousness, ranged himself on the side of those who refuse to be duped about Spain by the Marxist sympathizers with the Soviet Union. Like myself, Professor Brown realizes that the Red Nazis now in control of Poland are eager to exploit the Iberian Peninsula for the sake of their duel with our own country. Once more, in the General Assembly of the United Nations, we will be treated to the obscene spectacle of a Soviet-dominated Polish delegate raising the question of Spanish relations as a threat to peace. At that time, millions of alert United States citizens, Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic, will point out, for the enlightenment of the Nation, that it was not Madrid, but Moscow, that moved in on Jan Masaryk and Edouard Benes. It was not Spain, but the Soviet Union that enslaved 10,000,000 more people, after a war of liberation. It was not Spain that tried to sabotage the European recovery program, but the Soviet gauleiters in Prague, Budapest, Sofia, Bucharest, Berlin, Warsaw, and Vienna. And the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx in the United States seem to be determined to do everything in their power to perpetuate this Soviet system of slavery, against freedom, against democracy, and against all religion.

Fish-Canning Industry of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following on the effect of H. R. 3190 on the fish-canning industry of California, with particular application to the port of Monterey. The fish-canning industry of California employs about 15,000 people at full production. The bill before the House vitally affects the employment relations of these workers. So impetuous was the rush of the hearings on H. R. 3190 and H. R. 2033 that the California industry was refused any opportunity to be heard. The only witness before the committee who testified on behalf of the business interests concerned was a representative of the National Canners Association, who was also required to cover, in the short period allotted to him, the whole field of agricultural processing as well as fish processing for the entire country.

Various elements of the California fish-canning industry made specific request for an opportunity to be heard. This was denied. They were accorded the privilege of furnishing a written memorandum under a deadline which allowed the employers concerned exactly 48 hours to prepare and transmit from California to Washington a brief statement on the subject.

On the subject of the existing exemption for the taking and processing of fish in the Fair Labor Standards Act there were extensive hearings and debate in the House at the time of the adoption of the original act. Further hearings on the subject were held by the House committee in 1945. As a result, the House committee did not recommend a change. Again extensive hearings were held in 1947. Again the House committee did not recommend a change.

Over a whole decade this House has had before it, in one form or another, the question of the advisability of this exemption. Upon each occasion the conclusion has been reached that there should be an exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act for fish processing.

It has been widely proclaimed that the bill before the House is primarily the result of the deliberations of the Fifteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation held November 30 to December 2, 1948. A résumé of the proceedings of this conference has been published as Bulletin No. 104 of United States Department of Labor. The report of the committee on wages and hours states the following:

> The conference also supports changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act to bring its benefits to many more workers, by eliminating all minimum-wage and overtime exemptions. By these changes, the minimum-wage and overtime requirements would apply fully to many supervisory and professional personnel; to many employees in retail and service establishments; to farm employees; to transportation workers by rail, highway, sea, or air; to fishermen; to workers processing farm products and fish; to telephone workers in small telephone exchanges; and to many other workers who should receive the benefits of the act.

An examination of the report shows that the only California representative on this committee was the president of the San Francisco Labor Council (AFL). No employer and no representative of the public in California participated in the work of this committee—page 41.

The recommendations of the committee were embodied in Resolution VII of the conference—page 44. The portions of this resolution relevant to the fish-canning industry are as follows:

> Whereas certain industries such as agriculture, food processing, and timber cutting require great numbers of workers during certain seasons of the year and few, if any, at other times; and
>
> Whereas these workers in order to obtain year-round employment must, of necessity, move from State to State with the seasons and the crops; and
>
> Whereas the worker's employment is irregular, his wages low, and he receives no unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or other legal benefits afforded other types of workers; and
>
> Whereas State labor departments, in general, have not been in a position to take responsibility for these workers: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That steps be immediately taken by State labor departments and the United States Department of Labor to assume responsibility for these neglected workers whose labor is so essential to our economy, and that laws be enacted or extended to give to migrant agricultural workers the same protection afforded other workers. This would include such laws as workmen's compensation, child labor and school attendance, wage and hour and social security.

An examination of the facts set forth in the preamble of the resolution will show that the recitals are false insofar as they apply to the fish and canning industry of California.

The resolution states:

> Whereas these workers * * * move from State to State with the seasons.

This is untrue with respect to employees of fish canneries. Fish canneries furnish full-time employment to a large number of key workers in season and out; most of the other employees are casual part-time workers and virtually all reside permanently in their communities.

> Whereas the worker's employment is irregular.

This is true with respect to a large number of workers, but the irregularity is determined by the availability of fish and not by the desire of the employer.

The availability of fish cannot be regulated by congressional enactment.

Whereas the worker's * * * wages (are) low.

This certainly is untrue by any acceptable standard. The minimum wage for the lowest class of unskilled workers in the San Francisco area is $1.36 an hour. The minimum wage for the lowest class of unskilled workers in the Monterey area is $1.37. The minimum wage for the lowest class of unskilled workers in southern California is $1.45 an hour. A large group of workers in the Monterey area are those known as cutters. Many of these are paid on a piecework basis and average around $2 an hour for work which can be learned in less than two days. The fish-canning industry is one of the highest-paid industries of California.

Whereas * * * he receives no unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or other legal benefits afforded other types of workers.

This is false. Fish-cannery workers receive unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, and are afforded all the legal benefits applicable to other types of workers.

Whereas State labor departments * * * have not been in a position to take responsibility for these workers.

This is untrue with respect to fish canning in California. Fish canneries are intimately regulated by State law. They are subject to constant safety inspections by the Division of Industrial Welfare.

The fact is, that none of the reasons advanced by the President's conference apply to the fish-canning industry of California.

The objectives of the Fair Labor Standards Act would in no wise be promoted by the elimination of the fish-canning exemption which is found in section 13 (a) (5) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The supposed purpose of the law was primarily to discourage employment beyond 40 hours a week. Whether employment in a given cannery is less than 40 hours or more than 40 hours in any one week would not be in anywise changed by statutory provisions. It is altogether dependent upon the supply of fish available. If the canners are required by statute to pay at premium rates beyond 40 hours per week, the only consequence would be the payment of additional money and the upsetting of established wage schedules. Unfortunately, the sardines do not read the law. The luck of fishermen does not coincide with theories of social reform.

Fish is a highly perishable product. In its natural state it is owned by the public. From the dawn of recorded history all governments everywhere have followed a strong public policy to promote the utilization of fish as a food, to prevent the waste of it, and to conserve its supply. Even now the Department of State is engaged in international negotiations toward this end. Millions of dollars are being spent every year for research and regulation of fishery products in order that our fish supply for the future may be appropriately conserved. This policy is at least of equal importance to that of encouraging a 40-hour week. Yet if the exemption is removed there will necessarily result a wastage of certain fish products and a decline in the production of other fish products, because fish, when taken, must be processed before they are spoiled.

Peculiarly enough, H. R. 3190 preserves the exemption in connection with—

the catching, taking * * * of any kind of fish * * * including the going to and returning from work and including employment in loading and unloading, when performed by any such employee. (Sec. 12 (b) (2).)

Yet the processing of fish must be integrated with the catching of fish or the product spoils and is wasted. It is the sardine which is the largest fish catch in California. The tolerance of time between the taking of the fish and the sealing of the can in this type of processing is about 7 hours. If fishing should be exempted, processing should also be exempted, for without processing there is no sense in fishing. The same arguments apply to processing as to catching. Indeed, the taking of fish may be more subject to control than the processing of fish already caught. The bill says that the taking of fish is exempt and free from hourly control, but the receipt and processing of fish is subject to regulation. This is as much as to say that a man is free to speak, but the audience is not free to listen.

Free collective bargaining exists throughout the fishing industry on the Pacific coast. Hours and overtime can and are controlled and provided by contract. This is as it should be because contracts can be adjusted with changing times. Such a change occurred in recent years. During the war, the fishermen were able to find an abundance of sardines. Commencing with 1946, sardines have almost disappeared from the coast, except in small quantities. This required a complete revolution in methods of sardine processing. The bill now before the House provides for inflexible dictation from Washington.

Apparently it is contemplated by the administration that the fish-canning industry should make application for a seasonal exemption of 14 weeks under section 7 (b) (3). Some fish-canning operations are not seasonal. This includes the vast tuna industry, mackerel processing, and squid.

Moreover, the seasonal exemption, if granted by the dispensation of the Secretary of Labor, is for "not more than 14 workweeks in the aggregate in the calendar year." Under the provisions of California State law, it would probably be assumed that the sardine season commences August 1. Thus, presumably any exemption allowed would necessarily overlap two seasons. The processor would have to guess his 14 weeks' exemption covering two seasons instead of one. Normally, the sardine season is ended February 15. At the beginning of the calendar year the processor would have to guess whether he should take any portion of his 14 weeks at the end of the previous season or whether he should take it at the height of the next season in the following October and November.

At the present time the California Legislature has before it several bills drastically changing the conditions under which sardines can be taken. This is a major design toward conservation and what effect this will have in relation to the seasonal exemption is entirely unpredictable.

Moreover, the amount of sardines caught in a given season varies enormously from year to year. Fish must be canned when they can be caught. In a big year 14 weeks would be entirely inadequate, because the California sardine processing season has traditionally run from August 1 to the following February 15. In a small year the exemption would be meaningless.

Moreover, which 14 weeks shall the processor elect to take? Sometimes many fish are caught at the beginning of the season; sometimes in the middle; sometimes at the end. The only regularity about the catching of fish is its irregularity. Indeed, on a given day, until 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning the processor does not know whether he will have no fish, a moderate amount of fish, or whether his cannery will be going full blast for the next 20 hours. With an operative processing season in sardines in excess of 22 weeks, how is he to pick the 14 weeks which will best utilize the fish available with the least wastage of the public asset of fishery products?

The concept of seasonal industry is obviously taken from agriculture. Here, although the crops may vary in size, the processor knows when they will ripen for processing within a tolerance of a week or more and he knows within what period they will be flowing to his plant. This is untrue in fish processing. He may receive virtually no fish for 3 months and then during the next 3 months find his plant crowded to capacity. The receipt of fish is capable of infinite variation and no one has ever been able to contrive a plan whereby the operations of a fish-canning plant can be controlled or its production directed by season and time.

From the standpoint of the great California sardine industry, the present is the least appropriate time in a quarter of a century to embark upon new legislative reform to assuage the supposed sorrows of man. Sardine processing is now a distressed industry. Prices of canned sardines, fish meal, and sardine oil have declined. The cost of the fish which they buy from the boats has augmented. Worst of all, there has been no adequate supply of fish and the fishermen and processors have been under drastic pressure to utilize all the fish which are caught and by the cheapest methods. It would be inside the truth to say that not one in five of the sardine processors of California has made a profit from this operation over the past 3 years.

Most of the plants are small family enterprises. The number in California which regularly employ more than 200 people in sardine processing can be counted on the fingers of both hands. At the moment the principal problem of the sardine processor is to survive.

Excerpts From United States Steel Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from United States Steel annual report of February 23, 1949, Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board:

The year 1948 brought no abatement in the Nation-wide heavy demand for steel products. United States Steel contributed its full share toward meeting these pent-up steel needs of the country, and during the year established new peacetime records for the production of ingots and for the shipment of steel products.

United States Steel produced in 1948 a total of 29,300,000 tons of steel ingots and castings, such production averaging 93.8 percent of its rated capacity. Strikes in coal operations, shortages of essential materials, and necessity for repairs chiefly prevented the attainment of full capacity operations. During the fourth quarter of 1948, however, steel production averaged 99.4 percent of capacity.

Shipments of steel products by United States Steel in 1948 amounted to 20,700,000 tons, which exceeded its previous peacetime record by more than 400,000 tons. United States Steel's shipments to foreign countries under Government export licenses equaled 5 percent of its total 1948 shipments.

INCOME AND DIVIDENDS

For the second consecutive year United States Steel, in 1948, established a new high record in total dollar sales, receipts from customers amounting to $2,481,500,000. Income for the year was $129,600,000. Although sales receipts in 1948 were $358,700,000 greater than in 1947, income for 1948 was only $2,500,000 more than for the preceding year. The income for 1948 was equivalent to a profit of 5.2 percent of sales, compared with a profit of 6 percent of sales in 1947. Income in 1948 on the basis of return on sales was the smallest for any year of comparable rate of operations in United States Steel's entire peacetime history.

FACILITIES

United States Steel's rated annual capacity at January 1, 1949, for the production of steel ingots and castings was 31,300,000 tons—representing 32.5 percent of the total steel-ingot capacity of the Nation. United States Steel's capacity is 2,500,000 tons, or 8.6 percent, greater than it was at the end of 1945 following the elimination of certain obsolete and marginal facilities which had been continued in operation during the war.

Following the war United States Steel embarked upon an extended program of additions to and replacements of facilities. This program has been pushed aggressively during the entire postwar period despite constantly increasing costs of construction.

COST INFLATION

The cost inflation that began in the middle 1930's was continued in 1948, and, in fact, was then more rapid than in any preceding year except 1947.

All costs of United States Steel except interest have primarily reflected mounting wage rates. Thus, United States Steel's payments for products and services bought from others are required by such others to cover their mounting employment, purchases, wear and exhaustion, and tax costs. Tax costs, in turn, also represent in considerable measure the mounting requirements of Government to cover its expanding employment of people at advancing compensation rates. Wear and exhaustion costs largely represent past wage costs for facilities that have to be replaced at much higher wage costs.

Employment cost to United States Steel in 1948 amounted to $1.75 per hour per employee. To provide materials and supplies and cover their cost of transportation to plants, and otherwise to furnish employees with the wherewithal to produce, United States Steel bought products and services from others in the amount of $1.70 for each $1.75 of employment cost. Tax costs per employee-hour amounted to 27 cents. Wear and exhaustion cost per employee-hour amounted to 25 cents. Total costs per employee-hour were $3.97 in 1948. After taking care of these costs and after paying the fixed cumulative dividend to the preferred-stock holders, and with such reinvestment of earnings as was deemed necessary by the board of directors to insure the survival and promote the progress of the business, the dividends to common-stock holders for the year 1948 amounted to 9 cents per employee-hour.

PERCENT INCOME OF SALES VERSUS PERCENT OF OPERATIONS

United States Steel's income in 1948 was at the relatively low rate of 5.2 percent of sales. For the same year its ingot operating rate was 93.8 percent. As may be observed from the tabulation shown in the report, when the operating rate was over 90 percent in past peacetime years the income averaged 18.2 percent of sales—or 3½ times as much as in 1948.

Profit or loss is the relatively small difference left over from sales after all costs have been met. Profits or losses are neither good nor bad in nature or magnitude so long as the transactions from which they result are themselves equitably entered into and fulfilled. But one thing is certain, unless costs are kept under what customers are willing to pay in the light of prices at which competing producers are willing to sell, profit is not possible, and loss and unemployment are inevitable. More than that, mere survival of an enterprise competitively requires the purchase of ever more modern tools of production.

The U. S. S. "United States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the follcwing article which appeared in the March issue of the Bureau of Naval Personnel Information Bulletin, All Hands, entitled "New Super Carrier Bears Illustrious Name":

NEW SUPER CARRIER BEARS ILLUSTRIOUS NAME

A proud name—that of U. S. S. *United States*—has been assigned the new 65,000-ton flush-deck super carrier (*CVA 58*), the keel of which is scheduled to be laid next month at Newport News, Va.

Only other ship to bear this title was launched 152 years ago at Philadelphia when the 1,500-ton frigate named by George Washington and sailed to fame by Stephen Decatur slid down the ways.

The vessels represent the earliest and latest built for the Navy under the Constitution. Designed by Joshua Humphreys, the first *United States* was tops in fighting ships of its class and time. The new carrier has the same aim.

U. S. S. *United States*, a 44-gun ship, performed creditably under Capt. John Barry during the undeclared war with France from 1798 to 1800. But it was the fiery Decatur who led the crew to its greatest victory in the War of 1812. With an astonishing display of fire power and accuracy, Decatur's ship overwhelmed the highly regarded British frigate *Macedonian* near the Canary Isles.

A comparison of the old and new *United States* high lights differences in naval arms over a century and a half. Decatur's vessel had a displacement of over 1,500 tons, that of a modern destroyer, and a 43-foot beam. Its over-all length was 200 feet, roughly that of an LSM. The frigate's masthead height, however, equaled that of a *Midway* class carrier. Its cost, protested as an extravagance in the 1790's, was $299,000.

The new carrier's figures show a displacement more than 40 times that of the frigate, an over-all length (1,090 feet) more than five times as great, and a 130-foot beam triple that of the old vessel.

CVA 58 will feature a totally clean-deck operating area for its planes, without the usual island on the starboard side. This arrangement will permit operation of planes so large that their wings may jut out over the ship's side. Planes weighing well over 100,000 pounds can be accommodated, suggesting that number of necessary missions will decrease while striking range of the ship's air complement will be enormously extended.

Far and away the most powerful vessel in modern sea-air warfare, the modern U. S. S. *United States* provides a fitting continuation of the naval tradition of sea control begun by its sister ship in the youth of the country for which the vessels were named.

Mr. Truman Rides Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the Boston Post of Friday, March 18, 1949, entitled "Mr. Truman Rides Again?":

MR. TRUMAN RIDES AGAIN?

If President Truman spoke only in jest when he threatened to carry the fight for his campaign promises to the country in a personal tour, events have called him. Control of Congress, which for the moment has been wrested from him by die-hard Dixiecrats, who oppose civil rights, and reluctant Republicans, who ignore November 2, may force him to swing the circuit.

As he remarked, "I know how to do it." He demonstrated that. No other President in history bounded from the depths to the heights of leadership in a few fiery, fighting weeks of personal appearances. Sages will warn that Woodrow Wilson fell on his face in carrying the League of Nations battle to the people. But in that case the League was alien to all prior views of foreign policy. In Mr. Truman's case, the issues already have public acceptance.

Two things would make the Truman task easier. One is that in the midst of his congressional woes, Mr. Lewis has reopened his

personal vendetta. The other is that the American people will have it made clear to them that, right or wrong, the recalcitrance of some GOP Congressmen stems from an abhorrent, unsportsmanlike trait—poor losing. Whereas Mr. Dewey accepted his defeat with good grace, Taftian zealots of his party are wittingly or unwittingly giving the impression that they are not only chewing sour grapes, but also grapes of wrath.

It is understandable why some Republican Congressmen are privately worried about what Washington commentators call the unholy alliance between the Dixiecrats and the McKinley Republicans. They fear that the negative approach is going to hurt GOP resurgence in 1950 and 1952. They are aware of what Russia's reiterated "No" to everything progressive to peace has done to any regard which the world held for the fighting Russia of the early '40s.

Measured in men, they see how Herbert Hoover, most maligned of the GOP, bounded back into national affection when he put country above party to work out a better way of running the Government. They are also painfully aware that Mr. Dewey climbed back into national influence in January when he jumped the fence and presented to the Albany assembly a program for the Empire State which was more than "Fair Dealish."

Again and again and again, Mr. Roosevelt got himself reelected by pointing out to the Nation how a few willful men were endeavoring to thwart his labors for the plain people. With a negative approach and watered-down substitutes for the Truman preelection blueprint for a better America, the GOP may find its victory over the President in time a hollow one. Both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Dewey have come to realize that Archibald MacLeish picked a good title for one of his books: America Is Promises.

Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, originally when a bill making appropriations was introduced, it carried with it provisions for raising the money with which to pay the amount of the appropriation. Unfortunately, for purposes of comparison, our appropriation bills today make no provision for raising the money which they propose to spend but leave that to another time and another committee. The result is vast expenditures with no thought of where the money is coming from.

But let us not be beguiled into overexpenditure by the fact that this bill carries no proposal to raise the revenue required to pay for these expenditures. Eventually we must pay the fiddler. Let no one have any illusions about that. And when the day of reckoning comes I want to ask you now where you will get the money to pay for the millions of dollars of obligations we are saddling on the Federal Treasury by the amendments so gaily voted for on this bill over the protests of the committee and over the recommendations of the budget?

Mr. Speaker, the lot of members of the Appropriations Committee is an unhappy one. Theirs is a thankless task. At every hearing we are besieged by a large part of the membership of the House demanding huge expenditures in their respective districts. Any of these Members can show convincingly that the expenditure he requests will be advantageously invested. But that is not the question, Mr. Speaker. It is not a question of whether these expenditures are needed. It is a question of whether we can afford them. And in the present condition of the national finances we can afford very few of them. The result is we must choose the most essential projects and omit the remainder. And then when we bring the bill on the floor there is concerted effort on the part of all who have been denied appropriations—because we simply do not have the money—to force them in the bill. And every member of the subcommittee and the committee which has reported the bill becomes anathema to colleagues whose pet projects have failed to measure up to the very liberal requirements of admission to the bill. Santa Claus will not hand out the candy they want, so Santa Claus is in the dog house. And mob spirit develops and a concerted raid is organized against the Treasury already depleted below actual cash reserves—and deficit spending.

Now where is the money coming from? Under date of March 16, 1949, the Associated Press reports a probable deficit of $1,200,000,000. As a matter of fact, the prospect is that estimates yet unbudgeted will increase the margin between income and expenditures between now and June 30, 1949. The one item of armament of allies in the North Atlantic Pact alone can be expected to add 10-figure deficits to the final totals.

So the money you are adding to this bill in these amendments, rejected by the budget and the committee, must be paid for by either increasing the public debt or by raising taxes. You can take your choice. And the American taxpayers can take their choice—or at least express their opinion in a very substantial manner.

While on this subject, how many are in favor of repudiating the national debt? How many will vote to confiscate the Government bonds which constitute the national debt. We must either pay these bonds or repudiate them. When are you going to pay them. We owe $252,000,000,000. If we started paying them and paid only $5,000,000,000 a year—it would take over a hundred years to pay off the debt.

Instead of paying $5,000,000,000 this year we are here on this floor, in such bills and with such amendments as these, not only failing to leave any money in the Treasury to make a payment on the national debt—but we are adding to the deficit—which is adding to the national debt instead of paying it. Instead of paying the national debt in 100 years, if we continue to spend money this way it will take 101 years to pay the debt, if we start next year.

But it is worse than that. The House voted last Wednesday to build a 70-group air force. The cost will aggregate billions of dollars. Where do you expect to get that money? Where can you get it if we push appropriations above the national income with such home-district expenditures as these?

It is still worse than that. The springs of Federal revenues are drying up. The national income—and with it the Federal income—are dropping. Up to March 15, 1949, Federal receipts were running 8 percent behind the corresponding period last year. We knew, of course, that wartime income and wartime revenues would not be maintained, but the lag is more than has been expected. We can be certain that from now on—while Government obligations, especially in national defense, continue high or higher—the revenues from which such expenditures must be paid will continue to decline. That is the history of the inevitable return to normal following every great war. Instead of curtailing expenditures in this bill to correspond to the reduction in the national income, we are proposing to override the committee on this already too generous bill and by increasing it, thereby increasing the national debt. If Government bonds were not artificially supported, you would see a drop in the quotations on the bond market in tomorrow's newspapers.

The mythical Senator Claghorn, who voted for all appropriations and against all taxes, is represented here by Members who voted to reduce taxes in the last session and are voting for every increase offered to this bill.

Of course, we can always start the printing presses and print all the money we need for expenditures of this character—as many European nations have done in the past decade or so.

And we have not yet taken into consideration all the contingencies for which we must be prepared. What if we have a heavy drop in employment and it is necessary to finance public works as we have had to do in the past? Where will funds be procured to meet the emergency? Unemployment is today at the highest point since 1941. If it continues to grow and it becomes necessary to meet it, where can we expect to raise the money if we have already scraped the bottom dry?

Or if it becomes necessary to support farm prices—in order to prevent the national catastrophe which always follows a collapse in farm income—what will we use for money?

Mr. Speaker, let us not imagine that the people are not alert to the situation. The time has long since gone by when the people at home waited for us to come back from Washington and tell them what happened while Congress was in session. Here are excerpts from some of the letters received by the committee in the last week. The letters are not always officially from the firm whose name is attached but they are all from some official of the firm who wrote on the firm stationery.

PHOENIXVILLE, PA.

We just can't continue to pay out these huge sums of money with no idea as to how the money will be available. The only way we can do it is by inflation and such would lead to the same conditions which they are

now enduring in China. Now is the time when we should be reducing the huge debt which we built up during the war, as everybody seems to be agreed that incomes are at their highest level, and we are due for a leveling off. If such is the case, we certainly cannot continue this spending, as incomes will be reduced and the Federal income will be reduced in direct proportion to them.

S. L. SHANAMAN, INC.

DAYTON, TENN.

The last few years have been remarkable years for this country with respect to the amount of money in circulation and the amount of money the Government has been able to obtain through taxes; however, the high level of business has raised this large amount of money, and I do not believe that it will continue. No doubt the period of recession or getting back to normal competition is upon us.

The idea of continuing to raise taxes to me is ridiculous, and in the face of present conditions of the country it would seem impossible to get more money, as profits from which taxes are obtained are going to be surprisingly low the next fiscal year in comparison with the last few years.

Of course, lots of money in circulation and lots of money to spend should make good business, but the country went into a huge debt during the war and it seems to me that it is necessary that this debt now be reduced. How we can continue to pile it up without going into bankruptcy has never been satisfactorily explained.

GRAYSVILLE HOSIERY MILL, INC.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

We realize that each and every agency and department of the Government will fight any attempt to cut their budgets.

Each and every department will tell you that their particular budget should not be touched.

However, we feel that there is only one untouchable item in the Government budget and that is the interest on the public debt.

Uncle Sam hasn't any money to pay any bills except what we supply, and, unless your committee does succeed in making very drastic cuts, the day is soon coming when you will cripple our businesses to a point where we can no longer supply Uncle Sam with the necessary funds to carry on.

R. MACKELLAR'S SONS CO., INC.

TACOMA, WASH.

With Government taxes now taking close to 33⅓ percent of the national income, it is becoming more and more difficult for businessmen to make both ends meet and leave anything for growth of the business. While we have enjoyed a good business for the past few years and have made a paper profit, practically every dollar of that profit has had to be plowed back into the business to keep our business in a solvent state. These paper profits are represented to a considerable extent by write-ups of inventory, but nonetheless this has been subject to the regular rates of income tax. We have not heard that the Federal Government will rebate us for any inventory losses we sustain in the years ahead. From all present indications they are inevitable.

The "gravy train" for most businesses has long since slowed down and will probably come to a dead stop and reverse in probable near future. I, therefore, fully agree with efforts to stabilize and, where possible, reduce the cost of Government.

SHAW SUPPLY CO., INC.

BRADFORD, PA.

We should actually, drastically reduce the spending of money.

BARNSDALL PRINTING CO.

OMAHA, NEBR.

This country definitely had better put its financial house in order as well as individual institutions.

INSTANT PRODUCTS MANUFACTURING CO.

MONMOUTH, ILL., *March 12, 1949.*

It is about time the people of the country realize the Federal Government cannot continue to operate on a deficit financing basis without going bankrupt sooner or later.

BERSTED'S HOBBY CRAFT, INC.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

I do not feel, considering the swing business has taken the past 3 months, that corporations, as well as individuals, can at this time stand an increase in taxes to support a larger budget.

JOE HEASTON COMPANIES.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH.

The writer has just returned from a trip through Florida, Texas, Missouri, and Iowa, and talked to many people pertaining to the condition of the country. Without exception all parties concerned agree that it is time that Government expenditures be reduced by whatever means or method is necessary to save the American people.

BIRMINGHAM CONSTRUCTION CO.

MANCHESTER, N. H.

I heartily endorse curtailment of unnecessary and excessive spending in every department of our Government, to the end that it will strengthen our national economy.

FOSTER BEEF CO.

JONESVILLE, MICH.

The writer is not a politician and doesn't think in terms of political strategy or principles. Spending is largely a political expediency and that is the real waste that I believe that you are trying to eliminate. Both parties use it to such an extent that the average man is disgusted with both. When he votes he just picks what he thinks is the lesser of the two evils, as that is the only thing he can do.

So I'd like to say that this little organization, and the writer personally, are solidly behind everyone who is sincerely and unselfishly trying to make our Government one of economy and efficiency without political expediency.

KIDDIE BRUSH & TOY CO.

MORRISTOWN, TENN.

The writer makes no pretense of being an authority on economics. I am not a politician or a statesman. I simply know that an individual or a business cannot continue to spend recklessly more than its income. What applies to individuals in business must apply to the Government. No person, business, or government can spend more than its income without eventually facing bankruptcy.

MORRISON TURNING CO., INC.

WILMINGTON, CALIF.

I am trusting that much of the budget (for fiscal 1950 starting July 1) may be pared to lighten the burden of the man who pays the unbelievable United States of America peacetime taxes.

ROSSMAN MILL & LUMBER CO., LTD.

DETROIT, MICH.

We all know that giving away money is more popular with the general voters than making cuts.

H. J. CAULKINS & CO.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Our Nation in a better financial condition. Eliminate large unnecessary expenditures which only cause taxpayers and others plenty of trouble ahead.

ACME PETROLEUM CO.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.

For some time I have been depressed over the tendency on the part of those in legislative halls to appropriate money for things that seem unnecessary.

Many, many years ago, when I studied our history, I was very proud of the fact that our representatives were elected by the people at large, and felt that the best interests of the people and the country would be the paramount consideration of those elevated to office.

It was a great disillusionment to me to find in quite a number of cases measures were enacted that were fundamentally unsound solely because it seemed politically expedient. I have always felt that on the average those elected to office possessed superior intelligence, and must have known that unless some economy were wrought the country would be gradually ruined, and also that the direct and indirect taxes were affecting the poor as well as the rich.

C. B. MCMANUS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

There are undoubtedly numerous occasions during the course of a year when corporations as well as individuals should express themselves concerning proposed legislation.

It occurs to us individually and collectively that expenditures should at the moment be carefully screened and a policy of extreme conservatism be applied.

We are forced to this conclusion moreover by reason of the extremely heavy peacetime budgets which are in themselves causing us to arrive at the point wherein the danger signals are definitely obvious and without question a distinct threat to our accepted and known standard of living.

We sincerely trust that there are sufficient expressions from others to warrant continued objections to unnecessary and questionable appropriations.

GUYGNON & GREEN, INC.

HOUGHTON, MICH.

In these times when so many of us look toward the Government for financial aid of all kinds, it must be a great temptation to follow the easy course and acquiesce to all of these demands.

It is an unhappy fact that a large percentage of my generation has grown up under the stress of unusual economic conditions and has been exposed to fantastic Government expenditures both for domestic and foreign purposes. Consequently, these young people feel that the Government is the logical source for most of the wealth which they can obtain. Let me assure you, however, that many like myself believe that the future of our country and its wealth lies not in the spending of money by our Government but in the individual efforts of its people.

I. E. SWIFT & CO.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

We endorse reducing the expenditures of the Federal Government. These expenditures have already reached a point where it is almost impossible for a small business to operate, and if they continue as they have in the past, it will just be a matter of not too long a time before there will be no small business.

This, in time, will also effect big business and will mean the end of the American way

of life. It is still the best in the world regardless of the propaganda which is being spread from so many sources in this country.

SAN DIEGO NEON SIGN CO.

KENOSHA, WIS.

Unfortunately, many people think that the Government can create money according to its whims and thinking.

Most of the people believe that the Government has a never-ending amount of money that can be used, and they forget entirely that they—the same people—have to work much harder to supply the large funds which are under consideration at the present time.

DYNAMIC CORP.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Why should I as a head of a family or as an executive of a business be concerned about keeping the budget balanced if there is no indication that the Government intends to avoid bankruptcy.

WESTERN MINERAL PRODUCTS CO.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

I among millions of other Americans want to see unnecessary spending eliminated.

There is only one sure way to make a start in this direction and that of course is to cut down on appropriations to a minimum right now.

This country cannot stand continued high spending. It must be curtailed if we are to avoid bankruptcy and which is just what our foreign adversary would like to see happen.

NEW HAVEN VIBRATOR CO.

CLARINDA, IOWA.

Back here in the Middle West, it seems to us that the sensible thing to do during these years of good business is to cut down on unnecessary projects and use the money for reducing the public debt. Within a few years we might have to unbalance the budget and spend to give necessary employment to our people. During years of good business we should economize and pay on the existing debt which is alarmingly enormous, as you know.

Above all things, taxes should not be increased, for they have now reached the point where the businessman says to himself many times: "What's the use?" Why work and save? Why try to make a profit? It will simply be taken away and distributed to those less industrious.

RICHARDSON LUMBER CO.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

One of the biggest things to watch is necessarily the lobby of Federal employees to save their skin and to get more jobs for their relatives.

PANTZER LUMBER CO.

YAKIMA, WASH.

Our country may be on its way out and apparently following the same program of political procedure that ruined the Roman Empire, which ruin was based on excessive taxes voted largely by politicians to keep themselves in office.

WEST SIDE INSURANCE AGENCY.

OMAHA, NEBR.

In business and personal life we are at times presented with prospective expenditures for good, worthy, desirable purposes, but which we must forego simply because the expenditure is beyond our means; and, if made, will result in financial calamity. No individual, business, or group can escape this basic law, and neither can our Federal Government. It is my belief that the Federal Government is now exceeding the expenditures which the economy of the country can maintain.

There is consideration at present of increasing the Federal budget. It is my personal opinion that we not only cannot increase it, but that we cannot maintain it at its present level. Business is simply not going to be able to maintain its present top of an inflation earning power, and with the drop in business income, it simply cannot continue to produce as great a tax income to the Government as at present.

I do not suggest too stringent curtailment for defense, which I consider necessary, within our means, and worth its cost; but I do not think a large standing Army, regardless of how well equipped; or an unreasonably large Navy, even if equipped with many oversize multi-million-dollar flat-top sitting ducks, is going to successfully defend us in the next war. I, as a layman certainly don't know all the answers, but I would much prefer to take my chances with an up-to-the-minute, large, and well-equipped Air Force, with a good stock of atomic bombs.

MEAD FARM EQUIPMENT CO., INC.

DETROIT, MICH.

It is high time that we do cut down on spending, and more power to your committee in safeguarding the interests of the majority by critically analyzing each and every appropriation.

FRED J. ROBINSON LUMBER CO.

PORT WASHINGTON, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Keep the budget within reasonable bounds. Make a real contribution toward the continuance of our American way of life.

LEWIS COAL & OIL CO.

GREENSBORO, N. C.

Thinking people, who are interested in the future welfare of our Nation, say they realize vast sums must be spent for defense and to maintain our world position. They also realize that our national income is declining and that our indebtedness has carried the Nation close to bankruptcy.

Please curb wasteful and unnecessary Federal spending.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY & EQUIPMENT CO., INC.

LANSING, MICH.

In view of the large debt that is being constantly increased, we feel that your committee should handle this matter on the same basis that we do in our manufacturing plant, that is when it is tough going we refrain from spending money that could be kept in our bank account for future existence.

The way business is going with us at this time we have to watch every corner and how long this recession or slow-up is going to last, we do not know, but until we do know, we are watching our expenditures and you as a Government official should handle the Government affairs in the same manner.

Where we have kicked in in the past few years pretty sizable amounts in the form of taxes, the way we are going now our contribution to the Government is going to be very slim if anything. Therefore, we feel that the Government officials should sense this thing and realize that they may not have the money to do with as they have in the past.

DAIL STEEL PRODUCTS CO.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

I feel that reduction of appropriations for the Federal Government is the key to the whole situation and want you to drastically reduce Government expenditures.

H. E. SORENSON CO.

BAYONNE, N. J.

I feel keenly that the paralyzing excess of Government is pulling us toward a socialist, welfare state, which may well be followed by national bankruptcy, defeat in a future war, or a dictatorship.

As a citizen, I urge you to reduce governmental expense against all the present selfish pressure to receive a Federal hand-out at the expense of others in the present and of all in the future.

BERGEN POINT IRON WORKS.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

It is your duty to safeguard this Nation from wasters.

EUGENE C. KRAUS, BALL & CO., INC.

PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y.

A sane budget in keeping with the times in which we live would be a distinct contribution toward maintaining stability in the economic structure of our country.

WILLIAM H. REICH.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA.

The Representatives of this country, whose citizens enjoy the highest living standards of any people of the world, should restudy our Constitution and Bill of Rights which our forefathers struggled, fought, and slaved to bring into being simply to escape the very dangers that are now being propagandized as being good for us. All history records that every great nation of the world faded into oblivion when the cost of the Government became more than its citizens could bear. With our present staggering national debt plus the billions of dollars requested for our national budget we must guard constantly against that very thing happening here.

I will appreciate your taking a few moments to read the enclosed article by De Witt Emery which will reveal some of the things that we must constantly guard against. There is still time to stop this mad rush down the road to financial ruin, if the members of your committee search diligently all requests for funds and eliminate every unnecessary appropriation, you will be contributing greatly to the benefit of the Nation that stands today as the last great hope for free peoples of the world.

May we count on eternal vigilance in keeping Federal expenditures at the very minimum.

A. U. BLACKBURN.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

All of this talk about being unable to reduce the budget as the items are all unreducible is simply not the fact, as the only irreducible item in the budget is the interest on the national debt, and all of the others should be drastically reduced except possibly in a very few isolated cases, and I firmly believe that all of them could be.

Our form of taxation is in itself inflationary, and I consider that the Federal, State, and local taxes is one of the biggest items in our present high cost of living.

RAY-SER DYEING CO.

ALAMOSA, COLO.

Watch the pursestrings and not give away more than we have. We know there must be a stopping point to giving, and think that it is high time that we did something about it.

DANIEL'S FOOD STORE.

BURBANK, CALIF.

We cannot continue to pour out money in unlimited quantities. It is time for some economy in government and we sincerely hope your committee can effect substantial savings in the appropriations for the 1950 fiscal budget.

GENERAL WATER HEATER CORP.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

Small business, which is the economic backbone of the country, cannot survive if it is to be saddled with more taxes.

RAUGH & STOECKL PRINTING CO., INC.

COLEMAN, TEX.

It is hard for me to see how our Government can keep on increasing taxes without smothering and suffocating all business in the final outcome.

CLARK AUTO PARTS SUPPLY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

I think if some of the Senators and Representatives would go into an income-tax office along in February and March and see the pain and suffering on the faces of the people who are trying to find ways of paying their taxes, to say nothing of figuring the taxes out, they would feel that something should be done.

For ourselves, we need some machinery to lower the cost of our production, but it will be quite a long time before we can get it with the taxes that we have to pay.

BORDEN DECALCOMANIA CO.

PORTLAND, OREG.

As much as I may be in sympathy with many of the efforts of our Congress to give the people of our Nation economic security, I believe the safest way to achieve this is to have a sound fiscal and economic policy.

I look with a great deal of alarm at the continuous tremendous increases in our budget as time goes by. Somewhere we are going to have to sit down and draw the line and start it going the other way.

PURDY BRUSH CO.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the letters of this character received in the last week, but space will not permit them to be printed here without an estimate. I will include others in tomorrow's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Birth of Prince Kuhio Kalanianaole Commemorated by All Hawaii—Memory of Former Delegate to Congress Honored

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii nei—all Hawaii—will join tomorrow, March 26, in commemorating the birth and honoring the memory of one of their most distinguished sons.

He was Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole.

Today he is referred to in affectionate memory by the Hawaiian people as "Ke Alii Makaainana"—"A Prince of the People."

I call this event to the attention of the House because Prince Kuhio, as he is known among us of Hawaii, served in this House as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii with great distinction from 1903 until his death in 1922.

In this capacity he brought not only great honor to the people of the Hawaiian race, of which he was one of the outstanding members, but to all the people of this Territory without regard to their racial origin.

He not only embraced the principles of American democracy at an early age but fostered among all peoples the friendliness and understanding that is one of the distinctive features of the contribution of the Hawaiian to life in the islands today.

He was not only a great Hawaiian. He was a great American.

Prince Kuhio was one of the most appealing figures in the saga of Hawaii. Born to the purple in 1871, the prince proved, in his more mature years, to be an inspiring champion of American concepts of democracy.

Kalanianaole was born on Kauai, a direct descendant of the last independent ruler of that island. He was a son of High Chief David Kahalepouli Piikoi and the Princess Kinoiki Kekaulike. While still in his teens, the youth was created a prince of the realm by King Kalakaua, his cousin and uncle.

After attending both public and private schools in Honolulu, the prince became a student at St. Matthew's College in San Mateo, Calif. He concluded his formal education by taking a business course at the Royal Agricultural College in England.

RETURNED TO HAWAII

Forced by ill health to return to Hawaii, Kalanianaole served, under the monarchy, as a minor official in the office of the minister of the interior and in the customs service. When the revolution staged by the "haoles"—whites—erupted, Kuhio supported his cousin, Queen Liliuokalani. Shortly after the Republic of Hawaii was established, the unreconstructed prince was arrested, convicted, and imprisoned for conspiring to effect a royalist uprising.

In 1896, following his release, he married Elizabeth Kahanu Kaauwai, daughter of a chief of Kauai. Three years later the couple, despairing of a future in their beloved islands, left for an extended tour abroad. At first the prince determined to make his exile permanent, but after 2 years of traveling, hunting, and observing the Boer War, he decided to accept unreservedly the new order in Hawaii.

BECAME ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Returning to the islands in 1901, Kalanianaole immediately assumed an active part in public affairs. He joined the Home Rule Party, but his affiliation was not a happy one. Disgusted by the bigoted racial views and undemocratic practices of the organization, the prince, now an ardent advocate of the American way, renounced his association and, in 1902, joined the Republican Party. The same year he was named that party's candidate for Territorial Delegate to the Federal Congress. Victorious in his first campaign, Kuhio, with his uniquely devoted following, was never to know defeat at the polls; he served as Hawaii's nonvoting representative continuously from 1903 until his death in 1922.

KNOWN AS PRINCE CUPID

Known affectionately to his constituents and colleagues alike as Prince Kuhio, or Prince Cupid, the affable, able, and untiring Delegate won the hearts of all with whom he had contact. Assigned to the Committees on Agriculture, Coinage, Weights and Measures, Military Affairs, and Territories, Kuhio rendered significant services to his people. In 1919 he introduced the first of a long series of bills to accord statehood to Hawaii. The crowning legislative achievement of his career was his successful sponsoring of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Aware of the tendency of his people—those of original Hawaiian blood strains—to congregate in urban centers, where, as a result of crowded tenement conditions, the race was fighting a losing battle for survival, the Delegate in 1920 introduced a bill to modify the public-land section of the organic act. The measure was finally approved by the President on July 9, 1921. Under its provisions the Hawaiian and part-Hawaiians were to be given the opportunity to leave congested urban areas and settle on the land as homesteaders. It was hoped that in time a relatively prosperous class of independent citizen-farmers would develop.

200,000 ACRES MADE AVAILABLE

Approximately 200,000 acres of government land, comprising specified undeveloped areas, excluding sugarcane lands, were made available. The land so far utilized is divided into homestead lots of varying dimensions, each leased for 99 years at a nominal rental to those persons whose blood is at least one-half Hawaiian. Every homesteader is granted a loan to permit him to build a house or work a farm. The whole project is controlled by a commission—Kuhio was the first member appointed—and is financed, essentially, by a revolving fund of $2,000,000 accumulated from rentals of public lands and water licenses.

The first settlement under the plan was established on the island of Molokai; operations since have been gradually extended to other islands. By the end of 1946 more than 4,000 Hawaiians were living in homestead communities. Approximately one-fifth of these latter-day pioneers were situated on Molokai; the remainder were scattered among residential homestead sites on Hawaii and Oahu.

PLAN PRODUCED RESULTS

Although the rehabilitation project has not as yet fully justified the hopes of Kalanianaole and other founders, the plan has produced tangible benefits. The act prevented Hawaiian settlers from speculating with their land or disposing of it. Many small residential and subsistence homesteads, moreover, have been set up in the environs of the cities and towns where many of the native Hawaiians are employed.

On January 7, 1922, the prime mover of Hawaiian rehabilitation was called to his fathers. Despite his express desire to have his passing marked only by a simple ceremony, the grief-stricken peoples of Hawaii refused to have it so. The pomp

and pagentry incident to his funeral has never been surpassed in all the annals of Hawaii. He was revered not only as a man of the purest motives, but also as the last titular prince of his line. Hawaiian and "haole" alike acknowledge that he, through his example and influence, was the paramount factor in reconciling the Hawaiians to the loss of their independence, and in converting them to a passionate Americanism. Truly, he was "Ke Alii Makaainana"—A prince of the people.

National Service Insurance Funds

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago during the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress, which has taken so much abuse, I called the attention of the Members to the huge sums of money veterans of World War II had overpaid for their national service life-insurance funds during the late war, and asked what had become of these funds.

To my surprise, following my inquiry, the Veterans' Administration admitted that World War II veterans had overpaid for their insurance more than $2,000,000,000 and that this money would be returned to them.

This, as most Members of the House will agree, is no small sum. It does not belong to the Federal Government. It belongs to the millions of men who had voluntarily subscribed to national service life insurance during the war.

We who served in the Eightieth Congress obtained assurances for these veterans that these insurance overpayments would be repaid within a reasonable time, but we did not count on the slovenliness, the inefficiency, and, perhaps, the political propensities of those who have charge of the Veterans' Administration.

To my surprise, just the other day I was reading a well-known national weekly magazine and came across an item to the effect that 14,000,000 veterans in the United States have not yet received their refunds. In some cases these refunds amount to $100 to $200, according to my recollection.

Yet, not a single refund check has been mailed out by the Veterans' Administration. In fact, I am led to believe these checks will not be mailed out for some months to come.

In this magazine article it is suggested that these repayments probably will not be made because certain Democrats feel that the economic and political effects of repayment will be greater for them in 1950. I cannot, for the life of me, vision any person in the Veterans' Administration who would consider for one minute holding up these repayments any longer than is absolutely necessary for the amounts to be determined, the checks prepared, and the letters put in the mail.

To me, it is unconscionable to delay these repayments because they may have a great political effect in the elections of 1950. Veterans who have this money due them should raise a storm of protest against such a delay. I cannot believe that the veterans understand that this is their money. It is not Government money, as I said before, but money that the veterans themselves overpaid on their insurance. It is due them now, not just before the 1950 elections. In fact, it was due them a year ago. It should have been paid and forgotten about by now so far as the Government is concerned.

I am told that accounting, bookkeeping, actuarial and other difficulties will hold up the payments. This is a lot of political eyewash. It is a disgrace and the veterans who are not informed ought to understand how they are being treated.

I ask the veterans of this country, do you need $50, $100, or $200 today? I wonder how many of them prefer to have the Government keep their money for another year or two and pay them just before the next election so that they vote Democratic and thank the Great White Father in Washington.

That, apparently, is what the administration has in mind—to let this money draw interest until next year and then pay the veterans their own money back just before election.

If this is the case, and I personally believe it is, then I say it is a cheap politi cal trick that ought to be shouted from the housetops.

With the number of superfluous employees in Washington and the tremendous facilities the Veterans' Administration possesses, there is no excuse for these payments to be delayed any longer.

I am serving notice on the Veterans' Administration right now that they had better get those checks out to the veterans within the next few weeks or months. If they do not, they will not have heard the last of it.

Labor and Milk Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable controversy in regard to proposed legislation to undermine the dairy industry of our country.

Imitation butter is the first step. Ersatz cheese, filled milk and synthetic ice cream will not be far behind.

The following facts should be of interest. You will note that where milk is the highest in price, the wages paid to labor are the lowest, and where milk is reasonable in price, labor gets a fair break.

The table, computed from official United States Department of Agriculture reports, is as follows:

State	Average price paid to farmers (per 100 pounds) (1948)	Average wages paid to farm hands, monthly (1948), without board
Alabama	$6.02	$63
Arizona	5.05	178
Arkansas	5.46	80
California	4.89	202
Colorado	4.80	159
Connecticut	6.37	155
Delaware	5.39	110
Florida	7.15	93
Georgia	5.99	63
Idaho	4.15	187
Illinois	4.44	130
Indiana	4.85	117
Iowa	4.49	143
Kansas	4.47	136
Kentucky	4.72	83
Louisiana	6.26	69
Maine	5.59	129
Maryland	5.79	113
Massachusetts	6.17	155
Michigan	4.79	136
Minnesota	3.98	140
Mississippi	5.07	62
Missouri	4.71	105
Montana	4.25	176
Nebraska	4.49	144
Nevada	4.43	169
New Hampshire	5.99	147
New Jersey	5.98	150
New Mexico	6.25	132
New York	5.29	142
North Carolina	5.53	84
North Dakota	4.37	169
Ohio	5.06	115
Oklahoma	4.71	117
Oregon	5.27	192
Pennsylvania	5.33	121
Rhode Island	6.47	155
South Carolina	5.91	58
South Dakota	4.48	154
Texas	6.08	115
Tennessee	5.16	71
Utah	4.38	173
Vermont	5.69	145
Virginia	5.54	94
Washington	4.94	204
West Virginia	5.28	83
Wisconsin	4.15	147
Wyoming	4.50	170

The Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 25 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on the subject The Threat of Communism, in Trenton, N. J., on March 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTIETH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PAST COMMANDERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Chairman THOMPSON. Sir Knights, our guest and principal speaker tonight came to us from our Nation's Capital through an invitation extended to him by Sir Knight George E. Stringfellow. Sir Knight George is a member of my own commandery, Lebanon, No. 31. He has been prominent in Masonic circles for a considerable number of years.

He served Salaam Temple as potentate for 2 years and now he is on his way to higher honors at the next session of the Imperial Council of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of

North America. With pleasure I present to you Sir Knight George E. Stringfellow, who will introduce our distinguished visitor. [Applause.]

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. President, distinguished guests, friends, I am deeply honored to be asked to break bread with you tonight, and I consider it a great privilege to present to you tonight one of the Nation's most able statesmen.

To tell you everything about this man that is worth while would take me well over an hour. My problem in presenting him to you tonight is one of selection, not one of inflating the things I could say about him.

He is a farmer, a successful farmer; therefore, he knows something about the grass roots and he knows what makes things tick. He is a great educator. He is an author of a number of well-written and widely read books. He is an authority on criminal law.

The reactionaries in America call him a radical. The radicals call him a liberal gone reactionary. [Laughter.] I call him a great American. The greatest tribute I can pay him, I think, is to quote Aristotle, the great lover of democracy, who once said, "The greatest compliment one man can pay another is to say truthfully that he is a good citizen."

And so tonight I present to you—he needs no introduction—the junior United States Senator from the great State of Oregon, who will speak to you until traintime, and you will like it—the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon. [Applause.]

Senator MORSE. Mr. President, my good friend, George Stringfellow, brothers in Masonry: It is perfectly obvious from the introduction that George Stringfellow has just given to me that he is a biased friend. I appreciate that friendship very much and I want to say here publicly that the many manifestations of it which George has extended to me over the years have been a constant source of inspiration to me.

I mean no flattery when I say to you that in my opinion, George Stringfellow epitomizes and personifies the brotherly spirit of our fraternity. His life is a record of Christian service to mankind. In innumerable ways his service is not only a service to the citizens of New Jersey but to the citizens of the Nation.

Too many people in our country entertain the prejudiced notion that men of some financial means, of high economic position in industry or business, or of outstanding executive success in the corporate life of our economy cannot walk with men and keep the common touch. As vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., George Stringfellow has made an outstanding record of industrial statesmanship among the business leaders of America. His life and work is a complete denial that there is any basis for such a prejudiced generalization. I need cite only one of his many humanitarian activities to prove my point.

I am sure many of you people in New Jersey do not fully appreciate the national recognition which George Stringfellow's work in the cancer-prevention program has attained. You undoubtedly are aware of the fact that here in New Jersey the cancer-prevention program is frequently referred to as the New Jersey plan. However, I wonder if you realize that the New Jersey cancer-prevention plan, in the development of which George Stringfellow was so instrumental, has really become a national plan.

It is impossible for us to adequately appraise the value, in terms of lessening human suffering and increasing human happiness, which the great cancer-prevention program is bringing to many thousands of people across our country. George Stringfellow's indomitable will, humanitarian impulses, and devotion to a social ideal of helping those who need to be helped have left an indelible imprint of personal service on the formation of the national cancer-prevention plan. I only hope that when my days on earth are past I will have left a monument of public service which slightly approaches the monument of public service which George Stringfellow's life is erecting for his fellow citizens. Certainly his contribution in the field of cancer prevention will be an outstanding one among humanitarian works in our generation.

I appreciate being invited to talk to you tonight. At the outset of my speech I wish to thank Brother Cooke and Brother Rowe for the hospitality which they extended to me by chauffering me this afternoon from New York to Trenton. I learned a great deal on that ride about the broad social consciousness of those two men, about their points of views on many of the perplexing problems which confront our social order and about their abiding faith in the survival of the American way of life if only our people will live by the spirit and intent of our democratic system.

In my speech tonight I hope that in at least a small way I can exemplify the spirit which I caught from Brother Cooke and Brother Rowe this afternoon. It is a spirit which calls upon all of us to recognize before it is too late some of the great social responsibilities which confront us in America today.

The subject which I was asked to talk about is the subject: Is Communism a Threat to Our Fraternity? The answer to that question is obviously an affirmative one for the simple reason that communism is a serious threat to our Nation and therefore necessarily a threat to all institutions within our Nation including our fraternity. However, the threat of communism bears a direct relationship to our fraternity because of the inseparable relationship between the principles of our fraternity and its contribution of those principles to the formation of our Nation. As Masons we can and should take pride in the fact that Masonry made significant contributions in the early historical days of our Nation to the great charters of our Government, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Throughout the ritual of Masonry from its first degree to its highest are to be found the principles of democratic brotherhood which form the framework and governmental encasement of our system of self-government. As Masons we should appreciate fully tonight the fact that if the communistic ideology, which runs counter to all the precepts and concepts of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, should ever prevail in this country we will then have lost self-government.

I am afraid that too many people have forgotten that our economic system and our political system are inseparable. We cannot have individual rights and liberties as set out in our Constitution under any totalitarian economy. We cannot maintain the foundation principle of democratic government under a totalitarian economy. Although the foundation principle of democratic government to which I refer appears to many people to be an abstract one I would caution you to remember that it is an exceedingly concrete one measured in terms of your rights.

What is that principle? If I say nothing else tonight that you remember even until tomorrow I hope you will remember and reflect upon this principle of democratic government. It is obvious as one talks to many Americans that more of them need to do much more thinking about this fundamental principle than I fear millions of them are doing today.

This country of ours was founded primarily upon the basic democratic principle that the spiritual value of the individual citizen is the very core of self-government. You cannot read the Constitution nor the Declaration of Independence nor the great debates out of which was born this Republic without recognizing the fact that our founding fathers believed that a society of free people must rest upon a devotion to the spiritual value of the individual person. They considered that the primary purpose of a democratic form of government was to protect the dignity of the individual. They realized that the individual human being is the creature of the Almighty and that to exploit and debase the individual person is a sacrilegious offense. We Masons know that one cannot understand the ideals of Masonry unless it is recognized that Masonry too is based upon a devotion to protecting and furthering the spiritual value of the individual. That is the essence of brotherhood. It is the ideal and record of Masonry.

Therefore, when I talk about communism in relation to our fraternity I would urge you to remember that in communism there is no recognition of the spiritual value of the individual. When you are dealing with the communistic ideology you are dealing with the political philosophy in which the individual life has little or no value.

One only has to study or observe what we can observe even on this side of the iron curtain in the Russian-occupied nations to recognize the fact that under the Russian regime human life is cheap. During my trip through Europe in 1946, although I was unable to obtain from the Russians permission to get behind the iron curtain, I did have a chance to make some observations in some of the Russian-occupied areas of Europe. I talked to a great many Russians and to a great many Europeans who had experienced life under the Communist regime. My observations led uniformly to the conclusion that the Communist ideology is incompatible with the democratic ideal of giving primary importance to the spiritual value of human life.

When we speak in our country about the importance of the principle of self-government which is basic to our political philosophy, namely, that the people are the masters and not the servants of the state, we speak of a principle which rests on the concept that the individual is all-important in our American way of political thinking. On the other hand under the Communst form of government the individual is but an item of human fodder with which to feed the totalitarian appetite of the state. It is very difficult to reconcile in the interest of peace the political philosophies of communism and democracy but we must try to find some basis on which the two philosophies can live in peace in the world. I say that because if we are going to avoid a war which would result in the killing of millions of human beings living under both Communist and democratic governmental systems today we must face the cold, hard fact that some mutually satisfactory understanding for peaceful relationships must be reached.

I am not one of those who believes that the Russian people are being held in complete subjugation or in involuntary servitude by the Russian leaders. The evidence is very much against such a point of view although there are those in this country who are trying to convince us that the Russian people are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist regime. It would be rather reassuring and hopeful if one could believe that the Russian people are anti-Communist. The facts, however, point to the contrary. The facts indicate that the Russian leaders have succeeded with a program of indoctrination and propaganda since the Russian Revolution in convincing the Russian people

generally that the communistic form of government offers the only hope of survival for the Russian people.

We Americans need to remember that the Russian people have been convinced that we intend to make war upon them and that they must proceed as rapidly as possible to prepare for that war no matter what the personal sacrifice and hardship may be. It appears evident that the Russian people are making tremendous sacrifices and undergoing great hardships in carrying out the propaganda dictates of the Russian Politburo.

Part of the Russian strategy is a program of infiltration into the free governments of the world so that in case of another war the Communists will be in a position to do internal damage to those free governments including our own. This tactic of infiltration is characteristic of totalitarian techniques as used by Hitler as well as by the Russians. We cannot ignore the fact that a spread of the communistic philosophy in America is itself a threat to the great spiritual values of our form of government.

Although we must recognize this danger we must be careful at the same time not to become alarmists. We must be careful not to become Red-baiters in the negative sense. But on the other hand we must not close our minds to evidence and proof of Communist infiltration into our American institutions. In discussing infiltration tactics I would caution you to remember that we must try to lean over backward in controlling our emotional attitudes toward communistic activities. Keen perception and cool-headed statesmanship are better weapons to use against the infiltrating techniques of Communists than is the adoption of police-state methods on our own part in an attempt to combat an ideology which seeks to destroy us. It is very difficult to remain coldly analytical of the tactics of Communists but it is only by cold analyses that we can properly appraise the nature and methods of our Communist opposition.

Thus one cannot read the newspapers today as a loyal American and not recoil—yes, recoil emotionally—at the very thought that we have an organization in our country today, the Communist Party, whose leaders have told the American people brazenly that in time of war, if that war were with the Soviet Union, they would not support our Government. The statement carried in the press of our Nation today quoting the American Communist leaders to the effect that a war with Russia would be a Wall Street-manipulated war which should not be supported by believers in democracy is a treasonable insult to our intelligence. It is perfectly obvious from their statement that in the event of such a war the Communist strategy in America would be to engage in activities of sabotage in order to interfere with the successful prosecution of that war. One of my colleagues in the Senate has most appropriately characterized this announcement of the American Communist Party leaders by stating that they have pleaded guilty to treason in advance of the act.

What are some of the American institutions through which the Communists may be expected to infiltrate and spread their insidious propaganda against the spiritual values of democracy? We may be sure that they will attempt to infiltrate into every American institution which offers them any opportunity for the creation of a Communist cell. That they have tried and are trying to infiltrate their propaganda into the educational system of America is self-evident. Under the name of academic freedom they seek to carry out an indoctrination program.

Now I would caution you to watch out for witch hunts in our educational systems conducted by those who do not believe in academic freedom. We will defeat the purposes of democracy if our counterattack on communistic infiltration takes the form of police-state methods which destroy an untrammeled search for the truth in the halls of learning of our educational institutions.

Twenty-one years of my life have been spent in university classrooms, and I know that one of the greatest obstacles to academic freedom is the attempt from time to time, on the part of prejudiced groups to stifle the untrammeled search for the truth in our halls of learning. The great Biblical tenet of American free education, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is too precious to be shackled by academic censorship or the right of free minds to search out the truth no matter what shibboleths or existing prejudices must be pierced in finding the truth.

However, academic freedom is not synonymous with license to destroy that freedom. I fail to follow the logic of some of our educators who are arguing these days that the preservation of academic freedom in the colleges of America requires the recognition of a right of teachers to become Communists and retain their teaching positions. I say that I cannot accept that argument for the obvious reason that true Communists do not possess free minds but rather are indoctrinators of a philosophy which seeks to promote revolution and reduce our people to the dictates of a totalitarian form of government. Such teachers are not teachers at all, seeking to lead students through an objective analysis of governmental philosophies. Such teachers do not possess the devotion of the scientists to the findings of the facts but rather such Communist teachers, in order to carry out their indoctrination objectives, must necessarily slant their teachings away from the facts.

Last week I received an inquiry from a very able young citizen of my State, a graduate of one of our institutions of higher learning, who expressed great concern over the fact that in some of our colleges in this country steps were being taken to eliminate professed Communist sympathizers from our college faculties. He wanted me to protest such action on the part of our college administrators.

This young man, a veteran and thoroughly loyal citizen, is not at all friendly to the Communist ideology. He is a man who would be shocked if one even suggested to him that in defending the alleged right of Communists and fellow travelers to teach in our colleges he would be aiding and abetting the Communist program of infiltration against our system of self-government.

I am sure this young lawyer will be greatly disappointed when he receives my reply to his letter because as one who has taught for many years in various universities in this country I cannot agree with him that academic freedom requires that we allow Communists and fellow travelers to hold teaching positions in our colleges so they can indoctrinate the young minds of this country in support of revolutionary propaganda. I am a firm believer in intellectual freedom and a firm believer in the duty of our high schools and colleges and of our teachers to lead young minds into an analysis and a critical analysis of the various political philosophies which have challenged the thought of man over the centuries. But I cannot accept the thesis that in order to present to our students an objective critical analysis of the communistic philosophy it is necessary to employ some Communist teachers on the faculties of our schools.

Thus, in my letter of reply to my constituent who protested the attitude of some college administrators that Communists and fellow travelers should be discharged from their faculties I stated to him as follows:

"On the issue as to whether or not Communists should be allowed to teach on our college faculties, I am definitely of the opinion that they should not be allowed to hold positions of this kind because of the undeniable fact that one of the primary objectives of the Communists is to infiltrate into our educational, economic, and social institutions in this country to the degree necessary in due course of time to bring about a revolutionary change of government here.

"Granted that looking at the problem from the standpoint of an isolated case here and there, the danger does not seem to be too alarming, nevertheless when one looks at the Communist strategy pattern as a whole, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the danger is a very real one. I am not one who believes that students in political science, philosophy, economics, and other courses taught in the social sciences, should not study the Communist philosophies, because obviously we cannot have an intelligent, educated point of view in regard to the dangers of communism if we do not have an informed and enlightened public opinion in regard to the nature of communism. However, that is quite a different thing from taking the position that the taxpayers should pay for the teaching of communism in either a veiled or unveiled form by Communists on our college faculties.

"I see no principle of academic freedom involved in a refusal on the part of university administrations or boards of education to allow Communists to teach on their faculties. To the contrary, it seems obvious to me that we would soon lose academic freedom in this country—as it has been lost in Russia—if a Communist educational policy should ever come to prevail in our school system.

"In other words, I don't think it is necessary to have a Communist on a faculty in order to make certain that the students will be given an opportunity to analyse the Communist philosophy.

"I appreciate the fact that all you seek to assure is that our students will have adequate opportunity to analyze and compare the arguments, pro and con, for the various political systems which are competing in the world today for the support of the people in the various countries in the world. However, I think that assurance can be given by our scholars who are loyal to our constitutional political system and to our capitalistic economic system, without employing teachers who seek to undermine those systems in America."

I agree that our students should be familiar with the doctrines of communism in order to be able to help enlighten our citizenry as to the great economic and political fallacies of communism and as to the dangers of the doctrine of communism to personal liberty in America. However, I do not agree that academic freedom is violated when we refuse to have the analysis of communism taught in our schools by Communists. Likewise, I agree that students should study the political fallacies of fascism if they are to clearly understand the dangers of Fascist propaganda in America. At the same time I do not support the view that academic freedom is threatened by refusing to employ in our schools teachers who are advocates of the Fascist political system.

The fifth-column pattern of both the Communist and Fascist organizations is the well-established technique of subversive groups whose design is to cause trouble in a country in time of national crisis. France and Norway paid the price for tolerating fifth-column activities on the part of German Fascists prior to World War II. The Russian Communist fifth-column infiltration tactics in satellite countries which she has overrun since World War II should at least put us on guard in this country against the infiltration threat of communism. I would be the first to grant that there are tremendous differences—geographical, economic, social, and ideological—between the countries in which Russian communism has successfully infiltrated and the situation here in the United States. Nevertheless, when Communist leaders in the United States brazenly announce to the people of our country that in time of

war with the Soviet Union they would not support the United States I think we have the right and duty to take precautionary measures against any attempt to establish a fifth-column program in the United States on the part of any subversive group be it either Fascist or Communist.

Therefore, it seems to me that any attempt to pervert academic freedom into a license for Communists to teach in our schools should be rejected. I say that fully appreciating the fact that undoubtedly there are some American teachers who are sincere critics of the abuses of capitalism and of social and economic injustices in America and who are falsely accused of being Communists or fellow travelers simply because they present to their students critical analyses of some of the shortcomings of our own system of government. However, false and unwarranted attacks against liberal teachers in our American educational system can be answered and the teacher concerned can be protected in his academic rights without taking the extreme position that academic freedom immunizes teachers from any examination of what they teach or of any consideration of their loyalty to our form of government.

Academic freedom certainly should not become a sanctuary for propagandists. Academic freedom certainly should not become a refuge and protector of indoctrination. It is to be granted that drawing a line between freedom and license is always a difficult one and requires the exercise of tolerant and exceedingly intelligent judgment. However, the difficulty of the task of determining what falls within the realm of academic freedom and what endangers academic freedom by way of perversion through indoctrination does not justify either school authorities or our citizenry generally in throwing up their hands in surrender when confronted by any attempt, subtle or otherwise, of Communists and Fascists to infiltrate into our educational system. Any such challenge to freedom of education presented by indoctrination tactics must be met head on. Thus, I do not share the point of view that the President of the University of Washington, acting through the board of regents of that great institution, violated academic freedom by removing from the faculty any avowed Communists.

I do not take the position that students should not hear speeches by Communists because I do not believe in thought-control tactics or in police-state methods. It must be granted that we do not answer or rebut communistic fallacies by refusing to listen to them. That is quite a different thing from impressing upon students through a teaching position a constant bombardment of indoctrination of Communist propaganda presented in the name of academic freedom. It is one thing for students to go voluntarily to a lecture by a known Communist- or Fascist-minded person out of intellectual curiosity or desire to try to analyze and understand the point of view of the speaker but it is quite a different thing to impose in the name of academic freedom a subversive teacher on the students of any school.

Therefore, it is one thing to take the position, as I take the position, that true academic freedom forbids us from excluding from critical analysis and study in our schools any of the political, social, and economic philosophies which throughout history have contested for the support of peoples and quite a different thing to take the position that academic freedom permits any classroom in our free-school system to become a propaganda rostrum for the indoctrination of totalitarian doctrines. The proposition is unacceptable to say in the name of academic freedom that in order to give students a background and an understanding of the philosophy of communism, for example, we ought to put on our teaching staffs teachers who are seeking to lead them by way of propaganda into accepting the notion that the American systems of political democracy and economic capitalism are a failure in that they deny basic human rights.

As a liberal in American politics I hold to the view that any form of totalitarianism, communistic or otherwise, is incompatible with individual liberty and with protecting the spiritual value and dignity of the person. Our American system of a political democracy combined with a capitalistic economy has advanced human rights and provided for human needs to a degree far superior to that which has been developed under any other political and economic system in all history.

Some people always seem to be a little surprised to hear me, as a constitutional liberal, strongly defend capitalism. Those who take the time to study my record know that it is a defense of capitalism which I have always made throughout my public life including my many years as a teacher. Thus, I repeat, that we cannot have a free society in America in which the spiritual value of the individual is paramount and in which the political liberties and human rights, which are ours under a Constitution, can exist except under a system of political democracy with its capitalistic economy.

Why do I hold to that belief? Because the alternative to a capitalistic society must be some form of statism. History is replete with examples showing that whenever a people adopt some form of economic statism they lose the precious freedom of having the state serve as their servant. Under any form of totalitarianism the people become the servants and not the masters of the state. I do not care how the propagandists for statism gild the lily. I do not care what adjectives or plausible fallacies they use in their propaganda in an endeavor to confuse you in your support of our American constitutional system. I do not care how beautiful the siren call may be to gain, at least at first, your partial support of their propaganda that under statism you can have abundance for nothing. I repeat that a state economy and personal liberties are incompatible.

There are many millions of our fellow citizens working in overalls in America today who must someway, somehow, be made to understand that their standard of living, their rights as free workers, and their independence to enjoy the blessings which exist in America would be unknown to them if they lived under a Communist regime.

Likewise, I would point out to American workers, that any form of statism, such as socialism, if adopted in America, would result in a loss of so many individual and political rights that the standard of living of the American worker would soon suffer a serious decline.

During the last campaign I had several public discussions with representatives of the Socialist Party. I found that their technique was to evade, duck, and hedge issues, particularly the question as to what would happen to the political rights and liberties of the individual person once a state economy were substituted in America for our capitalistic economy.

Thus, in one debate with a prominent Socialist I asked him to join with me on the issue as to what would happen to the economic freedom of the workers of this country if a socialistic state were substituted for a capitalistic economy. I explained that I did not think that this particular Socialist leader would want to destroy our individual rights but I told him I was sure the audience would want to know how it could be avoided if a total socialistic regime came into the control of our Government.

It seems clear to me that under a Socialist regime the Socialist leaders would endeavor to entrench themselves deeper and deeper into our body politic in order to preserve themselves in power. In order to do so they would have to issue more and more controls and regulations upon the economic rights and freedoms of the individual citizen in order to keep in operation the Government-owned and operated economic facilities of the country.

It would only be a matter of time before the individual worker's right to work for whomsoever he pleased, for as long as he pleased, would be abridged. It would only be a matter of time before he would be limited in the wages he sought and the working conditions he demanded. Free trade unionism, as we know it today, would cease to exist under a Socialist regime, at least in respect to many of the rights of independent action including the right to strike, if our capitalistic economy were supplanted by a socialistic economy.

What was the answer of my Socialist opponent in that debate? No answer on the issue at all. He ducked and weaved and tried to paint the usual Socialist picture, appealing to the desire of the average person to live in a society free from want and free from fear of insecurity. He sought to give a glowing account of citizenship ownership of the production machinery of the Nation and subtly left the impression that the individual worker would be the boss of his own economic destiny. He avoided pointing out that under a socialistic system there would be bosses, too, but that these bosses would not be hampered by the checks that exist in our political democracy against the abuses of capitalism. He failed to point out that the abuses of industry and the abuses of government would be one and the same under a socialistic economy and that the danger would be very real that any attempt to check the abuses of bosses would only result in more drastic controls and dictates from the Socialist government.

When I pressed him for a head-on collision with the issue of what would happen to the economic freedoms and rights, to say nothing about the political rights of the workers under a socialistic regime, his rejoinder was by way of a humorous personal remark. Referring to my statements he said, "Wasn't that awful? You know WAYNE MORSE knows better than that. That just shows what the Republican Party has done to him." [Laughter.] "I just can't understand his position on socialism. Oh, yes, on second thought I think I can. I think if I lived in Oregon and wanted to belong to that gentlemens' club known as the United States Senate I would have sense enough to run as a Republican." [Laughter.]

Of course, I enjoyed his rejoinder which is what we call in debate, rebuttal by ridicule; but the fact remains that this Socialist leader, like all advocates of statism, could not deny that economic statism means economic dictation by the leaders of the state rather than economic determination of their economic rights and freedoms by the people of a nation.

Unsound in this regard as the proposals of the Socialists are, even more destructive of our personal liberties, both political and economic, would be a substitution of communism for capitalism. Thus, in the last campaign I debated against many representatives of the Wallace party. I am sure that some of them did not realize that they were following the Communist Party line throughout the campaign but I am satisfied that they were. There were several key questions which I put to them, their answer to which satisfied me that the Communists in America were at least obtaining a great deal of aid and comfort out of the Wallace campaign.

Thus, I would say to a Wallace speaker, "Let the representative of the Wallace party come to this microphone now and tell this audience whether he disapproves of any phases of the Russian foreign policy. Let him tell you if he approves of any phases of American foreign policy. Let him tell you if he approves of the Russian blockade of

Berlin." Then I would point out to my audiences that the Communist Party line in America is to offer no criticism of Russian foreign policy or no approval to any degree whatsoever of any phases of American foreign policy. Therefore, I considered it a fair request to ask a speaker for the Wallace party to talk in specific terms as to the position of the Wallace party on the various phases of Russian and American foreign policy. Not once during the campaign did I hear a single speaker for the Wallace party follow anything but the Communist Party line on foreign policy.

When I asked speakers for the Wallace party to explain to the audience what would happen to the workers if they tried to form a trade-union based upon the principles of American free trade-unionism, or when I asked them to explain what civil rights millions of human beings held in slave labor in Russia are able to enjoy, I would be met with the usual Communist line of evasion.

The line which the Wallace speakers followed in answer to such questions went something like this: "I refuse to be a party to the red-baiting, red-herring, and red-smearing tactics of the Senator from Oregon. It is a shocking and disgraceful thing that the Senator from Oregon, before this audience tonight, has made such a vicious attack against a great war ally of the United States—Soviet Russia; an ally that lost millions of soldiers and civilians during the war fighting German Hitlerism; an ally that suffered thousands of square miles of war devastation on the eastern front, thereby engaging a large portion of the German Army and saving millions of American lives on the western front."

As I listened to the clear evidence of the Communist Party line during the last political campaign in this country, I recognized that if the Communist infiltration should gain a foothold in the social, political, and economic institutions of our country our system of political democracy and capitalistic economy upon which our individual rights and freedom depend gradually would be weakened.

What is the best way to check this infiltration? Certainly the answer is not to be found in the adoption of police-state methods in America. It is not to be found in the adoption of a thought-control censorship law. We will not stop the spread of an ideology by adopting gestapo tactics. All such devices are the tools and weapons of totalitarianism itself. We are not going to check the threat of communism by emoting against it, no matter how irritating we find its false assumptions to be.

I appreciate the fact that we would be less than human if as loyal Americans we did not resent the newspaper announcement today that the members of the Communist Party in America would not defend our country in a war against Russia. We would be less than human if no flush of anger reached our cheeks when we read Communist propaganda in the press today built up around the old cliche that "capitalism thrives on exploitation" and another cliche, "Wall Street and the cartelists are organizing a war against Russian democracy."

Such hymns of hate against the American system which are being sung by the Communists and fellow travelers today within our midst must be answered cool-headedly. We must recognize that part of the Communist technique is to make use of word forms which have come to develop favorable emotional reactions on the part of the American people.

Thus, as I have said so many times in recent years, one of the propagandist strategies of the Communists is to use the words and symbols of democracy in spreading Communist doctrines. Hence, in the press today we see the Communists referring to "Russian democracy" and to the struggle of the "eastern democracies" against "western imperialism." Of course, we know that there is no democracy in Russia, no personal freedom, no civil rights, no freedom of speech, no freedom of religion, and no freedom for the individual. Yet we can fully expect that the Communists as they seek to propagandize dissatisfied groups within our country will talk in terms of the very freedoms and individual rights which the Russian system abhors.

How should we meet their threat? Those of us in the Masonic order who believe so deeply in the personal liberties guaranteed by our constitutional system should join with all other loyal Americans in meeting the challenge of citizen statesmanship in America today. That challenge is to see to it that the capitalistic system is made to work as it can work for the benefit of the common good rather than for the selfish interests of a privileged few.

Most of you in this audience before me are businessmen and as businessmen I say you must be your own severest critics so far as the abuses of the capitalistic system are concerned. The abuses and disjointures of the capitalistic system should not discourage us but make us rather bear the ills we have than fly to other that we know not of.

Our capitalistic system being a human institution, is bound to develop defects. It is the obligation of a representative government, acting through the elected representatives of the people, to pass whatever legislation is necessary from time to time to check, control, and correct the abuses that develop within our economy.

However, I would point out that the greatest strength we have against the threat of communism is derived from the benefits that can and should flow from our capitalistic system for the welfare of our people as a whole. The best way to preserve and advance legitimate private-property interests in America is to see to it that the capitalistic system constantly improves the standard of living, the health, the security, and the happiness of our people.

We must retain the inducements and incentives of our private-property system because without those economic freedoms we cannot avoid economic statism. However, I deny that the capitalistic system necessarily means the exploitation of the weak for the strong. I grant that too frequently too many have confused a laissez-faire economy with a capitalistic economy. I grant that under a laissez-faire economy the economic pattern takes the form of a repetition of a business cycle of a boom and bust. I admit that a laissez-faire economy produces basically a program of exploiting the weak for the benefit of the strong. However, I contend that a laissez-faire economy and a successful capitalistic system are entirely different economic phenomena.

Further, I contend that without the inducements and the incentives of the private-property system, which is the essence of a capitalistic economy, we cannot escape going down the road toward a national economy of statism.

I am not going to take the time to apply this thesis to a great many issues, but I want to apply it to one or two.

The first issue I shall select is considered a very dry issue by many people but it is basic to this whole matter of making the capitalistic system work. It is an issue in regard to which I say most kindly and in a spirit of complete friendliness that you businessmen and thousands of others like you across this country during the last few years have not done all you should do in carrying out your job of citizen statesmanship. I refer to that very dry political subject of taxation reform.

Too many people in America, particularly businessmen, have been making the mistake of discussing taxation from the standpoint of support or opposition to proposals for either tax decreases or tax increases. There has been too much discussion of the taxation problem from the standpoint of personal selfishness rather than from the standpoint of the one great tax need of the country.

What is that need? It is the need for tax revision. It is the need for eliminating from our Federal tax structure the many inequities which are interfering with making the capitalistic system work for the benefit of the common good. It is the inequities in our existing tax structure which are discouraging business incentive and which are preventing the needed investing of millions of dollars of venture capital into new wealth-creating projects so essential to maintaining prosperity in this country. It is only out of new wealth, gentlemen; out of new job-creating enterprises; out of a further development of our economic resources, industrial and natural, that we can ever meet the fiscal problems of our Government.

You will never, in your lifetime or in the lifetime of your grandchildren, meet the fiscal problems of this Government if you try to do it from the standpoint of juggling existing percentage tax rates either up or down. The job of statesmanship in the field of taxation is a job of complete tax revision in order to eliminate the inequities from our tax structure.

You must share part of the responsibility for the failure of the Congress of the United States in recent years to adopt a program of tax revision. I doubt if most of you have been any different from most Americans during recent years in thinking that your tax problems would be solved or at least helped by the adoption of a tax bill by your Congress which would provide for a reduction in tax rates.

Those of us in the Seventy-ninth Congress who opposed the Knutson tax bill, because its chief characteristic was a downward juggling of tax percentages rather than an entire tax revision program, were subjected to a great deal of criticism at the time for our opposition to that bill. In the Eightieth Congress when the Republican Party was in control, it too failed in its responsibility to the people by proposing the Knutson-Millikin tax program, which was chiefly characterized by further juggling of tax percentages.

I finally voted for that law, not because I considered it a satisfactory meeting of the obligations of the Congress on the tax issue but because we were able to secure a few concessions in the direction of sound tax revision principles. We did not secure enough concessions to make it a good bill, however. In my judgment, if the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress had met the tax issue head-on, adopting a tax revision program which contained the major recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, we not only would have made a sound contribution to economic statesmanship but we would have demonstrated a political statesmanship which would have won the confidence of several millions of voters who failed to support us on November 2, 1948, due in part to the poor record we made in the Eightieth Congress on the tax issue.

A few weeks ago I was invited to address a very interesting group in Philadelphia, known as the Philadelphia Sunday Morning Breakfast Club—which meets once a month on a Wednesday night. [Laughter.] Maybe some of your were in attendance at that meeting. As you know, it is not an organization of liberal Republicans; but nevertheless they demonstrated to me on that evening that they are a group of business leaders who are devoted to the ideal of making our capitalistic system work in the interest of our country as a whole.

During the course of the evening we discussed the relationship between our tax structure and a successful working of our

capitalistic system. At that meeting, as here tonight, I pointed out that too many businessmen have not given the support they should give to a sound tax revision program. They have been too much interested in percentage reductions, forgetting that percentage reductions in tax rates are not the answer to stabilizing the American dollar.

Thus to you businessmen and fellow Masons tonight I offer what I think is one of the best checks we have against the threat of communism to our capitalistic system. I offer what I consider to be a tax program more sound than any tax program adopted by the Congress in recent years. I am not responsible for the authorship of the program. It has been worked out by a group of businessmen, industrialists and economists who are far more competent in the field of tax economics than I ever hope to be. However, I believe that one of my obligations as a Senator is to be willing to recognize, accept and follow expert advice whenever that expert advice stands up under thorough and critical analysis and examination.

The tax program of the Committee for Economic Development is a tax revision program. It is a program which has been subjected to thorough analysis by tax experts and economists throughout the country. There may be a need for some changes in the recommendations of the CED, but no showing has been made to date—at least of which I have read—that points out any serious holes in the tax program of the CED. I have yet to hear of any group of manufacturers or bankers or industrialists or economists, or even of politicians, who have been able to tear apart the tax report of the Committee for Economic Development and show that it isn't a program which in the main should receive favorable action by Congress.

Therefore I offer to you tonight, for your consideration as one of the checks against communism in America, the tax program of the CED. The tax recommendations of this committee have been available to us for over 3 years. Twice on the floor of the United States Senate I have offered this tax program. In both the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses I introduced appropriate legislation setting forth the tax recommendations of the CED.

I was not able even to secure a committee hearing on these proposals. Imagine that. Did any leader in the Senate during either the Seventy-ninth or Eightieth Congress point out any reasons why the proposed tax amendments of the CED should not be adopted? They did not. Republican leaders, for example, said in effect that the tax amendments which I had introduced were meritorious and deserving of careful consideration in the future, but because they dealt with tax revision rather than tax reduction they could not be considered in connection with either the Knutson tax bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress or the Knutson-Millikin bill in the Eightieth Congress.

It is my position that the only sound type of tax reduction that is worth having is a tax reduction that is based upon a revision of our whole Federal tax structure. In my opinion, the difficulty with our leaders in Congress on the tax issue has been that they have been playing politics with the issue in the form of trying to give the American taxpayers a percentage reduction in tax rates, thereby misleading the American taxpayer into thinking a reduction in tax rates constitutes a real tax saving.

This problem is similar to the problem of the difference between real wages and wage rates. The only wages which in the last analysis are of importance to the worker are his real wages measured in terms of the purchasing power of the American dollar.

High wages paid with an inflated dollar are very deceiving, as millions of American workers today are coming to realize. Juggling percentagewise tax rates will not produce any real tax reduction, unless and until we eliminate from our tax structure the many types of tax inequities which are pointed out by the tax report of the Committee for Economic Development.

In this Eighty-first Congress I intend in due course of time to offer once again the tax program of the Committee for Economic Development. I wonder if I shall be able to get a committee hearing on it. I think I shall, if business leaders, farm leaders, and labor leaders in this country will wake up, before it is too late, to the fact that it is tax revision which they need as one of the great aids necessary in order to make the capitalistic system work for the benefit of all of our people.

I shall not take the time tonight to discuss the individual amendments to our tax laws, recommended by the CED, but I shall be very glad to send a copy of those proposals to any one in this audience who writes to my office for them. My basic interest in tax reform is motivated by a desire to stabilize the value of the American dollar. You bankers in this audience know that a fluctuating dollar is very disruptive to our capitalistic system and is very discouraging to business incentive and the investment of venture capital.

All of you businessmen in the room know that the American dollar today is only a 45-cent dollar, evaluated in purchasing power terms based on 1939 values. Thus I say that I do not care which one of the amendments proposed by the CED you might select; any one of them standing alone would be more helpful in stabilizing the value of the American dollar than the entire tax program adopted by the last two Congresses.

I do not ask you to agree with me about this point, but I make the point in order to stimulate you if possible into studying the tax program of the Committee for Economic Development. I would rather that you would not agree with me, at least on the spur of the moment, because I believe if you do not agree with me you will be more inclined to think about this problem and more inclined to give careful consideration to the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development.

If I can get you to thinking about strengthening the capitalistic system through stabilizing the American dollar by way of a thorough revision of our Federal tax structure, I shall have accomplished more good tonight than I could possibly accomplish by your going out of here and saying: "Well, I agree with that guy." I'm not used to very much agreement [laughter], but I am going to keep right on in my fight as a constitutional liberal trying to make the objectives of our Constitution—which rests upon the spiritual values of the individual—work in America.

It seems to me that is the great challenge which confronts American democracy today and if we meet it we shall automatically answer the threat of communism.

The only other issue I shall take the time to mention tonight to illustrate my point as to the necessity of making the capitalistic system work is the hot labor issue. There is no doubt about the fact that I am greatly misunderstood on that issue by a great many businessmen in this country. The reason for the misunderstanding is that so few businessmen will take the time to put on their glasses and read the official record. They are much more inclined to accept, without checking, the slanted information and prejudices presented to them by various employers and manufacturers and businessmen's associations.

As you know, in the Eightieth Congress I opposed the Taft-Hartley bill. However, I am sure that many of you do not know that in the Eightieth Congress, in cooperation with Senator IVES, of New York, I proposed the Ives-Morse labor legislation. In fact, the bill which the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommended to the floor of the Senate set forth for the most part the provisions of the Ives-Morse proposals.

This committee bill was changed into the Taft-Hartley bill, by various amendments passed on the floor of the Senate and by more than 25 procedural changes adopted by the conference committee of the House and Senate. I have discovered that when businessmen take the time to study the Taft-Hartley bill in comparison with the Ives-Morse proposals, most of them—at least now by way of hindsight—are willing to express the opinion that it would have been better to pass the Morse-Ives bill in 1947.

In fact, I was greatly encouraged about a month ago when BOB TAFT suggested to me that he thought probably what we ought to do in this session of Congress is to start at least in our consideration of labor legislation with the provisions of the committee bill of 1947 which set forth in the main Senator IVES' and my proposals. I told BOB, good naturedly, I thought that was where he should have stopped in 1947; and he with equal good nature pointed out that he has never taken the position that the Taft-Hartley bill should not be subject to amendment.

Right here I want to pay BOB TAFT a very deserved compliment. In my judgment the objectivity with which he has considered and listened to proposals for drastic modifications and revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, during our hearings on that legislation these past few weeks, is clear evidence of his desire to adopt fair labor legislation.

If one were to rely upon newspaper accounts in respect to the relationships between BOB TAFT and me, he would be led to believe that we are bitter personal enemies; whereas the fact is we are very good personal friends.

I'm sure our objectives are the same, namely, to vote for those legislative proposals which will help make the capitalistic system work most successfully for the benefit of all of our people. We frequently disagree on whether or not the procedures set out in various legislative proposals will accomplish that primary objective, but we do not disagree in our mutual desire to try to be controlled in our judgments by the facts. As you very well know, however, reasonable men can frequently differ as to what they believe the effects and results of the operation of certain facts will be upon the economy.

In regard to this labor issue, I urge you businessmen to recognize that what we need is legislation which is not unfair to labor or unfair to management; but rather legislation which protects the legitimate collective-bargaining rights of each and thereby protects the public interest.

It is my position that the Wagner Act discriminated unfairly in favor of labor, and that the Taft-Hartley Act discriminates unfairly in favor of management. The result of these two extreme positions reduced to legislative form has been the deepening and widening of the chasm of class conflict separating management and labor in this country. Our capitalistic system will not be safe if labor and management continue to organize into two strong camps of economic opposition and proceed to carry on class warfare against each other.

One only has to look at the results of the election on November 2, 1948, to know that the passage of the Taft-Hartley law had a great effect on that election. In fact, I think the Taft-Hartley law has done more to throw American labor into politics on a class-conscious basis than anything which has happened in this country during the last 25 years. I don't say the political activities of labor

elected Truman, but I am satisfied that the political activities of labor cost the Republicans enough defeats in political races for the Senate and the House of Representatives, so as to change the Congress from a Republican Congress to a Democratic one.

Further, I say that the labor vote combined with the farm vote determined the Presidential election. So far as the influence of the labor vote was concerned, there can be no doubt about the fact that it was motivated primarily by its opposition to the Taft-Hartley law. How anyone in the country can reach the conclusion that a law such as the Taft-Hartley Act, which produces such bitter class-conscious feelings, is a good thing for political democracy and for the strengthening of our capitalistic system is beyond me. What we need is a moderate labor-legislation program falling in between the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, namely, a middle-of-the-road bill which gives to American employers the same procedural rights and guaranties against the unfair labor practices of unions which the Wagner Act gave to unions against the unfair labor practices of employers.

In my campaign for the Senate in 1944 I stood for revisions of the Wagner Act. In 1937, prior to the Supreme Court decision declaring the Wagner Act constitutional, I stated at a labor institute on the Wagner Act, held in Portland, Oreg., that I thought the Wagner Act would be declared constitutional; but I went on in that speech to say that holding the act constitutional would not make it a good piece of legislation or a great magna carta for labor.

In that speech I guessed luckily as to the reasons the Supreme Court probably would give for declaring the act constitutional, because when the Court decision was handed down a short time thereafter it stressed some of the very points of constitutional law which I discussed in that speech. However, the Supreme Court decision declaring the Wagner Act constitutional did not change in any way the fundamental weakness of the Wagner Act, namely, that it violated one of the basic rules of the American playground. It failed to provide the same procedural rules for both teams.

The Wagner Act failed to give the same procedural rights and protections to employers which it gave to labor. Thus, in my 1944 campaign for the Senate I said I would propose amendments to the Wagner Act which I thought would be fair to management and fair to labor, thereby correcting the one-sidedness of the Wagner Act.

Hence, in cooperation with Senator IVES, of New York, such amendments were offered in 1947. As you can well imagine, I took a great deal of so-called political punishment in 1947 because of my refusal to vote for the Taft-Hartley law. I insisted that the Ives-Morse bill, which comprised the main features of the bill adopted by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, should be as far as we should go with labor legislation in that year. I took the position that the provisions of the Morse-Ives bill should be given an opportunity to demonstrate their workability.

It was not my contention that the recommendations set forth in the committee bill of 1947 should be considered final recommendations and not subject to future change based on experience. However, I warned the Republican Party that if it passed the Taft-Hartley bill with its biased provisions in favor of employers, it would create deep-seated political resentment against the Republican Party on the part of American workers. The election of November 2, 1948, certainly supported my warnings.

I am sure most of you do not know that the Labor Committee of the Senate in 1947, by a vote of 11 to 2, adopted the committee bill which contained the major recommendations of the Ives-Morse proposals. I am sure most of you do not know that employer groups which have taken the time to study the recommendations of the Morse-Ives proposals generally agree that they were reasonable proposals and many such business groups now recognize that it would have been better to try out those proposals in order to see what they could have accomplished in checking labor abuses rather than to pass the more drastic and sweeping Taft-Hartley Act.

Thus, I conclude my comments on this labor issue by repeating what I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate, namely, if we are going to try to make the capitalistic system work in the interests of promoting the common good, both labor and management should stop trying to secure the passage of legislation which discriminates in favor of either group; rather both management and labor should recognize that their own best interests are to be found in the passage of a piece of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress which is not slanted in favor of management—such as is the case with the Taft-Hartley Act—or in favor of labor—such as is the case with the Thomas bill offered by the administration in this session of Congress—but a piece of legislation that protects the legitimate rights of both management and labor and which applies the same procedural rules to both sides of the collective-bargaining table.

It is only such a piece of fair labor legislation which will protect the public interest.

I close by suggesting for your consideration the thought that if you really want to live up to the great ideals of our fraternity, then you must recognize that the best way to meet the threat of communism to our country is to take those specific steps which are necessary at all levels of our Government—Federal, State, and local—in order to make the capitalistic system work for the common good.

We cannot preserve and protect the spiritual values of the individual, nor his political rights, nor his economic freedoms, unless we make the capitalistic system work for the welfare of all our people. This means, of course, that we must see to it that the selfish interests of individuals and groups, who would use the capitalistic system as an instrument for exploiting the weak, are checked by sound legislation necessary to protect the weak from the selfish. [Applause.]

Chairman THOMPSON. Senator MORSE, we are honored by your appearance here. We are deeply appreciative of your inspiring and eloquent address. We thank you.

Maryland Day

REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, today is Maryland Day, the three hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the settling of the Free State. In my remarks I would like to include a history of our State as compiled by the Hall of Records:

1608, June: Capt. John Smith explores coast of Maryland.

1632, June 20: Charter of Maryland granted to second Lord Baltimore.

1633, November 22: The *Ark* and the *Dove* sail for the capes of the Chesapeake Bay.

1634, March 25: The *Ark* and the *Dove* arrive at St. Clements—Blakistone—Island.

1648: Toleration Act passed.

1694: Seat of government removed from St. Mary's to Annapolis.

1696: King William's School founded at Annapolis.

1729, July 30: Baltimore Town erected.

1763: Mason and Dixon begin survey of Maryland boundary.

1774, October 10: *Peggy Stuart*, laden with 2,000 pounds of taxable tea, burned.

1775, July 26: Formation of Association of Freemen.

1776, July 3: Maryland declares her independence.

1776, November: First State constitution adopted.

1782: Washington College, Chestertown, chartered.

1783, November 26: Annapolis becomes temporary National Capital.

1783, December 23: Washington resigns commission in old Senate Chamber, Annapolis.

1784: St. John's College, Annapolis, chartered.

1788, April 28: State convention at Annapolis ratifies Constitution of the United States.

1791, March 30: Maryland cedes District of Columbia to the United States.

1812: University of Maryland chartered.

1814, September 12: British repulsed at the Battle of North Point.

1814, September 13: Bombardment of Fort McHenry; Francis Scott Key writes The Star-Spangled Banner.

1828, July 4: Formal beginning of work on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

1829, October 17: Chesapeake and Delaware Canal opened.

1844: First telegraph line in the world built between Baltimore and Washington.

1845, October 10: United States Naval Academy opened at Annapolis.

1861, April 23: Maryland, My Maryland, written by James Ryder Randall.

1862, September: Battle of Antietam.

1864, July 9: Battle of Monocacy.

1876, October: Johns Hopkins University opens.

1889, May 7: Johns Hopkins Hospital opens.

Maryland's flag bears the arms of the Calvert and Crossland families. Calvert was the family name of the Lords Baltimore who founded Maryland. Crossland was the family of the mother of the first Lord Baltimore. The escutcheon or shield in the Maryland seal bears the same arms. This flag seems to have been used from the beginning of the colony, although it was not adopted officially until recently—chapter 48, acts of 1904.

The State flower of Maryland is the black-eyed susan and the State bird is the Baltimore oriole. The State tree is the white oak and a magnificent specimen of that tree is the Wye Oak located on the Eastern Shore.

Because the first settlers of our State 315 years ago were tolerant, the first seeds of American democracy were sown in the Maryland charter, which granted each settler of Maryland the right to worship as his conscience dictated. We are proud to be a native of the great Free State of Maryland.

Republican Party Policy Versus Republican Party Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party during the last 16 years has followed popular New Deal policies rather than sound principles, hoping that by aping the New Deal prophets they could win popular support. Four successive national elections have been lost by the Republican Party on a "me too" platform. One result of 16 years of the New Deal is that our people are less independent, less inclined to stand upon their own feet, and more inclined to lean upon the Federal Government for support. Our people have been persuaded by the politicians that they can eat their cake without earning it; that they need no longer exercise foresight and thrift, because no matter how foolish they are, the Government will take care of them by robbing the thrifty—through taxation—in order to support the foolish. How long will the thrifty continue to be thrifty if they are to be robbed of the results of their efforts? Are we not selling our precious American birthright for a mess of pottage by following vote-hungry politicians who insist upon bartering away freedom and independence for regimentation and a false security?

The Republican Party should get back to sound American principles and quit chasing the tail of the New Deal in quest of votes. A Republican Party that will fight for American principles of government, and fight against the socialistic program of the New Deal, would deserve and receive the support of the majority of American voters—regardless of party affiliation. A forthright declaration of principles and purpose by the Republican Party would halt the growing dissatisfaction within the Republican ranks, and would establish a base around which all virile Americans could rally. Until such a declaration of principles is made and until the Party establishes a rallying point around which real Americans can rally, it does not deserve the support of the majority of our American voters.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent request granted me I include as a part of my remarks a pertinent article taken from the current issue of the Reader's Digest which is a condensation of an editorial carried in the Omaha World-Herald:

GOD HATES A COWARD

That's gospel truth. If any witness were needed to attest it, the Republican Party of 1936–48 would more than suffice.

For 12 years the Republican Party has been a coward: the worst kind—a moral coward. In consequence it begins to take on the appearance of something the cat dragged in.

It is hard to define as an entity the Republican Party or any other large group of people since, however closely banded together, all cannot think alike in all respects. But, speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the insurance state, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly disguised and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the fleshpots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty, to stand up for the free Republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Owing to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional, glorious creed. And it finds the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling.

Here, in our own America, the state is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting freemen into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a "Great White Father"—a "father" corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction but out of cowardice. It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and to make it known. Its plea for votes has been the shameful one: Give us the offices, the power, and we'll give you as much of what we believe to be wrong as will the Democrats themselves.

Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls; and trails its flag.

What a wonderful thing it would be if Republican leaders could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party; how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it. A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition. Opposition not alone to a misguided and recreant Democratic Party here at home, but opposition, tenacious and resolute, to all the monstrous wrongs that today menace freedom, self-reliance, the courage to adventure, human dignity, in every land and every clime.

How joyously, with what reborn hope, men and women of the ancient faith of this Republic would rally about such a standard. Proud of it they would be in victory. No less proud in defeat.

Surely it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day that when the black flag of absolutism was raised back in the twentieth century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion to dedicate their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor, to driving that foul intruder back into the Dark Ages whence he emerged.

Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today in the ears of the Republican Party. The party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging. Or it can rise out of the dust of four merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that freemen prize.

Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a courageous and sound American editorial on the subject of the next blast of propaganda to be expected from the internationalists, interventionists, and one worlders. The Communists have no better friends than those who seek to destroy our economy, deplete our resources, and thus reduce our people to the regimented status of taxpaying serfs.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 25, 1949:

PACT PROPAGANDA

The pattern of the propaganda which will seek in the months to come to identify the Atlantic Pact with the multi-billion-dollar rearmament of western Europe is becoming clear.

The argument, already beginning to appear in the columns of editorialists and commentators, runs somewhat as follows:

An Atlantic pact minus rearmament is worse than no Atlantic pact at all. As a corollary, those Congressmen and others who approve the pact but question—from the viewpoint of American economic strength—the outlay of billions for European arms are potential saboteurs. If their counsels prevail, the disillusioned western Europeans will break away from the pact and seek refuge in the arms of the Kremlin.

The basic assumption here is that the solemn declaration of the United States to take action in the event of an attack on one of the signatories of the pact is in itself meaningless. The Soviet Union will therefore be just as inclined to undertake armed aggression in the pact area as it would if it thought it could count on United States neutrality.

This does not follow. The Soviet Union may attack western Europe regardless of what we say or do, but it is manifestly less likely to do so knowing that it will be immediately tangling with the United States. To suggest that our commitment in the Atlantic Pact does not improve the security position of western Europe is to flout reason and 125 years' experience with the Monroe Doctrine.

The second assumption of the rearmament thesis is that western Europe can in fact be defended against the Soviet Union. Even the rearmament proponents admit that the $1,500,000,000 now proposed is an initial outlay for the first year. Estimates of what reasonably adequate defense would cost make the whole Marshall plan and all other postwar European aid look like chicken feed.

What would be involved would be nothing less than putting the economy of the United States and those of the western European nations on a total-war footing. To create and sustain indefinitely a war economy is to destroy the economy itself and, inevitably, the liberties which western democracy is concerned to preserve.

Even then, you would not have made western Europe impregnable.

In the light of this, is it sabotage to suggest that the military strength of the United States resides where it always has—in a flourishing peacetime economy?

The final assumption is that the western European nations will pull out of the pact and embrace communism if they do not get arms right away. This is scarcely warranted by the struggle against communism which the western democracies have for some time been waging. More particularly, it reduces to absurdity the fact that the Atlantic Pact is the outgrowth of a European alliance—even if there is no Atlantic Pact there will still be the 50-year Brussels Pact of military defense.

But if it were true that, failing American arms, the western European nations would rush to the Kremlin, the United States would be well rid of such dubious allies.

Sale of Colored Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 25 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reserve Yellow for Butter," published in a recent issue of the Mosinee (Wis.) Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE YELLOW FOR BUTTER

It's time that both farmers and city folks get themselves riled up for the renewed fight coming up in Congress on the question of oleomargarine and authority to permit it to be sold in a form that resembles butter.

Frankly, we don't care whether or not there is a tax on oleo. We don't care if the manufacturers of it sell it as a substitute for butter. We don't care if it is sold colored or not. But we do care if it is sold in any form that resembles butter. For if that is possible then the public can be hoodwinked into believing that they are getting butter, when all they're getting is a substitute.

We can't for the life of us understand why it is that the proponents of oleo, who claim that it is as good as butter, don't be consistent and sell it on those merits, and not try to color it to resemble butter. Adopt some other color, if color it they must, that will be distinctly an oleo color and reserve yellow for butter. Of course, we know, the answer is that it isn't as good as butter and the vegetable-fat boys want to capitalize on the reputation the dairy industry has built up for their product.

We feel that the farmers must put up a good fight right now, and let their Senators and Congressmen know how they feel about this issue, or they stand to lose a large portion of the market for dairy products. On the other hand the city folks had better get into the fight, too, for if the farmers lose the users of butter are going to be sold down the river and will be on the receiving end of an inferior product whose price will jump as soon as they get the legislation that permits oleo to look like butter.

Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY can be contacted by writing to the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and Congressman REID MURRAY, who is carrying the battle for the dairy farmer, in Washington, gets his mail in the Congressional Office Building. How about writing to them right now?

United Nations Is Finished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Human Events contains an article by Mr. Felix Morley entitled "What Follows the United Nations?" This is an article that should be read by every Member of the House, and from it the conclusions must be reached that the United States is contributing substantially to the destruction of the United Nations Organization by entering into the so-called North Atlantic treaty. I recommend it to all Members:

WHAT FOLLOWS THE UNITED NATIONS?

(By Felix Morley)

Adolf Hitler is often quoted as having said: "The bigger the lie, the better the propaganda."

There is no documentary evidence that the late unlamented fuehrer ever put it quite that bluntly. But the idea undoubtedly was voiced by him in the chapter on war propaganda in Mein Kampf. There Hitler discusses the effectiveness of English propaganda in World War I, which successfully put over such concoctions as the fable of the Germans boiling down their war dead to obtain essential fats.

Hitler admiringly describes this type of propaganda fabrication as "a lie which by the absolute, colossal impudence of its presentation made allowance for the emotional and always extreme attitude of the common people, and therefore was believed."

The assertion that the biggest lies make the best propaganda comes naturally to mind as one examines the current effort of the administration to prove that the pending north Atlantic treaty "will strengthen and support the United Nations," to quote the words of President Truman.

Mr. Truman may quite possibly believe this. And it is further possible that a majority of the American people can be made to believe this. But it is certain that nothing is further from the truth.

II

Human Events, which is not interested in trying to fool anybody, could never force itself to be optimistic about the United Nations. On May 16, 1945, during the San Francisco Conference, we predicted that the unqualified right of veto would eventually wreck the Organization. On July 4, 1945, when the Charter was finally completed, we called it a constitutional monstrosity.

It would be more honest, and therefore more promising, if the Truman administration would say courageously that the United Nations is now regrettably a demonstrated failure and that the United States is therefore building a military alliance against Soviet Russia as a temporary alternative. Nobody who has actually read the Charter of UN can really believe all this hypocrisy about the proposed treaty being merely a regional arrangement of the type which the Charter contemplates.

And for the very good reason that it completely undermines the State Department case, Secretary Acheson must be very careful not to quote article 54 of the Charter, which says:

"The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The shrewd Mr. Vishinsky, now in complete charge of Soviet foreign policy, is in a position to have a good deal of fun with article 54 of the Charter, by placing it in conjunction with article 7 of the projected treaty, saying:

"This treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security."

If words mean anything, and if there is any sincerity in governmental actions, it follows from these two articles that we must report to the Russian representative on the Security Council all the military measures in contemplation against Russia, as these are developed under the North Atlantic Treaty. It will be interesting to note the extent to which that solemn obligation is observed.

Article 5 of the proposed treaty is superficially clever. That is the article which contemplates a Russian attack on one or more members of the North Atlantic Alliance and provides for collective action in response. The second paragraph of this article says:

"Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security."

This paragraph, of course, anticipates a Russian effort, in the Security Council, to veto measures taken against Russia by the North Atlantic Alliance. The plan is to nullify the Soviet veto by declaring that this consideration by the Security Council is insufficient. The members of the alliance, though they are members of the United Nations, will pay attention to the supreme organ of the UN only to the extent that the latter takes necessary measures.

This can only be called direct effort, sponsored by the Government of the United States, to undermine the United Nations as it is established. There is no attempt to define necessary measures, or to say who shall decide what constitute necessary measures. Again it appears that our Government shamelessly intends to be judge in its own cause.

But in spite of this plan to circumvent the Charter, as approved by our Senate on July 28, 1945, with only two dissenting votes, there is plenty of scope for Russia to raise awkward questions about the projected treaty, through the machinery of the United Nations. There is now even less probability than before that Russia will abandon its membership in UN. And the nuisance value of that membership is greatly increased by the establishment of UN headquarters in the United States, a most factuous accomplishment for which our Department of State can also claim full credit.

III

All this is not said in criticism of the projected treaty. Since it will presumably be approved by the Senate, though without enthusiasm, it is desirable to say all that can honestly be said in favor of the pact. Measured against the succession of almost incredible blunders made by American diplomacy under Roosevelt and Truman, this treaty can be regarded as the only immediately practical way of saving something out of the wreck. But the treaty cannot be advocated on the basis of any other argument.

If the American people are wise they will view this awful situation with all the reason-

ing power which they can concentrate. Then we shall realize that we are asking for war with Russia, and that only restraint on the part of the Politburo will keep us from getting that war. Just as lend-lease meant war with the Axis, unless Germany and Japan were unwilling to accept our challenge, so this treaty means war unless Soviet Russia decides to knuckle under. The Communists, however, may for a long time refuse to pick up the gantlet, because they have ways of waging war which are a great deal more subtle than those of military force.

As the cold war continues it would therefore seem practical to consider policies less crude and costly than this old-fashioned military alliance, in which practically all the bills will be paid by that patient beast of burden—the American taxpayer.

Since this alliance clearly seeks to circumvent the United Nations, and will be hampered in operation by the parallel functioning of the United Nations, it would seem logical to admit this, officially and frankly, at some early date. Secretary Acheson says that the understanding support of the American people is essential to the success of his policy. The only way to get the understanding support of people is to be honest with them.

IV

When the United Nations has been scrapped—in name as well as in deed—a plan for some more promising form of international cooperation should be ready to take its place. The proposed alliance is certainly not that plan. It is at best an undesirable, unsatisfactory, and uninspiring stopgap. But the alliance can be developed into something more promising.

One basic trouble with this alliance is that by its terms the American people abandon all control of their own destiny. If Russia and Norway go to war, we also go to war, regardless of whether or not Norwegian mistakes helped to provoke the conflict. As a long-range proposition that sort of situation is intolerable.

The only sure way to improve the arrangement, as matters stand now, is to begin to build some sort of federation out of the projected treaty. The American people cannot be expected indefinitely to finance, arm, and support these bankrupt European states without to some extent controlling their policy. The only proper way to exercise that control is by establishing a representative form of international government, in which the American and western European people alike have some say as to the disposition of their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Luxemburg is to the United States about like Rhode Island to the Union as a whole; Norway may be said to compare with Maine; Belgium with New Jersey; England with New York; and France with California, Pennsylvania, or Ohio.

Federation with western Europe on the basis of enlarging the American Union by bringing in these additional States would be in accordance with the material importance of the various sovereignties involved. And it would have the incidental, though enormous, advantage of immediately vitalizing the doctrine of States' rights, which is so basic to the preservation of our republican institutions. If France were a member of a North Atlantic federation it would properly insist on a large degree of autonomy in its domestic affairs. That would encourage Virginia, for instance, more resolutely to oppose the encroachments of centralized government. A larger federation could readily mean more home rule.

In his broadcast of March 18 Secretary Acheson asserted that similarities between the United States and its proposed allies in western Europe are not superficial, but fundamental. That may be questioned. But if the argument justifies a military alliance it also justifies a more satisfactory form of union, under which the power and arrogance of centralized bureaucracies would be reduced, not further increased.

A Global Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is no end to the drain on our taxpayers from abroad. Have we not been told that the trade-agreements program would eliminate trade barriers and that the United States would be the first to remove such barriers?

Yet now the Truman administration leads in creating one of the greatest cartels in modern times.

Our taxpayers foot the bill.

Will this raid on our people never end?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of March 25, 1949:

A GLOBAL BLUEPRINT

A second attempt to set up an intergovernmental wheat cartel has been launched. Five exporting countries, including the United States, and 37 importing countries have drafted a plan to stabilize among themselves the production and marketing of wheat at restricted prices.

A similar plan failed to pass the Senate last year. This year the wheat-buying countries have higher hopes that we will agree to it. Their enthusiasm for the plan is understandable.

This proposed world wheat agreement provides that the United States will supply 168,000,000 bushels annually to the importing countries at a price not exceeding $1.80 a bushel. However, the importing countries are not required to pay more than $1.50 a bushel the first year, and this minimum price declines each year thereafter until it reaches $1.20 a bushel.

That this is a good deal for the 37 wheat buyers is evident.

The present cash price of wheat in Kansas City is $2.22 a bushel. The current rate at which the Government will loan to wheat farmers who prefer not to sell their wheat is $2.24 a bushel. This loan rate, which has nothing to do with the supply of wheat, puts a floor under the price the Government will pay for its wheat.

Now, so long as the price of wheat remains above $1.80 a bushel, the 37 importing nations have an excellent buy. They pay the United States Government not more than $1.80 a bushel for wheat which the Government must buy at the going rate. The difference between the market price and the $1.80 fixed price is paid out of the taxpayers' pocketbook.

Here, as in the European recovery program, we have a direct subsidy to the world paid by the citizens of the United States, a redistribution of income on an international basis.

But here, unlike the ERP, the subsidy is hidden under the guise of market stabilization, and it has not even the excuse of helping former allies. Included among the beneficiaries are such diverse countries as India, Lebanon, Ceylon, and Guatemala.

These beneficiaries, of course, risk nothing; they cannot lose. If world prices are above the contract price they get a subsidy. If world prices should drop to the contract price they are even Stephen. In the unlikely event that prices drop below $1.20 in the next 4 years we have a contract that is unenforceable. They can play two major wheat exporters—Russia and Argentina—against us, for those two are not members. So far as the importing countries, such as Great Britain, are concerned, it is a case of heads they win, tails we lose.

But even more disturbing than the cost of this particular program is the point of view upon which it rests. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, in listing the advantages of the proposed agreement, says that it will set a pattern for action on other commodities. We are later to follow the same principle with regard to corn, cotton, or any other commodity that the planners think needs world stabilization.

The principle is supranatural economic planning. And if we here have to bend to these noble plans and accept a dictated economy and a lower standard of living to support the plans for other countries—well, that is supposedly meet and just, if regrettable.

We cannot embark upon these plans to dictate prices and marketing throughout the world without dictating, too, what shall be sown and what reaped here at home.

This implication has not escaped Secretary Brannan. He thinks it would seem reasonable that farmers should agree to regulate their production to fit the planners' supply and demand blueprints. That such dictation lies at the end of the road should not escape the rest of us, either.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Sunday, March 20, 1949, entitled "The Merchant Marine." The article is as follows:

THE MERCHANT MARINE

One of the important issues before this Congress is the adoption of a postwar policy on the American merchant marine. This question is not simply one of lending governmental approval to a legitimate private enterprise. The fact is that this country cannot have a merchant marine adequate for its peacetime needs and capable of contributing to national defense without Government aid.

The problem is graphically illustrated by the current controversy between ECA, the administrative agency for the Marshall plan, and the shipping interests. Paul G. Hoffman, as head of ECA, wants to use a large proportion of foreign vessels to move Marshall-plan goods to Europe because their rates are cheaper. By the accepted rules of business, he is right. The fallacy lies in the fact that the American merchant marine cannot keep afloat under the ordinary rules of business.

It might be argued that if other maritime nations, which are for the most part the countries we seek to aid through the Marshall plan, can provide ocean transport at lower rates, the United States might well turn the job over to them. This attitude, however, ignores the need for a merchant marine for national defense.

Twice in this century this country has been forced to build at huge expense a wartime merchant marine. In the last war we were fortunate enough to have the plans and the shipyards ready to build the Victory and Liberty ships that bridged the gap from the arsenal of democracy to the battlefields.

There are other factors now which make our need for a strong American merchant marine more urgent. Some of them were pointed out by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane in his address at the Mississippi Valley Association convention here recently. This country's depleted natural resources make us dependent on overseas imports in both peace and war. America's role as an exporting nation is constantly expanding and American-flag ships are our best salesmen for our goods abroad. The experience of the last war has shown that the merchant marine, with ships, port facilities, and personnel, is an essential fourth arm of the armed forces.

Out here in the Mississippi Valley we have an added interest in the development and maintenance of a strong merchant marine. The Gulf ports are the natural gateways to world markets for the valley. They are the logical ports of entry for the raw materials we need from abroad. We need the assurance of adequate and regular ocean services operating out of the Gulf ports. There have been in the past attempts to discourage the Gulf lines in order to benefit the Atlantic seaboard. Such attempts should have no place in the adoption of a national postwar policy for the merchant marine.

In formulating a new national merchant marine policy, Congress must recognize the shipbuilding and operating differentials which are essential to maintain a strong merchant fleet. Congress must also make provision for the maintenance of adequate shipbuilding facilities and encourage construction of new-type ships, capable of meeting the stern competition of the postwar years.

A Philosophy and a Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article taken from the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor, Wednesday, March 9, 1949. The title of this article is "A Philosophy and a Fact" written by a former Governor of Colorado, John C. Vivian.

In this article Governor Vivian analyzes with considerable logic and sound reasoning the peculiar and unusual type of government that was organized and set in motion by the adoption of our Constitution. Of course, every school child understands that we are not a democracy and many of our historians relate that our founding fathers never intended our country to be a democracy. The article is worth a careful reading.

A PHILOSOPHY AND A FACT

(By John C. Vivian, former Governor of Colorado)

No word in the English language has been dealt with more carelessly or interpreted more loosely than the word "democracy."

The fact is, we do not have a democracy in America. In a strict sense of the word, we never have had. Ours is a republic, as set forth by the Constitution of the United States. The two forms of government are very different. In a democracy, the people govern themselves without representatives. In a republic they are governed by elected representatives, as we, in America, have been ever since 1776.

George Norlin in the Quest of American Life says:

"The word 'democracy' appears to have as many meanings as there are patriots who mouth it on the platforms and is commonly thought of as being what we have rather than as a process of becoming what we want to be."

It is interesting to note that the word "democracy" does not appear in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States.

Historian Charles Beard in the Republic says the Constitution's framers considered it a word "to be dreaded rather than encouraged."

Today, too many people use the terms "republic" and "democracy" interchangeably. The town meetings of colonial days were examples of a democracy in action. If history correctly depicts the situation, practically all of the people gathered at regular intervals and transacted the public business themselves, not by delegated representatives; as in a republic.

Thus, if the people operate directly, they have a democracy. If they delegate their authority to representatives elected by them, they have a republic. Democracy as a philosophy involving equality of opportunity, dignity of the individual, and ultimate popular sovereignty, has a real application to American society. But there is danger in confusing a republican for a democratic form of government.

It is difficult to visualize any national government today as a pure democracy. It would be interesting to learn if there are any sovereignties which actually employ such rule. It would be even more interesting to know how, in detail, they are operated.

Madison says in the Federalist:

"The true distinction between these forms is that in a democracy the people meet and exercise the government in person. In a republic they assemble and administer it by their representative agents."

Down to the time of Woodrow Wilson, the United States was seldom described as anything but a republic. The word "democracy" occurs rarely in State papers. Nearly always the country is "the Republic." Thomas Jefferson was the founder of the Democratic Party; but in his first inaugural address, though he refers several times to the "Republic" or the republican form of government, he does not once use the word "democracy" or any derivative of it.

The pledge long used in our schools is a pledge of loyalty to the flag, and to the Republic for which it stands. Julia Ward Howe did not write the Battle Hymn of the Democracy.

Former Governor Lehman, of New York, a Democrat, in his first inaugural message in 1933 did not once use the word "democracy." In his message of 1935 he used it twice. But in his message of 1939 he used democracy or a derivative thereof 25 times; and in his annual message to the legislature, January 3, 1940, he used it no less than 33 times.

But there is another respect in which the United States is a republic in contradistinction to a democracy. This is in the division of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial—our well-known system of checks and balances. This division recognizes that if the same man or men make the laws, interpret them, and execute them, despotism results. The Constitutional Convention, by working out the principle of the separation of powers, gave us the freedom on which we built our country.

The republican form was not chosen by accident, but deliberately. This was the form sought by statesmen and philosophers throughout centuries of history, but not found until the American Constitution established the American Republic. This was done deliberately along with the more perfect union, described by the French patriot Lamartine and by the English statesman Pitt as a model republic.

It is worth remembering that when the sessions of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 had ended, Benjamin Franklin, a participant in the deliberations, was asked: "Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?" Franklin replied: "A republic, if you can keep it."

The Late Honorable Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert, in memory of my dear friend, the late Honorable Sol Bloom, the text of two radio programs by Galen Drake. These programs are about the autobiography of Sol Bloom, which was published a few months before his death. It seems to me particularly fitting at this time to glance back over the long and distinguished career of our late colleague and my very good friend, Sol Bloom. Mr. Drake selected some of the interesting little incidents from the autobiography and broadcast them on two successive programs over radio station WJZ. The first program was presented at 3:30 p. m. on Friday, December 3, 1948, and is as follows, with Mr. Drake speaking:

You know, a friend of mine who works in a big public library was telling me the other day that more people read biographies than any other kind of book. I was kind of curious about it. Personally, I prefer biographies, but I would have guessed that maybe adventure stories, or something like that would have a more general appeal.

But this librarian said, "No; biographies."

Now, it kind of reminds me of the saying that the proper study of mankind is man, which is right.

Right after talking with this librarian I picked up the Autobiography of Sol Bloom. There's a very rich piece of reading. I don't know whether you've read it, or not. It's just out now. If you have read it, I think probably you liked it.

Now there are lots of books on the history of the last 70 years in America, and there are lots of books about a poor boy who became a great national figure, but in this book you've got both of them at once.

I'm not going to try to tell the story of Sol Bloom's life in the next few minutes; of course, I think you're probably familiar with his name, the man who is one of America's

great elder statesmen. He's been counselor to four Presidents, a long-time Congressman who's seen wars come and go, who is chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who incidentally, drafted the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations.

Sol is 78 now, I believe, and he still puts in as many hours a day as he did when he was 40, which is a little tip-off to some of these youngsters who get very tired when they get about 45, and start thinking about retiring.

Now, when Sol Bloom was a young man he was working for himself. He was a big-time theatrical manager, and real estate operator, but now he works for the good of other people.

As a kid he used to sell violets on the streets of San Francisco. There's a beginning. But now he's selling that faith in America that he feels so strongly about.

He's one of those guys who can use words like faith and love and truth, and sound like he really meant it, because he really does.

Here's a little story which you might call in the nature of a scoop. This isn't in the book. Here's something that—well, it's not in the book in so many words, anyway. But if you like this you might want to read the rest of what he has to say.

I got a friend of mine who knows Sol Bloom to go over and see him and ask a couple of questions. That's what I want to tell you.

The first question was: "What's the difference between a politician and a statesman?" You know, that's a good question. Kick that around in your mind a while, see if you can explain it.

Well, Sol Bloom said, "That's very easy, A politician is a vote-getter. He's interested only in his own district, because that's the district that elects him. A statesman is interested in his whole country. Suppose some legislation came up which benefited his district 75 percent, the country 25 percent; suppose there was other legislation which would benefit the district 25 percent and the country 75, you could tell by the way he votes if a fellow's a politician or a statesman."

Personally, I think that's a kind of a neat way to put it.

And the next question was: "Do you have any advice to a young man who plans to go in for public service?" And Sol said, "Yeah, but first the man has to make up his mind whether he wants to become just an officeholder or whether he wants to get out in the ranks and work for the good of the people, and try to do what's right, and teach them what's right."

And he went on to say that to become an officeholder is comparatively easy for any ambitious young man, but to become a real servant of the people, that's something else again. There are too few of those.

In the first place, as a young boy either in college or in the knockabout school of life—that's the one Sol Bloom went to, by the way—if he wants to become a servant of the people the kid has to leave all fanaticism behind him. He must keep a clear mind on the subject that he learns about. He must never let isms and no bright clever arguments divert him from the path he chooses.

He's got to keep in front of him the foundation of what's real; the truth, and faith, and love, and so forth on which this country is built.

Then he pointed out that the young man must specialize. In these days no man can know everything; that's impossible. So let him become an expert in some one thing: Agriculture, foreign affairs, airplanes, economics, doesn't matter what, so long as he becomes expert in some one field. And he don't have to be a lawyer, either. He don't even have to be a lawyer to understand the Constitution. Lawyers are a dime a dozen in comparison with real experts in say, foreign affairs.

Incidentally, the guys who wrote the Constitution weren't lawyers, either. Well, they had a few of them mixed in there some place.

But he does have to be honest with himself. I think one of Sol Bloom's favorite sayings is this: One with God is a majority. That, I like.

Then he says, if the lad really wants to go into public service, he can't afford to be afraid. Let him get on one side of an issue, and as long as he knows he's right, or feels deep in his heart that he's right, that's where he belongs.

If somebody in the press takes a whack at him, or friends turn away from him; those things should mean nothing to him if he's convinced that he's on the right side of the fence.

And he shouldn't let anybody tell him that he has no right to do such and such. No one has the right to do a thing if it isn't the right thing to do. Likewise, if it's the right thing to do you have a right to do it, and don't let anybody stop you. Go ahead and do it. You'll get kicked around once in awhile, sure. But you're going to get that anyway. You're not going to please everybody, no matter which way you jump.

And finally, to be a great American statesman, you must first be a great American. Think first of all what's best for your country, and go along with them only if they meet your ideals, the people who want to come up with other ideas.

And when you get along in your own career, remember that everybody has a right to a chance, and give a word of encouragement to some of the young boys who are starting on the first rung of the ladder.

I think those suggestions for the making of a true public servant are worth giving some thought to. And we got that right out of the feed bag, and kinda proud to be the one who put it out for the first time.

I'll get back to some of the other things in the Autobiography of Sol Bloom one of these days, because there are some yarns in there that will make you chuckle even if you have a little catch in your throat once in a while, too.

But this stuff we asked about the difference between a politician and a statesman, that I had to get off the griddle while it was hot. I liked that.

On February 2, 1949, at 11:45 a. m., Mr. Galen Drake again broadcast a program about the Autobiography of Sol Bloom. This program was also presented by radio station WJZ and is as follows, with Mr. Drake speaking:

You know, maybe you remember back a few weeks ago I talked a little about Congressman Sol Bloom, who is one of the most popular, and best loved public servants today. He was an adviser to four Presidents, and still going strong at the age of 78, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the House of Representatives.

And I suggested at that time that his new book the Autobiography of Sol Bloom is not only good reading, but if you're interested in some very fine history of what's been going on in America for practically the last 75 years, through the eyes of a guy who's seen and heard practically everything worth seeing, from the age about five, by the way, when he was selling violets on a street corner in San Francisco, right up to today, you ought to read the book.

I've read it a couple of times and I liked it the first time, and I liked it better the second time.

But some of the—some of the early jobs that Sol Bloom held kinda bugged my eyes out a little bit. The kid never did have any time to play, I guess, because every minute of his time was employed trying to get an extra penny, or so, to bring home, because the family sure needed pennies. And a penny meant something.

He didn't go to school because at that time the public schools were free, but the kids had to furnish their own books, or else they had to acknowledge the fact that they were too poor to get any books, and they had to accept school books that had a stamp on it, and the stamp said, donated by charity. And they had to carry those books around.

Well, Sol, age 5 years or so, wasn't going for any of that charity routine. He was toting no books that said charity on them. So, he cut out of school after 1 day, and snagged himself off that violet-selling job. Of course, as you might suspect, he sold papers, too, and sometimes he helped his father sell sponges from door to door.

And not being behind the door when the brains was passed out, Sol finally discovered that if he would set his pack of sponges down with a long sigh, like it was almost more than he could stagger under, and then looked up at the lady of the house with a kind of a wan sweet smile, like as not she'd come through with a slice of cake, or something.

Already he was catching on to diplomacy. No wonder he's in the Foreign Affairs Committee today.

Well, Sol was working in a brush factory for a buck and a quarter a week. He was about—oh, he was about 8 years old at the time. On his way home one day he lingered to look at a play bill in front of a theater, and a young man called him inside and asked him if he'd like to earn four bits. The young man happened to be David Belasco, who was then just starting out in the theatrical world as a call boy.

It seems that one of the child actors got sick, or something, and they needed a little kid about Sol's age and size to do a kind of a walk-on for 2 nights, four bits, 50 cents. That was close to half a week's pay at the factory, and from that time on the kid was busy with brushes all day and hanging around the stage door waiting for a walk-on every night.

Maybe he was only 8 years old, and maybe he'd known great poverty for all his brief life, but from the age of 8 Sol Bloom always had money to take home, more money than his family ever saw before.

When he couldn't get a part he sold programs, when he couldn't sell programs, he swept up the aisles, and by the time he was 14 he was doing pretty good.

One yarn I like, you'll find it right in the first part of his Autobiography of Sol Bloom, about the time when Adelina Patti came to San Francisco in a private railroad car, trimmed with gold, lined with satin, wood and stuff, and got an ovation from the people the like of which had never been seen in those parts. Of course, the boys were asking some fantastic prices for tickets for her performance. I think Traviata was the first thing she was to sing in.

Well, Sol Bloom, age about 14 then, didn't see why he couldn't get in on the profits of some of those tickets they were getting so much dough for, so what he did, he went around very quietly taking orders from people standing in line, and since he'd already fixed it up with the watchman to let him in the back door, why he knew he could skin in and come out with a fistful of tickets and then dispose of them before the suckers could get up to the window where the speculators were charging these very weird prices.

Well, of course, the kid was going to make himself a healthy profit, but even at that he was doing them a good turn, because those speculators had no mercy.

The only trouble was that after he collected his orders, and got the dough to buy the tickets, so to speak at wholesale from the manager or something, whoever he had a contact with in there, the watchman, or somebody crossed him up by bolting the back door on him—his only way of getting in

without letting the speculators know what was going on.

And he said that it wasn't the money that he lost on the deal, that was bad enough—that wasn't what threw him, though—it was the disgrace of having to go back to that line of people and acknowledge that he wasn't such a big shot as he thought he was, that's what hurt.

That's a good lesson you know. Maybe more of us should learn one like that.

Well, I'm not going through the whole routine of the success he made of more jobs than you can shake a stick at, at an age when most kids are still making with the school books.

But there's one more yarn here I can't resist in this story.

I don't know what one of the modern better business bureaus would have to say about this, but nevertheless it happened, so we'll do it.

It seems that in connection with selling sponges, and feather dusters, and so on, young Sol Bloom had a thriving little wholesale business in window screens, so one day he called on one of his stores which usually gave him a fat order for screens, and the storekeeper told him right now the joint was full up of window screens, and they couldn't handle another screen. They didn't want any more of them. And the guy said, besides, I don't like the color of the screens you've got out there in the wagon. Who ever heard of bright green window screens; don't make any sense.

Seems that Sol was trying to unload some bright green screens he got some place. So, thinking quick like a bunny, Sol said, why, what do you mean? He said, you ought to thank me for offering you these screens. You don't have anything like this in the store. These screens are medicated.

Well, he sold this guy a bill of goods, and to the effect that he could have bright green screens especially treated to keep out flies for the same price as just old, ordinary, plain, everyday, black screens.

Storekeeper beamed all over, bought a gross, and the next thing Sol Bloom was in the Bloom's medicated-screen business, and they were in such demand that he couldn't buy enough green paint to keep them in stock.

He explained it by saying that they gave the users a sense of comfort and security, like when you take a daily vitamin pill, you know, you feel that you can do anything to your health then, because you're safe. But he says he doesn't attempt to justify Bloom's medicated screens at all, but he still thinks he made a great contribution to domestic morale, up and down the Santa Clara Valley, where he sold them to every retail store and practically every householder, too.

Well, anyway, that'll give you just a taste of a few of the jobs that a successful man holds down, and is successful at, before the world knows about him.

The autobiography of Sol Bloom is chockfull of yarns like that, I wish we had time for more of them, but we've got to get on to something else. You ought to read it.

Santa Clara Valley War Veterans

REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a serious situation has arisen in the Santa Clara Valley in California which endangers the health and welfare of three or four hundred veterans and their families.

Veterans' homes constructed with GI loans through FHA have apparently been built in an area where septic tanks and sewage-disposal systems will not work properly. Recent heavy rains in the Santa Clara Valley have backed up sewage into yards and homes of the affected veterans, and they are threatening to strike on their loan payments unless the difficulties are promptly remedied.

I have requested the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to conduct a prompt and thorough investigation but am advised that the committee lacks the necessary authority and funds. I am, therefore, today introducing the necessary resolution, and I trust that prompt and favorable action will be taken thereon.

The attached newspaper clipping explains the situation to which I refer:

VETERANS THREATEN TO CALL STRIKE ON LOAN PAYMENTS

(By Joel Y. Rickman)

Prompt Federal action out of Washington was promised 300 embattled GI's in the sewage-saturated Vollmer and Hillview terrace tracts yesterday as the GI families called a strike for April 1 against paying on Veterans' Administration loans with which their homes were purchased. The veterans' drastic step, which promises to bring the turbulent East San Jose situation to an early showdown, was precipitated by new rains which flooded the suburban neighborhoods with a fresh layer of sewage.

Affairs moved rapidly in the face of the new crisis, and as nightfall came, accompanied by the throb of small gasoline engines as home owners pumped fetid, contaminated sewage from their basements and yards, the following events had transpired:

Congressman JACK Z. ANDERSON, in a long-distance telephone conversation with Robert M. Bartholdi, chairman of the Veterans' Housing Committee in San Jose, promised he will have a representative on the job early this week. He asked Bartholdi to urge the veterans to take no precipitated action before the representative arrives.

2. The veterans, in no mood to heed caution in view of the desperate health situation, met and decided to strike April 1 against paying installments on their GI loans, until effective relief is provided them.

Pursuant to this action they prepared and started obtaining signatures to formal notices of their intended action. The notices will be forwarded to the finance companies through which the loans were obtained.

3. They dispatched a telegram to the State board of health and Gov. Earl Warren requesting that the resources of the State health authorities be thrown back of County Health Officer W. Elwyn Turner in staving off another threatened epidemic.

In the meantime, the veterans met at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Gable, 1794 Margaret Street, and voted to send a representative to Monday's meeting of the board of supervisors. Their spokesman was instructed to demand that something be done about the open sewer which starts near the barnyard of a large dairy south of their tracts and bisects both neighborhoods.

Congressman ANDERSON, talking from his place of residence in Chevy Chase, Md., assured Bartholdi that he has already been in touch with the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and that quick and effective action will be taken.

Bartholdi had previously telegraphed the Congressman advising him of what Bartholdi termed "evidence of possible fraud" in the financing and construction of GI homes in the Vollmer and Hillview Terrace tracts.

Anderson told Bartholdi he expects to have a representative in San Jose by the middle of the week. He urged that the San Jose veterans keep their heads until he has had time to act through official channels.

The veterans were in no mood, however, to condone further delays. The notices of their intentions to default in their GI-loan payments will advise the lending agencies that their action is being taken because of existing condition of their properties. They pointed to the fact that their septic tanks were installed in soil wholly unsuitable for such purposes, and until such time as effective remedial steps have been taken they will continue to default.

The GI's, many of whom fought in the same units in the South Pacific and through Germany, also served notice that if the need arises they will defy the Veterans' Administration, FHA, or any other agency to dispossess them.

They claim they were defrauded when they were sold homes whose septic tanks not only failed to function but created a dangerous health hazard. They said they are ready and willing to abide by the terms of their loan contracts when adequate steps have been taken to right their wrongs.

Both the VA and the FHA have warned that if the veterans default in their payments, their properties will be subject to foreclosure. In the event the foreclosures were carried through and the GI's evicted from their homes, the veterans would lose whatever equity they have invested in their properties, and would also lose any future rights to GI loans, the Government agents said.

However, the State American Legion has the affairs of the veterans in the two districts under investigation. State Commander Rex Whittemore has already declared that if the State Legion finds evidence of fraud in any of the transactions involving the veterans, it is prepared to assign the Legion's own attorneys to the cases.

Decision of the veterans to appeal to the State board of health and Governor Warren for support to the program already inaugurated in the contaminated areas by Health Officer Turner was reached late yesterday. It was taken at a meeting of the Vollmer-Hillview Terrace tract committee. Joseph Malone is chairman.

The young home owners praised Dr. Turner for the prompt and sincere efforts he has made to handle the emergency, but expressed the belief that the new rains had created a situation beyond his control.

Their telegram to the State health authorities and to Governor Warren follows:

"The undersigned, representing nearly 300 home owners, most of whom are veterans, in Vollmer and Hillview Terrace tracts of East San Jose urge your immediate intervention here to assist our county health officer in controlling health crisis created by failure of septic tanks installed in soil unfit for sewage disposal.

"Heavily populated district presently required to dispose of human sewage in open pits in backyards. Highly contaminated effluent from septic tanks now run through open sewage ditches in yards. Local health officer cooperative but handicapped in controlling project.

"We feel immediate steps imperative to avert epidemic. Copy of this telegram is being sent to Governor Warren."

Chairman Malone, who signed the telegrams in behalf of the committee, emphasized that the veterans wished to cast no reflection on Dr. Turner.

"Dr. Turner has caused chlorination tanks to be set up along the open sewer that taps the barnyards to the south, but the open sewer pits we are forced to maintain in our backyards are a constant threat of a deadly epidemic," said Malone.

"Equally dangerous are the small lateral ditches that run from our brimming septic tanks into the larger ditches that connect with the main sewer canal threading its way through the neighborhood."

Many of the homes in the area also have been without heat, due to the flooding of furnaces, since the beginning of the rainy season.

The Red Cross moved into the area yesterday to provide emergency relief for one family when it installed an oil heater in a home at 1913 Margaret Street.

Complaints of heavy damages to property in the area are commonplace. Peter Piazzi, 1759 Vollmer Way, said he had invested upward of $2,000 in improving and landscaping his premises. His work is now a total loss, he said, including the gold fish in the fish pond in his backyard. They were killed, he said, when his septic tank overflowed, filling the fish pond with sewage.

Union Policy Sometimes Lessens Jobs, Curtails Opportunity for Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those labor leaders who are asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the re-enactment of the Wagner law, the denial of free speech to employers and a blank check of power to certain union officials to call and maintain strikes which injuriously affect the public health, safety and welfare, should read the following articles from the March 26, 1949, issue of Labor, the official publication of 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations.

REPORT TELLS WHY AMERICAN PLANTS MOVE TO SCOTLAND—CITES LOWER WAGES, NO LABOR TROUBLE, RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS BILL

There is even more than meets the eye in a report from Glasgow, Scotland. "More than a dozen United States firms are expanding in the European field and have set up factories in Scotland since the war," the report says.

"Skilled labor is a third cheaper in Scotland than in the United States, and Scotland has had no major labor-management trouble for many years.

"Strictly unofficially, some observers say labor conditions in the United States influenced the decision of some of the firms to move to Scotland."

In short, the report says in fairly plain words that many American manufacturers are moving their plants to Scotland to take advantage of lower wages and frustrate American labor unions' demands for improvements in wages and working conditions

Among these concerns is Remington Rand, large manufacturer of typewriters and office equipment, which has an extremely bad record of antiunionism.

The report also refers briefly to some other reasons for the moves to Scotland. These reasons, which were more fully explained in the recent House debate on the reciprocal trade agreements bill, are:

After that bill is passed, American manufacturers expect to be able to ship more products from their Scotch plants into the United States; furthermore the American plants in Scotland will be making products for world markets which formerly bought products made in factories in the United States.

The reciprocal trade bill was passed by the House but has not yet been approved by the Senate.

BELT CONVEYOR CALLED THREAT TO RAIL JOBS IN OHIO—REPRESENTATIVES OF STANDARD UNIONS LOOK INTO PROJECT BEFORE STATE LEGISLATURE

Thousands of railroad jobs in Ohio are facing a new threat which may be even more serious than the Lake Erie-Ohio River canal which has long been opposed by standard railroad labor organizations.

H. B. Stewart, Jr., president of the Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway, announced that the Ohio State Legislature is being asked to charter a new private corporation to build and operate a 103-mile "conveyor belt" system between Lorain on Lake Erie and East Liverpool on the Ohio River. Branches of the system would run to Cleveland and Youngstown.

WOULD AFFECT 15,000

Moving belts, operating in weatherproof steel tubes, would carry huge quantities of iron ore, coal, and limestone between the terminals.

In addition to Stewart, big steel companies are behind the scheme. They prefer it to the proposed canal, according to a statement by Kenneth Lloyd, executive secretary of the Mahoning Valley Industrial Council.

Representatives of the rail labor unions are looking into the proposal to see that the interests of the railroad workers are protected.

After preliminary study, the cooperative legislative committee of the railroad brotherhoods in Ohio issued a statement saying that 15,000 rail employees will lose their jobs if the conveyor project goes through.

The carriers are also fighting the project.

These two articles show that sometimes union policies drive industry abroad, sometimes, by forcing wages up, compel employers to seek labor-saving methods.

Small Business Against Basing-Point Change—Identical Prices Exist as a Result of Complete Understanding—Basing-Point System Glaring Example—Collusion Is Necessary in Operation of Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, only where a complete understanding exists between members of an industry, or where an industry is completely integrated, can prices be controlled to the fraction of a cent.

Such an understanding produced identical prices in the cement industry through the use of the basing-point system. Uniform pricing prevailed to all classes of customers, whether dealer, contractor, or Federal, State, and municipal government. No one, however alert, could break through the tight ring of understanding which prevailed in the cement industry. This fact has been demonstrated many times through information assembled by the Federal Trade Commission and other Federal agencies. This practice is detrimental to small businesses everywhere.

Not only, as in the case of the cement industry, were prices controlled, but the establishment of additional manufacturing facilities was likewise controlled. This control of prices and facilities resulted in the creation of the Cement Trust. Free capital and free enterprise were thwarted in attempts to bring cement, a basic commodity, close to the consumer, thereby saving the public millions upon millions of dollars in actual transportation charges—yes, many millions of dollars in actual transportation charges and many, many more millions of dollars in phantom freight charges.

No matter how small or how large the quantity of cement to be purchased, the result was always the same. As an illustration, I include a table, Federal Trade Commission Exhibit 373–A, Docket No. 3167, on a relatively small quantity—500 barrels—for the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, on which bids were opened June 12, 1936. The table follows:

Name of bidder:	*Price per barrel*
Alpha	$2.02
Green Bag (West Virginia)	2.02
Southwestern	2.02
Standard	2.02
Universal	2.02
Medusa	2.02
Pittsburgh Plate Glass	2.02
West Penn	2.02
Bessemer	2.02
Lehigh	2.02
Superior	2.02
Louisville Cement Co	2.02
Diamond	2.02
Wabash	2.02

All bids were subject to 10 cents per barrel discount for payment in 15 days.

It will be noted that 14 cement mills bid at the exact price of $2.02 per barrel with the usual 10 cents per barrel discount for payment in 15 days. Fourteen widely scattered cement mills with varied transportation charges, some real and some phantom, all bidding the same price to the penny. Certainly no unanimity of thought prevailed here, but, rather, unity in purpose and understanding. This identical bidding practice has been going on since long before 1936 and also since that time.

Since the abolition of the basing-point system in the cement industry as a result of the Supreme Court decision, there seems to be a pattern of refusal by certain cement plants to supply all comers. This pattern of refusal, to my mind, is for the sole purpose of creating dissatisfaction among cement dealers and users in order to create a demand upon Congress to restore the basing-point system by way of a moratorium. Any new law enacted under the guise of a temporary expedient will give the monopolists more years to operate illegally, while the courts are engaged in the process of defining and understanding new words and phrases. A moratorium is a loophole through which the cement and steel industries can drive through toward the goal of great and even greater profits.

It is my belief if the basing-point system is eliminated, small fabricating and manufacturing plants will be revitalized and small business generally will be freed from at least one of the tentacles of the octopus of monopoly.

Free Speech Plea Gets Visas for Reds To Attend Propaganda Parley Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Dorothy Thompson:

FREE SPEECH PLEA GETS VISAS FOR REDS TO ATTEND PROPAGANDA PARLEY HERE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The State Department granted visas to 23 delegates from Cominform countries to attend a Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, beginning in New York tomorrow on the ground of "unswerving devotion to freedom of information and free speech."

That statement confuses the issue. This New York conference has nothing to do with culture, science, or free speech. Sponsored by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and called by Prof. Harlow Shapley, of Harvard, the conference is intended as a platform for anti-American Soviet propaganda. It is a Cominform invasion of America and a tactic in the cold war. And its convocation insults the very idea of free speech.

There are, in this country, writers, scientists, and members of the learned professions from Cominform countries who barely have escaped with their lives, precisely for free speech. Will these be heard? Will the conference invite Ferdinand Peroutka, Prague's most distinguished journalist? He served 6 years in Buchenwald for Nazi hatred of free speech. He escaped by a hair's breadth from forced labor because of Communist hatred of free speech.

Of course, he will not be permitted to speak. And what can he, and others like him, think of the State Department's reasoning?

MESSAGE DISTORTED

Will two Nobel-prize writers, Sinclair Lewis and Eugene O'Neill, have the platform?

Sinclair Lewis sent a message to the Breslau conference, of which this is merely a follow-up. The message was utterly distorted. A letter from Albert Einstein was read, which was largely forged.

The distinguished philosophical professor, Dr. Sidney Hook, asked to be permitted to present a thesis on three points, precisely pertinent to the scientific attitude:

1. There are no national truths in science.
2. There are no class truths or party truths.
3. The cause of international scientific cooperation and peace has been undermined by doctrines that uphold the notion that there are national or class or party truths in science.

But Dr. Hook is refused a hearing, though supported in a strong letter to Professor Shapley from Dr. Anton J. Carlson, famous physiologist, former president of both the American Association for the Advance of Science and the American Association of University Professors.

The upholders of free speech and free scientific inquiry are kicked out by the persecutors of both.

Alexander Fadeyev, general secretary of the Soviet Writers' Union, heads the Moscow delegation. He got this job for cooperating in purging the cultural life of Russia of all cosmopolitans and antipatriots, and sending his most distinguished colleagues to the dog house. Why didn't we invite Dr. Goebbels to a cultural conference?

PURGE LEADER INVITED

This conference begins with a purge.

Prof. H. J. Muller, American Nobel-prize winner, one of the world's greatest geneticists, former honorary member of the Russian Academy of Science, who resigned when distinguished Russian geneticists were purged, is barred from the conference; but Alexander Oparin, who took the lead in the purge which sent some of his colleagues (Professor Vavilov, for instance) to death, is invited.

Nor can I understand the distinguished American musicians who welcome Dmitri Shostakovich, after the repeated mea culpas he has sworn before Soviet gestapos.

Shostakovich probably would like to escape the Soviets, but they hold his wife and children as hostages.

Gieseking merely came here to play, but the State Department put him on a plane—after giving him a visa—while Shostakovich is here on a political (totalitarian) and anti-American mission.

Toscanini has refused to join the Shostakovich claque, though he made the Russian's war symphony famous in this country. But Toscanini knows how to keep his categories clear.

Now that the Department has issued the visas, it owes something to American upholders of free speech, namely, insistence that all sides should be heard—not in a rival conference but in this one.

Veterans' Hospital Cut-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time a special committee of the Senate has been holding hearings on the proposed cut-back in the construction of veterans' hospitals. Yesterday the Governor of South Carolina, the entire congressional delegation, veterans' organizations, and other leading citizens appeared before this committee in opposition to the proposed cut-back.

The chairman of this special committee, Senator PEPPER, of Florida, requested that we assist him and his colleagues by emphasizing two points: First, the need for the proposed additional veterans' hospital beds; and, second, the availability of doctors and nurses to staff the hospitals. I presented an argument which I believe answers both of these questions in the affirmative.

The proposed hospital beds for South Carolina are greatly needed. Even with the additional beds, we will be far below the national average. Under present conditions, we have scarcely half the required beds. Hundreds of veterans have filed requests for hospitalization and have been approved, but many of them have to wait as long as 40 to 60 days before gaining admission. The large number of veterans who have been processed for hospitalization does not reflect the need for additional beds. Many veterans in need of hospitalization refrain from asking for the service because they know how difficult it is to get favorable action. There can be no question but that the need is great.

Since the contemplated additional beds for South Carolina are to be for general medical treatment, I should like to point out there appears to be no acute shortage of general medical doctors and nurses. Proof is evident that we can staff the hospitals.

I speak with special reference to the authorized veterans' general medical hospital for Greenville, S. C. This project was approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of Veterans' Administration, and the President of the United States.

As we seek to economize let it not be said that the ax of economy struck first at the disabled veterans. I sincerely hope that the veterans' hospitals heretofore provided for may be constructed without further delay. As a part of my remarks, I herewith attach a statement I made before the special Senate committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON VETERANS' HOSPITAL CUT-BACK, MARCH 24, 1949

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a statement concerning the cut-back in the veterans' hospital construction program which was announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs some time ago and which is currently under investigation by this committee. This program involves the complete elimination of 24 projects and an alteration downward of 14 others. The facilities for a total of approximately 16,000 hospital beds will thus be eliminated, including 11,000 in the projects completely abandoned and 5,000 in the projects which are scheduled for reduction.

After a study of the available facts and data I am opposed to this cut-back. Neither the interests of the veterans nor the country as a whole will be served if this concellation of the construction program is allowed to stand. In my own State of South Carolina there is at present only one veterans' hospital in operation. This hospital is located at Columbia and has a standard bed capacity of 606 beds. According to available figures there are 167,000 World War II veterans in the State and an additional 34,000 veterans from other wars, making a total of 201,000 veterans. With the standard bed capacity of this hospital being 606, that makes an average of 332 veterans for each bed. However, the hospital has made use of 94 emergency beds to expand the facilities to a total of 700 beds, 670 of which are currently in use, and the remaining 30 are being held in reserve for emergencies. Even with this use of emergency beds, there is still available an average of only 1 bed per 290 veterans. This figure shows that available facilities are only one-third those of 1945 and the ratio is even lower if the standard figure of 606 beds, which is the maximum available over a long period of time, is used.

This situation was to be remedied considerably by the expansion of the hospital at Columbia to a standard operating capacity of 800 beds, an increase of 194 over the present facilities. There was also to be constructed at Greenville a new 200-bed hospital. Both of these projects are among those to be eliminated. Even with the addition of these 394 beds the ratio of veterans to beds in South Carolina would remain at 200 to 1. The national figures, which are considered far too high for the safety of our veterans' health, are in the vicinity of 178 veterans for each bed. It is obvious from these figures that the average in South Carolina would still be above the present national average even with the addition of the 394 beds. That these beds are sorely needed is evidenced by the waiting lists. As of January 31, 1949, there was a total of 964 veterans who had been cleared for admission through the former branch office at Atlanta, Ga. This office was headquarters for South Carolina and for other Southern States, so the figures as to how many were waiting for admission to the hospital at Columbia are not available. Nevertheless, the number was substantial, probably running into the hundreds. Of these 964 veterans awaiting admission to hospitals, 370 were forced to wait up to 20 days, 191 waited from 21 to 40 days, and 403 were waiting over 40 days. These are appalling figures. Almost two-thirds of these veterans had to wait over 20 days, and almost one-half had to wait over 40 days. As alarming as these figures are, they still do not tell the whole story. Often only veterans with emergency non-service-connected afflictions are being admitted because of the bed shortage, and when the veterans or their representatives learn this fact, they do not even apply for admission. These facts are incontrovertible evidence that more veterans hospitals are urgently needed in South Carolina.

In explaining the reduction of the hospital program the Veterans' Administration officials stated that, while more hospitals may be needed, there are not enough doctors to staff them. I am not prepared to discuss this aspect of the question as a whole for the country at large, but I am familiar with conditions in South Carolina. In Greenville the hospital under construction was to be of the general medical type. There does not appear to be a great shortage of general medical doctors in this area, at least not a sufficiently great shortage to warrant the cancellation of the project.

An additional reason to continue building the hospital at Greenville is to prevent a large sum of money from being wasted with no benefits accruing to anyone. A total of $303,000 has been spent on the project so far. All of this money will be lost if the project is not finished. I am not one who believes in throwing good money after bad, but that analogy will not hold in this instance. This hospital is badly needed, and it is needed now. We owe it to the veterans on the waiting lists to see that it is completed. Nothing that Veterans' Administration officials say can change the following facts: First, that although the number of veterans has jumped from 66,000 to 201,000, the number of authorized hospitals beds is being maintained at 606; the fact that 94 more beds have been temporarily made available by the use of porches and corridors is no argument at all, since the standard figure is still 606. Second, that hundreds of veterans are awaiting admission and the average number of beds available in this area is far below the national average, which is itself too low. Third, that plans have been laid, hundreds of thousands of dollars spent, and that facilities and personnel are available to run this hospital upon its completion. Any arguments against the completion of this hospital seem spurious if we are sincere in the belief that our veterans must be protected.

Now let us examine the national picture concerning this cut-back. I do not pretend to have as much knowledge about the national situation as about my home State. However, many of the general facts have been made available to me, and it is not difficult to draw conclusions.

It was the Veterans' Administration which originally recommended the construction of the hospital facilities which have now been ordered canceled. Before the cancellation, this recommendation had been approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States. The cancellation order affects construction in 18 States and the District of Columbia. While it is evident that certain sections of the country need additional hospitals more than others, available figures show that more hospitals are needed everywhere. On January 31 of this year there were 16,188 veterans who had had their applications approved and were awaiting hospitalization. The number who did not apply because of the long waiting lists is naturally not known, but such number is undoubtedly huge. From a moral standpoint, this is a sad state of affairs, but from the practical viewpoint, it seems even more foolish. Failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will in many cases result in aggravation of injuries, not to mention the suffering, and these injuries may some day result in added claims against the Government. If this program of reduction is being promoted in the interest of economy, its authors had better think twice. In the long run it will cost the Government far more than the cost of completing the hospitals.

The national ratio of hospital beds per veteran is today 1 to 178. That figure is supposed to drop to 142 when the construction now under way is completed, but it would drop to 124 if the canceled projects are restored. In 1940, less than 10 years ago, the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved, and the President approved in principle, a construction program which would have made a ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans available within 10 years. Any figure which is three times that amount seems high. Any figure more than three times as high seems entirely out of reason if the interests and the welfare of the veterans are to be protected.

As I previously stated, I am not entirely familiar with all of the special problems concerning the veterans' hospitals in other sections of the country, but every section has a problem of some type. In certain sections of the far West hospitals are so far apart as to be almost inaccessible. In my own section of the country there is such a scarcity of available beds that veterans in direst need must often wait long periods of time before being admitted. Just when a partial solution to these problems was in sight, the solution suddenly vanished. We must not allow this to happen. In spite of the argument advanced that doctors are not available to staff these proposed hospitals, several of the cities in question have submitted evidence that the medical talent is available.

In view of these facts and figures, I am of the firm opinion that the cancellation of the hospital program must not be allowed to stand. In the case of my own State a particular hardship will be visited upon the veterans, who have, and will continue to have, facilities so far below the national average that the situation is almost disgraceful. I sincerely believe that a restoration of the program for 16,000 additional beds is desirable and necessary for the veterans and that the whole country will be benefited by this program.

Expansion at Oak Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 23, 1949:

HERE YOU ARE, MR. LILIENTHAL

Some time ago David Lilienthal, chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, complained that there was not enough public discussion and criticism of the Commission's work to give it the guidance it needs from the Nation. There now is an occasion for criticism. It follows:

The Atomic Energy Commission has announced that it is contracting with the East Tennessee Natural Gas Co. for up to 60,000,000 cubic feet of gas daily, to be used at Oak Ridge for generating steam—in the heart of the Tennessee coal fields. With plans for expansion of Oak Ridge installations, this would step up to perhaps 80,000,000 cubic feet daily.

It is difficult to believe that the Commission is serious in taking this step. For it would be an absurd, uneconomic, and wasteful use of natural gas. It would jeopardize the fuel supplies of hundreds of communities in five States. It would whittle down the Nation's reserves of gas, which are none too plentiful at best.

Whatever its cost, natural gas is a premium fuel. It should be used for domestic heating and cooking and for heating water in homes and offices—uses to which it is ideally adapted. It should not be used extensively by industry, save for a few special types of ovens and furnaces. It should never be used on a large scale for generating steam, when coal is available, unless at a slack season in which gas otherwise would be wasted.

We have coal reserves in the United States for hundreds, and probably thousands, of years, at the current rate of consumption. It is the logical fuel for steam generation, whether for electric power or other uses. Our natural-gas supply probably will not last more than 25 to 30 years, at the present rate of consumption and wastage. The Atomic Energy Commission's proposal to use gas reflects a callous indifference to the Nation's future welfare. It is so striking an example of extravagance and of contempt for the public interest as to raise doubts about the reliability of the Commission in its main subject matter—atomic energy.

The Oak Ridge plants must operate continuously. And they must operate. That is agreed on all sides. But the fact of continuous operation is precisely the reason why gas is not the right fuel. The demand for natural gas varies greatly with the season and the weather, because as a premium fuel it is used so largely for domestic heating.

Gas distribution companies can and do sell to a few industries, in order to level out their demand curves. But they cut off their industrial customers in bitter winter weather when shortages threaten. The Oak Ridge operation could not be so treated. It would take its 60,000,000 cubic feet through any shortage. It is the wrong kind of user.

Yet it is proposing to buy enough gas, replacing its present excellent coal supply, to supply almost 150,000 average homes with space heat, cooking, and water heating. In other words, the Atomic Energy Commission would abandon coal as a fuel, although

we have it in overabundance, and take away from domestic users enough gas to supply all the households in Cincinnati with all their heating needs.

This doesn't make sense. And if the Atomic Energy Commission wants the confidence of the American people, it should itself show more interest in the welfare of the American people. It also should show a more intelligent grasp of the Nation's serious plight in respect to depletion of natural resources.

You asked for criticism, Mr. Lilienthal. There it is.

Correction of the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 21, 1949, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article containing excerpts from a communication which I received from one of my valued constituents in California. Certain paragraphs of this article reflected on the Marine Corps, and I have received information from General Cates which I wish to include with my remarks. I also include a communication from Glenn E. Rathbun which will be of interest.

Those of us who are aware of the splendid record made by the United States Marine Corps in World War II have no desire to in any way disparage their fine record.

The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED
STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: There has come to my attention an article which you read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1949. Certain portions of that article, which you indicated had been written by an ex-soldier, a Lieutenant Colonel Rathbun, discuss an alleged controversy between the Army and Marine Corps over the adoption of the M–1 (Garand) rifle, and in doing so disparage the Marine Corps.

The passages in question are the following:

"A good example of lack of coordination in standardization between services can be seen in the case of the Army-Marine controversy over the adoption of the new semiautomatic rifle just before the war. A marine developed a new semiautomatic rifle and at the same time Garand developed the now famous Garand M–1. Many tests were made, and it was eventually decided by the General Staff to adopt the Garand M–1 as the primary rifle for all the services. Top Marine and Navy officers objected loud and long, claiming graft, foul play, and conspiracy, but of no avail. The new rifle was adopted, and used throughout the Army with great success. It is claimed that it gave the American forces enough added firepower to be able to make successful attacks with only half the number previously required. For all of this, the Marines refused to accept or use the new rifle even after the weapon had been proven in war. The prejudice was limited strictly to the high brass.

"On the battlefields of the Pacific, where both marines and soldiers were fighting side by side, marine riflemen would discard the old 1903 bolt-action rifle every time they could find an M–1 dropped by some Army casualty. Some even went so far as stealing M–1's before they went into combat. The effect of the Marine high command's policy can be seen in a study of casualty figures in battles where both soldiers and marines were involved; an excessive loss of life was the reward of such foolish prejudices."

These passages are completely at variance with the facts. The facts run as follows:

In October 1935, the Ordnance Committee of the Army approved a recommendation that the M–1 (Garand) rifle be standardized. As a result of the committee action, the M–1 rifle was classed as standard for the Army. The Marine Corps was represented on the Ordnance Committee, concurred in the committee's action, and expected to procure the M–1 rifle for its own use if the production articles proved satisfactory in tests. The Marine Corps had been buying its rifles from the Army for at least 50 years, and expected to continue to do so as long as the Army continued to put out a satisfactory product.

The M–1 production line started in late 1937 at a rate of 10 rifles per day, and reached a production of 20 per day in the spring of 1938. In 1939, the Marine Corps purchased 400 M–1's, putting most of them in the hands of rifle units, and the remainder in the Marine Corps schools. The purpose of this procurement was experimental, and experience soon showed the new rifle to be unsatisfactory in some important respects. The Army, meanwhile, had reached similar conclusions, as a result of which the rifle was partially redesigned. The redesign was standardized by the Army in October 1939.

In 1940, the Marine Corps procured 50 of the redesigned rifles and conducted further tests. These tests included comparative tests with the M1903 rifle, the Johnson rifle, and the Winchester rifle. (The Johnson rifle had been developed by a nationally prominent ordnance expert who was also an inactive member of the Marine Corps Reserve. The Marine Corps was under no obligation to Johnson, however, and his rifle received no special consideration or treatment in the Marine Corps tests.)

In March 1941, as a result of the comparative tests just referred to, the Marine Corps notified the Army that the Marine Corps had adopted the M–1 rifle, and asked that the Army commence deliveries not later than April 1941, at a rate of not less than 3,000 per month. The enlisted strength of the Marine Corps at that time was approximately 46,000.

The Marine Corps received its first shipment of 3,000 M–1 rifles in May 1941. Between that date and September 1943, the Corps received a total of 132,000 M–1 rifles. The only M1903 rifles received by the Marine Corps during this period were some obtained from existing Navy stocks, and these were requested only because the Army could not supply the Marine Corps with M–1 rifles at a rate sufficient to keep pace with Marine Corps expansion. The M1903 rifles obtained from the Navy were used only for training and for security purposes within the United States.

The First Marine Division was committed to the Guadalcanal operation before the Marine Corps had received sufficient M–1 rifles to completely arm the Fleet Marine Force. It therefore fought the Guadalcanal campaign with M1903 rifles. Replacement drafts sent to Guadalcanal were equipped with M–1 rifles, however, as well as some units of the Second Marine Division which also saw service on Guadalcanal. In all other landings and battles in which marines participated, the marines were equipped, except as noted below, with the M–1 rifle. Marines fought with M–1 rifles at Bougainville, Cape Gloucester, Tarawa, the Marshalls, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Peleliu, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

After the Guadalcanal operation, the only M1903 rifles used by marines were those fitted with telescopic sights and used as snipers' rifles. The Army also made some use of the M1903 for this purpose.

When several paratroop battalions were organized by the Marine Corps, these units were permitted considerable latitude in their choice of equipment because of the newness of their specialty, and because of special operating conditions which were expected. The Johnson rifle was authorized for these special units because it possessed certain features which marine parachutists considered worth while, and which were not to be found in any other available arms. When these battalions were later disbanded, the personnel were issued M–1 rifles.

The foregoing makes it plain, I think, that contrary to the assertions and implications of the Rathbun article, there was no "Army-Marine controversy over the adoption of the semiautomatic rifle." The Army and Marine Corps both sought the most effective rifle obtainable, and their views coincided remarkably.

I am inclined to believe that Lieutenant Colonel Rathbun's motives in making his allegations were not malicious, and that he simply fell into the common error of accepting barracks gossip at its face value. Such errors, however, can be very unfortunate, particularly at a time when so much effort is being spent to create and reinforce interservice harmony.

Knowing the reputation you enjoy, I am sure you will want to set the record straight on the points I have covered in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. CATES,
General, United States Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *March 21, 1949.*

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much for both of your letters, dated March 8 and March 10; the former of which included General Cates' letter to you. I am returning this letter with my answer as requested.

General Cates' comments and references to supporting official reports are very interesting and more than a little formidable to answer. I can well appreciate his position in this matter and feel sure that I would have reacted in precisely the same manner if I were in his place. Admittedly, he has all the documentary evidence on his side, and I am in no position to dispute his assertions. Even so he has made one point that I feel is very important. It is that this is not the time to arouse any controversy among the branches of the service, when harmony is of the utmost importance.

This point leads me to believe that the general wrote his letter for two reasons. First, to have had answered a claim that he felt was in error, and secondly, to advise as to the facts as he sees them. The first point reflects his strict adherence to duty and devoted loyalty to his branch of the service. The second amplifies his admirable trait of forthright honesty, so characteristic to his profession. He has made his views known in the most direct manner he knows, rather than a public display of superior knowledge. His approach and implied attitude to the problem increases my admiration for the general and leaves me little grounds for dispute.

Even so, I feel that some statement in defense of my own remarks is expected. My personal observance of the marines in action was limited, so I was forced to rely on the

next best evidence, that is, information gained from interviews with officers who had actually seen front-line service in the Pacific theater, and from the various accounts published just prior to the war concerning the alleged controversy. As I stated in my report, I cannot divulge the identity of those interviewed, because many are still on active duty or in the Reserve Corps of Army, Navy, and Marines. Since I can see no reason why they should tell me false tales, I am inclined to believe that the general is unwittingly a victim of one of the most common practices in all branches of the service. This practice being that those in the lower brackets when put on the spot to report compliance with a directive, will report what they think the higher officers want to hear. The variance between cold facts and what is stated or implied in the report is often amazing.

An example of this is the actual case of a general who made an inspection of an infantry division. He reported the division was fully equipped and ready for any action, when in actuality he had inspected several pieces of equipment more than once and the division was not as fully equipped as it appeared. His report as far as he knew was as accurate as he could make it and yet it did not contain actual facts. This is only natural, men will always try to cover discrepancies in their compliance to duty simply because they always feel they can correct the shortage before the truth is known.

This in no way reflects discredit upon the general but merely a fault in the system. I speak of this fault reluctantly because I have no constructive suggestion to offer. I hope that you can see there are many times wide variations between what is stated in an official report and the actual conditions existing in the field. In this particular case I am representing the facts as I have learned them while the general is presenting his facts from his point of view.

I wish to again state that I share the general's viewpoint and do not want to stir up any friction between the services. Such a condition could only have an adverse effect upon the goal which we have set. It is my opinion that it would be best to drop the issue.

I would enjoy and appreciate it very much to be able to be in Washington as a witness. Thank you very much for considering the idea.

Sincerely,

GLENN E. RATHBUN,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry, Retired.

What Other Countries Think of Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is from Mr. Milton D. Button, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture:

OLEOMARGARINE CONTROLS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

The following regulations pertaining to oleomargarine are enforced in the countries listed under each heading:

1. Artificial color prohibited: Cuba, France, Uruguay. Hungary permits use of approved dyes. Ireland prohibits use of specified coloring materials.

2. Artificial flavor: Prohibited in France. Greece permits artificial flavor in exclusive grade only.

3. Mandatory ingredients: Certain proportions of sesame oils, unrefined cottonseed oil, or starch required in Union of South Africa, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Sweden, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The purpose of these ingredients is easy identification. Hungary requires chemical identification.

4. Specified size or shape of container required: Union of South Africa, Chile, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Poland.

5. Special container markings required: Chile, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Norway, Poland, Uruguay.

6. Specified labeling required: Union of South Africa, Belgium, Chile, Cuba, Austria, Brazil, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Poland, and Sweden.

7. Use of dairy terms prohibited: Poland, Sweden, Denmark.

8. Artificial preservative prohibited: Ireland, Norway, Iceland permits salt only.

9. Fortification: Advertising of vitamin fortification prohibited in Sweden and Denmark.

10. State monopoly: Norway controls include regulations of production as well as complete control of ingredients used.

11. Taxation: Sweden and Norway.

12. Price control: Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

13. Manufacture and sale prohibited: New Zealand, Mexico.

14. Imports prohibited: Trinidad, New Zealand.

15. In the Union of South Africa manufacture of oleomargarine permitted only under emergency control law expiring July 1, 1948.

Sources: Compiled from reports of Foreign Service officers of the United States to the United States Department of Commerce. Some of the reports have been published in Industry Reports, Fats and Oils, and World Trade in Commodities; others were consulted in the offices of the Foodstuffs Division, Office of International Trade, United States Department of Commerce.

Published: Hearings on oleomargarine tax repeal before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, second session, pages 280–283.

O. B. Grimley, the New Norway (Oslo, 1939), pages 86–89.

Supplementary information on Norway and Sweden, by Rolland Von Euler, office of Scandinavian area studies, University of Wisconsin, February 18, 1949.

This product was first made in France in response to a prize offered by Napoleon. However, you will note that France does not allow artificial coloring nor the use of artificial flavoring. Many countries do not permit the use of artificial preservatives.

In the United States, as permitted by Mr. Paul V. McNutt, artificial flavoring, artificial preservatives, and vitamins from fish oil are allowed.

Wheat Shipments to Marshall-Plan Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Ted Hopkins, district vice president of the American Federation of Grain Millers, International, A. F. of L. I am placing this letter in the RECORD since it very fairly and objectively states the viewpoint of a sound A. F. of L. labor leader who is concerned with certain harmful practices either now being performed or contemplated by officials of the ECA.

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF GRAIN MILLERS,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 4, 1949.

Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOLLEFSON: Our organization, the American Federation of Grain Millers, an international union, comprising 35,000 members, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, represents the vast majority of the production employees in the American milling industry. Our union is charged with primary responsibility in maintaining and uplifting the employment standards and economic opportunities of these workers and insuring continuity of their employment at decent wage levels.

As a spokesman for these workers our union has a profound interest in the congressional determinations with reference to the Economic Cooperation Administration law.

The Eightieth Congress provided in the Economic Cooperation Administration Act that 25 percent of wheat shipments to Marshall-plan countries must be in the form of milled flour. Cogent reasons and compelling statistics submitted in 1948 by the management and labor representatives of our industry persuaded the Eightieth Congress that such a congressional mandate was fair and reasonable.

Even with the effectuation of the 25-percent flour mandate, hours of work in the flour-milling industry have steadily declined during the past year. The take-home pay for the average member of our union has been drastically cut by the decreased demand for milled food products.

In the face of this decline, ECA Administrator Hoffman and the State Department now propoose that the 25-percent flour mandate be deleted from the Economic Cooperation Administration law.

Spokesmen for our industry have made statistical projections concerning the effect upon the milling industry of mandate cancellation. We believe that these projections are accurate. We are advised that the dropping of the mandate will curtail available man-hours of work in our industry. Based upon present pay-roll averages, the total annual price of mandate cancellation in earnings to the milling-industry employees will be $7,794,000. Total annual man-hours of work lost would be 6,388,200, the equivalent of annual employment at 40 hours per week of 3,070 workers.

The only reason which Mr. Hoffman and the State Department can give for their request for cancellation of the mandate is a potential saving in food-purchase prices of $7,200,000. The total pay-roll loss alone to the members of our union will exceed this amount by $594,000.

As a constituent unit of the A. F. of L., our union has stanchly supported the principles underlying the European recovery plan. As a vigorous foe of communism and Communists we joined with the American Federation of Labor in supporting a program that would enable Europe to recover from the disasters of war without recourse to totalitarian methods. However, we do not think that it is or should be the congressional intent to meet the threat of communism abroad by promoting unemployment and wage losses in a basic American industry.

We must stress that in urging retention of the ECA flour mandate we are not soliciting for ourselves or for our employers any advantage which we did not enjoy in normal times. We ask only that the same flour export ratio be maintained in connection with each of the Marshall-plan countries as prevailed prior to 1941.

The Congress must recognize that to do otherwise would be to destroy the employment continuity, earnings, and job opportunities of thousands of American workers. These workers were induced to pursue careers in the milling industry because of a given economic prospect which the cancellation of the flour mandate would seriously disrupt.

We do not and cannot purport to speak for our employers. We believe, however, that the examples they cite of additional losses of State and national tax revenues by unwarranted discrimination against the American milling industry and its employees should be additionally compelling and persuasive in the formulation of a congressional policy against mandate cancellation.

We reiterate: as members of a democratic society, and as general taxpayers, the members of our union wholeheartedly support American foreign policy as embodied in the Economic Cooperation Administration law. But we think that it is unfair and inequitable to expect us to additionally subsidize the Marshal plan by a reduction in our own general earnings or by the forfeiture of our jobs in the milling industry.

May we respectfully request that you give full consideration to the retention of the 25-percent mandate.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GRAIN MILLERS, INTERNATIONAL,
TED M. HOPKINS, *Vice President.*

House Builds the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial carried in the April 1949 issue of Southern Agriculturist entitled "House Builds the Man":

HOUSE BUILDS THE MAN

A city dweller whose income is no greater than his country cousin's usually lives in a much finer home. Why is this?

The answer is simple. A man in town can finance an expensive house without gambling on his entire business. A farm man, if he must borrow money, risks not only his new home, but his entire farm.

There is another reason. A man on a salary can fairly well predict the installments he can afford on paying off his mortgage. But a farmer can't accurately predict his income any more than he can predict next year's weather. By obligating himself to make regular future payments of a specific amount, he places himself in a precarious business position and his farm in jeopardy.

Therefore, many farm families with production capacity to justify a $10,000 home, end up with one much less attractive and adequate. Most farmers do not hesitate to obligate themselves by purchasing machinery, equipment, or fertilizer—with a goal of improved production and greater long-range income. But they understandably hesitate to take the perilous step of investing in a home much beyond their usual cash reserve.

And private institutions cannot usually lend a farmer money for home construction and let him fit his payments to the irregular pattern in which he receives his income.

Rural housing legislation now being considered in Congress would allow the farmer to repay a loan according to the ups and downs of his farm income. After a good year he would be expected to make a sizable payment. After a year of low return his payment would be reduced and carried over to the next year. In certain extreme cases he could delay payments for as many as 10 years.

Money lent to a farmer for building a home should be a strict business proposition, of course. The ability of a piece of land and its operator to eventually pay for a home should be closely figured before a loan is made.

If Government loans are kept on a business basis at fair rates of interest, we can see little reason for opposition to the program.

The farmer produces most of the Nation's children as well as its food. The farmer is the backbone of the Nation. He is the salt of the earth. He is lots of other flattering things. But to keep the best farmers—and their children—on the land, there should be home-making opportunities which are equal to those available to the man who moves to town.

We feel that the last good reason for moving to town will be gone when the man in the country can provide his family a home that will compare favorably with homes in town.

"It takes a heap o' living to make a house a home." But the type of houses in which we dwell determines the level of our living and, in a large measure, determines our character and the extent of our contributions to society.

Operation Snowbound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the mission of operation snowbound was accomplished to the great comfort and convenience of many thousands of Nebraskans, as well as other thousands of citizens of neighboring States. Grateful acknowledgment of the assistance received by Nebraskans is shown by the following testimonials that have been sent to me so that the Congress may hear of them, and that are hereby made a part of these remarks:

Whereas the blizzard conditions of this past winter, from November 18, 1948, marooned and isolated Knox County, Nebr., from the rest of the State with a blanket of 71 inches of snow on our 1,800 miles of roads, 2,500 farms, and 9 towns; and

Whereas the repeated and unprecedented high winds accompanying our nine blizzards caused huge drifts to envelop the highways, towns, farmsteads, and haystacks, which conditions made it impossible for traffic to move, and thereby brought about the acute possibility of human suffering to 18,000 or more persons, as well as to 200,000 or more head of livestock; and

Whereas the enormity of the task of clearing the snow from the highways, farms, and towns was far beyond the financial means of the county, and, in addition, the necessary volume of snow-clearing equipment, to do the task, was unavailable locally; and

Whereas such conditions prompted us to appeal for aid; and after our urgent appeals were answered, we were able to clear our highways of snow and make available to our citizens access to the much-needed feed, food, and medical attention to alleviate the desperate conditions that existed; and

Whereas the measures made available to us to relieve our disastrous predicament were swift and complete, the cases of human tragedy and livestock losses were slight; and

Whereas the people of Knox County feel a deep sense of appreciation to all of those persons and governmental agencies who made "operation snowbound" available to us; and

Whereas the County Board of Supervisors of Knox County, as the local governmental body representing all the people of our county, desires to express for all of our citizens appreciation of the splendid work done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of Knox County, Nebr., That those persons and governmental agencies responsible for "operation snowbound" be informed of our appreciation of their efforts in our behalf, and, as a token thereof, that a copy of this resolution be delivered to each of the following persons and governmental agencies, namely: The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the Governor of the State of Nebraska, Val Peterson; the Congress of the United States; Gen. Lewis A. Pick; Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; the Fifth Army of the United States; the National Red Cross; the National Guard; the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

Dated at Center, Knox County, Nebr., this 21st day of February 1949.

COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF KNOX COUNTY, NEBR.,
JOHN D. FORSYTH, *Chairman.*
P. T. MALONE,
T. E. TIKALSKY,
AUG. BOELTER,
ALFRED HARM,
RUEBEN E. ANDERSON,
ERIK RIISNESS,
Supervisors.

Attest:
[SEAL] GEO. W. PETERSON,
County Clerk.

To the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the Governor of Nebraska, Val Peterson; the Congress of the United States; the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; Gen. Lewis A. Pick; Engineer Corps of the United States Army; the Fifth Army of the United States; the National Red Cross; the National Guard; the Knox County Board of Supervisors:

We the undersigned have been authorized by the Bazile Creek District No. 4, an Indian community of the Santee Sioux Tribe, to write you a letter of appreciation for the aid given during this winter. Our gratitude goes out to the above-named persons and agencies for the time and energy spent to alleviate suffering to members of our community and their livestock. Special mention is made to the operators of the caterpillars and others with whom we had personal contact. Only in our country do we find people who will go to aid of suffering in this world. We are indeed grateful.

PAUL ROBERTSON,
PATRICK J. FRAZIER,
THEODORE ROBERTSON,
Committee.

NIOBRARA, NEBR., *February 28, 1949.*

Whereas the President and Congress of the United States made it possible for the Fifth Army to move into Nebraska to use whatever money and other resources are appropriate to relieve storm-stricken areas to isolated humans and farm animals; and

Whereas Gov. Val Peterson declared Platte County as part of Nebraska's emergency storm area; and

Whereas at the request of this board of supervisors, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, United States Army engineers, Omaha, Nebr., sent into Platte County Government dozers and set up an area substation in Humphrey, Nebr., to assist in the opening of roads and clearing operations; and

Whereas the Platte County Board of Supervisors have adopted a motion declaring the emergency completed at 6 p. m., February 21, 1949; and

Whereas in accordance with the reports turned into the county clerk's office, by the respective board members and their representatives in the townships, the following are the results of the road opening and cleaning operations:

Name of township in Platte County:	*Miles of road opened*
Creston	58
Sherman	0
Grand Prairie	26
Bismarck	0
Granville	51½
Humphrey	33
Burrows	36
Walker	80½
St. Bernard	59½
Woodville	27½
Joliet	31
Monroe	12
Shell Creek	20
Lost Creek	26
Oconee	0
Loup	23½
Butler	4½
Columbus	0
Total miles of road opened in county by Government dozers	489
Total miles retracing by reason of snowfall and drifting	98
Total number of people liberated by Government dozers	2,289
Total number of cattle liberated by Government dozers	11,571
Total number of other animals liberated by Government dozers	10,404

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Platte County Board of Supervisors express their appreciation for the Government dozers and other resources sent into Platte County during the emergency to assist in the opening of roads and clearing operations, and to relieve the need of food for humans and feed for farm animals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the county clerk to President Harry S. Truman, Senators KENNETH S. WHERRY and HUGH BUTLER, Congressman KARL STEFAN, Gov. Val Peterson, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, and Col. Louis W. Prentiss.

ED. WOLLBERG,
EDWARD ASCHE,
HERMAN W. MEYER,
JULIUS RUDAT,
JOHN BRANDL,
ERNEST A. KORTE,
E. E. JOHNSON,
Platte County Board of Supervisors.

Necessary Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Tuesday, March 22, 1949:

NECESSARY GAMBLE

The first apparent objective of a North Atlantic security pact is the creation of a plan of mutual defense among the western European nations, Canada and the United States. The second apparent objective is a program of assistance from the United States which would do for Europe militarily what the Marshall plan is doing economically.

The bulk of western Europe's military equipment was lost in the war's general destruction. What remains, outside of Great Britain, must be outdated, since the armies of France, the Low Countries, and Norway were knocked out of action in 1940. So the problem is to restore Europe's armed strength as well as its economy to the prewar level.

The American Government has now let it be understood, however, that economic aid will have priority over military aid. This should quiet some unfounded rumors of a big-scale arms expansion program and reassure all concerned that American aid is proceeding on the right track.

A North Atlantic defense alliance is something of a gamble, although a necessary one. No one outside the Communist sphere knows definitely when or if the Russians are planning to start another war. But the probability of the if is strong enough to demand joint preparations for defense.

There is no gamble connected with economic aid as far as Russia is concerned. The Soviets are openly making economic war by such means as closing trade channels and stirring up industrial and political disturbances in non-Communist countries.

It stands to reason that Russia is just as anxious to dominate Europe without going to war as we are to assure Europe's freedom without going to war. This is reason enough for giving the European recovery program first call on money, materials, and men.

But success of the recovery program carries its own risk as well as its own victory. If Russia is thwarted in its bid for European domination by economic war, the Soviet leaders may risk a shooting war when they feel they are ready.

If this should happen there is little doubt that the Russians would win some important early victories, defense pact or no defense pact. As James P. Warburg pointed out in a recent speech, a really adequate preparation for defending Europe would involve either the rearming and remilitarizing of Germany or a big American force stationed in Europe before a war began.

We are committed not to rearm Germany, as Mr. Warburg recalled. And even if the American people would sanction the sending of an American army to Europe in time of peace, its presence might provoke rather than prevent hostilities.

Strategists of the western European governments are reported to agree that the Rhine would be their natural line of defense in a war with Russia, but that it would be years before they would be strong enough to defend it. Even with American aid, perhaps their best hope would be to slow up the speed of a first Russian blow and protect the channel ports until the full strength of American power could be applied.

One thing seems certain. If we should attempt to build up our own and Europe's military strength to match Russia's, the economic recovery program would fail. We should dangerously weaken ourselves and our friends in an effort to make ourselves strong.

This Government has surely chosen the wisest course in deciding to concentrate on building up a productive and rewarding strength in Europe while at the same time giving Russia notice that the free world is not blind to the threat of a war which, in the end, Russia would lose.

The World Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Alfred Kohlberg's writing in Spiritual Mobilization on January 29, 1949, pointed out the struggle that is now going on in the world, especially as China goes down under the impact of Chinese Communist armies. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

THE WORLD STRUGGLE

As China slowly succumbs to the triumphant march of the Russian commanded and advised Chinese Communist armies; as the "battle-fatigued" Chinese people turn in exhaustion from the war for their liberty to an acceptance of peace without liberty; as the iron curtain slowly descends over the nearly one-quarter of the human race that makes up China, the time approaches when America must examine its own will for freedom.

Today we speak for peace everywhere. Not peace with justice; not peace on the principles of the Atlantic Charter; not peace with the "four freedoms"; not the peace of the Moscow Declaration, or the Cairo Declaration, or the UN Charter, but just "peace." And what a peace it is, as we spend nearly $20,000,000,000 a year to slowly replace the armament we destroyed so thoughtlessly in 1945.

We have forgotten the promises we made when we called our allies together on January 1, 1942, and all of them, including Russia, solemnly signed the Atlantic Charter.

Of the nations who signed this solemn document on that great day, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, with our approval, have been turned over to their Soviet-directed Communist minorities, or actually incorporated in the Soviet Union. In solemn treaties we signed our enemies Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania into the same slavery in spite of the promises of the Atlantic Charter, which were made to them as well as to our allies.

At Cairo, on December 1, 1943, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek agreed:

"That all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

Yet 14 months later, at Yalta, China not being present, we gave Manchuria to Russia.

Then by pressure on a war-weary and war-wrecked China, first using General Hurley and then General Marshall as our ambassadors of ill-will, we attempted to force the Republic of China to accept its Communist traitors into controlling positions in a so-called coalition government. To gain our ends we destroyed the lend-lease arms and ammunition en route to China, embargoed further shipments and forced truces for nearly 18 months, during which the Russians armed the Communists with captured Japanese and German arms as well as surplus American lend-lease shipped by us to Siberia. Having destroyed the wherewithal for Nationalist resistance against the Communists, we wring our hands as we see the iron curtain descend and regret it is now too late.

Following China behind the iron curtain in due course will go all southeast Asia, leaving the Philippines (no longer our ward) and inadequately occupied enemy Japan, both untenable and unfeedable, the only white spots in a Red western Pacific. Meantime

we hope to feed and arm unwilling allies in western Europe, who want no part of our struggle with world communism, if they can keep out of it, and who do not know whether to trust us not to sell them out in the name of peace, as we did our former allies.

No wonder they don't know; we don't know either. One day our President breathes defiance of communism, the next he proposes a Supreme Court Justice to make terms with Stalin. To our European allies this can only mean another country or two sold out for more worthless promises of peace to a President who, on the next day, exclaims "the Russian Communist Government never keeps its word."

Even this statement, taken literally, is a calumny. It is true that the Soviet Union never keeps its word to us or the western nations. It considers us its enemy. It keeps its word, however, to its agents and fifth columnists everywhere, whom it considers its only friends and allies.

Communist propaganda everywhere promises every variety of pie-in-the-sky to everybody. To increase disaffection everywhere it plays on the wrongs, real or imaginary, of every group and every minority. Wherever it gains control, it destroys freedom and delivers none of its promises except to its own fifth columnists. We, who are the heirs of freedom and the inheritors of the Judeo-Christian faith in the worth of the individual as the child of God, seem in danger of forgetting our faith and its precepts and seem inclined to compromise with, instead of opposing, the Devil in his modern totalitarian garb.

Our elder statesmen privately denounce acts of stultification and warn of the growing danger to our very freedom as a republic, while publicly remaining silent. Our spiritual leaders either do not understand or hesitate to risk unpopularity by denouncing our truck with the slave state. Meantime we wash our hands of the hundreds of millions of human souls whom we could so easily have aided to save themselves. While the great Christian leader of China, our steadfast friend and ally of the dark days of World War II, abandons a hopeless struggle because his wife reports no aid may be expected from us, and there is left to them only the solace of prayer, our leaders chloroform our consciences with "too late" as we see another few hundred million human beings sold into the totalitarian slavery of body and mind, if not of soul, as a result of the American victory in World War II.

Missing are the Patrick Henrys, the William Lloyd Garrisons, and the Wendell Phillips of today to recall us to our heritage and to lead a new crusade for freedom to release the nearly 1,000,000,000 people now held in chains behind the iron curtain.

We must take our stand in the struggle for the world—a struggle not between right and left, but between right and wrong.

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

NEW YORK, *January 29, 1949.*

Importance of Atomic Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles discussing the vital subject of dissemination of information to the public on the importance of atomic weapons.

The first article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of March 15 in the column of Mr. Roscoe Drummond. The second article appeared in the Twin Peaks Sentinel, a neighborhood paper in San Francisco, Calif., and is written by Mr. Ridgely Cummings.

The insertion of these two articles, one from an international daily newspaper published on the east coast, and the other from a neighborhood weekly published on the west coast, demonstrates the wide range of interest in this important subject.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 15, 1949]

STATE OF THE NATION

SOME ARMY SECRETS TO BE TOLD

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Both military and research experts in the field of mass-destruction weapons are known to have reached the decision that the American people deserve to have and need to have more information on their use in case of war.

Such information can be expected to be forthcoming from Washington in the near future, and it will be all to the good.

It is an ironic fact that more often than not it has been uninformed or overtimorous civilian officials, not the military authorities, who have stood in the way of equipping the public with a fuller and franker statement of scientific developments. It would be accurate to say that in many ways public opinion, schooled in recent years to be ultrasensitive to military security, has resisted rather than demanded the publication of military information which the military itself was prepared to release.

Even the press has often accepted uncrtically the extreme hush-hush about mass-destruction weapons, and sometimes the public reaction has been that those newspapers which were urging full knowledge were looking more for sensation than for public service.

There may be truth in that reaction, but the result has been that the very absence of authentic information has increased sensational speculation and fears. Such speculation has gone uncorrected because some people somewhere in the Government were sitting on the lid of restricted information which didn't need to be restricted.

Government officials at the highest level now are getting ready to take the people into their confidence on three main categories of scientific information, the use of which and the defense against which vitally affect the civilian population. These are:

Developments in the field of biological warfare, a preliminary report on which was issued by Secretary of Defense James Forrestal this week end.

Fuller information on the Bikini atomic bomb tests.

Reports on various phases of atomic energy which, in the words of one member of the Atomic Energy Commission, will "unlock new knowledge about life and matter so great that wholly new concepts of human life will follow in the wake of this new knowledge."

Obviously, the press is not asking, and the Government is rightly not releasing, secrets bearing upon the means of producing or the stockpiling of scientific weapons. Mr. Forrestal's statement on biological warfare simply underlined the alertness of the armed services to developments in this field and their confidence that there is no basis for jittery alarm.

The next report due for early publication is the heretofore confidential analysis of the Bikini tests which a civilian-military board of specialists made for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There have been repeated demands for release of this evaluation, including an article which appeared in the December Atlantic Monthly by one of its members, Bradley Dewey. At the time, all President Truman would say about the article was to quip that people called Dewey usually were wrong, and the serious case which non-Presidential candidate Bradley Dewey made temporarily went up in much-too-ready press conference laughter.

In any event, it deserves to be put into the record that at no time was it a decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which kept this report under lock and key. The military leaders have shown themselves aware that a calm, poised, and informed state of mind on the part of the Nation as a whole can be a vital source of military strength and security. Hence, the Joint Chiefs are desirous of not making such a fetish out of secrecy that the effect is to leave the whole civilian population so uninformed that it is the easy target of propaganda.

The effect of extreme secrecy is to breed either undue alarm or heedless indifference. The Joint Chiefs, who certainly are not going to be reckless with their information, are sensitive to the fact that there are risks in an underinformed democracy just as there are risks in an overinformed enemy.

[From the Twin Peaks Sentinel, San Francisco, Calif., of March 11, 1949]

MASS HOMICIDE AND MR. HOLIFIELD

(By Ridgely Cummings)

Civilization has survived countless other wars but that was in the days before Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The question today is, can our culture survive an atomic war?

If the answer is "probably not," then the next question is, how can we prevent an atomic war?

One of our California Congressmen has some ideas on the subject. He is Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat from the Nineteenth Congressional District, which is part of Los Angeles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD took the floor of the House of Representatives on February 24 last to warn that the American public has not been told the real meaning of atomic discoveries.

A few weeks ago in one of these columns I criticized the then Secretary of Defense Forrestal for not telling you and me and the man next door that the $400,000,000 worth of new ships to be built this year could quickly be put out of commission by radioactivity.

That was before Mr. HOLIFIELD made his speech. The California Congressman was much more blunt about it. He said:

"The full report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Bikini tests, shorn of legitimate military secrets, has not been given to us.

"Defense Secretary Forrestal has preferred not to worry us with the bothersome details."

Now that Forrestal has been replaced by Louis Johnson, perhaps this deficiency will be remedied. In the interest of world peace it should be.

Mankind is jiggling on the brink of destruction. A few technicians here and probably behind the iron curtain hold in their hands tools for mass homicide on a scale previously undreamed of.

So long as the peoples of the world are kept in ignorance of the consequences of an atomic war, the possibilities of such a war increase with the daily delicate negotiations of the gentlemen in striped trousers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD says the same thing in more polished form. Let me close this essay by allowing the Congressman to put it in his own way:

"I believe the American public is entitled to know the amount of radiation released by the Bikini bombs.

"This fact will provide a key to determining possible damage to cities and other targets in the event of an atomic war.

"This, I hold, is knowledge which will help prevent another war. The truth about atomic warfare is perhaps the only real defense we have today against the possibility of such a war breaking out."

Rent Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article in the Washington Post of March 25, 1949, by Marquis Childs entitled "Rent Dilemma":

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
RENT DILEMMA

It is like seeing an old newsreel played over again. History does repeat itself and in a strikingly exact sort of way.

Unless the new rent-control bill is drastically rewritten in conference between the two Houses, which at this moment seems unlikely, President Truman is going to be faced with a tough decision. The question—to veto or not to veto—is like the one he faced when Congress passed and sent to the White House in 1946 a bill cutting the heart out of OPA.

The President vetoed the first bill renewing OPA in such an enfeebled fashion that, as he said in his veto message, it was worse than nothing. The second he signed when his leaders in the Senate and House told him he could get nothing better and it was sign or let OPA die.

That, it will be recalled, was when the enemies of OPA were insisting that decontrol would inevitably mean lower prices. For 18 days, before the second emasculated measure became law, there were no controls. They were never effectively restored and the cost of living began to soar upward.

A lot of the same kind of double talk has come out in connection with rent control. The President's chief advisers are supplying him with facts which they believe show (1) that the net effect of Senate and House decontrol amendments is to shatter rent control and (2) that the shattering of rent control will further throw the Nation's economy out of balance.

Under the various concessions made to landlords, many of them justified in a great number of instances, rents have been slowly creeping upward during the past year. Rents were at an all-time peak for the most recent month—January—for which figures are available.

The index on rent for January of this year was four points higher than in January of 1948. From November to December of last year the index jumped almost a point. This, mind you, was under present rent control.

The analysis reaching the President's desk shows that this rise has tended to wipe out the slight drop in the cost of food that occurred since the all-time peak in the cost of living last August. Rent is 15 to 20 percent of the budget of the average householder.

The net decline in the cost of living since the peak has been only 2 percent. It is still 73 percent above the prewar base.

It requires no genius in economics and statistics to see what will happen if rent control is shattered or abolished. Estimates are that it would advance from 5 to 9 percent a month over a period of several months to a year. This would mean an advance in the cost-of-living index of 1 to 1½ percent a month.

Again, neither a genius nor a crystal gazer is necessary to forecast what would happen under such an advance. It would touch off new wage demands which could very well start the inflationary spiral upward. This would come at a time when a number of low-income families have already been priced out of the market. In short, it would encourage the kind of inflation-deflation that invites depression.

The gimmick the White House advisers are most fearful of is the amendment tacked on in the House, of which Representative PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, was author. That has an innocent enough sound, assuring the landlord a reasonable return on a reasonable investment.

In actual practice, the Brown amendment would create an almost hopeless administrative tangle. The big landlords with large resources of wealth would be able to stop any tenant protests in the courts. The little landlord, not having such resources and in many cases really needing relief, would not get it.

Faced with the March 31 deadline, when rent controls expire, the administration has shown extraordinarily bad timing. Bringing up the civil-rights issue at the start of the session precipitated the southern filibuster. That was ready-made for the persistent, powerful, tireless real-estate lobby.

Millions of families are watching anxiously to see what Congress does about rent control. They may not understand the talk about States decontrolling or cities decontrolling. But they will certainly understand when the landlord hikes the rent 10 percent or 25 percent. They will know that postwar history is repeating itself in a peculiarly grim and unpleasant fashion.

Luxemburger Sees West Relaxing Control in Ruhr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of March 24, 1949:

THE LITTLE PEOPLE LOOK AT PEACE—LUXEMBURGER SEES WEST RELAXING CONTROL IN RUHR

(The chief of the United Nations news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor recently made a brief swing around western Europe to study the impact of United Nations developments upon popular thinking. Articles from his tour have appeared under the title: "The Little People Look at Peace." His dispatch, written from Luxemburg, today completes this series.)

(By Homer Metz)

LUXEMBURG.—Henry Weber is a native of Luxemburg and a highly skilled mechanic. He has little regard for Germany or Germans; quite the contrary. His family home in Luxemburg, just across the frontier from the former Reich, was for 2 years a billet for Nazi officers, and he and his parents lost everything they possessed in the war.

Because it is difficult, if not impossible, for him to work at his trade in his own country, he has entered Germany and obtained a good paying job in a factory in Neuss in the Ruhr.

Mr. Weber has seen much of what is going on in the Ruhr, and he doesn't like most of it. He argues cogently that the Ruhr is on the way to becoming once again a tinder box which endangers Europe's hard-won peace. His opinion is a representative one; it is shared by hundreds of other non-German workers who have found employment in the Ruhr since the end of the war.

SAME OLD BOSSES

Says Mr. Weber: "The western allies are supposed to be exercising strict control over the Ruhr. But we foreigners who work there can assure you it is the same old Ruhr—the German Ruhr. Most of the old bosses and managers are back, and if there has been any noteworthy change in their thinking since the days of the Nazis we can't find any evidence of it."

Interviews with responsible American and British military men in the area bear out the basic truth of Mr. Weber's observations. The Ruhr once again is a beehive of industrial activity, and the old German bosses, because of their technical skill and tongue-in-cheek subservience, are enjoying positions of rapidly growing influence.

OFFICIAL POSITION

The official Allied position in western Germany is that no former bosses or managers should be barred from jobs as long as they were not openly active in Nazi affairs.

"That is all well and good as far as it goes," declares Mr. Weber, "but the Allied authorities forget that before and during the war no one could hold a position of responsibility in the Ruhr without being willing and psychologically able to cooperate closely with the Nazis. In other words, one had to be a Nazi mentally, if not actively."

Such men do not change overnight, adds Mr. Weber. They have nothing but contempt for the western occupation authorities. With each passing day, they become bolder and bolder in adopting the same methods of operation that enabled the German army to harness the full might of the Ruhr for two World Wars.

DANGER SEEN

It might be argued that the danger in this has been exaggerated by Mr. Weber, because the Ruhr is relatively unimportant as an industrial center compared to what it was before and during the war. But this is not true. Both in the United States and western Europe there is a surprising ignorance of the extent to which the Ruhr has come back in the few short years since the end of hostilities.

A few statistics gathered from British sources in Germany should help to make this point clear.

In spite of damage done by bombing and Allied dismantling, the steel-producing capacity of the Ruhr is at present more than 12,000,000 tons a year. At the peak of war production in 1938, the area's capacity was 15,000,000 tons.

As a result of currency reforms and other measures undertaken by the Western Powers, the Ruhr's industries are operating at roughly 70 percent of their output in 1936, when German war preparations were moving into high gear.

STEEL RATE RISES

In the production of steel, the annual rate of the Ruhr has risen from 1,164,000 tons in

December 1945 to 7,300,000 tons last December.

Under Allied control plans, the Ruhr will be permitted to have a steel production capacity of 13,500,000 tons, with a target rate of 10,800,000 tons a year.

The Ruhr's mills are producing only peacetime goods now, but Mr. Weber points out that under their old bosses and managers they can be refitted for military purposes almost overnight.

The area's coal fields are almost fully recovered from the damage done by Allied bombings and have kept apace of the mills in the march back to normalcy. For example, the Ruhr's coal output has risen from nil at the end of the war to more than 325,000 tons a day at the present time. In 1938, the daily peak output was never more than 448,000 tons.

"Take it from me," says Mr. Weber, "in 2 years the Ruhr will be just as powerful a factor in the industrial life of Europe as it was before the war, and unless the Western Powers are extremely careful their control over it will grow less and less."

NO GOOD REASON

Mr. Weber can offer no good reason why the Allied authorities have become so lax, as he sees it.

"It was not necessary to put these men back in their old jobs," he asserts. "It is true that they have had invaluable experience and that their technical skill is in a large part responsible for the swift recovery that has been made by the Ruhr. But equally proficient and equally experienced leaders could have been found elsewhere in Europe—in France, in Belgium, in the United Kingdom.

"Even if the Western Powers can continue to exert tight controls over the Ruhr—which I doubt very much—the presence of these bosses and managers in their old positions is having a disturbing effect on public opinion in Europe which may prove far more serious than anyone foresees now.

"When the average Luxemburger, Frenchman, or Belgian sees these former servants of the Nazis strutting around in their old positions of power and responsibility, he hardly can be blamed if he suspects that perhaps the Western Powers are not so honest and so pure in their intentions regarding Germany as they represent themselves to be.

"In any case, he is bound to wonder about the judgment of the Western Powers and ask himself if he seriously can trust his security against the German menace to them."

Are We on the Right Road?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a speech delivered by the Honorable Charles W. Spear, former county senator from Burlington, Vt., which reads as follows, and is fairly indicative of what Vermonters are thinking:

ARE WE ON THE RIGHT ROAD?

Today we are living in fast-moving times.

The speed at which we are traveling is not so important providing that the guiding hand keeps to a well defined highway and does not attempt to travel roads that lead to we know not where.

It behooves us, as free Americans, to pause and analyze our present status and compare it with the pattern laid down by our wise and far-seeing founding fathers.

It was because of their existence for nearly 200 years under a government directly opposed to their ideals that led the colonists to hope for and foster a government designed to give them the maximum of personal liberty and allow the greatest amount of community freedom consistent with a recognition of the rights of their neighbors. To prevent encroachment on these rights, they prescribed strictly limited central government.

It was inevitable that men living under a despotic government that had been guilty of a long train of abuses and usurpations should eventually seek to throw off the yoke of oppression that had become unbearable. The colonists declared their independence in 1776 and later established their Constitution for the express purpose of getting less government. They declared that their individual and inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness existed before government, therefor government was and should be their creation and that government, being creature, could not be greater than its creator and its function was primarily to protect their rights and not to curb or restrain them.

The colonists wanted no tyrannical central government over them and their community government, for it was apparent to them what harmful results would surely manifest themselves from a despotic government even though said government were kindly disposed. Their Declaration of Independence stated clearly and simply the evils of such a government.

And afterward they established their own limited central government, so they thought, and, with great stress, they wrote "No" after "No" into their Constitution to guard themselves and their posterity against the evils of a despotic central government.

Today we count among our most precious heritages the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Reading them now, many will see not only a recital of past governmental wrongs, but in some cases a warning to posterity, that posterity may be on its guard to prevent a repetition of the evils they were casting aside.

Today forces are loose in our land, as well as elsewhere in the world, that seem determined to bring into being a tyrannical central government, against which the colonists rebelled and which they sought to banish forever from the United States at least.

In some countries these forces have already overcome the individual, deprived him of his rights, and ground him into a mass. In other countries, the citizens, by continually seeking to get from the government more than the government of freemen could give them, have so weakened the government that they crash with slight provocation.

In spite of the warnings of our forefathers, in spite of the pitiful examples of other countries, we are falling more and more into the habits of thought and habits of action practiced by some of the unfortunate countries afore-mentioned, and if we persist in this conduct, the vitality of the Declaration of Independence and the safeguards of the Constitution might as well never have been written.

After we have dined on this expensive bill of fare we shall have nothing left but vain regrets and rude awakening.

We must not forget that our strength is in ourselves as individuals and the strength of our Government comes from identically the same source.

If we, as individuals and as groups, continue to demand special privileges from our Government and it has been established that the Government has the power and authority to grant these privileges by taking rights from one of its citizens and conferring them on another, then democracy as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution ceases to exist.

This practice of individuals and of groups to seek special favors is not new, but it has increased to the danger point. This is the logical result of yielding to the first demand, and since that time demands have become so increasingly frequent that soon it will be impossible to meet all the demands made upon the Government.

This vicious yielding to groups produces corruption, not only in the Government, but in the groups themselves as well as in the individuals.

The individual during this process gradually relinquishes, perhaps unthinkingly, his guaranteed rights, his individual liberty and dignity. He is no longer a freeman in a free country. He is a creature of his Government—the Government he created. This is seemingly impossible but it is actually true.

The average American, due to the necessity of providing food, shelter, and clothing for himself and his family, fails to take time to think these problems through and understand the results of this practice on himself. Instead he prefers to think of himself as a member of a pressure group to which he thinks it most advantageous to belong. And each group tries to feed on the Government, in effect on each one of us.

Today, we find many positions of trust in our Federal Government filled not with free Americans as free Americans, but allotted to certain Americans who happen to be members of certain pressure groups. By this I mean that so many positions on this board are allotted to industry, so many positions on that board are prescribed to be filled by labor, so many on the next go to farmers, etc. There seems to be no place for the unattached free American. He does not qualify for positions of national scope any more.

As a result of the system under which our Federal Government is functioning today, we have added thousands upon thousands of Federal officeholders. We have sent them into every city and village in our broad land to mingle with every conceivable affair. This has been done by the descendants of those who, in preparing their indictment against the King of Britain, entered as one of their principal counts that: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

There are other counts in that indictment that we might scrutinize and compare with conditions as we see them today. For instance, the charge that the King had subverted the judiciary, that "he has made the judges dependent on his will alone." Could it be that we have some cause for complaint along this line at the present time?

Another count I find in the Declaration is, "He has taken away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our government." The forms of our State government, which existed before our Federal Government and which the Constitution was to protect, have been basically altered and changes are continuing. Many purely local matters that should be left to the State are now being regulated by the Federal Government.

The same inducements that were effective in influencing the individuals to yield their liberties have been practiced against the States and the States have accepted their meager pittance. They will end, unless they change their course, by destroying themselves.

While it is true that our rights cannot be taken from us, we can give them up and many have already yielded. Those who sacrifice their right to protest in minor matters are not likely to offer strong resistance to major aggression.

A former President, James Madison, once said: "It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties."

Today there is a tendency in thought and action to veer away from some of the basic principles of a democracy on one pretext or another. We would do well to reread our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, and for their support mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

It is right and proper that we Americans pause and consider the question: Will the road along which we are traveling today lead us to peace and prosperity or to trouble and ruin?

Address by Senator Stennis Before Independent Bankers' Association Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered before the national convention of the Independent Bankers Association, at Biloxi, Miss., on March 21, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS AT INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION MEETING, BILOXI, MISS., MARCH 21, 1949

Just after accepting your invitation to speak at this convention I talked with members of the Federal Reserve Board and its staff in order to familiarize myself in a general way with such proposals affecting the banks as are likely to come before this session of Congress. Specifically, there appear to be three proposals of importance that probably will be presented to the Banking and Currency Committees, one dealing with bank reserves, a second with regulation of consumer installment credit, and the third with bank holding companies.

It is not possible at this time, of course, to tell with any certainty whether all of these measures will be reported favorably to the Senate or in precisely what form they will be reported if they are approved in committee. I wish to keep an open mind on any legislative proposal and to withhold final judgment until I have had a reasonable opportunity to hear all of the facts and arguments pro and con. My own judgment will be based on some very simple but fundamental standards to which I am sure the members of this association would subscribe. For one thing, I share with you the strong conviction that banking, as well as industry or any other field of endeavor, should be protected against the dangers of monopolistic practices. I would oppose, as I am confident you would, any legislation that failed to meet the test of fostering or preserving healthy competition. I would favor, as you would, legislation that would protect and promote sound banking enterprise in the general public interest. I think the tests of what that overworked expression means are likewise simple and fundamental. The yardstick I would apply to any given piece of banking legislation would necessarily measure the need for it, the adequacy of the proposal itself, and its implications in our free-enterprise economy.

I would welcome expressions from you at any time about these matters, and I would particularly appreciate having your critical judgment of any legislative proposal measured in terms of public necessity and interest. I am aware, as you are, that the banking fraternity has too often been blamed for economic troubles that were not of its making. Bankers have been the victims of misunderstanding of the function they perform in the community. I was therefore interested to have Chairman McCabe of the Reserve Board say to me the other day that he thought the bankers in general today stood far better in popular opinion than at any time in more than half a century. He was recalling that in William Jennings Bryan's time and recurrently since then, including the days of deep depression in the early thirties, the banker was frequently singled out to be the scapegoat for most of our economic ills. Notwithstanding the fact that the banker is as much a victim of bad times as the farmer or businessman, somehow the banker seems to be a convenient man to blame because his stock in trade is money or credit, and it is hard to think of any economic trouble that is not money trouble in one form or another. Speaking as an industrialist, not as a banker, Chairman McCabe said that in his judgment the bankers today stand better with the public and with Congress than they have in generations. I should like to think that this is due in part at least to the kind of leadership that has been exhibited in your profession in recent years—leadership that looks ahead and looks realistically at national problems and strives to find the right answers based on public need and welfare. The independent bankers can justly lay claim, I think, to that kind of leadership. You in this organization have stood for something. You have not been in the negative position of mere opposition. You have tried to face up to problems of common concern and to find reasonable and appropriate remedies. That, I believe, has been a vital factor in demonstrating to the general public and to Congress that bankers are more keenly aware today than at any time, of their public responsibilities. The preservation of private banking depends in large measure upon the continuance of alert, vigorous leadership in the broad public interest.

The present high esteem in all segments of the public for the banking profession is an asset to be highly prized and not lightly regarded. It offers an opportunity for continued, expanding, constructive leadership on the part of members of the profession.

This opportunity for leadership carries with it grave responsibilities. The people must be given sound advice, not only about their immediate financial problems, but about the affairs of their community and their government. The advice must be sound, but it must not be backward-looking. In the complicated economy of our present age, there are various service and welfare functions which can adequately be supplied to the people only through the agency of their government. Unless there is intelligent, progressive leadership to direct the demand for these services through the channels of sound, constitutional government, the people may fall victims to unthinking, demagogic excesses that will take us completely away from our basic traditions of local self-government built around constitutional precepts. There has already been far too great a tendency in this direction.

Local bankers who create a positive program of affirmative leadership will continue to earn a position of respect in their communities that will be a great bulwark against extremism in any form. The world is not going to stand still—your job and my job is to help direct this movement along sound lines that will provide the greatest permanent benefit to all the people.

Undoubtedly the position which you enjoy today is better than ever because the banking business was never in better shape than it is now. I am sure that no one can successfully challenge the statement that our banks are in a sounder position than they have ever been in the history of this country. The commercial banks have about 114 billions of loans and investments, and more than half of this total is in Government securities which are in turn the best investment in the world today. In fact, nearly two-thirds of the assets of all commercial banks are cash assets and Government securities which are for all practical purposes the equivalent of cash. I am satisfied from the conversations I have had with responsible officials that this fortunate situation is secure and that the policy of maintaining the market for Government securities is not subject to change.

It is apparent that the banking business is not vulnerable today, as it has sometimes been in the past, to downswings in the business cycle. Apart from the bulwark of insurance of deposits, and the ready liquidity of the major part of banking assets today, there are almost unlimited resources available to the banking system in case of need. For example, the Federal Reserve System is in a position today to supply the money market with virtually unlimited additional reserves through purchase of Government securities. The only limitation on this authority would be gold reserves, and I am informed that the Reserve System at present holds twenty-three billions of gold certificate reserves, or enough on the basis of existing legal gold reserve requirements to double—or more than double—the System's outstanding note and deposit liabilities. Furthermore, because of the liberalized lending provisions of the Banking Act of 1935, advances can be made on any assets of member banks that are acceptable as security to the respective Federal Reserve banks. This is a very broad and reassuring authority which is sometimes overlooked. Also, I am advised, the Reserve System would reduce bank reserve requirements and otherwise ease credit conditions, including installment credit and stock market margin requirements, if the need were to arise.

All these aspects of the banking picture today are reasons for satisfaction but not for complacency. Banking needs continued, enlightened leadership, and the defects in the structure that need repair should be attended to when the economic weather is good. Let me say here that I am as thoroughly in favor of maintaining our dual banking system as I am sure you are. In my very small way, as a one-time director of a small and independent bank, I have grown up with the dual system and I am fully aware of the contribution it has made to the development of the country. It represents the kind of competitive enterprise that has been the basic reason for the unrivaled progress which our Nation has made and will continue to make. It is the opposite of monopolistic practice and performance. It is the very essence of small business which it primarily serves.

In connection with our efforts to preserve the dual system, let me make clear at this point that I am opposed to any effort to curtail or restrict the individuality or integrity of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The FDIC has served us well in its present form, and it should not be merged with any other agency or otherwise consolidated under the Hoover Commission Reorganization program.

I take it that the support you have given to legislation designed to remedy existing defects in regulation of bank holding companies is motivated fundamentally by the

desire to protect the dual system and independent banking enterprise. I assume that any given legislation which has your indorsement will be designed to prevent the holding company device from being used to foster monopoly and to encroach upon independent banking. You are far better informed than I am as to the details of the bank holding bill which was favorably, and unanimously, reported to the Senate at the last session by the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as with such improvements in that measure as have been worked out in consultation with the banking authorities since then.

I merely wished to assure you that this legislation will have my most sympathetic interest when it again comes to the floor of the Senate. My prejudice against monopolistic developments will predispose me in its favor, even before I am acquainted with the specific provisions of the bill, and your indorsement will carry great weight with me. I cannot, of course, predict the action of the respective Banking and Currency Committees or of the Senate and House on this measure during the present session, but certainly the matter will not be neglected if you have sufficient interest in keeping it alive. It is my understanding that a great deal of time and thought has gone into trying to improve the bill without weakening it or its objectives, and that drafts of the measure will be forwarded probably to the chairman of the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees in a short time.

We in the South, and those of you from the West, have come to take a virtually inherent position against monopoly. We have seen the concentration of economic power restrict the growth of our own local enterprises—leaving us with virtually colonial status in many fields of economic endeavor.

The tide has been turned in our long struggle to achieve greater economic and financial independence, but it must be a never-ending fight if we are to continue to make progress and achieve eventual success. Count on me as your ally in the war against monopoly.

Elimination of the monopolistic barriers to free enterprise will do much to increase the productive power of our Nation, but there is an even broader field for achievement in which bankers can play an expanding role at all levels, but most importantly, on the community level.

I refer to the conservation and development of our natural resources. To my mind the youth of our land are our greatest natural resource. We can best protect and develop this resource by providing our youth with the best possible educational system and by maintaining stable economic conditions that make for the best home and religious training.

All of our material wealth has its origin in our soil, and if the riches of the earth are not conserved and replenished, it matters not how sound the outward appearance of our economic structure. Through the coaperative endeavor of our local, State, and Federal Governments, we are today engaged in a highly meritorious soil-conservation program that reaches down to the individual farmer. These programs will be greatly limited in value if they do not enjoy the support of bankers and other business leaders at the community level.

The independent bankers of America occupy a position of prestige and influence today that is without parallel in our history. The challenge which this opportunity for leadership affords is one that is already being widely accepted, and I am confident that it will result in even greater achievements to the credit of our American system of private initiative and enterprise.

Washington County Soil Conservation District Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington County Soil Conservation District made great progress in 1948. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert their report:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

SUPERVISORS' ANNUAL REPORT, 1948

An election of supervisors for the Washington County Soil Conservation District was held in May 1948 with the two appointed supervisors in charge. Mr. J. H. Pyeatt and Mr. C. E. Shafer, both of whom have soil-conservation-district agreements, were elected as new supervisors and Walter D. Ramey was reelected. Messrs. Pyeatt and Shafer took their oaths of office and attended their first supervisors meeting in June.

The board of supervisors held 11 monthly meetings with a quorum to perform any business at all meetings but 2 which were January and February. Mr. C. D. Griscom held the record for the year in attending all of the 11 meetings and the secretary, Mr. M. G. Lewis, was next having attended 10 of the 11 meetings. There were 5 of the 11 monthly meetings where all supervisors were present.

The annual tour of farms under district agreement was attended by four of the five supervisors on two successive days. Details of the tour will be carried under a separate heading.

The supervisors planned the annual group conservation leaders training day for March 11 but the weather man gave us 11 inches of snow the day and night before and the meeting was canceled, being so late in the year that no further date was set. (See exhibit A.)

In keeping with conservation week, May 2–8, 1948, the supervisors wrote letters to some 20 to 25 ministers in the district urging them to cooperate by delivering conservation sermons on soil and soul, Sunday, May 2. Enclosed with each letter were the following pieces of material for use in preparing the sermons: "No Man Layeth It to Heart," "The Lord's Land," and "The Earth Is the Lord's." Some very favorable results were reported.

The annual soil conservation field day which had been held for five consecutive years at Lake Weddington as a joint occasion with the supervisors of the Benton County Soil Conservation District was postponed on account of the shortness of SCS technical personnel assisting the district.

All five of the district supervisors attended the State association of district supervisors meeting at Little Rock on December 3. This meeting was of value and interest and Kent Leavitt, president of the National Association of District Supervisors, made a very fine talk to the group of supervisors. The forum attended in the afternoon was instructive and interesting.

The supervisors at their October meeting discussed the possibility of running some feature conservation sound films.

The county school supervisor, Mr. J. R. Kennan, is an enthusiast on conservation. He was contacted and is to place in the schools conservation material consisting of the following: 100 copies, Bibliography—Available Literature on Conservation for Schools; 75 copies, An Outline for Teaching Conservation in Rural Elementary Schools; 25 copies, An Outline for Teaching Conservation in Junior High Schools; 20 copies each, Conservation Education Reports Nos. 1, 2, and 3; 80 copies, the Use of Our Soil; 80 copies, Soil Conservation—Commercial Department; 80 copies, Our American Land—the Story of Its Abuse and Its Conservation.

The above material is to be given to the teachers of the schools of the county and much good will come from such teaching to the youths of the district.

SCS technical service

The personnel service has been reduced to our district due to the lack of funds for personnel and also due to more soil-conservation districts having been organized and requesting technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service for the State. In 1948 there were 831 days of personnel service rendered the district which was 25 percent less time than was given in 1947 and only 51 percent of the technical time which was rendered the district in 1946.

Seed harvest

Farmers within the district are realizing more and more the great need for vegetative cover to prevent erosion. This increases the demand for grass and legume seed. With the shortage of seed on the market, the supervisors have encouraged the harvesting of seed on farms of the district to help meet these demands. During the year 1948 the following seeds were harvested in the Washington County Soil Conservation District:

	Unit	Cooperators	Noncooperators	Total
Korean lespedeza	Lb	200,000	800,000	1,000,000
Sericea lespedeza	Lb	21,000	18,000	39,000
Red clover	Lb	7,500	5,000	12,500
Hop clover	Lb	1,000	500	1,500
Vetch	Lb	15,000	10,000	25,000
Balboa rye	Lb	25,000	12,000	37,000
Winter oats	Bu	12,000	30,000	42,000
Spring oats	Bu	10,000	25,000	35,000
Soybeans, Laredo	Bu	600	400	1,000

The seed harvested is becoming a benefit to the conservation program and is very profitable to the farmers who are raising the seed.

Conserve the soil—it pays

We supervisors spent 2 days last fall viewing the results of soil-conservation practices which were to be applied in the county and find the farms where soil-conserving practices have been carried out are in much better condition, growing crops of better quality, and greater quantity, than those farms where no conserving practices have been applied.

We find where terraces have been built from top of hills down, springs are still flowing flush, beneath same. Those where there are no terraces above are dry or dwindled to a trickle.

In localilities where a number of ponds have been built, above fast falling streams, we find they do not overflow with every small downpour, as previously, carrying away our precious soil. Only those who are over the soil as we farmers are can realize how fast our soils are wasting away.

We find where legumes and grasses have been combined and left for early winter grazing, it eliminates the expenses of harvesting hays and spreading barnyard fertilizer, while the vegetative cover is holding the soil and adding humus.

We are persuaded this program could be more fully carried out by more education through the schools, and from the theaters,

by picture shows, and if more suitable machinery were available for such work as sodding our pasture land with Bermuda grass if the individual farmers like Bermuda grass.

We consider our soil the most important thing to the welfare of our Nation. It is both our wealth and our food. Let's conserve it.

CECIL E. SHAFER,
Member, Board of Supervisors, Washington County Soil Conservation District.

Board of supervisors: Walter D. Ramey, chairman, Winslow, Ark.; M. G. Lewis, secretary, Farmington, Ark.; C. D. Griscom, Lincoln, Ark.; J. H. Pyeatt, Canehill, Ark.; C. E. Shafer, Farmington, Ark.

BENEFITS OF OUTSTANDING COOPERATORS WITH THE WASHINGTON SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

ORCHARD GRASS VERSUS CORN

Four years ago 8 acres of orchard grass and lespedeza on the J. R. Kennan farm began to be watched and studied by Raymond, as he is known to his many friends, and Jim Clark, the operating partner of the farm, spoken of in Tuttle community by his friends as Jim.

Raymond took the 8 acres of orchard grass and Jim took 8 acres of corn as the best crop. The orchard grass furnished 30 days grazing for 21 head of cows plus 21 calves during the fall and spring, thrashed 80 bushels of orchard grass seed valued at $196, followed by 10 tons of good hay valued at $200. The total value of the orchard grass mixture was $396 for the 8 acres, or $37 per acre.

The corn made 35 bushels per acre with corn $1 per bushel at that time, making $280 worth of corn, as compared with $396 value for orchard grass, in addition to 30 days of grazing for 21 cows and 21 calves. Jim thought about this difference of $116 plus 30 days good grazing in favor of the orchard grass. Then he remarked, "We would do well to have all of this farm in an orchard grass mixture." These partners agreed and started according to their conservation plan with the Washington County Soil Conservation District. The next field of 14 acres started under their conservation plan formerly grew only 16 bushels of barley per acre. It was phosphated, seeded to lespedeza leaving the growth on the land for 2 years with only light grazing. It was then limed, phosphated, worked with a spring-tooth field tiller, leaving all the lespedeza residue on or near the surface, and seeded to Fayette barley (2 bushels per acre) and orchard grass (2 bushels per acre) in early October 1944. The method of preparation left an abundance of lespedeza seed on the land.

The following summer Jim harvested 22 bushels of barley per acre, followed by a hay crop of 56 bales per acre that averaged 70 pounds. The hay was sold at 60 cents per bale and barley at $2 per bushel, making the cash value of $77.60 per acre return from the meadow for the first year. Now after four good crops of orchard grass mixture this meadow is still in excellent condition. The original 8-acre orchard grass meadow has now given 10 crops and still going good.

Today this farm has 99 acres of cropland in orchard grass mixed with red clover and lespedeza for meadow and temporary grazing in the fall and early spring. They also have another 25 acres of the above mixture strictly as pasture development, making a total of 124 acres now seeded to orchard grass mixture.

These fields are slightly gullied and taking a heavy loss of soil through sheet erosion while being farmed to grain. The gullies and natural drains were shaped to permit easy mowing, heavily fertilized and double seeded with this orchard grass mixture. Today what water leaves the fields of orchard grass is clear enough to drink.

Every other year each meadow receives 400 to 500 pounds of 4–12–4 complete fertilizer. Lime is added as needed, usually once every 4 or 5 years.

The farm was supporting only 12 cows and a bull before this program started. It now carries 30 Hereford cows and their calves with so much forage left that it becomes necessary to bring in more cattle every fall for a temporary period to utilize the extra forage. The barns are filled with hay and 17 stacks scattered over the meadows. Everything about the farm reflects the fact that Jim and Raymond were right in their determination to get all the land possible into an orchard grass mixture.

ORCHARD GRASS MIXTURE—IMPORTANT ON CECIL SHAFER FARM

In the fall of 1947, 28 acres of land much too wet for alfalfa was seeded to orchard grass, red clover, and lespedeza on the Cecil Shafer farm. Cecil, as he is known to his friends, cut 50 bales per acre of good hay the following summer, followed by 75 days of good fall grazing for 27 cows and 28 yearling calves.

This field had many large spots where even wet land vegetation drowned out year after year. It was drained as the first job after receiving a conservation plan on this farm with the Washington County Soil Conservation District. The next steps were: (1) Leaving some good vegetative growth of lespedeza on the land for 2 years, (2) phosphating, (3) liming. Now Cecil looks forward to 5 years of good meadow crops, maybe more, from this one seeding. He plans to add about 400 to 500 pounds of 5–10–5, or other complete fertilizer, about every other year to maintain the meadow in good shape and possibly lime about once every 4 or 5 years. A complete analysis of the soils is being made by Soil Conservation Service technicians for this field in order to know exactly what minerals must be added to hold orchard grass and red clover as long as possible.

In the summer of 1948 many people decided Cecil was going to wear out his 29-acre field north of United States Highway 62. He broke it following spring oats and started disking. The weather kept raining and disking continued but when dry early fall set in there was a fair amount of moisture when most fields were too dry to break. Then when our first rain came in September, Cecil got this field seeded. During last December it was one of the few fields in the county with a good start of orchard grass and alfalfa. The out-of-pocket expense on this crop now runs $34.11 per acre, without considering gas and oil and use of machinery. It includes tractor operator's time, lime, 600 pounds of 0–14–7 fertilizer per acre, seed, and inoculation. Many people are watching this field with great interest and the prospects look good today.

This last field gives Cecil Shafer a total of 48 acres of orchard grass mixture on the farm.

G. A. LANGHAM, A LEADER IN CONSERVATION

Seventeen years ago G. A. Langham, known to his friends as Garland, moved to the present farm of 180 acres with Mrs. Langham and two small children. People told him he would starve to death—that no one had made a decent living on this place since they could remember.

He and his wife were determined to make a go of the place. They started by plowing under crop after crop, terracing and depending on income mostly from timber. The fields had deep gullies and a heavy loss of topsoil before he started.

In the fall of 1943 the Washington County Soil Conservation District program reached Goshen community at the request of the people of the community. They selected Garland as their community leader stating that his leadership had already been proven by what he had accomplished with his place.

He had carefully supplied known mineral deficiencies of phosphate, lime, potash, and boron. Everything possible has been turned into the soil as green manure crops such as hairy vetch, cowpeas, lespedeza, and other legumes. Manure from 21,000 broilers per year, 12 cows and 2 mares has helped wonderfully, too. Now he and his son, Warren, have a broiler capacity of 13,000 with three broods a year planned. Garland says he can now get a good application of manure on all his upland fields and pastures each year.

Every crop goes in strictly on the contour.

Five acres of strawberries look very promising for 1949. Four irrigations held them through last spring's dry weather and gave quality on the 1½ acres of old berries picked last year. When average berries were bringing $6 per crate, his irrigated berries brought $9 per crate. The old berries yielded 157 crates on 1½ acres with a net income of $6 per crate after deducting all costs including fertilizer. "The extra quality with irrigation means a lot to us," says Garland.

Mr. Langham has 9 acres of Wonder oats from which he threshed 94 bushels per acre last year; upland corn on 2½ acres of his poorest land made 60 bushels per acre; 8 acres of wheat made 20 bushels per acre; 5 acres of tomatoes grossed $350 after over 50 tons rotted in the field due to the wet summer; 5 acres of alfalfa is yielding 3 tons of hay per acre; and last but not least, Garland now has 10 acres of Bermuda base pasture with 3 additional acres planned for spring sodding. He sodded 1 acre last fall and makes it a practice to get a few more acres in this manner every year.

All the upland is planned for irrigation if and when it needs it. Weather report statistics reveal a need for at least four irrigations per year as normal for the average crop.

The two Mrs. Langhams are just as interested in all that goes on over the farm as the men. It has been teamwork and a will to do that brought about the wonderful conservation program on the Garland Langham farm and causes people to say, "That is one of the most profitable farms in Washington County."

Mr. Langham's farm consists of 180 acres with 60 acres in cultivated land, 18 acres in meadow, 43 acres in pasture land, 56 acres in forest and 3 acres in farmstead.

TOUR MADE BY WASHINGTON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, SEPTEMBER 2 AND 3, 1948

On September 2 and 3 a tour of inspection of farms under agreement with the Washington County Soil Conservation District was made.

On September 2 Thomas P. Lee, work unit conservationist, and J. E. Critz, district conservationist, with Walter D. Ramey, chairman of the board of supervisors, left the Soil Conservation Service office about 8:45 a. m. and stopped at Farmington where the other supervisors, namely, M. G. Lewis, secretary-treasurer of the board, Claud D. Griscom, and Cecil E. Shafer, were picked up. Mr. J. H. Pyeatt was unable to attend.

From Farmington we proceeded on to the first farm, that of M. E. Shinn. This farm, consisting of 203 acres, was formerly under agreement with and owned by W. B. Pettigrew. On this farm we saw a combination of orchard grass and alfalfa which was 3 years old on terraced land. This field was in good shape to prevent erosion to the minimum. We supervisors were of the opinion that there was a little heavier stand of orchard grass than might be practical and beneficial. He had planted 1 bushel of orchard grass with 20 pounds of alfalfa seed per acre. His red

clover was doing well with almost gold dollars running on it as he had 11 registered Hampshire sows and 118 pigs. His Bermuda pasture was outstanding and his herd of white-face cattle is a splendid example of what this State can do in the production of beef with satisfactory vegetative cover and proper fertilization. Mr. Shinn is doing a splendid job of conservation.

Next we visited the farm of Lewis J. Johnson consisting of 66 acres. Mr. Johnson has an outstanding meadow of orchard grass and alfalfa and is preparing to extend his acreage of this crop. He has a nice plan and is progressing cautiously with his application. He has pasture development and other meadow development that has yet to be completed.

The next stop was at Bob Tucker's farm. Mr. Tucker has alfalfa which has been cut three times and was ready for the fourth cutting. He has a nice pond constructed according to district specifications and is preparing and developing further pasture work with Bermuda as his base grass.

In most of these alfalfa fields it was evident that there was need for additional potash and from an examination of the alfalfa there was some evidence of a lack of the trace element, boron, which makes the plant healthier. In most of these cases the farmers had planned to apply 10 to 20 pounds of commercial borax per acre during the early fall.

The Brooks Lewis farm was visited next. His outstanding sericea and annual lespedezas were of interest and his Bermuda pasture was making fine progress. For further development it would be beneficial to fertilize and cultivate the thin spots where there is very little Bermuda grass. This may be done next spring as it would not be advisable to do it this winter.

Having our lunches with us and there being a fine spring on Mr. Lewis' farm near his home, we all ate our lunches and, since there was no meter on the spring, we drank all the cold water we desired.

After lunch the first stop was at W. M. Hutchison's farm and his black locusts are now nearing 6 years old and will soon be large enough for cutting posts. Three acres of corn planted on the contour and sodded to Bermuda grass was of interest. His terraces are in good shape and his alfalfa will receive a complete fertilizer in the near future consisting of 3-9-18. The only thing Mr. Hutchison lacks in completing his program is some additional pasture work. He is doing a very creditable job. He is a veteran of the First World War and is being assisted by the Farmers Home Administration in financing his farm and if he has not paid it out already, he does not lack but little.

The next stop of the afternoon was at the R. E. Jackson farm. Mr. Jackson was formerly a Little Rock businessman. He now owns a 60-acre farm and has a splendid pond which has been stocked with fish and is being fertilized. He also has some fine acreage of alfalfa and orchard grass. One of his cash crops is turkeys. He raises two varieties—a large body type and a small body type—and has become nationally known for his smoked turkeys which are shipped practically all over the United States.

Mr. C. E. Shafer's farm was the last one visited on the first day of the tour. Mr. Shafer is doing some very remarkable meadow and pasture development along with a fine herd of Black Angus cattle. His volunteer crop of red clover was very interesting and his alfalfa was also good. His meadow on the creek bottom land consists of red clover, lespedeza, and orchard grass. This was a heavy vegetative cover. He was debating whether or not to pasture this meadow and then attempt to cut it for hay. We are expecting an outstanding piece of conservation work from Mr. Shafer, who is a new district supervisor. He has some very fine land and a good herd of beef cattle. Upon reaching the house, Mrs. Shafer served fruit drinks which were enjoyed by all as we were pretty much whipped out for the day had been hot and the roads dusty.

We adjourned at about 4 p. m. until the following day. The above tour was over the western section of the district.

On Friday, September 3, the same group made a tour of the eastern section of the district. We left the office at about 9:15 a. m. going first to the farm of Mr. Walter B. Pettigrew on White River. Much of his land is bottom land and one of his big problems is drainage. He had a fine crop of alfalfa and is preparing additional land for alfalfa where grass was over his head. His young grandson, Jack Hall, was handling the tractor in master form. They also had a mowing machine on another tractor where they had cut off the drainage way. You could see the drainage way after the mowing. It is V-shaped and doing a good job. Mr. Pettigrew has a crop of oats followed by alsike clover which is a sight to behold. His hybrid corn will make near 75 bushels per acre, and his Guernsey herd is a picture to see. "It is possible that no conservation practice will pay as quick dividends as drainage on wet lands," Mr. Pettigrew said. We did not go over the entire 203 acres in Mr. Pettigrew's farm. Mr. Pettigrew, who is a conservation leader in his community, joined the supervisors' tour for the remainder of the day.

The next cooperator we visited was Raymond Kennan, who is the Washington County school supervisor. He went into the conservation program on his 263-acre farm a few years ago and is doing one of the most commendable jobs in the county and making money at it. His orchard grass and red clover along with lespedeza is doing a splendid job. He cuts hay, saves seed, and pastures these fields. His herd of white-face cattle is outstanding in the production of calves. He sold approximately 30 calves last year which brought more than 28 cents per pound on foot at the farm. Mr. Kennan is very enthusiastic over his program and has a just right to be because he has done a swell job. He went over the farm field by field telling us what he had done the last 4 years. Every month out of the year he has something to sell—pigs, calves, hay, or seed. It is interesting how Mr. Kennan converted his tenant and partner in the job to conservation. When the tenant moved on the farm he had his old ideas of raising corn up and down the hill, etc. Mr. Kennan was shrewd enough to let him farm his part of the acreage according to his ideas but insisted "farm my acreage according to the conservation program." At the end of the year he said that Mr. Kennan produced so much more that he wanted to follow the conservation program.

We stopped for lunch at the community store, getting the drinks there and had our lunch in the shade of the trees.

We then proceeded to the G. A. Langham farm, where we saw irrigated strawberries on the contour that were outstanding, and he said that these strawberries netted him $890 per acre last year. His hybrid corn on the contour was outstanding and will possibly make 60 to 70 bushels per acre on upland. His pasture was good, it needs some brush removed but will really carry some cattle during dry as well as favorable years. His pond has been stocked with fish and is being fertilized, and he also irrigates from his pond. It is only about 100 feet down to White River. He plans to run a pipe from the river in order to irrigate additional acreage. All in all, Mr. Langham is doing an outstanding job.

We also visited others not included in the itinerary. One of these was L. B. Langley, who had just finished constructing a pond, as we wanted to see some newly constructed practices. This pond will be 10½ feet deep when the water is going over the spillway. He has a young Jersey herd and is progressing with his program but not as fast as is desirable.

The last stop we made was at Ira Oliphant's farm, but he had not been able to advance his program as he had planned, and since it was late and the supervisors had to complete their business session, we only hesitated on the highway for a brief review of this farm and drove on to the Soil Conservation Service office in Fayetteville for the regular meeting.

RESOLUTION

Motion was made by C. D. Griscom and seconded by J. H. Pyeatt that the foregoing material as herewith presented be adopted as the annual report of the Washington County Soil Conservation District for the year 1948 and that copies of the report be forwarded to all agencies and individuals that are deemed wise and necessary to the full acknowledgment and cooperation by district supervisors of those individuals and organizations that are assisting the district supervisors.

Respectfully submitted.

M. G. LEWIS, *Secretary.*

Approved:

WALTER D. RAMEY.
M. G. LEWIS.
C. D. GRISCOM.
J. H. PYEATT.
C. E. SHAFER.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to make known the replies to the questionnaire, which in January 1949, I attempted to place in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. I regret it was humanly impossible to send a questionnaire to each citizen, but I believe the replies received represent the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District.

My district might well be considered the main street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural population; all labor and farm organizations represented, as well as large industries and small business, two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman—both Democrat and Republican—laborers, farmers, attorneys, barbers, housewives, public officeholders, salesmen, and educators; those engaged in business and industry, newspaper and radio work, and professional persons, including doctors and dentists. A total of 3,000 questionnaires was sent and the number of individual returns received—approximately 2,000—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues which are before the Congress for consideration.

It was very gratifying to me that the legislative issues set forth in the questionnaire were the basis for study, discussion, and vote in numerous civic organizations, women's clubs, government classes of high schools, colleges and uni-

versities, local study clubs and veterans' organizations in the Seventeenth Ohio District. The total returns from this group voting indicate that approximately 690 persons participated in discussions and submitted their votes on the issues included in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire and results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT

1. Do you favor the continuation of the Marshall plan as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning $6,000,000,000 to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.) Yes ___ No ___.

2. If voting "Yes" on question 1, should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments? People ___. Governments ___.

3. Do you favor—

(a) Outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ___. No ___.

(b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ___ No ___.

(c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job? Yes ___. No___.

(d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a noncommunistic pledge? Yes ___. No ___.

4. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation)? Yes ___. No ___.

5. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control? Yes ___. No ___.

6. Do you favor an immediate return to Federal price control (such as OPA)? Yes ___. No ___.

7. Do you favor the continuation of rent control? Yes ___. No ___.

8. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production? Yes ___. No ___.

9. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages? Yes ___. No ___.

10. Do you favor Government support prices regardless of supply and demand? Yes ___. No ___.

11. Do you favor repeal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine? Yes ___. No ___.

12. Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia? Yes ___. No ___.

Signature_____

Address_____

Occupation_____

(Please write on the back of this page your comments on the above questions and any suggestions which might aid me in giving better service as your Congressman.)

Please return this questionnaire to me, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individuals according to occupation. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classifications:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1: Do you favor the continuation of the Marshall plan as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning $6,000,000,000 to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.)

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 53	*Percent* 47
Attorneys	68	32
Barbers	29	71
Business, industry, salesmen	52	48
Farmers	46	54
Housewives	61	39
Labor	41	59
Newspapers and radio	75	25
Professionals	55	45
Public officeholders	33	67
Retired	51	49
School teachers	80	20
Occupation not given and unemployed	42	58
Group voting	58	42

Question 2: If voting "yes" on question 1, Should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments?

	People	Government
Total replies	*Percent* 70	*Percent* 30
Attorneys	53	47
Barbers	100	----------
Business, industry, salesmen	69	31
Farmers	70	30
Housewives	80	20
Labor	73	27
Newspapers and radio	----------	100
Professionals	68	32
Public officeholders	86	14
Retired	60	40
School teachers	68	32
Occupation not given and unemployed	68	32
Group voting	74	26

Question 3: Do you favor (a) outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 87
Attorneys	6	94
Barbers	14	86
Business, industry, salesmen	9	91
Farmers	7	93
Housewives	9	91
Labor	22	78
Newspapers and radio	----------	100
Professionals	6	94
Public officeholders	----------	100
Retired	13	87
School teachers	16	84
Occupation not given and unemployed	12	88
Group voting	21	79

Question 3: (b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 54	*Percent* 46
Attorneys	58	42
Barbers	43	57
Business, industry, salesmen	46	54
Farmers	54	46
Housewives	45	55
Labor	44	56
Newspapers and radio	100	----------
Professionals	46	54
Public officeholders	57	43
Retired	52	48
School teachers	70	30
Occupation not given and unemployed	41	59
Group voting	64	36

Question 3: (c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 87
Attorneys	3	97
Barbers	43	57
Business, industry, salesmen	9	91
Farmers	4	96
Housewives	14	86
Labor	27	73
Newspapers and radio	----------	100
Professionals	4	96
Public officeholders	7	93
Retired	14	86
School teachers	23	77
Occupation not given and unemployed	7	93
Group voting	18	82

Question 3: (d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a noncommunistic pledge?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 92	*Percent* 8
Attorneys	92	8
Barbers	100	----------
Business, industry, salesmen	95	5
Farmers	94	6
Housewives	92	8
Labor	91	9
Newspapers and radio	100	----------
Professionals	95	5
Public officeholders	100	----------
Retired	90	10
School teachers	100	----------
Occupation not given and unemployed	91	9
Group voting	90	10

Question 4: Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation)?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 48	*Percent* 52
Attorneys	30	70
Barbers	86	14
Business, industry, salesmen	40	60
Farmers	50	50
Housewives	44	56
Labor	63	37
Newspapers and radio	20	80
Professionals	50	50
Public officeholders	40	60
Retired	50	50
School teachers	81	19
Occupation not given and unemployed	50	50
Group voting	45	55

Question 5: Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 10	*Percent* 90
Attorneys	6	94
Barbers	----------	100
Business, industry, salesmen	10	90
Farmers	9	91
Housewives	9	91
Labor	22	78
Newspapers and radio	----------	100
Professionals	3	97
Public officeholders	19	81
Retired	19	81
School teachers	35	65
Occupation not given and unemployed	7	93
Group voting	8	92

Question 6: Do you favor an immediate return to Federal price control (such as OPA)?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	8	92
Attorneys	6	94
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	3	97
Housewives	8	92
Labor	16	84
Newspapers and radio		100
Professionals	4	96
Public officeholders	13	87
Retired	14	86
School teachers	10	90
Occupation not given and unemployed	24	76
Group voting	8	92

Question 7: Do you favor the continuation of rent control?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	48	52
Attorneys	38	62
Barbers	43	57
Business, industry, salesmen	45	55
Farmers	37	63
Housewives	52	48
Labor	63	37
Newspapers and radio	60	40
Professionals	49	51
Public officeholders	25	75
Retired	55	45
School teachers	60	40
Occupation not given and unemployed	50	50
Group voting	49	51

Question 8: Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	8	92
Attorneys	6	94
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	7	93
Housewives	10	90
Labor	10	90
Newspapers and radio		100
Professionals	6	94
Public officeholders	6	94
Retired	13	87
School teachers	16	84
Occupation not given and unemployed	5	95
Group voting	8	92

Question 9: Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	7	93
Attorneys	8	92
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	8	92
Housewives	8	92
Labor	13	87
Newspapers and radio		100
Professionals	5	95
Public officeholders	25	75
Retired	7	93
School teachers	16	84
Occupation not given and unemployed	7	93
Group voting	6	94

Question 10: Do you favor Government-support prices regardless of supply and demand?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	13	87
Attorneys	5	95
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	8	92
Farmers	21	79
Housewives	8	92
Labor	15	85
Newspapers and radio		100
Professionals	5	95
Public officeholders	13	87
Retired	9	91
School teachers	17	83
Occupation not given and unemployed	8	92
Group voting	17	83

Question 11: Do you favor repeal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	69	31
Attorneys	90	10
Barbers	57	43
Business, industry, salesmen	76	24
Farmers	23	77
Housewives	71	29
Labor	75	25
Newspapers and radio	80	20
Professionals	83	17
Public officeholders	71	29
Retired	88	12
School teachers	87	13
Occupation not given and unemployed	79	21
Group voting	70	30

Question 12: Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	81	19
Attorneys	86	14
Barbers	71	29
Business, industry, salesmen	89	11
Farmers	78	22
Housewives	83	17
Labor	81	19
Newspapers and radio	75	25
Professionals	88	12
Public officeholders	93	7
Retired	84	16
School teachers	70	30
Occupation not given and unemployed	86	14
Group voting	74	26

Public Health and Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in reference to H. R. 3333.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS BEFORE THE LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—MARCH 25, 1949

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee in respect to what I believe to be one of the most important items contained in the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency for the coming fiscal year. I refer to the matter of assistance to States in public health work and to the vocational education services which are provided under the terms of the George-Barden act.

First, I would like to discuss the appropriation for assistance to States in the establishment and maintenance of public health services. The Bureau of the Budget saw fit to recommend $24,408,000 for this purpose. The House of Representatives saw fit to reduce this sum by nearly $11,000,000. I appreciate the problems of the gentlemen who made this decision, but I feel that their action was an unwise economy in view of the general picture of public health services now being developed in the various States of our Union. The figure approved by the budget would involve a very sharp program of expansion in this field of assistance to the States, but I submit my belief that the budget made a very careful analysis of the opportunity and necessity for expansion before this increase was approved.

The House Appropriations Committee in its report on this appropriation bill, H. R. 3333, stated that no concrete facts were available as to how the additional money would be allocated, and no definite showing was made that the States and other political subdivisions would be in position to take advantage of the additional grants. Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I am not in position to report upon the conditions in all of the States of the Union in this respect, but I can report in detail about my own State of Mississippi, and with some degree of knowledge about all the States of the South. I am in the midst of a general study of the progress which has been made in the field of education and public welfare in the entire South within the past few years, and one of the items which I have studied very carefully has been the development of the public health service. I can say very conclusively as a result of this study that this additional grant proposed by the Budget Bureau can very adequately and properly be used in the Southern States with no waste or inefficiency.

To provide details about the situation in Mississippi, let me review some of the accomplishments of the public health service in that State within the past few years. This is necessary in order to present the evidence as to how these additional funds will be used, for in virtually every case, the funds will be used to expand and broaden sound, thoroughly planned programs which are already in effect and producing wonderful results reflected in the increased health of our citizens.

The public health program in Mississippi is administered by Dr. Felix J. Underwood, executive officer of the State board of health, and the program has been widely recognized as one of the most efficient and beneficial in the entire Nation. Dr. Underwood and other responsible officials of our State have assured me that Mississippi will have no trouble in matching its pro rata share of the grants curtailed in this reduction made in the budget recommendation. I can best describe what will be done in Mississippi by telling you something of the progress that has been achieved during the past several

years. For instance, here are some figures in regard to reduction of deaths that are preventable: typhoid fever and paratyphoid deaths have been reduced from 1.6 per 100,000 population in 1941 to 0.3 in 1947, a figure which is below the national average; 80.2 percent of the rural population in Mississippi has been supplied with safe water supplies and other sanitation services. Deaths from malaria have been reduced to 1 per 100,000 from 1.8 per 100,000. Deaths from diphtheria have been cut in half. Deaths from diarrhea, enteritis, and similar ailments have been reduced to 2.7 per 100,000 in comparison to a national average of 7.2 per 100,000. Deaths from syphilis have been reduced from 19.7 per 100,000 to 12.16 per 100,000.

This reduction in deaths from syphilis is due to an intensive case-finding program by the venereal disease investigators, and to the public-health rapid-treatment centers which have been developed on a very ambitious program in every section of the State.

Deaths from tuberculosis have been reduced from 45.9 to 31.8 per 100,000 as compared with a national average in 1945 of 39.7. In 1947 the maternity death rate in Mississippi was the lowest on record, 2.6 per 1,000 live births. In the 6-year period which I am reviewing here, there has been a reduction of approximately 50 percent in deaths at childbirth for both the white and Negro races.

Even this reduced rate, however, is very high in comparison with other States that have a pronounced advantage over Mississippi in per capita income. The progress that has been made along all of these lines is attributed by all students of the problem in the State to the fine work of our public health service on both a State and local level. Failure to expand this service means nothing more than acknowledging satisfaction with the present status quo in this field. This money means the direct saving of lives of our citizens.

According to the most recent appropriation of per capita expenditure of all official State agencies for health activities, health progress made on the dollar expenditure in Mississippi is most commendable. The per capita expenditure in Mississippi, however, is only 98 cents in comparison with a general average of $1.90. We can increase this per capita expenditure in Mississippi only by an increase in the Federal grants and aid. Our tax resources in the State are being pushed to the limit, but we can take care of the increase to meet the available grants.

I have dwelt at length upon the improvements that have been made in Mississippi recently but there are similar accomplishments which can be pointed to in other Southern States. In Florida the mortality rate among Negroes is decreasing four times as fast as among whites. In Alabama the maternal death rate has been greatly reduced by a fine program of prenatal clinics. Ninety percent of expectant mothers helped by these clinics have been Negroes. Florida alone has more organized county health departments than all of the Eastern States north of Maryland and east of Ohio combined, and I understand that most of the other Southern States can make this boast.

We hear a great deal of criticism about the treatment of Negroes in the South and the alleged lack of facilities which members of that race receive. I submit the fact that the Negro is the greatest beneficiary of our public health service, and failure to take advantage of any sound expansion for these facilities results in a direct disadvantage to that race.

The great progress which has been made in the South is, I am sure, parelleled to some degree in all other sections of the country. If this much progress has been made through the agency of State and local public-health services, why cannot we expand their program to a greater degree? There are still 17 counties in Mississippi without county health departments. I have been informed that some of the increased funds which Mississippi would receive through the budget recommendation would go toward extending facilities to these counties in the form of State aid. It will be a tragic loss to the people of my State if this proposed program is not adopted. I ask the most earnest consideration of this matter on the part of you gentlemen of this committee.

As further substantiating exhibits on behalf of the necessity of this expansion, I have several documents which I would like to be incorporated as part of the record at this point, if there is no objection.

The program for vocational education in public schools has in recent years become recognized as one of the most important functions of our school systems in meeting the educational needs of the youth of the country. The Congress in 1946 provided full recognition of this fact when it passed the George-Barden Act, authorizing a detailed program of expansion for assistance to vocational education. Since that act was passed, however, the Congress has not seen fit to appropriate the full amount authorized. Perhaps because of this failure to make the full appropriation the Bureau of the Budget has this year recommended only $19,842,760, the same amount appropriated under this act last year. The George-Barden Act authorizes a total of $28,500,000 for the support of vocational education. I believe that this full authorization should be met. Unless it is met, no expansion of the present program can be made. Increasing instructional costs will make it difficult even to maintain the present program.

I am sure that it was the intent of Congress to ultimately make available the entire amount authorized in this law when the States could show the need for the service. If the need in my State of Mississippi is any criterion, all of the States of the Union can show a very definite need for these funds. The officials in charge of the program assure me that requests are piling up for additional programs, vocational agriculture, home making, trade and industrial guidance services. All of these various types of vocational training have contributed immeasurably to the great progress which my State has achieved in the past few years. If we are to remain sincere in our protestations of belief in the continued progress along these lines, we should carry out the directive of the Seventy-ninth Congress when it passed the George-Barden Act.

I have been informed by the State director of vocational education in Mississippi that 130 new projects in public schools could be established if the State were to receive the full benefit of the original appropriation for vocational authorization made under the George-Barden Act. Fifty-nine of these schools are for white students and 71 are for Negro students. In addition to these new projects, expansion could be made of existing programs in other schools, such as the adult-education program which gained a firm foothold in the State during the war and is now widely supported as a peacetime proposition. In 1948, 81,905 people, whether in school or out of school, received organized instructions in some phase of vocational education financed by Federal, State, and local funds.

My greatest interest in vocational education in Mississippi is in the program of the Future Farmers and Home Makers of America. I am sure that all of the members of the committee are in some degree familiar with the work of this organization, but I would like to emphasize my great admiration for the various benefits toward producing a better way of life in rural areas that the Future Farmers and Home Makers of America have developed. This program works in full cooperation with the 4-H Clubs of the extension services, and both are vitally necessary for the economic and cultural welfare of our rural areas.

One of our great problems in this country is to interest our rural youth in remaining on the farm and bettering our general agricultural conditions. We could do this only if we teach them how to take advantage of their opportunities, and there is no better way to do this than through such organizations as the Future Farmers and Future Home Makers of America. In the past few years much has been made of the threat to our American way of life that is offered by the philosophy of communism and other subversive doctrines. I believe that this type of alien philosophy will never gain a foothold in our rural areas if we have such wholesome programs for our youth as that provided by the Future Farmers and Future Home Makers.

At this point, I would like to submit as a substantiating exhibit a chart showing the progress of the vocational education program in Mississippi since 1920 and also showing the expansion of the program which could be put into effect if the maximum authorization provided by the George-Barden Act were appropriated. I would also like to submit a letter which I received sometime ago from two young officers of the Future Farmers chapter at Caledonia, Miss., which gives just a brief suggestion of the great work accomplished through this program.

The problem that you gentlemen of this committee face in determining what funds can be appropriated for the various services provided in this bill is a very difficult one, but I would like to emphasize again to you my very strong belief that no wiser use of Federal funds could be made than in appropriating the full authorization of the George-Barden Act for vocational education, and increasing the appropriation for health grants to States to that approved by the Budget Bureau. In each case very careful and deliberate study resulted in this authorization and recommendation. The Congress approved the George-Barden Act with the thought that a contribution would be made toward the better development of our rural life. The Bureau of the Budget certainly must have had strong substantiating evidence that the Public Health funds would be wisely spent. I hope that the committee will see fit to grant the requests that I have made with reference to this bill.

Veterans' Hospital Construction Program in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in which I objected to the

proposed curtailment of the veterans' hospital construction program in Pennsylvania, as recommended by the President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No more sacred obligation rests upon the American people than the care of the veteran who by reason of his war service is disabled or otherwise incapacitated.

We have been most generous in providing benefits for the veterans who are in good physical condition and in good health. We have made available to them educational advantages, vocational training, preference in government employment, and many other proper rewards in grateful recognition of their service to their country. Numerous other benefits have been proposed.

But to my mind we could adopt no more shameful course than to neglect the man who wore the uniform of the armed services and now faces a life of suffering and hardship because of injuries or other physical or mental impairment.

For many years I have been a firm and active advocate of economy in government. I have resisted unwarranted spending on countless occasions. But I shall never support any proposal in the name of economy which would deprive the disabled veteran of adequate hospital care and the best possible medical and other professional skill.

The proposed curtailment of the hospital construction program as it applies to Pennsylvania is to my mind a glaring example of disregard of the needs of the veterans.

It is another step in a policy which has discriminated against Pennsylvania and has failed to provide hospital facilities in the same proportion to its veteran population as has been provided in many other States.

Long waiting lists of veterans needing hospitalization in Federal tubercular and mental institutions are a tragic story in Pennsylvania.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by taxing its facilities to the limit, has been able to admit into State institutions a small percentage of those whose need is greatest.

As a result, 1,173 veterans are in State mental institutions and approximately 100 veterans have been admitted into State tubercular sanitariums. Others are in municipal and county institutions.

Bear in mind that these veterans are properly the wards of the Federal Government. They are entitled to and should receive from the Federal Government the best in professional and institutional care.

The revised construction plans of the Veterans' Administration call for the complete elimination of a proposed 200-bed general medical hospital at Harrisburg. A proposed 1,000-bed hospital at Philadelphia has been cut to 500; another medical and surgical hospital at Pittsburgh is reduced from 1,200 to 750 beds; and a mental hospital at Pittsburgh, planned for 1,250 beds, has been cut to 1,000.

This means that 1,400 beds are to be eliminated, or more than one-third of a total of 4,455 beds allocated to Pennsylvania in the new construction program.

Apparently this was based on a straight, across-the-board reduction in the whole program.

I contend it was a totally unrealistic approach to the problem. In my opinion it was done without taking into consideration the imperative needs of Pennsylvania veterans.

Apparently the cut-backs were applied only where actual construction had not yet been started.

In other words, in States where hospital construction was under way, no cut-backs were made. States in which delays had been encountered were penalized, even though the delays were caused by revision of plans or other circumstances that may have been unavoidable.

Pennsylvania's share in the building program had advanced to a point where sites had been acquired and all plans completed so that construction could have been started in a short time.

I will not take the time of the committee to repeat the figures which reveal the desperate situation with regard to veterans' hospitalization in Pennsylvania.

But I assure you that the statistical information that has been assembled and will be presented here will show that Pennsylvania has been made the victim of unfair discrimination.

I earnestly hope that this subcommittee will review the situation and will restore to Pennsylvania the hospital-construction program as originally planned to meet the pressing and immediate needs of our veterans, whose care, as I said before, is our most sacred obligation.

Development of the National River Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able discussion of the theory underlying the planning and construction of multiple-purpose dams and the development of our great river systems in the interest of the general national welfare.

I have reference to the column "Washington Calling" by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post, Saturday, March 12, 1949. The article is entitled "Hoover Commission Boomerang."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 12, 1949]

WASHINGTON CALLING

HOOVER COMMISSION BOOMERANG

(By Marquis Childs)

Behind the hydroelectric dams that have been built on several of America's great rivers since 1933 is a concept of the general good. Specifically, they were intended to provide flood control and navigation for all the people of the region.

For that reason part of the cost was charged up by instruction of Congress to benefits which would not directly return any revenue to the Treasury. This is a fact that private-utility propagandists either refuse to recognize or deliberately distort. Utility propagandists are constantly holding up the cost accounting of TVA alongside that of private utilities, although in the broader sense they are not comparable at all.

This same implication runs through the task-force reports of the Hoover Commission on public power. As was told in this space, those reports, not yet released, have stirred deep differences among Commission members.

That is unfortunate, since the detailed and lengthy studies contain many suggestions for improving the operation of these vast Federal enterprises. The danger is that the good will be lost sight of in the heat of argument over what are essentially political issues. Some Commission members have expressed the fear that the controversy may cut across all the valuable work that the Hoover group has done in trying to prune and pare down the luxuriant jungle growth of Government.

In a report prepared for the Commission by A. B. Roberts, consulting engineer of Cleveland, Ohio, it is estimated that multiple-purpose river-valley projects will cost $40,000,000,000 in the next 20 years. The report suggests that the total cost may be even larger because of "extensive shipments of steel, power-plant equipment, and supplies for aid to Europe." Then the author of the report says:

"In view of the continuing burden of taxation indicated by the trends shown above, it is believed that now is the time to reappraise the accomplishments to be anticipated from multiple-purpose projects. Once under way they are almost impossible to eliminate. Unless the Congress and the taxpayers consider carefully the implications of these trends of Federal expenditures, they may, without even realizing it, throw upon themselves and their children a continuing and perhaps an ever-mounting burden * * *."

Millions of Americans paying their income tax this week feel strongly about the volume of Government spending. But it is doubtful that the place to begin cutting is on projects that are in considerable part self-liquidating and that contribute so largely to the wealth and welfare of the Nation.

Only in an economy that is expanding and growing can the burden of taxation for European aid and to maintain a strong America be sustained. Once you stop expansion, you run the risk of mounting unemployment and further curtailment in a downward spiral.

This is a lesson some people never seem to learn. As was shown in the controversy between TVA and the private utilities, private operators would never have built TVA's dams and power projects. Equally clear is the fact that without TVA power the country could never have produced the aluminum for 50,000 planes a year in the war.

The great new projects in the Pacific Northwest are providing employment for thousands of newcomers who were attracted by jobs in war plants. Without this resource of power, there might be serious unemployment.

As the specialists for the Hoover Commission point out, there is much overlapping and duplication in the Government approach to flood control, navigation, and power. The Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the various power administrations, the Department of Agriculture, all have a hand in it.

Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, has now introduced a bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority which would have as its province the great basin of the Missouri and its tributaries. That river valley is now being developed on a sort of share-the-work basis by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Perhaps the valley authority is the correct way to get the most out of every Government dollar spent. But the argument should be primarily one of method and means. We are too rich, or, if you will, too poor, to let our assets or soil and water go wasting to the sea.

Missouri Valley Authority—Article by Former Representative Jamieson, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief column taken from the weekly news sheet called "The Window Seat," of March 30, 1949, edited by former Representative W. D. Jamieson, of Iowa.

In his introduction to his weekly comments on national affairs he says:

As I sit in my law office window in the Southern Building and look out (in my mind's eye) over the White House toward the balance of the country things occur to me of passing interest.

Because of his prior experience as a national legislator and continuing study of American economic puroblems, Mr. Jamieson is in a position to give his readers sound advice on public questions. This particular column has to do with the proposed establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority for the control and development of the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCUSED

A splendid lawyer friend in the Midwest (who doesn't read the Window Seat) says I am accused of being for the establishment of the MVA. He says: "I refuse to believe this as I think you regard a law that requires honest and efficient administration, with a reservation of sovereignty in the people, too much to be guilty."

My law friend of near a half century standing, if you had been reading the Window Seat for the last 10 or 15 years you would know I am red hot for MVA, and have been.

AND HERE'S WHY

Because, being patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, to be run the same way, it will—

1. Be as honestly and efficiently handled as any other Government agency I know, and more so—in the interest of the people—than any private utility I know.

2. Be more under the complete sovereignty of the people, in cooperation with the State, county, and community governments, than it could be under State or private control.

3. Be zealously concerned with all phases of the benefits to the public—flood control, power, drainage, irrigation, conservation, recreation, fishing, and in making the whole Missouri Valley blossom like a rose.

4. Cooperate with all interests of the local communities for their benefits.

5. Save consumers untold millions in money—TVA now charges domestic consumers 1.56 cents per kilowatt-hour, while the average charge by the private utilities, all over the United States, is 3.01 cents per kilowatt-hour.

TVA now does all these things and more.

Another point—th people have to put up the billions upon billions of dollars to do it, so they should get the benefits.

Enough reasons for one sitting?

AM I RIGHT?

I'll leave it to you to judge. If I'd leave it to $65,000 a-year-plus Lobbyist Smith, who is paid by the private companies and who works here trying to do everything possible to kill MVA, and who will see this article never fear—he would say I'm as nutty as this fellow the officer arrested for being tanked up:

Judge: "Tell me, officer, just what made you think this man was drunk?"

Officer: "Well, judge, he staggered out of Ryan's bar, walked to the fire-alarm box on Elm Street and put a penny into it; then he looked up at the town clock and exclaimed, 'My sakes, I'm 10 pounds overweight.' "

Should We Build a "Wall" of Radar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Walter Angrist which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 25, 1949, entitled "Defense vs. Economy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE VERSUS ECONOMY—SHOULD WE BUILD A "WALL" OF RADAR?

(By Walter Angrist, of the Minneapolis Tribune editorial page staff)

Nations have been building walls between themselves and outlander enemies for centuries. The Great Wall of China was erected to repel raiders from the Asiatic heartland. The Maginot Line rooted its "wall" into the earth as a concrete series of bastions facing Germany.

But history has proved in every case that more than the strength of a wall was needed to face and turn away invasion.

Now it is proposed for the United States that a "wall" of radar be established along both our coasts and across the Arctic top of the Americas.

In his annual report as Secretary for the Department of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington has asked top legislative priority for a continent-wide radar warning system to supply that element which he says is so sadly lacking in the American defense picture.

Just what did Secretary Symington have in mind when he outlined this air raid warning program?

Basically, it would consist of a network of land-based radar units, interconnected and linked with radar-equipped picket vessels far out to sea.

In the Arctic wastelands of north Alaska and Canada only land-based units would operate.

Also sought by the Air Force chief to round out his warning system are air defense control centers linked with Canadian and American civilian defense watchers as well as with the radar "wall."

Disregarding cost in terms of matériel and personnel and considering only military expediency, Symington's plan has great merit.

Since his Air Force is assigned the duty of defending America in the air, as well as carrying the offense back at any attacking enemy, he reasons properly that some warning system must be operating in conjunction with his defense plans.

But what of the economic expediency of Symington's program?

How much will his plan cost? Is the cost justified in terms of the over-all needs of the defense establishment?

Can the Nation's economy stand anything beyond what the President has indicated as the defense limit ($15,000,000,000) for fiscal year 1950?

The exact costs involved can be determined if and when Congress gives the Symington proposal consideration.

With the present range of a radar unit limited to about 300 miles, the number of units which would have to be in operation 24 hours a day to cover two coastal lengths and the northern continental fringe would run the cost into staggering billions.

And we as a nation are not able to maintain a reasonably healthy peacetime economy if the Nation's budget suddenly skyrockets by the billions for added defense features.

Then what is the solution? How can the need be met without dangerously increasing the budget load?

Symington's chief, Secretary of Defense Forrestal, will do well to weigh the Air Force proposal against severe strain on national economy and production.

Forrestal, others concerned in the military high command, and Congress will be employing sound over-all planning techniques if they refuse to shop for the most elaborate solution to air-raid defense.

A relatively few strategically located radar bases, plus similarly limited picket vessels, plus other alert at-sea Navy units could be a less expensive but fairly effective application of Symington's ambitious requests.

Such a set-up would be lifted beyond the fairly effective stage by adequate overseas intelligence.

As an added element of air-raid defense in times of strained world relations, all American and Canadian planes, commercial as well as military, should be required to carry IFF (identification, friend or foe) equipment.

These devices automatically indicate on radar plots whether approaching aircraft are friendly or presumed enemy.

This, linked with filing of commercial-flight plans, would complete the picture of a minimum, but functional continent-wide warning system.

Where Is the Money Coming From?—Editorial From the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where, Oh, Where?" from the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight of March 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE, OH, WHERE?

Legislatures, including our own here in Kansas as well as the National Congress, are

continuing to provide for the spending of money. Busy statesmen have been finding new functions to be carried on new additions to government, new welfare ideas, and increased compensation, all of which calls for money by the millions of dollars.

Once again, we desire to ask where is the money going to come from? Is there to be no limit to the amount of money our legislative bodies are arranging to spend? It is not that many of the things involved are not desirable. It is not that some of the beneficiaries are not entitled to more pay. It is not that extensive repairs are unnecessary here and there in governmental structures. If it is granted that every dime spent by the Kansas Legislature, for instance, will be wisely spent, we still have a paramount question that legislators everywhere seem to be overlooking and for why we know not. That question:

Where is the money going to come from?

We are not asking an argumentative question. We are asking for information. Why do not our statesmen, national and State, rise in their wisdom and fairness and advise the people how they expect to get all the money they are arranging to spend?

The men and women who are trying to operate business enterprises and industries and others who are working for salaries and wages and running farms have a deep interest in the money that is being spent by statesmen. They have a right to be interested. They have a right to be informed. They are putting up the money that the statesmen are spending.

Reduction in Prices of Petroleum Products—Resolutions of Board of Directors, National Oil Marketers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the National Oil Marketers Association in Washington, D. C., March 24–25, 1949, on the subject of reduction in prices of petroleum products.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT SPRING MEETING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NATIONAL OIL MARKETERS ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 24, 25, 1949

I. *Resolved,* That the public interest requires a general reduction of prices of petroleum products at all levels, beginning with the price of crude oil, and any governmental action that seeks to maintain present prices of crude oil is an attempt to enrich a few oil producers at the expense of the general public.

II. *Resolved,* That the action of the Texas Railroad Commission in reducing the production of crude oil in order to maintain high crude oil prices is an unwarranted interference with the natural laws of supply and demand by government.

III. *Resolved,* That the almost simultaneous increase in gasoline prices and reduction of fuel oil prices does not indicate that prices to the public are governed by the natural laws of supply and demand.

IV. *Resolved,* That a copy hereof be sent to the Attorney General of the United States for investigation as to possible violations of the antitrust laws in the manipulation of petroleum prices.

A Threat to Child Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady:

A THREAT TO CHILD CARE IN THE UNITED STATES

(Statement of Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, considering H. R. 2892, the Public Welfare Act of 1949, March 10, 1949)

For more than a hundred years the care of dependent, neglected, and delinquent Catholic children has been the basic concern of Catholic charities in the United States. In the early days of the church in this country large numbers of Catholic children were reduced to dependency by the premature death of their parents. Most of the child-caring institutions of the church were built in order to save these children to the faith. In most of the large centers in the United States local governments were willing to contract with Catholic institutions for the care of Catholic children. They recognized that the care of children away from their own homes is a very serious responsibility. The agency that assumes this responsibility is really taking over the responsibility of parents. The same type of child-care programs that were developed by the Catholic Church were also developed by other religious denominations.

In many of the larger communities in the United States it has been a recognized principle for a century or more that Catholic children should be turned over to Catholic agencies for care, that no other agencies can provide the type of religious care that they need. In communities in which Catholic agencies were not developed, large numbers of Catholic children were turned over to governmental or other agencies and were lost to their faith.

Catholic and other religious organizations set up for the care of children away from their own homes have made far-reaching contributions to the welfare of orphaned and neglected children. They have constituted a large sector of American charities and social welfare. They have saved millions of dollars to the taxpayer by their devotion and self-sacrifice. Any effort or movement that undermines the great work of our religious organizations and institutions engaged in the care of orphaned and neglected children would be a serious threat to all the best traditions of American social welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION A SERIOUS THREAT TO CATHOLIC CHILD WELFARE

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has now before it a bill (H. R. 2892) which is a serious threat to Catholic child welfare in the United States. If the bill is passed, it will mean that large numbers of Catholic children now under the care of Catholic agencies will have to be turned over to public departments. These children are in Catholic institutions and Catholic foster homes. The church has expended millions of dollars in developing facilities for their care. Government has nothing to gain and everything to lose by discontinuing the use of these facilities and developing purely governmental programs. Such programs would cost the taxpayers several times the amount that is expended in the care of the children at the present time, and would offer no guaranty that the children would receive comparable care. We know the difficulties that governmental agencies now endeavoring to take care of Catholic children experience in finding Catholic homes. In these agencies we almost invariably find a considerable number of Catholic children being cared for in homes not of their own religious faith.

WHAT AMERICAN COMMUNITIES WILL LOSE BY THE WEAKENING OF RELIGIOUS AGENCIES

Proposals for turning over to governmental agencies children now under the care of Catholic charities would mean the weakening of Catholic charities in a large number of communities in the United States. The same is true of other religious child-caring agencies. The work of Catholic and other private children's institutions has been the basis of the powerful appeal made by voluntary social work in the past. If the work of caring for these children is turned over to government it will mean that all private child care in the United States will lose a very large part of its appeal. We know very well what this appeal has done in keeping the spirit of Christian charity alive among all citizens. How can we maintain our spirit of Christian charity, our spirit of brotherhood, without the appeal of the great charitable institution for the care of children.

HOW H. R. 2892 WILL INJURE CATHOLIC SOCIAL WORK

The bill before the House of Representatives will injure Catholic work for dependent children because:

First, it proposes to set up a public program for the care of children in every community in the United States. This program will replace a Federal program that was designed to provide governmental assistance to child-welfare programs in rural areas and areas of special need. When legislation for the present program was being discussed in 1935, the thought was that the large centers already had well-developed child-care programs and that it was unnecessary for the Federal Government to interfere with these programs; that the Federal Government should confine itself to areas that were not reached by existing programs, namely, rural areas and areas of special need. The bill now under consideration would bring the Federal Government with all its rules and regulations into every community in the United States to set up governmental programs for the care of children.

Secondly, the bill provides that the States must formulate complete State-wide plans for child care, but it really tells them what kind of plans they must have. If, for instance, as happens at the present time in a number of cities, a juvenile court has been committing children to Catholic agencies, this plan will have to be discontinued because the bill says that in every community there must be one agency that has entire responsibility for the care of children. In certain communities the care of children is under a different civilian agency from that charged with the administration of public assistance. Under the proposed legislation this agency would have to become part of the public-assistance agency. If a community has decided to use voluntary organizations for the care of children, it will have to set up a public program.

The proposed legislation, H. R. 2892, provides that each and every State must contribute State funds to programs for child care. Now in a number of States it is questionable how far State funds can be used to purchase from religious organizations services for the care of children. This is very clear in the State of Pennsylvania. All funds for the care of children in Pennsylvania are now local funds. Under the proposed legislation Catholic and other religious child-care programs in Pennsylvania would be practically wiped out. While this problem has been solved by constitutional amendments in New York and by court decisions in some other States, it will still be difficult to maintain the purchase of service for the care of children with State funds in a considerable number of States.

The proposed legislation will affect not only the work of local voluntary agencies in the care of children to whose support local public funds are being contributed; it will affect the entire program of Catholic and other religious agencies. It envisages a complete governmental program that will virtually take over the entire field of child welfare. It proposes that governmental agencies take over the care of unmarried mothers, the placement of children for adoption, day care for children, all types of counseling service for both families and children. It really presents to the American people a false picture of the actual reality. We have already had a considerable amount of experience with the work of governmental agencies in dealing with families that are receiving aid to dependent children. Very little social service is being done in this field. Now it would seem more appropriate if the governmental agencies would achieve effective work in the areas in which they are now engaged before entering into new areas.

The enactment of H. R. 2892 would really be an announcement to the American people that the Federal Government now proposes to enter into the entire field of child care in the United States. The broadcasting of this news will in itself do a great damage to voluntary child welfare under religious auspices. The Government will be virtually announcing that it is ready to undertake a program for which it does not have the necessary facilities.

GOVERNMENT MIGHT CONCENTRATE IN AREAS TO WHICH IT HAS ALREADY BEEN COMMITTED

Under the Social Security Act the Government provides assistance to the States for the care of children in their own homes and in the homes of close relatives. The purpose of this aid to dependent children program is to assist in the maintaining of family life. But in spite of the vast sums expended by the Government for the care of children in their own homes we find that more and more homes are being broken up and that the facilities of agencies engaged in the care of children away from their own homes are overtaxed. When Federal assistance was first granted to the States for the care of children in their own homes it was expected that there wouldn't be as much need for the care of children away from their own homes. What has happened, however, is that the governmental agencies engaged in the care of children in their own homes are not providing any program of service for the children or their families. It would be more desirable for the governmental agencies to concentrate in this field rather than to seek a wider field. If they have not developed the necessary competence in caring for children in their own homes how can they expect to develop the necessary competence for the more delicate task of caring for children who have been deprived of care of their own parents

The Social Security Act provided assistance to the States for child care in rural communities and in communities of special need. But after 13 years we do not yet have any adequate programs of child care in rural communities and in many of our mill and mining towns. After 13 years this field still remains to be cultivated. It is more challenging now than it was 13 years ago.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND GENERAL RELIEF

In his message to the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1936 President Roosevelt said: "The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers. I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash, of market baskets, or of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destruction but also their self-respect, their self-reliance, and courage and determination."

At the time that President Roosevelt spoke, the social-security program had just gone into effect and this program was designed basically to protect the workers against the hazards of life by a series of benefits based on rights. This was in harmony with the report of the President's Committee on Economic Security made in 1935: "The measures we suggest all seek to segregate clearly distinguishable large groups among those now on relief or on the verge of relief and to apply such differentiated treatment to each group as will give it the greatest practical degree of economic security. We believe that if these measures are adopted the residual relief problem is apt to be diminished to a point where it will be possible to return primary responsibility for the care of the people who cannot work to the State and local governments." The measures that the President's committee recommended included old-age insurance and unemployment compensation—which were to provide the foundation-stones of a social security program—and supplementary programs including aid to the states for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind.

THE PROGRAM AFTER 13 YEARS

The programs recommended by the President's Committee on Economic Security have been in effect for 13 years. We recognize that old-age and survivors insurance has not developed as rapidly as might have been expected. In the meantime, the public assistance programs have expanded at an enormous rate and as they have expanded the problems of administration have become more and more complex. Anybody who believes that the basic problems of administering aid to dependent children under the Federal-State program has been solved, is really not looking squarely at the facts. Some of us have reserved our criticisms of local administration because we were afraid that it would lead us into a worse situation. We had always expected that aid to dependent children would solve many of the problems of child dependency and delinquency, but we have been disillusioned. We have been disillusioned by the lack of service in families receiving aid to dependent children benefits. On the local level we are endeavoring to get our Catholic groups to participate more actively in the administration of aid to dependent children. These volunteers have to keep constantly calling the attention of the workers in the public agencies to the wholesale neglect of the children in families receiving aid to dependent children. We hear well-founded complaints about mothers who call up the officers of local agencies to ask how much they could get if they divorced their husbands. Sometimes they find that they can get more in the way of public assistance than they can get from their husbands.

Many people all over the country are asking: How soon are we going to find a substitute for this program of aid to dependent children? People have asked me: Why don't you study the Canadian family-allowance system and promote it in the United States—something that is more consistent with the dignity of the individual and the family than our present program? It was our hope that the extension of old-age and survivors insurance would take up an increasing number of mothers with dependent children. And it has taken up a considerable number. At the present time, 570,592 children are receiving survivors' insurance benefits. On the other hand, a total of 1,176,198 are receiving aid to dependent children. It was hoped that under aid to dependent children child dependency would decrease, but we find that the problems of child care confronting our agencies are increasing rather than diminishing.

I have talked rather frankly during the past 6 months to many county officials charged with the administration of aid to dependent children in various sections of the United States. I have found very few among them who were satisfied with the program. They told me that they were bound by rules and regulations coming to them from the Federal Government, and they presumed from Washington. Among the ordinary citizens in these countries I found great dissatisfaction with the administration of the program. I am honestly convinced that year by year the program is going to become more expensive and more demoralizing to American families. I feel that it is necessary to speak thus severely at the present time, when it is proposed to carry the same program into much larger areas. I feel that the farther away we get from the present public-assistance philosophy in serving the needs of American families the better it will be for all concerned. What was back of this statement that the late President Roosevelt made to the Congress in 1936 that the Federal Government must and shall quit the business of relief? I talked to Harry Hopkins and his associates many times about this question. Why did the Federal Government get out of the business of direct relief? The answer was: Costs kept on increasing; standards kept going down.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE CONTRASTED WITH OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

According to the latest figures, we have some 2,469,000 persons receiving old-age assistance in the United States as compared with 2,254,000 receiving old-age and survivors insurance. I know that generally speaking the people receiving old-age assistance get more than those receiving old-age and survivors insurance, but does this mean that they are satisfied? On the contrary, I find very few people receiving old-age assistance that are really satisfied. It has been our hope that more and more of the aged will be covered by old-age and survivors insurance as much more economical and much more in harmony with the dignity of the American citizen. Here we have a benefit to which the individual has contributed. He considers it his own and in accepting it he feels no loss of dignity and respectability. One cannot fail to note, however, that the ordinary aged person who has been self-supporting all his life is very sensitive about receiving old-age assistance.

The ordinary workers and the ordinary farmers receiving old-age assistance are really products of the depression, but I do not believe that the ordinary middle-class citizen of our country is going to be satisfied with old-age assistance as a means of protecting himself against the hazards of old-age dependency.

A GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Implicit in the whole thinking of the Federal Security Agency is the principle that the Federal Government is fundamentally responsible for getting to every American family everything that it needs on the basis of a careful and detailed budget analysis.

Apparently the Agency does not accept the guiding principles of the Social Security Act. It is leading us more and more toward the concept of needs in contradistinction to a certain minimum protection against the basic hazards of life.

Let us think for a moment what this basic responsibility for supplying all the needs of American families on a budget basis would mean for the National Government and for the people of the United States. It would mean an analysis of the resources and needs of every family that needed assistance. On the basis of this principle several million wage-earning families would have to be included. As a matter of fact, at the present time many families receiving Aid to Dependent Children are getting more than their neighbors who are working for wages. Of course one can see that these families are in need. They can't supply all their budgetary requirements. This again assumes that they are bankrupt, that they do not have any initiative left. One might ask, what will this general subsidizing of the wage system do to wages? Will it not encourage lower wages? Again, what will it do to families? How far will it tend to demoralize family life in our country? How far, moreover, is it practical to apply the type of needs test indicated, to four or five million families. The resources and needs of families change from time to time. We would have to have a continuous study of families in order to apply the needs test effectively. It would require an army of workers to carry out the principles of the needs test.

MOUNTING COSTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will want to understand something of the costs of an enlarged public assistance program. For the fiscal year 1945–46 Federal grants in the amount of $439,132,000 were certified for these programs; for the fiscal year 1946–47 Federal grants in the amount of $613,831,000 were certified, for 1947–48, $775,602,000 was certified. The estimate for 1949 is $842,961,114 and for 1950 it is $1,078,000,000. It should be remembered that these increased expenditures have been made in a period of relatively full employment. One can readily appreciate what will happen if the Federal Security Agency extends its effort to the larger fields contemplated under H. R. 2892. One can readily hazard a guess that the relief expenditures of the Public Assistance Division will exceed $2,000,000,000 a year, and they will not stop at this point. They may well be increased by another billion within the next 5 years.

NATIONAL CONTROL OVER FAMILY LIFE IMPLIED UNDER H. R. 2892

I would like for a moment to examine another very important implication of the responsibility which the Federal Government assumes under H. R. 2892. Under this proposed legislation, the Government is virtually going to guarantee every family what it needs on a budget basis. Every family that receives assistance under this formula will virtually be taken over in bankruptcy. What does this mean from the standpoint of national control over family life?

I know that the Federal Government has been trying to get away from this responsibility and it has been trying to get the State and local governments away from a serious consideration of its implications. Charges and countercharges have been made in community after community in the United States that the funds given to families have been abused and that the money given for the support of chilren is not used for their benefit. I have heard these charges made in one city after the other, but the agents of the Government keep saying, "We are not responsible for the way in which families live. We have no responsibility for the way they spend the money we have given them." This certainly is a new concept in the administration of relief. I suppose it is an effort to get away from trying to control the lives of the families, but what are we going to do about the situation? We cannot overlook charges of neglect of children in large numbers of families that are supported by Government funds.

The difficulties to which we have pointed will be greatly multiplied if the Government should take over the larger part of the relief field.

When the Social Security Act was passed by the Congress grants-in-aid were provided to the States for certain well-defined areas of public assistance, including the aged, dependent children, and the blind. It was assumed that as the insurances developed the need for these categories would decrease. Nobody envisioned the expanding program that has been developed, especially through years of full employment. From the way in which the program is developing now it is beginning to look as if the Federal Security Agency wants to change the entire pattern; that it wants to give us a relief program rather than an insurance program. Many people have been raising this question. They have stated also that most of the thinking about social security has been done by a few people in the Agency. If one disagrees with them, he is supposed to be very unorthodox, to say the least.

Some of the advisers of the Federal Security Agency on the outside do not make any secret about their desire to substitute a complete public-assistance program for a social-insurance program. This, indeed, would be a great tragedy for the American wage earner and for the American people as a whole.

I know some of our conservative brethren believe that relief is less expensive than social insurance; they believe that relief will be governed largely by local standards, but once we get the program envisaged by H. R. 2892, I doubt if assistance administration will be any longer determined by local thinking.

VARIATIONS BY STATES IN THE NUMBER OF PERSONS RECEIVING OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

There is a great variation in the number of persons receiving old-age assistance in the States. Of every 1,000 persons over 65 years of age in Louisiana, 791 receive old-age assistance; in the District of Columbia, 47; in Oklahoma, 593; in Delaware, 58; in New York, 97; in Colorado, 464. This must mean that there is a great deal of variation in the needs test as it applies in the States mentioned. The needs test as interpreted by the Federal Security Agency means a complete study of the resources and needs of the individual and the making of a definite budget. However, the legislatures in States having a large number of persons receiving public assistance write a good part of the needs test. They try to define what resources are. They say that an insurance policy of a certain amount should not be considered; that a house valued at less than a certain amount should not be considered; that cash of a certain amount should not be considered. In other words, there is a struggle on between these States and the Federal Security Agency. The States want a pension; the Agency wants assistance. Now in the program envisaged by H. R. 2892 all the Federal grants are based on a general-assistance category. It would be very interesting to watch the reactions of the States that have set up what is virtually an old-age pension. Would they be satisfied to return their old-age assistance recipients to a general-assistance category where they would receive only the same consideration and have to pass the same needs test as the recipients of general relief?

PROVISIONS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

H. R. 2892 would set up a system of grants-in-aid to the States to provide medical assistance which is defined as medical services for needy individuals, provided by the State agency through payments to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services, but does not include medical services for individuals living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution * * *.

This would bring the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Administration and the State departments of welfare into a very large sector of medical care in the States. It is based on the assumption that medical services in the States at the present time are very inadequate and that grants-in-aid are necessary to enable local agencies to secure medical care for relief clients.

On the whole, medical care in communities in which there are adequate facilities, is fairly good. In the communities that I visited in Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and Illinois during the past 6 months, I found that medical care is looming very large in local expenditures. The greatest difficulty I find in other areas is the lack of adequate facilities for medical and hospital care in local communities. The hospital facilities are inadequate; the medical facilities are inadequate. Assuming there is an unmet need, there is a question whether this need should be met by adding to the responsibilities of State and local welfare departments. Isn't this definitely a health problem? We already have two divisions of the Federal Security Agency now interested in health, namely, the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. They are working with the States on health problems. Will this put a third division in the health field? Moreover, it is fairly well recognized today that our first step in any health program is to provide more adequate local facilities. We need more hospitals, more nurses, more doctors. We need more health centers in areas in which there are virtually no hospitals and no facilities for medical care.

One may very well ask today, in view of the general debate on a national program for medical and hospital care, whether the best approach from the standpoint of the Federal Government in dealing with the medically indigent would not be to concentrate for the time being on providing more facilities. I believe that it can be said that in the ordinary communities in the United States, outside of certain areas that do not have facilities, the medically indigent are receiving better medical and hospital care than the ordinary wage earners.

GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL UNNECESSARY AT THE PRESENT TIME

At the end of 1948 some 33,000,000 people were covered by unemployment compensation. This number of people, therefore, with their families, were protected against the hazards of temporary unemployment. In three States—California, Rhode Island, and New Jersey—we have provision for temporary disability due to ill health. The chances are that before the adjournment of their present sessions a number of other State legislatures will have made provision for temporary disability. We have also in the States, rehabilitation programs which take care of a sector of the physically handicapped. We have some 15,000,000 people included in veterans' benefits of one kind or another. We have the prospects of larger coverage under old-age and survivors insurance to cover the permanently handicapped. We have the prospect of a large housing program that will help to improve the standards of life of large numbers of people in the United States. We have voluntary health protection of one kind or another covering 53,000,000 people. There is no reason therefore why the Federal Government should embark on a greatly expanded program of public assistance which will cost the people of the United States another billion dollars.

I am sure that nobody is looking ahead to public assistance as a means of protecting the workers against the hazard of continuous unemployment. We do not need to look ahead to any continuous unemployment during the next year. Even if we should have a large volume of unemployment, public assistance would be the poorest remedy we could devise for it. We learned that from our experience in the early 1930's.

It will be much sounder for the Federal Security Agency at the present time to look ahead to ways and means of improving the administration on the Federal level of the various benefits committed to its charge. A great deal of improvement is needed especially in the administration of aid to dependent children. There is general dissatisfaction throughout the country with this program as it is presently administered. The Federal Security Agency should devote itself to studying ways and means of preventing the abuses that have arisen, of providing more adequate service for the families receiving aid to dependent children, and of preventing that process of deterioration which is affecting the lives of so many of these families at the present time.

Under title V of the Social Security Act, the Children's Bureau is charged with the administration of child-welfare services in rural areas and areas of special need. The Children's Bureau might very well now study its experience during the past 13 years. Why is it that there is so little constructive social service in our rural communities? The Children's Bureau is expending considerable money at the present time in the training of workers in the field of child welfare. How many of these workers are qualified to deal with the programs with which the Children's Bureau is charged? How many of them are qualified for work in the country? If this work in the country is not undertaken by the Federal Security Agency through the Children's Bureau, it may be that the people of the United States will have to devise other means of providing welfare programs for the large number of families that need service in our rural communities. We cannot go on without a more adequate social-work program in the country. The Farm Security Administration made an excellent beginning in this field but its operations have been restricted and now there is nothing to take its place.

I am sure that our American wage earners look to a social-insurance program that is in harmony with their dignity, that gives them a certain amount of protection against the major hazards of industrial life. They do not want a needs test. They do not want to admit that they have to be taken over in bankruptcy. They have a great deal of initiative and resourcefulness on their own. They want to be able to walk into the social-insurance office and secure the benefits that are coming to them as a matter of right; benefits to which they and their employers have contributed; benefits which are really a continuation of their wages during the periods in which they can no longer work.

Co-Ops and the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the March issue of the Pacific Northwest Co-Operator entitled "The Right To Face a Problem."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CO-OPS AND THE AMA—THE RIGHT TO FACE A PROBLEM

(The American Medical Association has received the following statement from the Cooperative Health Federation of America. Pacific Northwest Cooperative Health Federation is represented on the national board by D. A. Northrop, of Seattle)

There exists in most of the States legislation of a nature which permits the medical profession to sponsor and operate prepayment plans and denies the same right to our organizations.

Generally speaking, these State laws permit only physicians to organize a plan, or provide that the governing board must be controlled by a majority of physicians, or provide that no plan can operate unless with 51 percent or more of the eligible physicians in a given area participating.

In one fashion or another, these laws of various types are an effective bar to formation of plans by our groups. We believe that the American Medical Association and its affiliated bodies should cooperate with us in the removal of these legal barriers, which, in the first instance, were sought and obtained by medical societies.

These legal barriers place the medical profession in the position of saying, in effect, to the people: "You may have prepayment plans but only upon our terms; you may have a common pool of funds provided by your payments which will aid you in a medical crisis, but you shall have nothing to say about the management of these funds; you may budget for the cost of a limited type of medical care, but you shall have nothing to say about the rates you will be charged."

We doubt that the medical profession realizes the full implication of these restrictive laws and the reaction which they engender among large numbers of people in all the organizations which are attempting to solve the problems of paying for good medical care. We doubt whether the profession has considered that those medical society plans which are operating under an exclusive privilege enjoy a position not given to any other segment of the American economy.

In most of these plans there are none of the checks and balances which apply to other forms of enterprise through the usual application of free competition, democratic choice, or Government regulation.

In short, these plans enjoy a monopoly for all practical purposes, and their management, with few exceptions, is not subjected to the voice or vote of the investors or to effective supervisory control by a governmental agency, such as State insurance departments exercise in the control of rates, benefits, and investments of insurance companies in the interest of the public.

As the full implication of the monopoly feature of these medical society plans is becoming understood by the consumers of medical care, their increasing resentment is understandable. This type of monopoly is obnoxious to our sense of democracy and contrary to the American concept of free enterprise.

It cannot be said that these plans are nonprofit in the common meaning of that term (as distinguished from the legal meaning) because the physicians are the sole recipients of the funds and at the same time sole determiners of the rates.

We feel strongly that the medical profession must come to realize that we laymen have had successful experience in business administration and possess the ability to operate these plans on a sound basis. We need only point to our record in the administration of hospitals and other allied institutions.

While we insist on our right to organize for the useful purpose of forming prepayment plans and operating their business functions, we are equally determined to have the professions assume full responsibility for all professional and technical aspects of administration and the maintenance of the physician-patient relationship.

A barrier, second only to restrictive legislation, exists in the form of restraints imposed by medical societies against physicians to participate in our plans. These restraints take several forms.

Some of these physicians, although duly licensed and well qualified, are denied admission to the local medical society or are expelled from it for the sole reason that they are participating in one of our plans. The result of this drastic action is to deny to the physicians free access to hospitals and consultative services, as well as the usual privileges of his profession.

This reacts against his professional security and his social standing. His effective application of medical science having thus been partially destroyed, his patients (who have freely chosen him) are deprived of the full medical services which the licensing laws were designed to afford them.

Another type of discrimination on record is the denial of the right of a fully qualified physician-applicant to take his specialty board examination solely because of his affiliation with one of our plans.

These and other forms of restraints are being practiced in sections of the United States. An over-all survey of this situation shows that these restraints are not isolated instances, but follow a pattern which appears to us to be national in scope.

The resentment on the part of some consumer groups has reached the point where criminal and injunctive actions have been sought. Recent examples are the injunction actions now in process in Oregon and California, both of which are based upon the law resulting from the conviction of the AMA by the United States Supreme Court in 1941.

We feel strongly that in our democratic system there should be freedom of experimentation for all types of voluntary prepayment plans, of whatever sponsorship, so long as they adhere to acceptable standards.

We believe that the medical profession as well as all of our groups have arrived at the point where there is mutual agreement that prepayment is a sound basis for the budgeting and paying of the cost of medical care. There may be some differences as to the method and control.

However, we believe that it should be readily agreed that none of us has a blueprint we could call an ultimate goal. We are yet in the pioneering stages of a worth while and publicly acceptable idea. The medical profession, we feel, would agree that their plans are not a fully satisfactory answer.

Our groups are sponsoring and operating many types of plans, none of which completely satisfies us as the final answer. In this situation, the historical American approach is to experiment. As the years pass, public acceptability will ultimately give us the best answers.

Just as we feel that medical-society plans should be free to develop and seek public acceptance, so are we demanding that the consumer-sponsored plans should have the same opportunity, free from the artificial restraints imposed by class legislation and professional discrimination which now stifle free experimentation.

How a Bill Makes Its Way Through Congressional Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Clerk, official magazine of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, has in its March 1949 issue a most interesting and readable article on how laws are enacted by the Congress of the United States. The article perhaps contains some minor inaccuracies, but its clarity and brevity commend it. I include it as a part of my remarks:

HOW A BILL MAKES ITS WAY THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL MILL

During the opening months of the Eighty-first Congress a record number of bills have been dropped into the hopper.

But only a tiny fraction of all of the bills introduced will ever get on the statute books.

For example, during the first 75 Congresses, covering 150 years, 726,933 bills and joint resolutions were introduced. Of this number, 60,142 became law. That is a little less than 8½ percent.

In this session as in all others, too, a heavy proportion of the bills passed will be so-called private laws, dealing with individuals, and also one-shot acts for public monuments, holidays, park lands, and the like.

PITFALLS ARE MANY

It's a long course, strewn with many pitfalls, that a bill takes before it gets congressional approval and becomes a law of the land.

Where does a Congressman get all the bills he introduces in the course of a session?

Well, he gets them from a lot of places. Actually, he may initiate very few himself. And one paradoxical fact is that many of the bills which Members of the House and Senate introduce come from sources which often are most vocal in declaring that there are too many laws. It all depends, it seems, on what kind of laws.

Anyway, bills sometimes are initiated by Members, and they are either written by them or, more frequently, by that branch of the Capitol's highly competent permanent professional staff which specializes in legislative drafting.

Then there are bills which Members introduce at the request of Federal departments and agencies. And there are still others, in most sessions the greater proportion of all, which Congressmen introduce at the request of individuals and organizations, and for purposes incredibly varied. Some of these proposals are sound and eventually become law. Some which are not sound also become law if sufficient pressure is exerted in their behalf. Still others reflect seemingly unlimited imaginative flights on the part of their hopeful authors. But the good and the bad, the big and the small, all follow the same course.

There is a different procedure for introducing a bill in each branch.

In the House, a Member takes his bill and literally drops it into the hopper. That's a wooden box located on the clerk's desk in front of the Speaker.

A Senator rises and waits for the Presiding Officer to recognize him. Upon being recognized, he announces that he is sending the bill up to the desk.

The first thing that those who run the legislative machine have to decide is what committee shall handle the bill. In most cases that isn't a difficult decision since the rules afford a clear guide; but occasionally there are close questions and these are decided by the Speaker or by the President of the Senate.

THE JOURNEY BEGINS

Clerks record the title of the measure and give it a number. After each day's grist is collected and prepared the bills are delivered to the Government Printing Office. The printed copies are returned to the House and Senate document rooms.

In committee most bills first go to a subcommittee. Here, in due course, or not, as the case may be, the bill is considered and its pros and cons given preliminary thorough investigation. Many, but not all, of the hearings so widely publicized are actually subcommittee rather than full committee hearings.

The subcommittee goes over the bill and on the basis of what it has learned it either changes, approves, or kills it. The latter result it can achieve simply by taking a very long nap on it; and thousands of bills every session never get beyond subcommittee reference, either by failure to act or by direct negative vote.

On relatively rare occasions action will be taken to force a bill out of committee. It is possible for House Members to take a bill away from a committee by petition and bring it on the floor for action. A Senate committee can be discharged from consideration of a bill through a motion passed by a majority of the Senators present.

If a bill is given a subcommittee O. K. it then goes to the full committee where the same things can happen. If the committee gives its approval, also, the bill then goes to the House.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT

There's a quick way to get action, used chiefly on minor bills. They're put on a separate calendar for action by unanimous consent. There is only one drawback to that method, and it's a serious one, namely, that objection by a single member can upset the applecart.

In the case of all major legislation there is still another hurdle, the Rules Committee. However, the Eighty-first Congress in one of its first acts took away from that body a good deal of its erstwhile life-and-death power over legislation. Now, if the Rules Committee fails to report on a measure within 21 days or does so adversely, the bill can be called up for House consideration by the chairman of the committee in which it originated. And the Speaker is required to regard such a request as a point of highest privilege.

If the Rules Committee gives the green light, it comes out with a resolution which states the conditions under which the bill is to be handled on the floor—length of time for debate and the like. That resolution then is acted upon.

In the Senate there now is no limitation on debate. Thus, the filibuster is practicable only in the Upper House. Speeches on the floor do not, in general, have great influence on the course of legislation. Most important determining factor is the decision of the majority party to support or oppose; and facts brought to light in committee.

As soon as a bill is passed by either House or Senate it becomes technically an act. But it is still commonly referred to as a bill.

NOW IT'S AN ACT

When the House has passed a bill it achieves a new dignity. The version as finally approved—and it may have gone through dozens of transformations in the process, often being completely revised with the single exception of the enacting clause—it is printed on fancy light blue paper and is signed by the Clerk. In the Senate, acts are printed on fine white paper and are signed by the Secretary.

Then the House which has passed the bill sends it to the other side of the Capitol. It once more may go through the same committee-hearing routine. In both Houses committee decisions as to the disposition of bills always is made in executive session.

In many cases the House and Senate approve measures in which there are differences. That happens almost always on major legislation. This means the measure must go to conference. The presiding officers of each Chamber appoint conferees who then try to iron out their differences. If language has been approved by both House and Senate it is not subject to change by the conferees. The conference report goes before the two Houses for action.

These reports are not subject to amendment. They must be voted either up or down, as is. If they are rejected the conferees are given instructions on the disputed points. Sometimes it takes quite a bit of doing to reach final agreement.

Let's say, now, that Congress finally has finished all of its work on a given piece of legislation by approving the conference report. What's next in the long journey?

First there is a routine for getting the bill to the White House. That responsibility rests on the House which initiated the legislation.

A new bill is printed, without numbered lines, and single large sheets are used, with printing on one side only. The President of the Senate and Speaker affix their signatures. The signed bill then is sent to the White House by messenger and is promptly popped into a safe. At the same time, duplicate but unsigned copies of the measure are distributed to the Budget Bureau, Justice Department, and other agencies for review and then are returned for or against Presidential approval.

SIGNING CEREMONY

When the President signs the official copy it becomes law. On very rare occasions a bill awaiting signature has been lost in the White House mazes, but that happens so infrequently it becomes a page 1 story when it does. Most bills are signed without fanfare. Sometimes, however, a ceremony is made of the signing and the President will give the pen to one who has been closely identified with the legislation from its inception. Often more than one pen is used—and there are cases when half a dozen and more have been distributed to persons watching the ceremony.

If the President vetoes the bill it is returned to the House which initiated it. The measure must muster a two-thirds majority in both House and Senate to become a law without the President's signature. If the President doesn't sign a bill within 10 days after it reaches him—not counting Sundays—it becomes a law anyway. But if Congress adjourns in the meantime the measure does not become law unless he signs it within the 10-day limit. This is known as a pocket veto.

But even after approval the long hard row still isn't over for the legislation. It must be sent to the State Department where it receives a number and is published as a so-called slip law, which means that it is printed individually. After each session these are consolidated and bound in a volume called the United States Statutes at Large. All permanent laws of general application currently in force are included in the Code of the Laws of the United States of America and supplements issued after each regular session of Congress.

VARIOUS RESOLUTIONS

Many persons are confused by the different types of resolutions adopted by Congress. A joint resolution is acted upon by both Houses and must have Presidential approval, and has the force of law. A concurrent resolution

does not require Presidential action. It's not a public law but deals with issues over which House and Senate have jurisdiction concurrently. A simple resolution is the action of one House on matters of special concern to it. Bills are either public or private—the former dealing with matters of general application (such as taxes, the Marshall plan, appropriations for Federal departments), the latter having to do with persons, many of them involving compensation in varying amounts.

The investigation and planning that go into a major piece of legislation is far more complex than is generally realized, and those whose duties bring them into constant contact with Congress have a genuine respect for its members, a cross-section of the 148,000,000 people of America.

The Struggle for American Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit, without prejudice on my part to any one named, an article by William Bradford Huie entitled "The Struggle for American Airpower," published in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, for the month of April 1949.

Mr. Speaker, in the present unsettled world situation and in view of the discussions and great interest of the Congress and the people of this country in our Air Force, I believe that it is appropriate to place this historical narration of our air power in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN AIR POWER

(By William Bradford Huie)

In this the fourth year after Hiroshima, the battle to make America strong in the air is still being fought in Washington. On the side of the Air Force, as always, are the men of vision, backed by the American people. Arrayed against them are the Maginot minds, the yearners for yesterday, the men who oppose any innovation which may lessen their own prestige.

No thoughtful citizen need be confused in this conflict. To understand it, one has only to leaf through the record. In each and every year since 1908 the air visionaries have been right, the obstructionists have been tragically wrong. The black-and-white record would seem to indicate that the antiair generals and admirals who have been wrong for 40 years are still wrong today; that the airmen who have been proved right by events are still right in their determination to build the world's best air force to defend our country.

The record begins in 1908 when the Army General Staff yielded to the public air craze and ordered the first military airplane from the Wright brothers. The airplane cost $30,000. One of the specifications was that it "could be easily taken apart and packed for transport in Army wagons." It was assigned to the Signal Corps, and Lts. Benjamin D. Foulois and Thomas E. Selfridge began learning to fly it.

After Lieutenant Selfridge died in our first military aerial accident, Lieutenant Foulois was for 2 years our only pilot. The Signal Corps allowed him $150 a year for repairs; when he spent an additional $300 out of his own pocket to keep the airplane flying, the corps refused to reimburse him and censured him for wastefulness.

From this experience, Lieutenant Foulois concluded that for air power to have much future in America it would have to escape the Signal Corps and be recognized as a separate service in the Army. Not as a separate corps—aviation could never hope for equality with the Infantry or Cavalry—but just as a separate service to these majestic arms.

By 1913, Lt. Hap Arnold and other enthusiasts had joined Foulois in agitating for this Army Air Service independent of the Signal Corps. Although Bleriot had flown the English Channel and C. P. Rogers had made the first United States transcontinental flight, the Signal Corps denounced the agitators as visionary. Brig. Gen. George P. Scriven, Chief Signal Officer of the Army, testified before a congressional committee:

"The future of aeronautics in the United States Army should rest with the Signal Corps. Aviation in military affairs is merely an added means of communication, observation and reconnaissance."

General Scriven, West Point '78, member of the Fourth Philippine Expeditionary Force, decorated for gallantry in action against the Boxers, was a brave and patriotic American. His opinion in 1913 was not to be disputed by a few impertinent shavetails. But we know now that General Scriven lacked vision. Lack of vision can cause a country to buy the wrong weapons, it can force men to die needlessly, it can deliver a free nation into slavery.

General Maurice Gamelin, proponent of the Maginot line, was a brave and patriotic Frenchman. But his lack of vision wasted his nation's substance on the wrong weapons, gave it an unjustified sense of security and delivered it to its enemy.

The United States Army attitude toward air power had this effect: When war came in 1917, the Nation which had invented the airplane had virtually no air service. By throwing hundreds of millions of dollars into the wind, we tried to catch up; we bought 5,000 airplanes from Britain, Italy, and France; 196 third-rate American machines were at the front when the war ended—and this type of "flaming coffin" had killed more of our own men than Germans.

Even so, our airmen, led by Brigadier General Billy Mitchell, returned from France with the vision of American air power. They knew, however, that if they were to have the chance to develop a great, long-range, striking air force they would have to be free of the General Staff of the Army and the General Board of the Navy. For these were the citadels of the infantry and the battleship, which would always oppose the development of any air means not auxiliary to them.

When Billy Mitchell was rebuffed in his efforts to see President Wilson, he launched his appeal directly to the American people. He began shouting that an airplane could sink a battleship; he badgered the Army and Navy for a demonstration.

To this, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, speaking for the Navy General Board, responded:

"The idea is so damned nonsensical and impossible that I am willing to stand on the bridge of a battleship while that nitwit tries to hit it from the air!"

Congress, over the objection of the Army and Navy, ordered a bombing experiment on the German battleship *Ostfriesland*. The ship was placed 60 miles off the Virginia capes, and on July 19, 1921, Billy Mitchell and his men made the first hits on her with the light 230- and 550-pound bombs specified by the Navy. When these bombs failed to sink the ship, General Pershing, who was on a nearby observation vessel, shook his head and said:

"I doubt if I shall waste more time on this croquet game. He can't possibly sink the ship. And even if he could, how would airplanes ever take part in a naval battle in the middle of the ocean? Where would they come from? Is anybody foolish enough to believe that boats could take squadrons of airplanes within the zone of a thundering battle between superdreadnaughts? Mitchell did a good job for us in France, but at best it was just scouting in the air on a grand scale."

General Pershing's opinion so impressed Secretary of War Weeks that the two of them left the scene and were sipping refreshments at Old Point Comfort the next afternoon when Mitchell's men, with their primitive bombsight, dropped a 2,000-pound bomb on the *Ostfriesland* and sank her in 25 minutes.

Observers shouted uncontrollably as the *Ostfriesland* went down. A few of them wept.

Back at Langley Field, carried to his quarters on the shoulders of his cheering men, Billy Mitchell declared solemnly: "Boys, in the war to come, God will be on the side of the heaviest air force. Don't forget it. Keep your eyes on the sky."

A few week later, Secretary Weeks wrote to a friend:

"I'm not going to be stampeded by a circus performer. Mitchell is putting a lot of foolish ideas in the heads of the people, and one of these days we may have to get rid of him. We'll stick to the Army on the ground and the battleships on the sea."

In April 1923, Mitchell sent his farseeing recommendations about Alaska to the War Department. In these he predicted that flights could soon be made across the top of the world. Admiral William A. Moffett, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics, commented: "There could be no better indication than this fight of fancy that Mitchell's mind is beginning to crack."

In September 1925, the Morrow board investigated the air agitation. Maj. Gen. John L. Hines, Army Chief of Staff, testified:

"I am of the opinion that the Air Service, because of limitations imposed by natural laws on the operation of aircraft, will always be limited as to radius of action."

Maj. Gen. Hugh Drum, Deputy Chief of Staff, declared:

"I see no reason why the range of a military airplane should ever exceed 3 days' march by the infantry. An independent Air Force, if adopted and maintained, can only contribute to disaster and defeat in war."

Against this sort of blindness, Billy Mitchell the man of vision, testified:

"Why should the United States be prevented from developing this priceless attribute, the airplane, in which we are entirely capable of excelling through our initiative, inventive ability, raw materials, industrial developments, and the personal characteristics of our people? In reality, air power is our basic means of national defense. We need great long-range airplanes to strike the enemy first. In the war of the future, to sit down on one's own territory and wait for the other fellow to come is to be whipped before an operation has even commenced. The only defense against aircraft is by hitting the enemy first just as far away from home as possible."

One month after the Morrow board hearings General Mitchell was court martialed for his explosive statements. His trial was one of the most shameful episodes in American history. Col. Sherman Moreland pointed a trembling finger at Mitchell and shouted: "Expel from our midst anybody not meeting the requirements of patriotism."

Maj. Allen W. Gullion, after comparing Mitchell to Aaron Burr, threw his arms into the air and screamed: "Throw him out. We ask it in the name of the American people

whose fears he has played upon, whose hysteria he has fomented, whose confidence he has beguiled, and whose faith he has betrayed."

During this speech one of the American people got up, gritted his teeth, walked over to Mitchell, clapped him on the back, and said: "The people are with you, Billy. Keep punching. You can rope them yet." That was Will Rogers.

But General Mitchell was crucified just the same. He was crucified for being right. All he had wanted was to develop a powerful long-range air force for the protection of his nation.

It was only after his death that a grateful Congress awarded Billy Mitchell a special gold medal of honor.

For 9 years after Mitchell's martyrdom, the Air Service lay becalmed. Charles A. Lindbergh flew the Atlantic in 1927; Admiral Richard E. Byrd flew to the South Pole in 1929; by 1932 Pan American was operating 4-engine 36-passenger Sikorsky liners; in 1933 United States commercial air lines pioneered 38,200 miles in air-mail routes; but our military aviation remained bound hand and foot.

Our men of vision drew the plans for big, far-ranging bombers, but the General Staff would not include such planes in budget requests. Congress would have voted the money; Congress has always been air-minded; Congress has rarely cut an Air Force appropriation. But the General Staff would not ask for money for long-range airplanes; and the air officers being subordinate, could not.

And then the Government invalidated the air-mail contracts and ordered the Army to carry the mail. It was a 1934 version of the Berlin airlift, but with an opposite, tragic result. Col. Hugh J. Knerr, who directed procurement and maintenance for the air-mail venture, later testified:

"I knew we were going to kill good men and pile those flying junk heaps on a dozen mountaintops. For years we had had almost no money for equipment. We didn't have an airplane that had more than half of its instrument board operating. To carry tons of mail across the continent in the worst winter in years we had to rely on old Keystone trainers and pursuit planes. We had no radios and could get none from the Signal Corps.

"We had no sooner begun the flights than the crashes began to pile up. It could not have been otherwise. We were working with planes at least 7 years behind the commercial planes. Not only were the aircraft deficient but the personnel equipment was so poor that the pilots suffered frozen feet and hands and some of them got pneumonia before it was possible for us to accumulate ordinary decent clothing. Our men flew over the Allegheny Mountains through snow and ice in open cockpits without even a pair of fur-lined boots."

The air-mail fiasco, of course, shocked and angered the Nation. The immediate result was the investigation by a War Department special committee known as the Baker board. Written pleas were filed by 536 officers of the Air Corps imploring "some sort of freedom from the General Staff so that we may be able, with the help of Congress, to develop long-range striking air power for the protection of the United States."

The Baker board testimony remained secret for 15 years until it was released for this reporter.

Maj. Gen. Paul B. Malone, commander of the Third Corps Area, testified:

"In the Argonne the German Air Corps was operating against us with 5,000 planes * * * we were frequently bombed * * * but my total losses from the hostile air corps consisted of three artillery horses. * * * We cannot rely upon the Air Corps as a principal weapon; the Army must recognize that victories are won and lost largely by the bayonet. * * * I cannot conceive of placing the Air Corps in any position other than in direct subordination to the commander on the field of battle."

Apply this reasoning to the following two facts:

1. It took the German ground forces more than a year to reach and lay siege to Stalingrad, not counting the hundreds of thousands of casualties incurred on the march—330,000 men were lost on the field of battle alone—and Stalingrad survived.

2. Today one long-range bomber could take off from Labrador and, 16 hours later, destroy Stalingrad—with the risk of just 16 American lives.

Maj. Gen. V. H. Moseley, commander of the Fourth Corps Area, told the board:

"Too many of these young air officers have the idea that when war comes they are going to fly off somewhere else and leave the Army and do something more or less spectacular. They must be made to understand that they are going to stay with the Army and try to help the Army with a victory."

At Hiroshima the Air Force did fly off and do something more or less spectacular. The Army was 600 miles away.

Brig. Gen. John H. Hughes, Assistant Chief of Staff, testified:

"The War Department holds that the Air Corps cannot be developed to the detriment of ground troops; and, since the bounds of air imagination are apparently limitless, the General Staff must exercise a paternal restraint on the Air Corps."

How many Americans died in inferior planes in World War II, it might be asked, because of this paternal restraint? It was not until 1943 that we had a fighter plane which could match the German Focke-Wulf, yet the plans for both the P–47 Thunderbolt and the British Spitfire were available to us as early as 1937. The General Staff's paternal restraint prevented their development.

Admiral William H. Standley, Chief of Naval Operations, said:

"Naval aviation cannot replace any arm of the fleet or any functions of the fleet. It extends the range of scouting by cruisers; it extends the range of effective gunfire; it increases the area which can be covered by patrol work; but it does not supplant the regular Navy in any of these functions."

Such was the testimony of the men entrusted with responsibility for our future military security just 7 years before Jap planes wrecked our fleet at Pearl Harbor.

In hearings before the Baker board in 1934, Rear Adm. Ernest J. King, Chief of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, testified:

"It is an indisputable fact that no potential enemies can reach this country except by way of the sea * * * transoceanic air attack on the United States is not to be feared now nor in the future."

Today, of course, it is common knowledge that a transoceanic air attack is the only way an enemy could make a major assault against this country.

When the Baker board had concluded its deliberations, it issued a report which expresses the views of the General Staff down to the beginning of World War II. Here are the principal conclusions:

"1. The limitations of the airplane show that the ideas that aviation, acting alone, can control the sea lanes, or defend the coast, or produce decisive results * * * are all visionary, as is the idea that a large Air Force is necessary to defend our country."

All this, of course, is ridiculous in the light of events. In 1941, Winston Churchill announced that the Luftwaffe had "closed the sea lanes of the Mediterranean to the British Fleet." In 1942, at Coral Sea and Midway, the two pivotal naval battles of World War II, not one of our surface ships got within 50 miles of an enemy ship, while our airplanes sank five carriers and one heavy cruiser, killed 4,400 men and forced what was left of the Jap Fleet to withdraw. Only a few years before, our Chief of Naval Operations had asserted that aviation would be good for little more than an aid to cruisers in scouting.

"2. In future wars, aviation will not be a decisive factor."

The B–29's were instrumental in knocking Japan out of the war, making an invasion unnecessary, and saving untold American lives. Similarly, our bombing of Germany was certainly the decisive factor.

"3. The fear that has been cultivated in this country by various zealots that American aviation is inferior to that of the rest of the world is * * * unfounded."

Seven years later Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault said to his Flying Tigers: "Men, you've got to be good when you fight a Jap Zero with an American P–40. For when a P–40 meets a Zero, you are outnumbered 3 to 1."

"4. The board realizes the hold aviation has on the public * * * but the board feels that it would be unsound to sacrifice the fundamental principles upon which the security of a nation rests in order to take advantage of a temporary public psychology."

Here you have the obstructionists in the role of protectors of the people's purse from the people's folly. Yet, had our military decisions in the 1930's been made by house-to-house poll alone they would have been more intelligent than the decisions insisted upon by the professional military.

"5. The War and Navy Departments have opposed every proposal to unite them in a single Department, each realizing that it is far better to concentrate on normal and customary missions rather than adopt a system based upon occasional and short-lived operations."

Those two words "normal" and "customary" really sum up the 40-year opposition of the Army and Navy hierarchies to the airpower "visionaries." In a world being changed by the airplane, the Army and Navy have believed that it is "far better to concentrate on normal and customary missions." This they were doing on the morning of December 7, 1941. That they were right might be disputed by the 2,400 men who died at Pearl Harbor that day.

"6. It is the hope of this board that the present study may be accepted as the basis for the development of the Army Air Corps for the next 10 years and thus terminate the continuing agitation which has been so detrimental to harmonious development."

There you have it. The General Staff didn't like agitators; they wanted to pursue their normal and customary missions in harmony. They didn't believe in air power; they only wanted a few short-range planes; and they were going to retain veto power on plane types to make certain that the air officers didn't waste the gullible public's money on long-range airplanes.

But there was one man of vision on the board. He appended this brief minority report:

"I believe that the future security of our Nation is dependent upon an adequate Air Force. This is true at the present time and will become increasingly important as the science of aviation advances and the airplane lends itself more and more to the art of warfare. I am convinced that the required Air Force can be more rapidly organized, equipped, and trained if it is completely separated and developed as an entire separate arm. If separation is deemed undesirable at this time, I recommend an Air Force as part of the Army but with a separate budget * * * and removed from control of the Army General Staff.—James H. Doolittle."

Testifying before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in November 1945, General Doolittle declared:

"The 10 years during which the Baker board expected its rulings to endure expired on July 18, 1944. On that date, thanks to the scrapping of the Baker board's report and every idea in it, the Army Air Forces comprised some 13,000 four-motored bombers; and these bombers, which the Baker board would have outlawed, were pounding our enemies with 78,000 tons of bombs a month."

The Baker board, however, did toss one sop to the temporary public psychology. It recommended the creation of a General Headquarters Air Force; and the formation of this force in March 1935 was the first step toward building an organization for air power in the United States. Prior to this date all the airplanes we had were attached to the various corps areas, most of them in observation squadrons. The General Staff now conceded that there might be a brief aerial phase in a war while the ground armies were being mobilized. So the air officers were allowed to form this organization which was to maintain itself in readiness.

In command of the General Headquarters Air Force was Maj. Gen. Frank Maxwell Andrews (killed in Iceland in 1943). His chief of staff was Colonel—now Major General—Knerr; and on his staff was Lt. Col.—now Gen.—George C. Kenney. These three officers inherited Mitchell's mantle, and they led the fight for strategic air power during the critical years from 1935 until the outbreak of the war. They were almost completely defeated.

The first effort of the General Headquarters Air Force was to create an organization for air power; the second was to create an instrument for air power. This instrument was the B-17, the Flying Fortress, the first American four-motored bomber, and it cost the shocking sum of $230,000.

The idea of the B-17 was derided by most of the General Staff and by almost every admiral in the Navy. After the plane itself arrived at Wright Field, Ohio, in the summer of 1935, a large delegation of brass went from Washington to watch a test flight.

The size of the airplane was startling. Many officers doubted it could get into the air. The crowd milled around it as it was being made ready for flight; they shook their heads; they placed bets as to its performance.

"Colonel, what possible excuse is there for spending $230,000 on such an airplane?" an admiral asked an Air Force colonel.

"Well, sir, we need a plane with range enough to destroy the sources of enemy power," the colonel replied. "We could destroy cities and factories. We could build machines like this into a new instrument of power—air power—and we could exert our national will through air power, just as sea power has been used in the past."

The admiral shook his head and walked away. And that night as he rode back to Washington he may have felt justified, for the first B-17 had crashed on the take-off and burned to cinders in full view of the crowd. Two men lost their lives.

The explanation for the accident was simple and ironic. A small locking-pin holding the tail controls had failed to disengage; the plane could only stall, crash, and burn. All the brave plans for American air power almost crashed with it.

General Andrews and Colonel Knerr came back to Washington, hat in hand, to beg the General Staff for money to build more B-17's. Before the crash the Air Corps had requested 65; now they were given authorization for 13.

By 1937 the GHQ Air Force had tested and eliminated the "bugs" from its experimental B-17's. Now it was ready to take the next step forward in the creation of American air power. General Andrews and Colonel Knerr submitted a program to the War Department. It called for the construction of 108 B-17's; for the enlarging of Pacific fields so that the airplanes could operate to the Philippines; for the training of crews. Cost of the program: $21,000,000 a year.

The air officers knew that this program would meet fierce opposition, first in the War Department and then from the Navy. For the Navy didn't want any big, land-based bombers operating in its domain, the Pacific. So the air officers decided to seek the help of another temporary public psychology by forcing the Navy, if possible, into another sensational airplane-battleship test. The agitation was successful and President Roosevelt ordered the tests for the summer of 1937.

The tests were elaborate, progressive, and thorough. They culminated in an attack on the battleship *Utah* off the California coast. The bombing squadron found the *Utah* in the fog and attacked it with sensationally successful results—which are still kept secret to this day. The reports were submitted to the President and the air officers waited for the support which would certainly come when the President announced the results.

But the President didn't announce the results. Newsmen and Congressmen begged for them. The Air Corps did everything possible to get the results announced. The War Department did not oppose the announcement. But the admirals persuaded the President that to release the results would not be in the best interest of the Navy, and so the results were suppressed—and remain suppressed.

The B-17 program was now in extreme jeopardy. The General Staff appointed Brig. Gen. George R. Spalding to be chief of all Army supply policy. He handed down the War Department's decision on American air power. In essence, it stated that the War Department could not approve the program for developing the B-17's. Instead, the Air Corps was ordered to concentrate on a light, less expensive type of bombardment plane.

As a result of this directive only one B-17 was ordered in 1937. On the day that Hitler marched into Poland in 1939 the original 13 developmental B-17's constituted our entire strategic bombardment force. The type of thinking which produced this directive sent the United States into World War II with its hands tied.

After this decision, the GHQ Air Force was deprived of its principal reason for being. Yet, 1938 was the year of Munich. Both Germany and Russia were testing their new air weapons in Spain. Our commercial air lines were flying both the Atlantic and Pacific and logging more than 68,000,000 miles domestically with DC-3's and other improved planes. But our only existing agency for military air power was hamstrung.

Colonel Knerr was retired from the Army; General Andrews was reduced in rank to colonel; Colonel Kenney had been banished to an infantry school. The Army had learned exactly nothing since the crucifixion of Billy Mitchell.

That same year—1938—the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Leahy, asked Congress for $150,000,000 to build two new battleships. He told Congress that battleships were the best of modern weapons. President Roosevelt told a press conference that a battleship's antiaircraft guns were the obvious antidote to the airplane. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in the Philippines, told a correspondent: "Japan will never attack us here as long as our main fleet is in the Pacific."

And in September 1941 Senator George Norris stood before Congress and declared:

"I think a little war with Japan might not be bad for us. The Navy could blockade the island and the war would be over in a few weeks. It would train our men for the more difficult task in Europe."

America in 1941 had the same false sense of power that France had in 1939. The admirals had assured us that as long as we had our battleships we were safe and powerful. We had no air power because the vested interests had prevented its development. Our men of vision were the prisoners of the Maginot minds who, except for our geographical advantage, would have delivered this Nation into slavery just as France was delivered.

Today in Washington we have the same old struggle. We are arming for one particular purpose; we hope that through strength we can dissuade the Russians from war. In all of our arsenal there is but one means which the Russians have cause to fear: our long-range, strategic air power and its atomic bombs. Reason, therefore, would seem to dictate the concentration of our war money on the development of our air-atomic advantage. Each year our bombers should become faster, longer ranged; our crews should become more efficient; our bombs should become deadlier.

If there is to be a world war III we must win the brief aerial phase or we may not be alive to prosecute any further phases. If we can win the brief aerial phase there will be time to prepare whatever means are necessary for other phases.

The American people want this air-atomic strategy for peace. Congress wants it, too. But the vested interests want the so-called balanced power. They want the billions to be divided approximately equally: $1 for air power, $1 for infantry divisions, $1 for warships. They want to cut our 70-group air program to 48 groups, not to save money but just so we can spend more money on the Army and Navy. To impede the development of strategic air power, the Maginot minds are working just as hard in 1949 as they worked in 1925.

The Army in 1925 had a regulation which prevented the expansion of any one arm to the detriment of the others. The air service was balanced with the cavalry. Billy Mitchell asked them then: "Suppose a department store operated on the principle that it couldn't expand its hardware department without similarly expanding its ribbon department?"

The only balance the United States needs is a balance against Russia; and we need to maintain the particular arms which can assure us that balance.

There is no reason why Americans should be unduly impressed by the opinions of generals and admirals of the last war as to what is going to happen in the next war. Most of the general and admirals of World War I spent the rest of their lives trying to discredit the military airplane. They seemed to think that the airplane would always remain an unwieldy, stick-and-wire kite suitable only for artillery spotting. They were wrong; but their influence so retarded the development of our military aviation that it was very late in World War II before our planes became really effective.

Now we have generals and admirals of World War II who are insisting again that air power has reached its maximum effectiveness. Let us always remember that, on the record, they and their predecessors have been wrong about air power for 40 years. Their short-sightedness has cost us blood, travail, and tears. Why should we be distracted from our goal by their counsel now?

Admiral King has said: "Transoceanic air attack is not to be feared now nor in the future." Well, buggy-whip makers didn't think the automobile would amount to much, either. And if the development of the automobile had been controlled by buggy-whip makers, it wouldn't have amounted to much.

Transoceanic air warfare is the warfare to be feared in the future; any citizen on the street knows this is true. We now have airplanes which can take off from this continent, fly to Moscow, drop an atomic bomb and return. In possession of our Government now is a report from a group of our ablest scientists which states, without reservation, that within 10 to 20 years we can have an atomic bomber which can fly nonstop around the earth at the speed of sound.

We shall never have this bomber, however, if we allow its development to be controlled by our Maginot minds, our exponents of balanced power. But we can have it—and we can have the hope of peace and survival for ourselves and our children—if we and our Congressmen support our men of vision.

Wages in the Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Mr. G. A. Metzger, secretary-manager, Willamette Valley Lumber Operators Association, to Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, relative to wages paid in the lumber industry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE VALLEY LUMBER OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,
Eugene, Oreg., March 9, 1949.

The Honorable MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have recently read portions of the transcript of the House Committee on Education and Labor hearings held in connection with the minimum-wage bill known as committee print of January 20, wherein you are quoted as saying, among other things:

"I would say if there is one line of business in America that can afford to give triple wages and still make a profit it is lumber. I will say they have one of the lowest wage rates of any industry in the country. It has gone from $70 a board foot to $200 a board foot, and I think they even get away with capital gains."

That statement, Mr. Secretary, was obviously based on fancy instead of fact—prompting me to suggest that your reply should have been in that instance as it was in others: "That is another question I would have to ask the Bureau of Labor Statistics to develop."

According to a January 18, 1949, release of the Bureau of Labor Statistics the August 1948 straight-time average hourly earnings in the Douglas-fir industry were $2.10 for loggers and $1.63 for sawmill workers. This gives an industry average of approximately $1.80 per hour, based on the prevailing employment ratio of about two sawmill employees to one logging employee. I find it difficult to believe that you advocate tripling those wages.

Next, let's consider your statement that lumber has "one of the lowest wage rates of any industry in the country." The following data, taken from the January 1949 issue of the Monthly Labor Review, shows some average hourly earnings, which include overtime, shift differentials, etc.:

October 1948:	
All manufacturing	$1.366
Durable goods	1.415
Iron and steel	1.525
Nonelectrical machinery	1.519
Transportation equipment, except autos	1.578
Autos	1.685

Your own figures show that Douglas fir wage rates are higher than any durable-goods-manufacturing industry in the country.

Another thing: The Consumers' Price Index has risen from 129.3 on August 15, 1945, to 170.9 on January 15, 1949—a total of 41.6 points. The Douglas fir wage index during the same period has risen 79.8 points—nearly double the cost of living increase.

Now as to lumber prices. Even assuming that you meant to say $200 a thousand board feet instead of $200 a board foot the implication that the average price is $200 is, again so far as the Douglas-fir segment of the lumber industry is concerned, fantastically removed from the truth. West Coast Lumbermen's Association figures, which are accepted as reliable by most governmental agencies, show that the average realization, per thousand board feet, of reporting mills was $77.21 for the year 1948 and $67.30 for December 1948. Those averages, according to the WCLA report, are gross, f. o. b. mill, before commissions, trade and cash discounts and were attained largely by manufacturers whose plant facilities include planers, sheds, kilns and similar facilities for producing a variety of the higher and more expensive grades of lumber.

Statements made by persons high in the service of our Government are generally accepted as gospel truth by the uninformed and frequently quoted with damaging results, if inaccurate or misleading, to labor, management, and the public. I strongly feel your statement does at least the Douglas-fir segment of the lumber industry a grave injustice and have given you the foregoing information in the sincere hope that you will not be of disservice to it in the future.

Respectfully yours,
G. A. METZGER,
Secretary-Manager, Willamette Valley Lumber Operators Association.

Copies to: The Honorable GUY CORDON, United States Senator; the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator; the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Member of Congress; the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, Member of Congress; the Honorable RALPH GWINN, Member of Congress.

Excise-Tax Reductions

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide some measure of relief from the heavy excise-tax burdens imposed during the war. The bill which I am introducing is identical with my bill, H. R. 2845, introduced on February 17, 1949, except that this new bill contains an amendment providing for a reduction from 20 percent to 15 percent of the excise tax on the rental of safe-deposit boxes which are rented by over 12,000,000 of our citizens throughout the country. I should like to reduce this tax back to the pre-1941 rate of 11 percent, but in order to be consistent in my approach to the problem of reducing excise taxes over as broad a base as possible without serious loss in revenue, I believe that only a 5-percent reduction in the present rate would be wise at this time.

The whole loss in revenue of my bill would be approximately $452,000,000 for the year 1950, and the loss of revenue on each item affected by my bill would be as follows:

The revenue loss from eliminating the tax on ladies' handbags, pocketbooks, billfolds, and key cases, and reducing the retail tax on the remaining articles of luggage from 20 percent to 15 percent would be $57,000,000.

By eliminating the tax on fountain pen gold points and rhinestone buttons and reducing the rate of tax on jewelry from 20 percent to 15 percent on the retail sales price, the revenue loss would be $46,000,000.

By reducing the rate of tax on furs from 20 percent to 15 percent on retail price, the loss would be $16,000,000.

The loss from eliminating the tax on baby oil, lotions, and powders, would be $3,000,000, and the loss from reducing the retail tax on other toilet articles from 20 percent to 15 percent would be $20,000,000.

The loss from eliminating the tax on toilet articles sold to barber shops and beauty parlors for the use in operation thereof would be $4,000,000.

The loss resulting from either the elimination of the excise taxes or the reduction of the tax on the other items covered in my bill is as follows:

Transportation of property	$114,000,000
Transportation of persons	63,700,000
Communication facilities	50,200,000
Photographic apparatus	37,700,000
Trailer coaches	8,000,000
Safe deposit boxes	2,500,000
Propeller fans	700,000
Tires and tubes	600,000

And an insignificant loss from the other items affected by my bill.

In my opinion, it is essential to our domestic economy to provide this minimum excise-tax relief. A reduction in our budget expenditures for fiscal 1950 of only 1 percent will meet the loss of revenue resulting from the enactment of this bill.

Van Buren County Soil Conservation District Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. B. Naney, county administrative officer of Van Buren County, Ark., has sent me the 1948 report of the Van Buren County

Production and Marketing Administration. This is a very fine report and shows the interest which our people are taking in soil conservation. Under unanimous consent, I include this report in the RECORD:

1948 ANNUAL REPORT OF VAN BUREN COUNTY AAA

INTRODUCTION

We hope that with this report we will be able to give the business and professional people as well as the farmers of Van Buren County a better understanding of the need for our Production and Marketing Administration program (better known as triple-A).

The Production and Marketing Administration is a branch of the United States Department of Agriculture and several different programs are carried out through it. PMA in Van Buren County deals chiefly with the agricultural conservation programs, and we will devote most of our report to it.

American farmers have a higher standard of living today than any farmers in the history of our country have ever known, and we in the triple-A feel that we have helped them accomplish this distinction. We have helped them by offering incentive payments for carrying out good soil-conservation practices. Without these payments a majority of our farmers would not be able to carry out these practices. By helping the farmer we are indirectly helping the business people for in a community like ours, the business people are dependent upon the farmer for their source of income.

Soil conservation is the responsibility of all of us, and not just primarily the farmer who owns or operates the farm. The livelihood of everyone comes directly from the soil, and we should see that it is properly taken care of. Good soil with the proper minerals means good health, good community, good schools, whereas poor soils with no minerals means the opposite.

As county committeemen of Van Buren County we want to thank everyone who has cooperated with us in making our program a success, and solicit your cooperation and support in future programs.

ROY E. TESTER,
Chairman.
D. M. BAKER,
Vice Chairman.
CLAYTON GRADDY,
Regular Member.

ORGANIZATION

Triple-A is a farmers' program administered by locally elected farmer committeemen. Each year, in the month of November, an election is held for the purpose of electing community committeemen and delegates to the county convention. This is a democratically held election and all members of the triple-A program are entitled and encouraged to vote. In the month of December the men that were elected delegates to the county convention meet and elect a county committee to serve for the next year. No one may serve as a community or county committeeman unless he derives a major portion of his income from the farm.

The county committee is responsible for the carrying out of the program for the year they are elected to serve. They hire a county administrative officer to carry out the administrative details under their supervision.

County committeemen in Van Buren County have one regular meeting day a month and special called meetings when they are necessary. Community and county committeemen hold joint meetings to discuss better methods of conservation and any other issues pertaining to the program that may be affecting the county at the time.

A State committee composed of five farmers who derive a major portion of their income from the farm, are appointed by the secretary of agriculture to carry out the programs of the Production and Marketing Administration administered within the State. All county committees are directly responsible to this State committee for the administration of the programs being carried on in their county.

MINERALS

Superphosphate

One million three hundred and eight thousand six hundred and forty pounds of superphosphate was applied to approximately 5,234 acres of pasture and meadow.

Out of the 1,308,640 pounds of superphosphate used in 1948, farmers only bought 95,780 pounds and paid the entire cost out of their own pockets. Farmers received the balance under the purchase-order plan whereby the Government pays a part of the cost at the time the material is delivered. The purchase-order plan has proved very successful and is beneficial to the farmers as a large percent would be unable to apply the proper amount except for Government help.

Limestone and potash

A very small amount of lime and potash was used in 1948 due to the fact that it wasn't readily available to farmers in this county.

Lime and potash are two of our most needed minerals in Van Buren County and one of our aims for the next few years is to try for a plentiful supply of this material.

Nothing could be more important for the health and prosperity of our community than the use of the above-mentioned material. You may see a nice-looking meadow, pasture, or row crop, and it will be still low in nutritious value unless the proper minerals have been provided. It is the responsibility of everyone to see that these minerals are provided.

PASTURE PRACTICES

Mowing pasture

Van Buren County farmers mowed 4,299.4 acres of pasture in 1948 to control weeds. Weed control is one of the important factors in establishing a good pasture. Besides getting a better quality of grass you derive more quantity from pastures that have proper weed-control methods carried out on them.

Sodding bermuda

Two hundred sixty-nine and six-tenths acres of bermuda was sodded to new pasture in 1948. Bermuda grass makes an excellent pasture in dry summer months when most other pasture grasses are gone. In addition to being a good pasture bermuda grass is a good protection against soil erosion on hillsides or in ditches.

Pasture seedings

Fifty-five thousand eight hundred and ten pounds of different grasses and legumes were seeded for pasture in 1948. As our farmers are turning more and more to dairy and beef-cattle farming, pasture is becoming one of the main objectives for most of our farmers.

Farmers find that much better pastures are obtained when a mixture of the right grasses are combined. One base grass or legume must be included in this mixture and minerals applied where needed before payments can be made for seed. Only seed that have proven to be the best adapted to the county are included in the list for payment.

ENGINEERING PRACTICES

Stock pond

In 1948 29 stock ponds were built in Van Buren County. A stock pond accomplishes two purposes where some consideration is given to its location. First it is a storage place for a large supply of water that the farmer can depend upon it in the dry summer months. Secondly, it goes a long way in stopping floods and soil erosion. Just think how much more water would have been in our rivers during the recent floods if these ponds hadn't been there to hold it back. In most cases farmers pay from half to two-thirds the cost of building a pond.

Springs

Three springs were developed in 1948. Springs are only developed where they tend to go dry in the summer or get so low they don't afford enough stock water.

Terraces

Fifty-one thousand two hundred and eight-five feet of terraces were constructed in this county in 1948. Terraces are one of our best practices for the purpose of stopping soil erosion. Not only do they stop soil erosion but increase the yield from fields that are in cultivation or meadow.

Prior approval

Any of the above-mentioned practices must be prior approved. Reasons for this are (a) so county committee can determine if the farm needs the stock pond, terraces, or springs; (b) to be sure some qualified engineer stakes out the practices so that it will at least meet the minimum requirements set forth by the Department of Agriculture.

GREEN MANURE AND COVER CROPS

In 1948, 41,259 pounds of legumes were seeded for summer and winter cover crops, with lespedeza, hairy vetch, and Austrian winter peas being used the most.

Nothing could be more important in taking care of our soil than the protection a cover crop provides against the weather. Rain, wind, and snow, can take more topsoil and minerals from unprotected soil in the course of a year than man and nature combined can put back in several years.

Not only do cover crops provide protection for the soil, but make an excellent green manure crop to turn under. By turning under a green manure crop much-needed humus and minerals are being added to the soil.

COUNTOUR FARMING

Farmers of Van Buren County realize the full benefit of contour farming as established by the fact that 8,280.6 acres were planted on the contour in 1948. We estimate this to be at least two-thirds of the row crops planted during the year. They know that row crops planted on the contour will return a better yield, as well as conserve the soil.

CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

One thousand and twenty-eight farmers on 1,003 farms carried out soil-building practices valued at $29,810 under triple-A-payment rates with triple-A-payment rates set at one-third to one-half the cost of carrying out the practices. You can readily see the total value of all practices carried out would be in the neighborhood of $70,000.

Farmers only receive $25,861 for carrying out soil-building practices as this was the entire amount allotted to Van Buren County for conservation payments. By the above figures you can see farmers only received about one-third the cost for carrying out these practices.

ADMINISTRATIVE MONEY

Seven thousand, two hundred and seventy-nine dollars and fifty-three cents was spent as administrative money in carrying out the triple-A, price-support, and marketing-quota programs in the county.

Below is a digest of how this money was spent:

County committee	$490.80
Community committee	278.00
Office personnel	5,085.86
Engineer	716.00
Office rent	240.00
Fuel, mileage, lights, telephone, and office supplies	468.87
Total	7,279.53

PRICE SUPPORT

Price support was designed by Congress to give farmers a fair price for commodities they sell in relation to the cost of things they buy.

Contrary to some thinking we are of the opinion price support kept the prices housewives have to pay in retail stores as low as they have been for the following reasons:

1. Without the protection price support provides our farmers won't raise as large amounts therefore creating a shortage, and increase in prices.

2. Prices of farm commodities have declined, and the price the housewife has to pay still remains the same.

Price-support protection is provided for the following commodities in Van Buren County: cotton, corn, peanuts, potatoes (Irish), hogs, eggs, chickens, milk, turkeys, and wool.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Peanuts, and Irish potatoes were the only commodities in Van Buren County affected by marketing-quota regulations. Acreage allotments are worked out on the basis of cropland, and past history of the crop on the farm.

Both price-support and marketing-quota programs are administered through your local triple-A office.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN

Community committeemen who served during 1948 were elected by secret ballot by their neighbor farmers in the fall of 1947. These men are the link between the county committee and the farmer in keeping a good sound conservation program operating.

Community A, B, J: Robert Hooten, Remmel H. Harper, U. V. Huggins, Shirley, Ark.

Community C, D: Amon Wood, Jack Hice, Bee Branch, Ark.

Community E, F: J. H. Payne, Clayton Bradford, Ellis Hutto, Damascus, Ark.

Community G, H: A. A. French, Lester Crownover, Bee Branch, Ark.

Community I: Joe G. Bowling, Charlie F. Neal, Clinton, Ark.

Community K, L: George N. Graham, Ralph Miller, Dennard, Ark.

Community M: Grady McEntire, Johnnie P. Reeves, Woolum, Ark.

Community N, O: J. M. Gray, Dabney, Ark.; Millard Bruce, Copeland, Ark.

Community P, Q: Ray Stubblefield, Weldon Stroud, Scotland, Ark.

Community R, S: Reed T. Hammett, Formosa, Ark.; Lizzie Thompson, Clinton, Ark.

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Roy E. Tester, chairman; D. M. Baker, vice chairman; Clayton Graddy, regular member; J. O. Hill, ex officio member; J. B. Naney, secretary and treasurer.

Delegates to the county convention (who were elected by farmers in community committee election) met in the fall of 1947 and elected the above county committee to serve during 1948. These county committeemen were directly responsible for carrying out the triple-A and other programs administered within the county.

County and community committeemen do not draw a salary and are paid only for days actually worked.

OFFICE PERSONNEL

J. B. Naney, county administrative officer; Willie M. Story,[1] chief clerk; Vera M. Wallace, chief clerk; Danece R. Bowling, principal clerk.

The county administrative officer is hired by county committee to carry out the office work under their supervision.

One full-time, and one part-time clerk was employed to assist county administrative officer with the office work.

[1] Served as chief clerk through November of 1948.

Administration of Traffic Laws by Justices of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cow Pasture Justice," written by Jack Harrison Pollack, and published in the magazine This Week of January 9, 1949. The article portrays the hazards to which motorists are sometimes subjected in courts of justices of the peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COW PASTURE JUSTICE

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

(Thousands of motorists each year pay ransom to the justice of the peace. Too often he's a chap who never studied law, holds roadside court and charges whatever he thinks he can get. Here's a program to modernize an outmoded judicial system.)

Are you one of the millions of big-city Americans who have been hauled before a justice of the peace for a traffic violation? If so, though your fine may have been small, His Honor's two favorite words, "and costs," probably raised your ransom as much as $28 extra.

Since his judicial income usually depends on what he extracts from you, the average justice of the peace, usually a layman holding court in a rural area with jurisdiction over petty criminal and minor civil cases, almost invariably finds you guilty—especially if you're a stranger.

Asked how he rendered such speedy verdicts, a frank Ohio J. P. once winked, "I only listen to one side of the case. Otherwise it confuses me."

This bizarre method of dispensing justice—the only contact which countless Americans have with the law—is troubling legislators, judges, and the legal profession. Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt of the Supreme Court of New Jersey—which abolished the J. P. office on January 1—warns: "Undisciplined, unsupervised, the justice of the peace is a sore problem."

THEY'RE NOT ALL INCOMPETENT

Defenders of the oldest United States court remind us, however, that there are many competent, honest backwoods Solomons who mete out civil and criminal justice quickly and fairly. Respected by their communities, the conscientious J. P.'s settle chicken squabbles between neighbors, reprimand unlicensed hunters, and dispose of numerous petty complains without the delay and expense of an ordinary court. The justice tribunal, in fact, was set up to decide local disputes that otherwise would go to a county court which might be 2 days away by carriage.

Today, a comic philosopher by reputation, the justice of the peace is chiefly known for fining out-of-State motorists and marrying eloping couples. When a hard-pressed Kentucky female recently offered $10,000 for a husband, an Arkansas J. P. offered to wed her and perform the ceremony himself.

One thing that can definitely be said about our J. P.'s: we're well stocked with them. There are 50,000 in the United States. Pennsylvania has the most—about 5,500. Almost anybody can become a J. P. No special qualifications are needed for the job under most State laws. Some justices can't read or write. Only Louisiana and Arkansas insist they be citizens and speak English. In only nine States are they required to reside in the State.

As a United States Senator told me: "Men are apprenticed for years in the trades and professions but aren't even tested for the justice-of-peace position." To make it even easier, election to the J. P. office is rarely contested. As far as most voters are concerned, elections are usually "blind." In a swank Pittsburgh suburb, a 22-year-old female domestic worker, without knowing she was a candidate, was elected a justice of the peace. She turned down the job. A western J. P. who held on to his admits, "I've had this job since 1928 when two friends put my name in as a joke while I was away." A cigar-store Indian was chosen justice of the peace in Allentown, N. J., some years ago. Even dogs and horses have been "elected."

A J. P. ON THE SIDE

The average J. P. is 58 years old. One in five is between 70 and 90. Most serve part-time as storekeepers, farmers, bakers, butchers, barbers, carpenters, real-estate agents, shoemakers, or paperhangers. Few make a living solely from justice-of-the-peacing. To earn extra money, they take time from their regular chores to sit in judgment on their fellow men.

Some don't even take off time. A Tennessee J. P. continues milking his cows while fining defendants. An Illinois jurist stands behind the plow. On warm summer days, an enterprising New Jersey justice hawked gallons of ice cream while convening court in the soda parlor he owned. Other J. P.'s hold trials in general stores, gas stations, barns, hayfields, while leaning over a back fence—anywhere they happen to be.

Usually, though, court is held in the justice's home. But when a Michigan J. P. was trying a defendant in his living room, his wife started cleaning house, and chased them both out to the front porch.

Wherever this horse-and-buggy court is held, your chances of going scot-free are slim. Lawyers wisecrack that J. P. means "judgment for plaintiff."

On motorists, rural and small-community justices really go to town, thriving on speed traps and hidden red lights. A Utah J. P. has been known to accompany a cop. He holds court on the roadside, collecting fines from itinerant suckers on the spot.

QUICK CHANGE ARTIST

Occasionally grass-roots justices do double duty. The story is told of an Eastern motorist hauled into an empty room of a Midwest whistle stop and ordered to wait a minute. A few seconds later the cop returned, wearing a shabby judicial robe and muttering, "All right, court is now in session."

At a shady Florida justice mill, a backwoods jurist brushed aside a Northern motorist's not-guilty plea: "Not guilty don't go here. Pay the fine or I gotta send you to jail." A Pennsylvania J. P. refused to accept a not-guilty plea on the ground that it was Sunday and he couldn't administer an oath. "Pay up," he said. "That'll make it easier for both of us."

You can never be certain what kind of justice you'll get in a justice court. Some whimsical gavel-pounders will soak you $100 for not having your driver's license on you and only $2 for recklessly running someone down. An impatient southwestern J. P. fines all comers $10, whatever the offense.

Usually, though, the justice carefully observes where you're from. A Wyoming J. P. fines New Yorkers—whom he doesn't like—a flat $25. Californians complain that Texas squires prey on them. The Auto Club of Michigan reports that many of its members

are held up in an Ohio town. A Dixie jurist asked a defendant where he hailed from.

"Brooklyn," the culprit informed His Honor.

"Hm. That'll be $50."

Whether much of this booty ever reaches official coffers is doubtful. Many justices don't bother issuing receipts. When demanded, they may be scribbled on the back of an old envelope, a blank check or a hunting-license application.

Supervision of America's J. P.'s is as lax as selection. The majority of our States don't even have accurate lists of their justices' names and addresses, much less receive records or accountings from them. Checking by State auditing divisions is spasmodic and inspired solely by financial motives. No regular J. P. supervisory agency exists in most States.

"JUSTICE BY THE PIECE"

Justices get paid through the fee system in most States. They are supposed to remit the fines and keep the "costs"—justice by the piece. Cooperative States offer the J. P. costs for conviction—and nothing for acquittals. But as Virginia Trial Justice Harold F. Snead remarks, "It's doubtful whether any judge can be fair and impartial when the outcome of the case involves his own pocketbook." Justice truly limps when the defendant, whether he's a motorist, unlicensed fisherman, drunk, roadside petter, or what not must pay for the justice-dispensing—and hears only nine words: "What's the charge? That'll be $20 and costs."

Some unscrupulous justices of the peace in Illinois have been known to serve as collection agencies for finance companies on a commission basis. They write to a debtor: "Before my constable issues a warrant, I am giving you this opportunity to settle up." The frightened recipient of the letter usually pays—and the justice of the peace gets his cut. Instances are on record where "defendants" who owed nothing have been harassed with such threats.

Justices receive salaries in five states. South Carolina pays the lowest, beginning at $8 a month; California, the highest, up to $8,500 a year. Most justices of the peace say they'd rather be on salary. Justices preferring fees consider it "the only practical method." Legal experts agree that higher salaries and greater supervision would attract better men and raise the office's dignity.

COVER A LOT OF GROUND

Actually, the job's demands are much greater than generally realized. In many States the justice of the peace is the only court which is used by enforcement officers. Civil cases include breach of contract, trespassing, action on notes, damages for negligence. Criminal cases take in petty larceny, ordinance violation, assault, gambling, fish-and-game offenses, disorderly conduct, indecency, intoxication, fraud, malicious mischief, public nuisance and vagrancy.

Yet only 6 percent of justices of the peace are lawyers. A Nation-wide survey conducted for the National Committee on Traffic Law Enforcement by New Jersey Barrister George Warren revealed that 20 percent don't even possess copies of the laws they enforce! An Oklahoma justice, waving aside a dusty, unopened statute book on his shelf, told an inquisitive defendant, "No use lookin' in there, son. I run this here court on the Golden Rule."

The AAA knows of a justice of the peace who believes in equal justice. This impartial worthy likes to fine both the plaintiff and defendant! But upon one occasion, when he threatened to do so, the two parties in a civil suit went into a huddle and refused to testify against each other. Since there was no witness, the justice of the peace was stumped. He finally scratched his head and dismissed the case, muttering.

"I don't want to do this," he remarked, "but you fellows got me."

Justices are appallingly ill-informed on their own jurisdictional limits. Asked what their maximum allowable fines were, justices of the peace in the same State gave answers ranging from $1 to $5,000. Many justices have no idea how far their power goes.

THEY'LL TAKE ANYTHING

Your willingness to go to jail usually reduces the fine and costs. If you're short of cash, some "bargaining justices" will take whatever you have—watch, camera, ring, spare tire, jack, groceries—and call it square. As a result, some of their homes resemble hock shops.

Accessible to everyone, the J. P. tribunal isn't usually a lawyer's court. But in one civil case before a southern justice, reports Norman Damon, vice president of the Automotive Safety Foundation, two local barristers were representing their clients. At noon they vied to see who could take the J. P. to lunch. The defense lawyer won, and he and the J. P. adjourned to the local tavern where they had five quick ones. When the after-lunch court session began, the defense lawyer waxed alcoholically eloquent. At the height of his new friend's oratory, the justice excitedly leaned over and shouted, "Give 'em hell, Ben. I think we've got 'em licked."

SCHOOLS FOR J. P.'S

Gregarious souls, J. P.'s are usually potent politically in their communities. In some places justices have banded together in State-wide associations, chiefly to preserve their office.

Sensitive to growing criticism of their "cow-pasture justice," alert J. P. State associations in New York, California, and Illinois are trying to clean house within their own ranks. Today schools for J. P.'s are being run by major law schools. Last spring, a law professor, J. Walter McKenna, conducted one at New York University, and, another is in session at the University of Illinois Law School.

Recently, the first real national J. P. conference took place in Seattle, spark-plugged by the American Bar Association's indefatigable traffic-court director, James P. Economos. A permanent organization known as the American Association of Trial Courts of Limited Jurisdiction was formed. It will cooperate with the American Bar Association and seek to instill justices of the peace with a real desire to modernize their courts.

The J. P. tribunal is a hang-over from Edward III's fourteenth-century England. It was intended to preserve the King's peace, and holders of the office were the most responsible and capable men in each community. But this qualifying requisite and another safeguard, supervision, were never transplanted to these shores.

Instead, the office has been such a haphazard no-man's land that the J. P. has become one of the major modern judicial headaches. And today authorities agree that the justice of the peace court must be improved or eliminated. Missouri, in 1945, became the first State to abolish J. P. court, and Kansas City, Kans., recently did likewise. Ten States now deprive J. P.'s of jurisdiction over traffic cases. The situation was so bad in Virginia and Maryland that salaried trial justices and magistrates assumed most of their functions. California, Iowa, Michigan, Texas, Washington, Oregon, and Tennessee are now carefully reexamining their J. P. systems. Experts believe that J. P. courts should be replaced with State-wide supervised personnel.

Defending the justice court, Alfred Morrison, New York State J. P. leader, who is now trying to organize 56 county schools for J. P.'s with the State bar association, told me: "The J. P. court isn't outmoded. It's needed in rural areas. Justice is meted out promptly so people can go about their business. Sure, it has many faults which are of recent origin. They arose out of the complexities of modern jurisprudence. But if there's any truth in the adage 'justice delayed is justice denied,' then the J. P. court has much to recommend it."

PROGRAM FOR STREAMLINING

To streamline the justice-of-the-peace system, here is a program approved by the America Bar Association house of delegates:

1. Eliminate the vicious fee system and provide adequate salaries for full-time J. P.'s.

2. Reduce the number of justices. There are now far too many J. P.'s in the United States.

3. Furnish them with proper court facilities. Take the J. P. out of the cow pasture.

4. Select qualified men, preferably legally trained ones, for the office.

5. See to it that they are supervised by or responsible to a central State agency such as a chief justice, an administrative officer or the judicial council.

6. Furnish them with clerical assistance. Require them to keep satisfactory records and to report to a county or State office at least once a month.

7. Let them retain only judicial functions. Eliminate all their other local governmental duties.

8. Provide annual judicial conferences or schools to improve J. P. practices and procedures. Keep them abreast of latest developments.

By putting this type of program in practice, we can rid ourselves once and for all of our cow-pasture justice.

Boone County Soil Conservation District Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Boone County is one of the great counties of my congressional district, and the report of their soil conservation district is a tribute to the efforts of our people who are in charge of the program in that county. Under unanimous consent, I include their report in the RECORD:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOONE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, 1948

INTRODUCTION

This 1948 annual report of the Boone County Production and Marketing Administration has been prepared to give you a better understanding of the aims, objectives, and accomplishments of the program.

PMA embraces several programs of the Department of Agriculture, such as price support, marketing quota, crop insurance, production and marketing, and the agricultural-conservation program. Since the agricultural-conservation program is the major program in the county, more space has been devoted to the activities of this program.

It is realized that the accomplishments of the agricultural-conservation program was made easier through the cooperative efforts of all agricultural groups within the county as well as all civic groups, the churches, the banks, the chamber of commerce, the pasture development contest, the livestock program, and the editors of our local papers.

Civilization begins and ends with the plow and all life comes from the soil.

Cooperation of all agricultural agencies, civic organizations, business and farm leaders in disseminating information on this program is continually solicited.

ANNUAL REPORT

The Boone County agricultural conservation program is a part of the national conservation program that was designed to help improve the health and strength of all the people of the Nation. The farmer in the eyes of the program planners is only a temporary custodian of the soil. It is therefore a public responsibility to assist the farmer in maintaining and rebuilding the fertility of the soil.

All we have and all we are depend on the productivity of our soil. No one questions the public responsibility to share in the schools and highways. No less is it a public responsibility to share in the cost of carrying out conservation practices which improve fertility and conserve soil and water. Soil and water conservation is so important to the well being of all that it should not and cannot be done by any one segment of our population, but is a vital responsibility of all our people.

The Boone County agricultural conservation program is under the general supervision of three democratically elected farmer committeemen who are assisted by 28 community committeemen. These men are all farmers who are living on their farms and are deriving a major part of their income from actual farming operations. The committeemen are elected annually by the members of the association. Each farmer who participated in the program is a member and entitled to vote. Any farmer in the county can become a member by carrying out one or more conservation practice outlined in the triple-A program.

This program is under the direction of the farmer elected committee. These local farmer committees, being acquainted with local needs, recommended conservation practices needed in the county. Congress appropriates money annually to pay a part of the cost of carrying out these practices, with the farmers paying from 50 to 75 percent of the cost. Local farmer committees see that money appropriated for payments is spent on practices adapted to their individual needs.

The national conservation program, of which Boone County conservation program is a part, is concerned with the needs of all the people of the Nation. As the fertility of our farms is restored and maintained, the entire Nation is assured of a more plentiful supply of a better quality of food.

There are 2,273 farms in Boone County, as constituted under the Triple-A Program. One thousand and seventy-four farms participated in the program or a total of 47 percent of the farms. However, there was 124,915 acres of cropland in the county in 1948 with 91,250 acres or 73 percent of the cropland participation in the program.

Total program assistance used in the county in 1948 was $49,414.36. Farmers contribute from 50 percent to 75 percent of the cost of all practices; therefore, an estimated $101,299.42 spent in 1948 to improve the quality of food produced in Boone County.

OBJECTIVES OF AAA CONSERVATION PRACTICES

(a) To conserve soil and water by adapting better land use.

(b) To improve national health and nutritional standards by conserving and rebuilding our soil and water resources.

(c) To promote a more stable income.

(d) To assure the Nation of a more plentiful supply of food and fiber.

BOONE COUNTY PRACTICES, 1948

The most important practice in Boone County is the restoration of depleted minerals, phosphate, limestone, and potash.

In 1948 farmers of Boone County participating in the triple-A program applied 2,081,429 pounds of phosphate and 3,408 tons of limestone, 32,658 pounds of potash on pastures and meadows. There is an annual need in the county for 3,000,000 pounds of phosphate, 10,000 tons of limestone, and 800,000 pounds of potash.

Pasture development is one of the most important practices in Boone County since this county is primarily a livestock county.

In 1948 there were 12,821 acres of pasture developed or improved by sodding 223 acres of bermuda and seeding 125,985 pounds of other pasture grasses. In addition 12,432 acres of pasture were mowed to control weeds and bushes.

Stock ponds and springs: No pasture is complete without adequate stock-watering facilities. The triple-A pays a part of the cost of construction of stock ponds and springs for stock-watering purposes. In 1948 there were 69 stock ponds and 5 springs developed in Boone County. Thirty-nine of these ponds and four springs were planned and staked by the triple-A personnel.

Other practices that were carried out less extensively in Boone County:

1. Seeding annual lespedeza.
2. Summer legumes.
3. Winter legumes.
4. Establishing vegetative waterways.
5. Terracing.
6. Contour farming intertilled row crops.

PRODUCTION GOALS

Each year the Secretary of Agriculture gives to each State the national needs for farm commodities, and asks each State to set a State goal in line with what the State can produce to help satisfy the national needs. The State committee refers the needs to each county committee. The county committee calls the community committeemen together. The county and community committeemen work out a county goal, setting out the amount of each commodity that they feel would be reasonable for the county to produce. From the county goals the State committee is able to arrive at a State goal. The county and community committeemen then advise with the farmer as to the commodities that are in short supply so the individual farmer can fit his farming operations to the national needs.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

The price-support program is administered on the county level by farmer committeemen. Price support provides that the prices of farm products be supported at rates fair both to the farmers and consumers because of the importance of good farm prices in maintaining national prosperity.

Commodities produced in Boone County that are under price-support protection include: Corn, wheat, hogs, eggs, chickens, milk, butterfat, turkeys, potatoes (Irish), wool, cotton, tobacco, and other commodities.

The new price-support program, passed the last few minutes of the Eightieth Congress, has a considerable downward trend, and, if not corrected, will go in effect January 1, 1950.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Cotton, wheat, and tobacco are the only commodities in Boone County affected. Allotments are worked out on the basis of cropland and past history of the crop on the farm. The program is administered by the AAA committeemen.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The total estimated conservation carried out in the county in 1948 was $150,713.78.

The amount allocated to the county by the Government, $33,148.

Total operating expenses of the program within the county was $7,400.

Miscellaneous

Number of farms in the county	2,273
Cropland ---------- acres	124,915
Noncrop pasture ---------- do	68,511
Commercial orchard ---------- do	1,005
Number of farms reporting in 1948	1,074

PERSONNEL

The county is divided into 17 communities. Each year the community committees are elected by the farmers in each community to serve as their representatives for the coming year. At the same time one delegate from each community is elected to help elect a county committee of three farmers and two alternates. The county committee, with the approval of the State committee, hires the county administrative officer to administer the program under their supervision. The county administrative officer, with the approval of the State committee, hires his assistants.

THE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR 1948

J. W. Parrish, Lowry, chairman; Bert Askew, route 2, Harrison, vice chairman; Lawson H. Crawford, route 5, Harrison, member; Witt Bryan, route 1, first alternate; Austin W. Carlton, route 1, second alternate; Roy Keeling, Harrison, ex-official member.

DUTIES OF COUNTY COMMITTEE

The committee met regularly on the second Tuesday of each month, and at any other time there was a need to transact any important business of the administration. Some of the duties of the county committee are listed below:

1. Approve a method of budgetary control.
2. To hire an administrative officer and set his salary.
3. With the assistance of the community committee and other agricultural leaders, recommend conservation practices for the county and recommend practice-payment rates.
4. To set the policy to be followed by the county association personnel.
5. To certify the pay roll and approve the budget.
6. To assist in obtaining an adequate supply of conservation materials and services.
7. To keep the State committee informed on the progress of the work in the county and on other farm problems affecting the county.
8. Reviewing performance reports and applications for engineering practices.
9. Supplying equipment for testing soil, laying out pond sites, terrace lines, spring projects and arranging for spot checking performance.
10. To make arrangements for holding the annual committee elections.
11. To approve applications for payment.
12. To see that office expenditures are not excessive, in line with good administration.
13. To assist all farmers of the county in every possible way to achieve the maximum conservation on their farms.
14. To set production goals in the county.
15. To administer the price support programs and keep the Secretary of Agriculture informed on farm commodity production in the county.
16. To hold market quota elections.
17. To administer the crop-insurance program.
18. To keep the public informed as to the functioning of all programs in the county under committee supervision.
19. Check with bankers, feed and seed dealers to see that the farmers have an adequate supply of feed and seed.
20. To assist in establishing markets for farm commodities such as (a) livestock sales barns; (b) milk plants; (c) cheese plants; (d) milk and cream routes; (e) seed and fertilizer outlets.

COUNTY OFFICE PERSONNEL

Hood G. Lough, county administrative officer, secretary and treasurer of association; Ruth H. Kolb, principal clerk; William Thomas Johnson, veteran field officer trainee; J. Dale Crawford, senior field officer.

The agricultural conservation program assistance made available through the triple-A program is available to every farmer of the

county. It is the duty of the county committee to see that each farmer gets his fair share of program assistance. An individual farm plan is signed each year by every farmer in the county. The farm plan is to help the farmer and the committeemen in making available necessary technical services, equipment and supplies, to carry out necessary practices.

The aims of the triple-A program are to encourage and assist farmers in carrying out the necessary soil and water conservation measures.

We, the Boone County Agricultural Conservation Committee have tried to give in a brief way, the aims, objectives and accomplishments of the 1948 triple-A program.

J. W. PARRISH, *Chairman.*
BERT ASKEW, *Vice Chairman.*
LAWSON H. CRAWFORD, *Member.*

P. S.—Marguerite Carter was employed by this office as principal clerk until September 1, 1948. J. B. Naney was employed as veteran officer trainee until October 1, 1948. Marguerite is now at Monticello where her husband is attending college. J. B. is county administrative officer of Van Buren County, with headquarters at Clinton.

TESTIMONIALS

The use of limestone and phosphate on pastures and meadows was practically unknown in this section before it was introduced through the triple-A conservation program, according to Mr. Ralph Hudson, a livestock farmer of the Harrison community.

Mr. Hudson is a producer of registered Hereford cattle, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Cooperative Association and has served on the triple-A nominating committee for the past 2 years. He gives the triple-A conservation program much of the credit for the development of 270 acres of good pasture and meadow on his farm. While Mr. Hudson cooperates with all agricultural agencies, he especially likes the minerals and seeding practices of the triple-A program. The feature he likes best is the farmer-administered and farmer-control of the program.

In 1948 Mr. Hudson won second place in the Boone County pasture improvement contest. On this pasture he used 11,900 pounds of phosphate, 16 tons of limestone and grass seed that was furnished or partially paid for through the triple-A conservation program.

Many farmers through this section, according to Mr. Hudson, would not now have or would not continue to develop good pastures and meadows were it not for the assistance available through the triple-A conservation program. We are definitely in an agricultural area, continued Mr. Hudson, and the success of businesses in Harrison is directly dependent on the success of our farmers.

Bert Askew, route 2, Harrison, vice chairman of the AAA county committee, member of the board of directors of the local farm bureau, also a member of the Valley Springs School Board and prominent livestock man, says AAA has done its part in helping him make his 200-acre farm what it is today. "I try to use my minimum farm allowance each year to build up my soil. Through the use of phosphate and limestone this is being accomplished. Since I am primarily interested in livestock, I'm developing my pasture to better take care of my needs. Through the conservation of water, brought about by a AAA pond, my livestock do not have to walk as far to water. Through establishing and improving permanent pasture by seeding pasture grasses and through weed and bush control, promoted by the AAA mowing practice, my pastures have improved not only in quality but also in the number of livestock taken care of per acre."

"More farmers need to come to the full realization of what their soils need, and having found out, use every advantage possible in building these soils to fullest productivity. "That," Mr. Askew concluded, "is what AAA is for, to help share the out-of-pocket cost of conserving water and soils."

An example of wise planning in the use of triple-A conservation practices is portrayed on the 443-acre farm of Heber Tate, 2 miles north of Alpena Pass. Mr. Tate has 200 acres of good pasture stretched over these rolling Ozark hills. Most of the stock farm can be seen from the beautiful ridge on which Mr. Tate's house is located.

The brush on the fields are first killed with goats after which bermuda is sodded in strips. Between these strips is seeded to bluegrass, orchard grass, and lespedeza. Some of the pastures are set aside for winter grazing, thereby saving hay. All pastures are well watered with good live springs in the hollows and good triple-A ponds on the top of the ridges.

Mr. Tate has been a triple-A community committeeman for years and has each year matched all triple-A payments with his own money to develop more and better pastures, the triple-A conservation way.

Mr. Tate states, "I have followed the triple-A practices for years, matching all triple-A payments, whether $100 or $500, with my own money to build more and better pastures."

In 1947 Mr. Tate won the Boone County pasture contest on one of these pastures.

It is a thrilling sight to see the 200 head of Hereford cattle grazing over the fine pastures that are a monument to the farmer-administered conservation program.

Coy Holmes, a farmer living 5 miles south of Harrison on Highway 7, gives the following report on the accomplishments gained on his 119-acre farm through triple-A assistance.

"Before the triple-A program came into existence," Mr. Holmes said, "I was growing corn, wheat, and oats. Everything was going out of my soil and nothing being replaced. As the years rolled along my yield grew less. After 12 years of triple-A soil-conservation practices used on my farm, I find farm life to be more pleasant than I used to think was possible. Through the use of lime, phosphate, and legumes, I have built the productiveness of my soils up. I have healed the washes on my fields, built two stock ponds, developed more and better pasture. I now use a system of diversified farming and livestock. I now find life on the farm to be more pleasant for me and my family."

There are hundreds of living testimonials over Boone County as evidence of benefits obtained through triple-A conservation practices such as Noah Dearing, chairman of the Krooked Kreek Soil Conservation District. Mr. Dearing has been a good triple-A cooperator since the beginning of the program and has developed many acres of good pasture and good stock ponds with triple-A assistance. In 1948 Mr. Dearing won first prize in the Boone County pasture contest. On this pasture Mr. Dearing received the following triple-A assistance: $6 per acre for 30 acres of bermuda sodding, $180; 50 cents per acre for controlling weeds on the pasture by mowing, $15; a payment per pound for seeding bluegrass, red top, white dutch clover, lespedeza, and alsike clover, in addition to 34 tons of lime; 15,180 pounds of phosphate; and 8 cents per cubic yard of dirt moved in constructing a 1,963 cubic yard stock pond.

The triple-A office in Harrison is a service office through which conservation practices are reported, purchase orders for materials are issued, and requests are filed for engineering services such as stock ponds, terrace lines, and spring development projects. In 1948, 69 stock ponds were constructed in the county, 39 of which were staked out by triple-A personnel and the other 30 were staked by personnel from the Harrison and Berryville offices of the Soil Conservation Service.

San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1949, at the request of Gov. Earl Warren, of the State of California, I introduced H. R. 3800, a bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of California of easements for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a second San Francisco-Oakland Bay bridge and approaches thereto, in order to authorize the Secretary of Defense to convey to the State the necessary easements over lands belonging to the United States of America under his jurisdiction and control.

On March 23 the California Toll Bridge Authority by resolution determined that the public interest and necessity required the construction of this additional toll bridge, commonly known as the parallel bridge, across the Bay of San Francisco at the earliest possible moment and prior to the construction of what is commonly known as the southern crossing. It further determined that the State department of public works should proceed immediately to complete the final detailed plans and to do all other things necessary for the construction of the parallel bridge at the earliest possible moment and directed it to suspend work on a southern crossing until a method of financing such a southern crossing could be recommended by the department of public works to the toll bridge authority.

Prior to the passage of the resolution Governor Warren made a statement concerning the matter to the toll bridge authority, of which he is the chairman. Governor Warren said:

The time has arrived for the California Toll Bridge Authority to make its final decision on the location of a second San Francisco-East Bay crossing of San Francisco Bay and to proceed with its construction as soon as possible. The need for such a crossing is apparent to everyone who uses the present bridge or who has studied the problem. The phenomenal growth of the five counties surrounding the Bay during war years, must convince any thoughtful person that the area is destined to be one of the most densely populated areas of America. This area already has a population of 2,000,000 people. It has grown 39 percent since the 1940 census. Its possibilities for growth are almost unlimited provided, among other things, its traffic problems are solved. Like the New York City area, its parts are separated by water, which must be crossed at various places if the traffic is to be facilitated.

A start has been made with the San Francisco-Oakland and the Golden Gate Bridges, but as experience has already demonstrated, additional crossings will be needed in the comparatively near future, one of which should be constructed immediately to relieve present congestion. The Toll Bridge Authority through the State department of public works has studied the problem for a period of 3 years in accordance with legislative authorization. It has spent $657,000 in this work. It has employed the most eminent

tube, bridge and traffic engineers, in the country as consultants. It has cooperated with the Army-Navy Board which in the early stages of the matter, made a study based upon then available data. It has given serious consideration to the findings of that board and this may be measured by the fact that approximately 64 percent of the State funds spent during the past year were on the Army-Navy Board proposed southern crossing.

Although the Army-Navy Board recommended a southern crossing and the department of public works a parallel bridge, the two reports were not at such variance as that fact might imply. Each of them found that both such crossings are feasible and will be required for the future. The Army-Navy Board concluded that the parallel crossing would have more tangible advantages at the present time but that the southern crossing would have greater advantages in the future development of the bay area and should be built first. Our department, recognizing the growth possibilities of the southern part of the bay, concluded that a southern crossing was desirable for that section and should be constructed in the orderly course of events, but that present traffic conditions, present population densities, and present needs call for another northern crossing immediately.

This is not a question of conflict between the two agencies. It is a question of the emphasis to be placed on the complicated needs of one of the fastest growing areas in America.

I personally believe that both crossings are needed and should be constructed as early as possible. I believe our plans should be projected on that premise. If it were financially possible to do so I would vote for their construction simultaneously. But it cannot be done. Any new crossing must be financed by revenue bonds and the experts who pass upon such matters advise that we could not sell the bonds of two crossings at one time. We must, therefore, select that site which in our opinion will best serve the present needs of the district; in other words, that which will do the greatest good for the greatest number—now.

I have concluded after long study that the parallel bridge will accomplish that purpose. I know there are those who will honestly disagree. But there is no conclusion upon which all would agree. All we can do is to try and balance the equities. My main reasons for deciding in favor of a parallel crossing are as follows:

1. The parallel bridge will better serve 82 percent of the traffic that will use it. The southern crossing only 18 percent.

2. With conditions as they are today it will be possible to maintain a 25-cent toll on the existing bridge and a new parallel crossing. It would be necessary to increase the toll to 35 cents on the existing as well as the southern crossings.

3. The parallel bridge will relieve the congestion immediately upon its completion. The southern crossing will not relieve the congestion at any time.

4. The parallel bridge, including approaches, can be completed two and a half years sooner than a southern crossing.

5. The parallel crossing can be constructed more cheaply.

6. Safety to traffic will be greatly favored by a parallel bridge.

7. The cost of maintenance and operation of two parallel bridges will be cheaper by more than $400,000 per year than the cost of maintenance and operation of a combination of the present bridge and a southern crossing.

Because it is a matter of such importance, I have been particularly concerned with the effect of another crossing to national defense and the possibility of serious bomb damage. This has been discussed at length with military experts and I am convinced that in this instance the problems of national defense are by no means controlling—the Army-Navy Board did not find them so.

I have also been concerned with the problem of street congestion at the bridgehead areas on both sides of the bay. Our traffic studies and plans for ramps and freeway connections have explored this in great detail and I find it makes no difference where the next crossing is located. The ramps will effectively distribute bridge traffic and even improve present conditions.

The Army has issued a permit for the construction of either or both crossings. All that is needed from the Federal Government is to acquire the necessary rights of way across certain Government-owned land—in the case of the parallel bridge across Yerba Buena Island, and on both sides of the bay—and to repeal the provision of the 1931 Federal act that tolls on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge must be discontinued or at least restricted, when that bridge has paid for itself.

These rights-of-way should be requested immediately in order not to delay the project.

I therefore am prepared to vote for the new parallel crossing of San Francisco Bay which has been recommended by Mr. Charles H. Purcell, our Director of Public Works, and his staff, in whom I have implicit confidence.

I am fortified in this conclusion by the findings of various public bodies and civic organizations that have studied the problem and reported thereon. Among them are:

1. The bay area council consisting of representatives of the nine bay counties.
2. The Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco.
3. The Real Estate Board of San Francisco.
4. The North Central Improvement Association of San Francisco.
5. The Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco.
6. The Chamber of Commerce of San Mateo.
7. The Chamber of Commerce of Eden Township of south Alameda County.
8. The Oakland Chamber of Commerce.
9. The Richmond Chamber of Commerce.
10. The Vallejo Chamber of Commerce.
11. The Alameda Chamber of Commerce.
12. The Board of Port Commissioners, Oakland.
13. The Uptown Development Association, Oakland.
14. The Downtown Merchants Association, Oakland.
15. The Downtown Property Owners Association, Oakland.
16. Building and Construction Trades Council of Alameda County.
17. Building and Construction Trades Council of Contra Costa County.
18. County Board of Supervisors of Alameda County.
19. County Board of Supervisors of Solano County.
20. City of Berkeley, Alameda County.
21. City of Oakland, Alameda County.
22. City of Alameda, Alameda County.
23. City of Richmond, Contra Costa County.
24. City of Vallejo, Solano County.
25. Emeryville Industries Association, Alameda County.

Mr. Speaker, following the passage of the resolution referred to, the toll bridge authority passed a second resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the conveyance of easements required for this second bay crossing. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the California Toll Bridge Authority, as the public agency of the State of California duly authorized by law to make determinations respecting the location of toll highway crossings over the waters of the State, when such crossings are to be constructed pursuant to provisions of the California Toll Bridge Authority Act, has determined that the public interest and necessity require the construction at the earliest possible date of an additional toll bridge over the waters of the bay of San Francisco, to be built on a line between Rincon Hill, in the city and county of San Francisco, and the city of Oakland, county of Alameda, via Yerba Buena Island, approximately parallel to and northerly of the existing San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, together with appurtenances and approaches at the termini thereof, and a tube under the Oakland estuary with connections to the East Bayshore Freeway and the city of Alameda; and

Whereas the State of California will meet all construction and other costs of said additional toll bridge by means of an issue of revenue bonds, under the provisions of the California Toll Bridge Authority Act; and

Whereas said authority has further determined that Federal legislation is necessary before construction of said additional toll bridge is commenced, in the following particulars:

(a) Authorizing a perpetual easement for such bridge over Federal lands to be occupied thereby in and about the Bay of San Francisco; and

(b) Repealing section 2 of the act of February 20, 1931, Public Law 695, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 1192), which said section 2 relates to toll-free operation of the existing San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge on the retirement of the bonded indebtedness originally incurred for its construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the California Toll Bridge Authority, That said authority does hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation—

(1) Authorizing the proper officers of the United States to convey to the State of California a perpetual easement for such additional toll bridge over and across Yerba Buena Island (former Goat Island) and over and across such other Federal lands in and about the Bay of San Francisco as may be required as a right-of-way for said bridge; and

(2) Repealing section 2 of the act of February 20, 1931, Public Law 695, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 1192).

This resolution is hereby adopted by the California Toll Bridge Authority at Sacramento, Calif., this 23d day of March 1949.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of the State of California and Chairman of California Toll Bridge Authority.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Lieutenant Governor of the State of California and Member of California Toll Bridge Authority.

C. H. PURCELL,
Director of Department of Public Works of the State of California, and Secretary and Member of California Toll Bridge Authority.

JAMES S. DEAN,
Director of the Department of Finance of the State of California, and Member of California Toll Bridge Authority.

ERNEST L. ADAMS,
Member of California Toll Bridge Authority.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the proceedings which I have recited and the request of Governor Warren, H. R. 3800 was introduced. I hope for and request early and favorable action on the bill by the Committee on Armed Services, to which it has been referred, and by the House of Representatives.

Nation's Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., March 27, 1949:

EXPOSE TRUTH IN FILIBUSTER—LONG DEBATE PROVES THAT NINE STATES WITH 68,000,000 PEOPLE PAY HALF OF TAXATION BILL

(By Lester Allen)

The Senate fight on the cloture rule brought out all the information needed to refute the arguments of the States-righters, not only on the score of civil rights, but on which section of the Nation foots the bill for the majority of the expense of running the Nation.

It is no coincidence that the States which contribute most to the Nation's income, and, by the same token are targets for the ungrateful and often punitive action of the southern and "wild jackass" Senators, have the most progressive laws on civil rights.

One-half of the population of the United States lives in nine States, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, California, Texas, Michigan, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. These States contribute a rough half of the Federal revenue in taxation with 68,000,000 people, heavily industrialized, made up of many races, many creeds, and many viewpoints, working and living together under law with a minimum of friction.

LIBERAL LAWS

The explanation of their success in attaining this condition is that their populations were attracted by the liberality of their laws, by the strict guaranty of their civil rights, and by their high standards of public education. These things are a matter of record and cannot be denied.

Yet, bearing the burden of the expense of running the Nation, the taxpayers of the nine States inhabited by one-half of the population of the United States, have never yet yowled for States' rights in the matter of apportionment of Federal expenditures. They built TVA in Tennessee, Boulder Dam in Colorado, Grand Coulee, and many other majestic and mighty installations to raise the economic level of States incapable of supporting or financing public works of such enormous cost.

PAY FOR MOOCHING

Getting right down to cases, the nine States mentioned have been paying for the mooching done by the less fortunate States, but have never and will probably never complain because, under the democratic system, the inhabitants of those States believe and practice to the best of their ability the one for all and all for one concept of Americanism.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, with his little Sir Echo, Senator LONG, the son of the Kingfish, spent more than 12 hours not long ago advancing all the arguments for States' rights in the matter of granting the franchise to voters. Mr. Long asked the loaded questions for his senior and Senator ELLENDER gave the pat answers. Mr. LONG asks if the fair employment practices commissions established in some of the Northern States have been effectively enforced. Senator ELLENDER answers that in the State of New York which, like Massachusetts, has an FEPC law there have been very few offenders punished. "They simply got the parties together to compromise their differences," said Senator ELLENDER.

ODD BEDFELLOWS

This is a fair sample of the arguments used to prevent the effective use of majority rule in the Senate. Apparently it is dead wrong to compromise differences and prevent discriminations. There should be prosecutions and punishments and, perhaps, lynchings.

In all the history of the United States Senate there has never been such a strange assortment of political bedfellows as there was during the filibuster. One day there were 89 Senators present, the day that Senator ELLENDER spoke for over 12 hours.

During that day the voices of only 19 Senators were heard in the Senate Chamber, and then only to interpose brief questions to punctuate the drone of the voice of the gentleman from Louisiana reading the history of American civil rights according to Senator ELLENDER. The Senators who did interrupt had only the right to ask a question. None could propose a compromise, a refutation of Senator ELLENDER's arguments or indulge in an oratorical demolition of the barricade of words damming the legislative processes.

ALL ABOUT PAST

Regardless of which of the Southern Senators was carrying on the filibuster, the argument circled around one point, that, in the past, the loathed northern tier of States, which pay most of the freight, had restricted the right to vote, and that, in the past under State stature, Catholics, Jews and other minorities of the day had been denied the right to vote. It was all about the past, nothing about the present, nothing about progress.

If that isn't a paradox strange enough, consider that two of the stalwarts of the filibuster, Senator TOM CONNALLY of Texas, and Senator GEORGE of Georgia, are leaders in the Senate for approval of the European recovery program, the reciprocal trade treaties and the North Atlantic Pact. In sum, they are all for propagating democracy abroad, but unalterably opposed to the progress of democracy at home.

While the filibuster may expose all that is mean and unworthy in man's nature, few people would have such an epic struggle carried on anywhere else but in the open, for all the people to hear or read. The possibility that the nine richest and most heavily populated States would have tried to bludgeon the poorer States into conformance with their more enlightened way of thinking is remote.

COULD PREVAIL

Given a fair chance with no holds barred, it is fair to assume that the 18 Senators from the richer States could outmaneuver the 18 southern Senators who have shaken the American legislative process to its foundations.

The compromise procedure finally adopted is a backward step, not progress. The civil-rights program is beaten to earth, bleeding and dying like a victim of a lynching, and in the white supremacy areas of the South they are capering and dancing around the corpse.

OTHER FISH TO FRY

Was there any real effort to wear the 18 southerners down? The answer is that there was not. The Senate is made up of too many men who have other fish to fry, who, in the days to come, need the votes of southern Senators to put across some piece of legislation.

Any move now to bring up a civil-rights bill, perhaps the antilynching bill, would bring on a struggle with deadly attrition, a frontal assault. It seems likely that there have been cloakroom agreements not to do this during the regular session, in the hope that a special session will not be called during the summer months when a filibuster would have less chance of succeeding in humid Washington.

IMPORTANT BILLS

There is always the specter of public opinion leering over the shoulders of the Senators as well. The rent-control legislation was long overdue, and this would hit the people right in their pocketbooks. A new tax bill must be written, and that, too, is of first importance. The shadow of labor, which fell athwart the generous shadow cast by the senatorial togas, is also a looming threat and come what may, a labor bill has to be enacted.

Indeed, there is concern in the Senate over the unions, as insouciant and defiant as the Senators may appear, particularly the southern Senators. The serious suggestion the other day that northern industrialists contribute to an organizing campaign of the unions in the South from Chester Bowles, Governor of Connecticut, caused a shudder of dismay even though the northern industrialists did not take it seriously.

CHEAP LABOR BAIT

* * * to organize the South, coupled with the passage of a minimum-wage law that would elevate the living standards of hundreds of thousands of underprivileged workers in the South, might succeed and cheap labor has been the South's main argument in wooing away northern industries.

While there have been many grumpy analyses of what kind of a mandate the people gave President Truman last November, and many forthright assertions that the President has misinterpreted his mandate from the people, many Senators still believe they are trying to whistle themselves past the graveyard. They escaped from the upheaval that rocked the House and changed its political complexion only because of the fact that there were not enough seats at stake to make the kind of radical realinement in the Senate.

Only the southern Senators are on safe ground on that score. The Thurmond Democrats gave the southern Senators a mandate and, quite rightfully, they are sticking to it. If they did not there would be no hope for the democratic process.

In their hearts the southern Senators know that eventually civil-rights legislation will come, if not this year and this session, then at some future session. The Senators who in the past opposed social security, the Wagner Labor Act, and all the other social-progress laws, saw them enacted at last, saw the reinterpretation of the free-enterprise system and saw the national income soar to new heights beyond the peak of their wildest imaginings; saw the Nation's industrial and military power advance into world leadership.

MAY BLOCK FUNDS

But there is danger. The danger lies in those nine States which have one-half of the Nation's total population and about one-half of the income and the tax expense. There is vast room in the country for expansion of population, for relocation of industry, for further development of the economy. Holding the horn of plenty, the nine States might conceivably turn off the flow of gold, divert it into other channels and use it as a punitive weapon.

There has already been talk of this, of blocking agricultural price supports, of shutting off appropriations for public works, of withholding approval of Federal funds for countless things which the more richly endowed States have. Perhaps Senator Ellender's complaint that while the oil wells of Louisiana pour out riches they are owned by northern corporations is a reflection of those fears.

However, these are merely imaginings in the heat of battle in the Senate. The stark

reality is that the Nation is indissolubly welded together, that it will act for the greatest good of the greatest number. It may be a long, noisy, wordy process but in the end, democracy finds a way to flow along its traditional channels.

Sense Instead of Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon consider legislation to provide additional funds for the so-called Marshall plan. In view of this I recommend Members to read an article appearing in this week's issue of Newsweek, Sense Instead of Dollars, by Henry Hazlitt. The article follows:

SENSE INSTEAD OF DOLLARS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The Marshall plan has now become sacrosanct and apparently impervious to argument or facts. Even when a high official of the British Government blurts out in an official speech that Britain has now achieved complete recovery, he raises only a few eyebrows in Congress, and these are promptly lowered by the hasty assurance of other officials that the first one spoke out of turn. Yet Under Secretary Mayhew's statement is confirmed by the official indexes of Great Britain, and for that matter of Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, which show that industrial production in all these countries is now above the prewar level.

When this is pointed out, the reply is: "True, but our country still has an unfavorable balance of trade; and of course it is the American taxpayer's duty to pay for it. And he may as well know that we intend to go on buying more than we sell even beyond 1952."

In brief, in spite of the fact that these countries are now producing more than they produced before the war, they announce that they will continue to live beyond their means. They will continue to consume more than they produce. They will continue to buy more than they expect to pay for. They present figures showing what their foreign-trade deficit is going to be in future years. They talk as if a foreign-trade deficit were something foreordained, some malign fate, instead of something that they bring about by their own policies.

It is not merely the former European belligerents but our Latin-American neighbors, and in fact nearly all the former neutrals, who now complain of a dollar shortage. The primary cause of these chronic foreign-trade deficits and dollar shortages is not mysterious. It is exchange control. Every government that imposes exchange control contends that it is forced to do so by the dollar shortage. The truth is the reverse. It is the exchange control itself that causes and perpetuates the dollar shortage.

It is needless to spell out here all over again just how and why it does this. I have explained the reasons in my book, Will Dollars Save the World? in 1947 and in numerous Newsweek columns since. They have been pointed out in the last few years by such economists as John Jewkes in England, Wilhelm Röpke in Switzerland, Trygve Hoff in Norway, and Gottfried Haberler and Walter Sulzbach here, to mention only a few. But so far as the ECA is concerned, they might just as well never have written.

Perhaps an analogy would help. The 1947 per capita income of Mississippi was lower than that of Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, or France. Yet Washington did not start rushing millions of dollars into Mississippi either to halt communism there or to enable Mississippians to buy more goods from New York. But if Mississippi's State government suddenly decreed that 50 cents in Mississippi was worth $1 in New York; if it ordered its exporters to turn over all their dollars from sales to New York to the State government and accept only 50 cents apiece for them; and if Mississippi's government then allotted the proceeds to its importers to enable them to buy every dollar's worth of goods from New York at a cost to the importer of only 50 cents—then everybody in Mississippi would want to import from New York and nobody in Mississippi would be crazy enough to export to New York. Mississippi would immediately have an unfavorable balance of trade and an appalling shortage of New York dollars.

If Congress is determined to go ahead with the ECA—as apparently it is—then it ought at least to insist on one minimum condition. This is the abolition of exchange control. Such a condition would not only save American taxpayers billions of dollars; it would do more than any other single measure to restore free enterprise in Europe and bring real world recovery. Exchange control is not only a totalitarian device in itself (inspired by Hitler's Schacht); it is the keystone of present European controlism, nationalism, and socialism.

Destruction Caused by Western and Midwestern Blizzards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I call attention to the fact that fairly accurate figures are now being compiled to show what havoc was wrought by the many blizzards during the winter of 1948 and 1949.

There appeared in a local newspaper the following item which gives people a pretty good idea of the extent of the livestock loss and money damage caused by these unprecedented storms:

BLIZZARDS KILLED $33,000,000 WORTH OF CATTLE, SHEEP

CHICAGO, March 17.—The great western blizzards of 1949 killed more than half a million cattle and sheep worth $33,000,000, stockmen and State agriculture officials estimated today in a United Press survey.

The stock losses, heaviest in history, were not expected to create a meat shortage.

The total cattle loss was estimated at 165,000 head, compared with a Nation-wide cattle population of almost 50,000,000, not including dairy cattle.

The sheep loss was put at 422,000, compared with a total sheep and lamb population of almost 32,000,000.

The cattle loss amounted to $25,000,000 and the sheep destruction cost more than $8,000,000.

Commemorating the Founding of Seattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Seattle will hold a centennial celebration beginning in 1941. To express our pride in the faith and the enterprise of the pioneers who founded and built Seattle, we are proposing a centennial stamp to commemorate the landing of the pioneers at Alki Point in 1851. The Alki Women's Improvement Club of Seattle sponsored House Joint Memorial No. 24 in the State legislature and has submitted a sketch of the proposed stamp, depicting in the center the landing at Alki of the schooner *Exact*, with the Olympics shown in the background, Seattle buildings on the right, and Indians on the left. It is a privilege for me to introduce legislation in the House which calls for the centennial stamp.

Alki Point is a historic place in the great city of Seattle. Here the first settlers of the city landed in 1851. The vanguard of the first settlement arrived at Alki Point on September 28, 1851. It is recorded that the majority of the settlers at Alki Point and Seattle, upon leaving their homes in the East, had intended to locate in the Willamette Valley, but, when they crossed the mountains, the wonderful stories they heard about the Puget Sound country inspired them to investigate it.

The expedition crossing the plains from Illinois stopped at Portland while two members, John N. Low and David T. Denny, set out for Puget Sound. At Olympia they were joined by Lee Terry and Capt. Robert C. Fay. The party, aided by Indians from Chief Seattle's band, made a prospecting tour in the vicinity of the Duwamish River, finally moving their camp to Alki Point to make a permanent settlement. This was a natural townsite, with land free of timber, a beach of sand and gravel, and the uplands within easy reach. To the north and south, the sound was in clear view, the Olympic Mountains rising in the distance. Sailing craft going to the upper sound passed near the point; small boats and canoes made it a port of call.

The settlers called their townsite New York, which caused visitors to smile and say "Yes, by-and-by." Translated into Chinook, this expression became "Alki," and the name remained.

The main party left Portland on November 5, 1851, taking passage on the schooner *Exact*, which was carrying gold prospectors on a voyage to Queen Charlotte Island, intending to touch at the sound with emigrants. The *Exact* dropped anchor off Alki Point on November 13, there disembarking the party that founded Seattle. In the party were 12 adults and 12 children; A. A. Denny and family, John N. Low and family, C. D. Boren and family, W. N. Bell and family, and Charles C. Terry, who, with Lee

Terry and David T. Denny, brought the number of adults to 12.

From the original settlement at Alki Point grew the great metropolis which bears the name of the famed Indian chief, Seattle. Today, its alert and enterprising citizens, busily engaged in commerce and industry, enjoying in their leisure time its natural scenic beauty, show the same pioneer spirit of the settlers almost a hundred years ago.

Resolutions Concerning H. R. 526

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the following resolutions adopted by a group of farmers as a meeting held at Harrison, Boone County, Ark., on March 9, 1949. Under unanimous consent, I include these resolutions in the RECORD for the consideration of the membership:

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the county committees of the Third Congressional District at an information meeting on March 9, 1949, at Harrison, Ark.

This information committee is composed of 39 farmer representatives elected by all the farmers of the 10 counties of the Third Congressional District of Arkansas.

The meeting was held in Harrison, Ark., at 9:30 a. m., March 9, 1949, at which time motions were duly made and unanimously approved favoring the following resolutions:

"1. That this group go on record as favoring the following changes mentioned in the Pace amendment, H. R. 526:

"H. R. 526, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

"The above bill, introduced by Representative PACE, of Georgia, if passed would amend the Agricultural Act of 1948. (See reports, memorandum 122.) In effect this bill would provide price supports indefinitely at 90 percent of parity or comparable price to cooperators for the basic crops of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts; and for the four Steagall commodities, milk, and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs. The bill also would provide price supports on the other Steagall commodities at from 60 percent of parity or comparable price to not more than the 1948 price-support level. In addition, the present wool price support would continue indefinitely, as well as authority for the Secretary to carry out purchasing and lending operations with respect to commodities not included above. This bill would eliminate the entire title II of the act, thus doing away with the revised parity formula, the sliding scale for determining price support percentage minimums with respect to basic crops and marketing-quota provisions which otherwise becomes effective January 1, 1950. Title III of the 1948 act would remain as written.

"2. That this group of farmers go on record in favor of the Hays bill, H. R. 402.

"3. That this group go on record as opposed to the Jensen bill, H. R. 2368, the Hope bill, or any other bill that leaves out farmer control. In our opinion any and all farm programs should be under the control of democratically elected farmer committees.

"4. That this group go on record as favoring the Beckworth bill, H. R. 820. This bill gives the county-office employees a measure of security, paid for out of their own salaries, that will go far in acquiring and holding better trained personnel.

"5. That this group of farmers recommend the following budget changes:

	President's 1950 budget	Recommended changes
ACP program funds (1949 calendar year)	$232,197,000	$265,500,000
ACP administrative funds (July 1, 1949-June 30, 1950):		
National and State	4,992,439	4,992,439
County	19,854,000	29,854,000
Total ACP	257,043,439	300,346,439
Tobacco marketing quota	2,599,026	2,599,026
Peanut marketing quota (July 1, 1949-June 30, 1950)	2,551,748	2,551,748
Cotton, corn, wheat, and rice marketing quota funds (July 1, 1949-June 30, 1950)	27,805,787	27,805,787
Total marketing quota	32,956,561	32,956,561

"RESTRICTIONS

"1. No part of the funds can be used to pay salaries or expenses of regional, State, or county information employees—Out.

"2. No participant shall receive more than $750 of soil- and water-conserving practices—$10,000 limit.

"3. No part of the funds shall be paid to any person convicted of violating the act to prevent pernicious political activity (Aug. 2, 1939) or the act of July 11, 1919, which prohibits the use of Federal funds for personal services designed to influence any Member of Congress except upon request of any Member of Congress—Out.

* * * * *

"6. That Ralph Hudspeth, farmer of Searcy County, Ark., be elected by this group as the farmer representative to testify before the Agricultural or any other committee in Washington, considering the above-mentioned bills, if and when our Congressmen, Senators, and this group feel it is necessary. Dan Blair, of Benton County, was elected first alternate and J. W. Parrish, Boone County, second alternate to serve in the absence of Mr. Hudspeth.

"7. That we express our sincere appreciation to our Congressmen and Senators for their faithful efforts on behalf of the triple-A conservation program."

RALPH HUDSPETH,
Chairman.
HOOD G. LOUGH,
Secretary.

Nevada Endorses Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Alaska are grateful to the Nevada Legislature for having adopted a joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation which would admit the Territory of Alaska to the Union as a State. The resolution was signed by Governor Vail on March 15 of this year.

The legislature pointed out the compelling reasons why it believed Congress should take steps to admit Alaska, the most cogent of which I quote now:

It is inconceivable that a region as large as Alaska and possessing its great multiplicity and richness of mining and general resources and its strategic military position should remain indefinitely under the American flag in a condition of political servitude.

The Nevada Legislature has correctly stressed other reasons, almost any one of which is cause enough for changing immediately the status of Alaska from that of a Territory to that of a State. It recognizes that Alaska has more population now than several of our States had at the time they were admitted into the Union; Alaska has a Delegate in Congress with no vote; the Territory of Alaska has been a part of our great Nation for many years and has played a vital part in the economic structure of the entire country; during all times and during all crises of the United States, Alaska has contributed its share, and Alaska could better operate as a State of the Union.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Hon. WALTER S. BARING, Representative at Large from Nevada, and a member of the Public Lands Committee, voted to report the Alaska statehood bill to the House.

Organized Labor's Contribution to Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, as we advance labor legislation in this Congress, it is well that we refresh our minds with inventory of the many fine accomplishments of organized labor during the last quarter century. In so doing we draw out the wisdom of the past to help us understand the trials of the present and the problems that lie ahead for a great majority of our people.

We today are assembled here under the greatest freedom that prevails in any country of the world. This freedom and American way of life is not to be considered as a gift; it is the fruition of labor which has cropped from courageous and militant efforts ever since the first white man set foot on American soil, and I would gladly have every Member of Congress know that America is a divine gift in which we are blessed with the privilege of exercising this freedom.

Indeed, labor has played an inestimable part in the evolution of our cherished democracy. As I said on a previous occasion, all the wealth of our country comes from soil and toil, and most of it from toil. Who and where is the person that would deny man or woman a fair share of the wealth he or she produces? Ever since our founding fathers started for a new lease on life, and the inception of the ark of the people's covenant, the ranks of labor have unflinchingly blazed

the trails in our struggle for higher and better living. With a continuation of such determination and accomplishments, freedom and liberty will never perish from the earth.

The evolution of industry from decade to decade presented new problems, and the individual laborer gradually became a victim of some type of exploitation. His salvation was discovered in a system of fraternity known as the union, and today unions of workers for collective action are to be found throughout the world wherever the modern system of industry has been established. Appearing first in England, the birthplace of the factory system, these organizations have spread to all industrial countries and have flourished in rough correlation to the extent of industrialization. Not only is there this close correspondence between the extent of union membership and the type of industrial organization dominant in a country, but within the most highly industrialized countries, where the movement is strong, unionism flourishes only among those classes of workers who are directly affected by modern methods of production.

The facts most assuredly indicate that the labor movement has been, and is, an attempt on the part of a great number of working men and women to adjust themselves to certain conditions of life created by the capitalistic system of industry. Such a system of industry has separated the worker from ownership in the capital instruments with which he works, and it destroys the position of the laborer as an independent enterpriser. It reduces the mass of men and women in society to something like a uniform economic status, welding them gradually into a distinct social class. Workers have been concentrated in close contact within a limited geographical area, thus leading to a system of regimentation conducive to group action and conduct. Injurious economic forces pressed in on the workers. They brought long hours, low wages, unemployment, monotonous and hazardous kinds of work, unsanitary conditions, untimely declining years of life without security, exploitation of women and children, and demoralizing impressions on mankind. The existence of these common problems supplied the motive for collective and remedial action, and unions were born of necessity by public-spirited men and women that sensed their obligations to humanity and its civic, social, and economic welfare.

Fraternalization was the only alternative for the protection of the integrity of the human soul and the preserving of man's inalienable rights embodied in our American Constitution. It was the avenue on which a guiding ray of light lead the worker to a fuller and happier life.

Labor organizations of our country have accomplished inestimable results. They have elevated the standards of the workingman to a position of dignity. In their concern for the brotherhood of man, reasonable working hours have been established, increased wages have been secured to, at least, partially meet the ever upward spiraling of the cost of the necessities of life. Sanitary working conditions have been made a reality; unemployment compensation prevails; the right to bargain on wage, hours, and working conditions has become a rightful practice; health and safety provisions have been provided, and compensation for occupational diseases is assured and women and children have been afforded protection.

These benefits have been far reaching. They have played no small part in helping to build prosperous cities and communities. Every family of our unions, yes, every family in the communities of which a union is a part, has had democracy brought a bit closer to its fireside. As a result of organized union efforts free labor and free thought have been reinforced. Modern homes have multiplied, family life has been enhanced and the workingman has grown more contented in knowing he has some security against the twilight years of life. Again, I frankly say that when the laborer is receiving a fair share of the wealth he creates, every line of business and our entire country is prosperous.

Records reveal that organized labor has always been a stanch supporter of public improvements, high standards for education, patriotic endeavors of all kinds, of the elimination of slum districts and unhealthful conditions that have prevailed to cause crime and disease. It has always liberally supported all our drives and organizations given inception and dedicated to the good of humanity. It has always been interested in more than its own economic life; it has also been profoundly concerned in the economic life of our cities, communities, and the Nation, notwithstanding frequent false accusations designed to curb its noble purpose.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to salute organized labor on the progressive gains it has made and fought to sustain, and may the march of time find all members of every labor union obsessed with the desire to promote greater achievements dedicated to the welfare of humanity, economic security of our Nation, and a just and lasting peace for the world. Democracy will be safe just as long as we are willing to provide those conditions which assure free labor, health, happiness, education, contented home life, social and civic pride, economic security, integrity of the human soul, and the spirit of the true brotherhood of mankind.

Postal Rate Increases Seen as Device To Censor Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thought-provoking article regarding proposed increases in postal rates by David Lawrence, who suggests that need for revenue is merely a pretext under which the administration may censor certain publications. The article, which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Star, follows:

POSTAL INCREASE SEEN AS TRUMAN DEVICE TO CENSOR PUBLICATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

Every now and then the Russians accuse America of government control of thought and of the press. Most Americans laugh off the charges. But every now and then there is a modicum of truth in what the Soviet spokesmen say. In all fairness—if conscience is still to be our guide even in international debate—it must be conceded that the press and radio as well as the movies in the United States are subjected to forms of actual and potential censorship. These are by no means limited to such worthy restraints as the prevention of libelous statements or curbs on the use of obscene language.

Thus the Truman administration, under the pretext of a need for increased revenue, proposes an increase in postal rates which, it has been brought out in testimony before congressional committees this month, would put out of business many publications and impose such heavy financial burdens on others as to place the entire publishing industry at the mercy of the Government's licensing power.

The fact that a far less drastic schedule of rates may be finally adopted than the 400-percent increase now recommended by the Truman administration does not remove from the situation the capacity of the Government overnight to ruin the publishing industry.

LICENSE POWER ABUSED

The licenses to use the mails are, of course, within the power of the Government to grant, but when a licensing power is abused the motives behind such a penalty need to be explored. The excuse or pretext now is that the Post Office Department has a deficit. No other Government department that serves the people is obligated to collect for services performed for the taxpayers sums equal to the expenses of that department. Isn't this a service to the American people to be paid for out of general taxation?

The deficit of the Post Office Department for all clases of mail, amounting to $550,000,000 a year, is only a small fraction of the $5,000,000,000 spent annually by the United States to promote democracy in other countries. Nobody has arisen to suggest that this kind of aid should pay its own way any more than it is suggested that the Department of Justice ought to collect enough money out of its law-enforcement work to pay the expenses of the Department. It costs the Government about $8,500,000 a year to maintain the Library of Congress but nobody has suggested that an admission fee be charged sufficient to pay all the expenses of that institution.

For many decades the postal rates have been low because the Government wished to follow out the letter of the Constitution and promote the distribution of educational material. Now, when weekly and monthly magazines reach 35,000,000 buyers and daily newspapers reach over 52,000,000 buyers, the Government introduces a special tax to be borne by the distributors of knowledge. If the rates were nominal or in keeping with past schedules, there would be no finger of suspicion pointed at an administration which has more than once shown its hostility to the press because the latter does not act toward the administration in a subservient manner.

THREAT TO BUSINESS

If the object is to intimidate the press, no more clumsy way could have been selected though from now on the press will

have to realize that overnight an unfriendly administration, putting pressure on a rubber-stamp Congress, can threaten the entire structure of the periodical-publishing business. It is the reading public which would have to pay the higher costs. No better way to weaken democracy can be devised than for a tyrannical majority to place a higher and higher tax on the dissemination of knowledge.

Another power which is already subject to abuse is that which permits the Government to issue or revoke licenses for radio stations. Here intimidation by Government is not a potential theory but a fact.

Finally there is the case of the $74,000,000 a year which a House subcommittee revealed recently was being spent by the Government to influence opinion through Government bulletins and through propaganda devices operated under Government agencies and officials.

If American observers really want to be fair about it, they will admit that, while the bulk of the communications of the country—the press and the radio—are able to say what they please, they could be subjected to severe economic pressure at any time by an arbitrary and capricious administration and its rubber-stamp majority in Congress. At the same time the administration can perpetuate itself in power by spending public funds for propaganda which, in the influencing of public opinion, is far more skillfully and effectively utilized than propaganda devices to maintain a one-party system in power inside Russia.

Progress in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of March 22, 1949:

PROGRESS IN CIVIL RIGHTS

Passage by the house and senate, by the overwhelming votes of 53 to 4 and 27 to 2, of an Oregon fair employment practices act has been described by Edwin C. Berry, secretary of the Portland Urban League—principal sponsor of the legislation on behalf of Negroes—as "the greatest weapon against communism we could have in this State."

We don't know about that. But we do think the FEP law is minimum recognition of the right of all racial and religious minorities to earn their living and improve their economic status, and reaffirmation of that equality of citizenship which has been promised but not delivered under the American system. It restores a measure of our faith in the essential tolerance and open-minded progress of Oregon as a State.

It is particularly satisfying, and a tribute both to Democrats and Republicans of the Oregon Assembly, that the Oregon Legislature saw the desirability of moving toward improvement of this State's own civil-rights problems while the National Congress is involved in a bitter and confusing struggle over the same issues. Oregon has joined five other States in the enactment of FEP legislation—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Washington,

The efficacy of an FEP law will be almost wholly dependent upon intelligent administration of its provisions, among which educational activities perhaps outweigh legal responsibilities. We should have preferred the establishment of a separate fair employment practices commission, rather than use of the State labor commissioner as the administrator. Yet the main provisions of the law were saved, and we are hopeful of its success. It remains for the ways and means committee to provide funds to prevent FEPA from becoming just another empty statute.

Greater Federal Aid to States in Employment Security Programs Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter received by me from Mr. Frank Annunzio, the very able director of the Department of Labor of the State of Illinois. Mr. Annunzio so forcibly presents the picture obtaining in the State of Illinois, where lack of adequate Federal aid is seriously interfering with the efficient administration of the State employment security program, that I am sure his letter will prove of general interest to the membership of the House. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1949.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am seriously concerned over the inadequacy of the 1949–50 appropriation for State employment security administration now pending in the House Appropriations Committee.

As you know, the States rely upon Federal funds granted pursuant to title III of the Social Security Act for the administration of the unemployment compensation and the State employment-service programs. The States also administer the payment of readjustment allowances to unemployed veterans. The costs of administration of this program are allocated by the Veterans' Administration from funds appropriated by Congress for such purpose.

Under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, a 3-percent pay-roll tax is levied on employers of eight or more workers. Against this tax, these employers are given a maximum 90-percent credit, based upon their contributions paid and experience-rating credits earned under State unemployment-compensation laws. Thus the Federal Government collects from employers who take full credit under the State laws, approximately three-tenths of 1 percent of their pay rolls. At the time of enactment of the Social Security Act, it was intended that this three-tenths of 1 percent be used for the administration of the State unemployment-compensation programs. In actual practice, however, the proceeds of this tax are treated as general revenue. The Federal Government has returned to the States less than half of the amounts it collected.

The 1949 appropriation of $135,000,000 was grossly inadequate. A deficiency bill allowing an addition ten millions has been passed by the House. The States consider this amount insufficient to meet the increased work load for the balance of this fiscal year.

In Illinois inadequate Federal appropriations in the past have resulted in—(1) use of State funds to restore deficits in Federal allotments; (2) curtailment of essential State operations.

It now appears that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, Illinois will have used approximately $300,000 in State funds, made available by the general assembly, because the Federal Government failed to make available sufficient moneys to operate this State's program. It is obviously unjust to compel a State to use its funds for purposes for which the Federal Government is obligated to make moneys available, at the same time that the Federal Government is collecting from the citizens of that State for that purpose more than twice as much as it is returning to the State.

Even after the use of the State funds it was necessary to curtail operations in Illinois. This tends to result in an inadequate examination of benefit claims to determine whether or not the claimant meets the requirements of the law; a delay in payment to claimants entitled to benefits; failure to collect tax delinquencies; and deprivation of veterans and other unemployed of services they are entitled to expect. Thus the lack of Federal funds results in a double loss to the State's unemployment trust fund account, first, by expenditure of State moneys, which would otherwise go into such account; and secondly, by loss of moneys to the account by reason of inadequate facilities for checking the propriety of benefit payments and collection of delinquent contributions.

It is, therefore, my concern that for the next fiscal year the Federal appropriation provides sufficient moneys to the States for proper and efficient administration of their employment-security programs.

I believe that at least $170,000,000 is necessary for that purpose. I arrive at this conclusion on the following basis: For the present year $130,000,000 was appropriated. In addition, at least $10,000,000 will be allowed as a deficiency. To this should be added $20,000,000 allotted to the States for administration of the readjustment-allowances program by the States. This totals at least $160,000,000 to be expended by the States for the fiscal period ending January 30, 1949.

Title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 will expire for most veterans on July 25, 1949, and any amount granted to the States for administration of this program will be substantially reduced. Nevertheless it is anticipated that after that date the veterans, who were covered by the Readjustment Allowance Act, will come under the State unemployment compensation acts. Therefore the Federal title III appropriation should make adequate allowances for the handling of the claims of these veterans.

The Bureau of Employment Security, based upon estimates of work loads made some time ago and now obsolete, recommended an appropriation under title III of approximately $160,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

We believe that the claims load in the next fiscal period will be greater than it was in the last. Costs of operations such as rents, salaries, etc., will, no doubt, be higher. It thus appears that the appropriation for the 1950 fiscal period should be substantially greater than that for the current fiscal period and that there is absolutely no basis for the Bureau of the Budget's request for $135,000,000 for costs of administration of the State programs for the next fiscal year.

To recapitulate: During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the States will expend for administration of their employment-security

programs, including readjustment allowances, as follows:

Original title III appropriation	$130,000,000
Veterans' readjustment allowances	20,000,000
Deficiency passed by House	10,000,000
Total	160,000,000
For the next fiscal year they should have:	
Amount equivalent to that allowed for current fiscal year for administration of unemployment compensation, employment service and readjustment allowances	$160,000,000
Additional amount necessary to meet definitely increased work loads and cost of operations	5,000,000
Contingency for possibility of substantially increased work loads	10,000,000
Total	175,000,000
Less amount which will probably be appropriated for administration of readjustment-allowances program	$5,000,000
Total title III appropriation	170,000,000

I shall greatly appreciate your consideration of these matters.

Very truly yours,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Director of Labor.

Spain Says Future Is Linked With United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, March 27, 1949, entitled "Spain Says Future Is Linked With United States," by Ely Culbertson:

SPAIN SAYS FUTURE IS LINKED WITH UNITED STATES—FOREIGN MINISTER STATES NATION WOULD JOIN ATLANTIC PACT IF PROPERLY RECEIVED—ASKS IMPROVEMENT IN UN—URGES CHARTER CHANGE SO THAT NO PEACEFUL COUNTRY SUCH AS HIS COULD BE BARRED

(By Ely Culbertson)

The first question put to Spanish Foreign Minister Alberto Martin Artajo was: "What is the economic situation of Spain today?"

Foreign Minister: "Our economic situation leaves much to be desired. We have a bright future because Spain is rich in natural resources, especially metals, and there is order and peace in our country. Our strength is not sapped by the malignant fever that periodically comes in communistic waves of strikes and disorders, as in most other countries of Europe.

"But we have been much weakened economically by the urgent necessity of maintaining large armed forces and armaments against the vast threat of the Communist Moscow state battering at the very doors of Paris and Nanking. It must be remembered that since 1945 Spain was virtually the only nation in western Europe that maintained its full armed strength in readiness for defense against the possible advance into Latin Europe of the Moscow imperialists—and imposed upon us through Molotov's machinations at the San Francisco Conference.

"In addition, the entire Spanish gold reserve was shipped to Moscow during the civil war by Moscow agents, and it is still there. That is why we seek cooperation and mutual help with South and North America, who are our natural friends."

Here Señor Martin Artajo, a big, hearty, bluff man, looking typically like a prosperous American rancher, stopped and with a typically Spanish shrug of the shoulders added: "And, as you Americans know by now, to be prepared against aggressors costs money, and plenty of money."

Mr. Culbertson: "Is there still much bitterness among the Spanish people on the exclusion of Spain from participation in the United Nations?"

Foreign Minister: "Bitterness, no. Profound disappointment, yes. It is only natural. We Spaniards are a proud people, and we feel that we are being treated unjustly, and at the most critical period in world history. No nation needs and seeks world peace more ardently than the Spanish nation. Spain (and again Señor Martin Artajo smiled subtly) has had no war with any nation during the last 200 years. The only exception was our war with the United States in 1898, which was not of our making. Why then classify the one nation with the best peace record in the world as a threat to peace, as was done at the San Francisco Conference?"

Mr. Culbertson: "Does that mean that you are satisfied with the present United Nations Charter?"

SAYS NONCOMMUNISTS OBJECT

Foreign Minister: "No; it does not mean that. But in our atomic age the hope of the world lies in an effective world authority against aggressors anywhere, and the United Nations Charter was a splendid beginning. But of course it must be improved so that no aggressor may veto peace, or veto from membership a peaceful nation like Spain. We would have wanted to join with other peaceful nations to improve the United Nations, to make it work, and thus avert the catastrophe of the third world war, which this time will be an atomic war. We expect full well that when the Politburo, in the next 2 or 3 years, completes the building of its atomic plants, Madrid will be one of the first on its list."

Mr. Culbertson: "But, Mr. Foreign Minister, there is opposition to the recognition of Spain, not only by Communists, but by other voices who are listened to in the United States."

Foreign Minister: "I hear those voices too. But frankly (and the Foreign Minister shrugged his shoulders and raised his eyebrows to show utter bewilderment) I cannot understand them. On my street there are many things I don't like and don't approve about my neighbors, but to live in peace with them I must respect the sanctity of their homes.

"How are we going to get peace in the world if each nation elects itself the judge of the internal affairs of other sovereign nations? The Communists have their own reasons for doing so. Let the Spanish people settle their own internal affairs in their own manner. And let each nation find its own level of government best suited to its vital needs and traditions."

Mr. Culbertson: "Does this mean that Spain is satisfied with her present structure of Government?"

Foreign Minister: "No one claims that the present Spanish Government is either perfect or unchangeable. In fact, much of what we do at present is but a temporary phase comparable to the period of reconstruction after your own Civil War.

"We are forced to choose between the Communist-fostered anarchy and temporarily severe order."

WILL SURRENDER ONE RIGHT ONLY

"But whatever the nature of their own national government, no self-respecting people is going to accept the dictates of foreign states or international authority on matters of their own internal structure. Like the great American Nation, the one sovereign right we are willing and required to surrender to an international authority is the right to wage wars of aggression, and nothing else!"

"From the standpoint of America's own national interest there are only two questions that they should ask of the Spanish Government: First, is Spain likely to be a friend or an enemy of the United States now or in time of need? And, second, does Spain plan or prepare for aggression upon its neighbors, now or in the future? I leave it to any fair American to answer these two questions."

Mr. Culbertson: "I have heard some Spaniards talk who are not so friendly to the United States."

Foreign Minister: "We have our hotheads and you have yours. But the future of Spain and the United States is inextricably bound together by history and common interests. Whether we like it or not—and we Spaniards do like it—both nations must march together in friendship, for both belong to the Western Hemisphere. Our historical task is to help carry on the torch of Spanish-American civilization that we lighted four centuries ago. Your historical task is to bring in the benefits of American economy and technology to help blend in a higher synthesis the two great civilizations, the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin. There could be no conflict between us. The frontiers of the Western Hemisphere lie in the Pyrenees."

Mr. Culbertson: "Since the Russian veto bars Spain from the United Nations, what hope is there in your opinion for a more direct participation by Spain in the common concern of the Atlantic community?"

Foreign Minister: "Spain could be of great, immediate, and perhaps decisive help as a member of the North Atlantic security alliance. But the Spanish nation is asking for no favors. We can be of help only if we are received in the same spirit of serene and equal friendship which we offer to all peaceful and God-fearing nations. Spain is one of the principal powers of the Christian West, and it would make little sense to deny her her rightful place in the common struggle against the future aggressor, when she bled herself white in fighting the civil war against the same aggressor."

Mr. Culbertson: "What would be the contribution of Spain to the Atlantic alliance, Mr. Foreign Minister?"

Foreign Minister: "We can contribute with our good will in Central and South America; our natural resources that so far have been only partly developed, and which range from semitropical fruits to critical metals; our highly trained army of veterans, immediately available, if need be, to help hold the fortress of western Europe; our strategic bases in Spain, for sea and air forces, which will definitely insure the control of the Mediterranean for the Atlantic community."

Mr. Culbertson: "What is your reaction to the official invitation to Portugal to become a member of the North Atlantic security alliance?"

Foreign Minister: "I think it is excellent and wise. We maintain the friendliest of relations with Portugal, whose government and whose economic and political problems are very similar to our own. Portugal's participation will be of great help to the Atlantic alliance. Between Portugal and Spain there are friendly treaties generally known as the Iberian Pact, founded in well-known historical reasons and especially in the mutual conviction that only the related actions of both countries may give all its real strategical value to the Iberian Peninsula."

Mr. Culbertson: "Assuming you join the North Atlantic alliance, what would be your economic and military requirements?"

Foreign Minister: "American private capital will have a fruitful and secure field in Spain. From the American Government we expect no bounties, but we need help in the form of secure, self-liquidating loans to improve our fertilizer, mining, and textile industries for export into Marshall-plan countries. It is important for all that we also improve our transportation. As for military requirements, that would naturally be up to the joint staff of the North Atlantic security alliance. Even if nothing is offered to us economically or militarily, we are still most anxious to take our rightful place in the family of peace-loving nations. For what we want above all is what the American Nation seeks—a world free from aggressors anywhere."

The Woes of the Little-Business Man Set to Rhyme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a poem which graphically presents the effort of a rugged, honest-to-goodness American little-business man who is doing his best to keep on his feet and get ahead in the face of multiplying, entangling Federal interferences, exactions, restrictions, rules, regulations, and interpretations which make his confusion worse confounded.

RHYMES AND REMNANTS

(By D. A.)

LITTLE-BUSINESS MAN

This is the story, I must confess,
Of life in the Valley of Unsuccess,
The tale of a little-business man
Who steered by the Benjamin Franklin plan.

The follies of other young men he spurned,
For "a penny saved is a penny earned";
And "early to bed and early to rise
Makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise."

He studied Poor Richard's Almanac,
And held to his course, and turned not back;
And nobody ever saw him drift
Away from the blessings of toil and thrift.

Up in the morning to greet the sun,
He worked all day till his task was done;
And penny by penny his savings grew,
And presently dollar by dollar, too.

In time he was known as a man of means
With silver and gold in his jingling jeans.
But he didn't keep all in pockets or pots;
Instead he invested in building lots.

He erected houses, with signs: "For rent,"
Till the last of his capital had been spent;
And that, I am quite distressed to say,
Was the time that his planning went astray.

For his costs went up while his rents stood still,
And he had obligations he couldn't fulfill;
And he found himself floundering in the shoals
Of ruinous permanent rent controls.

And now in the Valley of Unsuccess
He'll spend the rest of his life, I guess,
Explaining the cause of his cruel fate:
Capital sunk in unreal estate.

—*Tubless Diogenes.*

Canadian Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will be of interest to the taxpayers of the United States to know that a preliminary report on the proposed tax reductions contained in the Canadian budget message of March 22, 1949, has just been received.

I wish to point out that this is the fourth reduction in Canadian taxes since the cessation of hostilities in World War II.

President Truman, however, still insists on a $4,000,000,000 tax bill in addition to our present tax collections amounting to $45,000,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 1949. Our Federal excise taxes alone yield over $8,500,000,000, with another $2,500,000,00 derived from customs and miscellaneous receipts.

There will be no countries in the world contributing to our tax reduction, but instead they will continue to enjoy and profit from the corporate, individual, and excise taxes extracted from the pockets of our people to reduce their taxes.

I am inserting, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, the preliminary report on the proposed tax reductions contained in the Canadian budget message of March 22, 1949:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE PROPOSED TAX REDUCTIONS CONTAINED IN THE CANADIAN BUDGET MESSAGE OF MARCH 22, 1949

I. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

(a) Reduction in personal exemptions: The exemption of a single person is raised from $750 to $1,000. In 1945 single persons had an exemption of $660. (In the United States a single person now has an exemption of $600. His exemption in 1945 was $500.)

The exemption for married persons is raised from $1,500 to $2,000. In 1945 married persons had an exemption of $660 under the surtax, and $1,200 under the normal tax. (In the United States a married person without dependents now has an exemption of $1,200; in 1945 his exemption was $1,000.)

The dependency exemption is raised from $300 to $400. The $300 exemption was instituted in 1946 and replaced a system of tax credits. (The dependency credit in the United States is now $600; in 1945 and 1946 it was $500.)

The exemption for children eligible for family allowances is to be raised from $100 to $150. The $100 exemption was set up in 1946 and was announced at the time to be the equivalent of the $300 exemption then allowed for other dependents, when the family allowances are taken into account.

It is reported that the proposed increases in exemptions will bring Canada back to the prewar level and relieve about 750,000 taxpayers of all tax liability. The prewar level of exemptions in the United States was $1,000 for a single person, $2,500 for a head of a family, and $400 for each dependent.

(b) Rates: Rate reductions are provided at percentages which decrease as the size of the income grows larger.

It is reported that a married couple without children having an income of $2,500 would receive a tax reduction of 56 percent. This appears to produce a tax of about $95 as compared with $170 under existing law. In 1945 this couple would have paid a tax of $385. Thus, the proposed tax burden is about 25 percent of the wartime burden.

Under existing law in the United States a married couple without children with an income of $2,500 pays a tax of $215.80. Prior to the first postwar tax reduction made in the Revenue Act of 1945, this couple would have paid a tax of $360. Thus, the present burden in the United States is about 60 percent of the wartime level.

Under the proposed Canadian legislation a married couple without children having an income of $10,000 will receive a tax reduction of about 17 percent. This produces a tax of about $1,652. Under existing law the tax is $1,990. Under the rates in effect in 1945 the tax would have been $3,612. Thus, the proposed tax burden is about 46 percent of the wartime level.

Under existing law in the United States a married couple without children with an income of $10,000 would pay a tax of $1,621.44. Under the rates in effect prior to the Revenue Act of 1945 this couple would have paid a tax of $2,585. Thus, the existing tax burden is about 63 percent of the wartime level.

The proposed changes in the Canadian tax on individual net income are to take effect January 1, 1949.

II. SURTAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME

The Canadian individual income tax includes a special levy of 4 percent on investment income. Under existing law the first $1,800 of investment income is exempt. Under the proposed bill the first $2,400 will be exempt. In 1945 the exemption was $1,500.

III. CORPORATE INCOME TAX RATES

(a) The present Canadian law imposes a flat 30-percent tax on corporate net income. The rate on the first $10,000 of profits is to be reduced to 10 percent, while the rate on the profit over $10,000 is raised to 33 percent. This is intended as relief for small business.

(b) As a first step in dealing with the double taxation of dividend income, individuals are to be allowed a credit against their personal income tax equal to 10 percent of the dividends which they received from common shares of Canadian taxpaying corporations.

IV. EXCISES

The following excises are repealed: travel tickets, sleeping-car berths, parlor-car chairs, telegrams, cables, long-distance telephone calls and extension telephones, soft drinks, carbolic acid, gas, candy, chewing gum, and transportation busses.

The rate of the tax on jewelry is reduced from 25 percent to 10 percent and the tax is to be levied on the manufacturer instead of the retailer.

The rate of the tax on cosmetics, toilet articles, and preparations is reduced from 25 percent to 10 percent.

The 35 percent on luggage, purses, fountain pens, pencils, and desk sets and smokers' accessories is reduced to 10 percent.

The 25-percent tax on cigarette lighters is reduced to 10 percent.

The present tax on matches is repealed and replaced by a straight 10-percent ad valorem tax.

The rate of the tax on coin-operated games and vending machines is reduced from 25 percent to 10 percent.

V. EFFECT ON THE BUDGET

The revenue loss in a full year's operation is estimated at $369,000,000. The loss in the fiscal year 1950, at $322,000,000.

After the proposed reduction a surplus of $87,000,000 is forecast for the fiscal year 1950. The total expenditures for that fiscal year are estimated at $2,390,000,000.

The estimated surplus for the fiscal year 1949 is $575,000,000. Total expenditures for that year are estimated at $2,200,000,000.

Student Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial appearing in the Peoria Star under date of March 24, entitled "Student Communists":

STUDENT COMMUNISTS

State Senator Paul W. Broyles recently received a telegram from the student president of the Communist Club of the University of Chicago. We think it warrants publication in toto in this column:

"In a Communist Club meeting of over 40 students of University of Chicago a unanimous vote was taken to protest both the Broyles bills and the 'investigation' of our university.

"The members of the Communist Club, along with hundreds of students on our campus, cannot accept the idiotic definition of communism stated in the bill.

"We wish to emphatically state that no 'commission' will ever wipe the Communist Club off the campus of our university.

"We will continue to fight for students' rights as laid down in the NSA bill of rights and continue to bring Marxism-Leninism to the campus. Your intended smear campaign will only make us fight harder and more consistently toward the fulfillment of our goal.

"We further realize that you are not coming to our campus merely to destroy the Communist Club, but also to destroy all other progressive elements on our campus. This fact is fully realized by most of Chicago's students, who have formed a campus-wide coalition at a meeting of over 1,500 students to protest the Broyles bills and the activities of your commission."

One is inclined to excuse the insolence of this amazing document partly on the ground that most persons in late adolescence and early maturity suffer from half-baked ideas which they take very, very seriously. We do not doubt that members of the Communist club of the University of Chicago have discovered that they are the intelligentsia of the student body and are puffed up with the importance of their discovery. For this we cannot much blame the young people. We blame the administrators of a school which permits its students to come under the influence of subversive teachings. And we blame the education profession for tolerating within its ranks persons who unscrupulously poison the thinking of immature and impressionable youth.

Note the sly way in which the president of the Communist club claims for his group the status of a progressive element. Note the candid way in which he declares his faith in Marxism-Leninism. And observe that the Communist club is fighting for a goal.

What is the nature of the progressivism which the University of Chicago Communists belligerently claim for themselves? It was recently defined by Foster and Dennis, leaders of the Communist Party of America, when they declared themselves against the United States in the event of war with the Soviet Union.

What do university authorities have to say about this organization bringing Marxism-Leninism to the campus? The University of Chicago is a Baptist institution. Lenin said, "Down with religion. Long live atheism. The spread of atheist views is our chief task." And Karl Marx said, "Atheism is an integral part of Marxism. Consequently, a class-conscious Communist party must carry on propaganda in favor of atheism."

The goal of these misguided young political prodigies, therefore, is the spread of atheism on the campus and the teaching of doctrines of revolution aimed at overthrowing the Government of the United States. No wonder they are alarmed by the prospect of an investigation.

If the Communist club is proud of bringing Marxism-Leninism to the University of Chicago campus, why do they resent an inquiry by the general assembly?

One thing the University of Chicago Communists seem not to realize. The General Assembly of the State of Illinois is not, like the Politburo of Russia, an autonomous body. It is a representative body. It speaks for the people of Illinois. When these young people, feverish with adolescent political excitement, challenge the general assembly, they challenge the people of Illinois. We are a tolerant people, but there are limits to our tolerance.

The Peoria Star believes that the general assembly will have the whole-hearted support of the people of this State in any effort to disclose subversive influences in our educational institutions. We believe also that the Broyles antisedition bills are a necessary weapon for fighting traitors in our State and should be passed by the general assembly.

Peace or War Via the Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Alexander Stewart, a member of the New England Conference of the Methodist Church, which is to be printed in the forthcoming issue of Zions Herald. In this interesting article Dr. Stewart makes a vigorous and thought-provoking appeal to the American people for study and discussion of the provisions and implications of the North Atlantic treaty as one of the most drastic changes that has been made in our American policy since the signing of the Monroe Doctrine.

PEACE OR WAR VIA THE ATLANTIC PACT
(By Rev. Alexander Stewart)

Among the many pronouncements of the National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order, recently held in Cleveland, one statement concerning the North Atlantic treaty needs to be reemphasized at this time. "We call upon the Senate of the United States to postpone final action on this pact until the Nation has had opportunity for full discussion of all its provisions and implications." There is scarcely anyone today who does not agree that the North Atlantic Pact, if ratified, will constitute one of the most drastic changes that has been made in our American policy since the signing of the Monroe Doctrine. We have never before in American history entered into a collective security or military alliance in peacetime with countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

The text of the alliance was made public on March 18 and the document is to be signed on April 4 by representatives of the nations participating. The Senate ratification is scheduled to follow. It is concerning this third step that the Cleveland conference is urging careful restraint. There must be time for full discussion of all the provisions and implications of the pact by the people before the Senate acts upon it. This is exceedingly important. Up to March 18 there was a tendency on the part of our Government to discourage discussion of the Atlantic Pact proposals and to veil the negotiations in what resembled a wartime secrecy. The very opposite method must now be used. Discussion of the pact must be encouraged. Our people must know the implications of the pact, which may mean peace or war for the world. There are many questions that will need to be discussed and answered.

1. What is the purpose of the pact? The preamble of the pact states that the parties of the treaty are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security." This is to be accomplished, according to article 5, by the agreement "that an armed attack against one or more of the parties to the agreement shall be considered an attack against them all." It is generally understood that in the preliminary conversations with the representatives of the European countries involved, a guarantee of actual military assistance was asked. Our representatives in the conversations, knowing that according to our Constitution Congress reserves the right to declare war, phrased the pact to read, "Each of them * * * will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

I was in attendance at the State Department meeting in Washington at the time of the television and radio broadcast of Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the night the text of the pact was released to the public. He clearly implied that resistance to attack by armed force is meant. Many other State Department officials have made it clear in one way or another that this is a military alliance. It is doubtful that the European countries would have been interested in the treaty if it were not a military alliance. If a two-thirds majority of our Senate approves the pact, there is little question but that our country is committed in advance to go to war if any of the other parties to the pact are attacked. This is in spite of the fact that there is much evidence from history showing that defense treaties have not prevented wars or insured victory once a war began.

Many supporters of the pact hope that it will deter the aggressive tendencies of Soviet Russia. It is possible, however, that it may have the directly opposite effect of forcing the other side to make its own treaties and to further divide the world into armed camps. It is well to remember the words of the Cleveland conference, "No defensive alliance should be entered into which might validly appear as aggressive to Russia as a Russian alliance with Latin America would undoubtedly appear to us. * * * History indicates that the most that can be achieved by military alliances is a temporary balance of power, while they easily give rise to menacing armament races ending in war." High Government officials have now admitted that our sending arms to China at the end of World War II actually stimulated the Chinese Communists to attack.

2. Will the United States have to back up the pact by sending arms to the member nations of the pact? Article 9 provides for the immediate establishment of a council that will consider matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. This council shall also set up a defense committee. Publication 3462, called the White Paper, released the day after the pact by the State Department, says that "A military assistance program is now being considered by the executive branch of the Government." Congressmen are very much concerned over the

military assistance involved in the pact. It has been variously estimated that the cost of this will run from fifteen to twenty-five billion in the next 5 years.

According to the Washington News for March 18, the United Press reports that "the administration plans to ask Congress to authorize a military lend-lease program to cost between $1,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 in the first year."

Constantine Brown, writing in the Washington Sunday Star for March 27, says: "The organization of the desired force will require, under the best possible conditions, between 3 and 5 years, and a rough guess is that we will have to put up for this rearmament program of our new allies somewhere between $12,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000.

"Added to an estimated $15,000,000,000 for the balance of the European recovery program, this sum brings to nearly $30,000,000,000 the expenditure to be required of American taxpayers for western Europe's recovery and security during the next 4 years.

"The first question which arises in the mind of every Member of Congress is whether the taxpayer will be able to stand the burden which the administration may feel compelled to impose—without our economic and social structure breaking down."

Compare these figures for a multibillion dollar European rearmament program with the small investments the United States makes in agencies of the UN—$18,000,000 for the UN itself, $1,250,000 toward the solution of world hunger through the Food and Agriculture Organization, $3,750,000 for "creating in the minds of men the defenses of peace" through UNESCO.

Not only is there a great danger in the cost of a gigantic military lend-lease program to our own economy, but to divert men, money, and strategic materials necessary for economic recovery in Europe to military purposes will delay, if not prevent entirely, the coming of the day when Europe might be back on its feet. A rearmament program would impose such a burden upon European economy as to lead to the lowering of standards of living, already inadequate in so many countries. This would undoubtedly help to insure the spread of communism, which thrives on the unrest and misery brought about when people lack sufficient food, decent homes, adequate schools, and proper health programs. Genuine reconstruction and rearmament cannot coexist. Judging by past experience, when the choice has to be made between allocating strategic materials to the necessities of daily life or to the needs of a military alliance, the latter stands to gain at the expense of the former.

After World War I, Viscount Grey wrote, "Armaments were intended to produce a sense of security in each nation—that was the justification put forward in defense of them. What they really did was to produce fear in everybody. Fear causes suspicion and hatred; it is hardly too much to say that, between nations, it stimulates all that is bad and depresses all that is good."

3. How will the pact affect the United Nations? In June 1948, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out the Vandenberg resolution, the committee spoke of the "present inability of the United Nations to assure international peace and security." Their report virtually called for a military alliance because there seemed to be no hope for peace or security in the United Nations. In large measure, the pact is based on this premise that the United Nations has failed. It is my contention that the pact increases the possibility of the failure of the UN.

In an article written at Lake Success and printed in the Chicago Daily News of March 7 under the caption, "Atlantic pact viewed at UN as fatal blow," the correspondent after extensive talks with UN officials says: "The United States is throwing so much emphasis behind the proposed Atlantic pact that if continued it could be a kiss of death for the UN, some fear. The United States may be giving lip service to the UN and its possibilities, but in reality it is selling the UN straight down the river."

The pact sets up a North Atlantic Council. This council would cease its work following an attack only when the United Nations would take steps to restore peace. The interesting fact here is that only the Atlantic Council would have power to decide when the United Nations had taken these steps. In other words, the Atlantic Council would sit in judgment upon the United Nations and the United Nations would be subservient to it. At present the United Nations is the one bridge across the iron curtain. If the United Nations is destroyed or rendered ineffective, there will no longer be one world, but two. Our task now is to strengthen the United Nations, not to wreck it.

On February 11 Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, said, "If people generally began to accept alliance as a substitute for genuine world-wide collective security, then the hope of a lasting peace would be gravely endangered."

The pact will increase the pressures between the nations within the United Nations. On February 26, 1,500 persons demonstrated outside the Parliament in Oslo against the alleged American pressure on Norway to join the Atlantic Pact. The demonstrators shouted, "We want peace, not east, not west." Trygve Lie, speaking at the University of Maine on March 16, said that the present east-west conflict was "too dangerous to last." If the present game of hostilities continued indefinitely, it would result in a "war that will end civilization as we know it."

4. Will the pact assure military success? Mr. James P. Warburg, a retired banker, who has become well known as author and publicist in the field of international affairs, believes that the proposed treaty will "fail to provide an adequate defense, or—in attempting to provide it—will provoke the very attack it is designed to deter." He does not believe that even with our military help western European countries could withstand a Russian attack. If in an attempt to guarantee effective military help to western Europe we send our troops there, Mr. Warburg believes that this act in itself might provoke a Russian attack before a sufficient number of our troops landed, and would thus defeat at once the purpose of the pact. Many believe that in the initial stages of world war III Russia would overrun all of Europe. What is to stop her, in that event, from capturing all the equipment we had shipped to western Europe, thus strengthening her own power? We already have the example of what happened in China, where the Communists now have over 90 percent of all the equipment we sent to Nationalist China since the end of World War II.

France heavily subsidized her military ally, Czechoslovakia, between the wars. Tanks, artillery, and planes, which France paid for and which were manufactured by Skoda, were seized intact by Hitler and were used by the invading German army to overpower the French in 1940. The United States shipped 21,000,000 tons of scrap iron to Japan in the 1930's. Much of this was returned in shrapnel at Tarawa, Guadalcanal, and Okinawa. Someone has said, "When you put arms in the hands of another man, there is no absolute guarantee that, if and when the arms are used, they will be pointed the other way. They may be pointed toward you."

It may be well to ask whether anyone can guarantee, on the basis of the current situation, that if there is not great progress in economic health and stability, Italy or France, for example, will not go Communist within the next 20 years and cease to be an ally. What happens then to the arms and equipment that have been shipped to them? It is generally understood that about one-fourth of France is now Communist. What is to stop mass desertions in the French and other armies in case of war with Russia? We have only to turn to China where whole Nationalist armies deserted to the Communists, for an illustration of this point.

5. Are there constructive alternative means of opposing communism? Yes, there are many things we can do and must do if we are to stop communism or save the world from a war of suicide. First, we must give more time and effort to the building of democracy in our own country, through adequate housing, educational facilities, health programs, and safeguards for civil rights and human liberties.

Second, we must continue to act on the belief that the best way to stop the spread of communism is to help countries rehabilitate themselves. The major problem of Europe is not military; it is economic and psychological. The economic program of aid to Europe that we have begun must not now be deflected into military preparations if we mean to stop communism. Hungry, unclothed, impoverished people are always easy converts to communism. Last summer in Europe I found two major fears—the fear of Russia and a greater fear, i. e., of the day when manpower, money, and resources would be diverted from economic rehabilitation to military aid and rearmament. People cannot eat guns or raise their families in tanks and obsolete airplanes.

Third, we must use and strengthen the United Nations and its specialized agencies to their fullest capacities for cooperative policies to meet the economic and cultural needs of the world's peoples. The United States is now spending $1,000 on its own armaments for every dollar it spends on the United Nations. A former chief United States delegate to the United Nations said recently, "The United Nations could be trusted much more than has been the case."

An example of the successful use of the UN is the Palestine situation. A war in Palestine has recently been ended by negotiation. No one has suggested that it would have been better to have other nations enter the war and thus extend the area of conflict. Yet, under the proposed North Atlantic Pact, an attack on any signatory nation would be considered an attack on all of them and might involve them in war.

The Cleveland conference reaffirmed its faith in the United Nations by saying, "We pledge ourselves anew to support this hopeful venture, trusting that the very trials through which the nations have passed in these years when open hostilities have ceased but when peace has proven elusive, may strengthen the growing organization and confirm the wisdom of its founders."

Fourth. We should support the United Nations Assembly's proposal for world disarmament under international law. This means multilateral action to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction and big national armies and navies, providing instead an international police force and equipment suitable for genuine police duty. The charter of the United Nations calls for a disarmament effort, as does the Vandenberg resolution, which passed the Senate with almost an unanimous vote. The people of the United States will now have to decide whether they want a semiglobal arms pact and suicidal arms race or whether their first allegiance and expenditures shall be for the United Nations and a world system of law and government. Their decision will be between the broadening of the Truman doctrine of military intervention and world rearmament or a halt to the world arms race, and world disarmament. One of the important pronouncements of the Cleveland conference said that "the goal of multilateral and balanced reduction of armaments, subject to

adequate international inspection and control, should be kept at the forefront of our national policy."

Fifth. Every effort should be made to keep diplomatic and nongovernmental channels open between the United States and Russia. The Cleveland conference urged that "the avenues of formal negotiation between the Governments of the United States of America and Soviet Russia must be kept open, and a way should be cleared for informal conferences between unofficial religious, educational, business, labor, and cultural groups of both nations. The American people covet conference as a basis for understanding. We believe that the method of tolerance that is basic to conference will enable each to learn from the other, and give opportunity for the extension of this method upon which peace in a world of contradictory ideologies depends."

Sixth. We should work toward, rather than avoid, an over-all settlement of Germany. We should continue to strive for completion of the treaties of peace between the contestants of the last war.

Seventh. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON has proposed an alternative in a Big Four conference. The President's seeming unwillingness to talk to Stalin or suggest some counterproposal to modify the cold war has caused apprehension among numerous Americans. It would be helpful for many to write their Senators and Chairman TOM CONNALLY, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging them to examine this and all other possibilities of peace before taking steps such as the North Atlantic military alliance that may make world war III inevitable.

WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY

Ministers and laymen should take a personal responsibility to study the pros and cons of the Atlantic Pact and see that this question is brought before peace committees, men's, women's, and youth organizations within the church; farm, labor, education, and community groups. Write to your Representatives as well as Senators. Though your Representative does not vote on the pact, since it comes before Congress as a treaty, and thus only to the Senate, he will have to vote on the world arms bill which is to accompany the pact, and the funds to carry it out. More rearmament means more taxes, more conscription, more likelihood of universal military training, and more diversion of the world's energy into nonproductive uses.

We may well ponder the words of Viscount Grey: "The lesson of European history is so plain. It is that no enduring security can be found in competing armaments and in separate alliances; there is no security for any power unless it be a security in which its neighbors have an equal share."

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 I placed in the RECORD the third of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 21, is the fourth of the series:

BRITAIN'S HOSPITALS STRUGGLE TO MEET HEAVY DEMANDS—MANY APPLY UNDER NEW FREE SERVICE LAW

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Fourth in a series special to the Brooklyn Eagle)

LONDON, March 21.—British hospitals now nearly all are owned by the national government and are struggling, with every ingenuity, to meet the avalanche of requests for admittance that has come upon them through the inception of a free national health service.

A person must be seriously ill or in need of an operation at once to gain speedy entrance. Otherwise one must wait and hope to receive a favorable reply within a month or two. When pain is present, or an ailment is of a type that could become acute and hazardous, a way is opened quickly.

The hospitals serving under the plan all carry on in a similar manner because they are parts of a big system covering the entire nation. The Health Ministry decided last year that efficiency could be secured only by merging all hospitals into a cooperative enterprise and legislation authorizing it to acquire all hospitals was adopted.

DIVIDED REACTION

Many are pleased with the arrangement, having become weary of the constant struggle to earn or to beg sufficient money to keep their establishments going. They had little hope of finding means of expanding their buildings and having remodeling tasks performed. These have surrendered their title to their premises and their funds cheerfully.

Others regret the action that has ended their labors as individual charities. This is true chiefly among some of the smaller and more remote institutions that are not connected with universities and are not classed as teaching hospitals. They find themselves mere little units of a big plan required only to proceed according to directives handed down to them by a regional hospital management committee.

Even some of the big teaching hospitals are not entirely pleased with the course of events, but they have decided the action is necessary and are cooperating completely and willingly. They are not under the thumb of any regional board and enjoy a direct liaison with the Health Ministry itself. They receive virtually no orders from on high and rather have the duty to propose policies to some of the smaller hospitals in their areas.

ENDOWMENTS RETAINED

The teaching hospitals have been allowed to retain control of their endowment funds, which now are used by them to promote medical research in their laboratories and to provide a few comforts and amenities to patients without means.

The nonteaching hospitals are not permitted to keep their endowments. They have been taken from them and deposited in a regional pool that is administered by a group of trustees for encouragement of research and hospital advancement. Some of these hospitals were deeply in debt when they were taken over and the government paid off their obligations.

Every hospital employee now is paid by the Government, not directly, but still from the National Treasury. Their wages are a bit lower than those in comparable work, but they are agitating for more money and are considered to have a good chance of getting it. Their hours of work have been reduced and they have been entered in a retirement plan largely financed by the Government. They make a small contribution themselves.

NO LOSS OF JOBS

No hospital employee has lost his job in the shuffle and no pay cut has been made. A few receive more money than the Government believes right for their duties, but they continue to draw it. Their successors will not be paid as much.

The hospital staffs are compelled by the great public demand to be more diligent and admission offices have larger responsibilities. The latter must be sure that urgent cases receive priorities, and that means constant surveying of the waiting list, conferences with attending physicians, and even personal communications with the patients themselves.

To ease up the pressure a little the policy is to have as fast a turn-over of patients as can be arranged. Cases that may be served by the out-patient departments are refused hospital admission. When a surgeon or physician can handle a situation in his own office, the out-patient bureau asks him to do so and to refrain from sending the case to them. As soon as a bed patient is recuperated sufficiently he is requested to go home and domestic help is provided there if required.

WAITING ROOMS ENLARGED

The out-patient divisions are so flooded with callers that enlargements of waiting rooms has been essential. Greater comfort for the waiting people is desired by the ministry, and out-patient officials have been requested to add some comforts and to set up canteens where tea and snacks can be served.

Under a new plan being contemplated, mammoth out-patient centers may be opened in the midst of three hospitals but having no direct connection with any. This may accelerate the care being given.

The waiting period in the out-patient offices is being reduced steadily and now is less than an hour. Use of appointments is helping somewhat, but even with this arrangement the patient cannot be seen within a half-hour.

EIGHTY-FIVE PERCENT OF CAPACITY

The need to keep some beds available for emergency cases prevents full use of facilities, and few hospitals are operating at 90 percent of their capacities. Most of them are 85 percent filled. One way of improvement is the arrangement of daily contacts between hospitals to learn if one can accept a few patients another cannot take at the moment. Often there are vacancies in a ward other than the one to which a patient is scheduled to go for certain types of illness. The patient is put in a ward where the bed is available and then shifted over where he belongs.

The hospitals agree that they cannot provide all the service that is wanted and do not expect to be able to do so. Enlargement of plants would be required, and building materials and construction labor are in great shortage, even though the Government might find the needed money. Some could do a little more if they could secure more nurses, but that means a slow training period. The hospital world in England is knocking itself out trying to make good and is not discouraged because an impatient public doesn't seem to appreciate it.

Our World Information Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, George V. Allen, before the second session of the New York Herald Tribune Forum for High Schools at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 5, 1949:

OUR WORLD INFORMATION PROGRAM

It is always a gratifying experience for me to speak to students from foreign countries. I am especially glad to meet with you who have come from the countries associated with us in the greatest experience in voluntary material cooperation the world has ever known.

Before coming to the United States, each of you had naturally formed a preconception of what the United States would be like. You have now had an opportunity to supplement these pictures of the imagination by photographs taken by your own eyes and developed in your own minds.

Nothing can erase the impressions which have now been fixed in your memories by the things which you yourself have seen, the people to whom you have talked, the experiences which you have had there.

You will be asked, when you return to your homes, whether America was as you had expected to find it—whether it was, on the whole, less interesting than you had thought, or more so, whether the buildings were less tall, the houses more hot, or the traffic less jammed than you had imagined.

Some of you may be asked whether you saw any gangsters, or cowboys, or Indians, or Hollywood stars, or perhaps any atomic bombs. Others will be asked about economic conditions—about the great strikes which, according to radio Moscow, are crippling American industry, or the unemployed who are reportedly in evidence on every hand. You may be asked whether a business depression has started, or is likely to start, whether the Tennessee Valley development is a success, and a host of other difficult subjects on which you may or may not have had an opportunity to inform yourselves.

Perhaps some of you may be asked whether you consider it true, as the Communists both inside the United States and outside allege, that the United States is preparing for an aggressive war and is determined to subject the world to its domination.

But most frequently you will be asked about the American people, what they are like in their homes, how they act, whether they have any interest other than in making and spending money, how Negroes are treated, whether the young people are well-mannered, whether you saw any people who were ill-fed and ill-clothed, etc.

I am by no means certain what your answers will be. Probably no two of you will answer entirely alike. It is quite certain that all of your answers will not be favorable to the American scene. You will have found some aspects of our life which did not please you. Perhaps even some of you may leave the United States with a less favorable impression than you had when you arrived. I hope this will not be true, but some visitors to the United States, in all genuineness, would have thought better of the United States if they had never actually visited our shores and had retained the image which they had gained from fancy rather than fact.

This is a risk that is always run by any exchange of visits. There are a few people not only in the United States but elsewhere, who consider visits to foreign countries a liability rather than an asset on the ground that such visits are likely to create more ill-will and misunderstanding than otherwise.

There is no denying that misunderstandings do arise from foreign visits. This is a calculated risk that has to be taken. But we have found by experience, particularly among those whose desire is to learn, that the best means of creating real understanding and sympathy among human beings is for them to learn to know and to talk to each other. Medicine men discovered long before the psychologists did that people are likely to fear the unknown and that their fears can be played upon by leaders who wish to keep them enslaved.

You, I am confident, are among the group which came here with an intense desire to learn as much as you could about the United States. You are students who have been selected for your outstanding qualifications. I know that you have been penetrating observers of the American scene, and we welcome your visit for that very reason.

I hope you have not felt that you have been shielded from any segments of American life which you may have desired to investigate.

We do not pretend that we are proud of every detail of our society. We make no claim of having achieved a perfect existence. But we have no desire to seclude them from view or to prevent investigation. And we are willing to present ourselves to the world as we are. We are constantly striving to improve our society, and it is this sense of striving and of accomplishment which, above all else, you will take away with you.

The cry of the revolutionist arises when there is no way to achieve improvement except by armed revolt. Any society which becomes static invites resort to forceful measures by its populace. Means for peaceful change, through open public debate without censorship, through honest and free elections, are necessary to enable changes to take place by peaceful means.

Likewise, the strata of society must remain flexible. Where there are no longer incidents in American life in which the office boy becomes president of a great corporation, you should begin to worry about the United States. But as long as immigrant boys such as David Sarnoff and David Dubinsky from Russia and Spyros Skouras from Greece, can arrive in this country without any knowledge of English and rise to the highest position in management and labor, when Bill O'Dwyer can come to this country at the age of 20 and rise to be mayor of this great city, we do not need to be alarmed that our society has become static or that the principles of our American democracy are running out.

I hope you have been able to obtain some understanding of this important fact in American life through your investigations.

A delegate from eastern Europe recently demanded in the Security Council that conditions of labor be investigated inside the United States. He neglected to say that the great free trade-unions in the United States are already constantly alert to prevent any exploitation of labor in the United States. He neglected to mention that there are today more foreign journalists in the United States than in any country in the world, that they are entirely free to travel about the country wherever they wish without police permit or even identity card, that they are free to investigate labor conditions as much as they wish and are doing so every day.

But even more important, they are entirely free to write any articles they wish and to send them out without any censorship or official restriction. Labor and all other conditions in this country are an open book. This is the one circumstance of which we are most proud, and I hope you have become convinced of this fact.

Some of you or your parents may not agree with the free-enterprise or capitalistic economic system which is chiefly employed in the United States for the production of wealth. You may feel that Government ownership of coal or steel mills, of banks or transportation facilities, is preferable in your own economy.

We shall not quarrel with you over that point or even try to convert you. Our system has served us well and has enabled us to support the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of your own countries. But we shall not try to force our economic system on anyone else. We are not concerned with your system of land tenure, or any other economic experiment which you may freely elect to try. We are naturally pleased with what our own system has accomplished, and many Americans are inclined to think that Europe would be less dependent on outside help if it followed our system somewhat more closely.

But if you can find a way, under your various systems of economics, to make a better mouse trap, we shall beat a path to your door.

While your choice of an economic system is your own affair, there is one field in which neither you nor we can afford to engage in any experiments. Every individual citizen must be allowed to think for himself and to express himself freely. Opposition parties must be tolerated and no economic or any other system must be imposed by force. We must be solidly united on these principles and must unite all free peoples in a determination to retain our liberties.

The police state, which breeds aggression, must be outlawed. People must be freed from the fear of invasion in their private lives and nations must be freed from the fear of outside armies. These two goals go hand in hand.

International joint action can rid the world of aggression. But the citizens of a state must be the first line of defense of their own liberties. If through your visit to the United States you have gained a little firmer conviction of the necessity for each individual to insist upon respect for his own personality and to resist the encroachments of a totalitarian system, you will have been amply rewarded for your trouble, and I am certain that the New York Herald Tribune, which made possible this excellent exchange, will feel amply repaid."

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a statement which I made on March 21, 1949, and trust that if it is quoted, it will be quoted in full:

My position regarding labor legislation dealing with the Taft-Hartley law is as follows:

I will vote for a one-package bill which repeals Taft-Hartley and reenacts the Wagner Act with certain amendments.

I am not in favor of the so-called Lesinski-Thomas bill as presented unless certain corrective amendments are adopted. However, if necessary I will vote to report this bill from our committee in order that we may get it before the House for amendment. I do not intend to waste days and perhaps weeks trying to write amendments in the committee, only to have the administration's supporters on the committee vote to table all our efforts and substitute the Lesinski bill in the final analysis. We went through this experience with the wage-and-hour bill, and I see no sense in asking for a similar experience regarding this legislation.

In the final analysis I am convinced that we will be able to write a law which will not only deal fairly with both labor and management, but which will also prove equitable to the general public who after all outnumber many times the combined labor and management personnel.

WALTER E. BREHM.

Monument to Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 4, 1949:

MONUMENT TO HOOVER

Nineteen months ago former President Herbert Hoover undertook what he said would be his last public service, which was the chairmanship of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

The task is now completed and the Commission has virtually disbanded. Eighteen exhaustive reports on conditions prevailing in the Federal establishment and recommendations for improvements have been prepared and will have been turned over to Congress by March 13. Of the 12 members of the Commission, none worked harder and longer on the job than the only living former President of the United States.

If all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were put into effect, it has been estimated there would be an annual saving in Federal expenditures of $3,000,000,000 a year.

But pointing the way to substantial economies is not the greatest service the Commission has performed, although the projected savings are highly important when the Government is draining from the Nation's resources a volume of wealth unprecedented in peacetime in order to support itself.

Even more important is the attempt the Commission has made to show Congress how the Federal Government can be reorganized to serve the people effectively and efficiently without becoming bogged down under mountains of red tape and the inertia of a crushing bureaucracy.

The proposal to undertake this monumental study of the Federal Government was originated in the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, and Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts. But there was no tinge of partisanship in the proposal itself nor in the manner in which it was carried out. The Commission was composed of equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats and it never divided along party lines. Moreover, it had the support of both parties in Congress, and its efforts received the approval and encouragement of President Truman both before and after the election.

Now it devolves upon a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration to begin the appraisal of the Commission's studies and to start carrying out its recommendations. This will not be the task alone of the Eighty-first Congress nor of the present occupant of the White House. Even the most optimistic among observers of the Washington scene estimate it will be 10 years before 60 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations can be put into effect.

There is always strong resistance to proposed changes in the Government. All the influence that pressure groups and an entrenched bureaucracy can bring to bear will be made to retain bureaus and to continue activities which are overlapping or duplicating in nature. Congress, we hope, will examine the recommendations in the same spirit in which they were made, namely, how to improve the Government so that it will function as effectively and as economically as possible and so that it will always be the servant of the people, not their master.

Smear Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column, which appeared in the New York Post of March 25, 1949, exposes again the dangers of organized attempts to mold public opinion:

SMEAR TACTICS

(By Albert Deutsch)

The average citizen who knows his family doctor as a kindly friend and comforter to whom he trustfully turns in sickness and sorrow is quite bewildered when he witnesses his physician's medical society acting up like an implacable enemy of the people.

The discrepancy between the attitudes of the individual doctor, on the one hand, and the American Medical Association and its local affiliates (known corporately as organized medicine), on the other, arises largely from the fact that the average doctor takes no part in the political activities of organized medicine and, often enough, doesn't even know what's going on.

"Organized medicine" likes to be considered synonymous with the "medical profession."

Its local leaders became so sensitized to the phrase "organized medicine" (coined by the societies themselves) that, in an uproariously flighty moment several years ago they had a resolution passed prohibiting the word "organized" ever to be printed in the official society journal side by side with the sacred name of "medicine."

The New York County Medical Society provided a forum recently for one of the most outrageous violations of democracy and decency in the annals of local medicine. Dr. Dr. William B. Rawls, incoming president, seized the occasion of his inaugural address to unleash an unrestrained personal smear on his unsuccessful rival for the presidency, Dr. Ernst P. Boas.

Dr. Rawls cited the discredited Dies-Rankin-Thomas committee reports as basis for a charge that Dr. Boas had been affiliated with eight Communist-front organizations. (Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt is listed with 58 such affiliations in the same reports.)

Dr. Boas, son of the famous anthrolopogist, Franz Boas, and a respected physician of recognized professional attainment in his own right, was given no opportunity to defend himself.

Thereupon, three distinguished New York doctors—all members of the county medical society—sent a letter to the society protesting Dr. Rawls' attack. They demanded, very properly, that their letter be read at the next society meeting and printed in its journal (as had the Rawls speech).

The letter, in spite of its distinguished signatories, was never read at a society meeting. it was not published. When Dr. John A. P. Millet asked for the floor at a stated meeting, in order to read the letter, President Rawls failed to recognize him. The letter was thus effectively suppressed.

In the same presidential address, Dr. Rawls sought to implicate the liberal-minded Physicians Forum, which Dr. Boas heads, in a communistic plot to foist compulsory health insurance on this country.

In the course of this smear, Dr. Rawls quoted with approval from a thoroughly discredited report by ex-Congressman Forest A. Harness of Indiana, charging a mission of experts sent to Japan by the Social Security Board in 1947 had tried to socialize Japanese medicine as part of a fantastic international Red plot.

The allegation was a contemptible falsehood. Gen. Douglas MacArthur on two occasions, in cables to the War Department in Washington, protested against the vilification.

These facts have been brought to the attention of Dr. Rawls. He has not seen fit to retract his repetition of a despicable untruth cloaked in propagandistic gossip.

Rent Control for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 25, 1949:

RENT CONTROL FOR CHICAGO

The version of rent control passed by the Senate places Congress in the position of legislating solely for the city of Chicago. This is done by the subterfuge of recontrolling rents of residential hotels in cities of over 2,500,000. Of the two such cities, New York now controls these rents by local law.

The only justification for this singular distinction was that Chicago has more apartment-hotel dwellers than smaller cities and that the action pleased Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who is being very "regular" with the administration.

The State of Illinois passed legislation permitting cities to impose local rent control. It specifically exempted hotels and apartment hotels. The Senate rent-control bill accepted the local option on decontrol voted by the House. By the clause affecting Chicago alone it clashes with its own decision that local desires should rule.

Actually, the effect of the Chicago provision would be negligible. Apartment hotels were decontrolled in the 1947 Rent Control Act. Most of the rent increases were effective prior to October 31, 1948, the date to which it is now proposed to roll back rents.

The theory behind decontrol of these units was that the maid, laundry, and other services provided in hotels has increased in cost sufficiently to justify rent increases greater than permitted on other types of housing.

Spokesmen for the apartment-hotel owners assert that the over-all average rent increase has been 30 percent. Since most of them now have vacancies, the prospect of further rent increases is slight.

Adding it all up, the only advantages from the Senate bill seem likely to be the thanks of a democratic community for the gesture and the realization that Congress now feels entitled to regulate business in the city of Chicago.

The World We Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Miss Rosemary Bristow, a student at the Forest Hills High School, at the second session of the New York Herald Tribune Forum for High Schools held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Saturday, March 5:

THE WORLD WE WANT

(By Rosemary Bristow, Forest Hills High School)

Ours is a weary world. A world torn limb from limb by almost ceaseless strife since the beginning of time. Too many peoples are homeless. Too many are cold and hungry.

Only three short years ago there was brotherhood among the victorious peoples; there was a firm belief in the United Nations; a steadfast trust in the peace to come.

And today? We need only recall the names of Masaryk and Benes to understand the meaning of failure. Surely this is not the world of which we dreamed. There is suffering in this world. There is the cold war. War in a world at peace. We still find men with a brutal lust for power, willing to use any device to gain and maintain supremacy.

What should be the answer of the peace-loving peoples of the world? Must we place a blind and unreasoning faith in American supremacy in battle through our possession of atomic knowledge? Inevitably, the atomic bomb? No, such is not the world of which we dreamed—a world that has failed to achieve the common beliefs on which one world might be founded. Can we, as a nation, as a world, find the way before it is too late? Peace lies in the mind of the individual. Our first problem is to educate all youth to understanding, sympathy and knowledge of each other. We must be sure there are no potential supermen to build Buchenwalds and practice genocide.

The United Nations has organized an educational, scientific, and cultural body to encourage exchange among nations. But this is only a beginning. We must break down the barriers of fear and prejudice which rise because of ignorance. We must have a complete intellectual understanding with the peoples of other nations; plan for the maintenance of schools in those places where education would otherwise be lacking; arrange a broader system of student and teacher exchange; and distribute intellectual information of all kinds to all nations. And we must start this program with the children. Each nation's future lies in her youth, and that future will be only as sound as they are sound. If we can give these children the understanding of others through common interests and common experiences with their brothers and sisters throughout the world; if we can teach them the principles of international cooperation, they will be prepared as no other generation before them has been prepared; they will be educated for peace. This is the foundation for the world I want. But the foundation is only the beginning, and we must build.

I believe it is America's duty to assist in the rehabilitation of the devastated areas of the earth. It is not enough to win a war. Men have been winning wars for thousands of years, but no nation, great or small, has ever been able to win a democratic peace. Today, we have within our knowledge and our material assets the power to make such a peace. We must be sure that the youth of no nation inherit a blank or barren soil. Only a land secure in itself can be secure from those external forces which would have it crumble and fall.

We can help them to gain the homes and farms and factories to make them economically stable; the schools and hospitals to make them socially secure. We can give them the fruits of our democracy, esthetic as well as material. We can give them life. And what is more, we can give them that which makes life worth while—freedom. Freedom to think, to act, to work, to play. Freedom to live. And in return, we shall have peace.

This world may be a dream, but I am not ashamed of it, for it was the dream of a great President and 300,000 American boys, whose dreams lie buried with them from Bataan to Berlin, and I am not ashamed of the ideals for which they died.

Let us make our battleground a laboratory, a classroom, and a hospital, places where we can work together, where we can win together.

This is the world I want, for it is a world in which I can believe.

Mr. Truman Insults 8,000,000 Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 25, 1949:

MR. TRUMAN INSULTS 8,000,000 VOTERS

In his speech before the United States conference of mayors Mr. Truman managed to insult six or eight million American voters and taxpayers. That is the estimated number of owners of rental property in this country who have been trying to put an end to the legalized robbery called rent control. It was of them that Mr. Truman said:

"They don't want us to build new low rent houses and they don't want us to hold down the rents of the houses that are available. If we had let them have their way, they not only would have pushed the whole cost of living up another 10 to 20 percent but they would have broken up the homes of thousands of low income families. It is a terrible and shocking thing that the real estate lobby—which pretends to speak for those whose business is providing houses—has become the real enemy of the American home."

Into that paragraph Mr. Truman managed to pack most of the falsehoods that the Socialists and Communists have managed to grind out in support of continued rent control.

There has been a property owners lobby in Washington recently, and a most effective one. Its success is measured by congressional rejection of the more extreme injustices of Mr. Truman's rent control program.

This lobby is effective for the very reason that it isn't composed of millionaires buying champagne and caviar for Senators. As described in the weekly, Human Events, the lobby is composed of little people. A lot of them have been showing up on Capitol hill in recent weeks to ask their Representatives when the Government is going to stop picking their pockets.

Most of these lobbyists got to Washington by bus. Many of them wear cracked shoes and trousers with frayed cuffs. Many of them are retired or elderly people, with incomes far less than their tenants. The average investment in rental housing in this country is only $5,000. It has been a favorite form of retirement investment for millions of people, particularly the owners of two flat and three flat buildings, who hoped when they bought that their savings would purchase them a place to live and rents enough to maintain it when they stopped working.

Mr. Truman says that these are the people who are trying to stop the Government from building low-rent houses. Real estate owners aren't against public housing because it charges low rents. They are against it because they have to pay income taxes and local taxes to provide the low rents for tenants, many of whom earn more than the people who are taxed to support them.

Mr. Truman asserts that if rent controls are abolished the cost of living would rise 10 to 20 percent. The average tenant today pays about an eighth of his income as rent. A few years ago he paid a fifth. To raise his cost of living 10 percent, all rents would have to be doubled; to raise it 20 percent, they would have to be almost tripled. An average increase of as much as 50 percent is held unlikely by building and rental experts.

Before rents go that high, investors would be encouraged to provide new rental housing, which, by increasing the supply, would lower all rents. That is, this would come about if investors were assured of two things: (1) that Mr. Truman and his socialistic advisers would be unable to confiscate their property, once it was built, through new rent control laws; and (2) that an extravagant public-housing program wouldn't preempt all the building mechanics and materials, and boost construction costs, which now are beginning to fall.

The end of rent control won't break up any homes, as Mr. Truman asserts. Instead, it will make available more rental units out of the existing supply. Figures gathered at the request of Mr. Truman's own rent controllers prove that controls caused the present shortage. People who used to be content with a single room are now occupying apartments because they can rent them at about 50 cents on the dollar of their true shelter value. And hundreds of thousands of new dwellings are withheld from the rental market because the owners know that once they get a tenant in, they will have difficulty getting him out if they find a buyer for the house.

When rent controls end, the housing shortage will disappear, and not before.

Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article appearing in the New York Times of Saturday, March 26, 1949, entitled "How They Voted":

HOW THEY VOTED

Before this week's long battle in the House of Representatives over the Rankin pension bill is forgotten—and it will not be forgotten

long, for Mr. RANKIN announced yesterday that he is coming right back with a modified version of his original bill—we should like to file for future reference the statistics of the vote by which this matter was at least temporarily disposed of.

The question was whether to send this multi-billion-dollar spending bill back to committee, which would be equivalent to killing it for the present moment, or whether to save it and to keep it before the House for immediate action.

On that question the House Democrats voted:

To kill, 151; to save, 100.

On the same question the House Republicans voted:

To kill, 57; to save, 106.

The House Democrats thus voted about 3 to 2 to close the Treasury doors to this proposed pension raid. The House Republicans voted about 2 to 1 to open the doors of the Treasury. We suggest that the incident provides further evidence that the Republican Party needs to reexamine its campaign pledges in such matters as promising Federal economy, and needs to chart more clearly the policies it intends to pursue in future.

The Only Workable Plan for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the thoughts of all are constantly turning to methods of establishing permanent peace. Many of us believe that one certain way is through world federation. Some think it will come by way of the United Nations, others believe it must be done outside of the United Nations.

The more thought that is stimulated about the problem the more likely are we to arrive at a solution.

The following article will do much to clarify our thinking on the subject. It appeared in the New York Tribune of March 27, 1949. The author, Hon. Owen J. Roberts, is a former Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who has rendered much valuable service upon the international scene.

THE ONLY WORKABLE PLAN FOR PEACE

(By Owen J. Roberts)

The world is afire with nationalism. Less than 4 years after World War II was allegedly won, the victors themselves are recklessly scattering the sparks of national selfishness and aggression. Unless they are smothered at once, these sparks are going to consume us in a fire far greater than the one we thought we had just put out.

Where is the fire department? We hoped we had one in the United Nations. But what kind of a department is it where the firemen sit around and deal themselves another hand of pinochle after the alarm has sounded?

Over at Lake Success the 11 fire chiefs—5 great nations and 6 small ones on the Security Council—after 3 years of palavering, have not bought a single length of hose or hired a solitary hook-and-ladder man. Indeed, every now and then one of them sneaks out and tosses gasoline onto the flames.

We have oversold ourselves on our fire department. The UN can and will keep the peace, we are told, and we want to believe it. A glance at the morning's headlines proves that is not true—a plane shot down in the western air corridor to Berlin, a soldiers' brawl in the Ringstrasse of Vienna, a brush with a submarine patrol in the Bering Sea. Any such incident, variations of which have already happened, could become the critical bonfire.

No fire department with 11—or 58—separate chiefs, each responsible finally to nobody but himself, could ever operate. But that is how we have organized the UN, and we wonder why it does not work.

The thing to do, I am convinced, is not to junk the fire department, but to organize a higher authority and force the chiefs to submit to it. I am for world government, but it is a goal we won't reach tomorrow or the day after. As things now stand, Russia won't cooperate, and many other nations, not only inside but outside the Soviet sphere, are simply not capable of participating yet in any workable world organization.

But this is no reason to abandon the goal. It is time for the democracies, the real democracies, to become politically aggressive. But, you say, we have the European recovery program and are working on a North Atlantic Pact, a fledgling western union is shaping up in Europe and the Communist lost the Italian elections. What more do we need? ERP is not enough. A united states of western Europe is not enough. A military alliance between America and our European friends is not even enough. I propose, now, a working federation of the United States, Scandinavia, the Low Countries, Switzerland, France, Italy, the Philippines, and the British Commonwealth, excluding India. Spain, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, or even the republics of Latin America are not yet eligible.

At first, membership must be limited to those nations—aggregating a population of some 500,000,000—where representative government is already a going concern. Such a federation offers the only real hope of an alternative to a third world war.

The real anarchists in the world today are sovereign nations themselves. They are answerable to no law but their own, or to the force of a stronger foe. All over the world, there exist laws to govern people, towns, counties, provinces. The so-called community of nations is the last important community without a police force.

If we cannot harness all the sovereign states at once, the next best step is to harness those that we can. That means us and our friends. And we cannot sit back and wait for our friends to act. They have already committed themselves, in general, to such a move.

Within the past 2 years, nearly every leading statesman of the British Commonwealth of nations has expressed an eagerness to discuss formation of a parliamentary union of nations. These overtures have stirred favorable responses in western Europe. No such union can work without the United States. Our prestige, our successful operation of democratic processes, our colossal wealth and resources are all vital to make it run. But if our friends begged us to join them, they would run the risk of implying that they loved us only for our worldly goods.

WE MUST ACT FIRST

If some statesman—says Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG—introduced into the Congress tomorrow a resolution asking for a conference of the democracies in Washington to study federation and recommend a constitution, we should be on our way. What we need is a modernized, internationalized version of our Constitutional Convention of 1787.

This new constitutional convention, therefore, would have to do something more fundamental than issue high-sounding statements. Suppose the delegates decided to call the organization the United Nations Federation—UNF. They must provide for an executive, a legislature, and a court. Then, I think the constitution should empower the UNF to formulate and adopt a:

1. Common defense system.
2. Common foreign policy.
3. Common medium of exchange.
4. Common postal and communications system.
5. Control of commerce among member nations.
6. Schedule of taxation for support of UNF functions.
7. Regulation of immigration among member nations.
8. Process of admitting other nations as they qualify for membership.

SO MUCH TO GAIN

Skeptics will charge this is an impossible program. It is not impossible. It will be difficult. Nobody contends that such a step toward world government can be painless. But if it shows real promise of solving a world crisis—and I think it does—then it is worth real sacrifice. Some concrete immediate advantages are apparent.

A common defense means UNF will have one army, navy, and air force under a single command. Admittedly, differences in techniques and military philosophy will be difficult to reconcile, but remember that after great struggle, the western Allies came up with a single command in World War II. Such a common military arm would save participating nations billions of dollars they now spend on separate defense systems.

With a common foreign policy, the federation's members could vastly simplify their diplomatic services. There would be one "master ambassador" where there were a score before. Again the consolidation would reduce expense.

In a common money system, we could get away from this business of dollars blocked against pounds and pounds blocked against dollars. A man in Wellington, New Zealand, could buy an automobile in Detroit, and a druggist in Dubuque could stock up on French perfumes without a lot of the fantastically complicated nonsense which snarl international transactions today. The common currency will be backed and stabilized by the combined resources of all member nations.

The International Postal Union is already tangible proof of how much can be accomplished toward a single postal system.

LOOK IN OUR MIRROR

UNF must have the power to regulate commerce among the constituent nations. Our own experience is the best evidence for this. If the constitution had not given Congress power over interstate commerce, the States would have passed discriminatory laws and tariffs making it impossible, say, to send a crate of oranges from Riverside, Calif., to Dallas, or a bolt of cotton cloth from Birmingham, Ala., to Boston. What has made our Nation great has been a citizen's right to trade freely with a citizen of any other State. The common welfare of all the people in a federation requires the same freedom of exchange.

Watchmakers who say they cannot compete with Swiss watchmakers and woolgrowers who maintain they cannot live without tariffs will shout their opposition. Which do they prefer, international cooperation involving sacrifices, or war? Free trade in the federation won't come overnight, but it must be aimed at from the start. The ultimate goal is to lift the scale of living in all the federated nations.

HOW TO RAISE MONEY

UNF will of course need funds to operate. Largely, the money could come from funds which the separate nations new spend for the same purposes. But, as experience under our articles of confederation proved, UNF must not be dependent on voluntary action of

members for its money. When Washington's army needed shoes and clothes, you remember, some of the States refused to pay their quotas and left his soldiers ragged and barefoot at Valley Forge. The federation must have the power, as the United States does, to raise funds by taxation. Perhaps a tax on all international shipments would suffice for its needs.

No American will ever submit to taxation by a "foreign power," people will say. The UNF would be no "foreign power." We would be citizens of it as much as we are citizens of our own States—and we would save on taxes ultimately by pooling defense systems and other services.

There is a danger that when UNF is organized, vast hordes of suffering Europeans will stampede steamship and airline offices for passage to our land of hope and plenty. It is somewhat contradictory of common citizenship to restrict a citizen's movements within the confines of UNF. However, temporary measures are needed to prevent mass migration which would dislocate local economies. I suggest that for, say, the first 50 years, the constituent nations should retain the power to regulate immigration as they now do. After that, assuming economies have stabilized and living levels generally have risen, the power of regulating all immigration should be handed over to the UNF legislature.

Are we making our club too exclusive by barring pseudo democracies, as well as Russia and her satellites, at the start? I think not. The United States, in my view, cannot, should not, and will not join any union unless its legislature is elected by the free popular vote of the people of the member nations.

Argentina, China, India don't measure up yet. We cannot hitch democracies like France, Britain, and the United States to autocracies or woefully backward lands in a federated legislature and expect it to work.

However, UNF should actively encourage all nations to try to qualify for membership. As fast as their respective internal regimes are remolded to meet the federation's requirements of a representative government where civil liberties are guaranteed, they should be admitted.

OBJECTIONS OVERRULED

There are two objections most frequently heard to our joining a federation of democracies. The first is that we cannot form a union with a Socialist government like England's, and the second, that we should not mix up further in European affairs. Both are utterly without substance.

Imagine for a moment that California should adopt tomorrow a system of State socialism and elect Upton Sinclair, Governor. Could Congress exclude California from the Union? Obviously not. As long as California's elections were free and fair, as long as guaranties in the Bill of Rights were upheld, she could not be barred from the Union, whatever her technical system of government.

As for our further involvement in Europe, we are already in up to our ears. The question now is not to withdraw, but to convert that involvement into a lasting, workable contact and not leave it—as it is now—at the peril of inefficient and expensive strain and emergency. A military alliance to back up ERP is not enough. Experience has taught Europeans that alliances are made to be broken. The strongest support to their hopes is not another treaty but an American membership card in a democratic federation.

People who argue that this thing called sovereignty is something inviolate, sacred, and virginal are still thinking in terms of the Middle Ages when a king's word was law and he changed it every day if he felt like it. Citizens of the world are waking up to the fact that human life is more sovereign than kings or dictators. As somebody else has said, the only right that the people of the nations sacrifice in submitting themselves and their nations to international authority is the right to exterminate each other.

What are the alternatives to UNF? The first is to fumble along with the United Nations and what seems to me the certain prospect of war in the visible future. The second is to try to organize a full-fledged world government immediately. This is a pretty but, under the circumstances, an utterly fantastic dream.

MAKE THEM LISTEN

A plan to federate the democracies now is the only realistic, workable plan. Many people say I criticize the United Nations only to destroy it. I do criticize it, but I by no means advocate its destruction. The members of UNF should retain membership in the United Nations. Through that forum we can still keep our contact with the East. We still keep Russia at least in the posture of discussing and listening.

In the meanwhile, we can confederate ourselves and show there is a better and more efficient way of cooperating. Shall we not then, by natural evolution, alter the United Nations into a world government at last?

What can you and I as individual citizens and voters do about it? In this country what we usually do when we become really concerned over a big issue is to telegraph our Congressman. We demand to know where he stands.

The people must realize that the question of war versus peace is a local issue in which they have a stake and in which they have a say.

Victory for Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial recently taken from the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., entitled "Victory for Oleo":

VICTORY FOR OLEO

Housewives in Michigan won a victory the other day when the legislature of that State repealed a 48-year-old law prohibiting the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine.

In Ohio, nearly 200,000 housewives are driving toward a similar triumph. They have signed a petition asking that a like law in that State be repealed, and the repealer bill has been recommended for passage by a senate committee.

Thus, the outlook for larger margarine sales in two populous northern States, close to or in major dairy regions, brightens.

The Congress which is now in session should regard the news from Michigan and Ohio as serving notice that the removal of all Federal taxes on margarine, and discriminations against it, should be effected this year.

Last session, it will be remembered, the House approved by a margin of 260 to 106 a bill repealing the special taxes and licenses levied on margarine by the Federal Government. But there was a last-minute legislative jam, and the bill did not come up for a vote in the Senate.

The friends of repeal, found in abundance in both parties and both Houses, should press for action before the end of the current session approaches. The butter interests, which have shown their craftiness in keeping these discriminatory levies on the statute books all these years, can be counted upon to prevent repeal, if they can, by any means available to them.

Complete removal of Federal and State discrimination against margarine would mean lower living costs for the American people. It would mean ending a rank injustice inflicted upon a major American industry.

The Want of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., former president of Fordham University, on Saturday, March 5, 1949, before the second session of the New York Herald Tribune forum for high schools at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City:

It is often remarked that a man in Denmark can understand a man in Java more readily than he can a woman in his own household and something similar can be said for men themselves in different age groups. As American boys and girls, it is easy for you to understand the general sense of values that prevails at your age in any part of the world together with the hatreds and loyalties that are based on it. Only an exceptional man however can remember why some things seemed so vital to him 30 years ago. That is the reason why fathers and sons are often so far apart; why one generation underestimates another. The underestimation of course is usually mutual. To the youngsters the elders are hopelessly stupid and to the elders, the youngsters are crazy (and much can be said for both points of view). But old and young should remember that the passage of years has two inevitable effects on mortal man.

It dulls his perception and deepens his understanding. So that in planning for the future you fresh recruits can help us by showing us your visions—visions that for some of us have faded into the light of common day—and we can help you by telling you how veterans interpret them.

Now, in every discussion preliminary to the blueprint of your brave new world, there is always the assumption that your fathers were to blame for getting us involved in World War II and your grandfathers in World War I. In this you are playing favorites. You are sparing the real culprits, your grandfathers' grandfathers and maybe their grandfathers before them. For all this horror which we old orange pulps have lived through twice and which is entirely too familiar to these visiting students sitting on the stage today, did not result even principally from the wilfulness of tyrants or the stupidity of messianic democrats. Our plight is much more the result of the philosophy that made it possible for our supermen to arrive at their fatal decisions. So it is not going to do you or the world any good to talk about freedom from this, that, or the other thing, as long as we are enslaved by this stultifying philosophy.

It is called naturalism—an innocent name for an appalling affliction. Through it we have inherited the intellectual arrogance of

the nineteenth century and with it a spirit of despair. William James was right when he wrote, "Sadness lies at the heart of every natural philosophy." For naturalism teaches that there is nothing supernatural, nothing spiritual, nothing to hope for. It has a kind of catechism all its own for it is in the last analysis a kind of perverted religion. Its first question reads, "Who made man?" and the answer, "Nobody. He just happened." To the second question, "What then is his purpose in life?" there are two answers, one for each side of the iron curtain, but both of them leading to the same sad conclusion. On one side, the eastern side, the answer reads, "Man lives to promote the interests of the state." On the other side, our side, "Man lives to promote his own health, culture, and comfort."

To us it is clear enough without proof and clearer still to the poor wretches who live in the Soviet and its dependencies, that life lived for the state is not worth living. Now it is beginning to dawn on us here in the free part of the world, that the same is true of a life that is lived for our own health, culture, and comfort. For if that is all we have to aim at, few can hope for even a shadow of happiness. For most of the human race, health is precarious, culture is on the wane and comfort has vanished. Even the favored few cannot enjoy all three for long. Besides, how can we expect the happiness of fulfillment when we are living for something that is dead—something that has been dead from its beginning; something that was still-born? I mean the world. Not the world of the good green earth; the world of the fjords, of the Côte d'Or, of the Delectable Duchy and the Rocky Mountains. Not the world of human souls which is the world you are planning for today. I mean the world that Christ refused to pray for; the world which symbolizes self. I mean human society insofar as it ignores God's claims, treats God's creatures as its playthings and makes health, culture, and comfort the rule of life. That world is dead. As Martha said of her brother Lazarus when he had been in the tomb 4 days "Jam foetet." By this time, it stinketh. You may call in the smart young moderns to strew the house with lillies and gardenias but you cannot hide the odor of inner death. The stench of a dead soul has gone all through society; a stench more pungent than the stench of last week's battlefield. It began by poisoning the air which a spiritual people must breathe to live. It ended by conditioning the people through despair for the absolute state.

So as you sit here today in the ballroom of this great hotel planning the world you want, be sure you begin with the want of the world, the world of human souls. What that world wants most of all is hope and the will to live; not merely to endure but to live a full and healthy intellectual and spiritual life, a life that will help it to come finally to grips with the spirit of naturalism, the spirit of despair.

It is easy, of course, to exaggerate in a time of crisis. After all, we are not the first generation to have smelt decadence in the air. If we think we are, it is reassuring to read the Old Testament occasionally and sermons that run back to the time of Saint Augustine. In them we shall find that the prophets and preachers have always liked to begin with the words "There never was a time when * * *" before describing a condition that existed a dozen times before they were born. Fortunately or rather providentially there is always an element in society too young for discouragement. Some of us knew Europe before the First World War. I paid my first visit 42 years ago. The conditions we found were not perfect, of course. They never are. There were social injustices, discrimination, and poverty more in some countries than in others. But to the casual observer, that is, to the average man, there was culture and beauty and charm, and above all there was order, an order largely entrusted to the keeping of an empire which hardly realized that Victoria was dead. There was a tranquillity of order known as peace which had not been disturbed, except locally, since the Congress of Vienna. Here in America the prospect was so comfortable and dull that we who were in college at the time used to lament our fate that we lived too late to see history in the making. With such a background it requires a conscious effort on our part to realize that something can be salvaged from the wreck of civilization. Your generation has a different point of view. You were born into chaos. It is part of the providence of God that you, our sons and daughters who have to pick up the pieces of the modern age, should look on disorder and uncertainty as a normal condition to be faced without surprise or fear.

Your elders perhaps have seen more disaster than you have, but if you can free yourselves from the philosophy that paralyzed their resistance, if you can realize your own absolute and relative value, that is, if you can understand the reason for your dignity as persons, if you can see clearly how you fit into the pattern of creation and why you are here, you will know more about disaster than your grandfathers did, for you will be able to see through disaster. You will be able to hope.

For you there will be no delusion that "All's right with the world" but merely the conviction that "God's in His heaven" which is a very different thing. You will expect the times to be frequently out of joint. You will expect as much regress as progress in the affairs of men. You will be prepared to find that there are some clouds that have no silver lining except what comes to them from the white light of eternity; that there are some roads that have no turning this side of the grave. You will not have the heart to tell every poor man you meet that his ship will surely come in some day, because it probably will not. Most ships never do. And yet you will keep your souls alive and keep society alive with hope. You will look life squarely in the eye and say "Life is bitter." Of course it is, stupid. What did you expect? Life is a warfare. But who ever said that this little round of weeks and months and years, with its monotony, its disillusionments and its heartbreaks, who ever said this was the whole story? Only the fool who hath said in his heart, "There is no God."

When you go to the university, you may run into a Spengler, for some historians can be very gloomy indeed but you will find that history itself is full of hope; full of dawning and of turning tides; full of recurring springtime and of youth. You are the dawn of the world and the turning of the tide. We need you not for what you know but for what you are. You can supply the want of the world. It is the only way you will ever get the world you want.

Readers Called To Fight Against Soft Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 10, 1949:

READERS CALLED TO FIGHT AGAINST SOFT SOCIALISM

Last Thursday, a Miami newspaper headline read: "Truman expected to lash Congress."

Remember, this is 1949; not the election year of 1948 when variations of the same headline appeared almost daily in newspapers from coast to coast.

Can you blame the Republicans for chuckling over the President's dilemma?

Most of his 1948 campaign blasts were directed against the Eightieth Congress, which he termed the "second worst in history." It was a "do-nothing Congress," he said.

Now his own Congress, the Eighty-first, is making the Republican Eightieth Congress look good by comparison. To date, it has not passed a single important piece of legislation favored by the President.

It has balked at his appointments, defied his leadership. All of the pressure groups which supported Truman in return for special privilege are biting their fingernails over his inability to deliver.

So the President, dismayed over the failure of his party leaders to hold even the Democrats in line, is going to lay the lash on Congress.

That will be something to watch.

WHAT'S BEHIND THE OPPOSITION

What is behind the opposition of Congress to the President's program?

In my judgment, two things:

1. Before Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Congress originated all important legislation. In the days of depression and the ever-constant threat of war, Roosevelt was able to draft his own legislative program and get most of it rubber-stamped by spineless hangers-on who owed their seats in Congress to F. D. R.'s vote-getting ability.

Moreover, Roosevelt was a leader of men and a consummate politician.

To defy Roosevelt in the days of his greatest glory was to invite defeat. To our disgrace, only a few men in public life have shown the courage to stand for principle at the risk of losing an election.

On the few occasions when Congress revolted against Roosevelt's dictatorial methods, it later crawled back on its belly to lick the great man's hand.

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, now Vice President of the United States, sickened by Roosevelt's repeated orders to the Congress, once rose in all his glory to challenge the President's authority.

He was cheered to the echo; but in a few days, BARKLEY reverted to type and once again became the servile tool of the White House.

President Truman inspires no man as did President Roosevelt. His former colleagues in the Senate remember him as a better than average legislator. They respect him for his inherent honesty, his political loyalties, and the vote-getting power of his down-to-earth folksy Americanism.

None of them, including President Truman himself, is under the delusion that he is a great statesman. Unlike Roosevelt, when Truman cracks the whip, nobody jumps to his command.

SOCIALISM'S FORERUNNER

2. The second reason why Congress is refusing to roll over and play nice doggie is that a majority of Republicans, and southern and independent Democrats are experiencing sharp qualms over the direction in which the country is headed.

Truman's welfare state, whether he understands it or not, is the forerunner to state socialism. At the moment, it can be described as creeping socialism, a political disease which is insidiously undermining the foundations of our Republic.

It is all very well in the heat of a campaign to emote about civil rights, free medicine, larger pensions, and security for all. But when the cost of this paternalistic legislation is added to veterans' care, a $15,000,000,000 military budget, the Marshall plan, and the staggering figure needed to rearm Europe under the North Atlantic Pact, anyone but a blind, blathering demagog can recognize the danger signals ahead.

Because Truman is not Roosevelt, even the members of his own party are appalled by his insistence upon pushing for early enactment of all his campaign promises.

Because Truman is not Roosevelt, they balk at such a legislative monstrosity as the Spence bill, which would give the President authority to impose a centrally planned economy on the United States.

The Spence bill, about which little has been written, gives to the President emergency powers over the national economy paralleling those of Stalin in Russia.

He may, under this act, issue any "such rules, regulations, and orders he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions."

Among the provisions are powers to control materials, make loans without regard to existing law, construct new plant facilities, acquire property, inspect books and records at his discretion, fix commodity prices and determine that higher wages "may not be considered as an increase in the cost of production for the purpose of adjustment in price ceiling * * * until 6 months after the effective date of the wage increase."

The Spence bill, better known as the Economic Stability Act of 1949, is but a forerunner of things to come if Congress were to follow the President blindly on his program of reform.

LET'S FACE THE ISSUE

It is not my intention to condemn everything for which President Truman stands. Some of his recommendations are sound and should be enacted into law.

But let's face it. This country must ultimately make a choice between an enlightened capitalism which thus far has given us an economy sufficiently strong and virile to meet most of our own requirements and prop up the rest of the world both economically and militarily and a system of soft socialism in which big government will forever regulate our mode of daily living in exchange for the illusion of perpetual security.

Every citizen of the United States must make that choice; every newspaper, every candidate for public office.

For one, I much prefer the competitive system which has made this country great; the system where every man can progress in proportion to his diligence and ability; the system under which individual freedom and liberty have been maintained since the birth of the Republic.

All other systems have failed miserably in their attempts to match our accomplishments. We stand virtually alone in the world today as an exemplar of progress, threatened only by the ruthless totalitarianism of Russia.

Yet, the Mr. Fixits in this country would have us cast all this aside for the imported isms of the Old World, a decadent, crumbling Old World which is existing today only through our charitable, humanitarian impulses.

DEDICATED TO STRONG AMERICA

This newspaper is dedicated to keeping America strong, both from the viewpoint of our own domestic economy and in the armed might which is our best guaranty of peace. We believe in the preservation of individual liberty and freedom of opportunity as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

We shall resist with all of the vigor at our command each and every attempt to shackle the United States with any system of socialism, communism, or totalitarianism.

Ours is a great country which is not fully appreciated by the people who live in it. It can be made an even greater Nation if we have the courage, integrity, and moral resolve to keep it a land of free men, untainted by moral decay and the wet nursing of pandering politicians.

It is up to you, dear reader, to choose the system you prefer.

Will you join us in the fight against selling out the United States to the soft Socialists, today the Nation's greatest menace?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Requisites of a Good Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salamanca (N. Y.) Republican-Press of February 23, 1949:

MR. FARLEY ON REQUISITES OF GOOD POLITICIAN

What makes a good politician? "Big Jim" Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman, has been giving his ideas on that subject to the Civil Service Leader, publication of civil-service workers.

Ten requirements are enumerated by Mr. Farley—some of them obvious, such as personality, native ability, and the faculty of recognizing ability in others, being aggressive without being offensive, being able to sense a situation, ability to make decisions, understanding of the word "compromise"—not compromise of principles, but on occasion accepting less than one had tried to get, then moving forward from there.

Over and above these are certain other requisites to which Mr. Farley attaches great importance. One of these is "character," or being "a substantial human being." "Only a man who can impress his constituents with his character can continue to build up confidence. And he can sometimes do this even when certain other qualities are lacking. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT is an example."

High among the qualities needed for success in politics, Mr. Farley places truthfulness. "The politician who says one thing to one man, and an opposite thing to another, the office-holder whose word cannot be relied on, the political leader who tries to gain h's ends by other than honest means—these types create resentments which fester long and rarely heal."

Ability to secure "team work" is another prime qualification—ability to get other people to work for one and with him. "The best politicians build up corps of aides who will go through hell for them. Governor Dewey's team has stuck with him since he first entered government, and so strong is its loyalty that not even successive defeats have alienated its members from him. Politicians who haven't this particular quality may go a certain distance, but rarely very far."

In giving his ideas as to what makes a good politician, Mr. Farley also gave a definition of politics which he says was written more than 150 years ago by Andrew Oliver in Boston: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do widespread harm—nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul—nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degredations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

Readers Favor Campaign Against Drift to Statism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 26, 1949:

READERS FAVOR CAMPAIGN AGAINST DRIFT TO STATISM

Our editorial of last Saturday which urged readers of the Daily News to take a strong stand against the soft Socialists who are hellbent upon turning America into a handout state, provoked both praise and censure.

Of the many letters received, a goodly majority agreed with our conclusions. Many of them expressed a desire to organize politically against the trend toward statism and have asked us to formulate a plan of action.

To these good readers, we have replied that an editor's job is to stimulate thought; not to lead the great crusade.

We shall leave that field to the ambitious editors and publishers with a big-shot complex who like to see their names on the letterheads of various causes which they have never troubled to investigate.

DISSENTERS REVEAL IDEALISM, PERPLEXITY

The letters written in opposition to our editorial reveal a strange admixture of idealism, frank disbelief in the capitalistic system, and an honest perplexity about things in general.

Mr. Sam Goldfus, 5229 South Woodlawn, Chicago, writes that the editorial on soft socialism should have been titled "Soft Soap."

He objects to the talkfests in Congress which delay legislation favored by the people in the last election and apparently believes that the filibuster is a deep-dyed plot of the Republican Party.

Mr. Goldfus should note that 23 Republicans lined up with 23 Democrats in opposing Vice President BARKLEY's unprecedented ruling that cloture could be invoked.

Sixteen Republicans joined the twenty-five Democrats who upheld BARKLEY's decision, making it evident that party lines were ignored in this particular instance.

Mr. Golfus says also that "civil rights were enacted by the founding fathers of this Republic and were further delineated in the amendments to the Constitution after the Civil War. Fulfillment of these promises, long delayed, is not socialism but sound democracy."

Exactly, but why have they been delayed and why do we need new civil-rights legislation to buttress what has already been so clearly stated in the Constitution?

Why didn't President Roosevelt insist that these constitutional guaranties be given effect when he dominated both Houses of Congress by sweeping majorities?

The facts are that while F. D. R. talked glibly of the humanities, he always ducked the civil-rights question when it come to action.

CITES WARTIME SELF-REGIMENTATION

Paul C. Tris, 834 Clinton, Oak Park, says that "my experience in procurement for two wars is that as a nation we cannot and have not depended upon enlightened capitalism to meet most of our requirements and prop up the rest of the world both economically and militarily.

"We the people, decided in both instances on self-regimentation, and soft socialism is a small reward for our voluntary submission to hard discipline and almost superhuman effort."

To Mr. Tris, we reply that in time of war, Government regulation and procurement are essential. No expense is spared to make the victory more certain. Nor is any account taken of the appalling waste in wartime production.

Still, Mr. Tris must concede that the industrial plants of America, built under the capitalistic system in the hope of profit, were the instruments of power that made victory possible.

No other nation, or combination of nations, could match the quality and production of weapons turned out in our so-called arsenals of democracy.

We cannot believe that Mr. Tris really thinks that we the people had any choice about self-regimentation and voluntary submission to hard discipline.

Uncle Sam made the rules and we obeyed them in an all-out war effort.

But, who, Mr. Tris, wants to live that way forever? We fought two world wars to defend democracy, not to lose it by following the pattern of Old World socialism in the United States.

FLAWS IN CAPITALISM DISQUIETING TO SOME

Another reader who prefers to be known as "Mrs. D. Q.," of Ashland, Ohio, refers to the many flaws in the capitalistic system such as the fear of unemployment, failure to give adequate recognition to the man who works with his hands, and the economic cycles of boom and bust.

Capitalism is far from perfect, "Mrs. D. Q.," but it has never had a more enlightened outlook in America than it has today.

One has only to compare hours and working conditions, wages, the growth of pension and profit-sharing arrangements with those of a few years ago to realize that tremendous strides have been taken. The point is that American capitalism, with its admitted imperfections, has given us much higher standards of living than are possible anywhere else in the world.

More Americans should visit Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other countries of western Europe to see for themselves. This is particularly true of those who are flirting with the idea that perhaps socialism is the answer to all our ills.

Have you ever asked yourself, "Mrs. D. Q.," why most Europeans who work with their hands are so anxious to live in the United States?

There must be a reason.

TWO SYSTEMS ALREADY INSEPARABLY MIXED

Other readers want to know if there isn't some other choice lying between "creeping socialism" and the type of capitalism that dominates America today.

Charles P. Taft, brother of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and a challenging thinker in his own right, believes there is.

My answer would be that the two systems are already irretrievably interlocked. In a mild way, municipal operation of sewers, schools, water supply, housing, and public utilities can be termed "socialistic."

Experience has shown that the public welfare is frequently best served when these agencies are a part of local government.

Nor is free enterprise the rugged, dominant, self-serving force that it was at the turn of the century.

What so many people forget is that private business in this country is now regulated by hundreds of Government agencies, many of which have overlapping functions.

Very often, it is difficult to define where capitalism ends and socialism begins.

Yet, as Fred E. Ayer, former dean of engineering at the University of Akron, says, the implication that we cannot have any Government regulation without going the whole way to complete state socialism is not true.

The danger lies in accepting the philosophy that because schools and sewers are municipally operated, the National Government should be able to run United States Steel or General Motors.

Actually further dilution of the capitalistic system simply means that we will be exchanging the opportunities and high standards of living which it provides for the drab mediocrity and security of the hand-out state.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Farmers Home Administration Should Be Given Ample Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, of all the agencies of our Government, in my judgment the one that has contributed more toward the stability and economy of our country as far as my district is concerned is the Farmers Home Administration. There are in northern Wisconsin thousands of farmers who are operating their farms only because of the intelligent supervision, encouragement, and financial assistance by the Farmers Home Administration.

The only difficulty that I have found in the administration of this agency is their lack of funds. If the Farmers Home Administration were given ample funds, in my judgment they could contribute more than any other agency of our Government to the general welfare and security and production of American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a résumé of the amounts of money allocated and the amounts of money needed in just three Midwestern States, namely, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. It is seen from this report that the Farmers Home Administration has a back-log of 4,806 applications and needs $8,458,000 to do the job right.

I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will view the good work of this agency and up the appropriation to $100,000,000 instead of the proposed $75,000,000.

Following is the report of money needed in just three States and I am sure that the other parts of the country are faced with a situation very similar:

WISCONSIN REPORT

In submitting a report on operating-loan activities in Wisconsin Congressional Districts 7, 8, 9, and 10, T. C. Schmidt, State director, said:

Even though they are good hard-working, substantial citizens, many operators of family-type farms in northern Wisconsin cannot meet the collateral requirements needed to get credit through the regular channels. They are dependent on the Farmers Home Administration for financial aid and assistance.

We recognize our responsibility and a large percentage of our limited operating-loan funds have been made available to families in the northern part of the State. Even though funds for initial operating loans were exhausted before the first of the year, we did make 900 loans in the four congressional districts serving northern Wisconsin. These loans involved $1,245,365. Wisconsin's total allocation of operating-loan funds was only $1,850,000. More than half of the operating loans in the four districts have gone to veterans.

Unfortunately, in the north and cut-over area of Wisconsin and other Lake States, farming operations, due to weather, do not get started until late in the spring. Most of the operating-loan applications are received at that time, but for several years past no funds were available when the farm work started and the demand for assistance was heaviest. It will be the same this spring. The supervisors in these congressional districts are familiar with the situation that exists each year and their estimates, based on past experience, indicate that approximately $2,900,000 additional funds would be needed if all requests were met.

The $500,000 of corporation funds recently received for Wisconsin is not reflected in the reports submitted. Probably 400 additional loans can be made in the State, but all of these corporation funds are earmarked for veterans.

We are entirely in sympathy with the policy of giving preference to veterans; however, we are being severely criticized in the northern part of the State, especially in the drought section, because funds were not available for nonveterans. Farm families and others who were not eligible for military service feel strongly that Federal funds should be made available to them, too. The additional $60,000 received March 1 for the drought section will be helpful to some of those most seriously hurt by the drought. We will make it go as far as possible.

I have endeavored to review the situation in the area as I see it now. No thought has been given to possible unemployment in the ore mines, woods, and paper mills. You covered much of the north country last summer and recognize that it is the problem area of Wisconsin.

The demand in the lake area is created both from these special problems and problems that affect small farmers everywhere. Throughout the State many young families need credit and supervision to get established on farms. Other farmers need to make adjustments in their farming operations. Still others find their working capital cut, as net farm income decreases. They simply lack the collateral to get credit elsewhere. For many of them, the only source of credit is through the Farmers Home Administration.

Production and subsistence loans made and estimated demand for balance of this fiscal year, Congressional District 10, Wisconsin

County	Loans made July 1, 1948, to Feb. 1, 1949				Estimated need Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949	
	Total		Veterans			
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Ashland, Iron, Bayfield, and Douglas	39	$75,900	17	$40,940	50	$95,500
Burnett, Washburn	54	59,750	24	26,200	85	125,000
Lincoln, Oneida	39	39,455	13	18,205	35	72,500
Price, Vilas	82	33,865	36	19,825	55	35,000
Taylor	68	64,525	23	30,210	55	85,000
Rusk	47	50,000	24	29,640	95	90,450
Sawyer	47	47,250	20	22,480	54	39,600
Polk	36	42,160	19	20,215	70	100,000
Total	412	412,905	176	207,535	499	643,050

Wisconsin's allocation of the $75,000,000 appropriated for operating loans this fiscal year was $1,800,000.

Additional allotment February 4, 1948, from corporation funds for veterans only, $500,000.

Additional allocation March 1, 1948, for drought loans in affected areas of State, $60,000.

In district 10, over 50 percent of all operating loans made and funds expended went to veterans.

County supervisors' estimate of funds needed, in the respective congressional districts, to meet the demand up to June 30, 1949:

District 7, $553,830.
District 8, $348,000.
District 9, $1,331,400.
District 10, $643,050.
Total, $2,876,280.

MINNESOTA REPORTS

Economic conditions have changed rapidly in the three congressional districts of northern Minnesota in the last 60 days, according to State Director Leo Brown. Many of the farmers are small operators. The high-price era did not benefit these families as it did farm operators in some of the other parts of the State. Few have accumulated savings as a cushion for emergencies. Any drop in prices immediately affects the purchasing power of the farmers in the area. As a rule, they operate on a small margin.

State Director Brown reports:

Much of the area in these three congressional districts is in the cut-over section of the State. Pulpwood is an important factor in the income of many farm families. Recently the big paper mills stopped buying pulp. They have tremendous stock piles. In addition, they have acquired tracts of lands from which they will cut their own pulp. Many small farmers in the area have bank loans. Some banks are calling these loans. The reduction in this income from pulpwood makes it difficult to meet these payments. In some instances it has been necessary to sell income-producing property to meet the obligation. The tightening of bank credit is reflected in the demand on our county offices for assistance.

Bankers no longer seem interested in making GI loans. This means but one thing—veterans wishing to establish their families on farms have no source of credit other than the Farmers Home Administration. It is reasonable to expect that veterans will make even a heavier demand on our operating-loan funds in the future.

Some small-farm operators have supplemented their farm income by working in the ore mines, docks, etc., in northern Minnesota. Many have been laid off. Now they must have more livestock and equipment to operate their farms to offset the reduction in off-the-farm income. This creates a further demand on our agency.

In some of the northern counties there was a very noticeable exodus of farm families during the war. They were tempted by high wages, left the farms, and went to the Pacific coast to work in industry. Now they are returning to their farms. Their savings are gone and they, too, are making demands upon our county offices. They must have credit to get reestablished on their farms. The only source of credit available to them is the Farmers Home Administration.

Another factor that must be considered is the effect of the drought in some of the counties of the area. It is now being seriously felt. Farmers are required to buy feed and this in turn affects some bank loans. Money that would have been available to meet pressing obligations now must be used to buy needed feeds.

It appears then that in an addition to the usual demand for operating loans, which we have been unable to fill the past few years due to insufficient funds, there will be a very substantial increase for reasons given above. Not only will this situation prevail in northern Minnesota but also in other sections of the State. Lack of available credit, restrictions, and liquidations of bank loans places further emphasis on the need for sufficient operating-loan funds.

Production and subsistence loan activities in the three northern Minnesota congressional districts:

Loans made this fiscal year from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948

Congressional district	Number	Amount
6. Mr. MARSHALL	230	$463,290
8. Mr. BLATNIK	87	124,815
9. Mr. HAGEN	152	285,765
Total	469	873,870

Estimated applications and operating-loan funds needed between Jan. 1 and June 30, 1949

Congressional district	Number	Amount
6. Mr. MARSHALL	480	$960,000
8. Mr. BLATNIK	256	384,000
9. Mr. HAGEN	423	930,600
Total	1,159	2,274,600

Minnesota's allotment out of the $75,000,000 appropriated for production and subsistence loans, $2,050,000.

November 10, 1948, additional allotment for operating loans—veteran preference, $140,000.

July 1, 1948, allotment from corporation funds restricted for corporation borrowers, $120,000.

February 4, 1949, allotment from corporation funds, earmarked for veterans, $500,000.

Funds for all initial operating loans were exhausted early in November 1948. Limited funds have been made available since but none for initial loans to nonveterans.

MICHIGAN REPORT

The following shows the number of operating loans made and the amounts advanced by the Farmers Home Administration in Congressional District 9 since July 1, 1948, and through February 28, 1949. The report also gives the supervisor's estimate of the potential need up to June 30, 1949.

In submitting his report, Mr. Carr, the State director, says:

December 1, 1948, I asked the county supervisors to submit a report indicating the number of operating loans that could be made and the funds needed, up to June 30, 1949, if money was available. The estimates attached are based on those reports, after deducting the loans that have been made in the respective counties since that time. We believe these estimates are reasonably accurate. Banks and other lending agencies advise that they have had, in the past few months, an unusual demand for agricultural loans from farmers who do not have sufficient collateral to offer. Inquiries, they say, come from good, hard-working, honest people who are worthy of the type of assistance we are able to give them. We are also noticing an increased demand from farm boys returning from industry. We anticipate that the veteran demand will continue to run about 50 percent.

We recognize the need for our services in the northern part of the State. About 50 percent of all the operating-loan funds allocated to the State have been used in the four northern congressional districts. However, the fact is that for several years, in all parts of the State, we have not had enough funds to fill the eligible applications, and each year this backlog of applications has increased. As a result we had enough approved and qualified applications on hand July 1, 1948, to have used in 30 days all of the operating funds allocated to Michigan.

This continuing and growing demand for operating loans is due to several reasons, including:

1. Veterans and other young farmers need operating-loan assistance to become soundly established on farms.

2. Adjustment credit adapted to the needs of many farmers and veterans is not available from other sources.

3. The demand for operating credit has increased because of the rising operating costs and the lower net farm incomes.

4. The fact that small farmers have not profited greatly from the relative farm prosperity of recent years.

5. Operators of family-type farms must increase the efficiency of their operations if they are to be established on a sound economic basis.

Production and subsistence loans made and estimated demand for balance of this fiscal year, Congressional District 12, Michigan

County	Loans made, July 1, 1948, to Feb. 28, 1949				Estimated need	
	Total		Veteran			
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Baraga	4	$8,500	4	$8,500	39	$77,500
Dickinson	14	18,725	6	7,375	38	63,300
Gogebic	1	1,020			18	21,700
Houghton	17	27,280	1	3,000	78	166,700
Iron	5	10,435	1	1,600	20	21,000
Keweenaw					13	26,000
Marquette	21	27,650	2	3,000	32	74,000
Ontonagon	12	16,105	3	3,000	20	23,300
Total	74	109,715	17	26,475	258	472,500

Michigan's allocation of the $75,000,000 appropriated for operating loans this

fiscal year was made February 4, 1948, $1,800,000.

Additional allocation from corporation funds for veterans only, $150,000.

Appropriated funds for initial loans to qualified applicants were exhausted prior to January 1, 1949.

In District 12, 24.1 percent of available funds, has been loaned to veterans.

County supervisors estimate of funds needed to meet the demand up to June 30, 1949:

District 9: $735,750.
District 10: $987,510.
District 11: $1,111,370.
District 12: $472,500.
Total: $3,307,130.

Summary of the production and subsistence loans that have been made, this fiscal year, in the northern part of the Lake States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan—and an estimate of the need and the number of loans that could be made, if funds were available, the remainder of the fiscal year:

	Made		Need	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Minnesota	469	$873,870	1,159	$2,274,600
Wisconsin	900	1,245,365	1,710	2,876,280
Michigan	637	898,280	1,937	3,307,130
Total	2,006	3,017,515	4,806	8,458,010

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my vote in favor of having H. R. 2681 sent back to the Veterans' Affairs Committee was not an indication that I am opposed to a pension program for veterans of World War I and World War II. Actually, I am most eager to see legislation enacted in this session of Congress which will be beneficial to all exservicemen, particularly in their later years. However, after 3 days of making amendments and amending amendments to the proposed veterans' pension bill, H. R. 2681 was riddled beyond recognition so that it was difficult to determine just what the bill would do.

The fact that this bill is going back to the Veterans' Affairs Committee does not kill the prospects of a pension program for veterans. In reality, this action provides an opportunity for a better, less controversial bill which will be more equitable and acceptable to everyone. To further emphasize that sending H. R. 2681 back to the committee is not an indication of disinterest in the future welfare of veterans, I would like to point out that the motion to recommit was made by a decorated Purple Heart veteran of World War II and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee—Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat of Texas. As H. R. 2681 stood at the time the motion was presented for recommittal, millions of the 4,000,000 World War I and 14,000,000 World War II servicemen would be excluded from its benefits. If this bill had remained on the floor of the House for further emasculation, there was the threat of its being amended to the point where it would have been even less beneficial to those for whom it was originally intended.

The following letter is typical of the many thousands of communications I have received from my constituents and veterans and their families throughout the country in grateful acknowledgment of my vote in favor of having H. R. 2681 recommitted to the Veterans Affairs Committee:

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I have just written your colleague, Mr. GRANAHAN, to tell him how proud I am that you and he turned the tide against the infamous Rankin bill. You should be receiving a flood of congratulatory letters from constituents and from Americans at large. You have demonstrated in a notable fashion that some Members of the House have the grit to stand up and be counted in support of what is for the welfare of this country, even when such action is supposed pretty generally to be unpopular and to endanger your prospects in the next election. Personally, I feel that you do not stand to lose by what you have done, though I have no doubt that you did not weigh the chances of personal advantage or disadvantage before casting your vote.

No one would wish to defraud the veteran of such help as he may require, no matter what the cost, but the Rankin bill plainly threatened the welfare of our country, and you showed high patriotism, as well as intelligence, in causing its defeat. The veterans themselves are the ones who would be called upon to shoulder the heaviest load of taxation to support any such raid upon the Treasury. I hope, too, that they realize that their war service was not merely a duty but also a privilege, that they were defending their own welfare and that of their loved ones. I feel sure that spirit moved my two sons to volunteer in the first months after Pearl Harbor. One saw active duty in the Navy, both in the North Atlantic and later in the Pacific; the other was in the Fifteenth Air Corps, and finally was shot down in flames over north Italy while returning from a mission over Germany. Many months in his base hospital, I am glad to say, brought about a complete recovery, but his hands still bear the scars.

Please accept the grateful appreciation of my wife and our two boys for what you have done.

Sincerely yours,

H. LAMAR CROSBY,
4312 Osage Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Address of Hon. Albert Rains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by my colleague, the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, to the United States conference of mayors in Washington, D. C., on March 23, 1949, and also to include a resolution which was unanimously adopted with respect to this address by the conference of mayors in convention:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the United States conference of mayors, I am deeply pleased to have the opportunity of a brief part on this very outstanding program of the conference of mayors.

Here on the platform this morning, I feel quite at home with my long-time friend and neighbor, the Honorable Cooper Green, mayor of the great city of Birmingham, and my former colleague, and good friend, Mayor Tommy D'Alesandro, of Baltimore.

It seems to me altogether fitting and proper that the conference of mayors should hold its meeting this year in the city of Washington. Perhaps never before have there been problems under consideration on Capitol Hill, in both Houses of the Congress, more vital to the interest and well-being of the cities of America. In the whole category of legislation before the Congress, there is, in my judgment, no issue of more paramount concern to you, as the mayors of the cities of America, than the proposed Federal aid for the school facilities construction program. As you know, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which would provide for Federal assistance to meet this great need. Similar legislation has also been introduced in the Senate.

The urgent need for Federal assistance for constructing school-plant facilities arises from the large backlog caused by deferred school-plant construction during the depression and war periods and the greatly increased birth rate during and since the war. The United States Department of Commerce reports that, from 1925 to 1929, which was a normal period of construction following the First World War, $1,900,000,000 was spent for school-plant facilities, or an average of $380,000,000 a year. During the 12-year period 1930 to 1941, the financial condition of State and local governments and the economy of the country generally, prevented the construction of sufficient school-plant facilities for the normal needs of the population. During that period a total of $3,000,000 was spent for construction of new public-school facilities; or an average of $250,000,000 a year and a substantial volume of the construction of new public-school facilities; or an average of $250,000,000 a year and a substantial volume of the construction during this period was stimulated by the Federal works and work-relief program. Approximately $1,000,000,000 of Federal funds was spent during the depression period for construction and repair of educational facilities on the work-relief program.

During the 5-year period from 1942 to 1946, when all available manpower and material was directed toward production for prosecution of the war, the Government restricted sharply the amount and type of construction that could be undertaken. Construction of public-school plant facilities was authorized only when such facilities were an aid in prosecution of the war. During this 5-year period, $379,000,000, or an average of less than $76,000,000 per year was spent for new construction of public educational plant facilities. This was approximately one-fifth of the yearly average for the normal period from 1925 through 1929. As a result of these conditions there has been built up since 1930 a backlog of need for new school-plant construction that State and local governments are not meeting.

Before the war the annual birth rate in the United States varied from 2,200,000 to 2,500,000. During and since the war it rose to 3,500,000 a year and last year it reached almost 3,900,000. This means that each year for the next decade at least, elementary- and secondary-school enrollment will increase. In 1947 there were roughly 24,550,000 children enrolled in elementary and secondary grades. It is estimated by the United States Census

Bureau that that number will increase by almost half a million in 1948. It is expected to increase from three-fourths of a million to one and a quarter million each year for the next 5 years. By 1954 enrollment is expected to be over 31,000,000, or 6,500,000 more than the current year, and in 1958, or in 10 years, it is estimated that there will be over 34,000,000 children enrolled in the elementary and secondary schools. This is an increase in 10 years of 38.9 percent, or roughly 9,500,000 more children than attended schools in 1947.

The increased birth rate is general throughout the Nation. But the problem is more severe for some States than others and for some communities in some States because of extensive migration. Communities all over the Nation are not only faced with the urgent need for modernizing existing schools, completing the repair and renovating of school buildings neglected during the war years and constructing new schools deferred during the depression and war period, but also they have the tremendous problem of building new schools for the extra millions of children born during and since the war.

Complete information is not available showing the extent of the need in each State or in the Nation, but considerable data has recently been reported in various places giving some information on the over-all needs. Educational authorities in Maryland recently reported a need for a $139,000,000 5-year school-building program, in addition to the present authorized school-construction program of over $50,000,000. Virginia localities recently reported to the State department of education that they needed $396,000,000 for school buildings in the next 10 years. The Ohio Education Association recently reported the need in that State for $264,000,000 for 7,000 classrooms in the next 2 years. The Commission on Education in New York State reports a need for more than $1,000,000,000 for school buildings in the next 5 or 6 years. The State of Oregon reports a need for a $120,000,000 program over a 10-year period to meet emergency problems. Pennsylvania reports a need of over $300,000,000; Michigan for over $400,000,000; and the State of Washington for over $500,000,000 for a 10-year period. Similar estimates are available for some other States and still others are making studies at the present time to determine the extent of need. Members of the staff of the United States Office of Education recently estimated that a total of $6,600,000,000 is needed during the next 6 years for new construction, repair, and modernization for public elementary and secondary school-plant facilities.

In our home State of Alabama, Mr. Chairman, there is a current need of $178,000,000 for school-plant facilities. The need for this sum is immediate and urgent.

The need for additional school-plant facilities is immediate and will extend over a period of years. With school buildings already crowded to capacity in many communities in the Nation, and with an increase of over 750,000 children expected each year until 1953, a start must be made at once if facilities are to be available in time for this increased enrollment. The State and local governments are exerting every effort to meet this problem with their own resources. They have increased property assessments, many are bonded to the legal limit and many others are seeking legislative changes that would authorize additional bonding power. In addition, more of the States are providing State funds to assist local districts to construct school facilities, but even these efforts will fall far short of meeting the need. There is not sufficient taxable wealth in many of the communities and States to finance this needed construction, and unless Federal assistance is made available, thousands of American children will be deprived of minimum educational opportunities. In view of the fact that this urgent need is the result of the economic condition of the country during the depression period, Government restrictions on construction activities during the war period, and the increased birth rate during and since the war, it is believed that Federal assistance is essential to help meet this problem.

Do you realize, Mr. Chairman, that out of each dollar of taxes paid by the taxpayer in this Nation, the municipality is allowed to retain only 11 cents, to meet all the myriad demands for services from the people who live in the cities. Out of this meager revenue, the city is required to furnish police and fire protection, sanitary services, streets and schools, and countless other services.

We have arrived at the point where either the Federal Government should withdraw sufficiently from some of the fields of taxation so that the States and cities may meet the demands for schools and other services which their people require, or the Federal Government should return to the cities and the States a sufficient portion of the taxes collected to meet these demands. I would prefer, as would you, for all of these services to be financed and paid for by the States and the municipalities. I think it is time that the Federal Government cease to monopolize completely the fields of taxation, to the almost total exclusion of reasonable tax incomes for States and municipalities. Until such action is taken by the Federal Government, the municipalities of the Nation have a right to expect and demand help from the Federal Government to meet the emergency needs of our people.

RESOLUTION

Resolved by the 1949 Annual Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors, That—

(1) Since the lack of adequate school buildings is severely hampering the education of our children; and

(2) Since the so-called Federal aid to education program neglects the very important matter of school facilities, this conference petitions the Congress to enact legislation providing for direct low-interest-bearing loans and grants to public agencies for school construction—without any intermediary State agencies involved.

Life's Work Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial tribute from the Daily Oklahoman on a great Oklahoma statesman, the late Thomas P. Gore:

LIFE'S WORK WELL DONE

When a Mississippi Legislature instructed that State's congressional delegation to vote for free silver, Senator Lamar refused to be bound by legislative orders. It was his conviction that a Senator should represent his people's interests regardless of the people's wishes. He believed that it was the people's duty to elect a Senator who was qualified to serve their interests and that having elected such a man they should leave it to his superior judgment to decide what course he should pursue.

Because of that deep conviction Lamar fought free silver and voted against it and then submitted his cause to the voters of Mississippi. In the campaign that followed the only issue was the right of instruction. And having heard Lamar's explanation of his principle of independence the people reelected him overwhelmingly.

The story of Lamar's battle for senatorial independence is of present interest to the people of Oklahoma, for Lamar's conduct had much to do with molding the political character of Thomas Pryor Gore. When Lamar was campaigning Mississippi on his issue of senatorial independence Gore was a very young boy in Webster County. He heard and remembered the arguments that were rife in his State in the days of his childhood. Later on he accepted Lamar as one of his heroes. It became his boyish ambition to become the equal of Lamar both as an orator and as a statesman. And he accepted fully Lamar's theory that a qualified and competent Senator should follow his moral conviction and serve his people's true interest regardless of the political consequences to himself.

Twice in his political career Gore's loyalty to conscience cost him his seat in the Senate, and finally it cost him his political life. He opposed policies that for the time being were extremely popular in Oklahoma and he supported policies that a majority of the people disapproved. He refused to temporize and he stubbornly refused to compromise. By trimming his sails to the changing winds of popular sentiment he might have been able to retain his Senate seat unto the end. But he "refused to crook the hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning," and largely because of that refusal, he died a martyr to his moral conviction of official obligation.

Senator Gore will be remembered for his uncanny memory, for his wealth of information, for his remarkable eloquence, for his unfailing wit, and for his power in debate. He will be remembered also for his inspiring conquest of a pronounced physical infirmity. He refused to be crushed by a handicap that would have kept a less resolute soul in life-long obscurity. He never tried to use his blindness as a political asset and he was never known to plead his blindness as any kind of excuse or alibi. The story of his long struggle upward from obscurity to eminence should be an inspiration to the aspiring youth of his country.

In one respect the early years of statehood were glorious years for Oklahoma. For at the every beginning Oklahoma chose as her Senators two men who proved to be the equals of any of the rest. During the years that followed, Oklahomans could always look with pride toward their two Senators. They knew that they had honored themselves by sending Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen to represent them in the world's greatest deliberative body. Now both of those Senators are gone. And of all the 92 men who served in the Senate in 1907, Senator Gore was the last to die. In the realm of the departed, the Senate roll of 1907 is at last unbroken, for on Wednesday morning's roll call Gore, of Oklahoma, answered "Here."

Veterans' Hospital Facilities in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

FOUR HUNDRED AWAIT BEDS AT VA HOSPITALS—ESTIMATE IS MADE BY OFFICIALS OF THREE INSTITUTIONS IN KENTUCKY

Almost 400 veterans are waiting hospitalization in Kentucky because of lack of Veterans' Administration hospital beds.

This estimate was made by VA officials at Louisville, Lexington, and Outwood after a report made by the Disabled American Veterans in Chicago. The report said 250 DAV's were awaiting hospitalization in the State.

Quintus Camp, acting national director for claims of DAV, said the Kentucky cases included 100 general, medical, and surgical cases, 60 tuberculosis cases, and 90 neuropsychiatric cases, the Associated Press reported.

At Nichols Hospitals here, VA officials said the hospital is operating 1,000-bed capacity with a waiting list of 300.

Dr. J. B. McHugh, acting manager at Outwood, said the institution there is filled to capacity and has a waiting list of 80.

NURSE LACK CLOSES WARDS

He said 318 patients are under treatment, and "We're crowded all the time." The hospital treats tuberculosis cases exclusively.

The hospital attempts to take service-connected cases before accepting patients with non-service-connected cases of tuberculosis. All those on the waiting list are in the latter classification, he said.

Two wards of the hospital were closed last summer, however, for lack of adequately trained nurses, Dr. McHugh said. He estimated the two closed wards could accommodate an additional 60 patients.

At Lexington Dr. Frederick M. Cook, manager, said only about 8 or 10 applicants for admission are on the present waiting list.

GOOD SHAPE IN LEXINGTON

"Fortunately we are in good shape in Lexington," he said. "We have had plenty of beds until recently, until we started accepting patients from distant points, such as Ohio and Michigan. We are practically full now. All beds are taken except some reserved for emergency cases."

He explained that the Lexington Hospital, with a 1,230-bed capacity, is supposed to take only neuropsychiatric cases, but that general medical cases are taken on an emergency basis.

TWO HUNDRED OF 272 BEDS FULL

The Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., is not set up to handle medical, tuberculosis, or neuropsychiatric cases and apparently was not considered by the DAV in preparing its report.

The Fort Thomas hospital is primarily a medical rehabilitation center. It has 34 beds for medical treatment, and they are full. It has 272 beds for medical rehabilitation, and 200 of them are full, W. G. Stevens, the hospital's manager said.

Cumberland University, Famed Tennessee Law School and Historic Christian Educational Institution, Enters Second Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Cumberland University, located at Lebanon, Wilson County, within the Fifth District of Tennessee, recently rounded out its first hundred years of service as a great southern educational institution.

On the occasion of this great and famed old university entering upon its second century of progress, I desire to commend the record of service and achievement of this historic school in Tennessee and to include excerpts of other comments and congratulations. A rich tradition of accomplishment has characterized the long existence of Cumberland University both as an academic and literary institution and as a school of law.

The tributes and felicitations to Cumberland University have been many and deserved. Some of the tributes have taken a material form and constitute an expression of confidence in the future of the institution. Other tributes have been in words of appreciation for the great work and great contributions of this Tennessee institution. These expressions emphasize the role of importance in southern education that has ever been the part of Cumberland University.

In this body, Mr. Speaker, where so many sons of Cumberland have served with distinction, I should like to add my own tribute to a great university as it enters another era of progress.

Cumberland has produced many outstanding leaders for our country. From its halls have passed young men and women who have taken their places in the fields of Christian education, the legal profession, and other phases of public service, and in that highest calling—good citizenship.

Cumberland University counts among its distinguished alumni, a Secretary of State; 2 Justices of the United States Supreme Court; 16 United States Senators, one, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the Honorable BERT H. MILLER, being now a Member of the United States Senate.

I am pleased also to note, Mr. Speaker, that more than a hundred Members of the House of Representatives of the United States have been educated at Cumberland University. Of that number, 12 may be counted today as Members of this body.

These distinguished alumni include our colleagues the Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi Fourth District; Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico, at large; Hon. OREN HARRIS, Arkansas Seventh District; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas First District; Hon. OMAR BURLESON, Texas Seventeenth District; Hon. FRANK L. CHELF, Kentucky Fourth District; Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri Second District; Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, New York Forty-third District; and five members of the delegation from the State of Tennessee, including the dean of the Tennessee delegation and national president of Cumberland University Alumni Association, Hon. JERE COOPER, Ninth District; also Representatives ALBERT GORE, of the Fourth; PAT SUTTON, of the Seventh; and TOM MURRAY, of the Eighth District of Tennessee. As the Representative of the Fifth District, in which Cumberland University is situated at Lebanon, it was also my own great privilege to have attended this great school in Tennessee.

The continuing progress in education at Cumberland University has been noteworthy in every respect and its citations for advancement and continuing excellence have been numerous. It was of interest to the alumni as well as the countless friends of Cumberland when the American Bar Association added its own accolade of deserved praise with official scholastic recognition of the excellent attainments of Cumberland's School of Law. This recognition was richly merited.

As a tribute to this institution, I should like to quote briefly from G. Frank Burns, writing in the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat:

> The real gift of the Cumberland University School of Law, looking back over the century * * * is not its graduates who have won fame and renown but rather the spirit of faith in the lasting tenets of democracy, passed on, like an unfailing torch * * * to five generations of young men and women.

The worth of this fine old school lies in its achievement of fine men and women, humble and great. Its external growth from a one-room institution of learning a century ago to its present plant of fine buildings is but the material evidence of its surging and progressive spirit.

Recently, the president of Cumberland University, Dr. Edwin S. Preston, visited Washington and called upon President Truman and invited him to visit Cumberland University in Tennessee. There was also a meeting of Cumberland University alumni in the Washington area on the occasion of Dr. Preston's visit in the Capital at which some 70 alumni of the university gathered to hear an address by Dr. Preston and a report on plans for the second century program at Cumberland University.

In this connection I desire to include in the RECORD a portion of a transcription which was presented at this meeting and entitled "The Romance of Cumberland University"—a great and inspiring story written by Col. Dixon Merritt, of Tennessee. Also an editorial from a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean entitled "Cumberland Laurels," commending the Cumberland University School of Law.

I request that these be included in the RECORD because of the general interest in the progress of this famed law school in the heart of Tennessee and because of the best wishes which countless friends extend to Cumberland as it begins its second century of progress.

The story and editorial follow:

THE ROMANCE OF CUMBERLAND—THE STORY OF A CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION

That May morning of 1842 was a great day for a university to be born and the name by which it was christened—Cumberland—was already a great name not alone in history and geography but even then in education. The place, too, was great. Lebanon, the city of cedars, the city of settled and seasoned culture, the city where Sam Houston had practiced law—Sam Houston, Governor of Tennessee, the "Raven" of the Cherokees of Oklahoma, the hero of Texas independence. Three of Lebanon's citizens—a governor, a Congressman, and a Supreme Court justice, were members of Cumberland University's first board of trustees appointed in that good national year of 1842.

Eighteen forty-two—how long ago was that? The gulf is hardly to be spanned by a mere measure of years. Stephen Collins

Foster was publishing his first song and furnishing a musical setting for the Old South. Missouri and Arkansas were America's farthest west. John Tyler in the Presidency was muddling the Whig Party's greatest opportunity and Clay and Webster were maneuvering, each striving to be the one to supplant him and Hayes and others were maneuvering to lead the Democratic Party back to mastery.

But best-laid plans of mice and men—no one of the four were to succeed though Clay won the Whig nomination. In the cool of the shade of the Hermitage, 18 miles west of Lebanon, sat Andrew Jackson, worn out with 8 years in the Presidency, with a long life of unparalleled turmoil—sat and planned—planned deeper and better than the recognized leaders of either party. It was his protégé, James K. Polk, who was to lead the Democrats back to power, to crush the mighty Clay in his final bid for the Presidency, to win for the United States Texas and the all but illimitable lands beyond, the new Southwest which was to furnish from that day to this so large a part of the patronage of the new university. In that decade, Tennessee, heart of the old Southwest, was in a position almost of dominance in varied fields. For 1842 was the middle year in that remarkable stretch of 44 years during which Tennessee placed one of its sons on a national ticket in 8 of the 11 national campaigns.

Into that kind of Tennessee, Cumberland University was born. Its early years were lush, green years. The civilization of the Old South was at its high tide and plenty rode on a springing harvest.

The general assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the people of Lebanon thought it hard to find the funds to get the university going. When did people anywhere not think it hard to raise money for any cause. They thought it hard then but a quarter of a century later in the great war's bitter aftermath they looked back with longing on those early days and knew that the first great task was an easy one. From 1842 to 1860—only a little while, the space from babyhood to a high-school diploma—in that 18 years the alumni of Cumberland University had come to fill in large measure the places of importance in the wide land. Some of them were already in the Congress of the United States, where from eight decades down to the present, Cumberland University graduates were to outnumber those of any other university in the United States.

Other and more numerous sons of Cumberland were in the branches of State and Federal courts of both original and appellate jurisdiction. They were filling chairs in colleges all over the United States and were administering the affairs of colleges and seminaries and other educational institutions. Still numerous others were in administrative positions in the church bodies, were in the pulpits of important churches, and were carrying Christian civilization to far places on the mission fields of the world.

Cumberland was powerful—a young giant in a young land and its prospects opened out fair and full to a glorious future.

The great red flower of war sprang up and shadowed the land. Prejudice and passion and hatred raged. Brother's hand was at brother's throat and all the splendid fabric wrought through the prosperous years was ready to split into tatters. Lebanon was not on the whole secessionist and Cumberland was not. A majority of its trustees, mostly citizens of Lebanon, opposed secession and a number of them remained stanch Unionists through all that followed. The faculties were divided and students, of course, were divided also. Cumberland's magnificent building stood deserted, not destined to withstand the shock of war—that building lay in ashes before the end, but there remained wrecked amid the ashes a lone Corinthian column, the building pitiable, but it was a valuable asset, for there was found written upon it, when friends of the university returned, the single Latin word "Resurgam," in translation "I will arise." The word was marked up there with a piece of charred wood by Dr. W. E. Ward, an alumnus, who stood sorrowfully among the ashes of his alma mater. That word scrawled in charcoal became the voice of faith crying among the desolation and Cumberland did arise, not bigger, but stronger, than in the booming years before the war. Friends who in the old days had given of their wealth now gave of their poverty and the institution struggled into motion.

The new day had fully dawned and the board of trustees recognized it by conferring upon Judge Nathan Green, Jr., the title of chancellor rather than that of president. For more than 30 years Chancelor Green directed the affairs of the university. For 63 years he occupied one of its chairs of law. Yet, his position cannot be called unique because he had a faculty hardly less notable than himself for length of service. His great colleague in the law school, Dr. Andrew B. Martin, taught for 40 years; Andrew Hayes Buchanan taught mathematics in Cumberland 45 years and made his living through working during vacations with the United States Geodetic Survey; William Duncan McLaughlin taught Latin and Greek 45 years and made his living milking cows; and John Iradelle Dillard Hinds taught chemistry for 31 years and supported himself by filling prescriptions in the drug store. Walter Verrell Vester taught for 44 years; Winsted Paine Bone, 47.

Against such a record of devotion, brick and mortar and money and bonds do not count. Out of a century of that tradition of special training and Christian service, what has Cumberland produced?

It is easy to see and measure the fruit of this as of other trees—they are on the topmost branches. Of the thousands of Cumberland University alumni who have done the world's work in common ways, no record stands out, but among the lot have been almost 450 ministers of the Gospel. There have been some 50 college and university presidents, some hundred college professors, 116 Congressmen, 11 Governors of States, some score of Federal judges, two United States ambassadors, two Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and one Secretary of State of the United States. In all, more than 12,000 public servants have been numbered among Cumberland alumni.

Judged by its fruit, it is a goodly tree which early in 1946 the Tennessee Baptist convention received from the friendly hands of the trustees who had conducted the affairs of the University under Presbyterian auspices. At that time, Tennessee College for Women, a Baptist institution located in Murfreesboro, was incorporated into the university. Since then the convention board of trustees and administration of Cumberland University have diligently labored and constantly toward developing a strong and practical second century program. There has been no pruning of the tree—there will be none. There has been some strengthening of the branches. The school of law, lustiest, shall it be said, of the branches, has been strengthened and enlarged in its program in accordance with recommendations of leading educators and representatives of the legal profession.

On the other main branch, the college of arts and sciences, Cumberland stands stanchly by the liberal arts' ideals. One of the immediate goals is attainment of approval by accrediting agencies and these goals if not definitely in reach are clearly in sight of attainment. Drawing closer to attainment is a larger and better faculty and adequate buildings for administration. Close to the heart of the sponsors is the goal of a large residence for women where special facilities and opportunities will be provided.

The second century program does not contemplate a different Cumberland—it does contemplate a stronger edifice on its existing foundation. It is not expected now or ever that Cumberland will become large. It will remain a small Christian institution. As such it will continue to afford opportunity for broad basic education and specialized training in a few selected fields to a limited number of young men and young women without regard to Christian affiliation. Thus Cumberland University faces the future. May the promise of the future ahead measure up to the performance of the century that is passed.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 15, 1949]

CUMBERLAND LAURELS

Recognition of Cumberland University Law School by the American Bar Association is a welcome and deserved honor which is at once a measure of the institution's great tradition and its promising future.

When the roll of distinguished alumni is called Cumberland need not bow in humility before any law school in the State or country. During the institution's first century her sons went forth to win laurels on the bench, at the bar, and as leaders in political and legislative affairs.

Until the Civil War the university required a 2-year law course, but after that conflict the course was compressed into 1 year. In 1934 it was expanded again, but it was not until 1946 that the present standard 3-year course was instituted.

Despite the fine record of Cumberland students, the American Bar Association never approved the school because of the shortness of the course. It was not a matter of too great moment, since most of the graduates began their practice in Tennessee.

In present times, however, the intricacies of the law have become more complex. Higher standards and lengthier courses are a necessity. There is also a greater geographical spread of students.

This approval by the American Bar Association means that Cumberland graduates may now take bar examinations in every State in the Union instead of just a few. The approval is only provisional, which is customary for schools just admitted to approval.

Those who know Cumberland, however, have no doubts as to the school's ability to maintain the higher standards set. There is every indication that the institution's second century will be even more important than its first.

The American Legion—A Constructive Force

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the pension bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] made the statement:

The leadership of the American Legion has not had a constructive thought for the

benefit of this country since 1918. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Tuesday, March 22, 1949, p. 2950.)

I feel reasonably certain that this statement was made in the heat of the debate and does not represent a considered judgment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am well aware that he comes from a distinguished family, and has a splendid war record in World War II. I do not believe that he would wish to traduce a leadership of 4,500,000 present members of the American Legion, and the 1,500,000 who were members of the Legion before World War II.

As a matter of fact, the American Legion is one of the great constructive forces in America today. That is true not only in my own State of Iowa, but likewise in the State of Massachusetts, and every other State in the Union. I had the honor of serving as department commander of Iowa during the year that Dan Doherty, of Woburn, Mass., was the national commander of the Legion. I am sure that the American Legion is as constructive a force in the community life of the Bay State as it has been in the life of the Hawkeye State.

We ought to remind ourselves of the accomplishments of the American Legion, completely aside from the emotional tension of the debate on the pension legislation. For example, the American Legion for 30 years has had a program of rehabilitation and assistance to disabled veterans, their widows, and orphans. Literally thousands and thousands of men who have suffered from the ravages of war and their dependents have benefited from the ministration of the American Legion and the women of the American Legion Auxiliary. Thousands of legionnaires, leaders in the American Legion, have given of their time, energy, and money to help their comrades who were in need. Surely, here is a constructive accomplishment which merits the praise and admiration of all Americans, whether members of the Legion or not.

Is the gentleman from Massachusetts acquainted with the youth program of the American Legion? For many years the Legion has carried on the program of junior baseball. Annually, over a million teen-age boys participate in the games leading up to the little world series. In the Legion program they learn the meaning of fair play and good sportsmanship, which is part of the American national game. Scores of these boys who have participated in American Legion baseball have gone on to become leaders in organized sport.

Have the American people forgotten the work that has been done by the Legion in its support of Boy Scouts? Hundreds of posts of the American Legion have taken the leadership of scouting in their communities. Thousands of boys have been given the benefit of the scouting program through the leadership of the American Legion.

Then there is Boys' State. Nearly every department of the American Legion has organized and carried out a Boys' State program to teach the youth of our country the responsibilities of citizenship. For a week or more during the summer months boys are brought together to learn about local, State, and National Government. They have an intensive course in training and citizenship by actually carrying out the duties of citizenship in Boys' State. The climax is at a national meeting of Boys' States here in the city of Washington every summer.

In addition, there are oratorical contests for our youth; health centers for war orphans; national commander scholarships for deserving youths; and hundreds of posts across the country have given aid and assistance in the educational enterprise. The American Legion was the leader in setting up and developing American Education Week, the period including Armistice Day every year.

Surely, most of the American people, including the gentleman from Massachusetts, have heard of the community-serving program of the Legion. I am rather proud to say that this idea originated in my State and was designated the Iowa idea. Its purpose is to encourage every local post of the Legion to do something constructive for its own community. All over this country, the community-service idea has been carried out and fulfilled by literally thousands of Legion posts. Because of the community service of the American Legion there have been hundreds of enterprises completed, such as community buildings, swimming pools, parks, and every conceivable improvement made in thousands and thousands of American towns and cities. This has been done as a voluntary effort on the part of the members of the Legion to improve the communities in which they live and to make America a better place to live in for all of us. Surely, this is a constructive work under the leadership of the American Legion.

I readily realize that some Members of the House have been in disagreement with some parts of the legislative program of the Legion, as shown in the vote of last week on the pension program. I myself have not always agreed with every part and facet of the national program of the American Legion. Such conformity is not asked or required.

I have mentioned only a part of the constructive actions of the American Legion. Its accomplishments are written in every community in this Nation. Its record is the proud accomplishment of millions of patriotic Americans, every one of whom served under the Stars and Stripes in the two world wars. Its service to our common country is its lasting memorial.

Surely the accomplishments of the American Legion in its sponsorship of better American life since it originated in March 1919 have amply justified its existence. Its leadership and membership has been a constructive force for good in our beloved country. I wish that every Member of this House and every American might know more completely the program of the Legion. I hope that its motto "For God and Country" is graven upon the heart of every legislator and every American citizen.

Summing up, I can do no better than quote the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Ripened Idealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Ripened Idealism," delivered by Hon. James T. Brand, of Salem, Oreg., associate justice, Supreme Court of Oregon, and chairman of the board of regents of Reed College.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The gathering of the alumni of any college is a matter of great moment. Especially is this true at Reed. You come not merely to see the blue flame burning on a plum pudding. You come also to warm your spirits at the vestal fire that burns in these halls, the fire of scholarship and inspiration. You return to recall the dreams of schools days and to catch once more, if but for a moment, the fervor and faith of the young St. George that you used to be as you sallied forth armed with a sheepskin and a fountain pen to slay your morning dragon who dwelt in the sinister caves of capitalism, or in the unknowable depths of philosophy, or in the unknown and mysterious realms of science.

There is a sadness as well as a joy in such reunions as this. When we graduated we wore our ideals like a sword, but as the years go by they more nearly resemble a walking stick to be used when convenient or necessary, or to be worn with spats on the Sabbath Day.

One of your great teachers here speaks with regret of the "erosion of ideals" worn down by the chilling rains of disillusionment and the harshness of the competitive life. Wordsworth understood the sadness of it when he wrote:

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy.
Shades of the prison house begin to close
upon the growing boy,
But he beholds the light and whence it flows,
He sees it in his joy.
The youth who daily farther from the east
Must travel, still is nature's priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended.
At length the man perceives it die away
And fade into the common light of day."

The real tragedy of maturity is not the hardening that privation brings nor the softening that follows wealth. The tragedy of the mature years, whatever its cause, is the dimming eye which no longer looks out and beyond the privations or the luxuries of the hour and searches the dim east for the signs of a new day. And so, because we remember the vision splendid, we gather here to renew old friendships and to make new ones, and each to tend his vestal fire, for if it dies the eternal city, John Bunyan's "City of Mansoul," will fall.

After all, despite the fading of some hopes and the cooling of some ardor, things are not so bad as they might be. I suppose a thousand solemn-faced high-school valedictorians have, with proper assistance, composed an epic essay entitled "Out of School Life and Into Life's School"; and there is a point to it. The rough and tumble struggle for that medium of exchange without which body and soul would wend their separate ways—that struggle is also an educational process. It subjects theories to pragmatic tests. It teaches that no man and no school has a monopoly on truth. Erosion may wear away the rubble, but it may also disclose rich veins of ore. The fact that mature life raises doubts about our early certitudes is good. That it paralyzes the will to resolve those doubts is very bad.

Our college days were in truth golden days and the product in memories and associations and ideals is our richest heritage. But life goes on, and, with it, the testing of old formulas and old beliefs. Perhaps our generation became intoxicated with relativity and lost the belief in standards of right and justice, or standards in art and literature. True, they are not to be found by us—these ultimate truths—but to be sought for so that we may say with Maxwell Anderson:

"In all these turning lights I find no clue,
Only a masterless night
And in my blood no certain answer.
Yet is my mind my own.
Yet is my heart a cry toward something
dim in distance
That is higher than I am
And that makes me emperor of the endless
dark
Even in seeking."

Youth has a clear mind. It knows the answers. It is only in maturity that we become confused by the eternal paradox—the need for change, the necessity for stability. Social institutions must grow or they die, yet when growth goes wild and cells too quickly multiply, growth becomes cancerous. Men who would steer a straight course soon learn that if there is a Scylla on the right there is also a Charybdis on the left.

Again the postcollegiate years emphasize the distinction between the quality of a theory and the quality, moral or intellectual, of the protagonists of that theory. In this connection the problems of communism come readily to mind. I must first state for the record that my personal attitude toward communism is like that of President Coolidge's preacher toward sin. You remember the dialogue in the White House?

"Grace: What was the topic of the sermon?

"Calvin: Sin.

"Grace: What did he say about it?

"Calvin: He is against it."

I think, however, that the prevailing American attitude toward communism is both unwise and harmful. In the bitterness of our criticism, we have failed to distinguish between end and means—between a theory and the avowed representatives of that theory, between an ideal, however mistaken, and a criminal conspiracy. A mistaken ideal must be analyzed in a cold light. A criminal conspiracy against the dignity and freedom of man led by a dictator may justify heat as well as light.

The earnest student who believes that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, sees two antagonistic theories competing for popular favor. In this he sees the processes of democracy at work, and he resents the unreasoned vituperation which damns as communism everything without distinction, from Marxian theory to Stalinist dictatorship. He thinks that if communism in a fair competitive field can win the loyalty of a majority of the people, then the principles underlying our own democratic system demand that it be given a try. And he is right. I believe that communism cannot win in a fair field of competition and should not; but if it does, we must either renounce our faith in popular rule or else give it a trial.

Political, economic, and social theory must be met with calm reason. Crime must be met with repression. To join both in a common condemnation breeds only confusion. Our earnest student then fails to distinguish between a debatable end and the undebatable wickedness of means employed. I do not fear the competition of communism in a fair field, but let us demand a fair field. The sovereign right of choice cannot exist where the weapons of our opponent are those of falsehood, where power is vested in a dictator whose temporary strength lies in the enforced ignorance of his people; whose methods are the purge, the secret police, the judicial murder, the concentration camp, and the ruthless domination by force of weaker states.

These distinctions between legitimate ideas and illegitimate methods, these discernments which come with the experience of postcollegiate years need not and must not dim the fine idealism which you absorbed in college days. The great triumvirate of rights, free inquiry, free thought, and free teaching, must remain regnant. If the goal of truth and human freedom and brotherhood stands clear before our eyes, the path to that goal, beset as it is by danger and complexity, will be a way of courage and inspiration. I am trying to show that early ideals may be enriched, not lost, by later thoughts and observations.

What has all this to do with you as alumni of Reed College? In this world of distracting activity, all but the few who are blessed with the genius of leadership learn that as individuals we can accomplish nothing. If justice is to become a reality, then courts must embody and exemplify justice. If religion is to prevail over doubt, a cathedral must rise as the symbol of faith. If the mind is to be free to seek, to doubt, or to believe; if academic freedom is to be preserved with the right to seek truth wherever it may be found and to teach the truth as it is believed, then those rights must become incarnate in an institution in which the search for truth and the right to teach it are free from the domination of church or state, of party or sect, or race or creed.

I know of but one institution through which men can combine their individual wills for the accomplishment of these supreme objectives. It is that institution of which Reed College is a preeminent and shining example. It is the privately endowed nonpartisan, nonsectarian college. It is born of benevolence and dedicated to scholarship and service.

Today the fate of the independent college throughout America hangs in the balance. It is the chief victim of inflation, the aftermath of war. This college and every college must fight a battle for existence. But through this college, you, her sons and daughters, can realize the ideals which you took from these halls and which in isolation no man can achieve. The very confidence that we have in the destiny of America and in the worth of our institution bids us have faith that the far-seeing people of this country, led by yourselves, will never let the clouds of financial depression dim the light of the independent college. To this task we must dedicate our efforts anew.

I should like to close with a note from the life of Charles A. Beard. He was asked what major lessons he had learned from history. His answer was fourfold:

"Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad with power."

"The mills of the gods grind slowly yet they grind exceeding small."

"The bee fertilizes the flower it robs."

"When it is dark enough, you can see the stars."

Lawrence Vinton Peterson, a Lover and Benefactor of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, L. V. Peterson, one of my dearest friends, died. I did not hear of his death till some days later and in the intervening time I have been so busy that I have not had time to write a short statement regarding him. Lawrence Vinton Peterson was a most unique character. He was an interesting and constructive man. It happens that his birthday and my birthday are on the same day, although we are not the same age and for a number of years we together celebrated our birthdays and also the birthday of the Stockton Record, the paper with which he was connected for over half a century.

It was my pleasure to serve on the Stockton Planning Commission with Mr. Peterson. He was a man of penetrating intellect and practical common sense. He had a keen sense of humor and a tremendous love for the great outdoors, as well as for his fellow men. His outlook on life was a broad and a tolerant outlook.

A very curious thing happened during his last illness. His son and daughter-in-law were perusing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially a speech by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, which was a filibustering speech against the Selective Service Act. In the RECORD they noted a reference by Senator LANGER to a Dr. Koch, who claimed to have a serum that could cure cancer. The son of Mr. Peterson got the doctor who was treating his father to obtain this serum. At the time it was obtained Mr. Peterson had gotten down to a weight of 78 pounds and was so weak that he was unable to dress himself. The serum was used and miraculously his health began to improve. His color became better. He developed an appetite. All his functions became normal and he began to get well, at least so it was believed. I, for one, was hoping and praying that he would completely recover which would be very convincing proof that perhaps a cure for cancer had finally been discovered. However, the article concerning his death, which I am making a part of these

remarks, by leave granted to me, indicates that Mr. Peterson died of a heart attack. Consequently we have no very convincing proof that the cure which he was trying to bring about by the use of Dr. Koch's serum is, in fact, a cure for this devastating disease.

The lives of many people have been enriched and made more cheerful by their acquaintance and contacts with "Vint" Peterson. He was sort of a philosopher, as well as a wit. After his operation he told me that it would be several years before he knew whether he was really cured, but, as he said, "I have lived a very happy life, and even if cancer gets me I still will have lived the Biblical threescore and 10 years, and what more can a man expect than that?"

By leave granted me, I include a news article on Mr. Peterson by William J. Rogers, an intimate associate of Mr. Peterson for several decades and an excellent writer in his own right. Also, an interesting guest editorial by Ross Williams, the general manager of the Stockton Record, in which he makes a splendid appraisal of our departed friend under the caption "Pete and his pipe," which topped Mr. Peterson's column. Then, also an editorial on the editorial page of the paper with which Mr. Peterson spent so many years.

It is tragic that such an excellent man should pass on, but it is a great comfort to know that the world produces and continues to produce men like L. V. Peterson. The older one gets the more he learns that the world is filled with interesting, constructive, and capable individuals. There is a peculiar pleasure in knowing men who are distinctive and the world is filled with them. In the same profession we find men attaining the top brackets of success, each in his own method and by the expression of his own personality coming into leadership and yet each one different than the others. Here is a good sample of what the American system of free enterprise and individual opportunity does in the way of producing men. Our departed friend was a true example of what can and does, in millions of cases, happen in the America that Mr. Peterson loved so much and for which he did a great deal.

The articles referred to follow:

PETE AND HIS PIPE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following tribute to the memory of L. V. Peterson, whose column occupied this space for many years, was written by Ross Williams, general manager of the Record.)

A great and wonderful light left this community at 10 a. m. March 11, 1949—a light that cannot be brought back by science, electrical engineering, or modern inventions—a light engendered by a human soul—a commonplace man who reflected the best in human relations; a man whose stature, not in inches and weight, stood heads above the commonplace crowd in human understanding; who needed no fetishes or dress or declamations to be recognized for what he was; a human in tune with his fellow man and in deep sympathy for frailities without criticism or rancor for weakness.

It is seldom that the average man is privileged to witness in a fellow man a feeling of understanding and sympathy in all problems, without self-motivation. This man did not pose as an orator or a saint; his strength of character was a light from within which always showed through any artificialities that he encountered. His was not a preconceived attitude; it sprang from a happy, straightforward soul, nurtured by a kindly wit and an honest, down-to-earth viewpoint of his fellow man. He always admitted his frailties and was compassionate with the other fellow's weak points. But, above all, he believed that there was good in this world and that it was an enjoyable place if we would give it a chance.

This is not a eulogy; that is the last thing "Pete" would want. It is merely the expressions of a fellow newspaperman who was granted the privilege of working desk to desk with him over a period of 20 years, a privilege for which I shall ever be grateful.

I have known him; that spirit of inner light and soul was an inspiration. My apologies to "Pete," for he was insistent in his attitude that bouquets be thrown at the living, but I know he will forgive me for this last-minute "30."

LAWRENCE VINTON PETERSON

(By William J. Rogers)

Lawrence Vinton Peterson, the "little man with the big pipe," will write no more columns for the Record. "Pete," the Record's oldest staff member in length of service, died this morning at 10 o'clock as a result of a heart attack last night.

In failing health for several months, he had shown slight improvement recently and his death was not expected. He made a marvelous recovery from a cancer operation in August 1944, in which his stomach was removed.

WIDELY KNOWN

One of the best-known newspapermen in California, Peterson was born in Minosha, Wis., on April 8, 1876, and resided at various times in Colorado, Visalia, Middletown, and Lodi.

Graduating from Stockton High School in 1898, he joined the Record organization on July 1 of the same year. For more than a half century the Record was not just a living to him—it was his life.

For a number of years Mr. Peterson was a reporter for the Record. So familiar did he become to news sources it was frequently said of him that newcomers often asked, "What is his last name? I just know him as Pete."

Coworkers for a quarter of a century frequently did not know what his initials stood for, although some of the very old old-timers knew him as "Vint."

When the Record opened a branch office in Lodi, Peterson was placed in charge. From this beginning he went into the business end of the paper and on his return to Stockton from his Lodi assignment was, successively, circulation manager, business manager, and assistant to the publisher.

Son of a pioneer father, although not a native of California, he had a deep interest in the history of the State and of its early days.

His father as a boy of 14 drove an ox team across the Plains, ending in Downieville. He then returned to Wisconsin, where he married and where Peterson was born.

ADVENTUROUS FATHER

The elder Peterson was an adventurous person, was a miner and teamster, an engineer on Lake steamers, miner in Colorado, and engineer on various boats running out of Stockton. In 1910 he bought a ranch in Lake County and lived there until his death in 1913.

A great lover of the out-of-doors, "Vint" Peterson made many trips for the Record with noted automobile drivers and wrote stories which went far to popularize the natural wonders of California and the West. In recognition of his love for the out-of-doors his associates on the paper built him a cabin at Big Meadows about 14 miles above Camp Connell, in 1931.

UNDERGOES SURGERY

Members of the medical profession were particularly interested in the surgery performed on him in 1945. Operations to remove part of the stomach are fairly common, but the entire stomach removal is comparatively rare, and his progress after the operation was watched closely. He spent 4 months at his cabin in the summer of 1945 recuperating from the operation.

Equipped with an elfin sense of humor and a firm determination to "stand up and be counted" when he had an opinion, Mr. Peterson discussed a wide range of subjects in the column he conducted under the heading "Pete and his pipe," for many years on the Record's editorial page. Not a lover of controversy but never a man to "back away from a fight," his opinions on various matters were stated clearly and firmly. That they aroused opposition, on some occasions, was a source of satisfaction and sometimes of amusement to him. "Shows people are thinking for themselves," he used to say. "It'd be a heck of a world if a thing was believed without check just because someone printed it."

Peterson never joined a church. Efforts to attach or attract him to any particular religion were met with a quiet remark that he "wasn't much of a joiner." He had one affiliation, Charity Lodge of Odd Fellows. Aside from this, his interests were in the paper, his home and family, and the "wide open spaces."

CALLED CLASSICS

Some of his writings, turned out while he was resting at his cabin during his illness, have been declared classics. His description of a long-standing feud he had with a porcupine, which he insisted on calling a quilled pig as an insult, aroused so much interest he had finally to give an almost blow-by-blow description of his campaign. His stories of the simple little people of the hills—the chipmunks, the squirrels, and the birds—of the cattle passing along the road near him, of the play of lightning over the hills and the mantle of snow on the highest peaks rippled like laughing water over a stony brook bed.

In his final illness, Peterson amazed friends and family with the will to live he had packed into his small frame. Never weighing more than 110 pounds, "soaking wet," as he described it himself, he declined at one time to a few over 80 pounds. Despite this, he stayed on his feet.

Besides his wife, Georgia Eletha Peterson, he is survived by one son, Robert Henry Peterson, also of the Record organization. He also is survived by a sister, Mrs. Joseph (Idamae) Johnson, and a granddaughter, Barbara Louise Peterson, as well as his daughter-in-law, Blanche Dale Peterson, and a brother, L. S. "Ren" Peterson, of Middletown, Lake County.

After showing a steady gain for many months, Mr. Peterson suffered a decline last summer and grew steadily worse.

In mid-December of last year, when doctors had decided no hope existed for him, the Peterson family decided to administer the antitoxin-serum treatment of Dr. William Frederick Koch, of Detroit. The serum was flown here and administered on December 22 of last year. Improvement was noted at once and his condition bettered steadily until last Tuesday when he went to his usual polling place and cast his vote.

MEDICOS WATCH CASE

With the Koch treatment a matter of some controversy among medical men, Peterson's

condition was watched closely by members of the medical profession.

Late yesterday the heart condition developed. He did not regain consciousness and died at 10 o'clock this morning.

Thoughtful toward the end as he was through life, Peterson asked that flowers be omitted at his funeral. He asked members of his family to notify anyone who might wish to spend money on such things to contribute the sum instead to a cancer fund.

FOR THE LOVE OF PETE

When a man devotes half a century to a single profession and to a single business enterprise, his character and personality are influenced inevitably by the kind of work he has done. And conversely, he is likely to make lasting impressions on his associates and on the business which was his career.

So it was with L. V. "Pete and His Pipe" Peterson and with the Stockton Record.

"Pete" and the Record were "boys" together. They shared immaturity and experience, tough times and the good. His first years on this newspaper were spent in reporting, but like all newspapers and newspapermen of that era, there was little departmentalizing. The hand that penciled the news also wrote the heads, collected subscriptions and stuffed papers in the mailing room.

As a reporter "Pete" acquired the spirit of kindly, friendly tolerance that goes with a genuine affection for people, the people whose sorrows, follies, foibles and achievements are a newspaperman's peculiar field. Later as a circulation manager he dealt with the boys who deliver the paper, and with the people who buy and the people who complain.

His job developed Pete's inherent affability into a life-long spirit of congeniality and hospitality. And what his job did for Pete, he returned in full measure. For many years the top representative of management, he set a keynote of informality and approachability which has always characterized relationships between departments and among the Record's personnel. There is no high brass in the usual sense of the term.

Another of Pete's influences was to transmit to the personality of this newspaper his deep regard for the out-of-doors, his interest in the people and in the furred and feathered creatures of the Sierra.

It was in the role of woodsman that his readers knew and loved Pete best, as in his homely and philosophic style he recorded the goings on, small and large, along the Ebbetts Pass Highway beneath his mountainside cottage.

"For the Love of Pete" reads the inscription on the plaque in the cabin built by his newspaper associates. And out of love of Pete do his professional associates and his fellow townspeople mourn his passing.

Representative Potter's Eloquent Canes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to ask permission to insert in the RECORD this article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1949, written by Mr. Fred Othman who in this unique fashion pays just tribute to the exceptional record of our colleague, Representative CHARLES EDWARD POTTER, of Michigan.

REPRESENTATIVE POTTER'S ELOQUENT CANES
(By Fred Othman)

When Representative CHARLES EDWARD POTTER, a black-haired young fellow from Cheboygan, Mich., hobbled to the floor of the House to make a speech about pensions for veterans and placed his two plastic canes on the table, he said nothing about his own war record. He didn't have to.

He lost both his legs in battle at Colmar, France, and if ever a disabled war veteran had a right to talk about Honest JOHN RANKIN'S $125,000,000,000 pension scheme, the gentleman from Michigan was the one.

When he joined the Army in 1942, said Mr. POTTER, he wasn't thinking about collecting any cash rewards. Neither, said he, were any of the other youngsters who shed their civvies at about the same time.

"You can't make mercenaries out of the veterans by paying them a few dollars each," he told his fellow lawgivers. He came then to his big idea.

Our fighting men have done their duty, pensions or no pensions, ever since our history began, he said. They've won every war they ever fought. And this has been all to the good, except for one thing:

"We always seem to lose the peace," Representative POTTER said. "And I am wondering if it might not be a good idea to provide pensions for the peacemakers in the hope that they would be inspired to do a better job. Yes; I believe I could vote in good conscience for a bill giving pensions to diplomats. But for this bill I cannot."

Representative POTTER then grasped his translucent canes with the electric batteries in their handles and with less effort than you'd imagine propelled his mechanical legs toward his seat. The applause was what the Official Reporters might call thunderous.

And before we worry about the somewhat incredible pension debate, let us consider briefly Representative POTTER'S canes. They have electric light in 'em, which he switches on at night for crossing streets. Not only do they illuminate the gutter, but they make it possible for passing motorists to see him. They're comforting for a fellow who still hasn't quite got the hang of navigating on aluminum legs.

His speech, I'm afraid, had little effect on Mississippi's Representative RANKIN, or upon the timid gentlemen who are against the whole idea of multibillion pensions for veterans—but who are afraid to vote that way. In public, that is.

The lawgivers demonstrated they were delighted to kill the Rankin bill when they could do so anonymously. But when the motion came to revive it, they had to sign their John Henry's for the record. So they changed their minds. They were taking no chances on the veterans back home voting against 'em 2 years hence.

There were exceptions, of course, like Representative POTTER. Such a one was Representative JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, who fought in both world wars. He, too, was bitterly opposed to pensions. He called the scheme of writing the bill on the floor a shameful thing and he managed to get a couple of propensioners into a weird argument.

Representative WALTER B. HUBER, of Ohio, said Veterans of Foreign Wars favored his amendment cutting out the World War II survivors. Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, said they were not, either.

"See," said Representative CARROLL. "Confusion. This bill ought to be sent back to committee."

Representative POTTER said nothing. Just sat there with his legs stiff in front of him, while he fiddled with his trick walking stick.

Limitation of the Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of the Honorable Archie L. Cross, State assemblyman of Sparks, Nev., in the Nevada Assembly, March 1949:

Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn occasion. We are about to exercise one of the greatest privileges of a legislature; to determine whether or not the Constitution of the United States shall be amended. Our Constitution is a sacred document, a beacon light of freedom in the world. The founding fathers were blessed with foresight and wisdom; they did not set a limitation upon the number of terms a President might serve.

The first question arises then, why should we now set a limit upon the Presidential terms? Why should we curb our democratic right of choice? Why should we limit ourselves and reduce our voting privileges as much as is suggested in this proposed amendment? "Oh, it is said, that the office is so great that two terms should be enough for any man." Washington, in his farewell address set an example, and limited himself to two terms. His address is couched in stately language and will be forever honored. But it advises against alliances with other nations, and especially decries against favored nations.

Mr. Speaker, two great wars have demonstrated that we cannot avoid having alliances and relations with other nations of the world. Our position is so eminent, our commerce so great and world-wide, that no matter in what high esteem we hold our first President, we must assert our world leadership and seek friends among the nations. We are no longer isolationists. We must take sides. The name of our President in a world war immediately becomes a symbol of freedom to the victims of oppression.

If everything is in balance, and the President is conducting the war in good manner, then we cannot change his leadership; we cannot change Presidents, be he a Democrat or Republican. We cannot let the people of the world, who believe in us, down.

We saw this in World War II. We saw a great English-speaking nation prostrate at Dunkerque. We saw 50 gunboats and all of the old Springfield rifles we could muster furnished to the nation in exchange for air bases, and that was all that she had to depend upon, because her munitions of war had been abandoned in France.

We saw the Atlantic Charter.

We heard a most eloquent voice in Chicago plead for a quarantine against aggressor nations and demand and order for our own defense 50,000 airplanes.

We were amazed at the magnitude of the order. We know that he had his finger upon the pulse of the world. We inaugurated lend-lease. We armed our ships against the

submarines. The Hun was on the march, nations were ravished and raped, we knew that Hitler was determined to rule the world, and that soon we would be marching also, but only goose-stepping under German orders. In our own melting pot, nationalities began to pull and tug, the isolationists seemed to have the better of it, until the great Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, arose at his desk, and made a historical speech in the Senate, that shook the Nation, and isolationism was thrown out the window, and the two-party foreign policy was inaugurated that endures today. So we took stock of the man at the helm.

We recalled his inauguration speech in the midst of the depression, when he declared that the Nation "had nothing to fear, but fear itself"; we saw the dramatic closing of the weak banks, and only solvent banks permitted to reopen. We saw bank deposits insured and safeguarded; we saw all of our gold recovered. We saw social security given to the people. We remembered the fire-side chats where the most-loved voice in the world told us of the problems he faced in the White House, and he told of his mistakes too, but that he was trying. We saw how he restored confidence, and helped to stop the forced sales of 650,000 mortgaged farms, and we saw how he brought dignity to labor. All precedents were broken, and he was elected to a third term as President. He all but prostrated himself in begging for world peace, but the Axis nations ignored him, and insulted him for his pains.

Then the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and the joint declaration of war by Japan and Germany before our Congress could assemble. Oh, the tragedy of it all, with a Japanese peace party conferring with our Secretary of State at the very moment.

We recall Iwoland, Iwo Jima, Suribachi, Namur, Guam, Saipan, and Tarawa. We recall the crossing at Normandy under Eisenhower. We recall Generals Marshall, MacArthur, and Wainwright; Admirals Nimitz and Bull Halsey; Doolittle, Hap Arnold, Spaatz, all selected and appointed through him. We recall that he summoned the scientists, set aside $2,000,000,000 for atomic research, and that it is our stock pile of atomic bombs that keeps back the slavic hordes behind their iron curtain with 14,000,000 slave laborers itching to engulf the world. He closed the 1944 election campaign with a prayer for our America. He asked Almighty God to grant to the people of this Nation the vision which was necessary to profit from the victory which was sure to come in the war. Again shattering all precedents, he was elected for a fourth term in the ides of November; and then in the following April, like the soldiers on the field who died for us, he, too, died for us.

His sacred remains lie sleeping at Hyde Park and thousands go there daily to pray for peace. A monument has been unveiled for him in London, and the English have reserved for him a niche and plaque in Windsor Castle, where they bury their Kings. Ah, he is immortal. Just recently the Idaho State Senate did as we are about to do, rejected this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let us realize our full stature as Americans. I verily believe that had not the pistol shot of an assassin leveled our beloved Lincoln he would have been a third-term President, and what a blessing it would have been to the South in the reconstruction period. Let us say here today that we reserve the right if we are beset with war or the rumors of war to reelect any President, be he Democrat or Republican, to a third term; and if any Congress declares war, and if any President indicates the path, we will follow our flag and say, as Ruth to Naomi, "Entreat us not to leave Thee; whither thou goest we will go; thy people shall be our people, thy God our God."

Pope of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to me by the House, I include with these remarks the following splendid editorial entitled "Pope of Peace," by Harry H. Schlacht, which was published in the Detroit Times of March 2, 1949, the New York Journal-American, and many other newspapers from coast to coast:

POPE OF PEACE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today America salutes Pope Pius XII on the anniversary of his seventy-third birthday. Today America congratulates Pope Pius XII on the tenth anniversary of his elevation to the papacy. He is the Pope of peace. We greet with glad acclaim a true benefactor of humanity, a noble leader of the century. Many, many happy returns of his blessed day.

The Holy Father was born Eugenio Pacelli on March 2, 1876, in Rome. He was always a true priest according to the heart of God. He had always nourished an ardent desire to the apostolate and the exercise of priestly ministry. The charity of Christ ever filled his heart. The needy and sick were always the object of his tenderest care and solicitude. The Catholics rejoice in their chief shepherd. He is the vicar of Christ on earth. He is the apostle of peace.

When His Holiness mounted the throne of St. Peter, the world was tottering on the brink of the bloodiest conflict in history. He chose the name of Pius XII in loving tribute to his predecessor. He chose to continue the policy of Pope Pius XI in the battle for world peace, in the defense of church rights, in the championship of persecuted people everywhere. In his first public utterance, he invited all mankind to turn their thoughts to peace—peace of conscience, peace of family, peace among nations. He is a living symbol of peace. He is dedicated to the goal that men shall be free of hate and of strife. He is a simple man of God.

He is tall and very slender. He has brown eyes, ever sparkling behind glasses. He has long, thin fingers which when folded in prayer seem like a decade of Gothic spires aspiring heavenward in supplication for the prayer of man. His career in the service of the church is long and brilliant. He is recognized as one of the great statesmen and diplomats of our time. He is the best-equipped personage in the world today to lead in the blessed cause of peace. He is a man of his time.

He was the first future Pope to fly a plane. He was the first future Pope ever to visit the United States. He was the first secretary of state ever to be elected Pope. He was the first Roman to be elected to the papacy since Pope Benedictus XIII. He was the first cardinal of the curia to become Pope in more than a century. He was the first Pope to be crowned outside of St. Peter's Basilica since 1870. He is the two hundred and sixty-first successor to St. Peter.

His reign is marked by a vigorous crusade against the curse of communism; against the agitators who make the negation of God the cornerstone of their work. He has boldly challenged the modern pagan world on religious liberty, on the policy of slavery, on atheistic communism, and on the state of totalitarianism. He is a world leader—one whose leadership every lover of liberty can proudly cherish in this hour when tyrants draw allegiance of subservient nations.

Slave states can compel obedience to their man-made decrees, but no power on earth can control the movement of God in the minds of men. No power can equal the force of God's truths. No dictator can control men's thoughts. God's truths have their roots in the policy of the humble folks whose minds no Stalin decree can reach and whose hearts no bond of servitude can fetter.

Humanity will survive amid the decay of dictatorial dynasties. Despair and defeat may threaten them, but the noblest thoughts of the centuries belong to them, and not to tyrants. The citadel of God will ever prevail. Its base is adamant. It is cemented with the richest blood. The ransomed of the Lord crowd its portals. Against this citadel tempests beat, the storms rage but spend their force in vain. Immortal in its nature, it stands firm. It will endure forever.

Before the power of God the forces of present-day tyrants must tremble. Their mortal coils will be shaken off. Their governments will collapse. Their empires will dissolve. Their despotism will sink into dust. For they will give way before the shining truths of the Almighty as the blackness of midnight yields to the approach of the rising sun. May the Holy Father ever stand forth as a strong protector of the good and godly in mankind. May He ever persevere for many more years in the faith of goodness, in the faith of justice, in the faith of charity, in the faith of peace. God, grant us this prayer.

Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution regarding immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law

Whereas there has been enacted by the Eightieth Congress of the United States a labor bill known as the Taft-Hartley law; and

Whereas since the passage of this law, labor organizations have been oppressed and collective bargaining has been made more difficult to promote the advancement of the American labor movement; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law creates an inferior class of citizens, and inferior category and a debased position politically for the men and women who toil by hand or brain for their daily subsistence; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act, in its entirety, is an insult to the working people of the United States, a brand upon their integrity and decency, a handicap to all fair-minded employers; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act invades the constitutional guaranties of free speech, free press, and freedom of contract; and

Whereas one of the main issues in the last Presidential campaign was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and such issue was supported by an overwhelming majority vote for candidates to political office who were on record for the immediate repeal of this vicious and obnoxious law; and

Whereas the Eighty-first Congress has conducted hearings on a substitute labor bill known as the Thomas bill and such hearings have resulted in needless repetitious testimony, consequently delaying action on the repeal of this law; and

Whereas thousands of collective-bargaining contracts presently expiring and will expire in the very near future, and labor organizations and employers cannot negotiate with any degree of confidence as to the provisions that may be contained in a new labor bill, thus creating an air of uncertainty and endangering harmonious labor relations between labor and management which may result in unavoidable work stoppages; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States of America have, by their vote last November, delivered a mandate to the new Congress for immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the town council of the town of Cheektowaga assert its disapproval of the Taft-Hartley law; and be it further

Resolved, That the town council of the town of Cheektowaga go on record for the immediate and unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, the majority leaders of the House and the Senate, the Members of Congress from the western New York area, and the United States Senators from New York State, be so notified as soon as possible after the passage of this resolution so that they may act accordingly.

State Department Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, It is obvious that the Truman administration has given the Communists and the fellow travelers the green light. Why have the investigations of the Red saboteurs stopped? There is hardly a community, large or small, in the United States to which the slimey trail of Communists does not lead. This underground subversive group are sapping at the foundation of our Government, yet instead of the administration restricting their activities it has granted visas to enable them to spread their doctrine here.

The specious argument for the issuance of visas to Reds to enter the United States is the administration's unswerving devotion to freedom of information and free speech on any issue. In this connection, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting the following editorial entitled "State Department Fiction":

STATE DEPARTMENT FICTION

When the State Department granted visas to a score of Russians and eastern Europeans to attend the Cultural and Scientific Conference starting in New York tomorrow, it justified the action as follows:

"The Government of the United States has approved the issuance of these visas because of its unswerving devotion to freedom of information and free speech on any issue, however, controversial it may be. As such this Government does not feel that the visa authority should be used to prevent any arrangements, however, dubious they may appear, for open public debate of outstanding issues."

Almost as soon as it had emitted this high-minded policy, the Department canceled visas it had already issued to four non-Communist Britishers and refused visas to other individuals in France and Italy—all of whom had applied for the purpose of attending the same conference.

The justification for this reversal of the principle that the visa authority should not be invoked to prevent public debate savors mightily of an afterthought. It is that the iron-curtain delegates are official whereas western Europeans are unofficial.

The Department also felt that the Communist case would be adequately presented by the Soviet and satellite group without the assistance of supposed sympathizers from non-Communist countries. It therefore invoked its visa authority to prevent an open public debate from being too one-sided.

In other words, any connection between State Department action and State Department policy is purely coincidental.

Comments by the Veterans' Administration on Article Entitled "Are You Happy, Son?" by Delbert Willis, Appearing in Collier's for March 26, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Veterans' Administration:

COMMENTS BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ON ARTICLE ENTITLED "ARE YOU HAPPY, SON?" BY DELBERT WILLIS, APPEARING IN COLLIER'S FOR MARCH 26, 1949

GENERAL

The writer is known to the Veterans' Administration as Charles D. Willis. He is a veteran of the Pacific theater. As stated in his article, he was severely wounded in island warfare. His wounds resulted in the loss of his left leg at the hip and serious injuries to his right leg. He is identified in the VA by the number C4114838.

The article readily breaks down into three component parts:

1. Finances.
2. Education.
3. Prosthesis.

A summary of the case indicates that the veteran has a legitimate complaint about the handling of his education, but that his dealings with VA in connection with securing compensation and an artificial leg have been properly handled.

In his opening sentence, Mr. Willis quotes a surgeon in the VA prosthetics clinic in Boston as saying, "Frankly, I'm a taxpayer. A new artificial leg for this young fellow will cost $500. We don't know. But I'm willing to take a chance." At several other points he quotes statements made at this prosthetics clinic. On page 60 of the magazine, he quotes a long conversation with a doctor asking about the type of crutches he was using, the type of leg he wanted, and several other matters which sound completely inane when taken out of their setting.

To understand these questions, it is necessary to know the character of one of these clinics. The general tone of the clinic is not unlike that of an operating room when a doctor is performing an operation and keeping up a running commentary for the benefit of students.

Those in regular attendance at the clinics are: The Chief, Physical Medicine Rehabilitation Unit; Chief Physical Therapist; and Chief of the Prosthetics and Sensory Aids Unit. In addition, there usually are visiting doctors. These are not surgeons but are psychiatrists who attend the clinic on their own time, both to help the amputee by giving advice and to gain for themselves further knowledge of the results of surgery and the use of prosthetic appliances. A representative of the Orthopedic Appliance and Limb Manufacturers Association gives his time to the clinic to advise on technical and mechanical problems that may arise.

Further, senior students from Boston schools of physical therapy are assigned to the clinic to round out their training. Many of these students plan a life work with the disabled and are keenly interested in the problems of amputees. From discussion at these clinics they gain first-hand knowledge of the use of prosthetics. Many of the questions and much of the conversation quoted by Mr. Willis was for the benefit of these visitors and not because the members of the clinic are utterly stupid.

Now, let us consider the three chief questions raised by Mr. Willis:

FINANCES

Mr. Willis says in his fifth paragraph, "You could count it a blissful moment when I received my first pension check, several months after my medical discharge from the Army." Twice later in the article, the writer refers to having to borrow money from fellow students who were more fortunate and were receiving checks while he had none.

Since Mr. Willis' application for education was mishandled, he did not get a check for subsistence for three and one-half months. He, however, was getting money from the VA regularly.

He was discharged from the Army at Walter Reed Hospital on September 16, 1948. His first check was mailed by the Veterans' Administration on October 25, 1948. From that date, up to and including the present (March 1949), there has not been a month that at least one check was not mailed to Mr. Willis by the VA. Up to this time, these checks have totaled $2,003.13.

The first three checks mailed Mr. Willis were payments as a captain on the Army Retired list and were for three-quarters the amount he was paid as a captain in active service.

On November 3, 1948, Mr. Willis wrote acknowledging receipt of the first check, stating he wanted to be paid compensation for injuries rather than retired pay, as he believed he would receive greater benefit in this way.

In compliance with this request, Mr. Willis was rerated and allowed compensation at the rate of $240 per month. This action was reflected in the check of November 30, and was made retroactive to the date of discharge, September 17.

Again on January 24, payments were raised to $315 a month and made retroactive to September 27, that being the date the veteran entered school. This increase was $75 a month subsistence allowance under Public Law 16.

On March 4, his pay was again increased in accordance with Public Law 877, bringing his monthly payments up to $371. This was made retroactive to the date of his entrance into school, September 27.

On March 11, the veteran was rerated and because of changes in his condition was granted increased compensation, raising his monthly pay check to $413.

Mr. Willis did not mention in his article the names of the friends from whom he borrowed money. If they were veterans it is doubtful that any of them were being paid at a higher rate than Mr. Willis himself.

EDUCATION

Mr. Willis' educational dealings with the Veterans' Administration were mishandled. Fortunately, his mishandling did not result in the loss of any educational opportunities to Mr. Willis.

On June 17, Mr. Willis, while still an officer in the Army, was examined by the VA Advisement and Guidance Center at Walter Reed Hospital, exactly as he states in his article. The documents, in connection with this advisement, were forwarded from Walter Reed to the Washington Regional Office to be sent to Boston. The record shows they were forwarded on June 23. The Boston Regional Office has no record of their receipt.

As a result of this advisement, the veteran was recommended for training with the objective of becoming a political columnist. The veteran sought, and was granted a Nieman fellowship. He enrolled and began school on September 27; so that the loss of the records did not delay the veteran's education. By securing the Nieman fellowship, he had the advantage of the cash award which goes with this fellowship.

On September 21, 1948, Mr. Willis visited the veterans' counsel office at Harvard University for the first time. This is not a Veterans' Administration office, but is operated, under contract with the Veterans' Administration, with employees assigned to the office from Harvard, Tufts, and Boston College. The contract for its operation is with Tufts College although it is located on Harvard University property.

Since no stenographic records are kept of conversations in the center, no comment can be made on the statements in Mr. Willis' article. He did, however, visit the guidance center on the date stated and undoubtedly told them he had been set up for training under Public Law 16 at the guidance center at Walter Reed Hospital as the Harvard center immediately started a search for his papers.

This search continued without avail until November 9, 1948, when Mr. Allen Gleason, Chief of the Special Rehabilitation Board, received a letter from the chief adviser at Walter Reed Hospital stating that Mr. Willis had received advisement there on June 17 and had been set up in the objective of political columnist. This letter further verified that the records had been forwarded on June 23 for transfer to the Boston Regional Office. A copy of the advisement test given on June 17 was also attached to this letter.

The originals of these advisement records were not in the case folder of the veteran at the Boston office.

On December 17, the Boston office advised Mr. Willis to file a duplicate application for advisement for the purpose of scheduling another test. The record contains no explanation of why the duplicate advisement records which were sent to Boston by Walter Reed on November 9 could not be used in qualifying the veteran. However, he was ordered for new advisement.

The day after this instruction was sent to Mr. Willis, Harvard University closed and remained closed until January 4, during which time, Mr. Willis returned to his home in Dallas, Tex., where he spent the holidays.

He did not return to Boston until some time in January 1949. On January 13, 1949, he reported to the advisement center at Harvard and was set up for training under Public Law 16. At this time subsistence payments retroactive to the day he entered school, September 27, were authorized.

While Mr. Willis was not deprived of his education and was receiving monthly disability compensation checks, he was, during this period, deprived of subsistence allowance.

PROSTHESIS

Mr. Willis' statements about his difficulties in securing an artificial leg appear to be somewhat colored. He says in connection with the artificial leg, "The first entry is dated October 6, 1948, when I approached the VA seeking a substitute for "Junior," my affectionate title for the bulky artificial leg the Army presented to me at going-away ceremonies last September at Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C."

After describing his impression of the leg, he says: " 'Junior' performed admirably for a few weeks. But one day while climbing the steps to my room I heard a sharp ping! 'Junior' had gone to hell in a flash—exploded like a hand grenade. Springs, nuts and bolts showered the hallway. A desperate grab at a railing saved me from crashing down the steps."

After getting to his room, he says: "Seated safely on the bed, I performed an autopsy on the Army's gift leg. The spring which locks the hip had jumped out of place. The wire which holds the bucket in line was missing. So was an assortment of nuts and bolts."

Mr. Willis says he patched up the leg with rubber bands and called at the VA office to apply for a new leg. (He doesn't give a date.)

He says that the VA chief suggested that I make the rounds of the artificial-limb makers in Boston and select a leg which, in my opinion, would be the most functionable, the most comfortable, and offer the greatest all-around utility.

Mr. Willis continues: "After a survey of the companies, I decided on a prosthesis which would weigh one-third less than my Army leg. Weight was the important factor, I believed, because of the weakened condition of my partially paralyzed right leg. When I made my report to the VA man, he wasn't convinced that it would be the best leg for me. So he dispatched me on another chase—this time to Dorchester, Mass., to see a vet with a disarticulation like mine and who was wearing a leg of the type I wanted. He showed me how the new type worked and recommended it very highly.

"This clinches the argument in my opinion and I made another favorable report to the prosthetic chief. He gave the project tentative approval and said I would hear from him in a few days. I did, by letter, ordering me to appear before a board of orthopedic experts, the last word in prosthetic knowledge, who would sit at a special clinic to review my case and determine the if, when, why, and what of my case.

"I circled another month on the calendar. It had been 90 days since I first made application for a successor to 'Junior.' "

Records of the Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Unit show that Mr. Willis visited that office on October 14, 1948. At that time, he requested that repairs be made to the artificial limb he had been furnished by the Army. There is no evidence of any request for a new leg.

The leg he was wearing was not a standard GI leg issued at service hospitals, but was a commercial leg manufactured by the J. E. Hanger Co., Washington, D. C. It is exactly the same leg which is supplied Veterans' Administration under one of its contracts.

The veteran was sent to the Hanger Co.'s Boston office with authority to have the leg repaired. Mr. William J. Ferris, Jr., of the Hanger Co., who is president of the New England Regional Council of Orthopedic Appliance and Limb Manufacturers Association, says that Mr. Willis came to the office with a broken hip lock held in place by the substitution of elastic bands for a broken spring.

Mr. Ferris saw the veteran personally and told him he did not have in stock the particular parts to repair the leg, but they could be secured in a few days. He quotes the veteran as saying that he was in no hurry; the elastic bands were working all right and that he would drop in at his convenience to have the parts replaced.

In a letter written to the Veterans' Administration, as the President of the New England Regional Council of Orthopedic Appliance and Limb Manufacturers Association, Mr. Ferris states: The type of prosthesis the veteran was wearing at the clinic, although it was furnished by the Army Medical Service and is classified as a temporary limb, is in fact probably the highest type civilian manufactured prosthesis of this nature, and undoubtedly, if it had not been for the condition of his right anatomical member, it would have been the request of the veteran his permanent appliance furnished by the Veterans' Administration be a duplication of that furnished by the Army Medical Service, which he was wearing and had become accustomed to. This has been the experience with similar amputee veterans and we are at present doing such duplication work.

There is one glaring bombastic statement which to anyone familiar with the industry and its appliance would leave them in doubt as to the veracity of knowledge of the writer inasmuch as a limb of the type worn by the amputee cannot explode springs, nuts, bolts and screws all over the place inasmuch as a breakage in the area indicated could only result in the loss of one small spring and possibly one metal button.

The evidence of the above would be borne out by the fact that the use of a rubber band in replacing the spring apparently adequately restored the functional efficiency of the appliance.

After Mr. Willis' visit on October 14, the Veterans' Administration received no request from him in connection with his artificial limb until December 10, 1948, at which time he requested a new limb.

Mr. Willis was informed that he was eligible for a new limb and for a spare one if he felt he needed it. The Prosthetic Unit discussed with him the relative desirability of various types of limbs which were available. This discussion included a very limited number of limbs as, because of his hip disarticulation, the veteran could use only one or two standard limbs.

He was given a list of manufacturers under contract to the VA with the suggestion that he investigate and select the limb which he found to be best suited to his needs.

Among other companies, the veteran visited the Boston Artificial Limb Co., which described to him a limb used in some disarticulation cases. This limb completely eliminates the half-saddle affair which the veteran mentions in his dossier of his artificial leg. The limb company did not have a leg of this type available so Mr. Willis had never seen the leg when he decided it was the desirable one.

He notified the VA that this was the leg he wanted because he believed that the light weight and the elimination of the thigh socket would improve his walking.

The prosthetic chief discussed this decision with the acting chief medical officer in the Boston office. They agreed that because of the serious condition of Mr. Willis' other leg the desirability of this type of limb was in question and certainly it should be measured and fitted under medical supervision.

On December 10, Mr. Willis left a telephone number with the VA and several attempts were made to contact him to suggest that the leg be fitted under medical supervision. VA was unable to get him on the telephone, so on December 21, he was written the following letter:

"In reply to your recent request, this is to advise that your artificial-limb problem has been discussed with the chief medical officer.

It is suggested that you report to this office at your convenience, in order to have medical concurrence with the type of appliance which you have selected.

"As your stump is so short and the condition of your other leg is not too satisfactory, it is felt that the fitting of your artificial limb should be done under medical supervision.

"Several attempts were made to contact you by telephone, but there appears to be no answer at the number given. It is suggested that you contact the undersigned by telephone if you have any questions regarding the above matters." (Signed by Wilfred G. Holsberg, chief, prosthetic and sensory aids unit.)

Mr. Willis came into the Boston office of the VA on January 10. This was his first visit to the office since December 10. At this time he stated that they had been unable to reach him, because he had gone home to Dallas, Tex., for the Christmas holidays and had just returned.

As the amputation clinic was meeting the next day, January 11, it was suggested that he attend the clinic for examination and discussion of the desirability of the leg he had selected. This he did. (See remarks under "General.")

On January 21, 1949, the veteran was authorized to be measured for the limb he had selected. The veteran had full knowledge that these legs are all built to the specifications and measurements of the individual who is to wear it and that it requires from 6 weeks to 2 months for the construction and final completion of the leg.

The delay of 10 days, from January 11 when Mr. Willis visited the clinic until January 21 when the leg was authorized, was necessary, because the VA contract with the manufacturer had run out, and a new contract had to be made.

In conversation with the Veterans' Administration on March 14, Mr. Willis stated that the manufacturer had advised him that the leg would be ready for final fitting and delivery within the next 2 or 3 days. The leg was completed and delivered to Mr. Willis on March 18.

To summarize the above, the original request for the artificial leg was made by Mr. Willis on December 10. From December 10 to January 10, one full month, Mr. Willis could not be contacted by the Veterans' Administration. On January 11, he was measured for the leg. Because of contract expiration, VA lost 10 days in authorizing procurement of the leg. The leg was delivered on March 18, 67 days after he visited the clinic.

This is not an abnormal length of time to secure a leg made to order.

Facts About Federal Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent unpleasantness incident to the political campaign, I stated that I favored necessary Federal aid to education so long as any and all money apportioned to the States was distributed by the States without Federal interference as to the manner of distribution and with no attempt to control the educational policies of the States.

Recently, I have received a letter referring to my statements and asking me to insert in the RECORD the statement made by Clarke Daniel, first vice president of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington, which statement indirectly attacks my position.

Under permission heretofore granted, I am, in all fairness, inserting the statement, Facts About Federal Education, which follows:

FACTS ABOUT FEDERAL EDUCATION
(By Clarke Daniel)

Ask the average man on the street if he believes the Federal Government should contribute money to the States in order to help them improve their school systems. The chances are that he will say yes.

A further inquiry as to why he favors Federal aid to education will probably bring an explanation that teachers are underpaid, present facilities are inadequate and the States cannot afford to appropriate additional funds for the schools.

The argument sounds reasonable. It is shared by many prominent educators and national leaders in addition to Mr. Average Citizen. The advocates of Federal education can paint a picture which is highly pleasing to many. Frequently the impression is created that an exceedingly difficult problem can be completely solved without hurting anyone and costing the individual taxpayer very little.

A thorough study of the question of Federal aid to education shows that it involves a great deal more than is usually recognized and indicates that its proponents are guilty of surface thinking rather than genuine rationalization.

The proposal is basically that the Federal Government would contribute money to the States to enable them to improve and more efficiently operate their educational systems under State control. In other words, the Federal Government which has some $252,000,000,000 less than nothing is to contribute money to the States most of whom have money in their treasuries. This indicates the folly of the entire proposal.

Now let's assume that the situation is just reversed; that is that the Federal Government has a surplus and the States all have a huge debt. Irrespective of whether the money is collected by the Federal Government or the States, the same people (the taxpayers) have to do the paying. If it is collected locally and spent locally the entire operation is simplified. On the other hand, if it is collected throughout the United States, sent to Washington, and then spent under the direction of a huge Government agency the cost of administration is magnified many times. Actually only a fraction of the money raised for education could be spent for the purpose for which it was intended because a substantial amount would, of necessity, be required to maintain a Federal bureau. If assessed at the State and county level, almost the entire amount goes for education.

A large number of the readers of the Home Builders Monthly are residents of the State of Maryland. Would you Maryland citizens favor your State agreeing to pay $5,349,000 yearly with 2½ percent interest to the United States, if the Federal Government would in turn give Maryland $2,135,000? The latter figure is what the State would receive if S. 246 became law. The former amount is what the State would be required to assume on the national debt.

A similar situation would exist in many States. The State of Florida would in effect be borrowing $4,288,000 with interest at 2½ percent annually in order to receive $2,260,000. California would be agreeing to pay the United States $25,230,000 every year, with interest at 2½ percent annually in order to receive $7,260,000.

One of the arguments advanced by the proponents is that certain States, particularly Southern States, are in poor financial condition and that even if the net result is that some of the wealthier States pay more in taxes than they receive proportionately for education, the program nevertheless, would be in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Federal aid to education would eventually mean Federal control of education. Most of the Senators and Representatives supporting pending legislation firmly believe that the control would remain with the States. However, when you have Federal money involved the danger of Federal control is paramount. The inroad would not be immediate. But perhaps in two or three years certain Members of Congress would decide that a few strings should be attached to the grants. Once the States became accustomed to receiving Federal aid it would become a crutch which could not be easily abandoned. If one State did decide to reassert its independence and not accept Federal aid it would still have to carry its share of tax burden for that purpose. The provision in S. 246 which is designed to guarantee against Federal control could be repealed after the law had been in force for a year or two. Then an amendment could be very easily inserted in future appropriation bills requiring the performance or nonperformance of certain conditions by the States before the money would be made available. For instance the amendment might read, "None of the money herein authorized to be appropriated shall be available to any State which does (or does not) do so and so." Such an amendment could be as broad as your imagination.

Now we have the best educational system in the world. We want to improve it even more. However, let's just improve the present system and not develop an entirely new one. Federal aid to education would eventually mean the establishment of a different system. The present superior system of education in the United States is largely responsible for our economic, political, and social development beyond that of practically every other country.

Federal aid to education, Federal medicine, public housing, Government regimentation of private property, and threats to nationalize the steel industry are all designed from the same pattern. This seemingly innocuous legislation has roots which reach into soil far beyond its announced purposes and probably beyond the intentions of its sponsors.

The Possibility of a New or a Divided National Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, is the Federal Government like the old woman in the shoe who had so many children she did not know what to do? A column by Mr. Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post for Friday, March 25, 1949, seems to indicate that the answer is "Yes." It is stated that Federal employment here is increasing at a rate of 1,000 a month with no office space available in which the new employees can work. Mr. Kluttz

cites the case of the Census Bureau, which must expand from 2,500 to 13,500 employees to handle the 1950 general census. The Senate Appropriations Committee has rejected a request for an additional building at Suitland, Md., to house the increased activities, and there is no other space available in Washington. Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, is quoted by Mr. Kluttz as stating:

I am hopeful that we can catch up by moving some people out of Washington. I think they are getting too highly concentrated.

These facts support the idea that consideration should be given by the members to the possibility of moving all or some of the activities of the Federal Government to another locality. On January 25, 1949, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I had received suggesting that the National Capital be moved to the eastern Rocky Mountain region, in the vicinity of Denver. Some of the reasons given in that letter for the feasibility of investigating this idea were: first, the crowded and obsolete condition of many of the Washington Buildings; second, the vulnerability of Washington to attack; third, the climate of Washington; fourth, traffic conditions; fifth, the move westward of the center of population in the United States.

I have had the Library of Congress prepare for me a memorandum concerning divided or duplicate capitals in foreign countries. Double capitals are to be found in the Netherlands, Bolivia, the Union of South Africa, and India. The facts about these capitals are as follows:

THE NETHERLANDS

In the Netherlands, Amsterdam is the formal capital, but The Hague is the traditional seat of the Government. The Hague is the residence of the court, of Parliament, and of the diplomatic bodies, and the seat of the states-general, the high council of the Netherlands, the council of state, the chamber of accounts and the governor of the province. The following paragraph describes in outline the functions which Amsterdam discharges in its role of capital city:

Only with the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1814 was Amsterdam designated as the country's capital; the jealousy of the other large cities had prevented such action previously. Actually, however, Amsterdam discharges the ostensible functions of a capital rather seldom. Coronations have taken place there, and the royal family used to make a visit of several days to Amsterdam every year; the largest public building, the former Town Hall, built in 1648, was used as a royal palace from 1814. But the royal residence was fixed at The Hague for the winter and the castle of The Loo in Guelderland for the summer. Though neither the royal residence nor the seat of government, Amsterdam was truly the capital, the very heart of the country. The constitution gave it the title; the size of its population, greater than that of any other Netherlands city, substantiated it, as well as the city's preponderance in the national life.

BOLIVIA

Bolivia has two capitals, Sucre, which has been the de jure capital of Bolivia since its establishment as an independent nation, and La Paz, the de facto capital since 1898 when a revolution confirmed its claim to that status.

The Pan American Union's pamphlet on "La Paz" draws an interesting parallel between the two cities:

We speak of La Paz as being the capital of Bolivia and thereby confuse the minds of those not fully acquainted with the facts. Sucre, formerly called Charcas, is the legal capital of the Republic, and it was there that the victor of the battle of Ayacucho, Gen. Antonio Jose de Sucre, exercised his functions as the first President of the Republic of Bolivia. The seat of the Government was maintained there for many years, but principally on account of accessibility and growing commercial importance La Paz became the actual seat of government several decades ago. In the latter city the President and his official advisers reside, the nation's congress meets there, and it is the residence of the foreign diplomats accredited to Bolivia, but the supreme court of the country still holds it sessions at Sucre. The distance between the two cities is about 300 miles, but the more rapid growth of La Paz, especially since the completion of the three rail routes to the Pacific, seems to accentuate the desirability of La Paz over Sucre as the capital of the nation.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

In the Union of South Africa, the seat of administration is in Pretoria, but the legislature meets in Capetown. This division dates back to the establishment of the Union in May 1910 when the question of the location of the capital threatened to split the delegates which had met to draw up a constitution. A compromise was reached with a division of government functions between Pretoria and Capetown and the designation of centrally located Bloemfontein as the seat of the judiciary.

The following paragraph relates how the two capitals were established:

Under the South Africa Act, 1909, it is laid down (sec. 18) that Pretoria shall be the seat of government and (sec. 23) Capetown the seat of the legislature of the Union, thus practically establishing a system of two capitals, though the act does not describe either city under that term. Under this arrangement the headquarters of the various departments of state with their staffs are placed in Pretoria; while the Houses of Parliament and the parliamentary establishment are situated in Capetown.

INDIA

Before World War II the supreme government in India and its staff used to work at New Delhi during the cool months of the year from October to April and move to Simla in the Punjab, which has an elevation of from 6,600 to 8,000 feet above sea-level, during the remaining hot months. After 1942, all the essential government departments remained in Delhi and those of lesser importance were established in Simla. The new government of the Dominion of India does not follow the old custom of seasonal shifts in the seat of government.

In the instances described it will be noted that in the Netherlands, The Hague retained the functions of government while Amsterdam gained the formal title of capital; in Bolvia La Paz became the functional capital while Sucre retained the legal title; and in the Union of South Africa, the functions of government themselves were divided between a northern and a southwestern city.

Revision of the Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD—page A925—a letter he had addressed to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., concerning a questionnaire entitled "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" In his letter Mr. JACOBS answered in detail the questionnaire which he stated was being disseminated all over the United States by the General Electric Co., propounded some questions of his own, and requested that Mr. Wilson "give me the benefit of your considered judgment upon these several matters." Mr. Wilson answered Mr. JACOBS in a letter dated March 10 and as it has not yet been made available to the Members of the House of Representatives by publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have made this request to have it printed.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson is one of America's leading industrialists and heads the General Electric Co., recognized the world over as one of the greatest organizations of its kind. Under the enlightening leadership of Mr. Wilson and his distinguished predecessors in office, Mr. Gerald Swope and Mr. Owen D. Young, this company has made many extraordinary contributions to the industrial development of our country and the progress of mankind in general, and his views on the important questions of the day are eagerly sought and are always welcome. I hope my colleagues will read Mr. Wilson's letter because I am sure they will be interested in his views on the current discussion about the revision of labor legislation.

MARCH 10, 1949.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JACOBS: A little over a week ago I wrote informing you that your letters of February 9 and 15 in comment in our labor-law questionnaire had just come to my attention and that I would furnish you our views as soon as possible. We have taken the liberty of setting forth at some length our opinions, as you have requested, which I hope are responsive to your very thoughtful and stimulating letter.

In view of the considerable thought you had obviously put into your letters and the importance of the issues and questions you discussed, I wanted our comments thereon to represent not only my own general opinion, reached after fuller consideration of your views and questions, but also the views of my associates who are more intimately familiar than I am with both the practical or operating aspects of these questions and with the technical aspects of the law. Accordingly, I am setting forth in this letter more or less briefly some views on each of the subjects covered in your letters and in our questionnaire, and I am then enclosing a more detailed discussion of the issues involved and the questions you have raised which has been

prepared by the staff of Mr. L. R. Boulware, vice president in charge of employee relations.

It appears from your letter that we are more or less in accord as to objectives, that what we both seek in common with all good Americans are laws which will adequately protect the paramount interest of the public and are fair to the employees, unions, and employers. As you point out in your letter, "We can use all the help and wisdom available to enact a fair labor law."

Accordingly I was somewhat disappointed when I realized that in reading our General Electric questionnaire, "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" you assumed that our questionnaire was devised to sustain the Taft-Hartley Act as such. I get this impression from most of your questions. Such an assumption is entirely unwarranted.

On the contrary, I agree fully—and, in fact, this was the very reason that prompted our questionnaire—with your suggestion for the need of an "objective approach to these important problems." I would like to suggest that you again read the introduction, conclusion, and suggestions contained in the box at the end of our questionnaire. An employer is rarely credited with objectivity in as emotional a field as employee relations presents, but I can certainly assure you we used our best efforts to state these questions objectively and fairly. We supplied this questionnaire to each of our employees (including more than 125,000 members of our many unions) and to many of their neighbors. We hoped to encourage them to give thoughtful consideration to the individual ingredients making up the issues involved as distinguished from the too-prevalent emotional assertions.

You must, of course, be familiar with the ridiculous characterizations of the present law which have appeared in many union publications. I am sure that you do not feel that we, or anyone else, should not suggest that employees and their neighbors consider the basic questions involved. By our questionnaire we simply hoped to initiate some objective thinking which, if continued, would gradually make our employees and their neighbors proof against such obvious untruths, intemperate emotional appeals, and encouragement of class hatred as have continued to appear in the union press.

We are all human. The learned psychologists who have studied human beings quite accurately tell us that, despite our best intentions, we are often more persuaded by emotional factors than we are by our God-given reason. I believe that this present controversy about the Taft-Hartley law is a perfect example of that. Discussion of the Taft-Hartley law has tended too much to be in the area of sheer emotion. Too much significance has been attached to labels and too many epithets have been used, such as the slave labor law or the tough heartless act or—on the other side of the fence—the save labor act or the labor emancipation act. Too little calm and intelligent consideration has been given to this highly controversial measure by too many of us.

It seemed to us that the only intelligent thing for people to do was to forget the epithets, for the proposals to go back to some former and abuse-strewn phase of our labor legislation, and instead turn our attention to a fresh attempt to create a more nearly perfect law in the public interest, based of course upon the experience we have had under present and past legislation and the evidence as to how well or how badly those laws have worked.

Accordingly, our aim in devising the questionnaire was in getting away so far as possible from the emotional influences and stigmas attached to either the Taft-Hartley label on one side or the Wagner Act label on the other. We believed, just as we continue to believe, that it would be very helpful for all of us if we could reexamine the fundamental laws regulating the relations of employees, unions, and management with each other and the public in the absence of emotional entanglements and solely on the basis of the really pertinent issues involved.

Accordingly, we selected what we thought were 18 of the more important questions that had been raised in the current discussions of the law up to the time the questionnaire was issued. We put considerable effort on preparing a questionnaire which would be as objective and impartial as possible and yet would be susceptible to a "yes" or "no" answer. Our best advice had been that it was necessary to have this simple question-and-answer type in order to get interest and response.

In this complicated field it would be difficult to devise a series of questions that would adequately cover all of the aspects of the problem in detail. We make no pretense of having done anything more than attempt to initiate some interest and then get public reaction on a few of the important issues under consideration.

You have suggested that the questions involved cannot be completely answered by a "Yes" or "No" answer. Your feeling that categorical answers to our questions are difficult to make without qualification would be equally true no matter how the questions had been framed and equally true of any equally complex subject. I think the presentation of issues in such a simplified way for public expression lies at the very root of our democratic system, otherwise no one but experts would ever be allowed to vote. After all, there is no greater simplification—I might say over-simplification—than that which is basic to our American Government itself: The act whereby the people in the solitude of the voting booth resolve all the different issues pro and con into a choice between two candidates for President—or even for Congress.

In preparing our questionnaire, we were entirely mindful of the value of comments. It was for these reasons that we suggested that people add any comments they might have on our questions and any others they might have. I agree with you that good logical letters, outlining facts, and pointing to specific and fair remedies would in many cases help all of us, in and out of Congress, more than mere "Yes" and "No" answers to any questions. Fortunately, a great many people have, I understand, made ample comments on the questionnaire itself and many, many more have written letters prompted by the questionnaire.

Your first answer in your letter to me illustrates a common difficulty with comments where it quotes a previous statement of yours in response to a labor questionnaire as being applicable to our questions one and two. You then say that this response illustrates how it categorically would not clearly disclose one's opinion to a single question. I respectfully suggest that if you reexamine these questions it is quite clear that the questions as phrased are clearly capable—and fairly so—of "Yes" or "No" answers. Possibly it would be desirable—but not necessary—for an unusually informed person to expand his answers and to go into the ramifications of the issue. But after reading your expanded answer, I confess I do not clearly understand your position.

Nevertheless you will note that we asked people to add their comments and further questions, so that any persons interested in amplifying his "Yes" and "No" answers were clearly encouraged to do so. However, it seemed to us that the expression of a view as to the principles involved was the important starting points and accordingly we attempted to encourage and stimulate public interest in those principles.

The average individual naturally feels that the intricacies and the technical involvement in constructing legislation must be worked out by the Members of Congress. Few ordinary individuals could be expected to have the necessary background, knowledge, or experience to be able to make any worthwhile contribution to some of the more complex aspects of the issues that must be considered in drafting the actual legislation. But certainly that is no reason a citizen should be deprived of an opportunity to express his opinion.

I hope that more of your associates in Congress, as well as all people out of Congress irrespective of their present opinions, will give these important questions greater consideration. If our questionnaire helps to encourage any of your associates in Congress and some other citizens to give as extensive and thoughtful expressions to their Congressional representatives as your letter to me on these important issues, we have exceeded our greatest hopes of encouraging consideration of these matters in the public interest.

I will now try to set forth briefly our views on the 18 individual questions inasmuch as our questionnaire made no attempt to disclose them and your letter indicates you would like to have them.

I will mark the answer boxes as you did in your letter, and indicate thereunder my understandings of your views on the basic issues involved, as expressed in your letter, and the areas of apparent agreement, of disagreement or of my uncertainty as to your views on such principal issues. In the attached staff memorandum your comments and questions will be considered in very much more detail.

1. Do you believe that labor laws should, in general preserve the employee's right to strike? Yes ☒. No ☐.

We have always believed and, of course, still do, that the right of the working man to strike should be jealously guarded—and that it should be curtailed only where the consequences of a strike to the many are out of all proportion to the issues involved for the few. Accordingly, we check "Yes" here.

You also agree that the labor laws should, in general, preserve the employee's right to strike. But you would apparently limit the right to strike much more severely than does the Taft-Hartley law, as you apparently suggest an exception to this general right in any case of industry-wide strikes.

2. Do you believe labor laws should give the President of the United States the right to seek, through courts of law, to delay a strike that would cause a national emergency endangering the health and safety of the entire country?

Yes ☒. No ☐.

I believe what present power the President has to protect the Nation from strikes that threaten the national health and safety must not be weakened. Since General Electric operates the great plutonium plant for the AEC at Hanford, it naturally watched with concern during the atomic energy labor dispute at Oak Ridge last year, in which the President felt he needed all the teeth in the present law and used all six steps the law contemplates. Not only for atomic energy, but in other vital industries, the public interest must have effective protection.

It has been proposed, I believe, in the bill which you are now considering as a committee member that the Nation's labor law contain no provisions to delay or stop national emergency strikes other than a Presidential remonstrance or proclamation begging the cooperation of the disputants in refraining from a work stoppage as affecting the Nation's welfare.

There is nothing in this proposal to make the disputants accede to the President's request or to accept the investigating board's subsequent solution. I believe there is no

way set forth in the proposed bill to obtain through the courts an injunction to block the strike, and I understand it is all too doubtful if the President possesses any powers of enforcement. In short, the proposal is that public opinion will be able to stop or defer a national emergency strike.

Under the Railway Labor Act, this sort of public-opinion provision has been in existence for several years. According to the latest report of the National Mediation Board (New York World-Telegram, January 31, 1949) which administers this act, it is close to a break-down. In the opinion of the Board's members, it has become weak and ineffective.

This experience demonstrates that any effective labor law must contain adequate specific means—through the judicial process—for enjoining promptly any national emergency strikes. Such a vital point should not be left in the realm of speculation. The labor law should clearly embody proper specific powers for the Chief Executive to use when the power of public opinion shall have failed along with any other means available. Doubt should be dissipated.

So, to the second question, "Should the labor laws give the President of the United States the right to seek, through courts of law, to delay a strike that would cause a national emergency," the answer is "Yes."

We believe firmly with you in the considerations you set forth in your own answer regarding the limitations necessary in special emergency situations to avoid destruction of our free economy. We are particularly pleased that you see so clearly what many do not see, that "a controlled economy inevitably results in socialism, communism, fascism, or some form of state monopoly * * * (with eventual) forfeiture of personal liberty to entrenched officials." We are against compulsory settlements, as we assume you to be from the tenor of your questions. We hold to no particular program for protecting the public in such emergencies, except that adequate compulsory delay should be promptly available and legally effective. Along these lines, we do not feel that the present powers of the President to protect the public should be weakened, since in the past he has felt he needed at least these and has used them all.

I don't believe you stated your views as to whether or not the President should have such a right to delay national emergency strikes. We can conceive of industry-wide strikes that might not be of real national emergency proportions and, on the other hand, a national emergency strike need not be an industry-wide one. In view of this and in view of the present controversy about his power, I believe the President should have a clearly defined statutory right subject to appropriate statutory limitation, to seek any necessary court action to delay national emergency strikes that would otherwise endanger the health and safety of the country.

3. When two or more unions are fighting each other over who shall do a job or who shall represent the employees, and a strike is called to compel an employer to give to the members of one union the work or recognition being given to the other union—that is a jurisdictional strike. Should labor laws prohibit such strikes? Yes ☒. No ☐.

You agree that jurisdictional strikes should be prohibited where the employer is taking no sides in the primary dispute. In the case of "different work of an intermittent nature for the same employer, as in craft trades and particularly in construction," you seem to assume that a given self-ordained group has somehow got a clear, inherent, exclusive right to do certain types of work. Do you really believe this? Remember, you have got immediately to face the fact that such a given group has not been able, despite constant effort over a great period of years, to establish that right with others—establish it even with other sister unions or with any top tribunal over this group of unions.

You say you appreciate the plight of the employer who wants to complete his work without getting caught in the crossfire of two competing unions, but shrug off this whole consideration with some situations defy remedy. Does not the innocent bystander deserve protection? In this case it is not the employer, but ultimately the public that must pay and should be protected.

It is true that employers and labor have changed their constitutional philosophy on the desirable degree of Federal intervention, depending on the matter at hand. So have all other groups of Americans, including Congressmen of all persuasions. Yet in this matter you yourself agree on Federal intervention, admitting that what you support is not a complete remedy. Our difference here is not over the desirability of Federal action against jurisdictional strikes, to which you agree, but simply that we want that intervention promptly while there is yet time and that we advocate protection for the innocent bystander, which you apparently would not provide.

I see no justification for an employer becoming involved in the primary dispute between the disputing unions if there is an effective and adequate prohibition and legal remedy against jurisdictional strikes. I do not seek to have the employer be the arbiter between the two unions. I only want some place the employer can go and find a qualified and disinterested Government representative who can come and settle the dispute equitably as between the parties and in the public interest. This settlement is usually not really hard to achieve, and it can usually be effected a week or a month ahead of the need for the actual work being done. Such government aid in settlement need be sought, of course, only after any voluntary or interunion procedures fail.

Apparently we agree that the answer to this question should be "Yes."

4. Should labor laws prohibit secondary boycotts—that is, prevent an employer and his employees, where there is no labor dispute, from being damaged by a union seeking to coerce another employer having a labor dispute? Yes ☒. No ☐.

You state that secondary boycotts should be prohibited where the second employer is not participating in the primary dispute. We agree.

We also agree that where there is a community of interest in the question at issue, clearly demonstrated, for instance, by an employer taking over work from another's struck plant in obvious effort to assist the struck employer to fight his battle with the union, a strike or boycott against such work should not be prohibited. Incidentally we don't believe this is properly to be called a secondary boycott at all, but a primary boycott.

I understand that the present law has been so interpreted as to treat a case, where the second employer is participating in the primary dispute, as a primary strike rather than a secondary boycott. I believe this is proper. Apparently we agree that the answer to this question should be "Yes."

5. Should labor laws provide that an employer cannot deduct union dues or assessments from wages unless the employee gives his personal O. K.? Yes ☒. No ☐.

There seems to be little quarrel with the proposition that a man's take-home pay should not be expended in whole or in part for him unless the wage earner authorizes such an expenditure of his money. There do not seem to be any serious complaints by employers or unions as to continuation of the voluntary check-off.

I don't believe you express any opinion in your comments as to whether or not an employer should be prohibited from deducting union dues or assessments from the wages of his employees without the employee's consent and authorization. In your comments on this question, and particularly in your comments on question 10, you indicate that you are fully cognizant of the abuses that sometimes occur in the handling of union funds, amounting in some cases to outright embezzlement and failure, in the one case you mention, to account for more than $1,000,000. I believe it is better to let an employee decide for himself—on the basis of how he feels the union is handling its funds—whether or not he wants deductions made from his wages and paid into such funds, particularly in the light of your rather shocking revelations of the misuse thereof. What we want is good unions, and this hold by its members on a union's purse strings tends to make the union officials responsive to the members' will. I feel that the proper answer to this question is "Yes."

6. Do you believe labor laws should see to it that both employers and unions be required to bargain in good faith? Yes ☒. No ☐.

I am pleased to see that you feel that both employers and unions should be required to bargain in good faith, particularly since I understand that neither the Thomas bill (S–249) now under consideration in the Senate, nor H. R. 2032 introduced by the chairman of your committee, and on which hearings are being held, nor the Wagner Act contain any requirement that the union bargain in good faith. I certainly agree with your answer of "Yes." I am told that you have voted twice in favor of a resolution to restore the Wagner Act without change and only thereafter to hold hearings on Wagner Act amendments consistent with the proposal made by the President. I hope your letter indicates that you are going to reconsider your earlier position.

7. Should labor laws give to both employees and employers the freedom to express their own points of view on employee-relations problems—provided such views, or arguments, or opinions do not promise bribes or threaten reprisals? Yes ☒. No ☐.

Since you state that no law ever denied free speech to the employer, and since your further comments appear to be concerned with the conditions under which some or all of any statements are allowed as evidence, I gather that you are in favor of the law giving both employees and employers clearly the freedom to express their own points of view, as asked by this question. Apparently we agree that there should be no material denial of the right to such expressions and that the answer to this question shou'd be "Yes."

It would seem that there could be no other answer to this question than one which strongly confirms the right of both employers and unions to speak freely on all subjects to anyone who is willing to hear them, provided that no promises of benefit in the form of bribes or other inducements nor any threats of reprisals are made.

8. Should labor laws protect the employee against unfair practices by unions and management? Yes ☒. No ☐.

Regardless of whether abuses are from the employer's side or from the union's side, the employee must be protected. There should be no quarrel on this score.

You state that "of course" the labor laws should protect the employee against unfair practices by unions and management, but that we must, as reasonable men, agree upon what should be unfair labor practices, and be fair in that determination. We agree, The answer to this question should be "Yes."

9. Do you believe that labor laws should require both union officials and company officials to swear they are not Communists or Fascists or members of any party or organization which plans to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence? Yes ☒. No ☐.

Not only as a private employer, but as a contractor for the Atomic Energy Commission, we believe the labor law should require affidavits of both company and union officials and bargaining representatives that they do not belong to the Communist Party or to any party which plans, teaches, or advocates the use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States. One would have to be naive indeed to think the affidavit could solve the Communist problem some unions apparently have. But we believe we see, at various places, some examples of members in unions having been aided—by the non-Communist affidavit requirement—in making progress toward purging their unions of Communist leadership.

Certainly, the very wonder by union members at some officials' refusal to sign has led to a great deal of new local consideration of the national problem. In a great many cases they have elected new officers where the determining factor seemed to be the belief of the membership that it would be getting new leadership with less Communist taint or certainly with less public suspicion of that taint.

You state that you desire to cleanse and preserve, not destroy unions. I certainly agree. I go further, and have so testified before the Senate committee, and recommend that this provision be extended and made applicable to all officers and bargaining representatives of both labor organizations and management. Apparently, while you are in favor of cleansing the unions, you do not approve of the effect under present laws of failure to file the so-called non-Communist affidavit. We think the affidavit is helping to cleanse unions.

Secretary of Labor Tobin has testified in the Senate hearings that he believes a law should be passed, making it a crime for a union official to be a Communist. This is a drastic suggestion. But there are those who are more violently shocked by a simple provision obligating union leaders to swear they are not Communists if they are to have access to NLRB.

I would not favor the elimination of the present remedial provision unless and until some other at least equally appropriate method of dealing with this problem is enacted. I feel this question should be answered "Yes."

10. Do you believe labor laws should require unions to make appropriate reports to members and government as to handling of funds—just as companies are required to make appropriate reports to owners and government? Yes ☒. No ☐.

Filing with the Government and their members information as to manner of operation, income, and expenditure—cannot but be an aid toward healthier self-government by unions and instill a sense of responsibility.

You mention that this question is dear to your heart and you describe your unsuccessful efforts to get the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses to sponsor such legislation. I agree fully with you as to the desirability of such legislation and am curious as to whether you or any other Member of the Eighty-first Congress has offered a bill or an amendment to H. R. 2032, to accomplish this. I also agree with your suggestion that the present law does not go far enough and provide for inspection of books, etc., but I don't understand why you have voted to eliminate even the first step taken in the present law unless you are intending to offer a stronger substitute. We agree that this question should be answered "Yes."

11. Should labor laws make it clear that a collective-bargaining contract must be honored by both parties? And that each has an equal right to sue the other for breaking the contract? Yes ☒. No. ☐.

As President Truman said in November 1945, "If we expect confidence in agreements made, there must be a responsibility and integrity on both sides in carrying them out."

Those who object to such a provision seem mainly concerned as to whether the Federal or State courts are the proper forum. Actual practice, under the present law which has such a provision for suits in it, has shown, according to the watchdog committee, that there have been only 56 actions of this nature, and to date, not one has gone to judgment. Like so many other provisions of the labor law, it may seldom or never have to be utilized, but there is assurance in its existence

You assert that unions have always been suable. Yet you must recognize the legal impracticability of suits in many States, although you have stressed the inadequacy of present legal remedies in the case of members seeking protection against their unions. If unions have always been suable, why not state so clearly in the law and make the remedy prompt and practical?

We agree with you and Mr. Swigert that a lot of nonsense has been written about this point, and I fear about many others in the present law. I am unable to determine from your comments whether or not you feel both parties to a contract should be required to live up to it and that each should have a remedy for breach thereof. I infer that you favor the provision in the present law insulating union members from suit but making union assets liable to suit if there has been a breach of contract. If so, I agree. I feel that this question should be answered "Yes."

12. Do you believe labor laws could make it unlawful for a union to compel an employer to engage in featherbedding; that is, to pay money for work which hasn't been done or won't be done? Yes☒. No ☐.

I am glad you oppose featherbedding. I agree. But I cannot go along with you in your opposition to a law forbidding what you admit is wrong. In view of our own experience and in the absence of any convincing explanation of your position, I feel that this question should be answered "Yes."

Let me briefly tell you of an experience of ours. In the fall of 1947 when General Electric was installing a turbine for the Consolidated Edison Co. at the Sherman Creek station, the local union of steamfitters and plumbers claimed that certain piping which had been done by the factory was a part of their work. The union took the position that this piping work should have been removed by them and then reinstalled by them at regular rates, or the company would have to make a payment of approximately $700 which represented the amount of wages in question. The General Electric Co. wanted to make an issue of this matter but the customer felt it unwise to do so. Faced with the threat that work on the project would have been stopped, thereby causing great loss and inconvenience to the public and to the Edison Co., because of the serious need of this turbine, it was decided to pay the amount in question and not risk a work stoppage.

The whole secret of our ever-higher American standard of living is in production. To the degree that we restrict or limit real production with "made" work we restrict and limit and lower that standard of living.

Featherbedding is morally bad and economically feeble-minded. The reason it needs to be prohibited by law is because the employer and union at the bargaining table are so frequently far from being equally matched.

13. Should labor laws permit the forcing of an employer to hire only workers who belong to a given union? Yes ☐. No ☒.

This question brings us to the broad topic of compulsory unionism, and specifically to the problem of the closed shop.

The present Federal law prohibits the closed shop. I am told that 21 States have declared the closed shop and various forms of compulsory unionism to be against public policy. Only severe abuses under closed-shop practices could have brought about all this legislation.

The closed shop is a denial of basic human rights. It is necessary to hear only one of the many stories of wrongs done to individuals to illustrate the point that the closed shop is contrary to our basic American concept of freedom and protection of the individual right of personal choice.

The closed shop can mean expulsion from a given skilled trade and extended permanent loss of livelihood for an individual who happens to be out of sympathy or out of step with the majority or perhaps just the ruling clique in his union. The argument, "Doesn't the closed shop seem justified in order to preserve union solidarity?" overlooks the fact that, both under the Wagner Act and the present law, the union is the "exclusive bargaining representative" when selected by only a mere majority of those voting in a representative election.

To the question, Should there be a closed shop? my answer is "No."

I wish you had expressed your opinion on this important question of the closed shop. I had rather assumed from your comments on question 8 that no combination should be permitted to crush the individual; your comments on questions 1 and 2, indicating that you disfavor Government control over wages and prices; your comments on question 17, indicating that combinations of men, whether corporate or union, spell power, and the need for fair regulation of unions as well as of corporations, that you would not favor legalizing the return of this restrictive type of organization.

Your comments on this question, although not stating your position specifically with respect thereto, seem to indicate that you favor the closed shop, with proper regulation, but not the closed union. The papers reported that a witness for one of the oldest and most traditional closed-shop unions in the country, in testifying recently before the Senate Labor Committee, indicated how effectively the closed shop is used to affect prices and regulate commerce in the industry in which they work. I judge that if you should favor legalizing the closed shop you would insist on close regulation to prevent the abuses to which it is subject—abuses not only restrictive of the freedom of individuals, but also abuses through restrictions on competition and price. I oppose removing the prohibition on the closed shop for the very reasons, among others, you have seemed to indicate in your comments on other questions. I infer that we probably do not agree as to the answer to this question, although you do not state your views specifically.

The closed shop begins by being wrong in its power over the individual employee and the employer. But that soon fades into insignificance as the power increases over a trade or a community or a city government or an industry.

14. Do you believe it should be unlawful for an employee to be prevented from working by the use of violence, force, or intimidation? Yes ☒. No ☐.

I am glad to see that you feel it should be unlawful for an employee to be prevented from working by the use of violence, force, or intimidation. We agree the answer to this question is "Yes."

General Electric has had experience in this area.

In Schenectady, in 1946, salaried workers, not members of the union on strike and not even included in the bargaining unit, were forcibly prevented from going to work by means of picketing and violence, in defiance of a court order which the Schenectady police force said they could not enforce.

It seems to me, on the evidence, that the labor law should contain provisions that will quickly and effectively stop such violence,

which has not been a General Electric experience alone. The Allis-Chalmers strike is of too recent and painful memory. In the past, this kind of violence has continued until it has either gained its point or been eradicated by counterviolence or other measures. Invariably, however, the Federal Government's prohibition against it comes at a time when it is only a memory. The labor law should provide the Labor Board with power to take quick and incisive action where warranted.

15. Do you believe foremen and other supervisors could properly perform their management duties of serving the balanced best interests of employees, customers, and owners alike, if bargaining for supervisors by unions should be included in the labor laws? Yes ☐. No ☒.

Supervisors are management. If they are unionized their unions are likely—as shown in the congressional hearings conducted a couple of years ago and in the Senate hearings 2 weeks ago—to become associated with, collaborate with, and even be dominated by unions representing the working force that they are supposed to lead and manage. The spirit and effectiveness of management goes, and the foremen are no longer useful to the employees and to others as management.

You state that you feel that foremen should not be permitted to belong to the production workers' union. I agree. You apparently have some question, without expressing your opinion, as to foremen's unions, provided they are not a part of the production workers' unions. Whatever may be the theoretical attractions of independent foremen's unions with compulsory bargaining powers, I believe that, once in such unions, the foremen will then almost surely begin to be brought under the dominance of the much more powerful unions of the people they are supposed to supervise. I feel this question should be answer "No."

16. Do you believe labor laws should protect individual workers in the right to join or not to join a union—to remain or not to remain members—just as they individually wish? Yes ☒. No ☐.

First of all, General Electric believes the individual should be protected in his right to join or not join a union. Secondly, he should be protected—if so-called union security clauses are to be permitted—in having at reasonable intervals, the opportunity to implement his decision to remain or not to remain a member. Above all, the individual should be protected against excessive admission or dues requirements or expulsion for any reason other than nonpayment of dues.

I do not believe you answered the question as to whether or not you feel the law should protect an individual worker's right to join or not to join a union, or to remain, or not to remain, a member, although you indicate you do not agree with the prohibition in the present law against the closed shop with respect to which I have already expressed my views under question 13. You indicate that you do not favor the union-shop-election provision of the present law. I agree. I certainly commend you upon your decision not to support the request made on you by a large union to support compulsory union shop. I believe this freedom to join or not join—remain or not remain—is one of the best ways of insuring a strong union, and strong for good reasons, because of the responsiveness of the officers to the membership. I feel this question should be answered "Yes."

On the question of a compulsory union shop I question whether it is fair to keep a man from earning a living at a particular plant because he disagrees with the majority as to a union. Here again I believe the presence or possibility of free riders is worth all the lack of dues costs the other members, because the union management will be so much more responsive to the membership. Nor do I understand the fear that individual voluntary assignment of dues will not be made by union members. The question seems to assume that unions should be strong at any cost, whether they are good or bad in the opinion of their members. We would assume that a union its members thought good would get its dues by voluntary assignments, while a union its members thought bad would have to mend its ways. My observations lead me to believe members will support their union even when they have considerable doubt as to the probity of what's going on.

17. Should labor laws make clear that both unions and employers can now so affect the public for good or ill that the labor-management relations of both should be regulated equally by law? Yes ☒. No ☐.

It is conceivable that several years ago the answer to this question might have been "No". It is an indication of our progress that today almost everyone would be likely to answer "Yes".

You state combinations of men, whether corporate or union spell power. You also indicate that it is Government's primary duty to protect the citizens from the unwarranted exercise of power from within or without its borders and that unions as well as corporations should be fairly regulated. Apparently we agree.

18. Should labor laws provide that a striker who has been replaced in the course of an economic strike—not involving any unfair labor practice—be permitted to vote in an election to choose a bargaining agent at the conclusion of the strike? Yes ☐. No ☒.

I have understood that the principle involved here originated under the Wagner Act and was continued under the Taft-Hartley Act, namely, that a purely economic striker, once he has been permanently replaced in the absence of any unfair employer practice, is no longer entitled to reinstatement. Hence as a logical result, the present law provides that he is not entitled to vote in an election to determine who shall represent those who are the employees.

You suggest that this rule, developed under present and past laws as indicated, may unduly curtail the right to strike. I can't believe that any such combination of circumstances, as you have assumed in your hypothetical case, could ever result in the possibilities you indicate. Needless to say, an employer should not be—and I am informed under the present law he is not—permitted to take advantage of anything in this provision by inviting a rival union into the plant or by manipulating the decertification of a union or by engaging in any other unfair practice to defeat the right of his employees to freely choose their representatives. Those who are more able to weigh all these possibilities discuss your fears more completely in the attached staff report. After weighing what seems to me the practical considerations and the equities involved in this question, I believe the fair answer to be "No."

I think the current reexamination of the present laws regulating the relations of employees, unions, and management with each other in the public interest is an extremely desirable thing. Calm and deliberate reexamination of any law at any time based on factual experience rather than emotional assertions is always a good thing and is always in the public interest. I am particularly in favor of public reexamination of the present law, however, because I think that any intelligent and calm examination of the issues involved will have a tremendously beneficial effect in achieving better understanding by individual members of the public with respect to the elements in that law.

I again wish to emphasize that the purpose in issuing our questionnaire was to encourage people to take a fresh look at some of the issues involved in any revision of our present labor laws.

As I stated before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we believe an objective fresh appraisal of each of the ingredients of the present Labor-Management Relations Act will indicate that, although it is a good law and contains a great many important advances in the public interest which need to be retained, there may very well be need for two types of revision:

First of all, careful attention should be given to any specific instances in which the law is claimed to have actually operated unfairly against unions, employees, employers, or the public.

Secondly, careful attention should be given to those instances in which the law needs to be strengthened in order to prevent certain abuses which still are prevalent and which are not adequately provided for under the present law. The law should provide better protection against violent and coercive mass picketing, for example, against featherbedding practices and especially against restrictive practices such as have been effectuated through the use of secondary boycotts, closed shops, jurisdictional strikes, and the like. We have already testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as to some of our own direct experiences with such abuses, and we will be glad, at your pleasure, to discuss them further with you.

In closing, I want to say that I was rather interested after rereading your letter several times to note how really close we apparently were in our thinking on even the specific issues involved, as well as the objectives. I have appreciated the very stimulating letter which you have written, and I am glad that you had it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since any intelligent expression of views should be welcomed by all of us, whether or not we are in full agreement with the views expressed, as an aid to better understanding, which in turn is bound to result in a drawing together ultimately of the thinking of all sincere students of these problems.

I shall regard it as a pleasure to see you shortly in our proposed appearance before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Very truly yours,

C. E. WILSON.

Alabama Coal Mine Burns in Underground Gas Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared a very interesting article entitled "Alabama Coal Mine Burns in Underground Gas Test." This outstanding experiment will be the means of utilizing millions of tons of thin-seam soft coal at a cost which is not prohibitive. The article is as follows:

ALABAMA COAL MINE BURNS IN UNDERGROUND GAS TEST

GORGAS, ALA.—Can coal burning underground, right in the mine, be converted into heating gas?

The second underground coal gasification experiment conducted jointly by the United States Bureau of Mines and the Alabama

Power Co. at the company's Gorgas mine, 55 miles northwest of Birmingham, Ala., began a few days ago. Results will help to determine whether coal burned underground can produce a gas which can be utilized for heating and for conversion to gasoline and Diesel oil.

The coal was set ablaze by explosion of a thermite fire bomb.

Thomas W. Martin, president of the Alabama Power Co., pulled a pin from a thermite fire bomb at 3 p. m., March 18. A. E. Sands, chemical engineer for United States Bureau of Mines, lowered the bomb into a shaft leading to a coal seam 160 feet below the surface. An elastic band held the handle of the bomb in place until it reached 100 feet. It was then dropped the remaining 60 feet and exploded.

FIFTY TONS BURNED DAILY

Lighted in an area comprising some 500,000 tons of coal, the underground blaze conceivably could burn for 3 to 4 years. Milton H. Fies, coal operations manager for Alabama Power, said some 50 tons of coal will be burned daily. He expects the experiment to continue at least a year, maybe longer.

Temperatures now have reached 900 degrees Fahrenheit underground. This will be increased to around 3,000 degrees during the next 30 days by introducing varying amounts of steam and oxygen and by use of an air blast.

Officials now are intent upon producing gas consistently. Its B. t. u. content is not expected to be measured for 2 or 3 weeks. In about 30 days, experiment leaders expect to produce a gas with a heating content of around 125 B. t. u.'s a cubic centimeter.

FLUE GAS USED

The gas now being produced is described as "flue gas," or the same as boiler smoke. This will be increased gradually, it is expected, during the ensuing months to produce a gas with a heating content of perhaps 900 to 1,000 B. t. u.'s by varying use of steam and oxygen.

"Right now we're just warming up the mine," explained James Elder, the Bureau of Mines' supervising engineer for the project. "We should know something in about 6 weeks as to whether this experiment can be termed successful or not."

Cost of the experiment is estimated at about $500,000. The Alabama Power Co. is donating the 500,000 tons of coal to be burned and technical aid.

Mr. Fies emphasized that America would need all the synthetic fuel it could get if there were another war. Ironically, in use in the experiment are a huge compressor and gas turbine, which were destined for shipment to Russia a year ago. The Bureau of Mines stopped the shipment and diverted the equipment to Alabama.

GREAT SAVING SEEN

If successful, the experiment means that millions of tons of thin-seam soft coal could be utilized without prohibitive costs. It is believed that the technique of gasification could be applied to rich, thick seams also.

The fire was lighted at borehole 1. Air was admitted into that shaft, and product gases were removed from borehold 2, 300 feet away. The other three outlets are sealed off at present. Temperatures are being controlled by use of a water spray. Fire passage will be increased as the experiment progresses, by using boreholes 3, 4, and 5—each 300 feet apart.

When operations are ended, the mine will be flooded to cool the residue for gathering information. Entries will be driven into the mine to determine whether coke in large quantities has been left underground and to determine effects of the combustion on strata overlying the burned coal bed. Flooding will prevent the blaze from spreading into adjacent coal areas.

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Philadelphia Daily News on March 25, 1949:

INSIDE THE DOME

The two Philadelphia Congressmen whose votes stopped the controversial Rankin veterans' pension bill in the House Thursday said today that they voted to send the measure back to committee because, as it stood, it would not give a square deal to the veteran of the First World War.

The vote in the House which ended 3 days of stormy debate was 208 to 207, the closest in the history of the Eighty-first Congress. As the roll call was completed, it looked as though the Rankin bill had weathered the storm with two votes to spare, but Representatives WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat, of Philadelphia's First Congressional District, and Representative WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Democrat of the Second District came into the well of the House and announced that their votes should be recorded as "yea" rather than "nay." The House roared and the Speaker ordered a recapitulation, but the end result was 208 to 207, a defeat for the Rankin bill.

Two other solons changed their votes. Representative ROBERT F. RICH, Republican, of Woolrich, outspoken advocate of economy, apparently decided at the last moment that the Rankin bill was just too much. He changed his vote, on recommitting, from "no" to "yes" as did BARRETT and GRANAHAN, but he was negated by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, another Republican, who switched in the opposite direction.

"I felt all the way through that all this pulling and hauling was an inappropriate way to formulate legislation," said BARRETT, after casting his vote. "When it was pointed out to me that the Jacobs amendment in it would bring the average pension for a World War I veteran down to only $13 a month, I decided that it was best to send it back to the committee for reconsideration."

BARRETT referred to the amendment offered by Representative ANDREW JACOBS, Democrat, of Indiana which provided for pensions based on length of service and on time spent overseas. His formula would give veterans at 65 $10 a month, plus $1 for each month of service in this country, and $3 for each month spent abroad in an actual theater of war.

"After 2 days of consistent confusion," added BARRETT, "with many overlapping amendments, I deemed the bill a harmful one to veterans of both wars."

Representative GRANAHAN indicated that the same reasoning motivated his action. When he saw that pensions for World War I veterans might be as low as $10 a month instead of the $90 originally proposed, he considered it a sell-out to vote for the emasculated bill, and instead changed his vote to send it back for redrafting.

Blame for defeat of the bill was placed squarely on the shoulders of Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN of Mississippi by Representative WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Democrat, of Philadelphia's Fifth District.

"The situation was very confusing," said GREEN, "because RANKIN was so dictatorial in committee that he forced several members to leave in protest and then reported out a bill that had to be amended and rewritten on the floor. Writing a bill on the floor is always bad and in the end, the bill was so confusing that the majority of Members didn't know what it contained and it seemed best to send it back to the committee."

GREEN had a heated exchange Wednesday with RANKIN during debate.

Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Philadelphia's Fourth District, who serves on the Veterans' Committee and who opposed the Rankin bill from the beginning, said that "if the chairman will stop being a demagogue we will now be able to get down to work and write some good veterans' legislation. We will not only work on a reasonable pension bill but on such matters as the cutbacks on veterans' hospitals, GI insurance, and other things that have just been left lie while we fought about this bill."

When the chips were down, Representative HARDIE SCOTT, Republican, of the Third District, was the only Philadelphian to vote in favor of the Rankin bill. SCOTT wired all veterans' organizations in his district last night that while he was critical of many features of the bill "when Representative RANKIN announced that a vote to recommit would kill the pension bill, I felt obliged to vote against recommitting it."

Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Republican, of the Sixth District, stuck by his guns in opposing the measure. SCOTT was absent filling a speaking engagement at Ohio Wesleyan University, but was paired with another absent member who favored the Rankin bill.

SCOTT was the only Republican leader to oppose the measure. About two-thirds of the House Republicans followed the lead of Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, in voting for the Rankin bill in the thinly disguised hope that to do so would put President Truman on the spot by forcing him to veto it.

They also took glee in the fact that the pension bill debate made the Eighty-first "Truman" Congress look a good bit more inept than the late lamented Eightieth Congress.

HUGH SCOTT, however, would have none of such strategy. A veteran himself, he denounced the cost of the Rankin bill and took a firm stand against it. In the end, by the margin of BARRETT'S and GRANAHAN'S votes, the strategy failed and the bill went back.

Jobless Claimants in Connecticut Rise to 62,537

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my purpose today to bring to the notice of the Members of the House the latest statement of the employment security division, Department of Labor, State of Connecticut.

This report on jobless claimants in Connecticut, dated March 22, 1949, indicates an increase from 61,804 for the week ended March 12 to 62,537 during the week ended March 19. The continuing increase in lay-offs, week after week since October 1948, is giving very

serious concern to the persons being taken off the employment rolls, their families, their employers, their unions, welfare departments, veterans' organizations, businessmen, and those who continue to be employed on shorter hours in many instances.

Should there be no leveling off in the very near future, there will appear to be more to this proposition than obtaining necessary funds from the Federal Government to provide the required personnel to process the claims for unemployment benefits, though such funds are of primary import, in order that there be no long wait for the initial unemployment checks which are due them.

Eliminating the details as applicable to each unemployment office in the "Constitution State," the report is as follows:

4. JOBLESS CLAIMANTS IN CONNECTICUT RISE TO 62,537

The number of jobless claimants for unemployment-insurance benefits in Connecticut rose to 62,537 during the week ended March 19, from 61,804 for the previous week. The total was 151 percent higher than the 24,888 who filed a year ago. Benefits paid out last week amounted to $821,848.

Initial claims, which start a new claims series, declined to 7,241 from 7,959 for the previous week.

Bridgeport led the State in the number of jobless claimants with 10,147 followed by New Haven 8,749, Hartford 7,316, and Waterbury 7,307. The other 15 offices were each under 3,200.

A steel and wire products firm laid off 300, a brass company 150, a watch factory 150, and a chain manufacturer 110 with lack of work the reason in each instance. Other lack-of-work lay-offs totaling 425 in the bearings industry, 250 in metal products, 90 in ordnance, 85 in hats, and 90 in textiles were reported. A razor manufacturer rehired 30.

Blow-by-Blow Account of the Veterans' Pension Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I feel the time has come to review the action of the House with respect to the so-called Rankin pension bill. Briefly, here are the facts and a blow-by-blow account of round No. 1 of the veterans' pension battle:

First. Since the Eighty-first Congress convened, the following pension bills were introduced for veterans of World War I and World War II on the same or similar bases as the veterans of the War with Spain: H. R. 8, H. R. 897, H. R. 1693, H. R. 2068, and other related pension bills.

Second. Hearings on pension legislation for veterans of World War I and World War II were held by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on January 27, February 1, 2, 3, 8, and ended on February 9. During these hearings representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, Veterans Committee presented testimony. States, AMVETS, and American Veterans' Committee presented testimony.

Third. In a statement made on the floor of the House and contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Monday, February 7, Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs invited Members of Congress to testify before that Committee. Chairman RANKIN'S invitation was accepted by six Members of Congress.

Fourth. On February 16 the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H. R. 2681 by majority vote. This bill, known as the committee bill and introduced by Chairman RANKIN, contained selected provisions from other bills pending before the committee at that time.

Fifth. Printed hearings of the testimony given before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs by all witnesses were distributed to each Member of Congress about March 1. These printed hearings contained factual and statistical information on the veterans' pension in general, including the number of veterans affected and the estimated cost. From time to time additional information was received from the Veterans' Administration and other sources. This information was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of Members of Congress.

Sixth. On March 9, Chairman RANKIN announced that he would call up the veterans' pension bill, H. R. 2681, on Tuesday, March 22, under the rules of the House giving soldiers' pension legislation priority. He announced that there would be 3 hours of general debate after which the bill would then be read for amendments.

Seventh. When the provisions of H. R. 2681 became known, there was launched immediately one of the most bitter attacks ever directed against veterans' pension legislation. False and misleading propaganda was employed by opponents of the bill. The veteran was portrayed as a Treasury raider. For the first time in the history of Congress, the cost of legislation was projected far into the future, as a carefully planned design to mislead the American people.

Eighth. Among the real opponents of the so-called Rankin pension bill were the social planners who, through their spokesmen on the floor of the House, revealed the desire to submerge veterans' benefits by consolidating the Veterans' Administration with the Social Security Administration. This same group also has plans to merge Veterans' Administration hospitals with other Federal hospitals under the proposed Department of Public Welfare, thus destroying the identity of the veterans' hospitals. They also are working in the direction of abolishing veterans' preference for employment with the Federal Government.

Ninth. What position did the major veterans' organizations take with respect to the pension question?

(a) Both the American Legion with its 3,500,000 members and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with 1,500,000 members vigorously supported the pension question. The American Legion accepted the Rankin bill as reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans of Foreign Wars favored the Rankin bill with amendments.

(b) The AMVETS with a membership of 160,000 and the American Veterans Committee with a membership of 40,000 united in opposing the pension question. Both these organizations indicated that benefits for the veteran should be in the form of social security.

Tenth. When it became apparent on February 7 that the benefits provided by the Rankin bill were highly controversial and were being referred to as too costly, I introduced at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars a compromise bill known as H. R. 2379. On February 8, I was called before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and for nearly an hour discussed the provisions of my compromise bill, H. R. 2379. My testimony was supported by not only factual information but an estimate of the cost of the compromise bill. The discussion between members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and myself is part of the printed hearings on the so-called Rankin bill and may be found on pages 149 to 159, inclusive.

Briefly, the compromise bill provided that a veteran of World War I and World War II holding an honorable discharge and with at least 90 days of service would receive a pension of $90 monthly upon reaching the age of 65 years, provided his income did not exceed $2,000 annually if he was single, and $3,000 annually if married. In addition, an eligible veteran if disabled, mentally ill, or blind and requiring the constant aid of an attendant, would be entitled to $120 monthly regardless of age. If such a veteran is not in need of an attendant but is permanently and totally disabled, he would receive $90 a month regardless of age; if 75 percent disabled, $75 monthly; and if 50 percent disabled, $50 monthly.

In the case of widows of World War I veterans receiving non-service-connected pension benefits, the present income limitation of $1,000 without children and $2,500 with children would be increased to $2,000 and $3,000, respectively. In determining income, the proceeds of life-insurance policies from any source would not be considered as income. By reason of the income limitations or so-called needs clause, the cost of the original Rankin bill before amendment would be greatly reduced. It is estimated that the reduction in cost would be approximately 70 percent.

Eleventh. On March 22 Chairman RANKIN called up H. R. 2681 for consideration on the floor of the House for 3 hours of general debate. Before the debate it was mutually agreed by Chairman RANKIN, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and myself, and other Members of Congress that the Rankin pension bill would probably pass the House this session of Congress if it were amended along the lines of my compromise bill, H. R. 2379. Publicity concerning the amendments was given in the newspapers, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and over the radio. In general, Members

of the House were fully familiar with the series of amendments to be offered to perfect the Rankin bill so as to conform to the provisions of H. R. 2379. It was further agreed that in perfecting the Rankin bill the veteran of World War II should be excluded, except the permanent and totally disabled veteran of World War II regardless of age and who is in need of an attendant.

Twelfth. As the debate on the Rankin bill got underway, it became apparent that the House membership opposing the bill was divided into the following groups:

1. Administration supporters.
2. Social planners.
3. Those who were confused by misleading propaganda and false statements.

Group No. 2 comprised of social planners, while giving lip service to a pension bill for veterans, revealed themselves on repeated occasions as masters in the art of creating confusion. One moment they appeared to be for the bill and the next moment they were voting to kill the bill. Several spokesmen for the social planners revealed their true objective during the general debate when they spoke in glowing terms of the day when social-security benefits would take care of all veterans. Many members who took part in the debate made fine contributions to the pension cause. Some were opposed yet were sincere. But through all the debate, the social planners revealed themselves in their true light as disciples of confusion. Their sole objective was to create doubt in the minds of Members of Congress in the hope of recommitting the bill and thus killing it.

Thirteenth. When general debate ended and the Rankin bill was ordered read for amendments, the true friends of the veteran in Congress were not hard to find. The first parliamentary action taken was a motion to kill the Rankin bill by returning it to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This motion was defeated but not before two roll calls were taken—roll calls No. 40 and 41, pages 2963–2964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 22, 1949. This motion if it had carried would not only have denied the friends of the veterans in Congress the opportunity to amend the Rankin bill but it was also designed to kill the legislation.

With the social-planners amendment defeated, the real friends of the veteran in Congress launched the effort to perfect the Rankin bill in the following manner:

(a) An amendment was offered to clarify the eligibility requirements so as to make mandatory an honorable discharge with 90 or more days' service. This amendment removed 46,951 dishonorably or otherwse discharged veterans from under the provisions of the bill.

(b) To remove the veterans of World War II from the bill an amendment was offered and after much debate the amendment was defeated. The strength of the opposition to this amendment was represented by the social planners who were content to let the Social Security Act take care of the veteran when he reaches the age of 65.

If the amendment excluding World War II veterans were approved, some 16,000,000 veterans of World War II would be ineligible for benefits under the Rankin bill. Thus the cost of the legislation would have been greatly reduced. It was pointed out during the debate on this amendment that those veterans of World War II who are now permanently and totally disabled or 65 years of age or over with a 10-percent disability can now draw benefits under part III, extension 5, of existing Veterans' Regulations. Thus the disabled and aged veterans of World War II are eligible for benefits under existing law.

(c) Realizing that an income limitation was necessary, the House approved an amendment to the eligibility requirements to the effect that the income of an eligible veteran if single, should not exceed $2,000 annually and if married, $3,000 annually.

Before this amendment was approved, it was pointed out that an income limitation represents a radical departure from the traditional pension policy of our Government. It was recalled, however, that a precedent was established when Congress voted non-service-connected disability benefits to the veteran of World War I and his widow. The amendment was approved and as a result the cost of the Rankin bill was reduced by 70 percent.

(d) Several amendments, to provide a schedule of benefits for those veterans partially disabled, were defeated. By the defeat of these amendments, another saving was made in the cost of the bill.

(e) An amendment reducing the amount of the pension from $90 to $72 monthly was adopted, and a further saving in the cost of the bill was effected.

(f) An amendment striking out the $72 monthly benefit and providing a schedule of benefits on length and type of service was adopted. This amendment was never considered in committee and no one had any idea of its cost. While the sponsor of the amendment was undoubtedly sincere, the social planners had a field day when it was adopted for it created real confusion.

Fourteenth. On Thursday, March 24, without the House having an opportunity to further perfect the bill, the social planners aided by the administration supporters offered a motion to send the bill back to the House Committee on World War Veterans' Affairs. Only 10 minutes of debate was allowed on this motion. On a roll call the motion carried by a vote 208 to 207, or by a margin of 1 vote. Thus the social planners were victorious in their program to scuttle the so-called Rankin bill.

Fifteenth. If the Rankin bill had not been returned to committee, the opportunity would have been afforded to the true friends of the veterans to further amend the bill by offering the following three amendments:

(a) Remove widows of World War II from the bill.

(b) Increase income limitations for veterans of World War I and World War II and the widows of veterans of World War I now receiving benefits under existing law.

(c) An amendment to correct the title of the bill.

Sixteenth. If the Rankin bill had been amended along the lines of the compromise bill, H. R. 2379, and in compliance with the wishes of the true friends of the veteran in Congress, the bill would be as follows:

(a) Honorably discharged veterans of World War I would receive at the age of 65 a pension of $72 monthly. If the veteran is permanently and totally disabled and in need of attendant, he would receive $120 monthly regardless of age.

(b) The World War I veteran receiving benefits under this bill would be ineligible for benefits if his income exceeded $2,000 annually if single and $3,000 annually if married.

(c) The veteran of World War I and World War II and the widow of the World War I veteran receiving benefits under existing law would have their income limitation increased.

Seventeenth. The cost of the amended Rankin bill as outlined in paragraph 16 would approximate $50,000,000 in 1950 the first year, and reach a peak in 1963 of $1,500,000,000. The cost would begin to decline after 1963 due to the death rate of World War I veterans.

Eighteenth. It is estimated that the last veteran of World War I will die by 1995. Thus, the total over-all cost of the Rankin bill as it was sought to be amended would not exceed the total cost of $15,000,000,000 during the life of the law. In other words, this pension for World War I veterans would not have cost as much as the Marshall plan to aid foreign nations.

Nineteenth. The two largest veteran organizations as the result of the debate and the defeat of the Rankin bill recognize two important developments as far as veterans' benefits are concerned. These developments are as follows:

(a) A determined effort on the part of social planners to destroy the traditional policy of recognizing the veteran and his dependents as a special group.

(b) To have all veterans' benefits absorbed by an expanded social-security program which would include merging Veterans' Administration hospitals with Public Health hospitals thus destroying the identity of the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

(c) Lastly, to abolish civil-service preference for veterans when applying for employment with the Federal Government.

Twentieth. The two largest veteran organizations accept roll call No. 44, page 3115 of the March 24, 1949, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a challenge which demands their best efforts in combating antiveteran influences. They recognize that a vote to recommit the Rankin bill as recorded in roll call No. 44 was a vote to kill the bill and against the best interests of the veterans of this country.

Twenty-first. The real issue behind the scenes is whether the social planners can attain their objective of having the Social Security Administration absorb the Veterans' Administration. Organized veterandom is prepared to meet this challenge in the coming months when all true friends of the veteran will have to stand up and be counted.

Three Great Spanish Intellectuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask permission to quote the following explanation made by my good friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs:

This clear, correct elucidation of facts was published on the editorial page of the New York Times on February 26, 1949. Dr. Thorning's exposition should be considered in connection with some of the misrepresentations made about intellectual life in Spain which appeared recently. (Mr. Ernest O. Hauser, the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 26, 1949, and Mr. Homer Bigart, correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, in the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1949.) Both Mr. Hauser and Mr. Bigart claimed, in general terms, that the Government has waged a quiet, all-out campaign against Spain's intellectuals or that in the matter of personal liberty, Spain is about on a par with Hungary—that is, Hungary up to the start of the present Communist campaign against the Catholic opposition.

This attempt to place on a par the Soviet satellite states, behind the iron curtain, and Spain, where the three founders of the republic are working for peace and unity, although free to express their opinions as they see fit, is typical of left-wing propaganda against Spain. The secularists of the left, realizing that a majority of the states in the United Nations favor rescinding the obsolete 1946 resolution recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic mission from Madrid, are engaged in a tremendous campaign of vilification and misrepresentation in order to stave off defeat.

This explains why Mr. Marvin Tonkin, acting chief of the Associated Press in Chicago, could accept, uncritically, the handout sent to his bureau and allow the lead to describe the famous Spanish scholar, Don José Ortega y Gasset, as an anti-Franco oppositionist, without any hint in this part of the propaganda press release that the gifted gentleman was not only residing peacefully in Spain, but also perfectly free to speak his mind as well as to leave the country at will, something that would scarcely have been true in Sovietized Hungary from the moment the Soviet Gauleiter, Matyas Rakosi (trained by the Leftists in the Spanish civil war) took charge with a real totalitarian program. Red fascism is something quite different from the type of militaristic dictatorship which exists in the Iberian Peninsula.

Can anyone imagine the Soviet Gauleiter of Czechoslovakia, Klement Gottwald, permitting a group of intellectuals like Prof. Ortega y Gasset, Dr. Gregorio Marañon, and Don Ramón Pérez de Ayala, to speak, write, and circulate, freely? It is opportune that slanderous comparisons cease and I believe that Dr. Thorning's elucidation of this subject will contribute to that end.

In an Associated Press dispatch from Chicago which was published in the New York Times of February 17 it was announced that three European scholars had accepted invitations to attend the International Goethe Convocation at Aspen, Colo., this summer.

Excellent as the news is, it was marred, in my estimation, by the misleading description of Prof. José Ortega y Gasset, admittedly one of Spain's most gifted sons, as a voluntary exile since the Franco regime came to power * * * and professor of philosophy and literature at the University of Madrid before 1931.

Would any readers of the New York Times, or others in the United States who saw this Associated Press story, have gained the impression of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? This question is relevant because the fact is, as every European intellectual knows, that Don José Ortega y Gasset is no longer in exile, either self-imposed or compulsory. Best of all, for the sake of philosophy and letters, he is giving regular lectures in the famous Ateneo de Madrid, where prior to 1931 he led the movement for the republic, with the cooperation of two other world-famous scholars, Dr. Gregorio Marañon and Don Ramón Pérez de Ayala.

In view of widespread misapprehensions in the United States this is an opportune moment to note that these three founders of the Spanish Republic, which might have fulfilled a glorious destiny, are now working for peace and unity among the people of Spain.

Dr. Marañon, whose achievements in biology are widely recognized, is practicing his profession of medicine in Madrid. Furthermore, he is an honored member of all the scientific academies connected with his area of specialization, laboring for the good of humanity among his own people and with the blessing of the present Spanish Government. This is the more significant because, in other days, Prof. Ortega y Gasset, Dr. Marañon and Don Ramón were the most enthusiastic and influential leaders of the organization known as Al Servicio de la Republica (in the Service of the Republic).

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs.

Taxes Go Up, Up, and Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial carried by the San Francisco News on a speech made on the floor of the House on March 14 by our colleague, Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington, on the subject of taxes go up, up and up.

In that speech Congressman MACK told members that whereas our Federal Government collected only $4,418,913 in taxes during the first 3 years of the George Washington administration, it collected $44,745,542,076 in taxes during 1948. Representative MACK pointed out that—

The amount of money our Federal Government collected in taxes in a single day in the fiscal year 1948 was sufficient to have operated the Federal Government for more than 100 years at the George Washington rate of spending.

The editorial from the San Francisco News follows:

JUST HOW HIGH IS PUBLIC DEBT?

The other day someone told Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington State, that the Federal taxes paid by the American people in a year would equal a stack of $1,000 bills as high as New York's 1,250-foot Empire State Building.

Mr. MACK was skeptical. He consulted a banker. The banker sent for a thousand new $1 bills, each the same thickness as a $1,000 bill. The thousand bills made a 4-inch pile. Mr. MACK and the banker then did some figuring, as follows:

A million-dollar stack (1,000 $1,000 bills) would be 4 inches high.

A billion-dollar stack (1,000,000 $1,000 bills) would be 4,000 inches, or about 333 feet.

President Truman's budget message calls for some $44,000,000,000 in Federal taxes for next fiscal year. That would be 44,000,000 $1,000 bills, which would make a 14,625-foot stack.

Quite a stack. It would be nearly 12 times as tall as the Empire State Building, more than 26 times as tall as the Washington Monument, and a couple of hundred feet higher than the loftiest mountain in the United States.

Congressman MACK and his banker friend sharpened their pencils and went to work on the $252,000,000,000 national debt. That, they calculated, would equal a stack of $1,000 bills towering almost 16 miles into the sky.

"We Americans have a long way to climb if we're ever going to get the Government out of debt," Mr. MACK told the House. "Congress had better start pruning extravagance and waste."

Politics From the Inside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, at St. Mary of the Springs College, Columbus, Ohio, on March 13, 1949:

Politics is at once the most hazardous and the most noble worldly career open to man. It is hazardous because it is beset by temptations even more seductive than the song of the sirens. He who yields may not only lose respect, personal liberty and his immortal soul, but may also work irreparable harm in the community, the nation and the world. It is a noble career because nowhere else can man expect to render so much service to his fellow man.

This week marks the birthdays of two great American politicians whose good deeds have won for them immortality. Tuesday is the anniversary of Andrew Jackson, soldier-statesman, an embodiment of Americanism, and Friday marks the birth of Grover Cleveland, for whom public office was a public trust. Both were supermen by reason of clear thinking, great courage and a large sense of public duty. By reason of these qualities they became great leaders, and as they led wisely their fame has endured. We honor their memories because of the stones they laid in the great edifice of progress and civilization.

Next month marks the deaths of two men who became intoxicated rather than tempered by power. Both aspired to be supermen but became arch fiends through the debasing alchemy of yielding to temptation. Adolf Hitler died by his own hand, beneath the rubble of Berlin, and Benito Mussolini, riddled with bullets, was hanged by his feet by an infuriated Milanese mob. Degrada-

tion is the inevitable end of those who betray their trust. I speak of the final judgment of history rather than the violence of the mob, for the verdict of time may revise the passions and prejudices of the moment, although hardly in the case of the two men of infamy whose careers will serve as an object lesson for all time.

There is one among the living today who can profit most by their ignominious fate. His hands are steeped in blood and their smoking red shadow hovers over us now, the most frightful menace to peace in a world of war and hate. I speak of Josef Stalin, the man of dark and bloody designs and frightful ambition, the sin of the angels. There is yet time for this man to repent and renounce slavery, torture, terror, and other instruments of darkness to accept justice and liberty for all, as the guiding light of leadership.

Those who rule by fear live in fear. Why else does Stalin, who gives mouth honor to peace, refuse to come to this country to make peace? The chief function of the police in a police state is to protect the chief of state. Certainly reign of terror is not calculated to protect Stalin from the love and affection of the Russian people, but to protect him from his fears of the Russian people, however real these may be. Stalin is aware that man abhors tyranny and will cheerfully brave death to end it for his fellows.

The vicious persecutions of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the 15 Protestant clergymen in Bulgaria demonstrate that the fear of the word of God is greater than the brutality of anti-Christ dictatorship. Their power by terror cannot survive in the light of the Prince of Peace. We know, and dictators know, that freedom of conscience is the first essential of human liberty. We would fight for freedom of conscience and they resort to torture, threats, and terror in their efforts to kill or silence conscience. In the end the dictators must be defeated and, again, there is profit in examples of Stalin.

World peace can be achieved in our time if the gag were removed from the Russian mouths, censorship were lifted from the Russian mind and religion were allowed to glow in the Russian heart. Freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and freedom of religion are the great cornerstone of our civilization. These were won for us in slow stages by political leaders from the dawn of man. They are yet to be won in the darkness behind the iron curtain. Without them this would have been a different America. Perhaps it would not have been America at all. As we enjoy them, let us not forget they were brought to us by political leaders.

I stand before you today because I spent 35 years in active political life in the community, State, and Nation. For the past 5 years I have been in business, on the sidelines, yet an interested observer of the political scene. I am proud of having been a politician. I hope that in my years in this career I was of some service to my town, county, State, and country. I am equally proud that I am a businessman. I also hope that I am rendering service to my fellow citizens in my present role.

Politicians stand more abuse, year in and year out, than perhaps any other class of citizens. And yet the success of our form of government, in large measure, is entrusted to their care. Public opinion in our country must find an outlet. We have grown too large for the town meeting with its individual participation. Orderly and effective expression now comes through political parties. The organizing of political parties and employing them to express the will of the people is the work of the politician. The political leaders must harmonize conflicting points of view, reach compromises which pave the path of political progress and chart the course of the ship of state. When politicians fail, the country fails. The last two decades have given us ample evidence of this fact.

Politics may be as pure or impure as the people themselves determine. If there is no public conscience why should there be complaint that none speaks in the politician's breast. Often have I heard eminent and successful businessmen announce they are in business, not in politics. It has always seemed to me that this is a confession of neglected duty, rather than the boast of superiority which is intended. If the wrong kind of politician gets control and uses his office for his own advantage or that of his organization, it is frequently the fault of those who conceive themselves to be too busy to be interested in their own Government, except when the Government adopts a policy which they deem harmful to their own personal interests or withdraws a privilege they have enjoyed.

Unhappily, the politician is no better and no worse than his fellow men. If our political leaders could all be Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Lincolns, our problems, which seem to become more complicated each year, might not loom so large on our daily horizon. Then, maybe we could sit back, without a worry or care, and let the leaders hew at the Gordian knots.

Politics has its share of conscientious, high-minded, incorruptible men. And it has its share of scoundrels. I like to think the proportion of the latter is small to that of the former. However, I will content myself by saying that the number of honest politicians is no more or less than we deserve and greater than we think. I have known men of both types and I must say there was more good in the worst of the political scoundrels than there was in prototypes I have known in other walks of life.

My 35 years in politics were among the most turbulent years in national and world history. It has been my good fortune to know, on rather intimate terms, the leaders of almost every country. Those years brought me some personal triumphs, troops of friends, thousands of memories, and a million laughs against a share of defeats, a few heartaches, and many disappointments. All in all, I have no searing regrets and I can truthfully say I hate no man. Politics has brought me honors, but more important it has brought me the good will of my fellow men, for which I am deeply and humbly grateful.

My boyhood and my entrance into politics in Rockland County, N. Y., was not unusual. I suppose that most men of my age had a similar boyhood and I am certain that those who chose a political career traveled the broad highway of public life much as I did. I was born a Democrat. I expect to die a Democrat, but I am as confirmed a believer in the two-party system, as this broad land of ours knows. I do not believe that party interest should supersede the national interest and I am aware there are many good men in the Republican Party, whose counsels help guide the national way, even if I do feel that the country prospers best under Democratic control.

If I cite my own career, it is not through any sense of self-importance, but because I can best point the inside of politics from my own experience. And, also, because I wish to emphasize the importance of participation in local politics. Politics in the village and politics in the national capital are played by the same rules. The proper study of the politicians is his fellow man. We are prone to think of politics in terms of campaigns and elections and to neglect the human element. Ambition, love, jealousy, hate and the other emotions affect the course of the Nation just as much as they affect the course of the village and county and State. Often the emotions play a more important part than principles or events. If you know the politics of your community you know the politics of the Nation and the world.

Before I was old enough to vote, I ran errands for party leaders. I rang doorbells and banged knockers and helped get the vote out in behalf of Democratic candidates. In the Taft-Bryan campaign of 1908, the Democratic committeeman of my district was taken ill before the election and from his sickbed charged me to take over his duties. After his death I was elected a member of the Democratic town committee, Peter Mundeville was elected in the first district and Pat Caffrey was the choice in the second district. Neither of them could see the other as town chairman so they ended by electing me. Too often have I seen this curious quirk in human nature operate in politics since that day, and I invariably think of those two stubborn men when I see some one slaking injured pride by drinking what little solace there can be in depriving another of a position at the expense of losing it himself. I have seen it up to nomination for the Presidency itself.

This taste of politics whetted my appetite for public office, which again is a most common reaction. In those days the highest office I could see on my political horizon was the New York Senate, but I did not expect to reach that in one leap. My first objective was the post of town clerk. I confided my ambitions to Pat Morrissey, proprietor of a village store, who sought to dissuade me, warning that men are inclined to neglect everything else for politics and apt to become embittered when political success eludes them. I can hear his final words, even now: "However, no matter what advice I am giving you, if you have made up your mind that you want to run, then run you will and nothing can be done about it. So run and get it out of your system. If you win good luck to you. If you lose, may you profit by the experience."

Not bad advice to this day. Politics was in my blood and I ran. The difficulties ahead of me were considerable. In the first place, the office had been filled by men of stature in the community. I was a stripling and it would be regarded as unseemly of me to reach out for a position of no little influence and dignity. Then, too, the community was normally Republican. The nomination was not difficult to secure because it usually went abegging for someone willing to take it on the chin for the party. My worthy and distinguished Republican opponent waited for the post to fall into his lap. My opponent's example seems to have survived in the Republican Party, if I may only for a moment recall the last presidential campaign.

I upset the law of political gravity in my community by starting out to meet every voter in Stony Point Township. I was helped by the fact that my semiprofessional ball playing made me known to most of my fellow men. This may seem far from addressing every whistle stop along presidential campaign routes, but the difference is chiefly one of size. The American people love a fighter and they have a wealth of sympathy for the underdog. On the other hand, they resent superiority, dislike smugness, and they have little use for the man who runs away from a battle. To borrow a figure of speech from my days as a politician-ballplayer, the American people do not love a candidate who waits for a base on balls.

My first campaign, which, incidentally, was successful, gave me the background for running other campaigns. Running for the humblest or the highest office is not so different as it may seem at first blush. The problems are much the same. You can speak too often or not enough. You can begin talking too soon or too late. You can say too much or too little. You can be too

polite or not polite enough. You can be too friendly or not friendly enough. Your accents may be too perfect or not perfect enough. You can be too immaculate or not immaculate enough. You can be too wise or not wise enough. And if there be anyone who thinks I refer to the recent campaign I hope he will profit from my words.

However, I prefer to remark that at any given time any of these extremes may prove fatal. Public sentiment is difficult to measure at any time. What may be good in June can be disastrous in December. You are called on to make split decisions, which may be fatal. An ill-chosen quip may bowl over the immediate audience but have quite the opposite effect with the vast multitude of voters. Finally, many a political career has been blasted because the feelings of some party leaders may be wounded. The slight may be unintentional but not the less deadly.

Politics, then, is the great American game. Party conventions have all the color and pageantry of sport spectacles. The politician must be able to hit like a tackle, roll with the punch like a fighter, parry like a fencer, show the change of pace of a pitcher, have the endurance of a distance runner, the grace of a diver, and the form of a tennis champion, to say nothing of the social grace of a ballroom dancer, and the intuition for precedence of a social dowager.

But politics is more than a game. It can be a career of honored service. Good politics can and should be good government. I learned this from my first days in the office of town clerk. I made it a point, as many others have, to do everything possible to carry out my duties efficiently, thoughtfully, and courteously. I have found that men in politics are longer at their desks, as a rule, than others. They are, and this may come as a surprise, more thoughtful and courteous as a class than any other group of men and women. I say this advisedly. The politician is not so brusk or domineering in his treatment of those who work under him or those who come to see him as are men of business, for example.

Politicians, as a class, like people. They delight in serving people. Of course they hope to gain advancement by this. But I can testify there is a genuine satisfaction in being of service to your fellow men. To this day, I am warmed when someone clasps my hand to give thanks for a favor rendered long ago. I may have long since forgotten the favor but it is good to find gratitude living on. It may have helped a man to a small job; it may have been only a kind word at a political rally; it may have been only a letter of introduction; it may have been a big boost up the political ladder, or it may have been a part played in legislation.

In rendering service, the politician has nothing to offer, in the final analysis, but his own word. If he tells the truth and keeps his word he gains the devotion of his friends and the respect of his enemies. Honest men can and do have honest differences. More often than not there is something to be said on both sides of a public question. Most legislation is the result of compromise in committees, on the floor of the House, the floor of the Senate, and in conference of House and Senate conferees. Compromise does not mean the surrender of principles or ideals but is the leveling influence of tolerance and understanding.

There is a gap as wide as that between honor and dishonor between compromise and surrender. Surrender is an abject and cowardly sacrifice of principles and ideals. It is a departure from the truth. This involves many fine questions as to how much personal principles and ideals may be sacrificed to the welfare of the party. While I am no moral philosopher I can answer that both parties have men of widely divergent views on some issues, who can remain in the party fold and freely express their positions, no matter how strong they clash with the party's position. Differences within the party are healthful. When the party thinks as one man, freedom has been exiled as it is in the Soviet Union.

The man who does not tell the truth and keep his word is distrusted and shunned. My mother taught me that truth should be told for its own sake and the conscience's sake. Most successful men in politics find it to be the easier as well as the most respected course. In rare instances where one cannot tell the truth, because he is bound by his word not to reveal party plans prematurely, it is not necessary to weave entangling webs of falsehoods. The best method is to say that you are sorry but you just cannot be questioned on that particular subject. The giving of one's word in politics is the execution of a solemn bond, not unlike the execution of a business contract.

Let me return to myself to illustrate this point. I was and still am opposed to a third term. In that position I opposed the majority of my party. However, that did not make me opposed to the party. I participated in the national convention that voted the third-term nomination. I registered my opposition by allowing my name to be presented for the nomination when no one was more aware than I that I did not have the slightest chance of winning that nomination. By my participation I bound myself to accept the will of the majority, but I did not bind myself to break with the party because I was in the minority. To this day some good people cannot understand that because I was overwhelmingly voted down on a test I sought, I did not leave the party and become a member of the Republican Party, merely because it was against a third term. They were not aware that the Republican Party would have, and properly, too, oppcsed even one term for me had I been the party's nominee. The Republicans were against Franklin D. Roosevelt because he was a strong nominee, as much as they were against the third term in principle, as the 1912 Progressive ticket demonstrated.

For the scoundrel in politics I feel nothing but pity. The corrupt and dishonest are revealed sooner or later. Disgrace comes at the hands of the party, the opposition, or the people. The man who has betrayed his trust stands revealed as a weakling, unworthy of the loyalty of his friends and the confidence of the people. He drags down not only himself but his family and his friends. The Judas agony of these unfortunates has always moved me to compassion. I abhor their crime but I have no hate for the broken weaklings. Let us not torture them with vengeance, but rather give them opportunity to make their peace against the day of judgment.

Politics is no place for the coward or the grumbler. The man who will not fight fearlessly for what he believes is doomed to anonymity. Discontent is more common. Discontent's invasion of the pride is a common disease of humanity, but in the politician it sears the soul and dries public progress. There is no shame in losing a fight, as there is in running away from a contest of principle. Sometimes brooding over defeat is difficult to bear because it involves ostracism. The fighter is passed by, by those he regarded as friends, even those for whom he did most. Men have gone from such discontent to cynicism and bitterness. Time always vindicates the honest fighter although it may not approve his cause. Defeat can be, and frequently is, more glorious than victory. The man who can accept both gracefully never lacks friends and his influence is ever felt in public affairs.

Politics is no place for the sluggard. Probably no man works longer or harder than the successful politician. Duties of office are exacting enough, but he must make himself accessible to all people at all times. If you win or would remain you must circulate freely among people. During the humble days as town clerk I was at my desk every night, although the post carried no pay except fees of office, most of which I waived in the interests of serving my Stony Point fellow townsmen. I was at my desk, although I put in long and strenuous days in earning my livelihood in New York City.

Let me note here parenthetically that public service makes heavy inroads on family life. The man who likes people finds that the hours he can give to his family become fewer and fewer, but are the more precious. Time after time I have been struck by the fact that where there is a man successful in public life there is a patient, charming and noble woman at his side. I do not know why politicians, as a class, have such fine wives. It must be because there are so many wise, understanding and beautiful women, although I like to think, in my own case, that politicians are excellent pickers.

Lest I be misunderstood, I do not consider politics as an exclusive masculine domain. I use the term "man" as distinct from "beast" although I am aware that Aristotle identified man as a political animal and that at times some political leaders would shame beasts. I have worked with men and women in politics and find women as capable of public service as men.

It was my aim when I first took office to render some attention or service to everyone in Stony Point. I did the same as a State legislator. I conceived the practice of writing every voter in the community, a practice which was to stand me in good stead in the national scene. I tried to take each voter into partnership in the performance of my duties. I took note of births, deaths, and anniversaries in personal letters and found when I entered the Cabinet that these attentions were appreciated no less on a national scale than they were in the community. It has been said my letter writing had much to do with the building of the Democratic machine which has remained in power for 16 years. I like to think so, although I realize that one must discount friendly exaggeration.

In this connection let me dwell on one popular myth. It has been said of me that I know more people than any man in the country. In all modesty, I must confess there is considerable truth in this statement. But it is also said that I know every one of these people by name. If that were true, I should be detailed to stand beside the judgment seat and identify my American contemporaries at that great hour. I have no desire to judge my fellow man now or hereafter, but earnestly pray that I can so conduct myself, and it takes a great deal of my time, that I will be dealt with kindly in that hour myself. One of the things that will go harsh with me in that hour are my thoughts of those people who approach me after one casual meeting, even one of years back, to say, "I want to test you; who am I?" or "You don't really remember me; what's my name?" My memory is better than average, and I have cultivated it, as everyone in politics should, but it doesn't approach what my irritating challengers expect.

If I have emphasized personal and individual phases of politics too much, it is not because I am not aware of the importance of politics from the viewpoint of groups of individuals or parties. It is altcgether fitting and proper that we should be governed by political parties. This has been so from the dawn of self-government in Greece; that parties struggle for management of the government.

More often than not parties take color and appeal, or the opposite, from their leadership. This is as it should be. Yet, it must not be forgotten that parties have certain fundamental principles which differ sharply, even though these fundamentals are being

constantly revised and attain varying degrees of emphasis by the play of social and economic forces and by the interplay of events and personalities in the party, in the nation, and in the world.

In our own country we have two parties with more or less fixed ranks of party faithful and a large body of independent voters who cast their votes for this party or that. The cleavage between the parties is not distinct, just as the division between night and day is not sharply defined. There is a twilight zone, and a good thing, too, for it enables men of both parties to support good measures each develops without breaking with their own party. Records of Congress offer ample evidence that certain fundamental principles or policies are above and beyond partisanship.

As a life-long Democrat, I am a firm believer in the two-party system and believe it would be a tragedy if the Democratic or Republican Party were to pass from the scene. I am sure that if all the Democrats would be stricken at one fell swoop, the Republicans would carry on the Government with conscientious regard for the principles of Jefferson, just as the Democrats would, I am certain, give consideration to the principles of Lincoln, if all Republicans were suddenly stricken. In fact, I believe that all Americans, regardless of birth, race, creed, or color, would keep the fire of liberty alight on their hearthstones if accident were to befall their fellow countrymen of other color, other creed, and foreign birth.

Americans look out upon a world torn by strife and discord. We have not contented ourselves with compassion, but have given freely of our resources to help other nations to liberty and plenty. America is leading the other nations through dangers and vicissitudes toward liberty and abundance. We have seen and are seeing dictators come to power and rise to authority because people had lost their faith in democratic processes. There is nothing that will undermine American institutions more rapidly or more dangerously than poor and inefficient government. At this time in the history of the world it is of utmost importance that each citizen do his part in providing an honest, able, and sincere administration of public affairs from the community to the National Capital.

Freedom has been tortured and outraged for almost two generations. She shrieks each time a free government falls. These cries should warn us to protect our liberties at home and strengthen our resolve to help every free people combat tyranny in any form anywhere in the world. America is the Greatheart of the nations, helping others out of our resources and wisdom, out of pits of want, fear, and hate toward the horizon of liberty and justice and peace.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered over radio station KWKH at Shreveport, La., on March 26, 1940. Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, on subject Air Power:

Ladies and gentlemen, recently the President nominated Louis Johnson, attorney of West Virginia, to fill the extremely important position of Secretary of National Defense, succeeding James Forrestal. His nomination is now in the Senate and he will undoubtedly be confirmed within the very near future. Louis Johnson will be remembered by veterans everywhere as having been a former national commander and leader of the American Legion. He will be remembered by Americans, generally, as having been Assistant Secretary of War immediately before the outbreak of World War II. The return of Secretary Johnson to Washington will have a marked effect upon all defense legislation. More than anything else, I believe it will mean a tendency to quicken the unification of the three great branches of the armed services, namely, the Army, Navy, and Air. A start has already been made in this direction but until unification is complete, our people will not reap the tremendous benefit in efficiency and in savings which is possible by pushing unification to a conclusion. It is thought that as much as $2,000,000,000 per annum might be saved by completing our unification program, and Louis Johnson, with a wealth of background, experience, and tremendous prestige, will bring to the defense establishment something which it has needed very badly during the last few years.

This new appointment to the Cabinet has accentuated the struggle to increase our military air power. This struggle is becoming increasingly intense as men of vision and patriotism demand a proper place in our defense establishment for the Air Force. During the early part of this week the House of Representatives, responding to the intense interest of the Nation, by a vote of 395 to 4, passed a bill to further expand our Air Force.

The passage of this bill marks a historic milestone along the pathway leading toward the full development of the military air power in the United States of America. To this extent, it is therefore deeply significant.

The passage of this bill by the House of Representatives does not, in any sense, signify the end of our fight to obtain adequate recognition for air power in our defense system. On the contrary, even though the present act sets a goal of 70 air groups for our Air Force, our battle must still go on to obtain money to implement this measure when it becomes law.

The struggle for air power in the United States has been a long and bitter one. The record begins in 1908 when the General Staff of the Army yielded to what was popularly termed the air craze, and ordered the construction of our first airplane. It cost the Government $30,000. The Army felt that the expenditure was so great for a new and freakish invention that it went to the trouble of issuing a special explanation so that our people would accept this vast expenditure of money for our first plane.

Initially, our infant air force was placed in the Signal Corps. It remained there for many years and long after the First World War, the chief signal officer of the Army testified in Congress that "the future of aeronautics in the United States Army rests with the Signal Corps. Aviation in military affairs," he said, "is merely an added means of communication, observation, and reconnaissance." There were, however, men and women in this country with vision who did not agree with him, men and women who could see ahead and understand the desperate need for further air expansion. Many of these men and women felt that our Air Force should no longer remain tied down to the Signal Corps but that air development had fully justified an expansion of this arm into a separate corps.

In fact, some air enthusiasts had the temerity to even boast that the day might come when an airplane could sink a mighty battleship. To a few of the old-line Navy officers, this was regarded as rank heresy. Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, who served in the First World War as one of our early aviators, began to insist that a test should be made, predicting in advance that such a test would show that air power could sink battleships. He was rebuffed by the die-hard Army and Navy men, and appealed to Congress. In due course, over the objections of a substantial number in old-line services, Congress did authorize a test between air power and naval power to take place 50 miles off the Virginia Coast. In this test, the former German battleship, the *Ostfriesland*, was bombed with a 2,000-pound bomb and sank in 25 minutes.

General Mitchell was carried on the shoulders of his men in triumph the day after the bombing, but this did not silence the opposition to the development of American military air power. On the contrary, in due course a few of those officers in high authority in the old-line services began to gun for Gen. Billy Mitchell. Eventually, he was tried by court martial and convicted and thrown out of the service. It was one of the most shameful cases on record in the annals of our service. It was the case of one of our younger officers with vision being court martialed for his belief in the ultimate importance of military air power. Only after General Mitchell's death did a grateful Congress appreciate the service which he had rendered in his conviction and presented to his widow a special gold medal of honor in appreciation for what he had meant to the Nation.

And a few of our leaders in the past have been men with limited vision. They have resisted the development of air power to the point of actually endangering the security of our country. The First World War found the Nation, which had invented the airplane, bereft of aircraft and forced to purchase 5,000 airplanes from England, France and other countries in order to establish any type of air force. The Second World War found us with only one long-range B-17 bomber when Hitler's invasion of Poland awakened a sleeping America, and then President Roosevelt called for an air force of 150,000 planes.

In recent years there has been a tendency to permit the Air Force to slip back to its prewar condition with a starvation diet. In fact, the Bureau of the Budget this year approved less than sufficient money. If Congress appropriates no more than the amount suggested by the Budget Bureau, our Air Force will actually be reduced from the 58-group Air Force which we have today to 48 groups—a net reduction of 10 air groups at a time when the cold war is at its height—and this in the face of the repeated warnings of our experts.

It is true, the increase of our Air Force from its present strength of 58 groups to 70 groups, as stipulated this week in the bill which passed the House, will take money. It will take much money. Our experts tell us by the year 1953 the amount needed may reach six and one-half to seven billion dollars per year for this purpose. On the other hand, those with vision who appreciate what is going on in far-away Russia behind the iron curtain, know that we must have an invincible Air Force as our first line of defense.

Without increasing the amount of the budget estimate, we can transpose the sum of $800,000,000 from another item and use it for aircraft, and I believe both Congress and the country want this action taken.

So aware are the people in this country of the potency of air power that your Congress has recently been moved to set up, at heavy expense, a radar screen for this country. There is much military secrecy surrounding such a defense action. On the other hand, the fundamental principles are well known. Our radars developed in the last war can detect hostile aircraft as much as 150

miles distant, and it is planned to locate at strategic points along the coast lines radar-control stations for this purpose. With fast-moving airplanes this means that detection precedes the actual appearance of the plane only by 15 or 20 minutes. In other words, our warning, even by use of radar, will be a very short period of time but, with proper communications, even such a brief time will be of tremendous importance to our defenses. It will at least give our aircraft time to get off the ground and, in many cases, to intercept and attack hostile planes approaching our coast. Already the Congress has passed, and the President signed, a bill which the Armed Services Committee has prepared to give our country this important radar protection.

Only about 2 weeks ago I personally handled a bill which bears my name, to create a base for long-range guided missiles. It has now become a matter of common knowledge that our scientists have developed these unmanned missiles which fly through the sky at supersonic speeds for distances exceeding 500 miles. It is planned in this legislation to have a guided missiles base for these new instruments of the air with ranges up to 3,000 miles or more. Did you ever stop to think of what that means for the future? It means, in the event of further trouble, perhaps our guns and artillery will be outmoded and outdated. It means that men may perhaps be able to stand on the shores of this country and send missiles of destruction into the mobilization camp of an attacking enemy in Europe or Asia. It may revolutionize completely our method of defense and may result in making urgently necessary some means of periodically checking to prevent the nations of the world from secretly building this and other types of death-dealing weapons.

The money which your Congress has appropriated and is now appropriating for laboratory use and development is paying huge dividends. It has made possible the development of the guided missile and the development of many other worth-while projects for our defense. It has developed planes which are, "out of this world", so to speak, and which it is hard for us to fully comprehend ever when we see them. The flying wing and faster jet planes are some that I have in mind.

The other day I was asked to attend an exhibit of our military airplanes at Andrews Field just outside of Washington. It was a startling demonstration of air power. A man at the microphone explained events as they happened. He especially explained the speeds of some of these supersonic airplanes. On the microphone, he began by asking everyone to look quickly to the left, saying, "the next plane will come down the airway in front of the grandstand from the south". He said, "It is only 10 miles below the grandstand and unless you look quickly you may miss it". Hardly had we turned our heads to the South before the plane zoomed by the grandstand at a supersonic speed—such are our newly developed airplanes.

This morning, as I was coming down to the office, I noticed the clouds hung low in the sky. In fact, as I looked up toward the Capitol, I noticed, for the first time I had seen it, that the dome was completely concealed by some of these low-hanging clouds. As I walked along I thought how this symbolized the world situation. In an international sense, not only do the clouds of trouble surround the dome of our Capitol but they likewise hang heavy over many of the capitals of the nations of the earth. Great troubles emanating from the Second World War harass peoples of the world. The struggle between two types of government—democracy on the one hand and communism on the other hand—goes on with unabated zeal. The march of communism is causing great concern here and elsewhere in the world.

The thinking peoples of the world established the United Nations, and it is a functioning organization today. It does not, however, have the power and the effectiveness which we first thought would be possible from such an organization. Because of this fact, the United States Government has felt it necessary to back up the United Nations Organization with treaties and with a strong defense.

The Atlantic Pact has just been submitted to the Senate for confirmation. It marks the greatest departure in our foreign policy since the days of the Monroe Doctrine. It means from now on this country acknowledges the necessity of assuming from the start responsibility for the consequences of events wherever they may occur, and, in effect, it says this country must be prepared to fight if any of these Atlantic powers are attacked.

Our idea now is to prevent a third world war. I am satisfied that either World War I or World War II—perhaps both—might have been prevented had this country been fully prepared to defend itself and had it let the aggressors know at the start of our intention to enter the struggle. If we are to keep a cold war from getting hot, we must have proper development of our air power. No other action will deter another Hitler as much as the impressiveness of our developed military air power. It is vital; it is fundamental if we are to maintain the peace of the world.

Government Expense Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

TRAVELING IS EXPENSIVE

Hearings before the House Committee on Executive Expenditures have produced some convincing testimony in favor of a larger expense allowance for Government employees whose duties require them to travel. The testimony of Dr. George Manov of the Atomic Energy Commission is indicative of how unfair the present $6-a-day allowance is in these days of high lodging and eating costs.

Dr. Manov had been a chemist with the Bureau of Standards for a good many years before he was transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission. Having never been on a traveling assignment for the Bureau of Standards, he did not know what he was letting himself in for when he undertook his AEC task of visiting half a hundred scientific laboratories in scattered parts of the country. Dr. Manov told the committee he had to cover more than 14,000 miles and stay in 36 cities and towns before he had completed his official tour. He had not traveled very far before he saw that his $6 daily allowance would fall far short of paying for his hotel room, meals, taxicab fares, tips, and incidentals. He began hunting for second- and third-rate hotels and restaurants and figuring ways to save on food and other costs. Despite all his thrift, including lugging his own baggage, avoiding tipping when possible, and resorting to other ways of reducing expenses, he found at the end that the trip had cost him $273 out of his own pocket.

Similar experiences have been detailed to the committee by Chief Postal Inspector James J. Doran, B. F. Sheehy, budget director for the Labor Department, and other Federal officials. All witnesses agreed that $6 a day is totally inadequate to pay for good hotel accommodations, meals, and other necessary expenses. A bill now pending before the House would increase the allowance to $10 a day. The bill deserves to be passed.

Our State Department Ought To Give Serious Consideration to Where the American Dollars Taken From the Taxpayers of America Are Going Under the Marshall Plan and Other Aids to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the various countries of Europe when a close analysis is made to determine just what uses our American dollars are being put to abroad and what countries we are really helping, in many respects the money which the American people are sending abroad at great sacrifice to themselves are ultimately winding up in the pockets of the dictators of Russia. It appears to me that our State Department and American officials that administer these huge funds that are taken from the taxpayers of America are doing a poor job. We either ought to have better supervision of these funds to guarantee that they do not reach Russia and enable her to become stronger so as to spread communism or we ought to cut a large part of these funds out.

A concrete and true illustration of what is happening to the taxpayers' dollars that go abroad, is shown in an editorial appearing Sunday, March 27, 1949, in the Washington Star. This article shows that America is spending $4,000,000 a week in Austria and that a large part of this money finally goes into Russia. I am incorporating this article herein so that you may have an accurate analysis of what is happening to the money that we are sending to Austria.

UNITED STATES REPORTED PAYING EXPENSES OF THREE OTHER ARMIES IN AUSTRIA

(By George Weller)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA, March 26.—When if ever you, as an American taxpayer, get a chance to look at your bill for holding Austria, a light like an atomic bomb may dazzle your brain.

No, it's not the size of the bill. It's the items on it that are fantastic.

You have been paying for the upkeep of the American forces in Austria, though the peace treaties do not oblige you to do so.

"All right I like and want to help Austria," you say.

Wait. Here are some more items:

1. You are paying for the British forces here.

2. You are paying for the French upkeep here.

9. You are paying for the Russian Army here.

4. In the case of the Russians, you are paying for the red-starred army not once, but twice. Your Soviet bill is half again more than the other two.

AUSTRIA IS BRIDGEHEAD

Austria is an invaluable bridgehead to the West, weaker but more necessary than

Czechoslovakia to the Communist East. To keep its economy alive you, the American taxpayer, spend $4,000,000 a week.

One of the reasons is that you are acting as host for three armies, none of them your own.

The American Army pays is own bills for its Austrian household. The British, French, and Russian armies live off the Austrian economy.

And the Austrian economy lives off the American taxpayer.

The Russians, under the smartest little blackmail system west of the iron curtain, collect everything with an extra dividend.

The vexed question of how much the Americans, through the Austrian Government, should pay to support everybody else here is almost constantly under discussion between the generals representing the four powers.

COSTS OFTEN DISCUSSED

Sometimes one of the western generals will try to introduce the idea of "occupation costs."

But Col. Gen. L. V. Kurasov shies away. If you start pinning down where American aid, going into Austria, is going, the Russian racket of extra collection for extra troops sticks up like a mountain.

Nearly 3 years ago a low-level committee struggled to hog-tie "occupation costs" into a fixed formula to include wages of soldiers and Austrian workers, rentals for premises, and goods supplied by Austria. But when the four-power board tried to outlaw special Soviet charges for running Russian business enterprises, transport and administration, the board itself disappeared in a puff of polemics.

GENERALS QUIT ARGUING

So now the four generals have given up arguing why the American money is being collected. They just bargain about the amount.

Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes, the American, holds out for the lowest amount possible—usually around 8 percent of the Austrian budget. Colonel General Kurasov wants 12 percent or so. The Briton, Lt. Gen. Alexander Galloway, and the Frenchman, Lt. Gen. M. E. Bethousart, usually hover around 9 percent.

Last year they compromised on 10½ percent. For 1949 they may go down another point.

METHOD CALLED BLACKMAIL

Why do the Americans keep on paying Russian bills?

Well, at least one American official here has an answer.

"We're scared of the Russians," says he. "It's blackmail, but we pay and keep on paying to avoid trouble."

Riding the American gravy train, the Soviets here in Austria up to January 1 had taken 1,956,000,000 schillings (about $200,000,000) through the ever-abnormal Austrian budget.

The French and British had taken about $64,000,000 each. But 20 months ago, when the United States stopped accepting anything more from Austria, the Americans had received $40,000,000 from themselves, of which they returned $30,000,000.

What these figures mean is that the Russian puts his hand in for about 4 percent of the Austrian budget and the Briton and Frenchman each for 2½ percent, while the American keeps pouring money in.

RED SYSTEM EXPLAINED

The way the Russian gets his extra dividend from the American taxpayer is especially adroit. Here's how it is done:

After the annual percentage figure has been agreed on by the four generals—with Austrian groans audible halfway across Europe—all four powers are supposed to get a quarter share of the pseudo-Austrian pie made of American materials. The facade of allied equality is maintained, but it is only a genteel sham to conceal the Soviet advantage.

The Americans take their $15,000,000 and hand it right back into the Austrian economy, to join the approximate $500,000,000 they have given under ERP. In addition the Americans pay in dollars their household costs of around $13,000,000.

FRENCH GET SHARE

The French take their $15,000,000 and pay their local bills, exclusive of soldiers' pay. Whether they do better than break even, nobody knows.

The British claim their $15,000,000, but for the last 6 months they have let it remain untouched. Without releasing their share, as the Americans have done, they have given the Austrians hope that they will, by paying their current accounts themselves.

The Soviets take their $15,000,000 and use it to meet some expenses. Then they take about half their Austrian bills and send them unpaid to the Austrian Government. And Austria pays them—with American money.

Mr. Speaker, if we would revamp our foreign policy so as to act with some sense to see to it that our money does not reach Russia and to see to it that no more is furnished to helpless European countries than is absolutely necessary, we could save enough money to furnish Federal aid to schools, to build flood walls, make river and harbor improvements, construct farm-to-market roads, have real farm conservation, and greatly improve and protect our own people. In addition to this, we could take a great tax load off the shoulders of the American people and further reduce our tax burden. I am hopeful the present administration will do this.

What Tomorrow of Today's Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Connecticut Circle:

WHAT TOMORROW OF TODAY'S YOUTH

Is he correct in his slogan—Uncle Sam owes me a living?

As we pulled up at our favorite gas station the other day the station owner, as he filled the car remarked, "Did you see that fellow who just drove out of here?" With our "Yes," he continued, "I cash his check each month. He is having his tuition and expenses and the equivalent of board paid by the Government—over a 4-year period. The check I cashed was in addition to this subsidy, in an amount just over $100; and as I gave him the cash, he said, 'How the h— does Uncle Same expect me to get along on this?' "

Two students from one of our Connecticut colleges were expounding for our benefit the other day and one of them said, "Communism—they haven't got communism in Russia. That's dictatorship over there. Communism is all right." Now he didn't get those ideas out of his own thinking. He was taught them and it's not a hard matter today to put your finger on those teachers. Communism and socialism are bandied about by university professors today in just about the same manner that free silver and free trade were preached in the nineties and early 1900's—with just as much ultimate good for the general welfare.

Our public schools and public and private colleges teach just about as little partiotism as possible and if a character like George Washington is brought up for discussion, more than likely it will be the Rupert Hughes version that is professorily propounded to receptive and retentive young minds. Pride in heritage is a matter of feeling as well as knowing. And heritage is not just a matter of possession by ancestral lineage. Heritage is the prideful ownership of those individual rights and the freedom of action and thinking which we have as a result of pioneer settlers, who sought and found religious freedom and followed it with civil demands for self government, which when refused, they fought, bled, and died for in order that we today—as has this country for a century and three quarters—might reap unforeseen miraculous "profits."

Only by the right thinking and industrious individual ambitions of our youth, can we expect to survive this present-day holocaust of unrighteous sycophant-breeding propaganda with which they are being filled. Nothing is worth while, which is not arrived at through hard work. If that belief alone may be instilled into today's youth, we will win the fight and raise such a bulwark against those who would tear down all that has been built for good in this country that we may look forward without fear to our continued better way of living, and be justly proud that we are carrying on "our heritage."

HARRY FRANKLIN MORSE.

The Present Crisis in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address entitled "The Present Crisis in Aviation," delivered by Mr. Louis E. Leverone on October 18, 1948, before the Economic Club of Detroit:

Today, and every day for many months past, your daily newspaper has carried a column or a paragraph or some comment about the magnificent effort of the United States Army Air Force in maintaining the airlift to Berlin. Each 24 hours hundreds of huge Army transport aircraft arrive at Berlin airports bearing precious cargoes of the necessities of life for the beleaguered citizens of Berlin, and, discharging these cargoes, depart—to return the next day in this history-making shuttle run.

In its least important aspect, the dollar cost of such an effort is high. In its truest objective, the airlift means to every one of us that the international prestige of America has been upheld, and, furthermore, by this very action we may hope that the same air power which won the war will, God willing, preserve peace for the world in years to come.

There can be no doubt about the importance of air power to our national security and to world peace. What about the place of aviation in our world of commerce? What are the basic economics which make aviation an integral unit in the economic mosaic of American prosperity? These are the points which I should like to discuss with you.

It is particularly fitting that I am privileged to make these remarks in the city of Detroit, the motor capital of the world. Men

started to fly airplanes at about the same time they began to drive automobiles. But flying involved not only a new method of transportation, but also a new science, and an exploitation of a new dimension. Only recently has aviation assumed important proportions in our economic orbit.

From Detroit came much of the pioneering and planning for the development of aviation. The late Henry Ford was the first private contractor to carry air mail. His interest in commercial aviation in the twenties instilled confidence in a public still thinking in terms of wartime flying. The Ford trimotor, affectionately known as the flying washboard, is a monument to Mr. Ford's encouragement of safe ships and accurate instruments. Incidentally, some of these ships, built before 1930, are still flying.

The beloved Charles Kettering, of General Motors, worked on aviation in World War I, organized and backed air-line transportation between wars, and was right back in the harness building our Air Force for World War II.

Prior to 1940, such leaders of motordom as Ernest Breech, now with Ford Motors; Howard Coffin, of Hudson; Alvin Macauley and Jesse Vincent, of Packard; Walter Chrysler; R. E. Olds; the Fisher brothers; Charles Nash; Henry Leland, of Cadillac; Charles Wilson, of General Motors; and many others were, at one time or another, actively backing aviation projects.

In World War II the task of powering our aircraft was, by and large, assigned to Detroit, and every leader participated. I might add, Detroit delivered the goods.

So this is a subject not only of international and national interest, but also of local interest.

The years between 1930 and 1940 marked the establishment and expansion of our present great network of air lines. Much credit for this solid foundation must be given to Walter Brown, Postmaster General under President Hoover, who foresaw a time when it would be possible to travel from coast to coast by air in a matter of hours. Through persuasion, by insistence, and by his own forceful belief in the future, Mr. Brown built the greatest air-mail system in the world. This was accomplished at a cost of only $73,000,000 to the taxpayers. At that time Mr. Brown was under political cross-fires for this program, and later, in the first years of the New Deal, saw a depression-minded Congress sharply curtail the appropriations for this program.

Within the last year a top Government official was quoted: "Our investment in air-mail service has proved to be the best expenditure in the history of Congress."

I mention this bit of history of aviation because of its specific parallel to the circumstances of the present day.

The aviation problems of 20 years ago may have seemed a little bit tougher, probably because they were a little bit newer. The problems facing us today, in aviation, involve the welfare of a great Nation, and, perhaps, the peace of the world.

Until these problems are seized with a firm grasp, aviation faces a crisis.

The crisis began to develop on VJ-day.

The vast manufacturing capacity which had been speedily developed during the war years for the output of aircraft was no longer vitally needed. Actually, very little of this productive effort for aviation was required for peacetime purposes, so it became our job to convert as quickly as possible to other lines of peacetime production.

Air transportation faced a similar reconversion problem. The DC-3 equipment, which had performed so valiantly for years, must be replaced by aircraft of longer range, and larger capacities, in the interest of progress. These newer aircraft, developed by and because of the war, had to find their place in peacetime commercial channels.

Operators of airports, who functioned as guardians of the main interests of aviation, supplied thousands of youngsters to the Air Corps during the war years. These training programs were sponsored by and paid for by our Government. After our victory, the emergency no longer being present, these war training programs were replaced by veteran training on a greatly restricted basis.

So we reconverted. But reconversion, in the case of aviation, proceeded too swiftly, our usual American custom of getting things done.

Reconversion picked up speed, and with a tempo which disregarded the realities of our international situation, snowballed to proportions which, a year ago, threatened to absolutely shut down the aviation industry.

Thousands of aircraft plants went out of business, and in their place other lines of industry started. Many aircraft manufacturers turned to production of household appliances, auto accessories, and even metal caskets.

The great aircraft manufacturing industry of the United States, greatest in world history, had, with but a few exceptions, disappeared.

The Eightieth Congress, to their credit, recognized the danger in falling below the minimum of needed production facilities, and, over the protest of the present administration, enacted into law the 70-group air-force bill.

In explanation of the 70-group air-force bill, I should like to point out that if this program were in operation in its entirety as authorized by Congress, there would be no problem in maintaining basic necessary manufacturing facilities. The extent of the increase here is sufficient to allow ample production, and its manpower requirements, although substantial, would be taken care of. Here again, there has been delay and procrastination, and no national policy in this important phase of aviation has been enunciated. This effort of Congress therefore must be accepted as a stopgap.

The air lines no longer have the long waiting lists of passengers brought to them by war-swollen travel demands, but the air lines do have expensive equipment to pay for, and most air-transportation companies have become involved in heavy debt structures. Deficits have become the rule, rather than the exception, as testified by air-line earning statements of the first 6 months of this year; their financial future has become obscure.

The immediate solution for the air lines seems to lie in an adjustment of the air-mail rate presently allowed them by the Post Office and the Civil Aeronautics Board. To realize this, one need only to go back to the year 1940, when approximately 23 percent of the net revenues of air lines was received from air mail, and then look at the present figures—8 percent of the net revenues from air mail.

The disparity is too obvious to need any further explanation. Earlier, I referred to the sustaining help given to the airport and fixed-base operators by the Veterans' Administration-training program. But wait. In spite of an act of Congress ordering the continuance of such a program, and in spite of a promise made to our young men in service that such training would be available to them, sometimes it seems to have gone off on the wrong tangent.

Those in the Veterans' Administration who have been entrusted with the responsibility of handling this assignment have apparently decided to override the orders of Congress, and to stop veterans' flight training at once.

This is the condition in my home State of Illinois, and I am informed—in my capacity as president of the National Aeronautic Association—that this arbitrary misinterpretation of a congressional directive has become widespread. Corrective measures, or, at least, a clarification of Veterans' Administration policies, is definitely needed here.

As the major facets in commercial aviation, the foregoing branches of aviation hold the bulk of its problems. The question is—What's to be done?

We know that we need a strong national policy on aviation, and we are equally aware of the fact that we don't have any policy.

We are fearful of war, and, as yet, have not clearly blueprinted our objectives, should war come to us.

We know that the aviation industry has provided thousands of jobs for Americans, in carrying its share of our tax burdens, and contributes to our economic balance, yet, to date, we have not helped the aviation industry to become a prosperous cog in our commercial wheel.

If we are to survive in the air age, here are some of the steps this Nation must take:

1. LEAD IN AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

We have lost our leadership in the past 3 years. Great Britain, France, and perhaps Russia, have developed jet planes of the transport size. Our best effort to date on jet-propelled aircraft is concentrated on smaller one- or two-man fighter planes. Think of it! United States, the wartime leader among nations in the production and development of aircraft—losing out—in the newest type of flying technique—to less powerful neighbors. We have our XS-1 and our other supersonic test aircraft. But we are not accomplishing our ultimate goals, principally because the means have not been set up. What's the answer? Every possible test of new types of aircraft should be encouraged, supported, and paid for by our Government. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, one of our best Government agencies, should be expanded by direct appropriation of Congress. This organization, through its three laboratories, is already a world leader in aviation research. Aircraft manufacturers should receive not only the manufacturing cost of the equipment they produce, but, also, should be reimbursed completely for all engineering, research, and development costs.

2. MAINTAIN AN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY CAPABLE OF MEETING MILITARY AND CIVIL DEMANDS

The wartime accomplishment of our aircraft manufacturers provided a record of ability to produce, or the lack of ability to produce. There were some terrific production flops, as well as some outstanding know-hows. On the old axiom—"By their deeds, ye shall know them," it would not be difficult to set up the most able of our manufacturers in a permanent production or stand-by position. This, again, must be accomplished by Government aid:

3. TRAIN AND EQUIP A MODERN AIR FORCE SUFFICIENT TO DETER OR CONQUER ANY ATTACKER

Let me say that in this proviso we can be justly proud. I think that one of the most impressive days that I have ever spent was less than 30 days ago as a guest on Air Force Day. I was keenly struck by the enthusiasm, the ability, and the very definite long-range vision of our Air Force. Demonstrations which I speak of attracted hundreds of thousands in New York City, and simultaneously many millions of people in other parts of the country saw the maneuvers of our Air Force that day in tactical war games. This was an effort on the part of the Air Force leaders to sell their problem to the public, and a worth-while job was done.

4. STRENGTHEN OUR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

Let us admit that from time to time our air lines may have suffered from excesses of prosperity in which they may have planned unwisely and not too well. Let us all agree that unfortunate accidents, which usually make headline reading, are not conducive to

the immediate return of passenger confidence in flying. But, in spite of these things, let us realize that a strong and well integrated network of air transportation is just as essential to our national well-being as any other form of transportation. It is also probable that a strong international air-transportation system, under the control of the United States, is more necessary than any form of transportation. This is not a problem of expediency, but of long-term need.

5. SUPPORT OF THE FURTHER GROWTH OF PRIVATE FLYING

There is only one way that this particular step can be accomplished. I think all of us realize that personal aircraft, or small planes, fall far short of practical utility requirements at the present time. Most small aircraft are not fast and many of the present types of small planes will have to be improved considerably from a safety standpoint. Nevertheless, our progress in flying is inescapable and, for the time being, every effort should be made to keep alive the interest and betterment of private flying. This, again, leads us to the next point, which is actually an extension of No. 5.

6. DEVELOP AIRPORTS, AIRWAYS, AND FLYING SAFETY

It is not the accepted pattern that development of large airports is the joint responsibility of city, State, and Federal Governments. Many large cities have realized what appears to be a most practical answer to airport development in the development of the so-called airport authorities, whereby the administration of all matters pertaining to airport development is centered in one body, which body may cooperate with any other subdivision of State or local government, and which, in turn, may receive funds from Federal appropriations. In its broader aspects, however, and in the development of secondary airports, while a substantial part of this can be, and is now being, accomplished through local subdivisions of government by far the greater part of airport development must be channeled through private capital. It is these smaller airports that have kept the interest in flying alive for the past 20 years, but which are now faced with wholesale bankruptcies because of the abrupt cessation of the veterans' flight-training program.

While I am inclined to the opinion that the veterans' flight program must stop sooner or later, I am definitely opposed to the sudden manner in which this accepted source of revenue was shut off from small airports and airport operators.

As far as airways and flying safety are concerned, we may find no quarrel with the programs currently under way in the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the various State agencies. In this respect, aviation is at least up to if not ahead of schedule. And coming to my most important point—No. 7:

7. MAKE THE PUBLIC UNDERSTAND THESE BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR PROGRESS

All of the foregoing provisions are not equal in importance. International tensions and the complicated foreign situation would indicate that the most important problem of today is military preparedness. Accordingly, military preparedness must have precedence over all other requirements, and must so be emphasized.

On the other hand, in one way or another, each point has a definite and important bearing on all phases of the program. This must be an approach where any one step may be sacrificed in the interest of another.

It does not mean that in the future when the peak of emergency is past that air progress will mean advancement of aviation on a broad front and not on the military field alone.

I wish that we could reminisce for hours and turn back the pages of history to the glamorous exploits and adventures of such men as the late Jack Knight, who made the first night air-mail flight; or Pop Hanshue, daddy of air transportation in the far West; or Col. Roscoe Turner, the great racing pilot; or other immortals of aviation history. Most of these incidents make colorful and interesting reading, but are only as important in aviation today as was the Golden Spike which joined the tracks of the first transcontinental railroad, many years ago.

These accomplishments were in the past and our problems are with us today, and for future years.

Any kind of program which we contemplate or establish must not be timed for now, or for even next year. In the final analysis any planning which falls short of 5 years or longer will not, in the long run, gain us our objectives.

What we need today—and at once—is a firm and definite national policy on aviation. I should like to at this time, pay tribute to the fine efforts of such men as Welch Pogue, former chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and its present chairman, Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., who, with his associates, is working very ably to the solution of these problems. The head of our Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Dell Rentzel, has brought his agency to a new high in efficient operation. Such manufacturers as Larry Bell, and his pioneering efforts in helicopter flight—supersonic flight—and others in that field—are adding daily to our record of air progress.

The Glenn Martins, the Kindlebergers, the Bill Allens, and other leaders in American aircraft manufacturing industry, are each working his way to better methods and better airships.

The Eddie Rickenbackers, the C. R. Smiths, the Bill Pattersons, and those of our great air transportation industry are gradually overcoming many of their internal headaches, but the fact remains that all of these groups, and each of these men, is handicapped by the absence of national policy which would specifically establish the limits, the pathways to the goals for a national aviation program for the next 5 years.

If you recall, we of the American public were presented with two sets of recommendations within the last year. One set came from a very able committee, appointed by the President. The other set was presented by an equally able group, appointed by Congress. So far, no determination has been made as to what we, as a Nation, must do or may expect.

May I review the points which I have presented to you as our constant and immediate need for a construction aviation program:

1. Lead in aeronautical research and development.

2. Maintain aircraft industry capable of meeting military and civil demands.

3. Train and equip a modern air force strong enough to deter or conquer any attacker.

4. Strengthen our domestic and international transport.

5. Support the further growth of private flying.

6. Develop airports, airways, and flying safety, and—

7. Sell this program to the public as the basic requirement for air progress.

There is one more specific point of progress which I should like to mention briefly. Most of us use air transportation at one time or another in the course of our business. On days when we are scheduled to take a flying trip, I am sure that many of us cast an anxious eye on weather and hope for clear skies for our trip. The fact is that the worst threat to sustained operations of commercial air transport, and one of the big reasons for air line deficits, is bad weather. Just about a year ago I was invited to attend the demonstration of the instrument landing system, sponsored by the United Airlines in Chicago. All of us who had the opportunity to see this demonstration came away convinced that the instrument landing system, or its counterpart—the ground-controlled approach system, provided the answer for all-weather flying. Here's the problem.

The dollar expense of the installation of all-weather flying systems for commercial purposes would be astronomical.

The Civil Aeronautics Board officials can see no possibility of the air lines being able to afford the tremendous financial outlay for the development and acquisition of new all-weather equipment, and substantial increased personnel necessary to apply the principles of the Berlin airlift to domestic operations. According to the CAB, the principal thing proven by the Berlin airlift is that anything can be accomplished if no economic problem is to be considered. The Air Force is expending unlimited personnel and funds to maintain the all-weather operations; the relation to commercial operations in this country is little more than fractional.

Unless Congress and the taxpayers want to subsidize—with much higher mail rates or direct appropriations—the billions necessary to make all-weather commercial flying a possibility of tomorrow, instead of 15 years hence, we can expect that it will be at least 15 years before all-weather instrumentation and production is available for commercial purposes.

Rising pressure from defense advocates is for all-weather flying now, not 15 years hence, but neither the air lines nor the Government can speed up the development without much greater subsidies.

It takes 10,000 men on the ground, covering all operations, including freight and air traffic control, to handle the airlift at two German terminals. And the distance is so minor as to be without any real significance in this country. Greater distances mean more airports, more installations and more personnel.

Air lines are reducing rather than adding personnel; all-weather landing and take-off equipment is better than ever, but still too expensive. In Berlin three kinds of blind landing devices are used to afford checks against each other. The best now in partial use in the United States are two types, ILS and GCA, and their effectiveness is diluted by various natural phenomena.

Only a relatively few airports have ground-control approach and it is too expensive for the air lines to install generally. The Army has new electronic equipment that serves as a check against failure of either ground-control approach or instrument-landing system, and, of course, its ground-control approach installations in Berlin and other air-lift terminals are few compared to what the domestic air routes would demand.

May I hasten to assure you that I do not wish to liken myself to a modern Paul Revere, rushing from door to door, to ring an alarm. Nevertheless, the cause for alarm is present—and time is rapidly slipping away. We cannot wait until the air lines are finally bankrupt; nor can we delay until grass has overgrown the runways, nor manufacturing has ceased.

I believe in free enterprise, as do most of you. But as a believer in free enterprise and supporter of our present form of government, I am convinced that an investment now in aviation, and for the next few years, will be the best possible investment that we, as stockholders in our Federal Government, can wish to make.

I dislike the word "subsidy" and feel that this phase of our economic life is way overemphasized and overdone.

There are cases, however, where subsidies must be given for the safety of our country, and I definitely favor governmental help to foster and advance aviation, to have our country attain and maintain a definite position of leadership in aviation in all of its forms.

Detroit has been a pioneer in the development and advancement of aviation. While the production of planes in Detroit has been practically discontinued, Detroit still makes its great contribution to aviation, and in the future, with this great industry, Detroit, I know, is going to play its full part.

I should like to again refer to my earlier comment about Mr. Hoover's Postmaster General, Walter Brown. We need a man, or men, like Mr. Brown to make these decisions in our national interest today. We need somebody to take this problem in his hands and, by foursquare and direct consideration of its different elements, to resolve such a program and set our pattern for us.

There is one way to get such a program under way. The way to do this is to do it—and do it now. Tomorrow may be too late.

Belasco Theater—Bring the Theater Back to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial taken from the Washington Post of March 25, 1949, an article from the Washington Post of March 27, 1949, and an article from the Washington Star of September 1, 1940:

[From the Washington Post of March 25, 1949]

BELASCO THEATER

Long before the National Theater sold out to the celluloids, Washington theater lovers talked of bringing the old Belasco back to life. Indeed, there was more than talk. Bids were offered to the Public Buildings Administration for leasing, refurbishing, and operating the building as a theater. It is now owned by the Government and used by the Treasury Department as a combination office building and warehouse.

We have hitherto supported every effort to put the Belasco back in business as the best available method of restoring the living theater to the cultural life of the Capital. Every such effort heretofore has aborted. Government obstacles stood in the way and could not be removed, partly because there was no organization to make the sentiments and wants of Washingtonians effectively felt by the Government.

We are, therefore, particularly happy to welcome the birth of a new and apparently sturdy move to get a legitimate theater in Washington. Out of what might have been just another wailing session last Wednesday evening has come a committee of key citizens, of doers, headed by Mr. Melvin Hildreth. Their first objective is the Belasco. Or, perhaps more rightly, their first objective is the Congress. Representative CELLER has introduced a bill under which the Government would make over the Belasco and lease it for stage productions.

The Belasco is certainly not an ideal solution to Washington's need for a legitimate theater. But it is still the only reasonable target for action, and many obstacles remain to be overcome before its curtain can rise again. The real significance of the new development is perhaps the appearance, almost spontaneously, of a group of citizens with the determination to get something done. Our theatrical desert is disgraceful.

[From the Washington Post of March 27, 1949]

A NEW, STRONG STEP TAKEN TO GIVE US BACK THEATER

(By Richard L. Coe)

The meeting didn't look too promising. As one of the speakers remarked, everyone who wanted one had an aisle seat.

But from it came the most constructive move yet in the effort to resume the living theater in the National Capital. Everyone in the hall of Smithsonian's Natural History Building had gone out of his way to be there. Everybody there, it turned out, meant business.

By business they didn't mean more talk, although the talks of the evening were far more concrete than the endless yuckety-yuk that's been going on since it was clear the National would replace the Capital's sole workable stage with a silver sheet.

But somehow, though roughly 140 souls looked pretty slim in the cavelike hall, they intended something more than just sitting around and saying, Something will turn up. They got together, elected a committee, which will be enlarged in time, and told it to bring back a living art to the most important city on the face of the earth.

CELLER BILL FOCAL POINT

The focal point of the evening was the Celler bill, designed to restore the Government-owned Belasco Theater with Government funds and then turn it over to the professional theater.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, who introduced the bill in Congress, was there to explain his idea and two of his House colleagues were on hand to speak bluntly about what Washingtonians could do.

"From the looks of this slim crowd," said Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, New York, "I'm not sure Washington wants a theater. Unless the voteless people of Washington can impress on the Congress that they want a live theater, I don't see much hope of the bill getting out of the Public Works Committee.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, Minnesota, a former school teacher and war veteran, put much the same idea in different words: "Make yourselves articulate," said he. "We on the Hill are not unaware of the lack of a theater, but you've got to talk it up."

COURSE BEING CHARTED

How to talk it up, how to make Congress conscious of Washington's need and desire for a theater, will be the work of the committee formed Wednesday night under the chairmanship of Melvin Hildreth, Democratic National Committeeman for the District.

Already Hildreth and several Congressmen are mapping the campaign and a meeting of the growing committee will be held sometime this week.

Eventually the plan will include the "write your Congressman" drive that has been the spearhead of many moves resulting in direct action. It's too soon to explain exactly what moves will be urged by the committee, but all the city's drama editors have promised to keep the public informed through their columns.

VOICE OF THE CITY

Chief virtue of this citizens' committee, as I see it, is that, for the first time, the city has found a voice in this matter, a voice that leads to action. No longer need it be the subject of isolated newspaper articles and sly cracks in national news magazines misinterpreting the lack of theater as lack of desire for one.

Another vital aspect is the fact that the group is out to bring back the theater. If the Celler bill does not pass, though at the moment several astute politicians have high hopes for it, there can be other means tried. The committee will keep at its task until a worthy curtain rises somewhere somehow.

After Thursday's newspaper stories appeared a person prominent in the National Theater dispute stopped me in the street. "Had this committee of residents been formed 2 years ago," my friend remarked, "the National need not have closed its stage door."

JAVITS' SUGGESTION

Representative JAVITS touched briefly on one possibility that deserves the greatest consideration. As author of the bill which seeks to create a national theater of the United States, Representative JAVITS suggested that ANTA—the American National Theater and Academy—might be the suitable authority to take over the Belasco once the necessary renovations have been made. This would have the effect of assuring management for the theater no matter what the National's Marcus Heiman does in the face of a second live theater; it also would give ANTA the home it should have in the seat of government which created it.

That, to be sure, is still in the discussion stage, but it is an idea worth consideration. The committee under its skilled political chairman will no doubt come up with other ideas impossible to foresee at present.

But at any rate, the citizens of Washington now are beginning to form into a concrete mass. And for a project about which there has been entirely too much talk and too much sitting around and too much "let George do it," this is a heartening thing.

Chairman Hildreth's committee includes: Miss Bess Davis Schreiner, Mrs. Hazel Markel, Miss Frances Starr, Mrs. Constance A. Snow, Mrs. Edgar Mowrer, Miss Charlotte London, Mrs. Edward Sturdevant, Miss Carolyn Will Stuart, Mrs. Frances Nash Watson, Father Gilbert V. Hartke, George Vivian, Horton Foote, Lawrence Heller, Edward Mangum, George Frain, Owen Dodson, Patrick Hayes, Ernie Schier, Oscar Davis, Tom Donnelly, and this reporter.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of September 1, 1940]

FINAL SCENES AT BELASCO THEATER BRING BACK MEMORIES OF STAGE TRIUMPHS—TALENT OF CAPITAL WOVEN INTO FABRIC WHICH GAVE DISTINCTION TO PLAYGOING—GHOST OF ANCIENT ACTOR WHO SEES SEATS REMOVED LAUDS GRANDEST UNITED STATES INSTITUTION

(By John J. Daly)

They took the seats out of the old Belasco Theater yesterday.

The seats were removed because the Government has purchased the theater, along with the adjoining Cosmos Club. And when the seats went the soul of the Belasco died.

In the lobby an old-time actor looked on.

"Ye gods!" he exclaimed. "There go the remnants of one of the grandest institutions in the United States—the old-time theater!"

When the last seat was carried out the actor wept. He was the ghost of one of the many old-time actors who had performed behind the Belasco's footlights, who had been spurred by roars of applause from those very seats.

On those boards, where once he had trod, had stepped the feet of most of the celebrated actors and actresses of America—and also of England, France, Germany, Russia.

Helen Hayes—Washington's Helen Hayes—made her debut on the Belasco stage. So did Ruth Chatterton—in a walk-on part, as a maid. Later she was to be starred. And so was Ina Claire—the Ina Claire born in the Capital as Miss Fagan, down in Swampoodle.

"I remember as far back as 1908," the old actor said, "when the Metropolitan Opera

Co. played the Belasco. * * * That was the year Caruso, Tetrazzini, Amato, and others of that grand company sang The Sextette From Lucia. They were encored 19 times—a record for Washington or any other city."

The Belasco Theater presented such stars as David Warfield, in The Music Master; Denham Thompson, in The Old Homestead; and James T. Powers, one of America's greatest comedians, in The Runaway Girl.

SWANKIEST IN TOWN

Before it was the Belasco they called it the Lafayette Opera House. In those days it was the swankiest place in all Washington. As an opera house it entertained the great and the near-great of the America theater—people like Jenny Lind, Mme. Schumann-Heink, and others of that caliber.

Then the house turned into a strictly American theater with minstrel shows rampant. It had Lew Dockstader, Honey Boy Evans, Neil O'Brien, and Primrose and West dancing on the stage.

"Will I ever forget those days?" the old actor asked as they moved the seats out of the Belasco.

"I saw Lew Dockstader and Neil O'Brien at their best, and there were never two greater blackface comedians. They knew their stuff. They could make you laugh over the simplest joke. That's what the old minstrel men did in the old days and there was never a dirty line in their text. They got applause because they deserved it."

On the trail of those old-timers came such stars as Helen Hayes.

"And I remember the day Helen got her start in the theater," said the old-time actor. "Lew Fields had come to town in a comedy called About Town, which contained a travesty on The Music Master. He saw Helen Hayes and liked her. Then signed her, as a young girl, to a contract. Next year she appeared with him in a play, and that was her start toward stardom. I tell you, boy, I've seen 'em all. I've seen Wilton Lackaye, who came out of the old Carroll Hall Players, and Al Jolson, who lived down in southwest Washington. I've seen 'em start and I've seen 'em finish. And they all looked good to me.

"There was, in those days, a different theater treatment from what you have today. Take Frank Daniels, for instance. He was a comedian of the first water. And he could set an audience crazy merely by the lifting of an eyebrow. That was the Frank Daniels technique. Well, sir, it was a classic."

MEMORY TEST

"The other day I was talking to Sgt. Joe Harrington, now attached to the traffic division of the Metropolitan Police Department. In the old days he was a program boy at the Lafayette Theater. Said Joe:

" 'Mister, when you talk about the old Belasco Theater you're giving me a memory test.

" 'I remember back to the days when Ira La Motte, of blessed memory, was manager of the Belasco. That was before "Duke" Fosse took over the role, or even L. Stoddard Taylor, both great managers. * * *

" 'What I was getting around to, of course, was the entertainment that went on the boards of the Belasco. One of the first plays that made an impression with me was Marie O'Dile, which featured Frances Starr, then under the direction of David Belasco. Previously she had starred under Belasco in the Rose of the Rancho and had as her leading man the famous matinee idol, Charles Richmond. Eventually she married the late R. Golden Donaldson. She is still a Washington resident.

" 'Now I remember a show called The Three Little Lambs. In this performance was Raymond Hitchcock, Marie Cahill, and Clara Palmer—all three later to become stars in musical comedy. I saw them when they got their start— and was that a thrill.

" 'Boy, will I ever forget the night of the opening of Victor Herbert's beautiful operetta, The Fortune Teller, starring Alice Neilson. She was a baby doll, as we used to say in the old days. In this cast were such performers as Eugene Cowles, Joseph Cawthorne, the old comedian; Johnny Slavin, who knocked down John McGraw, of the Giants; Joseph Herbert, no relation to Victor; and Josephine Bartlette, the original Dame Durdin in Robin Hood.' "

When you talk about the old Belasco Theater you must always remember Estelle Wentworth, one of the greatest singers ever developed in Washington. Sergeant Harrington was a personal friend of her late husband, Albert Parr, who was one of the greatest singers ever developed on the American stage. His singing of Robin Hood will never be forgotten by the old-timers. Miss Wentworth appeared with De Wolfe Hopper at the old Belasco in Happyland. In this same show was little Marguerite Clark, who afterward became a great moving-picture star in the silent days.

OLD STOCK SEASON

Along about Easter of each year the road shows stopped coming in and Washington enjoyed the old Lafayette Stock Co. In this company appeared such favorites as John T. Sullivan, Eugene Ormonde, John Daly Murphy, and a young actress by the name of Antoinette Walker, who afterward made a tremendous hit in David Belasco's famous show, The Warrens of Virginia. The star of this show was the late Frank Keenan.

"Are you telling me about the old Belasco?" asked the ghost of an old star.

And then he answered, through the voice of Andy Kelley, the old dramatic editor:

"It was at the Belasco that Florenz Ziegfeld signed Will Rogers for the Follies. He didn't actually sign him, for the cowboy comedian didn't believe in contracts. He just gave his word and took the other fellow's.

"Ziegfeld found Rogers playing two-a-day vaudeville for the Messrs. Shubert. He went back to his Lafayette Square dressing room, much to the consternation of Ira La Motte, the Shubert manager. Mr. La Motte hastily 'long-distanced' a phone call to the New York office of the Shuberts, and was told to 'throw Ziegfeld out.' But before the telephone conversation ended, Ziegfeld had received Rogers' promise to appear in his "Midnight Frolic on the New Amsterdam roof."

WHITE HOUSE OBJECTION

"Will Rogers that week encountered the first and only objection to his humor, which was registered from the White House. Among his drolleries was this: 'The American public will never get much accomplished until they get a President who gets seasick and who can't play golf.' Obviously, that was a quip on President Harding, who was addicted to the links and who took occasional trips on the White House yacht.

"A secret-service man called at the Belasco and conveyed word that the White House would appreciate it if Mr. Rogers would eliminate the joke. As it was an important part of his routine and got appreciative audience response, Rogers refused.

"Several months later, Rogers came to the National Theater as the star of Ziegfeld's Midnight Frolic. During that week President Harding was holding a congressional reception at the White House. Rogers wanted to go because it was an excellent source of material for his daily newspaper column. He made the usual approach for an invitation and was politely informed none was available. At the Saturday night performance of Midnight Frolic, Rogers stepped out of character long enough to say: 'All my life I have been making humorous observations and comment about the great and the near great. Invariably they have accepted it in a spirit of fun and with an appreciation that no malice was intended. I regret that I have offended the President, but I can also say that he is the first prominent American to publicly object to my stage liberties. I am sorry he can't take a joke.'

"On the opening night of Al Jolson in Wunder Bar at the Belasco, during the prohibition era, those in the front rows—and especially the critics—were handed drinks from the bar on the stage. Jolson personally distributed the liquids, and much to the surprise of those favored, the cocktails and highballs were found to have a high potency. It was a 1-day sensation, and the Internal Revenue Bureau got busy the next day. The investigation resulted in this report: 'No grounds for prosecution discovered. All the evidence, if any, was consumed.' And so that was that."

WILSON'S LAST VISIT

President Wilson's last visit to the Belasco was to see Percy Mackaye's new play, "George Washington," with Walter Hampden as the immortal patriot. Mr. Wilson thought it a good play, and so generously reported for publication, but in this case the New York public took the opinion of Alan Dale, who damned the play with no praise, as did his fellow critics. "George Washington" perished after 3 weeks.

As the old ghost recalled, President Coolidge was a loyal supporter of plays or musicals in which his friends appeared. He went to the Belasco one night to witness a performance of John Drinkwater's "Robert E. Lee," with Berton Churchill playing the immortal hero of the South. Mr. Coolidge's visit was a tribute to his old friend Burr McIntosh. But when the lights came up in the darkened theater, after the close of the second act, a romantic scene in the moonlight on the lawn of the Lee mansion, many eyes in the audience turned to the White House box. President Coolidge had his chin resting on his breast; he was sound asleep. The President's impromptu nap received more publicity than did the play, "Robert E. Lee," which survived only a week of New York performances. One New York critic said the fact that a play had put a President to sleep offered a form of criticism better than any which could be written.

Address of Dr. Tadeusz Bielecki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on my return from Europe last November I met in Paris, Dr. Tadeusz Bielecki, who before the last war was a member of the Polish Parliament, later he was vice-president under Paderewski, served with the Polish Government in exile in London during the war and is now chairman of the Polish National-Democratic Party.

After visiting with Dr. Bielecki for a few minutes I was so impressed with his comprehensive grasp of world affairs, his accurate knowledge of history, and his obvious honesty and love of liberty that I spent most of the afternoon with him.

In parting I invited Dr. Bielecki to call on me when he visited our country.

Realizing the long and loyal friendship that has existed between the United States and Poland, and in appreciation of the memory and services of Pulaski and Kosciusko, I was eager to have Dr. Bielecki meet some of the Members of the United States Congress.

A few days ago he called at my office and on March 22, 1949, he kindly consented to address a small group of about 30 of our colleagues at a luncheon in the Speaker's Dining Room, which I was happy to give in his honor.

Dr. Bielecki's statement was so forceful and forthright, so timely and convincing, that most all the Members present wanted a copy of it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his statement, which I wish every American could read because it is a most timely warning, full of sound and helpful advice:

Congressman SHORT, ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the invitation to this luncheon, as it gives me the opportunity of meeting such distinguished representatives of the American people.

The more the distances on our globe are shrinking, thanks to technical and scientific progress, the more cooperation is needed among the nations. But it is impossible to trust each other and to cooperate wholeheartedly without personal contacts and mutual understanding. In friendly conversation mistrust vanishes and prejudice is dispelled.

There exists, for example, a fairly widespread belief that the United States is a country of bull-headed materialism where the almighty dollar reigns supreme. I knew that such an opinion was a gross exaggeration, and that a certain power is spreading such falsehoods in order to slander the United States. But only after my arrival in this country, after visiting several States of the Union, and after talking to many Americans, I became convinced that at the roots of your great material power there are immense moral values and spiritual strength. In this country there is certainly no shortage of people who, devoid of any selfish interest, are willing to throw huge material resources into the struggle against communism for the purpose of destroying evil and introducing everywhere a just social and moral order. The right of each individual and of each nation to freedom, the right to organize the life of each nation according to its traditional customs, and not on a foreign-imposed pattern, are the guiding principles for a better world.

It is, therefore, highly gratifying that there exists a power capable of challenging the Soviet superstate both materially and spiritually. Otherwise, the entire world would be by this time under the Soviet heel.

To think that Communists may be converted or convinced by persuasion alone is a dangerous illusion. Communism in its essence abhors compromise, does not tolerate a conflicting opinion, destroys mercilessly people economically independent of the compulsory state. It tends to uniform the soul of man, to deprive him of all individual property, and to turn him into a slave of the state.

Therefore, the increase of the American Air Force to 70 groups, as adopted recently by the House of Representatives, is a most convincing argument for peace.

Force without law is lawlessness, but law without force is weakness.

We Poles, as well as Americans, are branded warmongers by Soviet Russia and her satellite regimes, because we advocate military preparedness as an effective safeguard for peace. But there is only one indisputable warmonger today—the Politburo of the Bolshevik Party in Moscow—which destroys the feeling of security, foments unrest, and sets the stage for an armed conflict by sowing seeds of distrust and uncertainty, and by splitting the free nations internally through such pronouncements of treason as those of Palmiro Togliatti, Maurice Thorez, Harry Pollitt, and William Foster.

I know that the United States does not want war. No responsible statesman or politician would ever instigate an outbreak of armed hostilities.

But the crucial question is what does the Soviet Union want?

The study of communism, its ideology and program of action, combined with the living examples of Soviet imperialistic policy, leave only room for one answer: the Soviets want to dominate our globe and are resolutely moving toward this goal.

I am not in a position to judge whether it is wiser to wait for an open act of Soviet aggression and for the successful culmination of the Soviet atomic research program, spending in the meantime enormous sums of money on rearmament and military aid to other free countries, or whether in the interest of humanity it is more advisable to bring matters to a head at an earlier date, to clear up the situation, and to establish a just and durable peace.

Considering the possibilities of avoiding war, the only way as I see it, is to weaken the Soviet Union. How to accomplish this?

First. The spread of communism must be stopped and its vanguards in western Europe, America, and the free parts of Asia reduced to helplessness.

Second. The Soviet Union must not be allowed to digest the nations under its domination and to consolidate its hold over the countries which were lightheartedly hitched to the Soviet wagon. I have in mind the historic countries of central-eastern Europe, of which Poland is the largest and most populated.

As we now know, the conquest of Poland and her neighbor states did not appease the Soviet Union. To the contrary, it sharpened its appetite.

In my country at present the Communists are struggling feverishly to smash any obstacle in the path of a complete Soviet rule.

After a ruthless onslaught against the democratic Polish political parties, the pressure spread in two directions: Godless communism began to destroy religious life and the Christian moral foundations of society. On the other hand, compulsion and terror are aimed at the individual farmers, who in their great masses formed the membership of my party—the National-Democratic—and of the Polish Peasant Party. The farm collectivization program was launched about 7 months ago. It cannot be realized too rapidly, because the Red regime lacks tractors and other agricultural machinery, needed by the so-called cooperative villages. However, the process has commenced and is being accelerated.

The struggle behind the iron curtain, though necessarily silent, is of a momentous character. Our people, surrounded by the Soviet Army and enmeshed by the secret police, are resisting in a brave and spirited manner, despite the feeling of being abandoned and forgotten by their western allies.

President Truman said that those who did not surrender to tyranny are helping America. It is certainly true. But those people in turn look toward the United States for political and material aid, which would enable them to survive until the international situation changes in their favor.

The main problem for our people today is the problem of physical and spiritual survival.

If Russia is permitted to consolidate her grip over the eastern part of Europe, to conquer Asia, and to undermine the Western Hemisphere, if she succeeds in producing the atomic bomb—the situation may become extremely serious, if not hopeless.

It is, therefore, necessary to switch from defensive to offensive, from containment to pressure.

The United States is being asked for help literally by scores of countries. I know that your resources, although enormous, are not inexhaustible. But maybe it is possible, without undertaking new obligations, and even without appropriating additional funds, to distribute the aid, already earmarked for Europe, in such a way that modest assistance could be provided for the anti-Communist forces of central-eastern Europe.

Some assistance could thus be given to the people behind the iron curtain, to the new political refugees fleeing the red terror, and to the free representatives of the enslaved nations.

There are many channels—let's call them unofficial—through which the people inside Poland may be reached.

The atitude of the Western Powers toward the free representatives abroad of the central-eastern European countries is also of primary importance. Our nations cannot speak or act freely. Therefore, we, their true representatives, speak on their behalf, and express their desires and opinions.

The anti-Communist forces of central-eastern Europe must not be wasted. Without war being actually waged, the struggle now in progress between the western Christian and the Eurasian worlds assumed such gigantic proportions that each addition to the strength of the United States is desirable and may prove decisive.

I would prefer not to go into details as regards the possible ways and means of cooperation. Our activities, both at home and abroad, assume various forms. The Poles still have a government in exile, which, though unrecognized by the big powers, is considered legal and constitutional by my countrymen. The Hungarians, Czechs, and others are organizing national committees. The formal aspects of cooperation are, however, immaterial and may be mutually agreed upon.

I am quite sure that the country of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln will not fail in this hour of trial, and that ultimately, with American assistance, a strong independent Poland will be established between Germany and Russia, a bulwark against these two traditional aggressors and the best guaranty for durable peace in Europe.

Thank you.

The American Theater and Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the American National Theater and Academy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1945 I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of purpose which the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) has since put into operation. To quote from that statement: "I see in this plan a hope and an opportunity that the people in the 48 States, my people in Utah,

may some day have some of the cultural advantages of the professional theater available in the places where they live—whereas now, at least 90 percent of them have never seen it."

It is a major satisfaction that the American National Theater is living up to its purpose as a service organization on a national scale. A tangible demonstration of this in my State is worth recounting. ANTA has been instrumental in bringing us some of the finest artists of the theater, Miss Katharine Cornell, Mr. Orson Welles, Miss Judith Evelyn, Mr. Brian Aherne, Miss Blanche Yurka, and others in the finest dramatic plays. In association with this nationally chartered theater organization, plans for building a great theater building, and for establishing a distinguished, professional State theater company are under way. We could not have reached this point without the help and assistance of ANTA.

Mr. President, there has been introduced into the Senate this year a bill sponsored by the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES, and myself providing for a national theater. And because of widespread interest throughout our country I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD comments appearing in the press concerning the work which the American National Theater has thus far accomplished in one field of operation.

[From the New York Times of November 21, 1948]

THEATER USA BOWS

(By Jack Gould)

Theater USA, produced by the American National Theater and Academy, is one of the new season's brightest and most zestful radio shows. Presented at 7:30 Thursday evenings over the ABC network, the program is by broadcasting's present day standards practically a paradox: it is a variety show, yet it has variety.

What ANTA has done is both so simple and sensible as to merit consideration for a Peabody award. It has enlisted the sundry talents of the world of entertainment but, more importantly, it has allowed those talents to stand on their own without superfluous production embellishment, without the usual maddening chit-chat of a master of ceremonies and without the common air of pontifical self-consciousness.

The result, judging by the premiere performance, is an eminently businesslike 30 minutes that boasts pace but still seems unhurried. Under the firm directorial hand of John Houseman, who has been away from radio too long, the first performance ran the gamut of spritely song, both broad and subtle comedy, and sophisticated drama. Theater, USA, is a refreshing example of what professional show folk can do on the air when they are left alone by the self-anointed experts of Radio Row.

On the initial performance, the proceedings were opened by Mary Martin in a rendition of Buttons and Bows. Next came Willie Howard in his uproarious French lesson, followed by a superb Puccini-Irving Berlin version of Annie Get Your Gun, contributed by Alec Templeton. The closing item offered Tallulah Bankhead and Donald Cook in a scene from their current revival of Noel Coward's Private Lives. As the presiding officer, Alfred Drake was a model of modesty, lending the show a lively sense of continuity without getting in the way.

Theater, USA, is presented in behalf of the current Army recruiting drive, but it goes without saying that ANTA, too, will benefit as much as the program's military sponsor. For on Thursday nights the theater definitely is putting its best foot forward.

[From the Billboard of November 20, 1948]

THEATER USA

Producer, the American National Theater and Academy; director, John Houseman; executive director, Roland Martini; writer, Howard Teichmann; music composer-conductor, Nathan Kroll; emsee, Alfred Drake. Cast: Tallulah Bankhead, Mary Martin, Donald Cook, Alec Templeton, Willie Howard.

One of the nicest greetings sent out by the Army is the new Theater USA program produced by the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA), with the tab being picked up by the Army and Air Forces recruiting service. The initial outing of the new series, aired via American Broadcasting Co. (ABC), offered a collection of top pro talent in a potpourri of variety acts.

Alfred Drake set the pace as emsee, staying out of the way of the various acts and doing a smoothly unobstructive job while on. Cast for the opening gambit included Mary Martin, Willie Howard, Alec Templeton, Donald Cook, and Tallulah Bankhead. Miss Martin led off with a lilting rendition of Buttons and Bows, ably abetted by nice backing from Nathan Kroll's tootlers. Willie Howard added a touch of nostalgia with his ancient French professor routine. Templeton did one of his usual take-offs on a classical number with a clever parody on Haydn's Surprise Symphony and encored with Miss Martin in a demiopera based partly on Madame Butterfly and partly on Annie Get Your Gun. The show wound up with a choice excerpt from Noel Coward's Private Lives, emoted with the proper understatement by Cook and Miss Bankhead who head the current legit revival of the play.

Two commercials stressed the positive significance of the Army and did not pitch hard for recruits. One spoke of the uniform as the symbol of freedom and peace; the other described how American youth is "voluntarily" rallying, not to win the peace, but to secure it. The show itself is grade A radio fare and will continue to offer entertainment's biggest names. As such, it furnishes ABC with the backbone of a strong Thursday night schedule.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune-Sun of March 10, 1949]

HUMPHREY, LAUREN HEAD PROGRAM OF STARS SPONSORED TONIGHT BY ARMY AND AIR FORCE

(By Dorothy Mahoney)

Theater USA a recruiting program sponsored by the United States Army and Air Force, will present Lauren Bacall and Humphrey Bogart, among others, at 8 tonight on KFMB. One would think that the radio appearance of two such microphone-shy actors as the screen team would be enough to satisfy any top sergeant, but Comedian Bert Wheeler, Bandleader Louis Prima and Singer Jane Froman are tossed in for good measure. There's one unqualified statement that can be made about the show: it doesn't drag for lack of talent.

[From the New York News of March 4, 1949]

LOOKING AND LISTENING WITH SID SHALIT

Nominated for the Radioscar: WJZ's expertly directed Theater USA. ANTA-Army sponsored show, for which you can credit Howard Teichmann and Vinton Freedley.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post of March 3, 1949]

THEATER IS A REAL VARIETY

(By Jack Norton)

If you like a true variety show—a program that neatly combines the better elements of what once was vaudeville in this country and is referred to as music hall in England, catch the offering on KXYZ-ABC at 7:30 p. m. Thursday. Called Theater USA, it has, over the past season, gone quietly about the business of presenting some of the world's top entertainers in a nice blend of music, comedy, and drama.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times-West Virginian of February 27, 1949]

UP AND DOWN BROADWAY

(By Jack Gaver)

One of the radio shows that has attracted most attention this season has been Theater USA heard every Thursday evening on the ABC network under sponsorship of the recruiting program of the United States Army and Air Force. No other air show has such access to the best talent in all amusement fields.

This is because it is produced by show business itself, in the name of the American National Theater and Academy, which has a congressional charter to promote the theater throughout the country. Any stars in New York are happy to appear on this show, either as individuals doing specialties or as actors in scenes from Broadway successes of the past.

The roster of those who have appeared includes such names as Joe E. Brown, Tallulah Bankhead, Helen Hayes, Walter Huston, Mary Martin, Benny Goodman, Rise Stevens, and Jack Pearl, to mention only a few. Stage producer Vinton Freedley serves as master of ceremonies.

It is one of the best radio shows available.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio, Post of February 24, 1949]

THEATER USA

(By Mary Wood)

On the chance that you might not have discovered it—it's fairly new—I'd like to recommend Theater USA tonight (WSAI, 8:30 p. m.) as the best of the current crop of variety shows on the air. Most of the guest stars are recruited from Broadway hits and the result is a happy blend of theater and radio.

[From the New York Sunday Journal American of February 20, 1949]

STARS ASSIST THEATER USA

Operating under a plan that makes available for appearances prominent entertainers from the legitimate, concert, and musical stage, Theater USA, the new air show heard every Thursday evening on the ABC Network, is the first regular major broadcast to represent the entire Broadway amusement field.

Sponsored primarily as a part of the recruiting program by the United States Army and the United States Air Force, the show is produced in cooperation with the American National Theater and Academy, chartered by Congress for the establishment of a National Theater.

Theater USA has in recent weeks presented such stage stars as Tallulah Bankhead, star of Private Lives, at the Plymouth; Joe E. Brown, Helen Hayes, Cornelia Otis Skinner, and Walter Huston in scenes from well-remembered and current stage vehicles.

The musical-comedy stage has contributed Mary Martin, Georgia Gibbs and Nanette Fabray, and Ray Middleton of Love Life at the Forty-sixth Street Theater.

And from the musical and concert field have come artists of such diversity as Benny Goodman, Eugene List, Rise Stevens, Tommy Dorsey, Segovia, and Vincent Lopez.

Theater USA is broadcast from the famous old Playhouse Theater on West Forty-eighth Street.

Vinton Freedley, producer of many Broadway hits, is master of ceremonies. The program is written and produced by Howard Teichmann. Nathan Kroll is the musical director.

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 19, 1949]

A NATIONAL THEATER IN ANTA

(By William Hawkins)

Interest in Anta throughout the world of showmanship is so intense that Theater

USA, as the airer is known, has never yet had to cope with a turn-down from any artist asked to appear.

Typical of the caliber presented are the most recent programs which included Charles Boyer and Judith Evelyn in Angel Street, Beatrice Lillie, Dorothy Shay, and the Piano Playhouse team of Cy Walter and Stan Freeman. Next Thursday the line-up will offer Rex Harrison and Joyce Redman in Anne of the Thousand Days, Lawrence Tibbett, Jack Carson, and the Ink Spots.

The "Gimmes" Sap the Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following two brief articles from this month's Reader's Digest. Some of us have been preaching for the past 16 years the truth contained in these two articles, and certainly it is to be hoped that most Americans are now fully aware of the financial danger that threatens to destroy us. They follow:

THE "GIMMES" SAP THE NATION'S STRENGTH

This country—indeed, the whole world—is being swept by an epidemic of the "gimmes." Nearly everybody wants to be given something at the expense of somebody else. This epidemic grows out of a belief that government can somehow provide aid and security for its people, no matter what the cost and how far in debt it already is.

The more government provides, the more is expected of it. One of the penalties of government assistance is a widespread lowering of the sense of responsibility. Individual stamina and self-determination go down at a time when public expenses are going up. This parallel development has destroyed other nations. It enabled a few thousand barbarians to overthrow the mighty Roman Empire. The Romans came to depend on the state for food, shelter and entertainment. In their eagerness for free security at state expense, they became so insecure they lost everything.

A state is just a large number of individuals. In the end, it is subject to the same limitations as the individual; it pays the same penalties for bad management. Take debt, for example. The United States Government owes over $250,000,000,000—more than $6,000 for every American family. Other political subdivisions—States, cities, counties, school districts—owe twenty billions.

All of them are under terrific pressure to provide more services and greater benefits. All are having to boost taxes and borrow money to pour out to a never-satisfied public.

The popular idea is that these funds can be obtained from the rich and the big corporations—so that the majority of people can have the benefits without paying the cost. But nobody gets anything for nothing. Everybody shares the debt. Everybody pays taxes—direct or indirect.

There aren't enough rich people to enable the government to finance itself at their expense. If government took all the wealth of the corporations, it wouldn't put the country on a sound financial keel. But it would put the corporations out of business and workers out of jobs. Meanwhile, all that the big companies pay to government becomes a part of the cost of the goods they produce—an important factor in the cost of living for everybody.

Only wider realization of these basic facts can stop the tragedy that must eventually happen if the give-everything-to-everybody theory continues unchecked.

THE EVER-LENGTHENING SHADOW

In 1929 Federal spending amounted to less than two-thirds of the personal income of the inhabitants of California. By 1947 Federal expenditures were approximately equal to the total personal income of all the inhabitants of California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and about four-fifths of Texas.

Federal expenditures amounted to $121 per family in 1929, $250 in 1938, and about $984 in 1948.

Remember that these figures represent the spending of the Federal Government only. When State and local government spending is added, the total amounts to some 30 percent of our national income. In other words, the American people devote nearly one-third of their working time and effort to supporting their various governments.

Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal of March 25, 1949:

BY ONE VOTE

The margin by which the House finally reached a wise decision on the Rankin pension bill couldn't have been closer.

The vote to send the bill back to committee was 208 to 207. Representative RANKIN for the first time this session uttered words that made sense when he then said, "That kills this legislation for this Congress." He could have persisted in bringing it out again.

As we said yesterday, the amendments that had been tacked on in 2 days of debate made an already unsound measure into a "bonus-pension freak."

If the motion to recommit hadn't passed by the hairbreadth margin, it is possible that other amendments might eventually have modified the extravagant scheme. But that was by no means a certainty, after the spectacle that many House Members made of themselves in trying to be all things to all persons.

The only reassuring note in the pension battle was the sensible attitude taken by many nonprofessional veterans who said frankly that they didn't want the Rankin pensions.

By far the most sensible words spoken on the floor of the House came from Representative CHARLES EDWARD POTTER, of Cheboygan, Mich., who lost both his legs in a battle at Colmar, France.

When he joined the Army in 1942, he said, he wasn't thinking about collecting any cash rewards. And he doesn't want any now.

"You can't make mercenaries out of the veterans by paying them a few dollars each," he declared.

We wonder whether Representative RANKIN and many of his colleagues haven't underrated both the patriotism and the good sense of a vast majority of the veterans.

It's fortunate that there are men in Congress like Representative POTTER to offset the Rankins. Yesterday, it was doubly fortunate. If POTTER were for pensions, the Rankin bill would still be kicking around.

Schools of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal which calls attention to the splendid program that has been initiated at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, which is in my district.

Certainly those at this great university, who are responsible, are to be congratulated for taking the initiative in giving the opportunity to the student body, as well as to the general public, to meet and discuss from a practical approach the various political issues of the two parties. This is truly a commendable program, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain will bring splendid results.

The editorial follows:

SCHOOLS OF POLITICS

Wesleyan University is teaching its students practical politics. The Delaware, Ohio, school is pioneering in an addition to college curriculums that has long been needed but generally overlooked in higher education.

The objectives of the school are twofold:

1. To prepare young men and women for positions in Government by classroom instruction and by requiring internships in public offices;

2. To prepare those students not interested in a political career for intelligent participation as citizens in their Government through lectures, seminars, and direct contact with political situations.

Practical politics is a subject that has been studiously ignored in the past to the detriment of our Government. Our educational system makes provision for educating teachers, mechanics, and businessmen. It provides long and detailed courses of studies for those who undertake medicine and law. The fields of journalism, engineering, chemistry, biology, agriculture, and practically all the rest are well covered.

But the men and women who direct the greatest business on earth, the Government of the United States in all its Federal, State, county, and municipal ramifications, have not been educated specifically for their jobs.

The people who are ultimately responsible for good government—the voters—have been restricted in a vast majority of cases to a smattering of civics in high school and a quick dash through American Government in college.

It is time for this Nation to accept public officeholding as a separate profession and to insist that candidates be trained for the work. It is time that our citizens be given

a broader, more complete view of their responsibilities and duties.

Every election brings out the same crop of perennial office seekers, many of whom possess few or no qualifications for the office to which they aspire. They need the jobs. They have friends who will support them and they are dependable "hacks" to whom political leaders owe some measure of political debt. Too often these incompetents get themselves elected.

One bright spot in the picture is that since the war, many young men, especially veterans, are taking a more active interest in politics, even to the extent of challenging the old-timers. But even these young men are handicapped by a lack of knowledge of both politics and of government.

Teaching practical politics in college and requiring internships in public offices will give young politicos both background and practical experience.

National and State leaders of both Republican and Democratic Parties are slated to take active roles in the Wesleyan University Institute. They can do more than talk. They can spot bright, energetic young men and women who may soon be likely nominees for political offices. Veteran politicians can give this training new impetus by guaranteeing internships for graduates.

A school for politicians is something novel in American education. If the idea spreads, it may be the means of producing a marked improvement in government and candidates.

Suppression of Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to suppress the evil of anti-Semitism and the hatred of members of any race because of race, creed, or color

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) Congress hereby finds that anti-Semitism and bigotry are potent weapons in the hands of the enemies of this country and of its institutions, and that the enemies of this country and of its institutions have been and are using the United States mails and the channels of interstate and foreign commerce to spread the doctrines and foster the feelings of anti-Semitism, religious, and racial hatred because of race, creed, or color, thereby tending to destroy the unity of this Nation, creating discord among our people, disrupting the normal channels of trade and commerce, and interfering with and dislocating the economic life of the country.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its powers to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations and the other powers granted to it by the Constitution of the United States, to prevent the spread of anti-Semitism, religious, and racial hatred because of race, creed, or color, through the use of the mails and the channels of interstate and foreign commerce.

IMPORTATION, MAILING, AND SHIPMENT

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to bring, or cause to be brought, into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or to deposit, or cause to be deposited, in the United States mail for mailing and delivery, or to deposit, or cause to be deposited, with any express company, or other common carrier, for carriage, or to send or carry from one State or Territorry of the United States, or the District of Columbia, to any other State or Territory of the United States, or the District of Columbia, any book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other publication which exposes the Jews or any other group as a nation, people, or any substantial portion of them, to hatred, contempt, ridicule, or obloquy, or which causes or tends to cause them to be shunned or avoided, or which has a tendency to injure them in their occupations, employment, or other economic activities, or exposes any race because of race, creed, or color to hatred, contempt, ridicule, or obloquy, or which causes or tends to cause the members of such race or religion to be shunned or avoided, or which has a tendency to injure the members of such race or religion in their occupation, employment, or other economic activities.

RECEIPT AND DISTRIBUTION

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any person to take or receive from the mails, or any express company or other common carrier with intent to sell, distribute, circulate, or exhibit the same, or to read the same to others, any matter or thing forbidden by section 2 of this act to be imported into the United States, or to be deposited for mailing, delivery, or carriage in interstate commerce; or to sell, distribute, circulate, or exhibit, or to read to others, any such matter or thing, knowing the same to have been imported into the United States or carried in the mails or interstate commerce in violation of the provisions of section 2 of this act.

PUNISHMENT

SEC. 4. Any person violating any of the provisions of section 2 or 3 of this act, or who conspires or acts in concert with any other person or persons to violate any of the provisions of section 2 or 3 of this act shall, for each such offense, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $5,000, or sentenced to imprisonment (at hard labor) for not more than 5 years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

JURISDICTION

SEC. 5. Any person charged with violating the provisions f this act may be prosecuted in any district in which any part of the offense has been committed by him or by his actual associates participating with him in the offense or by his fellow conspirators.

Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from his bedside in the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., where he is recovering from a heart attack, James Patrick McGovern, citizen, soldier, lawyer, poet, and crusader has sent me a sonnet entitled "Jeopardy," which I deem worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this sonnet be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEOPARDY

Men of America, in jeopardy
Stand the traditions of our country's soul;
Less and less the Nation's glorious role
Gemmed with starry truth's white majesty,
Lives in our flag, long famed in peace and war.
False gods of justice, virtue, beauty spurn
The wisdom of our fathers and unlearn
The human heart and simple nature's lore.
The fashions, rivalries, fanfare, and din
Serve private ends and not the commonweal;
The billions of our riches, gold and steel,
Grow Frankensteins, gross idols, public sin.
Have we no Christians now who live and die,
With truth their cross, to challenge every lie?

Chinese Communist Peace Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an interesting and challenging article on the present situation in China, written by Constantine Brown and appearing in the Washington Star of March 28, 1949:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

CHINESE COMMUNIST PEACE CONDITIONS SEEN REVEALING ERROR IN UNITED STATES ANALYSIS

(By Constantine Brown)

Unless the Chinese Nationalist' "rump government" at Nanking decides to accept at any price the so-called peace conditions offered by the Communists, it is highly doubtful that anything will result from the protracted negotiations which have been carried on since Chiang Kai-shek was forced out of the Nationalist set-up.

The Reds original nine points, on which there has been a considerable amount of Oriental bargaining, now have been reduced by the Peiping Communists to three. These are:

(1) Communist troops shall garrison Nanking, Kiukiang, and Hankow.

(2) All officials under the authority of the Nanking government who are not or have not been friendly to the Communists shall be removed from office; and

(3) The Nanking government, while not breaking diplomatic ties with the United States and Great Britain shall undertake to sever the hitherto friendly relations with those governments and remove American influence from all of China where it exists.

Later move seen

The request that Nanking, Kiukiang and Hankow be handed over to Communist troops would place them in key strategic position for a later move toward the still little-infiltrated south. The presence of Mao Tze-tung's forces in these areas by agreement with the Nanking government is considered to mean that the Communists would hold not only a blackjack over the Nanking government, but they would secure safe jumping-off points for a move southward whenever Russian strategy demands.

The request that all officials in the former Nationalist government who are unfriendly

to Communists should be dismissed is regarded to mean that an entirely new set of officials will be placed in responsible positions—and they will be hand-picked by the Communists themselves. In other words, the Peiping government is demanding the communization of all Chinese officialdom, even in areas which nominally would remain under the control of the Nanking government.

The most important condition—from our point of view—is the reported demand that the ties between the non-Communist Nanking government and the United States should be loosened almost to the point of nonexistence.

Error of policy

Some Chinese experts in the State Department have maintained in recent years that this country need not be concerned over Mao Tze-tung and his aides taking over China, since they pay only lip service to Moscow and are in fact, only agrarian reformers. They expressed their firm belief that once the corrupt Kuomintang government, and particularly its key men around Chiang Kai-shek, were removed, we would be able to continue our traditional friendly relations with China through the Communist leaders.

These arguments were accepted at face value by our policy makers, who were convinced that we would be able to deal with Mao and his associates. This belief was akin to Washington's conviction prior to 1947 that we need entertain no fears that Russia would not sincerely collaborate toward peaceful reconstruction of the world and that she had no real expansionist designs on her neighbors.

The reported demand from Peiping to the Nanking government that it eliminate the Anglo-Saxon imperialist influence may open the eyes of our Government, even if belatedly, to who is top boss in China today.

Federal Loyalty Check Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus Evening Dispatch of March 15, 1949:

THE ANSWER IS "NO"

A Washington newspaper whose readership, naturally, is heavy with Government jobholders, suggests that it is "time to call off the dogs," i. e., the Federal loyalty check program. Its reason is that Government workers checked have been found "99 percent-plus pure," since in only 7,996 cases out of 2,387,235 persons checked for loyalty has a full investigation been ordered.

It calls this result a heart-warming testimonial to the allegiance of Federal workers. No one can quarrel with this comment. It is. And it should be. After all Federal payrollers are Americans. It would have been a stunning surprise had a couple of hundred thousand or more subversives been uncovered.

Nevertheless the answer to the call-off-the-dogs proposal should be "no." Why?

1. Because, despite its insignificance percentage-wise, 7,996 is still a lot of people of questionable loyalty to be in governmental employ. The small percentage is due to the enormous size of the Federal bureaucracy. It is not impossible that a clever and devious enemy still could have planted substantial numbers of spies and sympathizers if the Government pay roll were only half as large.

2. Because one disloyal person in the right place at the right time can do as much damage as 7,996. A former State Department official is under indictment. A former Justice Department employee is under arrest. Both had access to secret data. Extend these cases statistically into the thousands and they add up, potentially, to an extremely threatening situation.

3. How many clever disloyal persons may have escaped detection?

We are fighting a cold war, all over the world, financed by billions of taxpayer dollars against a resourceful and ruthless system that seeks our Government's overthrow. All this effort and sacrifice, conceivably, could be wasted by failing to fight the whole battle; by giving subversion its opportunity to deal the treacherous blow at home that might cancel out the total effort.

Everyone will be glad to know that Government workers have been found 99 percent and a fraction pure. But while we're dealing in familiar sayings, let's not forget also that an ounce of prevention still is worth a pound of cure; that battles have been lost for want of a single horseshoe nail.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me over Station WDEL, Wilmington, Del., on March 27, 1949, in which I outlined my reasons for opposing the legislation pending before the Congress providing for Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I fully recognize that the educational system in our country is in need of vast improvement. This situation is true in our own State. I have always believed in and advocated an educational system for Delaware second to none, but it has been my contention that such improvements as are necessary should be conducted and financed on a State and local level.

Since 1919 proposals for annual Federal appropriations to the States for elementary and secondary education have been introduced in the Congress in increasing numbers. The appropriations called for have ranged from $100,000,000 to over $1,000,000,000 per year. The methods of allocation have been numerous and fantastic. The guiding hand behind these proposals has been, and still is, the National Education Association and its affiliates, and in order that there might be no doubt as to the scope of their fantastic scheme, I quote from a news release which they made on February 28, 1948, outlining their program:

"Carefully worked out, along practical lines, our program stresses education for all. It sees the future need for compulsory education from 6 to 60, such as exists today from 6 to 16. * * * To secure these, an increase of $5,000,000,000 yearly expenditure is proposed."

Already scores of bills have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress dealing with Federal aid to education. The two most likely to receive serious consideration are S. 246 and S. 496.

S. 496, the McMahon-Johnson bill, provides the same distribution by States as contained in S. 246 except that it extends the benefits to all private and parochial schools. When we speak of parochial schools, it is not a question of dealing with any particular religious denomination but a question of continued separation of church and state. In our own State we have parochial and private schools supported by practically every religious denomination. For instance, in Dover we have the Wesley College, a Methodist school, as well as schools supported by both the Mennonites and Seventh Day Adventists. In Middletown we have the St. Andrews School maintained by the Episcopal Church. In Wilmington, in addition to schools supported by these denominations, there are those supported by both the Friends and the Catholics.

Our forefathers left Europe and came to this country to obtain religious freedom and to escape the compulsory allegiance to any church of state. To guarantee this freedom in establishing this Government, they insisted upon a complete separation of church and state. Our freedom will last only so long as we maintain this separation.

The real issue confronting us today is not the appropriation of $325,000,000, which is only a beginning for the alleged purpose of equalizing the educational advantages for our boys and girls; the real issue is whether or not we shall take this most crucial step toward the socialization of America and thereby lose our individual freedom, the priceless heritage which our forefathers bequeathed to us. We must not forget that Federal aid will ultimately mean Federal control, and Federal control would reflect in the classrooms the views of the Government in control, thus hastening our progress toward state socialism.

May I call your attention to some of the other reasons why I believe Federal aid to our public-school system is unnecessary and most dangerous.

STATE RESPONSIBILITY

General education is not properly a function of the Federal Government. According to the Federal Constitution and tradition, education is of local, State, and private concern.

No stronger argument against Federal aid to education has been given than that given by Senator TAFT (in a minority report relative to S. 637) when he said, "Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain." Mr. TAFT further stated, "We cannot give Federal aid to education without the Government controlling education."

General Eisenhower on October 16, 1948, said he was opposed to Federal aid to education "so long as there is one single iota of Federal control coming with it * * * and * * * the Federal Government has no right to take tax out of our pockets and then give it back to us without some form of supervision."

In a test case brought before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1942, this highest court ruled that, "The Federal Government has the right to regulate that which it subsidizes." I am sure we do not wish our States to lose their identity nor to become merely administrative subdivisions of the Federal Government. Notwithstanding the arguments of the proponents of Federal aid, we all know that one Congress cannot bind a succeeding Congress, and any succeeding Congress can change the requirements of

participation and allocation of funds set up in this bill.

I cannot support any legislation which takes from either the individual or the State the freedom which was guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

MORE MONEY NOT THE CURE

The expenditure of money will not cure all the ills of our educational system. If the expenditure of money was the solution to our educational problems, then we would find in our richest States and cities, where there is no need of Federal aid, the highest level of spiritual, cultural, and political health. There the most is spent on education, yet there we find most deeply entrenched one-party political machines and the worst political corruption and great disparity in educational opportunity. Also, from these same places we find the greatest demand on the Federal Government for food, shelter, health, and education.

A few years ago, one of the greatest educators in our Nation's history, Nicholas Murray Butler, speaking on this subject, said:

"There is not enough money in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce through Federal authority, or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have been already reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us.

"Unless the school is both the work and pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

No longer should the major emphasis be upon how much money we can spend. On the contrary emphasis should be upon moral purposes, upon character and citizenship, without which no nation can long preserve a glorious republic like ours.

STATES BETTER ABLE TO ASSUME FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The States, at the present time, are much better able to assume the financial responsibility for an efficient school system than is the Federal Government.

Federal aid to the public schools of America is not desirable and it is not necessary. The debt of the Federal Government is over $250,000,000,000. The debt of all the 48 States, added together, is about $2,500,000,000. The debt of the Federal Government is, therefore, 100 times as much as the total debt of all the States combined.

Since 1940, the debt of the Federal Government has increased more than 600 percent while the debt of the 48 states has actually gone down. There is not a single State that is not better able to pay the expense of the education of its youth than is the Federal Government. Why, therefore, should we saddle the cost of education on the Federal Government?

Since 1936 annual public-school expenditures have increased from $1,760,000,000 to $3,700,000,000 in 1948, or more than double.

It is interesting to note that during this period in which the States have doubled their education expenditures, they have at the same time vastly improved their financial position. There is not a single one of the 48 States which has not reduced its debt since 1940 and at the same time greatly increased State contributions to public schools.

For example:

1. The national average of salaries paid public-school teachers has increased 86 percent in the past 8 years. The average salary was $1,270 8 years ago. Today it is $2,362.

2. In the Southern States, teachers' salaries improved markedly in the past 8 years. They have increased 156 percent in Mississippi; 150 percent in Alabama; and 157 percent in Arkansas.

3. State aid to education has increased 117 percent in the past 8 years. State governments paid 31 percent of the cost of public education 8 years ago. Today State governments pay 42 percent of the cost.

4. State governments now are better able to support their school systems than before. The tax collections have increased 88 percent since 1939.

5. Local school districts are in a better position to support their schools than ever before. Their tax rates have gone up; their assessed valuations have increased; and their tax collections are higher today than ever before.

DISTRIBUTION UNFAIR TO MANY STATES

Under the formula provided in this bill the State of Delaware would be compelled to pay $2,970,000 but would receive only the $5 per pupil minimum, or about $285,000.

Even if I were in favor of Federal aid to education, I would be opposed to taxing the citizens of Delaware to support education in other States until such time as the citizens of those States are taxed on a basis comparable to our own.

For example, Texas, under this bill, will receive $18,675,000, while only required to pay $7,950,000, or a net gain of over $10,500,000. At the same time Texas boasts of its number of millionaire ranchers and oilmen; yet Texas does not levy any income tax against its citizens. Why should the citizens of Delaware, who are already paying State income taxes to support our school system, now be expected to pay an additional income tax through a Federal-aid program in order to subsidize the Texas schools?

The same situation is true with many other States. In fact, there are 18 states which do not levy any State income tax on their citizens. In addition to the 18 States which levy no State income tax, there are 12 States which levy no inheritance tax. Many of these same States, some of which have neither inheritance nor income taxes, are the principal ones which are today seeking benefits under this Federal-aid program.

The argument is used that these States, principally in the South, are unable to finance their own school systems, but no mention is made of the fact that so far, notwithstanding their need for additional revenue for education, they refuse to tax their citizens on a basis comparable to ours. While it is true that their per capita income is lower, they at least could tax those of their citizens whose income equals that of any Delawarian.

Not one of the 18 States having no State income tax and not one of the 12 States having no inheritance tax has any right to expect the Federal Government to support their educational system until they have at least equaled the efforts of other States.

The argument has often been advanced that the principle of this Federal-aid program is merely an extension on a national basis of the system which is now operating in our own State whereby the more wealthy and more populated areas are supporting the rural schools. This argument cannot be supported in the face of the facts. It is true that in Delaware the schools in the rural areas are supported to a large extent by the more populated areas, but the citizens who live in the rural areas are taxed on exactly the same basis as the citizens in the more populated areas. This situation is not true on a national basis where, as I have pointed out, certain States are seeking to benefit under this Federal-aid program, yet they are not willing to tax their own citizens to the extent to which we are taxed in Delaware. Many of these States are enticing the industries and citizens of our State to take up residence in their States because of lower taxes.

How long would the citizens of our cities and towns subscribe to the principle of supporting the educational facilities in the rural areas if the citizens of these rural areas were granted exemption or a lower tax rate? Yet such is the principle embodied in this proposed Federal-aid program.

I am not overlooking the fact that throughout the country, including Delaware, we need a vastly improved education program. I heartily endorse the principles embodied in both the State Democratic and State Republican platforms last year advocating major improvements in our State educational system, and I am gratified that the State legislature is now considering a redemption of these pledges. I have always believed in and advocated an educational system in Delaware second to none. But such improvements should be conducted and financed on a State and local level.

If the Federal Government is sincere in its effort to aid the States, there is an easy way to accomplish this goal without endangering either our educational system or our freedom. For instance, the annual pay roll required to support the more than 2,000,000 Federal employees today exceeds $6,500,000,000. A mere 10-percent reduction in this pay roll, which anyone will agree could easily be achieved, would mean savings to the States of $650,000,000 annually, or just double the amount proposed under this Federal-aid program. Furthermore, if we are in earnest, let us give the States real Federal aid. All that is necessary is the adoption by the Congress of the economies recommended by the Hoover commission. These economies, through the elimination of overlapping bureaucracies, would result not only in a more efficient Government but also in a saving to the American taxpayers of more than $3,000,000,000 annually. This is 10 times the amount proposed under this Federal-aid program.

The best way, therefore, to achieve real Federal aid to the States without Federal control is to reduce the cost of the Federal Government, thereby reducing the amount of revenues taken from the States.

I summarize my opposition to Federal aid to education as follows:

1. Education, in accordance with our Constitution, was never intended to be a Federal responsibility.

2. Federal aid always brings with it Federal control.

3. Any aid granted now will only be an opening wedge for greater demands in the future.

4. States and localities are better able to finance school systems than is the Federal Government.

5. The present conditions of schools is due not altogether to finances but partly to inefficient organization and operation.

6. Methods of allocating Federal aid are unfair to many States.

7. Once Federal aid is granted for education, other State and local services will have a precedent for requesting aid.

8. Religious freedom can survive only so long as free public schools survive. Federal subsidy and Federal control will kill both.

I am thoroughly convinced that the enactment of Federal aid to education will be another long step along the road to national socialism. Let us not be fooled by believing this is a cure-all for the ills of our educational system, nor will it guarantee educational security without the loss of our educational freedom. Let us always remember the wise words of Benjamin Franklin, who once said, "He who trades freedom for security will lose both."

Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 28, 1949, entitled "On Saying and Doing":

ON SAYING AND DOING

The anxious student seeking an answer to the question, What's wrong with the GOP?, need look no further than the House's voting record last week on Representative JOHN RANKIN'S pension proposal.

Despite the GOP accent on Government economy—which, indeed, is supposed to be the party's hallmark—106 Republicans in the lower Chamber voted to save the multibillion-dollar Rankin scheme and only 57 of them voted to have it sent back to committee (which was equivalent to killing it). Across the floor, 151 Democrats, whose party the Republicans often charge with "squandermania," voted to defeat the proposal and 100 to save it.

Now, it took political courage as well as political principle to defeat the Rankin bill, and that, pure and simple, is the point of this story. Before fussing any further about whether their party should become more or less liberal in order to win the electorate's support, the Republican officeholders might first try proving that in the pinches they really stand for what they say they stand for.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Pacific Northwest Cooperator commenting on an article by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in the Progressive, relating to health insurance and the activities of the American Medical Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL MONOPOLY UNDER UNITED STATES FIRE — SENATOR BLASTS TAX-EXEMPT AMA'S "EDUCATIONAL" FUND — SENATOR MURRAY, HEALTH-INSURANCE PLAN SPONSOR, RAPS MEDICS' "MISREPRESENTATIONS" AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

MADISON, WIS.—Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, Democrat, warned the American Medical Association that its tax-exempt status as a scientific and educational society was being endangered by its lobbying activities, especially its costly campaign against national health insurance.

Writing in the February issue of the Progressive magazine, Senator MURRAY, coauthor of the measure to finance a national health-insurance program by increasing employee and employer pay-roll taxes, denounced the AMA's House of Delegates as an august body of short-sighted seers bent on spoon-feeding the American people their own special brand of education about national health insurance.

SLUSH FUND

The House of Delegates, he charged, decided on raising $3,500,000 to fight health insurance by taxing its members $25 each without consulting its membership. Seasoned observers easily saw this for what it was and called it a political slush fund.

MURRAY said that "many physicians, regardless of their position on national health insurance, resent an assessment intended for legislative propaganda to be conducted under the guise of education by societies incorporated for scientific and educational purposes. Certainly legal questions of charter and tax exemption are involved. And physicians should be disturbed because the activities of the existing medical lobby (already spending more than any other single registered group) are marked for sharp public scrutiny. The methods, if not the motives, of the medical lobby are clearly open to question."

NOT SOCIALIZED

Senator MURRAY assailed the AMA for "loosely using the phrase 'socialized medicine' for smear purposes" to describe national health insurance.

"Intelligent, literate minds define socialized or state medicine to mean that the Government owns and operates all hospitals and that practicing physicians are employed by the Government on a salary basis—that is, are Federal employees under Government control.

"No such system is or has ever been proposed by those of us advocating national health insurance."

FREE CHOICE OF DOCTORS

"Proponents of national health insurance cherish the freedom and intimacy of the doctor-patient relationship as much as our die-hard opponents. Patients, as now, would select their own doctors; doctors, as now, would accept or reject patients. National health insurance is just a method of paying for medical care.

"The only change proposed by advocates of national health insurance is that, instead of the patient paying when and if he has money available, the doctor or the hospital of his choice would be paid by the insurance system at a rate and by a method to which the doctor has agreed. This is impeccably American—based on insurance principles which have been part of our national practice for more than a century. Furthermore, the system would not be run from Washington, but by local areas and States. The national health-insurance bill plainly provides for this decentralization."

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

BOTH SIDES OF IT

President Truman, addressing the Conference of Mayors the other day, denounced troublemakers who talk of a rift between him and Congress. He asserted he and Congress are working together for the good of the country, and predicted enactment of a major share of his legislative program.

That's one side of the story. Here is the other as related by Ray Tucker, National Whirligig correspondent in Washington, who has gained a reputation for his careful and accurate portrayal of developments in the National Capital.

Says Mr. Tucker: "The basic explanation for the numerous rebukes which both Houses of Congress have delivered to the White House is the growing belief on Capitol Hill that President Truman is not big enough for his job, or willing to learn by experience.

"The bipartisan coalition, which is now a fact rather than an administration fear, means to handle national problems without regard for his advice or pressure. It is doubtful whether a single important Truman-sponsored suggestion will be approved at the present session, even though the Democrats enjoy full control.

"President Truman would not have suffered so many rebuffs, personal and political, if he had not been wrong so many times, not on routine questions but on major issues essential to economic stability and prosperity of the present model."

And then Mr. Tucker goes on to say that the record upon which congressional opinion of his ability was formed includes major blunders such as:

His forecast of 8,000,000 unemployed soon after the end of the war, whereas a boom developed and lasted through 1946, 1947, and 1948.

His stressing, during his 1948 campaign and in messages to Congress early this year, of inflation as the only domestic danger, whereas prices have levelled off and are still dropping.

His statement that only food prices had fallen, whereas cost of numerous basic commodities has fallen sharply, and supplies have become so plentiful that the Federal Reserve Board has relaxed credit controls.

His demand for authority to construct additional steel plants to meet an expected shortage, whereas there is now a likelihood of a surplus of this product.

His demand for a Taft-Hartley law substitute that would not bar the closed shop or give him power to ask injunctions in strikes in key industries, after which the Supreme Court has held the States have authority to ban the closed shop and John L. Lewis has called a coal-mine stoppage which would be disastrous but for the large supply of coal above ground.

Possibly the differences of opinion between the White House and Capitol Hill can't be described as a rift, the differences going far deeper than that.

They seem to stem from the opinion, on both the Republican and Democratic sides of both houses of Congress, that the President's program is not sound and is not in the best interests of the country at large.

To make matters worse, doubts about the ability of the President to lead the country through the complex problems of the post-war-reconversion period have arisen in minds of business and the public alike.

The President's legislative program contains measures which, if adopted, would impose heavy new burdens on business and individuals, at a time when the tax burden is the heaviest in the history of the country and when tax reductions are more appropriate than increased spending. At the same time, Mr. Truman would impose Government controls, if Congress should approve, on both business and individuals.

Our economy is so delicately balanced at present that it could be tipped either way. New tax burdens and new restrictions, for instance, could deal business a blow from which it could not easily recover, and might throw the country into a recession.

At a time when business is attempting to make a safe emergence from the infla-

tionary era, Government's aim should be to lend a helping hand and nothing that holds the least threat of curbing business activity should be given serious consideration.

Programs which contain the prospect of greatly increased taxes are discouraging to business at this time. Controls are even more unsettling in business circles. Even though there is the prospect Congress may not act favorably on Mr. Truman's recommendations, the very fact that there is a remote possibility of their enactment has an adverse effect on business.

Governments—Federal, State, and local—are costing the American people about $55,000,000,000 a year, roughly about one-fourth of the national income. And, under Mr. Truman's program, this cost would be materially boosted.

The American public can't take much more in the way of a tax burden. It isn't merely guesswork to say that increasing the tax burden or imposition of Government controls, or both, could well prove a disastrous blow to our economy.

This country has everything necessary to assure an era of great prosperity, if granted competent leadership. It would be a shame if lack of that one essential should not be forthcoming.

The Burley Tobacco Season of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, another burley tobacco marketing season has come to an end. Once more the chant of the auctioneer that was heard on one of the floats in the inaugural parade has ceased for the season. Once more the planters of the golden leaf in eight States know that they can keep their children in school, maintain their financial solvency, and face life free from the gaunt specters of want and deprivation. Tobacco farmers always grow other crops. The planter rotates his crops, for it is unwise to continue to grow tobacco back again on the same acres. The tobacco farmer always is producing food as well as planting on a selected plot the tobacco that goes into the American cigarette.

In the case of tobacco, the farm program has succeeded beyond all anticipation. Many grave difficulties are encountered in the development of any extensive plan or program touching upon any industry, agricultural enterprise, or branch of the Federal Government. When we find anything that works all right, we had better keep hands off, except to pat it on the back, keep it like it is, and give it all the help we can.

The total gross sales for the 1948 burley tobacco crop were the second largest on record. The Federal-State Marketing News Service reports that 632,332,263 pounds of type 31 Burley were auctioned for an average of $46.06 per hundred pounds. The total volume was roughly 131,000,000 pounds more than last year. The largest gross sales on record were reported for the 1946 crop when over 636,000,000 pounds were sold. It is interesting to note that the total number of pounds sold exceeded by approximately 115,000,000 pounds the original estimates of the Federal Government experts. Despite this large crop, the general average received was only $2.24 per hundred pounds less than the all-time high established last season. Some of the crop was of inferior quality due to bad weather as much of it was wet. This was a factor in the weight of the crop. Prices were off for some of the grades, although they held up well for the better type of cigarette tobacco. The total given for the sales and the average are preliminary and subject to revision and, also, include resales.

Of the total of slightly more than 600,000,000 pounds that were sold, after the resales are eliminated, the four Burley cooperative marketing associations, that are designated by the Commodity Credit Corporation to handle nonrecourse loans based on parity price of tobacco on which bids are rejected, received a total of approximately 97,000,000 pounds of the 1948–49 crop. These associations are formed by the growers themselves. They are designated by the CCC to handle the loan program as loan agents. They took approximately 16 percent of the total crop. At the beginning, the associations took approximately 15 percent, but during the last week they took as high as 25 percent of all tobacco offered for sale.

Where would the tobacco farmers have been without the loan program, properly and sympathetically administered in their behalf? Let it be borne in mind, too, that not $1 has ever been lost to the Federal Government by this program. It has not cost the taxpayer a cent. Every dollar, underwritten by the Federal Government in the form of loans, has been returned as soon as the cooperative associations have sold the tobacco they have taken off the auction warehouse floors under the farm program, authorized in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended.

Nothing has contributed so much to the popularity of this program as the fact that it has been administered by the cooperative associations, whose memberships include 274,000 tobacco growers and whose directors are elected by them. Recently there was a proposal that the Production and Marketing Administration State committees would replace the tobacco cooperative associations in all transactions involving the receipt, redrying, and packing of tobacco. After the outspoken expressions from the growers, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Production and Marketing Administration rejected any such proposals. The PMA State committees are appointed and paid by the United States Department of Agriculture and are not elected by the farmers. No greater mistake could be made than to change the present method of administration. Anyone who has witnessed the operation of the control program knows this.

Of course, the loan feature is only one part of the tobacco program. Tobacco farmers have applied the acreage allotment quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to their production continuously since 1938, except in 1939. Quotas are now in effect for these types. Next year a 3-year-quota period comes to an end. The tobacco growers will have the option next year by referendum of adopting either a 1-year program or a 3-year-quota program.

In 1943 after tobacco production had been reduced during the war period, there was a rapid increase of domestic consumption and for the armed forces and lend-lease. In 1945, burley tobacco farmers were allotted 609,740 acres. In 1946, this acreage was reduced by 52,336 acres and in 1947, it was reduced 88,784 acres. The allotment for burley production in 1948 totaled 463,186 acres, a reduction of 24 percent below the allotted acreage for 1945.

Decreased exports of tobacco in 1948 resulted from the conditions that made the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 necessary. There were larger exports in 1946 and 1947, but in 1948 they decreased. The total of exports of all types of tobacco last year was far below the estimate of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation prior to the adoption of the Marshall plan. Tobacco was included in the Marshall plan legislation as a commodity desirable for export. It is one product for which the people of foreign countries are willing to pay, since American cigarettes were popularized by the GI during the war. Also, to use the phrase of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY, it is advisable "for the domestic economy" to include in ECA commodities this important product of American farms.

A summary of the season and the situation shows that these factors fit together into a pattern. No single step prevented depression in the Burley Belt. However, the price did turn downward, but this was accepted without disorder or any panicky anxiety because:

First. Loans were available based on 90 percent of a parity price determined by a fixed base period. This is essential so the grower can have some definite assurance as to what such loans will be before he prepares his plant bed. The loan program took from the auction markets approximately 16 percent of the tobacco or almost as much as the difference between the size of the actual crop and the advance estimate of the experts as to what it would be.

Second. The reduction in acreage allotments has amounted to approximately 24 percent in the past 3 years.

Third. The continuation and prospect of exports abroad were advanced by the ECA and reciprocal trade agreements.

The earliest recollection of my life was seeing the tobacco warehouses burned by the night riders at the beginning of this century, when low agricultural prices forced them to desperation. That was the wrong way. Through the long years tobacco farmers have groped, experimented, and struggled in the effort to find the solution to their own problem. They have done so in the present Agricultural Adjustment Act and I hope that in regard to tobacco it will not be tinkered with or upset, because the success with this commodity offers a conspicuous example of a farm program that really works, now, just as it is.

Arms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another brilliant and compelling editorial written by Ted Thackrey, editor and publisher of the New York Post Home News as it appeared in yesterday's Post, dated March 28, 1949.

Not only is the Post virtually the only liberal daily newspaper published today in the United States, but Ted Thackrey is almost the only remaining exponent of militant, liberal, personal journalism. His editorials are frequently written in the first person and burn with the fire of his own ardor.

In this editorial Mr. Thackrey proposes a simple and logical solution of our international complications.

He proposes that the people of the world act now to make the United Nations a real and decisive force by creating at once a United Nations military force.

Of and by itself, the idea is not novel.

What makes this editorial an important historical document is its clarity and its urgency.

Mr. Speaker, we are soon going to vote on and doubtless pass the most stupendous military budget ever proposed in peacetime. We are going to pass over the crying needs of the people for schools, hospitals, civil rights, and the fruits of our complex and unique technology with scant notice, while we build such a military machine as the world has never known in a peace-loving nation. God knows, we may be creating a Frankenstein monster to devour us and our way of life.

Ted Thackrey's editorial proposes that we take the simple and logical step of making the United Nations work by supplying, through collective action, a collective force.

He proposes arms for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this editorial to every Member of Congress. I commend it to the Committees on the Armed Services and on Appropriations. I commend it to the Secretary of National Defense and to his Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force. I commend it to the President of the United States and to his Cabinet, and to the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury.

I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to every responsible public official, and to every man, woman, and child in this mighty Nation.

We can have a peace with dignity, and Ted Thackrey marks the highway.

The editorial follows:

ARMS FOR PEACE

(By T. O. Thackrey)

I have a simple armaments program calling for the formation of a new military force, complete with Army, Navy, Marine and Coast Guard divisions and a mobile air force.

In a way it is a suggestion of a substitution for the rearmament plans proceeding feverishly on both sides of the so-called iron curtain, though it is much less ambitious in its initial stages.

In the beginning, I venture that my armaments program's first year budget would be smaller than, say, the cost of maintaining the Berlin airlift alone during the next 6 months, or the equal of Russian Army-Air Force operations cost for patrolling the border of Finland this winter.

It is a deadly serious proposal.

If by some miracle it should be adopted during the next month—and it can be—I believe we will have made a beginning in the direction of securing the peace of the world, reviving the United Nations as a living and powerful instrument for international cooperation, and restoring a feeling of security for people everywhere.

Despite its simplicity—or possibly because of it—my proposal seems to be just about the only arms plan continually brushed aside by the military experts of west and east alike, but perhaps it is only because their attention has been so concentrated lately on preparation for something called by both sides "a defensive war" that an army for peace has begun to seem an anachronism.

It seems to me that the chief and fatal weakness thus far of the United Nations has been something other than the irritations of a stubbornly used Soviet veto, or the failure of the United States to challenge Great Britain and the Arab League in their grievious and continued violation of the Charter provision against aggressive warfare, serious as these have been.

The United Nations is constantly apostrophized * * * and bypassed * * * on the ground that it has no force; no power to compel but merely power to persuade.

Very well, then, let us by all means quit merely deploring its weakness, but proceed at once to make it strong.

Let us give it force, real force, of its own.

Let us provide it without delay with means for developing an independent, international supranational army, navy, and air force, modest in its initial stages, but entirely freed of subservience to any merely national command.

Theoretically, of course, nations that are so minded are now empowered to place contingents of their national forces at the disposal of the United Nations military staff committee, subject to the agreement of the Security Council that such forces should be called into play.

This is fatally defective for several reasons, chief among them being the very rivalries and suspicions between nations which the United Nations was organized to dispel. National contingents are placed at the disposal of international bodies exclusively for the achievement of what are considered primarily national objectives.

I would replace this unworkable theory with a workable and sound practice. I would first free the members of the military-staff committee from both the duties and the privileges of any national citizenship whatever, giving them undivided loyalty to the United Nations.

I would release to the United Nations, as such, the power and financial resources to recruit and equip military contingents, initially by volunteers from among the several nations comprising membership in that organ, designed to secure for future generations release from the scourge of war.

I believe there are enough internationally-minded people, including some who would be attracted at first merely by the adventuresomeness of membership in such a force, to provide all the manpower needed for at least the first year of organization and training.

I would not be averse to a lend-lease program for some primary equipment, either, and would not be too particular whether the half-tracks and the bomber-fighters and the corvettes and the cruisers came from the western or eastern division of the world, as long as they proved useful for the months intervening while United Nations ordnance- and material-purchasing organizations sent out their own specifications and sought world bids.

Some of the advisers to the military staff committee with whom I have talked protest that it would take perhaps a year as a minimum to train and coordinate a single ground and air division of such a mixed group. The only sensible answer I know to that is that if we wait a year it will still take another year, and that any week now it may be actually too late to begin.

I say that we must begin sometime and somewhere, and that the time is now and the somewhere is when the United Nations opens its formal sessions April 5 at Lake Success. I think preliminary plans should be under way, now, today, this minute * * * and I would like to see the United States take leadership in this particular armaments proposal.

I agree with those who declaim that we have learned, all of us, to our sorrow that moral persuasion is not enough; though I insist that we could use a higher standard of morality and more persuasion, too.

I agree that power and force are necessary to any organ seeking to compel as well as advise compliance with decisions, whether that organ is a city, a nation, or UN.

But I insist that the time has come to begin concentrating on building up that power where it can serve the international rather than the purely national concepts that ride as old men of the sea around the necks of our national diplomats and generals.

I would suggest small beginnings * * * nothing beyond the capacities of the relatively small initial force.

In the Middle East, for example, what a boon to Mediator Ralph Bunche and to the entire burdened world, if a contingent of say only 10,000 international troops, with a single bomber-fighter squadron, were to take over the task of defending the Israeli and Arabian borders while truce and peace talks are continuing at Rhodes.

Surely, not too ambitious a project for the world's only organ for collective peace!

And yet, think of what a blessing this small force would be to the various nations nervously and suspiciously eyeing each other in the Middle East, anxiously adding dollars to national budgets for military purposes.

Think for example, of the relief to Israel in being able to disband its mobilized citizenry in security and turn to reconstruction.

Think of the sigh of relief from Great Britain, for example; freed of the necessity for constantly pouring in reinforcements for Arab armies at Aquaba and other points in and near Palestine; relieved of the necessity for continuing the $8,000,000 annual subsidy to Transjordan for supporting the Palestinian invasion.

Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, Iran even, and Iraq and Turkey would feel the tensions release as the military appropriations dropped. Who knows but that a similar force might relieve pressure on the Soviet budget along her southern borders and, in particular, on the boundaries separating the eastern and western bloc nations.

No United Nations official who has seen diplomatic or semimilitary service in the Middle East and in Palestine has been found who will fail to agree that such a United Nations force could and would result in the possibility of disarmament of more than 10 times that number of other troops under arms in the name of purely national interests.

Or in the Pacific, where the troops of Holland and the civilian soldiers of the Republic of Indonesia continue a murderous and desperate struggle in defiance of the suggestions of the United Nations Commission.

Who can doubt that the borders and waters of Indonesia would be patrolled in

safety and security from attack by either of the forces now bitterly contesting? Think of the relief of the budget of Holland, now draining off at least a million dollars a day in the name of securing "law and order", and the relief to the sorely pressed Indonesians who could in security lay down arms and take up rubber-tree spikes once more to help the world's production of this scarce product.

It would be naive in the extreme to suggest that adoption of my proposal would bring universal cheers, particularly at first.

It is possible that Great Britain, for example, might not really welcome being relieved of the necessity—or shall I plainly write excuse—for maintaining large military forces in support of Arab political ambitions.

It is even possible that some members of the general staff operations in the United States, in the Soviet Union, in Holland, in every country, in fact, might view the proposal with some dismay, since it would be certain to result slowly but surely in a certain form of technological displacement, But I ask you. is that kind of unemployment bad?

It will be objected—in fact it has been objected in several private conversations—that any nation on the Security Council, including the Soviet Union or Great Britain or even the United States, might be able and willing to paralyze the international army by withholding orders.

My reply is that it would be at least much more difficult to thwart the wishes of the General Assembly if an actual available force were organized and at hand.

Certainly certain manufacturers of national and even international arms equipment might be aghast at an international force steadily growing in power to the point where disarmament of national forces could safely begin without conceivably impairing any national security.

Is this a reason for dismay and delay? I say "No."

At the worst, my proposal would, if adopted, rob every nation of the excuse for bypassing the United Nations on the ground that it is without power.

In our present world, where individual nations are planning new military budgets running annually into the billions, I say that as much as 1 percent, say, of the total direct military appropriation by every nation now holding United Nations membership would scarcely be an improper price to pay for this experiment in arming for peace.

And who knows, by creating an international army of international citizens, we might demonstrate the desirability of international status for international civilians?

Since it appears that the world as a whole is determined to train more soldiers and produce more arms rather than more houses, more food, more transport, more hospitals, more schools, let us at least demand that armaments and their human operators be subject to one loyalty only—loyalty to collective enforcement of peace under law.

Keep America Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by the Treasury Department, United States Savings Bonds Division, that the new theme song for the Opportunity Bond Drive will be Keep America Saving, composed by Frank H. Thorne, of Chicago, a former international president of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

Thorne's stirring song was selected by Fred Waring, chairman of a judging committee, with Oscar Hammerstein II and Perry Como, over 42 other songs submitted by barbershoppers in a contest sponsored for the Treasury by SPEBSQSA. Soon Keep America Saving will be sung, played, broadcast, whistled, harmonized, and otherwise musically rendered throughout the Nation. This song is the Treasury's first peacetime theme song. Irving Berlin's Any Bonds Today? was written especially to promote the sale of war bonds. I wish to compliment Frank Thorne, a busy industrial executive, on his achievement. He is the author of Keep America Singing, the theme song of SPEBSQSA. He is the colorful bass of the former world championship Elastic Four Quartet. He is practically a symbol of barbershopping in this country. Runner-up song was Buy a U. S. Bond Today. Joe Martin was the coauthor with Howard Liffick. I do not refer to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our former Speaker, but to Joe Martin, of Benton Harbor, Mich.

This evening the prize bond song will be sung at the Congressional Secretaries Club Talent Night at the Congressional Library by the Washington Treble Shooters Barber Shop Quartet.

Would the Sale of Yellow Margarine Actually Hurt the Dairy Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequent prophecies by those who oppose the repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws is that such action would mean the ruin of the dairy industry.

There is no proof to support these charges; the prediction is made and there the matter rests; and I am sorry to say that many dairymen have accepted these prophecies and have accepted them without looking into the facts.

For several years now I have been studying the butter-margarine controversy. I have advocated, and still advocate, repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws. I have done this as a matter of principle and in the interests of the consumers. However, I have come to the conclusion that the long-time interests of the dairy industry will be helped by repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws. I have come to the conclusion that butter has become an old man of the sea—riding on the back of the dairy industry. Today I propose to tell you some of the reasons for my conclusion.

First of all, the margarine fight has put the dairy industry in an extremely bad light. To unbiased observers, it seems that butter simply does not want to compete on even terms with a competitor. As a result, there has been a steady barrage of criticism against butter and the dairy industry generally; over and over again, the people have been told that margarine is a perfectly good product and as nutritious as butter. In other words, the margarine-butter fight has given margarine millions of dollars worth of advertising. It has caused many persons who otherwise would not have bought margarine, to try the product and, having tried it, to continue using it. The public relations of the dairy industry have been bad. Instead of campaigns aimed at increasing the sale of their products, the dairy industry, at the behest of the butter interests, has been fighting a product which competes with butter.

Bear in mind that there is no competition between the dairy industry and the margarine industry save on the single issue of butter. Margarine does not compete with fluid milk, with ice cream, with cheese and other dairy products.

It also must be borne in mind that butter furnishes the least profitable use for the dairyman's products. Or to put it another way, butter is his loss leader. He gets less for butter than for any other use of his milk.

The average price paid for standard—3.5 percent—milk sold as fluid milk or cream during the 10-year period, 1938–47, was about $1.05 per pound of butterfat. During the same period the same milk used for butter brought per butterfat pound, only about 54 cents. The prices paid for milk for use in ice cream, cheese, and other products fell between these two levels.

In other words it was twice as profitable during this period for the dairy farmer to sell his milk for whole milk use as it was for him to divert it to butter manufacture.

I am advised that this week Texas processors are paying $5.60 per 100 pounds, basis 4-percent butter fat, for milk used for fluid grade-A distribution; $3.10 basis for milk for making cheese and condensed milk; and only $2.20 (including allowances for the value of skim milk) for milk used for butter production. It undoubtedly costs somewhat more to meet the requirements for grade A milk, but certainly nothing like twice as much.

I do not believe it is possible at the present time for the dairy farmer to produce milk and sell it at $2.20 per 100 pounds without losing money and, yet, that is exactly what the butter people have been able to sell the dairy industry and the dairy industry has been sufficiently gullible to fall for the propaganda that the butter market absorbs the surplus of the over-all milk production and that if margarine replaces this surplus, it is going to mean the destruction of the dairy farmer.

Such a conclusion is as absurd as it is illogical. I am convinced that, if the dairy industry did not have any market

for low-grade milk used for butter manufacture, the industry as a whole would be in much better condition than it is today. First, it would necessitate a little original thinking and planning for better merchandising of milk products from those areas where grade-A markets were not immediately available.

All of us know that the real food value of milk is not in its approximately 4-percent butter fat. Further, there are many other foods that could be substituted for the fat itself and at much less cost. As you know, the real food value of milk is in the serum solids or the solids, not fat. It is here that the dairy industry has its greatest opportunity to develop markets for milk products so that the consumer will get the benefit of the full food value of milk and not just that represented by the small percentage of fat in the milk.

The dairy farmer actually finds nothing in the expansion of the margarine industry that will deprive him of any income. For that reason, I cannot see why anyone who is really interested in dairying will take that part of whole milk which produces the very lowest revenue for the dairy farmer and expend their energy fighting for that product which contributes practically nothing to the net profits of the dairy industry and absorbs the energy of the dairy industry that should be directed toward a better marketing of milk in more profitable forms where the consumer can get the full nutritive value of the product.

The real interests of the dairyman lies in expanding his markets for fluid milk, for cream, for cheese, and for other use except butter.

Today, many dairymen who do not sell a single pound of milk to be used for the manufacture of butter have been deceived by the butter propaganda to the point where they are all excited about margarine. To them, I say that the margarine fight is giving the dairy industry generally a black eye and that, furthermore, the advertising given margarine is increasing its use among those able to buy butter, far more than outright repeal would do. Repeal would only enable the low-income family which can never buy much butter, to buy more margarine in its most acceptable form. This dog-in-the-manger attitude of the butter industry has actually driven thousands of butter customers to use margarine.

Now, as to the facts about the effects of repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws upon the dairy industry:

During recent years the butter market has been reduced approximately one-third. Total butter production, in 1940, was 2,240,000,000 pounds. In 1946, it was 1,505,000,000 pounds. It rose somewhat during 1947—to 1,638,000,000 pounds—but the recovery was temporary and the decline set in again in 1948, when approximately 1,530,000,000 pounds were produced. Has this decline in butter production resulted in the disruption of the dairy industry? Has it been accompanied by a loss of revenue or by a reduction in total milk production? Finally, has it resulted in the slaughter of great numbers of cattle?

The facts speak for themselves fairly and convincingly. There has been no disruption of the dairy industry as a result of the decline of butter production. Total cash receipts to farmers from the sale of dairy products has increased from $1,345,000,000 in 1939 to more than $4,000,000,000 in 1947. There has been of course, a rise in prices generally during this period, but this general price rise cannot possibly account for the proportionately much greater increase in dairy income. Two other factors are important: First, dairy farmers were diverting milk from the low-price butter market to the higher-priced whole-milk markets; second, total milk production, far from decreasing as a result of the decline in the butter market, has increased from 106,792,000,000 pounds in 1939 to approximately 116,300,000,000 pounds in 1948. In general, milk production has steadily increased since the turn of the century. Butter has declined.

And finally, there has been no total decrease over this period in the number of dairy cattle despite the butter lobby's charges. Records of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that in 1939 there were 24,600,000 dairy cows and heifers 2 years old and over. On January 1, 1949, there were 24,450,000.

Dairymen and livestock breeders generally agree there is a certain periodic cycle in the numbers of cattle and livestock. Thus in 1945 the number of milk cows and heifers 2 years old and over had reached 27,770,000. This represented an increase of more than 3,000,000 since 1939. But, butter production during the same 5-year period had declined more than 500,000,000 pounds. In other words, from 1939 to 1945—butter production decreased approximately 23 percent while total number of dairy cattle increased 17 percent.

But from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1949, there was a decrease in milk cow numbers from 27,770,000 to 24,450,000. Butter opponents of margarine-tax repeal have used this short-period comparison to buttress their contention that the number of dairy cows, already low, would be further decreased by tax repeal.

More objective dairy economists point out that there are several factors which account for this decline in numbers of dairy cattle over such a short period. One is the cycle previously mentioned. This was at its height late in 1944. The downward swing began that year and apparently still continues, although it should be noted that the most recent report indicates a slight increase in the number of heifer calves. This natural development has been accentuated by another factor, a rapid increase in meat prices, which has made it profitable for farmers to dispose of their less productive dairy cattle for slaughter. Reduced feed supplies accompanied by high feed prices curtailed livestock feeding operations in many cases and prompted marketing for slaughter and closer culling of herds. Labor costs were up, and dairying, particularly farm butter manufacture, requires considerable farm labor.

There is absolutely no evidence nationally that declining butter production was responsible for this reduction in dairy cattle numbers. As a matter of fact, the decline in total butter production during these 3 years was less precipitate than it had been during the previous 5. In 1945 national butter production was 1,701,000,000 pounds. In 1947 it was 1,638,000,000 pounds, a decline of approximately 4 percent. Total dairy cow numbers, on the other hand, declined a little more than 9 percent.

TABLE I.—*Milk cow numbers, 1919–49*

COWS AND HEIFERS, 2 YEARS OLD AND OVER

Year:	*Number*
1919	21,545,000
1920 (low point)	21,455,000
1921	21,456,000
1922	21,851,000
1923	22,138,000
1924	22,331,000
1925 (high point)	22,575,000
1926	22,410,000
1927	22,251,000
1928 (low point)	22,231,000
1929	22,440,000
1930	23,032,000
1931	23,820,000
1932	24,896,000
1933	25,936,000
1934 (high point)	26,931,000
1935	26,082,000
1936	25,196,000
1937	24,649,000
1938 (low point)	24,466,000
1939	24,600,000
1940	24,926,000
1941	25,478,000
1942	26,313,000
1943	27,138,000
1944	27,704,000
1945 (high point)	27,770,000
1946	26,695,000
1947	26,098,000
1948	25,039,000
1949 [1]	24,450,000

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE II.—*Milk production,[1] and production per cow, 1924–48*

Year	Milk production on farms (million pounds)	Milk production per cow (average, in pounds)
1924	89,240	4,167
1925	90,699	4,218
1926	93,325	4,379
1927	95,172	4,491
1928	95,843	4,516
1929	98,988	4,579
1930	100,158	4,508
1931	103,029	4,459
1932	103,810	4,307
1933	104,762	4,180
1934	101,621	4,033
1935	101,205	4,184
1936	102,410	4,316
1937	101,908	4,366
1938	105,807	4,558
1939	106,792	4,589
1940	109,502	4,625
1941	115,268	4,741
1942	118,884	4,740
1943	117,785	4,606
1944	117,992	4,578
1945	121,504	4,797
1946	119,713	4,891
1947 [2]	119,366	5,000
1948 [2]	116,319	

[1] Excludes milk sucked by calves and produced by cows not on farms.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

A careful study of the relationship between total milk production and number of dairy cattle in recent years reveals a

significant trend. Total milk production, 1939 compared to 1948, increased 9.5 percent. The number of dairy cattle decreased but 0.6 percent. This emphasizes the fact that the least efficient dairy cows have been culled and the better producers retained, and that more efficient farming practices have been followed. Average production per cow has reached new heights. In our over-all economic picture, this is a healthy factor, and this greater efficiency has powerfully offset the recent decline in cows.

Thus we see that even if margarine tax repeal should fulfill the asserted fears of the butter interests and result in a drastic decrease in butter production, there is no reason why cow numbers should thereby decrease. Indeed there is no reason why they should not be increased to a level sufficient to fill all our whole milk needs in the future.

The reasons for the decline in butter production are simple. The dairymen get less for milk sold for the manufacture of butter than for any other use of his product.

The figures tell the story clearly and illustrate the basic reason for the decline in butter production. Tables III and IV indicate the dairymen's return for milk sold as butter and for other uses during 1947, as compared with 1940.

TABLE III.—*Butter as a source of dairy income, 1940 and 1947*

Area	Total dairy cash income (1,000 dollars)		Cash income from farm butter sold (1,000 dollars)		Cash income from cream sold to plants and dealers as butterfat (1,000 dollars)		Total butter cash income (1,000 dollars)		Butter cash income (percent share of total cash income)	
	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947
United States	1,520,346	4,059,266	18,857	30,727	350,577	568,576	369,434	599,303	24.30	17.76
North Atlantic	376,074	869,573	4,070	6,617	4,616	6,143	8,686	12,760	2.31	1.47
North Central, East	427,908	1,238,447	2,340	2,564	74,483	79,889	76,823	82,453	17.95	6.66
Ohio	70,148	202,786	690	792	9,561	13,762	10,251	14,554	14.61	7.18
Indiana	47,879	133,533	300	355	10,136	13,167	10,436	13,522	21.80	10.13
Illinois	72,860	182,620	510	468	13,273	19,326	13,783	19,794	18.92	10.84
Michigan	72,324	208,822	660	814	17,892	25,483	18,552	26,297	25.65	12.59
Wisconsin	164,697	510,686	180	135	23,621	8,151	23,801	8,286	14.45	1.62
North Central, West	284,646	758,732	1,398	1,362	190,976	371,667	192,379	373,029	67.58	49.16
Minnesota	89,191	242,056	210	74	64,839	92,238	65,049	92,313	72.93	38.14
Iowa	69,430	176,734	180	178	52,084	124,624	52,264	124,802	75.28	70.62
Missouri	37,398	127,595	405	502	14,125	21,806	14,530	22,308	38.85	17.48
North Dakota	18,380	43,671	168	144	15,304	38,170	15,472	38,314	84.18	87.73
South Dakota	15,398	34,213	102	72	12,246	27,216	12,348	27,288	80.19	79.76
Nebraska	24,576	57,489	145	144	16,086	36,210	16,231	36,354	66.04	63.24
Kansas	30,273	76,974	188	248	16,292	31,403	16,480	31,651	54.44	41.12
South Atlantic	90,862	253,928	4,443	8,595	4,397	10,414	8,840	19,009	9.73	7.49
South Central	143,001	400,256	5,814	10,482	34,785	55,239	40,599	65,721	28.39	16.42
Texas	48,445	119,033	2,295	4,158	10,480	12,378	12,775	16,536	26.37	13.89
West	197,855	538,330	792	1,107	41,320	45,224	42,112	46,331	21.28	8.61

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE IV.—*Milk use in butter, 1940 and 1947*

Area	Total milk produced on farms (million pounds)		Delivered to plants or dealers as cream (million pounds)		Used in butter churned on farms (million pounds)		Total use for butter (million pounds)		Percent butter use of all milk	
	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947	1940	1947
United States	109,502	119,366	33,044	21,001	8,129	6,268	41,173	27,269	37.60	22.84
North Atlantic	17,351	18,852	390	218	524	384	914	602	5.27	3.19
North, Central, East	30,621	35,526	6,559	2,838	585	338	7,144	8,176	23.33	8.93
Ohio	4,594	5,325	870	483	156	90	1,026	573	22.33	10.76
Indiana	3,225	3,664	898	450	78	51	976	501	30.26	13.67
Illinois	5,188	5,444	1,297	750	176	97	1,473	847	28.39	15.56
Michigan	4,949	5,697	1,549	871	144	86	1,693	957	34.21	16.80
Wisconsin	12,665	15,396	1,945	284	31	14	1,976	298	15.60	1.94
North Central, West	27,712	27,730	18,640	13,877	1,242	717	19,882	14,594	71.75	52.63
Minnesota	8,405	8,415	6,140	3,403	121	35	6,261	3,438	74.49	40.86
Iowa	6,611	6,520	4,907	4,422	140	84	5,047	4,506	76.34	69.11
Missouri	3,386	4,103	1,402	800	280	190	1,682	990	49.68	24.13
North Dakota	2,115	1,961	1,553	1,473	218	122	1,771	1,595	83.74	81.34
South Dakota	1,746	1,489	1,294	1,068	120	56	1,414	1,124	80.99	75.49
Nebraska	2,589	2,404	1,695	1,459	188	122	1,883	1,581	72.73	65.77
Kansas	2,860	2,838	1,649	1,252	175	108	1,824	1,360	63.78	47.92
South Atlantic	6,597	7,919	437	397	1,882	1,622	2,319	2,019	35.15	25.50
South Central	14,534	15,477	3,372	2,063	3,448	2,880	6,820	4,943	46.92	31.94
Texas	4,192	3,950	1,010	466	800	644	1,810	1,110	43.18	28.10
West	12,687	13,862	3,646	1,608	448	327	4,094	1,935	32.27	13.96

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The composition from margarine has had little, if anything, to do with this drop in butter production.

For example, per capita butter consumption in the United States decreased 6.4 pounds between 1940 and 1946, but during the same period per capita margarine consumption increased only 1.4 pounds. Between 1946 and 1948 per capita butter consumption decreased only 0.1 pound and margarine increased 2.4 pounds.

Nineteen hundred and one was the last year in which yellow margarine was sold in the United States without the payment of special discriminatory taxes. In 1901 the American people consumed 19.9 pounds of butter per capita and 1.6 pounds of margarine. The imposition of the tax on colored margarine did reduce its consumption sharply. In 1902 the use of margarine fell to 0.9 pound per capita and for the following 3 years it was almost consistent at 0.6 pound per capita—or just about one-third of what it had been; but how did this ruin of the margarine industry help the dairyman? His butter sales dropped from 19.9 pounds in 1901 to 17.5 pounds per capita in 1902 and never in any year since that date has the per capita sale of butter equaled the amount sold in competition with yellow margarine. In 1948 they were only 10.5 pounds per capita.

The truth is that, in spite of all the claims of the butter interests that the increased sale of margarine would ruin the dairy industry, there is absolutely no proof that the sale of more margarine would in any manner reduced the sale of butter, itself. These prophets of disaster simply assume a great break in the use of butter and from that point they begin to conjure up all kinds of evil. Before we accept their conclusions, let us look a little more closely at their assumptions.

TABLE VI.—*Margarine and butter per capita consumption, 1924–48*

Year	Margarine	Butter
1924	2.0	17.9
1925	2.0	17.9
1926	2.0	18.4
1927	2.3	18.0
1928	2.6	17.4
1929	2.9	17.2
1930	2.6	17.2
1931	1.8	18.0
1932	1.6	18.1
1933	1.9	17.8
1934	2.1	18.2
1935	3.0	17.1
1936	3.0	16.4
1937	3.1	16.4
1938	2.9	16.4
1939	2.3	17.3
1940	2.4	16.9
1941	2.7	16.3
1942	2.7	16.4
1943	3.7	12.9
1944	3.6	13.4
1945	3.8	11.8
1946	3.8	10.6
1947	5.0	11.2
1948 [1]	6.2	10.5

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The implications of these figures are clear. Many people stopped buying butter. Some new people bought margarine. But, actually, in 1946, the American people consumed 5 pounds per person less total table fats than they had consumed in 1940; in 1948, 2.6 pounds—to their definite nutritional loss. The basic reason for this was nonavailability of any more butter, and legal restrictions on the amount of margarine that could be made. If this still substantial gap in today's supplies of table fats, compared to prewar supplies, means anything, it is that there is much room for both butter and margarine. Butter production has not suffered from margarine, because supplies are still insufficient even by the comparatively modest prewar standards. Butter production has declined because whole-milk markets have demanded the milk.

The most striking evidence that this is so comes from the dairy industry itself. Not only has there been expressed the growing feeling that butter is no longer an adequate base for milk prices, but challenging statements have been made by leaders in the industry. I refer particularly to the editorial in the American Milk Review recently which concluded, after rehearsing the salient points of the strong case for unrestricted margarine, that by antimargarine legislation "the butter industry and the dairy industry as a whole is doing itself more harm than good. We believe that only by aggressive salesmanship, only by enlightened and dynamic merchandising, can this be accomplished," the editorial finished.

In 1940, about 37.60 percent of all milk went into butter; in 1947, only 22.84 percent.

Furthermore, the data graphically indicates that certain areas and States have little interest in the butter-margarine controversy as such. Wisconsin, for example, sold 15.60 percent of its milk for the manufacture of butter in 1940; in 1947, less than 2 percent—1.94 to be exact—of Wisconsin's milk went into butter.

Another indication of the same tendency is the continuing small amount of butter in commercial stocks of dairy products. As table VII shows, on January 1, 1949, of all dairy products in storage—in terms of milk equivalent—butter comprised only 18.69 percent. This is of special interest in view of the claim still made that butter is the basic hold-over outlet for milk. On January 1, 1949, butter ranked third as a dairy storage item. American cheese ranked first, with 35.07 percent, milk equivalent; evaporated milk was second, with 25.26 percent. This, too, is part of a trend that has been going on for some years, and is also reflected in the trend in the milk marketing areas away from butter as a base price factor in fixing class I milk prices—a movement signalized by the adoption of a new economic price base altogether in the Boston area last year, more recently by the abandonment of the butter-powder base in favor of a stipulated price in the Philadelphia area last August, and by demands from New York State groups that the same action be taken in that major milk-supplying area. It is not necessary to go into the various ramifications of this subject to demonstrate emphatically that butter is simply not the major dairy outlet, base, interest, balance wheel, and so on that it is claimed to be by a small group whose eyes remain fixed to this declining aspect of the otherwise flourishing dairy industry.

TABLE VII.—*Commercial stocks of cream and specified manufactured dairy products (milk equivalent) as a percentage [1] of total commercial holdings, 1947–49*

Month	Butter	American cheese	Other cheese	Evaporated milk	Condensed milk	Dried whole milk	Cream	Total
1947—January	21.77	31.86	9.30	10.96	0.52	5.60	19.99	100
February	15.46	36.90	10.89	13.16	.45	5.97	17.17	100
March	11.04	41.15	12.16	14.30	.52	6.61	14.22	100
April	9.56	43.64	12.53	15.90	.72	7.84	9.81	100
May	9.26	44.47	11.97	16.80	.58	6.95	9.97	100
June	12.12	38.51	9.05	20.86	.49	5.80	13.17	100
July	23.31	29.20	6.69	21.16	.35	4.16	15.13	100
August	30.03	27.21	5.72	19.24	.37	3.09	14.34	100
September	31.20	29.79	5.51	18.24	.41	2.71	12.14	100
October	30.40	32.39	5.46	16.72	.49	2.72	11.82	100
November	31.92	33.34	5.27	14.16	.45	3.31	11.55	100
December	25.84	38.94	6.20	13.59	.52	3.92	10.99	100
1948—January	17.83	48.03	6.94	12.71	.77	4.15	9.57	100
February	13.44	53.53	8.00	10.19	.94	5.40	8.50	100
March	9.15	58.20	9.79	9.75	1.23	5.97	5.91	100
April	4.90	63.31	8.57	10.65	1.32	6.54	4.71	100
May	5.69	58.45	8.08	12.59	1.31	7.58	6.30	100
June	14.39	40.98	6.13	15.32	1.07	8.84	13.27	100
July	24.52	32.19	5.79	17.05	.67	4.42	15.36	100
August	29.69	30.01	4.80	17.14	.51	3.86	13.99	100
September	31.03	29.31	4.89	17.66	.49	3.87	12.75	100
October	29.85	28.87	4.49	21.13	.54	3.61	11.51	100
November	28.41	28.39	4.50	22.89	.49	4.01	11.31	100
December	25.31	29.44	4.69	24.83	.68	4.12	10.93	100
1949—January	18.69	35.07	5.67	25.26	.76	3.85	10.71	100

[1] Computed on basis of table of actual amounts.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Finally, we have the experience of other countries which have no restrictions upon the sale of yellow margarine. Any comparisons of value must, of course, include countries which have substantial dairy industries.

Table VIII gives the experience of four countries. All have important dairy industry and, for that matter, important margarine industries.

If there was anything in the contention of the butter interests that repeal would destroy the dairy industry in this country, why did repeal of the prohibitions against yellow margarine not destroy the dairy industry in the countries mentioned?

There is no answer to this question save the obvious one that repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws will work no injury upon the dairy industry. It is a question whether repeal would do any real damage to the butter industry. Regardless of what would happen in this field, I think it is time for the dairy industry to shake the butter industry off its back and let butter stand on its own.

TABLE VIII.—*Per capita consumption of butter and margarine in countries where yellow margarine is sold*

	1938		1946	
	Butter	Margarine	Butter	Margarine
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Netherlands	11.9	15.7	11.9	15.4
Belgium	16.8	16.2	14.3	16.3
	1936		1946	
United Kingdom	25.0	8.7	10.7	15.3
	1939		1946	
Sweden	24.0	21.0	34.0	8.0

Coming a little closer home, let us look at the actual effect of State law against the sale of yellow margarine. Have such laws ever put a dollar in the dairyman's pocket? The facts are that South Dakota has State laws prohibiting completely the sale of yellow margarine. In

South Dakota butterfat brought only 74 cents in 1947, the last year for which I have the figures. In the adjoining State of Nebraska the State law prohibits the sale of yellow margarine only in public eating places, and butterfat brought 79 cents in 1947. Passing to Nebraska's southern neighbor, we find that Kansas has no State laws against the sale of colored margarine, but in Kansas the dairy farmer received an average of 83 cents for his butterfat in 1947.

Similar comparisons can be drawn all over the country. Iowa adjoins Missouri; Iowa prohibits the sale of yellow margarine, and her dairy farmers got only 82 cents for their butterfat in 1947. Their neighbors in Missouri, who met the competition of yellow margarine, got 90 cents for their butterfat during the same period.

In the Northeast, New York prohibits the sale of yellow margarine. New York dairymen got only $1.24 for butterfat, while it brought $1.60 at the same time in Rhode Island where yellow margarine is legally sold.

If we go back for a period of years we find the same kind of relation between prices in States that prohibit the sale of yellow margarine and neighboring States which have allowed its sales. Taking the 10-year period 1938 through 1947, we find the following:

States prohibiting sale of yellow margarine	Average price per hundred, 4-percent butterfat basis	States allowing sale of yellow margarine	Average price per hundred 4-percent butterfat basis
Wisconsin	$3.84	Indiana	$3.92
Iowa	3.28	Missouri	3.60
South Dakota	3.06	Kansas	3.32
New York	4.96	Rhode Island	6.40
Wyoming	3.88	Texas	4.68
Utah (10 cent tax)	4.28	Nevada	4.44

To say the least, these figures certainly do not establish the validity of the butter peoples' assumption that the sale of yellow margarine hurts the dairy industry.

What the dairy people need is some dynamic salesmanship. Who is there to say that pure fluid milk is not a better beverage than any soft drink? What if the dairy industry would devote its energies to opening new markets for its most profitable outlets rather than spending its energy and money in trying to keep somebody else's product from competing on equal terms for consumer acceptance? Coca-Cola has shown what can be done, simply by pushing one's own product. If the dairy people would share in the most profitable part of the great American market, let them devote themselves to the expansion of the market for fluid milk. Let them make their product attractive, dependable, and acceptable. Let them seek new outlets, and let them see that the consumer is supplied at a fair price. Even with today's high prices any eating place should sell milk for 10 cents per glass and show a handsome profit as well as pay the producer far more than he can possibly get by the sale of milk for butter, even when butter is 90 cents per pound.

Were I not an outsider, I would be tempted to suggest to the dairymen that they possibly need some new leaders—some leaders who were interested in the welfare of the men who feed and milk the cows, rather than simply in the least profitable of all outlets for milk. And I might even wonder if the butter people themselves might not do better to spend more time on the merits of their own product than to expend so much effort to keep the public from buying the product the public wants.

Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents recently called to my attention a matter which I should like to pass on to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Having enjoyed many excursions during the summer to the national parks, this constituent was shocked when she recently read an article in the latest issue of Harper's magazine which describes the neglect of the parks.

I join with my constituent in the hope that in the not too distant future, adequate appropriations will be made for the benefit of our national park system.

The article referred to follows:

THE EASY CHAIR

(By Bernard De Voto)

Last September a forest fire started on the side of a peak in a remote part of Yosemite National Park. Before it was put out it had burned more than 10,000 acres of timber (in the direction of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, which helps to supply San Francisco with drinking water) and had cost the United States $90,000 for fire-fighting alone. The scar of that fire will disfigure Rancheria Mountain, in one of our most famous scenic areas, for many years. Ugliness is an intangible, so its cost cannot be appraised, but the manager of a privately owned scenic resort would understand that forest fires depreciate his capital assets. There is no way of appraising tangible but indirect costs of the Rancheria fire, either, but they amount to a good deal more than the cost of fire fighting. As taxpayers, you and I have to pay for damage done to property of which as citizens we are coowners.

Why did this fire do so much damage? Because it took 24 hours, instead of 2 minutes, to get word to park headquarters that fire had broken out. Why did it take so long? Because it had been impossible to keep park service telephone lines in distant areas in good condition, and the one that led to this area had been forced out of operation. How could such deterioration occur in one of the most publicized places in the United States? Well, the National Park Service simply did not have enough money to maintain all of the Yosemite telephone system in working order.

Olympic National Park contains 11 public camp grounds. Minimum public health standards cannot be maintained at any of them. Nowhere in the park are facilities for water supply or garbage disposal adequate. Some toilets have decayed and collapsed. Many individual camp sites are no longer usable because tables and fireplaces have deteriorated beyond repair. Some bridges in the park road system have had to be condemned; some still in use are dangerous. All the roads are degenerating. Some of them are regularly flooded because revetments, culverts, and drainage ditches cannot be kept in repair. Some roads have had to be closed; long stretches of others are being undermined. The park service cannot get money to take care of them.

Death Valley National Monument has an area of nearly 2,000,000 acres. The permanent force which the Park Service is able to assign to it consists of a chief ranger, three rangers, and a naturalist. They cannot even man the checking stations at the three main entrances (where visitors register so that they can be kept track of in a desert that is sometimes dangerous) because they must patrol the main roads, clean up camp grounds, and serve as janitors for toilets. The water lines—important in a desert—have deteriorated so badly that they may have to be shut off. The Park Service has about 70 buildings in the area, some of them shacks originally erected in the understanding that they were to be temporary. The maintenance staff consists of one man and there are practically no funds to buy materials for repair. Three hundred miles of highway built more than 15 years ago have been so neglected that they cannot be repaired, they must be reconstructed. There are no funds for reconstruction.

At Grand Teton National Park a visitor must arrive at a public campground before 2 p. m., or there will be no room for him to camp. The park has at last got all its trails open for the first time since 1941, but cannot afford to put them in first-class condition. The Tetons attract mountain climbers and they are not all experts, so that half a dozen times a season one of them must be brought down from some precarious place on a stretcher. The park is so understaffed that when this happens from 50 to 75 percent of the whole ranger force has to abandon everything else in order to do the rescue job.

At the Statue of Liberty, a national monument, most of Bedloe's Island is closed to the public because the walks cannot be put in proper condition. Many of the 500,000 people who visit it every year wonder aloud why there is no historical and interpretative museum; one has long been planned but there are no funds to build it. Beginning in March there is a season when moisture condenses on the inside walls and the water drips on the visitors. A heating system would obviate this unpleasantness, would make the place comfortable in cold weather as it assuredly is not now, would protect the health of the Park Service personnel, and would prevent deterioration of the symbol that means the United States to hundreds of millions of people. A heating system cannot be installed—No funds.

Three years ago, administration of the Lake Textoma recreational area was turned over to the National Park Service. There were practically no visitors then; last year there were 2,500,000. And last year the Service could hire only three men for sanitation and clean-up work. It has no administration building; most of its office furniture has been borrowed from other Government agencies. It brought 45 trucks and automobiles to the area; 80 percent of them are more than 8 years old and the maintenance crew consists of 2 men, who must also take care of roadmaking equipment. The

rangers who patrol the lake have one motorboat, a 10-year-old, 31-foot cabin cruiser that can travel 12 miles an hour. When someone seems to be in a hurry about drowning, the rangers borrow a private boat, if one happens to be at hand.

These are just specimens. The National Park Service administers 180 areas all told: National parks, national monuments, historical parks and sites, military parks, recreational areas, parkways. From many parts of this large system similar reports have been made to me. Lack of adequate funds is causing one of our great public possessions to deteriorate at an alarming rate—while the demands put on it by the public are rapidly increasing. Many requirements of the public cannot be satisfied. Measures necessary to safeguard their health and comfort cannot be taken. Much irritation has to be inflicted on them. Many campgrounds are overcrowded and new ones cannot be built. Enough guides cannot be hired; enough maps and interpretative pamphlets cannot be printed; enough lectures cannot be given. There are not enough museums. Many people come away from parks without seeing what they wanted to because enough guided tours cannot be provided.

Meanwhile much of the physical plant is wearing out: Telephone systems, sewage systems, power systems, warehouses, living quarters. Construction machinery and even firefighting equipment are deteriorating for lack of proper buildings to keep them in. Nearly everywhere roads are going to pieces. Some have had to be closed. Some trails for hikers, riders, and mountain climbers have also had to be closed, either because they could not be maintained in a safe condition or because they could not be patrolled.

No Government bureau is more efficient, more dedicated, more hard working, or public spirited than the Park Service. The national park system, an American invention, is the admiration of other governments, many of which send representatives here to study it. The national parks and the areas integrated with them by the Service were set apart for the preservation of priceless scenic beauties, natural spectacles, and historic and prehistoric sites. But the appropriations for the Service are simply not large enough to enable it to do the full job that Congress and the people have charged it with. Meanwhile the eventual, the once avoidable, bill for deterioration goes on pyramiding. Meanwhile also irreparable damage has been done.

Take another consequence of the lack of funds. Morning Glory Pool was once one of the most beautiful places in Yellowstone Park but it finally revolted against the debris thrown in it by tourists, blew its crater, cleaned itself out, and is now just any spring, its beauty much diminished. The mere presence of a ranger is a deterrent to such vandalism as that which destroyed Morning Glory Pool but a ranger who cannot be hired deters nobody. So a large case of exhibits at the foot of Bright Angel Trail, in the Grand Canyon, was destroyed last year when somebody broke the cover, a sheet of plate glass so large that it had had to be carried down the 8 miles of trail by manpower since it could not be packed on mules. Grand Canyon also lost a heavy oak cross in the Shrine of the Ages, where religious services are held. The superintendent reports his inability to maintain mounted binoculars at observation points. So does the superintendent of Vicksburg National Military Park. The plate glass over a big panoramic picture diagram in Rocky Mountain National Park was twice broken and each time the exhibit was ruined by subsequent rains; cabins high on the side of Long's Peak where first-aid equipment is stored are regularly broken into and the contents scattered. At Zion Canyon merrymakers climbed to a ledge and rolled boulders down on the toilets, destroying them. At Scotts Bluff National Monument the observation station, with its bronze markers and orientation map, has been destroyed repeatedly. At the birthplace of George Washington an ancestral brass candlestick was stolen. At Gettysburg a sword was pried out of a statue and stolen and in 8 years souvenir hunters have carried away 403 parts of cannon.

Souvenir hunters operate wherever they are not watched, chipping off pieces of stalagmite at Mammoth and other caves, chipping rock or wood from other famous sites, pocketing small objects in historic buildings, wrenching off hardware, digging up bulbs, and stealing signs. Directional signs are also favorite targets for people who like to throw stones, and those that are made of wood are popular for fuel. So are picinic tables. And, of course, everywhere people write and carve their names. Various pioneer registers, rock faces where historic figures recorded their passing or where Indians left their signatures in pictographs, have been defaced by tourists who carved their own names over the original ones. There are names and initials in masonry, plaster walls (of famous Spanish missions, for instance), and original woodwork that can never be restored. Lipstick, which is almost irremovable, has recorded the peripatetic love of Joe and Polly nearly everywhere, from the Statute of Liberty to the cone of Old Faithful. A common job of park rangers, who should be serving the public, is removing obscenities from the walls of toilets. An evangelical sect painted its warnings of the wrath to come along Going-to-the-Sun highway in Glacier National Park.

Vandalism is largely a crowd phenomenon. If there were enough rangers to patrol the most crowded, most spectacular, and most famous places, and enough others to catch and prosecute a few offenders, most of it would never occur. But the Park Service has not got funds to hire them.

I cannot treat here the privately owned areas inside parks or on the approaches to them or to historic sites, holdings that must be bought for the sake of protection and decent dignity. Many are hideous or vulgar, some are slums, none or subject to any kind of regulation. Certain areas of the actual battlefield of Gettysburg are beginning to resemble Coney Island; a real-estate development locally called "Slabtown" is enroaching on that of Yorktown.

Two years ago the Director of the Park Service estimated that all the private holdings inside the national parks could be bought for $20,000,000. Last year Congress made the first appropriation toward that highly desirable end: $200,000. At that rate the parks will be complete in a century, if nobody raises his price. We may also remember that the Park Service's plans for development—construction of new roads and trails, opening up of important areas now inaccessible, relocation of buildings, construction of new camp grounds and other accommodations for the rising number of visitors, increase of recreational and educational facilities—these plans, developed by experts over many years, move exceeding slow and in many places are at a standstill.

In short, the National Park Service is failing to perform some of the functions assigned to it and is able to perform but few of them as well as it wants to. Great expense caused by unwise economy measures is piling up and will eventually have to be met. A good many areas that are among the favorite vacation places of the American people have become shabby or worse, and some of the wilderness, scenery, and natural spectacles in which the public takes the greatest pride are threatened with disfigurement and even destruction. Almost the entire national park system is already overstrained by the steadily increasing number of people who use it. The situation is shocking; it is becoming critical.

How did it come about? In two ways—the national park system is an inadvertent victim of the war, and the postwar attendance has been greater than the prewar set-up, even if it had been fully restored, could have handled. During the war only a skeleton force was maintained, and shortages in material and labor made proper upkeep impossible. Since the war the service has never been able to get back to full strength and has never been able to catch up with the job. This, not to mention the new parks that have been created and the new historic sites and recreational areas that have been turned over to it.

Service personnel, attendance, and congressional appropriations were in a fair equilibrium in the late 1930's, but by 1941, the last prewar season, the service was already stretched to the utmost, trying to spread appropriations wider than they could be made to go. In 1941 it had 5,104 permanent employees and 21,000,000 people visited the parks. Last year, 1948, it had 2,393 permanent employees, less than half as many, and visitors numbered 30,000,000, an increase of 40 percent. The cost of hired labor, material, supplies, and machinery has risen just as much for the service as it has for the country at large.

For the current fiscal year the Park Service appropriation is $13,000,000, of which less than five million is for roads, trails, and physical improvements. The Director has estimated that to rehabilitate the parks and equip them to meet the increased demand would require $145,000,000 for building and rebuilding roads and another $115,000,000 for other needed developments. (The latter figure is considerably less, all told, than the increase—not the total sum—in appropriations granted in a single year to the Army engineers for nonmilitary projects.

Unlike some Government bureaus, the Park Service has no enemies, so far as I know, in either Congress or the Bureau of the Budget. The disastrous situation has arisen through sheer disregard—concentration first on the war and then on defense measures has diverted everybody's attention elsewhere. Congress does not sufficiently realize what has been happening, the service does not and cannot set up such a bull-roaring as the Bureau of Reclamation does when someone threatens to reduce its appropriations, and anyone who wants a reputation for guarding the Treasury can always demand why anything must be done about Old Faithful while the promised 12-foot channel for barges in Goose Creek remains undredged.

Nevertheless the situation does exist, it is disastrous, and it must be met. Elementary business principles require us to protect a large national investment. The satisfaction of the millions who use the parks must be assured. And the declared will of Congress and the people, that the areas administered by the Park Service be kept inviolate for succeeding generations, must be carried out. The Park Service must have a lot more money than it has been getting. And it must begin to get it at once.

German Reparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a letter appeared in the New York Times under the date line of February 21, on German reparations, by the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

The following answer seems to me to deserve publication:

The letter on German reparations by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, published in the New York Times, should be answered, since there are several misleading statements in it.

The society pictures continuation of the German plant-dismantling program as one which the "highest officials in the Government, including Mr. Marshall" support, while the report of the investigative Humphrey committee, appointed by ECA, is discredited in advance since, says the society, the Humphrey committee included members who "belong to industrial organizations which have had financial interests in the heavy industries of Germany."

The facts are that Mr. Marshall's reaffirmation of support of the reparations program, probably referred to here, was made almost a year and a half ago, at the time Bizonia was set up and before any serious reappraisal of the economic effect of the program had been made. Mr. Marshall's support was based on the argument that we had committed ourselves at Potsdam to this program. Since that time, a flood tide of opposition to the dismantling program has mounted. This opposition has been based in main on these grounds; (a) The Potsdam agreement, in which we pledged 25 percent of west zone reparations to Russia, has been invalidated by the many instances in which Russia has violated the terms of the agreement, and by her failure to comply with her side of the pledge to give back in the form of specified commodities 60 percent of the value of the reparations shipped to her. Three years after Potsdam, Russia had fulfilled less than 9 percent of her return obligations; (b) the tremendous financial assistance to Europe through the ERP, not anticipated at Potsdam, has many times over compensated for the loss of promised reparations matériel; (c) the reparations program, insofar as it has involved the dismantling of plants essential to the immediate recovery of western Europe, has created bottlenecks which threaten to bog down the whole recovery program; (d) the dismantling of those German plants most potentially competitive with the export trade of the other 16 nations which constitute the Marshall-aid countries, means the liquidation of Germany's ability to pay her own way in the future, and thus creates a permanent burden upon the American taxpayer.

The American people are not even yet, I fear, sufficiently familiar with the extent of the economic havoc worked upon the European recovery program through the dismantlings. As long as a year ago, the UN Economic and Social Council explained in its Survey of the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe. "Among steel products there are particularly acute shortages of certain items for which production capacity is insufficient to meet requirements. Sheets, tin plates, and transformer and dynamo sheets are outstanding examples of products for which production will, in the next 2 years, fall seriously short of requirements; the shortage is estimated at 500,000 tons in the case of sheets * * * and 50,000 tons in the case of transformer sheets for the 24 months' period." Yet it is reliably reported that the Wolf Steel Investigating Committee, appointed last spring by the joint congressional committee, the Army, and the ECA, to reappraise the dismantling of German steel works, found that estimated capacity on the dismantling list included 100,000 tons of sheets, and 50,000 tons of transformer sheets.

There has been a continuous outcry for dynamo and transformer sheets to meet desperate power shortages. The August Thyssen works at Hamborn in the Ruhr have a capacity of 50,000 tons of electrical sheets annually, and represents half of the remaining capacity for electrical sheets in Bizonia. Yet the Thyssen-Hamborn works have been closed since the war, and are slated for total dismantlement.

The importance of such dismantled equipment to the claimant countries at some distant date (time required to dismantle, move, and reerect a steel plant elsewhere has to be reckoned in years, not months), is exploded by the further statement of the UN Security Council that "the new sheet mills which will come into production from 1950 onward will rapidly eliminate the deficit in sheets, and the same is true of transformer sheets and seamless tubes." In other words, the German steel-making equipment is not urgently needed in other countries.

The Thyssen works had not even been bid upon at last report. On the contrary, the greatest need Europe will have had for this equipment has been in these years immediately following the war, before the new plants of the other countries have been completed. There appears little doubt that in their willingness to see this vitally needed equipment lie idle and then suffer years of dismantling and reassembling, certain countries placed the importance of eliminating future German competition thuswise above the discomforts of living through an intermediary period of acute shortages requiring pump-priming from America.

It is inescapable that those plants which figure in past years most heavily in Germany's export trade, and hence possess greatest ability now to earn dollars for needed imports, are precisely those plants which have been placed on the doomed list by those countries fearful of future German competition. Conspicuous among these are, for instance, the Deutsche Edelstahlwerke, Germany's leading producer of high-quality steel, and the Rheinische Roehrenwerke, with a capacity to produce annually 100,000 tons of oil pipe. World shortages in oil tubular goods have caused world prices of steel tubes in the gray market to rise from $185 per ton to double that amount since the end of the war. At the time its dismantlement began this past fall, Rheinische Roehrenwerke was in possession of a contract, O. K.'d by the Dusseldorf Joint Export Import Agency, for 65,000 tons of desperately needed oil pipe for the Texas oil fields. Yet on September 13, this plant was placed by the British on the "rush" dismantlement list.

It is quite certain that the society is unable on the basis of evidence now available to make out a case for the dismantled equipment being used more economically in the other nations to which it has been allocated. Our State Department quite frankly states that it has almost no knowledge of what has happened to this equipment since it left Germany, or what contribution if any it has made to the economies to which it was given.

That part of the society's letter should not go unanswered, either, which implies that opinion on the German reparations is divided between "those in high government" who support, and those "interested groups" which oppose, the program. The society will have a hard time making out a case against such a large section of American opinion opposed to the present dismantling program as represented in the A. F. of L.; the CIO; the United Mine Workers of America; the National Association of Manufacturers; the National Grange; the United States Chamber of Commerce; the leading Protestant weekly, the Christian Century; the Commonweal, influential Catholic weekly; Herbert Hoover; the Administrator of the ECA; the Joint Committee on Foreign Aid; and the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid (the Herter Committee).

One further point, since the society has impugned the motives of the Humphrey committee, a great deal of interest is being manifested on Capitol Hill these days as to the motivation behind the society's continuous virulent attacks upon any form of German revival. It constantly harps upon the danger of the German "Colossus." Yet, in contrast to over-all recovery gains made by the rest of western Europe, which show an average level of industrial production higher than prewar, western Germany has recovered to only 78 percent of her prewar level of industrial production, and this figure ignores the important fact that 10,000,000 expellees have been herded into this area since the end of the war. Per capita German recovery is far lower.

The society's continuous campaign of vilification of the postwar German approaches in venom the genocidal, anti-Semitic attacks of Julius Streicher during the Third Reich. The society's slick-paper bulletin, which is distributed monthly all over the country, including copies sent to every Member of Congress, must run into hundreds of thousands of dollars of cost. All these hundreds of thousands of dollars are devoted to putting across policies which envisage the Morgenthau goat pasture at its worst. If carried out, they would be an insurance that Germany would in the end turn to Russia in sheer desperation. Nothing could be better calculated to serve the interests of the follow-traveler group. The American people have a right to push the society very hard regarding its honest intentions.

JOAN S. CRANE.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Results of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an interesting and informative letter received from Hon. James R. Nolen, of Boston, Mass., of certain impressions of his as a result of a recent trip to Europe:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 25, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority House Leader, United States Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I have just returned after a business trip that took me into Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, England, and Ireland. Although I am just an ordinary, plain citizen, I feel that I should write you my impressions of the effect of our Marshall plan, as I observed it in the countries I visited. I was fortunate to associate with all classes in these countries and therefore, my opinion probably has some of the reality that may be accounted to a cross-section observation.

There is no question but that the Marshall plan has been and is the instrument that has temporarily blocked the advance of communism into western Europe. The people of all of these countries which I visited are grateful to America for the aid that has been given them and they are determined to make every effort to rehabilitate themselves quickly and relieve us of the economic burden the Marshall plan has put upon us. Their spirit is remarkable and their effort is extreme.

The Norwegians and the English are outstanding in the effort they are making for rehabilitation. So that they may use our Marshall dollars for the purchase of basic equipment that will make possible an industrial recovery, they have accepted restrictions that are so severe that they are practically without many of the necessities of life. They have not only forgotten the luxuries, but they are making a sacrifice which includes a

lack of food and a lack of clothing and this whole spirit of sacrifice is sustained by the hope that they have in the United States of America and that hope has been signified to them by our Marshall plan. If this hope were now taken from them, in my opinion, nothing could stop the indoctrination of western Europe by communism.

In the other countries there is no food shortage because they are essentially agricultural. However, there is a clothing shortage everywhere and there are no luxury items anywhere. Moreover, there is no appreciable black market to be found in any of these countries. The people have accepted restrictions because they are certain that an honest, determined effort together with American help, will save democratic government for Europe and the world.

I know, of course, that you are in sympathy with the administration's policy for a continuance of ECA. Yet, I think that you can be inspired in your effort by the knowledge that the ordinary man and woman in Europe not only appreciates this program, but is demonstrating that appreciation in an all-out sacrifice for democracy. If Congress now saw fit to curtail or reduce the appropriation for Marshall aid, it would be a signal to communism for a renewed effort to capture the sympathies and to control the governments of western Europe. It would also signify to the peoples of western Europe an American surrender to tyranny and oppression. For the sake of freedom, liberty, and the security of our children, I sincerely hope that the Marshall aid will be continued and later extended into a basic, free economy embracing all of our democratic governments.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. NOLEN.

Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 6, 1949:

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

A government dedicated to guiding and assisting the individual from cradle to grave (or some portion of the span of life) inevitably grows like a tree. Twigs shoot out from the trunk of government, and as twigs grow into strong limbs, new branches shoot out from them.

The tree feeds on tax revenues, which are moneys taken out of the pay envelopes of the governed, the men and women who work in industry, business, and professions.

As the tree grows and nurtures a splendid foliage of Government employees, an ever-increasing amount of food for the tree is necessary. Taxes go higher and higher. The men and women who work and feed the tree have increasingly less and less left for themselves.

Moreover, the jobs on which the people work to nourish the tree are gradually but inevitably starved by it, for the multiplying employers of government do not themselves produce food, clothing, automobiles, and houses. They drain off a part of what the working population produces; they live off the workers.

The capital, too, which builds factories and develops new and better products is undergoing a shrinking process, as more and more of the money that the working population could be saving is drained off in taxes.

Investment of the capital that remains is also discouraged, as the claims of the tax collector, which come first, render new industrial and business projects more perilous. The chances of success become continuously more doubtful.

And all the while a secondary, insidious, and evil activity of government is growing like suckers on this tree of government. It is the activity of government propagandists, an activity in which scores of governmental agencies embracing thousands of employees dissipate tax revenues pouring Government doctrine into established channels of information.

The House Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the previous Congress found that in 1946 above 42,000 Federal job holders devoted full or part time and spent $75,000,000 in this manner. The number of employees and the amount so spent was sharply above previous years, and are greater today.

And besides, we can be sure that the House subcommittee only scratched the surface. It is extremely difficult to learn exactly to what extent this propaganda mill operates as employees by the thousands engaged in it are concealed by titles that are innocent and misleading.

The primary design of the work of these propagandists is to justify their own existence and that of the bureaus to which they are attached. The House subcommittee singles out, as the most flagrant examples, propaganda in behalf of socialized medicine, national health insurance, and compulsory military training.

The newspapers, radio, and the moving pictures, no matter how vigilant their guard, disseminate much of this propaganda as news by virtue of the circumstance that it is cleverly and deeply disguised as official information emanating from legitimate and responsible arms of government.

An idea of the quantity of this insidious propaganda that comes out of governmental bureaus is gathered from the Public Printer, who estimated that in a single week bureaucrats sent to the New York Times alone enough material to fill 800 columns.

Of course, the caution of the editors of the Times prevented most of it from getting into print. And this only emphasizes the enormity of the Federal waste, as huge and expensive governmental agencies were spending thousands of dollars in tax money for no purpose at all.

The Army has been assailed on factual evidence for the manner in which it has spent its funds in a public campaign for universal military training by going to the people in behalf of its ambitions instead of working out military problems with the proper committees of Congress and officials of the executive branch of the Government.

It is the duty of Congress, which alone has access to the facts, to cut out of the Federal Budget the enormous sums that are now being used by useless employees in bamboozling the taxpayers. And this spreading tree of government will never be trimmed until the fallacious notion that government can and should support and guide the individual from cradle to grave is crushed.

The way we're going now, the tree will sooner or later fall on us.

Time Has Passed Since Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial comment, Time Has Passed Since Potsdam, from the March issue of the Priest. The viewpoint as expressed here is one that no doubt will be interesting to many people who are concerned about our relationship with Franco. I have read it with a great deal of interest and enlightenment.

TIME HAS PASSED SINCE POTSDAM

Some of us have gone all out for Franco; some have gone all out against him; not surprisingly and perhaps as an inevitable result, some—despairing of the truth in a welter of charge and countercharge—have grown cautious, reserving judgment. Notwithstanding the old, old canard about the Catholic Church in politics, Catholics as usual have been divided.

The Partisan Review thinks it has discovered two Catholic parties, a pro-Franco Jesuit and an anti-Franco Dominican faction. More relevant and more credible evidence of the principle in dubiis libertas is the correspondence section of our own Catholic papers. Not too long ago a professor of philosophy fairly shrieked at the editor of the Boston Pilot: "Your cowardly and treacherous editorials against General Franco prompt me to call for public prayers on the part of loyal Catholics for the protection of the most gallant soldier of Christ in our times." We were delighted at the editor's calm rejoinder, "Franco is an item of current history. He is not an article of faith. The emotional partisans of General Franco and his equally emotional critics, both so passionately sure of their 'facts,' add heat to the discussion but small light." Amen!

Of course, it would be far more pleasant to dodge the controversy, to return to the proverbial Ivory Tower, to shut out the din of battle, and to recapture the calm of a bygone era. But Spain has again become a vital issue; again the problem turns about the question of communism, this time not within but without her borders.

SICKLY THOUGHT

For that matter, there is no dodging controversies today; less than ever before it would seem is there a place for splendid isolation. Your so-called liberal, whose liberalism consisted largely of inaction born of indifference or confusion, who was kind toward your opinion only because he was so unsure of his own, that liberal finds himself in a quandary today, caught between opposing forces which are terribly intolerant of his indecision. The modern Hamlet, his native hue of resolution sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, is a shocking anomaly. The times demand action and brook no delay. Specifically—something must be done about Spain.

Taking our cue from the newspaper quoted above, we shall try to consider Franco and Spain. Franco and Spain together, as an item of current history. Going still a step further, we shall try to consider them from the viewpoint of what is now erroneously called realism, that curiously and today characteristically immoral attitude (certainly not our own) which would divorce politics from right and wrong, making political success an end in itself. We shall range ourselves on the side of the many modern Machiavellians for whom might makes right. We shall somehow, with an effort and a wrench, twist ourselves round to that alien position where mass bombing of civilians and total warfare become legitimate because expedient, where anything goes provided only it really goes.

HUE AND CRY

What brings up this whole discussion is the rather solid evidence that our State Department is seriously considering a change of policy with regard to Spain. A hue and cry have immediately gone up from the same old gang against any relaxation of our defacto hostility—that hostility which has led us to

keep Spain out of the United Nations and has cut her out of the provisions of the Marshall plan. We shall make only one easy assumption: that a government which has sponsored a Marshall plan for the democratic rehabilitation of the world (and is even now pondering a north Atlantic alliance linking us with Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxembourg for a concerted defense against "aggression") thereby manifests its full awareness of the immediate threat of communism and the immediate need of help from anti-Communist nations. We shall ask only one question: Why, instead of alienating her, haven't we enlisted the aid of Spain?

FACING FACTS

We must first of all keep in mind that it is the proud boast of the realist that he above all others can appraise a situation precisely because he uncompromisingly faces facts. Because he is unafraid of facts, utterly without presuppositions, particularly of a theological nature, he alone can dig them out. As Thomas Huxley once said of his ideal scientist, he sits down before nature like a child. But, of course, his conclusions are utterly mature.

What are the facts he has gathered on Spain? Here unfortunately we find not fact but the most arrant kind of wishful thinking.

He would erect standards for this poor little country which can barely be met by our own. He tends to forget that Spain would be poor, Franco or no, as many small nations are poor today; that Spain as well as many another country has fallen victim to international factors far beyond her control. He talks as if replacing Franco would restore her to the splendors of the days of their Catholic Majesties Ferdinand and Isabella, whom, of course, he also dislikes, but whose power and prestige he feels his dream government would easily rival.

He appears to know nothing of the perilous course of pre-Franco history in Spain; and, where the trained observer fears to tread, he rushes in with light-hearted abandon. Yet Spain has rarely had good government. Even in the immediate past, of which he seems unconscious, the Moroccan War which brought about the dictatorship of Primo Rivera and the eventual if delayed abdication of Alfonso, was set in a context of confusion, rivalry, class hatred, oppression, and suppression. There have been not one but three military dictatorships in Spain since 1868.

SPANISH FAILURE

Sir Samuel Hoare in a book he calls Complacent Dictator speaks aptly of "the Spanish failure to achieve community of thought and action between the government and the people." Carlton Hayes agrees on the basis of his experience that the supreme individuality of the people is "especially in political matters a vice. They simply couldn't or wouldn't think alike or act together. And everyone was so sure he was right that he was apt to be intolerant of dissent or opposition. Compromise was alien and unpopular."

Providence, it seems, did not intend good government for Spain. Or at least that is the tenor of the following story Spaniards tell on themselves.

When Ferdinand III, who had freed Seville from the Moors, died in great repute, legend has it that, bypassing purgatory, he went straight to heaven where, further favor, he was asked by our blessed mother what he would wish for beloved and loving Spain.

"A fine climate."

"Granted," said our lady.

"Brave men and women."

"Granted."

"A fertile soil."

"Certainly."

"Oil, wine, and garbanzos."

"Granted."

"And a good government."

"Nay," replied the gracious lady at this juncture, "that boon can never be conceded, for then the very angels would leave heaven for your country."

But granted that our realist is ignorant of the past, where does he get his current information? Mostly from what Rita Hume calls "the 10-day journalist," who rushes in and out with startling revelations. Her own experience was that persons most qualified to do so will not venture a guess about what will happen next. She points out, too, but not to him, "Spain is a country of such diversified elements that anyone who comes here with a specific ax to grind can find almost anything to support his opinion."

LOUD-MOUTHED PUBLICISTS

He often enough falls victim to these axgrinders, too. So almost did the American State Department itself, its delicate negotiations through Carlton Hayes being nearly wrecked by the loud-mouthed publicists at home. Our then Ambassador writes, with understandable regret, of a group of journalists who compensated in noise and fury for what they lacked in numbers and knowledge.

Their sources? First, Spanish Republican or Communist refugees who wanted the United States to help them get back to power in Spain; second, American Communists and fellow travelers who took their cue as usual from Moscow. One group served narrow factional aims, whatever their merits; the other was a tool of Russia; neither paid attention to vital American and Allied interests.

This is indeed a strange kind of realism. For our part, we prefer Franco's.

Looking at the matter calmly and dispassionately, it now appears that, call him whatever else you like, Franco knows a thing or two about the political world. If it be objected that he is nothing but a hard-headed, hard-hearted politician himself, let it be remembered that we are talking about realism.

We can now see that Franco enjoyed clearer vision; that more than one man hailed prematurely as a great leader. During the height of the hostilities, he outlined for Carlton Hayes the theory of three wars: One was between the Allies and the German-Italian bloc, towards which he claimed a kind of neutrality tipped in our favor; and another, the Pacific war, he hoped we would win, and in this he was willing to cooperate; the third, he said, was the defeat of the Axis, for communism would seek to dominate the entire continent, would dominate it de facto. Oh, my prophetic soul!

IN GOOD FAITH

To this, Hayes, as almost any one of us then, answered that democracy would prove to be the eventual choice of the great majority of the masses of people everywhere. No answer at all, for it was predicated, though in good faith, on the assumption that a postwar world was to have the blessed privilege of self-determination.

True, the Atlantic Charter regarding the United States and Great Britain expressed what it called a desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. This turned out to be no desire at all but, rather, what theologians call a velleitas, a vague prompting, an ineffectual low-grade wish that dies aborning.

The Charter likewise proclaimed its respect for the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, a fine high-sounding bit of froth equal in effect to the complementary piece got off by Stalin: "We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples. * * * We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our help. Our aim is to help these people in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny, and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they see fit, with absolute freedom." (Yes, he really said that.)

FABULOUS EMPIRE

It was likewise Franco, the realist, speaking when he tried (in vain) to enlighten Sir Samuel Hoare about the prospects of a Germany occupied by Russia: "Will not the major peril to the Continent and England be Sovietized Germany which will distribute to Russia its secrets and manufactures of war, its engineers, its technicians and specialists, giving them the opportunity to create a fabulous empire from the Atlantic to the Pacific?" As for central Europe, he predicted only too accurately, "We can be sure that communism will reign supreme in these nations after the occupation."

Perhaps he foresaw also the disastrous Morgenthau plan, implying in his warning, "If Germany did not exist, Europeans would have to invent a Germany, and it would be ridiculous to think that Germany's place could be occupied by a federation of Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, and Rumanians, which would be rapidly transformed into a federation of Soviet states." Space forbids our quoting Hoare's reply, the expression of his vapid optimism. One can scarcely credit him with believing it himself. (The major part of the text of both letters, Franco's and Hoare's, can be found in the Brooklyn Tablet for October 23, 1948.) In any case, Franco has called the turn.

But by sheer dint of repetition, the American people have concurred in ignoring both him and their own real interests. They have gone so ridiculously far that they have even looked with the aid of foreign (not rose-colored but red-colored) glasses at Spain as a threat to their own welfare. When a quarter of the world's population and a fifth of its territory have fallen under the sway of Russia, they lie awake nights worrying about the threat of tiny Spain to the world's peace. And one might ask, What peace?

THE RAGING BEAR

It is the old story of the elephant and the mouse—the elephant afraid of the mouse but munching his peanuts in elephantine calm while a raging bear tears down the main tent. Of course, it doesn't make sense, except to the few behind the scenes who are managing the whole farce.

If there is any reason to be afraid of Spain (and there is, on second thought) it is rather in spite of Franco. The question that should rather exercise us is, what would happen to Spain without Franco? Prescinding entirely from the issues involved in discussing his own status as dictator or liberator or what, one should not fail to consider the alternative of a Spain without him and his established government; the important word being "established."

Some argue, it seems to us most naively, that, on the supposition of Franco's entire wickedness, he is furnishing a great impetus to communism; that to liberate Spain from Franco would be the first and greatest blow against communism. This is to suppose, in an innocence whose beauty is marred only by its complete lack of a sense of reality, that social justice would then be allowed to flourish all unimpeded and that all the natural and supernatural virtues of the Spanish people would immediately spring into full and luxurious bloom.

Has one never heard of the manifest strategy of communism throughout the rest of the world, of Red intervention and Red infiltration and Red double-dealing and dissimulation? The political vacuum produced by the downfall of the de facto government would be filled immediately.

LENIN ON SPAIN

Russia has always wanted Spain. Guided by the type of realists we have described already, Russia knows what Spain is worth

in the over-all picture of world politics. It was Lenin who first predicted, as he looked over the map and drew up his blueprint for conquest, "There will be the next Communist state in the world." And it would have been if our puny partisans had had their way. Russia, he saw, cannot control the Aegean and the Mediterranean without first controlling Spain and Gibraltar.

Shall we be less wise? We have already sought vigorously to offset Russia in Turkey and Greece; shall we now throw away the most important part of our international defense by neglecting Spain? Shall we shut in our own face the gateway to western Europe? Spain actually managed to remain neutral in the last war, though her neutrality was an impediment to Hitler (as Goebbels raved) and an advantage to us (as Churchill recently confessed); but she cannot remain neutral in the event of another.

Said Jim Farley a few months ago: "It is not a matter of whether we agree with the politics within Spain. It is simply a matter of whether Spain is essential to the security of the democracies, and any military man will tell you that it is." There is realism in a few words.

Said Mr. Churchill, "It is a great mistake to allow legitimate objections to Franco and his form of government to be a barrier at this time between us and a country with whom we have many natural ties. It is folly." Here is realism again, mixed in with a little rueful hindsight, for Churchill adds, "It is true that I agreed at Potsdam that Spain should not be invited to join the United Nations, but I said that in hope of obtaining full Russian cooperation in a real instrument of world peace. Time has passed since Potsdam and we have now a different relation with Russia." Different indeed in one sense, but in its fundamentals absolutely the same; only now we are more generally inclined to recognize how things really stand.

As we write this, the reports reach us that Spain is in dire need of help. Leigh Hunt claims that "The entire Spanish economy is on the verge of collapse." We are rather inclined to credit him, for his reputation has never been that of a pinko. We are more inclined to credit his recommendation that immediately we instigate a policy of economic cooperation, that Spain should be offered Marshall-plan assistance, that we help her to help ourselves.

A Sea-Level Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article contained in the March 1949 issue of the Pacific Marine Review, entitled "A Sea-Level Panama Canal," by Brig. Gen. Hans Kramer, United States Army, retired. The article is as follows:

A SEA-LEVEL PANAMA CANAL

(By Brig. Gen. Hans Kramer, U. S. Army, retired)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The maritime industry is affected so greatly by any development at the Panama Canal that we are publishing a series of articles on various phases of the proposal for a sea-level canal. The first article appeared in the February issue and dealt with the dredging problem. A third article, dealing with commercial traffic and toll rates, will appear in an early issue.)

The present Panama Canal is highly vulnerable to destruction by sabotage or bombing. To appreciate that fact fully requires some understanding of the Canal's physical characteristics. Without going into a detailed word picture, let me recall to your minds for purposes of this discussion that the principal elements of the Canal are twin flights of locks at each end, a deep cut through the Continental Divide and a large artificial summit lake perched at 85 feet above sea level. Gatun Lake, the summit pool, is dammed in by earth embankments, by the concrete lock structures and by the steel lock gates. Enemy attempts to destroy these vital elements were envisioned at the time of their construction as taking the form of naval gunfire, sabotage, or attack and demolition by land forces, and the Canal was well planned to meet those threats. However, with the advent of the airplane as a military weapon, the security of the Canal became obviously inadequate. But not until 1939, shortly before World War II, was work undertaken to augment the resistance of its vital structures and that work was designed to protect against attack by the largest aerial bombs then in production. It seems almost superfluous to point out that the 1939 degree of protection is now considerably out of date.

These shortcomings were substantially the basis for action by Congress in 1939 in authorizing the construction of a third set of locks for the Panama Canal. The new lock chambers were to be somewhat larger than the old locks, 1,200 feet long and 140 feet wide, compared with 1,000 x 110. The lock walls and other protective features were designed against 2,000-pound bombs. The new locks paralleled the location of the present twin locks, but at a third to a half-mile away for the sake of security against aerial attack. Construction of the Third Locks project was started in 1940 but suspended early in 1942, after an expenditure of about $75,000,000, because of more pressing war needs for labor, materials, and shipping. I was identified with that project, first as construction engineer and later as supervising engineer in full direct charge.

As we all know, World War II and postwar developments have brought us face to face with astounding advances in the gentle art of military destruction, particularly aerial bombing with conventional weapons as well as with atomic weapons. By "conventional weapons" I mean any weapon loaded with explosives not of the nuclear-fission type. Such weapons could be aerial bombs, aircraft rockets and cannon, guided missiles, or robot planes loaded with nonatomic explosives, that is, with explosives of the familiar TNT type.

These newer and much greater threats to the security of the Canal, together with its actual and potential inadequacies to accommodate traffic, caused Congress late in 1945 to direct the making of a comprehensive review and restudy of the means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. Those studies were conducted under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal who submitted a full report thereon to Congress late in 1947. It was my privilege to be a member of the board of consulting engineers which served in an advisory capacity in the preparation of that report. The Governor also relied heavily on expert technical advice from all branches of the armed services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and civilian sources.

Let me condense for you, from the official report on those studies, the consensus of expert opinion as to the potential effect of conventional weapons and atomic weapons.

First, with respect to the existing canal: Any conventional weapon could damage or destroy the locks and the larger bombs could breach Gatun Dam to such an extent that Gatun Lake would be drained. The loss of Gatun Lake would close the Canal for a period of one or more years, depending upon the volume of water lost and the amount of work necessary to repair the damaged structures. If the atomic bomb is used, a single direct hit could demolish the twin-lock chambers or breach Gatun Dam so that Gatun Lake would be lost and the Canal rendered useless. Contamination and lingering radioactivity from the atomic explosion, even though a vital structure were not physically damaged, would seriously impede and probably preclude functioning of the operating personnel, and therefore of the Canal, for a long time.

Next, with respect to an armor-plated lock canal. (I don't mean armor-plated literally, but a lock canal designed for maximum security with all the resistivity to destruction that could feasibly be built into such project.) I won't take the time to outline the structural treatment for such a canal but will merely ask you to bear in mind that as a lock canal it will still involve and be dependent upon a summit pool or lake. A determined attack with large conventional bombs on either the locks or retaining dams could bring about drainage of the summit lake and resultant uselessness of the canal for several years. A concentrated attack with two atomic bombs could render the canal useless for 4 years or more.

Finally, with respect to a sea-level canal: The canal channel could not be obstructed by debris or slides produced by any known or foreseeable weapon of conventional type. (The vulnerability of the auxiliary structures of a sea-level canal is not a governing consideration, as I'll bring out later.) The most serious damage to a sea-level canal would be from a surface or underground explosion of an atomic bomb in the canal channel or on its banks so as to close the channel with radioactive earth and rock debris. Such a block could be removed with dredges and other equipment specially shielded against the effects of radioactivity. It is estimated that traffic could be resumed within a matter of weeks, or within a few months, at the most, if adequate personnel and suitable equipment were available to start clearing operations. Despite contaminated water in the canal, vessels could navigate through it safely once a passage had been opened through the crater debris. Even complete destruction of the shore facilities by atomic bombing would not stop ships from using a sea-level canal because its operation, in extreme emergency, is not dependent on shore assistance. Furthermore—and this is a very important consideration—a sea-level canal has no vulnerable essential operating elements that might be subject to sabotage.

Thus, the Governor concluded, no lock canal but only a sea-level canal would meet the future needs of national defense.

The Governor's report goes on to present an up-to-date review, reestimate and analysis of the time and cost of construction, as well as all other pros and cons, of 30 alternative isthmian canal routes at locations all the way from the Isthmus of Tehauntepec in Mexico to the Altrato River in Colombia. Both lock-type and sea-level-type canals, either of which would meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce, were considered for each route where both were at all feasible. (Lock dimensions were projected as 1,500' by 200' to meet the Navy's requirements as against the present lock dimensions of 1,000' by 110'; channel dimensions would be 600' wide by 60' deep as against Gaillard Cut's 300' by 42'.) Comparative estimates show that a modernized lock canal, with maximum protective features, would cost $2,300,000,000 at Panama and $3,500,000,000 at Nicaragua,

the next cheapest; a sea-level canal would cost $2,500,000,000 at Panama and $4,600,000,000 on the Altrato route in Colombia, the next cheapest. These alternate figures cover only the costs of engineering works. They do not include the tremendous costs—and I can't give you those figures—of duplicating defense installations.

Today, fortunately, our engineering technique—as is true of all other scientific and technical processes—has the advantage of new tools and methods for dealing with problems that were almost unfathomable a generation ago. We now employ exploratory drilling to develop subsurface geological conditions in great detail and we have the relatively new science of soil mechanics for analyzing and testing earth materials and predetermining their behavior.

With the application of the modern techniques present-day engineers are able to design safe slopes for excavation in various materials and various heights. For example, a 500-foot cut in the weakest Cucaracha material would be designed for a slope of 1 on 9—that is, 1 foot rise for every 9 feet horizontally. The estimates of quantities to be excavated are all based on such very conservative slopes. It would be foolhardy, of course, to assert that even with such conservative designs there will be absolutely no slides in excavation. But it is safe to say—and I say this advisedly—that the hazards of slides will be minimized and that the engineers are justified in being confident of a successful job.

The second engineering problem is that of flood control for a sea-level canal. If large uncontrolled flows from tropical floods were to enter the canal, they would cause velocities and cross currents that would be objectionable and dangerous to navigation. Fortunately, there are favorable physical possibilities for taking care of those floods by means of a comprehensive system of diversion works and regulating reservoirs. This is a perfectly orthodox, workable, and effective engineering treatment of the flood-control problem.

THE TIDES

Now for the problem of tidal currents. This is one of the most debatable as well as intriguing aspects of the sea-level proposal, but fortunately it is not one of vital significance in the over-all plan. Even the man in the street asks: "What about the difference in tides on the Atlantic and Pacific sides? The Pacific tide has a range of about 20 feet while the Atlantic range is only about 2 feet. Under extreme conditions of spring tides—which fortunately prevail only about 2 percent of the time—the tides can create a maximum head or difference of level of about 11 feet which, in turn, would generate a current through the sea-level canal with a maximum velocity of about 4½ knots, or about 5 miles per hour. By way of comparison let me give you the corresponding data for other sea-level waterways. The Suez Canal experiences maximum currents of 3½ knots; the Cape Cod Canal experiences maximum currents something over 5 knots.

The practical question is, Would the Panama Canal be unduly hazardous for navigation with currents up to 4½ knots? On that question, frankly, there are some honest but not serious differences of opinion. But there is no difference of opinion on the conclusion that such currents could and would be navigated if and when they had to be, even though they might be undesirable for regular, normal operations. Accordingly, the engineering treatment is, in a sense, a compromise. The solution consists of tidal-regulating works which would provide control so that ships would not encounter canal currents greater than 2½ knots. At times when the tides would create velocities greater than 2½ knots in an open canal it would be closed off and the difference in level negotiated by means of a tidal lock. At times when the tidal current would be less than 2½ knots ships would go straight through a navigable pass in the control works instead of using the tidal lock—this is common practice on the Ohio River.

The point may be raised that a sea-level canal containing a tidal lock such as I've described is really a lock canal. That may be true as a matter of precise definition. But it is not true in the sense in which I have used the term "lock canal" in this talk, namely, a canal in which locks serve to negotiate a difference in land elevation by creating and retaining a summit lake. In that concept of a lock canal, as I've pointed out, the lock structures and lock gates are the solar plexus. If they are knocked out in any way, the lake drains and the canal is useless. A tidal lock, on the other hand, is merely a convenience to navigation; as a structure it is not vital to the rest of the canal. If the tidal lock or any other elements of the tidal control works are knocked out in time of war, any obstructive debris would simply be cleared away; ships would use the navigable pass exclusively, whatever the currents; and the canal would function as an open waterway without the help or need of any tidal regulation. I can assure you that that condition of functioning is anticipated in realistic planning and that it is entirely acceptable to the Canal's most important wartime customer, the Navy.

An obvious prime requisite in the plan of conversion is that the conduct of the work must involve an absolute minimum of interference with normal canal traffic. That requirement is met, in the first instance, by the alinement of the sea-level channel not being identical with that of the present canal; the new canal is designed to eliminate the sharp angles and short reaches that are bothersome to navigation in the existing canal. By virtue of that fact, the old and new alinements will coincide or overlap at only a few points so that the bulk of the new work can be carried on without regard to canal traffic in much the same way that highway construction on a bypass does not affect traffic on the old route except at the junction points.

DREDGING

The next feature involves some unprecedented but entirely feasible, though perhaps spectacular, procedure. It consists of digging down to grade and section; that is, to 60 fee below sea level and 600 feet wide, for the entire length of the new alinement while the old canal remains as is; that is, with the water in Gatun Lake and in Gaillard Cut remaining at elevation 85 feet above sea level and the small Miraflores Lake remaining at elevation 54. As I've mentioned, roughly a billion cubic yards of material will have to be excavated in that operation, material that varies in character from ultra soft muck to super-hard rock. Roughly a third of that volume will be removed by floating dredges, with hydraulic suction dredges handling the softer materials and bucket ladder dredges, of the type used in the California gold fields and internationally for ore dredging, handling the harder digging. These dredges will be designed and built (in fact, they're already designed [see February Pacific Marine Review—Editorial]) to dig to a depth of 145 feet below the water surface, so that they can dig the new channel to minus 60 while floating at plus 85. These machines will be veritable behemoths but entirely practicable with American know-how. While the dredges are working in the wet, so-called dry excavating equipment—that is shovels and draglines, but of king size—will be chewing away at the other two-thirds of a billion cubic yards of excavation. That equipment will work in the dry, behind cofferdams and natural plugs which will separate their sites and keep back the water from the old canal. However, these land machines will load their spoil into scows so that the excavated material will be taken away afloat rather than on wheels. The whole excavation process is, of course, the key to the entire job. Housing construction to accommodate the workers will precede the excavation; flood-control structures, tidal regulating works, and other appurtenances will be built concurrently with the excavation.

Even with all the work I've just described, we're not quite done with the conversion. We've dug a completely new channel, but the part dug in the wet still has water standing over it 85 feet above sea level. However, in the process of the excavation rock plugs have been left in place at the two ends, Gatun and Pedro Miguel, and a temporary steel dam for Miraflores Lake has been installed in the tidal lock. Also, that portion of Gatun Lake that has become separated from the parent body by virtue of the flood-control diversion embankments has been drained down. So now all the lock culverts, as well as the outlets of Gatun Dam and all other flood outlets, are opened, and the water remaining in Gatun Lake and in smaller Miraflores Lake starts to rush out in two directions to reach its level with the two oceans. Meanwhile, tunnel outlets that have been preexcavated but blanked off in the rock plugs are blasted open to accelerate the outflow and finally the temporary steel dam is rapidly dismantled section by section and the remaining mass of the plugs is blasted and obliterated. That entire draw-down procedure would take about 7 days and the Canal would have to be closed to traffic during that week of conversion. But that week could be anticipated and scheduled to suit traffic conditions and it would constitute the sum total of traffic interruption.

The complete job that I've outlined with such broad strokes of the brush would involve an estimated expenditure of about two and a half billion dollars ($2,483,000,000 is the actual engineering estimate). To attain optimum efficiency and economy it is programed to be performed in 10 years' time, with an average annual appropriation of $250,000,000 during that period. Employment estimates indicate a peak labor force of about 40,000. All in all, it will be a tremendous job but no more so, relatively speaking, than our initial "Big Ditch." I venture the assertion, with due humility, that the sea-level job, like others that have challenged our engineering profession and construction industry, can be creditably performed.

So much for the major engineering aspects of converting the Panama Canal to sea level. There still remains the overriding matter of strategic policy which has been dramatically highlighted in recent months by various political disturbances in Central America. Renewed concern for the security of the Panama Canal has brought forth proposals for new canal construction at alternative locations, on the premise that "it is unwise to carry all your eggs in one basket." However, that adage is utterly fallacious when applied to defensive strategy in respect to the Panama Canal because guaranteed interoceanic communication is not a matter of carrying eggs but of protecting baskets. Let me assure you that the Panama Canal sea-level recommendation submitted to Congress by the Governor of the Panama Canal was critically reviewed at the highest levels of United States strategic policy. That review led to the firm and irrefutable conclusion that the Panama Canal converted to sea level would be America's stoutest and safest basket and that our canal security lies not in trying to spread our defense to cover several canals but in having the staunchest canal obtainable and concentrating on the defense of that one.

North Atlantic Military Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me today to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech delivered by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace on Sunday, March 27, 1949:

On this Sabbath afternoon, I would like to speak to you of the peace of the world. The peace I am talking about is the one-world peace which Wendell Willkie and Franklin Roosevelt proclaimed. But today those who stand for one world based on mutual understanding are looked on with suspicion.

Four years ago this spring Roosevelt died—and every spring since there has been a determined drive against world peace. The latest is the North Atlantic military pact.

A farmer friend of mine said the other day: "What is this North Atlantic Pact? I hear over the radio that you are against it. Why? What is this pact anyway?"

My reply was very simple. I said this pact really means that we are going to send billions of dollars of tanks, planes, and guns to arm western Europe. My farmer friend is a veteran of the last war—and promptly replied: "How long will it be before we have to send men?" Ideologies mean nothing to him. Russia means nothing. But getting into war again means everything. This man had never talked politics or policies with me until the North Atlantic Pact came up. When he gets worried it means nearly everyone in the United States is worried.

Americans are rightly worried. They sense that the pact, as one writer has put it, is "superseding a one-world organization with a military alliance looking toward the possibility of war in a world split in two."

The first victim of the pact is the United Nations—the one hope for peace.

When Secretary of State Acheson claimed the pact is an essential instrument for strengthening the United Nations, the New York Post called this the most absurd of all claims, and one columnist called it nauseating. For the clear intention of the pact is to take the place of the United Nations. Mr. Bevin and Mr. Churchill have been more frank about this than Acheson. The pact sets up an Atlantic council with a military staff committee in Europe with more power than the UN Security Council. The Atlantic Pact substitutes the divided nations for the United Nations. The military men and the diplomats who put over the pact try to justify it as a regional arrangement under the United Nations Charter.

What kind of region is it that covers everything from the Aleutian Islands in the North Pacific to Africa? Can this hard dividing of the world into two armed camps bring peace?

Stripped of legal verbiage, the North Atlantic military pact gives the United States Army military bases up to the very borders of the Soviet Union.

Recently a national conference was held by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing all the Protestant denominations. These Protestant leaders said about the North Atlantic Pact, "No defense alliance should be entered into which might validly appear as aggressive to Russia, as a Russian alliance would undoubtedly appear to us."

As we ponder these words and think of the bases which the Atlantic Pact will set up so close to Russia we cannot afford to forget Russian history. In the last 25 years they have been attacked by foreign armies five separate times. Does anyone imagine that, as they stare across their borders at our jet bombers and our cannon, calm visions of peace will be born in their minds? If we apply Christian behavior and try for a moment to put ourselves in their place the true meaning of the Atlantic Pact will be clear to us. Supposing the Soviets had military bases on the Mexican border? Th Canadian border? On Cuba? Could the treaty which put guns in our faces be called a pact of peace? Has it ever happened in the world that the massing of armed men brought peace? Has it not always brought war? To call the Atlantic Pact a peaceful thing is hypocrisy and nothing less—and I raise my voice against it so that you may know it for what it is.

But there are many people of honest heart who say we must run the terrible risk of war which the Atlantic Pact involves because of the threat of Russian aggression. Is there really such a threat?

Even Mr. John Foster Dulles, leading Republican spokesman on foreign policy, recently said, "I do not know any responsible high official, military or civilian, in this Government or any government, who believes that the Soviet state now plans conquest by open military aggression."

If Mr. Dulles is right, and I think he is—if the Soviet Union does not plan military aggression—then to surround them with military bases becomes an act of aggression on our part. The road to peace is not lined with military bases. The road to bankruptcy is. This is what Roosevelt said at Buenos Aires in 1937. Roosevelt said of nations who spend their money and men in creating vast armaments:

"We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day either when their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbor or when an unsound economy like a house of cards will fall apart."

For 150 years our reverence for the wisdom of George Washington has barred this country from entering into entangling European alliances. Now the Atlantic Pact plunges us into the maelstrom of European politics. It forces us into a European alliance against a European power. It moves the heart of America right up to the muzzle of the first gun fired in Europe. And it commits us, without the right of deciding for ourselves, to another European war. No honeyed words from the State Department can cover up these facts.

This new pact forces all Europe to rearm. That continent, only half recovered from the most terrible war in history, is now to fling away its final hope. We impose on Europe again its ancient curse—the massive standing army. A rearmed Europe can never be self-supporting. The pact will impoverish Europe.

What will it do to the United States? According to Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times, a new lend-lease program will cost the American taxpayer three to four billions a year over a 4- or 5-year period. These billions added to our present $21,000,000,000 cold-war program means that we will not build houses in America, or hospitals, or schools. Former Secretary of Defense Forrestal spelled all this out last December when he said that the American people will not only have to give up domestic reforms but tighten their belts and lower their living standards in order to rearm the world. The Congress has already shown its readiness to vote vast sums for armaments while it defeats civil-rights legislation, waters down rent controls, fails to repeal Taft-Hartley or provide relief for growing numbers of our unemployed. Both parties in Congress voted for a bigger Air Force—but cut low-cost housing.

And all this we do and fail to do in the name of surrounding with armies a nation which no responsible statesman claims either can or will launch a military attack beyond its borders.

But perhaps the worst disaster created by this new pact is not a material one at all. This pact will place us upon a war footing, and all these millions of Americans who still wish to question, who still wish to seek peace, will be reviled in the press, and attacked in the pulpit. As I speak to you, the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions is holding a Conference for Peace in New York. This council includes among its members some of our most brilliant men of science and of the arts.

To try to stop the trend toward war, it invited to our country scientists and artists from every country in Europe. But our State Department, using a very clever and very dishonest method, has barred practically all the non-Communist delegates from western Europe, so that you would think that only the Communists were interested in the conference; so that you could easily be led by the nose to damn outright any American who participates in it. The English press is highly indignant over the barring of Dr. Bernal, who was decorated only 2 years ago by our own Government for distinguished services during the war.

The State Department is trying to bully everyone who dares ask questions and demand answers. Since when have our policy makers become immune from criticism? The administration thinks it has presented you with an accomplished fact that you will not dare to question or contradict. I say to those very clever men that this democracy takes no marching orders and writes no blank checks. No group of men has the right to lead us into war in the name of peace.

There is one particular result of this new pact which has received little notice in the press. It is this: If it now becomes American policy to rearm Europe, are we going to rearm Germany, too?

It was German militarism and German aggression against which we were forced to fight two wars in a single generation. It was German militarism and German aggression that launched all the carnage of the twentieth century. Our military men have already decided to place arms in the hands of the Germans, the very same Germans, unchanged and unrepentant, against whom we fought. Under the Atlantic Pact, the Nazis will have uniforms again. These will be of American and Australian wool, dyed a new color perhaps, but it will be German dye, and the men under the cloaks will be Germans. As the military expert of the New York Times writes, "Many of our military observers advocate a plan frankly based on the eventual utilization of Spanish and German manpower." Spain too, of course. Because it was Franco who in November of 1944 first proposed in a letter to Churchill the western alliance against Russia. Yes, Franco's Spain—the creature of Hitler and Mussolini—Fascist Spain is in our camp because she hates Russia just as she hates Protestantism. Does anyone imagine that the Japanese, with their Emperor intact, his admirals and generals at his side, will not be next on the list of American allies?

But this is practical politics, is it not? I would like to be present when its fine points are explained to the ghosts of our dead on the islands of the Pacific and the shores of the Rhine. I say to you that it is not practical politics—it is impractical and immoral politics, and the worst of it is, it is politics that can lead only to disaster. The proof of this is plain in China, Greece, and Turkey.

What we did in China is exactly what the Atlantic Pact would have us do in Europe. We spent some $6,000,000,000 to arm the Chiang Kai-shek government. We trained

whole divisions of its army and its entire air force.

What happened?

Whereas the country was only partially Communist when our military aid began, today it is all but completely Communist. And the irony is that the Communist armies are in great part using American equipment that they captured—or sometimes bought—from Chiang's armies.

But our American luck was with us in China. For there was no pact binding us to Chiang Kai-shek. If there had been a treaty like the Atlantic Pact covering the Far East, we would now be at war with Russia on the Asiatic mainland.

As it is, we have wasted billions in the money of American taxpayers. More important, where once the name of America was held in highest honor, the Chinese people now regard us as their enemies. Millions of them hold us responsible for feeding the fires of a civil war that might have been avoided. Even American businessmen, whose very essence is conservatism, plead through the press for a hands-off policy in the internal life of China.

Is this what we want to happen in Europe? Our policy there is the same. Will the results be different? For months the Russians have been saying to all the world that they are willing to sit down with us to talk out our differences. Stalin himself has invited President Truman to do this. The State Department and the White House brushed him off. The Atlantic Pact, this war alliance, is their reply. Forget, for a moment, the effect upon Russia. What does it mean to the man on the street in Paris, in Rome, in London? Does it raise our prestige? Does it make us seem like victims or aggressors?

An Oxford professor, Max Belloff, wrote the answer in the New York Times magazine. "It is perhaps not fully realized in the United States," he declared, "how instinctively Europeans still recoil from the idea of a new war. However exasperating the attitude of Soviet Russia may be, talk of a showdown which can only mean a shooting war, seems to Europeans no answer."

Of course it is no answer. No answer for Europeans, and no answer for Americans. It was no answer in China, and it will be a catastrophe for America in Europe. We are asking the people of Europe to become American mercenaries and to turn their countries into battlefields once again. We are saying to them, "Set aside your dreams of a better world; take this gun and stand ready. Watch your fields grow over with weeds. Set your tractor plants to turning out tanks again. Come out of school and take up arms. We have run out of ideas. We know nothing but war as a way to peace. You must follow."

We made that speech in China, friends. But the Chinese did not follow. We are making that speech in Greece, and there are now more Greek rebels in the hills than there were when we started to wipe them out.

Perhaps the military and Wall Street men who took over American foreign policy when Roosevelt died do not understand how this failure is possible. No more did King George understand how the farmers of New England could withstand his trained regiments in 1775.

In the same way, Adolph Hitler swore he would be in Moscow 5 weeks after launching his attack.

All these men were right, from a purely military point of view. But the military point of view, which is responsible for ideas like the Atlantic alliance, never understands one thing—one angry peasant, fighting for what he believes, is worth a company of mercenaries who fight only because fighting is forced upon them. The spirit of the people decides wars, and that spirit cannot be produced, like guns, in arms factories.

The Atlantic Pact, if ratified by the Senate, will put the people of western Europe into American uniforms. Amid their cathedrals, we will pitch the tents of armies. We will crush their hope of recovery under the burden of our arms.

What do we offer them in return?

Nothing of the spirit but anticommunism. That was not very strong meat for the Chinese to feed on, and they turned their faces from it. When the first blow is struck, is it reasonable to think it will be different with the Europeans?

Neither the United States and Britain nor the United States and western Europe can carry on the burden of the world by themselves. Down that path hatred accumulates. We don't have to choose Russian communism but neither do we have to embrace the British Empire, Roman Catholicism or monopoly capitalism. There is a fifth choice which is the concept of old-fashioned Americanism moving to bring about a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the whole world.

It is not our obligation to save any vested interest. A Churchill may come to our shores in March of every third year to stir us to action in shouldering burdens which Britain no longer can carry. A Catholic prelate may try to convince us that the one choice is between Rome and Moscow. Corporation presidents may strive to rouse our hatreds to such fever heat that great appropriations will be made to increase the business of concerns making airplanes and munitions. Our newspapers will run interference for all these vested interests. But neither the vested interests nor the newspapers can bring your children and my children security.

I have seen and talked to the common man in Latin America, China, western Europe, Palestine, and Soviet Asia. They all have the same hope of peace and fear of war. They all distrust balance-of-power politics.

Jeremiah and Isaiah, the ancient Hebrew prophets, were caught in times like these when two great powers were striving mightily for supremacy. They looked at those who trusted in the sword and turned away. By the law of the spirit they knew that those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword. They knew that the only final strength was in the Lord and his righteousness. They knew that violence never finally paid either in personal affairs nor international relationships.

If the Bible says anything of value in international affairs it says that the path to peace is not the path of arms nor the path of international alliances. "Put no trust in earthly princes" said the Psalmist. Put no trust in arms. Only by world service shall the Nation be saved.

If the administration, as it professes, sincerely desires peace, let it state its terms. Let the Russians do likewise, as they have clearly and repeatedly told us they are prepared to do. Let the heads of both nations, after preparations at the expert level, sit down to negotiate those terms. Peace will require compromises and accommodation on both sides. But no government that wants peace and knows its minimum demands can refuse to discuss them, and propose a war-creating alliance instead.

Why then should our Government so fear the risk of conference and negotiation with the Russians while it incurs the incalculably greater risk of war?

Now is the time for the American people to act. The UN was born at San Francisco in 1945. The supreme question is: "Shall it die in Washington in 1949?"

Will history record that the fatal step was taken when the Atlantic Pact decision divided the world into two warring camps? With you who hear my voice this Sabbath afternoon rests the decision. In this vast radio audience are millions who know that the only road to peace lies through the United Nations and an understanding with Russia. To you I appeal to make your voices heard in Washington before it is too late. Let your Senators know that you want full hearings, consideration and debate on the North Atlantic Pact. Urge them to vote against a step which may destroy the United Nations and commit our beloved country to a course that would finally divide the world into two armed camps and take us down the fatal road to war.

Payments to State of Montana in Lieu of Taxes on Lands Owned by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following Senate Joint Memorial 6 of the Legislature of the State of Montana, with regard to payments in lieu of taxes on lands owned by the United States Government:

Senate Joint Memorial 6

(Introduced by Tibbals, Aronson, Markle, Ross, Valiton, and Fewkes)

A joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON and Representatives MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, all of Washington, D. C., requesting the enactment of legislation allowing for and directing the annual payment of grants by the United States Government to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the several counties of Montana in lieu of taxes on lands owned by the United States Government in the State of Montana

Whereas in Montana there is in excess of 39 percent of our landed area which is owned by the Government of the United States, so held by it in proprietory or trustee capacity for Indian reservations, forest reserves, wildlife refuge, grazing lands, military reservations, and numerous other governmental purposes and objects, none of which lands pay taxes to the State of Montana or the counties therein, nor contribute equitable amounts in lieu of taxes to the school districts, counties, and State government, all of which furnish services to such lands and their occupants; and

Whereas such areas are increasing, and the taxation burdens upon sparsely settled communities of our State are becoming more serious; and

Whereas these areas should bear some part of the tax burden comparable to that imposed on lands of our own taxpayers; and

Whereas there has been and will be introduced in the Congress of the United States acts under which the Government of the United States will pay to the several States of the United States for the benefit of counties wherein Government-held lands are located, grants in lieu of taxes upon these lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States providing for the evaluation of property owned or held by the United States Government and providing for payments or grants to the State of Montana for the use and

benefit of the counties wherein Government-held lands are located, in lieu of taxes upon these lands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON and Representatives MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART.

PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 25, 1949:
JOHN W. BONNER, *Governor.*

New York Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, despite the rantings and the ravings of those who do not know, FEPC is working out well in the State of New York. The following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 28 is a fair review of the situation as it there exists:

NEW YORK SHOWS THE WAY

Legislation against discrimination in employment is practical and successful. This is common knowledge in New York; the evidence is everywhere plain. There were serious doubts when our State commission against discrimination began operation in 1945, but the subsequent record is one of expanding progress. The achievements have been many and precise, and the New York system is so well established and recognized that it is now taken as a model in other forward-looking cities and States.

The commission's annual report is a cheering document for all who believe that it is possible to proceed exactly by specific legislation against the social imponderable. The law's stated aim is "to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin," and this is exactly what New York is doing. Statistics hardly tell the story. There were 273 complaints filed last year, mostly charges of race discrimination. But the commission, ably headed by Mr. Charles Garside, was not content to sit and wait until approached by an aggrieved individual. Its formative investigations were successfully directed, for instance, at Caucasian clauses of labor unions and advertising in telephone directories. Broad and productive conferences were conducted on the industry level, such as the confectionery business, private hospitals, and surety companies. Continuing consultation proceeded on every level of government. Any New Yorker can look about in daily life, in offices, department stores, and everywhere, and see that something very definite and personal is being done.

What is our secret of success? First, there is determination firmly and simply expressed in law. Second, the commission gets results by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Third, our law has teeth. Up to now, the cease-and-desist sanctions of court order have never been sought, which is a tribute to the commission's skillful and forehanded administration. The necessity for crackdown is avoided by developing a community atmosphere that is progressively favorable. We progress by conscious education; the whole air is cooperation instead of conflict. And this is the triumph of intelligent legislation, the proof that a broad and imperative aim can be harmoniously translated into happy result.

ECA Still Discriminates Against American Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the Members of Congress voted for the Marshall plan they certainly did not do so with the intention of destroying American shipping, or other American industries. This, however, seems to be the policy of Hoffman and the ECA administrators. It was most foolish to have set up a separate administration over ECA funds. This act should have been administered under control of the State Department and the Department of Commerce. Under the present administration many American businessmen are waking up to the fact that their industry and business are being put on the skids. Let us take, for instance, American shipping—a recent ECA report discloses that United States flag ships carried only 43 percent of the aggregate ECA cargoes from the United States in January and February of this year. This figure includes shipments on Army vessels averaging 10 percent of the aggregate, according to recent testimony of an ECA representative before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. The percentage of ECA cargo from the United States carried aboard United States flag commercial vessels was therefore approximately 33 percent of the aggregate.

A very small percentage of ECA cargoes shipped from the United States by so-called maritime recipient nations in northern Europe was carried on United States flag vessels. From April 1948 to February 1949 the United Kingdom shipped only 17.6 percent of ECA cargoes from the United States on United States flag vessels, Netherlands only 29.8 percent, Denmark 17.7 percent and Norway 30.7 percent.

Certain American steamship lines provide regular and frequent year-around service to these northern European countries under contract to the United States Government through the United States Maritime Commission. They are not assisted in earning the necessary revenues to maintain these services by being advised that the deficiency in the statutory 50-percent requirement is to be made up by some other country to some other shipping line.

Failure of these nations to provide their fair share of United States flag ECA cargoes as required by law is evidence of the necessity of a country-by-country administration of the ECA Act.

Shadow of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 29, 1949:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
SHADOW OF FEAR

NEW YORK.—If a master Communist planner had carefully worked out a way to get the utmost public attention for the Communist-dominated world peace conference held here over the week end, he could not have improved on what actually happened. The supposed enemies of communism took care of all that.

They picketed in noisy, marching crowds outside the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and Carnegie Hall. They carried banners and placards duly recorded by newsreel and television cameras.

Without all this voluntary advertising, it seems to me likely that the conference would have been almost ignored. Americans have learned enough in the past 3 years about Communist propaganda techniques not to be fooled by such a transparent device as the conference.

The very fact that a delegation from the Soviet Union, including such a showpiece as the composer, Dmitri Shostakovich, could come here was sufficient proof of the importance the Russians placed on the meeting. From almost everything that was said, and above all from the reception of the carefully hand-picked audience, it was obvious that the immediate objective is a meeting between Truman and Stalin.

Back of that objective is the aim of halting the program of the United States Government for restoring the strength and independence of western Europe. America has gradually come to accept world responsibility. That does not fit into the Soviet postwar plan. In fact, it cuts directly across the Russian goal of domination in Europe and Asia.

A Truman-Stalin peace conference, in a climate of opinion warmed up by Soviet sympathizers and the deep desire of almost all Americans for peace, could achieve a lot. At the very least it would put the United States in the role of rejecting Stalin's magnanimous offer of peace on Stalin's terms.

One disservice done by all the free advertising was to make it seem that we were really afraid to have these people speak their piece. The State Department helped that impression along by its stupidity in refusing visas to some who wanted to come from western Europe and South America.

It must have seemed to the visiting Russians that we were in a highly jittery and nervous state. As they were spirited in and out of the Waldorf while the marching pickets shouted, they must have felt that here were overtones of the same fear that obsesses their country.

Fear is like a spreading plague in the world today. It seemed to me to be deeply etched in the thin, taut face of Shostakovich as I watched him sitting on the platform during the interminable and repetitious speeches.

Here is a young man who has composed some of the most brilliant and exciting music of our time. The music of Shostakovich

is played every day in this country and in almost every other country in the world.

Yet periodically the political bosses of the Soviet Union crack down, accusing him of political heresy in his music. According to those who have lived behind the iron curtain, this is torture for Shostakovich.

Some musicians and writers have become cynical under the Moscow whip. They shrug it off and promise to be good little boys. But not sensitive Shostakovich. He really believes he has betrayed a cause, and he suffers.

That seemed to me to be written in his face—in the tense, turned down mouth, in the restless movements of his thin artist's hands, in the way in which from time to time he glanced nervously at one or the other of the Russian delegation. Here was a man who lived under the shadow of fear.

Another meeting in New York over the week end was largely devoted to that fear. It was a meeting of protest called by Americans for Intellectual Freedom held in Freedom House, which is dedicated to the late Wendell Willkie. In a succeeding column I want to write about that other meeting.

One thing both meetings agreed on, and that is that the world is a very sick place. It is sick with the spreading plague of fear. Every manifestation of that fear in this country is a sign of weakness. It is a sign that we do not trust our own strength and our own resolution for peace. Fear can bring the thing that people everywhere live in dread of—another war.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by gentlemen on the floor of this House that rent control was of little concern to the rural districts. That statement is true only by comparison, of course. Rent control is not so vital in agricultural sections as it is in Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia. But my people in Missouri have rent-control problems of their own, although not so vital as in the congested areas. In the Sixth Missouri District we have one town of 75,000 population, one of 20,000, and 20 more where population will run from 2,000 to 8,000. Even if there were no towns in our district, we would be interested in the measure, because we are a part of this great country. A country that our boys fought, and some of them died, to save. We as farm folks are deeply interested in the welfare of our great cities. Good American men, women, and children live and labor in those cities, and we country people have always been generous, unselfish, and God-fearing. We have always been willing to live and let live, and help to do that which would bring the greatest good to the greatest number.

This rent-control measure has been evolved by the best minds of both Houses of Congress. The conference has reported a bill designed to give equal consideration to landlord and tenant. In the integrity, the honesty, and the ability of these gentlemen I have the greatest faith. I believe they have reported to this House a compromise bill superior to either original House or Senate bill. I am going to support the measure, and I firmly believe it is the best bill that it has been possible for the best and fairest minds of both Houses to evolve.

A Timely Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have pointed out on the floor of the House of Representatives that there are, all told, 45,000 publicity persons on the Federal pay roll scattered throughout the Departments and Bureaus of the Government; of the 45,000 there are 23,000 permanent publicity persons and 22,000 part time. More amazing still is that these self-serving barnacles on the ship of state have a budget of $70,000,000 taken from the pockets of the taxpayers.

I am inserting, under leave heretofore granted, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 29, 1949, which points out the danger of self-serving bureaucratic propaganda.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

There is a section of the 590-page printed report of the Hoover Commission's task force on public welfare that should be required reading for all of the Government's many publicity men. The section, entitled "Government Propaganda," deserves the special attention of congressional committees concerned with preventing improper use of departmental appropriations. For the task force (the Brookings Institution) found that some agencies, especially in the public welfare field, do not seem to understand the difference between objective publicity and bureaucratic propaganda.

Here is an excerpt from the report: "Although this (propaganda) situation has always presented some difficulties, it has become increasingly important in recent years with the advent of new philosophies as to the functions of the state in relation to economic and social policies. In the administrative branch, both in political and in permanent civil-service positions, are a substantial number of employees considerably to the left of the majority of the Members of Congress. Some of them appear to have a conviction that it is their duty to attempt to influence Congress and, in interpreting and applying laws, to go as far as possible in achieving the reforms in which they believe. They are not satisfied to act and administer within the intent of Congress. The experts in the executive establishments, according to this philosophy, know more and are better equipped than the Congressmen, and the view is not accepted that the experts should be on tap but not on top. Such attitudes affect both the research work and the publications of some governmental agencies. The most common manifestation is to give wide publicity to the material that will popularize a program and lead to its expansion and to play down the material that might raise opposition to it."

That is a serious charge by a competent investigating group. The report backs up the allegation by citing some of the research activities of the actuarial office of the Social Security Agency. It is asserted that although the actuarial office has prepared studies showing ultimate costs of old-age and survivors insurance of such magnitude that they may have a profound effect on the economic and social system, the SSA publicity emphasis has been on the benefits of the system and the need for extending and liberalizing it.

This tendency of Government press agents to emphasize only the favorable aspects of the work of their respective departments is not new or confined to the welfare field, of course. It is the natural inclination of a public-relations man to encourage good public relations for his agency. But the Hoover Commission is correct in viewing the tendency toward suppression of unfavorable facts and publicizing of the favorable as a real danger to democratic government. As the Brookings report comments, it is anomalous that the Government should tolerate misleading advertising by some of its own branches while condemning false advertising in private industry. The best curb on biased Federal publicity is unbiased congressional publicity exposing bureaucratic propagandizing whenever and wherever it occurs. Congressional committees have done some effective work along this line in the past. The vigilance should be increased as the opportunities for governmental propaganda multiply with the expansion of Federal activities into new fields.

Storm Against Excise Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Press-Register of March 25, 1949:

STORM AGAINST EXCISE TAX RATES

In recent weeks Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, and others in Congress have focused the spotlight on the fact that full wartime excise tax rates still apply to quite a list of articles, including cosmetics.

Women are beginning to demand relief from the tax on cosmetics. The Christian Science Monitor, taking note of this, comments:

"Where is American chivalry?

"Is it so much a thing of the past that the men of the United States Congress are willing to sit idly by and let the bloom fade from the cheek of the American woman and her cherry lips grow pale?

"During the war and the immediate post-war period hardly a feminine voice was raised against the 20 percent cosmetics tax.

"Loyal and patriotic wives, mothers, and sweethearts never murmured when they had to pay the extra dimes for their lipsticks, powder, face creams, and shampoos, even though they knew that comparable prerequisites of good grooming for the men—shaving cream and razors—were tax-free. They just paid and were patient.

"Masculine legislators, thinking over national problems as they applied their razors to well-lathered faces in days past, may have assured themselves that all was quiet on the cosmetic front. Maybe they didn't know that quiet often precedes a storm.

"The time has come, and the storm is on—a storm of protest from women throughout the country. Their patience was not rewarded, so they are now on the warpath."

We think the women shouldn't have to carry on a single-handed fight for relief from wartime excise tax rates. We think the men should help them out. After all, who earns much of the money that women spend on cosmetics and other products affected by these taxes?

They Walked in Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I gave my views on the floor of the House as to what could be expected of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace that opened in New York City 2 days later. That I foretold accurately what would happen there is best evidenced by the following editorial which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune:

THEY WALKED IN DARKNESS

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace has adopted its resolutions and adjourned. The resolutions are commendable in themselves, full of lofty aspirations which can only be challenged because of their source. For the conference was riven by an inner contradiction which sprang from the stark fact that to promote peace on the sponsors' terms, culture and science had to be disregarded.

The conference was based on the assumption that assorted warmongers, spreading hysteria, raised obstacles in the way of those practitioners of the arts and sciences who wished to use their common intellectual interests to transcend frontiers and political systems. But it was embarrassingly apparent, even to the supporters of the conference, that it was Russia which rejected the whole concept of cosmopolitanism in culture and science and which was indoctrinating its people with the contrary notion that no achievement in any field of human activity was valid unless it could be considered Marxist, as the Politburo defines Marxism. Indeed, the Soviet Union has gone farther. It has endeavored to force the mind of Russians into a strait-jacket of narrow nationalism, drawing upon the Czarist past for fantastic claims of Russian superiority in every branch of learning or artistic achievement. And this has not been done as the spontaneous expression of a victorious people, but under command, enforceable by the grimmest of penalties.

Under such circumstances, the sessions inevitably became unreal. Consider the irony of presenting a scroll to Mr. Shostakovitch which spoke of music as "an international language"—a heresy which the Russian composer has expressly recanted. And when the conference adopted a resolution praising the American Bill of Rights as a charter of cultural freedom under which "thought has made its eagle flight to new horizons," it stated good democratic doctrine, but only emphasized the fact that any unauthorized thought which flies toward Moscow will be shot down without compunction.

It was only by evading these thorny truths by considering the mote in democracy's eye as the equal of the beam in that of communism, by dismissing the differences between East and West as of no account, that the conference could discuss peace. But to do so, the self-appointed representatives of American art and intellect had to abandon the only fields in which they might be considered expert. At best, they could give voice to a pious hope; at worst, they confounded the existing confusion. They failed to shed any real light on real problems because they walked in darkness themselves.

An Appeal From the Youth of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of David S. Richie, a young man who has worked with the youth of Europe and has a message which I think should be of great interest to all of us.

The thoughts expressed in his statement have been clarified in his mind through his experiences as a staff representative of the American Friends Service Committee during 23 months of the past 3 years spent in Europe. These thoughts are, of course, his own, and he is no longer on the staff of the AFSC.

For identification purposes, it can be said that he is an executive secretary of the Philadelphia Friends Social Order Committee; but this statement is entirely his own and not authorized by his committees. He is a graduate of Haverford College and has been secretary of these committees since 1939.

In May 1946 he went for the American Friends Service Committee to Poland and did relief work there for 6 months. In November he went to Finland to promote the international voluntary work camps, staying for 5 months and returning there again in June of 1947 and again in June of 1948, for the same purpose. In April 1947 he participated in a work camp in Belgium and then returned to Poland to organize the first such international work camp held in Poland, at Lucimia during July and August 1947. In September he participated in four similar work camps in Germany before returning to America. In May of 1948 he returned to Europe to visit work camps in Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and Finland, and to share in the responsibility for the three camps held in Poland during July, August, and September of 1948, and returned to America in October of 1948. All told he has spent 12 months in Poland, having been permitted to pass the iron curtain on 5 occasions—10 times counting both ways.

Mr. Richie's statement follows:

AN APPEAL FROM THE YOUTH OF EUROPE

"Give us freedom from fear of war—that is enough!" This appeal, addressed to America by a Finnish volunteer worker helping with the reconstruction of Lapland summarizes the greatest longing of the young people of all Europe.

I have worked with these young people in Poland, Germany, Finland, Italy, France, and Belgium, during 23 months of the past 3 years, rebuilding schools, hospitals, and homes. Always the fear of another war has hung over their heads, war threatened, they feel, as much by the United States as by Russia. I have interpreted to them again and again and again that the American people do not want war, that the American people do not threaten war, and only too readily they agree, remembering too well how little the people in their own countries wanted the last war, how completely their own government got out from under the control of the people.

"Give us freedom from the fear of war. In Finland, right next door to Russia, they are doing their full share to free themselves from this fear as well as from the devastation of their two cruel wars. They have an unwritten agreement not to publish anything inflammatory against Russia in their newspapers. Last spring they forced the resignation of a Communist Minister of Interior for abuse of powers but granted the Communist Party complete freedom in the June political campaign. A dozen Finnish work campers, with twinkling eyes, pointed out to me the almost ever-present Communist posters denouncing American imperialism to see my reaction. They and the rest of the Finnish people calmly went to the polls and roundly defeated the Communists in the July election. For 3 years now Finland has had as Minister of Defense an acknowledged pacifist, pledged never to prepare for war or resort to war. That and the prompt payment of their heavy reparations even though they hurt are the surest guaranties Finland can make that Russia will have no cause to invade her land. But everyone knows that Finland will be occupied by Russia within 24 hours if a war between the United States and Russia should break. It is no wonder they appeal to us for freedom from fear of war.

In Poland the people are even more under the domination of Communist propaganda. Each American press release on our latest guided missile or rocket ship is publicized to strike fear into the hearts of the people. Again and again and again they are reminded that the former United States Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, said at Stuttgart that we did not consider the present Polish-German border as necessarily finally determined, a comment which can only be interpreted as meaning we might require the return to Germany of the lands allocated to Poland by the Potsdam agreement. This American bid for popularity in Germany has certainly hurt our popularity in Poland; but in spite of this there is a very large proportion of the Polish people who do not support the Communist efforts to prepare Poland for war.

In fact, I am convinced that there are fewer enthusiastic Communists in each country in Europe than there were immediately after the war. Communist ruthlessness, the deception and intrigue have disillusioned many millions at one time attracted by a Communist utopia. Now increasingly they fear it or hate it. But better than we can, they understand it. They share the longing of the Russian people for peace and for the chance to rebuild their thousands and thousands of square miles of ravaged countryside, and they understand the desperate fear of the Russians of another invasion, this time spearheaded by American atomic bombs. Often western Europeans explained the ruthlessness of the Communists by their fear of American encirclement and threat of war.

At the same time, as Europeans have become disillusioned about communism, a great reservoir of gratitude and good will for

the American people has been built up throughout eastern and western Europe by the UNNRA aid, the millions of CARE packages and direct mail parcels, and more recently by the Marshall-plan program. Certainly Poles and Czechs and Hungarians are grateful for the aid they have received and many of them are still aware that the Marshall-plan aid was originally offered to them.

But that has not been all. At the same time there has been a developing distrust of America, a fear that we have been buying their support for our side in a war, a feeling—ever since our unilateral military intervention in Greece—that we are ready to use them as cannon fodder in another war if it suited our purposes; that we are really not any more ready to compromise our purpose for the sake of peace than the Russians are.

Again and again I asked European work-camp groups what they would want me to advocate back in America. Usually they would hesitate at first to speak their mind, but when I suggested that the problem seemed to be to convince Europe that we really intended peace they readily agreed. When asked if they would be convinced if we reduced our military appropriations from fifteen billion to five billion and increased our Marshall-plan aid from five billion to fifteen billion they looked at me with such a wistful longing that I felt ashamed of raising their hopes when I knew it was too much to hope for. But why is it too much to hope for? Is it because we are preparing for aggressive war? No. Is it because we are afraid of an attack upon ourselves? No. Is it not because we have not made up our mind how we can save western Europe and ourselves from communism?

We want to save Europe by economic assistance in reconstruction. We also want to be prepared to stop military aggression by military force if necessary. But we do not yet realize that our military preparations defeat our primary peaceful purposes. The danger is not that Russian armies will attack the United States or that they will invade France or Italy, but that dissatisfaction and despair in those countries will make an internal seizure of power by local Communists possible. That danger is real. When we offer the poverty-stricken French or Italian workers guns instead of bread, tanks instead of houses, we are increasing their dissatisfaction and thereby increasing their readiness to follow Communist leadership. This is an inescapable and, I hope, sobering fact. When, on the other hand, we offer economic aid for reconstruction we offer hope; and the degree to which we offer hope will determine the degree to which Communist influence will decrease and the Communist danger will disappear. An all-out economic-assistance program, freed from all military entanglements, is the surest road to peace. Millions of common folk throughout Europe are praying that we will see this light before we clamp upon them a North Atlantic defense pact that will condemn them to a living death.

Ours is a fateful responsibility. If we ever use the atomic bombs, the guided missiles, the rockets, we are now spending billions of dollars upon, we will become the most hated people on earth, and rightly so. Even though by such methods we maintain our domination for a generation, our doom will be assured. That much is clear. What we must also realize is that merely the threat to use these modern means of slaughter, even for the loftiest motives, condemns us and alienates people from us.

Consider, for example (the young people of Great Britain particularly would ask us), the 1,500,000,000 colored people throughout the world, for whose loyalty we are competing with the Communists. Our military might has absolutely no attraction for them, especially when our race relations record here at home brands us as hypocrites. On the other hand, we can win the loyal cooperation of these hundreds of millions of colored people throughout the world. Britain in India is proving it. We can win, but only by actually practicing here at home the equality of opportunity for all people, which we profess, and by actually providing the economic, educational, and humanitarian assistance to the depressed people of Africa, Asia, and Indonesia, which our tremendous productive capacity makes possible. This is the only road to peace. Can we see how much, how desperately much, the tortured people of the world want us to choose this road and renounce the road to war?

Most young people in Europe understand economics better than we do. They know that free-enterprise economies are threatened by periodic depressions when the people cannot buy the total production of the nation. They know that these depressions can be avoided in two ways. They can be avoided, or at least postponed, by ever-increasing military expenditures, but everyone in Europe knows that Hitler proved this way to be the way of death. They also know that these depressions can be avoided by the cooperation of industry and agriculture with government in social-welfare programs that fully utilize the nations' productive capacity. Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries are proving this can be done, and they will do it if their economies are not overburdened by military involvements forced upon them by the North Atlantic Pact. They appeal to us to do likewise, to reject the profits and wages made by preparations for murder and to strive forward toward that free, full-employment, welfare economy that is within our grasp.

Finally, young people in Europe would urge us to put our faith in world government, in full support of the United Nations. Whether they are from eastern or western Europe young people would say the same—the North Atlantic military defense pact is a rejection of the United Nations; it is an admission that we consider the United Nations to have failed, that we consider cooperation with Russia in the United Nations to be hopeless.

It is an assertion that we choose to rely on the ways of force rather than on the ways of peace. They would say that this decision has not been forced upon us. They would say that the United Nations has not failed; the way of war has failed, but the way of world government has not yet seriously been tried. How can it be otherwise when the United States has not spent as much as one-fifteenth of what we are spending on war preparations this year on the peacemaking institutions of the world government? What could happen if we invested one-fifth or one-third, or conceivably one-half, of our military budget in the peacemaking functions of the United Nations, of UNESCO, and the rest? The people of Europe do not expect us to do so; they are only too cynical and discouraged. They are only too likely to become increasingly bitter. But somehow, I still have faith. I have faith in the American people, in our good intentions, in our ability to see the right, and in our courage to do it, without fear.

I have faith in the responsiveness of people and of governments to such right behavior. I have seen such responsiveness on both sides of the iron curtain to the tiny demonstrations of good will that the American people have made possible for the Quakers to carry out in a dozen countries of Europe. It is my hope that we will multiply these authentic demonstrations of good will. But it is my hope, above all, that we will listen before it is too late to the appeal of the Finnish work camper in Lapland, and so win the peace of the world:

"Give us freedom from fear of war. That is enough."

New Notions at Beirut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Malvina Lindsay entitled "New Notions at Beirut," which appeared in the Washington Post on March 23, 1949. The article describes the third conference of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

This conference, it seems to me, is of great moment. If the women of the world can be united behind common objectives, our chance for peace will be strengthened.

I should like to call to the attention of the House that I have introduced a bill (H. R. 2396) to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations and for other purposes.

I have also introduced a bill providing equal pay for equal work for women.

The article referred to follows:

NEW NOTIONS AT BEIRUT

(By Malvina Lindsay)

FEMININE STRATEGISTS

An event that may influence the lives of women—and inevitably the social order—in many parts of the world is taking place this week in Beirut, Lebanon. While on the surface nothing more than carefully worded resolutions may come out of the third conference of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, yet the ideas set in motion at this spot, called the "cross-bridge between Asia, Africa, and Europe" are likely to bear surprising fruit in a few years.

For in this global feminine stocktaking, women of east and west are finding in what ways they lag behind each other as the free human beings the United Nations Charter envisages. From these discussions women in the three continents lying off this listening post and across the seas in the Americas will get new notions of their own worth and destiny.

Few national toes but what will be stepped on at this Beirut meeting. Among these will be the 21 nations in which women do not yet vote—countries that will get the stigma of backward in the discussions. Also charged at this bar of feminine opinion will be nations that take away a woman's citizenship when she marries a foreigner, that deny her freedom of choice in marriage, that do not give her equal rights in divorce, that give control of her property or earnings to her husband or father, that do not give her freedom to join her spouse in another country, and that offend against the dignity of the wife by sanctioning polygamy.

Many of these ideas will prove disturbing to husbands in the areas around Lebanon. Yet the west cannot be too smug at this conference. For on some of these things it is vulnerable. The United States still discriminates against alien husbands of American women, and has not yet put women on a basis with men in all immigration matters. And hundreds of discriminations against women exist in State laws.

On one of the main subjects on the Commission's agenda, equal pay for equal work with men, the faces of both Great Britain

and the United States will be especially red. While the British are worse offenders than the Americans in this, yet this country has an Achilles' heel of discrimination that was recently taken advantage of by the Soviet Union when it charged in a statement on International Women's Day that American women get 30 to 40 percent less pay than men for the same work.

Another leading subject at the conference is nationality status of women who marry foreigners. The Commission is working for a general treaty to clear up the world-wide confusion on that matter. Now the diversity of laws results in some women who marry other nationals finding themselves citizens of two countries, while others become women without states.

Both west and east realize they have something to learn from each other about women's status—that is why the Commission is holding meetings in varied parts of the world. In Lebanon, for example, women have made great progress even though they lack the vote. In this small ancient country of 2,000,000 population on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean, women can attend any university on an equal basis with men—a privilege not open to American women—and can study at these any subject they may choose.

Education is the main lever women of the so-called backward countries have been using to get greater political and personal rights. One question that repeatedly comes before the Commission on the Status of Women is whether to put the main emphasis on getting political rights for women of the world or to press for more opportunities in education, which would equip them better to use the vote.

Helping women in remote areas to make themselves economically independent is another indirect way of breaking the power of those who would keep them in their place. The present conference will do something about this, too, through its action to raise nursing standards in all countries, and to encourage women to aspire to the professions.

Long Waiting Lists Tax Services of London Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 28 I placed in the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 22, is the fifth of the series:

LONG WAITING LISTS TAX SERVICES OF LONDON HOSPITALS—GOVERNMENT PAYS FOR ALL UNDER NEW LAW

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Fifth in a series)

LONDON, March 22.—The extent of the clamor for admission to hospitals is shown at a 500-bed hospital that has a constant waiting list of 700. That testifies to the public requirements that have arisen under the free National Health Service.

This particular hospital is of the teaching kind; that is, it is connected with a university turning out physicans and surgeons and has a school for nurses. It also manages another hospital with 300 beds, some 15 miles distant, that always has a waiting list of 600 prospective patients.

This teaching hospital would have preferred to have remained out of the health scheme and to have gone on as a private charitable institution. Its policy, through its long history, has been to house only those earning less than $1,600 a year and even then to receive only donations that patients can afford to make.

Under the arrangement, one who became its patient explained his economic circumstances to an almoner and if he was not in a position to pay anything, that is what he paid. All this is changed now, of course, and the Government does the paying for everybody. No private patient is accepted in this hospital, its service cannot be bought.

It is in an unusually fortunate financial circumstance. A century ago it was bequeathed a large tract of land which since has become of great value and delivers an income of $480,000 a year. In the past this was spent in the routine conduct of the institution and, in addition, monetary gifts helped it along further.

Its own income now is used in reopening laboratories that have been closed for some time and the renewal of scientific research tasks. It believes it can make some important contributions to medical knowledge under the new arrangement. Also some of its own money is continuing to be devoted to the provision of added personal comforts, over and above the routine, for those patients who are without funds of any consequence.

It is managed by a board of governors, appointed by the Minister of Health, and its standards have not been lowered by its National Health Service connection, it believes. It considers the contrary to be true. The type of person placed on the board is just as worthy from the medical viewpoint as in the past and many who have been on the board for 20 years have been retained.

It considers itself as being tied in with a necessary scheme and does everything conceivable to make hospitalization under the new plan just as successful as can be the case. Wards that have been closed since the war are being reopened as steadily as nurses and equipment are discovered and it is enthusiastic over its ability to take part in improving the health of the country.

At this hospital the physicians who send in the names of patients for admission are asked to take some of the responsibility of seeing that urgency is served. The physicians are expected to scan their lists often and to inform the admission staff when there is a change in a situation, when it becomes important to bring in a patient at once, or there no longer is an immediacy involved.

There is no making out of individual bills for the patients. The Government advances money to it every quarter of the year and it goes along in its work as economically as it can. There are observations by the governors all the time and, since these men are direct appointees of the Minister of Health, it practically is directed by top-flight figures.

Surgeons like to be attached to the hospital under discussion, as it adds to their prestige. When the board decides to employ a new junior surgeon it posts a notice of examination and scores of candidates file petitions for the assignment.

Another hospital serving a big district quite far from London is tackling the nurse-scarcity problem in a new way. It is seeking the interest of 16-year-old girls in becoming "cadet" nurses, a form of nurse's helper. A girl who accepts is promised she will not be called upon to do any of the work of a domestic or an orderly and will be given $120 a year "pocket money," board, lodging, laundry, and uniforms.

The People Report Progress in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a brief summary, the People Report Progress in Civil Rights, appearing in the February issue of the Woman's Press, the national magazine of the YWCA, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 5, 1949, relating to this report:

THE PEOPLE REPORT PROGRESS IN CIVIL RIGHTS

The February issue of the Woman's Press, national magazine of the YWCA, is a report of progress in civil rights from many parts of the United States and in many areas, including education, employment, transportation, housing, municipal protection of minority groups, and so on. The stories were gathered through the cooperation of nine national organizations. As the New York Herald Tribune stated editorially, the story that it tells is one of the success of gradualism, "the answer is exhilarating."

The issue opens with a foreword signed by a member of the national board of the YWCA, which reads:

"If one should venture to be prophetic so early in the new year, one might predict that 1949 will be an important milestone in the history of our Nation.

"For the third time in our history we are casting a critical eye over the state of our much-vaunted freedoms. The first appraisal culminated in the Bill of Rights; the second in the abolition proclamation. And this year of our Lord—the first anniversary of the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights—may well bring the promise of a day when neither race, color, creed, nor national origin will prove a deterrent to equal opportunities for education, employment, and housing, or to freedom from fear in the United States. In view of the pledges made by both major parties in the recent Presidential campaign, how can legislation to implement these ideals fail of passage? * * *

"This issue of the Woman's Press is in the nature of a report of the progress in civil rights that has made in many American communities, through the efforts of many individuals and of many national and local organizations."

I should like to quote particularly from the article written by Father John LaFarge, of the Society of Jesus:

"A cynic once remarked that a program of human rights was a refuge for lost causes. * * * The Gospel of Jesus Christ has taught the world that the ultimate guaranty of human rights is to be found not in man alone, but in the God who created him and to whom man and his laws and governments are ultimately responsible. * * * In the maintenance of this basic principle, and of the practical conclusions that flow from it, Jew, Protestant, and Catholic alike have a common duty, and—let us proudly say—a common privilege. Such maladjustments as exist in our democratic society can only be remedied, as President Shuster observed, 'by a complete awareness on the part of the public and a determination on the part of all groups to work together to cure them.'"

Religious groups are working actively in behalf of civil rights, as indicated in the statement adopted on December 3, 1948, by

the Federal Council of Churches, called the Churches and Human Rights. Individual churches are working toward complete human brotherhood among their members and congregations. The United Council of Church Women all over the country, but particularly in the South, is moving forward in the same direction. I quote from an article entitled "The Southern Woman Looketh to Her Household," by Mrs. M. E. Tilly, a member of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, in which she says:

"Otherwise timid women, with little religious or educational background, but with a deep sense of responsibility for safeguarding their families, now venture into council chambers and into courtrooms. * * * Women are learning that if democracy lives anywhere it must live in their own local community."

In the field of education, through such organizations as the YWCA, the Bureau for Intercultural Education, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Pacific Coast Council on Intercultural Education, and so on, programs are developed in public schools, colleges, and universities to foster intercultural and interracial understanding and to lessen hatred and prejudice between groups of differing racial and national backgrounds.

In employment, many department stores are finding that discrimination in employment does not pay. In one article in the February Woman's Press entitled "Democracy Pays Off in Merchandising," personnel directors in large department stores, including Macy's in New York, G. Fox Co. in Hartford, Conn., and Gilchrist's in Boston, speak as follows about the work they have done in employing Negroes in other than maintenance operations:

"We have used Negro sales girls successfully in practically every department of the store. * * * Within the past year we have placed several Negro salesmen. * * * The rug salesman is outselling every other sales person in the department. We have had several fine comments, including customers' letters of appreciation of his fine services."

"The standards for job performance are the same for all employees. * * * While there are instances of meritorious service among our Negro personnel, the job performance varies with the individual capabilities. There is no evidence of special qualities in job performance that arise out of racial origin."

In another article on fair-employment practices laws now operating in seven States, Mr. Ralph Bass, of the American Jewish Committee, writes that:

"There has been no influx of undesirable workers, no decline in profits. There has been the establishment of broader labor markets, greater efficiency, and a more vital conception of the meaning of democracy. The executives of the States and cities which have adopted the laws are soberly sanguine. They share a common belief that it will be necessary for the Federal Government to establish Nation-wide standards for nondiscrimination in employment. Then the local governments could really go to work and carry them out."

In another article entitled "Labor Fights Discrimination," by Carl Rachlin, a member of the panel of the New York State Board of Mediation, this significant paragraph appears:

"In recent years organized labor has declared that its objective of greater economic and political democracy for all people can only be achieved beyond the collective bargaining table. The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have both entered with determination upon the promotion of political programs which will increase democracy in all aspects of our existence. One of the items high on this list is the elimination of racial discrimination."

In a still further article, When Free Enterprise Meets the Color Line, by Dr. Clara A. Hardin, there are these sentences which point out the necessity of improving democracy if we are to maintain free enterprise:

"Racial minorities have had a difficult time in becoming established in successful business enterprises because they lack access to capital or credit. Despite their handicaps, however, their record of achievement has been impressive. The tragedy is that the individual who wins success is pointed to as an exceptional member of his race. In a truly free-enterprise system, success should be accepted at face value for any citizen."

Individual communities are working at the problem of discrimination in many areas in order to make possible decent housing, health facilities, suitable education, and proper police protection for minority groups. Among the communities that have done special work in this area are Chicago, Ill., Chester, Pa., and Denver, Colo., where Quigg Newton, a young Navy veteran who is now mayor, has taken the lead in establishing a committee on human relations. Mrs. Dorothy McCullough Lee, mayor of Portland, Oreg., is also taking a forthright stand, as indicated in her article on the municipal government's responsibility in these areas. The State of Michigan has a new State-wide committee on civil rights which has been very effective in many places in that State, as indicated in the article entitled "Michigan Works To Secure These Rights" by Olive R. Beasley. In Grand Rapids, Mich., there has been special progress in making hotel facilities available to all groups, and it is because of this that so many conventions consider it the ideal convention city.

This is a brief summary of the contents of this issue entitled "The People Report Progress in Civil Rights." The conclusion is that the American people, by and large, are eager to move forward toward the promise which both the Republican and Democratic Parties made as part of their national campaigns in the fall of 1948. There is much still to be done. There is no question but that the people expect this Congress to implement the President's committee report.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 5, 1949]

A HEALTHY FERMENT

Postwar ferment over civil rights has focused attention on the spots where democratic theories and practices do not meet. We begin to question whether reliance upon gradualism to right the disparities has not involved two steps back for one forward. [An answer is given in the Woman's Press, national magazine of the Young Women's Christian Association, which devotes its February issue to a report of civil rights progress in American communities from coast to coast.] The answer is exhilarating.

One review points out that efforts to outlaw unfair employment practices will be launched in 20 States in 1949. New York, which led the way with its 1945 antidiscrimination law, was followed by New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Oregon. The last three have no enforcement provisions but since all such laws depend more upon conciliation than compulsion, their working is similar. Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and Philadelphia have adopted antidiscrimination ordinances. The experience of these communities, where none of the prophesied catastrophes developed but prejudice did drop, should make victory easier in the 20 States.

The YWCA magazine reporters, enlisted from national organizations, describe community efforts to better democratic practices in Detroit, where racial tension is ever present; in Grand Rapids, where hotels invite conventions on a no-discrimination platform; in San Francisco and Portland and Denver, and in San Diego, where there is a project to fit Indians, Mexicans, and Orientals into the schools on a mutually respectful basis. They report the work of the Councils of Church Women in the South; one council told its legislature that it expected laws against the desecration of the cross (by the Ku-Klux Klan) to be enforced. They report movements on college campuses to look at prejudices and do something about them. Finally the YWCA checks on its own efforts to square practice with preaching: a 1948 interracial workshop that brought together everybody who could offer guidance; a move to merge interracial branches, and the success of an American room set up in Oklahoma City to offer one, just one, pleasant place in which Negroes might lunch with their fellow workers of whatever race.

A review highlighting the spots of progress rather than the spots of reaction leads to one very important conclusion. The ferment is strong and is healthy. We must wait upon gradualism to change the ways of years. But gradualism is a relative term. Great forces of the day, the lessons of the war, the goals of the United Nations and of the President's Commission on Civil Rights, are speeding its pace. Two steps ahead for one step back seems now a realistic prospect.

Development of Missouri Basin Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in regard to the Hoover Commission Report on the Pick-Sloan plan, which was filed last week, together with certain excerpts from the report.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PICK-SLOAN PLAN CONDEMNED BY HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. President, the report which was filed with the Congress last week by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government contains a critical analysis of the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, referring to it as a sort of horrible example of extravagant waste and general bad administration.

For several years the Congress has been hearing warnings that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers, operating under the Pick-Sloan plan, have been pursuing a course in the Missouri Valley wasteful of money, wasteful of resources, and wasteful of the area's great potentialities. These warnings have heretofore been totally ignored, but now we find that the report filed last Thursday by the Hoover Commission and its task force on natural resources completely justifies all these warnings. The criticisms

of the Pick-Sloan plan in the Hoover Commission Report are even more devastating than anything which heretofore has been said.

The Commission and its task force, both composed of eminent citizens of both political parties, tell us that the Pick-Sloan plan is not a properly integrated plan at all; that there is serious question if the supposed agreement between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation—actually a fictitious front arrangement—is not more costly to the Nation than continued disagreement.

ENORMOUS WASTE

It is going to take a good deal of time for the committees of Congress to study the Commission's reports and act on them. Some may lay over from this Congress to the next. But the Hoover Commission Report on the Interior Department, as it points out the enormous, current, questionable expenditures in the Missouri Basin, should have our immediate attention. There are before the Congress right now proposals for appropriations, in pursuance of this arbitrary and recklessly concocted plan, totaling many, many millions of dollars. These expenditures would commit us to further appropriation of even larger sums.

As an example, we are now asked for money to proceed with Garrison and Gavins Point Dams, in the Dakotas. In the study which was submitted to us, there is a finding that "the public may very well question those parts of the Pick-Sloan project as economical expenditures. They represent an eventual investment estimated in January 1948, at about $218,000,000."

The study calls attention to the fact that, when originally justified, the Garrison Dam was defended on the basis of impounding water for farm and domestic use in the Dakotas. But in the compromise between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Dakota water diversion was transferred from the Garrison Reservoir up to Fort Peck, so the huge Garrison structure now has only the most vague sort of justification.

NO REAL PLAN

The Hoover Commission task-force study is actually an astounding document as a commentary on the sort of wildly extravagant program which has been put over on the Congress, and for which appropriations are now being sought. It is indeed a major congressional scandal.

The Hoover Commission tells us, in direct quotations from the study of the task force:

"The (interagency) committees have failed to solve any important aspects of the problem * * * because the dominant members, the corps and the Bureau, have been unwilling to permit interagency committees to settle their differences. The result has been neglect or avoidance by the committes of virtually all major areas of interagency conflict, and concentration instead on technical studies and publicity. * * *

"The development agencies sometimes compromise their differences. After sharp clashes over plans for the development of the Missouri Basin, the corps and the Bureau announced complete agreement on the Pick-Sloan plan. Analysis of that plan reveals the fact that it contains many projects which previously had been subjected to devastating criticism by one or the other agency. The compromise consisted for the most part in a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other. The result is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious question in this case whether agreement between the two agencies is not more costly to the public than disagreement."

The case study in substantiation of this statement is specific on a large number of matters involved in the Pick-Sloan scheme now before us. I have told you of the comments on Garrison and Gavins Point Dams. There is another analysis of the water supply for all the things that the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation propose.

Mr. President, those of us who advocate an MVA program for several years have warned that there is not enough water in the river for both the Sloan upper basin plan and the Pick plan for a flowing navigation channel. The study filed with us indicates that there may be water deficits even larger than we had anticipated. It points out that private irrigation, industrial use, and soil conservation may require much larger amounts of water than heretofore estimated. In that event, the expenditure of $6,300,000,000 for both the Sloan plan for upstream uses of the water, and the Pick plan for a flowing navigation channel, would be even more ridiculous than anyone has claimed up to this time.

Mr. President, the eminent gentlemen who conducted this study and prepared this report constitute a nonpartisan group of nationally recognized experts in the field of conservation and use of our natural resources. They are Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, Chairman; Ralph Carr, former Governor of Colorado; John Dempsey, former Governor of New Mexico; Horace Albright, former Director of the National Park Service; Donald H. McLaughlin, president of the Homestake Mining Corp.; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Gilbert White, president of Haverford College; Prof. Samuel T. Dane, dean of the School of Forestry and Conservation, University of Michigan.

INVOLVES BILLIONS

Mr. President, the Pick-Sloan plan involves proposed expenditures of $6,300,000,000 or more. This part of the Hoover Commission Report relates to current and urgent matters, of great concern to all the people of the Missouri Basin, all the taxpayers of the Nation, and to the Congress. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that it should have widespread public circulation and study. I therefore ask that pertinent excerpts from the Hoover Commission's Natural Resources Task Force Study be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI BASIN RESOURCES—A CASE STUDY IN THE ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

(Excerpts from the Hoover Commission's Natural Resources Task Force Study)

BROAD PLANNING

The greater part of the agencies which are concerned with planning and operation in the [Missouri] basin act in terms of the authorized projects, with only passing reference to the likely economic and social pattern of the region. The Department of Agriculture should be commended for its insistence on planning, programing, and operation in terms of the rural economy as a whole, but no group as yet appears to be considering all aspects of the economy and society in an over-all valley program, and the relation of water and land resources to them. This is evident in the lack of any systematic plan for the development or encouragement of industry, industrial research on regional problems, or community planning. Yet diversification of opportunities for employment and opportunities for a better life for all classes in the region are very closely tied to such actions. Adequate consideration of them might even have changed some specifications for the engineering works. Even more important, there is no provision for continuing integrated action on these matters, which will become more real when the large engineering projects are completed. It would seem that regional conservation and development is not being looked upon as a dynamic process of indefinite duration, but is an emergency objective, which will drop out of focus until another emergency arises. A Department of Agriculture statement on one phase of the program might well be needed for the whole: "Making water available to a semidesert or subhumid area does not of itself guarantee successful development. Sound social and economic engineering is as essential to the success of such projects as is adequate engineering of the physical * * * plant."

IRRIGATION

These points emerge from the controversy concerning irrigation developments on the subhumid lands:

1. There is reasonable doubt as to the likelihood of farmer acceptance in the plannable future of irrigation in the subhumid areas, which comprise more than half of the proposed irrigated lands in the Missouri Basin. Therefore there is reasonable doubt as to the ability of the Federal Government to obtain eventual reimbursement for expenditure on the extensive works required.

2. There is some question whether the scope of the proposed irrigation program, particularly in the eastern section of the basin, can be justified as essential to the stabilization of the rural or the regional economy.

3. There is reasonable doubt as to the size of production increase which will result from the application of irrigation.

4. There are not sufficient basic data at hand to form a valid judgment as to the desirability of developing the large irrigation projects authorized for the subhumid areas of the Missouri Basin.

5. It is entirely possible that the funds required for development of these subhumid irrigation projects would yield greater benefits in terms of increased agricultural commodity production (possibly many times) if they were directed otherwise. Among the possibilities which may be mentioned are (a) land drainage in humid sections; (b) seed-improvement programs; (c) supplemental irrigation in humid areas more likely to accept irrigation; and (d) production of food yeasts.

NAVIGATION

The present navigation-channel plans call for a 9-foot channel from Sioux City to the river mouth. The amount of flow necessary to maintain this channel during the navigation season is not known exactly, but the figures most generally used are Corps of Engineers estimates of a discharge of about 30,000 cubic feet per second at Yankton, S. Dak., or 35,000 cubic feet per second at Kansas City. However, the Geological Survey records from 1929 to 1942 show a mean annual discharge at Yankton of only 21,780 cubic feet per second. On this basis Bureau of Reclamation testimony before a House committee in 1944 definitely suggested that the needs of both irrigation and navigation as planned could not be served consistently. * * *

The further elements which should be considered in judgment on the water supply leaving the upper basin are:

1. Beneficial use may very well include industrial demands and general community needs considerably greater than amounts now devoted to them. * * *

2. The Department of Agriculture considers the proposed irrigation development to be only part of eventual additions to the basin's irrigated lands. * * *

3. Treatment and management of all land in the basin for soil conservation and on-the-

spot water conservation, as proposed by the Department of Agriculture, may reduce the stream discharge of the upper basin. * * *

Under the circumstances it appears entirely possible that dependable navigation facilities, ensuring attainment of the objectives sought by the people of the lower basin, and at the same time giving the people of the upper basin the water promised them under the 1944 and 1945 Flood Control Acts, will be obtained only by the construction of a slack-water channel with locks. Many works constructed for the open-water channel obviously will contribute little to a slack-water channel, and the need for the authorized big dams upstream will be affected.

ELECTRIC POWER

The total power possibilities of the basin may be considerably different from those contemplated in the Pick-Sloan plan. The studies of the Federal Power Commission indicate that the 1,600,000 kilowatts which the Pick-Sloan plan would provide is less than one-half of the total potential hydroelectric possibility of the Missouri Basin. The figure for potential installation is 5,000,000 kilowatts, from which an average annual generation of 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours could be expected.

WATER MANAGEMENT

There is no provision for unified management of water by the Federal and State agencies responsible for its use. The Corps of Engineers will control main-stem reservoirs from Fort Peck on downstream, managing them primarily for flood control and navigation, if they are to discharge their principal responsibilities. The Bureau of Reclamation will control most of the remaining dams, particularly on the tributaries, but they will contain space for flood storage and in certain cases may be also used for navigation purposes, so that operations for these and other purposes will require some regional center of unified control. These will be managed with priority for irrigation. Although both sets of reservoirs certainly are going to produce power, it is not unlikely that there will be waste water which could be avoided with a single management of all Federal facilities in the basin.

Lack of coordinated water management is also a feature of concern in the development of ground-water supplies. * * *

ENGINEERING

At the time when the needs for irrigation, navigation, and flood control on the Missouri were being debated publicly by the agencies which later developed a combined plan, two features of the present authorized flood-control works were called into serious question. W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified before a Senate Commerce Subcommittee hearing concerning the large Garrison Dam in North Dakota, now under construction:

"It is unnecessary * * * not worth the expenditure * * * floods can be adequately controlled without it * * * (it) floods out 50,000 acres of irrigable land, including 20,000 acres in an irrigation project just completed at a cost well over $1,000,000."

It may also be noted that the earlier exhaustive engineering report on the Missouri by the Corps of Engineers also eliminated Garrison as a practical site for construction.

On the Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota Sloan offered similar conclusions:

"We think the Gavins Point Dam is unnecessary. * * * It is very expensive for the benefits to be derived. * * * As a power proposition the cost per kilowatt-hour is some 30 to 40 times the cost at any other dam. * * * As a regulator its capacity is so small that all it does is to regulate daily flows and no seasonal flows. * * * It has no flood-control value and practically no value to navigation. * * * We recommend the elimination."

Although the reconciliation of the Pick and Sloan plans, which includes both dams, may be considered a tacit approval of the two on Mr. Sloan's part, his opinion concerning the need for them has never been retracted publicly. The only explanation offered of the reconciliation approval was made by H. D. Comstock in 1945, region 6, director for the Bureau of Reclamation, who is reported as saying:

"When the Bureau opposed the Garrison and Gavins Point Dams there was no complete program. When we reached an agreement we withdrew from the fields of flood control and navigation. We shall be the sole judge of requirements for reclamation. If the Army engineers say those dams are required for their functions, we have no opinion."

The Garrison Dam was justified in the original Pick plan primarily as a reservoir for storage of water to be diverted into the Dakotas for farm and domestic use. This plan, however, was shelved in the reconciliation document, and the Dakota water diversion is to be made from the Fort Peck Reservoir. The Garrison Dam was justified in the reconciliation document only with very general reference to flood control, navigation, irrigation, and silt collection to prolong the life of downstream reservoirs.

The Garrison issue was not laid entirely to rest with the reconciliation. A later controversy arose over the dam's height, which finally had to be settled in Congress. The dam was originally scheduled to operate at a pool level of 1,850 feet above sea level. As it is finally to be constructed, foundations will be laid for a dam capacity of operating at the 1,850-foot level, but the reservoir actually will not be permitted to operate above a 1,830-foot pool level. This hardly seems an economical procedure.

In view of the conflicting engineering opinions on the value of the Garrison and Gavin's Point Dams, the lack of detailed justification for their construction, and the incompleteness of integrated flood-control investigations in the basin, the public may very well question those parts of the Pick-Sloan project as economical expenditures. They represent an eventual investment estimated in January 1948 at about $218,000,000.

TROUBLES AHEAD

The questions on water which thus far remain unanswered are matters of special concern to the people of the region, and may lead them into later difficulty which will dwarf their past water controversies. As matters stand the uncertainties are approximately as follows:

(a) Navigation or irrigation water?

(a) The present storage system will not provide adequate water for the authorized irrigation works, and the authorized navigation channel during an extended dry period.

(b) In the event of conflicting demands for the same water, Federal statute promises priority to upstream interests.

(c) The discharge, or storage available for release during dry periods may actually be less than now calculated, because:

1. Total additions to irrigated area may be larger than those now proposed.

2. Industrial and other needs may cause withdrawals not now calculated.

3. Water retardation operations may lessen stream discharge.

(d) More water may be needed for navigation (to supply the 12-foot channel) than now estimated (for the 9-foot channel), if the benefits of competitive water transportation are to be given the lower valley.

Accordingly, in the event that the uncertain water supplies are ignored and navigation facilities are developed, and traffic assumes the proportions promised in official documents, there almost certainly will follow a legal contest to test the constitutionality of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment when drought comes. The prospect of this eventuality can only serve to generate a feeling of insecurity on the part of prospective water users in the upper basin, and in the end might result in unusable developments having been made in the upper basin, should the decision be in the lower basin's favor.

(b) Who takes account of industrial water needs?

Under the plans presented, the decisions made and the actions taken, the provision for industry is not entirely clear. First, its position as a water user is not completely secure. If west of the ninety-eighth meridian, it is given preference in water use over navigation by the amendment, but that cannot be considered fully secure. Then also, what are its rights if conflict arises between it and other beneficial consumptive use within the upper basin? Furthermore, since the dams are to be managed for irrigation, flood control, and navigation, what assurance of firm power is there during extended dry periods? Attractions to industry in the upper basin are not at their best, so long as these uncertainties prevail, and that may be considered a definite loss to the people of the basin as a whole.

(c) How much will irrigators and other water users pay for their water?

The financial obligations of prospective water users in the Dakotas and Nebraska are not by any means clear, in spite of the estimates issued on amounts reimbursable. There is a possibility that the costs per acre may be much higher than those estimated. It is by no means certain that the net amount of land finally irrigated on the Nebraska-Dakotas projects will be as large as estimated in the Pick-Sloan plans. The amount of class I land in the proposed projects is unknown, and the extent of farmers' acceptance of irrigation is unknown, although some indications provide a pessimistic outlook. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the amount of good land which will actually be placed under water will be much less than that inferred in the general statistics on reimbursement. The capital-cost obligations of these good lands may be very high. It has been estimated that in Nebraska they may run as high as $500 an acre, if power contributions cannot offer material assistance. The Bureau of Reclamation itself estimates the irrigation repayment cost of one Kansas project at $263 per acre. Clearly, then prospective water users have some reason for a feeling of insecurity in the present outlook.

(d) What will power rates be?

One of the reasons, from a regional point of view, for the investment of huge sums in water development, is the opportunity for obtaining cheap power. Improvement of rural living conditions, and particularly the attraction of industry are closely dependent on it. The relative cheapness of the probable power available is not yet assured, however. It is to be noted that the greater part of the large power-producing projects will be under Corps of Engineers control, to which the following provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 apply:

Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread

use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. * * * Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery * * * of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. * * *

Since power's share of capital costs is going to be high, along with all other costs, and the provisions of the 1944 act are adhered to, one of two eventualities seems likely: (a) Power rates will not be low, or at least attractively low to industry in comparison with rates elsewhere; or (b) there will be little surplus revenue to assist in reimbursement for irrigation developments.

REGIONAL INTERESTS

It must be admitted that the programs are not ideal, that the job will not be completed even when present programs have been fully implemented, and that seeds of contention and difficulty will be left which may spring to life at any time. These are all matters of special concern to the people of the valley.

1. Over-all responsibility and initiative: The most conspicuous missing parts from the region's point of view are: (a) A means of considering the over-all social and economic objectives of the region (toward which all present effort should be directed); a means of evaluating the several programs in relation to those objectives; and an instrument for integrating the programs on some basis other than Federal agency compromise. (b) A means of continuing consideration of regional development and conservation problems, prepared for study, recommendation, and action on them as they arise.

It may be maintained that the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee answers these needs. Only a far stretch of the imagination could fit it into this role. Among the reasons why it should not be considered adequate are:

(a) It has no authority, other than the separate delegations made to the agencies and States represented on the committee. It therefore has no capacity for decision, and any controversial issue must be referred by the separate channels to Washington for decision there. It has no staff for the study of problems concerning two or more of the programs.

(b) It does not have an over-all social and economic program, nor the means of formulating one in its present composition.

(c) Stabilizing the economy and improving living conditions for the region involves more than is embraced in the present problems. A stabilized income and social structure will not be provided on the plains by irrigation alone because its effects cannot possibly touch the major part of the most susceptible dry-farming and ranching area remote from the large projects. This committee is not equipped to carry on the continuing research on industrial engineering problems relating to the development of raw materials, processing, plant-site location, employment, or the many other phases of a program of industrial encouragement. There is no provision for undertaking the complex task of balancing manufacturing and agriculture in the valley.

(d) The committee is not at present an agency for anticipating general problems, it is a forum for harmonizing established programs.

From one important point of view, then, the people of the Missouri Basin are not receiving all that might be provided for them at slight, if any, extra cost to the Nation beyond that now planned. In its present organization the Federal Government is not designed to provide either a temporary or a continuing agency for consideration of overall social and economic problems in the Missouri Valley, while the States concerned have not yet shown themselves temperamentally inclined or financially able to support one. * * *

ONE AGENCY NEEDED

The present system may also be criticized because there is no single administrative center in the region which can take leadership in pulling together the many segments for a comprehensive resources program for the entire basin. The State membership on the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, together with the public hearings procedure used by that committee, do not meet the need fully. They do not assure a basin-wide and active consciousness that the basin is a unit for coordinated management, despite the admission of informed public officials that it should be so regarded. The really important plans and decisions are made by separate Federal agencies responsible to a Washington desk or by the Congress or the President. Thus the present organization encourages centralization and the habits of dependence on centralized authority and largesse. A more unified organization in the basin should mitigate these tendencies.

One may raise doubts about the validity of the principal defense of the present organization of programs in the Missouri Basin (i. e., it is the most democratic procedure possible). Another more unified organization with less centralized agency responsibility, and more regional responsibility might presumably adhere more closely to the spirit of democracy in some respects, and probably would operate more efficiently.

American Workers Hurt by Low-Paid Foreign Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the misnamed reciprocal trade treaties in practice have no reciprocity. Foreign, cheaply made products of low-paid foreign labor are brought into this country with import duties so low that American labor must lower its standard of living or such American-labor-produced products must go off the market.

The fishing industry and the handmade glass industry are some of the most outstanding examples. The recent hearings held by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries show that the payment to labor of foreign-produced fish is not as much as that paid to American labor for fish production. In the Great Lakes area the pay to foreign labor on imported fish is nearly 40 percent less than that paid to American fishermen and with correspondingly low labor rates on foreign fish imported from salt waters.

These hearings have shown what a blow the executive side of the Government is dealing to the oldest American industry, especially to the tens of thousands of American workers engaged in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government should investigate this attack on labor engaged in the American fishing industry; especially should the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Tariff Commission, and I have introduced the following resolution calling upon them to report to Congress their investigation of this matter before May 15 of this year.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the fishing industry is an important part of the economy of the United States; and

Whereas the growing population of the Nation emphasizes the increasing future importance of fish as a food; and

Whereas the men and equipment of the fishing fleets and the shore workers engaged in the preparation of the catches, and the food resource thereby made available, have been demonstrated in two world wars to be necessary to the national defense; and

Whereas operations of much of the fishing industry have been seriously curtailed by reason of steadily growing imports of fish and fishery products, particularly of fresh and frozen fish, and there is reason to believe that similar conditions are imminent in the tuna industry on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas if the present trend is permitted to continue, the fishing industry will, within a short time, be so impaired as to force out of business a major portion of the fishing fleet of the United States and force out of employment a major portion of the workmen employed in various phases of the industry; and

Whereas the domestic fishing industry has already been adversely affected and is further seriously threatened by the consistently increasing importations of fish and fishery products into the United States; and

Whereas the imported fish are caught by workmen whose wage scale and standard of living are far below those of Americans in like occupations; and

Whereas notwithstanding the resulting lower cost of fish in their primary foreign market, the finally processed product is sold to the American housewife at the same price as the domestic fish; and

Whereas representatives of the fishing industry and others from many parts of the United States recently appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and attested to the facts hereinbefore stated; and

Whereas the foregoing indicates the need for an immediate study, examination and investigation of the causes and effects that will result in the serious impairment of the oldest and one of the most important food-producing industries in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Tariff Commission be, and they hereby are, directed to make an immediate study of the effect on the domestic fishing industry of the increasing imports of fresh and frozen fish, to report to the Congress the effects covering such importation of fresh and frozen fish, its effect upon the American fishing industry, the means whereby the American fishing industry may survive against the importation of low-labor cost, foreign caught and foreign processed fish; and further, by reason of the fact of testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries describing the present conditions with reference to the importation of fresh and frozen fish and processed fish on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and the fresh waters of the Great Lakes, the Department of State, Department of Commerce, and the Tariff Commission are requested to make their report to the Congress thereon not later than the 15th day of May 1949.

Hon. John Kee

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while we are all deeply grieved at the death of our old friend Sol Bloom, but with his passing on we are pleased that the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has succeeded him as chairman of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hold in my hand a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 33 adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia expressing the pleasure of that great legislative body on the designation of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Concurrent resolution concerning the appointment of the Honorable JOHN KEE to the chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives

Whereas West Virginia has been honored by the appointment of the Honorable JOHN KEE, a Member of Congress from the Fifth West Virginia Congressional District, to the chairmanship of the important Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives as the successor of the late Sol Bloom; and

Whereas Mr. KEE is now serving his ninth consecutive term as a Member of the Congress and has ably and capably represented his district and country during these crucial years in the history of the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. KEE prior to his service in the Congress was a leading member of the bar in West Virginia, active in all civic and public affairs, a leader in his political party, and prior to his election to the Congress served as a member of the West Virginia State Senate; Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That the Members of the West Virginia Legislature have learned of this appointment with great pleasure, commend the Nation on securing the services of this distinguished citizen of West Virginia in this highly important position, and congratulate Representative KEE on this signal honor which he has by long and faithful service won for himself and for his State.

Communist Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 4, 1949:

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

Throughout the world, the Communists have issued a new manifesto, the gist of which is that in the event of war between Russia and the United States they would take their stand with Russia.

There is really nothing surprising in this declaration. It always has been known that Communists recognize no loyalty other than allegiance to Russia and the dictates of the Kremlin. But, as we pointed out recently, there may be some significance in the fact that they chose this particular time to give advance notice of their intention to commit treason.

First there was the statement by Maurice Thorez that French Communists would welcome the Red Army as a liberator in the event of war between the East and West. This was followed by the declaration of Palmiro Togliatti that Italian Communists would aid the Russian Army if it ever chased "an aggressor" onto Italian soil.

Then Harry Pollitt said British Communists would try to sabotage any imperialist aggressive war against Russia. Next Wilhelm Pieck and Otto Grotewohl accused the West of preparing for war against Russia and declared that German Communists must fight the aggressors and support the Soviet Army in its effort to create peace. The Austrian Communists also joined the refrain that they would support the Soviet Union.

And now the American Communist Party, whose leaders are on trial on the charge of conspiring to overthrow the United States Government by force, have announced that they, too, would oppose an unjust, aggressive, and imperialist war. Of course any war against Russia, even one in self-defense against a Russian sneak attack, would be unjust, aggressive, and imperialist, according to the Communist Party line.

Last May, William Z. Foster, national chairman of the American Communist Party, made virtually the same statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee which had under consideration the Mundt-Nixon bill to regulate and control Communist activities in the United States.

Are the Communists trying to scare somebody? They can't do it by announcing what everyone already knew, namely, that they would betray their native countries the first time the opportunity arose.

It is difficult to understand what Moscow is up to. The United States has no intention of starting a war with Russia, but the American people are concerned about their ability to defend themselves in case Russia starts a war.

The Communists may be preparing in advance their alibis for engaging in treason, on the supposition that Russia soon will take some aggressive action in the cold war, or perhaps they are merely trying to dissuade some of the nations of western Europe from joining the projected North Atlantic defense pact.

Readying a Scapegoat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of March 30, 1949:

READYING A SCAPEGOAT?

Businessmen and consumers (in other words, the people) were warned by the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers of the President, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, that they could hurt the economic situation in the coming year by their attitude toward the changing economic picture.

Economist Nourse took both sides of the question saying, on the one hand, that "conditions are sound and basically favorable" and, on the other, that he had no intention of "fooling the public with an assertion that there are no perils in the economic situation today. As a matter of fact," he continued, "I think the year 1949 will present very sober and serious responsibilities to the American people, both in its private business agencies and in its public policies and actions."

He then went on to suggest that panic on the part of the people could spoil the future prospect and said that was the real danger in the situation.

It seems that Dr. Nourse is offering a rebuttal in advance. If the economic situation is deteriorating, the people cannot be blamed for that nor can they be blamed in advance for whatever further deterioriation occurs. The American people are fundamentally optimistic. They do not panic nor do they succumb to pessimism without cause. The world's greatest nation was not built on pessimism and it is not maintained in panic. When the American people do feel fear, when they do retrench, when their confidence is challenged, these reactions stem from fundamental stimuli and the control of factors capable of arresting their inherent optimism lies far more in the hands of their leaders than in themselves.

If a climate of confidence, optimism, expansion, and productivity is what Dr. Nourse wants in order to maintain a high level of economic health the way to encourage such a climate lies in not doing the things that worry the people.

A government does not encourage its people when it burdens them with the heaviest tax load in their peacetime experience and then threatens them with even more taxes; it does not encourage its people when it spends more and more money for nonproductive governmental purposes in the face of a declining national income; it does not encourage its people when its leadership is alarmist, disunited, and contradictory; it does not encourage its people when it continually sponsors class antagonisms and wars against this group of the population and that, the while promising all things to all groups.

People do not collectively and suddenly decide that they will become discouraged or that they will panic. Always there must first be a set of definite circumstances so overriding that they can break down the people's natural optimism. When the concern is economic, in whose hands rests the power to create circumstances which can frighten the people? When the problems are economic who, by cowardice or inability, can panic the people by sidestepping them? The answer is, of course, the government.

Hon. James Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune in commendation of our former Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal.

It is an honor for me to have James Forrestal as a constituent, and I know his

legion of friends in our part of New York State are proud of his receiving the Distinguished Service Medal from President Truman. Yesterday the House Committee on Armed Services expressed their appreciation of the cooperation they have enjoyed with Mr. Forrestal. I am sure that all of the residents of the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York join with me in wishing Jim Forrestal the very best of everything, which he so rightly deserves.

The editorial follows:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

When President Truman pinned the Distinguished Service Medal—the Nation's highest civilian decoration—on the lapel of the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal stammered and was left speechless with surprise. The surprise will be shared by none of his countrymen. Mr. Forrestal has rendered both difficult and highly distinguished service to the Nation. Even more than that, perhaps, he has stood as a prototype of the kind of public servant—highly competent, trained in business administration, understanding the strengths and needs of an enterprise economy but at the same time willing to give all his talents to the complex tasks of modern government—which this country must continue somehow to enlist if it is to bring its full potentialities to bear upon the gigantic issues which confront it.

When Mr. Roosevelt, in 1940, summoned the president of Dillon, Read & Co. out of Wall Street to be one of his administrative assistants there was a considerable lifting of Leftish eyebrows. The only result was to prove that even Wall Street could contribute essential virtues to the efficient and nonpolitical conduct of the public business. Within a few weeks the administrative assistant had become the first Under Secretary of the Navy; within a year or so he was driving the gigantic programs of naval building to success and victory; in 1944 he was obviously the only possible successor to Mr. Frank Knox as Secretary of the Navy, and in 1947 he was the inevitable choice as first Secretary of Defense. The whole story of his patient yet firm and expert work in face of the incorrigible problems of unification has not yet been told; perhaps it never will be fully, but if it ever is, the Nation will realize that it owes a debt to this loyal administrator which even a Distinguished Service Medal can only partially acknowledge. It may also realize how badly it needs more like him.

Farewell Ceremonies to Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 29, 1949:

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee come to order.

Mr. Secretary Forrestal, this is not an ordinary committee meeting of the kind you have participated in so frequently in this room in the days that have gone by.

This is a special meeting. It is called for a specific purpose—to take official note of your retirement yesterday from your high office in the Government.

Mr. Secretary, you have a long and brilliant career. Much of it has been on the highest level of finance and industry. But it is in the service of your country, as a high official of our Government, that you have most singularly distinguished yourself among your fellow citizens.

I recall that on August 20, 1940, you assumed the office of the Under Secretary of the Navy. Much of the world was then at war. That was the time when the Nation as a whole—and the Congress and official Washington in particular—were beset on the one hand with the hope that this country could avoid war, and on the other hand, with the fear that we could not.

At that time, what did we have in the way of a Navy? When you became Under Secretary of the Navy, we had 1,058 vessels of all types, comprising 1,892,000 tons, of which 383 were combat vessels. We then had only 189,000 men in the entire Naval Establishment. This seemed a large force in those days.

It was then that your characteristic vision first became apparent. For in those troubled times, when the future was cloudy, you foresaw not only the scope but the very nature of the conflict in which we were to be so soon involved.

It was your foresight—and this is a matter of historical record—which resulted in the early plans for the procurement of large volumes of material and its construction into naval weapons.

It was your vision and the magnitude of the conflict just over the horizon that prompted the Navy to embark upon its huge construction program of 200 combatant ships at a cost of over $3,000,000,000.

This was a tremendous task then. And it was undertaken at a most difficult time. The results you achieved in the brief time remaining before hostilities bore fruit at a most critical time.

Then came Pearl Harbor. The blow, though serious, was not deadly due largely to your efforts of the preceding year. Due to your farsighted preparations, the Navy Department had been brought to a state of readiness where it could replace in part and repair sufficiently most of the losses and damage.

It was 8 months to the day after Pearl Harbor that the Navy struck back to check our enemy in the Pacific at a critical point in his advance. At Guadalcanal Navy ships and aircraft and Marines engaged the enemy in a ferocious contest. I well recall the Imperial Japanese Command proclaimed this engagement to be crucial.

The progress made in the short period of 8 months from the disaster of Pearl Harbor to the grim struggle at Guadalcanal is a measure of the amazing achievements for which you are in large part responsible.

Two years later, on May 19, 1944, when we were saddened by Secretary Knox's untimely death, you became Secretary of the Navy.

The war was now reaching a climax. Two and one-half years of warfare had passed and the organized might of American industry had reached that astonishing and irresistible height which foretold victory.

In the short space of 4 years since you first took office in the Navy Department, the Navy had grown from 189,000 men to 3,600,000, from 383 combat vessels to 1,500 combat vessels, and from 1,058 vessels of all types, comprising 1,892,000 tons, to more than 40,000 vessels, aggregating more than 10,000,000 tons.

This was a phenomenal accomplishment—a tribute to American ingenuity, enterprise, and determination, and especially a tribute to your painstaking and farsighted efforts as Under Secretary of the Navy.

So you, as the new Secretary of the Navy, with the production problem already in hand, your concern was mainly one of governing, administering, and directing the full force of the flood of naval weapons and sailors to use them, which were pouring out in a steady stream against our enemy across two oceans and reaching out to many lands.

During this time the great sea battles of the Pacific were undertaken. The campaigns of the Carolinas and the Mariannas and others were prelude to the greatest sea battle in the history of the world. It was your privilege, Mr. Secretary, to be head of the Navy Department at the time of the battle of Leyte Gulf, where the opposing sea power was decisively defeated. You were fortunate, indeed, to see the culmination of your thought and efforts in the brilliant accomplishment of our fighting forces and the final surrender of our enemy on the deck of the battleship *Missouri*.

Yes, it was your responsibility and high historic privilege to guide the destiny of the largest Navy in all the history of man—probably the largest Navy ever again to be seen.

And it was likewise your responsibility to direct the expenditure of much of the $118,000,000,000 appropriated for the Navy since July 1940. And never, not once, in all these difficult years was there any criticism of the administration of these vast funds.

This is truly a great record of which you have every right to be proud, and for which the Nation may be everlastingly grateful.

Mr. Secretary, in the years I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and more recently, this committee, a number of great and distinguished Americans have held the office of the Secretary of the Navy. Let me name a few to recall to our minds the great character and ability this country must recruit from its citizens to fill the office of the head of one of our military departments.

Josephus Daniels, of North Carolina, a gentleman and patriot, forthright and vigorous, was the first I knew, and he left a large mark in the history of the Navy.

Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts, was another who brought great talent and high character to this office.

And Claude Swanson, of Virginia, was a statesman and administrator of notable vigor and integrity.

Mr. Secretary, I deem it a privilege to say that you have every right to be numbered in the distinguished company of these great citizens, who have given so much of themselves to the country through their task of governing the Navy Department.

It is, in fact, a fair statement, Mr. Secretary, that you have assumed and performed with distinction duties far transcending in responsibility any heretofore undertaken by any previous Navy Secretary in the history of our great Nation.

That you filled the office in such critical and momentous days would be honor enough for any man.

That you filled the office with such outstanding success entitles you to distinction and recognition far beyond that attainable by more than few men in our history.

Certainly your attainments will have lasting influence on the Navy, on the National Military Establishment, on the Nation as a whole—influence working to the Nation's advantage far into the future.

With the end of the war, not only the Navy but the other services as well were confronted by other great problems.

The lessons of the war had to be applied quickly while they were still fresh in all minds.

Certainly the guiding principle of the war was that of teamwork.

So acutely had you become aware of this that it was due in large measure to your

efforts that the Congress enacted the National Security Act of 1947.

Then, on September 17 of that year, you became this country's first Secretary of Defense.

The task you then undertook, and from which you have just departed, was that of welding our armed forces into an effective team.

Assuredly this has not been and is not today an easy task.

And as all of us know who have dealt with these matters, such a task cannot be accomplished over night.

Your efforts as Secretary of Defense have been highly successful.

They have resulted in notable and meritorious progress—progress which others less gifted with administrative acumen, patience, and vision would have found wholly impossible.

In view of all of these significant events in which you have played so commanding a role, we want it long remembered and permanently recorded here that your outstanding talents and accomplishments on the highest levels of our Government have been appreciated and valued highly by this committee and the Congress.

Your wise counsel and devoted service have been a tower of strength in aiding the old Naval Affairs Committee and this committee in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Mr. Secretary, on behalf of the committee, I present you this token of our high esteem. Engraven upon it you will find our names in testimony of our regard. That regard is also indelibly inscribed in our hearts.

We will miss you, Mr. Secretary. [Applause.]

(Presentation made.)

Secretary FORRESTAL. Mr. Chairman, I am too much overcome by what I consider to be a very gracious and a very moving testimonial of your friendship and of those deeper feelings that come from the heart.

I should like to say for the record, however, without venturing to contradict the rhetoric of the chairman, that that tribute which he gave should properly be directed to himself and to the members of this committee because it was the unfailing zeal, the high intelligence, and the continuing zest for work which really built the American Navy and which under the chairmanship of Mr. VINSON will also build the defense forces under the unification which I know will be ably guided by Colonel Johnson, my successor.

I am much too moved to go into a longer appreciation for this most generous and exceptional act. I thank you deeply. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, Secretary Forrestal, and fellow Americans, often I have thought, now I know I was born to be an anticlimax. But as a member of the minority I wish to say on their behalf and I am sure it is the sentiment of every member of this committee that we wholeheartedly concur in the very fine, noble, and well-deserved comments of our distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, in regard to James Forrestal.

Loquacious as I might be at times, those who know me best I think will agree I am not prone to flattery or addicted to fulsomeness, but I can't refrain from saying on this occasion which is both pleasant and sad that in my own personal opinion James Forrestal is the perfect example of the highest type of public servant. After spending a year at Dartmouth and 3 years at Princeton, he learned a little about zinc and more about tobacco. He is one of those awful investment bankers. But when the First World War came on he quit his lucrative job and went into the service I think as a seaman second class. He came out a naval aviator. He served his country well in war as he has in peace. He came up the hard way, as a poor boy, to become president of Dillon, Read & Co. He was selected by the President of the United States in 1940 to come as his executive assistant to Washington.

Grand are the names of our military and naval and air officers who were at the guns. We should not forget the men back of the guns and back of the men behind the guns. I think through the terrible, trying years of the war much of the credit for our victory should go to the Under Secretaries: Bob Patterson, Jim Forrestal, and Jack McCloy. They did a marvelous job. They did it so well that two of them were made the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy following their illustrious predecessors.

Nobly and ably as they served their country during war, I want to say that following the war in this most difficult period of transition the first Secretary of National Defense will always be remembered for the outstanding job he did in a most difficult, complicated, and almost impossible position.

Jim Forrestal will forever be remembered by the members of this committee because of the admirable mixture of imperturbability and of daring that is in him. Always cool, calm, courteous, courageous, and kind, he has won a permanent place in all of our hearts.

We regret to see you leave, sir, because we have seen you literally wear yourself away at this job, working from early in the morning until late at night. The public doesn't know the agony through which you have gone. With all of these contending forces and conflicting interests, in an atmosphere of disputatious contentiousness you have labored. And I think you have brought forth something more than a mouse. I am sure that the success you have achieved has been due largely to the cooperation and the understanding of Secretary Royall, Secretary Sullivan, and Secretary Symington.

We need a natural, healthy rivalry among our armed forces. It is a good thing. But we do want to forget the little, petty jealousies, bickerings, and bitterness. We shall continue to strive for unity, cooperation, and solidarity.

You are going to be succeeded by a great American, an illustrious soldier. I think I am not out of order, Mr. Chairman, when I say that Louis Johnson will have the same consideration and the same cooperation from this committee which Mr. Forrestal has had. Certainly we have not always agreed with him. We have fought and battled. But the members of this committee are a big family. I happen to be No. 8 in a brood of 10 children at home. We used to fight and knock each other over and break the furniture, but whenever some stranger or outsider jumped on one of us kids he had the whole family to whip. We are not always going to agree in the future, but I can promise you this: We have the welfare of the Nation at heart and the security of this country uppermost in our minds and we want to do everything in our power to keep America strong and to contribute our share to the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

As you leave us, Mr. Secretary, we want to wish you continued success, which we know your clean and clear mind, your stout and honest heart, and your ready and able hands will achieve. We hope most of all that you will get just a little well-earned and well-deserved rest. We wish you the best of health and God speed in all your undertakings. That comes from our hearts. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. SHORT.

Now, members of this committee, I have the honor to present to you the new Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Johnson. [Applause.]

Secretary JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my friend, Jim Forrestal. To the limit of my knowledge, I subscribe to everything that has been said about Jim Forrestal's record. Of my own personal knowledge during these last 60 days—and, parenthetically, the only well-kept secret since it was known Jim was retiring is the fact that Jim and I have been working together, even the Pentagon didn't find out about that until it was announced—during that 60 days in which I came to value Jim Forrestal's friendship, I came to value, too, a keen, incisive mind, one of the best analytical minds I have ever come to know. I have come to treasure the love of America, with the friendship between us that has now developed, that prompted him to help me get started on this job. I know I can do a little better job from this 60 days of intensive effort on Jim Forrestal's part to indoctrinate me.

I am glad to come before this committee, Mr. Chairman, and bear testimony to my affection for Jim Forrestal, but more importantly to bear testimony to the debt of gratitude I owe for his patience with me in this past 60 days. I haven't the gift of words of your brilliant testimonial. It is one of the finest things I have ever heard. I don't have round phrases like your colleague on your left used. I don't come from a family of 10. There were only six of us. We had the same sort of experiences.

I want the privilege of coming before this committee when you don't send for me sometimes and with the doors shut just talk about some of the problems that Jim leaves for me.

And, lastly, I want to say that there are things that will happen in the Pentagon in the next 3 or 4 weeks, a month or two, and the headlines will probably say Louis Johnson did this or that. I want you to know—for instance, there are two announcements that we will make at the press conference today on reorganizational matters and the headlines will say Louis Johnson did that—that those things are the results of studies that go back for months under the direction of Jim Forrestal and all that happened is they weren't quite ready to be announced before Jim came out over there and the credit is really Jim's.

I want to say further, sir, my affection for him and my appreciation for the foundation he laid is so great that never knowingly will there be a word come out of the Pentagon against the great record of Jim Forrestal. [Applause.]

Secretary FORRESTAL. If I might, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to the men who are seated behind me: Secretary Royall, of the Army, who has given the most devoted and loyal service; Secretary of the Navy Mr. Sullivan; and Secretary of the Air Force Mr. Symington, whose zeal and high devotion to his beliefs will be a lasting tribute to his record. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. May I assure the distinguished new Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Johnson, that I know I speak for all of the committee when I say we will welcome at all times counsel and advice. And we will be calling on you and no doubt you will be calling on us, and we will try to work with one objective in view: The best interests of our great country.

Mr. SHORT. I think we overlooked just one thing, Mr. Chairman. I am sure our professional staff, who worked so closely with you, Mr. Secretary, and with all the other Secretaries here, as well as our office force, will heartily agree with everything Mr. VINSON and myself have said.

Secretary FORRESTAL. To your staff, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. Chairman, both the committee and the military services are very deeply

indebted. They have made a very great contribution of intelligence and perception and work to the efforts of your committee and to the accomplishments of the military services.

Mr. SHORT. We think we have the best staff on the Hill.

Federal Control of Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Control of Schools," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat the week of March 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CONTROL OF SCHOOLS

Two bills, which would provide $335,000,000 annually for Federal aid to education, have been approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. One of the measures is the controversial school-aid proposal designed to equalize school opportunities in the States. The other is an appropriation bill to give $35,000,000 a year to check on the health of school children.

The Federal school-aid bill appears to have the support of nearly all of the southern Members of Congress. This is to be expected. No one is inclined to snub Santa Claus. The South is the section of this country which will receive the greatest benefit from Federal aid. The National Education Association and allied groups, which are supporting the bill, insist that the Southern States are economically unable to support adequate schools.

This argument, however, falls of its own weight. Texas and North Carolina, for example, cannot be called poor States. Yet together they would receive $41,500,000 under the distribution formula—which is approximately one-seventh of the entire amount. Alabama is another Southern State which has made rapid advances in industrial development during and since the war. Alabama, under the formula, would receive $19,390,000, and pay back in Federal taxes about $3,734,000. Kentucky certainly would resent being designated as a have-not State, yet Kentucky would receive $16,120,000 and pay back in taxes about $3,595,000.

On the other hand, as Missouri's Senator KEM points out, this State would receive about $4,000,000 in Federal aid and would pay out in taxes approximately $8,000,000 annually, a net loss of $4,000,000. In short, Missouri taxpayers would be required to help pay the cost of public-school education in the South, largely because the taxpayers of those States are unwilling to pay enough in local taxes to maintain proper standards in their schools.

The grave danger for the schools in every State is the threat of Federal control over education. It is as dangerous a fallacy to assume that Federal control of the purse strings does not mean Federal control, as it is to assume that Federal aid to schools will be limited in the future to $300,000,000 a year. The plain lesson of experience is that there is no such thing as a little pump priming. Once the precedent is set for Federal aid, there will be increasing demands for larger and larger appropriations until ultimately the Federal Government will be expected to carry the major part of the load. When this happens, if not before, Federal control of education will be inevitable.

Red Letter Man Hates Our Letters, But His Novel Wasn't Very Novel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Victor Lasky, World-Telegram staff writer, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on March 26, 1949:

RED LETTER MAN HATES OUR LETTERS, BUT HIS NOVEL WASN'T VERY NOVEL

Burly, voluble Alexander Fadeyev, who heads the Soviet delegation at the Waldorf-Astoria peace conference, achieved international attention last August when he described American literature as "reactionary waste paper" and swing music as "contemporary St. Vitus dance."

A writer himself—he has written two novels—Mr. Fadeyev accused leading American and European authors of breeding war propaganda. He mentioned by name Eugene O'Neill, John Dos Passos, T. S. Eliot, James Farrell, Jean Paul Sartre, and Andre Malraux.

"If hyenas could type and jackals could use fountain pens," he told the Polish-sponsored intellectual congress, "they would write such things."

EVEN HE ERRED

Mr. Fadeyev, as secretary general of the Union of Soviet Writers, is commander in chief of the well-disciplined army of Soviet literary folk. But even this top post did not save him recently from humiliation.

He was forced to rewrite completely his best-selling novel, Young Guard, after Pravda accused him of political heresies. And Mr. Fadeyev made the following confession:

"I quite agree with the criticism of the novel. I agree, not as a matter of form, but because I deeply understand the essence of this criticism."

TYPICAL RED AUTHOR

He went on to say that he would "attentively and lovingly" revise his novel to make it correspond to the "high demands of the party and the Soviet people."

Mr. Fadeyev thus typifies the Soviet man of letters—love of bureaucracy, servility, and what apparently is an almost paranoiac hatred of Western culture.

Mr. Fadeyev was born in Vilna in 1901, the son of a country doctor. He left a business school to join the Communist movement and between 1919 and 1921 fought with the Red Army against the White Russians and Japanese. After attending a mining school, he published his first novel, which was translated into English as The Nineteen. It dealt with Mr. Fadeyev's war experiences.

According to Dwight MacDonald, editor of Politics, Mr. Fadeyev then became a leading figure in the Association of Proletarian Writers (Rapp) and crusaded with fanaticism for Socialist realism.

His Young Guard, the story of Soviet partisan resistance to the Nazis, has sold more than 1,000,000 copies and won the coveted Stalin prize. But it was in December 1948, 3 years after he had written Young Guard, that he was forced to rewrite it.

MADE INTO MOVIE

Young Guard was made into a movie, whose musical accompaniment was composed by Dmitri Shostakovich, another Soviet delegate to the peace conference here.

Only recently Mr. Fadeyev led the public inquisition of several Soviet drama criticis. It seems they had not denounced with sufficient fervor the bourgeois-liberal play All My Sons, last year's Pultizer prize winner.

All My Sons was written by an American—Arthur Miller. Mr. Miller is a fervent sponsor of the Waldorf peace parley. Observers are awaiting with interest the moment when Mr. Fadeyev is introduced to Mr. Miller.

Tragic Conditions of Our National Fauna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a translation from Spanish of an article entitled "Tragic Conditions of Our National Fauna," by Julio Estrada, which appeared in the January 1949 issue of Cazador, Mexican outdoors magazine and official organ of the Federation of Hunting, Shooting, and Fishing of the Republic of Mexico, comprising over 300 sportsmen's clubs.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAGIC CONDITIONS OF OUR NATIONAL FAUNA

(By Julio Estrada)

The title of this article is painful.

I am certain that many will be shocked at seeing it in print and that it will cause others to protest, but a large majority will agree with me that it is an obvious statement and deserves most serious consideration by all hunters in the Republic, by our public authorities, and even by those who are interested in this sport.

For several months I have been tempted to write on this subject, but for one reason or another I had postponed it until now, because of the arrival of an American official mission from Washington, headed by Mr. Albert M. Day.

This mission will make investigations concerning the treaty on migratory birds in effect between the two countries and I have been honored with an invitation, together with other sportsmen of this city, to the various conferences that are being held on this topic.

American hunters are having trouble with their duck shooting because year after year the amount of birds of this species has greatly diminished, to such an extent that now the number of birds they may kill in 1 day is limited to only four and according to their laws they are only entitled to eight (in their possession).

Their hunting season has been limited to 30 days and, depending on the locality, the days suitable for this kind of shooting very often do not exceed 1 week, because these birds do not stop for a longer time on their way south.

As a consequence of these conditions, among other reasons, it has been imagined

that a frightful slaughter is going on in Mexico, because of the continuous reports they are getting in Washington, concerning the armadas that are systematically fired in the valley of Mexico, with the full knowledge and consent of the authorities, and to this date no steps have been taken, not even the most elementary ones, to stop this practice.

On the day this mission arrived, its members were interviewed and the newspapers of Mexico City published an article, with photographs, to the effect that the Government of our neighboring country was extremely satisfied with the way in which the international treaty on migratory birds had been complied with, and that the armadas had been completely abolished.

The statement made by the press can only be qualified as ridiculous because the foreign commissioners know that the armadas are fired, and to make us all appear even more ridiculous, a party of duck hunters, to which I belong, has leased the La Curva, La Fabrica, and Los Americanos lakes; among the members of this group well-known hunters such as Ramon Llano, lawyer Virgilio Galindo, Fransisco Gonzalez de la Vega, and the author of this article were present on the occasion I shall relate.

We had invited Mr. Day and his two companions Mr. Bennet and Mr. Gascoyne, and during the morning in which we were shooting an armada thundered right in these respectable gentlemen's faces, as if it had been prepared beforehand in order that they should fully realize our inefficiency to comply with the terms of the treaty that I have mentioned.

I was at my post (blind) with Dr. Bennet and I was horror-stricken when I heard the armada broadside, and also when he told me "Well, until (sic) I get to see what an armada is." A moment later the flocks of ducks the armada had started began to fly; an unavoidable confirmation of what had happened.

The readers may arrive at their own conclusions and imagine the opinion with which these gentlemen will return and make a report to the officials of their country who will undoubtedly be in a position to cause us a great deal of embarrassment.

The duck armadas as well as the use of (jacklighting) lanterns, the excessive abuses practiced by those living in rural districts, and unfortunately the continuous killing of the females of decreasing species of our Mexican fauna, has brought about a situation that now borders on tragedy.

And not only are we facing the appalling problem of the almost total extinction of our wild species, but these conditions have been extremely grave, and although many hunters realize it and bear it in mind, nothing, absolutely nothing has been done, neither by our officials, nor by the hunters, in order to avoid this calamity which has already made such great inroads.

I realize and imagine that our Government's problems are of great importance, and although it may seem harsh to say so, little does it care whether our descendants may have deer, ducks, or pigeons to shoot at * * * these are the actual facts.

Hunting laws are published but their observance is limited to whatever the hunters choose to do, or to the needs of a few wardens who in their zeal to comply with their duties may be carried to the extremes of quixotism.

San Luis Potosi, the source of white-tail deer in the Republic, so to say, and the State that undoubtedly had a larger amount of this species than any other, is today in conditions hardly possible to believe. I was in the capital of that State during the first week of December and I was astonished by being told by many hunters who are friends of mine that on several occasions when they were out hunting they had been unable to see a single male deer.

On the other hand many other unscrupulous hunters had killed some female deers.

One of my good friends returned from a hunting trip in the north, and told me how indignant he was to have seen a small truck loaded with two female "bura" deers that had been lanterned (sic); and I would never end if I were to investigate and seek evidence of such cases, and besides it being a bothersome task it would be courting trouble.

The critical moment has arrived in which radical measures must be taken, and as it seems that the proper authorities do not take the lead, it is therefore the duty of the hunters of this country to give this matter their most earnest consideration so that through them adequate means to this end are adopted, which, if put into effect at this time, will bring about a slight improvement of these conditions within 5 or 6 years, or probably 10. What does this mean? Simply that absolutely all of us, with certain exceptions, agree to a hunting prohibition for all "bura," white-tail, berrendo (spotted) and borrego deer, the latter two species being of course in more critical conditions than the former. The wild boar must also be included.

More than 300 clubs have been recently founded which belong to the National Hunting and Fishing Federation. In my opinion, these clubs perform their activities in a most excellent manner; they have kept their respective organizations perfectly well disciplined; the Government has granted us licenses to carry arms; it has made high velocity ammunition available to us, and we have enjoyed absolute freedom in the possession of the number of guns each of us may own. The only answer to this is that they have acted most honorably, a fact which our Government authorities should not fail to take into consideration, and it is with strict discipline and a most orderly manner they have taken advantage of the privileges that were granted them.

If this has been possible, why should not our federation take over the enforcement of hunting laws with the cooperation of the Hunting and Fishing Department by delegating to all the clubs of the Republic the facilities and responsibilities to do so. All this in view of the fact that they have given evidence of their union and discipline in their organization and shooting practice in their respective camps. Why not let them assume the obligation of enforcing hunting laws in their respective localities and decide on the hunting prohibitions they may consider necessary, which in my opinion should be a general prohibition for all the Republic or for a large portion of it, so that, as I have already mentioned, within a few years it may be possible to enjoy hunting again in a reasonable and just manner.

I sincerely believe that the suggestions that I am hereby making to all my fellow hunters of the Republic should deserve their serious consideration, and that we have, of course, our magazine Cazador which all can make use of to publish their opinions, to suggest and propose the measures that may be necessary with the definite purpose of putting a stop to the tragic conditions in which our national fauna now finds itself.

Cultural Parley Is Scored by Rabbi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on March 27, 1949:

CULTURAL PARLEY IS SCORED BY RABBI—ROSENBLUM SAYS RED DOCTRINE PRIESTS TURN LITTLE LAMBS INTO PROPAGANDA GOATS

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace was criticized for befuddling and deferring earnest efforts for the prevention of war by Rabbi William F. Rosenblum in a sermon in Temple Israel, 210 West Ninety-first Street, yesterday.

Other rabbis here preached on faith in democracy, promotion of world peace, biblical optimism and the renaissance of Hebrew culture.

Rabbi Rosenblum said he found it difficult to understand "how men of different faiths can make common cause with such individuals as the representatives of the Soviet and satellite nations, whose known plan to liquidate religion when communism comes to power is there for all to read in its manifestoes and for all to hear when its commissars get together."

"Unquestionably," Rabbi Rosenblum said, "the more trained and clever 'priests of the red doctrine' know that many artists, scientists and clergymen, once they leave their easels, laboratories, or pulpits, are so many 'litle lambs' of whom it is easy to make the 'goats'.

CITES PROPAGANDA SHEEP

"As for men like Shostokovich and his Russian fellow delegates, they may wish to be free and untrammeled intellects at heart, but it is clear that the Soviet Government has taken these mild 'sheep' and dressed them in the 'wolves' clothing' of red propaganda."

Vote on Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit, for the benefit of the GOP leadership in the House, an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, and I suggest that they reexamine their campaign pledges in promising Federal economy.

The editorial follows:

ON SAYING AND DOING

The anxious student seeking an answer to the question, What's wrong with the GOP, need look no farther than the House's voting record last week on Representative JOHN RANKIN'S pension proposal.

Despite the GOP accent on Government economy—which, indeed, is supposed to be the party's hallmark—106 Republicans in the Lower Chamber voted to save the multi-billion-dollar Rankin scheme, and only 57 of them voted to have it sent back to committee (which was equivalent to killing it). Across the floor, 151 Democrats, whose party the Republicans often charge with "squander-mania," voted to defeat the proposal, and 100 to save it.

Now, it took political courage as well as political principle to defeat the Rankin bill. And that, pure and simple, is the point of this story. Before fussing any further about whether their party should become more or less liberal in order to win the electorate's support, the Republican officeholders might first try proving that in the pinches they really stand for what they say they stand for.

Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of March 28, 1949:

BUYING VOTES

When the House voted by a majority of one to send the amended Rankin bill back to committee, the gentleman from Mississippi sorrowfully proclaimed that veterans pension legislation was dead for the session.

This, unfortunately, proves not to be true. Within 24 hours, he introduced a new bill.

This one would apply only to veterans of World War I. It would pay $72 a month instead of the $90 he proposed in the original bill. And it would be received only by those with less than $2,000 income, if single, or $3,000 if married or with dependents.

These changes reflect criticisms voiced in the House and some of the amendments adopted before the bill was re-referred by 208 votes to 207.

The amendments, of course, are welcome insofar as they tend to diminish the burden on taxpayers, including all veterans, for the rest of this century. Amended or not, the bill ought to be defeated.

If Rankin could get even his diluted measure adopted, it would only be a few years until he or his successors managed to work it back up to the bonanza that was first proposed, or something even more expensive.

On this issue, the American Veterans Committee was wholly right. It took the position that decent security for the aged is a general problem that does not concern veterans alone.

The Illinois Senate has already taken action to improve the payments of aid to the aged. So will Congress before the session is over.

The Congressmen from Illinois did not make a very good showing in the test vote to send the bill back to committee.

Only two Republicans from Illinois voted to send the bill back: MASON and MCMILLEN. Eleven Republicans voted to keep the bill alive: HOFFMAN, JONAS, CHURCH, REED, ARENDS, VELDE, CHIPERFIELD, SIMPSON, JENISON, VURSELL, and BISHOP.

Five Democrats, on the other hand voted to recommit the bill: DAWSON, SABATH, YATES, MACK, and PRICE. But seven Democrats voted to keep it alive: O'HARA, LINEHAN, BUCKLEY, GORSKI, O'BRIEN, GORDON, and CHESNEY.

These votes indicate one of the serious things wrong with the Republican Party in Illinois. Add to them the votes against recommittal by the official Republican leaders of the House, JOE MARTIN and CHARLES HALLECK, and you have a picture of something wrong with the Republican Party nationally.

Here is a defeated and largely disorganized party trying to establish some line of principle on which it can stand before the Nation.

Economy, financial integrity, prudence, and responsibility are the first things it ought to stand for. So many of the dangers that threaten the Nation are the byproducts of waste and the hand-out philosophy on which it is based.

But when the chips are down, too many Republicans vote just as recklessly as the Democrats. When you turn from their oratory to their performance on the subject of Government spending, you get the impression that many of them look wistfully upon office as a chance to outdo the Democrats at the business of buying votes with public money.

It was that theory that induced Governor Green and the last Republican legislature to vote a State bonus to veterans twice as generous as any other State's. Perhaps they concluded that the national administration's success at the polls was the result of spending for pressure groups, and decided to outdo the Democrats at their own game.

The time is here when stringent economy in public expenditures would prove decidedly popular, if anybody had the will to try it.

Contributions to Volunteer Fire Companies Should Be Tax Exempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there was introduced into the House of Representatives on January 25, 1949, by the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] H. R. 1822. This bill would allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies. At the time the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] introduced H. R. 1822 he outlined in an exceedingly convincing manner the reasons why this bill should be enacted into law by the Congress.

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that I heartily endorse the provisions of H. R. 1822, and I urge that favorable committee action be taken on this bill and that the Members of this House give their support to this measure.

In further support of H. R. 1822, I wish to have included as a part of my remarks the following editorial by Mr. Fred Shepperd, editorial director of the magazine Fire Engineering, which appeared in the March 1949 issue of that publication:

BROTHER BOGGS HAS AN IDEAL

In municipalities of this Nation where there is a local sales tax, the taxes are a deductible item in making out a Federal income-tax return.

In such cities, the taxpayers' local taxes go to support the paid fire departments. But in municipalities in suburban and country areas, protected by volunteer fire companies, should you make a donation to the support of the local fire force, whether it be large or small, it is not a deductible item under the Federal income-tax law.

The volunteer fire forces, no less than the paid municipal departments, protect not only the property of all residents and local governments but also Federal and State property, post offices, institutions, and other values.

Contributions to these volunteers in nearly all cases go to buy equipment, uniforms, and other requisites of the fire fighter. So the question arises, Why should Uncle Sam demand his pound of flesh on such contributions?

In the Eightieth Congress, Representative J. CALEB BOGGS (Republican, Delaware), introduced a bill to make these contributions exempt from Federal income tax. His bill got nowhere, despite widespread approval of the fire service, but he reintroduced it early in the year.

Representative BOGGS did not have Maryland alone in mind when he wrote his bill. He was presenting a case for all the volunteer fire service—Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey with their nearly half a million volunteer firemen, as well as Delaware with its 45 volunteer companies. He knows that in some communities a small share of municipal funds is given toward the support of the volunteers, particularly for the salaries of a handful of drivers of fire apparatus. The larger part of the bill is generally paid by contributors. Nevertheless, our Federal tax law is so drawn that the contributions are not tax exempt.

In the United States as a whole, there are about 1,000,000 volunteer firemen of all classifications. There are about 100,000 paid and part-paid firemen. There are around 14,000 volunteer fire departments (in many cases, it is true, the organization consisting of a single company) compared with the less than 2,000 fully paid departments.

When it comes to the responsiblity for saving life and property, there is little difference between the paid professional and the volunteer fire fighter. Both are essential to the American form of government and American fire control.

Representative BOGGS has this to say: "In nearly all the communities throughout the Nation served by volunteer fire companies, our Federal Government has post offices and other public buildings and properties of tremendous value. For the protection of these public buildings from destruction by fire, our Government is wholly dependent upon the unselfish service of the volunteer firemen.

"I am not suggesting that these firemen be paid," he continues, "or that they receive any Federal subsidy, but I do say that we should enable these companies to raise larger sums of money by reason of tax exemption to donors so that our public property may be more adequately protected.

"Volunteer fire companies are to a very large extent educational organizations. For many years, in thousands of communities, they have conducted campaigns to educate the public in fire prevention. The number of lives and the property values saved from * * * preventable fires cannot be ascertained in dollars. Everyone who has ever lived in a rural community also knows that the very existence of a volunteer fire company represents an actual annual dollar saving to him by reason of fire insurance rates. Our Federal Government is enjoying the same saving on the insurance of its public buildings."

Representative BOGGS has not stopped there; he and others have gone further—they have pointed out the injustice of the Federal Government levying a tax on fire apparatus bought with the funds of volunteers, or with money otherwise donated for the purpose.

It is too bad that the fire service, and the volunteer fire service in particular, hasn't more Representative Boggses in Washington.

FRED SHEPPARD.

Second-Class Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from a recent issue

of the Star-Herald, a very fine weekly newspaper published in Kosciusko, Miss.

The thoughts embodied in the editorial are worthy of our consideration and most certainly of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The editorial follows:

BUSINESSLIKE APPROACH

The Star-Herald has never liked the don't-tax-me—tax-somebody-else attitude. Theoretically, at least, taxation should be equal, just, and fair.

The proposed increase in second-class postal rates would work a great hardship upon the smaller newspapers, but we have not written our Congressman to increase the rates on the big publications without taxing us little fellows. Some have done that, arguing that the big dailies and the national magazines could pay the freight.

We prefer to let every fellow carry his share of the load. While the Post Office Department was organized as a service to the people, and not as a money maker, it should be self-sustaining. The whole question should be analyzed from a business standpoint. We think the Government should determine in just what categories it is losing money and increase postage, if necessary, in those categories.

We are convinced that if this is done the small newspapers will not be asked to pay additional postage—certainly not the all-out-of-proportion increases proposed.

All indications are that extra cost to any small-town post office for handling the local weekly is practically nil.

Hawaii Statehood Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, March 14, 1949:

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I see the subcommittee of the House of Representatives has unanimously approved the admission of Hawaii to statehood. The objections to its admission have seemed to center around the composition of its population, and we may now take it for granted that those objections are without merit. But no one seems to have given thought to the fact that conferring statehood upon the half million population of Hawaii deprives the other 150,000,000 people in the United States in a large measure of the power to govern themselves. The two Senators that statehood would give Hawaii would give her half million people power equal to that of the 15,000,000 people in New York State or the 10,000,000 in Pennsylvania. They could readily block the ratification of a treaty which required a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or the passage of a bill that has had the approval of the representatives of nine-tenths of the country's population.

As an organized Territory Hawaii has its Delegate in Congress to represent them in every way except the right to vote. In fact, the bill to admit Hawaii to statehood was introduced in Congress by her own Delegate to Congress.

We have already nine States (excluding any of the Original Thirteen) with a combined population of 5,000,000—less than one-third of the population of New York State alone.

May not the time have arrived to postpone the admission of new States, and the consequent dilution of the influence of the vast majority of the country's population, until the Constitution can be so amended as to provide for them such representation in the Senate as would give them only their fair share of influence in shaping our national policies?

MICHAEL SCHAAP.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1949.*

Underseas Exploration by the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Navy Is Exploring the Deep," written by Ansel E. Talbert and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1949.

Ansel E. Talbert is aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune. He is an honor graduate of Columbia University and its Pulitzer School of Journalism and has traveled world-wide as foreign correspondent of this great newspaper.

He was American delegate to the International Congress of Aviation writers in Rome, Italy, in 1939. He entered World War II as a private in the Eighth Air Force and later was an officer on Gen. "Jimmy" Doolittle's intelligence staff on the battlefront. After 4 years of service he was honorably discharged as lieutenant-colonel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY IS EXPLORING THE DEEP—UNDERSEA CRAFT AND DIVERS SET NEW FRONTIERS

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

Navy divers and submarine crews are establishing new frontiers beneath the sea while Navy airmen press onward high above it toward new milestones in flight.

Navy subsurface gliders having the appearance of strange misshapen aircraft from another world are being used for surveys of channel bottoms and other areas on the ocean floor. Observers sit inside these gliders like pilots in an airplane and manipulate controls which activate wing-shaped fins while being towed by surface craft.

Underwater television cameras developed by scientists working under Navy sponsorship now are able to pick up views beneath the surface and relay them to screens aboard surface craft and even aircraft.

During World War II a Navy diver named George E. Sherman, a chief warrant carpenter, picked up the first copy of the Japanese imperial code book while strolling about, 17 fathoms deep, off Guadalcanal near sunken Japanese ships. A few days ago Navy Boatswain's Mate Harold Wiensbrod plunged to a simulated depth of 561 feet in a new Navy diving suit during a tank test—a world's record—to give an inkling of things to come in diving.

All these developments fit closely into the Navy's preparations for the possibility of an undersea war of the future fought by fleets of long-range submarines equipped with snorkel breathing devices—or with even more advanced equipment permitting long undersea cruises without even a breathing tube on the surface.

Russia is known to be constructing a large submarine fleet while expanding the Red Air Force. This emphasis on air power and undersea power by both the United States and Russia, incidentally, bears out to the letter a prediction made nearly three decades ago by Gen. Billy Mitchell, America's far-seeing strategist, who while crusading for aviation wrote:

"The offensive power of submarines is constantly developing. Together with the airplane they will control the sea lanes in the future."

The United States, which imports large quantities of strategic materials from many parts of the world, would be particularly vulnerable to unchecked submarine warfare by an enemy nation, as was demonstrated during the early days of World War II. Then German undersea craft sank tankers and cargo ships only a few miles outside New York Harbor.

The Navy is preparing to prove General Mitchell's observation that "the best weapon to use against an enemy submarine is another submarine," and its divers are being trained for a variety of duties.

These include: (1) Examination of anti-torpedo nets; (2) study of sunken enemy submarines and other ordnance equipment; (3) recording of the damage on Navy ships; (4) detection and destruction of camouflaged enemy mines, either off the coasts of the United States or off enemy-controlled harbors.

In performing these and other duties Navy divers are making use of underwater photography and television.

In an effort to observe first hand the little-reported work of the Navy's undersea crews—the so-called silent service—this correspondent not long ago donned a diving suit at a naval submarine and air base in Florida and went down into the waters of the Gulf of Mexico for a look beneath the surface.

The descent took place at the tip of a pier jutting out into the harbor. A five-man Navy crew worked by hand a pump circulating air into the copper helmet fitting over the correspondent's head. The crew first had dropped a weighted rope off the pier's end down which divers could slide like firemen going down a pole in slow motion.

On reaching the bottom, which had a coating of slimy mud and vegetation forming a soft carpet, this correspondent could see nothing at first in the murky waters and was oppressed by a sudden sensation of loneliness and isolation. The only sound was that of the air pumped down from the surface and escaping with a gurgle.

Soon, however, the forms of objects in the vicinity were discernible and the keel of a submarine anchored alongside the pier could be made out, along with the dark shapes of the piles on which the pier was built. The only marine life visible to this correspondent, who already was looking about for giant octopi and other denizens said to inhabit the ocean depths, was a small fish of indeterminate species—almost 2 inches long.

It watched with curiosity for several moments the phenomenon of the correspondent's efforts to walk without losing balance—an awkward matter because of the feeling of extreme bouyancy and lack of weight—then darted behind a pier piling and came back for another look. The mutual observation continued until three tugs on a safety line attached to the diving helmet suddenly brought the correspondent to the surface and ended the acquaintanceship.

With considerable justice a quotation of Sir Walter Raleigh, the seventeenth century explorer, has been adopted as a motto by

Navy divers and submariners. It reads: "Whosoever commands the sea commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world and consequently the world itself." They even are willing to add behind "sea" the phrase "and the air," a correction suggested by the Navy air arm.

National Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear the chamber of commerce bitterly criticized. I believe it is unfair to assume that all members of the several chamber of commerce groups are reactionaries and opposed to the enactment of progressive legislation.

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I received from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Falls Church, Va., which I am sure reflects the opinion of many members of the fine chambers throughout the United States:

THE FALLS CHURCH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Falls Church, Va., March 25, 1949.
Congressman WALTER B. HUBER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBER: As a native of of your district in Ohio, I wish to call your attention to a matter of growing concern to businessmen throughout the Nation. American businessmen have traditionally been forward-looking, progressive-thinking individuals, because the competitive system demands these qualities. This picture is being altered now through the propaganda agency of the National Chamber of Commerce. The American businessman is becoming a symbol for moss-backed stubbornness, old-fashioned inefficiency, and general opposition to the public welfare. This picture is not true. The National Chamber of Commerce speaks for the oligarchy of master-minders heading the Washington office, not for the thousands of its members who support the legislative program of the present administration.

With a casual disregard for the opinions of the membership, the national office of the chamber speaks for businessmen throughout the United States. Vicious, untruthful attacks are made on every recommendation or proposal of the Truman administration. The local offices of the chamber in every State are flooded daily with pamphlets, broadsides, reprints, and throwaways describing the so-called evils of the Democratic administration.

The National Chamber of Commerce is no more than a spokesman for the National Manufacturers Association. It callously ignores the wishes of the people of this country as expressed in the November elections. It twists every administration-backed bill into a sorry scheme to socialize the Nation. It mouths the sour-grapes cries of the Republican National Committee, and heaps scorn on any Congressman who realizes that the times demand progressive legislative action, who believes the health of a nation is more important than a measly saving of taxes, who puts the welfare of our working population on a par with that of the top 100 families, who writhes at the sinister liaison of the Republican Party and the Dixiecrats in Congress, who favors world-wide economic aid to rescue the people from starvation, chaos, and communism; in short, who knows that we are living in 1949 and not the horse-and-buggy days of Hayes and Garfield.

I am enclosing samples of the sort of propaganda the national office of the chamber of commerce spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to distribute throughout the country. It is resented by many local chamber officials who prefer to see businessmen stand together with their fellow citizens to build a progressive, foresighted administration.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS A. WAGNER,
President.

Women Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech by Mrs. Leisa Bronson, one of the most distinguished women in the State of California.

Mrs. Bronson delivered the following speech at a memorial dinner for Franklin D. Roosevelt, sponsored by the Democratic Club of Monterey Park, Calif., on January 27, 1949.

In paying tribute to Franklin Roosevelt, Mrs. Bronson reminds us that women made more progress under the Roosevelt administration than they had in the previous 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, we can make some progress where women are concerned in this Eighty-first Congress.

I would like to call the attention of the Members to two bills which I have introduced, H. R. 2396, to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex and to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and H. R. 2438, providing equal pay for equal work for women.

Mrs. Bronson's address follows:

WOMEN REMEMBER

Tonight I have been asked by your chairman to say a few words about the special place which Franklin Delano Roosevelt held and will always hold, in the minds and hearts of women, not only in our own country, but all over the world.

Perhaps one thinks first of the recognition which President Roosevelt gave to the abilities of women, and the opportunities for public service which he afforded them. We remember that it was during the Roosevelt administration that the first woman Cabinet member in our history was appointed. We remember that for the first time a woman was appointed Minister to a foreign country; and that for the first time a woman served as Assistant Treasurer of the United States. We remember the appointment of the first woman Director of the Mint; of the first woman judge of a circuit court of appeals; the first woman member of the Social Security Board; the first woman judge of the United States Court of Tax Appeals.

Women deeply value the confidence thus placed in them and honor the outstanding personalities who have served in these positions. But these appointments are not the thing that gives most meaning to the Roosevelt administration in the hearts of women. They love Franklin Delano Roosevelt because he cared for people as individual human beings. His very first talks to the Nation, in those critical days of his first term, were Fireside Chats which came to the family gathered at home around the radio. He knew the value of those homes, and saw to it that they should be preserved.

Roosevelt cared for children. Through the school-lunch program 4,000,000 undernourished children received at least one good hot meal each day. Under the Social Security Act of 1935, the number of dependent children receiving Federal aid was tripled, so that more than 800,000 of them were able to stay with their own mothers, instead of having to go to institutions or to foster homes. Women remember the striking drop in infant and maternal death rates that took place between 1932 and 1940, after the development of the Maternal and Child Welfare Service. Deaths of children between 1 and 14 years of age also dropped during this period—dropped 38 percent. Child labor on articles in interstate commerce was prohibited in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Nursery schools and day-care centers were provided. Roosevelt cared for children.

Rural women remember that electricity came to their homes under the rural electrification program, lightening their toil in a hundred ways. Young women remember that they were included in the NYA program; and older women that special WPA projects were devised for them.

These are only a few of the many things I might mention that enabled women to make more progress under the Roosevelt administration than they had done in the previous hundred years. The home continued to be, as it will always be, the center of woman's life. But her horizons broadened; she became a true citizen of the world. This, in turn, will benefit women in many other lands. For all these things, women gratefully remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the greatest Presidents, perhaps the greatest, that our Nation has ever had.

Slum Clearance and Low Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the general court of Massachuetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress to provide for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing for greater allocation of funds for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 8, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 14, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Communism Versus Ten Commandments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the March issue of the magazine, National Republic, there was contained a very illuminating article on the subject Communism Versus Ten Commandments by Walter S. Steele. Included in this article is an amazing table which documents the case of the Red war on God's commandments. This article and the table to which I refer is, I believe, the first time such a documented parallel of the conflicting ideological war of our times has been prepared. I believe that it will be of vast interest to my colleagues and to the American people, and that it should serve as light, as truth, as a beacon to the American Nation in fighting the godless menace, atheistic communism. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the text of this article and table be placed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM VERSUS TEN COMMANDMENTS

(By Walter S. Steele)

Communism's attack upon divine religion, especially Christianity, is deeper than the mere attack in the past or present upon any one church, or order of religion, individual priest, minister, or rabbi, of which we read so much today. The Communist attack is made on the very foundation of truths on which divine religion is built and exists.

As individuals and as an organization, Communists (Marxists, Leninists, and Stalinists) adopt and propagate the theory that religion is not truth, is not moral, and is but an instrument concocted by kings and capitalists, improvised for the purpose of subjecting the masses to law and order, and designed for the benefit of the bosses, thereby precluding what the Communists call human progress. Yet, throughout history, religious worship and governments permitting the freedom of religious belief and worship have produced more individual freedom, and provided more human progress and peace than any government or materialistic ideology ever attempted, or that has ever existed under communism.

Because religion is the greatest bulwark against government-organized slavery, which exists under communism, the repression of freedom of thought and action, and the right of individual and collective progress, Communists center their attack upon religion, its foundations and tenets, and on governments devoted to the freedom of religion, individual enterprise and progress. In attacking religion, Communists center their main fire on the Ten Commandments and their fundamental teachings, since these set forth the divine moral principles of God.

The Ten Commandments, first handed down by God to Moses, prescribe God's moral truth to guide His worshipers and followers. And as referred to in the Book of Romans, 13: 8–10, in the Bible, it emphasizes a code of morals which has been the foundation of a civilized world. It provides for understanding and love, and thereby freedom, progress and a goal for man's future beyond his short span of life on earth. Love is the main theme of the commandments. Hatred is the supreme tenet of Communists.

The Book of Romans states: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. For thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is comprised in this word: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The love of our neighbor worketh no evil. Love, therefore, is the fulfilling of the law."

Communism, contrary to the Ten Commandments of God, teaches: "A Communist who rejects the religious commandments and acts according to the directions of the party ceases to be a believer. Inversely, a believer who pretends to be a Communist, but who infringes on the directions of the party in the name of the commandments of religion ceases to be a Communist." ("A B C of Communism," an official handbook and "explanation of the program of the Communist Party of Russia," 1922.)

In 1925 Lunarcharsky, the Soviet Minister of Public Instruction, issued the following statement: "We hate Christianity and the Christians. * * * They preach love of one's neighbors and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with love of one's neighbor. What we need is hatred. We must know how to hate. Only thus can we conquer the universe."

By these official explanations or commandments of communism one can readily see the violence with which the Communists attack the very foundation of religion. Communists preach hatred toward one's neighbor, that there is no God, there is no heaven, that religion is based on fraud, that there is nothing good in religion, that man's salvation is bound up solely within materialism enveloping himself and the dictatorship of communism, that Christian morals are out of date and are a hindrance to human progress, that the immoral practices advocated and permitted by Communists and communism are the tools of real freedom and progress, that religion hinders freedom and progress, while communism forges them.

Any schoolboy knows that these Communist teachings are lies. Communism is based on immoral ideologies which would drag man down into the sewer of satanic filth, weakening his mind and robbing him of his hope of a future, thereby conditioning him for enslavement to Communist dictatorship without objection. Slaves and morons do not make for progress, and the leveling process through which everyone is forced under Communist rule, either through Communist government or Communist Party following, is the process of decline or retrogression, the beginning of the complete decay of humanity.

The Communist philosophy of destruction and the doctrine of evil are synonymous, in that one follows the other. The opposite is the creative philosophy and the doctrine of good. The first is materialistic; the second, Christian. One represents satanism; the other, godliness. One believes that greater enjoyment and benefits on this mundane sphere are procured by thinking, urging, and producing evil, rather than by thinking, urging, and producing good.

Like Nimrod who lived 2,000 years before the Christian era, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and their cohorts have posed as the great deliverers. Nimrod, known as the great deliverer in his age, ruled over Babylon. He elevated man and degraded God, advocating that the people attribute their pleasures and fortunes to their own and to his government's actions, and not to God's will. In the midst of the materialistic feast, Nimrod gradually changed the form of government into a tyranny, seeing no other way of turning men completely from the fear of God and bringing them to sole dependence upon his power. Feeling that his greatness exceeded that of God, he determined to build a great and high structure to further exemplify his own greatness—the Tower of Babel, Babel meaning confusion. Babylon became the center of confusion of thought, of perversion of religion, a cesspool of moral debauchery and political corruption.

The Communists believe, as did Nimrod, that the way to control the masses is to control their thinking and their actions, and make them solely dependent upon the dictatorship. They accomplished this by making the individual believe his entire future depends upon the government, that no other power exists.

Jesus said to His disciples: "Beware of false prophets who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." (Matthew, vii: 15–21.) Communists pose as great humanitarians, claiming to offer the masses "good fruit." With this bait they camouflage their plot to rob men of their very souls. The battle throughout the world today is between Communist apostates and the apostles of religion, with the future of Christianity at stake.

COMMANDMENTS AND RED CREED

The following comparisons between God's Commandments, the foundation of Christianity, and the commands of the Communists should leave little doubt as to the methods Communists are utilizing in an attempt to destroy Christianity and pave the way for world Communist control. Church leaders, when holding the line against Communist aggression, are destroyed, together with churches and other religious institutions. The Communist plot is centered against all religions, which must be eliminated before communism can feel secure.

God's Commandments

I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have any strange gods before me.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath Day.

Honor thy father and thy mother.

Thou shalt not kill.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.

Red commands

"Lenin is God."—Stalin (1).

"The very first and wickedest moonshiner is named Jesus Christ."—"Besbozhnik" (2).

"Saturday and the Sabbath are suppressed."—Soviet Law (3).

"Children must be taught to hate their parents."—Lenin (4).

"Dictatorship is a government resting directly on the use of violence."—Lenin (5).

"The family and marriage code abolished the terms 'out of wedlock' and 'illegitimate child.' "—Soviet Law on Marriage (6).

"All means are justified."—Stalin (7).

"Adopt all possible tricks, dodges, and illegal methods of concealing the truth."—Lenin (8).

"The freedom of relations between the sexes does not contradict the ideology of communism."—Mme. Alexandra Kollontay (Soviet official) (9).

"The confiscation of all property and the denial of all rights to inheritance is the fundamental law of communism."—"Communist Manifesto" (10).

Following are additional Communist contradictions of the Ten Commandments:

1. "Anyone of the same mind of Lenin cannot believe in God."—ABC of Communism.

"Religion is the opium of the people."—Karl Marx.

"Marxism is materialism."—Lenin.

"We deny all morality taken from superhuman or nonclass conceptions."—Lenin.

"Atheism is an integral part of Marxism."—Lenin.

2. "We have dethroned the earthly Czars; now we shall destroy the heavenly ones."—Besbozhnik.

"The materialist gives a more important place to materialism and nature while relegating God and all the philosophical rabble who believe in Him to the sewer and manure heap."—Lenin.

"In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality? In the sense that it is preached by the bourgeoisie who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests. * * * We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human-class concepts. We say that this is deception, a fraud which clogs the brains of the workers and peasants, in the interests of the landlords and capitalists. We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat."—Lenin.

"We must make our school boys and girls not merely nonreligious, but actively and passionately antireligious."—Mme. Krupskaya, wife of Lenin.

"Religion and communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically."—Karl Marx.

"The transition from socialism to communism, will bring about the natural death of all religion and all superstition."—Karl Marx.

"Our task is not to reform, but to destroy all kinds of religions, all kinds of morality."—Zinoviev, president, Third International.

"Marxism is materialism. We must combat religion. This is the ABC of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism. Down with religion. Long live atheism."—Lenin.

"But communism abolishes eternal truths: it abolishes all religion and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis."—"Communist Manifesto."

"The fight must develop no less inevitably 'against God,' whether he be called Jehovah, Jesus, Buddha, or Allah."—Commissariat of Public Education, Soviet Government.

3. "To count the years since the birth of Christ is for us inadmissible; such a calendar strengthens religious prejudices by suggesting that Jesus really was born. Nor does the same calendar satisfy us inasmuch as it contains far too many religious feasts. The names of the days of the week (Sunday, Saturday) do not suit us either. This is why Saturday and the Sabbath are suppressed by the introduction of the 5-day week."—"The Godless."

4. "We must remove the children from the pernicious influence of the family."—Official journal of the Commissariat of Education in Russia.

"Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists."—Communist Manifesto.

5. "The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and all-blood-soaked reality."—Pravda.

"It would not matter a jot if three-quarters of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining quarter should be Communists."—Lenin.

"If our war * * * will cost half a million or a million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie will say that the first victims are justified and the second are not. The proletariat will give quite another answer."—Lenin.

6. "A girl having reached her eighteenth year is to be considered as the property of the state. Any girl having reached her eighteenth year and not having married is obliged, subject to the most severe penalties, to register at the bureau of free love in the commissariat of surveillance. Having registered at the bureau of free love, she has the right to choose from among men between the ages of 19 and 50 a cohabitant husband."—Soviet decree.

"The basis of the family shall be actual parentage; no distinction shall be established between natural parentage and legitimate parentage. * * * An unmarried, pregnant woman shall make a declaration at the registry office. * * * A married woman may make a like declaration if the father of her child conceived is not her registered husband."—Soviet decree.

"The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas."—Communist Manifesto.

7. "There is no way out except by seizing * * * the industries, the banks and all of the economic institutions." The way Out—Manifesto and Principal Resolutions, eighth convention, Communist Party of United States of America.

"I decided to create a purely Bolshevik club for expropriating state funds. Our advanced comrades, and particularly Koba (Stalin) approved my suggestion. In the middle of November 1906 the expropriators club was organized, and at the railway junction at Cheaturi we attacked a post-office railway car and took 21,000 rubles, of which 15,000 were sent to the Bolshevik faction, and the rest to our own group to provide for a series of expropriations. * * * September 27, 1908. * * * Seized a post-office car, terrorized the staff of the station and the car * * * carrying off 2,400,000 rubles."—Kot Tsintsadze.

"What coincides with the interests of the proletarian revolution is ethical."—E. Yaroslavsky.

8. "Communism abolishes eternal truths."—Marx.

"Religious vows, or oaths, are abolished."—Soviet decree.

"It is necessary * * * to be prepared to resort to make any sort of sacrifice, to be prepared to resort to every possible subterfuge, trick, illegal device circulated to conceal the truth."—Lenin.

9. "Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus * * * and Communists admit it."—Communist Manifesto.

"For us, for the republic of the workers, it is absolutely a matter of indifference whether a woman sells herself to one man or to many, whether she is a professional prostitute living by some other source than her own useful labor, or by the sale of her caresses to a legal husband or to an occasional purchaser of female flesh, whose identity may vary from day to day."—Mme. Alexandra Kollontay.

"Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests."—Communist Manifesto.

10. "Lenin approved the 'ex'es' while condemning their Apache deviation, provided they were carried out under strict party control. The object of these expropriations was to provide funds for the revolutionary group."—Stalin.

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."—Communist Manifesto.

"Those who cannot coordinate illegal forms of struggle with legal ones are very poor revolutionists."—Lenin.

"All the property of the existing ecclesiastical and religious societies in Russia become the property of the people."—Soviet decree.

West Haven, Conn., Veterans' Hospital Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, with a succession of administrators in the Veterans' Administration, we have been recipients also of a succession of policies, one differing from the other. I wish to point out the results of one of these policies which was inaugurated since the last war, and which is still in effect, to the best of my knowledge.

In October of 1945, the construction of a 500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital was authorized at West Haven, Conn. This was in recognition of the need for additional space to properly care for ill and disabled Connecticut veterans. Our small State contributed over a quarter of a million service men and women in World War II, notwithstanding that at the same time we were the arsenal of America in our contributions of foodstuffs and industrial products to the armed forces and our allies.

One year after the authorization, or in October 1946, the contract was let for preliminary plans for the facility which was to provide necessary hospitalization. The contract was let to a private concern under the policy in operation at that time, and still in effect. Under this system, the preliminary plans, or rough sketches of approximate size, shape, and placement were not completed until March of 1948, or 17 months later. It required from March until December of 1948 to obtain final approval, and to authorize the drawing of architectural plans and specifications for the hospital. The present schedule, I am informed by the Acting Chief of Engineers, Major General Crawford, calls for completion of architectural work by October 1949, and an advertisement of bids in February 1950.

Under this schedule, construction cannot possibly be completed before the fall of 1952. There will be no occupancy of this most necessary hospital for a period of 7 years from the time of its authorization until its completion.

This is a violation of the faith placed in the Government by our veterans and their families.

It is contended by the Disabled American Veterans that 173 of their number alone are now lacking hospital care and treatment in Connecticut. This does not take into account those who are currently ill or who may become ill in the near future.

During the almost 4 years which have already elapsed since the authorization of the West Haven project, Veterans Administration architects have themselves completed many hospitals which are already serving ill and disabled veterans in many parts of the country. Let us either demand that this practice of

letting out hospital contracts be completely abandoned, or that stricter supervision be placed upon private concerns so that definite schedule commitments are adhered to in the future.

Militant Nazis Run German Firms Slated To Exhibit Products in New York, Anti-Nazi League Charges in Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, charges that "a very large proportion of militant Nazis, cartel fronts and other undesirables upon whom the swastika trademark has become indelibly stamped" are among the 511 firms scheduled to participate in the AMG-sponsored German industrial exhibition to open in New York April 9—at the Museum of Science and Industry—have been made by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.

The league's charges were made in telegrams to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate President ALBEN BARKLEY, signed by the league's administrative chairman, Prof. James H. Sheldon, and Herman Hoffman, chairman of the board of directors, copies of which have been released to the press.

The Rosenthal Chinaware Co., one of the largest of the corporate exhibitors coming to New York in April, proclaimed its Nazism in paid advertisements in Hitler's personally owned paper, the league said.

Suspension of the projected exhibition was requested by the Anti-Nazi League, pending a full-scale congressional investigation of Army and AMG policies in Germany, which was also asked by the league.

Taking exception to an announcement made in Munich Monday by Gen. Lucius D. Clay that denazification, war crimes trials and demilitarization steps in Germany are over, Anti-Nazi Chairman Sheldon declared:

> The make-up of the proposed German industrial exhibition not only demonstrates that the job of denazification is less than half done, but shows that our policies are actually promoting the revival of Nazi forces in the German economy. The time for General Clay's new order is not yet.
>
> The use of American taxpayers' money to build up American markets for German firms still in the clutches of unreformed Nazis will only mean cut-throat competition for American labor and universal danger for democracy. This so-called industrial exposition is an affront to the memory of our soldier dead, a betrayal of the policies laid down by Congress for the rehabilitation of Germany, and a studied denial of the purposes for which we went to war.

SUBMITS DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

From its files the Anti-Nazi League sent the congressional leaders photostatic copies of an advertisement run by the Rosenthal firm—which is one of the largest of the exhibiting groups—in Hitler's Nazi Party organ, the Voelkische Beobachter, in December of 1938, just 1 month following the most violent anti-Semitic pogroms.

This world-famous china and porcelain concern had been expropriated by the Nazis from its original Jewish owners, but the trade name was kept because of its artistic prestige, the League said. The ad in Hitler's paper was designed to refute rumors that the firm was still Jewish-owned.

Headed "In Defense," the ad asserted that the incumbent ownership "corresponds fully with the principles demanded by the New Germany," and that "the management consists of five Aryans, three of whom are old veteran fighters of the Nazi Party." "The highest Nazi Party officials have appreciated this," the ad continued.

The company then went on to ask the public to help it "put our hands on" the "calumnious libelers" whom it described as "saboteurs of the new order, who must be annihiliated." By so doing, the company added, "you will help the 4,000 German racial comrades" which it employed.

The Anti-Nazi League charged that AMG has made only the most superficial changes in the management of this firm, and that the majority of the veteran Nazi Aryan directors installed by Hitler are still in actual control. In addition, four other German firms scheduled to show their products in New York are wholly owned by the same parent corporation, the League said.

PUT HITLER ON WHEELS

A second firm cited is the Lanz truck and vehicle manufacturing concern, which the League charged with being the first firm in the state of Baden to violate the Versailles Treaty by manufacturing forbidden war materials for Hitler's army.

As early as 1933, the owners and directors of Lanz were among Hitler's chief backers, the League added, and in time the firm became almost as important to his war machine as the Krupp arms works.

In addition, the League charged that the Lanz firm was originally built by pirating American machine designs, and that the firm's founder, Heinreich Lanz, financed much pan-German propaganda both before and after World War I. His son, Carl Lanz, became one of the chief financiers of Hitler's illicit militarist organizations, the League asserted.

FARBEN INVITED

Two of the chemical firms scheduled to exhibit in New York are "wholly owned subsidiaries of the notorious I. G. Farbenindustrie cartel," the Anti-Nazi League said.

In this connection the league scored a statement made at a press conference in New York last week by George J. Santry, AMG's coordinator for the exhibition. Santry said then that the 511 firms approved thus far had not been screened, as corporations, for pro-Nazi records, but only for compliance with the decartelization program.

"Inclusion of Farben subsidiaries makes even this screening a mockery," Sheldon said.

The Anti-Nazi League, Sheldon said, is making a thorough survey of the entire list of firms listed for the exhibit, and will make its findings available to congressional leaders. "It is already clearly apparent," he said, "that a very large proportion of these firms approach the American market with unclean hands, and ought not to be allowed to exhibit in New York at this time."

The Panama Canal—Symposium Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the March 1949 number of the Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers contains a most informative discussion of the so-called Sea-level Panama Canal project, by Capt. H. H. Little, United States Navy (retired).

Captain Little was Assistant Chief of Overseas Bases in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 1944–46, with cognizance over world-wide naval bases, including those in the Caribbean and Central American areas during war.

The presentation of thoughtful, well-considered views from different angles, and dealing with varying phases, tend to provide an illumination, of focal character, of the central object involved, viz, determination of the type of canal at Panama, and/or elsewhere which should be ultimately provided to meet the needs of increased facilities. The appended article—among other things—points out the importance of the matter of new treaty rights under agreement with Panama, which appears not to have been taken into account in official studies thus far made; but which, nevertheless, must be met if additional Panamanian territory and concessions are required. Any additional indemnity and annuity costs will necessarily have to be added to basic construction, operation, and maintenance figures, in arriving at totals; and these must, measurably, at least, be reflected in transit tolls to be charged to shipping. Either the tolls must be adequate to absorb these items, or the American taxpayer will have to be assessed for the margins above the maximum toll rates the merchant ships of our own and other lands may be able to bear. Important factors which escape theoretical discussions of the subject, must, notwithstanding, enter into any final and realistic calculation required.

In his analysis Captain Little does not speak especally as a naval officer; but primarily as an experienced seaman and administrator. He presents a truly objective viewpoint, and develops a number

of the most important features embraced in this all-important subject; and which—so far as I know—have not been adequately covered in previous discussions.

Under leave accorded me, I am extending my remarks in the RECORD, with inclusion of the indicated article:

PANAMA CANAL, THE SEA-LEVEL PROJECT—A SYMPOSIUM

(By H. H. Little)

Much was written, in the paper by Colonel Stratton, about the capacity of the Panama Canal. What does that term mean? Great stress is laid on time of transit. To avoid the creation of exaggerated impressions as to their importance, the relation of the terms, "capacity" and "time of transit," to the broad field of strategic planning should be explained by the author, in his closing discussion.

In regard to capacity, very little in the way of factual analysis has been published on the actual capacity of the Panama Canal as it now exists. Messrs. Johnson and Steinborn report (see Capacity of the Present Panama Canal: Dependable Daily Capacity of Present Canal): "The dependable daily capacity of the existing canal is taken at its minimum daily capacity during overhaul—or 36 vessels." This would be a minimum of 13,140 ships a year. Colonel Stratton reports (under Traffic History of the Canal) that there were nearly 17,000 transits of war traffic through the Canal from 1941 to 1945. Assuming that this period includes 4 years, the average yearly transit was 4,250 ships, which would indicate that, during World War II, the present Canal was operated for war traffic to only about 30 percent of its minimum capacity.

Under The Panama Canal As It Is Today, Colonel Stratton states:

"It is estimated that by about 1960 the capacity of the Canal will be inadequate to accommodate traffic without inflicting undesirable delays on peak traffic days."

In other words, the Canal is not to be used to capacity at other times, but by 1960 it will be used to capacity only on peak traffic days. What does industry do when confronted with similar problems of peak traffic? They control them. It spreads the load by proper planning; and, if need be, it increases charges for peak business, peak electric rates, peak labor costs, peak charges of any description. Has any attempt been made to control peak traffic at the Canal? None is mentioned in the symposium. There should be many ways of controlling sailings to, or arrivals at, Panama and also of removing bottlenecks in the Canal so that traffic will not jam on peak days. Certainly no canal could be built which would prevent occasional peak loads when no attempt is made to control traffic or improve its functioning. The obvious answers to the question are the control of traffic and the proper modification of the present Canal, not building canals at other locations across the Isthmus or attempting the construction of a new sea-level Panama Canal.

As for time of transit, it should be realized that plans for military operations are prepared far in advance of the dates of embarkation. Personnel, supplies, and ships are calculated, checked, and rechecked dozens of times. Material is ordered, manufactured, shipped, and stored weeks and even months in advance; D-day is never set until the required resources are on hand and allowance is made for shortages—material which would not arrive because of sinkings, bombings, or failure to load. No general or admiral ever had to tear his hair out because some ship or convoy of ships was late in passing through the Panama Canal. Although the expeditious handling of vessels at Panama (or anywhere else) is expected as normal performance, it is doubtful if any saving in time at the Canal ever had any bearing on the outcome of an important military undertaking.

Colonel Stratton's repeated use of the term "security" deserves to be properly analyzed or circumscribed in his closing discussion. The writer was startled by the statement in the synopsis that:

"A sea-level canal at Panama constructed by the conversion of the existing lock canal could not be destroyed by enemy attack or sabotage. Only the atomic bomb could cause significant interruption in service, and then for not more than a few weeks."

A statement such as this can be misleading without essential amplification. As a major premise it represents the greatest weakness in the attempt to justify the sea-level proposal. The statement is true, of course, in the sense that earth and water cannot be destroyed, but it is not true in the sense that the damage caused to a sea-level canal, even by conventional weapons, would be insignificant. A bomb or 1,000 bombs dropped in the Mojave Desert in California would have no effect in destroying the desert, but determined bombing attacks or sabotage on the many miles of proposed impounding dams, spillways, tidal locks, and other structures of the Panama Canal (which are shown in figure 11 to be necessary for the control of the floodwaters of the Chagres River Valley and for the regulation of tidal currents in a sea-level canal) would create almost incalculable problems and would make the Canal unnavigable for long periods. These dangers together with the greater structural damage and channel closures that may be caused by atomic bombs should be just as effective militarily in interrupting ship transit as would be the draining of Gatun Lake.

From the evidence presented in the symposium it seems questionable if the vulnerability of the many flood-control installations and of the other massive structures in the sea-level plan was explored as it should have been. Until such an exploration is made, the question of which type of canal has the maximum security against atomic bombing appears to be one for theoretical discussions and not for practical planning, because no amount of static defense measures can give a real security to any type of canal.

Conversion of the existing lock canal (see Synopsis) is another term that needs a more complete analysis. With the exception of the channel sections near the ends of the present canal the plans outlined by Colonel Stratton envisage an entirely new canal with the greater part located at varying distances from the present canal. This feature, because it does not conform to canal treaties, introduces a great international political question that would require complicated negotiations for a new treaty with the Republic of Panama and the payment of a huge indemnity and an increased annual subsidy by the United States Government. In view of the rejection of the Defense Base Treaty by Panama in 1948, the negotiation of a new canal treaty no doubt would present even more serious difficulties. This important subject might well be included in the symposium. Certainly any cost estimate should make some provision for the costs that would be encountered in this connection, in order to justify, fully, the ultimate cost of the sea-level project.

Much might be offered in comment on that part of Public Law No. 280 which Colonel Stratton quotes in his Introduction. For example, it is fair to question whether passage of this act really "expressed the temper of present concern" of the Congress rather than the ideas of those proponents who were determined on a sea-level revision. Regarding "increasing the capacity," it might be asked whether the sea-level project if built would work better than the present canal—an important phase not covered in the symposium.

Again, regarding the law's reference to "Canals at other locations," it should be remembered that the Nicaragua and other canal routes have always had large followings which had to be given some hope or the bill would not have passed Congress. In other words, it was a foregone conclusion that no scheme other than a sea-level canal at Panama would receive any real consideration under the act.

Colonel Stratton states (under the heading, "The Panama Canal as it is today") that:

"The restricting effect of the small locks (width 110 feet, length 1,000 feet) of the present canal on the design of Navy ships became intolerable with the approach of war."

As far as has been ascertained, the Navy has made no strong demands; nor has it indicated that the present conditions were intolerable. The U. S. S. *Missouri*, the latest type and only first-line battleship in active use, successfully transits the present canal. All the others are in "moth balls," peacefully awaiting overage status. These include the older battleships, which were modified by the installation of buoyancy blisters on their sides, thus increasing their beams beyond the capacity of the 110-foot locks.

Naval strategy, however, does look ahead. Should it appear that the wider ships are needed on the opposite coast, it would be no great hardship for these vessels to round Cape Horn. They carry sufficient oil for the full trip, coast to coast. Note well that this refers to the largest combatant ships, for there never has been any question about the adequacy of the present canal for the transit of commercial ships.

If the world situation ever requires a precautionary redistribution of United States naval forces, the largest vessels could be sent around South America with the utmost secrecy. There can be no secrecy once vessels are seen in the Canal Zone. As some of the larger aircraft carriers and three older decommissioned battleships are the only war vessels that cannot now transit the canal, the situation would appear far from intolerable from the naval standpoint.

It is true that the Navy asked for locks 140 feet wide for the third locks project. It also recommended locks 200 feet wide as a beginning for the recent studies. These naval statement must have been in the form of guarded replies to specific inquiries from canal authorities rather than as strongly worded recommendations for the 200-foot locks. As a leading question, how many times a year would the larger carriers or oversize battleships use the canal if it could accommodate them? The answer is probably not once in 2 years.

Next, how about the navigational safety of a sea-level canal? The related statements in the Stratton paper, based largely on ship-model tests, are assumptions and not established facts. In this connection, also, further elaboration is requested to support the incomplete facts presented. In the unregulated sea-level canal, with currents as much as 4.5 knots, an element of great danger that cannot be minimized is immediately introduced. In the regulated sea-level canal the much-increased length of restricted channel and the ordinary problems of navigation—night fog, heavy rains, and machinery failures—do not seem to have received the consideration that is due them. To the writer it seems obvious that the lake-type canal with its wide current-free channels is far better adapted to safe navigation than any necessarily restricted sea-level canal at Panama can ever be.

In the synopsis and under "Improvements in the interests of commerce only," Colonel Stratton states that with new navigational aids and other minor changes the present Canal could be improved sufficiently to accommodate the transit of 70 ships a day at a

cost of $129,983,000. The sea-level canal as projected, estimated as costing $2,483,000,000, he states, would transit 69 ships. This comparison indicates that the symposium authors are recommending something that will cost 20 times as much as improvements in the present Canal and that the completed works will not be as efficient.

In their closing discussions the symposium authors need to balance the presentation with an adequate treatment of the present operational deficiencies long recognized by all maritime agencies that use the Canal. These are such that the proposed minimum improvement program ($129,983,000) would not be a realistic solution; it would be only a repair job. For a fair comparison with the sea-level project, the alternate improvement program should include a cost estimate for the third locks project modified to include a Pacific terminal lake based on more reasonable lock sizes. The terminal-lake plan estimate, furthermore, should not be balanced, unfairly, with the costs of protective features against modern weapons when the leading authorities admit there is no effective defense against such weapons. In brief, the relative value of each case should be fairly stated with parallel tables of unit costs so that the best canal can be built at Panama.

The naval aspects of the present canal question have been well summarized by Rear Adm. D. E. Barbey, Commander of the Caribbean Sea Frontier, when he stated that the United States has a two-ocean Navy large enough to permit reinforcements to be sent around Cape Horn, that there is little likelihood of meeting a first-rate naval power in the foreseeable future, and that the Panama Canal has become a primary waterway for merchant ships in time of peace and a secondary route for critical raw materials in time of war. He minimized the probability of any enemy making a major effort to destroy it. "Why," he asked, "should they waste an atomic bomb on the Godforsaken Canal Zone, when they have New York Harbor as a target?"

The military aspects of Admiral Barbey's thesis have been supported by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, former head of the Manhattan Atomic Bomb project, who has also predicted that in a future war the first attack on the United States would be an atomic attack on New York. General Groves further emphasized that until effective international control of the A-bomb is established the only protection is to keep the A-bomb away by means of a well-balanced, effective, military strength. From this it follows that the only security for any type of canal project across the Isthmus depends on the combined industrial and military might of this Nation and not on the inherent merits or physical features of the Canal.

When the present confusions about vulnerability and security engendered by the atomic bomb are cleared away, and when these terms are understood in better perspective, the way should be open for a practical solution of this great problem as determined by the functional needs of the Panama Canal as a navigable waterway.

The Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our patriotic organizations constitute the bulwark of American liberty. They are composed of men who have served their Nation in times of great emergency.

I have just received in the mail a beautiful brochure entitled "Fiftieth Anniversary, Veterans of Foreign Wars." It is a fine historic review of 50 years of VFW activity. It portrays the birth and gradual growth of this organization from 1899 to the present date. It is truly a nice booklet.

In the foreword of this booklet, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, most appropriately congratulates the VFW when he states "There is no greater tribute to our gallant dead than service to their comrades. For 50 years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been paying this homage by helping the living to achieve a full and just measure of the security and the opportunity for which so many have given so much."

I, too, congratulate this fine patriotic organization on the golden anniversary of its foundation. I wish for it many more years of fruitful, constructive effort with increasing power, prestige, and patriotism. As long as men like Lyall T. Beggs, present national commander in chief, and the peerless Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, together with a host of other outstanding patriotic leaders remain at the helm, this organization will continue to exert a profound influence upon the history of America.

Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am supplementing my remarks of yesterday by including further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on Federal expenditures:

WINSTED, CONN.

The biggest element in the cost of living today is taxes, and everybody pays them. The way to build economic strength for this country and the individuals in it is to relieve rather than increase the burden of taxes. That means spending less and spending more carefully. The reports of the Hoover Commission indicate that there is a tremendous amount of wasteful spending and the time has come when the people can no longer support it.

THE UNION PIN CO.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal describes how hardware merchants are using extreme measures such as auctions, in the effort to move their inventories. They have cut buying and have canceled orders in keeping with the changing business conditions.

Considering all the forms of taxation, hidden and otherwise, that people in this country are burdened with, we feel it is imperative that unnecessary governmental expenditures be eliminated and the national budget drastically reduced.

WILMARS, INC.

PORT ANGELES, WASH.

Our Federal expenditures must be cut and cut, and then cut some more. The people of our country are far too heavily burdened with taxation now. Spending more and more for our children to repay, or even worse, to bankrupt our Nation, is asinine and unthinkable to all who will think.

NAILOR LUMBER CO.

WESTMONT, N. J.

I can see nothing but trouble and grief ahead for the American people if the terrific spending is not curbed.

Already the 1933 dollar which contained 100 cents of value, contains a value of only 38 cents today. People who purchased insurance with the 100-cent dollar, are certainly being cheated when they receive a 38-cent dollar, and there is no doubt in my mind but that the terrific spending by our Government has brought about this condition.

W. N. RUSSELL & CO.

MAKOTI, N. DAK.

Any reasonable-minded person can figure out that we cannot keep on spending millions without going bankrupt, however, I am of the opinion that conditions would please the Communists. We surely don't want any part of that organization here.

It has gotten to the point where most everyone is trying to get all they can from the Government regardless of the results, as they feel that the other fellow is doing just that. Unless something is done now I believe we shall soon have the results and they won't be as easy to handle as they were in the depression years, during 1930 and later years.

RENSCH GARAGE.

SEATTLE.

Let me congratulate you on the stand you took in your talk to the House Appropriations Committee on March 2, 1949. It is encouraging to know that we have some men in Washington who see the necessity of reducing the cost of Government.

We have far too big a national debt not to watch every item of expense, particularly at this time, with our foreign relations as they are. As I see it, in case of a national crisis, it would be very difficult to try to overcome the necessity of further taxation.

METROPOLITAN LAUNDRY CO.

WEST ALEXANDRIA, OHIO.

We hope you will be able to make the cuts in the budget, so that our Nation will operate on a financially sound basis, the same that you would operate a business if it were your own.

Although we know you will have lots of pressure brought to bear on you to appropriate the full amounts asked for, we do hope you will have the courage to say no to these unreasonable amounts asked for.

We understand there are billions of dollars asked for socialistic and experimental projects, the very thing that destroys a nation. Our Nation has been strong in years past due to the fact that it has been a capitalistic nation.

Look if you please, at all the nations that have embarked on socialistic, labor form of government, or what have you, and note the plight they are in.

If we continue to throw our money away, we will in a short period be easy prey to socialism, or some other form of government equally as bad, therefore it behooves us to sit up and take notice of our own situation before it is too late.

I wish to congratulate you on the courageous stand you have taken and I am sure you will have the backing of the majority of the population of the United States.

PREBLE COUNTY LUMBER CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Our Government today is the biggest business in the country and if we are to survive it should be put strictly on a business basis.

No other business in the country could survive with pay rolls padded to the same extent as in the Federal Government today. It is preposterous that 4 years after war our budget is still four times the prewar period.

SCHUTTE & KOERTING CO.

WEST BEND, WIS.

We have had it brought home to us so forcibly in years past and of late the dangers to our way of living should the economy of our country collapse. How better can we prevent this than an honest attempt put forth by our representatives such as you to balance a budget that is so badly in need of balancing.

GROVER'S BADGER PAINT STORE.

BURLINGTON, N. C.

I happen to be one of those individuals who talks to the person of the street and this includes a lot of factory workers and country people at every opportunity and I find that there is increasing interest, as well as concern, about this matter of enormous spending.

Whatever move you make to reduce appropriations for this or that activity, you may rest assured that it will be the wrong one, and other than our direct obligations such as interest on present enormous debt and a practical but realistic defense program, everything else can no doubt stand some trimming and if you don't do it now, it will be even more difficult next year and each succeeding year.

BAKER-CAMMACK HOSIERY MILLS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., AND MILFORD, DEL.

It is absolutely necessary for your committee to weed out the unnecessary funds in order to check our constantly expanding Federal expenses.

MULHOLLAND-HARPER CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The people have come to realize the seriousness of the spending policy of our Federal Government. I am certain that the small-business people of the country as well as millions of conscientious Americans, realize that we cannot go on pouring out money without regard as to where it is going to come from.

EVANS & CONVERY.

IRVINGTON, N. J.

If the Government continues to take so much of our income, we can't keep our businesses sound, much less make them grow. We can only get capital by making it and saving it. If you want small businesses to grow, you will have to let them keep something to grow on.

THE PALNUT CO.

RICHMOND, KY.

Be it a nation or a person, when spending is done without careful thought of income, bankruptcy is a natural consequence.

JAMES ANDERSON & SON.

BILLINGS, MONT.

This policy and procedure would not work in everyday business; therefore we naturally do not feel that it would work in government as government must be supported by both business and individuals.

GREAT NORTHERN TOOL & SUPPLY CO.

EL PASO, TEX.

We have so many bureaus and organizations and committees and departments scattered all over the United States that many times only serve to give somebody employment. We voters many times are to blame for this, because our Representatives are too often judged on the basis of how much they can bring home out of the "pork barrel" rather than how much they can save. I think it is high time that we did some careful combing of all of these appropriations for the Federal Government.

CAR PARTS DEPOT, INC.

KEWAUNEE, WIS.

We cannot keep on spending the way we did for the past 10 years. We are no longer at war, and when we were we exhausted our resources to a great extent. We should now begin to conserve, and we cannot conserve by spending.

KEWAUNEE ENGINEERING CORP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my feelings on the necessity of reducing the Federal budget.

Give us taxpayers a much-needed break in the tax burden.

SCHAFER BROS.

LANSING, MICH.

As a graduate of a university, who majored in business administration, and as a small independent businessman now struggling to maintain his business, the writer learned that the cardinal principle of any business is that its income must be greater than its outgo. Why the largest business in the world should be run on anything but the soundest of business principles is a question which I have never been able to understand.

The very top-heavy structure of our Government, as shown by the recent Hoover Commission Report, is a good example of duplicity and manpower waste. I sincerely believe that reducing Government appropriations is the key to the whole situation. Logically, when the supply of ready cash is cut it will force bureau heads and "empire builders" to reduce their working force so that it becomes necessary for the remaining employees to do a reasonable day's work. It will further enable us to at least make a start toward reducing the astronomical Federal debt.

PAUL AUTOMOTIVE, INC.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Having been in business for a number of years, and realizing, as most businessmen do, that to survive we must watch our expenditures, I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation for the stand of the House Appropriations Committee in demanding drastic reduction in our Federal expenditures.

BURTON LUMBER & HARDWARE CO.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Substantial reductions must be made—before it is too late—if we are to escape national bankruptcy.

I am in favor of doing everything within reason for the really needy and unfortunate citizens of this country. But too many appropriations, while doing some good, go far beyond the point of reason.

DAVIS BROS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Most of us, must of necessity, conduct our affairs so that we receive the maximum return for everything that we spend. To do otherwise would put us out of business.

It seems to me that the time has come when our Government must realize that it cannot continually increase taxes but that it must give greater consideration to spending money where it would do the most good for the greatest number of people.

Our Nation is a very rich Nation but even our Nation cannot stand the continued drain that present taxes are making upon all of us.

WELMAID MANUFACTURING CORP.

EDINBURG, TEX.

There is no need to tell you that this is the greatest Nation the world has ever known, and its past greatness is entirely due to the capitalistic system which has received so much abuse at the hands of politicians in the past several years. All that capital needs at the present is a reasonable assurance from the Congress that they will be given a fighting chance to carry on the projects now being handled by the Government.

A budget of $40,000,000,000 represents the entire income of all the people and the business of 25 of our 48 States.

EDINBURG ICE & COLD STORAGE CO., INC.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Reducing the appropriations for the Federal Government at this particular time is imperative if the Nation is to avoid bankruptcy.

SAN ANTONIO LAUNDRY AND CLEANERS.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

As a businessman of 30 years experience, I cannot see how the Government can continue to spend far more than it receives. Such a policy will not work in one's home, in one's business, or in one's Government.

MARSHALL & WILLIAMS CORP.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

All items in the budget must be scrutinized very carefully and reduced to the absolute minimum if this country of ours is to be kept from the brink of ruin.

MCCULLOCH AUTO SUPPLY CO.

FORT SMITH, ARK.

If our Government continues to spend such a tremendous amount each year, what little money we have worked a lifetime to save to take care of ourselves when we become disabled will not be worth the paper it is printed on.

FORT SMITH VEHICLE CO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

It is rather a sad commentary on the intelligence of some of the people sent to Washington to run our affairs, who try to make us believe that it is necessary to spend in excess of $40,000,000,000 a year to run our Federal Government, or in other words, to make us believe that there is any justification for having the cost of running the Federal Government today amount to over five times what it cost 10 years ago.

There is only one way to keep this Nation solvent, and that is to drastically reduce Federal expenditures and curtail waste and extravagance. If the article, starting on page 61 of the March 1949, issue of Reader's Digest is true—or only true in part—How Bureaucracy Swindles the Taxpayer, it would seem there is plenty to do. Furthermore, the report of the Hoover committee on executive reorganization indicates there are a great many rat holes into which we are pouring money with no visible return.

FRED B. HALDY.

BILLINGS, MONT.

This country is so close to bankruptcy that it isn't funny, and the only way the problem can be solved is that we must start reducing appropriations for the Federal Government. Let's start, and let us start now, on this economy program and reducing the supply of spending money. If we do that, we will then start cutting down Federal expenditure and get our Government down to the

size and type that the taxpayers of these United States will have a chance to handle and take care of on a reasonable basis.

MIDLAND IMPLEMENT CO., INC.

MIAMI, FLA.

All unnecessary appropriations should be eliminated.

FLORIDA GLASS & MIRROR CO., INC.

EVANSTON, ILL.

I hope sincerely you will support the Hoover report and reduce overlapping agencies.

B. D. WARK.

BEATRICE, NEBR.

It is my sound belief and the belief of every businessman of my acquaintance that no one, be it an individual, a business, or government can escape bankruptcy if there is a condition of spending more than is received and of continually going into debt on the basis of future hopes.

F. D. KESS MANUFACTURING CO.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

It is imperative that our country gets once more into the proper financial shape and into a safer position to be able to meet unforeseen complications as might arise in the near future.

SPONBERG'S DEPARTMENT STORE.

RIO VISTA, CALIF.

It is quite perturbing to have our elected representatives attempting to increase taxes when the business trend is downward. Apparently there is going to be quite a substantial deficit in the present budget and if appropriations are to be increased the onlly sound way to get such appropriations is to increase taxes. The burden now is heavier than many small businesses can bear. Surely, by such increases many businesses will have to be liquidated, thus again increasing budget deficits.

BLACKWELDER MANUFACTURING CO.

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ.

Face growing pressure for increased expenditures.

RIORDANS, INC.

DAVENPORT, IOWA.

I definitely feel that the Hoover Commission has done an excellent job in preparing their reports concerning methods to start reducing Government expenditures. I certainly hope that these reports will be given earnest consideration and that most of the recommendations can be adopted.

M. A. FORD MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

NEW YORK CITY.

We, who observe the proposals of the "spenders" to constantly increase the tax burden on wage earners and business are not only concerned but definitely fearful that we are headed for a crash unless somebody in the Congress has the guts to stand up and say, "You have gone far enough."

The people of this country are pretty well fed up with the unnecessary tax burdens that are being placed upon them and the day isn't far distant when they will rise up and let those who continue to add to this burden know very definitely their feelings.

It is very desirable that we call a moratorium on all Government spending, and do it promptly—that is, all Government expending except for the essentials of good, sound, economic Government.

NATIONAL SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

The financial condition of this, our Nation, is and should be the paramount issue before us. We cannot continue to tax and spend for common sense tells us that sooner or later a saturation point must be reached.

GRAFF BROS., INC.

MEADVILLE, PA.

Now is the time, as we see it, for all costs to be greatly curtailed as well in Government as in business. The manufacturer has long realized that the only sure way to solvency is to spend less than the revenue derived.

CHAMPION DEARMENT TOOL CO.

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.

Up until our day, it is an indisputable, proven fact that democracy has produced the world's finest living conditions, and what logical justification there can possibly be for a change, has not so far been demonstrated. You will appreciate, consequently, that there is a growing and bitter opposition on the part of many taxpayers, who realize only too well, they are being forced to provide funds to tear down the world's best form of government, and that by men who are certainly not true to their oath of office.

TREHEARNE'S.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

While I speak only for our individual company I know the problems of the average in the same line of business and our greatest problem today is excessive taxes, and not only can we not stand increases in these taxes but many businesses such as ours will discontinue in the next several months unless some relief from the present high taxes is brought about.

Most of us know that there will, of necessity, be heavy taxes for quite some time, but we all feel that the money asked for in the future budget will go for activities that are of no value to the greatest majority of the American people.

FLORIDA MOTOR SERVICE, INC.

CHICAGO, ILL.

In the past, and for that matter the present, we believe there has been an unfortunate tendency for Senators and Congressmen to listen to vociferous minority pressure groups.

SETHNESS PRODUCTS CO.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.

I am in business here in Kingman and I have Government spending very much at heart.

We feel the time has come to cut on useless Government spending. We have had nothing but spending since 1933, and if we do not halt it now before it is too late, we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

WAL-A-PAI AUTO COURT.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following copy of a press release by a distinguished citizen of my district and a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Martin C. Ansorge:

A warning that the Eighty-first Congress, by striking out the peril-point-to-American-industry amendment to the Hull Trade Agreements Act may bring on a depression causing unemployment that will dwarf that following the Wilson-Underwood tariff bill of 1913, was sounded yesterday by former Representative Martin C. Ansorge (Republican, New York.) The peril-point amendment passed by the last Congress provides that the United States Tariff Commission shall determine tariff floors below which American labor and American industry cannot compete against cheap foreign labor. It requires that the President report to Congress and offer an explanation of any proposed duties below these peril points before agreeing to them in any trade agreements with foreign countries. The House eliminated the peril-point amendment in its passage of the trade-pact extension, on Wednesday last. The bill will shortly come before the Senate for action.

Citing figures to show that present duties under trade agreements already entered into, are below those of the Underwood Tariff bill of 1913, and referring to the depression that followed during 8 months of operation before the First World War, Mr. Ansorge said:

"With the ending of the war and the gradual reopening of the channels of trade, the problem of protecting American wage earners and American industry from the onslaughts of underpaid European and Asiatic labor competition confronts the Nation. In spite of the pump-priming of the armament and European recovery programs, already there are serious problems of unemployment confronting us.

"For over 130 years a protective tariff has stood as a barrier between the working man of this country and the cheap, underpaid, prison and child labor of foreign countries.

"The continued employment of American labor and retention of his high standard of living are threatened if the Eighty-first Congress strikes out the protective amendment that limits the power of the President by requiring him to report back to Congress, before agreeing with any foreign nation to lower duties below peril points to American labor and industry, as found by the United States Tariff Commission.

"The situation today is no different in principle to that which brought on the depression of 1914. At that time, Woodrow Wilson, a minority-President-with-a-mandate, declared that American businessmen were illogical and provincial in clinging to a policy of protection. The Democratic platform of 1912 went so far as to assert that a protective tariff was unconstitutional.

"The Wilson-Underwood tariff bill, in which the idea of protection was discarded, went into operation December 1, 1913. The effects of that legislation during the 8 months preceding the First World War will never be forgotten. Merchandise with labels 'Made in Japan,' etc., flooded our markets, even as they are beginning to appear today. Foreign-made goods, the handiwork of underpaid, prison and child labor, poured into this country. The roar of factory machinery, the hum of busy wheels, and the smoking chimneys of successful industry melted away as the effects of the Underwood bill began to be felt. The protective wall had by the stroke of a pen been shattered to bits, and over the ruins foreign-made goods poured into this country.

"One-third of the steel mills in the United States closed down. One million men were idle in the iron and steel industries. Two hundred and seventy-five thousand miners were out of work who, under a protective tariff, were earning $715,000,000 annually. Five hundred thousand railroad men were out of employment and 238,000 freight cars lay idle on the tracks. There were 300,000 idle men in the industrial city of New York, and many will recall that a New York newspaper started a 'Save-a-Home' fund to care for dispossessed families. A vacant city building on Lafayette Street, called the Hotel-de-Gink, was opened by Jeff Davis,

'King of the Hoboes,' to house the unemployed. I personally visited the place and saw the appalling sight of men sleeping on bare floors and cooking their meals over canned heat on slabs of tin. Maybe that sight inspires this warning: It may happen here again.

"Millions of working people were out of employment throughout the country after 8 months of the Underwood tariff bill.

"In Japan in the textile factories manufacturing silk and embroidery there were 50,000 children under the age of 14, earning from 6 to 12 cents a day, and 489,000 male and female operators, over the age of 14, averaging 18 cents a day. In miscellaneous factories there were 73,000 men, women, and children averaging 17 cents a day.

"President Wilson, in opposing a protective tariff, referred to the 'unmatched energy of America.' But the unmatched energy of America must be protected from the underpaid energy of Europe and Asia.

"It was claimed by President Wilson that the Underwood bill would reduce the cost of living and capture the markets of the world. It did not reduce the cost of living; the cost of living went up. It did not capture the markets of the world; the markets of the world were rapidly capturing ours, until the European war saved the administration from its own folly.

"No matter what may have caused other depressions, that of 1914 was a man-made depression that was inexcusable and could have been avoided.

"The Trade Agreements Act was adopted in June 1934. The record of tariff slashes under trade agreements to date, is almost unbelievable. Based on the Tariff Act of 1930, duties were slashed 64 percent by 1945. Many were cut in half, hundreds reduced 25 percent, 40 percent, and many frozen on the free list. When the act was renewed in 1945 the President was empowered to cut again up to 50 percent on duties already cut. Since then, many of the 1930 rates reduced before 1945 have been cut or halved again. The United States announced in November 1947 further reductions, froze many items on the free list and affected 80 percent of all of our imports, all without any congressional ratification. As a result of these cuts, two-thirds of this country's imports by kind are admitted duty-free. The average duty on the other one-third has been slashed to 14 percent, even lower than the 27 percent under the destructive Underwood bill of 1913. It is obvious that there are no longer any prohibitive or high tariffs, and that the cry of 'high tariffs" is a pure myth.

"All fair-minded Americans are opposed to a high tariff. But one which compels the foreign manufacturer to pay Uncle Sam the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, is a low tariff, brings revenue into the Treasury and protects the wages of American labor, thereby increasing the opportunity to make and receive advanced wages. Without this protection, wages would have to be reduced to compete with the low level of foreign competition.

"The effect of import duties lower than the difference in manufacturing costs at home and abroad was recently dramatized by the closing down of the Waltham Watch Co., resulting in 2,300 jobless employees. T. Albert Potter, board chairman of Elgin National Watch Co., who died January 24, wrote just before his death to a group of Senators and Representatives, that the tariff on imported watches was so low as to place the American watch industry 'at a hopeless competitive disadvantage.' The watch industry is merely typical of what every competitive American industry will face, should the peril-point amendment be eliminated from the act, and should the President ignore the peril points in future agreements.

"The American Federation of Labor, through its National Legislative Representative, Walter J. Mason, emphasized before the Ways and Means Committee the existence within its ranks of protectionist elements who have always contended that the program of Cordell Hull failed to give sufficient consideration to the competition of low-paid foreign craftsmen. Endorsing the functions of the Tariff Commission, as provided in the peril-point amendment, Mr. Mason testified 'the Tariff Commission seems to us to be the appropriate agency to carry out the necessary factual investigations to aid and guide the State Department in its negotiations. We urge that the authority of the Tariff Commission be accorded full recognition in the adjustment of tariff rates and believe that this will not hinder progress of the trade agreements program.' O. H. Strackbein, executive secretary of America's Wage Earners' Protective Association, representing 12 A. F. L. unions, urged the House committee to retain, as a minimum, the Tariff Commission's present functions in preparation for the negotiations of future trade agreements.

"The escape clause in some of the present agreements provides that if any tariff cut causes or threatens serious injury to domestic producers the cut may be modified or withdrawn. The escape clause has never been used. In all probability, it would not be used until after the damage has been done. The watch industry is a sorry example. Even the escape-clause provision, offered in the House last Wednesday, was defeated by a party vote.

"The argument that we are a creditor nation and that foreign countries cannot pay their debts unless they sell us their products is very convincing on its face. But experience has shown that there is little probability of the debts being paid, and, furthermore, we cannot permit dumping of foreign goods into this country and demoralization of American industry in order to enable foreign countries to pay their debts. If a depression should result, this '- just what the Kremlin is praying for.

"The Constitution separates the powers of government into three distinct parts, so that one will be a check against the others. Congress is given power to provide for the collection of duties and to regulate commerce with foreign nations. The Senate is given power to concur in the making of treaties. Aside from the constitutional question as to the right of the House and Senate to delegate to one man—the President—the uncontrolled and unlimited power to fix duties and to make what are tantamount to treaties with foreign countries, is it consistent with our democratic form of government to place so much power in one man?

"The Hoover Commission, in its report, approved by the House on February 7, states that this Government 'must act decisively to preserve its human and material resources.' This country's material resources include a healthy industry, not one impaired by foreign competition that is being fathered and financed by American dollars.

"As in 1914, we have another minority-President-with-a-mandate. A mandate to do what? Surely not to sell American labor, agriculture, and industry down the river. I am sure that he doesn't want to do that.

"The principle of reciprocal trade is a good one, and the Trade Act should be extended. But the United States Tariff Commission should be permitted to retain the power to determine peril points to American labor and industry, below which the President shall not go without congressional sanction. If this be a crippling provision, it is a necessary one. Better a short delay, than a long depression. If the act be extended without the peril-point amendment, the President should carry out its purpose, in all future agreements. If he fails, the responsibility will be on his doorstep, but the injury will be ours."

England's Religious Hospitals Retain Private Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 I placed in the RECORD the fifth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 23, is the sixth of the series:

ENGLAND'S RELIGIOUS HOSPITALS RETAIN PRIVATE STATUS—HEALTH MINISTRY ALLAYS FEAR OF NATIONALIZATION

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Sixth in a series)

LONDON, March 23.—The hospitals owned and operated by religious orders are among those that have not been nationalized under the British Health Service Act and they are quite happy and optimistic over their outlook.

They have been worried for a year, but now have decided there is, and will continue to be, a great demand for their institutions. In addition to the denominational hospitals, others excluded from the force of the law are one fraternal-order hospital and one labor hospital.

These independents are not opposed to the National Health Service program. Those interviewed have good words for it, but they think it is unnecessary for the state to seize their facilities and compel them to be operated by Government direction in state medicine. They are forming an Independent Hospital Association to unite them for future discussions with the Government, should occasion arise.

CORDIAL RELATIONS

They are enjoying cordial relations with the Health Ministry; there is no antagonism, and they are cooperating by accepting national health service patients when the Government sends some to them. All that they ask is that they be allowed to retain their individual entities.

The religious-order hospitals protested strongly against seizure of their properties by the Government. The health act authorizes the Minister of Health to take them, but he has been persuaded to disclaim his powers over them. The subject was controversial a year ago, but everything is agreeable now.

One of these hospitals explained its operations in detail this week. It is an old institution, started with the encouragement of Florence Nightingale by some of her assistants in Crimea when they returned to England. It has cared largely for those with little means and has relied on contributions from the general public for its continuance.

MOST SERVICE IS FREE

Most of its service is free or at low cost, even though its patients officially are private patients, and it is a private hospital. When service has been rendered, an almoner talks with the patient and inquires if he has ability to pay. He donates nothing, or what he can afford, without pressure, but not more than the actual cost, anyway.

During 1948, when the fate of the hospital was in doubt, the usual appeal for funds was not conducted, and it was necessary to borrow $200,000 to keep going. Now the financial situation is improved, gifts are coming in well, and an appeal committee expects to

find whatever money will be needed to start the institution off anew.

It has 154 beds, only 36 of which are in private rooms available for private-room patients. These folks are charged $88 a week, exactly double what the fees were a year ago. Now all private patients in private rooms are asked to pay the entire cost of their hospitalization, and they pay their own medical and surgical fees, too.

TAKES GOVERNMENT PATIENTS

The hospital has about a dozen National Health Service patients and is paid by the Government for them at the rate of $37.42 a week. These are given exactly the same care and attention accorded the private patients, who also may not be paying anything themselves because they cannot afford to do so.

It seems strange that families with low incomes will make use of this hospital, which expects them to pay something if they can, rather than accept the free hospitalization offered somewhere else by the Government. The hospital says the answer is that it has a good reputation, people want to become its patients when they must be operated on, and there is less delay in getting into it than under the state-medicine program.

While people may not be suffering any health danger during waiting periods under the free service, they do develop an uncertainty and they want to get into a hospital and have the operation over with. Also, if X-rays are to be taken, they like to get them quickly and learn their exact condition.

POINT TO RECORD

These religious-order hospitals steadily impress on a visitor that they are not opposing National Health Service and point to their own century-old free service to anyone and everyone.

All in all, the remaining free hospitals are grateful to the Ministry for disclaiming its right to acquire their premises and to the public for its generosity in helping them to face the future bravely. They desire only to cooperate in fullest degree with the Government and to continue their works of mercy in their own way.

Release of William Wedge by Yugoslav Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the City Council of Marlborough, Mass.:

IN CITY COUNCIL,
Marlborough, Mass., March 21, 1949.

Ordered, That the city council go on record as thanking the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson and Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN for the efforts they attained on behalf of a Mr. William Wedge who was imprisoned by the Yugoslav authorities as the result of an accident in which the jeep he was driving killed a Yugoslav officer, in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and that through the persistent efforts of the American Embassy in Belgrade, Mr. William Wedge was finally released from prison and has now returned to the United States; and it is further

Ordered, That the resolution passed by the city council and approved by his honor, the mayor, on September 16, 1946, having attained its purpose, that the Secretary of State and the Congressman from the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts be and are hereby given a vote of thanks and appreciation for their untiring efforts on behalf of William Wedge formerly of this city and now of Newtonville, Mass.

In city council March 21, 1949.

Approved by Mayor Carlton W. Allen, March 28, 1949.

A true copy.

Attest: FRANCIS J. BERTRAND,
City Clerk.

Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am supplementing my remarks of yesterday by including further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on Federal expenditures:

PALM BEACH, FLA.

What a wonderful future this country has if the Government and individuals would respect old-fashioned thrift.

S. V. P. QUACKENBUSH.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

I believe most thoughtful citizens want our country to help Europe and also to support a western defense program but let's count the cost and not get in beyond our depth and there is a limit to that depth.

It seems to me that it is about time to consider the well-being of our citizenry and try to do something for the folks who must earn the money to pay the taxes. Social welfare is fine, but it is possible to kill the geese who lay the golden eggs and have the nest (our country) defiled by the drones who ask much but give little.

BAY STATE ELEVATOR CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

We can't go on spending $40,000,000,000 a year.

The country was developed by people working and not looking for Santa Claus every day.

SAWARD'S JOURNAL.

CHICAGO, ILL.

If this country is to be saved from bankruptcy, socialism, and worse, steps must be taken at once to reduce the expenses of government.

BERKSHIRE PAPERS, INC.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

We believe in our Government's business being "cut to the bone" basis of sound economical standards that serve the people the greatest benefits when they need it.

The various taxes are now so high many small businesses (after taxes are paid) are barely breaking even, and several are folding up under the heavy tax burdens being imposed upon us (the small-business men).

UNIVERSAL TOOL CO.,
O. B. DEMATTEIS.

RICHMOND, KY.

The elimination of all socialistic and experimental items from the budget has my complete backing.

Reduce appropriations not absolutely essential.

CANFIELD MOTOR CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Our Government cannot go on spending billions and billions of dollars and continue to survive.

It seems that certain people have in mind to continue to employ more people on our Government pay rolls, and as we understand it, now we have about four times as many people working for the Government as we had 10 years ago.

We recently read an article in one of our magazines where, in 1937, it took all the income from about three States to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government, and now, at this time, it takes the national income of 25 States to defray these expenses. In our estimation, this is certainly out of reason.

We sincerely hope you will try to eliminate all socialistic and experimental items from the budget, and reduce our necessary items to the minimum.

W. C. WIEDENMANN & SON, INC.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Billions are undoubtedly being spent each year for unnecessary purposes and in a wasteful manner. I sincerely hope that the pressure from selfish people will not deter you from weeding out unworthy projects, thereby saving the American taxpayer billions of dollars.

JOHN T. TABOR.

CARTHAGE, MO.

Many business lines are now passing through a cycle of recession. The total industrial activity will almost certainly be less in 1949 than at any time since the war. Even if this is not the beginning of the long-feared depression, it indicates readjustment and is a critical period for the economy. We should reduce Government spending at such a time—not maintain it at the present level or increase it.

H. E. WILLIAMS.

ST. LOUIS, U. S. A.

It is hard to say "No" to so many sincere citizens who devoutly believe that their own particular project is absolutely essential to the welfare of some segment of our population; yet these same groups overlook the most vital point of all—the necessity of keeping our financial house in order.

Certainly the many tried and true factors that we know from past experience must have the financial support of the Congress, should have their requests carefully studied and granted wherever possible; but in Government I believe the same care that we use in private business regarding new expenditures should be followed.

You can't spend more than you take in and still remain solvent; and the Government can't spend more than it receives in taxes without raising the tax structure somewhere.

With our present world-wide commitments, 1949 is certainly no time for spending on a lot of new experiments. The worst service we can render the world would be to go broke ourselves.

ST. LOUIS BLOW PIPE & HEATER CO., INC.

CENTRALIA, MO.

As a democracy, we can afford to spend just so much for Government if we are to remain free, and if Government is to remain the servant of the people and not their master.

The increase in Government pay rolls and the intervention of Government into our everyday lives is leading us down the road to socialism.

The popular opinion that special-interest groups can get something for nothing is a fallacy. What one group gains another productive group must lose, to the ultimate detriment of both groups.

A. B. CHANCE CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

During recent months we have all witnessed a substantial reduction in commodity prices, and every businessman knows that the volume of business has been on a steady decrease, and it appears it will continue to decrease for the foreseeable future. This will, of course, mean less income from taxes, and will result in a very serious deficit in the next fiscal year, unless you and others are successful in your efforts to reduce appropriations.

HERBERT V. JONES & CO.

OMAHA, NEBR.

There must, there simply must, be some end to the Federal Government spend, spend, spend program.

PAYNE & SONS CO.

TUSTIN, CALIF.

It is naturally easy for anyone to overspend when handling the other fellow's funds, so weed out unnecessary funds from the budget.

UTT JUICE CO.

ELMHURST, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

I hope that it will be possible to carry through on eliminating all socialistic and experimental items from the budget and to reduce all the other items as much as possible. It certainly does not seem possible that the Government can go on spending additional billions of dollars each year and expect the country to survive.

ELMHURST RUBBER CO., INC.

JOHNSTOWN, PA.

Remarks about weeding out unnecessary funds before the House Appropriations Committee on March 2 have strengthened my faith in our Government.

HARRY G. WISE & SONS.

ATTLEBORO, MASS.

If they would follow through on the reductions of spending money and cutting the Federal Government down to normal size, I am sure that a lot of important things would have more time in consideration.

REARDON & LYNCH CO.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

I have just filed my tax return for 1948 with check covering final payment, and am now starting on the year 1949 with my March 15 declaration and remittance. This subject being so fresh in my mind at the present moment, I thought it might be in order to voice a protest against the constantly increasing tax burden that has been forced on the people of this country. It is causing a great deal of hardship and discontent and will eventually lead to serious difficulty, and the very good possibility that come March 15 large numbers of people may file tax returns, but without the very important remittance being enclosed. This action will be caused in some instances by inability to pay and in other cases as a protest against the constant increased spending and demands for increased amounts of money by almost all departments of the Government, and this would seem to apply all the way from the Federal Government down to the township unit.

THOMAS M. FITZGERALD CO., INC.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

The country cannot continue to spend more than $40,000,000,000 a year and survive. This, I believe, is a self-evident truth but one which must be repeated time and time again for our Nation to realize its significance.

LANHAM HARDWOOD FLOORING CO., INC.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

It is obvious that a stop must be put to the ever-increasing governmental budgets. Continual increasing of the governmental budgets, and the necessity of each and every citizen continuing to work each day of the year in order to alone earn for the payment of taxes, will result in the reducing of initiative of the average individual to the point of what has happened on a national scale in Great Britain today.

EVERYBODY'S DAILY.

SAGINAW, MICH.

I have read a number of articles published in our best magazines on how the bureaus are wasting our money. It is hard for me to believe but it must be true because the writers of these articles are well known and reliable authors.

I am a small-business man and all employees as well as myself are vitally interested in keeping this Nation in a sound financial condition.

CONSOLIDATED FREIGHT CO.

SAGINAW, MICH.

Anyone seriously desiring to keep our economic system as we have known it for the past 170 years and who has the slightest knowledge of economics realizes that your statements are true and that unless we cut Government spending, we are headed for a break-down in our economy and a resulting dictatorship which always follows.

It is unpopular to mention such drastic consequences at this time, but history will reward those who have the courage to stand up for what they know will be right and will prove itself in the years to come. It is only by having a sufficient number of leaders who have the courage and the knowledge to take the steps required to reduce our Government spending that we can save our democracy.

JACKSON & CHURCH CO.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The undersigned is not wealthy, not even well-to-do, but I do have some United States E bonds and some life insurance, but by far more important than my personal welfare is the welfare of our Nation, and our Nation with its present enormous debt cannot stand any additional debt increase. Instead, the debt should be reduced each year. All these new proposals and schemes should be entirely stopped.

J. EMIL HEMMAN.

OSSINING, N. Y.

Weed out unnecessary funds.

Bring us back to the road of sanity and understanding.

OSSINING GARAGE SUPPLY CO.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Your remarks at the meeting of the House Appropriations Committee last week were extremely timely.

Your attitude regarding the spending of public money is honest and right, and you are to be commended for your stand. We believe that your position should carry weight and should cause others to stop and consider your statements.

We realize the tendency of the public to expect more and more from society, and to depend less and less upon itself, but there is a limit to what society can afford to do without harmful results and we agree with you that that limit has not only been reached but has been passed.

DALE BROS. LAUNDRY CO., INC.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Our free-enterprise economy is being wrecked by spending, the prodigious and wasteful spending of our Federal and State governments.

As an auditor, I get around a lot. Sentiment is increasing, with bitterness and disillusionment. I have not been across the river, but in central and southern Illinois it is getting pretty strong.

CRUMMEY, KOHTALA & CO.

GREENWICH, N. Y.

The business of our Federal Government is so big it is hard for me to think of it until I imagine the Government as an ordinary citizen just like myself. A look at this citizen's personal finances shows that he owes a year and a half's income more or less right now, and any American I know of that is in this position curbs his standard of living and pays his debts.

R. B. STEVENS.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

We are interested in carrying out former President Hoover's and his committee's recommendations to cut down department spending and overlapping. It should be done slowly, by degrees, accounting system established first, new booking systems, then each branch given 1 or 2 years to comply with some pattern, but it must be rigid and ruthless, because no high-paid Government head is going to reduce personnel or overhead unless he gets instructions and a plan of what has to be done. After changes are made he will be the first to concede that it was a wise move and should have been done years ago. Any organization that grows as fast as the United States during the last 25 years creates barnacles, and it needs a pruning knife to cut out the cancers or it will die of its own weight.

STIRLING LUMBER CO., INC.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his first campaign for the Presidency, made the statement, "Taxes are paid by the sweat of man's brow." It is my opinion that the majority of the projects which are undertaken are conducted in a very lavish and wasteful manner. I firmly believe the majority of these projects could be conducted, and conducted satisfactorily, at a cost considerably less than is being expended.

In these critical times it is the duty of our Representatives in Congress to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures and to see to it that those expenditures which are made produce value for the money which is spent.

FIBRE LEATHER MANUFACTURING CORP.

CLAY CITY, ILL.

We, as manufacturing and repair operators of oil-field equipment, like many other businessmen, have suffered quite a loss in the last 90 days. We know that we cannot survive if we must continue paying these higher taxes.

BIG FOUR MACHINE & SUPPLY CO.

MUNDELEIN, ILL.

I have a keen appreciation of the problems with which your committee is confronted. It is so easy to appropriate and to spend, but the day of reckoning is so inevitable. The slight abrasions that are caused by cutting appropriations always prove quite superficial, but the wounds of bankruptcy are fatal.

On your committee rests a very grave responsibility. Your decisions today will determine our Nation's future. Undermine it financially is to ruin it; to keep it solvent is to save it.

SPARKLER MANUFACTURING CO.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

I believe it is one of the keystones in the Russian arch that we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy and then be ripe for plucking.

No doubt you are now finding yourself under all sorts of pressure by the taxers and taxers and spenders and spenders, but I sincerely hope you will stand pat and find a sufficient number to stand with you so that we can one day get off the foolish road on which we have been too long.

D. G. HUGHES.

MEMPHIS, TENN.

Our Government, I am sorry to say, reminds me of a monkey with a coconut, in that it can manufacture more useless work for more useless people.

During my early years as a civil-service clerk in the Surgeon General's office in 1917, I was given a bunch of cards as a task, to write, which I did in about an hour, and being new, looked for more work to do. I was told emphatically by my associates in the office that the work was supposed to last me all day, and "what was I trying to do, show them up?" Needless to say I did not stay in the Government any longer than I had to.

E. G. COWAN.

MAYWOOD, N. J.

Anyone knows that you cannot continue to waste billions of dollars every year, with a huge debt piled up over your head, and still be able to survive for long.

J & H LABEL PROCESSING CORP.

DETROIT, MICH.

This present transition period back to some semblance of normalcy provides positively no support for definitely unbalanced financing. It is easily possible that a truly unselfish American program could be far more conducive to public interest at this time than a purely political expansion plan serving only a chosen few.

The reduction of the present army of Government employees to a decent level, consistent with good American business judgment, will solve the major budget problem of today. I shudder to envision the Government expanding into the private-enterprise field and shouldering the additional burden such a pay roll would entail.

BERT BAKER, INC.

BERWYN, ILL.

I just completed a short sales trip and I was amazed while on this trip to find how conscious the public has suddenly become on taxes and Government spending. I talked with farmers, small-business men and some big-business men and all seemed to feel that unless some drastic cuts are immediately made in Government expenses this country is headed for a crash.

Let's get back to basic American principles.

SOUTH-WEST AUTO PARTS.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

I am just an ordinary worker and I do not know much about my Government, but I understand that the Appropriations Committee has a lot to do with cutting down Government spending, which, of course, determines how much taxes we pay. I surely do hope they will cut down on the present budget.

HERMA S. COPEN.

GREENVILLE, S. C.

When I was in Washington some weeks ago attending the National Small Business Men's Association Washington meeting, the president of that organization made the statement that there was only one item in the Federal budget that could not be cut, and that was the interest on our public debt. I am sure his statement is absolutely true.

If we could just get rid of the lobbyists who are on the pay roll of the Federal Government, in the positions of heads of great bureaus and organizations in Washington, I am sure that we could make tremendous cuts in the budget expenditures of the United States Government. I am sure Congress re lizes that business is beginning to slump and slump badly. In my own immediate section notices have just been published to the employees that most of the textile mills are being cut back to a 4-day basis. This will materially reduce the prosperity of this entire section.

ALESTER G. FURMAN CO.

LOWELL, MASS.

You may know that there is a saying up in this older section of the country which goes something like this: "Any darn fool can spend money—it takes a good person to save it."

F. E. JEWETT CO.

Development of the Waterways of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions relative to the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts favors and urges the development of the waterways of the Commonwealth, wherever feasible, for the production of hydroelectricity to free the Commonwealth from dependence on coal and other fuels which are scarce or nonexistent in the Commonwealth, to stimulate industrial enterprises in the Commonwealth, and to encourage the establishment of new enterprises in the Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to effect said development of waterways for the production of hydroelectricity to be distributed through private enterprise and municipal power and light plants; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts invites and urges the cooperation of the five other New England States and the State of New York in the development of waterways coming to the New England States and the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, to the Governor of each of the five other New England States and the State of New York, and to the presiding officer of each branch of the legislature of each of said States.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 2, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 10, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the Palisades project, Idaho, the item for which is found at line 13, page 38, of the bill. There was no appropriation for this project for the fiscal year 1949 and the budget request for the fiscal year 1950 is $205,000 which was reduced to $174,250. These funds are to be used to continue investigation and studies of flood control, sedimentation, and related studies. The water that will be stored in Palisades Dam originates in the Snake River in Wyoming. A compact for the division of water between Wyoming and Idaho has not been completed. I shall not object to this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, but I serve notice here and now that I will certainly object to any appropriation for construction purposes on this project for the fiscal year 1951 unless a compact is concluded by that time. I wish to call attention to the letter which I received from our State engineer, Mr. L. C. Bishop, in regard to this matter:

STATE OF WYOMING,
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Cheyenne, March 21, 1949.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: This is in reply to your verbal inquiry concerning the effect of Palisades Reservoir on the State of Wyoming, if and when same is constructed and placed in operation.

First, I believe you should know that this development was authorized without the knowledge, advice, or consent of the State of Wyoming. It would seem that in any major development such as this that will require the use of water originating in an adjoining State that hearings should be held and the State that might be adversely affected be given a chance to be heard before authorization.

Immediately upon my information concerning the plan to build this dam, I wrote Idaho officials asking that a compact be negotiated at an early date for the purpose of dividing the water of Snake River and tributaries between Idaho and Wyoming. Idaho officials agreed to this.

Two meetings have been held to date and the best proposition we have received is to the effect that Idaho is willing to sell us storage space in Palisades Reservoir on the basis of 1 acre-foot for each 3 acres we irrigate in the future. They would recognize all present uses in Wyoming.

We have potential needs for the use of Snake River water in Wyoming that might eventually deplete the stream as much as 5 percent within the basin and 5 percent outside the basin (about 150,000 acre-feet each to the Green River and Wind River watersheds), in addition to present depletion of less than 4 percent. We contribute in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 acre-feet to the Snake River and tributaries in Wyoming. We have offered to settle for 5 percent within the basin and agree to make no diversions to other basins.

It is my contention that we are entitled to a reasonable and equitable share of this water. I hope you will back me in my contention. Idaho does not agree with this.

I believe it was in the La Plata River case where the Supreme Court ruled that "No State can use more than its equitable share of the water of a interstate stream."

Here the Bureau of Reclamation has completed plans for a major irrigation development affecting our future economy without in any manner consulting us. Certainly our State should be given an opportunity to be heard in this matter where our water resources are affected before any major development such as Palisades Reservoir is authorized.

Your advice and an early reply will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

L. C. BISHOP,
State Engineer.

Copies to Senator J. C. O'MAHONEY, Senator L. C. HUNT.

Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, upon leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Buffalo Courier Express dated March 12, 1949, entitled "Social-Security Benefits."

That very able Representative from Rochester, Mr. KENNETH B. KEATING, has voiced his opinions of social-security benefits very well.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Social-security payments for persons 65 or older are "pitifully small," Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York, recently asserted. He contended recipients have every reason to feel that social security partakes more of the character of lofty promise than tangible fulfillment. He pointed out that they have already paid into it 80- to 100-cent dollars and now face the prospect of drawing out 50-cent dollars. He urged that increased benefits be authorized.

The suggestion previously had been made that persons 65 or older receiving social-security benefits should be permitted to earn $50 in any month rather than $15 through employment, without losing their benefits for that month. That proposal seems most reasonable, as there isn't much sense in depriving a man of his small benefits through social security if he earns the slight sum of $15 a month by working.

But the social-security payments themselves must have some relation to reality and they must take the high cost of living into account as Representative KEATING suggested. Otherwise social security for the elderly becomes a mockery rather than a system designed to be of some help.

There has been much talk of extending social security to many groups not now covered by it. One would assume that the first matter to be taken care of would be to adjust the present payments to the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party at its convention at Philadelphia last June, had as part of its platform a plank which reads as follows:

Extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance program and increase of the benefits to a more realistic level.

I heartily concur with Representative KEATING that the Congress should enact legislation immediately to give relief to the needy who must depend upon social security for their existence.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, last year's Interior appropriation bill carried the following language:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly by way of wages, salaries, per diem, or otherwise for the performance of any new administrative function or the enforcement or issuance of any rule or regulation occasioned by the establishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument, as described in Executive Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943.

I am not offering an amendment to the bill this year for the reason that the Wyoming delegation is presently negotiating with the Department of the Interior in the hopes that a settlement of this matter may be concluded. A conference was held with Secretary Chapman on March 21 last. It is expected that a further conference between the Governor of Wyoming, or someone representing him, as well as representatives of the Wyoming Fish and Game Commission, and citizens from Teton County, Wyo., in addition to the Wyoming congressional delegation, with Secretary Chapman, will take place the forepart of April. If a settlement of the Jackson Hole National Monument controversy is not arrived at at that time, I will feel constrained to appear before the Senate committee and request the insertion of this limitation in the Senate bill. At this time I wish to call attention to the fact that the State Legislature of Wyoming passed a memorial by an overwhelming vote, and same was approved by the Governor, requesting the Congress to pass legislation abolishing the Jackson Hole National Monument. I call attention to the fact that at the hearings on that memorial, Martin Petersen, president of the Wyoming Federations of Sportsmen's Clubs, testified in favor to the memorial calling for the complete abolishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument. I desire also to call attention to one paragraph in a letter to me under date of January 29 last from Charles E. Piersall, of Casper, Wyo., national director, Izaak Walton League of America, and I quote:

Right at the present time, it is my belief that the surest way to lose our elk herd forever would be for Congress to appropriate any funds whatever for the administration of the Jackson Hole Monument, and I sincerely hope you will withhold your support of any such appropriation until such time as the boundaries of the monument are adjusted to the complete satisfaction of the State of Wyoming.

In a release by the National Park Service on March 21 last, it is contended that 55 percent of the elk in the Jackson Hole area never enter the Jackson Hole National Monument at any time and that 11 percent of the total herd travel across the monument for a distance of 15 miles or more for only 1 or 2 days each year, and that the balance of the herd, or 34 percent, are on the monument for less than 1 day each year. I am attaching herewith a letter which I received from Lester Bagley, Wyoming game and fish commissioner, under date of March 23 last, which, to my way of thinking, is a complete answer to the release by the National Park Service. Attached also are the records on the number of elk killed on the monument during the past 7 years.

STATE OF WYOMING,
GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, March 23, 1949.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARRETT: Receipt of a copy of the Department of Interior release dated March 21, 1949, has prompted me to make the following statement relative to what adjustment the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission would feel necessary in effecting a compromise on the boundary lines of the Jackson Hole National Monument.

As you are aware, this department has never taken a definite stand in this controversy other than to insist that the control of the elk herd remain with the commission.

Since the creation of the monument the commission has found it necessary to open the area to hunting periodically in order to reduce the herd that converges upon the national elk refuge and thus prevent overconcentration of the animals and complete destruction of the foliage and browse in the immediately surrounding area.

I am enclosing a tabulation which shows the number of elk killed in the Jackson Hole area, and the corresponding number killed on the monument the same year. During the past 7 years 23,540 elk were killed in all the Jackson Hole area, 11,024 of which were killed in the monument area. There was no other place where this reduction could be made, as this tabulation shows that the area south of Yellowstone Park to the monument boundaries had been opened to hunters from early September through the hunting season, and that the kill in this area was insufficient.

Our surveys and investigations have shown us that the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission must have control of these elk herds through the migratory period. Therefore, it is our belief that all of the area east of the Snake River and within the boundary lines of the monument must be in the hands of some agency that will permit this department to set hunting seasons in this area when necessary to bring about proper reductions in the herds.

Now, relative to the release of the Department of Interior as of March 21, in which they claim they have been studying this migration for a period of 5 years, we are aware that they have had some representatives in the area periodically during that time. When Mr. Cahalane made his first investigations, however, he was there a relatively short time. Last fall I am sure that they spent considerable time there. The report which

they submitted—of which I have a copy—is very unfair and was obviously prepared and the investigations made purely to establish a case for the Park Service to justify present monument boundaries.

In this release the statement is made that 55 percent of the elk migrating south never enter the monument area at all. This is substantiated by their map showing the different migratory routes and the percentages of the total herd passing along them through the refuge. These figures, however, do not coincide with our figures and maps, which were prepared by Game and Fish Department representatives not only for last year but for many years past. I am sure that our Department representatives have spent more hours in this investigation than any Federal biologists have spent minutes. Last season our men lived on these migratory trails, and our report shows that of the 7,375 elk which were counted on these migratory paths, 5,060 (68.6 percent) passed thorugh the monument area.

Further confirmation of this statement is made from the report of the kill on the monument which we are submitting. This report shows that 46.83 percent of all the elk killed within the entire Jackson Hole area during the past 7 years were killed within the present monument boundaries.

As you are aware, the Fish and Wildlife Service insists that 7,000 elk are all that can be safely maintained on the national elk refuge, and the Commission is under agreement to try to maintain that population. A recent count disclosed that we have 8,059 elk on the refuge—over 1,000 more than the maximum number agreed upon.

Due to the seriousness of the winter, practically all of the 5,000 tons of hay in storage has been fed. Since we have not cut any hay on the refuge, but have been purchasing 1,000 tons each year from the Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., and hauling it to the refuge, it is not likely that we could secure in excess of 2,000 tons from all sources to store on the refuge next year. We are also facing a definite increase of about 18 percent of the 8,000 elk now on the refuge, providing we have a winter similar to last year's.

Just how can this herd be managed properly unless a substantial reduction is made? And how can we make the reduction except through hunting under Commission regulation?

Sincerely yours,

LESTER BAGLEY,
Game and Fish Commissioner.

Forty-seven outfitters in Jackson unit of Sublette and Teton Counties. Seventeen operate in south area of 30. Balance: Twelve have camp sites on monument; 12 have camp sites immediately adjoining monument and must use roads on monument to maintain camps. Other six use area to some extent—roads or hunting. Have no records of outfitters from other sections that use area but know that some do. Monument, itself, is intensely used by resident hunters for camp sites and hunting. If additional information required, wire. (Compiled 1947.)

ELK HARVEST—TETON COUNTY AND FOREST

1942: Total kill, 4,883 (antelope flats opened to hunting); Monument kill, 2,350. Season: September 15–October 31, November 1–November 15, November 16–November 22.

1943: Total kill, 5,542 (antelope flats and refuge opened to hunting); Monument kill, 3,538. Season: September 5–October 31, November 1–November 15.

Following is an extract from the January 15, 1944, Federal aid quarterly report: "A total of 709 elk were killed on the Federal Refuge during the season and 2,829 elk were killed on Antelope Flats which is 63.84 percent of the total number of elk killed in Teton County."

1944: Total kill, 1,170 (refuge opened); Monument kill, 452. Season: September 5–October 31.

1945: Total kill, 2,326 (refuge closed); Monument kill, 834. Season: September 10–October 31.

1946: Total kill, 4,982 (antelope flats and refuge opened, early winter conditions); Monument kill, 2,496. Season: September 10–October 20, September 10–November 10 (Gros Ventre and Buffalo area).

1947: Total kill, 2,272 (antelope flats and refuge opened to hunting); Monument kill, 980. Season: September 10–October 31.

1948: Total kill, 2,365 (antelope flats and refuge closed); Monument kill, 374. Season: September 10-October 10.

Total kill for 7-year period, 23,540.

Total kill on Monument for period, 11,024.

Percent of animals taken on Monument, 46.83 percent.

And so it is plain and evident, Mr. Chairman, that unless a settlement is made on the Jackson Hole National Monument matter so that hunting may be permitted on that part of the monument east of the Snake River that it will be absolutely impossible for the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission to control the elk herd. Wyoming insists that it must have absolute control over hunting in that area in order to maintain the elk herd at a proper livel. Wyoming is unalterably opposed to any arrangement for the butchering of elk on the elk refuge and the sale of elk meat produced therefrom. Unless some settlement of this matter is arrived at, Wyoming sportsmen will find that they will be unable to hunt and kill about half of the elk each year as has been customary and the game and fish commission will find it impossible to control the size of the elk herd to a level that will permit their maintenance during the winter.

Service Pay of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the Hook Commission was appointed by the Secretary of National Defense to study the entire pay structure of all of the armed forces. The recommendations of that commission are contained in H. R. 2553, upon which hearings are now being held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. One of the members of that commission was Father John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of Notre Dame University. Father Cavanaugh rendered outstanding service to the commission. On March 29 he appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of the bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement made to the subcommittee by Father Cavanaugh:

STATEMENT BY FATHER JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, C. S. C., MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SERVICE PAY BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was privileged to serve as a member of the Advisory Commission on Service Pay for more than a year. You have heard from the other members—Mr. Keith S. McHugh, Mr. Lawrence Whiting, and Mr. Charles Hook, who served as our chairman and inspiring coworker. I regret that I was unable to discuss our repor' with you in February when the other members were present. Perhaps, however, there is some providential advantage in my appearance at this time, since you have had an opportunity to acquaint yourselves with the problems which confronted us and the solutions we have submitted.

The report, Career Compensation for the Uniformed Forces, which constitutes the findings and recommendations based on our study, seeks to establish a unified pay scale and benefit system which will insure fair and just treatment to the men and women engaged in defending and maintaining our national security, and those of other services who work under similar conditions. I am especially pleased to note and to emphasize that our Commission was unanimous in all its conclusions, and that I wholeheartedly endorsed the recommendations that are before you in legislative form.

At the outset, I should like to say that we regarded Mr. Forrestal's request for a comprehensive study as a mission to explore completely and fairly the financial and related problems of service personnel including the emolument necessary to help maintain the dignity of the individual. We started out with our minds open for study. We analyzed the present pay and benefits, and attempted to learn how they came to be what they are today. We studied the special needs of the various branches of the services, and we designed a scale of compensation with respect for the many military considerations with which your committee is fully familiar. We endeavored to provide about the same opportunity for obtaining fair income and security to men who select military careers as for those who enter the professions or business. Since we proposed that men in the armed services should enjoy such equal opportunity, we felt they should have an equal responsibility to support themselves and their dependents and share in the payment of taxes. These were some of our guiding principles and I believe that we have submitted a program which will permit their realization.

I think that the mature and normal man and woman need a living wage and the opportunity to rear a family in reasonable security. But, it is the duty of the normal individual to earn this wage. In addition to a living wage other incentives should be offered to appeal to the abilities and energies which men possess in varying degrees. A concrete graduated scale of wages and salaries justly determined by the dignity of individuals and on the basis of the relative importance of the services performed is necessary to an organization if it is to function efficiently. This principle, accepted in industry, as a general proposition, was used in arriving at the pay scales which we have prepared. Our task was to adjust the inequities in present military pay to accord with the cardinal principles of pay for responsibility.

I need not stress this point since my colleagues have demonstrated that the varying percentage increases which you find in both the officer and enlisted grades result primarily from the conversion of the present unbalanced structure to one in which promotion is properly rewarded and the monetary incentive to advance is far greater than the increment for longevity. We recognize on this basis that many ranks, particularly those of leadership, are relatively underpaid. We believe that in the program of pay which we propose every officer and enlisted man who chooses military life will have the opportunity to provide well for his material needs

if he applies himself diligently to his chosen career.

We were especially impressed throughout our study with the need for competent leadership in the military services. In the recent past and certainly today, the continuing failure to provide increases in income to the men charged with responsibility for our national security has induced many of the ablest officers to resign or to retire prematurely. The same pattern holds true for many who have attained technical proficiency and who are more appropriately rewarded in civilian occupations. This circumstance must lead to one inevitable result: poor guidance and inadequate concern for the younger men in military service.

My colleagues have emphasized the significance of good management in any enterprise. You will recall Mr. Hook stated that the scales which are recommended and the costs involved must be considered as a sound investment in good management and that well-trained leaders and executives generally save money in the long run. To this, with which I agree, I wish to add that well-trained leaders and capable executives, not only save money, but men. As you know, in my capacity as president of a university, I am mainly concerned with the development of individuals and with the welfare of the Nation which is ultimately composed of individuals. I cannot overemphasize the importance of providing competent men of good character to serve as examples for the great body of men and women who compose the armed forces. You all realize better than I that to attract the best, one must offer to the general run of men more than an ideal, more than a tradition; one must provide the assurance of proper pay and adequate personal and family security.

We must not lose sight of the fact that, despite the tremendous scientific achievement of our Nation and the mechanization which has been adopted in both civilian and military pursuits, the heart and the hand and the mind of man remain supreme. In fact, in this technological age the need of intelligence and a sense of moral responsibility is more acute than ever before, in both leaders and in those who are led. In all our considerations, the Commission was concerned with the human element, the dignity of the individual and the provision of justice, at least within the bounds of our task. We have attempted to apply the well-tried canons of economic reward to the problem of military pay. We proceeded, however, with the full recognition that pay is but one of the many personnel problems confronting the Military Establishment. Opportunity for promotion, assignment to appropriate duties, wholesome environment, recreational facilities and the provision of such elementals as proper food, clothing and housing are as important, if not more important than pay. These last-mentioned items are especially significant to the great body of enlisted men—the backbone and power of military organization. And since the administration of any pay plan ultimately determines its success or failure, I would like to restate what our Chairman said, that our plan is not submitted as a lifeless fixed pattern but one which could and should be modified and sustained by wise administrators to keep pace with changing conditions and needs.

One of the issues that was paramount in our study was the determination of appropriate pay for those who had obtained specialized education prior to entering military service. The question specifically involved, for example, the need of additional pay for doctors, for other professionals, and for those who had a military education such as that obtained at the military and naval academies.

On the whole, our group felt that the basic principle of pay for responsibility should not be modified to provide greater rewards for specialists. In the case of doctors and dentists, however, we were faced with the practical situation of a current shortage in both military and civilian areas and the prospect of a shortage in the foreseeable future. For this reason we approved the existing monetary advantage accorded doctors, but only so long as a shortage exists. We have recommended that the situation be reviewed by a joint board within the Military Establishment to determine the need for continuation of extra incentive for doctors. In all other cases, however, we saw no reason for extra money or extra credit because a man had had a professional education, for example, in law, engineering, or military science. It was our feeling that the selection of a profession or course of study was entirely voluntary and that the Government should not reimburse in any way the man who made such a choice. Presumably he did so in the hope that his advancement would be more assured and that he would be rewarded accordingly as he moved up to a position of greater responsibility. We believe strongly, on the basis of experience, that no further inducement than added pay for added responsibility is needed. Moreover, our surveys indicate that the career income recommended for the officer group compares favorably with earnings of college graduates in comparable civilian employment.

A second issue which the Commission considered and with which I especially was deeply concerned was the provision which our Government could and should make for the families of men in service.

The Commission has recommended the removal of allowances for dependents. During the war emergency when men were called away abruptly from civilian life, special provisions for the family had to be enacted.

It is our opinion that, during stabilized periods, enlisted men who might reasonably be expected to be married and have dependents living with them should be treated on the same basis as officers and be given additional allowances for quarters where there are close dependents, but that no extra allowances should be provided for the men just beginning. Thus, no allowances are provided for the usually very young man in the initial grades, that is, grades 7 through 4 with less than 7 years' service, whose career is still uncertain. Where the Government does not furnish food and quarters, a money equivalent would be given, as at present. The Commission believes that if the pay scales proposed are adopted, officers and enlisted men will be enabled to take care of their own dependents. Accordingly, the Commission's program, influenced by the patterns of our present society and levels of income, endeavors to put the military man, in respect to his dependents, on a basis comparable to that of his fellowman in civilian life.

It was urged upon us that a survivor benefit under which a continuing money allowance or pension would be available to the widow and orphans of a man who died in service or on the retired list should be instituted as a supplement to the retired and disability benefits which we have recommended. The Commission has proposed a $10,000 free death benefit, payable to survivors at the regular monthly salary. The death benefit plan recommended, plus veterans' benefits which may be available, should be sufficient to take care of the adjustment that is necessary upon the death of the husband or father, but it is essentially a personal responsibility and obligation of the individual—not of the Government—to make provision for full security. It is doubtful that in addition to the pay scale proposed a pension for survivors would be just or desirable, in view of the principles of self-reliance which we instill in the citizens of our country and in consideration of the expense to the taxpaying community.

I should like to leave you with this thought, that the Commission reviewed not only the basic and special pays and allowances and the benefits, about which you have heard so much, in terms of scales, costs, formulas, charts, and tables, but mainly in terms of human beings, of fellow Americans dedicated to the important profession of protecting their country. Here as a priest, I should like to pay high tribute to my three colleagues on the Commission. I frankly don't know where men could be found more competent to deal practically with the many complex problems that confronted us, and, of even greater importance, I don't see how men could proceed in such a task with a more painstaking sense of fairness to all. The Commission carefully looked into the special problems of family relationships which I have mentioned, the problems of housing and moving from post to post, and the additional expenses involved in maintaining a dignified and humane career. We were especially impressed with the circumstances of the several hundred thousand men in the enlisted ranks and believe the pay scales we recommended, considered together with the free goods and services which are provided, place these men on a par with, and in many respects ahead of, persons in parallel positions in industry. We understand that the military services have undertaken to plan appropriate careers within the enlisted grades and I fully believe that the pay and benefits which we propose will fit into this highly desirable program.

General Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending before it

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts earnestly urges the Congress of the United States to pass, and respectfully requests the President of the United States to approve, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending before the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 21, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 24, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A Real Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, people everywhere—whether here in the United States of America or in other countries of the world—look with admiration upon those kindly souls, those true benefactors, who give of their time and efforts untiringly and unselfishly for the welfare of others. Whether it be to aid the poor or to solace the afflicted, these people are ever ready.

In the district which I have the honor to represent there are many who can attest to the good works of one of my finest constituents—Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr. And it is with deep regret that I have learned that Mrs. O'Brien will soon leave our fair city to take residence in California. Newark's loss will be California's gain. For I am certain that she will there continue her great work in behalf of humanity.

She has earned for herself the title "A Real Humanitarian." And it gives me great privilege indeed to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J.:

Whereas Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr., a resident of the city of Newark, N. J., for many years, and who throughout those years has been actively identified with civic, cultural, and charitable groups; and

Whereas Mrs. O'Brien has given of her time and effort without limitation to bettering the condition of our less fortunate fellow citizens; and

Whereas in her charitable endeavors she brought a contagious enthusiasm which induced many others to join in her work of alleviating suffering and hardship, and her untiring energy was an inspiration to all who knew her; and

Whereas Mrs. O'Brien is about to make her permanent home in Hollywood, Calif.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Commission of the City of Newark, N. J., record its appreciation for the splendid contribution made by Mrs. O'Brien and extend to her heartiest good wishes for many, many happy years in her new home, at the same time expressing regret that we are losing a most representative citizen.

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.
M. ELLENSTEIN.
JOHN B. KEENAN.
VINCENT J. MURPHY.
JOHN A. BRADY.
RALPH A. VILLANI.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, at a meeting held October 8, 1948.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the seal of the city of Newark, this 10th day of October A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] HARRY S. REICHENSTEIN,
City Clerk of Newark, N. J.

Why Democracy Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following essay entitled "Why Democracy Works," written by George O'Connor, a student at West Orange (N. J.) High School. This was the winning essay in a contest sponsored by the West Orange Elks and was published in the West Orange Chronicle and the Orange Transcript on March 24, 1949.

Young Mr. O'Connor would appear to have a better grasp of the meaning of democracy than many of his elders who pride themselves on their patriotism. His belief that in a democracy the same rights and privileges must prevail for all is in striking contrast to the majority of our United States Senators as evidenced in the recent filibuster. His awareness of the need for tolerance is indicative of the growing realization among our younger citizens that in a democracy rights cannot be withheld from any individuals because of religious beliefs or the pigment of their skin. The young are naturally generous and openhearted, and the idea of second-class citizenship for minorities is instinctively repugnant to them.

WHY DEMOCRACY WORKS

(Winning essay in West Orange Elks contest by George O'Connor, West Orange High School junior)

Democracy works because there are people on the face of the earth who desire freedom and equality. Broad-minded people who unite and form a democratic government because they want to live in a land where all men are brothers to each other. Democracy works because the people who constitute it want such a form of government. They seek the fundamental freedoms which insure their liberty. These people make democracy work.

In a true democracy, each man is his brother's equal and there is no superior sect of people, no one group or race or religion which has the right to look down its nose at the other classes. The same rights and privileges are established for the minorities as are established for the majority.

The word "democracy" is derived from the Greek word "demos," meaning people, and the entire word signifies rule by the people. It is made up of many small things, all of which are essential to a true rule by the people. Tolerance, education, individual self-discipline and independence are a few factors comprising a democracy. All of these are necessary to the function of democracy. There could be no real rule of the people, by the people and for the people if intolerance dominated the minds of the citizens, for it would mean persecution of a minority or small group of individuals because of their religious beliefs, or because of the pigment of their skin.

Education is another essential to democracy. Without it, the people would be ignorant as to their heritage. There is no better means to instill in the minds of people their duties and the fundamentals of their government than education. It is essential that the people apply individual self-discipline for the correct functioning of a democracy. Without this factor it would become necessary to keep the people under the care of guards or disciplinarians. All of these things are all important to democracy and without any one of them, this form of rule would be void.

The functions of democracy might well be compared to the function of an automobile. All the parts must work together to produce the best performance. The four freedoms might be compared to the wheels of the car, without which the car or government would have a rough ride, and a complete break-down would be the inevitable result. The motor could be compared to tolerance and education, so vitally important to a real democracy. Next would come the steering wheel, represented by the Constitution—a device to keep us on the right road. Without this instrument, we would stray off the road into the bumpy fields of war and dictatorship. The headlights are the people's faith in their government. These lights show the way when the road is dark and obscure. The fuel is the love of freedom possessed by the people and which feeds the energy to the motor. The most important factor is the driver of the car. He represents the citizens of the government who control the movements of their form of rule as the driver controls his car.

Democracy permits a man to be free, and a freeman is a happy man. This is the reason why democracy works.

Statement of James A. Tawney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting the following statement of James A. Tawney, a distinguished attorney of Washington, D. C., before the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1, United States House of Representatives, at hearings on House Joint Resolution No. 2, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of the President and Vice President, March 31, 1949:

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is James A.

Tawney. I am a legal resident of San Francisco, Calif., presently engaged in the practice of law in the District of Columbia. I am appearing before you entirely in my own behalf.

House Joint Resolution No. 2 proposes an extremely important amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Upon its ratification by three-fourths of the States, the present system of electing the President and the Vice President would be replaced by a modified version of that system calling for election of these officers by the direct popular vote of the people of the several States. As a matter of fact, it is somewhat difficult to say, from reading the resolution, exactly what the new system would be or how it would operate because it calls for electors and electoral votes without specifying how the electors are to be chosen.

Mr. WALTER. I direct your attention to page 2, line 5: "The electoral-college system for electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished."

Mr. TAWNEY. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. The electoral-college system is abolished, and on line 8 of the same page, reference is made to the electors in each State.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I suggest to the gentleman that the word "elector" is used in this resolution as in the Constitution, as being synonymous with "voter."

Mr. WALTER. Many of the authorities on the Constitution have held that an elector and a voter are synonymous as used in the Constitution.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is true, except that in the case of members of the so-called electoral college, we have created a certain class of electors which is not identical with electors generally or with voters at large. By common usage the word elector when used in reference to the electoral college is regarded as synonymous with the term "presidential elector."

At any rate, the proposed amendment would clearly abolish the electoral college system as we know it now, and set up a device for presidential and vice presidential balloting on a State unit basis with the votes so cast allocated proportionately among the several presidential and vice presidential candidates.

It is commendable that we should be seeking to improve our system of Government but I honestly cannot see where such an amendment would offer any improvement in our present presidential elective system.

Despite the abuse that has been heaped on the electoral college, which I feel is not wholly justified, I still would prefer to see the present system retained. I wish to enter my vigorous protest, feeble though it may be, to abolishing the present system altogether and introducing proportional balloting in presidential elections for the following reasons:

1. It would contribute to the disintegration of the Federal Union concept underlying our entire system of government.

2. It would invite confusion and uncertainty by making a 266 vote majority, in the so-called electoral college, more difficult to obtain by any single presidential candidate.

3. The proposed change is thoroughly illogical.

4. The proposed change is wholly unnecessary.

We would all do well, Mr. Chairman, to bear in mind that the United States is precisely all that is implied in that name. In other words, we are a union of independent sovereign States. We are not a mere confederation of States existing under a compact that depends merely upon the good faith of the contracting parties. Our union, too, was never purely an artificial, arbitrary relation. It grew out of common origin, kindred principles, and similar interests and was confirmed by the necessities of war. Yet, despite the firm bonds of our national union, each State, within a certain sphere of jurisdictional authority, is an independent sovereign entity apart from the Federal Government, which, in turn, is a derivative of the several State sovereignties. It is this very separation of the component parts of our American system of government which has contributed so largely to our stability and our strength as a nation.

Let me quote briefly from Madison's Journal of the Constitutional Convention, in which James Madison, during the debates on the method of choosing the President, recorded the views of John Dickinson, a delegate from Delaware, in these (Madison's) words:

"If ancient republics have been found to flourish for a moment only, and then vanish forever, it only proves that they were badly constituted; and that we ought to seek for every remedy for their diseases. One of these remedies he conceived to be the accidental lucky divisions of this country into distinct States; a division which some seemed desirous to abolish altogether."

The present electoral college, consisting of electors, that is to say, of men and women qualified by their election or appointment, to cast their ballot for President and Vice President of the United States, and previously chosen under State auspices by the people of the several States, gives full recognition of the Union concept and of our dual system of separate and distinct State and Federal Governments. It permits the people of the several States by a popular vote within their States, to determine how that State's allocated number of electoral college votes shall be cast in a presidential election.

The electoral college in late years, however, has become a stranger to most people. The constantly growing public ignorance of the functions of government, in general, and the lack of understanding with respect to the fundamentals of the American system in particular, has resulted, very largely, in this deplorable attitude. The electoral college makes its appearance every 4 years clothed, it is true, in the ruffles and lace of a period almost forgotten by young and old alike. Its quadrennial appearance induces the mirth, even of some persons in high public office. Cartoonists, columnists, and other writers currently are having a field day portraying the electoral college as an antiquated piece of junk. It is looked upon as grotesque.

The present electoral-college system is not grotesque, Mr. Chairman. Rather, it is we who have become grotesque in our present failure to do more than we have done to preserve the two most fundamental principles underlying our dual system of government—the principle of State sovereignty and the concept of a Federal Union. Far too many of our citizens, however, know nothing of these principles, if, indeed, they have ever heard of them. Far too many other citizens, if they have heard of them, ignore them.

The present electoral-college system of indirect presidential elections, however, is linked to these principles by an indissoluble bond. It was because of them the present elective system was devised. We may laugh it out of existence if we choose, but in doing so we will only be destroying our two greatest national resources. Like the ancient republics mentioned by Mr. Dickinson in Madison's quotation above, our scorn for the rights and integrity of the States and their independent existence will only invite the same diseases that destroyed the republics of old.

Even though the present electoral-college system is retained, except for the proportional system of distributing electoral votes, I see no merit whatever in that step as applied to a presidential election. There is no more logic to the proportional system of electoral voting than there is if each Member of Congress served only a proportionate part of his term measured by the percentage of votes cast for the candidates seeking a seat in Congress. Why not choose Congressmen that way so as to make the votes for minority candidates count for something just as it is proposed to make minority votes in the electoral count for something? If 60 percent of the voters in a given congressional district voted for candidate A, and 40 percent for candidate B, then, on the theory that losing candidates have not completely lost, or missed the boat, so to speak, perhaps the loser ought to horn in for part of the boat ride anyway, just as we propose in House Joint Resolution No. 2 to recognize minority runners-up in presidential elections by making their electoral votes count for something. The idea is preposterous, of course, but no more so than proportional voting for President and Vice President.

Election by a majority of votes would no longer be mandatory if this resolution were to be ratified by the required number of States. Here again, another fundamental principle of government would be discarded. Rule by majority is deeply imbedded in our system of elections. It permeates every organized activity of public and private groups. It is a fair rule. I fail to see, however, how that rule is strengthened or even supported by a system of appeasing losing candidates or the minorities who voted for losing candidates. Rule by the majority is positively essential, I believe, in the interests of complete fairness to everyone.

Elections are not unlike any game of chance, Mr. Chairman. The winner by a majority wins. The loser loses. The loser made his bid. He lost. And that should end it until he can get the majority behind him in the next election. The proportionate system of allocating votes, or the so-called preferential elective system, is clearly contrary to this conception of political justice. In local elections, the preferential system is frequently found, and outside the expense and annoyance of run-off elections, is relatively harmless. I cannot imagine a run-off election in a presidential election, which would probably be required in a close contest.

On the question of the necessity for amending the present electoral college system, I have seen no clear proof. One might ask: Wherein has the present system failed to reflect the will of the majority of voters, or the people at large? Where is the injustice of the present system? After all, what more can we ask of any method of choosing a President and Vice President than that it permits the people of the several States to express their choice for presidential and vice presidential candidates? This is exactly what takes place under the present system.

It is true, the people of the several States do not vote as, or in the capacity of, citizens of the United States, but as eligible voting citizens of the States. At any rate, they vote. They have an absolutely free choice in deciding how their State's vote shall be cast. Unless we are determined to create a completely nationalized system of government, by adorning national citizenship with national suffrage, and otherwise centering public attention on national interests, national requirements, and a completely national life, we ought not change the present Presidential elective system. The danger of a completely nationalized government is inherent in the apparently innocuous proposal to do away with an electoral college system, simply because it is old, and is easily caricatured as an ancient and decrepit jalopy.

It is no defense to say that we are guarding against the threat of nationalism by retaining the electoral vote, as House Joint Resolution No. 2 provides, because the electoral vote as we know it now is not going to be preserved if the resolution becomes a

part of the Constitution. Contrary to the existing authority of the Constitution, the States, if this proposed amendment is ratified, would be prohibited from prescribing the method of appointment or selection of the Presidential electors, who would be acting, not for the States, as independent sovereignties, but for the individual voters living within each State's boundaries. At present the Presidential electors are the voice of the several State's speaking in accordance with the will of the majority of voters within such States. That would not be the case under this proposed amendment.

I have refrained, Mr. Chairman, from approaching the subject of the resolution from either a statistical or historical viewpoint. Nothing much can be proved by statistics of past elections. To me the proposed amendment involves, primarily, very fundamental theories and concepts of our republican system of representative government. If the proposed amendment is right in principle, I would say let the statistics fall where they may. I, for one, do not believe it is right in principle. Since the final decision will be made by the States, however, I think there is no harm in submitting the proposed change to them.

By not dwelling on the history of the present electoral-college system, I do not mean to infer that its history is not important. On the contrary it is of the utmost importance. But the committee is undoubtedly well versed on this subject, and I am sure will give the most thoughtful consideration to the reasons for the adoption of the present system in the first place. The fact that it may have been inspired by a similar system employed in the State of Maryland, prior to the adoption of our Constitution, and subsequently abolished, has been advanced by some to prove that we should also abolish the electoral college as applied to national elections. That kind of argument, Mr. Chairman, is nothing but nonsense. The analogy between the early Maryland situation and our present national requirements is completely false.

In studying the debates on this subject in the Constitutional Convention, and in giving full weight to the writings of experts on government in the early days of our history, I am sure the committee will find that most of the original reasons for adopting the present method of indirect presidential elections by the vote of the several States, cast according to the will of the majority of voters in those States, are as valid today as they were then. Times change, of course, Mr. Chairman, and people change their attitudes to things, but the fundamental principles and concepts of our American system of government are too right to be wrong at any particular time in our history. They are timeless. Our present electoral-college system of choosing a President, having been conceived as a projection of these ageless rules should not be disturbed, and cannot be disturbed without irreparable damage to the foundations of our American system of government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

House Roof and Chamber Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement from the Architect of the Capitol:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1949.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: In compliance with your request of March 27, 1949, I am sending you, herewith, in duplicate, report which I have today prepared for your use with regard to the reconstruction of the roof over the House wing of the Capitol and the remodeling of the House Chamber.

Yours very truly,

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol.

HOUSE ROOF AND CHAMBER PROJECT

This project, authorized by the acts of June 27, 1940, July 17, 1945, and the pending First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, provides for the reconstruction of the roof over the House wing of the Capitol and the remodeling of the interior of the House Chamber, including the cloakrooms, lobbies, and similar areas, and is estimated to cost, in all, $2,567,000. Acting under the direction of the special House committee appointed under the act of July 17, 1945, in charge of the House project, a general cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract will be formally negotiated for the house roof and chamber improvements by the Architect of the Capitol with the Consolidated Engineering Co. of Baltimore, Md.—the general contractor for the Senate roof and Chamber improvements—immediately upon approval of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, passed by the House February 16, 1949, and now pending before the Senate.

The Consolidated Engineering Co., acting under informal instructions of the Architect of the Capitol has, insofar as possible, made the necessary arrangements for placing the subcontracts for the various branches of work involved, in order that the required materials may be on hand when the actual construction work starts during the coming summer months.

The construction work will be done in two stages—the first stage during the recess period July to December 1949, and the second stage during the recess period July to December 1950. During the first stage, the old roof over the House wing, including the exterior cast iron and glass skylight over the House Chamber, will be replaced with a new steel and reinforced concrete roof, and the interior alterations within the Chamber will be completed above the gallery floor level, including replacement of the existing cast-iron and glass ceiling of the Chamber with a new stainless steel and plaster ceiling, together with all related mechanical and electrical work wherever located. During the second stage, the interior alterations in the Chamber will be completed below the gallery floor level, together with improvements in other areas not included in the first stage—such as the cloakrooms and lobbies. All work in connection with the House project is to be completed by January 1951.

ORIGIN OF PROJECT AND WORK DONE TO DATE

This project had its origin in engineering surveys made under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol in 1938–40 by experts specializing in this field of construction, which disclosed that the wrought-iron and cast-iron roof framing of the House and Senate wings, constructed in the 1850's, were obsolete and far short of present-day safety requirements, and should in the interests of safety be replaced without delay because of serious deficiencies in the roof trusses. Funds and authority for reconstructing the roofs and skylights over the House and Senate wings were provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940.

That war made it impossible to proceed with the permanent project as planned. As a temporary expedient, the Architect of the Capitol in the fall of 1940 installed temporary steel supports under the ceilings of both Chambers to relieve the old trusses of the dead-weight load of the ceilings, thereby removing the danger of a collapse of the roofs, pending their permanent reconstruction. The installation of these temporary supports has in no way corrected or remedied the defective structural conditions. No changes, whatsoever, have been made in the roof structure, skylights, or cast-iron and glass ceiling of either Chamber. The structural defects still exist. The temporary supports, while providing an element of safety, do not alter the original need for structural changes. If the supports were to be removed without carrying forward the proposed permanent reconstruction work, the hazard of collapse would become imminent.

The 1940 legislation provided for the retention of the existing cast-iron and glass ceiling in the House Chamber and for a new skylight above the Chamber. The act of July 17, 1945 enlarged the scope of the project to provide for improvements to the interior of the Chamber and further modified the original legislation by providing, as a part of such improvements, for the elimination of the skylight over the House Chamber and its replacement with concrete roof slab, and the elimination of the cast-iron and glass ceiling of the Chamber and its replacement with an acoustically treated plaster ceiling or ceiling of other suitable material.

DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF PLANS FOR HOUSE IMPROVEMENTS

The plans for improving the House Chamber, as finally approved by the special House committee appointed under the act of July 17, 1945, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, of Washington, D. C., associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, of Philadelphia, Pa., consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. They are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

The Commission of Fine Arts, whose advice was sought by the House Committee, in expressing their formal approval of the plans stated that their approval was predicated on the ultimate carrying out of the entire approved plan for the House Chamber. The Commission stressed the importance of carrying out ultimately the plans for both the upper and lower portions of the Chamber in order to obtain a unity of design, which they advised would not obtain if only the upper parts of the Chamber were to be improved.

The plans for the new roof construction represent designs developed by Thomas W. Marshall and James M. Gongwer, of Washington, D. C., retained as engineering consultants for the project.

The plans for the House roof and chamber improvements, proposed to be carried into effect during the summer-fall recesses of 1949 and 1950, were formally approved by the special House committee, June 14, 1946, and formally reported by the committee to the House, June 24, 1946, House Report No. 2321, Seventy-ninth Congress.

In accordance with instructions of the House committee, set forth in House Report No. 2321, the Architect of the Capitol kept the House Chamber plans on exhibit in the

Office of the Architect of the Capitol from June 24 to July 8, 1946, for inspection and comment by any Members of the House who wished to examine them.

When the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 was considered by the House in February 1949, an amendment proposing to retain the existing skylight and the existing cast-iron and glass ceiling of the House Chamber containing the State seals was rejected by the House, and the act, as passed by the House, provides for carrying out the plans as approved June 14, 1946.

The House was also advised, while this legislation was under consideration, that the State seals, when removed, will be preserved, and that it is the recommendation of the special House committee that the seals be taken care of according to the will of the various State organizations.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED HOUSE IMPROVEMENTS

Reconstruction of House roof

The present roof construction over the House wing, with its skylights and iron trusses, will be removed and replaced by reinforced concrete slab and structural steel beams supported on steel trusses. The skylights in the connection between the central portion of the building and the House wing will likewise be eliminated and replaced by a concrete-and-steel roof. The new roof structure will be fireproof throughout. The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. New air-conditioning ducts will be run below the new roofs, eliminating the old ducts which are now on top of the roofs, thereby materially improving the air view of the building.

House Chamber improvements

At the time the remodeling of the House Chamber was authorized in 1945, the special House committee directed the Architect of the Capitol to redesign the ceiling of the Chamber, and to plan all other required improvements, with prime emphasis on lighting, acoustics, and air conditioning.

The plans, as developed and approved, provide for elimination of the existing cast-iron and glass ceiling of the House Chamber and its replacement with a new ceiling constructed of decorative painted plaster and stainless steel perforated for distribution of air conditioning and for acoustical purposes.

It is the central portion of the ceiling which will be of stainless steel. This area constitutes about one-third of the total ceiling area and is the most important area from the standpoint of correct lighting, acoustics, and proper distribution of conditioned air.

In the center of the stainless steel portion of the ceiling will be an ornamental feature of carved shatterproof glass and bronze, illuminated from above, to furnish a visible source of direct light for the appearance of the Chamber.

The State seals, when removed, will be preserved and, as previously indicated, will be disposed of in such manner as the House may direct. A detailed description of the proposed improvements follows:

The design of the House Chamber has been studied with motives derived from classic architecture from the same sources as used by the architects of the earlier portions of the Capitol and of other buildings of the early Republic. The design has been developed to harmonize with the architecture of those portions of the Capitol Building of the period of the early Republic, insofar as this can be done while providing for modern lighting, air conditioning, and acoustic treatment.

In remodeling the House Chamber, the flag will be hung behind the Speaker's chair, framed in a columned motif and flanked by sculpture symbolizing the Nation's lawmaking body. The oil paintings of Washington by Vanderlyn and Lafayette by Ary Scheffer will be placed on the same wall of the Chamber, centered between the doors, and suitably framed.

The base of the Chamber walls and the base of the Speaker's rostrum will be of marble; the rostrum proper and the rostrum desks will be of wood; the lower walls of the Chamber and the cornice are also to be of wood. A clock, with a suitable sculptured group, will be located over the rostrum.

In order to obtain adequate space in the Press Gallery, the south of the Chamber wall will be brought forward about 1 foot and the north wall will be brought forward to correspond.

The Members' seats on the floor of the Chamber will be replaced with new and more comfortable seating, and the seating arrangement will be improved. By a reduction in the number of floor aisles from seven to five, those seats nearest to the south wall, as well as all other seats, will be rearranged and brought forward more directly in line with the Speaker's vision. The new arrangement makes it possible to increase the number of seats from 444 to 448.

The seven portrait busts, now in the gallery wall niches, will be removed from the Chamber and relocated in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building.

The present public-address system will be redesigned and the equipment now suspended from the Chamber ceiling will be concealed behind grilled panels over the doors leading to the Speaker's lobby.

The existing gallery seats will be replaced with an improved type of noiseless seats, with especially designed arms and ends. The existing desks in the Press Gallery will be replaced with new desks and this section of the gallery will be enlarged.

The existing gallery floor construction will be replaced with fireproof material arranged in steps, the face of which will be of marble, and the platforms covered with a rubber-tile floor.

The gallery door frames and wainscot will be of marble. Sculptured marble plaques will be located over the doors; and the wall panels between the doors will be covered with acoustical fabric.

The main cornice of the room and the coffered border of the ceiling will be of painted plaster. Conditioned air for the galleries will be introduced through semicircular outlets located in the ceiling border nearest the wall. Light for the galleries will be provided by flush-type ceiling fixtures located between the air-conditioning outlets.

The treatment of the ceiling contemplates a relatively flat portion extending outward from the walls in which will be incorporated a series of decorative coffers, and a higher curved section in the center springing from a concealed cove. The central portion will be constructed of painted stainless steel, perforated with small holes for the introduction of conditioned air. The rest of the ceiling will be of plaster. The entire area over the perforated stainless steel portion will be treated acoustically.

In the center of the stainless steel portion of the ceiling will be an ornamental feature of carved shatterproof glass and bronze, illuminated from above, to furnish a visible source of direct light for the appearance of the Chamber. The lighting of the floor will be accomplished by indirect light reflected from the ceiling, the source of which will be light fixtures concealed in the cove around the perimeter of the center section.

The simplified design of the Chamber and the reconstruction of the gallery floor and supporting wall make it possible to increase the cloakroom width by approximately 18 inches and to provide improved accommodations.

The reconstruction of the roof and the remodeling of the Chamber, when completed, will provide improved lighting, seating, air conditiong, and acoustics, and the Chamber will be a room of simple architectural dignity.

Truman's Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, appearing March 28, 1949:

TRUMAN'S WONDERLAND

Once upon a time there was a kind, generous king who lived in a gleaming white castle surrounded by marble palaces. He had a storehouse of treasure which was the wonder of all the world. It was stacked with bulging chests of gold and silver and contained row upon row of bins heaped with precious stones.

One day the king summoned his counselors and addressed them as follows:

"My heart bleeds for my people," he said. "There are so many things they lack which only I can give them. They ought to have more medical care and more savings for old age, sickness, and unemployment. They should have better and wider roads to travel upon. They ought to have more steel, more electricity, and more irrigation. They ought to build better houses and more of them. They ought to have more schools and more teachers. The city workers need more wages because food is so expensive. The farmers need more storage space so they can hold their products off the market and get higher prices for them.

"So I shall share my treasure with my people. Let all of them come to my storehouse and each help himself according to his wants."

When the people heard these tidings, they praised their king for his kindness and generosity. According to the decree, each of the king's subjects went to the storehouse and took from it the amount of treasure necessary to fulfill his desires. And the people rejoiced, because they were getting something for nothing.

The next day the king went to his storehouse and found it bare. Again he summoned his counselors and spoke thus:

"So that I may continue to minister to the needs of my people, it will be necessary to replenish my storehouse," he said. "In addition to payments necessary to safeguard the welfare of my people, the expenses of government have become very burdensome, and I have also promised to send gold and silver and arms to the people across the sea so that they may protect themselves from the barbarians who threaten them.

"Therefore, I have decided that all my subjects shall be taxed, each according to his means. From those who have little, little shall be taken. But from those who have much, much shall be taken, until all people are equal in the possessions they retain."

And so the tax collectors went forth and came to the houses of the people and demanded payment. And they gathered up the gold and silver and precious stones the people had taken from the king's storehouse, save that the poor were permitted to keep a small part of the king's bounty, while from the rich they took in addition their household goods and other possessions until they had left only as much as the poor.

The tax collectors kept some of the treasure themselves since, not being producers of wealth, they had no other source of livelihood, and gave the rest to the king. Soon the storehouse was full of treasure again,

and the king was pleased, saying: "Have I not dealt fairly with my people?"

Some of the people were pleased and some were not. The poor said: "Why should we work any more? The king will take care of us." The rich said: "Why should we work any more when the king takes away from us the wealth we produce?"

And so the people worked less and produced less, and every time after that when the tax collectors came among them there was less wealth to divide. Instead of everybody getting more, everybody got less. But the tax collectors were happy, because they always got their share, and the king was happy because his storehouse was always replenished. "I have given everybody a fair deal," the king said.

This is not as fantastic a fairy tale as it sounds. As Henry Hazlitt wrote in a recent issue of Newsweek, the Government cannot distribute more under President Truman's fancy hand-out program than the people produce. And it is not the Government which produces wealth, but private enterprise. But before the Government can give part of this wealth to some of the people, it must take it away from others.

This is true of every instance in which the administration proposes to distribute Federal largesse. The money first must be taken from some people before it is given to others. Frequently it will be taken from the same people who are intended to be the ultimate beneficiaries.

But in no case do the people get back all that is taken away from them. The Federal Government gets a rake-off on every pot to pay the costs of administration and, incidentally, to support an ever-growing Federal bureaucracy.

Such financial legerdemain eventually must lead to a tax burden which will devour the rewards of prudence, thrift, industry, skill, and foresight and destroy the incentives to work and produce. We are further along that road than we think.

Benefits for Soft-Coal Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 29, 1949:

UMW FUND GRANTS $2,000,000 WEEKLY—LEWIS SEEKS RISE IN BENEFITS FOR SOFT-COAL MINERS—EXTRA $200,000 ANTHRACITE AID—PLAN BASIS IS QUESTIONED—LACK OF RESERVES CALLED PERIL IN FACE OF MOUNTING COSTS AND DROP IN MARKET

(By A. H. Raskin)

The United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund, most ambitious of all union welfare projects, is paying out $2,000,000 a week in benefits to soft-coal miners and their families. The companion fund for hard-coal miners is distributing another $200,000 a week in pensions, death and disability payments and medical fees.

The UMW funds will have to spend much more before they achieve the full program sketched out by John L. Lewis, but they already are straining against the limits of the royalty of 20 cents a ton on each ton of coal mined from which the benefits must be paid.

Officials of the UMW are not concerned about the possibility that the intake will be too small to keep benefits up to the Lewis standard. They are confident that the UMW chieftain will be able to win all the money that is needed to fulfill the program, even if it takes a new strike to do it.

Coal operators, who have been convinced from the start that the benefits were too high to be maintained, expect that Mr. Lewis will seek a royalty of at least 40 cents a ton in the June contract negotiations. Mr. Lewis is keeping his own counsel on this score, but his aides do nothing to discourage such speculation.

Federal social security and labor experts applaud the aims of the UMW welfare experiment but question the soundness of its financing. They fear that its lack of reserves will make it impossible to keep pace with mounting pension, disability, and medical costs, especially if the market for coal drops precipitately.

COURSE HELD FORWARD

No one seriously expects that Mr. Lewis will turn back from the course he has charted. In the words of his associates: Mr. Lewis knows only one way to move—and that is forward. Moreover, the enthusiasm for the welfare program is so universal and so deep-rooted in the mine districts that it would be suicidal for any union leader to suggest that it be whittled down or even that it abandon plans for future extension.

Mr. Lewis has made his own position clear. He contends that caring for the human element in the mining industry should be considered as part of the cost of production, to be paid for by the industry and the consumers of coal.

"The United Mine Workers of America has assumed the position over the years that the cost of caring for the human equity in the coal industry is inherently as valid as the cost of replacement of mining machinery or the cost of paying taxes or the cost of paying interest indebtedness or any other factor incident to the production of a ton of coal for consumers' bins."

That is the way Mr. Lewis summed up his viewpoint in presenting the first pension check to a 62-year-old miner last September. Mr. Lewis added his belief that it was not fair to expect the general taxpayer to take over the burden of caring for human wastage in an industry as hazardous as coal mining.

"For that reason," he declared, "the United Mine Workers believe they are setting up a definite goal for others to follow to relieve the State of the necessity for caring for the extraordinary cost of industries which are particularly hazardous."

MINERS TELL OF AID

The files of the UMW in Washington bulge with letters from aged and disabled miners and widows and orphans who are being helped by the welfare fund. They tell how they have been rescued from dependence on the charity of relatives or of public relief authorities. In many cases they tell of strength restored to bodies shattered by mine accidents and of approaching self-support.

Miss Josephine Roche, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who is now director of the UMW welfare and retirement fund reports that more than a quarter of a million coal miners and members of their families have been aided by the bituminous fund since it paid its first benefits in June 1947. More than $85,000,000 has been distributed from the fund.

Fifteen thousand miners past the age of 62 and with 20 years or more of mine work behind them are receiving retirement payments of $100 a month. The average age of those who have retired is 66. Miss Roche said that most of them were suffering from permanent disabilities resulting from mine accidents or mine-contracted illnesses.

"Even though the UMW benefits are added to Federal old-age insurance payments, which average about $30 a month for miners leaving the pits at 65, only 'a negligible percentage' of the able-bodied miners past the retirement age have taken advantage of the pension provisions," Miss Roche said.

"Even with only 2 or 3 days' work in the mines, most of our people would rather keep working as long as they can," she noted. "We know of several past 80 who are still at work."

GRANTS AND DEATH BENEFITS

In addition to the $100 pensions, the fund provides disability grants ranging up to $60 a month for incapacitated miners, with additional allowances of $20 for the miner's wife and $10 for each child or other dependent. Widows receive a maximum of $60 a month and orphans are allowed $25. Death benefits of $1,000 have been paid to the families of 10,500 miners.

The area in which the fund is just beginning to make itself felt is in the provision of complete medical, hospital, and health care for mine workers and their families. As projected by Dr. Warren F. Draper, formerly chief medical officer at Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces, and now the fund's medical director, the program would meet every health need, extending even into the fields of preventive medicine and public-health work.

In this field the fund finds its resources taxed by "the great backlog of human neglect" that requires attention before it can turn to setting up the comprehensive program of current care that Miss Roche and her associates are planning.

"We have started out with the cases of most shocking neglect that had gone untended for years and years," Miss Roche said. "We will keep extending the coverage of our program as rapidly as we can make arrangements with hospitals and physicians."

Two hundred and eighteen paraplegics—men paralyzed from the waist down as a result of spinal injuries—have been sent to rehabilitation centers in this city, New Jersey, California, and other places equipped to help restore them to a measure of social usefulness after months and years of bedridden idleness.

HOSPITALS COOPERATING

Dr. Draper said the Mayo Clinic, Johns Hopkins Hospital, and similar institutions throughout the country were cooperating with the fund in providing facilities for the treatment of miners whose medical needs demanded more specialized treatment than their home areas afforded.

The aim of the fund is to enter into contracts with local doctors and hospitals in the 26 mining States and with specialized institutions elsewhere to provide the highest standard of service at the most reasonable cost for UMW members and their families.

The American Medical Association has given its blessing to the project and has recommended that State medical societies set up liaison committees to work with the 10 UMW medical field offices to see that the charges established by physicians and hospitals are fair and proper.

When the program is operating fully, the welfare fund will pay all the bills. At present it is doing that for miners, widows, and children in most urgent need, but not for the rank and file of miners and their families. Most miners still pay $3 or $4 a month under company check-off systems for medical services and some pay another $3 or $4 on a monthly basis for hospitalization. These payments will disappear when the UMW fund assumes full responsibility for medical and health services.

NEED SEEN AS MEASURE

Miss Roche made it plain that the UMW felt the degree of human need in the mine fields would be the measure of the program's ultimate extent, and not the availability of funds.

"This is about the soundest, most commonsense program for the public welfare that I know of—and Mr. Lewis has made it possible," Miss Roche declared.

"I have a feeling that the care of the United Mine Workers members and their families is going to be adequately followed through. We will advance—we will not stop. We will move forward on the basis of experience and not of blueprints."

She hailed the whole program as a model for the rest of the labor movement and as the greatest contribution to our economy and the preservation of our way of life. She contended that its benefits were not confined to the miners but extended to all Americans in terms of reduced tax burdens and improved citizenship.

From the industry's standpoint, she maintained that the fund was a factor for increasing productivity and for attracting young men to the mines. She told of one youth who operated a high-speed coal-cutting machine and who told her that he mentally calculated the fund royalty collections as his machine piled up ton after ton of coal.

"Whenever he was putting on brushings, he resented the fact the fund was not making money as fast as it would if he were working at the face," Miss Roche recalled.

"Our coal industry would have been the story of England all over again were it not for Mr. Lewis, with his emphasis on mechanization, increased output, and protection for the human element in the industry."

ADMINISTRATION OF FUND

The fund is administered by three trustees, with Mr. Lewis representing the union, Ezra Van Horn, of Cleveland, representing the operators, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, representing the public.

Senator BRIDGES, who has served as trustee for nearly a year, said he felt the fund was performing a very fine function and that Miss Roche, Dr. Draper, and the rest of the administrative staff were doing an excellent job of applying its resources in keeping with the policies laid down by the trustees.

"I am opposed to socialized medicine," Senator BRIDGES observed, "and I feel we must have something to take its place, such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield and private welfare funds, of which this is an outstanding example."

The Senator said he did not believe the fund had been operating long enough to permit final judgment as to whether it could afford to supply additional benefits or whether those now in effect were too generous.

"We are pioneering in a new field," he declared. "I feel this is an answer to much of the pressure for governmental action to take care of all human needs, but we are going to have to feel our way. I am always going to predicate any stand I take on the right to change it in the light of experience."

COMMENT OF OPERATORS

Mr. Van Horn, who has been at odds with Mr. Lewis and Senator BRIDGES on most issues of policy within the board of trustees, declined to comment in any way on the fund's operations. Other coal operators asserted that Mr. Lewis' ability to shut down the coal mines, to enforce his views, made a mockery of the whole trustee system, and put him in the position of making all the decisions himself.

They contended that the idea that human costs should be counted as a charge on production, ran contrary to the concept of Federal social security as a device for meeting the social hazards of old age, unemployment, and disability. They asserted that unions would seek to outdo one another in winning special benefits for their members, thus making a hodgepodge of social security.

The operators also challenged the argument that the fund should find out how much human need was to be met and then demand that the full amount be assessed against the cost of the product. If coal were to stay within the price reach of the public, Mr. Lewis would have to limit the extensiveness of his program to some reasonable estimate of the funds available, these industry spokesmen declared.

GOVERNMENTAL ATTITUDE

In Government circles fear was voiced that a declining coal market might prevent the UMW fund from maintaining its schedule of benefit payments and bring proposals that the whole program might be taken over by the Government.

Federal experts asserted that a somewhat similar development had taken place in the 1930's in the railroad insurance and disability programs, then privately administered, with the result that the companies and unions joined in requests that the Federal Railroad Retirement Board be established.

The estimated intake of the UMW fund this year on the basis of a 600,000,000-ton production of soft coal is $120,000,000. The anthracite fund is expected to take in about $12,000,000 on the basis of 60,000,000 tons of production. The anthracite fund has paid out about $8,000,000 since its inception 2½ years ago. There are about 400,000 soft-coal miners and 80,000 hard-coal miners covered by the two funds.

Reply to "Good-by Christ"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1949, I extended my remarks and included a poem by a Communist entitled "Good-by Christ." It was anti-Christ, of course, and it was brought to the attention of thousands of my constituents, who were astounded by its content.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a young minister, Rev. Louis G. Poppe, who replies to the poem referred to. He has entitled his poem "Good-by Mr. Hughes." Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include Reverend Poppe's reply:

GOOD-BY MR. HUGHES

Good-by, Mr. Hughes!
I'm leaving you soon
So you can take over,
I hope you have a good time,
Running things—
You've been making good progress
And your superstate is coming along fine—
And Stalin, what a superman!

I thought I'd drop you a line
To ask a few questions
Before I go.
Tell me, who made the atom?
Or who gave man wisdom
To release its power?
If a mother lose her child,
Will she find comfort in the gospel of Lenin
In the Communists' bible?
Or will she find spiritual strength
In the Molotov cocktail?
Tell me, self-sufficient superman!

And while you are busy,
Rebuilding the concept of power,
I'll be watching from within the shadows.
I will watch the faces of Judas,
And Pilate, and Herod the Tetrarch,
As they cringe at your foolishness,
And theirs;
While I wait in the company
Of the Fisherman, of Gandhi and Francis.

When the sands of the desert of time
Have covered your hammer and sickle
The Cross will still be standing
High on Calvary.

Sure I'll go—now!
But, I'll be back
To heal the wounds you leave.
I have been dismissed before,
Only to return again,
When other selfish men
Had learned,
As you will learn,
That justice,
And love,
And mercy and humility
Are eternal,
And unconquerable.

Good-by, Mr. Hughes.

—*Louis G. Poppe.*

MARCH 28, 1949.

Russian Control of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, nations have appeared, lasted for awhile, and then became but a memory. Empires have risen, held the attention at the center of the stage, only in a period of a century or so to make their exit into oblivion. Haughty autocrats crushing under their heels of authority the poor and the weak have vaulted to positions of power only in time to be forgotten, or if remembered, remembered only with scorn. The world is a changing place, but fundamentals and true concepts never change; and the divine rights of man are such that no empire, no dictator, and no nation can take them away from him due to the very fact that those rights have been divinely bestowed.

Today a power has appeared, outdictating the dictators of yesteryear, outruling the haughty kings of centuries past, and more cruelly scourging the people, and more unconscionably ignoring the concept of natural law in an attempt to outrage the sanctity of the Deity. That power is communistic Russia and the poor, weak nations that it has overpowered; and so, when we talk today of Hungary, we mean the Russian-dominated Hungary, where only recently we have seen again the infamous manifestations of the Russian determination to destroy religion. There are no exceptions in their attack. Protestant and Jewish groups take their place alongside of the heroic and broken body of Cardinal Mindszenty.

It might be well to pause for a moment and see by what authority this alleged government takes control over the people of Hungary. Law is a rule of action,

mandatory in form, established and promulgated by competent authority for the common good. Suarez says, "Law is a common, just and stable precept." Before a law can have any sanction, it must come from competent authority. The Communist regime in Hungary assumed its power by dubious means, and its means was the disenfranchisement of the opposition, so that a court, which has been so well described by our President as a "kangaroo" court, can have no authority or sanction for its findings. And where has this "kangaroo" court ever established its legality? The evidence is of a most compelling nature to support the findings that the present regime in Hungary is not one which rose to power through valid means; nor can it be said that it has either actual or implied consent of the people.

And now, in Budapest, Cardinal Mindszenty and six others with him remain doomed. They went from accusation to their doom of life imprisonment in 5 days. What a contrast with our American justice. Certainly the Communist regime in Hungary cannot claim to be for the common good in such an action where the citizen receives no protection, where every human right is violated, and attempts are made to destroy the body and the will; the very dignity of the human being.

The Cardinal has been a great source of courage to his people always. He was born among the peasants in his native Hungary of a family of German ancestry that had settled in Hungary some 300 years ago. Even when Cardinal Mindszenty became a prince of the church he never lost contact with his own people.

This case will stand forever as a monument to man's intolerance of man. Seldom, if ever, in the history of the world has there been such a ruthless crusade to destroy an individual because he dared to exercise rights that belong to him as a human being. The American people denounce this great miscarriage of justice.

Flood Control Record of Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., of March 29, 1949, entitled "They Never Fail." Often fine work of governmental agencies is overlooked in the bickering criticism that falls to the lot of those who fail to measure up to the proper standards. The magnificent work of the Army engineers in the handling of our flood-control problems in the lower Mississippi Basin is well presented in this fine editorial, and I hope those Members of Congress who are not acquainted with the work of the engineers in war and in peace will read this editorial carefully. It is as follows:

THEY NEVER FAIL

A Mississippi River levee opposite Baton Rouge broke last Thursday night, forming a large crevasse which resulted in flood of quite a number of square miles of land.

Working around the clock, the United States Corps of Army Engineers had the crevasse closed and the flowage of water stopped by Saturday night.

That is the way with the Army engineers. Always you can count on them. They never fail where human achievement is possible. They get far too little credit for what they accomplish not only in preventive work but in remedial work that at times approaches the miraculous.

Here in the Shreveport area there may be, at times, far too little realization of what the Army engineers have done in our own locality in protection of land, both city and rural. The municipal airport area owned by the city now is far bigger than it was when purchased—due to the fact that the Red River, instead of eating into the area, actually is enlarging it constantly.

This same revetment job of the Army engineers—$3,000,000 worth in all and extending well below Shreveport—is recognized by the Army engineers themselves, and by all unbiased and competent engineers with whom we have talked, as in every way a permanent job.

That's the way the Army engineers do things—the Corps itself has been a permanent factor in the Nation's welfare and progress for nearly 150 years and it has been a permanent factor in Mississippi Valley waterway work—which includes Red River—for well over a century.

When it installs preventive controls over river waters they are permanently preventive; and when emergency remedial work is the task at hand it fills the bill until the permanent job can be done.

Apparently what caused the Port Allen break in the Mississippi levee was the failure of some of our State agencies to be as competent as the Army engineers. Dredging firms were permitted to keep taking out sand until they undermined the levee itself.

Let's leave things to the engineers themselves hereafter where waterways, banks, and flood control are concerned. They have proved their ability and their competence.

Union Welfare Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 28, 1949:

THREE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND WORKERS IN WELFARE PLANS—RISE TO 5,000,000 IN SUMMER SOUGHT BY UNION LEADERS NEGOTIATING CONTRACTS—EMPLOYERS PAYING COSTS—INDUSTRY IS DIVIDED ON THEORY, FINDS BANKRUPTCY POSSIBLE—AMA APPROVES PROJECTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Three and a half million workers now enjoy the protection of union-sponsored health, welfare, or retirement plans, with their employers paying all or most of the bill.

Union leaders hope they can push the number of workers under welfare plans past the 5,000,000 mark this summer. Liberalization of existing benefits and increased employer contributions are also part of the union program in forthcoming collective bargaining negotiations.

A survey by the New York Times indicated that union officers and members were generally enthusiastic about the operation of welfare plans now in effect, while employer reaction varied from approval of the basic idea to belief that the whole problem should more properly be met through governmental action on social security.

In no case was there any suggestion that the huge sums being collected for welfare purposes were being dishonestly administered or that unions were using them as war chests. However, many employers expressed fear that rivalry among union leaders might touch off a competitive race in the welfare field of such dimensions as to bankrupt industry.

The survey also disclosed that the American Medical Association, which opposes governmental steps toward compulsory health insurance, was well pleased with the way union health programs were working. Dr. James McVay, of Kansas City, Mo., chairman of the association's council on medical service, said none of the plans now in operation ran afoul of its concept of what a sound medical program should contain.

UNITED MINE WORKERS LEAD

Biggest and best-known of the present plans are the two United Mine Workers welfare and retirement funds, which are taking in $120,000,000 a year in soft-coal royalties and $12,000,000 a year more in hard-coal royalties. Both funds are spending the money almost as fast as it is collected and are still far from providing the full list of benefits John L. Lewis feels the funds must supply.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO, which were in the welfare field even before Mr. Lewis, have piled up nearly $110,000,000 in reserves in their welfare funds. The ILGWU, which includes a pooled vacation fund in its welfare program, expects to distribute more than $20,000,000 in benefits this year. The Amalgamated will pay out about $6,000,000 on the basis of current estimates.

Hundreds of thousands of truck drivers, longshoremen, millinery workers, building craftsmen, utility employees and workers in scores of other industries receive protection through group insurance or pension systems, but there is a wide deviation in the range of welfare services provided and in the percentage of employer contribution.

Retirement benefits vary from a straight dollar-for-dollar matching of Federal Social Security payments, which currently average about $26 a month, to the Lewis figure of $100 a month, in addition to social security. On the health side there is little uniformity of benefits. A few programs protect workers, and sometimes their families as well, by providing full insurance against medical, surgical and hospital bills. Most have fixed limits on the cost and duration of benefits.

PERCENTAGE OF PAY ROLL

Employer contributions usually take the form of allocation of a specified percentage of pay roll or a certain number of cents an hour for welfare purposes. Most employer-financed funds run from 2 to 5 percent of pay rolls, with a few even higher. In the Philadelphia garment industry employer contributions total 8 percent, but 3½ percent of this goes into a unique fair income fund intended to safeguard workers against some of the hazards of seasonal unemployment.

The United Mine Workers funds derive their income from a royalty of 20 cents a ton

on all coal mined in the bituminous and anthracite fields. With the aid of new high-speed mining machinery, the average soft-coal miner accounts for a production of 6½ tons a day. This brings the royalty collection to about 8 percent if measured on a pay-roll basis. In anthracite, where mining conditions make the per-man yield much lower, the royalty amounts to 3 percent of pay roll.

In steels, automobiles, electrical manufacturing, rubber, and other industries, in which union welfare funds are still rare, several factors have combined to make unions feel that 1949 is the year to make the big push for expanded health and pension programs.

Chief among these is the adverse impact of the declining cost of living on union demands for fourth-round wage increases. Even though labor leaders argue that higher wages are necessary to promote a higher standard of living and to fortify purchasing power, they expect to win more popular support on the welfare front than the wage front this year.

Another factor has been the demonstrated effect of existing welfare funds in building up union morale and membership loyalty. Under most programs workers lose benefits when they leave the industry or quit the union. From both standpoints the existence of insurance and pension provisions operates as a stabilizing element. This may become a particularly important factor if industrial conditions become worse.

Recent decisions by the National Labor Relations Board requiring employers to bargain collectively on pension and other welfare programs have strengthened the union position in this year's negotiations. In past years many employers have declined to accept the view that such matters were proper subjects for bargaining. The new NLRB rulings are being contested in the courts, but unions do not intend to put off their demands until final rulings are handed down.

Employers faced with new welfare demands take the view that any assumption of new labor costs, whether in the form of higher wages or of welfare payments, will force prices up at a time when consumers are refusing to buy because they feel prices are already too high.

Another frequent employer argument is that the plans of the Truman administration for liberalizing and broadening the Federal social security program will entail a substantial rise in pay-roll taxes. With social security taxes likely to reach a combined employer-employee level of at least 8 percent if all phases of the Truman program are approved, many industrialists contend that allocation of further funds for union welfare programs would undermine the national economy.

Union spokesmen retort with a double-barreled argument. In the first place they see little basis in the record of the Eighty-first Congress to expect favorable action on any substantial part of the Truman social-security recommendations. In the second place they maintain that there will continue to be need for auxiliary programs to supplement and reinforce benefits available through social security.

Some major welfare agreements include provisions for reconsideration of employer contributions and employee benefits if social-security taxes are increased or Federal services liberalized. Others are subject to change only when new basic wage contracts come up for negotiation.

The 3,500,000 workers now under welfare plans represent a little less than one-quarter of the country's organized workers. Most of the plans are jointly administered by union and employer representatives, but some of the pre-Taft-Hartley programs are exclusively in union hands.

In most cases the employers are content to exercise an advisory function in fund operations. Their main concern is that the fund be applied honestly and economically. There have been virtually no complaints of dereliction on either of these counts. The employers re also concerned that there be no undertaking of functions that would necessitate expanded financial contributions on their part.

One fund recently negotiated by the United Automobile Workers, CIO, in a Muskegon, Mich., foundry calls for an employer contribution of 7 cents an hour, with a proviso that the union and its members are to be responsible for making up any shortage that may develop in meeting the cost of providing agreed-upon health and welfare services for the workers.

With the business outlook uncertain, such clauses may be widely demanded by employers this year If plants introduce short workweeks, it may become necessary to provide welfare services to an equal number of workers with only half the money originally expected. Income in some funds has already dropped 10 to 20 percent since the beginning of the year.

Union lay-off policies will probably be influenced to some extent by welfare considerations. Where there is a choice between laying off some employees entirely or putting all on a reduced work schedule, the need for protecting the welfare fund may induce a decision to favor lay-offs so that the reduced pay-roll contributions will be adequate to cover the smaller number of workers left in the program.

When the Kaiser-Frazer Corp., which pays 5 cents an hour into a UAW welfare fund, cut back operations in January, the union gave its support to a program of lay-offs instead of a reduction in the workweek. As a result, there are now some 3,500 fewer workers eligible for insurance protection and there has been no need to scale down benefits for those still on the pay roll.

However, the determining factor in the Kaiser-Frazer decision was not the welfare fund but the fact that under the Michigan unemployment insurance law there is no provision for unemployment compensation to persons who are not totally idle. In New York and other States days of unemployment are taken into consideration, but in Michigan the workers would have drawn no benefits from the State unless some were laid off entirely.

The AMA's views on union health and medical programs was set forth by Dr. McVay in a telephone interview last week. He gave special praise to the program provided by the ILGWU through its union health center in this city.

Dr. McVay said he favored the general approach being taken by Dr. Warren F. Draper, medical director of the UMW welfare and retirement funds, in setting up a comprehensive medical program for miners. In general, Dr. McVay remarked, the union welfare programs were successfully avoiding the objections the AMA has directed against socialized medicine.

"We are interested in encouraging the development of any program that will provide a high standard of service to the patient, safeguard the traditional patient-doctor relationship, and meet the other requirements of the AMA," Dr. McVay declared. "Thus far our study of the various plans established under collective bargaining leads us to believe that they are functioning satisfactorily in all respects."

Problems of the Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] last night over the Mutual Broadcasting System on the subject Problems of the Atlantic Pact. I point out that the Senator's address bears out the statements which have been made by the junior Senator from Utah that there are many problems connected with this pact which are hard to understand, and which should be thoroughly studied and debated before the North Atlantic treaty is ratified and approved by the Senate of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 4, the North Atlantic treaty will be signed in Washington by the United States and most of the important western European nations. Thereafter, it will be submitted to the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote.

I doubt if any measure affecting more vitally the problems of the future security and peace of the American people has been before the Senate in my time for serious consideration. The pact has been widely acclaimed by many newspaper editors, column writers and radio commentators, even before its text was made public. The Secretary of State has issued statements and broadcasts to the Nation setting forth effectively the merits of the pact. Public opinion polls have announced a large majority of the people in favor of the pact, but with little evidence that they have given serious consideration to the problems involved.

SENATOR WANTS FACTS

As a United States Senator, I have not made up my mind, and I do not propose to do so until I know more facts and hear more discussion of the problems involved. It has been tacitly assumed that the pact would be approved as a matter of course in a short time, but I think my feeling of uncertainty is shared by a large majority of the Senators, and I look forward to the debate in the Senate as a historic event which can still determine public opinion as well as as the opinion of the Senate.

To my mind, the foreign policy of the United States should be directed, first, toward the maintenance of the liberty of our people against foreign attack, and second, toward the maintenance of peace so far as is consistent with the preservation of our liberty. The making of this Atlantic treaty at this time is justified by its proponents on the ground that this country would be threatened by the military power of Russia if it were extended over western Europe. It is argued with force that if we make known our willingness to go to war in case of an attack by Russia on western Europe, it will deter such an attack and thereby contribute both to our security and to the peace of the

world. It is argued on the other side that the pact will not in fact protect western Europe from occupation if the Russians choose to go to war, that our security depends on other factors than the occupation of western Europe by the Russians, and that this pact will tend to provoke Russia to war rather than discourage such action.

WHAT IS FACT?

What is the Atlantic defense treaty? Like the United Nations Charter, the pact deals with the problem of preventing or punishing aggression by one nation against another. Both pacts contain an agreement to settle disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force. Under the United Nations Charter, we have agreed to provide armed force to the United Nations on action of the Security Council calling for such forces to prevent international aggression. Since, however, we can veto any action by the Security Council, we have reserved the right in that agreement to decide for ourselves whether our forces shall go to war. In the Atlantic defense treaty, our agreement is much more direct. We agree in article 5 that an armed attack against one or more of the signatories in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently we agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, we will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as we deem necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. While the treaty is obviously aimed at aggression by Russia, it appears to cover aggression by any nation, member or nonmember, against any other nation signing the pact, and the obligation is to be in force for 20 years. This evening I can hardly do more than state the problems which confront anyone charged with the solemn duty of passing on the wisdom of the treaty.

1. Is this a definite moral or legal obligation to go to war if any nation attacks a member in Europe, or is it subject to a choice by the Congress which, under our Constitution, is given the power to declare war?

The language certainly suggests that we are obligating ourselves to go to war if we consider that necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. I suppose the language is sufficiently indefinite so that we might refuse to go to war, but I hardly think we would be acting in good faith if we did refuse. The language certainly justifies the other nations in concluding that we have assumed at least a moral obligation to use armed force to defend them against Russia and to restore their freedom if Russia has invaded them. It is true that article II says that the treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. That seems to indicate that a declaration of war by Congress is necessary, but even this is not certain. The President of the United States undoubtedly has the constitutional right to use our armed forces against an armed attack on the United States without a congressional declaration of war. Article 5 says that an armed attack against any other nation shall be considered an attack against us. If a treaty can modify provisions of our Constitution, the President might be able to use armed forces without congressional action to protect the territory of one of the European participants against armed attack. Under Article 6 of our Constitution, treaties are given an independent status equal, in some respects, to the Constitution itself, and the Supreme Court has so held in Holland versus Missouri and other cases. It is at least doubtful, in my opinion, whether a congressional declaration of war will be necessary.

Of course, it is true that Congress might prohibit action by our Army and refuse to carry out the obligation of the pact. All treaties are subject to repudiation, but certainly we should not enter into a treaty unless we intend to carry it out, including a declaration of war by Congress.

I am inclined to believe, therefore, that if we adopt the treaty we should do so with the frank admission that we are committing ourselves to go to war if Russia attacks one of the western European nations.

I myself have not felt that this is a conclusive argument against the treaty. Certainly as long as we maintain armed forces in Germany we would be drawn into war, anyway, if Russia attacked western Europe. I am somewhat concerned about the fact that the obligation is to last for 20 years, and that it may well apply to much smaller and less important attacks by one nation on another, even though Russia has returned to an entirely peaceful status, and make us a policeman for all western Europe.

2. Does the pact carry out the purposes of the Vandenberg resolution adopted by the Senate on June 11, 1948? I was not myself able to vote on that resolution, but it was adopted by a large majority of the Senate. Undoubtedly that resolution advised the association of the United States with a regional agreement providing for the exercise of the right of collective self-defense under article 51 of the United Nations Charter should any attack occur affecting its national security. The resolution approved the general theory of an Atlantic Pact, but there is still a question whether the pact does not go further than then contemplated.

Senator VANDENBERG at that time, in explaining his resolution, said: "It declines automatically military alliances. It declines all peacetime renewals of the old open-ended lend-lease formula. It declines unilateral responsibility for the fate of western Europe. It is none of those things; it is the exact opposite. * * * Our cooperation must be a supplement and not a substitute for the adequate and continuous defensive activities of others. It is a paraphrase of the Rio treaty which the Senate overwhelmingly approved. * * * It never steps outside the United Nations Charter. It never steps outside the Constitution of the United States. It never steps outside the final authority of Congress."

Comparing the pact with the Rio treaty, we find it has much more the quality of a military alliance than that treaty. Under that treaty, in case of an armed attack, we are free to determine the measures which we desire to take, and all of those measures are referred to an organ of consultation which meets without delay for the purpose of agreeing on measures of a collective character. The obligation assumed in the Atlantic Pact seems to me much stronger than that contained in the Rio treaty.

I don't mean to conclude that we should not enter into such strong obligations in view of the Communist threat, but we certainly are not bound by the Vandenberg resolution to approve the Atlantic Pact as now drawn.

3. Is the pact in accord with the United Nations Charter? Article 51 of the Charter provides that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." I believe this recognizes the validity of such a pact, but it is hard to claim that it is in pursuance of the general theory of the United Nations.

A pact is permitted to exist and to operate in case the United Nations machinery fails to work. I had hoped that the pact might be a small United Nations within the larger one, setting up much more definite rules for the application of law and justice between those nations which were prepared to agree within the pact. I hoped we might have a model on which international agreements based on law and justice could be developed, which could later be applied to a modification of the United Nations Charter. But this pact is strictly limited to a supplementary military alliance for collective self defense.

4. Furthermore, if the pact involves an obligation to arm all of the nations of western Europe, I have some doubt whether the recognition in article 51 of "the inherent right of collective self defense if an armed attack occurs" justifies the arming by one nation of a great many other nations. From the statements of Secretary Acheson and other sources, our Government seems to have agreed as part of the Atlantic Pact to provide arms for all the nations of Europe. I seriously question whether such an agreement is consistent with our obligation to the United Nations. True, the United Nations has not yet prohibited the building up of armament by any member, although the Charter contains proposals looking to that result. But it is hard to reconcile with the general purposes of the United Nations the deliberate arming of a large number of smaller countries by one large and powerful state.

This arms proposal, which has not been definitely submitted to Congress as yet, raises one of the most serious problems we have to consider. It is said that we could approve the pact and then turn down the proposal for a lend-lease of arms. Technically, that is true, but I am inclined to think that the European nations have been given to understand that the arms are part of our Atlantic Pact obligation and would regard such action by us as a repudiation of our obligations right at the start of the pact. Therefore, we must consider the pact and the providing of arms as one proposition. This raises my principal doubt, and frankly I do not have enough facts to resolve it.

From the point of view of national security it is claimed that Russia could overrun western Europe today and that no rearming of those countries could be effective to prevent such action for the next 2 or 3 years. Therefore, our national security is not immediately increased. From the point of view of peace, we may give the Russians the impression, at least justified to themselves, that we are ringing them about with armies for the purpose of undertaking aggressive action when the time comes. They may feel that if war is to come, they had better undertake it before these armaments are built up. Under such circumstances the pact, instead of being a deterrent to war, might becomes an incitement to war, and makes it more probable instead of less. This seems to be the fear of Mr. John Foster Dulles. On March 8, he warned the negotiators of the proposed Atlantic Pact to avoid all commitments that might be construed by the Soviet government as bringing United States military might directly to Russia's Scandinavian border. He obviously felt that the including of Norway in the pact was a particular incitement which might lead the Red army leaders to feel that their homeland was immediately and seriously threatened.

5. Some of its opponents raise the question whether the Atlantic Pact is not really in effect a defensive and offensive military alliance. There are certain commentators who

feel that we should enter into that kind of an alliance because of the tremendous seriousness of the Communist threat. I cannot go that far. Certainly, the State Department and our Government are not admitting that the pact has any offensive implications whatever. I hope that they may be able to prove to us that that is the fact. We should not give Russia any reasonable grounds to believe that this is an offensive alliance.

6. I have one other question. How far do our military arrangements commit us to conduct a land war in Europe? We are told that military plans are being made. Do they involve our sending millions of men to fight on European soil against Russia? Many experts feel that our part in any war should be confined to the air and that we should not try to march to Moscow as did Napoleon and Hitler. Many feel that the tremendous manpower of Russia will make a land war on the European Continent a contest fought exactly as Russia would like us to fight it, on their chosen ground. Whatever may be our final decision in case of war, I certainly do not feel that we should commit ourselves at this time to any particular military plan or character of operation.

On the problems I have discussed, I have come to no conclusion myself. I urge very strongly that the people of the United States come to no conclusion until there has been complete revelation of our plans and obligations and a complete discussion of the fundamental issues involved, both in the Senate and throughout the United States. The decisions we make involve the very lives of millions of our citizens and the future of free government.

Russians in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a very important news article has just come to my attention. It puts all of Christianity on notice of the activities of Godless Communists in the Holy Land. Every church member should be aroused to action. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by George Weller, that appeared in the Chicago Daily News on February 21, 1949, under the heading, "Russians 'capture' church in Holy Land."

PRELATE FROM MOSCOW ASSUMES FULL CHARGE—TRIAL OF CARDINAL CALLED SMOKE SCREEN FOR MANEUVER

(By George Weller)

ROME.—While the democratic powers were roaring protests over the Communist inquisition in Hungary and Bulgaria, the Soviet Union was using the opportunity to steal for itself another safe, easy victory in the Middle East.

At the very moment Cardinal Mindszenty was facing his accusers, a Russian priest, safe behind the blur of the Balkan smoke screen, was taking over the valuable properties of the Orthodox Church in Palestine.

Moreover, the deal, obscured by Middle East censorship, was so deftly managed that it passed almost unnoticed, except here in Italy.

The entire Communist antichurch offensive in Hungary and Bulgaria was timed, it is recognized here, as a diversion to draw attention away from Russia's own capture of the Orthodox Churches and monasteries in strategic Palestine.

This capture gives Moscow two main conduits instead of only one to pipe more communism into the state of Israel and broaden Moscow's new foothold in the Mediterranean.

The political conduit is in Israel's traffic of dollar-purchased arms from the Communist Skoda plant in Czechoslovakia and in the Israeli Government's amnesty granted last week to the members and leaders of the Communist-controlled Stern gang.

The religious conduit, which is new, is the orthodox church, which until last week was free of Soviet control.

Here is how the Soviets tricked the western powers, while America was glowering over the Balkan fence at Hungary:

The orthodox church is split roughly between its Greek clergy, few and prodemocratic, and its Slavic clergy, numerous and pro-Russian. In the Balkan satellite countries the orthodox church is protected as an arm of Moscow's power. In Bulgaria the national archbishop is on the Communist government pay roll.

Stalin's instrument is the pliable patriarch Alexis of Moscow. He sent Alexis on a foresighted tour of the Palestine missions in 1945, before the cold war began. Alexis' mission was to spearhead the effort of Stalin to recover old czarist rights in the Holy Land.

Under the czars Russia had been the protector of Christian orthodoxy in the Middle East, by the same right as France was protector of Christian Catholicism. Having taken back at Yalta more than the czar's empire in the Far East, Stalin set out to duplicate the trick in the Middle East, using the church as a wedge.

In the Middle East, however, the hardheaded British and French rather than the Americans stood in his way. The British Army held Palestine and the French the Levant of Lebanon and Syria.

The French fumbled their Arab relations and stumbled into colonial war and finally into retreat. The British were gunned out of Palestine by Zionist forces financed by United States sympathizers.

With Israel's birth the coast became clear for the Soviets and only the matter of timing remained uncertain.

The Orthodox churches and monasteries in the Holy Land, worth tens of millions of dollars, were under the custodianship of the Archimandrite Anthony. For 25 years they had been held by White Russian prelates, but there was a disposition to meet Stalin's seeming wish to tolerate religion. When the Stalinist patriarch toured the Middle East, the Palestine custodian recognized his authority.

The break came when the Palestine prelate changed his mind and recognized a new anti-Soviet prince of the church, the Metropolitan of Munich. The Kremlin perceived that it must expel the Palestine prelate or lose his churches and monasteries to the west. The buildings are strategically valuable and a priestly robe is a matchless cover for entrance of Soviet agents.

To replace the anti-Communist clergyman, the Stalinist patriarch sent the Soviet Archbishop Leonidas of the Church of St. Gabriel at Moscow.

When Bulgaria's 15 Protestant ministers were confessing and Mindszenty was tottering before his Communist accusers, a quite different scene was being enacted in a church near Jerusalem. Moscow's priest was taking over all the most valuable Orthodox properties in Israel.

As soon as the Communist coup was complete, the Israeli Government, on February 10 made a pact with Russia to provide working funds for the new sovietized church. The Soviet Union agrees to balance the account by sending Israel exports from Russia—nature unspecified.

How valuable the Palestine foothold is to Stalin is gaged by the fact that atheistic Soviet communism for the first time not only captures a religion administratively but arranges openly and officially to pay for its support. The Orthodox Church overseas thereby becomes the kept official faith for a state whose schoolbooks still term religion "the opium of the masses."

Stalin's prelate, Alexis, has set himself another job for the world's fastest growing empire: To capture the keystone arch between Moscow and Palestine, the patriarchate of Constantinople.

Alexis, a sort of fulfillment of the ex-theological student, Josef Stalin, has announced that the Orthodox patriarch in Turkey, who lives in seclusion at Fanar, on the Straits, must be liberated. No one would be surprised if the Straits themselves, Russia's prize target, also gained a Soviet freedom.

Alexis also says that the great Orthodox Church of St. Sophia, now a Turkish national museum, should be the patriarchal seat when liberation comes.

What Does a Contribution Actually Cost a Taxpayer?—How Much Is Paid by the Taxpayer and How Much Is Paid by Uncle Sam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, lobbying organizations are raising money by the millions of dollars for the purpose of trying to convince Congress and the people of the Nation to believe and think a certain way. In other words, a group that is interested in favoring or opposing any particular legislation is out to do everything within its power to get public sentiment molded that way.

It is an easy matter to raise money for lobbying purposes. Under our internal-revenue laws passed by Congress, taxpayers are encouraged to make contributions, not only to religious and charitable organizations, but also to scientific, literary, or educational organizations that use the money for educational purposes or for prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or to organizations of war veterans. This money can be raised and charged to Uncle Sam in several ways:

First. A business firm, partnership, or corporation can purchase pamphlets, books, and literature in huge quantities and have them transmitted through the mails, or otherwise, throughout the United States, and the cost of purchase, handling, and transportation charged up to business expense of the concern.

Second. An individual may contribute up to 15 percent of his gross income for the year and it is deductible from his income tax.

Third. Under section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code, it is possible for certain individuals to make unlimited contributions which are deductible for Federal income-tax purposes.

By using one or more of these methods, a lobbying concern has little difficulty in getting all the money that it needs or wants for most any purpose because Uncle Sam pays most of the bill.

Al. gifts for the purposes heretofore mentioned from income, including wages or salaries, income from rents or securities, or business or professional earnings, are exempt from Federal income tax up to 15 percent of the adjusted gross income for the year in which actual payment of the gift is made. You can, as a matter of fact, in many cases effect a substantial tax saving by making such a gift.

There is another novel way of making a gift for the purposes heretofore mentioned that will actually benefit the taxpayer and cause Uncle Sam to pay, in some cases, all the value. For instance, you can make a gift to one of these organizations in stocks. The value of the gift will be the present market value at the time of delivery. The effect of the gift is that the taxpayer escapes entirely the tax on the appreciation. In other words, the taxpayer gets the benefit of the deduction at the higher value, yet he is not taxed for the appreciation.

STOCK TRANSFER CAN BE MOST HELPFUL

Suppose for instance, that a taxpayer owns stock that he bought for $1,000, and that its present value, on account of an increase in price, has risen to $2,000. The taxpayer may give this stock as a $2,000 gift. He will not be required to pay any capital gains tax on the unrealized profit of $1,000. The cost of the gift is only the $500 which the taxpayer originally paid, less a tax reduction for the benefit of the taxpayer—not $1,000 which he paid but on the full $2,000.

I am inserting herewith a table which shows the actual cost of a contribution:

What does a contribution actually cost?

TAX SAVED BY INDIVIDUAL'S CONTRIBUTION

If the taxed income less exemptions for		The tax saved per dollar by taking a deduction for charitable or educational contribution is—	Leaving net cost after tax per dollar contributed of—
Single person is up to—	Married couple is up to—		
$2,000	$4,000	$0.17	$0.83
4,000	8,000	.19	.81
6,000	12,000	.23	.77
8,000	16,000	.26	.74
10,000	20,000	.30	.70
12,000	24,000	.33	.67
14,000	28,000	.38	.62
16,000	32,000	.41	.59
18,000	36,000	.44	.56
20,000	40,000	.47	.53
22,000	44,000	.49	.51
26,000	52,000	.52	.48
32,000	64,000	.55	.45
38,000	76,000	.57	.43
44,000	88,000	.61	.39
50,000	100,000	.63	.37
60,000	120,000	.66	.34
70,000	140,000	.69	.31
80,000	160,000	.71	.29
90,000	180,000	.74	.26
100,000	200,000	.77	.23
150,000	400,000	.81	.19
200,000	400,000	.81	.19

All these organizations claim to be organized under laws that will permit tax deductions. In other words, they claim to be either religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational, which brings them within the law permitting tax deductions.

FREEDOMS ABUSED

I sometimes wonder how it is possible for a democracy established upon the will of the people to continue to function under our very liberal and, in fact, loose system of freedom of expression and freedom of press. It is not my purpose to advocate the restriction of either. I believe in both, but they are being abused now to the extent that it is very difficult for even a Member of Congress to get the truth about important proposals upon which he must vote. I think it is a great tribute to Members of Congress and to people generally that a majority of them are so seldom fooled or misled by disguised and deceitful arguments presented by selfish, greedy people.

PRESENT MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

It is not unusual for a business corporation to place whole-page newspaper advertisements in the principal daily newspapers of the country and charge the costs of them to business expense when the advertisements are devoted solely to propaganda, giving the biased and prejudiced views of the management of the corporation. Such advertisements are charged up as business expense and the cost is tax-deductible.

In the case of one huge corporation that is owned by two brothers, who are so wealthy that they are in the 81 percent income-tax bracket, the business expense would cause the Government to lose $3,800 on every $10,000 expended by the corporation. If, instead of spending the $10,000 for advertising, the corporation had paid $3,800 on it in taxes and had paid the two brothers the remainder of $6,200, each would have received $3,100, upon which a tax at the rate of 81 percent would have been paid to the Government, amounting to $2,511. In other words, the Government would have received $3,800 in corporation plus $5,022 in individual taxes, making a total of $8,822; so the charging of such business expenses amounting to $10,000 would have actually cost the Government $8,822 in this case. This can be multiplied millions of times a year.

The mails are filled with such advertising all the time, not advertising items, goods, or commodities, but advertising views, notions, and suggestions for the purpose of trying to get the people to think a certain way. Such efforts are naturally selfish because the private-enterprise system is selfish, and it is expected that views will be presented for the purpose of causing the people to believe in a way that the greedy interest of the concern is benefited.

STEEL CAPACITY

One of the most untruthful, misleading, and harmful campaigns that is being carried on today is by the "big steel" interests. They have the finest, best, and most highly paid professionals in our country to attract the minds of the people in a way that the cause of "big steel" is presented in the most favorable light and its failures to perform in the public interest successfully hidden.

It is well known that we must have an increased capacity in steel of at least 10,000,000 tons per annum in order to maintain full employment and production, yet the big steel companies are doing everything within their power to make the people believe that they are expanding adequately to take care of their needs.

Recently, Dr. Louis H. Bean, economist for the Department of Agriculture, pointed out in a letter published in Business Week, that we are now producing 88,500,000 tons of steel per annum when it will be necessary for us to produce 100,000,000 tons by 1950 in order to maintain full employment and production.

Dr. Bean also stated:

The danger we face today of even greater shortages in the 1950's is clearly borne out by the recent McGraw-Hill survey (BW, January 22, 1949, p. 54) which shows that while all manufacturing industries expanded 56 percent during the past 10 years, the steel industry expanded only 3 percent, and that over the next 5 years all industries expect to expand another 13 percent while the steel industry expects to expand only 3 percent.

If any of your readers are interested in seeing how the depression of the 1930's resulted in a halt to steel-capacity expansion and laid the basis for the wartime and current shortages in steel, the brief statement entitled "What About Steel (the Battle of Steel Statistics)" is available on request and will give them that information.

PROPAGANDISTS ANSWERED

If by chance, some public-spirited, patriotic employee of our Government answers a misleading and untruthful statement being used by the propagandists and lobbyists, a great cry goes up at once something like this, "I was advised that this release was typed on Government paper, on Government time, on a Government machine, and in a Government office." This is typical of the objections that are urged against any answer given by anyone in authority.

The propagandists and lobbyists do not stop there. They contact the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and make sure that language is written into the next appropriation bill that will make it impossible for Government money to be spent for such purpose, even if it results in telling the people the truth and giving them information that would prevent them from being misled and deceived.

Aids for Mine Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from United Mine Workers Journal of March 15, 1949:

FUND AIDS MINE VICTIMS TO FIND NEW VOCATIONS

Four days before Christmas, 1943, Pershing Smith walked to his working place in a mine

at Ethel, W. Va., for the last time. The injuries that befell him that December day left him permanently paralyzed from the waist down.

After more than 5 years—three and a half of which were a total loss economically, divided between bed and wheel chair—Pershing Smith is now the proprietor of a small food establishment in the little mining community of Blair, W. Va. It affords him a modest income on which to support his wife and two young children.

Smith, who was among the first seriously disabled West Virginia miners to be sent by the UMWA welfare and retirement fund to the Permanente Hospital in California for physical rehabilitation, was launched in a new vocation geared to his physical capacity, interests and abilities through the cooperative efforts of the State vocational rehabilitation division, the UMWA local at Ethel, friends, and fellow citizens in the community. Coal-miner friends gave their time and talent to help erect the small building which houses the Smith store. The local union made a substantial contribution to the building fund. Within 5 months his business was netting him an average of about $50 a week.

Although Smith had previously been rejected for hospitalization by the State on the ground that "physical restoration should not be considered beyond attempting to provide the client with suitable braces and instructions for using them," his physical condition was greatly improved by medical treatment under auspices of the welfare fund and his vocational usefulness increased accordingly.

Pershing Smith is one of the hundreds of disabled miners that the welfare fund has undertaken to restore to physical health, to assist in qualifying for and finding employment in a new vocation that will enable them to function once again as self-sustaining citizens.

There are scores of similar cases demonstrating plainly that given the opportunity, the disabled miner readily equips himself to carry on, to stand on his own feet economically to the maximum extent possible.

Take 45-year-old Austin Quillion, of Gardendale, Ala., who has been paralyzed for years due to a spinal injury. Hospital treatment in New York under welfare fund auspices rendered a considerable improvement in his health, although he is still largely confined to a wheel chair.

Quillion utilizes his considerable mechanical skill in operating a general fix-it shop adjacent to his home, where he repairs washing machines and other home electrical appliances. He is taking a correspondence course in radio repairs, provided by the State rehabilitation service. He has also acquired a knowledge of drafting and has drawn plans for several houses in his community.

A. J. Grammer, Jr., of Sumiton, Ala., lost both legs as a result of a mine motor accident in May 1947. Married and the father of three children, 25-year-old Grammer was a careful, enthusiastic worker. His only experience had been in mining coal.

Arrangements were made through the State rehabilitation service to give Grammer 9 months' training in watch repairing. He applied himself with such zeal that he was qualified inside of 6 months to open a shop of his own in Sumiton, which now provides his family with a fair income.

Until the UMWA welfare fund began functioning, however, a large proportion of the men seriously impaired in the coal industry were the further victims of a combination of circumstances that too often sentenced them to a bed of affliction or wheelchair for life, left them totally dependent on meager compensation allotments or charity, and devoid of vocational usefulness.

WELFARE FUND SPURS STATE AGENCIES

The rehabilitation program of the welfare fund has not only focused attention on the deficiencies of State vocational rehabilitation agencies, due in the main to inadequate funds and widespread indifference to the plight of the disabled, but has spurred public officials into action, to set about the long overdue task of improving facilities and securing adequate funds to do the job they are supposed to do, which will of course benefit all citizens.

When a disabled miner, after the necessary medical treatment, is ready for vocational training, the welfare fund steers him to the proper authorities, who determine his aptitudes and interests and map out a program of study or training to fit him for a new means of livelihood. The welfare fund works in close cooperation with State rehabilitation services in finding suitable employment objectives and opportunities.

It is a pioneer undertaking, on a scale never before attempted for the disabled victims of industry, despite the fact that a Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program for handicapped civilians has supposedly been operating for nearly 30 years.

Aside from all the humanitarian considerations, it is a common-sense economic program. As one authority pointed out recently:

"A disabled man or woman is a dependent and is a burden on somebody—his family or the community. It costs about $300 to $600 every year to maintain him in dependency. It costs about the same to effect (vocational) rehabilitation. That cost is paid just once. So, through rehabilitation, we not only restore the citizen to his family and his place in society but we cut off a continuing loss. In most cases the rehabilitated worker's income-tax payments alone will cover the costs of his rehabilitation. And there is definite indication that the average rehabilitant will repay in taxes $10 for every $1 spent on him during the course of his working life."

Bearing this out is the fact that during the 5-year period ending June 30, 1948, West Virginia spent a total of only $487,307.32 on rehabilitating the disabled, but during the same period the rehabilitation program produced nearly that much, $456,000, in State revenue.

Men's Preferences for Fabrics in Men's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this week the Department of Agriculture released a report of a survey which it recently conducted with respect to men's preferences for the fabrics to be used in men's clothing. I have just prepared a statement and made a transcription for radio broadcast throughout the country, and particularly in the wool-growing States, on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD NEWS FOR WOOL GROWERS

This is good news for the wool growers of America. It is good news for manufacturers of wool fabrics and for those who are engaged in the distribution of fabrics and clothing made of wool.

Less than 10 years ago the United States was the second largest producer of fine wools in the world. Here we grew sufficient wool to supply 65 percent of all our clothing needs even in the years of biggest demand. The remaining 35 percent was imported. Our annual domestic clip ran around 450,000,000 pounds a year and provided employment for some 500,000 people.

This year, due, among other causes, to the high cost of production, foreign competition and the unprecedented disaster which held the Rocky Mountain West in its grip for 3 months last winter, wool production will probably be not more than it was as long ago as 1867. The 1949 domestic wool clip will hardly exceed 225,000,000 pounds. In the meantime, consumption of wool has increased from a little over 600,000,000 pounds to approximately one billion pounds. And now we are meeting our wool clothing requirements by importing almost 80 percent of our peacetime needs.

While it is true that the storm losses during the winter were severe, livestock men have suffered more from a financial standpoint than from the actual loss of sheep. Their losses will range from 10 to 25 percent in the States of Utah, Nevada, Wyoming, and in parts of Kansas and Colorado. In all of the sheep-raising States, including California, it is expected that in addition the spring lamb crop will be severely reduced, and that the animals which do survive will be of inferior size and quality.

Livestock men fought heroically to save their flocks during the successive storms which swept the country. To do that they had to buy feed at double or triple the average costs. These expenditures, together with actual sheep losses and the poor spring lamb crops, which may be even smaller than today's expectations, result in making the disaster the most severe livestock raisers have ever experienced in the history of the Rocky Mountain West. No living white man ever saw anything to compare with last winter's snows.

The discouragements which wool growers have encountered from the rigors of nature and the progress of science in the development of synthetic fibers have been substantially counteracted by the revelation that American consumers prefer wool clothing. This was disclosed this week in a preliminary summary of a report now in preparation by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture as the result of a survey of consumer reactions to the various fibers used in men's clothing. This survey was completed in June 1948 and was made with funds provided by the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

The Bureau is noted for the high caliber of its statistical accuracy, and the survey is a splendid example of how Government can assist industry in assessing the size of markets, and in guiding industry in methods of increasing sales to the advantage of the producer of agricultural commodities.

A sample group of men which the BAE declares represents a total of 50,000,000 persons was questioned as to their fiber preferences in a number of articles of clothing. Opinions varied widely where shirts, bathrobes, socks, underwear, and pajamas were concerned, although the preference for wool in most of these items was surprisingly large. Cotton, that other great natural fiber, was high in favor among these items.

It was in men's summer suits that the preference for wool was overwhelming. No question was asked as to fiber preference in men's winter clothing because wool is practically the only fiber used in cold-weather clothing. Summer suits, the manufacturers tell us, have only emerged from the novelty stage within the past 10 years or so. In the deep South and in the tropics outside this

country men have worn cotton drill suits for generations, and have in fact developed typical tropical wardrobes.

Now, however, the wool grower can take satisfaction in the fact that a new use of his product is developing permanently in the lightweight, skeleton-lined tropical worsted suit which appeared first as a luxury in the central and northern parts of the United States. The use has grown until today it comprises between 15 and 20 percent of all men's suits.

The men questioned by the BAE representatives were asked if they bought and wore summer suits, and if so, what fiber they preferred and why? Here are some of their answers:

Forty percent of those questioned owned and wore summer suits.

Of this total 62 percent preferred wool and wool mixtures.

Eight percent said they preferred cotton.

Seven percent said they preferred rayon.

In other words, 9 out of 10 men prefer wool to rayon in their summer suits, and 4 out of 5 men prefer wool to both cotton and rayon.

The reasons for this preference for wool were interesting and understandable. They demonstrate again—if another demonstration were necessary—that the public acts with intelligence in buying the clothes it wears and uses, and that its choice is based on the practical purposes the fabrics serve.

The men questioned preferred wool because they like its looks; because they said it is comfortable, and because it is durable and wears well. The same reasons were given for the increasing use of wool in shirts, socks, robes, and other apparel items. They represented conclusions based on experience, and they reflected an understanding of the well-established traditional qualities which have made wool the most important fiber for the use of mankind in clothing.

These men do not prefer wool because it is the season's new color or the moment's new pattern, although these may give the careful dresser some concern. They buy wool because it makes fabrics which give them the most for their money in wear, service, and looks.

Since this country spends, for clothing, an average of 10 percent of all the wages and salaries earned by its people, and more than 20 percent of this total goes for wool clothing, it is important, first, that the prices for apparel wool be kept within reasonable price limits, to enable all of the people to buy wool clothing, and second, that we grow at least a substantial percentage of the wool we need.

The Department of Agriculture, which just completed this valuable survey, recently joined with the Wool Bureau, a joint organization comprising the American Wool Council representing American wool growers, and the International Wool Secretariat representing wool growers of the British Dominions, in a long-term wool-research project. This project is based at the Textile Research Institute at Princeton, N. J., and the Western Research Laboratories of the Department of Agriculture at Albany, Calif.

This research project is devoted to learning how to make better textures of all grades of wools, particularly those medium grades which are in greatest world supply. The successful results which are anticipated will widen all wool markets, and help in stabilizing wool prices in all grades, thus providing the public with a larger supply of those wools which this country demands in its clothing.

Here again is a splendid example of practical cooperation between government and agriculture, conducted for the benefit of industry and the public. It has in addition the further advantage of being a practical lesson in international cooperation in which everyone benefits to their mutual profit.

Webster County's Great Native Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the late Senator Thomas P. Gore was a great Oklahoman, but we in Mississippi claimed him as one of our most distinguished native sons. The people of the fine county of Webster, from which has come some of the foremost citizens of our State, consider Senator Gore to have been the greatest of them all.

One of the foremost editors of my State, Mr. Ned Lee of the Webster Progress, has reviewed Senator Gore's career in a very interesting editorial, and I ask that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEBSTER COUNTY'S GREAT NATIVE SON

Death at the age of 78 on March 16 in the Nation's Capital ended the career of former United States Senator Thomas Pryor Gore of Oklahoma, born and reared at Walthall, Webster County, Miss.

Not only was he the most distinguished native son in this country's history, but he was one of the greatest men in the world. His home people here in Webster County are familiar with his career and we'll not essay here to review in detail his long and remarkable life. Briefly, it might be said that he was one of the first two United States Senators from the State of Oklahoma; he was considered one of the world's most eloquent orators (William Randolph Hearst termed him America's greatest after-dinner speaker), and many of his speeches made on the floor of the United States Senate are considered masterpieces of literature and included in the classics destined to live for generations to come. But more impressive even than his great mental faculties was his intrinsic honesty, his willingness to sacrifice his Senator's mantle for the sake of his convictions. Twice in his career, astute politician that he was, he knew that he was destined for defeat unless he bowed to public opinion and to the powers that held sway at the time. But never did he recede from his stand which he sincerely considered right and proper. In other words, he was a statesman first and a politician second.

Eighteen years ago, when he made his first visit back to his native Webster County after gaining world-wide fame, this humble writer was privileged to meet him, associate with him, and gain that which we are so vain as to believe a rare and precious friendship which held firm through all the remaining years of his life. Since that time he has made several trips to Mississippi and of course we are proud that he would have his automobile driven into the writer's yard where he would greet us in his inimitable cheerful manner and leave with us a glow of friendship which warmed the heart for many days.

When he first came back home 18 years ago, it marked a memorable occasion not only for him but for scores of his boyhood loved ones and friends. Here is what the Webster Progress, his little home-county newspaper, published about his historic return to the scenes of his boyhood in its issue of May 28, 1931:

"Forty years ago on the last day of December 1895, a young man was a passenger on a train going from Mississippi into Memphis. He was blind but yet was reading Mill on Liberty. Between the little town of Elizabeth and this Tennessee metropolis he made a vow. His native State of Mississippi had been the scene of keen disappointment. His burning ambition had been thwarted. But his will had not been conquered. On this train while going into Memphis while reading this little book he vowed that he would never return to his native State until he had attained the office of United States Senator.

"He came back without breaking his vow.

"This dauntless fellow, this great man, United States Senator Thomas Pryor Gore from Oklahoma, was a visitor to his native Webster County Thursday and Friday of last week. He with his cousin, the Reverend E. M. Shaw, of Iuka (another Webster man who has gained great prominence, he in the Methodist ministry), first went to the home of Dr. W. W. Gore, uncle of the great Senator, where they were entertained overnight; then on Friday to the home of Mrs. Fannie Gore, his aunt, at Walthall for a few hours' association with relatives. After lunching there they came to Eupora where in the office of the Webster Progress hundreds of friends greeted them throughout the afternoon."

GLAD TO GET BACK

"'In my first race for the Senate,' said Senator Gore recalling the vow noted above, 'I was more concerned about being able to return to the home of my boyhood than gaining the office. And the visit this time seems sweeter than ever. I have in my pockets now rocks from the old chimney—the only thing remaining of the old house where I was born. I shall take them with me to Washington—to Oklahoma—as souvenirs, reminders of the days of my childhood where I shall treasure them ever."

"When told that hundreds of Webster Countians were anxious to hear him make a speech, Senator Gore said: 'I have not prepared. I would not want to disappoint, here among my home people. Anyway, I am like a clock, the only time I can make a noise is when I am a-running.'

"One of the first to greet him was W. N. Cartledge, Eupora merchant, who with Senator Gore composed the class when the Senator, then affectionately known as 'Gov,' graduated from the high school at Walthall. It is said that Mr. Cartledge played a big part in the Senator's early education, reading to him for hours. Of course their attachment had held through all the years and their reunion was inspiring.

"Then came Joe Embry. 'Joe Embry, the strongest boy in all of the countryside,' said the Senator, 'it is good to see you again. How I envied you at one time. Not for your strength of muscle which was enormous, but on another occasion. You went to Memphis and came back and told how you had seen President Grover Cleveland. How I envied you the opportunity to observe the President of the United States.'

"Others of his boyhood crowded 'round him, G. E. Childs, reared by the Gore family, Albert Eudy, George Few, Sim Hightower, Billy Reed, Cicero Latham, Miss Carrie Ray, and a host of others. Then came men who were children when he visted the home of their fathers. Apropos of his marvelous memory Senator GORE would recall with each greeting some pertinent incident. The afternoon was an occasion of delight for scores of local people who were continually laughing in gay good humor with each brilliant witticism from the Senator. Then touched by the review of some incident told of his boyhood. Then impressed as Senator Gore gave his views on national questions."

THE DEMOCRATS ARE COMING

" 'I was proud of my native Mississippi in 1928,' said he, 'when the Presidential returns were tabulated Mississippi returned the strongest Democratic vote of any State in the Union.

" 'Next year the Democratic Party will be victorious if it doesn't act the fool and commit suicide. As a failure the President has no equal. You know the only thing he really knows how to do is administer charity. He got his experience in Europe during the war in Belgium, Italy, and France dispensing millions to war-torn sufferers. Coming back home and finding himself President he was at a loss to know what to do. So he brought on the depression in order that he might be employed at the only work with which he is acquainted.

" 'Now there is a great Democratic sentiment sweeping the Nation, and victory next year will be easy unless we act the fool.' "

ROOSEVELT LIKELY NOMINEE

"When asked who the Democrats would nominate at the coming convention, he said, 'Whoever beats Franklin D. Roosevelt will win.'

"The subject of prohibition was brought up and the Senator said, 'I do not think it incumbent upon a party platform to instruct Congressmen and Senators how to vote. The country is now dry. The drys have the laws and the wets have their liquor. Everybody ought to be happy.' "

CONCERNED FOR FARMER

"Senator Gore showed a keen interest in farming conditions, but said that relief could never be legislated in agriculture. 'It behooves the farmer to work out his own salvation. Legislative relief measures are sometimes helpful, but only tomorrow, and accomplish little permanent good. Did you know,' continued Mr. Gore, 'that 20 percent of the farmers in this country do not have a hen or hog.' "

RAN LIKE A JACK RABBIT

"The scores of people greeting him declared their delight in the fact that he had made a comeback and had won in the recent election. Details of the election had never been heard by most of them and the Senator was showered with questions. How he managed to beat the millionaires? What were the results? And so on. Mr. Gore said, 'You know I was like a jack rabbit. In the primary elections I was running along comfortably on three legs, but in the general election against the Republicans I put the other foot down and really showed them some running.' "

NOTICED OUR ROADS

"Senator Gore said that he was especially surprised at the speed with which one could negotiate distance in Webster County. The trip from Embry to Bellefontaine, in the old days rather a goodly distance, was accomplished almost before we knew it."

GUEST OF EXCHANGE CLUB

"Senator Gore and the Reverend Shaw were honor guests of Eupora Exchange Club at dinner in the dining room of the local hotel. After the meal he consented to make a little talk. Famed as one of the best after-dinner orators in the United States his discourse, which was humorous in the main, suddenly turned near the end to boyhood memories at Walthall. Turning to Mr. Cartledge who sat next to him at the table Senator Gore recalled their companionship. His sentence was never finished. His heart was so full he could not speak. For over a minute he stood there speechless, with a tear on his cheek. His natural good humor suddenly returned and he finished his talk with a smile, but the men around the table were deeply touched by his emotional silence more eloquent than possible words."

DEPRESSION ALMOST OVER

"In the course of his talk Senator Gore said that darkness always preceded the dawn, and that economic conditions were similar to the old maid, who, when asked how her campaign for matrimony was progressing said, 'I'm on my last lap now.'

" 'Bet on America and you will win,' advised the Senator.

"In closing he said of his visit to Webster County, 'Every moment has been a jewel of joy.'

"The Reverend Shaw responded to a request of President Maddox and made a splendid talk on Webster County, how he loved the people here, and how he dreamed of coming back some day to a little cottage among his own people to live out the remainder of his days in peace and joy.

"Senator Luther Latham's introduction of Senator Gore was also a bright feature of the hour.

"The Reverend W. C. Newman in a short, touching talk, said that although he was a comparatively young man and had many years ahead of him in the ministry with a view of being drifted around from place to place, he, too liked to dream of some day coming back to the hills of Webster to finish his earthly existence in a little cottage.

"After the dinner Senator Gore motored to Mathiston with Eupora friends, where he boarded a midnight express for Gulfport. On Sunday he delivered a commencement address to the graduating class of the military college there of which his son is a member.

"The love and best wishes of his homefolk in Webster will go with "Governor" Gore to his seat in the world's greatest deliberative body—the United States Senate. And there are those of us here who believe the Democratic Party would do well in considering his nomination for President. He is a great statesman and fully equipped in heartiness, sympathy, and mentality to administer the executive affairs of this great Nation."

The Fundamental Objections to the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the economically unsound St. Lawrence seaway and power project is again threatening the jobs of coal miners and railroaders in my congressional district.

If the Congress of the United States wants to dry up a source of employment for thousands of railroaders and coal miners, let it give approval to the economic monstrosity known as the St. Lawrence seaway which will cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars.

The following article appearing in the November 19, 1948, issue of the Maritime Exchange Bulletin furnishes food for thought. The article is as follows:

A WARNING—THE FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIONS TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND—IN THE EVENT OF WAR, A MENACE TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The New York State Power Authority has petitioned the Federal Power Commission to authorize the development of the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power in conjunction with the Canadian Province of Ontario without the seaway.

The Federal administration is definitely on record that legislation for the canalization of the St. Lawrence seaway, together with the power project, will be resubmitted to Congress next year, and that the petition of the New York Power Authority will be denied.

The Maritime Association of the Port of New York, embracing within its membership all the steamship owners and operators, and all other branches of the marine industry, has for the past 15 years been the most formidable opponent of the seaway feature. This association has advanced irrefutable reasons why the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would be ruinous to the merchant marine operating from the Atlantic and Gulf ports and, as a result, ruinous to the national economy.

The project submitted in the past called for a 27-foot waterway for a distance of about 1,350 miles from the western head of Lake Superior through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River to Montreal, including the widening and deepening of the St. Lawrence River between Lake Ontario and Montreal—about 183 miles—for the development of hydroelectric power in the international section.

The vital weakness of the proposed seaway is the limited period when safe navigation is possible—only 7 months during the year.

The steamship services presently operating from the Atlantic and Gulf ports definitely require all the traffic originating from the Great Lakes ports and the central freight territory in order to maintain a 12 months' service to world's ports.

It would be a serious mistake to the economic welfare of the Nation to divert from the steamship services along the seaboard sufficient traffic to justify a prohibitive cost for maintenance of a 27-foot seaway into the Great Lakes. In the face of such a diversion of traffic, many steamship owners and operators would be compelled to reduce or abandon sailings to avoid bankruptcy.

With a curtailed steamship service from the Atlantic and Gulf seaports, all American import and export trade would be ruinously affected, and with drastically reduced steamship service, the markets of the world would be more available to competing nations.

The exporters and importers in the Great Lakes ports, and their hinterlands, should realize the serious injury to their commerce which would result from diverting the traffic necessary to maintain the 12 months' services from the seaports during the 7 months of open navigation. These shippers and importers, who have been clamoring for a deeper waterway to enable the larger sized ships to reach their ports, must seriously consider that they cannot expect to have the same steamship services available for their commerce from the seaports in the proposed seaway's 5 months of closed navigation. During this 5-month period, they would be completely dependent upon the frequency of services from the seaports which, owing to the diversion of traffic, as outlined, could not be maintained for purely financial reasons.

The Great Lakes and Central Freight Territory have an abundance of transportation facilities:

1. Railroads.
2. Water transportation from Chicago to New Orleans.
3. Water transportation via the New York State Barge Canal from Great Lakes ports to New York.
4. The over-the-road trucks, which are ever increasing in number, transporting materials to the steamship companies in the South and the East.
5. The large number of foreign-flag ships (Scandinavian, Dutch, Norwegian, etc.), carrying 2,000 to 3,000 tons from the West Indies, South America, and Europe on the 14-foot channel.

It is difficult to understand how any Federal Agency, or any Federal official, can maintain that the canalization of the St. Lawrence seaway is a necessity to the national defense.

During World War II, owing to its facilities, the great port of New York played an important part in the safe and uninterrupted

flow of men and war materials through the port in the dispatch of more than 40,000 ships and 1,500 convoys transporting troops and military equipment and supplies to the battle fronts and bases through the New York gateway.

One high official paid tribute to the Maritime Association stating that "the movement of thousands of ships through this great port to battle fronts all over the world, proved to be one of the vital components in this Nation's invincible drive to victory."

The facilities of New York were indispensable and greatly contributed to the winning of the war. New York, with its 600 miles of waterfront, with its numerous railroads, lighterage and towing facilities, the longest chain of warehouses in the world, were all indispensable factors in serving the Nation in its hour of peril. These facilities have proven their essentiality in every national emergency and under no circumstances should they be allowed to deteriorate or in any way lose their potency.

The most outstanding factor of all the features of this port was the fact that the piers where the ships were loaded were a distance to the sea of only 17 miles, and with this short distance there was no waste of time for the convoying vessels.

In fearful contrast to this tremendous contribution to the winning of World War II would have been the possibility of loading a portion of this flotilla of ships in the Great Lakes ports, where such ships would have had to navigate from the head of the Lakes to the sea, down the St. Lawrence River, a distance of some 2,400 miles. It is needless to say that in these vulnerable waters no ship could have moved with military supplies without a military convoy escort for every mile of the dangerous route.

If an attempt had been made to move a large number of ships during World War II, over the proposed seaway, it would have been impossible to prevent sabotage or the blocking of the Great Lakes by the sinking of one or two ships across the channels in the St. Lawrence River.

While the port of New York rendered the major services in the war effort, all the other ports along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts also played an important part. But the Great Lakes, on account of their extreme distance to the sea, could not have been used to any appreciable extent, and certainly could not have been used at all except under conditions fraught with danger to both the ships and to their precious cargo. In time of war, is there any conceivable justification to such a hazardous route?

We, therefore, maintain that the 27-foot channel would not have been helpful in the national defense, but quite on the contrary could easily have been the means of a national disaster.

The executive vice president of this association, who has had many years of practical maritime experience, has been directed to contact individually all steamship owners and operators, and all other branches of the marine industry, not only in the port of New York but in other ports along the Atlantic coast, and the Gulf, and all allied associations and other interests throughout the country, to oppose a seaway for the following reasons:

Commercially and economically unsound.

Imposition of inordinate tax burdens without corresponding benefits.

Diversion of traffic from railroads, steamship lines and inland waterways.

Permanent detrimental effect upon banking, industry, employment, and purchasing power.

Impairments of property and rental values resulting in diminution of tax returns to the Federal Government, States, and cities.

Dangers of navigating the proposed waterway.

Cost underestimated.

Will increase unemployment affecting a vast army of railroad employees, miners, seamen, longshoremen, and labor in many industries.

Will impair the fulfillment of the policy of Congress to foster the development and maintenance of a merchant marine for the transportation of the commerce of the United States on essential trade routes.

Excise Tax Upon Telegraph Messages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a constituent of mine, Mr. B. S. McClane, of Winona, Miss., has written me very lucidly and forcefully in regard to the present excessively high excise tax upon telegraph messages. I ask that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINONA, MISS., *March 21, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: As an employee of the Western Union Telegraph Co., and as a citizen of the United States, may I address you briefly in respect to the present Federal excise tax which is currently being imposed upon telegraphic communications?

The matter is of an urgent nature, both in connection with the particular industry with which I am employed, and also in reference to the general welfare of the country.

This is so because the tax is an injustice and an unnecessary imposition on the telegraph company; and the results of same are detrimental to that company, insofar as the tax is causing a loss of telegraph business that would ordinarily be obtainable were this tax not existent.

If the prosperity and sound industrial position of the telegraph company is endangered by any means that would be a threat to the welfare of the country, inasmuch as this special industry—the telegraph industry—is a vital necessity, not only in time of peace but also in time of war.

Won't you, therefore, considering that the tax is injurious and unfair—and particularly I urge that you so consider the tax, because of the fact that the Government is in competition with the telegraph industry by handling low-rate air-mail communications by subsidized air-line companies—do all you can to have this tax removed entirely from telegraphic communications.

It should not be the prerogative of this great Government to impose a tax of 25 cents on every dollar expended by anyone to send a telegram by a vital industrial agency, whereas the Government itself will carry an air-mail letter anywhere in the country for the small minimum charge of 6 cents.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter, and be assured of my highest regards and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

B. S. MCCLANE,
Manager.

Repair of Mississippi River Levee in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mission Accomplished," which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., on Sunday, March 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

The crevasse in the Mississippi River main-line levee near Port Allen, La., has been closed by Army engineer crews and a new record in flood fighting has been made. Their performance was superlative.

The break occurred before daylight last Thursday. By Saturday night 1,600 feet of rock and sandbag temporary levee had been constructed and the flow was shut off. To achieve that, operations had been conducted around the clock and the more than 400 men engaged had to work in water knee deep or worse.

The many congressional friends of the Corps of Engineers will miss an extraordinary opportunity if, in their efforts to prevent transfer of flood-control operations from the Corps of Engineers to the Interior Department, they fail to inform their colleagues in detail of what has been done at Port Allen. It was Army engineer performance at its best.

While they were effecting closure of the break, the engineer crews were also building a temporary loop levee as reserve protection against the closure works. This morning they will start construction of a permanent main line set-back levee.

The whole performance is the more remarkable because there had been no pre-break mobilization. There had been no main-line failure since 1927. A falling river, 172 feet deep at that point, had made an unseen and undetected attack under water against the bank. The flood fight which began after bank and levee slid into the Mississippi had to start from scratch. Huge earth-moving equipment had to be moved into the area, labor recruited, and supplies of rock, timber, sand, and bags moved in.

It was a military operation involving mobilization, transportation, supply—all for the purpose of flood combat.

Only military engineer leadership could have done it successfully in so short a time.

The closure of a main-line crevasse has been something rare in the history of American flood fighting. It involves such a tremendous gamble that, heretofore, it has generally been regarded as tremendous waste of time, effort, and money.

A standard textbook of the Mississippi River Commission, issued in 1932, sets out that: "After a levee has been broken nothing can normally be done until the flood plane behind the levee has built up to such a point that the slope through the break is very flat and currents are correspondingly gentle."

They threw the textbook away at Port Allen and waded in immediately against a swift current. They didn't wait for the flood plane to build up. They didn't give it a chance. They choked the river off before it could build up.

They made the first big crevasse closure in a main-line levee since the one at Beulah Lake, across the river from the mouth of the Arkansas, in 1912.

The Hoover Commission says military engineer direction of flood fighting is not essential. The lower valley insists it is. The world's mightiest river flows between hundreds of miles of great earthen embankments. Held within them, it is a beneficent friend. Once it breaks out, it becomes one of the most destructive forces known to man.

The control standpoint requires that the military engineer regard it as an enemy. He deals with it as he would any combat force, constantly shifting its points of attack. Where possible those are anticipated. It is not always possible. The MRC and its district engineers and their forces are the defending army. The Mississippi River is an always advancing, always retreating, sometimes flanking, never inactive, enemy. And every shift it makes does damage of some sort.

Sometimes this enemy, personified in "Ole Man River," achieves the completely effective surprise attack through an undermining operation, as it did at Port Allen. When that happens a large section of protective position goes into the river, the enemy breaks through, and has to be driven back.

But homes are destroyed and the land is scarred before he leaves.

All of the elements of what is unequaled American military engineering skill go into the decades-old control fight against the lower Mississippi River. This is their training and the proving ground, and the men who have fought the river have built to the glory, renown, and safety of the American people—the Panama Canal, Wilson Dam, Alcan Highway, Persian Gulf supply line, Ledo Road, a synthetic harbor on the Normandy beaches—a fuel-oil line from the French coast to advanced combat lines in Germany.

It was said of all those things: "It can't be done." But it was.

An Army engineer officer who had helped in the building of the Normandy invasion harbor and the combat fuel-supply line half across Europe stood in back of a crumbling main-line levee in Louisiana last Thursday, forgot the book, and ordered a river throttled. And again was the impossible done.

The Hoover Commission recommendations do not suggest a better, easier, or less expensive way of doing the impossible. The lower valley knows it cannot be done by substituting political control for Army engineer know-how.

Small Business Suffered Through Use of Basing-Point System—Cement Dealers Forced To Purchase Without Benefit of Competition—Moratorium Will Again Subject Small Cement Dealers to Mercy of Cement Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, basing-point proponents claim that destination prices, prior to the Supreme Court decision, at which shipments were invoiced to dealers often differed from what would be expected from the automatic operation of the basing-point system. This claim is baseless and far, indeed, from the truth.

I recently revealed the startling information that practically 97 percent of a total of 13,858 individual bids to governmental agencies for delivery of cement at 1,277 destinations were made identical by systematic observance of basing-point pricing. In other words, with an average of 11 bidders per destination, practically every bid was identical.

The bulk of cement, however, is sold to dealers rather than on Government contracts. So let us examine the facts as they related to purchases of cement by dealers during a period of absolute dominance by the Cement Trust.

DEALER INVOICES SHOW UNIFORM DESTINATION PRICES

The Federal Trade Commission examined more than 66,000 invoices, covering 21,649,667 barrels of cement shipped by 51 producers to cement dealers in 21 cities. Deviation from the basing-point system of pricing occurred in only 6 percent of these invoices. The percentage of adherence to the basing-point system in each of the 21 cities was as follows:

Manufacturers' sales of cement to dealers at formula delivered prices

[Source: FTC Price Bases Inquiry: Basing-Point Formula and Cement Prices, p. 58]

Destination	Total sales reported			Sales at formula prices			
	Invoices	Shippers	Barrels	Invoices	Shippers	Barrels	Percent of total
Baltimore, Md.	2,117	13	536,305	1,868	13	474,591	88.49
Birmingham, Ala.	3,633	9	657,348	3,633	9	657,348	100.00
Buffalo, N. Y.	2,752	15	681,866	2,750	15	681,366	99.93
Chattanooga, Tenn.	1,333	5	257,745	1,226	5	239,038	92.74
Chicago, Ill.	14,881	9	4,420,930	12,129	9	3,612,137	81.71
Cincinnati, Ohio	2,071	14	438,899	2,070	14	438,699	99.95
Cleveland, Ohio	8,716	17	2,392,887	8,716	17	2,392,787	100.00
Detroit, Mich.	6,069	14	2,224,298	4,988	14	1,960,618	88.15
Ensley, Ala.	773	7	137,374	773	7	137,374	100.00
Hedona, Ala.	608	7	128,833	608	7	128,833	100.00
Indianapolis, Ind.	2,797	11	732,244	2,766	11	724,878	98.99
Madison, Wis.	1,319	11	352,182	1,319	11	325,182	100.00
Minneapolis, Minn.	1,879	11	877,555	1,242	11	729,420	83.12
New York, N. Y.	6,457	17	5,367,916	6,547	17	5,367,916	100.00
Norfolk, Va.	430	5	67,930	430	5	67,930	100.00
Philadelphia, Pa.	3,296	15	813,803	3,296	15	813,803	100.00
Pittsburgh, Pa.	93	7	23,451	93	7	23,451	100.00
Richmond, Va.	753	7	129,346	753	7	129,346	100.00
St. Louis, Mo.	4,494	7	907,990	4,494	7	907,990	100.00
Washington, D. C.	1,295	10	426,412	1,295	10	426,412	100.00
Wilmington, Del.	391	7	101,453	391	7	101,453	100.00
Total	66,157	[1] 51	21,649,667	61,297	[1] 51	20,340,572	93.95

[1] Exclusive of duplications.

The same destination price was charged on every invoice to dealers in 13 of the 21 cities. Invoice prices were identical for 99 percent or more of the tonnage shipped to four of the cities.

This striking price identity in 17 cities was no accident. It was the result of the systematic use of the basing-point method of pricing by each of the individual producers. Errors in billing might well account for the slight deviations as shown in the table.

In some instances the apparent nonconformity to the basing-point system was due to deliveries made on old contracts, which were lower than the market prices prevailing at time of shipment. Therefore, the showing that 94 percent of all invoices were billed at basing-point prices actually understates the degree to which the system was observed. This means, in short, that the degree of price identity for dealers was no different than for Government bids. Again, the facts refute the spurious arguments advanced by the basing-point apologists.

Small business includes thousands of cement dealers. If the basing-point system is revived by legislative hiatus, these thousands of small dealers will once more be subjected to monopolistic hazing by the Cement Trust.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Quarterly Journal of Economics for February 1949:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

(Summary: I. Basic American labor conditions and distinctive characteristics of American trade unions, 1.—II. Efforts of the Government to protect the right to organize and some of their unintended results, 6.—III. Provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, 8.—IV. Areas where the law has not brought about important changes, 12.—V. Areas where the law has produced important changes, 21.—VI. Good features of the law, 20.—VII. Provisions of the law which deal with the right problems, but which are poorly worked out, 23.—VIII. Bad provisions in the law, 28.—IX. Basic characteristics of a good law, 29.)

The Taft-Hartley Act will soon be replaced by another law. It is therefore especially worth while to examine the brief experience under it. What is to be learned from this experience? What are the merits and weak-

nesses of the act? Which provisions should be kept, which modified, which discarded? What problems dealt with by this act must be dealt with also by any successor law?

I

The Taft-Hartley Act, like the Wagner Act before it, attempted to modify habits of behavior which have been deeply rooted in the American community. In order to understand the law and the problems of drafting a successor act, one needs to understand certain characteristic American labor conditions. Five of these conditions are particularly important:

1. The reluctance of American workers to become union members. This has been one aspect of American individualism. It has been reinforced by the rapid growth of population and the rapid expansion of industrial employment (as much as one-third in a decade during a good part of the nineteenth century) which gave individual workers a good chance to advance. Even as late as 1930, less than 20 percent of the industrial workers were union members. The growth of trade unions has been largely concentrated in a few periods—such as 1886, 1897–1904, 1916–1920, and 1933 to date—when conditions were unusually favorable.

2. The fierce opposition of American employers to trade unions. The same individualism which has made the American worker hard to organize has led employers to oppose unions with great vigor. Discharge of men for union activity has often been routine business management, and the use of spies and undercover men in unions has been far from unusual. Only those unions survived which defeated the attempts of employers to destroy them.

3. The frequent failure of American workers to maintain a united front during strikes. In America it has been common for some men to refuse to strike, for some to dribble back to work before a settlement had been made, and for some to be strikebreakers. This lack of solidarity, another facet of the community's individualism, is also pronounced among employers. When a strong union strikes against a group of enterprises individual employers have usually been willing to make settlements without consulting the group.

4. The reluctance of workers to pay union dues after their immediate demands have been met. The "free rider" is a well-known problem of the American union.

5. The reluctance of workers to participate in the day-to-day affairs of the union and to take an interest in its ordinary business. The members expect the officers to run the union and do not wish to be bothered by union affairs. They are reluctant to attend meetings. A well-established union in a recent election of national officers had only 40 percent of the members voting, although there were contests for the presidency and for other important offices. The alleged lack of democracy in American unions has long been a favorite criticism of Socialists and left-wingers. As a matter of fact, the members usually get the kind of unions they desire.

These underlying conditions left their mark on American trade unions—on the structure of the trade-union movement, on the way in which unions conduct their business, and on the methods and policies which they pursue. Of these characteristics of American trade unions, the following are of particular interest to us:

1. The dominant position of the national unions in the movement. In the beginning, of course, the trade-union movement was a "grass roots" affair. The indifference of many workers to organization and the strong opposition of employers, however, gradually caused organizing at the grass-roots level to diminish in importance, and led independent locals to join national unions. Nearly all of the union members in the United States belong to large or fairly large national unions. At present there are about 200 such unions. Britain, by contrast, has many small, independent local or regional unions. With only about half as many union members as the United States, there are in Britain nearly 1,000 independent unions, of which about 750 have less than 2,500 members each.

2. The dominance of professional officers, especially national officers. This is in large part a result of the desire of the rank and file not to be bothered about union affairs. The presidents of American trade unions do not have as much authority as presidents of corporations, but their authority is great and has been increasing. An examination of the constitutions of 88 A. F. of L. unions and of 36 CIO unions gives the following results: In 36 A. F. of L. national unions and one CIO union, the appointment of national representatives or organizers of the union is the exclusive responsibility of the president; in eight A. F. of L. unions the president may remove any national officer, and there is no appeal from his decision; in 13 A. F. of L. unions he may suspend and revoke charters without appeal; in 12 A. F. of L. unions and 3 CIO unions, he may discipline and replace local officers without appeal. In other cases, the president may appoint national representatives, suspend or revoke local charters, and discipline or supplant local officers, with the approval of the executive board. In still other unions these decisions are left to the national executive board, sometimes with right of appeal to the union convention but often without appeal.[1] In a few unions, contests for national office are usual, but these unions are the exception. In a study of 764 elections to national office in seven unions between 1910 and 1941, Professor Taft found that in 634 elections there was only one candidate.[2] Unions quite typically assert broad authority to discipline their members. Among 81 unions, Professor Taft found discipline authorized for the following offenses: Slandering an officer, 29 unions; creating dissension, 15 unions; undermining the union or working against its interest, 20 unions; action that is dishonorable or which might injure the labor movement, 25 unions; circulating written material dealing with union business without permission of the general executive board, 21 unions.[3] The reluctance of the rank and file to participate in union affairs and the dominance of the officers have been convenient in some cases for Communists or racketeers who wished to control unions. On the other hand, the dominance of professional officers has not meant that these men typically lacked support of the rank and file.

3. The absence of class feeling and the lack of strong concern on the part of national unions for the interests of the wage-earning class as a whole. Not only have employees and employers in America been individualistic, but so also have the national unions. Each has been jealous of its own independence, and unwilling to accept much guidance or restraint from federations, such as the A. F. of L., which seek to represent trade unions as a whole.

4. Development by the trade-union movement of the principle of exclusive jurisdiction. This principle means that there may be only one legitimate trade union in a given area—an occupation or an industry. It also means that the trade-union movement asserts the right to determine which union is the legitimate one—that is, which union employees shall join. The preferences of the men do not count. Obviously, such a principle could not prevail where the trade-union movement was a grass-roots affair. It fits a community, such as the United States, where the professional union officers are dominant. In Britain, where the influence of the rank and file is strong, the trade unions operate on a principle quite the opposite of the principle of exclusive jurisdiction, for in Britain no union has the exclusive right to organize any occupation or industry.[4]

The principle of exclusive jurisdiction has not prevented serious conflicts between unions about jurisdiction over men, for, as I have pointed out, American individualism has produced self-assertive unions which do not readily concede the claims of rival unions or accept the decisions of federations, such as the A. F. of L. Nevertheless, until the rise of the CIO, the principle of exclusive jurisdiction was fairly effective in preventing the rise of dual unionism in the United States. This is indicated by the fact that only 13 out of 52 unions founded by secession between 1852 and 1933 survived as independent unions. Twenty-three rejoined the parent union, 10 joined other unions, and 6 expired.

5. The use of short-cut methods of organizing. American unions have not always considered it necessary to get the consent of employees before signing an agreement on their behalf with their employer. Strong unions may approach the employer directly and ask him to sign a union-shop agreement for unorganized employees under threat of a boycott or strike. Then the union approaches the men and signs them up. In a community in which employees were easier to organize and took greater interest in union affairs, such organizing methods would not

---

[1] See Slichter, S. H., Challenge of Industrial Relations, pp. 108–109, and 181–189; and Philip Taft, "The Constitutional Power of the Chief Officer in American Trade Unions," this Journal, May 1948, pp. 459–471.

[2] Philip Taft, "Opposition to Union Officers in Elections," this Journal, February 1944, pp. 246–264.

[3] Philip Taft, "Judicial Procedure in Labor Unions," this Journal, May 1945, pp. 370–385. These vague offenses were created to help unions protect themselves from employer agents. This is one of the many ways in which the employers' opposition to unions has made for centralization of authority in the hands of the national union.

[4] The British Trades Union Congress does not, however, concede to the rank and file the full right to determine what union they will join. In 1939, the Bridlington Trades Union Congress, in order to control competition of unions for members, revised the "main principles" of "good trade union practice" adopted by the Hull Congress in 1924. The revision included the recommendations that all unions shall:

(i) Consider the possibility of joint working agreements with unions with whom they are in frequent contact. * * *

(ii) Not accept a member of another union without inquiry.

(iii) Adopt the inquiry form provided by the general council in the case of all inquiries under (ii) above, * * *

(iv) Not accept a member of another union where inquiry shows that the member is (a) under discipline; (b) engaged in a trade dispute; (c) in arrears with contributions.

(v) Not commence organizing activities at any establishment or undertaking in respect of any grade or grades of workers in which another union has the majority of workers employed and negotiates wages and conditions, unless by arrangement with that union.

The attitude toward joining a union is somewhat different in Britain from that in the United States. Here unions put strong pressure upon people to join. There one makes formal application for membership.

be tolerated by the workers themselves—nor would they be necessary.

6. The use of strikes and boycotts as methods by one union to fight another over members and over jobs, and the willingness of one union to raid another. Raids by one union on another do not mean that the principle of exclusive jurisdiction is not accepted—they mean simply that unions have their own ideas about proper boundary lines and are quite ready to enforce their claims by economic means. In a trade union movement in which either the rank and file or the federations had more influence, interunion warfare would rarely be carried to the point of strikes or boycotts.

7. Reliance upon the closed shop or the union shop. Both the closed shop and the union shop are distinctive American institutions. Occasional use of them is found in other countries, but they are not prevalent except in the United States and Canada. The closed shop and the union shop are devices partly to deal with the problem of the "free rider," partly to prevent employers from disrupting unions, partly to protect unions from raids, and partly to make internal union discipline more effective.

II

American labor conditions, and particularly the difficulties of organizing workers, led eventually to the demand by unions that the Government protect the right to organize. The first laws prohibiting employers from discharging men because of membership in unions were held to be unconstitutional. The War Labor Board during the First World War gave temporary protection to the right to organize, but the Board's principles and decisions were not legally binding. The Railway Labor Act of 1926 protected the right to organize, but only within the railway industry. With the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and especially the Wagner Act of 1935, however, the Government embarked upon the general policy of encouraging organization. The effect of these acts was far reaching and, in important respects, unintended.

The basic principle of section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and of the Wagner Act, was that workers are entitled to be represented by bargaining agents of their own choosing. This was a radical departure from well-established American trade union principle and practice—because unions had never conceded that unorganized workers were entitled to join any union which they saw fit.[5] Section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act and the Wagner Act were not intended to undermine the principle of exclusive jurisdiction, but that is precisely what they did. Each act gave to the employees in the bargaining unit, rather than to the trade union movement, the right to determine what union, if any, should represent the workers.

Government protection of the right to organize caused a temporary revival of grass roots organizing activity. In the years 1933 and 1934, when the National Industrial Recovery Act was in operation, 18 new national unions were formed. Eleven of these were dual unions in the sense that they covered areas of employment already claimed by existing unions. In the 2 years 1936 and 1937, shortly after the passage of the Wagner Act, 26 new national unions were formed—nine of them by secession from existing unions. No one of these nine has rejoined the parent union. When men became relatively easy to organize, the jurisdictional claims of established unions were widely challenged; the American Federation of Labor, committed to defending these claims, was split; and the challenging unions, together with others which had grown up independently, formed the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The encouragement of organization by the Government increased competition between unions for members, and this competition encouraged high-pressure organizing methods. Some employers were confronted with strikes and boycotts designed to compel them to violate the law by ceasing to deal with the certified union and dealing instead with another union which claimed jurisdiction. Interunion rivalry increased the interest of unions in the closed shop and the union shop as devices to prevent raids by rival organizations. Interest in the closed or union shop was also stimulated by the rapid influx of new members who were not used to paying dues. During the Second World War the War Labor Board, unwilling to grant the demands for the closed or the union shop, developed the maintenance-of-membership clause. This clause required workers who joined the union to keep in good standing during the life of the contract.

The Second World War delayed the emergence of problems created by the rise of unions, but when the fighting stopped, the country suddenly found itself confronted with new and formidable labor problems. Trade-union membership had increased about fivefold between 1933 and 1945 and about twofold between 1940 and 1945. About one-third of the members were concentrated in six large unions—the teamsters, the automobile workers, the steel workers, the carpenters, the machinists, and the miners. About 7,000,000 jobs were covered by closed-shop or union-shop contracts (about three times the entire A. F. of L. membership in 1933), and 4,000,000 more were covered by maintenance-of-membership clauses. This meant that large areas of American industry were open only to union members or to persons whom the unions were willing to admit, and that in these areas loss of good standing in the union meant loss of one's job. The most powerful unions are able to cut off the community from essential materials, such as coal or steel, or to shut down the ports of the country, or to deprive cities of essential transportation. In 1946 the time lost by strikes reached an all-time high—113,000,000 man-days, or three times higher than in the previous year or in 1937, the two worst years up to that time. On four occasions during the year, Nation-wide strikes deprived the country of essential commodities and services, and threatened it with disaster. In February and March 1946, the steel industry was shut down for 4 weeks; in April, the country was cut off from virtually all supplies of bituminous coal; in May, the railroads were shut down for nearly 2 days; and in November, 1946, the bituminous coal industry was again shut down.

III

Against this background in the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. It is a long law, covering 29 pages of 8-point type; and an ambitious one. It must be regarded as an attempt to provide a comprehensive code to cover the multitude of issues and problems produced, on the one hand, by the traditional hostility of American employers to unions and, on the other hand, by the rapid growth and great power of unions and by the recent breakdown of some well-established institutions of the trade-union movement. Most of the provisions of the law may conveniently be summarized as dealing with five basic subjects:

1. Relations between unions and individual workers.
2. Relations between unions and unions.
3. Relations between unions and employers.
4. Relations between unions and the community as a whole.
5. Administrative arrangements for enforcing the labor policy of the community.

Some provisions of the act fall under more than one of these headings, and different persons would make different classifications of the several parts of the law. The following is an incomplete summary of its most important provisions.

1. Relations between unions and individual workers: These provisions fall under six principal heads:

(a) The act specifically recognizes the right not to organize and the right not to strike, as well as the right to organize and to strike; and undertakes to protect all of these rights from interference by either employers, unions or the agents of unions. This means that coercive activities by either unions or employers in connection with organizing activities, strikes, or lock-outs are made unfair labor practices.

(b) The act, like the Wagner Act, recognizes the right of employees to choose their bargaining agent; and attempts to protect this right from interference by employers or unions.

(c) The act attempts to protect the freedom of workers to enter any occupation or industry by forbidding the closed shop, and by permitting the union shop only when approved by a majority of the workers in the intended bargaining unit.

(d) The act contains a number of provisions designed to make elections more representative. Some of the provisions merely convert into statutory form practices of the National Labor Relations Board in its later years. Others require changes in practice. The act directs that professional employees shall not be put in the same bargaining unit as nonprofessional employees unless such inclusion has been voted by a majority of such professional employees. It denies the right to vote to economic strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement. It provides that the ballot in run-off elections shall be limited to the top choice and the runner-up on the first vote—thereby assuring (contrary to Board practice) that the choice of "no union" appear on the run-off ballot in the event that "no union" was the first or second choice in the inconclusive election.

(e) The act attempts to protect the right to join a union by forbidding employers from discriminating, in hiring, against employees who are denied membership in a union on the same terms generally available to other members.[6] It also forbids unions which have union-shop contracts to cause employers to discriminate against employees who have been denied membership (except for failure to tender the regular initiation fees and dues), or to collect initiation fees which the National Labor Relations Board "finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances."

(f) The act attempts to protect the right to remain in a union, by forbidding employers who have negotiated union-shop contracts to discharge employees because of loss of good standing in a union (except for failure to pay regular union dues), and by forbidding unions to cause employers to discriminate against employees who have lost their membership for some reason other than failure to pay the regular fine.

[5] The National Industrial Recovery Act and the Wagner Act even gave broader freedom of choice to the rank and file than does the practice of the British Trade Union Congress. Although the British practice concedes the right of unorganized workers to join the union of their choice, it does not concede full freedom of one union to organize groups of workers within which a second union has members.

[6] Section 8 (a) (3), while permitting employers to enter into union-shop contracts under certain conditions, states that no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members. * * *"

(g) The act forbids the National Labor Relations Board to consider representation or unfair-labor-practice cases which originate with unions that do not provide their members with certain financial reports.

2. Relations between unions and unions: The act attempts to deal with conflicts between union over either jobs or members. It makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to use the strike or boycott (1) to require an employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class, unless the employer has failed to conform to an order of the Board determining the bargaining representative for the employees doing such work, or (2) to compel an employer to recognize the union as a bargaining organization when another union has been certified. Refusal to manufacture, transport, or handle goods, for the purpose of forcing an employer or another person not to handle the products of any other producer, is made an unfair labor practice, and also a basis for the recovery of damages by injured parties. This provision forbids strikes or boycotts against one employer for the purpose of controlling the union affiliation of the employees of another.

3. Relations between unions and employers: Some of the provisions of the act which pertain to relations between unions and individuals or between unions and unions also constitute important regulations of relations between unions and employers. In addition, some of the other regulations of relations between unions and employers are:

(a) The exclusion of supervisors from the protection of the act.

(b) The broadening of the right of employers to express themselves about unions and of unions to express themselves about employers, provided the statements contain no threat of reprisal or promise of benefits. Many people have assumed that this change was simply in the interest of employers, but it may limit the effect of some sections of the act upon the activities of pickets.

(c) The authorizing of employers to ask for an election to determine whether a union which seeks bargaining rights represents the employees.

(d) The imposing upon unions as well as employers of the obligation to bargain in good faith, provided the union is the certified representative of the employees.

(e) Provisions making it an unfair labor practice for a union to cause or seek to cause an employer to pay for services which are not performed, or are not to be performed.

(f) Restrictions on financial contributions by employers to representatives of their employees. There are exceptions to the general prohibition. For example, check-off of union dues is permitted on written assignment of the employee and so also are contributions to health and welfare funds, provided the contributions are held in trust for the payment of specified types of benefits to employees, and provided employers and employees are equally represented in the administration of the trust fund, with an impartial umpire to decide disputes.

(g) Provisions authorizing suits in the Federal courts for the violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization without respect to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties.

(h) Provisions modifying the usual rule of agency, by providing that any determination of responsibility of one person for the acts of another, shall not be controlled by the question of actual authorization or subsequent ratification. The Norris-LaGuardia Act went to the other extreme, by making unions and their officers immune from the illegal acts of their members and officials except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

4. Relations between unions and the public: In three principal respects the law deals with certain public interests in the activities of unions. It endeavors to discourage Communist leadership in unions by prohibiting the National Labor Relations Board from handling representation cases or unfair labor practice cases originating with a union unless each officer has sworn that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with it, and is not a member or supporter of any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government by illegal measures. The act attempts to deal with the problem of political expenditures by unions, through extending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 to apply to trade unions as well as to corporations. Finally, the act provides arrangements by which the Government may deal with strikes or lock-outs which threaten to imperil the public health or public safety. Strangely enough, until the act was passed, the President had no authority to deal with such emergencies, except temporary authority given by wartime legislation, and special authority given by the Railway Labor Act.

5. Administrative arrangements: The most important administrative change is the separation of the investigating and prosecuting functions of the National Labor Relations Board from its judiciary functions. This is accomplished by making the general counsel an appointee of the President instead of the Board, placing the regional offices of the Board under his direction, and making him responsible for investigations and prosecutions. Other administrative changes include the requirement that the proceedings of the Board and its agents shall be guided, insofar as practicable, by the rules of evidence followed by the Federal courts in civil cases, and the provision of slightly broader powers for the courts to review appeals from the Board. Of considerable importance is the authority given the general counsel to seek injunctions in some cases of apparent unfair labor practices, and the requirement that he seek injunctions in other types of cases—those in which a secondary boycott has been organized.

IV

What have been the results of the act? The law has operated only in a period of high employment—hence the experience under it has limited significance. Certain principal facts, however, stand out. The results may be conveniently reviewed under two main headings: (1) Areas where the law has not brought about important changes or where the changes have been temporary only, and (2) areas where the law seems to have produced important changes. Let us first consider where the act has had little effect, or only temporary effects.

1. The act has had little effect upon trade-union membership. Between 1937 and 1945 membership more than doubled. Hence, a slowing up was expected. This began in 1945. The slow rise which has been going on since 1945 continued after the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the fall of 1948 trade-union membership in the United States was approximately 15,070,000, in comparison with 14,841,000 in the fall of 1947.[7]

[7] These estimates are derived as follows:

	1947	*1948*
A. F. of L	7,578,000	7,220,000
CIO	6,000,000	6,000,000
Independent unions	1,836,000	2,450,000
Total	15,414,000	16,670,000
Less Canadian members	573,000	600,000
Total	14,841,000	16,070,000

The figures for 1947 are the estimates of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in Release LS-48-1865. The figures for the A. F. of L. in 1947 and 1948 are based upon the number of members on whom the affiliated unions paid a per capita tax. The actual membership may have been slightly larger. The drop in the membership of the A. F. of L. between 1947 and 1948 is entirely the result of the withdrawal of the United Mine Workers on December 12, 1947. In 1947, the United Mine Workers paid a per capita tax on 600,000 members. The withdrawal of the United Mine Workers also accounts for most of the increase in the membership of independent unions. In both 1947 and 1948, the CIO has claimed 6,000,000 members, but it makes no detailed report of membership.

The deduction for members in Canada is an estimate of membership in Canada of international unions whose headquarters and principal activities are in the United States. According to the Thirty-sixth Annual Report on the Labor Organizations in Canada, published by the Canadian Department of Labor, 573,258 Canadian workers were members of international unions in 1946.

The Taft-Hartley Act interfered temporarily with the organizing activities of unions because it compelled the national representatives to devote much time for several months to union-shop elections. Not all of this time and effort, however, was lost from the union point of view, because the union-shop campaigns helped unions to sign up new members and to bring delinquent members up to date on their dues. Some union leaders blame the act for the disappointing results of the southern organizing drive. The unions might wisely have postponed the drive until after the union-shop elections had been held and after the public relations of unions had had an opportunity to recover from the unfavorable effects of the great strikes of 1946. The act can hardly be blamed for the disappointing results of a drive which was poorly timed and which was conducted with inadequate personnel.

Is the fact that the Taft-Hartley Act had no observable effect upon trade-union membership attributable to the strong sellers' market for labor which has existed since its passage? I think not. There is no reason to expect it appreciably to limit the ability of unions to gain members, even in a buyers' market. It contains the same protections against discrimination and economic coercion by employers which are found in the Wagner Act. It does outlaw short-cut organizing methods (such as attempts to force men to join by refusing to handle their products or to service the plants where they work), but these methods have never accounted for a large part of the gains in union membership. The act gives employers more freedom to talk against unions, but this is a result difficult to criticize. Union leaders have usually expressed themselves quite frankly about employers.

2. The act temporarily interfered with the attempts of unions to win recognition through representation elections, but this effect appears to have been the result of special conditions. Some unions could not decide immediately whether to qualify under the act. Furthermore, there was delay in ascertaining what unions needed to do in order to qualify. Finally, the personnel of unions and of the National Labor Relations Board was busy for months with union-shop elections. For these reasons representation elections dropped by more than half in the year ending June 30, 1948, as compared with the preceding year, and petitions for such elections dropped by almost as much.[8] This

[8] In the year ending June 30, 1947, 10,677 petitions for representation elections were filed, and 6,920 elections were held; in the year ending June 30, 1948, 6,579 petitions for elections were filed, and 3,211 were held,

was the first drop since 1940 in the number of petitions filed and the first drop since 1943 in the number of elections held. As the year advanced the number of petitions and elections rapidly increased. In the last quarter of the year ending June 30, 1948, there were 2,483 petitions for representation elections (virtually the rate of 1947) and 1,261 elections were held.

3. The act has not affected the percentage of elections lost by unions. This percentage (27.3 for the period August 22, 1947 to June 30, 1948) was the highest since 1936, but the act has had nothing to do with this figure. There are cycles in the public relations of unions. For example, the proportion of elections lost was at an all-time low in 1937, when it was only 5.7 percent. It rose gradually to 23.1 percent in 1939, dropped slowly to 13.7 percent in 1942, and has been rising ever since. There are similar cycles in the percentage of votes against unions—except that the antiunion peak (24.2 percent) occurred in the year ending June 30, 1946, undoubtedly reflecting the great strikes of that year. In the year ending June 30, 1948, the percentage of votes against unions had dropped to 23.1.

4. The act caused a temporary drop in the number of unfair labor practice cases filed against employers. Between August 22, 1947, and June 30, 1948, the number was 2,548 in comparison with 4,232 in the previous fiscal year and 3,815 in 1945–46. The drop was due partly to the fact that some unions had not complied with the law, and partly to the preoccupation of unions with union-shop elections. In the 6 months ending October 31, 1948, 1,694 complaints were filed against employers. This was almost at the 1945–46 rate. The drop in complaints against employers originating with unions was partly offset by a sharp rise in complaints originating with individuals. There were 1,174 of the latter during the year, but they declined rapidly as the unions themselves became able to file complaints. During recent years the number of unfair labor practice cases filed has fluctuated. It reached an all-time high in the fiscal year 1937–38 when 6,807 cases were filed, declined steadily to 2,427 in the fiscal year 1944–45, and increased in the first 2 years after the war.

5. As a general rule employers have not refused to deal with noncomplying unions. This is notably true of enterprises which have contracts with the United Steelworkers, the United Miners, the United Electrical Workers, and the International Typographical Union—the principal noncompliers. The attempt of the Waterfront Employers' Association of the Pacific Coast to force the leaders of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union to take the anti-Communist oath was defeated after a long strike.

6. Hiring arrangements in previous closed shops throughout the country have been little changed by the law. Unions and employers have adapted themselves to the prohibition of the closed shop in various ways. In some cases a union shop has suited both parties as well as a closed shop. In these cases and in others where the union shop existed, the union sought union-shop elections. The Board held an enormous number of these elections—17,790 between August 22, 1947, and June 30, 1948. The union shop won in nearly all cases with a total vote of 6,164,322, and an opposition vote of 93,938.

The union-shop elections have covered less than half of the employees working under closed-shop or union-shop contracts. In the construction industry, the great stronghold of the closed shop, there was only one union-shop vote, largely because of the virtual impossibility of determining who is eligible to vote in that industry. In other cases unions and employers have worked out ways of evading the closed-shop prohibition. These include mutual discharge provisions which permit unions to require the discharge of "disharmonious" persons, special seniority arrangements which assure that preference in hiring will be given to men of long service in the industry, probationary clauses which permit the employment of a new worker to be terminated by either an employer or the union without an appeal under the grievance machinery of the agreement, and clauses permitting employees to refuse to continue to work with any employee of the employer whose continued employment is a source of friction among the employees of the employer. In some instances arrangements were worked out by which employers agreed that nonunion men would not be hired unless they passed an examination for competency given by a joint employer-union committee.[9] In the main, however, employers and unions have met the anti-closed-shop provision of the law simply by ignoring it.

This part of the law imposes no penalties and is not brought into operation unless some one charges an unfair labor practice. Hence, unions and employers can easily continue previous arrangements as if no law had been passed.[10] In some cases there was doubt as to whether the employer's business was sufficiently in interstate commerce to come under the act. In other cases, such as the bituminous coal industry and the Pacific coast stevedoring industry, the act has been deliberately defied by continuation of arrangements which conspicuously violate the law—a blunt challenge to the Government to enforce the law, if it dares.[11]

7. The act has had little effect upon discriminatory or burdensome impediments to union membership.

8. Unions have not been deluged with damage suits because of violations of contracts or other violations of law. The number of damage suits filed against unions is not known, but the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations reports that, up to near the end of 1948, 32 suits had been brought against unions by employers, 19 against employers by unions, and one by an employee against an employer. This is not surprising because the law in reality makes virtually no change in the right of employers to sue unions for breach of contract. Employers have long had this right in the courts of the United States and in nearly all of the States. The Taft-Hartley Act merely removes the previous restrictions that the suit must be for more than $3,000 and that in the Federal courts there must be diversity of citizenship. Employers have not used the right to sue unions because managements which wish to get the production from a group of men do not find it helpful to engage in law suits with the bargaining representatives of these men.

9. The anti-make-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act has had little effect and, if kept in its present language, is not likely to have much effect in a new law. It is easily evaded. The problem is important because unions in declining industries or in industries where employment is intermittent have a strong tendency to develop make-work rules which tend, of course, to keep down the standard of living of the country.

V

In some areas the Taft-Hartley Act has produced important effects. Twelve of the consequences of the act seem to me to be particularly significant:

1. The act has greatly invigorated the trade-union movement. Both the Wagner Act and Government controls during the war tended to diminish the self-reliance of the unions. Furthermore, the preferred position of unions in the administration for 14 years caused them to forget that they could incur the anger of the community and that it might have serious consequences for them. The Taft-Hartley Act has gone far to make union leaders aware that they must not lean too heavily on the Government, and that they must avoid too flagrant a disregard for the welfare and convenience of the community. The act has not had time to produce much effect upon organizing methods of unions, but if the rule against coercion in organizing men is kept in the new law, one may safely predict a great improvement in organizing methods—improvement from the standpoint of unions as well as of the community.

2. The union-shop elections have demonstrated the overwhelming desire of union members for the union shop, or probably for the closed shop. Furthermore, they have increased the power of unions by helping them to gain union shops where previously they had had only maintenance-of-membership clauses.

3. The withdrawal of the protection of the law from foremen has seriously impeded the growth of independent foremen's unions. After conversion to peacetime production, the impetus of foremen to organize substantially diminished. Fear that managements would make arbitrary decisions in selecting foremen for demotion or lay-off at the termination of war contracts had stimulated foremen to organize in the later years of the war. Even in the absence of the Taft-Hartley Act, the organization of foremen would have slowed up, but the act accentuated this tendency.

4. The provision of the law authorizing employers to ask for elections has caused a considerable increase in such requests. The Wagner Act did not prohibit the National Labor Relations Board to hold elections at the request of employers, but it did not specifically authorize such elections. In the first year of the Taft-Hartley Act, 472 requests for elections were received from employers or individuals, in comparison with 158 received during the preceding year and 82 in the year 1945–46.

5. The provision for decertification elections resulted in 154 such elections up to October 30, 1948. In 105 of these cases the bargaining representative was decertified. This record seems to indicate that the law has been useful in eliminating bargaining agents which had ceased to be active or which had lost the confidence of the employees.

6. The act has produced a moderate number of unfair labor practice charges against unions. No such charges were possible under the Wagner Act. From August 22, 1947 to October 31, 1948, 1,110 unfair labor practice charges were filed against unions in comparison with 4,930 filed against employers. The number is large enough to indicate that protection against unfair labor practices by unions is needed. Over half of

---

Fears have been expressed that employers could get elections postponed indefinitely by trumping up unfair-labor-practice charges against unions, thus taking advantage of the practice of the National Labor Relations Board against holding elections while charges are pending. See Archibald Cox, "Some Aspects of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947," Harvard Law Review, November 1947, p. 34.

[9] This arrangement, originally suggested by a representative of employers in the printing industry, has since been held discriminatory by the courts.

[10] In a large middle western city a union in the printing trades and the employers adopted the following clause: "Both parties have been operating for nearly 50 years under contractual relationship and the traditions and understandings they have developed and are prevailing shall continue as far as possible within the laws."

[11] Twelve States have declared closed-shop agreements to be illegal, but virtually no effort is made to enforce the laws. Some State anti-closed-shop laws contain no sanctions.

these cases (631) were brought by employers; but 421 were brought by individual workers, and 58 by unions.

7. The provisions for damage suits against unions for breach of contract have led some unions to limit their liability by clauses in their contracts specifically exempting them from liability for strikes which no union officer called or which the union had not ratified. The most famous of these is the clause in the bituminous coal agreement which states that the contract "shall cover the employment of persons employed in the bituminous coal mines covered by this agreement during such time as such persons are able and willing to work." This clause weakens the contract seriously from the standpoint of the public and of the operators.

8. The act may be credited with the establishment of machinery to settle jurisdictional disputes in the building trades. Its purpose has been to prevent these disputes from going to the National Labor Relations Board. On two previous occasions in the last 30 years the building trades unions set up machinery for adjusting jurisdictional disputes, but in each case it broke down after a few years because some unions refused to comply with decisions which went against them. The third attempt to set up the machinery, directly attributable to the Taft-Hartley Act, is the most promising one that has been made.

9. The provisions forbidding the National Labor Relations Board to hear cases which originate in unions whose officers have not taken the anti-Communist oath has weakened the influence of Communists in the trade-union movement. The deterioration of relations between the United States and Russia has had the same effect. Consequently, one cannot determine the precise influence of the Taft-Hartley Act. Some locals in New York and St. Louis have seceded from the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees' Union, and there have been secessions from other noncomplying unions, such as the United Electrical Workers, the United Public Workers, and the Farm Equipment Workers. Aggressive steps against Communist-led affiliates of the CIO were authorized by the convention of the CIO in November 1948.

Opinion concerning the anti-Communist provisions of the law has undergone considerable change. At the outset union officers were strongly critical of these provisions, but at the convention of the A. F. of L. in Cincinnati, there was sentiment for strengthening the anti-Communist provisions of the law and for applying them to representatives of management as well as to representatives of unions.

10. The act has greatly stimulated the interest of unions in political action, has caused them to organize more effectively for this purpose, and has led them to make substantial increases in their expenditures for political action. This has occurred in spite of the provision of the act against these expenditures—indeed, it has occurred partly because of this prohibition. The act is easily evaded by the device of setting up organizations for political education.

11. The attempt to narrow the area of industrial conflict by making the secondary boycott unlawful has not been thoroughly tested. Between August 22, 1947, and October 31, 1948, a total of 343 charges alleging secondary boycott were filed. Of these charges, 256 were withdrawn, adjusted, or dismissed in the regional offices of the Board. Secondary boycotts have thus far produced few damage suits.

12. Considerable use has been made of the national emergency provision of the law. In six cases boards of inquiry were appointed; in two, a strike vote on the employer's last offer was held (both votes were in favor of a strike); and in two cases, strikes occurred after the machinery of the law had been used. In two other cases, strikes had started or were about to start when the law was invoked.[12] In a part of one of the maritime disputes (the longshoremen and the stevedores on the Pacific coast) the National Labor Relations Board attempted to hold a vote of the employees on the employers' last offer. The union ordered its members not to vote, and from Canada to the Mexican border not a single ballot was cast.

VI

How good is the Taft-Hartley Act? What are its good points and what are its bad ones?

Perhaps the most important generalization about it is that it attempts to deal by statutory law with many issues which the courts have been handling by common law, and that it provides Federal policies in areas where policy has heretofore been left pretty much to the States. It would not be accurate to say that the policy had been laissez faire—although in reality the only effective public policy in much of the area covered by the act was laissez faire. However, the Wagner Act had replaced laissez faire in a considerable area also covered by the Taft-Hartley Act. Furthermore, the State courts had been struggling for years with important issues covered by the Taft-Hartley Act—with the problem of what kinds of strikes and boycotts and strike activities were legal and what kinds illegal. The courts, it is true, are not well prepared to deal with these issues and have lacked effective instruments for enforcing the law.[13]

The problems covered by the Taft-Hartley Act are better dealt with by statutory law than by common-law methods; a national policy is preferable to 48 separate State policies, and the machinery for enforcement which is available under the Taft-Hartley Act is superior to that available to the courts. In all these respects the act is an important step forward. One should observe that, although the act sets up a uniform national policy, it does not in all cases preempt the field and require that the Federal policy supersede State policy, even where interstate commerce is materially affected. Nevertheless, the foundation for this ultimate step has been laid.

The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act may be conveniently divided into: (1) Those which seem predominantly good; (2) those which deal with the right problems, but which are poorly worked out; and (3) those which are unqualifiedly bad. Among the features of the act which seem predominantly good, nine are of particular importance.

1. Protection of employers against strikes or boycotts designed to compel them to violate the law. Under the Wagner Act an uncertified union might strike or picket an employer to compel him to deal with it rather than with the duly certified union. The employer had no effective redress—although in some States he undoubtedly was entitled to damages against the union.

2. Protection of employees against coercion from any source in the exercise of their rights to organize or not to organize, to strike or not to strike. Until the passage of the Wagner Act the prevention of coercion in connection with organizing campaigns and strikes was mainly the responsibility of local governments. These did not give protection against economic coercion; and their enforcement of the laws against physical coercion was lax. Under the Wagner Act the Federal Government undertook to prevent economic coercion originating with employers, but not with unions. The Taft-Hartley Act extends the protection to economic coercion originating with unions as well as with employers, and goes even further to make physical coercion an unfair labor practice. It is a close question whether or not the Federal Government should undertake some responsibility for the policing of organizing campaigns, strikes, and lock-outs. In favor of it is the poor record of the localities in controlling mass picketing and violence. If the Federal Government limits its protection to economic coercion, that protection should be given, regardless of whether the source of economic coercion is an employee or a union. A serious defect of the act is its failure to define or limit clearly the meaning of "coerce" or "restrain," as used in section 8 (a) and (b). As a result, too much discretion in defining the words is left to the National Labor Relations Board and to the courts.

3. Comprehensive protection of employees in their right to choose their bargaining agents without interference. The Wagner Act gave only partial protection, for it permitted unions to influence elections by threatening to refuse to handle the product of the plant if the workers chose the wrong union.

4. The provision in the law safeguarding freedom of speech. Some think it goes too far in forbidding the Board to consider as evidence of an unfair labor practice statements which do not contain threats or promises of benefits. The question is a close one, but it is well to decide the doubt in favor of freedom of speech. As I have indicated above, this provision affects unions as well as employers.

5 Changes in the election rules designed to help employees select bargaining agents who represent their real choices. Most of these changes are desirable. Certainly the professional employees should not be put, against their will, in the same bargaining unit as nonprofessional workers. It is difficult to defend the Board's refusal to include the "no union" choice on the run-off ballot when this choice received the largest or second largest number of votes in an inconclusive election. Quite controversial is the question as to whether economic strikers who have been replaced should be allowed to vote. The act says not. There is an obvious difficulty in giving votes to men who will never again be employed by the company. Against this view it is argued that denial of voting rights to displaced men will encourage employers to break unions by replacing strikers. The rule of the Taft-Hartley Act seems, on the whole, to be sound, but the danger of abuse exists. The Board can probably prevent abuses by refusing to hold elections soon after strikers have been replaced by nonstrikers.

6. Authority for employers to request an election in cases of disputes over representation. This provision may not mean much

---

[12] The boards of inquiry were appointed as follows:

On March 5, in connection with a dispute between the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp. and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council at Oak Ridge.

On March 15, in connection with a threatened strike of the United Packinghouse Workers against Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Wilson & Co., Cudahy & Co., and Morrell & Co.

On March 23, in connection with an alleged strike in the bituminous coal industry.

On May 18, in connection with a dispute between the long-lines department of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the American Union of Telephone Workers (CIO).

On June 11, in connection with a dispute between seven unions in the maritime industry and a large number of shipping companies and stevedoring employers.

On August 18, in a dispute between the Atlantic Coast Stevedoring Employers and the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL).

[13] This has been particularly true of the Federal courts after the Norris-LaGuardia Act limited the use of injunctions in labor disputes. As a result of this act, the Federal courts might be unable to issue injunctions against admitted violations of law simply because the violation was occurring in connection with a labor dispute.

change in practice because the National Labor Relations Board has in late years considered requests for elections from employers. In the early years, however, it did not. The act does not require that the Board grant the employers' (or the unions') requests.

7. Removal of the ambiguity found in the Wagner Act as to whether the Government's policy of protecting the right to organize applies to supervisors. First, the National Labor Relations Board held that the Wagner Act applied to supervisors, then that it did not, and finally again that it did. This question should be settled by legislation rather than by administrative decisions. Many persons think that the Taft-Hartley Act should have included foremen among employees. I believe that the provisions of the law on this point are sound. The great stake of the country in efficient management is better promoted if foremen are not given special encouragement to form trade-unions. If conditions in a plant are bad enough to make foremen keenly desire a union, they are in a good position to organize.

8. The requirement that unions as well as employers bargain in good faith. The provision will probably have little effect because unions which are strong enough to refuse to bargain on certain subjects are also strong enough to reject successfully all proposals which employers may make with respect to these subjects. Nevertheless, the development of good industrial relations was hindered when employers found themselves compelled to bargain on any proposal made by a union, and yet were unable to get the union even to discuss certain matters which were covered by its constitution.

9. Limitations on the financial payments by employers to trade-union representatives. These limitations, which carry criminal penalties, are a useful protection against extortion and shake-downs. The regulation of so-called health and welfare funds is needed to prevent abuses of these funds and to keep union politics from affecting their administration, since thousands of employees rely on these funds for a substantial pension which will not become payable until after 20 or 30 years. On the other hand, the Taft-Hartley Act does nothing about the highly dubious method of financing welfare funds by imposing a private sales tax on coal, records, or other products.

VII

Some provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which attempt to deal with the right problems—that is, important problems which need attention—are poorly worked out and will not accomplish the intended results.

1. Provisions designed to protect the right to join a union. If the closed shop or the union shop is permitted (and they fit American conditions), the right to join a union needs to be safeguarded. It will be recalled that in 1946 about 7,000,000 jobs were covered by closed-shop or union-shop contracts. Organizations which seek to determine who may pursue a trade or who may enter an industry are no longer purely private and their admission requirements are affected with a public interest. Keeping the doors of unions open is no academic matter. About 20 unions have provisions in their constitutions against the admission of Negroes, and other unions practice discrimination without requiring it. A few decline to admit women, and many impose high initiation fees. Among 300 locals affiliated with A. F. of L. unions, Professor TAFT found that 65 charged initiation fees of $100 or more, and 24 charged fees of $150 or more.[14]

The provisions in the act designed to protect the right to join a union are unsatisfactory. As I have pointed out, the act forbids employers to justify discrimination against employees for nonmembership in a union on the ground that the union itself discriminates, and makes it an unfair labor practice for a union "to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee" because of membership or nonmembership in a trade-union. These provisions presuppose that the initiative in enforcing the act will come from employers. Few employers are likely to incur the risk of a strike or a lock-out by challenging the admission policies of a union, because employers usually have little or no stake in unions' refraining from discrimination.

Likewise of little use is the declaration that it is an unfair labor practice for unions to require employees covered by a union-shop agreement to pay an admission fee in an amount which the Labor Relations Board "finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances." Complaints are not likely to be initiated either by individuals or by the Board. Furthermore, no definite yardstick is given to the Board as to what fees are excessive. The Federal Government would do well to set a maximum—say $75 or $100. These amounts would protect men in intermittent trades from losing employment to persons who do not regularly pursue the trade, and yet would be small enough not to be a severe hardship to persons who wished to enter the trade permanently.

2. Provisions designed to protect the right to remain in a union. The union shop, the closed shop, or the use of maintenance-of-membership clauses require that the right to remain in a union be protected; but the provisions in the act on this point are unsatisfactory. The law makes it an unfair labor practice for the employer to terminate the employment of a worker covered by a union-shop contract if the employer "has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership." The law also makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee whose membership in the union has been terminated on some ground other than his failure "to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as condition of acquiring or retaining membership." This is too narrow. There are many offenses for which a union may wish to discipline a member, and if he can leave the union and still hold his job, the union loses the chance to impose effective discipline. A better arrangement would permit unions which have union-shop or closed-shop contracts or maintenance-of-membership clauses to require employers to dismiss men who lose their good standing, regardless of the cause; but would require also that the worker be permitted to continue to hold his job while exhausting his rights of appeal within the union, and would provide for an appeal from the highest union authority to a neutral agency—preferably the National Labor Relations Board.[15] If a man lost this appeal, the employer should be required to dismiss him. If he won, he should be permitted to keep his job, but the union should be permitted to exclude him from membership.

3. Provisions designed to discourage Communist control of trade unions The Communist problem in American trade unions, where actual Communist membership is very small, is a reflection of the unwillingness of American wage earners to concern themselves with union affairs. The use which Communists have made of trade unions in other countries indicates that the discouragement of Communist control of unions is an appropriate object of public policy It is reasonable to require the officers and key employees of unions to declare (under penalty of perjury) whether they are or recently have been members of the Communist Party. Both union members and employers are entitled to know this. The Taft-Hartley Act does not go far enough when it permits union officers and key employees to refuse to declare whether or not they are Communists; but it goes too far when it deprives noncomplying unions of the benefits of the law—although the latter disadvantage is diminished by the opportunity of individuals to initiate complaints. It is not sound public administration to make the benefits of a law available only when union officials have taken a given oath because the rank and file frequently have little control over their officials. Some people, however, believe that denial of the benefits of the law to Communist-led unions is necessary in order to force the members to take sufficient interest in union affairs to rid themselves of Communist officers.

4. Provisions designed to control the political expenditures of unions. Some control of the political expenditures of unions is sound in principle. Unions are essentially bargaining organizations, hence they need to admit all those in an occupation or industry regardless of political preferences. There are obvious objections to allowing organizations which impose union-shop or closed-shop contracts to collect money from Republicans to help elect Democrats or from Democrats to help elect Republicans. The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act designed to limit the political expenditures of unions are ineffective because, as I have pointed out, they can be evaded by calling the activity "education." I know of no way of making these provisions effective. Nevertheless there is some merit in applying the same restrictions on political expenditures to both unions and corporations.

5. Provisions for dealing with disputes which imperil the public health or safety. The procedures of the act are initiated when the President believes that a strike or lock-out, or a threatened strike or lock-out, is likely to imperil the national health or safety. The first step is for the President to appoint a board of inquiry to report on the facts and on the position of the parties. The report must be made public, and the board is specifically enjoined not to make recommendations. The appointment of such a board does not affect the right of the parties to initiate a strike or lock-out. On receiving the board's report, the President may direct the Attorney General to seek an injunction enjoining the strike or lock-out. If the district court finds that the strike or lock-out would imperil (or does imperil) the national health or safety, it may issue the injunction, and the board of inquiry is thereupon reconvened. If the dispute is unsettled at the end of 60 days, the board reports to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which were made to settle the dispute. This report must also be made public. Within 15 days after the second report, the National Labor Relations Board is directed to take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of accepting the final offer of the employer. Within 5 days after the vote the National Labor Relations Board must certify the results to the Attorney General who must then move for dis-

[14] Taft, Philip, Dues and Initiation Fees in Labor Unions, this Journal, February 1946, p. 222.

[15] Of considerable importance is the status of a union member during appeal from a penalty imposed by a local union. Professor Taft found 5 out of 126 unions in which the penalty is vacated during appeal, 9 in which the penalty imposed by a local is not enforced in event of appeal until it has been approved by a general officer or the general executive board (which may not be the ultimate appeal body), 52 in which appeal does not suspend the verdict, 42 in which the status of the appellant is not defined, and 18 in which miscellaneous arrangements prevail. Philip Taft, "Status of Members in Unions during Appeal from a Penalty Imposed by the Local Union," this Journal, August 1948, pp. 610–616.

charge of the injunction. The court must grant the motion. The parties are then free to initiate a strike or lock-out. The President, however, is directed to make a full report of the proceedings to Congress.

Certainly the provisions for obtaining a postponement of a strike or lock-out which would imperil the national health or safety are reasonable. But the other provisions for dealing with national emergencies are seriously defective.

To begin with, the arrangements create the danger that two rival agencies will simultaneously be attempting to settle the same dispute. Thus the act plainly contemplates that the Conciliaion Service will be attempting to settle it while the board of inquiry is ascertaining the facts; but it leaves the role of the board uncertain, since it does not forbid conciliation by it. Nothing is more likely to prevent successful conciliation than rival efforts to settle a dispute. Under the Railway Labor Act, by contrast, the so-called emergency boards, which are similar in some respects to the boards of inquiry authorized under the Taft-Hartley Act, do not come into existence until the mediators have formally withdrawn from the case.

If boards of inquiry are used, they should be made subordinate to the Conciliation Service—that is, appointed only at the recommendation of the Director of Conciliation—and they should either be prohibited from conciliating or not be permitted to come into existence until after the Conciliation Service has confessed failure and dropped the case. If boards of inquiry are made a second step in handling disputes which create national emergencies, the prohibition against their making recommendations should be removed.

The worst features of the act for dealing with so-called emergency disputes come into operation if the dispute is still unsettled after the injunction has been in effect 60 days. The National Labor Relations Board must then take a vote of the employees on the employer's last offer. The framers of the act apparently assumed that this vote would be a genuine expression of the willingness of the employees to strike, and that the employees would terminate the dispute by accepting terms which their leaders had rejected. There is no evidence to support this naive notion. Experience under the Smith-Connally Act during the war indicated quite the opposite: obviously men will not desert their leaders at a time of crisis for the union. In two votes held under the act, the union members stood behind their leaders. Furthermore, in one of these cases, the members even rejected an offer which had been made subsequent to the last offer, and which their leaders had accepted. In a third case the men, under instructions from the union, refused to vote.

The provision that the Government conduct a vote on whether or not the men shall imperil the national health and safety puts the Government in a ridiculous position. The vote implies that a strike is permissible provided only that the men authorize it; hence the Government is tolerating an attack on the community's health or safety. Obviously the only role which the Government can decently play is one of defending the community—not of sanctioning strikes against it.

Particularly bad is the provision that after the vote has been taken, the injunction shall be vacated. Consider the psychological effect of the sequence of events—a vote rejecting the employers' last offer immediately followed by vacating the injunction which up to that moment has prevented the strike. Certainly these arrangements are well designed to convince the men that they have met all conditions and are now free to strike regardless of the consequences. As a result, the dispute has been made more difficult to settle. At precisely this point the act stops. It provides no additional steps by which the dispute may be postponed or settled, stating merely that the case may be referred by the President to Congress, in case Congress happens to be in session. This is an ideal way of getting industrial relations into politics.

It is obvious that if interruption of production or service would imperil the national health or safety, the Government must have authority to assure that production or service continue—at least in amounts required to prevent disaster. One arrangement might be to authorize the President to require the parties to observe the recommendations of the board of inquiry (this assumes that the board is permitted to make recommendations) for a limited time—say 6 months, or long enough for the parties to make a fresh start on bargaining over their differences; another arrangement might be to authorize Government seizure and operation of the enterprise; still another might be to authorize the President to arrange for a limited amount of service at the previously existing terms of employment subject to retroactive adjustment when the dispute is settled.

6. The provision authorizing the general counsel to apply for injunctions to stop apparently unfair labor practices, pending final determination of the issue by the Board. There are likely to be many cases in which justice is best advanced by maintenance of the status quo pending a decision on the legality of a given action. Only the general counsel may seek injunctions, and the court, of course, may not see fit to grant his petition. As of November 1, 1948, 6 permissive applications and 31 mandatory applications had been made. Two of the discretionary applications were against employers. As a result of one of these the General Motors Corp. was restrained from installing an insurance plan without negotiating with the union.

Although the provisions for injunctions improve the enforcement machinery, they have two important defects. One is the requirement that the general counsel seek an injunction in certain types of cases (secondary boycott). Surely this should be left to his discretion. The other is an ambiguity as to whether the general counsel must show that the practices which he would restrain would cause irreparable damage and cannot adequately be remedied at law. One district court has held that these traditional standards in granting injunctions do not apply.[16] Yet there seems to be no good rea-

VIII

Of the features of the act which are completely bad, the two most important are the prohibition of the closed shop and the requirement that union-shop contracts be approved by a vote of the employees.

The closed shop is a well-established American institution which fits conditions here and which serves useful purposes, especially in occupations where much of the work is intermittent. It creates problems and is subject to abuse. Nevertheless, public policy should aim at making the closed shop work better, not at abolishing it. The fact that the Railway Labor Act imposes criminal penalties on managements which sign closed-shop (or even union-shop) contracts is not in point. The closed shop has never existed in the railroad industry, and the anti-closed-shop provision of the Railway Labor Act was actually put in at the demand of the unions, although they now demand its removal.[17]

It was a mistake to require that union-shop contracts be approved by a vote of the employees. Such votes serve no useful long-run purpose. Employers are not willing to sign closed-shop or union-shop contracts unless they believe that their employees strongly desire such a contract. Since managements are not easily convinced of this fact, there is little danger that closed-shop or union-shop contracts will be imposed upon unwilling workers. In a few industries, such as the building trades, compliance with the law is virtually impossible because no one can determine who is eligible to vote.

IX

What kind of a labor law should the country have? It would not be appropriate in this article to attempt to spell out the details of a successor to the Taft-Hartley Act. The comments already made have given some indications on particular matters and a few broad generalizations may now be set forth:

1. The law should be comprehensive. This does not necessarily mean that it should be long and detailed. Nevertheless, there is a wide range of problems on which public policies are needed—problems of relations between unions and individual workers, between unions and employers, between unions and unions, and between unions and employers, on the one hand, and the community, on the other.

2. It should take account of the fundamental characteristics of industrial relations in the United States—those which are the product of the American environment and which cannot easily be changed. This does not mean that no attempt should be made to change them, but the principal objective should be to protect the essential institutions of American industrial relations against abuse, and to make them work more satisfactorily. For example, it would be a mistake for public policy to attempt to undermine the dominant position of the national union in the American trade union movement, or to attempt to convert the movement into a grass-roots affair in which union officers have much less influence and the rank and file more influence than is now the case. The strong national union fits American conditions, and American employees wish their officers to run the unions. These conditions, to be sure, create certain problems. Public policy should attempt to deal with these problems rather than to change the nature of the trade union movement itself.

3. It should attempt to narrow the area of industrial conflict. Certain uses of strikes and boycotts are not appropriate, and it is high time that trade unions and the community dropped the naive notion that the unlimited right to strike is an inherent and necessary right of freemen. In general, it is inappropriate that the strike should be used by unions to battle other unions, or that strikes or lockouts should be used to coerce the Government or to compel changes in public policy.

4. It should attempt to deal with certain specific problems. The following six are particularly important:

(a) It should protect the right to organize. If this right is not protected, employers will use discharge and other forms of economic coercion to break up new unions. Protection of the right to organize should include protection against economic coercion by unions as well as by employers. Otherwise, some unions will attempt to control men's choices by boycotts, strikes, or other short-cut methods. There was a good case for tolerating such methods so long as employers were free to discharge men for joining unions. But now that coercion by employers is unlawful, public policy should also prohibit the use of economic coercion by unions to force men to join or to leave a union. It is anomalous for the legality of economic coercion to depend upon who uses it.

(b) It should protect the right of workers to pick their bargaining agents free of interference from any source. The Wagner Act

[16] *Dowd's* v. *Local 294, Teamsters Union* (75 F. Supp. (N. D. N. Y.)).

son why they should not.

[17] Since some of the railroad unions discriminate strongly against Negroes, the closed shop should not be permitted on the railroads until Negroes are adequately protected against discrimination.

destroyed the effective operation of the principle of exclusive jurisdiction, and a new arrangement must be developed to take its place. The British principle of tolerance will not do because it presupposes more influence of the rank and file in the trade-union movement than has been traditional in the United States. The trade unions themselves are not capable of providing a solution because the largest and most powerful unions, which do not wish interference from any source, have too much influence within the labor movement. Hence interunion rivalry over members can be controlled only by public policy. The very growth of unions makes such control imperative. When two powerful unions battle for the control of workers, as did the carpenters and lumbermen in the Northwest several years ago, or as have the teamsters and brewery workers in some cities, or the longshoremen and the teamsters, the costs to the community may be intolerable.

(c) It should permit closed-shop contracts where the union represents the majority of the employees in the bargaining unit. The Federal Government would do well to preempt this field and to forbid States from outlawing closed-shop contracts in plants engaged in interstate commerce.

(d) It should safeguard the right to become a member of a union and the right to remain in a union wherever closed-shop or union-shop contracts exist.

(e) It should make strikes over the jurisdiction of unions an unfair labor practice, unless the employer has denied work to members of the union which has the bargaining rights for the job.

(f) It should safeguard the health and welfare funds which are being set up and which are likely to be set up in increasing numbers. It would be desirable to reduce the incentive to establish such funds by greatly increasing the tax base and benefit base in the Government scheme of old age and survivors insurance. The pension which a man receives should not depend too much upon whether he happens to work for a generous employer, or to belong to a strong trade union. Furthermore, private health and welfare funds are likely to reduce the willingness of employers to hire men above 45, and thus seriously to limit the mobility of labor.

(g) It should provide arrangements for handling disputes which imperil the national health and safety.

Almost as important as the provisions of the law are the way in which it is drafted and the sponsorship which it receives. A great forward step would be taken in industrial relations if representatives of employers and of unions could reach agreement on the basic provisions of a successor to the Taft-Hartley Act. Unfortunately, the prospects for such agreement are not bright. Some years will probably be required for the country to develop a well-considered and well-balanced industrial relations act. Nevertheless, with the experience of the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts as a guide, the new Congress should be able to draft a law which is substantially better than either one of them.

SUMNER H. SLICHTER.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Lincoln Ordnance Depot, Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter which I have received from the Honorable Edward J. Barrett, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, and the copy of House Joint Resolution 27 of the Sixty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, concerning the Lincoln Ordnance Depot at Springfield, Ill.:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, March 30, 1949.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, JR.,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with House Joint Resolution No. 27 of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly, I have the honor to enclose herewith photostatic copy of said resolution.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 27

Whereas the Lincoln Ordnance Depot was established in the Springfield metropolitan area in 1942 and has ever since formed an integral part of the economic life of this community; and

Whereas the recent deactivation order came as a complete surprise in view of the disturbed international situation and general state of preparedness which prevails throughout the Nation; and

Whereas we would be remiss in our duty to our State and Nation if we supinely submitted to this apparently unwarranted action without voicing a vigorous protest: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, and Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes, Chief of United States Army Ordnance, to reinvestigate the factors that prompted the deactivation order, and that copies of this preamble and resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary Royall, Major General Hughes, Senator Scott W. Lucas, Senator Paul H. Douglas, Representative Peter F. Mack and each of the other Illinois Members of Congress in order that they may take such action as may seem necessary.

Adopted by the House, March 29, 1949.
PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CHAS. F. KERWIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate, March 29, 1949.
SHERWOOD DUER,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Foreign Policy—Keep It Bipartisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for March 31:

KEEP IT BIPARTISAN

Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, dissenting from the majority report on the European recovery program, are sharply critical of certain trends in American policy. Their views can't be dismissed as mere expressions of partisan bias.

Leaders in the revolt against what they contend has become only a me-too policy for Republicans are Representatives JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, and WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, two of the best-informed House Members on foreign issues.

They object, and properly so, to the piecemeal presentation of foreign-aid legislation. They say funds for ERP, Chinese aid, Greek-Turkish military assistance, and the International Children's Fund should be wrapped in one package, which seems elemental to sound budgeting.

They consider the proposed aid to China inadequate, which may be debatable. They hold that "American policy in China has collapsed," which is not debatable. Our dismal failure in China may prove the Achilles' heel of American foreign policy as a whole.

And they complain that the Truman administration has tried to "take credit for achievements, in which our party deserved at least equal credit." Certainly it is true that the 2 years when the Republicans controlled Congress were a crucial period in foreign policy, and that the administration owes generous recognition to the loyal and effective support then given by Senator VANDENBERG, Representatives VORYS, JUDD, EATON of New Jersey, and other Republicans. Mr. Truman needed such support then, and may need it again; the present large Democratic majorities may not be present in the next Congress.

It is tremendously important that American foreign policy shall continue to have bipartisan support in Congress. The President would do well to make it clear that he appreciates the past contributions of Republicans, and that he does not intend to ignore their views in the future.

Nothing New on the Western Front—Analysis of the Reorganization of the German Coal, Iron, and Steel Industries as Planned Under Law No. 75 of the AMG

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the March-April issue of the magazine published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III:

NOTHING NEW ON THE WESTERN FRONT—ANALYSIS OF THE REORGANIZATION OF THE GERMAN COAL, IRON, AND STEEL INDUSTRIES AS PLANNED UNDER LAW NO. 75 OF THE AMG

The State Department Bulletin of December 5, 1948, published the text of law No. 75 and an outline of decisions relative to the reorganization of the coal, iron, and steel industries of the western zones of Germany.

1. The outline of decisions hereafter called outline, states: "Before these decisions were reached (reorganization of iron, steel, and coal industries) the views of the various interested German authorities and organizations which are well known to military government were given full consideration and as far as possible, and as far as it is compatible with military government policy, these views have been incorporated in the plan."

This statement is a frank admission on the part of the occupation authorities that the so-called reorganization program has not been independently arrived at by the occupa-

tion authorities. On the contrary, the interests and influences of the Germans and their organizations have been substantial in the formulation of this policy. Thus, the occupation authorities have disregarded the basic mission of the Allied occupation which presupposed that the treatment of the German economy would be based first on the security requirements of Germany's victims and, second, on the requirements to whittle down Germany's economic preponderance for purposes of effectuating a more equitable balance of the productive forces in Europe.

In other words, these standards which were to have guided our occupation policy have been secondary to German consent, as admitted in the statement mentioned above.

2. In the preamble of law No. 75 it is declared that the policy of the AMG is designed "to decentralize the German economy for the purpose of eliminating excessive concentration of economic power and preventing the development of a war potential." However, a careful study of the law and the outline shows that this objective is hardly realized. For example, the law declares that a "German Steel Trustee Association shall be established for the purpose of assisting in decentralizing and reorganizing the iron and steel industry" (art. 3, par. 8). However, in that very same law (par. 10) the German Steel Trustee Association is empowered to draw up plans for the reorganization of the iron and steel industry. The plan shall provide for the formation of new companies to which shall be transferred assets seized as provided in paragraph 8 hereof and may provide for the merger or amalgamation of such assets and for the absorption of additional assets which may include assets outside the field of the iron and steel industry.

In clarifying this provision the outline states, in part, that the German Steel Trustee Association's primary task is to adopt measures for the further reorganization of the iron and steel industry with the object of combining the assets now held by the steel-producing companies into a fewer number of companies in order to obtain production units of optimum efficiency.

The German Steel Trustee Association can partially achieve this objective by including additional assets of the former iron and steel and coal complexes in order to provide further economic units of a size and range capable of sustaining the steel-fabricating industry in competition with world markets. Such additional assets may include colliery assets (assets pertaining to the coal-mining industry) and particular attention will be directed to the treatment to be accorded to the iron-ore-mining industry.

Thus, it is very clear that while there will be a reshuffling of the iron and steel industry of Germany, it will not eliminate excessive concentrations of economic power. It will, in fact, achieve the opposite. Significantly, the law does not define what is excessive concentrations of economic power. This will be left to interpretation by the German trustees.

In discussing the reorganization plan in the November 27, 1948, issue, Business Week declares that the United States opposed decartelization measures which would break down the vertical integration of the coal and steel industries. Commenting on this point as it affected law No. 75, Business Week states: "The United States has won its point."

In this connection, it must be pointed out that the vertical integration of the coal and steel industries of Germany has been, in the past, the pattern of their cartel organization. Moreover, Business Week in this same issue declares that the German Steel Trustee Association will provide the steel-producing units with their normal adjuncts—such as power plants (in some cases coal mines and coke ovens) but some steel-producing plants will have to be recombined.

In an earlier issue of this well-informed magazine, November 20, 1948, it is frankly admitted that the German steel industry "will be reorganized but will not lose the advantages of vertical integration."

As seen from the plan itself, this is definitely the case; the German steel cartel is reshuffled, but it remains a cartel.

A recent editorial in the London Tribune adds some interesting data: "In July of this year came the first unilateral American intervention. Officially unrecognized by the British authorities, eight directors of the United States Steel Corp., accompanied by a representative of the Congress Committee for Marshall Aid, toured the Ruhr for 3 weeks in Goering's special train. The United Steel Corp. is the largest horizontal steel trust in the world, employing 175,000 workers. Thus it is hardly surprising that a recartelization of that part of the steel industry already decartelized was recommended. The military governors are expected shortly to implement the United States Commission's recommendation in a plan providing for the recartelization of the 28 new companies into 12 larger concerns."

3. The outline bluntly declares that the sole criteria for the reorganization of the steel industry will be purely economic. By "economic" it is meant those measures and requirements which will make possible Germany's recovery.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the occupation authorities have sought the Germans and their organizations for advice as to what measures and requirements should be considered for making possible Germany's economic recovery. By using criteria which are purely economic, the AMG admits ignoring the security requirements of Germany's neighbors. By consulting the Germans—and not the victims—on the reorganization of these industries, the occupation authorities have ignored the economic interests and well-being of Germany's neighbors. This is a departure from the statements of the highest American officials who have declared that the German economy must be adjusted to the security and economic needs of all of western Europe and not vice versa.

4. Under Law No. 75, the coal industry is handled in approximately the same fashion. There is a reshuffling but essentially the coal cartel remains intact. Business Week of November 27, 1948, admits: "The Ruhr coal industries are in for a similar overhauling. The joint United States-British control group will attack the problem in the same manner and in collaboration with the new steel group."

Law No. 75 empowers the control group to define the assets of each new coal company. It will also be empowered to combine the coal mines with power and transportation facilities as well as byproducts units such as hydrogenation and nitrogen plants. Such a combination will be established as a new operating company. After this initial reorganization, German trustees will take over the new companies.

In the Outline it is stated: "In grouping these colliery interests for the future, care will be taken to group in accordance with the requirements of efficient operation and to avoid undue dislocation."

Thus, as in the case of the steel industry, only economic criteria will govern.

5. Law No. 75 stipulates that "those persons who have been found or may be found to have furthered the aggressive designs of the Nazi party will not be permitted to return to positions of ownership and control of the German iron, steel, and coal industries." The law omits any practical measures that would preclude the return to power of the men mentioned above. There is no provision that specifically takes the ownership of these properties away from such individuals.

It is true that German trustees are set up for these industries and they will exercise ownership functions. However, the Outline declares that the shares held by the trustees shall be "on behalf of the owners." This is the pattern of ownership in the coal industry. The same relationship of actual owner to trustee obtains in the so-called reorganization of the steel industry.

As stated in the Outline, the German Steel Trustee Association "will exercise the functions of ownership except that they shall not be entitled to distribute earnings or to dispose of either the shares or the assets * * *." In neither the reorganization for the coal or steel industries is there found specific provisions regarding the eventual ownership of these assets. Dummy corporations and other cloaking devices which could preserve the power of the present owners are not discussed at all.

Thus, we repeat that the law does not contain a definite statement that the actual ownership of the industries concerned will be taken away from those "who have been found to further the aggressive designs of the Nazi Party." As a matter of fact, these very people are in the saddle in those industries at this very moment and the AMG knows it.

The same editorial of the London Tribune above referred to, declares: "But more significant than the elaborate maneuvers of the German Ruhr magnates, in league with American businessmen * * * is the speedy German line-up which has taken place within the heavy industries and at Frankfurt. Heinrich Kost, one of Hitler's war-economy leaders, and former managing director of Rhein-Preussen, is in charge of the provisional coal administration; Wilhelm Zangen is back on the board of Mannesman; Rohland, one of Speer's right-hand men in the Armaments Ministry and a member of the SS, has returned from internment to the board of Vereinigte Stahlwerke. So have Sohl and Schwede, also wartime directors. Hugo Stinnes has been acquitted of all political guilt by a German denazification court and is active behind the scenes. Herman Reusch has emerged with enhanced prestige from his battles with the unions and the British authorities. Henle of Klockner, together with Pferdmenges, the Frankfurt banker, are faithful representatives of the combines in the Frankfurt Economic Council."

In conclusion, Law No. 75 declares that the ultimate ownership of these industries "should be left to the determination of a representative freely elected German Government." This is an unprecedented statement, for nowhere have we seen that our military authorities were directed to determine who shall decide the ultimate ownership of the German iron and steel industries of the Ruhr. There is no official directive known to the American people, nor is there any official inter-Allied agreement which justifies this unilateral decision by the AMG. The significance of the reorganization plan is clear. It is the plan for the so-called international control of the Ruhr.

Thus, Law No. 75 reminds us of the French proverb "Plus cela change plus c'est la même chose." In plain English: the more it changes the more it is the same thing.

A Commemorative Stamp Honoring the Workers and Contributors of the Nation's Community Chests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to commemorate

the unselfish work done by those who volunteer their services to advance the cause of the Nation's community chests and the contributions made by generous donors in all walks of life to this great Nation-wide effort.

In proposing that a special postage stamp be issued as a tribute to the community chests of America, I am not asking that a single small locality be honored, nor that a small group of citizens be singled out for special recognition.

This special commemorative postage stamp would honor more than a thousand cities and villages where community chests are now established. It would encourage and applaud a million chest volunteers in those communities who give not only their money but uncounted days and even weeks of their time for an unselfish, community-wide civic undertaking. And it would be a significant token of thanks and appreciation to some 20,000,000 community-chest givers, upon whose interest and generosity the effectiveness of local red-feather services ultimately depends.

Finally, it would honor the red-feather services themselves. It would salute the uncounted volunteer board members who direct red-feather hospitals and clinics, homes for the aged, homes for neglected children, Boy Scout and Girl Scout councils and troops, settlements and other youth services, family counseling agencies, agencies for the handicapped. It would honor the devoted, highly competent and, I regret to say, often underpaid social workers, nurses, therapists, and other skilled employees who make up the staffs of the red-feather services in a thousand communities.

While it carries forward the tradition of helpfulness that was the strength of the pioneer American neighborhood, the community chest is a money-raising device of fairly recent origin.

Back in 1877, in Denver, Colo., two Protestant ministers, a Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi called a public mass meeting and launched the first joint drive in America to raise funds for a group of local social agencies. Cleveland, in 1913, introduced the technique of budgeting, now almost universally adopted. My own city of Rochester, N. Y., in 1918, combined the annual appeals of local philanthropies with those of all recognized war-relief agencies to form the first community and war chest, and in 1919 first used the now universal term of "community chest."

I would like to emphasize that there is no national chest. Each chest is a local institution, a grass-roots institution. Each community raises and collects its own funds, and distributes those funds to its own local red-feather services. And these services are not charitable organizations in our generally accepted use of that term. Relief of actual destitution is largely carried on by public agencies supported by tax funds. The voluntary red-feather health and welfare services have an equally great responsibility—to make life fuller, happier, healthier, more worth living. The users of those services are not the underprivileged alone, but the general rank and file of our citizens. Nearly every individual, a member of nearly every family, at one time or another needs and uses these services. I know that in my own community there is a fine and healthy cooperation between the red-feather services and the public welfare agencies, a cooperation that promotes the welfare of the average citizen and taxpayer.

The typical community chest unites in a common purpose all economic and social groups, all professions, all creeds. In the campaign and in the year-round operation of a chest, the executives of great industries work shoulder to shoulder with representatives of organized labor. Chest workers and givers include factory workers, farmers, villagers, city dwellers. It is a powerful force for unity. It is local democracy in action.

I must confess that a certain amount of local pride in the pioneer work done in this movement by my own city prompted my introduction of this bill. But it is definitely not a local measure. I am not going to burden the membership by offering the list of those cities which have community chests of widely recognized excellence. Believe me, the list is a long one, and I am sure that each of my colleagues would find in that list one or more communities with which he is more than casually familiar. In their behalf, I ask favorable action on this resolution.

Barring Reds' Tour—United States Action Is Legal, But It Might Be Well To Let Communists See Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Star:

BARRING REDS' TOUR—UNITED STATES ACTION IS LEGAL, BUT IT MIGHT BE WELL TO LET COMMUNISTS SEE COUNTRY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The State Department has the strict letter of the law on its side in keeping 18 Communists who came here for the so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace in New York from making a projected tour across our country.

There's no doubt about that. They came here as official visitors from Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia with visas only for New York City and the conference there last week end. It was only because they were official visitors that they were admitted at all. That's the only way Communists can get into this country legally—as official visitors to a specified locale for a specific purpose.

It may be recalled that this procedure was adopted a couple of years ago in the case, first, of a French Communist newspaperman who came to this country to cover the United Nations sessions in New York. The Justice Department found a World War I statute still on the books.

This was the first appearance of our own iron curtain which was lowered just a bit this side of the Statue of Liberty.

LEGALLY ON FIRM GROUND

Technically and legally the State Department is on firm ground. It should perhaps get some credit, in the first place, for admitting these Communist musicians, scientists, and writers at all, in view of the temper of some people in our country, undoubtedly a minority, who protested their admission in the first place. The eye-for-an-eye, tooth-for-a-tooth case was put by a couple of Members of Congress, Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, formerly of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Representative WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, its present chairman, who objected that Russian Communist visitors should not be allowed in our country until they dropped their iron curtain for visitors from the United States.

Logical enough, one might suppose.

And yet the attitude seems not only unlike us, but it all seems an affront to the sound sense of the American people to fear the quick passage through our country of only 18 Communists, all of whom work in the arts and not politics, and therefore are a bit naive about politics. They would, it is presumed, have the local police watching them wherever they went, so we would be protected, and they would feel at home.

If they said from the platform elsewhere what they said in their New York meetings, we need have no qualms that any of our people would become tainted or indoctrinated. And while they very likely would get delegations of pickets wherever they went, that being an old American custom, it is probable that the folks out in the country, who are courteous and hospitable, would raise far less ruckus than some in New York did.

COULD LOOK AROUND

On the other hand, it might be a good thing to have even this small group of foreign Communists, only seven of whom are Russians, take a good look at our country and our happy and prosperous and free people and get rid of lots of notions they read in their newspapers and hear over their radios. It would be a fine opportunity for us to do some proselyting and merely by giving them a look.

It might help our own people to see some Russians, and see that they do not wear long black whiskers or horns or shoot fire out of their mouths, but are people just like ourselves. That might help us to distinguish between the Russian people and the rulers in the Kremlin and bridge the gap that is growing wider and wider every day between peoples of the world.

The peoples of the world want peace and it is high time they let their political masters everywhere know that. To do that effectively, people must have contact with each other. As it is, we are shutting ourselves behind barriers, behind iron curtains, if you please.

This is the spring season, the season of building, flowers, and good will, and the time when the circus comes around.

It is doubtful that 18 Communists would be nearly as exciting as the bearded lady or the thin man or those daring souls who climb up on each other's backs and balance on poles as the gentleman underneath the whole pack rides a bicycle across a wire way up at the top of the tent.

An afternoon at the circus would help the whole world.

Only a Paper Pact?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, Only a Paper Pact?, which appeared in the April 2 issue of America:

ONLY A PAPER PACT?

As a diplomatic document, the North Atlantic Pact may indeed, as many are claiming, be a classic of its kind. But of and by itself it is far from being what Senator Vandenberg would have us believe it is, "the greatest war deterrent ever devised." We should know by now that the rampaging Reds will not be deterred from aggression by pacts on paper. They will be convinced that the Atlantic community means business only when it actually and adequately implements the treaty to be signed next week.

Like the Russians, we are waiting to see what the Congress of the United States does about the supplementary arms program which is a necessary corollary of the pact. Legislation permitting the shipment of arms to the treaty countries has been prepared by the administration and in due time will be presented to Congress.

Already a weird coalition of penny-pinchers, administration-haters, and isolationists is gathering its forces to defeat any move to put teeth into the treaty. Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia is for the pact, provided it contains no commitment to arm participating nations. Senators WHERRY of Nebraska, WATKINS of Utah, and DONNELL of Missouri may be expected to support him. Senator TAFT of Ohio grumbles that the treaty is so worded that it appears to be inseparable from the issue of supplying arms to Europe.

Secretary of State Acheson denied during a radio address March 18 that the treaty binds the United States to any arms program, but added, "We all know that the United States is now the only democratic nation with the resources and the productive capacity to help the free nations of Europe to recover their military strength." The arms-shipment program prepared by Assistant Secretary of State Ernest A. Gross is simply an acknowledgment of that fact of first importance.

It is disappointing to note that the administration is paying so much attention to the small coalition which threatens to oppose its proposals. Under threat of that opposition, the administration has already given a number of assurances, some of which the realities of the cold war may force it to repudiate later. It undoubtedly inspired the story that its "modest rearmament program" for the fiscal year July 1949–July 1950 would cost only $1,500,000,000. It announced that the European recovery program will have top priority on United States money and materials sent to Europe. And it declared that the United States would provide arms and munitions only for "existing western European military formations." More comforting to the Russians than to the few infantrymen and fliers of the west—that news.

Such reassurances will have little effect on people like Senators BYRD, WHERRY, WATKINS, DONNELL, and TAFT. They may prove distinctly disturbing to those who, finally reconciled to the unavoidable necessity of seeking peace through strength since cooperation by agreement has failed, want the West to mobilize forces sufficient to deter the Russians from aggression.

No one can reasonably object to Senators who, like Senators VANDENBERG, CONNALLY, and HICKENLOOPER, reserve their positions on the arms legislation until its details are explained to them. We are sure they act out of prudence, not parsimony. And we are sure they will face this unpleasant fact frankly: the details will add up to a staggering amount of armament, which cannot conceivably be supplied out of surplus.

No one, of course, can tell at this date what adequate rearmament of the treaty nations will cost. One thing we should have no illusions about. To be adequate it must cost as much as is required to create a Western defense system which will overawe the Russians. Unless it costs enough to do that, there is no point in spending a cent on it. If we seriously want the pact to be the "greatest war deterrent ever devised," we must expect to pay, and to pay far more than the administration now pretends will be necessary.

This cost will be compounded by the dual nature of the rearmament job to be done. The treaty nations must be armed against both direct and indirect aggression, against a full-fledged attack by Russian armies, and against coups by native Communists. It seems evident now that the most immediate threat lies in the latter.

Administration spokesmen have been giving the impression, foolishly, we think, that the treaty nations have no intention of expanding and strengthening the Western military forces so that they could defend the Rhine against a Soviet onset. If the arms program is to mean anything, and especially if it is to have any uplifting effect on the morale of the Western peoples, rearmament with that objective will have to be provided.

Perhaps because they sense this costly necessity, the opposition bloc in Congress, which abhors any rise in taxes, is beginning to argue that any arms shipments in peacetime would provoke the Kremlin. A sufficient answer to them should be that the Kremlin will be provoked whenever it wants to be provoked, and anyway, who said that this is peacetime? Of all the illusions that are grasped as weapons against preparedness, that is the most dangerous. It is time we Americans realized that Soviet Russia is waging a new and terribly effective kind of war. To our way of thinking, the proposed arms legislation is wartime legislation. Much as we deplore its necessity, we cannot avoid it, and we cannot avoid paying the price it entails. Costs cannot be considered in time of war—hot or cold.

Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to a letter written by the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, for many years president of Columbia University and one of the Nation's most distinguished citizens.

The letter is as follows:

MARCH 7, 1947.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I call to your attention a matter which I regard of extreme importance to the Government and people of the United States. Under no circumstances, should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background, might easily mark, as I said, the beginning of the end.

Think of what would happen were the vote of one Senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world. It is unthinkable that we should allow any such possibility.

On the other hand, I suggest that each one of these Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—be set up, by treaty, as an independent and self-governing nation, subject to but two limitations. These are, first, that their relations with foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President of the United States and the United States Senate. This would prevent any foreign power from using them to our disadvantage. The second is that litigants in any one of these countries should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of this would be to establish a uniform system of public and civil law in this part of the world. This privilege now exists in the case of Puerto Rico and I am told works extremely well.

I earnestly ask your most serious consideration of this proposal and the avoidance of the damage that would be done to our Government and our people by extending the United States beyond its present very compact and naturally defined boundaries.

I regret that on account of my total blindness, I cannot sign this letter myself.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

Allied Veterans Council Protests Cancellation of Veterans' Hospital-Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks I have received numerous protests from veterans and families of veterans, and also from veterans' organizations, civic organizations, cities, municipalities, and even the State legislature, against the concellation of the veterans' hospital-construction program. These organizations have all brought out the urgency and immediate need for additional hospital facilities in our State. The Governor of the State of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, has presented a detailed statement to the Senate committee proving beyond a doubt the extreme urgency of additional hospitalization.

There may be some differences among the Members of Congress as to the extent of aid that the veterans are entitled to when it comes to the question of pensions, bonuses, Federal loans, and so forth. I am sure, however, that there is no difference of opinion in the Congress of the United States on the question of giving full hospitalization, medical aid,

and assistance to our veterans. The Democrats at the Philadelphia convention went all out for medical aid and assistance, not only for the veterans of our country, but for all the citizens of the United States. President Truman has valiantly taken up this fight for full medical aid and assistance and hospitalization for the citizens of the country.

Now I would like to ask the question just who it is in the Veterans' Administration, or outside the Veterans' Administration, who is so powerful that he or they have been able to sabotage the veterans' hospital-construction program that has been previously approved by the Congress of the United States? Someone must have sold President Truman this vicious and inhuman bill of goods. In all probability it must be the same gang that sold President Roosevelt the economy bill which caused no end of hardship to our veterans. I think the veterans of the Nation ought to get together and smoke out this group of economizers who always try to save the country money at the expense of our veterans. In all probability it is the same gang that in a couple of weeks will be urging the Congress to shovel out seven to nine billion dollars for aid and militarization of Europe and Asia.

I have heard many arguments for economy on the home front when it comes to cutting expenditures for power projects, flood control, the St. Lawrence waterway, aid to education, public health, veterans' pensions, and all those appropriations which go for the general welfare of our own Nation and our own economy. Yes, we can always hear the economizers shouting their lungs out. Yet these same people will be in the forefront for dishing out billions for Asia and Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is inhuman to deny proper hospitalization and medical assistance to our disabled and sick veterans. This is our first obligation. I have just received a letter from the Allied Veterans Council, Inc. In this council are included the following allied groups: United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Red Arrow, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of United States, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Canadian Legion of Wayne County, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Canadian Corps Association, Polish Army Veterans Association, District No. 6, Marine Corps League, Regular Veterans, Polar Bears Association, Rainbow Division, the AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, and the Army of the Philippines.

The past presidents of this council are:

Michael A. Whalen, DAV, 1934.
Thomas Barrett, USWV, 1936–42.
Carl W. Bischoff, VFW, 1938.
Harvey E. Hohlfeldt, VFW, 1940.
Frank R. Klett, DAV, 1942.
Nate M. Lerner, JWV of United States, 1944.
John E. Ciagle, PLAV, 1946.
Carl Schoeninger, VFW, 1935.
Vincent Schoeck, DAV, 1937.
Paul Tara, USWV, 1939.
John H. McPherson, Red Arrow, 1941.
Allan Steele, USWV, 1943.
Edward Rothwell, VFW, 1945.
Elmer Gettinger, DAV, 1947.
George C. Dollar, AL, 1948.

The present officers of this council are:

Eugene Sage, president, VFW.

Michael Macalla, vice president, Polar Bears.

Lester Graves, treasurer, United Spanish War Veterans.

Michael A. Whalen, secretary, Disabled American Veterans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that it is not only the veterans of our State that are aroused and angry over the cancellation of the veterans' hospital-construction program. All the citizens of Michigan are disappointed and bewildered. At this point I wish to include the letter that I received from Michael A. Whalen, secretary of the Allied Veterans Council, Inc., and Eugene Sage, the president of the council:

The Honorable GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SADOWSKI: This is to advise you that the veterans' hospital situation is becoming extremely tragic. First the administration cuts out 24 new hospitals and orders a reduction in the size of 14 others and now we have been advised that a directive has been sent out ordering Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the country to operate on an 85-percent basis. This means that 15 percent of the beds in all hospitals will remain unoccupied, at a time when there is a definite need for even more beds than are now available.

What is the meaning of this? Why is the Veterans' Administration curtailing hospital facilities 15 percent? In Michigan we have a drive on in Grand Rapids sponsored by the AMA for additional hospital space in that community and yet the Government insists there is no need for a Government hospital in that area, with a very heavy veteran population. We have a $19,000,000 program in Detroit for additional hospital beds and the Government says there is no need for additional facilities for veterans here and on top of this they are now rumored to be curtailing the facilities now available by 15 percent.

The American people are insistent that our disabled veterans shall be cared for. Who then is responsible for this undercover attempt to curtail the most essential of all services—hospitalization? Veterans of World War II are being confronted with the statement in seeking hospitalization: "No beds available." We, the organized veterans of Wayne County, urge that you as a Member of Congress from the State of Michigan, demand that our Government reinstate the veteran-hospital facilities to 100-percent basis and further, that the two hospitals previously allocated for Michigan, be built.

Awaiting your reaction, and thanking you for your past cooperation and support, we are,

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL A. WHALEN,
Secretary.
EUGENE SAGE, *President.*

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House I direct your attention to the series of editorials which have appeared in the New Orleans States, to which I referred in my previous remarks of this day. These editorials sound a warning to which we cannot turn deaf ears.

William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, has rendered a public service in writing these several editorials. They are thought-provoking, logical, and alarming, considering the implications of the so-called Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Here they are:

THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

HOW IT CAN BECOME OUR SUPREME LAW

The General Assembly of the United Nations last December adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The American people are not generally aware of this action or of what it may mean to us as a nation or as individuals.

The American delegation to the United Nations, composed of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, John Foster Dulles, Philip C. Jessup, and Benjamin Cohen, voted for this declaration. America is on record as favoring its contents.

The declaration alone will have no legal effect upon the United States. But the vote of the American delegates for the proposal will be considered a moral obligation on the part of the United States by other nations to press for implementation of the declaration.

Such implementation will come in the form of a covenant which the United States will be asked to adopt as a treaty. If the Senate adopts this covenant, it will become the supreme law of the land and will supersede all State laws and all county and parish and city ordinances.

This is so because the United States Constitution provides in article II, section 2, paragraph 2, that:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur—"

And because article VI, section 2, provides that:

"This constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

If the Senate should adopt this covenant, it will lead to an International Court of Human Relations.

This Court of Human Relations will have jurisdiction over each and every one of us who will be answerable to it for alleged violations of the covenant.

Frank E. Holman, president of the American Bar Association, has written of this covenant:

"In order to enforce the provisions of a bill of rights, the United Nations will have to interfere continually and minutely in the internal affairs of member nations. It will have to establish standards, and determine when and where those standards have been violated, and to take steps to correct or punish such violations."

This is among the studied conclusions of the president of an association of 40,000 lawyers in the United States.

ITS PLAN FOR WORLD-WIDE SOCIALISM

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted last December 10 by the General Assembly of the United Nations, is a document pregnant with world-wide socialism and nullification of present American laws and customs.

If the United States Senate ratifies a proposed covenant, an International Bill of Rights will become the supreme law of the

land and will be administered by an International Court of Human Rights.

Article 22 of the declaration says:

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to the realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each state of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

This language is plain enough.

It can mean social security for all the world, with Uncle Sam—through international cooperation in accordance with our resources—footing most of the bill.

What sort of social security does the declaration contemplate?

This language is also plain.

Article 25 says:

"1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

"2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection."

These two articles are typical of much of the social and economic program to be imposed upon us on an international scale by the covenant if it is adopted by the Senate.

How revolutionary it is in concept was adequately expressed by John P. Humphrey, Director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations, who wrote in the January, 1948, issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationship between the states and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."

That means an International Court of Human Rights with power to enforce these regulations.

It means the nullification of many laws of the states and the institution of dangerous, far-reaching and revolutionary changes in the processes of constitutional government.

It means you.

ITS EFFECT ON OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

Should the United States Senate ratify as a treaty the Covenant of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Congress need no longer be concerned with legislation regulating admission of displaced persons.

All any will need is passage to America.

Our immigration laws will be negated, for under the United States Constitution a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land.

This will come about through article 14 of the declaration, which says:

"1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution."

Discussing this far-reaching program, Frank E. Holman, president of the American Bar Association, a close student of the declaration, has this to say:

"This provision, if respected in the United States, would appear to nullify immigration laws and open the gates wide to anyone claiming persecution. Certainly the majority of Americans will not favor unrestricted asylum for the persecuted from all over the world."

And should any immigration authority take issue with this interpretation of the declaration, he could be subpenaed to appear before an international court of human rights, in whatever country it might be sitting, and explain why he did so.

The International Court will be final arbiter and interpreter of the entire declaration.

Consider article 13, which provides that:

"1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

"2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

Section 1 could easily be interpreted as meaning that anyone has the right to come into this country regardless of immigration or naturalization laws. "Everyone" is the broadest of possible terms. Had the drafters of this declaration meant only that each resident of a country had the right to freedom of movement within his country's borders, why did they fail to use that language?

Section 2 would appear to be open to this interpretation: If a person has a right to leave his country and to return to it, it seems implicit that he has the right of entry into any other country.

In any event, all he would have to do would be to leave his native state and claim persecution in order to enter this or any other signatory to the covenant.

ITS EFFECT ON LAWS, CUSTOMS, AND RELIGION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not only socialistic in its implications, but if implemented by adoption of its covenant by the United States Senate in treaty form, it would strike down laws of many States and social customs of wide acceptance among the people. And in respect to at least one religion, it would contravene church law.

Article 7 says:

"All are equal before the law and are entitled, without any discrimination, to equal protection of the laws. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

Article 16 reads:

"1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage, and at its dissolution."

There are on the statute books of 29 States, laws forbidding miscegenation or marriage between different races. In most other States which do not by law ban such unions, the social customs of the people forbid it.

The States prohibiting miscegenation are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Seventeen States and the District of Columbia have laws enforcing segregation in either education or public places or public conveyances, or all three. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In addition, six States give discretionary powers to school boards to establish segregation. These are Arizona, Indiana, Kansas, New Mexico, New York, and Wyoming.

Article 16 of the declaration of human rights would obliterate such laws, for if the covenant is ratified by the Senate in treaty form the covenant would become the supreme law of the land under our Constitution.

Should any mother try to prevent the marriage of her child because of objections to a suitor on racial, national, or religious grounds, that parent would be answerable to an international court of human rights, wherever it might be sitting, for under article 7 she would be guilty of incitement to discrimination.

The threat to religion is also plain. An example: The Catholic Church forbids divorce to its members as part of the free exercise of its religious tenets under our Constitution. The Catholic Church forbids marriage between Catholics when one has been married by the church and subsequently divorced.

Article 7 of the declaration of human rights could hold any Catholic priest, any Protestant minister, or any Jewish rabbi in violation of the declaration for incitement to discrimination should he attempt to dissuade any persons from marriage for any religious reason whatsoever.

WHO CONCEIVED IT, HOW AND WHY

The Declaration of Human Rights, which the United States Senate will be asked to make the supreme law of the land by ratification of a covenant in treaty form, can properly be characterized as another attempt by pressure groups to change the social and economic structure of this Nation.

Its impact will be felt in every State, city, village, and hamlet in the land if it becomes law.

Every American will be at the beck of an international court of human rights, wherever it may be at the moment, to answer charges. The covenant will set up a world-wide socialistic program for all governments, and if adopted by us would radically change the customs and nullify many of the present laws of America.

The declaration is of a piece with President Truman's so-called civil-rights program. The Committee on Civil Rights, established by President Truman under Executive Order 9808, has been working hand in glove with the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations of which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is chairman.

The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights was published in 1947. In January 1948, President Truman, in a special message to the Congress demanded passage of his committee's recommendations in his force bills which so recently resulted in the Senate filibuster.

Many students of constitutional government believe his force bills to be unconstitutional. Apparently, his Committee on Civil Rights is also dubious of their legality. For, on page 110 of its report to him, it is suggested that under the Supreme Court ruling in the *Missouri* v. *Holland* case in 1920:

"That Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty obligations, even where, in the absence of a treaty, it has no other power to pass such a statute. This doctrine has an obvious importance as a possible basis for civil-rights legislation."

The committee further reported:

"The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is at present working on a detailed international bill of rights designed to give more specific meaning to the general principle announced in article 55 of the Charter. If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established."

The composition of the commission which drafted the universal declaration of human rights is worth noting.

Frank E. Holman, president of the American Bar Association, writes of it:

"It is revealing to note the make-up or personnel of the commission.

"Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is its chairman and the sole United States representative. She is not a person in any sense trained in legal draftsmanship. She is primarily a social reformer.

"Australia's representative is Col. William Roy Hodgson, by training a military man,

and from his biography a person whose experience has been largely confined to government service.

"The United Kingdom's representative is Mr. Charles Dukes, a trade unionist by profession.

"These are the only Anglo-Americans or representatives of English-speaking peoples on the commission of 18 members."

The other 15 members comprise 3 from the Soviets and 1 from Yugoslavia, and 1 each from Belgium, Chile, China, Egypt, France, India, Iran, Lebanon, Panama, Uruguay, and the Philippines.

This is the commission which has drafted a document that, in the words of Mr. Holman, "might be held to impair, or be a substitute for, our own cherished Bill of Rights, which protects the individual citizen."

"Plot" is not too strong a word for this undermining of our American laws, customs, and rights.

THE PLOT AGAINST THE PEOPLE

The pressure groups which so far have failed to accomplish congressional enactment of the force bills, including the so-called FEPC, are plotting to do it through the United Nations.

The United States Senate ratified as a treaty the United Nations Charter. Under the United States Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations takes precedence over our State and local laws, because section 2 of article VI provides that a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land.

The United States Senate ratified the Charter of the United Nations because this Nation wanted to become a party to an international pact the purpose of which is to insure peace in the world. The Senate did not intend the Charter to become a vehicle for socialization and law abrogation.

Article 55 of the Charter contains this language:

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among the nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people, the United Nations shall promote—

"(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

"(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems, and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

"(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Senate bill 984, the FEPC bill, introduced in the Eightieth Congress, has this language in section 2 (c):

"This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'"

Note that article 55 says that these idealistic endeavors shall be promoted. There is nothing in the Charter which says any signatory shall force or demand that this millennium come about. The language is "shall promote."

The United Nations is specifically forbidden by the Charter to interfere in domestic affairs of any signatory. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter reads:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII." Chapter VII provides for action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression on an international scale.

The statement in Senate bill 984 that we are obligated to impose upon this country such force bills as the FEPC is therefore not only misleading, but actually untruthful. There is no obligation under the Charter to do any such thing. There is only an obligation owed by President Truman to pressure groups which supported him for reelection to do so.

The attack upon our laws, rights, and customs is a pincer movement.

Should the President's civil-rights program be refused by the Congress it may become in much more dangerous form the supreme law of the land simply by ratification of the covenant for the universal declaration of human rights.

That this plot has support in high places in our Government is apparent from the statement of President Truman in his Proclamation on National Freedom Day, published in the Federal Register January 27, 1949; Vol. 14, No. 17, page 361.

The President's proclamation stated, in part:

"Whereas the Government and the people of the United States wholeheartedly support the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948—"

Frank E. Holman, president of the American Bar Association which is investigating the impact of this Declaration on this Nation has this to say:

"When the Declaration was passed last December in Paris there was no copy of the final draft available in this country. I was advised that not even the State Department of our own Government had a final copy in this country of a document which as to our basic American rights is nebulous and ambiguous and the latter portion of which sets up a collectivist concept of government for all the peoples of the world, including ourselves."

Are the American people aware that they "wholeheartedly support" this Declaration as President Truman says?

If this is adopted as a treaty by the Senate, this country may no longer be as we have known it. We will have instead a worldwide social and economic system with Uncle Sam paying the bills. We will have an International Court of Human Rights to which every one of us may be held responsible. Our immigration laws will become ineffective. Laws of many States will be thrown out. The customs of the people will be disregarded. It attacks the institution of marriage by social recognition of illegitimacy just as Nazi Germany did and Communist Russia does. It invades the rights of people to choose their own intimates and fellow workers and it would strike a serious blow at religious beliefs and tenets.

It is a far-reaching, revolutionary document which could easily drive this country to the poorhouse and its people to totalitarianism.

THE SENATE SHOULD REFUSE IT

The question whether acceptance of the Covenant of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in treaty form by the United States Senate would conflict with the United States Constitution is one which the American Bar Association, composed of 40,000 lawyers, is presently studying.

The covenant's authority over all State laws and county, parish, and city/ordinances is unquestioned. A treaty made by the President and ratified by two-thirds of the Senate present when it is called to a vote, becomes the supreme law of the land, all State constitutions and laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

Proponents of the declaration and its revolutionary proposals point to the United State Supreme Court ruling in the *Missouri* v. *Holland* case in 1920 when the State of Missouri attacked a treaty signed by the United States and Canada protecting migratory birds.

The Supreme Court held then:

"Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention. We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treaty-making power; but they must be ascertained in a different way. * * * We may add that when we are dealing with words that are also a constituent act, like the Constitution of the United States, we must realize that they have called into life a being the development of which could not have been foreseen completely by the most gifted of its begetters. It was enough for them to realize or to hope that they had created an organism; it has taken a century and has cost their successors much sweat and blood to prove that they created a nation. The case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago. The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution."

Those who would enact such civil-rights legislation as President Truman has called for have pointed to the *Missouri* v. *Holland* case as the basis for such laws under treaty powers.

Their plea will be that to foster peace and justice in the world such a document as the covenant should be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago.

Lawyers and students of constitutional government believe that such a covenant would conflict with our Constitution in a number of ways, but mainly in article 1 of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Article 30 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads:

"Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any States, groups, or persons, any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein."

In other words, if the Senate ratifies this treaty and the Supreme Court upholds it, this newspaper could no longer criticize it; you could not speak against it, and the people—among them you—could not assemble to petition our Government for a change in it.

And there is no provision in this declaration for its amendment in any way, ever.

The Supreme Court will have the final say on the constitutionality of such a treaty, if the Senate ratifies it.

And it should be remembered that Charles Evans Hughes, a former Chief Justice of the highest court of the land, once said:

"The Constitution is what the judges make it."

Economic philosophy and political ideology often seem as important in Supreme Court decisions as legal interpretation.

The people of this Nation, however, have it in their hands to relieve the Supreme Court of ever having to decide whether this covenant would or would not supersede our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The people of this Nation have this power through their elected Senators. The President can only commit this Nation to such a program by ratification by the Senate.

Write your Senators, and all your friends all over this country to write theirs in opposition to this covenant for the universal declaration of human rights. Do this because it strikes at every fireside of the Nation.

More or No More Cartels?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the March-April issue of the magazine published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III:

MORE OR NO MORE CARTELS?

On March 13, 1948, 19 members of the Decartelization Branch in the American Government addressed a letter to General Clay in which alarm was expressed over his revision of the decartelization program. "In the opinion of the members of the staff," the letter declared, "it virtually repeals the decartelization law and contravenes the July 15, 1947, directive." Instead of replying to these grave charges, a top military government official attacked these hard-working and patriotic Americans as being disloyal. Apparently, it was felt that this smear would silence anyone who dared to question the activities of the American military government with regard to German cartels.

Upon reading the above-mentioned letter, the Society for the Prevention of World War III felt duty-bound to contact the military government directly. For months our inquiries were given the cold shoulder by those in charge of decartelization. Failure to reply to our questions made us all the more persistent because we were convinced that the American people were entitled to know the pertinent facts surrounding the decartelization program in Germany. On January 8, Mr. Lawrence Wilkinson, economic adviser to General Clay, woke up to the fact that the people back home had a right to know the true state of affairs. He sent us a voluminous report on decartelization, apparently hoping that by throwing the book at us we would forthwith hold our peace. We have a hunch, however, that one of the reasons impelling Mr. Wilkinson to meet part of our requests, was due to the growing apprehension among the people regarding the decartelization policy. Members of Congress were beginning to ask questions. The military government was alarmed.

In an ostensible effort to get the facts, Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, appointed a commission to make an on-the-spot investigation. That commission was in the position to render a distinct service to the American people, but it did not take into account the attitude of those in military government who are running the decartelization show. Of course, the latter could not ignore the commission, but hoped that with proper persuasion and diplomacy, the commission would go home satisfied and convinced that all was well.

Unfortunately for Mr. Wilkinson & Co., a hitch developed. A former Justice Department trust-buster, Alexander Sacks, who was on the decartelization staff, was called to testify before this commission. What he said was sufficient to make his superiors froth at the mouth. Apparently, he was not briefed before appearing before the commission. Mr. Sacks submitted a memorandum which stated in part: "There is no reason at this time for speaking of a revised decartelization program because no decartelization program has ever been put into effect and practice.

"The men charged with the highest responsibility by the Commander in Chief (President Truman) have failed signally to carry out the explicit orders of the July 15, 1947, directive of the commanding general and military governor for Germany.

"By the application of extra-legal and purely personal standards of judgment they have succeeded in killing the action against the VKF ball-bearing monopoly and Henschel & Son. * * * Their actions were clearly an usurpation or abuse of their authority and function. * * *

"It is no secret that the operations of the decartelization program have been hampered by Major General Draper and his associates in military government. * * * They have done whatever they could by innuendo and misstatement to discredit a program which they either did not understand or did not like."

Sacks told the Commission that effective execution of the United States anticartel policy in Germany would require a drastic shake-up in the AMG personnel. He said: "This means the selection of public servants who will show themselves to be immune to the pressure of German business for special favors and privileges."

He accused Philip Hawkins, one of the key officials in the decartelization set-up (a son-in-law of General Draper), of ignoring and even ridiculing the policies of President Truman. He condemned recent moves to transfer responsibility for anticartel legislation and action to German hands.

Mr. Sacks' charges against General Draper are not new. As early as February 1946—that is, 7 months after Potsdam, the Society for the Prevention of World War III in No. 13 of Prevent World War III in an article entitled "The Case of General Draper," analyzed General Draper's record. We pointed out the connections of General Draper's banking house, Dillon, Read, with the German steel trust. We also charged that General Draper was anxious to preserve the sacred cow of German heavy industry.

On October 12, 1945, the Society for the Prevention of World War III wired President Truman and General Eisenhower: "We believe that no person who has had or now has business or financial interests in Germany should be allowed to act as an economic expert or in a policy-making position." We had General Draper in mind.

Though we were aware of General Draper's nefarious role for a long time, we were happy to note that Mr. Sacks has confirmed our charges. Was Mr. Sacks promoted or congratulated for his courageous exposé? Oh, no. He was suspended and his reputation smeared by that very convenient method of implying disloyalty. Mr. John E. Tromer, Chief of the AMG Civilian Personnel Branch, had the effrontery to tell Mr. Sacks that he was to be separated from the Department of the Army "for reason that your retention in an active duty status is considered to be detrimental to the interests of the United States Military Government in Germany." No attempt was made to refute Mr. Sacks' statements to the Commission. Instead, he was arbitrarily branded by those who act as though the revival of the German cartels is in the interests of the United States Military Government in Germany. Thus Mr. Sacks was penalized for his disloyalty to the German cartelists and their active helpers.

The haste with which the American Military Government put the "screws" on Mr. Sacks seems to have embarrassed the Department of the Army. Thus latest reports indicate that Mr. Sacks has been restored to active duty temporarily. But it should be noted that the Department of the Army has not rebuked those who are trying to oust Mr. Sacks from his present position. Moreover the Assistant Secretary of the Army has stated that charges against Mr. Sacks might be pressed at a future date—possibly when public indignation dies down.

If this be the strategy, then it is urgent that the people remain on their guard. We know that the American people will demand an explanation from General Draper and his friends in military government. The Drapers et al. may feel that the German cartels are O. K., but the American people have learned through bitter experience that peace and security is more important than the business-as-usual plans of these gentlemen.

Hon. Earl T. Wagner, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is always the custom to criticize Members of Congress. However, when a newspaper sees fit to compliment a new Member, one of my colleagues from Ohio, I think it worthwhile to be placed where all Members may see it. I refer to the following article from the Cincinnati Enquirer of Sunday March 27, 1949:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE
(By Glenn Thompson)
NO LAZY MOMENTS IN WAGNER'S DAY

WASHINGTON.—What's it like to be a new Congressman?

Well, Cincinnati has one. So we asked him.

"It's hard work. It's fun. It's lonesome," says Representative EARL T. WAGNER, of Cincinnati.

WAGNER, to everybody's surpise—except, he says, his own—was elected from the Second Ohio District last November. That is the western half of Hamilton County. It had sent a Democrat to Congress only once in 20 years. That Congressman was Herbert S. Bigelow, and he stayed one term.

WAGNER intends to change all that. "I think the people out there woke up to the fact we can win," he says. "No; I don't even think it's going to be an uphill fight."

If work will do it—and WAGNER says, "You don't win sitting on your rear"—he might be right.

Take his day, for instance.

At his hotel here, the Hamilton, where all the labor leaders stop, he has a standing call for 7 a. m. By about 8:15 he's in his office, having shaved, breakfasted, and ridden a streetcar up to Capitol Hill.

He opens all the morning mail himself. "If I go back home and somebody comes up and says, 'Say, I wrote you a letter,' I'll remember that letter if I'm the one who opened it," he explains.

He has the mail read and the day's work outlined when his staff gets there at 9. He reads Cincinnati papers or dictates until 10. Then he goes to committee or, if there's no meeting, continues on the mail until the House meets.

That's at 12. He stays in the Chamber, except for ducking downstairs for lunch at 12:15, until it quits. Usually he lunches with TOM UNDERWOOD, of Kentucky; JOHN LYLE, of Texas; or GEORGE MILLER, of California, fellow Democrats, naturally.

Veteran Congressmen often spend little time on the floor. They stay in their offices and simply hurry over if the bell rings for quorum call or vote.

Not WAGNER. "You pick up too many tricks on how they run things by just staying there," he says.

At first he objected even to being called off the floor by reporters. Seems to have got used to that, however, probably realizing that that is part of getting elected, too.

As for the tricks he has learned, he displayed one trick this week. Some southern Democrats who had voted rather spitefully against the administration's rent-control bill last week were about to vote on a rent-control bill for the District of Columbia. This meant rent control on their own and colleagues' apartments. They wanted it. They could change colors and get away with it, if nobody demanded a roll call.

WAGNER, the freshman, got up and demanded the yeas and nays, a roll call. Some old hands in the House would have hesitated to do it. He got it.

"Some of the boys were a little red in the face," he said afterward.

Congressmen do not have regular seats in the House. They sit anywhere. WAGNER moves around, sits next to, and talks to nearly everybody. Moved 75 times, he says, in one long session.

"The result is," he says, "that I know every new Member and most of the old ones.

"It helps, too. For instance, that was the way I got to know LOUIS RABAUT, of Michigan. Well, we wanted to get that $650,000 back that the Government owed Cincinnati. And RABAUT turned up on the subcommittee handling the appropriation. I don't know how much he had to do with it, but he told me himself two or three times that he was working to get it in the bill. It got in."

Part of WAGNER's moving is probably due to nervous energy. He picked up that badge of nerves, a stomach ulcer, when going to law school and working at the same time, and still nurses it.

Contrary to many Congressmen, WAGNER says his votes don't worry him. "I know what the people want who elected me, and they know where I stand, so we both know how I'm going to vote," he says.

The way he is going to vote is pretty straight Truman Deal.

He won't admit he had any pangs about the veterans' pension bill, although a good many votes in the second district, including this one, thought it was a lousy bill.

WAGNER was a IV-F in the war, from that ulcer and arthritis, and friends say the veterans in the District would have murdered him if, under the circumstances, he had voted against pensions. He voted for 'em until final day. Then he voted to recommit, or shelve, the bill. By that time it was a patchwork of amendments.

He will say only: "Veterans, even at the best, had 4 years away from their families, four uncomfortable years. I think they've got something coming."

Ask him what is the most worrisome thing about his job and he replies: "Getting the work out at the office when they keep me late on the floor. I don't like to keep my staff after 5 o'clock."

A more experienced Congressman would smile at that, for several reasons.

When the House adjourns he goes back to the office, signs the mail and opens any late mail.

He takes this mail seriously. All Congressmen do. It is really a key to reelection.

WAGNER gets from 75 to 100 letters from individuals a day, he says. Most are from the District, and he tries to answer each one within 24 hours, a large number with personally dictated replies, the rest with information gathered by his staff.

The staff is comprised by a man, Richard Day from Cincinnati; two women here, and a part-time woman clerk in Cincinnati.

He evidently has something of a prize in one of the women here, Mrs. Nell Hamlin, a veteran of 20 years on the Hill. She seems to know somebody in every Government department, a great help when it comes to getting information.

It is she, also, who assembles that correspondence. When a bill is up, she hands him, that morning, a file containing all the letters he has received on the subject. He skims through these, reads the committee report on the bill while he is on the floor, and has a fair idea of what it is all about by the time the debate is under way.

To get back to his day, he leaves the office around 6 or 7. Once or twice a week Len Niederlehner, who used to be in Arthur Fricke's law office in Cincinnati and now is with Munitions Board here, drops by the office and they go out and get a steak.

Otherwise he eats at his hotel, picks up early editions of the morning papers at 8:30, and goes to bed at 9:30 or 10.

"SAM RAYBURN" he says, "once told me, 'Washington is the loneliest town in the world. I know what he meant."

RAYBURN is a bachelor. WAGNER's family is in Cincinnati.

WAGNER says he gets a good many dinner invitations but turns most of them down. "It's nearly always somebody who feeds you and then wants to shoot you full of propaganda all evening. Let 'em come down to the office. Then I can at least send out and get a bill and find out what it's all about."

Friday night at 6:30 he leaves for Cincinnati—by day coach.

Round trip costs him $28.90, plus 25 cents for a pillow. He says he can afford neither a sleeper nor to bring his family here.

Contrary to many people's belief, a Congressman gets Government mileage for only one round trip a session.

He gets off at Winton Place at 7 next morning and a 10-minute cab ride drops him at 2896 Grasselli Avenue, Westwood. Jean Ann, 4, youngest of his three, hears the key in the lock and greets him with: "What did you bring me?" She is permitted to rummage in his handbag until she finds it.

After a shave and breakfast, he is off again, either to call on a few constituents or for his office in the Eagle Savings Building. About 6 p. m. he shows up at Frank Ziegler's grocery on Tremont Street in Fairmount to do the week's marketing. There are usually a few constituents with problems gathered when he gets there or FRANK has saved up memorandums on the problems.

Home, finally, he and Mrs. Wagner have an evening together, while Carol, 12, and Earl W., 11, are at the movies.

Next morning it is church, dinner, maybe a drive in the afternoon, and at 6:15 the day coach back to Washington.

"You earn your money," he says, which was hardly necessary.

Next week, if we don't forget, we'll deal with the question: Why does anybody want to be a Congressman?

Fish Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the United States in 1948 imported 472,427,000 pounds of food fish valued at $110,954,000 according to figures supplied to me by the Office of International Trade. Those imports were 40 percent larger by weight and 300 percent greater by money value than our imports of fish during 1939, the last peacetime year.

That fishermen are alarmed by the inroads on their markets from those imports from low-wage, low-living-standard countries is indicated by an editorial which appears in the Fisherman's News, published in Seattle, Wash. The editorial follows:

PERIL POINT

The Pacific Northwest fishing industry finds itself on its hands and knees this month pitifully begging for the right to a meager existence. All but swallowed up with the threat of impending imports, we find ourselves pleading that a peril point be established.

As we look closer, we find a situation without comparison. Here are a group of American citizens, humbly requesting their own elected representatives for the right of a competitive opportunity to exist.

The American fishing industry is not afraid of competition, foreign or otherwise. The entire industry is built upon competition. Fishermen competing with the fury of the sea, buyers competing with each other for the fruit of the hardy vessel's labor.

The American Government apparently places little value on its fisheries resources.

The Scandinavian countries value highly their fishing industry, not entirely as a source of food, but as a tremendous reserve of trained seamen in time of war. During the past war, the United States Navy was full of former fishermen who dropped their nets to go to war. Now these men have returned to their fishing boats only to find that their product is no longer salable.

Before the war the Japanese controlled the American domestic crab market. After Pearl Harbor, it was a little unethical, as well as impossible, for them to supply the American housewife with this product. Our fishing industry promptly met this challenge by building up a crab industry of its own. Tremendous wealth was invested in canneries, boats, and gear.

Today, just a little more than 7 years since this infamous attack, the Japanese crab industry is once more bidding for its lucrative American markets. Bidding at a price which leaves American fishermen two choices: Cutting prices, and our standard of living to coincide with theirs, which is certainly not the solution. The second choice is, of course, close up and let the Japanese have it.

The American fishermen can accept neither of these choices without a battle. But it is a lopsided battle. The American fishing industry stands alone against not only the Japanese competition, but also our own Government which is apparently more interested in international good will than the welfare of the Nation's oldest industry.

The American Government is presenting a fine example of the Golden Rule. No doubt if more of us practiced these tried and proven axioms it would be a better world. But surely, we can go too far. A man cannot be expected to help his neighbor to the extent that it will mean utter neglect of his own family. Neither can a government aid another nation's industry and thereby kill its own.

Barrett Versus Fay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the News calls attention to a

situation in the District which is detrimental to its well-being.

The Committee on the District of Columbia should give it careful consideration.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1949]

BARRETT VERSUS FAY

A-FUSSIN' AND A-FEUDIN' AND A-FIGHTIN'

Washington, like other towns, has a police chief and a district attorney, each sworn to uphold the law, sworn to find and punish the transgressor. Normally, you'd expect them—if you'll pardon the expression—to be thick as thieves.

However, on the gambling question, the situation has developed to such a point that Jimmy Lake, the perennial emcee of local fights, could say:

"In this cornah, at 200 pounds, the champeen, Robert J. Barrett, chief of police, and in this cornah, at 162 pounds, the young challenger, George Morris Fay, United States attorney for the District of Columbia."

In fact, though neither will admit it publicly, they've been fighting for a year over the prosecution of what Mr. Fay insists is a $100,000,000 yearly gambling racket in Washington.

Each has a morning newspaper to back his views. The Times-Herald bangs the drum for Chief Barrett. The Washington Post sides with Mr. Fay. The Post violently crusaded against the chief when a Post employee was arrested as a molester of women. It claimed he was abused and beaten by police. It turned out no abuse or beating by police was ever proved, although the Post employee was later fined for beating a woman.

The News tried to take a fall out of Barrett's police, but didn't, in the case of a Mr. Bunch. Mr. Bunch was arrested for being drunk, later died, was found to have a lot of injuries. He could have gotten them in his cell. It was never proved one way or the other. The FBI investigated, but pretty much exonerated police of any brutality or even carelessness. The police chief instituted certain reforms in the handling of drunks.

The Star seems to be in neither Mr. Fay's nor Mr. Barrett's corner. Neither is the News. We opposed Barrett's appointment, on his record. But having said our piece, that's that.

As to Mr. Fay, he was apparently hurriedly dug out of a hat at the last minute when this newspaper revealed that Col. James (Jiggs) Donohue, Milton Kronheim's lawyer, was being considered for the DA's job by Milton's good friend, Attorney General Tom Clark.

Sometimes, when we look at Mr. Fay, we think maybe we should have left bad enough alone, but at any rate, being in neither man's corner and not reaching for any stick to beat the other man's dog, and under obligation to neither man, nor to anyone else, we herewith present the background of the current squabble between the police chief and the district attorney.

Mr. Fay, on April 28 last year, announced as a fact, the existence of a huge gambling ring here, and demanded a special grand jury investigate it.

The implications were obvious. Of itself, the statement meant if there was such a racket, the police must either say they know of it, or admit incompetence. If the Police Department admitted knowledge of the racket, the statement implied they were either powerless to stop it, or didn't want to stop it.

There was another implication in the statement, a loophole for the police, that if the police were powerless, maybe a Federal grand jury, with ability to cut across jurisdictions, could do the job.

Major Barrett immediately offered the full cooperation of his department to aid Mr. Fay's grand jury. He said, in a letter, that he would have any given number of policemen available on 2 hours' notice. But at the same time, he said he knew of no specific gambling places in the District. Major Barrett offered to be a witness himself before the grand jury.

The next day Mr. Fay wrote back, thanking Major Barrett, but suggesting it was up to the grand jury to ask for witnesses, not up to him, Fay, to request the appearance of any policemen. His letter very effectively held the police at a gingerly arm's length—a fact which Major Barrett doubtless realized.

Interestingly enough, Major Barrett and Mr. Fay—whose offices are just across Indiana Avenue from one another—saw fit to communicate by letter, releasing each letter to the press, instead of just sitting down to talk things over.

It was a curious situation for two men who each hold the same ultimate goal—control and punishment of crime in Washington.

The letters grew acidly polite. Major Barrett turned over 138 names of "big shot" gamblers to Mr. Fay. Mr. Fay said the list wasn't definite—it contained no specific addresses, and that much of the list was an accumulation of stray nicknames, last names, or just phone numbers.

Major Barrett wrote back, asking Mr. Fay just what did he expect the Police Department to do, whether he really wanted to use the police in investigating local racketeers, and what had become of the special squad he'd put at Mr. Fay's disposal?

Mr. Fay's reply was to the effect that Major Barrett should re-read his mail. The last letter from Major Barrett drew an "acknowledgement" instead of a "reply" from Mr. Fay.

About this time, Daniel B. Maher, special assistant corporation counsel, entered upstage, left, through the door labeled "D. C. Commissioners." He's supposed to be the big "hot potato" man for Commissioner Russ Young, buddy of Police Chief Barrett.

Mr. Maher's position as a sort of trouble shooter was, and is, curious. He'd been an assistant district attorney to Mr. Fay before the Commissioners got him for their private use.

First, Mr. Maher paid little private visits to the newspapermen who covered district court. He would sit down with each, separately, sort of cozy, with an air of one about to impart a great confidence, suggesting that he, Mr. Maher, had the real, inside dope on the gambling situation. There wasn't really a $100,000,000 yearly racket, Mr. Maher would whisper, and you couldn't blame police for not making arrests, anyway.

Nobody bit.

So, Mr. Maher drew up a report for Major Barrett, culled, he said, from police statistics.

The gist was that police had been making arrests, but the courts kept refusing to uphold them. Many cases fell through because the courts decided there was insufficient evidence or because the circumstances of the arrests were illegal, and in many instances Mr. Fay's office had refused to prosecute, Mr. Maher's report indicated.

The Times-Herald spread the report on its front page. It accused Mr. Fay of wanting to be a judge. It charged that his only interest in Washington's gambling was his personal ambition.

The Post, on the other hand, thought the report implied bad police work, Chief Barrett, not Mr. Fay, was to blame for the "big-shot" gamblers' immunity.

The News and the Star just went rollin' along, reporting the facts.

Pyramid Clubs had been cooking up, right about then, and Mr. Fay had indicted a bricklayer. The News took a good-naturedly dim view of the indictment, and asked editorially what had become of Mr. Fay's big gambling investigation of a year ago?

Well, what do you know? We had hardly got this printed when last Friday Mr. Fay led a force of United States marshals and former FBI men on a series of raids here and in Maryland. However, the coincidence, we are sure, was purely coincidental, and is not an example of the power of the press.

After Mr. Fay's raid the Post thought the raids proved that Major Barrett should be fired.

The Times-Herald, however, said on page one that Major Barrett's sleuths had furnished the necessary information for the raids. (Just to confuse things a trifle the Times-Herald, on its editorial page, said Mr. Fay had masterminded the raids.)

Two things were immediately significant. No policemen were in the raiding parties. They weren't asked to take part, and they weren't tipped off. The inescapable inference was that Barrett's gendarmes were not to be trusted in these matters. It carried with it the nasty suggestion of police and underworld collusion.

Second, the raids proved there were gambling establishments functioning here, which most persons supposed anyhow, but certainly the raids posed the question publicly: "Where have the cops been all this time?"

However, despite the publicity, these raids apparently didn't net any bigger shots than the police have been pulling in for some time. At least, not yet. Of the 33 men arrested, some 28 have police records. Of these, a good many have records of arrests for gambling. Again, many of these arrests failed to win convictions in court.

A police official yesterday said the evidence Mr. Fay's men collected in last week's raid wasn't any better than the evidence police get in their raids. He said he'd be interested to see whether the fact that Mr. Fay made the arrests would have a greater weight with the courts.

At the same time, up popped the ubiquitous Mr. Maher. He's making another report. Indications are it will be like his last report to Commissioner Young on the same subject. Chief Barrett said he specifically asked Mr. Maher to draw up the report because he felt Mr. Maher knew what the Commissioners wanted.

Today the Post printed a picture of Bernice Franklin, a waitress who gave Mr. Fay information. In the picture, she is attending a party. And surprise, surprise. A couple of alleged gamblers, a policeman, and a couple of Times-Herald employees are among those present. The Post's restraint in the caption under the picture was overwhelming.

Back of all this are two different philosophies on the gambling problem. Major Barrett's seems to be that people will gamble. You can't stop it. So the thing to do is to keep gambling within bounds. Don't let it get away from you. If there's a nice quiet syndicate monopolizing the trade that may be better than rival mobs shooting it out.

Mr. Fay's theory seems to be that gambling, by its illegal nature, flourishes in an atmosphere of crime, encourages crime, and should be reduced to insignificance.

Actually, neither man believes gambling can be completely wiped out. Both aim at its control.

But there is that ominous absence of policemen on Mr. Fay's raids. Mr. Fay, asked point-blank if the grand jury was considering any specific cases of bribery of police officials, said, "no comment," rather than "no."

Meanwhile, in a nook in the new Municipal Building sits Mr. Maher, friend of Russ Young, who in turn is Bob Barrett's friend, writing out reports.

Want to place a small bet? A bet that Mr. Maher's reports are going to show that the police have arrested just about as many alleged gamblers as Mr. Fay's raiders, and of

comparable unimportance, because, as Chief Barrett says, Danny Maher was appointed because Mr. Maher knows "what the Commissions wanted."

Present Postage Rates on Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in 1942 the postage rate on books was 1½ cents per pound. Since then it has been raised to 8 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is now considering again increasing these rates to 9 cents for the first pound and 6 cents for each additional pound.

The future of our democracy depends upon a well-informed and intelligent electorate and nothing does more to develop that intelligence than good books. It may be that handling books costs the postal service a little more than the book buyers pay, but how better can the Government invest a few millions than by spending it to encourage greater book reading by our people? The more the people read, the better equipped they will be to understand and act intelligently on the many diverse and complicated problems now confronting our people.

I append an editorial on this subject from the Portland Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., one of the largest and most influential newspapers on the Pacific coast:

A PENALTY ON BOOKS

For the second time this year, Congress proposes to raise the postal rate on books, from 8 to 9 cents for the first pound, from 4 to 6 cents for each additional pound. This is hardly in keeping with the avowed policy of the United States, which has been to favor by every possible means the diffusion of knowledge. One way to accomplish this has been by permitting books of all kinds to be carried cheaply through the mails. What matter it if a Forever Amber be carried for the same rate as A Study or History; the over-all result has been good.

The present proposal is the fourth of its kind since 1942, when the postal rate on books was raised from 1½ cents to 3 cents a pound. Other rises since have brought the rate to its present 8 cents for the first pound, 4 cents each for subsequent pounds.

This fourth rise now proposed seems to penalize in a most drastic way the diffusion of knowledge, especially in relation to schools and libraries, students and scholars. It will also, if passed, make an aggregate increase in the book rate, since 1942, of 500 percent on the first pound, 300 percent on subsequent pounds. Even in these days of unprecedented costs this would be a tremendous increase. Compared to other rates, to cite an example, it would work out thus: A book weighing 2 pounds mailed from Portland to Seattle or to Medford would require 15 cents postage. Two pounds of rich, fruity, and prehensile chewing gum could be sent to those cities for a mere 11 cents. And while this might be all very well for another branch of the arts, that of the motion picture, it is surely a penalty on books and also a commentary on the stage of civilization we live in.

A Bill for the Release of Mineral Rights on Certain Lands Situated in Bates County, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is introduced and sponsored to correct a rank injustice that exists in my home county of Bates, in the State of Missouri.

The Missouri Defense Relocation Association, Inc., a Government sponsored agency purchased the old English Scully estate holdings of some 40,000 odd acres of land, which it later liquidated to individual purchasers in Bates County, Mo.

These farms range in size from 160 acres to several hundred acres and are of value only for agricultural purposes.

When sale of these lands was first contemplated, appraisals were made by competent appraisors, who were appointed to appraise and establish the value for the purpose of sale to farmers and to be sold without mineral reservations.

The first sales were made but not completed when a decision was made that the principles and policies of section 44 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act pertaining to public lands be made applicable to defense relocation corporations to reserve at least three-fourths of the mineral rights.

The appraisers were recalled and again went over the lands to determine if there was any evidence of minerals or any existing mineral value and to determine the mineral value to be deducted from the original appraisal by reason of the three-fourths mineral reservation now required, and the appraisers after investigation made their report that the mineral rights had no value and nothing was deducted and sales were made on the original appraisal basis.

Some 30,000 acres was sold to individual citizens with a 75 percent mineral reservation and then Public Law 731 with section 9 was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress which was in content as follows: "Any conveyance of real estate by the Government or any Government agency under this act shall include all mineral rights." The remaining 10,000 acres was then sold with no change of appraisal value and without mineral reservation.

Here, gentlemen, is where the injustice arises. We definitely know as did the appraisers, who were trained in this kind of work, that there is no mineral value to this land but three-fourths of the purchasers have paid full value for their lands with an existing 75 percent mineral reservation which is a blot on their title.

I have in my office files a statement from one of the leading insurance companies making farm loans, and I quote, "Our company looks with disfavor on making loans on lands where the mineral rights are gone. We can consider applications in such cases only on outstanding farms, where we have a wide margin of security and where the applicant can make a strong financial statement." I am sure that this reflects the attitude of other companies as well. And also when the same is considered under aforementioned circumstances the applicant is required to purchase title insurance in addition to these other requirements.

Also in the case of a forced sale this injustice is again used as a club on the seller, due to the blot on his title.

I earnestly solicit your support for a correction of this gross injustice.

Achievement of Israel Parallels Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Achievement of Israel Parallels Moses," by Ralph W. Page, appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 28, 1949:

ACHIEVEMENT OF ISRAEL PARALLELS MOSES
(By Ralph W. Page)

The appearance of Aubrey S. Eban, the representative of Israel to the United Nations, at the Bulletin Forum brought home to the citizens of Philadelphia one of the most remarkable episodes in all history.

Eban's appointment to the UN signalized the birth of a nation.

His account of this achievement by his people and their ambition to contribute to the culture and welfare of the Near East and the peace of the world was a modest understatement. Such a demonstration of courage and faith in overcoming insuperable difficulties in pursuit of an ideal has hardly a parallel since Moses led his people out of bondage to the Promised Land.

A handful of Jews, scarce half a million, consisting of a third of the population of a semidesert surrounded by populous hostile states and armies, and representing a little, decimated and persecuted race scattered throughout the planet, undertook to defy not only the Moslem world but the British Empire and conflicting interests of great dynasties to establish their own independent government. To the utmost astonishment of creation, single-handed they defeated all opposition in the field of battle, negotiated honorable peace with their neighbors, kept a unique balance between the conflicting ideologies in the world, and proclaimed a program of cultural, scientific, social, economic, and spiritual cooperative development of the entire region between the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf.

There is every reason to have confidence both in the intent and in the ability of these talented people to further this ambitious

design. Within the limitations of the old regime they have already demonstrated their capacity to revive agriculture, inaugurate industries, establish centers of learning, religion, health, and recreation. And no people can draw upon greater sources of moral convictions, engineering, industrial, scientific, and philosophical knowledge and training.

They believe with reason that they can satisfy their Arab citizens and neighbors of their friendly intentions and show the way for a mutual development of natural resources and social reforms that will revitalize and unify all these seats of ancient civilization.

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 I placed in the RECORD the sixth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 24, is the seventh of the series:

INCOMES OF BRITISH DRUGGISTS DOUBLE UNDER HEALTH PLAN—200,000,000 PRESCRIPTIONS FILLED YEARLY

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Seventh in a series)

LONDON, March 24.—British druggists are harvesting a financial windfall under the free National Health Service, and to such an extent the Government this minute is finding ways to clip their incomes. Druggists do not want to talk about it much; it is a touchy subject, but it is certain their net business incomes, before taxes, have jumped on the average from about $3,000 a year to about $6,000 per annum.

Most druggists do not want to get into this field of discussion at all, and besides, they are too busy compounding medicines to stop for a chat. They are working much longer hours, are pleased over their rise in the economic ladder, think they are doing the best job of any facility engaged in national health work, and do some worrying about what their future may become.

The total number of prescriptions filled in this land in 1 year climbed from 80,000,000 to 200,000,000. The pay per single medicine order is lower, but the volume is what counts. When a druggist will mellow a bit, he will chuckle, admit things are wonderful, and hope he will not be quoted because he would not want to say anything that might interrup this flow of pounds over his counters.

WON HIS FIGHT

The chemist, as he is known here, is a whole-hearted supporter of the National Health Service, even aside from the vast income improvement it has brought into his life. He thinks the people are being helped by it.

One of his great joys is that the druggists have won an age-old fight against the physician who does his own medicine-dispensing. Some 75 percent of British doctors have dispensed their own medicines, to the chagrin of the corner chemist. Now if the doctor does so it is at his own expense, because he cannot collect from the Government for medicines. The Ministry will pay only druggists for such services.

In his elation, though, over the results of setting up a State Health Service, the druggist has a dread that eventually the Government will have its own medicine-dispensing service and he will have to accept a full-time salaried job and like it.

However, that's for the future and everything is rosy now. Let's struggle against that when it comes over the horizon, says one druggist, "maybe there is no dark cloud in back of this pleasant atmosphere in which we have zoomed."

HOW FEES WERE SETTLED

How were the fees for prescription settled upon, one asks. "Well," says a druggist, "we didn't press for any specific rates, the Ministry sent out a committee of investigation, it toured the country checking on the normal income of druggists and we said we would take what it would recommend.

"We suggested that the Ministry wants a first-class service and the way to have it is to pay the going rates, the average that the committee found existed. The committee's report was entirely satisfactory to us and it is so ample that they are looking for some way to cut us down."

"The Government's estimate of the national medicine bill was grossly inadequate," says our druggist, "our service has cost twice as much as was figured and naturally the Ministry finds itself in a vulnerable position as a result. But maybe they wouldn't have gotten the bill through Parliament so easily if the real prospective cost were known. I think even the labor side would not have gone so far. The service might not have become so broad."

"The sequel may be awkward for us," the druggist goes on. "For the last 3 weeks they have been inquiring how they can reduce the cost of this wretched service. The bills really are frightening. Dentists are making $40,000 a year, the same goes for the optical lads and they are going to be cut. Our turn has come up and this very week they are conferring with our representatives to see what can be arranged."

PRESSURE OFF HOSPITALS

One shop owner sees a chance to take a little of the pressure off the hospitals. He figures that if they will let the family doctor order anything he thinks is right, without sending a patient to a hospital for certain unusual kinds of things, the hospital will have that much less to take care of. When some things can be gotten only when one goes to a hospital, the result is the doctor sends you in and you are one patient the hospital need not have received.

The British druggists do not sell a line of general merchandise, as in the United States. They have no soda fountains or lunch bars. They stock medicines, cosmetics, films, and not much more. A few have cigarettes.

They rely on the medicine business. There has not been a sharp drop in their sales of patent medicine, or proprietaries, which is considered strange.

The boom in medicines has created a shortage of journeymen chemists and drugstore managers and the pharmacy schools are being largely attended. A manager of a good drug store receives $2,600 a year and the ordinary pharmacist collects $2,200 a year, both of which salaries are higher than they ever were before. A big chain will pay $4,000 for an especially good store manager.

The government requires the drug stores to be open from 9 in the morning till 6 at night, those are the minimum hours, but most druggists are working later to get out the prescriptions received during the day. In nearly every section a rota plan is in operation. Under it one shop in an area is open at least until 6 p. m. every night for a week. Then another store in the neighborhood does the same for another week.

Address of Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great voices of all time and one of the leaders of sound thought in peace as in war, Hon. Winston Churchill, spoke to a listening world last night from Boston.

All of those whom the RECORD may reach will be grateful for the opportunity of reading this challenging message.

His address follows:

I am honored by your wish that I should take part in the discussions of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. We have suffered in Great Britain by the lack of colleges of university rank in which engineering and the allied subjects are taught. Industrial production depends on technology and it is because the Americans, like the prewar Germans, have realized this and created institutions for the advanced training of large numbers of high-grade engineers to translate the advances of pure science into industrial technique, that their output per head and consequent standard of life are so high. It is surprising that England, which was the first country to be industrialized, has nothing of comparable stature. If tonight I strike other notes than those of material progress, it implies no want of admiration for all the work you have done and are doing. My aim, like yours, is to be guided by balance and proportion.

The outstanding feature of the twentieth century has been the enormous expansion in the numbers who are given the opportunity to share in the larger and more varied life which in previous periods was reserved for the few and for the very few. This process must continue and we trust at an increasing rate. If we are to bring the broad masses of the people in every land to the table of abundance, it can only be by the tireless improvement of all our means of technical production, and by the diffusion in every form of education of an improved quality to scores of millions of men and women. Even in this darkling hour I have faith that this will go on.

I rejoice in Tennyson's lines:

"Men, my brothers, men, the workers, ever reaping something new;
"That which they have done but earnest of the things that they shall do."

I was however a little disquieted that you find it necessary to debate the question, to quote Dr. Burchard's opening address, "Whether the problem of world production yielding at least a minimum living to the whole population can be solved, and whether man has so destroyed the resources of his world that he may be doomed to die of starvation." If, with all the resources of modern science, we find ourselves unable to avert world famine, we shall all be to blame, but a peculiar responsibility would rest upon the scientists. I do not believe they will fail, but if they do, or were not allowed to succeed, the consequences would be very unpleasant because it is certain that mankind would not agree to starve equally, and there might be some very sharp disagreements about how the last crust was to be shared. This would simplify our problem in an unduly primordial manner.

I feel somewhat overawed in addressing this vast scientific and learned audience on

the subjects which your panels are discussing. I have no technical and no university education, and have just had to pick up a few things as I went along. Therefore I speak with a diffidence, which I hope to overcome as I proceed, on these profound scientific, social, and philosophic issues, each of which claims a life-long study for itself, and are now to be examined, as schoolmen would say, not only in their integrity but in their relationship, meaning thereby not only one by one but all together.

I was so glad that in the first instance you asked me to talk about the past rather than to peer into the future because I know more about the past than I do about the future, and I was well content that the President of the United States, whose gift of prophecy was so remarkably vindicated by recent electoral results, should have accepted that task. We all regret that his heavy state duties prevent him from being here tonight. I shall therefore presently have to do a little of the peering myself.

For us in Britain the nineteenth century ended amid the glories of the Victorian era, and we entered upon the dawn of the twentieth in high hope for our country, our empire and the world. The latter and larger part of the nineteenth century had been the period of liberal advance (liberal with a small "l" please). In 1900 a sense of moving hopefully forward to brighter, broader, and easier days was predominant. Little did we guess that what has been called the century of the common man would witness as its outstanding feature more common men killing each other with greater facilities than any other five centuries together in the history of the world. But we entered this terrible twentieth century with confidence. We thought that with improving transportation, nations would get to know each other better. We believed that as they got to know each other better they would like each other more, and that national rivalries would fade in a growing international consciousness. We took it almost for granted that science would confer continual boons and blessings upon us, would give us better meals, better garments, and better dwellings for less trouble, and thus steadily shorten the hours of labor and leave more time for play and culture. In the name of ordered but unceasing progress, we saluted the age of democracy expressing itself ever more widely through parliaments freely and fairly elected on a broad or universal franchise. We saw no reason why men and women should not shape their own home life and careers without being cramped by the growing complexity of the state, which was to be their servant, and the protector of their rights. You had the famous American maxim "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and we both noticed that the world was divided into peoples that owned the governments and governments that owned the peoples. At least I heard all this around that time and liked some of it very much.

I was a minister in the British Liberal Government returned with a great majority in 1906. That new Liberal government arrived in power with much of its message already delivered and most of its aims already achieved. The days of hereditary aristocratic privilege were ended or numbered. The path was opened for talent in every field of endeavor. Primary education was compulsory, universal, and free, or was about to become so. New problems arising from former successes awaited the new administration. The independence of the proletariat from thralldom involved at least a minimum standard of life and labor and security for old age, sickness, and the death of the family breadwinner. It was to these tasks of social reform and insurance that we addressed ourselves. The name of Lloyd George will ever be associated in Great Britain with this new departure. I am proud to have been his lieutenant in this work and also as a Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer and later as head of the wartime national coalition to have carried these same themes further forward on a magnified scale.

Science presently placed novel and dangerous facilities in the hands of the most powerful countries. Humanity was informed that it could make machines that would fly through the air and vessels which could swim beneath the surface of the seas. The conquest of the air and the perfection of the art of flying fulfilled the dream which for thousands of years had glittered in human imagination. Certainly it was a marvelous and romantic event. Whether the bestowal of this gift upon an immature civilization composed of competing nations whose nationalism grew with every advance of democracy and who were as yet devoid of international organization, was a blessing or a curse has yet to be proved. On the whole, I remain an optimist. For good or ill air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man.

The submarine, to do it justice, has never made any claim to be a blessing or even a convenience. I well remember when it became an accomplished military fact of peculiar significance to the British Isles and the British Navy, there was a general belief even in the Admiralty, where I presided, that no nation would ever be so wicked as to use these underwater vessels to sink merchantmen at sea. How could a submarine, it was asked, provide for the safety of the crews of the merchant ships it sank? Public opinion was shocked when old Admiral Fisher bluntly declared that this would be no bar to their being used by the new and growing German Navy in a most ruthless manner. His prediction was certainly not stultified by what was soon to happen.

Here then we have these two novel and potent weapons placed in the hands of highly nationalized sovereign states in the early part of the twentieth century, and both of them dwell with us today for our future edification.

A third unmeasured sphere opened to us as the years passed, which, for the sake of comprehensive brevity I will describe as radar. This radar, with its innumerable variants and possibilities, has so far been the handmaiden of the air, but it has also been the enemy of the submarine and in alliance with the air may well prove its exterminator.

In the first half of the twentieth century, fanned by the crimson wings of war, the conquest of the air affected profoundly human affairs. It made the globe seem much bigger to the mind and much smaller to the body. The human biped was able to travel about far more quickly. This greatly reduced the size of his estate, while at the same time creating an even keener sense of its exploitable value. In the nineteenth century Jules Verne wrote Round the World in 80 Days. It seemed a prodigy. Now you can get around it in four, but you do not see much of it on the way. The whole prospect and outlook of mankind grew immeasurably larger and the multiplication of ideas also proceeded at an incredible rate. This vast expansion was unhappily not accompanied by any noticeable advance in the stature of man, either in his mental faculties or his moral character. His brain got no better, but it buzzed more. The scale of events around him assumed gigantic proportions while he remained about the same size.

By comparison, therefore, he actually became much smaller. We no longer had great men directing manageable affairs. The need was to discipline an array of gigantic and turbulent facts. To this task we have certainly so far proved unequal. Science bestowed immense new powers on man and at the same time created conditions which were largely beyond his comprehension and still more beyond his control. While he nursed the illusion of growing mastery and exulted in his new trappings, he became the sport and presently the victim of tides and currents, of whirlpools and tornadoes, amid which he was far more helpless than he had been for a long time.

Hopeful developments in many directions were proceeding in 1914 on both sides of the Atlantic and seemed to point to an age of peace and plenty when suddenly violent events broke in upon them. For more than 40 years there had been no major war in Europe. Indeed, since the Civil War in the United States, there had been no great struggle in the west. A spirit of adventure stirred the minds of men and was by no means allayed by the general advance of prosperity and science. On the contrary, prosperity meant power and science offered weapons. We read in the Bible, "Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked." For several generations Britannia had ruled the waves—for long periods at less cost annually than that of a single modern battleship.

History will say that this great trust was not abused. American testimony about the early period of the Monroe Doctrine is upon record. There was the suppression of the slave trade. During our prolonged period of naval supremacy undeterred by the rise of foreign tariffs, we opened our ports freely to the commerce of the world. Our colonial and oriental empire, even our coastal trade, was free to the shipping of all the nations on equal terms. We in no way sought to obstruct the rise of other states or navies. For nearly the whole of the nineteenth century the monopoly of sea power in British hands was a trust discharged faithfully in the general interest. But now in the first decade of the twentieth century with new patterns of warships, naval rivalries became acute and fierce. Civilized governments began to think in dreadnaughts. It would in such a setting have been very difficult to prevent the First World War.

There was, of course, one way—one way then as now—the creation of an international instrument, strong enough to adjust the disputes of nations and enforce its decisions against an aggressor. Much wisdom, eloquence, and earnest effort was devoted to this theme in which the United States took the lead, but we only got as far as the World Court at The Hague and improvements in the Geneva Convention. The impulses toward a trial of strength in Europe were the stronger. Germany, demanding her place in the sun, was faced by a resolute France with her military honor to regain. England, in accordance with her foreign policy of 300 years, sustained the weaker side. France found an ally in the Russia of the czars and Germany in the crumbling empire of the Hapsburgs. The United States, for reasons which were natural and traditional, but no longer so valid as in the past, stood aloof and expected to be able to watch as a spectator, the thrilling, fearful drama unfold from across what was then called "the broad Atlantic." These expectations were not borne out by what happened.

High hopes and spacious opportunities awaited the victorious Allies when they assembled at Versailles after 4½ years of hideous mechanical slaughter, illuminated by infinite sacrifice, but not remarkably relieved by strategy or generalship. War, stripped of every pretension of glamour or

romance had been brought home to the masses of the peoples in forms never before experienced except by the defeated. To stop another war was the supreme object and duty of the statesmen who met as friends and allies around the peace table. They made great errors. The doctrine of self-determination was not the remedy for Europe, which needed above all things, unity and larger groupings. The idea that the vanquished could pay the expenses of the victors was a destructive and crazy delusion. The failure to strangle bolshevism at its birth and to bring Russia, then prostrate, by one means or another, into the general democratic system lies heavy upon us today. Nevertheless the statesmen at Versailles, largely at the inspiration of President Wilson, an inspiration implemented effectively by British thought, created the League of Nations. This is their defense before history, and had the League been resolutely sustained and used, it would have saved us all.

This was not to be. Another ordeal even more appalling than the first lay before us. Even when so much else had failed we could have obtained a prolonged peace, lasting all our lives at least, simply by keeping Germany disarmed in accordance with the treaty and by treating her with justice and magnanimity. This latter condition was very nearly achieved at Locarno in 1926, but the failure to enforce the disarmament clauses and, above all, to sustain the League of Nations, both of which purposes could easily have been accomplished, brought upon us the Second World War. Once again the English-speaking world gloriously but narrowly emerged, bleeding and breathless, but united as we never were before. This unity is our present salvation, because after all our victories, we are now faced by perils, both grave and near, and by problems more dire than have ever confronted Christian civilization, even in this twentieth century of storm and change.

There remains, however, a key of deliverance. It is the same key which was searched for by those who labored to set up the World Court at The Hague in the early years of the century. It is the same conception as animated President Wilson and his colleagues at Versailles, namely, the creation of a world instrument capable at least of giving to all its members security against aggression. The United Nations organization which has been erected under the inspiring leadership of my great wartime friend, President Roosevelt, in place of the former League, has so far been rent and distracted by the antagonism of Soviet Russia and by the fundamental schism which has opened between communism and the rest of mankind. But we must not despair. We must persevere, and if the gulf continues to widen, we must make sure that the cause of freedom is defended by all the resources of combined forethought and superior science. Here lies the best hope of averting a third world struggle and a sure means of coming through it without being enslaved or destroyed.

One of the questions which we are debating here is defined as "the failure of social and political institutions to keep pace with material and technical change." Scientists should never underrate the deep-seated qualities of human nature and how, repressed in one direction, they will certainly break out in another. The genus homo—if I may display my Latin—is a tough creature who has traveled here by a very long road. His nature has been shaped and his virtues ingrained by many millions of years of struggle, fear, and pain, and his spirit has, from the earliest dawn of history, shown itself upon occasion capable of mounting to the sublime, far above material conditions or mortal terrors. He still remains as Pope described him 200 years ago:

"Placed on this isthmus of a middle state
A being darkly wise and rudely great
Created half to rise and half to fall,
Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all.
Sole judge of truth in endless error hurled,
The glory, jest, and riddle of the world."

In his introductory address Dr. Burchard, the dean of humanities, spoke with awe of "an approaching scientific ability to control men's thoughts with precision." I shall be very content if my task in this world is done before that happens. Laws just or unjust may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery of propaganda may pack their minds with falsehood and deny them truth for many generations of time. But the soul of man thus held in trance or frozen in a long night can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where and in a moment the whole structure of lies and oppression is on trial for its life. Peoples in bondage should never despair. Science, no doubt, could, if sufficiently perverted, exterminate us all, but it is not in the power of material forces in any period, which the youngest here tonight need take into practical account, to alter the main elements in human nature or restrict the infinite variety of forms in which the soul and genius of the human race can and will express itself.

How right you are in this great institution of technical study and achievement to keep a dean of humanities and give him so commanding a part to play in your discussions! No technical knowledge can outweight knowledge of the humanities in the gaining of which philosophy and history walk hand in hand. Our inheritance of well-founded, slowly conceived codes of honor, morals, and manners, the passionate convictions which so many hundreds of millions share together of the principles of freedom and justice, are far more precious to us than anything which scientific discoveries could bestow. Those whose minds are attracted or compelled to rigid and symmetrical systems of government should remember that logic, like science, must be the servant and not the master of man. Human beings and human societies are not structures that are built or machines that are forged. They are plants that grow and must be tended as such. Life is a test and this world a place of trial. Always the problems or it may be the same problem will be presented to every generation in different forms. The problems of victory may be even more baffling than those of defeat. However much the conditions change, the supreme question is how we live and grow and bloom and die, and how far each life conforms to standards which are not wholly related to space or time.

Here I speak not only to those who enjoy the blessings and consolation of revealed religion but also to those who face the mysteries of human destiny alone. The flame of Christian ethics is still our highest guide. To guard and cherish it is our first interest, both spiritually and materially. The fulfillment of spiritual duty in our daily life is vital to our survival. Only by bringing it into perfect application can we hope to solve for ourselves the problems of this world and not of this world alone.

I cannot speak to you here tonight without expressing to the United States—as I have perhaps some right to do—the thanks of Britain and of Europe for the splendid part America is playing in the world. Many nations have risen to the summit of human affairs, but here is a great example where new-won supremacy has not been used for self-aggrandizement but only for further sacrifice.

Three years ago I spoke at Fulton under the auspices of President Truman. Many people here and in my own country were startled and even shocked by what I said. But events have vindicated and fulfilled in much detail the warnings which I deemed it my duty to give at that time.

Today there is a very different climate of opinion. I am in cordial accord with much that is being done. We have, as dominating facts, the famous Marshall aid, the new unity in western Europe and now the Atlantic Pact. How has this tremendous change in our outlook and policy been accomplished? The responsible ministers in all the countries concerned deserve high credit. There is credit enough for all. In my own country the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, who has come here to sign the Atlantic Pact, has shown himself indifferent to mere party popularity in dealing with these great national issues. He has shown himself, like many American public men, above mere partisan interest in dealing with these national and world issues. No one could, however, have brought about these immense changes in the feeling of the United States, Great Britain, and Europe but for the astounding policy of the Russian Soviet Government. We may well ask, "Why have they deliberately acted so as to unite the free world against them?" It is certainly not because there are not very able men among them. Why have they done it? I offer you my own answer to this strange conundrum. It is because they fear the friendship of the west more than its hostility. They cannot afford to allow free and friendly intercourse to grow up between the vast area they control and the civilization of the west. The Russian people must not see what goes on outside, and the world must not see what goes on inside the Soviet domain. Thirteen men in the Kremlin, holding down hundreds of millions of people and aiming at the rule of the world, feel that at all costs they must keep up the barriers. Self-preservation, not for Russia but for themselves, lies at the root and is the explanation of their sinister and malignant policy.

In consequence of the Soviet conduct the relations of Communist Russia with the other great powers of the world are without precedent in history. Measures and countermeasures have been taken on many occasions which in any previous period could only have meant armed conflict. The situation has been well described by distinguished Americans as the cold war. And the question is asked are we winning the cold war? This cannot be decided by looking at Europe alone. We must also look to Asia. The worst disaster since our victory has been the collapse of China under Communist attack and intrigue. China, in which the United States has always taken a high interest, comprises an immense part of the population of the world. The absorption of China and India into the Kremlin-controlled Communist empire, would certainly bring measureless bloodshed and misery to eight or nine hundred million people.

On the other hand the position in Europe has so far been successfully maintained. The prodigious effort of the Berlin air lift has carried us through the winter. Time, though dearly bought, has been gained for peace. The efficiency of the American and British air forces has been proved and improved. Most of all the spectacle of the British and Americans trying to feed the two million Germans in Berlin, while the Soviet Government was trying to starve them, has been an object lesson to the German people far beyond anything that words could convey. I trust that small and needless provocations of German sentiment may be avoided by the Western Powers. The revival and

union of Europe cannot be achieved without the earnest and freely given aid of the German people.

The air lift has fully justified itself. Nevertheless fear and its shadows brood over western Europe today. A month ago in Brussels I spoke to a meeting of 30,000 Belgians. I could feel at once their friendship and their anxiety. They have no Atlantic Ocean, no English Channel, between them and the Russian Communist armored divisions. Yet they bravely and ardently support the cause of united Europe. I was also conscious of the hope and faith which they, like the Greek people, place in the United States.

We are now confronted with something quite as wicked but in some ways more formidable than Hitler, because Hitler had only the Herrenvolk pride and anti-Semitic hatred to exploit. He had no fundamental theme. But these 13 men in the Kremlin have their hierarchy and a church of Communist adepts, whose missionaries are in every country as a fifth column, awaiting the day when they hope to be the absolute masters of their fellow countrymen and pay off old scores. They have their anti-God religion and their Communist doctrine of the entire subjugation of the individual to the state. Behind this stands the largest army in the world, in the hands of a government pursuing imperialist expansion, as no czar or kaiser had ever done.

I must not conceal from you the truth as I see it. It is certain that Europe would have been communized and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States.

Another question is also asked, Is time on our side? That is not a question that can be answered except within strict limits. We have certainly not an unlimited period of time before a settlement should be achieved. The utmost vigilance should be practiced. But I do not think myself that violent or precipitate action should be taken now. War is not inevitable. The Germans have a wise saying, "The trees do not grow up to the sky." Often something happens to turn or mitigate the course of events. Four or five hundred years ago Europe seemed about to be conquered by the Mongols. Two great battles were fought almost on the same day near Vienna and in Poland. In both of these the chivalry and armed power of Europe was completely shattered by the Asiatic hordes. It seemed that nothing could avert the doom of the famous continent from which modern civilization and culture have spread throughout the world. But at the critical moment the Great Khan died. The succession was vacant and the Mongol armies and their leaders trooped back on their ponies across the 7,000 miles which separated them from their capital in order to choose a successor. They never returned till now.

We need not abandon hope or patience. Many favorable processes are on foot. Under the impact of communism all the free nations are being welded together as they never have been before and never could be but for the harsh external pressure to which they are being subjected. We have no hostility to the Russian people and no desire to deny them their legitimate rights and security. I hoped that Russia, after the war, would have access, through unfrozen waters, into every ocean, guaranteed by the world organization of which she would be a leading member; that she should have the freest access, which indeed she has at the present time, to raw materials of every kind; and that the Russians everywhere would be received as brothers in the human family. That still remains our aim and ideal. We seek nothing from Russia but good will and fair play. If, however, there is to be a war of nerves, let us make sure our nerves are strong and are fortified by the deepest convictions of our hearts. If we preserve steadfastly together, and allow no appeasement of tyranny and wrongdoing in any form, it may not be our nerve or the structure of our civilization which will break, and peace may yet be preserved.

This is a hard experience in the life of the world. After our great victory, which we believed would decide the struggle for freedom for our time at least, we thought we had deserved better of fortune. But unities and associations are being establishes by many nations throughout the free world with a speed and reality which would not have been achieved perhaps for generations. Of all these unities, the one most precious to me is the fraternal association between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States. Do not underrate the strength of Britain. As I said at Fulton, "Do not suppose that half a century from now you will not see seventy or eighty millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defense of our traditions, our way or life and the world causes which you and we espouse." United we stand secure.

Let us then move forward together in discharge of our mission and our duty, fearing God and nothing else.

Academic Freedom Versus Communist Indoctrination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Academic Freedom Versus Communist Indoctrination, which I delivered today to the graduating class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Hoover, members of the law enforcement graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to be invited by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to speak to the graduates of the fortieth session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy. I extend to you my sincere congratulations.

I am familiar with the origin and history of the FBI National Academy and I know, as you do, that it was born out of the inspiration and law-enforcement statesmanship of J. Edgar Hoover.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy is but one of the examples which the Director of the Bureau of Federal Investigation has set showing that our Federal Government can cooperate with State and local governmental departments without in any way diminishing local self-government responsibilities or substituting Federal jurisdiction and domination for local governmental prerogatives. The record of cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with State and local law-enforcement agencies has been responsible largely in recent years for greater public support in all of our States for improved law-enforcement services.

The standards and examples set by the FBI with respect to the direct relationship between high standards of qualifications for personnel and efficient law enforcement have caused many State legislatures, city councils, and county boards throughout America to reorganize their police administration in the interest of a more scientific law-enforcement program. The demonstration by the FBI that law enforcement on a Federal level should be, can be, and must be kept free of political influences has done much to encourage law-enforcement administrators on local governmental levels to win public support for the sound position that political patronage and political fixing should have no place or recognition in police administration.

For a good many years I served as dean of the State university law school in my State and taught criminal law and criminal procedure. It was my view that a law school should work in close cooperation with the law-enforcement agencies of the State if its graduates were to perform with understanding their duties as officers of the courts.

It has always seemed to me that too many lawyers practicing in our criminal courts, be they prosecutors or defense lawyers, fail to fully appreciate the fact that in the first instance they are officers of the court charged with the professional responsibility of helping the court and jury do justice in accordance with American principles of justice as set out in the law. I am afraid that too many prosecutors assume that their primary duty is to convict defendants charged with crime and too many defense lawyers assume that their primary duty is to acquit defendants charged with crime. Both groups of lawyers too frequently overlook the fact that their primary duty is to serve as officers of the court in establishing the facts involved in the alleged crimes so that the court and jury can render justice as determined by the facts.

It is this desire of prosecutors to convict and defense attorneys to acquit which so frequently gives rise to those abuses and questionable tactics on both sides of the case for which the legal profession is so often criticized. In their desire to either convict or acquit too many lawyers too frequently come to look upon police and law-enforcement officers as forces of opposition in specific cases if they discover that the evidence to be offered by the law-enforcement officer does not accord with their theory of the case. Such lawyers forget that the police and law-enforcement officers, too, are officers of the court charged with the same solemn obligation of assisting the court in doing justice.

I think, and I say it advisedly, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the leadership of Mr. Hoover, has been the greatest educational force in the country in improving the understanding of the legal profession as to its inseparable partnership with law-enforcement agencies in aiding our courts to administer justice in accordance with the facts. I could enumerate many examples in my own State of the educational services to the legal profession which the FBI has rendered. I remember, as a member of the Oregon Crime Commission, the close cooperation which we received from the FBI on police administration phases of our work. Never did the FBI fail to cooperate with us in connection with any law-enforcement program put on by the law school or by our State and county bar associations.

I know that the emphasis of the FBI upon scientific police methods and incorruptible law-enforcement procedures has won the admiration of the legal profession not only in my State but throughout the Nation. What is more it has made prosecutors and defense attorneys more appreciative of their primary public duty as officers of the court to see to it that justice is done in accordance with facts involved in individual cases.

This Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy is one of the signal educa-

tional services for improved law enforcement rendered by the Bureau. However, I hope that during your course of training in the FBI National Academy you have been inspired by the fact that it symbolizes more than improved law enforcement. I hope that you appreciate the fact that it offers more than a professional course of training in police problems and their solution. I trust that your work and study in the Academy has broadened your vision and understanding of the essential elements of American justice.

If you will reflect for a moment upon the course of study you have just completed I think you will agree with me that underlying it all has been an emphasis upon the basic principle that American justice flows from the constitutional rights of the individual person. Further, I think you will agree with me that the FBI National Academy sought to instill in you a much deeper appreciation of the rights, privileges, freedoms and obligations of American citizenship. Thus, rather than talk to you today about any technical phase of police administration I want to discuss very briefly one phase of the threat of communism, to the freedom of the individual in America.

I would entitle my remarks, "Academic Freedom Versus Communist Indoctrination." As you know, a controversy is raging in American educational circles today over the issue, Does academic freedom entitle Communists to teach in our schools?

To my way of thinking it doesn't make any difference whether the individual is a policeman, a farmer, a factory worker, a professional man, or a citizen in any other walk of life, we all in America are confronted today with the obligation of rededicating ourselves in support of the principles of our system of justice which protect the rights of the individual but at the same time place upon him the duty of respecting the rights of others.

There unquestionably is a clash of ideologies in the world today which threatens its peace. Great world forces are organizing against the threat of communism because they know that the rights of the individual existing in a free state are shackled in a totalitarian state.

I am afraid that too many people have forgotten that our economic system and our political system are inseparable. We cannot have individual rights and liberties as set out in our Constitution under any totalitarian economy. We cannot maintain the foundation principle of democratic government under a totalitarian economy.

When we speak in our country about the importance of the principle of self-government which is basic to our political philosophy, namely, that the people are the masters and not the servants of the state, we speak of a principle which rests on the concept that the individual is all-important in our American way of political thinking. On the other hand, under the Communist form of government, the individual is but an item of human fodder with which to feed the totalitarian appetitie of the state. It is very difficult to reconcile in the interest of peace the political philosophies of communism and democracy, but we must try to find some basis on which the two philosophies can live in peace in the world. I say that because if we are going to avoid a war which would result in the killing of millions of human beings, living under both Communist and democratic governmental systems today, we must face the cold, hard fact that some mutually satisfactory understanding for peaceful relationships must be reached.

I am not one of those who believe that the Russian people are being held in complete subjugation or in involuntary servitude by the Russian leaders. The evidence is very much against such a point of view, although there are those in this country who are trying to convince us that the Russian people are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist regime.

It would be rather reassuring and hopeful if one could believe that the Russian people are anti-Communist. The facts, however, point to the contrary. The facts indicate that the Russian leaders have succeeded with a program of indoctrination and propaganda since the Russian Revolution in convincing the Russian people generally that the communistic form of government offers the only hope of survival for the Russian people.

We Americans need to remember that the Russian people have been convinced that we intend to make war upon them and that they must proceed as rapidly as possible to prepare for that war no matter what the personal sacrifice and hardship may be. It appears evident that the Russian people are making tremendous sacrifices and undergoing great hardships in carrying out the propaganda dictates of the Russian Politburo.

Part of the Russian strategy is a program of infiltration into the free governments of the world so that in case of another war the Communists will be in a position to do internal damage to those free governments, including our own. This tactic of infiltration is characteristic of totalitarian techniques as used by Hitler as well as by the Russians. We cannot ignore the fact that a spread of the communistic philosophy in America is itself a threat to the great spiritual values of our form of government.

Although we must recognize this danger we must be careful at the same time not to become alarmists. We must be careful not to become Red-baiters in the negative sense. But on the other hand we must not close our minds to evidence and proof of Communist infiltration into our American institutions.

In discussing infiltration tactics I would caution you to remember that we must try to lean over backward in controlling our emotional attitudes toward communistic activities. Keen perception and cool-headed statesmanship are better weapons to use against the infiltrating techniques of Communists than is the adoption of police-state methods on our own part in an attempt to combat an ideology which seeks to destroy us. It is very difficult to remain coldly analytical of the tactics of Communists but it is only by cold analyses that we can properly appraise the nature and methods of our Communist opposition.

What are some of the American institutions through which the Communists may be expected to infiltrate and spread their insidious propaganda against the spiritual values of democracy? We may be sure that they will attempt to infiltrate into every American institution which offers them any opportunity for the creation of a Communist cell. That they have tried and are trying to infiltrate their propaganda into the educational systems of America is self-evident. Under the name of academic freedom they seek to carry out an indoctrination program.

Now, I would caution you to watch out for witch hunts in our educational systems conducted by those who do not believe in academic freedom. We will defeat the purposes of democracy if our counterattack on communistic infiltration takes the form of police-state methods which destroy an untrammeled search for the truth in the halls of learning of our educational institutions.

Twenty-one years of my life have been spent as a teacher in university classrooms, and I know that one of the greatest obstacles to academic freedom is the attempt from time to time, on the part of prejudiced groups, to stifle the untrammeled search for the truth in our halls of learning. The great Biblical tenet of American free education, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is too precious to be shackled by academic censorship or the right of free minds to search out the truth no matter what shibboleths or existing prejudices must be pierced in finding the truth.

However, academic freedom is not synonymous with license to destroy that freedom. I fail to follow the logic of some of our educators who are arguing these days that the preservation of academic freedom in the colleges of America requires the recognition of a right of teachers to become Communists and retain their teaching positions. I say that I cannot accept that argument for the obvious reason that true Communists do not possess free minds but rather are indoctrinators of a philosophy which seeks to promote revolution and reduce our people to the dictates of a totalitarian form of government. Such teachers are not teachers at all, seeking to lead students through an objective analysis of governmental philosophies. Such teachers do not possess the devotion of the scientists to the findings of the facts but rather such Communist teachers, in order to carry out their indoctrination objectives, must necessarily slant their teachings away from the facts.

Granted, that looking at the problem from the standpoint of an isolated case here and there, the danger does not seem to be too alarming, nevertheless when one looks at the Communist strategy pattern as a whole, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the danger is a very real one. I am not one who believes that students in political science, philosophy, economics, and other courses taught in the social sciences, should not study the Communist philosophies, because obviously we cannot have an intelligent, educated point of view in regard to the dangers of communism if we do not have an informed and enlightened public opinion in regard to the nature of communism. However, that is quite a different thing from taking the position that the taxpayers should pay for the teaching of communism in either a veiled or unveiled form by Communists on our college faculties.

I see no principle of academic freedom involved in a refusal on the part of university administrations or boards of education to allow Communists to teach on their faculties. To the contrary, it seems obvious to me that we would soon lose academic freedom in our country—as it has been lost in Russia if a Communist educational policy should ever come to prevail in our school system.

In other words, I don't think it is necessary to have a Communist on a faculty in order to make certain that the students will be given an opportunity to analyze the Communist philosophy.

Therefore, it seems to me that any attempt to pervert academic freedom into a license for Communists to teach in our schools should be rejected. I say that fully appreciating the fact that undoubtedly there are some American teachers who are sincere critics of the abuses of capitalism and of social and economic injustice in America and who are falsely accused of being Communists or fellow travelers simply because they present to their students critical analyses of some of the shortcomings of our own system of government. However, false and unwarranted attacks against liberal teachers in our American educational system can be answered and the teacher concerned can be protected in his academic rights without taking the extreme position that academic freedom immunizes teachers from any examination of what they teach or of any consideration of their loyalty to our form of government.

Academic freedom certainly should not become a sanctuary for propagandists. Academic freedom certainly should not become

a refuge and protector of indoctrination. It is to be granted that drawing a line between freedom and license is always a difficult one and requires the exercise of tolerant and exceedingly intelligent judgment. However, the difficulty of the task of determining what falls within the realm of academic freedom and what endangers academic freedom by way of perversion through indoctrination does not justify either school authorities or our citizenry generally in throwing up their hands in surrender when confronted by any attempt, subtle or otherwise, of Communists and Fascists to infiltrate into our educational system. Any such challenge to freedom of education presented by indoctrination tactics must be met head-on. Thus, I do not share the point of view that the President of the University of Washington, acting through the board of regents of that great institution, violated academic freedom by removing from the faculty any avowed Communists.

I do not take the position that students should not hear speeches by Communists because I do not believe in thought-control tactics or in police-state methods. It must be granted that we do not answer or rebut communistic fallacies by refusing to listen to them. That is quite a different thing from impressing upon students through a teaching position a constant bombardment of indoctrination of Communist propaganda presented in the name of academic freedom. It is one thing for students to go voluntarily to a lecture by a known Communist or Fascist-minded person out of intellectual curiosity or desire to try to analyze and understand the point of view of the speaker but it is quite a different thing to impose in the name of academic freedom a subversive teacher on the students of any school.

Therefore, it is one thing to take the position, as I take the position, that true academic freedom forbids us from excluding from critical analysis and study in our schools any of the political, social, and economic philosophies which throughout history have contested for the support of peoples and quite a different thing to take the position that academic freedom permits any classroom in our free-school system to become a propaganda rostrum for the indoctrination of totalitarian doctrines. The proposition is unacceptable to say in the name of academic freedom that in order to give students a background and an understanding of the philosophy of communism, for example, we ought to put on our teaching staffs teachers who are seeking to lead them by way of propaganda into accepting the notion that the American systems of political democracy and economic capitalism are a failure in that they deny basic human rights.

As a liberal in American politics I hold to the view that any form of totalitarianism, communistic or otherwise, is incompatible with individual liberty and with protecting the spiritual value and dignity of the person. Our American system of a political democracy combined with a capitalistic economy has advanced human rights and provided for human needs to a degree far superior to that which has been developed under any other political and economic system in all history.

As citizens in that democracy I trust that as you go back to your local communities your experiences here in Washington will have inspired you to a renewed faith in the basic principles of individual liberty on which American justice rests. I trust that you will have a better understanding of the fact that personal freedom does not mean license to undermine through indoctrination of totalitarian objectives our American system of self-government.

A London Longshoreman in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by a Los Angeles Times correspondent and an editorial commenting on the article, appearing in the Los Angeles Times.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 24, 1949]

A LONDON LONGSHOREMAN DOESN'T MISS CALIFORNIA

(By Waldo Drake)

LONDON.—California is far from being the land of opportunity for the British workingman, according to Don Cooper, a London longshoreman.

Cooper ought to know. He and his family of four are back home in Dagenham, Essex, after 3 months in Los Angeles County. They didn't like it.

Just a year ago, Mr. Cooper, who is 54, and his wife Maud, with their daughter May, 26, their son Bill, 23, and a family friend, Joe Buckingham, 38, sailed from London to live in Bellflower, where they had a brand-new house waiting for them.

During the war their daughter Grace, 27, had married an American soldier, Thomas D. Massey, 42, who now has a flourishing meat market in Long Beach. When Grace persuaded her family to come to California she and her husband built another bungalow alongside their own home at 15416 Clark Avenue, Bellflower. It was ready for them when they arrived, after crossing the Atlantic in the Cunarder *Queen Elizabeth* as tourist passengers for $165 apiece and the transcontinental rail trip for $72.

ALL GOT JOBS

Mr. Cooper, the elder, who has a disarming sense of humor, was lucky enough to get a visitors' card from the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, at San Pedro, and went to work handling cargo on the Los Angeles waterfront. Son Bill and Joe Birmingham also quickly landed jobs as bricklayer's helpers on a power-plant installation at Wilmington.

All three were joyful at the outset. Don was to get $1.50 an hour, with abundant overtime, and the youngsters would get $1.75 an hour, three times their rate of pay in London. But their hopes were quickly dashed. They had to work too hard.

"British workmen wouldn't stand for the things that happen in California," said Don. "Those longshore foremen are real 'drivers,' and if you even answer them back, they can 'sack' you—just like that."

QUOITS CHAMPION

Don Cooper is a strapping 6-footer, with a ruddy, lean face, reminiscent of a Sioux chieftain. He looks 10 years younger than his 54 years and is still one of Britain's leading quoits players. He was Australian champion in 1916, and all-England champion in 1927 and 1932. But he found the cargo-handling pace too strenuous and the weather too hot, he says.

"The Yanks do get through a lot of cargo and they make more money," Don admitted, "but what does it get them? It makes them old men before they know it.

"They handle more goods than we do here at Tillbury because they are willing to use mechanical loaders and gadgets like them. Our dockers won't go for those machines, because they put men out of work."

Mr. Cooper complained that the California longshoreman is a slave of the hiring hall system. He had to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning, he explained, in order to be in the Wilmington hiring hall in time for the morning call for men for the 8 a. m. shift.

GET PAID ANYHOW

"If your name wasn't called that morning, you had to stick around all day and night, or lose your turn," he said, "In London, the dockers wouldn't stand for that. We report twice a day and get some pay even if we aren't called."

His son Bill and Joe Birmingham had a similar doleful tale as bricklayer's helpers.

"We had to keep the bricklayer supplied with bricks," said Bill, "and did he make us work. He kept us on the dead run—in that heat and sun—and kept shouting at us for more bricks. That's the trouble with American labor. Everybody is on piecework and trying to make too much money.

"Over there the workers get paid for a lot of overtime," Bill admitted, "but the British workman doesn't want overtime pay. He would have to pay most of it back as income tax. The Americans were complaining to us about heavy taxes to feed the British. We told them they didn't know what taxes meant. The British worker gives back a third of his pay as income tax."

UNCERTAIN EMPLOYMENT

At this point, the elder Cooper interceded to say that the main reason the family voted to return to England, after 3 months, was not the arduous labor, but uncertainty of employment. The ILWU refused to renew Don's visitor's card after 3 months. Bill and Joe also preferred their steady jobs, at a third the pay, at Gamages Department Store in London.

Mrs. Cooper said the five members of the family subsisted in California for less than $80 a week, but that back in Dagenham they are living on $30. They pay only $30 rent for their tiny, doll-like, two-story cottage in Dagenham, one of a thousand little "peas-in-a-pod" houses near London's Tilbury docks on the Thames.

Don Cooper admits California workers get more—and better—food than British laborers' drab and scanty fare. But, he says, they don't appreciate it.

BIG CAR CRAZE

"Every California longshoreman thinks he has to have a big automobile," he said, "but all a British docker wants is a home and food for his family and plenty of leisure."

"Working people are much better off in England," cut in young Bill, "because the social-security plan insures them against want and gives them free care when they are sick."

Bill thinks Britain's nationalized medicine is a great forward step in socialism. He said the workingman isn't concerned that the scheme so far is being largely supported by public funds.

"All we know is that it only takes a dollar a week out of your pay," he said. "In California many doctors and hospitals won't even take a workingman's case unless he can pay in advance."

Don Cooper is sure that Britain's Labor Government will be retained by next year's elections, provided there is continued American aid to support economic recovery.

HOMESICK FOR PUB

"Poor old Churchill!" said Don. "He's traveling with the wrong crowd."

Don said the whole family was homesick for Dagenham's long summer evenings, but that he particularly missed his neighborhood pub, the Anglers.

"I'm not really a drinking man," he explained, "but you don't feel at home in an American bar.

"Down at the Anglers Bill Goffe will let you make a night of it with one glass of stout. But in a place in San Pedro the bartender clanged a big bell if a fellow didn't finish off his drink straight away. I've never been so embarrassed in my life."

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 24, 1949]

IN SPITE OF ALL TEMPTATIONS

Times Correspondent Waldo Drake interview with Don Cooper, a London longshoreman returned to Tilbury docks after an unsatisfactory interlude in southern California, ought to be required reading for bleeding hearts who think the whole world yearns to live in the American way.

As he tells it, Cooper didn't have such a bad go. His American son-in-law built him a house here, the water-front union gave him a visitor's card, and he and his two sons went immediately to work at wages unheard of in Great Britain. They made far more money, paid less taxes, ate better food than ever before.

But they didn't like it. After 3 months they packed up and went back to England. Any American who has seen both countries finds this well-nigh impossible to explain. Cooper doesn't.

In the first place, says Cooper, Americans work too hard. They make a lot of overtime but they don't have any leisure. They use a lot of machines that British trade unionists taboo because they supposedly put men out of work. Of course they do move a lot of cargo, but who cares about that?

"Every California longshoreman thinks he has to have a big automobile," he complains, "but all a British docker wants is a home and food for his family and plenty of leisure."

Here is pointed refutation of much prattle about the solidarity of the working class. The goals of labor in Britain obviously are not identical with the wants of American labor, although culturally and historically the two classes are about as close as any.

Don Cooper is not a lazy man, but he is an Englishman. His experience bears out W. S. Gilbert's familiar lyric:

> "But in spite of all temptations
> To belong to other nations,
> He remains an Englishman."

Other Englishmen, conservatives and capitalists, rared up with vigor when it was suggested that American production experts, in connection with ERP, might share some know-how with their backward English brothers.

For his part Cooper thinks Americans are incredibly backward in such matters as socialized medicine and cradle-to-grave security. He points out that London dockers get paid something even when they get no call to work.

Drake reports that Cooper is confident the Labor Government will be retained in power so long as there is continued American aid to support England's recovery.

A similar conclusion, from another viewpoint, was given in Los Angeles by visiting British Publisher Cecil Palmer.

"Our standard of living under socialism is lower, I am sorry to admit, than it has ever been in my lifetime," said Palmer. "If it were not for your generosity * * * we would be faced in 3 months with 1,500,000 unemployed."

There seems to be no doubt that American dollars are sustaining Britain's Socialist experiment, in what Winston Churchill calls a fool's purgatory.

But the key to Cooper's personal preference for London over Los Angeles lies, we suspect somewhat deeper than his Socialist leanings. The highly touted California sunshine bothered him; he sighed for the very climate Americans regard as the world's worst. Nor did he care for San Pedro's garish saloons; he was homesick for his old pub, the Anglers, "where Bill Goffe will let you make a night of it with one glass of stout."

Men cannot be made all in the same pattern; it would be a dull world if they were. Call it provincialism if you will, the attachment to familiar ways and places is an important part of human happiness, and if Mr. Cooper is happier in Essex, why, we wish him well.

What's Right With America—Radio Commentary by W. Earl Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, assorted and sundry critics and cynics these days utilize the slightest of provocation to find fault with what goes on in America. They criticize our American enterprise system, our balance of powers, our legislative procedures, our political independence, our private initiative and private profit system, and virtually every social, political, or economic process or condition in this Republic. I have no fault to find with those whose specialty is criticism or with those who deem it their mission in life consistently to focus attention upon the things which are wrong, and never speak up for the things which are right with America.

On the other hand, I earnestly believe it would be good for us all if we could have a "What's right with America" week in which all of us for that week alone would concentrate without exception or reservation upon pointing out and emphasizing the many things which are right with this Republic and the reasons why we have unquestionably become the leading country of this earth.

Consistent with what I consider to be the increasing need to focus attention occasionally upon what is right with America, I have secured much inspiration and gratification from a radio-editorial written by an old friend of mine, W. Earl Hall, editor of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette. I am placing this bit of writing—entitled "It's Time To Speak Up for Democracy"—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that it will stimulate still others to speak up, and that each and all of us may do our part to stress and publicize some of the fundamental concepts and procedures which, after all, have made America great and kept it strong. So I ask unanimous consent that this, his commentary, may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION—IT'S TIME TO SPEAK UP FOR DEMOCRACY

(A radio commentary by W. Earl Hall)

One day not long ago a crowd of 150 youths swooped on the Illinois State Legislature, denouncing and ridiculing the American way of life and loudly and proudly proclaiming, "We are Communists." They were from two college campuses, the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, also in Chicago.

A member of the Illinois Legislature in reporting to me on the incident, had this to say:

"As I watched the antics of these juvenile termites as they took over Springfield, blocked traffic, insulted citizens, and littered State house and other public places with seditious literature, I could not but wonder how youths favoring free enterprise would be treated if they attempted a demonstration in Moscow. You know the answer."

THE GANG THEY'RE BACKING

The answer, of course, is contained in this recent report by Chief Justice George W. Maxey, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court:

"In 12 years of the Communist rule in Russia there were executed 28 bishops, 1,219 priests, 6,000 teachers, 9,000 doctors, 54,000 officers, 200,000 soldiers, 70,000 policemen, 12,950 landowners, 355,250 intellectuals and professional men, 193,280 workers, and 815,000 peasants. Some 15,000,000 are in slave camps in Siberia."

In the face of such a record, one may well ask, "Why is a Communist?" Undoubtedly many of these youngsters who descended on Springfield were mentally unbalanced, proper subjects for a psychiatrist if not an asylum.

But many others not quite classifiable as mental cases are enamored of the Russian system. Henry Wallace, for example. Maybe we aren't doing quite good enough a job of selling our form of government, in comparison with communism or socialism or any other form of national rule.

SOME WIDESPREAD UNTRUTHS

Thousands, and perhaps, millions, of Americans not yet ready by any means to march under the Communist banner as these half-baked collegians did over at Springfield have been taken in by such untruths as these:

The poor get poorer and the rich get richer.

A few wealthy families own the greater part of the wealth of the Nation.

Most business concerns make unreasonably large profits.

Big corporations take advantage of their customers, of their employees and of small businesses, and should be drastically controlled by Government.

The owners of business get the larger share of the income produced; the employees get the smaller share.

Corporations are owned by a handful of people in contrast to the millions of employees on the pay rolls.

These are just plain unadulterated falsehoods and anybody who entertains such notions just hasn't been truthfully informed.

IT'S MADE AMERICA GREAT

It isn't even debatable that the American system of government and economics has brought more well-being to more people over a longer period of time than any other system ever conceived in the mind of man.

Let there be comparison with communism or socialism or fascism. The facts are all in favor of our way of life. Claims regarding

the accomplishments and the expected accomplishments under socialism or communism are glib promises.

There is no evidence in history, or in the contemporary world scene, that either communism or socialism ever eliminated poverty, brought about equality of incomes, improved the living conditions of the masses or increased personal liberties.

It's an amazing paradox that some Americans accept these unsupported indictments of our system of government and economics at the very time when our over-all wealth, our productive power, our standard of living, our personal freedom are the envy of the people of every country in the world.

WHO WOULD IMAGINE IT?

Dr. Virgil Jordan, in his article, "Life or Death of the Free Economy," had something pertinent to say about this paradox not long ago:

"Who would imagine that such a people [meaning the Americans], emerging from these immense achievements [twice within a generation saving the world from defeat by Germany], would be impelled, as if driven by some profound inferiority complex, to abandon the basic conditions and ideals by which it did these things?

"Who would imagine that such a people would wish to copy the pathetic example of the European and Asiatic peoples whose creative power has been destroyed by centuries of war, struggles for power, political plunder, exploitation, conspiracy, and oppression?

"Who would suppose that such a people, or any of them, fresh from these colossal accomplishments, could be persuaded to believe that a poor, primitive, predatory despotism like Soviet Russia provided for them and the world a model of freedom, or democracy, or economic progress—a mentor whose sterile ideas, methods, and institutions we should imitate or emulate?"

WE MUST KNOW THE WHY

If America is to remain American, it is essential that our people must know and appreciate how much better off they are than the people of any other country. But that isn't all. That isn't enough. Our people must know and appreciate why this is true and be prepared to preserve the fundamentals of our way of life.

Too many Americans seem not capable of recognizing the approaches to collectivism as such, or understand what collectivism is, or the ends to which every collectivist economy inevitably leads.

Somebody has made this observation: "No people ever entered the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted." But in America there have been side doors bearing no mention of the price of admission.

IF IT'S SUGAR-COATED

In recent years many Americans who disapprove of socialism and communism when marked as such have fallen for every type of socialistic legislation that has been proposed—so long as it has been sugar-coated and disguised with an American label.

Put to a vote—which, of course, communism never is—neither socialism nor communism would command any sizable support in our land. This was manifest in the vote for Norman Thomas and Henry Wallace last November.

But we can, as other nations have, arrive at the same destination through such well-camouflaged entrances in the form of promises often held out by political demagogs—rosy pictures of a never-never land where there's security and contentment for everybody—and almost no work to be done.

It wasn't in this manner that America became great.

FREEDOM FOR SECURITY

In our contemporary world and in the past centuries, nations have withered and decayed when their people were willing to trade their freedom for ease or contentment, or even for security. That danger faces us in our too-common disposition to look to Washington for the answer to all of our questions.

After a century or so in which mankind's march was in the direction of democracy, our generation has seen a reversal of the trend. We've seen totalitarianism rear its ugly head, under two labels—fascism and communism—but totalitarianism nonetheless.

The mark of totalitarianism is the dominance of state over people. Human dignity has no meaning when there are smothering curbs on religious freedom, free speech, free elections, and the other freedoms guaranteed to us in our way of life by our Bill of Rights.

HYPNOTIZED BY WORDS

In Russia's double talk for world consumption her form of government is referred to as democracy rather than communism, the name applied to it by Karl Marx, its atheistic inventor. Actually, of course, it is no more democratic than Mussolini's fascism or Hitler's nazism.

Here, as Walter E. Spahr has pointed out, is a warning to Americans who unthinkingly are drawn to any proposal bearing the label of liberal. Many a wholly un-American proposal is handed to us in that untruthful package.

By the same token, capitalism, has come to bear an unfavorable connotation in too many unthinking minds. Karl Marx of last century and the Russian Communists of today have sought to make it a term of opprobrium when as a matter of fact it's as honorable a word as democracy itself.

CAPITALISM MEANS DEMOCRACY

Capitalism in the truest sense means free enterprise, sovereignty of consumers in economic matters and sovereignty of voters in political matters. It rests upon individual planning, freedom of competition, prices determined in free markets, equitable taxation for the common good.

In assuming an apologetic attitude with respect to our dynamic capitalism, Americans are playing into the Communists' hands. They want us to believe that capitalism is something iniquitous, which it is not.

I wouldn't want to leave the impression that I think our system of government, including capitalism, is perfect. Of course it isn't. And that's another fact in favor of our way of life. We're free to seek perfection; the Communists are not.

WE'RE FREE TO CRITICIZE

A great writer, Philip Wylie, recently pointed this out in these words:

"Every forward step is achieved by some individual who sees a flaw in things as they stand, and by some individual who then works out an improvement. American freedom is designed to take advantage of public self-criticism and personal ingenuity.

"The Communists, on the other hand, believe their theory to be flawless as it stands. Criticism is therefore discouraged, with guns and concentration camps. Original Communist thinking is impossible, since potential thinkers are allowed access only to the old Communist doctrine.

"Philosophically, then, communism is the most hide-bound and conservative form of government on earth, no more progressive than ancestor worship."

ANOTHER YOUTH VIEWPOINT

I started this commentary with a reference to a group of harebrained students who invaded the Illinois State capitol proclaiming themselves to be Communists. I'd like to close it with this definition of democracy by a 17-year-old Minnesota youth:

"I speak for democracy and so I speak for men everywhere * * * the creators of wealth, the masses that are the power and glory of the world * * * those to whom all leaders are accountable. Only under democracy can men find their hopes fulfilled, whether it be to speak without fear or own a piece of land, to go to church or stay away.

"Democracy is many things—the right to trial by jury or to travel where you will; to take a ride in the country or to see a ball game, to be an engineer or a ditch digger."

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

"There is a price for everything. The price of freedom is responsibility. Your responsibility is that of voting, of seeing that justice is done, of doing your best to abolish racial and religious prejudice, of upholding your Nation's laws and her ideals.

"And the common man knows that democracy at its finest can be the only path to world union and the ending of war. Let us hope that with the grace of God, we will win through to make on earth a true brotherhood of man."

Supreme Court Decision Forces Real Competition in Cement Industry—Bids After Decision Produce Varied Destination Prices—Victory for Small Business If Moratorium Defeated

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to April 26, 1948, the date of the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case, competition appeared among members of the Cement Trust. The pattern of identical destination prices through the use of the basing-point system gave way to bid prices based on lawful published freight rates.

The deceptive basing-point system of pricing as practiced by the cement industry made a sham of competition. No purchaser of cement could look at a table of identical prices and arrive at a conclusion that anybody had competed for his business. To the contrary, the purchaser was neatly fenced in by a well-drilled team of robot prices. There was no escape from the artificial methods used in the distribution of cement. No escape, that is, until the Supreme Court decision outlawed the system. Valid illustrations of varied destination prices are now a matter of public record.

Bids on cement for use by the Reclamation Service of the Department of the Interior reflect real competition. I desire to include at this point tables assembled from abstracts of bids on two projects under the Reclamation Service, which were received after the Supreme

Court decision on April 26, 1948. The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Specification No. 2243, 2,500,000 barrels of portland cement in bulk for the Hungry Horse project; bids opened May 20, 1948—destination Coram, Mont.*

Bidder	Per barrel price, f. o. b. mill	Freight rate	Per barrel destination price
Permanente Cement Co.[1]	[2] $2.65	$3.0456	$5.6956
Spokane Portland Cement Co.	2.90	1.2784	4.1784
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	3.20	1.2784	4.4784
Ideal Cement Co.	3.30	1.44384	4.74384

[1] Net price, others 10 cents per barrel discount.
[2] In paper sacks, 40 cents extra; others, 30 cents.

NOTE.—Maximum price increase at time of delivery: Spokane, 60 cents; Lehigh, 15 cents; Ideal, 15 cents; Permanente, indefinite.

TABLE II.—*Specification No. 2356, 70,000 barrels type II portland cement for the All-American canal project; bids opened August 19, 1948, various destinations*

Bidder	Per barrel price f. o. b. mill	Freight rate	Per barrel destination price
Riverside Cement Co.	[1] $2.55	$0.3883543	$2.9383543
Southwestern Portland Cement Co.	2.60	.3883543	3.0783543

[1] In paper sacks, 40 cents extra.

NOTE.—Maximum price increase at time of delivery: Riverside, 20 cents; Southwestern, none.

These tables tend to show that not only is it possible to secure competitive prices when the basing-point system is abandoned, but competitive prices which are unwatered by phantom freight. It will be noted in table I that the Spokane and Lehigh companies had the same destination freight rate but very different destination prices. In table II the freight rate to the fraction of a cent is the same but competition produced different destination prices.

Small business will reap the benefit of free and open competition in the cement industry if a moratorium on the basing-point system is not declared. There is nothing to be gained by hasty or injudicious legislation. It only dams the streams of progress and causes discontinuity in the orderly determination of antitrust-law violations.

I hope Members who are interested in the strengthening and preservation of small-business enterprise, will join with me in defeating any attempt to give the Cement Trust a blank check by way of a moratorium on the Supreme Court decision.

Canada Cuts Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington (Pa.) Observer, relating to the tax situation in Canada and in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA CUTS TAXES TO HALT RECESSION

Canadian Finance Minister Douglas Abbott is convinced that inflation in the land of the maple leaf is a thing of the past. He thinks that at least another year of unexcelled prosperity lies ahead. Therefore, he is passing along some of the benefits of this happy situation to the paying customers, the Canadian people.

Canada is taking realistic action to head off depression. Income taxes will be reduced by approximately 32 percent. Taxes on the earnings of small businesses will also be reduced, and import restrictions on a long list of commodities will be relaxed. Taxes on jewelry will be reduced by half to 10 percent. Many other levies and luxury taxes will be wiped out altogether.

Not only is a 32-percent reduction in income taxes something to gloat over, but for the first time in history taxes in Canada will be lower than in the United States. Income-tax rates on middle-bracket incomes in Canada will be one-half those in effect in the States.

Canada's come-back from the gloomy vistas of a tight war economy has been nothing short of phenomenal. It shows good management and a will to live in the sunlight of a free economy. Canada has achieved the state which citizens of the United States looked forward to fondly at the end of the war—a prosperous era with drastic reduction in wartime taxes.

Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, advocates adoption of a policy similar to that ordered in Canada by the United States. Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he has long specialized in public fiscal matters.

He referred to the fact that Canada is adopting such a policy even though that Dominion has a public debt which is comparatively greater than that of the United States. He made this reference in citing that reduction of public debt is one of the reasons advanced by advocates of higher taxes.

There is no good reason why the spending of the United States should not be reduced to make a payment on the public debt possible under even present conditions. Even with all the talk of recession, business activity is still at a very high rate. A leveling off is inevitable but even so the outlook for business for some months ahead is still good.

Conditions will be somewhat different but the need for things still exists and there are many who want them.

Perhaps Congress should appoint a joint committee to tour Canada and learn how it was accomplished there. Perhaps the White House should send a representative on a similar mission.

Child Labor Carriers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Rafael Independent for February 21, 1949:

[From the San Rafael Independent of February 21, 1949]

CHILD LABOR CARRIERS?

A vicious, unwarranted, and ill-founded insinuation that the newsboys of the Nation—the carriers for instance who deliver your copy of the Independent-Journal to you—are the victims of unscrupulous child-labor exploitation is made in the February issue of the Woman's Home Companion.

The article deals generally with child labor in various industries—working in agriculture, in restaurants as waitresses and soda jerkers and so on—and then on page 88, after a number of alleged abuses of child labor have been quoted, contains the following paragraph:

"Almost as unregulated is the occupation of newsboy, another job generally thought to be good for children. Not a single State has adopted in entirety the standards recommended by the National Child Labor Committee, a voluntary organization which since 1904 has endeavored to protect working children.

"These are: no carrier ought to be under 14—or 12 if he has an afternoon route in a residential neighborhood; newsboys should not work earlier than 7 a. m. nor later than 7 p. m. and not for more than 3 hours a day or a maximum of 18 hours a week during school terms."

The statement that the recommendations of the National Child Labor Committee in respect of newsboys have not been adopted by any State, followed by a listing of these recommendations, is, of course, a left-handed method of accusing newspaper proprietors generally of ignoring these recommendations and, in short, of using sweated labor to get their product on the market.

Such an accusation, the more potent because the arguments in support of it are skipped over as if obvious to be superfluous can best be dealt with by fact rather than by bluster, by an examination of things as they are rather than by a justified condemnation of such an unfounded charge.

So let's look at the facts.

First, as to the insinuation that perhaps the occupation of newsboy, another job generally thought to be good for children is not so good for children.

What does a newsboy do?

First of all, he is in business for himself. He gets newspapers from the publisher and sells them on an appointed route. He takes his own profit on these sales and turns over the cost of purchase of his wares to the publisher who supplied them.

In the course of this conducting of his own business, he learns many valuable things which are not taught in any school.

Here's a partial list: dependability, salesmanship, management of money, experience in extending credit, the need for credit in marketing, ability to meet the public, the need for keeping books, the thrill of increasing his own business and reaping a proper return from his efforts, independence, honesty, an understaanding of human strength and weakness, and the importance of thrift. A not unimpressive list, we believe.

We cannot find in all of these, recalling even the most jaundiced approach, anything of detriment to the boy; anything which suggests in the least way that his work is harmful. Furthermore, his work is not carried out in a confined space, but in the open air and among his own neighbors. We submit, then, that the type of work is not harmful to youth, but on the contrary, is most beneficial.

Now, how about the conditions of work—perhaps it is in this that we, and the newspaper publishers of this Nation who have campaigned for years for a better life for the people, are the blackguards, preaching

the greater freedoms in our paper while grinding the very soul of youth in our own business.

It is maintained that boys under the age of 12 should not be employed as carriers on afternoon newspapers. We do not know why the arbitrary age of 12 was picked, and we have no such untenable and artificial standard. We select our carriers on the basis of intelligence and health and initiative. It has long been established that age is no criterion by which to judge human beings. We do not employ infants but boys, and do not bar one because he is only 11 years, 11 months old.

The time the boy works is largely up to the boy. He can deliver his papers in an hour or he can take 3 hours over it if he wishes. It's his business and he's running it. And the same goes for newspapers everywhere in this country.

Finally, there is the recommendation that newsboys should not work for more than 3 hours a day or a maximum of 18 hours a week. This is covered in the statement that our newsboys work an average of an hour to an hour and a half a day—depending largely on their own desire.

No mention is made of the remuneration received. The minimum adult wage in the country is about 60 cents an hour. Being liberal and assuming that the average Independent-Journal newsboy works 10 hours a week, he earns an average of 70 cents an hour—or 10 cents above the minimum wage.

From this it can be seen that quoting newsboys as a class of sweated child labor is a baseless and unwarranted statement, and if the author of this dubious article were to succeed in ruling out the employment of boys as paper carriers, the result would operate to the disadvantage of the boys themselves, and not to that of the publishers.

In our own instance, we use some 134 boys to deliver our papers. We could accomplish the same delivery for perhaps less money, and certainly no more, by employing men. But we would be denying to these 134 boys a chance to earn some money and get some business experience which will stand them in good stead later on.

And we wonder whether the writer of this vicious piece has thought what would happen to these boys in their leisure time if they had no newspaper route to cover? Some would probably find something else to do. The rest would be left to their own devices, possibly getting into trouble from sheer idleness.

We are ready to step down now from this witness stand, into which we have been thrust, and let you, the jury, decide whether we are guilty of running our business by sweated labor.

But perhaps before you reach your verdict, you might like the evidence of a prime witness—your carrier.

Why not ask him whether he is being abused and overworked?

We think he'll probably pop his bubblegum and say cheerfully, "Who, me? Shucks, no."

Pressing Needs of America's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article compiled by the American Parents Committee Education Fund, Inc. This document is in a sense a statistical and factual report showing the most pressing needs of the Nation's children as regards their education, health, and welfare, as well as the shocking neglect of children who are without the means or assistance to help themselves.

A SUMMARY OF THE MOST PRESSING NEEDS—EDUCATIONAL, HEALTH, AND WELFARE—OF AMERICA'S 46,000,000 CHILDREN 17 YEARS AND UNDER

There is great inequality of health, educational, and welfare facilities among the States. In the poorer States the citizens have not enough income that can be taxed by the State or by the towns in which they live to provide adequate schools and health and welfare services. Furthermore, in the poorer States there are as many as 50 percent more children per 1,000 adult population than in the richer States. So children unfortunate enough to be born in the poorer States are getting a particularly raw deal. They are growing up without adequate schooling, without proper health facilities, and without decent welfare services such as are provided in the more prosperous communities and States. Even in the richer States many schools are overcrowded and unsafe, and the child health and welfare services pitifully inadequate. Can the United States afford such shocking neglect of children?

Children are our most precious and promising national asset. They alone can assure our future as a democratic people. And yet we are subjecting them to the conditions described below:

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN

More than 4,000,000 children of school age do not attend school at all either because there are no schools or because school attendance laws are laxly enforced. Many children go to school only 6 months a year. In many communities there is no schooling beyond the eighth grade. Many schools are fire-traps. There are still about 100,000 one-room wooden schoolhouses, where one teacher teaches children of all ages. Seventy-five thousand teaching positions remain unfilled; 110,000 emergency teachers are being employed without proper qualifications. Money for education is not only too little but is unequally distributed; some communities spend 60 times as much on education per child as others do.

Schools are already overcrowded. In some communities children have to attend two-shift, even three-shift schools. Because of the sharp rise in the birth rate during and since the war increasing numbers of children will be flooding the schools. In three years (1951) school enrollments will be up 2,400,000 more than in 1948; in 8 years (1956) 8,000,000 over 1948. The estimated cost of needed new school construction between now and 1956 is $6,800,000,000 or $850,000,000 a year above present school expense budets.

HEALTH NEEDS OF CHILDREN

Every hour 12 babies die. And many, many mothers also die needlessly. At least one-half the maternal deaths and one-third the infant deaths are preventable. Although the national death rate for babies under a year old has been reduced to 34 per 1,000 births, yet in one State 28 babies out of 1,000 died, while in the State at the other end of the list, 100 out of 1,000 died. Nearly a quarter of a million mothers and babies have no medical care at childbirth and during the first few days of life.

Seventy-five percent of American school children need dental care; 10,000,000 have defective vision; 4,000,000 have hearing defects. Half a million have orthopedic and plastic defects. 175,000 have active tuberculosis. Rheumatic fever and diseases of the heart cripple 500,000 children.

Forty percent of our counties have no hospitals. Twenty-five percent of our children live in areas where no full-time public health services are available.

Only 50,000 out of the 200,000 school units have a school lunch program. Approximately two-thirds of school-age children do not benefit. Growing evidence proves that the school lunch program, by providing proper nourishment, if only for one meal a school day improves health, reduces absences from school.

One out of every 20 American children is destined, as conditions are now, to be a patient at sometime in a mental institution. Most mental difficulties begin in childhood, yet 25 States have no child guidance clinic in any community. Full time clinical service for child guidance is provided in only 27 of the largest cities.

WELFARE NEEDS OF CHILDREN

Nearly 4,000,000 children are fatherless, motherless, or both. Yet 6 out of every 10 such children neither receive public assistance (grants for aid to dependent children) nor Social Security benefits (as survivors of men who have died after being in covered employment). Some 564,000 children are receiving Social Security benefits as survivors. The average monthly benefit for a family, in which a single child receives a benefit, is $13.10. Half the children whose fathers died in 1946–47 did not qualify for even this meager benefit. For 1,000,000 of the children receiving public assistance (23 out of every 1,000 under 18 years) the average grant was only $24.21 per child per month. Five-sixths of all U. S. counties have no full-time child welfare workers paid from public funds one-half are concentrated in 7 States, mainly in urban counties.

OTHER NEEDS OF CHILDREN

Child labor: More than 2,000,000 boys and girls 14 through 17 work, part or full time. This is twice as many as were gainfully employed in 1940. These figures do not include children under 14, many thousands of whom work in agriculture. Fifty-six percent of these children are not attending school. Federal laws protect only about 20 percent of children against harmful employment, in industries which ship goods interstate.

Juvenile delinquency: At least 250,000 youngsters annually come before juvenile courts.

Children in migrant farm families: Hundreds of thousands of children in families of migrant farm laborers fail to receive the health, education, and welfare benefits available to children of fixed residence.

The Proper Approach to Social Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Bulletin of the Essex County (N. J.) Dental Society. It reviews succinctly the American Medical Association's habit of misinterpreting socio-political issues and it seeks that intelligent approach on the part of professional men which the sponsors of national health insurance have urged for years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LET THERE BE LIGHT"

Once upon a time, when old-age insurance was being introduced and the very radical idea of unemployment insurance was contemplated by our Government, the spokesmen for the American Medical Association declared that such action was a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism. Organized medicine and dentistry rallied against the new "evils" but to no avail. These bills became the law of the land and subsequently were embraced by almost all groups of people comprising varied shades of political opinion. As to the advent of communism or totalitarianism, the prognosis offered by the AMA, I am very happy to say, was entirely wrong—the patient is still alive and kicking.

Ten years ago, when the Senator from New York, ROBERT WAGNER, introduced a bill authorizing Federal aid for hospital construction, we were again informed by the leaders of our allied professions that this marked the beginning of an invasion by the State into the personal life of the individual, a weakening of national caliber, and a step toward—you know what. Well, exactly 5 years later, Congress passed the Hill-Burton Act, which contained essentially the same idea as that which WAGNER had presented just a few years before. Since then, our medical colleagues have done some fine constructive work under the provisions of the very act whose contents they originally had opposed so vigorously.

When workmen's compensation laws were first introduced, all inquiry concerning its merits and all support for this social legislation was drowned out by the loud cry that medical freedom was being endangered. Today the medical profession is not only in favor of workmen's compensation laws, but is actually in control of the medical end in most of our States.

In 1932, when Dr. Ray Wilbur, a former president of the AMA and Secretary of the Interior under Herbert Hoover, released a report that favored voluntary health insurance for the American people, that report was immediately denounced as socialism and communism inciting to revolution. And when a committee under Dr. Wilbur advocated group practice they were charged with trying to set up medical Soviets. At the present time organized medicine and dentistry lends its enthusiastic support to voluntary health insurance while group practice has also been accepted.

Now comes the latest collectivist scheme, President Truman's compulsory health insurance plan. And once more the same cries of "Wolf! Wolf!" are being heard. The administration's health insurance proposal may have some merit to it and it may not, but before any reasonable appraisal can be made all the facts of the matter should be known. It is not enough to be told that it is socialism or alien or a danger to the American way of life. Name calling does not clarify issues, it camouflages them. Furthermore, such labels are strange indeed when the leading pink endeavoring to make this bill a law is the Chief Executive himself.

If there are any serious misgivings in this piece of legislature what are they? Can they be amended? Should they be amended? Many reputable civic leaders and Government officials are opposed to this bill. Why? A multitude of questions have yet to be answered about compulsory health insurance and we are entitled to know all of them. The common goal of all of us is a stronger, healthier, and more prosperous America. Does this bill bring us closer to that goal or does it make the realization of those aims more remote?

The record of organized medicine in its action against social and economic legislation has not been one in which we can or should place blind faith. Even the latest effort by the AMA to offer new opposition to the President's proposal was described by the columnist Marquis Childs as "an eleventh hour deathbed conversion, and because it is that, the sincerity and intention of the AMA will be questioned." Let's drag the compulsory health insurance bill out of the "back room" and bring it into the bright light of reason. If the AMA is right in this issue, let us find out for ourselves and then lend them our full and active support. Only after careful and detailed examination of the question can we come to any intelligent decision upon this matter, a decision that will be of vital concern to the American people as well as to the profession. If this bill is passed, of one thing we can be certain, the control of the professional aspects of this plan must be in our hands, so that it never can be used as a political football or become bogged down with ward-heeled favorites or red tape.

We have heeded the cry of "Wolf, wolf" too many times in the past. This time let's take a look for ourselves, perhaps, after all, we'll only find a sheep in wolf's clothing.

M. J. TEITELBAUM, D. D. S.

Advertising as a World Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the luncheon of the Advertising Club of New York, New York City, on March 23, 1949:

I have been asked to talk about advertising, foreign markets, and politics.

At first these subjects seem completely unrelated. But when we examine them closely we may find a common denominator that ties them together. I suspect that they are all part of the same world, and that some principles apply equally to all three.

Let us begin by looking at advertising. Aggressive sales promotion is so much a part of our life that we accept it without worrying too much about the premises on which it is based.

Most advertising begins with a trade-mark. Look at an ad and somewhere you will find usually a mark that distinguishes the goods advertised.

Now what is a trade-mark? I quote Mr. Edward S. Rogers, an authority in the field. "In a nontechnical sense, a trade-mark is a name or symbol which tells where goods come from and hence, who is responsible for their identity and quality, so that if they are satisfactory they can be bought again, and if unsatisfactory they can be avoided." A trade-mark is a simple, practical device—a commercial invention of the first order. In the millions of daily transactions of buying and selling it is a symbol of an implied contractual relationship between buyer and seller that establishes the identity and responsibility of merchandise. It fixes identity and responsibility much in the same manner as your own signature at the bottom of a letter makes you its responsible author.

Again, what is the function of advertising, and how does it work? It is customary to say that advertising sells goods. I think it is more accurate to say that advertising speeds the sale of goods. In the long run, no product sells because of advertising that would have sold in a lesser degree without it. For if the product is not worthy, advertising simply hastens the day when the whole market has sampled the product and rejected it. Advertising cannot make a permanent success of any product that is not fit for success on its own.

Thus, advertising is a multiplier that broadcasts your virtues—or your defects—all the faster.

Now we know that speed—the length of time it takes to make and sell a certain number of units—has everything to do with cost and profit. The longer the time and the lower the quantity the higher the unit cost; the shorter the time and the greater the quantity the lower the unit cost.

Viewed in this light, advertising is no different from a machine tool that cuts manhours from a manufacturing operation. It is, in fact, the same thing in a different form. The final justification for advertising is not that it is customary, or that you do it because a competitor does it, but that it cuts cost. You advertise simply because it costs less to send a message to a customer through the printed word or over the air and screen than it does to send a salesman to call on everybody door to door.

Advertising is thus part of a complex system—a routine, a know-how—that includes inventiveness, organization, machine tools, and skilled labor and workmanship, and that has resulted in the more universal distribution of more goods at lower cost than the world has ever known.

When we realize this, no one needs worry about the future of advertising. It is with us to stay, because it is one of the cornerstones of our standard of living.

I have been asked whether I think the administration is for advertising or against it. I do not have any crystal ball from which to pick an answer. I do know that as far back as 1945, President Truman, in a letter to Mr. Elon Borton, of the Advertising Federation, went on record—and I quote:

"In these war years we have demonstrated our capacity to produce far beyond anything previously thought possible. That productive capacity must be maintained and used in peacetime for full employment—and for the highest possible standard of living for every man, woman, and child.

"But goods produced must be marketed—promoted, advertised, and sold—for enjoyable, beneficial use by consumers, or production will not continue. Production and distribution must go together.

"We have proved our ability to produce. Now we must demonstrate that we can sell into consumption or use the full output of full employment. This will require the complete mobilization, the thorough training, and the effective work of the millions of our people engaged in the processes of advertising and selling. I am confident that American business can and will do this."

The administration has at various times recently, and since the election, stated clearly that it is not antibusiness, and that business has nothing to fear from it.

Actually, our security is much greater than that. If we hold fast to the clear idea that advertising is a tool for cutting costs—that it is completely entwined with our standard of living—that its use makes goods cheaper—that its absence makes them more expensive—then you can be sure that it is safe, because you can depend on the innate common sense of the American public to protect it. The public, collectively, can generally be trusted to be more sensible than any one of us individually, and to stop any error before it goes too far. Take the matter of taxes and budgets. So long as we were at war, and

so long as take-home pay was on the increase, additional taxes were not too difficult to pass. Today, with the rise in wages slowed down, the public—and its servant, the legislator—have become very sensitive to tax increases. You can see this not only in Washington—but even our local chief executive, Mr. Dewey, has found it out. Mr. Dewey never compromises with his legislature—that is, scarcely ever—but on budgets and taxes he compromises too.

It is up to us, I think, to make our own case clear. Like most professions, I think we advertising people are guilty of spending too much time on how, rather than why. If you ask an advertising man how he would advertise a product, he drowns you in ideas. But ask him why we should advertise at all, and this seems so obvious to him—it is so long since he has thought about it—that he is apt to stutter a bit. It is no more true of advertising than of any other piece of merchandise that the public knows all about it. It is up to us in the business to continually promote its most important feature—that it cuts costs—as we would for any product. Therein lies our real safety.

We hear a good deal of talk these days about the need for advertising censorship and regulation. I know of no field that needs regulation less or that has disciplined itself more. There is no governmental body whose wisdom could be as great or whose discipline could be as harsh as that of the open competitive market. If we stop to think about it, competition functions in much the same way as his majesty's loyal opposition or as a minority party. State an untruth, be it ever so small, and your competitor is quick to point it out and to force you to correct it. Here and there a fly-by-night may publish an exaggeration and before competition and the public have time to catch up with him, he will be gone. But the permanent manufacturer who represents 98 percent of the products we live by has long since learned that truth and honesty in advertising are the only policy that enable him permanently to live with his public.

Politics and advertising have this in common, that they thrive best in a free society where both are subjected to the continued harsh light of publicity, claim and counter claim, criticism and opposition. About the only difference that I see between the two is that a politician is a little bit like a banker. A banker draws up a statement at the end of his fiscal year—a politician subjects himself to the approval of the public every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. But with a piece of merchandise and with advertising, every day is election day, and every product and every advertisement is continually and completely subject to the verdict of public opinion. In both cases it is truth and character that stand out.

If we look over the field of famous trade names, the ones that are permanent are the ones that have been truthful and honest, that year in and year out have given full value for the dollar. If you stop to think of the amount of faith the average buyer puts in the merchandise he buys in the American market today, it is the finest possible tribute to the veracity of the American printed advertising word. If you will look at the politicians the world remembers, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln down to our own day—it is not the clever and expedient whom we remember but those who were known in their day for their stubborn addiction to the truth.

I do not know what your concept of a politician is. Perhaps it is as erroneous as my own idea of an advertising man used to be. I used to think that advertising men were long-haired artists who dreamed up dreams. Perhaps you think a politician is an adroit character who spends his time glad-handing in a smoke-filled room. But just as in advertising the harsh reality of sales results weeds out the impractical craftsman in favor of the dependable workman—in politics the same harsh light of public opinion weeds out the opportunist in favor of the statesman who renders a public service.

Let me give you a definition of politics that I have carried with me for a quarter of a century, written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago. It goes like this: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm. There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul—nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all its temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

With the change of a few words that would be an equally good definition of advertising.

To carry the parallel still further, let me give you a list of 10 rules for the making of a successful politician which I have set down for my own guidance. A politician must have a good personality. He must have what we call character—he must be a substantial human being. He must work hard. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him. He must have active ability and must be able to see and use ability in others. He must be aggressive but not to the point of being offensive. He must have a feeling for what people want. He must be able to make decisions. He must understand the meaning of the practical compromise without loss of principle. Above all, he must be truthful. The man—or the advertisement that does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. The dog of untrammeled ambition is usually pursued by the rabbit of conscience.

In short, I find little difference in the rules for success, whether in advertising, or politics, or any other field.

To what extent and in what countries are American advertising and promotion techniques adaptable to marketing problems? It would be nice to give a flat answer and an exact list, but either the problem is not that simple or I am not that wise.

It is obvious that advertising does not function in a vacuum, but thrives in the soil of a free economy with its characteristics of competition, publicity, criticism, continuous improvement of product, and adherence to truth.

It is likewise obvious that advertising will thrive best in those countries where conditions most nearly approach our own. In free countries we will find that it work much the same as here. In the totalitarian countries it will hardly work at all. Again the reason is clear. The essence of an advertisement is the belief and faith in it that is earned by the manufacturer.

When you get to a totalitarian country the printed word is used not as a means of examining and distilling out the truth but as prpopaganda to enforce a predetermined point of view. Here all words lose their meaning and advertising suffers—it is discounted like everything else that is said. The home of totalitarianism is also usually the home of the state monopoly and the cartel, and under these conditions you can neither advertise nor do business as we understand it. It is clear to all of us, I think, that American advertising would not pay very well in Russia even if it were possible. On this basis I think you can make up a list of countries where our advertising methods will succeed that will be as good as any I could give you.

Yet there is one saving grace. I have found people are much the same the world over, and if you treat the public with respect it will respect you in return. The public everywhere responds to quality and character to such an extent that the integrity of American products has tended to make them synonymous for quality around the globe. The public in other countries will respond likewise to quality and integrity in advertising when they find you mean what you say. Here again the respect has to be earned and in many places you start from scratch. It takes time but it works. To the newcomer in the foreign advertising field, I have only this word of advice. The temptation to be expedient and to compete with the propagandist will be very great, but like most expediency it is short-sighted and costs more in the end. It only succeeds in classifying your product as one of those that claims whatever is necessary to make a sale. Permanent sales cannot be built in that way.

In this respect, American advertising has a function to perform. It is clear to all of us by now that in the world as it is constituted today we cannot live alone. It is clear that this country can live only in a world of character, truth, faith, and honest words among neighbors like ourselves. The ERP and the Atlantic Pact are but one expression of that fact. They are merely an advance guard which must be followed up in hundreds of ways and through thousands of commonplace details in our daily contacts with the countries about us. It must be followed up by trade, by quality of product, by strict adherence to truth in the printed word—by a slow process of education. I am certain that it will be ideas rather than force that will finally succeed in showing the rest of the world what kind of people we are and thus eventually win them over to our way of living.

In this process, American advertising with its self-discipline, its policy of deliberate understatement, its sense of fair play, its respect for a competitor, and its ability to live and let live can play a vital part. It is an endeavor worthy of the best that is in us as advertising men.

The Freedom Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, recently, at the conclusion of an adress at the University of Florida, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, offered the first draft of a proposed freedom manifesto. This is an inspiring document and it will be received favorably wherever the love of freedom persists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full statement:

THE FREEDOM MANIFESTO

For the last 100 years, the world has been dominated by the Communist manifesto, issued by Marx and Engels in 1848. True liberalism has been under attack from Marxism from without. As the democratic nations have been weakened by human fifth columns, so the democratic philosophy has been weakened from within by the poison of Marxist conceptions, and related statist conceptions.

By its fruits, shall we know this philosophy. The Marxist century has ended with half of the world in slavery and the other half in fear.

We are, in this year of 1949, starting a new century. Let us make it a century of hope.

Let us, in this year of 1949, issue a freedom manifesto. The Communist manifesto led

mankind to slavery and despair. The freedom manifesto will guide the world to liberty and hope.

Let me propose a basis for the freedom manifesto.

PROPOSED BASIS OF THE FREEDOM MANIFESTO

We proclaim the Free Society.

Let us begin with the economic, since economics is basic. We do not accept the Marxian theory that man is animated only by materialistic motives. We do not believe that ideas and ideals are only an expression of a predetermined economic system; but we do believe that ideas and ideals which do not find expression in the way we work, buy, sell, distribute, and consume are vain. So we express freedom in our economic life.

Marxism teaches that one economic system succeeds another in automatic evolution—slavery, feudalism, capitalism. Marxists claim that capitalism is destined to be followed by socialism or collectivism which is to be the final and permanent system. This we deny.

ECONOMIC DIVERSITY

There is no need to accept, or reason to choose, a society dominated by one economic form. In our free society, various economic forms exist side by side, in competition with each other, and flourish as they meet human needs and conceptions of the good life; they diminish as they do not meet these needs.

In our free society there is self-employment—the person who employs himself repairing radios, or watches, or automobiles, or making by hand, furniture, or baskets, or hats, or cookery. Perhaps we should have more self-employment; certainly it should be recognized as one of our permanent and valued economic forms, and the doors should be always wide open to it for those who like it and can make it pay.

There is the partnership.

There is the cooperative, where a group of people join forces to produce, to sell, or to buy.

There is the corporation. Corrections are needed in corporate structure and practice. Stockholders should have more voice and take more responsibility. Workers should share profits and have a sense of owning and belonging. Perhaps, even, corporations need to develop and perhaps can develop, souls. However, which of us would want to live in a society without corporations? Not everyone wants to work for himself, or in a cooperative, or for the Government, or to depend on such forms to meet all his needs. There are things which the corporation can do better than any other economic form. So the corporation is permanently one of the economic forms in our free society.

There is government or public ownership. Public ownership is sometimes inefficient, sometimes bureaucratic; but there are economic activities which government—municipal, State, or national—can do better than a cooperative or a corporation. So we will have government ownership in our free society. We shall get away from bureaucracy and inefficiency by an extension of the TVA idea. That is, through the government corporation instead of the bureau, through regionalism instead of centralization in the capital, we shall induce government enterprise rather than mere government operation. In such government enterprise, employees are under a personnel system, oppressed neither by political uncertainty nor by the dead hand of an unimaginative civil service; they may find careers, promotion, and security such as they would find with a well-managed private corporation.

However, Government operation is only one of our economic forms; it is not a social corrective of ills that may exist in other forms. Law, not collectivism, is that corrective.

NO FINAL DECISION

In our free society, we never make a final decision as to how much of one economic form we shall have and how much of another. If a Government operation is not working well, the people will not hesitate to sell it to a corporation or a cooperative. If it is indicated that a corporate activity should be under public ownership, the people will not hesitate to buy it. Experience and a sense of values, not dogmatic theory, will determine their decisions, and decisions are always subject to review. We find what is better by never-ending thought and experiment. However, changes from one form to another are made without confiscation, and without harm or loss to individuals.

PRIVATE PROPERTY

The right of private property is fundamental.

The institution of private property is not evil; it is a positive good. Property is necessary to the freedom and dignity of man. A propertyless man can have spiritual freedom and dignity, but not complete freedom of movement, activity, and enjoyment; he cannot be an effective citizen in a vigorous democracy. If property is not owned by individuals, it will be owned by the state, and the state will thereby become a dictatorship. We need to have property more fairly acquired, more widely distributed, and more securely held against loss and confiscation. High taxes from war and excessive governmental activities are one form of confiscation. A free society requires that most of its citizens shall be responsible property owners.

LABOR MOVEMENT

With such a conception of the need of private property, the labor movement will necessarily change its strategy. Instead of moving on and on in the industrial field toward the confiscation of profits, it will see them as a necessary thing. It will strive to increase the property holdings of the workers it represents. Under a system in which private property is becoming ever more widely held, the workers represented by labor unions would become owners of stocks in their own and other industries. Workers should become owners; owners should be workers. Thus we can attain a stability under which society will not move, with the inevitability of gradualness, into a centralized Socialist state.

RESERVES

Under such a system there should be few periods of recession or depression.

However, corporations should build up reserves for pensions and for employment, in order to avoid lay-offs or discharges in slack times. This will minimize dependence on government and strengthen the property system.

But no security outside one's self can equal the security of ownership of property in a system in which property is made secure.

The ownership of property by individuals, and the building up of private savings reserves should be that reliance.

DECENTRALIZATION

A healthy rural life is the foundation of a free society. A family living on its own acres is the ideal.

We favor the decentralization of property, of industries, of population. Our cities are too big. They should be remade to make possible more wholesome living. Bring the country to the city, as we have already brought urban comforts to the countryside. Eliminate smoke, smells, noise and traffic hazards. Bring to the country the interest and variety of the city; to the city dweller that self-expression that comes from working with growing and living things.

MASS PRODUCTION

Mass production should have brought man freedom from drudgery, not slavery to mechanism and to artificial appetites for un-needed things or cheap satisfactions. The object of mass production should not be something not needed or to be thrown away after a brief use.

The commercial manufacture of food and clothing outside the home, the commercial performance of services for the individual which the individual should do for himself has been carried too far. We need to do more things for ourselves with our own hands.

Exaggerated, high-pressure advertising is illegitimate. Man is not a consumer. He is not a waste container for industries whose wheels dare not stop. Industry is a servant whose wheels turn at the command of man to satisfy his needs. We are not slaves of the industrial machine.

POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

Freedom depends on a vigorous political democracy also. Citizens should take responsibility for government in their counties, towns, and cities. When citizens committees, without selfish motives, organize permanently to maintain nonpolitical county-manager government, as is done in Cincinnati, they are accepting their responsibility. Then there is no room for a boss.

UNION OF THE FREE

We do not despair of the United Nations. We wish to continue our efforts to make it ever more and more effective as the organization of our "one world." But we put freedom first. Freedom is fundamental. If freedom is to be preserved and extended in the world as a whole, then the nations which have long practiced freedom must federate. They must have a common policy in international affairs, a common defense force, a common currency, common citizenship, and a customs union. Therefore, we favor a federal union, not merely a military alliance, of the Marshall plan countries—those contributing and those receiving. Those are the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Eire, Great Britain, and the democracies of western Europe. We favor a great union of the free, and we urge that the first steps be taken now. If the present crisis which threatens freedom should pass, it will still be necessary, in order to avert or to cope with future dangers, that the free nations be permanently united with each other. To the great union should be added other states, from time to time, as they wish to join and can qualify through having established within themselves the practice of freedom and democracy.

MAN

In order to bring into being and preserve this free society, we must have men who are determined to remain free, and who know how to remain free. There is nothing wrong with the nature of man. He need only awaken to what he really is, and live in the fullness and perfection of his true nature. He was made for dominion over a self and a world which offer him satisfaction and joy. Man is the expression of God, the fulfillment of the Divine Being. When man lives at one with God, and wields God's infinite power, he will not desire any puny power over other men. He will not submit to any human being so foolish as to wish to lord it over him. Here is the key to human freedom.

How shall we get such men, such citizens for our free society? By cultivating them. The principles are laid down in all religions. Religions do not agree on the reasons why men should be good, but they substantially agree on what men should do. The need is to get these teachings practiced. This can best be done by forming groups or circles of laymen in each faith to meet with each other to study the practice of religion and to encourage each other in that practice. It is useful also to form "cells" which cut

across denominational lines for the encouragement of the practice of individual responsibility in freedom.

Thus men will be trained to live and help other men to live in the sunlight of freedom in the joy of that self-expression which belongs to all the sons and daughters of God.

ERP Nations Selling War Goods to Reds—Survey Shows Russia, Allies Get $3,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald for March 24, 1949:

ERP NATIONS SELLING WAR GOODS TO REDS—SURVEY SHOWS RUSSIA, ALLIES GET THREE BILLIONS—POTENTIAL MATÉRIEL SENT UNDER 91 TRADE PACTS

(By Frank Holeman)

Soviet Russia and her satellites are acquiring through 91 trade deals with Marshall-plan countries many of the potential war matériels which this Government, through export controls, refuses to ship to the U. S. S. R. because of the cold war, a survey showed yesterday.

Statistics on the flow of trade—amounting to about $3,000,000,000 in total value—across the iron curtain came from government agencies and embassies here of our European allies.

SPIRIT OF ACT VIOLATED

Such trade deals involving heavy industrial equipment and similar war-vital goods violate the spirit if not the letter of the Marshall-plan act, and also grabs off potential markets behind the iron curtain denied American exporters by the export-control policy.

The cautious Eightieth Congress inserted in the Marshall-plan law a provision designed to prevent recipient nations from selling behind the iron curtain those goods which this Government will not export into the Communist domain.

On the other hand, an economic cooperation administration official pointed out yesterday, this trade is saving the United States money in that the ERP nations swap their exports directly for food and do not have to use dollars. If all raw materials had to be bought outside the iron curtain, the cost of the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan would go up another $5,000,000,000 over 4 years, officials estimate.

METHOD USED BY REDS

The way in which Russia and its satellites have been able to force industrial equipment from Marshall-plan countries in exchange for vitally needed food and raw material shows up in these trade facts:

1. In fiscal 1950 Britain, France, and other western European countries are committed to sell to iron curtain countries an estimated $1,500,000,000 in goods which will further build up the Communist economy and make Russia tougher to fight if war comes. Crude rubber, tin and nickel, scientific equipment, locomotives, generators—those are some of the "hot items."

2. In exchange for this inward flow of potential war material the Communist nations are turning over approximately $1,500,000,000 in raw materials, including grain, coal, timber, potash fertilizer.

CAN'T BUY IT HERE

A Commerce Department official freely admitted that no export licenses for delivery to Russia would be granted on such items as these on the Russian-British trade list:

Ten oil refineries, 2,400 flat trucks, $600,000 worth of scientific and laboratory equipment, 1,100 narrow-gauge locomotives, 150 mobile Diesel-electric generators, 25 steam-power turbines, 18 ball mills for copper ore grading.

The strict export controls have cut our outgoing trade with Russia down to $500,000 a month, compared with $12,000,000 a month in 1947.

One top ECA planner declared:

"If we served an ultimatum, and told the western European nations to quit doing business with the Communists, or give up Marshall-plan aid, they would probably have told us to go to hell," he said, bluntly.

"They would rather have their world trade than the aid program any day."

Britain, getting the lion's share of United States aid, has besides its Russian agreement, a trade pact with Poland. This 5-year barter deal calls for Britain to supply $40,000,000 worth of wool a year, 3,000 to 5,000 tons of crude rubber a year, $500,000 worth of rubber tires for cars and tractors a year, $500,000 worth of auto spare parts, and 3,000 pounds of semimanufactured copper.

TITO GETS MACHINERY

In addition, Britain agreed to clear the way for British merchants to sell Poland 180,000 to 250,000 tons of crude oil from the Middle East every year. Also, they would help find sisal, manila, electrolytic nickel, ferrotungsten, ferrovanadium, ferromanganese, and 1,000 tons a year of tin.

None of the stuff could be exported directly from the United States, the Office of International Trade advised. Moreover, the United States Munitions Board is still buying sisal, manila, tungsten, vanadium and manganese for war stock piles, an official said.

The British-Yugoslav pact provides for Tito to get $10,000,000 worth of miscellaneous machinery, $2,400,000 of electro technical material, $140,000 worth of instruments and parts for scientific use, 3,000 tons of rolled steel, 10,000 tires, and 1,500 tons of rubber.

Other deals in the British pattern include:

France: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. The French generally export luxury goods, wines, and light manufactures in exchange for timber and other raw materials.

Benelux countries (Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg): Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, Soviet zone of Germany. Light manufactures and industrial goods, scientific instruments, etc., for food and raw materials.

SOVIET GETS $9,000,000

Sweden: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Soviet zone of Germany. Sweden sells ball bearings, a wide range of industrial products, in exchange for raw materials, sending Russia $9,000,000 of stuff a year.

Italy: Pacts with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, Soviet zone of Germany. Italy sells agricultural products, wines, and industrial goods, for raw materials.

Turkey: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland. Poland has imported $166,000,000 worth of goods from Turkey and sold $106,000,000 since the agreement was signed in July 1948.

Greece: One pact, with Czechoslovakia; terms secret.

Switzerland: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, and the Soviet zone of Germany. Switzerland deals in a wide range of industrial and agricultural products, as the middleman of Europe. Own manufactures are mainly instruments and watches.

Butter Versus Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on the butter-oleo issue for 2 days. There is general agreement that the tax on oleo should be removed. I certainly agree. The important question, the question which has not been satisfactorily resolved, is that of the proper marketing of oleomargarine. I know of no competent biochemist who will maintain that the nutritive value of oleo is equivalent to that of butter. The sellers of oleo may say that their product contains an equivalent number of vitamin units or an equivlent calorie value. These two standards do not in any way indicate the nutritive value of the two food products. The evidence of experience is that animal foods are more nutritive than vegetable foods; that healthy, progressive nations and peoples have lived on a diet which contained an adequate proportion of animal food products. There is a place for vegetable foods and for vegetable oils. But I hold that the consumer should know what he is eating. The Rivers amendment fails wholly to meet this requirement. I do not believe that the Poage amendment provides the guaranties which are necessary. The Granger bill is not satisfactory. Its approach is indirect, its effects cannot be clearly seen, but in the absence of better proposals—and it appears that this is the best measure we shall have a chance to vote on today—it has the advantage that it gives the people of the various States opportunity to protect themselves through their own State legislatures.

California Democrats and the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Capital Scene," written by Frank Macomber, and printed in the Tribune Sun of San Diego, as of March 26, 1949. This article clearly depicts the controversy

between the California Democrats and the Truman administration:

CAPITAL SCENE

(By Frank Macomber)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—A bitter scrap between Democratic Party leaders in California and the Truman administration is boiling toward the surface here.

The reason? Because the Interior Department has sold California down the Colorado River, so to speak.

Top California Democrats, in the Capital and in the Golden State, are becoming more and more concerned about the treatment accorded their State by the Reclamation Bureau in the struggle between California and Arizona over the division of Colorado River water.

Some Californians who previously supported the Reclamation Bureau are backing away now and are ready to join forces with those who believe the time has come for a show-down. That must come, of course, at a conference with President Truman. No one else can resolve the differences which have created the present strained relations between California and the Reclamation Bureau.

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY (Democrat, of California) for months has been the only articulate foe of the Reclamation Bureau. He has stood up in committee and on the Senate floor to warn that the Bureau and its policies will ruin California's Central Valley project and block further water and reclamation development in the State if Interior officials aren't harnessed.

The senior California Senator has been accused of harping too much on the evils of the Reclamation Bureau, whose functions influence the shape of things to come in the far West, so far as water development is concerned. But DOWNEY merely has been repeating what other California legislators have found to be true in the last few weeks.

They have discovered to their dismay—and the word has been passed on out to California Democratic Party leaders—the Reclamation Bureau is firmly on the side of Arizona in the fight over Colorado River water. Like DOWNEY, lawyers and California State and local officials who have come to Washington from time to time on water problems have known this for a long time. But the California congressional delegation roster changes in some respects every 2 years—at election time. So there are many newcomers who have not been so familiar with this fight.

Now even the freshmen must realize their fight to bring California its share of Colorado River water is not only with Arizona but also with the Reclamation Bureau.

The record of the Bureau in the last few weeks—the Bureau and the Interior Department being synonymous in this essay—has proved the hostility of Reclamation officials toward California. For example, President Truman said he didn't want to see the central Arizona irrigation-reclamation project started until the 2-State Colorado River water controversy had been resolved. Budget Director Frank Pace quoted the President to this effect in a letter to Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Yet when Oscar Chapman, Interior Under Secretary, referred to the project in a letter to O'MAHONEY, he deleted the President's thinking. Moreover, he neglected to point out that the President had gone so far as to say the central Arizona project was not in line with his program for developing the far West at this time.

These omissions were deliberate, according to California Congressmen, and certainly they appeared to be. Chapman's letter to O'MAHONEY brought into the open the hostility between California and the Interior Department, at least the Department's Reclamation Bureau.

The criticism of DOWNEY because he had harangued so long at the Bureau has died down. Californians read into Chapman's letter to O'MAHONEY a Bureau approval of the central Arizona project which would take from California some 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water annually.

Chapman, the real villain of the piece so far as California Congressmen are concerned, has tipped his hand before, but not many noticed it. In effect, he was supporting the central Arizona project when he advocated time and again the distillation of sea water for drinking and irrigation purposes along the California coast and the channeling of surplus Columbia River water thousands of miles from the State of Washington to southern California.

These projects were proposed to show California has potential sources of additional water other than the mighty Colorado.

Both of them are years away, even if they are practical, and Californians claim neither of them are.

In at least one other way Chapman and the Reclamation Bureau have attempted to thwart California in her fight for enough water to keep the southern end of the State from turning to desert. The Under Secretary's second letter to O'MAHONEY, in effect, was an unfavorable report on a California-backed resolution to send the Colorado River water division quarrel to the Supreme Court for settlement. Chapman said this should be done only as a last resort.

This position is Arizona's position too, for its officials know full well a Supreme Court decision would split the disputed 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water between the two contesting States. Arizona must have all 1,200,000 to make its central Arizona project work.

Unfortunately, squeezed into the middle of this mounting struggle between California and the Reclamation Bureau is a former Californian who would like to support the State where he was born, but can't. He is William E. Warne, Assistant Interior Secretary.

Warne has been a great help to Californians as they come to the Capital with individual water-development problems. But when it comes to the larger issue of the fight with Arizona he must remain silent officially and must side with his superiors as far as policy goes.

Not until O'MAHONEY's committee decides what to do about the central Arizona project and the bill to let the Supreme Court be a water-rights referee will Californians make their next move. If the committee rules against the Golden State, you can look for the fight to take on partisan lines, with California Democratic leaders stepping in to blast away at Chapman and his associates through the White House.

Canadian Tax Reduction Reflects on United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merryle S. Rukeyser:

CANADIAN TAX REDUCTION REFLECTS ON UNITED STATES

(By Merryle S. Rukeyser)

The newly announced tax-reduction program revealed by Douglas Abbott, Finance Minister of Canada, provides a yardstick for measuring the incompetent management of the finances of the Federal Government in the United States.

Exemptions in Canada have been raised in connection with the personal income tax, and rates have been lowered. In addition, the tax rate has been substantially cut for small corporations, though increased slightly for large ones. The net over-all effect will be substantial tax relief.

Numerous wartime excise taxes in Canada have been eliminated and others have been reduced. In addition, there has been relaxation of import restrictions, and numerous price ceilings have been removed.

SEEK STABILITY

In contrast to the policy of the Truman administration in proposing this year net increases in regular Federal taxes of $4,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 additional in pay-roll taxes the Canadian fiscal policy nearly 4 years after the end of the shooting phase of the war is to readjust Dominion affairs to more stable conditions.

Even in regard to price ceilings, the Canadian approach has been more orderly. On the other hand, the Truman administration backed and filled. The administration was anxious to beat the gun early on removal of war controls, and then later changed its mind and wanted to restore them.

But in respect to taxation, the Canadian attitude seems more healthy than that of the Keynesians and other doctrinaire policymakers in the Fair Deal.

These American theorists appear to be contemptuous of the taxpayer. They lean to the totalitarian view that the total national income belongs to the Government, and that the politicians in their generosity decide how much to release after taxes to the earners.

TAX RELIEF

Thus, they are reluctant to concede, as the Canadians have, that the time has come for tax relief.

Shortly after the Republican congressional sweep in November 1946, the counter-propaganda to the effect that the time has not yet come for tax relief began.

This was carried so far that Secretary Snyder took the view that even correction of admitted tax inequities should be deferred.

It resulted in a veto by President Truman last year in the personal income tax reduction schedules passed by the Eightieth Congress. The bill was, of course, repassed over the Presidential veto.

But through the campaign of 1948 the tax-reduction measure was castigated as a rich man's tax law.

That characterization was a Hitlerian lie because the 1948 revenue law primarily relieved low-income groups, removing several millions from the bottom of the tax rolls.

WRONG SLANT

In addition for the fiscal year to date, that is, since July 1 last, collections under the new law have resulted in a loss of revenue primarily from the low brackets only. The workingmen, including those on pay rolls subject to the withholding tax, have paid in during the current fiscal year $1,185,000,000 less than in the previous year. On the other hand, collections from the so-called rich men, those not in the withholding tax groups, have paid out in Federal income taxes substantially the same amounts as under the previous law.

Another difference between the Canadian and the Fair Deal bloc approach is that the latter evidently regards unprecedently heavy peacetime Federal spending as an instrument in economic planning for the welfare state.

Whatever the notivation, high taxation and a big Federal budget add to the social overhead, and are reflected in the cost of all goods and services produced.

Israeli Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole world has hailed Israel's fight for her own independence and her resistance to aggression. The courage and skill shown in this struggle have been convincing evidence of the fact that the Jews of Israel know how to fight in the cause of justice. A group of Israeli veterans are about to tour the United States in the interests of the United Jewish Appeal and to thank the American people for their sympathetic consideration of Israel. There is appended hereto the invitation to a reception to these veterans held in the Capitol, sent to interested Members by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and myself:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1949.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You are cordially invited to be present at a reception for soldier veterans of Israel's fight for independence on Friday, 1 p. m., April 1, in Statuary Hall in the Capitol. This contingent of from 7 to 12 Israeli veterans under the leadership of Lt. Col. Mati Dagan, Lt. Herzala Shalfon, Capt. Geyra Gershon, and Maj. Ben Arzi, is leaving from Washington on a train called the Caravan of Hope, one of seven different train units which will visit more than 100 cities in 41 States from April 3 to April 27 sponsored by the United Jewish Appeal to thank the United States for past help and as part of the current campaign to raise $250,000,000 for Jewish refugees and rehabilitation work in Europe, north Africa, and Israel.

Also present at the reception will be the military attaché of the Israeli Embassy (Col. Efraim Ben Arzi) and officials of the United Jewish Appeal. National and local press services are being invited to be present and to take photographs.

Will you be good enough to telephone extension 450 or 1974 to advise that you will be present.

Sincerely yours,
J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.
EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of Congress.

Among the Members of the Senate and House present were: Senator IRVING M. IVES, New York; Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida; Representatives WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; EMANUEL CELLER, New York; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey; EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey; JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, New York; LOUIS B. HELLER, New York; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; ARTHUR KLEIN, New York; HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; HENRY J. LATHAM, New York; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; HARRY P. O'NEILL, Pennsylvania; JAMES T. PATTERSON, Connecticut; WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, New York; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Connecticut; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois.

The Lacrosse (Va.) High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to welcome to Washington, the seat of government of our great country, the senior class, its teachers and sponsors, of the Lacrosse High School, Lacrosse, Va.

I desire to take this opportunity of commending these fine young people for the great interest they are taking in their Government. The youth of today will be the citizens of tomorrow; the failure of our country will depend upon them; they will chart its course; guide it toward its destiny.

This great Nation of ours remains the one great hope of freedom-loving people all over the world. It is the duty and obligation of the adults of today to see that our young people are given adequate, proper, and sufficient educational training, so that they may take their proper place in a fast-moving civilization. The burden is ours to impart unto them that spirit of liberty-loving, peace-seeking citizenship that will mean so much to the future of our civilization.

The schools, outside of the family, exert the greatest influence upon these, our future citizens. We have not adequately supported them; particularly is this true in my great State, and I for one desire to do everything in my power to see that equal educational opportunities are given to our boys and girls all over the country.

We who live in this great country of ours are indeed fortunate. We accept the many advantages and modern living conditions without realizing the hardships that went on before and secured for us our great heritage.

No ordinary men and women faced and suffered the harshness of the American frontier as they labored and bled to build a free society. An enterprising spirit was needed and a strength of body, industry, and daring. With it all was a willingness to serve at the same time the best interests of man, of the family, and the community in voluntary cooperation. They suffered much in sweat, blood, and tears to carve out of a vast wilderness a real civilization that remains the one last hope of democratic people all over the world.

Such men and women wanted no masters to rule over them. To the pioneer, freedom of body and soul, the right to determine his own way of life, the fellowship of neighbors and to follow his conscience in the worship of his God was sufficient compensation, and sometime the only compensation, for the hardships of the wilderness he was mastering. This freedom has been bequeathed to us. It is for us in this generation of gentler ways of living, the fruitage of earlier toil, to lose no part of the independence of spirit and the dear freedoms which our sterner age fathered.

Some Very Important Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the efforts of the vegetable-oil interests to substitute their oils for the greatest of all animal fats, butterfat.

Oleo is made by a combining of 80 percent vegetable oil and 15 percent skim milk, with salt, and so forth, added. A filled milk is made up of 3½ percent vegetable oil to 96½ percent skim milk.

Dr. Anton Carlson, the official spokesman for the oleo interests, stated at the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, held at La Crosse, Wis., on October 18, 1948, that skim milk was the real valuable part of milk, and attached little value to the butterfat content, as he held it could be replaced by vegetable oil. I take exception to this statement by him, as no experiment has ever been conducted that proved that a vegetable oil was equal to butterfat. When this is proven, the public may accept it, but not before. They should not accept conclusions drawn from phony experiments.

By replacing butter with oleo the savings, under normal times, would not exceed three to four dollars per capita per year. By replacing natural fluid milk with filled milk the savings would exceed $35 per capita per year.

If oleo equals butter, will you also vote to legalize filled milk? If filled milk, 96½ percent skim milk and 3½ percent vegetable oil is not nutritionally equal to natural bottled milk, how can a product with 80 percent vegetable oil and 15 percent skim milk be nutritionally equal to a 100 percent dairy product? If oleo is made legislatively equal to butter, will you accept filled milk as legislatively equal to natural bottled milk and allow it to be sold in the city of Washington? I include only Washington, as it is the only city in the United States that the Congress has direct control over the milk supply. If you accept the above substitutes, will you also accept filled ice cream, made with vegetable oil instead of butterfat, as being legislatively equal and allow its sale in the city of Washington? Will you also accept filled cheese, 32 percent butterfat content replaced by vegetable oil, as being legislatively equal to natural cheese, and allow it to be sold in the city of Washington?

The principle is the same, the formula is comparable, and if oleo is equal to butter, the other imitation products are

equal to butter, the other imitation products are equal to natural products.

Do you really wish to ruin the dairy industry? If not, support the Granger-Andresen bill, which is the real honest approach to a serious economic and nutritional problem.

Completion of John Martin Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. MARSALIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, a memorable occasion is taking place in eastern Colorado this day, with the Governors of both Colorado and Kansas present; also present will be Mrs. John A. Martin, widow of the late Congressman, and an estimated twelve to fifteen thousand people to witness the completion-day ceremonies held at the site of the John Martin Dam.

Older Members of this body well remember the late John A. Martin, for whom this project was named. A long resident of eastern Colorado, he had many times witnessed this river in times of both drought and flood. He had seen its ravages at flood stage and its impotence in time of drought. Upon his election to Congress in 1932, he immediately became active in behalf of this project and after some 6 years continuous effort was rewarded by seeing its final approval. Mr. Martin died in 1940, but he lived long enough to see the construction work on this undertaking actually started.

I quote from the March 25 issue of the Pueblo Chieftain concerning the initial phases of this project:

In 1923 the dream of a dam that would take care of the irrigation needs of the lower Arkansas Valley began to shape up. In that year M. C. Hinderlier, State engineer, and H. D. Amsley, superintendent of the Fort Lyon Canal Co., made a survey of the watershed from which water would be drained if a dam should be built at Caddoa. The map of the survey covers land from Palmer Lake to Leadville and Trinidad, showing all the Arkansas River system above the dam.

In 1932 chambers of commerce throughout the valley selected men to work on a committee to promote the dam project. This committee was composed of A. C. Gordon, of Lamar; Arthur S. Dean and C. N. Troup, of Las Animas; J. D. Craighead, of La Junta; Louis Sickenberger, of Manzanola; and Miss Vena Pointer, of Pueblo.

In 1935 the Colorado State Legislature passed a flood control of water in all Colorado rivers. The Governor appointed a committee at that time for Caddoa Dam, which was composed of Miss Pointer, Craighead, Dean; M. M. Simpson, of McClave; Charles Wooden, of Lamar; and W. J. Rowe, of Wiley.

June 22 of the following year authorization for the dam came when Congress approved the flood-control act to provide for flood control and water conservation for Colorado and Kansas.

Today both eastern Colorado and western Kansas are reaping the benefits of the untiring efforts of the late Congressman John A. Martin and all these many other people who worked so unselfishly for this project. Waters of the Arkansas River, which otherwise, in a flood stage, would have caused great damage in this area, are now harnessed and made harmless. They are now stored instead and put to the beneficial use of irrigating many fertile farmlands that otherwise would, during certain periods of the year, become parched and barren.

I am certain that all who have worked so hard toward this undertaking share a great feeling of satisfaction at this time in knowing that they have helped accomplish that which has already benefited, and will continue for years to come to benefit, the people of a large area of our State and adjoining Kansas.

I extend to them my sincere congratulations on a job well done and express my deep regrets at my inability to be present on this occasion.

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Oldest Settlement in the Mississippi Valley: Cahokia, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1949, observance of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the oldest settlement in the Mississippi Valley will begin at Cahokia, Ill., in the Twenty-fifth Illinois Congressional District.

Historical societies of Illinois and Missouri and a dozen or more other prominent organizations are cooperating in arrangements for this important event. The governors of all the States within the area of the old Northwest Territory have been invited by the Governor of Illinois to participate in the observance.

The story of Cahokia is best told in the article by Mr. Irving Dilliard, past president, Illinois State Historical Society. Under leave to do so, I herewith present this interesting story to my colleagues in the House. It follows:

CAHOKIA: TWO CENTURIES AND A HALF

(By Irving Dilliard, past president, Illinois State Historical Society)

The first settlement on the Mississippi River.

The oldest community in the entire Mississippi Valley.

The westernmost American defense outpost in the Revolutionary War.

The last surviving example of a French colonial church.

To possess one of these distinctions would be honor enough for any community. Cahokia, a village of 830 people at the junction of Illinois highways 3 and 157, 3 miles south of East St. Louis, enjoys all four.

Cahokia took its name from a village of Indians adjacent to the point where a mission was started in 1699. The English spelling of the name of this group of Indians passed through many forms, including Caos, Caoquias and Kaouches and finally became Cahokia.

This first permanent white settlement in the wilderness along the Mississippi was founded by priests of the Seminary of Quebec. The year, 1699, was less than two decades after LaSalle's Fort de Crèvecoeur on the Illinois River, short-lived first French fort in the West. Thus, Cahokia is 19 years older than New Orleans, 65 years older than St. Louis, 104 years older than Chicago and 139 years older than St. Paul. Perhaps the best way to date Cahokia is to say it was founded the same year as Williamsburg, Va.

Official sanction for the mission which became Cahokia was issued by Bishop Jean Baptiste de la Croix-Chevrière de St. Vallier at Quebec July 14, 1698. (Bishop St. Vallier had formerly been court chaplain to Louis XIV.) Traveling by canoe and portage via the Great Lakes and the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, the mission party, under Father François Joliet de Montigny, was received by the Tamaroa Indians December 8, 1698. Friendly relations were established, and the priests went on to survey the valley as far south as the Arkansas. On their return, Father Jean François Buisson de St. Cosme, Capuchin monk, became resident pastor of the mission to the Tamaroas.

By May 14, 1699, a lodging had been put up, and a chapel was under way. The exact date of the first church's dedication is not known, but it followed soon, and a cross was raised "with greatest possible ceremony." It is said that some 2,000 Indians looked on.

Cahokia soon began to attract French settlers from Canada and the Gulf. As a rapidly developing fur center, it was a vital link to the West, the Canadian far North, and the Gulf coast South. Though an important trading post up to 1800, the settlement always was small. A combination of causes kept it from growing. The mission was in territory through which an occasional Jesuit had moved on calls to Indian villages. As a result, the Jesuits set up a rival mission at Cahokia. This circumstance caused the resulting controversy over mission territory to be taken to France. There it was decided in 1701. Under the ruling, the Jesuits departed 57 miles downstream in 1703. This new site became Kaskaskia, first capital of Illinois on the State's admission to the Union in 1818.

Cahokia's growth was affected also by the decision of the French to erect Fort de Chartres (1719), only 40 miles south on the river, and to make this new post the seat of civil and military government. The worst set-back, however, came after 1763, at the close of the French and Indian wars, and after the eastern side of the Mississippi was ceded to the British. About this time, Pierre Laclède Liguest decided for trade reasons to found St. Louis, on the west bank, 4 miles north.

Through the centuries Cahokia has been host to many diverse celebrities. Among these was Pontiac, the famed Ottawa chief, who was assassinated on the village street April 20, 1769. Here, during the American War of Independence, George Rogers Clark negotiated successfully for Indian neutrality in the struggle and drew aid for his successful expedition against Vincennes.

New research is bringing out the role of Cahokia as the site of Fort Bowman, whose foundation stones perhaps became the base for the old Holy Family Church. This rock fort was the westernmost bastion of the American defenses in the Revolutionary War from 1778 to 1781. With St. Louis' help, Cahokia conducted the successful defense of May 1780 which saved the whole Mississippi Valley for the colonists. Cahokia was the site of the great Indian council of August-September 1780, and Cahokians took a prominent part in the Rock River expedition and other strategic campaigns.

In the 1700's, Cahokia was the typical French village in the New World. It had a common pasture land and a large common field. The latter was divided into long strips for cultivation. Life centered around the

church. Most inhabitants were humble folk, farmers, traders, or adventurers inured to the wilderness hardships.

Today Cahokia is still an autonomous community in the St. Louis-East St. Louis metropolitan area. The village government consists of a board of trustees whose president is Ernest Sauget—a name that bears witness to the persistence of French influence.

Cahokia has had much less than its fair share of attention in our history. The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary provides the best possible opportunity for recognizing its great importance as a mission, as a pioneer settlement, as a fur-trade center, as a seat of frontier government, and as a key defense in the West when the stake was success or failure in the colonial struggle for freedom. Cahokia's many birthday candles may burn quietly, but they are steady and bright after two centuries and a half.

The British tried to persuade the white French settlers to stay and were able to keep some families, but others ferried their goods, their cattle, and even portions of their homes at night. And so Cahokia remained a village, fronting close to the Mississippi's narrow channel, between its two small streams, petite rivière des Kaohias and rivière du pont.

About 1760, there was erected at Cahokia a sturdy dwelling of French provincial architecture. This was the home of the Saucier family whose first member in the New World had come from Orleans, France, to erect Fort de Chartres. It became a St. Clair County district courthouse in 1793. Cahokia was the county seat from 1795 to 1814. At this period, St. Clair County included most of southern Illinois. After exhibition in St. Louis and Chicago, its old logs were brought back to Cahokia and in 1939–40 were set up by the State of Illinois in a careful restoration, now maintained as a public museum.

Cahokia's original Holy Family chapel was destroyed by fire. In February 1799 Father Jean Olivier came to the village, and by September a new walnut log church was ready. Hand-hewn timbers were set upright, and the eaves were built in the flaring style of Quebec. In the nineteenth century, the log and stone construction was covered with siding to protect it from the weather. Later supplanted by a stone church, the old structure is now in process of restoration. The National Park Service has announced its readiness to designate the church as one of a few national historic sites if it is restored under proper architectural guidance and opened to the public. On behalf of the diocese of Belleville, Bishop Albert R. Zuroweste has pledged $10,000 toward the restoration. Other places of historic interest at Cahokia are the large brick Jarrot mansion house, built about 1799–1805, and the old burying ground.

Who Is Behind the Move of the Veterans' Administration Medical Center From New York to Boston?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has determined to move the medical center from New York City to Boston.

Following the receipt of a large number of protesting telegrams and communications, I wrote the Administrator as follows:

This letter is intended to register my emphatic protest against a proposed move of the headquarters of the Veterans' Administration from New York to Boston. Attached are a few of the professional and administrative reasons which seem to me to argue against this change in location.

I have received a number of communications from constituents vigorously opposed to this move to Boston and hope it may be possible for you to reconsider the decision which has been made.

I shall be grateful if I may have a report from you, and if the decision is adhered to that the location should be Boston, I should appreciate it if I might have a statement of your reasons for this decision.

Attached to this letter were set forth 14 professional and administrative reasons why this move appears to be a mistake, both from the point of view of the veterans to be served and the interest of the taxpayers. In my letter, as will be noted, an invitation was extended to the Administrator to set forth his reasons for this action.

To my letter I have received the following reply:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 15, 1949, in which you outline the advantages of the location of the so-called district office in New York City.

May I state that it is not contemplated that any operative functions will be carried on in any installations other than our field stations and central office. However, in the interest of economy and travel we will have representatives with official stations at certain localities in the field. This in no sense will be a district office, but simply, as previously stated, official headquarters. The personnel on duty will be traveling the greater part of the time and these supervisory activities will bring the supervision of central office closer to the hospital and other medical activities in the field, thereby assuring the finest medical service to veterans.

It has been decided that for those representatives visiting Veterans' Administration installations in the New England and New York State area, Boston, Mass., will be their official headquarters. Of course, a large percentage of their time will be spent in the New York area, where there are a number of medical Veterans' Administration installations.

Obviously, this letter gives no reason for the change, perhaps for the justifiable reason that there is none, at least none on the merits.

The newly created region which is to be served by this office consists of the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Puerto Rico. It is now proposed to change the headquarters from the geographically central and most easily accessible city of New York to the relatively remote and inaccessible city of Boston. The only Members who should view this move without concern are those representing districts in and around Boston. Naturally, they are greatly pleased by this decision. Regardless of their political affiliation, however, or the political prominence of those advocating this change, the 45 Members from New York, together with the 15 from New Jersey and Delaware, as well as those representing veterans in New England districts closely adjoining New York, should register their vigorous protests.

One of the foremost doctors in the East, who has intimately studied this problem, has furnished me some interesting statistics. They were passed on to the Administrator and remain unchallenged in his reply.

Fifty percent of all veterans examined and 62 percent of all veterans treated in out-patient clinics in the proposed regional area are in metropolitan New York. Fifty-eight percent of all Veterans' Administration hospital beds located in the entire area are concentrated in metropolitan New York. The physical medical rehabilitation program and clinic activity are more fully developed in New York than anywhere else. The prosthetic shop and curative work shop are located in New York, as is the prosthetic and sensory aid service.

The New York City area contains a great preponderance of the medical schools and dental schools in the proposed region. The social service training program and the clinical psychology training program are concentrated in New York. The concentration of medical, dental, and nursing manpower is to be found in the New York area.

Fifty percent of the veteran population of the entire area is located in metropolitan New York. Of course, if there is added the veteran population of the rest of New York State and of New Jersey and Delaware, the proportion of the total number of veterans adversely affected by this surprising move reaches a figure leading one to question seriously whether, in this proposed change of headquarters, the interest of the veterans themselves has been a factor at all. Among all those who have served their country, certainly the disabled are entitled to our first consideration. I feel sure the Veterans' Administration recognizes that fact, as do the Members of Congress. The American Legion, Department of New York, should be commended for its vigorous opposition to this inexcusable and unexplained maneuver. I hope the voices of all Members from this regional area will be raised in protest, even, indeed, any who may have heretofore urged a special benefit for the few in and around Boston at the expense of the many throughout the entire area.

Should Anyone Be Misled Into Passing Legislation To Ruin the Dairy Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a comparatively few years much progress has been made in experiments to show the true value of milk. There is nothing in a hundred pounds of milk that is not found in 5 pounds of butter and 8 pounds of dried skim; or 10 pounds of cheese, if byproducts are recaptured; or in about 50 pounds of evaporated milk.

The University of Wisconsin has been one of the leading institutions conducting experiments developing the true value of milk. Much of the work developing vitamin A was performed in the laboratory of Dr. E. B. Hart, recognized as one of the world's greatest nutritionists. Vitamin D was also discovered at the University of Wisconsin by Dr. Steinbach. Dr. Hart has always contended that there was an unknown factor in milk that he called X, still remaining to be discovered, that was accountable for some of the nutritional miracles performed by this great product, milk.

The Waupaca County Post, of Waupaca, Wis., dated March 17, shows another discovery. The article follows:

DISCOVER MILK TO BE BIG SOURCE OF NIACIN

CHICAGO.—Something new has been discovered about the nutritious quality of milk.

Science reported today that milk, because of its high protein value, is an important source of niacin, a vitamin required by the body for normal health.

Working on a 4-year research project at the University of Wisconsin under the sponsorship of the National Dairy Council, Chicago, Dr. Elvehjem and his associates point out that niacin's dietary values became known in the search for a cure for pellagra, a skin disease with a history of several thousand fatalities annually, particularly in the southern part of the United States.

Patients fed milk improved in health, but no one seemed to understand why. More recent research discloses that milk prevents early signs of niacin deficiencies which may occur even in persons who think they are well nourished.

The University of Wisconsin study provides proof that milk, generally thought to be low in niacin content, acquires an abundance of the much-needed vitamin for health from the protein in the milk through the process of synthesis in the body.

Saint Patrick's Day Address of Secretary of the Navy Hon. John L. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by Hon. John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy, before members and guests of the Irish Civic Association, in Cleveland, on March 17:

It is always a great pleasure for me to come to Cleveland, because of the many good friends I have here and because of the enthusiasm which this community has repeatedly demonstrated toward your United States Navy.

I had the privilage of witnessing that enthusiasm on Navy Day, 1946, when I came here to take part in the day's observance and to present to my good friend, Mayor Burke, a model of one of our fightingest cruisers, the U. S. S. *Cleveland*, as a small token to the citizens of Cleveland of your Navy's appreciation of services rendered. These services included the raising of huge sums of money through war-loan drives, the manufacture of multiple types of equipment and munitions during the war, and, above all, the service of your sons and daughters in the armed forces.

It is a very special privilege for me to come here on Saint Patrick's Day to join with you leaders of this great city under the auspices of your Irish Civic Association in honoring the men and women of Irish descent who have contributed so much to the greatness of America since the very earliest days of the Western Hemisphere.

We gather here tonight as, all over the world for 1,500 years Irishmen, their descendants and their friends have gathered to pay tribute to the birthland of great ideals, the homeland of an indomitable spirit.

Tonight—wherever they may be, Irish and those like you and me—their kin in race or sentiment—pause to pay their ancient tribute to Patrick, the patron saint and the inspiration of that great land of saints, scholars, and pioneers. Tonight, once again, we realize that Ireland, often destitute in many ways, is always rich in the love and loyalty of her children and her admirers at home and abroad. Proudly we remember that for centuries she had commanded a respect, a loyalty and an affection that almost any other nation in the world well might envy.

Usually upon such an occasion, the speakers of the evening talk about the role of Irishmen in the birth of this Republic—as though we had to prove our birthright. They speak of Smith, Taylor, Thornton, and Rutledge, Carroll, McKean, Read, and Lynch—all of whom signed the Declaration of Independence. They talk of Long, Fitzsimmons, Duane, Carroll, Burke, and the others who were Members of the Continental Congress. They tell you of James Moore, Governor of Carolina in 1700—and of Dobbs, Rowan, and Burke who were Governors in the next 80 years—all Irishmen. They talk of John Barry, the father of your Navy. They remind you that in the Revolutionary War there were 327 Connors, 500 Murphys, 695 Kellys.

Now we all know the extent to which men of Irish descent have participated in every war this country has fought. But tonight I might be supposed to talk about Americans of Irish blood in the Navy in World War II. I acknowledge a temptation to talk about such heroes as Adm. Dan Callaghan, Father Joe O'Callaghan, the Sullivan brothers and many others of Irish name and blood. Tonight I resist that temptation. To be sure, there were thousands of Kellys and Murphys and Sweeneys in every type of uniform American fighting men wore in World War II. But we must remember that there were an equal number of Browns and Joneses. And a lot of Bernsteins and Cohens.

So rather than narrate the long and honorable roll of contributions to the war effort by men and women of Irish blood—both in and out of uniform—I prefer to speak more generally of all Americans of Irish blood and their hopes for America in the years to come.

We Americans of Irish ancestry know we owe as much to America as any other group, and probably much more than some. We're proud that we have been able over the last 175 years to give more than we've taken. We hope it will always be so. We have our faults and we know them. But we think we possess some qualities of the heart and some eternal principles of humane justice and charity that America and the world need.

Our own fortunate America attracted the Irish because from the very first day of the founding of the early colonies our institutions were dedicated to the protection of freedom of the spirit and the preservation of the dignity of man. The American dream of liberty under the law and of equal opportunity for all did not take long to fire the imagination of the Irish. We find woven into the third stanza of that old Irish ballad, The Wearing of the Green, these very significant words:

"I've heard a whisper of a country
That lies beyond the sea,
Where rich and poor stand equal
In the light of freedom's day.
O Erin, must we leave you, driven
by a tyrant's hand?
Must we ask a mother's blessing
From a strange and distant land?"

Our forebears who asked and received that blessing were men and women of simple and abiding faith. They came to America full of hope, and for them and for their children's children their faith and their hopes have been justified and fulfilled.

It is against their background and heritage of faith, hope, courage, optimism, and enthusiasm that we of Irish blood contemplate the international problems that beset the people of the United States.

We know full well that without a just and enduring peace the horizons and the boundaries of the human spirit will shrink ever inward, and that neither America nor any other nation will achieve its destiny. We are convinced that peace is not an accident that just happens, but rather an objective requiring and deserving the same effort and uity that is required to win a war. We know, too, that there is a price for peace—but it is characteristic of the Irish never to count the cost.

For we know, oh so well, that in this modern world no man can ever again be an island entire of itself. Henceforth, whenever forces of aggression seek to abridge liberty and disrupt the peace in however remote a corner of the globe no one will need ask for whom the bell tolls. We will know it tolls for us all, unless America, acting in concert with the other peace and liberty loving members of the United Nations exerts its full influence at once to halt that aggression.

I detest alarmists and I hope I never become one. However, it would take a very optimistic man indeed to survey the world of today and find that all was well. I believe it is possible for us to work out our differences. I pray God that we will. But only a fool could fail to recognize the potential dangers of today's international tension.

Ever since 1914 we have wondered if we would ever see a return of those conditions we usually describe as normal. Speaking to a high school forum in New York, Father I. Gannon, former president of Fordham University, said to those youngsters: "Your generation has a different point of view. You were born into chaos. It is part of the providence of God that you, who have to pick up the pieces of the modern age, should look on disorder and uncertainty as a normal condition to be faced without surprise or fear."

I completely agree with Father Gannon that the world is, and for some time has been, in relative chaos. I fear he is right when he says that we must look on disorder and uncertainty as a normal condition to be faced without surprise or fear. I am sure he would agree with me that despite our lack of surprise and fear we must in the years to come—as never before—stay alert and on guard. We must all broaden our interests and our perception. We must all learn to appreciate just what is at stake in this world today and the methods and techniques that may be used to deprive us of our birthright.

Since the beginning of this year in the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and the Protestant clergy of Bulgaria our world has seen the most brazen and ruthless attack upon God and on religion that has been witnessed in many centuries. The significance of these trials can neither be minimized nor discounted. They were steps in the progress and development of an ideology, which since VJ-day has brought to all civilization history's greatest disillusionment.

Three and one-half years ago we settled down to enjoy the fruits of victory in a world liberated from aggression, from the dread

specter of future war and from the bestiality and oppression that brought war to Europe in 1939.

With record-breaking speed this country demobilized the world's greatest Army, Navy, and Air Force and left America with a skeletonized military organization. To our amazement we saw our international influence disintegrate in proportion to the demobilization of our military power.

Already we had seen Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania gobbled up. We witnessed now the death of democratic processeses in Poland. We watched Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania fall victims to as ruthless an aggression as any country had suffered at the hands of Hitler. Then we watched Czechoslovakia die. For the second time in 10 years there was imposed upon the free people of that country a way of life to which they prefer death—even as Jan Masaryk. The tear-streamed faces of the plain people along his funeral line-of-march in Prague reminded us of those broken-hearted men and women who wept publicly when France was dismembered.

Then it was that we experienced something of the same apprehension that paralyzed us in the late thirties and early forties. But today there is one conspicuous difference. We know now that salvation cannot be found in appeasement. We know now that wisdom and vision and military strength that commands respect can help to preserve the peace, just as stupidity, blindness, and weakness can invite the very conflict we seek to avoid. The cold war in which we are now engaged is tragic, but it is immeasurably better than the hot war into which we might have been mouse-trapped by a policy of inaction.

I realize that the $15,000,000,000 budget set by President Truman for military expenditures during the coming fiscal year is a very large sum of money. I ask you to remember that it is still less than 5 percent of the $350,000,000,000 it cost us to win World War II—a war in which 400,000 fine young Americans gave their lives.

Until this world achieves a far greater stability than is apparent today, we cannot afford the luxury of reducing the premiums we pay to insure world peace.

Since our national decision to wage peace with the same vigor with which we waged war, the situation in Europe has improved substantially. Greece and Italy—almost lost to democracy 2 years ago—remain steadfast. In western Europe there has been a gradual and noticeable improvement which encourages us to believe that the Marshall plan is one of the most important paths to peaceful settlement of the problems of the postwar world. All of this, though expensive, has been well worth the price.

Since the German surrender and including the first year's installment of the European recovery program the people of America have given to the impoverished people of the devastated countries of the world assistance totaling $21,000,000,000—more than 10 times the cost of developing the atomic bomb.

As Bernard Baruch has wisely observed: "One could search vainly mankind's whole history for comparable generosity."

Were it not for these saving contributions made by the people of the United States, the condition and the future of Europe and many other parts of the world today would be indescribably chaotic.

We are now in the process of formulating an Atlantic Pact to give further assurance to the western European democracies that we do not intend again to stand idly by while they will be engulfed by totalitarianism. We do not intend again to see a fortress Europe in hostile hands. For curselves and for the friendly peoples of Europe, an ounce of true liberty now may be worth many pounds of liberation later.

Make no mistake about it. All of these acts and every move your Government is making is devised to protect and preserve the peace, not to prepare for war.

It has never been the policy of your Government to attempt to drive the Soviet system from its birthplace. Your Government has never taken the position that it cannot live in a world where communism exists. However, Communist leaders view with alarm every manifestation of freedom and repeatedly proclaim that communism and what we call democracy cannot exist together.

America has no military or imperial objective which threatens the Russian people. The Communist system has nothing we want or ever will want. Their greatest exportable product today is chaos. Their only reason for saying that communism and democracy cannot live together is because they know that tyranny, however buttressed by censorship in the cruelest police state, cannot survive so long as freedom exists anywhere in the world.

Not for long can they satisfy their own people with communism while life remains worth the living under any other system.

Why the fantastic propaganda against the four freedoms of the western world in those satellite countries where secret police sway opinion and the sword dangles menacingly over the ballot box? It is because they know that to dominate they must first confuse, distract, and divide—and then conquer. Their every effort is bent to prevent and abort the one thing they fear most—the one thing the people of the world must have—truth.

Hence, the refusal of communism to let the rest of the world see freely into their world, and their refusal to let their own people take a free look at ours. Hence the iron curtain. Hence the resolution offered to the United Nations by Vyshinski calling for world-wide censorship.

By its official pronouncements and by its every act since VJ-day, communism has made its ultimate objective abundantly clear—the complete communization of the world. For communism to flourish they are convinced that freedom must perish.

In this contest of ideologies which today threatens to divide the world, we can depend upon Americans of Irish descent to support unitedly and wholeheartedly the present American policy to prevent the spread of godless communism. Their full and undeviating loyalty to the principles and practices of American democracy has never been questioned. They have always been among our foremost champions of personal liberty, national independence, and human dignity. We know that it is but natural for an Irishman, coming as he does from the land which has had to fight for nearly 1,500 years to preserve its integrity and its culture, to join voluntarily and with all the vigor at his command into any campaign for the liberation of the bodies and spirits of men anywhere. That is why, through the centuries, Irishmen, like our United States marines, have fought in every clime and place.

Like every American of Irish blood, I share your pride in this record. I hope that in my lifetime I may prove worthy of the rich heritage of faith, hope, courage, enthusiasm, and optimism passed on to me by my forebears and of the mighty examples given me by compatriots of the past and the present.

We love America and the ideals for which she stands. We love her for what she has given us in opportunities to enrich our lives, to enjoy the freedoms we cherish. We love her for the place she holds in the affections of all mankind as the land of enlightened liberty and the champion of human dignity.

Our devotion, however, must be something more than an affectionate optimism that somehow everything will work out all right. We must face present problems with a realistic approach and with full consciousness that we must all continue to devote our best efforts to these ideals if they are to survive and prosper. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that our survival will always be threatened so long as there are destructive ideologies with aggressive tendencies abroad in the world.

We must always remember that the price of inaction may ultimately be many times greater than the costs of all the steps we can take to preserve our heritage.

The events of the past 3 years of uneasy peace and the reaction of the American people to these events hearten my confidence that all of us are ready to work as hard, as unitedly, and as untiringly for peace as we did for victory in war.

Our experiences in the last two great wars have taught us a lesson which we are prepared to heed from now on. We are resolved to make every effort while time remains to weld the strongest possible chains to keep in leash the dogs of war.

We believe that a strong America can help to prevent war. As a Nation, we will continue to take every possible practical step to preserve the peace of the world.

Our President has repeatedly pledged our support to all measures contributing to the preservation of peace.

We have done all these things because we believe we can best assure our own security and the stability and peace of the world by these means. We freely acknowledge that the problems our generation will face in the next 20 years may be as great or greater than those we face today. We must acknowledge that the sacrifices we shall be called upon to make may be greater than those we are now making.

Whatever the problems, whatever the sacrifices asked in our remaining years we gladly accept as the challenges of our destiny.

We know that everything we are, that everything we hope our children to become, is at stake. We dare not fail, lest civilization suffer its worst retrogression in all recorded history.

Here on this continent our forefathers established a system of government and a way of life which has proved to be the world's greatest contribution to human freedom and the dignity of man. It represents today civilization's brightest promise and strongest hope. It must not perish.

In the words of the poet Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We made this thing, this dream,
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This peaceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
over submitted bodies and the dead
But as live earth where anything could grow
* * * We made it * * * and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained!"

May God give us the wisdom and the courage and the determination to do all those things that must be done to protect and preserve this America, and to help keep the world at peace.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the April issue of Better Homes and Gardens, by Ellis Arnall, former

Governor of Georgia, on Federal aid to education:

The schools belong to children. There are 28,000,000 boys and girls of school age in the United States. Some of them have the advantages of fine buildings, adequate libraries, carefully tended playgrounds, and wholly competent teachers. Most of them do not. Perhaps your children are among the latter.

Five days each week, for more than three-quarters of the year, millions of American children go to school in slums. Their homes may be attractive, but the places where they spend many of their waking, formative hours deserve the phrase a child recently used in my presence: "I don't like to go to that dump!"

We are disseminating illiteracy all over the Nation. Americans have a right to travel freely about their country, seeking the kind of place that they want for a home. They are entitled to good schools wherever they live.

The aim of Federal aid to education is to make it possible for your child, for every child, to have a high-school education in a good school.

Washington and the debates of the United States Senate may be a long way from the school where your child spends 5 days each week, September until June. They may be a long way from your community. But the decisions made there decide the kind of neighbors you have and the kind of playmates your children have and the kind of education that they get.

To explain that, here is the story of a grammar-school class, and of four of the children attending it.

The school building is a good one. The Federal Government paid for its erection in this instance, because it is located in an area where new wartime industries swelled the population. It is a single story structure, well lighted and well heated, and more attractive than 90 percent of the school buildings in this country.

The sixth grade has 37 pupils, 7 more than desirable; but is less overcrowded than in many towns. The teacher is paid $1,890 a year, somewhat better than the national average for sixth-grade teachers. She has taught school 9 years.

In the second seat of the first row sits Robert Lee. He is attentive. He is doing fairly well in civics, reading, and geography. His spelling is poor. His arithmetic is surprisingly good; he has a knack for figures. He is almost 14, 2 years behind in school. He comes from a rural school, four rooms, each heated by a stove fed with fat lightwood knots. When the weather was bad, he had to stay out, because he lived more than a mile from the school-bus stop. His teacher was paid $75 a month, $750 a year, the highest salary she had ever received for caring for a class of almost 40.

Elaine sits in the first seat of the second row. She will be 12 this month. She has not mastered the use of the school library and its reference books. Her reading and arithmetic are both poor. She may have to drop back a grade. She came from a metropolitan city where there is an iron curtain about the operations of the schools. Its adminstration will have nothing to do with the National Education Association. Standards are locally set. The school system is the toy of politicians.

Midway in the same row sits Gertrude. She is 12. She found it hard to get along with the other children at first. Gertrude comes from the same city as Elaine. Her parents had a better-than-average income. This year is her first in a public school, because, before she moved, they sent her to a private school, a thousand dollars a year. She likes the public school better, now that she is used to the children. Her report card shows "A" all the way down.

Opposite Gertrude, in the third row, sits James. He is a home-town child. He went to the first grade in the old building, and then transferred to the temporary wooden structure that went up, complete with pot-bellied stove in the middle of the room. It burned during the Christmas holidays in 1945. That winter before the school burned was a winter of sniffles for James, a winter of dread of fire for his mother. She was relieved when the school burned down and it was safely over. He has been going to school in the new building for 4 years. James makes average grades. Jimmy's parents like their town. They like it better than the one from whch they moved, soon before Jimmy was born—in a New England State which assumed no responsibility for education. There through a very high local tax rate, the resources of the community could provide fairly good teachers' salaries, well above the average for the State; but money could never be found to replace the school building, which combined the exterior aspect of a prison with the inside climate of a cold-storage room.

Those are some of the schools of America, and some of the children who become your children's associates, children who must manage the world's affairs tomorrow.

Almost half our States cannot provide the money for decent schools. These States have exported illiteracy throughout the country.

More than half our teachers are underpaid. Less capable men and women are likely to become predominant in the school world within another 10 years. The better teachers appreciate the gratitude of the public and its recognition of the high responsibility of their calling; but they are beginning to regard gratitude as counterfeit currency and to ask for payment in cash.

The average per capita income in the United States in 1946 was $1,213. In 14 States it was less than a thousand dollars. In all but one of these 14 States, rejections for educational deficiency under selective service during World War II were more than double the national average.

These young men were illiterate because they had been deprived of an opportunity to learn. In the middle of a war, facing a manpower shortage on the battlefield and in industry, the Nation had to stop and teach young men to read and write. Federal aid is designed to equalize educational opportunity in America, end illiteracy, give every child a chance for a decent education.

Federal aid has been attacked on the grounds that it's an invasion of State and local rights to control education.

Put briefly, the Thomas bill, the same as introduced by Senator TAFT and passed by the Senate in 1948, provides that:

"The Federal Government appropriated $300,000,000 a year to be distributed to the States for public elementary- and secondary-school uses. The distribution is determined by the ratio between the average income of the citizens and the number of children attending school. Supervision of the schools remains in the hands of the States, except that the Federal Government would have to be assured that the money actually went for teachers' salaries and other legitimate purposes."

Security for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, wide consideration is being given to the proposal by the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, that our veterans and their families be given special protection within the framework of the social-security system.

Proposals now are before the Congress to increase the benefits and broaden the scope of our present social-security law. There is general recognition of the need for the passage of such legislation. We also are aware of the need to give our veterans and their families security on a fiscally sound basis.

The Carroll plan unites these two needs into a proposal which has many advantages over a so-called veterans' pension plan. Each veteran is given what amounts to a paid-up insurance policy, to which he can add by making additional contributions to the social-security fund. There is no needs test and veterans are not placed on a dole in any sense. Benefits for widows and dependent children are considerably greater than those possible under a straight veterans' pension. The total cost of the plan is estimated at 8 to 10 percent of that of the pension bill which was brought to the floor of the House recently.

The Carroll plan can be made a part of H. R. 2893, on which hearings are being held by the House Ways and Means Committee. I understand that legislation to this effect will be introduced soon.

We must approach the problem of security for our veterans on the most practical and sound basis possible. The Carroll plan certainly offers good reason for the House to delay any other action on veterans' pensions until this alternative has been thoroughly explored.

The principal features of the Carroll plan are ably explained in articles appearing in the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers on March 29. I include these articles for study and consideration by Members of Congress:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of March 29, 1949]

CARROLL PENSION PLAN TIED TO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(By James Daniel)

Representative JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, Colorado, has proposed to blanket all veterans of World Wars I and II under the social-security old-age insurance system, instead of putting the superannuated ones on the pension rolls.

Here's how Mr. CARROLL says his plan would work:

Each of the more than 18,000,000 veterans would be given, at no cost to him, a social-security basic credit equivalent to pay-roll taxes on an income of $3,000 a year for 10 years.

Each veteran would have this credit as a right, regardless of the duration of his military service.

The credit would entitle the veteran to minimum retirement benefits of $64 a month when he reaches age 65. He could increase the benefit to as much as $90 a month by paying the social-security pay-roll taxes on his earning from employment before reaching that age.

For a married veteran and his wife the basic-credit benefits would be $96 a month when the husband has reached age 65 and the wife has reached age 60, and these benefits also could be increased by payment of taxes on earnings while employed.

SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

If the veteran died, leaving a widow and orphans, the widow would receive $96 a month insurance if she has one child less than 18 years old; $120 a month if she has two children; $150 a month if she has three or more children. If childless, the widow would receive $48 a month at the age of 60.

These insurance features, Mr. CARROLL believes, should be of special interest to World War II veterans, most of whom won't reach retirement age for many years.

The original pension bill offered by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, and defeated last week in the House, proposed $90-a-month pensions at 65 for all veterans who served as long as 90 days in either world war. The substitute bill now offered by Mr. RANKIN would provide pensions of $72 a month, limit them to World War I veterans, and apply a means test for eligibility.

Representative CARROLL, who is 48, served overseas in both world wars. He was one of the leaders in the House battle which resulted in defeat of the original Rankin bill by a 208-to-207 vote.

Mr. CARROLL says actuaries have estimated the eventual cost of his plan at $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000. The pension proposal of the original Rankin bill would have cost over $100,000,000,000 in the next 50 years, according to Government estimates.

As one concession to practical politics, the Carroll plan would put all veterans under social-security protection without forcing an immediate decision on President Truman's request that coverage be extended to farmers, self-employed persons, and others not now in the social-security system.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of March 29, 1949]

BETTER THAN PENSIONS

Congress should give careful consideration to the plan, proposed by Representative JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, for aiding aged veterans of World Wars I and II.

Mr. CARROLL, who served in both wars, believes he has something better, fairer, and much less costly than the Rankin pension bill, which he helped to defeat in the House last week. His plan is explained in an article by James Daniel, Scripps-Howard Washington correspondent, today.

A great advantage of the Carroll plan, we think, is that it would tie in with the social-security system.

Instead of putting the veterans in a special class, apart from that system, it would provide them with special benefits under that system. The Government would give each veteran without cost to him, a basic social-security credit. He could increase the value of this credit by paying social-security taxes on his earnings from employment in the years before reaching age 65.

Each veteran and, if he is married, his wife would be assured of retirement benefits. And World War II veterans, most of whom won't reach retirement age for many years, would be assured meanwhile of added life insurance protection for their families.

The basic-credit benefits of the Carroll plan would be somewhat less than those proposed in the defeated Rankin bill. But they would be much greater than those offered by the modified Rankin bill, introduced after the first one was beaten. And Mr. CARROLL estimates the cost of his plan, over the next 50 years, at only 10 or 15 percent of the original Rankin bill's more than $100,000,000,000.

Congress has voted pensions to veterans of all American wars previous to World War I. This fact is cited as a precedent for pensioning veterans of the two World Wars. But when that precedent was established there was no social-security system, and therefore no possibility of anything like Mr. CARROLL now suggests.

Because the Carroll plan is a new departure, it needs thoughtful study. But we think it could prove to be the answer to a problem which most Americans earnestly want to solve—the problem of providing adequate old-age security for millions of veterans without inviting national bankruptcy.

High Taxes—Thin Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 29, 1949, the Chicago Daily Tribune published an editorial entitled "High Taxes—Thin Markets." This editorial merits more than passive consideration. The subject matter so capably discussed and analyzed in the editorial is of vital importance to all American citizens. The market has been spotty and bad for some time. Since this editorial was published, the Federal Reserve Board has lowered the marginal deposit requirement from 75 to 50 percent. Business throughout the country is not good, and you might well keep your eye on the stock market if for no other purpose than as a barometer indicating the upgrade or downward trend of business in the United States.

The editorial follows:

The New York Stock Exchange, in a desperate effort to stay in business, is trying to get people in the lower-income brackets to buy stocks. The investors and speculators who used to keep the markets active have been driven out by high taxation and high margin requirements.

Investors are people looking for opportunities to put their money to work. For the most part they have been persons of substantial resources, experienced in picking good risks from many opportunities presented to them. After paying taxes and living expenses the wealthy—those with incomes above $50,000—now have little left for investment.

In a study of the Treasury Department presented to the House Ways and Means Committee last year, the Secretary of the Treasury showed that the 63,000 persons with incomes over $50,000 a year had income before exemptions of $5,600,000,000. Their taxes amounted to 3½ billions. After deducting taxes they had a little over 2 billions left or an average of about $31,000 each. Any of them who had a surplus left after meeting living expenses was discouraged from putting it in the market by the knowledge that the Government would take in taxes nearly all of any dividends received.

The other group of former stock buyers, the speculators, used to operate on a margin of 20 or 25 percent. The present requirement is that they must put up 75 percent of the price of stocks they buy. The broker or banker can advance only 25 percent. That eliminates nearly all the speculators. Any who aren't killed off by the margin rule, fall before the income tax. The speculator aims at short-term market swings. He therefore must pay the full income tax on any profits, and can use losses only to offset gains. He cannot, as formerly, deduct losses from income, except to the extent of $1,000.

With both professional investors and professional speculators on the side lines, trade on the New York Stock Exchange is down to as little as 500,000 shares a day. At an average commission of 25 cents a share for buying and the same amount for selling, this means that the key market is kept operating on an income of as little as $250,000 a day. This is the revenue available to pay for the wires, office rent, salaries of partners, salesmen, clerical workers, and other expenses. On as little as this, an institution tries to function, which is expected to keep the economy liquid by providing a market for anyone who wishes to sell stocks in leading corporations.

Without experienced buyers, security holdings of any size cannot be sold except in small quantities at declining prices. Yet, with estate taxes running up to 77 percent, stocks have to be converted into cash in these thin markets. Absurdly low prices are obtained. One of the weekly magazines recently published a list of stocks selling for less than the mere working capital, some for less than per share cash holdings. Judged by the price of stocks, the buildings and equipment of these corporations, although modern and of recent acquisition, are worthless.

Extra value of a business as a going concern no longer exists. Many families would be better situated if businessmen directed that at their deaths the enterprises which they built up be broken up and liquidated, leaving employees to fend for themselves. Such is the market for the most liquid kind of assets found in an estate.

The stock exchange will go about the program of making capitalists out of carpenters with the best wishes of those of the old regime who may have to sell some of their holdings at any time. Moreover, any prospect of finding a new source for capital with which to expand and improve production should have the encouragement of noninvestors.

The millions of potential petty capitalists have the means to succeed. People with incomes under $5,000 get 75 percent of the total incomes of the country after taxes. The new investors lack experience and are likely to make the mistake of buying cars and dogs instead of sound securities. Not only investors but society suffers when savings are dissipated in this way. However, the little man's capital is about all that society has to go on until income and estate taxes are made reasonable and margin requirements modified.

Dentists' Boom in Income Stirs British Health Plan Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 I placed in the RECORD the seventh of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle, describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 25, is the eighth of the series:

DENTISTS' BOOM IN INCOME STIRS BRITISH HEALTH PLAN ROW—ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED-DOLLAR-A-MONTH RECEIPT LIMIT ANGRILY FOUGHT

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Eighth in a series)

LONDON, MARCH 25.—British dentists, whose vastly increased incomes under the new national health service are a public

scandal, are fighting angrily against a ruling by Health Minister Bevan that their gross receipts shall not average much over $1,600 a month. They are calling his attitude dictatorial, but admit they have no recourse, that he has the power under the law.

Probably the greatest criticism leveled against the health scheme is directed at the dental division, and members of the profession admit things are not good, although blaming a few scalawags, of which, they remark, there are some in every business and every profession.

Dentists are collecting $40,000 and $50,000 a year, which is tremendous in England. They estimate their expenses for their office, nurse, technician, and other needs at 52 percent of their take. Then they pay heavy taxes, almost confiscatory here after $20,000 a year.

COMPLAINTS POUR IN

Loud complaints are expounded every day by members of the House of Commons against dentists for declining to relieve people who come to their surgeries with aching teeth, because they are too busy with other folks filling their waiting rooms by appointment.

The British Dental Association denies such occurrences are general, doesn't say they are happening at all, and is scolding the members of the profession, through its journal, and reminding them of their professional and ethical duties.

Dentists were against the health plan, much more so than the medical men, and joined it only through force of economic circumstances. Now they think it is an excellent idea, although poorly planned, badly managed, and would be far superior if the Health Ministry had heeded or would listen to their suggestions.

TRY TO SERVE WELL

On the whole, the dentists are trying to give the public good service and to conduct their practices in a way that serves the general welfare. Most of them wouldn't allow a person to suffer from an aching jaw for a minute, and would do what they could at once, whether or not they had any prospect of payment by the patient or by the government.

Any of them who want to do so can, or could, make a quick fortune, within the tax-law restraints, by exploiting the plan. Enough of them have been doing so to draw fire. Their answer is that their large income shows they are working endlessly to serve the people. They cannot get it without long hours.

Out of all the distorted and deceptive charges and answers, it is possible to put together some semblance of the truth of the whole deal.

High-type practitioners and their association leaders, interested in good dentistry for the people within their means and desiring to preserve the profession from full regimentation, are striving to improve conditions, to prevent the Government from oppressing the dentists and to inspire the dentists to exercise good sense and display some idealism.

"Dentistry was a depressed profession here in the past," one of its leaders says, "and 75 percent were making less than $4,000 a year, a large number much less. The great trouble under the National Health Plan is that the cheap dentist is overpaid and the good dentist is underpaid. The Government has placed a premium on quickly done and poor quality workmanship."

GRANT-IN-AID PREFERRED

"It is true that over 90 percent of the dentists are in the plan now," he continued, "but 50 percent went in against their will. Their private practices disappeared, they had to join to eat. We would have preferred a grant-in-aid system, well controlled, and think the evils existing today would not have developed.

"The health plan does break down the dentist-patient personal relationship. The practitioner no longer is permitted to give his patient the treatments he thinks are necessary. He must wait to receive permission from a Government committee before he extracts a tooth (unless there is pain present), puts on a crown, or makes a denture. That lowers the dentist in the eyes of the patient.

"Prophylactic work and simple fillings can be provided at once without Governmental approval, but that doesn't save the dentist's standing. Sadly, we feel that there will be no improvement so long as the present Government is in power."

A Wheel for the Shoulders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 29, 1949, and an editorial from the New York Times of March 30, 1949:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of March 29, 1949]

A WHEEL FOR THE SHOULDERS

What the Hoover Commission has begun Congress and the President must finish. The eighteenth and last report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government now goes to Congress.

These reports, taken together, represent a monumental work. To be sure, the several task force subcommittees have not always agreed among themselves. Nor has the Commission itself. It is true that some reports appear to spill over from the assigned field of administration into the adjoining pastures of policy (where Congress is the husbandman).

Nevertheless, the coincidence of congressional and Presidential backing, of nonpolitical expertness and experience, and of the extraordinary kind of leadership which only an ex-President and a gifted administrator like Mr. Hoover could bring offer a combination not likely to be duplicated in a generation. One does not have to endorse every detail of its recommendations to conclude that, in general, the findings of the Hoover Commission should be carried out.

Yet, Congress appears disinterested and cool. It is in the nature of political realities that organized protests from constituents back home or from officialdom in Washington who have an interest in keeping some particular activity as is, free from reorganization, may make more impression on the average Congressman than do the merits of so tremendous a plan.

The Hoover report will need strong backing from a public opinion broad enough to cancel out the conflicts of interests within it. And such a public opinion must have leadership and organization at its core. That, it appears, is in the making.

A citizens' committee is being formed around a nucleus of commission and task-force members. When this group is launched and announced, Americans who want to help modernize their archaic government will have at least one wheel to put their shoulders to.

[From the New York Times of March 30, 1949]

REFORM IN WASHINGTON

It is good news that a nonpartisan organization of some 700 well-known people in all parts of the country has been formed, under the leadership of President Robert Johnson of Temple University, to work for "far-reaching and enduring reforms in the Federal Government" on the basis of the reports of the Hoover Commission. Mr. Hoover and his colleagues have done a spectacularly good job. They have looked into every corner (including some of the almost forgotten corners) of the vast and chaotic machinery of Government in Washington. They have studied the purposes for which literally hundreds of bureaus were created and discovered the reasons why many important duties are now being performed inadequately. They have come up with pointed and specific recommendations (unanimous in most cases) which ought to be adopted promptly in the interest of more efficient and more economical government. But, good as these recommendations are, the danger is that little will be done about them unless some alert and public-spirited organization, such as that which has now been formed for this purpose, keeps pressing for reform.

That this is true is demonstrated by the experience of a long series of earlier attempts at Federal reorganization, under Taft and Wilson, under Harding and Coolidge, under Mr. Hoover himself, and under Mr. Roosevelt. Scores of worth-while recommendations have perished of neglect. To cite but one example: It is now just 26 years since the Brown committee, operating during the Presidency of Mr. Harding, recommended consolidation of the War and Navy Departments—a reform which we are just getting around to now. There is a vast inertia to be overcome in matters of this kind. The new citizens' committee will be needed, if the full benefits of the monumental work of the Hoover Commission are to be gained.

National Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to accumulate that the people support the effort to mobilize and bring to them the democratic culture of our country through the living theater. Support for House Joint Resolution 104, introduced by me in the House and by Senator IRVING M. IVES, New York, with Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah, as cosponsor, is coming from community theaters throughout the country. A typical example is a letter from the business manager of the St. Louis Community Playhouse appended hereto:

ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY
PLAYHOUSE, INC.,
St. Louis, Mo., March 23, 1949.

Congressman J. K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I have studied House Joint Resolution 104 calling for a national theatre, with great interest, and you may count on my strong support for it.

Let me tell you a little about the St. Louis Community Playhouse. I think our history exemplifies the need for support such as your resolution contemplates.

We were organized in 1927—thus, although we are comparatively young in years—we are one of the oldest if not actually the oldest continuously operated little theaters in the United States. That, I believe, depicts the hardships and the mortality of the little theater movement and why there is need for governmental assistance. And from my knowledge of the dance world, as former publisher of Dance Magazine, I know that the same is true in that art endeavor also.

During the past 3 years, partly because of our sponsorship of a children's theater, and also because of rising costs and an income frozen to the size of our theater, we have accumulated a deficit of $4,800. This, on an annual budget of $22,000 is not great, but great or small, unless we succeed in raising that sum either from our own personal contributions or aid from other interested individuals and corporations, we shall have to go out of business.

You may be interested to learn that the Community Playhouse is regarded as sufficiently important to the cultural and civic life of St. Louis for several of the larger businesses in town to offer to pick up part of our accumulated deficit. They did, however, stipulate that we not make this an annual event. I believe that these persons, important industrial leaders, would be in favor of the help your proposal would afford.

Frankly, if we should have to close our doors, St. Louis would lose greatly. Here, in a metropolitan area of 1,400,000 persons, we offer youth access to theater which it cannot get elsewhere. We have seen boys and girls come off city streets and develop an enthusiasm and talent which molded their lives for the better. We have seen half a dozen or more of our people go on to success in Hollywood or Broadway. And for our subscribers and single ticket audience, we offer an opportunity to see both hit shows and plays more of the experimental type, well performed by nonprofessionals. This latter is important because, like many American cities of today, we have only one legitimate theater in operation and naturally this compels a limited selection of presentations in a year.

Our director, who with our secretary and technical director comprises our paid staff, is a graduate of Yale's school of drama; a very talented, capable person. Because of his interest in our work, he is serving for far less than he could earn in the professional theater.

We need help. I believe our need is shared by most other comparable organizations. Therefore, I am writing our three Congressmen and our Senators, all good men, asking that they support your resolution and I shall also bring it to the official attention of my fellow directors.

Please pardon the length of this letter but I felt the matter serious and worthy enough to merit a complete statement.

Sincerely,

HAROLD HARTOGENSIS,
Business Manager.

Hundredth Anniversary of William Jewell College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a notable and timely address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at the alumni dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., last evening.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ON THE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

It is always a pleasure to have a part in celebrating the hundredth anniversary of an American institution. In our young Nation—only 160 years old—comparatively few institutions have roots which go so deep into the soil of American history. You, the alumni of William Jewell College, have reason to be proud tonight.

For my part, I enjoy centennial celebrations for many reasons. They make me feel very young—and that is a good feeling. But these celebrations also are inspiring—and that is healthy for all of us. We are inspired when we look back down the corridor of time and see how amazingly far this Nation and its institutions have come—when we see the thread of continuity leading back a century and more—when we recall the handicaps our progenitors overcame and the bravery with which they faced the dangers and hardships of the frontier. It was in such circumstances that William Jewell College was established.

It is hard for me to visualize that when this college was founded the gold rush to California was just taking place. The Mexican War had recently ended, the Civil War was 12 years in the future. Indian country was dangerously close to Liberty, Mo., the site of the college. Wagon trains toiled over the prairies. The pony express carried the mail. Overland stage coaches jolted along rough roads. This was the frontier: a line extending north and south and cutting through Missouri, Iowa, and Minnesota. Small wonder that some persons of influence argued that if William Jewell College should be established in Liberty, the call of adventure would be too loud and clear to resist—and the students would desert the classrooms for the trail of gold and daring.

But it was decided—wisely—that the frontier was the place for this school. And I see in the establishment of your college on the very frontier of the growing United States of America a lesson out of the past and a warning for the future.

The lesson of the past concerns the great stress which early Americans placed upon education. In his farewell address, George Washington said: "Promote * * * as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge."

Thomas Jefferson argued that the people must be the depository of the ultimate powers of society. And he warned, if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

But even long before Washington and Jefferson had thus expressed their opinions about the place of education and democracy, the Congress had stipulated in the third article of the Northwest Ordinance, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education, should be forever encouraged."

So it was that as the frontier moved westward, schools and colleges were close behind. In these institutions were taught the principles of free government upon which our Republic was founded. In the hearts of the students, the torch of democracy burned bright. There was a zeal for freedom in the frontiersmen—a zeal to help create a free country for generations to follow—to build the best possible future out of a present that was better than the past.

Today you and I profit by this devotion to education. Undoubtedly it is one of the forces which has made our Nation great and kept our people free.

Just 2 years before your college was established in Missouri, two German theorists issued the first public declaration of international socialism. This was the document known as the Communist Manifesto. Its authors were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Thus, at the very time that William Jewell College in Liberty, Mo., was beginning to form in the minds of its students an appreciation of the principles of democracy, the seeds of what has grown to be the most vicious doctrine of enslavement the world has ever known, were being sown in Europe.

Marx and Engels foresaw an eventual climactic struggle between the forces for and against communism. A full century was to pass before this struggle became critical—and it is critical today. But contrary to the predictions, the conflict today is not between two economic systems, capitalism and communism. The choice facing our world is between liberty and slavery; between right and might; between freedom to speak one's mind and coercion to parrot what the state dictates; between worshipping according to one's conscience or according to a state-prescribed formula. The struggle today is a struggle of human freedom against the totalitarian, dictatorial, all-enveloping state.

More and more, the true issues facing the world are being realized by American men and women. Every one of us has reason to be grateful that the base of our educational system has been broad enough to help create in the minds of most American citizens a fundamental appreciation of the meaning and value of democratic freedom.

In this land, we are sometimes told, we have sacrified educational quality to quantity. In other countries the critics say comparatively few persons are college trained—but these are more intensively trained than our average college man and woman. Be that as it may, I have the idea that the straight-thinking minds of the average American young man and woman compare very favorably with the products of other education systems. And the opportunity for higher education in this country is unequaled anywhere in the world.

In the past century the United States has changed from gangling adolescent in the family of nations to the most powerful figure on the world scene. The basis of our strength is both spiritual and physical. The spirit of our people has long been the subject of world admiration. The physical ability of our industry and agriculture to produce economic wealth has been the envy of our friends and the despair of our enemies.

In the building of this twofold strength a college such as you represent has played a role of great consequence. I sometimes wonder whether we give full credit to the role of education when we assess the wonderful capacity of our Nation.

I happen to be in a particularly favored position to witness some of the marvels scientific research has accomplished in agriculture. During the war a number of young scientists, just a few years out of school, developed important techniques and processes.

One young man, working in a regional agricultural laboratory, learned how to make a rubber substitute from soybean oil.

Another young scientist—under 30—developed a method of converting starch in wheat to fermentable sugars without the use of malt extract. This was important because malt extract was scarce during the war.

Still another young scientist, a few years ago, developed a new and effective method of ridding farm animals of a whole multitude of internal parasites.

I could take you through an average day of your lives and show you how again and again in the course of that day you are touched by the helping hand of agricultural scientists.

I could show, for example, that the cattle industry which supplied the raw material for your shoes would never have reached its present size but for the work of agricultural scientists in fighting animal disease and fostering better nutrition and care of livestock.

You might be surprised if I told you that the wool in your suit may have come off the back of Columbia sheep, a modern made-to-order breed of sheep developed by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Going back some decades, I could show you that it was a test tube in the hand of a Department of Agriculture scientist that helped build the Panama Canal—for that test tube played an important part in enabling medical science to control yellow fever.

At this very moment, in thousands of hospitals and homes over the land, doctors are administering penicillin. The Department's Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria was largely instrumental in enabling penicillin to be produced in commercial quantities.

These are just a few of the spectacular benefits we have all reaped from education in science.

But as I said in the beginning of this talk, the history of American education holds for us not only a lesson out of the past but a warning for the future.

Never has knowledge been so important for good or evil as in this our day. Never has man been faced with such an opportunity—and such a dread responsibility—as since he found the means of releasing atomic energy.

Since knowledge can be used either for good or for evil, it is obvious that mere knowledge is not enough. It is not true, as Socrates argued some 2,400 years ago, that wickedness is simply the result of ignorance. That is why there is a special need in our day for the kind of training of the will as well as training of the mind that you received in your college days.

If this world is to be a safe place to live in the year 2000, let us say, we shall need to cling fast to our belief in human dignity, human freedom, and human responsibility.

We shall need to broaden the base of our education even further and strive for educational opportunity for all our people.

We shall need to push ahead with the social sciences—which up to now have lagged far behind progress in the physical sciences. We shall need to know how to control the ups and downs of the business cycle. We shall have to eliminate racial, religious, and national prejudices. Above all, we shall have to find the way to live in peace with mankind throughout the earth.

It would be presumptuous of me to try to chart how these goals can be reached. The most that I can do is to indicate for your consideration one or two points which seem to be of consequence.

We have all heard it said over and over that the greatest threat to the world peace and prosperity is widespread hunger. There is a rather fiery debate raging now as to whether or not the world has the resources and the know-how to feed itself. My own conviction, based upon careful estimates of our soil scientists, is that the world does have the resources—and most certainly does have the know-how—to provide adequate diets for all its population in the foreseeable future.

I say the world has the resources and the know-how. I do not say that the world will make the best use of them. Prejudices, suspicions, hatred—all these stand in the way of a full and free interchange of knowledge. These same factors hinder world production and trade today as they have throughout history. The job of wiping out malnutrition in the world can be done—but it probably will not be done without the most earnest, tireless, and determined effort humankind have ever put forth in time of peace.

Another factor of prime importance if the world is to be made a safe place in which to live is good government. This is a topic which lies close to my heart. Very few schools in the Nation prepare their students specifically for Government positions. Georgetown, here in Washington, has a school of foreign service. The University of Denver now trains students for public service. These are the proverbial exceptions to the rule. The sad fact is that in many quarters today, working for the Government is not regarded as quite dignified, if indeed it is quite honorable. Talk of waste and bureaucratic gangling, talk of kicking the American people around and feeding at the public trough, have done much to undermine the reputation of Government employment. There are people who believe irresponsible charges that the Government worker is perforce a boondoggler. This is a sad thing, and one for which the Nation must pay in terms of loss of capable men who do not wish to subject themselves to such charges. But it is sad particularly because it is false.

Oh, yes, there are inefficiencies, overstaffing here, understaffing there. Whether there is more of this in Government than in big private corporations has never been settled. But it is certainly more than a little ridiculous to build up a fence between the public servant and the rest of our society and try to separate them as the goats from the lambs.

The Government administrator went to high school and probably to college. Just as did the business executive.

The Government secretary went to business school, just as the secretary in private enterprise.

The Government professional man did his work at recognized educational institutions, just as the professional man in private life.

They all grew up in American communities. They all lived and voted and went to ball games and played golf and ate chicken on Sunday. Is there any reason why one should be less efficient than the other? If so, why should business be so all-fired eager to attract experienced bureaucrats from public to private employ at double and triple the salaries?

No; service in the Government is honorable. For the Government worker serves the highest employer of all in the Nation—he serves the people. That, of course, is the vocation of every man and woman—to serve other people—but it is especially the vocation of the public worker. His employer is not an agency chief, a Cabinet officer, or even the President. His employer is also their employer—the people. And so the Government worker is one of that great company of men and women, who will never wear sables on their Government salaries, but who can don the mantle of a good conscience for unselfish service to their fellow men.

Personally, I am proud to work for my Government, for my country. I am proud of the company it gives me, the scientist bound to his laboratory not by his salary of five or six or seven thousand dollars, but by his love for the job; the administrator, calmly and conscientiously dealing in millions of dollars and never tempted to violate in the slightest his public trust; the clerk, doing his tasks in his or her own area of responsibility.

More things are wrought by the Government worker than this country dreams of.

It is important to the Nation, and to the peace of the world, that the standard of Government service should rise even higher. President Roosevelt once said that the greatest domestic achievement of recent years in the United States was neither saving the Nation from economic chaos, nor the enactment of laws to improve social conditions, but rather "the awakening of many millions of American men and women to an understanding of their own Government."

It is in this awakening that much of our hope for a good future lies.

We do not expect Utopia overnight. We have no panacea which can make this world a pacific place.

Our best hope is to keep alive in American hearts the fire of freedom, knowledge, and morality. Our earnest desire must ever be to leave to our children, and their children, a world in which this Nation can progress as much in the next century as it has in the 100 years since William Jewell College was founded. To do that we shall need iron resolution, perseverence, and a crusading spirit to serve mankind. We shall be required, in other words, to show that we have used our inheritance of knowledge and education wisely and well.

Long Beach, Calif., Harbor Passes Los Angeles, Calif., Harbor Cargo Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me so to do, I take great pleasure and pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues and all readers of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news statement, published in the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Saturday, March 26, 1949:

PORT MANAGER TELLS LIONS CLUB SESSION OF LOCAL PROGRESS

For the first time in the history of the two ports, Long Beach harbor last month passed Los Angeles harbor in the tonnage of general cargo handled, E. J. Amar, port manager, reports.

February tonnage through the Long Beach port totaled 194,000, Amar said, while Los Angeles harbor handled only 178,000 tons.

During 1948, the Long Beach port handled 4,517,981 tons of cargo, valued at $483,000,000, the port manager said.

"On one day last week," Amar told the Lions Club Friday, "we had approximately 800 longshoremen at work here. Only 240 were at work in the San Francisco port on the same day."

BIG INDUSTRY

Long Beach Harbor is a big industry in which taxpayers are the stockholders, Amar said. Last year this industry did a $30,000,000 net business, he added.

Six times since the first of the year, ships due into the local port have had to be diverted to Los Angeles Harbor because there were no facilities here to handle them; everything was filled to capacity, Amar said.

In 1938–39, the monthly shipping through Long Beach Harbor amounted to 10,000 to 12,000 tons. Today the average is 200,000 tons a month, according to the port manager.

This month, one line alone—the Calmar Line—will ship 30,000 tons of steel. In the last 10 days, Amar said, the local port has received 16,000 tons of newsprint from British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest.

ALL IRON ORE

Long Beach is handling the shipment of all iron ore destined for Japan. To date this month, 70,000 tons have been shipped and another 20,000 tons is due out during the next 4 days.

In the past 10 years, $25,000,000 has been spent on the harbor. These facilities are now valued at $50,000,000 to $60,000,000, Amar revealed.

Five hundred and forty-six wells are pumping in the harbor area and have produced a total of more than 100,000,000 barrels since the first well was spudded in 1938, he said.

More than $30,000,000 has been impounded to await congressional action on the ownership of the tidelands, Amar added.

The port manager was introduced by Frank Hardesty, chairman. Charles L. Vickers presided.

Mr. Speaker, the recital of the facts in this article speak for themselves. They are significant, too, because, generally speaking, folks only hear of what is termed the Los Angeles Harbor; whereas, as a matter of fact, the port or harbor of Long Beach, right next door to the Los Angeles Harbor, has arrived to be one of the great harbors of the world in availability, in accessibility, in efficiency and in tonnage and shipping. This newspaper statement will be edifying to all who read it.

I am very proud that Long Beach is my home city and that it is my place of residence in my native State of California. It is the site of the great Long Beach naval shipyard and what has been, until recently, commonly known as the Terminal Island shipyard. The magnificently efficient facilities and naval and shop installations in this shipyard, during the war and since, have contributed their full share to the best interests of the American Navy and to the American merchant marine. And, by virtue of location, accessibility, strategic fitness, and need, this Long Beach naval shipyard has become, of absolute necessity, one of the imperative units for the repair and keeping in order and housing of the ships and men of our glorious American Navy. Presently it is presided over by a most beloved officer of the Navy, Admiral Paul Hendren. He and his staff have the cordial esteem of all of the citizens of Long Beach.

Relinquishment of Federal Financial Control in Locally Owned Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill amending an act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to the States, their political subdivisions, local public agencies, and nonprofit organizations the privileges conferred upon educational institutions by Public Law 796 of the Eightieth Congress, second session. Under Public Law 796, the Federal Government has been required to relinquish to educational institutions, upon compliance with the conditions set forth in that law, all contractual and property rights of the Federal Government with respect to any temporary housing located on land owned or controlled by such institutions.

Many local public agencies are operating temporary emergency projects similar to those operated by educational institutions. The city of New York, through the New York City Housing Authority, is operating eight such projects having a total of 8,600 dwelling units. The sites for these projects were acquired and improved by the city of New York, and various major repairs and alterations were made by the city, at a total cost to the city which thus far has exceeded $15,000,000. Nevertheless, under the contracts between the city and the Federal Government under which these projects are operated, the net operating revenue derived from the projects goes exclusively to the Federal Government, except for payments in lieu of taxes and for a small amount of ground rent which the city is permitted to retain. Thus the city is saddled with a substantial debt and must pay a substantial amount of annual debt service for the operation of these projects, while the Federal Government takes whatever net income is derived. To add to the inequitable nature of the present arrangements under which these projects are operated, is the fact that if the operation results in a deficit, the city must bear the burden of the deficit, despite the fact, as has already been noted, that should there be a net income, that net income goes exclusively to the Federal Government.

This arrangement is not only unfair, it is also unwieldly and difficult to administer. The commendable desire of Federal officials responsible for safeguarding the Federal Government's financial interest in these projects to derive a net income from the operation, conflicts with the equally commendable desire of local officials to recoup necessary and substantial expenses from operating revenue, with the result that controversies are bred in the allocation and apportionment of items of expense undertaken by the city, and the city is inhibited from making all but the most urgent repairs for fear that it will not be permitted to charge the cost as an operating expense. It is felt that only the termination of further Federal financial interest in these projects can remove the administrative difficulties arising as a concomitant of the anomalous situation in which the present arrangement places these projects, and free the localities to administer the projects in a manner best suited to the requirements of local conditions.

A further difficulty in which the city of New York finds itself with respect to temporary emergency projects is the necessity, under present Federal law, of removing this vitally needed housing by January 1, 1950, unless exceptions are granted from year to year. In view of the Federal requirement for early disposal of these projects, the city obtained only temporary interests in the sites of most of the projects, and is now faced with the necessity of commencing additional condemnation proceedings to obtain new interests. The 1950 deadline leaves the city in a quandary as to the term for which the new interests should be obtained. It also makes it difficult for the city to plan an over-all housing program, since it is unable to tell from year to year for how long it will be permitted to operate the temporary projects. At any rate, the disposal of these projects is a local problem determinable only on the basis of local housing conditions, and should be left within the province of the localities.

The bill would effect the following changes in section 1 of Public Law 796 as enacted by the last Congress:

First. It would extend the law generally so as to cover States and their political subdivisions.

Second. It would remove the requirement that the relinquishment of Federal rights takes effect at the end of the month in which the transfer is made. This would permit the Federal Government to relinquish rights which may have accrued prior to that time and would permit solution of many of the problems that have already arisen with respect to the determination of the amount of income in which the Federal Government is entitled under present contracts.

Third. It would remove the requirement that a request for relinquishment of Federal rights must be made within 120 days of the date of enactment of that law, since that time period has already elapsed, and would instead substitute the requirement that the request be made on or before January 1, 1950, which date corresponds with the date by which temporary housing must be otherwise disposed of.

Save the Soil by Which We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, I introduced a soil-conservation bill, H. R. 2368. On March 23, I placed in the RECORD an analysis of H. R. 2368. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I now include my complete bill, H. R. 2368:

A bill to provide for establishment of a soil- and water-conservation policy, the coordination of soil- and water-conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Soil Conservation Act of 1949.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) That it is hereby recognized that the lack of a sound national soil- and water-conservation policy as a foundation for other agricultural programs; the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and woodland of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion; failure to maintain and improve soil fertility; improper lay-out for farm- and ranch-irrigation systems and use and management of irrigation water thereon; inadequate farm drainage; improper use of land; and, development of land unsuited for sustained agricultural use, is a menace to the national welfare.

And that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for using the Nation's land in accordance with its capabilities and the treating of it in accordance with its needs; for the control and prevention of soil erosion; for the maintenance and improvement of soil fertility; for the conservation, proper use, and management of agricultural water resources; and for the sound development and use of agricultural land resources and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, and protect public health, and public lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture, from now on, shall coordinate all activities of the Department of Agriculture with relation to soil erosion; soil fertility maintenance and improvement; conservation, use, management, and disposal of farm and ranch waters; development and changes in use of agricultural land; and shall recognize as basic the conservation of soil and water resources in the formulation of other agricultural programs, and in order to effectuate this policy is hereby authorized, from time to time—

(1) to conduct surveys, investigations, and research, in cooperation with the State experiment stations, relating to the character of soil erosion, loss of soil fertility and productive capacity, water wastage, land misuse, and the preventive measures needed, to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, or research, and to disseminate information concerning such methods;

(2) to provide technical assistance to soil-conservation districts and other conservation districts deemed by the Secretary to be qualified in the preparation, carrying out, and maintenance of locally developed and adopted programs for soil and water conservation, preservation and improvement of soil fertility and sound land use on farms, ranches, and other land in such districts; for rehabilitation or construction of needed individual and group farm and ranch drainage and irrigation systems and in conserving, managing, and disposing of irrigation water in such districts; and for necessary guidance of a widespread application program of recurring conservation practices requiring little or no "on site" (on farm or ranch) technical assistance for those farmers and ranchmen not yet reached in the schedule for assistance in adopting a basic conservation farm or ranch plan or not desiring to participate in the comprehensive program in such districts;

(3) to provide technical guidance, supplementing the efforts of the State extension services, and the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to landowners and operators in those agricultural areas not included in soil conservation or other districts in the widespread application of recurring conservation practices requiring little or no "on site" technical assistance. In addition, technical assistance may be provided in these areas in the preparation of a limited number of basic conservation plans on farms or ranches for demonstration purposes; and

(4) to complete, as rapidly as possible, a conservation survey of the Nation's farm and ranch lands; to analyze, publish, and distribute the inventory thus secured; to provide copies of land-use capability maps to landowners and operators for their own units of land and to assist them in interpreting and utilizing such maps; to survey and classify by capabilities for agricultural use the lands in existing, proposed, or potential agricultural development projects or the agricultural parts of multiple-purpose projects; to determine the suitability of such lands for sustained agricultural use; and to provide technical and other aids necessary to, or to clear, level, and otherwise develop project, woodland, cut-over, and other lands needed and suitable for agricultural use.

ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) In furtherance of the policy expressed in section 2 of this act, the Secretary is also authorized to cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other assistance to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he may deem appropriate. Such assistance may include, but is not limited to, financial payments, conservation materials, planting stock and seed, use of equipment, or other similar materials and aids: *Provided*, That in furnishing financial or other assistance authorized under this act to any person with respect to land situated within a soil-conservation or other conservation district which meets the standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture, such assistance shall be made available only through, or in cooperation with, such districts.

(b) In determining the nature and extent of the assistance to be furnished, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take into consideration—

(1) the recommendations of the governing bodies of soil-conservation or other conservation districts concerning the need for, and the capabilities of such districts to use effectively, the funds, materials, or equipment;

(2) the urgency and extent of the need for such funds, materials, or equipment to prevent irreparable damage to agricultural land and water resources; and

(3) the availability of technical assistance to assure the most effective use of such funds, materials, or equipment.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) Any financial payment authorized to be made to any person under the provisions of this act shall be a class A, B, or C payment and shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe except—

(1) class A payments shall be made for conversion of land that has been for the previous two or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops to non-soil-depleting uses such as meadow, hay, pasture, and woodland, in order to encourage livestock and forest production and prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land. The first payment shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of converting the land to grass or trees, and payments may be made not more than five times thereafter at a rate of one-fifth of the original cost as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on a generally fair and reasonable basis for continuing the land in nondepleting use. After June 30, 1952, class A payments may be made only when such conversion of land is initiated and carried out as a part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan, and if such conversion of land is initiated and carried out on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil-conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator;

(2) class B payments shall be made for practices and improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, such as terrace systems, drainage and irrigation installations, farm ponds, range water-diversion systems, and for other practices and improvements as may be required to prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land. Such a payment shall not exceed 60 percentum of the cost of such practice or improvement, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on a generally fair and reasonable basis, and shall be made only once. After June 30, 1952, class B payments may be made only when such practice or improvement is carried out as a part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan, and if such practice or improvement is carried out on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil-conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator;

(3) class C payments shall be made for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility, such as liming, fertilizing, grass seeding, crop rotation, cover cropping, mulching, and prevention of stubble burning. Such payments may be made annually and shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of performing such practice, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, on a generally fair and reasonable basis.

(b) Classes A, B, and C payments shall be classified according to such areas and practices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine and announce for each fiscal year.

(c) Classes A and B payments may be made to a landowner or operator only when the governing body of the conservation district has certified to the Secretary of Agriculture through the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, in accordance with certification standards prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; that the work has been performed in accordance with the provisions of this section, except that prior to June 30, 1952, classes A and B payments may also be made to a landowner or operator with respect to land not within the boundaries of a soil-conservation or other conservation district under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe.

(d) Class C payments may be made to a landowner or operator with respect to land within or without the boundaries of a soil-conservation or other conservation district when the local committee, established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, has certified, as specified in subsection (c), that the work has been performed in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(e) In making classes A, B, and C payments the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize as his agents the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 5. The members of conservation district governing bodies shall not receive Federal compensation for services rendered or reimbursement for expenses incurred under the terms of this act. This provision regarding Federal compensation and expenses, however, does not preclude their being compensated for their services, travel, and other expenses by the State, county, or district.

SEC. 6. (a) In furtherance of the policy expressed in section 2 of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized—

(1) to provide for the employment of, and with State extension services jointly to select, necessary personnel to assist locally with conservation education activities primarily (a) in the areas critically in need of conservation treatment not now in districts and (b) in supplementing the county extension staffs in soil-conservation and other districts in preparing the way for conservation, farm planning, and application action on the land;

(2) to cooperate or enter into agreements with or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act; and

(3) to acquire submarginal agricultural lands, or rights or interests therein, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, and to sell federally owned lands suitable for agricultural use to neighboring landowners needing additional acreage to complete a sound farm unit, or in family-sized units to veterans and others desiring to engage in farming or ranching using procedures consistent with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The acts authorized in sections 2, 3, and 4 may be performed—

(1) on lands owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, with the cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction thereof; and

(2) on any other lands, upon obtaining proper consent or the necessary rights or interests in such lands.

SEC. 8. As a condition to the extending of any benefits under this act to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of Agriculture may, insofar as he may deem necessary for the purposes of this act, require—

(1) agreements or covenants as to the use of such lands; and

(2) contributions in money, services, materials, or otherwise, to any operations conferring such benefits.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture may—

(1) secure the cooperation of any governmental agency;

(2) subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as he may deem necessary; and any persons with technical or practical knowledge may be employed and compensated under this act on a basis to be determined by the Civil Service Commission; and

(3) make expenditures for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the purchase of lawbooks and books of reference, for printing and binding, for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and perform such acts, and prescribe such regulations, as he may deem proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. In recognition of (1) the necessity for technical assistance in determining and applying needed conservation practices and measures, and in assuring the effective use of such grants-in-aid as may be necessary to supplement the contributions of landowners and operators in establishing such conservation practices and measures; (2) the impossibility of practically separating the responsibility for the conservation of water or the sound use of land from the responsibility for soil conservation and the prevention of soil erosion; (3) the desirability of having all technical action programs involving conservation, irrigation, drainage, water development, and flood control on farm lands, as well as the development of new agricultural lands, technically directed by one agency; and (4) the desirability of taking advantage of existing relationships and working arrangements already developed with conservation districts organized under the laws of the respective States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize the agency known as the Soil Conservation Service in carrying out the powers conferred on him by sections 2, 3, and 6 of this act and the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, in carrying out the powers conferred on him by section 4 of this act, and in order that there may be proper coordination of the activities including grants-in-aid involving soil and water conservation, sound land development and use, drainage, irrigation, and other physical adjustments of farm and ranch lands, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the Soil Conservation Service such functions, funds, personnel, and property of other agencies in the Department of Agriculture as he may from time to time determine necessary to avoid duplication, achieve economy, and carry out the spirit of this act.

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. And the Secretary is directed in presenting his first budget to Congress after the passage of this act to recommend a preliminary conservation timetable, based on currently available information, as a guide to Congress in making appropriations. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary shall revise and improve the conservation timetable and present it to Congress for use in determining annual appropriation needs.

Brooklyn Leads the Way Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of March 30 indicates that Brooklyn is making progress in its efforts for unified action to make America a better and happier place in which to live:

NEW BOROUGH GROUP RAISES FIRM VOICE FOR ALL CIVIC RIGHTS

The Brooklyn Citizens Legislative Conference has just met for the first time. The meeting was an event of importance.

It is the conviction of those who attended and the organizations that sponsor the conference that civil rights and freedom from discrimination are not merely the special problem of one minority or another that may enjoy those rights and that freedom less frequently than the majority of Americans but the immediate, vital and individual problems of every American.

It is their conviction that if one minority is left to fight alone while the rest sit it out smugly on the sidelines, the sitters will be refusing to stand up for what are in reality their own rights, will lose, when there is losing to be done, exactly what the minority loses. It is their conviction that all rights are the property of all Americans, that those rights are indivisible, that a wrong done one is a wrong to all. No rights can be said to exist unless every one enjoys them equally.

And so the Brooklyn citizens legislative conference is an eloquent army marching in step and composed of representatives of all sorts of Americans. Whatever it does it does for all faiths, all nationalites, all colors, and even for the protection of the rights of displaced persons still in Europe. There could be no better way for Americans to unite for the good of their countrymen and their country. The principle involved is that of Dumas' Three Musketeers—"all for one and one for all."

Joining forces in the conference are the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Protestant Council, the Brooklyn Council for Social Planning, the Urban League. Any number of prominent Brooklynites and others attended. Dr. Arthur J. S. Rosenbaum, of the Jewish Community Council, opened the conference. Special Sessions Justice Matthew J. Troy, Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora, the Reverend Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, of the Protestant Council, Milton D. Stewart, of the mayor's committee on unity, former County Judge Nicholas Pinto, of the State commission against discrimination, Edward Corsi, of the State department of labor, and many others addressed the conferees.

Then the group passed pertinent resolutions. They called upon Congress to give priority consideration to fair-employment legislation, antilynching, and anti-poll tax measures, and they censured President Truman for taking his vacation during the civil-rights fight. They called for the elimination of discrimination in employment and in colleges, asked for State FEPC laws to cover all employees. They supported Negro longshoremen barred from jobs on the waterfront and urged legislation against discrimination in public-supported housing and mortgage-financed units on residential property, asked for a commission to investigate that sort of thing. And they urged Congress to pass the McGrath-Celler amendments to the Displaced Persons Act.

The Brooklyn Citizens' Legislative Conference came into existence a fine lusty baby full of life, protest, and action. It raises the firm voice of united Americans in affirmation of the rights of all, in the name of all. The work this conference can do is limitless. We hope it will go on doing it without pause or hesitation.

National Park Service Deserves More Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that every Member read the article in Harper's magazine for March by Bernard DeVoto on our national parks entitled "The Easy Chair."

My interest in the national parks goes back to the time of my boyhood in Wisconsin. I enjoyed the streams, the lakes, and the forests of that beautiful State. One of my ambitions was to be able to make a trip to Yellowstone National Park and some of the other scenic places in the West. Since that time it has been my pleasure to see many of the beauty spots of our great West, such as Yellowstone, Zion, Brice, the Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Crater Lake, and other national parks, as well as many other beautiful spots that are not part of our park system. I have a conviction, that amounts to almost a mania, that it is our duty to preserve the beauty spots of nature for the pleasure and the inspiration of our people. The more urban we become and the larger our population, the more necessary is it for us to set aside for future generations these beautiful spots in all parts of our country which God has given to us.

However, I also have a very personal interest in the National Park Service. During the Wilson administration, Franklin K. Lane, a Californian, became the Secretary of Interior. He was a striking individual and in 1916 he inaugurated the National Park Service. He appointed as the first director, Stephen Mather, a gifted man, and a Californian. Mr. Mather greatly expanded the National Park Service. Mr. Lane had a secretary, a young man by the name of Horace M. Albright. Mr. Mather brought Mr. Albright into the National Park Service and Mr. Albright followed Mr. Mather as Director of the Service. Later Newton B. Drury, another Californian, became and is now our National Park Director. Mr.

Drury and Mr. Albright were classmates of mine at the University of California. The present Governor of California, Earl Warren, was also a member of that class. Consequently I have a very close association with the National Park Service through my friendship and admiration for the last two directors. I am tremendously proud of the fine records they have made as park directors.

The Park Service is suffering from a lack of funds. That is true with other agencies due to the terrible drain on our finances because of the war and postwar problems. However, I am hoping that the Park Service may get more financial recognition next year and I have every confidence that it will. The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations desires to do something but it must trim wherever possible considering the fact that the budget today is the largest in the history of our country. I compliment the committee on its recommendation and hope it may be able to raise it next year.

It should be of interest to the Members of the House to note that the item of $180,000 for river-basin studies included in the departmental estimates, was eliminated entirely. This item was designed to cover the cost of preliminary planning for recreational facilities, and for survey and excavation of Indian remains from areas which Federal dam construction threatens with inundation.

This item was eliminated on the basis that State and Federal agencies having funds for archeological investigations should make the surveys, and excavate these remains. I should like to point out that State agencies have been participating for several years in a cooperative program with the Government, along these lines. Up to date, 17 local agencies have expended $55,000 of their own money. But they are completely unable to carry the load entirely by themselves. In some areas, there simply is no research institution which can do the job. In others, where there are several projects, the State institutions are already cooperating to the fullest extent of their abilities and could not take on a further program no matter how willing and cooperative they may be.

There are, unfortunately, no Federal agencies at all with funds for excavation work in river-basin areas. Funds of the Smithsonian Institution for archeological work are small, yet they have expended what they could in an effort to forestall a complete loss to the country of these remains. Other funds expended by the Smithsonian on river-basin programs are derived from the National Park Service under the terms of a memorandum of understanding.

Local people are interested in these Indian remains and the story they tell of the early days in America. Many of the sites have been dug into by people desirous of obtaining these old remains either for personal collections or for commercial sale. Instead of being preserved together in the regions from which they originated, these unique and interesting remains are scattered and lost all over the country. Local historical and archeological societies, universities, and many individuals are keenly interested in seeing that these remains are properly recovered before it is too late so that they may be of educational and display benefit to the areas in which they belong.

Under the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Federal Government is obligated to see to it that antiquities on Federal land are adequately preserved and protected. Yet, by the construction of numerous multipurpose dams and the flooding of large areas, the Federal Government is doing more damage to those same antiquities than all the looting and pothunting put together since this country was first discovered.

Recreational potentialities of these reservoirs should also be studied in connection with their construction. Otherwise, cheap and undesirable resorts will spring up around them, damaging the scenic aspects and antagonizing the nearby communities. Because of the National Park Service's long experience in these matters, the Government agencies building these reservoir areas have requested them to undertake the recreational planning rather than to duplicate the work of the National Park Service by setting up a separate staff. Coordination through one central agency is necessary to assure adequate facilities and prevent duplication and unnecessary effort.

We hope that in the next bill this matter may be given financial recognition.

Jewish-Catholic Relations in and Over Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in a recent issue of the Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N. Y., I am sure, will prove of considerable interest to my colleagues:

During the first months of the Palestine war, reports describing desecration of Christian sanctuaries by Jewish soldiers were widely publicized in the American press, particularly in Catholic publications. Needless to say, these reports had an unfavorable effect on Jewish-Catholic relations in the United States and the world over. If left unchecked, this development could have led to most undesirable results.

Eliahu Ben-Horin, well known writer and adviser on middle eastern affairs to the American Emergency Council, recently made a survey of Catholic institutions and interests. Part of Mr. Ben-Horin's tour of Catholic institutions in Israel was made in the company of Monsignor Thomas McMahon, who represented Cardinal Spellman on a special mission to the Middle East, and Monsignor Vergani, vicar-general of the Latin Patriarchate in Israel.

The outstanding feature of his report is the fact that not a single case of desecration or mistreatment of Christians has taken place since the establishment of the Government of Israel. This merely reemphasizes the truth that whatever excesses occurred, took place during the height of the Palestine War last summer and were perpetrated by irresponsible individuals. From the moment stable government was established in Israel, not one serious complaint was recorded.

In an article in the New York Herald Tribune of January 5, Mr. Ben-Horin described and analyzed the facts about the situation of the national and religious minorities in Israel and the treatment accorded them by the Israeli Government. A large-scale and costly program of education for Arab children has been adopted and put into operation by the government at the expense of the state budget. The minorities, Christian and Moslem, enjoy complete equality of civil rights, with the exception of freedom of movement for the duration of the war. As soon as peace is established, this single restriction will be removed. The special needs of the various religious communities are catered to by the government with the greatest care and understanding. Mr. Ben-Horin described a Christmas party tendered the Christian prisoners of war by the Israeli command of the camp, which he attended, along with a Catholic bishop and an Arab Catholic dignitary from Haifa. Both the prisoners and the Haifa visitors praised the Israeli authorities for the humane and considerate treatment they accorded the prisoners of war.

The mass flight of the Arabs from Palestine has left only about 100,000 of them in Israel. However, it was mostly Moslems who ran away. An equal number of Christians remained out of a total prewar community of only 125,000. Nazareth and the Christian villages in lower Galilee now hold the majority of the Christians in Israel. Their churches and monasteries were hardly touched by warfare. Most of the Christian communities are intact.

In the mixed cities—Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa, Acre—the Christian population has decreased in number through the Arab flight, but the communities exist, enjoy complete freedom to practice their faith, and most of the churches are in perfect condition. The same is true of the smaller towns like Ramleh, on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road. It was mainly in Jerusalem where a battle of artillery went on for months at close range, that churches as well as synagogues suffered damage from warfare. The Church of Dormition, on Mount Sinai, was hit by many Arab shells. The same applied to the Church of Notre Dame, which is on the border dividing the Jewish positions from the Arab. Wherever physical damage was inflicted on Christian churches it was done by Arabs, namely, by the Transjordan Legion. This fact is proved beyond doubt.

Mr. Ben-Horin stated there is no reason to expect future complications in Jewish-Catholic relations as far as the safety of the Catholic sanctuaries and the rights of the Catholic community in Israel are concerned. However, there are other problems concerning Israel which will surely affect Jewish-Catholic relations in the future. The question of the administration of the holy places is one of those problems. However, there are indications that this issue may be resolved in the not too distant future.

Support for Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Young Republican Club, well known for its forthright and enlightened stand

on public affairs, endorses the Atlantic Pact in a resolution hereto appended:

RESOLUTION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB, MARCH 10, 1949

Whereas the independence and territorial integrity of the free countries of western Europe are vital to the United States; and

Whereas these can be made secure only by firm, coordinated and well-implemented plans to resist any possible aggression; and

Whereas participation by the United States in these plans and preparations is necessary if they are to be effective: Be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club urges the President and Senate of the United States to conclude with all free states of western Europe which may need and desire such assurance a treaty including:

1. A statement by all signatories that each would regard an attack upon any signatory as an attack upon all.

2. Guarantees for the exchange of sufficient supplies and equipment between signatories to enable any and all to defend themselves from attack during the period before troops can be brought into action in full strength.

3. Joint staff plans and provision for the appointment if necessary of a joint chief of staff.

HENRY V. POOR, *President.*
JAMES VAN B. DRESSER,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.
SIDNEY G. KINGSLEY,
Chairman, Board of Governors.

Employers Proud of Two Unions' Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 31, 1949:

EMPLOYERS PROUD OF TWO UNIONS' FUNDS—CLOTHING MANUFACTURERS PRAISE HANDLING OF WELFARE PLANS FOR WHICH THEY PAY—MANY BENEFITS OPERATING—AMALGAMATED HAS $30,749,975 FOR RETIREMENTS, WHILE ILGWU HAS $18,000,000 RESERVE

(By A. H. Raskin)

Employers in the men's and women's clothing industry are almost as proud of the welfare funds set up under their union agreements as are union officials.

Unlike coal operators, who have fought John L. Lewis unremittingly in his efforts to establish the United Mine Workers' health and retirement funds, clothing manufacturers accepted the welfare principle without strikes in a period when such funds were virtually unknown in American industry.

What is more, the manufacturers make no secret of their satisfaction with the way the funds are being applied by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO.

The cordiality of the employer attitude is, in part, a reflection of the harmonious relations that prevail between the two unions and their respective employers. However, it is also founded on a belief, shared by many neutral social insurance experts, that the financial base of the clothing funds is much sounder than that of the United Mine Workers.

The Amalgamated has a retirement reserve of $30,749,975 to protect the pension rights of 136,500 workers in the men's and boys' clothing industry. The union expects to collect $5,771,500 in employer contributions to the pension fund this year and to pay out $1,260,000 in benefits to 3,500 retired workers past the age of 65.

RETIREMENT COVERS 173,000

The benefits match Federal social-security payments on a dollar-for-dollar basis and currently average $30 a month. Hyman Blumberg, executive vice president of the Amalgamated and head of its insurance operations, estimated that about 9,000 persons were eligible to retire under the program, but that nearly two-thirds of these were still at work.

The ILGWU has employer-financed retirement programs covering 173,000 workers in various branches of the women's garment industry. but the only fund that has been operating long enough to begin actual pension payments is the one covering 60,000 cloakmakers in the metropolitan area.

This fund has a reserve of $18,000,000 built up through employer payments amounting to 3 percent of pay roll since 1943. The Amalgamated fund also operates on a 3-percent pay-roll collection. Benefits under the ILGWU program are $50 a month, beginning at 65, and 1,700 retired workers are currently receiving payments.

Whenever a worker goes on the pension rolls the union blocks off an amount equal to his anticipated pension payments for 12 years. This $7,200 account provides an actuarial basis for guaranteeing that the fund will not have to default on its future obligations.

David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU, is convinced that the fund is in a position to increase monthly pension payments to $75 and to lower the retirement age for women to 60. Employer representatives in the tripartite administrative board, which is headed by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Federal Commissioner for Social Security, have refused to agree to these changes.

Additional ILGWU retirement funds have been established in this city, Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, and the Pacific coast. They have accumulated $8,000,000 in reserves and some will begin paying pensions this summer. Among these is the New York Dress Joint Board, largest union in the metropolitan district.

Virtually all of the union's 400,000 members (and some 35,000 nonmembers) are covered by the ILGWU health and vacation funds. These operate on a decentralized basis through 62 separate local funds, each of which functions under the general supervision of the union's international executive board.

PAID OUT $19,000,000

Last year the funds took in about $25,000,000 in employer contributions, representing an average of about 4 percent of pay roll, and paid out $19,000,000 in benefits. The combined reserve in the health and vacation funds was about $35,000,000 at the beginning of 1949, Mr. Dubinsky reported.

He said the union's aim was to pile up reserves large enough to pay all foreseeable benefits for 3 years. In general the funds provide 1 week's paid vacation, sickness benefits of $12 to $15 a week for a maximum of 13 weeks, hospitalization payments of $4 to $7 a day, $50 in maternity benefits, surgical benefits ranging up to $100, $25 in medical incidentals, cash allowances of $300 for tubercular cases, health center services, sight conservation allowances, and a $500 death benefit.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers does not operate on the pooled vacation fund basis. Its members receive 2 weeks' vacation, but in most cases they receive their checks direct from their employer.

The Amalgamated got into the welfare field through the pioneer unemployment funds it established in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia in 1923. When the Federal Social Security Act was passed 12 years later and State unemployment insurance systems were set up the Chicago fund was converted into a social benefit fund. By 1940 several such funds were functioning in the Amalgamated to provide health protection and life insurance benefits. In 1945 retirement benefits were added.

The retirement program is confind to workers engaged in the manufacture of clothing, but the other benefits cover a total of 264,684 workers in such other fields as laundries, cotton garments, neckwear, retail clothing stores, and cleaning and dyeing establishments. At the end of last month the reserve in the various welfare funds, other than retirement, stood at $15,220,513.

In addition to all this, the Amalgamated has its own insurance company, chartered by the State of New York, and operating under all State rules, which has a contingency reserve of $6,500,000. The company has a board of directors made up of 12 union officials and an advisory committee made up of 12 employers.

The union board of directors has full operating authority, but there must be joint employer-union agreement on any change in the benefit schedule. The employers also exercise veto power on the investment of funds and on authorizations of expenditure. Costs run about 5 percent, or half the cost of insursuring through a commercial insurance company.

The health and hospital benefits paid by the Amalgamated fund are substantially the same as those under the ILGWU fund, although some, such as the surgical benefit of $150, are somewhat higher. An employer contribution of 2 percent finances these welfare services, exclusive of vacations. The Amalgamated has no health centers, but is planning to open such agencies soon in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia.

EMPLOYER PRAISES UNION

The employer reaction to the fund's operations was summed up by Victor S. Riesenfeld, long a chairman of the labor committee of the United States Clothing Manufacturers Association and a member of the fund's executive committee.

He said the welfare program was working out "exceedingly well," and he complimented the union for the "skill and scrupulous care" with which it administered the funds. Mr. Riesenfeld expressed confidence in the financial soundness of the insurance company but added that he saw no prospect of liberalizing benefits in view of the uncertain business outlook.

Both Mr. Riesenfeld, for the employers, and Mr. Blumberg, for the union, noted that the collective-bargaining agreements in the industry provided for a review of benefits and employer contributions if the Federal social-security program were expanded. Mr. Riesenfeld said he felt an adjustment would have to be made if new Federal services were provided and pay-roll taxes increased.

In the women's clothing industry, I. A. Agree, executive director of the National Dress Manufacturers Association, said the employers were "rather pleased that our industry has taken a pioneering role in this field of social protection."

"While we have contributed substantially to the construction of the union health center and the building up of the welfare fund, we are so confident that the ILGWU is administering it efficiently and honestly that

we are not too conversant with its detailed operation," Mr. Agree observed.

Joseph L. Dubow, executive director of the Merchants Ladies Garment Association, voiced the view that retirement programs were of benefit to employers for practical, as well as humanitarian, reasons. By providing incentives for workers to retire after 65, pension funds helped increase the level of efficiency in shops making women's coats and suits, Mr. Dubow said.

"I think other branches of industry are taking a short-sighted view of the pension problem," he added.

On the other hand, Mr. Dubow said he felt that the health and hospitalization services should be provided under the governmental social-insurance programs.

Robinson-Patman Act Aids Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit upheld a cease and desist order of the Federal Trade Commission against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana prohibiting this company from engaging in certain unfair methods of competition and monopolistic practices. This decision represents a great victory for the small independent oil dealers, but has occasioned some criticism by a number of our newspapers.

As a friend of small business, it is, therefore, refreshing for me to read a comment on the other side of this issue on the editorial page of the Detroit News, March 18, 1949. In the Commentator column of W. K. Kelsey appears an article entitled "Small Business Fights for Existence." This article analyzes the Standard Oil decision from the point of view of small business and, althought I do not necessarily agree with all of its observations, respectfully commend it to the Members of the House and to the citizens of the country.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS FIGHTS FOR EXISTENCE

(By W. K. Kelsey)

A fierce but almost unreported struggle is going on between big business on the one hand and small independent business on the other. Small business is fighting to maintain its very existence, and such independence as has been left to it. Big business wants absolute control of its industries all the way to the consumer. That is as simple a way as the commentator can find for stating a highly complex issue.

Last week the small independent oil dealers with a notable victory when the United States court of appeals for the seventh circuit, sitting in Chicago, upheld a cease and desist order of the Federal Trade Commission against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana. But the little fellows can't begin to crow yet, since the decision will surely be appealed to the Supreme Court.

Meanwhile they may lose their cause if a bill introduced in the Senate passes Congress in its present form. This bill, presented in consequence of the Supreme Court's recent decision in the cement cases, would modify the Clayton Antitrust Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 and would apparently legalize the practices against which the FTC issued its order against Standard Oil. The Robinson-Patman Act was passed to protect small dealers against discrimination by manufacturers in favor of chain stores, by allowing them lower prices and other favors on large-volume orders.

The effect of the decision is Nation-wide, and applies not only to the oil industry, but to all industries which indulge in forbidden practices.

What the case was about—in effect, the court said: "For a business to indulge in practices which discriminate between its customers, in local territory, to the benefit of the few and to the injury of the rest, is unlawful."

The issue arose in this way—in the late 1930's Standard began selling to a few large dealers gasoline in tank-car lots at tank-car prices, 1½ cents below the tank-wagon price paid by operators of Standard's leased stations and by Standard's independent dealers who owned their stations. The dealers thus favored in price were enabled to sell to customers, through their own outlets, at lower retail prices than other dealers who bought from tank-wagons.

Standard's gas station lessees, and Standard's independents, all of whom were under contract to take only Standard products, had to continue buying at tank-wagon prices. They were not even permitted to buy from the favored jobbers who were handling Standard gas. Because of their contracts, they could not switch to any other brand that might be offered them more cheaply. In effect, Standard was thus subsidizing competition against the majority of its own dealer customers. Naturally those men protested to the retail oil dealers association, which filed a complaint against Standard with the Federal Trade Commission. The war intervened to delay proceedings, but at last the FTC issued its cease and desist order, which Standard decided to test in the courts. Last Saturday that order was upheld in the circuit court of appeals, with one slight modification. The principal point in the court's decision was its denial of Standard's contention that its lower prices to a few dealers were granted in good faith to meet competition. It was held, in effect, that the lower prices to the few constituted discrimination against those dealers who were compelled to pay tank-wagon prices, and that such discrimination is unlawful. The court took into consideration testimony that some small dealers, alone or in combination, had or could obtain storage capacity which would enable them to handle tank-car lots, but nevertheless standard had refused to grant them the privilege and the lower tank-car price.

The reason the small independent dealer requires protection is to be found in recent history. The little man operates on a small margin, which forbids him to meet price-cutting competition and make a sufficient profit to live on. If he is pinched long enough, he goes broke and quits. If in a long price-cutting war, in which favored stations are subsidized, he maintains his prices, he loses customers to the lower-cost, lower-price stations and may eventually be pinched out. During the great depression the big oil companies took over a multitude of stations from owners unable to make ends meet, getting them at bargain prices.

Price discrimination can be used by "big oil" to force independents out of business and acquire their property. Congress saw that fact, among others, when it passed the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act and other antitrust legislation.

We Can't Take Chances on Tomorrow's Meals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. LIND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to a most interesting article written by Mr. H. E. Babcock, and which appeared in the April 1949 issue of the Country Gentleman. Storing food "on the hoof," the author says, builds soil, human health, and stable markets for producers, providing a foundation for a farm program fair to all.

The article follows:

WE CAN'T TAKE CHANCES ON TOMORROW'S MEALS

(By H. E. Babcock)

Soon after the Eighty-first Congress settled down to work, I spent a week in Washington looking it over. There are too many men in Congress to get acquainted with each one, so at the end of my stay I resorted to a stockman's device. Mentally I ran them through a cutting chute and sorted them according to their qualifications to vote on farm and food legislation.

My first cut was less than a score of Senators and Representatives who seem to me to have a grasp of the over-all farm and food problems confronting the Nation. My second cut showed up 40 or 50 "captive" Congressmen—fellows whose thinking is entirely dominated by the problems of the districts or States they represent.

The balance—I'll call them "confused" Congressmen—includes a great majority of the Members of both Houses. Mostly these are men of fine ability and the best of intentions. But they are completely mystified by the numberless and contradictory demands of farmers and consumers.

Nor is this vast unhappy majority being helped out much by the national farm organizations. They, too, are split, both among and within themselves. Only by Herculean efforts are the heads of these organizations able to hold a working majority of their members in anything resembling a line.

With conditions as chaotic as this, there is an obvious need for spelling out a few fundamentals for a national farm and food program which will be in the interests of everyone. Country Gentleman has recognized this need by publishing a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan in its January issue, and in the March editorial, Price Supports Don't Make a Farm Program. Now I have my opportunity.

I shall begin by laying down the commonsense premise that a population soon to number 150,000,000 human stomachs can't take chances on tomorrow's meals. I suggest that we accept this principle as a basic test of all future farm and food legislation.

I'll even go a step further. Does the proposed program hold out hope of more Americans eating better? If it doesn't it's not in the national interest and should not be written into law. I repeat that 150,000,000 people can't take chances on tomorrow's meals.

Surely no one can quarrel with this start. But there is a lot of farm and food legislation due to come before the Eighty-first Congress which will not square with this ideal. Some of it will be proposed by the "captive" Congressmen backed by powerful commodity and regional farm lobbies. Some of it will be put forward by individuals at the moment

more interested in socializing agriculture than in our future food supply. These individuals would like nothing better than to cross 6,000,000 farmers off the list as private business managers. If they cannot do this any other way, they are prepared to buy them off with public funds.

It is going to take statesmanship, clear thinking, and stout courage on the part of the administration and Congress to stand up against these drives by the representatives of special interests and the subtle foes of private enterprise.

If we can agree on "better meals for more Americans" as a national long-time goal, it is only common sense to describe such meals in terms everybody can understand in order to secure maximum public acceptance of the goal. In previous articles in Country Gentleman I have done this.

The foods for such meals (when they are available at reasonable prices) are found in any well-stocked home refrigerator on any Saturday night anywhere in the United States. They are the milk, meat, eggs, butter, and cheese, and fresh fruits and vegetables with which most American housewives like to prepare the meals they serve. Any American family which eats free choice from a well-stocked home refrigerator certainly should be well nourished, happy, and content.

A second premise is that a nation with a growing population and the task of selling its philosophy of free enterprise to the rest of the world cannot afford to eat at the expense of its soil. Mere soil conservation is not enough for America. We must actually increase the productivity of our land. If we don't do this, there is no chance over the long pull of maintaining even our present dietary standards, much less of improving them. Fortunately, thousands upon thousands of farmers know how to do this job, and are doing it.

Summarizing, I offer two guiding principles for everybody's farm and food program:

1. It must provide an ever-increasing American population with an ample supply of the foods we like best and which are best for us—the refrigerator foods.

2. These foods must be produced by the kind of farming which will build up soil productivity as well as conserve it.

As a security measure (I will discuss this later) we also must so farm and eat that we maintain at all times a substantial food reserve against war or natural disaster.

Only by the wise management of our food-producing livestock can we develop such a program. Under our system of farming, even soil fertility depends to a great degree on our animal population.

The ratio between our domestic livestock and our humans is one of the most important figures in our so-called way of life. How much food-producing livestock should there be behind the family refrigerator?

In an endeavor to get at some answer to this question I appealed to the Chief of the United States Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Agricultural Economics. As I expected, his staff already had a figure in which all food-producing livestock (including milk cows and laying hens but excluding horses and mules) was annually reduced to a hog-equivalent. I asked the Bureau to compare this figure on an annual basis with our population figures. My object was to see if it would be possible to keep track of the balance between our food-producing livestock and our human population. While this may come to be known popularly as a hog-man ratio, it must never be forgotten that the hog-equivalent figure includes the all-important dairy cow and laying hen as well as meat animals.

The Bureau came up with some most interesting comparisons. In 1919–20 we had 1.67 head of productive livestock to 1 human being. In 1934–35 this hit a low of 1.27. At the present time the ratio is estimated to be 1.41 hog equivalents to 1 man.

For myself, I need no more accurate measure of the progress being made in working out a satisfactory farm-and-food program for everybody than this ratio. As it inches upward, we shall have well-stocked family refrigerators, improving soil fertility, and the kind of food stock pile we need for national safety. If it goes the other way, we shall be headed for a poverty standard of eating.

I am convinced that there is only one way for us to stock pile any substantial amount of food—on the hoof. No better storage bin has ever been devised than the flexible hide of a steer or a dairy heifer. It is storage which also can be eaten if necessary. As we expand the numbers and weight of our livestock, we achieve everything the ever-normal granary ever tried to accomplish, including support of grain prices.

Actually, no country's livestock population should be a stationary thing. Traditionally, it operates as a cushion between our human population and the land. When good crops are produced, the bulk of them (normally over four-fifths of our cereal production) is naturally taken up by an expanding livestock population. Then, in the event of war or other disaster, we have a reservoir of high-quality, nutritious food just when we need it most. Killing the livestock releases the cereals and other foods that animals were eating for direct human consumption as we need them.

Stock-piling grain in dead storage is quite another thing. To go into storage at all, more has to be paid for the grain than the owners of livestock are willing to buy it for. The natural adjustment that would be made by feeding it to livestock thus is stopped in its tracks and the surplus is frozen. This is a bad thing for everyone.

Once in storage, the grain overhangs the market and becomes a football for politicians and the pressure boys. It costs money to hold it in storage and keep it in condition. Even then, the grain tends to deteriorate in nutritive quality. Finally, the whole economy is denied the turn-over of this wealth in improving its standard of living.

In the long-time farm-and-food program which I am suggesting, grain in dead storage is a stand-by factor. Experience has indicated the normal carry-overs of grain that we should expect to maintain. The prudent livestock man will naturally attempt to protect himself. Our stored grain, in addition, should be sufficient to protect and to encourage the livestock producer who operates in regions where weather brings wide fluctuations in crop yields and the threat of liquidation of his herds because of lack of feed.

What really counts in dealing with big crops and building useful stock piles of food is our productive livestock population. Let farmers on their own move the present ratio of 1.41 hog-equivalents to 1 man up to, say, 1.75 to 1, and we shall have improving soil fertility and a better supply of foods for the home refrigerator. The alternative is simple: An ever-increasing amount of grain in dead storage, acreage controls, progressive regimentation of 6,000,000 farmers, and finally no market for—refrigerators.

Now for some positive ideas for producing better meals for more Americans. The first step in implementing such a program is to manage our food-producing livestock to the maximum advantage of the human population. This is a job we have never tackled squarely.

We have been dealing with it in sections. We have veterinary schools for the health protection of animals. We have divisions in our experiment stations studying animal genetics. We have others dealing with the growing of forage for livestock, and still others with barn and feed-lot nutrition. But nowhere in the United States do we have an institution which brings together and correlates all these programs for the preservation and improvement of our domestic food-producing animals.

A few such pace-setting institutions are badly needed. I seriously propose for the consideration of some of the leading land-grant universities the establishment of schools or institutes of animal agriculture, the purpose of these institutions being to deal with our food-producing livestock population as a whole and to bring together for the teaching of graduate students who are destined to become skilled in the management of livestock all we know about the preservation and management of this basically important part of our way of life.

I am reliably informed that at least one leading land-grant university is considering setting up just such a school.

As a second positive step I feel that the great mass of publicly supported agricultural research should be inventoried and reviewed. This review should be by a committee representing all the people. Perhaps the National Research Advisory Committee might do this job.

Primarily, such review should seek to determine whether or not the public dollar appropriated for research in agriculture and food is being spent in the right proportions. Is enough aimed at the problems of our animal agriculture; or is too much of it devoted to fringe production, to specialty crops and the like?

Such a review should extend clear down to the State experiment stations. If it turns out as I expect it may, that we need to spend more research money to learn how to control animal diseases, breed them better, feed them cheaper, and make better utilization of the food they produce, then this money should be made available. Or better still, it should be saved from projects which are not as fundamentally important.

As a third step, in putting a long-time farm-and-food program into effect we must cancel out, gradually but thoroughly, all those activities of government which work against an expanding livestock industry with all the benefits it can bring to our standard of living.

It is at this point that our present conception of price supports must be brought into focus. It is at this point, too, that our ways of supporting soil conservation and soil building must come under critical study.

The above are complicated activities. Some of them are sired by socialism. Others are the children of pressure groups. All these devices must be kept under continuing review and constantly challenged to see if they are in accord with a long-time program of soil building, an expanding livestock population, and better meals for more Americans.

For these are the three objectives toward which our economy must move. Actually, I think the question of whether our agriculture shall remain in the hands of free farmers or be State-managed, important as it is, is secondary to the question of how well we want to eat in the future. Which system will fill the most home refrigerators? This is what we all want to know, because we all have stomachs.

Realistically, this is the question now before the Eighty-first Congress. But, in my opinion, neither the administration nor Congress but the market place eventually will answer this question.

If 150,000,000 Americans become sufficiently sold on the importance of the kind of meals they like best and is best for them, they won't kick in the long run on paying 6,000,000 farmers well to grow these meals. But this supposes two developments: (1) that through mass education and mass selling the American people will buy the ideal of good nutrition, and (2) that 6,000,000 farmers will be left free enough to apply their courage, their ingenuity, and their

proved ability to produce cheaply adequate quantities of the foods for such nutrition—the "refrigerator foods."

If we can gradually straighten ourselves out to a point where everybody appreciates the health, energy, and social satisfaction of good eating; and farmers—principally through keeping more livestock—can get set to provide what the market really wants, we shall be on our way.

Consumers can be sold on the idea of paying fair prices for the foods they like best and which are best for them. Dairymen, poultrymen, and livestock feeders under such circumstances will be willing to pay fair prices for grain. Remember that right now they provide four-fifths of the grain market. And, finally, the whole Natior will be safer because it is preserving its soil fertility and maintaining as it goes along a food reserve, the best which possibly can be devised, against war or natural disaster.

While actually the kind of farm and food program I have sketched should be self-sustaining because of the great flexibility which is inherent in our food-producing livestock population, let us suppose that we run into such a depression that too many of our 150,000,000 can't buy an adequate diet.

If this happens, then it seems to me that through school lunches and other diet subsidies which may be devised we can deal much more effectively with the emergency than we can if we try to meet it by shutting off production of food by acreage controls with resultant restriction of livestock numbers and, finally, State management of farming.

It must never be forgotten that over the long pull it is the suction of the market place on the food supply which determines the pay farmers get for raising food.

Why Are Taxes Going Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 29, 1949:

WHY ARE TAXES GOING UP?

Taxes are going up in this country.

But they are going down in many other parts of the world—especially in England.

How come?

England has made two large scale tax cuts since the war. The general rates were lowered in 1945 and again last year; and exemptions were increased to a point which dropped hundreds of thousands of families from the tax rolls.

Canada also is on the highway to lower taxes. At this moment there is before the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa an official Government recommendation that the income tax be cut one-third. Meanwhile personal and dependency exemptions also are to be raised a third, so that an estimated 600,000 Canadians will be relieved from paying any income tax. Canada also is slashing her excise and nuisance taxes. It is planned to eliminate entirely the tax on candy, soft drinks, and transportation.

The contrast between rising taxes in the United States of America and falling taxes in this British Empire is a strange aftermath of the war. It is especially startling in view of the fact that Great Britain has been represented as broke, impoverished, and desperately in need of financial aid.

Where is it that the British Government is finding revenue in such abundance that it can afford to cut its people's taxes—even to relieve great numbers of them from making any contributions at all to the support of their Government?

Why is it that a nation like England, supposedly up against an economic crisis just as critical as the war itself, does not find it necessary to keep its internal income at least up to the war?

And why is it that our people, supposedly prosperous since the war, and supposedly rich enough to afford to help others, still have to keep paying more and more to keep their Government going; while these other demoralized lands, although so badly off one would think they need every cent of revenue, can slash their domestic-' x rates?

The answer to these questions is no mystery. The British Government has found a way to get money without working for it, and without taxing their own people for it. In the old Broadway slang phrase, they've found an "angel" to pay their bills.

You are the angel.

The reason the people of England can enjoy two tax cuts in succession since the war with a third almost a certainty before the pending election, is that you are paying their bills for them.

And the reason Canada is "prosperous" enough to cut its own taxes is that the American people have been making the contributions to British support which the Canadians, as part of the British Empire, otherwise would have had to make.

We got into the postwar foreign relief business, including the Marshall plan, on the theory we were going to help the destitute and aid the suffering.

It wasn't presented to the American people as a scheme for helping Socialist politicians abroad reduce the taxes on their voters, and thereby prolong their tenure of office.

Yet that is the way it is working out.

The second dose of the Marshall plan is now before Congress. Its big political purpose is to give the Socialists in England a war chest with which to win reelection for another 5-year period.

Inescapably, part of it will go to allow the further reduction of taxes in England, and thus "sweeten" the British voters.

If you oppose the use of your money for this sort of political run-around by your Government, write and say so to your United States Senators and your Congressmen.

Congressional Colleagues Urged To Visit Lighted-Up Jefferson Memorial and Cherry Tree Area at Night; and Correspondence Between Congressman and Department of Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the famous cherry tree festival season, and the world-famous Jefferson Memorial is situated spectacularly in the midst of this area and just across the beautiful Tidal Basin waters from the most numerous of the cherry trees, now in blossom. Go see them—at night, if possible. Go in the daytime, too; but do not miss the night illumination of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial as well as the cherry trees.

While a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mrs. Doyle and I noted that the Jefferson Memorial, itself, was not lighted on the exterior nor was the park area surrounding this famous Thomas Jefferson Memorial lighted. Consequently and manifestly folks generally did not visit the memorial building at night except in very, very rare cases. We felt it was a shame to keep Thomas Jefferson in the dark and that he should be brought into the light. Other nationally famous memorials, such as the Lincoln Memorial, were very beautifully and adequately lighted outside as well as inside. The inside of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial was, in our judgment, not adequately lighted to be efficient as well as beautiful to behold in the nighttime. But I did nothing more than to make inquiry as to why this was so and expressed regrets that it was so.

Returning to this Eighty-first Congress, Mrs. Doyle and I again immediately noted the conditions of inadequate light continued to exist, and inaugural week was just ahead of us. So I called upon our good friend, Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and I asked him why Oscar Chapman kept Thomas Jefferson in the dark and why not light up the Jefferson Memorial appropriately and adequately at nighttime. He replied that the suggestion had never before been made. But Mr. Chapman, as usual, moved promptly, as will be revealed from the following correspondence between myself and him:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1949.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: While a Member of the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mrs. Doyle and I frequently visited the national monuments and memorials in Washington and vicinity many times during the evening hours.

It, then, impressed us very, very much that the Jefferson Memorial was (in our judgment) neither lighted adequately in the interior thereof, and it was entirely nonilluminated on the outside of the monument. This, it then seemed to us, resulted in a loss to the visitors of Washington of a great deal of the value of the monument—both of the statue of Jefferson and of the beautiful architecture of the memorial itself and also of the park and planting surrounding the same.

Again, as we return to Washington, we have renewed our friendships with these national memorials and monuments, and it again occurs to us that the exterior of the Jefferson Memorial should be lighted during reasonable hours of the nighttime so that passersby could be inspired by a view thereof and so that it would naturally attract many, many visitors directly to it in the evening. We now note that the interior of the memorial is lighted so that, upon going close to the memorial, a person could reasonably observe the lighted statue of Jefferson. But from the highway or a distance, it still is not too noticeable. Probably the lighting of the exterior of the memorial would greatly enhance its value as a memorial.

Having been president of the playground and recreation commission of my own home

city for some 15 years, I feel it is possible that either the District or the National Park Service would have available adequate flood lights to install. Could the exterior of this memorial be flooded with lights, at least inaugural week? Could you experiment quickly enough to have this result accomplished? I am sure that the thousands upon thousands of visitors to Washington next week would enjoy having it so.

Probably you have already experimented with this possible feature with the Jefferson Memorial—but I could not help but know that, after personally observing it on many, many occasions, Mrs. Doyle and I have felt we should not hesitate to make this anxious inquiry, trusting that you would not find it entirely out of order.

I have the honor to be, and with appreciation of all your busy department is already doing,

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1949.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: I was greatly pleased at the suggestion contained in your letter of January 14 that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial be illuminated during inaugural week, and I directed the Office of National Capital Parks to undertake the project during inaugural week. This was done and the lights were operated on the evening of Wednesday, January 19, and continued through Sunday, January 23.

The extent of the temporary lighting of the memorial was of necessity limited by the amount of available equipment, but we feel that a creditable showing was made. The light was well distributed over the north facade and the east and west sides of the memorial, but the spotlights used on the south facade did not give a pleasing effect. Unfortunately, no floodlights were available to correct this situation.

We will ask the Commission of Fine Arts to give us an expression of opinion concerning the advisability of permanently illuminating the structure. In the event that it is held to be desirable, we shall make a study of the cost of the installation and request funds for the purpose in connection with the submission of our next budget estimates.

I am greatly pleased at the keen interest which you continue to exhibit in the national memorials and the valuable suggestions which you have made for improving their attractiveness to the people. I am also grateful for your thoughtful expression of appreciation for the work which the Department of the Interior is doing.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary.

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Immediately acknowledging receipt of your favor of February 2, 1949, in regard to the lighting of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, at night, I note that you say, "We will ask the Commission of Fine Arts to give us an expression of opinion concerning the advisability of permanently illuminating the structure. In the event that it is held to be desirable, we shall make a study of the cost of the installation and request funds for the purpose in connection with the submission of our next budget estimates." In this connection, I will say that I am very certain that there will be ample evidence to convince the Commission of Fine Arts, and your own Department, of the fact that the lighting of before, and since, made the Jefferson Memorial truly an attractive, inspiring memorial, at nighttime as well as during the daylight hours. I cannot personally conceive of any reason why the memorial of Thomas Jefferson should be kept in the dark and other memorials kept in the light, during the visiting hours after sunset.

In connection with the consideration of this matter, by the Commission of Fine Arts, I would thank you to inform me, in the premises, as to what manner they function in such problems, in connection with the Department of the Interior.

Several Members of Congress have expressed definite interest in keeping the lighting conditions on this Jefferson Memorial and, we are, therefore, desirous of committing to the responsible parties, the fact that the great difference was noted as a gladsome condition which caused real inspiration and pride to those who observed it. I know of several people who deliberately drove around the Basin after dark in order to observe the inspiring sight across the waters of the Basin, looking from the driveway toward the Memorial.

Granting that what you say is true, that the spotlights used on the south facade did not give a pleasing effect, yet the balance of the lighting was so very well distributed and the results so inspiring that it would appear that the relatively small cost of acquiring necessary floodlights to illuminate the south facade might well be determined as a relatively insignificant amount.

I am trusting and hoping, therefore, that the responsible parties will make an expression of opinion, to the effect that it is advisable to promptly illuminate the structure at night, and that the cost of installation will be found well within and commensurate with the inspiring and profitable results achieved from the night illumination.

I will say that a great number of folks here in the Capitol, have come to me and commented on how pleased they were that you were able to so promptly fulfill the suggestion made by me that the memorial be illuminated during inaugural week, and that they thought it would be wonderful if it were possible to have it permanently illuminated at night.

If you have any suggestion of ways and means in which the many of us here who are interested in having the memorial permanently illuminated, can make our findings known, and likewise can contact those in the premises regarding the requirement of funds in connection with the submission of our next budget estimates, I will appreciate your advising us of such.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1949.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: I have received your letter of February 4, complimenting us for the temporary night illumination of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial which we were able to effect during inaugural week. I am delighted to know that you were pleased with the result, even though the inadequacy of the equipment available left much to be desired.

The problem of lighting the edifice is one that would require expert treatment to insure proper artistic results and preservation of effect which the architect sought to achieve in his design. Before proceeding further, therefore, we plan to bring the matter to the attention of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The act establishing the Commission of Fine Arts (36 Stat. 371) as amended (46 Stat. 366) authorizes the Commission to advise generally on questions of art. Proceeding upon the premise that it was the intention of Congress that the recommendations of the Commission should be obtained by the executive departments before reaching decisions in such questions, it has been the policy of the Department of the Interior to seek the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts on all matters within the scope of the act.

I greatly appreciate your offer of assistance in this instance and will inform you of our progress in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1949.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: You and your associates were very prompt and helpful to the end that the Jefferson Memorial was temporarily lighted during the recent inaugural celebration, and, no doubt, you have heard some of the many, many commendations you folks in authority have received for doing that sensible thing.

Now I am urging you to immediately see if it is not possible to again—at least temporarily—light the Jefferson Memorial for the period of the cherry-blossom festival. It would certainly be an added inspiration and point of delightful view to have that memorial lighted so that the many thousands who will visit during the cherry-blossom festival could also visit the Jefferson Memorial while it is lighted at night.

That Jefferson Memorial, adequately lighted, would be one of the memorial locations in all of the District and surrounding States to which people would go and view the same from nearly as well as from across the waters of the Tidal Basin. We have experimented with it and have driven along the roads when the memorial was lighted and have viewed it from different locations and distances, and it is magnificent, and it would be a glorious tribute and improvement of the appearance and use of this significant memorial.

There are many of us who earnestly hope that this memorial may be again lighted during the cherry-blossom festival; and then permanently lighted by the authority of the Commission having authority to act on such matters.

With personal regards and appreciation, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—The lighting of it during the inaugural celebration caused some newspapers and periodicals to headline that circumstance with such language as "Jefferson no longer in the dark," "Why keep Jefferson in the dark," "Jefferson all lighted up," "Jefferson brought out from darkness," etc.

MARCH 31, 1949.

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Thank you very much for following my suggestion contained in my letter to you of March 19, to wit: That the Jefferson Memorial again be lighted for the cherry-tree festival. You and your associates have certainly done a splendid thing in having those spotlights placed around the Basin. By doing this you have accomplished even more than I had expected would be possible, to wit:

1. You have lighted the Jefferson Memorial and its immediate surroundings in a magnificent manner so that when last night we visited it there were literally hundreds of men and women, young and old alike, walking through and around this inspiring memorial. I am told that never before have so many people visited the Jefferson Memorial during the season that the cherry trees are in bloom.

2. You have succeeded in bringing out at nighttime the beauty and grandeur of the cherry trees themselves. I have been told again that never before have so many people been at the Tidal Basin during the cherry-blossom season.

3. You succeeded in lighting the Tidal Basin waterways so that actually the reflection of the Jefferson Memorial in the waters looks as though there were two memorials.

4. Your lighting of the total Jefferson Memorial area by means of those Army spotlights resulted in a very magnificent reflection of the Washington Monument in the waters of the Tidal Basin.

Yesterday morning at 8 o'clock Mrs. Doyle and I visited the Jefferson Memorial area, as well as the night before, and again last night (when it was lighted for the first time).

I hope that you personally went there to receive the inspiration and joy of seeing literally hundreds of people enjoying that grandeur of the total picture—which primarily resulted from the lighting of the Jefferson Memorial.

Last night when Mrs. Doyle and I drove across the bridge near the Jefferson Memorial, she said: "This proves, CLYDE, that the people will travel almost any distance to see real beauty, and this lighting of the Jefferson Memorial and cherry-tree area will make the cherry-blossom festival more famous than ever. It will also make the Jefferson Memorial more famous than ever." I agreed with her.

I do hope that the Fine Arts Commission will make the lighting of the Jefferson Memorial at night a permanent feature. I hope, too, that the enriching experience and result of the lighting of this memorial to this famous American citizen during the inaugural-week period and again now during the cherry-tree festival will result in the Jefferson Memorial and total cherry-tree area being lighted annually during the cherry-tree festival and probably during other similar occasions of more than just local interest.

Thanks again for your following my anxious inquiry and suggestion.

Please let me know of any further way in which I can be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will join with me in the expression of earnest hope that the Fine Arts Commission, who has final judgment in such matters and has to make the final decision in such cases, will arrange so that this famous Thomas Jefferson Memorial will be adequately lighted on the exterior, and that the area itself will be likewise adequately lighted to attract folks at nighttime to go and visit the Thomas Jefferson Memorial the same as they are attracted to go to the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument because they are adequately lighted about the exteriors.

Let us bring the greatness of Thomas Jefferson out into the light and knowledge of more Americans. It will strengthen the sinews of our American democracy to do so. A visit at nighttime to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and the reading of the inscriptions upon the interior will inform and inspire every reader and visitor.

Who Pays the Fiddler?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I am supplementing my extension of yesterday by including further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on Federal expenditures:

BENTON HARBOR, MICH.

It seems to us to be particularly important at this time to cut all nonessential items completely out and reduce drastically the funds allocated to many of the so-called essential Government functions. It is our feeling that the country is mortgaged to the hilt right now, that a reduction in tax income will be apparent when taxes are all in this year, and a very serious slump will be revealed next year under our present tax laws due to reduced personal and corporation incomes and taxes being drained out of the Federal coffers by the carry-back privileges of the present tax laws.

Only by hard-boiled appropriation cutting can we get through the next fiscal year without a damaging deficit.

PRODUCERS SERVICE CORP.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Our own thoughts have a close parallel with the Hoover Commission recommendations for the interest of taxpayers and the soundness of our national economy. We only hope that way of thinking will find widespread support and effect some degree of saneness in Government-spending programs.

THE WEDLER-SHUFORD CO.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

It is time that something is done to get Government expenses back to a reasonable figure so that our large national debt can be systematically reduced.

Most of us from our earliest days were taught to work and to save, to provide security for that time in our lives when we would be unable to work any longer. We have consequently invested our money in Government bonds, insurance, etc., which will be entirely wiped out if we continue to spend as we have, permit our debt to grow larger, and not get the financial condition of our Government on a good, sound basis.

MISSOURI STEEL & WIRE CO.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

There is definitely too much money spent today on foolish projects, which the taxpayer has to assume.

GENERAL WINDOW CLEANING CO.

EAST PROVIDENCE, R. I.

It is unbelievable and discouraging that the budget is so overwhelming. It is my opinion that the President and Congress should give grave consideration to the carrying out of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It is more important than loading the "gravy train."

HENRY MAXSON BRIGHTMAN,
ROBERT HENRY BRIGHTMAN,
Heating Engineers.

OLEAN, N. Y.

It is time that the representatives of the people stop the political maneuvering with our money and cut our budget down to a figure that will not bankrupt all of us.

DAILEY MILLS, INC.

BROWNING, MONT.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing some clippings from the Great Falls Tribune quoting an Indian in his remarks before the Kiwanis Club in Great Falls. He states that about 80 percent of the Indian appropriations are squandered in administration and that the district office is a joke, being mostly handlers and producers of red tape.

When the Indian himself in the very department that is supposed to assist him sees the squandering and makes the statement in public that it can well be dispensed with, it is high time to cut it out and save as he suggests, 80 percent of the expense of the Indian Service.

THE SHERBURNE MERCANTILE CO.

WARRENTON, VA.

Individuals and businesses, from whom the Government expects to collect, are thoroughly tired of rule by bureaus with their attendant enormous cost. These sources, which are the only sources of revenue, have reached the point of discouragement and only immediate and drastic reduction can hope to avert bankruptcy.

BLACKWELL ENGINEERING CO.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Surely all thinking businessmen and a large majority of our people know if a business was run the same way the Government was managed, there would be a creditor's meeting in the very near future. To keep on expanding and spending the money must be available, but from where?

Cut out unnecessary spending and reduce the Government pay rolls. If industry does not need five men for a one-man job, neither does the Government.

HINSDALE MANUFACTURING CO.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

It so happens that in checking my returns at the end of the year I find that I am working for Uncle Sam at least 40 percent of the time. With an increased budget such as requested by the President and his staff, it would no doubt mean that we business people in the medium brackets will be working for Uncle Sam not only 40 percent of the time but perhaps 60 percent of our time in order to carry out what I call socialistic practices in our Government.

It is quite easy for anyone in business—and in all business today you have to come in contact with Government agencies one way or another—to see the waste that goes on at the expense of those who risk their capital and devote their time trying to build up a sound economy program in our country.

BROOME FURNITURE CO.

ETNA, N. Y.,

There must be a halt in the progressively increased spending for uncertain socialized and experimental projects, until our very large and burdensome debt is reduced and the proposed Federal Government budget should lead the way.

We are having some very definite reductions made in the New York State budget because of the program set up by the Governor which covers the same type of projects. There is a very definite undercurrent against these increased spendings, which necessarily calls for more and more taxes.

FINGER LAKES CHEMICAL CO., INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Any of us who have had the slightest amount of business experience realize that

neither a company or a government can stay in existence when the point is reached where the liabilities continually exceed the receipts.

THE FAIRFACTS CO.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA.

Everybody has been in the habit of throwing money around for the past several years and it became quite a gesture to see how much one could spend in private as well as in business. The Government has not encouraged people to be thrifty. What I am thinking about is if another depression would set in what would happen to this country?

NEW HOTEL MAYFAIR.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

As a businessman I cannot understand why our Government should continue to spend such large sums of money.

The American citizen cannot go on contributing such a large share of his income for Government. As I see the picture, our economy is at a very critical stage and continued extravagance in Government spending could easily cause serious damage.

WOOD-DAVIS HARDWARE CO.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J.

It is a well-known fact that few nations have remained solvent long when the tax load reaches one-third or more of the people's income, and we are dangerously near that point, if not already at it. It also does not appear sound over the long pull for such a small percentage of the people to pay as high percentage of the individual taxes, as now exists. The base is not broad enough.

STILLMAN & HOAG, INC.

OMAHA, NEBR.

I have worked for the Federal Government myself and am aware of some of the wasteful and fruitless expenditures that are typical of many bureaus and branches. I appreciate the resistance to be encountered from almost every quarter by anyone proposing to make a specific reduction in personnel or expenditures in any bureau but if more Representatives and Senators would take a stand similar to yours it would be quite possible for the Government to make tremendous reductions in personnel and expenditures and operate on the more economical lines of any private or corporate business.

I am sure that there can be reductions and believe that at least 75 percent of the voters feel that Federal expenditures should and could be reduced by elimination of useless personnel, consolidation of bureaus in similar and related fields and withdrawal from excessive business controls and socialistic activities.

JAMES E. LOFTUS, A. I. A.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

So few people appear to realize that the old law of economics cannot be ignored. I have frequently wondered how the Nation could survive on a spending budget of more than $40,000,000,000 if the national income again reaches the total of $58,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000.

It is very difficult to understand why the thinking people of the Nation do not rise up in open rebellion at the manner in which we are now being taxed.

For with the tax situation on income and the confiscatory tax on estates, one wonders whether we shall ever again become a self-sufficient people.

THRIFT INVESTMENT CORP.

HIGHLAND, N. Y.

Unnecessary expenditures will mean unnecessary taxes. I welcome honest business competition and you can take my word for it being competitive. However, excessive taxations to meet this stupendous budget can also ruin many a small-business man like myself.

RATHGEB KNITTING MILLS, INC.

NEWPORT, TENN.

If our Government does keep on spending money at the rate they are now doing, our children's children, children's children's grand-children will still be trying to pay this tremendous debt. I am behind our Government for any worth-while spending for the good of our Nation, but all the gravy-train jobs should be thrown out of our Government.

WOOD PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC.

VIRGINIA, MINN.

We who are operating small businesses throughout the rural United States are beset by increasing costs, rules, and regulations labeled by our Congress as necessary to our economic welfare. It has become a requisite in business to retain a battery of accountants and lawyers in order to comply with all these laws. This is not as it should be. This is not America as our founding fathers hoped it to be.

The Hoover Commission has reported its findings. I believe our Congressmen should give this report serious consideration. The perspective of a group of men such as those that sat on this board has not been tainted by the ever present lobbyist. They had no nest to feather.

THE TROY LAUNDRY & DRY CLEANING CO.

UTICA, N. Y.

You no doubt are well aware of the present recession in all lines of industry, due to the fact that we have created and are continuing to create considerable surpluses not only in farm products but in many manufactured articles. At the present time it is definitely turned from a seller's market to a buyer's market. We in business and industry have endeavored to the best of our ability to effect such economies in the operation of our businesses in order to go along with our Government, not only during the war years but in the reconstruction period.

At the present time there is no national emergency and we, like yourself, feel that it is now time for the Government at Washington to give legitimate business a break if we are to survive during this period of economic adjustment in the United States.

FULLER SUPPLY CO., INC.

EAST LANSING, MICH.

Statesmen make their decisions on whether a thing is right, or will work, or can we afford it, or is it good for the country as whole rather than listen to the organized pressure groups who are constantly looking for something for nothing and never satisfied no matter how much they get.

It is my opinion that if this money that is going down the drain is checked and poured back in building our industries and creating more jobs no one in this country will suffer too much for lack of anything.

If we are to keep America the country it always has been with opportunities for all regardless of race, color, or creed, this wasteful dole for the strong minority groups must stop and the Government put on a sound and economical basis. We cannot spend ourselves into utopia.

If we are going to get into a third world war we should be preparing for it financially as well as in a military way. Where would the money come from to finance it, with condition we are in today.

J. J. MCLEAN.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.

I think most of us believe that taxes should be maintained to a point that will preclude deficit spending. I know, too, that most intelligent taxpayers feel that this can be accomplished without increasing the tax burden by eliminating unnecessary expenditures.

It is realized that the various Bureaus and Departments will squeal like stuck pigs on any reductions that affect them. It takes courage to take a stand such as yours, and hence you deserve much commendation. I am sending a copy of this letter to my Representative and my Senators, and I believe you can count on their cooperation to further your efforts.

While on the matter of expenditures, I would like to put in a plug for the 70-group air-force plan, by reducing if necessary, appropriations for the Army and Navy. I am in a business that derives all the benefits that accrue to it from Government spending through the Navy, so I stand to lose by this procedure. However, I want to keep the United States free, and I believe that if Russia starts something, we want to go in and finish the job fast. The Army and Navy cannot do that, but a heavy Air Force might.

PACKLESS METAL PRODUCTS CORP.

MERRILL, WIS.

Our Government, since the cessation of hostilities, has gone on spending money almost at the same rate as when we were in the height of a war.

We cannot continue to spend more than $40,000,000,000 a year. I could ply you with many statistics—all of which would be a repetition of what you already have in your files and have had called to your attention.

I realize that money must be spent, but the days of the gravy train are over in business and, rightly so, should be over in politics and in governmental affairs.

MERRILL CANDY CO.

LANGDALE, ALA.

We must find a stopping point in our taxation and spending.

The businessman can't get around without running into a Federal or State tax collector. This should not be. The different reports we have to make takes time and effort and is expensive. This is an added expense and if continued will make for more employees and of course further expense to the Government.

JOHNSON & CO.

OELWEIN, IOWA.

It is time citizens wake up and begin to realize that after all the biggest corporation in the world can go on the rocks too if it continues very long to spend more than it can take in. Frankly, we've been spending too much for too long. Why can't something be done to cut off at least part of the waste and unnecessary expenditure? Why don't we attempt to streamline the Government activities along the line of Herbert Hoover's recommendations?

CITY LAUNDERING CO.

COLUMBUS, NEBR.

If this country is to continue to prosper, Government spending must be kept within the bounds of the country's ability to create wealth. Government spending, while it does temporarily put more money into circulation, does not create wealth. Any money spent by the Government must eventually be paid by the toil of some person or by the depletion of some natural resource.

The future of our country lies in the hands of men who are willing to put expedient petty politics aside and take the long view with regard to the whole country's welfare.

ROGERS MOTOR CO.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

These enormous appropriations place a heavy tax burden on individuals, business, and industry. It is a positive fact that more and more small businesses (which are the backbone of this Nation) are compelled to fold up through excessive taxes and restrictions, caused by wasteful spending.

You know if you don't give them as much as they want but curtail appropriations these bureaus and special groups will find ways to carry on if their particular operation has any merit. How can we hope to maintain our position as a democracy if we persist in burdening the people with excessive waste and high taxes.

BIRMINGHAM ORNAMENTAL IRON CO., INC.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

In my visits to various offices in this area I have seen a great many unnecessary employees. This was especially so in the shipyard occupied by the WAA, and when I made a remark to the girl who was serving me that there seemed to be a lot of incompetents she said, "I am sorry that I have to agree with you."

A colonel told me that the same conditions prevail in the Army. It is quite probable that a budget of $37,000,000,000 or less could supply efficient service.

M. B. MARKLAND CONTRACTING CO.

HARLAN, KY.

If we don't put a governor on a spending machine that has been put in motion to slow it down, not a bit, but an awful lot, we will find ourselves in the poorhouse or worse.

Please see to it that the spendthrifts of our Federal Government are stopped before it is too late.

We are living in a time when clear thinking is needed as never before since '65.

SILAS CAMPBELL.

SHARON, PA.

If the country keeps on pouring out money, who is going to furnish the money, even though this is the richest country in the world? But, some of our good friends in Washington seem to be anxious to see what the bottom of the bag looks like.

THE WELLER-KROUSE CO.

SANBORN, N. Y.

Anyone who knows or understands conditions at all must realize that we cannot keep up the present trend and survive as a free Nation. Trim all the unnecessary bureaus as much as possible.

If this is not done the source of revenue will dry up.

C. F. TREICHLER.

HOUGHTON, MICH.

Cut all unnecessary appropriations to the very minimum so that we can again get our country back on a sound financial basis.

HAMAR-QUANDT CO.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

The fact that Federal expenditures per capita have increased from $7.56 in 1915 to $268.23 in 1948 is alarming enough in itself.

TAYLOR KNIT WEB CORP.

UNION CITY, N. J.

Inflationary pressures are still so great that it is the duty of all of us to use prudence in our daily economic affairs, and the Government, as the biggest purchaser of all, should surely use most care and caution. It would be tragic indeed if our Government, in its zeal to do good for the people, were the prime force in turning loose the flood that spells inflation.

FINGER & LEVINE, INC.

SALINA, KANS.

It is pleasant to dream of our Government doing everything for everybody the world over, but common sense tells us our Government will collapse in the undertaking. Furthermore in attempting to do all things for everyone, we are developing a nation of weak people unprepared to take care of themselves.

OTHO SCHMIDT INSURANCE SERVICE.

TAMPA, FLA.

There is only one way to successfully operate a business, and that is on a sound financial business basis. The United States Government is the biggest business in the world. But for many years the United States Government has not been operating on a sound financial business basis.

VITAMINERALS.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

It appears to be more apparent each day that even comparatively uninformed individuals are becoming increasingly aware of the selfishness and waste which accompanies an extensive and loosely supervised group of Government agencies, and in view of this fact it would appear to be sound politics as well as sound economy to effect economies in Government where these can be made at no loss of efficiency and at the sacrifice of only superfluous personnel.

As a veteran of the last war and an active member of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States, I wish to call to your attention specifically the great economies which could be accomplished through a true unification of the armed services.

R. D. MCKEE HARDWARE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

I assure you, Mr. CANNON, that the tax burden is getting just too much. Somebody in a position of power must say "No" to pressure groups, or else the Nation will soon be where, whether anyone says "Yes" or "No" it will make little difference.

CHALMERS OIL BURNER CO.

ROCK CITY FALLS, N. Y.

One of the main objections to socialistic programs, which in themselves may be proper, is that apparently they can only operate on an increasing basis and will, unless properly curtailed, snowball to such an extent that they become inoperative.

COTTRELL PAPER CO., INC.

SWAMPSCOTT, MASS.

Most of us want to go back to the economic pattern which permitted us to earn an honest living and keep all of it except the modest percentage required to maintain good government. We do not want to be subservient to the Government; we want the Government to serve us.

THE LYNN SAND & STONE CO.

The Case of Samuel L. Wahrhaftig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding the treatment accorded Samuel L. Wahrhaftig, an American military government official in Germany, who on March 9 was removed from his position in the office of the military government in Germany. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON THE WAHRHAFTIG CASE

On the 17th of January of this year I addressed a letter in protest to Secretary of the Army Royall concerning the treatment accorded Samuel L. Wahrhaftig, an American military government official in Germany. Mr. Wahrhaftig was summarily suspended in early January and ordered back to the United States pending further investigation. He was not given a hearing nor a statement of charges. He was simply told that he was under suspicion. On March 9 he was removed from his position in the office of the military government.

In my letter of January 17 to Secretary Royall I stated that "I should hesitate to feel that such serious accusations were brought against an American citizen loosely, through personal malevolence, or by a confusion by Army investigatives of anti-Communist liberals with Communist Party members or fellow travelers."

On February 15 I again wrote to Secretary Royall and said I was "appalled that the investigative procedure followed in cases of this nature precludes the possibility of the subject knowing the specific charges against him until after he is found guilty."

This is exactly what has happened to Wahrhaftig. I first received a letter from John W. Martyn, Administrative Assistant to Secretary Royall, defending and explaining this procedure. Subsequently, in response to my letter of February 15, Secretary Royall replied over his signature and voiced a similar defense. Both acknowledged that under the Army's loyalty investigation procedure an accused man is not given a hearing until after he has been removed from service.

I know of no precedent in the American system of justice for a doctrine that a man's trial should be delayed until the verdict is handed down. It seems patently clear to me that a person removed from his position, transferred back to America, and suspended without pay, even though it might be possible at some future date he will be restored to duty, is automatically stigmatized. He has no opportunity to defend himself, to deny charges, or to present evidence that might well establish his innocence. The terrible inequity in this system is dramatically revealed in the case of Wahrhaftig.

When I wrote to Secretary Royall in January I described Mr. Wahrhaftig as a strong anti-Communist liberal. I charge that he was being railroaded by men who apparently could not tell the difference between a liberal and a Communist.

At this point I should like to present a statement to support my contention. It is the statement of Ernst Reuter, mayor of Berlin, and a heroic figure in Berlin's resistance of Soviet aggression. Mayor Reuter is in the front lines of the battle against communism. He has emphatically stated that he knew Wahrhaftig well in Germany and regarded him as a devoted friend of democracy. The attached news story published in the New York Post, March 24, 1949, describes Mayor Reuter's statement delivered at a National Press Club luncheon on that day:

"ANTI-RED BERLIN CHIEF DEFENDS WAHRHAFTIG

"(By James A. Wechsler)

"WASHINGTON, March 24.—Ernst Reuter, fiery anti-Communist mayor of Berlin, today warmly defended Samuel Wahrhaftig, AMG official whom the Army fired without a hearing on the ground that he is subversive.

"In a dramatic declaration made in the presence of high state and Army dignitaries attending a National Press Club luncheon, Reuter said bluntly:

"'I know Mr. Wahrhaftig. He was a very good friend of ours. I have always had the greatest respect and admiration for him.

" 'I must say to you that I considered him one of the most able and capable men whom I knew in the American military government.'

"Tribute follows speech

"Reuter's tribute to the ousted AMG official came during the question period which followed his speech before 500 correspondents and government officials.

"Among those seated at the head table as Reuter lauded Wahrhaftig, were Tracy Voorhees, Assistant Secretary of the Army, and Robert Murphy, top political adviser to Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

"His personal endorsement of Wahrhaftig created murmured comment in the audience, which earlier had given the mayor a standing ovation as he described Berlin's resistance to Soviet aggression.

"Wahrhaftig was summarily flown back to the United States from Berlin early in January, suspended from the AMG pay roll pending further investigation, and finally dismissed this month without receiving a chance to defend himself. Thurman Arnold, former Assistant Attorney General, is appealing the decision to the Army Review Board—first and last court of appeal in Army loyalty cases.

"Reuter has volunteered to submit an affidavit in Wahrhaftig's behalf. His statement today made it plain that he had not altered his judgment of Wahrhaftig despite the Army crack-down.

"Reuter's entrance into the case may create major embarrassment for the Army intelligence officers who reportedly prepared the dossier against Wahrhaftig and attempted to picture him as a Communist sympathizer.

"In his address to the Press Club conclave preceding his endorsement of Wahrhaftig, Reuter said:

" 'Berlin was the last city to give in to Hitler, and we will not yield to the Soviet generals. It is cold in Berlin, but it is colder in Siberia.' "

In the light of Mayor Reuter's declaration I again challenge the Department of the Army to admit that it has committed a colossal blunder. I ask the Army to grant Mr. Wahrhaftig a speedy hearing before the Secretary of the Army's Security Review Board, or if, as I believe, no real charges can be formulated against him, to reinstate him at once.

I should like to contrast the procedure which has been followed by the Department of the Army in the case of Mr. Wahrhaftig to that of the trial of the 12 Communists before the Federal district court in the city of New York on the charges of sedition. These 12 openly avowed and confessed Communists are given the full protection of due process of law. Their defense has been given every opportunity within the technical limits of American law. They are having trial by jury, they have the right of counsel, they are notified of the charges, they face the witnesses. In other words, they are given what we call justice and fair treatment under the Constitution of the United States. But in this instance, a man who was accepted for duty in the military government, cleared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and supported by his colleagues in military government in Germany as an outstanding anti-Communist leader and defended by the democratic leader and mayor of the city of Berlin is denied any of the protections which are afforded the avowed enemies of our way of life.

The ouster of Mr. Wahrhaftig has already created confusion, dismay, and fear among strong anti-Communist Germans like Mayor Reuter, who knew him as one of our able military government officials. I am convinced that the Department of the Army owes an abject apology to Mr. Wahrhaftig and that his official vindication is long overdue. I hope that this case will not be closed without careful examination of the procedures and circumstances under which this injustice was perpetrated. I further believe that this case demonstrates the grave need for drastic revision of the Army's loyalty investigation procedure to give innocent men a genuine chance to defend themselves before their names are irrevocably smeared.

Minimum-Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, never before in peacetime has a committee in Congress reported a bill which delegates such extraordinary and unlimited powers to an administrator as does H. R. 3190, the minimum-wage bill. Briefly, the bill grants power to the Secretary of Labor to, first, make rules and amend them or rescind them at will; second, make inspections of company records; third, bring civil action for enforcement; fourth, charge criminally for failure of a person to conform to the act or any of the Secretary's rules, regulations, or interpretations, and fifth, bring suit in the name of employees against employers, at no cost to employees, to recover allegedly unpaid minimum wages or overtime payments. It has been estimated that it will take more than 1,000 lawyers in the Labor Department to prosecute these private suits.

I have prepared, while working with other members of the House Education and Labor Committee, a questionnaire, which I insert with these remarks. I invite, I importune you to study this questionnaire so that you may know just how far-reaching, how vicious this legislation is. The questionnaire follows:

AN ANALYSIS, IN QUESTION AND ANSWER FORM, OF H. R. 3190 (AS REPORTED ON MARCH 16, 1949, BY THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE), ON A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WAGE-AND-HOUR LAW

Question. How many workers not now under the law are covered by the bill?

Answer. Administrator McComb estimates the number to be over 5,000,000 workers. But he admits that there are no figures upon which an accurate estimate can be based.

Question. How are so many additional workers brought under the law?

Answer. In two ways. First, by a drastic reduction in the scope of existing exemptions. Second, by covering all employees of an employer who is engaged in interstate commerce. The House Labor Committee recognized this in its report (see second full paragraph on p. 18 of H. Rept. No. 267). As almost every employer gets some supplies, goods, or materials from outside the State, it may be categorically stated that almost every employer is engaged in interstate commerce, including the barber, the shoe-repair shop, the restaurant, the hotel, the motion-picture theater, and every other neighborhood business.

Question. Does any other Federal statute use "commerce" language which is as sweeping as that used in the bill?

Answer. No. Such language has never been used before and virtually will have the effect of bringing almost all employees under the minimum-wage and overtime provisions of the law unless specifically exempted.

Question. Does the bill retain the present year-round overtime exemptions for (a) the first processing of the farmer's milk and cream, (b) the ginning and compressing of the farmer's cotton, and (c) the processing of the farmer's sugar beets and sugarcane?

Answer. No. The bill deprives these industries of any overtime exemption as a matter of statutory right and merely authorizes the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to grant them a limited overtime exemption of not over 14 workweeks per year.

Question. Does the bill retain the present 28 workweeks per year overtime exemption for the packing and canning of the farmer's fruits and vegetables?

Answer. No. The bill deprives fruit and vegetable packing and canning of any overtime exemption as a matter of statutory right, and merely authorizes the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to grant this industry a limited overtime exemption of not over 20 workweeks per year.

Question. Does the bill retain the present 14 workweeks per year overtime exemption for the slaughtering and dressing of the farmer's poultry?

Answer. No. The bill deprives this industry of any overtime exemption as a matter of statutory right and leaves to the Secretary of Labor's discretion the granting of any overtime exemption to this industry.

Question. Does the bill retain the present year-round wage and overtime exemption for the processing and canning of fish products and byproducts?

Answer. No. The bill deprives this industry of all wage exemption and merely permits the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to grant the industry a limited overtime exemption of not over 14 workweeks per year.

Question. Does the bill retain the present year-round wage and overtime exemption for country grain elevators and other storage places for grains and seeds within the area of production?

Answer. No. The bill deprives this industry of all wage exemption and merely permits the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to grant the industry a limited overtime exemption of not over 14 workweeks per year.

Question. Does the bill retain the present year-round wage and overtime exemption for the buying, handling, and candling of eggs within the area of production?

Answer. No. The bill deprives this industry of all wage exemption and merely permits the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to grant the industry a limited overtime exemption of not over 14 workweeks per year.

Question. Would the bill make any change for white-collar employees?

Answer. Yes. Tens of thousands of white-collar employees are brought under the act for the first time by (a) extending the coverage to include every employee of an employer engaged in interstate commerce, (b) eliminating the local retailing exemption in its entirety, and (c) narrowly restricting other exemptions.

Question. Does the bill greatly reduce the existing exemption for retail and service establishments?

Answer. Definitely yes. The bill imposes two new limitations upon the present exemption. First, it provides that the exemption shall not apply if the employer has a total annual volume of sales or servicing in excess of $500,000. Second, it provides that no retail or service establishment shall be exempt unless 75 percent of its selling or servicing (1) is to private individuals for personal or family use, or (2) is to farmers, or (3) is of goods or services not differing materially in type or quantity from goods or services normally sold or rendered for personal or family consumption.

Question. Will the $500,000 limitation relieve the small retail and service establishment from the requirements of the law?

Answer. No. Employees engaged in the local retailing and service trades in any community form a common labor pool. If the larger establishment has to maintain the wage-and-hour standards of the law, then as a realistic matter the smaller establishment across the street will have to pay the same wages and overtime to maintain good labor relations or as a result of unionization and collective bargaining.

Question. Does the bill grant the Secretary of Labor any other unusual powers?

Answer. Yes. He is given the authority to sue any employer for back wages. No such authority is conferred upon the Administrator in the present law.

Question. Will the provision that nothing is retail selling except sales to private individuals for personal use, farmers, etc., deprive small retail and service establishments of the exemption?

Answer. Yes. Most retail stores and dealers sell both to private consumers and to local business consumers. Hardware stores sell both to private householders and building contractors; coal dealers sell both to private householders and to churches, schools, hospitals, etc.; furniture stores sell both to private householders and to business offices; etc.

Irrespective of how small the volume of the store may be, the effect of this limitation in the bill would be to take the exemption away from thousands of local stores engaged in selling hardware, stationery, furniture, coal, lumber, paint, dry goods, automobiles, etc. Even numerous country general stores which sell both to private householders and business customers would lose the exemption.

Question. Does the bill continue the present year-round exemption for local trolleys and local motorbus carriers?

Answer. No. The bill eliminates entirely the existing wage and overtime exemption for employees of local trolleys and local motorbus carriers.

Question. Does the bill continue the present year-round overtime exemption for employees of motor carriers?

Answer. No. The bill eliminates entirely the overtime exemption for loaders and mechanics. Even the driver or driver's helper will lose the exemption if he spends as much as 50 percent of his time in activities other than driving or helping the driver.

Question. Was evidence submitted to the House Labor Committee showing that wages can be raise to 75 cents per hour under the broadened coverage of the bill without substantially curtailing employment?

Answer. No. Such evidence as was presented was to the effect that the impact of a 75-cent minimum in the retailing industries, for example, would have the effect of substantially curtailing employment.

Question. Does the bill continue administration of the act under an independent administrator?

Answer. No. It transfers administrative authority to the Secretary of Labor, who is duty bound under the Organic Act of the Department of Labor to foster and promote only the interests of labor. Moreover, the Department of Labor is staffed with assistant secretaries recruited from organized labor and takes the position that it is spokesman for labor in the President's official family.

Question. Does the bill grant the Secretary of Labor rule-making power not now conferred upon the Administrator?

Answer. Yes. The bill grants the Secretary of Labor unlimited rule-making power which is without precedent in a peacetime statute. The House Labor Committee's report states that this power includes the power to define any term used in the law (see p. 34 of H. Rep. No. 267).

Question. Is the present 2-year statute of limitations on employee suits for back wages continued?

Answer. No. It is increased to 4 years. The bill also continues the provision in the existing law for assessment by the court of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the back pay sued for. This means that an employer may be sued under the bill for an amount equivalent to 8 years of back pay.

Two American Communists Abdicate American Citizenship Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I place before you, my colleagues, and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial dated March 26, 1949, from the Los Angeles Daily News, and desire to comment that I not only urge its most careful and repeated reading, but I urge consideration of its ultimate import and significance.

Our Nation needs nothing of communistic ideologies or practices, and even though we, as sound, patriotic Americans must steadfastly seek and work to the end that we must make our democracy work better tomorrow than it ever did before—that is no sign or reason that we need to yield, even a toe length, in our firm conviction and appreciation of the fact that our American way of life has and does continue to be paramount in comparison with that which is controlled and dominated by the political and economic philosophy which stems in totalitarianism and the deification of the state as contrasted to the supremacy of the rights of freedom of thought and the dignity of the individual. Godlessness never gained anything for a nation or an individual except distress, disgrace, depreciation, despondency, and, finally, destruction; and any nation which does not magnify the propriety and the power which comes from seeking divine guidance is destined to find himself without the blessings of God.

The editorial follows:

THE UNDECIDED QUESTION

The statement by two American Communist leaders that they would support Russia in the event of war is quite different from recent statements by Communist leaders in France and Italy. The words sound the same, since Moscow announced the text. But the circumstances were not similar.

Thorez and Togliatti spoke in countries where Communists are more numerous than here. They spoke in countries which would be in real danger of speedy Russian occupation if war broke out now. And they spoke to people still suffering from the horror, exhaustion, and destruction of the last war.

Their appeal was based on the assumption that many Frenchmen and Italians would prefer Soviet serfdom to battle. It was not, we believe, a safe or reasonable assumption. But at the time it was the best answer that Moscow had for the challenge of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The statement of Foster and Dennis was only a faint echo of the others. These men were not silly enough to ask Americans to welcome the Soviet armies as liberators. They simply said that they would support Russia in any "unjust, aggressive, imperialistic war" brought on by "Wall Street."

Well, everybody knows that's what they would do. They've said so before and they will probably say so again. But one would think that something new had been added.

A Presidential press conference made quite a big thing out of President Truman's permitting a direct quote when he called these Communists traitors. Senator EASTLAND indignantly proclaimed that he would ask legal provisions "to curb these traitorious agents of a foreign power, and to prevent sedition, espionage, and treason."

The president of the National Association of Manufacturers called on labor to cooperate with management in driving the Reds out of industry. William Green said the A. F. of L. would take no part in strikes to sabotage American defense. Even Henry Wallace got into the act by saying he was not in accord with the Communist statements.

Apropos all the flurry, General Eisenhower said something sensible—as is his custom—in a talk to the New York Bar Association.

"The 146,000,000 people in this great land," he said, "are the mightiest temporal power that ever existed. Let us look on our problems like a man who knows he is strong no matter how humble he is."

That is sound advice. The greatest temporal power that ever existed can certainly cope with the danger of domestic communism, which is a real menace even with virtually no popular support. It can cope with communism as it has coped with other dangers and menaces—by action, not by fear and hysteria.—J. T.

Cotton in Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses on the subject Cotton in Our Economy, one by me and one by William D. Felder, Jr., president of the Texas Cotton Association, delivered at the meeting of the Texas Cotton Association on Friday, March 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, DELIVERED BEFORE THE TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION, FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1949

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity of speaking to the members of the Texas Cotton Association. I am glad to be able to come to the great State of Texas for this meeting.

I had a visit with your capable and able Senators CONNALLY and JOHNSON before I left the Nation's Capital. Senator CONNALLY is now carrying on the fight for the continued authorization of adequate funds for the ECA. He and Senator JOHNSON told me to extend to you their best wishes and to express their regrets at not being able to be present. I know that you in Texas are tremendously proud of the great part that Senator CONNALLY is serving in the direction of our foreign affairs. Senator CONNALLY has vision and leadership at a time when these qualities are so urgently needed. He is, as all of

you know, one of the Nation's and the world's outstanding statesmen.

I had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives with Senator LYNDON JOHNSON for almost 10 years. He is a very close friend of mine. I have great confidence in his judgment, his integrity, and his ability as a legislator. He is a tireless worker, and he will make a great Senator for the State of Texas. I know that you will take continued pride in his accomplishments.

CLARK THOMPSON, the Congressman from Galveston, and the whole Texas delegation are notable in their accomplishments.

From a purely selfish standpoint, there is probably no other group more interested than yours in the promotion and expansion of production, distribution, and consumption of goods throughout the world, and I find you to be liberal in your views in that connection. Apart from any selfish interest, however, there is your personal interest—a deep and abiding one, shared by all sincere American citizens and by many citizens of the rest of the world—in the building of a just and enduring peace.

I have arbitrarily chosen as my subject on this occasion The Time Is Now. I feel that time is of the essence in building for world peace. Every minute we delay in our efforts may cost a proportionate number of lives. I do not mean to imply that I favor rushing headlong into a plan that may not prove effective. The peace that we make this time, after two wars within our generation, must be effective. That is of prime importance. At the same time we should not permit our feet to halt, nor our hands to grow weary in our efforts to find the solution to our critical world problems as expeditiously as possible. The time is now for us to give the very best of which we are capable in the continuing and intensive effort to determine the best course for the peoples of the world to pursue. We need then to apply our every energy to the consummation of a workable peace organization.

There has been in the past a great deal of criticism on the part of those who follow the foreign relations of the United States to the effect that the United States does not have an established foreign policy. If I am any judge—and I have given considerable study to the matter—it is my contention that we do have a policy at the present time. That policy emanates from the expressed desires of our people.

The purpose of our policy, necessarily, is to save our freedom. We must somehow find a way to settle differences among the nations of the world by the utilization of some method other than war. Surely there is a more humane device. Our civilization cannot withstand a third World War.

At the present time there is being considered an alliance of the nations of the North Atlantic region, whereby one would come to the defense, with appropriate action, of any or all of the others in the event of aggressive action on the part of a nation not a signatory to the pact. There is bipartisan agreement in Washington on the ratification of this pact. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, the Republican leader in the United States Senate on international relations, has stated that this alliance is entirely proper in furtherance of the United Nations Charter. Some time ago he made a very pointed statement in which he said, "In my view, the thing we are undertaking to do in the North Atlantic Pact is nothing more than to acknowledge in writing the facts of life as they are." It is clear that, under articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter, the creation of regional arrangements and such alliances by the participants in the United Nations Organization is not only permitted, but sanctioned. The treaty that is being considered in the North Atlantic Pact is intended chiefly as a warning to any government with aggressive intentions that aggression will be met with a united and overwhelming force.

It is significant that the aggressor nations in history have always begun their conquests with the uniform practice of destroying, one at a time, the smaller nations surrounding them. It is my belief that any further aggressive action on the part of any nation in the world will follow this same pattern. Perhaps I should qualify the statement I have just made. It is within the realm of possibility that atomic warfare, and the inventions and discoveries coming out of World War II, may make it possible for an aggressor nation to strike and weaken the major powers of the world with the first blow. However, judging from the recent actions of the Soviet Union, we must assume that, if Russia does have aggressive intentions, she intends to gobble up all of the smaller nations surrounding her before coming to grips with one of the major powers of the world.

I wonder if you share my idea that, had Kaiser Wilhelm anticipated that the free peoples of the world would join together in time to strike him down, he would never have begun his career of conquest which led to World War I; and that Hitler and Mussolini would never have plunged us into a Second World War if they had known, or had had good reason to believe that the free peoples of the world would again join in time to halt them and save the world for freedom.

Therefore, time is of the essence. The farther we draw away from the realities of bloodshed and the other horrors of war, the more likely the people of the world will be to forget. We need to act with dispatch lest some new aggressor take advantage of our complacency.

In my judgment, the North Atlantic alliance is a step in the right direction. It does not provide, however, the complete and final solution. Equally important as a step in the direction of world peace is the program of President Truman, made known at the time of his recent inauguration, to lend our production know-how to the development of wastelands of the North Atlantic region. When we strengthen the weaker nations, which are susceptible to easy defeat at the hands of an aggressor, we strengthen our chances for world peace. To my mind, it is better to expend some of our resources and technical knowledge in this manner now than to expend them later on at greater cost, in time of disaster, in another horrible conflagration. I think that the admitted success of aid to Greece and Turkey and of the Marshall plan is definite proof that such funds are well spent.

The North Atlantic alliance has great value not only as a stop, look, and listen signal to the men of the Kremlin, but it is the first time that the democratic nations of the North Atlantic have gotten together for their mutual protection during a time of peace. I think that, out of this cooperative effort, a permanent and substantial agreement for security and economic cooperation may grow. I hope that in the future these nations may work into a limited federation for their own protection and development.

The most encouraging prospects for an eventual North Atlantic security arrangement that will really work for the maintenance of peace and world stability are found in the announcement earlier this month of the formation of the Atlantic union committee for a Federal convention of democracies. In my opinion, the formation of this committee represents great vision and force in the furtherance of a permanent plan which will strengthen the possibility of preventing a third world war and enable the people of the world to have peace for generations to come.

This committee is composed, not of those in government, but of private citizens. They have the vision to discern our great need, and the will to do what is indicated to fill that need. They are taking a bold step, and only courageous men and women are capable of bold actions. These great private citizens are laboring night and day to see that we chart our course in the direction in which we should go.

According to former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, the federation proposed by the committee would strengthen the United Nations and would raise the standard of living and lower the cost of military security for all. Justice Roberts is president of the Committee.

Another committee officer, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who is certainly an authority, stated, "A union of the democracies will convince the Kremlin that the democracies mean business."

A vice president of the committee is a man whom all of us hold in especial veneration, the Honorable Will L. Clayton, of Houston. As a former Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton is in a good position to understand the gravity of our present situation. With your permission, I should like to quote his entire statement, which is not long, issued at the time the Atlantic Federation Committee was announced.

Mr. Clayton said, "The preservation of peace and freedom is the only thing that counts in the world today. Russia is on the march, determined to communize the world. Russian communism opposes the civil freedom and the religious freedom which democracy holds dear. There is only one way to stop Russia, short of war. Democracy must be made to work in all those lands which are still free. In economic terms, democracy works when people have more to eat, more to wear, and better homes in which to live. This rising standard of living can only be realized in the modern world by releasing the world's productive capacities, through striking off the shackles of economic nationalities, and by reducing armaments. I favor union of the free, believing it to be the only road to world freedom, world prosperity, and world peace. I believe such a union is the next step forward in the spiritual, economic, and social development of the human race."

This question is burning in my mind at this point: Shall we have to have world war III to prove the correctness of the statements of these learned men?

I submit to you, history has proved already that their position is sound—and not only sound, but essential to our civilized existence.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM D. FELDER, JR., PRESIDENT, TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION, FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1949

The past year has witnessed the greatest, most unselfish effort by one group of people, on behalf of their fellow men that the world has ever known—the operational beginning of the Marshall plan and China-aid program. I know that we all feel great pride in being citizens of a Nation whose resources, generosity, and plain know-how, enable it to undertake such a vast program on behalf of our friends overseas whose properties were devastated, and whose resources were sadly depleted in the late war against totalitarianism. Only because we are a free people operating under a system of free enterprise were the miracles of production performed during the war, and being continued today, possible. The active shooting war did not give our part of the cotton industry the opportunity to participate directly as it did the manufacturers and heavy industries. The

shooting war is over, but the winning of the peace is still in the balance. Under present plans for the assistance of our foreign friends, our industry is provided with a unique opportunity in helping to win the peace. We are to play a stellar role in bringing goods, but even more important, the example of what free enterprise, operated under a democratic government can do to our former allies and enemies, who in many cases are brought into daily contact with the opposite philosophy. Ours is by far the most important commodity going to our overseas friends through regular, established trade channels, and the responsibility of demonstrating the superiority of our great country's philosophy of free enterprise and democracy falls heavily on our shoulders. We are not taking these responsibilities lightly. To protect the good name of our industry against any possible element which might be tempted to undertake business practices not in keeping with the high ethics of our trade, your association, in conjunction with all our affiliate organizations, adopted six special rules almost a year ago. We recognize that these rules are not perfect, by any means, and that rules cannot be written that cannot be violated. However, these six special rules are certainly a step in the right direction, and evidence the seriousness with which we are accepting our responsibilities. There have been some bothersome details in connection with the beginning of the operation of this great plan, and there are still some minor problems to be solved, but a truly remarkable job has been done to date, which would not have been possible without such able administration, and wholehearted cooperation as has been given by the ECA cotton administrator, and his extremely capable staff. It was a fortunate thing for the taxpayers and the cotton people that there was an E. D. White available when there was a man chosen to administer the cotton end of this great program.

Our product, now in surplus, affords a perfect medium of assisting our neighbors, and it would now appear that our volume of exports will increase materially during the coming 12 months. For our part, we accept this responsibility and can get the job done.

A great deal is being said these days about the loan rates on commodities for 1950 forward. Since all of us have lived close enough to the situation in the past to have seen the disastrous results, when the sunshine fiber has been overpriced, I am not going to take up your time in discussing this topic. I would like to remark, however, that if we do not exhaust every means of acquainting our legislators with the facts concerning the loss of our markets to foreign growths and artificial fibers when the price on our cotton has been noncompetitive, we will be guilty of not keeping faith with our producer and manufacturing friends. This past year, with cotton only slightly overpriced by comparison, saw much ground lost to artificial fibers, and with price competition becoming keener daily, some realistic program must be adapted to assure our farmer friends and the sunshine fiber against the loss of a market. While I know you are all familiar with the situation, I would like to draw your attention to the following simple two facts which point up the seriousness of the problem. Since 1940 rayon production, at the expense of the sunshine fiber has increased 238 percent, synthetic fiber has recently been reduced in price 12½ percent. Some means other than a high loan rate must be found to assure our southern producers a fair share of the national income.

Although generally slow, some progress has been made during the past 12 months in the return to private channels of cotton trade in some of our larger export markets; and where this has been the case a marked improvement in the efficiency of handling has been seen. Trading in France is approximately 75 percent in private hands; some private purchases are being permitted in Germany; and in Japan, while the military government is faced with special problems, I believe we can confidently expect some constructive steps soon. While business with Japan is still under the direction of the military, its administration has been a model of efficiency, for which we all owe a vote of thanks to our former member, W. S. Carter. There seems little hope that our largest export customer, England, will soon return to private trading. Since bulk buying seems to be the rule, it is indeed gratifying to know that the buying of U. S. A. cotton will be done by an experienced and highly regarded contemporary of ours, Mr. Richard Thorpe. Business with the RCC has gone forward in the past with few minor difficulties, and the officials of the RCC have shown a fine spirit of cooperation.

The cotton trade is following with great interest developments in Germany. Mr. Bode and other officials in JEIA have rendered yeomanlike service to all interested in this important phase of the German economy, and we, through the ACSC, and ACSA are pleased to have been privileged to make a contribution in these efforts through making available the high talent and technical knowledge of Carl Bartz.

We members are more than fortunate to have a trade association as well organized and ably directed as the TCA. Having lived with our problems closely the past 12 months, I cannot compliment Mr. Murray and his staff too highly on the efficient manner in which they discharge our day-to-day business. In my opinion, your organization is qualified and capable of rendering a much greater service when called upon to do so. The moving of cotton, from the field to the loom, is a complicated process, and requires many resources and much technical skill. Our present system, which we are constantly striving to improve, has come as the result of much blood, sweat, and tears—to say nothing of indigestion and heart attacks. For my part, I am more than a little bit proud to be a member of an industry that has found means of rendering the unique services that we perform, for so little cost. A cotton man is a fabricator, an insurance company, a bank, a shipping agent, etc.—we have proved that we can do the job of merchandising far better than a publicly-owned organization, whose mistakes were paid for with the taxpayers' funds, and in the interest of perpetuating our system, which is tried and proven, I think that money, time, and effort spent in acquainting the public and our legislators of the facts will pay dividends in the long run. Our fine sister organization, the National Cotton Council, is demonstrating what public relations can do for cotton generally. I would like to see us take a leaf from their book and do something for our part of the industry through supplying funds, and personnel, and ideas, to our affiliate, the ACSA, to better our public relations and locally, to tell our neighbors what we are doing. When our neighbors and legislators are acquainted with the facts, the opinions we, as highly qualified specialists, and public-spirited citizens express, concerning our commodity will receive the deserved attention. Your present staff is capable of rendering such services when, and if, called upon, and I hope that they will be.

Your TCA presently has larger resources—and more members than at any time in the past. The largest single item in our budget was for the cotton improvement and contact committee. This committee is performing a wonderful job for us and the funds furnished them are, in my opinion, more than a sound investment in our future. During the 12 months ended March 10, 1949, we collected from you, for account of ACSA over $31,000, and the money has been well spent. The ACSA, owing to its increased activities and loss of revenue from domestic sources, presently is operating at a deficit. It seems to me to be a sound policy that this affiliate must increase its revenues to a point where a reasonable surplus can be created each year against a rainy day, which may be in the offing—at which time it will undoubtedly be necessary for the ACSA and our association to expand its activities materially.

I would like to take this occasion to thank the directors and committee chairmen for their splendid cooperation, guidance, and assistance. They gave unselfishly of their time and talents during the year, in the interest of us all, and I know we are all deeply grateful. It has been a great privilege and pleasure to serve you as your president, and an honor that I will always cherish.

Democracy Can Take It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democracy Can Take It," from the Putnam (W. Va.) Democrat of March 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY CAN TAKE IT

The easy strength of a giant speaks for itself. We believe the United States has just shown that strength, through its State Department, in issuing visas to 29 delegates from behind the iron curtain to attend the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace in New York.

The State Department makes no bones about the fact that the conference will undoubtedly be used to attempt to spread Communist propaganda. But it makes some far more effective democratic propaganda of its own—all the more effective because of its basic truth—when it declares:

"The Government of the United States has approved the issuance of these visas because of its unswerving devotion to freedom of information and free speech on any issue, however controversial it may be. As such, this Government does not feel that the visa authority should be used to prevent any arrangements however dubious certain of them may appear, for open public debate of outstanding issues. We owe it to ourselves not to prevent such arrangements regardless of the actions and policies of other governments."

The greatest temptation to be met in fighting an ideological enemy is to make yourself over into the image of your foe in the process. Hence the force of the New Testament warning against man's gaining the whole world while losing his own soul. But to overcome your enemy by the force of a superior example is another matter. We believe the State Department has the right idea.

Christian Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has never had a more brilliant or more beloved Chaplain than the late Dr. Peter Marshall. Though his death was untimely there is no one in this distinguished body who can adequately appraise his influence for good. It will live after him "woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

No less a master of the English language than Mr. Winston Churchill could have expressed as eloquently as did Dr. Marshall the fundamental truth that God governs in the affairs of men. In his Boston speech last Thursday evening Mr. Churchill said:

> The flame of Christian ethics is still our highest guide. To guard and cherish it is our first interest, both spiritually and materially. The fulfillment of spiritual duty in our daily life is vital to our survival. Only by bringing it into perfect application can we hope to solve for ourselves the problems of this world and of this world alone.

Today I received a letter from the mother of Dr. Marshall's widow, Mrs. John A. Wood, the devoted wife and helpmate of a consecrated Presbyterian minister now serving in one of the garden spots of the Old Dominion—Northampton County, Va.

Many references at this session of the Congress have been made to our international problems and to our domestic racial problems. The faithful Christian women of the United Council of Church Women of Northampton County are pointing the way and the only sure way to "drive out discontent" as Woodrow Wilson once said "and lift the shadows from the road ahead."

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: As president of the United Council of Church Women, of Northampton County, I am writing to ask your interest and cooperation in a project which we are trying to carry out in our county. One which we believe will have far-reaching influence on the lives of the future voters of this county.

In connection with the Gideons of the Norfolk camp, we have undertaken to place a Bible in each hospital room, and a New Testament (with the Psalms and Proverbs) in the hands of each nurse in the hospital, and a New Testament in the hands of each student in the county, above the fifth grade, and a Bible on the desk of each teacher. The first part of the project has been carried out. At a special service held in the hospital 2 months ago the Bibles and Testaments were presented. The Bibles for the school rooms and Testaments for the students, should be presented before the end of this school year. Due, however, to the lack of funds, we have been unable to do this work.

We have 1,700 students above the fifth grade in Northampton County. Of these, more than 900 are colored. No greater work could be done for the young people of the county, both white and colored, than to inspire them to read the Bible. We are most fortunate in having the wholehearted cooperation of our county superintendent and the principals of our schools, and the door is wide open for this Bible work. The Testaments which we want to give cost about 35 cents each, wholesale, the Bibles $1 each. The Gideons will do all they can to help with the project, but we will have to raise several hundred dollars to help pay for the books.

From friends of yours on the eastern shore, and my son-in-law, the late Dr. Peter Marshall, I have been happy to learn of your deep interest in spiritual things. So, if it seems a bit presumptuous on my part to ask for your help in this Bible for the youth of Northampton County project, it is only that I am fully convinced that we need only to give those who are interested the opportunity to help us. It is the Lord's work, not that of our group of church women, but we do not want to fail Him by any lack of making our needs known and giving others the opportunity of helping.

The little leaflet which I am enclosing will give you a better idea of the project. And if you are guided to make a contribution toward it, make the check to the Gideons, International, and I will forward it to Norfolk camp.

With sincere good wishes for you personally, and the thanks of the United Council of Church Women of Northampton County, for any help which you may be led to give us, I am,

Yours most sincerely,
LEONORA W. WOOD
(Mrs. John A.)

Bretton Woods, the British Loan, and the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have a rather interesting compilation of statements regarding the Bretton Woods agreement in 1945, the British loan in 1946, and the Marshall plan in 1948, covering the various objectives of currency stabilization, the ending of trade barriers, strengthening security, and establishment of a fruitful and peaceful world; and I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Bretton Woods, 1945	British loan, 1946	Marshall plan, 1948 (first year)
Currency stabilization	"The Bretton Woods proposals present us with a chance to avoid this disaster (economic warfare and shrinking international trade) by acting in common with the other nations in the world to put aside the implements of economic warfare and make possible an expansion of production and consumption and trade" (Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, before House Committee on Banking and Currency, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).	"The credit to England is in no way a precedent for other loans. Its particular purpose from the American point of view is to free a major segment of the world's trade from the currency and trade restrictions by which it is now shackled" (Secretary of the Treasury Vinson before Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Mar. 6, 1946).	"It (this European program) is aimed at achieving a true, solid, firm, economic recovery, and reconstruction of this devastated part of the world. * * *" (Ambassador Lewis Douglas, hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee on ERP, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 81, Jan. 9, 1948).
	"The cornerstone for international economic cooperation is the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" (Franklin D. Roosevelt message, Feb. 12, 1945).	"It (the British loan) will aid British recovery and reconstruction and at the same time be of enormous advantage to this country" (Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace before Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Mar. 12, 1946). "Currencies, under United States-British leadership, will gradually be stabilized on a modified gold-exchange basis and the United States and Britain will stand together against the race to revalue currencies" (Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, in the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 26, 1946, p. 4153). "The British financial agreement is the supplement or the complement of Bretton Woods. It is merely the speeding up of the transition period in Bretton Woods, and time is of the essence" (Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, hearings before Senate Banking and Currency Committee, May 14, 1946, p. 39).	

	Bretton Woods, 1945	British loan, 1946	Marshall plan, 1948 (first year)
End trade barriers		"One major virtue of this loan agreement is that it cuts through the financial log jam which has made it so difficult to get on with the job of removing other obstacles to trade between nations" (Dean Acheson, speech to the United Nations Association of Maryland, Feb. 1, 1946). "New trade opportunities for the United States will be opened up because the dollars earned by British Empire countries must be spent in the United States and under the arrangement will be free from any British control" (Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, in the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 26, 1946, p. 4153).	"If the (Marshall) plan succeeds, the entire international sky will brighten like magic. With the 16 nations of western Europe restored to health, production, and cooperative trade the world will achieve a new stability which only a madman would attempt to upset" (Will Clayton, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 13, pp. A4664 ff).
Strengthen security	"Bretton Woods is the complement of Dumbarton Oaks. To construct a peace, there must be one peace—an economic peace as well as a political and military peace" (Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, before House Committee on Banking and Currency, 79th Cong., 1st sess.). "Without international collaboration in the economic and financial fields, organization for security in other fields will not insure us a lasting peace" (Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, before House Banking and Currency Committee, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).	"The British loan will aid the revival of world trade and prosperity, which is necessary to heal the economic wounds of war and insure the preservation of the peace" (Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace, before Senate Banking and Currency Committee, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 12, 1946, p. 270).	"I firmly believe * * * that a recovery program for Europe of the size and nature proposed by the President will serve the cause of peace" (W. Averell Harriman, hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee on ERP, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 245, Jan. 12, 1948). "* * * its (the Marshall plan) success will yield priceless dividends in world peace and security—which also means American peace and security—in comparison with which the cost of the plan will be insignificant. "In simplest terms, it is a proposal that America help western Europe to save herself from economic and political collapse; * * *" (Will Clayton, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; vol. 93, pt. 13, pp. A4664 ff).
Fruitful, peaceful world	"They (the Bretton Woods agreements) are all parts of a consistent whole. That whole is our hope for a secure and fruitful world, a world in which plain people in all countries can work at tasks which they do well, exchange in peace the products of their labor, and work out their several destinies in security and peace" (Franklin D. Roosevelt message, Feb. 12, 1945).	"We are making this loan to Great Britain because it will enable nations to trade all over the world, instead of in restricted areas; because it will give an outlet to our products of farm and factory, and employment to American working people; because it will contribute to the prosperity and happiness and contentment of other people as well as of our own, and thereby contribute to the foundations for peace and security and accord among the nations of the world." (Senator BARKLEY, in the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 17, 1946, p. 3840). "This loan would be good business for us. Moreover, I regard this loan as necessary to peace. It tends toward a solution of the economic problems in the world which are at the root of international disputes." (Senator Austin, radio speech in Boston, Apr. 29, 1946). "This agreement is a part of the world economic policy of the Government of the United States. It is a part of the peace program." (Senator BARKLEY, in the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 17, 1946, p. 3840).	"To promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States" (title of Public Law 472, 80th Cong., 2d sess.). "I believe that this program is one of the most far-reaching undertakings for peace and for human progress ever undertaken by this or any other country. It is noble in concept but it is based on considerations of our own self-interest and in fact, in my opinion, of our self-preservation." (W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee on ERP, 80th Cong., 2d sess., p. 246, Jan. 12, 1948.) "This legislation * * * seeks peace and stability for freemen in a free world. * * * It fights the economic chaos which would precipitate far-flung disintegration. It sustains western civilization. * * * It recognizes the grim truth—whether we like it or not—that American self-interest, national economy, and national security are inseverably linked with these objectives." (Senator VANDENBERG, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 5, Mar. 1, 1948, p. 1915).

Address by Archbishop Bergan at St. Patrick's Day Banquet, Omaha, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Archbishop Bergan at the annual St. Patrick's Day banquet, sponsored by Omaha's Ancient Order of Hibernians, at Omaha, Nebr., on March 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Looking at the world through rose-colored glasses will not change the drab, sober coloring of the leaden, darkened tinge of the present day. Black predominates with a not too rosy future and clouds hide the sunshine which daily should bless us. Here and there in an ever-widening circle the haunting black is splotched with a vivid red; the red of blood and defiance streaming in floodlike torrents from a supposedly friendly nation of wartime days. She was our ally; side by side, her sons and ours fought and died, and she with us shared the fruits of victory.

But the friendship of deceit and treachery faded fast in the dim light of the afterglow; and by stealth and propaganda, by lash and prison and death, the lands of 10 countries are crimsoned with the rising tide of absolute slavery; loss of God and loss of self, with a positive threat to all liberty-loving men the world over. The most dangerous menace in history faces us; we must conquer it or perish.

But with all the might of the minions of Moscow, with their armies, their secret police, their spies, and their machinations, they are having a hard time in turning this world Red. But come the 17th of March, without a whisper of a gun, or the clank of a chain, or a suggestion of force or fear, the whole world turns green. Indeed, there is heard around the globe the tramp of thousands and thousands of marching feet. But they will neither be the feet of armies on the march nor of slaves dragging themselves to doom. The Irish, who for centuries have been too familiar with both these sounds, march on this day proudly and freely, gaily boasting of their heritage of faith and freedom—and all the world will applaud and join in the wearing of the green.

Green is the symbol of everlasting hope. It is the sign of another springtime; the harbinger of better things to come. It is the answer to the threat of a perpetual winter of discontent, the constant reminder that God is still in His heaven and all could be right with this world. Seven hundred years of winter never blotted out from Irish hearts the undying convictions that spring would return, no matter how black the night or long the weary vigil.

Long and severe was their winter. Starvation their daily diet, when plenty abounded; but starvation was preferable to apostasy and famished mothers with babes at their empty breasts turned their faces to the gutter and died, lest they lose their souls by a bowl of soup. Hunted like the beasts of the forests, they worshipped their God in the early morn, when faithful priests broke unto them the bread of life on craggy altar with wind and wave singing no requiem but the Mass of Resurrection, which one day would come. Prison and exile, sons and daughters of them I met in Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand and all over the world. Deprived of an education; poverty stricken, they learned the lessons of life and were rich in the blessings of their Heavenly Father. Never conquered by an overwhelming foe but ever victorious, for they were true to their convictions of freemen. God's children could never be slaves and one day they would rise to their stature and regain their birthright.

Smiles mingled with their tears, playing hide-and-seek the live-long day—friendless, never—for daily they held sweet converse when they told their beads to her, who was a sorrowful mother too; and brave men walked up the rough, hard, stony road, first traveled by their Saviour.

Today we celebrate the feast of the patron saint of these heroic people. It makes little difference where he was born; suffice to know that he did go to an island of pagans and, without bloodshed or force of any kind, but by the persuasiveness of the Gospel, converted the entire land to the sweetness and peace of the Christian way of life. He had no army, nor wealth, but was only a commoner in the eyes of those who held sway in those days. But he did his work and did it well, and after 1,500 years it still perseveres. I wonder if 15 centuries from now a parade similar to that which marched up Fifth Avenue in New York this afternoon will march through the streets of Moscow in honor of Josef Stalin? He is supposed to be a conquerer, too. There are no parades in Berlin or Rome for those who only a few years past were national heroes. They held power and nations trembled, and their subjects obeyed in abject fear and waved banners and some closed fists when they passed by. They were to bring great blessings to their people; yet one lies in an unnamed grave, and the other took his own life as a cringing slave.

There is a lesson in St. Patrick's Day for all freemen, and there is a promise of hope for all who suffer under the cruel heel of the tyrant. St. Patrick, saint and apostle, gave the Irish a faith that not all the fury of the tyrant nor any form of human adversity could tear out of their hearts. During all the long years they stood for God and St. Patrick and their native land. And they won. They kept their faith, and they earned their freedom. All freemen can learn from the Irish that loyalty to God, and to Him alone, can keep them free.

There is grave reason to doubt that the present-day world has learned this lesson. After the most disastrous war in history we still do not have peace. Men sit at tables and barter and haggle, and 12 men keep this world in turmoil. Will they ever learn that without faith in God, the one source of truth, there can be no faith in your fellow man? Without trust in Him, the One who will keep His promises, there can be no security in the whims of our neighbor? Without inspiration from Him, there can be no safe planning for the future? Without a prayer to Him for help, He who is still the ruler of the world and our provident Father, this world will perish?

There is a lesson too for all those who even today languish in prison cells, martyrs for liberty and love of their fellowmen. There have been Cardinal Mindszentys and Archbishop Stepinacs in the long list of Irish saints. May St. Patrick sustain them and cause them to remember that all those who suffer persecution for justice sake can look to the Irish and know that theirs is the kingdom of heaven and theirs too must be the freedom of the children of God.

Thus it is that this evening in the city of Omaha, in glorious America, the Sons of St. Patrick rejoice in him and his children. With their brothers, whose ancestors came from every nation under heaven and who fought for freedom in days gone by, and some are suffering today, they glory in the triumphs of days that are past. It is right and proper that it should be so. Pride of ancestry will be the incentive for imitation. Our forebearers came here seeking liberty and were welcomed. They had their days of sadness; they were objects of ridicule, scoffed at, calumnated on the stage, denied the opportunity of employment. But in the spirit of their patron and their fathers, they too remained faithful to God and to their burning desires for a free way of life in lovely America. Some fought and died to preserve it here, and we are the fortunate beneficiaries of their sacrifices.

Are we their worthy sons? America has been good to us. What have we done in return? Do we spend our time in complaint or everlasting criticism?

Have we ever performed one positive act for the advancement of our beloved land? Have we one tiny spark of the zeal of our pioneers, who fought against overwhelming odds that the American way of life might be born? Are we awake to the dangers which beset her now? If I could leave one thought with you on this day, it would be this: Are we acting now to prevent in America the sufferings of those who have gone before us? There may not be too much time left. I ask you in the spirit of St. Patrick to put your faith in God and America to a practical purpose. Live it, act it, love it. Much has been given us; much will be expected in return. May we ever be faithful Sons of St. Patrick and faithful sons of America.

It's a great day for the Irish, this feast of St. Patrick. It's a great day for the whole, wide world—the day that the world turns green.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Union," from the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION

A whole series of developments are coinciding to attest, in a dramatic way, to the reality and vitality of the great idea of Atlantic union. Starting from many different springs of motive, from many special sources of hope or anxiety, the origins are coalescing into a mighty historic stream, carrying with it a greater present power and future potential than many, perhaps, are aware of.

A single day's news brings a grist of dispatches which 20 years ago would have been almost inconceivable, and even 10 years ago would have seemed almost improbable. The Danes are following the Norwegians in throwing their fate in with the Western alliance, not because that alliance can as yet offer them any absolute security, but because in a cold and perilous world one must stand with one's own side, in defiance of the risks. The Brussels pact powers are about to expand their rudimentary organization of the western European community—an organization which already includes a joint defense system and a common structure of economic cooperation—to embrace a common political organ. They are projecting a bicameral consultative political council, to which the three Scandinavian powers, Italy, and Eire will be invited, together with Britain, France, the Low Countries, and Luxemburg, who are the signers of the Brussels Treaty. In Washington the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has unanimously reported the bill authorizing further aid under the Economic Cooperation Administration, the basic expression and generator of western European and Atlantic union. And the Atlantic Pact text itself is reported to have been completed and referred to the participating powers for early action.

These are all striking developments, each pointing in its own way to the emergence of a new form of political union and organization, a new factor in the tangled history of Western culture. Something like a United States of Western Europe, operating in intimate alliance with the strengths of the North American Continent, is already on horizons where a few years ago one could scarcely imagine that such a thing could ever appear. Behind its appearance are, plainly, two great factors: One is the successful organization of the vast totalitarian empire of Soviet communism, operating on principles diametrically opposite to those of the libertarian West and inevitably a threat to every system which refuses to accept them. The other is the realization by the American people that the best use to which they can put their own resources, their own blood and their own convictions is in the rebuilding of a common western system capable of standing by its own strength and power against any alternate method for organizing human life and human needs.

Without the threat of Soviet Russia, there would be no pressure for Atlantic union; without the resolve of the United States to support it, an Atlantic union would be impossible. Both factors are, however, present; and from them a new synthesis of international policy, a new and creative development of governmental organization, is actually appearing in world history. It is not growing out of theory, but out of facts; with clarity of understanding and vision among the peoples, it will continue to grow, and its possibilities are almost limitless.

Truman Economics and the Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman Economics and the Realities," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN ECONOMICS AND THE REALITIES

President Truman's dogged insistence on higher taxes and stand-by wage and price controls, in the face of overwhelming evidence that inflationary forces are dwindling, merits no support either in Congress or from the public.

There was doubt about the need for these controls last January, when the President asked for legislation authorizing them. Events in the past 2 months have removed the doubt; they have made it certain that there is at this time no justification for moves to give the executive branch power to clamp down ceilings on either wages or prices.

Mr. Truman passed lightly over the facts of recent economic history in asserting that his anti-inflation proposals are still desirable. He ignored the evidence of falling prices in many lines, of increasing supplies of goods

the consumers want. In effect, he disagreed with the top financial advisers in his official family, who have been issuing statements reassuring the public that the current price drop does not mean the Nation is headed toward a serious depression.

That is sound advice. There is no reason to fear that the reduction in prices is anything but the result of the operation of two perfectly normal factors in a free economy—supply approaching and sometimes exceeding demand and overpricing of some articles.

Those clearly do not add up to a dire situation for the Nation's economy. They mean that the full-scale production since the end of the war is beginning to show its effect, and that the overpricing stemming from scarcities is responding to resistance of buyers.

But if an orderly price drop is no cause for alarm, neither is it an occasion for instituting controls aimed at keeping wages and prices from soaring out of sight. If the situation should change, there will be time to act.

In renewing his demand for stand-by controls, Mr. Truman appears to be unaware of the economic forces at work. Asking those powers now, when there is no need, smacks of a move to make Government controls a permanent part of the economy, to interfere at some future date with all economic activity.

The President's demand for higher taxes also seems strange in view of the testimony of the Nation's markets that inflationary forces are disappearing. For it will be remembered that last year, when Mr. Truman vetoed a tax reduction, he did so on the grounds that higher taxes were necessary to take the steam out of inflationary purchasing power.

Now prices are falling, and still Mr. Truman asks for higher taxes. But he fails to answer the question whether, if higher taxes last year were essential as a deflationary measure, they would not be just as deflationary this year when the Nation doesn't need any more deflation, and the administration itself is invoking its powers to modify the downward pressure on prices.

Most Americans will subscribe wholeheartedly to Mr. Truman's desire to avoid a deficit this year. But the alternatives facing him are not simply to have a deficit or have higher taxes.

The sensible—and long-overdue—step to avert a deficit is to start work right now on cutting down the swollen Federal budget. The President's budget recommendations increase, instead of reducing, the number and size of the sprawling Government bureaus, in themselves a tremendous drain on the economy. The Nation would get better government service—and perhaps eliminate the deficit—if the administration undertook a sincere pruning job this year.

The Nation's economy is strong, but it could be seriously harmed by the ill-advised moves urged by the President. An approach based on economic facts, not political campaign slogans, is essential. If Mr. Truman persists in his drive for controls and taxes that would be unnecessary and dangerous, he will fully deserve another defeat in Congress.

Why South Fights for Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial which appeared recently in the United States News and World Report.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SOUTH FIGHTS FOR FILIBUSTER—DIXIE SENATORS FEAR A NATIVE NEW DEAL

(South's political, business life is at stake in Senate fight against filibuster. Any change now upsets an old system. Right to talk a bill to death is a weapon to protect States' rights, to beat antilynch laws, equal-rights plans for Negro. What southern conservatives fear is a Senate gag rule that will cut their power, swing South over to New Deal ways.)

The battle of the filibuster, now being waged in the Senate, involves far more than whether a majority, or two-thirds, of the Senate shall be able to shut off debate. It is a stand of southern Senators to keep the old way of life for the South and to keep their own places of power. And it is a battle in which northern conservatives have a big stake.

The fight is the first engagement in the campaign to halt President Truman's civil-rights program. It marks a show-down between conservative and New Deal forces, of both parties. Business outside the South is interested in the fight. Many southern plants run on northern capital. Southern Democrats often have combined with northern Republicans to fight off New Deal labor and tax legislation. The old coalition now is threatened.

Through the filibuster, with its unlimited debate, southern Senators have been able to talk to death many measures that might have doomed the political system that holds them in power. Under the present regime, the South stays conservative and business has a strong voice in running affairs. The system thrives on low votes and a divided labor force. The filibuster has helped southerners beat measures to give the Negro broader voting privileges and better jobs.

Now the South sees its old weapon endangered. A plan to stiffen Senate rules against the filibuster is taking shape in a Senate committee. It would prevent a small minority of the Senate from talking endlessly until they have killed a bill or forced its withdrawal. This has been the chief weapon southerners have used to hold off action on antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation.

Death to coalition: Southerners say the end of the filibuster would slowly strangle the coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans by permitting legislation to pass that would overturn the present political regime in the South. Through this coalition Republicans and southern Democrats have been able to hold in check Democratic Presidents and New Deal legislation.

The southerners argue that removal of the poll tax would widen the base of the electorate in the South and might imperil some southern conservatives. An act to compel industries to give Negroes and whites an equal chance at jobs would bring the Federal hand deeper into business.

And in the backs of their minds some of the southerners see the old division between the Negro and the white worker wiped out in the South. An undivided southern working force would be easier to unionize, and an organized working force in the South could spell the same disaster for southern conservatives that organized labor has worked out for conservatives in the North.

The South's political system is staked upon the battles of the present Congress, and of these the fight against a ban on filibusters is the key engagement. If the rules are changed to ban filibusters, southerners have little hope of winning their fight. Restrictions that hold down the vote are important to the South's one-party system, and southerners fear the Negro vote and unionization.

A low vote bolsters the present system. Kansas, with about the same population, cast three times as many votes in the 1948 Presidential election as did Arkansas and five times as many as South Carolina; Iowa cast five times as many votes as Alabama; Minnesota three times as many as Georgia or Virginia. In southern primaries the average range of voting is from 1 or 2 percent of the potential total in Virginia to 23 percent in Texas.

The poll tax, whose removal by Federal legislation southerners now are fighting, is only one of the restrictions that help to hold down the vote. Three southern States have property qualifications for voting. The requirement usually is for ownership of 40 acres of land or $300 of personal property. Seven States have educational qualifications for voting; seven States require the payment of a poll tax before voting.

As it stands, the poll tax is only a fighting symbol. In such States as Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and North Carolina, which have abolished it, the percentage of potential voters who ballot is not much higher than it is in poll-tax States. The real job of holding down the vote is done in most southern States by the boards of registrars in the counties. These pass on voter qualifications. They can make it hard for voters to register.

A united labor force in the South is feared both by the politicians and by business interests. It is this fear, in part, that underlies some of the opposition to the bill to require industries to give Negroes an equal chance with whites at all kinds of jobs. For Negroes and whites have been played against each other by some southern industries to keep down unionization. A Labor Department study of unions in the South says, "Race prejudice has been used to break strikes in the South (and elsewhere) and to keep workers divided among racial lines."

This is cited as one of three important factors that have kept down unionization in the South. Another is the fact that much of the southern labor force comes from farms and is not accustomed to group action. And the third is that there is a great scramble of desperately poor people from farms for jobs. The result is that unions have grown slowly in the South. But now they are taking hold.

Negroes and whites alike are moving away from farms and into cities of the South, hunting better jobs. Between 1941 and 1945, upward of 3,000,000 changed their places of residence. Some now are moving back to farms, for there are not enough jobs to go around in the South. Southern incomes almost trebled between 1938 and 1946, but in the latter year they still averaged $500 a year less than those of the rest of the country.

A politician's nightmare is shaping up in this picture of the South. If the white man and the Negro throw down racial prejudice and work together, unionization will grow. With stronger unions, the workers can do the same job on southern conservatives they have done on northern conservatives.

Indications of what can happen already have shown up. ESTES KEFAUVER was elected to the Senate from Tennessee by the strong backing of labor. Mrs. Helen Mankin got a majority of the popular vote in the Georgia congressional district that includes Atlanta, 2 years ago, by mustering the combined support of labor and Negroes. She failed of election when the local Democratic committee decided to use the county unit system; Mrs. Mankin had gotten more votes, but her opponent had carried more counties.

Southern politicians, therefore, are fighting hard to hold in check any effort by the Federal Government to bring the white worker and the Negro worker together. But

Negroes are driving steadily toward more privileges. In every southern State, they are developing careful, thoughtful leadership. Young Negroes are taking advantage of schools. The South now is spending more for Negro schools alone than it did a few years ago for both white and Negro schools.

Negroes are insisting on more pay, a larger part in all kinds of work, and shorter hours. Negro women are demanding more pay and less work, or, in view of the better pay of their husbands, they are not working. This is deeply resented by the white South, long conditioned to Negro help for little pay.

Southern whites are angry and fighting stubbornly to hold back the drive of the Negro for a better share of everything. Much bitterness is developing. The Ku Klux Klan is marching again, and the preachers of race hatred are busy. But broad factors are at work in southern schools and colleges to change the old pattern of thought.

In this situation, old-line southern politicians are fighting with their backs to the wall. If white and Negro workers in the South manage to work together and get to the polls, they can send a new kind of southerner to Washington. He would speak for the poorest people in the Nation and might make the New York and Chicago New Dealers look like pikers. The southerners want to use the filibuster to halt this trend.

The Chicago Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Chicago and S. 1070" from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 23, 1949. This editorial points out the need for housing by a large segment of our population, and I believe it should be called to the attention of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO AND S. 1070

Chicago's housing shortage is so chronic and so acute that every possible method of attacking it should be used.

That is why Chicago has a stake in S. 1070, the bipartisan Senate housing bill. That is why the people of Chicago and their city government should get behind the drive for S. 1070 in Congress, and should prepare to make the maximum use of its provisions when it is enacted.

S. 1070 is primarily a bill to provide Federal aid for cities in slum clearance and the construction of public, low-rent housing. What it might mean to Chicago has been described for Sun-Times readers by David Anderson. As the bill now stands, Chicago could qualify for 30,000 homes to be built by the Chicago Housing Authority over the next 6 years.

We now have in operation fewer than 8,000 permanent public dwellings, with about 2,000 more in sight. Thus S. 1070, if Chicago officials are on their toes, could mean tripling the city's stock of public housing.

We need that public housing for many reasons. One of the strongest reasons is the terrific over-all shortage of housing of all types. The metropolitan housing and planning council estimates that more than 242,000 families need new or rebuilt homes and flats.

Measured against the need, 30,000 public housing units are a drop in the bucket. But if we don't go after the 30,000, we shall be even worse off. Private enterprise just isn't filling the need.

Though 1948 was a big year for residential building, only 6,000 permits were taken out in Chicago proper. That, too, is a drop in the bucket compared with the need. Most of the postwar building has taken place in the suburbs, and virtually all of it has consisted of construction for sale.

We need home building inside the city. We need home building for rental. We need home building of a kind that will permit slums to be rebuilt. All three of those targets demand that a substantial public-housing program be included in Chicago's plans.

Well, isn't everybody for housing? You'd think so, but public housing doesn't always get a friendly reception in the city council. One alderman has blocked a public-housing project in his ward for more than a year.

In rejecting the Carey ordinance, the city council decided not to apply the principle of no-racial-segregation to privately financed slum-clearance projects. It cannot afford to narrow the area in which the nonsegregation policy does operate. It should go after a substantial public-housing program as an integral part of the city's long-range slum-clearance plans.

Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, all too infrequently in these days we hear about constructive efforts to broaden understanding and to improve effective cooperation among the peoples in our community of neighbors. However, there recently came to my attention what I believe to be a constructive effort along those lines. It was extended by one of our well-known New England enterprises, but involved leading educators and agriculturists from many of our States, and was directed at results outside our own country.

The United Fruit Co. invited some 24 educational leaders—college presidents and those chiefly interested in the improvement of farming—to visit the firm's operations in the Republics of Honduras and Guatemala. These visitors not only studied the accomplishments of the fruit company, but also had opportunity to examine the peculiar problems and singular opportunities existing in that part of the world.

As might be expected, these men made observations and reached conclusions of varied nature. A friend has given me a copy of their reports; and I have found them somewhat interesting, particularly in view of our current interest in ways and means of accelerating the progress of our friends and neighbors outside the United States. I shall not take time to read these reports to the Senate though they are, for the most part, brief; but I ask unanimous permission to include salient points from their reports in the RECORD, so they will be available, as time permits, for wider service.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was much impressed with the evidence everywhere of the fundamental need of adequate capital operating under broad, forward-looking policies. Where such use of capital has taken place, living standards of the people are much higher and health and educational opportunities much better. Sociologists and other would-be solvers of the world's economic and social problems should study this section before criticizing capitalistic developments. (Dr. Ernest L. Anthony, dean of agriculture, School of Agriculture, Michigan State College.)

The United Fruit Co. has done a fine job of instilling a philosophy of loyalty to the organization in the personnel, and of cooperation with the governments and the public of the countries in which you operate. To them, the United Fruit Co. is more than a company to produce and merchandise various products; it is also a public service organization, with social and economic responsibilities. * * *

In other words, you are making a contribution to the welfare of people. To me, this philosophy of business is fundamentally sound. In business as in other activities you will always get back far more than you give, even though what you give costs considerable money. * * * What makes a company great is what you are doing for human welfare: raising the standard of living of the people; providing better health safeguards and medical care; developing the resources of these countries; engaging in reforestation and soil conservation; providing employment; educating the youth; improving nutritional habits of the people. * * *

"What you give in these ways will in the long run reward you in revenues to a far greater degree than a policy of take as much as you can for profits and give as little in return to the people in the countries in which you operate. (Dr. C. E. Brehm, president, the University of Tennessee.)

The constant attention to plant and soil science is a sure indication that the company is overlooking no factor in improving production and efficiently utilizing its lands. * * * When banana cultivation fails because of plant disease or soil conditions, that area is utilized for other crops. * * * What United Fruit is doing should serve as a great lesson to citizen farmers * * * particularly in the field of soil conservation in which the old custom of burning to clear lands is replaced by cutting down the jungle and permitting the quickly rotting vegetation to return to the soil. In this development in the tropical lowlands there rests great possibilities, for these areas will supply highly desirable products for which the great nations of the world offer a steady market. (John F. Cunningham, dean emeritus, College of Agriculture, Ohio State University.)

Because of the hazards of disease, the extremely perishable nature of the product, and the close coordination of production and marketing that is necessary, I am afraid that these banana plantations might again become jungles but for the skill of the present management. (Prof. A. W. Gibson, director of resident instruction, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University.)

The establishment and operation of the Escuela Agricola Panamericana in the Zamorano Valley near Tegucigalpa, Honduras, by the United Fruit Co. have resulted in a unique and valuable enterprise. Not only will the young men who receive training at the school at no expense to themselves profit from the experience personally, but the communities to which they return will be greatly benefited. The director, Dr. Wilson Popenoe, is managing the school in excellent fashion. The plan whereby applicants for the school are visited in their homes prior to acceptance is especially noteworthy. The neat, orderly appearance of buildings and grounds made a most favorable impression on our group and will undoubtedly have a lasting influence on the young men enrolled in the school. (Dr. R. S. Hawkins, vice dean and vice director, College of Agriculture and Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arizona.)

The group was most universally impressed by the widespread application of agricultural science and engineering skills to agricultural production. This included the scientific methods of draining land and irrigating crops, the timing and methods of applying commercial fertilizers, the system of plant selection and breeding, disease control, mechanization, and health and nutrition programs. (Homer J. Henney, dean of agriculture and director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Colorado A. and M. College.)

All of our group was particularly impressed with the application of scientific facts in the production and transportation of bananas. Certainly this is an example of what can be done by applying science to agriculture. Particularly is this true in the program worked out to control and possibly in time to eliminate the Panama disease in bananas. (Dr. J. H. Hilton, dean and director, North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina.)

Your provisions for the development of other crops to insure permanency of operation of the company and employment and assistance to nationals in various ways, your measures for the improvement of health—the child nutrition work was particularly impressive—the school of agriculture at Zamorano, all are evidence of an enlightened management and the recognition in a very practical way of the values of inter-American good will. (Dr. C. B. Hutchison, vice president of the university and dean of the College of Agriculture, the University of California.)

Abacá, citronella, African palm, the many new plantings of valuable woods and the great variety of tropical fruits impressed me greatly as to what may be excellent possibilities for the future. I believe there would be an excellent demand for papayas, mangoes, sugar-loaf pineapple like those growing around Cortes, Honduras, and many other fruits if they were available in our North American markets and our people were educated to their use. There is no question but the foresight of planting such trees as mahogany, teak, rosewood, rubber, and cedars will be of great importance in the future. (Dr. F. D. Keim, chairman, department of agronomy, College of Agriculture, the University of Nebraska.)

One of the achievements that was particularly impressive to me was the level of agricultural accomplishment in the highlands without commercial fertilizers, lime, or farm implements on land where apparently agriculture has been practiced for centuries. When we see what has been accomplished in our own country with the increased use of such aids to production we can envisage what lies in store in these other countries in future agricultural development. (Dr. W. B. Kemp, director, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maryland.)

I was impressed, as anyone must be, by the efficiency, alertness, and general competence of your organization. I was impressed even more by the sense of human values that seems to characterize it and by the long-range thinking and planning which is being done in terms of what is best for the people and the countries themselves. I recognize that this may be good business but it is also statesmanship of a high order. I would like to feel that American business enterprises in every part of the world constitute unofficial ambassadorships of such high quality. (Dr. H. B. Knapp, director, Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute.)

The whole venture is a great example of what free enterprise, imagination, energy, intelligent management, and capital can do to transform a jungle into a great wealth-producing organization which benefits all concerned. In Guatemala I was asked what I thought would help the agriculture of that country and I replied, "More United Fruit Co." (Dr. H. J. Reed, dean and director, School of Agriculture, Purdue University.)

The results in capturing the jungle, harnessing the rivers, controlling disease, and marketing quickly the banana crop are amazing. They represent a new height of business enterprise. At the same time a people are elevated to a level of living heretofore unknown to them, and a country gains likewise in economic resources. (Dr. L. L. Rummell, dean and director, College of Agriculture, Ohio State University.)

The visit to your school at Zamorano was another high light of the trip. This constructive and well-organized educational enterprise should have a far-reaching influence for better relations between this country and all of Latin America. It was my first opportunity to meet Dr. Wilson Popenoe, who was once an employee of this Bureau and about whom I had heard so many enthusiastic comments. His encyclopedic knowledge of tropical agriculture and of Latin peoples, his enthusiasm for his job and the energy which he puts into it all mark him as a most unusual individual. The young men who graduate from the school doubtless will exercise a profound influence for the betterment of agriculture in all of tropical America. (Dr. Robert M. Salter, Chief, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.)

The research program conducted by Dr. Dunlap and his associates impressed me as well planned and effectively conducted. Here again I seemed to sense an attitude of "how can we benefit the countries and the people living in these countries?" The work on the African oil palm and the properties and uses of the oil, the work on the establishment and growth of plantations of tropical woods, and the development of a breed of cattle better adapted to tropical and subtropical conditions would do credit to any of the agricultural experiment stations in this country. (Dr. Henry Schmitz, dean, College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, University of Minnesota.)

It seems to me that your public health and educational programs are outstanding, and I want to congratulate you on the forward-looking policy which your company has in effect at this time. (Dr. C. N. Shepardson, dean of agriculture, Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges of Texas.)

I was impressed with the great diversity of interests of the United Fruit Co., and particularly in its efforts to reforest areas that are not suitable for fruit production looking toward the production of valuable hardwoods which are becoming more and more scarce. (Dr. R. H. Walker, director and dean, Agricultural Experiment Station, Utah State Agricultural College.)

The technique being used for the control of the fusarium of the banana through flooding is a gigantic experiment which only a well-financed organization could perform. This observer was constantly impressed with the forward-looking program and scientific direction of the United Fruit Co. (Dr. H. L. Walster, dean and director, Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota Agricultural College.)

Basing-Point System Called "Bunk" and Hypocrisy by Cement Official—Causes Iron-Bound Monopoly and Fixed Prices in Cement and Steel Industries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an official of the Cement Institute admitted in a letter to one of his associates, which was intercepted by a Government agent, that the basing-point system, as used by the Cement Trust, was "bunk" and hypocrisy. This admission was in a letter from John Treanor to B. H. Rader, regional manager of the Cement Institute, which I have already placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also inserted a sample of bids made by cement companies which showed that they were identical.

I am now inserting bids by steel companies to furnish steel conduit pipe. They are as follows:

Through the use of the basing-point delivered-price formula, supplemented by the use of common delivery-charge factors and common freight-rate books to aid in reducing and eliminating price differences which might arise through the individual calculation of freight rates and the conversion of such rates from terms of cents per hundred pounds to cents per hundred feet of conduit of any given size, respondent conduit sellers have been able to achieve a substantial degree of delivered-price identity in quoting and selling conduit. The effectiveness of respondents' formula is illustrated in the record in several ways. The following examples, taken from public bids, show varying degrees of uniformity.

Bids to the Panama Canal for supplying 111,000 feet of conduit f. o. b. Cristobal or Balboa, C. Z., were opened June 17, 1935, and were as follows:

American Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	$1,188.90
M. B. Austin Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90

Baitenger Electrical Co., Inc. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	$8,188.90
Philip Cass Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Central Tube Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Clayton Mark & Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Enamel Metals Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Gaffney Kroese Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Garland Manufacturing Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Gertler Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Graybar Electric Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Greene Wolf Co., Inc. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	8,188.90
Home Lighting Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Hudson Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Laclede Tube Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	8,147.70
Lavenson & Savasta (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Lee Electric Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Loman Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	8,188.90
National Electric Products Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Noland Co., Inc. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	8,188.90
Shell Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10 days)	8,188.90
Thomas Summerville Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Steel & Tubes, Inc. (5 percent, 10 days)	8,188.90
Steelduct Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo after shipment)	8,188.90
Triangle Conduit & Cable Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
U. S. Electric Export Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Walker Bros. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Weinstein Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	8,188.90
West Philadelphia Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Westinghouse Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
Baltimore Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	8,188.90
National Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	8,188.90

(Committee exhibit 318.)

In the above instance, 12 respondent conduit sellers submitted bids. Austin, Central Tube, Clayton Mark, Enameled Metals, Garland, National Electric, Steel & Tubes, Inc., Steelduct, Triangle, Walker Bros., and Youngstown each bid $8,188.90, and Laclede Tube bid $8,147.70, but, under a policy of disregarding bids which did not comply with the invitation, the award in this instance was made by lot.

Bids on 100,000 feet of conduit for the Panama Canal, opened January 6, 1938, were as follows:

American Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	$6,200.00
M. B. Austin Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Baitenger Electric Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Enameled Metals Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Gaffney Kroese Electric Co. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	6,200.00
Garland Manufacturing Co. (5 percent, 30 days)	6,200.00
Germantown Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 15th proximo)	6,200.00
Gertler Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 20 days)	$6,200.00
Gold Seal Electric Supply Co. (5 percent)	6,200.00
Graybar Electric Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Greene-Wolf Co., Inc. (2 percent, 10 days)	6,000.00
Laclede Steel Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
E. B. Latham & Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Loman Electric Supply Co. (2 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Louis Electric Corp (2 percent, 10 days)	7,000.00
Clayton Mark Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
National Electric Products Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Noland Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Shell Electrical Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	6,200.00
Steelduct Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Steel & Tubes, Inc. (5 percent, 30 days)	6,360.00
U. S. Electrical Export Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Walker Bros. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
S. Weinstein Supply Co. (2 percent, 10 days)	5,823.95
West Philadelphia Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	6,200.00
Westinghouse Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
General Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00
Nathan Goodman Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	6,200.00

(Committee exhibit 324.)

In the instance above, 10 of respondent conduit sellers submitted bids. Austin, Enameled Metals, Garland, Laclede Steel, Clayton Mark, National Electric, Steelduct, Walker Bros., and Youngstown each bid $6,200, and Steel & Tubes, Inc., bid $6,360.

Bids on 2,000 feet of conduit for the Panama Canal, opened December 21, 1938, were as follows:

Graybar Electric Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	$687.00
Greene-Wolf Co., Inc. (5 percent, 10 days)	687.00
Clayton Mark & Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	687.00
Monumental Electrical Supply Co. (5 percent, 20 days)	638.00
Steel & Tubes, Inc. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	685.80
Walker Bros. (5 percent, 10 proximo)	687.00
Williamsburg Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10 days)	666.40
General Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	686.60
National Electric Products Corp. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	687.00
E. B. Latham & Co. (5 percent, 30 days)	686.60
Garland Manufacturing Co. (5 percent, 30 days)	687.00
Gertler Electric Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10 days)	666.80
Associated Hardware & Supplies Corp. (5 percent, 20 days)	656.00
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. (5 percent, 10th proximo)	687.00
Electrical Industrial Equipment & Supply Corp. (5 percent, 10 days)	640.00
American Electric Supply Co. (5 percent, 10 days)	687.00

(Respondents' exhibit 12.)

It will be noted that six of respondent conduit sellers bid in the above instance. Clayton Mark, Walker Bros., National Electric, Garland, and Youngstown each bid $687, and Steel & Tubes, Inc., bid $685.80.

(b) The effect of this pricing system in securing and maintaining identity of delivered-price quotations and prices in private sales was substantial. RSCA tabulated the percentage of all sales of conduit which were "on card"; that is, which accurately reflected the controlling base prices. In a memorandum circulated by Mr. Booth under date of February 10, 1938, it is stated:

"The percentage of tonnage shipped in the month of December on card 76 by the industry was 81.46 percent.

"This includes all the 13 members in the industry and compares with 80.86 percent in the month of November 1937 (committee exhibit 496)."

The report of the conduit committee of NEWA of its meeting of May 23, 1938, states, in part:

"You will probably be interested in knowing the manufacturers' report, that in the month of March 1938, 87½ percent of the rigid iron conduit sold at card 76 (committee exhibit 39–D)."

Reds in Peiping Hold Open-Air Trials of Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the insensibility of our State Department to the tragic conquest of China by communism becomes from day to day more shocking. I should like to call attention to the following news article in the New York World-Telegram, of March 28, 1949, by Clyde Farnsworth, descriptive of actual Communist behavior in Peiping:

REDS IN PEIPING HOLD OPEN-AIR TRIALS OF RICH

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

SHANGHAI, March 28.—The new Communist bosses of Peiping are keeping the public amused with mass open-air trials of well-to-do persons accused of crimes against the people.

Chinese who have arrived here said the trials are held out of doors to permit crowds of spectators. So there will always be large numbers present, the Communist council for each of the city's 10 districts supplies at least one spectator from each family under its jurisdiction.

Generally accused of being undercover men from the Kuomintang, the defendants are declared guilty by acclamation of the audience, then led indoors to have their sentences confirmed by a people's court.

MORE SOUND THAN FURY

The trials are more sound than fury so far, with no known cases of lynch action.

Meanwhile, say the visitors from Peiping, rich people who haven't yet been arrested fear to make any display of their money. Good Communists drive automobiles, wear fine clothes, or frequent expensive restaurants. Others don't dare.

Civilians are sometimes seen marching in custody of police or soldiers. Disappearances are common, though it is impossible to say whether the vanished people were detained or have fled.

MANY SHOPS CLOSED

Sixty to seventy percent of Peiping's shops are closed. Private manufacturing has stopped. After dropping, in the first 10 days of Communist occupation, commodity prices soared. There is a heavy black market in American dollars, with Communists themselves eagerly exchanging their local currency for United States greenbacks.

Church services are allowed to continue, but Communist-led student unions are rapidly taking over mission universities and high schools. Russian movies, books, and photographers have appeared in schools.

Four armed Red soldiers guard the United State consulate by day, and more by night. Visitors entering must identify themselves or be identified by the consulate gateman. Sometimes they are searched, and once an armed squad made an inspection of the consulate itself.

Mr. Speaker, I also call attention to a letter of Louis C. Wyman appearing in the Washington Post for March 31 protesting the really outrageous smugness of that newspaper, about what is going on in China, in consequence of what has gone on in our State Department. I emphatically agree with the writer that—

It is never too late to put our shoulders to the cause of freedom and the protection of our own security.

The letters follows:

CHINA'S FRIENDS

I am profoundly shocked by your March 24 editorial, China's Friends. When the Washington Post sinks to the level of a plain smear in attempting to support its traditionally liberal approach, and calls hopeless the fight of those who genuinely wish to prevent a Communist Eastern Hemisphere, I am almost sick at heart.

It is unnecessary to spell out the consequence of complete Communist control in the Far East. Not only China, but Indochina, Burma, Malaya, and the East Indies are already troubled with the first signs of Communist infection. Lies, deceit, treachery, spoliation, noncooperation, murder, pillage are in the same familiar pattern. How long can a free nation such as ours continue to have basic security without prohibitive military expenditures, in a world one-half of which is proposed to be supinely donated to this same communism?

If Senator McCARRAN'S attempts to protect our interests in the Far East and to put the lie to the theory that coalition with Communists can work for peace, is a senseless intervention—if, as the Post states, the cause of the truest friend the United States has had in China is a hopeless fight—if, as the Post implies, the poor, unfortunate people in China would be left alone (which means left to Communist control), then the wholly negative conclusion is that the United States should get out of China, get out of the Far East, and let the whole eastern, oriental world go by default to the hammer and sickle.

It is not too late to help hold the Yangtze line. It is never too late to put our shoulders to the cause of freedom and the protection of our own security.

We have had some experience with Manchuria—the Ruhr of China—before. From 1931 until Japan marched, this same Manchuria we permitted to work for Japan. Today it and its vast industrial capacity works for Russia. Perhaps this time, if we continue to sleep, it may be less than 7 years.

It is not a question of being a friend to China. What is involved here is a commonsense protection of this country. We will not be safe if all of the oriental millions become vassals of the Kremlin.

LOUIS C. WYMAN.

WASHINGTON.

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of First European Settlement of Biloxi Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the peoples who inhabit the lovely area surrounding the Bay of Biloxi on the Gulf of Mexico are celebrating the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first European settlement in the region. The chief city of this region, Biloxi, was the first capital of the French Province of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article outlining the history of the region, written by Mr. Anthony V. Ragusin, of Biloxi.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILOXI BAY AREA REACHES 250-YEAR MARK WITH CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE—HISTORIC GULF COAST REGION PREPARES FOR COLORFUL BIRTHDAY PROGRAM

(By Anthony V. Ragusin)

BILOXI, MISS.—The peoples of the Bay of Biloxi area, including Ocean Springs, North Biloxi (d'Iberville) and Biloxi, are making ready to light up the candles on a huge birthday cake—250 candles to be exact. Much has happened since the first capital of the French Province of Louisiana was established on the shores of the Bay of Biloxi. Many flags have flown from numerous countries which have furnished citizens in the intervening time.

Against this background of subtropical climate, romance, history, and color plans are being completed to observe the founding of one of America's oldest and most cosmopolitan cities.

Pageants, musical programs, and visits to shrines, old homes, and landmarks will feature the observance. The festivities will begin April 3. Actual birthday time will come Friday, April 8. It was on April 7, 1699, that Pierre Charles le Moyne d'Iberville, famous Canadian in the service of King Louis XIV of France, actually marked out the site. The following day workmen swung axes to effect a clearing on the eastern shore of the bay, on the site of present-day Ocean Springs.

FORT IS BUILT

D'Iberville previously had put his fleet into the lee of Ship Island, some 12 miles directly south of Biloxi, on February 10, 1699. The intrepid colonizer and his brother, Jean Baptiste le Moyne Bienville, conducted subinvestigations with the use of small boats. The mouth of the Mississippi River and Lake Pontchartrain were visited. It was finally decided to build a fort and settlement on the high eastern shore of a large bay which offered a sheltered and safe haven behind Deer Island. When d'Iberville stepped ashore he was greeted by the Biloxi Indians, a small but cordial tribe of the Sioux Nation. The name Biloxi was chosen for the new settlement in honor of the friendly Indians. A fort was constructed at the same time guarding the entrance to the bay, and called Fort Maurepas.

This was the first actual colonization of that vast part of America, consisting of more than 1,250,000 square miles of land which later became known as the Louisiana Purchase Territory. There were several capitals called Biloxi, the first and second being on the Ocean Springs shore near the present-day Bay of Biloxi highway bridge. Later the seat of government was maintained at Dauphin Island, and at Mobile.

The greatest colonial capital called Biloxi was the one established on what is now West Beach Boulevard, between the historic Biloxi lighthouse and the old cemetery.

When the John Law land scheme reached its height, colonists came from Europe in large numbers for concessions elsewhere, especially along the Mississippi River. Slaves were dumped on Biloxi's west beach like ballast.

BUBBLE BURSTS

The Mississippi bubble finally burst. In 1722 Governor Bienville was successful over the objection of his senior engineer and practically all the members of the superior council in removing the headquarters to a town which had been established in 1718 on the lower Mississippi and which had been named for the Duke of Orleans. Thus, Biloxi became the mother of the fabulous city of New Orleans.

It would require many books to tell the long story of the Biloxi area. Eight flags that have waved over this exotic coast land, will fly in the Gulf breeze during the approaching celebration. They are French, English, Spanish, West Florida Republic, United States, Mississippi Magnolia State, Confederate States, and Mississippi State.

In addition to soldiers and sailors of the principal old world nations, these shores have felt footsteps of mercenaries such as Hessian and Swiss hired-out troops. Pirates, too, contributed their presence. Today, Biloxi houses large colonies of Yugoslavians and French Arcadians. The headstones in the private and public cemeteries of the Bay of Biloxi area attest that these fecund waters, teeming with shrimp, oysters, and fish along with the salubrious climate, brought people here from Nordic countries and nearly every corner of central and southern Europe during the 250 years. The first settler to live on what is present day Biloxi was believed to be a French-Canadian named Deslots.

POPULATION DOUBLED

With Biloxi having doubled its population since the last Federal census and with the development of the fishing industry, resort, and convention facilities and the gigantic Keesler Air Force base, the peninsular city has expanded all the way from Point Cadet to Beauvoir and beyond and from the Gulf to the Back Bay. Many shopkeepers and businessmen as well as a good part of Keesler's permanent military and civilian party now reside at Ocean Springs and North Biloxi.

Few regions have experienced the long and colorful history as the Biloxi sector. Despite the vicissitude of the sea-food industry, an occasional storm and the prevailing custom of taking time from work and business in order to play, Biloxi and its immediate neighbors look forward with confidence to the next 2½ centuries.

Government Paternalism Menace to Progress and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a portion of the New England Letter, published by the First National Bank of Boston, Mass., which discusses the relationship of Government paternalism to

the progress and security of the people. The letter, dated February 28, 1949, follows:

VERDICT OF HISTORY: PATERNALISM GREATEST INTERNAL MENACE TO PROGRESS AND SECURITY

The administration has proposed a Fair Deal program that if adopted would impose intolerable burdens and speed the Nation down the road of socialism. It is estimated that this program would raise the total budget to $60,000,000,000 annually within a 5-year period.

On the surface, it would appear that providing security from the cradle to the grave for all people is in keeping with an advancing civilization. But irrefutable historical evidence down the ages clearly shows that the protective spirit of government is the greatest internal menace to general welfare as it undermines the very foundation of security that it designs to establish.

It is held by the proponents of such a program that a nation cannot prosper unless the government watches over its people, protects them against want, and directs social and economic activities through an ever-expanding bureaucracy. But when a government loses confidence in the capacity of its people to rule and to provide for themselves, and proceeds to coddle and pamper them and to shield them against the storms of life, the wealth-creating power of the people is undermined, personal intiative is smothered, and incentives seriously impaired or destroyed. The end result is that the nation becomes impoverished while free enterprise and self-government are engulfed in some form of regimentation. This is the verdict of history.

Let us call the roll of a few countries that have tried the experiment of doing everything for the people, and soberly note the baneful consequences. There was Greece, the mother of art and culture, that reached the climax of her glory in the golden age of Pericles. Under this benevolent dictator the Government embarked upon a huge spending program to provide for the wants and entertainment of its people, a large proportion of whom were on the Government pay roll. But as the burdens accumulated, and with bankruptcy imminent, Pericles led his people into a disastrous war, and that was the end of Greek leadership.

As Greece fell, the torch was handed to the Romans, who extended civilization over Europe and formed the basis of modern society. But the Roman Empire was destroyed because its citizens became flabby and too weak to defend themselves against the barbarians. In stating the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire one authority has said: "The pressure of public burdens was an increasing disability that ate the very heart out of the capitalist and the laborer alike: There was no hope to inspire energy or encourage enterprise and the gradual decay culminated in an utter collapse."

When Rome fell, the world was plunged into darkness for 500 years. The torch of learning was burning very low and would have been extinguished if it had not been for the knights and their friends, the monks. As governments became weak, daring and resourceful men rose to the occasion and broadened the horizons, lifted the spirits, and stimulated the energies of the people. Then came the Crusades, accompanied by the flourishing of international commerce with its riches and leisure. This paved the way for the Renaissance—the rebuilding of civilization and the rapid development of learning and culture. Then followed the great discoveries of the New World, and during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Great Britain emerged as the leader of civilization, which leadership she retained until fairly recent times.

In the meantime Spain, too, had her day of glory and at one time was mistress of the world. But as she rose in power her government extended its protective wings so that everything being done for the people, nothing was done by the people. The nation tottered into stagnation from which it has not been able to emerge.

So in Spain, as in Rome and in Greece, "it was when things were the most prosperous on the surface that they were the most rotten at the foundation," according to the noted historian, Henry Thomas Buckle.

Then let us skip a few decades to more modern times and see whether the extension of paternalism and government planning has had the same consequences as in earlier times.

Before the war, the Fascist countries abroad held out to their people a Utopian plan of full employment, security, and better homes. This was to be achieved by a planned economy financed by government borrowing and spending, while a totalitarian government was to regulate all activities. But after surrendering their freedom for illusory security and military pageantry, the Italian and German people were led into a war of aggression that ended in humiliation and misery. The tragic experience of the Fascist countries should be a stark warning to us of the dangerous course plotted by those who are so anxious to rebuild our society. In the face of indisputable evidence that we are following the same economic and financial pattern, and are drifting along under the same forces, we cannot afford to harbor the illusion that it "cannot happen here."

Before turning our backs upon a system that has served us so well over the decades, we should ponder now, before time has run out, on the price that must be paid should we heed the siren voices of those who would lead us down the road to serfdom. We should be warned that government planning through the ages invariably shows that one step leads to another until finally the entire economy and all institutions are brought under the iron rule of bureaucracy.

At this crucial stage we should also be mindful that it is a recognized part of the Communist strategy to have this country spend itself into bankruptcy in order that we may be softened for easy conquest.

The tragic irony of it all is that after spending $400,000,000,000, sacrificing the lives of 300,000 of our best youth to defeat the Fascist powers, and now spending around $20,000,000,000 to combat communism, we should be pursuing a domestic policy that will inevitably lead to some form of totalitarianism.

So with red lights flashing and foghorns blaring, the American people should be heedful of the danger signals that the many chapters in world history grimly and soberly remind us are warnings of the treacherous reefs upon which have been wrecked so many so-called liberal governments down through the ages.

It should be apparent to all that income and wealth are not created by government but by the productive efforts of the people. The government merely siphons the money by means of taxes and borrowings, and then distributes the money through the spending channels.

The government providing for the people is not a novel experiment but can be traced back to dim antiquity. It is atavistic and has a blighting influence on the recipients. What might appear like manna from heaven would in reality be a drug that in the course of time would make the people submissive and subservient to those in power. As has been said:

"Thus runs the law, and the law shall run till the earth in its course is still
That whoso eateth another's bread shall do that other's will."

Public Safety Work of the National Safety Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we are all greatly interested in the public safety work which the National Safety Council has been carrying on. Mr. W. A. Irvin, chairman of the board of trustees of the National Safety Council, has taken an important part in this work, and has written me a letter under date of March 24, 1949, giving a summary of what has been accomplished. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 24, 1949.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I have been looking over some recent reports on the public-service work (now known as the Green Cross program) that the National Safety Council has been carrying on under the sponsorship of its trustees since 1942, and as a matter of information, I think you may be interested in a brief summary of what I have found. The gist of it is:

That every year for the seven consecutive years since this work was started the number of accident fatalities has been lower than the year before the work began.

That last year the accident death rate was the lowest on record.

That, despite a tremendous increase in highway travel, traffic fatalities in 1948 were below those of any other year.

That the decrease in accidental deaths since the public-service program was started has meant a saving of 39,000 lives and about three times that number of permanent physical impairments.

That organized safety work, which was confined almost entirely to industrial operations and enforcement aspects of traffic regulation before 1942, is now reaching also into homes, schools, offices, farms, and all the daily activities of people to influence them to protect themselves and others against the common day-to-day hazards to which everyone is more or less regularly exposed.

That as a nonprofit organization devoted wholly to promoting safety, the National Safety Council, through its public-service program, has been able to enlist the cooperation of the press and radio to such an extent that more than half a million newspaper and magazine articles and more than two and a half million radio broadcasts have been used since 1942 to channel safety information and advice to the Nation.

That hundreds of organizations—such as trade and professional associations, women's clubs, parent-teacher groups, fraternal orders, boys and girls clubs, agricultural organizations, et cetera—that had never before been identified with safety work, have been drawn into various phases of accident prevention on an unprecedented scale.

I will not attempt to go into detail about all the various activities embraced by this program beyond pointing out that a great

deal of constant research and field service, and the production of enormous quantities of printed and other materials, are obviously entailed. The main point is that the situation does look like we are getting somewhere with this work, and I thought that, just as a matter of information, you would be interested.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. IRVIN,
Chairman, Board of Trustees,
National Safety Council.

Veterans of Foreign Wars

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, the year 1949 marks 50 years of patriotic service by the best veterans' organization of our time, the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is a proud organization, and, justly, it should be. The men who cherish the wearing of the Cross of Malta, the emblem of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are veterans who have shed a part of their lives in the battles and campaigns of the Stars and Stripes on foreign shores. Whether it was on the frozen plains of the Arctic or the steaming jungles of the Philippines, Guadalcanal, Burma, or in the defense of American lives in China, or in the battles of Château-Thierry and St. Lo, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars walk with their heads high. Their contribution to American history in time of need rightfully places them in the front line of the parade of American patriotism.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, with its rich heritage, is always in the forefront to provide aid and help to its members and families. The record of legislation possesses countless actions to assist the honorably discharged veteran.

How can we forget the Veterans of Foreign Wars' ceaseless drive to provide hospitalization for disabled veterans, pensions for Spanish-American War veterans and benefits to veterans of World Wars I and II? The achievements of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are immeasurable. From its humble beginning in 1899, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, first under the leadership of Gen. Irving Hale, the hero of the Philippines, to the present commander, Lyall Beggs, has tread a glorious path. It is significant that in this day when the world is yearning for peace, the wearers of the Cross of Malta are pledged to defend the principles of human rights in times of peace and war.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars' symbol of service to its fellow men is an outstanding declaration to all Americans that justice and freedom shall not perish as long as there are veterans organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars to uphold the principles of the American way of life.

My own State of Illinois is extremely proud of the VFW. Its present membership totals approximately 75,000 overseas veterans. The great majority of these men are veterans of World War II. From the northern tip of the State of Illinois to the down-State city of Cairo, Ill., the VFW and its auxiliaries are constantly devoting their time to the needs of veterans' families in distress, and the needs of disabled veterans. The hospitalized veterans of Hines, Downey, Danville, Dwight and Marion, Veterans' Administration Hospitals, will vouch vehemently of the grand work of the VFW in planning the numerous programs of morale and welfare activities.

Whenever there is a service to be rendered, the overseas veterans of the VFW are always ready—whether it be aid to his fellow man or in defense of his country.

The citizens of the State of Illinois salute the VFW.

Congratulations to Commander Henry L. Warner and his staff and the VFW posts in the Eleventh Congressional District: General Leonard Wood Post, No. 143; Naval Convoy Ship Post, No. 300; Mont Clare Post, No. 1284; Irving Park Post, No. 1487; Louis D. David Post, No. 1493; Henry A. Honack Post, No. 1583; West End Post, No. 2004; Northwest Post, No. 2042; Norwood's Own Post, No. 2131; Conrad Martens Post, No. 2202; Barb-Wire Post, No. 2245; Logan-Avondale Post, No. 2978; Leyden's Own Post, No. 3509; Indian Portage Post, No. 3592; Europac Post, No. 5151; Armana Post, No. 6460; Diversey Post, No. 6868; Pfc. Frank Witek Post, No. 8844; Kosowitz-Evankoe Post, No. 9420; Greater Higgens Post, No. 9792; and Lieut. Otto Staeheli Post, No. 849.

Proposed Legislation Affecting Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the proposed removal of restrictions relating to the coloring of oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because I am convinced that removal of restrictions relating to oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter would have a serious adverse effect on the dairy industry, and eventually the entire agricultural economy, I have joined with a group of Senators in sponsoring a bill that repeals the Federal taxes on oleomargarine but makes unlawful the manufacture, transportation, or sale of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce.

Yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is consumed is not subject to the provisions of the act but to the laws and regulations of the State or Territory. Application of Federal pure food laws are not limited by the act, and the enforcement provisions of those laws are specifically cited in connection with the new provisions to be administered by the administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

This measure is along the lines I believe necessary as a fair safeguard to consumers and producers of both dairy products and substitutes. In fact, in considering this problem I am concerned that oleomargarine should not be sold on the market or served in public eating places in such a manner that the consumer is not aware when he is getting a substitute. Coloring oleomargarine to look like butter does not make the product either more nutritious or more palatable. When such coloring is permitted commercially without restriction it places the substitute product in a competitive position with butter where only a laboratory test could determine whether the commodity being sold was a genuine dairy product or not.

Therefore, I am in favor of repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine which increase the cost to the consumer, but I will strongly advocate continued protection of the public as regards the color and appearance in marketing of butter substitutes.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway—Necessary Link in Our Inland Waterway System for Both Transportation Purposes and National Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is appropriating billions upon billions of dollars for the peoples of other countries, it seems to me that we can afford a small amount to start on the most important undeveloped link of our inland waterways—important for both navigation and national defense. I refer to what is known as the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, which will provide a slack, or still water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek on the Mississippi-Tennessee line, a down-stream route on the Tennessee from that point to the Ohio River at Paducah 215 miles, and a down-stream route from Paducah 47 miles down the Ohio to Cairo, Ill.

This project has been approved by the Army engineers and authorized by Congress. All we are asking for is a small appropriation to begin its construction.

As I have pointed out before, the main cut will be through a sand ridge in which, General Kingman, Chief of the Army Engineers, stated that—

The absence of rock in the ridge makes it the most favorable location for the proposed waterway.

The Army engineers have investigated this project time and time again, and have unqualifiedly approved it. The chief of Army engineers, General Reybold, and his successor, General Wheeler, came before the committee and gave it their enthusiastic support.

They said that there is not another place on the face of the earth where the

traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

General Robbins, of the Board of Engineers, in discussing this project before the Senate committee, said that if he were to tell them, that with the amount of money called for to develop this project, they could extend an arm of the Gulf of Mexico to provide a slack-water route all the way up to Cairo, Ill., and back, they would throw up their hats and shout.

Yet, he said, this project is infinitely better. Because it saves the swift current of the Mississippi River for downstream traffic, and still gives us a slack-water route up to the Tennessee River for returning traffic, and then a downstream route on the Tennessee River 215 miles to Paducah, and then down the Ohio 47 miles to Cairo.

It is 869 miles from Cairo to New Orleans down the Mississippi River, 156 miles from New Orleans across to Mobile along the protected intercoastal waterway, 481 miles from Mobile to the Tennessee River in slack water behind the locks and dams which this project will provide, and 262 miles downstream from that point to Cairo, Ill.

In other words, the round trip from either Paducah on the Ohio River, or Cairo on the Mississippi River to New Orleans and Mobile and back will be 1,768 miles, of which 1,161 will be downstream, and the rest of it in slack or still water.

As the Army engineers have said, there is not another place on earth where a project with these advantages can be provided.

The savings which this project will provide are so great as to challenge the imagination of its most enthusiastic advocates. They seem almost astronomical.

But these figures of the Army engineers cannot be questioned.

In order that Members may understand what this project would mean in savings to people along the Ohio River and its tributaries, including the Allegheny and Monongahela, along the Illinois River and the Great Lakes, along the upper Mississippi, all the way to St. Paul and Minneapolis, along the Missouri River all the way up to Keokuk, Iowa, and along the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Arkansas, and the Tombigbee, as well as along the Gulf coast, I am inserting some tables supplying that information.

These tables were worked out by the Army engineers, and they are as nearly correct as they could possibly be made.

If there is any difference at all, it is that the savings would be greater today than when these tables were worked out 3 years ago, owing to the increased cost of fuel.

Here is a table showing the cost per ton for both routes, and the savings per ton this project will provide on the fuel bill alone:

TABLE No. 1.—*Comparison of costs per ton of upstream traffic*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi, per ton	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee, per ton	Average savings, per ton
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$2.02	$1.32	$0.70
	Paducah	2.10	1.26	.84
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	2.42	.99	1.43
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	.95	1.44
	Paducah	2.47	.89	1.58
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	2.79	.62	2.17
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	.95	2.01
	Paducah	3.04	.89	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	3.36	.62	2.74
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	.67	2.01
	Paducah	2.76	.61	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	3.08	.34	2.74
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	.51	2.32
	Paducah	2.91	.45	2.46
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	3.23	.17	3.06
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	.46	2.42
	Paducah	2.96	.40	2.56
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	3.28	.13	3.15
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	.41	2.52
	Paducah	3.01	.35	2.66
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	3.33	.08	3.25

You will note that the cost of this traffic from New Orleans or Mobile to points on the Ohio or the upper Mississippi are almost unbelievable, and they increase as we ascend the Tombigbee.

We already have a 9-foot channel up to Demopolis. You will see from the above table that this development will cut the cost of transportation from Demopolis to Cairo, Ill., exactly three-fourths, or from $2.68 a ton to 67 cents a ton. And of course the savings to Paducah and all points on the Ohio River and the Tennessee are still proportionately greater.

But wait till you see the savings in dollars and cents in the following tables.

Here is a table showing what these savings would amount to on a 3,500-ton load returning by way of this slack-water route.

This is the size tow composed, of course, of a number of barges, that has been most frequently used on this inland waterway for the last few years.

The following table will show the cost per tow by way of the Mississippi River, then by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee and the savings per tow of 3,500 tons which this short, slack-water route will provide up to the Tennessee River and then down to Paducah and Cairo:

TABLE No. 2.—*Table showing cost per tow of barges carrying 3,500 tons, and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 3,500 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$7,070	$4,620	$2,450
	Paducah	7,350	4,410	2,940
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	8,470	3,465	5,005
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	8,365	3,325	5,040
	Paducah	8,645	3,115	5,530
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	9,765	2,170	7,595
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	10,360	3,325	7,035
	Paducah	10,640	3,115	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	11,760	2,170	9,590
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	9,380	2,345	7,035
	Paducah	9,660	2,135	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	10,780	1,190	9,590
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	9,905	1,785	8,120
	Paducah	10,185	1,575	8,610
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	11,305	595	10,710
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	10,080	1,610	8,470
	Paducah	10,360	1,400	8,960
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	11,480	455	11,025
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	10,255	1,435	8,820
	Paducah	10,535	1,225	9,310
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	11,655	280	11,375

The reduction in cost of every load going to the Tennessee-Tombigbee junction would mean that amount of savings on every such load going to our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge.

This project should be constructed at once for national defense, if for no other reason. Let us not sit here and wait for another Pearl Harbor.

Here is a table showing the cost and the savings which this project would provide on a tow of barges carrying 10,000 tons:

TABLE No. 3.—*Table showing cost per tow of barges carrying 10,000 tons and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 10,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 10,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 10,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$20,200	$13,200	$7,000
	Paducah	21,000	12,600	8,400
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	24,200	9,900	14,300
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	23,900	9,500	14,400
	Paducah	24,700	8,900	15,800
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	27,900	6,200	21,700
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	29,600	9,500	20,100
	Paducah	30,400	8,900	21,500
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	33,600	6,200	27,400
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	26,800	6,700	20,100
	Paducah	27,600	6,100	21,500
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	30,800	3,400	27,400
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	28,300	5,100	23,200
	Paducah	29,100	4,500	24,600
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	32,300	1,700	30,600
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	28,800	4,600	24,200
	Paducah	29,600	4,000	25,600
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	32,800	1,300	31,500
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	29,300	4,100	25,200
	Paducah	30,100	3,500	26,600
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	33,300	800	32,500

Some of the larger concerns are now using tows of barges carrying 14,000 tons. That is true of the traffic going down the Ohio River, the Illinois River, the Mississippi River, and the Missouri River.

The Army engineers have supplied us with figures of these large tows of 14,000 tons going down from Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and points on the Missouri River.

Here is another table which the Army engineers have provided showing the cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and also the savings which these barges would provide:

TABLE No. 4.—*Table showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$28,280	$18,480	$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	45,920	1,820	44,100
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.	46,620	1,120	45,500

You will see from the above table that going from New Orleans to Cairo the cost of a 14,000-ton barge tow is cut from $28,280 to $18,480, or a saving of $9,800 on its fuel bill alone.

If it goes up the Ohio River, it would cut the cost from New Orleans to Paducah from $29,400 to $17,640, or a saving of $11,760 on its fuel bill alone.

Going from New Orleans to the Tennessee River, traffic to any point on the Tennessee, including Oak Ridge, where our atomic-bomb plant is located, the cost would be cut from $33,880 to $13,860, or a saving of $20,020 on its fuel bill alone.

Now, let us look at the traffic going from Mobile to Cairo, Ill. The cost will be cut about 70 percent, or from $2.39 a ton to $0.95 a ton. On a 14,000-ton load going from Mobile to Cairo, the cost would be cut from $33,460 to $13,300, or a saving of $20,160 on the fuel bill alone.

Remember, that means every barge load going into the Middle West, along the Missouri River, up the Mississippi, to Minneapolis and St. Paul, up the Illinois River into the Great Lakes, and around to Detroit and Cleveland.

But suppose that traffic is going up the Ohio to Cincinnati, Wheeling, or Pittsburgh, or into the Monongahela or Allegheny. The cost will be cut on a 14,000-ton barge from $34,580 to $12,460, or approximately two-thirds, and the saving on the fuel bill alone will amount to $22,120.

Of course, if it is going into the Tennessee River, the cost will be cut from $39,060 to $8,680, or a saving of $30,380 on its fuel bill alone.

Nothing that could possibly be done would be worth more to our great atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge.

In addition to these tremendous savings, it would cut the water distance between Oak Ridge and the Gulf of Mexico more than 650 miles.

Now let us take the traffic from the Birmingham area which comes down the Warrior River and joins the Tombigbee at Demopolis. We already have this water route developed up to Demopolis, Ala.

You will note by referring to table No. 1 that traffic going from Demopolis to Cairo will have its cost cut to exactly one-fourth, or from $2.68 a ton to 67 cents per ton.

On a 14,000-ton load the fuel bill from Demopolis to Cairo would be reduced from $37,520 to $9,380—a saving of $28,140 on the fuel bill alone.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are so miraculous that one could hardly believe them were they not carefully worked out by the Army engineers, the finest experts on this subject to be found anywhere in the world.

Suppose these barges are going from Demopolis to Paducah. The cost per ton would be cut from $2.76 a ton to 61 cents a ton, and on a 14,000-ton load the cost would be reduced from $38,640 to $8,540, or a saving of $30,100 on its fuel bill alone.

And if you will take the figures on the traffic going from Demopolis to the Tennessee River, you will find that it is reduced to about one-tenth of the cost, or from $43,120 to $4,760—a saving of $38,360—on every 14,000-ton barge load going from Demopolis, or Birmingham, to Oak Ridge, or to any other point on the upper Tennessee River.

I will not take up the time of the House to discuss the saving this waterway would provide from other points along this waterway. They speak for themselves. They are simply astounding.

This project has already been authorized by Congress. It is a vitally necessary link in our inland-waterway transportation system, and it is most vitally necessary from a standpoint of our national defense.

It is just as sure to be constructed as the night follows the day; and the sooner it is done, the better it will be for all America.

Basing Point Hasty Action Warned Against by Food Brokers—Defeat of Moratorium Bill Vital to Preservation of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Food Brokers Association, meeting in Chicago for the forty-fourth annual convention of the association were warned of the inherent dangers to small business if the basing-point moratorium is enacted into law. As reported in the Wall Street Journal for March 22, 1949, Mr. Paul F. Myers, general counsel for the food brokers' national organization told a capacity attendance at the initial session, among other things that—

If the prohibition against the use of devices which have the purpose or effect of destroying competition is taken out of the law, it is perfectly clear that the big concern can adopt a basing-point system which could utterly destroy smaller and less wealthy competitors in the market place, even though the plan may be free of any deception, coercion, and fraud.

Small-business men in all walks of life may benefit by this timely warning and rally to defeat legislation, which as Mr. Myers said, "could utterly destroy smaller and less wealthy competitors." The article, in part, follows:

FOOD BROKERS AIR MONOPOLY FEARS IN BASING-POINT BILL

(By A. E. Mockler)

CHICAGO, March 21.—Hasty legislation to legalize the basing-point system holds the danger of emasculating the anti-trust laws to the point where large corporations can adopt basing-point systems which could utterly destroy smaller and less wealthy competitors, the forty-fourth annual convention of the National Food Broker's Association was warned here today.

"Any overhauling of the antitrust statutes to clarify the statutes of basing-point selling," Paul F. Myers, general counsel for the food brokers' national organization, said, "should insure the retention of the vital parts of the present law, namely, the outlawing of any device which has for its purpose or effect the destruction of competition.

BACKS ANTITRUST LAWS

Addressing a capacity attendance at the initial session of the brokers' convention, Mr. Myers declared that "the heart of the antitrust laws is the prohibition of devices which substantially lessen or destroy competition. Without this prohibition, the antitrust laws are meaningless."

Referring to recent court decisions on the basing-point system, the speaker pointed out that as a result of these rulings there is agitation for action by Congress by moratorium or other law, to legalize basing-point systems, provided they do not involve collusion or conspiracy.

"The proposed legislation," he said, "would provide as a test for legality that such systems do not involve fraud, deceit, or coercion."

"The proposed test of fraud, coercion, and deception," Mr. Myers charged, "is not enough for preservation of the antitrust laws."

FEARS IMPACT ON SMALL FIRMS

"If the prohibition against the use of devices which have the purpose or effect of destroying competition is taken out of the law," he said, "it is perfectly clear that the big concern can adopt a basing-point system which could utterly destroy smaller and less wealthy competitors in the market place, even though the plan may be free of any deception, coercion, and fraud.

"I say with great earnestness," he continued, "that if we are to have legislation let's be vigilant, lest by some device such as the ones proposed, that the very heart is cut out of our antitrust laws. Conversely, let's make sure that the vital parts of the present law be kept, namely, that any device is illegal which has for its purpose or effect the destruction of competition. If that is removed from the law, nothing of importance remains.

"It would seem to me to be important that we be a little patient. Other cases are in or on their way to the Supreme Court involving this question, and I feel quite confident that the Supreme Court will give us an answer which will wipe out the present confusion."

OVERFLOW ATTENDANCE

The convention during the afternoon session featured a forum of manufacturer-broker relationships, and as was the case at the morning meeting again attracted an overflow attendance.

The formal phase of this year's NFBA meeting wound up tonight with the association's annual banquet, held in the grand ballroom at the Palmer House.

Association committees will continue sessions here during the remainder of the week, however, and numerous sales conferences have been scheduled, running through the rest of the week by manufacturers and processors. At these conferences, plans for the development of advertising and merchandising programs to cover the marketing of the coming season's packs of processed foods will be developed.

Inflation Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis News of April 1, 1949:

STUBBORN ABOUT IT

Stubborness makes a man look a little ridiculous, even the President of the United States.

Despite evidence that prices are easing, that the economy is receding, Mr. Truman persists in demanding controls for inflation. Even his right bowers on economic questions, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY and Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, have cooled off on the advisability of selective price and wage controls. They now recognize, as most perceptive business leaders and bankers have for some time, that business needs a stimulant, not a sedative. That was why the Federal Reserve Board eased up installment credit and reduced the margin requirement on stocks.

In the face of all these actions, what else except mulishness could prompt the President to renew his demands for price controls and higher taxes? His insistence on increased taxes is hardest of all to understand. With the Nation's economy in the balance, heavier taxes are the last thing that should be considered. Both industry and individuals need every cent of income these days. Business must have sufficient funds for continued productivity and expansion capital that would be drained off by higher taxes. The President would be wise to heed the warning of an influential Senator in his own party, WALTER F. GEORGE, who bluntly stated that heavier taxes now could produce a depression.

Tree Shelter Belts in the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 3, 1949:

TREE BELTS HAILED AS MIDWEST BOON—STEFAN, HOUSE REPUBLICAN, SAYS NEW DEAL PLANTINGS SAVE SOIL, PROVE WINTER AID

WASHINGTON, April 2.—A veteran Republican Member of Congress pays high tribute to the tree shelter belts planted in the Midwest by the New Deal in the 1930's.

Representative KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, declares that the forest stands have proved a great conservation boon to their areas and were particularly helpful to farmers in this winter's severe weather.

He predicts that, as a result of this showing, Congress will approve a new forestry experimental station in Ames, Iowa, with a branch in Nebraska.

"The way in which these woodlots and shelter belts withstood three successive heavy layers of snow and ice this winter confirmed the highest expectations for them," he states.

"There has been some destruction. It was inevitable in view of the severity of the storms. But all the shelter belts have survived, and I have many photographs to prove it.

"I have sent these pictures to the Senate Appropriations and Senate Agricultural Committees so that they can see for themselves just what the situation is."

According to Mr. STEFAN, the shelter belts saved thousands of cattle and unknown numbers of wild animals this winter.

"During the blizzards," STEFAN asserts, "the belts enabled farmers to get to their livestock. In many cases the trees kept the snow off the road. Also, the timber stands provided refuges for deer, pheasants, and other game which have flourished in the Prairie States as a result of this forestation program.

"And now that the snow that was held back by the trees is melting the soil is getting much-needed moisture. The snows kept the ground from freezing, and the melting snow is being absorbed by the soil. That's going to help a great deal on the flood problem."

Recalling the strong opposition to the original shelter-belt program, Stefan declares it now has wide support throughout the Midwest.

"I remember very clearly," he adds, "how angry many people were when the program first got under way. Nurserymen charged that the Government was going into their business. They called the plan cockeyed and

almost succeeded in holding up the appropriation.

"Now the trees that were planted then are 40 to 50 feet high in many instances. They started out with cottonwoods and then went on to elms, locusts, and cedars.

"The program has been of great benefit to many areas and many farmers. Antelope County, Nebr., is an example. Before the forestation program farms that had been very productive had become covered with sand. As a result of the shelter belts that's all changed now. I visited some of these farms recently and they are altogether different now.

"They have fine stems of grass, and the growers told me they were able to get to their livestock during the storms and feed them. The county agents were unanimous that soil conservation would be years behind if it had not been for these tree belts. These are just a few examples of the tremendous value and the great success of this program."

The Militia Belongs to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's for March 26, 1949:

COLLIER'S BELIEVES THE MILITIA BELONGS TO THE STATES

The Gray committee for the Defense Department suggests that the National Guard be federalized. Collier's is against it. Here is why. The National Guard is organized State militia. In every State men and women are proud of their militia—divisions, battalions, regiments, and companies. The Seventh, the Sixty-ninth, the Blues, the Greys, have heroes' records in many wars.

The men and the boys who serve in these State forces are the best we have. They are the fellows who enlist to do what is required to save our skins and our civilization in war and in peace.

The roots of admiration and affection and pride for the companies and regiments that compose the National Guard go down deeply into our historical traditions.

That is why so much anger was aroused when the Gray committee recommended the National Guard be federalized. In all our wars the National Guard has borne the brunt of our defense.

Collier's is against federalizing the National Guard for many fundamental reasons. First of all, ours is a Federal and not a National Government. The difference is far more than a matter of words. It is the difference between a Nazi or a Communist state and a free state.

The American idea is to give the Federal Government only as much authority as the States cannot successfully administer. We have always thought that local governments and States should do what they could to govern the country. Where the State turned out to be too small the Federal Government has stepped in.

The Federal idea has worked well up to now. The United States, and not any other Government, was invited in to settle the First World War. The industrial might of the United States was the factor that finally determined the issue in the Second World War. Industrial might was something that came out of our Federal system. Without the freedom, personal initiative, and individual enterprise that make possible the prodigious production of the United States, we might not have the industrial might that makes American production possible.

We are against federalizing the National Guard for the same reason that we are opposed to federalizing other general activities. We don't think that public education ought to be federally controlled. We don't think education should be federalized, for the very simple reason that any national government would be tempted to use public schools as a medium of propaganda for whatever doctrines it wanted to preach.

That is precisely what Bismarck did in the old Germany. Thus he sowed the seeds for World War I. That is what the Kaiser Wilhelm did and made World War I certain. That is what Adolf Hitler did. That is what the Russian Communists do. That is what any strong central government having ideas it wants to make popular is tempted to do. That is precisely why federally controlled education in the United States could be dangerous. And that finally is why Collier's is opposed to the federalization of education.

The federalization of the National Guard is open to similar objections. The Constitution laid the foundation of the National Guard. From the very beginning both the States and the Federal Government have shared the control and expenses of maintaining the National Guard. Since 1787 the Congress has had the duty of prescribing the training and the discipline of the National Guard. In times of war the National Guard becomes a part of the United States Army. But the States have enduring control. The States choose the officers. The roots of the National Guard regiments go back to the States. So nobody at Washington can indulge in military speculations with the idea of using the National Guard. In peace the Guard belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government.

Thus no American has to be afraid of his own soldiers. If we lived in Russia we would know that the Red Army would do what the Communist government wanted, right or wrong. We don't have to worry about our National Guard.

Collier's believes it is better to safeguard what we have. The Defense Department has a problem in being prepared against a surprise attack by Russia or by any other enemy. A peace-loving people such as we Americans are always at a disadvantage in dealing with an aggressive imperialist government. But when attacked and aroused freemen have been good fighters. We think the young men of today have lost none of the vigor, courage, and enterprise of their elders.

Our view is that the Defense Department will have to do the best it can with existing law. The Congress will appropriate many billions for defense in case we are attacked. We shall surely come through victorious in the end if we should be forced into a war we did not want.

The big thing is to retain the free way of life that makes America the envy of all other peoples. There are short cuts to efficiency but if we run even a small risk of sacrificing our freedoms by taking them, the risk is too great. Let's not federalize the National Guard or any other governmental enterprise that can be successfully operated by State or local governments.

W. L. C.

Commander Frackman, of Regular Veterans' Association, Speaks Up for Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio talk by National Commander of the Regular Veterans' Association David H. Frackman, because I felt that it is of special interest to the Members and also to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I had the pleasure of introducing Commander Frackman when he spoke over the radio station, WWDC of Washington, D. C., on the evening of March 27. I understand that he has received dozens of compliments on his excellent talk. My introduction of the commander and his own address follow:

Congressman HAGEN. I am pleased to have this opportunity to introduce the National Commander of the Regular Veterans' Association, of which I am an honorary life member. This organization and National Commander Frackman are rendering an exceptionally fine service to the personnel of the regular establishments of the armed forces and the veterans of the two world wars.

Commander Frackman is a life-long resident of the City of New York, where he has been actively engaged in the practice of the law for upwards of 30 years. There and in Washington, his ability both as a lawyer and as a leader in veteran and civic organizations is well established and fully recognized. He has done much to place the Regular Veterans' Association high in the esteem of veterants organizations throughout the Nation. A veteran of World War I, he enlisted at the outbreak of the war in the United States Naval Reserve Force and for some time was stationed in the Bureau of Navigation at Washington, D. C. Subsequently he was instrumental in forming and heading the legal department of the Third Naval District, coupled with a public defender bureau for officers and enlisted personnel and their dependents, in naval, civil, and criminal courts.

He is a member of the law committee of the American Legion in New York City; a past county judge advocate of the Jewish War Veterans; one of the founders and first president of the Manhattan Civic Club, Inc., which is prominent in civic affairs in the City of New York; a director of Interfaith Movement, Inc., a member of the American Society for International Law, the Society of American Military Engineers, the Masonic Order, the B'Nai B'rith and other civic, fraternal, and law societies.

He has served faithfully and well in all the capacities to which he has been called. Prior to his election as national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association, Commander Frackman served it in many capacities, including that of national judge advocate. Since its inception he has been the national representative of the Regular Veterans' Association to the organization of the United Nations accredited by the State Department for nongovernmental organizations.

A man of the people, possessing a keen understanding of their problems and a deep-

rooted desire to serve his fellow men, Commander Frackman will continue his efforts to aid the personnel of the Regular armed forces, the veterans of our World Wars and their dependents. I present to you the national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association, the Honorable H. David Frackman.

Commander FRACKMAN. Thank you, Congressman HAGEN, for your kind introduction. I deeply appreciate your presence on this program. I have had the pleasure of working with you for sometime past in relation to the problems of the servicemen and the veterans of our wars. I know your deep interest and desire to further their welfare. It is to you and the officials who keenly feel the problems which face both groups that they owe much for your efforts to bring to them just and proper benefits and privileges. It is to sincere public officials that the American people owe much for the preservation of their freedom and way of life. The Regular Veterans' Association is grateful for the fine public service you are rendering your country. We are proud to have you with us as one of our most valued honorary life members. May you continue your service for many years to come.

The Regular Veterans' Association and I extend our grateful appreciation to the officials of station WWDC for granting this most valuable time to us for this broadcast. We all deeply appreciate your interest in the welfare of the servicemen and veterans and add their thanks to ours for your fine public service.

The shooting war is over but peace is not yet assured. The veterans of our wars and the servicemen in the Regular Military Establishment must of necessity be concerned with the efforts now being made to bring about a lasting peace. They must likewise concern themselves with the attempt of certain subversive and un-American groups to weaken and destroy our concepts of democratic government. Our organization is composed of veterans and servicemen of the Regular Military Establishment. Our membership today represents every branch of the armed forces. We are, therefore, in a position to reflect the thoughts of both groups and to speak on their behalf.

This organization was among the very first veteran groups to publicly oppose communism and every other ideology which seeks to make inroads in America to either weaken or destroy our democratic institutions. We are committed to the task of bringing to the attention of the American people the dangers of permitting these ideologies to penetrate any further. We intend that our activities in this important movement reach out to every American, including the young ones now being prepared for the duties of citizenship. These children will one day have the responsibility of directing and preserving our freedom. We must make known to them in their youth the advantages and privileges which flow from a free form of government and the terror and oppression which come to people of lands where freedom such as we enjoy is unknown. We must not permit the false philosophies and untruths spread by those who seek to destroy us to remain unanswered. We must vigorously bring to their attention the unalterable truth that our way of life is the best known to the human race. The Regular Veterans' Association is committed to the task of spreading this knowledge everywhere. To aid in this most important program we have recently formed and are sponsoring an organization to which all people who believe in our form of government are eligible for membership, namely, Freedom Incorporated, the primary objective of which is to combat communism and every other ideology dangerous to our institutions. We believe a campaign is essential which will disseminate information through the press, magazines, periodicals, the radio, public forums, and speakers' bureaus to destroy the myth that there is a better way of life than the one known to us. We invite all Americans who love liberty to join with us in this effort.

We believe that we must be militarily strong until such time as peace is assured. We must have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Corps; one second to none. We cannot otherwise make secure to our people the concept of life so dear to all of us. We favor universal military training as necessary and just under our form of government to aid in maintaining our national security.

In an effort to bring about permanent peace in the world we support the organization of the United Nations as the means most likely to achieve this end.

We urge for the servicemen of the Regular armed forces and the veterans of our wars and their dependents full consideration for their needs. The disabled are entitled to just compensation, proper hospitalization, and full rehabilitation wherever possible. We must help them to be restored to a life of usefulness. On behalf of disabled veterans we urge that Veterans' Administration hospitals now maintained be kept under the direct control and independent direction of the Veterans' Administration. We do not approve of the effort now being made to consolidate them with the armed forces general hospitals. This in our opinion would operate to the detriment of the veteran and deprive him of adequate hospital facilities. We must not permit this.

We recommend that steps be taken to provide additional housing for the United States Soldiers' Home. The permanently disabled and retired soldiers of the Regular services need some permanent home for their comfort and welfare, where they personally are unable to provide one. The funds for additional housing are presently available, the same having accumulated from their service pay while on active duty. It is difficult to understand why these men are kept waiting and denied admission for lack of facilities when the money necessary to erect additional housing is presently available. We urge that a suitable building program for the United States Soldiers' Home be enacted immediately.

This organization is supporting equal disability compensation for peacetime servicemen and war veterans alike. We feel that all of them are entitled to just compensation for their disabilities, but on equal standards. Lack of parity in the payment of compensation to both groups should be immediately remedied. We have recommended legislation to provide the same standard of compensation for both groups and we urge its adoption by the Congress.

As a final word the Regular Veterans' Association urges upon servicemen, war veterans, and all the American people a united effort to keep alive the torch of liberty. Let all of us work together for the common good. Let no group for selfish purposes ask for any special privilege which would tend to weaken or destroy our economy or our American way of life.

Address to Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address at the Women's Army Corps Training Center officer candidate graduation ceremonies, Camp Lee, Va., on Friday, April 1, 1949:

INTRODUCTION BY LT. COL. ELIZABETH SMITH, COMMANDANT OF WAC TRAINING CENTER

The exigencies of total war presented demands upon the resources of our country far beyond any which we had ever known. The utilization of the skills and the patriotism of American women presented itself as a national potentiality to many of our country's leaders. From one of these came a positive, strong, courageous advocacy of this utilization in its most practical form as a part of the Army of the United States.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who was that advocate, is our distinguished guest this afternoon. Her record as dean of our Congresswomen speaks for itself in constructive legislation. Her faith and confidence in the abilities of American women is also a matter of historical record.

Her championship of the WAC as a permanent part of our plan of national security made an inestimable contribution to our present legal status as a part of the Regular Army.

It is my privilege to present to this audience the woman who introduced, sponsored, and championed the original legislation which brought into existence the WAC—the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

REMARKS OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MASSACHUSETTS

First, I want to tell you what a pleasure it is to me to come to Camp Lee and speak before you who are graduating as officers in Women's Army Corps, so ably led by Col. Mary Halloran of my own city of Lowell, Mass.

This day has special significance to you—it represents a great many weeks of intensive training to prepare for the responsibilities of being an officer in the Army. It represents more, too, in that all of you gave quite a bit of service before you came here to work for a commission. But more than this, your graduation day represents a day on which our Nation has proved its recognition of the fact that national defense is the business of every American. Women since the Revolutionary War have shown their interest in security as much as have men. Men have died for democracy—so have women. Women have gone wherever duty has called them and it has been their duty to serve to the best of their ability—just as this is a man's duty.

Today proves that the Nation, finally, has seen the truth of this—today is just as important as that day in May 1942 when you came into being—because today represents the final step in the historical process which marked the important milestone of that year.

Let's look back for a moment. There have been 7 years of trial—a period far longer than is given to other so-called new trial ideas. Moreover, this trial is in name only, because women, in or out of uniform, have always felt this way in this Nation.

Remember that this trial will never end. Those who are doing a job are always subject to criticism from the sidelines. You have heard, and will always hear, many statements about your Corps. You will hear it said of you that you are helping to glamorize war and militarism, but you will remember that there was no glamor where you were on Normandy Beach shortly after D-day.

You will hear it said that you are of fragile morale and require special treatment. But you will remember that many of you were far from your homes and the security of your native shores for as long as 3 years at a time during wartime. You lived in tents and mud, dugouts, Quonset huts; you

washed in helmets and were packed into troop transports for days while crossing an enemy-infested ocean.

It will be said that the public has not accepted you. This in part is true—there will never be total acceptance of the great American public of anything—that's what makes democracy! But the way to gain public acceptance is not to argue about it, but do your job with quiet efficiency. Proof is in the pudding. It is the work produced which wins acceptance, not the words which are spoken about it.

Bear these things in mind: Never forget that you are here because the Nation's Congress wanted it—and that you achieved it through democratic forms.

Never forget that the Army wanted you and proved it by making you part of the Regular Military Establishment.

And never forget that all of this came about because of the good job done by you personally, and thousands of women in the service.

Now—you must meet the standard of that work—it is a heritage—a proud one. But you know all of these things. If you did not, you would not be here in the first place—and because you know these things I am confident of the high quality of work you are going to do.

I know that you will accept the responsibilities of your new office with an acute awareness of its importance to the Army and to the people.

I know you will bear in mind at all times that the greatest portion of your mission in uniform is service! I know that you will enlarge on the qualities of stamina, endurance, and adaptability—that you will ask for no special privileges or consideration—and that in your relations with your sister services, you will recognize their unquestionably equal contribution to the Nation.

Last of all—be proud!

Be proud, not with the vocal, garrulous type of pride which springs from a secret inferiority complex, but with the quiet real pride of a woman who knows the real truth about herself—that she has been selected and trained for a job she can do and that she is in the company not only of the Wacs who have worn their uniform with honor and efficiency, but of all those men and women, past and present, in all services, who have led or are leading a life dedicated to the service of their Nation.

Depression Fears Flouted by Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Times of April 13, 1949, entitled "Depression Fears Flouted by Facts":

DEPRESSION FEARS FLOUTED BY FACTS—DR. REED, OF THOMPSON AGENCY, ASSERTS JITTERS IN BUSINESS IS PSYCHOLOGICAL ILLNESS

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Business' current case of jitters can be pampered into a nervous break-down, or make a hypochondriac out of an organically sound economy, but it will be wholly psychological, not a mortal illness.

Opening an interview last week with this medical metaphor, Dr. Vergil D. Reed, associate director of research for the J. Walter Thompson advertising agency, vigorously attacked depression fears with a deskful of facts. Commenting that he recently had met with some serious cases of jitters among business executives, of the let-me-cry-on-your-shoulder variety, he described the victims as so busy looking for hidden weaknesses that they entirely overlook hidden strengths.

In every instance, he continued, it was admitted that advertising budgets had been cut. "Naturally, sales are going to fall off if you stop advertising. Under present favorable circumstances, American business will have to try very hard indeed to become a hypochondriac, let alone make itself really sick. Faith must be bigger than fear."

EMPLOYMENT STILL AHEAD

Concern over the current unemployment total of some 3,000,000 appears foolish, Dr. Reed said, when it is placed beside the facts that the number of persons employed in December of last year and January and February of this year was higher than in the same months a year before.

"The small increase in unemployment for those months can be accounted for by new additions to the labor force. The usual seasonal increase in employment started in March can easily digest the additions. Even in good times, an unemployment of 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 is necessary before selectivity can be exercised in hiring employees. In fact, it takes an unemployment of at least 2,500,000 to take care of those who are changing jobs or shifting from place to place."

Dr. Reed recalled that unemployment during postwar reconversion, gloomily forecast as approaching 10,000,000 to 12,000,000, actually turned out to be no more than 2,700,000. "Strangely enough," he remarked, "many business and Government leaders alike have grossly underestimated the vitality and stamina of the American economy, its industries, as well as the market."

Changes in markets, while always occurring, are extremely rapid in a period like the present, Dr. Reed said. "Right now," he added, "when competitors get scared, is the cheapest time to buy leadership in a market."

Turning to doubts about purchasing power, Dr. Reed declared that it is now 50 percent over 1940 in terms of goods and services rather than mere dollars. Discretionary buying power, that remaining after essentials have been provided, is four times that of 1940, he said. Savings of individuals, he continued, are approximately three times greater than in 1940, and the rate of saving is still high.

"Consumer debt is very low in relation to both income and savings," Dr. Reed noted, "in spite of the alarm recently expressed by some. Consumer long and short term debts combined are about 32 percent of aggregate individual savings, compared to 99 percent in 1940.

"The rate of family formations remains high, and in spite of a gradual decline in the birth rate, to be expected, live births for 1948 are estimated to have been 3,715,000. The abnormally high birth rates of the war and immediate postwar years have added an unexpected bonus to the American market."

Farmers' income in 1948 was three times that of 1940, Dr. Reed said, and farmers' cash assets in 1948 were $22,000,000,000, against $5,000,000,000 in 1940. Wages are expected to remain at least as high as last year, he added, and there will be the additional "props" of $5,000,000,000 in economic recovery program funds and $15,000,000,000 in military expenditures.

Producing additional facts, Dr. Reed recalled that in the last quarter of 1948 the value of the gross national product was at the rate of $265,000,000,000, and payment to individuals at the rate of $221,000,000,000. He estimated that the gross national product this year will approximate $245,000,000,000.

It is fundamental economics that with reduction of prices the dollar will become more valuable, he pointed out, and added that concern with dollar totals was a delusion. "Business men," he said, "always want to compare their latest sales year to their worst, instead of their best. It's all psychological."

Ownership of Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Joint Memorial 3 adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 3

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters, and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not; and

Whereas under the common law and civil law the States' sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed, and respected by the Federal Government whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government; and

Whereas the States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands but retained same to and for the States; and

Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S. v. California*, while not deciding the question of ownership of the tidewater lands of California, casts a cloud on the State's title to said lands and the minerals and other natural resources beneath; and

Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the matter of ownership of said tidewater lands is still a question for the Congress to decide; and

Whereas the title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendible to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to the minerals and other natural resources or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States; and

Whereas this cloud of uncertainty affects minerals, fisheries, and all other natural resources and should be removed by the Congress, thereby acknowledging and reaffirming ownership to the States; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill, reaffirming and acknowledging ownership in the submerged lands and resources of the respective States and quitclaiming all right and title thereto to the respective States, reserving only a paramount right to the Government in case of national defense, by a vote of 198 for to 26 against, but the measure

died in the Senate by the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and enact suitable legislation for the purpose of acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources thereof to the respective States in accordance with the heretofore long-recognized constitutional rights of the States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collectively give wholehearted support to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

Adopted by senate March 7, 1949.

WM. E. WALSH,
President of Senate.

Concurred in by house March 28, 1949.

FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
Speaker of House.

Hawaii Youth Calls for War on Communism in Prize-Winning Essay of DAR Contest—People of Territory Combat Subversive Influences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a speaking contest conducted by the Daughters of the American Revolution in Hawaii late last fall brought forth many fine expressions of American patriotism from the youth of our territory, the most eloquent of which came from Archie Makaiwi, grade 11, of the Wallace Rider Farrington High School.

I am presenting this young man's first-prize-winning speech for publication in the RECORD in hopes that it will receive the careful attention of Members of Congress. It is a splendid manifestation of the high standards of American citizenship that generally rule the attitudes of the youth in the schools of Hawaii. It is one of many speeches made in this contest that should be proof enough that the youth of the islands are not yielding to Communist influences despite the fact that one contestant, and only one, in a preliminary contest in one of the high schools delivered a pro-Communist speech.

This incident was recently brought to the attention of Congress when the speech in question was incorporated in the RECORD without pointing out the circumstances under which it was made and the fact that its appearance was the object of an immediate investigation by the Department of Public Instruction in Hawaii.

The widespread public attention given the department's investigation and the prompt steps taken by the Commissioners of Public Instruction warning the entire teaching staff of the Territory to beware of Communist influences is but one of many incidents that prove the people of Hawaii are completely alert to this problem and entirely capable of dealing with it.

And the utterances of the youth in the schools is evidence that they are, with rare exceptions, equally awake to this menace. The speech of Archie Makaiwi should be proof enough of this.

It follows:

MY PLEA FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Archie Makaiwi, grade 11, W. R. Farrington High School, Honolulu, T. H., DAR contest speech)

Suppose you were a young American of George Washington's day and some grave gentleman in a wig, brocaded coat, and knee breeches asked why the history of your country was worth understanding, you would have said: "Because it is the story of how a people came from Europe to be free to govern themselves, worship as they saw fit, and make a living as they pleased, and how they finally fought a long and bloody war to establish complete liberty".

Suppose you were a young American of Andrew Jackson's day, and some backwoodsmen in buckskin leggings and hunting shirt asked the same question, you would have replied: "Because ours is the story of how a free people spread themselves over the wild West, hewed their homes out of the wilderness, and made the common man the equal of the richest aristocrat, thus showing that democracy could not only hold its own, but grow."

Or suppose you were a young American of Lincoln's day responding to the same inquiry. To your questioner you would have said: "Ours is the story of how a free people after expanding from ocean to ocean, proved to the jealous Old World that it could endure a great civil war, and could rid itself of slavery."

And finally, suppose you were a young American of Woodrow Wilson's day. You might have said: "The history of our country is worth understanding because it is the story of a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the welfare of the common man, a Nation which went to the aid of freedom when it was threatened in other lands, fought for justice throughout the world, and tried to lead other nations into peace."

This is the background of our continuous struggle for democracy; and with these thoughts in our mind, will and can we sacrifice our own democratic heritage by ignoring the fact that communism is within our own country?

With this as our background, will we let communism grow to the extent where our own people will be devoured by this hungry monster?

We, the youths of today and the leaders of tomorrow, must educate ourselves to rise and defend our Government. We must rally to a cause and rid ourselves of this undemocratic society.

This is my plea to all of you.

For the Russians, any inroad into our democracy is occasion for a joyous celebration, a victorious harvest, for they know that a lifetime dream has come true. The seed they planted has at last grown to an extent where the plant is beginning to bear fruit. They know that we are human beings after all. That we will be tempted to taste this fruit, a fruit so bitter, so tasteless, so rotten, yet appetizing enough so some people lower their integrity by working for a foreign ideology.

What can we do? What will we say?

We can wage another war, a war against communism. Our weapons will be our books, books to let the world read the words or phrases compiled by men of wisdom who believed in a free and equal government, government by the people, for the people, and of the people. Our weapons will be our pencils—pencils to write out these thoughts of our free government. Our weapons will be our papers—papers to decree these thoughts and prove to the world what we aim to accomplish. And our weapons will be our voices, voices to explain to the world our form of government, to educate the meek and uncertain, and to rally the strong to be aware of the diseased nucleus of communism.

I am sure that with the rightful use of these weapons our battle, though perhaps a hard-fought one, will be a victorious one.

My voice is a single one and a very small one out of many millions. But I know that the American people will echo this feeling and together we will blend our voices and shout our praises, and let the world know we will and can win this battle.

Only then can we march home, home to a country, home to a people, home to a government we are proud of, home to the land of democracy.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Speaker, following the disclosure that a pro-Communist speech was presented in a preliminary phase of this contest in one high school, the commissioners of public instruction of Hawaii adopted a statement of policy as follows:

Teachers should be alert to the possibility of Communist propaganda from sources outside the school system being introduced into the thinking of students in connection with essay and speech contests. One instance of this has recently been reported and thoroughly investigated. Constant vigilance is essential for two reasons.

Not only must we guard against subversive groups, thus gaining back-door access to the public schools and indirectly using the classrooms as a forum for their propaganda, but equally important is our responsibility for the education of the individual student who may be misled by antidemocratic totalitarian doctrine. Loyal teachers will know how to develop appreciation of democracy and faith in American institutions.

The appropriate educational method is simple but effective. One teacher, for example, in dealing with a student who had made a bid for attention by repeating Communist Party-line propaganda found that merely holding the student responsible for reading and presenting the arguments against communism was sufficient to counteract any subversive influence and begin to build in the student the intelligent and informed loyalty essential to good citizeneship.

Superintendent of Schools, Dr. W. Harold Loper, said:

The department is on the alert to deal promptly and decisively with any subversive activity in the entire school system.

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS

The board of commissioners, after adopting their statement of policy, issued the following statement to the press in Honolulu:

The commissioners of public instruction at their meeting yesterday adopted a policy warning teachers to be on the alert for the possibility of Communist propaganda coming into the schools from sources outside the system. The occasion for this action was a pro-Communist essay written with outside help by a Kaimuka High School student and delivered in a DAR speech contest held at the school last November.

The young lady who wrote the paper frankly admits having received help in the form of pamphlets and ideas from a member of the Communist Party but says she took the initiative in contacting him rather than the other way around. A portion of her

speech was based upon comments of Dr. Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York, as quoted in a London paper, and in the Honolulu Advertiser of November 11.

The matter was investigated shortly after the contest and dealt with rather effectively as an educational problem. The outside-help angle came to light and was investigated only recently. The student says she is not a Communist and that she took the pro-Communist line just to be different and attract attention, and that she is interested in entering a forthcoming contest with a paper on the function of education in a democracy.

Everyone interviewed in this connection now agrees that the speech should have been excluded from the school finals and followed up merely as an individual educational problem. Allowing it to go on the program was a mistake in judgment at the time. It is worth noting that the last of four speakers in the school finals, a young veteran of World War II who has had some personal experience with communism in the Orient, won a most enthusiastic applause with his speech against communism.

The statement of policy adopted by the commissioners is being issued to all schools to put teachers on the alert for totalitarian propaganda stemming from sources beyond their control.

DAR APPROVES ACTION

The DAR rules for the speech contest allowed free choice of subject and indicated that the speeches were to be judged on organization, knowledge, English construction, and delivery.

Following the press release, the Honolulu Advertiser printed the following item:

DAR PRAISES BOARD STAND ON PRO-RED TALK

Members of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at their annual Hawaii State Conference here Saturday adopted a resolution commending the school department and school commissioners for their action in the case of the pro-Communist essay written by a Kaimuki high-school girl. The essay was written in connection with preliminaries to the annual DAR essay contest held here last year. It was not selected for presentation in the final contest.

The DAR members voted a rising vote of thanks to the department of public instruction for its hearty cooperation in the holding of the annual speech contest of Aloha chapter, DAR, and to commend the commissioners upon the sensible and effective way in which the present situation with regard to one of the speeches on communism had been handled.

Mrs. Reginald W. Carter, State regent, presided at the conference. An officer of the DAR said that the student who delivered the pro-Red speech was never in the finals but took part only in the school's preliminary contest.

Poage Oleo Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Poage bill because I believe the taxes and licenses now imposed upon the manufacture, distribution, and retail sale of oleo and other types of margarine are unjust, and should be removed.

I also believe that oleo and other types of healthful margarine should be allowed to move in interstate commerce without any restriction, other than the restrictions normally imposed by law on all interstate commerce.

I am sympathetic to the interests of the dairy farmers of this country, but they themselves, acting through their various organizations have, as I understand it, agreed that the taxes and licenses now imposed on oleomargarine should be removed. At least they are making no fight against the removal of the taxes and licenses. Their logical objections then are to the sale of colored oleomargarine as butter. The Poage bill in my judgment provides the necessary safeguards.

Under the Poage bill, the manufacturers of oleo must clearly label it as such. This binding restriction of course applies to the distributor and the retail seller. The restaurant that serves it must clearly indicate in one of the several ways provided in the bill that it is serving oleomargarine.

So, when this bill is passed, all parties will be given a reasonable protection. The housewife can buy oelo, colored or uncolored, as she desires and as the family budget will permit. The patron of a restaurant will know whether he is getting butter or oleo. The discriminatory taxes and licenses, first imposed by this Government in 1886, will be removed. Housewives will be saved the laborious hours presently spent in coloring their oleomargarine. Oleo sells on the market at a price of approximately 60 percent of the cost of butter. It is nutritious, wholesome, and healthful. Those of us who desire to use it, should be allowed to do so without restraint.

Some of the gentlemen who have spoken here have tried to make an economic or sectional issue of the debate on this bill. As I have tried to state, I believe the bigger issue is the welfare of all our population. When I forget the side issues, it is crystal clear to me that we should allow those who desire to buy and use oleomargarine to do so without penalty.

We hear a lot about free enterprise in this country and in this House. I believe in free enterprise. The principle of free enterprise would suggest that we allow the oleomargarine industry to be free to develop itself without being unduly penalized or discriminated against.

The district that I represent might be called a "cotton" district. Cotton is the biggest money crop. However, the district has great dairy and cattle possibilities.

A large percentage of our cottonseed oil goes into the manufacture of oleomargarine.

I believe that the dairy industry in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama will continue to grow. Our fine climate that allows 10 months grazing is a factor that is being recognized more and more. I look forward to the day when there will be a greater balance in my district between a diversified agriculture—cotton, corn, dairying, truck crops, poultry, livestock, fruit and vegetables—on the one hand and a diversified industry on the other. I do not believe we can have this development by unduly penalizing one section of the economy at the expense of another. This bill does not give oleomargarine any advantage. It only places it on a par of equality with our other industries. I think this bill should pass.

Arizona's Pitch Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial written in the Los Angeles Daily News of March 31, 1949, by Manchester Boddy, distinguished editor and publisher of that daily paper:

ARIZONA'S PITCH GAME

(By Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher)

Californians have good reason to be concerned over Arizona's latest move to circumvent the Colorado River water compacts, particularly since there is growing evidence that the Truman administration has been wooed into supporting Arizona at California's expense.

By the indirect route of advocating the $738,000,000 central Arizona project, which can only mean giving Arizona 1,200,000 acre-feet of water to which she is not entitled under the agreements, the Arizona water lobby is knifing at vital local interests.

The strategy of the Arizona water grabbers seems to be something like this: (1) California isn't using all of its 5,362,000 acre-feet allocation and won't need it all for another 40 years (a fallacy); and (2) by that time new sources of water supply can be developed; therefore, (3) why not let Arizona have the 1,200,000 acre-feet for her project now?

Such new water resources (suggested by Under Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman) are set forth as: (1) Distilled sea water; (2) hauling water from the Columbia River in Oregon; or (3) tapping remote mountain streams.

Well, as the late President Roosevelt was wont to say, "That's a pretty 'iffy' proposition." Certainly California isn't going to trade its blue-chip water supply, already developed and assured, for a wildcat possibility that may turn out to be a dry hole.

Distilling sea water on an experimental basis by the Reclamation Bureau has been proposed in a bill introduced into Congress by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. The bill would appropriate $30,000,000 for research and pilot plants. California should indeed support this bill, for it cannot afford to be placed in the position of blocking the advance of science. But such support should not be turned into a weapon against itself. Present information advanced by experts is that sea-water purification on a quantity basis sufficient to supply southern California would cost 25 times that of our present supply. It is apparent that our agriculture and industry would collapse and die under such a system that imposed higher costs.

For that matter, why should California, with its $500,000,000 investment in Colorado

water installations, be the goat? Why not, instead, let Arizona wait out the results of this research and then, if it proves feasible, install its own sea-water pumping and distilling system from the Gulf of California, by way of a treaty with Mexico? It certainly would cost no more than its present larcenous central Arizona project idea.

As for the alternate sources of supply so glibly advanced by Arizona propagandists—Columbia River water and remote mountain streams—they hardly bear mentioning. An exhaustive Daily News series on water sources last May examined all these methods and found them not feasible or economic for decades to come—and then only under conditions of near disaster where cost would be no object.

In a recent blistering historical review of the 30-year California-Arizona water controversy, Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, San Pedro, summed up the matter very well when he said: "How can Arizona get additional water? Only by taking it from California.

"Arizona is not concerned that California has contracts with the Federal Government for 5,362,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water. Break these contracts, says Arizona; the Government had no right to sign them. California is not entitled to this water."

Arizona has been playing this same broken record for over 30 years—including two appearances before the United States Supreme Court, both lost by her. California is willing to adjudicate the matter before the same tribunal again. But Arizona isn't. It appears that she wants water by whatever method; not merely such an abstract thing as justice.

We repeat: The situation is very serious in Washington. Congressmen from other States, not familiar with the whole involved legal and economic implications, are intrigued by Arizona's latest pitch game, which on its face appears reasonable. Only those desperately familiar with the problem, through years and years of experience, can know the fallacy of Arizona's proposals. For that reason California must again mount its guard and by every honorable means mobilize its forces to acquaint the Nation with the true situation.

Where Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an item entitled "And How Are You?" dealing with an important meeting held in Chicago, Ill., during 1923, and which deals with 10 of the world's most successful financiers and their present whereabouts. The item brings out very forcefully the fact that all of these men learned well the art of making money, but not one of them learned how to live. The item follows:

AND HOW ARE YOU?

In 1923 a very important meeting was held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago. Attending this meeting were 10 of the world's most successful financiers. Those present were the president of the largest independent steel company, the president of the National City Bank, the president of the largest utility company, the president of the largest gas company, the greatest wheat speculator, the president of the New York Stock Exchange, a member of the President's Cabinet, the greatest "bear" in Wall Street, head of the world's greatest monopoly, president of the Bank of International Settlements.

Certainly we must admit that here were gathered a group of the world's most successful men. At least men who had found the secret of making money. Twenty-five years later, let's see where those men are.

The president of the largest independent steel company—Charles Schwab, died a bankrupt and lived on borrowed money for 5 years before his death.

The president of the greatest utility company—Samuel Insull, died a fugitive from justice and penniless in a foreign land.

The president of the largest gas company—Howard Hopson, is now insane.

The greatest wheat speculator—Arthur Cutton, died abroad insolvent.

The president of the New York Stock Exchange—Richard Whitney, was recently released from Sing Sing Penitentiary.

The member of the President's Cabinet—Albert Fall, was pardoned from prison so he could die at home.

The greatest "bear" in Wall Street—Jesse Livermore, died a suicide.

The head of the greatest monopoly—Ivor Krueger, died a suicide.

The president of the Bank of International Settlements—Leon Fraser, died a suicide.

All of these men learned well the art of making money, but not one of them learned how to live.

British Dentists Discuss Outlook Under Nationalization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 I placed in the RECORD the eighth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 27, is the ninth of the series:

BRITISH DENTISTS DISCUSS OUTLOOK UNDER NATIONALIZATION PROGRAM

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Ninth in a series)

LONDON, March 26.—British dentists are becoming reconciled to their role in the new national health service and will be happy if it is allowed to roll along as is, but with more weight given to the considered opinions of the ethical spheres of the profession concerning techniques and policies.

They think they always will be in danger of regimentation and this may be just the beginning of a long-range plot to cast them into the position of being full-time paid public servants with little individual freedom.

Let us present the viewpoints of several of the more conservative kinds of dentists, topflight men who have had good private practices.

DOUBTFUL OF FUTURE

"Yes, I was against the scheme," says one at a luncheon at his country club, 50 miles outside of London. "I thought there was too much regimentation in it but I came in in January. I grant the Government is not domineering now. I hate to think that may not be so later."

"He" gets into the conversations often. "He" is Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, the big bad wolf in the minds of the middle and upper classes and the professional men. So "he" always will mean Aneurin Bevan.

One speaker resumes: "What I think he will do is reduce the fees all around to such an extent a large number will not want to work the scheme. The public is becoming accustomed to it and ever to start a private practice again will be impossible."

FLAT-SALARY CLINIC WORK

"Then we may be forced to work in a clinic at an annual wage. That is wholly my own fear. It will not come in my time, but we have the coming generations to think about. The standard will descend to a low point. It will not be good dentistry."

This dental leader, who has been a member of committees setting forth high principles, deplores the Ministry's attitude on dentures. He explains:

"My contention is this: The biggest blot today is the denture. My average patient wants a denture that will be a credit to him and an esthetic job cannot be turned out for the $42, which is the Government's allowance for one. I would not want my wife or daughter to wear one of them."

SERVICEABLE JOB

"It is a good serviceable job, it will fit all right, but it has no finesse. My average fee for dentures for private patients is $126. The difference between the two dentures is the workmanship. The health-plan denture may be set up in 30 or 40 minutes. Mine takes over 2 hours. I like to have a photograph of the patient when he had all his teeth. It helps me to maintain his good appearance."

The dentist thinks the fees for the remainder of the dental program are reasonable and he has no complaint against them. The denture part of it gives him the horrors and he bemoans the fact that he is doing work that he considers to be undesirable, even though useful.

Another dental surgeon in the better-than-average class gives us some of his ideas.

BETTER THAN EXPECTED

"It's much better than I expected it could be," he starts off. "There isn't nearly as much red tape as I anticipated. The forms are many in number, that's true, but they are explicit and not complicated and a good nurse can keep them in order and get scores of them required into the mail every night.

"We regret that in our field, as in everything else, we have rogues who are working this plan to get themselves $40,000 a year. Whoever told 'him' that $19,200 a year gross income is adequate for a dentist was very near the mark. If a dentist does legitimate work he cannot do more than that under the Government scale of fees.

"I still do much private practice. My turnover under the health plan in February was $1,468, and it was about the same in January. I work from 8:45 in the morning to 6:30 at night, with an hour and a half off for lunch and 20 minutes off for tea. I work 4½ days."

QUITE ABSURD

"If I were working fulltime making dentures under the scheme I would make $1,600 before a month would be up. Under the new rule I would get only 50 percent of the fee after that. After I paid my costs I would have a profit of only $2.20 per denture. That is quite absurd, and I wouldn't do it."

We move along and steal some of the valuable time of a third dentist. He goes into the problem of meeting the heavy demand from the public.

"I just can't do otherwise than let patients wait for treatments," he declares. "My bookings are 4 weeks ahead, but if someone comes in here in pain I manage to give him some immediate care, though it may be only temporary in nature.

"It would be easy to book much more than 4 weeks ahead, but it is not wise to do so. When a patient comes in for the first time he may need six or seven treatments, and I want to get those all in inside of a month. You see, we do not get paid until we finish up with a patient and have him sign a statement that we have concluded with him. I keep openings through my 4 weeks of appointments to insert these newcomers."

England and Some of the Worth-While Things She Has Accomplished, as Told by Col. Robert R. McCormick, of Chicago, and Reprinted in the Chicago Tribune of March 20, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an address of Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, delivered over WGN on Saturday evening, March 19, 1949, and reprinted in the Chicago Tribune of March 20, 1949:

ENGLISH HISTORY

(Following is an address by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, delivered last night on the Chicago Theater of the Air over WGN, and the Mutual Broadcasting system.)

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

Visiting the conscientious and able governors of Jamaica and Trinidad, it occurred to me that propagandists are so busy trying to make England out to be what she is not, that they have overlooked the really tremendous claims she has to our admiration and gratitude.

It is a fair generalization to say that modern England began at the time of Queen Elizabeth. The revolution of Henry VIII was over, and there swept in a whole series of events. First, let us consider the English language. The ancient English of Chaucer had passed through the period of Spenser and burst into refulgence with Shakespeare. I have never heard the supremacy of Shakespeare challenged in behalf of any post-Dark Ages author. The claims of Homer and the Greek tragedians, who were what Shakespeare was not, great moralists, need not be considered here.

Shakespeare was followed by a half dozen Fletchers, then by Milton and the King James version of the Bible, and the language was established to stay.

I have heard Luther's Bible compared favorably to that of King James, but as I do not read German, I cannot make the comparison. Certainly the French plays and poems fall far behind the great Englishman.

The sonorousness of the English language makes it supreme in poetry, prose, and in oratory and fortunately does not lend itself to the vituperation achieved by Hitler in the German tongue.

Compared with our Virginia philosophers, Franklin, Lincoln, even Borah, English political literature does not shine, but it is far superior to the anarchist mouthings of the Rousseau school and the brutal teachings of Nietzsche and Treitschke.

England extended her language to Scotland and to Ireland. The greatest Scotch writers, Sir Walter Scott, who wrote for an English audience, and the patriot, Robert Burns, who borrowed the immortal phrase "chains and slavery" from Patrick Henry, both wrote in English as did the famous Irish authors.

It is satirical that George Bernard Shaw used the English language to destroy the nation which forced it upon his ancestors. Before that Irish nationalists under the lead of the Welshman Lloyd George destroyed the veto of the House of Lords, reducing the Government of England to the tyranny of one House. We did well to keep English as our national language. It is sure to become the world language.

England did not originate the system of conquering and imposing tyrannies upon weaker people. The Portuguese came first in that field, the Spanish second; and then the Dutch and French.

In the early days, its brutalities were excused as crusades. By the time the English entered the field, it had become plain, commercial larceny, accepted by all that called itself the civilized world. British conduct, according to our ethics, was evil, but, compared to its contemporaries, almost humane.

In her world conquests, England showed great statesmanship. All over the world, she permitted small Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and French colonies, thus not driving her defeated rivals to desperation. She also permitted local princelings to rule—in her interest—and unquestionably reduced their excesses.

The India Company was nothing but chartered piracy; the rule of the viceroy a would-be beneficent autocracy that finally fell before a changing world.

In her great wars, our sympathy goes to England. Certainly the world would have been worse for the success of the Armada, of Louis XIV, or Napoleon.

In the reign of Elizabeth, again we find the English common law at its height, when the judges told the Queen that her gifts of monopolies to her lovers were illegal. At one time the courts even held that Parliament could not change the common law. It was a sad day for England when this doctrine passed away.

In the mistaken effort to make out that the English gave us at least the base of our Constitution, it is entirely overlooked that she did give us her common law, which works hand in hand with the Constitution in opposing the efforts of subversives to destroy our liberties.

The Church of England came back with Henry VIII, was abolished under Mary, and returned with Elizabeth. As the state church, it has partaken of all of the vicissitudes of English revolutions and even English politics. Of it, the late Bishop George Craig Stewart, of the Episcopalian diocese of Chicago, remarked that the Church of England is really England. The Reverend John Evans, an Episcopalian rector, believes that most American Episcopalian bishops would assent to some form of that statement. He continues:

"All bishops of the American Episcopal Church acknowledge the Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, as their spiritual supreme as well as the chief bishop of the world-encircling Anglican communion. That communion is composed of a score of completely autonomous churches, including the Episcopal Church in the United States as well as many younger mission churches, which are autonomous to the extent that they support themselves. The ties that bind the communion together are maternal rather than ecclesiastical. Such, however, can be more potent than organic bonds.

"Significance of Bishop Stewart's remark is deepened by the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury traditionally has crowned English sovereigns. Such coronations literally are ecclesiastical consecrations of kings who become not only head of state, but also temporal head of the church.

"While it is true that the designation of King George VI, as the temporal head of the American Episcopal Church would be both ridiculed and denied, yet the flavor of that long tradition in England lingers with an undeniable influence on the attitudes of American Episcopalians toward England. Evidence of this was observed when Edward Windsor visited Chicago in 1924 as Prince of Wales and heir apparent to the throne of George V.

"The round of Chicago's hospitality began with a celebration of holy communion in old St. James Episcopal Church. The Prince read the Epistle from without the sanctuary just as a Prince of Wales always may do if he wishes in any church of the Anglican communion throughout the world."

Lord Macaulay, the British historian, found the most distinguished feature of the Church of England to be "its relation to the monarchy and the sway the sovereign had over it." So strong was this feeling of loyalty that a number of bishops stood by the Catholic James II and against the Protestant Parliament of William and Mary, forfeiting their livings thereby. The higher clergy were once appointed by the King, now actually by the Prime Minister. One of these, Disraeli, although baptised in childhood, was always a Jew at heart; another, Lloyd George, was a Welsh noncomformist; Bonar Law, a Presbyterian. Their appointments of Anglican bishops appear to have occasioned no protests. The lower clergy have been the patronage of the larger land owners. The doctrines of the church, originally set by the King, are now a matter of parliamentary regulation. A proposed change in dogma was defeated in Parliament some years ago.

Whatever the vicissitudes of the Crown, it has always been the head of society; so that except for a few, very old Catholic families, anyone of social ambition must belong to the Church of England, a status which is growing in Northern Ireland as well as in the United States.

In the Revolutionary War, the Church of England was unanimously Tory. As such, it was ejected from the country. In order to reestablish itself after religious toleration had been created, Episcopal clergymen had to go to a nonjuring bishop of Scotland for ordination, because the Archbishop of Canterbury would not ordain anyone who did not take the oath of loyalty to the King.

This formality has since been done away with but the substance remains. The Church of England in the United States is English. It unanimously supported England in getting us into the recent two wars, and it is worth while to note the President Franklin Roosevelt and the last four Secretaries of State have been Episcopalians.

While endeavoring to enforce conformity on the English-speaking people, the Church of England has not been a missionary church. It is taking little interest in the colored subjects of the Empire. It was largely from ignored American missionaries and hospitals that the Chinese and Indians learned the principles of freedom that overthrew the Empire. One of the inconsistencies that puzzles non-Episcopalians is the violent antipathy of the English church and the royal family to divorce, when one considers that both came into existence through Henry VIII, who divorced three queens.

England owes her banking system to the Dutch, introduced by King William III, and by the Scotch with the Union.

From then on to World War I, England was the world's banker. Now without the financial resources to back it, her prestige is still dominant.

In achievements of abstract science, England ranks among the highest. Her application of steam brought in the industrial revolution and modern standards of living. It also heralded labor strife. Serfs who for centuries had seen no chance of betterment, resolved to share in the new prosperity, while the emerging middle class fought to maintain and increase the slender capital which began to come into existence.

Ireland forms a black page in England's history. For that part that came after the Battle of the Boyne, I can find no mitigation, but it is supplied by the Irish author, Shane Leslie, of an old Irish Protestant family, recently turned Catholic, in his book, The Irish Tangle.

From the time of Elizabeth, English politics have been constantly anachronistic. The failures of the Long Parliament and of Cromwell were as tragic as the French Revolution. After this collapse, the aristocracy had recourse to a series of expedients. A Dutch commoner, in the person of William of Holland, with Mary, a royal English wife, were invited with a French Huguenot general to drive the Stuarts from the throne. They were successful, but issue continuously failing, the Whigs had recourse to a whole series of German princelings to give an atmosphere of royal legality to the aristocratic usurpation. Dr. Johnson horrified Boswell by saying that if popular opinion could prevail, the then rulers of England would all be hanged.

In the present English unrest, the royal family is turning to Scotland again, naming the German blooded husband of Princess Elizabeth, Duke of Edinburgh, and the heir to the throne Charles, in recognition of the Stuarts. The present Queen of England is of commoner birth in that country, but in Scotland is a resident of the Glamis Castle of Macbeth and royal as a descendant of Robert Bruce.

It was one of the German princelings, William IV, who began the destruction of the aristocratic system by threatening to create enough new peers to pass legislation desired by the House of Commons.

Since then the aristocracy has slowly lost all political power and has been robbed of its wealth, while the Government has moved further and further to the left to its present quasi dictatorship of the proletariat and economic collapse.

The doctrine that gentlemen must not soil their hands in trade has furnished that enormous bureaucracy which has administered the Empire for hundreds of years.

The British military has been largely officered by younger sons of the nobility and by what the French would call the petite noblesse, largely from Ulster.

The great Generals Marlborough and Wellington received their titles for service in the field. The Earl of Cornwallis, successful in Ireland and India, is generally known for his surrender at Yorktown.

The English Navy ruled the world for centuries. In preferment, Trevelyan says it was third to the army and the church. Its greatest hero, Nelson, rose from the lower class.

In its decline, the aristocracy have served their country well. The noble British ambassadors have dominated most diplomatic posts for a century, and in particular have run the State Department of the United States for over 50 years. Lord Lothian, perhaps the last of them, devoted his whole life to understanding, influencing, and dominating American foreign policy with complete success.

Reds' Speakers Expose Them as Enemies of Religious Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have directed attention to the fact that communism is attempting to spread its tentacles by undermining all religions. The following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, of Sunday, April 3, further accentuates these dastardly tactics:

REDS' SPEAKERS EXPOSE THEM AS ENEMIES OF RELIGIOUS FAITH

In the week-end edition of the Daily Worker there is an article entitled "The Truth About Religion in the Soviet Union." The author is listed as G. Karpov, chairman of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. The first paragraph of the piece says: "Along with the other civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of the U. S. S. R., the full freedom of religious worship is enjoyed by the people of the U. S. S. R."

In another paragraph Mr. Karpov says: "Freedom of conscience, and hence freedom of religion, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the U. S. S. R. has done away not only with national but also with religious strife among the numerous peoples of the Soviet Union." Then he adds that the constitution also recognizes the freedom of anti-religious propaganda. The last sentence is a gem of understatement and at the same time the key to the real truth about religion in Russia.

The professional Communists play it safe in their drive against God. They begin with the children in their formative years to make sure they will not be misled by the religious-freedom front in their beloved constitution.

CAN'T BE NEUTRAL ON RELIGION

On March 30, Soviet youth met in the Great Hall of the Kremlin for the first All-Union Komosol Congress in 13 years. This is the Communist youth organization which claims a membership of 9,283,289. The session was addressed by N. A. Mikhailov, the general secretary, who said that "in certain places there is observed some revival of church activity which seeks to increase its influence on youth."

"Some organizations," he declared, "ignore such phenomena. Komosol organizations cannot be neutral concerning religion. Komosols are called upon to propagandize the advancement of science, and any religion is in direct conflict with science."

The speaker said the organization has an army of 200,000 propagandists working among the youth of the country and operates 237,125 political circles and schools attended by 4,000,000 youths,

There you have the picture of religion in Russia today. Stalin's wistful weasels work night and day sinking their agnostic fangs into the throats of children in an all-out effort to destroy any spiritual leanings that might betray them into joining the world family of decent God-fearing men and women.

CAN'T COMPROMISE WITH REDS

It is strange indeed that we have so many Americans, including men of the cloth, who berate the tough policy of the United States toward Russia and look upon the Soviet Union as the future hope of the world. Strange, too, that there are liberals who oppose such measures as the one Governor Dewey signed Friday barring subversive teachers from our school children.

A decent man cannot compromise with an ideology that seeks to warp the minds of the young as a means of perpetuating the system, particularly when he knows that no child or person in any country is wholly immune to these false teachings. I consider that any Communist here or anywhere else is my enemy and the enemy of my son, and I know of no better justification for my belief than the words of Mikhailov in Moscow on March 30.

Mikhailov and his cohorts set the pattern for all Communists—in his country, mine and everyone's. We need to know the full nature and intent of our adversaries. The cold war is a war against freedom but it is also a war against God. Mikhailov makes them all too clear.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In our Lodge," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel of March 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR LODGE

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER's candid view of American foreign policy was not popularly received, but then critics of Government spending and world policing are never popular.

The Hoosier Senator, who apparently was not playing to the gallery, recently made a major foreign policy speech in which he accused the American foreign spenders of going on a Broadway playboy's splurge.

This newspaper has not always seen eye to eye with Senator JENNER. We opposed his gubernatorial ambitions. We said he could be doing a better job in the United States Senate.

The stand he has taken against exorbitant outlays abroad and his denouncement of phony bipartisanship put him in our lodge on foreign policy and, incidentally, serve to justify our belief he could best serve his State in the United States Senate.

In the Senate, the Indiana lawmaker was first to come out solidly against the misnamed bipartisan policy. He realizes it is a shrewd method of funneling credit for any good to the Democratic side of the ledger and of charging the GOP with any liabilities of the arrangement. Except for forthright speeches such as Senator JENNER has made, one in Washington would hear only of the glories of this unholy alliance.

The product of 3 days' continued research, the Hoosier's 18-page speech touched a sore spot. Nobody has denied, he said, the recent speech of Christopher Mayhew. This British political leader, it will be recalled, embarrassed the Labor Government by asserting that Britain has accomplished recovery and is now engaged in social experimentation.

Senator JENNER says the American taxpayer is complacently financing these experiments, "financing the purchase of false teeth and toupees and every other socialistic experiment the mind of man can conceive."

And if the Senator's charge—that ECA shipments have found their way to Russia—can be confirmed, the Hoosier will have made his point that we're "squandering material and financial resources in a foreign scheme labeled for recovery."

Reply by Tom Henderson to Attack by Henry McLemore on Daughters of Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very splendid article by Mr. Tom Henderson, of Yanceyville, N. C., in which he defends the United Daughters of the Confederacy against a recent attack by Mr. Henry McLemore. The Daughters of the Confederacy is one of the outstanding organizations in the whole country and has rendered marvelous service in preserving the finest traditions of the South and in keeping green the memory of her illustrious dead, even as it has worked to contribute to and perpetuate the greatness of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAUGHTERS OF CONFEDERACY DEFENDED AGAINST HENRY MCLEMORE'S ATTACK

(By Tom Henderson)

"We give to you our faithful vow,
No vandal touch shall bruise thy brow."

Maybe the United Daughters of the Confederacy have never put these lines on any one of the many monuments they have laboriously builded and prayerfully dedicated to the memory of the men who wore the gray, but this silent vow is in the hearts of every one of them as they vigilantly stand guard over these markers. But, while they would cheerfully give their lives in defense, they are too ladylike to engage in a war of words with those who deride their motives and scurrilously attack in print the labors of their hands and spirit of their hearts.

Henry McLemore would dynamite all these monuments, dig up their hallowed graveyards, and hang these faithful Marys and Marthas on cypress trees.

Silly tommyrot. And, southern papers print the slurrings and the calumnies. This at a time when the South again has her back to the wall, fighting a horde of foes intent on taking away all of what is left of her States' rights and mongrelizing her citizenship.

HISTORY CANNOT BE DISMISSED

You cannot dismiss history, however distorted and hypocritically it is written; you cannot erase altogether the scars of war, however unreasonable and unrighteous the causes may have been; you cannot forget the bravery and the sacrifices of those who did the fighting. The boys of World War I who sleep in Flanders field never knew for what they gave their lives. "Their's was not to reason why; their's was but to do and die."

The Alamance County lad of World War II did not make the world either safer or better, but he had something appertaining unto ironic realism when he wrote to his daddy back home: "Dear Pappy: I come mighty nigh getting killed last week. A piece of iron whizzed right by my head. I hunted it up and found it was one of them old worn-out Dixie plow points you sold that junk dealer last year." There were those in Washington who knew the Japs were on their way to Pearl Harbor long before they got there.

Henry McLemore was straining himself to be funny, but his humor was mean and contemptuous wit. In keeping fresh and green the graves and memories of their Confederate fathers the Daughters are not opening up old wounds and stirring up old hatreds. They memorialize and glorify not the "casus belli," but the bravery of those who died at Bethel and Gettysburg and those who surrendered at Appomattox.

Henry evidently does not know much of the aims and objectives of the Daughters of the Confederacy. It is not only a memorial and historical organization, but, now that probably the last monument has been erected and almost the last grave has been marked, it is also a benevolent, educational, civic, and social association. It is caring for the aged, providing scholarships for chest drives and bond sales—and will probably help raise funds for the next foolish war which is seemingly in the making.

HATED WAR, BUT FOUGHT

This scribbler's Confederate daddy hated war, was for the preservation of the Union, did not believe in slavery and was never a secessionist at heart, but, like Robert E. Lee, he fought with his South when the despot's heel was at her door. While he never held any hatred against northerners, even the one who shot off his leg, he ever eulogized the gallant conduct of his comrades—and he loved them all, the dead and the living.

However much we may castigate the politics and despicable actions of Gov. William H. Holden (born at Leasburg, Caswell County) and write him down in the words of Editor Josiah Turner as "a white-livered miscreant," we must give him credit for trying to keep North Carolina from seceding and out of the fratricidal war.

The late Daisy King Barker (a Daughter of Leaksville) did a great deal of research work for her excellent book, Echoes of the Old South, (dedicated to the memory of my father, D. Franklin King, who volunteered in the Confederate Army at the age of 16 and became a boy captain, Company F, Forty-third Virginia Regiment, and to the memory of my mother, Eliza Dyer King, a child of the Confederacy) and preserved these historical notes:

"In June 1859, President Buchanan, who attended the University of North Carolina commencement, assured his audience that North Carolinians 'have always stood by the Constitution and the laws, and are destined in the history of this country to do much to preserve our glorious Union.'"

HOLDEN'S INFLUENCE FELT

"When the Democratic National Convention met in Charleston, April 23, 1860, its great problem was to harmonize the demands of the northern and southern wings of the party. In this debate North Carolina occupied a middle ground and her stand was an important factor in holding the delegates of Virginia and other border States to their position. While State after State was seceding, a member of the North Carolina delegation, coming from a consultation with the Virginians, urged Holden to make a speech to hold our delegates against going out, saying, 'From what I have heard, if our delegates go out, Virginia will go out also, and the constitution will be broken up.' Holden complied with a 10-minute speech, declaring that North Carolina had sent her delegates to the convention to maintain and preserve and not destroy the bonds of the Union; that by an immense majority the people of North Carolina would frown indignantly on the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which link together the various parts. He exerted a strong influence.

"A great Union rally was held at Salisbury in October, prior to Lincoln's election. Among the great orators of the occasion, Vance carried off the honors. The correspondent of the Raleigh Register wrote that but one sentiment prevailed: 'We fight for the Constitution, the Union, and the laws—we will not be led off by seceders, in the South, or by black Republicans in the North, and we will never give up our institutions until stern necessity compels us to believe that they being no longer adequate to our protection, we must resort to the right of revolution, which is inherent in every people.' * * *

"After the fall of Fort Sumter, which news flashed over the country like an electric shock, the South, believing that the defense of southern rights had become necessary, sprang to the support of the Confederacy."

If I were Henry McLemore I would first abjectly apologize to all the papers of the South which carried his sordid column of the Confederacy, then go out to Lee's tomb, hunt a judas tree, climb it, drape a Confederate flag around my neck, and jump off.

Letter From Five Great Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district which I have the honor to represent is the University of Chicago, one of the great educational institutions of the world. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, is a professor of economics at that university. A number of the Members of this House who are held in highest esteem are graduates of Chicago.

Certainly no institution of learning in the great middle western area, none in the Nation during the period of its existence, has made larger contribution in the field of education. It has been a contribution to scientific progress, to the cultural and the spiritual tones of daily living, and to the free, unhampered processes of thinking with open and unbiased minds on the economic and political problems of a changing world.

The people of Chicago are proud of the university. This is especially true among the men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

On the faculty of the University of Chicago are many of the great atomic scientists of the world. James K. Allison, professor of physics and director of nuclear studies, and Harold C. Urey, discoverer of hydrogen atom of atomic weight 2 and winner of the Nobel prize for chemistry, are but two of the number whose renown for achievement is international.

These men, so distinguished as scientists, are of towering stature as patriots. Not one whisper came from those closed doors behind which they were toiling

when the atomic bomb was in the period of conception and development. With devotion to country and with the desire of all true scientists to advance the welfare of all mankind, they are striving in the experimentations with and the development of atomic energy to enlarge the horizons of human existence. They deserve the commendation of us all and the appreciation which is the reward of good service faithfully rendered.

They were active in the campaign of last fall, which resulted in my election to this distinguished body, because of the unfair and unjustified aspersions cast, not upon them individually but anonymously upon atomic scientists as a body, by the Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress.

Under the permission granted me by the unanimous consent of the House, and that the position of these men may be more thoroughly understood by my colleagues, I am including in my remarks the following letter signed by five members of the faculty of the University of Chicago who are recognized as among the foremost atomic scientists of the world:

MARCH 29, 1949.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Many of us in the neighborhood of the University of Chicago believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities, under the Eightieth Congress, flagrantly abused and exceeded its legitimate functions of inquiry and recommendation of legislation. The present Congress certainly has the right to investigate subversive activities and the measures taken to counter them. The committee for this purpose, however, should have a more reasonable name and conduct its affairs in a manner consistent with the responsibilities and decorum of the Congress. Our disgust with the past activities of the committee may be summarized in the following points:

1. The committee has operated in an atmosphere of witch hunting and headline seeking. It has used unfavorable publicity in an attempt to punish persons who have been cleared repeatedly by loyalty boards. The committee has attacked in a similar manner persons whose records have been examined carefully by the Department of Justice and reported clear of any derogatory evidence admissible in a court of law.

2. The FBI and the Federal Grand Jury are responsible for dealing with treason and espionage. If they are derelict in these duties, it would be a legitimate function of a congressional committee to report this fact. The Committee has in the past attempted to usurp the functions of these agencies.

3. The aspect of totalitarianism which we dread above all others is the limitation on freedom of thought and the exchange of ideas. In a few sensitive Government positions it may be necessary to be certain that the incumbent is not affiliated with any movement denying him freedom of thought and conscience. A person in such a position must have no loyalty conflicting with loyalty to the Constitution.

In all other cases only overt, illegal, treasonable, or subversive acts should be penalized. A man should be free to think as he pleases and to associate with whom he pleases without endangering his means of livelihood.

4. The previous activities of the committee have furnished a wealth of propaganda material to the enemies of the United States, and held our Government up to ridicule all over the world. The very term "un-American" denotes an aggressive attitude toward citizens of other countries.

5. The staffing of Government posts with persons of high intelligence and capability is an outstanding problem of our time. The unwarranted activities of the committee in question have made Government positions undesirable to the very persons who should be attracted to them.

Kindest regards,

SAMUEL K. ALLISON.
HAROLD C. UREY.
EDWARD TELLER.
JOSEPH E. MAYER.
WILLIAM H. ZACHARIASON.

The Need for a Single Supply Catalog System for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about my proposed bill, H. R. 321, entitled "The National Defense Catalog Act."

Ralph W. Page, writing in the Philadelphia Bulletin a short time ago, stated and I quote:

It is now manifest that the National Security Act has not been effective—the National Planning Association has released a report stating "the United States is now getting a too meager yield in security for its expenditures." It finds that the rivalry and jealousy among the services, the easy-going attitude toward expenditures by all the services, a great surplus of high-ranking officers and the piecemeal grab-all policy by which each service submits an independent and exaggerated budget, are piling up needless costs.

And Henry J. Taylor, speaking over NBC, stated and I quote:

And this is all backing up our amazing expenditures. Why, the overlapping of authority and wasted expenditures hardly seem believable, my friends, and, with our other vast expenditures at home and abroad, our military budget would in time crack our economy wide open. The military costs now consume more than 34 cents out of each tax dollar you and I pay; and unless the Army, Navy, and Air Force become more cost-conscious, the bill may zoom to double that figure. Although our three armed services are supposedly unified, each still arrives at its own budgetary requests separately, with the left hand often not knowing what the right hand is doing. And yet they say taxes must go up. Meanwhile, public relations and publicity costs of the services inflate like a giant balloon. The request is in for $8,338,575 for public relations in 1950. And other items reveal a similar disregard for cost. It (military budget) represents a prodigal approach to the whole question of costs. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that padding has been a very general practice.

Industry would not permit for a moment the loose, uneconomical, and inefficient methods of carrying on supply operations that are prevalent in the armed forces; they could not and still stay in business against more alert competitors.

The views of industry were exemplified during the war by the activities of William H. Harrison, at that time operating vice president of one of America's largest concerns, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., now president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

One of the Army's technical services had run into unusual difficulties and was finding it harder and harder to carry out their supply mission. The Congress was advised that their supply activities were the worst in the Army, and were probably the worst in the Armed Forces.

The correction of this sorry situation was assigned to Maj. Gen. Harold C. Ingles who was returned from overseas where he had been acting commanding general of the European Theater of Operations. As a part of the agreement between him and General Marshall, he asked for and obtained the services of Mr. Harrison.

As acting head of A. T. & T. operations, Mr. Harrison had jurisdiction over such activities as the production facilities of Western Electric Co., some 20 operating companies, including Southern Bell, Bell of Pennsylvania, Northwestern Bell, and so forth; the huge Bell laboratories; and the vast distribution system of the Bell system.

All of these varied activities, including every supply function of research, development, procurement, transportation, warehousing, requisitioning, issuance and maintenance, were knit together into a huge single efficient system by a single catalog system. This single catalog system contained all the items used by the Bell System and was used by all its subdivisions. In it an item was shown once and the same name for an item was used throughout the Bell System. Statistics could be gathered and stock records could be maintained easily because of this single catalog system.

Harrison was astounded at the conditions he found in taking over the procurement and distribution activities of the technical service and had ample cause to wonder how any supplies were ever moved to the fighting fronts.

In a single month 44 percent of all the requisitions routed in the Supply Control Agency could not be filled because the data on the requisition could not be understood. The following month this rose to 47 percent—almost half. And this in spite of the fact that hundreds of technically trained personnel reviewed the requisitions attempting to establish the identity of the item desired.

Millions of dollars' worth of items lay in warehouses that could not be identified because they were shipped without proper marking, even though thousands of technically trained personnel, located at the receiving warehouses, opened all the boxes, and attempted to establish the identity. Such items could not be issued on requisitions and took up critically scarce space.

There were little or no statistics or reports, because there were no common definitions, terminology, names, and identification system.

And to his utter amazement, he found over 13 different catalog systems used by the same supply system.

These conditions were not unlike those existing in all the technical services and bureaus at the time and are not unlike the conditions existing today.

Harrison's actions were prompt and specific. His first decree was that one single catalog system would be developed and used by all supply units. There was a great hue and cry against this as it meant that each supply unit ceased to be a separate empire, sufficient unto itself and to blazes with the others; but Harrison persisted and a single supply language, instead of 13, was adopted for all units in the supply procedure.

This enabled the supply operations to be streamlined so that his motto of "one requisition, one shipping ticket, one 24 hours" was changed from a phantasy to a reality. Within 18 months, the operations became the finest in the Army; skilled personnel by the thousands were released to other important work; the time of filling requisitions dropped from weeks to days, then to 1 day; unidentified items on requisitions were no longer possible; and industry applauded at the elimination of duplicate unnecessary red tape and paper work.

Warehouses were cleared of unidentified items; purchase orders and requisitions were correctly written; shipments were packaged and marked correctly; and in every way a complete transformation had taken place.

With the end of the war, capable officers are transferred to other duties, the Harrisons return to civilian life and the knowledge and techniques developed at such cost and effort go with them.

Many of the leaders of the armed forces are aware of the need for a correctly designed and properly functioning catalog system. Mr. Forrestal on many occasions has expressed the need for such a system and recently Mr. Kenney gave a speech in which he stated:

A wartime Navy Department cataloging project, with the accompanying simplified inventory control for the engine parts of one airplane company, saved in 1 year over $275,000,000. That is enough to pay the operating costs of the Aviation Supply Depot at Philadelphia for over 30 years.

The Bureau of Ships has estimated that through its cataloging program a net saving of $25,000,000 on an inventory of $282,000,000 will be achieved over the next 6 years.

Due to estimated inventory reductions through cataloging, approximately 500 fewer employees will be needed at two naval supply depots. Resulting annual pay-roll savings will be about $1,000,000.

To turn to savings on individual items—cataloging disclosed, for example, that the Navy was buying identical thread taps from three different suppliers at $9.12, $2.33, and 73 cents.

Identical turbine bearing liner assemblies supplied by two companies at $25 and $63, respectively, were found to be manufactured by a third company which could supply them at $9.06.

Screws purchased at 5 and 10 cents were found to be identical with one screw carried by the Navy General Stores at 7.2 mills.

One pinion shaft supplied by one company was known by 13 different identifying numbers; a single refrigeration compressor piston by 94.

Three hundred thousand antifriction bearings identification numbers have been consolidated into approximately 9,000 different items.

However, the difficulty now as in the past has been that the leaders in whom has been vested the authority to take action have not had the experience and training in supply and catalog techniques to take action; the personnel having the necessary training have not had the authority.

The provisions of H. R. 321 are based on the wartime experiences of the armed forces, of civilians from industry who served in the armed forces, and of many Members of the House and Senate. H. R. 321, entitled the National Defense Catalog Act, should be approved by all personnel of the armed forces as it will make it possible for them to carry out their mission of preparing to defend this country with greater dispatch and efficiency and with the expenditure of less money, personnel, and resources. Industry will be relieved of much of the unnecessary duplicate work about which so much complaint has been made and every taxpayer will be delighted at the savings in the national budget.

Statehood for Hawaii Wins Widespread Support From Nation's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a compilation prepared by the Hawaii Statehood Commission of editorial comment appearing in the newspapers of this country during the first 3 months of this year on the subject of statehood for Hawaii shows 76 newspapers favoring statehood and only 2 opposed to it.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission is an agency of the government of the Territory of Hawaii and is financed entirely by funds appropriated by the legislature from the tax revenues of the territory.

Newspapers appearing in 32 States commented on this question, among those favoring statehood for Hawaii being the Baton Rouge Advocate, Boise Statesman, Dallas Morning News, Denver Post, Detroit News, Milwaukee Journal, New York Times, Omaha World Herald, St. Louis Post Dispatch, and San Francisco Chronicle.

These newspapers encompass every shade of political and social opinion. Some of the points of view expressed are contained in the following excerpts:

Alabama, Anniston Star: "Hawaii is * * * inhabited by persons who share our thinking and our traditions, and we cannot hold ourselves out as champions of democracy if we retain all these persons in territorial status. They deserve proportionate representation in the Congress which governs them."

California, Long Beach Press Telegram: "On the basis of population, wealth, payment of Federal taxes, wartime service and military importance to the nation in any future conflict, Hawaii deserves statehood."

Delaware, Wilmington News: "To our mind, there are few, if any, reasons for keeping the islands dangling on a territorial status. The aims and interests of its half million inhabitants are so closely tied in with our own that the casual visitor never thinks of it as anything but an extension of this country."

Florida, Tampa Morning Tribune: "Hawaii's long record of orderly government and its peoples' outstanding record of orderly living have shown it to be as capable of ordering its own affairs as any State in the Union."

Georgia, Albany Herald: "There is no excuse for delaying a vote on Hawaii as the forty-ninth State. Inaction is incongruous, to say the least, when Congress is earnestly considering closer alliances, militarily and economically, with western nations."

Idaho, Boise Statesman: "They ought to be admitted to our Union, and the Congress now in session ought to vote them the opportunity to join us."

Illinois, Marseilles Press: "At a time when the Far East is assuming vast importance in American calculations, Hawaii's successful laboratory experiment in racial relations can serve as a useful bridge of understanding to the Orient."

Indiana, Elkhart Truth: "The political kinship of Hawaii with the United States has been long established. It has been tested under the fire of a great war in which Hawaii was a virtual 'front trench.' There seems little doubt that the 520,000 citizens of this lovely island group are ready to join us."

Maine, Bangor News: "Certainly Hawaii has earned its admission to the Union as the forty-ninth State. A modern transportation system has invalidated the former principal argument against it. The islands are no longer remote. The 2,400 miles that separate them from the mainland can now be translated into 7 hours, or Bangor to Boston by automobile."

Michigan, Holland Sentinel: "Their citizens have proved themselves good Americans and they have earned the right to play the role of full-fledged citizens."

Michigan, Pontiac Press: "The platforms of both major parties call for statehood. * * * The chief executives of all 48 States have gone on record in their national conference in support of admission. Hawaii qualifications for statehood have been studied by no fewer than five congressional committees."

Missouri, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: "Exhaustive hearings on the Hawaii bill were held last year in which the evidence conclusively showed that the territory is ready for the responsibilities of statehood."

New York, the New York Times: "All the old arguments against statehood for the lovely islands that lie 2,400 miles off our west coast and over which the United States flag has flown for over 50 years have long since been worn threadbare. The new one of communism is no more valid against Hawaii than it is against any present state. * * * By every known standard Hawaii and its 520,000 inhabitants are well qualified to become the forty-ninth State of our Union and to have in Congress spokesmen for their interests. Further delay would be an injustice to them that cannot be defended."

Ohio, Toledo Times: "Hawaii, by every standard, is entitled to statehood. That has been proved, again and again. There really is no argument in favor of delaying admission to the Union any longer. Both political parties, at their last conventions, recognized this fact. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the ill-advised Senate opposition will not prevail this year."

Oklahoma, Tusla World: "Hawaii has the ingredients of statehood; it is a progressive area."

South Carolina, Columbia Record: "The courage and the loyalty of the Hawaiians in the war against the Axis was a demonstration of their capacity for statehood."

Texas, Fort Worth Evening Star-Telegram: "Hawaii stands as the closest point of United States ownership to the vast area of the Orient in which the rise of communism is becoming more than a potential threat. As

a State, it would furnish a demonstration to the oriental peoples of what democracy has to offer its citizens."

Texas, Houston Post: "Hawaii has a considerably greater population and is far more advanced in the arts of civilization than were many of the Territories when the accolade of statehood was conferred upon them. * * * Simple justice requires that Congress grant them the rights they have so long sought."

West Virginia, Weston Democrat: "By every known standard Hawaii and its 520,000 inhabitants are well qualified to become the forty-ninth State of our Union to have in Congress spokesmen for their interests. Further delay would be an injustice to them that cannot be defended."

Wisconsin, Milwaukee Journal: "Congressional hearings of recent years have shown no serious objection to Hawaiian statehood. Both Democratic and Republican Parties have pledged Hawaiian statehood in their platforms. The whole peoples of the Pacific area are watching Hawaii's fight for statehood as a symbol of American justice. It is sincerely to be hoped that the Eighty-first Congress will make Hawaii the forty-ninth State in this year 1949."

The two papers opposed were the Times-Democrat of Orangeburg and the Index-Journal of Greenwood, both in South Carolina.

The Times-Democrat argued that—

the main advantage in statehood for the inhabitants of the regions affected will be an increased claim upon the Treasury of the United States.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission points out that the Territory of Hawaii, for many years, has paid more taxes into the Federal Treasury than has any one of 12 States.

The Index-Journal editorial said:

It may be the right thing to do but we are not the least bit enthusiastic over the move.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley Before Portsmouth, Va., Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 the Portsmouth, Va., Chamber of Commerce, in my district, was fortunate in hearing former Postmaster General of the United States, James A. Farley, as its guest speaker. It was my pleasure to attend that meeting and I was much impressed by Mr. Farley's thought-provoking analysis of the peculiar position which the United States occupies in its leadership role in the world today.

On the day following Mr. Farley's address, the Portsmouth Star carried an editorial which I believe will be of interest to the members. It follows:

MR. FARLEY'S SPEECH

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States and onetime national chairman of the Democratic Party, set forth a commendably well-balanced program for America in his address at last night's annual membership meeting of the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce.

He reminded his listeners that the United States must not forget its responsibility for world leadership if the democratic world is to survive. "We have raised the expectations of the world," he said, " and we cannot be false to our promises."

Mr. Farley said that his world travels had convinced him that the United States enjoys a great asset of good will among nations, but also said that foreign countries are beset by two fears concerning America: (1) that it will lose itself in its own interests and forget its responsibility for world leadership and (2) that it will blunder into another depression.

Then Mr. Farley cautioned his audience as follows:

"To fulfill our own hopes and to fight those fears we must be strong and stable at home. Our Government must be efficiently organized and less repressive on the spirit of enterprise. Our relations between business and government must be friendly and mutually helpful. Our business community must be prudent but progressive. Our people must not expect unending miracles of generosity from government. We must in industrial relations seek mutual respect and cooperation."

Much credit should go to the chamber of commerce for its skillful planning of the program that featured Mr. Farley. The gathering was representative, and the handling of public relations in connection with the event brought favorable national publicity to our community.

The Autocracy Within Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, many hundreds of miles out in the blue Pacific under the tropical sun lies a bit of America—the island possession of Guam. It is inhabited by some 24,000 permanent inhabitants and by about twice that many temporary residents, all of whom are loyal and patriotic Americans.

The Americans who live in Guam, like those of us who live elsewhere under the American flag, give allegiance to the United States of America. Like us, they raise their eyes to the Stars and Stripes as the symbol of democracy and government by law. Unlike us, however, they experience little of the democracy and government under law which is yours and mine in everyday life.

It has been said—and I fear it is beyond contradiction—that the government of Guam is an absolutism. Even though the inhabitants are Americans and the very island itself is territory under the sovereignty of the United States, the Constitution and the laws of the United States have only such local application as suits the benevolence of an appointive governor who wields almost absolute power. The government of Guam is an autocracy existing within a democracy. It is a contradiction of the basic concepts of personal freedom and representative democracy which characterize the American way of life.

The people of Guam, like Americans everywhere, are peaceful and law abiding. They love liberty and aspire to a maximum of personal freedom. They want a part in their own government and a hand in the making of the laws under which they must live. They demand a form of government which will guarantee to everyone an equal measure of the social, political, and economic justice which is basic to life in the modern world. Like you and me, they will not stand idly by when these are denied and perverted.

I have here, and ask permission to introduce into the RECORD, an article by columnist Peter Edson entitled "The Guam Style Center" which was published in the Washington Daily News of April 1, 1949. The story which Mr. Edson relates is a sad commentary on democracy as it finds its expression in the island possession of Guam. This article reiterates the crying need for the enactment of organic legislation for Guam. In that respect, I invite attention to H. R. 3799, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes."

The article follows:

THE GUAM STYLE CENTER

(By Peter Edson)

Navy Clerk Abe Goldstein and a women's clothing shoppe on the Pacific island of Guam, known as the Guam Style Center, may go down in history. They now seem headed for fame right along with the British Stamp Tax and the Boston Tea Party as the start of another great battle for liberty. Interior Department, the Navy, Congress, and even the White House are involved.

Guam itself is reported to be in an uproar bordering on civil warfare between the Guam Congress and Rear Adm. A. C. Pownall, naval governor.

How the Navy can get off the hook without going into full reverse is not at all clear. Best solution at the moment would seem to be for Congress to pass an organic law giving Guam self-government and transferring responsibility for civil affairs on the island from Navy to Interior.

Until August 1947, the naval governor had absolute power. Then the Guam Congress was made a legislative body, instead of just an advisory body, on orders of the Secretary of the Navy. The Guam Congress consists of an upper council and a lower assembly, all elected by the people.

The assembly now says it has no powers and it has gone out on strike in protest against Governor Pownall's action in vetoing a bill which would have allowed the congress to arrest Abe Goldstein and cite him for contempt of congress.

The case grows out of a postwar naval government order that outside business interests would not be permitted to invest in Guam as competitors to native establishments. A system of licenses was set up to control who could start and run a business.

To get around this requirement some Navy personnel and some businessmen from Hawaii and the mainland tried to use natives as fronts to acquire licenses. Native merchants complained.

Guam's Congress investigated. It subpenaed, among others, Abe Goldstein, 37-year-old civil-service employee. He had gone to Guam as an Army clerk, then transferred to Navy as an administrative assistant.

The Guam assembly's commerce committee wanted to question Goldstein about his alleged backing of the Guam Style Center. He appeared, but defied the committee. He said the Guam Congress had not been established by law of the United States Congress, so it had no authority.

Committee Chairman Jesus C. Okiyama then went to the island's attorney general, one Commander McKinney, of the United States Navy. McKinney gave an oral opinion tht the committee had power to issue a subpena and make Goldstein talk. Assembly Speaker A. B. Won Pat signed a warrant for Goldstein's arrest for contempt of congress. Governor Pownall stayed its execution, refusing to allow Goldstein's arrest.

The congress then passed a law giving itself power to subpena witnesses. Governor Pownall vetoed it, and had his attorney general draft a substitute. The assembly didn't like it.

Governor Pownall the next week called a special session of congress to deliver a speech on the state of Guam. The council showed up, but only two members of the assembly were present. The Governor had his attorney general issue an opinion that 34 of the 36 assemblymen had vacated their posts. The Governor said he would appoint successors.

This threw the little 30-by-6-mile island into turmoil. There have been mass meetings and petitions all over the place. There isn't much else to do on Guam, so the natives take politics seriously. They say Governor Pownall has no right to appoint members of the assembly, without prior confirmation of the Guam Congress. That's the law.

If Guam is troubled, official Washington has been no less so. With characteristic Navy loyalty, Secretary John L. Sullivan has cabled Admiral Pownall, backing up what he has done and commending him for it. He has been told to fill the 34 assembly seats by a special election, unless the striking assemblymen return Saturday for the next scheduled session of the congress.

Reds Pledge China To War for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of April 4, 1949:

REDS PLEDGE CHINA TO WAR FOR RUSSIA—COMMUNISTS ISSUE STATEMENT ATTACKING NORTH ATLANTIC PACT AMID PEACE PARLEYS

NANKING, April 3.—The Chinese Communists said amid peace negotiations with the Nationalists tonight that they would unite the people of China to fight for Russia in any war between the Soviet Union and the North Atlantic treaty nations.

A Communist broadcast quoted a statement signed by No. 1 Communist Mao Tze-tung, and other leftist leaders, denouncing the western treaty and pledging aid to Russia in event of war.

Discussions for settling the 22-year-old civil war between the Reds and the Nationalist government continued behind closed doors in Peiping.

CEASE-FIRE PROPOSED

Details of the talks were kept secret, but the government party newspaper Central Daily News said the six-man Nationalist delegation led off with proposals for a cease-fire and the calling of a multiparty political consultation conference.

This report drew an indirect denial from official sources who said the early stages were devoted to mapping an agenda for discussion.

The Communist broadcast tonight said that in event of war between east and west, even if it should start on the other side of the world, the Communists and their associated "democratic parties" would unite the people to march forward hand in hand with the ally of China, the Soviet Union.

TREATY CALLED AGGRESSIVE

The joint Communist-leftist statement condemned the North Atlantic Treaty as endangering peace and the security of mankind by aiming at a new aggressive world war.

It was signed by Mao and leaders of the Democratic League, which recently moved its headquarters north from Hong Kong; the National Democratic Association, peasants-workers groups, and the National Salvation Society.

Meanwhile, travelers from north China reported that more than 3,000 university students suspected of anti-Communist thinking have been massed in a huge concentration camp near Peiping.

Thousands of persons—students, former Government officials and private individuals—were reported fleeing southward in increasing numbers daily, trying to get into areas still held by the Nationalists.

The refugees journeying to south China travel mostly by rail and bus to Tsinan in Shantung Province or to Tangku, the port for Tientsin, and then by ship to Government-held cities.

The official military news agency reported that Gen. Lin Piao's Manchurian Communists had arrived in central China and attacked Hsinyang, strategic rail town 100 miles north of Hankow. Lin Piao's troops earlier were reported moving in a southerly direction toward Nanking.

Gen. Liu Po-shen's Communists at the same time were reported attacking Huayuan, 50 miles to the south.

"Communist attacks on the Yangtze River port of Anking, 145 miles southwest of Nanking, continued with increasing fury," the agency said, "while a small Nationalist bridgehead at Tuchiao, 50 miles northeast of Anking, was believed to have fallen to the Reds."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 24, 1949, issue of the Vidette-Messenger, published at Valparaiso, Ind.:

AND WITH IT, CONTROL

Now out of committee and headed for probable passage by both Houses of Congress is a $300,000,000 Federal aid-to-education measure.

In the last session of the Indiana Assembly the legislature passed a bill providing some $53,000,000 to help Indiana school systems maintain what has been termed a "minimum foundation program."

Quite naturally the State measure includes adequate provision for control by the commission on general education, the State board of education, and the State board of tax commissioners on how this $53,000,000 is going to be spent. It further provides that the State may adjust local school tax rates as necessary. The theory is, of course, that since the money is coming from the State, the State should have something to say about how and under what circumstances it is to be distributed.

The fact that the State government got the money in the first place from the local communities who will now be told what they must do to get it back doesn't have anything to do with the picture.

Does anyone think the Federal Government, any more than the State, is going to pass an aid-to-education bill without reserving, in its own right, the power to tell how and under what conditions this money is going to be spent?

Moreover, does anyone believe that the money which the Federal Government is appropriating for this cause did not come originally from the local communities which it now proposed to aid?

The situation between State aid and Federal aid is parallel.

Every time the State or Federal Governments boost appropriations to aid schools they dry up that much more a community's potential sources of self-help. If the trend continues we might as well face that fact that in the days to come virtually all school taxation receipts will be funneled either to the State capital or to Washington for redistribution to the local communities. And when that day comes all control over local schools will be vested in State and Federal agencies.

Jim Farley's True Remarks at Syracuse Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Syracuse Herald-Journal of March 23, 1949:

JIM FARLEY'S TRUE REMARKS AT SYRACUSE DINNER

No truer words were ever spoken than former Postmaster General James A. Farley's remarks at the Kiwanis dinner at the Onondaga last night fixing responsibility for post-war chaos in international relations.

As Farley emphasized, the threat to world peace is none of our making but "springs from the unholy ambition of one power—Soviet Russia—to dominate every way of life in every place in the world * * *."

After the war the American people went into the United Nations with high hopes that a better day was in sight for all mankind. Then Soviet Russia embarked on the course of rule or ruin that has split civilization, all but wrecked UN, and posed the threat of a third world war. Or, as Jim Farley puts it, "We escaped one form of totalitarianism, fascism, to be confronted with another, red fascism, perhaps more dangerous than the vanquished form."

That's it precisely—they call it communism but it is perhaps even more menacing than Hitlerism. At any rate, from the freeman's standpoint there's little to choose between them.

And so what? Where are we heading?

It is encouraging to note that Jim Farley, a shrewd observer with excellent sources of information, believes that we're coming through all right. Civilization certainly is on trial, he says. But he is convinced that not only will free civilization survive but that the brightest period in the history of the great Republic lies ahead. To put it in his own words, "our horizon is not a whit less limitless and not a shade less promising than

that which lay before our forefathers in the blackness which followed the Revolution."

In order to speed that bright future, Jim Farley would have us remember that America's greatness was created through the freedom, rights, and initiative of the individual.

"We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American," he says. "The door of opportunity must be kept open. The American boy must be taught from experience that whatever he attains depends upon his own inner integrity. We have won the past by hard work and honesty and self-reliance. There is no better formula through which we can win the future. The greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured if no man-made shadows blur the road."

All this is sound American doctrine. We must avoid the totalitarian theory common to both fascism and communism that the individual is a mere cog in a massive, ponderous, all-powerful state—a mere nothing who is to be told what to do, what to read, what to think, what to say and what to believe. We must take our stand on the principles of the freedom of the individual and freedom of individual enterprise, under which America has flourished and become the light and hope of the world.

Jim Farley is an alert, patriotic American, genuinely devoted to the progress of his country. His Syracuse remarks come as a refreshing breeze in a sultry period in the world's history.

Solving the Grain Storage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Spokane Spokesman Review of March 27, 1949.

My reason for inserting this article in the Appendix of the RECORD stems from the present crucial storage situation among the producers and handlers of cereals in the United States. The storage situation in many parts of the Nation is becoming increasingly critical and with another sizable crop in prospect, anything that would effectively meet the probable storage problems should be useful all the way around.

In this case, it is encouraging to hear that a new type of bin that can be built speedily has been designed and developed by Spokane men. I know the article will be interesting to all of my colleagues from wheat-producing and wheat-storing areas. It follows:

SOLVING THE GRAIN STORAGE PROBLEM—SPOKANE BUILDERS BELIEVE JACK BINS WILL HELP FARMERS IN MARKETING WHEAT

(By M. G. Bassett)

A wooden triangle called a jack is a new kind of sedative for wheatmen's headaches. It is a framework for a grain storage bin that can be built in a matter of hours.

Rancher's operations are now limited to the confines of storage sheds. Lack of space has forced some farmers to sell their wheat at a low price. Others were deprived of Government loans by inadequate storage facilities. A cheap, quick solution has been offered by three Spokane builders who operate the B. & B. Manufacturing Co., North 5616 Market.

L. O. Ballard, Robert H. Camp, and L. A. Ogle have staked their reputations on the jacks as a partial solution to the storage problem. Their faith rests on reason.

In 89 days during the last harvest, jack bins furnished space for a million bushels of grain in Washington, eastern Idaho, and northern Oregon. They saved a quarter of a million bushels in 11 days in Wasco, Oreg.

"But the Spokane industry is not an emergency outfit. We've got material on hand for 500,000 bushels of storage and enough lined up for 12,000,000 more. We should be able to make a real contribution to wheat marketing," Mr. Ballard explained.

The record looks good so far. Now jacks are about ready to meet their real test—the 1949 wheat harvest in Washington.

Stacks of frames lie ready on the Market Street lot adjacent to the manufacturing company. Each is made with three wooden beams supported by a cross bar. The square bin takes shape as jacks are placed in rows, each 2 feet from the other. Metal or wooden sheeting nailed on the parallel frames completes the siding. Builders then put up a slanting roof and install an apparatus for filling and emptying the bin.

Sheds can be used to store anything that will go through a door 12 feet square. It takes pressure of 49,000 pounds a square inch to crumble one of the timbers. No braces or rods are needed. So a jack bin within another storehouse can be removed if a farmer needs it only temporarily. Between 16 and 17 million bushels of grain are now behind jack walls in the Pacific Northwest.

Business has skyrocketed. Operators have recorded a 50 percent increase each year of operation. Farmers who have seen grain saved by the jacks can believe that report. The Sherman county cooperative in Wasco, Oreg., knows. Wheatmen there sent a desperate call to the company during the last harvest. Trucks had lined the street in front of the co-op. The men were waiting to unload in storage bins that were already brimming with grain. B. and B. crews transported jacks to Wasco. Two hours and 30 minutes after they had unloaded the frames at the railroad depot they had the side walls up. Anxious farmers ordered 35,000 bushels of grain poured into the sheds even before the roofing was laid.

What bothers wheat men now is that the 1948 crop may not be moved out of storage in time to move in the 1949 crop. Present Washington State storage facilities can take care of 60,000,000 bushels of wheat. An average Washington crop is just 60,000,000. Last year it ran up to 79,000,000. Farmers can find room only with careful planning and cooperation with all grain dealers. Storage is essential for wheat ranchers who take a Government loan or purchase.

Loans simply give producers a chance to store grain in hopes that the market price will rise. Amount of the loan is at least 90 percent of parity at the time when the agreement is made. Parity guarantees buying power equal to that from 1909 to 1914. So the actual effect of the loan is to establish a minimum price. It also helps the farmer with midseason financing to harvest crops like fruit, beets, and hops. He can get the wheat back to sell for market prices if they are higher than the amount of the loan. The loan expires April 30.

A producer doesn't have to agree to a loan to assure Government purchase. The Government will arrange to take wheat on April 30 and pay for it then. But the essential condition of both plans is a catch for northwest farmers strapped for storage space. Only stored grain can qualify for Government financing aid.

Project No. 1 for this spring is to get rid of from forty-five to fifty million bushels of wheat in country elevators and on the farm. By July carloads of new wheat will be headed for warehouses.

"One elevator operator got his farmers to sign releases on the wheat. The producers agreed to move their crop whenever prices reached a prescribed level," Pete Stalcopp of the Pacific Northwest grain dealers' association, said.

Another idea has been suggested to the association. This would allow the farmer to surrender his wheat to the Government in full satisfaction for his loan before April 30. If such a method were approved, the warehouseman could not expect to collect full storage and conditioning charges.

Clearing storage bins of old wheat is one way to prepare for the new crop. Building warehouses is another. But wheat men contemplate limited construction.

"The Government recently allocated 50,000 tons of steel for farm storage. But the bulk of producers want storage in grain elevators," Mr. Stalcopp explained.

He estimated building of storage bins for 5,000,000 bushels in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, within the next year.

While Government construction plans and private needs attempt conciliation, Ballard, Camp, and Ogle are getting results. They envision jack walls on farms by elevators and at mills. The Spokane industry is aimed at saving millions of bushels of grain and miles of red tape.

Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the people of our country are aware of the great service performed by our veterans in the past world wars. Their sacrifices preserved for us our great democracy. None can forget their contribution.

Today the disabled American veteran—he who gave so much and asked so little—is requesting consideration for his needs. It is incumbent upon us to heed him. I am certain that we will not lend a deaf ear to the man to whom our Government owes its greatest debt—the disabled veteran.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey:

Whereas this Nation's primary obligation is to its wartime-disabled veterans; and

Whereas Gen. Carl Gray, Jr., the Veteran's Administrator, said in an address to the last national convention of the Disabled American Veterans that the "greatest debt of government is to the wartime disabled"; and

Whereas the wartime-disabled veterans are the ones who suffered most for the preservation of this Nation; and

Whereas proper and ample hospitalization and medical treatment is the first step in the rehabilitation of the war-handicapped, as well as vital to their continued rehabilitation; and

Whereas the originally authorized building program of the Veterans' Administration is necessary and the delay in getting hospitals built is bringing pain and misery and death to hundreds, if not thousands, of American veterans; and

Whereas the recent executive order reducing the Veterans' Administration's hospital-building program by 16,000 beds is in direct conflict with the need for these hospitals; and

Whereas powerful organizations are working to retard if not destroy the accepted hospital program of the Veterans' Administration as authorized by Congress, and that the Hoover Committee in its report to Congress recommends the merger of the veterans' hospital program with other agencies which will mean the complete destruction of the VA hospital program; and

Whereas any merger of VA hospitals with other services as recommended by the Hoover Commission is a complete breach of faith between this Government and its wartime defenders.

Now, therefore, the Department of New Jersey, Disabled American Veterans, meeting in executive session in the city of Paterson, March 27, 1949, hereby expresses itself on record as being vigorously opposed to any reduction in hospital beds and asks the reinstatement of the original building program; we also militantly attack any proposed merger of VA hospitals with any other agencies and urge the speeding up of completion of hospitals now planned; it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Veterans' Administrator, and our congressional representatives.

CHARLES A. MCSPIRITT,
Department Commander.

Coolie Wages Show Effect in Decreasing Numbers Choosing Teaching Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the coolie wages America offers her school teachers show their effect in the decreasing numbers choosing the teaching profession. Congress should heed the warning given in the telegram from the Honorable Robert G. Buzzard, president of Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston, Ill., which follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 3, 1949.*

The Honorable MELVIN PRICE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers and members of the executive committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, with whom I have been in session for 2 days in Chicago, have just wired President Truman and congressional leaders expressing deep concern over the great gap between the number of new teachers who will graduate and the number required to keep open the schools of United States.

A new national survey shows that the colleges and universities of the Nation will turn out this year only 13,500 college graduates prepared to teach in the elementary schools to meet a demand for more than 100,000 new teachers in these lower grades. Enrollments swollen by the unprecedented increase in birth rates since 1940 will increase the total elementary school enrollment almost 50 percent in the next decade. The total need for the next decade exceeds 1,000,000 new elementary teachers.

The colleges which prepare elementary teachers will continue to lose ground in a desperate effort to meet the demand for new teachers until they can assure young candidates who wish to prepare for teaching that positive steps have been taken to strengthen the financial structure of the American school system. I would greatly appreciate your exerting every effort to bring about favorable action at the earliest possible time on legislation to provide Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools. The chief reason why teacher supply falls far short of demand is low salaries. The information that the Congress has adopted a sound policy of extending financial aid to the States on a systematic basis would be tremendously helpful to us in assuring candidates for elementary teaching that school systems have been greatly strengthened in their efforts to offer opportunities equivalent to those in other occupations.

ROBERT G. BUZZARD,
President, Eastern Illinois State College.
CHARLESTON, ILL.

Two Planes for One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for April 4, 1949:

TWO PLANES FOR ONE

Ivan H. Driggs, director of design research for the Navy's aeronautics bureau, has just laid a barrage of eggs, all smelly, on the Air Force's B–36 bomber.

He accomplishes this unusual effect in a highly technical piece written for Aviation Week charging that the B–36 is "economically unsound" and has "questionable tactical promise."

NAVAL SNIPING

It ill becomes any spokesman for the naval forces to talk about any other branch of the fighting forces being uneconomical, considering the billions that have been wasted on battleships in the past 40 years and considering the billions more the Navy wants to waste on aircraft carriers. Battleships were the flop of World War II because they were sitting ducks for airpower and submarines. Flattops are the same in the present day.

To give you an idea why we are worked up we quote from a United Press account of the Driggs piece:

"Mr. Driggs summed up this way: A bomber with a 10,000-mile range 'can only be obtained with an airplane which is economically unsound and which has a low probability of success. Too long a time spent over enemy territory reduces the chance of reaching the target and returning home. Too low cruising speeds increase the liability of fighter interceptions.'

"By 'economically unsound,' Mr. Driggs apparently meant that the bomber's size and fuel consumption would be out of all proportion to its bomb load."

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR

In the first place, if Mr. Driggs is going to talk about economy in military and naval operations he could do a lot better to impress some of his theories on the Navy. From the end of World War I to the beginning of World War II the Navy spent between $7,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000 in building up our sea forces. For a reminder of what the Jap air power did to our Navy at Pearl Harbor, see the picture to the right.

The Navy now says little about battleships, but instead is pinning its hopes on an airplane carrier of 65,000 to 85,000 tons, to cost $125,000,000. That's the cost of the vessel alone. It doesn't take into account what will have to be spent on planes or the more than 1,500 men aboard. Or the other naval craft needed to protect the carrier's every move.

A B–36, on the other hand, costs between $2,500,000 and $3,000,000 to build, depending on the number ordered and standardization and carries a crew of only 14—plus bombs. And one bomb from one B–36, or one B–29, B–50, or B-anything, can scratch one flat top, as all too many were scratched in World War II.

As to Mr. Driggs' other specific complaints against the heavy bomber, we're just going to cite here three missions flown by the B–36, the results of which are on record all over the country.

On December 7, 1948, a B–36 took off from Fort Worth, Tex., and flew nonstop to Hawaii and return. It was in the air 35 hours. It did not need to be refueled.

GASOLINE TO SPARE

It flew 8,400 statute miles and returned with 12,000 gallons of gasoline left over in its tanks in addition to the 5 percent of its fuel load always carried for emergencies. On that mission it flew as high as 40,000 feet and carried a 10,000-pound bomb load which it dropped at the halfway mark of its trip. The cruising speed was more than 250 miles per hour.

On January 29, 1949, a B–36 left Fort Worth and flew to Muroc, Calif., and back carrying two 42,000-pound bombs. These bombs were dropped from altitudes of 35,000 and 40,000 feet. The flight distance was 3,000 miles. The cruising speed was above 250 miles per hour.

On March 11, a B–36 hit for the sky at Fort Worth and flew 9,600 nonstop miles over this country, going to Minneapolis, Key West, Spokane, and back to Fort Worth. It dropped a 10,000-pound bomb load at the 5,000-mile mark and cruised between 230 and 240 miles per hour.

Although these cruising speeds have been conservatively announced by the Air Force as over 250 miles an hour, it is a known fact the big ship will do 100 miles an hour more at top speed at 40,000 feet.

These records along with reports from Eglin Field that jet-fighter pilots find it almost impossible to work out any satisfactory interception of the giants certainly knocks the latest attack of the Navy into a cocked hat.

WE NEED THE BEST

We need the biggest planes and the best planes. And more planes than any Nation in the world today. We need the B–29 now and we need to keep on developing intercontinental bombers until we have a sky covered with B–99's, if progress will allow it.

During his speech in Boston last Thursday, Winston Churchill said:

"For good or ill air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man."

Two planes for one.

Southern Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Anderson, S. C., on March 31 by the Honorable J. Roy Jones, commissioner of agriculture for the State of South Carolina. I am informed that the cost of printing the address will be $225.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 11 FIDDLERS

Nero made a name for himself because he fiddled while Rome burned. The Interstate Commerce Commission is composed of 11 members and in some respects they are trying to emulate Nero by their czaristic handling of the present transportation situation. The economy of our country is at stake and they are still fiddling around.

The subject is not frequently discussed in agricultural circles. Indeed, this subject is not given the measure of importance to which it is entitled. That subject is the effect of high transportation charges upon the farmers, and it cries aloud for a larger plan of action.

It is recognized generally that the measure of freight rates used for transporting goods is of great importance to the economic welfare of this country. High freight rates are barriers to national and international trade. Let's take transportation seriously for once, because you cannot escape its effects.

In years past, transportation charges were considered to be only a small part of getting the agricultural product to market. The situation, as you know, has changed and the constant upward freight-rate trend necessitates corresponding adjustments.

The producers of food and fiber are important in the lives of every man, woman, and child in this Nation. The farmer's economic contribution to his country, therefore, need not be emphasized.

It should be emphasized, however, that the farmers bear the freight charges in getting their products to the market place. The farmers, likewise, bear the charges on all items of commerce that are consumed on his farm. In other words, the farmer looks at freight rates from both directions. He should be considered the transportation agencies' best friend.

But now the burden of the freight charges that are being borne by farmers has reached an all-time high with prospects of still greater rate assessments against our farm products and supplies. It is appropriate for members of service organizations to join forces with all others interested in agriculture to do something about it.

Incidentally, the rural inhabitants of our country consume more different types of commodities than the urban dwellers. Their relative, and also their direct, interest in such charges are above the per capita average for the country.

In far too many instances the farmer concludes that, because he does not pay the actual freight bill on the commodity he produces, it is a matter of no direct concern to him. This is, indeed, false logic.

The farm product has only a potential value at its point of origin, the real value being acquired when it reaches the consumer. All expenses attached to marketing performances, including freight charges, are deductible items from the sales price. This is equally true on the articles consumed by the farmer, such as seed, sacks, fertilizer, etc.

When the farmer purchases a plow from the retailer he pays the amount asked and freight charges are not discussed. The dealer, however, paid the freight charges which were definitely added to his cost price. Quite obviously, the dealer could not bear freight charges from the factory to his place of business, because such charges would frequently be the equivalent, or greatly in excess, of the profit he must make in order to stay in business. Thus it can be seen that freight rates contribute to the farmers' financial status or, in other words, the size of farmers' net income depends largely upon the freight charges assessed.

This brings us face to face with some of our present transportation problems because trade distortions and marketing limitations due to high freight rates can curtail the sale of the farmers' products into certain markets.

Since June 30, 1946, the railroads of this country have, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, horizontally increased their freight rates seven successive times. The last increase became effective on January 11, 1949.

The railroads are now assessing, on most products of agriculture, increases amounting to 50 percent or more over and above rates in effect 18 months ago. The discouraging part of this entire situation is that other horizontal increases are in prospect. Indeed, there are rumors to the effect that the railroads may seek even greater increases by amending their pending petition identified for the record as Ex parte 168. Another uncomfortable point about this matter is that when the railroads obtain their increases, which they usually do, other forms of transport follow through with similar increases.

Constructive projects supported by combined interests have often resulted in great savings to the farmers, only to be lost almost immediately, by increases in freight rates on farm products. Freight rates are as important to the users as to those who make them.

We are creating machines, such as the cotton picker and tractor, to lift the back-breaking problems off the farmer only to have his back broken by higher freight rates. Higher and higher freight rates are exacting an increasing toll against the farmers' net returns. It follows that the higher the freight charges, the lower the profit to the farmer.

Railroads are constantly preparing themselves for succeeding and similar formal actions as Ex parte 168. In other words, they have in their employ a large corps of statisticians, economists, attorneys, traffic experts, and other specialists, totaling literally in the hundreds, whose time and talent are employed on an annual basis in developing the best ways and means of acquiring increased revenues.

Agriculture is presently faced with a new series of hearings in connection with Ex parte 168. In other words, while the railroads have obtained as high as 6 percent increases, dating from January 11, as a result of their latest effort to acquire horizontal increases, there is still pending a permanent or final decision in this matter which may cause increases totaling 13 percent, the amount originally requested last fall by the railroads.

The first of a series of hearings in this litigation was held in Washington, D. C., on March 1, 1949, with territorial hearings following in Chicago, Montgomery, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and Oklahoma City.

It may be helpful to mention that a discussion of the effect of transportation charges upon the farmers' products is to develop Where are we in transportation? Our consideration of this subject is timely because the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives have all recently gone on record with respect to their opposition to higher freight rates and other matters pertaining to transportation that is working against the farmers' interest.

It is known definitely also that the National Association of Commissioners of Agriculture and the southern commissioners of agriculture have been giving considerable attention to this subject, especially during the past year. Perhaps many other farm organizations and units of national groups have also discussed increased transportation charges and their effect upon the farmer.

Many shippers of agricultural products have appeared before the Commission in recent years in cases similar to Ex Parte 168. National farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture have been most active in these cases. Efforts have been made to keep the increases on agricultural products on as low a basis as possible. Voluminous testimony, many rate exhibits and other items, placed in the record to refute the carriers' claims, have available practically nothing in recent cases because the Interstate Commerce Commission always authorizes a major part of the increases requested by the railroads.

It seems to be the policy of the railroads to ask for a higher percentage increase than they expected to acquire, perhaps to make it a bit easier for the Interstate Commerce Commission to meet the railroads' actual hopes.

The maintaining of our railroads in good order is recognized as an imperative need to our economy. We wish their continuance upon a prosperous basis, but we do not want to pay undue tribute in the processes. What we are seeking for the farmer is an equitable adjustment of his freight rates to which he is entitled.

Questions with respect to the railroads could be framed to include the following: What's wrong with the railroads' revenue-earning capacities? Why do the carriers aspire to higher earnings? Under prevailing conditions are carriers entitled to increased freight rates? Are they rendering an honest, economical, and efficient service? The law says they must. What is it that the Interstate Commerce Commission has, or has not, done to bring about efficiency of operations? Comments to follow will include references to some of these points. Perhaps, but it isn't likely, the Interstate Commerce Commission might care to offer answers. We certainly extend that type of invitation.

Earnings by railroads are of great importance because no one, let alone the agricultural interests of the country, wishes to see our large transportation agencies go into bankruptcy. It is recognized that transportation is an essential part of every farm. Because of this recognition, prospects of solution can be explored to the betterment of all concerned. It is this concern in behalf of the farmers' interest that I ask your help.

Railroads invariably cite employee wages as one of the main agreements for rate increases to bolster revenue returns. The Secretary of Agriculture in his December 6, 1948 motion to the ICC to deny railroads further increases, states: "No national emergency in transportation now exists requiring further immediate general increases in railroad freight rates. The record in the present case shows that, even if wages of all railroad employees are increased 10 cents per hour, following the pattern of recent increases granted to railway trainmen, and if present high levels of prices of commodities purchased by railroads are maintained, the railroads of the country will receive in

1949, without an increase in the present freight rate or in the present volume of tonnage moving by railroads, and without improvement in present efficiency and economy of railroad operation, an average return on the value of their properties of approximately 4 percent after the payment of all taxes, including income taxes."

The front page headline of the February 11 issue of the Wall Street Journal, published just one month following the last over-all increase of railroad freight rates, includes the following statement: "Truckers haul more produce as shippers shy from rail rates." Now that the railroads' favorite newspaper is taking cognizance of such things, it is appropriate for the railroads themselves and the Interstate Commerce Commission also to give some thought to these happenings and to other potentialities that will have an adverse effect upon railroad earnings. Two years ago I wrote the ICC that the railroads are following a policy of pricing themselves out of the market.

Agricultural Secretary Brannan said recently that the peak of farm prosperity appears to be past. He told Congress that, since farm prices have been coming down faster than nonfarm prices, the Nation is put on notice to protect itself against imbalance in its economy.

The core of this entire problem with respect to Ex parte 168, insofar as producers and their interests are concerned, revolves around our ability to get the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the efficiency of the railroads. No other Federal agency has the statutory authority or mechanics to undertake such steps. Section 15a (2) of the Interstate Commerce Act reads as follows:

"In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic by the carrier or carriers for which the rates are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient railway transportation service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service; and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable the carriers, under honest, economical, and efficient management to provide such service."

This section has been used by the Commission in behalf of all railroads. Section 15a of the quoted act implies that no carrier is entitled to increased rates or charges unless the railroad is honestly and efficiently operated. In addition, the shippers and producers also have certain rights under the same section, but the Interstate Commerce Commission's actions in this regard have been of no visible value to the American farmer.

Every farmer in South Carolina, and, indeed, every farmer in the United States should be informed of the comprehensive petition filed on December 6, 1948, in behalf of the United States Secretary of Agriculture for the farmers of the country in opposition to carriers' attempt to acquire further over-all freight-rate increases. This document has obtained recognition as one of the most outstanding petitions ever filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Secretary of Agriculture directed the Commission's attention to many important past studies compiled by well-equipped agencies designed to bring about improvement in carriers' operations, with particular attention directed to the reduction of costs through coordination, consolidation, and other things. In effect, the Interstate Commerce Commission was reminded of recommendations made by the Coordinator of Transportation some years back. Collateral recommendations were made also by individual members, and groups, of ICC Commissioners.

The Board of Investigation and Research in recent years made elaborate reports indicating how numerous savings, totaling many millions of dollars, could be effectuated, but to no avail. All these documents point a finger to the definite direction the ICC should take to create its own investigations and a program of action. If this agency of the Government continues in its complacency, other steps must be taken.

It is preposterous that the only Federal agency obligated and equipped to perform, practically sits idly by and permits one of the supporting pillars of our economy to undergo gross impairments. The message that I am trying to make you understand, gentlemen, strikes at the very vitals of our economic existence. Another thought important in its implications, is our national defense, which is likewise involved in this matter. The Commissioners to permit all of these things to get out of hand must have a warped sense of values.

On page 7 of the Commission's most recent order in these ex parte proceedings it is stated with brutal emphasis that the Secretary of Agriculture's petition was dismissed for the reason that "such an investigation could not be made in the manner sought without large appropriations for the purpose that are not available." Again the Commission growled out its dirge by stating: "We have had on our docket, since 1931, a continuing investigation under Ex parte No. 104 into and concerning practices of carriers by railroads which affect operating revenues or expenses, under which we have investigated certain of such practices. While progress has been made, much remains to be done, particularly in achieving the economies which require cooperation and coordination among the railroads, but we must recall that the war disrupted all industries and its effects are still felt."

The Ex parte 104 investigation was divided into seven parts with hearings conducted in connection with four parts, none of which had to do with carriers' efficiency. In the main, their investigations have been conducted with reference to terminal and switching service charges—inter- and intraplant operations, refrigerator car rentals, storage conditions at the port of New York, and the free use of packing sheds in Texas and Louisiana.

It is noted that the three important subdivisions, relating to efficiency, that might have been investigated are under part 1, railroad fuel costs; part 3, construction and maintenance of private sidetracks; and part 4, traffic expenses. The latter from the standpoint of promoting efficiency was the most important. My information, to date, has not brought to light, however, any actual or contemplated hearings in this regard.

I am informed there is a strong intimation by the Commission, that the lack of personnel prevented further investigations and lack of appropriations was given as the reason for such shortage of personnel.

An investigation to date has unfolded some very interesting facts. These include the discovery of the Commission's total unobligated balance of appropriation—unused—and returned to the Treasury—from June 30, 1931, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, amounting to $5,507,575. Indeed, at the end of the fiscal year terminating June 30, 1943, the unobligated balance of the appropriation was $808,360. The so-called general administrative fund from which the investigations would likely be financed has had a surplus for the same period amounting to nearly $1,300,000. You are reminded, my friends, these are the amounts reported as unused to the Congress of the United States.

It, of course, should be understood that the South Carolina Department of Agriculture has not had the opportunity of conducting an extensive research of the wherefores and whyfors of the ICC's performances. It does appear, however, from where we are sitting, there is a substantial dereliction on the part of the Commission. It is my opinion, however, gathered from the Commission's own record, which shows the return of huge sums of money to the United States Treasury at the end of each fiscal year, that to rely upon a claim that they had insufficient personnel and funds, is a very flimsy excuse for not conducting surveys as to the carriers' efficiency, and cries aloud for an investigation.

If they had examined the operations of only one carrier, particularly the New York Central Lines or the Pennsylvania Railroad, which I understand are the leading agitators in the matter of increased freight rates, it would have been most helpful in establishing the actual facts in the situation.

The height of all-time excuses perpetrated upon the American farmer by a Federal agency is that indulged in by the Commission in this case. Imagine, if you will, an investigation of this magnitude and importance pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1931. Do you realize that many girls and boys not yet born in 1931 have since graduated from high school.

I, for one, do not recall ever having seen any special report made by this Commission to the public, the Congress, the press, the President, or anyone else, stating that they have been handicapped in measuring up to its requirements because they lack funds to make the necessary investigations which go directly to the heart of our economic existence.

Talking about questions reminds me that I can ask one along about here: How long do these 11 Commissioners on the ICC think that the agricultural interests of the country should sit on the side lines and await their convenience to determine the efficiency of common carriers, which, by law, they are obligated to perform?

Another appropriate question would be if the Commission does not perform and continues to be negligent about measuring up to its obligations, should not the Congress of the United States take cognizance of this condition and make an investigation of the Commission's inactivities as to carriers' inefficiencies because this matter is of outstanding importance to every citizen of the United States?

The Interstate Commerce Commission in its recent annual report, submitted to the Congress a few days ago, had much to say about "carriers' operations." They mentioned "high rates may become self-defeating" and that "much more must be done to reduce operating costs," as well as similar expressions, but gave no indication that any action would follow the failure of the carriers to heed the admonition.

Shortly, subsequent to the preparation of this same annual report, the Commission further increased by 4, 5, and 6 percent, depending upon territorial origins, freight rates on most items, including all products on the agricultural list. Remember again, these recent increases can be described as interim or temporary, with favorable prospects of additions at the close of the pending proceeding.

A continuance of the system now in vogue, especially because carriers are prone to follow a well-defined pattern of profitable routine, convinces me of the hopelessness of the present situation if allowed to continue without drastic protests and a well-planned policy of opposition.

The adopted vicious cycle includes presentation by railroads of evidence of increased labor charges and/or material costs, and a lowering of net income based upon unaudited (by the Commission) financial accounts, resulting in the filing of another

over-all freight-increase petition with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Railroad petitions usually receive almost immediate action from the Commission insofar as hearings, decisions, and orders, including higher levels of rates in succeeding continuity, are concerned. Incidentally, should John Doe, farmer, attempt to get similar action he would be doomed to disappointment, although his individual condition could be substantially more serious. Farmers should realize that when freight rates go up, their income goes down.

All manner of opposition has heretofore been designed and put in motion to refute the carriers' incessant attempts at horizontal increases. In effect, the Commission generally issues an explanation regarding its order allowing increases which, in substance, means, irrespective of the showing made by the opposition, the carriers have proven to the Commission's satisfaction that their earnings are insufficient. This, mind you, has taken place repeatedly, with the Commission giving little or no consideration to carriers' efficiency.

A point that I have considered is to the effect that the railroads in their operations, including practices and policies growing out of managerial discretions and perhaps many managerial indiscretions, have a way of showing up ultimately in the respective carriers' balance sheets. A recapitulation of these balance sheets, which the Commission does not go back of, includes profits and losses of the strong and weak railroads and is the document most relied upon to obtain increases.

Incidentally, there is no individual or agency, save the Commission, that is in position to make a check as to the accuracy of these financial statements, let alone to determine that such is the outcome, in all instances of efficient operations.

Emphasis should be placed upon the fact that without the Commission's investigation the carriers "can do no wrong," because if earnings are not sufficient, which may be due in part to inefficiencies, they simply approach the Commission again for further increases—a beautiful arrangement for the railroads, but not for the farmer.

A point to be emphasized is the fact that nowhere in the Interstate Commerce Act is mention made of a stipulated rate of return or any fixed amount carriers must earn. The act is silent on this point. A seeming inconsistency exists under the same section of the act, upon which railroads rely, in that the rights of carriers thereunder are respected by the Commission but the rights of shippers or those having primary interest in freight rates, such as farmers, are accorded slight consideration.

The carriers' earnings collectively, at the time the railroads filed their last petition, were between 4 and 5 percent and this average includes "all of the weak sisters." Such average earnings, however, present no conviction that an extreme emergency exists, warranting interim increases without a complete investigation.

In recent years railroads operating in the southern and western districts have been relatively much more efficient and remunerative than their eastern brethren. Expressed differently, the railroads handling the most of agricultural tonnage are seemingly the most prosperous and these railroads have not taken the initiative in creating the last three ex parte investigations.

The eastern railroads have been relatively worse off than their southern and western connections. In a late newspaper report, however, one of the prime movers, in the recent ex parte investigation, the Pennsylvania Railroad, has reported its 1948 income as being in excess of $34,000,000, nearly five times greater than the $7,000,000 net income of the previous year. Similar earning expansions have occurred with the other eastern carriers. Remember the 1949 rate levels are higher than 1948.

From good authority, the railroads operating in the grain and cotton belts were not enthusiastic in supporting present policies of ex parte investigations. Even the Association of American Railroads has not been connected directly with Ex partes 166 and 168. This organization did, however, at the request of the eastern railroads, so I am informed, lend its senior statistician to compile and present certain financial and collateral data in exhibit form.

Under date of January 22, in connection with Docket No. 29886, the southwestern carriers petitioned the Commission for an order requiring certain official (eastern) territory railroads to furnish specific and so-called essential information for use in connection with the development of relative costs and stressed the savings to be effectuated by the use of Diesel equipment. In other words, the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, B & O, the New Haven, the Nickel Plate, the Erie, and the Norfolk and Western because of their previous refusal to do so, if so ordered, would be required to display their known inefficiencies. Perhaps we are getting somewhere when one group of railroads accuses some of the most important railroads in the country of things we have long suspected.

If the southwestern carriers prevail the eastern roads must put into the record of docket No. 29886 certain information regarding the antiquity of their motive power, the presumption being that such outmoded equipment results in high costs of operation, which, in turn, brings about a demand from the eastern railroads for a higher split in the divisions of all joint through rates between that territory and the southwestern territory.

In the same petition the following is particularly noted: "The southwestern respondents allege, upon information and belief that this terminal expense is excessive, due to the inefficient equipment in use, etc."

Another circumstance of importance may be of interest to relate. Some of the railroads, as you know, are the principal lines serving the thickly populated eastern industrial sections. The New York Central has made many claims to the Commission of its financial distress. Indeed, its vice president and counsel was the chief attorney and the principal outstanding advocate for higher rates in several of the most recent of the ex parte cases.

Of all items handled by the New York Central lines, to cite an example, its volume consists of more than 50 percent of articles listed as products of mines, a very low-rated list of commodities. They originate only a relatively small portion of this character of freight—the preponderance of this type of tonnage coming to it from the financially strong so-called Pocahontas railroads. A similar increase applied on coal tonnage as assessed against the products of agriculture would help financially weaker eastern lines. Similar horizontal increases ordered with a better division of the through rates between the strong Pocahontas coal railroads and their weaker eastern connections would also be another way to solve most of the lower earning eastern railroads' problems.

For the year 1947 (1948 data unavailable) the raw products of agriculture accounted for approximately 11 percent of all rail tonnage but the railroads derived 16 percent of their entire revenue from this source. For animals, and products thereof, these figures are 1 percent and 4 percent, respectively; while for products of mines the percentage was 56 for tonnage and 28 percent for revenue. The rail equipment used for shipments of coal is always returned to the mines empty or, in other words, for the most part, coal cars are loaded only about 50 percent of the time in transit.

While we will not quote extensively from the Secretary of Agriculture's petition, there is, however, one point that should be an exception and bears repeating: "The total average movement of freight cars in the United States is less than 47 miles per day, of which the loaded movement is only about 32 miles per day, while the average speed of freight trains is 16 miles per hour. These statistics reveal that the average freight car is in movement transporting freight only a little more than 2 hours out of every day and makes only about two revenue trips per month."

As freight rates go up railroad tonnage goes down. The railroads hauled 16,600,000 carloads less in 1948 than they did in 1947. With less and less tonnage, higher and higher rates are inevitable. This is recognized even by some important railroad officials. Recently the president of the Union Pacific Railroad made a speech using this fact as his subject. On the other hand, however, the president of the New York Central Lines is quoted as having said it was his belief that the ICC should be allowed to increase freight charges without a hearing upon application by the railroads.

In all cases affecting the various products of agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture has been very active in protecting the farmers' interest under the authority vested in him through section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

There are those of us who believe that now is the time for something to be done to save the railroads from themselves because it is inevitable that, if the carriers continue their present routine, it can lead only to Government control and, ultimately, to Government ownership of railroads. I believe it time now that consideration be given to the advisability of the farm and city organizations, collectively, offering the Interstate Commerce Commission their support in acquiring special appropriations to make any necessary investigations that will remove many of the indicated and suspected inefficiencies of carriers' operations.

A sort of closed corporation practice indulged in by the Commission is the method employed in rendering its decisions. In late ex parte cases the verdict reached appears to be unanimous. It is suspected, however, without any way of proving it, that in advance of conferences and vote, agreement was reached to record its findings as unanimous. To say the least, it is rather unusual for 11 men to agree completely in so many of these cases with its involved commodity and territorial ramifications. Even the United States Supreme Court, with only nine members, seldom reaches a unanimous decision in outstanding issues. Each individual Commissioner should be personally held accountable for his vote and should give his reasons in support of his actions.

Another criticism of the Commission's practices pertains to its declarations of what is a manufactured product of agriculture. The Harwood trucking case presents an example of the decisions opposed. Even when the Commission faces such issues in court and loses the verdict it will eliminate such practices in that court's jurisdiction but not in other districts which is, indeed, an arbitrary policy to follow. The South Carolina Department of Agriculture testified in this case.

In recent ex parte cases maximum rate increases were prescribed in certain instances. The railroads have been in severe violation of the Commission's decision by applying increases on two factor (combination) rates resulting in advances in excess of the Commission's decision. The Commis-

sion appears reluctant, at least in some instances, to order the railroads to respect its decisions.

The time is appropriate for the farmers and those who depend on the farmer to demand improvements in our transportation methods—starting with the Congress if necessary. Included in such a program should be our endorsement of membership on the Interstate Commerce Commission of a person, or persons, having a background of agricultural transportation experience. Other segments of our economy are represented on the Commission; therefore, this idea cannot be classified as inconsistent.

It seems that the 11 fiddlers are out of tune and their actions are not in harmony with the farmers' interests. Indeed, with the laying off of thousands of railroad employees all over the country, because of less tonnage, the Commission's decisions appear to be helping no segment of our economy. The railroads, following World War I also made substantial increases in their freight rates which diminished the volume of business handled. Later they had to reduce their rates. The railroads have resurrected the same unworkable pattern, aided and abetted by the Commission, which appears to be headed for the same disastrous experience.

It is my suggestion that we write Congress to create a special committee to investigate the operations—or better still, the lack of some imperative operations on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, especially as such would relate to carriers' inefficiencies. But let's demand this investigation be conducted by a committee that is nonpartisan. Members of this Congress have instituted proceedings for an investigation—but let me read from the Produce News, of February 12, under the column Capitol Letter.

"WHOSE INVESTIGATION

"Considering the rapidly growing clamor of the Nation's shippers and receivers for an investigation of both ICC and the railroad and motor carriers, an unprecedented and unexpected action by Senator CLYDE M. REED took place this week on the Hill.

"The Senator, speaking for himself and Senator MYERS introduced Senate Resolution 62, calling for an investigation of the land and water transportation system of the United States, which resolution promptly was referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"The investigation is to discover (a) if the transportation system follows national policy as expressed in the Interstate Commerce Act, (b) if expenditures are in accordance with that policy, (c) if legislation is necessary to bring transportation practice in line with national policy.

"Experienced congressional observers, however, are giving the resolution knowing winks, pending further development. The resolution naturally calls for a subcommittee (usually of three members) to conduct the investigation and the naming of a chairman.

"Such subcommittees are often completely dominated by the chairman, who becomes in effect a one-man committee. Senator REED was chairman of both the Bulwinkle bill and the railroad car shortage investigation hearings and bludgeoned his way through the opposition to the railroads on both occasions.

"Senator REED has been generally and without qualification spoken of as a railroad front man for some years. Senator MYERS is Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, home of the Pennsylvania Railroad. He also was on the car-shortage investigation committee last year.

"As this column goes to press, members of the subcommittee have not been named. Pending further development of the investigation, determination of witnesses permitted to testify and such matters pertinent to a genuine investigation, noncarrier transportation circles are keeping their fingers crossed.

"Last guess of all is that Senator REED, prodded by western carriers who in a late January petition to ICC charged railroads in the eastern district with inefficiency, may be calling the investigation for a settlement of this dispute. But then, Senator MYERS is from the eastern district.

"At any rate, there is ample evidence in the record, pending further development, of course, to warrant a look-out on the part of the trade to prevent such an investigation becoming window dressing designed to stop a real investigation."

Will higher freight rates help the railroads? By way of being a bit facetious, we may compare the present ills to the mother giving more candy to the child when candy had already made it sick.

Boiled down to a simple question, Are the railroads operating economically, honestly, and efficiently? The law says the answer should come from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Automobiles for Blind Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes of the time of the Members to urge upon them their support of legislation, now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that would authorize automobiles for those veterans who are blind as a direct result of their war service. Also the bill includes the amputees.

There are no less than five measures now on file that would accomplish this result. One of the latest of such proposals is one by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], with whom I have just been talking. Many Members have spoken to me about the proposal and have agreed with me that its enactment would be one of the most humane and thoughtful acts that Congress has taken in caring for veterans who gave their sight that we might be protected.

As each of you probably has, I have received many, many letters from blinded veterans and their families, letters that are most touching and in many instances pathetic, written on a typewriter obviously by one who cannot see, telling me what a boon an automobile would be in their every day existence. Many of these veterans can obtain gainful occupation if transportation is provided. Anyone who watches the blind on crowded streetcars, in subways, in railroad trains, in crowded busses realizes the difficulties they encounter.

I want to quote a few excerpts from some of these letters:

A blind veteran of World War II, from Brockton, Mass., writes:

I am a blinded veteran of World War II, and I am vitally interested in this bill. Its passage would mean a great deal to myself and fellow veterans so disabled. While it is true we cannot drive cars ourselves, we can derive the benefits of being driven in our own cars by members of our own families. As you can well imagine, public means of transportation leaves much to be desired from the viewpoint of a blinded person. A great deal of security could be realized if we could depend on our own resources in accomplishing our own travel.

Another of these men, from Camden, Ark., writes:

Having heard of your deep and sincere interest in the welfare of the disabled veterans, I feel that I would like to extend my thanks to you for our past benefits through your efforts. Having lost both my eyes and both hands in Germany in April 1945 it is difficult for me to get around as much as I would like. * * * Should the bill pass, my wife, who is a good driver, would take good care of my car.

Then there is the blind veteran from Fairview, N. C., who lives out in the country:

I live about 12 miles from the nearest town, and bus facilities are very poor, necessitating much walking and waiting for schedules. I feel an automobile would aid me very much in my readjustment. My wife could act as driver for me.

There is a veteran down in San Antonio, Tex., whose eyesight is so impaired that he is groping about trying to make his own way for his wife and children.

As the bill now stands I meet the requirements to qualify for a car. My vision is 20/200 uncorrectable in both eyes. I cannot see to read or to do any close work. I need a car for transportation to my job and to take my child to the doctor. It is very inconvenient to ride the bus to work in bad weather because of delays in transfer. I cannot always take my baby to the doctor and other places by bus. In inclement weather I am forced to stay at home. My wife will be available to drive the car for me, should the bill pass.

The family of a blinded veteran of World War II, from Methuen, Mass., writes:

I wish to take the opportunity to write to you in behalf of my brother-in-law, a blinded veteran of World War II. You have his and our support for the blinded veterans' auto bill, a Godsend to those shut-ins, our blinded veterans of the past war. Sometime in the past we approved the granting of cars for amputees and have found from observation that this has been of great benefit to these helpless unfortunates. In his particular case, we feel a car belonging to him and at his disposal to take him wherever he has reason to call would round out and better his future to compensate for his present handicap. In closing we hope the rest of your honorable colleagues vote favorably on this bill for the sake of these veterans.

Down in Louisville, Ky., there is a veteran who is living in a world of darkness, who has been hoping and praying for this legislation for a long while. He writes:

I am writing again as I wrote you last year, but I feel sure the bill will be passed this session as we have a Congress that wants to help the veteran to his best advantage. I realize Congress can't pass every bill that comes its way, but this bill if passed would do much to raise the spirit of many blinded veterans who will never see the light again, only through the kindness of our fellowman. Being a blinded veteran, I am in favor of passage of this legislation, because it would be a Godsend for me and many other blinded veterans to have transportation to and from

our daily work. I am sure you know how helpful automobiles are to the amputees in their rehabilitation. To the veteran who lives off the bus or car line, who must trudge through rain and snow to reach an overcrowded bus, to be pushed and shoved around, to own a car so my wife or another member of my family could drive me to and from work in comfort would truly be a gift from God.

One of the Red Cross Gray Ladies wrote this for a young man out in Long Beach, Calif., but he signed it himself—and legibly, too:

The bill pending in regards to blinded veterans, I understand, is about to come before you once again. I would appreciate very much if you would do everything reasonable to consider casting your vote in behalf of the blinded veterans. If I am fortunate enough to secure one of the automobiles it will mean a considerable lot to me and my family. It will serve as a means of transportation with my wife as a driver. I also have a brother who will be able to assist me in the way of driving. At the present I am engaged in an on-the-job training in a small candy and tobacco business. It would help me in securing my supplies.

From Glastonbury, Conn., comes the following:

Being blinded myself, this bill is of the greatest importance to me. Having it passed would aid my rehabilitation considerably. It would bring much pleasure and also help to get back and forth to a job. My wife would act as chauffeur and life would be lots brighter. There is so little I can do for activities at times morale is pretty low. I would like to thank you for all the effort you have put into this bill. I feel most confident having you on our side. Thank you again. I will in the meantime pray for the passage of the bill.

Out in Denver, Colo., is a boy who will never see the beauties of that wonderful scenic State. He writes:

I served in the United States Army and lost my sight 5 years ago. The car would certainly mean a lot to me in my rehabilitation as I attend school—and also an automobile is a great source of enjoyment. My wife is a licensed operator.

This letter comes from the wife of a blinded veteran from Philadelphia:

As the wife of a blinded veteran and the mother of his son, I feel that I must write and ask you to do all within your power to seek the passing of the auto bill for the blinded. Your past records have been so outstanding and we can't forget how untiring you worked for the amputees that we feel you will do the same for our loved ones. You realize how hard it is to get around without a car, for when you have a baby and husband to look after and prices of taxis beyond our budget very often, you understand that our visiting is very limited—so as a woman I appeal to you, for we wives have given unstintingly of our love and encouragement that our men may feel they are living a normal life as much as possible, but with a car to take us it would be the opening of many new and different thoughts for them. So again I ask and pray that we won't be told again that it hasn't passed, for so much money going abroad can't a little be given to those who gave so much to all of us. Hoping you won't let us down and pray God gives you the good health to continue your wonderful work.

A young man up in Fall River, Mass., typed a beautiful letter, free from errors and well signed:

I know if passed it will be a wonderful thing for these fellows, because I am one of them. I find it a great inconvenience to get about, especially finding and waiting for transportation on many needed occasions. This is why a car would help in my rehabilitation. I would like to explain that my friends and members of my family are available to act as drivers.

Near to my home in Malden, Mass., a blinded veteran writes:

I am a member of the Blind Veterans' Association, and I am writing in regard to the bill providing automobiles for blind veterans. I am so in need of a car to take me here and there. My brother could do the driving. I just want you to try your best to have this bill passed.

From the town of Hopedale, Mass., another veteran writes:

Would you do everything in your power to support and help secure passage of this bill? A car would be of great assistance in my rehabilitation. It would help me in getting to Boston, as I am taking voice lessons there. (Boston is a distance of approximately 35 miles from my home.) My wife can drive, and she could act as driver of the car and take me to Boston, as it's pretty difficult getting in there any other way. Also, it would come in handy for getting me to the many functions I have to attend. Being blind, I feel it a necessity in having a car of my own, making it much easier for me to get to my destination and making life more pleasant and bearable in not being tied down for lack of easy communication. Please think it over, my dear Congresswoman, and with your help and support I'm sure this car bill will become law.

Another blind veteran writes from Roxbury, Mass.:

Passage of such a bill would help greatly in the readjustment for myself and other veterans in the same condition. It would enable us to get out more often, especially in the large cities where there is so much traffic, and we would be able to associate more with our friends. I myself have a couple of members in my family who would be available to drive me around, and they would be only too glad to help me out.

Here is a veteran who lives for from the beaten path, in Alcalde, Ky.:

I am a blinded veteran of World War II and believe that the auto bill for us blinded boys is a great thing. I can't put in words how much in need of a car I am. I live 6 miles from our nearest town and doctor, and there is no bus nor anything that runs on our road. Every time my wife, baby, or myself need a doctor I have to hire a car there and back. It is almost impossible for me to travel without a car, and I am not able to buy one myself. I can think of nothing that would be of more service to us blinded soldiers than a car. I have a neighbor's wife or her brother who would be glad to drive my car for me if I should be given one.

This one comes from Wheeling, W. Va.:

As I am a blinded veteran with a wife and five children this would greatly improve my rehabilitation. It would enable my getting to my work, as my wife could drive for me. It would mean an awful lot, for as it is we can go nowhere. Please give your support to this bill, and it will be greatly appreciated.

None of us can read these letters without visualizing the vast scope of new activity an automobile would open up to these unfortunate men. It would do more to encourage them and help their morale, as well as to make them forget their handicap, than any other thing I can think of.

The blinded veterans are one of the most courageous classes of disabled veterans. They are tremendously proud of their accomplishments, and rightfully so. There is little we can do to ease the monotony of their daily lives, but each of them is unanimous in the belief that the possession of an automobile would do more toward a normal existence than any other thing we could do.

The Fear of War Hangs Like a Dark Cloud Over the Peace and Contentment of the People of This Nation—They Want Us in Congress To Do What We Reasonably Can To Prevent War, Rather Than To Assure Them That We Can Win It—They Do Not Want It To Start

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the American people acclaimed President Truman when he declared in Newark, N. J.:

I would rather have peace in the world than be the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the two most profound expressions with respect to world peace since that memorable statement of our President were made in the last 72 hours.

One I came upon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was spoken by your good friend and my good friend, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who long served with us in this House and is now the junior Senator from the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

In the debate now taking place in the Senate with respect to the ERP, that distinguished Senator on Friday last spoke these profound words:

The fear of war hangs like a dark cloud over the peace and contentment of the people of this Nation. They want us in Congress to do what we reasonably can to prevent war, rather than to assure them that we can win it. They do not want it—to start.

I do not know as yet what we shall spend this year for armed services. I am glad that I am on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which will have to make the first decision on that matter. I understand the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House has proposed that $1,500,000,000 be added to that sum. There seems to be quite a sentiment in Congress as well as among the people of the Nation, that we would do well to increase our Air Force units from the 47 or 48 we now have, by at least 10 more, and some would like to see them increased to a total of 70 air squadrons.

The second statement to which I refer was made by the Honorable Winston Churchill during his speech in Boston last Thursday when he said:

For good or ill—air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power—and fleets and armies, however necessary, must

accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man.

Mr. Speaker, what words could more truly express the American sentiment than those spoken by Senator ROBERTSON when he said that the American people want us in this Congress to do all that we reasonably can to prevent war rather than to assure them that we can win it. They do not want it to start.

Then sentiment in Congress as well as among the people of the Nation is that we would do well to increase our Air Force—

So declared Senator ROBERTSON.

The people of this country know that American air power is American peace power.

It was in order to prevent war from starting that this House last week passed legislation creating the 70-group air force.

It is for that reason that the Honorable CARL VINSON, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee of this House publicly stated his desire to have this House vote the money necessary to implement the 70-group air force program.

The success of the United States Air Force in operating the Berlin lift day after day, night after night, month upon month—the wonderful performances of our B–29's, our B–50's, our B–36's and our other long range superbombers—the marvelous record of the globe-encircling flight—prove that our air defense is not alone by far the least expensive—but that it is the sole deterrent to foreign aggression that the American people possess.

Dentists in Industrial Areas Praise British Health Service—But Some Ideas That Have Come Up Annoy Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, I placed in the RECORD the ninth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 28, is the tenth of the series:

DENTISTS IN INDUSTRIAL AREAS PRAISE BRITISH HEALTH SERVICE—BUT SOME IDEAS THAT HAVE COME UP ANNOY THEM

(Tenth in a series)

(By E. J. Delaney)

LONDON, March 28.—Dentists who live and work in industrial districts of England's cities have only praise for the new British National Health Service. They think it is wonderful, but do have a few reservations concerning possibilities that would affect their professional standing. They are more trusting in their attitude toward the Labor Government and its leadership, but they say there are some ideas they will not stand for and will revolt against.

These dentists are caustic in their remarks concerning other dentists who serve the white-collar and higher economic groups. One of them puts it this way:

"The trouble with them is that they want to spend too much time arguing with a patient against the Health Service and trying to induce the person to become a private patient."

BEST PLAN EVER

This man, in the docks section of a big city, is a member of the Labor party. He helped form the ideas on dentistry included in the Beveridge Report that make up the modern base from which National Health Service has emerged. He handles 50 patients a day, instead of the 20 that get into the chair of dentists in better neighborhoods.

But let him speak for himself: "Huge taxes, direct and indirect, have driven all classes to take advantage of the dental benefits of the health scheme. Aneurin Bevan's plan is the best that ever has been thought of for the dentists and it is working wonderfully.

"I am able to handle 50 patients a day, working 6 hours, during a 5-day week. I close on Thursdays. Formerly I had to labor in the evening, but not now. I close my door at 6, although I sometimes unlock it again because somebody comes around with a swelling jaw and rings my bell vigorously. I have 3,000 patients and no private practice. I don't take in $4 a month in cash from patients."

SAYS PATIENTS ARE HAPPY

What is the disposition of his patients toward the health service? "They are happy about it," the dentist says, "they are more cooperative in their relations with me than they ever were before around this region. They feel that the work is being paid for by somebody else and they are extremely grateful."

"What about the dentists and their freedoms?" you ask. This man says: "We are freer under this system than we were under the insurance plan for workmen that existed before the health service was started. Principally we are allowed to do a much wider range of work than I ever could do hereabouts.

"In this district about all I ever have done have been extractions, simple fillings and dentures. I have not put in one inlay in years. I can do a lot more for my people, and, isn't it wonderful, I can get paid for it."

OPPOSES TECHNICIANS

This dentist is ruggedly against the movement to make technicians and dental mechanics into some kind of an assistant dentist. Only in this respect does he indicate he would break with the labor government.

He says: "The technicians have a union and, of course, under a Labor government they may be able to induce the authorities to look most kindly on their ambitions, but the profession will fight against it. We will not stand for girls cleaning teeth and performing prophylactic tasks."

The technicians are trying to work up an arrangement that will make them more important in the service. They ask to be organized into dental auxiliaries. They offer to stop all advertising, to have their employees and helpers subjected to proficiency tests, and they swear they will not attempt any dental surgery and will refer everything not strictly mechanical work to a dentist.

SEEK REGISTRATION

They aspire to be registered by the Government. The technicians, too, are against regimentation and say they will oppose aggressively any attempt to turn them into civil servants working under a bureau for a flat pay per week.

One dentist who holds a high elective position has made a public statement in defense of his profession, of the public and of the health service.

He denies that most dentists are reaping fabulous profits, says he could not make the $1,600-a-month limit without an excessive amount of labor and, besides, everybody forgets that the gross income of a dentist is not a profit. He thinks overhead runs to 66 percent rather than 52 percent, and he knows dentists who barely are getting along.

Farmers Only Want Fair Competition From Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Minnesota Ninth District which contains a part of the great Red River Valley, referred to for the past century as the "breadbasket of the world."

My district is almost wholly a farming district with scores of very fine creameries and many thousands of farmers who produce dairy products.

The State of Minnesota produces one-eighth of all the butter used in these United States and I am proud to say that the quality of Minnesota butter is known throughout the world. In addition to private-owned creameries and dairies, we have great farmer cooperatives which send hundreds of millions of pounds of butter and other dairy products to all parts of the world.

The farmers of my district do not fear fair competition from oleomargarine. The quality of our butter is such that we can compete with any producer in the world, provided the consumer knows he is getting butter and not oleomargarine.

This bill we are considering today was introduced by a Republican representative, Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Minnesota's First District, who has been for many years a member of the Agriculture Committee of the House and has given intensive study to this controversy between oleo and genuine butter. We are also considering a bill, identical to the Andresen bill, sponsored by a Utah Democrat, the Honorable WALTER GRANGER.

This bill removes the Federal tax on oleo but it prohibits interstate commerce in yellow oleomargarine unless it is clearly labeled and marked so that the consumer will know that he or she is buying oleo.

I am heartily in favor of the Andresen-Granger bill, since it gives protection to the dairy farmers of America. I repeat, that the makers of real butter do not fear fair competition, but when some thousands of restaurants and hotels over the Nation serve oleo which they buy and color at a low cost to customers, who think they are getting genuine butter, then I say a halt should be called to this nefarious practice.

Other speakers have ably covered many points concerning this bill, but I

want to stress that soil conservation also is very much involved in this debate today.

Congress for years has appropriated tens of millions of dollars for soil conservation. We all realize that soil is the basis of prosperity and economy and that erosion and depletion of the soil is one of the most serious problems confronting not only the United States but every nation in the world.

If the dairy farmers meet such unfair competition that they do not plant sufficient land to grass, hay, and feed crops, then the soil becomes depleted and the riches of the Nation go down to an alarming degree. Millions of dairy cows furnish thousands of tons of fertilizer.

Millions of dairy cows furnish the milk which all of you realize is the fundamental food not only for children but adults. I think some of you Members from the Southern States realize that planting crops year after year, such as cotton and soybeans, has seriously depleted the soil, and the fact that some of your States are switching over to dairying will bear out my contention that the production of dairy products is one of the greatest builders of the soil known to mankind.

The dairy industry in America produces 25 percent of our total farm income, and in Minnesota it accounts for more than 50 percent of the farm income. On our farm income depends many jobs in other walks of life, such as those of railroad men, bankers, laborers, doctors, merchants, clerks, lawyers—in fact, in farm districts almost every job depends upon the prosperity of the man who tills the soil; therefore, when you harm dairying you harm all the people of the farming community.

We have only one request of the few oleomargarine manufacturers of America. We ask them to sell their product in its own clothes and on its own merits.

There are only 28 oleo manufacturers in the Nation, and yet they have such a powerful rich lobby here that it seems almost a hopeless task to protect the 2,500,000 dairy farmers of America.

Let me emphasize that the welfare of the farmers in my district is the welfare of all the people of the Ninth District. If the farmers fail, the business and professional people have no market and no money, as was shown during the depression of the 1930's, when everybody went down because agriculture went down.

I especially urge you Congressmen in the South and from the cities to vote for this law which protects the dairy farmer by prohibiting the sale of yellow oleomargarine with unfair competition with real honest butter.

When you knock down an important part of America, agriculture, you start destroying the soil, ruining the business of millions of hard-working farmers, and practicing deceit on the consumer, who thinks he is getting butter but is served yellow oleomargarine.

Vote for this Andresen-Granger bill as it stands and you will best serve agriculture and the Nation.

Soil Conservation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, early this year the boards of supervisors of Wisconsin soil conservation districts made their annual reports to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the State Soil Conservation (Districts) Committee. The United States Soil Conservation Service, at the request of the district supervisors, provides these districts with technical help which farmers cooperating with the local district can use in planning and applying complete farm conservation programs to their farms. After reading the district supervisors' reports, M. F. Schweers, State conservationist at Madison for the Soil Conservation Service, wrote a letter to the supervisors commenting on points of interest to the two groups.

He complimented the supervisors highly on their excellent job of planning and administering the affairs of the local districts, thereby making more effective the technical help which districts get from the Soil Conservation Service and the other kinds of help they get from governmental and private groups, either Federal, State, or local. He referred especially to the "speeding up of all activities in districts during 1948." The soil conservation districts are organized by farmers under State law and are administered by local governing boards.

Following are some of Mr. Schweer's comments:

1948 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During mid-winter of 1947–48 you supervisors, in consultation with county agricultural agents, soil conservation service field personnel and agricultural leaders, set your district's goals for the 1948 calendar year.

Prior to determining goals, we reviewed the kind and amount of work which district personnel and others believed farmers would undertake during the year, not taking into account our limitations of SCS personnel or equipment.

With information on the total job, and using locally derived rates per unit, we then totaled the number of man-days it would take to provide all the assistance farmers would need from the district staff. This assistance includes making detailed plans, laying lines for soil conservation practices, writing farm conservation plans, and assisting cooperators with any of their soil conservation problems. With only a few exceptions, these totals ran two, three, and, in some instances, as many as five times the personnel that were available to the district.

We use these total work-load figures in determining assignments of soil conservation service personnel to districts. We try to place our manpower in those locations where it can be used to the greatest advantage. We believe this work-load information serves as a guide for making the best distribution of our personnel.

Let's return to this business of reducing the work load to fit the number of men available to a district. In determining priority of work within a district we believe that without exception, you supervisors agreed upon the following order:

1. Lay-out: Assisting farmers in applying planned practices (called for in their complete farm conservation plans) on the land during the very limited season that this can be done.

2. Follow-up: Working with district cooperators in changing their farm conservation plans; guiding them in the expenditures of money for lime, fertilizer, and seed; encouraging them to speed up the application of the planned practices to the land, etc.

3. Replanning: To assist farmers in making what might be termed a complete overhaul in their plans.

4. New farm conservation plans: After each district work load was determined we then made a summary for the State. At the end of 1948 we totaled accomplishments. We have prepared a table listing the goals for the year, total accomplishments, and the percent of the goal attained.

Activity	Unit	Goal	Accomplished	Percent
Follow-up	Number	8,543		
Planning and replanning.	do	1,884	1,712	91.0
Contour farming	Acre	6,430	10,859	170.5
Strip cropping	do	76,498	63,469	83.0
Pasture improvement.	do	10,281	9,439	91.8
Wildlife area improvement.	do		3,423	
Woodland management.	do	3,558	4,250	119.8
Tree planting	do	2,113	1,840	87.1
Terraces	Mile	459.9	381	82.9
Field diversions	Acre	102.3	114	111.5
Farm drainage	do		14,533	
Structures	Number	236	26	11.0
Waterways and outlets.	Linear foot.	726,370	841,760	116.0

Unfortunately, we do not have detailed records on follow-up but we estimate that this percentage would be near 100.

1949 GOALS

We carried through on the same procedure in analyzing 1948 accomplishments and setting 1949 goals as was followed last year. We want to present a summary of the possible 1949 work load, goals for the year, and the relationship of goals to last year's accomplishments.

Activity	Unit	Total	Goal	Percent	Ratio, 1949 goal to 1948 accomplishment, percent
Follow-up	Number	12,109	10,095	83.4	
Planning and replanning	do	4,555	2,269	49.8	132.4
Strip cropping	Acre	83,376	68,508	82.3	108.0
Pasture improvement	do	20,235	16,043	79.4	170.0
Wildlife area improvement	do	665	540	81.3	15.8
Woodland management	do	8,400	5,050	60.1	119.0
Tree planting	do	3,054	1,600	52.4	87.0
Terraces	Mile	820.3	465.4	56.8	122.1
Field diversions	Acre	175.2	126.0	71.9	110.5
Farm drainage	do	31,411	20,020	64.5	138.0

Under "Total" is listed the amount of each of the activities that both you supervisors and our own field personnel believed farmers in the State will undertake during 1949. It would take 265 man-years of full-time assistance to do the job. With 140 man-years available, the 1949 goal appearing under "Goal" was devised. As in the past year, the same priority of activities was followed. Plans for the lay-out season will call for all personnel to concentrate on assisting farmers in the installation of practices during these periods.

We believe you will agree with us that the above goals present quite an ambitious program, particularly with respect to the increases planned for 1949 in relation to what was accomplished in 1948.

PERSONNEL

Goals set for the 1949 calendar year were figured on the basis of having no more personnel than we had in 1948. The appropriation recommended for the Soil Conservation Service during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, was slightly less than we are receiving for the current year. In informing you of the number of men you can expect to have in your district for the calendar year, it is logical to assume therefore that there will be no increase. In the event the final appropriation differs, either upward or downward from that recommended, we will make the necessary adjustments in our staffs which assist districts. We will look to the goals and total job ahead for the year in each district as a basis upon which to make changes. In discussing personnel with district governing bodies, a majority of them asked us for additional help from the Service. Under present circumstances this will be impossible.

We will be staffing several new districts which farmers have organized. To do this we will have to either withdraw personnel now in training positions in some districts or use some of the funds, expended during the past year for part-time help in districts, in employing additional permanent farm planners for these districts that have not as yet been staffed, or as replacements for the experienced men who are transferred.

EQUIPMENT

One of the factors limiting an increased lay-out is the scarcity of heavy equipment. During 1948 a number of county boards purchased equipment that will be operated by the highway departments, with soil-conservation work having first call on these units. We understand that quite a number of counties are considering similar action. Several construction companies have gone into this business and if their rates are reasonable, there should be a pick-up in earth-moving and clearing jobs.

There is no question but that we will have to devise new techniques in using farmer-owned equipment for installing a lot of these practices. The use of the moldboard plow in the construction of terraces has materially stepped up the mileage of this erosion-control measure. However, more heavy equipment and more contractors working in this field, hired, and paid by the farmer, will speed up the job.

STEPPING UP LAY-OUT

You supervisors all agreed among yourselves that lay-out of soil-conservation practices is the No. 1 job in your district. We agree with you that soil conservation is of little value until it is applied on the land. We would like to present the following suggestions for speeding up this work.

A. Better planning of time and following your district work plan to bring about increased efficiency. Working through neighborhood groups should help.

B. Farmers should indicate seasonal needs in advance.

C. Do not look to the SCS alone for assistance, but also investigate possibilities of extra contributions by other agencies, State, Federal, and local.

D. Greater and more efficient use of farm power and equipment:

Wider use of contractors and county-owned heavy equipment on soil-conservation jobs with skilled operators on the machinery units.

E. Show farmers how they do their own lay-out.

F. Pool equipment.

G. Coach adapted farmers (or others) to do lay-out on an exchange-of-work basis or for hire.

H. Have groups of farmers employ competent aides.

I. Use funds in local district treasury, if any, to hire aides.

These are only a few of many ways of increasing the planning and application of a sound soil-conservation program on the land.

YOUTH TRAINING

We want to mention progress made in this activity. In quite a number of districts marvelous jobs have been done and are being done in having soil conservation included in the rural school curricula. Since the State soil-conservation committee employed I. O. Hembre to head up the youth program in soil conservation many other districts have gone into this fine program. Furthermore, 4–H projects in soil conservation have been introduced and considerable work is being done with FFA members and vocational students.

Anti-Semitism in Soviet Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following item which appeared in the April 4, 1949, issue of Newsweek. It is further proof that freedom of religion as we know it does not exist in Soviet Russia. Soviet communism countenaces religion only so long as it can be used by her to further her attempt to subjugate the world:

ANTI-SEMITISM IN SOVIET PURGE

The following article is printed in full by permission of Newsweek:

A widespread official anti-Semitic campaign clearly emerged for the first time last week as one of the chief reasons for the current Soviet cultural offensive against Western decadence and cosmopolitanism. The Moscow censorship has hitherto kept news of this development from reaching the outside world. Edward Weintal, Newsweek diplomatic correspondent, has obtained the following documented report on this new discrimination against Jewish writers and publications.

A campaign to eliminate Jewish intellectuals from cultural life is now underway in the Soviet Union. Officially the campaign is directed against homeless cosmopolitans. But of the 50 intellectuals publicly attacked during the last 2 months, 49 are Jewish. Where the Jewish origin of the accused is obscured by an adopted Russian name, the original Jewish name is quoted by the Soviet press in parentheses. This is unprecedented in a country where anti-Semitism is a criminal offense.

Thus an article in the February 12 Literary Gazette refers to a "malignant putrid story written by homeless cosmopolitan Melnikoff (Mehlman)." Another article in the same issue twice mentions the "cynical impudent activities of B. Yakovleff (Holtzman)." In a subsequent issue a literary critic with the good Russian name of Kholodoff is revealed as "homeless cosmopolitan" Meyrovitch. In the February 19 Pravda Ukrainy three noted literary critics, I. Stebun, Ya Burlachenko, and L. Sanoff, are identified as "homeless cosmopolitans" Katzenelenbogen, Berdichevsky, and Schmulson, respectively.

For reasons known only to the Soviet propaganda masterminds, Jewish sports writers are not homeless cosmopolitans "but passportless wanderers." Komsomolskaya Pravda (March 6) thunders against four of the wanderers—G. Yasny (Finkelstein), V. Victoroff (Zlochevsky), A. Svetoff (Sheidlin), and G. Gurevitch. Their collective sins are cataloged as: (1) claiming that a Soviet wrestler before an international match drew inspiration from a Jack London book rather than from his love for the Soviet motherland, (2) asserting that employees of the Indo-European Cable Co. in Odessa introduced football into Russia, and (3) depicting Soviet sportsmen as petty seekers of glory.

The Jewish publishing house Emes has been closed and the only Yiddish-language daily, Einigkeit, suspended. A number of Jewish intellectuals have been arrested. Among them is believed to be Johann Altman, a literary critic, described in a recent issue of Soviet Art as a "double dealer, a man with the dark soul of a traitor, a servant of the imperialist West, a diversionist in art." Another victim of the purge is M. M. Borodin (Gruzenberg), Anna Louise Strong's successor as editor of the Moscow News, who disappeared after the paper itself ceased publication.

The homeless cosmopolitans are accused of the usual offenses: Decadence, bourgeois materialism, and admiration of things foreign. But the bitterness, viciousness, and spite of the onslaught are unparalleled. According to playwright Safronoff, the homeless cosmopolitans have even "utilized the experience of the anti-Soviet underground." Even Dmitri Shostakovich, the Soviet composer, larded a speech he made in New York last week with attacks on cosmopolitanism.

Other examples:

The plenum of the Ukrainian Writers Union on Feb. 28 condemned the "serious manifestations of Jewish bourgeois nationalism especially evidenced in the periodical Der Stern, which we suspended."

Vechernaya Moskva of March 14 discusses the autobiography of Alexander Isbakh (Izak Bachrach), in which the author is accused of exalting Hebrew religion and propagating Zionism.

N. I. Gussaroff, secretary of the Byelorussian Communist Party, in a speech February 17 declared: "Only one theater in the Byelorussian Republic—a Jewish one—puts on unpatriotic plays in which life in America is praised."

The campaign has its lighter moments. On February 16 the Literary Gazette castigated one I. Weisfield for "monstrously distorting Lenin's idea of the nature of reality." It so happened that Weisfield quoted Lenin correctly. In a subsequent issue the Gazette sulkily admitted its error but failed to withdraw its attack on Weisfield.

Russia was notorious throughout the 19th century for the ferocity of its pogroms. The Czarist governments also enforced many anti-Jewish measures, while writers even then referred to the Jews as "cosmopolitans." The Bolsheviks made anti-Semitism a crime, but carefully—and on the whole successfully—stamped out Zionism among the

3,000,000 Soviet Jews. Dislike of the Jews nonetheless remained ingrained in the Russian character. Stalin himself appears to be sporadically anti-Semitic, while many of the Communist leaders who opposed the Generalissimo's rise to power were Jews.

Western observers in Moscow hesitate to assume that the present compaign is deliberately designed to arouse this latent anti-Semitism. But they feel it may be intended as a stern warning that only by strict adherence to the precepts of the Soviet state can the Jews hope to survive.

A number of developments may have made the Kremlin decide on such a warning: (1) The Soviet Union acquired in the territories annexed during the war some 2,000,000 strongly pro-Zionist Polish and Rumanian Jews, (2) establishment of the state of Israel revived the attractiveness of Zionism among Soviet Jews, and (3) Jewish intellectuals, originally attracted to communism because of its universality, now find it difficult to embrace the peculiar combination of Russian nationalism and Communist internationalism known as "Soviet patriotism."

Beware the Ides of March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Beware the Ides of March" by W. Alton Jones, published in the April 1949 issue of the magazine Service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE THE IDES OF MARCH

Everybody is against higher taxes but few oppose the expenses of Government which call for the higher taxes. We chuckle at the Congressman running for reelection who declared he "voted for every appropriation and against every tax bill." While we are chuckling, it is an even bet that 99 44/100 percent of us voters and taxpayers, in reality, think and act likewise. We forget that the only way a government, no matter how strong, can spend a single thin dime is to get it from a citizen-taxpayer.

We hope and pray for an expanding economy, a condition where everyone grows because he is active and prosperous. This Nation, alone of all the nations of the world, has had such an economy from the beginning. It was blessed with low Government expenses, which left money in pockets to take risks on new industries, which alone provide such expansion. In the 30-year period from 1900 to 1930, as Senator BYRD pointed out in Service magazine, 100 billion of such savings developed industries which did not exist in 1900. Eighteen of these new industries, such as aviation, plastics, electric appliances, automobiles, radio, accounted for 40 percent of the total jobs in 1930.

This was possible because in 1900 only 5 percent of the incomes of all of us went to State, local, and Federal Governments as taxes. Today it is 35 percent, which after the Nation's bare living expenses are met, leaves little or nothing, to risk on new enterprises.

If we wish to continue the upward curve of our famed standard of living, we must reduce taxes and thus assure the availability of capital for expansion. There are two things the citizen can do just now toward that end. First, get behind any plan that looks to greater economy and efficiency of present governmental activities. Second, put every new legislative proposal to this test: Is it something Government should do? Is it in the twilight zone, where cost is excessive and bureaucratic operation inefficient? Is it a proper activity of Government but which might be postponed until the foreign recovery drain upon us is over?

If any of us is in doubt as to what Government should do, here is a definition by a great statesman, Abraham Lincoln. He said:

"The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people individually can do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

The Ides of March saw the passing of Caesar and the greatness that was Rome; we should see to it that our Ides of March does not terminate our famed expanding economy and thus frustrate the American dream of getting on and up in the world.

W. ALTON JONES.

Poland's Western Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, by request, I include the following address by Paul Super, under leave to extend my remarks:

My topic today is Poland's western boundaries, a matter which is sure to become a subject of much discussion as soon as a peace treaty with Germany is genuinely before the nations for final settlement.

Before this recent war, which we all now call World War II, Poland was a large and peaceful state of 35,000,000 inhabitants, lying squarely between Germany and Russia. Germany began the war by attacking Poland on the west on September 1, 1939. Russia attacked Poland on the east on September 17. On Poland's defeat, Germany and Russia divided Poland between them. Now Germany has in turn been defeated and Russia is in full possession of all this area; Poland exists only as a puppet state of Russia. Many of us think this arrangement is only temporary, and that Russia will be forced back where it belongs.

The question of the permanent Polish-German boundary will then be a very real and important one. Real and important not only to Poland and Germany but to the whole world, and especially to America. Because when war breaks out in Europe, the United States is now always drawn into it. This we cannot prevent except by preventing war in Europe. A wisely arranged Polish-German boundary thus becomes an important matter to all Americans.

When those discussions about the future Polish-German boundary begin, three points of view will have to be considered. First, what boundary between Poland and Germany would best represent justice to Poland. Second, if Germany is to be deprived of territory in the interest of Poland and of peace, just how much land should be taken from the prewar German state, and why. Then, third, what settlement of this problem will best insure peace in Europe. The answers to these three questions will be found in the brief statement I am now to present.

Those of us who have long and intimate knowledge of Polish and German affairs believe that from every angle of justice and wisdom the line separating Germany and Poland should be the line of the Oder and Neisse Rivers. This line begins just west of the once German city of Swinemunde on the Baltic Sea, runs south putting all of the city of Stettin on the Polish side, thence on south along the Oder River, leaving Frankfurt in Germany, on south to where the Neisse River, coming from the south, flows into the Oder River; the line then continues south along the Neisse River to the northwest border of Czechoslovakia. The total air-line distance north and south is 225 miles.

So much for the Oder-Neisse line itself. Now, before we discuss how much territory this takes from Germany and gives to Poland, and before we look at the present population of that area, let us get clearly in mind three facts.

First, this line is the actual line today. This area east of the Oder-Neisse line has already been taken from Germany, evacuated of Germans, repopulated by Poles, and put under the administration of Poland pending the final arrangements of the peace treaty.

Second, the temporary award of this territory to Poland was legally made at Potsdam July 28, 1945, by President Truman for the United States, Prime Minister Attlee for Great Britain, and Stalin for the Soviet Union.

Third, the assigning of this area to Poland, a country now completely under the domination of Russia, would obviously for the present play into the hands of the Soviet Union. But we must remember two things: First, that Russia is now, already, in actual control of these lands and there is nothing much that we can at present do about it. Second, in our long-term planning for Europe, our thoughts must overleap these present evil days of Russian expansion, and plan for the more decent time of freedom which is sure to come at no distant date. Russia contains the seeds of its own dissolution. The time will come when Russia will have to retreat to behind its own frontiers, and Poland will again be free. In that day, these former German areas would be part of a free, independent, and democratic Poland—a Poland whose augmented size and power will be needed in building a strong belt of states between Russia and Germany.

Now let us look at the size and character of those provinces that are added to Poland on the west. In the first place, they greatly improve the strategic front of Poland in relation to Germany, giving Poland a 280-mile frontier with Germany instead of the 1,263-mile line that made it so easy for Germany to attack Poland in 1939, approaching Warsaw in six converging directions.

These new western provinces of Poland are an area about 130 miles wide in the north at Stettin, 50 miles wide on the Frankfurt Poznan line, and 75 miles wide down in Silesia. They give the Poles a coast line 285 miles long from Stettin to Danzig. The area is 39,120 square miles, about the size of the States of Maine, Connecticut, and Rhode Island combined. Added to Poland's prewar 150,000 square miles we have a Poland of roughly 190,000 square miles before we add the East Prussia area. This 190,000 square miles is a little more than the area of pro-Hitler Germany.

As to population: Before the war 8,200,000 people lived in this area, most of them Germans, but about 1,500,000 were of Polish blood. By the spring of 1945, after the Russian advance into Germany, millions of these people had fled west. Then Poles from other parts of Poland were sent in to occupy this almost empty land. The present population is about 5,500,000 Poles and 40,000 Germans.

We are now ready to consider our central problem: Why should this territory be awarded to Poland?

First. This transfer of territory to Poland in part compensates Poland and the Poles for all the horrors, suffering, and loss inflicted upon the Poles by the Germans during the recent war and the German occupation of Poland. I say "in part," for to those who suffered these brutalities, no compensation can be adequate.

Second. From the point of view of building a complete and strong state, well balanced in industry and agriculture, and with a firm basis in commerce, these lands are a great benefit to Poland. A truly complete Poland is arising. And Stettin is the natural seaport for much of the land west of the Vistula River.

Third. The loss of this territory weakens Germany in its war-making power. As Germany has launched five foreign wars with its neighbors since 1866 this is an important point.

Fourth, this strengthening of Poland increases its value as the central unit in the future federation of eastern European states, the form which political organization will probably take after Russia has been forced out of Christian Europe.

Fifth, historically, that is—600 to 800 years ago—all this area was occupied by Poles or by Slavic tribes related to the Poles. This argument by itself would not have great force, but as a consideration supporting all the other arguments it has peculiar value.

Sixth, and finally, we must remind you again that with the evacuation of these lands by the Germans in front of and during the Russian advance of 1945, the empty cities and towns and abandoned farms were occupied by Poles, and it is Poles who are there now, rebuilding the war-destroyed cities and farms and ports. It would be neither just nor easy to push more than 5,000,000 Poles off these lands and back east in time of peace. We had much more wisely leave things there as the fortunes of war left them.

We see, therefore, that common sense, justice, historic facts, and the grounds of future peace all argue that the present Oder-Neisse line be made the permanent boundary between Germany and Poland.

German Ethnic Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a press release issued by the Department of State on March 30, 1949, containing the definition of the term "German ethnic origin" used in section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

In view of the interest that has been shown in this matter by many Members of Congress, I think it advisable to have the entire press release inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Department of State has formulated the following definition of the term "German ethnic origin" for the guidance of American consular officers in Germany and Austria in implementation of section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948:

"In order to qualify for an immigration visa under the 'German ethnic origin' portions of the German and Austrian quotas the burden of proof shall be upon each applicant to establish that he is not subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws and to establish the following qualifications as a person of 'German ethnic origin' as intended by Congress in enacting the provisions of section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of June 25, 1948:

"1. That he was born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia. The statute specifically requires this as an element of classification.

"2. That he resided in any part of Germany or Austria on June 25, 1948, when the Displaced Persons Act became effective. This is also a specific statutory requirement.

"3. That he does not come under the jurisdiction of the International Refugee Organization. The statute classifies as displaced persons certain aliens who are under the jurisdiction of the International Refugee Organization, and provides a special procedure for dealing with them as 'eligible displaced persons.'

"4. (a) That he is a German expellee, or the accompanying wife or minor child of a German expellee, pursuant to the Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945, from Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, or (b) that he is a refugee, or the accompanying wife or minor child of a refugee from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia.

"5. That he is characteristically Germanic, a status which is to be determined upon the basis of the following combination of factors, the presence or absence of any particular one of which will not, in itself, be considered as conclusive, but any combination of which may be considered as providing satisfactory evidence of German ethnic origin:

"(a) Antecedents emigrated from Germany.

"(b) Use of any of the German dialects as the common language of the home or for social communications.

"(c) Resided in the country of birth in an area populated predominantly by persons of Germanic origin or stock who have retained German social characteristics and group homogeneity as distinguished from the surrounding population.

"(d) Evidences common attributes or social characteristics of the Germanic group in which he resided in the country of his birth, such as educational institutions attended, church affiliation, social and political associations and affiliations, name, business or commercial practices and associations, and seondary languages or dialects.

"6. Any person who fails to qualify under 1 or 2 is statutorily ineligible to receive an immigration visa under the 'German ethnic origin' clause in section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act, but such person may apply in the usual manner for an appropriate immigration visa under the quota of the country of his birth, at such time as his turn is reached on the waiting list, and his priority on such waiting list shall be determined as of the date of his registration for an immigration visa under the 'German ethnic origin' program.

"7. In the case of any applicant who qualifies under 1 and 2, but who fails to qualify under 3, 4, or 5, action should be suspended and a full report should be submitted to the Department for an advisory opinion concerning the alien's proper classification."

Persons in Germany and Austria who were born in one of the five countries mentioned in the above definition may submit to the American consular office at which they are registered appropriate evidence to establish that they are classifiable as persons of German ethnic origin. Such evidence should not be sent to the Department.

The Truth About Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems which confronts this Congress is the level at which farm products will be hereafter supported. The Agricultural Act of 1948, unless amended, will effect a severe drop in support levels beginning in 1950. In my opinion this will bankrupt American agriculture. I firmly believe that supports must be maintained at a high, stable level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I made on this subject before the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation in convention assembled at Jackson, Miss., on October 28, 1948. The address follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PRICE SUPPORTS

The major problems of our State are farm problems. For many years your organization has been in the forefront of the fight for agriculture. The farm programs that are in existence today trace back to men like Ed O'Neal, Earl Smith, Chester Davis, to mention only a few. The three I have named, and many others, who had a hand in shaping national programs for agriculture were Farm Bureau leaders.

Many of us here today recall with painful clarity, the late 1920's and early 1930's. We remember when cotton sold for 5 cents a pound and wheat was the cheapest since the days of Queen Elizabeth. Other farm prices were similarly low. The ownership of land, even the best Delta land, was a liability. The more land a man had, the more money he owed. Food was cheap in those days—cheap if one had money—but to millions of city unemployed so high they couldn't buy a loaf of bread or a bottle of milk for their children. We had the amazing spectacle of bread lines within sight of elevators in which were stored surplus grain and cotton.

Recently, there have been complaints about high prices for food. One of the reasons for high prices, it has been stated, has been support prices for farm products. There is now in progress a well-organized campaign against supports and the farm programs generally. We know that support prices have not been responsible for the high prices of foods. Support prices for most agricultural commodities have been at 90 percent of parity since 1942. During most of the war period and until this year, the price of almost all farm products have been well above parity.

Today, livestock products, meat, dairy products and poultry, are primarily responsible for high food costs. These items all are well above parity today. They range from around 180 percent of parity in the case of beef to 115 percent in the case of chickens. Furthermore, they account for 45 percent of

the average consumer food expenditures. People want these foods and have the money to buy them. Therefore, prices are high, but this cannot be blamed on the support program. Instead of being responsible for high food prices, supports, as I hope to show, actually have kept food prices down and have prevented ruinous inflation.

It is significant that every presidential candidate who has spoken out on the subject has backed the support-price program. I am no prophet, but I think I can safely predict that the support-price program for farm products will be continued. There are reasons and sound ones for that continuance.

First of all, these programs constitute assurances to farmers and the country that there will be no repetition of 1920–21. This was a bad time for farmers. Their prices fell 50 percent and for some crops even more from the middle of 1920 to the middle of 1921. Many farmers were ruined in that 12 months. Production costs were high; many had overextended themselves and they never recovered from the price debacle.

One of the reasons for the passage of wartime legislation providing support prices at 90 percent of parity was that experience after World War I. Farmers produced abundantly then but the reward for their patriotism was a cruel one.

Not only do existing support prices provide assurances against a sudden price debacle, but they give agriculture stability which extends beyond a year-to-year period. The theory behind price supports is a simple one. They operate on the theory of a reservoir which stores up water during rainy spells for use when drought comes. The principle is sound and sensible. It has worked well thus far and should work well in the future.

Without production control, or a workable loan program, farmers were in a precarious situation before 1933. A big crop oftentimes was a calamity. The fall in prices which resulted hurt almost everyone but the speculators. They lived in a hog's paradise. An unusually large crop report might break cotton prices fifteen and twenty dollars a bale. About the only help Government gave farmers was advice on how to grow bigger crops, and bigger crops were likely to result in still lower prices.

There are factors in the over-all farm problem which must be kept constantly in mind. First of all, farmers tend to produce abundantly year in and year out. People who were horrified at the plowing up of cotton and killing little pigs did not realize that industry is the real offender when it comes to production control. Year in and year out, farmers go right on producing abundantly. They have done so even with the triple-A programs.

Let me quote a few figures to illustrate this very important fact. Using 1935–39 as 100, agricultural production declined from only 99 to 96 in the 1929–32 period, the years of the great depression. But during these same years, industrial output fell from 110 to 58. From 1933 to 1937 agricultural production rose from 96 to 106. Industry rose from 69 to 113 during those years.

The second factor to keep in mind in connection with this farm problem is the decline in exports. Over the years our export markets have almost withered away. There were many reasons for this situation; one of the chief ones being our failure to admit exports after the First World War. During that conflict we became a creditor nation but we still had a debtor mentality. We exported heavily during and immediately after World War II, but that war also has further curtailed our export market for farm products. This decline in exports, coupled with continued abundant production, was the core of our farm problem in the 1920's. Most of our worries concerned the export crops and products, such as cotton, lard, wheat, and tobacco.

The McNary-Haugen bill, vetoed twice by President Coolidge, aimed at getting rid of our surpluses abroad. It might have served its purpose in the early 1920's, but after the Farm Board experience in 1930–32 farm leaders decided they could no longer rely upon exports to stabilize prices. The Farm Board, as you will remember, also tried to stabilize the price of farm products by loans. However, only half a billion dollars was available for stabilization and the greatest depression the world has ever known was in the making. Farm Board officials advocated production control to help keep down surpluses. Others familiar with agricultural problems came to the same conclusion.

I do not need to detail the provisions of the first Agricultural Adjustment Act, to review its invalidation by the Supreme Court, or to discuss at length the successor to the first triple-A, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937. And now we have the act of 1948, yet to be tested in operation.

When the first triple-A began in 1933, administrators of the act shied away from loans to stabilize prices. They had the Farm Board's disastrous experience in mind. Yet the authority for loans was contained in the first triple-A and before long loan programs began. There was comparatively little risk in those loans. Farm prices were near all-time lows and price had only one way to go, and that was up.

Furthermore, farm leaders had come to recognize that the stabilization of farm prices was a job to be undertaken over a period of years. It also had to be undertaken with ample funds. It was a big job to be gone at in a big way. The Commodity Credit Corporation now has capital approximating $5,000,000,000 and more may be provided as time goes on. Periodically, as farm products accumulate through Commodity Credit loans, there is a great outcry. We are asked the question: "How long can this foolishness continue? The Government can't stand it much longer, etc."

I would like to call a few undisputed facts to the attention of those who look upon the farm price-support program as a piece of foolishness and who feel that it has made farming as restful as a bed of roses. For the past 8 years farm population has been declining, the support program notwithstanding. More than 7,000,000 people have left the farms and they continue to leave. We are told that farm population will go on declining, probably 1 or 2 percent a year. This is most alarming and if the trend remains unchecked there will come a day when the consumer will really be given something to complain about.

Even in these flush times more than half our farm families have gross incomes of less than $2,500 per year. In fact there are still a fourth of our 6,000,000 farm families who gross less than $600 a year for their farm production. And these figures include the Government support loans.

It is true that loans at too high a rate and continued indefinitely, could be disastrous. But, be that as it may, the surpluses accumulated in the past have proved of tremendous value and may prove of even more value in the future.

Surpluses accumulated during the depression helped prevent a major catastrophe after the droughts of 1934 and 1936. Those droughts wiped out grain reserves and sent the price of meats soaring. In 1934 and again in 1936, the corn crop was exceedingly short. We have had, over the past several years, a whole series of record or near-record harvests. There is no guaranty that such harvests will continue indefinitely. We need ample reserves to protect us against crop failures which are bound to occur.

We need reserves for another reason. Along in 1939, critics were saying that the farm programs had proved a failure. The Government owned or had under loan 8.4 million bushels of wheat, 77.2 million bushels of corn, and 6.8 million bales of cotton not to mention 177 million pounds of tobacco and some other commodities besides. When the war broke out if this food and fiber accumulated through price supports, had not been available, we do not know what would have happened. Without these supplies, we certainly would have had disastrous inflation and possibly a longer war.

Nor would there have been the record production we had during the war without the price-support program. To win the war, we not only needed the surpluses available in 1939, we needed the tremendous production we have had since that time.

Nevertheless, the first year that we begin to store up reserves of food and fiber a chorus of protest breaks out.

Everyone had hoped for peace after the end of World War II, but the peace we have is a most uneasy one. There is great international tension and worry about the future. Under such circumstances, I cannot understand the concern referred to. As I see it, we should be thankful that we have these reserves. We should be thankful also that we have the farm programs through which we can put food and fiber aside for use when it is needed. If we did not have reserves, I would indeed be fearful. I regard the commodities which will be stored this year as national safety insurance.

Now let's look at the charge—that supports paid farmers are holding up food prices. I believe when you know all the facts that you'll agree that price supports are necessary, and that they are actually holding down food prices, not boosting them.

It is basic to recognize that the greatest increases in prices paid by consumers are coming on items which are not supported. The items which are within the average person's pocketbook range are usually supported foods. The real pressure on food prices comes from livestock products, not supported. All the meats, for example are far above parity and therefore far above the level at which price supports would be brought into use. As a matter of fact, beef and lamb are not covered by any price guarantees at all.

Supported commodities which are at or near the support level—wheat, corn, and cotton—have declined during the past few months but prices of nonsupported livestock have increased.

In a sense, you might compare price supports to some of the social legislation provided other groups. Unemployment compensation, for example, is something not used except in emergencies, but when needed, the worker is mighty glad it's available. It does not cost the Government or the taxpayer a cent unless it is used; very little when it is used.

The farmer does not have the advantages of unemployment compensation, but he does have emergencies similar to unemployment. Suppose he harvests an enormous cotton or wheat crop—and so do all his neighbors. Without price supports, if his harvest comes at a time when demand is falling off, the price might drop to where he would not even recover the price of his expensive seed and fertilizer.

At the start of the last war, Uncle Sam asked the farmer to grow all the food and fiber needed by a nation at war and much for our allies. And, remembering how farmers had accepted a similar command during World War I, then lost their farms because the prices dropped 50 percent in 1 year, Uncle Sam offered them a variety of unemployment compensation. He assured them, in effect, that in return for all-out food production, he would see that they did not lose their farms this time.

Price supports do not apply to all crops the farmers raise—only to certain ones that are basic in our economy and, temporarily, to products which the farmer is asked to raise in increased amounts. Supports on them were established to prevent a recurrence of the postwar disaster of 1920 which

saw cotton fall from 38.5 cents a pound to 9.5 cents a pound within a year; corn drop from $1.95 a bushel to 42 cents.

Of course if the consumer thinks no further than that, he can still say "Well, obviously then, if price supports are going to hold up prices a farmer receives for his product, they will also hold up the price I pay for it." Actually price supports have helped—not harmed—the consumer, just as they have helped the farmer.

Let me first illustrate with an example which has nothing at all to do with farming, how I think of price supports. Two towns on opposite sides of a big river have a bridge connecting them so that people can go across whenever they desire. But once in a while this bridge needs repairs. The local townspeople, desiring to keep traffic moving between the two places, bought a ferryboat and stationed it below the bridge. They did not plan to use it when the bridge was passable; it was just insurance. But it was mighty good insurance to have in case of an emergency. The man who lived on one side of the river and worked on the other could still get across to his job, so production would not stop. People could keep on shipping merchandise so the wheels of business would keep rolling.

Price supports for the farmer are like that ferryboat, not often used, not costing a cent unless used, but mighty handy to have when needed. To pull them down would be like taking minimum-wage and unemployment-compensation rights away from labor.

There are some other factors in this price-support picture which must be taken into account. Industry profits are near all-time highs; labor is demanding and receiving wage increases. To withdraw price supports from agriculture would leave farmers at a hopeless disadvantage by comparison to other groups in our society.

No one, so far as I know, is demanding that the legislation which has enabled labor to organize and protect its earning power, be repealed. Nor should they. Industry is keeping and will continue to keep protection against low-cost foreign production.

The persons who criticize price supports have not taken into account what farm purchasing power means to this country. The farmer not only produces our food and fiber; he is the best customer for the products of city factories. Over the years, farm income and factory pay rolls have risen and fallen together. They will continue to rise and fall together. The removal of farm price supports and the end of national programs for agriculture would be the beginning of our most disastrous deflation.

So long as the Government gives protection to labor and to industry, it must give it to agriculture. It must give wisely and constructively. I do not claim that the present system of price supports, or the parity formulas used as a base for them, is perfect. The levels at which loans should be fixed are matters for discussion. Farm programs should be revised in the light of circumstances and developments; but they should not and will not be abandoned, which in reality is the effect of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948. They have proved their worth, not only to the farmer but to the Nation.

I do not mean to imply that farm programs are perfect. They will need revision and remodeling as time goes on. Many problems remain. We are faced, for example, with a tremendous surplus in cotton if we continue to produce at the 1948 rate. Our export markets for cotton, if it were not for the Marshall plan and aid to Japan, would be a trickle. No one can foresee when Europe, Japan, and other countries will again buy, year in and year out, large quantities of American cotton.

The problem in wheat is similar to that for cotton. There will be a surplus problem in tobacco and in other commodities. We must deal with these as best we may. We must have supports at levels which will stabilize prices and yet will not encourage ruinous production. In other words, we must improve existing programs, not destroy them.

My committee, the House Committee on Agriculture, is attempting to work out legislation which will assure us a continuing three-part agricultural policy of abundance—organized, sustained, and realistic abundance. We need such abundance in order to cross over into an era of truly good living.

But abundance is not something that nature simply places upon our doorstep. If we wish to have sustained abundance, we must take care of our natural resources. If abundance is to be realistic, there must be a policy of price protection and a floor under consumption of food in times of slack demand. If abundance is to be realistic, it must be tied to purchasing power, to full employment and full production in industry, and to a reasonable amount of foreign trade.

We are attempting to develop a program which will let us consume our surpluses up to the point of a desirable reserve and avoid any future need for a plow-up.

The farm programs which are in existence today are the product of many minds. Farm leaders all over the country have worked on them. The Farm Bureau Federation has been a leader in their development. And not the least of the reasons why we have them is the united front presented by American farmers. Cotton farmers, dairy farmers, wheat farmers, livestock producers, and producers of almost every commodity have taken the other fellow's point of view. They have realized that these programs must be national in scope and have acted accordingly. They have refused to let themselves be divided by occasional differences. So long as farmers stand united, I have no fear about the future of price supports or national farm programs.

Strictly a Guess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a few days ago I offered for the RECORD, an editorial written by F. W. Brinkerhoff, editor of the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight, entitled "Where, Oh Where?" Mr. Brinkerhoff is the dean of Kansas editorial writers, and one of the able men of the State. Now comes Rolla Clymer, editor of the El Dorado (Kans.) Times, who comments upon the Brinkerhoff editorial. Mr. Clymer is also one of the outstanding editors of Kansas.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRICTLY A GUESS

"Where is the money coming from?" asks the esteemed Pittsburg Headlight referring to all enormous expenditures by agencies of Government that are now being made or are in prospect.

The answer is: Don't look now, but that little guy standing over there in the threadbare suit, vintage of 1946, will pay most of it. The money will come out of his pockets, out of his living and out of his future prospects. He isn't bleating much these days. Maybe he is punch drunk. Some folk talk about the taxpayers' revolt that one day may come along. After taking another look at the little guy's face, with its hopeless, beaten, what's-the-use expression, we judge said revolt will be somewhat delayed.

The Kansas Legislature, just about to shut down with its 1949 session, has spent a lot of money. Some of it will have to come from taxes, now and hereafter, but a large portion will be derived from funds that already carried heavy surpluses. These accumulations will be spent. After they are gone, other officials will have to devise ways and means for the future. That, of course, is another story.

Sitting down here at El Dorado and getting most of our information about legislative procedure from fragmentary newspaper reports, we are not so sure what happened during this past session. But this might be a fair guess. The Republicans, in legislative majority, simply cleaned out the coffers. One time, we remember, the Republicans operated in a strictly economical vein and piled up considerable cash in savings. Then, one of those political upsets occurred, the Democrats came on into power and gleefully spent the money Republicans had carefully saved.

That won't happen again, not this time, at least. It could be that the Democrats might stage an overturn in State politics come November of 1950. But if they do and if they assume governmental power the following January, they will find the cupboard bare—even as did Old Mother Hubbard.

This, we repeat, is only in the realm of speculation. But it might have its points in totting up a balance sheet as to just what has happened at Topeka.

United States Schools Found in Need of Ten Billions for Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems confronting the people of the Nation is adequate school buildings. Recently, I introduced H. R. 3514, now pending before the Committee on Public Works, providing for Federal assistance for local government units in the construction of school facilities. Yesterday, the New York Times carried a front-page article, which I submit herewith for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

UNITED STATES SCHOOLS FOUND IN NEED OF 10 BILLIONS FOR BUILDINGS—SURVEY SHOWS DEPLORABLE OBSOLESCENCE, WITH STATES REQUIRING FEDERAL AID TO FINANCE 10-YEAR PROGRAM

(By Benjamin Fine)

Public school buildings in the United States, on both the elementary and high school levels, are in deplorable condition today, with a vast number in need of immediate repair or replacement. Millions of children now attend classes in buildings that are obsolete, potential firetraps or totally inadequate to meet the needs of a modern educational program.

A vast school building program, estimated to cost $10,000,000,000 during the next 10 years, is necessary to meet the requirements of a rapidly growing school population.

Every State in the land regards the need for additional buildings as one of its most urgent school problems. All realize that they face a serious educational crisis because of inadequate school buildings.

These conclusions are reached in a Nationwide survey on school building needs conducted by the New York Times. The survey showed that 82 percent of the Nation's school buildings are either fair or poor. The rest were listed as in good condition. No State reported that its buildings were excellent.

The Times study, based on information obtained from the 48 States, indicates that the present serious situation is expected to become considerably worse in the next few years. Many States report that they do not have the funds with which to build new schools, even though these are desperately needed. In some instances the local communities already have reached their maximum legal debt limit and cannot go beyond that without special legislation.

Various reasons are advanced for the critical shortage of adequate classroom facilities. Based on the viewpoints expressed by the educational leaders reached in the survey, these reasons would appear to be the most commonly accepted:

1. Increased birth rate: Every State reports that its school population has increased in the last year, and will continue to increase rapidly. In some communities the school enrollment in the elementary grades has jumped as much as 50 to 75 percent. On the average, the estimated increase for the next half dozen years is placed at 20 to 30 percent.

This will mean, the educators emphasize, a vastly expanded school system. In some States the schools are not able to meet present needs. Unless additional buildings are constructed, the increased school population will swamp all existing facilities.

2. High construction and labor costs: Because of the doubled—in many instances trebled—costs, many communities are unable or unwilling to undertake school construction now. The school administrators and boards of education are reluctant to spend huge sums for buildings that may deteriorate in value within a short time. The cost per classroom has increased enormously, jumping as high as 300 percent. Buildings that cost $250,000 before the war now cost as high as $500,000 or $750,000.

Because of high costs, many communities find they are unable to raise the necessary bond issues to construct schools. A number of cities reported that they had reached the debt limits imposed by their legislatures, and said they could do nothing but wait until these restrictions were removed.

3. Schools not built during war: The educators said that at present a serious backlog of needed buildings exists because of the building lag during the war and during the prewar depression. While the increased birth rate added to the school rolls, the communities have been able to provide only a fraction of the buildings needed.

$1,250,000,000 PROGRAM PLANNED

Reports from the various States show that a building program totaling $1,250,000,000 is planned. This sum is divided almost equally between the elementary and high schools, and ranges from less than $1,000,000 to more than $100,000,000.

However, the States report that they require $5,500,000,000 to meet present needs. They say this sum is a minimum and can not be pared to any considerable extent without harming the school system of the Nation. Many educators frankly admit that they will be unable to get the full amount they need. The Times study indicates that the plans for the school construction program will total only about 20 percent of the full amount needed.

In a number of States a wide gap exists between the amount of money that will be spent for school building construction during 1949–50 and the amount necessary to meet existing needs. Arkansas, for example, estimates that it will spend $5,500,000 for buildings in the coming year, but says it needs $50,000,000 to do an adequate job. A similar disparity is shown in figures supplied by Florida. During the 1949–50 school year, Florida intends to spend $5,000,000 for elementary schools and $7,000,000 for high schools. During this period, the State estimates it would need $70,000,000 for elementary and $80,000,000 for high schools.

Similarly, Dr. Pendleton Mitchell, director of Schoolhouse Planning in the Georgia State Education Department, reports that $2,000,000 will be spent for school construction this year, while the need will reach $100,000,000. In some States that gap is not quite as wide, although the educators observe that it is serious enough. For example, Illinois communities plan to spend $10,000,000 on school buildings, with the need set at $70,000,000.

TEN BILLIONS NEEDED BY 1959

During the next 10 years, the study found, the States will need a total of $10,000,000,000 for new buildings to meet the needs of a growing school population and to replace obsolete buildings. Many educators suggested that this long-range program could be developed on the basis of $1,000,000,000 a year during the coming decade. As reported by the States, the $10,000,000,000 would be divided equally between the elementary schools and the high schools. Although the great increase in population will come on the elementary level, the officials point out that high school buildings are more expensive.

New York and California lead in the amount of money necessary for school buildings. New York State puts the figure at above $1,000,000,000, while California says it will need $1,500,000,000 over the 10-year period. Pointing out that its enrollment has increased tremendously in recent years, the California school officials declare that the building shortage is acute today.

"The problem in California is not the condition of the existing buildings but the number of children that do not have any buildings at all," Dr. Charles Bursch of the California Department of Education, said.

Virtually all the States say they will not be able to meet the costs of the necessary long-range building program. They indicated that not more than 50 percent of the funds necessary will be available. In some States less than 10 percent of the money can be raised, the educators report. Nebraska, for example, estimates that it will need $40,000,000, and will be able to spend $8,000,000 for buildings. Of the $400,000,000 needed by Michigan, less than half will be available.

Most Southern States report that they will need huge sums to develop their building programs. Alabama put its needs at $200,000,000, Kentucky, at $100,000,000, Oklahoma at $75,000,000, South Carolina at $250,000,000, and West Virginia at $110,000,000. In almost every instance, the State officials say that they will be unable to get the funds unless outside assistance is provided.

Only three States—Connecticut, Delaware and Wyoming—indicated that the necessary funds were available.

NEED FOR FEDERAL AID CITED

All the States declared they needed assistance from the Federal Government. Some, such as Alabama, reported that they would need from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000, while others, such as Oklahoma, placed their needs at the comparatively low figure of $5,000,000. In the aggregate, the States urged that the Federal Government make available, during the next 10 years, a total of $5,000,000,000 for school building purposes.

Officials in Connecticut note that the condition of the school buildings is critical, with many of the buildings obsolete. Connecticut points out that in addition to the need for replacement of existing buildings, there is a great need for new construction.

A number of the States report that they are planning to consolidate their school districts, and build central schools. This would mean that the building costs would increase during this process. However, the educators emphasize that the reorganization and consolidation of the rural schools into larger units would ultimately benefit education generally. In the meantime, though, the pressure put on the school districts to raise money for new school buildings will increase.

In addition to new buildings, the States report that a substantial sum will be needed for necessary repairs and equipment. It is estimated that the Nation would need, over the next 10 years, a minimum of $2,000,000,000 for the improvement and the modernization of the school plants.

Idaho says it needs $1,823,600 to make the necessary repairs and replacements. Another $73,000,000 will be needed to provide additional buildings to house the present school enrollments and the expected increase. Illinois stresses that because of the reorganization of districts the building prob'em is serious in some parts of the State. It says it does not have the funds to finance an adequate school building program without Federal assistance.

DEBT RESTRICTIONS HAMPER MANY

Many States are in the position of Iowa, where the constitutional limit on bond issues prevents the school systems from constructing the buildings they need. It is not likely that the constitution will be changed to permit schools to be built, the officials indicate, adding that the influx of war babies will make the situation even worse. Some States, such as Kansas, make no contribution toward construction of school buildings. All building there is done on local plans and finances.

Similarly Kentucky notes that while it will spend from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 for school construction next year, it needs a minimum of $20,000,000. Without Federal assistance the schools that are needed in the State will not be built, Kentucky officials report.

Dr. John J. Seidel, assistant State superintendent for vocational education in Maryland, reports that $80,000,000 will be needed from the State or Federal Government to meet present building requirements. Eight out of the 23 counties in the State have reached their limit governing the marketability of bonds. Dr. Seidel observes that the need for additional school buildings is without a doubt the most urgent problem at this time.

The school buildings in Maine are generally poor, Dr. William O. Bailey, deputy commissioner in charge of planning and research, reports. Antiquated buildings, he notes, together with increased enrollments and a demand for larger units have combined to make the school building problem serious for the State.

New Hampshire says it will spend $3,000,000 for school buildings, but needs $35,000,000. Fifty percent of the buildings in the State were built before the end of the Civil War. Two-thirds need replacement, enlargement, or other fundamental alterations.

Noting that its buildings are in poor condition, school officials in Michigan report that while $50,000,000 will be spent on school construction next year, $300,000,000 will be needed. School construction has not kept up with the needs since 1932 when a restrictive constitutional tax limitation was passed. This limitation was modified in the last November election, and the school officials expect a considerable volume of new construction.

Mississippi estimates that it will need 6,000 new classrooms, 5,000 to replace unsatisfactory rooms and 1,000 in additional facilities

for increased enrollment. It will take $40,000,000 to provide the classrooms; lunchrooms, gymnasiums and other facilities are not included in this sum.

NEBRASKA NEEDS $25,000,000

Nebraska reports that while it needs $25,000,000 to meet present school building needs, it expects to spend $2,250,000, or less than one-tenth the actual need. The officials recommend that the Federal Government provide $25,000,000 for school needs.

North Dakota says its buildings are inadequate for the enrollments. South Carolina reports that its school housing is not adequate for the large number of births of the last few years, Dr. H. L. Duncan, director of schoolhouse planning in West Virginia, observes that a State-wide survey showed it would take $20,000,000 to eliminate the present emergency needs. These include hazards to the health and safety of the children.

Present critical conditions are not all the fault of the educators, Dr. A. L. Buechner, of the Wisconsin Department of Education, asserts. The increased birth rate, he says, has made it necessary to use substandard, old, hazardous buildings and various other spaces, thereby penalizing a generation of youngsters.

Reports from many sections of the country indicate that the more enlightened communities are beginning to meet the problem of increased school enrollment and obsolete buildings by appropriating funds for the necessary facilities. Responsible school officials expressed the hope that the local community, cooperating with the State and Federal Government, would be able to provide the classrooms so urgently needed today.

FLORIDA BUSY ON PROGRAM

Florida has recognized the problem and is attempting to meet it on a State-wide basis. Many school buildings have been constructed or repaired; in the last 2 years Florida has spent $20,000,000 for new school buildings and the renovation of existing plants. New facilities constructed in the last 2 years include 305 classrooms, 52 school lunchrooms, 36 industrial arts rooms, 17 science laboratories, and a number of other special rooms.

Almost every county, reports Dr. Thomas D. Bailey, superintendent of public instruction, is making plans for the future construction of school buildings to serve the needs of the community. Forty-eight building sites have been purchased. Dr. Bailey says a special staff has completed surveys of school building needs and has made recommendations for better-planned buildings.

Taken as a whole, the school building situation in the United States is critical. The United States Office of Education estimates that within 10 years the elementary and high-school enrollment will increase by 9,000,000 students. The present school buildings will be forced to accommodate from 30 to 40 percent more children than they do today.

The Times survey indicates that the school building problem cannot be solved by the local communities alone. Without State and Federal help, the communities say, they will find it difficult if not impossible to meet the needs of the coming decade. School officials emphasize that several million children are not receiving an adequate education because of the poor school buildings. In some communities the children attend classes in garages, church cellars, private homes, and abandoned shops.

Although this condition is denounced by school leaders, they frankly admit that they do not know how to remedy it at present. They are almost unanimous in urging the development of a sound, comprehensive school building program, to provide adequate facilities for all the children.

Mr. Truman's Great Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, April 4, 1949.

This editorial is of special interest to me because it confirms a prediction I made during the campaign last fall. It was my privilege and sincere conviction during the campaign to say and believe that Truman would be the choice of the American people for President. I also stated that Truman, as President in his own right, would so conduct the affairs of that office during the world's most critical period, that he would become one of our greatest Presidents.

I recommend this editorial to you and believe the events of the immediate future will fully justify this quotation from the article:

We of this generation will at least know that once again, in a time of great need, the American system has produced a President who had the wisdom and the courage to make the right decision and the strength of character to act upon it.

MR. TRUMAN'S GREAT ROLE

It would be unbecoming on this historic day of signature of the North Atlantic security pact not to take particular notice of the great role which has been played by President Truman in recasting the foreign policy of the United States.

We have come a long way since George Washington admonished a struggling young nation against permanent alliances, since Thomas Jefferson spoke out against entangling alliances, since James Monroe enunciated the policy which bears his name and which served thereafter for more than a century as the guiding star of our foreign policy. We have seen great powers come and go. Through the processes of age and decay in other parts of the globe rather than through any design of our own, we have seen the United States rise to the pinnacle of world power. Finally came the time when we had to decide what use would be made of our power, whether in the face of a new world aggression we would shackle ourselves with the remnants of the old isolationist tradition or whether we would move forth boldly in an endeavor to employ our power to prevent another war rather than fight it after it had begun.

The man who had to make that decision was Harry S. Truman, newly come to the White House through the accident of the death of his predecessor. For a man fixed with the ultimate responsibility, it was no easy decision to make. Certainly there were grave risks involved, but Mr. Truman saw very clearly that it was not a question of accepting or avoiding risks, but of choosing between risks. And it is to his everlasting credit that he chose the risk which went along with the assumption of responsibility. He decided that the immense power of the United States should be used affirmatively in the interests of a decent world, and it may very well be that the whole hope of western civilization rides on that decision.

Of course, other men contributed to the grand design. General Marshall and Senator VANDENBERG were conspicuous among them. But in the last analysis it was the President who had the responsibility, who made the decision, and who is entitled to the credit. The Rio Pact, which changed the Monroe Doctrine from a unilateral to a reciprocal undertaking, was followed by the Truman doctrine of extending financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey so that they could resist the threat of communism. Then came the European recovery program, without which western Europe could not have survived as a non-Communist community. Today it is the North Atlantic Pact, which, with the attendant arms agreement, spells the end of American isolation. Ahead, still unformed but rich with promise, lies point 4 of the inaugural address—a program for applying American skill and American resources to the resuscitation of the backward areas of the world.

What history will say of the man who has fathered this unprecedented undertaking, where he will be ranked among the American Presidents, can best be left to the historians. But if the desired results are achieved, if aggressive communism is turned back, if the peace is saved, if the consummate disaster of another war is averted, we of this generation will at least know that once again, in a time of great need, the American system has produced a President who had the wisdom and the courage to make the right decision and the strength of character to act upon it.

Count Carlo Sforza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

A SFORZA OF THE SFORZAS

Count Carlo Sforza, here to sign the North Atlantic pact, is no stranger in Washington. He has visited this city on many occasions, resided here for lengthy periods, kept in touch with friends here constantly during the course of three decades. His work as a career diplomat has made his contact with the Capital of the United States natural. It was to Washington that he came when the vicissitudes of his long struggle against fascism rendered him an exile. Yet not everybody knows the background of his life or understands exactly why Washington must seem more like home to him than any other place outside his beloved native Italy.

The honored name he bears traces back nearly six centuries. His family was established by Giacomuzzo Attendolo, who was born in the Romagna in 1369. Kidnaped by adventurers, he became their commander by the exercise of a genius for leadership, was commissioned constable of Naples under Joanna II and created a count by Pope Martin V. Sforza, signifying strong or forceful, originally was a sobriquet, adopted on the field of battle. The first to render it famous set an example of valor in which his descendants take pride. By 1447 the family ruled Milan, building great castles and churches there for a court which was distinguished by poets and painters of the highest order.

Among the artists attracted by the generosity of the clan was Bernardino Luini, whose canvases now are treasured beyond price.

Three Sforza dukes left indelible impressions upon history. Francesco, Gian Galeazzo and Ludovico il Moro dealt with emperors and kings on approximately equal terms. Their fortunes rose and fell and, possibly on that very account, their legend never has faded. Count Carlo, the incumbent Foreign Minister of the Italian Republic, belongs to a collateral branch of the tribe but his own experiences follow the standard pattern of Sforza tradition. Himself a scholar, he appreciates the points of resemblance. In Washington especially he is close to the family. The National Gallery has many relics of its Renaissance grandeur—white marble bas-reliefs of Il Moro and Gian Galeazzo and portraits of Francesco, Ginevra, and Bianca Maria among the number.

These Dis-United Nations—A Historical Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday many of us witnessed the signing of the momentous North Atlantic Pact which will so crucially affect the future of our Nation and of the world.

This morning I received a copy of the distinguished international magazine, United Nations World. In its April issue, there has been published an article which I prepared some time ago on the subject of these Dis-United Nations—a historical parallel.

The purpose of the article was to invite a comparison between the skepticism which prevailed 150 years ago when the infant United States of America, consisting of 13 divided colonies, was beginning to grope its way toward a meaningful union—invite a comparison between those times and the present times.

I feel that there is every reason for expecting that the miracle which came to pass in the uniting of the disunited States may yet come to pass in the uniting of the Dis-United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent therefore that the text of my article in the United Nations World be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DIS-UNITED NATIONS—IF UNION REQUIRES A MIRACLE, LET'S HAVE A MIRACLE

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"The United Nations is just a talk marathon."

"They ought to name that organization the 'Dis-United Nations.'"

"The only thing the United Nations seem to agree on is to disagree."

"They ought to quit talking and get on to having their third world war."

These are some of the sour notes on the United Nations which one hears these days. From every side rise the voices of discontent, the prophets of disaster, the groaners of gloom. This pessimism, this absence of faith in the ultimate ability of the world organization to establish a just and lasting peace is perhaps one of the most dangerous elements in the world today. So long as there is faith in the UN, so long as the common people of the world believe that somehow, in some way, a lasting alternative to war can be worked out, then the dead of World Wars I and II will not have made the supreme sacrifice in vain.

Usually the discontented base their disapproval on the premise that, since World War II has been over for 3½ years, the problems of the world should have been cleared up. They seem to assume that the millenium was to have been ushered in automatically, once the guns stopped firing. From the over-optimism of August 1945 the pendulum of opinion has swung to the deep pessimism of 1949. Crises in Palestine, in Korea, in China, in Berlin and elsewhere have precipitated a disbelief in the potentialties of the UN for growth and evolution into an organization that will spare future generations the horrors of war.

Many criticis simply do not understand the necessity for thorough debate in the UN. But as one Senator once said about the apparently endless talking in the United States Senate, "I would rather see debate, if necessary, without action, than action without debate."

If you believe that it would be a miracle for peace to come through the UN's efforts, then I say that it was by no greater miracle that peace and unity came to the United States, despite the countless feuds of 13 jealous, suspicious colonies, a century and a half ago. The utterly chaotic conditions that prevailed among the feuding principalities east of the Alleghenys in the latter part of the eighteenth century is a facsimile parallel to the seeming chaos that prevails in much of Europe and Asia today.

I think that I can appreciate somewhat the problems of trying to get principalities to agree, for I remember some of the skeptical reactions here and abroad when I introduced a mere policy declaration resolution in the Eightieth Congress which would have placed the United States on record as favoring the formation of a United Democratic States of Europe. I did not and do not believe that the unification of all the states on the European Continent is desirable or possible at the present moment because, to place Russia and her satellites in such a union would be akin to trying to merge some heterogeneous South American dictatorships into the American Union of 48 States. I do believe that a United Democratic States of Europe could work, and I for one will continue to bend my efforts toward that objective.

NO NEED TO FEAR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

A United Democratic States of Europe would be the sort of regional federation envisioned under the United Nations' charter. It would function with the very closest of cooperation with the United States in all international discussions and in membership on the various unaffiliated organizations of the UN.

Of course, there will be considerable pioneering necessary in the field of international law in settling in written form agreements between, for example, the United States and the United Democratic States of Europe. It will take the finest experts experienced in world jurisprudence to work out these relationships.

We have seen the Benelux economic entente. We have seen how the western European nations can work together for the preparation of joint estimates on financial needs under the Marshall plan. What we need now is for the nations to establish a strong basis for cooperation for purposes other than merely obtaining financial aid. There is every indication that the United States Senate would look with great favor upon voluntary federation such as I have above suggested and would be eager to define United States relationships with such a union.

The basis of the union of the western powers should not, of course, only be fear of posssible military aggression. On the contrary, these powers should unite on the basis of recognition of the intrinsic advantages which can be secured under such a union.

There is a tremendous amount of potential good will among the people of the United States which will spontaneously manifest itself when once our people see these western powers coming together sincerely and conscientiously for union. We of the 48 States on this North American Continent who have known the blessings of union will take to our hearts a movement abroad for a similar union. We recognize, of course, the tremendous complexities involved, the tremendous administrative problems, the deep factor of national pride in individual heritages, but we know that union, far from being impossible, is a definite possibility if the western European nations have the statesmanship—the will, intent, and purpose—to accomplish it.

The 16 western European nations have been slowly gravitating toward union. In fact, the painfully slow progress, although discouraging, is hardly fatal. Some of us who are so prone to cast stones at others' unbuilt glass houses should remember that, even after the United States established a union, we had to consolidate that Union with the blood of hundreds of thousands at Gettysburg, Vicksburg, Bull Run; and we had to watch the smoldering embers of hatred burning in our own Nation for decades thereafter. Why, then, should we be so impatient with the continuing feuds of European nations in the UN?

THE UNITED STATES PATTERN OF WRITTEN COMPACTS

The history of America shows that miracles can happen. The situation in the world today, therefore, requires neither pessimism nor optimism, but hopeful realism.

At the time our own Constitution was written, no other nation had ever previously operated under a written compact. No other nation had ever sprung into existence as did the United States. Why then should men be discouraged by the fact that there has never been a successful governing body to unite the nations of the world?

Do we, with 150 years of experience as a Government, lack wisdom and leadership and maturity to help save the world for peace? Do we question the ability of Europe's statesmen? Our Constitution was written by men who were mere youths by today's standards. Four men elected to the Constitutional Convention were in their twenties. Eighteen men were in their thirties. Twenty men were in their forties. Only 13 men were 50 years or older.

In fact, the few older statesmen who were present, such as Washington, Franklin, Robert Morris, John Dickinson, and George Wythe, as a rule, sat silently. It was the new and young generation that debated the fierce issues of the time, and finally drew up that great document, the United States Constitution. Hamilton was only 30 years old. Madison 36—two of the outstanding leaders for the cause of a united states.

Nor were all of the signers of the Constitution exactly suited to their task. Madison, for example, was a well-to-do bookish scholar and student, taken to theorizing and philosophizing, rather than to the practical matter of earning his daily bread. Yet he helped to form one of the most practical and pragmatic documents of world history, which has withstood the test of guiding our great country for a critical century and a half.

THE UNITED STATES PATTERN OF EARLY SKEPTICISM

Obstacles? Yes; the framers of the Constitution had plenty of problems waiting to strangle their efforts. As we all know, the signing of the Constitution (like the signing of the UN Charter) was not the end of the fight for unity, but the beginning.

Many leading statesmen of the times seemed firmly persuaded that the cradle of the Constitution would be the grave of republican liberty.

Five men elected to attend the Constitutional Convention, including that great patriot, Patrick Henry, refused to attend. They were fiercely opposed to the Convention, the Constitution, and its ratification.

Four men attending the Convention became so dissatisfied with the form the Constitution was taking that they left before it adjourned.

Three of the 42 men present at adjournment of the Convention refused to sign the Constitution because they objected to it.

Nor were the leading statesmen of the time the only enemies of the Constitution who firmly believed it was bad for the country. Many of the citizens themselves were against it. As early as the election of 1792, the South made a threat to secede. The frequency with which the word "secession" appeared in Congress appalls a contemporary observer. From 1804 to 1815, leaders in New England made no less than four aggressive attempts to destroy the Constitution, to separate the Northern and Eastern States from the Federal Union, and to organize a New England Confederacy.

"Can it be supposed that this vast country, including the Western Territory, will, 150 years hence, remain one nation?"

That was a question put before the Constitutional Convention by Nathaniel Gorham, a delegate from Massachusetts. He was referring not to the expanse which Americans of today understand by that description, but merely the land extending westward from the Appalachians to the Mississippi River.

Today the century and a half has expired, and not only has the territory east of the Mississippi been incorporated into what is apparently an indissoluble Union, but additions have been made which, in Mr. Gorham's eyes, would have seemed, indeed, a miracle.

Yes, the people back in 1790 lacked faith in the Constitution, just as many of us are inclined to lack faith in the UN. Only the fact that Washington was to be the first President, it was said, made the adoption of the Constitution possible. It was predicted that the whole thing would go into discard when he retired. Moreover, it was believed that Washington would go down in history as a great man—but also as a great failure—because of what was felt to be the temporary nature of the Constitution and the United States Government. Even as late as 1812, it was commonly declared that James Madison would be the last President of the United States under the Constitution.

So doubtful was the ratification of the Constitution that it took an emotional incident of the heart, such as an insult to the integrity of the beloved Washington, to help turn the tide for ratification. At a critical hour, a reckless opponent of the Constitution in a Philadelphia newspaper denounced Washington as a born fool, and a tyrant wishing to subvert the liberties of the people. The reaction to this charge among those who differed from Washington in opinion but could not endure such an attack upon him, persuaded a majority of the anticonstitutionists to his side, and aided to complete his victory in obtaining ratification of the Constitution.

IT'S A MATTER OF PERSPECTIVE

Compared to the hard fight that had to be put up before the Constitution became accepted, it might almost be said that the United Nations is having easy going of it. For one thing, work is well under way in constructing the home for the United Nations. But, the Supreme Court, which is the protector of our Constitution, was held in such little esteem that when the new Capital City was established in Washington, D. C., in 1800, but a decade and a half after the Constitution had been ratified, no building and no chambers were provided for the judicial branch of Government.

Up until the time that John Marshall became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, that now revered position was looked down on as being of little importance. Such great men as Patrick Henry, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Robert Hanson Harrison. Alexander Hamilton, all declined the honor.

In fact, until Marshall breathed life into the judicial arm of Government it was considered the most helpless and harmless of all the Government's organs.

These are but a few of the obstacles that the Constitution of the United States had to overcome. It took a miracle to make it work, but today the United States Constitution is indeed a success. In the 160 years which have passed since its adoption, virtually the only institution to remain unchanged is the Constitution itself. America, the youngest of the great nations, is at the same time the oldest government.

It may very well take a miracle to make the UN the strong, effective instrument for peace for which the peoples of the world have been praying, but that miracle can be achieved. The once disunited 13 Colonies, now the greatest Nation in the world, are the inspiring pattern for the disunited nations which in turn can be the fulfillment of the dream of centuries for a world organization that will forever banish the catastrophe of war from human affairs.

Need for Development of Natural Resources in the 11 Western States To Serve New Population Increases; Los Angeles Area Shows Greatest Gain

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the development in the eleven Western States so that they may fully understand that those of us who represent that section of the country are not asking for more than our share of what we are entitled to in the development of the natural resources and the other facilities with which the Government assists its population in various parts of the country.

Since 1940 the population in the 11 Western States has increased from 13,900,000 to 18,650,000 in 1948, which is more than 10 percent of the entire population of the Nation. The war years brought many, many millions of people there to make a livelihood, which requires the development of our natural resources, our hydroelectric power, our reclamation projects, our transportation facilities. I trust that when we come before you, you will understand that we are seeking only to serve the people whom we represent.

Gains that are counted, in 11 Pacific and Mountain States, show the vast difference between the new West and the old.

In people, these 11 Western States have registered a bigger gain than any other United States region. Population jumped from 13,900,000 in 1940 to 18,650,000 in 1948. A 22,000,000 total may appear by 1955. California, Washington, and Oregon suddenly have become a bigger market, in terms of people, than all of Canada.

But more than one-third of the people in the Western States are crowded into two metropolitan districts—Los Angeles and San Francisco. There still are vast areas throughout the West where there are few people or none. The current problems of caring for the new people who arrived with the boom are being complicated by the pin-point crowding that has occurred.

California is forced to consider the first billion-dollar budget in the State's history, largely because the need for new city facilities cannot be avoided any longer. The State needs $325,000,000 worth of new schools as fast as they can be constructed. New mental-care institutions are needed at the rate of one each 18 months. Several hundred youthful lawbreakers are in San Quentin prison because the State lacks enough reformatory space.

Other States face the same kinds of trouble on a smaller scale. Oregon needs $120,000,000 worth of emergency school facilities. Washington educators want $500,000,000 worth of new schools in the next 10 years.

All the new improvements and additions, as they are made, will change western cities, make them more like the crowded centers of the East. Texas will rise. California already has a 2½-percent sales tax and more than 100 other California cities have local sales levies on top of that. Increased pensions just voted for aged persons will, if not changed, add more than $100,000,000 to State costs in the first year of the higher payments. Officials fear, too, that the generous new pensions may attract hordes of older people from other States. Only young and vigorous workers are really wanted.

New industry is another guide to the transformation of the West. Manufacturing plants gradually are removing the old dependence on the East. A few examples of gains already made and those in prospect:

Los Angeles is second to Detroit in number of cars and trucks assembled. A total of 159,000 units was turned out there in 1940, about 700,000 in 1948, and 1,000,000 units are predicted for 1955.

The West makes 40 percent of its machine tools and mining and construction equipment. Its factories turn out one-sixth of the area's farm implements. Production is increasing.

Steelmaking capacity has been doubled. Electric-power generating capacity rose from 6,470,000 kilowatt-hours in 1940 to 9,545,000 in 1948, and it will reach 17,000,000 by 1954.

All told, more than 3,000 new plants were built in the West during the war and postwar boom—shipyards, aircraft

factories, atomic-energy installations, aluminum, magnesium, and chemical works, fabricating plants of all kinds. Cement production is expected to be double that of 1940 within the next few years.

Manufacturing employment more than doubled between 1940 and 1947 in California. Washington and Oregon factories employ one-third more workers than they did in 1940.

Western-made products are sold on a Nation-wide basis. A list of nationally sold goods would include such diverse products as material-handling machinery, oil-well equipment, auto and truck trailers, lumber, plywood, fresh and preserved foodstuffs, refractory brick, gas furnaces, linoleum, paper products, outboard motors and flatirons. Westerners are hoping they can move still farther into the national market. But they are hampered by high operating costs at home and freight rates that work out to the western shippers' disadvantage.

It costs $1.60, for example, to ship a case of fruits or vegetables from the Northwest to New York. Wisconsin shippers pay only 79 cents per case to reach that major market.

Foreign wines can be landed in eastern ports for less cost than California wines. That partly explains why there is a slump in the consumption of California wines.

From the East, a Sparrows Point, Md., steel plant can land steel products in Northwest Pacific ports for the same prices that the nearest western competitor charges, even though the western plant is located at San Francisco. The major west-coast steel producer just cut prices—up to $39 a ton in some cases. That is a tip-off that the fight for the western steel market is beginning.

The freight-rate disadvantage is so great that some western concerns are opening eastern plants so they can continue to compete for national markets. That means a loss of potential industry, from the standpoint of the West. Canners have bought eastern canneries, and a linoleum manufacturer opened a plant in New Jersey because of the freight problem.

As competition increases, freight-cost differentials will make it harder for western manufacturers to meet price cuts by competitors in other regions. Recent freight-rate increases have widened the gap between West and East freight costs, to the West's disadvantage.

Growth of capital, the funds to finance expansion in the future, is a significant milestone in western development. Bank assets totaled $7,087,000,000 in 1940. By 1948 the total was up to $21,091,000,000. A modest increase to $23,000,000,000 by 1955 is considered a conservative estimate.

With more funds of their own to spend, western investors talk less about the colonial status of their region. Bankers feel they have adequate resources of their own now to finance any sound new projects. Nationally known companies are beginning to locate their head offices in the area. Insurance companies are investing in western enterprises the money they get from western insurance business. These trends increase general confidence about the future. Total income is expected to drop during the next few years, then resume its upward trend. Income was at the $8,500,000,000 level in 1940. The total was more than $27,135,000,000 in 1947.

That is a picture of progress the West has made in less than a decade.

For the future the West is pinning its hopes on certain great resources. But not all the outlook is rosy.

Favorable factors include an expanding labor supply, cheap power, the promise of vast new mineral resources.

Cheap power explains the West's great attraction for metal and chemical industries. Only one-fifth of the Columbia River Basin's power capacity has been tapped so far, though more than 200 hydroelectric plants already are drawing on the rivers there. By 1960 power output probably will be three times present output. Power generated by the Colorado River plants will be doubled in the same period and so will power production in the Central Valley area of California.

Power rates at the big public power projects run about 2.5 mills per kilowatthour in the Pacific Northwest. Power rates along the east coast usually are much higher. The West, in fact, has oversold its power attractions for the time being. It is claimed that hundreds of companies seeking to locate in Washington and Oregon have been told to come back later, when more power is available. Power is expected to be insufficient there for several years at least. Northern California is meeting its power needs more promptly.

Mineral resources will be a big drawing card for industry and capital. Oil-shale deposits in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming offer, prospectively, more oil than all United States natural-oil deposits put together. The largest phosphate-rock deposits in the United States are located in the West. A great new fertilizer industry is expected to exploit that resource. An infant steel industry at Geneva, Utah, and in California, is growing up on the West's coal and iron deposits.

But the West lacks one resource—water. And water is the key to further development in more and more places.

Water scarcity is partly due to the hasty, unexpected growth of recent years. Southern California, Arizona, and New Mexico suffer most from lack of water, but it is a problem even in San Francisco, for example. Some parts of all the western States are parched most of the year. That explains why only 16 percent of all western land is cropland.

Farmers in southern California for 40 years have been taking out ground water for irrigation faster than nature puts it back. In some areas, wells go more than half a mile deep and dry wells are becoming common. Ground-water levels have dropped 100 feet or more in spots. Around Los Angeles the fresh-water table often falls below sea level so that salt water seeps into wells. Pumping costs are becoming prohibitive.

During last summer's drought about 300,000 acres of land that had been irrigated had to be abandoned for lack of water. In Arizona an estimated one-third of the arable land may be returned to desert soon if new sources of water are not discovered.

Yet irrigation farming is the foundation for much of the West's prosperity. Farming operations have been broadening out, tying in with industrial development, too. Cotton, for example, is becoming a big crop. Western growers produced 868,000 bales of cotton in 1940. By 1955 the crop may be up to the 2,000,000-bale level. California's first textile plant is going up this year, attracted by the home-grown cotton.

Unless more water is found farming operations will have to be curtailed rather than expanded. Many industrial concerns have vetoed a move to the West after they found that water costs would be prohibitive, or that no sure supply could be found. Western Senators are demanding Federal research on ways to purify sea water. At the same time the Federal Government is pouring several billions of dollars into irrigation projects. The vast river developments are aimed at getting every benefit possible from all the water the West can find.

In months ahead, to sum up the prospects, most observers of trends in the West anticipate a little recession in the great boom. By 1951, however, they expect another upward spurt in population and new industry. It could happen even sooner in this expanding region.

A Sea-Level Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, I extended in the Appendix of the RECORD an article contained in the March 1949 issue of the Pacific Marine Review entitled "A Sea-Level Panama Canal." This was the second of a series appearing in this magazine and I now ask permission to extend the first of this series which appeared in the February 1949 issue of the Pacific Marine Review. The subject dealt with is so very important that I have considered it desirable to etxend the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

A SEA-LEVEL PANAMA CANAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Interest in the project for a sea level canal is becoming so widespread, and the maritime services are so importantly affected, we shall publish a series of articles on various phases of the enterprise. They will deal with engineering, construction, traffic, tolls, and national defense. The first, dealing with dredging, follows.)

THE DREDGING PROBLEM

The proposal for a sea level canal at Panama to replace the present lock structure, now far advanced in engineering discussions and technical society meeting, has reached the point where the practical phases of construction and operation will occupy the public mind. A certain amount of demagogic thinking will be, and is being, encountered

both for and against. Such comprehensive generalities as "the present Canal was conceived by engineers and built by engineers, and the men who have to get the ships through were never consulted," a statement made in Congress last month, is hardly a convincing argument one way or another. Such a statement lessens the force of the whole contention of the speaker, but since there may be those who will be influenced by it, some other points he makes should be deflated.

For instance, an argument is presented in favor of calling on the engineers who built the present Canal to participate in present discussions, for who should know better than they the problems of construction? This proposal is followed by the kind of planning which might be expected from them in this quotation:

"No engineers who had anything to do with building the Canal regards the sea-level idea with anything but consternation. These gentlemen ask how we are going to construct dredges to excavate under water at depths up to 147 feet. None believes the present estimates of cost and of 5 to 10 years for building are anything but a rough minimum, with the present Canal out of operation so long no one knows what the economic, political, and strategic effects might be."

This is hardly an up-to-date engineering opinion, for deep dredging has been developed to a degree that is apparently far beyond the speaker's knowledge. The Yuba Manufacturing Co. of San Francisco has recently completed a contract with the Panama Canal for development designs for bucket-ladder dredges, one of which is to dredge to a depth of 145 feet.

An extensive engineering study carried on by the Yuba Manufacturing Co. has proved the bucket-ladder-type dredge is practical for excavating the materials to be found in the proposed new sea-level Panama Canal, providing the hard formation will be suitably broken up by blasting. A special project has been carried on in the hard formations of the Panama Canal providing the rock formation can be broken up economically to desired sizes for dredging.

Two dredgers are proposed, both having buckets of 54 cubic feet capacity each, one digging to a depth of 90 feet below water level and the other digging to a depth of 145 feet below water level. These dredges as designed embody the experience of the harbor-type bucket-ladder dredge and the placer-mining-type bucket-ladder dredge, with the units being modernized with proved designs.

In an authoritative paper which Charles M. Romanowitz, director of sales for Yuba Manufacturing Co., presented before the American Society of Civil Engineers last year, the history of dredging, dredge efficiency and digging depths are dealt with, and his outline of the proposed bucket-ladder dredge is presented herewith:

PROPOSED BUCKET-LADDER DREDGES

Yuba Manufacturing Company has designed two bucket-ladder dredges which are recommended for the proposed excavation of the blasted rock on the proposed sea-level Panama Canal project.

One of these dredges will be capable of digging to a depth of 90 feet below water level and will cut its own clearance, although it will require a depth of at least 40 feet of water to start operations. The second dredge will be capable of digging to a maximum depth of 145 feet below water level with the ladder at an angle of 48 degrees with the horizontal. This dredge will not cut its own clearance, but this is not required in its proposed operations.

After a prolonged study, the Yuba Manufacturing Co. has recommended the use of buckets having a capacity of 54 cubic feet each. This capacity bucket has been used on harbor bucket-ladder dredges and the study shows to go beyond this size presents many difficult problems in the various units making up the dredge. It was therefore decided to develop the designs for the 54-cubic-foot bucket capacity.

The dredge to dig 90 feet below water level will have the units interchangeable with the deep-digging dredge. Therefore, the description of the various units will be confined to the deep-digging dredge.

The general information of the dredge to dig 90 feet below water level is as follows:

Hull size: 244 feet 8 inches length; 100 feet beam; 15 feet 1 inch depth.

Bucket capacity: 54 cubic feet; bucket pitch, 6 feet; bucket width at base, 60½ inches; bucket width at lips, 74 inches; bucket height, 86½ inches.

Number of buckets: 62.

Ladder length: 163 feet 6 inches center to center of tumblers.

Horsepower: Installed horsepower, 4,900. Estimated average operating horsepower requirement, approximately 2,200.

Generating plant: Three 1,600-horsepower Diesels each direct-connected to a 1,250-kilovolt-ampere, 2,300-volt generator.

Rock disposal: From buckets into main hopper to a tilting apron to divert materials either to port or starboard; then to manganese steel apron feeder to chute into barges on either side of dredge.

Total estimated weight of dredge (light): 5,895 tons.

The general information on the dredge to dig 145 feet below water level is as follows:

Hull size: 370 feet 8 inches length; 100 feet beam; 13 feet 1 inch depth.

Bucket capacity: 54 cubic feet. Bucket dimensions, same as shown in preceding table.

Number of buckets: 88.

Ladder length: 239 feet center to center of tumblers.

Horsepower: Installed horsepower, 5,294. Estimated average operating horsepower requirement, approximately 2,400.

Generating plant: Four 1,600-horsepower Diesels each direct-connected to a 1,250-kilovolt-ampere 2,300-volt generator.

Rock disposal: Same as shown in preceding table and described below.

Total estimated weight of dredge (light): 7,220 tons.

In the design of these dredges, the manufacturers of the various units or parts on which they have specialized were consulted and gave excellent cooperation and assistance. While some items are larger than furnished before by these concerns, we were given assurance in each case that the final design of the parts will be within the scope of their experience and manufacture, even though some would require special machinery or setups to perform the work.

In designing these dredges, one factor that was given special consideration was that of ease in making replacements, and I am confident that the various parts can be replaced quickly. This will assist in keeping the running time as high as possible.

The following is a description of the important units on the deep digging dredge.

The hull, superstructure and gantries present no problems. The hull is of conventional design with many bulkheads to provide watertight compartments, assuring maximum safety. The hull extends across the bow. The well hole thus enclosed will permit the ladder being raised clear of the deck. This well hole will be 24 feet 5 inches wide for a distance of approximately 130 feet from the forward end to enable the ladder system being raised with the bucket line off the lower tumbler and supported on the lower hanger bars. This is being done to enable the bucket line being put back in position in the shortest time possible, in case it is forced off the lower tumbler. The remaining portion of the well hole has been reduced to 11 feet 4 inches in width.

The proposed buckets were designed by the American Manganese Steel Co. in cooperation with the Yuba Manufacturing Co.'s engineering department. The Taylor-Wharton Iron & Steel Co. also can furnish buckets of this size of their own design. The buckets are of the rock type, well proportionad. A rock 4' x 4' x 3½' will fit inside the bucket, but no determination has been made as to the maximum-size boulders that can be handled. The experimental blasting project carried on recently in the Panama Canal demonstrated that blasting can be done economically, to keep the size of boulders within the capacity of these buckets. Therefore no difficulty is anticipated.

The digging ladder will present no difficult problem in manufacturing. On the underside of the ladder will be placed a Perry type bucket idler supporting the bucket line and located in a manner to develop the best catenary; also to maintain alinement of the bucket line with the lower tumbler. This idler will prolong the life of the bucket pins and keep to a minimum the chances of the bucket line coming off the lower tumbler.

The lower tumbler will be made up of two castings on a shaft, with replaceable manganese-steel wearing plates bolted in place. The lower tumbler, as well as the ladder roller bearings, will be lubricated by means of an automatic lubrication system.

The ladder suspension will be of the double type, that is, a complete set of suspension bars and hoisting blocks located on each side of the digging ladder. Each set of hoist lines and suspension bars will have sufficient strength to hoist the ladder in case of failure in one of the suspension units. The front hanger bars will be provided with a safety device placed on the forward side, which will be connected with an indicator in the winch room, to stop the bucket line in case some obstruction has come against the bar. It is believed this system is flexible enough and of sufficient size to give long and useful service.

The main drive, part of which is the upper tumbler, is designed for long life and for quick replacement. The Falk Corporation cooperated in the design of this unit. The main drive is made up of a double train of gears connected to the ends of the upper tumbler shaft through flexible couplings, which reduces the shock from the bucket line. The upper tumbler can be replaced easily as a unit by disconnecting the couplings, making it unnecessary to move the bull gears. Power will be furnished the main drive either by one extended shaft 2,500-horsepower synchronous alternating current motor, direct-connected on each side to the gearing through reduction gear sets with flexible couplings and magnetic couplings, or by two 1,250-horsepower direct-connected motors with Ward-Leonard control. The upper tumbler will have a maximum of 2,583 revolutions per minute, which is equal to a maximum bucket line speed of 93 feet per minute or 15.5 buckets per minute.

The winches will consist of two ladder-hoist winches, each driven by a 600-horsepower motor; two bowline winches; two stern-line winches; two headline winches; one stern haul-back winch; two spare-line winches for repair and other work on the dredge; one spud-hoist winch; two winches for rock-spill chute to barges. The ladder-hoist winch will be equipped with Lilly control safety unit to limit the lowering speed and also limit the maximum height and depth to which the ladder may be raised or lowered.

The dredge will be held in its digging position by either a set of dual headlines 2½-inch diameter and stern haul-back line 2-inch diameter, or a spud, when in its digging position, will be on an angle with the horizontal and fastened to the stern of the dredge.

The maneuvering of the dredge will be by 2-inch-diameter wire ropes from the four corners of the hull.

The disposal system will provide for the materials being dumped into the main hopper to pass directly to an apron approximately 8 feet wide and 14 feet long, capable of tilting to permit the materials being passed either to port or starboard. From the tilting apron, the materials will go to either side to a short fixed apron or chute and then to an apron feeder approximately 8 feet wide and 32 feet long. This feeder will be a heavy-duty, self-contained, manganese-steel, feeder type, which has been in use in various sizes in mines and quarries throughout the world for the last 20 years. From this feeder the materials will drop into a chute which is adjustable vertically and is used to deliver the materials into the barges alongside the dredge.

All units of the dredge will be serviced either through a suitable crane, or trolley beams with chain blocks. All units will have adequate safety protection.

There will be placed, in the stern of the dredge, the Diesel generating system in a housing that will be soundproof and air-conditioned. This power plant consists of four 1,600-horsepower Diesel engines, each direct-connected to one 1,250-kilovolt ampere, 2,400-volt, 3-phase, 60-cycle, synchronous generator with double-shaft extension. To each of these generators is connected a 75-kilowatt, 720-revolutions-per-minute, 250-volt, direct-current, variable-voltage generator to supply power to the bow- and stern-line winches, and on top of this direct-current generator is mounted a 10-kilowatt, 125-volt, 1,750-revolutions-per-minute, v-belt-driven exciter. This plant is also equipped with a 100-kilowatt, alternating-current, emergency Diesel electric set to generate electric energy to operate all the auxiliary equipment aboard the dredge in case of emergency, when the main Diesel electric units are not operating.

The electrical equipment is an alternating-current drive with an alternate employing the Ward-Leonard direct-current system on the main drive and all the principal winches.

ALTERNATING-CURRENT SYSTEM

The main drive is powered with a synchronous motor driving through two eddy-current couplings to provide smooth acceleration, variable operating speed, and cushioning to the main drive.

The control is arranged with automatic excitation of the couplings to provide predetermined value of torque limit under all operating speeds.

The ladder hoist winch is powered by two alternating-current, variable-speed, wound-rotor, induction motors. The control circuit provides full protection to both the motors and mechanical equipment during hoisting, plugging, and lowering cycles.

The two head line winches and the stern haul-back winch are powered by alternating-current, variable-speed, wound-rotor, induction motors. The equipment is arranged with reversing control and several speed points in each direction. The operation of the brakes is automatic and is interlocked with the control circuit to provide maximum protection.

The bow- and stern-line winches are powered by direct-current motors and are arranged to operate on Ward-Leonard control. Each winch is equipped with automatically operated brakes. The remaining equipment, such as pumps, ventilating system, and tools, is all driven by standard alternating-current motors.

WARD-LEONARD DIRECT-CURRENT SYSTEM

The main drive will be powered by two 1,250 horse-power direct-current motors operating on variable voltage. The control for this drive will consist of the latest development in the Ward-Leonard system to provide automatic torque limit, variable-speed operation, and smooth acceleration.

The ladder hoist winches, head-line winches, stern haul-back winch, bow-line and stern-line winches, are each driven by direct-current motors operating on variable voltage.

The direct-current power is furnished by synchronous motor generator sets employing the latest development in the Ward-Leonard system.

ESTIMATED OPERATING DATA

Due to the affiliation of Yuba Manufacturing Co. with Yuba Consolidated Gold Fields, the operators of many placer dredges with experience dating back over 40 years, it was possible to obtain the assistance of their engineering department. As in the design of the dredge, the calculations as to estimated yardages and costs were figured on a conservative basis. Experience has shown, as mentioned above, that the deep digging dredge will dig less yardage than the dredge to dig 90 feet. In determining the yardages and costs, only those dredges operated by Yuba Consolidated Gold Fields, with experience in deep and hard digging, were considered.

The maximum speed of the bucket line as mentioned above, is 15.5 buckets per minute; however, in the yardage calculations, a speed of 12 buckets per minute was used. These calculations show the following:

Theoretical output of the dredge: Annual output equals C x S x M x D when C equals capacity of bucket level full in cubic yards; S equals speed of bucket line in buckets per minute; M equals minutes per day; D equals days per year on 6 days per week basis, with no holidays; 2 x 12 x 1,440 x 313 equals 10,817,280 cubic yards.

Estimated actual output equals 10,817,280 x 40 percent operating efficiency for the deep digging dredge equals 4,327,000 cubic yards and 10,817,280 x 50 percent operating efficiency for the 90-foot digging depth dredge equals 5,408,600 cubic yards.

In determining the operating efficiency, the following was taken into consideration:

1. All lost time due to servicing and repairs, both operating and major.
2. All lost time due to maneuvering the dredge in its cut.
3. Loss in output due to buckets not being completely filled at all times when dredge is actually digging.
4. Loss in output due to bucket line running with empty buckets when raising ladder or overswinging.

These yardages are about the same as obtained with the 18-cubic-foot dredges in placer mining. The main reason for the apparent lower yardage for the labor bucket capacity is the bucket speeds are about one-half as fast as that for the dredges used in placer mining. Further, the dredge efficiencies used in the calculations are much lower than those obtained in placer mining.

For the calculations of the estimated costs per cubic yard for these proposed dredges, the following cost items were taken into consideration:

1. Operating labor.
2. Operating supplies.
3. Power.
4. Repair labor.
5. Repair material and replacement parts.

In the labor costs were included all salaries, wages, and subsistence of the operating crews, with rates in force in the Canal Zone as per schedule of July 1946, and included a sick leave of 20 percent. As shown above in the make-up of the formula used in determining the annual theoretical yardage, a work week of 6 days was used, but if the dredges are operated on a split shift, 7-day basis, the cost will indicate a lower cost.

The power cost is computed on a basis of 2 cents per kilowatt-hour as eventually all power will be delivered from the shore and this rate was considered conservative.

The costs of operating supplies, repair, and replacement materials were made up from experience in placer mining dredges with liberal allowance for the conditions to be found in Panama operations and should adequately take care of the requirements.

On this basis, the estimated unit operating cost, covering the five items mentioned above, was slightly over 20 cents per cubic yard for the deep digging dredge and slightly over 15 cents per cubic yard for the dredge to dig 90 feet below water level.

Selecting Our Future Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the full text of an address by Hon. Herve J. L'Heureux, Chief, Visa Division, Department of State, at the annual conference of National Council of Naturalization and Citizenship held at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on March 25, 1949. I desire to draw the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that the responsible representative of the Department of State clearly indicated the necessity of providing for a more selective system of immigration than the system under which we are now operating. I have introduced H. R. 3001 which, if enacted, should meet the needs of American economy and of the defense of our country. I do hope that we will be able to schedule my bill, H. R. 3001, for early consideration.

SELECTING OUR FUTURE CITIZENS

There are two basic theories or fundamental systems for the control of immigration into any country. One is that no alien shall be permitted to enter the national territory of a country unless there is some specific provision of the law of the country concerned, which authorizes the admission of the individual alien or the particular class of aliens to which he belongs. In other words, under this theory the national law of the particular country bars all aliens from admission into the national territory, except in such cases or classes of cases as the law may specifically provide for the admission of aliens.

The other basic concept of immigration control is predicated upon the theory that all aliens may have the privilege of entering the national territory of a country, so far as the fundamental law of the country is concerned, unless there is some particular provision in the national law which specifically provides for the exclusion of an alien in an individual case, according to the excluded class of aliens to which he belongs. This is the fundamental concept of immigration control which is followed by the United States, although most countries of the world follow the first basic principle I have mentioned.

You can appreciate the reason why our immigration laws are based upon the second theoretical concept. It is simply a matter of our historical development as a nation of immigrant people. In the early days of our history we welcomed and encouraged all immigrants who wanted to come here. We needed manpower to develop the vast wilderness which has become what we know today as the United States of America. We were looking for men and women who wanted to start a new life in this new world of rugged

individual and collective opportunity—men and women who loved human freedom and who cherished political and religious liberty. We wanted immigrants who would leave their old-world problems and controversies behind them and come here to establish upon the continent of North America, a new nation of people from many lands—a new nation based upon new political and economic concepts of national life. That we have succeeded so well is in itself a tribute to the sturdy character of our early immigrants.

We want to keep the doors open for worthy immigrants and yet preserve our heritage. We do not wish to see our favorable position in the world frittered away by a lackadaisical immigration policy which would permit a vast influx of people from other countries of the world who would create insurmountable problems for those who are already here.

This is a time of great and far-reaching achievement in the fields of science and invention. In these modern days of global-flight aircraft, radio, radar, television, and other electronic as well as mass-production developments, not to mention atomic energy, we are living in a much smaller world. It is also a more highly developed civilization from many points of view. There is, therefore, sound basis for a new concept of immigration control. We need to have a more selective immigration policy in the interests of our own people, and yet we would not close the door to immigrants who, for their own benefit alone, may desire to come to this country.

In a more technical sense, it has been our practice in past years to follow the first-come-first-served rule in granting the privilege of immigration into the United States. This was necessary because of the fact that we have imposed numerical as well as qualitative restrictions upon the entry of immigrants into this country. In other words, when you have more applicants for permission to enter than there are seats in the hall it is customary for people to line up at the entrance. Those first in line may be admitted, but the hall may be filled before the last person in line is reached.

In enacting our quota immigration laws Congress has provided that we may take certain imr igrants out of line and move them ahead of others. This we call granting a preference. But Congress has stipulated precisely in the law the classes which may be granted such a preference over others, whom we call nonpreference immigrants. We are therefore precluded from taking other persons out of their normal order and, in effect, granting to them an unauthorized preference, or a preference not provided by law.

The only occupational preference authorized by law is for aliens having skill in agriculture above that of an ordinary farm laborer, but the law provides that this shall not apply to applicants who are chargeable to quotas of less than 300 annually, and it is, of course, in the quotas smaller than 300 annually that preference may mean the difference between coming to the United States or not being able to come at all because of the heavy demand for visas on the part of aliens who are the close relatives of citizens or residents and who are entitled to preference as such in acordance with the law.

Our experience of a quarter of a century in the work of controlling immigration into the United States primarily at the foreign source, through the visa or double-check system shows that there is sound basis for an amendment of the law which will enable us to penetrate further into the field of selective immigration. We have been obliged to tell American industrial, commercial and scientific institutions and firms that they may not bring to the United States as immigrants out of the regular turn on a quota waiting list, a highly skilled and greatly needed technician or scientist. In some such cases it may be many years before the aliens they may desire to bring to this country can be reached on the waiting list.

This situation, in my opinion, is one that would justify early remedial legislation, not for the purpose of assisting for his own sake, an immigrant who wants to come here as soon as possible, but for the purpose of enabling the important Amercan interests involved to fill an urgent need, which in turn will provide for greater activity and expansion of our business and industry and provide more and greater employment for our citizens and residents. In other words, a sovereign nation should have the power to select and bring immigrants into its territory whenever it is in the national interest to do so, instead of filling up the quotas year in and year out with immigrants who, for their own sakes, desire to enter, regardless of whether they may be able to make any appreciable contribution to the national welfare.

The Future of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following address, delivered by the Ambassador of the State of Israel to the United States, His Excellency Eliahu Elath, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., on February 28, 1949, I am sure will prove of considerable interest to the Congress. It will go far toward dispelling much of the misinformation prevalent about the new State of Israel:

THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL

Two generations ago our early settlers in the Holy Land were faced with three major tasks: to colonize an arid and half-empty country; to establish a modern, progressive society; and to rebuild a national community in the ancient homeland of the Jewish people.

For 400 years the Ottoman Turks had ruled Palestine. The Ottoman Turks were not colonizers but military conquerors, who did very little indeed to develop agriculture and industry. Trade was largely left to foreigners, and public services and communications were badly neglected. This applied in particular to provinces, such as Palestine, which were poor in natural resources and remote from Constantinople, the capital of the empire.

This policy, especially since the decine of the Turkish Empire in the sixteenth century, had a disastrous effect on economic life in Palestine. The desert encroached on cultivated land and Bedouin chieftains ruled large parts of the country, robbing farmers, attacking trade caravans, and paralyzing the economy in the towns. Following the example of earlier conquerors, the Turks and Arabs systematically deforested the country. The coastal zone and the valley of Esdraelon, today the most fertile parts of Israel, were covered by swamps. Malaria, together with the general insecurity, depopulated the countryside. Many peasants fled into towns, but there too arts and crafts declined, particularly since the eighteenth century when cheap manufactured goods were imported from Europe at an increasing pace. The general decline of the country caused large-scale emigration. Before World War I many thousands of Arabs left Palestine every year on their way to the Western Hemisphere and other happier and more prosperous lands.

At that time a new and dynamic factor entered the scene. In the second half of the nineteenth century the Jewish communities in eastern Europe were aroused by the ideal of return to Zion. Individual Jews had been immigrating into Palestine for many centuries. But the 1880's saw the beginning of organized Jewish colonization in Palestine.

Many parallels can be drawn between the colonization of the United States and the work of our settlers. Draining swamps, building roads, and establishing settlements in the wilderness, our pioneers led a typically frontier life which, with its adventures and satisfactions, attracted the most vigorous and devoted youth of the Jewish people.

The Chalutzim, or pioneers, became one of the most respected elements in Palestine's Jewish community. Our pioneers, like the early American settlers, learned the elementary facts of adjustment to climate and local conditions from the native population. But they brought about fundamental changes through the introduction of western methods and scientific knowledge.

On the other hand, there exist great differences between the colonization of this country and the upbuilding of Israel. Your forefathers took their land by the right of settlement; we had to buy it, mostly at exorbitant prices. Your settlers enjoyed the protection of the colonial administration and later an independent American Government. We lived, until last May, under foreign governments which—with the short exception of the early period of the mandate—were either hostile or, at least, not very encouraging.

EARLY ZIONISM

Jewish colonization in Palestine was carried out simultaneously in different ways. At first, villages on the European pattern were established in the coastal zone, in Galilee and near Jerusalem with the majority of workers being hired Arab laborers. These settlements were not too successful because of the hostility of the Ottoman government, the general insecurity in the country, and the inexperience of the Jewish settlers. They were saved from complete economic collapse only by large subventions from Jewish philanthropists such as Baron Hirsch and Baron Rothschild.

A new phase began early in this century following the establishment of the World Zionist Organization in 1897. The second wave of immigration in the beginning of this century brought to Palestine highly idealistic youth who tried to blend their national and social ideals in a unique synthesis. They found it impossible to compete with cheap Arab labor on Jewish farms without giving up a minimum standard of civilization. They, therefore, organized themselves in independent groups which were given land acquired by the Jewish national fund and supplied with capital by Zionist Funds. According to Biblical law, land was leased to them for 49 years at a nominal fee, and they were allowed to repay the capital they received over a long period of years. The Zionist organization which planned their colonization efforts stressed national, not material considerations alone, and established settlements not mainly in places where it was most profitable for the settlers, but where new villages would strengthen the foothold of the Jewish community in the country. Thus, compact blocks of settlements emerged and their security was safeguarded by the settlers' own watchman organization which became the nucleus of the Haganah and so, indirectly, the forerunner of our present defense army of Israel.

These new settlements also showed more foresight from an economic point of view. The older colonies were largely based on

monoculture of citrus which in good years assured large profits but in years of crop failure or limited exports presaged disaster. The new settlements, on the other hand, engaged in many varied fields of agricultural production, thus gradually lessening the dependence of the Jewish consumers on imports. This economic policy was strikingly vindicated during the last world war when imports from abroad were cut and in the recent war with the Arabs when no supplies from the neighboring countries were available.

Beside the usual type of privately owned farms, many of our settlements are of the communal type. In all of them the land, as said before, is national property. In the Kibbutzim, or communal settlements, the houses, agricultural machinery, and all other belongings are the property of the settlement of which all members are coowners. The first settlement of this kind, Deganyah, was founded in 1909. Complete individual freedom is enjoyed by members of these settlements, who may join and leave of their own free will. The settlers have large autonomy and even today, after our state has been established, the settlements are run by their members without government intervention. Their administration is highly democratic. All important decisions are made by the General Assembly of the settlers in which all members, men and women over 18, have equal vote.

Another type is the Moshav Ovdim, or cooperative settlement, where only the major agricultural machinery and the central institutions belong to the settlement, while all other property is privately owned. The farmers are pledged to large-scale mutual help and do all their selling and buying jointly through cooperatives.

These settlements, the communal and the cooperative settlements, of which there are today over 300 spread all over the country, became important schools of democracy for our people. It is not surprising, therefore, that many leading figures in politics, administration, the army, and the cultural life of Israel hail from these settlements.

The strong feeling of independence and self-reliance of our settlers had a vital effect on our security. In Haganah days all members of the settlements were militarily trained to withstand Arab attacks. In the recent war every settlement was turned into a small fortress, able to defend itself until regular army units arrived on the scene. To mention only one example: In Deganyah, the colony mentioned before, south of Lake Tiberias, the settlers threw back a full assault of the Syrian Army backed by tanks, planes, and heavy artillery, though they had only small arms and their courageous spirit.

Side by side with these settlements, villages based on private ownership developed rapidly. The old colonies grew into townships. New villages were founded, particularly by settlers, refugees of Nazi persecution from central Europe, after 1933. A striking example is the transplanting of a whole Jewish village community from southwest Germany to the Mediterranean coast north of Acre.

Visitors to Israel are surprised to meet in all these settlements a large number of intellectuals and university graduates. This is the result of a deep Zionist conviction that the building of a new nation has to begin from the very basis of a healthy social and cultural structure. We did not want to become another Levantine community which leaves manual work to others. This return to the land and to labor was a necessary reaction to the abnormal structure of Jewish society in many countries of the dispersion.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND IMMIGRANTS A YEAR

Though we attach greatest importance to agricultural development, we are fully aware that in this way alone we cannot absorb large numbers of immigrants. In 1948 about 100,000 Jews found refuge in Israel, as many as President Truman in 1945 unsuccessfully asked the British Government to let into Palestine—an intervention the Jewish people will never forget. This year we hope to welcome a quarter of a million Jewish immigrants to our shores. The greatest possible expansion of our economic resources is therefore a most urgent task to which we shall devote all our efforts as soon as peace is restored.

Our industries have considerably expanded during the last decade. It is true that Israel is relatively poor in raw materials. But we are fortunate to be able to make up, at least partially, for this deficiency by our many specialists and skilled workers. As Dr. Weizmann, our President, has frequently pointed out, we hope to be able to emulate Switzerland, the important industries of which are based on highly skilled labor. Our diamond, optical, and chemical industries are a beginning in this direction.

Since Israel's territory is very limited, we look to the sea and the air for further development. In recent months we have energetically begun to build up a merchant marine and we hope that boats under Israel's flag will carry a considerable percentage of our immigrants and tourists in the future. Deep sea fishing, especially in Elath on the Red Sea, will also be promoted. Israel lies at the crossroads of the world, near the junction of three continents. Before the last war Lydda became one of the major airports in the Middle East and we are determined to put forth every effort to make it an even more important center of air communications.

All these development schemes will be accelerated with the help of the $100,000,000 loan granted by the United States Export-Import Bank to our new state. We trust that, in addition, private capital will be invested in Israel at a growing pace. The Government of Israel welcomes such investment and is willing to extend every facility and advantage to private foreign investors.

With the help of international loans, private capital and contributions of Jewish individuals and organizations all over the world, we hope to enlarge Israel's productivity to the utmost and to make of our new state one of the most prosperous and progressive countries in the Middle East.

THE NEW STATE OF ISRAEL

A year and a half ago, the United Nations passed an historic resolution to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. If the United Nations had had the power and the means to implement this decision peaceably through international machinery, the Jews would have been glad to accede. But the ink had barely dried on the resolution passed on November 29, 1947, when a policy of open sabotage was started in many capitals of the world in an attempt to nullify this resolution and to obstruct its fulfillment by every possible means.

In Palestine itself the mandatory government had shown no desire to cooperate with the decision of the United Nations. On the contrary, every effort had been made to encourage the Arabs in their belief that it is by them and not by the United Nations that the destiny of Palestine will be decided, and that the Jews, faced with bitter reality, would have to surrender their hopes and rights for Jewish statehood and independence.

But neither the mandatory administration nor the Arabs understood the real meaning of the November 29 resolution, which was only a recognition of the 2,000-year struggle by the Jewish people for their redemption.

Countless generations of our people have prayed for a Jewish state. Century after century. Messianic dreamers attempted short cuts to it.

As I already mentioned, 70 years ago, a new type of practical idealists began to work for it. They went back to the land. They built a new Jewish society, the future State of Israel, from its very foundations. Their efforts laid the groundwork. The Balfour Declaration gave this effort both recognition and fresh impetus. The gigantic tragedy of our people during the Second World War intensified its urgency.

In that war, Jewish Palestine fought as a distinct, national unit. Statehood ceased to be a mere historic ideal. It became an immediate political objective.

The emancipation of the entire Arab Middle East made the denial of statehood to Jewish Palestine an anomaly. As the collapse of the mandatory regime became imminent, independence came within the grasp of the Jewish people. Basing itself upon its natural right to independence, the Jewish people in Palestine, through its elected representatives proclaimed the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, a few hours before the British mandate came to an end.

The future historian will undoubtedly recognize that it was not November 29, 1947, but May 14, 1948, that was the decisive event and turning point in the fight for a Jewish state.

On that very day, the invasion of Palestine by Arab forces from the outside began under the eyes of the British Army.

WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

We now can say with full confidence and satisfaction that in the final analysis, it was better for us that we had to defend our State alone, rather than to have it defended by American or Russian soldiers. Future generations will be proud of that fact. It made our independence more secure and more stable, both morally and politically.

It was their courage and their faith which enabled the Jewish people in Israel to lift themselves out of subjections into solid nationhood, and to withstand the hostile intent of nations many times their number and far richer in the resources of war.

The Jewish people everywhere, and we in Israel in particular, can be satisfied with the achievements of this year. Throughout these crucial months, our people have been engaged not only in fighting and creating a modern army, but in building up the new state, with the utmost energy and devotion.

More than 60 new settlements have been established in different parts of the country. At present, almost 25,000 immigrants reach the shores of Israel every month, where they joyfully join their brothers and sisters, sharing their happiness and grief, as well as their responsibilities. Israel heals their wounds, gives them new hope and renewed confidence in themselves, and makes of them useful and constructive citizens of the new state.

On the ruins of the mandatory administration, a democratic self-government has risen in Israel. It functions with devotion, efficiency, and foresight.

When our young men and women so gallantly rose to the defense of our infant state, they were fighting not only for the existence of that state, but for the survival of those spiritual and moral values that the Jews first gave to humanity and which we believed had been accepted as a basis of conduct for the whole civilized world.

In this war, it was primarily not the material weapons of modern warfare which gave our soldiers the courage and spirit to defeat a superior force, but the ideals of our ancestors and the genuine democratic convictions of the Jewish society in Israel.

It is common knowledge that the Arab soldiers, though better armed and better equipped, were not moved by equally strong emotions and deep convictions, nor were they able to face the moral superiority of our

pioneers. The Jewish victory over the Arabs was in reality a victory of a socially and economically progressive community over a stagnant and decaying feudalism.

Our war for liberty and independence in Israel has been a costly war. We have sacrificed thousands of our best boys and girls. Many settlements have been damaged or destroyed. The Jewish commuity of Jerusalem has suffered beyond words. But there was no sacrifice too dear or too great for the fulfillment of the dream of countless generations; to make the Jewish people in Israel free, to give the remnants of European Jewry a home, and to assure the existence of Israel as an independent nation.

Our armistice agreement with Egypt at Rhodes is an important landmark in the relations of Israel with the United Nations and with the Arab world. We now look forward hopefully to successful armistice negotiations with the other Arab states and to the early transformation of the armistice into a final peace settlement by agreement between us and our neighbors. We are gratified by the historical achievement which this agreement represents for the United Nations, which by the wise and moderate exercise of its authority has demonstrated its capacity to contribute to peace and understanding between the peoples of the world.

When admitted to the United Nations we shall endeavor to contribute our share to the peace and security of the world and to the constructive cooperation between nations.

May I assure you, however, ladies and gentlemen, that we dare not exaggerate our present victory over the Arabs, and assume that the rout of their armies on the battlefield alone will be enough to assure our security in the coming years.

While strengthening Israel is the main guarantee for our survival, we shall simultaneously launch on a far-sighted and statesmanlike policy of rapprochement and understanding with our neighbors, in trying to build bridges and not walls between us. We shall not spare any effort to look for closer relations and cooperation with the Arabs and the other peoples in the Middle East.

THE MIDDLE EAST

While we preserve and continue to develop the western features of our civilization, of which we are so proud, and which has contributed so much to the success of our cause, we must remember that our destiny will depend in many respects on what will happen in the Middle East. Nothing would be more dangerous, therefore, than to follow a policy of isolation or indifference to what is happening in that part of the world: The Arab countries, Turkey, Iran, and even India. We shall have to assign our best people to cultural, political, economic, and diplomatic activities on that vital front in our foreign relations.

A new dynamic and democratic Jewish society is now being established in the heart of the Middle East. The neighboring Arab countries are still struggling to rid themselves of their semifeudal social structure, their backward economy, their diseases and illiteracy, and their resulting political instability. There is no doubt that in the world of today there can be no security without social and economic stability.

Israel can be, and we will endeavor to make her, an example for these countries to follow.

Israel wants Arab economic and social progress in her own interest. The economies of Israel and its neighboring countries are complementary. We have to import the majority of our food and our raw materials, much of which used to come from the Arab countries. For instance, Transjordan before the last war sent to Palestine over 90 percent of its exports, the major portion of which went to the Jewish community. On the other hand, the products of our industries normally have a large market in the Arab states.

Future development schemes in that part of the world such as the Jordan Valley Authority, will benefit both Israel and its neighbors. We sincerely hope that after the Arab states are reconciled to the existence of an independent Israel, the common economic interests will come into the foreground. Economic cooperation will pave the way to other forms of cooperation between Israel and its neighbors in the Middle East.

The great potentialities of that part of the world may contribute much, if properly organized and managed, to the welfare, progress, and security of the entire world.

Israel is inspired by the desire to add its share to this noble and important task and to the better understanding and cooperation of peoples everywhere.

Not Just Digits in a Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert herewith an article by Doris Lockerman, associate editor of the Atlanta Constitution, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on March 27, 1949:

NOT JUST DIGITS IN A BUDGET

(By Doris Lockerman)

It must be ironic to people on relief to read the accounts of the running political joust between the county commissioners and the board of the Fulton County Welfare Department, given dignity by such respected bodies as the grand jury and the taxpayers, and to understand that they are simply considered as statistics in the over-all scheme of things. I have a feeling that the most blunted and degraded human being on the dole, unconsciously considers himself a person, crippled, deserted, ill, unlucky, down-at-the-heels, hungry or homeless, but never, even in the depths of greatest despair, as simply a figure in the budget.

Fulton County has been witnessing, in the last 10 days or so, a pushing and shoving for power and prestige, in the fine old name of balancing the budget. Without reading the intent beyond apparent facts, the situation is this:

Fulton County Welfare Department requested an appropriation of $965,000 from the county board of commissioners for the coming year. This was to be added to State and Federal funds that last year added up to $3,533,809.10 as their part in the care of our old, helpless young, unemployable.

The estimate was a little higher than last year's budget, because 1,600 more persons have been added to the rolls, and, in addition, there was an item of $36,000 to operate Oak Hill Homes, the fine new institution planned for protection of dependent children, just completed and not yet put into use. There were also modest plans for an improved program.

After discussion between the County Manager, A. E. Fuller, and the commissioners, the request shrunk to $883,000 with the elimination of a contingency fund, and the commissioners then asked Manager Fuller, Welfare Director Welborn Ellis and Welfare board chairman Ivan Allen to go before the grand jury to ask for approval of a two-mill tax levy for welfare.

Now the word "millage" has fallen into disrepute long ago, because it can be misinterpreted with the addition or subtraction of a word. In 1940, the grand jury recommended and the commissioners ordered a levy of 2¾ mills for welfare; in 1941, 1942 and 1944, 2½ mills. The grand jury has never recommended less than 2½ mills, as a matter of fact.

This year the welfare board asked for 2 mills * * * not extra mills, but 2 mills, provided the over-all tax levy should not be increased. It hoped such a levy would not only hold the relief lines, but would finance an improved program of rehabilitation.

There are differences of interpretation, but the grand jury failed to recommend the 2-mill levy. They referred to it as a 2-mill extra levy, and in a mood of reckless economy, they voted it down.

The county commissioners instructed their manager to adopt a working budget of $820,000 and a legal budget of $710,000, earmarked for public welfare. A matter of $20,000 rent has since been allowed the welfare budget.

The result was the announcement of a curtailed program. Several private agencies were told they could no longer participate in the public funds, and it was declared that rolls would be "frozen" to meet restrictions.

Anguished howls were heard from private agencies who have good voices, but no sound has been forthcoming from the unemployables who make up 722 of the 11,747 cases on Fulton County's relief rolls, nor the 1,776 children directly involved, nor the 400 youngsters who receive protective care. They have never had much of a lobby.

Now all of this is confusing to citizens as well as "reliefers."

At a peak, or certainly just a few minutes past the peak, of the greatest earnings in our history, why is Fulton County so poor it cannot tax itself 2 mills, not extra, but include 2 mills in its allotment for the indigent and helpless? If it is so financially insecure, what of the future when heralded disinflation will take its toll in incomes?

And how do we figure a community can protest bureaucracy and decry Federal paternalism, holding out for self-rule, local option, and State's rights, when we say we cannot take care of our own unemployable? It is simply asking for a return of the Federal dole.

For people are not going to be permitted to drop on the streets and die of hunger. We will pay the taxes to care for them, eventually, one way or another.

In case this sounds like maudlin sentimentality, it is a matter of record that the average person on direct relief in Fulton County receives $18.44 a month. If that allowance can be dropped lower with humane consideration, I cannot see how it can be done. Of course, the cynics who always discover the ladies living in mink coats on charity, will point to an isolated instance or two where that money is being squandered by some undeserving mother who neglects her children and shows other evidences of ingratitude. But, by and large, you don't get far into orgies with $18.21 per person per month.

Actually, all this is rhetorical because at best our public-relief system is only a stopgap. It is as outmoded as the man trying to shield his family from mortar fire by holding a silk umbrella loyally over their heads during a battle. If he had sense enough to hold the umbrella, he should have thought of trying to wipe out the source of the mortar fire.

What every planner knows, is that we should take every cent of money we can spare and rehabilitate families, especially where there are children still in the formative stages, so they will not wind up undernourished and failing in school, ill, and dependent at Grady Hospital, delinquent and criminals in jail, eventually married and deserted and

back on charity with a second or third crop of "reliefers."

We should try to get deserting fathers back into responsibility, provide food and shelter for children, bolster health, housing, and recreation, with all we can spare, using every private and public agency available in a great onslaught against underprivilege and human failure.

It would cost money. But we are careful to repair holes in our streets, lest they get big enough to swallow us up.

The least we can do for our heirs is to take care of our own sociological diseases, so that they can manage better with their own poor—that we have with us always.

We don't have to establish a hierarchy of poverty to leave them for a legacy.

Analysis of H. R. 2516

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2516, a bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an analysis of H. R. 2516.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2516

This bill supplements existing aids by a program of direct Federal loans at lower interest rates to meet the housing needs of lower income families whose needs have been neglected until now. The purpose of such housing is to fill the gap between families above the level eligible for public housing and those below the level of income where they can obtain privately financed housing (even with the proposed liberalized financing amendments). The housing provided through direct Federal loans is limited to families who cannot afford to obtain housing under the mortgage-insurance system and other existing aids to private housing.

Within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a Housing Loan Administration has been established as a constituent unit with a commissioner at the head of it. The job to be done among lower-middle-income families is so large that there is clearly the need for a separate constituent agency to handle that job without the diversion of other present programs. Moreover, the tool of direct lending for private construction is one which appropriately belongs to a separate constituent.

Loans for the development or acquisition of housing for families of lower income is made to mutual ownership or cooperative housing corporations undertaking projects which are restricted in occupancy to members of such corporation; also to other nonprofit corporations. In addition, loans are made to limited dividend corporations or other corporations restricted by law, regulations, or contract so as to conform to the requirements of the Commissioner as to rents, rate of return, and methods of operation.

The loans bear interest at not less than the going Federal rate of interest, plus one-half of 1 percent toward covering the cost of administration. The program involves no subsidy as such, but makes money available to nonprofit and limited-dividend operations on a basis representing the cost of the money to the Government. The loans are repayable within a period representing the estimated useful life of the property but not to exceed 60 years.

On the basis of a 60-year loan at 3 percent (based upon the going Federal rate of 2½ percent plus one-half of 1 percent) the carrying charges applicable to a mortgage loan of $8,000 on a dwelling are $24 a month. This compares with the present carrying charges almost double that amount on the present financing basis of a 25-year mortgage, with 4½ percent interest plus one-half of 1 percent premium. Actually, the monthly saving and financing cost amounts to about $22 as compared with the financing cost on an $8,000 mortgage on a home purchased under the present FHA insurance system on newly constructed homes.

There is a monthly reduction of cost of about $16 per month under the new program as compared with a 608 rental housing project, with present financing over a period of 32 years, 7 months at 4 percent interest plus one-half of 1 percent insurance premium (based upon an $8,000 mortgage).

These savings of $16 to $22 per month make it possible to reach a substantially lower group in the income scale and meet the needs of a large proportion of moderate-income veterans of World War II as well as other citizens who are presently unable to rent or buy housing within their means.

The Commissioner is authorized to issue $1,000,000,000 of notes initially for the purpose of making these loans. This limit is increased by an equal amount in each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952. The notes are purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury who charges the current average rate on outstanding obligations of the United States. The notes and obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury are secured by the obligation of the borrowers from the Housing Loan Administration and repaid from the proceeds of such loans. The loan authorization makes it possible to build about 120,000 units per year during each of the next 4 years. This housing is available solely for lower income families who cannot now be served with privately financed housing.

Hour of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, some people not too well acquainted with the character of America must have questioned some years back, whether America was capable of fulfilling the role of world leader. Undoubtedly, there is no room for questioning now. For America has paved the way toward the creation of a new world—and nations once demoralized and seemingly hopeless as the result of the last war, have taken a new lease on life. And their peoples, having felt the spring of democracy have renewed their determination to rebuild. In so doing they join hands with us in a common purpose—against a common enemy. Undoubtedly the pace being set is indeed a furious one in history. There are many questions yet to be resolved and America must point the way still further. The following editorial which appeared in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano on April 3 is very timely since it points out the effect which our role has had on Italy, who only recently recoiled from communistic domination, and how it continues to look to America for a just determination of its territorial problems:

HOUR OF DECISION

Today, the Marshall plan is 1 year old. Within 24 hours, the foreign ministers of the leading democratic nations of Europe will gather in Washington to sign the Atlantic Pact. On Tuesday, the General Assembly of the United Nations will convene at Lake Success. What a furious pace of history. How crowded are these days with events vital to the fate of whole peoples, of all mankind.

As we shift history's spotlight from Washington to New York and as we ponder the enormity of the problems confronting the statesmen of the free nations, we can only pray for their best judgment and success. Their decisions will affect every living person everywhere, for peace and war, prosperity and chaos, freedom and slavery skip none of us. The humblest and the mightiest cannot escape the consequences of the alternatives before humanity.

As Americans we are glad and proud that our country has shown such increasing and evermore effective initiative in international affairs. More and more can the world rest secure that America will meet its heavy international responsibilities in a truly progressive manner. What we have done through the Marshall plan in raising the hopes and faith as well as the production capacities of millions of freedom-loving peoples is an act of unparalleled generosity and humanitarianism. And the very spirit and substance of the Atlantic Pact represent an endeavor to assure international cooperation and peace on a scale unmatched in human history.

THE ITALIAN ARENA

As Americans of Italian origin we also rejoice in the role played by Italy in these great developments. In no western country has the road to recovery been beset by greater difficulties and the conflict between the forces of freedom and depotism been more acute. Thanks to the aid of the American people and thanks to the indomitable spirit and hard work of the Italian people, Italy can today boast marked achievements in economic restoration and inspiring and significant victories over Communist totalitarianism and other brands of reaction.

But in emphasizing these historic forward steps we do not lose sight of errors made, of mistakes to be corrected, of difficulties to be overcome, and of tasks yet to be fulfilled. Ours is a great country, a very great country. But we are only human. We have erred and we shall err. Our nation has the vitality and the greatness and the courage to face the errors of yesterday, to correct them today, and to avoid their recurrence tomorrow. It is in this spirit that we hope Congress will not heed the pleas of the advocates of false economy who propose to cut the European recovery program appropriations for the coming year. It is in this same light that we hope our government will move to give life to the Atlantic Pact by losing no time in unshackling itself from the remaining chains forged in the days of appeasement of Communist Russian aggression.

Again Italy will be the test. The Atlantic alliance, to be worthy of its name, must be an alliance of equals. The Atlantic Pact, to be a living force and not a worthless (though expensive) scrap of paper must bring justice and strength to the signatory nations. There can be no first- or second-class nations in the Atlantic union of free peoples. It must be a one-class affair all the way—and first class only. In the Atlantic alliance there can be no room for pawns, puppets, and big-power politics. Otherwise, the Communist demagogs, the Bolshevik totalitarian termites

will break through the edifice now being set up with so much care and concern.

BEGIN WITH A CLEAN SLATE

From this viewpoint and from this viewpoint only and on the basis of the actual conditions and challenge of the spring of 1949 and not the fall of 1939 must the problems of the day be met. Hence, there is no African problem as such which can be isolated from the rest, from Europe, America, or Asia. There is no Adriatic question which can be put into a test tube and filed away for examination at some future date by a scholar or historian in splended isolation.

The Italian people have, in the short period of years since they have overthrown the dictatorship, rendered the most superb services to the cause of human and international reconstruction and security. Italy is the one land where there has occurred a truly democratic revolution—after Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism was defeated on the field of battle. It is in Italy where the Communists have been dealt the heaviest blows by the ranks of democracy. The fury with which the Communists have fought in Italy and the fabulous finances placed by the Kremlin at their disposal emphasize not only the import of their defeats but also the significance of the triumph of the democratic ranks. No nation in western Europe can show a more energetic and fruitful effort to assure economic rehabilitation.

Furthermore, no country in Europe has been more articulate, active, and effective in promoting the progress of continental cooperation, unity in life, between nations and neighbors. This is the real meaning of the customs union between Italy and France. This is the stirring and dynamic spirit of the foreign policy represented by the illustrious fighter and renowned world statesman, Count Carlo Sforza.

Indeed, it is on this firm and unchallengeable ground that we strongly urge our Government to move for the United Nations granting Italy the trusteeship over her African territories. If Italy is worthy of being our ally in peace and for peace, then she is worthy of such a United Nations trusteeship. What we say about the colonies also calls for immediate American recognition of Trieste as under Italian sovereignty. Let America lead and the other democracies will join. Let these hours be not only hours of decision but above all hours of right and just and sound decisions. Give the new Italy a fair deal.

Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Central Falls, R. I., endorsing a bill which would set aside the proceeds of the tideland oil reserves as a trust fund to be used as Federal aid to education. The resolution follows:

Resolution endorsing Federal aid to education

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Central Falls as follows:

SECTION 1. That the City Council of the City of Central Falls unanimously endorses the bill now pending in Congress which would create a trust fund from the proceeds of the tideland oil reserves, which trust fund would be used for the sole purpose of providing Federal aid to education; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators GREEN and MCGRATH and Representatives FORAND and FOGARTY in Washington, D. C.

Passed in concurrence March 7, 1949.

A true copy.

Attest:

FRANCIS KEEFE, *City Clerk.*

Two American Soldiers, Members of the Occupying Forces in the United States Army in Germany, Have Wrongfully, Ruthlessly, and Unjustly Been Tried and Convicted and Are Now Held as Prisoners in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were greatly shocked a few days ago to learn that two young American soldiers, who were serving our country as recruits in the United States Army in Germany, had been captured by one of the Red satellite nations of Russia, namely Czechoslovakia, hauled off into that country, forced into a secret trial, and convicted. The only news that the American people so far have been able to get is to the effect that these two young American men, members of our Army, had wondered off near to the international boundary line between the American zone in Germany and Czechoslovakia.

These soldiers were not allowed to communicate with the American consul before trial. They were tried in secret and, insofar as can be ascertained, they had no counsel to defend them, and one of these young soldiers, George R. Jones, comes from the great State of Kentucky, my State. This man was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor.

The other American soldier, who was tried and convicted without representation, is Clarence R. Hill, of the great State of Mississippi, and this young soldier was given 12 years in prison at hard labor.

This situation where two American soldiers, who were serving their country in an honorable way, are now behind the iron curtain and possibly suffering great humiliation and possibly physical mistreatment. This confronts the American people with a very serious situation. No one wants war, and everybody is striving toward peace. At the same time this great Nation cannot suffer the indignities imposed upon our armed forces by this ruthless example of the cruelty and injustice of the Red regime in this satellite country of Russia.

The great State of Kentucky, through a concurrent resolution of its senate and house of representatives, has made a vigorous protest of this conduct on the part of Czechoslovakia, which I wish to have spread at large in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people of America and the people of the world shall know that Kentucky and all of her resources are pledged to accomplish by any peaceful means the immediate release of these two honorable young men that are members of our occupying forces in Germany.

I feel that the great State of Mississippi, and all of its people, feel the same as the people in Kentucky.

We wish to call upon the President of the United States and our State Department to do everything that is necessary to bring about the release of these two soldiers, and immediate steps should be taken through our American consul to determine just where these two soldiers are and how they are being treated, and an intensive effort should be made to bring this to the attention of the proper authorities, and every protection should be given these soldiers, and the Czechoslovakian Government should be immediately notified that unless these men are released that the entire resources of this great country will be pledged to their protection.

From the meager information, it appears that these young men were just picked up by a large number of Czechoslovakian soldiers when they were near the international boundary line and had committed no crime and their secret trial and conviction is more in the nature of an insult and reprisal than anything else. This conduct must be stopped and even if there were only one man involved, it is the duty of our State Department and our military authorities, if necessary, to see to it that he will not be abused or required to serve unjustly at the brutal hands of the Communist-dominated Red regime in Czechoslovakia. We hope and believe that our State Department and our armed forces will immediately take all steps necessary to right this wrong and restore the freedom of these two young soldiers.

A concurrent resolution condemning the trial and conviction of George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., and calling upon the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to use all of the means at their command, including the full power and resources of our National Government and economy, to effect their immediate release

Whereas shocking news has been received that George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., recruits in the United States Army, were tried in secrecy by the Czechoslovak Government, and without regard for the rights of the accused or without the protection of the normal safeguards provided by free and independent governments for the protection of those accused of law violations, were sentenced to 10 and 12 years, respectively, in prison at hard labor; and

Whereas the youth of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and from every other State of the Union had given their lives and of their safety, security, and fortunes in order to establish orderly procedure and due process of law all over the world, and for which a terribly horrible and shocking war had just been fought; and

Whereas the safety and welfare of our form of government demands the full and complete protection of the members of our armed

forces, wherever they may be or whatever duty they may be given, so that we at home and those other freedom-loving people throughout the world may be able to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the house of representatives concurring therein):

1. That the Commonwealth of Kentucky, as a free and sovereign State, but as a part of the Union of States comprising the United States of America, does hereby condemn as vicious, cruel, inhuman, and unjust the a. 'est, secret trial, conviction, and sentences of Recruits George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., by the Czechoslovak Government;

2. That it is necessary in order to insure the welfare and security of our form of government and the maintenance of the armed forces thereof that the security of our citizens and especially those members of our armed forces who have been sent abroad be protected and secured at all costs;

3. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States are hereby called upon to use all of the means at their command and at the command of the National Government to effect the immediate and unconditional release of these two members of our armed forces, and to this end, and by this resolution, the Commonwealth of Kentucky pledges its aid, assistance, power, and resources.

4. That the clerk of this house of representatives certify sufficient copies of this resolution and that he forward same, via United States registered mail, air-mail special delivery, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, to each Member representing Kentucky in the Congress of the United States, to the family of each of the men affected, and that suitable copies be furnished the press with the request that same be published to the end that all free-thinking and freedom-loving people may be informed hereof.

A Stabilized Currency and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert part of an editorial by David Lawrence in the April 1, 1949, issue of United States News and World Report:

TOWARD A NORMAL WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

Everybody hopes that someday we will live in a normal world.

Few of the people alive today really know what normality is like.

The concept of peace, of course, is not difficult to imagine, but financial and economic stability in the world has not been experienced for 20 years.

Even those persons old enough to remember have probably forgotten that there was a time when world trade could be carried on with currencies stabilized in terms of each nation's price levels and when the common standard of the world was gold.

Most people today have forgotten, too, that there was a time when a paper dollar could be converted into gold coin at any bank in the United States and when currencies abroad could be redeemed for gold or silver in values that fluctuated hardly more than a fraction of a point.

True enough a paper dollar is theoretically backed today by a substantial amount of gold locked up in Fort Knox. Presumably this is enough to create confidence that what we use for currency has a gold value. But this is not the main reason why currencies are made redeemable in gold. It is not just to instill confidence inside a country. It is to provide a common denominator that all peoples everywhere can use as a means of exchange.

Until the world is able to use one standard of exchange again, whether it be in gold alone or in gold and silver related to one another in specific proportions, there can be no economic stability in the United States or elsewhere.

Disclosure of Multi-Million-Dollar Discrepancies in Accounts of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, several days ago on the floor of the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] disclosed that there are startling discrepancies in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounting to several hundred million dollars.

A few days after this disclosure of such large discrepancies in this Government corporation's financial accounts, Senator WILLIAMS' earlier statements were fully confirmed when he directed the Senate's attention to a letter in his possession from the General Accounting Office acknowledging fully the existence of these discrepancies.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I hereby include an editorial entitled "Guilty as Charged," which appeared in the March 31, 1949, issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Journal Every Evening:

GUILTY AS CHARGED

The accusations of multi-million-dollar shortages which Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, leveled last week against the Commodity Credit Corporation have now been supported in full in a report by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States. These are the charges which Senator LUCAS, majority leader, described as pure politics and sought to keep from consideration by the Senate. If Mr. LUCAS is now of the same mind as before he is shockingly indifferent to the need of elementary efficiency in the conduct of the Government.

The record, as Mr. Warren reveals it, is one of incredible carelessness in the distribution of the taxpayers' money, of a waste of fixed assets, and of clear favoritism in the award of contracts. There may not have been actual fraud but the invitation to fraud was always present. In any event, says the Comptroller General, the accounting deficiencies encountered were "so substantial and the inaccuracies so material" that he cannot express any opinion whether the financial statements prepared by the Corporation present fairly its financial position.

This indictment of the wartime operations of one of President Roosevelt's pet agencies shows again the length to which the Harry Hopkins' doctrine of spend and spend, elect and elect, was carried. Senator WILLIAMS is entitled to the utmost credit for bringing the sordid facts to light and the Senate itself should speedily adopt the Comptroller General's recommendation for a further investigation into the whole situation. The American public, for its part, should be interested in finding out just how its money was thrown around by the New Dealers.

The Government Housing Program for 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under permission of unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, delivered before the assembly of the Mortgage Bankers Association in the city of New York on Monday, April 4, 1949, wherein Mr. Foley endeavored to acquaint that group with their responsibilities as a part of the home-building industry and their obligation to the public in cooperation with the Government housing program for 1949.

ADDRESS BY RAYMOND M. FOLEY, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Once more I am in your debt for this opportunity to talk directly to members of the Mortgage Bankers Association, who have so large a part to play in making good housing available to the American people.

Your committee has suggested that I discuss today "The Government Housing Program for 1949." If by that is meant the aim in housing being set forth by the Administration and the legislative steps toward accomplishment of the aim which it is recommending, I am glad to respond. In addition there is a program in housing that can more properly be called our common-action program, since it is an active application of authorities already voted into law by Congress—and I would like to tell you of that also.

In the first place, the Government has no aim or objective in housing that has not been spelled out pretty clearly by the American public in a broad public forum over decades of discussion. In my opinion, that objective has been well stated in the outline of national housing policy set forth in Senate bill 1070, now pending in Congress. The same legislation covers the broad fields of low-income families with publicly aided housing, slum clearance, broadened research, and farm housing aids. We are supporting all of them. In S. 712 are found the proposals we have thus far developed for further aid to private enterprise, particularly in the field of middle-income needs.

Other problems which may result in further legislative requests are under study. As I stated to the American Bankers Association very recently, we are likely, in the midst of controversy over housing, to overlook the fact that there is a continuing job to do, and continuing progress goes on. All we have been able to accomplish in housing the

people of America during the past generation has been done while we carried on discussions as to how better we might do it. Successively we have adopted new measures and plans and have gone forward—but always to progressive change in our approaches and methods.

However, there has been no fundamental change in our basic concepts. In my opinion, none of the legislative proposals now under debate as part of the President's program, would actually mark any fundamental change in those basic concepts. One is that American families have a right to a reasonable opportunity to attain a decent home in a proper environment—either as purchasers or tenants. Another is that they have a right to expect the American system to work in such fashion that it will develop that opportunity so that they, with reasonable industry and frugality, can avail themselves of it. Another is that under the American system the great bulk of the housing task can and ought to be done by private enterprise. There is nothing new in any of those statements—nothing changing, and it seems to me nothing really debatable.

But when we examine them as against the degree of accomplishment of the total task we begin to reach the regions of controversy. Much of the debate has become stereotyped and static. It concerns itself with a few moot points: What is the estimate of need? What is decent housing? When, in terms of years, can we expect to meet the housing need? By what standards can we measure progress and so conclude whether we are doing the job—privately or otherwise? What really is this private enterprise of which we hear so much? What part should Government play in housing American families?

I do not intend to discuss all these matters today, but I have sketched quickly the background of great public interest and debate—because as I told the bankers' association, everyone who has any part in the provision of housing today carries it on in the atmosphere created by that situation and he may not hope to escape influence from it, either in the actual results of what he does, or in the reception his action receives. None of us who has a function performed publicly in connection with housing can hope to escape such evaluation. You, as mortgage lenders, are a part of the home-building industry and your part is performed publicly.

I would like to tell you some more of the things I said to the bankers and some of the things I did not say. I said there may have been a day when residential mortgage lending policy was narrowly concerned with real-estate security and rate of return and that both remain basically important, but there is no place in America today where a mortgage banker can properly determine his lending policy on those factors alone and remain an adequately functioning part of free enterprise or of his community. That says, and was meant to say, that within the framework of soundness and proper return, there are other constructive factors with special reference to housing to be considered in building a balanced mortgage portfolio. That does not say and was not meant to say that it is necessary or advisable to ignore soundness and forego a reasonable return, in such lending.

One of the indispensable uses of the accumulated savings of a community entrusted to a mortgage banking institution through one or another channel, is improvement of housing opportunity in that community. Consequently, the problem of whether, or how, or when, to lend on residential mortgage security cannot be settled solely by a comparison of yields and ratio of security currently offered in various investment fields. There remain the fundamental requirements of a community for shelter for its people and good environment for its children. Residential lending on a basis calculated to further those objectives soundly in a continuing program seems to me an inescapable part of the responsibility of a mortgage banker and the word "soundly" there used means lending soundly, as well as building soundly. Were it otherwise, mortgage lending would be an easier business. It is the compelling necessities of maintaining a currently sufficient supply of housing and a stable and adequately functioning housing industry, through times of ease and stress, that complicate the problem.

This is one of the times of stress. We are confronted this year by a situation calling for the most thorough statesmanship in government, in business, and especially in your part of business, if we are to make the degree and kind of housing progress the nation needs. Such statesmanship, in the lending business, will exert itself to be sure that savings of the community do their proper part in the housing development of the community, over the range of its needs so far as is soundly practicable.

In the midst of a postwar era of high employment, high average income, and unprecedented total national income, we have millions of families badly housed. We have an industry which has made a remarkable recovery in producing capacity; we have materials and men sufficient for a record-breaking production and yet we have housing priced out of the reach of the mass of the people. It is easy to overstress some of the possible interpretations of that statement. It does not mean building has stopped. It does not mean no one can buy, is buying, or should buy. But it does mean that housing costs too much to fit the purse of the average family—the family in most of the range of income that we call middle—and it is true that the longer that remains a fact, the more will we face a decline in volume of production.

Bringing down the cost of housing is a prime necessity.

It won't be brought down just by talking about it. And it should not be brought down by the devastating process of depression. It can be brought down gradually and to a very helpful degree by concerted effort throughout the industry to effectuate economies in cost without reducing standards of construction or of livability. No one part of the industry can do that alone. That is why we have taken a leading part in developing the industry-wide, Nation-wide economy housing program now going on. There has been some misunderstanding of what we seek in that effort. It is not designed just to produce a flood of little houses. It is not intended to produce any jerry-built, substandard houses at all. It is intended to encourage cost cutting through economies—individually small, perhaps, but many—that will reduce the cost and price of housing through the whole range. But it is true that we hope also to focus attention upon the mass market need in the middle-income range, and thus produce the most immediate effect of economies in that area. It is not a case of lowering price by cheapening the house; rather of lowering price for the same house; or of designing good new houses that can be produced at less cost.

We are encouraged by the progress made thus far. Nearly 75,000 persons active in one or another phase of the industry have attended community meetings so far held, discussed the problem in its local aspects, set up continuing advisory committees, and have undertaken to try to do something about it. We don't expect results to flow in specific cost cuts from one meeting. But we do expect a continuing effort to produce them. The tendency of costs in the residential field already is slightly down, as revealed by FHA monthly cost-study reports.

The mortgage lenders of this country—you in each of your communities—have a very great stake in this undertaking, as you have in the whole of the housing scene. It is not just an opportunity to make some loans. It is not just a chance to participate in some meetings. Rather, it is an opportunity to demonstrate the active, effective, constructive part the lending institution can play in a progressive, cooperative community movement toward better housing. Your stake, indeed, is more than one of money. It is also one of public relations in a particularly vital way.

There is today a mass consciousness of the importance of good housing that did not exist on anything like the same scale a dozen years ago. There is with it a keen awareness of the responsibilities of private business and of Government, local and Federal, in this field. We are all on trial to a degree, in the effort now going forward, to find means whereby decent, livable housing can be made available for all American families.

And to the public, in this new consciousness of the social, economic, and even spiritual importance of good housing, "all families" means just that.

It means those of low income, those of middle income, as well as the more fortunately situated; it means those who live in rural and suburban areas, as well as in cities; and it means the slum-dwelling families and the Negro and other minority groups who have even more difficult situations with which to contend.

The challenge before industry and Government today is not that we provide housing for everyone at once, but that we have a plan and a program that can be expected to move forward progressively to the end that it is made available through new production and existing inventory, by design, rather than by accident, fortuitous development, and sole reliance on trickle-down to serve the problem areas.

Development of such a plan calls for maximum use of all the resources of Government and industry. I think it calls for a thorough-going adoption of the idea that private enterprise in the housing field consists of four main factors—management, labor, finance, and Government—each with a vital part to play. The maximum value of the part of each can be had only if there is a coordinated effort among them all.

Its development calls for maximum use of all the resources of industry, all the efficiency and skill of labor, all the resources and special authority available to governmental agencies—local and Federal; and it calls for the availability of funds in three broad stages of housing production—developmental finance, construction or production finance, and consumer finance. As we move further in formulation of plans for treating the housing needs as a whole on a long-range basis, developmental finance will increase in importance. If we are to bring down housing cost, the development of sites, communities, and facilities precedent to good housing must have an adequate and economical method of ready financing. As we develop further, even in the programs we have, availability and terms of construction finance grow increasingly important. We are told that its scarcity and its cost are becoming stumbling blocks in many areas. Pending legislation may do much to ease this situation. It will not be a cure unless there is an active recognition of a responsibility in that direction among the custodians of private lending funds.

Consumer finance, in the form of long-term mortgage funds, has had more attention, resulting in a range of liberal, Government-supported devices, than any other division of residential financing. Senate bill 712, which is part of the administration's legislative program, would carry this program under mortgage insurance, further in an effort to put major emphasis on low-priced homes—but in a range of accommodations up to four-bedroom houses for sale.

It makes a considerable and important revision of title II of the National Housing Act, and proposes a broadening of the FNMA secondary market and some direct lending for cooperatives where private funds are unavailable. It would extend the present mortgage-insurance provisions for rental housing, and we are studying various other adaptations of that idea. As you know, Congress has already voted an interim 90-day extension of section 608 in the rent-control bill.

But whether you as lenders use the insured-mortgage system of FHA, the guaranties of the Veterans' Administration, or your own system of conventional lending, is not the important matter. The real question is whether you are seeing to it that loanable funds in the care of your institution are doing their share of work in building a practicable housing opportunity for your citizens. If you are, then you will be taking a very active interest in Federal and State housing legislation, to see that you get maximum effectiveness from it. You will be trying to find ways to make your funds help to resolve the housing dilemma of the Negroes or other minorities of your city. You will not dismiss the subject of housing cooperatives as unimportant. It is important and may be very useful in urban housing—and a challenging field for you as lenders to explore. You will be looking very carefully into rental housing needs and lending opportunity in small, as well as large, projects.

You will not be dismissing prefabrication as an illusion. It is bound to have a definite place in housing, and it ought not be prevented from exercising its influence on cost and supply by unfounded prejudice in your institution or in your community.

You will not be refusing to consider sound loans for veterans or ruling out modest home loans because they, or the houses they produce, are small. You will be finding that you can do much in all of these fields, without disregarding soundness or sacrificing fair return.

There are a great many ways in which you can put your influence, and the funds you control, soundly and constructively to work in this field. I urge you to review the whole matter. I am happy to offer you the full cooperation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in your application of your resources to the job.

Lime, Phosphate, and Cover Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House the pressing need for more lime and phosphate for West Virginia and especially for the area along the Ohio river.

Nearly 90 percent of the soils of West Virginia are of nonlimestone origin. Furthermore, in regions of plentiful rainfall such as West Virginia there is a heavy loss of lime through leaching. Such leaching steadily removes the lime already in the soil or added to it by the application of fertilizer, and results in the development of soil acidity. Erosion takes its toll also, washing away the topsoil with all its minerals. In 1926 the West Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station reported that 95 percent of the cropland of West Virginia was deficient in lime, and a study in 1935 revealed that 85 percent of our pasture lands were deficient. Since then, soils have tended to become more acid since not enough lime was applied to meet current maintenance needs.

Lime is not the only need. What has been said about lime can be applied also to phosphates.

Failure to maintain soil fertility, coupled with the expansion of populations, has brought the downfall of formerly prosperous nations in Europe and Asia. We have allowed that same process to start in the United States. By years of neglect and abuse we have encouraged our soils to prematurely age.

We must not allow that process to continue. Continuing prosperity of the economy as a whole requires that we maintain prosperous, productive farmlands. Without food to feed our workers, our great industrial plants would be useless.

The lime and phosphate program has done much to retard the loss of our soils, but the program must be continued and strengthened. Instead of being increased, however, the amount of fertilizer allotted to West Virginia has been reduced since 1943.

Here are the figures covering 1937 to 1947:

	Tons
1937	153,000
1938	226,000
1939	272,000
1940	344,000
1941	361,000
1942	442,000
1943	560,000
1944	520,000
1945	409,000
1946	529,000
1947	413,000

I have been informed that the figure for 1948 is even lower—about one-half the 1947 amount.

And this reduction comes in the face of the fact that the soils of West Virginia need an average application of 555,000 tons of lime each year to maintain their fertility.

I wish to urge the Members of this House to vote to correct the mistakes of the last 2 years. Return to the farmers—the backbone of our Nation—a decent amount of lime and phosphate, for it was through this program that the farmers were able to feed much of the world and to save it from the ravages of the different isms.

Forest Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, while we in Missouri are gratified that the agricultural appropriation bill carries approximately the same amount for forest research for fiscal 1950 as is available for 1949, we fail to understand and are disappointed that appropriations for forest- and range-management investigations were not increased by amounts commensurate with the needs. We of Missouri have been very happy to have had the nucleus of a forest-research center in our State this year. Our people have received this new activity in a very cooperative spirit and have provided facilities to further the work. We had hoped to see steady growth of this activity in accordance with the needs. So far as our Ozark research center is concerned, these needs for research arise not only in our own State but also from problems in adjoining portions of four other States. These problems also are handled from our Ozark research center. The Congress has already recognized that forest research is a Federal responsibility in the McSweeney-McNary Act of 1928.

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1950 recommends a total of about $51,000,000 for Forest Service activities. This is a very large sum of money, but I believe that not many people realize that this is only one side of the financial picture of Forest Service activities. I should like to point out that in fiscal year 1948 receipts from the management of national forest properties amounted to nearly $25,000,000 and for the current fiscal year are estimated to be about $30,000,000. Actually, so far as the taxpayers are concerned therefore, the actual cost of our Federal forest-conservation activities is less than half of the amounts appropriated. It seems to me that this fact should be kept in mind, and that in view of the importance of the work, the Congress can afford to be a little more generous in expanding justifiable projects than might otherwise be the case.

Talking Books for the Physically Incapacitated Who Cannot Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, through an annual appropriation, provision is made for the Library of Congress to furnish books, published in raised characters or on sound reproduction recordings, to the blind. By this modest expenditure of public funds, life acquires a new meaning for those afflicted in this manner.

It has recently come to my attention that there is a group which, although undoubtedly small in numbers, is equally deserving of our sympathetic consideration. I doubt that their inclusion in this program would require any increase in the allotted funds. This group is composed of those who are so physically incapacitated, as established by competent medical evidence, that they are unable to read in any normal manner. I have in mind a former teacher who, because of injury or disease, has been placed in

a cast and is compelled to lie face down practically all the time. Naturally, although her eyes are normal, she cannot read in this position. It impresses me that, equally with the blind, she belongs to a class of citizens who, because of their misfortune, have a legitimate claim to special treatment. I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to broaden the scope of title II, section 135 (a), of the United States Code to extend its provisions to this limited class of physically incapacitated, as well as the blind.

I feel sure that such a measure would receive hearty response from those Members whose experience has brought them in contact with any unfortunates thus afflicted, whose enjoyment of a necessarily drab life would be so greatly enhanced by the passage of such legislation.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto a poetic tribute to this great organization on its fifty-fourth birthday. Members will be interested in the names and records of our distinguished soldiers and sailors of the Jewish faith who have served our country from the first days of its struggle for independence, and for the success of the noblest effort in self-government known to civilized man—our constitutional democracy:

THE FIGHTING JEW
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today we hail the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on its fifty-fourth birthday.

Today we salute the JWV with great respect and admiration, for they tell the story of gallant men and women who have fought and died that this Nation may continue to be the land of the free.

An anniversary dinner tribute will be celebrated Army Day eve, Tuesday, April 5, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The ceremonies will be staged in a cavalcade of patriotic splendor. The guest of honor will be Gen. Omar Bradley, United States Chief of Staff, who will receive the medal of honor, the highest decoration of this famous organization.

JWV posts throughout the country will commemorate the historic event with patriotic services.

Myer Dorfman, World War I hero, is national president. Ben Kaufman, Congressional Medal of Honor hero, is executive director.

The Jewish War Veterans are pledged to maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate the principles of Americanism, to combat bigotry and instill the love of God and country, to honor the memory of patriotic service of men of Jewish faith, to inculcate the doctrines of liberty, equal rights, and justice to all.

O, fighters for freedom—
Unfurl your banner for all the world to see
Your gallant record in the service of humanity.

What a halo of proud glory surrounds your names.

O, let us today, unfold the scroll of the fighting Jews for America.

We see them in all the wars of the Republic. We see them win the highest commendation from every President of our Nation.

We see them among the soldiers at Valley Forge when the spirit of the American people hung low and only the stout of heart stood constant by Gen. George Washington.

Of the 3,000 Jews in all the colonies, 4 of them were lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 6 captains, and many in the ranks.

Lt. Col. Isaac Frank was aide-de-camp to Washington.

Haym Salomon dedicated his entire fortune of $640,000 to the young Republic and later died impoverished.

We see them in the War of 1812.

Uriah P. Levy, Commander of the brig-o-war *Argus*, ran the British blockade and destroyed 21 British merchantmen.

With pen and tongue Commander Levy succeeded in effecting the abolition of bodily punishment in the United States Navy, and died a commodore, then the Navy's highest rank.

We see them in the Mexican War, the fight for Texas and the Seminole wars.

We see the fighting Jew in action.

We see the healing Jew, in the person of Surg. Gen. David Deleon.

We see them rallying under the inspiration of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War.

Of the 200,000 Jews then in the United States, 10,000 saw active military service and 7 received the Congressional Medal of Honor. There were a number of high-ranking officers in the Army. Lincoln named Leopold Newman, of New York, a brigadier general while he lay dying of battle wounds received at Chancellorsville.

We see them with William McKinley striking the shackles of bondage from a neighboring people and bringing forth an island Republic.

America accepted the challenge of Spanish tyranny.

"Remember the *Maine*."—Fifteen Jews were on that ill-fated battleship, and Sgt. Maurice Joost, of California, was the first to fall in the attack on Manila.

Five thousand intrepid Jewish volunteers gladly answered the call of their President.

We see these gallant warriors with Woodrow Wilson fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews were in uniform, constituting 5 percent of the fighting forces. Ten thousand Jews held commissioned rank, and 1,100 Jews were cited for valor in action.

The greatest epic of courage ever to come out of that war, the exploits of the Lost Battalion, was a demonstration of conspicuous bravery.

We see them with Franklin D. Roosevelt—fighting to make democracy safe for the world.

First American penetration of German soil was made by the Third Armored Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of Denver, who gave his life for his country.

First American assault boat to hit the shores of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti, of Brooklyn.

First Japanese battleship sunk in the war was the *Haruna*, sent to the bottom by a plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly, whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

First American officer killed in the Philippines was Lt. Henry D. Mark, of Los Angeles.

First four-medal winner in the American Army in World War II was Lt. Morris Berenson, of Garfield, N. J.

And there are scores of Americans of Jewish faith whose names will live forever in the archives of our Government.

The fighting Jews of America have sustained their shield of honor with courage and loyalty, with devotion and respect to God and country.

The record of the fighting Jews is now cast in monumental mold.

They have received the highest decorations. They have received the acclaim of civilization. They have helped write "liberty" in the sky over all nations.

Travel where you may, through American cemeteries on a thousand battlefields—

Travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with rich red blossoms or in the glistening white stones rising above flower-strewn mounds—

There you will see, side by side, one beneath the Cross of Christianity and one beneath the Star of David, Jew and Christian pillowed in eternal glory.

They have fought, bled, worshipped, and died together, so that we may all live together for the glory of God and country.

VFW Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I join in hailing the golden jubilee of this great national organization of which I have the honor to be a member, and append the foreword to the Golden Jubilee Book of the VFW by National Commander Lyall T. Beggs who states eloquently the tradition and purposes of this great national organization of the veterans of overseas service. I insert this foreword in the RECORD as a tribute to my comrade of Fort Tryon Post, VFW, No. 3037, and to the VFW Fred Myer, D. S. C., Post, No. 403, and in which I have many friends:

FOREWORD

During the past 50 years many factors have contributed to the recognition that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States enjoys today as a great force for good in America.

No résumé of the story of the Veterans of Foreign Wars would be complete if it failed to give due credit to the patriotic citizens and public officials, in every community where our organization is established, for their help and encouragement; to the newspapers large and small, throughout the Nation, that have given so generously of their educational support and cooperation to our aims and purposes; to the radio industry, from coast to coast, for its cordial acceptance of the public-interest values of our activities.

Thus this story—inspired by the golden jubilee anniversary of the founding of our organization in 1899—is simultaneously an expression of gratitude to our fellow citizens.

We are celebrating our golden jubilee anniversary at a period in American history when the last surviving veterans of the War Between the States are responding to their final roll call. As we voice a farewell salute to the surviving members of the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars inherits the proud distinction of being the Nation's oldest, active major veteran association in existence.

Under the charter granted to us by the Congress of the United States, the ranks of the Veterans of Foreign Wars remain open to the overseas veterans in any war in which America may be engaged. By virtue of this

characteristic, the VFW is destined to retain the honor of being America's oldest veteran fraternity as long as the nations of the world shall see fit to employ war as an instrument of international policy—and the United States is forced to send its armed forces beyond it own borders to defend its national security.

In appreciation of this heritage, we proudly assume our responsibilities as members of an organization that stands pledged to maintain, strengthen, and defend the institutions of American liberty.

LYALL T. BEGGS,
Commander in Chief.

Monopoly of the Labor Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, if the administration and its congressional leaders succeed in their avowed intent to repeal entirely the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and replace it with the Labor Relations Act of 1949, every working man and woman in America would face the prospect of paying tribute to a union official in order to get or hold a job. In other words, the administration is trying to make the workers themselves put up the money to buy the support of the union bosses.

Union treasuries were opened wide in the Presidential campaign last fall in support of the administration now in power. Union officials are laying even more expensive political campaign plans for the future. The administration, through its proposed Labor Relations Act, would give the unions the opportunity and privilege of replenishing their funds and fattening their treasuries at the expense of America's workers.

This could happen here because the administration proposes to give union officials a monopoly on the American labor market by removing all restraints and restrictions from union organizing activities and contract demands made upon employers under any circumstance.

Compulsory unionism is a principal jeopardy to freedom inherent in the administration's Labor Relations Act of 1949, now pending in Congress.

Not content with restoring the Wagner Act, and thereby legalizing contracts making union membership compulsory, the administration's bill would seek to invalidate all State laws and constitutional provisions imposing restrictions on compulsory union membership—something the Wagner Act never did and never intended to do.

The effect of this provision of the bill is to invalidate, insofar as they apply to any industry affecting interstate commerce—and that includes virtually all industry today—all State laws and constitutional provisions imposing any restrictions whatever on contracts making union membership a condition of employment, whether the contract is one for a closed shop, union shop, or maintenance of membership.

Thus the laws of some 17 States, adopted in response to overwhelming public demand, would be nullified by the Democrat administration's bill. Moreover in several States, notably Arizona, the voters of the State have approved such restrictions by the adoption of constitutional amendment or by ratifying legislation in a referendum, or both.

This particular "improvement" in the original Wagner Act would not only interfere with the exercise of the police powers of the States, but would in addition place the power and prestige of the Federal Government behind compulsory membership of employees in unions, whether the employees desire it or not. The Wagner Act never did any such thing.

The inevitable effect of this provision of the bill, particularly when the difference between this provision and that in the present law is considered, will be to give every worker in this country the definite impression that his Government is committed to a policy of forcing him to join a union in order to work. A more cynical betrayal of individual freedom and disregard of the guaranty to employees of a free choice in joining unions set forth in section 7 of the Wagner Act would be difficult to imagine.

It is worthy of note that, paradoxically, proponents of the bill refuse even to consider the existing provision of the Labor-Management Relations Act which makes coercion of employees by unions an unfair labor practice, primarily on the ground that such coercion should be left to the States to handle. But at the same time they propose to deny the States any authority to police the abuses growing out of compulsory union membership.

ABUSES OF THE CLOSED SHOP

No other provision of the Taft-Hartley Act when it was passed in 1947 has such universal support, even among union members, as evidenced by numerous public-opinion polls, as did the provisions doing away with the abuses of the closed shop and protecting the individual's right to work under union-shop contracts. Members of the House and Senate committees in the Eightieth Congress received hundreds of letters from individual workers, most of them union members, urging support of this provision of the law.

For obvious reasons, the writers of such letters asked that their names be not published because of fear of reprisal. But their stories were often pitiful, detailing how heads of families had been expelled arbitrarily from unions and the employer forced to discharge them and deprive them of a means of livelihood on such flimsy pretexts as twisting a request for a financial accounting from union officers into a charge of conduct prejudicial to the union, or a refusal in one case of a veteran to buy lottery tickets in a lottery run by the business agent. In another case, a veteran who was employed in radio communications was expelled from the Communist-tinged Communication Workers, CIO, simply because he refused to contribute his dollar to CIO-PAC. Such instances reported by the victims to Members of Congress could be multiplied by hundreds.

It is true that such abuses of compulsory-membership provisions occurred in a minority of the tens of thousands of local unions which had such contracts in this country. But it is the essence of democratic government to protect the rights of minorities. One of the most flagrant kinds of abuse of closed-shop powers occurred shortly after the act became law. A union in New York, local 65, Wholesale and Retail Workers, CIO, which had numerous closed-shop contracts with employers, levied an assessment against its members to raise funds to oppose the Taft-Hartley Act and agitate for its repeal. Many members of the union objected to the assessment and refused to pay it. The union thereupon expelled the recalcitrant members and directed the employers to discharge them, and the employers were required to do so under the closed-shop contracts. The leadership of this same union was notoriously Communist and later on called an extended strike against a New York employer who refused to fire a number of clerks who had been expelled from the union because they led a movement to get rid of the Communist leadership.

In addition to the illiberal deprivation of the individual's right to work and earn a living which occurred in consequence of abuses of the closed shop, another evil was the notorious tendency of such unions to become closed unions, often restricting membership to sons or relatives of members. Even the International Typographical Union, which in many of its locals is a model of democratic union procedure, was disclosed in the 1949 Senate hearings to have indulged in this practice of limiting membership.

Although the union witnesses in the 1949 hearings insisted that abuses of the closed shop were too minor to merit legislative attention, such administration witnesses as William Leiserson, William H. Davis, and others who testified in the Senate hearings, all of whom have had long experience in labor relations, did not take that view. Leiserson opposed any form of compulsory membership and the others either wanted the closed shop prohibited or else agreed that if it were permitted it would have to be policed in order to protect individuals against arbitrary expulsion from the union and loss of their jobs.

The Taft-Hartley Act makes provision for union security under a union shop, if the union is authorized to negotiate it by a majority of all employees affected in a secret ballot conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. These elections have been a major focus of attack by the unions. The elections are claimed to be unnecessary since the great majority of them have been won by the unions. The Republican minority recognizes merit in this contention and proposes to recommend that the requirements for such elections be eliminated from the law.

However, the Taft-Hartley Act contains other safeguards on individual rights which are essential, whether the shop be a closed shop or merely a union

shop, which are omitted entirely from the administration's bill, H. R. 2032. Thus under the act it is an unfair practice for a union to demand the discharge of an employee who has been denied membership in or expelled from the union for any reason other than nonpayment of dues and initiation fees. Under this provision the union retains complete control over its own membership but it cannot expel a member for arbitrary or capricious reasons and then force the employer to discharge him. Republican Members propose to recommend that additional reasons for expulsion and discharge be included in the law.

Confronted with the wealth of evidence on the abuses of individual and minority rights under closed-shop contracts, the framers of the Taft-Hartley Act faced the dilemma of either prohibiting the closed shop and protecting individual rights under other forms of compulsory membership in unions, such as the union shop, or else writing an elaborate statute protecting the rights of individual members of unions against arbitrary or capricious expulsion. The solution of the dilemma was to reject the idea of having the Federal Government interfere and police the internal activities of unions. Instead, unions were left free to run their internal affairs as they saw fit, but the Government steps in only to protect the individual's right to work against arbitrary or capricious action by the union. Some solution of this dilemma confronts any legislator facing the problems growing out of compulsory membership in unions. The Taft-Hartley Act seeks to solve it in one way. Unfortunately, administration forces have, for reasons of political obligation, completely dodged the issue of protecting the individual, for their bill contains no safeguards for the individual's right to work.

The Soviet Union, Not Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask permission to place side by side the analysis made in the New York Times, September 20, 1947, about the correct terminology with respect to the Soviet Union and the interesting column of Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick which was published in the New York Times on April 2, 1949. Anyone who studies these two pieces will see at once that Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs, was more than 2 years ahead of most of the newspaper editors and reporters in this country, if not in the world. What is now described as "the new emphasis on the people of Russia" is exactly what Dr. Thorning emphasized years ago in the conviction that the people of the Soviet Union, in contrast to the men in the Kremlin, were our best potential allies in our struggle for freedom, representative government, and democracy. The two statements follow:

[Dr. Joseph F. Thorning in the New York Times, September 20, 1947]

When an educator like Dr. George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois (the New York Times, September 7, 1947), in an otherwise excellent article uses an admittedly incorrect term, "Russia," four times in succession, readers have a right to inquire about the reasons which motivate such phraseology. The question is important, because all democratic, freedom-loving peoples have an obligation not to identify the Russians with their totalitarian masters.

Can it be that slovenly newspaper practice is responsible for the careless language of some educators? Too many editors and news commentators forget that "Russia" went out of existence in 1917, when a new body politic, eventually to be known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was established. The name which the original totalitarians selected brings out clearly the international character of the Marxist police state. "Russia," with its necessary connotations with the Russian people, simply does not have the connotations that are present in "the Soviet Union." Why do journalists, who like to pride themselves upon their accuracy, continue to use an outmoded, unhistorical vocabulary?

To be sure, some newspaper folk as well as a few of the professors try to justify themselves by pointing out that they are merely following common usage. This seems to be a weak apology. In point of fact, the more alert foreign correspondents usually lead off their pieces in this field by mentioning "the Soviet Union" and then occasionally employ "Russia" as a variant.

On the other hand, Messrs. Henry A. Wallace, CLAUDE A. PEPPER, and their supporters almost invariably introduce talk about "Russia" and "the Russians." Naturally, these words, with their aura of courage and glory, elicit immense sympathy and admiration for the valiant Russian people.

Does any thoughtful reader imagine that this choice of language is not deliberate, although incorrect? With such radiant diction, Marxist apologists in the United States plead the cause of the clique which runs the Soviet Union. The interests of the Russian people and those of the Soviet Politburo, it may be noted, do not often coincide.

Why not be realistic as well as exact in this sphere of semantics? The distinction between tyrants and their slaves can and should be recorded each time that we mention "the Soviet Union" and "the Russian people."

Is it not significant that the statesman identified as X, who wrote the widely quoted piece on the surviving totalitarians, spoke clearly and consistently and correctly about "the Soviet Union"?

Truth depends upon accuracy of expression. Furthermore, fairness to all concerned demands that there be no name calling. This is a case where the rulers of the Soviet Union have themselves chosen their own titles and descriptions. They are the self-proclaimed leaders of a federation which not only has fifth columns everywhere but also, avowedly, aims to embrace the world with its peoples. That is in the nature of world revolution. The Constitution of the U. S. S. R. was drawn up with explicit provisions for the incorporation of all other political entities.

It is a practical measure of self-defense to employ the nomenclature selected, not by non-Marxist adversaries, but by the Soviets themselves. At any rate, some citizens of this country will protest every time a mistaken terminology is employed.

[Column of Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick on April 2, 1949, in the New York Times]

ABROAD—THE NEW EMPHASIS ON THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIA

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

In Boston Winston Churchill referred to his Fulton speech of 3 years ago but he did not mention the "iron curtain," the phrase he originated at that time. One reason may be that the curtain is not quite so opaque as it was. This is not to say that the outside world knows any more than it ever did about what goes on inside the Kremlin. The wild and contradictory guesses on the current changes in the high command are the best proof that there are no peepholes in the thick walls of that fortress.

But we do know more about life and conditions under Soviet rule. In the last 3 years news and people have trickled through and out of the border states in a widening stream. Nearly everywhere in Europe today you meet a sprinkling of Russians among the fugitive Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, and Rumanians who have evaded the frontier guards along the "Great Divide." It is not so easy to keep secrets in the Soviet sphere as it was in the Soviet Union; the farther the curtain extends the harder it is to nail it down.

From these fresh witnesses and a variety of other leaks the reporter hears much that confirms Mr. Churchill's theory that the admittedly able men in the Soviet Union have acted to unite the free world against them because "they fear the friendship of the West more than its hostility" and for the sake of their own self-preservation "cannot afford to allow free and friendly intercourse to grow up between the vast areas they control and the civilizations of the West."

HOMESICK FOR FREEDOM

Certainly anyone who has ever been in Soviet Russia or who encounters outside the latest Russian exiles, most of them products of the Soviet system and therefore bewildered and curious strangers in the outer world—a little like men from Mars—knows how friendly and open-minded the Russian people are by nature. Years ago, before suspicion and hatred of the United States became a policy, the writer recalls the warmth and excitement of the peasants in a collective village who followed her around all day to hear about "dear America." The experience was almost duplicated this year in a border country, when a runaway young Red Army man suggested they had not changed much by relating how wistfully the people in his home village talked of Americans they had once met. They were homesick for freedom, he said.

It is significant that there is more emphasis now than ever before on the distinction between the Russian people and the Soviet Government. No passage in Mr. Churchill's speech received more applause than the statement that "we have no hostility to the Russian people." The striking fact is that nobody has; no nation in history was ever so completely absolved of blame for the acts and aims of its rulers. Even the Communist Party and the Komsomols, that army of husky youth nearly 9,000,000 strong, are not held responsible for the policies of the little group on top which speaks and thinks for them all.

Ernst Reuter, mayor of Berlin, made the same point as Mr. Churchill in speaking at a luncheon given in his honor in New York on Friday by the American Association for a Democratic Germany. Dr. Reuter spent much time in Russia in his early years; he speaks Russian and today has exceptional opportunities to see and hear of what is happening behind the curtain. Berlin is by all odds the best observation and listening post on the Soviet Union. It is the big sieve

through which news of the West goes East and news of the East goes West.

On the basis of his knowledge of the Russians and his experience on the barricades, Dr. Reuter begged his audience not to make the mistake of confusing the "innocent" people with their Government. If the Russian people could have participated in the great resistance rally of the people of Berlin before the Reichstag last September, "I am sure they would have been on our side against their masters," he said.

A NEW WORLD POLICY

The signatories of the Atlantic Pact are assembling in Washington this week end. In this bevy of Foreign Ministers, the largest the Capital has ever seen, western Europe comes to the United States to solemnize a historic innovation not only in American but in world policy. No such peacetime coalition has ever been formed before. It represents the failure of Soviet policy, as the angry casuistry of Moscow's protest reveals.

The Atlantic Pact, like the Marshall plan, of which it is the supplement, is one way of strengthening free nations to resist the threat of aggression. But neither pact nor plan is the only way of dealing with Russia. Stepping up the effort to break through reflects a growing conviction among policymakers that there is a growing restlessness on the other side. This conviction stems from more information of what is going on. It does not mean that there are signs anywhere of an organized underground, such as existed in Poland under Nazi occupation, or the slightest chance of rebellion. Risings against totalitarian dictatorships are practically impossible. But the urge for liberation from tyranny is a force that any event could unleash—an open break in the Kremlin leadership, for instance, or a series of splits in the satellite regimes. Strength and freedom in the West, are other factors that could upset the balance of the Soviet empire. At any rate, fostering and keeping alive the spirit of the people on the other side of the iron curtain are as important for a well-rounded policy as organizing resistance on this side.

Biloxi, Miss., Celebrates Its Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt, in all sincerity, if there is a more attractive place in all of these United States than the little city of Biloxi, which adorns the Gulf coast line of the State of Mississippi. Not only is it an attractive city, but there are few spots richer in history and legend than this beautiful little Gulf-kissed coast town. In its history it has the distinction of having in its 250 years of existence, 8 flags to fly over it. It was once the capital of a territory which embraced possibly one-fourth of the area now occupied by these United States.

This month marks its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, and an appropriate program, which promises to be one of the most colorful celebrations of its kind ever held in this country, is scheduled for this month.

Its natural beauty is unexcelled. Its giant centuries-old live oak trees growing in profuse abundance down to the white sands of the Gulf of Mexico, its beautiful, natural scenery, with its historical significance, all combine to make it one of the most attractive places in the world. Moreover, its commercial activities, added to its tourist trade, make it a most exceptional place in which to live.

Biloxi, Miss., is the home, in this modern day, of Keesler Field, one of the largest air mechanical training schools in this country.

It ships a large portion of the shrimp and other fish which go from the Gulf of Mexico to all parts of the country. Moreover, it is and has been for more than a half century the largest canner of oysters in the world.

I know that my colleagues will join with me in saluting this beautiful, historic spot and the fine, hospitable people who dwell within its limits on this, its two hundred and fiftieth birthday.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I submit herewith a statement prepared by one of its outstanding citizens, Mr. Anthony Ragusin. The statement follows:

BILOXI WILL HOLD TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY PARTY IN APRIL

Biloxi, the Plymouth Rock of the Deep South—a city that once was capital of a region that reached from what now is Yellowstone National Park to the site of present-day Pittsburgh, is this year celebrating its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary.

Mississippi's most famous coastal city, which today depends on tourists, fishing, and boat building for its livelihood, was established as the first permanent white settlement in the Mississippi Valley in April 1699.

The occasion is being observed in the same month this year with a program which begins March 27 and continues through April 9, with a pageant depicting the colorful history of this city over which eight flags have flown.

Early in 1699 an expedition sent out of France by King Louis XIV arrived at Ship Island under the leadership of Pierre le-Moyne d'Iberville and assisted by his brother, the gallant Jean Baptiste leMoyne Sieur de Bienville. Its goal was the establishment of a colony in Louisiana.

After a preliminary exploration of the coast, d'Iberville decided upon the quiet Bay of Biloxi as the ideal site for his settlement. He soon made friends with the amiable Biloxi Indians, after which the colony was named.

Construction of the settlement, just north of the present city of Ocean Springs, was begun on April 8. The fort established to defend it was known as Maurepas.

A second colony was established in the southeast area of the Bay of Biloxi but was short-lived. The third establishment of the city was on the Gulf on a narrow, finger-like peninsula where the city today stands.

Thus Biloxi, by virtue of its discovery and settlement, became the first permanent establishment in the Mississippi Valley and the first capital of the Louisiana Purchase Territory.

When colonial Biloxi ruled land as far north as Canada there were nine judicial and military districts, including the Illinois, Wabash, Missouri, and Natchez.

Oldsters today say that one reason so many lawyers came to Biloxi was because land titles along parts of the coast involved 22 different tenures.

Biloxi remained the capital until 1722 when the seat of government was moved to newly established New Orleans.

Mississippi's 75-mile coastal area has long been a happy fishing ground. Its nearness to fertile spawning grounds for both crustacean and fish life, its shallow, island-protected sound and network of bayous and rivers attract tons of crabs, shrimp, oysters, small fish and the larger game fish which come to feed.

Biloxi has become the capital of this huge fishing industry.

Today the city has approximately 30 seafood shipping establishments. During the shrimp and oyster seasons more than 900 boats work out of Biloxi and more than 5,000 boatmen are engaged in catching seafood for the factories which process them for the markets of the world.

More than half of all the oysters canned in the United States during the past 30 years were packed at Biloxi.

Growing directly out of the fishing and seafood industry is the trade of shipbuilding. The Biloxi lugger, a power-propelled boat of from 30 to 46 feet in length, represents the experience of generations of building boats suitable for coastal waters. Nearly all the shrimp and oyster boats operating out of Biloxi, as well as many used in Louisiana, Texas, and other coastal points are Biloxi-built.

Biloxi, as a resort city, makes playing its business. Many of the plantation-type homes in the city today were built by planters who came to the coast to escape the heat and fever of their inland homes.

It is known that as early as 1840 Biloxi was favored as a summer resort although the only means of transportation along the coast at that time was by boat. During this period many New Orleans families had summer homes along the coast, a custom which still prevails.

However, it was not until the 1890's that the first winter tourists discovered this part of the Deep South.

Jefferson Davis, the South's wartime President, acquired a beautiful plantation-type home at Biloxi, facing the sunlit, blue waters of the Gulf. It was here that he wrote The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, in the declining years of his life.

Today Beauvoir is a shrine and museum through which thousands of visitors pass each year.

The War Between the States left Biloxi comparatively unharmed. About the only reminder left today is Fort Massachusetts on Ship Island. This massive, semicircular fortress built at the west end of Ship Island, a sandy strip 12 miles from the mainland, was taken, lost, and retaken by Union forces, and the mainland was harassed by patrol boats from the fort, but no major engagements were fought near the town. Biloxians ran the blockade for food and supplies, giving basis for the anecdotes that preserve much of the war history of the town.

Probably the most notable Biloxi landmark, however, is the 100-year-old Biloxi Lighthouse, built in 1848, and situated at the water's edge on the Old Spanish Trail, which today is followed by a modern, paved highway, known as U S 90.

When Biloxi was seized by Union forces in the War Between the States, Confederate sympathizers buried the lighthouse lamps until after the war.

Today, however, they serve to guide not only the ships at sea, but the traveling public which motors along Mississippi's famed playground.

Legislative Difficulties in Oregon Under Republican Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newport (Oreg.) News of March 20, 1949, containing excerpts from a recent speech by State Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Portland, Oreg. Mr. Neuberger analyzes the shortcomings of the Oregon Legislature which he attributes in large part to nearly a century of Republican domination. Because the State legislature is a vital element of democracy working through representative government, I believe the Members will be interested in this statement.

MR. NEUBERGER'S TALK

Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Portland is one of the most controversial figures in the present session of the Oregon Legislature. On several points, both Republicans and Democrats are agreed about Mr. Neuberger. His mind is one of the most brilliant in Oregon. And he is destined to be very important in future Oregon politics. From there on opinions are divergent. The Democrats see him as a great hope for their party. The Republicans look upon him as the most dangerous threat in many years to their placid and secure position in the government of the State.

Last week Senator Neuberger made an important speech before the Exchange Club of Salem. His title was "What's Wrong with Oregon Legislature?" From the address we take some excerpts which are extremely thought-provoking:

"Sessions are too short. It is impossible to give serious and thoughtful consideration to nearly 1,000 bills and resolutions in 70 or 80 days. Many legislatures, of States smaller in area and population than Oregon, now meet for 180 days.

"A legislative reference bureau is sorely needed. Members are to reliant on lobbyists for information. There is no time for a member on his own to engage in research at the State library. Nor has the library ever been given an adequate appropriation to do extensive research for the legislature.

"The pay is incredibly low—near the bottom for the United States. For this session it barely will average $5 a day. This means the members must dip into personal savings to live at Salem. It also puts heavy pressure on the legislature to adjourn early and go home. This sounds fine—but what about bills of importance which never get out of committee? Miserable salaries force half the legislators to put their wives on the pay roll.

"The abysmal pay discourages many young men of promise from becoming candidates. How will they support their families? Thus our legislature loses its historic role as a training ground for future leaders in Government. It becomes a haven for mediocrity. The legislatures of other States produced such national figures as Roosevelt, of New York; Connally, of Texas; Aiken, of Vermont; Norris, of Nebraska; etc. However, consider the fact that comparatively few Oregon statesmen have ascended out of the legislature. McNary, Martin, Morse, Sprague—none ever served as legislators.

"The atmosphere is more that of a private club than of a public body. Attachment to the electorate seems remote and distant. This is why the legislature so often disregards the decision of the voters on such issues as old-age pensions, sales tax, conservation of resources, and educational policy.

"An example of this aloofness from the people is the fact that the house of representatives, traditionally regarded as the body closest to the voters, is far less public-spirited than the senate. Debate is shut off too soon in the house on vital questions. The senate, customarily considered the State's "house of lords," gives a bold idea better shift than does the other house.

"The legislature is so cushioned by unreality that it has deliberately violated the State constitution for almost 40 years to preserve its membership status quo. Although the basic charter of Oregon provides that each district must be of equal population, the legislature refuses to follow this mandate from the State's founders. This gives a curious sophistry to all subsequent legislative acts.

"There is a timidity about partisanship which stems from the fact that one political party has dominated the legislature for nearly a century. Out of 90 present members, 69 are Republicans and 21 are Democrats—and this is an exceptionally large number of Democrats for Oregon. Thus all rivalry is steered into personal channels. Individual ambitions flourish like weeds. This is more insidious than political partisanship. Furthermore, it submerges issues and exaggerates personalities.

"Because the legislature and the executive branch of government so long have represented the same political party, no check is exercised by the legislature, which actually is in default of its responsibilities. Only one committee out of 55, the ways and means, can swear in a witness. All other committees are dependent on hearsay evidence. The legislature has no real comprehension of how millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds are spent by the countless boards and commissions of the State government."

The Four Freedoms, an Original Poem by Distinguished Retired Chaplain of the United States Navy, James M. Hester, of Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens of my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., is James M. Hester, retired chaplain of the United States Navy. He has written a poem, entitled "The Four Freedoms," and I wish to share the inspiring content with you, my colleagues, and with the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Likewise, I felt it very appropriate that it be inserted in the records of the Congress of the Nation for which this distinguished Chaplain has already and does still continue to render devoted and untiring service:

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

Man shall be free to speak the truth
In every tongue and clime
And spread his views by word and press,
A right from God, sublime.

Man shall be free to worship God,
The still small Voice as guide;
Light of our fathers to the world,
A torch that shall abide.

Man shall be free from painful want,
Abundant life shall share;
And making straight the path to peace,
Good will to all declare.

Man shall be free from monstrous fear,
Belief in God his stay;
Abiding by the Golden Rule,
Right over might holds sway.
—*James M. Hester.*

May be sung to the tune Materna, as is used for "O Beautiful for Spacious Skies" (America the Beautiful).

Servicemen's Readjustment Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is likely the Congress will be considering legislation at some future date to extend the period during which servicemen's readjustment allowances may be paid. In order to present information regarding this matter to the Members of the House of Representatives, I am inserting in the RECORD an exchange of letters between Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Gov. Beauford H. Jester, of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the letters referred to dated March 3, 1949, and March 26, 1949:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, March 3, 1949.

Hon. BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor of Texas, Austin, Tex.

DEAR GOVERNOR JESTER: We in the State of Michigan are very much concerned about the possible failure of Congress to extend the period during which servicemen's readjustment allowances may be paid.

Almost one-third of our unemployed are veterans receiving such allowances. Our experience indicates that the veterans have not yet become completely assimilated into the labor market. He lacks seniority, and is, consequently, the first laid off and the last to return to work. Most of our veterans have not yet acquired such employment experience as to qualify fully for normal unemployment compensation benefits. As a consequence, unless servicemen's readjustment allowances are continued, these veterans and the State of Michigan will suffer considerably. Perhaps the situation in your State is somewhat similar. If so, you may be interested to know what we have done to meet the situation, and we would be interested to learn what you are doing.

After getting together all the statistical data that the unemployment compensation commission had, some of which is enclosed, a meeting was called in the Governor's office with representatives of all veterans' organizations, the unemployment compensation commission, the Michigan Veterans' Trust Fund, and the CIO veterans' department. This group, after discussing the situation, unanimously agreed that every veteran organization would contact its counterpart in every State of the Union, either directly or through the national office, suggesting they

contact their Congressman to secure the extension of these allowances. It was further agreed that I should contact the Governors of all the States to advise them of what we are doing and to ask their cooperation. Finally, we are attempting to have our legislature, by a joint resolution, memorialize Congress on this matter.

In my opinion, you will find that the extension of these allowances is a matter of great importance to the veterans in your State and to the general welfare of your people. I certainly hope that we can cooperate in this matter for our mutual interests.

Cordially yours,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., March 26, 1946.

Hon. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor of Michigan, Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Recently you wrote to me concerning the possibility that Congress will fail to extend the period during which servicemen's readjustment allowances may be paid. I referred copies of your letter to our unemployment compensation and veterans agencies.

I now have comments from Mr. Harry B. Crozier, chairman of the Texas Employment Commission, and Mr. James C. Jones, Executive Director of the Veterans' Affairs Commission. I wish to pass on to you some portions of their comments.

Mr. Crozier writes, in part, as follows:

"You have invited me to give you my reactions to Governor Williams' letter and his argument for extending the period during which readjustment allowances may be paid to veterans. There is merit to what Governor Williams says, and Representative HUBER of Ohio, I understand, is the author of H. R. 1374 which proposes to extend the period to July 25, 1954, and to embrace discharges that occur during the 2-year period following.

"In addition to Governor Williams' points there is perhaps sound reason for extending the program to take care of youths who have entered the service out of high school during the time we have been stressing a defense program. These youngsters * * * have had no training in the business of making a living, and our experience with the readjustment allowance program leads us to believe that it is eminently fair that they, too, should have some relief while they are adjusting themselves.

"As regards the continuation of the program for veterans of the war period, our study of the program as it has been operated leads us to believe that such a course is much sounder than the giving of bonuses to our former servicemen. The money that has been paid out in readjustment allowances has done material good to its recipients.

"Because of the fact that the Veterans' Administration was able to utilize the unemployment compensation agencies that had already been set up in all of the States, the readjustment-allowance program has cost much less than any similar program ever costs. There are still those who believe that the readjustment-allowance program was abused and that a great proportion of our former servicemen enjoyed membership in the 52-20 Club, but cold figures dispute that charge. Our records reveal that less than 50 percent of the veterans of Texas have filed a single claim for readjustment allowances. Slightly less than 7 percent of all eligible veterans in Texas have drawn their full 52 weeks' entitlement as of February 28, 1949.

"You will recall that many of our economists were predicting dire things for the months following the close of the war and all of us had some fears of high unemployment. It is interesting now to look back and see that in Texas the maximum number of unemployed veterans filing claims in any 1-month period after demobilization was 99,153 in March 1946. In the corollary program of paying allowances to self-employed veterans the maximum of 29,647 was reached in June 1946. Month by month these veterans were returning to gainful employment, and by October 1948 the number of unemployed veterans filing claims dropped to 9,221, which is the minimum up to now, and in November 1948 the self-employed veterans filing claims dropped to 1,790, which is a minimum for them.

"It is a somewhat illuminating commentary on the present economic situation that during February of this year the number of unemployed veterans' claims jumped to 26,105, and the number of self-employed veterans' claims was up to 3,732. Of course, a part of this increase was due to seasonal conditions and the usual midwinter increase of unemployment. That fact helps to point up Governor Williams' contention that the veteran needs longer time to become fully assimilated into the labor market.

"My own personal opinion is that probably the best reason for extending the readjustment-allowance program is to tide over the youngsters who have been enlisted into the service. Their education has been interrupted and they will return to civilian life without any wage credits for unemployment compensation and without work training, to face a pretty dismal outlook. I should think it would be a contribution to our economy of tomorrow to provide some educational and rehabilitation programs for these youngsters."

Mr. Jones also quotes some interesting figures concerning veterans' employment in Texas, and then adds:

"The above figures show that the majority of the Texas veterans do not want a dole and will not take advantage of this entitlement except in extreme emergencies. However, these figures do indicate that unemployment in Texas is definitely increasing and although Texas is not an industrial State as compared to some of the Northern and Eastern States and our unemployment is not as great at this time as theirs must be, we may very easily be faced with a definite and serious unemployment problem in the near future.

"We have always believed that the termination of the readjustment allowance section of the GI bill of rights would be detrimental to the future welfare of those veterans who, through their own initiative or good fortune, received jobs whereby they were able to provide for themselves and their families without resorting to their entitlement under this particular provision.

"We believe further that this particular section of the GI bill of rights should become permanent, thus forming an annuity to all veterans of World War II so as to provide a permanent protection to those men who will never take advantage of its opportunity unless forced to do so by extreme necessity. * * *"

I concur in the findings of these experts in the field of veterans' readjustment and will see to it that the Texas delegation in Congress has an opportunity to study their comments.

Hoping that I can be of further assistance, and thanking you for your own interest in this program, I am

Very sincerely yours,

BEAUFORD H. JESTER.

When You Pay the Piper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on Federal expenditures:

KINZERS, PA.

It is good business, for an individual or the Government, to balance the budget and try to remain solvent. The Government debt is too large and should be reduced instead of more deficit financing.

Reducing appropriation for the different divisions of the Federal Government is one fine way to start. A reduction of the amount of money in circulation which would come from a reduction in Federal spending and better management of Government funds is the thing that is best for the country in my opinion.

Taxes are high enough considering the conditions in this country today and it is sound economics to have a balanced budget. Income of the Government has sufficient places to be spent without overappropriations to the separate branches of the Government.

JOHN J. HESS.

HARTLAND, WIS.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for taking up the issue of Government expenditures which are allocated for the fiscal year of 1950, beginning July 1, for socialistic and experimental projects.

If our Government is to continue pouring out money, there is no doubt that this Nation will suffer extensively and perhaps to the point of economical chaos.

We believe that our only salvation is in reducing appropriations for the Federal Government.

We do not want increased taxation or the inevitable bread lines to follow.

HARTLAND PLASTICS, INC.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

With a very apparent recession in business, the budgeting of Government expenses should be on the basis of where the money is coming from to meet the budget. If the earning power of individuals and corporations falls below the last 2 or 3 years, then obviously the revenue which our Government will receive from taxation will be less.

I am enclosing a clipping taken from a recent issue of our local newspaper in which you will notice that Canada is considering cutting taxes 32 percent. This merely indicates that other countries realize the importance of reducing governmental expenditures.

Yours very truly,

C. E. ERICKSON CO., INC.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y.

There is not enough assessed property in United States to cover its bed. A deuce of a situation for the greatest country that God ever let the sun shine on. Many in Washington, and Albany, and other State capitals have been running the country on the theory that there would always be a magician that could pull a white rabbit out of

a plug hat. There are no more white rabbits or plug hats.

WARREN ROSS LUMBER CO.

AURORA, ILL.

We have simply got to have a reduction in spending by the various bureaus in Washington.

Even after making the cut of over $80,000,000 for the Department of the Interior, the reduced total is still $126,000,000 more than was actually spent during the past fiscal year. That brings up the point of why can't this appropriation be cut an additional $126,000,000,000. It would seem as if we were facing a time when there should be a decrease in expenditure and in personnel in not only this Department but others as well.

OATMAN BROS., INC.

MILAN, MICH.

We are confident that we speak the language of all industrial concerns in condemning the extravagant spending that has been so consistently on the increase the past few years. Our Nation-wide economy is in serious jeopardy and it will require convictions and thinking to force the issue and effect the reduction in appropriations that threaten the national economy.

THE AMERICAN BOILER & FOUNDRY CO.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA.

It has been a long time since anyone at Washington has thought of Government spending realistically.

THOS. KEMIS.

MIDDLESBORO, KY.

We are disturbed over the continued deficit spending of our Government. The newspapers print in very small type on the inside page the deficit of approximately one billion dollars at present which may be cut to a half-billion by the first of July. We all know that the period of high profits and high income tax returns has passed; and if the Government does not curtail sharply its spending then next year it will be a much more serious deficit which means higher taxes. History has repeatedly confirmed the failure of any government to survive deficit spending and high taxes.

This leads to one of two things: a cancellation of all Government debt or a cancellation of all private liberties. We hope neither of these happen, but we do believe that unless the leaders in Government, business, and labor do some sound thinking and prompt action, it may be too late.

REAMS LUMBER CO.

BURBANK, CALIF.

The Federal Government has been spending far too much unnecessarily what with the present recession or minor depression, whatever it may be termed, that business is now in the midst of.

I trust that all unnecessary expenditures can be eliminated.

GENERAL WATER HEATER CORP.

INDIANOLA, MISS.

By the time I pay my living expenses and taxes I do not have anything left for expansion or making improvements in my own business. If we can reduce Federal expenditures and start reducing our national debt and then gradually reduce taxes I think we will see more prosperity in our country. All these schemes of giving somebody something for nothing are not in keeping with the way this country was developed.

I know that it is a tough job when people all over the country want something for their particular territory or their friends.

W. W. GRESHAM.

OXFORD, MICH.

We are business men the same as you Mr. CANNON and realize that this Government of ours occupies the same position as a sound business which cannot operate at deficits and still exist. The faith of the people which has held up and permitted such a staggering debt that we now owe is beginning to waiver and falter. This faith must be restored.

THE SMITH SILO CO.

TYLER, TEX.

I want to commend the business approach upon the subject of our national budget.

Our cities, counties, and States are burdened with debt, but in the face of crisis their new budgets call for many millions. Truly the fate of our economy rests with your committee.

EAST TEXAS AUTO SUPPLY CO.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

I would urge that all items for socialistic and experimental purposes be eliminated from the Budget and that all of the necessary expenditures be cut as much as possible. You will find most of us Americans right back of such an effort.

L. A. RATHBUN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

It seems that many are intent upon making us all very rich, with everybody getting more than a billion dollars a week, and with bread selling at $100,000,000 a loaf.

Many have felt, as indeed I did for some time, that our income tax would make an all-out inflation impossible. My humble opinion is now that this confidence is not warranted. Likewise, price controls in peacetime would only accelerate the inflation.

AMERICAN ENVELOPE MANUFACTURING CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

I am heartily in favor of drastic cuts in appropriations, as are all the people of this country, with the exception of the special groups who are so blind that they are willing to sacrifice the future of our country for their immediate gain.

If more of our legislators took this viewpoint the future would look much rosier to the public in general.

NORMAN S. SMITH.

MEXICO, MO.

I feel that the spiralling cost of Government is as serious a threat to our country's future as is the rapid depletion of our natural resources.

A. P. GREEN FIRE BRICK CO.

KIRKWOOD, MO.

In 1932 the cost of Government was around $5,000,000,000 per year. In 1949 it will be around $42,000,000,000.

There are 72,000,000 insurance-policy holders who have seen their insurance dollar drop from 100 cents in 1933 to 38 cents in 1948. These people are thrifty, hard-working, and the backbone of the Nation. They are not happy.

E. E. SCHOLER.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

It is a fact that a family which cannot live within its income in normal times is headed for trouble. If during lush times when the family income is above normal this family steps its scale of living up to where it absorbs the entire income, the family is in trouble when that income declines. It finds itself unable to adjust its scale of living downward and begins to get deeper and deeper into debt. The wise thing for this family to do when the family income is inflated is to save that part which is above normal or else apply it to the reduction of outstanding debts, if any.

The above facts are true of a city, state, or nation, as well as a family. Communities of people appear to be just large families and behave in about the same way.

We, the people of the United States, in our national affairs have followed the usual pattern. During the war we necessarily had to raise huge sums of money and spend them to achieve victory. Since the end of hostilities we have found ourselves with the same huge income and have looked around for other places to spend the money. Many of the things for which we are spending the money may be desirable, but they certainly are not essential. We cannot afford them while we are nearly $300,000,000,000 in debt. It appears to be time for us as a Nation to get back to governmental essentials and apply any surplus income we have to reduce our national debt.

The way to keep governmental departments from spending money on unnecessary activities is to refuse to appropriate the money.

J. C. SKAGGS.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

It seems that today the good, old-fashioned American idea of thrift—of living within your income—has been discarded. Such a course can only lead us to a bankrupt socialism.

OAKLEIGH R. FRENCH AND ASSOCIATES.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

I feel that we should immediately curtail our huge Government spending, get the budget balanced and make every effort to maintain our present prosperity.

GEORGE H. SWAIM.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The amount of money that is being expended by the Government is staggering. The Federal Government has over 1,800 departments, agencies, and bureaus. We all know that many of these departments and agencies are not operated as efficiently as they could be. If it were a business corporation there would be a constant check for leaks and losses because the corporation has to make up for its inefficient operations, but the Federal Government meets its inefficient operations by increasing the tax schedule.

LEE-ROWAN CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

One of the easiest ways for communistic ideas to seep into our Government is to have our Government bankrupt as so many of the European countries are and I can see Stalin and his friends like "wolves waiting for the kill."

It is up to our Congress to keep this from happening.

H. A. ROES.

FREDERICKTOWN, MO.

If drastic cuts are made in Federal Government expenditures along with a streamlining of Government as suggested by the Hoover Commission a renewed confidence will eventuate on the part of this country in its Government to say nothing of the large amount of unnecessary spending which will be saved resulting in some relief to the taxpayers or a reduction in our national debt.

After all our Federal Government conducts the biggest business in the United States. If private business was handled in the same unbusiness-like way as a great deal of Government business has and is being conducted, they would soon go broke. Surely the fundamental, sound principle of conducting any business should be used by the biggest business in the country.

FREDERICKTOWN LEAD CO.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

It is my opinion that continued spending by the Government beyond that which is absolutely necessary sooner or later will not only bankrupt the country but will bring on unbearable conditions. This thing of Congress appropriating money just because certain pressure groups demand it, regardless of its detrimental effect upon the country, should be stopped.

CROWN MANUFACTURING CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Drastically reducing the expenditures of our Federal Government will go a long way toward getting this country back on its feet and eliminate the possibility of a socialistic state which apparently we are gradually heading for and sooner than most people seem to realize.

NOURSE OIL CO.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.

A great majority of the people in our country today are honestly, way down in their hearts, worried and do agree that we can't spend more than $40,000,000,000 a year and survive as a free country.

As I see it the material curtailing of our Government spending is the first and most important thing to get done for the well-being of the whole people.

ROBERT D. KISSICK.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

It is "up to us to do something about" the terrific and largely unnecessary expenditures for Federal Government. Goodness knows there are enough absolutely necessary expenses, and at best the costs must be high, but it is evident to every taxpayer that we have about reached the limit and must start in the other direction.

WALTER F. PAGE & CO.

JOPLIN, MO.

As one who has witnessed the increase in our Federal budget from $1,000,000,000 to something over $41,000,000,000 per year your statement really makes sense. I realize that economy may not be a popular subject in Washington these days, but I can tell you for sure that it is very popular with the many, many taxpayers.

GATEWAY CREAMERY CO.

RICHMOND, VA.

The one paramount thing that we need for a healthy state of our Nation, is for the Government to decrease its "take" from the taxpayers, and to get this overgrown bureaucracy off our backs, so that we can make some progress in getting ahead.

Recently—just to show you the way the wind is blowing—one of these bureaucratic boys from Washington came down here and made a speech, in which he referred to our national debt as being "only a quarter of a trillion dollars." You see, they have left the billions behind now, as old-time stuff, and are going after the trillions.

Let's all of us unite to stop them by removing their feed bag.

BINSWANGER & CO.

CAMDEN, N. J.

We want economy in Government. It is absurd the way the administration has been wasting money that could go into regular channels of business.

ELMER G. VAN NAME,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

OTTUMWA, IOWA.

It would seem to me that the time has come to call a halt to the thoughtless spending and extravagance that is now being done by our Government agencies.

I heartily approve of the Hoover Commission and their report in most every detail and while I believe that the report is not going to be given the consideration that it should, it is such men as you that can do the most good in helping to have recommendations of that character upheld.

J. W. EDGERLY & CO., INC.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

Unless the appropriations are drastically reduced no improvement can result. The various bureaus will not be reorganized and smaller appropriations asked by them and for them. The reform can be brought about only if you and your committee reduce the appropriations so that the bureaus will be forced to reduce their spending and reorganize for more efficient operation.

NORMAN ARMSTRONG, INC.,
Arborists.

ATLANTA, GA.

Economy is the watchword of every business today. There is probably not a single enterprise that isn't taking positive strides toward greater efficiency and economy.

But as we work toward this goal, the greatest business in the world, our Government, is marching backward, with greater inefficiencies, greater programs and projects, greater appropriations and expenditures.

DOWLING TEXTILE CO.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

It seems that as long as the bureaucratic heads can obtain money by heavier taxes that they will keep on adding to their pay roll and attempt to raise taxes more and more instead of attempting to reduce taxes and take a load off the American people.

NELSON LABORATORIES.

WAPAKONETA, OHIO.

I am sure I am not alone when I express a feeling of deep concern regarding the apparent trend in the Congress to pass new laws which will require additional large expenditures of tax money.

CLARENCE HENRY GOEKE.

MANITOWOC, WIS.

It is without question the ripe and high time to begin reducing our Federal expenditures if we do not wish to continue on our road to Federal bankruptcy. People must commence to realize that the Federal Government is not a profit-producing organization but rather a spending body. It is impossible to receive anything from any level of our Government whether it be local, State, or National without someone paying it to the respective body.

This can be clearly experienced if one does but so much as to contact businesses throughout the country. The surpluses which they should have been permitted to set up as reserves for times when extra investments for inventories, construction, and development is required was paid in excessive taxes, with the result that they now find themselves obliged to negotiate loans with their bank connections or to operate on the verge of bankruptcy.

SMALLEY MFG. CO.

SUPERIOR, WIS.

It is a well-known fact that many of the projects which are financed by Government appropriations are pet projects of those pressure groups which are able to make themselves heard by the "right" people. Of course we all know that the ultimate source of the money which is used to carry out these projects is the taxpayer's pocket. I am definitely interested in seeing a reduction of the appropriations which have been, and are being made, to further the development of non-tax-paying enterprises. To eliminate this drain on public tax funds would do away with one of the projects from which no return is received.

SUPERIOR TENT & AWNING CO.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

Throughout this entire United States there are hundreds of thousands of us men and women who are working, and working very, very hard, to raise the tax money which is pouring into the Government coffers today. We, the people, are entrusting you men in Washington with the guardianship of these funds.

We are working hard to provide money to make democracy work for us as we have known it during these past decades. We do not want to have this money wasted in such a manner that some day socialism rather than democracy will rule this wonderful land of ours. It certainly would do a man's heart good to see some of you fellows in Congress get in there and really fight and let some of these boneheads who insist upon throwing our money away know what is fundamental and right insofar as frivolous spending is concerned.

EBENREITER LUMBER CO.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Charleston Gazette, dated March 22, 1949. This editorial discussed the construction program by the Government of veterans' hospitals.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

The goofy way the Government does some things convinces every citizen that reorganization is not only highly desirable but absolutely necessary.

Recently it was discovered that 24 veterans' hospitals with a total of 16,000-bed capacity were due to be constructed while there was absolutely no need for them. President Truman and Administrator Carl Gray, of the Veterans' Administration, announced that the construction program would be canceled.

While this program was going ahead, there were a number of Army hospitals over the country for which there was absolutely no need and they were declared surplus and offered for sale to local governments, some of them, it was reported, for only $1. Also there were others in partial operation only because it was impossible to get doctors, nurses, and other attendants to operate them at full capacity.

The sad part of this story is the fact that all over the country there is an acute scarcity of civilian hospital facilities. In most places, notably Charleston, existing hospitals are crowded far above rated capacity. Veterans were getting hospitals they did not need or want while civilians were dying for lack of hospital accommodations. The millions of dollars wasted in building unnecessary hospitals for the veterans could have done inestimable good if spent through State, county, and municipal governments for civilian hospital extension.

Who was responsible for this foolish condition? No one and everyone, it seems. The principal fault lay in the fact that the United States Government's right hand does not always know what its left hand is doing. What private business would ever tolerate such a system?

Congress never has adopted any clear policy about free hospital service for veterans. It seems to have been a matter that was

loaded with trouble, and no Senator or Representative wants to get the veterans down on him.

No civilian begrudges the veterans hospitalization, but there are worthy and unworthy cases. Free hospitalization ought to be for veterans who are financially unable to get the care otherwise. But those who can pay ought to be compelled to do so. It is nice to get something for nothing from the Government, but no right-minded veteran wants to chisel off the Government, especially when he stops to think that he is one of the taxpayers who have to foot the cost.

One would think that there would be no objection anywhere to dropping the 24 veterans' hospitals construction when it was explained that they were absolutely unnecessary. But there were objections—loud and mighty howls. They came from businessmen in whose sections the hospitals were projected. These businessmen and some misguided veterans put the pressure on Congress to get the stop order rescinded and the Congressmen put up a howl, of course only to satisfy their constituents.

Anyone who has ever had any connection with the United States Government has seen waste going on all about him. The policy of politicians to get Government jobs for their constituents has so overloaded the pay rolls that workers often are standing on one another's toes. Because often there is not enough work to go around, duplication of effort has become commonplace. And often millions of dollars are thrown away on projects for which there is no need whatever, simply because some Congressman wants to show the folks back home that he is doing something for them.

Congress is getting a particularly intelligent blueprint for the reorganization of the Government business and the cutting out of waste. But it can be seen that its application would take some of the political power from the politicians. That is why we despair that the report will ever get beyond the "received and filed" stage.

Endorsement of Rankin's Record on Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN.

To JOHN E. RANKIN, *Mississippi, Member, Committee on Un-American Activities:*

By resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, in convention assembled at Milwaukee, Wis., this citation is authorized in recognition of your courageous leadership as a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities.

Your militant and fearless leadership in conducting investigations into un-American activities has disclosed startling subversion injurious to our form of government.

These disclosures have alerted many Americans to the danger of subversive groups and have awakened in the hearts of many a realization of the dangers confronting America.

Your contribution as a member of this committee has been of inestimable value to the United States of America for which the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, commends you highly.

Dated this 1st day of March 1949.

JOHN F. O'MELIA,
Department Commander, the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I had the pleasure of meeting a remarkable lady, Mrs. Paul d'Otrenge Seghers, of Sunnyhill Farm, Huntington, Long Island. Mrs. Seghers, a foreign-born American, organized the now famous I Am an American Day, and established the Helios Foundation.

Having spent her early life under oppressive regimes in Europe, she came to America with a great appreciation of the liberties and freedom which so many Americans unfortunately take for granted. She has made a magnificent contribution to our great country by the establishment of I Am an American Day, which is now observed in every community in the land.

In connection with my remarks, I am enclosing herewith an article from the famous publication, Editor and Publisher, which appeared sometime ago:

SHOP TALK AT THIRTY

(By Robert U. Brown)

Back in 1939, William Randolph Hearst launched through his many newspapers the "I Am an American Day" celebrations which have since grown into Nation-wide observaces through a 1940 act of Congress. In recording the efforts of the Hearst newspapers to popularize this event, Editor and Publisher reported July 1, 1944:

"In 1939, in the city of Wauwatosa, and county of Manitowoc, Wis., a 'citizenship day' was held in April at which 350 young folk born in 1918, took an oath of citizenship before the Chief Justice of the State in token of their twenty-first birthdays qualifying them to vote.

"Not content with supporting the local ceremonial in his Milwaukee newspapers and reporting it elsewhere, Mr. Hearst editorially advocated on June 4 that it be emulated by all American cities, and the publisher instructed his numerous papers to put their organizations and columns behind the idea.

"Accordingly, 'citizenship day' exercises took place June 25, 1939, in Hearst newspaper cities."

No one can detract from the credit due Mr. Hearst and his papers for putting the idea across.

However, it develops that others had similar ideas even before 1939.

In March 1938, Mrs. Paul d'Otrenge Seghers, of Sunnyhill Farm, Huntington, Long Island, organized the Helios Foundation. She is a native of Poland who had spent her childhood in oppression there and in Russia until the revolution. Aims of the foundation are to propagate and inculcate knowledge, understanding and love of America among Americans, in particular among those of foreign birth.

At the first foundation meeting it was decided to set 1 day a year apart for all Americans to rededicate themselves to the ideals of America and as far as we can determine the first "I Am an American Day" was held at Sunnyhill Farm, May 31, 1938.

At the tenth anniversary celebration last year, a stone memorial was erected on the spot of the first observation.

Senator Arthur Capper is now honorary chairman of the Helios Foundation. He succeeded Maurice Maeterlinck when he returned to Europe after the war.

Mrs. Seghers is proud of the idea she had 11 years ago but she pays tribute to Mr. Hearst and his newspapers "for their magnificent piece of work in popularizing the event."

"I think it would be most unfortunate to minimize the credit Mr. Hearst deserves," she told us.

We think so, too. We report it merely to give credit for a grand idea to a lady in Long Island, to the Wisconsin community for having a similar idea (perhaps others had the idea, also) and to the Hearst papers for popularizing an event which without their attention might still be local observances.

Dr. John J. Sippy: a Pioneer in Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1949, John J. Sippy, director of the San Joaquin local health district, passed to the Great Beyond.

Dr. Sippy was an unique character. In the early twenties, he came to Stockton, Calif., as the director of the San Joaquin local health district. This district had been organized pursuant to a California statute. The health district covered the entire county and took care of all public health activities within the county. From a purely administrative viewpoint, it was a remarkable type of organization. It eliminated the duplication of public health services by the cities and the county. It carried out one administrative public health policy for the entire county including each of the municipal corporations. It eliminated epidemics and made the people conscious of and informed on health problems.

The health district, however, was successful primarily because of the administrative genius of its director, John J. Sippy. He was the ideal administrator for such a project. He was a physician and surgeon. He knew how to administer the law and be firm without being arbitrary or oppressive. He knew how to clean up the tubercular herds among the dairy operators in the county without getting into interminable conflict. He knew how to make restaurants sanitary in the interest of public health without causing a revolution. He was a real administrator who had the knack of selecting good inspectors, nurses, and so forth, and training them to properly handle the public whose activities they were required to supervise and to do it in

such a way that they felt by making necessary changes in the interest of public health they were making a public contribution. He knew how to insure the people of his district against epidemics.

His work received national recognition. Scarcely a month passed during his incumbency in the office but what someone from various parts of the country and even from foreign countries came to inspect the district and learn from him how it was successfully operated. Some very complimentary things were said about his work. He could separate the flattery from the truth, but with it all, he never became afflicted with the phobia of greatness. He was modest. He was kindly. He was cooperative and he was devoted to his job. He was offered jobs with larger pay and perhaps greater responsibilities. However, he had become endeared to the community in which he pioneered in the field of public health, and I think he took great satisfaction in remaining there and seeing his plans and efforts flower into success and his usefulness and effectiveness increase from year to year.

Dr. Sippy was elected president of the League of California Cities, an honor seldom accorded one in administrative health work, but usually accorded to mayors, city managers, and so forth. This was a tribute to his genius as an administrator.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news story regarding Dr. Sippy and also an editorial, both from the Stockton Record of Stockton, Calif.:

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record of March 16, 1949]

DR. JOHN SIPPY SUCCUMBS TO LONG ILLNESS

Dr. John J. Sippy, 69, director of the San Joaquin local health district for 26 years and who retired from that post March 1, died in St. Joseph's Hospital last night at 11:10 o'clock.

Dr. Sippy had been ill for several months and at the time of his request for retirement was confined to his home at 19 East Pine.

Death was due to a heart condition brought on last year by an attack of virus pneumonia.

For the past 2 weeks Dr. Sippy has been in an oxygen tent.

PUBLIC HEALTH EXPERT

Generally recognized as an authority on executive and administrative matters connected with public health, Dr. Sippy was appointed director of the local health district in February 1923.

At that time, the health district idea was a new conception in health protection and he pioneered in this field.

Dr. Sippy came from a family of doctors. His father before him was a country doctor and Dr. Sippy was reared in Garden Plain, Kans. He graduated from St. Louis College of Physicians and Surgeons.

After his graduation he practiced medicine in Kansas several years.

Prior to his coming here Dr. Sippy was employed by the Montana Public Health Service.

VETERAN CAMPAIGNER

His tenure of office as director was marked by battles for better living conditions. He ran campaigns to raise funds so that operations could be performed on crippled children; he fought for a fresh air camp at Silver Lake and which is now the Stockton Municipal Camp, and he helped put over the Bret Harte Sanitarium for tuberculosis prevention at Murphy.

With these fights, the District's fame spread and doctors from all over the world have come here to study Dr. Sippy's methods.

Dr. Sippy is survived by his widow, Mrs. Grace Sippy, and two sisters—Mrs. Edna Brown, Topeka, Kans., and Mrs. Grove Bellinger, Wellington, Kans.

At Dr. Sippy's request, flowers are asked to be omitted. In memory of Dr. Sippy the San Joaquin local health district office at 130 S. American will be closed all day tomorrow as will branch offices in Lodi, Tracy, and Manteca, according to Dr. E. M. Bingham, who succeeded Dr. Sippy as director of the health district.

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record of March 17, 1949]

JOHN J. SIPPY—PIONEER IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Dr. John J. Sippy needs no biographer or editorial writer to ennoble after death the life which was so nobly lived. Not only did he live the Hippocratic oath of his profession, but also he exemplified the best qualities of public service expected of public officials.

World-wide personal fame came to the little physician who began and carried to success the experiment in public health which is the San Joaquin local health district. Yet Dr. Sippy never used acclaim for personal advantage. From his standpoint, the glory belonged as much to his associates in the health office and to the citizens who supported and benefited from the unique organizational set-up as to himself.

Thrice over was Dr. Sippy a pioneer in a field which still offers great opportunities in medical service, if not in remuneration. Back in a rough-and-ready, developing Kansas he was the foe of superstition, entrenched selfishness, and satisfaction with things as they were. Later, in Montana, he was on the front line of the dangerous fight against Rocky Mountain spotted fever—a fight in which several associates forfeited their lives; and in California he was the untiring instrument of enlightened legislation and epidemiological methods, many of which he originated or inspired.

Throughout his professional successes and despite the fame which knocked at the door of his office, Dr. Sippy remained the country doctor, humble and approachable, a man who wore easily a bedside sympathy and gentleness, whether at a desk or investigating a malodorous septic tank.

Never was Dr. Sippy adequately recompensed for his services on the basis of potential income from private practice or from public office elsewhere. Indeed, he refused on at least one occasion an offer of additional pay.

Yet in death as well as in life, Dr. Sippy might well be envied by many another man vastly more successful in terms of this world's goods, for Dr. Sippy's reward is reckoned in terms of deep and undying admiration, appreciation, and affection from the community which he served so well.

Resolutions of Wisconsin REA Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1949, the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative held its annual meeting at Madison, Wis., and adopted several significant resolutions relating to the organization's position with regard to Federal policy. The Wisconsin Electric Cooperative is a Statewide association of REA cooperatives representing 65,000 members of rural electric cooperatives in the State of Wisconsin. The adopted resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—LOAN FUNDS FOR REA

Almost one-third of the Nation's farmers are still without central station electric service, and there remains thousands of Wisconsin farmers without electricity in addition to more thousands of other rural residences and establishments.

Of those farmers and other members of rural electric cooperatives now receiving service, the great majority will require expanded facilities for generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy to adequately serve their rapidly increasing needs.

The orderly and economical development of rural electric cooperative systems requires long-range planning in order to save the waste of "too little" or "too late" in the way of preparing to meet coming needs.

Delivery of materials is still slow, requiring that orders be placed well in advance of anticipated use. Rural electric cooperatives must be able to back up their orders with loan authorizations from REA at the time of placement of the order, even though the actual expenditure of the purchase price will not be made until delivery later: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to authorize loan funds for the rural-electrification program sufficient to meet these needs adequately and fully, in the amount of not less than $450,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950.

RESOLUTION 2—ACQUISITION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

In many instances complete electric-service coverage for an area in which a rural electric cooperative is operating cannot be accomplished economically because of division of the territory with other power systems which are unwilling or unable to extend service on a complete area-coverage basis. Acquisition of these existing facilities by the cooperative would frequently permit it to complete coverage of the entire area, and in many instances would result in improved and lower-cost service to all consumers in the area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to amend the Rural Electrification Act to broaden the powers of the Administrator to make loans for the acquisition of existing facilities so that he would also be authorized to make loans in any case in which the following circumstances are found to exist:

(1) That the security of existing loans made by the Administrator would not be impaired;

(2) That the borrower will be benefited, either financially or by improved operating conditions;

(3) That the service to the acquired system will not be impaired;

(4) That the existing facilities are so located as to permit effective integration of the system to be acquired;

(5) That the sale is voluntary on the part of the seller.

RESOLUTION 3—EXTENDED REA LOAN AMORTIZATION PERIOD

Be it resolved, That in order to permit the extension of the rural electrification program to the more thinly populated areas of the country and in order to permit REA-financed systems to generate and transmit more power where it is found to be advisable, we urge the Congress to authorize the extension of the amortization period of REA loans from 35 to 50 years, and in the case of loans for hydroelectric facilities, to a longer period cor-

responding to the reasonable productive life of the property.

RESOLUTION 4—RIVER AND VALLEY DEVELOPMENT

A Nation-wide power-development program is necessary at once to meet present shortages and increasing demand: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we support early, unified development of all of America's river basins for the fullest possible production of economical hydroelectric power consistent with other programs.

RESOLUTION 5—ST. LAWRENCE AND MISSOURI RIVER PROJECTS

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is of vital necessity to the Nation from the standpoint of power needs, transportation, national defense, and economic development of the Great Lakes Basin. Its specific value to our members relates particularly to the increased income advantages that it would provide by making ocean-going transportation available at Wisconsin ports for our products.

The proposed Missouri Valley Authority project will particularly benefit rural electric cooperatives and residents in the area immediately to our west, but by reducing the electric power deficiency in the whole region will directly benefit our cooperative systems. Moreover, the completion of this project and the St. Lawrence power project will provide an opportunity for interconnections between power systems to establish an East-West power grid extending over a distance which would afford substantial advantages to people in areas outside of the immediate areas affected. East-West interconnections of such magnitude would permit substantial advantages to the participating systems by allowing power transfers from East to West and West to East to meet peak loads, the occurrence of which tends to follow the course of the sun. These peak loads at the easternmost extreme of this possible interconnected power grid occur 3 to 4 hours earlier in actual time than they do at the western end and at the eastern end have terminated well before they begin further west: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we particularly urge upon our Representatives and Senators in Congress that they vigorously support in every possible way the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the Missouri Valley Authority project, and that these projects be quickly approved by Congress and promptly gotten underway.

RESOLUTION 6—RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Only about one-half of Wisconsin's farmers have telephone service of any kind at the present time. Many of the half who have telephones do not have adequate telephone service. There are few people whose need, from the standpoints of safety to property and health, and of convenience to business operations and home life, is greater than that of rural people. In some areas of the State, particularly in the North, there is practically no rural telephone service at all: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to speedily enact legislation to enable REA to lend funds to finance the extension and improvement of rural telephone service, and appropriate sufficient funds for this purpose to permit all those who wish to avail themselves of this opportunity to do so providing it can be done with reasonable assurance of self-liquidation of any loans made for this purpose; be it further

Resolved, That we support the development by cooperatives of rural telephone service to the fullest practical extent, whether by existing rural electric cooperatives or by new or existing cooperatives operating primarily or exclusively in the field of telephone service, in order to assure rural people of the advantage of democratic direction and control and nonprofit service; be it further

Resolved, That we direct the board of directors of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative to investigate the possibilities of assisting rural telephone cooperatives by extending to them the service facilities of WEC on a nonprofit, service-at-cost basis, and of developing any new services that would be of practical value to such rural telephone cooperatives, and of extending to such rural telephone cooperatives the opportunity to become members of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative; be it further

Resolved, That if practical means can be found to extend our services to such rural telephone cooperatives, and to admit them to full membership in Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, the board of directors of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative is hereby instructed to take all practical steps necessary to acomplish those purposes.

RESOLUTION 7—FPC SURVEY OF POTENTIAL HYDRO POWER

Be it resolved, That we urge the Federal Power Commission to undertake and complete without unnecessary delay a survey of undeveloped hydroelectric power potentialities in the region which includes Wisconsin.

RESOLUTION 8—FARM ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH

Electricity furnishes a new type of energy to agriculture, the full potentialities of which are not as yet scarcely realized, much less developed. It is known that there are many potential productive farm applications of electricity as a source of light, heat and power. Additional research is urgently needed to determine the possibilities of using electricity to reduce labor, improve productive efficiencies, minimize plant and animal losses due to insect pests and disease, improve facilities for processing, handling, and marketing of farm products, and to meet the electrical needs of the farm household. Moreover, there is a great need for the establishment of a research program for the study and investigation of the technical problems of rural power system design, construction, and operation; the evaluation of consumer and power system equipment performance; the development and study of new and improved power system, farm and home equipment; the study of power system loads; and related research activities, in order to insure that rural power consumers will be provided with reliable and economical electric service and be able to utilize it fully and efficiently: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request Congress to make available to the Farm Electrification Division of the Agricultural Research Administration and to the Rural Electrification Administration the sum of not less than $500,000 per year for research and study on the applications of electricity to broad agricultural usage, and on the technical problems of rural power systems; be it further

Resolved, That we request that the University of Wisconsin expand and intensify its research activities into the fields of practical farm and home applications of electric power and evaluation of equipment performance, and that this be done strictly on a tax-supported basis without special grants from persons or groups who may have interests opposing or conflicting with those of consumers of electricity.

RESOLUTION 15—FULL PARITY OF FARM INCOME

Throughout history, agriculture has been the first section of the economy to suffer from disastrous deflationary declines in economic activity and price levels. Following the First World War, farmers suffered a depression lasting throughout most of the twenties and up to the initiation and establishment of a comprehensive Federal farm program. At the present time, farm-purchasing power is again declining at a substantially faster rate than farm costs. A continued decline in the relative income levels of farmers would be disastrous in terms of the human welfare of rural people, and would be equally disastrous to the economic stability, or even the survival, of our rural electric cooperatives as business operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we earnestly support measures to establish a Federal farm program which will insure full parity of income to family-type farmers in relation to other groups in society.

RESOLUTION 18—GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

According to studies of the Federal Power Commission, all regions of the United States are short of generating capacity to meet the needs of expanding demands for electric power. In Wisconsin almost every single rural electric cooperative has felt the pinch of inadequate power supply, and during the past year we have witnessed brown-outs and threatened curtailment of electric service due to inadequate generating capacity throughout the State. The amount of reserve power-production capacity in the United States has decreased from 52 percent in 1925 to less than 5 percent in 1948. It is generally recognized in the electric-power industry that 15 percent is the minimum reserve for safe operation. Although commercial utility companies are now taking some steps to increase their power capacity, past experience has demonstrated that the statements of the leaders of these companies on the question of power production capacity have all too frequently failed to be in accord with the actual needs of the public for power production. The present dangerous shortage of power was frequently and categorically denied by these same leaders of commercial power companies, who ridiculed those who reported the inadequacy of power-generation capacity and predicted impairment of service to consumers. If rural electric consumers are to be safeguarded with respect to their future supply of electric power, it is imperative that they look more and more to their own facilities for furnishing that power. Up to the present time Rural Electrification Administration has followed a policy of making loans for generation and transmission facilities in only limited cases, with the result that only about 6 percent of all loans made by the Administration have been to finance generation and transmission facilities. If REA cooperatives are to be assured of an adequate supply of power for the future, the percentage of REA loans allocated for generator and transmission facilities will have to be substantially increased.

RESOLUTION 19—ELIMINATION OF 30-DAY NOTICE REQUIREMENT IN GENERATION LOANS

Be it resolved, That we urge Congress to amend the Rural Electrification Act by deleting therefrom the existing requirement that the Administrator notify the Senate Banking Committee at least 30 days prior to the granting of any loan to finance the construction of generation facilities. This requirement was not in the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, but was added at the urging of opponents of the rural electrification program as a means of hampering and delaying the granting of generation loans. The act without this requirement gives adequate protection to the public, and the only purpose served by this requirement is the unnecessary delay in the granting of generation loans. In this time of critical shortage of power, unnecessary delays are expensive and tend to jeopardize the timely construction of sorely needed facilities. This 30-day notice requirement is inconsistent with the underlying purposes of the act and should be deleted.

Veteran Patients in California State Mental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter dated March 25, 1949, from the director of the Department of Mental Hygiene of the State of California.

I was connected for many years with the State of California as an assemblyman and as real-estate commissioner and had an opportunity to know the overcrowded condition of the State mental institutions. Over 2,000 veterans are now in these institutions when they should be in Federal hospitals, receiving the treatment to which they are entitled.

The letter follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE,
Sacramento, March 25, 1949.

Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As I told you in my wire of a few days ago, the number of veteran patients in California State mental hospitals is becoming an ever-increasing problem, and these veterans account for the major portion of the present overcrowded condition of these institutions.

You are, from past experience, close study, and visits to our hospitals, aware of the overcrowded situation, and I should like to show you how the veterans affect this situation. We have presently in our institutions in excess of 2,000 veterans of all classes. Additionally, we are receiving veterans into our hospitals at a rate in excess of 100 a month, and if past experience is any criterion this influx will increase rather than decrease. Of the 2,000 veterans there are perhaps, though at the moment exact statistics are not available, approximately 500 veterans who, for one reason or another, are not eligible for treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility. The remaining 1,500 are, however, veterans with service-connected disabilities, or non-service-connected disabilities. These veterans, as you know, under the provisions of Executive order, veterans' regulation No. 6 (a), have the right to hospitalization in a veterans' facility if there is room for them. Our file is replete with statements from the Veterans' Administration that there is no room for them.

Now, I should like to show you what relationship these 1,500 veterans have to our situation of overcrowding. As of February 28, 1949, we had in our hospitals an excess of population over capacity of 4,056 patients; of these 1,693 are male patients and 2,363 are female patients. The 1,500 veterans, barring perhaps two or three, are male patients, and from that we may therefore conclude that 88.6 percent of our overcrowded condition, with respect to male condition, is due to the present of these veterans in our State hospitals, and of our total overcrowded conditions these veterans constitute 36.9 percent of the entire picture.

I sincerely trust that this information will be helpful in obtaining not only a continuance of the Veterans' Administration building program in California, but a step-up of that program that will enable the Veterans' Administration to acquire, as temporary facilities pending the construction of permanent quarters, the military hospitals declared surplus and now being disposed of by the War Assets Administration.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,
DORA SHAW HEFFNER,
Director.
By CARL E. APPLEGATE,
Deputy Director.

Russia Winning Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jim Carroll, from the Washington Daily News of April 5, 1949:

RUSSIA WINNING COLD WAR
(By Jim Carroll)

Here are the reasons why William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, is supporting the movement to form a federal union of the world's democracies.

First of all, he contends Russia is winning the cold war.

Mr. Clayton believes the Atlantic Pact is an important step in the right direction but that it does not go far enough.

Ex-Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, former War Secretary Robert Patterson, Mr. Clayton, and others recently announced formation of the Committee for Atlantic Union.

Mr. Clayton was chief of the United States delegation which negotiated the British loan. He also took a prominent part in the initial stages of organization of the Marshall plan, particularly in Europe, and was chief of the United States delegation which negotiated the Habana charter for an international trade organization.

Mr. Clayton issued this statement:

"Soviet Russia has split the world into two parts—the Communist world and the free world. Sooner or later every country will find itself in one or the other camp.

"The Communists are organized as one.

"The free world is divided into separate sovereignties, but in certain limited respects it must also organize as one if it would remain free.

"There is only one effective way of doing this and that is by federal union, just as the Thirteen American Colonies formed a Federal Union in 1787.

"As a minimum, the union should have the power to maintain armed forces, conduct foreign relations, regulate currency and regulate commerce between its members and with nonmember nations. Its powers would be as great or as small as its citizens decided. I would expect that the delegation of powers to the union would be explicit and limited.

"Only those who stick their heads in the sand fail to see that Soviet Russia is out to communize the world.

"Soviet Russia intends to destroy the Christian religion because it is the foundation of the home, of freedom, of democracy, of representative government, of the dignity of the individual and of private property.

"The Kremlin despises such things.

"Wherever communism enters, freedom, hope, the dignity and security of the individual, the joy of living—all depart.

"Most men who have lived in a free society would rather die than surrender these precious God-given rights.

"But in spite of general knowledge that communism enslaves the individual, it still is catching on in the world. It bores from within; it promises all; it feeds on hunger and cold; it thrives on frustration and hopelessness, born of economic misery. And there is too much misery in the world today. A way must be found to open up a better life to hundreds of millions of people, or communism may sweep the world.

"To help in only one small sector of the world, the United States continues to pour billions into Europe.

"Meantime, the cost of readying our armed services for world war III mounts steadily and ominously. Soon we shall be lend-leasing war materials to member governments of the Atlantic Pact.

"This total burden will get too heavy even for our strong back.

"But if we lay it down, economic conditions in Europe will deteriorate to the point where the seeds of communism will commence to sprout again.

"Russia is winning the cold war.

"Who, knowing the objectives of the cold war, can doubt this?

"Soviet Russia has two principal objectives in the cold war. One is to frighten democratic governments into excessive expenditures for defense; the other is to frighten private capital and initiative so that it will not operate freely.

"If both objectives can be achieved, economic disintegration will eventually ensue.

"Economic disintegration is usually followed by political disintegration.

"In a very real sense, therefore, the democracies are playing the Russian game.

"If we go on fighting this cold war in the way we are now fighting it, one of two things must happen: Either we will get into a shooting war, which we would win but which might end civilization for centuries to come, or we will run into another colossal economic 'bust' as a result of inflation brought on by the cost of the cold war.

"Russia is counting on the latter to happen.

"The question which will naturally occur to everyone is: 'How will your proposed Union lighten the burden and enable us to avoid both a shooting war and an economic bust?'

"The answer to this question, I believe, is as follows:

"Federal union of the democracies will greatly reduce the danger of a third world war, and the cost of defense measures.

"Federal union would bring the armed forces of all its members under one command, with bases wherever needed. Enormous savings would result. Take the combined navies of the democracies, for example. When brought into one navy, it would have 90 percent of the naval strength of the world.

"I am for the Atlantic Pact, as an important first step, but it doesn't go far enough. History proves that alliances do not prevent—they merely postpone—wars.

"Fear of war, and fear of the integrity of certain European currencies, is freezing literally billions of private capital, and immobilizing the creative genius and activity of its owners.

"Federal union would largely dissipate this fear, and release this money and brains for the vital task of European recovery, modernization, and development.

"Because this money and brains is in hiding while the war clouds hang so low, governments have been compelled to undertake a very large part of the job of recovery. But if recovery is to be complete, with western Europe restored to a condition of financial independence and a decent standard of liv-

ing, the job must be done largely by private enterprise. Government cannot do it.

"Private enterprise will operate again in Europe only when there is peace and when confidence in currencies is restored.

"Today, there is neither.

"Federal Union would bring peace.

"There would be only one currency in the Union and it would be the strongest in the world.

"The Union could have no dollar shortage.

"The shortage in production which causes the dollar shortage would quickly disappear with the release of frozen capital and private initiative.

"Soviet Russia couldn't get anywhere in a cold war—or a hot war either—without her satellites.

"In nearly every case the satellite governments are dominated by Communist minorities—15 percent or so of the Czechoslovakian people, 25 percent at best of the Poles, for example.

"A Federal Union of the democracies would be so powerful, prosperous, and free that the pull on these satellite states lying in between would be so much greater from the West than from the East that in time Soviet Russia would surely lose them—and her drive for world conquest would end in failure and without world war III."

Amendment of Displaced Persons Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Genera' Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing Congress to make certain changes in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, so-called

Whereas the present Federal law, known as the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, allowing the admission into the United States of certain displaced persons, is manifestly discriminatory against members of the Catholic and the Jewish faiths; and

Whereas said law discriminates against persons because of their land of origin, religion, and occupations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts strongly urges the Congress of the United States and the leaders therein of the Democratic and Republican Parties to lend their strongest efforts for the enactment of legislation to end such discrimination and to liberalize said law by removing therefrom in the definition of "eligible displaced person" the restrictive admittance date of December 22, 1945, and by removing the preference granted to those eligible displaced persons who have previously been engaged in agricultural pursuits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 10, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 16, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of March 18, 1949:

STEEL PRODUCTION

Steadily increasing steel production in the United States, now meeting a lessening demand in numerous lines, presages a balance in practically all steel requirements sometime after the middle of 1949. This situation becomes the more interesting in the light of President Truman's controversial demand for powers to permit Federal entrance into certain basic businesses where private enterprise does not, in the Government's opinion, provide production equal to demand. He suggested the steel industry in particular.

The much-criticized American steel industry in 1948 made 52 percent of the total world production of steel and the Soviet Union, next biggest producer to the United States, accounted for but 25 percent of the world total. American steel production, in 10 years and in spite of wartime restrictions on expansion, increased 16 percent. Postwar demands for steel, additionally, sharply curtailed the steel available to plough back into expansion of facilities since, when it takes 25 percent of a given amount of new production merely to produce the facilities to turn out that production, it was difficult to allocate steel for new production when consumers were clamoring for all the raw steel that could be turned out from existing production.

The looming balance between supply and demand in steel, and the very definite possibility that supply may ere long exceed demand, takes the wind out of the administration's demands for Federal intervention into the steel business on the ground that private enterprise did not produce enough steel. Actually, in the immediate postwar years, few productive enterprises in any field were able immediately, or even in 2 or 3 years, to overcome the immense backlog of consumer demand dammed up by the years of production primarily for war purposes.

It must have been all along quite evident to the Government interventionists that the shortages in steel, or any other field where supply was short of demand, were the fault of no one in particular and were, instead, the natural and inevitable byproduct of a national productive system geared to fighting a major war. Moreover, the comparative speed with which American industry has erased so many of the postwar shortages has been little appreciated in Washington. Instead, it appears that these inevitable shortages have been used as an excuse for proposals to put Government in the steel or other major industries.

Governments in steel, and other enterprises, exist for comparisons all over the world and their performance records are unimpressive viewed beside those of the American heavy industries. The threat of Federal intervention, posed by the President, hangs over the American steel industry now and it is certain that nothing could be more calculated to discourage it and to dry up its drive for continuing expansion than the threat of Government competition financed by the United States Treasury.

Perhaps such discouragement is what the Federal interventionists seek, since nothing else, neither war nor depression nor postwar inflation, has succeeded in keeping the American steel industry from producing more and better and cheaper steel than any other in the world.

It would be an alarming thing indeed if the threat of nationalization, with all the ugly undertones that this connotes, could achieve what the great challenges of war and peace have not been able to do, namely to throw American heavy industry off base and give the administration socialists the excuse they appear to seek.

A hopeful sign therefore lies in the developments of the past months as industry again shows signs of winning the great postwar supply battle and another hopeful sign lies in the quiet that prevails in the administration ranks on the matter of taking over basic industry.

When You Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD, I am including further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on Federal expenditures:

WINONA, MINN.

Quite recently a minister in one of our churches in Winona said in part that there are far too many irresponsible people in that they want things given to them without working and without taking on responsibility in making any personal effort toward receiving benefits. These irresponsible voters might very well include the apathetic voters who oppose what is offered, but don't do anything about it.

THE WINONA KNITTING MILLS, INC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

An individual in financial trouble is declared bankrupt by a higher authority such as a court, but who is to declare our Federal Government bankrupt? I don't know, unless it would be the Congress and I don't suppose they ever will. I do feel that Congress should realize that we cannot continue deficit spending indefinitely and should make it their duty to whittle the debt.

W. S. JACOBSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Our Government's expenditure at the present time is so large that the only way they will ever be able to pay it back is by inflation. To me this means that the savings which I hope to enjoy in a few years may have only a fraction of their present value.

O. F. MASIN,
Manufacturers' Representative.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The writer believes firmly that the pioneering instinct that made America the most powerful and wealthiest nation on earth is gradually being eliminated in the generation that is coming along now and our grandchildren definitely will have the entire perspective upside down if they continue as they are going today.

Nowhere have we heard anything mentioned regarding the fact that we must save.

It is perfectly true through the centuries that the costliest thing that the average human being gets is something he thinks is for nothing at the expense of the Government.

LOCKWOVEN CO.

RALEIGH, N. C.

May I express an opinion of my own and that of others in this State whom I serve.

The Federal Government is providing so many matching funds that the States and counties are strained to the breaking point. Local governmental units have been forced to raise taxes to provide the most needed public improvements and now the support of four governmental units—the cities, counties, State, and Federal—are most burdensome to our economy.

It seems to me that we could forego any more public works and social reforms, for the time being, until our huge national debt is curtailed and our national strength against a foreign foe is made secure. The liberal distribution of free money is encouraging indolence, idleness and dependence.

It is my candid opinion that if we extend our public work and social legislation at this, the most prosperous, period in the Nation's history, we will be weakening our domestic economy to such an extent that this Nation will be helpless in case of foreign aggression. Small businesses cannot withstand further taxes.

SENATOR LEE B. WEATHERS, *Chairman.*

DULUTH, MINN.

You can be very sure that many of us out here throughout the United States are definitely counting on you to reduce appropriations this year. Don't fail us.

THE KLEARFLAX LINEN LOOMS, INC.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Speaking for myself, as well as many others in this area, it is a source of considerable dismay to realize that in most cases the principles of thrift and individual effort which have resulted in this country's dominant position have largely been forsaken in favor of a policy of spending, the return from which can be only a weakening of our inherent strength.

I do not desire to indicate disapproval of projects which are connected with defense or other generally recognized fundamental areas of government expenditures. I do mean to refer to unreasonable tampering with normal price relationships, unnecessary public works, and, most important of all, the maintenance of ridiculous bureaucratic structures. Regarding the latter, I realize that your committee is not primarily concerned with legislation resulting from the recommendations of the Hoover commission. However, any efforts your committee can direct towards the support of this report will be in fundamental accord with general views on the size of Federal budgets. I might also add that in my opinion the carrying out of this commission's recommendations should be the starting point of any program of Federal budget reduction.

Reducing appropriations for the Federal Government is the key to our entire current situation. If the supply of spending money can be reduced, a start will be made on reducing the Federal Government to its designed size and other things can be taken care of in due time.

EDGAR E. BROSIUS CO., INC.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

We have given considerable thought to items included in the proposed Federal budget for the fiscal year 1950. This is no time to burden the taxpayers, and particularly manufacturers, with added taxes to finance unnecessary programs.

NEWMAN BROS., INC.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It is about time that our legislative body thought of the Nation above all else. It is about time that this body attempted to conduct the Nation's business on a sound economic basis. It is about time that all the Members of this legislative body put the true welfare of the Nation above all individual interests. It is about time that the Government expenditures be fitted to a budget that will require taxes that will still foster individual initiative and ambition, instead of a budget that requires taxation that throttles these things, discourages the type of young men that built this country into the wonderful Nation that it is.

SAMUEL K. MACDONALD,
Manufacturers' Representative.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Along with millions of other Americans I am worried over the future of our country and feel that we cannot keep on spending without eventually facing a serious depression which will wipe out the savings of that large class of people who want nothing from the Government except good government without waste.

TECHNICAL REPRESENTATION.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

After all the Government is merely a collection of individuals and the individuals are the people who, in the final analysis, furnish the money. An individual can't go on indefinitely spending more money than he makes and a government can't do it either for any length of time.

C. K. ALEXANDER.

ST. LOUIS, U. S. A.

As a businessman who naturally is directly affected by the tax situation and who also understands probably more clearly and forcibly than the average citizen that there is a limit to the amount of unproductive expense that even this wonderful productive country of ours can stand, it is indeed exhilarating to know that seemingly the tide is finally turning and that our representatives see the wisdom of economizing. I know that I am speaking for many, many people like myself who would like to see an end to so much of this unnecessary, wasteful spending, and only by so doing can we keep our country in a healthy condition.

MILBRADT MANUFACTURING CO.

NORTH BERGEN, N. J.

It is about time some of the men in Congress were willing to stand up and take a stand for the good of the country, and I am quite sure that if they do there will be many reductions in the cost of our Federal Government. The cost of Government is the point to start reducing expenses. When this is done the economy in other departments will follow.

UNIQUE METAL NOVELTY
MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

No sound thinking businessman would go on and on increasing his business debts, and good management cuts its expenses whenever necessary to balance its budget.

Surely there must be some good businessmen handling our Government affairs. The public wonders who they are.

MONARCH LAUNDRIES, INC.

STEELTON, PA.

It seems inconceivable to think of the national budget still being in the amount of forty some billions in peace times even considering the ERP program.

I feel there are ample places to cut expenditures and stop new expenditures.

GEO. W. WEAVER & SON.

FLINT, MICH.

There are millions of Americans like me who stand and believe that the key to the whole present situation is in reduction of appropriations for the Federal Government.

YELLOW AND CHECKER CAB CO.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Everywhere I go I encounter instances of reduced business volume. There are plenty of things the people need, but present prices seem to be too high. One of the major items of expense in operating any business, whether it be manufacturing, distribution, or what have you, is its tax business. Tax costs for most businesses have gone up at a much more rapid rate than almost any other item of expense. That portion which is due to the war is necessary expense, in spite of all the waste that war brings. All the more reason, therefore, for economy in the remaining expenditures, as every careful businessman today is endeavoring to trim his costs; and the Federal Government must also consider this same situation. The safety of our future is absolutely dependent on this being done.

AETNA PLYWOOD & VENEER CO.

DETROIT, MICH.

By cutting the budget appropriations by 50 percent your committee would perform the greatest service to our country in its history.

VULCAN IRON & WIRE WORKS.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

We are overspending ourselves to the point where we will be on the brink of ruin unless we call a halt and make a check of our position to find just where we are heading.

It is an easy matter to pass bills, appropriating large sums of money for this, that, and some other apparent worthy cause. But, at the same time, it is another thing to understand from where the money is coming, and whether the economy of the country will stand it.

This country cannot stand this constant increase in spending, and now is the time to put an end to it; in fact, this would be a good time to start housecleaning, with a view of eliminating all of the unnecessary bureaus now in the Government and reducing Government spending drastically.

There is considerable complaint about the present taxation—people being taxed not only by the Federal and State governments on their income, but on everything they buy, to the point that people are not enjoying a real freedom. Many of them really are in slavery, because the amount of money that they receive is insufficient for them to live, and they merely exist.

The costs of materials have been running ahead of the increases in incomes in many instances, and consequently the tax burden put on these people, plus the tax burden placed on manufacturers, which in some measure is responsible for these costs, is assuming such proportions as to be alarming.

STEELCOTE MANUFACTURING CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

The greatest danger the world faces today is that the economy of our Nation be irreparably damaged by senseless schemes for spending the taxpayers' money. If our country is made weak, the cause of freedom the world over will lose its greatest champion.

PARK CHAMBERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

I firmly believe that if you remove all the padding and stuffing, you can obtain a really streamlined appropriation suit that will fit us admirably in these uncertain times.

R. CRAM & CO.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

The welfare of all of the people is at stake, and their welfare should be considered before that of special privilege groups. This country is on the verge of an economic breakdown and a depression with far-reaching results.

The only thing that can save us is the reduction of Federal appropriations to a reasonable amount. The budget should be reduced as much as possible. The economies suggested by President Hoover's Commission on Reorganization should be adopted and put into effect.

SCHWULST LUMBER & COAL CO.

PELLA, IOWA.

Frankly, the enormous public debt and the spendthrift attitude of Congress has been of much concern to me. Unless we bring spending under control, the Nation faces bankruptcy.

ROLSCREEN CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Push them off the "gravy train," and reduce Federal spending.

KELLEY HEATING & PIPING CO.

LANSING, MICH.

Every businessman at this moment knows the era of high profits is over and is plenty concerned about what reduced sales are going to do to his budget and profit possibilities. It is high time that Congress realizes that expenses must be cut and that debts must be paid or bankruptcy is liable to be the result, whether in government, business, or personal levels.

THE DUDLEY PAPER CO.

BURLINGTON, N. C.

Certainly I think and feel that it is time we stopped and took stock of what is happening before we have gone too far in the "wild orgy of spending."

THE FOGLEMAN-JEFFERIES CORP.

ELKHART, IND.

If there ever was a time when our country needs to be strong financially it is now in the face of world conditions as they are today, but we cannot be strong if we keep on spending and spending.

ELKHART LUMBER & SAWMILL CO., INC.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

This country is wonderful as it is, and, with all the resources it has, it is no different, in the final analysis, from an individual with great resources. Such an individual can go broke.

And, at the rate we are going, just as sure as God has been wonderful to this country, it won't be long before we will be in that situation.

J. V. PILCHER MANUFACTURING CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Many of us have wondered for years how long the Government could continue spending and going deeper and deeper into debt.

GARDNER DISPLAY CO.

PENSACOLA, FLA.

Recently I had some extra business offered me which would require more money, more men, and materials.

If the venture does not prove profitable I stand to lose money, but if it makes money then the Government through its extravagance will take most of the profits.

It begins to look like it is "Heads I win and tails you lose."

OWSLEY LUMBER CO.

ALTON, ILL.

I have been preaching economy in my own little way for several years. It is very plain to me that if an individual or a Government continues to spend and spend, they will some day encounter a condition that they cannot surmount.

I hope you will be successful in doing something about reducing the Government waste and, thereby, reduce expenses.

SPRINGMAN LUMBER CO.

SUSSEX, WIS.

I recently sat in on a Rotary Club meeting at which a business economist spoke and after he got through he asked the 78 men who were at this meeting whether any of them would go into business again if they had the choice to make. Nearly all of them were businessmen who had been in for 15 or more years; only two out of the 78 indicated that they would start up a new business if they were free to make such a choice. This is a good indication of how business feels about regulations, high taxes, and the "two strikes" that business has from government.

In this week's United States News you have on the front cover an important formula for the amount of weeks people work for the Government; the man who has a $5,000 income works 28 days to pay his taxes; the man who earns $25,000 a year works 52 days to pay his taxes; the man who earns $100,000 works 104 days to pay his taxes.

You just don't build up a strong nation with this sort of a situation and were it not for the war impetus we should feel this situation much more keenly.

MAMMOTH SPRING CANNING CO.

HONEOYE FALLS, N. Y.

The Russians and Communists are looking for us to overspend ourselves and we are about to do that very thing.

I cannot run my business that way and neither can the Government.

ROSCOE S. TOMKINSON.

SHAMOKIN, PA.

I sign nearly 800 pay checks every pay day in our business and when I look at some of the tax deductions, I cannot help but think of the danger this country is in by this vast expenditure of public funds.

SHROYERS, INC.,
Manufacturer of Dresses.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.

Our country is in a very dangerous condition. Our taxation has reached the point of diminishing returns.

This program of more and more taxation and more and more spending can only result in ruin and national bankruptcy. The tendency seems to be for more and more radical spending for unnecessary purposes.

This is more than a political question. It is a question of survival.

ERB-KIDDER CO.

North Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include herein my remarks on the North Atlantic treaty. They are as follows:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY—INSURANCE AGAINST AMBUSH

The boldest step in American foreign policy since 1823, when the Monroe Doctrine warned that no European power could seize territory or set up a government on the American continent, is the North Atlantic treaty which was signed early this week.

On the principle that in unity there is strength we are giving due notice that any attack will be met with collective resistance. In this way we hope to deter any aggressive moves before they start. Although no one nation is singled out as a possible aggressor, the pact stems from the expansionist activities of Soviet Russia and is intended to place a roadblock on the path of Communist imperialism.

The principal parties to this defense alliance are Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Norway. Italy, Portugal, Denmark, and Iceland are also, or will be, included.

The pact is considered as insurance to prevent or postpone war. The life of the treaty is to be for 20 years, but it will be reviewed and renewed in 1959 to allow for possible readjustments in the international situation at that time.

This is permissible under the terms of the United Nations. It is justified because of Russia's consistent veto of United Nations proposals. It constitutes in effect the development of a new League of Nations without Russia and her silent partners. From this beginning it will grow as a Western Hemisphere alliance and a Mediterranean alliance are formed and are joined to the pact.

By this the United States is reversing its historic position and is turning its back on a policy of attempted neutrality that failed to work. The center of gravity has shifted to the United States. We are assuming a position of leadership befitting our present responsibility and all the burdens that go with it. This decision did not come easily. It was forced on us by the bitter experience of two wars and the realistic recognition that hoping for peace does not preserve the peace.

We are determined that we shall not fall victim again to the policy of divide and conquer.

Remember August 2, 1914? We thought that Europe's business was no concern of ours. Two years and 247 days later we were in.

Another fateful date was September 3, 1939. Again, we turned our eyes the other way, but 2 years and 97 days later we were drawn in. And when we came in, Hitler had conquered most of the continent of Europe by knocking off the democracies like so many clay pigeons one by one. If we had learned our lesson from World War I and had supported the League of Nations and had let Hitler know that we would support democracy against aggression, he would not have invited collective retaliation.

On January 20 of this year, in his inaugural address, President Truman said—and I quote: "If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our nation's security would be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack might never occur."

At last we have learned that the United States is not located on another planet, but is part and parcel of this shrinking world where planes can circle the world without stopping and where rocket missiles could—within our time—be fired from one continent in attack upon another continent. The day when we regarded oceans as a natural and insurmountable barrier to attack is gone. Europe is now our next-door neighbor, and we've got to face up to this reality. For our own sake, we cannot permit any bandit to terrorize the world community, to liquidate our friends, and make himself strong with their resources in preparation for that final assault when we might stand alone.

To eliminate this possibility we became prime movers in the effort to establish a system of collective security through the United

Nations organization. We still believe that given time it will mature into an effective instrument for preserving law and order in this world.

As of the moment, however, the plain truth is that the UN is not able to cope with the situation. Under one pretext or another, Russia has absorbed the nations of eastern Europe. By a cynical and indiscriminate use of the veto, the Communists have blocked every effort to solve differences. Events have moved faster than the ability of the UN to deal with them, bringing the world to a tense and dangerous pass which we cannot ignore. To save the situation from degenerating into chaos, we have been obliged to seek a new approach to the problem of world security. We are, as it were, trying to form a new and workable league of nations within the structure of the UN.

As the only nation possessing that fearful weapon called the atomic bomb, we generously offered to surrender our monopoly and share the know-how of developing atomic energy for the arts of peace with all nations. To this offer we attached one reasonable condition: to guarantee security for all. That condition provided for an inspection system, administered under UN authority, and applicable to all countries to make certain that such knowledge would never be used for aggressive purposes. Was there anything one-sided in such an offer? Certainly not. Yet, Russia refused to go along with it. We are led to suspect from this that she wants an unfettered hand for the time when she will have the bomb to use as she sees fit in defiance of the world community.

To protect those nations which are searching for a method to protect the peace and to salvage those constructive possibilities within the UN which have been sabotaged by the Russian vetoes we have made a fresh beginning.

Piece by piece the mosaic assumes form and substance. Within the institution which free nations are building is a cooperative spirit which is its main strength. It is forced by the necessity of self-preservation, but it also contains the elements of fair play and of reasonable compromise upon which any future system of international morality must rely if it is to succeed.

Here is the timetable of events.

Remember the Russian pressure on Iran and the Communist-supported rebellion in Greece? We established the Truman doctrine by giving help to Greece and Turkey to enable them to withstand Russian blackmail. Under the Monroe Doctrine we discouraged foreign powers from attempting to gain that foothold on this continent that might endanger our young Nation. By the Truman Doctrine we recognized the fact that a threat to any nation is a threat to all. It was obvious that the democracies of the west, weakened by war, could offer no resistance to Russia if she decided to sweep to the English Channel. But the Communists preferred an easier way. By boring from within and playing upon fear and poverty and despair they thought they could undermine existing governments.

The first mistake the Communists made was in overthrowing the Government of Czechoslovakia by minority infiltration. From within this democracy patterned after the United States, which was now a Communist prison, Jan Masaryk took his own life as a means of warning the world of the creeping peril. This tragic gesture did succeed in shocking us out of our innocence. The cold war was on.

When the Marshall plan went before Congress this time last year it was called a calculated risk in the effort to prevent poverty, starvation, and political chaos from playing Russia's game in western Europe.

In this counteroffensive the Marshall plan is slowly winning the fight against aggression on the economic front. It was felt that France held the key to recovery on the Continent, and that the success or failure of the Marshall plan in that country would determine the swing of the pendulum for all Europe. We can now say that high hopes for the recovery of France are justified. The effectiveness of the coalition government, aided in no small measure by its realistic and courageous cooperation, is bearing fruit. The success of the recent internal loan and the drop of the black-market rate of the franc prove that France is regaining her strength.

Another mistake of communism was to order its stooges in various nations to declare that they would betray their own countries and support Russia in the event of a conflict. Far from intimidating the governments of the respective countries, it had the opposite effect. The mask was off. People recognized the Communists not as one of several political parties within the framework of an individual country but as the agent and tool of Russian imperialism, and they took steps to defend themselves against this treason. Where there was division, there is now unity. To economic improvement has been added the vital quality of morale.

Taking heart, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, on March 17, 1948, at Brussels, formed a western European union, called the Brussels Pact. Its purpose was to broaden the security system and to define the obligation of its members against attack from the east.

Three months later, on June 11, 1948, the United States Senate gave its blessing to the idea that this country should take part in a defense set-up which should be an extension of the Brussels Pact.

It is hoped that this will put a dead stop to Russia's strategy of swallowing up nations one by one.

How? By pledges of mutual assistance backed up by military plans and military strength.

The North Atlantic Treaty takes in almost all the North American Continent, the Atlantic Ocean and the islands in it, Europe's western areas; part of north Africa, the northeastern Mediterranean shore, and occupied territory including the Allied sectors of Berlin.

This is the answer to Russia's veto in the United Nations and her opposition to the unification of Europe. Russia has blocked efforts to form an international army under the United Nations and in so doing has obstructed the development of an effective world organization to prevent war. Now the nations of the Atlantic alliance are building such a police force whether Russia likes it or not.

Soviet attack upon any member, or even upon the Berlin airlift, would require all signatories to the Pact to consult immediately. They would then decide whether to go to war, impose economic sanctions, or just break off diplomatic relations, depending on whether or not the incident could be contained.

Also—and this is important when we consider the Communist tactic of boring from within—the treaty calls on members to consult if "the political independence of any of the parties is threatened."

All of these provisions are consistent with the UN. The United States and South American countries signed the Inter-American Defense Pact at Rio de Janeiro in 1947. A Mediterranean alliance composed of Italy, France, Greece, Turkey, the United States and Britain is next. There is the possibility of an Indian Ocean alliance embracing some Arab states with Iran, India, Siam, and Australia. Such a chain would unite most of the world into a cooperative organization which Russia and others could join once they gave evidence of obeying the rules.

To provide the pact with teeth will take money. Our bill for arms to strengthen the alliance will amount to $1,200,000,000 the first year, increasing later as the organization is perfected.

Some people question the right of this Congress to commit a future Congress to approve automatic resistance to aggression. Others doubt whether Congress can delegate authority to the President to use American forces to resist an aggressor without a formal declaration of war.

If the North Atlantic Security Pact includes a provision specifying conditions under which the United States would automatically fight, and the treaty is ratified by the Senate, then future Congresses would be bound by article 6 of the Constitution which states: "All treaties made or which shall be made, shall be the supreme law of the land." Again under articles 43 to 45 of the Charter of the United Nations, which has been ratified by our Senate, the President can put American forces into action against an aggressor without a formal declaration of war by Congress.

At Pearl Harbor it was Japan who decided that we would wage war. The declaration by Congress was inevitable and automatic.

Stop Russia—this is the first intent of the Alliance. It is an emergency move, born of necessity. Do not overlook the fact, however, that it culminates a series of moves which are promoting economic, political, and cultural cooperation in a world which must move toward such adjustments, if the human family is to survive.

The Atlantic Pact is defensive. We do not intend to stop at this point. With this strong foundation of security we shall be better able to concentrate on the problem of building real peace through negotiation. That after Senate ratification of the pact is the next step in civilization's program.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article on Alaska which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Journal-American on March 30, 1949:

ALASKA—AMERICA'S FINAL FRONTIER

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today marks the eighty-second anniversary of the purchase of Alaska. It is America's richest territory. It is America's final frontier. Alaska was bought from Russia in 1867. It cost $7,200,000. It covers an area of 586,400 square miles. Its population is 92,000. Its capital is Juneau.

Alaska is not a land of tradition. It is a land of tomorrow. It is a land of today. It is a fabulous country. It is a source of inexhaustible wealth in quintals of fish, in sands of gold, in the choicest furs, in the most beautiful ivory.

Alaska is preeminent as the empire of scenic wonders. There is no sea trip in all the world to equal it. There is no lure of mountain, stream, or valley to surpass it.

Gems of landscapes pass before you like some glorious panorama of grandeur. Sparkling rills and river courses, marked by emerald tints of verdure. The earth, and air and sky unite—water, mountain-top and valley, bathed and lost—in one grand union, in one gorgecus overflowing.

You see the crystal rivers run musically through the pretty valley alive with flowers and other beauties of nature. You see a mirage which gives the appearance of Nebuchadnezzar's hanging gardens of Babylon as recorded in Biblical history. You gaze in speechless wonder. Every breath in charmed suspense.

Blending in such matchless splendor, in such pure, translucent beauty, that it seems the gates have opened and the world beyond the shadows, has drawn near and shed its glory over all. While nature silent bends in reverent awe, receiving from the glorious land a blessing, from the sun a benediction.

And you lift your eyes to our banner of liberty as it proudly floats in the whipping breeze radiant in all its majestic glory. In it are centered all the inspiring memories of our past, all the blessings of our present, all the hopes of our future.

Today from the ice peaks of the Arctic to the jagged green fjords of the inside passage, the Territory of Alaska is in grave danger of Soviet sneak attack. Undefended Alaska—the attic door to America—invites another Pearl Harbor.

The Hearst newspapers have revealed the shocking inadequacy of military defense in the Arctic and sub-Arctic areas. It was the Hearst newspapers that warned our country of the Japanese menace for more than three decades. It was William Randolph Hearst who foresaw the treachery of the Nipponese and their aggressive designs upon the world.

If the American people heeded his prophetic editorials there would never have been a Pearl Harbor tragedy. Today Soviet spies are pouring into Alaska. Today Soviet spies are planning our destruction.

Their recipe for world domination is working splendidly in Alaska. First, infiltration and soothe well. Then place prepared people in boiling pot of war. Thence comes the realization of the Russian dream—America, the strong, America, the beautiful, bound in chains.

The defense of Alaska centers largely around the airfields at Anchorage and Fairbanks. We poured millions of American dollars into big airfields throughout Alaska during the war—but now they are abandoned. Russia is building air bases in Siberia. Russia is concentrating on its air power. Americans! What are we waiting for? Are we waiting for an Alaskan Pearl Harbor?

Members of Congress, forget party, forget party divisions, unite as patriots for your country.

Alaska needs airports with hangars and housing facilities, heavy bombers for strategic purposes, jet fighters to intercept attackers. We must have a radar screen from Alaska—across Canada to Greenland and Iceland. We must do this at once.

We must have airplanes activated and ready for instant use. We must be ready until the Soviet gunmen government recognizes the futility and stupidity of trying to communize the world and dictate to the American people. The monsters of Moscow recognize strength. They shrink from strength.

To preserve the peace of the world we must have air power, for air power is peace power. The longer we delay, the greater chance for war.

America, the best hope of freedom, America, the best hope of humanity will defend its Alaskan territory.

Flag of the free heart's hope and home!
By angel hands to valour given;
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome,
And all thy hues were born in heaven.

Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And freedom's banner streaming o'er us?

—*Joseph Rodman Drake.*

The Late Honorable Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a poem by Horace Carlisle which was written as a tribute to our former colleague—the late Sol Bloom:

SOL BLOOM

To Congress great men come and go,
Some hold their own, some of them grow
Into great statesmen, and serve on—
While years have come and years have gone—
But, of the ever swelling stream,
Few have enjoyed such high esteem,
Methinks, we safely may presume,
As has the widely known Sol Bloom.

Some men are born, so it appears,
For leadership, and through the years
They, far beyond their fondest dream,
In power, prestige, and esteem,
Grow, but they seem to never feel
The greatness that their works reveal—
How few great statesmen would presume
To fill the place left by Sol Bloom.

Someone must occupy the place,
That he filled with becoming grace,
Left vacant when his voice was stilled,
Which cannot easily be filled—
But New York State has never yet,
When some grave problem must be met,
Failed—may she, in her day of gloom,
Give us another great Sol Bloom.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

What the Missouri Valley Authority Means to the Entire Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What the Missouri Valley Authority Means to the Entire Country." The article was originally prepared by me for printing in the Business Review of the City College of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY MEANS TO THE ENTIRE COUNTRY

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota)

Since you have asked a Midwest Senator for a brief article, you should not be too surprised that I am going to write about a definitely Midwest topic. I can justify the choice, however, by showing that the Missouri Valley presents this country with one of the most challenging problems in economics, business administration, and democratic government.

I need not, I think, preach to business students of a large college the obvious relationship of this Midwest project to the East and the rest of the Nation. Cheap navigation and electricity to the Midwest has a direct effect on the other parts of the Nation in lowered costs. Soil conservation and flood control are even more clearly related to the whole economy in their relationship directly to the cost of food, the amount of food available and the regularity of successful crops. Irrigation would tend to diversify crops and reduce the payments of price supports on the staple commodities.

These effects, it seems to me, are obvious. Just as clear is the fact that the functions of flood control, soil conservation, navigation, and irrigation are Federal responsibilities and are from now on to be handled by the Federal Government. That is a political fact as well as an economic one.

With this understood, we can discuss the most efficient and worth-while development of our river valleys, and specifically, of the Missouri Valley.

At present the valley is being developed under a plan called Pick-Sloan, a marriage of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department and the Army engineers. The marriage has not resulted in full agreement and understanding, however. Let me quote what the Hoover Commission had to say about the recent method of Missouri River development:

"There is simply no escaping the fact that so long as the present overlapping of functions exists with respect to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission, costly duplication, confusion, and competition are bound to result. It has been demonstrated time and again that neither by voluntary cooperation nor by executive coordination can the major conflicts be ironed out. * * * Consolidation o these agencies is the only remedy. The Commission feels there is a possibility that the disastrous Portland floods last year reflect the failure of the present divided program."

I might interject here, that figured in engineering terms, it can be proved that the Missouri River floods of the spring of 1947 were not only not alleviated by the work the Army engineers had done, but contrarily, the floods were apparently intensified by the single-purpose planning of the engineers for navigation, a plan which overlooked flood-control.

So the Hoover Commission calls for multiple-purpose projects of unified control.

Floor control is not the only failing of the present Pick-Sloan plan. Even the navigation part of the development has been incompletely planned. The 9-foot channel planned by the engineers was apparently set up with no consideration of the water needed for irrigation. It did not even consider the most practical sized channel for navigation. Twelve-foot channels are being proposed in the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. The Missouri's 9-foot channel, then, would require shifting barge loads from one sized barge to another when loads are to transfer from the Missouri to the Mississippi or back. This would surely affect eastern freight costs. Furthermore, engineers have figured that the present Army engineers' plan will either make irrigation inconstant and impractical or navigation inconstant and impractical. Yet the 9-foot channel the Army is digging is scheduled to cost $222,000,000—and no one seems empowered to deny them the money to literally throw into a useless ditch.

The Bureau of Reclamation is planning a recreation project which would spend considerable money and use enough water annually to irrigate 55,000 acres. W. G. Sloan of the Bureau told a St. Louis Post-Dispatch reporter, Rufus Terral, that he didn't think that was the best use of the water, but that he was doing it, "to get those people over there to stop talking."

Now MVA must provide—and plans to provide—plenty of room for the valley citizens to talk, but it will not, if it is an over-all authority responsible directly for its actions and expenditures, go against its own estimation of useful projects simply because there was pressure for it.

Electric power is perhaps the worst failure of the whole Pick-Sloan arrangement. Mr. Lester Walker, engineer of the Federal Power Commission, said 2 years ago: "In our examinations into the ultimate hydroelectric potentialities of the Missouri River Basin, we find with our as yet unfinished investigation that the 1,600,000 kilowatts provided by the Pick-Sloan plan of development is less than one-half of the total potential power of the basin. We consider 5,000,000 kilowatts a somewhat conservative estimate of the potential hydroelectric power of the basin." That is perhaps the reason why private power companies who violently oppose MVA are in favor of the Pick-Sloan plan. W. G. Sloan himself admitted that the large Gavin's Point dam, which will cost $200,000,000 is unnecessary and not worth the expenditure. There is, furthermore, another irrigation and power project called Colorado-Big Thompson which will produce electricity at startling high costs. The charge has been publicly made and never denied—and I said this on March 2 on the floor of the Senate—that unnecessary costs have been added to this dam without adding one acre foot of irrigation or one kilowatt hour of electricity.

Planning on the basis of loosely connected and jurisdictionally jealous agencies for proper resource development in a single river valley has been proven impossible. The Hoover Commission states that bluntly in their recent report. The facts on the Pick-Sloan plan state it just as graphically in wasted dollars, wasted time and wasted water.

One of the most essential concerns of any river valley plan must be soil conservation. Yet the Pick-Sloan plan cannot even begin to integrate soil conservation into its planning, since Pick-Sloan only has jurisdiction over 1 percent of the surface area of the Missouri Valley. Soil conservation must begin where the rain hits the ground, not where it flows into the river—carrying rich topsoil with it.

We can talk about wasted resources and mismanagement under Pick-Sloan but it is fair to ask, "How do we know MVA would do any better?" We can only speak about what TVA has done and say that the same principles of administration will apply to MVA. Today the Tennessee is one of the most flood-proof rivers in the world. The use of electric power by homes, farms, and industries has boomed. Residential users who consumed only 55 kilowatt-hours a month in 1933, 11 years later consumed 129 kilowatt-hours a month. Rates have fallen from 4 cents a kilowatt-hour to 1.88 (as compared to 3.55 cents on the national average). At the same time TVA was a successful business, electrically speaking, making payments in lieu of State and local ad valorem taxes, paying all expenses, straight-line depreciation, and earning 4 percent on investment in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. TVA's electric-power industry earned 5½ percent in the previous fiscal year under the same circumstances.

But power is not the only achievement of TVA, although often we are deluged into thinking so, both by opponents of TVA (who are almost all private power representatives) and by proponents of the bill who recognize that the attraction to nonvalley residents can most easily be made with statements of low-cost electric bills.

Opposing the Pick-Sloan method of two agencies planning single dams singly, TVA operates 26 dams as a single unit. There is a newly usable 630-mile navigation channel carrying raw material out and finished goods in. Current savings by shippers are estimated at $2,000,000 a year. Soil has become more productive through planned soil conservation and greater phosphate production.

While national per capita income increased 56 percent, income in the valley went up 73 percent between 1933 and 1940. Furthermore, the people of the valley are so clearly in favor of TVA that it is difficult to argue that TVA has lessened their freedom.

Can we actually compare TVA to the proposed MVA? We often hear the assertion that MVA could never be successful as TVA is, because the area involved is so much larger than TVA. Yet the opposing suggestion is that we have national instead of regional administration. Surely, if we agree that development of one river must be made according to an over-all plan, we must admit that the smallest practical unit—large or not—is the whole Missouri Valley. There is an alternative plan, opposed both to the present Pick-Sloan arrangement and the proposed MVA solution. That is the suggestion of the Hoover Commission task force (not the Commission itself) which suggested a unified national department of natural resources and under the department a water-development service. While the department and service would have regional offices and local liaison, the administration and decisions would be in Washington hands.

The advantages, according to the task-force report, of a vertical national directorship for resources development instead of regional valley authorities are these:

1. Greater assurance of similar treatment throughout the country.

2. Makes possible utilization of central services.

3. Makes possible the development of standards for all programs.

4. Restrains sectional tendencies which might lead one region to develop to its own advantage but against the national interest.

I submit that these are scarcely strong arguments and seem rather the rationalizations of a mind already decided in a course. The MVA type of organization can make use of these same advantages and the further advantages of constant on-the-spot planning, close to the region and its people. Indeed, the task force suggests that TVA is good enough to be excluded from the other over-all plan. The regional authority plan has and will make use of central services already provided by the Government or capable of being provided. That need not affect the direct administration of the valley development. (This is acknowledged in a discussion of TVA.) With a number of valley authorities common standards of any of the authorities can still be established for all. They will be the best accomplishments. There is no more need for one agency to set a standard for all authorities than there is for the auto industry to follow a single standard set by a central agency.

Restraint on development against the national interest will probably be necessary since what is to the best interests of the region—what they can produce most efficiently—will be to the best interests of the Nation in most instances. However, there is now, and will be continually under regional authority systems, such restraint. The MVA bill provides for congressional approval of the over-all plan before work is begun.

The same treatment will surely be given all sections under an authority plan, for only in that way can general principles of Federal participation be set up and followed through. Under a Washington-directed administration, there is always more chance for favoritism and "pork-barreling" than under a system where each region operates to develop its own resources most efficiently within the general framework of a Federal law and congressional approval.

The task force is not altogether certain that the plan they suggest is superior to the authority system and does say that should their suggestion not be followed, an authority would almost surely be necessary. Indeed, the report goes as far as to say, "Another more unified organization with less centralized agency responsibility and more regional responsibility might presumably adhere more closely to the spirit of democracy in some respects, and probably would operate more efficiently."

In a minority report of the Commission itself, signed by 3 of the 12 Commission members, Vice Chairman of the Commission, now Secretary of State, Dean Acheson wrote: "We propose a single agency whose major purpose is the conservation, development, and use of our natural resources. This unification can be achieved on the national level * * * or on the regional level with the regional authorities for river basins, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority. * * * A combination of the two is practicable."

The majority, acknowledging the present gross inefficiency, seeks to solve the problem with unified control of construction projects on the river in the hands of the Interior Department and advice from local authorities and review by the Department of Agriculture, which would direct all land programs. This seems highly inadequate in view of the interrelationship of problems of land and water, industrialization, resources development and human welfare in regional development. Under the majority plan the land and the water would be administered separately, but land programs may affect floods and water programs affect farm land and industry. With more than 300,000,000 tons of silt going down the river annually, land programs may easily determine the feasibility of half the dams and all of the navigation plans. Land and water programs are hard to separate. On-the-spot administration and grass-roots administration—not simply advice sent to Washington after the plans are drawn up—are much more valuable for valley development, as TVA has proven.

What we have now, then, is an open and shut case against the present Pick-Sloan plan and some uncertainty of decision by the Hoover Commission members between centralized control and regional unified control of river valley development. The main groups opposed to any effective development seem about to drop support of the totally discredited Pick-Sloan plan and about to accept delaying tactics, specifically sponsorship of a commission to study the whole problem. Actually, the problem has been studied under TVA, under Pick-Sloan and under smaller localized projects ever since the New Deal. There are experts who have studied the problem thoroughly, and they include just plain United States citizens in the Tennessee Valley. The destruction of valley settlements through floods, of farm land through erosion, of farm settlements through the discomfort of electric-less living is going on now, not in 10 years. Valley development like so many other tasks of this Congress is not too new or radical a subject—it is decades too late.

The MVA bill, which Senators MURRAY, GILLETTE, and I introduced last month, affects you—whether you live East or West. Its efficiency, effectiveness, and democracy are basic to effective American government. It poses one of the basic problems of our day—how to achieve democratic, effective government through governmental units large enough to do the job yet still sensitively responsible to the people they serve. MVA does this through clear lines of responsibility running directly to corporation directors who are on the spot in the valley, who are, in a large part, citizens of the valley and who are constantly kept advised by an official body composed of the governors and valley leaders in the fields of labor, industry, farming, and conservation, and outdoor recreation. Responsibility is clear—who to shape up or fire to get action is clear. Where valley people

can go to be heard is clear. And the success of the system in the Tennessee is clear.

MVA should be on the list of bills you in the East are lobbying for, just as we in the Midwest will go down the line to favor similar developments in the eastern river networks. It is a symbol of liberalism in that it is an acknowledgment that the meaning of democracy in 1949 that responsible Government should be the agency through which the people can act together to do for themselves what each individually cannot do. It is a symbol of conservatism in that it is a champion of efficient and economical Government and practical business administration. It is plain good sense. And it is urgent.

MVA should come out of the Eighty-first Congress.

Orphans of the European Storm: The DP Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include several newspaper articles which appeared in the New York and Washington papers describing the arrival of 67 displaced European war orphans brought into this country under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. One article refers to the desire of two little displaced citizens of the Western World to see a circus. The reply from the owner of that greatest show on earth is typically American—seats are provided—and Rose and Jackie will be the honored guests of Ringling Bros.-Barnum & Bailey. I congratulate and commend the owners, managers, artists, and employees of Ringling Bros. and wish to them everlasting good luck and prosperity for their sympathetic understanding and cooperation in spreading this bit of sunshine and happiness into the hearts of these two children.

Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago I saw these poor little unhappy, forlorn creatures—deprived of their parents—undernourished, sad, and neglected, languishing in camps in Germany and Austria. It is a pleasure indeed to be able to see that the law that we passed last year is operating and is helping to bring these youngsters into the United States, where we can mold strong, good, substantial, God-fearing, God-loving American citizens of tomorrow from the little, tired, lonely, friendless orphans of today. I have repeatedly expressed my interest in the great humanitarian aspect of the law passed last year, but most certainly no other phase of the operation of this law focuses the good that it does more clearly than the arrival of these 67 youngsters who will soon be placed with American families for adoption and for a future home.

I regret that it is impossible to reproduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the many pictures of these new little pilgrims taken as they landed in the United States. Nevertheless, I know that their smiling faces and the joy that was in their hearts which burst forth into a song on their lips as they landed on the soil of our native land was far more than sufficient to repay a generous and hospitable America whose Representatives in Congress enacted the necessary legislation which has given to these pathetic youngsters succor and a haven of refuge.

These warm-hearted and kindly citizens of our great Nation will surely be blessed for their charity and their generosity in providing homes for these poor unfortunates who have weathered the storms of war in Europe; who have been subjected not only to the ravages of war, but the cruel inhuman atrocities which stalked in the wake of the most recent world conflagration. Yes, these foster parents will be blessed, for was it not said by the Master: "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of April 1, 1949]

RINGLINGS TO PLAY SANTA CLAUS AS TWO DP KIDS SEE FIRST CIRCUS

NEW YORK, March 31.—Nine-year-old Rose Gelbard stood and stared at the bright circus poster with the laughing clown one day.

That night she wrote a letter. Although Rose, her parents, and her brother, Jackie, 4, had arrived in this country only a week before as war refugees, her English was clear:

"DEAR RINGLING BROTHERS: I saw a picture with a funny clown and it says there will be a circus. Please, can I come to your circus. In the place I was before I came here to U. S. A. there was never circus or anything for us to laugh. Always we are running from war. My mother saw a circus. My mother says before the war we could see circus monkeys and everything and things to eat. But I wasn't born then.

"I would buy a ticket but I am 9. I thought maybe you would have a seat nobody wants and you would write me a letter because I would want that seat so much. If you have no seats I could stand up. I would be glad to stand up just to see your circus. If you have a seat my brother could come. We only need one seat. He is 4.

"Thank you please rite to me.

"Your friend,

"ROSE GELBARD."

Yesterday, Rose received a reply from the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey circus from its winter quarters at Sarasota, Fla. It said two seats had been reserved for Rose and Jackie for an afternoon performance of the circus at Madison Square Garden April 13.

Rose read the letter over and over again. She laughed and cried.

"I once saw a monkey in Antwerp," she said, "but never a circus."

[From the New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram of March 17, 1949]

BREAD AND MEAT AMAZE 67 DP ORPHANS, IN BY AIR

At the reception center of the United States Committee for the Care of European Children at 661 Cauldwell Avenue, Bronx, 67 children awoke today, rubbed the sleep out of their eyes and prepared for their first real glimpse of the United States.

Last night they spent trying to catch up with the succession of bewildering experiences since their arrival at Idlewild Airport in a Transocean Air Lines plane from Hamburg, Germany.

BREAD—SOMETHING NEW

First was the huge city itself. Then came food. Bread. They didn't know what it was. Oranges they held in their hands until someone showed them how to peel them to get at the juicy fruit. One little 6-year-old blonde began to cry when she was given a plate of pot roast. She said she didn't know what it was.

All from the Baltic states of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, the 57 boys and 10 girls ranged from 5 to 14 years old. All their parents dead, they were brought here from a displaced person's children's home in Germany.

WILL STUDY AT CENTER

Jacob Reingold, director of the center, said they will be placed in foster homes by religious agencies of their own faiths, the National Lutheran Council, the Catholic Committee for Refugee Children, the European Jewish Children's Aid and the Church World Service. While at the center they will attend classes in English, American history and civics.

They remain citizens of their native countries since the United States still recognizes those Baltic governments. Later the children or the persons who adopt them must provide for their citizenship through regular naturalization channels.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Sun of March 17, 1949]

WAR ORPHANS HAPPY LEARNING UNITED STATES WAYS—102 HERE FROM DP CAMPS—WAITING AT CENTER FOR FOSTER HOMES

(By Mildred Faulk)

Six little boys, one in baggy pants anchored uneasily somewhere around mid-thigh, were forcing a satisfyingly horrible uproar from an old piano today. Their grins for the moment were of blissful friendship.

Baggy Pants had arrived in America about 2 hours earlier from a displaced children's center in Germany. The other five came yesterday.

Yesterday's batch of 67 war orphans, originally from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, came by plane and were already temporarily established at the reception center of the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, 661 Cauldwell Avenue, the Bronx. Thirty-five more from Poland, Yugoslavia, Romania, and other countries, arrived today on the steamship *Hahn*.

PICKED UP SOME ENGLISH

Although their first day here had scarcely begun, yesterday's arrivals had already learned a few Americanization preliminaries. In a drawing group they had picked up the English words: nose, eye, ear, hair, head, face, house, window, door, and roof. They had learned the meaning of "How are you?"

Breakfast was a delightful, but somewhat baffling novelty. Faced with a mysterious concoction called orange juice, they poured it over their cereal, and they ate sugar right out of the bowl. One boy made a sandwich, spread first with sugar, then marmalade, and finally with butter.

Last night most of them made their first acquaintance with oranges. Today the pungent odor of the fruit lingered throughout the halls of the high-ceilinged center, once a nurse's training school for Lebanon Hospital. And the stands and tables in the rooms were scattered with peelings.

The bewildered obedience of the group who came today was slow in dissipating. The first relaxation came at the sight of a French poodle pup, which brought a few grins with its friendly waggling. Holding tight to their few belongings in small knapsacks, the girls were escorted first to their rooms on the upper floor.

TAKING CARE OF SISTER

A small shaggy-haired boy trotted along. Every one smiled a bit when he was sent back, but their eyes were sympathetic as he explained that it was his business to take care of his sister.

Relaxation finally became complete once every one was upstairs, assigned to rooms in groups. Without orders, meager possessions were secretly stowed away in drawers and

closets, and in no time at all the more venturesome were exploring the halls and joining the stomping, incessant traffic up and down the steep stairs.

A query about a name frequently brought a quick flash of a wrist, around which was wound an identifying band of adhesive tape.

"It's simply amazing how quickly they accustom themselves to a new place," said a staff member. "Yesterday I touched that little girl on the shoulder to steer her in the right direction, and she jerked away in complete mistrust. Look at her now."

The little girl was blowing a toy horn with utter abandon, interestedly following another staff member around at the same time.

STAY FOR WHILE AT CENTER

At the center, which was set up in May 1946, children remain from 2 weeks to 3 months awaiting placement in foster homes found by sectarian agencies—the Catholic Committee for Refugee Children, the National Lutheran Council, the European Jewish Children's Aid, and the Church World Service.

In rare instances, a child may have American relatives and be placed with them. Today Hilda Sieber, an 11-year-old pigtailed blonde from Hungary, who is going to an aunt in Pennsylvania, was greeted at the center by three other aunts, one of them Mrs. Anna Non, of Jersey City, bearing gifts of chocolate bars and cookies. She accepted with silent thanks, but her only conversation was an occasional "yes" or "no."

As soon as possible after their arrival at the center the children receive a thorough medical examination. The passive calm with which they accept this routine comes from many other such tests in the course of their movements as war orphans.

GET NEW OUTFITS

Their oddly assorted clothing is discarded and they receive new outfits, sometimes rebelliously when a beloved but dirty old hat is taken away.

While waiting for placement they attend morning classes, starting in their native tongue and slowly incorporating English. The educational program also includes talks by doctors, who explain the strange American standards of daily bathing, washing hands before meals, and brushing the teeth regularly.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of March 17, 1949]

DP CHILDREN HERE, DAZZLED BUT HAPPY—LITTLE BALTS ARE BEWILDERED BY POT ROAST, ORANGES, AND THINGS IN GENERAL

When 6-year-old Erna Kulmanis, a shy, blonde war orphan, was given a plate of pot roast yesterday, she started to cry. She said she didn't know what it was.

She had arrived a few hours earlier at the New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens, with 66 other war orphans from a DP children's home in Germany.

The children were taken to the reception center of the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, 661 Cauldwell Avenue, the Bronx, where they will remain until their transfer to welfare agencies throughout the country for adoption.

The children—57 boys and 10 girls ranging in age from 5 to 14 years—originally came from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. When they arrived in Hamburg on Tuesday to board the plane for America, they broke into cheers; they thought they were already in the United States.

When they stepped off the plane at Idlewild they seemed so impressed that most of them couldn't speak, but Alexander Kleins, 10, started to sing Latvian folk songs and said he wanted to be a musician. Austra Kurse, 7, said her "stomach was sick" and she didn't know what she wanted to be.

Only a few have any remembrance of their war experience, but the older ones talk about it sometimes among themselves at bedtime, said Edward Francel, an officer of the International Refugee Organization who was with them.

At the reception center they were greeted by Jacob Reingold, director, and his staff.

Mr. Reingold said they will be placed in foster homes by religious agencies of their own faiths—the Catholic Committee for Refugee Children, the National Lutheran Council, the European Jewish Children's Aid, and the Church World Service.

Today each youngster will get a physical examination and a set of clothing. While at the center they will attend classes in English, American history, and civics.

In the recreation hall Immonts Franks, 9, kept asking joyfully: "Is this America?" A little girl played with a yo-yo. A group of boys happily pressed the levers on the vending machines. Two curly-haired youngsters hugged each other as tears streamed down their reddened cheeks.

Then they were given lunch. Some were hesitant about taking slices of bread. When a basket of oranges was passed around some stared at the fruit. "They don't know how to eat it," explained Mrs. Olga Kiwul who acted as interpreter. Volunteers helped the youngsters peel the oranges.

After a short rest, they went to their rooms, took baths, and got into their new pajamas. Then they straightened out their worldly belongings and climbed wearily into bed to dream about the new world ahead of them.

Why Risk Another Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege last night to be invited to talk at a dinner at the National Retail Furniture Association at the Shoreham Hotel in this city. The subject was Why Risk Another Depression? I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY RISK ANOTHER DEPRESSION?

Do not misunderstand the title of this talk. There is no depression just around the corner. On the contrary, all indications point to a continued high level of prosperity for several years to come. The recent slight decrease in certain prices is not a signal that the inflationary pressures have been lifted from our economy, but rather a warning that we must not be content merely to let things drift.

I am talking not about the near-future, but about the long-range outlook for our country and for the world. I am talking about peace and the preservation of the American system of free competitive enterprise. I am talking about the preservation of opportunity for the masses of men and about the stabilization of a high standard of living for all. I am talking about the individual and the growth of big Government. I am talking about the appearance throughout the world of a new form of dictatorship and about the responsibility of business leaders and political leaders with respect to it.

Winston Churchill, speaking the other night in Boston, declared that if it had not been for the possession of the atom bomb by the United States, western Europe by this time would already have been taken over by Communists. Let me say that if the atom bomb is the secret weapon by which we have prevented military aggression from the Kremlin, the Russian secret weapon is the hope that we cannot avoid a depression here in the United States. Capitalism, to protect itself, must prevent another depression.

MOSCOW WANTS ECONOMIC CHAOS

The policy of Moscow ever since the end of the shooting war has been directed primarily to the creation of economic chaos in the countries of western Europe and everywhere else their saboteurs can work. They have acted in the belief that the capitalist world is unwilling to take effective steps to prevent depression. They have thought, therefore, that by obstructing the processes of recovery they can hasten the economic collapse which, in their judgment, would result in the triumph of communism.

A depression here would render utterly fruitless everything that we have done abroad during and after the war in the defense of freedom and for the establishment of peace.

Without us, western Europe would be an easy prey to communism. Consider only the fact that in Italy, in France, and in Germany as well there are already substantial Communist minorities, tough and well disciplined, ready to take over with all the ruthlessness they have already exhibited in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and the other satellite nations. The hope of Russia is not based upon any plan of military aggression against us, but upon a deliberate plan of hastening by every means in their power the capitalistic collapse which they believe to be inevitable. Since a prosperous free economy in the United States is the essential key to the whole effort to maintain peace in a free and prosperous world, the supreme duty of our people and particularly of our leaders in business and in government is to devote every energy to the maintenance of prosperity here in the United States.

Let me now recite one or two of the reasons why we need not fear that a depression is just around the corner, why we should not mistake a little decrease in the cost of living as the beginning of a slide into recession. The Congress is presently planning the extension of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act. The only real debate now taking place in the Senate has been whether the authorization should be reduced 5 or 10 or 15 percent. Congress, like the country, is convinced that we must continue to support the economic basis of western Europe. That means that here in the United States we shall continue to produce food and fuel, raw materials, semifinished products and machinery for export to Europe. According to the February report, 62 percent of the total European recovery program authorizations of $3,707,000,000 has been spent in the United States. Agricultural and industrial commodities, raw materials and fabricated commodities totaling in value $2,300,000,000 were purchased here in the United States. That makes business. It will continue to make business throughout next year because it will continue to create the demand for United States products no matter what happens to the purely civilian economy.

Add to this the fact that here at home we shall spend $15,000,000,000 for national defense. Add to that the fact that other billions of public funds are being spent by the States for public purposes of various kinds. Add, also, that the civilian economy is running at a high level. Billions of private funds are being expended for expansion and development. More than 57,000,000 civilians are employed and are drawing compensation at better rates than before the

war. The latest information available from authentic sources shows that during the month of March 1949 there were fewer unemployed in the country than during the month of February. Thus the predictions of growing unemployment which were made earlier in the year seem already to have been shown to be without basis. Employment creates the purchasing power which, in turn, creates the market for all the goods and services which are produced by and distributed among the civilian population of the United States.

Industrial production in the United States in February 1949 was still running at a higher level than in either 1946 or 1947. It is true that in 1948 we allowed prices to reach by far the highest peak in history whether measured in the wholesale market or in the consumer market. They have declined somewhat in 1949, but this decline has brought us only to a level which is still far above the levels of 1947 and early 1948 when we were all screaming about the high cost of living. This explains why Dr. Nourse, head of the Economic Advisers to the President has coined a new word, "disinflation," to describe the present situation.

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECT OF NATIONAL DEBT

No, it is not the short-range picture that should give us concern. We must think of the long-range outlook and of the sort of world in which we want to live when peace has been restored, when people once more are able to go about the ordinary and normal activities of living, when it will no longer be necessary to spend billions to maintain armaments, billions for the occupation of foreign lands, billions for international cooperation, billions for the payment of the interest on the national debt.

War inflation resulted from the fact that we were producing goods and services for destructive purposes and paying for them, not with other goods but with Government I O U's. The Government was buying almost 50 percent of all the goods and services that were produced and was hurling them into the bottomless pit of war. To do this we incurred the greatest debt in history. More than $252,000,000,000 it still is. It is a mortgage on all the future production of the United States. The very existence of this debt is the fact which should compel us to organize all of our forces now that we may maintain a civilian economy of high-level production and employment when the peace comes. We must provide a substitute civilian market for the market which is now created in large part by Government in its effort to put the cap of permanent peace upon the figure of victory.

The furniture dealer or the dealer in consumer goods of any kind who sells upon the installment plan knows that the installment buyer is pledging his future income for whatever period within regulation W the purchase contract may run. The dealer will not make the contract unless he is reasonably certain that the purchaser has the capacity of producing the income necessary to meet the installments. Every such dealer knows that no profits are to be had in the repossession of such goods.

It is the task of Government so to organize the economy that all of the people will be able to produce at a sufficiently high level so that the Government, through taxation, may have the income necessary to carry and to reduce the national debt. Only the Government can provide the plan under which agriculture, labor, and industry, working as partners, may develop a new permanent high standard of living, the necessary substitute for the false, unstable standard of living built up on the production of commodities to be destroyed in war. Just as it was necessary for the Government to organize industrial production for war, so now it is necessary to organize production for peace.

Everyone agrees that modern mass production must have mass markets. Every businessman, manufacturer, or retailer knows that prosperity requires purchasing power, but not everyone has learned yet that the biggest markets are in the low-income brackets. There are so many people receiving less than $2,000 a year that they have three times more money to spend than all who receive over $25,000 a year. The under $2,000 group have a total income of more than thirty-five billion as compared with less than eleven billion for everybody in all the income brackets above $25,000. Indeed, the total income of all who receive more than $10,000 annually is fifteen billion less than the total receipts of the little fellows who earn less than $2,000.

Why risk another depression? It's not the purchasing power of the wealthy that will furnish business the market it needs, but the purchasing power of the masses at the bottom of the scale. If they lose their jobs, business loses its market and prosperity goes out the window. We must have prosperity if we're going to beat communism. Surely it is cheaper to have prosperity on a rising standard of living than it is to have another war.

WHAT MAKES BIG GOVERNMENT BIG?

The greatest obstacle to the establishment of a mass market is the fear that the Government in doing so will threaten the freedom of business; so I want to talk about government for just a moment and show what makes it big. No American who believes in the principles of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States desires to see established here an authoritarian government. Despite all the name-calling one sees in print or hears in debate, the Government in Washington grows and grows, not because anybody with influence in public affairs wants to change our system, but only because stern facts over which we have no control compel the expansion of government.

Take the case of atomic energy, for example. The appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission this year will be about three-quarters of a billion dollars. That will be a sum greater than was ever expended by the Federal Government in a single year prior to World War I, except during the Civil War in the years 1863 and 1864. The nature of atomic energy is such that everybody in Congress agreed that its development could be entrusted only to the Government although the whole project is managed from the top. This was not because anybody in the Government wanted to give the Atomic Energy Commission the extraordinary power it has, but only because nobody in Congress had the slightest idea how else to handle the new scientific fact.

But someone will say that is not a proper illustration. Very well, let us consider the activities of the Hoover Commission and the plan to reorganize the executive branch of Government. Letters pour into Washington urging the Congress to approve the reorganization plan submitted by former President Hoover. Yet, after all, it is clearly not a plan to remobilize big government, but to make big government more efficient. It is based upon a proposed statute recommended by both President Truman and former President Hoover by which the Congress will delegate to the President the power which only the Congress now possesses to define the form and the organization of Government bureaus. It is a proposal to place in the hands of the President the full power to make any changes he determines to be desirable.

It would be absurd to say that the former President wants to establish an authoritarian government and yet it must be clear that a grant of power to the President to reorganize the whole Federal Government by executive order is a development which results only from the fact that the problem is of such magnitude that this seems to be the only way by which the task can be accomplished.

GOVERNMENT HAD TO GROW

The growth of the Federal Government and the expansion of its powers bears no relation to any partisan division, past or present. New boards and commissions have been created indiscriminately by both Republican and Democratic administrations. The Federal Power Commission was established by a Republican Congress. It simply had to be created because the electrical and gas industries which once were merely local enterprises had become national with transmission lines and pipe lines extending throughout the country, across public and private lands without regard to mountains, rivers, or State boundaries. Back in 1931 there were handled by the Commission 64 applications for the construction of about 864,000 kilowatts of new hydroelectric capacity. Now there are 91 such applications for more than 5,579,000 kilowatts. With this sixfold expansion of this single aspect of the electrical industry, the Power Commission had new duties thrust upon it to prevent the imposition of unreasonable rates upon consumers. Without this Federal agency there could have been no effective regulation in the public interest, for the States are without authority in interstate commerce.

A check of all the bills introduced in the Senate in this Congress up to March 30 reveals that no less than 132 titles have been offered which involve the Federal Government directly or indirectly in activities affecting private enterprise. There are no less than 12 separate bills setting forth a complete program for Government support and supervision of air transportation. Government subsidies for aviation or for shipping seem to occasion no surprise and even those who are frequently most voluble in calling for the reduction in Federal expenditures are themselves the sponsors of measures which can only result in increasing Federal expenditures.

There are 15 bills having to do with financial assistance to education in various forms. Nine bills are concerned with legislation to improve public health. Ten bills propose Federal housing programs, principally slum clearance and the improvement of rural housing. One of the most striking proposals is the bill which provides for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of low-income families. One bill dealing with the aviation industry would put the Government into partnership with a single private management to assume financial, if not managerial, responsibility for a worldwide air transportation monopoly.

There is no sense in getting mad about these things or calling names about them. They are just plain facts. They are merely the measure of a great and growing nation. The Government is growing bigger and we are trying to make it more efficient because science, invention, and industry have made business bigger than it ever was before.

National and international business, which had little or no influence in shaping the economic lives of men when George Washington was President, now constitute the determining factor in all the economic issues before the Congress. Little business and local business, and particularly retail business, operate on an altogether different plane from that of the great aggregations of capital which dominate trade and industry in the national and international field.

INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION

The meaning of this is illustrated by the statistical fact that out of about three and one-fourth million business enterprises in the United States, 29,000, or eight-tenths of 1 percent, employ more than 52 percent of all the workers. Of these 29,000 businesses,

less than 5,000, or to be exact, 4,900, have so many workers each that their employees constitute 40 percent of all workers. These employers and these employees are engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, the regulation of which was committed by the Constitution to the Congress. That is the reason and the only reason why the Government at Washington has been expanding. It had to expand or else the regulation of the economy of the people would have been abandoned by their elected representatives into the hands of the private managers of the private corporations which carry on so tremendous a segment of all the business, trade, and commerce of the United States and of the whole world.

That, of course, is precisely what happened in Europe and brought on the Second World War. Government surrendered the control of the economy to the managers of the world cartels who failed to prevent depression and then the people let the dictators, Mussolini and Hitler, take over both the cartels and the Government.

The Constitution gives the Congress the power to regulate commerce. George Washington was the President of the Constitutional Convention and he signed the Constitution. He was the first President, so nobody can deny that it is good Americanism to have the Federal Government regulate commerce. It must do so if the people are to be kept employed, earning the wages and salaries that will enable them to purchase all the marvelous goods, including furniture, that modern industry makes.

We shall solve our problem according to the American ideal of business and government, not by weakening the Federal Government and thus destroying its power to serve the people or by attempting to destroy big business, for big business fills an essential spot in our economy. The modern world could not operate without it, but it should not be permitted to swallow up little business. The one thing needed is to make certain that neither big business nor big government shall have the arbitrary power to tell the people what to do.

To this end we must recognize that the modern corporation is merely an instrument of commerce. Every organization, whether it be a corporation, a trade association, a labor union, or a cooperative, which carries on the commerce which, according to the Constitution, is to be regulated by Congress is an instrument of that commerce and must be subject to the rule of order under which all groups of our society may work together to promote business, production, and employment. This is the simple way to create the climate in which little business and local business can operate in security without danger from either monopolistic business or monopolistic government. It is the simple way in which the growth of arbitrary big government may be avoided, in which there may be provided the incentives which will promote investment and stimulate the development of our resources in every quarter of the country.

WE DARE NOT RISK A DEPRESSION

Only the Federal Government can regulate national and international business in the public interest, and the public interest now requires that there shall be no depression, for that way lies world chaos. Capitalism is facing its greatest challenge. It must stabilize the economy. Business leaders and leaders in government, both activated by the great traditions of freedom, must unite now to prevent a depression. If we are to confound the Communists and win the free peace for which the war was fought, we must organize production for peace on a standard of living so high that all the world will want to copy our pattern of democratic economic organization just as it was trying to copy our pattern of free government until, in the modern world, economic dictatorship first started the trend toward the authoritarian state.

Communism is a defeatist philosophy, suited only to those who have lost faith in man. We can beat it here by peaceful means. But we must not risk another depression.

The American Cancer Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by myself in regard to the beginning of the American Cancer Society's annual drive for funds.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the month of April, as most of you know, the American Cancer Society conducts its annual campaign for funds to combat the disease that takes the second largest death toll in the Nation.

This year it is estimated that 200,000 of our citizens will succumb to this merciless killer. American Cancer Society statisticians estimate that cancer will strike every other American home if this death rate continues.

President Truman has issued a proclamation naming April as National Cancer Control Month, in accordance with a joint act of Congress passed in 1938. In his proclamation the President said: "I * * * invite * * * all organizations and individuals interested in a national program for the control of cancer by education and other cooperative means to unite during the month of April in a public dedication to this program and in a concerted effort to impress upon the people of the Nation the necessity for such a program."

To aid in this public dedication, a number of my distinguished colleagues from this body and the House of Representatives have joined me in forming a Congressional Cancer Campaign Committee to assist the April drive of the American Cancer Society, which is the largest and oldest voluntary agency engaged in fighting this dreaded disease.

Today we met with leaders of the Cancer Society and heard from them encouraging reports on the progress being made in the all-out cancer war.

There are some edges of light in the dark cancer picture. This year one out of every four persons who develop cancer will be saved by surgery and radiation treatment, by the results of laboratory and clinical research.

This cure rate could be doubled by early detection and prompt treatment of the disease, provided that there were an increase in the number of persons receiving periodic physical check-ups and greater alertness to cancer's early warning symptoms by both the public and general practitioners.

This heartening prediction of a doubled cure rate was made at a remarkable meeting in Memphis last month, the first annual national cancer conference, sponsored by the American Cancer Society and the Public Health Service's National Cancer Institute. Some 500 of the Nation's leading research scientists, physicians, and clinicians pooled their knowledge at the conference which closed on the note of hope that a doubled cure rate was possible.

To help speed this great forward step, the American Cancer Society this year is seeking $14,500,000 to expand its programs of research, service to cancer patients, and public and professional education.

Through pamphlets—more than a hundred million last year—through information centers, through the press, magazines, motion pictures, radio and television, the simple truths that can save tens of thousands of lives are presented by the Cancer Society to the public. More than a million ficld army volunteers work in a carefully planned program of service to cancer patients. Seventy-three fellowships have been awarded to internes and young scientists in 32 institutions to train manpower for the continuing war. Medical films, lectures, exhibits, and publications help keep the physicians abreast of expanding cancer frontiers. The Cancer Society has supported 244 research projects in 86 universities and laboratories in 30 States and the District of Columbia. All this is in addition to the broad program of the National Cancer Institute.

CANCER INCREASE PREDICTED

There is one hard fact indicating the growing menace of cancer that I want to mention here. That is the estimate of the increase in cancer cases that may be expected because of our progressively aging population. Although cancer strikes all age levels it extracts its greatest number of victims from middle- and old-age groups.

To illustrate this point, let us take one segment of our population—our veterans. In the next 10 years it is estimated that cancer will strike more than twice as many veterans as it does today. This year an estimated 25,000 veterans are suffering from cancer. Within 10 years that figure will mount to more than 50,000 as our World War II veterans reach the middle-age bracket.

Last year our Veterans' Administration hospitals took care of some 15,000 cancer cases. The VA estimates that in 1960 it may be called on to take care of more than 43,000 cancer cases. That figure represents 80 percent of the predicted total number of cancer cases among veterans in 1960.

Apart from the humanitarian aspects involved in this sharp increase, let us examine the increased financial burden that will be placed on the Government in expanding VA hospital facilities to take care of these patients. American Cancer Society statisticians estimate that the cost of caring for a cancer patient is approximately $1,000 per year. This means that the cost to the Government in 1960 may be as much as forty or fifty million dollars annually, and that a substantial increase can be expected in each succeeding year.

It is only by the concerted attack being made on cancer by the American Cancer Society and the United States Public Health Service that we can save more and more lives each year and hold back the rising incidence of the disease. That is why the April campaign of the Cancer Society merits our wholehearted support.

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there recently appeared in two publications in Milwaukee, Wis., two important statements on one of the most momentous

issues of our time—the North Atlantic Pact.

It was my privilege on March 30 to discuss the pact and point out what I felt are some of the important factors which we should review in our consideration of it.

On March 18 the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial entitled "It's a Peace, Not War, Pact."

In addition, in the March 27 issue of the magazine, the Living Church, which is also published in Milwaukee and which records "the news, the work, and the thought of the Episcopal Church," there also appeared an editorial endorsing ratification of the pact.

While both of these items are somewhat extended, I feel that they so clearly present vital comments on so tremendous an issue that they merit the attention of my colleagues and myself.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two splendid statements be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of March 18, 1949]

IT'S A PEACE, NOT WAR, PACT

Every intelligent American should read the entire text of the proposed North Atlantic treaty. It is relatively short, simply written, and crystal clear as to intent.

It is a treaty every line of which breathes the spirit of the United Nations. The UN is mentioned no less than six times in the text. The first line reaffirms the faith of the signatories in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

It is a treaty to promote the well-being of the North Atlantic area, to develop the capacity of signatory nations to resist armed attack. An attack on one is to be deemed an attack on all, and each nation shall take the steps it deems fit to meet that attack. Thus the United States Congress retains its largely theoretical right to decide for or against war measures. But the clear implication is expressed in the treaty that we will stand shoulder to shoulder with the free nations who sign.

The defense measures to be taken are outlined clearly in the spirit, and according to the procedure, of article 51 of the United Nations Charter. That article provides that UN members singly or acting collectively, shall be entitled to defend themselves against armed attack until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

That's what the proposed Atlantic Pact also provides. Furthermore, the Atlantic treaty nations shall immediately report any armed attack, and the defense measures taken, to the UN Security Council. The proposed treaty says: "Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security."

Thus the Atlantic Pact is completely dovetailed into the UN Charter. If the UN Security Council takes effective steps, the Atlantic treaty nations will not have to. But if the Soviets, or anyone else, prevent the Security Council from taking effective action to safeguard peace, then the Atlantic treaty nations will continue their defense against attack.

It should be noticed that the area covered in the treaty includes the territory of any of the signatories in Europe or North America, the Algerian departments of France, the islands under the jurisdiction of any signatory in the North Atlantic north of the Tropic of Cancer. It includes the signatories' ships and aircraft in this area.

The treaty also covers attacks on the occupation forces of any member in Europe. If the Soviets should attack the American, British, or French forces in Berlin, that would be viewed as aggression, just as would an attack on the territory of the United States, Britain, or France.

Ratification of the treaty shall be in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the adhering nations. No member shall have the right to withdraw until the treaty has been in force for 20 years.

This North Atlantic treaty is a masterpiece of drafting. It marks a tremendous step toward peace. Despite all the flood of calumny and untruth from Moscow and its minions, the proposed Atlantic treaty contains not one line that suggets an alliance to make war, or to carry on an aggressive conspiracy.

It is a pact to maintain peace—by the collective action of free nations. It expresses a determination to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

Moscow papers please copy—if they dare.

[From the Living Church of March 27, 1949]

THE ATLANTIC PACT

One of the most vital decisions in our history faces the people of the United States as we consider whether or not to ratify the North Atlantic defense pact. Because of the moral implications involved in so far-reaching a policy, it is a question that deserves particularly thoughtful and prayerful consideration by sincere Christian people.

For months the public has been awaiting the text of this important agreement, which all the world has known was being negotiated, and of which tantalizing "sneak previews" have been given by the State Department. Now the text has been published, and the representatives of the participating nations will sign it early in April. The next step, so far as American participation is concerned, is the submission of the text to the Senate for ratification. In this connection, we hope that adequate time will be given for full and free discussion by the American press and public, and that hearings will be held in which all pertinent arguments, pro and con, may be presented.

The Federal Council of Churches, in its national study conference recently held at Cleveland and subsequently in action taken by its executive committee on the eve of the State Department's announcement of the text, declined to take action either endorsing or rejecting the pact because it did not have the actual text for consideration. The executive committee did, however, outline the kind of pact that it thought this Nation might support, based on the findings of the Cleveland conference. The committee wired the President its view that since the foundation for a universal structure of law and order is still inadequate, the United States can properly join its political power with that of other nations in such regional pacts as are authorized and encouraged by the United Nations Charter.

In our opinion, the Atlantic Pact does meet that test. It is drawn in careful conformity to the requirements of articles 51 and 52 of the Charter, and should tend to strengthen rather than to weaken the effectiveness of the United Nations. We hope that it will be ratified by our Senate and by the other nations concerned, and that it will be reinforced by such a program of mutual consultation and of lend-lease materials as will make it a genuine bulwark of peace and security to the democracies of western Europe, Scandinavia, and North America. If that is done, we believe it will prove to be a genuine and important step toward the stability and sense of security which alone can be the basis for enduring world peace.

It is unhappily true that the value of the European recovery program has been greatly limited by the sense of insecurity that hangs like a pall over western Europe. The essence of the Marshall plan was that help would be extended by the United States simultaneously with the vigorous mobilization of all resources for self-help on the part of the receiving countries. But, to take a single example, French capital is being largely withheld from constructive use because of the fear of the Soviet Army poised in central Europe, aided by the fifth column of French Communists and bolstered by a flood of propaganda. The recent declarations by Communist leaders in France, Italy, and even Britain and the United States, that in any "capitalistic" war their allegiance will be not to their own countries but to Soviet Russia have added fuel to that fear.

The countries of western Europe, and of Scandinavia, see themselves largely at the mercy of Russia if war should break out. Therefore, before they throw in their lot with America, they want to know what practical measures we are prepared to take to prevent them from being occupied by Soviet troops, as so many of them were recently occupied by Nazi troops. Given the situation, the question is a natural one; and it is one that we must answer, if we want their continued friendship and cooperation.

We have already assured these countries that a Soviet attack on western Europe would be regarded as an attack upon the United States, and that we would doubtless take action to counter it. But this is not enough for democratic leaders in Europe, who fear that any such counter measure would come too late to prevent occupation of their countries and liquidation of their leadership. Eventual liberation is a poor prospect, set against the threat of foreign occupation. Western Europe wants a more immediate and surer guaranty than that, and wants it in terms not only of food and equipment but of weapons and the assurance that our power will be used to prevent any such eventuality.

The problem is not only one of the security of western Europe; it is also and primarily—from the American standpoint—a problem of the security of the United States. This country does not want war; its people are indeed the most peace loving on the face of the earth. But if war is to be forced upon us, or if the world has become too small for the conflicting ideologies of communism and democracy to exist side by side, then we certainly do not want to see all of our friends and potential allies swallowed up one by one, until we are left to face a powerful enemy alone.

As Christians, however, we are bound to weigh the moral considerations underlying any such alliance, and not simply to justify it as a military measure. There is, we believe, strong moral justification for taking measures to knit together the peoples of the democratic nations, and to provide for their defense against the Red totalitarianism which is so destructive of every divine and human value. There is less moral justification, if any, for a purely military coalition, set up on the assumption that war is inevitable and that any means of winning it is warranted.

We do not think that the Atlantic Pact is primarily a military alliance, in the old balance-of-power tradition. True, it has important military features designed to promote mutual self-defense, and these are essential in the present uncertain state of the world. It would be foolhardy to blind our eyes to the threat of military aggression by Soviet Russia, in the light of the history of the past 4 years. But the pact is definitely

defensive, not offensive, in nature. And its objective is not to force American ideas upon European nations nor to hinder the process of peaceful internal change, but to provide the framework of security within which the recovery and rehabilitation of western Europe may go forward.

The North Atlantic Pact is, we believe, a realistic and statesmanlike plan to strengthen and underwrite the community of interest between this country and the European democracies. If it can allay the penetrating fear that now paralyzes western Europe, and that is beginning to affect our own country, it will be a good thing. And it is just as well that we should recognize clearly that the future of America is intimately bound up with that of Europe. The world has become too small for us to return to a policy of isolationism, even if we wanted to do so.

The strongest guaranty of a united free world is not the detailed provision of military commitments in case of this or that contingency, but a common determination on the part of free peoples to throw off the shackles of fear by working together for the good of all, and to remove the evils that lead to the false philosophies that thrive on disunity, chaos, hunger, and fear.

We believe that the proposed North Atlantic Pact will help to underwrite the security and sense of unity which must be the basis for progress toward such a free world. We believe that it is in harmony with the provision of the United Nations Charter for regional pacts, and that it is defensive in nature. We wish it might be universal rather than regional and that it might serve to guarantee the security of the whole world rather than only a part of it. But it is Soviet Russia, not the United States or the other democracies, that has chosen to split the one world into two. If and when the Russians come to themselves and decide to cooperate with the other nations in forming a world community, the door will still be open to them.

It is important that any such far-reaching national policy as that involved in the Atlantic Pact should be made in the light of full knowledge and free discussion, for it will vitally affect every man, woman, and child in the United States. No treaty of a democracy can or should be stronger than the public opinion that stands back of it. Therefore we hope that full opportunity and sufficient time will be given for study of the terms of the proposed pact before it is brought up for vote in the Senate. We are confident that the result will be general recognition that the pact is both necessary and desirable, and that it will give force to what the Cleveland study conference called the moral use of American power.

Necessity for Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete text of a radio broadcast given by me on March 26. The broadcast was entitled "Halt the Three Bigs," and it dealt with the necessity of reestablishing a Senate Small Business Committee.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALT THE THREE BIGS

Thank you, and greetings, fellow Americans.

This week, ladies and gentlemen, I invite you to listen to a brief interview with Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of the State of Nebraska, after which I shall make a few remarks.

Senator WHERRY has been one of the country's most outspoken defenders of our American system of free, competitive enterprise. His fine record during the Eightieth Congress as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, qualifies him to speak authoritatively on the many problems now confronting American small business. The fate of the Senate Small Business Committee was being debated when the following interview was recorded. Mr. George Burger, federation vice president, from our Washington office, who has worked closely with the Senator, is heard as interrogator.

And now, by transcription, we take you to the radio studio of the United States Senate. The first voice you will hear is that of Mr. George Burger, vice president, National Federation of Small Business, in charge of the Washington office:

I am speaking to you from the radio room of the United States Senate. Across from me is seated a Senator who needs no introduction to millions of Americans, and especially small-business men, throughout the Nation, I refer to the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Nebraska, the honorable KENNETH WHERRY.

At this moment, Senator WHERRY, small business is facing a very critical situation, and for the benefit of our radio audience I am going to ask you some leading questions that may tend to stimulate public interest in what is happening. One, do you think the controversy over the reestablishment of a special small-business committee will be solved for the benefit of all concerned by the establishment of a permanent standing committee for small business in the Senate?

Senator WHERRY. George Burger, if you don't mind I'd like to call you George, because I know you so well. I would like to thank you for the opportunity of expressing these observations, especially to the small-business men of America.

In answer to your question, I believe that if the best interests of the small-business men of America are to be served there must be established by the Senate, a committee that will have broad authority to handle all of the problems which are thrust upon the independent businessmen in their struggle for survival. No single committee of the Senate has jurisdiction broad enough to take care of the many and varied problems of the independent businessmen of America. By that I mean that their problems cut across each and every standing committee line. Efforts are being made to have this great and necessary work done by a subcommittee of only one legislative committee of the Senate, but as I have just said, I contend now that such a procedure will never take care of the small-business men of America adequately because they would have to set up a subcommittee of each of the 15 committees, and you know as well as I do, George, because of your experience here in Washington, that what is everybody's business is nobody's business.

We should have one committee where the small-business men can come and there receive the representation and the relief that they ask for. The problems of the small-business men are just as distinct and peculiar as are those of farmers, and of labor, and of all the segments of our economy. Every great segment in our economy has a place to go in Congress with their peculiar problems. Why not small business?

The more than 2,000,000 small-business men of America have had such a place to go in the Senate, because of the special committees which have been set up over the past 8 years. Their problems involve the encroachment of monopoly. Small-business problems involve getting a fair break in Government contracts; their problems in getting a fair share of the available supplies of materials so they can do business and provide jobs. These problems cut across every committee in the Congress. This is basic. The overall reason why there must be a separate standing committee of the Senate on small business of the small businesses of America, these men should get a square deal. You know, George, that I have been doing my level best to get a committee established by the Eighty-first Congress but up to this very hour in which we are making this recording, I am unable to report much progress in the accomplishment of this purpose.

Mr. BURGER. Thank you, Senator. Now, what do you think would be the effect upon small-business enterprise if the Senate fails to reestablish a special committee, or a standing committee, as it is sometimes called?

Senator WHERRY. My answer to that question, not only from my experience as a Senator but as a businessman as well, would be that it would be a serious injury to fail to establish this committee. A serious injury would befall the small-business man of America if the standing-committee proposition is just fumbled out of existence. Small business is the backbone of American industry. It is a great field of opportunity for the youth of our land. We want to preserve in our country every advantage of freedom of opportunity and freedom of choice. That is my chief reason for being so interested in the welfare of small-business concerns.

Our Nation is suffering today from three bigs; big monopoly business, big labor, and big government. We must change this trend or our ship of state will land on the rocks.

Mr. BURGER. Believe me, Senator, we are very happy to hear you speak in this manner. You have spoken this way as long as I have known you and your actions have been in keeping with every statement you have made over this microphone. No one has fought harder than you to see that the small-business men of America get a square deal. I have just one more question that I would like to ask you. The small-business men have noticed a growing tendency in the legislative branch of our Government to absolve industry from the liability of the antitrust laws. Do you believe that if this trend continues, it will have a disastrous effect upon the future of small business?

Senator WHERRY. My answer to that question is, indeed there is such a trend. I have noticed this in a lot of hearings, especially on our small-business committee, and the small-business men of America should be vigilant and make it their duty to watch these developments, because if they do not do so, and if they do not interest themselves in this branch of our Government, they will find themselves crowded out of business entirely. We want America to be strong, so that we can be prosperous and fulfill our obligation to the world. To be strong we must have a flourishing and prosperous business economy based upon free, competitive enterprise for small business as well as big business and all segments of our economy.

Mr. BURGER. Thank you very much, Senator WHERRY. Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard some very important remarks from the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. Senator WHERRY is the minority leader in the Senate and at present he is

facing many twofold duties. It is a great tribute to the many small-business men of America that he has taken this time out of a busy day to give you these words of encouragement. I have known Senator WHERRY since he came to Washington in 1943. I have found him consistent; delivering on the line every promise he has made to protect the small business of this Nation.

My parting advice is that every American keep in close contact with Members of Congress, insisting upon the fact that no amending or weakening of the antitrust laws take place.

Mr. WIMMER. Ladies and gentlemen, I know you have gathered from the remarks of Senator WHERRY and Mr. Burger that both men are in hearty agreement that small business needs a good strong voice in the United States Senate. It is true that many sincere Members of Congress have the feeling that some other agency or committee will serve just as well, but both the House and Senate Small Business Committees have performed such valuable services that reconstitution of each was sought with great vigor.

In the first of a series of articles on small business, Tully Nettleton, who is a staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor, referred to American small business as "big business," which he further described as "the bulwark of these United States." Mr. Nettleton quoted from a report of the Committee for Economic Development, which stated that 95 percent of all business could come within the definition of "small business."

This is unquestionably true. The little shoe-repair shop is a very, very small business when compared with the smaller independent motorcar manufacturer; which in turn is small business indeed when compared with the largest manufacturers of automobiles. It should therefore be very clear to everyone that preservation and expansion of, let us say, independent enterprise, is mighty important to every person in this Nation.

The House and Senate Small Business Committees have been a bulwark against special-privilege groups who have made numerous attempts to disrupt the channels of free, competitive enterprise with unfair monopolistic practices. These committees have been the guardians of the rights of individuals to participate as independent enterprisers in the production and distribution of goods and services, and as such they have not only served small-business men but they have served all of the people of the Nation.

Last week I discussed the various problems which these committees have studied and acted upon, and we shall return to this same subject in future broadcasts.

One thing is certain. No stone must be left unturned that will protect the independent enterpriser from unfair competition if we are to open the avenues of opportunity to the millions of boys and girls now pouring from our schools and colleges.

The National Federation of Small Business speaks for these boys and girls when we come to you with such facts as have been brought out in the interview with Senator WHERRY, and in all our other activities.

Give Freedom a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it may be possible for President Truman and his Congress to pump enough billions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets to temporarily stem the tide of depression, but the more billions given away under ECA will eventually deepen and prolong the approaching depression.

Reports coming to congressional offices confirm the correctness of Mr. Babson's observation with reference to the factors which point to the approaching financial storm.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Mr. Babson, which appeared in the Dunkirk Evening Observer on April 2, 1949:

BABSON SAYS

WASHINGTON.—Harry Truman told voters last fall they needed a Democratic Fair Deal Congress to protect their pocketbooks, their homes, their futures, and even the happiness of their children. I know a few workers who are beginning to smart under this Fair Deal. Today they can't pay the grocer or the landlord.

THE BLOOM IS OFF THE BOOM

The postwar boom has faded so badly that nearly all of our governors are crying for Federal aid. Unemployment in some States is up 100 percent. In some New England towns where the normal working population totals five to ten thousand, as many as 40 percent of the working population are unemployed.

The economic laws of life are catching up with Mr. Truman in spite of the clairvoyant prognostications of his economic pontificate. Retail sales volume has shrunk. Unemployment consequently continues to increase. Carloadings have likewise slumped. Rail, plane, and bus seats are vacant. Hotel accommodations are available without advance reservations. Automobiles are once again procurable. Food prices are down. Clothing prices have been slashed. The housing boom is busted. Business failures are up. Warehouses are full, and many concerns are burdened by too heavy inventories. Why?

HAVE AMERICANS LOST THEIR INITIATIVE?

The fact of the matter is, some thinking Americans are pretty well convinced that Harry Truman himself is not only killing the proverbial goose, but also smashing the golden eggs. Many sharing this opinion are American businessmen. They are the ones who supply the jobs. They are the mainspring of every Main Street in every city, large or small, of the United States. They are best symbolized by sweat and ulcers.

In the face of bureaucratic waste and inefficiency and demands for greater bureaucratic control to create more waste, businessmen are getting discouraged. With the President wanting to embark upon steel making, regardless of the consequences to jobs and savings of millions involved, businessmen rightly question the President's business acumen.

GIVE FREEDOM A CHANCE

Perhaps there are no longer men left with the competitive spirit. Perhaps all Americans are fast becoming a bunch of leeches unwilling to exert the individual energy necessary to keep this country great. I cannot believe this. I am old fashioned enough to believe in America and in those creative principles which have made her great. I think Mr. Truman needs to develop a similar faith in our country. He needs to add a fifth freedom to the now famous four, namely, freedom of enterprise.

The fruits of freedom will ripen only if the social climate is conducive to good growth. The human organism may have the experience, knowledge, and necessary inheritance to develop into a full-blown freeman. But, how humans use these assets and their savings depends on environmental factors which alone develop industry, perseverance, competitiveness, and self reliance. In short, the human organism must be adequately conditioned and motivated to "git up and git." This is a lesson in elementary psychology of human relations which President Truman overlooks.

GOVERNMENT'S TRUE FUNCTION

If Mr. Truman is sincere in his desire to fulfill his campaign promises, he will try to remedy his gross misunderstanding of business functions. He will realize the importance of the competitive spirit and the profit motive in a healthy and free national economy. Government is justified in preventing monopolies and assuring that business is carried on honestly; but otherwise politics and business do not mix to make prosperity.

The Dangers of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Jurist's Warning," by the Honorable Hugh C. Todd, a very distinguished jurist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of March 28, 1949]

A JURIST'S WARNING

(By Hugh C. Todd, judge of the superior court)

I wish to warn the American people of the dangers of communism to our institutions of free government and to the worship of God in this country. You are slumbering in a complacent sense of security because you do not physically see or feel any danger, yet overnight, freedom and religion might fall prostrate in America, and when you awaken you will realize that another Pearl Harbor has struck you down.

If you are not aroused by that statement, you are not aware of what is going on in the world at large and right here in the United States. If you have no fears, you had best take heed and take action. The time has come to act against communism.

This is a duty which rests upon every American citizen, and particularly upon those in public authority: every officer administering the affairs of our Government—the legislators, the Congress and the President, the prosecutors and the Attorney General, and the members of the judiciary as well. A judge is opposed to robbery, burglary, and murder, yet in an American court the robber, the burglar, and the murderer can get a fair trial.

The menace is the growing force of a foreign government that has declared war on freedom and liberty, on democracy, and on Christianity, and all forms of religion. This force is marching on us with a fervor no less than that of those who sing Onward Christian Soldiers, Marching as to War. This force is encroaching on nation after nation, not only breaking down their territorial boundaries, but spreading its devastating ideology in the minds of millions of their peoples,

until today it moves toward our shores with vicious propaganda and marshaled military power.

The Soviet Government recognizes no God; religion is banned; all labor is slave labor; private property is forbidden; liberty and freedom of the individual do not exist. Soviet Russia's sphere of influence has spread to satellite after satellite in eastern Europe and to the hordes of starving orientals in western Asia. Soviet Russia enslaves the millions of the new states it has engulfed and imprisons those in authority who pray to God—Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile—those who on bended knee profess any religion.

Do you Americans realize what kind of government you enjoy—and that you may lose it? Your Government is founded on this premise: "All men are created equal; they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness": freedom of religious worship, freedom of speech, freedom of press, right of assembly and petition. If the onward march of communism is not stopped, you will surrender every such right and principle.

Soviet Russia has planned the destruction of free America for years. Ten years ago, on October 27, 1938, I decided a case in the King County Superior Court—Case No. 305196, entitled *"Northwest District Communist Party* v. *City of Seattle."* This was the first case in America where a judge has ruled, based on evidence and testimony, that the Communist Party believes in the overthrow of the capitalistic, republican, and democratic Government of the United States by force and violence.

Exhibits introduced in evidence in that case, which included the constitution and bylaws of the Communist Party and the program of the Communist International, proved to me that the war for the destruction of liberty and religion was on.

Under the Communist International program, the Communists' fight is pedagogical and administrative, which means that they will seek high public office and professorships and attempt to influence the public and students, both in Government and in the schools, colleges, and universities of America.

Freedom-loving Americans — Catholics, Protestants, all believers in religion—ask God on bended knee tonight to give us wisdom to realize our peril, and courage and strength to arm and defend ourselves before it is too late. Now is the time to get tough and rough with communism.

Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in casting my vote against H. R. 3830, which was a simple measure authorizing the President to expend the unobligated balances remaining from the China Aid Act appropriations, I was making a protest against what I cannot help regarding as a plunderous attitude on the part of Nationalist officials in China and in this country.

Because I was one of 70 Members voting against the bill, and because it would be hard to find two of those 70 Members who voted from the same motives, I think I owe my constituents this explanation.

The present bill is not a bad bill; and, if we are to try to prime the pumps of recovery in all the United Nations, we can scarcely omit China from our beneficence.

However, I have a strong distaste for using American money to bolster up corruption and reaction in the name of progressive American democracy, and I am afraid that nowhere in the world have well-meant American contributions done less good, in proportion to funds expended, than in China.

For many years the Washington press corps has seethed with rumors of a great scandal about to break around the purchases of real estate in New York by Chinese officials in this country, beyond all reasonable expectations of their known incomes; the break has never come, and it may be that the rumors were only rumors, having no substance in fact. Nevertheless, the presence of the rumors cannot be attributed to malice alone; predominantly, the sympathy of America and of the American press and its working writers has been with the Chinese people.

There has been no such reticence in regard to scandals of expropriation, fraud, bribery, theft, and discrimination in China.

Our military aid during the days of war was partly nullified by stupid jealousies and indecision and favoritism and corruption in the Chiang Kai-shek government. Suppression of the moderate political parties of the middle way took the place of long promised reforms, reorganization, and popular government under a written constitution; the constitution was produced finally more as a sop to American public opinion than as an instrument of enlightened popular government.

In an editorial published in the New York Post Home News Wednesday, March 30, that newspaper declared:

By now it should not be necessary to remind the most fumbling of old hands that a vote of no confidence has already been registered against the decadent nationalist crew. Not by our State Department which might have continued to support Chiang Kai-shek and his henchmen until they had plundered China bare of all democracy and gold, but by the non-Communist Chinese people. By the soldiers, the peasants, the intellectuals, the coolies who lost faith in the nationalist fight because many nationalist leaders sat in silks at home, fattening on black-market profits and languidly waving their secret police into repressive action.

Instead of daydreaming that any moment now, Chiang will return on a white steed to win the people back to his discredited and empty cause, the alleged China experts might better catch up on their reading.

Post Home News correspondent Robert Martin reports that normally progovernment Chinese newspapers are demanding that the United States refused to extend the nationalists further aid. They argue that any assistance now would give the Nanking government a semblance of strength which it does not possess, thus fatefully undermining peace negotiations.

If more money must be appropriated for China, let the President assume complete charge of the spending. Through the settling dust, Mr. Truman may discern the need to spend the full sum on relief—and relief alone—for the victimized Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have complete faith in the ability of the Chinese people to find their way to a democratic way of life; I am glad, in reality, that the bill passed over my protest vote.

But I had to voice that protest against corruption, reaction, and stupidity in the nationalist government.

Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the task force report on public welfare, prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by a letter of transmittal from former President Hoover, devotes a part of the report to Government propaganda. Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I insert as a part of my remarks that part of the task force report dealing with the self-serving propaganda emanating from the agencies of the Federal Government, as follows:

Old-age and survivors' insurance has given a long-existing problem of American Government a new significance in a new political setting. The problem is: To what extent should administrative agencies use funds not specifically appropriated for the particular purpose to promote the extension of a program beyond the limits thus far established for it by the Congress, and thus to put pressure on the Congress as a whole and sometimes on individual Congressmen in particular to support the extension? A close liaison between the administrative agency and private individuals or organizations may develop in such a way that the private individuals or organizations carry on the activities which would be patently improper for administrative officers on the pay roll of the agency, but the material which they use has been prepared for them by these officers who may be privy to the proposed use.

The division of powers between the President and the Congress increase the complexity of this problem. The Constitution makes it the duty of the President to "recommend to their consideration (the two Houses of Congress) such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient" (art. II, sec. 3). If the President has recommended a program for the consideration of the Congress, he may raise no objection to the activities of the administrative agencies under him in promoting that program. On the other hand, the Constitution provides that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law" (art. I, sec. 9) and the Congress has specifically constituted it a criminal offense to use appropriations to pay for personal services to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose legislation (41 Stat. 68).

If this provision of the criminal law is to be enforced the action must be taken by the Attorney General, the President's own appointee who holds office at his pleasure. The Comptroller General, the congressional

watchdog of the Treasury, does not have the mechanisms for getting at the situation. Salary for the position has been properly provided by law and hence payments to the incumbent are approved in the final settlement of accounts. It is entirely impracticable for the Comptroller General to determine the actual activities of employees as distinguished from their nominal ones and to withhold payment of salaries because the activities actually carried on were prohibited by law. The facts often do not come to light until after all payments have been made and accounts finally settled. They generally come out after the event and through congressional investigation.

Although this situation has always presented some difficulties, it has become increasingly important in recent years with the advent of new philosophies as to the functions of the state in relation to economic and social policies. In the administrative branch, both in political and in permanent civil-service positions, are a substantial number of employees considerably to the left of the majority of the Members of Congress. Some of them appear to have a conviction that it is their duty to attempt to influence Congress and in interpreting and applying laws to go as far as possible in achieving the reforms in which they believe. They are not satisfied to act and administer within the intent of Congress. The experts in the executive establishments, according to this philosophy, know more and are better equipped than the Congressmen, and the view is not accepted that the experts should be on tap but not on top.

Such attitudes affect both the research work and the publications of some governmental agencies. The most common manifestation is to give wide publicity to the material that will popularize a program and lead to its expansion and to play down the material that might raise opposition to it.

The office of the actuary of the Social Security Agency has, for example, prepared a number of studies of the ultimate costs of old-age and survivors insurance, showing a future magnitude so great that they may have a profound effect on the economic and social system. They have not been widely publicized or popularized. What has been widely publicized is the benefits which people get from the system and the need for more extended coverage, higher benefits, and more liberal eligibility provisions. Very little has been done to dispel an apparently prevalent notion that the present taxes of 1 percent on the employee and 1 percent on the employer will supply the benefits.

Such a course might be more excusable if the problems of financing an old-age retirement system were a matter of common knowledge. On the contrary real understanding is exceptional rather than general. One of the most common ideas is that the excess of receipts over benefit payments in the early years of the system is at least evidence of solvency if not that the system can afford to pay much more liberal benefits without increases in taxes. The question should be raised as to whether in a democracy the government should not present to the people in clear and simple form an analysis of all the problems involved and of their ultimate social and economic implications. The system has its benefits and its costs, and the people should decide whether the benefits are worth the costs. More specifically, initial opposition to a means test is almost instinctive, but there appears to be very little general understanding of the degree of control over the earnings of the people that will ultimately result from a universal no-means test system paying substantial benefits. If the degree of control was widely understood, it seems possible that large numbers of citizens would desire an unbiased and comprehensive study of the possibilities of developing a means test which will be stripped of most of the old features which account for its disrepute.

Interview With Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, on the Program "Meet the Press"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and educational radio program entitled "Meet the Press," in which the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was interviewed by several newspaper reporters, on March 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D. C., news center of the world, Mutual brings you the most revealing half hour in radio—Meet the Press, America's press conference of the air.

We invite you to listen to an unrehearsed and spontaneous press conference, as four of your country's ace reporters fire questions at Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, who is taking an important place in the Senate filibuster now in full swing.

Each week Mutual presents Meet the Press in cooperation with the editors of the American Mercury, one of America's most fearless, outspoken, and stimulating magazines. Our press conference will begin in just a moment.

What about the filibuster? Has it a legitimate place in a democratic government? Is it, as its defenders claim, a protection for a minority against an all-powerful, hard-hitting majority? Or has it become, as its opponents insist, a device whereby a handful of wrong-headed, willful legislators can defeat the will of the people? Is the filibuster the best guaranty of free discussion and deliberation in democratic legislative halls? Or is it a travesty upon the whole democratic process, leaving the door open to the tyranny of a backward minority? Once again, as so many times in the past, lines are drawn in the Senate for a battle over the issue of the filibuster. This time the battle will be more hard-fought than ever before. A large part of President Truman's program is at stake. The administration is determined to bring the filibuster under control before the highly controversial civil-rights bills are presented for passage. The southern legislators in the Senate know that their only hope in keeping these bills from becoming law is in maintaining the age-old right of the upper House to unlimited debate. They will fight to the last man against any change in the rules. An important participant in the fight is Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, whose colleague, Senator PEPPER, is with the administration and against him. He is here tonight to answer some of the questions you would ask if you were here.

And now, here is the well-known commentator, Albert Warner, to welcome Senator HOLLAND and the gentleman of the press.

Mr. WARNER. Welcome, everybody, to another weekly news conference. Seated around the press table are: Lawrence E. Spivak, of the American Mercury Magazine; Marquis Childs, of United Features; John T. Carlton, of the Miami Daily News; and Louis R. Lautier, of the Atlanta (Ga.) Daily World, who this week won a Wendell L. Willkie award in Negro journalism. Facing the press table is Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida. He is a lawyer, a former judge, and a student of the law. He was Governor of Florida before coming to the United States Senate in 1946. He's a veteran of active service in the First World War and a winner of the Distinguished Service Cross. Senator HOLLAND has been a leader this week in the fight against a new Senate rule to limit debate. After speaking for 3 hours, he fortified himself with a glass of Florida orange juice and continued on for 1 hour and 52 minutes more, but always on the subject and always with logic. After speaking that long, he may be excused for having a rather hoarse throat tonight. Now the President has entered the fight urging limitation of debate by a simple majority vote. And in the background of the conflict lies the waiting civil-rights legislation.

I see Mr. Childs has the first question.

Mr. CHILDS. Senator HOLLAND, you talk a lot about unlimited debate and the right of unlimited debate. But when does unlimited debate become a filibuster, and will you please for us define the word "filibuster"?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, Mr. Childs, the matter of defining a filibuster depends on who's defining it. We speak of unlimited debate because we're given that right, we are proud to have that right, we feel that it's worth something to our States and to the people of the Nation, we think that it's not only legitimate, but it was one of those features that was in mind when the Senate was set up, and that for 128 years there was no departure from the rule that there should be no limitation of debate in the Senate except during the War Between the States, and then only as to war measures.

Mr. CHILDS. But there is something called a filibuster, isn't there, Senator? What is it?

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Childs, the filibuster is a term used by people who don't like to go up against unlimited debate, particularly when they don't have sound arguments to meet the arguments of those who are conducting what the critics call a filibuster. In this instance I think it's completly wrong for anyone to speak of what has happened so far in this debate as a filibuster, because as a matter of fact, only 7 have spoken out of around 22, and each of them comes from a separate State. There are several other States whose Senators haven't been heard at all, and under our belief that the Senate is the peculiar forum where the States are given the right to be heard through their Senators, we haven't even made a beginning as yet. And so I think that it was a travesty when, on the occasion that Senator GEORGE rose to his feet the other day to make the first speech, a 44-minute speech, that the papers all blazoned out with the news that the southern filibuster had begun. Now that's simply ridiculous.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, actually you are out to stop a vote. You aren't out just to clarify an issue and get a vote—you're out to stop this vote from being taken on the amendment. Isn't that so?

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Spivak, we are out to beat the change of the rule, and we don't even know in what shape a vote might finally be presented. We know that while the committee has reported in a resolution to perfect, as they call it, the two-thirds cloture rule, we know that the majority leader, Senator LUCAS, and the majority whip, Senator MYERS, and the Vice President of the United States, and the President of the United States apparently all want a majority cloture of one kind or another. And they're not even together—some of them

want the constitutional majority cloture, that is, by 49 Senators; and some, including the distinguished President of the United States, have come out for a simple-majority cloture, which means by 25 of the Senators when there's only a quorum present.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, sooner or later you're going to clarify this issue. Some of the men who are with you in this debate—not filibuster—insist that they'll talk in order to stop the vote. Now, would you admit that at that time this thing would become a filibuster? Is there any danger of that?

Senator HOLLAND. When the time comes that people run out of arguments and are talking about matters that are completely extraneous to this debate, then and then only will anybody be properly and legitimately entitled to call this a filibuster. As a matter of fact, Mr. Spivak, more Senators have spoken since this debate started on Monday who have not been in accord with the views of the group from the South, of which I'm one, than have spoken on our side. We've had seven to speak. There've been four or five to speak directly against us, and then there have been some seven or eight others who've spoken on other subjects during this period of time. So by no means have we trespassed or in any way hogged the time up to now.

Mr. LAUTIER. Do you think, Senator, that the Senators who framed the present cloture rule in 1917 intended that the Senate should have a rule which would enable two-thirds of Senators voting to limit debate on any matter before the Senate?

Senator HOLLAND. That's a good question. It's a question that I wish I could answer definitely. I wasn't here. I knew some of those distinguished gentlemen. They were among the finest statesmen that we've produced in this world—I mean, in this Nation—and it's very hard for me to believe that that large group of both parties who were on the committee failed to see these two defects which have come in, particularly when there is in the Senate rules, and was then, a provision that an amendment or motion to correct the Journal was a privileged motion which anyone was entitled to bring at any time. And, to close my position on that, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the defects in this rule appeared while most of the men on that committee were still Members of the Senate. And we have no indication that they tried to correct or strengthen the rule. And we're forced to the conclusion either that they knew that the defects were there when the rule was prepared and adopted, or that when the defects appeared they had found that the rule was vicious, and that they didn't care to attempt to perfect it, one of the two, because certainly none of them ever spoke up to correct the defects which you speak of.

Mr. CARLTON. Senator, various members of the press gallery today, in talking to Senators from off the floor, got the very definite impression from a great many of them that the southerners had this attempt to change the rules beaten, and that if a vote was put today, the so-called southern group would have won. In view of that fact, if it is a fact, would you not be willing to have a vote tomorrow or Tuesday or Monday or at any time on this question?

Senator HOLLAND. Jake, we'd have been glad to have a vote today. And so far as we're concerned, if the vote could have come today by our merely stopping, we would have welcomed it. But as to what the vote will actually be when it does come, I have no idea. You must remember that with the President and the Vice President and the majority leaders all in this fight, that all of the trading material is against us, and that therefore the fact that we might have been in ascendancy today, which I believe to be the fact, shouldn't make us feel that we've won the battle by any manner of means, and we do not so feel.

Mr. WARNER. Well, Senator, are you intimating that President Truman's intervention yesterday hurt his own cause?

Senator HOLLAND. No; I haven't intimated that at all.

Mr. WARNER. Well, your suggestion that today you might have won out, I thought carried the implication that perhaps the situation was different today from what it had been yesterday morning.

Senator HOLLAND. Well, there were several things that happened yesterday and today which contributed, I think, to better the situation. Now, what will happen from now on we can only wait to see.

Mr. CHILDS. I'd like to ask you, Senator HOLLAND, why, in your opinion, your colleague Senator PEPPER takes an opposite stand from you. He's a southern Senator from Florida. Why does he disagree with you?

Senator HOLLAND. Why, Mr. Childs, I couldn't possibly answer that, except upon the theory that he conscientiously believes in the other side of the question. I accord to him the quality of good conscience, which I think every Senator must accord to every other Senator.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, instead of the two-thirds or majority provision, would you be willing to accept a provision that would give you the unlimited right to debate, continue the unlimited right to rebate, as long as you stuck to the subject?

Senator HOLLAND. You mean a relevancy provision?

Mr. SPIVAK. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. Well, that isn't before us now, Mr. Spivak. I have frequently thought of that. It might be the answer to this whole situation. I did, in my speech yesterday, as you may recall, state that not only I, but I thought the southern group as a whole, would be agreeable to support the Stennis resolution, which proceeded to clear up all the defects but to cut down the number against whom cloture could be voted to not to exceed 10, on the theory that we didn't want a small obstreperous group left in position where they might hurt the Nation in time of grave emergency. And 10, you know, is a considerable number. They might represent the five most populous States in the Nation with nearly 50,000,000 people.

Mr. WARNER. May I—may I suggest at this point—don't the present rules provide that there must be relevancy in speech making? Don't you have to keep to the subject under the present rules, if you have a presiding officer who interprets them strictly?

Senator HOLLAND. Certainly not. Certainly not, Mr. Warner. If that were the case, then a Senator with a message of tremendous importance to his people, and something which he felt should by all means be promptly called to the attention of the Nation, would be precluded and shut off from doing so just by the pendency, perhaps, of some inconsequential measure. So that there is no rule at this time of that kind in the Senate.

Mr. SPIVAK. I was going to say that I'd understood that there was a Senate rule based on Jefferson's Manual which states no one is to speak impertinently or beside the question superfluously or tediously, and I just wonder whether that has been enforced. Evidently it hasn't, and has gone by default.

Senator HOLLAND. I think it's been enforced during this debate, because I don't believe anybody, certainly on our side, has spoken either tediously, impertinently, or beside the question.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, Senator RUSSELL, your leader in this fight, has said, "We shall show that the present rules of debate have been productive of more good than harm." Do you agree with that statement

Senator HOLLAND. Entirely.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, can you name a recent instance where that has been so? Where a debate has been stopped that has been productive, that has gone on that has been productive of real good?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, there's a long list of legislation to which cloture has been attempted to be applied, and then before the rule of cloture was adopted, in 1917, there's a considerable list of attempted legislation which was stopped by long debate, and I believe when you read that,, you'll come to the conclusion that there has been nothing good that has been so stopped. As a matter of fact, since this rule was adopted, it is absolutely a demonstrable fact that nothing has been stopped except these three measures which are most often mentioned in this so-called civil-rights program. Now, while it's true that two or three other measures were stopped for the time being, they became law and became law shortly, and there is nothing that has been held up since 1917 under this rule and denied permanent passage, except these three items which are so offensive to the South, its laws, its custom, its philosophy, and which we believe will very greatly harm us and turn us backward in the tremendous progress that we've made on our path of good will and understanding, in which both races have progressed greatly.

Mr. LAUTIER. In the light of your opposition, Senator, to any change in the cloture rule except the Stennis proposal, I'm wondering whether you would be willing to make any concessions on the civil-rights program first.

Senator HOLLAND. Yes, I certainly am. I was one of those 10 southern Senators who, you recall, joined to introduce an amendment to the Constitution which would take care of the poll-tax question. And we think that's the only legal way to approach it, that is, from Washington, the only legal way to approach it, except by handling through the several States, seven States I believe it is, who still have the poll tax. That is, I think can be properly stated to be, a concession.

Mr. LAUTIER. On the matter of antilynching, I'm wondering whether you would favor Federal action in cases where persons are taken from law-enforcement officers, where they are suspected of crime, and are lynched without the imposition of penalties on the community in which the lynching occurs.

Senator HOLLAND. No; I wouldn't, because I think you'd get no good results, and I think you'd get very bad results. As a matter of fact, when under the present laws and under the present mandate of popular opinion in the Southern States the situation is so good that in 2 years within the last 5 there has been only one lynching in each of those 2 years—and I deplore the fact that there was one—I say that you've gone far beyond what you can do through the force of law, and that we've made the progress that we've made most largely through good will and through understanding and through patience and through the insistence of the good people of both races, yours and mine, that this blot shall be removed, and I don't believe that there's any other capital offense that you can mention or that any of us could mention, unless it is dueling, which has been so nearly extinguished, and I'm perfectly willing to put up, as I did in the Senate yesterday, our record in the South, which is so vastly better in this field, against the record of some other parts of the Nation, where the same kind of cause, that is, intense race feeling, has provoked race riots and other difficulties in recent years, as, for instance, the one at Detroit in 1943, when 34 people were killed and 471 wounded, and the one at Harlem that same year, when 5 were killed and about 500 wounded, and I'm not making any suggestion of criticism against those communities. I'm sure they deplored those things worse than anybody else anywhere. I'm sure that they had good laws and good enforcement officers.

But this thing we're talking about, this matter of race hatred, when it explodes, is something that flies in the face of the law, it doesn't follow the law, and those things didn't happen because there was no law, but they happened because there was a conflagration that came too quick to be stopped.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, if you've succeeded in handling the lynching law as well as you have, what objection have you got to a law? You won't have to worry about it at all.

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Spivak, having served as governor of a southern State, I have seen the emphasis which is placed by every southern governor, by every attorney general, by the law enforcement officers generally, by the good people in general, upon building a decent record based on fair treatment and on justice and on insistence that the law shall prevail, when we're standing on the soundest ground that people can stand on——

Mr. SPIVAK. I know, but Senator——

Senator HOLLAND. That is, a good conscience——

Mr. SPIVAK. We have a——

Senator HOLLAND. And my point—let me conclude my answer, please, sir—my point is that to inject compulsion here from outside, voted by people who haven't the slightest understanding of this problem, will take us off of that good, sound rock of sound conscience, and instead will put us in the position of having to do something—and we won't get anywhere——

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator—Senator, all laws——

Senator HOLLAND. On that basis.

Mr. SPIVAK. All laws are compulsion. We have a Federal lynching law today, and that hasn't bothered you fellows too much. Why should you worry on any Federal kidnapping law? Why should you worry about a lynching law, especially if you've handled the lynching matter so well?

Senator HOLLAND. The Federal kidnapping law, if I understand it, relates to the transportation of kidnapped persons across State lines, and is built on the thought that here's an interstate matter. There's no such point as that at all in the antilynching law. I'd certainly have no objection to an antilynching law which would include only that element of Federal jurisdiction, because I think you'd be building on sound grounds.

Mr. CHILDS. Senator Holland, leading off this question on which you are so very sensitive, don't you feel your party's come in here, the Democratic Party, with the tremendous promises your President has made—I say "your President" advisedly—don't you feel this unlimited debate—I won't call it filibuster—is going to hold up vital measures—rent control, European aid, and so on—that will destroy your party in Congress?

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Childs, if that results, it won't be the fault of the southern Senators——

Mr. CHILDS. Well, it doesn't matter whose fault it is——

Senator HOLLAND. Let me conclude my answer——

Mr. CHILDS. I'm talking about your party—you're a Democrat, aren't you?

Senator HOLLAND. You bet I am a Democrat. And I've supported the President and I've supported the party. But let me tell you this—that I'm one of those who foresaw the coming of this question, and after talking to the leaders and getting nothing out of talk, I addressed a letter—a formal letter—to the majority leader now, Senator LUCAS, on January 13, calling his attention to the fact that if this fight were precipitated now, that those who precipitated it would have to take the responsibility for knocking down the chance for bringing up other important legislation. And notwithstanding that, notwithstanding the fact that many splendid Senators in the South and elsewhere in our party agreed with that, the leadership insists on butting its head into a wall—I think you saw the cartoon in the Star the other day which shows so clearly that that's what's going on—they're butting their head into a wall, and they've done it after notice and knowledge of what was apt to happen.

Mr. CARLTON. Senator, we recognize, of course, that you are no Dixiecrat and that you supported the Truman-Barkley ticket in the last election. I want to ask you this question—the President, Mr. Truman, and Mr. Barkley carried Florida, as they did all except four of the other southern States. Do you think that victory indicates public support of everything in the Democratic platform?

Senator HOLLAND. Not at all, Mr. Carlton. If the Governor—the then Governor of Florida—this is my humble judgment—and myself, the junior Senator from Florida, and the six Congressmen, all of whom had taken the same position that I had, and the six Cabinet members, who are elected every 4 years just like the governor, and numerous county officers throughout the State, had not stood loyally by the party even though we were not in accord with this civil-rights program, and not in accord with at least one other thing in the platform, the State would not, in my humble judgment, have remained in the Democratic column. You'll recall that our party got only a plurality down there this last time, Jake, and that the Republicans were right closely on our heels, and that the so-called Dixiecrat Party also got a quite heavy vote in Florida.

Mr. CARLTON. Well, Senator, I understand that there's some consideration, or at least it has been suggested that the President could dissipate a great many misunderstandings about his program and about his personality should he make a trip through the South, similar to the one he made through the Midwest, or the several he made through the Midwest prior to the last election. What do you think the reception would be that the southerners would give to President Truman should he make such a trip?

Senator HOLLAND. Why, Jake, we'll give him the same courteous, cordial reception which we always give to the President of the United States. I'm leaving here tonight by plane to meet the President and others next Tuesday morning at Rollins College, where he'll receive an honorary degree. We are proud of the fact that he has placed his out-of-town White House there. He certainly would receive cordial welcome in Florida, and I'm sure in every other Southern State where hospitality is part of our nature.

Mr. CARLTON. Well, don't you think he would render a real service to his party and to the Nation should he make such a trip?

Senator HOLLAND. Perhaps.

Mr. WARNER. Supposing he makes such a trip berating the Eighty-first Congress?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, that's his prevlefe—that's his privilege.

Mr. LAUTIER. Do you think, Senator HOLLAND, that the Democratic Party is duty-bound to carry out the pledges it made in the platform adopted at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia last summer?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, now that—you've asked a question that's pretty big. It—some of them are. People who were elected upon the strength of that platform I should say are. There are many of us who are not in that position. I personally have taken my own personal position against civil rights, both when I ran and ever since I've been up here, and though I stayed with the party I made it very crystal clear when I came out to stand with the party this time that I wasn't yielding on civil rights and on one other question with which you're familiar. And I think that those of us who had our own platforms and were elected upon them have the perfect right to stand upon those platforms and records.

Mr. WARNER. Senator, may I ask if the action in the Senate Labor Committee today in reporting the administration bill without considering any amendments—has that had any effect on the filibuster fight?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, I haven't heard of any yet, but I should think it would, because it's a practical, specific demonstration of what a majority, working with the administration, can do to beat down ordinary rules of fair play and of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. CHILDS. One thing I'd like to hear you explain, Senator HOLLAND, and that is the fact that in the Southern States the Truman ticket got far more votes than the Dixiecrat ticket, even though in many States the Dixiecrat—the Truman ticket was barred from the ballot. Don't you believe that that indicates that the southern Senators represent a minority of the South, rather than a majority?

Senator HOLLAND. I do not. I think if you'll check the States you'll find that in those States where the Governors and the Senators and the Representatives and the important State officials and county officials went Dixiecrat, that the State went Dixiecrat. And where those officials to the contrary stayed with the party, the State stayed with the party. And I think that I'm speaking for every southern State and the vast majority of the people in every southern State insofar as I know they were, when I say that they are opposed to this so-called civil-rights program, because they think it will roll back the tremendous progress which we made in this field and of which we're very proud. And we think, Mr. Childs, that the rest of the Nation ought to be expressing their approval and praise of the fine record that has been made in the South.

Mr. CHILDS. Well, exactly, you fought for antipoll tax legislation in Florida. Why do you now oppose it on a national scale Senator?

Senator HOLLAND. I certainly don't. I've offered an amendment to take care of it, but I'm certainly not going to support a statute which I believe to be not only hopelessly unconstitutional, but an entering wedge and an invitation for other Federal measures which would be equally unconstitutional and which will disturb even more the States' control of their own election machinery.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, the South has been tremendously concerned with the constitutional issues involved. Have you always been so concerned with the Constitution as you are today in this issue—in these issues?

Senator HOLLAND. Why, I think so.

Mr. SPIVAK. I mean the Southern Democrats? What, for example, have you done about the fifteenth amendment? Do you think the South has attempted to enforce that?

Senator HOLLAND. Now, which is the fifteenth? Just——

Mr. SPIVAK. The fifteenth amendment——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Spivak, I sincerely don't think we've got time to go into that. I'm sorry to interrupt, but we must bring this to a close. This has been a relatively short time in which to air the views of our guest—after all, he kept the Senate floor for 4 hours and 52 minutes yesterday. But we have at least touched on some of the highlights of the issue of restricting debate in the Senate. We leave it to our listeners to decide whether the resistance to limitation of debate has become, as Republican Senator TOBEY suggests, just words, words, words, or reasonable opposition to the threats of high-handed action by an uncompromising majority. For this press conference of the air, the thanks of the Mutual network go to

you, Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND of Florida, and to my colleagues of the press: Lawrence Spivak of the American Mercury; Louis Lautier of the Atlanta Daily World; John Carlton of the Miami Daily News; and Marquis Childs of United Features. Until next time, this is your correspondent Albert Warner.

The European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address regarding the European Cooperation Administration and the European recovery program, by Harold G. Stagg, editor of the Marshall Plan Letter, before the Export Managers' Club, at the Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., on March 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Export Managers' Club, and distinguished guests, I was very pleased by your invitation to discuss with you my impressions of the European recovery program and the operations of the Economic Cooperation Administration, particularly as they relate to you in your business. As editor of the Marshall Plan Letter I have some knowledge of your problems, and of the problems which confront ECA.

But in trying to explain the workings of the European recovery program objectively, there is one fact which everyone must consider. That is, that there are two sides to the question—yours, and the other fellow's.

I could probably make many friends by saying that ECA is a foe, not a friend, of American business. And I believe I could document that statement reasonably well. On the other hand, I could say with equal emphasis that ECA is a friend, not a foe, of business. And I could easily document that statement, too.

But neither statement would be wholly true. ECA is much too aloof from the routine problems of American business to bear so human a label as friend or foe. It is more like a benevolent tyrant, impersonally trying to guide the world into the utopian sunshine of economic prosperity and political good will.

Perhaps it will be best to remind you at the start that your support of the European recovery program is not a matter of choice. It's a matter of necessity. To use a homely and undoubtedly odious comparison, it's something like paying alimony to a divorced wife. There's a lot of justification for it, you're not very keen about it, but you'd certainly be a lot worse off if you withheld your support.

And so, whatever your quarrels with ECA, you've got to continue giving it your support. Right now the program is primarily a European recovery program. But in a few years it may well become a vital necessity as an American prosperity program, or even an American recovery program.

I want to tell you a few things about the situation we are going to face in a few years in regard to American world trade. But first I'd like to tell you a little about the men who run ECA, things you rarely hear unless you have close and constant contact with them.

With few execeptions, you can say this for the men around Paul Hoffman, the ECA boss: They're not afraid of hard work and long hours. From the bright boys fresh out of Harvard and Yale to the big boss himself, they tackle Europe's problems with an attitude of consecrated devotion. That attitude is emphasized by the astounding number of overtime hours they put in on the job. And if you know about Washington, you know that this is a rare phenomenon.

Recently, just before Mr. Hoffman was scheduled to present ECA's case for more money to the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, you could find the elevators in the ECA building crowded at 11 o'clock every night. And not all of the members of ECA's varsity team were on their way home. Many of them were going out for a quick cup of coffee to keep them on their feet until 2 and 3 a. m. Now they've settled down again into a normal routine that includes working all day Saturday and at least half a day on Sunday.

It isn't hard to explain this gluttonous appetite for long hours of work. First, there's the nature and scope of the job. Give a group of men several billion dollars, tell them to reshape world trade and the economic lives of 270,000,000 Europeans, and they're bound to feel a sense of God-like power and responsibility.

Second, there's the leadership within the organization. Hoffman is the kind of man who inspires his aides to maximum efforts. With his ability as a supersalesman, he wins support from almost everyone he comes in contact with. He does this with what appears to be amazing ease. And his assistant deputy, Richard Bissell, provides the drive needed to back up Hoffman's inspiration.

Third, there is the caliber of the men themselves. That it is extremely high is explained by the fact that many of the policy men are on loan from high-salaried industrial jobs, to which they anticipate an early return. Their work for ECA is their stint of patriotism. And why not, with the whole world to play with, and a salary of from ten to twenty-five thousand dollars a year?

Unfortunately, in some officials, this consecrated, single-minded devotion becomes bigotry. Their eyes and minds are so firmly fixed on the European horizon that the United States is just a blur in the distance. They yell "team, team, team" so loud and so often that they can't hear the dissatisfied grumblings of businessmen in this country, businessmen who for good reason feel that ECA has no interest in their problems.

Much of this holier-than-thou tone is set by Deputy Administrator Dick Bissell, whom my associates describe as an almost inhumanly brilliant economist, and by his young assistants who are dubbed by the press as the "palace guard." These youngsters keep themselves well-insulated from the everyday problems of businessmen, and the queries of a frustrated press, with glib mental wanderings through a field populated with phrases like "balance of payments," "deficits on current account," and "exportable surpluses."

Bissell without doubt is the know-how man of ECA. The press speaks of him privately as the "know-how-but-won't-tell man." He's a phenomenal worker. He's honest and sincere. But his shy and chilly personality and his passion for abstractions keep him from being popular. As a planner, ECA needs him; but as an administrator, he doesn't quite measure up to his reputation, because he doesn't seem able to delegate authority. If it weren't for Hoffman's warm charm and the good-humored practical shrewdness of Deputy Administrator Howard Bruce, ECA would be far more unpopular and misunderstood than it is now.

Here, then, we have a handful of handpicked American economists, businessmen, and politicians reshaping world trade policies under a congressional edict to bring about the complete recovery of Europe by 1952. There is nothing in the Foreign Assistance Act under which ECA was created which authorizes or instructs ECA to use its funds to stave off a depression in the United States, or to save American businessmen from the results of softening markets.

Hoffman was very emphatic in explaining his position in this regard to the Foreign Relations Committee. Here is one sentence from his recent testimony, and I quote:

"If Congress for any reason wants us to give particular support to any segment of the American economy and thus make this somewhat of an American recovery program, all we ask is that we be given very specific and direct instructions, because if you do not give us those instructions we are going to buy where we can buy at the lowest possible price."

Where ECA is concerned, the recovery of Europe is the only keynote. Where ECA is concerned, the recovery of Europe is the only goal.

Anything more is in the future and is up to you and up to Congress.

What happens to American business in the meantime is rightfully your concern. But it is not the concern of ECA under the law which Congress wrote and which has been widely supported by the public.

Despite the complaints of many businessmen and groups of business representatives, the economy of this country is better off today as a result of ECA than it otherwise would be. For without ECA Europe would have no dollars to buy our products.

At the moment the short-range outlook for American world trade is good compared to prewar years. But the long-range outlook holds a serious threat to United States exporters, and this threat appears certain to reach the acute stage by 1952. When that time comes, it will be necessary to continue the European recovery program as an American recovery program—a program which will be vital if this country is to maintain its place in the trade pattern of the world.

Therefore, whether we like it or not and by this or any other name, the European recovery program—in some form or other—is going to remain with us.

The over-all accomplishments of the European recovery program have been substantial and the basic operations of ECA are wise and sound. But there is much room for a little giving here, and a little taking away there, that would make ECA operations of more genuine help to greater numbers of American businessmen. That's why the Marshall Plan Letter occasionally appears critical of ECA's stubborn adherence to the strict letter of the law and its somewhat fawning willingness to proceed on the theory that European governments, like Caesar's wife, can do no wrong.

ECA has emphasized again and again that it is a financing and not a purchasing agency. Although this is manifestly true, United States exporters who are losing their traditional markets under ERP inevitably turn to ECA to register their complaints.

The policy of letting participating countries make their own Marshall plan purchases, subject, of course, to the approval of ECA, was designed to encourage the use of private trade channels and to avoid placing ECA in the position of acting as another huge Government buying corporation.

However, some exporters complain with considerable justification that under ERP, private trade channels are not being used in the true sense of the word. The United Kingdom, France and Italy, which receive most

of the money under the recovery program, are using Government agencies, or quasi-governmental purchasing monopolies such as the French groupments, for nearly all purchases.

In many cases, the purchases consummated under the Government-controlled program are not those most desired by the countries' own importers.

The view of American suppliers has been confined largely to specific problems of their own particular businesses. ECA tends, quite properly under the law, to view ERP as a whole. Consequently it feels that the governments of participating countries must decide themselves what goods they will import from the United States.

With limited dollars available, ERP countries, as a matter of self-interest, will be forced to reject many requests from their own importers for the right to import specific commodities and materials.

However, the fact remains that the impact of ERP on our domestic economy must be assessed realistically. It must be assessed not only in terms of its fast-disappearing inflationary aspects, but on its possible undermining of the markets of United States business.

The eyes of ECA still view only the European scene and there is a continuing tendency to deny United States business groups opportunities for greater participation which are possible within the present scope of the European recovery program.

American suppliers have tried to have the buying programs of the various countries publicized in advance so they could compete for some of the business. But ECA has given them little help in their efforts.

Time changes all things and it has already brought into focus the need to reexamine some of the fundamentals of our foreign aid program. Before the basic ERP legislation was submitted to Congress last year, the probable impact of this type of spending on the American economy was thoroughly studied by a number of Government committees. However, because the studies were undertaken in the fall of 1947 and the spring of 1948—when inflationary pressures were causing considerable concern—the principal emphasis in the basic studies was on softening the impact of the program on price levels in this country.

This concern with the possible inflationary effects of ERP was carried over to Congress, and in writing the authorizing legislation Congress included specific provisions to limit the quantities of various commodities that could be bought in this country. Except for the sections of the ECA Act dealing with the procurement of "surplus agricultural commodities," almost no attention was given to the problems of sectors of the American economy which already have felt the effects of a sharp down trend in foreign demand for their products.

As a result, ECA and other Government agencies concerned with United States exports under the Marshall plan attempted, with a considerable degree of success to limit the quantities of certain goods exported from this country.

The limitations on exports imposed by ECA and the Office of International Trade were generally confined to commodities in short supply. But the European countries in attempting to stretch their limited dollars displayed an immediate tendency to schedule purchases in the United States, only if supplies were available nowhere else in the world.

As you well know, the effects of this general policy have been disastrous to some segments of the United States economy.

As a result of complaints some Members of Congress gradually are becoming aware that this year they face an entirely different problem in gauging the impact of ERP on the domestic economy, than in 1948. Now the problem is how to increase buying in the United States of a relatively large number of items, instead of trying to limit purchases. This problem should come to the fore when the new ECA bill reaches the floors of the House and Senate.

The position of ECA—which is still largely concerned with the inflationary aspects of the program—has already been outlined before Congress in considerable detail. But with a very few exceptions it would take an alert Diogenes with an awfully bright lamp to find many Members of Congress who know what it's all about.

Except for some Members of the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, there are few Congressmen who have more than a superficial knowledge of how the European recovery program operates—of why ECA does what it does—or why businessmen sometimes complain about ECA practices.

ECA has published and continues to publish numerous documents and charts which provide excellent reviews and graphic illustrations of what the European recovery program is, what it means, how it functions, what it has accomplished, what problems still lie ahead.

Unfortunately, too few Members of Congress and almost none of the general public ever give these charts and documents more than a casual glance. For all the good they do in spreading the gospel of ERP, they might just as well be buried in the cornerstone of the renovated White House.

ECA marshaled all of its big guns from Europe, brought staff aides winging home across the Atlantic, burdened with great masses of impressive reports and statistical information. They were allowed to make their formal statements before the Foreign Relations Committee. They were permitted to point out the fact that they had available beautifully drawn and colorfully decorated charts, and were prepared to explain them in detail. They were questioned briefly and instructed to make way for the next witness.

Formal hearings on ECA's request for additional funds began before a joint meeting of the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees on Tuesday, February 8. The scene was one of great conviviality, with klieg lights and cameras and a majority of the members of both committees on hand.

When the lights had dimmed, when the cameramen had gone, only a handful of interested committee members remained to show their interest in ECA and its $5,000,000,000-a-year program.

Most people spend too much time looking at the export picture entirely from the point of view of the American businessman. They overlook Europe's own recovery objectives, which are bound to have a very far-reaching effect upon American trade.

It isn't generally known, but Europe's recovery objectives during the life of ERP involve reducing imports from the United States by a thumping big 40 percent and capturing half of the United States markets in Latin America for her own products. These, undoubtedly, are overly ambitious goals, but the fact remains that the impact of trade shifts in the next 3 years will seriously dislocate the present United States trade pattern and demand difficult decisions by Congress, the Government, and business.

Government trade experts predict that United States exports in 1949 will average $1,000,000,000 a month. That will be close to 1948 levels, but far below the 1947 bonanza. However, in the days ahead, American traders are going to face keener competition in almost all world markets.

The trade pattern of the last half of 1948 will probably continue for the next year because of continued heavy spending of ERP dollars. After that, however, the determination of all the western European countries to reduce imports from this country will become a matter of urgent concern. It will be of concern, not only to producers already feeling the effects of the collapse of the extraordinary 1947 demand but to the entire domestic economy.

Price declines in the United States will have little effect on the short-range picture, which, as I said before, is favorable. Although European buying in this country is encouraged by price declines here, this is somewhat offset by the fact that European exporters will receive less for products they sell here and their supply of earned dollars will be proportionately reduced.

The over-all trade problem is complicated by the fact that Europe is aiming not only at reducing imports from the United States but at increasing its exports to this country and to the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

This export campaign already is causing trouble. Some United States suppliers complain they are losing markets in Latin America and some domestic producers are concerned over the threat of European competition in this country.

Despite the fact that an increase in European exports to the United States is a basic objective of the Marshall plan, there is trouble brewing on this score. It will come in connection with the extension and strengthening of the President's powers to negotiate tariff reductions under the reciprocal-trade program.

The Truman administration is adjusting slowly to the conclusion that the end of postwar shortages in this country requires an entirely new assessment of trade policies. And although some tariff reductions will be made at the conference next month in France, they will not be as far-reaching as the ERP countries would like.

Building long-range markets for United States exports will require aggressive action in the coming year as European imports become more and more limited to a few products which can be obtained only in this country. The road ahead is rough.

For example, by 1952 France plans to cut its annual imports from the United States from a prewar level of about $900,000,000 to about $365,000,000.

France's exceptional postwar imports of coal, bread grains, and dairy products are already being reduced substantially. And coarse grains, fats, and machinery will soon feel the pinch of cutbacks as well.

By 1952, France hopes to restrict dollar purchase to oil, cotton, copper, machinery, leaving only $95,000,000 for miscellaneous items.

Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg are moving rapidly toward economic union. Traders should begin analyzing export opportunities to these areas as a unit. Imports by the Benelux countries from the United States will continue through next year at the present rate of about $700,000,000, four times the prewar rate, then move downward to a goal of about $500,000,000 for 1952.

On the other hand, exports to this country from Benelux countries are programed to rise from the present level of about $100,000,000 to nearly $250,000,000.

Italy plans rapid changes in its supply markets. Imports from the dollar area, which amounted to 44 percent of her total imports in 1947, will be reduced to 15 percent by 1952, and purchases in other areas will be increased.

Italian exports to this country, now at 6 percent of the total, are programed to reach 10 percent by 1952.

Bizone Germany, that is, the American and British occupied areas, is now making nearly 50 percent of its purchases in the United States. But it will begin lowering this proportion late this year, with the objective of

reducing the United States share of total imports to about 15 percent of the total.

However, the United States may be able to continue the actual volume of its exports to Germany at a high level. But only if recovery there proceeds speedily enough to permit a planned 75 percent over-all increase in German imports in the next 3 years.

The United Kingdom, whose trade plans are being urged as a guide for other ERP countries, is making giant strides in reducing its purchases from the United States. Imports from this country in 1948 were cut 42 percent, and a further 17-percent reduction is planned by 1952.

These factors are not related to frighten any segment of the American business economy. Rather, they are emphasized as a reminder that while European recovery may be the paramount consideration today, maintenance of the American high level of prosperity may well be the big issue tomorrow.

To keep ourselves vigorous and healthy in the field of world trade we're going to have to continue casting our bread upon the waters. Congress will be compelled to approve the extension of some form of foreign-aid program after 1952.

Undoubtedly, emphasis then will be placed on guaranties of purchases in the United States as a prop for our own domestic economy. And the scope of aid will spread out to encompass assistance to backward areas of the world in line with President Truman's point 4.

Perhaps, in the interim, political unity in Europe and peace throughout the world will brighten the outlook for all of us. At least, it's something nice to think about.

Address Before the Sentry Club in Philadelphia by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], to the Sentry Club of Philadelphia, meeting in the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford in that city on April 6, 1949. The Senator from Nebraska spoke by telephone from the Radio Room in the Senate Office Building, through loud speakers, to the meeting of the Sentry Club in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, Madam Chairman, and members of the Sentry Club.

From the Capitol of the United States I am speaking to you. As you know, by this time, my plans to attend your meeting have necessarily been changed. We have approached the closing moments in a historic Senate debate on foreign aid, and these closing moments have been dramatic.

A brand-new issue has developed. Is ECA an authorization to feed destitute people and rehabilitate their economies, or is it now an authorization to subsidize the participating countries for expansion of their foreign trade to heights never dreamed of before?

This is a weighty decision that the Senate is called upon to make, for it may have a tremendous impact upon our domestic economy, the very subject I have been asked to speak on tonight. It is a great pleasure for me to address you. I fully realize that I am on the spot, so to speak, when I am asked to discuss prices, controls, economics, and related ponderous subjects with you women.

There are innumerable organizations of mere men in the various trades and industries, mining, and agriculture. With tremendous seriousness they debate, weigh, plan, and consider the raging currents of government, economics, labor, and management relations. They strive to keep the factory wheels humming and to find their way in a confused Nation and world.

But when all their labors are ended—I might as well say "we," for it is quite evident that I, too, am a man—we have yet to consider what milady—the women—will think of it all.

For, isn't it true that women, chiefly women, do the buying and make the decisions on the end products of factory, mine, and farm; whether it be food for the table, clothes for the family, or the homes in which we live? So, when I told the boss, my good wife and severest critic, Mrs. Wherry, that I was going to address a women's organization in Philadelphia, she said: "It better be good."

I told her I did not know how good it would be, but that I was full of courage, and that, after all, women are just as vitally interested in problems, local, State, national, and international, as are men, and we will get along all right. She gave me a comforting "Amen."

The problems that confront us as a Nation are so fundamental to the future of our country, and to the world, that this is a time when we must stand up and be counted, counted for or against our republican principles of government. What we do in Congress, during the next 100 days, will be the most crucial in our country's entire history, save the declaration of and waging of war.

This is a time for Paul Reveres to get busy. Your organization is the Sentry Club. You want to be alert and vigilant and hand on to future generations the heritage handed down to you through the years by such great statesmen as Benjamin Franklin. There is no more suitable place for this highly patriotic endeavor to flower and spread its influence than from Philadelphia, amid its hallowed shrines of liberty.

Let us be specific. Let us examine briefly some of the crucial problems crowding for decision.

H. R. 2756, self-styled "a bill to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power" is one of them.

This is the administration's bill, a bill to delegate to the President, one man, broad, sweeping power to manage all or any part of our national economy as he chooses, a sort of, or a kind of "papa-knows-best" proposition. This is not a surprise measure. It is in keeping with a philosophy of government with which we have become familiar in recent years. Its advocates boldly assert their support of a planned economy and their determination to drive it through Congress.

The President has told the country he wants power from Congress to fix ceiling prices over commodities and wages, and floors under prices and wages, power and more power to tell businessmen what they shall produce, how much and at what price, power and more power to tell workers when and where they can work and for what wages. I wonder whether the rank and file of workers in America relaize how their inherent rights would be violated by such legislation. What would become of their fair and just rights to work where they please, to organize, bargain collectively, and strike?

Do they realize once this tremendous power is vested in a President, one man, it would lead to the next step, a planned economy, in which shackles for their freedom would be hammered out? This bill was introduced into the House of Representatives on February 15, 1949. There is a companion bill in the Senate.

The bill is designed chiefly to increase supplies of goods and materials in short supply. Under its provisions the President, acting of course upon advice of this group of master planners, would determine maximum goals of production, and then put the resources of the Government to the job of attaining those goals, by loans, price-and-wage fixing, mandatory priorities, and allocations.

The bill further provides that where private enterprise does not measure up to these requirements, the Government may build facilities for the manufacture of steel, or any other commodity the planners deem short in their idea of a balanced national productivity.

Here, then, within the provisions of this bill is the big stick, or club, the President asks to be held over the owners of industries and the working men and women. To the businessman "Comply with my orders, or I will put the Government in direct competition with you." And, to the working men and women, "I'll tell you where you can work."

Section 201 provides that to encourage increases in production and supply, the President shall designate materials or facilities in short supply, and shall:

(1) Determine the quantity goals to which it is necessary and feasible to increase the supply within a reasonable time; (2) explore the extent to which these goals can be attained through the efforts of private enterprise, and (3) develop and administer the programs needed to supplement the efforts of private enterprise.

Section 401 would authorize the President to require sellers, that is, sellers of commodities, to give 60 days' notice prior to any announcement of price increases. After such notice the price increase may become effective, provided the President meanwhile has not, himself, set a maximum price. This was one of the main provisions imposed upon sellers during the war, setting price ceilings, and subsidizing producers that ceiling prices might be maintained. Coupled with this power to impose price ceilings, there would also be delegated the power to distribute materials. This is done by rationing. It is just another factor that must be imposed to control all prices, which involves fixing wages.

This bill is the imposition of OPA all over again, except it grants additional power not even granted during the days of the war.

Now, as you housewives know, something has happened since last November. It would have happened much earlier, if it had not been for the tremendous commitments made abroad. We, of course, all believe in feeding hungry people, but in doing so the tremendous amount of foodstuffs shipped out of this country, held up our price levels. But due to the maximum production of materials accomplished over the past 3 years, the slump in prices which began last November is now generally noticeable throughout the country.

The administration demanded the passage of H. R. 2756 under the word "inflation," and is now urging its passage to alleviate what it calls disinflation which is generally becoming known as the Truman depression. That is being acrobatic. Has it become circus time for the administration? Think of

it, prices fall and unemployment rises. Yet, advocates of a planned economy, tell us they want power to control our economy against high prices, and against low prices. That is Red fascism.

We were told by the President the leveling off in prices was just what the people wanted; "Fine," he said. But, as the drop persisted, the old pumps to stem the tide were put to work. Credit controls have now been relaxed and reduction in cash requirements for margin accounts in the securities markets has been ordered by the President.

Along with control of prices, the administration bill provides for the establishment of a Wage Board independent of the Department of Labor. It requires a wage increase may not be considered as an increase in cost of production for price-adjustment purposes for 6 months, except to the extent that the increase can be justified by any one of the following reasons:

(1) To compensate for increases in the cost of living; (2) to correct inequities in the wage; (3) to correct substandards of living; or (4) to maintain essential production.

The exceptions, obviously, give wide latitude for wage increases. But, in the final analysis, wages are to be controlled. But let me warn you, ladies, if we are to have an effective price-control act, it is mandatory that wages and prices must be controlled from the producer all the way to the consumer, because one man's price is another man's cost.

Those of us who believed in the free competitive system, full production, fair prices, and wide distribution have failed to get our story across to the people. Too many people last November listened to the Pied Pipers who promised lower prices, higher wages, full employment, free medicine, free hospitalization, free old-age pensions, free everything.

You ladies are the shoppers of the family; you know there isn't anything free. None of these things are free. They all cost money. They all come out of the income of the people in direct taxes and in the cost of everything we buy. These master planners think these things are as free as water, as free as the air. These party intellectuals have a deep yearning to apply their slide rule to soulless mass welfare, to regiment our people according to bureaucratic statistics, to make each individual a robot in a socialized state, and yet they never figure the cost. They never consider who is going to pay the bill.

Their attempts to repeal or nullify the law of supply and demand by the imposition of artificial controls, by providing a blueprint for businessmen and farmers, employers, and workers have frightened the people and they have lost confidence in the leadership at Washington. The fear of adoption of a socialistic program is chiefly responsible for this loss of confidence and has resulted in a slowdown in business in general.

To prevent further recession, we must get away from this socialistic trend. We must reestablish confidence among our people so that business and labor can go ahead. Depressions, like the rain, fall upon all of us. None of us want a depression; our country comes first above any partisan consideration. And so, we cannot have all the things we want because we can't afford them. In our efforts to pay for them the tax burden would be unbearable.

Congress, then, is confronted by inescapable alternatives: cutting the President's budget, increasing the taxes; or returning to deficit spending. It is a problem of simple arithmetic. Either we reject billions in money-spending proposals made by the President, or we must slash appropriations, or we will have to go back to an unbalanced budget. We will no longer be on a pay-as-you-go basis, which, may I recall, the Eightieth Congress accomplished for the first time in 16 years.

That do-nothing Eightieth Congress did cut the President's padded budget, reduced the national debt, rolled up the biggest Treasury surplus of all time, and cut taxes $5,000,000,000. If the Eighty-first Congress does not cut the present budget by at least 10 percent, taxes will have to be increased $5,000,000,000 or the Government must resort to sale of bonds to balance the budget, and these bonds will be the basis for credit expansion. That is deficit-financing. It is highly inflationary. It cheapens the dollar. It is the road to wreck and ruin, and jobless millions.

The bedrock of business is confidence. It is the formula for good times. Confidence today, confidence in the future, confidence that earnings and savings will not be confiscated by the Government, and, above all, confidence in the wisdom and stability of our leaders in Washington. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, a Democrat, has sounded the warning that an increase of $5,000,000,000 in taxes will be required, if the spending program submitted to Congress by the President is approved.

He said, such a program would add momentum to the downward spiral of prices, and the upward spiral in unemployment. It would cause a terrible slump in business and could only end in one thing, a depression, hard times. Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, said:

"Nothing worse could happen for the economy of the country at this time than to have Congress place additional taxes upon the people of the United States.

"Approximately 70 percent of our appropriations are now earmarked for debt service, the various defense units of the Government, veterans' care, and for pensions. These items cannot be reduced as they are obligations and for the defense of the country. Hence, only a small percent of the total budget, some 30 percent, can be reduced. No one knows what the trend of business will be 6 months from now, but everyone knows that it is on the down grade, and unless something is done to aid the taxpayers and business it will continue."

And may I again give warning, as I have done many times before, that higher taxes would be prohibitive. Some levies are already confiscatory. Incentive and initiative of private enterprise has been discouraged. The thinking in Congress must be changed, there must be a return to the homely principle of thrift in Government. Thrift is becoming a lost word, a lost virtue.

For my part, I am going to fight for reduction of the President's budget all along the line. I am going to fight against an increase in taxes. I am going to oppose deficit-spending. Oh, it won't be popular with the pressure groups, but they will have to be pushed overboard if we are to save America from disaster.

The action of the Senate in refusing to reduce the $5,580,000,000 authorization for the Economic Cooperation Administration was disheartening. ECA should have been cut 15 percent.

It was the first money authorization to be considered by the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. We lost a golden opportunity to set a pattern in ECA that could have been followed all along the line in our appropriations. I introduced an amendment to cut ECA by 15 percent, but that failed. I also supported the Taft-Russell amendment to reduce the authorization by 10 percent. That also failed. Let's take a look at ECA. It was offered as a plan to make freedom-loving war-torn countries strong against the lure of communism.

It was also presented as a program to strengthen our own national security, on the ground that a communized Europe would in time, threaten our own security. Senator SCOTT LUCAS, the Democratic leader in the Senate, told the Senate on April 1, last Friday, "Communism has been stopped dead in its tracks in Europe." Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of ECA, said communism in war-torn Europe has been stopped cold in the cold war.

I agree with them. There is ample evidence to support these observations. The recent elections in France and Italy showed a sharp drop in Communists in those countries. The record shows western European countries have recovered above prewar levels; that productivity is 25 percent greater than it was before the war.

ECA's stated objectives of a year ago, to restore the participating countries to where they were before the war, has been accomplished. It's goal of relief for the utterly destitute, the jobless, the hungry, the sick, the famished, and the underclothed has been attained.

ECA's broader goals of financing the participating countries in attaining their own plans for expansion of their industries and world commerce, are now being carried out at the expense of the American taxpayer. This is the part of ECA that calls upon America to provide dollars, factories, materials, and ships.

The pipe lines to western Europe are full and overflowing. There are still two and one-half billion dollars' worth of goods and cash out of this year's appropriation that have yet to be processed and shipped. Add to this two and one-half billion the five billion five hundred and eighty million in the present authorization and it makes a grand total of over $8,000,000,000 in cash and goods that would go to the participating nations in the next 15 months. That's a lot of money.

Oh, yes, I know, we have become accustomed to big figures, to big government, big business, and big labor, but it is difficult to appreciate the value of $1,000,000,000.

The $5,580,000,000 requested by the President is $100,000 more than the combined farm income of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas in 1945. And that area is the breadbasket of our country.

It is more than twice as much as the total assessed valuation of all the property in my State of Nebraska. It would take 100,000 men, earning $100 a week, 10 years and 9 months to make that much money.

Of course, Americans do not begrudge what we have done for the relief and recovery of Europe. It was the neighborly thing to do. But there is no moral obligation upon our people to finance our friends overseas in attaining goals of prosperity set by themselves.

We are now subsidizing the imports of materials from the United States to the 16 participating ECA nations for manufacture and shipment back to the United States, to be sold in competition in our own domestic market, in ships built with the American taxpayers' money.

Fellow Americans, rehabilitation is one thing, but subsidizing their plans for foreign trade in the dollar areas is another. Pennsylvania is one of our great industrial States. How many Pennsylvanians, how many American workers and employers, generally, know that Great Britain, for example, has mapped a program that calls for an increase in exports to this country for nearly double what they were before the war?

How many American workers and employers know that already the revived European countries have begun to compete effectively for the American market?

Leaders in the woolen-goods industry have testified before congressional committees, that the American woolen-cloth industry is threatened with disaster by ECA. Other lines of business have begun to feel the impact of foreign competition. By 1952, the British Government plans to ship us 82 percent more goods than she exported to us in 1938.

Not only have our markets suffered this impact by ECA, but the downward slashes in our tariff by the administration, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, have put the United States virtually on a free-trade basis. How long do you think America's full employment and America's living and wage standards can be maintained if we continue on a free-trade basis?

Before the Senate there is an administration bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The Eightieth Congress put limitations in the law to give American industries and American labor protection. But this administration is demanding a completely free hand to fix the tariff rates, practically no limitation for protection of our own economy.

This is another "papa-knows-best" link in the administration's goal for a socialized American economy. Some of us will make an effort to have inserted into the reciprocal-trade-law extension bill, a provision to prohibit reductions in tariff below peril points, which means floors on the tariff, for protection of American industry and labor.

The House of Representatives already has passed the administration bill, and we in the Senate, are facing a hard fight to obtain this protection for American industry and for American labor. The picture is simply this: The ECA bill is passed to expand foreign industries and shipping, so that the participating countries can sell their products in the United States, and at the same time, keep our tariff low enough, so that there will be no hindrance to the sales of those products in competition for our own American markets.

I am opposed to that kind of treatment for the American-business man, American labor, and for the American people. The business outlook in America is too cloudy, too uncertain, to warrant high-living spending by the Government both at home and abroad. We must be prudent. The recent action of Canada in reducing taxes, nearer to prewar levels than we have in the United States, has shown sound thinking.

Canada has contributed magnificently to the recovery of Europe, but Canada thinks it is equally important that she remain spiritually, financially, and economically strong, and what we need in this country is more of that kind of thinking. Have we become so calloused, so softened by the constant cries of emergency and crises in Washington, that our people no longer care what happens?

Have our people become so demoralized and confused that they just don't care? Given the facts, I still think the American people will find their way. I have an abiding faith in the wisdom of the American people. They will make the right decisions, and our Republican Government will live.

An aroused American people will see that our ship of state weathers the storm.

America must go forward, America will go forward, as a free people, adding ever more to the happiness of its people, and keeping them strong and alert as the lighthouse of liberty for all mankind.

You are sentries. You know, eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

General Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, adopted on March 1, 1949, by the Common Council of the city of Cudahy, Wis., relevant to the observance of General Pulaski memorial day. One hundred and seventy years have almost passed since the day when General Pulaski gave his life at Savannah while fighting for the freedom of our great Nation, but time has not taken away any luster from his great and heroic deeds. Mindful of the supreme contribution he has made to our national existence, millions of Americans each year pay tribute to the memory of this great man. There is at present the General Pulaski memorial day resolution pending in Congress, and the Common Council of the City of Cudahy joins with others in petitioning the President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, and the Congress of the United States to give their approval to this measure.

The resolution adopted by the council reads as follows:

Resolution 790

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's memorial day in United States of America; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Cudahy and State of Wisconsin:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin.

Passed and approved this 1st day of March 1949.

VINCENT TOTKA,
Mayor.

Congress, Not the Federal Register, Is the Place To Change a Law, and Federal Savings and Loan Associations Should Deal Fairly With Their Customers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Federal Register of Friday, March 11, 1949, on pages 1001 to 1113, inclusive, is printed a proposal by the Home Loan Bank Board to change the essential character of Federal savings and loan associations from institutions in which their shareholders invest their money into what appears to be an institution authorized to accept money on deposit. Actually, when a person places his money in the hands of a Federal savings and loan association he becomes the owner of stock in such organization and does not become a depositor in it. Such a share account in a Federal savings and loan association represents ownership in such association and is clearly distinguished from a debtor-creditor relationship such as exists between a savings bank and its customer or a customer of a commercial bank. A depositor in a bank is a creditor of the bank; the bank owes him the amount of his deposit. The depositor, unless he places his deposit with the bank for a definite time, is entitled to withdraw it upon demand. Under the Federal savings and loan plan, the association may repurchase from its shareholders their shares in it, but an association cannot be forced into liquidation because of financial inability to meet promptly its obligation to repurchase the shares it has sold to its shareholders.

Federal savings and loan associations are the creatures of Congress. The Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 authorized the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to provide for:

The organization, incorporation, examination, operation, and regulation of associations to be known as "Federal savings and loan associations," and to issue charters therefor, giving primary consideration to the best practices of local mutual thrift and home-financing institutions.

Said act provides that:

Such associations shall raise their capital only in the payments on such shares as are authorized in their charter, which shares may be retired as provided in their charter.

It is further provided in the act:

No deposits shall be accepted and no certificates of indebtedness shall be issued except for such borrowed money as may be authorized by regulations of the Board.

The home-loan nature of these associations is further established by the provision in the act that:

Such associations shall lend their funds only on the security of their shares or on the security of first liens upon homes or combinations of homes and business property within 50 miles of their home office.

The act further provides that:

No charter shall be granted except to persons of good character and responsibility, nor unless in the judgment of the Board a necessity exists for such an institution in the community to be served, nor unless there is a reasonable probability of its usefulness and success, nor unless the same can be established without undue injury to properly conducted existing local thrift and home-financing institutions.

The Home Owners Loan Act and the Federal savings and loan associations authorized by it have fulfilled the purposes of the act.

There has, however, developed a disposition upon the part of some of the officials connected with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and a few of the directors of the Federal savings and loan associations to change the name of Federal savings and loan associations to Federal savings associations. Bills containing such a proposal were introduced in the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress as S. 3874 and H. R. 10558 in April and May 1938, respectively. These bills were identical in terms. Section 8 of each bill contained amendments to subsection (a) of section 5 of the original act of 1933 as amended by providing that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is authorized to provide for the organization, incorporation, examination, operation, and regulation of associations to be known as Federal savings and loan associations, or Federal savings associations, as the Board may determine.

This proposed amendment to the act thus sought to clothe the Board with authority to change the name and, therefore, the character of the savings and loan associations theretofore organized by it to Federal savings associations. Neither of these bills was reported to the Congress. In the following year, 1939, a bill was introduced in the House seeking to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. The bill passed the House, but not until after it was amended by striking out all of section 11 which contained the proposal to change the name of the insurance corporation to Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. Congress thus stood by its original purpose as expressed by the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 as amended to create and operate Federal savings and loan associations.

It is, therefore, seen that the Home Loan Bank Board in the amendment to its rules and regulations which it published in the Federal Register of March 11 of this year is attempting to do the very thing which Congress refused to do. This action on its part is clearly an unconstitutional attempt to usurp and exercise a power which is vested only in the Congress.

The proposed amendment to the rules and regulations smacks of a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. The promulgation and adoption of these rules and regulations is intended to make it possible for Federal savings and loan associations to hold themselves out to the public as savings banks authorized to accept deposits, when in fact they are authorized by law to accept only money for purchase of their shares of stock. I have heretofore emphasized the fact that, under the law creating these Federal savings and loan associations, they are essentially different from savings banks and commercial banks. The person who places his funds in a savings bank is a depositor. If he writes a check for the withdrawal of his deposit and the payment of such check is denied, the bank is deemed in law to be insolvent. On the other hand, the person who places his funds in a savings and loan association thereby becomes a part owner of the association. If his request that the association repurchase or redeem his share, or shares, is denied by the savings and loan association, he must wait until such time as the association may have sufficient funds to meet his request.

It is common knowledge that numerous Federal savings and loan associations throughout the country have sought to convey the impression, and are now seeking to convey the impression to the public that they are savings banks. Many of these institutions are placing on the front of their places of business the words "and loan" in their names in exceedingly small letters, much smaller than the letters in the words "Federal savings * * * association." Others are advertising to the public that they accept "savings accounts." Men with experience and ability enough to conduct savings and loan associations are charged with knowledge that they intend the necessary consequences of their own acts. They are, therefore, chargeable with misrepresentation when they seek to give the impression that the investment in the shares of the association is on the same basis as a deposit in a mutual savings bank or in the savings department of a commercial bank.

At this time banks throughout the country are paying only 1 percent on certificates of time deposit. Federal savings and loan associations pay their stockholders dividends of 2½ percent on their stock. They are able to do this because they are not under necessity of maintaining their assets in a liquid condition. The assets of these associations are loaned on the security of long-term mortgages. If the increasing depression which has hit the country becomes more severe, many mortgage debtors of these associations will default in their payments. And the time may come when a substantial number of investors in Federal savings and loan associations may seek to withdraw their investments in these institutions. The accounts of investors in Federal savings and loan associations are insured up to $5,000 by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. In 35 cases Federal savings and loan associations have had to call upon the insurance corporation to settle their liabilities.

All bank deposits, both checking and time deposits, up to $5,000 in amount, are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Since the enactment of this measure there have been only 26 bank failures in the country and the depositors insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have been promptly paid 100 cents on the dollar. Should a Federal savings and loan association become unable to promptly pay its shareholders the amount of their investments in the event they should seek to withdraw them, their accounts would be paid as follows:

(1) Not to exceed 10 percent in cash, the remainder in negotiable non-interest-bearing debentures of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation 45 percent due within 1 year, the balance of 45 percent within 3 years.

In what amounts to amendments to the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, embodied in the change in the rules published March 11 of this year in the Federal Register, it is provided that the association is not required to distribute earnings on short-term savings accounts. Under these provisions Federal savings and loan associations are permitted to issue certificates indistinguishable from certificates of deposit issued by commercial banks and the associations will thus be permitted to mislead the public into the belief that these associations are deposit institutions. The proposed amendment to the rules and regulations is further against the law and the public interest. These rules permit Federal savings and loan associations, with the approval of the Board, to establish one or more branch offices. No such power is conferred upon them by the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933. The Supreme Court of the United States held that the power to establish branches had not been given national banks expressly or as a necessary incident to carrying on the business of banking (*First National Bank in St. Louis* v. *Barrett*, S. Ct. 213, 68 L. Ed. 486). As a rule, power not granted by an act of Congress is, in effect, denied.

A careful examination of these amendments to the rules and regulations governing Federal savings and loan associations leaves the impression that they are carefully and shrewdly designed to make the Federal savings and loan associations into institutions which they are not and were never intended by Congress to be. If the Home Loan Bank Board desires to accomplish such a result, in all candor and honesty, it should seek to accomplish it through an act of Congress. Certain it is, a fraud by any other name is nothing more nor less than a fraud. Obtaining people's money by false pretenses is indefensible. An attempt by a Federal bureau to usurp the legislative power of Congress is indefensible. In order to implement what I have just said it is my purpose to introduce a bill making it unlawful for the Home Loan Bank Board to change the essential character of Federal savings and loan associations as set out in the rules published by it in the Federal Register of March 11, 1949.

It is characteristic of bureaucratic legislation that the proposed rules are enshrouded and befogged in approximately 17,000 words.

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, I placed in the RECORD the tenth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on March 29, 30, and 31, are the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of the series:

BRITISH HEALTH HEAD HAS TOO MUCH POWER, DOCTORS SAY—MEDICAL MEN FEEL INSECURE UNDER SET-UP

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Eleventh in a series)

LONDON, March 29.—The British medical man never will know where he is at when a Minister of Health can make any regulations for the National Health Service that suit his fancy. One of England's prominent physicians makes such a declaration, and most of the members of all professions agree heartily with him.

"Aneurin Bevan can do anything he likes under an emergency clause of the Health Act," the doctor states, "and it is much too much power to place within the discretion of any man."

This physician takes quite a liberal view of the whole health program and has not been an opponent of it. He believes wisdom has been lacking in the initiation and projection of the system.

HAS BROUGHT CHAOS

"The whole trouble is the plan was not brought in gradually as recommended by the British Medical Association, long a supporter of the movement for a good general health program," this veteran diagnostician says. "It has brought chaos and we have not recovered from it. We will recover.

"We had an insurance medical service for workmen making less than $1,600 a year. If that had been expanded broadly and also made available to all the dependents of the workman it would have been enough for one step and would be a happy deal for everybody.

"There is no doubt the present health plan is doing a tremendous amount of good, but it has encouraged many abuses, too."

The medico being interviewed recalled that when the profession and the Ministry were at a deadlock on health-plan arrangements last year, the doctors raised a $5,000,000 fund.

STRIKE INTENT DENIED

They refuse to acknowledge they were going to strike against the plan, but prefer to describe the plan as a means of providing a living for needy physicians who were about to refuse to join at that time and who might not have been able to maintain private practices. Concessions by the Government through intermediaries ended the battle and the doctors signed up.

"At the present time," he says "We are organizing something new, a medical guild, and it will seek to amass a fund of $20,000,000. If a time ever comes when the doctors feel they do not want to work under the Government health arrangement, there will be money to save their families from economic hardship."

Some physicians are doing quite well and others are poorly off under the scheme, a second man of the medical sphere tells us.

"There are two classes of doctors," he analyzes, "those with big industrial practices being the first class. Let's consider them a minute. They have benefited. They are getting a decent fee for every person on their lists and the income is good, but they are working hard for it. When this doctor treats one member of a family he is likely to be asked to check them all.

"Then there is the second class. This is the man in a smaller place, who must rely on some private practice along with his scheme duties. He is hurt badly. He can't uproot and move somewhere else, because there is no house for his family somewhere else."

Staying on the general economic theme, our informant says: "Before the plan, a fair income for a doctor was $6,000 to $8,000 a year and $8,000 to $12,000 was well above the average. Very few doctors made $20,000 a year in private practice. Under this plan, a doctor with 1,000 patients takes in $3,600; one with 2,000 receives $7,200; one with 4,000 will be entitled to $14,400.

TOO MANY PATIENTS

"But 4,000 patients is too much, even though the plan contemplates that number for a man, as his maximum. If a doctor in the city has 2,500 and one in more open spaces 2,000, they are doing all the work that is reasonable. An average of 2,300 will give the physician with such a list $8,250, plus some mileage."

Under the health payment plan, a doctor receives $1,200 a year anyway, even if he does not have enough patients to give him that amount at a rate of $3.60 a year each. But now the physicians find some fault with the arrangement and do not like the way it works.

"The objection to the fixed payment is that it comes out of the local pool of money," a doctor says, "and when there are some physicians with only a handful of patients, they really collect their guaranty from the other doctors, not from the Government.

"The cost of conducting the local committees and councils and headquarters also comes out of the local pool, so the doctor really doesn't get $3.60 per patient per year—the overhead comes out of him."

SOCIALIST DOCTOR PREDICTS GOVERNMENT SALARY PLAN IN ENGLAND—SEES PHYSICIANS WORKING ON A FULL-TIME BASIS

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Twelfth in a series)

LONDON, March 30.—All physicians eventually will work on a full-time basis for the state under an annual salary arrangement, one of the busiest practitioners in central England predicts. It will be a good arrangement, too, he thinks. He is a member of the Socialist Party and the organizer of the Socialist Medical Association.

"When all physicians are under full-time annual salaries we will become a profession and not a trade," he declares, "and that will not make us civil servants.

"There is too much showmanship in medicine now and there is need for a physician to attract patients to him by something other than ability and good service. Yes, there will be an emerging, through the National Health Service, into a real profession. It is the vehicle."

CATCH IT AT THE START

"This is a great thing," he chats on. "Now we see children when they have some minor ailments and we are able to treat them and to prevent them from affecting them seriously. We catch it when it starts. Under the old way we never saw anyone until a disease had dragged him down into a serious condition and it was too late for us to save him much sickness."

This physician has two assistants and no private patients. His office waiting room has four rows of benches in it, each seating five people, but he says, "My office never is crowded now. I am having much consultation by appointment.

"There are always two of us on duty at one time and we can give good care to 4,300 people without any rush or haste," he points out. "If a doctor arranges his work well he will not have to extend himself beyond reason."

LIKES RETIREMENT PLAN

He likes the plan to pay for practices when one retires.

"If I average $8,000 for my last 5 years I will get $12,000 and maybe $14,000," he says. "I think a physician should make at least $4,000 a year to live decently and support a wife and two children. With care he can put those children through college, but not if he has big parties and has expensive automobiles.

"When the new health centers are opened it will be possible to give everyone a thorough check-up occasionally. We can now, if one wants it, but we are not doing it generally. The best place for the general practitioner to be effective is in the home, but the people are showing a tendency to come to us. The ratio of home visits to office calls is going down."

CITES PARTNERSHIP

"At the new health center the physicians can work as a team and can form a partnership. Of course, we cannot have any competitive medicine in a health center and no private practice at all. In Dartford, 11 doctors have formed one partnership and they are giving good service to 40,000 people."

Asked if he thinks there is any abuse of the system, the doctor says:

"I have not seen one abuse. Take the spectacles field. It has been shown that the vision of the people is not good, nearly everybody has some defect. This plan has brought about an improvement and the eyesight of the nation will be better. The spectacles division is working out marvelously."

YEARS OF ARREARAGE

"Remember, there are years of arrearage to be taken care of and that can't be done in months. The same is true in dental work, too. Many people are getting attention they should have received years ago, so we are trying to catch up with everything all at once. We are doing very well at it, I think."

"A voluntary plan for medical care would not work in England," our doctor says. "We have had some associations for hospitalization and insurance-company schemes, but they were not enough. A health plan must be operated by the government to be a success; nothing else will do it."

LOW-INCOME GROUPS ENTHUSE OVER BRITISH HEALTH SERVICE—RESENT FIGHT DOCTORS WAGED TO HEAD IT OFF

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Thirteenth in a series)

LONDON, March 31.—The English people like their National Health Service in varying degrees, but far more than a majority regard it highly and will make use of it as they require.

The industrial sections prize it most, the white-collar employees think it is fine and one has to reach into the junior executive class to begin to encounter distrust. The upper groups condemn its administration.

The mill operatives, construction forces and transportation corps consider it something wonderful added to their lives and they harbor a strong resentment against medical men for opposing its installation.

NEARLY WENT ON STRIKE

The doctors did practically threaten to strike against it and organized a $5,000,000 fund with which to fight, but their opposition was against administrative arrangements, not the plan itself.

Medical men can show a long history of support for a good public health system. They have been trying to minimize regimentation and they have won most of their points.

The workers do not make any fine distinctions. All they recall is that the doctors were against it and tried their best to prevent it from being adopted. They think the physicians were thinking too much about their own incomes.

EASIER GOING FOR DENTISTS

The dentists do not seem to have aroused so much hostility against themselves, although they were more reticent about cooperating than were the doctors.

Here are some informal expressions by individuals:

A dock worker's wife—"I have wanted a denture for a long time, but I couldn't afford one. I have four children. I hope to get my denture tonight. It will be wonderful."

A seaman whose merchant ship had just docked to unload a cargo—"What do I think of the Health Service? There's nothing like it. I need some work to be done and now I am going to have it."

"We haven't had any sickness, but I'm glad to know I can have a doctor for my children if they do get sick."

A businessman—"They have led the country into a Fool's Paradise. We will be broke in 3 years and they the Communist will try to take over. If America should cut off the Marshall plan there would be no National Health Service and we would be sunk tomorrow. I hate to say so, but I think it would be a good thing to cut it off so the country could wake up."

Retailer—"It's like a lot of other things. When everybody becomes broke they will try something more radical on us. I'm making money, yes, but a regulation is liable to come along without any notice and my capital will be cut in half, just like that."

A jewelry salesman—"When I want medical aid for me or my family I get the same doctor I always did and I pay him myself. I think I will be surer of better service. I think the Health Service is just a step toward full socialism which I abhor."

Resolution of Americans of Lithuanian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted on February 20 of this year, by a group of Americans of Lithuanian descent, who assembled in St. Gabriel's Church Hall in Milwaukee to commemorate the thirty-first anniversary of the rebirth of the Lithuanian nation. Similar celebrations were held in many other cities and communities throughout the country, as the estimated hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians in the United States joined in expressing their hope that the country of their forefathers, which is striving so bravely to resist the attempts of the Soviet to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign state, will be able once again to enjoy a free democratic form of government and to attain her rightful place among the nations of the world. At this particular gathering resolutions were adopted petitioning the President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, the Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, and the Congress of the United States that they may aid in creating conditions which would make it possible for the people of Lithuania to realize these ambitions.

The resolution adopted reads as follows:

Whereas (a) the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic individuality and the political traditions of the Lithuanian people,

(b) the ancient Lithuanian statehood dating back to the year A. D. 1200, its splendid historical record of tolerance; of individual, racial, linguistic, and cultural liberty,

(c) the long, unceasing, and determined struggle of the Lithuanian people against the foreign—Muscovite and German—domination and oppression,

(d) the heroic sacrifices of each succeeding generation of the Lithuanian people in the great mass insurrections of 1794–95, 1812, 1863–64, 1905, 1918–20, and the epic Lithuanian fight for basic human rights, for human dignity, for the fredom of the press and of the printed Lithuanian word during the 40-year suppression of all Lithuanian literary activities, 1864–1904,

(e) the imposition by the Soviet Union—by threat of superior force and in connivance with Nazi German war criminals—of a "mutual assistance pact" on October 10, 1939, whereby Lithuania granted and leased to the Soviet Union military bases in the strategic centers of Lithuania in exchange for a solemn Russian guaranty of the independence of Lithuanian and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, political, social, and economic order of the country,

(f) Soviet invasion of Lithuania June 15, 1940, violating all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual assistance pact with a guaranty of the political independence and noninterference in domestic affairs—then and now in force between the Soviet Union and the sovereign Republic of Lithuania,

(g) the Atlantic Charter declaration holding out a promise of the restoration of sovereignty to the peoples forcibly deprived of same, and the subsequent embodiment of the Atlantic Charter as a part of the declaration by the United Nations, including the Soviet Union, on January 1, 1942,

(h) the effective Lithuanian underground liberation struggle during the 3 years of German occupation and continuing to this date, directed against Soviet attempts to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign nation,

Be it resolved, To petition the Congress of the United States to create conditions enabling the formation of broadly representative interim governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to repatriate Baltic deportees from Siberia and northern Russian exile, under the supervision of the United Nations and evacuation of the Russian troops, police, and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, helping the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to restore their democratic self-governments after the harrowing experiences of three successive hostile occupations.

To initiate the move for an immediate admission of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, still full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the United Nations Organization.

REV. JOSEPH KUPREVICIUS, M. I. C.
FRANK JURKUS.
STANLEY MILANCIUS.
JOHN BAUKUS.
PAUL LABANAUSKAS.

German War Crimes Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including excerpts from a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by one Willis M. Everett, Jr., in the Supreme Court of the United States on behalf of Valentine Bersin et al. against Harry S. Truman, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Services of the United States, et al.

Valentine Bersin, and others, are German citizens and formerly German soldiers, and they were found guilty of alleged war crimes by a general military government court at Dachau, Germany.

Willis M. Everett, Jr., is a counselor at law, and from September 1, 1940, to June 15, 1947, was an officer in the United States Army. In May 1946, while serving under the commanding general, United States forces in the European theater, he was directed to serve as chief defense counsel for the above-named defendant and others. Obviously, he had intimate contact with and knowledge of the facts in relation to the trial of said accused persons.

Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of said petition, Mr. Everett alleged that the trial before the general military government at Dachau, known as the war crimes trial or Malmedy trial, was utterly void. On page 4 of said petition it is alleged:

11. Plaintiffs had been illegally and forcefully incarcerated in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, a German penitentiary the equivalent of one of our United States Federal penitentiaries and used by the United States Army as an interrogation prison, for varying lengths of time but generally in excess of 10 months prior to being served with charges of war crimes as set forth in paragraph 10 above. There were approximately 500 other German soldiers, suspected war criminals, also confined thereat. With few exceptions, each was placed in solitary confinement throughout this period. That the said Schwabisch Hall was exclusively under the control of and used by the United States Army for all suspects in the Malmedy case. One Lt. Col. Burton F. Ellis JAGD United States Army was the senior officer thereat and responsible for the abuse and mistreatment of plaintiffs herein at said penitentiary.

On pages 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, containing allegations 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, as follows:

12. The forced and illegal detention of plaintiffs as aforesaid was in violation of the Geneva Convention which provides that prisoners of war must be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence and insults. They should be equally treated. No coercion may be used on them to

secure information, and under no circumstances will they be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind whatever. They are entitled to have their honor and person respected. They must have sanitation, open air, and exercise. Under all circumstances, prisoners of war are subject to the laws in force of the detaining power.

13. As illustrative of those violations of international agreements, the American prosecution team in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, would place a helmet hood completely over the head of individual plaintiffs herein, then usually a beating would be administered, after which they would be forced into a completely dark cell which was their trial room. The hood was removed and each plaintiff would see before him a long table, draped with black cloth touching the floor, with candles burning at both ends of the table and a crucifix in the center. Sitting behind this table were varying numbers of American civilians, members of the prosecution team, who were wearing illegally the uniform and rank of United States Army officers. A mock defense counsel, usually an officer of the United States Army on the prosecution team, was furnished these youthful German soldiers, who, although he was not an attorney, held himself out to the plaintiffs herein as their defense counsel. They were informed or led to believe that they were being tried by the Americans for violations of international law. At the other end of the table would be the prosecutor who would read the charges, yell and scream at these 18- and 20-year-old plaintiffs and attempt to force confessions from them. If this method of threats failed to force desired false confessions from these plaintiffs, the mock trials would proceed by bringing in one false witness after another against them, proving beyond a doubt by falsehoods that these plaintiffs were guilty of many war crimes. During the entire mock trials these purported defense counsels were making a sham and pretext of defending them. At the end of these illegal trials conducted in the name of the United States of America, these guileful defense attorneys would pretend to make a plea to this purported Army court for mercy. Upon conclusion, these sham courts would render death penalties within 24 to 48 hours by hanging. Thereupon said false defense attorney would express his sympathy, stating that he had done the best he could for these various plaintiffs. After these mock trials, the pretended defense attorney would attempt to and was in a majority of instances successful in coercing these plaintiffs to sign false and void confessions, admitting any and all charges brought against them, because, as this false defense counsel would in effect say, "You will be hanged in 24 hours anyway, so why not absolve someone else by taking the blame and writing out this confession I will dictate to you." Many variations and modifications were made in the conducting of these mock trials which appeared entirely regular to these plaintiffs as they were devoid of any knowledge of the American Army courts martial system or war crimes trials. There were 74 defendants, and there were 74 prosecution-dictated statements. All of the above-described acts, deceits, and chicanery of American justice were performed by United States civilians, under Army jurisdiction, and by officers of the United States Army or executed under their immediate supervision and control.

14. As further illustrative of the violations of said international agreements and treaties, many plaintiffs herein at various times were deprived of food for days, all blankets were withdrawn in the middle of winter, many were given severe and frequent beatings and other corporal punishment, many were forced into what was called the death cell for days and weeks, others were given promises of immunity or light sentences if they would sign confessions implicating others, and endless tricks, ruses, and so-called strategem, all performed by these United States civilian employees of the Army or enlisted men in the United States Army, or under their direct supervision, instruction, or acquiescence. Said group of American investigators or a majority of them subsequently became the prosecution team in said Malmedy trial.

15. As illustrative of promises of immunity or hope of reward, various behooded plaintiffs herein would be conducted to a room, then allowed to look out of a window where unknown persons were playing volley ball and similar games, at which time some American member of the prosecution team would urge plaintiffs to sign a confession, stating that they were not interested in punishing them, but were trying to convict their high-ranking officers, and if they would sign these dictated confessions implicating their officers they would be released within a few months and be out playing games with those other boys. Various plaintiffs herein would be assured and promised by the Americans that if they assumed full and complete responsibility for all the acts or alleged crimes committed by the soldiers under them and signed these prosecution-dictated statements or confessions, then the prosecution would not prefer any charges against members of their command.

16. As illustrative of the cruel torture and inhumane treatment of these plaintiffs as well as others in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, while prisoners of war, reference is made to the introduction into evidence of an unsigned statement by Arvid Freimuth, a young German soldier who had been through the various tricks, ruses, and stratagem administered by the American prosecution which ended in one of those fateful mock trials. Lt. William R. Perl, an officer of the United States Army, had purportedly defended this youth was found dead hanging from his those forced confessions in March 1946. Only 16 pages had been written by this boy and due to the lateness of the hour the completion was delayed until the next day. His death would not occur until then, according to the fake verdict of this false American military court. He was forced to write lies about his comrades in arms pointing to their guilt in crimes never committed. About 2 o'clock in the morning other prisoners heard him crying out in his cell, "I cannot utter another lie," or words to that effect. The body of that 20-year-old German youth was found dead hanging from his prison cell in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, when the guard opened the door a few hours later. The American prosecution was not satisfied with having the blood of this youth on their hands. During the real Malmedy trial the prosecution, over the objection of the defense staff, introduced this unsigned and unfinished statement in evidence against other plaintiffs herein, all with the approval and favorable ruling of the law member of the court. It was then that the American prosecution commenced asking this Lieutenant Perl, under oath, what this dead German youth would have said in his statement if he had lived. This incident is illustrative of the total lack of justice both pretrial and during trial.

17. In furtherance of illustrations wherein violations of international law were carried out by the United States Army investigation team or prosecution while holding plaintiffs in solitary confinement in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, the investigators would forge the names of certain of plaintiffs' superior officers to confessions or statements, which would completely detail and point out the purported guilt of another accused. Then they would confront these young German soldiers with one or more of these forged statements and induce them to sign confessions to acts never committed by them. Many of the plaintiffs herein, while in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, would be hooded and taken to the "death chamber" and there unhooded and shown bullet holes in the wall where gruesome human flesh and hair would be imbedded from one of their "latest executions." By this method the American prosecution would force confessions of crimes never committed. On other occasions various hooded plaintiffs herein would be taken to the "hangman's room" and there unhooded, placed on a high stool and a hangman's rope placed around their necks. It was then that various plaintiffs herein would, upon belief that they would be hanged forthwith, sign directed statements, not only admitting their own guilt of crimes never committed but implicating other plaintiffs herein of crimes they had committed, which in truth had never been committed.

At the conclusion of many of these mock trials where other ruses had failed, the United States prosecution team would suggest and allow these youthful plaintiffs to write farewell letters to their parents before they would be hanged, which was in furtherance of the duress, scheming, and conniving of the Americans. Also the American prosecution would offer the privilege of seeing a priest in order to secure the "ministration of a Catholic priest before death." The American prosecutors would make many threats of violence and torture directed toward mothers, fathers, sisters, wives, and children of various accused unless they signed complete dictated confessions of acts and deeds never committed by them and acts and deeds of other accused never witnessed by them.

18. One favorite rule of the United States prosecution team in Schwabisch Hall, Germany, was to place plaintiffs in solitary confinement upon first being captured. These German youths had no knowledge of why they were placed in this penitentiary. For weeks and months they would stay in the same cell without seeing a single person, not allowed to receive or write even a letter to their parents or wives, and not allowed to read anything. Then a "stool pigeon" would be placed in the same cell who was another German soldier. This youthful plaintiff was anxious to know what it was all about. This prosecution stool pigeon would relate an imaginary story of how he had just been tried by the American Army for shooting many Belgian civilians and maybe a few American soldiers. The stool pigeon would go into much detail about his own trial and then conclude with how light the verdict had been because he had cooperated, admitted everything whether true or not, and had written exactly what the Americans had dictated. Although he, the stool pigeon, had admitted many murders he had received only 1, 2, or 3 years' confinement for all that he had done. It was ony a few days thereafter until that German lad would be hooded and brought before one of these mock trials with the hope and expectation of a light sentence such as the stool pigeon had described if he would sign an American prosecution dictated statement.

19. All of the foregoing illustrations of violations of international laws, or practically all, were laughingly or jokingly admitted by the American prosecution team during their presentation of their case in the Malmedy trial or on direct examination of the witnesses. At this point those questions strongly suggest themselves: What did the American defense do about these forced confessions at the real Malmedy trial? Why were these confessions admitted as evidence and in many cases constituted the sole and only evidence against certain of these plaintiffs? Attached here, marked "exhibit C," and made a part of this petition, is a copy of Motion to Withdraw Confessions or Statements of Accused, which was properly pre-

sented and pleaded at the Malmedy trial, but this motion was promptly denied by the ruling of the law member of the court.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to believe that American citizens would stoop to such acts as set forth in the petition of Mr. Everett, yet he was in a preferred position to know what happened. The Army officers who participated in these un-American activities so revolting to our sense of justice and fair play should stand court martial without further delay.

Comments on Labor Legislation By Hon. Thomas H. Werdel, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 7 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD some labor-legislation comments which were recently made by the Honorable THOMAS H. WERDEL, of California. I have not studied Mr. WERDEL'S views, but I am pleased to draw the attention of others to his views.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to say a few words about labor legislation.

THE DIMINISHING PAY CHECK

The high cost of maintaining an extravagant government will only be a part of the burden placed upon the American worker's pay check before he gets it, if the Lesinski bill, the Democratic administration's "Labor Relations Act of 1949," is enacted into law. This bill represents the Administration's attempt to buy votes with public money—including the worker's money.

If the Administration and its spokesmen in Congress have their way, union officials will be given the authority to get their organization and political expenses and profits out of the worker's pay before he gets it. and with or without his consent.

A most obnoxious and resentful provision of the Administration's bill to repeal the present law of the land is that which gives union officials the special privilege of confiscating for their own unrestricted use as much of a worker's earnings as they wish.

In short, the Truman Government supports wholeheartedly the unions' private power of taxation through an unrestricted check-off system.

UNION FINANCES

Section 107 of the Lesinski bill contains another so-called improvement of the original Wagner Act, which gives legal sanction to the deduction from employees' pay, without their consent, of virtually any sums the unions might assess.

In restoring the closed shop proviso of the Wagner Act, the Lesinski bill slips in language which seeks to legalize contracts under which an employer is required to deduct from the employees' pay envelopes and pay over to the union, any membership obligations or sums equivalent thereto.

While neither the majority report on the Lesinski bill nor the report of the Senate committee on S. 249 mentioned this adroit bit of draftsmanship, its effect is far reaching. There are many jurisdictions, including some of our major industrial States, which have statutes prohibiting any assignment of wages without the written consent of the individual workers. In those States a blanket check-off of union dues has always been illegal. Moreover, Congress in enacting wage provisions covering employees of Government contractors has frowned upon the check-off. Both the Bacon-Davis Act and the Walsh-Healy Act require payment of prevailing wages without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account. The adroit language of the Lesinski bill was aparently deliberately designed to sweep away all of the State and Federal restrictions in this regard that were unaffected by the original Wagner Act.

By extending the automatic check-off to all membership obligations the bill would authorize the deduction from the pay envelope of any sums which a union assessed against its members, and for any purpose. This would include not only members' dues and initiation fees, no matter how discriminatory or exorbitant, but also any fines or assessments which the union might levy either against members generally or against particular individuals. This would mean that unions in many cases, by a simple majority vote of those present at a union meeting, could assess all members substantial sums to be used for political activities to which many members might be opposed. Likewise, it is not uncommon for unions to levy heavy fines on members for infractions of union rules. All of such assessments and levies under the language of the Lesinski bill could be deducted from the employee member's pay without his individual consent or authorization.

The penalty for objection by the individual would be loss of his job and livelihood. The net effect of this provision, combined with the legalization of the closed shop and the abrogation of State laws dealing with compulsory union membership, is to deny to individual employees even what little freedom and rights they enjoyed under the original Wagner Act, and also to deny them any legal redress whatever if they are discharged and deprived of their livelihood because they happen to incur the displeasure of the union official.

The attempt of the majority of the Democratic members to foist such cynical provisions as this on the American people and the Congress under the guise of improving the Wagner Act should receive the overwhelming condemnation of the Congress.

POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS

The repeal of section 304 of the present law of the land by section 402 of the Lesinski bill leaves individual and minority members of unions completely helpless to prevent the majority from levying any and all kinds of political assessments on them, no matter how strongly they might be opposed to the purposes for which such political expenditures are to be made.

Section 402 of the bill simply reenacts section 610 of the Corrupt Practices Act, prohibiting political contributions by national banks or corporations, as it existed prior to the War Labor Disputes Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Its effect is to leave unions free to use their funds, whether raised by regular dues and initiation fees or special assessments, for any kind of political purposes the majority may wish.

Taken in conjunction with the legalization by the bill of the closed shop with no safeguards for individual rights, as well as an unlimited check-off of any sums which the union calls membership obligations, the effect will be in a great many instances to make an individual's job and livelihood forfeit if he objects to the use of his money for political purposes which he opposes. It would be possible under H. R. 2032 for a Communist-controlled union to levy a $100 political assessment on all its members for support of the Communist Party and, if it had a closed-shop contract and check-off as authorized in the majority bill, the only recourse a loyal American worker would have would be to quit his job. It is inconceivable that the Congress intends to permit such a ruthless invasion of the rights of free Americans to become possible.

Section 304 of the existing law developed out of the War Labor Disputes Act, which made political contributions by both unions and corporations illegal under the Corrupt Practices Act. Several congressional subcommittees had reported that the prohibition in the War Labor Disputes Act was being evaded by making direct expenditures rather than contributions, and this section in the existing law was taken verbatim from a bill pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1947, drafted as a result of the various recommendations of these subcommittees.

Congress had three objectives in mind in prohibiting political expenditures by either corporations or unions, all of them still justified:

1. To protect the essential political freedom and right of individual and minority stockholders and union members not to have th ir funds used for political purposes they oppose.

2. To prevent the improper diversion to political purposes of stockholders' and union members' funds contributed and meant to be used primarily for other purposes.

3. To remove the possibility of improper influence corrupting Government as a result of excessive political expenditures.

The major argument against this provision in 1947, when the present law of the land was pending, was that it would prohibit union publications from publishing voting records of Members of Congress and urging their election or defeat because such publication would constitute an expenditure. This interpretation was denied on the Senate floor by Senator TAFT and others. Subsequently the United States Supreme Court held that the section did not apply to campaign views expressed in union publications during an election.

WELFARE FUNDS

With no apparent reason discernible on the record, the Lesinski bill wipes out all of the safeguards on so-called health and welfare funds now provided by law.

Section 302 of the existing Labor Relations Act simply requires, whenever direct employer contributions to welfare funds are provided by contract, that the fund shall be a trust fund with the employee entitled to protect his rights by appeal to the courts, that such funds shall be jointly administered by employer and union representatives, and that the detailed basis on which benefits are to be payable shall be set forth in the agreement establishing the fund.

Its purpose is to protect such funds from becoming union slush funds and to assure that they are held in trust for the purpose of paying the benefits to employees for which they are established.

Section 302 also requires that check-off of union dues be authorized in writing by the individual employee affected, which is a minimum protection for employees against having their pay checks diverted for purposes which they disapprove.

More than 3,000,000 employees are now covered by such welfare funds, and the total in such funds runs into tens of millions of dollars. Payments into the United Mine Workers' fund alone, for instance, amount to $250,000 per day. With such huge sums involved, the necessity of protecting employees against improper diversion or use of the funds is apparent.

Secretary of Labor Tobin, in testifying before the Senate Labor Committee agreed that

statutory protection of employees' rights in such funds was advisable and necessary, but objected to the present provision on the ground that it interferes with free collective bargaining. Secretary Tobin suggested a separate statute.

There appears to be no basis for the charge that the present law has interfered with the negotiation of welfare funds, since the record shows that the number of employees covered by such funds has doubled in the past 2 years.

The unjustifiable destruction of the personal right of workers to disburse their earnings as they wish, and the wiping out of protections of their union and welfare funds, are the most reprehensible proposals of power and special privilege ever suggested to Congress.

Politics Has a Part in International Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Politics Has a Part in International Oil," published in Life magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS HAS A PART IN INTERNATIONAL OIL

The extension of American oil enterprise to Saudi Arabia in 1933 committed Aramco to a new venture in the rough, tough field of international politics. It is obvious that Aramco can never again separate itself from big politics. Recently, in fact, a mass of fascinating evidence has tended to show that Aramco accepted its fate in 1941 and entered into high-level political activity on a scale equal to its size. Many of the revelations of Aramco's diplomatic adventures have come from a veteran oil man named James A. Moffett, a long-time friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In a Federal court in New York in February a jury decided that Aramco should pay Moffett $1,150,000 for services which involved using his influence with F. D. R. on Aramco's behalf. Moffett already had outlined his story in Washington for the United States Senate's BREWSTER committee, investigating sale of Aramco oil to the United States Navy. The story, as it developed in Washington and New York, was this:

In 1940 the King of Saudi Arabia found his revenues badly thinned because Europe's war, nearing the Middle East, had cut off the profitable flow of pilgrims to Mecca. With this trade lost, the King needed $10,000,000 from other sources; he could raise $4,000,000 from Britain. He asked Aramco for $6,000,000. Aramco already had advanced the King $6,800,000 more than he had coming from royalties, but it was afraid to turn him down. Moffett, chairman of two affiliated oil companies, talked it over with Aramco's president. In April 1941 Moffett put Aramco's problem to his friend at the White House.

At F. D. R.'s request Moffett obtained an offer from Aramco: If the United States would advance $6,000,000 to the king annually for 5 years, the Navy could have petroleum products at attractive prices. But the Navy at that time did not feel that it needed Aramco's oil. Another complication also arose. When King Ibn-Saud learned of the company's effort, he angrily advised Aramco that he "knew he could borrow money from the United States Government if he so wished, and that if he did so wish he would do so directly and * * * not restrict himself to requesting such an inadequate sum." Nevertheless Aramco and Moffett pursued their project.

Harry Hopkins wrote Jesse Jones, "Some of it might be done under lend-lease although just how you could call that outfit (Saudi Arabia) a democracy I don't know. * * *." But temporarily another way was found. The United States was lending Britain $425,000,000, and F. D. R. wrote Jones, "Jesse, will you tell the British I hope they can take care of the king of Saudi Arabia. This is a little far afield from us." An interested Standard Oil executive wrote, "Perhaps something can be worked out to let the king know, and the British admit, that this is our money." Three years later, when Aramco warned of "increasing British economic influence in Saudi Arabia," the United States put Ibn Saud on direct lend-lease.

Moffett later charged that when Aramco finally did sell oil to the Navy, it charged $20,000,000 too much. Aramco replied that it saved the Navy $26,500,000. The Brewster committee found Aramco had overcharged. This argument may never be settled, but Aramco is trying by an appeal to win the case over Moffett's pay. Aramco's attorney told the court during trial, "I have yet to learn that friendship with the President is a salable commodity," and also argued, "This suit wasn't brought until Franklin Roosevelt's lips were sealed in death, but I wish to God he were alive today to tell this jury how he would have reacted to a suggestion that * * * Jimmy Moffett was telling that he was going to be paid for influencing the conduct of the President."

Moffett's lawyer summarized the plaintiff's case, "This is indeed a sad commentary on the morals of big business. * * * They are * * * saying that this man has volunteered to do this job, a story that is absolutely and totally unworthy of belief." The jury's award of $1,150,000 was far less than the $6,000,000 Moffet had asked, but he said, "I feel fine." If the award sticks he can count his long career in the oil business satisfactorily ended. Aramco knows its career is only started.

Legislative Record of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe, as I am sure my colleagues do, that it is the responsibility of every legislator to keep his constituents adequately informed of exactly what he is doing in their behalf, what bills he has introduced, how he has voted, and so forth. For that reason, I send out, as I am sure many of my associates do, numerous reports to the people of my State outlining my actions so that they will know exactly where I stand on important issues and so that they can give me their frank reactions, their suggestions, their criticisms.

I have prepared a brief listing of some of the general bills which I have introduced in the Eighty-first Congress thus far. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this list be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to acquaint my constituents and other folks with my over-all efforts and to invite their reactions.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO DATE IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS BY THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER WILEY

Tax reduction—S. 1029: To kill the wartime rates on hundreds of goods on which there are heavy excise taxes, like cosmetics, baby lotions, drugs, purses, wallets and other leather goods, furs, jewelry, long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, admission fees, etc.

Tax Commission—S. 810 (co-sponsor): To end the duplication between Federal, State, and local taxes by establishing a National Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, along the lines of the Hoover Commission. One purpose of this Commission would be to survey the problem of Federal tax-exempt property causing a financial burden to many hard-pressed localities.

Antistream pollution—S. 1118: To give businessmen tax advantages in order to develop industrial facilities to treat wastes so as to curb stream pollution. (Endorsed with Congressman JOHN BYRNES' companion bill by Izaak Walton League officials and other leading conservation organizations and individuals.)

Farm parity—S. 762: To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce immediately 90 percent of parity support for dairy products. (This and House legislation by Congressman REED MURRAY was one of the factors leading to the Agriculture Department's long-delayed action to support certain dairy prices which had been disastrously nose-diving and which are still in a difficult situation.)

Social security—Senate Concurrent Resolution 7: To establish a Joint Committee on Social Security to plan a comprehensive revision of the Nation's obsolete old-age security structure.

Decentralization—Senate Resolution 30: To provide for an immediate investigation into ways and means of decentralizing the National Defense Department and getting it out of Washington, D. C., to other areas of the Nation (so that if an atomic bomb hit Washington, our military set-up would not be paralyzed).

Overtime definition—S. 252: To fairly define regular hours and rates of pay and overtime (thus ending the terrific confusion and chaos facing businessmen as a result of muddled interpretations on overtime-on-overtime by the courts).

Veterans' earnings—S. 325: To permit disabled ex-servicemen to earn on their own initiative a little more money without losing pensions to which they are legally entitled. (This legislation endorsed by Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.)

Dairy amendment to H. R. 2023 (cosponsored by Senator WILEY and 26 other Senators): A State's rights amendment to ban the shipment of yellow-colored oleo in interstate commerce.

Quartermaster Laboratory—S. 1438: To authorize construction of a Quartermaster Corps Research Laboratory at or in the vicinity of Madison, Wis.

Widows' pensions—S. 565: To permit widows to earn a little more money on their own initiative without, as at present, losing the modest pensions which the Government gives them under the social security laws.

Displaced persons—S. 1055, S. 1315, S. 1316, S. 1317: Amendments to liberalize displaced persons law. (These amendments have been generally endorsed by citizens' committee on displaced persons and leading Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish organizations.)

Miscellaneous bills, plus other legislation for electrical voting by the Senate (in place of present time-consuming horse-and-buggy system) (S. Res. 41), for Emblem Day on June 20 (S. J. Res. 62) (endorsed by Fraternal Order of Eagles); legislation to encourage hiring of handicapped veterans (S. 677) (endorsed by Disabled American Veterans); Pulaski Day bill (S. J. Res. 8); bills for justice for postal employees in third-class offices and for employees who served in our armed forces, but have received no credit for sick leave (S. 1461 and S. 1462) (endorsed by National Federation of Post Office Clerks); for protection of American Legion insignia (S. 646, S. 647, S. 676), etc.

Communists Subsidize Teaching at Columbia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Plain Talk magazine for April 1949 contains an article by one Arthur P. Coleman entitled "Munich in the Academy." It is a story of his experience at Columbia University. For 20 years, from 1928 to 1948, Dr. Coleman taught Slavic languages and literature at Columbia in New York. Last summer he resigned his position because the university, with the approval of General Eisenhower, its president, accepted a subsidy from the puppet Polish regime in Warsaw which inaugurated a policy of similar endowments from Soviet satellite states.

Mr. Speaker, it seems incredible that Ike Eisenhower, a great American, should permit the pollution of the minds of the students at one of our leading educational institutions by accepting these endowments so that Communist propaganda may be advanced under the guise of academic freedom.

But here we have the personal narrative of a reputable teacher, with a distinguished record who would not sacrifice his independence and who refused to knuckle-under to fellow-travelers on the faculty at Columbia. Today, Mr. Speaker, he is paying a heavy price for his refusal to sell his academic birthright. More power to him and to Plain Talk for its determination to smoke out the Red rats in our institutions of learning. The fight must go on. I insert the article under my permission to extend my remarks:

IT HAPPENED TO ME AT COLUMBIA—MUNICH IN THE ACADEMY

(By Arthur Prudden Coleman)

This is a personal story. Like all things we know best, it happened to me. I am telling it to prevent others from learning what I did in as painful and expensive a manner. What happened to me occurred at Columbia University. It may, and unless steps are taken, it will happen to others elsewhere. I do not exaggerate when I say that the independent character of American university education is endangered. I am therefore telling my story while there is still time.

It is one of the tragedies of our time that personal testimony regarding the infiltrative techniques of totalitarianism has often come after the event, when it was too late. With this knowledge I speak now, when democratic counterforces in American education can still accomplish a good deal. But before protective measures are considered it is important to know what happened to me.

Who am I?

For 20 years, from 1928 to 1948, I taught Slavic languages and literature at Columbia University in New York. The department of which I was a member ranks fifth chronologically among such American centers. Under the influence of its founder, the late John Dyneley Prince, a distinguished linguist, one-time Governor of New Jersey and American diplomat, this Slavic department resisted all Soviet blandishments. It was a free department, devoted to the interests of independent American education. In October 1945 Mr. Prince died; his intimate friend, Nicholas Murray Butler, universally respected scholar and president of the university, suffered declining health.

It was at this time that rumors spread among the faculty that the Slavic department was being slated for expansion. In time, the members of our department were assembled at a luncheon and introduced to the new executive officer, Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, of Cornell University. This was a change and it was evident that we could expect overnight, as it were, to be transformed from a solid and sound Slavic department to the most advanced, as a peculiar terminology which is fashionable would have it.

What is Professor Simmons like? One can perhaps achieve some insight into the personality of this advanced academician if he is aware of certain of his administrative regulations. At this point it is necessary to mention only one: Professors in his department must clear all visiting speakers in their classes with his office.

He writes well and undoubtedly receives admiration in some quarters for a sentence like this: "The difference between the Soviet realist and the bourgeois realist is essentially a difference between faith in life and lack of faith." Or this: "Soviet literature has scarcely begun to realize its vast potentialities, but its present vitality, positive affirmation and soaring faith give promise of a great future." He has written a good deal in this vein, and so it is no surprise that in these same admiring circles he has come to be known as an expert on the Soviet Union. The fact that he is deserving of such a mantle of distinction is perhaps best indicated by occasional revelations of the professor of which even the best informed authorities on the Soviet Union are unaware. Speaking before a large section of the Modern Languages Association in December 1946, he revealed the absence of concentration camps in the Soviet Union. His latest gambit is an attempt to correlate the pacifism of Tolstoy with the new Stalinist peace front. All in all, the professor is a most learned gentleman and, obviously, quite deserving of the recognition he has won as an authority.

This may all seem humorous to the reader but the activities of Professor Simmons were quite unfunny to those who recognized what they meant in terms of independent American education. He began slowly, quietly. He established an important precedent, which was to be useful later. The first step was persuading Columbia to accept $7,500 a year from Benes' Czechoslovakia for the Thomas G. Masaryk chair of Czechoslovak studies. (At present, according to the recently published report of the former acting president, Dr. Frank Fackenthal, the amount provided by Communist Dictator Gottwald is now $22,500 a year this on a departmental budget of approximately $60,000.)

With the grant from Czechoslovakia accepted by the trustees, Simmons boasted to me that he had great plans for our department, hinting broadly that promotion, a new office, research grants, all these were in store for me. I also understood quite clearly that reverse treatment would be forthcoming if I did not cooperate with the new plans.

One day he waxed expansive.

"You know, Arthur, I want more. I'm already in contact with the Polish Ambassador. The Yugoslav is favorable. I also hope to obtain a grant from Hungary. With these in tow, I'll go after $100,000 from the U. S. S. R. Then we'll really have a department."

Soon I heard that Simmons was attempting to obtain a Soviet visa. He did receive one; his expenses were paid by the Rockefeller Foundation through the American Council of Learned Societies. He sailed in June 1947.

Just before he left, however, Simmons recommended to the President that he reject an offer of $1,200 from an American businessman in Georgia. The grant was offered to aid an anti-Soviet Polish writer, whom I proposed, to give a series of lectures at Columbia's summer session for the benefit of students in Polish. On Simmons' recommendation, Columbia refused this grant.

Privately, Simmons told me that he was opposed to the acceptance of such money; his reason was that it might embarrass the Russian institute and the Slavic department in their efforts at a cultural rapprochement with the Soviet Union. I, of course, was unable to follow such reasoning, but in all such matter, I am proud to say, the record shows that I have always been pretty dumb.

But let no one say that Simmons totally lacked fairness. For example, before he made the adverse report on the $1,200 gift he informed me that he had telephoned Polish Ambassador Winiewicz in Washington, and that Winiewicz had courteously agreed to contact Warsaw for their opinion of the Polish refugee I had in mind—a well-known anti-Communist.

I am understating my reaction when I say that this amazed me; that the executive officer of the Slavic department of an American university should feel it necessary to ask Warsaw and its secret police to pass on the reliability of a Polish refugee before this same American department head would O. K. his appointment.

It would have been better for me academically, and financially, if I had been pleased instead of shocked. Stalinist heat began to be turned on me soon after Simmons returned from the U. S. S. R. (house guest of Ambassador Smith, full use of diplomatic pouch, etc.) in September 1947.

At any rate, soon after this, a well-known fellow traveler said to me: "What Ernie (Simmons) now needs is a sharp denunciation in the Soviet press. Since he has been the only American professor this past summer to obtain a Soviet visa, his pro-Soviet statements will not gain so wide a credence as they would if he were to be denounced in Moscow."

And even this came to pass.

Moscow attacked Simmons. Mrs. Simmons ruefully told me: "They owe a great deal to Ernie."

It was time to act. With the aid of a number of other Slavists, those with unbroken records of resistance to Soviet cultural aggression, I succeeded in persuading the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, which I founded in 1941, and of which I still am national secretary-treasurer, to vote at their fifth annual meeting on the proposition that all national officers be required to swear to a non-Communist affidavit before being allowed to assume office.

The present text of the affidavit reads:

"I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party. I do not believe in, and I am not a member of, nor do I support, any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

This is a simple oath and, frankly, I do not see how anyone devoted to this country could possibly object to subscribing to it.

The Bulletin of the above Association, making public the fact that its national officers had formally sworn to such an affidavit, was published on March 15, 1948. Two copies of the Bulletin went as usual to Moscow, by air mail, and arrived there in advance of publication date. Shortly after, the Polish Embassy in Washington canceled an order for a wholesale lot of my books on Polish literature.

The rest of the story I shall transcribe from my diary, which was kept carefully, on a day-to-day basis.

May 4, 1948: Simmons told me, while riding downtown in a taxi to Laurence Duggan's Institute of International Education, that after a lull of 1 year, the Polish Ambassador had suddenly invited him to a swell lunch, and had informed him that he was ready to grant a large sum to Columbia for Polish studies. I was stunned as I attempted to observe the amenities at the subsequent meeting attended by the Czechoslovak cultural attaché as well as by a sprinkling of Soviet sympathizers. * * * Returning home I told Mrs. Coleman: "I guess the CP'ers have got me, and I'll have to resign before I get out of this." My wife said that she had been wanting to go to work. (Note: She has had to since.)

Later in May (undated): Simmons said that he had gone to Washington, at the request of Acting President Fackenthal, to consult the State Department, and that they had not objected to the grant. Also he had consulted Ambassador Winiewicz as to who was to be invited to become Adam Mickiewicz Professor of Polish Studies. The Ambassador wanted Professor Manfred Kridl of Smith College, whom Simmons hardly knew. Kridl, for the record, had easily obtained a Polish visa during the past summer, and had returned praising the Communist regime.

May 20: Ambassador Winiewicz brought the first check for $10,000 to Acting President Fackenthal today. * * * I did not attend Simmons' cocktail party for Winiewicz. * * * Ernie said that I missed a good time.

May 28: I left for Indiana University where the Polish consul general in Chicago, not guessing the step I was contemplating, greeted me on behalf of Ambassador Winiewicz in Washington, and asked for my help in persuading a certain American university of note to accept a similar subsidy from Warsaw. He said that this task would be easier now, since they could use the name of incoming President Eisenhower to convince officials of the pure motives of the Polish Ambassador in his support of Polish studies in the United States. * * * My growing resolve to fight back was strengthened by the statement of the son of a former professor under Hitler to the effect that if German professors had fought nazism hard enough in the early days, fewer of them would later have died in the concentration camps. My own situation was no doubt somewhat smaller in scope, but unless each individual fights back in his own situation, the problem becomes enlarged soon enough. My determination to fight Simmons was fixed. I would let the Columbia administration decide for or against his appeasing policies. I was to supply all the information I had available.

June 3: Simmons told me that Kridl, whose English is not good, was to lecture in English next autumn on recent Polish literature, correcting mistakes which had crept in during the thirties. I knew that this meant the usual anti-Fascist line. He said also that he hoped I would arrange a large meeting at which the ambassador would speak, and a fine banquet at which the new set-up could be announced appropriately. This meant that I was to exploit my popularity as an exponent of the Polish Christian tradition to bring a large group of New York Poles to do under my lead what they previously refused to do: listen to the ambassador, a man whom 99 percent of them recognized as a representative of the Communist government of Poland. I said nothing to Simmons, but my Irish was mounting fast.

June 10: Met President Eisenhower at a reception for professors and alumni who have performed conspicuous service for Columbia's endowment drive. * * * I wish I could tell the general how his name and that of Columbia have already been used in the Soviet-satellite drive against free American Slavic studies.

Later in June (undated): Depressed to learn that President Eisenhower thinks it not unwise to allow a Communist organization to hold a meeting in a Columbia building, this in response to a protest by the daughter of a large donor to the university.

Still later in June (undated): Further depressed to learn that President Eisenhower in a letter to the editor of the Polish-language Everybody's Daily (Buffalo) confirmed the act of his predecessor in accepting a 3-year grant of $30,000 from Bierut's regime.

June 30: Provost Jacobs received a delegation of protest from the Polish-American Congress, stating that Columbia was not able to accept their position, and would definitely initiate the new Warsaw-supported program in the autumn. * * * I wrote my resignation. * * * This letter of protest was addressed personally to President Eisenhower in the hope that I could somehow convince him that it was unwise to let the Communists subsidize instruction in our Slavic department. * * * Over the week end I pondered why I must sacrifice the fruits of 20 years of teaching, but when I heard Ike speaking to hundreds of American war heroes, scattered among the thousands who listened to his inspiring words, telling them, with his wonderful dynamism, to give, if necessary, their lives for their country, I thought to myself: "Yes, Ike; I'm ready to resign for my country."

July 9: Provost Jacobs received me cordially, informing me that President Eisenhower had carefully considered my case. He was, nevertheless, determined to go ahead with the Polish grant; I could terminate my service at my own pleasure. I stated that I was sorry to go and would stay, (1) if the courses by Professor Kridl were withdrawn; (2) if the $10,000 already accepted were devoted to the purchase of needed scientific instruments for the devastated universities of Poland; (3) if President Eisenhower would investigate Stalinist infiltration at Columbia. These were rejected and I walked out determined to fight publicly the prostitution of American Slavic departments by means of Communist subsidies.

For my efforts to help keep American education free, I have been rewarded with the following: Threat of a libel suit, slanderous epithets, abuse, and worse. I have been investigated again and again. A Federal personnel officer told me that the publicity which my case received has made it difficult for me to get admitted to Government service (United States Government service, lest the reader has forgotten). The dean of a great eastern university denied me mailing privileges. In Prague I have been called a Communist agent; in Wisconsin it has been said (oh, these smear campaigns) that I was motivated by a desire to have a free trip to Poland. Ad nauseam.

As for financial rewards (since the great Stalinist myth is that anticommunism pays big dividends), I need only note that this year my income tax will be 10 percent of what it was formerly. I have already spoken of my wife's necessary excursion into the business world.

One point needs to be expressed explicitly. Most American universities perpetually need additional funds, nor is this to their discredit. Adequate staffs must be maintained, new courses must be added, new talent must be attracted to the universities. In view of this state of affairs, Communist offers of subsidy may be difficult to refuse now that so well-known an organization as Columbia has set a precedent. That is the danger. It must be fought. It can be fought only by those who are willing to conduct a full-fledged fight against the spread of such monied Communist infiltration.

That is why I tried to make my contribution to this democratic, antitotalitarian fight. Was I wrong?

Address of Hon. W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Under Secretary of the Navy W. John Kenney before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association at Norfolk, Va., February 24, 1949:

Congressman Hardy, Mayor Darden, President Seawall, of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, members, and distinguished guests, as my plane descended today I was again impresed by the glorious sight of the ports of Greater Hampton Roads: The storage, terminal, and handling facilities; the piers, warehouses, and grain elevators; the Army, Navy, and Air Force installations; the drydocks and the shipyards and the ships—naval ships and merchant ships; ships at anchor, under way, and in reserve.

No American can gaze down upon this composite symbol of industrial and commercial achievement without pride and without confidence in our country's might. The emotions which Virginians must experience, particularly those who have taken part in the planning and developing of this area, I will not attempt to define.

The wartime record of the ports is so well known that I need pay only collective and passing tribute to their vital contributions to the winning of World War II. Their war and postwar accomplishments have been impressively set forth in terms of facts and figures in the maritime association's annual for 1949.

But from where I sit in the Navy section of the Pentagon, the ports take on a significance outside the scope of cold statistics. From a Navy viewpoint, strictly from the point of view of national defense, I visualize them as a great reservoir of sea power, actual and potential. I do not refer to the present only. I am looking back to both world wars and ahead. The ships built here, whether carriers, cruisers, or destroyers; whether cargo vessels, oil tankers, or passenger ships, all are essential both to the peacetime and wartime needs of our country.

The great new aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *United States*, about to be built in nearby Newport News, will be a great advance from the 200-foot frigate which bore the same name and which was launched 151 years ago.

Although the designers of this mighty carrier drew upon the lessons of World War II, they did not fall into the error of designing a ship to fight the same kind of war all over again. They looked back only so that they could better see ahead.

Carrier-based air forces take with them all necessary components for immediate action and sustained air operations. The great extra range for naval aircraft is built into the carriers themselves. Their planes arrive at combat zones—no matter how far distant—with tanks full and flyers fresh.

No other nation has this form of air power. It gives our country great advantage, not only in event of war but in the support of our national policies anywhere.

In the initial and highly critical stages of a war, the Navy's air power can buy time during which the weight of the Air Force and the Army can be brought forward. This modern power—more correctly, air-sea power—is not a duplication of the land-based air power of the Air Force. It is additional air power, tailormade to sea and amphibious operations. In short, naval mobile air power is the other arm of our national air power.

Our minds are storehouses of impressions of the wartime devastation of air power. Current headlines, photographs, newsreels, and spectacular air shows contribute to mass respect for, and appreciation of, its potential fury. The sight and sound of our planes flashing across the skies fill us with pride, fill us with confidence, and with a vague and pleasant sense of security; and this is certainly proper. But, the accumulative effect of this should not lull us into a false sense of security.

Today Americans are searching for simple solutions and easy roads to victory—victory without pain and sorrow—victory without denial of the comforts and without the loss of life—that have always accompanied, and will always accompany, wars. This search has led in some cases to extreme views.

As General Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army, recently stated: "If we construct air power at the fatal expense of ground and naval arms, then we may foolishly be forced to desert our allies and forsake our capacity to wage a sustained blow."

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Vandenberg, has also said: "It has always been, and is now, our belief that the security of our Nation depends on the proper combination and employment of our land, sea, and air arms. We do not believe that a strategic air offensive alone will win the next war, if it comes."

In spite of our great technological advances since VJ-day, war within our lifetime is not going to be a push-button struggle. War will require the concerted efforts of all three services—in fact, of all of us, man, woman, and child.

And in our preparation for war, we must never forget the merchant marine. It is essential not only to our Nation's economy, but to its national security. This country is wholly dependent on imports for many of its essential materials—manganese, chromium, tungsten, iron and copper ores. These materials are vital to our existence, and they must constantly be brought to us across the seas in ships. The merchant marine is the backbone of the logistic support of our land, sea, and air forces. The armed services cannot carry out their assigned missions without sufficient troop transports, cargo vessels, and oil tankers. These vessels must be appropriately designed, readily available, and capable of being swiftly produced.

In World War I $3,000,000,000 in emergency ship construction were required, and the program was not completed until after hostilities ended. World War II required an outlay five times greater and did not reach its peak for 3 years. It would be folly to assume that we again will have as much time to prepare for war.

In both World Wars friendly maritime powers furnished us with greatly needed ships. Although these nations today are building better and faster merchant vessels in quantity, there is no guaranty that they would be available for our use in the event of another war, and especially so if these nations were overrun by enemy forces. Therefore we should not rely on others to provide the ships that may mean the difference between victory or defeat.

In our planning the menace of the high-speed, long-range, and deadly "schnorkel" submarine of today must be taken into account. Despite improved antisubmarine equipment, weapons, techniques, and tactics, ships inevitably would be sunk by underwater attack. How many is anyone's guess. For a long time after the start of World War II, ships were being sunk more rapidly than we could build them.

Consequently, next time, if there be a next time, we must have faster cargo ships, faster tankers, faster troop ships and plenty of them. The Maritime Commission already has taken a realistic and forward-looking step toward this objective. It is a step which also may provide a possible answer some years hence to the worrisome problem of the block obsolescence of our Liberty and Victory ships of the last war.

The step I refer to is the building of two prototype cargo ships by the Maritime Commission to meet requirements based upon the wartime experience of the Navy. One of these ships is designed to meet the general cargo-lift needs of any future emergency; the other will represent the commercial version of a wartime auxiliary vessel used by the Navy as attack cargo ships and attack transports. Both should have peacetime commercial uses, particularly the strictly cargo type vessel. Private industry already has expressed interest in it. The President and the Congress have given this prototype project enthusiastic approval and support. It is hoped that actual construction of these two vessels will get underway this summer, and that eventually they may be turned out on a large scale by private shipbuilding firms.

Other important steps also have been taken to revive our merchant marine and to keep it vital and flourishing. Chief among them are the recent and pending congressional appropriations totaling several hundred millions for the construction of a substantial number of high-speed tankers, passenger and combination passenger-cargo vessels.

Among such ships to be built is one of particular interest to the Navy, the 48,000-ton liner ordered by the United States Lines. Her special defense features will, in time of emergency, make her invaluable as a troop transport.

The bid opening of last December 1 indicates that this outstanding ship will be built in this vicinity. Negotiations are going forward and it is hoped they soon will be consummated. The building of this liner will be a three-year project and should afford a great measure of employment for this area. More passenger liners are greatly needed to meet our military needs.

Obviously, all the needs of our Military Establishment cannot be met through the medium of ships built by private interests. Nor can private industry be expected to bear the full financial load. Appropriate construction and defense-feature differential subsidies as well as operation-differential payments have been and must continue to be provided by the Government. They are key incentives to attracting private capital and to convincing the American investing public that the upbuilding of our merchant marine is not only essential to the security of this Nation, but also a good business risk.

Private industry appears ready and willing to assume its share of the burden if the Government will extend a fair and reasonable amount of construction subsidy assistance and assume the total cost of any national defense features incorporated into the design of ships. In fact, practically every major American ship operator seems willing to further the extension of the current ship construction program.

The current level of employment in both naval and private shipyards throughout the country is far below the level at which emergency shipbuilding expansion could be rapid enough again to meet defense requirements. The Navy estimates that "safety level" at from 80,000 to 100,000 workers. Today it is in the neighborhood of 50,000.

If a strong and effective nucleus of both ship design and shipbuilding workers is to be a reality, there must be reasonable assurance of definite periods of employment. Our shipbuilding industry cannot develop properly through an occasional shot in the arm. There must be a long-range program.

The ship construction and conversion program of the Navy is a part of this over-all program. At this time it involves a total of 49 ships, of which about one-third represent new construction. To provide the necessary and continual maintenance work on the reserve fleet vessels, laid up at a time when adequate repairs could not be made upon them, a 5-year overhaul program was initiated. In 1948 20 percent, or approximately 400 vessels, were thoroughly overhauled. The same percentage is scheduled for the fiscal year 1949. This program will be continued under the new Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Admiral David H. Clark, who, from his days spent in Norfolk, is well known to all of you, and who succeeded Vice Admiral Earl Mills, retired.

Since the surrender of Japan, our merchant marine has shrunk to less than one-third its wartime size. Coastwise shipping is virtually nonexistent. How it best can be restored is not yet clear, but it is clear that something must be done—and soon.

I have touched upon a few steps that have been taken toward the revival of the merchant marine so necessary for our defense requirements, and for our Nation's economy. These steps are only a beginning.

The sum total of the efforts to date is to reverse a downhill trend. The climb back will be long and hard. Many obstacles will have to be overcome.

However, because the survival of our merchant marine and a vigorous shipbuilding industry are so essential to our national defense, the National Military Establishment, along with the Maritime Commission, has put its shoulder to the wheel. It intends to keep it there until the job is done.

With the help of all hands, I am confident that it can be done and that it will be done—because it must be done.

Oppose Restriction of Hospital Facilities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in Wisconsin there is rather widespread disapproval of the plan to reduce the authorization for hospitals for the veterans of our wars. The press relates that the plan is to so reduce the hospital program as

to prevent the construction by 16,000 beds.

This move is particularly resented by many veterans, especially those who are in need of hospitalization and are denied it at present. In the near future, that need will become even greater.

To limit the building of new hospitals for veterans at such a time, when veterans of our wars are on waiting lists of the hospitals already in use, is unwise and is unjust to the veterans and to all who recognize the great service they rendered in our time of greatest need. While economy in government is necessary to prevent bankruptcy, to start economy by depriving thousands of veterans of the medical and surgical treatment they need, is little short of outrageous. Contrasted with the recent congressional action is the fact that we are sending billions abroad to benefit nations whose armed forces fought against our own, which is a poor form of economy.

The Eau Claire Post, chapter 10, of the Disabled American Veterans, Don Comerford, commander, recently entered its strong protest in the unanimous adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas this Nation's primary obligation is to its wartime-disabled veterans; and

Whereas Gen. Carl Gray, Jr., the Veterans' Administrator, said in an address to the last national convention of the Disabled American Veterans that the greatest debt of government is to the wartime disabled; and

Whereas the wartime-disabled veterans are the ones who suffered most for the preservation of this Nation; and

Whereas proper and ample hospitalization and medical treatment is the first step in the rehabilitation of the war-handicapped as well as vital to their continued rehabilitation; and

Whereas the originally authorized building program of the Veterans' Administration is necessary and the delay in getting hospitals built is bringing pain and misery and death to hundreds, if not thousands, of American veterans; and

Whereas the recent Executive order reducing the Veterans' Administration hospital-building program by 16,000 beds is in direct conflict with the need for these hospitals; and

Whereas powerful organizations are working to retard if not destroy the accepted hospital program of the Veterans' Administration as authorized by Congress and that the Hoover Committee in its report to Congress recommends the merger of the veterans' hospital program with other agencies which will mean the complete destruction of the VA hospital program; and

Whereas any merger of VA hospitals with other services as recommended by the Hoover Commission is the complete breach of faith between this Government and its wartime defenders;

Now, therefore, the Eau Claire chapter, No. 10, of the Disabled American Veterans, hereby expressed itself on record as being vigorously opposed to any reduction in hospital beds and asks the reinstation of the original building program; we also militantly attack any proposed merger of VA hospitals with any other agencies and urge the speeding up of completion of hospitals now planned.

Adopted this 17th day of March 1949 at Eau Claire, Wis.

It is further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Veterans' Administrator, and our congressional representative.

Yalta—George Sokolsky on the Crime Committed at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald on April 5, 1949, as follows:

In an effort to explain away history, some of our current statesmen excuse their errors of knowledge and judgment, which have been so costly to the human race, by insisting that their conduct must be judged according to the necessities of the moment.

They created the necessities of the moment by failing to understand the forces of history, and now shirk the responsibility for their shortcomings.

History, however, gives no man so advantageous a break. It writes its story regardless of personalities.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill were the representatives of western civilization at the court of Joseph Stalin. It was a curious situation both at Tehran and Yalta.

Stalin had been in alliance with Hitler for 22 months. During the period of the Stalin-Hitler alliance, the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement governed conquered Europe.

The Marxist-Leninist line had been changed to make possible an alliance of Communist and Fascist countries. Y. Matsuoka, the most vivid anti-Democrat in Japan, had been welcomed in Soviet Russia.

In the United States, Communists picketed the White House; their slogan was, "The Yanks are not coming."

Then Hitler broke with Stalin and invaded Russian territory, marching with such speed that it seemed that Moscow would fall to the Germans.

The great battle was the siege of Stalingrad. At that moment, Churchill adopted the policy that whoever kills Germans is a good man, even though shortly before he was a bad man.

Harry Hopkins flew to Moscow. The Roosevelt grand design was integrated. The United States, through Roosevelt, assumed leadership in the war, engaged in lend-lease, poured billions into Russia, Great Britain, and other countries.

Stalin immediately and wisely adopted the attitude that victory or defeat for the western allies depended not upon American production and wealth but upon the manpower of Soviet Russia.

He permitted himself to be courted, and Roosevelt and Churchill accepted his valuation of the war situation, and courted him.

Pearl Harbor strengthened Stalin's position because, in spite of more than a century of intercourse between the United States and China, our military were astoundingly ignorant of that area.

Furthermore, all the most competent and long-experienced Far Eastern experts in the State department had been pushed out of it; in their stead, Mr. Roosevelt had employed Communists, fellow-travelers, and pro-Russians who have not stood up well in the recent loyalty tests.

When all the evidence is in it will be shown that they were employed to please Stalin. Furthermore, the British were overconcerned with the problems of India, Burma, and the Malay States, for which they were willing to sacrifice China as well as Japan, displaying an ignorance of Far Eastern geopolitik so astounding that one still wonders how it could possibly be.

Obviously, under such circumstances, Soviet Russia had all the advantages which she used freely at Tehran and Yalta, and even subsequently at Potsdam.

At Yalta, America and British policy displayed total moral bankruptcy and all our costly current troubles are rooted in the errors of knowledge and judgment there.

The record clearly shows that at Yalta, from his own standpoint and for the accomplishment of his objectives, Stalin made no errors.

It was not until after Potsdam, where the untrained and unskilled Harry Truman caught on to the play, that the United States altered its policies and began to reckon the consequences of Stalin's brilliant maneuvers at Tehran and Yalta.

This compact statement of the case can be documented now, although at the time the American people were not adequately informed.

If Winston Churchill or anyone else says that we need to forget all this and go on from here, the proposal is untenable because policy has to be based upon understanding of the problem, and understanding is impossible except with Tehran and Yalta as a basis.

Nor can the British adopt the attitude that they have no moral responsibilities for what has happened to all of Europe east of the Stettin-Trieste line, and to all of Asia. They cannot say that they followed the leadership of Roosevelt blindly. That they did not is clear in the record of the Singapore conference; that they should not have done so is in the spirit of British history and tradition.

Colorado River Compact of the Upper Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a day of great significance for the people of the upper-basin States of the Colorado River Basin. The President of the United States signed a bill allowing the States of Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona to enter into a compact, or an agreement, confirming a division among them of the water of the Colorado River and its tributaries. This agreement was consummated in conformity with the Colorado River compact which had previously allotted a certain amount of water to the upper-basin States.

The significant thing about the compact was the fact that the agents of the States, after long and arduous deliberation, finally came to a unanimous agreement as to the division of the water for each of the States. Water is a precious thing for the present and future development of all these States, therefore, the representatives of the various States were expected to get every drop of water to which his State was entitled.

All of the distinguished negotiators of this compact were men of experience and were determined not to repeat the sad experience of a long-drawn-out, costly

litigation, so they wrote a new chapter in the history of western irrigation and reclamation and demonstrated that agreements can be reached through considerate understanding. By their action they hope to avoid costly lawsuits, thereby setting a good example to their neighbors to do likewise.

Government and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Floyd Poe from the Dallas Morning News of November 12, 1948:

THIS, THAT, AND THE OTHER

"The time of our departure is at hand." This is a sort of paraphrase of the last words of a great man. The thought in mind is that for public education in the United States—the time of its departure is at hand. I mean, its departure from its original conception. Our founding fathers had learned from their homes across the sea that the most unhappy things in their lives came from the admixture of government and education. They had seen education controlled and used for the propaganda of rulers. To prevent this happening in their new world they resorted to some strange devices. They determined in their new constitution to keep government and education entirely separate.

These forefathers of ours set up independent colleges which could not be touched by the Federal Government. They divorced public elementary and secondary education from political control and authorized local units to elect their own boards and trustees. These local school boards were given power to levy their own taxes separate and apart from Federal Government. Private educational institutions were free from taxes for two reasons—because their purpose was the making of good citizens and because if the Government could levy taxes for them it could also control them, for the power to tax is the power to perpetuate or destroy. These regulations showed the determination of the constitutional fathers to keep education separate and apart from government.

Now there was another feature—the religious element. Many of our forefathers came from living under state controlled religion. The church was a state church and was largely controlled by the state. Our forefathers were determined that their religion should be free. It was not to keep people from being religious but to make it easy and natural for them to be religious that it was written into our Constitution that the Government would neither favor nor prevent the right to worship according to the dictates of one's own mind and heart.

Now we are coming upon a time when we are departing in a hurry from these early attitudes and decisions. This is brought about by two practices. First, the politician is for education. He is for it regardless. He will advocate any sort of tax for education, whether it is an absurd plan, a duplication of facilities or what not.

The second danger lies in the wild dreaming of educators themselves. I have never met an educator who didn't need funds. There you have it. An educator who needs funds and more funds and the politician who votes more taxes from any source for education. Even a blind man can see this danger. It eventually means Federal taxes for local schools.

Now revert to an earlier statement—the power to tax means the power to control. The United States, even according to the report of the President's commission on higher education, looks to a program which calls for Federal aid, which means Federal control for our whole school system, and that means a distinct break with the original ideas which this country has steadfastly held throughout its history. The time of our departure is at hand for free education.

FLOYD POE.

Army Day

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was asked yesterday to participate in a parade and dinner given to commemorate Army Day in Lowell, Mass. It was the most striking affair I have ever seen in this country. There was the marching of the infantry, there was the mechanized equipment of tremendous size and impressiveness, also the great tanks. It was a parade that should give every country food for thought.

Mr. Speaker, those who marched yesterday were in our peacetime Army, undoubtedly the greatest peacetime Army of all times. I observed the expression on the faces of the people in the street who were watching; I watched the expression on the faces of the children. The children realized the impressiveness of all of it and the older people realized our peacetime Army and what it stands for, this in contrast with an army that would today march in Russia or in Europe where they would be flaunting their might. Instead our Army was telling the world that it was ready if there should be aggression, that they were a bulwark against communism and other isms all over the world.

I want at this point to call attention to the exceptionally fine job being done by Maj. Gen. R. W. Grow, the Army commandant at Fort Devens. Through his wise administration, his extremely able leadership, there has developed the highest type of friendly relations between the Army and the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and especially so in the vicinity of Fort Devens.

In addressing the dinner given by The American Legion in Lowell last evening, to commemorate Army Day, I said, in part:

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago a small group of people, some of them your ancestors, landed on the shores of this continent in the search for freedom from tyranny, oppression, and fear. They were a tired and weary group who had braved the unknown dangers of a long sea voyage fraught with peril, storm, and pestilence in the hope that in this land there would be a life worth living, a land yet unknown but full of promise and hope that here man could raise his eyes to the skies and see his God in his own image and breathe into his lungs the freedom that man has, since time began, dreamed of. The landing here was not the end of the quest, but only the beginning. Through many years of hard work, sacrifice, starvation, death, and new life these people opened up a new world for others who followed, others who were seeking the same goal. Tyranny and oppression followed but did not stay in this bright new land. Soon this way of life began to become apparent to all and suddenly a new nation was born, a nation of free people who understood the meaning of freedom and opportunity and individuality—and the sanctity of man.

Today that Nation has reached greatness. It did not acquire this quality easily. Wars were fought, people died, man sacrificed again and again in order that his children would be able to enjoy the fruits and privileges that are inherent in a democratic world. The principles of freedom and democracy have been challenged twice within our own lifetime. We have witnessed and many of you have participated in the two greatest wars in the history of mankind. Today, April 6, marks the date of our entry into the first of those two.

In spite of the fact that we defeated the enemy in both these wars, we did not achieve the peace for which we fought. In fact, but four short years after World War II we are again engaged in a struggle against tyranny, oppression, and fear. The eyes of the world, the hopes of the countless millions bent upon us, beseeching us to provide not a haven but a bulwark against the force of communism which threatens to overrun them. There are some in this country who claim that we should not supply such a bulwark, that it is a thankless task to lend a helping hand to these needy peoples. It amazes me how short-sighted such persons are. They apparently cannot see that the real basis of our greatness is the ideals for which we stand and for which we are ready to fight.

Fortunately, these opponents of a dynamic America are a minority and we can show to the world the American soldier as concrete evidence that our Nation is today and every day a bulwark against the forces of tyranny and oppression. Your Army, along with the Air Force and Navy, are recognized as great factors for peace in this troubled world. It is hard to picture the chaos and confusion which might result if the restraining hand of our Army was withdrawn.

As these thoughts pass through our minds on this Army Day, we cannot help but feel a sense of obligation to do all in our power to retain and maintain this Army of ours as an army for peace. And we can do this only by lending support to a program of adequate preparedness for all the services. The unselfish support given by veterans' organizations to adequate national security is better understood when one stops to reflect as we have done here today. The rest of us can ask whether we have been derelict in this regard.

And finally on this occasion our thoughts cannot help but stray to Army Day services in other countries and compare ours to theirs. In an increasing number of sections of the world an Army Day merely serves as an occasion to flaunt one's military power in the faces of one's neighbors and the rest of the world. I pray that ours will never be used as such an occasion. But if Army Day is to be a day of peace and not war, then our Army deserves our wholehearted confidence and support. Let us take this day to demonstrate this confidence and support.

Inside Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, we have appropriated millions of dollars in an effort to develop the most effective programs of action and education to reveal the true nature of communism and other forms of totalitarianism. We need to make crystal clear the reactionary, oppressive, and tyrannical character of these modern apostles of regimentation and to constantly contrast them with our own democratic way of life and thus demonstrate to our own people and to the world the great superiority of the American democracy. To achieve these purposes the Congress has appropriated funds to finance studies, to pay for the preparation and publication of various documents, for investigative activities, and to provide for the strengthening of the United States Office of Education in the field of the social sciences. By these means, and many others, Congress, as our most representative body of citizens, has stimulated and encouraged many private organizations, particularly those engaged in broad programs of enlightenment and education, to do increasingly effective work along this line. The Honorable John Studebaker, former United States Commissioner of Education, resigned his position and accepted a position as vice president and chairman of the editorial board of Scholastic Magazines. As United States Commissioner of Education, he initiated a magnificent program for the school systems of this country designed to expose to the youth of America not only the real truth about communism and its threat to our way of life, but to also educate our people to know and understand the glorious heritage which we enjoy under our system of government. I am happy to note that in his new work he is carrying on this program.

In the April 6, 1949, issue of Scholastic magazine appears one of the most revealing articles on this subject that has come to my attention. Here for the first time in an article entitled "Inside Soviet Russia" is presented by description and translation the powerful influence of distortion over the minds of children exercised directly by the Soviet Government through the publication of its own periodicals for use in their schools. This article supplements an outstanding series of 30 articles carried by these magazines last year to help millions of our young people to appreciate more thoroughly our American system of government and life and to acquaint them with the evil nature of communism.

I asked the privilege of including the article referred to in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of these remarks to enable the Members of Congress and many others to see another illustration of the way in which falsehoods, exaggerations, and distortions are skillfully used by the Soviet rulers to poison the minds of Russian children. This article serves to show by contrast the great blessings we daily experience under the freedoms of our American system of life and government.

"INSIDE" SOVIET RUSSIA

(By Irving DeW. Talmadge, foreign affairs editor, Scholastic Magazines)

I have just returned from Soviet Russia. I got through the iron curtain without a passport, without a visa, completely unnoticed by the Soviet secret police.

In fact, I did all that without leaving our offices. Mine is, perhaps, the first and only armchair visit to Stalinland. How I did it is no state secret. I shall readily confess it at any Soviet trial.

To make a short story long and intriguing, it all started one revolutionary morning in January. With the mail dumped on my desk—press releases, catalogs, orchids, and brickbats from readers—was a mysterious letter bearing a Moscow postmark.

"Dear editor," it said. "Your magazine has come to our attention and we should like to be placed on your exchange list. We, in turn, shall send you copies of the Pionerskaya Pravda and the Komsomolskaya Pravda." The letter was on the stationery of the Soviet Anti-Fascist Youth League.

To this cultural swap, we readily assented. And ever since then the volume of mail between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has taken a sizable jump. We have been getting stacks of copies of the Komsomolskaya Pravda and the Pionerskaya Pravda.

Both of these publications are the official organs of the Komsomol—the Young Communist League of Soviet Russia, Pravda is Russian for truth.

NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH

Komsomolskaya Pravda, a 4-page daily, with a reported circulation of more than a million, is the mouthpiece of the young Communists up to 25 years of age. Pionerskaya Pravda speaks for the youngest Communists (ages 10 to 16).

The pioneers of Soviet Russia have been likened to the Boy and Girl Scouts in the non-Soviet countries. The resemblance is most remote. Actually, the pioneer movement is a government-sponsored and controlled organization for the indoctrination of Soviet youth with Communist ideology.

Since Pionerskaya Pravda is addressed to a reading audience of the same age level as our own Scholastic Magazines, I spent several painstaking hours perusing its pages. Fortunately I am able to read Russian fluently.

It was like a trip to the Soviet Union.

If you want to learn first-hand what the life of Soviet youngsters is like, I strongly recommend the reading of this official youth publication. Here reflected in its columns is the Soviet pattern for regimenting young minds—the teaching of half-truths, the distortion of facts about conditions in non-Communist lands, the uncritical praise of everything Soviet. All this in a publication brazenly calling itself Pravda (The Truth).

Yes, reading the Pionerskaya Pravda was, indeed, like a visit to Soviet Russia. For, as a matter of fact—and I hope I am not betraying any professional secret—that is all foreign correspondents in Moscow are able to do. With sources of news barred to them by government authorities, they have to depend almost exclusively upon the Soviet press for their material.

THE "LINE"—OR ELSE

No less than 99 percent of all dispatches filed from Moscow are based on stories which had appeared in Soviet newspapers. Soviet censors will not approve a dispatch unless the hard-pressed foreign correspondent can prove to him that the story was culled from either the Izvestia, Pravda, or some other Soviet publication.

Now, with you looking over my shoulder, I'll leaf through the copies of the Pionerskaya Pravda. (To spare our typesetter, I shall refer to this journal hereafter as PP.) It is a 4-page tabloid, with five narrow columns on each page.

PP is published twice a week (on Tuesdays and Fridays), and sells for 10 kopecks (roughly, 2 cents) a copy. The only name appearing on the masthead is that of the "responsible editor," V. I. Semyonov. Under the Soviet system, the "responsible editor" is indeed responsible. He is responsible for any straying from the party line in his journal. Until recently all Soviet publications had to list the code number of its Glavlit (censor). This listing has recently been abolished.

All "responsible editors" are, of course, Communist Party members. But every article in a Soviet periodical is also carefully screened by a government censor for ideological boners. If such boners appear in the print, the censor, the responsible editor, and the author of the article are all held accountable—and, occasionally, all three are purged.

On the front page, over the logotype, Pionerskaya Pravda are two slogans: "Workers of the world, unite" and "Be ready to struggle for the cause of Lenin and Stalin." Under the name of the publication is the legend, "Organ of the Central and Moscow Committees of the Komsomol." To the left is a reproduction of the badge of the pioneer member.

So much for the physical appearance of the sheet. Now let's examine its contents. (I'll provide the translations, as we go along.) Before us are the first nine issues of PP for this year.

Issue 1, the New Year's issue, is a gay affair (see reproduction of first page). A headline across the first page proclaims, "Ours are happy vacations." Under it are photographs of youngsters skating on the frozen river in Pushkino, near Moscow. There is a brief story by Liuba Kukhticheva, a girl student of school No. 624 in Moscow, entitled "At the New Year's Tree." (By Soviet edict, Christmas trees must be called, "New Year's trees.") Liuba's story describes a celebration at the Moscow clubhouse of the pioneers.

MARTHA LEE'S FATE

In the inside pages, there is an article under the heading, "The might of our fatherland is growing." It tells of the reports submitted to Stalin by the coal and steel industry stating that they had fulfilled their 1948 programs ahead of time. Another article describes a visit to the Lenin Museum and repeats Stalin's advice to remember, love, and study Lenin. This article is continued in subsequent issues. The back page is devoted to puzzles and riddles by Grandfather Frost (the Russian equivalent of Santa Claus).

All told, a cheerful, gay issue—except, except for one story, the only foreign news item in that issue. It is called "the fate of Martha Lee Funderburk." It reads:

"On the eve of the New Year, on December 31, 1948, in the American city of Baltimore, a young Negro girl, Martha Lee Funderburk, died. She had been starving for a long time and then contracted pneumonia. Martha's parents, impoverished sharecroppers, had applied at various hospitals for several days, but none of them would admit a Negro girl.

"The New Year brought no happiness to millions of other American children. * * * Newspapers report daily that owners of large plants and factories are continuing to dismiss workers. The children of the discharged will live in the New Year even worse, even poorer, than they had lived heretofore. But even for the children whose parents are still employed, the New Year—the papers say—holds no promise of happiness."

(We looked into the case of Martha Lee Funderburk. We checked the facts with Editor-in-Chief Hamilton Owens of the Baltimore Sun. He replied, "There is no truth in the statement that no hospital would admit a Negro girl. The sister of the child in question had been in the City Hospital for 2 months." Mr. Owens enclosed a clipping from his newspaper giving the ungarbled version of what had happened.

(As will be seen in the other examples mentioned, it is characteristic of Soviet propaganda methods to build their yarns on a minor element of truth. This grain of truth, they amplify, exaggerate, and distort beyond recognition, to serve their own purposes.)

What else are Soviet students taught about foreign countries? In the issue of January 18 there is a news story headlined, "Every seventh American is starving." Here is the story in its full version:

"The number of unemployed in the United States is continuing to grow. For example, in the State of New York the number of jobless increased by two-thirds during the last 3 months.

"Recently a census was taken in a number of American cities and it was established that during the last year every seventh person starved."

Or take this item from the January 28 issue, "Children on sale in Japan":

"The Japanese newspaper, Asahi, reports that 2,500 children from various villages have been sold to slave-owners in the province of Yamagata."

Belgium? In this little capitalist country, according to another news item in PP, there are hundreds of thousands of unemployed. As explained by the Communist editor, "The number of jobless is rapidly rising because under the Marshall plan many industrial products are no longer manufactured in Belgium but are imported from the United States. As a consequence a series of Belgian plants and factories are either curtailing production or shutting down completely."

UNITED STATES DREAMING OF NEW WARS

One more item from the Soviet classroom publication: "English students hiss Assistant Minister Mayhew." According to this story, British Under Secretary for State Christopher R. Mayhew was booed by London students when he dared to suggest in a lecture before them that the strained world relations may be the fault of the Soviet Union.

My esteemed colleague the foreign-affairs editor of PP has a comparatively soft job. In all the nine issues there is a total of only 10 foreign news stories. In addition to those already listed, there are 2 attacking the rebirth of fascism in Italy; ditto western Germany (American capitalists are dreaming of new aggressive wars); another praising the people's government of Poland, while attacking the capitalist regime in France and, finally, a story hailing the victory of the Communist liberators in China.

What makes up the rest of the contents of PP? There are no comics, no jokes. But there is an abundance of puzzles and games and, occasionally, what the Russians call a krossvord (which is just a transliteration of our capitalist crossword puzzle). Also, in the lighter vein, there is a serial, called The Unusual Adventures of Thaddeus Balakirev. Balakirev is somewhat of a Baron Munchausen. The idea is to have readers send in letters putting him straight on geographic and historic mistakes in his tall tales. Those scoring highest get their names printed in the paper.

Now and then the pages of PP are brightened with poems. Here is an excerpt from one:

"We follow Stalin to our goal;
'Lenin-Stalin-Victory' are the three words
We proudly carry on our banner."

And another, with the repeating refrain, "Hold sacred, my son, the name of Stalin."

Most articles express a strong Russian (not just Soviet) nationalism, which is a comparatively recent development in this presumably internationalist society. There is even a lengthy essay praising the career of the Czarist hero, Adm. S. O. Makarov, who perished in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904.

This stressing of Russian superiority is carried to ridiculous extremes. The readers of the PP are taught that it was not the Englishman, James Watt, who invented the steam engine but the Russian, Ivan Ivanovich Polzunov. The radio was invented not by Marconi but by A. S. Popov; the electric bulb not by Edison but by A. N. Ladygin; the first airplane was built not by the Wright Brothers but by A. F. Mozhaisky; etc., etc.

What about Soviet teachers? What sort of information are they fed? The answer is supplied by Joseph Newman, Moscow correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune. In a dispatch, dated February 12, he quotes from an article written by one Sergei Kozelski in the Soviet Teachers' Gazette.

"If you visit a New York school," writes Tovarich Kozelski, "you will see two policemen there. They peep into every corner of the school. During recess periods these policemen go to the playground to watch the children. They are present at this school, because crime is reigning there. There is a special policeman for the examination in arithmetic, because the children send anonymous letters to the teacher threatening to cut off her fingers or put her eyes out in the event she gives them a bad mark for the exam."

Will all American teachers who have had their fingers cut off by their pupils please send us their names and addresses? We are sure we can get Pionerskaya Pravda to furnish them with new, Soviet-invented fingers.

4–H Club Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the 4–H Club movement:

NATIONAL RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT HAD LOCAL START—EVIDENCE DISCLOSES CLARK COUNTY MAN ESTABLISHED FIRST OF CLUBS—BEGAN ON JANUARY 15, 1902—GROUP FORMED BY A. B. GRAHAM LATER DEVELOPED INTO 4–H ORGANIZATION

(By George M. Barmann)

More than 2,000,000 American youths are observing National 4–H Club Week.

Forty-seven years ago this week the Nation's first boys' and girls' agricultural club was scarcely 2 months old. It formation marked the beginning of the vast 4–H movement.

It was a Clark County club.

The evidence which establishes the fact that the movement had its beginnings in Springfield is not obscure. It is voluminous; it is indisputable. Yet, encyclopedists are vague; their reports, contradictory.

On January 15, 1902, A. B. Graham, superintendent of Springfield Township Schools, organized an agricultural club for boys and girls. There were 30 members at the initial meeting. They elected a president and a secretary. They held monthly meetings on Saturday afternoons in the new county building. The room is now occupied by the Clark County Board of Elections. By the time the schools closed that year, club membership had risen to 85.

Although Mr. Graham was a school superintendent, the club was not under the control of any board of education. It was purely a self-governing, independent group of rural youths interested in agriculture and willing to follow a definite program under the tutelage of Mr. Graham. The club program was not a school exercise.

Club members were interested in soil tests, experimental corn plots, vegetable and flower gardening. Each youth maintained a record of his work. The system closely resembles the so-called project work with which all 4–H youths of today are familiar.

In February, 1903, the club held its first exhibit in the Clark County Courthouse. The display was held in connection with a farmers' institute.

Theodore Spears, who lived near Reid School, won a first-place award for his corn entry. Mr. Spears now lives at 530 West Liberty Street.

The courtroom in which the exhibit was displayed was crowded to capacity that day. Mr. Graham singled out young Theodore. He asked him to stand. The applause was long and vigorous. He then asked the club members' parents to rise and they, too, received an ovation.

This was the first demonstration of public acclaim for the successful completion of a club project.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Graham's efforts were made easier with the cooperation of many individuals and firms. A widely known florist concern furnished a variety of plantings at cost. About 1,000 year-old rose plants were supplied at 1 cent each. Tulip bulbs cost 2 cents apiece.

James M. Cox (at that time a Member of Congress) furnished a small mailbag full of garden and flower seeds.

On June 4, 1903, a gift of $75 enabled Mr. Graham to finance a club excursion to Ohio State University. In the January 5 edition of the Springfield Press-Republic (now the Springfield Daily News) a story of the trip appears. It recounts at length the details of the excursion.

About 100 members and their parents left Springfield at 7:30 a. m. over the Columbus, London, and Springfield electric road. The group was met by a special car in Columbus and was taken to Ohio State University.

"The visitors received a royal treatment from the officials of the university," the Press-Republic reported.

During the morning there was a lecture on color photography and a picnic dinner was held at noon. The visitors toured the campus and inspected the livestock departments, according to the story. W. O. Thompson, president of the university, and Dean Thomas F. Hunt of the College of Agriculture gave short talks.

Joseph Hartman, an amateur photographer, accompanied the tour. Mr. Hartman's efforts during the years the group was active were responsible for the remarkable photographic history of the organization now in existence.

A Press-Republic reporter met the group upon its return to Springfield.

The excursion to the university was destined to be an important step toward the development of boys' and girls' agricultural clubs throughout the country.

This reporter has photostatic copies of letters exchanged between Mr. Graham and university officials following the Columbus visit.

On June 18, 1903, Dean Hunt wrote to Mr. Graham requesting information and photographs dealing with the club. He said he wanted to prepare a pamphlet on the work of the Clark County group.

The story of the club's work was outlined in Dean Hunt's pamphlet, issued shortly thereafter. Part of that publication contains a letter of Mr. Graham's, explaining the functions and achievements of the organization. The OSU dean concluded his publication by pointing to the Clark County project as a model for those who would form similar groups.

Another letter from the university, dated September 25 of the same year, indicates that the story of the Clark County movement was being disseminated throughout the country. Dean Hunt's bulletin had a wide circulation in Ohio, and it is significant that 100 agricultural newspapers were given the information about Superintendent Graham's club.

It is reasonable to assume that the farm publications which had been furnished the novel story were important in giving impetus, if not actual inspiration, to the formation of similar groups which within the next few years were springing up throughout the Nation.

The Springfield Township organization had no name in the early days. The trademark of "4-H Club" to designate boys' and girls' agricultural groups was not introduced until about 1910, and it was not generally accepted until several years after that date.

But there is reference to three of the "H's" in the early history of the Clark County club.

In 1904, L. E. Brown, a printer in St. Paris, published Mr. Graham's "Report of Springfield Township Schools." Few copies are known to be in existence, but photostatic copies of the work from the United States Department of Agriculture reveal the stress placed upon the "H's."

An excerpt from page 38 of this report, which outlines the extracurricular activities of some of the pupils, reads as follows:

"Not only must provision be made for the three R's but for the three H's, as well; the head for wealth of information and knowledge, the heart for moral and physical strength, and the hand for manual dexterity and skill. The study of the science of agriculture and the practice of the art at home provides much for head, heart and hand."

A reference to the "H's" again appears in a bulletin compiled by Homer C. Price, a later dean of the OSU College of Agriculture. The pamphlet, published in 1904, outlined agricultural club programs, using the Clark County efforts as a model.

In 1905 Mr. Graham became superintendent of extension work at Ohio State University. In 1907 the forms and the bound records used by the Springfield Township club were exhibited at the Jamestown Exposition. It was the only extension display at the exposition.

There are other counties in the United States which claim to be the cradle of the 4-H movement. The evidence that these claims are baseless fills a considerable space in the vaults of the Ohio State Museum, Columbus.

On file in the museum are complete records of the Clark County club. There are also numerous letters and publications, which prove that the club antedates all other boys' and girls' agricultural organizations.

Supplementing this material are histories and records compiled and owned by the Clark County Historical Society, County Agent C. E. Rowland, and J. Lynn Gower, a member of the original club, and now chairman of the Clark County Agricultural Conservation Association.

L. H. Bailey, a professor of horticulture at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., encouraged interest in nature study prior to the formation of Mr. Graham's group. Professor Bailey has been designated by some writers as the originator of the club movement.

But a letter is on file, signed by the Cornell professor, which dismisses this contention. Referring to organized clubs, he wrote: "We have done nothing in this particular line." The letter was written in 1903.

In 1900, 500 boys of Macoupin County, Ill., were mailed packages of seed corn. Many planted it, harvested it, and showed it at a farmers' institute. There was no club organization or meeting program.

On February 22, 1902—a little more than a month after the initiation of the Clark County project—O. J. Kern, school superintendent of Winnebago County, Ill., formed a boys' corn club of 32 members at Rockford. The club also raised sugar beets.

Records show that numerous independent clubs began bobbing up in midwestern and southern counties from 1904 to 1907. One was formed by C. E. Miller in Keokuk, Iowa, in 1904; another was organized by O. H. Benson, Wright County, Iowa, in 1907. Benson called his group a 3-H club.

This 3-H group has been referred to as the first club in the movement. Efforts have been made by overzealous Iowans to push back the date. But authorities refute this claim. P. G. Holden, who was in charge of the Agricultural Extension Service in Iowa, assisted Mr. Benson in his first efforts. Mr. Holden, who is still living, has confirmed the date of his assumption to the Iowa post. It was in April 1906 according to his statement.

Mr. Holden also helped Jessie Field Shambaugh, another Iowan, in her efforts to promote club work. The story that the 4-H Club was originated by a woman gained wide circulation and credence after the idea had been propagated by a nationally known writer, who incidentally lived in her neighborhood.

There is documentary evidence that Jessie Field Shambaugh was seeking information on the best way to form a club and follow a desirable program more than 4 years after the organization of the Clark County group. She was not named to the post in which she was active as a club organizer until the summer of 1906.

The addition of the fourth "H" and adoption of the four-leaf clover as a club symbol have been subjects of wide speculation.

Whatever the origin of the name or trademark of the present 4-H movement, it is not important. It is the priority of the activity, not the priority of the name that is significant.

Origin of the fourth "H"—for health—is generally credited to O. B. Martin, of Aiken County, S. C., who is said to have added the letter in 1910. Use of the figure "4" in front of the "H" was suggested by Martin at the Conference for Education in the South, held in Richmond, Va., in 1913. The 4-H emblem was afterward used as a trademark for produce and canned goods exhibited by club youths. Use of the emblem was considered practical, inasmuch as it was intended as a label for 4-H goods that were marketed. It was thus first considered merely as a brand name for products that met certain club requirements or standards.

Benson's 3-H Club in Wright County, Iowa, had used a clover leaf, according to some writers. This may be true. However, the fact that Mr. Graham had stressed the three "H's" in connection with the work of the Springfield Township club and that this emphasis was widely circulated, it is likely that the generally accepted name of the club also had its origin where the actual movement began.

Among early clubs in the 4-H movement was one formed in Nebraska by E. C. Bishop in 1905; a corn club organized in Indiana by John Haines in 1905, and a similar group formed in 1906 in Mississippi by William Smith.

After the formation of the early clubs, Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, of the United States Department of Agriculture, enlisted the aid of children in his war against the boll weevil. He previously had been only moderately successful in his boll weevil fight before this time, but the boys' and girls' club idea proved to be very effective.

Clubs spread throughout the South. Farmers were urged to grow a variety of crops, instead of only cotton and tobacco.

All of the early youth club organizers did commendable work, for which they deserve commensurate credit.

What is Clark County doing to comemorate the first club?

A plaque to memorialize the first meeting is located in the courthouse. Local 4-H leaders believe this is but a small memorial for so important an event.

Apparently the board of directors of the Clark County Agricultural Society agrees.

The board has approved a master plan for the Clark County fairgrounds. The plan provides for a 4-H memorial museum.

Consensus among agricultural leaders here, however, is that erection of such a building should be at least a State-wide project. The cradle of the movement, they reason, is of interest not alone to the county but to the Nation.

Mr. Graham, interviewed at his Columbus home, disclosed that more than 50 persons who were members of his club during the early years still reside in the Springfield area.

He said Mrs. Clara Valentine Reid, 111 West Jefferson Street, one of the original group had done considerable research and can account for the whereabouts of nearly all of the early members now living.

According to her list, those in Clark County and vicinity—not previously mentioned—who were club members include Ralph Hansel, 1401 S. Center Boulevard; William Gross, Springfield, route 5; Mr. and Mrs. William Irie, 1189 Longview Drive; Joseph Kessler, Springfield, route 6; Mrs. Mildred Butler, 2031 Columbus Avenue; Mr. and Mrs. Elliott Goodfellow, Springfield, route 6; Harry Otstott, Springfield, route 6; Herbert Lucas, Springfield, route 6.

Mrs. Jessie Butler, Springfield, route 6; Mrs. Ralph Runyan, South Vienna; Addison Colegrove, New Carlisle; Lee Quick, Selma Road; John Shafer, 632 Woodlawn Avenue; Armine Arthur, Springfield, route 4; Harvey Miller, Springfield, route 4; Roy Frantz, Springfield, route 10; Oscar Lightner, Springfield, route 10; Mrs. Frank Click, 215 North Western Avenue; William Kadel, Urbana.

Elden Chrissinger, 517 East Liberty Street; Roy Dickerson, Springfield, route 10; Lester Crabill, Troy Road; Oscar Laybourne, Springfield, route 5; Mrs. Frank Layton, Springfield, route 4; Frank Click, Springfield, route 2; William Click, Springfield, route 2; Ivan Wertz, 1025 West Jefferson; Joseph Anderson, 51 Dartmouth Street; Noah Anderson, Springfield, route 3; Robert Allender, 727 Linden Avenue.

Harry Bruney, 1027 West Pleasant; Roscoe Bean, Beatty; Hiram Von Huben, Springfield; Earl Hislop, Springfield, route 2; Walter Shuirr, Springfield, route 5; Raymond Click, Springfield, route 2; Mrs. Helen Dolber Burton, 1628 West High Street; O. P. Hause, New Moorefield; Charles Schneider, Springfield, route 6; Robert Petre, Springfield, route 4; Bernard Tavenner, Springfield, route 4.

Harry Hicks, 545 East Leffle Lane; Mrs. Charles Drumm, Christiansburg; Charles

Turner, Springfield, route 2; Warren Fenton, 617 Snowhill Boulevard; Karl Hertzinger, Springfield, route 2; Roy Kohl, 2856 East Main Street; Ralph Kohl, 1576 Fulton Street.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I publicly endorsed and advocated Federal aid to education for 13 or 14 years before I came to Congress. I have, and will continue the fight here. I have many times stated publicly that I thought Federal aid to education was the most important legislation from the standpoint of the future of the children of the United States that this Congress would have to deal with.

I had a letter from the students of Curry High School, of route 4, Jasper, Ala., under date of February 7, 1949, which impressed me very much.

Curry is a rural community in northern Walker County, Ala., my home county, and its high school is typical of hundreds of rural high schools throughout the South. Its needs are great. Its accomplishments are wonderful, and bear testimony to the faith of its teachers and patrons.

Mr. Speaker, we are the greatest country in the world. We are the richest Nation on the face of the earth. Our democratic school system is the bedrock of our greatness.

Let us listen to the plea of the students of this rural high school. It is more eloquent than I could ever be.

CURRY HIGH SCHOOL,
Jasper, Ala., February 7, 1949.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As students in a rural Alabama high school, we realize the importance of Federal aid to education. We need so many things which we do not have, which would help us to obtain a better education. We are crowded terribly with as many as 60 pupils in one room under the guidance of one teacher, poor toilet facilities, poor heating systems, poor transportation, and poorly trained teachers, poor library and laboratory facilities, and poor health and recreation facilities.

We believe Federal aid would help remedy these situations, and help us as rural children of Alabama to obtain better educational advantages.

We know you are a friend to rural education, having been educated in a rural section yourself. We, therefore, urge you to do everything you can for the passage of the Federal-aid bill.

STUDENTS OF CURRY HIGH SCHOOL.

Vivian Stewart, Brenda Faye Stewart, Ruben Gaines, Alton Kimbrell, Glenn Gregory, Jerry White, Tommy Roberts, L. O. Uptain, Dorothy Willingham, Doris Goodwin, Joan Anderson, Gail Lay, Linday Lindsey, Mike Gossett, H. D. Albright, Dwayne Gilland, Gary Davis, Tillmon Elliott, Ollie Fay Murry, Johnny Elro, Alene Couch, Larry Robertson, Eugene Durham, Frances Findly, Jewell Lay, Crable Stover, Rose Cooper, Jean Dickson, Billy Estes, Gary Hallmark, Iva Nell Bennett, Nell Williams, Patricia Phillips, Charles Lay, Georgia Allen, Wayne Swindle, Robert Holloway, Paul Ray Gilliland, Max Barber, L. C. Forrester, Charles Mays, James Short, Emma Jean McCullar, Lottie Jane Tidwell, Wanda Lee Jefferson, Erskine Lay, Marcella Abbott, Ivaline Estes, Vernell Harbison, Frida Rivers, William Spears, J. D. Kelly, Arstine Meeks, Ludell Ramey.

Jackie Aaron, Naomi Dean Hill, Opaleen Brown, Melba Ann Gordon, Gaynell Brown, Jeanette Courington, Dorothy Snow, Annie Williams, M. J. Goodwin, John B. Dutton, Don Hudson, Julian Hudson Buddy Smothers, Devora Spears, Hilton Woodley, Kathleen Acycox, Hollis Snoddy, Eugene Braker, Jo Ann Wilson, Carrie Hamilton, Jack England, Freddy Timmons, Bobby Estes, Billy Johnsey, Louis Best, Charles Brock, Bruce Dailey, Faye Smith, Fay Meeks, Frances Dooley, Dorothy Sue Estes, Melvin Drummond, Miriam Gossett, Betty Jane Estes, Joyce Farley, Rosielee Chambers, Margie Allen, Marie Burgett, Kattie Brock, Christine Wright, Peggy June Dailey, Opalene Dobbins, Jeanette Turner, Ray Baker, Oliver Gaddy, Orbay Gaddy, James Smith, Linda Abbott, Bonnie Calvert, Brenda Smothers, Kay Uptain, Patricia Murphy, Roland Smothers, Kathryne Payne, Avoline Pope, Nina Sue McClendon.

Gerald Wilson, Shirley Wilson, Lois Lathum, Clinton Johnsey, Mary Taylor, Joyce Gardner, Bobby Murray, Sherald Wilder, Charles Holloway, Bobbie Bobo, Freman Snow, George Kennedy, Jeanette Lathum, Josephine Dutton, Ann Wilson, Freddie Stricklin, J. B. Pruitt, Ray Wilson, Shelby Kennedy, Wallace Nunnally, Jack Mays, Donald Kitchens, Benny Johnsey, James Tidwell, Ellen Lindsey, Judy Myers, Josephine Smith, Mary Taylor, Donald Gardner, Esther Wilson, Peggy Ponder, Helen Young, Diane Wilson, Peggy Hamilton, Ernie Nicholson, Muyrl Wilson, Harold Chambers, Wanda Robinson, Dorothy Gaddy, Mary Lee Kitchens, Jo Ann Wade, Phyllis Burrow, Margaret Woodard, Lillie Mae Brock, Anna Laura Adams, Gene Rigsby, Doyle Rigsby, Joan Boyd, Lois Key, Dorothy Wilson, Brenda Brock, Agnes Sullian, Onie England, Delma Nunnalley, Arnold Brown, Roger Gilliand.

Leo Robinson, Merle Cobb, Jerry Cobb, Caroline Hill, Horace Farley, Barbara Young, Dorothy Dees, Peggy Stover, Sue Wilson, Ray Bryant, Cecil Baldwin, Ray Hambric, Barbara Brown, Mary Ann Windsor, Charles Kenneth Brown, Shelby Jean Elmore, Ann Durham, Faye Stewart, Glenn Nunnally, Kenneth Holloway, Shirley Ruth Wilson, Revis Forrester, Felton Ray Parnell, Gennette Ferrell, Doris Faye McSwain, Betty Jean Bennett, Jeanette Dailey, Reba June Key, Iva Dell Bennett, Imogene Elliott, Paula Sue Turner, Colene Bennett, W. O. Boyd, Billy Joe Lay, Mae Jean Elliott, Vourlan Hood, Billy Meeks, Neil Durham, Henry Lee Chambers, Shannon Patton, Faye Dees, Marion Watkins, Annie Mae Mathews, Betty Joe Wells, Doris Jean Drummond, Ollavene Ann Redmill, Louise Sullivan, Carlos Ray Elliott, Troy Windsor, Ray Aaron, Ray Dees, Glenn Wendell Drummond, Billy Steele, C. D. Robertson, Ray Estes, Freman Davis, Gail Burrow, Ruby Ann Ivey, Virginia Miller, Edna Bee Allison, Zera Mae Fortner, Doris Gilliland, Alves June Gilliland, Grace Frye, Charles Phillips, Willodean Laye, Pearline Finley, Maurice Noblett, Florine Humphries, Mary Sue Baldwin, Howard Gaines, Dorthy Williams, Sarah Williams, J. T. Robertson, Benny Joe Robinson, Erskine Hood, Ervin White, Leon Woodward, Travis Wilson, Bobby Wilson, J. T. Bolen, Betty Jean Smother, Martha Raye Stewart, Mary Sue Aaron, Laura Fay Timmons, Loavell Johnsey, Jimmy Bobo, Charles Harding, Bob Taylor, James Sullivan, James McNeal, Bruce Abbott.

Barbara Jefferson, Vanell Drummond, Roy Pulliam, Roy Key, Margaret Dean Myers, Alan Roberts, Collene Baldwin, Bonnie Phillips, Nell Dean Elliott, Betty Lou Wilson, Tommie Stover, Betty Lou Lathum, Franklin Cunningham, Shirley Phillips, Ruby Lois Harper, Noble Twilley, Willard Waldrop, Louise Elmore, Willodean Wilson, Charles Wilson, Aubin Carter, Harold Dailey, Clyde Johnsey, Betty Ryan, Arley Bridges, Vaudie Lee Robinson, Emaline Forrester, Alta Berry, Braxton Harbison, Myrna Faye Gober, Ina Gibson, Daurice Nell Daniel, Bobbie Ramey, Carolyn Cooper, J. C. Farley, Bobby Wilson, Ernest Lindley, Lacy Redmill, Robert Lowery, DeWayne McCauley, Charles Miller, Rip Herman King, James Aaron, Herrin Parris, Williams Bufford, Murvel Drummond, Sue Payne, J. W. Bryant, Howard White, I. V. Ferrell, Geraldine Smith, Peggy Jane Taylor, James Wilson, Hershel Robinson, Ray Swindle, Ellis Jean Uptain, Wayne Myers, Janis Powell, Johnny Tidwell, Jimmie Lene Estes, Billie Short, Terra Mae Snow, Leon Tidwell, Larry Redmill, Joyce Lindsey, Norma Jean Smothers, Raymond Bennett, Ray White, Lacy Drummond, Frances Hunter, J. M. Ivey, Billie Faye Dutton, Phelan Ponder, Glenn Gibson, Annie Lois Tidwell, Betty Frances Meeks, Oma Abbott, Jo Abbott, Louise Shaw, Kenneth Ford, Dale Wells, Doris Jean Windson, Johnnie Watkins, Willie Whittemore, Bill Aaron, Donna Calvest, Augustine Taylor.

Willie Powell, Carlos Jefferson, Chett Calvert, Eloween Pierce, Joyce Brown, Frances Huffstutler, Nettlene Lay, Berta Meeks, Sarah Lee, Charlene Bennett, Dan Aaron, Lillian Davis, Sara Pearl King, Clyde Goodwin, J. C. Dailey, Durward Moles, Harold Brown, Billy Busby, Willodean Kelly, Iva Jean Key, Hazel Cooper, Lila Sanford, Doris Keeton, Betty Williams, Damoris Skinner, James Ed Hunter, Jimmie Collum, Melvin Gay, Ralph McCauley, Bobby Gilliland, Charles McCauley, Ruby Short, Irene Tidwell, Ovelene White, J. W. Smothers, Reba Jane Noles, Frances Noles, Doris Borrow, Yvonne Letson, Mary Alice Bobo, Shirley Jean Gilliland, Glenda Ann Myers, Troy Lee Moore, Geraldine Bennett, Dorothy Gallimore, Claris Chambers, Barbara Hill, Coleen Dailey, Dorothy Uptain, Hoyte Farley, Anna Faye Shaw, Wayne Smith, Betty Faye Williams, Jeraldine Holloway, Curtis Tidwell, Carl Brown, Kenneth Wilson, Ray Wilson, Betty Faye Wilson, Harold Couch, Clarisie Chambers, George W. Truett, Johnnie Shumate, Marie Ivey, Joyce Chambers, Betty Joe Robertson, Betty Ruth Gosa, Hansel Holloway, Robbie Faye Drummond, Kenneth Black, Ulendell Black, Bill Hambric, Ruth Bennett, Joan Fay Bennett, June Elmore, Virginia Ferrell, Buddy Estes, J. L. Drummond, Billy Joe Frye, Wilford Uptain, Shelby Jean Stewart, Betty Joyce Robinson, Betty Lou Burgett, P. F. Currie, Florence Letson, Jimmie Sue Gilliland, Ruth Helen Harris, James Brock, H. L. Couch.

Mr. Speaker, these students present to us their problems which are real, which are vital. These students and unnamed hundreds of thousands like them are crying out for more and better school buildings, heating, toilet, transportation, library, laboratory, health, and recreational facilities.

I trust that this Congress will hear their cry and will enact legislation providing Federal aid for schools.

The Growing Need for CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The

Growing Need for CVA" by Joe Miller, published in the New Republic magazine of April 11, 1949. Mr. Miller, formerly of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer staff, is a well-known writer on the development of the Pacific Northwest. His article presents a timely account of the background problems relating to a CVA.

THE GROWING NEED FOR CVA—FLOODS, EROSION, DEFORESTATION, AND AN INADEQUATE POWER SUPPLY ALL THREATEN THE ECONOMY OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

(By Joe Miller)

SEATTLE.—When President Truman's proposal to create a Columbia Valley Authority was told to Purcell L. Smith, $65,000-a-year lobbyist for the private power interests, he exclaimed, "But the Northwest's people neither want nor need a CVA."

Perhaps a farmer in Washington State's Columbia Basin might disagree with him. The farmer wonders as he watches the dark snow clouds gathering over the distant Cascade Mountains, "Do those clouds mean more floods this year?"

There is good reason for his fear. Last June he was one of the thousands of Pacific Northwest farmers who lost the greater part of their crops as Columbia floodwaters inundated more than 224,000 acres of farm land. Since that catastrophe the fear of floods has become a major one to the people of the Pacific Northwest. The United States Geological Survey Bureau has warned them in a recent report that "these floods, or the conditions that created them, will undoubtedly recur in the future." Those who live near the Columbia realize there is little to protect them if the waters run wild again, since flood-control plans remain largely in the blueprint stage.

Perhaps a worker in one of the Northwest's hydroelectric-powered industries might disagree with Smith too. The worst power shortage in the region's history browned out the Northwest this winter and threw 155,000 men out of work, according to the recent congressional testimony of Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville power administrator. A region that contains 42 percent of the Nation's total hydroelectric potential doesn't have enough power for its own industries. Only 10 percent of the potential total is developed.

Many an idle worker remembers that at a Seattle hearing in 1946, representatives of Washington Water Power, Pacific Power & Light and Northwestern Electric helped hold up construction of more dams on the Columbia by testifying that "we would have a surplus supply of power so great that it would run a million kilowatts or more for a period of 10 years."

"We'll have kilowatts running out of our ears," said Kinsey M. Robinson, president of Washington Water Power. Last year the same Robinson blamed the shortage on "the lack of Government foresight along with the Federal attempt to force private power into a subordinate position by expropriating all major dam sites."

Whatever the reasons, many Pacific Northwesterners are beginning to have deep-rooted fears over the future course of this region. The latest population figures for the Northwest show an increase of 36 percent since 1940. While this increase has been triple the national average, unemployment figures in the Northwest are double the national level. The lag in industrial development has meant that nearly 200,000 persons are without employment in Washington and Oregon today.

If the region is to survive economically, new jobs must be found for these people. The Northwest must produce goods and services worth $8,500,000,000 a year and provide about 2,500,000 jobs.

Regional planners agree that the way to accomplish this task is to develop the twenty-five- to thirty-million-kilowatt potential of the Columbia and reclaim the 9,000,000 sagebrush acres for farm use. The question is, How it is to be done?

No less an authority than Bernard DeVoto believes that, of all the American "colonies," the Northwest has the best chance to free itself from its provincial status. DeVoto contends that the area's economic and social homogeneity and its war-built industrial development provide the opportunity to break away from the East's economic control.

Cheap power is the answer. During the war boom, and after, industrialists were anxious to locate plants in the Northwest because of the Federal power rate, the lowest in the Nation—$17.50 per kilowatt-year. Henry Kaiser saves $500,000 a month in power alone at his Spokane aluminum mill, and other industrialists who got in before the power ran out are making similar savings.

But the power shortage, which is expected to last until 1954, has discouraged manufacturers from locating new plants in the Northwest. "We're losing new industries every day because of the kilowatt crisis," moans an official of the Portland Chamber of Commerce. Other communities, such as Hoquiam and Aberdeen, Wash., have been forced to discourage prospective businesses.

It isn't merely the farmers, workers, and industrialists who would benefit by a uniform program of Northwest development. At Glenns Ferry, Idaho, which lies in a semi-desert between Boise and Twin Falls, a young mechanic I talked with complained that little land-reclamation work had been done in that area.

"We were told that family farms would be provided for veterans," he said. "I've been working in this garage for 3 years and nothing has happened yet."

A lumberman I talked with at Coos Bay, Oreg., was worried for another reason. "Less than 25 percent of the Northwest's timber is left, and the United States Forest Service says all the region's privately owned timber will be gone in 15 years," he said.

"Timber has been the No. 1 resource of this country. It has supported 25 percent of us; we've thought it was inexhaustible. Look at it now. Unless we do more than point with pride at the few showcase tree farms, there won't be any more lumber industry."

Mining men say the same thing. "We've dug and dug, and pretty soon there won't be any more," one of them told me. "We've got to explore for new mineral resources."

It was an increased realization of these common problems that led the voters of every Northwest State but Oregon to give Truman a good-sized majority last November. In the far West where he campaigned largely on the issues of public power and river-valley development, the President received an electoral-vote majority of 59.

Western voters remembered the record of the Eightieth Congress in slashing reclamation appropriations and saw through Governor Dewey's lengthy platitudes on western development. They seemed to think that Republican policy would be to build dams at Government expense, then sell power to private utilities at preferential rates, getting the taxpayer going and coming.

Creation of a CVA was one of the Democratic Party's campaign promises, written into the platform by young Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington. The CVA bill, now being drawn up by a Presidential team headed by Charles Murphy, will not create any new Federal authority in the region, but will be "primarily just a machanism for better operation of existing agencies in the region."

The quote belongs to C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Davidson believes that the bill will contain the "better parts" of the TVA, with added provisions for reclamation and irrigation, problems foreign to the Tennessee Valley.

The CVA, like the TVA, would be independent of everyone but Congress, but would be required to consult with State governments and provide for cooperative research to be done with regional universities and colleges. Its offices would be located in the Pacific Northwest—a chunk of Washington, D. C., moved to the grass roots. The CVA's job would be:

Full development of the region's vast sources of hydroelectric power. This power is not only important for the Nation's defense; it is also the basis of the Northwest's hope of creating a diversified economy.

Preparation of some 9,000,000 acres of sagebrush land for agricultural development. Reclamation of this land would provide more than 100,000 family-sized farms for new settlers.

Development of a river transportation system which will furnish the region's internal areas with cheap and easy access to the sea.

Exploration of the region's untapped mineral wealth.

Development of power technology with a view to concentrating the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries of the West. A good start has been made. During the war northwestern plants produced 600,000 pounds of aluminum a year—one-third of the Nation's total—and contributed an equally impressive output of calcium carbide, magnesium, and ferrosilicon.

Protection and stabilization of the Northwest's valuable fishing and lumber industries, which have suffered from boom-and-bust exploitation.

Development of the region as a tourist and recreational center.

Effective flood control.

Supported by the Republican Governors of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, the Seattle and Portland Chambers of Commerce and other businessmen's groups, the private-power interests have sounded a die-hard opposition to such plans. The same groups which opposed Bonneville and Grand Coulee are now determined to stop the CVA.

Lined up against them is the first farmer-labor coalition in the Northwest's history. Eleven AFL, CIO, Grange, and Farmers' Union State organizations have joined in a League for CVA.

At a recent region-wide meeting in Portland, leaders of these groups voted financial support to the CVA campaign after Evan Weston, Washington State AFL president, warned that the giant power combines will spend big money to mislead the public about CVA.

Also backing the CVA are many Northwest residents. A young businessman from Pasco, Wash., said: "We've always operated on a raw-material economy. We buy pots and pans made from our aluminum in Cleveland, furniture made from our lumber in Grand Rapids. What we've got to have is a diversified economy to give us stability, a good standard of living and the materials to compete successfully with other sections of the country.

"No one has come up with a better idea than CVA, and that's why I'm for it."

The Northwest's outstanding businessman, E. B. McNaughton, has publicly expressed support of the CVA. A lifelong Republican, McNaughton told a luncheon of amazed Portland businessmen that a CVA "had tremendous possibilities for the region." He recalled business' bitter opposition to Grand Coulee and Bonneville years ago and asked the group: "If Roosevelt had not given Bonneville and activated Grand Coulee, where would we be today?"

Such influential heretics keep the CVA's enemies awake nights. Hugh Mitchell, who fathered the original CVA bill in 1945, believes that the most powerful opposition stems from eastern absentee owners. They do not want a new Federal agency which might halt their rapid exploitation of the Northwest.

However, most Northwest Republicans have faithfully recited their denunciations of the

CVA. The anti-CVA Seattle Times reported on January 29 that the local Republican county commissioners passed a resolution opposing the CVA, although two of the three commissioners admitted beforehand that they didn't know a thing about it.

Most of the Northwest's daily newspapers have continued to lay down a barrage of editorials condemning the CVA. "It must be fought with all the vigor we possess," said the Spokane Spokesman-Review. Last year President Truman called this paper one of the two worst in the Nation. One newspaper, the Tacoma Times, has published a pro-CVA editorial. The Portland Oregonian and the Wenatchee World are maintaining open minds, but most of the others have shouted that the CVA is communism, socialism, or fascism.

President Truman, who saw the floods in the Northwest on his campaign tour last summer, is reported to have placed the CVA high on the agenda for congressional action. Perhaps he has been looking at some of the region's anti-CVA newspapers and remembering what the Nation's press said about him until the day after election. From that point of view, the prospects for the CVA should be good.

Sound Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the following editorial which appeared in the Bristol (Conn.) Press on March 22, 1949:

SOUND ADVICE

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley whose unquestioned ability as a political administrator ranks him as one of the best, has also proved that he is no mean shakes as a businessman. As chairman of the board of directors of the Coca-Cola Export Co., Mr. Farley is becoming concerned over the policies of the administration with respect to the future of business.

Speaking recently at a New York State Bankers Association meeting the Coca-Cola board chairman said that ever increasing services from the Federal Government will ultimately destroy the American way of life.

"No private business could afford to operate under the conditions prevailing in most Government departments," Mr. Farley said. He put partisan considerations aside when he pleaded for the adoption of the report of the Hoover Commission on unnecessary expenditures. Mr. Farley said: "The last election shows that a majority of our citizens are determined that the Government must, to a greater extent, bring its services to all the people. They are no longer going to be satisfied with the maintenance of an Army, Navy, Air Force, Post Office Department, and a diplomatic service."

Thus we must operate more efficiently in order to provide what the people want, he reasons. In plain English, we must get more public service for each taxpayer dollar than we are now getting. In order that business will not suffer, Congress and the President must go easy on appropriations and consider the implications of our present rates of spending.

This should be plain enough for administration leaders to see. Mr. Farley usually speaks to the point.

Playing Down the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlantic Monthly for April 1949 by Dr. I. I. Rabi:

PLAYING DOWN THE BOMB—BLACKETT VERSUS THE ATOM

(By I. I. Rabi)

Published in this country last month by Whittlesey House, "Fear, War, and the Bomb" appeared in England under the more restrained but less accurate title "Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy." It created a minor sensation in England and a greater one at the UN Assembly meeting in Paris. There it served a most useful purpose, to the Russians, because in it they found almost all the arguments which they had used to frustrate all attempts at a reasonable international settlement of the problems of atomic energy set forth anew and with some novelties in addition.

The great windfall for the Russians was that Professor Blackett is no Soviet stooge from a satellite country, but an upper-class Englishman with a high scientific reputation made more popularly resplendent by the award of the Nobel Prize in physics for 1948. Furthermore, Professor Blackett is an important authority on methods of antisubmarine warfare, so recognized by the United States Government by the award of the Medal for Merit. Support from such quarters is not easily obtained and was gleefully used by the Soviet debaters.

There is little question as to Professor Blackett's attainments in physics or in military matters. His credentials as an analyst of political and social and economic matters are more obscure, and not evident from his book. He is known to be politically well left of center, yet there is no trace of doctrinaire Marxism in the book. On international affairs he writes like the amateur which he is, with no penetration into the underlying causes of present tensions. In matters which concern political life and thought in the United States he manifests the hopeless confusion of the average Englishman.

Actually, Professor Blackett's book is an emotional and, indeed, almost hysterical personal reaction to the mounting tensions in world affairs, which have resulted in part from the development of the atomic bomb—hysteria disguised in the prose of the scholar. Although there is a great and ostentatious display of scientific objectivity, it is only a thin veneer which covers an extraordinary piece of special pleading.

A deep responsibility devolves on the scientist when he writes for a lay public in a field outside his special competence. The public is avid for conclusions. It cannot follow critically and in detail the arguments involved, particularly if important factors are suppressed or smoothly glossed over. The prestige of science is so great that the lay reader will naturally consider a high scientific reputation as a guarantee of intellectual honesty, objectivity, and general competence. A misuse of this prestige can lead to lamentable consequences when a wrong doctrine catches the fancy of the public or of lay persons in high places.

There have been many examples in recent years. The racial doctrines of the Nazis led to the slaughter of millions of innocents. The atavistic teaching of Lysenko has led to the suppression of Soviet genetics and now threatens other sciences as well. A more cogent example was the effect of the pronouncements of Lindbergh on the invincibility of the Nazi Air Force, which emboldened the Germans and intimidated many groups in France, England, and the United States.

It would be disastrous for all, and for the Russian people in particular, if Professor Blackett's book had the effect of making the Soviet rulers believe that the atomic bomb would be of minor importance in a war between the Soviets and the West.

II

The first half of Professor Blackett's book is devoted to his analysis of the military consequences of atomic energy. Here he marshals his data on the general effects of bombing as revealed by the Allied experience in the bombing of Germany and Japan. His chief source is the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, an excellent United States Government report too little known in this country. His knowledge of atomic bombing is gleaned from official unclassified publications, newspapers, and magazine articles. He cites his ingeniously selected authorities chapter and verse and makes, superficially, a fair-minded and scholarly impression. As Professor Bancroft once remarked in a book review, "The author is at his best when quoting."

Some of the facts which Professor Blackett presents will be startling to the lay reader. The British and American bombing of Germany up to the end of 1944 did not seem to bother the Germans at all. Indeed the graph reads as if they thrived on it. The British night bombing, in his opinion, was useless and wicked. The American daylight bombing had its chief effect in reducing the German air fighter force which rose up to intercept it. On the other hand, the use of air power in support of ground troops and its concentration on specific objectives like transportation is a paying proposition in a military sense, unlike the area bombing of cities. He cites the Russians as understanding these basic principles, whereas we and the British largely ignored them in a futile destruction of German cities.

In his opinion, the B-29 bombing of Japan was more successful, but largely unnecessary and cruel, since Japan was already beaten and its air force had been destroyed. The success of the blockade by ships, submarines, and mines had made the area-bombing effort unnecessary.

It is clear from the foregoing that Professor Blackett takes a dim view of area bombing. Since the atomic bomb can hardly help being an area weapon (8 square miles is his estimate of severe damage), it too, comes under his general condemnation as an effective military weapon. His syllogism runs; area bombing was no great shakes in the last war; the atomic bomb is a weapon for area bombing, therefore, the atomic bomb will not be decisive or even very important in the event of a war with the Soviets.

Let us examine the argument more closely. The early bombing of Germany was in driblets, and clearly permitted recovery when important centers were damaged in air raids. Other centers and alternative plants could be brought into play. There were places where refugees could be housed. But if the British or we could have succeeded in bombing Hamburg, Bremen, Hannover, Lubeck, and Rostock in one raid, that tale of recovery could have been quite different. Atomic bombing could have accomplished such a huge raid more easily than a single raid on Hamburg alone with ordinary bombs. This implication of damage causes a kind of supersaturation of defenses and recovery facilities and is a logical extension of the tactical idea of mass bombing introduced by the British in their air attacks on Germany.

Professor Blackett points out that a great improvement in the effectiveness of the bombing of German industrial centers occurred when the pathfinder technique was introduced. The pathfinders were specially selected crews who accurately spotted the target with flares. The rest of the mission bombed on the flares. This expected increase in accuracy is most important since a large number of raids over Germany were really wasted on open fields. Because of the much smaller number of air crews necessary for atomic bombing, they could all be trained up to the quality of pathfinders.

There is, in addition, an important morale factor difficult to evaluate, but which the Japanese and those who have seen an atomic explosion are not likely to minimize. The omission of these three factors—supersaturation, target accuracy, and morale effect—entirely vitiates Professor Blackett's elaborately constructed arguments, charts, and tables.

Strangely enough, even though he actually speaks of it, Professor Blackett nowhere seems to appreciate the possibilities of atomic warfare with a really large number of bombs. This is, unfortunately, a general tendency. People talk of the bomb or of dropping a bomb somewhere. The American scientists have always warned of the effect of a large number of bombs. One of Professor Blackett's odd points is that the atomic bomb is too big for many targets—as if that were an argument against the bomb, rather than a prediction of the complete annihilation of the target. Only few worth-while military targets cost less than an atomic bomb. This point is one which students of military affairs would do well to consider. Atomic warfare is very different when considered in terms of dozens or hundreds or thousands of bombs.

The first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, the second on Nagasaki on August 9, and on August 14 the proud Japanese Empire surrendered by radio. Many people, Professor Blackett included, have tried to shrug off that stupendous sequence of events. At this point Professor Blackett's objectivity as an operational analyst breaks down completely. His strong bias against strategic bombing, which dates back to the early war years, will not permit him to absorb this fact into his system of thought. His strong pro-Soviet or anti-American bias (it is hard to tell which is stronger) makes it impossible for him to live with the idea that the atomic bomb, an American monopoly, could play such a decisive role in a future war.

The impact of Hiroshima on Professor Blackett reaches its climax in chapter X, the Decision To Use the Bombs. Here Professor Blackett permits himself to indulge in a dignified tantrum. The sum and substance of this chapter is to show that we dropped the bomb on Hiroshima on August 6 to steal the newspaper headlines away from the Russians, who were expected to invade Manchuria on August 8, and thus win a diplomatic victory. "The dropping of the bombs was not so much the last military act of the Second World War, as the first major operation of the cold diplomatic war with Russia now in progress." That this statement can be put forth by a man of Professor Blackett's intelligence is astonishing. He assumes that we knew that the Russians would win a quick victory in Manchuria—an assumption which is belied by the initial phases of the other two Russian campaigns in the last war, in Finland and against Germany. Our own contacts with the Japanese did not give us reason to hold their military prowess in low esteem.

Professor Blackett argues further that if the use of the bomb was not the first act in the cold war, it was at least very tactless to steal the headlines away from the Russians, and showed a lack of the finer sensibilities. This argument had best be left to stand unanswered.

It is a plain fact that the United States had consistently pressed to have the war over in a hurry. We prodded a reluctant Churchill on the invasion of Europe and when that was over we went all-out for Japan. Europe was facing starvation and chaos. We could not delay a conclusion with Japan with the whole world degenerating into anarchy. We had the weapon to end the war and we used it, and it ended the war, even though, as Professor Blackett says, an atomic bomb is only equivalent to a raid of 300 B–29 bombers carrying 10 tons of bombs each.

As a matter of actual fact, the bomb was dropped at the first opportunity. Depending on the weather, it could have come earlier or later than the August 6 date. Furthermore, the Russians were informed by Mr. Truman at Potsdam that we had an atomic bomb. Judging by their insistence on a second front, they certainly would have interpreted any delay on our part in using the bomb as a device to put more of the burden of the war on them.

Professor Blackett does not forego the opportunity to castigate us on moral grounds for the use of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Even though he proves to his own satisfaction that it is only the equivalent of an ordinary B–29 raid or the kind of bombing the British did so well over Hamburg, this particular raid gives him a special horror. He does not say why, but the reason is clear. Deep down he shares the view of other scientists that this raid could be the beginning of a new era of horror. This feeling he tries to talk away, but the vision remains as an afterglow.

The wailing over Hiroshima finds no echo in Japan. The Japanese knew that Hiroshima was an important headquarters and staging area and a legitimate target. They are very glad that something, anything, happened to stop the insane war. However, with sufficient propaganda, they might in time be induced to feel that they were greatly wronged. Hiroshima, by the way, is largely rebuilt.

Professor Blackett is not alone in his views. There seems to be a general playing-down of the importance and effectiveness of atomic warfare. That our own military people play it down is understandable. Owing to security restrictions, they know little about it and, further, it is difficult to defend UMT or expenditures for enormous conventional military installations — naval, air, and ground—if the atomic bomb is too strongly stressed. As a result of some of our misguided secrecy, we are not only paying for the atomic bomb but for a large conventional military set-up which the atomic bomb has made obsolete. Congressional committees pass on military expenditures without a knowledge of how many atomic bombs we have on hand or how many we shall have in future years. What is the rate of production? To what figure can it be increased? How can it be used for maximum effectiveness? The Congress would not tolerate such ignorance in any other sphere of our activity. The mystic power of the atom secrecy has dulled common-sense perceptions, not only in Professor Blackett but in many responsible people on this side of the Atlantic.

III

Almost half of Professor Blackett's book is devoted to an attack on the majority plan which grew out of the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy within the UN. He does not pull his punches when they are directed at the United States. Although he does not strongly defend the Russian plan, he tries to show that the Soviets could hardly have taken any other position in view of the intransigence with which we pursue peace and security.

Although the negotiations in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission have so far produced no tangible results except for a sharpening of the division between the Soviet planetary system of states and the Western World, a certain moral glow, perhaps only of innocence, has dwelt in the breasts of most scientists and statesmen on our side of the iron curtain. Our plan, the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan, as modified by prolonged discussion to become the majority plan of the UNAEC, was a great and generous gesture. It was an offer to surrender our greatest weapon of military power in the interest of the security of all nations. While guaranteeing solid advantages to ourselves in terms of our traditional immunity from military attack, it aimed to achieve this end without depriving any nation or people of the legitimate use of discoveries in the field of atomic energy. It is a significant first step toward the ultimate abolition of armed conflict between peoples.

That the Soviets could not agree to this plan has been held variously to result from the original sin of communism, the intrinsic inability of a totalitarian state to withstand impartial inspection from outside, ignorance of the Kremlin of the fatal power of the atomic bomb, and lastly to plain cussedness. The result, in any event, has been a greatly heightened tension in the Western World, particularly here in the United States. The mounting fear and frustration have resulted in vastly increased military appropriations, a severe loyalty check to weed out all leftist elements from any important phase of American life, and in general an effort to put the country and in fact the whole non-Soviet world in a state of preparedness for war.

Under such conditions, it appears that the two great ponderous machines are rolling on a single track to an inevitable head-on collision, which can bring only sorrow to hundreds of millions of well-meaning innocent people and advantage to none.

Professor Blackett brings no new bridge with which to cross the chasm separating the Soviets and the West. He is fully aware, as some of our statesmen are not, of the advantages to us in the proposals for an international authority to control atomic energy, but he implies a certain contempt for our profound desire for security to work out our destiny in peace and freedom from foreign interference. He sees nothing which the Soviets can gain from these proposals. They would be outvoted in any international body not subject to the veto. This assumes a continuation of the Soviet attitude of no compromise. They would give up the solid advantages of the iron curtain, which hides the location of their vital industrial plants and military installations, for the dubious attentions of foreign spies in their midst (this point had best be answered by the Central Intelligence Agency). Not the least of the Soviet objections, which Professor Blackett endorses, is the proposition that our policy of gradualness or stages, on which the whole system of international control would be set up, would deprive the Soviets of an early utilization of atomic energy for industrial power.

This last remark is not meant humorously by him; in fact, it is pointed up by facts and figures that the United States has more kilowatts per capita than any other country, including the Soviets.

Professor Blackett did not work on the atomic bomb project during the war, and his professional interest in recent years has not been primarily in nuclear physics. There are many points in the book which show that his thinking in this field is that of an outsider. Our security has apparently been much better than many people expected. These points cannot be discussed in detail in this place. However, one conclusion has become quite clear and has been reiterated by members of the United States Atomic

Energy Commission. Atomic power is not around the corner. Atomic power which would be economical and competitive with coal or oil, even in Russia, belongs to the distant future, far beyond any time-scale envisioned in the principle of stages. The Soviets would lose nothing and gain years through the disclosure of American and British knowledge now necessarily held secure. In any event, the matter has never come up for negotiation because the Soviet Government has rejected the majority plan in toto.

The final chapter of fear, war, and the bomb is called A Way Out? The question mark is appropriate. It presents a rather frightening concept. According to Professor Blackett, the bright dawn will come when Russia has made a few atomic bombs. Although we will have many more, the Russian weapons will be more effective when used in conjunction with her vast land armies. Under such circumstances, Professor Blackett feels that the United States and the Western powers will be more in a mood to negotiate, to trade off reduction in the number of our atomic bombs and carriers against reductions of the Russian armies by so and so many divisions. (This is exactly the kind of dreaded armed truce which American scientists have sought to avoid.) At a much later stage, if no third world war intervenes, a proposal like the majority plan of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission could be taken up again.

This is the sum and substance of Professor Blackett's positive contribution to the subject of the political consequences of atomic energy, and his advice to a world torn asunder by a battle of giants. He also agrees that it doesn't amount to much.

Rehabilitation of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those people who has become very much alarmed over the attitude of our military leaders in the occupied zones of Germany. The coddling of former Nazis, and the reconstruction of the monopolies and cartel interests of pre-war Germany, are, in my opinion, a nullification of all the principles for which we fought. Not only have a great many of the United States military leaders failed to protect the democratic principles in the rehabilitation of Germany, but we find the same lack of understanding on the part of certain officials in the State Department. We also find a certain willingness to "go along" with pre-war Nazi cartelists.

A recent article in the March-April issue of the pamphlet entitled "Prevent World War III," presents an analysis that is worth the careful consideration of the Members of the House. I submit this article to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BLUNDERS IN THE MAKING

As reported in the press, certain State Department officials quietly instructed United States consular officials in Germany that Nazis may immigrate to the United States under quota arrangements. We think the word "quietly" is a very apt description of the manner in which some of the more nauseating pro-German policies are made. Some officials prefer to work that way. They don't like publicity. But as it is always the case in a democracy, there are leaks. We are, therefore, thankful to an alert press for this information.

We wonder how long the American people are going to tolerate these slick maneuvers which are intended to fool them. The officials responsible for this new decision are very careful. When they put out this new welcome mat for the Nazis they made sure that it had all the blessings of the law.

Several months ago, Mr. Herve L'Heureux, Chief of the State Department's Visa Division, and Hugo Carusi, Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, were interviewed by newspapermen. When they were asked if former members of the Nazi Party would be allowed to register for admission to this country under the displaced-persons program, Mr. L'Heureux said: "Under normal immigration laws, there is nothing that would exclude a Nazi or a Fascist * * *." When asked by the press if the Nazis would be denied entrance under the Government rule that prevents persons from immigrating to this country who advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, Mr. Carusi replied: "I don't think so. At least we have never determined that." Mr. L'Heureux further clarified this point and said: "Well, there may be an individual case of a person who is a Nazi and who also believes in the overthrow of the Government by force, but I don't think we have ever concluded that the Nazi Party agreed that it is for the overthrow of government by force." The newspapermen were astonished. They told Mr. L'Heureux and Mr. Carusi that it had been their assumption that the Nazis were bent on overthrowing governments by force and violence. Mr. L'Heureux very calmly retorted: "Well wouldn't we all believe in the overthrow of government by force and violence if we were at war with another country?"

Where was Mr. L'Heureux when the Germans raped Czechoslovakia and set their fifth column to work in Austria, in Norway, etc.? Has Mr. L'Heureux ever read Mein Kampf? Dr. Goebbels, Hitler's chief propagandist, did not hide the aims of the Nazi Party in a speech delivered March 23, 1936. He said: "The government has decided to extend the German order over the whole world. The world will have to reckon with German economy, German soldiers, and cannons."

It is strange that an official of the Department of State should be so unmindful of the basic principles which guided Hitler and his gang of cut-throats. To equate the aims of the Allies with those of the Nazi Party is unfair to all those who gave their lives for democracy.

In accepting the theory that the purposes of the Allies were in essence similar to those of the Nazis, it is logical for Mr. L'Heureux to interpret the law in favor of the entrance of Nazis into this country. This is the General Patton attitude which viewed Nazism as a political movement on the same plane as the Republican and Democratic Parties in this country. It is a perversion of everything America stands for. The attitude of those who are responsible for this new interpretation is in sharp contrast to the indifferent treatment meted out to the victims of the Nazis. There are thousands of these tortured souls all over Europe and in Germany who seek the protection of these shores. For years as inmates of the concentration camps they dreamed of the day of liberation. They had faith in America. But their hopes were shattered; and now responsible officials would have the American people warm up to our deadly enemies while the victims of German bestiality languish in DP camps.

America is a big country. It has always been big enough for those who sought refuge from the tyranny of Europe. But it can never absorb those evil creatures who brought so much misery to this world. Each one of them is a sower of hate, a potential enemy within our midst. They will bring disunity and more bigotry to this land and put new zest into the conspiracy of pan-Germanism which has never given up the dream of including the United States of America into the concept of "Deutschland uber alles."

Immigration quotas may be an administrative problem, but to admit Nazi Party members to this country through legal loopholes of one kind or another most certainly requires the attention of the American people. More is involved than technicalities. The good name of America and the strength of its institutions are threatened. This is not an exaggeration. On the contrary, we would be remiss in our duty as a responsible organization which understands the true face of the pan-German conspiracy if we remained silent. Let us not forget that the Germans have not as yet been accepted into the family of nations, that the United States has not as yet made peace with them, and that nazism is by no means a dead issue.

There are even more grandiose plans afoot to flood the United States with German itinerants of one kind or another. For example, some top American officials are trying to convince Washington that German businessmen should be permitted to travel and reside freely in this country and elsewhere. These so-called German businessmen would be accorded all the rights and privileges which are given to other foreign business interests. They will try to reach their old contacts and travel up and down the land for this purpose. They will spend American dollars—the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers. They will be permitted to make market surveys and analyses and establish permanent branch agencies in this country.

One press report reveals that German business interests plan an industry fair, to be held in New York in April. Apparently, the American military government is trying to make this a successful enterprise, and so public relations has gone to work. It has changed the original name of the exhibition from the Germany '49 Industry Show to Military Government German Exhibition. But no matter how they try to change the name, the leopard never changes its spots.

There are several important facts which must be considered with regard to these new plans for the revival of German business influence in this country. For one thing, the Germans are in the position to dump millions of dollars worth of goods in the American market because of their cheap labor. Europe is already undergoing the pressure of German dumping methods. The English and the French are very much concerned and have minced no words in condemning the unfair-competition methods of the Germans, which, incidentally, is nothing new. The kind of shoddy commodities which the Germans would want to sell in the American market could never compete with the products of American industry or that of other foreign imports under ordinary conditions. This, the Germans know very well, but they are confident that their undercutting methods will win out in the end—with our benevolent help.

In view of the fact that consumer-goods industries in this country are now facing difficulties and that unemployment is growing, we think it would be suicidal for our Government to permit the Trojan horse of German business to penetrate our country. It becomes all the more ludicrous when these German business projects are going to be subsidized by the American taxpayers, many of whom may find themselves out on the streets once German business methods get a good grip on the American market.

From a long-term point of view, there is even a greater danger. As one American correspondent put it, there are people who are disturbed over these German plans because they "remember how German political dominance has so frequently followed German trade channels." It was not so long ago when agencies of German business concerns in this country were acting as the eyes and ears of the German military and were subsidizing on a large scale subversive movements in this country. It was not very long ago when German "businessmen" were devising all kinds of schemes to tie up American productive potential.

The blissfully ignorant may say that this is no longer possible. But the sad truth remains that the German cartel network has not been at all touched and is beginning to operate with new life. We have no doubt that Germany's economic penetration in this country or in any of our allies will be the prelude to political activity. This is the way German business has always worked. It has always been the arm of the geopoliticians and the German General Staff.

We resent treating the Germans as though they are now our bosom friends. They have a long way to go to prove that they are trustworthy in economics and politics. So far they have merely confirmed our fears that they remain unrepentant supernationalists who are waiting for "der tag." America cannot afford the luxury of inviting German businessmen to take up where they left off.

Congratulations to the New York Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following announcement appeared in the New York Post of April 6, 1949. The New York Post is to be congratulated upon its forthright action and its splendid statement of policy. More power to it!

The board of directors of the New York Post Corp. today accepted with deep regret the resignation of T. O. Thackrey as editor and publisher.

Irreconcilable differences on fundamental questions of policy made a request for his resignation inevitable.

Ten years ago when the present ownership acquired the New York Post, there was no other newspaper in New York City supporting the liberal policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt. With him we fought for many things—for the rights of minorities, against fascism and nazism, for social security and public housing, for the recognition of the rights of labor, and for the establishment of the United Nations. We also supported his efforts to convince the U. S. S. R. that cooperation with the West was necessary for world peace.

Since President Roosevelt's death, however, the Communists have not only blocked the United Nations by misuse of the veto but have taken over the governments of helpless neighbor nations.

This newspaper, in line with its policies of the past 10 years, must and will meet these new threats to democracy by opposing with equal vigor all totalitarianism, whether Fascist or Communist. We believe that this is the true path to a lasting peace. The world has learned that appeasement leads only to war.

The Post Home News readers are aware of the passion with which Mr. Thackrey fought for the cause of Israel. We will continue that fight, and the fight for all new democracies seeking to free themselves from imperialistic domination. We will insist that their efforts be upheld by the Government of the United States and that they be admitted promptly into the United Nations.

The Post Home News agrees in principle with President Truman's Fair Deal. We shall work unceasingly for its achievement.

Today we are engaged in a great struggle at home and abroad for the cause of liberal democracy. This newspaper will keep up its fight for that cause.

DOROTHY SCHIFF THACKREY.

Churchill's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader, published in Manchester, N. H., under date of April 1, 1949, entitled "Churchill's Challenge":

CHURCHILL'S CHALLENGE

Winston Churchill has probably never before in his long and distinguished career as a world leader and orator delivered a more significant address than the one last evening in Boston. Its quality was marked not only by its eloquence but by the inspiration it brought to the people of America and the world.

He gave a realistic analysis of current conditions as only a person of his wide experience and keen insight into international affairs is capable of offering. There was no attempt to minimize the perils of the East-West conflict. But his words gave reassurance that war was not inevitable. He set the course by which the freedom-loving peoples of the world may secure themselves against aggression and the sacrifice of liberty.

Speaking as a private citizen, the former wartime British Prime Minister's remarks were not restrained by diplomatic responsibility. There was sincerity of purpose in his tone and a challenge to the Western World in his stirring words. He made it clear that unity among the democracies has been forced upon us by the tactics and ambitions of Russian leaders, and only through such unity can we hope to survive.

He placed particular stress upon the motivating reason behind the Soviet's stubborn resistance to settlement of cold-war issues. "It is because they fear the friendship of the West more than its hostility," Mr. Churchill said, adding that "they cannot afford to allow free and friendly intercourse to grow up between the vast area they control and the civilization of the West."

Pointing out that peace can be achieved ultimately through the creation of a "world instrument capable at least of giving to all its members security against aggression," the speaker sounded a significant note when he declared that "we need not abandon hope or patience." The former British leader knows full well that the development of lasting peace will not come easily or without superhuman effort and sacrifice. He is equally aware that the people of the Western World cannot allow themselves to become impatient by the delay or they may suffer as a consequence.

America has reason to be thankful for Mr. Churchill's visit and the challenge he made to all of us in this critical hour. His words have brought greater realism to the issues we face and increased hope for ultimate peace and universal liberty.

Praise for Clair Engle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think the Members will be interested in this article commending my colleague CLAIR ENGLE of California, written by Frank Rogers, Washington representative of the Los Angeles Daily News, and printed in the California magazine Fortnight of April 1, 1949. I join Mr. Rogers in praising CLAIR ENGLE.

WASHINGTON LETTER
(By Frank Rogers)

"With both guns blazing, Representative CLAIR ENGLE charged out of the legislative sagebrush, shooting wildly and—"

The gentleman from Red Bluff, Calif., likes to recount how some now unidentified big-city newspaperman once wrote a line like that about him. He regards most Washington newspapermen as friendly and unintentionally helpful enemies.

Likewise on his friendly enemy list are big-city people, big-city issues, and just plain big cities. For CLAIR ENGLE almost, but not quite, makes a political profession out of lambasting the folks from the paved areas where no deer and no antelope roam.

Like some Dixiecrats who win many votes by crying out in anguish when the damnyankee newspapers attack them, ENGLE gets a pixielike satisfaction out of seeing metropolitan dailies in California take out after him when he cuts a legislative caper—which he frequently does.

But important events of the past fortnight proved all this was not an all-out pose with youth (37), vigorous, ebullient CLAIR ENGLE. As few Members of Congress can, he simply enjoys the comfort of knowing that no matter what the big-city press says about him—so long as it isn't flattering—his folks at home like him all the better.

But he doesn't trade too much on that happy circumstance—although he might if political times turned tough, which they haven't yet for him. Proof of a more honest inner attitude came when he demonstrated that the rural boy who represents perhaps the biggest rural district in Congress is not above turning a favor for his big-city colleagues.

His performance was generally overlooked, underemphasized—and still mystifies some Capitol Hill observers, who wouldn't bet their pyramid-club winnings on where CLAIR ENGLE will land next.

The upper basin States were before the House Public Lands committee with a bill for congressional ratification of their new Colorado River compact. California, a lower basin State, and already locked in mortal combat with Arizona over this precious supply, wanted assurances that nothing in the new compact would be interpreted as having any bearing on California's interests.

Southern California, most affected by the river battle, had no Democrat on the Public Lands Committee. Its only Republican member, NORRIS POULSON, was barely out of a hospital with pneumonia. ENGLE had never

shown much friendly interest in southern California's thirst—had, in fact, feuded with Los Angeles for years over the ancient Mono Basin deal.

But, in desperation, he was asked to carry the fight—this time for southern California—and he did. Always an effective man in committee, ENGLE hammered so hard on California's reservations about the upper basin compact that the basin's five commissioners felt obliged to put their reassurance in writing to him. Nothing in the upper basin compact was to apply to California's compact. Positively.

It was almost exactly what the southern Californians wanted and they accepted ENGLE'S favor with slightly stunned looks of appreciation.

He hasn't always been so amenable, has often been perverse and exasperating. Usually, however, he has a reason—even if it is only to let the folks back home know he isn't being sold any wooden nickels.

His ancient feud with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power over water and property rights in the Mono Basin-Inyo County area (one of the 18 counties in his district) is an example.

When representatives of all the counties and agencies involved landed in Washington with compromise legislation to which all had agreed, ENGLE at first agreed to go along—then blocked the deal at the last minute. That was more than a year ago; now he promises to support a new compromise. Angelenos are keeping their fingers crossed.

Perhaps, as some say, he simply enjoys being a character. And maybe, they admit, one needs to be a character to cover and represent a district which stretches down California's backbone from the Oregon boundary to the San Bernardino county line.

Personally popular in the California crowd despite some strong differences of opinion, ENGLE has reason to be content as well with the attitude of his far-flung constituency. He was elected district attorney of Tehama County at 23, State Senator at 31 and Congressman at 32. As the current secretary of the California delegation, he has achieved some distinction as the only member who can talk as tough as, and faster than, Chairman HARRY SHEPPARD.

One reason for ENGLE'S apparent new mood, if it lasts, is that he may have been infected with the still weak but growing virus of cooperation on State matters. There are some signs of a delegation-wide epidemic on this score.

If ENGLE has contracted this happy malady, not many others can resist it.

Communist Words Versus Communist Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post on March 29, 1949. It is an excellent exposé of how the Communists attempt to hide their real intentions.

COMMUNIST WORDS VERSUS COMMUNIST TEACHING

(By Julius Epstein)

In their statement of March 2, Messrs. Foster and Dennis, the chairman and secretary of the Communist Party, said: "We do not regard a new world holocaust as inevitable. We hold the peaceful coexistence of two different systems wholly possible."

With this statement, both leaders of the American Communist Party expressed an opinion which is in the strongest possible degree at variance with the classical teachings of their masters, Lenin and Stalin. Messrs. Foster and Dennis' opinion is not only in complete contradiction to the Bolshevist theories of the past; it is in obvious opposition to everything taught by the Communists at the present time.

No real Communist, Messrs. Foster and Dennis included, ever believed that the U. S. S. R. would be able to live in peace with the non-Communist part of the world. They not only believe in the inevitability of the third world war, they have professed this basic belief a thousand times.

It may suffice to confront the hypocritical utterance by Foster and Dennis with some of those classical expressions of Communist opinion as written by Lenin and Stalin and distributed at present time throughout our country.

It was Lenin who said: "We live not only in a state but in a system of states, and the prolonged existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialistic states is unthinkable. Finally either the one or the other will be victorious. And until this happens a series of terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is unavoidable." (Lenin's Complete Works, vol. XXIV.)

And it is Stalin who echoes Lenin's ideas in his most widely distributed book, Problems of Leninism (more than 30 million copies sold) when he emphasizes: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states—ultimately one or the other must conquer."

One of the most important paragraphs on the duty of the first victorious proletariat to support the revolutionary struggle of the workers of other countries all over the world was written by Lenin as early as 1915. The paragraph, a cornerstone of the whole Bolshevist theory, has been quoted by Stalin time and again. In the latest American edition of Stalin's Problems of Leninism it reads as follows:

"Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states."

The very purpose of the Bolshevist revolution of 1917 has been defined by Stalin as "to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries." (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, American edition, 1939.)

There is no doubt that the Communists regard the United States as the foremost imperialistic country in the world and that, therefore, they regard the overthrow of this American "imperialism" as their foremost duty. From that follows their strategy in case of war. Any war again the U. S. S. R. is an imperialistic war and their duty would be to sabotage it as much as possible.

The old slogan, "Turn around the rifles," created by Lenin during the First World War, is certainly still the only valid guidance for the Communists all over the world and especially for the American Communists. It is, therefore, not at all surprising when Messrs. Thorez, Togliatti, Pollit, Foster, and Dennis in a well-timed movement declare that they are not going to fight the Red Army in case of war against the Soviet Union.

On January 11, 1948, the New York Herald Tribune carried over three pages of an interview with Foster. One of the questions submitted to him read: "In case of war between Russia and the United States would you bear arms for the United States against Russia?"

Mr. Foster's answer to that question was exactly the same as he gave it on March 2, 1949. Sometimes even the wording is the same. Said Mr. Foster 1 year ago:

"Communists like progressive Americans generally, distinguish between just and unjust wars, supporting the former, and opposing the latter. The Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War II were all just, democratic wars, and they played a constructive role historically. But, on the other hand, several of our wars were reactionary, and democratic Americans have opposed them. * * * The Mexican War was a huge land grab against a weaker neighbor, and, as such, Lincoln and many other true democrats condemned it. * * * A war against the Soviet Union would also be an unjust, imperialist, and criminal war, and as such would be condemned by a large section, if not the majority of American public opinion * * * We conceive it to be a high patriotic duty to oppose all imperialist war, whether it be directed against Great Britain, France, Poland, Paraguay, China, the Soviet Union, or any other country. The only possible war between the United States and the U. S. S. R. would be an imperialist war provoked by Wall Street."

On May 29, 1948, Mr. Foster expressed again his opinion about the behavior of the American Communists in case of war with the Soviets. This time he appeared before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which dealt with the Mundt-Nixon Communist bill. Asked by Senator REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, whether or not the American Communists would disobey the military orders of the United States, Mr. Foster answered: "We're not going to fight against the Soviet Union. We're not going to fight in any imperialistic war."

We have seen that this attitude of the Communists is completely in line with the classic tenets as proclaimed by Lenin and Stalin. The Communists have never changed these tenets or the necessarily ensuing practical attitude toward the problem of war. What they have changed—and dishonestly changed, because they know the change is a hoax—is their belief in the inevitability of war and world revolution as expressed by their masters, Lenin and Stalin, to this day.

While they profess in interviews given to innocent and gullible Americans to believe in the absolute possibility for the Soviet Union and the Western World to live peacefully together for an unlimited period, they teach to the party members the uncorrected classical tenet of the inevitability of world wars and world revolution. By playing this double role, the Communists follow Lenin's teachings. He always advised the Communists to use every ruse, every lie and every deception in their fight against capitalism.

That is the core of what Lenin called the doctrine of "progress and retreat." Whenever the Soviet Union finds itself on the defense, the Communist world undergoes a process of "zigzags," of "retracing" and "abandoning the course once selected." The most famous instance of such a "retracing" and "abandoning the course once selected" occurred in August and September, 1939, when Stalin and Molotov publicly praised Hitler and the Nazis and when they concluded their public and secret pacts with Hitler. Hitlerism became suddenly a "matter of taste" as Molotov expressed it and the urge to fight fascism and national socialism an unpardonable crime.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a resolution adopted by the Eighth District Dental Society in opposition to compulsory health insurance:

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States, three bills—S. 5, H. R. 343 and H. R. 783, commonly known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, the object of which is to establish a system of compulsory health insurance in the United States; and

Whereas the experience of other nations of the world which have adopted such a system has demonstrated that compulsory health insurance does not materially improve the general health of the people of such countries; and

Whereas the people of the United States today have the best and most efficient dental, medical, nursing and hospital service care that the world has ever known; and

Whereas the great advances in the health professions heretofore have been made as a result of individual initiative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eighth District Dental Society of the State of New York does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

The Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, published in Manchester, N. H., under date of April 5, 1949, entitled "The Atlantic Pact":

THE ATLANTIC PACT

A good deal is being said to confuse the issue on the Atlantic Pact, signed yesterday at Washington, that is not being said by Communists.

For instance, we are being told by some conscientious Americans that the pact bypasses the United Nations and calls a return to the old balance-of-power doctrine. We are told also that the pact is an unnecessary affront to Soviet Russia and therefore may result in hastening war.

Both of these statements miss the point of the pact completely. Landing at New York to take up his duties as president of the United Nations Assembly, Herbert Evatt declared that the Atlantic Pact and regional pacts in general are of assistance to the UN. The possibility that regional agreements would be set up, said Dr. Evatt, was foreseen at San Francisco and fully provided for at the meetings at which the United Nations Organization was planned.

As for hastening war with Soviet Russia, the Atlantic Pact has no bearing on Russia or any other nation if it harbors no aggressive designs. It is purely a pledge of mutual assistance against aggression and has no offensive or aggressive purpose whatever. In fact, the pact would never have been thought of it it had not been for Soviet expansion and Communist aggression that put the security of the Western World in jeopardy.

The Western nations were forced to seek some guarantee of security against the threat of Soviet attack. They propose to do this by stabilizing the present military situation so as to prevent Soviet Russia from absorbing any more of the free areas of the world.

To get this question in its proper perspective, consider the situation with no pact at all. That would be to leave the Western nations exposed to Soviet aggression, and thereby stimulate the ambition of the Kremlin to overreach. We must face facts as they are and not as we would hope them to be. The grim fact is that the nations sought world union and world peace through the United Nations.

But the United Nations has failed because of Soviet obstructionism. The Western nations have made every effort to establish a basis of peace with the Soviet Politburo. But these, too, have failed. Meanwhile, through the promotion of Communist aggression in China and Greece, and the fostering of subversion in other countries, the Soviets have given convincing proof of their baneful purposes.

Thus the Western nations have been forced to unite for their own protection within narrower limits than the UN. They are faced with the challenge to unite or to see the nations of western Europe sucked one by one behind the iron curtain, and their freedom destroyed, and the menace of Soviet domination spread across the Atlantic. This situation must be met with cold realism. It is no time for quibbling or controversy over details or what might have been.

The Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, no thinking American objects to positive action aimed at stopping communism. The issue of what to do about the creeping paralysis of Communist slavery is today's most vital issue. It is so important that it affects the today and the tomorrow of you and your children. Unquestionably it is one of the great problems of this generation.

That mainly is the reason for the North Atlantic Security Pact. Few citizens will protest against the United States taking part in it but the thing to which many can, and will, object, with justifiable cause, is the way in which the writing of the treaty was handled by the State Department.

The purpose of the treaty is to obligate the participating countries to use armed force, if necessary, to help any member of the alliance who is attacked. That is a commitment of the utmost importance. It simply means if Luxemburg for example, should be attacked, we would be morally obligated to go to her aid with arms if necessary. That obviously would mean that everyone's sons, including mine and yours, would go back into uniform. That's how close to home the matter stands.

Minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who had joined in a minority report to the ECA bill pointed out that—

The House has not been consulted on the formulation of this vast program nor, so far as we know, have any of its members or committees.

Obviously, the bipartisan foreign policy has not been extended to include the House of Representatives. It is apparent, too, that the Department of State has overlooked—or perhaps forgotten—that it is the House that must underwrite the bill with billions of dollars for its accompanying program of lend-lease rearmament and maintenance for 20 years of western Europe by the United States. The House must pick up the check as all appropriations must originate there.

It is conceded that representatives of the United States Senate were included in treaty-writing talks for it is the Senate that must give its approval, under the Constitution, to any treaty this country signs.

But it is difficult to understand why the House of Representatives was completely ignored—and at the same time representatives of foreign governments given the details of the treaty in full confidence.

One Washington columnist and a reporter for the New York Times—both of whom follow State Department policy faithfully—were writing about provisions of the treaty in detail for weeks before it was published. It is easy to assume the Communists knew at least as much about the treaty as did the House of Representatives, since House Members were getting their information from these same public sources.

There is where the American people have a legitimate objection. It would have been a simple matter to call in Republican and Democratic members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs just as were Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY, who helped write the treaty into its present form.

Members of my Foreign Affairs Committee pleaded with Secretary Acheson in vain for House consideration because if we are to assume responsibility for possible crash landings we should have been consulted at the take-off.

What the treaty does is this: It frankly pledges the United States, Canada, and the non-Communist nations, the free nations of western Europe, to a united fight on communism.

The key to the treaty is article 5. That says in effect that if any member of the alliance is attacked, the brothers-in-arms shall consider that an attack upon all—and all shall go to the aid of the nation or nations attacked.

The power to send your sons to war is kept technically in the hands of Congress. We would have the right to determine whether we should declare war or what action we should take so there would not be an automatic involvement in war under the treaty. But such a determination would be a Hobson's choice—no choice at all. For all practical purposes the language of the treaty is so strong that obviously there would be a moral obligation on our part to resist any aggressor by the use of arms. This country keeps its moral commitments and does not go back on its treaties. In other words a mere 64 of the 96 Members of the Senate, and without any expression of approval by the 435 Members of the House, can morally commit a future Congress—not yet elected by the people—to a possible future war.

In a resolution to strengthen the United Nations which I introduced in the House as early as May 17, 1948, I recognized the possible need for a regional security agreement. The last provision of that resolution advocated support and assistance to free nations in their firm determination to defend their independence and liberty against aggression. But I wanted any such agreement to be passed on by both houses, and our right of self-determination as to future action unequivocally preserved.

Certainly this treaty raises many issues which should have the fullest consideration before ratification by the Senate. In mentioning some of them I do not want it inferred that I am against this pact, but do believe we should consider all its implications.

Does this treaty increase rather than decrease the chances of attack on countries that are not members of the pact? Will we have to enter into similar pacts in other areas of the world? Are there sufficient safeguards in the agreement if one of the members turns communistic within the next 20 years? Do we enter into a one-sided agreement whereby we not only agree to arm the participating countries but to maintain their military strength for the next 20 years? Why does not this Atlantic Pact provide for reciprocal assistance from European nations to support us in the Far East? Does this agreement undermine the United Nations? Is a military alliance sufficient to maintain peace? Are we entering into an armament race with Russia? Will this tend to weaken us at home? In addition to the Marshall plan and the Atlantic pact should we not also strive for political unity in western Europe through machinery of the United Nations?

In any event the importance, the historic significance of the North Atlantic Security Pact cannot be underestimated nor overstressed. Ten years ago almost the same nations refused to take similar steps to stop Hitler. It is the fervent hope of all of us that this treaty will not provoke the very attack it is designed to prevent. Americans can only pray the new treaty will stop Stalin and that it will be by peaceful means.

President Approves Rent Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD IRVING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the language of President Truman's statement to the press on March 30, when he announced the signing of the bill extending rent controls for another 15 months.

It will be noted that in approving the bill, H. R. 1731, he called particular attention to the provisions which leave in the hands of local authorities the responsibilities for actual continuances of rent controls in their areas and to the fact that he feels the "fair net operating income" provision is not unworkable as it is now written.

I see in his message a note of desire that all rent difficulties be adjusted fairly and equitably between both landlords and tenants.

His message reads as follows:

I have today given my approval to H. R. 1731, the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, which extends rent control for 15 months until June 30, 1950.

This act is a result of the joint efforts of the Congress and the administration to find an equitable solution for a difficult problem.

While affording more effective protection to tenants against illegal or unjustified rent increases, the act also facilitates the making of adjustments necessary to correct injustices against landlords.

In particular, the act will be helpful in the case of any small landlords who may not be obtaining an adequate net operating income.

Specifically, the act strengthens rent control in the following respects:

1. It gives the Housing Expediter the authority to regulate evictions. He has not had this authority since June 30, 1947. Since that time the fear of evictions has been one of the major factors leading to a black market in rents. The restoration to the Housing Expediter of the right to control evictions will make it possible to curb this black market.

2. It gives the Housing Expediter the right to sue for treble damages for violation of rent ceilings. He has not had this authority since June 30, 1947. This will provide another powerful weapon to curb the black market in over-ceiling rents.

3. It gives the Housing Expediter the authority to recontrol on his own initiative any area he may decontrol hereafter. It also permits him, upon the recommendation of a local rent advisory board, to establish rent control in any area not now controlled. The Housing Expediter has not had authority, since June 30, 1947, to establish rent control in new areas or to recontrol any decontrolled areas.

4. It requires approval by the Housing Expediter before additional units created by conversion may be decontrolled. Since June 30, 1947, such decontrol has been automatic. The new provision will assure that decontrol will be permitted only for genuine conversions and will prevent evasive practices and pseudo-conversions which have been taking place since June 30, 1947.

5. It brings back under rent control a number of types of accommodations which have been decontrolled since June 30, 1947. Among these are accommodations not rented for any successive 24-month period between February 1, 1945, and March 30, 1948, trailers and trailer space, except those used exclusively for transient occupancy; and permanent hotel accommodations in cities with a population of 2,500,000 or more, except in predominantly transient hotels.

6. It does away with the much-abused procedure permitting so-called voluntary leases with rent increases up to 15 percent. This removes the possibility of coercion by landlords to make tenants sign such leases in the future, and eliminates the practice of requiring tenants to sign such leases before they can rent vacant units.

7. It restores to the Housing Expediter the authority to obtain all necessary information by direct testimony or from records and to use the power of subpena for this purpose whenever necessary. The Housing Expediter has not had this power since June 30, 1947.

8. It requires landlords who receive rent adjustments to certify that they are maintaining and will continue to maintain all services furnished on the date determining the maximum rent.

In short, the act establishes an effective system of rent control administration—remedying weaknesses in the present law which tend to make rent control ineffective because of inadequate enforcement powers.

With respect to decontrolling areas where rent control is no longer needed, the act gives new responsibility to the States and to incorporated cities, towns, and villages.

In doing this the act extends the principles underlying the operation of local rent advisory boards, that is, the granting of greater discretion to local authorities to say whether Federal rent control is necessary in their localities.

The act provides that in order to obtain decontrol, an incorporated city, town, or village must hold a public hearing after 10 days' notice and must make a finding as a result of that hearing, that there no longer exists such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require rent control.

Furthermore, such determination to decontrol must be approved by the Governor of the State. I urge local authorities in reaching their decisions to examine all the facts carefully and to exercise their best judgment in the interest of all citizens in their communities.

The act provides that in making adjustments the Housing Expediter shall assure landlords a fair net operating income. This provision does not create an administratively unworkable standard of fair return, nor does it mean a general rent increase for all tenants. Rather, it provides an equitable standard for adjustments where they are needed.

This act was passed by the Congress despite the propaganda barrage which was designed to destroy rent control altogether. In its final form, it represents a crushing defeat for the real-estate lobby.

The passage of this effective rent-control law clearly demonstrates the purpose of the Congress to maintain adequate protection for tenants until the housing shortage is relieved.

By this action, the Congress has reemphasized the necessity for the prompt enactment of legislation which will help to relieve the housing shortage.

Making Child Abandonment a Federal Offense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4057, to prohibit utilization of the facilities of interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the desertion or abandonment of dependent children, and to make available to local enforcement officials more specific information from welfare sources on child-abandonment cases.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the Federal program for aid to dependent children from abuse by able-bodied parents who abandon their children. Such abuses have increased so rapidly in recent years that they are becoming a national curse and are threatening this entire program.

Today, it is too easy for a father to walk out on his family. He knows that a program authorized by Federal law is ready to furnish cash assistance to his wife and children. He knows that if he leaves the State no Federal crime is committed and the more miles he puts between himself and his family, the less likely it is that he will be sought out, returned to the State, and prosecuted. He knows that, even if he remains within the same State as his family, the law enforcement officials may not be informed of his failure to support his children.

My bill would stop the practice of using the aid-to-dependent-children program to encourage the breaking up of homes. The bill would, first, make the abandonment or desertion of dependent children by a parent who crosses State lines a Federal offense punishable in the United States district court of the district from which the parent departed, or of the district in which he may be found; and, second, require, as a condition for the receipt of Federal funds, that the State or local agency administering the program give prompt notice to the appropriate Federal, State, or local law-enforcement official, whenever aid is furnished to children who have been deserted or abandoned by a parent. Thus, not only would those responsible for enforcing the nonsupport laws be informed of the furnishing of public funds to these children, but Federal law could be invoked against those parents who now disregard State nonsupport statutes and leave the State.

Aid to dependent children is now being provided to more than 1,200,000 children through the cooperation of the Federal and State Governments under the provisions of the Social Security Act. Many of these children would not be living in their own homes or homes of relatives but instead would be residing in institutions or in homes of strangers if the Congress had not provided Federal grants-in-aid to the States for children in families with no breadwinner. The Federal and State Governments in furnishing aid to dependent children have recognized that there is no adequate substitute for a family home for children and that economic need should not result in the breaking up of normal family relationships.

I believe in the general purpose of this program. In introducing this bill, I do not intend that aid should be withheld from any needy child, but rather this bill is aimed at parents who, without justification, shift the financial responsibility for their children to the Federal, State, and local governments.

In fact, my bill should receive the support of everyone interested in seeing that the dependent children of the Nation are furnished adequate care. The cost of aid to dependent children has increased sharply. In the 1948 fiscal year the Federal, State, and local governments expended in excess of $352,000,000 for this purpose. In 1941 total costs were less than $153,000,000. Although I recognize that the rise in the cost of living has had its impact on expenditures for aid to the needy as it has on everything else, I also know, not only from reviewing the statistics, but from my own observations that fathers of children have been taking advantage of the aid to dependent children program and shirking their moral and legal duties. This bill will enable the law-enforcement officials to stop this abuse of the use of public funds and to keep the program from falling into disrepute on a national basis as it already has in some parts of the country.

Proper administration of the program, with strict enforcement of the responsibility of parents to support their children whenever able to do so will be facilitated by the provisions of the bill. Thus, unnecessary expenditures of tax dollars can be avoided and the funds made available for the program can be used to better meet the needs of those children for whom other financial resources are lacking.

Michigan Says "No" on Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permisson granted, there is inserted herewith an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 6, 1949:

MICHIGAN SAYS "NO" ON SOCIALISM

The socialism and the welfare State that Gov. G. Mennen Williams and Walter Reuther of the CIO have been preaching in Michigan don't go over with the voters of that State. They said so Monday by repelling the attempts of the Democrats to take control of the State administrative board.

The administrative board in Michigan has wide powers over State policies and the expenditure of State funds. The members include the elected heads of important State departments. The offices at stake Tuesday were those of the head of the highway department and the superintendent of public instruction. The Republican incumbents were returned by comfortable margins, and their party retains its 5 to 3 control of the board.

Last November Michigan reelected its Republican Senator, HOMER FERGUSON, and gave its electoral vote to Governor Dewey, but Williams, a political unknown whose campaign organization consisted of the CIO, defeated Governor Kim Sigler, Republican. Since his inauguration, Williams has shown himself to be a virtual puppet of the CIO, in both policies and appointments.

With August Scholle, head of the State CIO council, calling the signals, Williams ousted the regular Democrats from control of the party organization at the State convention in February. The same forces set out to grab control of the administrative council and to elect two State university regents on Tuesday.

Only about a quarter of the State's voters participated, a circumstance that favored an organized minority group. In Detroit, a Democratic and CIO stronghold, there was the added advantage of a referendum on a $10,000,000 school-bond issue, which was expected to bring voters to the polls. Nevertheless, Williams and the CIO lost all along the line.

Williams and the CIO were promising the people of Michigan a lot of something for nothing. The vote should dispose of claims that Mr. Truman has any mandate, in at least this one highly industrialized State, for the program of socialism that he is promoting on a national scale. A Michigan Democrat, Representative LESINSKI, has been trying to push repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act through the House under a gag rule. The returns from his own State show what Michigan thinks of the CIO leaders whose lust for power the Taft-Hartley Act has curbed to the benefit of the Nation and the acute discomfort of the labor bosses.

The Republicans should look about the Nation before taking too much comfort from the Michigan victory. They couldn't have won in Michigan with Governor Dewey's program of a welfare state. They won because the people didn't want such a program. The socialist Republicans and the internationalist Republicans are doing their best in Washington to keep their party crying "me too." If they succeed, the Democrats will run the country for another 20 years, and into a couple of new wars.

China's Communists Gain Confidence of Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very interesting article by Gordon Walker, chief far eastern correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, which article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1949:

CHINA'S COMMUNISTS GAIN CONFIDENCE OF BUSINESSMEN

(By Gordon Walker)

SHANGHAI.—Whether or not a peace settlement in China's civil war is reached this time, the military advantage and political power of China's Communists appear to be experiencing new and significant increases.

There is still little hope expressed here and in Nanking that the negotiations which opened in Peiping on April 1 will bring any immediate results.

But the mere fact that the Communists have consented to open negotiations, however, has been of considerable propaganda value among the war-weary Chinese citizenry. And although it might be inaccurate to say that the Communists now are winning further active support among former Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) circles, it is noticeably certain that active opposition seems to be breaking down.

BUSINESSMEN IMPRESSED

Developments in Communist control of Peiping and Tientsin, for instance, have made a profound impression here—particularly among business groups that had been ready to flee at the first sign of a Communist take-over in Nanking and Shanghai.

It is recognized that Communists are doing a highly inefficient job of restoring business in the northern cities. But there also is a growing feeling here that experience in the north has proved that it is possible to do business with the Communists in the future.

Gradual reopening of trade with Tientsin has helped provide some degree of confidence. And recent Communist proposals for banking arrangements with non-Communist areas, together with Communist acceptance of Shanghai shipping advisers, have added weight to this feeling.

CONFIDENCE RETURNING

As one prominent Shanghai Chinese banker put it, "At first we expected the worst from the Communists. Now we feel that we might as well make the effort to work with them."

Coupled with this new assessment of Communists is continually mounting resentment with that portion of the Kuomintang which now is ensconced in south China.

Important Shanghai businessmen who once were stanch supporters of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek now talk bitterly about his stubbornness and failures.

The currency reform of last August resulted in heavy financial losses for which they blame the generalissimo. And now, as they try to do business with a new currency which has inflated 3,500 times since August, their bitterness has led to exploration of the possibility of working with the Communists.

IRKED BY SPECIE EXIT

If any lingering support remained for the generalissimo, it has been jeopardized by the conviction that the generalissimo and his rightist clique deliberately removed from Shanghai the bank's gold and silver specie which otherwise might be used to preserve some measure of currency stability.

Another important development, meanwhile, which has strengthened the Communist position is the recent flare-up of Communist military activity in Yunan Province.

It now is reported that well-organized Communist columns have captured between one-third and one-half of that southwest Province, which has contiguous frontiers with Burma and Indochina.

HUGE SOUTHERN FORCE

The significance of these fresh military achievements is increased when it is remembered that at present it is estimated that the Communists have upward of 350,000 armed guerrillas south of the Yangtze River.

The potentially most important portion of this group is centered in Kwantung Province, of which Canton is the capital. Both American and Chinese official estimates state that the Communists have an army of 50,000 just north of Canton and a total of 150,000 Communist followers in the entire Province.

These Communist forces have furthered the feeling here that in the long run resistance is futile and that neither Canton nor Formosa offers the possibility for refugee government headquarters.

Second-Class Mail Rate Should Be Reasonable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have noted vigorous protests from newspapers and magazines against what they regard as an excessive postal rate on second-class mail, as proposed by the Post Office Department. Among these protests is an editorial from the Daily Telegraph of Bluefield, W. Va., dated March 25, 1949, which states the case for the newspapers. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit this editorial to the attention of the committees in charge of the proposed legislation:

FREE PRESS TO BE HAMPERED BY OVERWHELMING MAIL COST

The Post Office Department, employing the matter of a deficit as its background and justification, has urged Congress to pass H. R. 2495 which measure provides for enormous rate increases. If this House proposal were passed by Congress and enacted into law, second-class mail rates would be increased by approximately 250 percent the first year it was effective. Another 50 percent increase would become effective the second year.

Some publishers of newspapers and magazines that would be affected by an increase of such size have protested on the ground that it would be impossible to pay the additional cost of delivery if subscription and advertising rates remained where they are. Metropolitan newspapers with circulation figures in hundreds of thousands would have to pay in excess of a million dollars to meet the new exorbitant postal rate. Newspapers in smaller cities would find themselves paying a postage bill $200,000 to $300,000 larger than they now pay. In many cases if subscription and advertising rates remained at present figures the increase in postage expense would wipe out every dollar of profit and leave the publications with a deficit of their own.

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, said in Washington in commenting on the proposed increases in second-class mail rates that "I think that our Government should in part subsidize the widespread distribution of as many news organs as possible." Why did he say that? It seems to be perfectly obvious that the Senator had in mind the pressing need of the American people for the services performed by the publications of the country if they are to stay abreast of the times in keeping themselves informed, if they are to progress socially, economically, culturally, and politically, if they are to make a worth-while contribution to human advancement in the movement for a better world. He must have thought that if a low second-class mail rate originally was permitted for that purpose it was a good idea in the first place and ought to be continued.

The newspapers and magazines that would be sorely affected by so immense an increase in second-class mail rates are justified in protesting. It ought to be possible year by year to make it easier for the American people to obtain such service instead of harder and in some instances impossible.

Letter of F. Herbert Capps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith a letter from F. Herbert Capps, a student in the special course for American students at the University of Stockholm, Sweden:

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, *January 23, 1949.*
Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I wish to thank you for your letter and the list of Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. I am grateful to both you and my father for this information which is so difficult to get here. I would like to put in a good word for the Information Service and Library here which does its best with the limited facilities it has to help anyone who is interested.

I am very much interested in the events now taking place in the United States. I am a history student now participating in the special course for American students at the University of Stockholm. I belonged to the American Veterans Committee at the University of Chicago and was in sympathy with the Bolte-Roosevelt wing. I was able to vote in the primary at my home, Rolla, Mo., before leaving for Sweden, and therefore pride myself upon having taken a part in helping place such outstanding liberals as yourself in Congress. But, unfortunately, I could not vote in the general election, due to the lack of an out-of-State absentee ballot in Missouri.

I am watching with great interest the activities of the new Congress, and wish to congratulate you upon the great steps forward already taken, especially in breaking the power of the Rules Committee to bottle up bills. I may call upon you to send me information on legislation if I cannot obtain it here.

I am studying the ideological development of the Swedish Social-Democratic Party, and my first great surprise was in finding little of what we in the States think of as socialism in the party. The Swedes have had quite a bit of success in using cooperatives to break monopolies, and there seems to be no plan to nationalize industry, outside of the Communists. Another surprise was that there seems to be agreement on the social welfare program among all parties, except for very small groups on the extreme right and left. There is comparative parliamentary peace here, and it is the consensus that the Social-Democrats will remain the largest party for several years at least.

I like the people, their customs and their school system, and am enjoying my stay immensely. There are some fifty-odd students in the special course. The language barrier is not so great for me, since I had studied Swedish in the Army speed-up program at Minneapolis during the early part

of the war. But I must say it is difficult. I might put in here that we veterans were very inconvenienced over Christmas due to the failure of the VA in London to send our checks. Some of us did not receive our first checks until the middle of January. The Embassy was very nice in helping us tide over.

Should you desire any information about Sweden, I will be very happy to reciprocate your kind action. Thank you again.

Sincerely yours,

F. HERBERT CAPPS.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech made by Hon. C. M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, over radio station WOL on February 17:

The question of Federal aid to education is by no means an academic one. The decision as to whether we shall ask the Federal Government to help equalize educational opportunity may well determine the future of the American way of life.

We are engaged in a cold war—a life-and-death struggle with competing ideologies that sweep across the European continent toward our own. Ideology is specifically the field of education. We must build an intelligent home defense in a vigorously American citizenship for which the basis is laid in the American schools. That defense must be built now. There is no time to quibble.

Not all States and communities can provide adequate schools for their children. It is idle to insist that the financial support of schools is solely a State and local responsibility, when for many years some States and localities have not been able to carry that responsibility. They lack the resources to do so.

There is a wide gap in the ability of the States to pay for education. This inability may not indicate that a State produces little wealth. Wealth moves across State boundaries. It tends to concentrate in industrial and commercial centers. It is taxed there. The State that produced the wealth cannot levy upon it for schools or for anything else. My own State of West Virginia, the richest in the Union in natural resources, has made more New York millionaires than any other State.

There is a great difference between the States in the average per capita income of their citizens. The average personal income in the State of Mississippi is $575. In Nevada it is $1,770. Does anyone think that as a result of any kind of taxation the State of Mississippi can support schools equal to the standard at which Nevada can support them?

Perhaps it will be proposed that the great discrepancy in the average personal income in these two States be ignored, and that a sales tax be imposed to raise money for schools. In Nevada the per capita retail sales each year amount to $1,195. In Mississippi the per capita retail sales each year are only $481. Is anyone prepared to support the statement that Mississippi can raise as much money as Nevada from a sales tax when the retail sales are two and one-half times as great in Nevada as they are in Mississippi?

Of course, the vast gap in the economic ability of the States is reflected in the quality of education which they are able to provide for their children. Some States spend five times as much for the education of a child per year as other States spend. The difference between communities in expenditures for education is still more astounding—some school districts spend 60 times as much as others.

In education as in other things, you get what you pay for. Millions of American children go to school in buildings that are unsafe, unsanitary, and unadapted to a modern educational program. They are assembled in overcrowded classrooms. Many schools must hold two half-day sessions in order to get all the children seated. There are some schools in which three sessions must be held each day to enable all the children of the community to attend.

Approximately 3,000,000 children are taught by teachers who hold substandard emergency certificates, because low salaries have been responsible for driving thousands of qualified teachers from the profession.

Some children have the benefit of 10 months of school a year. School is in session only 7 months for others. Some children can complete their education through college. Others find it impossible to finish the elementary school. There are millions of children of school age in no school at all.

This situation is undemocratic, un-American, unjust, and indefensible, even by so formidable an organization as the United States Chamber of Commerce. It denies freedom to learn and freedom of enterprise to millions who will resent rather than praise the form of government they are called upon to maintain. It offers a weak bastion for popular government based upon the ability of the people to govern. To permit this situation to continue is the first retreat in a battle for the survival of the American way of life.

This condition is not a result of sudden emergency. It has existed for years. It will continue to exist unless the Government takes steps to equalize educational opportunity through Federal aid. Indeed there is every reason to believe that the condition will get worse. The children of the increased wartime birthrate are now entering already overcrowded schools. Census Bureau figures released only this week estimate the enrollment in our elementary and secondary schools will reach a total of 34,091,000 by 1960 as against 24,546,000 in 1947.

The unequal distribution of children adds to the gravity of the condition. Here in the District of Columbia there are 134 children per 1,000 population. Down in New Mexico there are 283 children among every 1,000 people. New Mexico has therefore more than twice as many children to educate as the District of Columbia. The cost is proportionately greater.

Unfortunately, the States with the most children do not always have the most money. As former Senator Josh Lee of Oklahoma once said "Those who have the kids don't always have the cash."

The people of the United States have enough wealth to support their schools. The wealth is unequally distributed. It must be taxed wherever it is to aid the education of children wherever they live. There is nothing novel or revolutionary about this principle of taxation. It is practiced every day. The Federal Government builds post offices in Arizona and Wyoming with taxes raised partly in New York and Pennsylvania. It widens the channel of the Mississippi River with taxes paid in part by the people of Alabama and Maryland. Ever since the first day of this Republic the Federal Government has taxed wealth wherever it is found in order to expend it for national welfare wherever there is a need.

Even if all States were equally able to support their schools, the Federal Government would still have a stake in its young citizens. It hasn't been very long since this Government called upon youth in every community to serve in a great war. Was it of no concern that the selective service had to reject 659,000 for the sole reason that they were practically illiterate, and could not serve in a war in which science and technology played so large a part? There is no less at stake in the issues of peace.

Our people move about. More than half of the people in some States were born in other States. We are citizens of the Nation. We fight our enemies as a Nation. We will survive or perish as a Nation. It is a responsibility of the Nation to help keep the flag flying over every American school.

The Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin of April 4, 1949]

PACT NOT SPECIFIC—WOMAN SENATOR SAYS ATLANTIC TREATY IS VAGUE ON RED FIFTH COLUMNS

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—I shall cast, very soon perhaps, the most important vote in all the time that it will be my privilege to serve in the Senate—my vote on the ratification or rejection of the North Atlantic Pact. I hope it will be the most important vote that I ever will make—important in the sense of the treaty being the vehicle for realistic peace and not the fuze for war.

I think the North Atlantic Pact by its very word, "North Atlantic," perhaps means more to all the people of my own State of Maine than to anyone else. Maine is nearer all the nations in the treaty than is any other State. The pact is to Maine what a Pacific pact would be to Hawaii.

AWESOME DECISION

I hope every adult American will read and study this treaty. I hope there will be intense and thorough discussion of it in and out of the Senate before it is ratified or rejected. The decision is awesome.

The articles that have particularly arrested my attention are article 4 and article 5. Perhaps the reason they do is because of my own personal interest as a United States Senator in the question of whether Senate ratification of the pact would commit the United States to war to the extent of short-cutting another and more important article of a more important document—article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, which vests in Congress the power to declare war.

ARTICLE 5 CLEAR

Article 5 of the treaty says, in part, "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and * * * they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them * * * will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking * * * action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

That means that an attack against France would be an attack against us. To be real-

istic, it is France and western Europe that we want to keep Russia from gobbling up—and to do this by this pact. And an attack on us means only one thing—war.

A SAVING CLAUSE

Of course, there is the saving clause of taking such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force. Technically, this would permit us to assist the party or parties so attacked by action other than the use of armed force—perhaps lend-lease or economic warfare.

But lend-lease and economic warfare after shooting starts would be hopeless folly in a swift, atomic war. While I agree that the saving clause prevents outright contradiction of article I of the Constitution and abrogation of the power of Congress to declare war, I think that the difference is technical. Under article 5 of the pact, Congress would have an unequivocal moral obligation to declare war immediately on the attacker of one of the signers of the pact. Otherwise, the pact doesn't mean a thing.

But this deals only with external attack. Soviet Russia does not make external attacks. She makes internal attacks. She attacks through subversive fifth columns. The Communists inside the countries take them over for the men of the Kremlin.

Is there anything in the treaty that deals with internal attack?

ARTICLE 4 QUESTIONED

Certainly, there is nothing specific on the point. The nearest approach is in the broad language of article 4, which says: "The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened."

The action authorized is only joint consultation, and you can't stop communism merely by consulting. At the request of the country whose political independence was threatened, we could send men, arms, and food to strengthen that country's government. We have shed the cloak of isolationism. We will fight on foreign land, if attacked. But I am not convinced yet that we will readily send men and arms to another country to help it combat an internal conflict.

That is why I want article 4 spelled out in detail. I want the State Department to tell the Senate exactly what it means, to say how far we are committed in the event of internal attack. I may agree to the extent to which the State Department wants to commit us. But I want to know. I don't want to buy a "pig in a poke" without the American people knowing what they are letting themselves in for.

Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, in saluting the Veterans of Foreign Wars, let us remember that this patriotic organization has always sought to make America a better country in which to live.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars goes back to 1899, when various groups of overseas veterans were formed spontaneously. These organizations were dominated by democratic principles from the very beginning.

Its purpose, as stated in the charter granted by Congress is as follows:

The purpose of this corporation shall be to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America, and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies whomsoever.

In the past 30 years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been a constant guardian and champion of the rights and welfare of the veterans and all the people of America. Posts throughout the Nation have been among the hardest workers in community enterprise.

We do well to pause this week to pay tribute to a great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In doing so I wish to especially call attention to the very excellent Veterans of Foreign Wars posts we have in my own home city of Springfield and in the second district. The members of those posts are among the finest in the country.

Armament Economy Seen Costing Nation Ten Billion a Year—Thoughts of Substitute Less and Less in Minds of Government Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Evening Star, as follows:

ARMAMENT ECONOMY SEEN COSTING NATION TEN BILLION A YEAR—THOUGHTS OF SUBSTITUTE LESS AND LESS IN MINDS OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(By David Lawrence)

Perhaps the most significant and thought-provoking piece of statistics that has come out in a long while is the statement by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that the "cold war" with Russia is costing the United States at least $10,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS frankly comments that if it were not for the threat of communism, this expenditure would, in large part, not be necessary.

This tells in unmistakable language what the failure of postwar diplomacy has cost America and will continue to mean unless some way of producing an atmosphere of mutual trust is found and some means of bringing Russia into a peaceful relationship with the rest of the world can be devised.

There is no sign that the American Government is thinking just now along those lines. On the contrary, all the talk is of defensive alliances and more military aid of a lease-lend nature to implement the Atlantic Pact.

COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED

There was a time, shortly after the war, when an economic plan for world rehabilitation involving much less money might have been used to secure concessions from the Russians, but skillful statesmanship was lacking, and the cold war ensued. The foundations for such a postwar relationship might well have been laid during the war. Possibly if President Roosevelt had lived some formula might have been developed, for he had the confidence of the Russians. It certainly does seem that a line-up of east versus west might have been avoided by the opportune use of reconstruction funds.

Basically, the Soviet demands, which the allies say have been impossible for them to grant, involve at root the matter of money. A treaty with Austria would have been signed long ago if Russian demands for reparations could have been satisfied. The same holds true with respect to Germany. The Russian rulers need and want financial help for their own country.

But today the situation has reached the point where America is helping to build up the democracies, and even former enemy countries, and Russia is on the outside, too proud to beg aid even if she could get it here. To the above line of reasoning, the answer is customarily given that the present Russian rulers are unscrupulous and that any help for Russia would be appeasement. It is, however, a problem of timing and a matter of reaching peoples over the heads of governments. This is where financial and economic assistance can be tempting and the Russian Government would respond or lose its power.

FOURTH OF UNITED STATES BUDGET

Sooner or later a way will have to be found to live in the world with the Russian system alongside the democratic system. Expenditures of $10,000,000,000 a year on a "cold war" cannot be continued indefinitely. It is one-fourth of the Federal budget.

Incidentally, Senator TYDINGS, unwittingly perhaps, revealed the "pump priming" aspects of the $10,000,000,000 stimulus to the American economy. While the Marshall program, for example, he said, is designed "primarily to help our Western European allies to regain strength from the effects of the war, indirectly it does create work for our workmen and markets for the products of our people." He added that "practically all of it is spent in our own country to purchase food, machinery and other supplies which Western Europe needs to regain economic stability and security."

It makes one shudder to think what the outbreak of sudden peace might mean to the American economy. It could make the difference between recession or mild readjustment, such as is being experienced today, and deep depression. Small wonder perhaps that an armament economy is so easy to perpetuate and that all thoughts of a peacetime substitute—a world economy based on normal relationships—seems at the moment to be less and less in the mind of governmental officials.

End of a Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 5, 1949:

END OF A HOAX

Joining the goose-step of the Kremlin satellites, the Chinese Communists and their supposedly non-Communist liberal associates

have now come out with the routine denunciation of the Atlantic Pact and the routine declaration that they will fight with China's ally, the Soviet Union against imperialist aggressors. If anything more were needed to end, once and for all, the great hoax about the Chinese agrarian reformers, this is it.

One of the major causes for our military disasters in the Pacific in 1941 and 1942 was a fantastically ingenious underestimate of the strength of our antagonist. Similarly, one of the causes of our political disasters in the Pacific in the last 3 years has been a correspondingly ingenious misappraisal of what we faced. By this time the Chinese Communists themselves should have corrected our blunder.

Reorganization of the Executive Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of today:

PUBLIC SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

Former President Hoover has witnessed the rise and fall of a number of efforts to reorganize the executive establishment. His observations have convinced him that much more would have been accomplished in the past had there been widespread and determined public support of the various efforts. One of the reasons for the apparent apathy of the citizens has been the failure of reorganization advocates adequately to educate the people as to the need for more efficiency in Government.

It is gratifying, therefore, to learn that a Nation-wide committee is being formed to make certain that the Hoover Commission's exhaustive findings and recommendations do not suffer from lack of public understanding. This nonpartisan citizens' group is headed by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, who was a member of one of the Hoover Commission's task forces. More than 700 persons have accepted membership on the committe.

Although the avowed objective of this group, in the words of Dr. Johnson, is to prevent the voluminous Hoover reports from gathering dust at the Capitol, it will not be a lobbying outfit in the usual sense. Most of the education work will be done not in the Halls of Congress but among business, farm, labor, educational, veterans', women's and other representative civic organizations and groups throughout the country. This, then, will be primarily a campaign to inform the taxpayers of the added burdens imposed upon them by costly waste, duplication, and general inefficiency within the Government departments and agencies. Dr. Johnson estimates that the taxpayers could save about $3,500,000,000 a year by eliminating overlapping functions, unnecessary activities and other uneconomic practices.

The idea behind the new committee is a good one. Mr. Hoover has warned that this may be the last chance to do an effective reorganization job. This is a matter which touches the pocketbook of every citizen. If Congress knows that the overwhelming majority of the people want the reorganization effort to succeed, it is not likely that the splendid work of the Hoover Commission will end up in a dormant file.

Pie for Army Officers and Crusts for Retired and Helpless Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present herewith a speech of Hon. John H. Hoeppel, former Congressman, relative to the treatment of helpless retired enlisted men in pay raises authorized by Congress. This injustice should be corrected at the earliest possible moment, and the agreement entered into with them in good faith ought to be kept. To do otherwise would be to make enlistments more difficult, and, above all, this action created a distrust in the Government.

ARMED SERVICES MAKE SCRAP OF PAPER OUT OF SOLEMN PROMISE TO RETIRED ENLISTED MEN—PIE AND CAKE FOR OFFICERS, MOULDY CRUSTS AND CRUMBS FOR AGED AND HELPLESS RETIRED ENLISTED MEN

With a background of over 50 years' experience with the military service, of which 21 years have been devoted to the printing of a publication in the interest and welfare of the armed services, and especially those retired, I feel fully qualified to present a clear and irrefutable statement which proves conclusively how the higher ranking officers grab every advantage for themselves, while at the same time at each and every grab they have taken something from enlisted men in the active service and the retired.

In the Pay Act of June 16, 1942, the armed services leadership prevailed upon the Congress to break a solemn unilateral contract which the Government had consummated with retired enlisted men and which had been in operation for a period of over 55 years.

In this same Pay Act the officers grabbed an increase in pay for themselves and an increase in subsistence allowances for themselves and their dependents, and at the same time they urged to the Congress the repeal of the then existing law which provided allowances of $15.75 per month to those who were on the retired list after 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

As a result of this grab by the officers for their own individual interest, approximately 7,000 retired enlisted men—some of them veterans of two wars—received absolutely no increase whatsoever in pay in the so-called Readjustment Act of 1942. Ten thousand or more additional retired enlisted men received only a pay increase of $1.21 per month. Men who had been receiving allowances for a period of 30 or more years, in this pay act arbitrarily had their allowances taken from them and, as a consequence, those who did receive a small increase in pay did not receive an approximate increase compared with those of similar rank and service in the active service.

To prove how unfair and unjust was the attitude of the officers in urging the breaking of the solemn contract which Congress made with retired enlisted men of the armed services in the act of March 1885 I reiterate that approximately 20,000 or more retired enlisted men received no increase in retired pay, or only an increase of $1.21 per month, while at the same time the officers, all of them, were given substantial increases in pay, plus an increase in subsistence allowance for themselves and their families.

This unjust and selfish act on the part of the armed-service leadership in the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, should be corrected by restoring to all retired enlisted men allowances of $30 per month—allowances which would be in keeping with the Government's solemn promise to these men when they enlisted that if they served to retirement they would receive three-quarters of the pay of their rank, plus allowances for the balance of their lives.

Every official document issued by the armed services since 1885, in appealing to men to enlist, assured them without equivocation that if they served to retirement they would receive the above-designated retired pay, plus allowances for the balance of their lives. What right have we to criticize foreign nations which violate their agreements or commitments with other nations, when we here in America, in our own armed services, arbitrarily break a solemn contract which the Government consummated with those who served 30 years to retirement in taking from their allowances which they had earned because of stipulated service—allowances which they had been receiving for years prior to the act of June 1942?

H. R. 2553 ALSO DISCRIMINATORY

As a whole, H. R. 2553 is an outstanding document and one which should be enacted into law with certain amendments and perhaps certain omissions. It is noted in this proposed pay increase that the very same retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who received no increase, or only $1.21 per month increase, are scheduled to receive an insignificant increase in pay under the provisions of this proposed act. For instance, men transferred to the Reserve and who retired after 30 years' active and Reserve credit, under the proposed pay increase bill will receive an increase of $5.75 per month only, whereas the men who received only $1.21 per month increase in 1942, under the proposed bill will receive no increase in pay whatsoever.

When we consider, in comparison, that officers in the active service and those retired will receive increases in retired pay up to as much as 40 percent on their already existing lucrative pay, this is proof conclusive that the officers are in line again for another serving of pie and cake, while the retired enlisted men are again to receive moldy crusts and crumbs.

We ask in all sincerity of the Members of Congress if it is fair that the officers should always be given such liberal consideration and, with each dishing out of liberality, should at the same time take from the enlisted men the meager benefits which they receive in proportion to benefits meted out under existing law to the officers, both active and retired.

A BRIEF PRESENTATION OF SOME OF THE MANY DISCRIMINATIONS PRACTICED ON ENLISTED MEN, BOTH ACTIVE AND RETIRED

In the Pay Act of 1922, for the first time in American history, the officers urged Congress to give to them subsistence allowances for themselves and their families. At the same time, generously and munificently, the armed-service leadership recommended, and the Congress then reduced, the $30-per-month pay to enlisted men to a meager $21 per month.

In Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, the officers again grabbed a rich plum for themselves. This act provided that young,

able-bodied officers, 40 years or less in age, after 20 years' service, could be retired with their highest attained World War II rank. In this same act the officers provided, however, that warrant officers and former enlisted men be retired and receive a pay of their highest World War II rank only after these latter two groups had served 30 years. In other words, the Regular officers grabbed easy high retired pay for themselves after 20 years' service, but had written in the law a provision that former enlisted men would not come into these benefits until after 30 years' service, active and inactive.

In this same Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, the armed service leadership discriminated distinctly against enlisted men who served at higher rank in World War I. They refused to permit these aged men (not over 2,000 are today alive) to receive the pay of their highest World War I service. This rich plum of high retired pay to young, able-bodied officers, who easily acquired high rank, was reserved only for those who served in World War II in the Regular service.

It should be recalled, as a matter of principle, that the late General Liggett attributed much of our World War I successes to the high caliber of commissioned service, which was rendered by former enlisted men in World War I. Few of them attained higher grade than captain or major. However, in World War II the sky was the limit, and some young Regular officers, with only the rank of first lieutenant, have been retired at their highest temporary rank of general and thus will be on the backs of the taxpayers for generations to come; whereas the few who served at highest rank in World War I and who were denied pay of their highest World War I rank, few of them attained high rank and because of the attrition due to death their numbers are rapidly diminishing. Yet, notwithstanding this, they, and they alone, do not receive the pay of their highest World War I rank.

I repeat, with an experience of 50 years, or since 1898, when I first enlisted during the Spanish-American War, that I have observed continual unfair dealing on the part of officers directed against the enlisted men, and especially has this discrimination been more and more pronounced since World War I. I could continue to present innumerable instances of unfair treatment on the part of the commissioned personnel toward the enlisted men, and it is because of this that the problems of recruiting are most difficult. From correspondence with men in the active service, I am satisfied that there is much improvement that could be made in the active service in the interest of popularizing and especially in increasing the efficiency of the armed services.

Fair dealing on the part of the armed services heads toward the 50,000 or 60,000 men on the retired list would make of each and all of them walking recruiting officers for the armed services, thus making it easier to obtain outstanding youth through the volunteer method for our armed services.

This periodical is primarily interested in the highest degree of efficiency in the armed services, with the fullest regard to the interests of the taxpayers who must carry the burden in the maintenance of our armed forces. Fair dealing on the part of those in authority to the enlisted men now serving and fair dealing to those retired by restoring allowances rightfully due them would contribute much to improving the mental attitude of those serving, as it would alleviate the financial plight of the thousands of retired enlisted men who have been robbed of the allowance which were promised them for life in all official recruiting documents, provided they served to retirement.

JOHN H. HOEPPEL,
Manager, National Defense.

Mrs. Luce Sees Death Struggle of Christians and Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce at the third annual Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on World Affairs, on Wednesday, March 23, 1949:

The rosy optimism of the past century is no longer possible today except to frivolous minds.

Now wise men ask grim questions. Is the curtain going up on a terrible tragedy? Is the end of our time near at hand? Are two world wars—or will it be three—the prelude to the collapse of our civilization?

Man's life on this planet has never been a matter of high joy or long ease. Since outraged Eden's flaming sword seared his vision, he has sweated in his exile and bled in his banishment. He has stumbled and fallen. And he has risen again and groped blindly on. But never in all his pitiful, tumultuous history has his suffering been so widespread, his misery so abysmal, his confusion so confounded, and his consequent sense of hopelessness so contagious.

Science, his long-heralded liberator, has failed—no, betrayed him into the hands of his ancient enemies; fear and want. The very machines conceived by his own proliferating imagination, to release him from his centuries-old bondage to nature, have turned against him. They have increased what he invented them to abate: his elementary needs for food and shelter.

FALSE STEWARDS

His servants, the technologists, do not seem to have worked their magic on matter to his best interests.

Those adored conquistadors of the telescope and the microscope and of all the world that lies between the fleeting stars and the congregrating microbes, have proved false stewards. In their experiments they have shown a strangely perverse tendency to include man himself as part of nature's raw material; a sort of flesh and blood plastic.

He has seen again and again in the past two decades a handful of men, or one man, buttressed with microphones and armed with the sharp or hard or shining or explosive fruits of their laboratories, exploiting, abasing, murdering millions.

"So he sent the word to slay,
And slew the little childer."

A new breed of Herods offer him the new look in freedom—freedom from freedom itself. And they bid him, on pain of death, to accept the offer voluntarily.

Surely man faces such tribulation as has not been known since the world began. And finally, he must face the possibility of his own obliteration—his atomic suicide.

What is the cause of this bitter condition? And what the cure?

A CONFLICT OF IDEAS

For the first time since the days of the scholastics, historians, philosophers, theologians, and poets are in correspondence on a grave human question: they agree that both cause and cure are to be found in a study of the present conflict between the Soviet Union and the western democracies.

There is further accord: this conflict has three aspects. First, there is the conflict between capitalistic, or so-called free enterprise economics, and Marxian, or socialistic economics. The rapid industrialization of the past century created new relations between men and their employers, and men and their jobs, and overturned all the old relations. The prime casualty of this violent upset was the sense of personal responsibility in both workmen and employer. But the brunt of the resulting hardships fell on the working class. Problems were created, which, it was said, could only be relieved by the state, if men were not to starve at unexpected times, in great numbers.

Despite the quasi-scientific and technical jargon of economists, the plain fact is that economics is simply political arithmetic. The contest between capitalistic political arithmetic and Marxian political arithmetic is being won—and handsomely—by socialism. For those who see our cause as the cause of capitalism, there is small comfort in current events. In the plain language of General Stilwell: "We have taken a hell of a licking."

PLANS ARE READY

The welfare-state is a fait accompli in Great Britain and much of Europe. The blueprints for the completion of the American model, begun under the New Deal, are now on the drawing boards in Washington.

Politicians who deny its general popularity, or threaten to dismantle it, will continue for quite some time to make more newspaper headlines than votes.

It is idle to blink this fact: Whatever socialistic economic solutions have been vigorously put forward to correct abuses caused by the rapid growth of industry, they have been eagerly accepted by the people. Wherever they are not offered, they have been and will continue to be demanded. If they are not forthcoming peaceably, they will be forcibly seized, and the rulers who denied them will be discredited.

Since the conflict between capitalism and Marxian economics has been largely decided in favor of the latter, this conflict cannot in any precise historical sense, provide the issue of war with the Soviet Union Both sides, however, may use it as an additional excuse in case of war.

CONFLICT OF NATIONALISMS

The second aspect of the conflict is the clash of world nationalisms. The gargantuan growth of nationalism is perhaps the greatest and most terrifying political phenomenon of the past three centuries. It is marked by the nations' relentless search—in the name of peace—for a preponderance of physical power over one another.

Among the nations of the west today, this search nears its temporary goal in the Atlantic Pact. The Soviet east replies by enlarging its ring of satellite states. Mounting armament programs are the logical corollary of nationalism's tireless thrust for security through physical power.

Another mark is the Nation's avid thirst for the development of favorable foreign markets, and trade areas, which each seeks to close along with its domestic markets to all competitor nations.

Today, all this is called the cold war.

No one need say that one's own nationalism is worse than anyone's else. But without reference to other and higher ideals espoused by the citizens, no one can claim it is any better.

WE COULD WIN THE CONFLICT

Pure nationalism has its roots in collective pride and arrogance. There are few countries today which are guiltless of this advanced and dangerous form of tribal worship. So there are few who do not stand in

danger of slipping into war in a fit of national hysteria.

Fortunately for us, if the raw clashes of national arrogance and ego detonate in a war within the next ten years, we shall probably win it. We hold vast technological superiority over the Soviets. The great manpower of the U. S. S. R. will not be a match for our engines of mass destruction.

Yes, we would win the conflict. But would we win the struggle?

The third aspect of the conflict is the truly significant one. It is the struggle between Christianity and Marxian atheism. If we study this struggle as it has spread itself out on the pages of modern history, we may come to understand both the cause of our troubles and the cure that we may reasonably hope for.

"It is upon the trunk that a gentleman works," said Confucius.

If we fail to go to the root of the matter, to grasp the real nature of the struggle, we risk losing that aspect of the conflict which alone gives its significance either in the long perspectives of history—or the eternal perspectives of God.

Let it be quickly said that in this conflict there can be no compromise of basic concepts. It is a struggle to the death—the death in our time of either the Christian view of life, or the Communist view.

A LIFE OF MATERIALISM

Communism is the first attempt in man's entire history to found a way of life solely on a single plane: That of the material world. It is the absolute denial of man's dual nature. It rejects the view man has held from the most primitive times concerning himself, that he, too, is fissionable material—part mortal flesh and part immortal spirit.

The prime value that communism gives to economics (if the word "value" can properly be used cogently by a Communist) is consistent with its end: To materialize—to bring down to a horizontal level—the whole of man's life, and on this earth-bound foundation to build an egalitarian or classless society whose only object will be the temporary welfare of the average citizen—or, as he has come to be called, the common man.

CHRISTIANITY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Communism then affirms as its primary article of faith, an unlimited belief in this common man, in his inevitable physical and mental progress, and his final, total, mastery of his environment and nature. Man, in the Communist view, is the measure of all things.

Christianity insists that man is the highest of animals, and the lowest of the angels. It therefore asserts with equal logic the primacy of God. Consistent with this faith is Christianity's goal: To spiritualize all of human life, to raise it to a supernatural level on which alone the eternal happiness of man can be guaranteed—and be it noted, without necessary prejudice to his earthly well-being.

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all the rest will be added unto you," is a capital article of Christian faith.

There is to be found no tangible evidence or scientific proof in this world, in conclusive support of either position.

Only faith itself will give the answers.

DEFINITION OF FAITH

And faith, as both the common man of the East and the plain man of the West know, is not belief which is held in spite of factual evidence. It is belief that is held in the absence of all evidence. It is intellectual assent to a proposition that can neither be proved nor disproved. Above all, it is a clinging to this proposition regardless of the personal consequences; death, even.

Whether you give the Marxian or the Christian answer to the riddle of man, the answer is valid only because you believe it to be valid. "Not flesh and blood, but my Father who is in heaven has revealed it to you." What the Christian takes on divine revelation as truth, the Communist takes as truth on the revelation of Marx as interpreted by Stalin.

Precisely what is compelling in communism is this very element of blind faith in man. It is the passionate mystique of materialism, the substance of things unseen and hoped for and not communism's accomplishments, that draws men.

THE TRUE COMMUNIST

False or not, a burning faith will ever and always conquer tepidly held opinions. At the turn of the century, the soaring faith Communists had in the ever onward and upward progress of man, and his transfiguration under communism, seemed to sweep before it all loosely held convictions, however decent and liberal and democratic. Its dark grandeur lay in its passionate, single-eyed, unequivocal aim to tear down the city of God, as advertised by nineteenth century bourgeoise Christianity, and to erect a whole new world—the city of Man—upon the ruins.

ILLOGICAL RED VIEW

The true Communist—what you might call the sincere Red—was, and is, the man who is utterly (and properly) disgusted with hypocritical Christianity. He hated the nineteenth predatory century bourgeoise capitalist who had lost all sense of personal responsibility to the workers, but concealed the fact by preaching Christian resignation to the masses, while wealth accumulated and men decayed.

The Communist fails to see that his own solutions have created a situation in which men accumulate and wealth decays and he, the Communist, made one grave error: He wrongly attributed the injustices suffered by the so-called Christian few, not to the hypocrisy of these few, but to the sincerity and gullibility of the many. Illogically enough he blamed Christians and Christianity, rather than those who have failed to be Christian.

Then he allowed his angry eyes to move fiercely over history's pages. In every civilization he found—naturally enough—a coincidence of injustice and a belief in Divinity. He made—most unscientifically—a direct correlation of a coincidence; he announced, as a matter of scientific fact, that all injustice was based in a belief in God.

The Christian believes that all injustices sprang from a lack of belief in God.

During the last century, many in the West have secretly sympathized with the atheistic view of the universe. They have yearned to see the experiment made of forming a society purged of religious myth and fantasy, and brought down to scientific reality. In our time their desire has been gratified.

A DISASTROUS EXPERIMENT

We have seen two great nations undertake the experiment of official godlessness. Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia have provided fine laboratory tests for those who feel that a belief in God has too long hampered man in his forward march.

The Nazi and Soviet experiment of life without our Father, has not, on the record, worked out too happily in Germany or Russia. Ethics and morals seemed also to disappear, and with astounding rapidity, in the wake of religion.

The natural laws, the laws of general human beneficence, of good will toward men, which are to be found in all religions, in all times and climes, no longer appeared in Germany and Russia in any form.

"Thou shalt not kill," cried the ancient Jews. "Who meditates oppression, his dwelling is overturned," warned the Babylonians. "Utter not a word by which anyone could be wounded," cautioned the Hindus. "He whose heart is in the smallest degree set upon goodness will dislike no one," commented the Chinese. But the Golden Rule found no echo in the official codes of ethics of Hitler's or Stalin's lands.

LAW OF LOVE OUTLAWED

Gone, too, were the ancient laws concerning sexual justice, honesty in business dealing, duties to parents and forebears, justice in bearing witness, mercy to the weak and helples, generosity to the vanquished enemy.

Above all, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany contravened, despised, and wholly outlawed the Christian law of love. This was the law based on the example of Crucified Divinity: "Greater love hath no man than this * * * Love one another, as I have loved you * * * I come to minister, not to be ministered unto * * * Father, forgive them, they know not what they do. * * *"

It is against the background of knowledge provided by the Russian and German experiments in living without God that we must ask ourselves this decisive question tonight:

Is Christianity, the faith of our fathers, an adequate religion for us in this time of awful crisis? Is any faith necessary, any religion useful in the predicament of modern man?

DIFFERENCE IN CHRISTIANS

First, let us remind ourselves once more that it is the Person of the Saviour Himself which constitutes the difference between Christianity and all other religions. Christians believed that He had been one of us; that He lived in a house as we did, on a street; that He ate and drank, and had a mother whose holiness was hidden, as the God of Grace Himself is hidden. We believed that He slept and spoke as we do, and was born and died, as we die; and suffered and bled, and cried out, too, that He was forsaken of God.

We believed in the Man-God Who insisted He was the Way and the Life, Who forgave a thief on his deathbed, but threatened with hellfire and damnation all those who failed to see Him, to see God Himself, in the least of his children who were weak or weary or persecuted or underprivileged.

It is the supreme contention of Christians that in His Person not only were all of God's natural laws, but all His revealed truths exquisitely codified and fulfilled; but that in Him, and by Him, and through Him, man was raised to a new level higher than that of any human justice—he was raised to that level of divine mercy and love which extends even to his enemies.

THE FAITH OF THE WEST

The faith of the West was a faith in God's thirst for the love of man, a man's hunger for the love of God fulfilled in the incarnation. Christ was the ultimate testimony to man's awareness of his intrinsic freedom, his uniqueness, his unrepeatableness, to his sense of worship, and to his need for fruitful, ennobling participation in the life of nature and society. All that was both noble and elemental in man responded to the Christian dispensation.

And a burning faith in it made what we call civilization in the West during the past 2,000 years. All the greatest art, music, architecture were rooted in Him and built in Him.

With God as his Father and Christ as his brother, and the Holy Spirit as his friend, western man dared everything, tried everything, sought everything, endured everything, and triumphed over most things.

When we examine the bases of our American civilization—when we follow to the headwaters the sources of all the values that we treasure in our way of life; the devotion

to humaneness, tolerance, freedom of speech and conscience, the passion for equality, the preference for peace, the insistence on fraternal attitudes, in short, the whole nexus and cluster of democratic ideas and ideals, we find Christianity. If we are honest, we will admit that the catalysing agencies in our democracy were always the Christian ethics and morals, which we evolved in political or economic terms from the tenets of Christian faith.

But man must also love his brother as himself, because his brother is no less unique than himself, nor any less the child of his Father. The Christian preached the indefeasible value of the individual soul, the uniqueness of yourself, the immortality and the inviolability of the unrepeatable you, and of your repeatable neighbor.

DEMOCRACY FROM CHRISTIANITY

Were not what we call liberty, fraternity, equality—all the great ethical values of democracy—born and evolved from His words, "One is your master, and all ye are brethren"? Did not St. Paul emphasize the fraternity and equality of all men (regardless of color or condition of birth or previous state of servitude), "We, being many, are one body in Christ and everyone member of one another"?

We, in our age, will forget to our peril—both temporal and eternal—that Christianity is the foundation upon which the house of democracy was built.

Our forefathers were sharply aware of this fact. The writings of our signers of the Declaration of Independence are full of direct references to Christianity and the Gospel messages as the prime source and justification of the great new experiment in democracy that we began in 1776 on this continent.

WASHINGTON'S VIEW

One passage from Washington's Farewell Address should be enough to convince any American generation of the paramount importance our founding fathers attached to the Christian religion in securing the good of the citizen. Said our first President: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man pay the tribute of patriotism who would labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. * * * And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason, and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in the exclusion of religious principles.

" 'Tis substantially true that virtue or morality is the necessary spring of popular government * * * who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundations of the fabrics?

"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge."

MONUMENT TO CHRISTIANITY

It was once considered a cliche to say that Christianity has been tried and failed. It is equally banal—and equally untrue to retort today that it has not failed, because it has never been tried. The plain historical fact is that Christianity has been tried. And wherever it has been tried, with honest intent and passionate purpose, it has succeeded as nothing else ever tried by man has done. Our very form of government is a living monument to the acceptance in political forms of Christian principles.

Today, we are living, says Arnold Toynbee, on our spiritual capital. Our Christianity is a wasting asset.

What is the fate of spiritual parasites? How long can we demand, as individuals, to share in the group benefits of Christianity, and yet insist on our right to disassociate ourselves and our children from the practical task of conserving, no less increasing, those benefits.

CHRISTIANITY NEEDED

How long can we clamor to be treated as Christians, while insisting that we are not ourselves obliged like Christians, or to believe in Christianity?

No day goes by, no forum is held in America, without its quota of stirring appeals for high ideals and noble efforts in the solution of our many melancholy problems. We demand the functions of an organ which we have indifferently allowed to be ripped out of our social body. We want to produce Christian deeds without Christian hearing, Christian thought without Christian minds. We desire to pluck the fruits of faith where we have torn out the branch of faith itself. And the totalitarian night still sweeps westward.

Germany in 1949 may well be the parable of the house that was swept clean of an evil spirit, and garnished, and left empty.

SUCCESSION OF EVILS

We swept Germany free of its Nazi devil with our B-29's and we garnished it, and guarded its emptiness with our military government. Yet will seven new devils, worse than the first, take possession of it, called communism? And then shall we clean Europe once again of the Communist devils, with our atomic broomsweep, and once again garnish the house afresh? If it is not filled by a good spirit will not the 14 devils come to take up their residence? And if we liquidate them, still, even so, what shall be put in their place?

Ah, yes, but of course, we could put an adequate faith—providing always we felt that in Christianity we have one. But shall faith be borne by men who feel that it is bad taste to show any evidence of it? Let us speak plainly.

NO TIME FOR THE LUKEWARM

Our fate, no less than Eurasia's, is sealed in communism if we dare hope we shall defeat communism with embarrassed protestations about feeling good will toward all men, or mealy mouthed murmurs that doing the decent democratic thing is all that counts.

The yawning agnostics, the sneering finger-drumming atheists, the drooling, sentimental, misty-eyed humanitarians who spend their days conceiving plans for saving all mankind while a beggar dies of hunger on their doorsteps. These, and all the Christian Pharisees and hypocrites will not save us from the fiery sons of Marx. These are the tepid ones that Nietzsche and Dostoievsky, those European prophets of doom, retched over 100 years ago. These are the lukewarm that even God spews from His mouth.

We shall walk with the Lions of Love, like the early Christians, or we shall be devoured by those tigers of hate, the Communists.

Only men of deep religious faith can lay down the challenge of totalitarianism. Only the apostolic Christian can win. For he is forever armed against defeat, and most certain of victory. For come what may: let the totalitarian night fold its iron wings above him, let the fires of persecution and torture rain upon him, what does he care if he can still say with St. Paul:

"I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. Henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me on that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that love Him."

The Pact and Mr. Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post, April 7, 1949.

In this article, Mr. Lippmann discusses the Atlantic Pact and its effect on diplomatic relations and negotiations. What Mr. Lippmann has to say is of the greatest importance. I do not know that anyone has stated more clearly the effect of the pact on policy decisions of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call this article to the attention of the Members for their careful study. I repeat, it is of utmost importance.

THE PACT AND MR. CHURCHILL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The pact that was signed on Monday will be remembered long after the conditions that have provoked it are no longer the main business of mankind. For the treaty recognizes and proclaims a community of interest which is much older than the conflict with the Soviet Union and, come what may, will survive it. The peoples who live around the shores of the Atlantic are many nations, but they are also one of the great and enduring communities of the modern age. They are competitors, they have been serious rivals, and are still rivals. They have been at war. But the wisest of their leaders have always known, and events have proved them right, that when the issue was life or death, they would stand or fall together.

The pact, as Mr. Acheson so truly said, does not create this community. But it does record and publish and give legal form to its existence. It would not be worth the paper it is written on if it were not an unwritten law of geography, history, and vital interest that an attack which threatens the existence of any member of this pact is an attack on all the members. The two world wars of this century have proved that this is the unwritten law of the Atlantic world—that Great Britain and France, Canada and the United States, the military powers of the pact, are, whatever their differences in time of peace, natural allies in time of war.

The proof that the Atlantic community is not a temporary diplomatic and strategic contraption dealing with Russia lies in the fact that the natural alliance of the Atlantic nations has already been tested in two gigantic wars, and that neither of them was against Russia. Indeed in both of these wars the Atlantic nations were the allies of Russia, and therefore whatever the Russians may think of us now and we of them, it is the truth which no one can deny that the Atlantic community is not necessarily and cannot be solely a coalition against Russia.

To be sure the pact would not have been signed now but for the fear and frustration, as Mr. Pearson, the Canadian Foreign Minister, put it, that arise from our bad relations with the Soviet Government and with the international Communist movement. But even if we cannot easily and quickly make the Russians understand, we at least must understand, that the community of interest which the pact records, is older and

deeper than the conflict with the Soviet Government, and that it would be a reality if we were at peace with that government, and that it will still be the reality when at long last we are again at peace with the Russian people and their government.

Seen this way, the pact itself does not make better or worse our relations with Russia, make war less or more probable. I do not myself think there is much to the claim that war will be prevented because we have announced formally that we shall go to war if there is an armed attack. The Soviet Government knew that without a pact. It has never entertained the illusion that it could go to war against France or Britain, Norway or Italy, while the United States debated whether it would intervene. Quite the contrary. The Soviets have been insisting for at least 3 years that we were the head and front of a coalition against them. Far from imagining, as Hitler did, that we might be neutral, they accuse us day in and day out of preparing and fomenting a war.

Nor is there much, I think, in the idea that the pact as such, and the military program which is to support it, will make war more probable. It will certainly not make us more warlike to realize, as we shall when the bill to prepare against war comes before Congress, that a war with Russia would be no 30-day affair of atomic bombs and a few airplane crews. Nor can it fail to make our diplomacy more and more responsible to have to consult fully before we take a position—as we are now obligated to do under the pact—our allies on the European continent who would, if war came, have to fight on the ground and not in the stratosphere where the B–36's are at home.

What will determine the outcome will not be the pact, nor even the solidarity which it promotes, but the policy which the Atlantic nations acting as a community take with respect to the great areas of dispute in central and eastern Europe and in the Middle East. If there is to be a war, the Russians will not start it for the purpose of conquering any of the nations that have signed the pact. If there is war, it will be about the control of regions which are not inside the pact—primarily about Germany, and secondarily about eastern Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East.

The pact, because it binds the Atlantic nations together, will mean that in the diplomatic show-down and the negotiations, which must soon begin, the Western governments must now act together and can no longer act separately. It will, henceforth, be a violation of the spirit, and indeed the letter of the pact, for American Military Government in Germany, or for the British Foreign Office, or for the French, to insist upon, or to carry out separately, any serious policy in Germany which has not been worked out together by the members of the pact. The gentlemen who have been talking glibly about whether we should place our bets for Europe on Germany or on France must now shut up and sit down. The choice, if it ever existed, has been made by signing this pact, and from now on our policy in Germany will not be an American policy but a common policy worked out by the Atlantic community.

The same rule will hold in eastern Europe and the Middle East, for ourselves, the British and the French, for an alliance which binds us all to go to war if there is war that could lead to war. A collective system of defense cannot be created unless there is a collective policy. The alliance would fall apart if at every critical juncture the policy of the alliance does not rest on the understanding and the consent of the peoples who may have to underwrite it with their blood.

The necessity of proceeding by consultation, which will be tedious—rather than by impulse—and by agreement, which will often be difficult—rather than unilaterally—is the surest guaranty that the alliance will not be adventurous. A solemn pact to walk together is a solemn promise that no one will on his own motion go off the deep end. It is an engagement not to be stampeded into that violent or precipitate action, against which Mr. Churchill, who was suspected of contemplating it, advised in his Boston speech—apparently to the surprise and disappointment of those who imagine they can settle great affairs with a big loud bang.

Opportunity in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of April 4, 1949:

OPPORTUNITY IN ASIA

Harold Stassen has done us all a good turn by reminding us of our opportunities and duties in Asia. One may, as he suggested the other night, part company with him on details, but there's no doubt about the crying need for positive American policy in Asia.

Today in Asia, Communist movements—and some loosely called Communist—win friends largely because there is no positive, non-Communist alternative program offered. Asiatics were offended when, during the war—and in the postwar settlements—the principles of the Atlantic Charter were not repeated in a Pacific charter. They have felt similarly snubbed by the fact the Marshall plan was set up for Europe.

Actually, a good deal smaller investment in southeast Asia would likely pay us greater long-range returns that we probably will reap from our great outpouring to Europe. For it is almost exclusively with the backward areas that this country must trade to get the kind of imports needed to maintain our national security and keep up our high standard of living. And southeast Asia is the richest of all those areas.

We must not, however, think in terms of rapidly raising the tragically low living standards of Asia's masses even to the lowest levels in Europe. That would be impossible. But Asiatic standards are so low, that even pitifully small gains—in our eyes—would be enough to make the Communists' empty boasts look sick.

Any Marshall plan for Asia—not a MacArthur plan, please—would have to start with modest aims and be tightly administered, perhaps as Stassen suggests, "in relation to local provinces and individual projects" rather than through central governments. But even a modest, localized program would be a potent weapon.

In the face of the tremendous economic and technological problems which Asia presents, communism, paralyzed by ideology and overburdened by bureaucracy, is bound to fail. China's Communists, in their so-called land of reforms alone, provide a clear indication of failure to come.

But, in the absence of positive action on our part, Communist propaganda may give the Soviets an unbreakable political grip on Asia's hungry people before communism's failure is plain enough to warn the misled masses.

Seldom have stakes been so large—or required such a relatively small investment.

We Must Not Be Afraid of Change—The Strength of Democracy Is Its Ability To Grow, To Use the New and Reinterpret the Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Raymond B. Fosdick, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on April 3, 1949.

Mr. Fosdick retired last June after 13 years' service as president and 37 years as trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Raymond Fosdick has said what I have been trying to say for some time now only he has said it much better.

The article follows:

WE MUST NOT BE AFRAID OF CHANGE—THE STRENGTH OF DEMOCRACY IS ITS ABILITY TO GROW, TO USE THE NEW AND REINTERPRET THE OLD

(By Raymond B. Fosdick)

When the last glacier retreated northward from what is now Connecticut, it left behind, as mementoes of its visit, great boulders of rock which are now strewn lavishly across the State. Several of them, as large as a corncrib and many tons in weight, were deposited on my farm, and for 15 years I have watched one of them fight a losing battle with an ash tree. The tree evidently started in a seed lodged in a tiny pocket in the top of the rock. When I first saw it, it was a sturdy sapling that had made for itself a comfortable crevice for its roots. Today its irresistible growth has torn the massive rock into fragments.

This is law of life. The future belongs not to rigid absolutes, whether they are primal rocks or unyielding social arrangements, but to the thing that can grow, whether it is a tree or a democracy.

It is strange that a principle as familiar as this should today need underscoring, but we are living in years of uncertainty and fear, and fear induces a kind of spiritual astigmatism. To be sure, in our generation we have reason for our fears, and every justification to resist the threat that creates them. But I am thinking of fear as an evil in itself and what it does to human emotions and reactions.

For one thing, fear breeds an instinctive hostility to growth, because growth means change, and in anxious hours men tend to cling to the shelter of the present or to put their faith in nostalgia for the past. But history's current is sweeping us into the future and we cannot stand still, nor is there now any place left to go back to. The illusion that security can be found in immobility, or that safety is dependent upon the absence of change, is perhaps the most dangerous form of imbalance which plagues the minds of men.

Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and re-expressed in contemporary idiom to accord with contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the

Revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of Magna Carta.

Today the conception of freedom is once again taking on a larger meaning. Our generation is thinking of the threat to freedom which comes from poverty and insecurity, from sickness and the slum, from social and economic conditions in which human beings cannot be free. In many countries, including our own, this new conception of freedom is struggling to make itself articulate, and irresistible change in older points of view is taking place before our eyes.

Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very essence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

Here again we have a familiar concept to which most of us would doubtless subscribe. But it needs to be reemphasized today because our current fear of communism is driving some of us to believe that change is somehow subversive, and that anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow traveler who should be watched. Not only the House Un-American Activities Committee but similar State committees and various self-appointed groups are creating a climate of opinion definitely hostile to those who fail to conform to predetermined standards, and suspicion is thrown on individuals and organizations who dare to think in unorthodox or nonconformist terms.

With the possible exception of John Adams' administration, there is a risk today in being a liberal that has never existed before in the history of this Republic. If you sign a petition to admit colored people to public-housing developments, if you favor fair-employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you fight for the protection of the rights of the foreign-born, if you oppose religious prejudice and Jim Crowism, if you sanction cultural exchange with foreign countries, if you aline yourself with those who are working for more effective labor unions or more adequate medical care, if you take any point of view which involves the implementation of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, you are apt to be suspected in some circles as a knowing participant in the Communist front, or at the very least as a witless dupe of Moscow's hypnotic influences.

There is hardly a progressive organization or undertaking in the country to which the adjective "communistic" has not been applied in the last few years—from the Tennessee Valley Authority and water-power developments generally, all the way to farmers' and consumers' cooperatives and plans for rural electrification. Fingers are even pointed at organizations like the YMCA, the YWCA, and the defunct Epworth League. In many States teachers and college professors have been frightened into sterile silence, and even the pulpit has not been free from fear.

The tragedy of this business is that it plays into the hands of the Communists. It identifies Russia with the process of social change at the same time that it limits us to a bleak and hopeless status quo. It concedes the Soviet claim of concern for the underprivileged while it stigmatizes the achievement and promise of democracy toward this same goal. A prominent doctor, head of a State medical society, recently condemned the idea of the broader distribution of medical care on the grounds that it was being pushed by Soviet agents in this country.

That is the kind of reckless statement which creates an atmosphere favorable to communism. If the idea of making available to all the people of our country the curative techniques of modern medicine is communism, if communism has a patent on the idea, then communism has something for us which we very much want. But it isn't communism. It is democracy. Its roots go back to the Declaration of Independence, long before Karl Marx was born. It is a translation into social terms of a concept that was first conceived as a political idea. It is part of our developing spiritual testament. It is in line with all that is best in our tradition and hope. It is democracy facing the responsibilities of its maturity.

Those frightened people who use the word communism so easily had better reckon with its implications. There are plenty of arguments against communism. It is a facade for a ruthless tyranny. It is a brutal hoax by which millions of confused and hungry people are persuaded or coerced to sign away their freedom in exchange for utopian promises. But to paste a label of communism on the yearnings of men everywhere for a better life, to classify as subversive those goals of equality and human service toward which our democracy is moving, is to concede to the Communists all the best arguments and make a mockery of the faith that sustains us.

It is undoubtedly part of the Communist strategy to frighten us into a position which seems to identify our democracy, not with forward-looking movements related to the hopes of men, but with outmoded patterns of social thinking. If in the eyes of the nations, America could appear as a victim of spiritual paralysis, frozen to the present, deaf to the impact of new ideas of human equality which are sweeping the world, it would be an overriding victory for Soviet policy. That is the picture the Communists are trying to paint of us, and that, unfortunately, is the picture that some thoughtless and panicky people in this country are trying, unwittingly, to help them paint.

I do not underestimate the necessity which we face in times like these of keeping the Communists clear of our Government and rooting out treachery wherever it may be found. Split loyalties or loyalties that respond to strings pulled in Moscow cannot be tolerated in positions of power. We must know who our enemies are. But this is a task requiring consummate judgment and skill. If, in a clumsy attempt to exorcise evil, we proscribe the good as well, the damage will be irreparable. To act as if the term "communism" covers all the plans and dreams of men for making this world an inviting home to live in instead of a place to freeze and fight and starve in is no more intelligent than using a steam shovel to weed a flower garden.

In our concern over what communism may do to democracy we have overlooked the danger of what we ourselves may do to democracy under the stimulus of fear. Fighting fire with fire is an easy but misleading slogan which has betrayed more than one cause in the past. Challenged by authoritarianism, men begin to build an authoritarianism of their own; they tend to take on the mood and techniques of their opponents; they answer heresy-hunting with heresy-hunting; they become like the thing they fight. That is what fear does to people. If the tactics of the Soviets succeed in inducing us to try to stamp out dissent and to measure loyalty by conformity, if they scare us into a denial of our historic goals, then they have maneuvered us into retreating from the field before the battle has even begun.

If democracy means anything at all it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom.

This is what our democracy has always meant. We have given it its pre-eminent place in the world because we have welcomed diversity of opinion, because there has been no fixed creed to which our citizens have had to subscribe, no Siberia for our intellectual and spiritual nonconformists. Our national life has been healthy and vigorous because dissenters have been encouraged to think critically of the political, social, and economic order in which we live.

Indeed, as we look back on our history we realize that the periods when we rose to moral greatness were periods of nonconformity—when Thoreau wrote his essay on civil disobedience; when Seward appealed to the country with his revolutionary thesis: "There is a law higher than the Constitution"; when Theodore Parker from his pulpit in Boston denounced the iniquity of our war on Mexico in words that burned their way into the conscience of the Nation. "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation," said the Supreme Court in the Barnette flag-salute case in 1943, "it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It is this kind of tolerance and adaptability that makes the evolving will of the people effective in reaching new definitions of liberty and equality. It is this philosophy of growth that gives us assurance in the present crisis. The only adequate way to answer the challenge of communism is to continue the building of an economic and social system whose concrete results in terms of the welfare of mankind will far outstrip anything that communism can even promise. Democracy thus interpreted as a positive force can create new hopes and new initiatives in human life and can capture the imagination of the world.

Here is a faith worth fighting for. Stalin boasts of his "new order." We have a new order, too, based on the capacity of each generation to experience what Lincoln called "a new birth of freedom." The Communists extol the youth and virility of totalitarianism. In the evolution of democracy we have a world that is perpetually young.

I started by saying that the future belongs to the thing that can grow; a tree can demolish a rock. In spite of the present impetus of its revolutionary program, communism, by encasing itself in an ironclad orthodoxy, is sealing its own ultimate doom. Whether the field is science or economics or literature or art or music, the Kremlin has circumscribed it with an adamantine authoritarianism. The conformist reaction which holds the intellectual and humanistic life of Russia in a viselike grip can end only by strangling the vitality of the system it seeks to preserve.

In such an atmosphere there can be no flowering of the human spirit; it withers and dies from suffocation. The Communists are fighting against the laws of nature. In their fanaticism they have forgotten, if they ever knew, that stagnation and death await ideas as well as social and economic arrangements which have lost their power to grow. They taunt us for being the supporters of a crumbling status quo, but it is they who are looking backward, they who are trying to build

a status quo far more rigid and absolute than anything the world has ever seen. It is they who would put blinders on men and establish boundaries beyond which ideas and dreams shall not be allowed to go.

Four hundred years ago Galileo shook the world with the question: "Who is willing to set limits to the human intellect?" Well, the Communists are not only willing to do it, they are attempting to do it; and in that attempt which flies in the face of history lie the seeds of their own ultimate disintegration.

There is no future for such a system, any more than there is a future for a rock stranded by a glacier. Ultimately the irresistible power of a thing that can grow will shatter it. That is why democracy, rightly interpreted, is the last best hope of earth. It is rooted in the principle of growth; it is adaptable to new concepts of social justice. It is built, not on a fixed creed or on a system of regimented ideas, but on the sure knowledge that frontiers are never stationary, that the thrust of events is steadily forward, that there are no privileged ideas around which magic circles can be drawn to protect them from competition. It is only freemen who dare to think. And it is only through free thought, freely expressed that the soul of a people can be kept alive.

Mississippi Leads in Community Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I arise to protest the injustice that has been done the great State of Mississippi by the proponents of Federal aid to education. They have insistently pointed out that the Magnolia State is the most backward of all the States in educational opportunities and I am delighted to be able to call to their attention the article entitled "Colleges for All," which appears in the Pathfinder News magazine for April 6. It would seem from the facts therein set forth that many of those who have been holding Mississippi up as a horrible example should mind their words and incidentally look elsewhere for justification for saddling the Nation with a program of federally subsidized education.

COLLEGES FOR ALL

It is almost an axiom among American educators that Mississippi is at the bottom of the educational ladder. In most categories, it is. But in one vital educational field Mississippi leads the nation.

"Mississippi," says Dr. Jesse Bogue, secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, "has the only real State-wide system of community colleges in America."

Some United States educators may rub their eyes in disbelief. But there stands the fact. Only in Mississippi is the State divided into zones, with a community college in each zone.

Belatedly, some wealthier States now are falling into line. New York's Governor Dewey, acting on the recommendations of a commission headed by Owen D. Young, is proposing to the legislature a State-wide system of community colleges. In the Governor's budget is a $2,000,000 item to start the administrative machinery. In Michigan, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Illinois State-wide systems are under way.

California and Texas, however, are nearly in sight of Mississippi's achievement. In public-supported community colleges, in fact, California leads with 62 and Texas is runner-up with 34. But there are still large areas of both States without community colleges.

Counting both public and private institutions, the United States total stands at 651 junior colleges, with more than 500,000 students. Yet as recently as 1931, there were only 436 with only 74,000 students. In sheer growth, United States higher education has seen nothing like it.

What is a community college? Basically, it is the freshman and sophomore years of college—at drastically cut rates.

Tuition is very low, sometimes trifling. In California it is free. Where students live on campus—that is, in dormitories like those at any 4-year college—and eat in a common dining room, the cost of board and room is fantastically cheap. In Mississippi it is about $6.25 a week; total costs do not exceed $225 for the whole college year.

VALUE RECEIVED

Community college graduates make good records. One typical survey made in the South in 1944 disclosed that 46 percent of the number of community college students who transferred to regular 4-year colleges made higher marks than the average for students there already; 42 percent equaled the average; only 12 percent fell below the average.

Basic advantages of community colleges are obvious:

Being free, or costing little, they receive thousands of students who cannot afford the estimated $1,600 a year necessary for all expenses in the "Ivy League" colleges.

They provide both academic and vocational training. In addition, they offer a terminal course—2 years of general, college-level education for those not going on to senior college.

Finally, and most important of all, community colleges are designed to serve their local areas. They keep boys and girls in their native habitat, training them for their adult life within the geographical orbit in which they were born and reared.

Deep in the heart of Mississippi, 16 miles west of Jackson, the State capital, is Hinds Junior College, a typical community college. Organized in 1917 as an agricultural high school, Hinds added the first year of college in 1922. In the same year it dropped the first year of high school.

Roads then were poor. Commuting from any distance was impossible. So dormitories were built. Meals were served in a common dining room. A farm was part of the college; today it includes more than a thousand acres.

In 1926, Hinds dropped the second year of high school, added a second year of college. The student had his choice of a vocational or a general education course. Those taking the vocational course, however, also had to take some academic subjects. No student was allowed to avoid English, history, or civics.

Many new vocational courses have been added. Now they cover barbering, radio, auto mechanics, refrigeration, air conditioning, electricity, woodworking, body and fender repair and machine shop work.

Hinds' president, stocky, genial George McLendon, tries to fit the vocational courses to the needs of the community. Before a student takes up training in barbering, President McLendon consults the CIO and AFL barbers' unions about the need for more barbers. Then he tries to adjust the number of students taking the barbering course to what the trade will absorb.

Only about half Hinds' 500 students are taking vocational courses. The rest are pursuing either the college preparatory or the "terminal" course.

PLOWING SCHOLARS

The low cost of living at Hinds, as at most community colleges, astonishes visitors. Food, for example, averages about 23 cents a meal. The 1,000-acre farm, always producing, helps to explain that. Each student donates 1 day of work a month to the college. Most of this is done on the farm. Tremendous quantities of food are canned.

Not far from the dormitories and recitation halls is the meat-processing plant, with its cold-storage locker. The community has a stake in this. For small fees, farmers and citizens from the whole county store their frozen meat in it. There is a curious story back of this plant. When it was built it was privately owned. But the owners didn't know enough about meat storage to run it successfully. They failed. Similar plants had failed in Mississippi, for lack of technical know-how. President McLendon decided to take it over, teach students these skills. Now it shows a profit.

Hinds' 32 faculty members live on the campus. Their board and room is free, the bulk of their salary clear. Thus, a $3,500 salary at Hinds goes further than $6,000 in Chicago or Washington.

FEE FODDER

Almost a fourth of the students work their way through school. When times are bad, some students bring, as part-payment of their fees, sacks of potatoes, jugs of molasses, hay by the ton. These are credited to their accounts and help to cut down expenses.

There is no mystery about Mississippi's leadership. It grew naturally out of the agricultural high school boarding system. But, as a college system, it might have bogged down but for one man. He is Knox Broom, former State supervisor of public junior colleges. It was the slow-spoken, methodical Broom who defied politicians, aroused citizens to the need of keeping the State's community colleges out of politics, and spaced to prevent overlapping and competing.

Cooperation from Mississippi Governors and Members of Congress in recent years has been 100 percent. Two of Mississippi's present Congressmen, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS and ARTHUR WINSTEAD, are junior college graduates.

Mississippi's Broom puts it this way: "Parents know that boys and girls going away from home often make little progress the first 2 years. Most college freshmen are too young to be away from home. It is difficult for them to orient themselves. The community college is smaller, with less caste. There is more direct contact between students and faculty, and between both and parents. Result: a maximum gain at a minimum cost."

Obviously, it takes more than a campus and dormitories and recitation halls to make a college. There are intangible and psychological factors. In most community colleges, for one thing, there is a definite religious atmosphere. Churches border the campus. Lectures on various phases of religion are more widely attended than at the big universities.

ATMOSPHERE

At Hinds, music and theatrical groups are part of the college life. Sports of all kinds are encouraged, particularly football, baseball, and basketball. Most of the college paper, The Hindsonian, is devoted to sports. But it enthusiastically reports classroom techniques as well. When Dean M. F. Herring installed a machine which tested read-

ing ability—a tachistoscope—the student paper challenged students to try it.

The device, bought for remedial reading courses, soon became a center of campus interest. Designed to increase reading speed, it flashes words, sentences, or figures on a screen for a period of time ranging from 1 second to one one-hundredth of a second. What might go unnoticed at a big State university becomes a real educational aid in the more intimate atmosphere of a community college.

To Hinds, as to America's other community colleges, industry and business are turning for workers. The cry is not for men trained in the professions, but for men and women with some college or some semiprofessional training.

In the Nation at large, too, there is growing emphasis on the need for more general education for good citizenship. Last year the President's Commission on Higher Education recommended the universal extension of education 2 years beyond high school. This is precisely the field of the community college.

EVERYMAN'S SHEEPSKIN

Incidentally, the Commission foresees the two added years of schooling as the right of all those who want it, regardless of economic status. In other words, in the Nation as a whole the free public high school eventually may be followed—on a national scale—by the free community college.

Some community colleges are wholly State-financed, others supported entirely by the city, the county, or the district.

Regardless of the method of financing, however, the community college is fast becoming a college for everybody. It is serving a social and economic need the Nation over. In a very real sense it is "the poor man's college." In New York State, Associate Commissioner of Education Cayce Morrison has set the highest goal of all. "We envision," he said, "a community college within 25 miles of every home."

Appreciation for the Merci Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 of the Oklahoma Legislature as adopted by the Oklahoma Senate on March 3, 1949, and by the House of Representatives of Oklahoma on March 8, 1949. I think this resolution is highly appropriate and I join wholeheartedly in concurring in the sentiment expressed therein.

A resolution of appreciation to the people of the Republic of France for their kindly expression of friendship as exemplified by the sending to the citizens of Oklahoma the Merci Car

Whereas the French Merci Car transmitted to Oklahoma by the people of France as a token of appreciation of the gifts of wheat by the farmers and other good citizens of Oklahoma has been received with appropriate ceremony at the Capitol Building in Oklahoma City, February 18, 1949; and

Whereas we find in this exhibit remarkable tokens of sacrifice and love of the French people toward the citizens of Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein), That we express to the French people the gratitude and genuine friendship which Oklahomans have, and will continue to have through all the years, for the people of France, and here record an ardent hope that the faithful and unbroken friendship which has been maintained from the days of the American Revolution to this hour will be continued; be it further

Resolved, That a true copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the French Ambassador in Washington, D. C., for transmittal to the French Government; a copy be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States; a copy be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a copy to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Two Editorials on CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials from the Prosser Record-Bulletin, of Prosser, Wash., relative to the CVA, discussing some of the objections which have been made to it:

UNAPPRECIATIVE

Last week, over at Seattle, was held a meeting of the so-called Northwest Power Development Association, organized for the purpose of opposing the establishment of a CVA.

Prominent on the program was a Gen. Thomas M. Robbins, retired, who came up all the way from Portland to urge that the present agencies be continued. Of course he meant the Army engineers.

Now we have no criticism of the efficiency of the Army engineers nor of the two or three thousand civilian engineers they employ to do the bulk of their work. Our criticism is rather one of technique.

The record is illuminating.

For perhaps a hundred years the Army engineers have been trying to harness the lower Mississippi but, repeatedly, floods have devastated vast areas in that part of the valley. If anything, the floods are getting worse.

Contrast to this the work of the TVA engineers in the Tennessee Valley. In a period of 10 years they tamed both the Tennessee and the Cumberland Rivers, two of the worst troublemakers in America. They were forever going on the rampage and for the simple reason that their sources lie in regions having an annual rainfall of up to 80 inches. Those rivers were tearing the guts out of those valleys, leaving nothing but eroded soil and ruined hopes behind. But all of this has been changed. It is even asserted that the control of these rivers lowers the floodtide on the lower Mississippi a substantial number of inches.

In other words, due to the work of the TVA engineers, the Army engineers do not have to run so often from floods on the Mississippi, nor do they have to run so far nor so fast.

Really, General, you boys ought to be more appreciative.

A TERRIBLE RESPONSIBILITY

In Tuesday's issue of the Yakima Republic appears an interesting editorial under the caption "The CVA stumped." On the whole the editorial supports the formation of such an agency in a fair and unemotional manner pointing out that proponents of the CVA have execellent arguments in behalf of this administrative reform.

What seems to bother the Republic especially is the fear that the long and beneficial experience and contribution of the existing Federal agencies is to be set aside.

There is merit in this question but not so serious as to stump anybody.

We do not know how many private engineers the Department of the Interior employs, temporarily, when it tackles an especially important job, but Harold Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, states in a recent article that the Army has about 400 engineers engaged in development work but that it employs from 2,500 to 3,000 private engineers to do the bulk of the engineering.

Evidently there is an enormous personnel of private engineers who are employed by these agencies. The skills and experience these men possess need not and should not be lost. Were a CVA administration established every one of these trained experts could start working for the new agency with a knowledge that at long last their dreams would come true instead of remaining indefinitely upon their drawing boards. In addition, such a law should provide that a leave of absence from all other Federal agencies could be granted these experienced Federal experts to shift over temporarily to the CVA.

But this is not all. A CVA law should require that other agencies turn over to the CVA all surveys, maps, drawings, studies, and estimates that have previously been made. We have in mind especially the Army 308 report and the Department of the Interior report of 400 pages issued a year ago.

These reports represent separate surveys and studies. Since they largely duplicate each other they also represent a waste running into millions of dollars. To fail to use these surveys would be inexcusable and indefensible.

An opportunity of limitless magnitude presents itself to the people of the Northwest. Never before in history has a Congress led by the President been in such a favorable mood to engage in the development of the entire Columbia watershed. Yet in a large measure it is entirely possible that the people in this area will get to squabbling and defeat it. In fact they are disputing the issue today.

A terrible responsibility rests upon the opponents of a CVA. The leaders in the Northwest, especially the newspapers, should ponder long and hard as to whether they want to go down in history as among the saboteurs of the greatest opportunity that ever has, or ever will, knock at our door.

Veterans' Hospital at West Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a resolution

of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas the State of Connecticut has about 275,000 veterans of both world wars; and

Whereas the veterans of the State of Connecticut are provided with only one United States veterans' hospital with a bed capacity of 352, and there are 333 Connecticut veterans of all wars now hospitalized in State tubercular and mental institutions and over 400 Connecticut veterans hospitalized in the United States veterans' hospital for neuropsychiatrics at Northampton, Mass.; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission, which veterans is a primary responsibility of the Federal Government, and the facilities presently existing within the State of Connecticut are obviously inadequate; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission, which has made a survey of this area, has found that a real necessity exists for another veterans' hospital, and the need for such a hospital is getting greater day by day; and

Whereas the families of veterans presently hospitalized outside the State of Connecticut are being put to great financial and loss-of-time hardship due to their having to travel many miles to visit their war injured or wounded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the General Assembly of Connecticut, the house of representatives concurring therein, do urge and recommend that the President of the United States, the Administrator of Veterans, the Senators and Congressmen from Connecticut and the chairmen of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees exert their individual and combined efforts to effectuate the immediate opening of the veterans' hospital in West Haven, Conn.

Given under my hand and the seal of the State, this 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1949.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.
WINIFRED MCDONALD,
Secretary.

Have We a Reserve Shelf of Public Works?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful address on the subject Have We a Reserve Shelf of Public Works? delivered March 10, 1949, in Chicago, by Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, together with a brief foreword of my own.

There being no objection, the foreword and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD BY HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, on March 10 delivered an address before the Chicago Building Congress in which he discussed the need for a reserve shelf of public works.

Nearly every community in the country urgently needs improved and enlarged public facilities for its citizens.

These projects, whose construction has been postponed since the early thirties, first because of financial problems and then because of war, include schools, highways, sewer and water systems, hospitals, and other necessary and worth-while public works.

General Fleming estimated that the accumulated need for public works has reached a figure in excess of $64,000,000,000.

Existing facilities are outgrown and of insufficient capacity to meet immediate requirements. Our schools, for instance, are overcrowded and, in some cases, unsafe. Nearly all rural and urban areas need additional hospitals if the health of the Nation is to be safeguarded and improved.

The question of the right time to swing into a full construction program of public works turns on the interpretation of economic and social factors. Among these are employment, cost and availablity of materials, need for stabilizing the construction industry, and the prior call of other types of construction, such as housing, upon labor, materials, and finances.

Whatever yardstick is used in determining the best time to start actual construction in any given case, the need for advance planning is clear. No part of such a construction program can be carried out in an efficient and orderly manner unless the local communities have selected their sites and prepared their plans in advance.

The need for Federal loans to stimulate advance planning has been demonstrated by experience.

General Fleming's presentation of the facts, and conclusions based on these facts, merits wide consideration.

HAVE WE A RESERVE SHELF OF PUBLIC WORKS?

(By Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency)

There is no need to remind this audience that the topic which I have chosen raises the $64,000,000,000 question. We all know that the accumulated need for public works has reached a figure well in excess of $64,000,000,000. Some estimates put the need for State and local public works at $100,000,000,000—excluding Federal projects, which would add to the total of needs.

When figures of this magnitude are set against last year's volume of public construction—$4,000,000,000—they would seem to indicate an enormous reserve, a backlog of needs that could hardly be met within the next 25 years. The need is real enough, in fact it is urgent in many communities. We need schools, highways, hospitals, conservation projects, sewer and water lines and a long list of other public works.

These needs have been accumulating and growing for nearly two decades. You will remember that this type of public construction was largely postponed throughout the war years to divert men and materials to the war effort; it was postponed again following VJ-day to direct men and materials to the construction of housing for returned veterans, and to provide the means to construct added industrial facilities.

This prolonged postponement, plus increases in population and sizable migrations, created the present need for public construction. That much is clear. Whether you accept the figure of $100,000,000,000 or a lower estimate, no one will deny that the backlog of legitimate, worth-while public works is huge.

But this obvious fact does not prove that needs can be translated into construction or that we have an adequate reserve shelf of public works. Existing needs cannot be translated into plans or projects by wishes. Nor does such a huge reservoir of public construction needs enable us to gage the adequacy of our present shelf of public works.

Before passing judgment, pro or con, let us try to set up a more definite frame of reference, with some bench marks we can all agree upon.

For example, when I speak of a reserve shelf of public works, I mean construction projects for which blueprints have been completed. The best estimates which I have seen total some $4,500,000,000 for local, State, and Federal projects. According to estimates made by the Federal Works Agency, that total includes about one billion in State projects blueprinted under the advance-planning program made possible by title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. As you know, title V permitted the FWA to advance $56,000,000 to State and local governments in the form of repayable loans to help these agencies prepare blueprints of worthwhile public works.

We estimate that planning carried on by States and cities without Federal assistance has added another $600,000,000 to the list of blueprinted public works. Completed blueprints for highways amount to almost $900,000,000 and bring the total State-local reserve shelf to approximately $2,500,000,000.

It is very difficult to estimate the value of blueprints completed for direct Federal civil construction, because of the nature of the work. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that expenditures for direct Federal civil construction between July 1, 1949, and June 30, 1950, may reach $2,000,000,000. While these projects are not necessarily fully blueprinted at this time, it may be claimed that lack of present plans would not interfere with the orderly construction of these projects.

On that assumption let us add the Budget Bureau's estimate to our State-local shelf, making a grand total of $4,500,000,000.

Measured against the existing need for public works that shelf looks pitifully small. The Nation could spend twice that sum on school construction or on sewers and waterworks without fully meeting our needs in either category. It would require about $8,500,000,000 to construct the hospitals we need.

Of course, none of these demands can or will be met in a single year, but they do represent goals well worth planning for.

I would like to enlarge a bit on the need for more school facilities. During the period from 1930 to 1940 the volume of school-building construction averaged less than three-fourths of the volume during the previous decade. From 1940 on, the average annual rate of public-school construction was about one-fourth the average yearly volume during the twenties.

At the same time the annual birth rate in this country climbed from a prewar average of less than 2,500,000 to an all-time high of 3,900,000 in 1947.

Our already inadequate school plant faces a period of fearful overcrowding in the years ahead.

Another way to judge the adequacy of our current reserve shelf of public works is to relate it to over-all construction prospects. The total value of new construction estimated for 1949 is $18,250,000,000—thirteen and one-quarter billions for private construction and five billions for public works. Thus the volume of projects available in the reserve is 10 percent less than the expected 1949 public construction volume.

Perhaps that sounds like a relatively small gap. So it is—provided that our economy continues to operate at current levels. I am not going to indulge in any crystal gazing, but I do want to remind you that the volume of private construction can decline very sharply and rapidly in a period of recession.

If the volume of private construction anticipated for this year were cut in half—it has fallen much more than that in previous slumps—we would need $11,600,000,000 of public construction to maintain construction employment on an even keel. Our present reserve of public works would bridge little more than one-third of that gap.

Every construction man knows that it may take from 6 months to 2 years to bring proposals for public works to the point where construction can begin. To translate a rec-

ognized need for schools and other structures into on-the-site employment is a slow process. The last depression taught us that without adequate planning it took many months to put even a handful of men to work on useful public projects.

As matters stand today we simply are not ready with plans which could both stabilize the construction cycle and help to bolster the business cycle. In general, the States and municipalities are not ready and the Federal Government is not ready.

There is at present no concerted program of advance planning of Federal projects for use as a reserve. Congress is now considering legislation which would enable the Federal Works Agency, through the Public Buildings Administration, to purchase sites for future Federal buildings and to blueprint structures to be erected on these sites. No immediate construction is contemplated and the sum proposed, $40,000,000, while a step in the right direction, will provide plans for only $450,000,000 of construction at current prices.

No doubt a good many of you are saying to yourselves "but what about the vast river basin programs and other large-scale Government undertakings." You may even have read recent discussions of these construction trends in many magazines and newspapers.

Let me quote some of these paragraphs:

"The United States Government is going easy on construction in the year beginning June 30. It will not even make a start on a backlog of $27,000,000,000 worth of work being piled up by Federal agencies.

"The Federal budget, released recently, shows that the Government has $12,800,000,000 worth of projects, already authorized in general or specifically by Congress, on which it will not start work until after June 30, 1950.

"Another $14,000,000,000 worth of work includes projects like the St. Lawrence seaway, which have been proposed but not yet authorized." * * *

Remarks like these tend to create the impression that there are vast sums ready to go into immediate construction. But actually, there is as yet no large reserve of work fully planned. No doubt the big over-all figures are more impressive and newsworthy then the smaller totals of work blueprinted—this very contrast deserves a note of warning.

We should remember too that there is a very real distinction between the amount of money which Congress may authorize and the sums which are appropriated for construction year by year.

I am very much in favor of these long-range programs, they are essential conservation projects, but I think it would be a grave error to assume that they constitute an adequate shelf of public works. Generally speaking, they will take many years to complete and usually are not located near centers of population—where unemployment strikes hardest. Because they are long-drawn-out, these projects offer far less employment at any given stage than the dollar value of the program might lead one to expect.

This is especially true of work involving power plants and power transmission lines and distribution systems—according to studies of PWA projects, direct labor costs were less than 20 percent on such construction.

For all of these reasons I think it is essential to have a much larger reserve of State and local public works than we now have. Moreover, I think such a reserve should include a large proportion of buildings, blueprinted and ready for contract letting. This type of construction can go forward on innumerable sites simultaneously and can provide the largest and best balanced volume of employment to replace a falling off in private building.

Surely we cannot afford to neglect this broad sector of the construction front. It is the construction of buildings, plus highways and sewer and water projects, rather than the huge long-range Federal projects, that afford the quickest, most effective and broadest means of construction reemployment.

Moreover, this widespread construction would set in motion long-range forces to combat recession. A demand for construction materials creates jobs in mines and forests, in factories and transportation. And this added spending power will be felt in manufacturing and retail establishments throughout the economy. Thus public works can even help to stimulate reemployment in circles entirely outside the construction and building-materials industries.

Quite apart from the possible need for public works to stabilize the construction cycle and to help bolster the business cycle, we need more advance planning merely to assure the wise selection and orderly flow of public construction. The range of needs is so great that careful selection and timing are imperative.

So, no matter what yardstick we use, or how we approach the problem, it is obvious that we need a much bigger shelf of State and local public works, blueprinted and ready for the contractor.

In my estimation, the soundest and most rapid way to build up a more adequate reserve of public works would be to reinstitute the advance-planning program. As you know, the funds provided by the program which ended on June 30, 1947, stimulated the design of projects all over the country. It was justly hailed as the most progressive step we have taken toward orderly planning of public construction.

The program was administered by the Bureau of Community Facilities, a constituent of the Federal Works Agency. In the State of Illinois, BCF approved 414 projects with an estimated total cost of about $236,000,000. More than $3,345,000 of Federal funds were loaned to plan and blueprint this construction.

Here are a few typical examples. There was an advance of $2,450 to Salem to plan a $479,000 electric-distribution system. Pontiac received $3,000 to plan sewer, water, and sanitation facilities costing $368,000; an advance of $2,655 to plan some $91,000 worth of needed educational facilities; an advance of $5,150 to Aleco covered plans for hospital and health facilities costing $320,000.

The list could be extended indefinitely and would include communities from coast to coast.

By all means let us reinstate that program immediately. With a real reserve shelf of worth-while public projects that can be started at a given signal we will indeed have a powerful lever ready at hand—a lever that cannot contribute to inflation. The very existence of this reserve would engender confidence in our economy, for our business community would know that a vast program of public works could be launched whenever the pace of industry faltered.

There is, of course, no reason why the Federal Government should not be equally farsighted. We are not, at this time, embarking on a large program of new public buildings. But the fact remains that we have not built since 1939. Meanwhile, the population has risen at an increasing rate, there have been large migrations to new areas, new urban sections have been developed, and our economy is operating at levels far above those of 1939. Many public services are not efficiently housed. Moreover, in order to transact business at all, the Government has been forced to rent considerable space.

Surely this is the time to secure sites and prepare designs for tomorrow's Federal buildings.

Here in Chicago you are building and rebuilding a great dynamic city. You have plans and projects designed to make this the finest commercial city in the world. In achieving this purpose you also will create the finest city in which to work and live.

That, fundamentally, is the purpose of all advance planning. We build to meet human needs and these needs often have their counterpart in many unsolved problems of business and industry.

I am not in any way attempting to forecast the future trend of business. I am not asking that any large-scale program of public works be started at this time. I do think that the wise use of public works could help us steer a course between inflation and deflation—if we had a large shelf of fully planned public works, and if the need should arise. No one expects to meet with an accident because he takes out accident insurance.

I wish I could say that we do have a large and adequate shelf of construction blueprints. At the risk of repetition I want to say again that large estimates of needs for public works can provide a bulwark only if blueprints are complete and ready.

Only a sound, forward-looking public-construction policy can help us meet the future with confidence. The keystone is a sound policy to blueprint in advance an adequate reserve of public works.

March 18, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address entitled "March 18, 1949," which was broadcast by me over radio station KSL on April 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1949

March 18, 1949, marks for me one of the great days in my senatorial experience. On this day we were able to report out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the Senate Calendar the Federal aid-to-education bill, known as the Thomas-Taft bill, and the child-health bill. After making these two reports I went to the Senate floor and the calendar was called to consider what is technically termed, "unobjected to bills." All bills on the calendar are read off in rapid succession. They are passed if there is no objection. But if one single Senator objects to a bill, that bill goes over to another day. On this calendar was my bill providing for the creation of the National Science Foundation. The clerk called the bill. Vice President BARKLEY asked if there was any objection to present consideration. There was no objection. When the time came for its passage Vice President BARKLEY ruled without objection the bill passed. That was a once-in-a-lifetime experience.

If these bills become law, in a generation America will be a different country. The education bill will make us a literate nation. The child-health bill will bring about youthful health corrections which will make us a healthy people. The science foundation bill will put our country on the scientific alert as strong and as great in results in peacetime as our scientific work was in wartime. Each measure is constructive and points toward the building of citizenship. The cost of the three measures will be about one-fifteenth of the amount spent on European aid this year.

This is the fourteenth year my name has been on the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

We have reported that bill to the Senate three times and it passed once in the 14 years. The House has never acted. The objections to the bill have always been technical objections based upon a rule of law. The bill was killed in the Senate once by an amendment which was craftily put in order to wean away supporters. The amendment struck at the segregated schools of the South.

In our committee talks this session one of the opponents of the bill, not a real opponent of Federal aid, but a man who wants to narrow the scope of Federal aid suggested an amendment which brought up a point which is old and fallacious—that is that the Federal Government shall help only those States that need help. The assumption being that some States are richer than others and that the Federal Government should help only the States which have not the wealth to help themselves. The Senator's amendment hit at a provision in the bill which provides that the Federal Government shall give $5 to every student registered in our public schools. The point he made was that the rich States did not need the $5 and it would be better to give more to the poorer States. President Roosevelt advanced the same argument. He pointed out that his State of New York was very rich and did not need Federal support. I replied, "Of course New York does not need Federal support, but New York is not taking care of the education of its citizens because New York has thousands of illiterates and we need to overcome illiteracy in the United States. This time, again, we had an answer for our Senator. I asked Senator TAFT, since the suggestion came from a Republican Senator, if he would answer for us. Now comes an interesting story about Utah. I knew Senator TAFT had these statistics because I had seen them, and I suggested that he read one of his letters. It was a communication telling of the school which our Army maintains in Germany to teach our soldiers how to read and write. The statistics in the letter showed that, with the exception of Utah and Vermont, there were American soldier boys from every State in the Union called to the Army school in Germany to learn to read and write. When the various Senators learned of the number of boys from their own States who were in the Army in Germany who could not read and write there were no arguments advanced against the Federal aid-to-education bill in committee, and we reported it out unanimously.

Two world wars and the administration of a selective service act in each of them has taught us more conclusively than anything else that our country's outstanding need is education and an equalization of educational opportunities. The selective service system of raising an army and navy has been spoken of as the democratic way in that every young man becomes equal to the call with all others. That is all right in theory, but in fact it has not borne out because certain standards were set up before persons became eligible to call. Because of these standards, taking the Nation as a whole, 5 out of every 10 men called were rejected for some cause or another, sometimes for health, but more often than anything else for an inability to read or write. At the first of the Second World War no illiterate was accepted. This cut into the list of persons called so strongly in some States that protests were made and the Army had to accept some men who could not read and write. These persons had to be put in Army schools at a tremendous cost to the Government compared with the cost of ordinary fourth- and fifth-grade education. Our statistics show that in those States like Utah and the other intermountain States where public education has been in existence even longer than statehood, 7 out of every 10 boys called under the Selective Service Act were accepted. That proves that education benefits health and aids in the development of the boy. But in those States where educational standards are not good only 3 out of every 10 boys called were accepted. See what this does to the people of the State which neglects universal education. The trained boys have to bear a greater proportion of the liability to serve. Under the peacetime draft that is going to be the same. The knowledge of this has brought about almost universal support for the equalization theories in the Federal aid to education bill.

The reason for the child-health measure is simple. Our American Constitution provides for the separation of church and state. Most of the State constitutions and State laws provide that public money shall not be used for nonpublic schools. In general, that is interpreted that public money shall not be used for church schools because most nonpublic schools in America are church-sponsored schools. More and more the line which marks the division between the private and the public school is being made thinner—that is made thinner by an interpretation of what constitutes aid to schools. If a State allows State-owned textbooks to be used in private schools on the theory that every boy and girl should be treated the same, is that an aid to a private school? Shall the busses which carry boys and girls to public schools pick up boys and girls going to private schools? Now the Federal Government has aided private-school education indirectly in various ways by giving what constitutes a scholarship to the individual student and letting him go to school wherever he chooses. That is the theory of my soldier-education bill. Veterans of the last war are going to schools of their own choice and many of them are in private schools. Nearly everyone says that the health of a boy and girl is vital to the whole Nation regardless of where he or she goes to school. In many States the State provides for physical examinations and nurses' aid for the pupils and it is narrowly interpreted that that activity is not aiding the school as such but it is an activity which the Government gives directly to the pupil and that pupils no matter where they go to school are entitled to this health aid. It therefore seemed reasonable and wise to the committee to lift the health provisions out of the education bill and separate the two. That has been done at least to the satisfaction of every member of the committee so that the two bills will go to the calendar together and be acted upon as closely as they can together. This action constitutes a highly constructive compromise which should command universal support.

As I said before, each measure is constructive and points toward the building of citizenship. Men's political thinking habits have caused them to think first, and without objection, of defensive measures. These defensive measures, generally, have been for the purpose of building and creating power for destruction. Men have thought less of what should be our first line of defense—the building of a strong and enlightened citizenry.

American Contributions to European Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "ECA Is Building Formidable Competitors," from the Bedford Daily Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA IS BUILDING FORMIDABLE COMPETITORS

The United States through the European Recovery Plan is now in the position of a business firm giving away its money to build up a vigorous competitor. The money sent abroad has been of invaluable assistance in rebuilding European economy, but it has also been a means of establishing peacetime competition, which has already pinched the export trade of our country.

The last report of the United Nations Economic Department shows that economic recovery has been nearly twice as fast following the second World War as it was following the first. In the autumn of 1948 world production was 32 percent higher than 1937 and 11 percent higher than 1947.

Most of this gain has been accomplished at the expense of the United States, which furnished the money and a good share of the technical advice which is fast making Europe self-supporting.

British exports in 1948 climbed to $6,600,000,000, four times the 1945 mark and the highest figure ever attained. During the year Britain sold nearly 300,000 motor vehicles abroad; 35,000 of them coming to the United States. During the same period this country sold only 430,000 vehicles overseas. It is true that the British austerity program and the idea of manufacturing for export was a very important factor in British sales; nevertheless, the British auto maker, with 10 percent of the American production, sold 40 percent of the total export business.

In the field of textile manufactures Britain's sales eclipsed American sales almost 50 percent—$1,300,000,000 against $800,000,000. Americans have long prided themselves as manufacturers of machinery and machine tools, yet in 1948 Britain sold for export $1,016,000,000 while the American makers sold only $1,670,000,000.

Since 1946 there has been a distinct drop in American exports, accompanied by a rise in the exports of other nations. In 1947 this country exported to Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay seven times as much as did Britain; but by the end of 1948 the South American nations were buying virtually the same amount of goods from both countries. In Argentine sales Britain led the United States by a substantial margin.

In the prewar years two of the toughest competitors for world trade were Germany and Japan. These defeated nations were almost entirely out of the market from 1945 to 1947, but in 1948 they started a come-back which is making itself felt all over the world.

"Made in Japan" and "Made in Germany" were very familiar marks throughout the world prior to 1939. Those same marks are showing up on store counters again. Japan gained almost a monopoly in the field of low priced vases. Christmas tree ornaments, cheap toys; and was a very important factor in such fields as electric light bulbs, rayon, and cotton textiles. Western Germany is again pushing the market in dyestuffs, chemicals, and cutlery, fields in which it has been dominant for nearly 50 years.

The military governments of Japan and Germany have been carrying out a policy of making both regions self-sufficient since the close of the war on both fronts. The American taxpayer has sent billions of dollars to those areas to accomplish this self-sufficiency; but the same taxpayer now finds he has erected competition to himself, which is being felt especially in South America and Asia.

This matter of rebuilding the world is a many-sided problem. From a military standpoint, it is certainly beneficial to us to have a strong western Europe and a stable

Japan, as these areas would necessarily be the bases for armed action against Russia, should the much-discussed war ever come. From an economic standpoint, however, the situation is quite different. The reforms, socialized medicine, and nationalization of industry in Britain have been possible only through American aid. In fact, all recovery in Europe and Japan has been American financed.

It would seem time to revise our thinking on European aid. For 2 years foodstuffs were the chief item of purchase by Europe; now the purchases are machinery and tools. Europe likes aid, just as does any other recipient. Perhaps aid is not necessary in such staggering quantities. A careful appraisal of all factors, military, and economic, should precede any further grants to our possible and potential allies. The American taxpayer is worth some consideration, too.

Address of Charles Smith, of Canadian, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma congressional delegation had the honor yesterday of being host to a group of prize-winning champions sponsored by the Oklahoma Farmers Union, and including Oklahoma boys and girls who have made outstanding records in 4–H Club work and in activities of Future Farmers of America. I was delighted indeed that among these young champions was a boy from my own congressional district, Mr. Charles Smith, of Canadian, Okla. I have the honor of inserting in the RECORD an address delivered by this 4–H champion to the Oklahoma congressional delegation in a meeting in the capitol on April 6, 1949. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, representatives of the Farmer's Union, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply indebted to the Farmer's Union for granting me the opportunity of representing the Third Congressional District of Oklahoma in presenting a talk on my organization: the 4–H Club, and the part it can play toward family type farming with home ownership as our goal.

I am also indebted to the Honorable Congressman CARL ALBERT for recommending me to this appointment also Mr. Gen Stipe, our State representative.

The 4–H Club, and the part it can play toward family type farming with home ownership as our goal. As you all know, no active 4-H Club member can vote because we are too young, we can support no lobbyist, because we don't pay dues. The 4–H has done very well without this. We have forced recognition by our achievements, that is: we have always been recognized, but not always fully recognized, as an important farm organization. Because of this fact, I believe that we need a parent organization such as the Farmers Union, to back us.

I want to quote our 4–H citizenship pledge: "We individually and collectively pledge our efforts from day to day to fight for the ideals of this Nation.

"We will never allow tyranny and injustice to become enthroned in this, our country, through indifference to our duties as citizens.

"We will strive for intellectual honesty and exercise it through our power of franchise. We will obey the laws of our land and endeavor increasingly to quicken the sense of public duty among our fellow men.

"We will strive for individual improvement and for social betterment. We will devote our talents to the enrichment of our homes and our communities in relation to their material, social, and spiritual needs.

"We will endeavor to transmit this Nation to posterity not merely as we found it, but freer, happier, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

You can easily see from this, that the 4–H Club endeavors to make good citizens of its members.

You might say, that it is a very nice pledge, but do you carry it out?

Let me explain what the 4–H Club has done and is doing, and then draw your own conclusions.

4–H Club work for rural boys and girls is a part of the National Agricultural Extension system which reaches every State in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. It is also being developed in many other countries.

In Oklahoma there are 61,773 Club members and they have completed 200,808 projects during the last year. 4–H work is organized on a community basis. Boys and girls meet together in regular 4–H Club meetings and jointly plan and conduct their work; in fact there are 52 clubs in our county alone.

There is a project for every boy and girl, whatever they are interested in, from leadership, arts and crafts, to livestock, forestry and crops.

The significant feature of 4–H Club work is that club members "Learn to do by doing." They are supervised by the county extension agent and they learn many things while they are young that otherwise they would have to learn when they were older in the university of hard knocks. 4–H Club work becomes part of the lives of rural young people while their minds are still plastic; gives them guidance when they need it; teaches them some of the inspiring things in agriculture and home life and gives them a vision of its possibilities as a life work.

4–H Club work demonstrates the best practices in agriculture and home economics to the communities and counties by means of original projects carried on by the members, by their exhibits, fairs, and public demonstrations. Also, 4–H projects are lifting, or helping to lift the mortgages on farms all over America, and that is an end in itself.

4–H Club work develops rural leadership, community pride and spirit. It builds young men and women who know how to conduct meetings, organize community projects, and who are trained to conserve the soil, judge livestock, and products of the farm and home, and to use the electrical power furnished by rural electrification. It emphasizes the home and brings parents and children increasingly together in a common interest.

4–H Club work develops self-reliance, ambition, and aggressiveness. It applies business methods to farming and promotes industry and thrift.

It fosters individual ownership, a love of nature, and of the open country. Through competition it brings out the best efforts and thought, and gives rural boys and girls an opportunity to earn money and acquire property.

4–H Club work shows boys and girls how to do the wholesome, helpful things and to play the game fairly.

Above all, it develops the highest type of manhood, womanhood, and American citizenship. It develops the farm's best crop, its boys and girls into the men and women of tomorrow. In fact I can find no record where any active 4–H member has ever been in any State institution.

The 4–H Club generally works through the local school and too often it is not given much time. With this handicap the 4–H has done an excellent job, but with more time and help from the teachers and the school we could do even more. We of the 4–H Club heartily endorse the bill offering half-pay to any teacher, who will lead a 4–H Club. This will force each school, which accepts it, to give the 4–H Club full recognition and a time to hold meetings. It will cause the leader to give more time and thought to the 4–H.

I leave with the question: Is the 4–H Club worth it?

Thank you.

Tributes to Hon. Arthur Capper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, Arthur Capper retired from the United States Senate after 30 years of distinguished service in that body, a period of service equalled by no other Kansan and by few in the history of our Republic. In addition, he served the State of Kansas most acceptably as its Governor for the 4 years immediately preceding his election to the Senate.

But Senator Capper's 34 years in public office is only a part of his public service. For many years prior to his election as Governor in 1914 Arthur Capper had been a leading citizen of our State, the publisher of great and influential newspaper and of farm publications with a national circulation and millions of readers. He was known for his philanthropy as exemplified in the Capper Crippled Children Foundation and the Capper Boys and Girls Clubs which antedated our splendid 4–H Clubs of today.

Senator Capper's career in and out of Congress has meant much to the State and Nation. He has been an inspiration to the youth of our State. Credit is due to him more than any other person for the fact that politics in Kansas throughout the years has been clean. His whole career has been an exemplification of public service on the highest possible plane.

Arthur Capper will be remembered long in Kansas and in the Nation as a constructive statesman. Some of the most important legislation of the last 30 years bears his name. He will be remembered as an outstanding Governor. But above and beyond that, he will be remembered by thousands and thousands of friends of high and low station for his kindly and helpful spirit. As one of these thousands, I am deeply grateful to Arthur Capper for many personal kindnesses. I shall never forget them.

On January 8, shortly before Senator Capper's return to Kansas, the Kansas delegation in Congress attended a breakfast in his honor. At that time all of the Members of the delegation in the House and Senate expressed their appreciation of Senator Capper's distinguished service and wished for him many years of

health and happiness as Kansas' first citizen.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith copies of the tributes which were paid to Senator Capper at this breakfast:

Senator REED. I have known Arthur Capper a long time. Politically, my first contact with him was when he was a candidate for election by the legislature for the office of State printer. That was around 1899.

He was one of the leading Bull Moosers in Kansas. He and his publications, especially the Topeka Capital, were very effective in the issues of that period. Others who helped with their newspapers were Henry J. Allen, of the Ottawa Herald, and later the Wichita Beacon; William Allen White, of the Emporia Gazette; and Victor Murdock, of the Wichita Eagle. I was still in the postal service, but my newspaper, the Parsons Sun, cooperated with the others.

Senator Capper was the Republican nominee for Governor in 1912. On the face of the returns he was defeated by the Democratic candidate, George Hodges, of Olathe, by 29 votes. Although urged by many to ask for a recount, Arthur Capper refused.

He was again the Republican nominee for Governor in 1914 and was elected by a large majority. He was reelected in 1916 at a time when the Democratic candidate for President carried Kansas.

He was nominated and elected to the United States Senate in 1918. He ran in the ablest field of candidates ever involved in a single campaign. His competitors were former Governor Stubbs, former Senator Bristow, and former Member of Congress Charles F. Scott, of Iola.

His record of 4 years as Governor and 30 years in the Senate is the outstanding career of any public man ever serving the State of Kansas. It will probably stand as the record for the next 100 years.

The strongest characteristics of Senator Capper are his kindliness and his friendliness. In the whole history of Kansas, there is no man who has commanded the respect and affection of the people of Kansas for so long a consecutive period as Arthur Capper. His service to the farmers of Kansas and to the United States has been given suitable recognition by Nation-wide farm organizations. Our best wishes for his health and happiness go with him through the years yet to come. We wish for him the best that is possible.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to be at this breakfast with you, to honor our distinguished senior Senator from Kansas who is returning to his home in Topeka after a long and distinguished career, not only in the United States Senate but in our home State of Kansas.

I appreciate the opportunity of paying my respects to a man who is revered and respected for having given the major portion of his life to rendering a fine public service.

I am coming to the United States Senate as his successor and I recognize that he is leaving an awfully big pair of shoes for me to step into. He leaves an enviable record, not only for me but for any man serving in the United States Senate, to follow; and I hope that I can live up to it, to a degree at least, as creditably, as conscientiously, and as constructively as he has done. His record and his life will be an inspiration for me to emulate in the discharge of my responsibilities here.

As he returns to our home State I wish him Godspeed, and a happy and contented life.

Representative REES. Senator Capper leaves the Congress with a great record of 30 years' service—a record of which he or anyone else may well be proud. He has rendered outstanding service to the great State of Kansas as well as to the Nation.

Senator Capper has always been alert to the views and wishes of his constituents. No request has been too large or too trivial but that it received the attention to which it was entitled.

Many of the measures approved by Congress and enacted into law for the benefit of agriculture during the years of his service were sponsored by Senator Capper.

Senator Capper's activities on behalf of the boys and girls of his home State are well known.

Senator Capper was always considerate of his colleagues in the House of Representatives from his State of Kansas. His advice and his assistance were always at the disposal of his colleagues from Kansas. I want to acknowledge a debt of personal gratitude by reason of the kind treatment and the help I have received from Senator Capper during the time I have served as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Senator Capper has an interesting personality. During the long years of service he acquired a warm friendship among the Members of the Senate and the House. It is an enviable sort of friendship, in that Senator Capper had no enemies on either end of the Capitol or on either side of the aisle. He carries no grudges and respects everyone for his honesty and integrity.

Few men in public life have such great sense of justice as that of Senator Capper. He leaves an indelible imprint upon the records of the Congress and upon the history of this country that contributes to the betterment of our country and of mankind.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Senator Capper, I feel that CLIFF HOPE has pointed out that the one great characteristic that has endeared you to so many. It is your spirit of kindly helpfulness.

I remember quite distinctly when I came here 5 years ago how we met, how you put your arms across my shoulder and told me to let you know if there was any way you or your office could help.

The Capitol will never be quite the same without you. We'll miss your pleasant, gracious smile—your helping hand, your kind heart. And, as you go back to Topeka you'll leave a spot here no one can ever fill. And though you are there at home, you'll also be occupying a deep and a warm spot in our hearts and memories—pleasant memories of a great man, a great Kansan, a great public servant who has and deserves the good will of the State and the Nation.

Good luck and best wishes.

Representative COLE. The career of Senator Capper is to me a symbol of service. His public life has been dedicated to serve the people of his State and of his country. The underprivileged, the weak, the crippled, the little people have been recipients of his special interest and attention.

He is noted for his able advocacy of agriculture and concern with foreign affairs. But his true character shines in the symbol of service. His unobtrusive, yet persistent and even stubborn demands that the people be heard and their claims be given fair consideration have endeared him to the people of Kansas and the Nation.

Instead of inquiring about your health, the Senator asks, "What can I do for you?" No mere formal greeting, it is an expression of a fundamental and deep-seated desire to help his fellow man.

Kansas and America are proud of their distinguished son. He leaves the Halls of Congress with our best wishes, highest esteem and affection.

Representative MEYER. I am very happy to join with my congressional colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished and beloved Senator Capper. Anything I might say on this occasion, no matter how strong my expressions might be, would be an understatement of the regard and affection we entertain for him.

I do want to say to you, Senator, in a very personal way, that I shall always cherish the many evidences that I have had of your fine friendship, and I shall always have before me as a beacon light the precepts of your long, honorable, and distinguished record in the service of our State and our Nation.

I extend to you, sir, a warm handclasp of good will, coupled with the earnest hope that, in your return to private life, there will be many years of rich contentment before you.

Representative SMITH. Arthur Capper—the most famous name in Kansas today. He is probably known by more people in his native State than any other living Kansan. For the last 40 years of Kansas history he has been an outstanding citizen. Today he is the patriarch of all Kansas, a man who made an outstanding success in the field of journalism, then 30 years in the United States Senate where he so distinguished himself as to be an outstanding Member.

Arthur Capper always knew what the people in Kansas were thinking. He wanted to interpret their thinking to the country at large. He was able to do this because he was a native Kansan of pioneer days. So it was easy for him to understand the forces that make public opinion in Kansas.

Kansas has lost an able representative in the Senate. The country at large has lost a great humanitarian. Arthur Capper will always be exalted in the eyes of the people of Kansas.

This quotation from the Bible typifies Arthur Capper: "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."

Socialized Medicine in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A British Doctor Discusses Socialized Medicine," from the Bedford Daily Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH DOCTOR DISCUSSES SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Recently a member of the staff of the Culver Hospital in Crawfordsville, Ind., wrote to a British physician inquiring about effects of the National Health Service (NHS) which has been in operation in Britain since July 5. The reply has particular interest in this country now in view of the proposal of President Truman to enact a somewhat similar program in the United States. Excerpts from the letter follow:

"In point of fact the ordinary working-class patient is less well off than he was be-

fore the scheme started. You will appreciate that the NHS has brought no more doctors, no more nurses, no more hospital beds, and indeed, no more facilities of any kind into service with the result that there are now infinitely more people competing for the same amount of facilities because people who formerly paid for their attention now seek it under the scheme.

"The ordinary family doctor has queues outside what you call his office—most of the people in the queue are either wanting some sort of form signed or else they are coming with some very trivial ailment with which they would formerly have dealt quite effectively with themselves—for example, Junior with a sniveling cold in the head. A proportion of the people in the queue will, however, have some genuine, and perhaps serious, complaint but the doctor will find it difficult or impossible to give the necessary time to this patient and there is, of course, a grave danger that in the rush he may miss things.

"Dentistry has developed into an absolute racket. It has been said we have become a nation of weeping and wailing and national teeth.

"As is inevitable under any socialist scheme, there is no reward for skill, energy, and enterprise—payment is on a flat rate and the dullard and the laggard get the same scale or remuneration as the prodigy. The general practitioners are already worked to death and they have not so far had any epidemic to deal with—the Lord only knows what will happen if and when, for instance, a severe influenza epidemic comes along. My general practitioner friends are now, without exception, unhappy men—pride in their job is waning and, most significant sign of all, I know of none who are bringing up their sons to follow in father's footsteps, as happened so very often in the past.

"The result of this will be, I am sure, that there will be an entirely different type of man going in for medicine. Our future doctors will be small-minded little men with civil-service mentalities and their main concern will be keeping on the right side of their administration superiors, the correct filling of forms, watching the clock, and passing the buck.

"Hospital facilities have been depleted by the fact that there are more people sharing the same sized cake.

"Any statements you may have heard that there has been a change of attitude toward the NHS by the medical profession of this country are deliberate falsehoods, and have probably been issued by the propaganda departments of your left-wing organizations.

"H. A. H. HARRIS, F. R. C. S.

"LONDON, ENGLAND."

Proposed Changes in the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the social-security program to our citizens cannot be overemphasized. This matter concerns all of us, as old age brings with it the fear of financial insecurity. I believe that the American people are not so desirous of cradle-to-the-grave security as they are for adequate coverage and benefits to the elderly and to survivors of employed beneficiaries which will allow the maintenance of the necessities of life.

H. R. 2893, while not perfect in its provisions, does seek to apply the promises in the platforms of both the Republican and Democrat parties as expressed at the national conventions last summer.

The newspapers in the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut have cooperated with me in publishing a questionnaire I developed to sound out the sentiment of my constituents on this legislation. The results are being received daily and I hope, in the near future, to make them public.

The American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service, in the issue of April 5, contains the following explanation which partially describes contemplated changes in the present act:

HIGHER RETIREMENT AND SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

Monthly benefits would be raised to take account of the increase in wage scales and living costs, through changes in the benefit formula and in the wage base used in the computation.

The average monthly wage would be based on the 5 consecutive years of highest earnings and would therefore reflect earnings in a worker's most productive years. Earnings up to $4,800 a year (now only $3,000) would be counted.

Under the new formula, the basic benefit amounts to 50 percent of the first $75 of the average wage (instead of 40 percent of the first $50) plus 15 percent of the remainder up to a total credited amount of $400 (instead of 10 percent up to a total of $250). To this basic amount, are applied factors which differentiate between workers with steady coverage and those who qualify on the basis of in-and-out coverage, and which produce higher benefits for long-term contributors.

The minimum primary benefit for an individual is raised from $10 to $25 and the dollar maximum is increased from $85 to $150. The bill would also increase the proportion of the primary benefit which is payable to survivor children and to the aged parents of a deceased worker, and would remove the maximum which now holds family benefits to not more than twice the primary benefit.

The amount which a beneficiary may earn in a month and still draw benefits is raised from $14.99 to $50.

Benefits for persons already on the rolls would be raised to a level which reflects these liberalizations and takes account of the upward trend of wages since the enactment of the original program.

ADDITIONAL TYPES OF BENEFITS

The proposed program provides comprehensive protection against the risks of sickness and extended disability. Benefits, comparable to those for old-age retirement, would be payable to disabled workers and their families when the insured individual is unable to engage in any substantially gainful work. Weekly benefits to compensate the loss of wages during the short spells of sickness and during the early stages of extended disability are provided if the worker is unable to perform his most recent, customary, or reasonably similar job; weekly maternity benefits are also provided. Medical, surgical, training, and other rehabilitation services are to be provided to persons eligible for disability benefits. (Self-employed persons and Federal civilian employees would not be covered for sickness insurance, nor would this type of benefit be payable to members of the armed forces while they are in service.)

Weekly disability benefit amounts for a worker without dependents approximate 50 percent of his weekly wage. There is a minimum of $8 and a maximum of $30. Benefits are increased if he has dependents. The maximum weekly benefit for a worker with three dependents and at the highest wage level on which benefits are computed is $45. The maximum duration is 26 weeks.

Other new benefits are those payable at age 65 to the disabled husband of a woman primary beneficiary and to the disabled widower of a woman who was insured when she died. Provision is made for continuing the payment of a disabled child's benefit after treatment of age 18.

Under the revised provisions a lump-sum death benefit would be provided whether or not monthly benefits are payable in the month of the worker's death.

Illustrative monthly benefits under present law and under provisions of H. R. 2893 [1]

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR AGE (AND FOR EXTENDED DISABILITY UNDER THE BILL)

Average monthly wage	Insured person		Insured person and wife		Insured person, wife, and 1 child		Insured person, wife, and 2 children	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
$100	$27.50	$45.40	$41.25	$68.10	$55.00	$80.00	$55.00	$80.00
$200	38.50	61.90	57.75	92.90	77.00	123.90	77.00	150.00
$300 [2]	44.00	78.40	66.00	117.60	85.00	150.00	85.00	150.00
$400 [2]	44.00	84.90	66.00	142.40	85.00	150.00	85.00	150.00

MONTHLY SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Average monthly wage	Widow		Widow and 1 child		Widow and 2 children		Widow and 3 children	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
$100	$20.63	$34.10	$34.38	$68.20	$48.13	$80.00	$55.00	$80.00
$200	28.88	46.50	48.13	93.00	67.38	123.90	77.00	150.00
$300 [2]	33.00	58.80	55.00	117.60	77.00	150.00	85.00	150.00
$400 [2]	33.00	71.20	55.00	142.40	77.00	150.00	85.00	150.00

[1] Assuming 10 years of coverage in an elapsed period of 10 years. No allowance is made for the fact that the average monthly wage, as defined in the bill, would ordinarily be higher than under the present act. The fact that a woman worker or the wife of a retired worker would be eligible for benefits at 60 rather than 65 as at present is in most cases equivalent to a further increase in benefit amounts.

[2] Maximum average monthly wage used in computing benefits under present law is $250.

Yalta and the Communists' Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the crime that was committed at Yalta has a direct connection with the objectives of the Communist Party, and goes back to September 1, 1928. I am inserting as part of my remarks a memo addressed to all Members of the Eighty-first Congress by Alfred Kohlberg, of New York City. It is illuminating and Mr. Kohlberg raises some very interesting questions:

To the Members of the Eighty-first Congress:

Gentlemen, the New York Times, February 20, 1949, said of Yalta: "The talk was of peace for 50 years. None of the Yalta negotiators could have believed that the cold war would be on in 3 years."

John Foster Dulles said, in Colliers, March 12, 1949: "It was like a nightmare when, at the end of the most awful of all wars, we suddenly awoke to learn that a great partner in victory was actively plotting against the freedoms that we thought we had been fighting for together."

On April 4, 1945, I sent each Member of Congress a copy of the enclosed dream of Earl Browder, written in January 1945, the month before Yalta. Each March since then I have duplicated it to each Member of the House and Senate.

Earl Browder's dream is based mainly on two official Comintern documents, both unanimously adopted by the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. Both were adopted the same day, September 1, 1928. The Library of Congress has both available for you.

Neither Mr. Dulles, nor any of the other great statesmen who represented us at Yalta had ever read these documents. For that reason, they have nightmares now, instead of prophetic dreams at the right time.

This administration scuttled the working United Nations (which was formed by the Declaration of Washington, January 1, 1942, with its operating Joint Chiefs of Staff, minus Russia), in favor of a new United Nations, still-born via the veto, and with an abortive Chiefs of Staff, including Russia.

Having replaced strength with weakness it has produced one improvised cure-all after another, each guaranteed to prevent world war III. In chronological order, these were UNRRA; Bretton Woods; the UN; Potsdam; the British loan of $3,750,000,000; post-UNRRA; the Italian, Rumanian, Bulgarian peace treaties; the Truman doctrine; the Marshall plan; and now, the Atlantic Pact.

Each had its uses, but meantime Americans may properly ask:

1. Who ordered the destruction of untold billions worth of airplanes, tanks, antitank guns, artillery, antiaircraft guns and ammunition in Europe after the war? Was it done deliberately to leave western Europe militarily naked before the Russian bear?

2. Who ordered destruction and/or dumping in the Pacific lagoons of $17,000,000,000 of ammunition? And is it true that it is now being salvaged for scrap?

3. Who ordered destruction of more than $1,000,000,000 of arms, ammunition, and airplanes in India after the war? Was it to keep China from being properly armed?

4. Who ordered destructions of surrendered German and Japanese arms for which China had asked?

Is it not the same administration and same State Department that now want billions to replace in Europe the very arms they ordered destroyed there in 1945–46?

And is it not the same State Department that now does not want to arm Nationalist China, but advises that we let the Red dust settle in China and all east Asia in the hope that Mao Tse-tung will turn out to be a Chinese Tito?

Unless the National Government of China is a much stronger reed than our State Department believes, will not all east Asia be Communist long before 1951, the year Browder's dream calls for Soviet conquest of western Europe and Britain? That would be 1 year before completion of the Marshall plan or the arming of the Atlantic allies, and a year after Pacific Fleet Admiral Ramsey foresees our withdrawal from Asiatic waters.

Secretary of State Acheson and White House Secretary for Foreign Affairs Niles and other makers of our bipartisan no-foreign policy (to quote Alf Landon) brag that they have never read the Program of the Communist International or the Resolutions on the Colonies and Semi-Colonies—the two documents referred to above. No wonder we have gone from the exultation of VE- and VJ-day to the confusions of today, and seem headed for the defeats of 1951 and the conquest of 1963 predicted in Earl Browder's dream.

Just to be fair, I must also ask: Where are the Republican leaders who read these two documents, knew what was coming, and spoke up?

Very truly yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

Comparison of Potential Voters and Actual Votes Cast in 1944 and 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have had prepared a tabulation of the potential voters and a comparison made with the number of votes cast in 1944 and 1948. Opposite this is shown the percentage voting in both years, followed by the number who did not vote.

An examination of these figures reveals many interesting facts, but the most important is the number of people who were eligible in November 1948, but did not vote. No doubt there are as many reasons for that as there are individuals. Whatever the reasons may be, the American people should be aroused to the seriousness of the situation, for if this apathy continues, it might well be the underlying cause that could destroy our representative form of government.

I particularly call attention to column 3 and ask the Senate to note the decreased percentage of those voting in most States in the last election.

The figures in column 1 show an increase of 13,400,000 potential voters; but in spite of this 13,400,000 increase, there were less than 1,000,000 additional votes in 1948 than in 1944.

The figures are, to me, most astounding, for they show that 45,000,000 persons out of approximately 93,000,000 eligibles did not vote. I think it is a reflection upon everyone in political life that we have so utterly failed to capture the imagination of the American people. Accordingly, I have had this tabulation prepared. I am not even blaming the political machines, because I think in the first instance bringing home to the people of the country the profound issues with which we are faced is the responsibility of those of us who are in public life. Of course, whatever reflection this situation may involve upon our respective political machines can be determined.

I point out, in contrast, that while our people were casting slightly more than 50 percent of the potential vote in this country, Italy, which we have thought was not quite so familiar with the meaning of democracy, in its great election last spring cast 89 percent of its potential total vote. That is certainly a tribute to the interest which has been aroused in Italy.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED CIVILIAN POPULATION OF VOTING AGE AND VOTE CAST FOR PRESIDENT, 1944 AND 1948

NOTE.—Voting age for the purpose of this table means all those 21 years and over (except Georgia where the voting age is 18), and it includes about 2,000,000 aliens (estimate by Census Bureau), and also undetermined number of persons in the District of Columbia who do not have voting residence in any State. It excludes, however, members of the armed forces both here and abroad.

EXPLANATION

Opposite the name of your State you will find—

1. The first column marked "Potential voting population" means those 21 years of age and over for 1948 and 1944. By subtracting we arrive at the population increase between 1944 and 1948.

2. The figures in the second column, "Total vote cast," are for all candidates. By subtracting we arrive at the increased or decreased number of votes cast in 1948. In most States the number of people voting was greater in 1948 than in 1944.

3. The third column marked "Percentage voting" is the percentage of potential voting population as listed in the first column. The percentage shows a decrease for 1948 in all States except Arizona, Nevada, and the Southern States. (This is the important column—it is the percentages that count.)

4. In the fourth column, the figures given are for the number of eligibles not voting.

	Potential voting population	Total vote cast	Percentage voting	Not voting
United States:				
1948	93,704,000	48,833,680	52.0	44,870,320
1944	80,298,000	47,976,263	59.7	32,321,737
	13,406,000	857,417	−7.7	12,548,583
Alabama:				
1948	1,564,000	214,980	13.74	1,349,020
1944	1,416,000	244,743	17.3	1,171,257
	148,000	−29,763	−3.56	
Arizona:				
1948	374,000	177,065	47.3	196,935
1944	300,000	137,634	45.9	162,366
	74,000	39,431	1.4	

	Potential voting population	Total vote cast	Percentage voting	Not voting
Arkansas:				
1948	1,100,000	242,475	22.0	857,525
1944	978,000	212,956	21.8	765,044
	122,000	29,519	.2	
California:				
1948	6,714,000	4,021,538	59.9	2,692,462
1944	5,481,000	3,520,875	64.2	1,960,125
	1,233,000	500,663	−4.3	
Colorado:				
1948	721,000	515,237	71.4	205,763
1944	641,000	505,039	78.8	135,961
	80,000	10,198	−7.4	
Connecticut:				
1948	1,376,000	883,518	64.0	492,482
1944	1,163,000	831,990	71.8	331,010
	213,000	51,528	−7.8	
Delaware:				
1948	196,000	139,073	70.9	56,927
1944	174,000	125,361	72.0	48,639
	22,000	13,712	−1.1	
Florida:				
1948	1,465,000	577,643	39.4	887,357
1944	1,213,000	482,592	39.8	730,408
	252,000	95,051	−.4	
Georgia:				
1948	1,917,000	418,760	21.8	1,498,240
1944	1,744,000	328,109	18.8	1,415,891
	173,000	90,651	3.0	
Idaho:				
1948	318,000	214,816	67.6	103,184
1944	288,000	208,321	72.3	79,679
	30,000	6,495	−4.7	
Illinois:				
1948	5,896,000	3,984,000	67.5	1,912,000
1944	4,998,000	4,036,061	80.7	961,939
	898,000	−52,061	−13.2	
Indiana:				
1948	2,557,000	1,656,000	64.7	901,000
1944	2,210,000	1,672,091	75.2	537,909
	347,000	−16,091	−10.5	
Iowa:				
1948	1,718,000	1,038,264	60.0	679,736
1944	1,506,000	1,052,599	69.9	453,401
	212,000	−14,335	−9.9	
Kansas:				
1948	1,294,000	788,819	61.0	505,181
1944	1,109,000	733,776	66.2	375,224
	185,000	55,043	−5.2	
Kentucky:				
1948	1,618,000	822,658	50.8	795,342
1944	1,427,000	867,921	60.8	559,079
	191,000	−45,263	−10.0	
Louisiana:				
1948	1,495,000	416,326	27.7	1,078,674
1944	1,299,000	349,383	26.9	949,617
	196,000	66,943	.8	
Maine:				
1948	568,000	264,787	46.6	303,213
1944	482,000	296,400	61.5	185,600
	86,000	−31,613	−14.9	
Maryland:				
1948	1,363,000	596,000	43.0	767,000
1944	1,195,000	608,439	50.9	586,561
	168,000	−12,439	−7.9	
Massachusetts:				
1948	3,228,000	2,155,347	66.77	1,072,653
1944	2,720,000	1,960,665	72.00	759,335
	508,000	194,682	−5.23	
Michigan:				
1948	3,981,000	2,109,609	52.99	1,871,391
1944	3,372,000	2,205,223	65.10	1,166,777
	609,000	−95,614	−12.11	
Minnesota:				
1948	1,906,000	1,212,226	63.6	693,774
1944	1,662,000	1,125,529	67.7	536,471
	244,000	86,697	−4.1	
Mississippi:				
1948	1,155,000	192,190	16.6	962,810
1944	1,090,000	180,080	16.5	909,920
	65,000	12,110	.1	
Missouri:				
1948	2,623,000	1,578,628	60.0	1,044,372
1944	2,323,000	1,571,677	67.7	751,323
	300,000	6,951	−7.7	
Montana:				
1948	319,000	224,278	70.3	94,722
1944	277,000	207,355	75.0	69,645
	42,000	16,923	−4.7	
Nebraska:				
1948	846,000	488,939	57.7	357,061
1944	754,000	563,126	74.7	190,874
	92,000	74,187	−17.0	
Nevada:				
1948	90,000	62,117	69.0	28,000
1944	79,000	54,234	68.6	24,766
	11,000	7,883	.4	
New Hampshire:				
1948	365,000	231,440	63.4	133,560
1944	299,000	229,625	76.7	69,375
	66,000	1,815	−13.3	
New Jersey:				
1948	3,255,000	1,949,555	59.9	1,305,445
1944	2,760,000	1,963,761	71.1	796,239
	495,000	−14,206	−11.2	
New Mexico:				
1948	295,000	185,767	63.0	109,233
1944	241,000	152,225	63.1	88,775
	54,000	33,542	−.1	
New York:				
1948	10,035,000	6,274,527	62.5	3,760,473
1944	8,672,000	6,316,790	72.8	2,355,210
	1,363,000	−42,263	−10.3	
North Carolina:				
1948	2,049,000	791,209	38.6	1,257,791
1944	1,816,000	790,554	43.5	1,025,446
	233,000	655	−4.9	
North Dakota:				
1948	332,000	220,716	66.5	111,284
1944	290,000	220,171	76.0	70,000
	42,000	545	−9.5	
Ohio:				
1948	5,189,000	2,936,071	56.5	2,252,929
1944	4,477,000	3,153,056	70.4	1,324,000
	712,000	−216,985	−13.9	
Oklahoma:				
1948	1,438,000	721,599	50.0	716,401
1944	1,124,000	722,636	64.3	401,364
	314,000	−1,037	−14.3	
Oregon:				
1948	1,109,000	524,080	47.0	584,920
1944	857,000	480,147	56.0	377,000
	252,000	43,933	−9.0	
Pennsylvania:				
1948	7,111,000	3,735,149	52.5	3,375,851
1944	5,987,000	3,794,793	63.3	2,193,000
	1,124,000	−59,644	−10.8	
Rhode Island:				
1948	503,000	326,098	64.8	176,902
1944	451,000	299,276	66.3	152,000
	52,000	26,822	−1.5	
South Carolina:				
1948	1,029,000	142,571	13.85	886,429
1944	928,000	103,375	11.1	825,000
	101,000	39,196	2.75	
South Dakota:				
1948	387,000	250,105	64.6	136,895
1944	306,000	232,076	76.0	74,000
	81,000	18,029	−11.4	
Tennessee:				
1948	1,840,000	550,283	30.0	1,289,717
1944	1,600,000	510,692	31.9	1,090,000
	240,000	39,591	−1.9	
Texas:				
1948	4,311,000	1,147,245	26.6	3,163,755
1944	3,691,000	1,150,326	31.2	2,541,000
	620,000	−3,081	−4.6	
Utah:				
1948	370,000	276,305	74.6	93,695
1944	313,000	248,319	79.3	65,000
	57,000	27,986	−4.7	
Vermont:				
1948	238,000	123,382	51.8	114,618
1944	195,000	125,361	64.3	70,000
	43,000	−1,979	−12.5	
Virginia:				
1948	1,772,000	419,256	23.66	1,352,744
1944	1,541,000	388,485	25.20	1,153,000
	231,000	30,771	−1.54	
Washington:				
1948	1,649,000	905,000	54.9	744,000
1944	1,326,000	856,328	64.6	470,000
	323,000	48,672	−9.7	
West Virginia:				
1948	1,103,000	748,750	67.8	354,250
1944	939,000	715,596	76.2	224,000
	164,000	33,154	−8.4	
Wisconsin:				
1948	2,147,000	1,276,800	59.0	870,200
1944	1,856,000	1,339,152	72.1	520,000
	291,000	−62,352	−13.1	
Wyoming:				
1948	169,000	101,425	60.0	67,575
1944	148,000	101,340	68.5	47,000
	21,000	85	−8.5	

ECA—What We Can Really Afford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address entitled "ECA—What We Can Really Afford" made by me over five stations in my district:

Greetings to my friends in Kansas. I am happy to be starting this series of radio talks because it gives me an additional means of talking over Washington events with you.

The spending spree is still going on. The Senate has about finished debate on the Economic Cooperation Administration—commonly called the ECA and, in spite of a vigorous fight by some Republicans who want to know where the money is coming from to pay all the bills, ECA was voted the full amount of over $5,000,000,000 for the coming year. The cry is that we must support the bipartisan foreign policy. I believe that we should present a united front in foreign policy but I do not believe that we should vote billions of dollars out of your

pockets and mine without knowing something about how that money is to be spent. Foreign policy is not a sacred cow like those of India. It must and should be a policy which is thoroughly debated and studied from all angles.

This Marshall plan or ECA, according to Administrator Paul G. Hoffman, is costing every man, woman, and child in the United States $35 apiece. And Mr. Hoffman states that we are not going to get any of it back. That cost is for the first year only. For a family of man and wife and one child, this is more than $100, and I think we should look into this spending, for it is going to cost us a great deal more before we are through with it. The administration says we can't cut any of the appropriations or we will destroy the whole program. Well, let's look into that statement a little more closely.

It's true, no doubt, that ECA made it possible for the European people to get back on their feet. It fed them and gave them tools to work with. When people are fed and when they have work to do that earns them money, they are not so interested in communism. If ECA funds were used to feed hungry people to the extent of our ability to do so, and if money were given or loaned them so that they are able to rehabilitate themselves industrially, I'd say that was a fine thing. But it goes much further than that. We are giving them our precious raw materials, which they, in turn, can fabricate and turn over to Russia and her satellite countries. The administration, on one hand, is fighting communism through ECA and the Atlantic Pact, and, on the other hand, providing some of the very sinews of war by not having a checkrein on where that aid is going.

Several weeks ago the British representative at the United Nations stated that England had now recovered the use of her prewar economic legs and would be able to go forward with the expansion of her home plans. Everybody knows that England has a totally socialistic form of government and has nationalized everything from the coal and transportation industries to banks. She is now in the process of nationalizing the strongest industry she has—the steel industry. Even the London Economist, one of England's big weekly magazines, states that the nationalizing of the steel industry is a political commitment and not an economic necessity.

And so our ECA or Marshall-plan money, which all of us pay out in the form of taxes, is to be used to further social experimentation in England. This statement created such a furor that the British Ambassador and the Prime Minister of Great Britain immediately issued statements saying that it wasn't so—that recovery was based on further ECA money. The wires got crossed somewhere. Well, what are the true facts? Just last week the British treasury announced that Great Britain ended its fiscal year of 1948 with a surplus of over $3,000,000,000. On the same day that that announcement appeared, the president of the Board of Trade in England announced in the House of Commons that Britain is loaning Russia $36,000,000 to buy supplies from them. And some of the items might be used in the making of war goods. These items England is exporting to Russia and loaning her the money with which to buy them include graphite, mica, various other minerals, precision machinery, industrial diamonds, some scientific apparatus, various chemicals, and other war potentials.

Can we really afford to pay over $35 a year for every man, woman, and child so that another country can have a budget surplus and loan money to Russia to pay for goods that might be turned against us?

Like Calvin Coolidge's preacher who was "agin" sin, I'm "agin" giving ECA a blank check with no questions asked. I want to know what is being done with our money. Since the President has stated that unless taxes are raised we face a budget deficit here while England, only one of the countries to whom we are giving money and goods, not only boasts of a surplus but is loaning money to Russia, I want to see why we can't shave at least a little of that cost.

All of you know when you paid your income taxes on March 15 that you had a tax reduction. A Republican Congress gave you that tax reduction, predicated on the fact that Government expenditures could and should be reduced. And yet today, President Truman is still insisting that taxes must be raised this year by $4,000,000,000. ECA is going to cost us over 5 billion this year—with no questions asked and no strings attached if the present administration has its way.

None of you can pay your bills and keep going financially if you constantly overspend your income. The same thing is true of the Government of the United States. The only way to get out of debt is to begin to cut expenditures and live within our income. If we do not make some judicious cuts in ECA spending, how in heaven's name can we begin to cut anywhere?

Recently a delegation of the Verdigris River Flood Control Association journeyed to Washington and appeared with me before the Committee on Appropriations to urge an appropriation of $1,000,000 to start construction of the Toronto Dam and Reservoir, so imperatively needed because of the devastating floods we experience each year right here at home. The committee gave us an attentive hearing but turned down our request and others of like nature in other parts of the country. The committee also cut the President's budget requests for rivers and harbors and flood control by 15 percent, stating that its desire was to appropriate the minimum amount required to carry forward any program which should be provided for, and that it expected the Department of the Army to use every device at its disposal to insure the lowest possible expenditure of the taxpayers' funds. The 15-percent cut was made because of greater available materials, increased production, and reductions in material costs. This was the policy announced by the Committee with respect to projects within our own country, and yet when we come to spending in foreign countries, the administration insists we can't apply to ECA this downward trend in costs.

If our help to Europe is in such a precarious condition after spending over $5,000,000,000 during the last year, that a 10 percent cut, for instance, would destroy the whole program, then we have thrown that money away and ECA head, Paul G. Hoffman, is right when he says we won't get a cent of it back. But it isn't only money that's involved. It is our real substance such as food, minerals, oil and other commodities which, if kept at home, would have lowered our own cost of living. This fact is admitted by the former Secretary of Commerce and present European head of ECA, Averell Harriman.

There are no people more generous than the American people, including the folks in our great State of Kansas. But there is not only a bottom to the barrel but also a ridiculous and dangerous situation when we send materials and money that are, in turn, exported to countries with whom we refuse to do business. It just doesn't make sense.

I'd like for once to have some nation to whom we have given so generously to say "I still need a little help but I don't need so much this time. You can cut down a little on this loan." Friendship that is bought is not genuine. And if our aid, so generously given by every citizen of this country, means so little that the slightest curtailment would throw all of Europe into the arms of Russia, then I say we had better keep that money and use it to build the strongest Army, Navy and Air Force in the world.

But I do not believe this. I contend that we can give adequate aid and still cut some of the cost. The time has come, however, when we have to ask ourselves—how much can we afford to do without bankrupting ourselves? How much can we really afford to spend internationally and nationally without a back-breaking tax burden?

Every head of a household goes over his income and his needs and then asks himself—"Can I afford to buy this or that." In government we must ask ourselves the same question. We've just got to get off this spending spree. A financially weakened or unsound United States is what our potential enemies are praying for. I say we can afford to give real aid and help. But we cannot afford to give to help those who openly state that they are against our way of life. And we cannot afford to give to those nations whose recovery is assured and place the burden of taxes and debt on our own people.

What do you think about this? Do you agree with me? I'd like your thoughts on this and the other perplexing problems that confront us here in Washington.

I want to say I have enjoyed this opportunity of talking to you and am looking forward to visiting with you next week. Until then, thanks for listening and good luck, all.

Basing-Point Change Will Have Permanent Effect, Federal Trade Commission Asserts—Commission Fears Legal Status of Price Differential Actions During Proposed Moratorium—Statement of Robert B. Dawkins, Associate General Counsel, Before Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Thursday, March 31, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert B. Dawkins, associate general counsel for the Federal Trade Commission, testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in charge of S. 1008, the moratorium bill, on March 31, 1949. Mr. Dawkins expressed the opposition of the Federal Trade Commission to the passage of moratorium legislation. Mr. Dawkins' statement clearly indicated that the proposed legislation did not settle any of the existing controversial issues nor did not modify or clarify existing antitrust laws.

Mr. Dawkins unequivocally stated that—

The Commission does not believe that enactment of the proposed legislation is necessary or desirable. Insofar as it may affect existing law, it is obviously intended to be and acts only as a suspension, but it is almost certain to create new doubts as to the legal status of the practices which the Congress finds necessary to safeguard with a moratorium. The issues which have been most frequently cited as causes of uncertainty are involved in the Rigid Steel Conduit case. This case will be argued today before the Supreme Court and it appears likely that it will be decided in the near future, perhaps a few weeks. The decision should establish with certainty what the law now is upon the

points involved. After this decision, no doubt Congress will be in a position to determine whether any permanent change in existing law should be made as a result thereof.

Pointing out that the proposed moratorium is likely to increase any confusion which now exists, Mr. Dawkins further stated:

One of the most important points of uncertainty in the bill is in the provision for a moratorium applicable to the use of a delivered price system by an individual seller. Contrary to the implications of this provision, there has been no holding or decision by the Commission that delivered prices are unlawful per se, and as the Commission has publicly stated, there is no basis in the law for such a decision.

Speaking of the decision against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana a week or so ago in the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Judicial Circuit, upholding a cease-and-desist order of the Federal Trade Commission which prohibited the Standard company from engaging in certain unfair methods of competition and monopolistic practices, Mr. Dawkins said:

If the decision is not reviewed by the Supreme Court, or if reviewed and affirmed, the effect of the moratorium would be to change the law for 2 years rather than merely to clarify it.

Thus, it may be unqualifiedly asserted that no useful or good purpose is served by the passage of moratorium legislation which affects the antitrust laws, but rather the progress of a half-century is destroyed by hurried congressional action. The rigid-steel conduit case was argued before the Supreme Court the week of March 28; therefore, the issues which Mr. Dawkins cites as the most frequent causes of uncertainty have come to rest, and will undoubtedly soon be resolved. Mr. Dawkins' statement in its entirety follows:

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON S. 1008, PRESENTED BY ROBERT B. DAWKINS, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Robert B. Dawkins. My employment is associate general counsel of the Federal Trade Commission. I am appearing here pursuant to the request made by the Commission to your committee. May I say first that the Commission appreciates the opportunity afforded to have its views concerning S. 1008 presented before your committee. It should also be said that the views are those of the Commission, with one member, Commissioner Mason, dissenting.

The proposed legislation under consideration by your committee contains a general declaration of policy which would have permanent effect. This becomes of importance, as will later appear, in connection with certain language used in stating what it has not been the intent of Congress to do. The general declaration is followed by specific provision for a 2-year moratorium respecting the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to the use of a delivered-price system by an individual seller and to the absorption of freight in good faith by an individual seller to meet competition.

The Commission feels that the adoption of the moratorium proposed is likely to increase any confusion which now exists as to the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts. An important reason for this is that a Congressional declaration designating certain practices which are to be exempt from the law for a specified period necessarily implies that these practices might otherwise be unlawful. Should the moratorium expire without amendment of the statutes covered by it, this implication might easily become the basis for further uncertainties arising from the questions of what becomes unlawful as a result of the lapse of the moratorium. Yet the practices to which the moratorium is directed are, for the most part, innocent practices that have not been challenged by the Commission and about the legality of which no reasonable basis for doubt exists. Insofar as the moratorium is applicable to certain other practices the scope of its application is not entirely clear or certain.

BASING-POINT MORATORIUM OPEN INVITATION FOR CONSPIRACY

One of the most important points of uncertainty in the bill is in the provision for a moratorium applicable to the use of a delivered-price system by an individual seller. Contrary to the implications of this provision, there has been no holding or decision by the Commission that delivered prices are unlawful per se, and as the Commission has publicly stated, there is no basis in the law for such a decision. Numbers of decisions of the Commission in Clayton Act matters are in fact based upon discriminations between delivered prices. Under the Federal Trade Commission Act, controversy has centered upon the question of how far each of a group of sellers can engage in practices parallel to those of other members of the group with the knowledge that all members of the group are acting in the same way and in contemplation of the fact that price competition will thereby be suppressed or eliminated. This problem arose from the second count of the complaint in the Rigid Steel Conduit case. On February 11, 1949, Commissioner Davis, with the concurrence of Commissioners Ayres and Ferguson, stated to the Subcommittee on Trade Policies of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that in the Commission's view the Conduit case is simply a proceeding against a conspiracy situation. In public discussions some persons have argued that the Commission's position in that case applies to other than conspiracy situations. The Commission has publicly stated that the position taken in the Conduit case is applicable only in conspiracy situations. So far as the Commission is aware, no one has offered any basis for a belief that the mere use of a delivered price system by an individual seller without any concert of action with others is at stake in that case. In any event, however, the proposal to authorize individual use of a delivered-price system does not touch the major question in that case.

The proposed legislation does not definitely settle any of the controversial issues which exist about the application of the Clayton Act to delivered-price systems. An unlawful price discrimination may exist in the difference between delivered prices at different delivery points such as may appear, for example, when a buyer in one locality is charged phantom freight not exacted from his competitors elsewhere, and this may be sufficient to seriously endanger his ability effectively to compete. The same may be true of differences in zone or sectional delivered prices. So far as the Commission is aware, no one has challenged the propriety of a proceeding against such forms of price discrimination, yet the legal status of such price differentials during the proposed moratorium would be uncertain. If the authorization to use a delivered-price system should be interpreted as a sanction for any price discriminations that might exist between delivered prices, the Commission would be prevented from challenging this or any other form of discriminations in price so long as the seller took the precaution of selling on a delivered basis. If the bill were not so interpreted, the Commission would remain free to proceed against any unlawful discriminations as readily as before, and this part of the proposed moratorium would have no effect upon the application of the Clayton Act. Whether or not the language of the bill is intended to grant immunity not only to the use of delivered prices but also to discriminations that may appear among delivered prices is not clear. In this way it would introduce new and important uncertainties into the enforcement of the Clayton Act.

MORATORIUM DOES NOT CLARIFY BUT CHANGES ANTITRUST LAWS

The other practice which is given the benefit of the moratorium is absorption of freight by an individual seller to meet competition. The declaration of policy in the first section of the bill supports this type of activity when carried on in good faith and, although section 2 of the bill does not include the phrase "in good faith," it will be assumed for the purpose of the present comment that the moratorium is only intended to be applicable where the practice is characterized by good faith. On this assumption the moratorium would not in any way modify or clarify the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act, for where there is a price conspiracy and where the members of a group knowingly engage in a practice designed to eliminate price competition, good faith is necessarily absent. In price discrimination cases under the Clayton Act the Commission believes that the present law makes good faith in meeting competition less than an absolute defense in those relatively rare cases in which the statutory injury to competition appears in spite of the fact that the seller's discrimination consisted merely in meeting competition. In its recent decision in the Standard Oil case the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit sustained this view of the law. It is not now known what action will be taken, but presumably a review of this decision by the Supreme Court will be sought. If the decision is not reviewed by the Supreme Court, or if reviewed and affirmed, the effect of the moratorium would be to change the law for 2 years rather than merely to clarify it. The Commission has publicly indicated that it would see no objection to a permanent change in existing law that would make the meeting of an equally low price of a competitor in good faith a full defense in price discrimination cases. However, injury to competition seldom arises from a mere meeting of the equally low price of a competitor in good faith, and therefore the Commission believes the issue to be relatively narrow and not of sufficient importance to require emergency action. There is also the further consideration that should the case be reviewed and reversed by the Supreme Court, there would then be no occasion for such legislation.

BASING-POINT MORATORIUM UNNECESSARY AND UNDESIRABLE

The Commission does not believe that enactment of the proposed legislation is necessary or desirable. Insofar as it may affect existing law, it is obviously intended to be and acts only as a suspension, but it is almost certain to create new doubts as to the legal status of the practices which the Congress finds necessary to safeguard with a moratorium. The issues which have been most frequently cited as causes of uncertainty are involved in the Rigid Steel Conduit case. This case will be argued today before the Supreme Court and it appears likely that it will be decided in the near future, perhaps a few weeks. The decision should establish with certainty what the law now is upon the points involved. After this decision no doubt Congress will be in a position to determine whether any permanent change in

existing law should be made as a result thereof.

In the event, however, that your committee should decide to adopt the general principles of the proposed legislation, it is believed that it would wish to avoid, so far as possible, creating any new uncertainties or changing the law in respects other than those explicitly spelled out. The bill presumably was not intended to weaken the antimonopoly laws, but there is some incidental language in it that might have this effect. The Commission would, therefore, like to suggest for the consideration of your committee certain changes in the language of the bill.

In line 8 on the first page, insert the words "or discriminatory" after the word "monopolistic." Presumably the declaration of policy contained in this section of the bill is intended to embrace the present policy of section 2 of the Clayton Act, which condemns discriminatory pricing practices when they injure competition. It is not certain that the phrase "monopolistic practices in restraint of trade" will be understood to include this aspect of congressional policy.

In lines 1 and 2 on page 2 of the bill and in lines 12 and 13 on the same page, substitute the phrase "quote and sell at delivered prices" for the phrase "use delivered price systems." It is possible that the latter phrase, now contained in the bill, might be interpreted not merely as an authorization to sell at delivered prices but also as an authorization to maintain differences in delivered prices, no matter how injuriously discriminatory these differences might be. It is also possible that the word "systems" might be interpreted as an echo of the word "systematic," which the Commission and the courts have employed in cases involving conspiratorial use of the basing-point system, and if so the explicit authorization to use delivered-price systems might be interpreted as a limitation upon the policy against conspiracies. The substitute language here proposed is intended to make clear that quotation and sale at delivered prices is not in itself subject to attack; and at the same time is intended to avoid impairing the prohibition of conspiracies and to leave any discriminations which might arise in the delivered prices to be considered on their merits in the light of the applicable law and of the other provisions of the present bill.

In line 2 on page 2 and in line 13 on the same page, substitute the phrase "an equally low price of a competitor" for the word "competition." The present statute as to price discrimination uses the phrase "to meet an equally low price of a competitor." Use of different language in the bill invites claims that the Congress intends to change the concept of meeting competition, whereas, if the Commission understands the bill correctly, such a change is not a part of the purpose. Moreover, the change in language would raise questions about the validity of precedents established under the present law. There is also the consideration that meeting competition lacks the objective certainty of the phrase "meeting the equally low price of a competitor," and thus tends to introduce subjective tests of an uncertain character.

In lines 4, 5, and 6 of page 2 eliminate the words "and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act as amended." The declaration of policy already contains, in lines 7 to 10 of the first page, a condemnation of combinations and conspiracies, so that the repetition of the thought is not necessary. Moreover, by specifically invoking the Sherman Act, the bill might be held to imply that there can be no violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act except in conduct which would violate the Sherman Act; and, if so, the effect would be to cast doubt upon the validity of precedents in cases under the Federal Trade Commission Act and to indicate that the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission is narrower than the Congress intended, and than the courts have repeatedly held it to be.

In line 13 on page 2 insert the phrase "in good faith" immediately before the phrase "in any and all markets." The same phrase was used in line 4 on the same page, and its omission in line 13 was presumably inadvertent. Unless it is included, there is danger that the bill might be so interpreted as to authorize a large enterprise to engage in price discrimination designed to destroy its small competitors for a monopolistic purpose, so long as the discrimination takes the form of a meeting of competition.

Change the period at the end of section 3 to a comma, and add the words "or the enforcement of any order which was entered on or before that date." In seeking to preserve the validity of cases now pending in the Federal courts, the bill presumably intended to preserve also the validity of the orders of the Commission where these orders were not appealed or where they were affirmed upon appeal. Though the Commission does not believe that any of its orders contravene the principles set forth in the bill, it suggests the desirability of avoiding a flood of requests or motions that orders be modified because of the bill and also the desirability of avoiding a debate about the significance of the bill in each enforcement proceeding having to do with delivered-price systems.

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the thoughts of America are focused on the North Atlantic Pact, and when we are all concerned with whether it is indeed a move toward safety, peace, and security, or a gamble inviting war, it is good to see a very clear analysis of its significance in the Vineland (N. J.) Times Journal. Mr. Max Leuchter, the editor of this newspaper, does not deceive himself about the pact. He recognizes its merits, but he also recognizes it is a confession of the temporary failure of the United Nations. The editorial follows:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

We call them World War I and World War II, but future historians will consider them what they really were: "One war for 'one world'."

If we today consider these two wars in their proper light, we must admit that the tragic loss in lives and treasure, unparalleled in all recorded history, did not result in one world.

The North Atlantic security pact, signed by representatives of the United States and 11 other nations of the Northwest Atlantic, is sufficient proof that all the blood, sweat and tears occasioned by the two past world wars have not been sufficient to weld the peoples of the world into the common cause of international peace, and the settlement of international disputes by amicable means.

The Atlantic Pact is proof in itself that the United Nations while not as feeble and as useless as the defunct League of Nations, has not succeeded in attaining the lofty aims which motivated its organization. The Pact of itself proves that the sword is still mightier than the pen.

The Atlantic Pact provides the basis for an international military force to be utilized when any one of the signatories is threatened or made the subject of an attack by an aggressor. It provides the teeth that should properly have been an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations.

"In this pact," said President Truman, "we hope to create a shield against aggression and the fear of aggression—a bulwark which will permit us to get on with the real business of government and society, the business of achieving a fuller and happier life for our citizens."

The pact is more properly a weapon than a shield. If it is ratified by the United States Senate later in the year, it will serve notice to Soviet Russia and the Communist-dominated governments of eastern Europe that this is no walkie-talkie alliance with vetoes puncturing all forward movement, but that it is a power-packed steel-fisted machine of war. Lacking approval of the Senate, the pact would have no more effect than a busheiful of other "defensive" pacts.

The North Atlantic security pact is the visible evidence of how, thus far, the United Nations has failed to bind the East and the West into Wendell Willkie's One World. It is visible evidence of Rudyard Kipling's sour contemplation: "East is east and west is west and ne'er the twain shall meet."

The western nations consider the Atlantic Pact as a barrier against aggression. The Soviet Government considers it as "an instrument of aggression." On the latter charge, President Truman said: "We have no purpose of aggression against others. To suggest to the contrary is to slander our institutions and defame our ideals and our aspirations."

Russia can only blame itself for this new development. That country has persistently and consistently, by the use of the veto power in the United Nations Security Council, by nonparticipation in the international, economic, and cultural organizations set up within the United Nations, and by its organized method of creating chaos in every part of the world, prevented world-wide progress and rehabilitation and world peace other than on Communist terms.

There are many high-minded people in many nations who believe that constitutional government can live in "one world" with Red fascism. In their zeal for an end to war, they close their eyes to the fact that communism depends on physical force to maintain its position.

If the North Atlantic security pact is ratified by the Senate, we will then be back to where we started, except that this time the aggressor nation or nations will not find themselves in as favorable a military position as was the case of the Axis Powers in the past two world wars. Only the knowledge that a quick conquest cannot be attempted may bring about world peace based on reason and conciliation.

MAX LEUCHTER.

Excessive Cost of National Health Service in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard and read a great deal about the advantages of a socialized health program. As a part of my remarks, I am including a statement from a London magazine which indicates that

the socialized Government of England has a bear by the tail and does not know what to do with it:

EXCESS OF COST OF NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE OVER ESTIMATE

All the undertakings of the Socialist Government show one thing with melancholy monotony—increased cost. The official figures, just issued, for the National Health Service are no exception. The cost of doctors is $118,000,000, an excess of $9,200,000 over the estimate. The cost of dentists is $82,800,000, an increase of $54,600,000. The cost of pharmacists is $70,860,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the estimate. The cost of opticians is $57,800,000, an excess of $15,000,000 over the estimate. A large part of this vast expenditure is wasted, as is so characteristic of Socialist finance.

Cleveland Quick To Recognize Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I make available to the House membership editorials from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 6, 1949]

COMMUNIST FRONT IN CHINA

Those Americans who have been deluding themselves with the belief that the Chinese Communists were somehow different from the Russian Communists, that they were merely advocates of land reform and had no interest in promoting a world revolution, have had a rude awakening.

For the Chinese Communists have joined the other Communist Parties throughout the world in proclaiming that in the event of another war they would fight on the side of Russia "to defeat the aggressors, overthrow the entire imperialist system and realize the liberation of all mankind and permanent peace."

This manifesto, like the other issued by the Communist Parties in the United States, England, France, and Italy, to name a few, was inspired by the North Atlantic Pact. The Communists are trying to convince the people in the countries they dominate that the pact is aimed at provoking a war against the Soviet Union. The fact is, of course, that the Soviet Union has nothing to fear from the pact unless it is planning an aggressive war against one or more of the 12 nations which signed it, in which case the power of all 12 signatories would be arrayed against the aggressor.

The manifesto of the Chinese Communists puts the stamp of complete bankruptcy on the policy, or lack of policy, the United States has pursued in China since the end of the war. A major policy of the Roosevelt administration, one which brought on the war with Japan, was our refusal to abandon China to Japanese domination. At great cost we saved China from Japan, only to make it possible for another foreign power to move in.

The campaign to discredit the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek, to bring about the suspension of American aid to China and to attempt to compel Chiang to form a coalition government with the Communists was one of the greatest victories ever won by the Communist propaganda. It resulted in delivering a large part of China into the hands of the Communists.

If the maintenance of a free China was one of our major war aims, as we proclaimed it to be, then we have in fact lost the war in the Pacific so far as that objective is concerned.

In a pathetic finale to the Chinese debacle, Congress has extended until February 15, 1950, the authority of the administration to spend $54,000,000, which had been previously appropriated, to aid Nationalist China. This is a futile gesture, which does little more than to express the dissatisfaction of Congress over the administration's failure in China.

[From the Cleveland Press of April 6, 1949]

CHINA'S MARSHAL LI IS FELLOW-TRAVELING, FAST

China's Communists and fellow agrarian travelers have proclaimed that the North Atlantic Pact is aimed at provoking a new world war, and they warn that in such event they'll fight beside "China's ally, the Soviet Union."

There is nothing surprising in that—it's the familiar patter of Soviet stooges the world over—but it is interesting to note the No. 2 man on the list of names supporting the statement. First, of course, is Mao Tse-tung, Communist chief in China. Then comes Marshal Li Chi-sen.

It was a significant honor for Li, and he'll be worth watching. Marshal Li is a former South China war lord who broke with Chiang Kai-shek in 1947 and lived unobtrusively in Hong Kong until a mystery ship—some say it was Russian—called for him last New Year's and smuggled him off to North China, where he was warmly welcomed by the Communists.

Though Li contends he is not a Communist, he has attempted to become a rallying figure for China's anti-Nationalist group and he aspires to the presidency of the Communist-proposed "coalition" government. As Scripps-Howard writer Clyde Farnsworth has pointed out, the Communists have good reason for starting with a coalition facade. They are in great need of technicians and administrators, who might be more readily attracted into a coalition government rather than a straight Red regime. Also, a coalition government is more likely to gain recognition of other nations.

Marshal Li is traveling fast with the Reds. They may have a job for him. Already he has qualified as an able Charlie McCarthy.

Letter of State Advisory Committee of the Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter from John R. Holland, chairman of the State advisory committee of Iowa for the Farmers Home Administration, in which he sets forth the achievements of this organization. A careful reading of this letter and an examination of the figures contained therein will convince Members of Congress that this organization has made a remarkable record and the actual achievements are amazing.

I believe it can be said that no Government department or bureau has done so much with so little, and I am happy to bring this report to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

MILTON, IOWA, *April 6, 1949.*

Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LECOMPTE: On Friday, March 25, the State advisory committee of the Farmers Home Administration held a regular meeting at our State office in Des Moines and as chairman, I was instructed by the committee to give you what might be called a progress report on the activity of the agency.

First you probably would be interested in the committee membership itself. There are nine on the committee and they are appointed annually by the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. Will list them alphabetically:

N. P. Black, Des Moines, State superintendent of banking.

Mrs. Edith A. Chester, Clarksville, Butler County, farmer's wife.

John R. Holland, Milton, Van Buren County, farmer.

H. H. Kildee, Ames, dean agriculture division, Iowa State College.

Frank A. Lauters, LeMars, Plymouth County, farmer.

Harold E. McCord, Denison, Crawford County, business.[1]

J. S. Russell, Des Moines, farm editor, Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Richard L. Stephens, Crawfordsville, Washington County, farmer.

Donald C. Travis, Winterset, Madison County, farmer.

In Iowa two types of loans can be made, farm-ownership and operating loans. Farm-ownership loans are for the purchase of family-type farms with loan limits set for each county in the State by the Secretary of Agriculture. These limits vary from $9,500 in the poorer land counties to $21,000 in the counties with the best land in the State. Loans up to $12,000 are approved by the State director and loans above that figure must have the approval of the Administrator. Only four such loans have been submitted to Washington.

Since the beginning of this program in 1938, 1,048 loans have been made and 50 percent have been repaid in full without a cent of loss to the Government. These loans now bear 4 percent interest and are for a 40-year period with the provision that the borrower must refinance with other credit institutions when eligible and at not to exceed 5 percent interest. Normally this will be when the borrower has about a 35-percent equity in the farm.

Last year Congress appropriated $15,000,000 for loans of this kind of which Iowa's share was $557,125. Seventy percent of these funds were earmarked for veterans and 30 percent for nonveterans.

In addition to these loans from appropriated funds the FHA Act provides for the making of insured farm-ownership loans

[1] Actively interested in farm veterans and town and country cooperation.

All farmer members either are or have been members of their respective county FHA committees and are thus very familiar with the operations of the program as it affects farm families.

As you know, the Farmers Home Administration is the successor agency to the Farm Security Administration and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration, the consolidation having taken effect in late 1946. Also that FHA is authorized to make loans only to those farm families that cannot get their credit needs from any other source.

with the same terms and conditions except that instead of the Government advancing 100 percent of the investment cost, the borrower must advance 10 percent and the balance is secured from a lender with the Government fully insuring the mortgage. The interest rate to the lender is 3 percent with 1 percent going to the Government.

While the insured mortgage program does permit the making of many loans through the use of local credit, yet Iowa's share of the $15,000,000 is insufficient to meet the demand of veterans and others who do not have the 10-percent down payment, in addition to their operating capital.

For operating loans FHA in Iowa has what the committee feels to be a very commendable record, considering the type of risk that is taken. Of the $31,600,000 loaned since the program started back in 1935, approximately $27,000,000 in principal has already been collected plus over $3,700,000 in interest. It is our feeling from an examination of the records that, if the program closed its books today and liquidated the indebtedness, the Government would not only get back as many dollars as it advanced, but in addition right close to 4 percent interest on the money.

Operating loans are made on a 5-year basis and at 5 percent interest. One percent of the interest collected has just about absorbed the losses that have occurred. Slightly over 28,000 farm families have been assisted since this program started in 1935 and while there have been some failures, thousands of these borrowers have gone on to become successful tenants and owners and are today an asset to their communities.

It is the feeling of the entire State committee that the guidance of the county FHA supervisor that follows each loan plus the active interest of the county committee of three farmers has had much to do with the success of this work. Particularly since the close of the war we have not been able to meet the demand for operating loans. The State director advised the committee that the funds for this fiscal year were exhausted during February and that there were 1,168 applications on hand at the close of February, of which 528 were veterans.

During this fiscal year we have been able to make only 448 new operating loans. The applicants that the county committee have approved but for which there were no funds have had to do one of the following: (1) give up their leases and go into other work; (2) operate without adequate livestock, machinery, fertilizer, etc.; (3) get what credit they could from high-interest loan companies; (4) get what credit they could on short-term notes that would not permit a properly planned farming program.

Unless one is close to the situation, it is difficult to realize the degree to which operating credit has tightened up. FHA has the best of relations with local banks and production credit associations, but their regulations and concern over future economic developments will not permit them to extend the needed credit. In fact, a high percentage of the applicants that come to our offices are referred to us by banks and production credit associations.

The budget calls for the same appropriations for 1950 as for 1949—$75,000,000. Iowa's share of this amount will probably be about the same as last year, $1,400,000. Because of the large carry-over of approved applications, a high percentage of this amount will have been committed by July 1 with only a very small amount left for new applications after July 1.

Just about 60 percent of the funds this year for new loans were used for veterans of World War II.

With the guidance of the county supervisor and county committee, it is our feeling that the borrowers are not only becoming better farmers but are making a real contribution to soil conservation. You will be interested, I believe, in a few figures that the committee received for 1948.

	Farm-ownership borrowers	Operating-loan borrowers
Number linear feet terraces built	159,994	173,527
Number linear feet grassed waterways constructed	141,029	367,658
Acres of row crops contoured	6,608	19,284
Total acres crops on contour	10,826	25,934
Number acres limed	4,389	25,033
Number acres drained	1,039	5,682
Percent crop acres in legumes	22.46	16.57

I am informed that this is the first time a general report of this kind has been sent to you, but it seems logical to me that you would be interested in the work of one of the agencies that is trying to fill a need that is not covered by any other State or Federal group and that is not in competition with anyone. It is for this last reason, I feel sure, that we have the wholehearted cooperation of other lending groups.

You are accustomed to weighing the needs for hundreds of appropriations. FHA appropriations, administered as they have been in Iowa, make useful, happy, conservative farm owners and operators out of harassed, hopeless, near-public charges; they give the borrowers a real interest in their communities and their Nation; and best of all, they restore to discouraged men and women their own self-respect. You can guess at the effect of all this on their children.

I doubt if any other appropriation that has come before you has bought so much for so little, especially when you realize the money appropriated for loans is being returned to the Government with interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLLAND,
Chairman, State Advisory Committee.

The Economic Situation

REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have important news out of Hartford, Conn. I am quoting from an excerpt of a radio program from News of the World, by Morgan Beatty. Mr. Beatty says as follows:

And here in Hartford, the capital of Connecticut, is a Governor, a solid Truman supporter, who feels the time is coming for a different outlook from economic windows.

Gov. Chester Bowles is the man, and he's the one American who is preeminently associated with Government controls, because he was the energetic head of OPA and the center of most of its purple controversies.

Governor Bowles told News of the World today that, from the point of view of Connecticut, unemployment is increasing.

And he concludes by saying:

And this man says, "I am learning in elected public office the facts of political life. The so-called liberal likes to solve problems with long, eloquent, and articulate memoranda. I can tell anybody from where I sit in Hartford that you can't solve problems with memoranda."

The complete excerpt is as follows:

And here in Hartford, the capital of Connecticut, is a governor, a solid Truman supporter, who feels the time is coming for a different outlook from economic windows.

Gov. Chester Bowles is the man. And he's the one American who is preeminently associated with Government controls because he was the energetic head of OPA and the center of most of its purple controversies.

Governor Bowles told News of the World today that from the point of view of Connecticut, unemployment is increasing.

There are 90,000 unemployed in a total work force of nearly a million. The Governor says there's been a recession in the three spending-money pools that make for good times. Government has not yet resumed spending on public works in the wake of the war. The private business establishment has been building steadily to replace worn-out equipment and plants. But that spending is tapering off now and consumer spending is dropping.

Therefore, says the Governor of Connecticut, there is no point now in higher taxes from where he sits and there is no need now for stand-by controls.

Here's his idea of the way to get things going:

1. Business corporations should sharpen their pencils and call a few vice presidents back from Florida and put them to work. And he means that advice not critically but merely in passing to note that the economic picture is changing and it requires a coats-off, back-to-work movement at the top.

2. He proposes the States start public works to replace worn-out capital equipment such as schools, roads, hospitals, and so on. That should come before people start beating a path to the doors of Congress in Washington.

And this man (many have called him a spending liberal on the wild side) says "I am learning in elected public office the facts of political life. The so-called liberal likes to solve problems with long, eloquent, and articulate memoranda. I can tell anybody from where I sit in Hartford that you can't solve problems with memoranda. The job is to put teeth into projects and whip down the vast power of confusion in politics."

The American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 8 (legislative day of Friday, March 18), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bow to the Bureau," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of April 5, 1949. The editorial makes some observations relative to several paragraphs of an editorial in the American Farm Bureau Federation's publication the Nation's Agriculture.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOW TO THE BUREAU

From time to time this newspaper has expressed an unflattering opinion of pressure groups. Most of them can't see beyond the ends of their noses. Representing various trades or interests or ideologies, they turn on heat and twist arms to gain legislation which will directly help their members—usually at the public expense.

But there are exceptions. One of them, to which today we bow from the hips, is the American Farm Bureau Federation.

It is one of the three or four leading farm organizations. It operates a lobby in Washington. Since Harry Truman's strong showing in the farm country was largely responsible for his election, the lobbies of the farm organizations are in a strong position. It is a common saying that farmers "can get just about what they want" in Washington.

If the Farm Bureau were as short-sighted as many other trade associations it would be whooping and hollering for 100-percent parity. It would be demanding that the Government use its Treasury to guarantee high prices.

But the Farm Bureau isn't doing anything of the kind. In a recent editorial in its publication, the Nation's Agriculture, it expresses a point of view so civilized, so statesmanlike, that we think it deserves general reading.

These paragraphs give the essence of the Farm Bureau's attitude:

"The American Farm Bureau Federation is unchanged in its support of full parity-support prices. It means the opportunity for farmers to earn, in as free an economy as possible, as good a living as anyone else.

"We do not believe that this objective can be obtained by a Government guaranty. We do not believe that rigid price support at 90 percent of parity or at 100 percent of parity, or at any other level can assure equality for agriculture.

"In our opinion, full parity can be obtained by farmers only when they are allowed to do most of their own planning, to take advantage of market conditions as they see them, to shift production to commodities most in demand and best suited to their individual farming opportunities.

"For example, consumers want more meat and livestock products. The market for grain is shrinking. The logical course is to feed more grain to livestock. Our price-support programs should be designed to permit and encourage such shifts in operations. They should not establish rigid support levels which tempt farmers to go on trying to market or store more grain than is needed while consumers fail to get as much meat or dairy products as they are willing to buy.

"Reasonable and realistic support prices, which take account of supply and demand, and which permit farmers to adjust production in line with consumer needs, are justified. To avoid economic disaster, they are at times imperative.

"But we cannot look to Government as the final arbiter of farm prices. We do not wish to exchange freedom of choice for a guaranteed price. Farmers are, we think, capable of exercising sufficient business judgment to make their own production decisions in line with demand.

"The Government support price should not be the price we expect to live on. It is not, and should not be, the farmer's chief incentive."

For those sentiments we give three rousing cheers.

It is true, we think, that in the partially managed American economy the farmers need some economic protection. Industry has it through tariff laws and tight trade associations. Labor has it through unions and labor laws. Agriculture, as the third mighty leg of the economy, should be equal in strength to the other two.

But those self-styled friends of the farmer who advocate support prices at 100 percent or 90 percent of parity actually are proposing that the farmer be placed completely under the control of the bureaucracy, and that he surrender his American independence.

The Farm Bureau contends that the better way, the more thoroughly American way, is to give the new system of flexible support prices a fair trial. This system promises to give farmers a reasonable protection, and at the same time it encourages the individual farmer to produce the things the consumers want to buy. In advocating that plan the bureau is speaking the language of old-fashioned Americanism.

Basing-Point Change Opposed by Strong Small-Business Organization—Spokesman Advocates Compliance With the Full Provisions of Antitrust Laws—Statement Before Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Opposes Antitrust Moratorium

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president in charge of the Washington, D. C., office of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate on March 30, 1949, strongly advocated the sound principle of an all-out vigorous antitrust enforcement program rather than a weakening of our antitrust laws by way of legislative repudiation.

Mr. Burger stated unequivocally that the position of the Federation today is no different than it has been upon the occasion of previous appearances before congressional committees and that—

We have been consistent in our efforts to protect small business and the free-enterprise system and we in the federation do not come to our conclusions because we have been guided by legal authorities, or that we are what might be called "professionals" in trade-association activities, but our conclusions in our statements are brought about by a commonly used phrase, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." In other words, we have gone through the mill of experience in owning and operating our own independent businesses and we realize from bitter and costly experience the total disregard by certain big industries in compliance with the full provisions of the antitrust laws, and by some manner or means they are able to evade the full provisions of the laws.

Stating that these may be strong words, but nevertheless supporting the correct view with regard to the dangers inherent to small business by weakening the antitrust laws and denying the need for clarifying legislation, Mr. Burger further stated that—

It is our opinion that all the high Court did was to outlaw an organized system. Nothing beyond that, and it appears to us that members of that industry (cement), or allied industries desire the system carried on to protect the concentration or monopoly.

Mr. Burger has long been in the forefront of the battle to nurture and preserve the Nation's small-business institutions. He speaks with authority and I commend his statement to all who are interested in the economic security of this Nation. The basing-point system, which has been used for more than a half century to strangle free competition and to destroy small business, should be permanently rejected, for as a punitive pricing instrument it has no equal.

Mr. Burger's full statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE, WASHINGTON OFFICE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES SENATE

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of the Washington, D. C., office of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

The National Federation of Small Business, Inc., is an organization composed of, and representative of, small independent businessmen and professional men over the Nation. It is the largest independent business organization, in point of numbers of individual actively supporting members, of any business organization in the United States.

I wish to take this time to thank the chairman, Senator MCCARRAN, for affording me the privilege of appearing before the committee and giving our views in opposition to the adoption of S. 1008, solely due to the resulting disastrous effect it would have on the morale of Nation's small business, who, at the moment, are crying from the housetops for a more vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

This statement is confirmed by a mailing of approximately 100,000 copies of excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 31, 1948, covering the extension of remarks by the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, in which he stated, and I quote: "I am sure that the statement of Mr. George J. Burger, of the National Federation of Small Business, before the subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee To Investigate Monopolistic Practices, on November 17, 1948, will be of great interest to the membership of the House in considering the problems of that great segment of our economy known as small business, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following." The complete statement made by me is then inserted in the RECORD.

FEDERATION OPPOSES MORATORIUM—ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS NOW PREVALENT

As we believed the statement contained invaluable information which would be of great service to small business of this Nation, the same was sent to small business institutions in every State of the Union. The reaction to this excerpt was simply startling to the executive offices of the federation. By that I mean the way letters poured in to us, and the way they are continuing to pour in right up to this very moment, all highly commendatory, and more important, laying before us factual evidence of a startling nature with reference to the rampant violations or disregard of antitrust laws in most of our industries throughout the Nation. This, then, in behalf of the people we represent, members and nonmembers, but all small independent business, is the reason for our position in opposing S. 1008 or any other proposal which would weaken or nullify anti-trust-law enforcement.

I was accorded the honor of appearing for the federation and speaking before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Committees in convention. To the credit of both committees they accorded me special and sincere attention, and I particularly noted the deep interest of the members of the committees to the federation's main and principal proposal, not alone to protect small independent business of this Nation, but also our

free-enterprise system, calling for an all-out vigorous anti-trust-enforcement program, and more important, that increased adequate appropriations be granted for the enforcement of the laws. In my appearance before one of these platform committees, which I do not care to identify, I was more closely questioned on the subject matter of antitrust than on any other recommendation of the federation before that committee. I felt convinced because of that questioning that the members of that committee were cognizant that a serious situation was prevailing in the entire free-enterprise system, and that this would be recognized in their platform planks as an aid to small business.

The outcome was that the Republican National Committee pledged themselves to:

1. Aggressive antitrust action.

The Democrats pledged themselves to:

1. Intensive enforcement of antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations.

2. Strengthening of existing antitrust laws where gaps exist.

3. A positive program to promote competitive business, independent trade.

FEDERATION CONSISTENT IN STAND AGAINST BASING-POINT SYSTEM

The position of the federation today is no different than it was in its appearance before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on July 14, 1947. Therefore, you will admit, Mr. Chairman, that we have been consistent in our efforts to protect small business and the free-enterprise system and we in the federation do not come to our conclusions because we have been guided by legal authorities, or that we are what might be called professionals in trade-association activities, but our conclusions in our statements are brought about by a commonly used phrase, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." In other words, we have gone through the mill of experience in owning and operating our own independent businesses and we realize from bitter and costly experience the total disregard by certain big industries in compliance with the full provisions of the antitrust laws, and by some manner or means they are able to evade the full provisions of the laws.

ENFORCEMENT NEEDED—NOT LIP SERVICE OR BASING-POINT HOLIDAY

These may be strong words, but it is far better to have, for the record, something to sustain this correct view from those in the seats of the mighty in the Government who have been charged with the enforcement of the laws, and who, for a decade or more, have studied the whole over-all law-enforcement program of the Government. I refer to the startling statement made by the then Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust before the Senate Civil Service Committee in February 1947 when he said in substance, that for 35 years or more the administrations had merely given lip service to the enforcement of antitrust laws. A year or so later, then as a private citizen, in his appearance before the House Small Business Committee, Monopoly Subcommittee, on being questioned by members of the committee, he stated that the laws never had a chance to function.

Is it any wonder that the field representatives of the National Federation of Small Business in their daily contacts with small business throughout the Nation, and also that I, in my own private business in an industry which has been plagued for many years with antitrust violations, get the same expression from small business "The Government won't do anything," and again, "The big fellow in industry can get away with it."

It was shortly after the United States Supreme Court rendered its decision on the system used in the cement industry, early in the spring of 1948, that a subcommittee of the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce started to function and explore the whole situation. I refer to S. Res. 241, Eightieth Congress, second session. To the credit of that committee it will be found that some of the most outstanding men in industry were brought in to that committee in an honorary advisory way to explore the proposition. Extensive public hearings were held on the subject matter. In fact, the recently released printed report of the committee covers 1,401 printed pages.

I was accorded the privilege of appearing before the subcommittee in behalf of the federation, and in my many years of experience before congressional committees, I have never had more exceptional privileges extended to me than I had in my appearance before that committee. To their credit a sincere and sympathetic attitude was held by the members of the committee. I would gather that the opposition of the national federation as expressed to the committee was near sound and we had built our case for no need to suspend the Court's decision condemning a system.

PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE DEMANDS OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATIVE CLARIFICATION

I said that we speak from practical experience and not as members of the legal profession and we hold to the premise that any individual manufacturer in his national sales policy, and this policy being of his own making, can sell f. o. b. the plant or f. o. b. destination, and there is no law in he land that we know of that will prohibit any such individually announced action by any producer. So, why should there be any need for any clarification? You and I know, Mr. Chairman, that big industry of this Nation is fortified with the most competent legal authorities that can guide them in their policies, wholly in keeping within the law. In this respect I was very much interested in a statement made by Mr. Paul F. Myers, of Washington, D. C., whom I believe is classed as an antitrust law specialist, and he is reported as being counsel for the National Food Brokers Association. I quote from his remarks made in Chicago, March 21, 1949, as reported in the New York Times. The press story states: "Mr. Myers told the food brokers it is his own personal opinion that the Supreme Court's decisions leave manufacturers free to adopt f. o. b. pricing, uniform delivered pricing, basing-point pricing, and total or partial absorption of transportation pricing, provided at all times there is not present in any of the plans or policies devices to injure or to destroy competition." Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, he is a specialist in law, and I am not a lawyer.

ABOLITION OF BASING POINT BOON TO FREE ENTERPRISE AND SMALL BUSINESS

An Associated Press story of March 11 quotes the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee as stating in their report "In the long run, required f. o. b. selling will probably result in a decentralization of industry which will tend to make most regions of the country self-sufficient." If the decision of the Court on the system used in the industry charged with the offense would bring about decentralization, this no doubt, would be a great boon for the free-competitive-enterprise system and for small business of this Nation.

Recent reports of the findings in congressional small-business committees will show the recommendations for decentralization and breaking up of entrenched concentration.

We were amazed to read in the subcommittee's report that the military security of the Nation might be seriously affected by the enforcement of the full provisions of the Court's decision on the respective industry. We have heard that opinion rendered before by the military services in the early days of the war. I mean when our Nation officially went into the war, when at that time a proposal was made to use only 3,500 tons of rubber to keep the essential automotive transportation in use during the war and the military forces frowned and condemned the proposal as it would affect the military security. Small-business leaders held otherwise and proved their case without a question of doubt. So we in small business see no serious results accruing to the military forces of our Nation with the ever increasing enforcement of antitrust laws.

The position of the federation in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the Senate on December 6, 1948, was no different than it would be today, and I respectfully refer you to that testimony which appears in the committee print, and note the close questioning by members of the committee on the testimony during my appearance.

The National Federation of Small Business is fighting to keep government out of business for the good of our economy, and slowly but surely if big, concentrated industries are not aware of their shortcomings it can only result in socialization of those industries. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, God forbid that this would ever take place. I have heard the above statement made repeatedly, not by New Dealers or Old Dealers, but by career men in the Government, who value our Government's future more than they do personal success. They themselves are fearful of this trend.

Shortly before we entered World War II, I was reliably informed by a factor in a particular industry with which I am well acquainted, in which industry concentration or control is in the hands of about four, that he was told by a high official of that industry, "Maybe if we make conditions within the industry bad enough, the Government will take us over."

BASING-POINT SYSTEM DESIRED ONLY BY MONOPOLISTS

It is our opinion that all the High Court did was to outlaw an organized system. Nothing beyond that; and it appears to us that members of that industry or allied industries desire the system carried on to protect the concentration or monopoly. What they apparently are attempting to do is to get Government sanction, and the danger of this to themselves and to the free-enterprise system and the people we represent—small independent business—is ably stated in an editorial entitled "Government and Monopoly," appearing in the Wall Street Journal, March 7, 1949, and the editorial states, in part: "The truth about monopoly is that it can exist only by the positive connivance of the Government or by the failure of the Government to do its duty."

We ask the committee to report "No" on S. 1008, solely for the good of our free-enterprise system and for the good of the industries affected by the Court's decision, whether they know it or not, and at the same time, if and when the House acts on the companion bill, H. R. 2222, we request that they, too, vote "No." Any other action by the Congress will be a complete repudiation of their party pledges as made to small business of this Nation is the last Presidential election.

Disabled Veteran's Claim of Charles D. Willis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago a young friend of mine, Charles Del-

bert Willis, of Fort Worth, Tex., wrote a story for Collier's magazine which described his difficulties with the Veterans' Administration in securing rights which he was entitled to under our veterans' laws. Mr. Willis is one of the great heroes of this last war, and has suffered the loss of one leg and his other is almost completely paralyzed. After his article appeared in Collier's, the Veterans' Administration attempted to answer his charges and Nation-wide publicity was given the VA release. I think it only fair that Members of Congress read the rebuttal of Mr. Willis and I am inserting it in the RECORD for that purpose.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
COUNSELOR FOR VETERANS,
Cambridge, Mass., November 18, 1948.

Mr. J. E. LOGGINS,
Chief, Claims Division,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOGGINS: This has to do with Mr. Charles D. Willis, C–4,114,838, a disabled veteran now enrolled in Harvard University.

I wish to thank you for your letter of November 15, 1948. You will be interested to note that yours is the first answer we have received to a series of letters and telegrams to the Washington VA from Mr. Willis and from this office, dating back to September 20. We have gained an altogether unhappy impression of the Washington VA.

I think that Mr. Willis is entitled at this late date to more direct action and certainly more specific information than is embodied in your general assurance that appropriate action will be taken. Mr. Willis urgently needs to know, and soon, what specifically is the state of your processing of his Public Law 16 case and when he can expect it to be cleared. More than that, he needs to have somebody in Washington wake up and shove those papers along.

We are excited and angry about this case because it appears to us that the VA is guilty of unforgivable indifference, bungling, and discourtesy in its dealings with Mr. Willis. Mr. Willis is a double-amputee veteran, just out from 3½ years hospitalization, a man with a wife and three children to support. If ever a man deserved prompt attention and support from the VA it is he. In order to avoid just the complications and delays which have now snarled his case, he was put through advisement and guidance for Public Law 16 benefits last June, and was assured by the responsible training officer, a Mr. Smirsna, attached to Walter Reed Hospital, that his papers were in order and would move along expeditiously to Boston. Well, here it is November 18, 6 weeks after the opening of the university, and 4 months after the VA started the paper work toward Mr. Willis' "rehab" training, and after a series of telegrams and letters dating back to September 20, he now finds himself assured that, sometime, appropriate action will be taken.

If the VA cannot become interested in expediting papers and showing minimal courtesy out of consideration for the needs of a double-amputee veteran, then I recommend strongly that it do so out of concern for its own public relations. As I have informed you in previous correspondence, but without underlining, Mr. Willis is attending Harvard as one of a group of 15 outstanding newspapermen from all parts of the country. I need not tell you that these reporters and editors find the Willis case a most interesting case study of the working of the VA as it affects the seriously disabled men.

Since early October this office has been holding the fort for the VA in this case, telling people to cool off and give the VA time to work the complex thing out. We regard this ordinarily as our proper function. But the accumulated discourtesies and delay of the Washington office have persuaded us that this case is in fact being hacked, at the expense of a most seriously disabled veteran. The last person to see me about the Willis case was asking: "How many legs does a guy have to lose to rate an answer out of the VA?" It is a fair question.

I realize full well that there is probably more to the complexity of this case than meets the eye, that the VA has its own problems of technicality which must be met in orderly fashion, and that this may appear too intemperate a letter to address to a new man who has just entered on the case and who has after all done us the favor of a courteous letter. Still, I think it only fair to acquaint you personally with the explosive power of this case. The VA cannot very well escape the charge that here is a double-amputee who was set up in June, who entered training under firm assurance from VA officials that all was arranged, who finds now that the arrangements were in fact loused up, who has run out of money to support his wife and children and who cannot get so much as a letter from the VA after 8 weeks of trying. I believe this adds up to a monstrous bust by the VA and see no reason why I should try to gloss it with pretty language.

Yours very truly,

JOHN U. MONRO,
Counselor for Veterans.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
NIEMAN FOUNDATION FOR JOURNALISM,
Cambridge, Mass., April 5, 1949.

Hon. WINGATE LUCAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUCAS: In a 15-page publicity release, the Veterans' Administration has attempted to explain the many delays and needless red tape in my case which I had related in a Collier's article titled "Are You Happy, Son?"

Since the VA gave this statement Nation-wide distribution in all media, as well as giving it to a number of the Members of Congress, I should like an opportunity to defend myself against some of the innuendoes and inferences in this release. Since I have no publicity machine at my disposal to answer the charges made against me, I am requesting that this reply be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While aiming at me personally, the VA did not attempt to contradict my essential facts. I have the records, Harvard University has the records, the Boston Artificial Limb Co. has the records, and the VA, which should have all of the records, admits that it has lost an important part of my file.

The principal contention in the Collier's article was that it took the VA 10 months to get me properly set up for educational rehabilitation, 6 months to straighten out my disability compensation, and 5 months to deliver a new artificial leg. Reaction of the VA to the story was to send a squad of men scurrying around to check the records. After many man-hours of investigation, the result was this lengthy news release. Enclosed is my statement pointing out the principal errors in the VA statement.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT WILLIS.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
April 4, 1949.

STUDY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PRESS RELEASE OF MARCH 28, 1949, WHICH COMMENTS UPON THE ARTICLE "ARE YOU HAPPY, SON?" BY DELBERT WILLIS, IN COLLIER'S FOR MARCH 26

I. GENERAL

(a) General conclusion: In its opening summary the VA states that I had a legitimate complaint about the handling of my education, but that my dealings with the VA in connection with securing compensation and an artificial leg have been properly handled.

Comment: This is the VA's general conclusion—that two-thirds of my complaint was completely unjustified, not to say false. The record simply does not warrant this complacent conclusion.

(b) Clinical routine: The VA explains at the outset that in any clinic situation the doctors and visiting celebrities must discuss the details of the case before them. In concluding these remarks the VA states that many of the questions and much of the conversation quoted by Mr. Willis was for the benefit of these visitors and not because the members of the clinic are utterly stupid.

Comment: I have spent 3½ years in Army hospitals, and am entirely familiar with the nature of clinical discussions. The questions at the Boston clinic seemed to me unusually irrelevant, unnecessary, and embarrassing. The clinic machinery, with all of its long-winded and pointless questions, was obviously responsible for a considerable amount of the delay in getting me the new leg I needed so badly.

If the VA thinks it necessary and desirable to ask embarrassing questions for the benefit of visitors and to ignore the resulting long delays, then perhaps it is time to reexamine the whole concept of clinics centering on disabled veterans. In view of the new release it is a fair question whether the Government is running such clinics to benefit the veterans or the visiting celebrities.

II. FINANCES

(a) Borrowed money: The VA concerns itself twice in this section with the fact that I had to borrow money to keep going at Harvard during the months the VA was hunting around for my papers. In its first reference the VA says: "The writer refers to having to borrow money from fellow students who were more fortunate and were receiving checks while he had none." In the second reference the VA states: "Mr. Willis did not mention in his article the names of the friends from whom he borrowed money. If they were veterans it is doubtful that any of them were being paid at a higher rate than Mr. Willis himself."

Comment: All this is sheer guesswork and embroidery by the VA. I did not say anywhere in my article where I borrowed the money, and the fact is I did not borrow from fellow students. Since the VA considers this proper grounds for jesting, I will say that the money was loaned to me by Harvard University through friends in its veterans' office.

(b) Regular checks: The VA says that I was discharged from Walter Reed Hospital on September 16; that the first check was mailed to me on October 25; and that from that day on there has not been a month that at least one check was not mailed to Mr. Willis by the VA.

Comment: The implication is that the VA was prompt in starting its subsistence payments. However, the checks for October and November were checks for Army retirement pay which various officials of the VA advised me not to cash. They warned that if I should cash these checks I would thereby commit myself to the retirement pay plan and cut myself off from the possibility of receiving the more generous pension and subsistence benefits of the VA plan for amputees. The record shows that this matter was not settled until November 23 when I brought the problem to the Harvard veterans' office and asked that they please get me an authoritative answer whether I should use this Government money or not. The Harvard office telephoned the claims division of the VA in Washington, and, after some discussion of the matter, was assured that no jeopardy would be attached to my pension claim if I cashed the retirement checks.

All during these months while the VA was struggling with the red tape and trying to get me paid, I had to be concerned about the problem of supporting a wife and three children back home in Fort Worth, Tex. You may be sure I needed all the money I could get and would not have hesitated a second in cashing the retirement checks except for the firm advice of responsible VA officials.

(c) Big pension: The VA says that the checks sent to me up to this time have totaled $2,003.13, and the article makes several references to the size of my pensions, pointing out that it is higher than most veterans are receiving.

Comment: Unfortunately this is true. But this is a pension for 100-percent disability, plus a statutory award for the loss of two limbs, and it was the intent of Congress that veterans disabled like me should be given just compensation. Yet the author of this VA release points to my high pension in an effort to discredit my complaint against the delays of the VA systems.

I will add that three-fourths of the funds paid to me by the VA came after I had written the Colliers article last January, and that my disability pension was not adjusted and brought up to date finally until March 18, some 6 months after I was discharged from the Army.

III. EDUCATION

(a) No loss of time: The VA finds satisfaction that its admitted mishandling of the educational dealings did not result in the loss of any education opportunities to Mr. Willis.

Comment: That is correct, thanks to Harvard for carrying me on the cuff and for loaning me money to support my family in Texas. Full settlement for my VA education benefits was not made until after March 4, 10 months after my original application for the benefits, at Walter Reed Hospital last June.

(b) Nieman fellowship: The VA article is vague about the Nieman fellowship and by the order of its wording implies that the Nieman fellowship, if not actually a government grant, at least was awarded to me after, and because of, the VA's process of advisement and guidance.

Comment: The Nieman fellowship is a grant awarded entirely by Harvard University, and I was awarded the Nieman fellowship by Harvard two months before going through advisement and guidance with the VA.

(c) Cash award: The VA speaks of the cash award which goes with this fellowship.

Comment: The only cash award attached to my Nieman fellowship was a small stipend intended to supplement the pension and subsistence payments due me.

(d) Harvard office: The VA says that on September 21, 1948, I visited the Veteran's Counsel Office at Harvard University and states that this is not a Veterans' Administration office but is operated under contract with the Veterans' Administration, with employees assigned to the office from Harvard, Tufts, and Boston College. The contract for its operation is with Tufts College although it is located on Harvard University property.

Comment: The confusion here is complete. The office I visited on September 21, and the office which fronted for me through scores of phone calls, telegrams, and letters seeking to unsnarl the red-tape entanglement, was the Counsellor for Veterans Office of Harvard University, which is responsible for the management of affairs for better than 7,000 veterans at Harvard and has dealt with the VA daily for 4 years. However, in its release the VA has managed completely to confuse this Harvard office with the VA Advisement and Guidance Center which is indeed operated under contract by Tufts, but which I did not visit until January.

(e) Criticism of Boston VA: The VA goes on to say: "On December 17, the Boston Office advised Mr. Willis to file a duplicate application for advisement for the purpose of scheduling another test. The record contains no explanation of why the duplicate advisement records which were sent to Boston by Walter Reed on November 9 could not be used in qualifying the veteran. However, he was ordered for new advisement."

Comment: The fact is that Boston VA on December 17 received part of my folder but there were no advisement records there at all. Therefore, in desperation, the Boston VA decided to put me through advisement and guidance again, thus getting control of the case locally and enabling Boston to start setting me up for regular payments. The alternative for Boston was to wait around some more months while Washington searched, for the missing papers. Under all the circumstances Harvard considered that Boston had made an entirely intelligent suggestion. Central Office does not think so highly of the idea, but it should be clear by now that Central Office is not always right.

(f) Christmas in Texas: The VA makes two references to my Christmas trip to my home in Fort Worth, the inference being, I suppose, that if I had only stayed in Cambridge, the VA would have straightened out my problem more quickly.

Comment: I offer no apology for borrowing funds to spend my first Christmas since 1941 with my wife and three daughters. The war and my hospital siege had separated us for seven Christmases, and I was letting nothing stand in my way. My Christmas trip to Texas did not slow up the VA processing of my case in any way. While in Texas I corresponded regularly with the Harvard veterans' office regarding the new advisement and guidance, and even signed and forwarded the necessary applications for it. When I returned to Cambridge the Harvard office telephoned the guidance center, and the officials there said that they were not quite ready to give me a hearing. The advisement finally was held on January 13.

(g) Retroactive payments: The VA article makes some point of the fact that after the advisement in January the VA decided that they could make subsistence payments retroactive to the date I entered school, September 27.

Comment: This was done only after repeated appeals had been made to the VA. It was at first maintained that the payments could not be retroactive under any circumstances. Then the decision was changed to make the payment retroactive to November, when the Washington claims board first ruled on my disability rating. If Boston VA officials had followed the Washington ruling, I would still be seeking back payments for educational benefits.

IV. PROSTHESIS

(a) Date of application for leg: Throughout this section the VA concentrates on technicalities about the dating of my request for a new artificial leg, claiming that I did not actually report to the VA until October 14 and that I did not technically apply for a new leg until December 10.

Comment: My artificial leg broke down on October 5. On October 6 I visited the VA prosthetic-limb office of the Boston VA to see about it. I am able to verify this date exactly, because I was given transportation to the VA limb office by the Cambridge Red Cross, which made a record of the trip. I have no doubt that I was in the prosthetic-limb office again on October 14, when they said I was. I was trying to get a good artificial leg, and found that I had to spend a good deal of time humping around the 10-mile triangle from Harvard to the VA office to the leg factories.

(b) Bombastic statement: The VA has produced an artificial limb expert who declares that my description of the break-down of my leg is a glaring bombastic statement. Mr. Ferris, whose company manufactured my artificial leg that went to pieces, says that this statement casts some doubt as to the veracity of knowledge on my part of the way such a leg breaks down.

Comment: He didn't question the fact that the leg broke down. It was my description of the disintegration that upset him. I said the hip joint "exploded like a hand grenade—springs, nuts, and bolts shot all over the place." Maybe I shouldn't have said that. Maybe a figure of speech is illegal.

(c) Another date mixup: In the concluding paragraphs of the release, the VA states that I was authorized to be measured for a leg on January 21 and that I was thereupon measured for it on January 11.

Comment: This revelation of the state of the VA records and the care with which this release was prepared needs no further discussion from me.

(d) Contract: One obstacle in getting me a leg, says the VA release was the fact that the contract between the VA and Boston Artificial Limb Co. had expired and consequently no order could be drawn up until a new contract was signed. That was the reason for the delay from January 11, when I appeared before the prosthetic clinic, to January 21, when I was authorized to purchase a leg from Boston Limb Co.

Comment: If the VA will recheck its own records, I'm sure it will find that the 1949 contract with Boston Limb Co. was signed on December 22, to go into effect on December 28—2 weeks before the VA informed me that it was confounded by contract trouble. Administrative delays in communication (red tape to most of us) prevented the prosthetic section from knowing that the 1949 contract was in effect.

(e) Christmas vacation: The VA takes another jibe at my Christmas vacation with the inference had I remained in Cambridge the leg might have been delivered sooner.

Comment: It was necessary for me to appear before the prosthetic clinic before the VA would consent to my getting the leg. Only one clinic was held in January—January 11—so it would have been impossible for me to have secured approval prior to that date, even if I had remained in Cambridge all of the time.

(f) Final delivery: The VA says the leg was delivered on March 18, 67 days after I visited the clinic.

Comment: Just to set the record right, the leg was not delivered to me until March 21, 165 days after I first went to see them for help with my artificial leg held together with rubber bands.

CHARLES DELBERT WILLIS.

Truman Wrong 32 Times, Right But Once, in His Veto of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Phelps Adams, chief of the New York Sun's Washington Bureau, is distinguished for careful reporting and research.

He was recently elected president of the Gridiron Club by his fellow craftsmen. For 20 years he has been a careful student of labor legislation.

I have requested permission to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his noteworthy study on the working of the Taft-Hartley law.

He has found 32 of the objections and prophecies by the President to support his veto of the Taft-Hartley law wrong. But one is found right. His findings and statistics are carefully documented.

His study appeared in 18 special feature articles in the New York Sun from February 7 to March 2, 1949, as follows:

TRUMAN NO LABOR PROPHET

(By Phelps Adams)

NO. 1

WASHINGTON, February 7.—When President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley law in the early days of that Eightieth Congress, he climbed far out on the long limb of prophecy and took a dim view of the future.

He predicted that the law would increase strikes, weaken unions, clutter the Federal courts, generate jurisdictional disputes, impede industrial production, and place an impossible burden on the National Labor Relations Board.

He insisted that it would prove useless in combating national emergency strikes; that it would increase interference by Government in the affairs of its citizens; hamper the work of conciliation and mediation, encourage Communist disorders, and endanger the very structure of American democracy itself.

But President Truman was a poor prophet.

Today the law has been in full operation for more than 17 months and it is possible to contrast these gloomy forebodings with the actual results as they have been recorded officially by his administrative agencies in Washington. It is possible in fact to show exactly what has really happened to labor, to industry, and to the Nation since that law went into effect.

The evidence is all to be found in the records of the CIO, the AFL, the United States Department of Labor, the NLRB, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Federal Reserve Board, and the congressional "watchdog" committee set up under the terms of the Taft-Hartley law itself to study and report on the actual operation of the new statute.

Administration leaders in Congress now are using their newly won majority powers to prevent the House and Senate Labor Committees from spreading this evidence upon the public record where it might injure their chances of passing Mr. Truman's bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law; but it will be fully presented to the readers of the Sun in the succeeding articles of this series.

Those articles will discuss point by point the 33 major objections and prophecies advanced by the President in his veto message. They will show that in 1 instance he was completely and undeniably right; and that in 32 others he was not.

NO. 2

The bill would substantially increase strikes

WASHINGTON, February 8.—President Truman, in his veto message, declared that the Taft-Hartley law would "substantially increase strikes." He prophesied that it would "encourage distrust, suspicion and arbitrary attitudes," and that "employers and workers would find new barriers to understanding."

But President Truman was wrong.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the United States Department of Labor, keeps an accurate check each month on the number of strikes occurring, the number of workers directly affected, and the number of man-days of idleness which result. Its records for the first 16 months under the Taft-Hartley law and for the last 16 months under the old Wagner Act provide the following amazing contrast which tells the story conclusively:

Period	Number of strikes	Number of workers affected	Man-days of idleness
16 Wagner Act months	6,300	4,785,000	83,725,000
16 Taft-Hartley months	3,925	2,143,000	39,060,000
Reduction under Taft-Hartley law	2,375	2,642,000	44,665,000
Percentage reduction	38	55	53

This means that in every single working day of the year for the last 16 months—

There have been six fewer new strikes than there were each day under the Wagner Act;

Forty thousand fewer workers have walked off the job and started trudging weary, payless picket lines; and

Nearly 179,000 men who were on strike every day under the Wagner Act were on the job every day under the Taft-Hartley law, producing the goods that Americans need and want, and wiping out the shortages on which inflation breeds.

Under this law labor has enjoyed more uninterrupted job security and has pocketed nearly half a billion dollars in wages that it formerly lost through strikes; industry has enjoyed steadier production in ever-increasing volume, and consumers have begun to enjoy surcease from constantly mounting prices.

The facts therefore do not support Mr. Truman's alarmist prophecy. Neither do they support his demand for Taft-Hartley repeal.

NO. 3

More about strikes

WASHINGTON, February 9.—In his veto message President Truman warned that the Taft-Hartley law would operate in four specific respects to increase, rather than decrease, strikes.

1. He said that since unions would be requested to live up to the letter of the contracts they signed, they would be discouraged from putting no-strike clauses in their bargaining agreements. But the United States Department of Labor, after studying the contracts which are filed with it, reports that the number of no-strike clauses is steadily increasing, and that approximately half of all the labor contracts in its possession now contain such clauses.

2. He said that because unions are now required to file burdensome reports in order to qualify for protection under the National Labor Relations Board, they would resort to strikes instead. But the NLRB reports that it knows of no case where a union which had filed the required non-Communist affidavit was ever disqualified by reason of its failure to file any other report required under the Taft-Hartley law.

3. He said unions would be forced to call jurisdictional strikes in order to get them before the NLRB for settlement. But the Department of Labor reports that the number of jurisdictional strikes has declined sharply under the Taft-Hartley Act. In 1946, under the Wagner Act, they averaged more than four per month. In 1947, while the new law was being put into operation, they rose to more than five per month. In 1948—the first full year under Taft-Hartley—they dropped to three per month.

4. He said that unions of supervisors and foremen, deprived of NLRB protection, would be forced to strike to gain their economic ends. The Department of Labor has no specific break-down on foremen's strikes, but concedes that there were very few under the Taft-Hartley law.

This congressional watchdog committee reported, moreover, that the Foreman's Association of America was on strike against the Ford Motor Co. at the time the Taft-Hartley law was passed. Within a few days the strike collapsed, the men returned to their jobs, and the company went to work to devise a plan to insure the fact that the salaries of its foremen are equal to, or better than, those paid anywhere else in the area. The committee concluded:

"Not only has the exclusion of supervisory employees from the benefits of the act failed to produce the work stoppages predicted by opponents of the provision, but it has served to promote the establishment by employers of plans creating many new benefits for supervisory employees."

So it appears that President Truman was wrong again.

And again, and again, and again.

NO. 4

The bill would weaken unions

WASHINGTON, February 10.—One of President Truman's chief fears, back in June 1947, was that the Taft-Hartley law would weaken unions and he stressed the point frequently in his veto message. But the official records of Government agencies and of the unions themselves, show that neither the membership nor the economic power of organized labor has waned under the new law.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations reports that its membership declined sharply during the postwar reconversion period (under the Wagner Act); that it has been climbing steadily since; and that last year (under the Taft-Hartley law) it not only recouped its losses but reached a new all-time peak.

That the American Federation of Labor did not fare equally well was due to John L. Lewis rather than to Taft and Hartley. "Disaffiliating" last year, Lewis pulled his 600,000 members out of the A. F. of L. and set up shop again as an independent union. Exclusive of the miners, however, the A. F. of L. had 6,977,716 members when the Taft-Hartley law went into effect in 1947. One year later it had 7,220,530 members—a gain of nearly a quarter-million.

The congressional watchdog committee reports that independent unions scored similar gains, and that the only notable losses of membership occurred in unions whose officers refused to sign non-Communist affidavits, and whose members turned to other unions, not Communist-dominated.

The most conclusive test of organized labor's strength or weakness, however, is: Were unions able to keep wages abreast of mounting living costs? The records of the Department of Labor answer that question as follows:

In the final 16 months under the Wagner Act, average hourly earnings in industry rose 18.4 percent, while the cost-of-living index rose 20.8 percent. So the purchasing power of an hour's work fell slightly and labor lost ground.

In the first 16 months under the Taft-Hartley law, earnings rose 12 percent and living costs went up only 8.2 percent. So labor was able to recover all it had lost in the closing months of the Wagner Act—and more.

Today the average American workman with the proceeds of 1 hour's labor can buy more goods than he ever could at any previous time in history.

Clearly, then, President Truman's fears on this score were groundless.

NO. 5

Collective bargaining elections

WASHINGTON, February 11.—Because of the impressive gains made by organized labor under the Taft-Hartley law—both in membership and in the purchasing power of wages—administration forces have been

hard pressed to prove their primary contention: namely, that the law has weakened unions.

Early this week, however, the National Labor Relations Board—one of the principal centers of opposition to the Taft-Hartley law—made a good stab at it in a press release announcing the transmission of its annual report to Congress.

The release declared that under the new law, labor unions had won only 72½ percent of the collective-bargaining elections conducted by the Board, whereas, during the entire 12 years under the Wagner Act, they had won an average of 81.4 percent of such elections.

Here, then, was the first concrete evidence that the Taft-Hartley law had damaged the organizing powers and prestige of unions—or so it seemed, at least.

But what the NLRB release omitted to note was a sentence in the annual report itself, which pointed out that the percentage of collective-bargaining elections won by unions had been declining steadily since 1943 under the Wagner Act. The true facts, as supplied to the Sun by the NLRB today, show an interesting trend that neither the release nor the annual report revealed. Here is the Board's own record for the last 4 years:

Fiscal year ending June 30	Percentage won by unions	Declined since previous year
Under the Wagner Act:		*Percent*
1945	82.9	1.6
1946	79.5	3.4
1947	75.1	4.4
Under Taft-Hartley law: 1948	72.5	2.6

So it develops that the percentage of union victories declined far more rapidly in the closing years of the Wagner Act than it did in the first year of the Taft-Hartley law. Moreover it will be noted that union losses under the Wagner Act were heavier each year than they were the year before; but that this trend was reversed under the new law.

NO. 6

Union security will be largely canceled

WASHINGTON, February 14.—"While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, the Taft-Hartley law would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled."

So said President Truman in his veto message.

But he was wrong again. The Department of Labor reveals that of all the contracts filed with it, one out of every three contains a union-shop provision, and the number is increasing steadily. The National Labor Relations Board at the same time reports that it has held 30,508 union-shop elections under the law and that the unions have won 97½ percent of these tests. But in the 776 cases where the workers themselves did not want a union shop the law protected them.

The President complained further that even where the employer and the entire union wanted a union shop, it could not be granted without an election. The NLRB says, however, that where both parties are willing, the necessary election can be held within 3 days, so no serious delay results.

Mr. Truman also warned that the "featherbedding provisions" of the new law could be used to prohibit agreement on "safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices"; but the NLRB concedes that it knows of not one single case where the featherbedding provisions have been so used. Only two featherbedding cases have come before the Board at all, it says.

Then, too, President Truman declared: "The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds." But apparently it has not interfered at all. The Department of Labor reports that the number of workers covered by such welfare funds has more than doubled under the Taft-Hartley law, and that today one contract out of every eight contains provisions of this kind.

And, as for the President's fears that "union responsibility" would suffer under the act, it is evident that they were illusory. The congressional watchdog committee finds that the number of man-days of idleness resulting from wildcat strikes in the plants of the Ford Motor Co. declined 90 percent during the first 8 months of last year.

So it is difficult to see wherein either union security or union responsibility has been canceled by the Taft-Hartley law.

NO. 7

Cluttering the courts

WASHINGTON, February 15.—President Truman protested strenuously against a provision in the Taft-Hartley law which declared that unions could sue or be sued in the Federal courts for violations of contracts or for damages resulting from illegal jurisdictional strikes and boycotts.

In his veto message, he said that the bill "would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements." He also declared that "it would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless."

Conceivably this could have happened. Actually it never did.

The Congressional watchdog committee, after surveying the records of all the Federal courts, reports the true facts as follows:

Although there are more than 100,000 labor contracts in force under the Taft-Hartley law, there have been only 57 damage suits filed in the Federal courts. Instead of taking thousands of minor grievances to law, unions have filed only 19 such actions against employers, and an individual employee has filed 1. Employers, instead of resorting to endless litigation, have brought 37 suits against unions.

Twenty-one of these cases were dismissed by agreement between the parties, and nine others were dismissed by the court. In one, an arbitrator's decision was set aside, and in another the union obtained an injunction against the employer. The remaining cases are still pending; but in not one instance has either party received as much as 1 cent in damages from the other.

This means that in 99$^{94}/_{100}$ percent of all the bargaining agreements now in effect the obligations and contractual responsibilities of both parties have been discharged in a mutually satisfactory manner without resort to the courts. The watchdog committee concludes:

"The committee believes that the suits reported to date show that neither party desires to recover money damages from the other, but that the very presence of this remedy has encouraged employers and unions alike to act with the deeper sense of responsibility."

And in support of this conclusion the committee cites the sharp decline in the number of wildcat strikes since the Taft-Hartley law became operative.

NO. 8

Injunctions

WASHINGTON, February 16.—While denying any individual the right to obtain an injunction against a union in a labor dispute, the Taft-Hartley law decrees that in certain, clearly specified cases, the Government may apply to the courts for such relief. In his veto message President Truman denounced this provision bitterly as a "backward step toward the old abuses of the labor injunction."

Spurred by these dire forecasts of disaster, the congressional watchdog committee has made a thorough study of every injunction proceeding that has been undertaken under the new law. The facts, therefore, are a matter of official record.

They show that out of nearly 4,000 strikes occurring since the law became effective, exactly 43 injunctions have been sought and only 24 granted. Here is the detailed analysis:

One section of the law permits the National Labor Relations Board to seek injunctions against either unions or employers where certain unfair labor practices are charged. Under heavy pressure from both unions and employers to do so, it has refused in all but six cases. Of the six restraining orders it has asked under this section of the law, two were against employers; four against unions. Three injunctions were granted, one denied, and two disposed of by agreement between the contending parties.

Another section of the law requires the NLRB to seek injunctions where illegal secondary boycotts are in progress. In all, the Board has received 342 cases in which such boycotts were complained of, but, after sifting the charges carefully, it has sought injunctions in only 31 instances. Restraining orders were granted in 15, denied in 4, are still pending in 5, while 7 were disposed of by agreement between the parties.

A third section of the law authorizes the use of injunctions in national emergency strikes which threaten the public welfare, health, or safety on a Nation-wide scale. Under this provision President Truman himself has six times ordered the Attorney General to seek injunctions against a labor organization, and in each instance the restraining order has been granted.

So it appears that in only six-tenths of 1 percent of all the strikes occurring under the Taft-Hartley law has injunctive relief been granted by the courts. Clearly, therefore, it cannot be said truthfully that the Taft-Hartley Act has turned the clock back to the days of government by injunction.

NO. 9

The bill would impede production

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Among other iniquities of the Taft-Hartley law cited in President Truman's veto message was the possibility that it would impede industrial production.

"The bill," he said, "would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections and adding new types of elections. This would harass employers in their production efforts."

It didn't, however. Although thousands of elections have been held to determine the wishes of the workers, in matters of organization and union security, industrial output has risen steadily. The Federal Reserve Board index shows that the physical volume of production increased 9.1 percent during the 16 months of Taft-Hartley operation, but only 7 percent in the 16 months immediately preceding passage of the new law.

Another major complaint which President Truman stressed repeatedly in his veto message was that the new law would inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale and conflict with important principles of our democratic society.

"It would be," he warned solemnly, "a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy."

But the records of administrative agencies reveal that Government interference has declined—not increased—under the Taft-Hartley Act, unless it can be said that the holding of an election in which workers themselves

have the right to settle their own affairs democratically can be called interference.

Apart from union-shop elections the National Labor Relations Board has received almost exactly the same number of cases under the new law that it did in the corresponding period under the Wagner Act; while the number of cases on the docket of the Mediation and Conciliation Service has declined 26 percent.

On this point the administration has been embarrassed by an apparent cross-up in its signals. NLRB Chairman Paul Herzog, an administration stalwart and a foe of the Taft-Hartley law, recently appeared before the Senate Labor Committee to support President Truman's demand for repeal.

But while Mr. Truman was complaining that the Taft-Hartley law was a stride toward totalitarianism, Mr. Herzog testified that the President's new bill repealing the Taft-Hartley law was designed to reestablish and augment Federal authority.

NO. 10

"I conclude that this bill is unworkable"

WASHINGTON, February 18.—"I have concluded," said President Truman in his Taft-Hartley veto, "that this bill would prove to be unworkable." He predicted that the National Labor Relations Board, with many new duties assigned to it, would be "hobbled at every turn." Three of the provisions from which he anticipated the greatest trouble were these:

1. Splitting the Board into two separate agencies, with the Board itself acting in a judicial capacity, while the general counsel acts as investigator and prosecutor. The President prophesied that this would lead to conflict within the agency, and it might have done so had not the Board and the general counsel drawn up an agreement specifically outlining the duties and prerogatives of each. But they did draw up such an agreement, and the conflict which the President anticipated has not developed.

2. Requiring the Board to settle jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. "This single duty," said Mr. Truman, "might require a major portion of the Board's time." But this duty has taken virtually none of the Board's time. Under pressure of the Taft-Hartley law, labor and management have worked out procedures for the amicable settlement of such controversies, and only two jurisdictional disputes are before the Board.

3. Giving employers the right of "free speech" in discussing labor problems with their workers, so long as no threat of reprisal, or force, or promise of benefit is contained in their remarks. The President protested that since other sections of the law would make it an unfair labor practice "to induce or encourage" certain types of strikes and boycotts, the free-speech provision would make it impossible for the Board to assemble the necessary evidence.

The Board, however, has apparently encountered no difficulty at all in this respect. When its chairman, Paul Herzog, appeared before the Senate Labor Committee recently, he advocated the repeal of virtually all of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, but said he saw no reason why the free-speech section and a few others should not be permitted to remain in force.

Even William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, announced last week that he had "no objection" to the free-speech guaranties now in the law.

NO. 11

A 5-year backlog of election cases

WASHINGTON, February 21.—President Truman's conclusion that the Taft-Hartley law would prove unworkable was based primarily upon his prophecy that it would put an impossible burden of election cases upon the National Labor Relations Board. Complaining that the Board had experienced great difficulty in conducting the number of elections required under the old Wagenr Act, he pointed out that the new law would greatly multiply this load.

Specifically, he said it would "impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate."

But although the Taft-Hartley law has required the Board to hold more than 30,000 union-shop authorization elections, no such backlog as the President gloomily foresaw has developed.

On December 31 of last year—after the Taft-Hartley law had been in operation for 16 months—the Board had only 3,386 election cases pending and since it has actually conducted more than 5,000 elections in a single month, the present backlog could apparently be disposed of in about 3 weeks, instead of taking the predicted 5 years.

More than half of these pending elections, moreover, are of the collective-bargaining variety, and would have had to be held under the terms of the old Wagner Act in any event. Only 1,440 of them are union-shop elections required exclusively by the Taft-Hartley law, and their number is declining steadily. Last May the Board was confronted by three times as many union-shop elections and still had no practical difficulty in disposing of them.

As for the other types of cases handled by the Board—cases which do not involve the holding of an election—the passing of the Wagner Act on July 1, 1947, found 2,443 of these awaiting Board action. Sixteen months later this number had risen to 2,701—an increase of only 258; but studies of the Board's dockets reveal that some 500 of these present cases originated under the Wagner Act and are still unsettled.

It seems clear, therefore, that the Taft-Hartley law has not imposed any unbearable burden upon the facilities of the NLRB and that the great rush of election cases immediately following passage of the law has subsided, leaving relatively clear sailing ahead.

So here again Mr. Truman guessed wrong.

NO. 12

The President was right

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Throughout his veto message, President Truman complained repeatedly about the number of worker-elections which the Taft-Hartley law requires. Both the Wagner Act and the new law decreed that workers should have the right to choose, in a Government-sponsored election, the particular union which they wished to have represent them as their bargaining agent. In addition, however, the Taft-Hartley law declared that workers should also have the right to decide at the ballot box whether or not they wanted a union shop, whether they wished to decertify the union they had previously authorized as their bargaining agent, and whether—in a national emergency strike—they wished to accept the employer's last offer of settlement.

Of all the objections which the President raised to these and other provisions of the new law, one alone was valid in the light of actual experience to date. He said that the last offer elections would prove useless, and that the workers would always uphold their union leadership by rejecting the employer's final proposal.

That has been true. In the half-dozen such elections which have been held under the national emergency sections of the law, the workers have always refused to accept the employer's offer of settlement.

In many cases the unions have ordered their men not to vote in such an election, and in one case not one single valid ballot was cast. In disputes like the maritime strike, moreover, where union members are scattered all over the world, the holding of such an election has presented tremendous problems.

Then, too, in one instance, the employer came through with a better offer after he had officially posted his formal last offer; so that by the time the election was held the men were confronted by a question that was no longer an issue.

Recognizing the validity of the President's complaint on this score, the congressional watchdog committee has already recommended that this provision be stricken from the law—not on the ground that it has damaged anyone; but merely because it has proved a waste of effort.

Meanwhile, chalk up one hit—and one only—on Mr. Truman's box score.

NO. 13

National emergency strikes

WASHINGTON, February 23.—The Taft-Hartley law established an elaborate mechanism for dealing with national emergency strikes through the fact-finding boards and injunctions, but President Truman wanted no part of it. In his veto message he said:

"I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes."

But it did. Mr. Truman has invoked part or all of this mechanism in seven cases during the last year, with varying degrees of success. Here is the record:

1. Atomic-energy workers at Oak Ridge voted to strike. The President prevented the strike by obtaining an 80-day injunction. No agreement was reached during this period, and the injunction was lifted. Two days later the dispute was settled. No strike ever occurred.

2. Meat packers struck in a wage dispute. The President appointed a board of inquiry, but did not seek an injunction. The strike ran its course, and the workers finally went back at the employer's terms.

3. Coal miners walked out last spring, and for 9 days defied the injunction ordering them back to work. The dispute was then settled, and the union was found guilty of criminal contempt, and was fined. This is the only occasion upon which an injunction under this section of the law was disobeyed.

4. A second coal strike occurred in the captive mines later, and the Government applied for an injunction; but, even before the court could act, an agreement was reached.

5. Telephone workers threatened to strike over new contract negotiations. The President appointed a board of inquiry, and the threat faded at once. Negotiations were resumed and agreement was reached 4 weeks later, without further action by the board, and without an injunction.

6. Maritime strikes loomed on the east coast, west coast, and the Great Lakes. Three injunctions were obtained at Mr. Truman's direction. Before they expired agreements had been reached with the east coast and Great Lakes workers. On the west coast no settlement was obtained before the injunction was lifted, and a strike of several months' duration followed.

7. An injunction was obtained to prevent a strike of longshoremen on the east coast last August. Before it expired agreement was reached by the employers and a union negotiating committee, but the restraining order was lifted before the settlement was ratified by the workers. Sporadic strikes developed and became general under union leadership. The stoppage lasted several weeks.

In a majority of the cases, therefore, the procedure prevented, or ended, dangerous work interruptions; in two it merely delayed them.

NO. 14

The Conciliation Service

WASHINGTON, February 24.—Believing that the Federal Conciliation Service would operate more effectively if it were freed of any taint of bias on either side, Congress, when

it wrote the Taft-Hartley law, removed this agency from the Department of Labor and set it up as an independent establishment beholden to no one.

President Truman, in his veto message, protested vigorously. He denied that any improvement in the service would result, and declared that the agency would be deprived of factual research activities of other branches of the Department of Labor.

But once again it appears that the President was wrong. The record shows that the new service has operated more effectively than the old one in a number of respects:

First, it is one of the few Government agencies in Washington that has been able to cut down on personnel. In 1946 the old service had 488 employees. This year the new service will have 388—a reduction of more than 20 percent.

Second, the congressional watchdog committee has been unable to discover a single complaint of bias voiced either by management or by labor against the new agency.

Finally, the percentage of strikes occurring in cases handled by the new service is substantially lower than it was under the old service, as the following table shows:

	Number of cases closed	Percentage of strikes	
Fiscal year ending June 30—			
1946	16,434	20	Old service.
1947	14,422	21	
1948	10,627	18	New service.
1949 (first half)	7,734	12	

So the fact is that the Conciliation Service, as an independent agency, has operated more economically, more impartially, and more successfully than it did under the Wagner Act, when it was a mere adjunct of the Department of Labor.

NO. 15

The non-Communist affidavit

WASHINGTON, February 25.—In his veto message, President Truman stoutly condemned a provision of the Taft-Hartley law decreeing that union officers must sign a "non-Communist affidavit" before the union itself can qualify for the protection of the National Labor Relations Board.

"The only result of this provision," said Mr. Truman, "would be confusion and disorder, which is exactly the result the Communists desire." Basing this prediction upon the assumption that Communist-led unions—deprived of the NLRB's facilities—would have to win their objectives by strikes, he concluded that "it would increase, rather than decrease, the disruptive effects of Communists in our labor movement."

Of course, it has not. The sharp decline in the number and intensity of strikes has already been reported in an earlier article in this series, and Communist leaders have come under vigorous attack from the rank and file within their own unions. The congressional watchdog committee reports:

1. An overwhelming majority of unions has complied readily with this provision. Included are 95 of the A. F. of L.'s 105 internationals, 31 of the CIO's 39 national and international unions, and 50 unaffiliated independents.

2. One large international has adopted a constitutional amendment requiring its officers to sign the non-Communist oath, and in a number of cases union officers refusing to sign have been defeated for reelection.

3. Unions whose officers have complied have enjoyed "marked success" in supplanting noncomplying unions in NLRB collective-bargaining elections.

4. The Atomic Energy Commission has moved to bar two noncomplying unions from its laboratories. It has directed the General Electric Co. not to recognize the United Electrical Workers, CIO, as the bargaining representative of its employees at the New Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory at Schenectady; and it has ordered the University of Chicago not to recognize the United Public Workers of America, CIO, at the Argonne National Laboratory at Chicago.

So the indisputable fact is that the non-Communist affidavit provisions of the law have helped both labor and the Government to protect themselves against Communist activity.

NO. 16

Miscellaneous objections

WASHINGTON, February 28.—In addition to the prophecies already discussed, President Truman expressed numerous miscellaneous objections to the Taft-Hartley law, which are susceptible neither of proof nor contradiction. He insisted that the law would make it easier for employers to discriminate against union members, and that management could force a collective-bargaining election at a moment strategically disadvantageous to the union.

Perhaps. All that can be said is that there is no evidence on the records available here to show that the new law has encouraged such practices.

He complained that penalties against unions for violation of the law were more rigorous than those against employers, and cited, specifically, the section requiring that existing labor agreements be kept in force for 60 days, without strike or lock-out, pending negotiation of a new agreement. Strikers violating the law, he pointed out, could be discharged summarily, but in case of a lock-out, the employer could be forced only to restore the previous conditions of employment.

That objection, of course, is entirely academic. The Department of Labor, after searching its records, reports that it can find no case in which a lock-out ever occurred during this 60-day negotiation period. In fact, among the thousands of work stoppages that occur each year, it would be difficult to find a single bona fide lock-out of any kind. The lock-out is no longer a factor in labor-management relations.

Next, the President protested against the Taft-Hartley provision outlawing political expenditures either by labor unions or corporations. He said "it would prevent a union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections." The Supreme Court itself disproved that statement, however, by ruling that the law placed no such prohibition on union newspapers.

Finally, he criticized severely a section of the law declaring "that State laws prohibiting the union shop should take precedence over the Federal statute which permits the union shop."

"This," he said, "is a complete forsaking of a long-established constitutional principle."

But again the Supreme Court disagreed, and in a recent decision upheld the constitutionality of such State laws.

NO. 17

Unfair labor practices

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Throughout his Taft-Hartley veto the general theme of President Truman's complaint was that the bill would give employers an overpowering strength in their dealings with unions.

The old Wagner Act, it will be recalled, did just the reverse. It set forth a list of things which it said employers would not be allowed to do, an it called these unfair labor practices. It contained no corresponding list of things which unions should not be permitted to do.

The Taft-Hartley law retained in its entirety the list of unfair labor practices contained in the Wagner Act, but in an effort to restore a balance of power between labor and management, it included an additional list of practices to which unions were not allowed to resort.

Thus employers were given the right to go before the National Labor Relations Board with complaints against unions; just as unions continued to enjoy the right to bring to the Board their complaints against employers.

Now, if the new law had succeeded in achieving a perfect balance of power between labor and management, it might be expected that the number of cases brought to the Board by employers would be approximately equal to the number brought by unions; and if the law were as one-sided as President Truman and other critics insist it is, it would be assumed that the cases brought by employers would vastly outnumber those brought by unions.

The record of the NLRB tells it own story:

In the first 15 months under the Taft-Hartley law, 5,324 unfair-labor-practice cases were brought to the Board. Of these, 4,136—or nearly 80 percent—were instituted by unions against employers. Unions and individual workers filed 528 of the remaining cases against other unions; and employers brought only 660—or about 13 percent of the total—against unions.

"Clearly," concludes the congressional "watchdog" committee, after analyzing this record, "the majority of the Board's time will continue to be spent in preventing employer unfair labor practices."

NO. 18

A clear threat to our democratic society

WASHINGTON, March 2.—As a peroration to his veto message President Truman bundled all his objections to the Taft-Hartley law into one smashing, "superdooper" prophecy of doom.

"The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour," he said. "I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society."

Particularizing, he said it would weaken our trade-union movement, thus destroying a strong bulwark against totalitarianism; it would weaken the national economy, and would go far toward destroying our national unity.

But nowhere in the records of any official agency in Washington is there to be found any evidence that America's democratic society has been weakened under the Taft-Hartley law. On the contrary that enfeebled society has managed to devote billions of dollars to the job of strengthening the less democratic societies of other nations. Here, in quick summary, are the facts:

Instead of being weakened, labor unions are stronger than ever before in their history. They have more members. They have more union-shop agreements. They are more largely covered by welfare funds. They have scored tremendous economic gains and strengthened their ranks against Communists.

The national economy has reached a new all-time peak with the highest national income in the history of this or any other nation, the highest wages ever paid, the greatest purchasing power, and the highest standard of living. Since the law went into effect employment has reached a fantastic new high and production has zoomed upward. Critical wartime shortages are disappearing and inflation apparently has been licked.

Instead of being destroyed, national unity has been strengthened materially by a sharp decline in hate-breeding industrial disputes. Work stoppages have decreased enormously, the number of strikers has dropped off mark-

edly, and 45,000,000 man-days of labor that were lost through strikes in the closing months of the Wagner era have been saved in the Taft-Hartley period.

In short, not one of the major disasters which President Truman prophesied has materialized, and, in view of the actual results of 16 months' experience under the Taft-Hartley Act, it is difficult to believe that his veto message was intended to apply to that measure at all.

It would be far more reasonable to suppose that he was talking about S. O. B.—Some other bill.

The Charitable Organizations of the Nation Should Not Be Taken Over by the Social Security Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the words "social security" have come to mean much to the American people. Until a few years ago these words had no special connotation. These words also mean much to industry and to the employers of the country. They are also important words to the Federal Government and to the governments of the several States, because of the tremendous amount of money that has been required to make these words effective under the law.

More than 50,000,000 of our people are now included in one or the other of the several categories of the social-security laws. If the administration's proposed legislation which is now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee was to be enacted it would take in 23,000,000 more. This would be more than one-half of the population of the Nation.

If this group should ever be of one accord with reference to some national political or social question and would raise its voice in unison in a demand on the Government, it would be a mighty crescendo which would surely be heard by those in power whose power depended upon the turn of general elections.

There is little wonder, therefore, that the Ways and Means Committee has been sitting nearly every day for the past 6 weeks, hearing testimony of the groups who are interested in the social-security laws and in any amendments that may be offered to these laws.

This great committee surely appreciates the importance of this subject and the grave responsibility of bringing to this House changes designed to strengthen this program.

I do not presume to speak for the Ways and Means Committee or for any member of the committee except myself. I volunteer these few statements because I feel the importance of the changes which the Federal Security Agency is proposing to make in these laws.

If the Congress should follow all the recommendations made by the Social Security Branch of the Federal Security Agency, as set forth in H. R. 2892 and H. R. 2893, plus other proposals which will be offered, such as national prepaid insurance, we will be on the broad, straight highway that leads directly to the welfare state. This highway is not provided with any turn-outs. Once on it, our future will be dangerously uncertain. From the welfare state to the socialist state is only a short distance.

The first social-security laws were passed in 1935, and at that time many people thought that this was the most important and the most far-reaching domestic or social legislation ever passed by any Congress. At that time fear was expressed in many quarters that we were adopting a principle that was inherently socialistic and that a tremendous bureaucracy would be the inevitable outgrowth of this principle. The fear as to the bureaucracy has been fully justified. If the administration's measures now before the committee are all passed, the fear as to the socialistic tendencies will be fully justified.

The first social-security legislation was presented to the Congress by Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a piece of "must" legislation, to be passed immediately. The Ways and Means Committee of the House refused to heed the Great Voice, and took its own time to work out this important task. The committee worked for 9 weeks and prepared its own bill. That bill was passed by the House after nearly 2 weeks of debate and consideration. The first bill passed by the House did not contain title 10, which provides relief for the blind. Title 10 was offered as an amendment in the House by me, and although it received enthusiastic support, it failed to be adopted by a few votes. The Senate adopted title 10 in about the same language as I had offered it, and it became a part of the law.

The first social-security bill provided for assistance to several categories. These categories have become well defined now, and are about as follows:

1. Grants to States for old-age assistance.
2. Grants for aid for dependent children.
3. Grants for maternal and child welfare.
4. Grants for aid to the blind.
5. Federal old-age insurance benefits.
6. Federal and State program for unemployment compensation.

In 1939 the social-security laws were amended somewhat. The principal amendments were provisions for survivor benefits and increases in the benefits formula.

As I have already stated, when the social-security laws were first passed and the Social Security Board set up much fear was expressed that this legislation had inherent in it great potentialities of usurpation of power. This was the Federal Government's first venture into "give me" legislation. The real purpose of this legislation was a worthy one, but, as I have already stated, it had in it the germ of socialism.

That there was justification for the fears of the people with reference to the administration of this legislation was soon established, because the Social Security Board began to assume power and authority that was greatly beyond its jurisdiction. I wish to cite two instances of the unreasonable arrogation of power by the Board:

First. The Social Security Board about 10 years ago improperly injected itself into the administration of the old-age-pension laws in the State of Ohio, for no other reason than that the Governor of Ohio, who was a Democrat, had crossed swords with Harry Hopkins, who was then the great money dispenser for the Government. Each took to the newspapers with scathing personal accusations. At that time I was inclined to believe the accusations made by both of them, but since both of them have since died, it would probably be more polite for me to leave them alone in their glory. At any rate, Ohio was arrogantly and unlawfully deprived of $1,338,000. This amount, with interest, is still owing to Ohio. That the Social Security Board was wrong in its action is proved conclusively because when I introduced a bill in Congress providing that Ohio should be reimbursed for the loss of this money, that bill passed the House and the Senate by a tremendous vote, but the President, under the influence of the forces which made the unreasonable order, vetoed the bill. The Congress failed to override the veto by only a very close vote. Justice will not be done until the Federal Government pays the State of Ohio the money which was withheld from her by the arrogant and unlawful action of the Social Security Board.

Second. Another case of gross usurpation of power is shown in the conduct of the Social Security Board in placing more than 750,000 persons on the list to receive benefits that were not entitled to be on the list. As a result, most of these received compensation for which they had not paid a penny. It required an act of Congress to compel the Board to desist from its unlawful practices. The money that had been unlawfully paid out has not been returned to the fund from whence it came.

I now proceed to address myself to the two bills which the Ways and Means Committee has been considering for the past few weeks. These two bills are administration bills, prepared by the Federal Security Agency, and were sent up to Congress by the President with a rating of urgent legislation. Again the Ways and Means Committee asserted its independence and refused to do the will of those who would deliver us into what is now frequently spoken of as a welfare state.

H. R. 2892 is a bill which would put practically all public assistance under the control of the Federal Government. Those who foster this bill maintain, in effect, that any individual, regardless of age or condition of health, would be eligible for assistance payments, based solely on need.

This bill, if passed, would discourage all voluntary charity which runs into many millions of dollars and which has characterized the American people and which is one of the evidences of the true greatness of the American people. "Charity suffereth long and is kind." "Charity is not puffed up." Nothing should be done by legislation that would

stifle charity. The Good Book says that "Charity never faileth."

By this bill the Government would force itself into control of the great charity work that has been so wonderfully done by the American churches and by the civic and the fraternal organizations. This Agency would do this on the theory that the Government could do this work more scientifically and efficiently. They give little consideration to the fact of the tremendous financial outlay it would entail.

Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, has indicated that the Government must extend to every individual complete medical care and hospitalization and nursing facilities, without reference to the cost of the specific service.

He would go further, if possible, than Mr. Arthur Altmeyer, the Social Security Commissioner, who recently said:

> Social security, in the most inclusive sense of the term, includes all things necessary to enable the individual citizen of a country to lead a personally satisfying and socially useful life.

In other words, these men apparently are practically committed to a program of Federal assistance that would be sufficient to personally satisfy every individual, so that he could live a social life to his own personal satisfaction. That would cost the Federal Government, conservatively, $25,000,000,000 annually in a few years. While this group favors this extravagant legislation, they do not say anything about the terrific political potentialities inherent in it. This could become the vehicle by which a power-minded Federal administration could perpetuate its hold upon the country. Social insurance would reach into millions of homes with potential benefits which might, under certain conditions, develop political implications. Certainly it invites competition between opposing political parties in making promises to the electorate, and a party in power might attempt to keep itself in power by convincing voters that their social benefits would be endangered by a change in administration. When more than half of our people are in one social operation which depends substantially on the Federal Treasury, their wishes, expressed in consonance, would command political power.

Also, it must not be forgotten that the chief supporters of this legislation are closely related by political consanguinity to Harry Hopkins, whose chief claim to fame was that he was the most profligate spender in the history of the world, and it was he who effectively proved that free distribution of Federal money is the best way to "Elect, elect, elect."

I feel that the hearings now being held by the Ways and Means Committee have completely put to flight these apostles of Government in everything, and that their program for taking full control of all the public assistance of the Nation is doomed to failure. This was one of the boldest attempts toward putting the Government into socialism that I have ever seen. While I think these forces have been stopped, I would have you know that this group has a persistency that nearly surpasses its impertinency, if that is possible. Truly, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Every man is entitled to his rights, but in these stressful days every man is bound to assume and give a complete fulfillment of his entire duty. Rights should be respected. Duty must be done.

I would not have you believe that I am opposed to all amendments to the social-security laws. The contrary is true. I favor wider coverage. I also think that in many instances benefits should be increased, and I also believe that the contribution of the employer and the individual to the old-age and survivors' insurance coverage should be increased now or in the near future so as to insure the solvency of the fund from which the social-security benefits are paid. I think that those groups who are anxious to be included should be given every reasonable consideration, and likewise I believe that the problem of extended coverage of some other groups is not so urgent as to warrant the use of compulsion to drive them into the program.

In the Eightieth Congress the Ways and Means Committee voted out for consideration by the House a bill providing a number of amendments to the social-security laws. The House passed that bill, but the Senate did not have time to consider it. I voted for that bill, and I think it would be well at this time to have that bill reintroduced and reconsidered.

The central philosophy of social security is that it affords an opportunity to individuals to better themselves and to better the condition of their families, and to secure themselves and their families against some of the vicissitudes of life.

Mr. Speaker, work and thrift have done more to make America great than any other policies. Work and thrift should be encouraged. America is still the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the best social-security system that our country can have would come from a full realization by our people of the great opportunities that our country still offers. We need a resurgence toward the virtues of industry and thrift.

Mr. Speaker, practically all wealth comes from the ground and from the dexterity of the hands of the people and the acumen of the mind of the people. It does not come from the Government.

Why Food-Drug Checks Cannot Be Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, April 4, 1949, the Washington Post carried an editorial on the subject Why Food-Drug Checks Cannot Be Divided, written by the Honorable Edward Brown Williams. Mr. Williams is an attorney here in Washington and formerly was assistant general counsel for the Federal Security Agency. He is, therefore, well qualified to write on this subject. He is a native of my district from Arkadelphia, Ark., and it was my happy privilege to have been a classmate of his in Henderson Brown College, of his home city.

I have had occasion to read the article referred to and written by Mr. Williams. It is based on the Hoover Commission recommendation that the functions of the Food and Drug Administration relating to foods be transfered to the Department of Agriculture. It is an excellent discussion on this subject, showing his reasons why such transfer should not be made. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House and ask unanimous consent to extend the original with my remarks.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1949.*
The EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, Welfare Reports, of Monday, March 28, takes note of the proposal of the Hoover Commission that the functions of the Food and Drug Administration relating to foods be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and that those relating to drugs be transferred to the Health Bureau of a proposed new United Medical Administration.

The Commission states that the present separation among several agencies of regulatory authority over food, drugs, and cosmetics "creates great overlap and confuses the public." The matter is one of considerable importance to both the food and drug industries and the public. The Commission's proposal should, therefore, be subjected to the closest scrutiny before a decision is made to carry it into effect.

The Food and Drug Administration, now a constituent unit of the Federal Security Agency, has been at the job of policing interstate shipments of food and drugs since 1906 with conspicuous success. During that period, the advance in standards of food and drug manufacture and processing in the United States has been notably greater than that of any other country in the world. The Administration has, moreover, achieved the highest order of respect among the industries subject to its regulatory jurisdiction. The responsible majority of them regard it as a safeguard for their own high standards and reputations against the marginal violators of the law who, sooner or later, are taken into camp by the Administration and either converted to the faith, or, if they are recalcitrant, are put out of business.

That there is no real justification of either economy or efficiency for disturbing the present successful operation is, I think, demonstrated by the following considerations:

(1) The Commission's proposal would involve the subjection of the policy-making and enforcement function in food-regulatory activities and food standard-making to a producer-minded department rather than, as now, to an agency whose interests are not geared to any one segment of the population.

The aim of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as its legislative history amply demonstrates, is the protection of the public interest in the integrity and honest marketing of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. It will certainly be granted that the Department of Agriculture would enforce the food provisions of the law in the consumer interest as that interest appears to it. But the farmer is also a consumer. Can it reasonably be supposed that his interest as a particular class—a minority—would not weigh with some heaviness upon policy-forming personnel who, in effect, represent that interest and that this influence would not make itself felt in regu-

latory matters which concern both industry and the general public?

The Commission's task force on agricultural activities recognized that occasional conflicts arise between consumer and agricultural interests and achieve substantial political significance, but stated that such controversies are, after all, relatively infrequent. The fact is that such controversies underly every contest in the Food and Drug Administration's important food standard hearings where the use of chemical substitutes for natural products is involved, as well as controversies such as those mentioned in the report of the Commission's task force. Similar conflicts arise in connection with the day-to-day prosecution of legal actions against agricultural products. They are likely to come to the attention of the public only in exceptional cases. But this is no measure of the significance to the public of the manner in which they are decided by the Government.

The primary interest of the Department of Agriculture is in the rural-life activities of the country and not in the regulation of commercial practices. The fact that it does exercise regulatory functions in other than its primary field is no valid reason for adding to those functions.

Eight years ago, in recommending to Congress the transfer of the Food and Drug Administration from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Security Agency, President Roosevelt said that, "The work of the Food and Drug Administration is unrelated to the basic functions of the Department of Agriculture," and expressed the belief that "the opportunity for the Food and Drug Administration to develop along the increasingly constructive lines" lay in the Federal Security Agency. These reasons are as applicable today as they were then.

(2) The proposal would entail the loss of the effective continuity of policy and personnel maintained for many years by the Food and Drug Administration; the loss of the breadth and intensity of experience in the development of scientific techniques which comes from such continuity and from the technical advantages of operating in the three areas of food, drug, and cosmetic regulation rather than in a single one of those areas; and it would result in unnecessary and wasteful duplication by the Department of Agriculture and the new medical agency of headquarters and field administrative, technical, and inspection personnel and laboratory equipment. These are quite obvious disadvantages which promote neither economy, efficiency, or better service to the public.

(3) Adoption of the Commission's proposal would create overlaps and conflicts of jurisdiction more troublesome than those which would be eliminated.

(a) The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains numerous basic provisions common to food, drug, and cosmetic regulation; for example: the criminal, seizure, and injunction provisions; authority to promulgate exempting regulations as well as regulations establishing affirmative requirements; and certain very basic misbranding and adulteration provisions. It would be intolerable to have two agencies following different enforcement and regulatory policies under the same or substantially identical provisions of the same law.

(b) Carriers and industry would be faced with investigations of their records, plants, and warehouses by two different sets of inspectors instead of one, as now.

(c) Under the law, many articles may be subject to regulations as both foods and drugs, according to the uses to which they are to be put and whether they are listed as drugs in the United States Pharmacopoeia, the National Formulary, or the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia, the official drug compendia. The United States Pharmacopoeia alone lists as drugs more than 35 common foods.

A manufacturer of vitamin pills who succeeded in clearing his product as a drug with the splinter of the divided Food and Drug Administration enforcing the provisions of law relating to drugs—the medical agency—might, nevertheless, find the product seized and himself prosecuted criminally by the food splinter—the Department of Agriculture—for the violation of identical provisions relating to foods. This is not an unlikely situation. Manufacturers and shippers have suffered similar painful experiences as a result of the present divided jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, which polices advertising of foods and drugs, and the Food and Drug Administration, which regulates labeling of the same articles.

The extreme divergence of opinion as to the disposition of the Food and Drug Administration between the Commission and the three task forces which have considered this problem, and between these task forces themselves, is a significant element of this picture.

Commissioners James K. Pollock and James H. Rowe, Jr., dissented from the Commission's recommendation and have recorded an excellent statement of their reasons. The task force on agricultural activities proposed the shift of all functions of the Food and Drug Administration to the Department of Agriculture; the task force on public welfare said they should all go to the Public Health Service; and the task force on Federal medical services wanted them placed in the public-health division of a proposed national bureau of health. Such unanimity of difference is not conducive to confidence in the Commission's conclusions in this matter.

This impression is underlined by the fact that these conclusions are themselves inconsistent with the Commission's own professed principle of grouping agencies according to major purpose. Elaboration is not required to show that protection of the purse and health of consumers is not the major purpose of the Department of Agriculture and that the projected medical agencies would have little to do with the important nonhealth function of the Food and Drug Administration—the safeguarding of the public's pocketbook.

It seems clear that better reasons must be advanced if the change recommended by the Commission is to be justified on the record. As a matter of fact, the Commission has succeeded only in a penetration of the bare periphery of the food and drug regulatory problem. It has obscured the real issues by the adoption of an oversimplified pattern of functional alinement apparently based on product origin rather than on the purpose and character of the regulatory function itself.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD BROWN WILLIAMS.
Formerly Assistant General Counsel, Federal Security Agency.

The Significance of Army Day 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1949, Americans throughout our Nation observed Army Day to commemorate the huge contributions of our fighting men of this branch of our armed forces who fought in defense of our country. But greater yet is the admiration and veneration we owe to our soldier dead of all wars, who made the supreme sacrifice for God and for country.

Every American today looks with great satisfaction upon the successful operations of our armies completed in the past and present, on behalf of the safety of our established institutions. Our citizen armies coming from all races, creeds, and colors have always filled the breach which the emergencies of unpreparedness and necessity for speedy and efficient action have made necessary. They came from the factories, the offices, and the farms, from the cities and the rural districts. Amenable to instruction and discipline, they fitted into a mold into which only an American can be patterned. For in this mold is honesty and sincerity of purpose, courage and understanding, swiftness and determination in action, and last but not least, a love of peace and distaste for aggression. Once this mold is broken, the greatest attributes of character which must rest in the make-up of a fighting man, quickly disappear. For in time of crisis, it is the infantryman and his coworkers struggling and sloshing through mud and burning sands, wind, rain, and snow, climbing and descending hilltops and mountains, penetrating forests and brush—yes, it is this branch which holds the ground already won or stands immovable as a rock in defense of the terrain either to be held or saved.

If we peer into the history of our small beginnings, we marvel at the greatness which our fighting men have attained.

The Minute Men of '76, after 7 years of discouragement and uphill fighting, established a Nation of freemen and freewomen. We never fail to remind ourselves of the sufferings at Valley Forge, the difficult and courageous Trenton crossing, the slow but skillful retreats of Washington employing fabian tactics of delay. But the indomitable spirit of these irrepressible and stouthearted fighters for liberty and freedom was not to be denied in spite of the hardships these early Americans encountered and so successfully met. It was these men of 1776 who gave full force to the Declaration of Independence and support for the Constitution of the United States.

Reviewing further the meritorious efforts of the infantryman and the other members of his team, we recall the War of 1812 wherein, although they suffered defeat after defeat, nevertheless when the chips were down, they fought and routed a superior host, the pick of the English troops at New Orleans under that distinguished leader, Gen. Andrew Jackson.

History again tells us of the American soldier in action at Palo Alto when, in the Mexican War of 1848, the great military general, Winfield Scott, matched forces with Santa Anna, the Mexican, and inflicted terrific and lasting losses upon the attackers and from this victory came the acquisition of the vast territory of California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and part of Colorado.

Today we look back with regret upon the internecine strife which pitted American against American, the men in blue

of the Grand Army of the Republic against the gray of the Confederate forces. Here we find two superior specimens of American manhood battling each other to a standstill, until exhaustion and weakness brought on by reduced manpower and material strength forced upon the South, the surrender at Appomatox. And with this victory was assured the preservation of the Union.

On this day of gratitude and thanks to the men and women of the Army, we recall the brave efforts of the men of '98 who, fighting tropical heat and disease, over difficult terrain vanquished Arsenio Linares at San Juan. And with the vanquishing of the Spaniard, we assumed for the first time our rightful place among the nations of the world—a world power with which to be reckoned.

If the book of history were to be closed with the record established by the Army up to 1898 we would look upon one of lustrious military accomplishment in Army exploit. But the record is not complete, for there followed two magnificent demonstrations of American military prowess never equaled in military annals. On April 6, 1917, 32 years ago today, World War I was upon us. The doughboy of '17 and '18 met the Boche at the height of his fury and full force, traded blow for blow with him at Belleau Wood, at Chateu-Thierry and in the Argonne. How well this American soldier distinguished himself is related in the continuing saga of American superiority under arms; demonstrated when free Americans living under a truly representative Government oppose and conquer representatives of totalitarian forces of self-styled supermen bent on aggression and wanton destruction of life and property.

In passing it may be noted that today only four Members of the House serving on April 6, 1917, are still Members of the House, namely, Mr. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; our Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, and myself.

And now we come to what we hope is the last chapter in world history of destructive acts upon the ideals and peace of mankind. In 1941 we find history repeating itself and again the same forces are pitted against each other with the same causes and effects, the same ideas and same forces arrayed one against the other, and with the same results, the defeat and subjugation of the tyrant, and again the huge destruction of life and treasure. Once again in that conflict the American boy whose branch of service we honor today, barred the path of his cruel adversaries in the far reaches of Europe, Asia, and Africa and slowly but surely reduced them and their braggart leaders to craven and abject hulks of men they always had been, even during their periods of temporary advantage.

And thus it is on this Army Day of 1949 I raise my voice with reverence in praise and admiration of our honored American dead of all wars who have never failed and shall never fail to protect the honor of our flag—who shall in the present and in the future, guarantee our democratic ideals and democratic form of government.

May our gratitude and our fervent prayers bring to them solace and consolation. To them is transmitted the loving memory of a grateful American people for a life ennobled and dedicated to justice, freedom, and democracy.

We the living, ever mindful of their supreme sacrifice, salute American royalty, our heroic war immortals, at the bivouac of the dead on this Army Day, April 6, 1949.

Guaranty Clause of ECA Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the House of Representatives will consider amendments to the ECA Act. The guaranty provisions, as adopted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, present some of the most important of these changes. I append a communication of Norman M. Littell as it appears in the Washington Post of April 8, 1949, because it presents a clear discussion of the problem:

APRIL 1, 1949.

RISKLESS ENTERPRISE? RECKLESS JOURNALISM (REGARDING THE GUARANTY CLAUSE OF THE ECA ACT)

Your editorial of Friday, March 25, attacking the House Foreign Affairs Committee's amendments to the guaranty clause of the ECA Act commences with a misrepresentation of fact in its very title, "Riskless Enterprise." As a description of the proposed amendments, this irresponsible caption has no basis in fact, and grossly misleads your readers.

In the text, instead of looking at the merits, your writer proceeds to look for creeping things under rocks and characterizes a serious attempt to solve a problem which he does not understand, first as a "trap" into which the Foreign Affairs Committee "fell * * * under the insistent pushing of the American Bar Association and of certain businessmen and bankers," then as "the kind of sham now sanctioned by the Foreign Affairs Committee," and finally as "an unconscionable raid on the Federal Treasury." Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, most of whom have vastly more training and practical experience in American life than your penman, are dismissed as a group of men who "do not seem to understand what free enterprise means," and the changes they deemed necessary are said to "conflict with the system under which the United States has grown rich and strong."

To anyone acquainted with the exceedingly able and conscientious group of Democrats and Republicans on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, this is an evil reward for their conscientious study of all amendments in long hours, days, and weeks of painstaking work.

To reach a safe vantage point for condemnation, your heady writer also had to sweep aside such trivial and inconsequential minds as three distinguished Members of the United States Senate known for their progressive attitudes, a distinguished authority on international law who is the editor of the Journal of International Law and Washington representative of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, all of whom signed the report of the Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation [1] of the American Bar Association, and others who recommended changes which your editorial condemns. Your editorial assumes that none of these distinguished citizens has any interest in the welfare of our country or any knowledge of the complex legal background of the problem—that is, no knowledge comparable to the ivory-tower reflections of your editorial writer.

What are the dread amendments proposed?

The original guaranty clause provided for a guaranty of convertibility (i. e., from foreign currencies back into dollars) for the principal amount of private investments made in Marshall-plan countries with the approval of the Administrator. The proposed changes would: (1) Extend the guaranty in amount to include interest or profits to the extent found reasonable by the Administrator; (2) extend the guaranty in scope to include certain political risks lying on the level of American foreign policy rather than on the private risk level, e. g., leases caused by seizure, confiscation, revolution, war, or other governmental regulations or decrees which in the Administrator's opinion prevent the further use of the investment for the intended purpose; and (3) reinstate $272,000,000 of the original $300,000,000 guaranty appropriation so it must be used for guaranties instead of being consumed in direct loans to foreign governments as the original funds were, contrary to the intent and instructions of Congress.

Your alarm over these things could stem from a failure to consider the underlying premises which led to the Foreign Affairs Committee proposals. In 1947 this Nation committed itself to a vast program of reconstruction and rehabilitation in western Europe to help our friends stand with us for a free way of life. We have backed that commitment with billions of dollars.

In the system under which the United States has grown rich and strong, standards of living depend on the production of goods. Trade, agriculture, and industry flourish when capital, raw materials, manpower, and production know-how are joined and held together by good business management. Simply stated, that is free enterprise. The alternative, in black and white terms of contemporary history, is the total regimentation of capital and labor by Government bureaucracy.

So when Congress set up this vast program of reconstruction, it could appropriate money and set up a bureaucracy to dole it out (the ECA) and receive it (the OEEC); or it could enlist private resources and American industrial know-how and management. In the emergency, Congress used the former method as a common denominator of administration, authorizing $5,000,000,000 in direct grants and $1,000,000,000 in loans, but it also laid foundations for the latter course in authorizing guaranties up to $300,000,000 for the encouragement * * * of private enterprise to contribute through its initiative and capital in the reconstruction and development of Europe.[2] We set up bureaucracies on both sides of the Atlantic, and they were astonishingly efficient before the real challenge of spending so much money so fast.

Only the guaranty program was a complete failure for reasons reviewed by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. The guaranties weren't adequate in amount or in

[1] Members of this committee are Senators Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Mr. George A. Finch, editor of the Journal of International Law and representative of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, D. C.; and the writer, who serves as chairman of this committee.

[2] S. Rept. No. 935, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948 (p. 53).

scope. And 90 percent of the $300,000,000 was allocated by ECA for loans instead of guaranties (contrary to the intent of Congress). In the words of Mr. Bevin, speaking in Parliament, we Americans proved ourselves to be great free enterprisers at home and great state planners abroad.

When the ECA officials came around to tell Congress what they wanted for next year, their proposal, as adopted in good faith by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, looked as if the $300,000,000 was to be reestablished for guaranties, but actually it wasn't. Any further guranties were to come out of grant funds. If adopted, this will be absolutely fatal. No participating country will ever approve a single guaranty if it constitutes a deduction from granted funds. If there is any trap in the picture, this is it, for without the Senate committee having fully realized it, the guaranty clause is deftly eased out of the act and complete bureaucratic control maintained over every penny of ECA money.

The Foreign Affairs Committee in the House not only exposed these facts but rewrote the guaranty clause to reinstate and implement the original intent of Congress to induce private enterprise and risk capital to assume part of the load of reconstruction. Under either system we are spending the same American dollars, but in one case it is tax money and in the other it is stockholders' money spent under business management.

We are only talking about $300,000,000 (which will very probably invite into operation partnership capital of about equal proportions abroad) for privately managed projects approved by the Administrator and the participating country as furthering the purposes of the Marshall plan. Your editorial does not state this material fact, but says, "It is idle for advocates of this change to pretend that it would not put an appreciable burden on the Government. Suppose the proposed guaranty had been in effect during the twenties, when American private investors lost hundreds of millions in Latin America, or during the thirties in central Europe. Wouldn't our Government have had to foot the bill for a large part of these losses?"

The superficiality of that statement is breathtaking. We were not engaged in a world struggle to preserve a free way of life in the twenties. We are now. A Marshall plan or an Atlantic Pact were undreamed of then, and we have spent or committed on them vastly more than we dropped in South America in stockholders' money without ever expecting to see it again—all a part of the calculated risk.

The sum we are now discussing is $300,000,000, and the risks embraced in the proposed guaranty amendments are not ordinary business risks, but are extraordinary political risks which no investor would encounter in a similar undertaking in the United States. Such risks are properly the concern of governments and not private investors. They are a part and parcel of our foreign policy already, for every penny of the billions spent on the Marshall plan may become a total loss for one or more of the reasons stated in these amendments, with this vital distinction: The loss of our investment under the Marshall plan will be total and complete if the plan fails in any participating country, but under a guaranty the Government would not sustain a total loss because it takes over currencies, credits, and assets of the guaranteed investor, from which something can surely be salvaged to the Government through diplomatic negotiations or recourse to the International Court.[3]

[3] See sec. 115 of the act, and art. X of the bilateral agreements with each participating country, in regard to espousing claims in the courts on behalf of nationals.

In conclusion,[4] your editorial misses the purpose of guaranties. American industrial production won the war. Even Joe Stalin recognized this in proposing toasts at Tehran to American productive capacity. It could help win the cold war too, and (if extended under President Truman's Point IV) raise living standards all over the world, for what Europe and the so-called backward areas of the world need is goods, goods and more goods. And what we need is goods flowing in a two-way world. No Atlantic Pact can produce goods or create employment at reasonable wages in order to replace despair with the hope and means of a free way of life, but American techniques and know-how of production abroad could do so.

Thus far this unique American contribution to contemporary civilization, the genius for industrial production, has remained meekly chained at home.

The object is to release our productive capacity not for the purpose of exploitation but for greater service, participation and mutual prosperity in industrial enterprise.

NORMAN M. LITTELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

[4] I cannot trace out all the errors in your editorial, like the statement that the amendments "would add to the dollar drain on European countries." This is simply untrue. Guaranties are a new source of additional dollar credits.

Socialized Medicine—Russia Under Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, constantly the big metropolitan press with their highly paid editorial staffs discuss the problems of the day.

I present herewith two editorials from a small-town newspaper that to my mind present the subject matter more forcibly than any of the so-called metropolitan press.

These two articles clearly show that people back home in the rural areas are deeply concerned with this country's problems.

[From the Argonia (Kans.) Journal of February 18, 1949]

UNCLE SAM HAS NO DOCTOR OF MEDICINE DEGREE

Men who like to call themselves liberals have one outstanding trait. They are always kicking and anyone who opposes their wild-eyed schemes is classed as an obstructionist or a conservative. Right at present the victim of this particular brand of so-called liberalism is the medical profession and a drive is being made to make people believe they're being denied medical attention which only the Government can provide.

Doctors have struggled for centuries in laboratories and at bedsides to learn the secrets of keeping the human body alive and healthy. Many dread diseases have been eliminated and the span of life has been doubled in a few decades. Not so very long ago appendicitis was treated with opium pills, poultices, and castor oil. This form of treatment was cheap, but most of the patients died. The diabetic was given codeine and put on a diet. Again the doctor's charges were low, but, as the obituaries read, the patient departed this world. The enormous progress in medical care and the ever-growing complexity of treatment has naturally added to the cost, as does anything which contributes to modern living.

A lot of cockeyed schemers whose blood pressure would have killed them long ago if a few competent physicians had not been at hand are telling the people how neglected they are and that the medical profession has got to do better or Uncle Sam will have to step in and take care of all their needs, from the cradle to the grave, at a cost of six or eight million dollars a year, to be taken out of all pay checks each month.

In the palmy days of the Roman Empire the average lifetime was about 25 years. By 1700 it had risen to 33 years in the most advanced nations. Now it is crowding 70 years, and it has been done by the eternal vigilance of the medical profession, not by socialized medicine. After the shouting has died down and the professional psalm-singers have taken up some other fad, it will still be up to the doctors to keep us healthy, and they won't need some bureaucrat in Washington to tell them how to do it.

Voluntary prepaid medical plans, such as the Blue Cross and other similar organizations, have made it possible for the majority of Americans to anticipate doctor and hospital costs by paying small monthly sums. The small proportion of people who cannot pay anything at all can be cared for without compelling everybody to go into it, whether they need it or not. The country does not want or need a grandiose medical scheme that would cost billions of dollars and subject the doctors to the political whims of some bureau at Washington.

Socialized medicine would do no more than make the Government a bill collector for the doctors, payable in advance, with a part of the money retained for bureaucratic activities. Uncle Sam has no degree in medicine and medical advancement will be achieved in the future by the doctors, as it has since the days of Hippocrates, in spite of those self-styled liberals who are trying to woo votes by making the health of the Nation a political issue.

F. J. C.

[From the Argonia (Kans.) Journal of April 1, 1949]

GOVERNMENT OPPRESSION IS AN OLD STORY

It is claimed by the Communists in Russia, and echoed by their fellow travelers in this country, that some form of communism will eventually prevail throughout the world because it is a young and dynamic doctrine, filled with vitality and promise, which satisfies the higher ambitions of people. On the other hand, these same people argue that capitalistic democracy is old and exhausted, has outlived whatever value it once had, and so is doomed to extinction in the long run. It is to this class that some of our intellectual nuts belong, some of whom are found on college faculties, and who think such ideas show a superior form of intelligence.

This has been stated by totalitarian propagandists and by some misguided people in this country who are continually striving to give the Government more power over the people. But it is a complete perversion of all history. There is nothing basically new in communism, fascism, or other totalitarian doctrines except the name. It is as old as cruelty and oppression. It deals with heretics, with weapons of torture, execution, and banishment. Its labor policy is that of serfdom—every man and every woman is regarded as a slave of the state, to be used as the official ruling class desires. Its economic philosophy is that of an absolute monarchy, when everything was the property of the king and the freedom of opportunity was unknown. Its attitude toward all civil

liberties—freedom of press, of speech, or assembly—is likewise as old as history. Everyone must say and think what they are told, or suffer the consequences.

Are the masses of Russian people any better off under the Soviets than they were under the Romanoffs? Can ruthless dictatorship succeed another by force of arms? The people, in whose name the revolution was effected, are still submerged in an abyss of ignorance, want, fear, and absolute mental and physical regimentation.

Capitalistic democracy, with all its admitted faults, is the only form of government which has proved itself capable of maintaining the freedoms of the people. It is the only form of government in which the people exert complete authority and have the eternal safeguards that make dictatorships impossible. It is the goal toward which nations have strived through long bloody centuries, and for which millions of men have died. The dynamics of the total state are in reality the dynamics of the cruelest form of feudalism.

F. J. C.

State Department's Spanish Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Donald J. Lotrich, secretary of the Yugoslav Savings and Loan Association, Chicago. The writer queries whether there is anything we can do to stop our State Department from carrying out their present Fascist policy. The subject matter of this letter is most revealing and worthy of serious thought on the part of each and every Member of Congress.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 18, 1949.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I write to you because I know that you are interested in the manner in which our State Department has been handling the situation concerning Spain.

On August 24, I wrote to the State Department about the murder of the group of Spanish miners in the most barbaric way such crimes could possibly be committed. They replied on September 17 that the Department had no available information on the case, but that the Embassy in Madrid had been instructed to ascertain the facts and they would report again.

When on November 23 no further word had been heard, I inquired again. Their December 3 letter explained that the American Embassy made a preliminary inquiry, but that it failed to disclose such an occurrence. The investigation was being continued, however.

I took them to task in my letter of December 9 and again on February 16, 1949, but it looks like to no avail.

Is there anything we can do to stop our State Department from carrying out their present Fascist policy?

Please let me hear from you.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD J. LOTRICH.

Address of Hon. Sam Hobbs, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. SAM HOBBS, before the Canadian Council of Laymen, at Toronto, Canada:

Mr. Chairman. Friends. The honorable gentleman who so graciously strained his conscience in introducing me, made me think of the funeral of a prominent colored citizen down in Alabama. The officiating minister was eulogizing the deceased in glowing terms, describing the perfection of his character as husband, father, neighbor, friend, and churchman, when the widow arose and started toward the coffin. The preacher tearfully remonstrated: "Now, sit down, Sister Brown, I knows you is hurted in your heart, but dis aint de time to view the corpse." But the widow replied: "Maybe not, Reverend, but, 'fore God, I believe you is burying the wrong nigger."

The sole reason that my duty is neglected to accept your gracious invitation and fill this engagement, is the place of world leadership that Canada has attained in the movement toward Protestant unity, and her service through the Canadian Council of Laymen.

Nothing could be more important.

And may I dare anticipate the approval of your noble King, and congratulate your great nation upon the imminence of making your oldest Crown Colony your tenth Province?

My subject poses the most soul-searching query, that must be troubling every thoughtful mind:

Do we stand at Armageddon?

The forces of evil are certainly already massed on that field of battle, and spoiling for the fray. They have swept the world, capturing every stronghold of morality, and winning every pitched battle.

"God's first and holiest school," the home, is losing, if not lost.

Decades ago, when polygamy was the only real threat to the home in the United States, a determined effort was made in our Senate to deny Reed Smoot the seat in that body to which he had been duly elected by Utah. A Senator who favored the denial approached Senator Boise Penrose, seeking to enlist his powerful aid in the fight against seating Senator-elect Smoot. Penrose heard him through, then took his cigar from between his teeth, and said: "You say he is a member of a church that believes in polygamy; but does he practice it?" "Oh, no, he never has," replied the other Senator, "but he's still a Mormon." Knowing his man, Penrose rejoined: "I'd rather sit in the Senate with a polygamist who doesn't polyg, than with a monogamist who doesn't monog." That ended the argument. Smoot was seated. Polygamy is gone, but the more insidious kind, "the serial polygamy" of Hollywood, still flourishes.

Communism has infiltrated our colleges, and even our Government, with its poisonous pedagogism, seeking to destroy both State and God. It is the most dynamic force in our world, preaching the lie that war is inevitable and glorious.

So now the legions of victorious veterans of the Devil, haughtily challenge, like Goliath of Gath.

Can anyone deny that the armies of the Lord are ill-prepared, divided, and hopeless, save for our invincible, omnipotent Leader, whose enlistees fail to comprehend His campaign plan, or for 19 centuries have largely failed to follow?

Some of us are like a colored boy from Alabama. He was in our Nation's Army in World War I, in a service battalion. After the Hindenburg line had been broken and overrun, this battalion was ordered to fall in with fixed bayonets. The officer in charge explained: "Go down into the Hindenburg line, see if any lurking Germans are still there, and, if so, run them out so we can kill them and prevent an attack from our Army's rear. Forward, march. All moved forward except our hero. "You blankety, blank," roared the colonel, "I ought to have you shot for failing to obey orders." Our hero replied: "I'se gwine, Colonel, of course I'se gwine, but there's just one request I'd like to make before I goes." "All right, but be quick about it," snapped the colonel. The soldier said: "If there is any of them gentlemen down there, and if I finds 'em, for God's sake, don't shoot the first man what comes out."

In the February issue of Christian Laymen, the bulletin of a laymen's movement, the first article, by Charles P. Taft, is entitled: "Tame Churches; Tamer Laymen." It is excellent. The great layman who wrote it was critical, but constructive. His basic plea is that as Jesus taught those living in the comparatively primitive economy of His day, bringing every truth home to the heart of the daily life of His hearers, so, now, His truth must be applied to those living in the complex economy of today. He well says:

"Sometimes a layman's choice or decision may affect the living of a lot of little groups under his power and control, like the man whose decision can make a city of 14,000 people into a ghost town. Who challenges him with his responsibility to God in those moments? It can't be somebody in a pulpit who never stood near him before, or had any real understanding of the human and organization problems he faces, even though it may be his own pastor that has talked over his head and around him, but never learned how to make him think and talk for himself about religious principles applied practically."

Many an orthodox and eloquent sermon has been as wide of the mark of practical helpfulness as was the diligent search of the "drunk" in Memphis. He fell in an alleyway one night and heard his watch strike the pavement. He staggered up to the next corner, got down on his hands and knees under the powerful light at the intersection, and began crawling, feeling carefully every inch of the lighted area. A kindly cop guided traffic around him, for some time, then asked: "Lost something, brother?" The drunk replied; "Yesh, sir; I lost my watch. It was my father's watch. I gotta find it." The cop said: "All right, maybe I can help you; where'd you lose it?" The drunk: "Down yonder in that dark alley." The cop: "Then let's go back there and look for it where you lost it." The drunk: "Why, you big, fat fool, can't you see there's a lot more light up here?"

Dr. Elton Trueblood develops the same thesis as that suggested by Mr. Taft, and outlines a plan modeled after the one adopted by the Master. He calls it: "The fellowship of the discerning," and suggests a weekly circle meeting of 12 members, for thought, silent meditation, voluntary prayer, and exchange of ideas, dominated by Jesus. He differentiates the purposes of these groups from others, as follows:

1. From discussion to commitment.
2. From apology to witnessing.
3. From individualism to fellowship.
4. From emptiness to discipline.

He illustrates with this story: A visitor, sitting in the meeting which began with a period of unbroken silence, finally whispered to his host: "When does the service begin?" The answer: "The service begins when the meeting ends."

He believes that such circles will multiply of necessity as the members are impelled to go out into lines of service inspired by the leadership of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and that the new circles would and should center in the occupations of those in the groups that have been served.

The challenge of such thoughts to laymen grows as we contemplate.

Our individual responsibility is impressed upon us as we remember the old story of the conference that preceded the departure of Christ from Heaven for earth on His redemptive mission. The question was asked of Him: "What is your plan?" He explained, of the incarnation, the life, the gathering of the twelve, their fellowship with Him and their training; of His crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension; entrusting the rest to the twelve and to those who should believe their witness, and the working of the leaven; of the omnipresence and leadership of Himself—the risen Lord—and the mission of the Holy Spirit.

"But what if that plan should fail?" came another question. The Master answered:

"There is no other plan."

Except for Jesus it was doomed to fail. He and each of the twelve was a layman. Christ and His 12 friends constituted the first laymen's movement. He alone was brilliant, or constantly strong, and one was a traitor, but according to contemporary enemy testimony, they "turned the world upside down."

The glory and marvel of the miraculous achievement began with the transformation of the eleven and the members of the early church. From weakness they came to sublime strength; from cowardice to witnessing that meant martyrdom.

Who follows in their train?

Jesus told the twelve: "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savour wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."

There are multiplied millions of grains of salt that have lost their savour. They still believe that Paul's answer to the Phillipian jailer—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved"—is the all-sufficient answer now, as it was then. The fallacy is plain. It meant much then. It meant the loss of position and livelihood, the scourge, the enmity of the emperor, possibly the torch. Now it means just the reverse. It means gain, not loss, if we stop at simply believing. "The devils believe and tremble." So, fully understood, the plan of salvation meant the same then as now: to take up the cross and follow. There's fighting ahead on every man's path that leads to the goal of the kingdom of God.

We laymen are weak, but our Leader is invincible and omnipotent. With Him we can't lose, but the greatest compliment ever paid mankind is that He has given us an indispensable part in His campaign plan. It is to follow Him, uphold the hands of the clergy, and help make His church militant. He waits on us. Let's fail Him no longer. Victory is sure but the cost is high—loyal service.

"Dreamer of dreams! We take the taunt with gladness,
Knowing that God beyond the years we see,
Hath wrought the things that count with you for madness,
Into the texture of the world to be!"

Excerpts From Debate on Hawaiian Organic Act in Fifty-sixth Congress Shows Statehood Was Envisioned When Hawaii Was Made a Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call to the attention of Members of the House a series of excerpts from the debate in the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress—December 4, 1899, to June 7, 1900—on the Hawaiian Organic Act. These are pertinent to the consideration of H. R. 49, to enable Hawaii to become a State, as they show clearly that the authors of the organic act, under which Hawaii became a Territory, envisioned the time when Hawaii would become a State.

The excerpt follows:

MORGAN OF ALABAMA SPEAKS

Mr. Morgan (Senator from Alabama): "I will say, Mr. President, that it has been observed here by a Senator who knows all about Hawaii, who has studied the system very fully, that that is a government which is equal in all respects in its political economy, in the wisdom of all its constitutional and other provisions—and he might have added in the fruits of government—to any State government in the American Union.

"When I went out there under commission from the President, in company with my colleagues, one from the Senate, one from the House of Representatives, and two from Hawaii, after I had studied the system there during that visit and also the year previously, I became satisfied of the perfect truthfulness of the observation that those people had built up a government that was at least equal in all respects to any government in the American Union. My first proposition was that we should recommend that the people of the Hawaiian Islands should hold a convention, adopt a constitution, and apply for admission into the American Union * * * I still adhere to that as the opinion which I think is best entitled to be followed.

"When we got to Hawaii we found a state in full operation; we found a republic there. It had been an independent republic. We found that that republic had been ingrafted upon a monarchy; that it had excluded all of the monarchic features but still retained many of the constitutional features which had been inaugurated there by the monarchs themselves, beginning with Kamehameha I or Kamehameha II and running down through that dynasty. Our duty was dangerous and disagreeable, the difficult duty of tearing down a state government, a perfect system of government, with its constitution and laws, with its supreme court, with 11 volumes of supreme court decisions of a very high grade and character, tearing all that fabric of government down, attended, as it was, with a great many institutions of renown really, such as colleges and hospitals, and the like of that, and substituting for it a territorial government" (p. 1987).

PEOPLE PATRIOTIC

Mr. Morgan: "I am sure, Mr. President, there is not a State in the American Union whose people have shown a higher degree of patriotism than the people of Hawaii have shown" (p. 1989).

VIEW OF TELLER, OF COLORADO

Mr. Teller (Senator from Colorado): "Here is a stable and established community with a government which has existed for more than 50 years. The people have had the privilege of self-government for several years under a Republican administration, and enjoyed a good deal of freedom under a monarchical administration" (p. 2180).

WHAT MORGAN TOLD HAWAIIANS

Mr. Morgan: "I said to the Hawaiians, when I first went there, 'If you want justice in the Government of the United States, stand your ground and apply for admission as a State into the American Union, where your Senators can come upon this floor, and in the other House your Representatives can come and take care of your interests; for if you throw yourself into the hands of a foreigner and that foreigner is influenced in his conduct toward you by prejudice and passion or by the baneful effect of political power bought with money, you will be in a serious condition hereafter, and you will live to lament the fact that ever you consented to become a part of the United States of America.' Mr. President, no warning could have prevented the Hawaiians from coming here. Those people have as assiduously and as continuously celebrated the birthday of American independence for 50 years as we have. They have never allowed a Fourth of July occasion to pass that they did not bring out the banners of the United States and hold their feasts and festivals in honor of our independence" (p. 2194).

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT STEP TOWARD STATEHOOD

Mr. Hill (United States Representative from Connecticut): "The American people look upon the authorization and full organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood. It has always been so construed; it always will be so construed" (p. 3864).

PART AND PARCEL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Thomas (United States Representative from North Carolina): "I believe they (the Hawaiian Islands) are part and parcel of the United States. * * *

"The policy of the Democratic Party has been to acquire all territory for the purpose of making the same States and the inhabitants thereof citizens. * * * and if not to make States or citizens, what does that policy mean except a colonial system such as exists under the English Government today?

"* * * In the language of the report of the Hawaiian Commission: 'The free school, free church, free press, and manhood suffrage have marked their progress. The government of the islands has shown the same progressive development. For 60 years it has been administered under a written constitution. The first constitution was promulgated in 1840.'

"* * * whether it be true, as a general proposition, that trade follows the flag, certainly in relation to Hawaii it seems to be true, and doubtless the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands will in the future be of advantage to the United States, as it already has been, by reason of this extensive trade and the character of the majority of the people" (p. 3717).

MONDELL, OF WYOMING, PRAISES HAWAII

Mr. Mondell (United States Representative from Wyoming): "The Hawaiian has continuously displayed a sincere regard for and attachment to the Government and the people of the United States, while in the breasts of those of our countrymen who made these summer isles their homes there has ever burned the ardent fires of patriotic devotion to their native land, which have been transmitted to their children born and reared there, with scarcely diminished fervor, coupled with an attachment to the isles of their nativity. * * *

"To the men in the island of American birth and American parentage, and not only to them, but to many others, who, through their influences, had learned to value our institutions and look to us for defense and development, the final raising of the Stars and Stripes, never more to be lowered, on August 12, 1898, above the palace of the Kamehameha's, was the consummation of a long, earnest, and unselfish effort to be brought within the protection of the banner of the free, an earnestly longed-for coming home.

"Thanks to a good school system and a laudable ambition to secure an education, illiteracy is rare among them and many members of the race have distinguished themselves in business affairs, statesmanship, and in the professions. Their young men and young women will compare favorably with the young men and young women of any race in ability and aptitude to learn, and of their grace and charm of manner our race may well take lessons. In working out the future destiny of their country they will perform an important and honored part; if I mistake not, a more important part than they performed even under their native monarchy.

"* * * This legislation meets the hopes and expectations, I believe, of those for whom it is to be enacted, and in my opinion is admirably suited for them. They deserve the most generous treatment at our hands, for they became freely, voluntarily, and gladly part of us and our territory. Every American citizen should rejoice that our flag waves over these beautiful islands; that here, at the meeting place of the thronging trade and commerce of the Pacific, where the Orient first meets the Occident, shall be seen of all men an object lesson of that peace, progress, and liberty which ever abides beneath the starry banner of the free" (p. 3722).

A Lawmaker's Opportunity in Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address, A Lawmaker's Opportunity in Conservation, delivered by the illustrious State senator, William P. Baskin, of Lee County, S. C., before the Association of South Carolina Coastal Soil-Conservation Districts held in Charleston on March 25, 1949.

This able address is a thought-provoking document and should commend itself to anyone in preserving for future generations the precious heritage of our basic wealth, our soil.

A LAWMAKER'S OPPORTUNITY IN CONSERVATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the Association of South Carolina Coastal Soil-Conservation Districts, and guests:

I appreciate your kind invitation to meet with you here today in historic Charleston and the opportunity to sit in on your discussions of methods and means of assisting the people of coastal Carolina in the conservation of their soil and in the realization of the full extent of their natural resources.

I come from a county which lies on both sides of the dividing line between the rolling hills and the flat lands, and we are interested both in terracing of hill lands and the drainage of flat lands; therefore, I shall today speak generally concerning the entire soil-conservation program.

My friends, this subject of soil conservation is, and for many years has been, very close to my heart for I have come to realize in the years that have passed, the true value of this great work of soil conservation and its very definite influence on the health, well-being, income, and economy of the people of our great State.

Agriculture is truly the life line of America and although we may not like to admit it, the fact remains that the true value of our soil and its productiveness is dependent largely upon the success the individual farmer has obtained in conserving the life-giving plant top soil on our agricultural lands.

We have for generations here in the South, almost without exception, permitted the all-important top soil of our rolling and hilly lands to wash away with the rains which patter on our window panes. We have permitted our valuable and rich bottom and lowlands with their sediment of rich top soil to remain wet, damp, and acid because of faulty or inadequate drainage and in some instances because of our failure to attempt to drain those lands at all.

Years ago, those who owned lands subject to water erosion made no attempt to control the loss of their valuable top soil and those who owned rich bottom and lowlands which were continually wet, damp, and acid simply abandoned them to crop production, but today, thanks to the effort of many public-spirited citizens and many able and far-sighted public officials, our Nation has the Soil-Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, an agency which devotes all of its time to assisting us in land conservation—thanks also to your own General Assembly of South Carolina for enacting in 1937 and 1938 the now famous soil-conservation-district law under which soil-conservation districts, organized and operated by farmers, have been set up all over our great State, aided by engineering and conservation technicians of the United States Department of Agriculture and supervised by conservation-minded farmers whose main passion has been to aid the landowner and the tenant in increasing and protecting the productive worth of his lands. In addition we have the Extension Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, the former AAA Administration, the vocational-agriculture teachers, the Farmers Home Administration, and the State forestry commission who also cooperate with soil-conservation districts in furthering the conservation of our soil.

That soil-conservation-district law states in section 2 (d) "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the legislature to provide for the conservation of the soil and soil resources of this State, and for the control and prevention of soil erosion, and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers and harbors, preserve wildlife, protect the tax base, protect public lands and protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of this State."

Section 2 (c) of that same act provides "That to conserve soil resources and control or prevent soil erosion, it is necessary that land-use practices contributing to soil wastage and soil erosion be discouraged and discontinued, and appropriate soil conserving land-use practices be adopted and carried out." Those statements by our General Assembly of South Carolina are the foundation of our conservation program as far as legislation is concerned.

Since land is the basic bedrock of our agriculture and our civilization, certainly if millions can be spent on scientific research to find better ways of processing and distributing foods and other important studies, we can and should spend reasonable sums for scientific research to find better ways of conserving our soil and increasing its production now and in the future.

Your soil conservation supervisors not only deserve the commendation of the general public for your public spirited efforts, without pay, in aiding the conservation of our soil and the financial improvement of our farmers, but you also must realize that no forward advance in agriculture has ever come about without its share of criticism. In having to accept and even apparently like criticism and the unwarranted attacks by so-called leaders, you are not unlike members of the general assembly. You must remember, however, that almost all of mankind's greatest advances in the field of science, health, and agriculture were violently fought when first proposed. I say to you, therefore, accept the criticism, grit your teeth and intensify your efforts, for you have a highly beneficial program of help for our farmers and as years go by, you will find that our people will increasingly praise you for your honest and far-sighted efforts.

As we increase the productivity of land by terracing, drainage, irrigation, land clearance, flood control, and better methods of land use, we will increase the income of the farmer, give him a better community in which to live, increase the economic level of the people of our State and last but by no means least, we will bring back into the tax base many acres of unused and sometimes absolutely abandoned eroded hills and swamp lands, thus reducing the tax load of our people.

In our work for conservation of the soil by terracing and drainage, we should not forget conservation and land use by irrigation. That is a field which has not been fully explored here in our State, but mark you the time will come when "water rights" will be highly valuable in the production of crops and the full utilization of our soils right here in South Carolina.

We must make every effort to diversify our farming methods. Use our soils to the fullest but still not destroy those soils for future use. They can best be preserved by proper land use, proper terracing, proper irrigation, proper drainage and proper flood control.

The immediate aim and problem of your group, however, is the erection of major outlet drainage in the coastal area of South Carolina, and I would like to comment on that program.

Do you know that a recent survey here in South Carolina reveals that we have 3,500,000 acres of discarded, low, swampy, marshy, and bottom land, which, if properly drained, could be made highly productive and usable for crops or pasture. That 3,500,000 is more than one-half of the present tilled acreage in this State. That new 3,500,000 acres would not be subject to erosion like the sloping land which now constitutes most of the 5,000,000 acres now in cultivation. Your efforts for major outlet drainage, together with the necessary lateral ditches, will greatly increase the taxable wealth of your section and greatly benefit your people, thereby increasing the tax base, making it possible for our State to spend more for schools, roads, and other improvements.

My friends, we must increase the tillable acreage of our land to meet the needs of the rapid increase in our population and the advancement of the living standards of our people. Our present tilled acreage must be worked and guarded so it will produce the greatest for the present and not lose any of its productiveness in the future. In other words, we must use sound land science on all our lands. The problem of major outlet drainage in the coastal areas is no small problem, the surface has just been

scratched—the outlook is good, and I urge you to pursue your work diligently, for by so doing you will be laying the foundation for an achievement that will be of immense value to your section and State.

With this outline of our needs and our possibilities in this great and beneficial program of soil conservation, let us, who are members of the general assembly, ask ourselves this question, What is the legislator's opportunity in soil conservation?

As I view that question I would say:

1. We should immediately undertake the necessary study of the present soil-conservation district law passed in 1937 and 1938 and bring that law up to date so as to make the act broad enough to aid in every possible phase of this work and sufficient to meet the needs of the program and every farmer in our State.

2. We should study the provisions of our State constitution and, if need be, prepare and submit to the people all necessary constitutional amendments to enable the soil-conservation districts of our State to qualify as a public agency, be eligible for and get grants of funds from our State and its subdivisions, and enable the districts to borrow from the State sinking fund commission and other political subdivisions of our State for the purchase of equipment to be used for terracing, clearing land, drainage, and related programs.

In connection with this study, I would like to call your attention to the fact that during the past 3 years, more than one-fourth of the 46 counties in South Carolina have made direct appropriations or loans to their local soil-conservation districts to be used as operating capital or funds with which to purchase drainage and terracing machinery for use by the soil-conservation districts in advancing the drainage and terracing programs for farmers in their respective counties. In addition, a number of counties have actually appropriated county funds for the purchase of drainage and terracing equipment by the counties and then made provisions to rent that equipment to the soil-conservation district of their particular county for use in draining, clearing, and terracing lands of the farmers. Several of the counties have even set up soil conservation and development commissions to supervise the work and the only criticism that I have been able to find of the drainage and terracing program is the apparent failure of some of the soil-conservation districts to distribute their work over their entire district. In some instances, all of the work of the district in the field of drainage has been done in a small section or sections of the district and all of the terracing and land clearing has been done in several small sections of the district. In that connection, I would like to urge the supervisors of the various soil-conservation districts to be sure that their work, both drainage, clearing land, and terracing, is distributed as evenly as possible over the total area of their district, and to both the large and small farmer. That will do more to create greater public interest in the program than almost any other thing that can be done.

3. We should sponsor the establishment of a Department of Research in Soil Conservation manned by sufficient technical help, but directed by real dirt farmers who are soil-conservation minded.

4. We should sponsor the broadening of the soil-conservation program so as to include all farmers, tenants, and landowners, large or small, with all types of soil and who use their lands for crops or timber and who grow vegetables, grains, cottons, tobacco, or use their lands for pasturage or fish production.

5. We should encourage the establishment of the necessary committee composed of technical men, soil-conservation supervisors, legislators, and plain dirt farmers to inspect tried and tested soil-conservation practices in other States with a view of advancing our program of terracing, drainage, irrigation, and proper land use, as fast as possible.

6. We should sponsor the necessary legislation to enable the various State conservation agencies, the forestry commission, the highway commission, the fish and game department, the department of agriculture, State board of health, and Clemson College Extension Service, to enter into valid memorandums of understanding with the Soil Conservation Service to facilitate and encourage conservation not only of land but of game and every other resource of our great State and the protection of the health of our people.

7. We should sponsor the urgent need for ditch maintenance in connection with the drainage problem, for it will be useless to provide adequate drainage and then not require proper maintenance of those drainage ditches.

8. We should immediately sponsor an amendment of our State sinking fund law, so as to enable our State sinking fund commission to make loans to soil-conservation districts for the purchase of needed terracing, land clearing, and drainage machinery and equipment, taking from such districts a lien on the machinery so purchased with suitable provisions for repayment of the loan.

These things are of course not all we can do for we should encourage soil conservation in every way to the end that our State will advance as rapidly as possible. We must educate the people to the needs for all these types of soil conservation, we must obtain concrete data showing the health and financial benefits from terracing, drainage, pasturage, fish production, and other soil conservation practices. We must carry this program to the businessmen as well as the farmers of our State for when sufficient public demand is built up, then your legislators can rapidly expand the program.

Let me on behalf of many farmers, businessmen, legislators, and others whom I have talked with and who understand this program, express our appreciation for your efforts in soil conservation. We appreciate your unselfish work without pay, and in many instances with severe criticism, and we assure you our fullest cooperation.

Agriculture is truly the life line of America, and soil conservation is the best way to make certain that America's agricultural life line will continue productive now and in the future and assure us of an increasing area of tillable and productive lands for our growing population and our need for increased production.

Reduction in Postage on Relief Parcels Sent to Addressees in Countries Which Do Not Participate in the European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, by the terms of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 provision is made for reduction in postage on relief parcels sent to addressees in the various countries participating in the European recovery program. By virtue of the authority granted by this legislation, steps have been taken to reduce postal charges on shipments to most of these countries from 14 cents to 6 cents a pound. Any resulting deficit is chargeable to the appropriation made for carrying out the aid program.

Those who wish to send a relief package to relatives or friends in one of the countries excluded from participating in this program are, of course, in no way benefited by this legislation. He or she must still pay 14 cents a pound. Thus, four housewives walk into the post office, each with a package weighing the permissible limit addressed to her sister in Germany, Italy, England, and Poland. The packages all have the same content. Yet three of the women pay $1.32, whereas the one with the package going to Poland pays $3.08. Although there is an understandable reason for this distinction, it is difficult to justify.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to reduce by one-half postal rates on any packages sent to addresses in any European country which does not enjoy the benefits of inclusion within the provisions of the European recovery program.

Obviously the countries primarily embodied in such a measure are those east of the iron curtain. The objection may, therefore, be voiced to the legislation that it contemplates assistance to people living in Communist-dominated countries, contrary to the established policy of our Government.

I do not so view it. The primary benefit is to those good loyal American citizens who are the givers, not to the recipients. True, the lowering of the expense in transportation may result in more packages being sent. The primary purpose of such a bill, however, is to assist those who are now so generously trying to relieve hunger and distress in the world, oftentimes at great sacrifice, by sharing with them a portion of the expense to which they are put. At present, frequently the postage charges actually exceed the value of the articles sent.

Furthermore, far from encouraging the spread of totalitarian ideas or aiding the cause of communism, such legislation would, in my judgment, have exactly the opposite effect. We all know that the great majority of those unfortunates whose countries have been overrun by tyrannical aggressors are not at all sympathetic to the objectives or ideals of their masters. They chafe and smart and suffer under a despotic domination to a degree difficult for us to comprehend. They do not want it this way. Yet they are helpless to do other than submit.

Every relief package sent to them by their relatives or loved ones in this country is a harbinger of good will. It is a symbol of American friendship. It is a recognition by the people of a great Christian country that hungry stomachs and cold hands and feet have nothing to do with politics. To facilitate the movement of these relief parcels into these countries is one manner of piercing the iron curtain, not with the sword or the clenched fist but with the outstretched hand of friendship and brotherhood.

Until the rather recent reduction in postal charges, it was time and again

communicated to me by constituents who have relatives and friends in Europe that they often found themselves unable financially to do all they would like to do for their brothers and sisters across the sea because of the exceedingly high postal rates which prevail. To a large extent, this situation, I am happy to say, has been corrected. It still holds true of those who want to send packages to Poland, Lithuania, the Ukraine, and many other areas. For a family of modest income, such as is usually represented by those who are now so generously sharing their bounties, to pay over $3 to send one of these packages represents a great hardship and a definite deterrent from doing all they would like to do.

Favorable action on this legislation would go far toward relieving much hunger and distress suffered by those near and dear to many of our own loyal citizens who would enthusiastically welcome such a measure. It would, however, go much further and deeper than that. It would actually furnish a potent weapon in combating much of the false propaganda directed against this country in the effort to destroy our social, economic, and political system. which alone makes possible such evidences of generosity and good will.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 1, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound imposed on colored oleomargarine sold at retail and also a license tax on the manufacturer and on the wholesaler and retailer handling oleomargarine. Now there was no sense in this tax. It should have been repealed long ago. The three oleo bills presented to the House all remove the tax. That is not a question on which there is disagreement. The real fight is on the question of whether or not the Congress should permit oleomargarine to be colored yellow in imitation of butter.

No responsible person questions the value of oleomargarine as a cheap substitute for butter, but likewise, few people do not prefer butter if they can get it at a reasonable price. Oleomargarine in its natural state is a somewhat brownish white. The oleomargarine we see is the finished, bleached product. It can be colored yellow to look exactly like butter. The yellow color adds nothing to its nutritive value or to its taste, but, since people think of butter as the best spread, coloring oleomargarine yellow adds to its selling appeal. The more it looks like butter, the better the price it can command.

So the real question on these bills is not the removal of the tax—practically everyone is for that—but how far should we go in permitting one commodity, oleomargarine, to be treated so that it looks exactly like a more expensive and, from the point of view of the general public, a more desirable product—butter? Would permitting oleomargarine colored yellow to be sold freely be fair to the consumer and to the dairy industry?

My answer is "No." The consumer needs protection. There can be no deception with white oleomargarine, and for cooking purposes few housewives, if any, object to the white color. Also with the new plastic-covered package containing a small bean of yellow coloring imbedded in the center of the stick of oleomargarine, a few seconds manipulation produces a light or dark yellow and without using any dishes or getting your hands sticky. I know from personal experience how quickly this can be done and packaging will replace the old-fashioned way of mixing oleomargarine and the color in a bowl which is such a bother. One argument is that the housewife wants yellow oleomargarine and should have it. I would agree, but would she want any oleomargarine if the price ran up to nearly that of butter? She uses oleomargarine because it is cheaper.

But the chances are if the Poage bill becomes law that all oleomargarine will be colored yellow and that the price will go up. Now let me tell you why this is likely.

There are only 28 manufacturers of oleomargarine and of these, 5 concerns make 65 percent of all the oleomargarine sold in the country. The great soap manufacturers are interested. They are not tied to the use of domestic soybean and cottonseed oil. Lever Bros., for example, has access to various plantations producing coconut, palm, and other oils. Fortune magazine recently had an article on Lever Bros. and on Unilever, Inc., describing the company as one of the world's greatest producers and distributors of materials that go into oleomargarine. For example, it is reported to have 40,000 natives in the Belgian Congo producing palm oil. Lever Bros. recently bought the largest oleomargarine factory in this country and paid $16,000,000 for it. It operates all over the world and has a major influence on the price of fats and oils. The price of oils has dropped in the last few months, but the price of oleomargarine has not followed. There are many other evidences of what approaches a monopoly in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

The oleomargarine campaign has been well backed by many periodicals and the housewife has been told she is being greatly discriminated against because she could not buy yellow oleomargarine. Lever Bros. is reported to have spent $15,000,000 in 1948 on advertising and the oleo industry another $5,000,000. There are indications of a planned and concentrated drive to pass the Poage bill permitting free sale of yellow colored oleomargarine. I had many letters, not from my district but from large cities, each in the same kind of envelope, many obviously addressed by the same hand and the letters all using the same language. Other Members had a similar experience.

The consumer must look ahead. As long as there is white oleomargarine it will be a cheap substitute for butter. As soon as yellow colored oleomargarine is sold without restriction, the price goes up. Even today in Washington white oleo is 22 cents a pound, yellow colored oleomargarine, 43 cents—the difference in price 21 cents—of which only 10 cents covers the tax. The Poage bill is not in the interest of the housewife for eventually it will mean higher prices for what has been a cheaper spread.

Moreover, it is unfair competition to permit the sale of a substitute which looks like butter. It is unfair to the dairy industry. This struggle on colored yellow oleomargarine is part of the struggle between big business, the oleomargarine manufacturers, and small business, the dairy farmers. Oleomargarine is a mass-production product, made as I have said by 28 companies in the United States and really controlled by 5 large companies. Butter comes from 2,500,000 family farms and 40,000 small dairy plants. We cannot afford to hurt the dairy farm. If we do, we hurt the city merchants. Where the dairy farms are doing well, the farm families buy in the city stores.

Now it is true that we make practically no butter in eastern Connecticut. We sell fluid milk. But butter is the balance wheel of the dairy industry and has a determining influence on all other dairy products.

Dairy products compose more than 25 percent of all the food we consume in this country. Some 40 percent of our beef comes from dairy herds. If we permit oleo to wreck the market for butter there will be a decline in the size of our dairy herds. And the result will be less, beef, higher beef prices; less milk, higher milk prices. Personally, I would rather spend a few seconds manipulating the package of white oleomargarine with the little yellow bean in it when I want colored oleomargarine than take the risk of less beef and less milk at higher prices.

Moreover, the dairy industry means more than this price question. The dairy farm is a great asset in soil conservation, and soil conservation is essential if we are to continue to produce the food and other agricultural products which we must have if we are to maintain our standard of living.

The dairymen are not opposed to removing the tax on margarine. They are in favor of the Granger bill which is also supported by several large labor organizations and for which I voted. The Granger bill takes off the tax on oleomargarine and prohibits the shipment of yellow-colored oleomargarine in interstate commerce leaving it to each State to handle the question within its own boundaries. This is exactly the way we have handled so-called filled milk for some years and with fairness to both the consumer and the dairy industry.

The dairymen have not treated the oleomargarine industry badly. Oleomargarine manufacturers have been permitted to imitate the taste of butter by adding diacetyl and to fortify oleomargarine with vitamin A so that it approxi-

mates the nutritional value of butter. They have been allowed to imitate the texture of butter by adding skim milk and there has been no objection brought against their practice of illustrating their advertisements with pictures of pastures and barns which obviously suggest butter. The one thing which the dairymen protest is taking what is really their trademark, the yellow color, which although it varies in intensity with the season of the year, is always the most obvious characteristic of butter.

Even on this point our Connecticut dairymen were willing to go along with the free sale of oleomargaine colored yellow provided the lighter end of the yellow color scale was reserved for butter and oleomargarine limited to the darker range of yellows. This would have been a good solution. The consumer would have had tax-free, yellow colored oleomargarine and would have had at the same time protection against false substitution of oleomargarine for butter, and the dairy industry would likewise have been protected from fraudulent substitution. There was no opportunity to vote for or against this proposal as the bills were reported.

Lever Bros. recognize the sales value in color. Sometime ago they brought suit and got a court decision that they, as makers of Lifebuoy soap, alone could make a cake of health soap colored red. "Yellow" taxicabs have the sole right to paint their cabs yellow. No yellow coloring is permitted in bakery products to suggest that eggs are used in the baking when in fact they have not been.

The Poage bill contains clauses that are supposed to protect the consumer. All packages of oleomargarine must be so labeled and when served in public eating places each serving must be labeled or cut in the shape of a triangle and further, a sign must be displayed or a notice printed on the menu, stating that oleomargarine is served. But the bill provides no penalty for failure to obey these regulations, and the Pure Food and Drug Administration informed the committee that it would cost $5,000,000 a year for an inspector to visit each eating place once in 12 months. The regulations would probably work for packaged oleomargarine sold in retail stores, but the so-called protection to the consumer and to the dairy farmer would mean little so far as the serving in public eating places is concerned.

Also as a practical matter it should be noted that the bill contains a clause that "The act should not abrogate or nullify any statute of any State now in effect or hereinafter enacted." I note that none of the Members in favor of the Poage bill rose to amend this section. It makes the legislation do nothing more than remove the tax in Connecticut and in 17 other States which forbid the sale of yellow colored oleomargarine. It does not give the housewife in these States yellow colored oleomargarine and it does injure the dairy industry throughout the country. The Granger bill should have been passed in fairness to both consumers and dairy farmers.

The Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Air Force Secretary, Praised for Businesslike Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I came upon an editorial, under date of April 6, 1949, written by Mr. Ralph B. Chandler, owner and publisher of the Mobile Register, one of the leading, oldest, and most widely read newspapers published throughout the South. The editorial was occasioned by the visit to Alabama on April 6 of the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, and certainly one of the best beloved and one of the most highly respected officials in our Government.

The editorial requires no explanation.

I do, however, want to point out to this House the sensitivity of the American press and the newspaper editors everywhere, even though they are far removed from Federal activities in the Nation's Capital. There is little that occurs here in Washington of which they are not fully apprised.

I know that every Member is proud of the work that Stuart Symington is doing in building a vital, powerful United States Air Force—and doing it under some business principles with economy, efficiency, and due regard for every taxpayers' dollar entrusted to his spending.

In order that my colleagues may read this short, concise, and pleasing editorial of that great public official, I am asking that unanimous consent be accorded me by this House to extend my remarks and insert same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial reads as follows:

AIR FORCE SECRETARY VISITING STATE PRAISED FOR BUSINESSLIKE METHODS

On Alabama's guest list Wednesday is one of the top figures in the National Military Establishment—W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, who is scheduled to deliver an address in Montgomery.

Secretary Symington's visit to Alabama is a reminder of the praise he recently received from Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, of the First Congressional District, for businesslike administration of the Department of the Air Force.

Congressman BOYKIN's comments appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and grew out of the study he made of Mr. Symington's first annual report as Secretary of the Air Force.

He spoke of Secretary Symington as "one of America's young, outstanding businessmen and executives * * * a man of great administrative abilities—a creative builder of business—one whom the Nation is indeed fortunate to have heading the great Department of our Air Force."

Concerning Mr. Symington's "clear, concise, factual report," Mr. BOYKIN said it was "just such a statement as one would expect a modern business executive in private industry to make to the stockholders at the annual meeting of his concern."

Mr. Symington, who had been Assistant Secretary of War for Air since February 1946, was named head of the new Department of the Air Force in September 1947.

Congressman BOYKIN said that in this new position, Mr. Symington "started from scratch to create * * * a modern, streamlined business administration within the structure of the Federal Government."

Efficiency and economy were made administrative, watchwords of the Air Force, said Mr. BOYKIN, citing as an example that "all Air Force procurement has been streamlined and procedures instituted to place the buying process on a modern business basis."

In extending Secretary Symington a cordial welcome to Alabama, we suggest that a good many other Government operations could use more businesslike practices such as Mr. BOYKIN observes in the Department of the Air Force.

Investment Guaranty in European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Norman M. Littell from the Washington Post of April 8, 1949:

INVESTMENT GUARANTY IN EUROPEAN RECOVERY

(By Norman M. Littell, former Assistant Attorney General)

Your editorial of March 25 attacking the House Foreign Affairs Committee's amendments to the guaranty clause of the ECA Act commences with a misrepresentation of fact in its very title—"Riskless Enterprise." As a description of the proposed amendments, this irresponsible caption has no basis in fact, and grossly misleads your readers.

What are the dread amendments proposed?

The original guaranty clause provided for a guaranty of convertibility (i. e., from foreign currencies back into dollars) for the principal amount of private investments made in Marshall plan countries with the approval of the Administrator.

The proposed changes would: (1) extend the guaranty in amount to include interest or profits to the extent found reasonable by the Administrator; (2) extend the guaranty in scope to include certain political risks lying on the level of American foreign policy rather than on the private risk level, e. g., losses caused by seizure, confiscation, revolution, war or other governmental regulations or decrees which in the Administrator's opinion prevent the further use of the investment for the intended purpose; and (3) reinstate $272,000,000 of the original $300,000,000 guaranty appropriation so it must be used for guaranties instead of being consumed in direct loans to foreign governments as the original funds were, contrary to the intent and instruction of Congress.

Your alarm over these things could stem from a failure to consider the underlying premises which led to the Foreign Affairs Committee proposals. In 1947 this Nation committed itself to a vast program of reconstruction and rehabilitation in western Europe to help our friends stand with us for a free way of life. We have backed that commitment with billions of dollars.

In the system under which the United States has grown rich and strong, standards of living depend on the production of goods. Trade, agriculture, and industry flourish when capital, raw materials, manpower, and production know-how are joined and held together by good business management. Simply stated, that is free enterprise. The alternative, in black and white terms of contemporary history, is the total regimentation of capital and labor by Government bureaucracy.

So when Congress set up this vast program of reconstruction, it could appropriate money and set up a bureaucracy to dole it out (the EAC) and to receive it (the OEEC); or it could enlist private resources and American industrial know-how and management.

In the emergency, Congress used the former method as a common denominator of administration, authorizing $5,000,000,000 in direct grants and $1,000,000,000 in loans, but it also laid foundations for the latter course in authorizing guaranties up to $300,000,000 for "the encouragement * * * of private enterprise to contribute through its initiative and capital in the reconstruction and development of Europe." We set up bureaucracies on both sides of the Atlantic—and they were astonishingly efficient before the real challenge of spending so much money so fast.

Only the guaranty program was a complete failure for reasons reviewed by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. The guaranties weren't adequate in amount or in scope. And 90 percent of the $300,000,000 was allocated by ECA for loans instead of guaranties contrary to the intent of Congress. In the words of Mr. Bevin, speaking in Parliament, we Americans proved ourselves to be great free enterprisers at home and great state planners abroad.

When the ECA officials came around to tell Congress what they wanted for next year, their proposal, as adopted in good faith by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, looked as if the $300,000,000 was to be reestablished for guaranties, but actually it wasn't. Any further guaranties were to come out of grant funds.

If adopted, this will be absolutely fatal. No participating country will ever approve a single guaranty if it constitutes a deduction from granted funds. If there is any trap in the picture, this is it, for without the Senate committee having fully realized it, the guaranty clause is deftly eased out of the act and complete bureaucratic control maintained over every penny of ECA money.

The Foreign Affairs Committee in the House not only exposed these facts but rewrote the guaranty clause to reinstate and implement the original intent of Congress to induce private enterprise and risk capital to assume part of the load of reconstruction. Under either system we are spending the same American dollars, but in one case it is tax money, and in the other it is stockholders' money spent under business management.

We are only talking about $300,000,000 (which will very probably invite into operation partnership capital of about equal proportions abroad) for privately managed projects approved by the administrator and the participating country as furthering the purposes of the Marshall plan.

Your editorial does not state this material fact, but says, "It is idle for advocates of this change to pretend that it would not put an appreciable burden on the Government. Suppose the proposed guaranty had been in effect during the twenties, when American private investors lost hundreds of millions in Latin America, or during the thirties in central Europe. Wouldn't our Government have had to foot the bill for a large part of these losses?"

The superficiality of that statement is breath taking. We were not engaged in a world struggle to preserve a free way of life in the twenties. We are now. A Marshall plan or an Atlantic Pact was undreamed of then, and we have spent or committed on them vastly more than we dropped in South America in stockholders' money without ever expecting to see it again—all a part of the calculated risk.

The sum we are now discussing is $300,000,000, and the risks embraced in the proposed guaranty amendments are not ordinary business risks, but are extraordinary political risks which no investor would encounter in a similar undertaking in the United States. Such risks are properly the concern of governments and not private investors.

They are a part and parcel of our foreign policy already, for every penny of the billions spent on the Marshall plan may become a total loss for one or more of the reasons stated in these amendments, with this vital distinction: The loss of our investment under the Marshall plan will be total and complete if the plan fails in any participating country, but under a guaranty the Government would not sustain a total loss because it takes over currencies, credits, and assets of the guaranteed investor, from which something can surely be salvaged to the Government through diplomatic negotiations or recourse to the International Court.

Your editorial misses the purpose of guaranties. American industrial production won the war. Even Joe Stalin recognized this in proposing toasts at Tehran to American productive capacity. It could help win the cold war, too, and (if extended under President Truman's point IV) raise living standards all over the world, for what Europe and the so-called backward areas of the world need is goods, goods, and more goods.

And what we need is goods flowing in a two-way world. No Atlantic Pact can produce goods or create employment at reasonable wages in order to replace despair with the hope and means of a free way of life, but American techniques and know-how of production abroad could do so.

Thus far this unique American contribution to contemporary civilization, the genius for industrial production, has remained meekly chained at home.

The object is to release our productive capacity not for the purpose of exploitation but for greater service, participation, and mutual prosperity in industrial enterprise.

Save the Veterans' Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the President has ordered a cut-back of 16,000 hospital beds in the hospital-construction program of the Veterans' Administration. General Gray, the Veterans' Administrator, is necessarily taking steps to carry out a reduction of veterans' hospital beds as a result of the arbitrary slash of the President. I am here today to protest this slash and ask for the reinstatement of the full program. Because of this slash some hospitals will have to be redesigned and others abandoned entirely.

Pennsylvania now has four veterans' hospitals with a total of only 4,608 beds and lags much behind her sister States of New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Illinois in adequate veterans' hospital facilities. Under the program originally planned by the Veterans' Administration, Pennsylvania was to have had 4,525 new beds. Under the slash ordered by President Truman, one Pennsylvania hospital is being completely eliminated and the total number of beds in Pennsylvania is to be cut by 1,400. This represents an indefensible cut in the hospital facilities necessary to the proper care of Pennsylvania veterans.

Specifically, the cuts in Pennsylvania are the elimination of 200 general medical beds in a proposed new hospital at Harrisburg, the reduction of the proposed medical hospital at Pittsburgh from 1,200 beds to 750 beds, the reduction of the proposed neuropsychiatric hospital at Pittsburgh from 1,250 beds to 1,000 beds, and the reduction of the proposed medical hospital at Philadelphia from 1,000 beds to 500 beds.

The Veterans' Administration, on January 10, 1949, announced a reduction in the hospital construction program as follows:

Location	Type	Number of beds	Reduction
Altoona	General medical	200	None
Erie	do	200	None
Philadelphia	do	500	500
Pittsburgh	do	750	450
Do	Neuropsychiatric	1,000	250
Wilkes-Barre	General medical	475	None
Harrisburg	do	(1)	200
Total		3,125	1,400

[1] None (canceled).

The original plans called for the construction of 7 new hospitals in Pennsylvania with a total bed capacity of 4,525, located as follows:

Location	Type	Number of beds
Altoona	General medical	200
Erie	do	200
Philadelphia	do	1,000
Pittsburgh	do	1,200
Do	Neuropsychiatric	1,250
Wilkes-Barre	General medical	475
Harrisburg	do	200
Total		4,525

Facilities for mental and nervous diseases in Pennsylvania are so overcrowded that veterans are being confined in our jails until hospital quarters can be found for them. In the veterans' hospital at Aspinwall the facilities for mental patients are not adequate, and this places an unwarranted burden on the Veterans' Administration staff, which is sincerely trying to do a good job of veterans' care.

There are no veterans' facilities in Pennsylvania for the treatment of cancer and virtually none for the treatment of tuberculosis cases. From my own experience with tuberculosis cases among veterans' cases in my district, I know that it is extremely difficult to get them

admitted to a Veterans' Administration facility anywhere.

According to American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars officials, approximately 3,000 Pennsylvania veterans are seeking in vain to obtain admission to a veterans' hospital for necessary treatment.

I respectfully urge that the full hospital-construction program for veterans be restored as conditions will become more acute in the months and years to come. We veterans of World War II must see that our older veterans are not forgotten in time of need. This Nation should be forever grateful for the service which they rendered for its protection in time of war.

I urge that the full program of 16,000 beds be restored and that President Truman's cut-back of 1,400 hospital beds in the Pennsylvania program be immediately set aside, since the slash ordered by the President represents an arbitrary action based upon false economy.

Article by George Sokolsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. George Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of April 7:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

It is difficult to realize the extent of the American empire. Only a decade ago, most Americans, including the internationalists, regarded this as a non- or even an anti-imperialist country.

The war placed upon our shoulders not only the burdens of debt and taxation but even the weightier burden of supporting and holding an increasing number of areas and functions.

Empire is an expensive operation as the British well know. For instance, it is a question whether India, on balance, was a profit or loss.

The Hoover report on the subject lists obligations as follows:

"Occupied areas—Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. European recovery program. Special missions—Greece and Turkey. Trust territories—Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas. Non-self-governing territories—Guam and Samoa.

"Self-governing Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"Office of Foreign Liquidation, American Battle Monuments Commission, Philippine War Damage Commission, Philippine Alien Property Administration."

To these might well have been added China, were it not that Soviet Russia defeated us in that country. Also, we might consider in this connection our responsibilities and obligations under the North Atlantic treaty, th United States being the only nation in the group that can do anything very important about it.

In a word, our empire is one not of benefits but of obligations, not of advantages but of costs.

The administrative pattern of our country makes little or no provision for empire management. Thus, activities concerning these areas and problems fall upon several departments and numerous agencies.

There is no coordination of plan or implementation. The Army goes one way; the Navy another; Interior in all directions and the independent agencies wherever they can. We repeat in our empire the confusions of domestic administration.

The Hoover report proposes that an "administration of overseas affairs" be established which would be charged with all the functions of the administration of empire.

This administration would cooperate with the State Department and the Department of Defense, but would report directly to the President.

It would seem even more advantageous to add a cabinet officer, the secretary of overseas affairs, and to create a career force, perhaps like the British colonial office, to take care of these matters.

For should we go to war again, and not be defeated, we may find even more areas and functions on our hands. Perhaps the Hoover Commission assumes that our empire will be temporary, but I doubt that such good fortune will be ours.

It is doubtful whether any American gazes upon our added responsibilities with any satisfaction. In the first place, this business costs tremendously, between $6,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 annually, including ECA and military occupation.

Secondly, it does not seem likely, at this writing, that we shall soon be rid of either the occupied areas or the programs of economic aid. We may get rid of the latter obli- tions as we did in China, by Russian conquest, but that would mean war, for while we lost China willfully through errors of judgment and policy, we are not committing similar errors in Germany, Japan, or Korea.

In fact, the Berlin airlift, as a policy, strengthened our position and therefore our obligations i- Germany and Austria.

The union of Europe, which Winston Churchill is so avidly advocating but concerning which he was silent when regional blocs were proposed by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson in their book, the Problems of L-sting Peace, can only involve a further obligation on our part.

For such an enterprise requires underwriting by a power capable of preventing outside interference while the union is in formation.

It is too often forgotten that Great Britain did not accept the finality of the Revolutionary War until the War of 1812 and that France sent citizen Genet to this country much as Soviet Russia maintains a fifth column in every state in western Europe today.

It all amounts to this then: as long as empire has been thrust upon us, we might as well organize to manage our affairs competently, as the Hoover Commission proposes.

Veterans' Pension Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to introduce a letter which I received from the department commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, on March 28, 1949. On March 24, 1949, I introduced into the RECORD a letter from a member of the Broadview Post of the American Legion, which expressed his views as an individual concerning the pending veterans' pension legislation. Inasmuch as I have been informed that this viewpoint did not represent the official viewpoint of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, and in order to give fair consideration to its viewpoint, I am presenting the letter of Mr. William G. Burns, department commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
Chicago, Ill., March 28, 1949.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATES: My attention has been called to the fact that you had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and in the column of the Voice of the People in the Daily News which you evidently gave considerable consideration to when the pension was before the Congress. I believe you owe it to the American Legion, department of Illinois, to have inserted in the RECORD my telegram to you indicating the position of the department of Illinois, the American Legion.

The views expressed by our comrade from Broadview were his own views and not the views of Broadview Post, fifth district, first division, department of Illinois, or the national organization. One can always single out someone who differs, in a democratic organization such as ours, on most issues, as we are a cross section of America, but we believe democratic process should follow because of the way we operate in Illinois. The 234 delegates, by which this post was represented, as well as every post in the department, was unanimously for the pension at Miami.

When I write or wire you with the viewpoint of the American Legion, I do not express a personal opinion but I speak with the authority of the 226,181 members that have determined the course of action.

We regret that you have selected this statement for insertion because I can furnish you thousands of letters from posts, individuals, etc., stating the position of the Legion in Illinois.

I am anxious to inform the posts in your district of your opportunity now to consider H. R. 3821 which carries provisions that apparently you support.

The American Legion stood solidly for no amendments because we wanted you to know that that was the strategy of the opponents of the veterans and it has been their strategy over the years.

As department commander of Illinois I ask that you set the record straight by the insertion of my statement to you of our position on the pension legislation which was given to you before your vote was cast.

I sincerely hope and trust that in the opportunity that will be afforded to you to indicate definitely your position that you will support it and our all-out American Legion stand for enactment of H. R. 3821. Of course, it doesn't meet the desires in their entirety in this department, but it will indicate to the veterans that the eighty-first session of the Congress is to preserve the attitude of faithful Congressmen that have granted land grants and pensions from the Revolutionary days through six wars ending with the Spanish veterans of 1898.

Yours very truly,

WM. G. BURNS,
Department Commander.

Text of the North Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, since it will be necessary for Congress to take the North Atlantic treaty into consideration in drafting much future legislation I ask that the document be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The treaty text lists as signatories Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Additional nations signing the pact are Portugal, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, and Italy.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

PREAMBLE

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security.

They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article 6

For the purpose of Article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any Party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any Party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the Parties.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third state is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the states which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other states on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatories.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Washington, the 4th day of April, 1949.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

The following resolution is moved by Councilman Joseph J. Carry:

"Whereas there has been enacted by the Eightieth Congress of the United States a labor bill known as the Taft-Hartley law; and

"Whereas since the passage of this law, labor organizations have been oppressed and collective bargaining has been made more difficult to promote the advancement of the American labor movement; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley law creates an inferior class of citizens, an inferior category and a debased position politically for the men and women who toil by hand or brain for their daily subsistence; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act, in its entirety, is an insult to the working people of the United States, a brand upon their integrity and decency, a handicap to all fair-minded employers; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act invades the constitutional guaranties of free speech, free press and freedom of contract; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act breathes suspicion and repression in every line and in no instance aids or assists the process of peaceful collective bargaining, and

"Whereas one of the main issues in the last Presidential campaign was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and such issue was supported by an overwhelming majority vote for candidates to political office who were on record for the immediate repeal of this vicious and obnoxious law; and

"Whereas the Eighty-first Congress has conducted hearings on a substitute labor bill known as the Thomas bill and such hear-

ings have resulted in needless repetitious testimony, consequently, delaying action on the repeal of this law; and

"Whereas thousands of collective-bargaining contracts, presently expiring and will expire in the very near future, and labor organizations and employers cannot negotiate with any degree of confidence as to the provisions that may be contained in a new labor bill, thus creating an air of uncertainty and endangering harmonious labor relations between labor and management which may result in unavoidable work stoppages; and

"Whereas the citizens of the United States of America have, by their vote last November, delivered a mandate to the new Congress for immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Town Council of the Town of Lancaster assert its disapproval of the Taft-Hartley law; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Town Council of the Town of Lancaster go on record for the immediate and unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the majority leaders of the House and the Senate; the Members of Congress from the western New York area; and the United States Senators from New York State be so notified as soon as possible after the passage of this resolution so that they may act accordingly."

Seconded by Councilman Francis J. McDonald.

Councilmen Garry, McDonald, Rybak, and Supervisor Keysa voted aye, and Councilman Rozler voted present.

Supervisor Keysa declared the resolution duly adopted.

Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an extract from the monthly letter of the Northeast Economic Foundation entitled "Butter." It is well worth the reading by any Member of Congress:

BUTTER

It is doubtful if the American people realize just what they are doing to themselves in the matter of butter. The metropolitan newspapers damn the butter lobby and shout for untaxed margarine as though they were engaged in some kind of a crusade. And so they are, more or less unknowingly—a crusade to degrade the American diet for all time; ably assisted by a margarine lobby that has, at the moment, great political power.

This is no brief for special taxes on margarine. We see no economic reason for taxing cottonseed oil, though the attempt to make it into imitation butter is a fraud, against which consumers once sought to be protected. But in the long run, taxation will not stop the public from mixing sawdust with its cornflakes, if the people prefer it.

The American people for a hundred years have been able to take butter for granted, which is something that only a pioneer people, reveling in the lush resources of a virgin continent, could do. In the long history of civilization, that has never before been possible for any race. Butter has always been a luxury, reserved solely for the rich and fortunate.

No one knows when that original desert nomad, with a skin bag of sheep's milk slung across his jolting camel's back, first discovered, at journey's end, the peculiar conglomerate which we call butter. Men have known about it for at least 4,000 years, but over practically all of that long span they have reserved it for medicinal use, for a beauty aid, for anointment after the bath and other luxury uses. Only in the last century has mankind had enough butter to be able to use it as a real food, and then only in a few countries, and very sparingly.

Butter is, in our time, the world-wide symbol of earth's highest standard of living. Hitler, when he led the German people down the road to war, had to confront them with the grim modern alternative, guns or butter. Throughout the world today, nations are most readily classified in respect to their economic affluence by the tell-tale blessing or absence of butter on their tables. Even the proud British, one of the most truly civilized peoples on earth, have scarcely tasted it for 10 years and just about the first remark of every Englishman visiting our land is, how wonderful to have milk and butter.

Yes, America has had butter—so bountifully that it has graced virtually every man's table here for a hundred years. Four generations have simply taken it as a matter of course.

We still have plenty of milk and butter, thanks to the most efficient dairy industry in the world. Butter is still reasonably cheap, too. The average wage earner here can buy a pound of butter with fewer minutes of his labor than he could 20 years ago.

But now a certain body of consumer sentiment seems to want to turn the clock back permanently toward those cheaper substitutes that less fortunate peoples have always had to use: vegetable oils and by-product greases. Whipped up together we call it margarine.

There is nothing the matter with margarine. It is undoubtedly wholesome enough, as made now, and will supply the human craving for fat in spreads and cookery. But no masquerade that cotton oil and carcass grease can be put through will ever make of them the princely food that is butter.

Cheap imitation butter, a byproduct that can be produced at a fourth the cost of butter—in other words, yellow-colored margarine—thrown into open competition with butter, can have but one effect on the dairy industry and that is to hurt it. To be sure, our dairy industry will not perish because of this competition but it will gradually dwindle to a smaller output. Insofar as margarine displaces it, butter will gradually become scarcer. Fewer and fewer children in average families will know the taste of it. More and more, butter will become a luxury for the well-to-do. In a couple of generations we shall, perhaps, be largely a Nation of oil eaters, like our poorer cousins in the Old World. Perhaps our patriotic slogan, when we tighten belts for the next war, will be "guns or margarine."

The political fight for imitation butter, so far as it is successful, will move us one long turn around that historic cycle which long ago brought the Orient and part of Europe down to the drab level of a subsistence diet. For a century we have enjoyed the abundance from a highly developed animal agriculture, the richest fruits of this most blessed of all lands. We have lived on the fat of the land, and butter typifies it. Butter is part of that food bounty which includes meat, milk, eggs, cheese, and other livestock products—the rich, protective foods that have lifted the American diet up out of that age-old cereal and turnip level of the Old World. These products of animal agriculture are the backbone of the American dinner table, the things that distinguish it.

The descent back toward the cereal and vegetable diet, the loss of those rich animal foods (and once reduced, the animal industry is permanently reduced), is a process that most nations in this day and age would resist to the last ditch. Far older peoples than we would give much to have great livestock industries such as we have, especially the dairy. Those who have been mostly without meats, milk, butter, and eggs are the people who really prize them. Ask the British or German people what they would pay to have butter and eggs once more.

But some American consumers, who over long years have been surfeited to the point of unappreciativeness, seem to regard our incomparable butter industry as a sort of dog in the manger. Some of them seem to have set up dyed cotton or bean oil as a kind of fetish, a cause to champion, a symbol of thwarted privilege.

Well, assume that their cause will triumph; that before the year is out these good folks will be able to spread their bread and shorten their cake with untaxed, ersatz butter. Assume that the deed is done. Then what? Why, then future generations will, perhaps, be able to record that in the year 1949 the American people took steps to rid themselves of one of their most precious foods, to revert to the sardine oils of the poor and backward countries, in short, that they took steps to guide their children's diet once and for all into the torpid orientalism of cheap grease.

All in the name of economic progress.

Why We Behave Like Inhuman Beings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward L. Bernays:

WHY WE BEHAVE LIKE INHUMAN BEINGS

(By Edward L. Bernays)

Once upon a time—long, long ago in the fabulous 1920's—a noted American anthropologist, George Amos Dorsey, wrote a best-seller, Why We Behave Like Human Beings.

This appeared in the Coolidge era, when the future looked boundlessly bright and everybody was going to win a prize in the national sweepstakes of plenty. Prosperous, self-confident, hilariously optimistic, the United States was drinking bootleg liquor; dancing the black bottom; reading Hemingway, Cabell, and Gentlemen Prefer Blondes; cheering a young man named Lindbergh, who had just flown solo across the Atlantic; applauding Marco's Millions by Eugene O'Neill; laughing at the satires of Sinclair Lewis and the antics of a new strip-cartoon character, Mickey Mouse.

The old American dream of rags to riches, log cabin to White House, was still going strong. Elbert Hubbard's Message to Garcia still inspired high-school boys with the conviction that, if you let nothing stop you in the competitive obstacle race of our time, you were bound to reach the glittering goal or success. Coué, a smiling Frenchman with a flare for semantics, had persuaded many Americans to recite, "Every day in every way I am growing better and better"; and millions believed this magic incantation would enable them to grab and keep forever the

coveted brass ring as they whirled around on the golden merry-go-round of eternal prosperity. In the Nation-wide quest for fame and fortune just around the corner, thousands probed for the secret of it all in Bruce Barton's The Man Nobody Knows, which portrayed Christ as a supersalesman, town booster, and Rotary Club toastmaster.

America in those days was a world in which success was everybody's almost for the asking. All you had to do was work hard, brush your teeth with the right dentifrice, avoid BO and that nine-letter horror about which your best friends wouldn't tell you. Then you were sure to marry the boss' daughter, get a 20-percent interest in the business, and live happily ever afterward in a land which had never heard of a housing shortage.

This sublime assurance pervaded even the highest levels. Concluding his story of the Rise of American Civilization, the late Charles A. Beard, dean of United States historians, announced in 1927 that this was the dawn of the gods. And from Washington, D. C., there emerged on history's horizon the shining promise of the Kellogg Pact, signed by the many nations which solemnly agreed to outlaw war and establish permanent world-wide peace. In this happy age men appeared to be quite human.

In the fall of 1929, this beautiful dream did a Humpty Dumpty. A historic process we had blandly ignored suddenly caught up with us, and woke us with a violent shock.

World War I had opened an epoch without precedent in history. Now, for over three decades, humanity has been rent asunder by uninterrupted conflict. World-wide war, revolution, and counterrevolution have accompanied global depressions, national uprisings, class conflicts, conspiracies, putsches, underground resistance movements, civil war, dictatorship, fifth columns, show trials, assassinations, suicides, executions, and colonial revolts. Old empires have been destroyed; new nations have been created; republics have sprung up only to vanish under the boots of invading armies or totalitarian regimes.

The dream of universal prosperity, progress, and peace has been pulverized by universal ambition, violence, and fraud. No sooner is one aggressor beaten than another raises his mailed fist. Each war, world-wide or local, is followed by an ambiguous peace haunted by fear of the next war. Once kings battled with each other for the shape of things to come, then nations; now hemispheres and ideologies clash with conflicting promises and the force of modern armaments.

Never before has mankind undergone such vast changes in every aspect of its existence on so world-wide a scale, and the end is not yet in sight.

In the midst of this volcanic eruption of change, men have abandoned the religious and ethical conventions of 40 centuries and have hounded each other to the grave with a ferocity which makes lions and tigers appear like harmless kittens. Large sections of the world have made "man's inhumanity to man" their fanatical creed, and deliberately employed the most bloodthirsty, paranoid cruelty to impose their will upon whole populations. Führers, duces, caudillos, generalissimos, marshals, police states, gestapos, spies, informers, unscrupulous propagandists, and totalitarian courts have played the grim overture to melodramas of history at whose climax appeared the firing squad; the hangman; the masked executioner with his silk hat and broadax; the concentration camp; the factory manned by slave labor; the incinerator where people were burned for their race, religion, or politics; the lamp shade faultlessly fashioned out of human skin.

For all its advanced democratic way of life, America has not wholly escaped the nightmare upheavals of this century. We have known depression, war, strikes, lynching, race riots, religious and racial bigotry, juvenile delinquency, increased divorce rates. And there has been an alarming rise in mental illness, the last desperate refuge of the acutely maladjusted from the tensions, dislocations, and horrors of an age which opened with a pistol shot at Saravejo and ended its first act with the explosion of the atom bomb at Hiroshima.

In the dawn of the modern world Shakespeare could exclaim: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason, how infinite in faculty; in form and moving how express and admirable; in action how like an angel; in apprehension how like a god!" Today we are less impressed by man's angelic and divine qualities. Rather, we are overwhelmed by the discovery that millions of people can so easily succumb to mechanized headhunting and cannibalism. And so the current $64 question is not why we behave like human beings, but why we behave like inhuman beings.

Everybody is asking this question, from the man in the street to the most learned scientist, for the events and discoveries of the past four decades have forced us to change our basic viewpoints about ourselves and the world we live in.

The pioneer discoveries of the nineteenth-century science encouraged the belief that man's unbroken progress and freedom lay wholly in mastering the physical world. Every accelerating invention, unloosed by the industrial revolution, seemed to guarantee not only universal well-being, but universal peace. Today, when the physical sciences have perfected aircraft that travel at the speed of sound, and promise to release us from the control of gravitation, the material conquest of nature is at the highest peak in history. Yet the world is aflame with conflict rendered all the more violent and devastating by the inventions of science.

This has altered the emphasis of science itself. It is not surprising that religious conferences, such as those which met recently at Lambeth and Amsterdam, should call for moral regeneration as man's last best hope on earth. Nor is it surprising that a congress of the world's leading psychiatrists, meeting at about the same time in London, should urge the study and control of man's nature, especially his aggressive impulses, as the major solution of the twentieth-century crisis. It is logical, too, that a social scientist like Dr. Hornell Hart, of Duke University, winner of the Edward L. Bernays Atomic Energy Award, for action-related research in the social implications of atomic energy, should propose a Manhattan project of the social sciences as the first step toward grappling realistically with the crisis of which man is the center.

But of late we ave had unexpected news of the man-bites-dog variety. Now it is the physical scientists themselves who have begun to emphasize man, about whom we know so little, rather than nature, which we have mastered so well that it may destroy us unless we learn to master ourselves.

Speaking at this year's convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, its president, Dr. Edmund W. Sinnott, of Yale University, said: "Man, not nature, is the great problem today. These vast new powers in the hands of selfish or arrogant men simply increase their power to dominate their fellows." Man wants to be much more than a well-kept beast, Dr. Sinnott said, adding:

"Unless we give him ample opportunity and encouragement to cultivate the higher side of his nature fully and can free him from the restraints of dogma and compulsion, he will never be satisfied, and there will be no real hope for him."

At the same convention, Dr. Roger J. Williams, noted Texas University biochemist, said that while scientists have learned a great deal about the atom of matter, they are still profoundly ignorant about the atom of society, the human individual, a much more explosive force than the atom bomb. "Civilization," Professor Williams said, "is not threatened by atomic bombs and biological warfare today. It is threatened by ourselves. If civilization goes down, man will be his own undoing. The instruments and tools that he uses will not be the source of the trouble."

The key problem of the twentieth century is one of human relations. The continued triumphs of physics, chemistry, and biology are taken for granted. But if we want to know why, in the midst of these triumphs of mind over matter, we continue to behave like inhuman beings and how, in spite of everything, we can learn to behave like human beings, we must turn to the new sciences which have begun their real development only in the past 30 years—anthropology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and sociology.

This makes me feel somewhat at home, because my uncle, Sigmund Freud, pointed out long ago that the solution of most of our problems lies in following out scientifically Socrates' famous injunction: Know thyself! Today it is recognized psychiatric treatment for the maladjusted to cure themselves by knowing themselves. Since man as a whole seems to be maladjusted to the new conditions imposed by the twentieth century, this technique is being applied to man as a whole.

In their attempt to discover why we behave as we do, the sciences are probing the nature of man from various angles. Physiologically, the human being is the way his body works; psychologically, the way his mind works; sociologically, the way he functions in groups; biologically, the way he reacts to heredity and environment; pedagogically, the way he is formed by early and adult education; economically, as the beneficiary or the victim of our mass-production system. By exploring these phases of everybody's behavior, we may come up with answers which may explain some mysteries of human nature and conduct. This fundamental knowledge may help us find the way to better social adjustment and happiness.

The various sciences now agree that societies are stable and healthy when individuals obtain the physical, intellectual, emotional, esthetic, moral, and religious satisfactions which their natures require. One of the reasons why we behave like inhuman beings is that so many people throughout the world are frustrated in their basic needs and desires. Severe frustration tends to throw people back to primitive and infantile modes of conduct. It rouses fear, and fear rouses a desire for revenge. Above all, frustrations, in a world raging with conflict, stimulate the aggressive impulses which a satisfying civilization sublimates into constructive channels.

Recently there has been a great deal of discussion among scientists about man's aggressive impulses. Dr. Thomas Nixon Carver, of Harvard, has classified aggressive forms of conduct as destructive, deceptive, and persuasive.

Destructive forms include war, robbery, dueling, murder, and brawling; deceptive forms are thieving, swindling, adulteration of goods, false advertising; persuasive aggression involves political, erotic, commercial, and legal attacks upon others. No matter how we classify it, aggression always seeks to bring injury or death to others; and these days the question, "Why do we behave like inhuman beings?" has become "Why do we behave aggressively?"

The opening in 1914 of this age of blood and blunder came as a terrible shock to a generation which had absorbed only at the top intellectual level the real meaning of Darwin's theory of evolution, and had no

real grasp of historic time. Even today many do not understand the fundamental concept of modern science that human beings are descended from lower forms of animal life; and that, like other animals, we seek to satisfy our desires and defend ourselves against danger.

The basic desires and fears are there, but with the development of civilization, we learn to control them in the interests of group survival. Indeed, civilization begins with man's renunciation and sublimation of jungle impulses. Family and social life are impossible unless men curb their primitive sex and aggressive instincts. Even the most primitive societies prohibit incest, robbery, and murder. When these prohibitions break down, we get anarchy. When they are abandoned by a despotic ruling elite, we get a totalitarian state with the law of jungle imposed on a helpless slave population. On the other hand, when the repression of primitive impulses is carried too far, we get first hypocrisy, then widespread frustration and neurosis. Modern science is looking for the factors in man which can make for balanced individuals and a balanced society which recognizes the force of man's primitive impulses and converts them into a source of creative power; or at least mitigates their destructiveness.

More and more the modern psychiatrist tends to relate the contemporary crisis to our early childhood experience in the family and society. People are not static units. Like everything else in the world, they evolve and change under the pressure of circumstance. As the world makes them, so they make the world. Civilization requires that each of us adjust himself to social living. When faulty upbringing or make-up prevents us from making this necessary adjustment, we behave like inhuman beings.

We do so because even the oldest civilizations on record go back only 6,000 years—a mere drop in the millions of years since man emerged from the unit cell. We were jungle animals far, far longer than we have been civilized men, and the impulses of the jungle animal lie dormant in our being beneath the surface of civilization.

When we come into the world as children, our impulses are those of primitive creatures struggling for survival in the primitive animal world. The psychological problems of childhood revolve around the need for becoming socially adjusted to family, community, country, and world. All education and training—at home, school, and church—is directed toward curbing the primitive impulses, especially those of aggression with which we are born, and redirecting them to social ends.

But those who bring us up, above all, our parents, are not always aware that if their attempts to civilize us are indifferent, ignorant, or brutal, if they fail to take into account the particular needs of our developing personality, we may become frustrated. Creative redirection of the child's primitive impulses is one thing; the suppression which comes from lack of love and understanding quite another. "Flowers that fester are far worse than weeds," Shakespeare observed; and natural impulses which fester through repression may emerge in later life as impotent neurosis or dangerous aggression. If we are brought up as inhuman beings we are likely to become inhuman beings. Nobody is so cruel in adult life as the man who was weaned on cruelty.

It is not only in the family, however, that aggression can be encouraged by aggressive upbringing. Society is that larger family which brings all of us up. Its failure to do so properly can also sour and inflame primitive impulses which ought to be sublimated and redirected constructively. The child who is humiliated on account of his poverty, race, religion, or looks may harbor feelings of vengeance which, in a violent age like ours, are likely to find aggressive outlets.

Man lives not by bread alone, the Bible tells us. The child, father of the man, needs love. He needs to feel that he is accepted and cherished by his family and community. If he is rejected—above all unjustly rejected—the iron enters his soul and he becomes embittered, vindictive, and aggressive.

In this epoch of world-wide dislocation and conflict, frustrated people often take out their aggression in antisocial behavior. They try to soothe their own psychological wounds by wounding others through racial and religious discrimination and persecution of so-called inferior peoples.

Anatole France once said that Napoleon overran the world with blood because he was a failure in his own tent; and modern psychologists have found that the men who murdered millions in concentration camps were seeking scapegoats for the forgotten suffering and frustration of their childhood. The child who is economically and psychologically insecure, who eats his crust of bread in tears and feels that he is rejected and unloved, is likely to develop into the man who seeks a "whipping boy" whom he will force to pay for his early defeats.

Science is giving a great deal of thought to the fact that so many of our modern political sadists, from the most obscure brown shirt to the booming dictator at the top, are psychological cripples devoured by hate and resentment which goes back to early childhood.

Frustration, defeat, suffering, insecurity, and the sense of being one of the insulted and injured, are very dangerous things during times of economic, political, and military insecurity.

It is, we have discovered to our cost, only too easy for the psychological monster with a flair for leadership to promise a heaven of security and victory on earth, and thus rouse primitive impulses of aggression in millions of frustrated people.

A paranoid like Hitler had no trouble inflaming a German people smarting under a lost war and a harsh peace, or to intoxicate them with the promise of world conquest into behaving like inhuman beings on a colossal scale. Here, as everywhere else today, barbarous aggression was mistaken for a short cut to achievement, and destruction as a short cut to a sense of psychological security.

Another reason why we behave like inhuman beings is sociological. We live in a highly competitive society. Our behavior in this society is predicated on jungle rules of survival.

As civilization, morality, and ethics developed in the course of history, men drew up rules of the game which tend to make us behave more like human beings. But modern competitive society is still so relatively new that these rules are not as well defined as they ought to be, and we do not adhere to them as much as we might. The pecuniary values of competitive society make us punish adultery, which affects the happiness of three people, far more harshly than adulteration, which may affect the health of millions.

It is true, as many of our wisest social scientists point out, that environment is a far more powerful factor in shaping our behavior than heredity. For the most part, we are what our surroundings make us. Just as the child in its mother's womb begins as an embryo and passes through the various stages of man's evolution from the unit cell, so each of us has to learn in his own lifetime the entire heritage of the race in our particular civilization. William Graham Sumner—from whom Franklin D. Roosevelt got the phrase "The forgotten man"—calls this heritage our folkways. In essence, this heritage comes to us through our environment. Our folkways are the everyday incidents of our environment which pattern our thoughts and actions.

Some individuals absorb these patterns more quickly and easily than others. Some have little or no capacity to absorb them. These regress easily to the primitive folkways of the jungle which are part of our unconscious heritage.

Another factor in our environment which makes this regression possible is that of the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of the world, one-half are still illiterate. Unequipped to absorb the gains of civilization, they are responsive not to the wisdom of the ages, but to words, pictures, and actions as these would be interpreted by primitive man. They are easy prey for distortion and superstition. Instead of being guided by knowledge and understanding, they are driven by the most primitive fears and hopes.

According to the 1940 census, the average American adult has had only 8 years of education. He lives in a highly complex world of competitive drives where all sorts of conflicting appeals, representing diverse interests, are made to the public day in and day out.

This leaves the door open for the conscious or unconscious propagation of antisocial, primitive viewpoints. Those who are not educated to resist the onslaught succumb to words and pictures whose explosive meanings stimulate the inhuman behavior which is the stock in trade of bigotry, fanaticism, and the fantasy of world conquest.

To be sure, we have in this country a system of public education which, as the Educational Policies Commission recently put it, should educate men to be free citizens in a free democracy. But there is a great gap between this ideal and the reality around us. The National Education Association and similar groups have shown that many States, cities, counties, and villages lack the physical equipment, the properly trained teachers, and the basic ideas to fit the child for life today and tomorrow.

To climax this serious lag, our educational system does not carry into the schoolroom all that the social sciences have discovered about human nature and conduct. Children are still taught antiquated ideas by antiquated methods. When the adolescent leaves school, he is often ill prepared to meet the complex problems of modern life. In most cases he has been fitted for an entirely different pattern of life, one much closer to the nineteenth than the twentieth century.

This may give him a sense of psychological insecurity. He may feel let down and resentful because those who had charge of his education dropped him into the seething contemporary world unequipped to meet it. If he meets defeat and frustration in his struggle for security or success, he becomes the perfect sucker for the paranoid demagog with his dazzling, unscrupulous promises of revenge, conquest, and plunder that will include all the good and evil things of which the frustrated, anonymous man feels himself deprived.

All these factors which make us behave like inhuman beings are augmented by the great paradox of the twentieth century. We have made fabulous progress in technology without comparable progress in ability to handle human relations.

We can make the atom bomb, but do not know how to control it socially so that it does not annihilate most of mankind.

We can press a button and start a TVA powerhouse, yet cannot prevent race riots caused by ignorance, misunderstanding, and prejudice.

We are so elated over our mastery of the machine that, like the characters in Samuel Butler's satire, we run the danger of ceasing to be men. And though we know perfectly well how fatal another armed conflict may be for the whole of civilization, there has

never been so much talk of war as now, only a few years after two wars to end all war.

That is why all the sciences today, from psychoanalysis to physics, are concerned with the problem of why we behave like inhuman beings. It is symptomatic of these times that the staff of the United Nations has its own psychiatric consultant.

Assuming this post, Dr. Carl F. Sulzberger, of the New York Postgraduate School and Hospital, urged further study of mankind with the hope that someday men will not have to fight an enemy, real or imaginary, to get along in the world.

Psychiatry, he said, is definitely on the way to acquiring an understanding of human behavior that may someday aid in achieving peace. The key to many current problems of human behavior is the study of the child's frustration and disappointments, since "the pattern of anxiety and satisfactions that will later color the whole life is established at an early age."

It is also a sign of the times that Dr. Carl Binger, of Cornell University, addressing the recent International Mental Health Congress in London, urged statesmen and politicians, who would not think of waging war without the help of scientists, to give scientists a hearing on how to prevent wars. Dr. Binger confirmed Freud's thesis that wars result from man's aggressive instincts, and he equated war with ailments having no single cause, but several causes, all contributing to the final catastrophe.

Thus science, with its modern equipment of experiment and method, is seeking to solve the problem of inhuman behavior through greater and greater knowledge of man and the world in which he lives. The key to our liberation from our jungle heritage of force and fraud lies in accelerated self-understanding. The truth shall indeed make us free when we learn, with the same control we exercise over physical nature, that it must now be the truth about ourselves.

Address of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to include the address of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, one of the principal speakers at the investiture of the Very Reverend Francis X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore, with the insignia of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, with the rank of knight commander:

BALTIMORE, March 31, 1949.—Speaking at investiture ceremonies in honor of the Very Reverend F. X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College and former editor-in-chief of the national weekly, America, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, declared that "the insignia of the Order of Isabella the Catholic were being conferred on Father Talbot on the tenth anniversary of the collapse of Soviet-dominated, leftist resistance in Spain as well as upon the tenth anniversary of the full recognition of the present Spanish Government as the de facto and de jure administration of that country by the then President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Addressing himself to a number of "misinformed commentators on the tragic events of 1936–39 in Spain and the evolution of public opinion in the United States during the same period with respect to what was happening in the Iberian Peninsula," Dr. Thorning offered evidence to prove that "millions of our non-Catholic fellow citizens, including some prominent members of the Protestant and Jewish clergy, understood that a Soviet-inspired Red reign of terror had taken over the Spanish Republic through the now-familiar device of a coalition government, the same type of regime which brought about the doom of Jan Masaryk and Edouard Benes in Sovietized Czechoslovakia and which led, directly, to the triumph of Soviet imperialism in China.

"Operating under cover of misguided fellow travelers and other secularists of the left, just as occurred last week at the so-called art and culture conference in New York, Generalissimo Josef Stalin made a serious effort to seize the strategic Iberian Peninsula.

It is to the eternal credit of Father Talbot and the millions of enlightened Americans associated with him that both he and they refused to be hoodwinked. As a result, Spain today does not share the totalitarian, Red-Fascist, police-state fate of sovietized Rumania, sovietized Bulgaria, totalitarian Yugoslavia, Soviet Hungary, Soviet-terrorized Poland, and a Kremlin-dominated Far East.

The present state of the world, with its topheavy armaments, overloaded budgets, and general uneasiness, is the direct result of the teamwork of left-wing simpletons and Red agents. Almost every one of the actors in the Soviet-stage-managed Waldorf Astoria spectacle was notorious, from 1936 to 1939, as a bitter opponent of Christian Spain. How many must remember the virulent attacks of the Reverend Guy Emery Shipler upon Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen and myself. How much in keeping with his role it was to find him allied with the enemies of our country in the gigantic Soviet propaganda show in New York City. Mr. George Sokolsky, the nationally respected columnist, did a service to truth and to the national welfare when he published (Mar. 305, 1949) the names of those connected with the alleged Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. Among the leftists, whose names were notorious for their attempt to foist the Soviet-dominated regime of Dr. Juan Negrim upon the American people as a true republic, were the following individuals: Mr. Kenneth Leslie, editor of the Protestant; Mr. Ring Lardner, Jr.; Mr. Howard Fast; Mr. Olin Downes; Mr. John Howard Lawson; Mr. Louis Adamic; Mr. Kyle Chricton; Dr. J. Raymond Walsh; Prof. Clyde R. Miller; Mr. Clifford Odets; Mr. Marc Blitzein; Mr. Paul Draper; Mr. Donald Ogden Stewart; Mr. Dalton Trumbo; Miss Lillian Hellman; Mr. José Ferrer; Mr. Herman Shumlin; Mr. Arthur Gaeth; Mr. A. B. Magil; Mr. Emil Lengyel; Mr. Albert Maltz; Mr. Aaron Copland; Mr. Lester Cole.

"To be sure, there were thousands of United States citizens, not under the thumb of the Kremlin, who sincerely believed that the republican form of government would benefit the people of Spain. They had a right to their opinion. The sad feature of their stand was that most of them never realized that they were just as much pawns and puppets in the Kremlin game as were Jan Masaryk and Edouard Benes. These good people were imposed upon and exploited. They contributed millions of dollars to the Soviet propaganda mills; they attended huge mass meetings where the Kremlin line was carefuly camouflaged under the familiar titles of 'Peace and Democracy,' or the 'Joint Anti-Fascist Committee,' etc. It is no historical accident that many groups, now labeled as subversive by the Department of Justice, had their origin and their sole 'raison d'être' in the Soviet campaign to utilize genuine sentiment in favor of the Spanish Republic for the ulterior purposes of Generalissimo Stalin. In other words, whereas the bellwethers of the flock were Red Nazis, posing as 'republicans' or 'democrats,' the innocent sheep were in the position of dupes preparing their own destruction, as happened in every country now behind the iron curtain. Just as Nikola D. Petkov in Bulgaria and Zoldan Tildy in Hungary, two fellow travelers were stalking horses for the Soviet Union in eastern and central Europe, so our own secularists of the left are doing all in their power, although frequently quite unintentionally, to pave the way for the Soviet seizure of power in the United States of America. International traitors, some conscious and the others, who are far more dangerous, the unconscious, are setting the stage for Soviet world domination. They are feverishly at work in every Republic of the Western Hemisphere, exactly as they have been exposed as an advance guard of the Kremlin in their activities in Canada. There are David Mays and Gerhart Eislers everywhere. Their conspiracy, which cuts across the lines of race, religion, and nationality, derives its real peril from the fatuous, self-appointed delegates of the arts, professions, and sciences of the left. Prof. Harold J. Laski, among others, is wrong: The Soviet menace stems from the extreme left. We who oppose Soviet manuevers and expose Kremlin tactics, are the real liberals, the true progressives, the genuine democrats. Everyone who belives in God, be he Protestant, Jew, or Catholic, is a watchman of freedom in this perilous hour. Fascism and nazism, thanks be to God, have been pretty thoroughly pulverized; Red nazism is the overwhelming grave threat to world democratic unity and world peace. The Soviets, or the collectivizers, are the most active gravediggers of democracy, everywhere. Decent libertarians must stand united for freedom, plenty, and peace."

The Greeks and Their Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therewith a very moving and inspirational letter about the fight which the Greeks are waging against godless communism.

Mr. Speaker, the Greek Nation has contributed much to the history of civilization. It has provided the western world with much of its law, literature and culture. It has shown us how to live intelligently and peacefully. Its peoples have mingled with others throughout the world, and wherever they have gone, and into every country they have moved, they have made intelligent, productive citizens. Their actions have earned for them the respect and friendship of all decent peoples.

Today that famous little country is fighting a life and death struggle against aggression, oppression and Communist tyranny. The Greek people are now fighting as their forefathers did, not only for the defense of their homeland but for traditions of independence and democracy. In short, they are now fighting the good fight against a foe dedicated to destroy our western civilization and our way of life. The Greeks are fighting and

dying to uphold the ideals which are near and dear to us.

I was therefore happy and honored to support vigorously President Truman's program of aid to Greece when it was first announced, and without equivocation or qualification. I was happy to support it last year, and I shall consider it an honor to support that program this year to the fullest extent possible.

It seems to me that the time has come in our lives when people everywhere must choose between the two basic philosophies which are in irreconcilable conflict in the world. One says that the state is supreme and should subjugate all human beings and their rights and liberties to it; that is the Communists' position; the other supports the dignity of man, his individual rights and liberties, and says that governments shall exist at the will of the governed—that is the position of the democracies. Greece is today fighting on the side of free democratic governments, for the right of little people in Greece and elsewhere to live under a democratic government of their own choice.

In my opinion there is no easy solution to this problem; there is no cheap compromise with the Communists and despite what the Communists' apologists have long told us, this issue will have to be met directly and forthrightly and there is no sidestepping it.

The people of Greece today are fighting this holy battle. We must in the name of all that we hold dear, assist them and uphold their hand wherever and whenever possible.

The letter follows:

AID GREEKS

To the EDITOR OF THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS:

Fully recognizing your keen interest in arousing America to the real menace of communism, may I call upon you to help the Greek nation which is presently engaged in a death struggle with the forces of communism? The outcome of this battle is of crucial importance to the western democracies and the very principles for which we in America fight.

My intense feeling in this matter results from a recent trip made to Greece when, at General Van Fleet's invitation, I accompanied him on a visit to the fighting fronts. From first-hand observations, I learned Greece is fighting Communists in a full-scale, all-out war which is the most violent and ruthless in her history. True to her traditions, Greece again fights to preserve western democratic civilization. After visiting refugee and children's camps, and talking with prisoners of war, I am absolutely convinced the guerrilla armies composed of die-hard Communists and criminal and lawless elements are intent on destroying everything Greek while they pillage, rape, and plunder. Patriots of the resistance movement left the guerrillas when Greece was liberated and the Communists took over, for they knew the Communist aim is to destroy Greece and make her a Communist satellite by establishing Russian domination of the Mediterranean.

Despite 9 years of invasion, occupation, and bitter privation, the courage and determination of the Greek people is admirable. However, we must encourage them to continue the present struggle just as we have shown wholehearted support by giving them material and financial aid.

SPYROS P. SKOURAS.

NEW YORK.

Federal Building Projects in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and tables on Federal building projects located in the State of Massachusetts, covered under the provisions of title I, H. R. 3662:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 6, 1949.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In compliance with your request of March 29, there is attached herewith a tabulation indicating the Federal building projects located in the State of Massachusetts, covered under the provisions of title 1, H. R. 3662.

This list, submitted pursuant to title 1, includes all communities having annual postal receipts in the amount of $10,000 or more where Federal-owned buildings do not exist. It further includes such projects involving the extension and remodeling or replacement of present Government-owned structures, in order to meet current and future space requirements of Federal establishments throughout the country. I am sure you are aware that a large number of the listed projects, particularly those in the smaller communities, will not under normal circumstances be undertaken for a number of years.

As of this date, a priority list has not been established. However, it is expected that those projects previously authorized under the 1937–38 Public Buildings Act, and now in deferred status, will receive prior consideration in formulating the first construction program. The Massachusetts projects in that particular category are identified by symbol No. 1 preceding the name of the community on the attached list.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. HUNTER,
Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

Purpose:	
PO etc	Post office, etc.
FOB	Federal office building.
PO AX	Post office annex.
PO	Post office.
MH	Marine hospital.
Character:	
SB	Site and building or buildings.
ER	Extension and remodeling.
AL AF	Additional land and additional facilities.
AL ER	Additional land, extension, and remodeling.
B	Building.

State and city	Purpose	Character	Proposed limit of cost
Massachusetts:			
Agawam	PO etc	SB	
Amesbury	PO etc	ER	
Ashburnham	PO etc	SB	
Assonet	PO etc	SB	
Athol	PO etc	AL ER	
Attleboro	PO etc	ER	$2,300.00
Auburn	PO etc	SB	
Avon	PO etc	SB	
Barre	PO etc	SB	
Bedford	PO etc	SB	
Beverly Farms	PO etc	SB	
Billerica	PO etc	SB	
Boston	FOB	SB	160,000.00
Boston [1]	PO AX	SB	66,000.00
Boston: [2]	MH	AL AF	29,000.00
Belmont branch	PO	SB	3,450.00
Braintree branch	PO	SB	2,300.00
Charlestown station	PO	SB	2,900.00
Dorchester Center station [1]	PO	SB	4,050.00
Grove Hall station	PO	SB	3,800.00
Hyde Park station	PO	SB	2,800.00
Jamaica Plain station	PO	SB	4,250.00
Melrose branch	PO	SB	3,650.00
Needham branch	PO	SB	2,300.00
Newtonville branch	PO	SB	7,000.00
Roslindale station [1]	PO	SB	3,100.00
Watertown branch	PO	SB	4,000.00
Wellesley branch	PO	SB	3,200.00
Winter Hill branch	PO	SB	2,650.00
Bridgewater	PO etc	SB	
Brookfield	PO etc	SB	
Buzzards Bay	PO etc	SB	
Chartley	PO etc	SB	
Chatham	PO etc	SB	
Chelmsford	PO etc	SB	
Cohasset	PO etc	SB	
Dalton	PO etc	SB	
Deerfield	PO etc	SB	
Duxbury	PO etc	SB	
East Bridgewater	PO etc	SB	
East Longmeadow	PO etc	SB	
East Northfield	PO etc	SB	
East Pepperell	PO etc	SB	
Edgartown	PO etc	SB	
Groton	PO etc	SB	
Hanson	PO etc	SB	
Harwich Port	PO etc	SB	
Hingham	PO etc	SB	$2,550.00

[1] Indicates previously authorized project.

[2] Indicates project included subject to the provisions of sec. 321, Public Health Service Act, dated July 1, 1944, and no work will be done on any project until approved as provided in Budget Circular No. A-27 revised, dated June 25, 1948.

State and city	Purpose	Character	Proposed limit of cost
Massachusetts—Continued			
Holbrook	PO etc	SB	
Holden	PO etc	SB	
Holliston	PO etc	SB	
Hopedale	PO etc	SB	
Hopkinton	PO etc	SB	
Housatonic	PO etc	SB	
Hudson	PO etc	B	
Indian Orchard [1]	PO etc	B	
Lawrence:			
Methuen branch	PO	SB	
North Andover branch	PO	SB	
Lee	PO etc	SB	
Lenox	PO etc	SB	
Ludlow	PO etc	SB	
Lynn:			
Swampscott branch	PO	SB	2,750.00
West Lynn station	PO	SB	3,000.00
Marblehead	PO etc	ER	
Marion	PO etc	SB	
Maynard	PO etc	SB	
Medfield	PO etc	SB	
Middleton	PO etc	SB	
Millis	PO etc	SB	
Monson	PO etc	SB	
Nantasket Beach	PO etc	SB	
North Abington	PO etc	SB	2,100.00
Northboro	PO etc	SB	
North Brookfield	PO etc	SB	
North Chelmsford	PO etc	SB	
North Easton	PO etc	SB	
North Grafton	PO etc	SB	
Norton	PO etc	SB	
Oak Bluffs	PO etc	SB	
Onset	PO etc	SB	
Orleans	PO etc	SB	
Osterville	PO etc	SB	
Oxford	PO etc	SB	
Randolph	PO etc	SB	
Rochdale	PO etc	SB	
Scituate	PO etc	SB	
Sharon	PO etc	SB	
Shelburne Falls	PO etc	SB	
Shirley	PO etc	SB	
Shrewsbury	PO etc	SB	
Southboro	PO etc	SB	
South Deerfield	PO etc	SB	
South Lancaster	PO etc	SB	
South Sudbury	PO etc	SB	
South Hamilton	PO etc	SB	
Spencer	PO etc	SB	2,100.00
Springfield: Forest Park station	PO	SB	2,700.00
Stockbridge	PO etc	SB	
Three Rivers	PO etc	SB	
Uxbridge	PO etc	SB	
Vineyard Haven	PO etc	SB	2,000.00
Warren	PO etc	SB	
Westboro	PO etc	SB	
West Concord	PO etc	SB	
West Upton	PO tec	SB	
West Warren [1]	PO etc	B	
Westwood	PO etc	SB	
Wilmington	PO etc	SB	
Wrentham	PO etc	SB	

NOTE.—Spaces left blank under the "Proposed limit of cost" column indicate amounts below $200,000.

British Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has been spreading throughout this country by means of its powerful $3,500,000 propaganda machine the story that the British National Health Service is a failure, and a warning to us not to adopt national-health insurance.

Now the AMA has discovered it has a bull by the horns. The British program is developing into a tremendous success and is the most popular thing the British Government has done. Doctors and laymen alike testify for it. The doctors are getting a good living, patients are getting better medical care than ever before, and the national health is expected to show a tremendous improvement.

For an impartial story of the British program, as contrasted with the fictitious tales the AMA has been spreading, I refer Members of Congress to a recent broadcast from London by Frederick B. Opper of the American Broadcasting System, which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD. His story jibes with many others now reaching this country. I wonder if the AMA will continue to tell the American people we should follow the experience of the British. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a transcript of Mr. Opper's broadcast, as follows:

The American Broadcasting Co. and its affiliated stations now present Foreign Reporter. Each Sunday at this time ABC brings you an authoritative, comprehensive analysis by one of its many foreign correspondents on an important issue of the day. Because of the controversy over Government medical aid now sweeping the United States, ABC has asked Correspondent Frederick B. Opper, to tell us just how medical insurance is working in Great Britain, where it has been in effect for months.

Opper has made a close study of the British medical situation, and now he reports on how socialized medicine has worked out over in the British Isles. Now here is Correspondent Frederick B. Opper in this transcribed report, speaking to you direct from London.

Mr. FREDERICK B. OPPER. A few months ago Britain's Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, found he was having foot trouble, and at the same time he noticed his stomach was also causing him difficulty. So he paid a visit to his doctor and, after an examination, he was sent to a hospital where he spent several weeks, being treated for an infected foot and stomach ulcers. There was nothing significant about the hospital incident, except that Mr. Attlee paid nothing for his examination nor for his basic hospitalization.

Like 93 percent of the people of this country, the British Prime Minister has signed up under the new National Health Service scheme that gives free medical attention to any British citizen, whatever his complaint may be. Actually, the plan goes even further than that. A foreigner here in Britain, an American tourist perhaps, who falls ill with appendicitis, a broken leg, eye strain, can, by applying, receive complete attention without paying a red cent. But, of course, foreigners are only a drop in the bucket, and the plan is aimed at the British people themselves. It means that every person in this country, no matter what his age or his sex, no matter what he does for a living or even whether he works or is unemployed, no matter whether or not he pays insurance, can receive free medical attention if he wants it and if he needs it, from a private doctor or from a hospital. No British subject ever again has to pay a penny for his wig, for his set of false teeth, for an X-ray, for a bottle of medicine, for a pair of eye glasses, it is all free, open to everyone.

This nation-wide health plan, a gigantic scheme that 40,000,000 people already have signed up for, is not of course free any more than a battleship is free, or police protection is free, but no longer does a private citizen pay out of his own pocket for his health every time it is affected, any more than he pays individually for every battleship salvo that is fired, or every time the policeman on the beat arrests a pickpocket.

Health, like other public services, is now paid for in Britain by the Government out of taxes, and only in that sense does the citizen pay. This of course is a tremendous social change, particularly here in Britain where national health has never been an outstanding British characteristic, in fact it only has been since the health bill went into effect last July 5, that people have realized how bad British health actually was.

For only now, for the first time, have many people been able to afford medical attention, people who before would let their teeth decay because they could not afford a dentist, people who only knew that they were having trouble with their chest but who never could afford an X-ray to find out if they were suffering from tuberculosis.

Before this health plan became law, though, a great many millions of wage earners were protected medically to some degree, through deductions from their pay envelopes. But the present scheme is so much more far-reaching both in the number of people who can benefit from it, and from the benefit they are entitled to, that there is very little comparison.

I spoke a moment ago of people who can benefit from this health measure. That is because nobody has to register. It is completely voluntary and if any rugged individualist wants to stay out of the plan he is perfectly free to do so. In fact, as I say, 93 percent of the British people have registered,

but a stubborn or unaware 7 percent still are outside. I've wondered, as perhaps you do, whether the Royal family has come into the scheme, but when I called Buckingham Palace today to find out I could not get any information. I would think it unlikely, though.

Well, you may ask, what about the doctors? Are they also free to come in or stay out independently the same as the patient? The answer is yes.

And according to the latest figures available as of last month, out of 21,000 British doctors, 18,165 are members of the health service, and the remainder have chosen to remain outside it, taking only paying patients. Previously, doctor bills here in Britain were extremely high, especially the specialists, but there were always waiting lists in the consulting rooms of exclusive Harley Street.

Doctors on that famous street used to get their patients from the upper 10 percent of the population; they are now getting only the top 2 or 3 percent, because of course, fewer people are going to private doctors and paying the former fee; when now they can get attention free of charge. Certainly, people who have to count their money are pleased with such a development as the health plan.

But what about the doctor, does he like it? Mrs. Ralph Spunseller, of Canton, Ohio, for instance, wonders whether would-be doctors are discouraged at the development, and how medical-school enrollment has been affected. I am afraid that there aren't any comparative figures available. It is known that a year ago before the system started operating, there were 13,300 men and women studying medicine here in Britain, but since then, no medical-school census has been taken although the ministry of health says that medical schools are crammed to the doors, and that there are long waiting lists. In fact, the Ministry said more people are trying to become doctors now than ever before, although, as I say, they can't produce any definite figures to back up their claim.

Two Californians, Mrs. George Jerome, of Brawley, and George Fulton, of Asalia, apparently have been thinking along the same line too, wondering if perhaps British doctors have lost their incentive now, or whether or not patients complain that they are getting too impersonal, possibly losing the bedside manner common to private practice.

Well, I certainly haven't heard of such complaint myself, and the health ministry, when I asked them about it there, was indignant at the suggestion. In fact, so they said, the doctor-patient relationship in some ways is perhaps better now, for previously many doctors were embarrassed at having to ask fees from people they knew could scarcely afford to pay. Now the money barrier has been removed and, so the Ministry says, the family doctor is still the family doctor.

This view is backed up to a considerable extent by a recent article in Lancet, the well-known medical journal, which said both the doctor and the patient are pleased with what Lancet described, as their new and easier relationship, and, it added, doctors are working wholeheartedly in the new services. I think that it will be a considerable stretching of the truth, however, to say that all British doctors are backing the health plan wholeheartedly. Certainly, before it went into effect, when it was being debated in the House of Commons, and then during the transition period, they opposed it in large numbers. Possibly a majority of them were against it, at least a majority of those vocal in their opinion. Now as I say more than 18,000 out of 21,000 British doctors are taking part.

Not all of the 18,000 though are in favor of the plan. There have been rumors of some of the doctors trying to sabotage it by prescribing the most expensive medicines, for instance, and certainly, many doctors who didn't like the idea were forced to join when they found that patients who formerly paid them private fees were now going to the service doctors free of charge. So, reluctantly, many did join up while still disapproving. However, more doctors have joined up than the Government originally estimated would do so, and among the dentists there is almost a 100-percent score.

And, incidentally, I ought to say that these medical men are paid either flat yearly sums, or if they choose a smaller basic sum, plus a certain amount for each patient, and in a good many cases the doctors are better paid now than they were before, certainly in some of the poorer areas such as the Welsh Valley or the slums of London.

You are probably wondering, though, exactly how this British health plan works. Well, let's suppose John Smith wants to get the free medical benefits he has heard about. He goes to Dr. Jones, a family doctor he has had for years, and says he wants to be put on Dr. Jones' list. If Dr. Jones is not a member of the plan, or if he already has too many patients, Mr. Smith will be helped by the Government to find a doctor, but if Dr. Jones has signed up and has vacancies, Mr. Smith's choice is noted down and he is free to call on the doctor whenever he thinks there is something wrong with him. If Dr. Jones isn't sure of the exact nature of the trouble, he'll send Mr. Smith on to a specialist for consultation and, if necessary, to a hospital for lengthy observation, for an operation perhaps, and convalescence.

All this, of course, is free, and the attention is free for Mrs. Smith who perhaps is expecting another baby, attention that includes doctor's observation and midwife care and if little Johnny Smith breaks his wrist climbing a tree, and goes to the hospital as an out-patient, he, too, is treated free of charge, a question Mrs. Charles Makaldoney of Flossmoor, Ill., has asked about.

And, finally, if little Mary Smith begins to have headaches, she, too, is examined. Possibly her eyes are bad, and she is sent along to an eye specialist, who prescribes glasses. In that case she takes a prescription to an optician who fits her with spectacles, all free of charge.

Well, says John Jacobs, of Chicago, what has been the result of all of this? Has the plan had any noticeable effect on the British health picture, such as mortality rates or man-hours lost through illness?

So far the plan has been operating for only 7 months, and there are no figures that would prove its benefit beyond the fact that in the first 3 months the British infant mortality rate dropped to the lowest point in the country's history. I wouldn't use that one item as proof of anything, though I do agree with the Health Ministry certainly that British health will improve slowly but unquestionably with time.

For one thing, if for no other reason, people are now going to doctors who couldn't afford it before. They are getting medicine and surgical appliances they couldn't previously afford, and they are getting attention earlier in their illnesses than they did before. In time British medicine will be preventive instead of corrective.

Well, you may ask, all this sounds fine, but surely there must be drawbacks. Yes; there are. There are not enough doctors or dentists in Britain, and with more patients than ever before, they are terribly overworked, with the result that patients receive less physical attention at the moment, and the patients have to wait in line for hours, sometimes for weeks and months even, for special care or operations that are not immediately necessary. So many people needed glasses after examination that there is a great shortage of frames, for instance, and many people are abusing the plan, claiming attention for imaginary or trivial complaints just because the service is free.

But that is the crux of the whole matter. It is indeed free to everybody in Great Britain and as such is overwhelmingly the most popular measure in many years.

It is so popular that it is now a political weapon with the present labor government, under whose administration it was passed, claiming sole responsibility. Recently Winston Churchill, leader of the opposition, complained about the cost of the plan, particulary condemning the fact that the Health Ministry seriously underestimated expenditures. In fact, he made a bad political mistake in pressing the matter, because the Health Minister scored a great personal triumph in the House of Commons debate and an important political advantage.

Recently there was an important midterm election campaign in progress in one of the London districts. In many meetings of both parties, I have heard speaker after speaker claim credit for the bill. During the next year, I am sure that attitude won't change a bit, and very probably the national health plan will be the most tedious item in British politics. Certainly, it is here to stay; nobody will be so rash as to advocate its repeal.

There will be changes, of course, as experience picks out flaws, but the principle is now thoroughly established that every British citizen by right shall have free and complete medical attention wherever he or she needs it.

The Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Judiciary Committee of the House on yesterday, favorably reported House Joint Resolution 2. This is a resolution to abolish the archaic electoral college and electors and to provide for the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by a direct vote of the people. The resolution retains the electoral vote of each State but provides that such electoral vote be divided in the exact ratio with the popular vote. The resolution would set up a fair, honest, accurate and democratic method of electing Presidents.

The identical resolution was unanimously reported by House committees in the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses. The same resolution was reported last year by the Judiciary Committee of the House and also by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

This proposed amendment is wholly nonpartisan, and has overwhelming support from all sections of our country.

I am inserting herewith a resolution just received from the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, of Dallas, Tex. This club is composed of several hundred of the leading women of the Dallas area:

Be it resolved, That the members of the Public Affairs Luncheon Club in meeting assembled this 28th day of February 1949, do reaffirm our hearty approval of the resolution offered in the Congress of the United

States by Congressman GOSSETT of Texas and Senator LODGE of Massachusetts (known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 2) which proposes that there be submitted for ratification to the legislatures of the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college and providing that the electoral vote of each State shall be apportioned among the several parties on the ballot of that State in accordance with the votes polled by those parties in the Presidential elections, as it is the strong conviction of this group that the adoption of such an amendment would greatly strengthen the two-party system upon which the continuance of our democratic government rests and that the adoption of the amendment would also greatly lessen the influence of minority and pressure groups upon our political system and upon the administration of our Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization and that copies also be sent to Congressman ED GOSSETT and Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE and to Senators TOM CONNALLY and LYNDON JOHNSON and Congressman J. FRANK WILSON.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. M. C. TURNER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Unanimously adopted:

CORINNE NEAL COOK,
President.

PAULINE ADOUE HALL,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Bartholomew W. Buckley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include recent articles from the Ware News and the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram concerning my valued friend, Chief Bartholomew W. Buckley, who has so efficiently headed the police department of Ware, Mass., for the past 40 years.

Chief Buckley has made an outstanding record. For more than 50 years he has been a member of the Ware Police Department. He enjoys the esteem, respect, and affection of his fellow townspeople. Able and energetic, possessed of kindly, humane, and amiable qualities, he has endeared himself to citizens of every class. He is widely known and highly regarded throughout the State for his rectitude, marked ability, courage, conspicuous efficiency, and unfailing courtesy. Police chiefs may come and go, but when the full record is written the name of Chief Buckley must be placed in the topmost rank of merit, achievement, and service.

After long years of tireless and unselfish service he is entitled to rest and relaxation from arduous duties. It is my fervent wish and prayer that he may be spared for many years to come to enjoy the happy retirement which he so richly deserves. It may well be said of him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

[From the Ware River (Mass.) News of April 6, 1949]

"BAT" BUCKLEY TO END POLICE SERVICE JULY 1

Ware will lose an outstanding civil servant July 1, when Bartholomew J. Buckley retires.

His retirement will terminate a public service that began 46 years ago when he was elected a patrolman and 31 years as chief of the Ware Police Department.

Chief Buckley last night notified the board of selectmen of his impending retirement.

"The town has been good to me," he said. "I am announcing my retirement effective July 1 so that the selectmen and the town may have ample time to make a selection of my successor. This is a momentous decision. I have never been without a job since I was 10 years old and I expect to keep busy after I retire."

The retirement of the chief does not come unexpectedly. Though hale and hearty, he is 72 and as a member of the Hampshire County retirement system which Ware joined 2 years ago, his retirement this year would have been automatic. He will receive a pension under the system approximately equal to one-half of his regular salary from the town.

The chief could look back on a memorable life. Born in Ware, the son of James and Johanna (Welch) Buckley, May 30, 1877, Bartholomew Buckley went through the grades in Ware's public schools and at 10 took a job as waterboy at the Hitchcock Building. For a short time he worked in the Otis mills. He can recall earning $3.20 for a 60-hour workweek.

He can recall his years as outstanding athlete and as a member of the famous Ware Young Men's Union basketball team, which he captained and led on a victorious tour. He can remember how his team mates thought he'd make a good patrolman and induced him to run for the office, which in 1903 was elective.

"Bat" won the election and earned for himself a place of highest respect in police circles and of deepest affection among his fellow citizens. His efficiency in office led to his appointment to the office of chief in 1908 after the then chief, Maurice Fitzgerald, was dangerously wounded in a gun battle with a horse thief, and subsequently became sheriff of Hampshire County.

The chief can look back on a multitude of official and unofficial activities which won for him praise for his charities, for his sympathetic understanding of the unfortunate, for his interest in the welfare of boys and girls, and for his efficiency as a law-enforcement officer.

He can take out the gold badge which the merchants of Ware gave him in 1910 in recognition of the high esteem in which he was held. Most striking of his memories is that of the 1938 flood and hurricane, when for 70 hours he became mayor of the town and brought the town through without loss of life.

To quote from an editorial written by John P. Callaghan, former editor of the Daily News, on October 18, 1938, "A leader was needed. A man of courage, of vision, of cool judgment, and of heart. Ware had that man in the person of Chief Buckley, and Ware knew it."

Chief Buckley was one of the organizers and is vice president of the Ware Cooperative Bank; he was one of the organizers of Ware Rotary and is an honorary member of the club. He is a member of the Knights of Columbus and of the International Police Chiefs' Association and the Massachusetts Police Relief Association. He has been a deputy sheriff in Hampshire County for 40 years and will continue.

Twice married, the chief's first wife was Pamilia Girard, of Ware. His second wife is the former Beatrice V. Murray. He has two daughters, Mrs. Leo Dubois and Mrs. Theophile Gervais, and three grandchildren; two brothers, Michael, of Ware, and Timothy, of Hartford, Conn.; and two sisters, both of Springfield, Mrs. John McKenna and Miss Ellen Buckley.

The whole story of Chief Buckley's life may never be set down in black and white. Countless chapters are locked in the hearts and memories of a multitude of friends and beneficiaries.

In discussing the matter following the acceptance of his resignation, the members of the board of selectmen were loud in their acknowledgment of the remarkable work Chief Buckley had accomplished in his nearly half a century of service.

Within a short time the board will contact the Civil Service Commission and request an examination for candidates for the to-be-vacant post, to name his successor.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram]

POLICE CHIEF FOR 40 YEARS AT WARE TO RETIRE

WARE, Wednesday.—Chief of Police Bartholomew W. Buckley, head of the Ware Police Department for 40 years and a member of the department for 50 years, will retire on July 1.

Chief Buckley conferred with selectmen last night, after which the selectmen announced they accepted, with regret, the chief's decision to give up the post.

BORN IN WARE

Chief Buckley was born here May 30, 1877, and reached the retirement age under the Massachusetts law 2 years ago. He was granted a 2-year extension by State officials. Chief Buckley started his police career at the age of 22, when Maurice Fitzgerald, then chief of the department, was elected Hampshire County sheriff. In 1909 Buckley was named chief and has held the position since that time.

He was appointed a deputy sheriff in 1908 and has served in that capacity since.

EMPLOYED IN MILL

Sometime before entering police work Buckley was employed in a local mill on construction work. Just before entering police department he worked at the former Domestic Bakery.

He was a member of the famed Ware basketball team of 50 years ago.

Chief Buckley served as head of the Camp Cook Club, a well-known headquarters for sportsmen from all parts of the State, for almost 40 years.

The incident which made Chief Buckley best known throughout New England was his single-handed capture of Clyde Taylor, a horse thief and desperado, in a barn at Ellington, Conn., 40 years ago.

Taylor stole a horse and vehicle at the J. H. Gilbert place here and was trailed by the chief and Connecticut officers to the lonely Ellington hideout. When Taylor refused to surrender, Chief Buckley improvised a shield of wooden planks and went into the building alone. Taylor, although armed, surrendered without firing a shot.

WELL KNOWN IN EAST

Chief Buckley has a wide reputation for efficient police work and is well known in police circles throughout the East.

He is a vice president of Ware Co-operative Bank, a member of the bank investment committee, a member of the Springfield Elks, Ware Knights of Columbus, Massachusetts Police Chiefs Association, and other organizations affiliated with his work as deputy sheriff and police chief.

He is married and has two daughters.

He has no definite plans for the future.

The selectmen made no comment as to his successor.

The Putnam Phalanx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, concerning the Putnam Phalanx:

Resolution Concerning the Putnam Phalanx

Whereas it has come to the attention of the general assembly that the Putnam Phalanx is planning a trip to England, France, and Belgium in the fall of this year, in the course of which visits will be made to many places of historic interest to the people of this State and of other countries; and

Whereas this good-will tour will be the occasion for the confirmation of international friendship and mutual understanding: Be it

Resolved by this assembly, That the greetings of the general assembly are hereby extended to Col. Sam E. Dockrell, commanding officer of the Putnam Phalanx, and to the entire membership of that historic organization, with the best wishes of each member of this assembly and of the people of the State for a happy and successful trip; and that we request the Putnam Phalanx to extend to the government and citizens of the countries visited our most friendly greetings and heartiest good wishes; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and the senate cause a copy of this resolution to be sent to Colonel Dockrell.

Changes in Procurement Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the general interest in the procurement policies of the National Military Establishment I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a self-explanatory communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army. I am sure that my colleagues and their constituents will find this to be of interest:

APRIL 1, 1949.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I wish to refer to your letter to the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, of March 4, 1949, and to the subsequent discussion with you by my executive, Col. G. K. Heiss, on March 17, with regard to procurement of 500,000 trunk lockers by the Department of the Army.

Procurement of these lockers has been thoroughly investigated, and it was determined that procurement, f. o. b. origin in this instance, was not the most economical to the Government. In order to afford all qualified manufacturers or vendors, irrespective of geographical locations, an equal opportunity to participate in Department of the Army procurements and at the same time assure the maximum of economy in the expenditure of Government funds, I have directed the following procedure be followed by the procuring agencies of the Army in procurement of all supplies:

"(1) Where the destination is known at the time of issuing invitations for bids, supplies will be purchased f. o. b. destination, except where it can be demonstrated that financial savings to the Government will result from an f. o. b. origin purchase.

"(2) Where the final, ultimate, or in transit destination has not been definitely established at the time of issuing invitations for bids, destination points will be selected based upon the best available information as to distribution. The invitations for bids will specify that the award will be made on an f. o. b. origin basis but will designate the selected destination. In making the award f. o. b. origin, transportation costs between the source of supply and the designated destination point or points will be considered in determining the lowest estimated cost to the Government. Invitations should make this point clear."

I believe this action will avoid a recurrence of the difficulties we experienced in the procurement of the trunk lockers and that it will prove to be of real benefit to the commercial suppliers of the Army in future procurement of all our supplies.

I appreciate your interest in this matter, and I am returning the letter you received from Mr. Charles Bruno.

Sincerely,

GORDON GRAY,
The Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Foreign Traders Make Worthy Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, during some reading the other day my attention was called to two great paragraphs of the final declaration of the Thirty-fifth National Foreign Trade Convention held in New York early last November.

Because I feel those paragraphs sum up so well the innermost feelings of the leaders in foreign trade in the United States, I have asked and obtained permission of the House to extend my remarks at this point. The paragraphs are short, so I hope each of the Members of Congress and others who read the RECORD will take time to read them. They are:

The American system of private enterprise has been proved by experience. It has produced for our people the highest standard of living in all recorded history. Our system is designed to produce and distribute wealth, and its success in achieving this aim is demonstrable by the record. This is in sharp contrast to Marxism, which claims to distribute wealth, but succeeds only in distributing poverty. The system of free, private, competitive enterprise is man's best and only hope to keep alive his age-old dream of a world where he can enjoy with them the good things which their combined labors have produced.

We who represent American private enterprise in the fields of foreign trade and investment do not know what the immediate future may hold for us and our country. We earnestly hope and pray that our Nation can remain at peace with all the world; but whatever comes, we shall not shrink from our task. We shall be ready, as always, to make whatever temporary adjustments are necessary to meet our country's need; but we shall ever keep alive in our hearts our faith in ourselves, in our country, and in the system which has made our Nation great.

All in British Health Plan Are Opposed to Per-Visit Pay-Off—British Public Asks 8,000,000 Pairs of Free Eyeglasses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 7 I placed in the RECORD the eleventh twelfth and thirteenth of a series of articles appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle describing the British health plan. The following, which appeared in the Eagle on April 1 and April 3, are the fourteenth and concluding articles:

ALL IN BRITISH HEALTH PLAN ARE OPPOSED TO PER-VISIT PAY-OFF—SAD EXPERIENCE IN MANCHESTER IS REMEMBERED

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Fourteenth in a series)

LONDON, April 1.—Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan and the doctors and dentists of England are in entire accord on one point in the national health-service arrangements. It is that a nation that pays its professional men on a per-visit basis under a public health plan will be sorry. It will have difficulty finding enough money to pay off.

Whenever it is mentioned everybody smiles and remarks: "New Zealand tried that and went broke."

One man, just retiring after a life-long career associated with pharmaceutical companies and associations tells a different story. He remembers when it was tried right in England, in Manchester, and he was in the middle of the crash that came.

ON VOLUNTARY BASIS

A voluntary association was organized to provide its members with medical care from general practitioners and a prescription service. The cost was estimated and rates for membership assessed on that basis. Thus was formed a fund to carry the work for a year.

The physicians declined a capitation arrangement, insisted on per-visit payments and got them. Going fees were agreed on for the pharmacists.

The physicians knew that only a limited amount was available and some of them started rushing around making all the visits possible. They proved they made them by writing a prescription every time.

BANKRUPTCY SETS IN

Before the year was up the fund was bankrupt and both physicians and druggists were unable to collect their bills. The druggists blamed the doctors, raised a fuss and collected thousands of pounds from the medical men, but in the end received only 60 percent of their money.

Starting with the next year, the doctors asked for a capitation system. Ever since then—it was 30 years ago—the per-visit payment plan never has been mentioned in England. Not seriously, anyway.

One question is not discussed out loud in connection with health plans, but is mentioned softly sometimes. Nobody wants to be quoted. It's the question whether doctors report and pay income taxes on all their earnings and whether a national health plan, with all their checks coming from the government, deprives them of the chance to beat the internal-revenue man for a few bucks.

SMILING HESITATION

After a smile and hesitation it usually is remarked that all professional men and most small-business men have a great opportunity to come out of the income-tax struggle a little better off than big companies and those who are on salaries.

How much it is done nobody knows, and if doctors and dentists do so, they are not the only ones. But a health plan under which they work for the government does upset that deal.

One physician here remarked that if a doctor now will have to pay taxes on all his income because the government will know just how much he gets, he will not have any uncollectible bills any more, he will not have a lot of bad accounts on his books, so that ought to be a good balance.

More seriously, it is believed here that the government is so efficient in tracing incomes that most professional men have come mighty close to sending in their full shares of the taxes. One might get away with something, but never very much. It definitely is not a factor in the opposition of British physicians and dentists to the National Health Service, responsible members of the profession say.

BRITISH PUBLIC ASKS 8,000,000 PAIRS OF FREE EYEGLASSES—HEALTH PLAN WIPING OUT NORMAL SALES

(By E. J. Delaney)

(Last in a series)

LONDON, April 3.—Prior to National Health Service the total capacity of England to produce spectacles (glasses to you) was 4,500,000 pairs a year. Now the people are asking for 8,000,000 pairs, for free, each year, and the eye specialists, optometrists and opticians do not hope to come close to meeting the demand for months, or a year, or more.

From 4 weeks to 3 months are required to secure glasses after one gets the urge to seek some help for the eyesight. First a visit must be made to the general practitioner. He is supposed to find out whether there is any general health condition that is affecting the sight, and, if he can't find anything wrong, to pass out a paper which authorizes an appointment with an eye man chosen by the patient.

There is a wait of a few weeks for the eye tests. Then, a need for glasses being detected, permission for their issuance must be secured from a regional committee. That board sends a notice to an optician telling him he can make the glasses for the person. The committee is buried with work, too, and may take a week to clear the way. Then the glasses can be made. Since permission almost always is granted, the optician often makes the glasses and holds them pending arrival of the approval message.

The optician is paid $6.32 a pair for turning out the specs and he is allowed to give the customer a choice of 10 different colors or shapes of frames. There are nine more, but the customer would have to pay a little himself to get those.

THIRTY PERCENT RECEIVE TWO PAIRS

Ninety percent of those who apply for glasses need them and 30 percent of those given approval receive two pairs. It is found that some people want an eye examination just because it is free and not on the ground they are having any trouble. Nineteen percent are wearing glasses for which they never were examined, and 47 percent of those already wearing glasses haven't been examined recently, their last tests having been 4 to 10 years ago. Just over 16 percent never wore glasses before. One big chain store system here has been selling 2,000,000 pairs of glasses every year.

The opticians have been getting a thick slice of the big health melon. In a city of 120,000, opticians not long ago were averaging $1,440 a month gross income from the health plan. Their private business practically has ceased; it is down below 4 percent of prehealth service times. The optician makes little profit on the nine kinds of frames not within the plan because nearly everybody takes the free frames.

DOCTORS DEMAND RISE IN FEES

Many of the physicians of England say they are underpaid for the heavy load they are being asked to carry under the National Health Service and they are asking for an increase in fees from 35 to 60 percent. Minister of Health Bevan declines to discuss the subject while it is under negotiation, yet it can be sensed that the doctors will not be successful.

The Minister appears to have decided that the physicians in the populous areas are doing quite well and that more mileage allowances and other subsidies will assist those in the rural districts. The issue will reach a climax soon.

At the present time the doctor receives $3.60 per patient per year, regardless of the number he has. The medical negotiating committee is seeking $6 per patient for the first thousand patients; $4.40 each for the second thousand, and $3 each for all over 3,000.

A doctor with 1,500 on his list now is paid $5,400 and the new rates would give him $8,200. Another with 2,000 patients would go from $7,200 to $10,400. An office with 2,300 patients, considered the ideal number, now is paid $8,280 and would be improved to $11,300. Those with the maximum, 4,000, collect $14,400 and would be upped to $16,000.

HOSPITALS CUT 10 PERCENT

The Conservative Party is attacking the cost of the health service and the Labor Government clearly is trying to find ways to cut it down. Hospitals are being slashed 10 percent in the new budget and they do not know how they are going to comply without closing some wards. Such big increases for the physicians would make economies difficult. Nearly everybody expects the health service bill to the national treasury to be much more before it will be less.

The Health Ministry has announced the total for the health service from the treasury will be $913,698,400 for the next year. During the last year $120,000,000 was taken from the social-security funds and transferred to the health service account, and to what extent that will be done again this year is not disclosed. However, the estimated cost in the Health Ministry budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1950, has been set at $1,038,910,400.

Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of World War I the Congress has paid increasing attention to the credit needs of farmers. In 1916 Federal land-bank loans were initiated, and only 2 years later emergency crop and seed loans were authorized.

Under the emergency crop-and-seed loan program some 4,000,000 loans, aggregating approximately $500,000,000, were made—of which amount more than 82 percent has been repaid.

During the period from 1935 to 1946 the Resettlement Administration and its successor, the Farm Security Administration, made rural rehabilitation loans to about a million farmers, in an amount exceeding a billion dollars. Almost 90 percent of the matured principal of these loans has been repaid, plus more than $100,000,000 in interest.

In 1946, Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration was created to take over the emergency crop and seed loan program and the rural rehabilitation program and to develop other areas of farm credit. This new agency makes the following types of loans:

First. Operating loans, which are made to farmers—either owners or tenants—for the purchase of livestock, equipment, seed, feed, fertilizer, supplies, and other farm necessities.

Second. Farm ownership loans, which enable tenants to purchase family-type farms.

Third. Insured mortgage loans, under which program the Farmers Home Administration insures real-estate loans made by banks, insurance companies, or other private lenders, not to exceed 90 percent of the borrowers' investment.

Fourth. Water facility loans, which loans enable western farmers and ranchers to build and improve wells, ponds, windmills, and small irrigation systems.

In all of these programs, applications from veterans receive preferential consideration.

It should be emphasized that the Farmers Home Administration provides credit to farmers who cannot get the credit they need from other sources. Each loan is made through a county office, subject to approval and review by a local committee of three persons, two of whom must be farmers.

The Farmers Home Administration is doing a first-rate job—especially in promoting owner operation of farms. Moreover, the American taxpayer is receiving good returns on his investment in the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues from other States may have an opportunity to appraise the progress of these farm-credit programs in the Corn Belt, I include with my remarks a report on Farmers Home Administration activities in Iowa which I just received from Mr. John R. Holland, a dirt farmer from Van Buren County, who is chairman of the FHA State advisory committee for Iowa:

MILTON, IOWA, *April 6, 1949.*

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALLE: On Friday, March 25, the State Advisory Committee of the Farmers Home Administration held a regular meeting at our State office in Des Moines and as chairman, I was instructed by the committee to give you what might be called a progress report on the activity of the agency.

First you probably would be interested in the committee membership itself. There are nine on the committee and they are appointed annually by the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. Will list them alphabetically:

N. P. Black, Des Moines, State superintendent of banking.

Mrs. Edith A. Chester, Clarksville, Butler County, farmer's wife.

John R. Holland, Milton, Van Buren County, farmer.

H. H. Kildee, Ames, dean, Agriculture Division, Iowa State College.

Frank A. Lauters, LeMars, Plymouth County, farmer.

Harold E. McCord, Denison, Crawford County, business (actively interested in farm veterans and town and country cooperation).

J. S. Russell, Des Moines, farm editor, Des Moines Register & Tribune.

Richard L. Stephens, Crawfordsville, Washington County, farmer.

Donald C. Travis, Winterset, Madison County, farmer.

All farmer members either are or have been members of their respective county FHA committees and are thus very familiar with the operations of the program as it affects farm families.

As you know, the Farmers Home Administration is the successor agency to the Farm Security Administration and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration, the consolidation having taken effect in late 1946. Also that FHA is authorized to make loans only to those farm families that cannot get their credit needs from any other source.

In Iowa two types of loans can be made, farm ownership and operating loans. Farm ownership loans are for the purchase of family type farms with loan limits set for each county in the State by the Secretary of Agriculture. These limits vary from $9,500 in the poorer land counties to $21,000 in the counties with the best land in the State. Loans up to $12,000 are approved by the State director and loans above that figure must have the approval of the Administrator. Only four such loans have been submitted to Washington.

Since the beginning of this program in 1938, 1,048 loans have been made and 50 percent have been repaid in full without a cent of loss to the Government. These loans now bear 4 percent interest and are for a 40-year period with the provision that the borrower must refinance with other credit institutions when eligible and at not to exceed 5 percent interest. Normally this will be when the borrower has about a 35 percent equity in the farm.

Last year Congress appropriated $15,000,000 for loans of this kind, of which Iowa's share was $557,125. Seventy percent of these funds were earmarked for veterans and 30 percent for nonveterans.

In addition to these loans from appropriated funds the FHA Act provides for the making of insured farm ownership loans with the same terms and conditions except that instead of the Government advancing 100 percent of the investment cost, the borrower must advance 10 percent and the balance is secured from a lender with the Government fully insuring the mortgage. The interest rate to the lender is 3 percent with 1 percent going to the Government.

While the insured mortgage program does permit the making of many loans through the use of local credit, yet Iowa's share of the $15,000,000 is insufficient to meet the demand of veterans and others who do not have the 10 percent down payment, in addition to their operating capital.

For operating loans, FHA in Iowa has what the committees feels to be a very commendable record, considering the type of risk that is taken. Of the $31,600,000 loaned since the program started back in 1935, approximately $27,000,000 in principal has already been collected, plus over $3,700,000 in interest. It is our feeling from an examination of the records that, if the program closed its books today and liquidated the indebtedness, the Government would not only get back as many dollars as it advanced, but in addition right close to 4 percent interest on the money.

Operating loans are made on a 5-year basis and at 5 percent interest. One percent of the interest collected has just about absorbed the losses that have occurred. Slightly over 28,000 farm families have been assisted since this program started in 1935, and while there have been some failures, thousands of these borrowers have gone on to become successful tenants and owners and are today an asset to their communities.

It is the feeling of the entire State committee that the guidance of the county FHA supervisor that follows each loan plus the active interest of the county committee of three farmers has had much to do with the success of this work. Particularly since the close of the war we have not been able to meet the demand for operating loans. The State director advised the committee that the funds for this fiscal year were exhausted during February and that there were 1,168 applications on hand at the close of February, of which 528 were veterans.

During this fiscal year we have been able to make only 448 new operating loans. The applicants that the county committee have approved but for which there were no funds have had to do one of the following: (1) give up their leases and go into other work, (2) operate without adequate livestock, machinery, fertilizer, etc., (3) get what credit they could from high-interest loan companies, (4) get what credit they could on short-term notes that would not permit a properly planned farming program.

Unless one is close to the situation, it is difficult to realize the degree to which operation has tightened up. FHA has the best of relations with local banks and production credit associations but their regulations and concern over future economic developments will not permit them to extend the needed credit. In fact a high percentage of the applicants that come to our offices are referred to us by banks and PCA's.

The budget calls for the same appropriations for 1950 as for 1949—$75,000,000. Iowa's share of this amount will probably be about the same as last year, $1,400,000. Because of the large carry-over of approved applications, a high percentage of this amount will have been committed by July 1 with only a very small amount left for new applicants after July 1.

Just about 60 percent of the funds this year for new loans were used for veterans of World War II.

With the guidance of the county supervisor and county committee, it is our feeling that the borrowers are not only becoming better farmers but are making a real contribution to soil conservation. You will be interested, I believe, in a few figures that the committee received for 1948.

	Farm-ownership borrowers	Operating-loan borrowers
Number linear feet terraces built	159,994	173,527
Number linear feet grassed waterways constructed	141,029	367,658
Acres of row crops contoured	6,608	19,284
Total acres crops on contour	10,826	25,934
Number acres limed	4,389	25,033
Number acres drained	1,039	5,682
Percent crop acres in legumes	22.46	16.57

I am informed that this is the first time a general report of this kind has been sent to you, but it seems logical to me that you would be interested in the work of one of the agencies that is trying to fill a need that is not covered by any other State or Federal group and that is not in competition with anyone. It is for this last reason, I feel sure, that we have the whole-hearted cooperation of other lending groups.

You are accustomed to weighing the needs for hundreds of appropriations. FHA appropriations, administered as they have been in Iowa, make useful, happy conservative farm owners and operators out of harassed, hopeless, near-public charges; they give the borrowers a real interest in their communities and their Nation; and best of all, they restore to discouraged men and women their own self-respect. You can guess at the effect of all this on their children.

I doubt if any other appropriation that has come before you has bought so much for so little, especially when you realize the money appropriated for loans is being returned to the Government with interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLLAND,
Chairman, State Advisory Committee.

Why Cannot the Republican Party Learn Anything Any More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few comments of mine, together with certain introductory matter which precedes an editorial published in the Omaha World-Herald under the date of March 30, 1949, and I also wish to offer for publication in the RECORD the editorial itself.

Many Democrats in the Congress have viewed with alarm and sadness the doings of their congressional brothers who claim to be affiliated with that great political party which in the fruitful days of yore were so wont to point with pride at its accomplishments instead of moaning regretfully, and which so truly scorned to be known as political "needlers," political scarers, political "talker-downers," political faultfinders, political egotists, and political frustraters.

I make bold to say that as one listens to, and views fairly either of the two branches of the great United States Congress in action, he sometimes wonders where the Republican Party acquired its strange un-American technique in its efforts to scare, delay, and prolong the passage of legislation, and then the next day, week, or month, cry out scornfully that the Eighty-first Congress has done nothing, although months have passed.

Out of curiosity some months ago I read several articles about the pattern followed by Communists in the United States at meetings of labor unions when officers are to be elected or other important decisions are to be made by the membership.

Strange and startling as it may seem, in my opinion, the majority of the Republicans in Congress seem to have read or dreamed these same articles and adopted in part some of this sinful Red technique and I feel sure that it was so done, unwittingly.

Many of the northern Republicans, in my opinion, on certain very important matters have joined hands with a group of reactionary Democrats. It is an old saying that politics makes strange bedfellows, and this statement if brought up to date would read "nonconstructive politics makes strange associations and voting blocs." Those who seem to desire civil-rights slavery walk the same political ways and vote the same way as those who seem to desire some form of industrial slavery. They both perch themselves ghoullike, for the ravens' feast, upon the dying carcass of the Taft-Hartley and antiminimum wage monsters. Whether or not the anti-civil-rights monster will find these groups again cheek to jowl also remains to be seen, but if verbal chaff, like other chaff, tells which way the wind blows it is a pretty good guess that this unholy coalition will carry on their much publicized unity and their cohesive, unholy brotherhood.

The Republican Party is too grand and too great a party to stoop so low, and I, as a Democrat, grieve exceedingly with the few, fine, constructive, forward-looking, and patriotic acting Republicans in this Congress.

When will Republican reason which seems to have fled to brutish beast and filthy fowl return to its ancient citadel? Why cannot these men, referred to by Republican National Committeeman HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., at the last chilly Omaha policy meeting of the party, as the better people with the better minds, use their social standing and their brains for worthier purposes? If they do not do so the observation of the Omaha bartender made at the Fontanelle Hotel, where the Republican parley was held, that he had seen better heads than the parleyers possessed, on nickel beers, a truism instead of a cruelly witty wisecrack.

Our Republic cannot long endure without two strong political parties with vision and patriotic purpose—real American purpose. On every hand and in every hamlet throughout the land the cries go up "What has happened to the Republican Party? Why has it gone berserk? Why does it drag itself about in this day of manliness as a fat, purposeless fear-spreading eunuch? Why has it turned its political face against constructive progress and toward frustration and destructiveness and erroneous cries of 'The wolf is coming?'"

As I write these lines here in the House of Representatives this afternoon and hear the fear-generating and other arguments in the well of the House as made by the Republican Members, I wonder why it is necessary to say that the United Nations and other efforts in the cause of peace are doomed to failure and to play politics here while the second deficiency appropriation bill is up for passage? Why is it necessary to say we are on our way to national bankruptcy, and why is it necessary to try to prove that the Eightieth Congress was so wonderful when the people have disgustingly decided that question in the last election to the exact contrary? Why all of these loud bickerings by Republican members of the committee about this bill and its specific appropriations when the committee reported it out for passage with no minority report? Why do they attempt to prune items in the bill on the claim that they want to save the taxpayers some money when in the closing days of the Eightieth Congress some of these same men helped to double the appropriation for the structures they had designed previously for Governor Dewey's inauguration ceremonies—the "Curly Brooks stadium"? Why was not their economy endeavors functioning then?

We must all unselfishly help the Republican Party restore itself to reason and to decency and to return itself to the ways of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. The Republican Party must once again become a builder, instead of a frustrater, a scarer, and an underminer.

It should have a definite policy of its own instead of being a coalition party or a me-too party or scare-the-tar-out-of-them party.

The Omaha World-Herald in the editorial, "God hates a coward," endeavored to, and did, point out the way, but all to no avail. Why does not this party composed of the claimed better people and better minds, try to make a better record and a better Republican Party for the sake of this great Republic and its future?

For the purpose of being helpful only, I now wish to put into the RECORD another editorial from the Omaha World-Herald which is as follows, and I hope that it is read by Republican Congressmen and acted upon with profit by their hitherto great party and themselves:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of March 30, 1949]

TO THE COUNTERATTACK

Nebraska's Republican State Central Committee has asked the national committee to call a representative meeting to form a statement of Republican principles.

That, we think, is a good, solid idea. All Americans, including the men and women who make up political parties, ought to stop occasionally and take stock of their convictions.

But if this proposed Republican gathering confines itself merely to stating its creed, it won't have much original work to do. The things the party believes in, or says it believes in, have been expressed many times in America's past, perhaps more eloquently than the present leaders of the party could express them. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address—those and many more immortal documents say all that need be said.

But saying is one thing and doing is another.

It is in the field of doing that the Republican Party, and particularly the Republican leadership, and most particularly the Republican Congress, need to examine their souls.

S. E. Torgeson, president of the Nebraska Republican Founders Day, put it in a nutshell when he told the central committee:

"I can tell you what's the matter with the Republican Party in Nebraska. It doesn't have any guts."

Dwight Griswold, the former Republican governor, went on from there. "I read the 'God Hates a Coward' editorial in the World-Herald," he said, "and now I am rather ashamed to read where our three Congressmen from Nebraska voted for the veterans' pension plan."

The votes of those three Congressmen, and many other Republican Congressmen of greater national celebrity, is a scandal which the Republican Party will be a long time living down.

The issue on that bill was naked politics, nothing more.

Congressman RANKIN introduced his fantastic pension bill in frank retaliation for a slap given him by the Democratic leadership in Congress. He was trying to put the President and the Eighty-first Congress on a spot.

The peanut leadership on the Republican side saw a chance to play politics. By supporting the Rankin bill it could please a few bosses of veterans organizations, and thereby, it hoped, bring in some votes for 1950. And at the same time if the bill passed both Houses of Congress, President Truman would have to veto it, thereby alienating the veterans and widening the split in his party.

A slick trick, three of Nebraska's Representatives * * * went for it. But not they alone. On decisive tests * * * the minority leader, the man who sought the Republican nomination for President last year, also voted with Congressman RANKIN. So did * * * the floor leader of the Eightieth Congress. So did * * * the the party whip.

They proved that on the slightest pretext they could rise above principle.

That is the Republican leadership, 1949 style, not only in Nebraska but at the high level where principles, theoretically, are translated into action.

What the Republican Party needs is to develop some leaders with guts. As a me-too party and a we-could-do-it-better party it has no excuse for existence. If it is going to try to get back in power by fishing for minority votes it might as well let the New Dealers take over. They are better at it.

The Republican Party, if it is to survive usefully, should make itself the American Party. It should defend resolutely the liberties of the people and with the fury of outraged patriotism launch a new fight against advancing, seemingly irresistible State socialism.

"My center gives way," said Foch at the Marne, "my right recedes, the situation is excellent; I shall attack."

The American right has receded too far before the aggressive enemy of the left. Now if ever is the time for the counterattack. It can be ordered only by a brave and rededicated Republican Party—a party which from top to bottom has purged itself of the psychology of abject retreat.

Cotton for Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, many of us feel that our attitude toward Spain should have a careful reexamination. Many of us feel that we can and should trade with Spain to the mutual benefit of both countries. In this connection, I wish to insert a resolution adopted by the

annual convention of the Texas Cotton Association:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION HELD IN GALVESTON, TEX., ON MARCH 25–26, 1949

Resolved, That this association urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to establish short-term credits for Spain to finance the procurement of United States cotton. In past years about two-thirds of cotton Spain purchased was of United States growth, and we feel that the American farmer is rightfully entitled to that market. Now as a result of a serious drought in Spain and other unusual economic circumstances current dollar balances are too low to permit the purchase of United States cotton. The shortage of cotton is forcing mills to curtail production to only a few days a week, causing a serious situation in the country. In view of the impending surplus of cotton in this country, the need for stimulating consumption in Spain and throughout the world, and particularly the need for restoring normal commercial relations with Spain, we believe such credits are justified. In view of the resources of the country, we feel such a credit would be economically sound.

Attest:

L. T. MURRAY,
Executive Vice President and Treasurer, Texas Cotton Association, Waco, Tex.

Corona Naval Hospital, Riverside County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Assembly Joint Resolution 25

Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to make the Corona Naval Hospital in Riverside County, Calif., available to the Veterans' Administration

Whereas the present and potential need for veterans' hospitalization facilities in this area is great and said need is further increased by the realization that the tremendous influx of people to California has included and will include many veterans; and

Whereas the Corona Naval Hospital has cared for up to 4,000 patients at times during the war and has a permanent capacity of 1,400 beds, and has for a number of months cared for less than 500 patients, and the balance of the beds have laid idle; and

Whereas the Los Angeles City Council, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and many other civic and veterans' organizations have long supported such action: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take effective steps immediately to make the Corona Naval Hospital available to the Veterans' Administration, in order that full use of this fine facility can be made, to the end that all beds, other than those needed at the present time by the Navy, can be used for the treatment of veterans; and

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my regards in the RECORD and include a portion of a letter which I received from a union laboring man in my district. This part of his letter exhibits a great deal of thought on the part of the writer on this very important legislation which is coming before the House in the very near future. Many similar letters have been received from working men, some of whom have been good labor union members for years, and shows that this is representative of the sentiments expressed by many of these writers.

The letter follows:

Now about domestic policies. The Taft-Hartley law, in my opinion, is about as important as any. I am a member of the International Chemical Workers, A. F. of L., and I am not following what they preach to us, and yelling against the T-H law. I believe it is a good law; far better than the old Wagner Act. I believe in freedom of speech, as long as that freedom is not abused, and I believe that the employer has some rights. This the Wagner Act denied in many cases. I believe that the employer has a right to talk against the union, but not to abuse it, and the union has the same right against the employer. In fact, I believe the individual worker has that same right if he wants to use it. I also believe in the right of the Government to enjoin unions against striking if it interferes with the general welfare. In fact, I don't believe in strikes. I have yet to see any strike where anyone gained anything. I believe in collective bargaining, and I believe in arbitration in all cases. I have yet to see the employer who would not be fair if the unions were fair. I believe the non-Communist affidavit provision should be enforced, not only on union officers, but that it should be required of every voter in the United States. I believe Communists are troublemakers in any free country in the world, and that membership in their party is very close to actual treason. I work at Commercial Solvents Corp., of Peoria, and I know positively that we would not be working now if it were not for the Taft-Hartley Act. Last summer we had a strike there that lasted over five months. The strike was a "wildcat," called by the United Mine Workers, district 50. When we started our present union, in order to get back to work, the UMW union could not get on the election ballot because their officers had not signed the non-Communist affidavit. Our present union can call no strike in that way. We must have the consent of the international, and that can only be had when negotiations have absolutely failed. If we had not gotten in there, we would still be outside the gate, and the strike would still be going on. Therefore I give the T-H Act credit for putting us back to work. There may be some mistakes in the law, but it is so much better than the preceding one that there is no comparison.

Power and Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during the sessions of the Eightieth Congress I called the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Soviet communistic espousal of the cause of the state of Israel, and the pro-Jewish attitude occasionally adopted by Soviet Russia were merely temporary changes of policy pursued solely for expediency and that they did not represent the permanent Soviet communistic policy which was always anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist. Since then I have had occasion to point to the indications that the temporary expedients were being abandoned with a reversion to form by leaders who are adept at creating chaos and causing confusion. Following are two items which appeared in the New York Post of April 6 which vividly establish the accuracy of my predictions:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITIC

(By Frank Kingdon)

The more anti-Semitism changes, the more it is the same thing.

Soviet anti-Semitism says the Jews are bourgeois and servants of the imperialist West.

Capitalistic anti-Semitism says the Jews are Communists, mouthpieces of the Soviet fifth column.

Indiscriminate demogoguery says the Jews are international bankers, weaving the web of financial mastery of the world.

When Thomas Carlyle wanted to give his opposition to Disraeli wings, he spoke of him as "the Hebrew conjurer."

We need dip no further for illustration. The facts are all too clear. The only point in dredging this sewer again is that its fumes have risen foully once more in Russia. Anti-Jewish utterances mark the latest sign of the end of whatever idealism may once have brightened Soviet thought.

Apologists for communism have hitherto been able to crush any argument for a parallel between it and nazism by saying that communism had no trace of racial discrimination in it. In communism as a historical theory there is no such trace. In Stalinism, as a political practice, it has cropped out. Why?

The answer, I think, is clear. Stalinism is intensely nationalistic. It has made communism and Russianism synonymous. In the name of Russianism it has lately cracked down on its creative artists of all kinds, forcing them to cast their works into the mold of its own brand of nationalism. It still had to find some explanation of why its artists and writers had to be disciplined. It had to find a scapegoat to explain their heresy. It followed an old line to make the Jew the scapegoat.

Jews, they said, corrupted genius. How familiar it sounds. The nationalism of this accusation is plain in the phrases of denunciation used. The Jews are homeless cosmopolitans and passportless wanderers. The Russia of the Czars turned the discontent of the masses against the Jews with this technique. The Russia of Stalin follows suit.

Once established, this scapegoat and other familiar practices follow. A spark is laid to the train of prejudice by playing up a change of name. B. Yakloveff is really Holtzman; Alexander Isbakh is Izak Bachrach; Yasny is Finkelstein. Stalin and Rankin find themselves partners in this device. Then on the hapless heads of Jewish creators are piled the heady charges of decadence and corrupt sophistication.

If any hopeful liberal still nurtured the hope that some good thing might come out of Moscow this should end the illusion. If any honest Marxian still thought Russia truly socialistic this should strip him of that fancy. Stalinism as now enforced in the Soviet Union is totalitarian nationalism displaying its true nature in the unmistakable symptom of anti-Semitism.

There is no assurance of the good life for any where there is not that assurance for all regardless of whatever differences may appear among them.

Marcella says: There are no aliens in the democracy of talent.

KREMLIN ECHOES HITLER: "ISRAEL NO FRIEND OF OURS"

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Once more the handwriting appears on the wall—the ancient, terrible wall, stained with Jewish blood through the centuries.

Once more the Jews of eastern Europe, the Jews of Rumania and Hungary and Russia, are in deadly peril.

Not long ago this column called attention to the outpourings of Radio Bucharest, ordering the immediate stamping out of "Zionist nationalism" and placing the responsibility for the leadership of the Jewish communities of Rumania in the hands of a selected group of Jewish Communists. I suggested then that such orders do not originate in Rumania, but with Rumania's masters in the Kremlin.

I wish I had made that warning stronger. It was, alas, only too well justified.

Consider the evidence now available, the evidence which marks the recurrence of that dreadful danger in which the Jewish populations of eastern Europe have always lived, that danger which so many wishful thinkers have supposed to be at an end because the Soviet Union once took a line against anti-Semitism.

1. As reported by Edward Weintal, Newsweek's talented diplomatic correspondent, "a drive to eliminate Jewish intellectuals from cultural life is now under way in the Soviet Union." For the first time, the Jewish names of individuals who have adopted Russian names are being published in the Soviet press. Jewish writers and scientists are being referred to as "homeless cosmopolitans." That means that they are no longer considered Soviet citizens, but are persons outside the law, persons who, according to Andrei Vishinsky in "The Law of the Soviet State," have no rights which the law is bound to respect. "Exalting the Hebrew religion" and "propagating Zionism" are among the crimes charged against Soviet Jews. Newsweek "hesitates to believe" that this widespread campaign of attack against Jews, against the Jewish Church, and the ideals of Zionism, "is deliberately designed to arouse latent anti-Semitism." This reporter is not so optimistic.

2. Look what has just happened right here in New York. The Morning Freiheit, the Communist Yiddish newspaper, has shifted its line. It is now suddenly anti-Zionist. Israel is being transformed, says Freiheit's Moshe Katz, formerly an ardent Zionist, into "a bastion of Jewish reaction and a prop of Anglo-American imperialism." There could be no clearer evidence that the word has come down the line from above. The men in the Kremlin have decided that Israel will be no friend of theirs. They are against Israel and against that Zionism which makes Israel possible.

You have now only to recall the constant attacks of Hitler against the international Jew and the bloody consequences of those attacks when delivered to a prejudiced people, to understand what is happening now and worse, what may happen in the future in the lands where Jews live under Soviet control. What will happen in the Soviet Union itself we can only guess, we will not know about anything that happens there which the Kremlin does not want us to know.

But this much is clear. The immediate and terribly urgent problem before the Jewish communities of the free world, before the new state of Israel and all those who have been Israel's friends is to save the 600,000 Jews of Rumania and Hungary.

This will not be easy. It is a task in large part for the governments of the free countries. In attempting it—and the American and British Governments have made a beginning by their sharp warnings to the Rumanian and Hungarian Governments about details of civil and religious rights—the earnest help of all men and women of good will must be enlisted. The blind and stupid support of the Soviet Union by many American Jews who could see only that Russia voted for partition must come to an end. The men in the Kremlin are no friends of freedom—any kind of freedom—religious or otherwise. They are no friends of any state based on the principle of individual liberties—whether its capital is Washington or Tel Aviv.

I wish I had said this bluntly long before. I'm saying it now—I hope before it is too late.

Andrew Jackson—Son of Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry H. Schlacht from the San Francisco Examiner of March 15, 1949:

ANDREW JACKSON—SON OF DESTINY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

From the plough to the Presidency.

Once in a lifetime, the grim sisters who weave the warp of our existence, run through a thread of brilliance, the colors of which cause it to stand apart though it is buried among thousands of others. Such a thread was Andrew Jackson.

Today we commemorate the one hundred and eighty-second anniversary of his birth. Today we salute the warrior, statesman, and patriot. Today we honor the seventh President of the United States. He was a son of destiny.

In the story of his life—as "Old Hickory" wrote it for himself—there is no single line that we would cancel; there is is no single word that we would erase.

On the remote frontiers of South Carolina, on the forest-clad banks of the Catawba River, in the region where the settlers were just beginning to cluster, Andrew Jackson first saw the light of day. There his infancy sported in the ancient wilderness. There his mind mused to freedom under its influence. He was born of Irish parents. He was fatherless at birth.

He was a British prisoner of war in the Revolution at the age of 13.

In what age did Jackson live? Where in the records of history is to be found an era in which the human race made mightier movements—an era in which occurred the formation and dissolution of European governments, and of the triumph of the American system?

His life is full of instruction. His life sprang from the dark valley of obscurity—like the peak of his favorite Alleghenies—rough, rugged, and sublime—piercing every cloud—till its summits bathed in the sunlight of heaven.

Washington was the father of his country. Jefferson was the philosopher of democracy. Jackson was its defender.

He did not create democracy. But he did arouse people to the reassertion of their rights. He did not set up our Government of, by, and for the people. But he did force the Government to respond to the will of the people.

No man has ever evinced so much knowledge of American ideas. No man has ever expressed them with such dauntless intrepidity. No man has ever executed them with such immovable will. No man has ever been so nobly and enthusiastically sustained.

He was the great warrior in the Battle of New Orleans. He is in a class by himself in the history of Presidents.

Andrew Jackson was not schooled in military strategy, yet he was a great general. He was not schooled in public service, yet he was a great statesman. He was great in peace. He was great in war.

He led our people to a victory that literally preserved free and popular government for our posterity. He felt that this Nation under God must be protected not only from foreign foes, but from foes within our borders. His patriotism knew no bounds but his country. His hope, his joy, and his ambition—all centered in its perpetuity and prosperity.

Directly across from the White House in Washington—stands a statue of Andrew Jackson—and on the pedestal is written the deathless phrase: "Our Federal Union: It must be preserved."

Andrew Jackson was a man of superb courage.

He did not indulge in the defeatist policy of surrendering vital principles upon which our Government rests. He held fast to the true American dream which has made America the greatest Nation on earth.

Let us all speak of his virtues. Let us all speak of his greatness. Let us all grow wiser and better by the salutary lessons his life inculcates.

Affection has no greater theme, and wisdom has no nobler counsel than the living actions of our sainted sires. History is the mirror of the past. It is the guide of the present. It is the beacon of the future.

May the poorest lad in our blessed land learn from the career of Andrew Jackson that poverty is no bar to the triumph of the free spirit. The avenues of the citadel of our strength and the posts of honor are open to universal competition. The freedom of our country calls to highest honors her children—from the workshop, from the city, and from the farm.

The ranks of American eminence have come from the humblest origin. Long will Andrew Jackson's memory be cherished by humanity.

His cenotaph is the love of his countrymen. His monument is the holy reverence in the hearts of our people. Let us all serve our country as he served it. Let us all serve our God as he served Him.

In life his career has been like the blaze of the sun in the fierceness of its noonday glory. In death he was as lovely as the

mildest sunset of a summer's evening, when the sun descends in cloudless, tranquil beauty.

Andrew Jackson died as he had lived—a Christian. And his last words were: "God and my country."

National Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 104, providing for the convening of an assembly to develop plans for a national theater, opera, and ballet, is gathering support from all over the Nation. Appended below is a resolution adopted by the American Legion's theatrical post in New York City endorsing its objectives:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE CAPTAIN CHARLES B. DILLINGHAM POST, NO. 1605, AT ITS REGULAR CONVENED MEETING ON MARCH 7, 1949

Whereas the Captain Charles B. Dillingham Post, No. 1605, is a theatrical post consisting entirely of veterans connected with the theatrical field; and

Whereas there are two theatrical posts in New York County, namely, the Captain Charles B. Dillingham Post, No. 1605, and the NVA Post, No. 690, having in excess of 600 members; and

Whereas there are about 28 theatrical posts throughout the country having a membership of over 40,000 veterans; and

Whereas the theater and its members have done and still are doing splendid morale work for the armed services and the disabled veterans in hospitals without any compensation whatsoever; and

Whereas the rendering of services toward the improvement of morale of not only the armed services but to the disabled veterans is as essential as the food and medical attention they receive; and

Whereas such beneficial work as has been rendered by the theater and its members has been conducted on a more or less haphazard basis due to the lack of a coordinated organization; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of the armed services and the disabled veterans that a national theater group be established so that not only they but all America as well can participate and receive the benefits of the education and morale-building values which stem from the theater; and

Whereas practically every theatrical organization in this country is in favor of the establishment of a national theatrical group; and

Whereas veterans of World Wars I and II will be largely and gainfully employed in this project: Now therefore

Resolved, That the United States Government be urged to sponsor, establish, and finance a national theatrical group; further

Resolved, That should this resolution be adopted by the New York County organization of the American Legion that the same be forwarded through channels to the Department of New York and the national body.

Dated March 7, 1949.

HARRY WEBER,
Commander.
GENEVIEVE P. LILLIOTT,
Adjutant.

Lands of the Crescent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago, May 10, 1948, to be exact, I outlined to the House my ideas about an MERP, that is a Middle East rehabilitation plan. I am happy to note that since that time many other persons have urged the same plan. I am certain that that plan is encompassed as a part of the much broader world-wide plan of our President looking toward world economic progress. The following editorial, which appeared in the New York Post on April 6, 1949, reiterates very forcefully much that has already been said on the subject. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

LANDS OF THE CRESCENT

Many Americans were relieved when it became evident that General Zayim had seized control of the Syrian Government not to draw his scimitar against peace negotiations with Israel, but rather to fight Syria's near-surrender to internal economic chaos.

But the Zayim coup emphasizes that the Middle East will continue to be a sick area, plagued by chronic uprisings and spans of sullen, revolt-breeding silence until the Arabian people have been rescued from serfdom and poverty in the feudal lands.

President Truman's "bold new program" to work through the United Nations to prime the industrial development of backward areas will probably lift many Arabs from the edge of starvation.

Yet the Truman-UN program cannot effectively raise the middle East's over-all living standard unless it is accompanied by basic econmic reforms within the Arab states.

The Middle East's almost unbelievable poverty is frequently blamed on "Arab nationalism," the fanatical insistence of robed sheiks on spending endless treasure and manpower to war against any semblance of alien domination.

The very phrase, Arab nationalism, conjures up compelling visions of T. E. Lawrence fighting beside fierce desert warriors to gain their freedom from Turkish and other tyrannies.

But the truth is that "Arab nationism" is not so much the cause of current middle eastern misery as it is the excuse employed by feudal Arabian lords to divert the people's attention from necessary social and economic changes.

For instance, by warring against the "infidel" Israeli, the Arab League was, in part, attempting to make its subjects forget their rising resentment against a new imperialism which genuinely threatens the Middle East—the arrangement under which a handful of Arab monarchs secure their power by accepting fabulous payments in return for permitting western companies to exploit the area's rich oil resources.

A basic need in the Arab states is a tax program which will tap the wealth of the haughty agricultural magnates, making it possible for the Arab governments to extend social, welfare, and educational services to the people.

But the popular demand for tax reform is muted because most Arabs are illiterate and many are even inarticulate. Their leaders are inspired youths who boast a thin veneer of western "culture" and are sneeringly labeled "radicals" by the ruling caste.

And as long as the cynical Arab potentates can incite the people to pitch their tents against some new, perhaps imagined threat to "Arab nationalism," reforms will be delayed.

The Truman-UN program may undertake such projects in the Middle East as the Jordan Valley Authority which would restore the ancient fruitfulness of Palestine; the Iraq irrigation project suggested by Herbert Hoover, opening the land to another million settlers; and a multinational authority in the Euphrates Valley, providing six middle eastern States with power, navigation, irrigation and flood control.

These and other projects could begin to give the Arabian people the fertile farms, the water, the power they need to turn their arid desert from a breeding ground of international tensions into a productive and peaceful land.

But the Truman-UN program will serve solely as a transfusion which momentarily delays a fatal middle eastern sickness, unless the Arabian governments, themselves, resolve that their oil-earned wealth shall be spent on the people who hold first title to the land's resources—the hungry and oppressed Arabian citizens.

East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the impending debate on the authorization of appropriation for continuing the European recovery program for the 3 months from April 1 to June 30, 1949, and for the fiscal year 1949–50, there is appended hereto an article showing the care with which the desire of the Congress is being met in connection with east-west European trade. Such trade is, we all know, very important to western Europe's recovery, but Congress specified in the original ECA it should not impinge on strategic considerations. The article appended below shows the care with which ERP nations are trying to follow the policy established by the Congress on this point:

BRITAIN TO TIGHTEN CONTROL OVER EASTWARD EXPORTS

(By John Allan May, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

LONDON, April 2, 1949.—Britain will greatly tighten its control over the exports of possible war potential to eastern Europe as of April 8.

Almost every type of machine tool, a wide range of chemicals, and many items of scientific apparatus are included on the new schedule of goods needing export licenses thereafter if eastward bound.

This British action may be seen as the first fruit of a high-powered United States drive to get a unified, agreed policy on east-west trade to cover the whole of western Europe.

Difficult but friendly negotiations are now in progress on this subject between the Economic Cooperation Administration and nations cooperating in the European recovery

program. Some of these nations are not yet convinced such security trade barriers really will do the job intended.

NEW ATTEMPT

Running parallel to these licensing talks is a new attempt, through the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva, to draw up a detailed schedule of machinery and equipment which can be exported safely from the west to the east and of raw materials which can be sent from the east to the west.

Reports are current in Europe that the United States is trying to impose in full its own particular system of export licensing on all of western Europe. This has been categorically denied to me by the highest authority in Paris.

What the United States is trying to do is to get a general agreement on a complete ban of exports to the east of a small number of items on the restricted list of goods obviously of primarily military use.

What is wanted thereafter is an understanding that the countries will not allow the export of other goods if a reasonable man would conclude from the known facts that in any particular case they were likely to be put to military instead of civil use.

GENERAL ACCEPTANCE

Britain's extension of its own export-licensing controls signifies its general acceptance of this point of view.

Export items now listed are not banned altogether. But the evidence of probable end-use can be sifted in the case of each particular sale.

The new list is a wide one. Harold Wilson, president of the board of trade, told the House of Commons it would be extended still further if such a course seemed necessary in the interests of British security.

The list includes graphite and all graphite compounds, diamond-tipped tools, metals like titanium, high-speed compressors, rust-resisting cocks and valves, mine-sweeping equipment, electronic computors, and many chemicals and pieces of scientific apparatus.

Graphite has important uses in nuclear research and the production of atomic weapons.

POTENTIAL WAR USE

Most of the chemicals specified are potential raw materials for modern types of explosives, smoke bombs, and rocket propellants.

High-speed compressors of the type of the schedule are used in wind tunnels for the development of aircraft with speeds at or above sound. Diamond-tipped tools are essential to any modern war industry. There is no suitable substitute for the hardness of diamond when making metal tools that later make weapons.

But, of course, almost all goods specified have even wider uses for peaceful purposes and are part and parcel of the industrial equipment which Britain and other countries are anxious to sell Russia and its satellites in exchange for food and fodder.

ECA is having a hard time to persuade some European countries that an export-licensing system can be made to work, since any goods actually banned can form only a very small proportion of the total goods moving in trade. Otherwise the policy would defeat Europe's declared intention and need of expanding its eastern trade.

EASTWARD EXPORTS

Under the Marshall plan, for instance, Benelux expects to increase its eastward exports to more than three times the prewar value. Britain hopes to expand from $170,000,000 worth last year to $365,000,000 in 1952 and nearly 20 percent of Austria's exports is planned eastward.

Is it really worth banning what can only be a token trickle of goods in days when everything from food to silk is a war potential in some way or another?

The United States answers such questions with a firm "Yes." ECA is replying most strongly that while general trade has to be encouraged, it would be a mistake for every nation not to do whatever it can to protect its own security.

Today's news shows Britain for one has come a long way round to the United States view.

Purchase Under ECA Act of Grains Milled in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1949.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUES: The attached statement and telegram from the American Federation of Grain Millers describe the necessity for continuation of the provision of the ECA Act that 25 percent of the grains purchased for shipment abroad must be milled in the United States.

It appears unwise to me to seek to help others without regard to the interests of our own people.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD IRVING.

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GRAIN MILLERS

The American Federation of Grain Millers represents approximately 50,000 members in the flour-milling industry throughout the United States.

Your attention is called to the problem of the Foreign Relief Act which requires 25 percent of the wheat going to Europe to be ground into flour before leaving this country. We understand that a move is on foot to change the act so as to allow all the wheat to leave this country without being processed. This would add to the misery of those employed in the flour-milling industry throughout the United States. They are already working short hours and their take-home pay has been greatly reduced through a decrease in the demand for flour.

We ask your fullest cooperation in helping to retain the act as it was which required 25 percent of the wheat to be ground in the United States. We cannot be too insistent in reminding you that it is a serious problem with us and we will greatly appreciate your cooperation in retaining the 25 percent as it now is.

Thanking you for your cooperation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

J. A. LEVERIDGE,
General Vice President.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 21, 1949.*

Congressman LEONARD IRVING:

Supplementing Mr. Leveridge's letter to you since October 1948, 22 mills have been shut down, representing a capital investment of $15,000,000 and 1,200 of our people have been permanently laid off. We have 6,500 people temporarily laid off because of slack business in the mills that are still operating, but at a reduced capacity. We have 21,000 members who have had their workweek reduced from a 6-day week to a 4- and 4½-day week because of slack business. Should this trend continue it will be only a matter of months until approximately 40 percent of the milling capacity in this country will be shut down. Last week the mills here in Kansas City reduced 67 percent of capacity, which is the lowest percent of capacity run since 1940. Three mills within 200 miles of Kansas City have been permanently shut down in last 30 days. If we fail to retain the present provision of the law which required 25-percent grind of wheat into flour, several thousand more of our members will be laid off. We authorize printing of this for distribution.

R. H. MCCLAIN,
Vice President, American Federation of Grain Millers International Union.

Old Shell Game in New Hands

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the widely heralded "new" farm program unveiled by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan is nothing in the world but the old shell game brought up to date to fool the American people.

There are, of course, some differences between the old shell racket and the "new" farm program. In the old shell racket a person could play or not play, according to whether he wished to do so or not. But in this new racket developed by the smart boys in the Department of Agriculture every American taxpayer would have to pay, whether he played or not.

Also, a customer, or sucker, in the old shell game had one chance in three of winning something, even if it was a worthless blanket bought at wholesale for 98 cents and touted by the side-show barker as being worth $25. In this Brannan farm program none of us has any chance of winning, unless we consider the bureaucrats who will handle the huge shuffling of tax money here and there as a result of this new racket.

The Fair Dealers would have us believe that everyone will benefit from this "new" farm program. Actually, everyone would have to pay for it—and pay more for it than they would have to pay otherwise.

If you can remember how difficult it was to find the pea under the shell in the old shell game, you will understand why the administration has made this "new" farm program elaborate so as to attempt to deceive the people. It is this way only so that the people will think they are not losing their dollars in taxes, although demonstrably they are doing so.

Under this program the farmer is guaranteed a certain cash price. If the commodity is not sold for that certain price,

he can get the difference from Uncle Sam. The consumer, on the other hand, gets the lower price. Where, then, does Uncle Sam get the money to pay the farmer and to subsidize the consumer? Why, from the so-called bottomless Federal Treasury. This money comes from taxes.

So the "new" program proves to be nothing but another way of milking the taxpayer for the benefit of the Fair Deal politicians. They will have a good reason to raise taxes, to increase Federal spending, to increase the number of Federal employees, and to keep themselves in power forever and ever, amen.

If the people are going to fall for rackets like this one, I do not see why they do not demand that the Federal Government pay all their grocery bill instead of just part of it. And, instead of having the farmer collect a part of his money from Uncle Sam, why not have him collect all of it from an all-wise, all-powerful Federal bureaucracy? It would be far more logical and efficient to adopt socialism in toto rather than to follow a slow, gradual course of strangling our free economic society.

I have put my references to this "new" program in quotation marks for a good reason. There is nothing new about it in the least. It was practiced during World War II in this country. We called it a program of consumer subsidies then and that is what it is now. The British put it into effect during the war and kept it going until they switched over entirely to a socialized economy. It is the first step—and a long step—toward a collectivized economy. The farmers fought the consumer subsidy a few years ago tooth and nail. I wonder if, in the intervening years, they have been drugged and beguiled by the New Dealers and the Fair Dealers into taking this bitter pill under another name.

The farmers and consumers should know that when the Federal Government gets into this racket, it will raise the ultimate cost of food by raising taxes for all. This will be necessary because when the Federal Government handles money, it always sticks on, through necessity, a huge service charge. A gigantic new bureaucracy, staffed by thousands of persons and costing millions of dollars annually, will be required to administer this flamboyant program. Not a single one of the accountants, administrators, clerks, typists, checkers, sleuths, investigators, or information men to be employed in this new agency would add one iota of production to our farm program, or one new idea to lower the cost of distribution. He or she would simply be an extra knot on the log of Government bureaucracy, adding to the burden of the log but contributing nothing in return.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my Republican colleagues to help counter this bold, pernicious, bald-faced attempt to buy millions of votes with public money by calling this proposal what it is in every speech, every letter, and every statement issued during the coming months. We may not be able to defeat this program, but we can awaken a few more Americans to the perilous courses on which the Fair Deal has launched our ship of state.

Socialism—American Variety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, what ails America?

Why do more and more of our citizens feel helpless and inadequate to take care of themselves in the midst of the greatest production of income we have ever known?

While acting as a political body like a good Samaritan making gifts to socialist governments abroad have we caught their socialism ourselves? Are we, too, washing our hands of personal responsibility to take care of ourselves and to do right voluntarily toward each other without compulsion? Or are we giving way to the compulsion, the management and control, the false promises of our own compulsory statism?

Let us avoid wishful thinking. Let us examine the recorded facts.

WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT TAKES FROM US

We know that our American Government has, in recent years, changed its character. It has become an overwhelming and omnipresent machine of controls and compulsions. It manages our money, credit, farming, rents and housing, foreign trade, social security, production, and education. This Federal Government management and control of us costs us about $50,000,000,000 a year out of our total income of about $200,000,000,000.

The Federal, State, and local governments combined take one-third of everything we produce. That means that, as a people, we work for ourselves only 2 out of every 3 days. With a 40-hour work-week, we have less than 27 hours, or about 3⅓ days per week to produce our food, clothing, and shelter, and to maintain our health and education. It cannot be done. So, as a consequence, the people cry out in increasing millions for the Government to do for them what they are incapable of doing for themselves in 3⅓ days' work per week. The only cure that Government proposes is that of extending Government management, increasing taxes, and thus reducing even further the number of days in which the people can work for themselves in the management of themselves, their property, and their happiness. Such methods can only lead to scarcity and general poverty, as in Russia.

WHEN IS A COUNTRY SOCIALIST?

Many enlightened scholars have expressed doubt as to whether any government can take more than 2 days in 10 from the people, or 20 percent of the nation's income, and still leave a people able to take care of themselves. Above that level, Socialist management becomes inevitable. We must remember that as recently as 1930, London and Paris managed only 21 percent of their national economy; Berlin managed 22 percent and brought on national socialism 3 years later. Moscow, after 13 years of socialism, managed only 29 percent of the Russian economy. Can we be excused, if we fail too to take to heart these facts and govern ourselves accordingly?

The present impact of this concentration of power in our Government is crushing the people now. Do you realize that we pay out more to Washington annually than we do to all of our 6,000,000 farmers for the food we eat? We pay in taxes 2½ times more to Washington to manage us than we pay in net income to all American corporations for all of their manufacturing, transporting, and other services to us.

NUMBER OF AMERICANS MANAGED BY GOVERNMENT

Government already owns one-fourth of all the land in the continental United States. It has also become the biggest employer in the world. It now has more than 2,000,000 civilian employees. They receive a cold half billion dollars per month, and they with their wives, parents, relatives, and dependents are naturally interested in seeing the pay-roll receipts continued by keeping one and the same party in power. Since by conservative estimate each Government employee guides or controls at least four votes, our citizens fight for freedom against a monstrous Central Government having 8,000,000 voters with a direct monetary interest in keeping one party continually entrenched in power.

This is not the whole story. Many, many more million citizens have become dependent upon payments, benefits, subsidies, and hand-outs. Already one out of every six adult Americans receives checks regularly from Washington. A United Press dispatch sets the figure at 15,830,899. If each check went to a different family, it would mean that 42.7 percent of our families now balance their budgets with money from Washington. Each year our tax burdens increase. Each year others join the ever increasing ranks of the 15,830,899 who are directly dependent on Washington's management of their lives in whole or part.

THE FIRST MARXIST CONCEPT ADOPTED

The measures Marx outlined in the manifesto include abolition of private property, a heavy progressive income tax, centralization of credit in the hands of the Central Government, extension of government ownership and production, and national control of the education of all children. Socialists the world over have acted in strict accordance with this 1848 dictum of Marx that "Political power is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another." Who can deny that we have followed and are now following these very precepts here in America?

The first and most important of these Marxist precepts came with your constitutional amendment of 1913, giving the Federal Government the right to tax individual incomes. Few persons then thought that it would become a transmission belt for the heavy progressive or graduated income tax, prescribed by Marx. Congress debated then in terms of a 1 or 2 percent tax at most. A

10-percent tax was considered preposterous. Yet we have had taxes which exceeded 90 percent and Washington today commonly takes more than three-quarters of the earnings of some of our most inventive and creative citizens. All of us are now liquidated to the extent of 33⅓ percent of all of our annual income in taxes which are added to the price of everything we buy from houses to bread. For example, gasoline enters into every item of living costs. Without excise taxes, gasoline would sell, generally, for 14 cents a gallon; without income taxes, for much less than 14 cents. Taxes make living costs so high, especially to the low-income group, that they cannot manage for themselves. Think of it, free Americans clamor for the socialist state, begging it for shelter, food, health and education. We too have our cynical Goebbels who knows that if you tax and tax, spend and spend, you can vote and vote the people into socialism anywhere in the world. They can be fooled into making little resistance to taxes if you begin by feeding them the delusion that the rich pay them. It is always the people who pay and carry the burdens.

THE SECOND MARXIST CONCEPT

Washington took the second Marxist step in a big stride when it destroyed, or reduced by 41 percent, all of our national monetary values in 1933. It went off the gold standard. By that act it robbed everyone of 41 percent of his or her savings up to that time. It started to enrich others by printing paper money and issuing it in exchange for nothing of value. All of our people's savings were liquidated just as all socialist governments in Europe liquidated the property of their people. Thus 41 percent of the peoples' capacity to take care of themselves was destroyed by the Government forcibly taking away 41 percent of the value of their money and locking up all gold in the vaults at Fort Knox. Several millions of us became at once absolutely dependent on Washington.

THE THIRD MARXIST CONCEPT

This became manifest first of all among the old people when Washington adopted the third Marxist pattern some years later. It compelled the people to pay to the Government their future savings for old-age and survivors' pensions. There are now already 2,471,000 people receiving old-age or survivors' social-security benefits. They have actually become the wards of Washington and with 45,000,000 others who are, in this year of 1949, being compelled to pay the Government most of their savings in taxes must depend on Government for the management of all or a goodly part of their economic life.

Over a period of 12 or 14 years the unsuspecting citizens have paid their good dollars to Washington. The Government promised to reinvest for the security of all. It would be a Fair Deal. Instead of conserving and investing the people's savings, however, the Federal Government has spent and wasted nearly every dime of it on socialist experiments. It has dropped I O U's in the till—like any other embezzler—to take the place of the billions spent. The general taxpayers are further defrauded and liquidated by being compelled now to pay taxes to make good the Government's embezzlement. The original savings funds are gone, and, therefore, constitute no security to the old people.

Besides all this the old people, once promised security, are getting paid in the Government-inflated dollars worth only 50 percent of the good dollars paid in. The old and the sick are being exploited. They are desolate, hungry, and on the relief rolls, robbed and liquidated among the first even in America as was the case in every socialist state abroad.

So 41 percent of the people's savings up to 1934 have been liquidated. The old people's savings have been wasted. The savings of everybody else since 1934 have been cut in half by inflation and on top of this criminal mismanagement everybody is forced to pay out a third of his income in taxes.

MORAL CONFIDENCE GONE—MARXISM CONTINUED

In such a demoralized state of law and public morals private lenders will not give loans and private citizens will hesitate to borrow. So the Government walks into the vacuum created by it and starts doing business. By the end of 1947, Washington had made $10,109,000,000 in loans, one-fourth of all the loans our 15,000 private banks made. Washington furnished 70 percent of all the money that has gone into new housing since the war, because private lenders have come to have so little faith in the integrity of our Government that they refused to lend for private building. They could not invest with confidence in the future, not knowing what the Government would do on rent control or Government housing. This is what happens when, to use the exact words of Marx and Lenin, "centralization of credit in the hands of the state" takes place.

Private trade and investment in every socialist nation are at a standstill for the same reason that free investment in housing and new business enterprises is stopped here. A moral collapse of the Government, causing the individual to lose faith in what his Government will do, breeds modern socialism everywhere. Since a socialist government breeds and lives without any moral base, what is right and wrong is simply determined by an army of arbitrary commissars whose fanaticism is hardly subject to review. We are experiencing that situation now in agriculture, in export licenses, loans by Government, awarding of contracts to favorites, administration of rents to benefit tenants, allocation of space in Government houses to those who are faithful to the party, and so forth. Individual management and responsibility are drying up everywhere. They must of necessity cease. There is no 50–50, no, not even a 10–90 arrangement possible between socialism and freedom. One or the other must perish utterly. One is wrong and destroys confidence. The other is right and inspires confidence, invention, and production. One is compulsion, the other freedom.

SOCIALISM DEFINED

It is possible that most Americans have never stopped to define socialism. If we do not know what socialism is, how can we know when we have it? Socialism simply stated is Government ownership or Government management of the Nation's economy and the denial by the Government of the right and the capacity of individuals to manage themselves and their property. Socialists, fellow travelers, and Communists always move toward compulsion and violence and away from freedom. Socialism is directly opposed to American constitutional freedom.

SOCIALISM AT WORK IN HOUSING BRINGS SCARCITY

The field of housing illustrates what is happening to morals and confidence under compulsion in a most dramatic fashion: Washington already is the landlord of some 557,000 American families. Allowing four persons to a family, we have 2,300,000 people who are beholden to our Central Government for living space. As in Europe, the ruling party sees to it that the voting booths are placed conveniently in the basements of such Government socialized housing. Alas, we have witnessed how American voters living in socialized housing projects cast a 90-percent vote, or more, in favor of the controlling party that builds the houses.

We used to laugh when we heard about 80- or 90-percent voting in Fascist Italy for Mussolini, in Nazi Germany for Hitler, and in Communist Russia for Stalin. Now it is becoming an American pattern for the big-city vote to swing elections for the party that controls rents, builds houses, and, thereby, owns the votes of the favored tenants. We, too, allocate living space NKVD American plan in exchange for loyalty to the party and the votes that keep the political party in power.

For all this building, the Government induces big lenders to invest in the certificates of participation by exempting them from Federal income taxes. It compels the municipalities to exempt the housing projects from local taxes for schools, streets, police, and other services. It then rents the Government apartments at about one-half price and charges the bill to the general taxpayers. Since the individual investor has no such power over other people's money, he cannot compete in any field that the Government enters.

Thus, Government housing kills confidence, moral sense, and all possibility of equal opportunity, equality of taxation, and justice before the law. The individual quits cold. The story of house building in France is told by Bertrand de Jouvenel in No Vacancies. When the protection of property rights was abandoned, the Government simply expropriated and divided up what houses there were. New building has ceased for 33 years. Cannot we learn either from our own experience or from that of Europe? Must we, as a nation, land in the prison house of Marxism?

RENTAL HOUSING DRIES UP

The general taxpayers are further liquidated. About 8,000,000 property owners, having saved over the generations of free American enterprise $67,000,000,000 and invested it in 17,600,000 rental

dwellings, are now forced by our Socialist-dominated Government to sell these dwellings at less than 60 percent of their values and quit business. Thus rental housing dries up just like the supply of shoes, shirts, dresses, and all sorts of foods dried up before OPA was repealed. Socialism never increases the supply of wanted goods. It always reduces the available supply.

In 1948, the "for sale" dwellings were three and four times greater than in 1940. In August 1940, the New York Times advertised 6,322 houses, apartments, and apartment buildings for sale. In August 1948, it carried 23,036. The Chicago Tribune shot advertisements for sale of housing from 11,303 to 32,045; Los Angeles, from 18,930 to 78,925 for the same period. This fantastic increase in the number of houses, apartments, and apartment buildings offered for sale is found in every big city. We had, according to the Census Bureau, over 4,000,000 more dwelling units in 1948 than we had in 1940, but we had more than 2,000,000 less for rent than we had in 1940.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Our Socialists propose to continue the march down the road to Marxist serfdom by bribing our doctors to socialize health and medicine from Washington just as the British Marxist Government has done. The procedures are almost identical. Seven hundred and fifty thousand doctors, nurses, and hospital personnel would enter our Government employment and cease the free practice of medicine. Washington would guide and control it all, drying up the voluntary source of skill, mercy, health, and hospitalization. Multiply 750,000 by 4 and you get another group who will vote according to the promises of appropriations for their particular benefit. The less fit will grab $8,000 a year in Government salary just as they grabbed 2,000 pounds a year in England.

There will be no more need to excel in skill and devotion to patients; there will be no more competitive effort for public favor. Payments by Government will be for quantity, not quality, of service. Yet, as a doctor in Nashville said recently, "Socialism is the syphilis of medicine. It is easy to take but rots the body to death." Government medicine is sterile. It never invents or discovers new cures. It can but appropriate and try to take by force what the individual alone can give as a voluntary free servant of the people. He alone can have the heart of sacrifice and devotion and love of service. Without freedom in medicine, the art of healing itself disappears.

MINIMUM WAGES AND HOURS

The very devil himself devises humanitarian slogans, we must admit, such as the minimum-wage law, for example. In this manner, the Socialists hope to fool the people into thinking that goodness will come faster by compulsion of the Government than by the community spirit of freemen. All Socialist compulsions are made to sound humanitarian. Its practical purpose, however, is always the same, viz: to rob or exploit one group to benefit another that has more votes. The Lesinski bill now before Congress proposes to make all employers engaged in interstate commerce pay the apprentice, the slow worker, the handicapped, the aged, the part-time worker, even the baby sitter, at least 75 cents an hour for 40 hours a week and $1.12½ for overtime.

This demagoguery disregards whether anybody can or will pay that or whether the worker can produce such value. The right to work itself is denied if the worker cannot induce somebody to pay the legal rate; otherwise, he must go on relief. He dare not take even 73 cents an hour. The bill in effect is a compulsory unemployment bill. It is planned economy. It is socialism in any country, including America.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

In planning a Marxist America, our Government Socialists do not overlook the teachers and school personnel of America. There are a million of them. It is proposed to offer hundreds of millions of dollars for their allegiance to the party that makes the appropriation. If education is socialized by appropriations, influence, supervision, or control, then national elections shall go to the party promising to make the highest appropriations. With the control of the minds of our children centered in Washington, the last act in the tragedy of lost freedom will be over. God must be thrown out of education. Instead, the goodness of the pagan state will be taught in exchange for the favors it bestows. Private education in free schools ceases for sheer lack of funds.

SOCIALISM—AMERICAN VARIETY LIKE ALL OTHER SOCIALISM

The American people have deceived themselves far too long into thinking of our variety of socialism, just because it is ours, as being different from the Marxist slave state throughout the rest of the world. The fact is that our present Government trend is identical in principle to other central governments which manage their people and their people's property. But for its slower and more hesitant tempo, it is like the English nationalization and the French Popular Front. We simply have socialism, American variety, stealing from some citizens and corrupting the rest of the citizens with the proceeds derived from the first group. We are at about the halfway stop on the road to total socialism such as Italian fascism, German nazism, and Soviet communism. The Western Powers are not yet as rough and tough and cruel in the administration of the same socialism, viz: we do not yet torture or murder.

Thank God, here and there throughout our land there is a growing anxiety about the survival of our constitutional Government and a new appreciation of it that comes only from a real danger of losing it.

Our acceptance of socialism may have been caused, so far, by ignorance and unwitting apathy. This does not change the awful fact that the Socialist cancer has already spread widely in our political body. The only cure is a rebirth of the free spirit of men and women. It is like the free elements of light, heat, rain, and soil. Freedom is explosive energy, much more explosive than atomic energy. It is the precious possession of our American society. It must be our first concern, for on it society is wholly dependent for the very pressing essentials of food, shelter, and the opportunity for the good life. This question is that practical. Yet this creative and explosive substance that we call the free mind and spirit is so delicate that it cannot be managed, controlled, or made the subject of compulsion by other mere men. Under compulsion it dries up, and scarcity, even famine, follows. It has been so in the history of man since the beginning of time.

Our forefathers knew this. So they made the whole concern of our Constitution that of maintaining, protecting and extolling the life, liberty, property and pursuit of happiness of individuals. That was the central function of our Government, which was instituted in the very beginning, for that purpose. History proved them right: The American way became a gospel to the peoples of all the earth for a hundred years.

THE CHALLENGE

Shall we extend further our brief interlude of American liberty, suspended as it has been between ages of darkness gone by and the age of darkness that threatens to follow us all?

That is the challenge of our moral decision. We dare not drift into the darkness of the Marxist atheist state god, his commissars and his tyranny. Instead, we must man the political trenches and the platforms which are the election districts throughout the land. In each district we must have captains of 10 and their auxiliary forces. Already our enemies are organized in the field literally with their captains of 10 in every industrial area. Just now they are winning the battle through lack of opposition.

We can win the freedom battle decisively. Vast unused forces and manpower wait to be enlisted and organized. There are 3,500,000 little-business men. There are 7,000,000 little-property owners being hurt and liquidated. There are farmers and laborers hurt by monopolistic pressures and restrictions. They want freedom and the right to work for themselves. There are millions of retailers, wholesalers, commission men, doctors, nurses, druggists, teachers, and preachers, all ready to fight for liberty again, if led by men who have convictions that burn in their hearts for the right as against the wrong. Liberty waits once more for volunteers like you, serving as the volunteer leaders and organizers of an American-freedom movement. Then socialism, even our own variety, shall be utterly destroyed, every root and branch of it. At the same time the victory over world sovietism will be won in this battle now drawn up right here on our own American soil. God give us strength to win that battle.

The Indians Have a Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has taken the trouble to study our Indian problem can rightfully be disturbed at the failure of the Indian Commission to adequately discharge its responsibilities.

Congress should awake to its duties and take appropriate action in behalf of our American Indians. Their needs and problems are plain to everyone except, apparently, the Congress of the United States.

While we fail to take appropriate action to guarantee the Indians their rights, it is encouraging to note that among the many people who want us to act is a group of small but alert boys in faraway La Jolla, Calif.

Under their leader, Katherine Boole Legge, den 3 of pack 4 of the Cub Scouts, has been studying the problems of the Navajo Indians. When they found out the plight of these people, they wanted to do something about it. First, they collected their own books and sent them to the Indian children in one of the hospitals. Then, they wanted to do something more fundamental and decided to appeal to Congress.

This week I received a letter from each member of the den. The following nine letters serve notice that our younger citizens expect action from us. I hope we do not disillusion them, nor the thousands of Indians who need our action so desperately.

CUB SCOUTS, DEN 3, PACK 4,
La Jolla, Calif.

DEAR MR. MCKINNON: Our Cub Scouts' den is studying about the Navajo Indians, and I think that they need more money and more schooling.

Please, will you ask the Congress for more money?

Love,
FOREST MCEVEN.

Our Cub Scouts' den is studying about the Navajo Indians, and we think that they should have more schooling. And I'm sure they would appreciate it if you would ask Congress to do something about it.

Yours truly,
BILL CORBIN.

P. S.—Please excuse my messy writing.

I am a boy from den 3, pack 4, in La Jolla, Calif. My address is 482 Palomar, and our den is studying about the Navajos and we heard about them and we ask Congress to please send them some money.

Thank you.
GORDON LEGGE.

Den 3, our cub den, is studying about the Navajo Indians, and we have heard about these poor Indians. We heard about the help that these Indians need, so we are writing to you to ask you to help them by giving them more money, food, and more schools; so I'm asking you to ask your Congress to help them by giving them all the things that I've asked for. I would appreciate it if you would do this for me and for all the boys in our den and in our pack.

Cordially yours,
MICHAEL DIFFENDERFER.

Den 3 has been thinking about the Navajo Indians. We thought that you could help the Navajos by asking Congress to give money for food, clothes, and schools. And would you send me a letter and tell me if they did anything to help the Navajos?

RICHARD DAVID COUTTS.

DEAR MR. MCKINNON: The cubs of den 3 heard about the help that the Navajos need, so we are asking for you to try to send more money for schools and food. We hope you can help. We hope you can help by asking Congress to help them. We will appreciate all you have done for us.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD DEACON,
Den Chief.

P. S.—If you write to us, mail the letter to 525 Westbourne Street, La Jolla, Calif.

Thank you.

DEAR MR. MCKINNON: Den 3 heard about the Navajo Indians and about their needs for help for food, money, and schools. You can help by asking Congress to give the things I have suggested.

Yours truly,
JON SWINNEY.

DEAR MR. MCKINNON: I am studying Navajo Indians, and I think you should give the Navajo Indians more schools.

BOBBY GROVES.

DEAR MR. MCKINNON: Our Cub Scouts' den is studying about the Navajo Indians, and I don't think it is fair for us that we have schools and they don't. Please see Congress to do something about it.

PETER BURNELL.

I'm studying the Navajo Indians, and I don't think it's fair to give us schools and don't give the Navajo any schooling. Please ask the Eighty-first Congress to give money to educate.

Yours truly,
BILL KEMP.

Denazification and War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1949, the executive committee of the American Jewish Congress adopted a resolution with regard to denazification and war criminals. I call the attention of the House to the resolution, which is as follows:

The executive committee of the American Jewish Congress meeting on February 28, 1949—

Recalling its resolutions of November 29, 1948, with regard to the problems of denazification and the punishment of war criminals, in which the American Jewish Congress expressed its grave concern over the emergence of anti-Semitic and pro-Fascist movements and trends in Germany and over the suspension of the trials of war criminals and the commutation of the sentences of many of those found guilty;

Notes that since the date there has been fresh and additional evidence of the failure of the denazification program as reflected in the continued growth of these anti-Semitic and nationalist trends;

Expresses its grave alarm over the threat to world peace which these developments constitute;

Therefore calls on the Senate of the United States to conduct a public investigation into the implementation of the denazification program and the intensification of anti-Semitic and antidemocratic trends in the American zone of Germany and that an opportunity be given to recognize public organizations to present their evidence and recommendations;

Urges the World Jewish Congress to take appropriate action toward the organization of similar investigations in other zones of Germany;

Directs the officers of the American Jewish Congress to organize a campaign of public information and action to acquaint American public opinion with the situation.

Amendment of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I intend to submit at the proper time appears to me to be so advisable because of purely simple and sound reasons that I was somewhat amazed when I heard the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House had complied with the requests of the ECA Administrator, Mr. Hoffman, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, that the provision for milling 25 percent of the grains shipped abroad be stricken from the act.

The amendment to H. R. 3748, a bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is as follows:

Strike the following words after "SEC. 7." on lines 5 and 6 of page 7: "(a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed."

The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate has recognized the need for continuance of this provision for the benefit of not only American trade and workers but because it actually felt there were just reasons why its retention would help the entire program. The action of our own committee, taken in face of conflicting testimony given it, indicates that the committee members themselves were somewhat undecided as to what was the right thing to do. The questions asked by the committee members of the witnesses and the weakness of its own committee report clearly indicate lack of full consideration and indecision about the matter.

While some administration spokesmen contended that to ship wheat entirely instead of 75 percent wheat and 25 percent flour would cost the Government $8,000,000 more, there was direct testimony from one of the leading wheat millers in the country, who spoke for his industry, to the effect that the Government would actually save money by shipping 25 percent of the wheat in the form of flour. In addition, he pointed out that the millfeeds, a byproduct of the flour milling, were seriously needed in the United States by farmers who today have on their places the largest numbers of livestock in the country's history.

There are indications, substantiated by facts, that by milling at least 25 percent of the wheat into flour in this country, our own economy will be benefited along with the extensions of benefits to the countries now receiving Marshall-plan aid. In the first place, substantial proofs have been presented that the Government would actually save money by milling the flour here. Furthermore, the costs of shipping would be less as would be the costs of handling in the Marshall-plan countries where wheat would have to be unloaded, moved to flour mills away from port areas, and then still have to be transported to the actual consumers. With transportation facilities in those countries already taxed to capacity because of the job of reconstruction, we should not add this burden, particularly when our own Government could save money without impairment of the basic premise of this act—to assist in the economic recovery of those nations friendly to the United States.

It appears to me that there is such a tremendous propaganda value to having flour delivered in bags marked as coming from the United States that this argument alone should outbalance any argument against shipping flour. Wheat would lose its identity whereas the bagged flour, with clear-cut markings on each bag, would not.

The Communists, ever seeking propaganda footholds, would, without question, seize upon this omission as a means for charging that the wheat being shipped to mills was coming from countries behind the iron curtain or elsewhere than from the United States, the real benefactor. It would be an effective propaganda, too, because who would know otherwise.

Pamphlets and radio talks to counteract such an untrue propaganda barrage could never be as effective as the sight of an American bag of flour, labeled as coming from the United States. Remember this operation will not be like the Friendship Train which everybody in Europe knew came from the United States because of the goodness of the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I implore you to sincerely consider my position in this matter because I truly feel that the best interests of our country will be served by retention of the present provisions of the present legislation.

Long Live Free Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in the March 25 issue of the New York Journal-American there appeared a very interesting editorial entitled "Long Live Free Greece." This editorial was written in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of Greek independence and is as follows:

LONG LIVE FREE GREECE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today marks the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of Greek independence.

Today marks the day when Bishop Germanos proclaimed freedom at Patras. Today marks the day when the Greek flag of liberation was unfurled.

What liberty-loving heart does not throb, what liberty-loving bosom does not swell, at the thought of Greek independence?

We hail her unconquerable soul which has ever been the proud possession of the Greek people. We salute with joy "not the glory that was Greece" but the glory that is Greece.

The history of Hellas is the history of the world.

No tyrant has ever been able to crush her. No tyrant ever will.

The torch of democracy was first lighted in Athens.

The Greek people have demonstrated in the most terrible of all wars that they still possess the flame which made their ancestors transcendent examples of what the human spirit can achieve.

They have emerged triumphant through every test of fire and sword. They showed the world that as they had taught other peoples how to live, so would they demonstrate their willingness to die while defending their liberty. No prophet is needed to predict that the people of Greece will continue to exemplify the noblest attributes of man.

Greece stands resolute as the pillar of civilization.

Her past is unrivaled in intellectual richness. Her past is assayed with the meaning of truth, justice, and beauty. Her past is studded with every form of human achievement. Her past is kindled with the eternal love of liberty.

Liberty is an Hellenic quality.

The historical annals reveal that the spirit of democracy found its full fruition and development in ancient Greece.

Its grandeur in every domain of human endeavor has never been excelled. Its poised brow, like that of her Olympian god, was ranked high above the contending forces that surged below. Its spirit of freedom, its love of music and arts, all of the finer impulses of the heart and mind, flourished and blossomed with such rich fertility during the golden age of Pericles that they have never been surpassed in history.

Greece has been a brilliant light throughout the centuries, casting its illuminating rays upon the nations of the world.

Her gallant leaders, true to the traditions of Thermopylae, Marathon, and Salamis, chose the path of honor in the last world conflict.

Despots have attempted to subdue and crush her valiant spirit with hunger, exposure, and death. But her unshakable will to live as a free nation has remained ever constant and steadfast through all her tribulations.

Nor have the Greeks ever surrendered or compromised their lifelong convictions and ideals.

For they have manifested, in blood and suffering, the invincible spirit of their martyred heroes who fought and died for liberty.

From the lamps of Acropolis, from the tragedies of Euripides, from the songs of Maenander, from the poems of Palamis, from the thought of Aristotle, from the science of Archimedes, the light of liberty will never be extinguished.

Spring has come to the golden land of Hellas, spring with all its natural freshness and exuberance.

The warm breezes play gently over her pastoral Arcadia. The red poppies of Attica bloom beneath gray-green olive trees. The branches in the Thessalonian orchards are now heavy with buds. The season brings the joy of Greek music, songs, and folk dances.

On her face is the smile of liberation. It is radiant with freedom. It is softened by sorrow. It is sweetened by sacrifice.

Greece will rise again to greater heights of splendor. She will live again in the fullness of her ancient glory and valor. For the luster of her historic fame can never be dimmed.

O, Greece, for you—your long and glorious line of statesmen, philosophers, scholars, poets, and artists must be singing a heavenly chorus of hallelujahs.

Here's to the land of Hellas: One nation, one language, one history, one greatness. May your country ever be worthy champions of justice and liberty.

Greece lives again.

Zeto 'e Helles—Long live free Greece.

Proposed Postal Rates a Threat to Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the weekly press of America, since the very beginning of the Republic, has been our greatest defender of individual freedom and democracy.

Our Nation today has more than 10,500 of these weekly newspapers. Nearly all of these weekly newspapers are individually owned. Nearly all of them are individually edited. The editorial opinions these weekly newspapers express are almost as divergent as the number of the 10,500 men and women who edit them. The very expression of such a divergence of opinion is not only healthy and desirable, but also necessary, in a country where laws are the product of open debate and discussion and not the dictatorial edicts of one man or a small clique of men.

It is an adage, as true as it is old, that he who would destroy liberty first controls, muzzles, or suspends a free press.

WEEKLY PRESS IN DANGER

There are now pending in the House and Senate of the United States bills which, if enacted in their present form, would greatly weaken most of the 10,500 weekly newspapers of this country and bring financial difficulties to many of them

The bills to which I refer are those which would increase the second-class postage mailing rates on weekly newspapers by 600 percent this year and 900 percent next year.

Under these bills, which I understand are sponsored by the Post Office Department, the present postal rates on weekly newspapers delivered by mail to citizens in the towns of publication would be increased from the present rate of 1 cent a pound to 4 cents. This is a fourfold increase, an increase of 400 percent.

But this is not all. If a weekly newspaper devotes as much as 50 percent of its columns to advertising, the rates, under the proposed bills, would be 50 percent higher than 4 cents, or be 6 cents a pound.

Few weekly newspapers, due to present-day high wages, high cost of materials, and high taxes, can survive unless more than 50 percent of their columns are filled with advertising. This means, therefore, to all intents and purposes, that the postage rates on weekly newspapers, which now are 1 cent a pound for home-town delivery, will be raised, if these bills are enacted, to at least 6 cents a pound. Furthermore these bills would raise these rates another 50 percent next year.

The administration has complained very bitterly about some manufacturers and producers having raised prices too much. I can think of no business, however, which has imposed a 600- to 900-percent increase in its prices, such as the post office now desires to do on second-class mail.

If the electric companies were to increase their rates to users by 600 percent, to six times what these rates now are, I imagine most people would discontinue using electric lights and go back to the candle, the oil lamp, or some other way of providing light for their homes. Is not very much the same thing likely to happen with newspapers if the Post Office Department, as it seems to desire, imposes a sixfold—600 percent—increase in postal rates?

NOT GOOD BUSINESS

Suppose this 600-percent increase in postal rates on weekly newspapers is imposed, what will the weekly newspaper publishers do?

Many of them certainly will put on carrier boys to make town deliveries. That will be cheaper than paying the post office the new and much higher postal rate.

If the newspaper in a little town of [illegible] to 5,000 does that, will the post [illegible] move into any smaller building? [illegible] use fewer mail carriers? Will [illegible] less lights or consume less heat? [illegible] think so. The expense of operating the small post office will be just [illegible] as it is now. The increased rate will merely have driven away some of its customers and lost it some of the revenue it is now receiving. That will not help [illegible] the post-office budget.

[illegible] AND ACCOUNTING

The Post Office Department, at my request, has supplied me with a report which shows that the United States post-office service last year handled 6,206,890,360 pieces of second-class mail, and that this mail weighed 2,107,309,398 pounds, or an average of 5.36 ounces to the piece."

Note these figures. They are not round figures. They are not estimates. They are exact figures, down to the very last decimal. If these figures are correct they could have been obtained in only one way, by a piece-by-piece count of that mail and by a sack-by-sack weighing of it. Think of the enormous number of workers that were required to count more than 6,000,000,000 pieces of mail. Think of the enormous number of man-hours of work required to weigh more than 2,000,000,000 pounds of mail. Why, 2,000,000,000 pounds is 1,000,000 tons. It would require a train of 25,000 railroad mail cars to hold that much mail. If there was some simpler and less expensive way of figuring the quantities and cost of handling such mail, the cost of handling it might be much less than it is.

The Post Office Department says its average cost of handling a second-class piece of mail is 3.22 cents per piece. After post-office accountants have gone to all of the expense of figuring in detail this cost, can anyone say the figure is correct? I doubt it.

In most small towns the cost of maintaining the post office with lights, heat, and janitor service would be just the same whether these newspapers were handled in the post office or not. There would be just as many carriers.

On the rural routes the carrier would drive in the same car over the same number of miles whether he carried the newspapers or not. He might have to make a few extra stops because of the newspaper mail. What does it cost to carry these newspapers? It is almost impossible to say.

CONCLUSION

I am not saying there should be no increase in second-class postal rates. I am saying that the proposal to raise these rates by 600 percent this year and 900 percent next year to the weekly newspapers is unrealistic and unreasonable. If punitive rates of this kind are imposed, many of the Nation's 10,500 weekly newspapers will be driven out of business.

A free people must be an informed people and the weekly newspapers help to keep them informed.

The Government itself needs these weekly newspapers. During the war years these newspapers donated many millions of dollars of free advertising space to such Government campaigns as war bond sales, the planting of victory gardens, and the collection of scrap metal and waste paper. These campaigns never would have been the success they were had it not been for the free advertising space donated to the Government by the weekly newspapers of the Nation.

High labor costs, high taxes, and higher costs for materials, all have made it increasingly difficult for the average small weekly newspaper to keep its income sufficiently high to meet its increased costs.

The costs of labor and materials for weekly papers have risen sharply, but rarely as much as 200 percent. The postal bills under consideration propose to raise postage costs to weekly newspapers by 600 percent. Even in these days of inflation that is simply too much and, if imposed, I am sure will be the last straw that will break the back of many small weekly newspaper publishing businesses.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short statement which I have prepared and sent to weekly newspaper publishers of my State to provide them with details on how the unrealistic and unreasonable increases in weekly newspaper postal rates, contained in present bills, would affect them. The statement follows:

The seriousness of the threat to weekly newspaper publishers of the proposed postal increase rates is indicated by the following statement on your postage rates now and what they would be under the departmental proposal.

	Now	Proposed
City delivery within county	1 cent per pound.	4 cents per pound.
Rural delivery within county	Free	1 cent per pound.

If publication is mailed outside county, new zone rates will apply. The new out-of-county zone rates will average about twice as high as you now pay.

Furthermore, all the above raises are the minimum. If your paper carries 25 to 50 percent advertising, your rate will be raised 25 percent above the new rates listed above.

If it carries 50 to 75 percent advertising, your rate will be 50 percent above the above new rates.

If it carries more than 75 percent advertising, rates will be 75 percent above the new rates.

If more than one-half of your issues in any year carry more than 75 percent advertising, your second-class mail privilege shall be revoked.

Furthermore these bills propose to increase the above rates another 50 percent next year.

These figures would seem to indicate that if this bill passes, your postage rates will be increased at least 500 percent, probably 700 percent.

No such drastic boost in rates in my opinion is justified and might prove ruinous, particularly to weekly newspapers.

What do you think?

Obviously, such rates will force weekly publishers to abandon mail delivery in their own cities and go to carrier boys for that probably would be cheaper.

Will be glad to have your views.

Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of April 9, 1949:

AID TO CHINA

(By Mark Sullivan)

RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATIONALIST PLIGHT

China—that is, China as a concern to us, as a major factor in our resistance to com-

munism—refuses to be ignored or forgotten. At the very moment when we were exulting over the Atlantic Pact, and assuming we had secured defense against communism on the European front, we were reminded of China by Winston Churchill. He had to remind us; he was giving an over-all picture of the world as it is:

"Are we winning the cold war? This cannot be decided by looking at Europe alone. We must also look to Asia. The worst disaster since our victory has been the collapse of China under Communist attack and intrigue."

Within 2 days after Churchill reminded us, concrete proposals for help to China were made by two important sources—former Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, and an exceptionally able young Senator, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California. Their proposals reflected a deep concern about China, felt strongly and somberly in informed areas of thought.

Both Senator KNOWLAND'S proposal and Governor Stassen's have to do with making American funds available to the part of China not yet overrun by the Communists. Both take the China situation as it exists today—they must, of course, and every present proposal about China must. But if we are limited in what we can concretely do in the present stage, our thought about China should take in the whole scope—how the present situation arose, the obligation we are under to China, as well as the urgency of helping China in our own interest.

About this, although thoughtful leaders know it well, there is on the part of the public widespread incompleteness of understanding. Some of this is due to preoccupation with the swift and compelling urgency of other events. The administration, intent upon Europe, takes about China an attitude expressed as waiting until the dust settles.

Some of the incompleteness of understanding is due to reticence about discussion of foreign policy voluntarily practiced by leaders of both parties during the presidential campaign, though this is now relaxing as respects China. Governor Dewey, in his Lincoln Day speech, charged the fall of China to the Truman administration, saying: "It was this present national administration which supinely sat by and allowed it to happen."

But our relation to the fall of China is not adequately described by the words "allowed it to happen." Our part in the fall is not a mere failure to give help, nor is it confined to the period of the Truman administration. The beginning of our relation to the fall of China was a step we took before the Truman administration, while the war was still on; and the nature of that step by us was such as to make us, in large part, responsible for the fall of China to communism.

At Yalta in February 1945 President Roosevelt conferred with Marshall Stalin about Russia entering the war against Japan. (Russia had so far been only in the war against Germany.) Stalin demanded a price—that at the conclusion of the war Russia be given territory then a part of China, other territory that had been taken from China by Japan, and control of railroads and other strategic advantages at the expense of China.

To these demands Roosevelt assented, in agreements secret at the time. The status thus created was shocking. China had been with us from the beginning of the war, but now was sacrificed as the price of getting Russia to join.

There was worse, Stalin made a demand, and Roosevelt agreed to it, expressed in these words: "It is understood that the agreement * * * referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures * * * to establish this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin." Chiang Kai-shek must agree to concessions at the expense of China, must do it and like it.

The territory and other advantages thus acquired by Russia composed leverage and impetus for the Communist drive into China that is now at the point of success. There was another step, this during the Truman administration. In 1946 we suspended for 18 months the shipment of arms to the Chiang Kai-shek government which we had been carrying on since the beginning of the war against Japan. The blow to the Chiang Kai-shek government was more than military. Communist propaganda was able to make it appear as if Chiang Kai-shek's resistance to the Communists did not have support by the United States.

Retention of Excessive Profits Has Become One of Our Greatest Economic Evils—More Such Profits Should Be Paid Out, and Under Section 102 of Internal Revenue Code Such Payments Can Be Enforced—Also Possible for Stockholders To Take Definite Action and Hold Directors Personally Liable—Stockholder Becoming Forgotten Man

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 corporate profits amounted to $12,840,000,000 after all Federal and State income taxes; instead of the customary two-thirds being paid to the stockholders, only $5,605,000,000 were paid.

In 1947 such corporate earnings were $18,075,000,000, with payments to stockholders of $6,808,000,000.

In 1948 such profits amounted to $21,000,000,000, with payments to stockholders of $7,300,000,000.

If the stockholders had been paid in dividends at least two-thirds of these earnings for these years, as customary before World War II, and as contemplated by law, the stockholders would have received $15,000,000,000 more than they were actually paid in dividends. The corporations would have been able still to retain more than $17,000,000,000, in addition to their allowances for wear and tear, depletion and obsolescence.

Under section 102 of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Code it is contemplated at 70 percent of the earnings of corporations be paid to stockholders. Under this law, $36,340,500,000 would have been paid to the stockholders these 3 years instead of $19,713,000,000, which they actually received, and the corporations would still retain $15,574,500,000 in addition to allowances.

COSTLESS CAPITAL

In a hearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following testimony by a witness is typical of the testimony introduced by all the witnesses from large corporations on this point:

American industry is depending primarily upon its own resources—profits and reserves for depreciation largely—to finance its purchases of new plant and equipment. This is only partly a matter of choice. Many of the companies surveyed would like to get outside funds, particularly by selling common stock, but many of them cannot do it except on financial terms that they consider disastrous to their business.

Now, the following is the testimony of a very prominent businessman:

A substantial part of the working capital and capital for expansion is obtained from retained earnings, because such funds are most readily available when needed and are the cheapest for the country.

Business Week, January 22, 1949, in a report to executives on capital spending plans for the 5 years 1949–53, states that industry is prepared to spend a total of $55,000,000,000 in the next 5 years. The astounding disclosure is that three out of every four plan to get almost all of their capital for expansion from profits and reserve, and that only 9 percent plan to sell stock. Such a policy as this is dangerous and could be devastating to our private-enterprise system.

DEATHBLOW TO SMALL BUSINESS

If corporations are compelled to pay out their earnings to the stockholders, the stockholders will have money to invest is small businesses of their own, or other businesses, big or little. The capital market has been dried up by the policy of these large concerns getting their costless capital from the consumers in the form of profits. A continuation of this policy will result in a deathblow to small businesses and a stopgap for the private-enterprise system.

INITIATIVE CRUSHED

Such a policy gives existing corporations not only a great advantage, but practically a monopoly. If they continue to retain billions of dollars a year for expansion of their businesses, including the acquisition of competing businesses and the purchase and entering of nonrelated businesses, it will not be long until a few concerns, controlled by a few men, will control the corporate wealth of the Nation, thereby crushing personal initiative and private enterprise.

UNITED STATES ACTION AGAINST DIRECTORS UNDER SECTION 102, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

In the case of Trico Products Corporation against McGowan, Collector Internal Revenue, in district court, western district New York, July 3, 1946, recorded in 67 Federal Supplement, page 311, the court discusses reasonable needs of a business, and in order to avoid surtax on account of accumulation of profits there must be substantial proof of a specific plan, objective, or continuance, which in the exercise of good business judgment demands the accumulation of the earnings and profits in a reasonable and reasonably definite amount.

WHAT IS REASONABLE JUDICIAL QUESTION

It was decided in this case that the plaintiff's undistributed earnings or profits for certain years had been permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of business. This case also says that the intent to prevent surtax on shareholders need not be the sole or

dominant intent in permitting the accumulation. Clearly the question of what is reasonable is a judicial question.

PENALTY ASSESSED AND DIRECTORS LIABLE

The corporation was compelled to pay approximately $2,000,000 penalty because of the action of the directors in retaining in the corporate funds too much of the earnings. Later the stockholders in the State of New York filed suit against the directors for negligently causing the corporation to pay the penalty.

Although the case was not actually tried on its merits, it was settled by stipulation of settlement which was approved December 23, 1947, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Under the settlement the defendants paid to Trico Products Corp. $2,390,000.

The following excerpts are from report No. 1, page 9009, in the New York Corporation Law Reports, New Court Decisions, February 26, 1948, concerning this case:

The defendants named hereinafter agree to pay to Trico the amounts set opposite their respective names in full settlement and satisfaction of the claims asserted against each and all of the defendants named in the complaint in Mahler action No. 1:

John R. Oishei	$135,000
Peter C. Cornell	212,500
Stevenson H. Evans	92,500
Trico Securities Corp	1,950,000
Total	2,390,000

The aforesaid payments to the extent of 80 percent shall be paid in satisfaction of the claim in Mahler action No. 1, as supplemented, for damages alleged to have been sustained by the corporation as a result of section 102 and undistributed profits tax liabilities assessments against, or paid or incurred by the corporation, exclusive of interest thereon, and to the extent of 20 percent thereof, in satisfaction of said interest and all other claims asserted in said action.

* * *

The plaintiffs contend that the detailed financial facts and data provided prima facie the basis for the charges made against the defendants. Broadly stated, their position is that the vast accumulations of earnings year by year, which reached a sum in excess of $23,000,000 in 1941, were far beyond the reasonable requirements of Trico and that the purpose of such accumulations was not to benefit the corporation but to serve the private advantage of the controlling stockholders. The plaintiffs contend that had Trico's profits been distributed the defendants would have been required to pay very substantial additional surtaxes. In further support of their position, they point out that a very considerable portion of the surplus was invested in Government and other securities rather than in operating assets, as indicating that the accumulations were not, in fact, either needed or utilized in the operation of Trico's business.

SIX STOCKHOLDERS WOULD HAVE SAVED $1,850,000 IN INCOME TAXES

In *Trico Products Corporation* v. *Commissioner McGowan* (169 Federal Courts (2d), p. 345) the court stated:

If we allow to stand, as we think we should, the finding that earnings or profits were permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the taxpayer's business, then the finding that a tax-avoidance motive played a part in this result is also a permissible inference, notwithstanding denials by the officers. *Helvering* v. *National Grocery Co.* (304 U. S. 282, 295, 58 S. Ct. 932, 83 L. ed. 1346); *Helvering* v. *Chicago Stock Yards Co.* (318 U. S. 693, 701, 63 S. Ct. 843, 87 L. ed. 1086). Not only is the finding bolstered by the express provision of section 102 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1936 but the defendant presented evidence from which the court found that had all the net earnings been distributed as dividends in 1936 and 1937, the six largest stockholders would have had to pay additional income taxes aggregating $1,850,000.

SECTION 102 OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU CODE

"SEC. 102. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus—

"(a) Imposition of tax:

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year (in addition to other taxes imposed by this chapter) upon the net income of every corporation (other than a personal holding company as defined in section 501 or a foreign personal holding company as defined in supplement P) if such corporation, however created or organized, is formed or availed of for the purpose of preventing the imposition of the surtax upon its shareholders or the shareholders of any other corporation, through the medium of permitting earnings or profits to accumulate instead of being divided or distributed, a surtax equal to the sum of the following:

"27½ percent of the amount of the undistributed section 102 net income not in excess of $100,000, plus

"38½ percent of the undistributed section 102 net income in excess of $100,000.

"(b) Prima facie evidence:

"The fact that any corporation is a mere holding or investment company shall be prima facie evidence of a purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders.

"(c) Evidence determinative of purpose.

"The fact that the earnings or profits of a corporation are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business shall be determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the corporation by the clear preponderance of the evidence shall prove to the contrary."

Do not overlook the phrase "or availed of."

CONCLUSIONS

It appears evident that directors of a corporation cannot illegally withhold earnings without subjecting their corporation to the penalty provided by law.

If the directors violate section 102 and a corporation is compelled to pay the penalty, it is likely that the directors will be held personally liable.

In addition it appears reasonable to presume that minority stockholders may compel the liberalization of a dividend policy to forestall a potential impact of section 102.

In view of existing law and the rulings of the court, it would appear that the directors of corporations would prefer to pay the money in dividends to the stockholders rather than subject the corporation to a heavy penalty and make themselves personally liable for the penalty imposed.

Attached hereto are copies of letters to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. It is contemplated that when the Ways and Means Committee considers this question, small businesses will be given some preference for the purpose of expansion:

MARCH 24, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue,
Internal Revenue Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHOENEMAN: The object of this letter is to make the request that you carefully analyze, investigate, and study the income-tax returns of corporations for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 for the purpose of determining whether or not excess earnings were retained in violation of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Congressional investigations have disclosed that for the 3 years mentioned corporate earnings amounted to $51,915,000,000. If two-thirds of these earnings had been paid to stockholders, as customary before World War II, the stockholders would have received $34,610,000,000. However, the corporations for these years reversed the usual and customary policy by only paying to the stockholders $19,713,000,000, which was $14,897,000,000 less than two-thirds of the corporate earnings, after taxes and after allowances for wear and tear, depletion, and obsolescence.

Under section 102 of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Code, it is contemplated that 70 percent of the earnings of corporations be paid to stockholders. If 70 percent had been paid these 3 years, the stockholders would have received $36,340,500,000, instead of the $19,713,000,000 actually paid to them.

It is my request that a special investigation be made of all corporations failing to pay their stockholders at least two-thirds of the corporate earnings after the payment of all Federal and State taxes, and in cases where it is disclosed that earnings are illegally held that a penalty tax be invoked in accordance with section 102. It is my opinion that this work should be undertaken as soon as possible.

Since I announced several days ago that the corporations were undoubtedly withholding excessive amounts in violation of law as retained earnings, I have received a large volume of correspondence containing interesting information that confirm my beliefs about specific corporations, which I shall be very glad to place at your disposal. Many of these letters from stockholders disclose that directors frankly admit that the earnings are withheld for the purpose of avoiding the payment of surtaxes. It is possible for such investigation to produce several billion dollars in additional revenue for the 3 years mentioned.

Thanking you for giving this matter such attention as you believe the subject deserves and at your earliest convenience, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

MARCH 24, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and
Means, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Retained earnings by corporations are becoming an economic evil. For instance, last year corporate earnings were $21,000,000,000. Instead of the corporations paying to the stockholders two-thirds of this amount, or $14,000,000,000, as customary before World War II, the stockholders were paid approximately $7,000,000,000. The withholding of these earnings for corporation purposes, the reasons usually given are for expansion, operates against the interests of the private-enterprise system and is destructive to small business.

Corporation leaders have announced that they expect to spend $55,000,000,000 the next 5 years, and they expect to get 75 percent of

their money from retained earnings. In other words, they are making the consumer pay the cost of expansion, at least to the extent of 75 percent. This means that in a few decades a few of the large corporations will practically own and control the corporate wealth of the Nation.

With such a policy in effect, the small-business man does not have a chance. The capital market is dried up and he is unable to get funds. In addition if he is able to get funds he must pay the venture capital back with interest, whereas the corporations getting their capital from profits compete with him with costless capital. Therefore this trend, Mr. Chairman, is toward monopoly and will crush personal initiative and private enterprise if not stopped.

It is believed that section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code is sufficient to compel these corporations to pay their stockholders a fair percentage of their profits. However, the question is so important I am writing this letter to suggest that your committee give this matter careful and early consideration. In the event it is discovered the present law is inadequate to properly deal with the situation, then I suggest that adequate laws be proposed by your committee.

Thanking you for considering this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

The City Built by Living Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of April 7, 1949:

THE CITY BUILT BY LIVING MEN

(By Arthur Krock)

HOUSTON, TEX.—Although the contrasts between Texas and Mexico, in all their visible aspects, are registered with stunning sharpness to airplane passengers as they cross the Rio Grande and afterward when they move about among the Mexican people, the impact of these differences strikes the homeward traveler even more powerfully when he returns to Houston. The atmosphere of antiquity, the culture and tempo of modern Mexico disappear into a background that seems to be the fragment of a dream.

The sudden and revolutionary nature of the change would not be felt as much in any other American city near the border. But Houston is perhaps the outstanding symbol of the transition the independence of Texas wrought in the history of this continent and in the mores and physical aspects of what was the richest part of Mexico a hundred years ago.

A FABULOUS STORY

Mexico lost that part, amounting to almost one-third the area of the United States, at the battle of San Jacinto, which was fought about 20 miles outside Houston. On the shaft that rises from the center of the battlefield—as noble a memorial to American greatness as that dedicated to George Washington, and in some aesthetic values its superior—is a simple inscription relating incontrovertibly that San Jacinto was one of the decisive battles of history. When 1,200 Texan immigrants, from all sections of the United States and western Europe, defeated a Mexican Army of 4,000 on this site the Nation began its inevitable advance toward continental scope and the acquirement of natural resources which have brought it to its primary estate.

The battle monument is a true introduction to the fabulous story of Houston, and the qualities which animated the victors at San Jacinto seem to the visitor to live in the strong pulse of the city. The shaft, the memorial park that surrounds it, the battleship *Texas* that rests in retirement nearby, the oceangoing ships that appear to be sailing through the prairie toward the port of Houston, and its towering skyline—all these belong to that large part of the city's history which was made by its famous citizen, Jesse H. Jones.

MR. JONES' VISION

He is at home again after the long career in Washington as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Loan Administration during which, in the opinion of many, he did more than any public official to save the free-enterprise system in the depression period of the thirties and World War II. Mr. Jones is building again, still pursuing the practical vision which he described as follows to his fellow citizens in May 1933 at a banquet in his honor:

"To get a picture of the Houston of the future we should have to get a picture of the whole growing empire of the South and the Southwest, and the best way to do this is to look back over 50 years of growth of the great Middle West and Northwest. * * *

"Private industry, and the common carriers by land and water, will invest sums here compared with which our own public investment will appear infinitesimal, and before the children of today have become the representative men of tomorrow every foot of frontage from Main Street to the Gulf of Mexico will be in use, not because of the efforts of any man, but because of the natural movement, growth, and progress of civilization."

THE RISE OF INDUSTRY

This prophecy grows daily with its realization. First the source of industry and wealth was cotton, then oil, and then chemicals. But, unlike the history of other American cities, the new industry did not supplant the old. New and old flourished side by side, and today the recession or disinflation which occupies the thoughts of other industrial areas does not concern Houston. A recent survey by the American Public Works Association offers these statistics by way of explanation:

In 35 major industrial areas of the United States, accounting for 45 percent of industrial expansion since VJ-day, the Houston area's new construction plans call for expenditures of $110,000,000 as compared with $86,600,000 for New York's tri-State metropolitan region and $79,600,000 for Pittsburgh and Chicago, respectively. In the value of new industrial investment Texas stands first with $323,000,000.

The depression fears elsewhere, the price-cuts worrying the national administration which so recently was calling for lower prices, seems to be as distant from this city as if they were disturbances in the moon. The new Shamrock Hotel, one of the largest and most luxurious in the world, can barely handle its trade, though its wares come high and it was located 5 miles from Houston's center by another of the extraordinary citizens that exist in such numbers here—Glenn H. McCarthy.

The millionaires of Houston come in battalions, which encourages the hope that, when they have expressed themselves to the utmost in towering concrete and splendid houses in River Oaks, they will set out to zone and otherwise beautify this lusty, sprawling industrial capital of the Southwest. The time for that is overdue.

Economic Conditions in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, we of the West, particularly in the great State of California, feel it is incumbent upon us to call the attention of the membership of the House to the economic conditions which prevail in California.

First of major importance is the solution of the Colorado River Compact in which we are asking the Congress to give to us the equity of determination by reporting out and passing House Joint Resolution 3 which authorizes the Supreme Court to adjudicate the controversy which has been going on for the past 20 years between the States of California and Arizona. The respective representatives of both States, have, in my opinion, tried to work out a solution but have utterly failed due to different concepts of the basis of water distribution of the Colorado River emanating from the Colorado River Compact. We definitely feel we are entitled to go to the Supreme Court for adjudication of this problem in order that we may know in the final analysis what our water resources may be. If the Supreme Court should render an adverse opinion to California, then at least we would know what we have to do as the next step to provide the necessary water to preserve our economic existence.

Among other disturbing factors, since the war, California has had a terrific influx of population and the housing conditions to take care of the increased population are deplorable.

The old philosophy that the only economy of this country worth protecting is that of the Mideast and East is no longer adaptable to the reasonably successful economy of the West. We must have flood control, reclamation, and public power. The only way these projects can be made possible is through a sympathetic and realistic evaluation of our requirements by the membership of the Congress.

Because of outmoded concepts by some of our departments of Government, we are continuously being penalized. For example, the following is an editorial from the San Bernardino Daily Sun of March 18, 1949, which explains one aspect in which we are being penalized:

SOAKING THE WEST

California is a long way from the big markets of the country. So is the rest of the Pacific coast.

The West pays Uncle Sam a penalty for this geographical position.

This is how the penalty is applied: The Federal excise tax on freight and passenger fares involving California amounted to $32,970,000 in 1948; the same tax on communication was $49,634,000; the total, $682,604,000.

That is the figure for California. The total for the rest of the Pacific coast is not available.

No other section of the country pays such a proportion of these taxes. The reason the West pays through the nose is that the tax is a percentage of the transportation and the communication bills. Naturally it costs more to ship a car of freight from California to New York than from Chicago to New York. By the same token, the Californian who travels to Washington to transact business with his Government has to pay a far greater tax than the citizen of New York bound for the Nation's Capital on the same errand.

The West has protested vigorously to the Federal Government, but without result.

Now the California Public Utilities Commission demands the removal of the tax.

Says R. E. Mittelstaedt, president of the commission:

"The commission has gone on record in a formal resolution as announcing support of present efforts in Congress to repeal or modify the excise taxes on transportation and communications

"The taxes are 3 percent on freight shipments; 15 percent on passenger-fare transportation; and 8 to 25 percent on telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, and wire-equipment services.

"The commission charges that the present heavy wartime Federal excise taxes on transportation and communications when first imposed were reportedly designed for emergency revenue purposes and to lessen public uses of the taxed facilities."

The commission says that the 3-percent freight tax inevitably falls heavier upon all shipments originating long distances from the larger consumer markets, thus discriminating against all long-haul traffic. And, of course, the same is true of passenger-fare tax and the tax on messages which are sent over long distances.

Here is a job for the western Congressmen. They should inform Congress that the West cannot longer tolerate the discrimination that results from a percentage tax, and that either the tax measure be corrected or the West must support total repeal.

Mr. Speaker, the only consideration we are asking of the membership of the Congress is to give the West a fair and equitable participation in governmental functions that will permit the economy of the State of California to support its population; and it is obvious to anyone who is fair-minded that a request of this character is compatible with the legislative thinking the Congress of the United States has for a long time been giving to other States of the Union. We respectfully request your understanding and equitable consideration of our proposals.

The Problem of the Older Worker—Jobs Cannot Stop in the Forties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a report of a campaign to stimulate job opportunities for middle-aged and older workers that has been made by the Federal Employment Service. This report outlines a few concrete steps toward increasing employment opportunities for older workers. The report is primarily based on an educational program.

Providing jobs for older workers constitutes one of our most complex problems. We are all aware of this problem, and we realize that it is not a simple one to solve. The problem must be solved not on the basis of giving special privileges in the labor market to the older people and lessening job opportunities for the younger people.

During the war, when there was an acute labor shortage, the problem temporarily solved itself. Now that we have a certain amount of unemployment, the older people are the first to be cast aside, and that is why I feel that this article is most timely.

I wish to congratulate the Federal Employment Service for the constructive suggestions that they make and for the exploratory job that they have commenced. The phrase "Life begins at 40" must sound like a hollow mockery to a man who is thrown out of a job as being too old.

The report follows:

THE PROBLEM OF THE OLDER WORKER

During the war, the word "unemployable" went through a radical change in definition. Under the stress of wartime manpower demands, physically handicapped persons, workers of limited mental ability and other hard-to-place employees found, and held, a wide variety of jobs. Among these unemployable persons were a tremendous number of middle-aged and older people who had previously retired, willingly or otherwise, from the labor market. And with the others, the majority of the older workers had demonstrated their ability to handle jobs that had ordinarily been barred to them in the past.

With the end of the war the situation returned to normal and workers in these categories once again found employment avenues closed to them. Employment throughout most of the country was maintained at high levels, but in New York City the job market was uncertain and during 1947 there were between three and four hundred thousand workers unemployed at any one time.

The effect was immediately felt by workers over 45 years of age. Hiring standards reverted to prewar conditions, and older persons again encountered job discrimination based on age alone. Large numbers of these people who had proven their value as workers, found it hard, psychologically, to accept the fact that jobs were no longer readily available.

At FES, we felt an immediate trend away from the employment of mature persons. Job orders without age limitations fell sharply while the number of older applicants rose sharply. One year after VJ-day, our files showed that more than one-half of our applicants were over 45 years of age. And the incoming mail began to reflect the same trend, underlining some of the personal tragedies:

"I'm a woman 51 years old and a few weeks ago went job hunting. I called on a store which advertised for help and was told they wanted sales people not over 35 years old. It looks as if middle-aged people have no place in this world."

"I am 50 years of age, but faithful, loyal, dependable, and conscientious, as my employer will state. I want to make an honest living. It feels terrible to be discarded with that age. I am desperate. Please help me to find a position. I would appreciate it very, very much."

"I have been unemployed for a year and 5 months. Why? Wherever I go I am told I am too old. To be too old to work at 53 that's what happened to me—a sober, industrious, and loyal worker. I was good enough to work for one firm for 18 years."

"I find it very difficult to obtain work due to most places having an age limit of 40. I am in good health and lots of experience. At the present time I am ready to work at a minute's notice. My trouble is that I am 57."

"I am 52 years old, and after serving my country as an officer for 6 years, I find myself a victim of circumstances. An excellent service record, including letters of commendation from three-star generals, and valuable civilian experience seem of no help in finding a job. I have answered more than 40 advertisements, directly contacted more than 50 corporations, registered with numerous employment agencies, and tried to get my old job back. All to no avail * * * men who have served their country twice since 1915 are entitled to better jobs than messenger boys or elevator operators. I am now under the impression that life ends at 50. Unless industry realizes that we have something to offer, men in my category are licked. Let's salvage the men over 50. They deserve a break."

The conditions emphasized the need for a special effort. But before making any decisions, we felt that further investigation was required. Three questions seemed to be important:

1. How widespread was the problem?
2. What proof was there that older workers could competently handle jobs?
3. Why was industry reluctant to hire these people?

THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

On the first question, regarding the size of the problem, we found rather quickly that the country was facing a social and economic issue of tremendous scope. As we examined the literature in the field it became apparent that our Nation is aging. Medical advances have performed miracles in prolonging man's life span, and as a consequence older people are becoming a larger proportion of our population.

Of four babies born in 1900, the statistics showed, only three reached age 25; of four babies born today, three will reach age 57. In 1860 there were 860,000 persons over 65; today the number is approximately 10,000,000; and in 1970 the figure will have risen to approximately 16,000,000. Population projections indicate that 30 years from now one-half of America's citizens will be over 45; 15 percent over 65.

In light of these figures it seems apparent that our present concept of age is outmoded. As a group, older people are healthier and better able to work than the similar group 50 years ago. And modern psychology points out clearly that chronological age does not measure the fitness of any one worker. Individuals differ in so many ways that age can be considered only one factor in the total make-up of the person.

As population problems go, the increase of older workers has affected the Nation with relative rapidity. In terms of planning, America will now have to make major social, economic, and industrial readjustments. Of necessity, planning for jobs will become more vital. By 1980 our working force will number 30,000,000 people more than the present labor pool. Unless jobs are forthcoming, the burden of care for unemployed older persons will fall on the shoulders of younger workers and the taxpayers. It is difficult to predict what this might mean in increased taxes and relief costs.

CAN OLDER WORKERS HANDLE JOBS?

On the second question, regarding the competency of older workers, our own wartime

experiences were rather positive. Exploring further, moreover, we examined a number of studies which proved clearly that older persons make good employees. The New York State Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging, for example, reported that older workers, when compared with their juniors, were as productive, more experienced, more conscientious, less distracted, and absent less frequently. They found, in the words of the slogan we were to develop for our campaign, that "Experience, loyalty, skill, come with age."

Similarly, studies by the California Department of Industrial Relations, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, and others showed the same facts, proving as well that there was less turn-over in jobs among older persons, and that, according to studies of compensated accidents, they suffered fewer industrial casualties.

In general, the reports showed that the family responsibilities of mature persons made for greater stability. They indicated that age did not diminish efficiency except in jobs with heavy physical demands. More enlightened employers, the reports stated, preferred older workers in jobs calling for experience, judgment, and qualitative performance.

INDUSTRY'S POINT OF VIEW

Question 3, regarding industry's hesitance in hiring older workers, was not simply answered. The fact that age discrimination existed was fairly apparent; the reasons behind the prejudice, however, were not so clearly evident.

Employers whom we questioned gave a number of vague and inconclusive reasons to the effect that older workers could not do their jobs, would not fit in with younger people, could not be offered beginner's wages, could not be trained in new ways, and so on. Some generalized that older workers had passed the peak of efficiency; others stated that it was difficult for mature people to work under younger supervision; still others used the reverse of this argument and said that if older workers did not move on there would be no promotional possibilities for younger workers. Some employers insisted that it was difficult for them to hire older workers because of their particular type of pension plan. They contended that they felt obliged to pay the same retirement rates to a worker who could only give them a few years of service as well as to one who could give them 25 years of service.

Too frequently the reasons were based on scanty information and generalized thinking about older persons as stereotypes. Equally significant, we found, was the fact that a great deal of hiring is based on out-dated policies. Many firms continue employment practices established in the past when the worker of 45 or 50 had fewer productive years ahead of him than the worker of 45 or 50 today. Many of these policies have continued despite the present-day extension in life expectancy and improved physical well-being.

THE CAMPAIGN GOALS

The decision to embark on a campaign, and the goals at which to aim, grew from our investigations. As our plans developed, we realized that the primary objective should be an educational drive to acquaint employers with the positive values of hiring middle-aged and older workers. It was important, we believed, to have people know the facts; to point out that the hiring of mature persons was sound business practice and not charity. And the obvious related goal was the promotion of actual job opportunities for our applicants.

It is difficult, of course, to separate an educational campaign from a service program, and during the drive we worked toward both ends. We know, however, that the size of the problem made the finding of specific jobs a difficult task. For the future we hope to start a larger movement and involve many other facilities to carry on beyond the time of our relatively short campaign.

PROCEDURE

The major trade associations, as well as a number of prominent persons were invited to endorse the campaign and serve as honorary sponsors. The response was very gratifying indicating a vital interest in the problem. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Mayor William O'Dwyer, State Senator Thomas C. Desmond, Emil Schram, Jacob Potofsky, Julius Hochman, and many other eminent individuals gave support to the campaign. Twenty-five important trade organizations similarly responded.

A campaign slogan was created; the opening date of the campaign was set; and it was decided to concentrate the publicity in a 10-day period.

Fact sheets, newspaper releases, magazine stories, radio spot announcements, and other interpretive material were prepared for release, on a scheduled basis.

An employer field visiting schedule was drawn up; staff schedules were rearranged to allow for field visit time; and a campaign postal card, in cartoon format, was prepared for direct mailing to employers.

All of the preliminary activity crystallized on April 19, 1948, when the campaign was officially opened with a press conference held at the federation building. Speaking at the conference were: the president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, Mr. Ralph A. Samuel; the president of FES, Mr. Walter A. Miller; the campaign chairman, Mr. Arnold S. Askin, and a prominent industrialist, Mr. Benjamin Lazrus, president of Benrus Watch Co.

On the day of the press conference and in the succeeding 10 days we mailed cards to thousands of employers, visited newspaper and magazine editors, called radio stations, sent staff members out on field visits and released our prepared material to all of the public relations media we could reach.

RESULTS

The response to the campaign was immediate, exceeding all our expectations. We felt, in fact, that we had struck an exposed nerve in our social and economic structure.

As an educational campaign, our primary goal, this is what happened:

More than 60 newspaper stories were devoted to the campaign. Every New York City daily paper carried an account of the drive and a large number of stories were printed in various parts of the country. We received letters from people in Chicago, Oakland, Montreal, and other cities, stating that they had read about the campaign in their local newspapers.

The New York Times, New York Sun, New York Post, Brooklyn Eagle, and others carried editorials supporting and commending the drive.

Newspaper columnists Sylvia Porter, Newbold Morris, George Sokolsky, Howard Rusk, and others wrote stories about the campaign and the job problems of older people.

The newspaper PM (now the New York Star) wrote an illustrated week-end feature in its magazine section, featuring an interview with Mr. Roland Baxt, the executive director of FES.

A number of business organizations inserted messages concerning the campaign in their newspaper advertising.

Stories on the drive were carried in more than a hundred trade papers including Women's Wear Daily, Printers' Ink, Law Journal, Laundry Age, National Jeweler, Men's Reporter, and similar publications.

Every New York radio station carried spot announcements directed to employers. Several nearby New Jersey stations also carried the message.

Over 30 leading radio programs gave attention to the drive, and to the problems of the aging. Among some of the well-known programs were: Mary Margaret McBride, Martha Deane, The Fitzgeralds, Arthur Godfrey, Hi-Jinx, and Kate Smith.

J. Raymond Walsh on his regular Sunday afternoon program, interviewed Mr. Baxt. Station WMCA sponsored a round-table forum composed of Gen. John Reed Kilpatrick, president, Madison Square Garden Corp.; Frieda S. Miller, Director of the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor; Dr. Robert W. Searle, executive secretary, Human Relations Committee of the Protestant Council; and Dr. Channing H. Tobias, director, Phelps Stokes fund. Walter A. Miller, president of FES, served as moderator.

Reports came in that various radio commentators and newscasters gave time to the campaign, although it was not possible to monitor all of the programs and we cannot say how many covered the story.

The Town Hall Meeting of the Air, over a national hook-up, devoted a meeting to the topic: Are you preparing to grow old successfully? In preparation for the program, Town Hall called FES for technical consultation, suggestions for speakers, subject content, and methods of presenting the basic ideas. During the broadcast, the moderator devoted a portion of his remarks to the FES campaign, noting that it was a concrete demonstration of what might be done in trying to solve the job problems of older workers.

An attractive poster, designed by professional copywriters and commercial artists, was displayed without charge in 3,100 positions on the subway platforms and suburban railroad cars. The city of New York also gave subway advertising space to the campaign by means of the Subway Sun, a car poster used for city projects and public-service programs.

A number of magazine articles, in whole or in part, covered the story of the campaign. Look magazine, Survey Graphic, Business Week, and others featured the material. The New York State Industrial Bulletin and Coronet magazine have written stories for early release. Writers for Life magazine, Ladies' Home Journal, Reader's Digest, and other national magazines have come to the agency for information for future stories. At least six or seven authors who are writing books on the problem requested further information on the drive.

The City Council of New York passed a resolution supporting the campaign, and Acting Mayor Vincent R. Impelletteri (in Mayor O'Dwyer's absence from the city) accepted the official campaign poster from Mr. Miller, the president of the FES board, and the campaign chairmen, Mr. Askin and Mrs. Schulte.

The March of Time produced a documentary film entitled "Life With Grandpa," containing a number of scenes which high light the FES campaign.

The National Association of Manufacturers, in cooperation with the United States Chamber of Commerce, organized a program in the interest of older workers. The effort was stimulated, in part, by the FES campaign during which we initiated conferences with officials in the industrial relations department of NAM.

It is always difficult to evaluate an educational campaign, but despite limited resources we were able to reach a listening and reading audience of huge proportions.. Town Hall, for example, is heard by an estimated 10,000,000 persons; March of Time is seen by

approximately 30,000,000 persons; and additional millions read about the campaigns either in the newspapers, the magazines, or on the subways and trains.

During the life of the campaign we placed a few hundred older workers, constituting a 68-percent increase in placements as contrasted with the preceding period. Anticipating only a limited immediate response to this objective, we were heartened by the sharp gain. However, despite the fact that we found jobs for a number of persons, 10 of our older applicants remained unemployed for every 1 we placed. The reaction, encouraging though it was, reinforced our original belief that we were attacking a very difficult situation.

Significantly, however, we learned later that our campaign was helpful to other vocational agencies, many of which were able to capitalize on our publicity in dealing with their own employer accounts. Veterans' Administration, for example, wrote to say that "reports from employment agencies, social organization, and guidance clinics indicate a favorable response to the program. They have noted a willingness on the part of employers to relax their age requirements. * * * The value of this campaign should not be measured only in terms of the number of job orders received. It has started a movement, the effects and ramifications of which will add to our productive capacity and richness as a Nation." From a number of other sources we received reinforcement of the opinions expressed in the VA letter.

Significant also, was the fact that the persons we placed stayed on their jobs. As a matter of routine, FES follows up with employers to find out whether its placements are satisfactory. And the results showed that the proportion of workers placed during the campaign who were still on their jobs was higher for older persons than for younger people placed over the same period of time.

As an anticipated byproduct of the campaign, we were immediately deluged with older job seekers. Although our publicity material was deliberately directed toward employers, we were flooded by thousands of applicants. From all parts of the country written requests for help further underscored the extent of the need.

Moreover, our experience revealed that most of the older applicants were between 45 and 55 years of age. Over 70 percent of the persons responding were in this age group. These were not aged people, but persons with skills and good work backgrounds who were rejected by employers primarily because of age. And yet most of them, physically, mentally, and emotionally, were ready and able to work.

GENERAL COMMENTARY

During the campaign some of the problems we had anticipated were confirmed. In addition, our experiences justify several observations:

1. We were attacking a problem that hit home. Reaction to the campaign was widespread and indicated that job difficulties for older persons are very real situations to a tremendous number of people. These include not only unemployed older workers but a larger number of younger people who find it necessary to support aged parents.

2. The lack of adequate employment often contributes to personal and social maladjustments, family conflict and related emotional difficulties. While satisfactory placement does not necessarily remove these problems, it frequently lessens their impact. This is true, of course, for all age groups, but with older persons there are the many additional complications that family life imposes.

3. The community was receptive to a demonstration campaign in the interest of older workers. We were given a great deal of cooperation, volunteer effort, radio and press assistance. If New York City, which has many worthy causes vying for attention, can respond so well to a drive of this kind, it seems probable that campaigns in smaller communities would receive similar support.

4. The campaign helped to shape positive community opinion regarding older persons. Future programs can succeed if based on wide public understanding, and the establishment of a climate of opinion will help materially in leading to direct action.

5. Employers, by and large, are not aware of the effectiveness of older workers when placed in the right jobs. There is a need to explode some of the misconceptions about mature persons and their potential value to industry.

6. Many employees claim that pension systems make it difficult for them to hire older workers. Others state that the newer pension plans do not cost them more for older workers than for younger persons. There seems to be some confusion not only in the manner in which pension systems operate but in related employee benefits including group insurance, health insurance and workmen's compensation.

7. Age, as a factor in employment, begins before the time for retirement. Varying with the occupation and the individual, age may be a stumbling block long before 65. Workers over 45 have problems in finding jobs and in achieving job promotions. Workers over 65 have job-finding problems but their situations are troubled by inadequate finances upon which to retire, enforced idleness and related difficulties.

8. The majority of workers have done little in making vocational plans for the future. Our experience with older applicants showed that as younger people they failed to recognize that they would ultimately face job discrimination because of age.

9. Older workers, out of necessity, are frequently willing to make major job compromises, often at great personal cost. The majority of our older applicants had expended considerable effort in job hunting, were able to work, and were not interested in relief grants. Many, however, were discouraged and had reached the point where they were willing to accept lower salaries and jobs below their maximum level of skill. Obviously this spells out wasted productive manpower, and can lead toward economic exploitation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FES began the campaign for workers over 45 as a demonstration program, knowing that any real solution would require the energy of larger forces. With the impetus of the campaign, and the resultant communal interest, however, it seems appropriate to recommend further action.

The major recommendation, and the structure from which further recommendations might flow, is the establishment of a permanent citizen's committee to study the problem and plan long-range constructive steps.

Ultimately committees might be organized in the major communities of the Nation. Our immediate recommendation, however, is for an organization to consider the problem in New York City. The problem is acute in this area, the geographical unit is fairly large, and the city has a concentration of interests and people who could offer much constructive assistance.

The committee should be composed of outstanding persons representing industry, labor, Government, private organizations, and other major interests in the community. To be a truly communal organization, it should not be weighted in any one direction. Adequate financing will be required and might come from the groups involved or from foundation support.

Out of our experiences a number of projects recommend themselves as activities for the committee's consideration. Some of them might logically fall within the framework of the committee; others might be pursued independently. Briefly, they are as follows:

1. An industry-by-industry analysis of jobs to determine which of them are appropriate for middle-aged and older workers. Recognizing that individuals of the same age may differ markedly in their ability to handle the same job, it still seems important to set up general age guides when analyzing jobs in terms of work skills, physical ability, required training, and related factors. If this were done and the facts made available through widespread publicity, it would be simpler for employers to understand that many older workers can handle jobs in their plants.

2. A study into private pension systems with a view toward eliminating whatever present barriers there may be in the employment of older workers. Examination of this area might be broadened to include other insurance and compensation benefits.

3. An educational campaign among employers to—

(a) make the age of industrial retirement more flexible;

(b) establish plans to transfer older workers to less demanding jobs when they can no longer handle their usual tasks;

(c) allow for part-time employment when older workers find full-time work too difficult; and

(d) arrange for retraining to related positions within the worker's capacities.

4. An educational campaign among workers to help them realize that with age they must prepare for the eventuality of lessened job opportunities.

5. The development of special facilities within the public employment service to care for the vocational needs of older persons. This might take the form of a special office for older workers, special staff consultants within each office, or other devices that might be accommodated within the structure of the public agency.

6. The stimulation of adult education facilities to plan training programs geared to the needs of older persons.

7. Communication with trade associations, labor unions and related bodies to have them endorse and support drives in the interest of jobs for older workers.

8. A year around public relations program, highlighted by a Hire the Older Worker Week.

9. Some of the above recommendations are long-range goals; some may be achieved in the near future. In the immediate future, however, it seems possible for employment and guidance agencies to be of great assistance by devoting more attention to the job problems of older applicants.

From the viewpoint of an employment service there are many drawbacks to such action which must be carefully weighed. In the first place, it is entirely possible to lose employer accounts if an agency "sells" applicants whom employers feel do not meet their requirements. Secondly, any activity in this direction will mean a rapid rise in the number of older applicants, which may be difficult for the agency to absorb. And thirdly, the added time and effort that must go into this work means that each placement will cost the agency more per case than it will for younger and "better qualified" workers.

Despite these handicaps (and FES was aware of them all before launching its campaign) the gravity of the problem still suggests that employment and guidance agencies seriously consider a policy of additional service for older workers.

Throughout the country many of these agencies are members of coordinating councils and so may be able to press for joint communal effort. Some of them may be able to launch campaigns along the lines of the FES drive. In any case, it seems entirely feasible for the agencies to develop practical techniques for use in day-by-day operations.

Depending upon the size and kind of agency, it may be possible to do some of the following:

(a) Attempt to have age specifications left open on job orders.

(b) Plan in-service training sessions to orient staff workers regarding the problems of older applicants and the methods of working with them.

(c) Assign counselors to the special task of developing retraining plans suitable to the needs of older persons.

(d) Develop special job promotional letters high lighting qualified persons in the upper age brackets.

(e) Allocate staff time to promote jobs through telephone solicitation.

(f) Hold group meetings with older workers to discuss job-hunting techniques, methods of writing effective application letters, and related job-finding devices.

(g) Visit employers to stimulate the greater utilization of mature persons.

(h) Discuss the problems of older workers with labor unions to determine where and how they might be employed.

(i) Sponsor joint meetings with labor and management to explore the problem in specific fields of employment.

Depending upon local circumstances, many other approaches can be used. The important consideration is not one of mechanics or techniques, for these can be developed; it is rather the adoption of policies in the interest of a vital human problem. If vocational services take these steps, and develop positive interpretive programs, it will be easier for employers to understand that "experience, loyalty, skill—come with age."

The Only Rapid Road to Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from a recent issue of the New York Times:

THE ONLY RAPID ROAD TO FORTUNE

(By Arthur Krock)

HOUSTON, TEX.—Texas is booming with the production of land crops, steel, chemicals, and the direct mineral yields of the earth, and public spending for necessities and luxuries is sustained despite a high-price level. But, though the old fortunes here were made in building, cotton, and ranching, the national tax structure now allows only one way for a citizen to become a new millionaire. That way is to strike oil.

When oil is found the rights to drill the land have usually cost very little; the owner of the land gets one-eighth of the value of the product; and Government taxation begins only with production. If the lessee keeps his rights he is entitled to charge off high percentages for depletion and depreciation; and, if he sells them after the strike, which he often does, he only pays the capital gains tax of 25 percent.

Under this system, the great oil fortunes have been made, and the opportunity remains. The story of Dan Harrison and Jim Abercrombie related here is typical; also that of Hugh Roy Cullen, whose vast benefactions for hospitals and for the struggle to deal with cancer are of national scope. Harrison and Abercrombie, with a small loan from a prosperous merchant of Houston, made what is known as the "Conroe strike." They were offered $50,000,000 for it, or $25,000,000 apiece. Harrison sold and netted about $18,000,000 after paying the capital gains tax. Abercrombie held on for a while and got over $50,000,000 for his half with a net of more than $40,000,000.

Nevertheless the two most prominent citizens of Houston, whose fame is international, made their fortunes wholly outside the oil business and still have no part in it. The career of one, Jesse H. Jones, was briefly sketched in this space yesterday. The other is Will L. Clayton, whose last official post was that of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

THE RISE OF MR. CLAYTON

With two members of the Anderson family and his brother, Mr. Clayton, at Oklahoma City in 1904, started the business of cotton merchanting which under the name of Anderson, Clayton has become one of the largest industries in the world. In those days Government taxes did not bite into corporate earnings, and the young cotton men, who began with a capital of $9,000 and made a profit of $10,000 the first year, were able to plow back the income from their enterprise. By 1914 the company was a very important one; in 1920 it was first in its field, and there it has remained, meanwhile expanding into cotton ginning and compressing, manufacture of cottonseed oil, construction of ports and docks, and the operation of large model farms, one of which is the source of the present fertility of the San Joaquin Valley in California. And like most other successful men in this region, Mr. Clayton and his partners set up a charitable foundation in the interest of public health.

As a cotton merchant Mr. Clayton traveled in many countries and acquired early the international viewpoint which has made him one of the chief architects of the current foreign policy of the United States. His observations in Europe and as our representative at the Geneva trade conference in 1945–1946 produced the memorandum to George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State, which was one of the principal bases of the Marshall plan. And now, out of office, he is concentrating on the Habana Charter of the International Trade Organization, soon up for congressional approval, and on the Atlantic Union which he believes is the logical and necessary sequel to the North Atlantic Pact and all our foreign policy steps since the neutrality laws of the thirties were repealed and lend-lease was authorized by Congress.

A HOUSTON TRAIT

Mr. Clayton was summoned to Washington by Mr. Jones in 1940 to take charge of the prewar stock piling of critical materials, and from that time until recently he has been a distinguished Government servant in the field of economic foreign policy. It was he who, returning from Geneva when Congress raised the tariff on wool in 1946, induced President Truman to veto it as a reversal of established policy. By that action, Mr. Clayton observes, the President proved himself an executive of the greatest courage with full understanding of world conditions and needs.

He said today that the I. T. O. Charter, if accepted by Congress, will commit the world to principles and policies which will return it to multilateral, nondiscriminatory trade, that any other path is the road to destruction. This view Mr. Clayton shares with Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, with whom he has long been associated.

Like most of the unusual number of Houston citizens who have engaged importantly in national and international affairs, Mr. Clayton has returned to residence in his home city. Perhaps that trait helps to explain why he, Mr. Jones, and those other prominent Houstonians who reveal it have attained such high places and why they have built a dynamic city. The President describes men who hold office in Washington and never want to go back home as sufferers from "Potomac fever." There are no signs of Potomac fever along the banks of Buffalo Bayou, which Houston enterprise transformed into an oceangoing ship canal that brings the Gulf of Mexico to the foot of Main Street.

The War of Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the question of nutrition, of an adequate food supply, not only in volume but in terms of fundamental nutritional values, cannot be underestimated. The foundation of a good nutrition is a good, healthy soil.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an excerpt of the following article from the 1949 edition of the Old Farmer's Almanac:

SCIENTISTS AT WORK

(Courtesy (in part)—U. S. Department of Agriculture)

1. THE WAR OF FOOD

While much of the world remains unable to feed itself, while our population and the world's (despite famine, and disease, and war) increases as the amount of arable land and its fertility decreases, the need for bigger and better crops becomes most urgent. We must, it is argued, therefore wage war on all enemies of crops—especially the insects. This means more insecticides. The number of these that have been experimented with is scarcely believable. In just the last 5 years no less than 10,000 chemical compounds have been tested. We used to think of basic insect killers as being kerosene, pyrethrum, the arsenicals, nicotine, and rotenone, but as this is written there are no less than eight new ones so deadly that we might well throw all the old ones away and not miss them at all. It is estimated that crop losses in the future should be cut no less than 25 percent and perhaps by as much as 75 percent. Coupled with this is the fact that many plant varieties resistant to diseases and insects are being developed. Agricultural scientists generally believe that the deadly new insecticides (and fungicides) and these new plant varieties will be important factors in winning the war of food.

But they are not the chief factors. We are turning to these fungicides and insecticides as an emergency measure, and should recognize that they are in no sense a cure-all for our real trouble. Indeed they may in the long run be getting us into more and more trouble, since it can be argued that the more we use of them the more we may have to use. It is our soil that is sick. Over the

years we have relentlessly been taking from it more than we could put back in those minerals that make for healthy, healthful crops. There are those who believe that a thoroughly natural, normal soil will produce crops needing no fungicides and insecticides at all since they will not be attacked by insects and disease. All of us can at least go along with them in this hope, and certainly agree that the preservation and restoration of our soil is the first essential. Unfortunately, restoration cannot be had with a snap of the fingers, and we must fight ignorance, careless farming methods, and lack of fertilizers to really preserve what we have left. Soil building can be done organically with compost methods, but on a large scale this, at the writing, appears a slow, terribly laborious job—excellent though it be. Our commercial fertilizers are "the quick way," if we know the right fertilizers to use in the right amounts. Almost invariably we underfertilize or put on mixtures that are not best for the balance of our soils. And, of course, we have had and still have a serious lack of nitrates.

Any measures to immediately protect our crops are necessary; therefore, the use of fungicides and insecticides. But the basic long-range battle remains to win back the fertility of our soil.

We are up against a vicious and apparently inevitable circle: a rapidly increasing world population (despite wars and famine), greater demands for more and more food from decreasing croplands most of which become less fertile each year.

Here are some population and food statistics for the United States. The population in 1918 was 105,000,000, in 1945 it was 145,000,000 and it is not unreasonable to suppose that in 1960 we may see 155,000,000 and 10,000,000 more in 1990.

Nutritionists estimate that it takes about 3 acres of land to provide each American with food and clothing to maintain an average American standard of living. At the present time we have about 460,000,000 acres of cropland, and that sounds like a lot, but in the next few years a point may be reached where there are less than 3 acres of cropland for everyone. We believe farmers and scientists and manufacturers working together will lick the problem, but in the meanwhile it leaves us with plenty to think about.

The Big Rat Hole—United States Policy in Greece Scathed as Wasteful in Secret Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles which were written by Robert S. Allen and appeared in the Detroit News:

THE BIG RAT HOLE—UNITED STATES POLICY IN GREECE SCATHED AS WASTEFUL IN SECRET DOCUMENT

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—Scathing criticism of United States aid policies and officials in Greece is contained in an unpublished report in the hands of the Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation.

This committee is known popularly as the watchdog committee on the Marshall plan. The highly denunciatory report was prepared by Louis E. Wyman, the committee's counsel, following an extensive personal survey in Greece. Mimeographed copies of Wyman's report have been received by all members of the committee.

Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the committee, stated that no decision has yet been made on the publication of the Wyman report.

Wyman's blunt blasts at United States officials and Greek authorities echo criticisms contained in another official report on Greece submitted to the State Department several months ago. This report, revealed exclusively by the North American Newspaper Alliance in a series of articles, declared that "certain major rat holes" are seriously impairing United States-sponsored recovery and anti-Communist military operations in Greece.

REGIME DENOUNCED

The tenor of Wyman's numerous and detailed charges is summed up in his flat statement, "we are not getting our money's worth out of our ECA dollars in Greece. There is grave danger that our efforts to aid Greece may slip into a situation of outright subsidy of an unsound internal administration."

Wyman denounces the Greek Government as incompetent, reactionary, and obstructive. He declares that it does not represent the people, and has been a constant thorn in the side of United States officials.

The latter are also caustically criticized. Wyman declares that there are too many United States officials in Greece, that many are inadequate, and that they live and act in a disruptively ostentatious manner.

"It is impossible to avoid the impression of confusion, excesses in personnel and program planning, and lack of central direction in the administration of our Greek program," Wyman asserts. "A substantial percentage of the American personnel is paid in excess of $10,000 a year, and (receive) an additional $7,000 rental and food allowance.

TOO MUCH SWANK

There is too much American ostentation in Greece, including specifically, too many new automobiles being driven by chauffeurs, and too much pomp, circumstance, and privilege for Americans, who move about well-fed, with good clothes and expensive cars, in a country where poverty and tragedy are on all sides."

In contrast to this display of opulence, Wyman reports the direst need and poverty among the great mass of Greeks.

"There was practically no heat when I was in Athens," he states, "and very little decent food, except at the American Mission Hotel and at expensive local establishments. Everywhere in the city crowds milled around in rags and tatters. There is no such thing as a middle class in Greece. In this nation of 7,500,000 people, approximately 1,800 individuals have wealth. The remainder are very poor."

Wyman states flatly that the Greek Government is not representative of the Greek people and does not have their confidence and support. It is these factors, he holds, which are breeding despair and turmoil in Greece.

FEW REBELS ARE REDS

"It is impossible to win in Greece by a purely military operation," Wyman declares. "Nor will money alone buy the Greek people. It is apparent that a purely military operation without a sound economic foundation, without a 'cause' for the Greek people, cannot succeed in eliminating the guerrillas.

"Until some visible evidence is given the Greek people that their government offers them something to make life more bearable than a miserable dole, many of them will remain susceptible to the appeals of the guerrilla forces."

UNITED STATES URGED TO FORCE BETTER GREEK REGIME—"MUST GET TOUGH IN ATHENS TO GET VITAL REFORMS," WYMAN TELLS CONGRESS UNIT

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Drastic changes in both the Greek Government and the United States administration in Greece are vigorously recommended in an unpublished report submitted to the Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation.

High lights of this sensationally critical report of United States aid operations in Greece were exclusively revealed Wednesday by the North American Newspaper Alliance. The report was written by Louis E. Wyman, the committee's counsel, following an extensive personal survey in Greece.

Members of the committee, popularly known as the "watchdog committee on the Marshall plan," have received mimeographed copies of Wyman's findings. It is reliably understood that publication of the scathing report has been held up at the instigation of the State Department and the ECA.

NO PROGRESS MADE

Wyman's caustic comments on United States and Greek officials are a repetition of similar criticism in another official report on Greece submitted to the State Department several months ago. This report also revealed exclusively by the North American Newspaper Alliance, characterized the Greek aid program as a "major rathole."

This official report never has been made public. But meantime, President Truman has released a State Department report on Greece painting a very optimistic picture of the progress of the aid program. And the State Department has privately indicated that it will seek another $400,000,000 for this program.

Wyman's report declares flatly that no real economic or military progress is being made in Greece.

RECOMMENDATIONS LISTED

Wyman states flatly "we are not getting our money's worth in Greece," and holds there is no hope of doing so unless a number of sweeping reforms are instituted. His chief recommendations are as follows:

1. Putting an end to the incredibly wasteful and corrupt practices within the present Greek Government.

2. Setting up a fair and reasonably representative Greek Government.

3. Much firmer American control of the policies and personnel of the Greek Government.

4. Cessation of Communist-inspired aid to Greek guerrillas from the Balkan border, either through the United Nations or, if that is impossible, by outright western power inspection.

5. The establishment of a single United States agency for aid to Greece, making the military, economic, and political an integrated operation.

6. Reduction of the number of American personnel in Greece, with emphasis on fewer but more competent administrators.

"For more than a year and a half," Wyman says in support of his recommendations, "several hundred Americans have been spending nearly $1,000,000 a day in Greece for peace and economic stability. Satisfactory progress toward neither objective has been gained. United States economic aid to Greece must not be permitted to earn us the title of 'Uncle WPA.'"

REGIME MUST GO

Wyman holds that no real progress can be hoped for in Greece as long as the present Government is kept in power. He is unspar-

ing in his condemnation of this Government. He declares that it is incompetent, corrupt, obstructive, and totally lacking in popular support.

"The continuation of the Greek Government as presently constituted," Wyman declares, "with its waste, graft, inefficiency, and narrow representation, is overwhelmingly prejudicial to the attainment of ECA objectives."

A Government reorganization, with United States support, is urgently necessary to achieve a representative government composed of able and younger administrators.

Wyman is sharply critical of both the State Department and the United States Embassy in Greece.

"Having the political side of American policy in Greece in the hands of the State Department," Wyman asserts, "practically sterilizes the powerful inductive force of future ECA dollars to accomplish in the political arena by economic duress, if necessary, the fundamental political reforms without which continued aid of either an economic or military nature can only succeed in perpetuating an unsound situation. Political control in the United States Embassy in Athens has demonstrably harmed ECA's Greek mission leadership."

Restoring the Panama Canal Toll Exemption for Coastwise Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 I introduced a bill, H. R. 2511, to restore the Panama Canal toll exemptions for American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States.

We built the Panama Canal and paid for it. We are now maintaining it. Yet we are forced to bear an unreasonable burden in the payment of tolls for our coastwise trade.

Remember that no foreign vessel can do a coastwise trade. Therefore, restoring the Canal toll exemptions for our vessels doing a coastwise trade would not affect any foreign power that now uses the Canal, for the simple reason that they cannot compete with our own vessels doing a coastwise trade for the reason that they cannot engage in our coastwise trade.

The American people have been deprived of the benefits they were given to understand they would enjoy by building this great Canal. Those benefits should be restored, especially insofar as our coastwise trade is concerned.

In this connection I am inserting a statement by Hon. Charles L. Wheeler, of San Francisco, Calif., which I trust every Member of Congress will take the time to read.

The matter referred to follows:

THE CASE AGAINST PRESENT PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

(By Charles L. Wheeler)

The urgent need for a reduction in the tolls charged by the Panama Canal has long been evident; only recently has the possibility of effecting a change been more than remote. A month ago, House Resolution 44 empowered the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to examine tolls charged by the Panama Canal with particular attention to proper accounting and allocation of costs. Such examination may well be the forerunner to an intelligent and far-sighted revision of tolls, if the most is made of the present opportunity.

A few figures will prove the importance of Canal tolls not only to the shipping industry but to the economy of the coastal States as well.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, total tolls collected amounted to $17,596,602. Of this amount 51.1 percent was paid by American-flag ships. It is equally significant that 26 percent of the entire tolls bill was charged against our intercoastal lines. Of this amount, iron and steel manufactures moving intercoastally paid tolls amounting to $913,197 during 1947. Lumber and mill products moving to the east coast from the Northwest were charged $872,744 for the same year, and canned-food products contributed a total of $335,508.

The unhappy plight of the intercoastal trade is well known. Today the volume of shipping on that route is 40 percent of the prewar figure—and that 40 percent is operating at a loss. It is estimated that the intercoastal carriers lost a total of $7,500,000 in maintaining operations during the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1948.

At present rates, the Canal toll for the intercoastal round voyage of a C–3 is $13,826, or almost as much as the entire monthly wage bill including overtime and all other supplemental payments. Fourteen thousand dollars a voyage can mean the difference between the revival of the intercoastal trade to its prewar level, or its gradual abandonment in the face of mounting losses.

The intercoastal trade is not alone in the difficulties it is experiencing. Our entire merchant marine is finding it increasingly difficult to meet the renewed competition of low-cost foreign-flag operators. And in two world wars it has been our merchant marine that has supplied the vital nucleus of trained personnel and available shipping which are invaluable in time of emergency. It would be false economy to let this part of our economy deteriorate, when its importance from the standpoint of national defense is beyond question.

There are two general misconceptions with regard to the Canal, and the first of them revolves around the question of tolls. It is widely believed that the tolls charged are barely sufficient to cover the actual out-of-pocket costs incident to Canal operation. Actually, the reverse is true. The Governor's report for fiscal 1948, just released, indicates a net revenue from operation of the Canal and its business units of $2,622,672.75. Such sizable profits are not out of line with past performance.

Over the life of the Canal, toll revenues have exceeded expenses attributable to transiting by over $274,000,000. To put it another way, commercial tolls, plus tolls forgiven on Government vessels, have been sufficient to pay all operating and maintenance expenses on the basic Canal and its cost of construction, with a profit remaining of over $2,000,000.

The matter of forgiven tolls is worth special attention. From the first, American warships have been allowed to transit the Canal without charge. The result has been an undercollection averaging $1,000,000 annually from 1914 to 1942. A further undercollection of approximately $43,000,000 occurred between 1942 and 1947 for a total short-charge of some $73,000,000 to date. The result has been the curious spectacle of a Canal built primarily for national defense with nearly 100 percent of its capital and operating costs charged against commercial shippers.

The Kiel Canal affords the closest parallel to the Panama Canal in origin and employment. Built primarily to increase the mobility of the German Navy, its employment by commercial shipping was always secondary. Shipping tolls prior to the First World War paid for less than 1 percent of the initial cost of construction. In 1919, the capital investment was written off as a military expenditure and subsequent tolls reflected nothing but operating costs and such sums as might be needed for commercial betterments.

It is true that the accounts of the Canal purport to show an accumulated loss from operation, but this result is arrived at only through application of an interest charge at the rate of 3 percent of the total cost of the Canal. This charge is at present in excess of $15,000,000 annually.

It is manifestly unfair to make this charge solely on the basis of commercial use, when the semi-military nature of the Canal is self-evident. Needless to say, such practice is unique as far as our Government is concerned.

The second general misconception concerning the Canal is based on the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. The object of the treaty was simply to establish certain principles of neutrality, but it is supposed to contain a specific guarantee that our intercoastal vessels will never be exempt from tolls. No such guarantee exists, though through constant repetition the originators of this myth have probably come to believe it themselves.

The wording of the treaty itself is worth examining. Article III, which is customarily cited as bearing on the intercoastal toll position, merely states that "there shall be no discrimination against any nation—in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic." But the intercoastal movement of cargoes is exclusively an internal transportation affair, open only to American vessels. Toll concessions granted in this trade could by no stretch of the imagination be considered discriminatory against foreign shipping. Congress followed an identical line of reasoning in the Panama Canal Act of 1912, which specifically exempted our intercoastal vessels from tolls. Although this legislation was rescinded 2 years later, Congress took pains to reserve all treaty rights in future toll legislation.

Many suggestions have been made for restoring a measure of vitality to our intercoastal shipping. The most effective immediate assistance would be through the elimination of all tolls on transits of intercoastal domestic vessels. The forgiven tolls should be treated as revenue as are forgiven tolls on Government vessels, and would not, therefore, act as a burden on other vessels using the Canal.

It is clear that there is no treaty obligation against removing these tolls, and that considerations of national defense and our domestic economy both underline the necessity for such action.

In the past, tolls have been fixed without regard to the fact that the Canal is one of our greatest military assets. Its worth from the standpoint of national defense would at the very least equal its commercial value. If such a 50–50 division were made, it follows that present tolls could be cut 40 percent and still leave a wide operating margin.

Such a toll reduction is more than justified by past earnings of the Canal, by its semi-military nature, and by the fact that 51 cents out of every dollar of tolls collected comes at present from the pockets of our own hard-pressed shipping industry.

Finally, there is every reason to believe that reduced tolls would result in increased traffic through the Canal, and that actual loss of revenue would accordingly be decreased.

It has taken years of effort on the part of the shipping industry and a serious depression in our domestic steamship operations to obtain the investigation called for in H. R. 44. We must not let our hard-won opportunity slip through our fingers; we must push most vigorously for the removal of intercoastal tolls, and for the reduction of other tolls by at least 40 percent.

There is not much time to secure this action, for the report of the investigating committee must be submitted prior to June 30, 1949.

Favorable results will be obtained only if the civic organizations, port authorities, importers, exporters, community interests, labor and management groups, propeller clubs, and similar organizations in the principal coastal cities band together in demanding a revision of tolls while it is still not too late to help our shipping industry.

Federal Power Commission Betrays Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appears in Trainman News, issue of April 9, 1949:

FPC BETRAYS TRUST

The Federal Power Commission is guilty of grave betrayal of public interest in approving the sale of $60,000,000 of Texas Gas Transmission Corp. bonds without competitive bidding.

The shocking truth is that when FPC permitted the private sale of these bonds to a handful of mammoth eastern insurance companies it had before it the assurance of a Middle Western banking group that a saving to gas consumers of at least $3,000,000 would be made if the bonds were sold at sealed bids.

The equally shocking truth is that FPC simultaneously approved the payment of the fabulous fee of $235,000 to the Wall Street banking house of Dillon, Read & Co. for "introducing" the gas company to the insurance company buyers of the bonds.

The Commissioners who perpetrated this double violation of their sacred public trust are appointed by the President. It is time Mr. Truman took his big stick to these agencies of his to make them quit selling the country down the river to Wall Street.

Warsaw Bible Shop Reports 130,000 Sales in 10 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, undear leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, stating that the British and Foreign Bible Society has sold in the city of Warsaw over 130,000 Bibles in the last 10 months.

WARSAW BIBLE SHOP REPORTS 130,000 SALES IN 10 MONTHS

WARSAW.—In the midst of the devastation and ruins of Warsaw is a little shop, clean and neat, run by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The manager, a Pole, reported in perfect English that in 10 months over 130,000 Bibles had been sold.

By that he meant New Testaments and "Portions," or extracts from the Bible. He pointed to the almost empty shelves and said he was awaiting r new consignment from England.

Ninety-nine percent of the Bibles sold were in Polish and the rest in English.

In 1563 the Bible was printed in the Polish language from the original Hebrew and Greek, at Brest-Litovsk; this version is called the "Brest" Bible. Another translation from the original, printed in Danzig in 1632, is called the "Danzig" Bible.

REVISION IN 1881

As the Polish language had changed somewhat, this translation was revised in 1881, and the revised version is the one in current use. Since the printing plates of this translation were destroyed in Warsaw during the war, the Bible is now printed in England. Soon it will be printed in Poland—first the New Testament only, later the full Bible.

The Protestants in Poland are organizing the Polish Protestant Council, which includes Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Reformed, and Evangelicals. Among the Protestants is also a small group of Christian Scientists.

And another article which appeared in the same issue of the Christian Science Monitor, Thursday, April 7, written by R. H. Markham, in which he states:

Postwar Poland has a more uniform population than any other state in eastern Europe both from the ethnological and religious point of view. An overwhelming majority of the inhabitants are Poles and 96 percent of these are nominal or practicing Roman Catholics.

So far, the Roman Catholic Church in Poland has been subjected to less onerous pressure or persecution than is the case in any other Communist-ruled land.

The 210,000 Protestants enjoy more freedom there than anywhere else in eastern Europe.

METHODISTS CITE GROWTH

The head of the Methodist Church in Poland, the Reverend Konstanty Najder, is quoted by the Chicago Daily News as saying there are now 17,000 adult Methodist Church members in Poland, in addition to 30,000 children and youth. They are served by about 60 churches. Pastor Najder is quoted as saying that before the war there were fewer than 4,000 Methodists in Poland.

There are 10,000 Calvinists or Presbyterians, whose origin dates from reformation years, according to Polish sources.

Semiofficial Polish sources report 13,000 Baptists, mostly in the new areas. The number is said to be growing.

There are 10,000 Jehovah's Witnesses and 5,000 Adventists, spokesmen for new Poland say. Also 3,000 Unitarians whose movement dates from reformation years.

ISSUE MANY PAMPHLETS

These churches, as well as Roman Catholic organizations, issue religious pamphlets, books, and periodicals.

A semiofficial government source says 10 percent of the books appearing in Poland are produced by religious institutions. More than 400 books and pamphlets of a religious nature appear yearly, the regime says, as well as a number of weekly and monthly papers, mostly written by Roman Catholics.

Church services, including outdoor processions, are held regularly. Some religious schools, including theological seminaries, function, and religious subjects are taught in public schools.

In a word, Roman Catholic churches continue to hold mass, perform religious ministrations, issue religious literature and maintain some schools, while Protestants are free from many restrictions in the strictly defined field of worship or evangelization. In this sphere non-Lutheran Protestants are freer than before the war.

Mr. Speaker, this should refute the charges made by shallow-minded people that the Poles are Communists.

I wonder how many Bibles were sold in Berlin last year, and whether the Mein Kampf is still their official bible?

Russia Can Now Import From 42 Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from the Polish Research and Information Service, an agent of the Polish Government, a most revealing document relating to Poland's world trade. Inasmuch as I cannot, under the rules of the House, have the illustrations appearing in the document reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including under leave to extend heretofore granted only the factual statements appearing in it:

Poland's foreign trade has recovered from the ruins of war so rapidly that in 1948 it was more than double that of prewar 1938. Poland is now not only a major supplier to her western neighbors, but also a fast-expanding market. The growing reach and volume of Polish commerce abroad is indicated by the drop of the U. S. S. R.'s share of the total to little more than 20 percent in 1948, against more than 90 percent in 1945.

Poland's world trade in 1938 was $468,900,000, in 1945 it was $71,800,000, in 1946 it was $270,700,000, in 1947 it was $547,400,000, and in 1948 it was $1,000,000,000. These figures are exclusive of army surplus purchases.

Poland is buying: Needs machinery, equipment, certain industrial raw materials, and credits.

Poland is selling: Offers coal, textiles, iron, metal products, timber and furniture, chemical products, glass, china, newsprint, and foods to United States.

Poland's world trade report goes on to say:

The rapid increase of imports is due to the extraordinary progress in national recovery from war devastion, and to basic trade policy. Imports have grown as follows:

1945	$33,870,000
1946	143,550,000
1947	301,480,000
1948	509,511,000

Exports—

Says the report—

have grown as spectacularly as imports. Here are the figures:

Exports in 1945 were $38,010,000; in 1946, exports were $127,240,000; in 1947 exports were $245,880,000, and in 1948 exports were $528,134,000.

The compelling reason for the successful effort to increase exports is that in view of

the shortage of gold and foreign-exchange reserves, Poland's total needs from abroad for recovery and well-being can only be met by what Poland sells.

Poland has always had much to offer that other countries need, above all coal, which was the first postwar export to revive quickly. Now, although total coal exports are growing, the proportion of coal in the over-all picture is steadily diminishing.

In 1945 and 1946, exports were mostly industrial. Besides coal, there were cement, soda, cotton and wool textiles, zinc, iron, and steel products. In 1947, agricultural products, which in 1938 accounted for 40 percent of all Polish exports, appeared again in export lists, as farming began to recover.

Coal and coke exports

	1945	1946	1947
Millions of tons	3.64	14.60	18.60
Percent of total exports, by value	82.25	67.4	62.9

The changing character of exports

	1938	1946	1947
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Coal and coke	19.1	67.4	62.9
Textiles	3.4	9.2	13.7
Agricultural	40.1	2.2	5.4
Iron and steel products	8.1	6.6	5.2
Glass and ceramics	.1	.9	2.5

The other outstanding development in exports has been their rapid diversification geographically since 1945, when the U. S. S. R. was almost the sole customer.

In 1945, Poland had trade contracts with 6 nearby countries; by the end of 1946, with 23; and in 1948, with 42 countries in all continents.

Especially because the U. S. S. R. could supply capital goods and raw materials, which were scarce elsewhere in Europe, Polish-Soviet trade has boomed since the war, whereas it was minimal before 1939. As rehabilitation of transport and production has increased Poland's trade elsewhere, the importance of exchanges with the U. S. S. R. has proportionately decreased, although it shows an over-all increase:

	U. S. S. R. share of all Polish imports	U. S. S. R. share of all Polish exports
	Percent	*Percent*
1936–38	1.1	0.4
1945	90.6	93.4
1946	70.4	49.4
1947	26.5	28.6
1948	[1] 21.5	----------

[1] Estimate of all trade.

The Scandinavian countries, partially replacing Germany, were next, in increased volume of trade with Poland as compared to prewar, supplying iron ore, machinery, etc., in return for Polish coal, coke, textiles, and chemicals.

Countries of eastern Europe accounted for 46 percent of total Polish 1948 trade. Western European trade had great impetus in 1948.

Overseas trade connections were resumed in 1946 and in 1947, especially with the United States of America, Latin America, and the Far East.

Trade agreements with other countries have been a conspicuous feature of Polish international trade, because of the general lack of foreign exchange.

Immediately after the war, these agreements were short-term and on a clearing basis providing simply for exchanges of goods in a balance-free relationship for both countries.

More recently, particularly since 1947, the agreements have been longer-term, covering a period of years, rather than 12 months only as before, and two new features have appeared in them. 1. Poland has been granted special credits, accumulated through Polish sales to the country involved, against which Poland may buy or order. This applied where the other country was mainly a supplier of producers' goods and thus could not deliver as fast or steadily as Poland. 2. A further development has been partial payment to Poland in foreign exchange, enabling Polish purchases elsewhere.

Outstanding trade agreements are—

With Great Britain, signed January 14, 1949, for a 5-year term and exchange of goods to a total value of more than $1,000,000,000. Poland will receive: Wool (Britain giving credits for purchases in British Dominions), rubber, crude oil, copper goods, capital equipment, tires, dyestuffs, and others. Britain will receive increasing amounts of bacon, eggs, lumber, poultry, fish, berries, and frozen fruit—50,000 tons annually of bacon by 1950 and 480,000,000 eggs annually at the end of the 5-year period, from Poland. 3,000–5,000 tons of rubber and $40,000,000 worth of wool from Britain.

With Sweden, under which Poland received capital equipment, orders being placed immediately.

With the Netherlands and Czechoslovakia similarly providing for acquisition of capital equipment.

Careful, advance planning is another essential element of Polish trade.

The advent of the 3-year plan on September 21, 1946 (see Poland's Recovery, Polish Research and Information Service, September 1948), made it both possible and necessary to develop a meticulous plan covering foreign trade.

The foreign-trade plan is the basic guide in negotiation of agreements and in making all purchases. It is based on the larger national plan covering all investment, production, consumption, and sales. The larger plan determines the export potential on which imports, and thus much of the whole national development, depend.

Truman's Fourth-Point Program as Compared With Earl Browder's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is strange to find and realize that the fourth point of President Truman's bold new program for undeveloped areas is strikingly similar to a program announced by Earl Browder in a book which he published 5 years ago entitled "Tehran: Our Path in War and Peace."

We are indebted, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Henry Hazlitt, editor of Business Tides, in the current issue of News Week. Mr. Hazlitt is an outstanding economist and his column is widely read throughout the country. This article should be of great interest to Members of the House. As part of my remarks, I am including it herein:

In his inaugural address President Truman announced what has now become the famous fourth point—a bold new program for underdeveloped areas, a program to foster capital investment in areas needing development, to greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations, and to raise substantially their standards of living.

No sooner was this announced than the brains of Washington bureaucrats began to bubble with grandiose schemes for giving away still more of the American taxpayers' money to foreign lands. Our Government representative put the idea before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which adopted a resolution approving it. Now the ECA has set up a Colonial Development Division. And Deputy Administrator Bruce says that this new Division is intended to carry out point 4.

Before we go further with this idea it may be instructive to look into its origin. I do not know who sold the idea to Mr. Truman, but at least the record shows clearly where the idea came from in the first place. The following quotations are from a book published in 1944:

"America can underwrite a gigantic program of the industrialization of Africa to be launched immediately. * * * It must initiate a general and steady rise in the standard of life of the African peoples.

"Closely related socially, economically, and politically with Africa are the near-eastern countries of Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Transjordan. * * * Here also a broad regional program of economic development is called for.

"What is clearly demanded by the situation is that the United States take the lead in proposing a common program of economic development of the Latin-American countries. * * * For Latin America [such a program] opens the door for an immense leap ahead in progress.

"For the United States especially it contributes a large part of the answer to that all-important quesion as to whether we shall be able to keep our national economy in operation.

"The Government can do it, if free enterprise fails to meet the challenge and bogs down on the job.

"Our Government can create a series of giant industrial development corporations, each in partnership with some other government or group of governments, and set them to work upon large-scale plans of railroad and highway building, agricultural and industrial development, and all-round modernization in all the devastated and undeveloped areas of the world. America has the skilled technicians capable of producing the plans for such projects, sufficient to get them under way, within a 6-month period of time after a decision is made. * * *

"On a world scale the combined projects could be self-liquidating in the period of a generation. They would become the best investments the American capitalist class has ever made in its whole history."

The book in which this proposal appeared 5 years ago was Tehran: Our Path in War and Peace (International Publishers). And the name of the author was Earl Browder, then still officially head of the American branch of the Communist Party (temporarily calling itself the Communist Political Association).

We need not point out here everything that is wrong with this proposal on political and economic grounds. We need not point out, for example, that every million dollars of capital we send abroad sets back our own capital development by just that much. And this at a time when President Truman himself insists that at least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our [own] productive facilities over the next few years, and when he complains that our own steel, oil, and electrical industries are not being expanded fast enough to suit him.

It is enough to point out for the moment that the idea for the bold new program comes straight out of the book of the then head of the Communist Party in this country.

Basing-Point Pricing System Opposed by Wholesale Grocers—Serious Objections Voiced to Language of Moratorium Bill—Robinson-Patman Act Regarded as Vital Protection Against Unfair and Destructive Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, through its general counsel, William A. Quinlan, Esq., has voiced opposition to the basing-point moratorium bill, S. 1008, according to a dispatch to the New York Journal of Commerce from its Washington bureau, under date of April 6, 1949. Mr. Quinlan, in outlining USWGA policy, emphasized that his association "regards the Robinson-Patman Act as vital protection against unfair and destructive discrimination, and they do not want it weakened in any way."

Referring to the moratorium bill's broad and ambiguous references, Mr. Quinlan pointed out that such references "might be construed as legitimatizing an infinite variety of discriminatory and destructive pricing practices."

At this time, when small business is compelled to fight ever-growing monopolies, the thought of legislation which, by its very nature, lends aid and comfort to the proponents of discriminatory pricing must be terrifying. Surely, the interests of hundreds of small independent wholesale grocers scattered throughout our land must far outweigh the monopolistic design of the food, or any other trust-like group banded together for purely predatory purposes. The moratorium bill must be defeated. The article in full follows:

DELIVERED PRICE BILL AMENDMENT PROPOSED—MORATORIUM MEASURE SEEN ENDANGERING ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT GAINS

WASHINGTON, April 6.—United Wholesale Grocers' Association today announced that it had filed with the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee proposed amendments to delivered-price moratorium bill (S. 1008).

The amendments, proposed by William A. Quinlan, general counsel for the wholesalers' group, were accompanied by serious objections to the language of the proposed measure, the association stated.

The suggested amendments, the association said, are designed to confine the legislation to providing, in effect, that uniform delivered prices to competing customers are not to be considered discriminatory merely because of differing delivery or shipping costs or, in other words, confined to banning the contention that price as used in the present antitrust statutes means the so-called mill net.

CHANGES PROPOSED

The essential portion of the amendment proposed by the association follows: "The Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended (Robinson-Patman Act) shall not be construed as prohibiting a seller merely because of differing delivery, or shipping costs and, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, from charging the same delivered price to all competing customers."

The vital portion of S. 1008, the association contended, is the following: "The Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended (the Robinson-Patman Act), shall not be construed as depriving individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any and all markets."

OBJECTION CITED

In objecting to the present wording of S. 1008, Mr. Quinlan made the following assertions:

"The bill's broad and ambiguous reference to 'delivered-price systems' might be construed as legitimatizing an infinite variety of discriminatory and destructive pricing practices, and its deletion is suggested. Likewise, the language 'to absorb freight to meet competition,' which makes no reference to good faith or to whether meeting competition is confined to meeting an equally low price, as presently provided in section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act. It is suggested that further legislation, if any, with respect to meeting competition should await more thorough consideration."

POLICY OUTLINED

Mr. Quinlan, in a statement to the subcommittee, outlined the USWGA policy on the moratorium bill, as follows:

"They would welcome a removal of whatever legal cloud there may now be over normal and reasonable delivered-pricing practices, which was not intended by Congress or anticipated by industry when the Federal Trade Commission and Robinson-Patman Acts were enacted. But at the same time they are vigorously opposed to any legislation which might go beyond the removal of that cloud and alter the basic purposes of the provisions outlawing price discrimination or weaken their effectiveness.

"They regard the Robinson-Patman Act as a vital protection against unfair and destructive discrimination and they do not want it weakened in any way. They emphasize the danger that legislation on the complex problem before you might inadvertently have that result.

"The wholesalers' organization," Mr. Quinlan added, also believed that the effective life of the moratorium bill should be limited to 1 year instead of 2 years, as now provided in the measure.

Those Who Dance Must Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing remarks previously extended in the RECORD, I am including further excerpts from letters received by the Committee on Appropriations on the subject of economy in Federal expenditures:

THREE RIVERS, MICH.

It is extremely important that action be taken now to reduce the cost of Government if we are to maintain a sound and solvent Nation. The national budget can be reduced below $40,000,000,000 a year and still maintain all necessary departments and agencies on an effective and efficient basis. This can be done by weeding out all unnecessary funds.

I have discussed this great problem with several Congressmen and Senators. All of them agreed that Government spending and the budget should be drastically reduced and that it could be reduced. The difference of opinion came on the question "Will it be reduced?"

WELLS MANUFACTURING CORP.

MACON, GA.

We are facing a very serious situation in this country and we need to cut expenses in every way possible. One of the chief ways to do this is to stop spending money.

A. S. GRINALDS & SONS.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.

The greatest danger lies in financing programs beyond our abilities to pay.

The great bureaucratic hodgepodge is costing needless billions in duplication of effort, inefficiency, and waste, surely far more than what could possibly be afforded by any individual or corporation.

CHARLES R. WEIR.

FORT WAYNE, IND.

National solvency is the first consideration at this time—the "first line of defense" against communistic ideologies. If this line is violated in fact, we are vulnerable indeed.

WILLIS S. MARTIN CO.

MILLERSBURG, PA.

Anyone using a bit of common sense can realize that the present rate of spending will land any nation in a state of bankruptcy.

WILLIAM E. SEAL & CO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

While we don't claim to be more patriotic than our fellow man, we believe those of us who are conducting businesses of our own are perhaps better able to understand the necessity of keeping expenses below income.

One does not need to go farther back than the present generation to readily understand what eventually happens to even the lowest income groups if this cardinal rule is continuously ignored.

ENGLE BROKERAGE CO.

ATHENS, TENN.

We need men in Washington who will put a curb on wasteful spending.

WILLIAMSON HOSIERY MILLS, INC.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.

It seems so very obvious that the Government cannot continue to spend and spend and remain solvent.

VETTER MANUFACTURING CO.

ALLEGAN, MICH.

Bring down within reason the spending of the taxpayers' money for unnecessary appropriations.

It is only through such efforts that this country can hope to exist.

DAVIES-WHEELER, INC.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.

Drastically reduce the unreasonable expenditures of our Federal Government.

It is my opinion that in reducing appropriations for the Federal Government we will have the key to the whole situation, giving us a chance to handle other important things demanding rigid attention.

FOSTER ENGINEERING CO.

WESTBORO, MASS.

Industry and business as a whole are being considerably hampered by the mounting expenses of government.

I am enclosing herewith copy of letter sent to Paul A. Dever, governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which is a statement of actual conditions in our State, and needless to say, is no doubt reflected in the majority of States of the Union. This is real food for thought and I trust that all Members of our Congress and Senate are giving consideration to appropriations regardless of party or politics.

KENWORTHY BROS. CO.

OMAHA, NEBR.

The end of the financial road the Government has been taking since the war is certain disaster. The incentive to work and produce is to better our own individual conditions and to help our children achieve a better life. Excessive taxation removes that incentive and bankrupts both us and our children.

EASY PARKING CO.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

Small-business men are taxed so heavily at the present time that it is impossible to build up reserves for depreciation and other business contingencies. It is alarming to everyone that the budget increases year after year and particularly when business volume and projects have started down at a very fast pace since the first of the year.

LEACH AUTO PRODUCTS, INC.

CAMDEN, OHIO.

It seems that for a number of years budgets are being prepared in a somewhat thoughtless manner.

Some thought must be given as to where this money is going to come from.

THE NEFF & FRY CO.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

"Cut" should be the byword in Congress these days as far as the budget is concerned. We certainly should be defensively prepared, militarily, but as to spending money the report of the Hoover Commission should be followed, where possible, in cutting down overlapping Government agencies.

Let's reduce those taxes.

WHITEMAN, INC.

COVINGTON, KY.

It is high time that a program of economy be adopted by our Government to reduce every expense possible, as well as, eliminating all unnecessary expenses.

Otherwise, unless we business people get some relief from these high taxes and costs of living we are just going to have to throw in the sponge.

THE COUNTRYMAN CO., INC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

I, like most people, am unable to conceive of $1,000,000,000, much less $40,000,000,000.

We need more legislators with the stamina to face the present-day problems as they really are, instead of as some select few would like to have us think they are.

WESTERN MINERAL PRODUCTS CO.

WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT.

We "little people" of Vermont mostly Republican, claim to think straight and talk straight. We are willing to go along with national spokesmen of the people who stand first for the welfare of American democracy.

THE SHEPARD CO., INC.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

As a small-business company, we are forced to watch our expenditures practically 24 hours a day. Relaxing in this vigilance for even a short period of time and we soon get into hot water. It seems elementary that expenditures must be controlled and yet in Washington, D. C., where supposedly some of our greatest citizens are gathered to protect the interest of all, the only cry you hear is spend, spend, spend.

Recently, the newspapers and news services have been full of vast new spending programs. Undoubtedly, in addition to the cost of the programs, many thousands of new employees would have to be added to the already swollen Government pay roll. Can it be possible that sincere thinking men and women can honestly believe that this increased spending can go on from year to year without a day of reckoning?

Frankly, it is my personal opinion that all business, both large and small, are frightened half to death on the news coming out of Washington and undoubtedly, a good deal of the present slump in business can be attributed to this fright.

M. J. GRASS SCREW MACHINE PRODUCTS CO.

DEPEW, N. Y.

Your committee is the first defense of our country against the orgy of governmental spending.

Upon your committee rests the hope and prayer of all thinking Americans, and your efforts and results will be anxiously watched by the rank and file of America. The one common subject in our land is that of taxes, and in order to halt the further increasing in taxes, spending must be reduced.

CABLE GUIDE RAILING CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Keep Federal expenditures at an absolute minimum. All sound thinking businessmen in the country today realize that the Government cannot continue their reckless program of wanton spending.

DIXIE WAREHOUSE CO.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Bankruptcy is slavery. It's history that Lenin had declared that this country would be taken over by making us spend ourselves to exhaustion, and it appears as though we are striving to the limit to make Lenin's prophecy come true.

It's my humble view that a good start would be to adopt the Hoover Commission report of reorganization in full, any deficit could be corrected in future years as the need showed itself.

MILTON CROWE,
Grain Broker.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

It is beyond the comprehension of the average man how any administration—politics or no politics—can continue spending and spending and taxing and taxing, without realizing what it is doing to the country.

CENTRAL MOTORS, INC.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart for your statement on March 2 concerning the billions set up in the President's budget for socialistic and experimental projects.

Eighteen months ago we were all scared of Russia—today we are all scared of Washington, our own National Capital; what a pity. The tax-and-spend theory is fast ruining the businessmen of America. Every one of them that I talk to is scared for the future of his business.

I pray that there will be debt retirement and a reduction in taxes.

P. R. LETTS.

DULUTH, MINN.

Surely, we must all realize by this time, that you can't buy prosperity and survive for any length of time when the liabilities exceed the assets. Something must be done immediately to eliminate this waste.

MOLAND BROS. TRUCKING CO.

FLINT, MICH.

The country in general and business and commerce in particular are suffering seriously from too much Government bureaucracy. I feel that appropriations should be drastically cut. I also think efficiency should be increased and number of employees reduced even in the bureaus which are necessary and desirable.

ARNOLD GAUGE CO.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

May I particularly express my concern for the large amount of money our Federal Government is spending.

BROOME'S.

JACKSON, MICH.

We all shudder at the thought of a depression such as occurred in the thirties when the interest of our national debt would be greater than the total national budget was at that time. We must remain solvent if our form of democracy is to survive.

DR. C. CORLEY.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

I am working hard to keep business going and pay all the taxes we must pay. If these taxes are cast about loosely then we are ready to give up.

HAMILTON LUMBER & VENEER CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Expenses have to be cut all down the line, or costs reduced in Government as in industry and business.

I plainly observed among the Congress and the administration an expense consciousness, and I also feel that the good old solid Americans who came up the hard way and who really made this country the greatest in the world have the same consciousness.

A reduction in expenses is necessary and the expenditure of tremendous sums of money must stop and will stop either by voluntary direction and control now or by malevolent forces later on.

JAMES A. JACKSON.

WHEELING, W. VA.

If I read accounts correctly, just last week the Appropriations Committee approved an increase in the Department of Interior funds which would enable that agency to add 8,000 new employees.

Now on one hand it seems foolish to talk about economy in government unless we are willing to practice a little of it. In a sense it's very unfortunate that some of our money spenders and those who pass on expenditures have not a more impressive background as producers or as administrators of funds in private enterprise.

It will take the incomes of thousands of taxpayers to pay this additional 8,000 employees that your appropriation to the Interior Department would enable it to put on the public pay roll.

OTT-HEISKELL CO.

WICHITA, KANS.

To an intelligent individual, there has always been some question as to how a person,

company, or country could spend itself rich.

Fight for economy and the curtailing of Federal spending.

ELLIS M. SKAGGS.

Mr. Speaker, supplementing these letters, I am appending names and addresses from similar letters received by the committee on the same subject too lengthy to be included in the RECORD:

Lincoln Dairy Co., Hartford, Conn.; Union City Chair Co., Union City, Pa.; Furniture City Dowel Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; Henry River Mills Co., Henry River, N. C.; Scheuren & Mok Lumber Co., East Detroit, Mich.; Chamberlain's Sheet Metal Works, Greeneville, Tenn.; Jefferson Drug Co., Inc., Beumont, Tex.; Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington, Mo.; Gifford-Hill Pipe Co., Dallas, Tex.; Oliver Manufacturing Co., Rocky Ford, Colo.; Samson Cordage Works, Boston, Mass.; Seldner & Eneguist, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Crystal Bottling Co., Fairmont, Minn.; Brown Oil Co., Inc., Wilson, N. C.; Geyer Manufacturing Co., Rock Falls, Ill.; Vehicle Co., Fort Smith, Ark.; Young Coal Co., Waterloo, Iowa; Cushman Baking Co., Portland, Maine; Simpson Weatherstrip & Insulation Co., Sioux City, Iowa; A. Teichert, Laurelton, N. Y.; Gaynor-Bagstad Co., Sioux City, Iowa; Hoffmaster Paper Co., Oshkosh, Wis.; What Cheer Clay Products Co., What Cheer, Iowa; Anthony Caquatto, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Lime Rock Springs Co., Dubuque, Iowa.

Hicks Grocery Service, Klamath Falls, Oreg.; W. Earl King, general contractor, Dallas, Tex.; Toledo Window Shade Co., Toledo, Ohio; Kickhaefer Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; James W. Baker, Evanston, Ill.; C. W. Marsh Co., Muskegon, Mich.; The Carson Payson Co., Danville, Ill.; Tuthill Spring Co., Chicago, Ill.; Monite Waterproof Glue Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. T. Reichert, Chicago, Ill.; Lite Soap Co., Aurora, Ill.; Breyer Bros., Whiting & Co., Waupun, Wis.; Wellever Business Systems, Battle Creek, Mich.; Proctor-Keefe Body Co., Detroit, Mich.; The York Supply Co., Dayton, Ohio; Lightfoot Oil Co., Eureka, Ill.; Jones Superior Machine Co., Chicago, Ill.; Chicago Furnace Supply Co., Chicago, Ill.; Allen Edmonds Shoe Corp., Belgium, Wis.; Geidel Canneries, Inc., Adell, Wis.; Rockford Industries, Inc., Rockford, Ill.; Power & Heat Engineering Co., Detroit, Mich.; Schober Printing Co., Detroit, Mich.; Crescent Engraving Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.; Mrs. Doris Hemman, Chicago, Ill.; Eagle Luggage Co., Racine, Wis.; Richard G. Staebler, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Burdsall-Haffner Paint Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.; The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; The Priestley Printers, Philadelphia, Pa.; Clark Door Co., Inc., Newark, N. J.; Cannon Optical Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Peck's Hardware Store, Port Jervis, N. Y.; Niles Steel Tank Co., Niles, Mich.; Paul B. Davis, Buffalo, N. Y.; Lee Clay Products Co., Clearfield, Ky.; Woodside Mills, Greenville, S. C.; Arner Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Seymour Gmeiner, Appleton, Wis.; Security State Bank, Keokuk, Iowa; Otis I. Pennington, Birnamwood, Wis.; United Federal Savings and Loan Association, Des Moines, Iowa; Cutler Hardware Co., Waterloo, Iowa; Gillett State Bank, Gillett, Wis.; Gillett & Eaton, Inc., Lake City, Minn.

Robinson Manufacturing Co., Dayton, Tenn.; Kessler Chemical Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Food Centers, Inc., Hastings, Nebr.; The Philadelphia Chair Co. Philadelphia, Pa.; J. V. Patten Co., Sycamore, Ill.; Christensen Lumber & Millworks, Inc., Fairmont, Minn.; A. W. Williams Inspection Co., Mobile, Ala.; Borough of Peoria, Peoria, N. J.; Young & Greenawalt Co., East Chicago, Ind.; Lignum Vitae Products Corp., Jersey City, N. J.; Kendrick Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.; Sherman Printing Co., Duluth, Minn.; David A. Hillstrom, Corry, Pa.; Smith Cabinet Manufacturing Co., Inc., Salem, Ind.; David Williams, Miami, Fla.; Metcalfe Wholesale Florist, Hopkinsville, Ky.; Limback Lumber Co., Seattle, Wash.; Pykes Variety Store, Crescent City, Calif.; Alice Stebbins Wells, Los Angeles, Calif.; Shiner-Sien Paper Co., San Antonio, Tex.; Eaton Metal Products Co., Denver, Colo.; Shatterproof Glass Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Edna Lumber Co., Hagerstown, Md.; Western Mineral Products Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Securities Acceptance Corp., Omaha, Nebr.; Titsworth Mills, Inc., Brawley, Calif.; The L. F. Dettenborn Woodworking Co., Hartford, Conn.; Federal Lithograph Co., Detroit, Mich.; Johannesen Electric Co., Inc., Greensboro, N. C.; Spindale Mills, Inc., Spindale, N. C.; Taylors Lumber Co., Taylors, S. C.; Howard MacDonald, Marie, Mich.; C. A. Hoffman, Browning, Mo.; Swehla & Co., Sterling, Ill.; The Motor Supply, Marshall, Tex.; Motor Parts Co., Dalhart, Tex.; Unique Metal Novelty Mfg. Co., Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; Robert M. Longman, Freeport, N. Y.; Wright Co., Kansas City, Md.; Sharp's Bakery, Freeland, Pa.; The Wisconsin Cold Storage Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; R. J. Tinkham, Chicago, Ill.; Arnold W. Totman, Chicago, Ill.; Association of American Railroads, Chicago, Ill.; The Dexter Co., Fairfield, Iowa; Walter B. Braun, Milwaukee, Wis.; The Sioux Steel Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; C. A. Dunham Co., Chicago, Ill.; Melvin F. Hall Advertising Agency, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Burns, Potter & Co., Omaha, Nebr.; American Archery Co., Clarendon Hills, Ill.; L. R. Kerns Co., Chicago, Ill.; Lammert & Mann Co., Chicago, Ill.; Paxon Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry Engineering Co., Moline, Ill.; The Matchless Metal Polish Co., Chicago, Ill.

Optennerg Iron Works, Sheboygan, Wis.; Pennock Oil Co., Pennock, Minn.; Henry Haertel Service, Stevens Point, Wis.; Charles Meissner & Associates, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.; Northfield Iron Co., Northfield, Minn.; J. W. Gates, Wittenberg, Wis.; Minnesota Mercantile Co., Stillwater, Minn.; Glove-Van Doorn Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.; Schaefer Brush Mfg. Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Baley Blower Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; The Everite Pump & Mfg. Co., Inc., Lancaster, Pa.; Liberty Craftsmen, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.; Morris H. Adler, New York, N. Y.; Carlisle Paper Box Co., Carlisle, Pa.; J. R. Heineman & Sons, Inc., Saginaw, Mich.; Publisher of the Sun, Quarryville, Pa.; Means Stamping Co., Saginaw, Mich.; Louis Gulotta, New York, N. Y.; Bohn Organ Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.; W. C. Borcherding Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; G. S. Lyon & Sons Lumber & Mfg. Co., Decatur, Ill.; Southport Lumber Co., Southport, Ind.; Northern Star Silk Co., Inc., Hancock, N. Y.; Truwal Signs, Binghamton, N. Y.; McCreary Tire & Rubber Co., Indiana, Pa.; Camden Iron Works, Camden, N. J.; Verkler-Peyer Co., Peoria, Ill.; Tomlinson & Hawley, Bridgeport, Conn.; Galewood Outfitting Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; George H. Drake Heating, Plumbing, Piping Installations, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sterling Ring Traveler Co., Fall River, Mass.; N. P. Benson Optical Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Paris Cleaners & Dyers, Erie, Pa.; Boswell Lumber Co., Boswell, Pa.; Monumental Sales & Manufacturing Co., St. Cloud, Minn.; Kurt Versen Co., Englewood, N. J.; D. A. Lubricant Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.; John R. Scott, Roslyn Heights, N. J.; Selby, Battersby & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Gardner Manufacturing Co., Horicon, Wis.; United Conveyor Corp., Chicago, Ill.; Frank J. Hughes, Deer River, Minn.; Ralph E. Miller, Fond du Lac, Wis.; J. W. Kellogg, Chicago, Ill.; Defoe Shipbuilding Co., Bay City, Mich.; W. B. Arnold Co., Waterville, Maine; Schaeffer Hardware Store, Bellefonte, Pa.; H. F. Everett & Associates, Allentown, Pa.; Printers' Port, Inc., Omaha, Nebr.; United Wholesalers, Sioux City, Iowa; Erle P. Dudley, Kellogg, Idaho.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, divers extensions of remarks by Members of the Congress show that the modernization of the Panama Canal is one of the most important problems currently presented for determination.

The questions involved are so important to interoceanic commerce, national defense and security, and the foreign relationships of the United States that it is incumbent upon the Congress to explore every vital phase of the subject during the course of the investigations now authorized, or which may be authorized in the future.

The August 1948 edition of Marine Progress, a magazine devoted to the development of the merchant marine and the improvement of waterways, contains an able and informative editorial discussion of Panama Canal problems. The writer makes some pertinent observations concerning the atomic bomb, and deals with the very important treaty question which must be faced in any realistic treatment of the subject. Strong reasons are stated in behalf of the contention that the main features requiring correction are those of an operational character in the present Canal. His approach is from the standpoint of the navigator and the merchant marine.

The editorial reflects an extensive section of maritime and engineering opinion. It is admirably presented, and should be of value to the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to the general public.

It may be added that House Resolution 44, introduced and passed at the present session, contemplates a full and thorough investigation of the financial operations of the Panama Canal as to military and commercial transit, a subject of paramount importance touching the entire Canal problem.

Under leave given, I am including as a part of these remarks the indicated editorial:

WATERWAY IMPROVEMENTS—ISTHMIAN PLAN

Recent developments concerning interocean canals have brought to the attention of the maritime industry the current controversial question of sea-level versus terminal lake plans for the Panama Canal. The new development is a report in the Bogota, Colombia, newspaper El Tiempo, which reports Colombian Foreign Minister Eduardo Zuleta Angel as saying that the United States has proposed a new canal linking the Atlantic and Pacific via the Atrato and Tranto Rivers.

The Atrato is the more important of the two and it empties into the Caribbean via the Gulfs of Uraba and Darien.

This proposal for a new canal naturally focuses attention once again on the present Panama Canal and the plans for its modernization. Little has been done about the modernization since the Panama Canal Zone Governor's report was issued. In this report a sea-level canal was recommended but the minority opinion was so strong that no action has been taken. The plans that have been advocated other than the sea-level canal are for a high level terminal lake at Miraflores and also for a third set of locks at all the present lock sites. This last plan has been abandoned, leaving the terminal lake plan and the sea-level plan the ones to be considered.

Since the sole purpose of the waterway is to facilitate travel between the two oceans it would seem that the logical thing to do would be to examine the existing waterway with a view to seeing whether it can serve the needs of defense and commerce in its present form or in either of the two proposed modifications.

SEA-LEVEL PLAN

The sea-level plan, as proposed, would provide a channel of adequate depth from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a tide lock at the Pacific end to compensate for the different range of tide between the two oceans. Part of this canal would be between dikes which would be built along the route and protected against flood during the rainy season.

Since the present Canal is at a height of 85 feet above sea level on the portion between Gatun and Pedro Miguel locks it would be necessary for the engineers to excavate that depth in addition to the existing cut in order to reach sea level. Such additional excavation naturally calls for extreme care in disturbing the terrain since the danger of slides is ever present.

The danger of major slides, which would close the Canal to use, is ever present should the existing channel be utilized by the sea-level advocates. Major dislocations of the terrain are looked upon by competent engineers with some misgivings since the tendency of rock structures to slide are enhanced by their formation, particularly if the earth structure is relatively soft as shale or thin strata of limestone or sandstone, volcanic ash, and similar earth materials.

Any structure is in danger of sliding as the result of strong explosions in the vicinity and such an event would close a sea-level canal to use just as surely as it would close a lock-type canal.

THE ATOM BOMB

The possibility of an explosion naturally brings the atom bomb to the fore in thinking about the Canal. The recent tests at Eniwetok have indicated that improvements in the atom bomb are such that no canal structure can withstand the forces of its explosion. Should a potential enemy of the United States develop an atom bomb it is reasonable to believe that their physicists will also make improvements in it to the extent that it, too, will have destructive power enough to incapacitate the Canal structure.

As a result any calculations that entertain the idea that the Panama Canal can be built to withstand an atom-bomb attack are at variance with known facts and this major premise of the sea-level advocates must be abandoned.

TREATY QUESTION

There are many indications that the proposals for a sea-level canal contemplate locations other than along the present Canal route. The treaty entered into between the United States and Panama calls for a strip of land extending 5 miles from the center line of the channel on each side. Slight modifications in this area are provided for in the region of Gatun Lake. In the original treaty it was also provided that additional land, or modifications of the present limits were permitted in perpetuity but this part of the treaty was subsequently given up by the United States.

Should a new location be laid out for a sea-level canal, a new treaty would, in all probability, be required before the waterway could be started. To think that such a new agreement could be reached on the same financial basis as the present treaty would be looking at the entire idea with the most optimistic viewpoint imaginable. The disagreements between Panama and the United States over the bases on Panama territory are an indication of their present attitude.

A high-priced treaty would naturally bring the cost of any new canal well up above the present estimates which have been termed too moderate.

THE TERMINAL LAKE PLAN

Since there are strong arguments against the advisability of digging a sea-level canal one must necessarily turn to the other major proposal for canal modernization, the Terminal Lake plan most recently envisioned by Capt. Miles DuVal, United States Navy, while he was port captain at Balboa about 5 years ago. Briefly this plan calls for the entire removal of the locks at Pedro Miguel and the construction of a three-lift lock close by at Miraflores. It also calls for the damming of the relatively shallow valleys between the ring of hills close to the Pacific end of the Gaillard cut and impounding the water of Miraflores Lake until it reaches the height of 85 feet above sea level, the present height of the Gaillard cut and Gatun Lake. This would then create an anchorage area at Miraflores adequate for the mooring of a considerable number of vessels in safety.

There are, however, more practical reasons for this man-made lake than providing an anchorage for ships. The operational difficulties of canal navigation have been aggravated by the presence of the Pedro Miguel locks in their present site. This flight of locks lies at the Pacific end of the long Gaillard cut and at a point where ship handling problems present themselves at a time when room to maneuver is most essential. Lock surges occuring in the cut have had an adverse effect on ships as far away as Gatum Lake and within the cut itself the force of the surges has literally picked up a large, ocean-going vessel that had touched bottom and thrust it farther aground than it already was.

Further navigating difficulties are met when fog closes the cut to navigation. Ships Pacific bound anchor in Gatun Lake when the fog closes down and, when the channel is clear, proceed through. Ships Atlantic bound, however, must remain out in Panama Bay or tie up at the lock structures of Miraflores and Pedro Miguel until the fog lifts. Then the rate of transit is governed by the speed of locking through which is approximately an hour per ship.

Should the terminal lake be created, vessels delayed by fog would be locked through the single Miraflores locks, move to anchorages in the lake and then transit the cut on a 5-minute headway with ships coming from Gatun moving through at the same rate. The procedure would then be to have the ships bound for the Pacific anchor in Miraflores Lake and lock through in turn and the ships for the Atlantic anchor at Gatun for a similar process through Gatun locks. Traffic would then be speeded to the capacity of the waterway.

Many prominent engineers have studied the modernization problem and have come to the conclusion that the terminal-lake plan at Miraflores will offer the best canal obtainable. One such engineer, Harry O. Cole, who was resident engineer at the Canal at the time of the building, and later in charge of the completion of the Pacific locks, speaking before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States said, "I am convinced that the terminal-lake plan is not only the most feasible but the most suitable way to modernize the Panama Canal and that the failure to adopt this plan would be a grave mistake. Such a failure would probably delay action for many years to come because the present public interest could not be easily aroused again should it be allowed to die."

Mr. Cole was emphatic about the failure of the group to study modernization of the Canal to avail themselves of available first-hand information on the engineering problems connected with the construction of the waterway. He said, "The recent studies at Panama recommending the conversion of the present lock canal to sea level were made without the advice of those who have first-hand knowledge of the difficulties and hazards encountered in the building of the present Canal. They are certainly the ones best qualified to advise on the major engineering questions and any report that does not consider their views is fatally deficient."

OTHER CANAL ACTION

Representative Willis Bradley, of California, a former Navy officer, has prepared legislation for introduction into Congress calling for the creation of a nine-man Presidential Commission to make a final determination of the Canal modernization. Three of the members would represent the armed services while the other six would be civilians. This legislation was presented to an earlier session of the Eightieth Congress and should the present session fail to act, the bill will be reintroduced. Mr. Bradley, in commenting on the proposed bill said, "It should be noted that this bill does not require that those appointed from civil life be engineers, although I assume that a considerable number of them would be of that profession. It does contemplate the appointment of the best-qualified men of established reputations and backgrounds of experience, men in which the public may have every confidence. With a Comission such as this, there would be every reason to expect a final determination which both the people and the Congress could accept as the best within the scope of our present-day knowledge and ability."

Atlantic Pact and ERP Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the accompanying editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, reveals that the Atlantic Pact is the best assurance against a future war. Today the Congress takes up the European recovery bill which is companion legislation to the Atlantic Pact. The Atlantic Pact is merely another step in the pathway of making amends for the mistake our Senate made 28 years ago when it refused to join Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations to preserve peace in the world:

ATLANTIC PACT IS WEAPON FOR FIGHTING AGGRESSION

All of the speeches made at the signing of the Atlantic Pact emphasized its defensive character. The western nations are getting together merely for protection against aggression and no country which stays in its own sphere need fear the new organization of nations.

It should not be necessary to spend so much time to prove the obvious, but in view of the Communist effort to give new meaning to old words we must keep hammering on the accepted meanings to prevent Communist propaganda from taking effect.

Most of the people of the newly allied nations will not be deceived by this Communist deception, but some will be led astray unless we keep telling them our purpose. Then there are the hundreds of millions in eastern Europe, in Russia, in Asia, in Africa who must be told repeatedly that our intentions are peaceable as long as the Russians let us alone.

The speeches indicate that finally the west has awakened to the methods of the aggressor nation and intends to fight back with similar but better weapons. For assuredly it will be easier to speak the language people know than the one that is being forced on them. It may be hard to understand why anyone would believe the Russians are using democratic methods no matter how often they insist they are, but the fact remains that some will believe if the lie is repeated often enough and no denial is made.

Indeed the Russians have already charged that the new pact has been created for the purpose of aggression and this story will be repeated so long as the present dictatorship exists. This type of mendacity is effective as is shown by the accomplishments of Stalin and Hitler before him. But it has its limitations as proved by the downfall of the latter.

There seems to be little doubt that the Stalin methods will last until his death, but no one can be sure what will happen then. Winston Churchill implied in his recent speech that some internal convulsion may concentrate all Russian attention on a civil war and relieve the outside pressure.

If that should happen, it might mark the beginning of the decline of communism as a world force. For it has nothing to go on but the pressures the Russian dictatorship is able to exert. Lying propaganda endlessly repeated and pressures exerted in countless ways are the basic ingredients of the Communist mechanism. If we can scotch the lies, it won't have much life left. This is the lesson we are learning as the pact and speeches inaugurating it prove.

The Phoenix City of Warsaw: The Feverish Rebuilding, the Vigor, the Shattering Ruins, and the Pervading Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Richard Hughes, which appeared in the March 15 issue of Vogue.

Richard Hughes is a Welshman, a playwright, and the author of more than a dozen books, among them High Wind in Jamaica, his most famous. The dramatic version, called The Innocent Voyage appeared on Broadway in 1943. While still an Oxford undergraduate Hughes wrote his first play, The Sisters' Tragedy, which was produced in London; George Bernard Shaw called it "the finest one-act play ever written." The article follows:

THE PHOENIX CITY OF WARSAW: THE FEVERISH REBUILDING, THE VIGOR, THE SHATTERING RUINS, AND THE PERVADING FEAR

(By Richard Hughes)

It is time somebody wrote a natural history of ruins. There is the common or tufted ruin, the noble fragment dear to the romantics; with its ivy and its tussocks of turf and wild flowers, it dwindles still from century to century. There is the same ruin tidied up by a government department, with slabs of concrete instead of verdure and guardrails for the giddy tourist instead of ivy—what might be called the ruined ruin. Again, there are all the characteristic ruins of natural cataclysm: the earthquake ruin, the wild debris of the hurricane or the flood. But in Europe today a new genus, formerly rare, is now the commonest of the lot: the man-made ruin, the urbs debellata.

Even in this genus there are many species. One soon learns, for example, to distinguish between the effects of air bombing and those of shell fires. If you fly over Berlin or any other large town principally ruined from the air, it is like looking down on a honeycomb the top of which has been sliced off. The roofs are gone—miles of them. The walls still stand, the houses are rows of little empty boxes without lids. A town destroyed by shell fire, a town such as Breslau where the Nazi armies made their last big stand in the east, looks very different. For shells go particularly for the walls. Little shells knock holes through them, big shells kick them altogether out from under the roofs they support. Then the roof may collapse utterly; but more often it still hangs askew from some fragment, looking rather like the sort of umbrella a tramp abandons in a ditch. But even shell fire is uneven in its effect, leaving many a dramatically jagged fragment still standing among the brick heaps and torn concrete.

Warsaw suffered both bombing and shell fire in its two sieges, but that was not enough for Hitler. He seems to have had a maniacal hatred for Warsaw. When it was apparent that the Nazis must presently retreat, he gave orders that the town should be destroyed so utterly that it could never be rebuilt. Thus, while the last remnants of General Bor's tragic insurrection were being stamped out in the old city, and the Russians waited on the far bank of the Vistula, squads of skilled demolition workers moved from home to house and street to street. For these specialists the difference between a medieval church, a sewer, an eighteenth-century palace, a block of flats was purely technical, a problem of the type and placing of the explosive charge required to destroy it.

No other great city had been razed like this since Carthage. The job was done so thoroughly that even the Polish Government thought it was successful and proposed to move the capital to Lodz, leaving Warsaw as a memorial mountain of rubble in the middle of the great plain. But the remnant of the people of Warsaw, unbidden, came back like ants to a shattered anthill. Burrowing into the cascades of bricks they found shelter in cellars and basements. Rebuilding began. Half the citizens of Warsaw seemed to discover that they were bricklayers born. A passageway for handcarts would be cleared down the middle of some broad street. The women set to work to sort the billions of bricks and clean them for reuse. Shops and restaurants opened at the ground-floor level, a low facade of new plate glass and cement topped by the crazy outsize crenellation of the shattered walls above.

Warsaw is already a new city, a city of resurrection, of life, vigor, national pride. Everyone has sore throats from the clouds of dust, but through the clouds the miracle of a town growing from day to day like a mushroom astonishes the eye. Nor is there anything shoddy or "utility" about the work done. Where a palace once stood a palace rises again, detail by detail. Museums, theaters, churches, were not left to the last (as we should have done): they were given priority. It all happens with incredible speed. To walk in the streets of Warsaw today is to see Phoenix reassembled feather by feather.

Only in the ghetto is there no resurrection. What was once a teeming quarter of the city is now a flat tableland of level, trodden rubble, some 6 feet above normal street level. Crushed among the crushed masonry there still lie some 20,000 murdered bodies. There is a moldy smell, and no life there but a few desolate tufts of dusty willow herbs.

In the gardens of the Lezienki Palace (which happily escaped destruction) there is a little eighteenth century open-air theater. The stage, a perfect setting for the tragedies of Racine, is on the shore of an island and defined against the willow trees by a semicircle of Greek columns. Two of the columns are broken off short. They were built like that. So they still stand today; memorial, among the canyons of shattered buildings, to an age so civilized that its ruins had to be artificial, an age when "ruins" were a pleasing architectural conceit.

HARVEST FESTIVAL

West of Warsaw a vast, mostly sandy plain stretches to the marshes of the new frontier: a patchwork of pinewoods and small farms, the occasional modest manor now derelict and smothered in its own shrubberies, or turned over to government uses. The pattern is small and intimate, not widespread as the horizons would suggest; and certainly not dreary.

Suddenly near a country town we came on the gayest of scenes, a harvest festival. Processions of decorated wagons covered in branches and flowers and corn sheaves (one wagon top was a model windmill made of straw): children in traditional peasant finery of white flounces and tight bodices, smiling and singing, all converging on a sweet-smelling Catholic church whose bells sent out peal on peal.

Under the lee of a pinewood the smashed fighter aircraft still littered the ground in a silvery line, like dead fish left by the tide.

Almost every yard of the fields had to be searched for land mines before they could be tilled. The ravaging armies left the country bare of every means of transport (UNRRA supplied what horses you see today, and except for a few Fiat busses and Skoda cars traded for Silesian coal, automobile traffic is still rare). They might well be thankful for a harvest.

THE BEST FOOD IN EUROPE

Yet in Poland you will eat better food today than in any country of Europe I know. Rationing? Your purse is your ration book: you can eat whatever you can pay for. A country inn will knock up a meal for a prince; a Warsaw restaurant a meal for a god. I went to a reception given by the Prime Minister in his official palace, through anteroom after anteroom decorated with saluting guards to a supper room that recalled Vienna before 1914. It was a function as punctilious as any court, except in the matter of dress.

If you have occasion to talk to eastern Europeans, you will be struck by the fact that as soon as the word "fascism" has crept into a discussion they cease to be able to argue rationally or even sanely. You might as well tell a medieval Christian that the Devil was dead as argue to a Pole that fascism is dead, or hope to get him to believe that it is not, even today, the source of every evil abroad in the world. Yes, his attitude is almost precisely the medieval one about the Devil—he conceives of fascism as an eternal spirit of all human evil, and it is a subject on which he is mad—mad as any witch burner.

It is important to understand why this has happened, for it is the mainspring of much that seems otherwise inexplicable in the eastern scene.

Janus-like, nazism had two faces—one turned west, the other east. We in England only saw the western face. We liked even that little enough. Heaven knows; but the eastern face was beyond measure more horrible.

THE BELIEF THAT IS BEYOND REASON

Such a figure as 2,000,000 civilians slaughtered in cold blood cannot move the imagination, since human suffering is not susceptible of arithmetic; but let me recount one instance out of the 2,000,000. I will tell it as plainly as I can, without details.

At the time when all Jews were confined in the Warsaw ghetto, children would sometimes slip out for an hour or two. An SS man found one such little child crying in a Gentile street. At first she denied she was Jewish; but he questioned her, and at last she admitted it. So he ordered a Polish policeman to take the manhole cover off a sewer, and he dropped the child in alive, to drown in filth.

How could anyone of the passers-by who saw this happen ever be quite sane again when the word "fascism" stirred his memories? The Poles are a nation of which almost every man has himself seen at least one such thing happen.

Thus we can begin to understand, perhaps, how easy it is to work malicious magic in eastern Europe with that word. When it is whispered that Washington is the home of Fascist warmongers, that ERP is a Fascist plot—then there is awakened a kind of belief that is beyond reason.

For as well as wishful thinking there is such a thing as fearful thinking. As well as believing what he wants to be true, man also tends to believe what he most fears to be true. And what the Poles fear most in all the world is that fascism is still, somewhere, alive and menacing.

Soil Conservation in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the following newspaper articles which appeared in the Dallas County News, Adel, Iowa, on April 6, 1949:

SET NEW RECORD IN CONSERVING SOIL

Iowa farmers set an all-time record during 1948 in applying soil-conservation practices to their land.

Soil conservation district cooperators' reports bear this out. Farmers put 236,000 acres of land on the contour, bringing the State's total up to 845,000. They added 9,000 acres of cover crops to bring the State total to 25,000 acres.

During the year 26,000 more acres were strip cropped, more than 9,500 acres of Iowa pastures were improved, 2,000 miles of terraces were built, and 19,000 acres of land were made more productive by drainage.

Too, farmers are planning these improvements so that they fit their farms. A total of 15,000 farmers in the State have now developed complete farm conservation plans with technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. These plans cover 2,800,000 acres. During the calendar year of 1948 alone, service technicians helped 3,269 farmers develop complete plans which increase farm income as much as a third, control erosion, and hold more rainfall on the land. They gave assistance to 3,000 other farmers with one or more conservation practices.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND IOWANS ATTEND 1948 SOIL-SAVING DAYS

Iowa farmers are conscious of the need for conserving their soil and are eager to learn how they can carry out good land-use programs on their farms. This was shown by their interest in soil-conservation field days, tours, demonstrations, and plowing contests during 1948.

Total attendance for these events scattered throughout the State was an estimated 319,150. This is more than double the estimated attendance at similar occasions during 1947.

State and National events drew the largest crowds, accounting for 229,500 of the total attendance. These included the all-Iowa soil conservation field day on the Ben Cole farm in Clarke County, the national plowing contest, and soil conservation field day in Dallas County, the national plow-built terrace contest in Shelby County, the forage field day in Jones County, the Pilot rock soil conservation field day and plowing contest, and the Conservation Sunday soil conservation district as a follow-up to the field day held in 1947.

DEMONSTRATE

Conservation practices which are essential to good land-use programs in the particular areas were demonstrated at all of these events.

Twenty-three local and county-wide contour plowing contests and field days drew 28,500 people. Soil conservation and other improved farm practices demonstrated at these events included preparation of grass waterways, building terraces, pasture improvement, gully control, drainage, contour cultivation, diversion ditches, weed spraying, and plow adjustments.

These same practices and others were demonstrated before 22,400 people attending 13 local and county-wide field days. These were held in Des Moines, Louisa, Black Hawk, Mahaska, Monroe, Muscatine, Cass, Wayne, Jefferson, Decatur, Appanoose, West Pottawattomie, and Johnson Counties. Particular emphasis was placed on soil-conservation demonstrations.

District or area-wide contour plowing contests and field days were attended by 19,750 Iowans. These events were held in Clayton, Van Buren, Adams, Clinton, Butler, Jasper, and Washington Counties. Major practices demonstrated included gully control, pasture improvement, waterway construction, terrace construction, drainage, and the building of farm ponds.

A total of 8,400 people turned out to experimental farm field days. These included events at the Howard County experimental farm, soil conservation experimental farm in Page County, western Iowa experimental farm in Monona County, the pasture-improvement farm near Albia, and the agronomy and agricultural engineering field day held at Iowa State College.

Attendance at local or county-wide terrace building contest, tour, field demonstrations, and contests sponsored by Iowa soil-conservation districts made up the rest of the total figure.

Building Awards Up 10 Percent in March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 9, 1949:

BUILDING AWARDS UP 10 PERCENT IN MARCH—SHARP RISE OVER YEAR AGO LIFTS TOTAL FOR FIRST QUARTER OF 1949 IN 37 STATES

A substantial upswing in March made a good-sized cut in the margin of decline in building and engineering awards in the first 3 months of 1949, the F. W. Dodge Corp. reported here yesterday. The report covers the 37 States east of the Rocky Mountains.

Awards in the first quarter totaled $1,799,070,000, or 9 percent under the $1,986,936,000 reported for the same period of 1948. Building and engineering awards in March, however, totaled $747,619,000, or nearly 10 percent over the total of $689,763,000 in March, 1948.

Despite the 3-month decline, the Dodge Corp. said, the quarterly total was the second highest on record for a first quarter, exceeded only by last year.

Nonresidential building for the quarter gained 1 percent over last year, totaling $771,219,000. Public building contracts were chiefly responsible for the rise.

Residential building awards in January, February, and March were down 19 percent under last year, from $746,889,000 to $603,971,000. Heavy engineering awards, including roads, bridges, and heavy industrial works, totaled $423,880,000, an 11-percent drop, under last year.

The Dodge report said 4 of its 15 major reporting districts showed increases in dollar volume of contracts in the first quarter. They were metropolitan New York and

northern New Jersey, the Southeastern States, northern and eastern Ohio and the region composed of Minnesota and North and South Dakota.

United States Policy Is Failing in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Willard Edwards that appeared in the Detroit Free Press:

UNITED STATES POLICY IS FAILING IN GREECE, REPORT SAYS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—The Greek ship of state is sinking fast despite the spending of 1,000,000 American dollars a day to bail it out.

In this testing ground of our foreign-aid program, the United States must either take over complete control of the Greek Government or pull out.

These are among the high lights of a confidential report to the congressional "watchdog committee" on the Marshall plan. It has been suppressed by Democratic leaders.

The lengthy report is sensational in its implications, which affect the entire $17,000,000,000 plan for military and economic aid to Europe.

It states, in effect, that a drastic change in Government policy, constituting virtual domination of Greek affairs, is essential if any results are to be obtained for vast expenditures.

This will support Russian claims of imperialism against the United States, the report concedes, but Stalin is making such charges in any event.

The report was made some weeks ago to Chairman MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada), of the joint congressional committee on foreign economic cooperation.

It was based on an inspection trip in Greece by Louis C. Wyman, committee counsel.

The report brands the administration of aid in Greece as incompetent. American behavior has stimulated hatreds and jealousies.

"A present lessening of American ostentation in Greece, including specifically less chauffeur-driven new automobiles and less pomp, circumstance, and privilege for Americans is recommended," it states.

"Such individuals now move well-fed, with good clothes and expensive cars, in a country where poverty and tragedy are on all sides."

Communist guerrillas are not out to conquer Greece, the report asserted.

"The objective clearly is to harass, spoil, and break up the Greek economy so as to prove before the world from the wreckage of Greece that the western powers have no ability to make their great experiment (the Marshall plan) succeed," the committee was told.

"This single plan to destroy the Greek economy and to cause Greece to fall into pieces urgently requires a single plan for the United States."

Greek officials themselves recognize the need for a new political formula with basic appeal to the Greek people, the report states.

This would involve a social reform, revision of taxes, prices, and distribution control without graft, and better administration under a Greek-American program.

"The more intelligent among the Greek people want such a change, but as long as the United States Government supports the present Greek Government as presently constituted, such a change will be impossible," the report continues.

Our Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, having jurisdiction over patents my interest has been revived about our patent system.

In this fast changing age I fear we do not fully appreciate the significance of our patent system.

I attached hereto an article appearing in a recent issue of the American Scholar entitled "Is Our Patent System Obsolete?" as prepared by Judge Clarence G. Galston, district judge of the United States Court, Eastern District of New York.

IS OUR PATENT SYSTEM OBSOLETE?

Had Professor Hamilton (autumn 1948) sought merely to demonstrate that our patent statute is ancient, and therefore in need of thorough revision, one could hardly disagree, for from its insufficiencies has sprung judge-made law probably beyond that found necessary in any other Federal statute. But it is a system which he attacks.

The objectionable system, as the article describes it, is the fostering of monopolies by assignments and licenses from inventors to powerful corporations.

Professor Hamilton's thesis seems to stem from what, with all due respect, I regard as an unsound reading of the constitutional clause. A proper evaluation of this clause as given by the courts is to place the emphasis on the promotion of science and arts as the objective of the framers; the reward to the inventor is but secondary. The early period was marked not by mass workers but by the produce of the farmer and the product of the individual craftsman. Certainly there was no prevision of the industrial evolution which followed, nor of the dominant scientific era in which we live.

Just as other clauses of the Constitution have yielded to congressional enactments to meet economic conditions without destroying or impairing our capitalistic base, the patent clause should not be denied comparable elasticity.

But in the system Professor Hamilton finds lurking monopoly because patents may be assigned or licensed to offending corporations. Well, the Supreme Court has thrown up safeguards which, to be sure, though not found in the patent statute, are derived from the broad equity power of the courts. Now no one—inventor, licensee, or assignee—who reaches beyond the frontier of his lawful monopoly grant can secure relief against infringers.

Nor should Professor Hamilton be too much concerned lest the reward to the inventor be not commensurate with his contribution. It is difficult to see how, without substantial financial backing, an individual inventor could effect commercial success in fields which require enormous sums for research. Not to recognize such existing conditions is to close one's mind to actuality. Are inventions in industrial adaptations of atomic energy, radar, cyclotronics, and ultrafax not to be protected by patents because such patents may and probably will be controlled by corporate interests? The age of the garret inventor is over, and, despite the functions of the governmental Office of Scientific Research and Development, research laboratories of private interests are necessary for chemical, electronic, and other forms of industrial development. To say that corporations which maintain such research laboratories under appropriations which run to enormous annual outlays are not to profit thereby over competitors who make no such investments would be, not to promote progress but to stifle it.

No; granted that the patent statute needs drastic revision, it by no means follows that a system which has contributed heavily to the material welfare of our people is obsolete.

World Health and Power Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "World Health and Power Politics" written by Richard L. Carp.

Mr. Carp is the son of Mr. Avery Carp, prominent businessman of Granite City, Ill., and a close personal friend of mine.

Richard Carp is in Geneva, Switzerland, at the present time on a fellowship, and has contributed this article to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

WORLD HEALTH AND POWER POLITICS

(By Richard L. Carp)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—Russia's use of any means for political ends is painfully apparent in the recent action of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine and Byelorussia in withdrawing from the World Health Organization.

Excuses offered by Russia for this action simply do not make sense when official Soviet statements are compared with the record of Health Organization activities. The very right of children to live, and to achieve a healthy maturity has become a pawn of Russian political policy in the cold war.

The telegram sent to the World Health Organization here by Nikolai Vinogradov, Soviet Deputy Minister of Health, announcing Russian withdrawal from the WHO, gave as reasons:

"Tasks connected with international measures for prevention and control of diseases and with the spread of medical science achievements are not being accomplished by the Organization satisfactorily. At the same time, maintenance of the Organization's swollen administrative machinery involves expenses which are too heavy for member states to bear. All this shows that the direction taken by the activities does not correspond to those which were set before it."

During the first World Health Assembly of the WHO, in June 1948 here in Geneva, the same Dr. Vinogradov addressed the founding group in these words:

"What are to be the fundamental tasks of the organization in years to come? In our opinion they should comprise, in the first in-

stance, assistance to nations which have suffered from the war; elimination of the effects of the war on health, cooperation in the fight against epidemics, and a strengthening of international relations in the field of science."

Comparing this statement with accomplishments, Dr. Brock Chisholm, of Canada, director-general of the WHO, pointed out that the World Health Organization has been officially in action only since last September, although functioning as an interim commission since 1946. Dr. Chisholm said the Russian condemnation of the Organization now was premature to say the least. By Dr. Vinogradov's own statement, hopes for the WHO were based on years to come.

Dr. Vinogradov had said the WHO should offer assistance to nations which have suffered from the war. Dr. Chisholm pointed out that the Special Office for Europe, under the WHO, was set up for this purpose in January of this year. Within less than a month arrangements were made to rehabilitate penicillin plants in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. In addition, the WHO is coperating with the United Nations Childrens' Emergency Fund to supply war-devastated countries with streptomycin. Distribution already has begun in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria.

Efforts to increase penicillin production were impeded by the fact that Byelorussia and the Ukraine, where additional penicillin plants are located, refused to attend the conference held on this subject.

Medical books, X-ray films, microscopes, and other supplies have been sent to war-torn countries, including Poland, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine. The Ukraine alone, for instance, has received some 5,500 medical books through the WHO. Between last September and December, 50 medical fellowships were awarded by the WHO to students in war-devastated countries for study at some of the world's chief medical centers. Medical teams have toured many war-torn areas, advising on improvement of medical facilities and methods.

When Dr. Vinogradov said the WHO should try to achieve "cooperation in the fight against epidemics" he anticipated what has been one of the most dramatic of the WHO's achievements. When a cholera epidemic threatened Egypt last year, airplanes were pressed into service to fly anticholera vaccine from China, Switzerland, Russia, Palestine and the United States.

In a large measure through the efforts of the WHO, the epidemic in Egypt was brought to a halt within 6 weeks. Thousands of lives were saved, judging from the experience of past epidemics of cholera in the Middle East.

In 1950 it is proposed that the WHO set up an eradication program against cholera in selected areas all over the world where it is endemic, such as India, China and Burma. This type of action represents protection for the whole world, for in the past the great plagues and epidemics have started in small areas and spread with great speed. WHO now is sponsoring a series of daily world-wide radio broadcasts detailing methods of controlling epidemics of all kinds.

To aid in "strengthening of international relations in the field of science," as called for by Dr. Vinogradov, the WHO has entered into active relations with the World Federation for Mental Health, the International Red Cross, the International Council for Nurses, the International Union Against Cancer, the International Union Against Tuberculosis, the World Medical Association, the International Union Against Venereal Disease and other nongovernmental agencies.

In discussing Dr. Vinogradov's tardy complaint about WHO's heavy expense, Dr. Chisholm pointed out that for 1948, the American share of these expenses totaled $1,860,000, compared with the U. S. S. R., $295,000; Ukraine, $39,000, and Byelorussia, $10,000.

The U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, and Byelorussia, however, have not bothered to pay their bills, as yet.

Dr. Chisholm has answered the Soviet telegram of withdrawal by suggesting that this action be reconsidered and that he be allowed to go to Moscow for fuller discussions. His answer was sent in mid-February. "I await your invitation," said Dr. Chisholm. He is still waiting.

As to Russia's real reasons for withdrawing from the WHO, it has been suggested that there are too many western representatives in this vital world health work, also that the WHO was not useful to Russia for propaganda purposes. It is clear only that the Soviet motives seemed to be political; the precise political logic that led to the withdrawal may be clear only to members of the Politburo.

Excise Taxes Seriously Affecting Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following special article in the Saginaw (Mich.) News:

Where is the luxury in such items as baby oil, electric light bulbs, diaper bags, and laundry cases?

Thousands of Saginawians who buy these items daily and pay the Federal or excise tax, which usually amounts to 20 percent of the cost, are asking that question.

They ask it of clerks, who shake their heads and explain they don't understand the tax either. Merchants are bitter over the tax. They assert the tax reduces sales of certain items, and they can get sales records out to prove their point.

The tax, the merchants and clerks say, isn't equitable. Why should baby oil and all baby toilet items be subject to a 20-percent tax and dad's shaving soap be tax free?

Why should electric light bulbs, which are as necessary as the switch that turns the lights on, be subject to a 10.4-percent-excise tax? The lamps the lights glow in are tax free.

Why should a student needing a laundry case made of canvas or a mother needing a diaper bag pay a 20-percent tax when another person buying a cigaret case or poker chips not pay the tax?

The excise tax was put on by the Federal Government during World War II as an emergency measure to help finance the war. Merchants and customers alike believe the tax should be lifted.

Arthur S. Boettcher, of Lansing, assistant manager of a luggage firm, has spent 2 years and $1,500 of his own money fighting the excise tax. The Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce consented to sponsor a pamphlet Boettcher prepared, which points up the inequities of the tax.

"The ridiculous taxes that make me mad are those on witch hazel, eyewashes (if they bear beauty claims), sunburn preparations, and peroxide (20-percent volume)," Boettcher said.

He sees no justice in taxing a woman's handbag, even if it is only the $3 cloth variety, when a jewel box for her trinkets is tax-free. Boettcher has been corresponding with Congressman R. L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, on the excise tax. DOUGHTON wrote him:

"I am hoping in this Congress and perhaps in this session we will be able to consider the entire tax problem.

"But the President has asked for increased revenue of $4,000,000,000 over and above what present tax laws will yield. For every dollar we would take off present taxes we would have to more than make up on new or increased taxes."

At least one Saginaw merchant complains the excise tax has so seriously affected his business he has been forced to reduce wages of his employees.

Many customers stay away from the expensive items that carry 20 percent excise taxes. Paying the 20 percent on a tube of lipstick may not seem like much, but paying it on a $500 luggage set, or a $1,000 diamond ring the tax assumes major proportions.

The retail merchants division of the board of commerce has taken no action to form a policy on the excise tax. Individual merchants, however, are outspoken in their opinions of a tax which they claim is unfair to them and to their customers.

Plight of American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Garry Cleveland Myers:

PLIGHT OF AMERICAN CHILDREN

(By Garry Cleveland Myers, Ph. D.)

Out of America's 46,000,000 children, 4,000,000 do not attend school at all either because there are no schools or because of inadequate school attendance enforcement. For many children there are only 6 months of school each year.

In some school communities children have to attend in two shifts, even three shifts. The birth rate has risen rapidly in recent years. In 1951 school enrollment will be up 2,400,000 over 1948; in 1956, 8,000,000. In the next 5 years the much needed school construction would cost $6,800,000,000.

BABIES DIE NEEDLESSLY

Every year hundreds of thousands of mothers and babies die needlessly, though at least one-half of the maternal deaths and one-third of the infant deaths are preventable. Almost a quarter of a million mothers and babies have no medical care at childbirth, and the first few days of life.

Three-quarters of our American children need dental care. Ten million have defective vision, 4,000,000 defective hearing. Half a million have orthopedic and plastic defects, 175,000 tuberculosis. Annually, rheumatic fever and diseases of the heart cripple half a million children. Forty-five percent of the counties throughout the United States have no hospitals and a quarter of our children live in areas having no full-time public-health service. Only one school unit out of four in the United States has a school-lunch program. At the present rate,

1 out of every 20 children in our Nation is destined to be a patient in a mental institution. Though most mental difficulties begin in childhood, 25 States have no child-guidance clinic. Full-time clinical service for child guidance is provided in only 27 of our largest cities.

SINGLE CHILD

We have about 4,000,000 children who are fatherless, motherless, or both. Yet 6 out of every 10 of these children receive neither public assistance nor social security. The average monthly benefits for a family, in which a single child receives a benefit, is $13.10. One-half the children whose fathers died in 1946–47 did not qualify for this. Five out of six of all the counties throughout the United States have no full-time welfare worker.

Over 2,000,000 boys and girls 14 to 17 years of age work part time or full time. Besides, many thousands of children under 14 work in agriculture, not half of whom are attending school. Even Federal laws protect only about a fifth of America's children against harmful employment in industries which ship goods across State lines. Annually about a quarter of a million children come before juvenile courts.

Among our States and different communities of each State there are great inequalities of educational, health, and welfare facilities. In the poorer States there is not enough wealth to bring in enough revenue from taxation to provide adequate schools, health, and welfare services. Moreover, in the poorer States there are 50 percent more children per 1,000 adults than in the richer States. So children in these poorer States don't have opportunities afforded most children in the richer States. Even in the richer States many schools are overcrowded and manned with poorly trained teachers and the welfare services are, in places, pitifully inadequate.

These and similar facts have been presented by the American Parents Committee Education Fund, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York City, and appear in the February issue of Parents' magazine.

Italy's Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of April 9, 1949:

WITH UNITED STATES AID—ITALY TAKES LONG STEPS IN RECOVERY

ROME, April 8.—Italy's recovery is progressing so well with the help of the Marshall plan that it may reach its goal of a balanced budget even before 1952, Giuseppe Pella, Minister of the Treasury, said tonight in his annual report to Parliament.

The Italian deficit will be $290,000,000 in the current financial years, compared with $1,300,000,000 last year. The new financial years starting this summer will show a further improvement, Pella said. The improvement was obtained in large part by raising the prices for transportation, postage stamps and telephones.

But Pella said the average Italian income is only $200 a year, 20 percent below prewar.

Italy's exports rose 50 percent in 1948 and industrial activity increased 17 percent, bringing production up to 90 percent of prewar.

Generals Open Up—Oratory on Army Day Likened to Ominous Thunder of War Drums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Star:

GENERALS OPEN UP—ORATORY ON ARMY DAY LIKENED TO OMINOUS THUNDER OF WAR DRUMS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The generals have been sounding off recently, scaring us well-nigh to death. But they really opened up, with all stops out, on Army Day, mounted stumps here and there with the brass clinking, and let the oratory roll with the ominous thunder of war drums.

Despite all the noise and furor, there were two factors which might offer some consolation to the peace-hungry citizen who is the target of much of this high-pressure psychological warfare.

One was the announcement that hereafter there will be only 1 day a year set aside for the parades and speeches, which will be known as "Armed Forces Day," instead of the four we have had yearly for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The reason is to promote the idea of unity in the services.

PEACE DAY SUGGESTED

It might be a good idea also to have every year a day of silence, which might be called Peace Day, on which the citizen could pick up his newspaper and listen to his radio and watch his television without reading or hearing about or seeing a single soldier, tank, airplane, rocket ship, warship, or fiery speech from a general or admiral.

The other consoling factor in the Army display this week was that some of the military seem to have become conscious of the criticism of the gun play and cries of alarm and the way the military has been throwing its weight around in a manner unseemly in peacetime for a Government supposedly in charge of civilians.

For example, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Vice Chief of Staff, in his speech at Pittsburgh, said: "Our foreign policy is not made, and should not be made, by the Army." It would appear that the caustic criticism of Herbert Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of the Government might have had some effect. The Commission's task-force report on the National Defense Establishment said the military had been arrogating to itself too much influence in the field of policy.

Then there was Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who, in a speech before the Union League Club in Philadelphia, had the grace to admit he might be charged with preaching a doctrine of fear. This was a recognition at least of the sort of psychology that seems to be the aim from what has been going on in recent weeks.

EXCUSES APPROACH

Then he excused this approach, thus:

"A powerful nation is using fear to intimidate neighboring peoples and to hold satellites in submission. We are, therefore, compelled to employ fear of inexorable retribution against that powerful nation if we are to stop her arrogant and ruthless aggression."

Here is a clue to the apparent strategy: To scare Russia, to scare our own people, and to scare Congress; the last in the interest of getting all the appropriations the military wants, including those to arm western European nations in the Atlantic Pact.

Russia just screams back, and in a rising crescendo, with all sorts of boasts about her might, and feeds her own people with propaganda that we are getting ready to make war on them, all of which creates a highly emotional state in which it becomes more and more impossible to sit down around a table and negotiate our differences.

It's like two bullies swaggering up and down opposite sides of a street shouting their prowess and daring the other to do something.

Split in Communist Bulgar Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, April 6, 1949:

SPLIT IN COMMUNIST BULGAR RANKS

(By R. H. Markham)

The demotion and arrest of Traicho Kostov, long one of the most important Communist leaders in Bulgaria, is an event of considerable political importance. It reflects profound Bulgarian dissatisfaction with the Communist regime and with onerous Russian domination.

The authenticity of the event seems to be proved beyond doubt, since it was reported in the official Sofia Communist paper, and announced by the official Communist news agency.

The decision by Bulgarian Communist leaders to debase and fire such a powerful Bolshevik comrade—the term "Bolshevik" is now preferred by Bulgarian Communists—could not have been taken lightly.

Mr. Kostov was a revolutionist of unusual worth and standing in the Communist world. He was a virtual economic dictator, Deputy Premier, member of the supreme Communist governing body, the Politburo, and occasionally served as Acting Premier. He was considered the party's leading practical economic expert, at a time when such a person was direly needed.

MILITANT LEADER

His record during the great hours of Bulgarian communism was exemplary. He became militant Communist youth leader at the age of 23, participated in Bulgaria's first serious Communist revolution at the age of 26, spent long years in prison, was once condemned to life imprisonment, studied world revolution in Moscow, preferred to do dangerous underground work in Bulgaria rather than sit in exile, and played a leading role in events that gave Bulgarian Communists absolute power after the overturn of September 9, 1944.

Why was such an experienced, tireless, devoted Communist purged?

Marshal Tito's press agents report, on the basis of the findings of alert Yugoslav spies in Bulgaria, that Bulgarian Communist leaders are being arrested on a large scale. Although Belgrade is always prone to exaggerate in appraising Bulgarian developments, Marshal Tito's men have shown them-

selves well informed regarding the actions of their Bulgarian comrades.

OPPRESSION SEEN

It appears that Russian oppression of the Bulgarian nation had become so onerous that even Mr. Kostov couldn't ignore it. The Bulgarian economic and social machine was faltering. Five-year planning, so dear to Communists, was being stalled. The economic expert openly advised that the social, political, and economic pressure be slackened and that Russia relax in its draining off of Bulgarian wealth. Therefore, his comrades purged him for opposing Russia and the great George Dimitrov (Bulgarian dictator).

Evidence of widespread Bulgarian resistance abounds. The Bulgarian Communist press and radio stations have been shouting, "Peasants, sow more grain." The peasants were far behind in sowing and prospects for food to feed the proletariat seemed terrifying.

Such a situation in Bulgaria in April is almost beyond belief. Bulgaria is southeastern Europe's best-tended peasant land. The Bulgarian peasant is proverbially a good gardener and tiller of the soil.

HARD WORKER

He has not been a serf for centuries. He owned his own land. He turned his valleys and plains into a succession of parklike gardens and little fields. No one had to tell a Bulgarian peasant to work; on the contrary, others were told to "work like a Bulgarian." But now he doesn't sow his precious fields.

On March 28 the Sofia Communist daily wrote: "The Ministerial Council is alarmed. The sowing season is nearing its end. We are way behind."

The day before the Communist press was filled with threats and coaxing. There was to be wonderful production, the papers said. Peasants were to be marvelously rewarded; but now let them sow "according to the Soviet example."

The same day the Minister of Agriculture ordered the People's Councils, the Fatherland Front, youth societies, and women's associations to prod the peasants into sowing. He declared: "It is disgraceful that tractor drivers do not start working till 10 a. m. Kolkhoz workers do worst of all, setting bad examples."

APPEALS ISSUED

Appeal after appeal was issued for everybody to become a "shock worker" and outdo his neighbor. The villagers were told they must sow at night, must toil night and day. All "activists" were instructed to get busy. Young activists, who had spent their time in party clubs studying propaganda and reading about Leninism-Stalinism, were set running from house to house to make their "tatkos" (papas) go out and sow.

The Government commanded: "Work every available hour. Bring the nation under mobilization."

For a millennium Bulgarian peasants with their gray oxen had been arising at 5 a. m. to plow and sow, but now with Communist tractors work started at 10.

Why? Because a minority party had seized the country and was skimming off the cream. More than 3 years a large Russian Army had stripped the land before the eyes of the people. Thousands of Russian civilians still remain in privileged positions.

LESS FOOD

The Bulgarian people, amid a plethora of rosy promises, have less food, more ragged clothes, more meager supplies of fuel than for decades.

Expressions of enmity toward Russia resulted. Grandpa Ivan was called oppressor, not liberator. Economic and political advance bogged down. Some Communists, including Mr. Kostov, sensed all this and urged a lightening of burdens. Moscow opposed, Dictator Dimitrov obeyed Moscow and Economic Dictator Kostov was purged.

The long-silent Bulgarian peasants in homespun clothes, wearing sheepskin caps and pigskin moccasins, and using handmade hoes are making their silence heard.

Giving the Pact Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, published in Manchester, N. H., under date of April 7, 1949, entitled "Giving the Pact Teeth":

GIVING THE PACT TEETH

It has been correctly said that signing the Atlantic Pact is only a beginning. The pact constitutes a pledge by the Atlantic nations to stand together in a mutual defense against aggression.

This pledge is important, but only if its implications are followed through by practical implementation:

1. The pact must be supported by mutual steps toward a reasonable rearmament.

2. It will demand a greater unity of purpose and a stronger spirit of cooperation among the nations of western Europe than has yet appeared.

The policy toward Germany may also prove the greatest test the pact will have to face. Germany is generally recognized as the key to western Europe's economic recovery. It is the key to its military defense. What happens in Germany will set the stage for successful resistance to Soviet aggression or eventual defeat.

If Germany remains an area of unrest and uncertainty, the stability of all western Europe must be affected. Therefore the foreign ministers of Britain, France, and the United States have done well to follow their signing of the Atlantic Pact with a search for a solution of the German problem.

Western Germany has made much progress economically. Production has been stepped up and food shortages have been relieved. But the constitutional convention at Bonn, called to create a democratic West German state, has bogged down. Cynicism and the old unwholesome German nationalism is again spreading. The Russians are playing their propaganda hard of a united Germany and it is winning some willing listeners. The western Germans do not want communism, but neither do they want frustration, conflict, and division.

Most of this situation hinges on the incoherence of western policy. Britain and the United States are at odds over the dismantling of German industry. Britain wants the German industrial capacity held low for selfish reasons. Britain wants a strong centralized government in western Germany, while France wants a loose federation of sovereign German states.

These differences should be ironed out and an agreement reached on a sensible, coherent policy. Above all, the time has come to throw away prejudice and meet the German problem in a realistic way. Effective restraint on a rebirth of German militarism is obviously imperative to the peace of mind of Germany's neighbors, but this should not obscure the fact that the rebuilding of western Germany as a free, stable country, and its integration with western Europe is essential to the security and prosperity of the West. Moreover, the hope of unification of Germany—East and West—must never be lost sight of.

Germany stands at the crossroads between Russia and the West, and what happens there can cancel out much of the efficiency of the Atlantic Pact.

Is Communism in China Different?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a recent radio broadcast by Jack Beall, distinguished reporter and commentator. It is the eightieth in his series of informative broadcasts on communism. How much longer must the world wait in jeopardy before those in our State Department, who make far-eastern policy, wake up to the true nature of communism in China, as General Marshall and Secretary Acheson belatedly woke up 2 years ago to the nature of communism in Europe?

Good evening. This week, eight nations have published a historic document—the Atlantic Pact—the treaty which they propose to sign. It is, in effect, a statement of solidarity against the inroads of communism in western Europe and on the North American Continent. It does not declare war on communism, because it is a defensive pact—it doesn't come into operation until one or more of the countries signing it, has been attacked in a major way by some aggressor. That potential aggressor, while not named—is nevertheless known by everybody to be Soviet Russia. We are not declaring war on Soviet Russia, through this alliance. But we are banding together to tell Soviet Russia that it will have a large fight on its hands if it goes any farther. We have, in effect, drawn a line across Europe and told the Kremlin so far and no farther, at your peril.

But, while we are doing this in Europe, we have a highly negative attitude toward the encroachment of communism in the Far East, where it is in a far more advanced form. We do not uphold the hands of the anti-Communists there. We positively do things which hurt them. The attitude of our State Department seems to be that the great potential enemy of the United States is not Soviet Russia, but Chiang Kai-shek. From various reports, notably a story in the current Newsweek magazine, it seems the State Department is behind a move to cut off the last refuge of Chiang Kai-shek and destroy the last bastion of Chinese anticommunism—the Island of Formosa. It was there that Chiang expected to go, or the Chinese Nationalist Government expected to go, in the last extremity. Great quantities of records, personal belongings of high officials and much of the remaining gold supply of the government were shipped there. The governor's palace was being prepared to receive Chiang. Now, all such preparations have been suspended. And the unanimous opinion of the foreign colony in the capital of Formosa is that the State Department had stopped it. I don't know what other high policy may have got in the way, but, it looks, from the outside, very much as if the covert little crowd in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, who have done so much to

help the Communists, to beat down Chiang Kai-shek and to defeat the fundamental interests of the United States Government, vis-a-vis communism, had gotten in its deadly work again.

As to the relative importance of the Asian Continent and the European Continent, I don't pretend to know which is really more vital to us. It would be hard for anybody to pick the more vital. Both are highly important. I shall show a little later that the Communists themselves think that Asia is more important to them, for purposes of subduing their arch enemy—America. But, it seems very strange that when we have this openly avowed policy in Europe, of opposing communism, we have only a "wait and see" policy in China. Secretary Acheson was up on the Hill, only this week, and told the so-called watchdog committee that the United States is waiting for the dust to settle, in the Chinese situation. The only trouble with that is that when the dust does settle, everything else will have been settled, too, and China will become a Communist satellite nation.

It is also reported, from among those on the watchdog committee that the State Department does not now have any objection to the granting of funds to China—a thing which many Members of Congress have been pressing for, while the State Department has been heretofore holding back, waiting for the dust to settle. The new approach is that there is no objection to the granting of funds—but there must be no strings on it, so far as the Nationalist Government is concerned. The inference there is that a succeeding government—very possibly a Communist government in China, would fall heir to whatever the United States granted. I don't think for a moment that Congress would want, or intend, that a Communist government anywhere would fall heir to its funds. But what else is to be supposed of this reported State Department attitude that there be no strings on it as earmarked for the Nationalist Government?

It all smacks too much of the bill of goods which was sold the State Department, back during the war and shortly thereafter—the general Communist line that a coalition government—of Communists with the Kuomintang—should rule China. That line certainly was not the line we proposed to follow in Europe.

And it is rather disconcerting to find that on June 19, 1946, the general press quotes Dean Acheson—then Under Secretary of State, as saying that the United States had agreed to train and supply Chinese Communist troops as a preliminary to incorporating them into a nonpolitical Chinese Nationalist Army. Now, it's impossible for me to believe that anybody who formulated this concept, or passed it, or anybody who talks in those terms has much understanding of the nature of communism. There couldn't be any nonpolitical incorporation of the Chinese Reds into the Chinese Nationalist Army. The concept is as impossible as a political coalition—and the State Department acknowledged this later, concerning Europe.

This was all some months after the Kremlin had shifted its line of cooperating with the west, as during the war, and had decreed "cold war" with the west. In 1945, Mao Tse-tung, the leader of communism in China, had openly declared himself with Russia and against the United States, telling the Chinese Communists that coalition government was a temporary expedient, and one that would lead to the destruction of Chiang Kai-shek and American imperialism.

I want to quote now from a very important article, which I hope you will all read, in Collier's—the issue for March 19. It is by Louis Budenz, the former Communist editor of the Daily Worker, who finally foreswore communism and has been a most valuable source in telling what went on while he was among the inner circle. I think I will avail myself of that publication's permission to quote a limited amount of the article which was well documented before publication. Here is the way it starts:

"The Communist conquest of China, now dangerously near completion, long has been planned as a major milestone in Moscow's road toward creation of a Soviet America. Japan and Korea are next on the schedule, then Indonesia and the Philippines. Once in control of the western Pacific vast manpower and vital rubber, tin and oil resources, Russia hopes to be ready for the final showdown with the United States.

"That is the blueprint, at least, of Soviet world conquest. It has been known to United States Communists since 1927, the year Earl Browder was sent to China to plant seeds of anti-Americanism there. Since 1927 every American Communist has been inculcated with the Soviet tenet that China is the master key to a Red White House." Budenz continues:

"During my 10 years as a Communist editor and party worker, no other indoctrination program was more important. Numerous United States Red leaders stated their belief that China's 463,000,000 people would be the decisive factor in Sovietizing the United States. At a 1940 educational meeting of Daily Worker staff members, William Z. Foster, now the party's national chairman, stressed China's role in America's future.

" 'China's millions,' he said, 'will be a great aid to the Soviet Union in helping the American proletariat establish a Soviet America.' Continuing, he pointed out that China was also the key to Korea, Japan, and the Philippines. * * *

"The tremendous potential of China's manpower and materials dominated many discussions at United States Communist Party headquarters while I was editor of the Daily Worker. Conferences with secret conspirators, spy and saboteur agents like J. V. Peters and the late Jacob Golos always traced the route Asiatic operations would follow: China first, followed by Japan, Korea, and the Philippines, and then Alaska and Hawaii."

I might say that some very effective preparation for the coming of communism to Hawaii has recently been going forward in those islands. From all I can gather, the Harry Bridges-CIO organization is in pretty much complete control out there.

Mr. Budenz gives some very interesting light on just how the American people and the State Department were sold the line that the Chinese Communists were not real Moscow Communists but were simply "agrarian reformers," and remember that this comes from someone who was there, who sat in on the meetings, who helped to plan the campaign. It began, he says, in 1937, when Earl Browder called a meeting at Communist Party headquarters in New York. Ten United States Communist leaders were there. Browder announced to them that he had received word that "the followers of Mao Tse-tung have to be presented in a new dress." Then and there it was planned to further the "agrarian reformist" line. It was decided to plant the idea in the legitimate far eastern organizations. Frederick Vanderbilt Field, whom Budenz describes as a "millionaire and dilettante left-winger," emphasized use of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which is not a Communist organization, although its most influential committees and publications have been infiltrated by Communists and their sympathizers. Frederick Vanderbilt Field got to be secretary of its American council. The idea of "agrarian reformers" took root in such organizations and such publications and spread to certain policy-making circles in the State Department and then gained headway in the general American press. But the chief success the Communists had was in planting articles in American journals of special interest on the Orient, such as Far Eastern Survey, Pacific Affairs, and the renowned Amerasia. This latter magazine faithfully followed the Communist Party line and figured in the first case of State Department secret documents being abstracted. There wasn't very much of a splash, as compared to the Hiss case, but the publisher, Philip Jaffee, received a fine. Budenz recounts, in this article, that, after paying the fine, Jaffee threw a party that night for his codefendants and members of the staff of the Daily Worker, and he says, "Toasts were drunk that night to 'the coming victory of communism in China and the defeat of American imperialism'."

Budenz says he discovered that the main objective of Amerasia was the establishment of State Department contacts which could prove helpful in stopping aid to Chiang Kai-shek.

These magazines I have named were widely read in the State Department and there came to be a group, with Communist core, which existed in the State Department that used the arguments and the articles in these magazines with telling effect in selling the higher echelons of the Department on the Mao Tse-tung status, as a mere agrarian reformer.

I think probably the best way in which that idea can be disabused is to quote from Mao, himself. He finally threw off the mask, after it was no longer useful and, in a broadcast, proclaimed his absolute solidarity with Stalin in the world-revolutionary united front headed by the Soviet Union. He said that any idea of a middle road or third road between capitalism and communism is utter hypocrisy and total bankruptcy.

Mao has certainly followed every twist and turn of the Communist Party line, in his actions, as well as in his words. He has been held up as a patriot—a man who would place the interest of China above the interest of any other nation, when the show-down came. But there is at least one strange discrepancy here. How can it be explained, if he was such a patriot and not following some higher line of policy, laid down by interests other than the interests of his own country, that he allowed 10 Japanese divisions to move through Communist-held territory, without meeting any show of resistance? And yet this happened and it cannot be satisfactorily explained away. The 10 Japanese divisions were allowed to come down from Manchuria, to the central China front, in 1944, and it was this Japanese force which eventually cut through to east China and overran Gen. Claire Chennault's Air Force bases. Apparently General Mao was more interested in Japan chewing up some of Chiang's divisions than in keeping the Japanese out.

But the concept of agrarian reformer, carefully and deliberately planned by the Communists, was attached to Mao and was sold to this country and it had important effects on our policy. I begin to suspect that two new concepts have the same parentage: first, the idea that it is too late to do anything about China, and second, the idea which you hear more and more that it won't amount to anything, anyway, if the Soviets do take over China because Mao is such a good Chinese patriot. And besides, the Chinese are such individualists that Russia will have more than it can handle in China.

I wonder how it can be argued that individualism can defeat this great collectivism when whole nations and world organizations have not been able to stand up against it?

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Why Democracy Works—Prize-Winning Essay by Miss Isabel Bern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Why Democracy Works," by Miss Isabel Bern. The essay, which won the prize in a contest held by the Elks, was printed in full in the April 4, 1949, edition of the Anderson, S. C., Independent.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DEMOCRACY WORKS

(Prize-winning essay in Elks contest, written by Miss Isabel Bern)

Democracy. A word cherished and dear to the hearts and minds of freedom-loving people all over the world. Democracy. A way of life, a free way, which has a government to insure equal rights and liberties for all.

What is the true meaning of democracy? The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle defined it as "polity or constitutional government," "the rule of the majority of the free and equal citizens as opposed to monarchy and aristocracy"; but it is even more than this. Since it is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," its basic principles enhance the welfare of the people whom it serves and provides for them a larger way of life. The main principles which it sets forth are (1) the value of individual worth and dignity is held as sacred, (2) open and orderly justice is given to all, (3) the five freedoms are granted to everyone, (4) the powers of the government are gotten only from the consent of those who are governed, and (5) the people are to be uplifted through education. In such a form of government the individual is truly able to enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

What makes this ideal form of government work? It works because it recognizes its weaknesses and strives to correct them. Constructive criticism of the government definitely helps democracy to work and to better the conditions of its people.

Democracy works because of the will of the people for it to work. Every individual is born with a desire for freedom and liberty, the kind which can be had only in a democratic form of government. All of us who are fortunate enough to live in a democracy love our form of government. We love it because of the privileges we enjoy; the opportunity to live and work and better ourselves, the right to develop our personality and broaden our field of service. We love it because it is true. Democracy is indeed true to the people it serves, and true to itself in upholding the respect of our Nation in the eyes of the world. The main principle on which democracy is founded is truth, which is righteousness, sincerity, and a real representation of fact. It has been said that "Truth crushed to the earth will rise again." Since democracy is based on truth, it shall always rise again and flourish as the right way of life, so long as the peoples of the earth seek that which is good and noble.

Democracy works because of the feeling of brotherhood in men. Every person should have a feeling of good will and love toward each other. When all men have this feeling, they will be as their brother's keeper and will do kind things for them rather than any evil. Men who have this feeling will enjoy some of the world's greatest gifts, such as friendship, tolerance, compassion, good will, truth, and peace.

The reasons why democracy works may be summarized by saying: Democracy works because its firm foundation is truth, its strong walls are brotherly love, and its lofty roof is the will of the people for freedom, equality, and justice. An altogether strongly built government must be formed to work in accordance with the will of God. We believe democracy does this better than any other form of government; and therefore, it works more effectively than others do. We all hope it will continue to spread and flourish in our country and in others with the help of God.

Veterans' Pensions—Letter From S. Fred Olsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, sometimes we are led to believe that every veteran feels his Government owes him something in a material way. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD some observations from a veteran in Seattle who seeks only an opportunity to make something of himself. I have long been of the opinion that Mr. Olsen's views are shared, in whole or in part, by tens of thousands of veterans everywhere.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 19, 1949.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I don't want a pension.

No, Mr. CAIN, I am not interested in a veteran's pension when I reach the age of 65. Here are a few of the reasons why:

1. At no time during my 5 years' service did I expect the Government to subsidize me in old age for the few brief years spent in defending my country and our way of life.

2. At no time during those 5 years did I hear any talk among either enlisted men or officers about a pension. I firmly believe it was everyone's desire to win the war and then go home with the knowledge that the United States was still a free country where every man could plan his own way of life without interference.

3. Today, it is obvious that a few people in Congress wish to plan our future for us. This is just plain socialism—and the sad part is that they are promoting this pension for vote-getting purposes alone. This plan is certainly not one conceived by a real veteran of World War II.

4. It is obvious that the recipients of this pension are veterans of World War I. When are those people going to quit patting themselves on the back for their great sacrifice 30 years ago? I am not willing to pay the taxes necessary to pay off those people.

5. It is as clear as crystal that a pension plan involving expenditure up to $8,000,000,000 a year—then continuing year after year—is liable to be the straw to break our back.

6. As a taxpayer, I am not willing to bear this expense for 35 years more (when I will be 65). I prefer to plan my own retirement program—in my own way—and in any manner I choose.

7. The Government brokerage fee in a plan like this would be tremendous. Another bureau with thousands of new employees to administer the plan. Which way are we headed, Mr. CAIN? I want to see this fantastic maze of Government bureaus, divisions, departments, administrations, etc., etc., cut down—not increased.

8. The real veterans of this last war did not come home. Thousands of other veterans were disabled and occupy hospitals throughout the Nation. These are the people I want to see helped in every way possible. And we do have the Veterans' Administration for that purpose.

9. But why give a pension to everyone who participated in World War I or II? A good percentage never left the shores of the United States—are they entitled to a pension? I say "No."

10. Finally, I don't believe the real veterans want this program.

I respectfully, yet strongly urge you to do everything you can to prevent this legislation from being passed.

Very truly yours,

S. FRED OLSEN.

Top-Level Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Top-Level Salaries," published in the Washington Post of April 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 11, 1949]

TOP-LEVEL SALARIES

Under a bill which is expected to come before the Senate this week, the salaries of Cabinet members would be raised to $25,000, while other top executives and administrators would be put in three groups with salaries of $20,000, $18,000, and $16,000, respectively. By comparison with the salaries paid in comparable private employment, the proposed scale of payments is still very modest. The Federal Government cannot, for obvious reasons, attempt to compete with private industry for the services of qualified executives and professional men. Efficiency demands, however, a scale of salaries that, as the Senate Civil Service Committee says, will not subject competent officials and their families "to economic sacrifices so great as to outweigh the nonsalary incentives and advantages of the Government service."

At present the salaries paid high-ranking Government employees obviously do not meet this simple test of adequacy. That is proved by the reluctance of able men who lack independent sources of income to enter the Government service and by the exodus from Government employment of capable officials. The loss of trained and experienced men comes, too, at a time when the duties and responsibilities of the executive heads of

Government agencies are becoming increasingly difficult and men of exceptional ability are needed to insure efficient management.

While some changes in the proposed salary grouping seem desirable, the salary increase bill as a whole is a careful, well-balanced measure that, if enacted, would be of tremendous value. The cost would be slight; only 250 officials are covered by the Senate bill, and the salary increases amount to less than $1,400,000. That outlay would be recovered many times by the gains resulting from the increase in efficiency and improved morale.

Apart from salary increases, the bill also undertakes to adjust salaries on a rational basis, with regard for the nature of the duties and responsibilities of officials. At present some of the most exacting and responsible positions in Government service have a lower salary rating than others of much less importance. The salary scale is, in fact, erratic and illogical, due largely to the practice of creating new positions carrying salaries that Congress fixed with slight regard for the prevailing rates of pay for comparable existing positions. This lack of standardization has a bad effect on morale and has been one of the reasons why good men have left the Government service for private employment.

This bill is, as the Senate committee states, only a start toward a comprehensive revision of the Government's whole salary structure. But general revision is a much more complicated and time-consuming undertaking. Top-ranking Government employees have been denied the advantages of pay roll increase given their subordinates with the result that the gap between the salaries of high-ranking officials and lesser Government employees has been steadily narrowed and in some cases has disappeared. There is no reason for further delay in dealing with this neglected aspect of the salary problem. Indeed, haste is essential to arrest the deterioration in efficiency caused by the retirement to private life of public officials who are disheartened and disgusted by the failure of the Government to provide reasonable salary increases that would to some extent offset the pressure of high living costs.

The Military Problem in the Pacific—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand two articles, recently published, which present different aspects of the same problem. The first of these is an editorial which appeared in this week's issue of Life magazine, and which is entitled "Pacific Retreat—Military Planners Are About To Let Down the United States and Asia."

The second of these articles, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on Sunday, April 3, carries the byline of Mr. Constantine Brown, one of our best informed writers on international affairs, and has the headline "United States neglecting to protect Pacific interests."

Both of these articles are cogent, coherent, and timely; and I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC RETREAT—MILITARY PLANNERS ARE ABOUT TO LET DOWN THE UNITED STATES AND ASIA

In its issue of February 28 Life had some sharp things to say about Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall and his nitwitted inferences in Tokyo that the United States was preparing to pull out of the western Pacific in time of trouble there. We must now apologize to Secretary Royall: he was all too right. The United States military, with the consent and knowledge of the State Department, has indeed decided to write off China as a total loss: to maintain the present United States position in Japan as long as it is cheap and convenient but not to invest any further men, money or effort in strengthening our fringe positions off the coast of Asia, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur so strongly recommended to Washington 3 months ago (Life, December 20).

Our planners have gone much further: they are instructing the armed services to regard the United States west coast as the basic defense frontier in the event of war in or affecting the Pacific, which means that the Philippines and hard-won Okinawa, as well as Japan, are now to lie beyond the area of primary United States concern and effort. The Marianas and the Aleutians are given a higher rating and with luck may be held, but anything beyond their line is to be considered expendable. This ugly little cat was popped from the military bag by an alert Associated Press correspondent in Pearl Harbor. His dispatch reporting naval plans to reduce emphasis upon the far Pacific and to look backward toward the United States west coast was not denied, and Life has reason to believe that it reflects the thinking of military Washington. The excuse for this line of reasoning is that China is lost anyhow, that the Russians lack the resources and the will to make it a new center of Soviet strength in the immediate future and that the main United States effort must be concentrated in Europe. Besides, the planners reason, land-minded Russia can't advance across the wide Pacific in any case. Viewing the Pacific as a purely military problem, this reasoning may make a modicum of sense. But there are no purely military problems in the world of 1949, as any general or admiral worthy of his rank should know by now at this late date in history.

This news doubtless comes as a shock to those who, agreeing or resigned to the write-off of China, have assumed that things still would not be too bad if we maintained strong positions in Japan, Okinawa, and the whole ring of peripheral Pacific bases. Indeed it has been argued that one justification for "facing the facts" in China is that after all there is still Japan. The decision recently taken in Washington does not of course mean immediate or outright withdrawal from the Pacific periphery; but, until further notice, it does mean that the United States will not commit any important part of its strength to preparatory defense of the far Pacific.

There can be no quarrel with a decision to create the strongest possible United States position in western Europe. But the assumption that this decision requires an abandonment of so much of the Pacific and of Asia is false and foolish. Secretary of State Acheson, who had a wonderful opportunity before him to carve out a distinctive Asiatic policy of his own, has feebly bowed out. His policy in China, he has recently said, is to wait and do nothing "until the dust settles." It will be a long and fateful time before the dust settles over a Pacific world abandoned without a murmur to Moscow and to communism. We cannot believe that this decision will stand; our necessities and our times will not allow it. But that it should be entertained even for a moment is a grave reflection upon the men and agencies who are responsible for the peace and survival of the west.

UNITED STATES NEGLECTING TO PROTECT PACIFIC INTERESTS—ATLANTIC FACT PROVIDES FOR NO RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE FROM EUROPEAN NATIONS TO SUPPORT US IN THE FAR EAST

(By Constantine Brown)

The foreign ministers of the Atlantic Pact nations are now gathered in Washington to sign the document which, for the first time in history, will bind the United States to Europe and will compel us to support the free European nations with all our resources in the event of aggression against them.

Although the U. S. S. R. is not specifically mentioned in the document which creates this new coalition, the alliance is aimed to deter Russia from further encroachments against nations outside the iron curtain in western and northern Europe.

The creation of this coalition is regarded as the last diplomatic effort of the free nations to put an end to Russia's aggrandizement in the west. It is a warning to the Kremlin that henceforth its military actions will be answered in kind.

However, while we focus our attention on the free countries on the other side of the Atlantic, we are once more neglecting the vast American interest on the other side of the Pacific, where Russia has made tremendous strides in areas where 1,350,000,000 persons live and where vital basic raw materials are produced in vast quantities.

While we pledge our unlimited assistance to western Europe—and to a lesser degree to the countries of the eastern Mediterranean—none of them is required to support us in the Far East. Europe and particularly western Europe is the cradle of American culture. All of us are descendants of European ancestors. Hence it is understandable that emotionally Europe should play a great role in the formulation of our policies.

FAR EAST GLOSSED OVER

But in doing this we have not attempted to obtain even the limited assistance which our allies might be able to afford us in the struggle in the Far East, which is being glossed over by our policy makers. Russia has been acting in a spectacular manner in Europe; but she has been far more efficient in her policy of aggrandizement in the Far East.

Russia has taken from under our noses the most important parts of China and northern Korea, while in India, Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, and Malaya she has made rapid strides. The men in the Kremlin are probably more acutely aware than we are of the importance to our national defense of the raw materials which lie in those countries. And she intends to create a situation which will prevent us from having access to those materials, even if she does not directly control all of Asia.

Soviet activities in China have been misunderstood by the American people. The optimism displayed by so many officials in the Government is entirely out of place. These men erroneously contend that Russia "cannot possibly digest nearly 500,000,000 Chinese and will have her hands full for generations to come."

The Kremlin evidently has no intention of controlling a centralized China. Its Far Eastern experts, who are far better informed and more realistic than their opposite numbers in our State Department, realize that it is impossible to organize and control that

vast country, regardless of how harsh and ruthless Soviet methods may be.

Moreover, the Kremlin does not wish to repeat the mistakes it made in Yugoslavia, where an able and unscrupulous dictator—Marshal Tito, whom Moscow trusted because of his long service in the Soviet secret police—became a rebel. If Yugoslavia had been divided into its component parts with a puppet at the head of each, Tito would never have succeeded in his ambitions.

That is the reason why Mao Tze-tung, who at one time was considered Moscow's principal stooge in China, now has become a secondary figure, whose role will be confined soon to heading a certain part of China. Mao already has been dislodged from Manchuria, where the Soviets' top man now is Li Li-san.

The armies under Mao's control now are operating in other areas, while a newly trained Chinese Communist Army, supervised by Russian commissars and other officials, now is in possession of that strategically and economically vital area which Russia intends to convert into a Russian province on the pattern of Outer Mongolia.

NEW COMMUNIST ARMY

The actual plans of the Soviet Government in the Far East were set forth last fall at a joint conference of the East Asian Affairs Council of the Communist International held at Harbin, Manchuria.

Alexander Leskiv, the secretary of the organization, and Gen. Ivan Lokotikov, Russia's commander in northern Korea, were alternately in the chair. Those present included Mao's rival, Li Li-san, representing the Chinese Communists. General Lokotikov told the conferees in part:

"The reactionaries in the world are focusing attention upon us right now. They might consider that we are advancing in big strides in eastern Europe and Germany to an extent that we may make war against the capitalistic imperialists of Great Britain, the United States of America, and France.

"I hope that our comrades will keep a clear understanding of these developments. I wish to say that the essential point of the present world revolution is still being focused on east Asia. We have already built a firm foundation in Europe, and we are in full grasp of the power to make peace or war at our own will.

"We are employing temporarily political offensives to distract the attention of those capitalistic countries like Great Britain and the United States. While in east Asia if all our comrades would put to proper utilization the 1,000,000,000 people and the resources of the continent of east Asia, we could gradually capture the Pacific Ocean and expand westward to the Mediterranean Sea. When that time comes, it will be the most suitable occasion for us to launch military operations in Europe."

We are already feeling an oil shortage. The resources of the American continents are sufficient under existing conditions. But as time goes on we shall have to depend more and more on oil from other sources.

Soviet policies in Iran are aimed not so much at the Tehran government itself as at the oil resources of that country.

At the same time the activities of Moscow's agents in Burma, Indonesia, and Borneo are intended to create a situation in which we shall be denied access to those still almost unlimited oil fields, which in war or peace can provide the world with large quantities of the fluid gold.

CAN ISOLATE SUPPLIES

Deposits of tin, antimony, bauxite, and many other minerals which have never been fully extracted from the soil of the vast Pacific and Indian Ocean areas, and which are so vitally important to our peacetime as well as wartime industries, also can be denied to us in the event that the present do-nothing policy continues in the west.

Most political and military observers in Washington seem to think in terms of whether the U. S. S. R. will attack us from the Pacific, and are attempting to solve the problem in those terms. But few among our top policymakers seem to pay attention to the fact that without any physical aggression the U. S. S. R. can weaken our defense to a dangerous extent, merely by creating conditions which will shut us off from Far East supplies.

Ever since the U. S. S. R. became our associate in World War II we let her have the initiative in the political field. We pride ourselves that with the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, and now the Atlantic Pact we have taken the initiative from the men in the Kremlin. This is not correct, however. By the cold war the Russians have succeeded in focusing our attention exclusively on Europe, which they themselves consider only a shell.

NEED ANOTHER PACT

The Atlantic Pact unquestionably is an important political step and conceivably may give the Russian rulers some food for thought. The rearming of Europe for defense is an even more important move because without it the Atlantic Pact is only an expression of good intentions and nothing else.

However, some pact or agreement to ward off, with every means at the Allies' disposal, Soviet encroachments in the Pacific and Indian Ocean areas is a must which our policymakers seem to have overlooked. The British, French, and Netherlands Governments are unwilling to discuss the matter publicly, lest they be accused of old-fashioned imperialism.

The American Government is neglecting—to put it mildly—the situation in that area for fear of the criticism by the liberal element that we are imperialistic-minded. In fact, however, this Government should realize that no Russian aggression can actually be defeated unless we thwart the Kremlin's effort to exclude us from the Eastern Hemisphere.

The North Atlantic Security Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to the Hangman," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 6, 1949]

INVITATION TO THE HANGMAN

The American Secretary of State and the foreign minister of the 11 western European nations who on Monday signed the North Atlantic Military Pact have denied Russia's assertion that the alliance is an aggressive move against the Soviet Union. They can say that the pact is defensive, but the Russians don't have to agree.

Some illuminating remarks on this subject were made in a recent address before the Iowa Press Association by Owen Cunningham, an American lawyer who appeared as counsel in the Tokyo trial for a Japanese diplomat who was sentenced to life imprisonment. Speaking of the trial in relation to present-day problems, Cunningham said:

"Weeks of time were consumed during the trial to prove that Germany, Italy, and Japan sought through a military pact to oppose any European aggressor who might attack them. The present Atlantic Defense Pact is almost identical with the pact proposed between Germany, Japan, and Italy. When Germany, Italy, and Japan made such an agreement to curtail and frighten Russia by demonstrating solidarity, it was sinister. Now that we are making one, it is purely defensive. Can Russia not make the same claim against the European powers as the Allied powers made in the Tokyo trial against Japan?"

The answer to that is self-evident. Russia already has submitted the contention that the North Atlantic Pact is aggressive. We have denied it. If there is war, our position can be upheld only by military victory. If we should lose, Russia has already entered in the record a contrary view, and, by our own action in the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, we know what the consequences will be should Russia be in a position to enforce them in the light of these precedents.

Mr. Cunningham quite properly notes the parallel between the North Atlantic Pact and the German-Japanese agreement of November 25, 1936, to which Italy adhered a year later, commonly known as the anti-Comintern pact. The only difference is that the anti-Comintern pact was more frank in the statement of its intentions. The North Atlantic Pact is not directed against Russia by name, although there is no other nation against which it could be directed, and Secretary Acheson in his accompanying explanation did not dissimulate. The anti-Comintern pact, on the other hand, specifically named the Communist International, the international arm of Russian communism, as the force to be held in check.

It is stated that the German and Japanese Governments recognized that the aim of the Communist International, known as the Comintern, is to disintegrate and subdue existing states by all the means at its command. It stated that Germany and Japan were convinced that the toleration of interference by the Communist International in the internal affairs of the nations not only endangers their internal peace and social well being, but is also a menace to the peace of the world. It invited the adherence of other states, established a permanent committee to consult on countermeasures in the manner of the North Atlantic Pact, and provided for defensive measures necessary for the struggle against the subversive activities of the Communist International.

The purpose of containing Russia and of preventing the further spread of communism is the same as that which animates the Atlantic Pact. In association with Russia, at present a declared threat to the peace, and with France, Britain, Holland, and Canada, which in the Atlantic Pact join us in this view, we labored with infinite diligence at Tokyo to prove that the anti-Comintern pact was a criminal conspiracy to plan, prepare, initiate, and wage aggressive war. Now, when we assume the same role and same means as the defeated nations of World War II, in order to check Russia, we turn around and call our pact defensive.

The ceremony in Washington, when the pact was signed and this country assumed the mission to which Hitler dedicated himself in 1936, is one of the great ironies of history. We fight a world war to military

victory only in order to confess that our aims in that war and the peace aims with which we emerged from that war are identical with those of the man against whom all of America's resources were marshaled in order that he might be destroyed and his surviving associates hanged.

We can only hope that the outcome of the lunacy of national policy during the last 8 years will not validate the somber prophecy made by Mr. Cunningham: "The precedent we have set at Nuremberg and Tokyo, until it is repudiated, will come back to haunt us some day, if it has not already."

Moral Rearmament—Letter from H. Kenaston Twitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, all of us have heard of moral rearmament. Most of us are curious these days concerning its progress and success. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on this subject which I have received from H. Kenaston Twitchell in Germany. Mr. Twitchell is making a contribution to his time, and I think that his letter will be of substantial interest to all Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNTAIN HOUSE,
CAUX-SUR-MONTREUX,
March 19, 1949.

DEAR HARRY: The inside story of what has been happening in the Ruhr during these weeks is of such importance that I want to send it on to you at once. We have been able to put a hundred trained moral rearmament workers at the center of the war of ideas which is so intense in that valley. Using as a spearhead the Forgotten Factor, we have been in close touch with some 50,000 key men in labor and management who represent hundreds of thousands more. Theaters showing the Forgotten Factor at night have been packed out with hundreds standing and many more turned away. During the day our people have been addressing trades councils, union meetings and other industrial groups. They have been living and eating in the homes of the workers.

The great battle is for the mind of the workers who have been trained in the Marxist ideology. In many of the unions Communists number 30 to 40 percent. In many of these sessions the Communists have counterattacked vigorously after our presentation of an ideology that has a moral backbone and can make democracy work. These sessions have lasted sometimes 7 hours or more. But out of them has come a most significant change in the thinking and living of men who lead both workers and management today. Leading Communists are renouncing the class war and accepting a greater conception. Socialists are accepting for the first time that a change in human nature is fundamental to the good of society and that teamwork with management is possible.

August Schmidt, president of the Mineworkers of the Ruhr, has just said: "We leaders of the miners' executive understand the ideology of MRA. We have examined it thoroughly and we approve of it."

Last week end Heinrich Kost, chairman of the German Coal Board, gathered 190 of the chief industrialists of the Ruhr for an all-day meeting at Essen. Invited to attend was Hans Boeckler, head of the German trade-unions of 3,000,000 workers in the British zone. Industrial spokesmen from nine nations brought evidence of the way in which this ideology is gripping the mind of management and workers alike and enlisting both in the ideological advance which can out-live and out-think communism and bring to western Europe the flowering of a truly Christian civilization.

At this meeting one of the top industrialists of France said: "Management has so often been late by 1 hour, one idea, 1 franc. Unless we fight for the remaking of our civilization, we are not doing our job." Heinrich Kost stated: "We must get these ideas with all possible speed to our people in the Ruhr." And Boeckler, the workers' leader, summed up the day by saying: "This has been a great success. This is the way we must talk to management in the future."

At the invitation of Dr. Adenauer, chairman of the parliamentary conference at Bonn, which is framing the new western Germany constitution, we took the forgotten factor to that city. Delegates were invited to attend by Dr. Adenauer and by Dr. Carlo Schmid, his political opponent, who heads the Socialists at that conference. While there our workers found an immediate and deep response from the university students at Bonn, an indication of the hunger of German youth for an ideology to fill the void in their lives.

As a result of these developments the cabinet of North Rhine-Westphalia, the top leaders of management and the unions are working enthusiastically with us. There is, of course, intense opposition, but there is as well the possibility that the Marxist thinking which has historically dominated industry in western Europe may be lifted to a new conception.

The men who are under God creating these new developments have been trained at the MRA ideological training center at Caux-sur-Montreux, Switzerland. The spirit of Caux has become a byword in the cabinets and councils of many countries. It can bear the same relation to the training of men and of ideological weapons for democracy as the Comintern furnishes for communism.

I am writing at this time to bring you the news of these results. But above all I am writing in the hope that you may be able to come to Europe this year and see them and the men concerned in them at first hand. I cannot tell you how much the visits and personal contacts of American leaders mean to these men over here. They are facing enormous problems and always with the shadow of the iron curtain over their heads. I sincerely hope that you may be able to be with us at Caux, even if only for a few days as you did last summer.

Yours sincerely,

H. KENASTON TWITCHELL.

(Statement by Alfred Wimmelmann, general manager of the Harpener Coal Co., which employs 18,000 workers, and next week takes over another coal company with 9,000 workers.)

FEBRUARY 26, 1949.

Moral rearmament is the only way at the present time to create a new teamwork in industry because it enables each side to see each other in a completely different way. One of my shop stewards who is a Communist came to me after seeing The Good Road and said, "This has so shattered me I need a week to think it over."

This has created a completely new basis for all our negotiations; a new atmosphere has been created in which we have found many solutions over wages and prices. We gave holidays with pay without knowing where the money was coming from, but increased production has made up all the money that it cost.

We are now undergoing new negotiations concerning the workers' part in the control of industry. I am sure it is only possible to have these negotiations because we are beginning to apply MRA. Time and time again in our negotiations the spirit of Caux comes up, and there is no session of negotiations in the coal industry where we do not spend 2 hours afterwards, literally, discussing moral rearmament.

On this basis of applying moral rearmament, August Schmidt, president of the mineworkers, is our strongest support in these negotiations which affect the entire coal industry of the Ruhr. We shall soon have for the first time complete agreement between the management, the union, and the Ministry of Economics. This will revolutionize the coal industry of Germany and will affect also the other industries of Germany.

Ratification of North Atlantic Security Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Petition Asks Senate to Ratify Atlantic Treaty," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION ASKS SENATE TO RATIFY ATLANTIC TREATY—BACKERS SAY PACT SUPPLIES POLICE POWER LACKING IN UN TO GUARANTEE PEACE

A petition calling on the United States Senate to ratify the Atlantic pact as an instrument which remedies the United Nations' defect of having no police power is being circulated by the Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, for submission to President Truman and Congress. The committee announced yesterday that 114 signatures have already been obtained.

The petition says that the Atlantic pact conforms "in principle and intent" with United Nations mechanism and falls within the UN Charter provision for regional pacts.

"It forcefully demonstrates" the petition says, "the determination of the United States and associated nations, joined by a common faith in the dignity of the individual, the principle of democracy and the rule of law, to exercise their inherent right of self-defense against the threat or fact of aggression.

"One of the obvious weaknesses of the United Nations is the lack of a police force as authorized by the Charter to compel compliance with its decisions. This defect is remedied under the terms of the Atlantic Pact until the international organization is provided with its own gendarmerie. Whatever may be the cost of arming our associates against another war, it will be microscopically small in comparison with the vast sums that would have to be spent in prosecuting a war. The Atlantic Pact is not only the best insurance for the maintenance of peace but additionally offers the most promising assurance

of survival, if, in spite of everything, war should come."

Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh manufacturer, is chairman of the Committee on National Affairs. Arthur J. Goldsmith, of the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria Tower, Park Avenue and Fiftieth Street, is secretary. Among the signers of the petition, it was announced, are Barry Bingham, Margaret Culkin Banning, T. E. Braniff, Leo Cherne, the Reverend Edward A. Conway, Dr. George S. Counts, Charles Denby, Eddie Dowling, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, Christopher Emmet, Raymond S. Fanning, James A. Farley, John Farrar, Desmond FitzGerald, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, Mrs. William Henry Hays, Sidney Hook, Goodhue Livingston, Jr., Cord Meyer, Mrs. O. L. Mills, Edgar A. Mowrer, Lithgow Osborne, Robert P. Patterson, Joseph M. Proskauer, Philip D. Reed, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, Herbert Bayard Swope, Robert H. Thayer, Dwight D. Wiman, Matthew Woll and Wilson W. Wyatt.

Investigation of Accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on April 4 there appeared in the Washington (Pa.) Observer an editorial entitled "Warren Backs WILLIAMS." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 4, 1949]

WARREN BACKS WILLIAMS

Accusations of multimillion dollar shortages which Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, leveled against the Commodity Credit Corporation have now been supported in full in a report by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

These are the charges which Senator LUCAS, majority leader, described as pure politics and sought to keep from consideration by the Senate. If Mr. LUCAS is now of the same mind as before, he is shockingly indifferent to the need of elementary efficiency in the conduct of the Government.

The record, as Mr. Warren reveals it, is one of incredible carelessness in the distribution of the taxpayers' money, of a waste of fixed assets, and of clear favoritism in the award of contracts. They may not have been actual fraud but the invitation to fraud was always present.

In any event, says the Comptroller General, the accounting deficiencies encountered were so substantial and the inaccuracies so material that he cannot express any opinion whether the financial statements prepared by the Corporation present fairly its financial position.

Senator WILLIAMS is entitled to the utmost credit for bringing the sordid facts to light and the Senate owes it to the taxpayers to speedily adopt the Comptroller General's recommendation for a further investigation into the whole situation.

What Is the Matter with the Taft-Hartley Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, from time to time and particularly in recent days, some of my colleagues in the House have asked, "What, in specific terms, is the matter with the Taft-Hartley Act?" For example, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] recently inserted what was substantially an information-wanted advertisement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, asking for reasons why the Taft-Hartley Act is a bad law and should be repealed and replaced by the Wagner Act with certain amendments as provided in H. R. 2032.

I will give ten examples of ways in which the Taft-Hartley Act is loaded against unions—ten reasons why it is an unfair, unjust, and evil law that outrages the American sense of fair play:

First. An employer charge of unlawful sympathetic strike must be given priority treatment, regardless of the number of union unfair labor practice charges on the docket.

But a union charge, no matter how urgent or important, must await its turn in the tedious processes of the Taft-Hartley board.

Second. If union members strike during the term of the contract or before the expiration of a 60-day notice, in order to change the conditions of the contract, they may be fired summarily without right to reinstatement.

But if the employer locks out the union members for the same purpose or unilaterally breaches the contract he may only be charged with an unfair labor practice—and much, much later be told not to do it again.

Third. If the NLRB entertains a charge by an employer of unlawful sympathetic strike the board must seek an injunction.

But in no kind of unfair labor practice charge by a union is the NLRB required to seek an injunction.

Fourth. If the union participates in sympathetic strikes or boycotts which are unfair labor practices the employer also may sue the union for damages.

But there is no unfair labor practice on the part of the employer which also entitles the union to sue for damages.

Fifth. If, during a strike for a new contract, the employer hires scabs and petitions for an NLRB certification election strikers are not allowed to vote.

But all the scabs can vote.

Sixth. In every grievance, the employer has the right to press his interpretation of the contract.

But in grievances that may be taken up by individuals, the union has no say as to what the contract means.

Seventh. Unions must file full financial data in order to utilize the NLRB.

But employers need file no financial data in order to utilize the board.

Eighth. Union officers must reveal political beliefs and swear to political affidavits before their unions can utilize the board.

But employers may keep their political affiliations and opinions secret and still retain full access to the NLRB.

Ninth. Union cases are subject to periodic and continued delay while registration and affidavits are brought up to date annually when new financial reports are due.

Employers, however, are subject to no such delays.

Tenth. The law prevents union members from combating sweat-shop labor within their own industry by refusing to handle nonunion goods.

But the law does not prevent the employer from breaking down union standards in his union contracts by utilization of sweat-shop goods; dealing with sweat-shop employers.

Basing-Point System Exacts Toll From TVA—Members Asked To Consider Effects of Basing-Point Pricing on Small Business—Cement Trust Would Welcome Moratorium Nullifying Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the basing-point system as perfected by the cement industry exacted a heavy toll in the construction of the great Tennessee Valley projects. I desire at this time to call the attention of the Members of Congress to 18 different abstracts of bids for cement shipped to various destinations for use by the Tennessee Valley Authority. These bids were selected at random from a series of abstracts covering a period from December 1946 to April 1948. The bids are representative and definitely portray the pattern of all bids on cement prior to the Supreme Court decision on April 26, 1948.

The tables described above follow:

227 barrels of cement for Martin substation, f. o. b. cars, Martin, Tenn.

(Bids opened Dec. 24, 1946)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	$2.69	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	2.69	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp.	2.69	10	15

Awarded to Hermitage Portland Cement Co. by drawing between equally low bidders.

250 barrels of cement for Fort Loudoun project, f. o. b. Lenoir City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Jan. 14, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	$2.59	10	15
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.59	10	15

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. by drawing between equally low bidders.

500 barrels of cement for Watts Bar project, f. o. b. cars, Spring City, Tenn.

(Bids opened Feb. 3, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	$2.65	10	15
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	2.65	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.65	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.65	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.65	10	15

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. as the only bidder offering firm price.

1,000 barrels of cement for Cherokee project, f. o. b. cars, Jefferson City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Feb. 12, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	$2.59	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.59	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.59	Net	------

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. as the only bidder offering firm price.

280 barrels of cement for Cleveland substation, f. o. b. cars, Cleveland, Tenn.

(Bids opened March 12, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	$2.61	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.61	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.61	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.61	10	15

Awarded to Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

32,000 barrels of cement for Wheeler project, f. o. b. cars, Town Creek, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Apr. 9, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Alpha Portland Cement Co	$2.67	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Lehigh Portland Dement Co	2.67	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.67	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.67	10	15

Awarded to Penn-Dixie Cement Corp. by drawing between equally low bidders.

7,000 barrels of cement for Fort Loudoun project, f. o. b. cars, Lenoir City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Apr. 30, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Lone Star Cement Corp	$2.59	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.59	10	15
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.59	10	15

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

2,500 barrels of cement for Cherokee project, f. o. b. cars, Jefferson City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m. May 7, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	$2.60	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.60	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.60	10	15

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

1,000 barrels of cement for Fort Loudoun project, f. o. b. cars, Lenoir City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m. May 7, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	$2.60	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.60	10	15

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

1,000 barrels of cement for Watts Bar project, f. o. b. cars, Spring City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m. May 7, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	$2.60	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.60	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.60	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.60	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.60	10	15

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

1,500 barrels of air-entrained cement for Wilson project, f. o. b. Sheffield, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., May 20, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.67	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.67	Net	------
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.67	10	15
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.67	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15

Awarded to Hermitage Portland Cement Co. by drawing among equally low bidders.

12,000 barrels of cement for Chemical Engineering Division, f. o. b. cars, Sheffield, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m. June 25, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	$2.67	10	15
Alpha Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.67	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.67	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.67	10	15
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.67	10	15

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. because their bid was the most advantageous to the Authority.

330 barrels of cement for Watts Bar project, f. o. b. Spring City, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., July 9, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	$2.65	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.65	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.65	10	15
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2.65	10	15

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. because their bid was the most advantageous to the Authority.

500 barrels of cement for South Holston project, f. o. b. cars, Bristol, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Aug. 21, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	$2.76	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.76	10	15

Awarded to Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

12,000 barrels of cement for Wilson project, f. o. b. Sheffield, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Dec. 9, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	$2.82	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.82	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.82	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.82	10	15
Lone Star Cement Corp	2.82	10	15
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.82	10	15

Award made to Hermitage Portland Cement Co. by drawing between equally low bidders.

28,000 barrels of cement for Wheeler project, f. o. b. Town Creek, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Feb. 18, 1948)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Alpha Portland Cement Co	$2.95	10	15
Lone Star Cement Co	2.95	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.95	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.95	10	15
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.95	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.95	10	15

Award made to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. on proposal most advantageous to the Authority.

7,500 barrels of cement for Upper Holston project, f. o. b. cars, Elizabethton, Tenn.

(Bids opened 10 a. m., Mar. 18, 1948)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	$2.95	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.95	10	15
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	2.95	10	15

Awarded to Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division by drawing between equally low bidders.

8,000 barrels of cement for Air Entraining Chemical Engineering Division, f. o. b. Sheffield, Ala.

(Bids opened 10 a. m. Apr. 15, 1948)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms	
		Per barrel	Days
		Cents	
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	$2.95	10	15
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp	2.95	10	15
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division	2.95	10	15
Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.95	10	15
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2.95	10	15

Awarded to Lehigh Portland Cement Co. by drawing between equally low bidders.

BASING-POINT BIDS ON CEMENT INCLUDE PHANTOM FREIGHT CHARGES

Each and every abstract clearly indicates the collusive use of phantom freight charges propagated and perfected by the cement trust during the past several decades. It will be noted that each price bid to each destination is identical. Such bids are not made by chance but by the systematic use of the basing-point system of pricing. The basing-point system as practiced by the cement industry is useless without the unearned increment of phantom freight—phantom in the sense of having the appearance of freight charges but in truth, unreal and nonexistent. Phantom freight charges, however, by being included in the destination price become a real and heavy burden on the purchasers of cement, whether they are governmental agencies, dealers, contractors, or consumers.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ASKED TO CONSIDER EFFECT OF MORATORIUM BILLS S. 1008 AND H. R. 2222

It is not my purpose to criticize or to impugn the motives of the sponsors of these bills. To the contrary, I know that the distinguished gentlemen are actuated by the highest principles. They are my friends, and I respect and honor them, not only in friendship, but for their true and solid worth in the field of public affairs. They represent a great State and their convictions in respect to the moratorium are undoubtedly well-founded in the viewpoint they now hold.

My viewpoint is equally well-founded. Years of study on pricing problems and discriminatory pricing practices have convinced me that the basing-point system is a pricing instrument, which, in the hands of the cement, the steel, and other trusts, has sabotaged our antitrust laws. I am convinced we shall take a long step backward in our efforts to foster and preserve small business if the moratorium is allowed to become law. I earnestly appeal to the Members of this House to give some thought to the weakening effect on our antitrust laws, if by way of legislation we upset and nullify the very purpose for which Congress passed antitrust and price discrimination legislation. For 60 years or more we have endeavored to evolve a set of laws which would protect and aid the small-business institutions of our country. Let us not abandon them now.

Security and Freedom—Can We Have Both?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Third Annual International Student Conference was held on April 8 to 10 inclusive at Bard College, Annondale-on-the-Hudson, N. Y., on the subject of the dimensions of security. Student panels discussed economic, military, and individual security with representatives from 30 European, Asiatic, African, Central, and South American countries. The conference heard addresses by the Honorable Adolf A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, and by the Honorable Ernest A. Davies, M. P. I append hereto my address made at the opening session on Friday night, April 8, entitled "Security and Freedom—Can We Have Both?"

SECURITY AND FREEDOM—CAN WE HAVE BOTH?

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman, no discussion of freedom and security can be realistic without at once coming to the main point of the ideological struggle now raging in the world which we euphemistically call the "cold war." For the challenge of the communistic ideology, the chief propagator of which is the Soviet Union, is postulated upon assured economic security—or what the Communists like to call "economic democracy"—and this is contrasted by the Soviet propagandists with what is called our political democracy but economic insecurity. Though the Communists talk a lot about the new democracies as defining their kind of political organization, generally speaking even they do not go so far as to claim that their one-party system and monolithic state has anything in common with our constitutional democracy so far as individual freedom is concerned.

This then is the cut-and-dried choice which the world is offered by the Communists.

But should we accept this issue and debate it on that narrow ground, we would not only be doing ourselves a great disservice but we would be belying the facts; for the Communists neither offer economic security nor do we of the democracies necessarily have to be content with a lack of economic security.

I do not think it is necessary to labor the point that living conditions in the Soviet Union are bad. We are all well aware of the dreadful congestion of housing, with four to six people to one room in Moscow not at all unusual, with the absence of sanitary facilities and with other shortages. I did, however, note an analysis, however, recently which was most interesting to me. It showed that the worker in the Soviet Union must labor 10 times as long as the worker in the United States for the ordinary necessities of shoes, clothes, food and beer, and, of course, these do not include automobiles, refrigerators or bathtubs which are simply unobtainable except for members of the Politburo and the higher government hierarchy. The Soviet worker, for instance, must labor 583 hours and 20 minutes to get a new suit, while the United States worker need labor only 38 hours and 28 minutes for his new

suit—and a very much better one at that; the comparison for new shoes is 108 hours and 20 minutes for the Soviet worker and 9 hours and 37 minutes for the United States worker.

But let us consider our own situation first, rather than the faults of the Soviet Union. The economic situation of the rest of the world leaves much to be desired. It is calculated, for example, that the average annual income in the world is $70 per annum per capita—hardly enough to maintain life let alone a decent standard of living. It is interesting, too, to analyze the annual incomes in dollar terms of even the democracies closely allied to us in the European recovery program and now in the Atlantic Pact. France, Italy, and the United Kingdom may be taken as the leading nations, and for 1946—the last year for which comparable figures are available—compared to our annual per capita income of over $1,262 per annum, their incomes were $214 per annum per capita for France; $653 per annum per capita for the United Kingdom (about $400 when adjusted for exchange), while for Italy the comparable figure was $94 per annum. In Latin America the situation is no better. Average per capita income varied just before the war between about $30 per annum and $334 per annum, between Eucador and Argentina.

The toll of World War II in terms of economics in the non-Communist world has been very grave. Ravaged countries like Italy, Austria, and Greece have had their incomes about halved. Other countries have fared somewhat better, but certainly not well.

We are all too familiar with the need, but the fundamental difference between the Communists and ourselves is that we are ready to recognize the need and free to mobilize the best solutions, while with the Communists recognition of the need is considered counter-revolutionary activity, and self-criticism by those in absolute power was never so likely as to be a reliable spur to action. The Communists are not at liberty to get the best solutions being confined only to the solutions for which the ruling clique of the Communist Party can be responsible. But the mere freedom of choice on our part is obviously not enough, we must go forward to make the best choice. The important thing is that the choice is there to be made and that we can assure the democratic peoples of the world not only of their political freedom and of the recognition of their human rights but of economic security as well, thus not only meeting the Communist argument by going far beyond it to realize in fact what the Communists only promise. For this purpose, I propose a five-point program to seek to bring to ourselves and the world the benefits of economic security and at the same time the retention and expansion of political democracy. We can in this way do what the Soviet Union and its satellites the new democracies admit they cannot do.

First, the establishment within the United States of an economic planning mechanism composed jointly of trade and industry, agriculture, Government, workers and consumers, to establish economic goals for our economy and to implement the attainment of those goals.

Second, greater democracy in corporations making their managements truly trustees for a broad electorate—the holders of their voting securities.

Third, employee participation in management through labor-management councils and in profits through profit-sharing or guaranteed employment plans.

Fourth, coordination of Government and private social-security activities, including pensions, retirement, disability, and similar benefits.

Fifth, international economic development by Government-industry partnership.

The planning mechanism which I have outlined is essential to deal with one of the two overriding fears in the minds of the American people—that we shall have a depression—the other being war. There is also a haunting fear of the whole democratic world which looks to the United States for leadership, because it is recognized that a depression in the United States will either require the United States to withdraw its aid to the other democracies or so dislocate world economic conditions as to make their situation intolerable.

It is by now clear to us that we cannot afford the jeopardy of permitting automatic adjustments of our economy by alternate booms and depressions. Right now we are depending upon the interposition of Government through expenditures from tax moneys to avoid a depression, but the scare we are just going through because of the diminution in the volume of private business and the rise of unemployment indicates only too well how unreliable is our dependence upon Government spending to stave off a depression. Government can do much to relieve the results of a depression, but its expenditures of under 25 percent of the total, in terms of a gross national product in the magnitude of $250,000,000,000 are unlikely alone to halt at its inception a major economic slide.

The planning mechanism which I have described would set goals for our economy through the joint action of trades and industries, agriculture, government, labor, and consumer. It goes much further than the Employment Act of 1946 under which the President's Council of Economic Advisors are now operating. Such a planning mechanism could operate by permitting voluntary agreements in private business in order to effectuate these goals under its supervision. It would also perform the present functions of the Council of Economic Advisers in advising upon the utilization of the regulatory powers of government, whether of credit, banking, expenditures, securities, or otherwise as they have an impact on the Nation's private economy. Such a planning mechanism is not equivalent to the planning ministries of the Soviet Union and its satellites because it does not proceed by decree or by force but by agreement. It does serve the essential purpose of establishing the end result in terms of economic goals, which is sought to be achieved by agreements freely made in a continuing private economy.

I have spoken of greater democracy in large corporations. And this is a very real thing, for our corporations today are owned directly by a number estimated at 7,000,000 or more holders of stocks and bonds; indirectly by 75,000,000 holders of private life insurance policies aggregating over $50,000,000,000 and 50,000,000 savings-bank depositors with over $57,000,000,000 on deposit. It is significant that in some of our greatest corporations the number of stockholders materially exceeds the number of employees. So, for example, in the great General Electric Co. there are 249,311 stockholders to 196,798 employees; in the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. the ratio is 765,800 stockholders to 651,500 employees, and the United States Steel it is 228,006 stockholders to 290,785 employees.

Most people undoubtedly feel that the managements of these great corporations are hand-picked by a few families and a few bankers. Whether or not this is so is really arguable, but it certainly need not be so if the security holders exercise their franchise, and it is our job as part of the plan for making security and freedom both possible to see that they do exercise their franchise; it is our job to see that, and that the resultant corporate managements operate in the public interest, because they are elected as trustees by a broad segment of the public. Lest we think this is a small matter, let us remember that in 1947 more than 79 percent of the manufacturing in the United States was done by corporations with assets of $5,000,000 or more.

Labor-management relations have profoundly affected the issue of our Nation's economic security as is shown by the great wave of strikes which succeeded the war and by the struggle over the Taft-Hartley Act, which is not yet settled. Yet our principal problem is generally recognized to be the problem behind management-labor relations—the human interest of the worker in his job. First, there is the feeling by most of our workers that the means of production are so complex and expensive to come by that their chances of going into business for themselves are practically nil, and, second, as a corollary of the first, their resulting feeling that they are just a cog in the machine of some big corporation and have no meaning of their own in its operations.

During the war we tried a remarkable experiment in making production operations more efficient through labor-management councils. These were directly concerned with the operations of individual plants. In this way, the worker was given a personal relationship to his job, and it could be made to have meaning and content for him. Nor, according to the record, did any such practice result in diminishing the authority or effectiveness of management, despite the fears of management presently reiterated. Hence, a new effort should be made to again give the worker this personal interest in his job, and the whole labor-management-council practice should be revived and utilized even more extensively in peacetime.

We are today engaged in a great effort to extend the social-security activities of the Federal Government. This applies to old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment insurance, and to the new fields of disability and health insurance. Yet great segments of American trade and business, many fraternal and social organizations, and cooperatives have social-security plans of their own for retirement annuities and pensions, disability and health benefits, severance and lay-off pay. Little effort has been made to fit these two systems together so that in sum total a man who has given his years of greatest usefulness to the community through work in the private economy receives from the private economy and the Government the security which his work deserves. This problem may be complex, but its solution is essential and we must apply ourselves to it if we are to realize security and freedom, too.

The President outlined in point 4 of his inaugural address a means by which the United States through the utilization of those of its resources, which have no ceiling in terms of dollars, may bring the world through economic recovery into a new plateau of economic well-being and security. This point calls for the mobilization of the technological skill and manpower which have made the American productive machine both in industry and agriculture the greatest on earth. It has been discussed and considered before in and outside of Congress and the President was restating it again.

A study made not so long ago under the auspices of the National Bureau of Economic Research by Louis H. Bean, leading economist and statistician, showed that in the areas of the lowest per capita income in the world, enormous progress could be made by relatively small shifts in the labor force from food production to industrial production. In the United States under 25 percent of the working population is engaged in agriculture, but in the world as a whole 60 percent of the 800,000,000 gainfully occupied

persons are so occupied. It is calculated that in countries like China and India a shift of not more than 15 percent of the population from agriculture to industry would double standards of living. A shift on the world basis, it is estimated, would raise average per capita income from $70 per year to $190 per year.

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Kansas State Agricultural College, has recently suggested that the United Nations bring together the world's best agricultural talent for the purpose of conserving the world's soil resources. Other examples of the potential economic development of the world are readily available. The United States, because of depletion or unavailability in our territory, is short of a whole host of scarce materials, among them tin, petroleum, tungsten, bauxite, copper, lead, zinc, nickel, and vanadium. Vast underdeveloped areas in the world contain these materials, but they cannot be brought out because of lack of exploitation due to lack of manpower and transportation. Already under the European recovery program great projects are contemplated for the development of the British colonial empire in Africa of approximately 2,000,000 square miles. This development is to make accessible rubber, copper, and other scarce materials. Vast mileages of roads are necessary in all parts of the world as well as great works of housing, sanitation, and education. Rates of illiteracy in great areas of the Middle East, Africa, Asia, the East Indies, and Latin America, generally speaking, exceed half the population and in some areas runs as high as 95 percent.

In a real sense, it is not parts of our world which are underdeveloped, but the whole world is underdeveloped. The challenge inherent in the utilization of our technical resources in the interests of world economic development are staggering to the imagination, but it is clear that the Government alone cannot carry on these works, and for two reasons. First, because our technologists are reluctant to devote themselves to exclusively Government employment, and, second, because were the Government alone to undertake this program on a world-wide basis it would be underlining the charge of imperialism already being leveled against it constantly by the propagandists of the Soviet Union. We may indeed have to undertake recovery programs in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin-America, but in undertaking them government will have to work as a team with business, government determining the broad international policy involved but business actually seeing to production.

It will be essential, also, to strip these operations of the old imperialism which sought inordinate returns for small risk and constituted a drain on raw materials from underdeveloped areas without regard to the best interests of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas themselves. A Government-business partnership is essential to see that this is no longer the case and that return bears a reasonable relation, both in time and amount, to capital investment and skill expended and to the economy of the country or area be developed. Also, that as soon as is practicable, indigenous management and ownership be developed and encouraged. In return, business will have a right to ask that it be assured against political risks of the loss of investment or reasonable return from investment.

To my mind, youth is especially interested in the opportunities opened in this way. It used to be a popular expression in the United States to recall Horace Greeley's injunction: "Go West, young man," when the West was an area of golden opportunity. Today that expression should be "Go anywhere, young man," for all the free world now offers similar opportunities. If we undertake realistically the effort to square our freedom with economic security and thus to confront the Communist ideology with the fact that the democracies deliver in the terms of goods and human satisfactions, while the Communists only promise and talk, I see ahead for the youth of the democratic nations the greatest adventure, the greatest exploration, and the greatest opportunity for material and spiritual reward which the world has ever in history vouchsafed to its youth.

Pennsylvania Gridiron Dinner—Song by Milton V. Burgess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Tuesday evening, April 5, the biennial gridiron dinner of the Pennsylvania Gridiron Club was held in Harrisburg, Pa. This gridiron dinner is an even older institution than the famous National Gridiron Club dinner held in the Capital city of Washington. The president of the Pennsylvania Association is Gerson Lush, of the Philadelphia Inquirer. Mr. Milton V. Burgess, political writer for the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegram, composed the closing song for that program. It is a parody on the song Roll Along, Covered Wagon. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLL ALONG, PENNSYLVANIA

(From the finale of the Pennsylvania Gridiron Show, Harrisburg, April 5, 1949)

Roll along, Pennsylvania, roll along.
To your rivers and your hills we sing a song.
Other places may be fine,
But give me that State of mine.
Roll along, Pennsylvania, roll along.

Roll along, Pennsylvania, roll along.
To your women and your men we sing a song.
Keep your flag a flying high
From your mountains in the sky.
Roll along, good old Keystone, roll along.

The China Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the China Monthly, March 1949, by Anthony T. Bouscaren, assistant professor of political science, University of San Francisco:

THE CHINA TRAGEDY

(By Anthony T. Bouscaren, assistant professor of political science, University of San Francisco)

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor and thus declared to the world their intention of establishing a Far Eastern empire, a Japanese co-prosperity sphere. By December 7, 1948, the Soviet Union, through its agents the Chinese Communists, had achieved the military control of Manchuria and north China, making possible the establishment of a Soviet Far East empire, a Communist coprosperity sphere. The Soviet goal in the Far East is seemingly no different than that of its Japanese predecessor-in-aggression: control of 968,000,000 human beings in China, India, Japan, Korea, Indo-China, Burma, the Netherlands East Indies, Siam, and Australia, and of some of the world's richest mineral resources, including most of the world's tin and rubber, and almost all its exportable rice.

This time as last, independent China has been the main bulwark against totalitarian aggression in the Far East. In World War II China was America's ally and a most valuable one at that. The United States declared that if China was lost, the Far East would be lost and America's position in the Pacific would become precarious, as would its very existence as an independent nation. How much more true that is today, with the advent of the atomic bomb, guided missiles, schnorkel-type submarines and fifth columns that are more efficient than ever before. Lenin once declared that the time would come when, while the attention of the world was focused on Europe, the Soviet Union would conquer the whole Far East.[1] That time seems to be at hand. Stalin is well on the way towards fulfilling Lenin's prophecy, and just as Japan's aggression against China in the 'thirties was but a prelude to a larger conflict, so may Soviet-Chinese Communist aggression in China be a prelude to a wider struggle, especially since the West is holding the fort in Europe, but is encouraging the same expansionist-minded dictator to realize his goal in the Far East.

In 1941 the United States answered the totalitarian challenge, and in alliance with China, met force with force to save the Far East and world peace. Since World War II, the United States, drugged into a false sense of security and paralyzed by fifth columns in high places, has betrayed its trust as watchdog for world peace, and has encouraged, at least by default, what it fought almost 4 years to prevent—the control of the strategic Far East by a powerful expansionist dictatorship. China, which has never known real peace due to Japanese and Soviet aggression, was readily saved from the former, but when confronted with the latter, has not been extended the same aid, even though American interests are still endangered by the disappearance of a free and independent China.

Soviet propaganda has achieved no greater triumph than on the Chinese question. It has enlisted the cooperation of many Americans, who wittingly or not, do much to further the Soviet cause. Theodore White, John Fairbank, Edgar Snow, Harold Isaacs, Richard Lauterbach, Owen Lattimore, Harrison Forman, Alger Hiss, and John Carter Vincent have outdone one another in denouncing the Nationalist Government, in stating that the Chinese Communists are just agrarian reformers; that they have little or

[1] For Lenin's views on China as a potential Soviet colony see Selected Works of Lenin (International Publishers, New York, 1943), vol. 4, pp. 300, 305-313.

no link with Moscow, and that no aid be given to the embattled Chinese Government. It has been unfortunate for China and the United States that this group has had the official ear in preference to such people as Alfred Kohlberg, Freda Utley, Walter Judd, William Bullitt, General Wedemeyer, David Dallin and Claire Chennault, who, perhaps, understand more fully the dynamics of the Soviet plan for the Far East from personal experience than many in the first-mentioned group.

The U. S. S. R. has, on its own initiative, taken by force Tannu Tuva, Mongolia, and Sinkiang. To make it feel more secure, the United States gave it Sakhalin, the Kuriles, the Liaotung peninsula and effective control of Manchuria. Today the Soviet attack is extended to China, Burma, Siam, Indo-China, Malaya, and the Netherlands East Indies. China, as the key to control of the others, is under the most severe fire.

To better understand the Far East in international relations a proper perspective must be had. In 1911 the Manchu dynasty was overthrown in China and a republic was established under the leadership of Sun Yat-sen. The Kuomintang Party was his party, and was the dynamo of the Chinese regeneration. The Soviet Union, keen to take advantage of all young revolutionary movements, sent Michael Borodin and General Blucher to develop Communist infiltration and control of the Kuomintang. Following Sun's death in 1925, his young lieutenant Chiang Kai-shek succeeded to Kuomintang leadership, but was soon faced with a Communist frontal attack on his government. Acting with energy and courage he sent Borodin and Blucher back to the Soviet Union in 1927 and got rid of the Communists in the government who always put the interest of the Soviet Union above those of China. The Comintern then sent Gerhart Eisler and other agents to Canton, where they attempted unsuccessfully to continue the rebellion.[2]

In 1929 a war between Russia and China in Manchuria resulted in Russia's wresting certain economic advantages. In the same year Russia successfully completed its infiltration and control of Tannu Tuva. In 1931 the U. S. S. R. made a secret treaty with Sinkiang,[3] giving it much internal control there, and in the same year indicated its friendship with Japan, who was launching its major attack on China. China, reeling under the Japanese attack, asked Russia for aid, which was not forthcoming.[4] In 1933 Russia extended its control of Sinkiang. In 1935 the U. S. S. R. helped Japanese aggression by turning over to Japan the key Chinese Eastern Railway, seized from China in 1929 in violation of treaty obligations.[5] At this time Litvinov hailed the good relations between Japan and Russia.[6] In 1936 the Soviet Union concluded a treaty with Mongolia, to gain complete control of the Mongolian People's Republic in that year, in violation of a treaty made in 1924 with China.[7]

As Japan became stronger in the Far East, however, Russia changed tactics and determined to make use of China as a buffer between her and Japan. In line with the 1935 tactic of the united front, or trojan horse, a gradual policy of rapprochement with China was followed, and the Comintern ordered Chinese Communists to seek a coalition government. Ambassador Bogomolov set the new tempo by declaring: "There will be no more civil wars in China."[8] The Soviet Union even gave the Chinese limited aid so that they might hold off Japan from key Soviet interests, while at the same time using the Chinese Communists to infiltrate and gain control of the Chinese Government. Chinese-Russian relations worsened, however, after the Hitler-Stalin and Stalin-Matsuoka pacts, and only improved when Germany attacked Russia in the summer of 1941.

The Chinese Soviets (or Communists) have been led since 1931 by Mao Tse-tung, who was appointed to that job by the Comintern.[9] With the aid of Chu-Teh, a military leader trained in Moscow's military academy, Mao was able to create a state within a state, and a private army, always obedient to the Soviet Union. In this he has been helped by direct Soviet aid and encouragement, and by the weakness of the Central Government and the vast size of rural China. The Chinese Communists had shown their true colors when in 1929 they sided with Russia in the war against China over Manchuria. When in 1931 the Japanese struck at Manchuria, the Chinese Communists offered no aid to China. The Chinese Communists set up their own government in 1931 in Kiangsi Province, again on Comintern orders.[10] Based on the unity of party and Government, this regime was an exact copy in miniature of that in the U. S. S. R. By 1934 the Chinese Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek succeeded in driving these Soviet agents out of south China, and the Communists made their famous long march to north Shansi Province, and finally established their capital in Yenan. Direct liaison with the U. S. S. R. was maintained through Wang Ming (Chen Shao-yui), who was also a member of the Comintern. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party sent the following greeting to Stalin at the fourteenth congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R.: "Thou, best disciple of Lenin, our teacher in combat, our ardent friend, our commander, our leader: The revolutionary proletariat and peasantry of China have created their own Soviet Republic in one quarter of China with a population of 80 million. We now have our own armed force for the defense of the achievements of the revolution from our class enemies. Let the entire capitalist world shudder at our success. Only the Soviets can save China from final disintegration and encroachment. Lead us on, O our pilot, from victory to victory."[11] Wang Ming declared in 1935: "The ideological, political and organizational growth of the Communist Party in China is due to the fact that it has been under the guidance of the Communist International. Our party has remained faithful to the teachings of Stalin."[12] Further evidence of the direct link between the Chinese Communists and Moscow came with the appointment in 1935 of Mao Tse-tung, Chou Enlai and Wang Ming to the executive committee of the Comintern.

In line with the new tactics, the U. S. S. R. and its agents the Chinese Communists brought about a rapprochement with the Nationalist Government in 1936. The Communists, however, insisted on keeping their own government and army in Shansi Province, which made incongruous their coincidental demand for representation in the Nationalist Government. Unfortunately the Government, faced with Japanese aggression, was forced to accept proffered aid from any quarter, and Chiang Kai-shek allowed seven Communists into the National Political Council. He was not particularly heartened when the sixth congress of the Chinese Communist Party was held in Moscow in 1938, and the official organ of the Comintern stated: "The Communist Party of China owes its success to the immediate and constant guidance and help which have been forthcoming from the executive committee of the Comintern."[13] In March 1939 Mao Tse-tung sent the following message to the Eighteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party: "The central committee of the Communist Party of China sends flaming Bolshevik greetings to Comrade Stalin, leader of progressive humanity of the whole world * * * Long live Comrade Stalin."[14]

The period 1937 to 1939 saw limited cooperation between the Government and the Communists, with the Chinese Red Army receiving supplies and equipment from the Government, but remaining autonomous. However, there were constant clashes over which areas each army was responsible for, and the Government soon discovered that the Communist Army was taking no major action against the Japanese, but rather was conserving its strength for future use, and that the Communists were taking advantage of the coalition to gain control of the Government permanently.

Relations cooled when the Chinese Communists hailed the Nazi-Soviet pact of August 23, 1939, and the Soviet-Japanese pact of April 13, 1941, in which the Soviet Union de facto joined the Axis, and the three dictators denounced the decadent democracies. During the period 1939–41 serious clashes occurred between Nationalists and Communists, the most serious being that of January 1941 in Anhwei, when the Chinese Red Army crossed into Nationalist territory in violation of a July 1940 agreement regarding their respective spheres of operation. The Soviet-Japanese treaty of April 1941 enabled Japan to turn her attention to American and British Pacific bases, and in particular to prepare the Pearl Harbor attack without fear of embarrassment from the Soviet Union on its western flank. In March 1942 a fisheries agreement with Russia was renewed. Japan constantly sought to patch up Nazi-Soviet relations after the two dictators fell out in June of 1941, in order to present a grand coalition of totalitarians against the democracies.[15]

In spite of the fact that Russia was receiving American lend-lease, and American lives and ships were being sacrificed in great number to deliver supplies over the Arctic route to Murmansk and the Red Army, Russia would offer no cooperation to the Allies in the Far East. In April 1942 five American airmen from the Doolittle raid were interned. American planes were fired at by Soviet batteries, and American fliers were disarmed and interned when they were forced to land in Russian territory. Soon 250 American airmen were interned in a Tashkent detention camp. In March 1944 the Soviet Union agreed to give Japan oil from north Sakhalin (assigned to Russia by the Matsuoka agreement). In 1942 the American military coordinator in Russia, General Deane, reported that Russia had agreed to allow the United States the use of air and naval bases in the Maritime Provinces. In anticipation of this, the United States sent a steady stream of supplies and munitions to Soviet Far East destinations, only to have the Soviets declare in December of 1944 that the United States could not have the use of these bases. Need-

[2] Martin Ebon, World Communism Today (Whittlesey House, New York, 1948), p. 367.

[3] Martin Norins, Gateway to Asia: Sinkiang (John Day, New York, 1944), p. 68.

[4] China Weekly Review, June 18, July 9, 1932.

[5] The 1924 Sino-Soviet Agreement. See China's protest in China Year Book, 1934, pp. 737 ff.

[6] David Dallin, Soviet Russia in the Far East (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1948), p. 65.

[7] China Year Book, 1926, pp. 21, 22.

[8] Hallett Abend, My Life in China (Harcourt Brace, New York, 1943), pp. 237–239.

[9] Dallin, op. cit., p. 104.

[10] Strategiya: taktika Kominterna, translation by Dallin, p. 109.

[11] Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Stenographic Report, p. 1323.

[12] Kommunistichesky International (1935), No. 25, translation by Dallin, p. 122.

[13] Ibid., No. 20, pp. 62, 63.

[14] Dallin, op. cit.; pp. 141, 142.

[15] Department of State Bulletin 1946; II, 483 ff.

less to say the supplies and munitions remained.[16]

At the Cairo Conference in 1943, the Chinese Government had been promised the return of all territory seized by the Japanese, but Roosevelt broke his Cairo promise at Yalta in 1945 by bribing Russia to come into the Pacific war, when he promised her Chinese territory without the knowledge or consent of China. Roosevelt's desire to bring Russia into the Pacific war at the expense of China was based on the false assumption that the Pacific Allies needed Soviet military cooperation to defeat Japan. At Yalta the following concessions were made to the Soviets: (1) Their predominance in Mongolia was de facto recognized; (2) the Chinese port of Dairen was to be an international port but Soviet preeminent interests were recognized; its municipal administration, was, however, to revert to Chinese sovereignty. Port Arthur, the other key port of the Liaotung Peninsula, was to be leased to the Soviet Union as a naval base; (3) the Chinese Eastern and Southern railways were to be jointly operated by a Soviet-Chinese company, but again the fatal formula of Soviet preeminent interests was inserted; Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria was nevertheless recognized; (4) South Sakhalin and the Kuriles were turned over to the U. S. S. R. In return for these gifts, Russia promised to enter the war no later than 3 months after the German surrender. At the Potsdam Conference, the Soviets insisted that the United States force China to agree to these odious conditions, which the United States did. This led to the Sino-Russian agreement of August 14, 1945. In this pact the Russians promised to get out of Manchuria 3 months after the Japanese defeat, and to recognize the Nationalist Government as the only government of China. The U. S. S. R. finally entered the Pacific war on August 8, but participated only for 6 days, as Japan surrendered on the 14th.

This was one of the cheapest territorial acquisitions that any country has ever gotten, and it marked the beginning of the attack on independent China. It has been suggested that if the United States had not made concessions to the U. S. S. R. that China would not be in any better position than she is today. That is, of course, speculation but it would seem that appeasement having failed to save Czechoslovakia, Poland, and others, both in the thirties and in the forties, would not succeed (and has not succeeded) any better in China. It does seem certain that China's position could not be much worse if the Yalta concessions and others had not been made.

The Chinese Communist role in the battle to defend China from Japan was insignificant. As Mao Tse-tung declared: "Our policy should be 70 percent expansion, 20 percent dealing with the Kuomintang, and 10 percent resisting Japan." [17] He also made the startling assertion that the Soviet Union was the only nation that assisted China in her fight against Japanese aggressors.[18] During the war the Chinese Communists kept their own forces largely intact, to be used against the Nationalists, and fought no major engagement with the Japanese. Lin Yutang has said that for every Jap killed by the Communists, they killed five Chinese Government soldiers, and this charge has been supported by David Dallin, among others.[19]

In July and August 1943 for instance, while the Government armies were locked in mortal combat with the Japanese invader, the Communists attacked them in the rear in Shantung Province.

In 1944 Henry Wallace was despatched to China by the American Government to make a report which was to be the basis of future American policy in China. He praised the Communists and damned the Nationalists and urged what the Soviet Union urged—a coalition government. Arrangements were made between Stalin and Roosevelt to send correspondents to the Chinese Communist capital of Yenan, where they were given the typical Soviet-type conducted tour, so that the world could be told of the attractiveness of that regime. This marked the beginning of the largely Soviet-inspired pro-Chinese Communist and anti-Nationalist propaganda which has been of so much aid to Soviet foreign policy. Leading the play here was Edgar Snow, who declared: "The Soviet Union cannot have any expansionist tendencies."[20] Owen Lattimore, who in 1943 had spoken of Chiang Kai-shek as a "world statesman and real genius,"[21] began to attack him and praised the Communist "election system" as "the most positive step yet taken in China toward democracy." [22] The Stilwell Papers, edited by Theodore White, also contributed to a pro-Chinese Communist sentiment in the United States. Stilwell, unlike Chennault, Wedemeyer, and Hurley, could not get along with Chiang Kai-shek, and his anti-Chiang bias strongly colors his remarks. Stilwell praises the Communists, although he apparently never visited Communist China. Interestingly, Mr. White in editing the papers, chose to delete several important passages.[23] Harrison Forman and L. K. Rosinger also took up the pro-Chinese Communist line, which was soon echoed in the publications Amerasia, and in the Far Eastern Survey (the latter put out under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations).

On the basis of the Wallace report, successive American representatives, Patrick Hurley and George Marshall, sought, as part of their efforts to achieve peace and broaden the Government, to force Chiang into a coalition with the Communists. Negotiations broke down, however, in 1945 when the Communists refused to yield part of their army, and to allow a supreme military committee of one Nationalist, one Communist, and one American to direct the consolidation of the two armies. The United States did succeed to the point of forcing Chiang Kai-shek to send a Communist representative to the San Francisco Conference in 1945.

The Yalta agreement and the Japanese surrender played into the hands of the Chinese Communists. Manchuria and the Liaotung Peninsula were detached from China and the Chinese Red Army was built up by the Soviets for a final assault on the Government. When the Soviet Red Army entered Manchuria, it began the work of industrial removal to the Soviet Union: heavy machinery, tools, grinders, huge dynamos, hundreds of turbines, generators and rolling stock were removed. The American Reparations Commission which visited Manchuria in June 1946 put the damage at over two billions.[24] The Chinese Communists praised this looting of China's arsenal and the Soviet seizure of the Manchurian railways and economy.[25] To consolidate their work and to build up the Chinese Communists, the Soviets stayed in Manchuria well beyond their 3-month dead line. There were no Chinese Communist troops in Manchuria when the Red Army began its occupation. All foreigners were expelled by September 1945 and Chinese Government Army officers imprisoned. The iron curtain was down.[26] Officially no Chinese Communists were allowed in Manchuria, but in July 1946 Pravda admitted that in Manchuria there were growing "people's armies under Communist leadership." It has been claimed that Chinese Communists from Russia joined these armies.[27]

The Chinese Government was not permitted to enter Manchuria, in spite of the Sino-Russian agreement of August 14, 1945. When an American convoy bearing Chinese Government troops tried to land at Hulutao it was fired upon by Chinese Communists and retired. The Red Army allowed Chinese Communists into Yangkow to prevent Admiral Barbey from landing Chinese Government troops there. The only Manchurian city into which Government troops were allowed was Mukden, and this as blackmail to permit the Red Army to stay in Manchuria beyond the 3-month limit. All the while the Red Army was quietly incorporating northern Korea into the Soviet empire. It stayed in Manchuria until May 1946 to insure that it would come under the control of the Chinese Communists, and to get the machinery to the Soviet Union.[28] Even after the withdrawal, Russia administrators remained, especially to operate the Manchurian railway, and to control the Liaotung Peninsula."

The Chinese Communists built up their army between August 1945 and May 1946, greatly helped by the Marshall-imposed truce. Telling evidence has been accumulated to support charges that a new, strong Chinese Red Army, aided by Korean, Japanese, and Mongolian recruits, and educational and military advisers from the U. S. S. R., was trained and armed, part of it in the Soviet Union.[29] Many of the top officers were schooled in Soviet military academies and at the Sun Yat-sen University in Moscow.[30] Evidence of direct Soviet aid to the Chinese Communists is extensive and for the most part authoritative. The principal aid given has consisted of Japanese arms and arsenals.[31] The United States cooperated by diverting large amounts of UNRRA supplies to Chinese Communists.

[16] See John R. Deane, Strange Alliance (New York, 1946).

[17] Documents on the Problem of the Chinese Communist Party (Chungking, 1944), quoted in Freda Utley, Last Chance in China (New York, 1947), p. 194.

[18] Loc. cit.

[19] Lin Yutang, The Vigil of a Nation (John Day: New York, 1945), p. 125; Dallin, op. cit., pp. 227, 228.

[20] Edgar Snow, Battle for Asia (New York, 1941), p. 300.

[21] China Monthly, October 1948, p. 284.

[22] Owen Lattimore, Solution in Asia (Little, Brown: New York, 1945), p. 134.

[23] See Alfred Kohlberg's China via the Stilwell Road, China Monthly, October 1948, pp. 283–287.

[24] Department of State Bulletin 1946, p. 1154.

[25] See Li Li-san's statement in the New York Daily Worker, July 26, 1946.

[26] George Moorad, Behind the Iron Curtain (Fireside Press: Philadelphia, 1946), p. 291.

[27] New York Times, November 30, 1945, and Dallin, op. cit., p. 250.

[28] During this period the Chinese Government pathetically tried to prevent its press and student groups from protesting Soviet machinations in Manchuria in the vain hope that the Soviets would show a corresponding good faith and live up to the Sino-Soviet pact. The Chinese news agency in San Francisco was instructed not to say anything offensive about the Soviet Union. See also Dallin, p. 314.

[29] New York Times, September 9 and November 20, 1946, September 10, 1947, November 21, 1948; Lien Lai in China Monthly, November 1948, p. 318; Dallin, pp. 322–331.

[30] Dallin, p. 250.

[31] Dallin, p. 328, and Lien Lai, loc. cit.; see also China Monthly, July 1947, p. 57, UP dispatch San Francisco News, Dec. 28, 1948, by Arthur Goul, Henry Lieberman dispatch from Suchow to NYT, November 27, 1948, describes captured Russian equipment. On January 6, 1948, the United States challenged the U. S. S. R. in the Japanese Allied Control Council on Jap arms and equipment turned

In Manchuria the United States Consul General was refused admission into Harbin, and the Danish Consul ejected, but the Soviet Consul General was free to perform his duties. The Sino-Soviet treaty of August, 1945, had allowed joint control of the Manchurian railroads, but the Soviets saw to it that the designated Chinese officials never got to their posts. The port of Dairen has never been opened to the shipping of nations other than the Soviet Union, nor has its administration been returned to the Chinese.

Gen. George C. Marshall effected a truce between the Chinese Government and the Communists in January 1946, but this truce did not extend to Manchuria until March. In the interim the Chinese Communist armies built up their strength there. Christopher Rand, writing in the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1947, declared: "The Communists were no match for the Government troops as has been proved at the battle of Szepingkai in the spring of 1946. Most observers think that Government troops could easily have taken the Communist Manchurian capital of Harbin. They were prevented from doing so by the truce imposed during Gen. George C. Marshall's attempt to mediate the civil war." In November 1947 the Cominform for the Far East met at Harbin to plan a Soviet coprosperity sphere of Chinese, Mongols, Koreans and Japanese.[32]

During his mission, General Marshall could do nothing to prevent Soviet aid to the Communists, but he could and did bring pressure to bear on the Government. To bend Chiang Kai-shek to his will, he used a form of pressure that was potentially as damaging to the security of the United States as it was to the immediate security of China. He cut the military supplies of the Chinese Government armies. In the early summer of 1946, to force President Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into the Chinese Government, as an attempt to broaden and liberalize it, General Marshall had the State Department refuse to give licenses for the export of arms to China. Thus he prevented the Chinese Government from buying munitions in America. General Marshall confessed to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 20, 1948, that "it was in effect an embargo on military supplies." William C. Bullitt and other responsible observers claim that from the summer of 1946 to the end of February 1948, except for some ammunition left in China by our Navy and Marines, the Chinese Army did not receive one single cartridge or single shell from the United States.[33] In the field of aviation General Marshall's actions were seemingly even more damaging. In September 1946 he deliberately broke the contract of the American Government to deliver to the Chinese Government planes to maintain eight and one-third air groups for 3 years, and spare parts to cover replacements and ammunition, and materials needed for ground services during the same period. It has been charged that from September 1946 to March 1948 not a single combat plane was delivered to China under this agreement.[34]

Despite the Soviet-inspired propaganda of much American military aid to the hard-pressed Chinese Government, this aid has been comparatively slight until the spring of 1948, and very little has reached China since then, this in part due to the Pacific longshoremen strike. In December 1948, American military aid to China was running under one-third of that to the far smaller and more easily defended countries of Greece and Turkey.[35] At the end of October 1948, a Chinese Ministry of Defense spokesman declared that due to American red tape and obstructionism in certain quarters, not a single thing from an $88,000,000 military aid fund had been delivered.[36] The United States was so busy locking up the front door to Soviet aggression that it left the back door wide open.

Senator D. Worth Clark, of Idaho, special consultant to the Senate Appropriations Committee, issued a report after a visit to China, on November 21, 1948, which contained the most complete attempt made up to that time to compile an answer to Soviet far eastern aggression. His report recommended: (1) Immediate and extensive direct military aid to the Chinese Government in the form of guns, tanks, planes, and ammunition; (2) Combat advisory aid, extending to strategic and tactical authority; (3) Financial aid for the Chinese military operation of an amount which would remove a major portion of the war cost from China's internal budget; (4) Financial aid to stabilize China's currency; (5) Strict American supervision of expenditures. Clark reported that Chiang Kai-shek was willing to accept close American military supervision, and that he was willing to make essential political, and social reforms of which he had already made some, and would make others when peace was restored. Aid on the scale projected by Clark could salvage at least part of China and the price is not too high. It is far less than we thought it worth spending to keep China in the war against Japan. It is infinitesimal compared with the probable cost of allowing the Soviets to occupy China and the Far East. What logic is there in fighting tooth and nail to save independent China in our own interest against one aggressor, only to turn her over to another?

In addition to the recommendations of Senator Clark, Roger Lapham, chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration's mission to China, has urged increased military and economic aid, as has William Bullitt, who has made several extensive on-the-spot surveys of the Chinese problem. His most recent report, that of January 6, 1949, recommended an aid program designed to hold the Yangtze River line for the Chinese Government; the military defense to be under American guidance with a view to saving South China and southeast Asia from Soviet control.[37]

One of the excuses given by some observers for not having extended aid to the Nationalist Government is that it is corrupt and must first reform itself.[38] It might be recalled in this connection that pro-Nazis said the same thing about Austria in 1938, and about Poland in 1939. Decisions in international affairs can never be made in a vacuum. One must frequently choose between alternatives, especially when one's own security or world peace is at stake. In 1941 the British Government extended aid to an authoritarian Greek Government, not because Britain necessarily agreed with this government, but because it was being attacked by a far greater evil—the Nazi military machine. Let the Soviet apologists recall that the United States extended all-out aid to the U. S. S. R. during World War II, which was as absolute a dictatorship as the world has ever known, whose economic system is based on a slave labor army of 15,000,000, but there was no insistence that the Soviet Government should reform itself before the aid was extended. The same Chinese Government which has been under Soviet attack since 1945, was given aid without question in World War II, not because we necessarily agreed with it, but because it was the main bulwark against Japanese far-eastern aggression, and an ally of the Western World. The situation continues to be in its essentials no different than it was then; the aggressor has merely changed names. It is true that we now control Japan and have the atomic bomb, but our armed forces are far smaller and less well trained, and the Yalta concessions plus Communist successes in the Far East make our position precarious. To appease the Soviets and their adherents in the United States by not aiding China, is to change the balance of power overwhelmingly in favor of the Soviet empire.

With China gone and the whole far-eastern coast in Soviet hands, Alaska, the Aleutians, Japan, the Philippines, Dutch and British possessions and American bases would be endangered, as would Australia, Hawaii, and the American homeland. The situation would revert back in many respects to the period of Japan's greatest successes during World War II, except that it is perhaps an even more precarious position for the Western Powers, because of similar Soviet pressure elsewhere, and because of the effectiveness of their fifth columns, which most states still insist on treating as if they were normal political parties. With the Snorkel-type submarine and long-range bombers carrying deadly weapons of destruction, the Soviets do not need a powerful fleet to launch attacks in the Pacific.

It is not within the scope of this analysis to review the admitted weaknesses of the Chinese Government. That Government, like any government in wartime (and China has been at war almost constantly of recent years), has been authoritarian,[39] but at least through it there seems to be a possibility of extending political and economic democracy, and of building a peaceful Far East. There is no such possibility in a Chinese Communist regime.[40] In Nationalist China opposition parties such as the Democratic Socialists and

---

over to Chinese Communists and got no satisfactory answer. The Chinese Government has repeatedly charged that the U. S. S. R. supplied the rebels with 50,000 Japanese war prisoners. See also Chinese News Service No. 250 November 9, 1948, and articles by Scripps-Howard correspondent William Newton in early 1948 giving documentary evidence of the date, place, and amount of arms and equipment which the Russians have handed over to the Chinese Communists since the end of the war. See also NYT November 20, 1946, UP, July 4, 1947, and AP June 24, 1947.

[32] In May 1946 Li Li-san was appointed chairman of the Far East Bureau of the International Revolutionary Action Committee. See also Dallin, p. 379.

[33] See William C. Bullitt series How We Won the War and Lost the Peace, Life, August 30 and September 6, 1948; also Col. W. Bruce Pirnie, Who Hamstrings United States Military Aid to China, the China Monthly, October 1948.

[34] Bullitt, loc. cit.

[35] As of December 6, 1948, only 63 millions in military aid went to China, while 230 millions went to Greece and Turkey; New York Times, December 7, 1948.

[36] See Henry Lieberman in New York Times, October 14, 1948.

[37] See Bullitt's remarks and proposal for China, New York Times, January 7, 8, 1949, pp. 1, 2.

[38] Arthur Koestler terms this confusion in some liberal circles as the fallacy of the perfect cause. See his Babbitts of the Left, Life, May 3, 1948.

[39] This is not to say that the Chinese Government would be a political democracy in the western sense in peacetime.

[40] Eleven of twelve foreign correspondents in China, on being questioned as to whether or not freedom of religion, one of the most vital of the four freedoms, was allowed in Communist China, answered in the negative: Brooklyn Tablet, November 27, 1948, p. 1. Further, it is obvious from recent experience that no Communist regime extends any of the fundamental freedoms.

the Young China Party have had full and free play, and hold 260 seats in the National Assembly and 75 seats in the legislative Yuan. Both these parties have declared through their leaders that the principles enunciated by Sun Yat-sen could never be realized in a coalition regime which included Communists, and could only be realized by parties whose first allegiance is to China.[41] The Government claims, with some justice, to have done more in the way of genuine land reform than have the Communists.[42] In much of Nationalist China a 25 percent reduction in land rent was decreed in 1948, with a year's exemption from the payment of the land tax. Farm loans were extended and larger farms broken up into workable agricultural units. In November 1947 elections were held by the 250,000,000 in free China to elect a national assembly which drew up a democratic constitution for the Chinese Republic, and elected its officers. That a great deal remains to be done in democratization is of course obvious, but it should also be remembered that much of that path cannot be traveled until peace is restored to a free and independent China.

China has many imperfections, but what nation hasn't? The Nationalist Government is the legal government of China, one of the most valiant of the United Nations during World War II, and a member of the United Nations Security Council.[43] To stand by while this Government is overrun by the Soviet aggressor is to violate all that the UN Charter stands for. This is the sort of problem which the UN should act promptly upon, through articles 51 and 52 if necessary. The experiences at Munich, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam indicate that appeasement of dictators who threaten world peace leads only to war, with the appeasor at the greater disadvantage. The democracies in the thirties wanted peace at any price and they got war at a heavy price later on. History does not forgive those who do not learn its lessons.

The Chinese problem has been, and remains (as long as a non-Communist government exists), today primarily military. There can be no reform until the Soviet pressure on free China is ended.[44] General MacArthur defined the issue when he said: "the international aspect of the Chinese problem has become somewhat beclouded by demands for internal reform. Desirable as such reform may be, its importance is but secondary to the issue of civil strife now engulfing the land. Underlying all issues in China is now the military problem. Until it is resolved, little can be expected toward internal rehabilitation."[45] To these might be added the words of Claire Chennault: "If we fail to give China military support it will be the greatest failure of American foreign policy in all our history. The Russians are not willing to make Hitler's mistake; they will not move against us until their eastern flank is secure. In my opinion China is the key to world peace—or to victory if a third world war is precipitated."[46] It has been pointed out that the Government military position even as late as January 1949 was no worse than when it had to retreat to Chungking before the Japanese advance. MacArthur has emphasized that what is not spent to save China must then be spent to defend encircled Japan.

A Communist China means another colony in the Soviet empire. The Chinese Communists are no more mere agrarian reformers than were the Czech Communists, and a coalition government in China would have the same result it had in Czechoslovakia, and has had in all the Soviet satellite states.[47] Mao Tse-tung, writing in the Cominform magazine published in Bucharest in November 1948 scoffed at the idea of any middle road or third road between communism and democracy as utter hypocrisy. Praising the thirty-first anniversary of the Soviet revolution he declared: "We hail the constant strengthening of the U. S. S. R., bulwark of world peace and democracy * * * the world revolutionary front has defeated Fascist Germany, Italy, and Japan * * * after the victory of the Second World War American imperialism and its running dogs replaced fascism and are menacing the world."[48] Mao then called on all revolutionary forces throughout the world to unite behind the Soviet Union against the United States. Mao knows that there are in the United States many groups and individuals who will cooperate wittingly or unwittingly to extend the Soviet empire to include China and the entire Far East. With their aid, the Soviet empire will then embrace a total of 1,160,000,000 people.

In 1938, Neville Chamberlain, speaking of Czechoslovakia, said: "How can we help such a far away country about which we know so little?" and signed the Munich agreement, as Hitler looked on with anticipation. Have we, and are we making the same mistake in China?

[41] The China Magazine, April 1948, pp. 32–38 (Carson Chang).

[42] There have been serious peasant uprisings against the fraudulent Chinese Communist agrarian reforms. See for example Tillman Durdin's report from Shantung Province in New York Times, October 14, 1947; also New York Herald Tribune, September 17, 1946. For government land reforms see China's Rural Reconstruction Plan, China Monthly, November 1948, pp. 321–325, and Government Land Reform, ibid. January 1948, pp. 42–50.

[43] It is often forgotten by those who compare Soviet aid to the Communists and American aid to the Nationalists, that the United States is aiding the legal government, whereas the U. S. S. R. is aiding the rebels, in violation of the Sino-Soviet treaty and of international law.

[44] See Freda Utley, Marshall and Coalition Government, New Leader, March 27, 1948.

[45] Life editorial April 5, 1948.

[46] Loc. cit.

[47] That Czechoslovakia was an advanced democracy at the time of its Soviet coup does not mitigate the general principle that to form coalitions with Communists leads inevitably to Communist dictatorships. See Hanson Baldwin's analogy, New York Times, November 21, 1948.

[48] New York Times, November 7, 1948.

The Building of a Personal Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Right Reverend Austin Pardue, D. D., Episcopal bishop of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been delivering a series of broadcasts on the Building of a Personal Faith.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Bishop Pardue's broadcast No. 11, which was delivered over Station WCAE from Pittsburgh on March 15, 1949. All of these broadcasts are well worth reading, but this one is particularly timely and I hope it will prove most helpful in aiding each of the readers to discover the unexplored, undeveloped, but real and vital power that is in him.

This is the eleventh conversation on the building of a personal faith. Tonight we are concluding a section which deals with the short circuits in human personality. These short circuits prevent us from expressing the vast inner power that is entrusted to our keeping. You may believe that you are without this endless resource of spiritual energy which can accomplish all things. But it makes no difference who you are, where you are from, what you are, or how highly educated you are. You still are entrusted with more power than you can dream you could ever possess. No one could believe that the infinitesimal atom is the possessor of energy that could blow up a world until it was split. You can't believe the power that God will give you until you are relieved from the short circuits that may be blocking it.

Our Lord promised power. He said that you would have power after the Holy Ghost came to you. He said that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit. He said that you are sons and daughters, and heirs of the greatest riches ever known to man. He wasn't talking about the power the little would-be dictators are trying to get. He wasn't talking about riches, personal ego, cleverness, stuffy social prestige, or the ability to bully people. Whether it be the big Hitlers and Mussolinis of Europe, or the little ones in every city block, they will pass away. The power we are talking about is that which has the wisdom to overcome every problem; the power to lead men for generations to come; the power to be selfless and therefore without worry; the power to maintain physical strength and health; the power to demonstrate fearless love; the power to think with charity; and to be relaxed under great pressure. Such is the power that God has waiting for you and me.

In the past two broadcasts we talked about some of the short circuits that prevent power from flowing through us. When we are short-circuited we are fatigued, tired, worried, despondent, nervous, jittery, jumpy, irritable, and confused. We live in rhythmic cycles of ups and downs. We have discussed some causes of these short circuits caused by fear, hate, revenge, jealousy, and anger. When they possess you they will empty into your thoughts and into your veins—a poison that will bog you down in defeat.

And tonight we will conclude these problems under one other powerful short-circuit heading "Pride." I wonder if we know how much one may suffer from pride? Sometimes we say, "Well, he has a lot of pride," not meaning pride at all. We don't always understand the word. When we say it as a compliment, we mean that people have courage and strength; but the pride I am talking about is a false inflation of the ego; that supersensitive nature which is so often hurt; that feeling which blinds us to the truth and makes us paralyzed with inner fears; that unattractive quality that makes us want to quit because someone has not appreciated us. I think it was John Ruskin who said that pride is at the bottom of all great mistakes.

Years ago, when I was a choir boy back in Chicago, each year on Easter night the rector and the choirmaster gave prizes to the outstanding choristers. They gave beautifully engraved gold and silver medals. I had never received a prize. Then came the last Easter that I was to sing; my voice was changing. I waited through the presentation of some seven or eight medals and then they came to the last one. But another name was called and no medal came my way. Instead I was given a book called The Rover Boys. My pride was hurt, so I went home and wrote a note to the choirmaster, which said:

"Dear Mr. Hyde: The book which I received for 5 years' faithful service in St. Peter's choir is now in my locker No. 13 in the choir room. I hereby resign."

Did you ever do that? Are you about to quit a church, or a club, or a lodge, or a

home, or a family, because your pride is hurt? Listen, take the hurt and give it to God, and ask Him to deflate your ego, and go on and forget it. Learn to carry the cross with joy. That's why you go to church. Do your feelings get hurt often? I knew a young woman in another city who joined a tennis club. She was an outstanding player. The girls in the club accepted her and played with her, but there was one who was a would-be social leader and she snubbed this new member. Every time the socialite had an opportunity she passed by without speaking. Now I happened to know the new member very well and I said to her, "What are you going to do about it?" She said, "Oh, I'll fix that. I am just going to stop whenever I meet her and speak to her regardless. She is a nice person with a small mind but I'll help her to overcome it." My friend rode out the storm, lived above it, was a lady, and before long had the respect and the affection of everybody including the problem girl.

How much better it is to have greatness of spirit. If you once see the principle of love and unselfishness, you can afford to take any kind of slights, snubs, insults, and oversights. Then everybody begins to recognize you as a true leader and a great person. Only the sensitive people are always being hurt, getting mad, taking their play things and going home. If you are big and have a sense of humor, you are going to be happy. One of the things that I have been observing recently among a group of outstanding men I know is that most of them are neither suspicious or easily bruised. They have risen above it.

So, finally, let's take all of these unpleasant things that we have been talking about for the past 3 weeks and let's dump them out of ourselves once and for all. We cannot overcome them by our own will power, that is impossible. But God will give us the power to defeat them. He called it grace. Tell Him, point blank, after you have carefully examined yourself and found the short circuits in your life; tell Him that of your own strength you can't conquer them; tell Him you know that with His power and strength you can be made new; and that the short-circuits will be destroyed. Then accept His forgiveness and His new life.

Speech of Maj. Gen. J. E. Dahlquist, Deputy Director, Personnel and Administration Division, General Staff, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Army Day in north Louisiana this year was an outstanding occasion. The people of Caddo and Bossier Parishes were privileged to hear Maj. Gen. J. E. Dahlquist, Deputy Director, Personnel and Administrative Division, General Staff, United States Army. He spoke to a large gathering of many Kiwanis Clubs from all parts of north and central Louisiana and made a splendid speech on Army Day. General Dahlquist ingratiated himself with the people of my home and my congressional district, and it is my privilege to place in the RECORD a copy of the speech which he made on Army Day in Louisiana. It is as follows:

There is one great pleasure that the Regular Army soldier enjoys. He feels at home everywhere in America. Although I have never had the privilege of serving in Louisiana, I count as friends many of your people, especially the citizen soldiers, with whom I have been associated throughout the years. During the war many sons of Louisiana served with me in the Seventieth Division and the Thirty-sixth (Texas) Division. I was never quite sure whether they were Cajuns or not, but I was always certain of their soldierly qualities.

There was one great compensation from the war. It brought men together from every part of the country and forged friendships which will last as long as we live. I was in the Texas Division. When the war ended, it was an all-American division with men from every State in the Union. They were all Texans, of course. An incident that happened a few days after I joined the division in Italy illustrates that fact. In going around the division trying to get acquainted with it, I came upon a strange contraption in one of our areas. It was a bath unit which we had swiped in North Africa. A soldier came out of the tent, gave me a big salute and reported. I remember him as one of the smallest, skinniest men I have ever seen, wearing one of the biggest pair of horn-rimmed glasses. I asked him what outfit this was. He answered, "Company B, One Hundred and Eleventh Engineers." Not yet knowing all the numbers of my units, I asked him what division. He drew himself up to all of his 5 feet and said, "The Thirty-sixth Texas Division—the best division in the Army." "Is that so," I asked, "What part of Texas are you from?" "The Bronx" was his answer.

Whether we are Texans or not, we were all a part of the greatest Army and Navy the world has ever seen. No other nation of comparable size can boast of a people as homogeneous as we are. In another continent, people from areas as far apart as Minnesota and Louisiana would view each other with all the suspicion which springs from different languages, customs, histories, and national aims. This unity which we have is our greatest strength.

Today marks the thirty-second anniversary of our entry into the First World War. Those of us who participated in that war remember its slogans: "The War to Save Democracy," and "The War to End All Wars." Many cynical comments have been made about those slogans. In the decade following the armistice, America was flooded with an avalanche of books and articles and speeches dealing with the problem of war. Pacifism became vocal and strong. Wars were caused by munitions makers, by imperialism, by the international bankers, by the militarists. Do you remember the titles, "The Road to War," the "Merchants of Death," the "Martial Spirit," the slogan, "I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier;" and the organization, "The Veterans of Future Wars"?

Many of our people became convinced that armaments caused wars and that disarmament was the solution. To prove that we believed that, we sank, with our own hands, more men-of-war than had ever been sunk in all of our previous wars by enemy action. We let the active Army deteriorate to a strength of 118,000, scattered in small detachments at home and abroad. More serious than that, we let a generation of young men grow up, firmly convinced that war was wrong under all circumstances and that anyway there would be no more wars. That was the generation which had to bear the burden of the Second World War.

What was wrong in our thinking? In my opinion we were too prone to accept the glib, the clever, the muckraking type of analysis which was about as follows: War is a terrible scourge. It is obviously wrong for fine young men to be destroyed in a struggle not of their choosing. We did not save the world for democracy. We did not end war. Who was to blame? Who were the individual culprits? Let's expose them. Names make good headlines anyway.

We in America, as well as the people in other parts of the world, had a rude awakening, but it took a long time. We were slow to grasp the meaning of the rise of the totalitarian powers. Disarmed spiritually, we failed to act when Japan began the rape of Manchuria, when Hitler occupied the Rhine, when Mussolini wantonly attacked Ethiopia. The depths of degradation for freedom-loving peoples were reached at that fateful meeting in 1938 when Chamberlain and Daladier signed the Munich Pact because they were helpless. Chamberlain announced, "Peace in our time," but what he probably meant was "Peace until we can partially get ready."

Would it have been better for the world had we not fought in World War I and had the German autocracy won the struggle? Assuredly not! World War II resulted not from militarism, from imperialism, from the machinations of either munitions makers or of generals and admirals. It resulted from a failure to recognize the fact that until a world organization is a successful reality, the freedom-loving nations of the world must be prepared to defend themselves and their way of life. In our haste to do away with the distasteful things about war we destroyed the means of averting another. War was bad. Armies and navies fought wars. Industry expanded in war and individuals made fabulous sums of money. Do away with armies and navies and damn the industrialists. That was the simple way in which we would solve a vexing problem. But it was bad reasoning.

We have now fought another great war and have won that. But the objectives we fought for, particularly freedom from fear, have certainly not yet been achieved. Our statesmen are still desperately seeking a solution which will secure the objectives. Winning the military victory was but the first step. It would have been wonderful could that victory have ushered in the era of peace. Unfortunately, such was not to be the case. Our demobilization, many think of it as the great demoralization, of the armed services, was stopped last spring.

A year ago the President in a special message to Congress urged the adoption of certain measures to strengthen our national defense. In support of that program, the Secretary of Defense when appearing before the Senate's Armed Forces Committee stated, "I propose a specific program which is solely designed to achieve one great objective—to avert war—whether it be open or covert, in these times and in the times which lie ahead for us and the free people of the world." The Congress held exhaustive hearings and lengthy debates on the proposals, and before the session ended approved appropriations and enacted defense legislation to give approval to the general program. It was an unprecedented thing. This legislation wrote in letters big enough for anyone to read that the United States is willing to take the preparedness measures required.

No longer is the issue one of preparedness versus unpreparedness as it was in the decade preceding World War II. Our people recognize now as they never have before the vital necessity that this Nation be strong if the free peoples of the world are to remain free. There is no debate in the halls of Congress, on the public forums, or in the editorial pages

of our responsible press on the necessity for military preparedness. The great problem that confronts us today is the amount and kind of military readiness that we need for our security.

If the zealots of each of the armed services had their collective ways, there would be an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force in being and ready for action, greater in size and superior in equipment to those of any other nation or collection of nations in the world. But in accomplishing such an objective, we would lose the very freedom we seek. We would have to adopt Hitler's famous dictum: guns instead of butter. All of our thought, all of our energies, all of our production would go into armament. Controls, regimentation, and a bare existence standard of life would be our lot. Obviously, we must seek a saner and a better solution than that.

If the partisans of any one of the services had their way, the available resources would be largely spent on their service to the exclusion of the others and generally on one type of weapon. Fortunately, for our Nation the men charged with responsibility for the problem of security, that is the President, the Congress, and our defense chiefs, both civilian and miltary, do not share this view.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to the fact that for the last 2 years in both the Senate and the House there has been but one Armed Services Committee. Establishing a single committee in each House for all armed services has resulted in a most salutary surveillance of the problem of national security. It has been a surveillance from a national viewpoint instead of from a single-service viewpoint. Your Representative, OVERTON BROOKS, is a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and you have every right to be proud of the job he is doing. The Nation is fortunate to have committees composed of such men keeping close watch on the armed services.

When he submitted his budget this year, the President stated, "The basic concept on which my recommendations are based is that the Nation's military security should rest on a nucleus of highly trained and mobile forces—Army, Navy, and Air—backed by ready Reserves of trained men, stand-by equipment and productive facilities, and an integrated mobilization plan which relates our national security requirements to the tremendous productive capacity of American industry."

The Army wholeheartedly subscribes to this concept. Its theme on this Army Day of 1949 is "The United States Army—Part of the Team—for Security." For without a team made up not only of the Regular components of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, but also of the citizen soldiers, their civilian components, and of the great productive genius of our industry, we can have no security. Our Chief of Staff stated our viewpoint well when at Boston on February 4 he said: "Security is a cooperative venture; it is not a competitive race. To forewarn aggressors and to construct effective military might, we are in need of partnership, not partisanship, concern for the safety of this Nation, not the survival of our arms."

The security of the world was almost destroyed by the rising tide of pacifism in the democracies in the decades preceding the outbreak of World War II. Unpreparedness and weakness has never stopped an aggressor. It has encouraged him. Hitler's statement to his commanders on August 22, 1939, bears eloquent testimony to that fact. Just 9 days before the Nazi marched into Poland and started World War II, he said, "We have nothing to lose; we can only gain—our enemies have men who are below average—no personalities, no men of action * * * our enemies are little worms * * * I saw them in Munich." He was not impressed by weakness. No aggressor ever is.

Today, most people realize that fact. Pacifism is certainly dormant if not dead. Today the danger to the security of the world lies in the search for an easy solution. It lies in the siren song that wars can be won by science and technology alone. It lies in the doctrine preached by the arm-chair strategists that the atomic bomb carried to the heart of the enemies' territory will result in an instant decision. It lies in the delusion that we dare risk our future on any one weapon, no matter how devastating that weapon can be.

The prophets of such doctrines apparently believe that in a future atomic war each contestant will cower in his own homeland while he strives to destroy his adversary thousands of miles away by deluging his cities with destruction. The real "Buck Rogers" of this group would do it with pilotless rockets. Such a thesis completely ignores the fact that we live in a world of many peoples; the majority of whom have the same ideals, the same aspirations for freedom as we have. Sole reliance on the effectiveness of bombing alone means abandonment of these people to the ravishment of war. And if they should be overrun, would we then be willing to subject them to atomic bombardment?

If we fail to preserve the relative readiness of our Army and our Navy to seize and hold advance bases we do abandon the promise of timely help for our allies. American isolationists helped bring on two world wars because the aggressor felt we would not and could not bring our strength to bear in time. A new type of isolationism in which we abandon the whole Western World to the ravishes of war while we strive to end it by global bombardment from our own shores is just as dangerous. It would truly isolate us and leave us alone in a world subjugated and controlled.

Failure of the initial bombardments to end the conflict would condemn us to a war of attrition with the odds against us ever growing larger. It would make our homeland a beleaguered fortress, and no war was ever won from within a fortress. I do not think our people will be willing to subject themselves to such a fate.

Fortunately, for our Nation, the military leaders of all three services fully understand that the security of the Nation, yes, of the world, depends upon teamwork. It was General Vandenberg who, a few months ago, said: "The three services are in complete agreement that no one service can do the job alone." The United States Army is the most air-minded military force in the world. It recognizes the vast capabilities of air power as a priority weapon for attack against an aggressor. It realizes that threat of instant retaliation through an air offensive is possibly the greatest deterrent to war today. Finally, no one knows better than a veteran soldier of the last war that dominance in the air is a prerequisite for victory on the ground.

However, we also realize that air power itself is weak without the other services. The Army conceives its mission, first, to make possible; second, to complement the roles of the sea and air members of our defense team. Those missions dictate the present day form of your Army. It must contain small but highly trained and mobile forces ready for immediate deployment; it must also have trained reserves in sufficient numbers to permit the rapid mobilization of the forces necessary to bring a conflict to a victorious conclusion.

In the last 2 wars our insular position and our allies gave us time and space to build our armies. We could choose the time and place for our entry into battle. This is no longer the case. If we wish to make our air power effective we must be able to seize and hold the bases from which it can bring to bear in ever increasing intensity its blows. Sporadic and weak attacks will not do the job. Nor must we ever forget that bombers can fly in both directions. Security for our homeland lies principally in our ability to deny an enemy access to those places from which he could effectively hit us. Unless the enemy suddenly collapses from our air blows and unless we are willing to subject ourselves to a war of attrition from which there can be no end except ruin, we must be prepared to strike at his forces, wrest from him his bases, and destroy his armies.

This means two things, mobilization of armies and of our industrial might. Mobilization of armies depends upon the trained citizen soldier, the Organized Reserves and the National Guard.

The budget for next year gives a good picture of what is considered by our leaders the Army requirement for security. The total sum allotted, except for housing is $4,000,400,000. A sizable amount of this must go to the cost of our occupation troops. It will give us 10 Regular Army divisions plus 59 battalions of supporting troops, plus the overhead on which must be based mobilization. Two hundred and seventy thousand of these troops are of necessity deployed overseas. This Regular component must be ready for immediate deployment. It certainly is not a mass army, but properly equipped and properly led, it can give us some time. Backing up this force will be 550,000 Reservists and National Guard men in a training status.

Expenditures for this civilian component will total $760,000,000. That is 30 percent higher than this year and twice the amount spent last year. This money will be spent to cover drill and training pay and maintenance of reservists, operating expenses and procurement of equipment over and above the amounts transferred from wartime stocks.

Lacking universal military training, the work of the Reserve components is of vital importance to the Nation. They must form the framework for mobilization. We possess now something we never had before, thousands of war-trained and highly competent officers, but age has already started to take its toll and we must see to it that the younger brothers are given as much training as facilities and their time will permit. The ROTC just rebuilt after the war is of prime importance in producing the young combat leader of the future.

Fifteen billions of dollars for the National Military Establishment, four and one-half billion of which goes to the Army, is a tremendous sum of money. It imposes a burden on every one of you. But it is a burden worth carrying if it can avert another war. That can be the only justification for such expenditures. The size of our military forces today does not give us absolute security. I, personally, doubt that there is any such thing. If we are not to become a police state ourselves, we must accept some military risk. The Army subscribes to the necessity of precedence in military spending. Real security can only come from a healthy progressive people. Constantly improving living conditions for those who labor will insure that our great industrial plant will be equal to any challenge. The ability of our people to produce, coupled with a balanced military force able and ready to act quickly and decisively, gives the freedom-loving peoples of the world, and they are legion, faith and hope in eventual reconstruction of a world in which the dignity of the individual human being will be respected. War is not inevitable. It does not have to come. It can be prevented if we can rebuild the spirit and hope of men and women throughout the western Christian world. For the aggressor

will not strike if he knows defeat and destruction await him if he does.

Four things stand out in my memories of the last war. First, was the impression bombed London made upon me. I went there in May 1941, just as Hitler's furious bombardment was dying out. I saw the acres and acres of destruction along the East India docks. I saw the complete ruin of the so-called "City of London." But more impressive, I saw the courage of the Englishmen who refused to give up. He seemed to stand completely alone but he gave no thought to surrender. The second memory is of the great armada that stood off the shores of the French Riviera at dawn on August 15, 1944. We were beginning the sixth and final amphibious assault in the European and Mediterreanean theaters. Hundreds of ships bearing the men of three great veteran divisions, the Third, the Thirty-sixth, and the Forty-fifth, rode to and fro within sight of the shore as though thumbing their collective noses at Hitler. The last bombs of a great air strike had just exploded when the guns and the rockets of the men of war opened up and men in small boats started in to go across the beaches. It was the greatest assembly of power I have ever seen. The Mediterranean Air Force, the Western Naval Task Force, the Seventh United States Army were all part of it. Any one of these forces would have been powerless. Together they were irresoluble.

The third memory is of the indomitable spirit of the foot soldiers, the men of my own Thirty-sixth Division, in the fall of 1944. They had already spent one horrible winter in the mountains of Italy. Now after more than 100 days of continuous combat since landing in southern France, they faced the dark and forbidding Vosges Mountains. Nothing but great masses of heavily wooded, rugged hills faced them. Other units were to go through relatively open passes. These men had but one tortuous, narrow, winding, seemingly impassable road leading over the St. Marie Pass. Supporting aviators would be of little help because the aviators could see nothing below but a jungle-like tree growth. There was no room for massed artillery and its observers would be blind. Tanks could not be used except singly. Furthermore, the Vosges was an obstacle that never had been breached. Those men did breach it, however. They did, although they were dead tired, depleted in strength, and without much help from modern armament. They did it by climbing the hills and carrying their weapons in their hands and ammunition on their backs, destroying the German defender at close range. My memory of that fall is a memory of what indomitable men can do regardless of fatigue or obstacles or hardship.

The fourth and probably the most lasting memory is the picture of the last 10 days of the war, when we were deep in southern Bavaria and the Austrian Tyrol. As we had moved through the Siegfried line, across the Rhine, and on into Germany, we had seen the destruction wrought on German cities and Germany industry. They were nothing but a mass of rubble. They had been destroyed for months but still the German soldier fought on and the war was not over. But in those last hectic days we saw the death of an empire in the thousands, yes, tens of thousands, of prisoners, dusty, disheveled, bedraggled, who flowed past our leading columns in search of the prisoner of war cages in the area. We saw in those columns of wretched people the destruction of the mighty Wehrmacht, and, with it, for us the victory for which we had been struggling.

Those four memories, of bombed London, of the power of an amphibious assault, of the indomitable will of soldiers, and of the destruction of the German Army, teach one lesson and that is the victory in modern war is not won by sea power, or air power, or ground power—it is won by military power, which means a proper balance of all three supported by the industry and will power of a united people.

Stop Running

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Lily Pons, which appeared in This Week magazine of March 27, 1949:

STOP RUNNING

(By Lily Pons)

"The ideal man is his own best friend and takes delight in privacy" (Aristotle).

American people are becoming more and more like the Red Queen in Alice in Wonderland, who had to keep running in order to stay where she was. The hectic tempo and mass activity of the business world have spread into all phases of modern life. People have forgotten how to slow down, how to be alone.

How often, during the furious activity of the week, we think of all the things we will accomplish on the week end—reading a book we have long heard about, taking care of unfinished correspondence, putting our houses—literally and figuratively—in order. But when the week end arrives, we find ourselves hurrying to parties to which we do not really want to go, being swept up by a dozen social obligations. Finally there is nothing left to the week end but the beginning of another working week.

But the ideal man whom Aristotle described, indeed, the healthy man in this or any other generation, allows himself some time for his own thoughts. He is able to behave as a social being when he is in society, but he is not afraid of his own company. He knows that each day he must give some time to contemplation—that is, to looking over his actions of the day and comparing them with his intentions, making constructive plans for the future, and simply being himself.

The problem, of course, is where to find the time or the place to be alone. Singers and musicians are fortunate, for their work compels them to take time to study and practice, and time to rest before performances or concerts.

If musicians find such relaxation a help, then I think men and women in the business world would, too. Take a little time before that next conference to let your mind run away from office cares. Break the boredom of a routine job, now and then, with a few minutes of escape thinking. If you have time left over after lunch, take a walk, and daydream or window shop as you go.

Privacy of this sort can be found by any man. And each of us must find it if he is to remain a consistent and sane individual with a normal, happy social life.

A Fine Citizen Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, God and the people of my district were good to me on November 2 last.

I am not unmindful that there were many capable and good men in my district who also sought to come here to serve God and country. One of these was Dr. Horace Tantum, of Nutley, N. J. Though he was of the opposite political faith, I know that his was simply an unselfish ambition to sit here in this great and august body as a servant of the people and to work toward the common good. For this I admired and respected him. I do not stand alone. For the many fine people of Nutley, N. J., to whom he had dedicated a lifetime of public service and devotion had long before me counted him as one of their finest citizens.

Though the loss will long be felt now that he has passed away, I am certain that as Mr. Hunzin puts it, "The town is so much better for 'Tod' having passed through it."

I did not know him so well as others who affectionately called him "Tod," but having known his deeds and useful record, I can well say, "He was made of gentle clay." And in reverence and respect to his memory and ambition, I feel it fitting as one who also seeks to serve, that these remarks and the editorial tribute in the Nutley Sun be published in this, our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A FINE CITIZEN PASSES

The town is so much better for "Tod" Tantum having passed through it.

Ever a fine citizen, devoted to his friends and fellows, without personal ambition as a stimulant, Dr. Tantum will long be remembered for the good he has done, the good will he has created. But for a quirk of politics, he would have ended his life in the halls of the Nation he loved and served with devotion.

Among us, there are few who do not have, for some widely different reason, cause to respect "Tod" Tantum, to revere his memory, to be grateful for his friendship, so warmly and richly given out of his gratitude for the trust and friendship of others.

Perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid his memory is the realization that his long life of service and civic activity remains unsullied. In his character, there was only goodness and honesty, a loyal belief in his fellows. The belated maneuver which, last year, cost him a nomination to Congress impressed him only by the humorous antics of the dickerers. His true friends can be glad that another finally was chosen, for it preserved for his family and for all of us those final few months which were spent among us.

The entire community mourns the passing of a man who, surely, will stand out in the pages of history of our town as the outstanding citizen of our generation. As a comparative newcomer, without the opportunity to have witnessed the wealth of good deeds done by "Tod" Tantum for his town, I feel a depth of loss for a true friendship which he gave so generously in realization of the dif-

ficulties of a return, after half a life, to the land of birth.

With tears and a heavy heart, with gratitude and emotion, but with pride, Nutley and all of us will remember and revere a great friend, a fine citizen.

R. E. H.

A Great Week's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 10, 1949, entitled "A Great Week's Work":

A GREAT WEEK'S WORK

A series of developments that began with the signing of the Atlantic Pact and ended with a truly impressive vote in the United States Senate for extension of the European recovery program might well be summed up in the words of Mr. Ernest Bevin as "a great week's work in the history of the world." It was a week which demonstrated beyond cavil the constructive vitality of Western democracy, the ability of men and nations to sink their minor differences in the face of a challenge that confronted them all.

There was progress in every major field of activity engaging the interest of the Atlantic community of peoples. The signing of the pact and the presentation of a program for European rearmament were important steps toward buttressing the military security of a great area of the world; the overwhelming reaffirmation by the Senate of the Marshall plan gave confidence that economic reconstruction would proceed at an accelerated pace; the agreement reached by the United States, Great Britain, and France on the German question went to the heart of the most difficult political problem vexing the Atlantic nations. There will be many practical obstacles in the way of carrying out the policies adopted during the great week, but the broad outline of a workable society of interdependent states has been sketched on a scale seldom approached in history.

There is no disguising the fact that much of the impetus for last week's efforts was defensive, that it was inspired by the threat of Russian aggression. The Kremlin would deny it, but it is the Politburo which has shaped this new, close union of nations, and has created a pattern of international collaboration which may well outlive, and overshadow in history, the fears which gave it birth. For it is to the honor of western statesmen, and the political order they represent, that although an emergency has called the Atlantic community into formal existence, its economic and political forms look beyond the immediate crisis, beyond the accumulation of weapons, in seeking security. Perhaps the nature of total war and the pervasive techniques of Communist infiltration should also claim some of the credit for this trend, but in any case the efforts of the west have been directed not merely toward military preparedness but toward the fostering of economic health and political sanity within its domain.

Thus, out of the tragedy of a world divided—a division which was not of the west's seeking, and which it did everything possible to avoid—has emerged a sense of unity among the Atlantic nations, expressed in practical measures to assist the well-being of their peoples. These steps are essentially peaceful in nature, and they require continued peace if they are to progress to their goal. The west poses no threat to any state, or group of states, but, like Scotland's symbolic thistle, it presents a warning: "No one provokes me with impunity."

The Skipper of Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial entitled "The Skipper of Guadalcanal," from the New York Times of March 27, 1949.

This editorial is a fitting tribute to Gen. A. A. Vandegrift on the occasion of his retirement from active duty. General Vandegrift has achieved a reputation that places him among the great combat commanders produced by our Nation. In addition to his able professional attributes, his career was further distinguished by the fact that he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his bravery and leadership on Guadalcanal.

In a larger sense General Vandegrift's accomplishments are but a reflection of the Marine Corps itself. His courage in the face of Japanese supposed superiority in Guadalcanal was the same kind of courage as was possessed by those gallant marines who comprised the indomitable First Marine Division. This Nation will not forget the magnificent achievement of the First Division, which, under General Vandegrift, halted the Japanese imperial advance at Guadalcanal, and by so doing put our country on the road to victory.

It was no accident that General Vandegrift and his First Marine Division were selected to spearhead the Allied offensive in the Pacific. Marines had long studied and prepared for such an amphibious type of warfare. Indeed it was fortunate that marines had developed their amphibious specialty to such a point of perfection between the wars. When it was discovered that the First Marine Division was the only readily available division for the assault on Guadalcanal, the marines under the leadership of General Vandegrift were able to demonstrate the dominant attributes of fleet marine forces—ready availability and amphibious proficiency. Such fleet marine forces as General Vandegrift commanded proved to be a decisive factor in the campaigns waged in the vast Pacific. Although marines did not participate in all landing operations in the last war, it was still the amphibious know-how developed by our Marine Corps that was used by Allied troops in their many amphibious operations throughout the world.

It was under General Vandegrift and other able marine field commanders that the value of specialized amphibious troops was repeatedly demonstrated.

A maritime nation such as ours will never have an adequate number of specially trained amphibious troops in case of war. Therefore, Congress evidenced great wisdom when, in passing the National Security Act of 1947, it provided for the continuation of a permanent agency to develop landing techniques, equipment, and tactics. When we recall the record of General Vandegrift and his marines in the last war, as well as the brilliant achievements of the Marine Corps in developing amphibious knowledge and matériel, we can understand why Congress assigned the amphibious mission to the Marine Corps.

As we contemplate the true significance of the glorious achievements of General Vandegrift and his marines on Guadalcanal as they fought jungle and Jap to turn the tide of Nipponese conquest, and by so doing gave us our long-needed victory in the Pacific, we can be certain the historians will someday add Guadalcanal to the list of history's decisive battles.

With good reason peoples of the Allied Nations can, on the occasion of General Vandegrift's retirement, wish him well, for he and his marines have earned a "well done" message from all who believe in those things for which the Allied Nations fought the greatest of world wars.

The editorial follows:

THE SKIPPER OF GUADALCANAL

The retirement of Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift will remove from the active list of the United States Marine Corps one of its finest officers and one of the most modest of the men who fashioned victory for their country in the war against Japan. It was the Marines' First Division, which he led in the attack on Guadalcanal, that exploded the myth of the Japanese soldier as a superman and set the pattern for the successful island fighting that followed.

When General Vandegrift—then wearing only two stars—sailed from New Zealand for the Solomon Islands in July of 1942 the Japanese conquest of half a world was almost complete. They held all of China they wanted, the Philippines, the Netherlands Indies, Malaya, Siam, and they were deep in Burma. The ineffectiveness of the defenses of those areas had inflated the Japanese to fantastic proportions as a fighting man. The 15,000 men led by General Vandegrift were about the only troops trained in amphibious warfare that the United States had.

Facing the frightening unknown on Guadalcanal, the reinforced Marines' First Division soon proved that a properly trained American, equipped with good weapons, was more than a match for the Japanese. With inadequate air support and only timid sea support for 3 months, the marines successfully slugged it out with a constantly reinforced enemy and did it with a proportion of fatalities that was not equaled again—700 marine dead to an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 of the enemy. The keyman of the whole show was the tall, balding, soft-spoken marine in unpressed khaki who occupied the No. 1 tent in the willow thicket hard

by the Lunga River. None deserved more the Medal of Honor that was awarded him.

General Vandegrift was the first marine ever to wear the four stars of a full general, which also was appropriate. For it was under his command in the South Pacific and later as commandant of the corps that the marines finally reached their full stature and received full recognition as the world's elite fighting force. Anyone who saw them in action would not trade Vandegrift and his marines for any other shock troops in the world. After 40 years of service he can leave the corps secure in the knowledge that he added luster to its reputation.

An Assault on the Civil-Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article taken from the April 3, 1949, issue of the Washington Times-Herald. Although the article is written in a facetious vein and without precise regard for factual accuracy, it nevertheless invites attention to what amounts to an assault on the civil-service system.

My purpose in placing the article in the RECORD is twofold. First, I wish to invite attention to the high purpose which apparently is followed by the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Kenneth Royall, and by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Tracy Voorhees, in the selection and appointment of the civilian employees of the Department of the Army. Secondly, I want to bring to the widest possible attention the account of an assault on the position of a civil-service worker which, as I see it, really constitutes an assault on the civil-service system itself. It is immaterial to me whether this assault is motivated by a thirst for political patronage or by a consuming desire for personal revenge.

It seems that a former Republican candidate for Congress has been appointed to a position in the Department of the Army. On inquiry I have learned that the position is in the classified civil service, that it is a grade CAF–14 which pays somewhat less than $10,000 a year, that it is in the office of Assistant Secretary Voorhees, and that the appointment was made in strict observance of the civil-service law and regulations. The appointee, a former Navy commander, Roy E. James, is a long-time career civil servant and World War II veteran who has simply been reinstated into the civil service at the same grade which he resigned a little more than a year ago in order to run for Congress.

In my view, Army Secretary Royall should be commended, not censored, as the article indicates. In making the appointment, Mr. Royall quite properly refrained from inquiring into the party affiliation of the applicant. In that respect, Secretary Royall and his aides observed not only the letter but also the spirit of civil-service law and regulations. More than that, they demonstrated that neither party affiliation nor considerations of political patronage are taken into account in the selection of the civilians who work with the Army. It would be a sad day indeed if civilian positions in any of the component parts of the defense establishment were reduced to mere prizes in the patronage grabbag.

I herewith insert the newspaper item:

DEMOCRATS WAIL AS REPUBLICAN GRABS FANCY JOB

(By Edward K. Nellor)

Patronage-hungry Democrats have unwittingly provided an answer to the question of what happens to defeated Republican congressional candidates—they get $10,000-a-year jobs in the Truman administration.

At least, this was the happy fate of one Pennsylvania Republican, who slipped into a top-salaried Army job.

BATTLED PATRONAGE CHIEF

The occurrence has an added sting for faithful but job-hunting Democrats inasmuch as the individual involved was defeated by the veteran House stalwart, Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a nip-and-tuck race.

WALTER, the good Democrats shudder to admit, is patronage chief of the administration.

Just how it happened the administration's patronage boss let a top-flight job go to a Republican, and (shades of Joe Grundy) to the man who almost trimmed a big administration wheel, is the subject of much soul-searching at the moment.

BLAME PUT ON ROYALL

Roy James, serenely entrenched in the $10,000-a-year Army information job, is the man who tangled with WALTER during the Pennsylvania congressional scrap. To make it worse, James had some harsh things to say about WALTER. In fact, both candidates swapped punches freely in the close race.

Unfortunately, the finger of guilt is now being pointed at Army Secretary Royall, as WALTER and angry White House aides seek a scapegoat to blame for the patronage fiasco.

Royall can't stand the harsh words that are being uttered about him over this incident. He is already on the skids as far as administration Democrats are concerned. Now, the scalp hunters are out after him in earnest.

IT'S A LAUGH TO GOP

Naturally, the incident is providing Republicans with many hours of mirth. As for James, he considers the cries of anguish from President Truman's faithful the just reward for victory-happy Democrats who sat around gloating instead of reaching for the political plum.

James is qualified for his post. He put in 17 years in the Department of Interior before resigning in 1947 to run against WALTER.

James can be removed only if WALTER can prove him unqualified, a violator of the Hatch Act or a Communist. Friends of the Pennsylvania Republican say James is simonpure on all three scores.

As Democratic patronage boss, WALTER has had plenty of trouble. However, all previous gripes from deserving Democrats are minor ones in comparison to his own shouts of anguish over Royall's approval of James for the Army job. He has carried his beef to the White House.

Naturally, Mr. Truman was not happy over the James appointment. Whether or not he can soothe WALTER'S ruffled feelings by getting rid of James is the subject of high administration strategy meetings of the moment.

Meanwhile, deserving Democrats drool outside Royall's Pentagon doorway, helplessly contemplating those 10,000 good administration dollars being wasted on a Republican politician.

Hon. James Wolfenden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN F. JAMES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, news of the death of James Wolfenden, a distinguished former Member of this House for nine successive terms, while not completely surprising, came to the people of Delaware County, Pa., as well as to his many former colleagues in the Congress, with unexpected suddenness.

Though in steadily declining health for several years he had waged a courageous battle against the inevitable and even the most recent reports gave no indication the end was near at hand.

I have the honor to represent here the people of the congressional district whom "Jim" Wolfenden served for many years, so ably and in so many ways. In their names and on their behalf I gratefully acknowledge the many splendid tributes paid to him as a man and as a public servant, and the many expressions of sorrow and remembrance by those in this body at whose side he had labored.

We of Delaware County will remember "Jim" not alone as an able and earnest Representative of our district in the Congress, but also as a leader in the development and growth of our largest community, the township of Upper Darby, to which he gave unstinting devotion and unswerving loyalty.

It was there that his forebears from England settled more than a century ago and established a small enterprise in the wilderness beyond the city of Philadelphia. Through three generations of his family that enterprise prospered with its community and Jim's pride in the little city that has grown from a village in the woods was boundless.

Like his father he served in the governing body of his township, and, like him, gave leadership and support to every movement for the greater good and contentment of its people.

Jim Wolfenden's faith in the American way of life as the means to a happier world was profound and often expressed. He had before him always the examples of high achievement within his family and within his community under the American system of free enterprise and freedom of opportunity. He labored diligently to sustain and promote the true, self-reliant spirit of American democracy in his community, his State, and in this Nation. May he find rewarding peace everlasting. May his widow and family find consolation in pleasant memories at this time of their great bereavement.

World Federation Necessary To Prevent War and Protect Freedom and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a letter received from Prof. Charles C. Price, head, department of chemistry, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., April 4, 1949.
Hon. THURMAN C. CROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a Quaker scientist, with the deepest respect for our American principles and ideals, who has had and continues to have an active role in war research, I would like to express my thoughts on our present dilemma. It is my firm conviction and belief:

1. That another war would bring vast destruction to our American people, our cities, our economy, and our political institutions, as to all other nations involved;

2. That history demonstrates that any league or organization which depends solely on the good will and consent of all its individual members for its effective operation is doomed to fall and inevitably will lead to war;

3. That the only hope to avoid this catastrophe to us and to all humanity is through an effective world federation with powers limited but adequate to prevent war;

4. That if we are firm and clear in making a proposal which will prevent war and protect each nation's domestic rights, there is a real chance that Russia will realize the practical benefits and accept;

5. That, as our only hope, each of us must do everything within his power to present this, the greatest issue of our time, to the American people for action; and

6. That, to this end, everyone interested in the future of the United States and of the world should read and understand the Anatomy of Peace by Emery Reves, one of the truly great books of all time, one which will profoundly influence human destiny.

I hope and believe that you, as a representative of the American people, will do whatever you can to make a world federation strong enough to prevent war and protect freedom and justice the clearly expressed aim of our Government.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES C. PRICE,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

What Is a Liberal, Progressive Republican?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, few men have I ever known in or out of Congress whom I respect as much, admire more, or love as dearly as Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, of the State of Maine.

The first day he came to Congress I greeted him and there began a friendship that has ripened, strengthened, and grown more precious through the years. Mrs. Short and I have been in his home and he has been in our many, many times.

Born in the rugged north country, FRANK FELLOWS has learned through long experience and bitter struggle how to deal with the formidable forces of nature and the strong competition of men.

Before coming to Congress FRANK FELLOWS was a brilliant and successful lawyer, building up with his brother, the former attorney general and now a supreme court justice of Maine, Hon. Raymond Fellows, one of the largest and most lucrative practices in that beautiful State. Since coming to the House of Representatives he has, by hard work, diligent application, pleasing personality, keen wit, rare humor, won an imperishable place in the hearts and minds of all his colleagues.

For many hours we have listened to him quote poetry, discuss complicated legal problems, discourse upon complex legislation, and with superb histrionic and theatrical ability entertain his friends.

FRANK FELLOWS is a philospher, as well as a scholar, lawyer, and statesman, and above everything else is a loyal friend. He is serious because he refuses to be too serious, and is most intelligent because he knows he does not know it all.

Recently Congressman FELLOWS delivered a broadcast over some of the radio stations in Maine, and when several young men from my district in Missouri were visiting the Capitol the other day I asked FRANK to read this broadcast to them. He kindly acquiesced, and these young Americans from the Key Club in Joplin, Mo., were so visibly impressed that they have written me since their return home to kindly send them a copy of the Honorable FRANK FELLOWS' inspiring address.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include this address which clearly reflects many of the sterling qualities of one of the greatest and best men I have ever known:

Spring has started up the coast, and touches with its magic wand the icy lids of lake and stream, stirs the sleeping crocuses and trailing arbutus, blows its warm and fragrant breath on the forsythia hugging southern walls of old farmhouses, and starts sap running and small boys' interest in marbles and kites. Its promise each year fills the world with new hope.

And in this year of our Lord 1949, the Congress of the United States has placed before it proposals that, if adopted, will in time remove this country forever from its present role as the hope of the hopeless. As of today, few, if any, nations offer the opportunity these United States set before their young people to work and build a competence. It is true that the present trend is toward taxing away more and still more of income, thus cutting incentive as well as possible savings toward such a competence. Already, so-called planners would, by Government subsidy, make up that difference in income between those who, given equal opportunity, succeed and those who do not. Such procedure disregards the nature of man. Man will not make a supreme effort and practice thrift to obtain something the Government will give gratis to the other fellow, who squanders both time and money.

Recently I received from a constituent a letter urging me to indicate by word and deed that I was "a liberal, progressive Republican." I don't know whether that person knew what he was talking about. Certainly I did not. The words "liberal" and "conservative" have been kicked around until Noah Webster or any student of English would be fit material for a psychiatrist if he attempted to rationalize some of the statements we hear made today regarding them.

Those who favor centralized government, and who, strangely enough, now refer to themselves as "liberals," encourage the natural tendency most people have to let someone else take responsibility—so, increasingly, eyes turn to Washington for answers to the questions that plague either individuals or groups. As a result, Congress is asked to give authority to Government agencies to confiscate the property of the landlord under the terms of a rent-control law which in thousands of instances will make illegal a fair return on the investment—and this under the guise of war. The Constitution forbids the taking of private property without just compensation.

Abraham Lincoln, that poor boy who sought no subsidy—no Federal assistance—in speaking of property said, "Let him not who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself; thus, by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Because, in the common course of human events, sickness and even death invade the homes of all of us, Government bureaus dream up scareheads for newspapers and statistics for radio broadcasts regarding the horrible prevalence of malnutrition, heart disease, etc. We are given to understand that malnutrition in our State, as well as others, is due to poverty, when, as a matter of fact, it is a condition almost as common among the wealthy as among the poor. Frequently it is the result of lack of thought, rather than of cash to buy proper food, that creates the difficulty. But Government planners and professional do-gooders would assure the hypochondriac that more power in and money from Washington will quickly solve the problem, and we must have, they tell us, compulsory health insurance.

If Federal supervision and control of the individual and business—government by bureaucracy—and relinquishment of personal liberty are liberal policies, then most certainly I shall remain what advocates of such things scathingly term "reactionary" and "conservative."

Wherever these social and socialistic schemes have been tried, they have failed miserably to produce either happiness or progress. What use is there in reading, if we do not note and profit by the experience of others? History is of little use if it records and does not teach. The New Deal and the Fair Deal were new to us, but were experiments that had been tried and discarded elsewhere. The old saying that "Experience is the only school for fools" labels us definitely as at least immature, unwilling to learn from others, tinkerers with rejected theories, and not worldly wise realists. Social planners—some no doubt with the best intentions—will bring this country to economic and moral bankruptcy if our present course is long followed.

In Washington last week, mayors held a convention at which Mr. Truman stated he holds out hope for some of his so-called Fair

Deal. As there was nothing new about the New Deal, so there is nothing fair about the Fair Deal. As the word "deal" implies, both involve the element of chance, as in any card game. To gamble with freedom, liberty, and national solvency is not only wicked—it is suicidal.

In speaking to this same conference of mayors, Mr. Bernard Baruch, the elder statesman with whom many Presidents have taken counsel, asked this question: "Everybody wants to lean upon the Central Government, but who is the Government to lean upon but the people?"

General Eisenhower also spoke, warning local government against being tempted to pass things unnecessarily to the Federal Government, lest in surrendering their responsibilities they surrender their authority. He said they may undermine the American concept of democracy if they depend upon the Federal Government to solve their problems.

I again quote Mr. Baruch, who said, "You have seen planners of all sorts in every country, and look at the mess. Some of the worst mistakes of modern times have been committed by Government planners."

So far as I can figure out, the main difference today between what they are pleased to call a liberal and a conservative is one of method. Presumably both desire the attainment of the greatest possible good for the greatest possible number, but a conservative believes in giving the individual freedom and letting him find the answers, while the so-called liberal of today believes in giving the central government both the power and privilege of furnishing the answers.

Mr. Baruch suggests that we look at the condition in which other countries find themselves; to observe what government planners can accomplish in the way of chaos and confusion. Baruch is definitely a conservative, I should say. He, too, believes that to ignore history and the awful experience of other countries is to deliberately court disaster with a view to marriage with calamity and ruin. Our Government and our way of life evolved through observation of the bitter experience of others with their forms and their ways.

The last outposts of freedom in this country are our religious institutions and our schools. We have prided ourselves on our freedom of religion and education, and others have envied us. But recently I heard the statement that more and more people are taking their problems to the labor unions for solution. And you and I know that more and more they are taking their questions to the Government for answer. What a commentary.

Where is our vaunted individualism? Where have our homes, our churches, and our schools failed? Failed they certainly have, if that statement is correct. No child acquires knowledge by letting his parents do his home work, and no athlete keeps in physical trim by allowing someone else to take his work-outs and sit in his place at the training table.

Reliance on our own initiative and acceptance by each of us of responsibility for our own economic future and that of less fortunate relatives and friends is sound procedure. The founding fathers thought it made for good morals and good government. It may mean I am a conservative—even a reactionary—but I agree with them.

Our Constitution recognizes no common or uncommon man, but endows each of us with self-respect, a certain dignity, and guarantees us freedom and opportunity to work out our own political and economic salvation. It recognizes that the desire for freedom of thought and action—the urge to function as an independent entity and acquire property—is inherent. It is as ridiculous to fail to perceive the laws of nature as it is to break them, for no act of Congress can repeal these natural laws.

Let us think on these things, while we join with one of our Maine poets in saying—

If we should pray and pray and pray
From now until next Christmas Day,
We could not ask God's intervention
In half the ills which merit mention.

And so, to save God's time, and ours,
To concentrate our utmost powers,
We have composed a simple prayer
For all our friends to bring to bear.

God, give us grit and grant us grace
To push Saint Paul from Jesus' place.
Make purpose firmer, action wiser,
To save us from the Organizer.

Without recourse to any plan,
Let each one do the best he can.
May here be where, and now be when,
Christ's way be how, peace why, Amen.

Andrew L. Somers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of April 7, 1949. It is but one more deserving tribute to a faithful public servant.

ANDREW L. SOMERS

With the death of Representative Andrew L. Somers, Brooklyn lost its second Congressman within the past half year. The son of a distinguished Brooklynite, Mr. Somers embarked on a political career as a young man and was first elected to represent the Tenth District in 1924. Last fall he was reelected for a thirteenth consecutive term. In the nearly a quarter of a century that he served in the House, Mr. Somers always took particular interest in those matters that closely concerned Brooklyn and her people. He won special recognition, however, as a champion of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. He helped organize the Jewish Army, made a 2-week inspection tour of the Israeli battlefront, and was in the forefront of the fight for full recognition of the young nation by the United States. The passing of this experienced legislator at the age of 54 will be mourned by a host of friends and admirers.

Economic Cooperation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Cooperation Act will have my support because I firmly believe the operation of the ECA over the past year has demonstrated that it is the most effective way of preventing the drawing westward in Europe of the iron curtain.

Everyone realizes that $5,500,000,000 is an extremely heavy burden on the American taxpayers, but it is small when compared to the cost of a world war III. It is estimated that $5,500,000,000 would not pay for more than 41 days of another world war. This program, having been inaugurated and having led the anti-Communist groups in Europe to take hope, should be continued, through the most critical period since the end of World War II and the most critical year of the ECA. The unification and confederation of Europe should be the aim of all peace-loving peoples, and the ECA has proved to be a decided step in that direction. This program has demonstrated that it possesses the sinews of resistance to the advance of communism, it is the Voice of America calling a halt to the further spread of communism. Furthermore, it is an effective way in which to protect our own economy, but I firmly believe its administration should have close scrutiny in order that certain segments of our economy are not destroyed, and I refer particularly to the American merchant marine.

The passage of this bill should result in increased activity in our American merchant marine and put back to work some of the thousands of American seamen who are now unemployed. In the port of Baltimore alone, we have more than 3,000 unemployed seamen, and I am told there are 30,000 unemployed seamen throughout the United States today. I want to do everything possible to help the war-torn countries of Europe rebuild their economy, which is so essential to our own economy, but, clearly, no foreign industry should be developed at the expense of an American industry, particularly one so important to our national economy and national defense as the American merchant marine.

The Congress has stated and repeatedly affirmed that "it is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce" that the United States foster, develop, and maintain the American merchant marine as an indispensable arm in its national defense, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States. The United States Government has spent many years and many millions of dollars in the hope of attaining this objective and, with the impetus given shipbuilding and American-flag ship operation during and subsequent to the war, the entire American fleet is at the crossroads. In effect, we have had a rebirth of what was formerly a great industry, and that industry, as reborn, is now in a position where present help is most essential. There is neither time nor necessity to outline the many advantages of a strong and balanced American-flag fleet to the thousands of American seamen now employed, the rather extensive shore staffs of those companies, the shipbuilding industry, and all of the other allied indus-

tries and crafts which contribute to its maintenance and operation.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee recently held extensive hearings in connection with the determination of the advisability or necessity for a fair allocation of the overall ECA cargo movement to American-flag vessels. That committee concluded that such allocation was both desirable and necessary and presented for approval of Congress in H. R. 1340, the principles of which should have been incorporated in the pending measure. That bill would guarantee American-flag participation in the entire ECA program to the extent of carrying 50 percent of all cargoes wherever originating or terminating.

However, strong opposition to this provision in the bill was interposed by Mr. Paul Hoffman, director of the ECA, and after lengthy conferences between administration representatives, Mr. Hoffman and representatives of the shipping industry, the Magnuson amendment was agreed upon, with a definite understanding that if the ECA Administrator did not comply strictly with the terms of the Magnuson amendment, then H. R. 1340 would be presented to the House and the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee would press for its immediate passage.

It would seem to me that opposition to carrying 50 percent of all cargoes wherever originating or terminating is both shortsighted and overreaching in the demand that the American-flag fleet be, in effect, relegated to its prewar status in order that the foreign fleets, or certain of them, may be rebuilt and maintained beyond their respective prewar sizes and resume their prewar trades to the exclusion of American vessels. There would seem to be but little logic in providing for the internal recovery of European nations not only at the expense of the American taxpayer but also at the expense of a very important American industry. It seems only right and equitable that our vessels be given an equal opportunity to participate in the movement of cargoes financed and paid for by the American taxpayer.

The demand that, if there be an allocation of 50 percent of cargoes to American-flag vessels, the allocation be limited in respect of cargoes originating in the United States is clearly improper.

The proposed elimination of American-flag vessels from participation in the "cross trades" would do violence to a 50-percent requirement and would greatly reduce the percentage of American-flag participation. It has been estimated that 35 percent of all ECA cargoes move in the cross trades. This figure does not include the vessels on which freights are paid for the movement of non-ECA cargoes. It was testified by the ECA representatives during the hearings in connection with H. R. 1340 that of the American-flag percentage of ECA cargoes about 10 percent of that figure is carried by Army vessels. Obviously, this further reduces American-flag participation and does not reflect the carriage of certain ECA cargoes on the 57 commercial-type tankers now operated by the Navy. While on the subject of tankers it might be well to point out that the Economic Cooperation Act requires that petroleum requirements be obtained from sources outside of the United States wherever possible. Automatically, therefore, such carriage is in the cross trades, and acceptance of Mr. Hoffman's proposal would practically eliminate American-flag tanker participation. ECA has reported that American-flag tankers have participated in but 23 percent of the entire petroleum movement. Admiral Smith, of the Maritime Commission, has testified that there is a world surplus of tankers at the present time and that all possible aid should be given this segment of the industry. The New York Journal of Commerce for February 6, 1949, carried the following significant article dealing with the tanker situation:

Coastwise tanker chartering continued dull during the past week, as mild weather cut further the demand for tonnage. Rates generally ranging from 15 to 20 percent below USMC scale. No appreciable improvement is now expected before next winter.

London reported a decline in both activity and rates during the week, Lincoln Ship Brokerage Co. reports. British and French charterers now find themselves in a very stable position, and have no pressing requirements. They have indicated, however, that May–June Persian Gulf vessels might be considered at 10 percent to 15 percent under schedule rates. The 10 percent for Transatlantic March–April positions, and are gradually covering these needs. The Swedish have fixed four dirty carriers at the flat MOT rate to fill February and March loadings, while vessels were fixed for creosote and crude oil cargoes for Italian destinations.

Standard of New Jersey has announced it will cut back imports of crude oil from the Middle East up to 50 percent, according to Ocean Freighting and Brokerage Corp., which reports that Standard is also planning to lay up about 25 tankers and redeliver approximately 58 ships, mostly T–2s, between now and September.

The foregoing statements are at variance with the statement contained in a report on recovery progress and United States aid published by the ECA in February, 1949. At page 248 therein the following appears:

In the tanker field these pressures are not likely to be important. The balance of ships and cargo will require that United States flag tankers be fully used, and if dollars must be paid for tanker freights in order to secure the movement of the cargo, it is a matter of small interest to the foreign countries whether such tankers are employed in the small United States export trade or in the larger movements from offshore areas. Furthermore, tanker rates are set in worldwide market and there are no cash discrepancies between United States flag and foreign-flag rates as appear in the dry-cargo tramp market.

Mr. Hoffman explained during the hearings on H. R. 1340 that the inclusion of American-flag vessels in the cross trades would include services in which United States-flag vessels are not now and have not traditionally been engaged. It would seem that this is small reason for exclusion of American-flag vessels. The philosophy that we must develop our merchant marine would seem to indicate that if there be an opportunity to extend our ships into new fields, every opportunity to that end should be encouraged.

A very apparent reason for the concerted effort to exclude American-flag vessels from the cross trades appears at page 248 of the ECA report just above described. It is here stated:

Second, the dollar shortage of the European nations will continue to be acute. This means that they will have very strong incentives to economize on the use of dollars by avoiding American-flag vessels and using soft-currency vessels whenever possible, and to attempt to earn dollars by offering their own vessels for employment in the United States export trade at low rates.

Phrased another way, it means that the foreign recipients of our aid, paid for with our dollars, would like to reserve for themselves the exclusive benefits of the cross trades, preserving their traditional position, and, at the same time, employing their excess tonnage in competition against American-flag vessels in the United States export trade at low rates.

Yes, I am going to support the ECA program but shall be alert to its administration as it affects the American merchant marine.

Social Security Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Gloversville (N. Y.) Herald for Monday, March 7, 1949:

WOULD BE INTERESTING

Should the Federal Government tell the people what it is doing with the money the workers of the country have paid in for social security?

Rather a strange question, you might ask, yet it is a legitimate one, for the Government spends this social security taxation money just about as fast as it comes—and not for social-security purposes.

The matter was brought into the spotlight on the floor of the House the other day by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester.

Mr. KEATING pointed out to his colleagues that although employers and employees have built up an accumulation of $10,700,000,000 in old-age and survivors insurance funds in the past 12 years, the money simply isn't there—with the exception of a paltry one hundred and fifty million. The remainder has all been spent for one thing or another.

Oh, yes; the Government has put in its I O U's for the money it has taken out of the social-security trust fund. These I O U's are in the form of Government bonds; and they are just as sound as the Government itself.

But in order to pay out benefits, it is necessary either to sell some of those bonds,

make new appropriations, or tap future pay rolls still more. In other words, the cash would have to be raised by some method all over again.

Representative KEATING believes that we should discontinue the practice of the Government collecting money for one purpose and using it for another.

"But if," he told his colleagues in the House, "we are going to follow that questionable practice, let us tell the people who put up the money frankly and openly what we are doing."

That would be fair enough, in all conscience. Actually, what has been happening is that the Government has collected staggering sums from pay envelopes to run the Government "on the pretext and the representation to workers that this is an insurance fund," to use the words of the Rochester solon.

Maybe, we all like being kidded along that way.

Brooklyn's Woman of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud that another one of my constituents has been chosen by the Brooklyn Eagle for laudatory comment. The Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, April 10, 1949, nominated Mrs. Gazelle Joblin as the woman of the week. The following article tells only a few of the many worth-while activities to which she devotes herself. May she continue to serve her community for many years to come.

BROOKLYN'S WOMAN OF THE WEEK—BOROUGH HOUSEWIFE LEADS 18,000 HADASSAH WOMEN

(By Arthur Pollock)

This is the story of Mrs. Gazelle Joblin of 3519 Bedford Avenue, president of the Brooklyn chapter of Hadassah, women's Zionist organization of America, though it is also more or less the story of 18,000 other Brooklyn women. They stand back of her.

They raise money for Israel, in pennies, in thousands, with parties, luncheons, bazars and in a hundred other ways. And they are constantly at work making themselves better citizens, which is one of the reasons for the existence of Hadassah.

In Brooklyn there are 54 groups of these women. In the United States Hadassah women number 250,000 and thousands are still enrolling. There is a Hadassah in 47 States, all but Idaho.

Of the chapters in the 47 States Brooklyn's is the largest. One month recently Mrs. Joblin signed a check for $83,000, the sum her co-workers had raised that month. Some such sum her people raise month after month.

The money goes for health work in Palestine, for the purchase of land.

"Even for the land that has been won by military victories," Mrs. Joblin says, "the Arab owners will be paid."

CLIMAXED BY LUNCHEONS

The drive that has been keeping 18,000 Brooklyn women busy this year culminates in four donors luncheons at the St. George Hotel on May 2, 3, 4, and 5. One luncheon would not accommodate all who want to come. The chapter's 54 vice presidents draw lots for a day for their group. Mrs. Joblin will make a report each of the 4 days, and each day Frank Kingdon, recently returned from Israel, will speak. At least $700,000 should be the year's fund-raising total.

"The need is greater than ever," says Mrs. Joblin. "And the understanding is greater, too."

Hadassah is 37 years old. It had an ambitious program long before there was talk of a Jewish state. Its program was—and is—in two parts. It aimed to rehabilitate the thousands of Jews in Europe who came to Palestine. And it strove here to further education, create leadership, teach Jewish history, work for a peaceful, democratic world.

"There can be no strong Israel," is the way the women's spokesman puts it, "unless democracy is maintained here."

Leading 54 groups of women and acting as a member of the National Board is not child's play. Eighteen thousand women can get terrific inspirations at all hours of day and night. And every inspiration is a potential jewel. Mrs. Joblin is therefore a busy woman all day every day and all evenings. If she were a businesswoman she would be less busy.

SHE'S EASY TO TALK TO

What is this woman like whom so many thousands chose in 1947 as their leader, re-elected for 1948?

She is relaxed, easy to talk to, gracious, intelligent, and without pose or affectation. She is 5 feet 4 inches tall and slender. Weighs the same today as she weighed at 16. She has gray-green eyes.

"I guess you'd call me rusty," she says. "I've always been called that." Her hair is rusty, a kind of tender titian. She freckles when the sun shines on her. But she does not mind freckles. When she was a child she was told they were "sun kisses," and she rather likes them. Her nails are long and red, well cared for. And when you look at her in profile she could be Jean Arthur or Gloria Swanson or Eleanor Holm, however the resemblance strikes you at the moment.

As a child in Philadelphia, where she was born, she wanted to be a pianist or a dancer and was being groomed for both. She loves to dance now. She would have gone to Europe for a musical education, but when she was 13 her father died and she went instead to business school. She was working as a bookkeeper and secretary when she married Emanuel M. Joblin, also of Philadelphia. They moved to Brooklyn 26 years ago. Her business training comes in well now.

She has two children. Son Shelby, 23, got his M. A. from Cornell last June. He's 6 feet 2. Daughter Nancy, going on 17, 5 feet 9, and troubled by the high-heel problem when going out with short young men, goes to Brooklyn College. Mrs. Joblin owes her success in Hadassah to "the tolerance of my husband and children."

When she is cross at the end of a day, Mr. Joblin, a business executive, says, "Well, it all comes under the heading of Hadassah." That is, no doubt, the reaction in the 18,000 other Brooklyn Hadassah households.

JOINED IN 1933

Since June 1947, she has been a composite of housewife, mother, and executive.

When she was installed, the outgoing president said, "You will have the privilege of being president in the first year of the Jewish state." It seemed nebulous then. But UN acknowledged the right of the Jewish people to state status in November 1947, the Jewish state was established May 14, 1948, and the following day President Truman gave it de facto recognition. It celebrates its first anniversary the week after the donors luncheons.

"It has been a historic time for me," Mrs. Joblin says with pride. "I'll be able to tell my grandchildren about it."

She joined Hadassah in 1933, when Hitler was threatening the world. She formed the Esther group here in 1938. She likes to cook. She cooks Hungarian style. Her parents and grandparents were from Budapest. Her mother, 74, lives in Atlantic City and comes from time to time to stay with the Joblins. Gazelle Joblin is named after the Hungarian Princess Gazella.

She collects, has ever since she was married, antique, silver, and jewelry. "It's the Hungarian Gypsy in me," she says, speaking of the jewelry.

"When I get up to address a meeting the women look to see what ring I'm wearing, not what hat."

NOT TIRED ANY MORE

Mostly she has a trim, tailor-made look. When the occasion is right, however, she is very feminine.

She looks tired. "But when I know that 35,000 homeless Jewish children of Europe have settled in Israel and are now living like normal human beings, I don't feel tired any more. When I count up the number of trees we've planted and the acres of barren land we have transformed into fertile soil, when I reckon the number of families now making a decent living tilling that soil, I can attend meetings day and night. When I know that 4,300 wounded Israeli fighters and civilians were treated by the Hadassah medical staff in Jerusalem alone, no effort is too great."

These 18,000 Brooklyn women of Hadassah are proud women. For Hadassah is going to build the first hospital in the Negeb, to be called the Hadassah Yassky Memorial, after Haim Yassky, Hadassah staff member killed by snipers. It will be begun this month. Hadassah is also the first to build a medical school in conjunction with the Hebrew University in Israel. Students are being screened now and enter in May. In honor of Rabbi Stephen A. Wise's seventy-fifth birthday Hadassah will dedicate an apprenticeship building in the Brandeis Vocational Center in Jerusalem.

Their summers the Joblins spend at Longshore Country Club in Westport, Conn., golfing, swimming, and going to the Westport Playhouse.

Mr. Joblin's golf does not show the strain appreciably. He plays in the low 90's. With a life less active he might cut a few strokes off his score. Say one stroke—on a good day. Still, he'd prefer Hadassah to the 80's.

School Hot-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, the national school-lunch program is one of the most constructive services provided by the Federal Government. It helps maintain our Nation's health and at the same time provides a means of reducing agricultural surpluses.

Under this program the Federal and State Governments jointly contribute money to help them pay the expenses of serving hot lunches to their pupils. The Department of Agriculture also donates part of the surplus food it buys through its price-support program, and buys for distribution to the schools certain foods the children are known to lack in their

ordinary diets. These contributions allow the children to get a healthful meal at a very low price, and makes it possible for needy children to get their lunches free.

If it were not for this program, most of our school children, especially in rural areas, would have to carry their lunches long distances and eat the cold, monotonous meals under unsanitary conditions. Because of the school-lunch program they can have warm, nutritious lunches in healthful surroundings. If it were not for Federal and State aid, many children could not afford to pay the cost of these meals. As it is, needy children can get their lunches free or at a few cents a meal. Even children who are not from needy families often do not eat the right foods, as is shown by draft board rejection figures. This school-lunch program provides the proper foods for our Nation's children, and trains them in proper eating habits.

Health is only one of the objectives of the program. It performs another service by making use of surplus farm products.

Last year $20,000,000 worth of surplus commodities was purchased by the Department of Agriculture and used in the school-lunch program. The school systems themselves bought $140,000,000 worth of food products, and their selection was based on a list of foods in plentiful supply issued by the Department of Agriculture to encourage the purchasing of surplus commodities. The school-lunch program thus helps to keep the farmer's income at a high level while at the same time providing a healthful diet for his children.

The results of the program have been encouraging. It has been shown that children who get lunches under this program gain more rapidly in weight and height, have better attendance records, improve more in scholastic standing, have better deportment, and show more resistance to disease than children not participating in the program.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, recently passed by the House of Representatives, provided funds for continuing the program another year. The House and particularly the members of the Appropriations Committee should be commended for approving this worth-while program. I sincerely hope the Senate will do the same.

Adequate Program of Slum Clearance Requires Enactment of H. R. 4009

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the first steps in achieving the solution of a national housing program is to meet the problem of slums and blighted areas in our larger metropolitan cities. The bad effect of slums upon the lives of our citizens now and in the future generations is clearly an appropriate matter of national concern.

Except in isolated instances no broad and effective policy has as yet been put into action to accomplish the necessary objectives. Extensive hearings were held in 1947 and 1948 by the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress. These hearings culminated in the report that provision be made for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake clearance of their slum and blighted areas but the substantive legislation needed to achieve this commendable aspiration was never enacted by the Congress. The land costs in some cases and the demolition costs in others make construction for such areas prohibitive to private capital and municipalities. It is not from lack of interest or from any lack of appreciation of the seriousness of this vital problem that American cities have thus far failed effectively to meet the problems presented by their slum areas.

Without the help of Federal assistance they do not have access to sufficient resources to absorb the full costs. Title I of the pending bill, H. R. 4009, authorizes contracts with local public agencies for Federal loans and capital grants for locally planned projects. The basic idea is that the Federal Government meet the financial differential which stands in the way of the municipality acting for itself.

A loan authorization totaling $1,000,000,000 is provided. It becomes available over a 5-year period. Twenty-five million dollars commences to be available on July 1, the year of enactment, and is increased by $225,000,000 in the first succeeding year and by further amounts of $250,000,000 each of the three following years. Capital grant authorization for slum clearance would be $500,000,000. This grant authorization would be available over a 5-year period commencing with $100,000,000 on July 1, 1949, and increasing by $100,000,000 each July 1 of the succeeding 4 years. Provision is made for increasing in any particular year to the extent of a $250,000,000 loan authorization and a $100,000,000 capital grant, subject to the over-all amount of $1,500,000 for the whole program of slum clearance embodied in title I.

A requisite of the Federal aid provided in this title is that the project areas be redeveloped for essentially residential uses. One-third of the costs must be borne by the locality and the remaining two-thirds by the Federal Government. This slum-clearance program recognizes the importance of local initiative and local responsibility and requires that all the projects shall be subject to the approval of the governing body of the locality involved.

The early enactment of this legislation will enable cities, with Federal aid, to embark on a long over-due program on a large scale to eliminate their slums which have been growing in area and in blighting consequences. It is also timely that we embark on this work now when there are certain evidences of a recession in employment.

More Building in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the high lights of an article which appeared in the April 11, 1949, issue on page 57 of the magazine Steel, entitled "More Building in 1949":

MORE BUILDING IN 1949

Government authorities continue to be confident that the volume of new construction in 1949 will exceed that of 1948 by about $1,000,000,000. A joint estimate by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor places total new construction this year at $18,800,000,000 compared with $17,775,000,000 last year.

It is estimated private construction in 1949 will total $13,750,000,000, a slight increase over 1948. According to the forecast, residential construction, both urban and farm, will be off moderately. A minor drop in industrial construction will be more than offset by increases in commercial buildings, schools, churches, and hospitals. Although railroad construction is expected to remain at the 1948 level, the volume of other public utility building will increase.

Publicly financed construction in 1949 is expected to total $5,050,000,000, as against $4,040,000,000,000 in 1948. The increase is accounted for chiefly by larger expenditures for institutions, highways, sewer and water projects and conservation programs.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the department of agriculture of the great State of Wisconsin is most concerned about some of the practices of the oleomargarine industry. Let me quote a letter I received on February 28 from Mr. Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., February 28, 1949.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BIEMILLER: Efforts now being made to repeal all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine present extremely serious implications to the consumer, to the dairy industry, and to all citizens of the Nation.

Those who are interested in the long-range aspect of the matter, question the logic of a Congress that appropriates many millions of dollars for a program designed to preserve the priceless heritage of soil fertility, and simultaneously considers the adoption of legislation that will change our Nation's agriculture from a grassland ani-

mal husbandry structure, to a row crop soil-depleting type of agriculture that will inevitably destroy our irreplaceable top soil. The problem is basic and serious, and it must be given major consideration by all statesmen of Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is charged by statute with the duty of protecting consumers against fraudulent advertising and imitations. In this capacity it is our contention that the advertising of yellow oleomargarine with pictures of cattle, dairy barns, and pasture scenes, accompanied by phrases and slogans designed to make the consumer believe oleomargaine is a dairy product is a direct, intentional, and flagrant violation of the fraudulent advertising statute.

The United States Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have refused to give attention to this problem or are powerless to cope with it.

The oleomargarine industry has sought and received permission to imitate, synthetically or otherwise, the desirable qualities of butter. They are now imitating the distinctive butter flavor and texture, they are adding synthetic vitamins, they are packaging their product in cartons similar to those used by the butter industry, and have appropriated for themselves the age old butter trade-mark, its yellow color. These facts indicate that oleomargarine was developed and is being marketed as an imitation product. Historically, this Nation has protected consumers against such deceptive imitation.

For many years new legislation has been designed to provide additional protection against fraud and imitation to the consumer. This policy has been extended to include the interests of the producer and manufacturer.

Now great forces are at work to destroy this protection that we have taken for granted. The oleomargarine industry is asking that the controls against imitation and fraud that now exist in other industries be removed from its particular product.

In the main, other nations of the world maintain the consumer controls that the oleomargarine industry is attempting to avoid in the United States. Some nations maintain a tax or fee as we do. Some enforce the statutes relating to fair trade practices in labeling and advertising. Some require the addition of ingredients that will make identification immediately possible for the consumer. Some have controlled the matter through the establishment of a state monopoly which has removed the opportunity for unreasonable profits. Some do not permit the manufacture of yellow oleomargarine. Still others protect the consumer by rigid and arbitrary price-fixing schedules.

To summarize, the methods vary but other nations do afford consumer protection. We are looking to you and your associates in the Eighty-first Congress for legislation that is in keeping with the principles and traditions of consumer protection.

Sincerely yours,

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director*.

I also desire to quote a memorandum from Mr. Einar O. Hammer, editor of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, on the subject of oleomargarine controls in other countries.

Subject: Oleomargarine controls in other countries.

The following regulations pertaining to oleomargarine are enforced in the countries listed under each heading:

1. Artificial color prohibited: Cuba, France, Uruguay. Hungary permits use of approved dyes. Ireland prohibits use of specified coloring materials.

2. Artificial flavor: Prohibited in France. Greece permits artificial flavor in exclusive grade only.

3. Mandatory ingredients: Certain proportions of sesame oils, unrefined cottonseed oil, or starch required in Union of South Africa, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Sweden, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The purpose of these ingredients is easy identification. Hungary requires chemical identification.

4. Specified size or shape of container required: Union of South Africa, Chile, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Poland.

5. Special container markings required: Chile, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Norway, Poland, Uruguay.

6. Specified labeling required: Union of South Africa, Belgium, Chile, Cuba, Austria, Brazil, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Poland, and Sweden.

7. Use of dairy terms prohibited: Poland, Sweden, Denmark.

8. Artificial preservative prohibited: Ireland, Norway, Iceland permits salt only.

9. Fortification: Advertising of vitamin fortification prohibited in Sweden and Denmark.

10. State monopoly: Norway controls include regulations of production as well as complete control of ingredients used.

11. Taxation: Sweden and Norway.

12. Price control: Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

13. Manufacture and sale prohibited: New Zealand, Mexico.

14. Imports prohibited: Trinidad, New Zealand.

15. In the Union of South Africa manufacture of oleomargarine permitted only under emergency control law expiring July 1, 1948.

Sources: Compiled from reports of Foreign Service Officers of the United States to the United States Department of Commerce. Some of the reports have been published in Industry Reports, Fats and Oils, and World Trade in Commodities; others were consulted in the offices of the Foodstuffs Division, Office of International Trade, United States Department of Commerce.

Published: Hearings on oleomargarine tax repeal before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, second session, pages 280–283.

O. B. Grimley, The New Norway (Oslo 1939) pages 86–89.

Supplementary information on Norway and Sweden, by Rolland Von Euler, Office of Scandinavian Area Studies, University of Wisconsin, February 18, 1949.

I think it is obvious that in a matter of such vital interest to consumers and farmers alike the House should proceed with caution. I agree that discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine should be removed. I think the Granger bill will accomplish this end with the least possible damage to the dairy industry and maintaining the greatest possible protection to the consumer.

Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD BREEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, and I are introducing legislation which calls for establishment of an Air Force academy with its location at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. There are many excellent and substantial reasons why this academy should be located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The base is headquarters for Air Material Command (AMC), which is the largest command in the Air Force. AMC employs more than 100,000 persons at its bases throughout the United States. Its over-all mission is (1) research and development, (2) procurement and industrial planning, and (3) supply and maintenance.

Many experts and scientists in these three fields are stationed at headquarters, AMC, in Dayton. This makes Wright-Patterson Air Force Base the "heartbeat" of the United States Air Force. At this base, everything pertaining to the Air Force, in all its phases, begins and ends.

By establishing the academy at Wright-Patterson, cadets can take advantage of the brains of the country's foremost experts in the aviation world. They can work side by side with these experts in their work with electronics, armament, static testing, development of ground equipment and flight testing. A large number of the world's leading aeronautical scientists would be available to the cadets for lectures.

The Air Force already has established the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson. This school could be the nucleus for expansion into the proposed Academy. The institute is a post-graduate school of engineering with 34 professors and instructors. Approximately 300 students now attend the school. The instructors are both permanently assigned from accredited universities, as well as visiting professors on loan.

By establishing the Academy at Wright-Patterson air base, the cadet would be able to choose his career in the Air Force by being able to absorb under actual observation and practical training procedures the phase of aviation he wishes to specialize in. This would greatly increase the value of his education to the Nation.

In no other place could the cadet obtain more first-hand information and education on the latest aeronautical trends. The Academy at Wright-Patterson air base would be a tremendous saving to the American taxpayer by having young men embark on their careers from an installation which is responsible for the future progress and development of the United States Air Force.

Wright-Patterson air base is comprised of nearly 7,000 acres of land. There is sufficient room, Mr. Speaker, for establishment of the proposed Academy without great cost to the taxpayer. Considering the multimillion dollar investment the Nation now has at Wright-Patterson air base, it seems foolhardy to attempt to duplicate these facilities at another installation.

It should also be pointed out that cadets at the Academy could take advantage of the Air Force's all-weather flying station which is located a few miles from Wright-Patterson Field at Wilmington, Ohio.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite with justifiable pride that Dayton, Ohio, is the birthplace of the late Messrs. Orville and Wilbur Wright, coinventors of the airplane. The city of Dayton is the home and birthplace of aviation, and for this reason alone, even discounting the substantial facts mentioned heretofore, I respectfully believe this distinguished body of Representatives would be paying the proper salute and recognition to the memories of these famous Americans and to their contribution to our Nation. I bring this legislation to you for earnest consideration.

Riding the Cocked Elephant to Banbury Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us in our early childhood years were quite familiar with the following Mother Goose rhyme, and I regret that I must rely upon memory alone to quote same:

Ride a cockhorse to Banbury Cross,
To see an old lady upon a white horse,
Rings on her fingers and bells on her toes,
She shall have music wherever she goes.

If same was brought down to date, so as to conform to the actions of some of the overzealous, keyed-up Members of this Congress, affiliated with the Republican Party, this old Mother Goose jingle, I am sure, would be as follows:

Ride a cocked elephant to Banbury Cross,
To see an old "fooler" upon a strange course,
With politics on his "kisser," the next campaign on his toes,
He shall spread propaganda wherever he goes.

It is sad and singular, indeed, that House bill 3748, a bill to amend the very proper Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, having been reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously, should, on the slightest pretext, be made the occasion for unnecessary Republican propaganda for future campaigns, by the filing of an alleged minority report, joined in favorably by all of the 11 Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Two of the 11 Republican signatories to this strange document presented additional minority views. Throughout the alleged minority report, and also the additional minority views, the words "minority party Republican," "Republicans," and "Republican minority" are eased, so to speak, into the document by great and tremendous rhetorical flourishes.

In the light of our past boastful claim that we had formulated and put into practice a truly bipartisan plan as to our foreign relations, it occurs to me that it comes with mighty poor grace to sanctimoniously or otherwise drag the bedraggled Republican Party into the very fore in the alleged minority report and additional minority views. The doing of this I believe is but the putting in operation an ignoble, preconceived plan to carry on a Republican preprimary campaign in Congress, with all of the zeal of the reputed California real-estate salesman who attempted to sell the unknown mourners at the funeral of an unknown man building lots in a new Los Angeles subdivision. I have observed that wherever it has been humanely possible to do so there has been injected, at the most inopportune times and at the most inappropriate places, Republican propaganda. The only place that I, as a new Member of Congress, have not heard Republican propaganda has been in the fine morning prayers of our Chaplain, the good and rare Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., and other equally fine ministers of the Gospel who have been selected by him to do the much-needed praying for us and our actions, legislative and otherwise. We Democratic Members of the House of Representatives must alert ourselves. We must be vigilant lest some of the Republican Members of this House surreptitiously try to get some of their propaganda into our Chaplain's opening prayers and in all of the funeral eulogies made in sorrowful appreciation of the memory of our revered dead. It is a joke, McGee, and it is not funny.

In the about-face language of the genial, handsome, and able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FRANK B. KEEFE], I ask: Are you Republicans not ashamed of your propaganda antics? Are you not just a little bit ashamed, my dear Republicans, just a "teenie," "weenie" little bit ashamed of your new political doings in committee hearings and in Congress? Oh, I hope you are—I hope that you resolve to scrap your present practices of making political soup and political hash out of everything conceivable, when you know full well that your soup and your hash will turn out to be of no good whatsoever to either the cookers of these unwholesome dishes or to the unfortunate consumers of the foul, synthetic stuff.

Please, my Republican friends, as in the old fable, you are making stone soup and it has no political nutritive value whatsoever.

I am fully in support of this bill as it has been given to us by the Foreign Affairs Committee, plus amendments, and, with God's help, acting through both Democratic and Republican Members of the Congress, it shall be shaped into functioning United States law, in spite of the senseless and weak opposition which may be arrayed against it by the children of the darkness.

The European recovery program to stop communism must continue.

Something About National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, a new list of Foreign Service promotions will be announced. Several hundred of the men who represent the United States of America abroad will be recommended for promotion.

I do not think I have to point out for the benefit of the Members how important this matter is for the country at a time when ideological differences split the world and make things more complicated at home.

It is my feeling that we in the Congress have every right to demand, in the interest of the American people whom we represent, that every precaution be exercised to make sure that the very best men are selected for the best jobs available to them in the foreign service.

So it is, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to point out that there is some doubt whether all precautions necessary have been taken.

Information has just come to me that makes me wonder if we really are alive to the perils which exist for this Nation; at least to wonder whether the responsible authorities in our State Department are aware of them.

I find that a State Department employee who 4 years ago was arrested and charged with stealing American secrets—and who was exonerated of those charges under circumstances questionable enough to warrant an investigation by a subcommittee of this honorable chamber—is a member of one of the boards which decide the promotions to be made in the Foreign Service.

Mr. John Stewart Service, one of six persons charged with the theft of an estimated 100 files of secret Government papers—and the State Department acknowledges this—is the third member of a five-man Board which passes on all promotions from classes VI to V, V to IV, and IV to III. It is called the Foreign Service Promotion Board B.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I know the State Department never announced this appointment of Mr. Service to such a position of responsibility. We have the ever-alert press to thank for that information.

Mr. Service, with Philip Jaffee, Kate Louise Mitchell, Navy Lt. Andrew Roth, Julius Mark Gayn, and others, was arrested on June 7, 1945, on charges preferred by two very responsible Americans—John Edgar Hoover and Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew. They were the charges generally referred to as the Amerasia case or the State Department espionage case. They alleged violations of the espionage laws. The charges originally were brought before the July 1945, grand jury; but for some reason a change of grand juries was obtained by attorneys for Service, Miss Mitchell, and Mr. Gayn. The August grand jury failed to return indictments because of insufficient evidence against the three.

As I have charged several times previously on the floor of this House, there is ample reason for the belief that the August grand jury never was presented the full evidence against Mr. Service, Miss Mitchell, and Mr. Gayn. Why that was, I do not know; but I have some ideas of which you will hear more later. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I rise to question the advisability under these very peculiar circumstances of appointing

Mr. Service to such a high position of responsibility. If he has since announced his previous Communist associations, he should, as a token of his complete loyalty, publicly reveal all those with whom he was involved and the full nature of his activities.

It is my understanding that the criteria for members appointed to these promotions boards include a requirement that they enjoy the full trust and confidence of the Foreign Service, the State Department, and other branches and agencies of the Government.

It would be interesting to know if Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI now have full trust and confidence in Mr. Service. If they have not, that, at least, is one doubt that should be resolved in favor of the United States Government and the security of its people. It is not too much to ask in times fraught with as much peril from enemy agents working for the Soviet Union as these.

Working Conditions of Agriculture on West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two letters from employees who earn their livelihood employed in west coast canneries and fields:

SALINAS, CALIF., *March 20, 1949.*
Representative ROY W. WIER:

I am writing to you because I seen in a newspaper that you are on a labor committee. I am a lettuce worker. I work in the sheds where the lettuce is processed and packed and shipped. Now before 1937 we lettuce workers come under social security and unemployment insurance. In the fall of 1936, the shippers sent a committee before a congressional committee to have this kind of work declared agricultural so they could beat us out of our social security and unemployment insurance. They got that decision from Congress, and I understand it, by a ruling from the Supreme Court. But when the Taft-Hartley union-busting bill was put out we were told we were not agricultural; we were workers in interstate commerce and we would have to live up to the Taft-Hartley Act. That split our union, Local 78, CIO, wide open. We have been fighting among ourselves for about a year; a few have landed in the hospital and a few have landed in jail. I quit working for those crooked lettuce shippers. I say "crooked" because they have beat me out of my social security by lying before a congressional committee (a contempt of Congress) and got away with it.

I think the lettuce workers should come under social security, unemployment insurance, and under the income withholding tax. The railway workers are workers in interstate commerce and the income tax is withheld from their pay checks and if they did not have their own insurance they would come under social security and unemployment insurance, and so should we. We are workers in interstate commerce and we always were. In 1936 we weren't eating the lettuce, we were processing it for the eastern market. I think that the lettuce shippers should be punished for their actions and pay those funds in to the social security and unemployment administrations that they have beat us out of.

Well, wishing you the best of health, I am,
CHARLES F. CONNORS.

LINDSAY, CALIF., *March 18, 1949.*
Congressman ROY W. WIER,
Representative of Minnesota.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Not knowing who else to write on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, I am taking the liberty of writing to you as I fully believe you are for the repeal of same.

I am an employee of a canning industry in California and have worked in fruit canneries here since before the union went in. I am now in an olive cannery. Anyone that worked in the canneries before the union went in, after the union went in before the Taft-Hartley law and after the Taft-Hartley law was put in effect can see the unfairness of the bill.

Before the union went in the people that worked in the canneries were known as cannery slobs. However, they were decent, respectable people trying to make an honest living. They stood in mud during rainy seasons and the working conditions were terrible, to say nothing of the unfairness. The unions have cleaned these places up, made them decent places to work. College students and school techers work there through their summer vacations. You feel you are a human being and are not ashamed to be seen entering the premises as an employee. The canneries have been run on a seniority basis and a person know where they stand the same as any other job.

Then they pass the Taft-Hartley bill, the most unfair deal ever passed to my knowledge. We have practically no protection. The employer has it all. Every unfair deal that is pulled the employer comes back we are covered by the Taft-Hartley law. We pay union dues for decent working conditions. The company signs an agreement but the agreement doesn't mean a thing; they are covered by the Taft-Hartley.

If we are to have such a law, let's at least make it a fair law.

I wish some of these lawmakers could or would step in workingmen's shoes for a while. We are all decent American citizens and should all have equal rights.

I don't suppose this letter will ever be read or even considered, but I feel in my heart I at least have done my part in expressing part of my opinion on the repeal of the most unjust law ever adopted.

Thanking you for your consideration and hoping you'll do all in your power to repeal this law.

Respectfully yours,
MRS. JEANNETTE ROUPE.

The Case of the American Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, April 11, 1949:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

I got interested in the American watch industry when I heard the gossip that the representative of a Swiss watch company was in Washington lobbying for a higher minimum wage for American workers.

Said I to myself: Naturally, if the wages of watchmakers go up in America, it will be a good thing for their only competitor, the Swiss watchmakers.

For, as it works out, the American pay roll already costs about two and one-half as much as the Swiss pay roll for the manufacture of the identical commodity: That is, a jeweled watch. So I looked into the picture—and, of course, found that the reciprocal trade agreements hit this industry very hard indeed.

Actually, only 3 American firms out of 60 remain in this field, Hamilton, Waltham, and Elgin. Waltham is in bankruptcy.

Bulova does make some watches in the United States, but its principal business is importing them from Switzerland.

These figures tell the story:

	Imports	Elgin, Hamilton, Waltham
1936	2,131,000	1,396,000
1937	2,947,000	1,504,000
1940	3,267,000	1,484,000
1942	5,107,000	885,000
1943	7,609,000	271,000
1944	6,754,000	174,000
1945	8,709,000	618,000
1946	9,039,000	1,124,000
1947	7,357,000	1,582,000

The very low figures for the years from 1942 to 1945 are due to the fact that the American makers were engaged in war work during that period, the sales representing stocks trickling into the market. It was during those years that the Swiss captured the American market.

Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers Union, had this to say in his testimony before a congressional committee:

"The problem of the American jeweled-watch industry is simple; it's a matter of competitive factors. The Swiss watch importer buys the uncased watch movement in Switzerland and brings it to this country.

"It costs him on an an average of $6.50 for these movements. These are not my figures; these are the figures of the Department of Commerce, which has averaged the cost of the movements imported into this country during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948.

"These importers pay a duty based upon the line, size, and number of jewels, ranging from $1.80 to $2.25. The minimum cost of production on any jeweled movement made in the United States is $13.

"This is a comparable movement as is shipped into the United States for $6.50 from Switzerland. Now, add the duty of $2.10 to this $6.50, and you have a cost of $8.60; subtract the $8.60 from $13, and you have an edge of $4.40 per unit that the Swiss watch importer has over the American jeweled-watch manufacturers.

"And you must remember that some types of movements produced in the United States cost three times that $13. Now, what is this $4.40 utilized for? Brand-name advertising, principally * * *."

Citing the Bulova Watch Co. as the largest importer of Swiss watches, Cenerazzo said:

"This company, in the year ended March 15, 1947, sold approximately 3,000,000 units. Its gross sales totaled $38,000,000.

"Its net profit was $3,800,000 after taxes and after spending more for radio advertising than any other single product in America. Mind you, not more than any other watch company—more than any other single product in America.

"Now, with 3,000,000 units, multiply this by the $4 cost differential and you have $12,000,000 available to this company that is not

available to any American manufacturer for advertising."

In going through the various statements on the subject—and I preferred the printed word rather than emotional interviews—I find nothing notable to contest Mr. Cenerazzo's contentions.

The American companies cannot successfully compete against the Swiss advantage. The proof of it lies in the greater rise in profits of the Swiss companies as compared with the American companies.

Nor does the evidence that Waltham was inefficient stand up, if a study is made of unit costs. In fact, they lost the market because they could not afford, out of earnings, to advertise their product adequately in a competitive market.

The United States cannot afford to lose a precision industry. Although it would be nice make the Swiss rich, it would make more sense to protect American production.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (Hoover Commission)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, almost daily there are articles in our newspapers berating Congress for their apparent lack of interest in the reports of the Hoover Commission. I, for one, have been very much interested in these reports and so has every other Member of Congress to whom I have talked. I also deplore the fact that anyone who mentions some provision of the report with which they do not agree they are accused of playing politics with the Hoover Commission report. I know personally many members of the Hoover Commission and I have taken much more than passing interest in their work.

I hope the Congress will adopt the majority of the Hoover Commission reports but certainly I do not intend to vote or support any provision which I do not think to be best for my district or for the country as a whole and I expect every other Member of Congress to take the same attitude.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Frank R. Kent which appeared in the Washington Star regarding this subject:

HOOVER REPORT RECEPTION IN CONGRESS DEPLORED—REORGANIZATION HELD MENACED BY INDIFFERENCE AND POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

The sluggish indifference in Congress to the Hoover Commission's recommendation for reorganization of the Federal Government, grotesquely swollen and incredibly bungling, wasteful and inefficient, is a direct reflection of the inertia and unintelligence of the American people. There is no other way to explain it. The present situation is as complete an indictment of our unfitness to govern ourselves as has been made.

These may seem harsh words, but they are justified by the facts. If this Nation were free of debt; if its citizens were lightly taxed; if there were a dependable surplus in the Treasury; if there were no war clouds in the foreign sky; if peace were assured, our defense armament reduced to the minimum and the rest of the world on its economic feet (an ideal condition which, of course, will never occur but may be assumed for the sake of argument), even then it would be inexcusably stupid not to enact the Hoover recommendation, which not only would save $3,000,000,000 a year but, through the elimination of duplication, waste and absurdities, restore reason and efficiency to a machine close to bogging down of its own weight.

Even under the ideal conditions above described there could be no defense for inaction, no argument against adoption, no sense in refusal. But, under conditions as they really are, not to act swiftly and favorably is more than stupid—it is wicked. It comes close to national insanity. It would be the most shocking demonstration of popular incapacity in all history. It would exhibit this Nation as having, first, gone on record as realizing the necessity of regaining control of its governmental machinery; second, as having its request to be shown the way fully complied with; third, with full knowledge of the danger, as having turned its back, shut its eyes, and done nothing.

These statements are by no means too strong. The truth is they cannot be made too strong. For here are the facts—far, indeed, from those ideal conditions, financially, the Nation is in an appalling state. Instead of being free of debt, the debt—now more than two hundred and sixty billions—is far greater than anyone dreamed could be sustained. The annual interest alone is twice as much as the total cost of government 20 years ago. Instead of being lightly taxed, the tax burden is unprecedentedly heavy. It bears grievously upon rich and poor alike. It has reached the point where to gain acutely needed revenue, economists generally fear the result of adding to it. Instead of a dependable surplus for nearly 18 years, we have consistently run increasingly large deficits. Under such conditions any business, big or little, would be marked insolvent, branded as bankrupt. In other words, our Federal fiscal structure is strained to the limit.

Instead of permanent peace, for 2 years we have been engaged in a frightening cold war with Russia and no man can be sure it will not become a shooting war. Instead of reduced armaments, at vast cost we are forced to build up a gigantic defense machine. And billions are being poured into the friendly countries of western Europe to promote their economic stability and strengthen our position. Finally, we have just concluded the North Atlantic Pact, under which in the next 12 months we will furnish to the other signers $1,500,000,000 worth of military supplies. This one and one-half billion is not provided for in the President's budget and must be added to the five and one-half billions necessary for the Marshall plan in the coming year. On top of all this, before the session has ended Congress will have appropriated several other nonbudgeted billions for a variety of purposes. The drain upon the Treasury will be terrific. We have got to get more revenue or go under. Where is the money coming from? Even if more taxes are levied, we will still be far short of our needs. In face of these facts, which no one disputes, one would think the Hoover proposal to eliminate waste, increase efficiency, and save three billions annually would seem heaven-sent.

Literally, there is everything to commend it. It is not as if the Hoover Commission were trying to sell it. The idea was not originated by Mr. Hoover but by Congress itself. It was Congress which unanimously passed a resolution creating the Commission and asking it to do the job. The Commission has done the job. Neither the accuracy of the report's figures nor the soundness of its recommendations are questioned by anyone. Practically every newspaper in the United States has approved. There isn't so much as a trace of politics anywhere. No one connected with the Commission has anything even remotely to gain. No one in any party disputes the vital necessity of the proposed reorganization, which every President since Theodore Roosevelt has urged. Informed men know that if it fails this time it will never be done. This is the last chance.

Opposition comes from the intrenched Federal bureaucracy and the labor lobby. Powerful as these are, they should be easy to override on so tremendously essential a matter as this. Yet, incredibly, it lags. Already it is being said that Congress will evade responsibility itself and merely authorize Mr. Truman to reorganize to the extent he desires. That, of course, means nothing at all. Most Congressmen shrink from doing anything to disturb the constituents whom they have on the pay roll. Their disposition is to run away from the drastic steps they are now asked to take in the national interest. If some way is not found to save this report from the lingering death which its opponents predict, this country's future is not pleasant to contemplate. Easily, it is the most important matter before Congress. Its fate will affect every project upon which we are engaged, abroad as well as at home. It is a dreadful thought that the people are incapable of being aroused on so vital and simple an issue.

The Politician's Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mrs. R. Earle Smith:

THE POLITICIAN'S UTOPIA

To socialize doctors, politicians would try—
A dictator's paradise, no one can deny.
Good honest medicine they would efface,
A political nostrum, instead to replace.

The totalitarian talk is only for the majority,
They think it's unimportant—to protect the minority;
If this trend of thought is not quickly curbed
All private enterprise will soon be disturbed.

The bureaucrats, socialism would spread,
Such a state of affairs is something to dread;
If their propaganda the public should heed—
To communism this eventually will lead.

We always look to our country with pride;
For our democracy, men have fought and died
Free enterprise is part of their contribution;
Any kind of dictatorship is against the Constitution.

The demagogues' talk is so full of deception—
What they mean, the public has no conception;
These bills they promote—greatly increase the tax,
To mention the truth, agitators are lax.

Thousands of employees will have to be hired,
To handle the red tape and taxes required.
The things they claim to the people are free
A national burden, ultimately will be.

Political medicine fails wherever it is tried;
The best medical care—patients are denied.
American medicine is the best in any land;
This truth the layman must understand.

If honest facts the proponents do not hide,
Each man for himself can then decide
And the black flag of absolutism will never wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

MRS. R. EARLE SMITH.

CARE Packages of Food and Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me showing what the great humanitarian organization CARE has been able to do to help millions of Europeans by sending over during the last 3 years a total of well over 7,000,000 CARE packages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this time when plans are under discussion for the continuation of United States long-range assistance for the rehabilitation of the economies of the war-devastated countries of western Europe, it seems to me important that we take a few moments to review the role played by individual Americans who, through their own initiative, have helped to reconstruct the lives of millions of Europeans by sending over the past 3 years a total of well over 7,000,000 CARE packages.

Last year Congress directed the allocation of certain sums of money out of ECA funds for the subsidy of ocean freight charges for CARE packages of food and clothing. This sum was a very small one in relation to the total ECA funds appropriated, but from an economical standpoint it has shown important results by encouraging many more Americans to take a personal part in what has been called the junior Marshall plan by sending an increased number of CARE parcels, each of which—clearly marked as originating in the United States—carries its message of American generosity and interest, bringing new hope and material help to the distressed abroad.

May I briefly review the origin and growth of this new American institution which has come to be regarded by the citizens of many countries as the symbol of American individuality and humantarianism.

CARE, meaning Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, came about as the result of the combined planning of 26 American voluntary relief agencies and some of our leading citizens who had spent much of their lives in the field of overseas relief.

At the close of World War II it became apparent that widespread famine in the war-devastated countries was an even greater danger than it was after World War I. From all sides Americans began hearing cries for help, from their friends, from their relatives, and from millions of persons overseas who had no one in America to help them. Many of us tried to respond to these calls by buying food supplies, packaging and mailing them. But only comparatively few of these improvised parcels reached their destination. The postal systems of Europe, the railroads, and other internal transportation means were disrupted as the result of the war and, in addition, a great many packages were pilfered by people driven to desperation by hunger and cold.

Our Government was, of course, participating in the relief activities of UNRRA, but there was no organization which could serve the millions of Americans eager to send direct and scientifically planned help to individuals in Europe. Such a private organization was desperately needed.

Late in 1945 the President's War Relief Control Board brought together 24 of the leading American voluntary agencies, representing the major religious, relief and labor groups, and on November 27, 1945, CARE, a nonprofit organization was incorporated in Washington under the laws of the District of Columbia.

Early in 1946 the first CARE food package was handed by a CARE representative to a European citizen. The ceremony took place among the ruins of the French port city of Le Havre. On the day before, the steamship *American Traveller* had steamed into the harbor carrying the first shipment of 15,000 CARE food packages. Three years have passed since that first package was delivered, and more than 7,000,000 CARE packages, ordered and paid for by individual Americans, have been delivered to the homes, the orphanages, the hospitals and schools of Europe.

The figure of 7,000,000 packages perhaps does not convey the full significance of the amount of assistance involved. These packages represent more than 156,000,000 pounds of the kind of food that in many parts of Europe could not be bought at any price. Where it was obtainable it was, and often still is, far beyond the reach of the average family. In the majority of cases the cost of a single item in a CARE food package—such as the dried whole milk or the meat—was the equivalent of a week's wages.

And food alone does not tell the whole story of CARE. As the second winter after the war approached it was evident that many of the men, women, and children living in the unheated homes of Europe were in desperate need of warm clothing. CARE packages containing blankets, cotton or woolen materials were then made available so that American donors could help their friends survive what turned out to be the worst winter in Europe's history.

In order that there should be no burden on the needy recipients of the packages, CARE, with the approval of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, was able to work out agreements with European governments for customs-free, ration-free admittance of the packages, and a carefully thought-out system of distribution was arranged so that the delivery of each package could be guaranteed and a signed receipt returned to the donor.

As the demand on CARE'S service grew throughout America the organization was proportionally expanded. In the New York offices of CARE, a staff of 500 is now engaged in purchasing food and textile supplies, receiving and processing orders. A large plant in Philadelphia, capable of packing 50,000 packages a day, operates an efficient assembly line. In major cities throughout the United States, CARE offices, largely manned by volunteers, have been opened to serve the public.

Overseas, American personnel supervise missions in 11 European countries, as well as in Japan, Okinawa, and Korea, the most recent area of CARE's expansion. At strategic points in all these lands thousands of packages are stock-piled and distributed upon individual orders received from this country.

It seems to me that one of the outstanding features of CARE is its adaptability to each particular stage of Europe's struggle for recovery. As conditions change new packages can be offered to meet specific shortages. For instance, because of the current critical lack of fats in Europe, CARE is now offering a special 10-pound package of lard, enough to supply the average family through the crucial winter months.

With the assistance of the ocean-freight subsidy CARE has found it possible to revise and add to its packages so that the standard food package now contains a greater variety of the foodstuffs at present in short supply. In addition it has been able to provide a special food package designed to meet the deficiencies of the British diet; another conforming to the needs and tastes of the people of Greece and Italy; and another for the people of the Orient.

This year CARE has made available a new package which I believe will do much to help individuals in European countries to assist in their own rehabilitation. I refer to the vegetable garden seed package. In connection with this package I would like to mention a statement by Sir Herbert Broadley, Acting Director General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Sir Herbert said that the FAO had made an estimate of the increased supplies of food needed to give individuals abroad a satisfactory diet. It was estimated that fruit and vegetable production ought to be increased by 163 percent, two and one-half times the amount produced at present. He said that domestic gardeners all over the world could help greatly to improve this situation and that the assistance provided through the CARE vegetable seed package should result in a very desirable increase in the supply of vegetables for the European countries where their nutritive content is particularly important.

Of interest to all of us is the disposition which is made of any surplus funds accruing from the sale of CARE packages. All such funds are turned back either into the improvement of the parcels or into the purchase of packages for general relief.

Because of bulk purchasing and shipping methods the standard food package which costs $10, including all packing and delivery costs, now contains more food than could be purchased for $10 in the retail stores. Despite this outstanding value CARE has found it possible to distribute general relief packages at the present rate of 100,000 per month in areas of critical need.

To date more than a million dollars of CARE relief packages have been distributed on the basis of need alone, on the advice of CARE's member agencies, cutting across religious and political lines. Such well-known agencies as the American Friends Service Committee, the Save the Children Federation, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Service, the AFL's Labor League for Human Rights, the National CIO Community Service Committee—all member agencies of CARE—have guided the distribution of such packages.

The New York Times, which honored CARE with the title of "ambassador of good will," recently said editorially that CARE has "carved itself a bright and honorable and ever widening place in communities the world over." Let us glance briefly at the list of countries to which the American people have been able to send CARE packages.

In Austria distribution started in June, 1946. Since then 700,000 CARE packages of all descriptions have been delivered in that country. On the basis of Austria's population, this means that one person in every four has received a CARE package. Indeed, the head of the Austrian Government has said that "CARE has become an honored word in our language."

Four hundred thousand packages have gone into France since that first delivery in early 1946. To Germany Americans have sent through CARE 4,500,000 food and cloth-

ing textile packages, many of them to the homeless displaced persons. To Czechoslovakia, 106,500. To Finland, whose people have felt the blows of three wars in the last decade, 46,000. To equally stricken Greece, 50,000. To Italy, 210,000. To Poland, 177,500. To England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, nearly half a million. CARE packages have also brightened the homes of Belgium, Hungary, the Netherlands, Bulgaria, Eire, Norway, Rumania and the island of Cyprus.

It will be asked, as it has been asked before: Does the need for CARE's service continue now that the United States has undertaken the long-term aid program under the ECA? The answer is decidedly in the affirmative.

Last year the Congress, by authorizing the payment to CARE of the ocean-freight subsidy from ECA funds, gave distinguished recognition to the fact that CARE's operation has an important part in our country's over-all program for European recovery. We are trying to reestablish the productive capacity of Europe. As the various countries try to rebuild their economies, their agriculture, their foreign trade, the problem of the daily diet of their citizens remains a serious one. For many months Americans will be called upon to help sustain their relatives and friends and the many other needy persons through direct aid. This can be done effectively through CARE.

Reports from Europe indicate that there is a gradual over-all trend toward improvement in conditions. But by no means do these reports show that the need for direct aid has ended, particularly in certain areas. We could terminate what we are doing now in the field of direct individual relief only at the risk of a later general collapse, with results impossible to calculate. The withdrawal of CARE from Europe would mean, aside from the material loss to its citizens, an irreparable drop in morale. Peace and security are not so well grounded that they can withstand further strain at this moment in history.

For these reasons I have thought it timely to remind Congress of what Americans have done, through CARE, over the past 3 years, and to urge that all aid and encouragement be continued to this worth-while effort. I would like to congratulate all those who have participated in the operation of CARE, its founders and its member agencies. Most of all I would like to congratulate the American people whose faith and help have made this humanitarian and practical program possible and who continue to demonstrate that, given the means to help, they will gladly and generously do their best to alleviate human suffering and misery wherever and whenever it may exist.

FM Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House what I consider to be an appallingly flagrant disservice to the American people—and to America's progress.

America has grown, prospered, and become the bulwark of the world's free societies by reason of a competitive, free enterprise which has stimulated the initiative and the inventiveness of Americans, and made possible the world's best, most comfortable and richest way of living.

What has made this possible is the freedom for the merit of a man, a machine, or a method of doing something he has discovered to rise to the top.

When the marketing, or acceptance of something newer and vastly better than what we have is prevented or impeded, that is not only evil, it is also shackling the thing that makes America great.

That, I believe, is what is happening in the case of one of the important discoveries of the twentieth century—a discovery which was proved 15 years ago to be one of great and unchallengeable beneficence.

But its benefits today—15 years later—are not made available as they should be to the American people. I refer to FM radio, or frequency modulation, to use the full name.

It has been 15 years since FM was demonstrated to be not only the best, but the only system of clear, high-fidelity radio communication—one that is free of noise, static and interference—no matter how bad the weather, and no matter how near or intense the power lines or other man-made disturbances may be.

It is the only system of radio that is able to provide reception for large blocks of listeners throughout the Nation, particularly in rural areas, and even inside the boundaries of the so-called areas of existing AM broadcasting stations.

But, despite FM's obvious advantages and benefits, and the clear necessity for employing FM to give uncounted thousands of people the services of radio, FM has been obstructed, stepped on, blocked, or ignored from the start—by some of the big interests in AM radio—and by the Federal Communications Commission.

A prominent consulting radio engineer has said, that if FM had been allowed to proceed naturally, there is no question but that FM would be far ahead of where it is today, and in fact, would probably be the accepted system of sound broadcasting. AM, he declared, would be on the way out.

With this thesis, many other engineers and experts in the radio industry are in agreement.

Edgar Kobak, president of the Mutual network, declared recently that there was what he described a strange broadcast apathy toward the wider use of FM.

FM, Mr. Kobak declared, is the only means the radio industry has for giving every person good reception, especially, he said, the millions of people still getting poor service from standard broadcasting.

He charged that broadcasters have been selling too much poor listening over bad AM reception; they have been selling the blue sky too long.

Ever since the superiority of FM radio was first demonstrated on a field scale—in 1934—it has been beset by opposition, and it has had to go over and around road blocks.

The Radio Corp. of America, to whose executives it was demonstrated, ignored it. The Federal Communications Commission's chief engineers labeled it visionary and impractical. The Commission for 10 years would assign no channels for relaying FM programs across the country.

Three years ago, in an obviously stupid blunder, the Commission moved FM broadcasting channels to a new band on the dial, thereby delaying the quantity production of receiving sets at reasonable prices for several years.

It has done other things to favor and encourage AM over FM. Members of the House and Senate have charged that the Commission has served corporate, rather than the public interests. And one Senator has stated that the FCC and RCA have often been synonymous.

And in a report from the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee 2 months ago, it was stated the Commission relies on, and appears to be overawed and too much impressed by the engineering views of major commercial interests, and does not always balance these views against the broad public policy of what is best for the general interest of the people.

The big networks have opposed before the Commission the development of regional FM networks. The clear and superior reception of small FM stations would be too much competition for their high-power AM stations.

FM would put all broadcasting stations on an equal footing, since FM reception is equally good in all parts of the broadcast area. The only commodity a station would then have to sell, would be the quality of its programs; the fortune or the influence that provided a high-power station would count for nothing.

More recently, the attitude of the FCC has changed, and it has even offered FM a helping hand on occasion.

Obviously, a local station that is trying to serve its listeners with programs of interest to the community cannot meet this condition.

Secondly, FM facilities are constantly subjected to a barrage of propaganda designed to convince advertisers that their money should be spent on AM broadcasts.

As an example, I cite a listening survey conducted by an organization called the Broadcast Measurement Bureau for the National Association of Broadcasters—AM broadcasters, that is—on comparative coverage of AM and FM.

The BMB report favored AM coverage by an overwhelming margin. But a quick look at the sampling techniques used by the organization demonstrates that it gave a false and erroneous picture. The samplings were not taken in accordance with the densities of population, and the questions were so worded that the result was largely a score sheet on how distant a station a listener could get on his set rather than what stations he usually tuned in on his dial.

The president and chief engineer of BMB were discharged following this survey. But that did not prevent AM broadcasters from using the figures to make a little hay with advertisers and advertising agencies. So far, neither BMB nor the broadcaster's association—which foots BMB's bill—has done anything to rectify the damage done by the faulty survey.

But the most important consideration in this whole field is the discouraging fact that the public has a hard time getting a good FM receiver. A radio executive—in the business of manufacturing both AM and FM sets—has declared, and I quote:

There are many models in stores that are so deficient in sensitivity, tone quality, and freedom from noise that they are no better than the cheapest AM receivers. These contraptions, incidentally, do no good for FM's reputation.

Continuing, he said:

Here is the picture we found when we tested 16 competing makes of FM sets. They had average sensitivity of 106 microvolts, and some of them were worse than 200. On the FM sets we produce, we had no difficulty maintaining an average sensitivity of 30 to 35 microvolts—three times as good as the industry average. And there is no magic about it. Anyone can do the same. There is no more reason for building insensitive sets than there would be to power heavy automobiles with motorcycle engines.

Perhaps some of these things may account for an item in the column of Danton Walker, in the New York Daily News the other day. It said the Federal Communications Commission is pondering a strange turn of events, whereby in the first 3 months of this year, 46 FM stations have turned back their licenses.

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that these FM broadcasters just quit cold because they could not get network programs to fit their needs? Did they become discouraged because the propaganda of the National Association of Broadcasters had driven away advertisers with life-giving revenue? Or did they just decide that there was no point in operating stations whose listeners were unable to get decent receiving sets?

All of these things do not add up to a pretty picture. The public has waited too long to reap the benefits of a revolutionary discovery which proved its worth 15 years ago.

Any single one of the obstacles to the development of FM broadcasting could be considered an accident. But these "accidents" have been too frequent and too closely connected.

It is impossible to escape the conclusion that somehow, somewhere, there is an underlying pattern that ties all these things together. It seems to me that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice might well look into this matter in order to determine whether or not there are any violations of our laws.

Tax on Colored Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the brief statement I made on April 8, 1949, before the Senate Committee on Finance regarding the taxes and license fees on colored oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I have appeared before this committee so many times in order to voice my opposition to the existing taxes and license fees on colored margarine that I feel right at home in coming back here today.

I hardly think it necessary to again go through the long 63-year history of this injustice. That has been done before this committee many times in the past, and is a matter of record in the printed proceedings which are available to all. Extensive hearings were held in the House of Representatives, and the arguments were thoroughly and ably presented prior to the passage of this bill (H. R. 2023) by that body. It does not even seem necessary to go into the many, many reasons for the repeal of these taxes and license fees again at this time.

As far as the manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and housewives are concerned, they are positively aware of the unjustness of these regulations. Their testimony is clear and true evidence of their feelings. The farmers, the men who produce the high-grade vegetable oils used in the manufacture of margarine, are certainly well acquainted with the facts, and, Mr. Chairman, all of these people have felt the burden of these ridiculous penalties far too long.

This is a question that transcends the lines of any party or any group, even so powerful a group as the one which has been able to maintain this legislated stranglehold on an otherwise competitive industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are no longer willing to tolerate the existence of such a restraining hand on the manufacture of one product, a product which has every right to take its deserved place and stand on its own merits along with other products in its field.

The properties of margarine and the benefits to be gained from its use on the family tables of this country have been expounded over and over again by competent authorities. Its nutritional value is an established fact, controlled and regulated by our Pure Food and Drug Administration standard of identity.

The argument always resolves itself to one of color. While butter, the admitted opponent in this particular battle, may be colored any tint of yellow without even being so labeled, even though it may have been white originally, the ingredients of margarine must be bleached to keep from giving the finished product a natural yellow tint. Butter, cheese, and ice cream each enjoy special and unique exemption from labeling artificial coloring under the act of 1923. Margarine is denied the use of yellow simply because the dairy industry has used its enormous political influences to drive a competitive product off the counter. This is discrimination and a flagrant violation of the American principle of open, competitive business.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere belief that these regulations are pointedly designed to restrain the free marketing privileges of one group of manufacturers. They go beyond that. They place undue hardships and restrictions on our housewives in their daily marketing. I have no doubt but that the majority of our people prefer butter for table use. That may be habit and education, and it may not.

The main point is this: The low-income families of this Nation have no choice. The purchase of margarine for their daily table use is an economic necessity. But whether they buy margarine by choice or by necessity, it is their inalienable right to be free to buy yellow margarine if they so desire. Butter is colored a particular tint of yellow to meet the consumer preference of a particular market. Why not margarine?

Secretary Brannan's Proposed Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial entitled "The Old Shell Game," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of April 8, 1949. The editorial relates to the agricultural plan which has been proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD SHELL GAME

Agriculture Secretary Brannan's proposed farm plan, outlined to Congress Thursday, has all the earmarks of the old carnival shell game.

The social uplifters doubtless will rally round. But we don't believe the rank and file of good farmers will go along with the Secretary down the road to socialized farming.

Secretary Brannan proposes:

1. To let prices of farm products in the market place seek the levels determined by supply and demand.

2. To fix theoretical prices on farm products by arbitrary directives from Washington.

3. To pay the difference to producers by doling it out to them from the taxpayers' income collected by the Federal Treasury.

That is what the Secretary offers to replace the Aiken law, passed last year and due to become effective next January 1. The Aiken law, indorsed by most responsible farm leaders, would return to farmers a considerable measure of individual initiative and offer a method of averting surpluses and low prices by a sliding scale of support prices. Crops in large supply would carry low-support prices, and farmers thus would be encouraged to use their own initiative to shift production to crops in which higher support prices reflected relatively lesser supplies.

This system hasn't even been tried yet, to see how well it would work.

Secretary Brannan's plan hasn't been tried either, but he makes it sound simple. He improves on the shell game barker's technique by using not one but two little green peas. He is going to give consumers low-food prices. He is also going to give all producers high-farm prices. But when he lifts the little shell, the traditional result is apparent. You're hooked again.

The plain fact is that the money to pay the difference between market prices and what the Washington deep thinkers would consider a fair price has to come out of the pockets of consumers. For in these days of tax and spend all consumers are taxpayers, whether they be farmers, wage earners, or the hated capitalists.

So how would the consumer be any better off? While he might pay lower prices at the corner grocery, the Federal tax collector's hand would be in his pocket to pick up the loose change that the consumer thought he had saved.

How would the farmer be any better off? Except in the case of the indolent, inefficient farmer, the producers of food would be no better off than under the Aiken law, which

sets up a scale of sliding support prices that could be used as incentives to produce the commodities that were in shortest supply.

They would be less well off, if they consider their individual initiative as worth anything. For under the Brannan plan, farmers would be subjected to more rigid controls from Washington than ever before. They would be told what to plant, when to sow, and when to reap. They would have to comply with a Government-directed program.

Farmers deserve and should have reasonable legislative safeguards within which they can exercise their own good judgment and direct their own initiative and labor to guaranteeing their own incomes.

But if farmers can have incomes that are guaranteed by the Government, regardless of sound business practices, why shouldn't the Government guarantee through taxation the incomes of labor, of management, of capital investments?

This may be what the socialistic planners in Washington have in mind. If so, it is away past time for this seedling Politburo to be uprooted and tossed into the ashcan.

European Recovery Program and the British Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received this morning from a lady in England. I have made a copy of the letter and purposely left her name and her husband's name from the letter, because I did not have her permission to use their names, and I did not want to have any reprisals against them as the result of the printing of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 9, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Congratulations on your remarks in the Senate on April 7, relating to the new appropriation for the European recovery program. I am thrilled and delighted with them.

I am an American woman from Cleveland, Ohio. My husband, * * * is in Britain on business and I am with him. We shall be here for a year or more. And I am doing what Americans for Democratic Action suggest, studying current, political conditions in Britain. May I send you a magazine article which will be published shortly which I have written on the present Socialist Government?

Through ERP the United States is supporting an incipient Communist Government in Britain. I am terrified by the arbitrary restraints with which people in this nation are being suffocated. A mad Socialist government is traveling the road to communism.

1. I have to carry an identification card, as do all other inhabitants of Britain. Without it, I am liable to arrest, a fine, and imprisonment. 2. Four years after the close of the war, this Nation still has direction of labor. No one may quit his job or seek another except through direction of the Government. And at any time the Government may drag a man or woman off one job and thrust him into another. 3. My British friends eat nothing except what the Minister of Food dictates. And they may buy their meager rations only where he dictates. 4. There is a shocking injustice in the distribution of food. Those who have access to industrial or school canteens are fed lavishly while those who have access to neither, and no bit of land upon which to sustain themselves, have the magnificent choice of slow starvation or existing on bread and potatoes. 5. No British subject may leave this Nation today except as a pauper. His possessions may never be taken out. This Government recognizes no right to private property. 6. Some of my British friends have had their collieries seized and their only compensation has been a promise that they will some day be paid in an amount which the confiscators only will decide upon. After 2 years and 3 months since the siezure, they have not yet received a penny for what was taken from them. 7. The Town and Country Planning Act, which was passed about a year ago requires every industrialist who wishes to expand his industrial facilities to pay to the Government a tax of 100 percent on expansion cost. If a new factory costs $100,000, the same amount must be paid to the Government for the privilege of building. 8. At a meeting of the Conservative Party which I recently attended, a Socialist arose and arrogantly reminded the Conservatives that the present Government is magnanimously allowing the continuation of freedom of speech.

I could go on for pages with the stupidities of the present Government of Britain. But I am in a hurry, as you may see, and I shall not take too much of your time. Government here today is not by law, but solely by the whims of bureaucrats. They are weaving a web in which they are entangling themselves so that nothing but chaos can possibly lie ahead. Should Marshall aid be cut off, the entire structure would collapse over night. The the sooner, the better.

I know of almost no one in Britain today who would not leave it, if he could take his possessions with him and go to America, Africa, Canada, or elsewhere. The young are going in vast numbers. But the middle-aged are tied here by the hope that the brakes will be applied on the road to communism, and their right to their own property again recognized.

If you are interested, I shall be glad to send you newspaper clippings from time to time supporting all that I have said to you in this letter. The Conservative Party of Britain has never had a fair hearing in America. But we have been bombarded at home on lecture platforms and in publications by British Socialist crackpots until we have no conception of the truth. I had to come to Britain and live here to learn the truth.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Food Subsidies: Fiction Versus Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Food Subsidies: Fiction Versus Facts," written by Edward H. Collins and published in the New York Times of April 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 11, 1949]

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—FOOD SUBSIDIES: FICTION VERSUS FACT

(By Edward H. Collins)

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan produced a blueprint for a new farm program last week that could have emanated only from an administration politically desperate for a plan that would be popular at any cost.

Last summer and fall during the election campaign spokesmen for the administration repeatedly assured the Nation's farmers that under its prevailing support policies there could not possibly be a repetition of the break in farm prices that followed World War I. It was the farmers' reliance on these assurances more than anything else, perhaps, that produced the unexpectedly large rural vote for Mr. Truman in November and swung the election to the Democratic Party.

But farm prices since that time have fallen if not disastrously, at least very severely. Moreover, the declines in many cases have carried prices right through the Government's supposedly impenetrable support levels, the result being to raise doubts in some quarters as to the dependability in a crisis of the present machinery. To the administration this unhappy misadventure apparently suggested the need for a new formula for circumventing the law of supply and demand—one which would be more surefire in operation and preferably one which would antagonize neither the farmer nor the consumer. And like everyone who ever set out on such a quest it now announces that it has found the answer in that sovereign cure for the incurable, the two-price system.

The Journal of Commerce summed up the plan of Secretary Brannan in its political aspects pretty completely last Friday when it declared:

1. To farmers generally he has offered an over-all annual income of the attractive levels of wartime.

2. To consumers and labor he holds out lower prices for meat, milk, fresh vegetables, eggs, butter and other perishables that represent a large chunk of the cost-of-living items.

3. To southern producers and Congressmen he offers a price-support program for cotton and tobacco even higher than the 90 percent of parity they have been demanding.

4. To the powerful Corn Belt he offers drastically increased price-support levels for meat animals—and most corn is marketed in the form of meat.

5. To producers of fruit and vegetables—and their vociferous congressional representatives—he offers for the first time a real and permanent place in the price-support system.

6. To small farmers he offers a preferred price-support position over the large producers, who represent only 2 percent of the Nation's farmers but grow about a quarter of the commodities.

When a program has to be made as unashamedly attractive to as many groups in the community as this one has, it is usually because it will not stand inspection economically. There is little doubt that that explains the general resemblance of the present proposal to a political Christmas tree. Farm price-support programs are difficult to justify under any conditions, but there are limits beyond which a government cannot go with such adventures so long as the mechanism operates in clear view of the public and so long as the consumer is conscious of the fact that he is paying the bill. The peculiar iniquity of the so-called two-price system is that, by guaranteeing high prices

to the producer and low prices to the consumer, the Government virtually eliminates all opposition and criticism in those quarters that are politically articulate. It creates, in effect, a huge mechanism for the redistribution of wealth, the cost of which is footed by the taxpayer, and which, once established, not only perpetuates itself, but grows larger and more burdensome with each passing year.

It is not necessary to rest such conclusions as these on mere theory. Britain embarked during the war on just such a two-price system of food subsidies. In her case, it should be observed, there were plausible reasons for doing so as a temporary expedient; reasons which do not exist in this country and which, in theory at least, have nothing to do with long-range policy. The holding down of food costs was, for Britain, part of a larger plan for combating inflation and strengthening her competitive position in world trade. Moreover, food subsidies in Britain's case are not identified with the idea of abundance, but with a Spartan system of food rationing. Yet the table below shows how, even in that economically highly disciplined nation, annual expenditures for food subsidies have grown year by year over the past decade:

Year:	*Amount in millions of dollars*
1939	52
1940	252
1941	384
1942	572
1943	608
1944	900
1945	1,232
1946	1,456
1947	1,568
1948	2,272

This is the general picture that Sir Stafford Cripps had in mind when, in his budget speech last week, he declared that such subsidies have grown and grown and grown beyond anything that was ever contemplated. And it goes far to explain what the London Economist meant when it said recently, "It is still official policy that the food subsidies—or most of them—are temporary. But it requires a sanguine temperament to believe that any government will ever dare actually take them off."

Federal Aid to Education—Letters in Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like other Members of the Senate, I have been glad to receive many comunications from constitutents on pending Federal aid to education legislation. In the March 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I secured the printing of several resolutions which I had received from educational and parent-teacher groups supporting the aid legislation.

It would, of course, only be fair to indicate that I have heard from many prominent individuals in my State who are as deeply and sincerely opposed to this legislation as are constituents who have written to me favoring it.

Many of the folks who oppose this legislation feel that it would be a step toward Federal control of education. Naturally, I for one, like my colleagues, am deeply opposed to any such control; that is, to regimentation of the Nation's schools.

Because I believe that the communications which I have received opposing aid to education merit my own careful study and the study of my colleagues, as a token of thinking throughout the Nation on one side of this issue, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several representative letters which have come to me vigorously objecting to passage of this pending legislation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHMIDTMAN CO.,
Manitowoc, Wis., April 7, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Federal Aid to Education bill, S. 246, should be quashed. We don't want Federal bureaucrats to set the policies, programs, and costs of our schools. Certainly the people who are writing you in favor of the bill are misinformed and do not realize the threat it involves to the very foundations of our American public-school system and our traditions of decentralized responsibility in government and in education.

We trust you will serve our future by voting as an American would vote, rather than be guided by an uninformed public.

Dr. John McClure, dean of College of Education, University of Alabama, said in 1948: "I believe that it is the obligation of school as well as other leaders to have a philosophy of government and of education that will stand firm and unshaken even with the temptation of $300,000,000 to be distributed to the States on the basis of a law which threatens the very foundations of the American public-school system, and our traditions of decentralized responsibility in Government and in education."

Also this, said by the United States Supreme Court: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." (*Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111).)

We feel certain you won't be coerced into voting against your personal principles in order to appease a misinformed constituency.

Very truly yours,

SCHMIDTMAN CO.,
E. J. SCHMIDTMAN.

HURLEY X-RAY CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 8, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have been watching with considerable interest bill S. 246, with reference to Federal aid for educational purposes in the different States and for the Nation as a whole.

I have heard several discussions concerning Federal aid to education, and my conclusion is that a program of this type will open many channels for extravagances and irresponsibility in administration through the Federal Government. This has definitely been evidenced by many of the programs already undertaken by the Federal Government, and it seems to me that it is up to the States to provide proper education for the residents of their respective States, independent of the Federal Government.

Federal aid, in many of the programs I have observed, means Federal control, and Federal control must be cut and not increased. Unquestionably the greater part of $1 collected in taxes for Federal aid will be wasted in administration of such a program. It seems to me that our State has the necessary financial ability to meet its educational needs. Information which I have shows that about 25 percent of World War I draftees were unable to read or write, while approximately 4 percent of World War II selective-service registrants had to be rejected for educational deficiencies. It seems to me that this is conclusive evidence that the States have the ability to supply their own educational facilities and funds.

There is unquestionably need for improving our own Wisconsin educational facilities because many of the schools now are overcrowded, but most communities with which I am familiar in this State can very well afford to issue bonds, raise money, and increase their educational facilities to the extent that is needed at this time.

I am unconditionally opposed to any such program that will add to our already top-heavy Government and increase personnel that will be required to operate and administer this program.

Respectfully yours,

V. H. HURLEY.

ADJUSTABLE FIXTURE CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 8, 1949.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A group of businessmen in Milwaukee, of which I am one, has been discussing this bill, S. 246, regarding Federal aid to education. We have agreed definitely that passage of this bill, S. 246, would surely be a step in the wrong direction. The people behind this bill are looking only to the immediate future, more pay for teachers.

I agree that teachers and educators today are grossly underpaid for the great service they are rendering to the parents in this country and to the United States itself. These teachers spend a third of their lives educating and qualifying themselves for a very important and responsible task, and then receive no more remuneration for their labors than a man in a factory who presses buttons to operate an automatic machine.

This is a deplorable condition indeed, but, please, let us remedy this without risking the very freedom in education, religion and everything else which has made this Nation flourish.

I am not an alarmist. But communism is one thing we cannot ignore. If we ignore communism, we will have it. If we fight communism, it cannot possibly succeed because it is fundamentally incongruous with human nature and must sneak past unnoticed before it can seize a nation in its awful grasp.

As I see this bill, it is a step toward communism if nothing else. I do not want my children educated as the children in Russia are educated today. Supporters of this bill will laugh at my concern, and that is all the support communism needs. Simply ignore communism right into this country, and then, what?

Sincerely,

ADJUSTABLE FIXTURE CO.,
NORBERT F. SCHUMAKER, *Treasurer.*

A Message of Hope Regarding Western Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Assistant Secretary William E. Warne, Department of the Interior, before the annual meeting of the Riverside County National Farm Loan Association, Riverside, Calif., March 30, 1949:

This is doubly a pleasure for me. It is a pleasure to return home to southern California to be with you tonight and it is a pleasure for me to discuss with you the subject of water—water for irrigation, water for all uses.

Some people may think water a dry subject for a speech, but surely there will not be many of them in a southern California audience.

We have been saying for many years that water is the most precious resource of the West, that water rather than land or minerals or climate or location will be the factor that places the ceiling on the growth of southern California, and indeed on all of the arid and semiarid West which encompasses one-third of the Nation. We have been saying that every single drop of this precious water that falls in the West must be controlled and conserved and used, that not a drop of it should be wasted to the sea.

These statements are so obviously true and have been so often repeated that all of us have accepted them, sometimes without realizing what they, in reality, mean.

We said these things for more than 50 years before we began to develop water plans that encompassed whole river basins. No previous concept of planning for the development of the waters of the West, however, went so far toward meeting the requirements forced upon us by our philosophical acceptance of the importance of water in the scheme of things in the West.

There were instances, of course, in which an entire basin was developed without anyone's having bothered at any stage to lay out a plan, but in every such instance unnecessary problems have been stored up to be solved by us or by our children.

Riverside lies in one of the most beautiful and most fruitful river basins of the West; that of the Santa Ana River. Let us look at the Santa Ana River Basin. It lies in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange Counties and drains 2,480 square miles. The river receives 240,000 acre-feet of water as rain and snow in the mountains and 30,000 acre-feet are added as rain that falls in the valley.

In all our broad land, there are few rivers which are so thoroughly used as the Santa Ana and I doubt whether any contributes more in proportion to its flow in the way of wealth and sustenance to people of its basin.

In 1946 there were 534,000 people living in the three counties, largely concentrated in the Santa Ana River Basin. That number was still increasing. By 1966, given water, it is estimated that there will be 850,000 living here.

Presently 82 percent of the water that flows in the Santa Ana River is beneficially used. Allowing for percolation to ground water from valley rains, as much as 90 percent of the total supply may be put to beneficial use. There is an average annual waste of about 21,000 acre-feet to the sea, though it comes in floods that may be spaced several years apart. There is a loss of nine or ten thousand acre-feet that goes to feed useless vegetation in small swampy areas along the river.

In 1946 Redlands, San Bernardino, Riverside, Colton, and Corona were using more than 36,000 acre-feet of water, while only 7 7 years earlier their requirements were less than 20,000. If these cities are to grow, as they can and should, they will use more than 50,000 acre-feet of water in 1956. In 1946, approximately 60,000 acres of land were irrigated in the interior valley of the Santa Ana Basin. With respect to the total water supply, there is an annual overdraft in the Chino Basin area of 21,000 acre-feet, and overdrafts in other areas bring to an estimated 35,700 acre-feet the total annual overuse of water in this river basin. This means that reserves that may have been stored by Nature ages ago are being depleted and exhausted. Wells that were artesian sources of water 30 years ago now have to be pumped. This means that not growth but the opposite impends in parts, at least, of your beautiful river valley unless something constructive is done.

The irresponsible sinking of wells in ground water areas leads to overdrafts and eventually to catastrophe. Creation of false droughts by such thoughtless means cannot be in the public interest. States are now enacting laws to control this, and more should do so.

I do not wish to be represented as a harbinger of doom, because I bring a message not of despair but of hope for this and other areas in the West where similar conditions are faced. I have simply shown that the problem of the Santa Ana River Basin is serious. There is some waste of water here and at the same time an overdraft on the annual supply. You have the climate, the soil, and all needed things except water to continue your growth and development. It is that deficiency in water supply that ought to be faced now forthrightly. Water holds the key to your future.

The rules by which western basins should live in order to flourish and prosper are, in my judgment, quite simple.

The people of western river basins should conserve and use wisely all of the waters that God gives to them. For example, in the Santa Ana River Basin some thought should be given to those 21,000 acre-feet of water that are wasted to the sea in the average year, and to the 9,000 acre-feet of waters lost unnecessarily through keeping useless vegetation alive. Possibly an additional 24,000 acre-feet that disappear annually in evapotranspiration can be reduced without sacrificing on total agricultural production. It is worth considering at least. Also, only those irrigation practices that are the most saving of water should be practiced.

I realize that a reasonable view must be taken of this matter, but, as development proceeds and higher and higher percentages of the total amount of water available are required for beneficial uses, the losses of water in transit from the source to the land must be reduced by lining and covering the canals and by other methods. On certain types of land, evaporation and seepage losses from irrigation ditches may amount to a considerable percentage of the total water supply. Investigations for the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington disclosed that the prospective losses from farm ditches on class 3 sandy soils might be as high as 12.5 percent of the supply that reached the land. In 1948, almost 200,000 acre-feet of water were lost in the main delivery section of the All-American Canal, across the mountains from you in Imperial County. These instances are cited only because they are well substantiated. They are neither unusual nor excessive amounts when compared with general average experience. Such losses, however, could be lessened by the use of pipe-distribution systems or canal linings if it is found that the added cost involved is justified by the potential savings of water. In addition, waste through overuse in irrigation must be eliminated if we are to have our greatest development. Without having investigated the matter closely in the Santa Ana River Basin, I would guess that your farmers and your water companies give a better account of themselves on this score than in almost any other area of the West. My point is, however, that in our immature irrigation economy in the West we are wasting large amounts of water because, so far, it has not seemed worth while to save and use them. When we face the alternative of putting up such signs as "No admittance" or "Standing room only," the saving of this water will seem more important.

The use of sprinklers often results in marked water savings compared with surface irrigation methods, especially on coarse, sandy soils, lands underlain by gravel beds, or lands on a considerable slope. In a survey of orchards in the State of Washington, where sprinklers are being used, the estimated average saving as compared with former use by surface flooding was 24 percent. Four acres could be irrigated in place of three. On sandy land on the Yuma Mesa in Arizona, project officials think now that, with sprinklers, about double the area can be irrigated as with surface methods, using the same amount of water. This latter example is extreme and may not fairly indicate possible savings on other types of land. But that is Colorado River water, and one need not appear prophetic to indicate the values that are being attached to it in seven great States.

Also, research might be directed profitably toward the production of crops and strains that will reduce the water duty. We have bred special crops and special varieties for almost every other purpose. This might be a promising method of reducing the transpiration requirement of each acre without reducing the yield in terms of the general economy. Thus the water supply might be made to go further.

Having pursued to the limit these lines of more effective use of the local waters, you may ask, Must the Santa Ana Basin and other areas like it that have developed mature economics in the West fold their hands in resignation?

No. I do not believe in the last-waterhole philosophy that encourages such resignation.

Let us step back a minute and take another look. Let me repeat:

"We have been saying for many years that water is the most precious resource of the West, that water rather than land or minerals or climate or location will be the factor that places the ceiling on the growth of southern California, and indeed on all of the arid and semiarid West which encompasses one-third of the Nation. We have been saying that every single drop of this precious water that falls in the West must be controlled and conserved and used, that not a drop of it should be wasted to the sea."

Much less than half of the waters of the West are beneficially used today. Few indeed are the individual basins, small or large, for which the waters, like those of the Santa Ana River Basin, are now 82 percent beneficially used. There are many areas, however, like your own Chino Basin, where pumping has outrun recharge of ground water. There have been several instances of complete disaster from this source. Planning will not be sufficiently flexible to care for such areas of trouble in the future, and cannot be made so. It is like lighting the fuse to a bomb and then trying to plan how to meet the disaster that its explosion will cause, to enlarge pumping irrigation beyond the safe yield of the wells.

While we have been slow in reaching the point at which our planning has been broadened to the limits of river basins, we are just now coming to a period when students of this problem dare speak seriously of planning for the wide use of the waters of the whole arid and semiarid region.

Oh yes, I know there have been interbasin diversions, some of them of great size. I need only mention the Metropolitan Water District Aqueduct which brings Colorado

River water to the southern California coastal basins to provide you with the prime example. But these diversions today are relatively few in number and generally do not involve large amounts of water. Some of the people who have sponsored the construction of such interbasin diversion projects apparently have not felt themselves committed to any principle involving West-wide planning. They have scoffed at the idea of finding out where surplus waters exist so that such surplus waters might be used on a West-wide basis to sustain or to create wealth and opportunity.

You have a right to ask me whether I mean that the Santa Ana River Basin can supplement its limited local water supply by diversion from the Colorado River.

I know that the waters of the Colorado are at the vortex of a controversy that is loud and bitter among the States. I know that California has limited herself as to the amount of water she would take from the Colorado. I know that areas within California and within the other Colorado River Basin States are dependent upon the waters of that stream, and that the Colorado River is the hope and promise of communities from Wyoming to the Gulf of California. I do not mean that the Santa Ana River Basin might tap the Colorado River, except as it might do so through participation in the metropolitan water district and under the allocations of water made to California.

But, for a moment, let us see how the Colorado River is being used. One rule for the use of the western waters was that in any river basin local waters should be conserved and fully utilized. That is not being done in the Colorado River Basin today. Half of the annual flow of the river reaches the Gulf of California unused. Meanwhile, California and Arizona bitterly struggle over approximately a million acre-feet of water, which is involved in various interpretations of compacts and laws. While this contest rages, more than a million acre-feet of water annually are wasted from unlined irrigation canals and ditches and by other irrigation practices to flow into the Salton Sea without producing anything. In 1948, all California allottees in combination diverted only 3,800,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River as against the 4,400,000 acre-feet that are mentioned in the California Self-Limitation Act. About 200,000 acre-feet flowed through the Metropolitan aqueduct and 2,900,000 were diverted for California use into the All-American canal.

The boom has not yet been lowered, as these facts show, nor is it about to be lowered on either side of the Colorado River. There is much that remains to be done if it can be approached calmly. The President, Secretary Krug, and all of us in the administration with responsibilities in this field are determined that appropriate solutions must be found.

In the rivers of California that flow westward to the Pacific Ocean, if they are considered together, are several millions of acre-feet of water that are unused and wasted each year. Already an aqueduct 250 miles long is in operation. The complex Central Valley project, now nearing completion by the Bureau of Reclamation, will provide a southward shift of more than 450 miles of surplus waters arising in the Pit, McCloud, and upper Sacramento Rivers. This is done by the borrow-and-exchange method that cuts down on the size and length of individual ditches and uses gravity as well as pumps in a series of stair-step diversions.

When I was a boy, I could scarcely credit my ears when Mr. Mark Rose described a dam that he was advocating to be built in Boulder Canyon for the purpose of controlling the terrible Colorado River, so big and wonderful did it seem. My father had taken me to my first public meeting in the Alamo School in the Imperial Valley. I thought about it for days and I remember the experience still. But such things do come to pass. Twenty years later I was working in the Bureau of Reclamation when the wonderful dam was finished.

We who have experienced the miracles that have been wrought in America surely cannot now believe that we lack the skill to do a simple job such as that involved in saving, transferring, and using the surplus waters of the West.

Provided we of the West work together and provided we plan far enough ahead, I think that we can supply the water needs of any populous area as they arise 20, 30, or even 100 years from now.

The costs of the needed works in the future will be great, but if they are broadly spread, they should not be intolerable, and there will be many more people to help in paying them.

Costs of water are relative, in any event. In Los Angeles, bottled drinking water sells for 17 cents a gallon delivered. Fair enough for water in a drinking cooler, but this amounts to $55,000 per acre-foot. No large water supply could be sold at such a fantastic rate, but, if it were, aqueducts could profitably be built to all corners of the continent to satisfy the need. To be serious, some pumping irrigators pay charges of $40 per acre-foot for water in California today. With known and proved methods, I am told, it might be possible to bring water 1,500 miles to southern California for $115 or $125 an acre-foot, and there is surplus water at this time much nearer at hand. I have had explained to me a plan to haul water from the mouth of the Columbia River in a new type of tanker that, it is estimated, could make the deliveries for $150 or less per acre-foot.

It must always be borne in mind that great works are feasible only to serve great peoples in great need, and they will never be built by a people while in a petty, bickering mood.

I personally visualize a climbing of the ladder to the north. One stream after another might be reached to take a surplus supply of water which would suffice for years. At last, the Columbia might be reached. That great river could then begin to make the contribution that it can make to the whole arid region, a region which is bigger than States or river basins, which is as wide as the West, which is bound forever in a community of interest by the fact that nature withheld from the West the plentiful waters that she gave to the East.

I almost hear shouts of, "Utopia, open your doors. Warne has let his imagination run away with him." But even in the face of such sarcasm, if it were real, I would add one more bit of food for thought, but before I give it to you let me reassure everyone. Only surplus waters should be sought or taken.

To avoid misunderstandings, let me point out that the Columbia discharges 140,000,000 acre-feet into the sea, enough to irrigate more than twice the amount of land presently irrigated in all of the 17 western dryland States, including the Columbia Basin States. All demands that can be foreseen in the Northwest can hardly dent the present surplus. The Columbia River is a great river. Getting much of its waters from ice fields in Canada, it is unlike any other western river in that it has a tremendous volume of flow. Lump all of the other western rivers together and their flow would be far less. Though the time is distant the full use of the Colorado River can be visualized or conceived. After years of study I cannot conceive of local or diversive uses that combined would require all of the flow of the Columbia, except in power generation. The repeated use of all of the Columbia River water for power generation would not be interfered with in such diversions as I have outlined.

There is one other source, as indicated a moment ago, that may be suitable when water requirements grow sufficiently. Possibly this source would become competitive and replace the last rungs of my ladder. The purification of sea water may provide water at costs which would permit its use for domestic water supply or even permit its use for irrigation. Treatment of sea water so far has been tried only on a limited basis. One manufacturer claims that his equipment will produce pure water at a cost of about $180 per acre-foot, which can be reduced if a suitable market for byproducts can be found. Perhaps the application of atomic energy in this field may increase the potentialities for the treatment of sea water. I do not know. Other vistas may be opened in time. We are on the threshold of a new age.

The rather limited research now being carried on through private and public means would be supplemented by a large-scale inquiry under a bill introduced by Congressman McKINNON, of San Diego, and Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and now pending before the Congress.

American ingenuity should not be dismayed by the water problems of the West.

The Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey, historically has carried the responsibility in cooperation with the States and local authorities for the planning for conservation and use of western waters. It is now beginning study of the United Western Project. This work is no farther ahead of the technology and the need of today than was the work of A. P. Davis 30 or 40 years ago on the Colorado River ahead of his time. The work of this early reclamationist became the foundation on which our generation has built the Hoover Dam and all the magnificent things that that dam has made possible. We have a right to hope today that the future may hold the fruition of our plans.

If the future does, then California this year can face with confidence the beginning of her second century. If these hopes materialize, there is in sight no ceiling placed by water on the growth and development of California, or Oregon, or Washington, nor on that of Arizona as well.

Birth of the New State of Israel—Address by Aubrey S. Eban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 30 it was my pleasure to be on hand at a very interesting session held by the Washington Chapter of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America. At that time, we heard a fascinating after-dinner address by Maj. Aubrey S. Eban, Israeli delegate to the United Nations. Major Eban, speaking without notes, discussed the inspiring story of the birth of the new and free state of Israel—marking the historic reestablishment of the centuries-old dream of a Jewish National Homeland.

All men of good will, of all religious faiths, rejoice in the reestablishment of peace in the Holy Land, and wish for Israel and the entire Near East peace and prosperity.

The rebirth of Israel follows the sad years when 6,000,000 members of the Jewish faith were exterminated in the slaughterhouse of Europe. Already, the new state has made heroic strides toward welcoming and assimilating the shattered remnants of Jewish displaced persons from all over Europe.

The American people have always felt a warm bond of friendship with the aspirations of free peoples for independence, sovereignty, and liberty, and this bond of friendship is certainly extended by all Americans of good will to the new state of Israel. I believe that Major Eban's address will be of interest to all of my colleagues, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel that this is particularly appropriate in view of the start this week of the holy days of Passover, celebrating the liberation from bondage of this ancient people when they were in the land of Egypt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. EBAN. Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen; the organizers of your program, with a fine sense of contrast have provided that my address shall be swiftly succeeded by what is called "entertainment." [Laughter.] They have shown a profound historical insight, for the most typical process in the long and immemorial annals of our people is this sudden transition from acute suffering to unrestrained joy. [Laughter.]

It is such a transition that we celebrate tonight, for we are gathered together at this annual function of the Hadassah chapter at a high moment in the history of the Jewish people and in the annals of international statesmanship.

We look back over a period of 10 months which marks an episode of unparalleled glory in the long and adventurous journey of the Jewish people across the historic scene.

To appreciate the full proportions of that achievement, it is sufficient that we briefly recall the circumstances in which the State of Israel proclaimed its independence on the 15th of May 1948. We were besieged and blockaded. We were entirely alone. We were cut off from international support. We could expect no international recognition for our act. Around our heads the institutions and procedures of government were falling to pieces in disintegration and ruin.

Upon our frontiers ready to swoop down for our destruction stood the armies of five Arab states equipped with the manpower, the weapons, the resources, the finances, and the military experience derived from their long-established sovereign status and their intimate alliance with a greater military power.

Such were the grim and awful circumstances in which the representatives of Palestine Jewry meeting together in the city of Tel Aviv, affirming their faith in divine providence and in the destiny of their people, established the State of Israel as a nation amongst the nations of the world.

Here was an act of supreme historical audacity. It was not the action of practical men. It did not proceed from any cool calculation between advantage and danger.

Practical men have their place in this world, I suppose, but their place is not amongst the liberators of nations, for the liberation of peoples is an act of faith rising up in defiance of logic and drawing its strength from those moral and spiritual impulses which are decisive in all issues of human conflict.

How different, how changed, how miraculously transformed is the situation that confronts us today. To have stood firm against overwhelming invasion, to have carried the war into the territory from which the invasion was launched, to have sustained the crushing burdens of full mobilization, to have met a fierce challenge upon the international scene, to have won through to universal recognition, to have established the organs and institutions of democratic administration amidst the turmoil of war, to have brought 170,000 fugitives and wanderers beneath the shelter of Israel's protective roof, to have done all of this—all of it in 10 short and crowded months—is surely a convincing testimony to the vigor, the resilience, the capacities of self-sacrifice which repose in the people of Israel, sustained by the Jewish communities throughout the world.

Nothing was more remarkable in the whole of this achievement than the moment of history at which it was recorded, for it took place in the sequel to the Second World War, which left 6,000,000 of our kindred buried in the fields of Europe and 1,000,000 Jewish children—1,000,000 children—thrown deliberately and unbelievably into the furnace. It was in the aftermath of that unprecedented disaster at a time when our manpower was depleted by unparalleled slaughter, when the morale and the spirit of our people might have been at its lowest ebb, when our claims for national independence were traduced and misrepresented by powerful interests throughout the world.

It was at this climax of our agony and weakness that the Jewish people somehow summoned up within itself the forces, the faith, the resolution, and the will to survive—with which to bring the third Jewish commonwealth into triumphant existence. No wonder that this performance has bestowed upon every Jew wherever he lives a sense of heightened dignity and deepened pride.

No wonder that the international community stands before this achievement amidst all the manifestations of recognition and respect. No wonder that the greatest of contemporary historians in the western world now on a visit to this country has described this as a millennial event to be measured by the temporal values of thousands of years.

And so we are assembled tonight to review the qualities which have brought this achievement to pass and to survey the challenges which the times now direct towards us in this hour of achievement and opportunity. The whole of this performance was made possible by an action of military victory which has made an irresistible appeal to the sentiment and chivalry of liberal mankind. It was a victory of David against Goliath; a victory achieved against overwhelming odds, for in manpower and equipment and facilities for preparation and in all the mathematical criteria whereby the prospects of military victory may be assessed, we were hopelessly outweighed, and the state of Israel in its infant weeks passed unbeknown to the world through many moments where both its friends and adversaries might have expected its imminent collapse.

We hope that this military episode can now recede into the records of history to take its place side by side with the wars of Maccabeus and Bar Kochba, and be recognized by all posterity as having been the agent, the cause, and the architect of the peaceful life that awaits us upon the horizons of the future.

We never selected war as a method of regulating the relations of Israel with the neighboring states. That grim and fateful choice was made by Arab governments which by that act of choice inherited the full responsibility for all the sorrow and anguish, all the suffering and panic and exile, all the squandering of life and treasure which have been inflicted upon both sides, upon both sides in this futile and unnecessary conflict.

Since war was their choice, we had to adapt ourselves to it as effectively as we could, and when we read the records of Israel's performance, I am tempted to reflect that the process of adaptation was not entirely without success.

Yet our interests and our ideals command us at all times to adhere to our real preference, which is for peace—peace founded upon the political and territorial integrity of Israel as of its neighbors, peace upon the basis of regional cooperation, peace within the shelter of the United Nations and upon the basis of its charter.

This military victory might be regarded as belonging to the past. We therefore attach crucial importance to the current negotiations now proceeding at Rhodes which have already led, under United Nations mediation, to the conclusion of a cause between Israel and Egypt and between Israel and the Lebanon. We hope that the coming few days might crown the recent efforts at Rhodes with a successful agreement between Israel and Trans-Jordan.

We hope that this system of armistice agreements will be swiftly replaced by treaties of peace regulating the relations of Israel with its Arab neighbors upon lasting foundations of mutual respect.

This military victory, spectacular as it has been, should not be allowed to obscure other aspects of Israel's achievement which, beneath the glance of eternity, might appear equally as impressive. I refer to Israel's political and social achievement in establishing the full framework of a functioning parliamentary democracy in the adverse conditions of invasion and amidst the chaos and anarchy bequeathed by the outgoing power, for when the British mandate came to an end in circumstances not worthy of its auspicious beginning, nothing was handed over. Everything had to be taken up, constructed from the very foundations.

There existed a real danger that the institutions of the country would fall apart in disruption and ruin, that no centralized focus of orderly administration could be erected, that forces of social discontent and political dissension would run riot throughout the land, and in this danger of anarchy and chaos there lay a peril as grave to the future of Israel's survival as any implied by the military invasion itself.

This prospect never matured. The provisional government, resting upon a broad coalition, made successful appeal to the allegiance and solidarity of the community as a whole, struck the roots of its authority ever deeper and wider into every aspect of the economic and political life, and has laid the foundations of the democratic constitutional government which now proceeds towards its full consolidation at this time.

This process of administrative consolidation reached a climax last month with the election by popular suffrage of the constituent assembly charged with the task of formulating the purposes of the state in a written constitution, and of defining the prerogatives and responsibilities of the republic's new institutions.

The constituent assembly will not see its task in terms of a slavish imitation of the forms of government prevailing in other states. If we are right in having believed throughout the centuries that the Jewish tradition, the Jewish historic experience represent distinctive elements of human

thought, then the stamp of individuality will be written upon Israeli society as well.

We already see distinctive features in the society of Israel, the existence in harmony side by side of private enterprise together with the most advanced forms of social cooperation. If we can prove that that harmonious coexistence is possible, if we can communicate that dynamic example to the stagnant Middle East, if thereby we can prove that these conflicting doctrines of thought and life can live peacefully together in the world, shall we not within the frontiers of our small State have made some contribution to the wider causes of universal peace?

There is another aspect of Israel's consolidation in which spectacular progress has been recorded in recent weeks. That is in the sphere of diplomatic consolidation, the process whereby Israel has advanced with giant steps toward its own recognition by the civilized world. Upon our bewildered and embarrassed heads there descends an embarrassing deluge of recognition from countries old and new in Asia and in Europe, in every continent of the globe. We are at least, I fear, 3 days behind in the acknowledgment of recognition, and it becomes evermore longer and evermore distinguished. [Laughter.]

It was once suggested that it would be necessary to publish a notice to the effect that Israel was available to be recognized only between the hours of 9 and 12 each morning. [Laughter.] We accept all these manifestations of recognition with appreciation and respect, although we should be less than human if we did not retain a special sentiment for those who, led by President Truman, conferred their recognition and their confidence in the hour of our adversity and danger, at a time when our prospect of bare survival seemed less certain than now. [Applause.]

Nevertheless, any awakening to justice and reality is welcome whether early or late. Nonrecognition has for long been obsolete and unrealistic and evasive policy. It has been nothing but an attempt, ostrichlike, to evade facing evident facts. When an ostrich, even in a great capital of the world, buries its head in the sands to avoid facing unpleasant facts, it not only constitutes an undignified spectacle—it also presents an irresistibly inviting target. [Laughter.]

No wonder that the advocates of nonrecognition have been assailed by a mounting wave of criticism from all directions, until at last the bulwarks of nonrecognition lie before us in ruins. We are now in the happy situation where all the flood of paper communications addressed to us are marked with the correct address. [Laughter.]

Thus the foreign policy of Israel goes forward toward its two crucial objectives, the conclusion of peaceful accords with the neighboring Arab states, and the entry of Israel into full partnership in the international community by its admission to membership in the United Nations. [Applause.]

Decisive progress has recently been made toward each of those objectives, for although the agreements concluded at Rhodes are restricted to discussions on a military level, they have undoubtedly instituted a fruitful precedent for direct Arab-Jewish contact for the resolution of conflicts of interest.

For many weary decades we constantly pleaded that only the establishment of equality between the political status of the Jews and that of their neighbors would create the objective conditions for their partnership. As the Arab Nations emerged one by one out of the regimes of protectorate and tutelage toward full sovereignty, it became an intolerable paradox that the Jewish community alone in the Middle East, in no sense less mature or advanced in its standards than the surrounding Arab communities, should alone be without the capacities and prerogatives of sovereignty, unable to live its life in a sovereign state expressing its distinctive culture and tradition.

The establishment of Jewish statehood abolished that paradox. As long as the Jewish community of Palestine lacked an independent political status, it could not once even contrive to achieve contact with the Arab world for the adjustment of differences and conflicts. No sooner did the state of Israel exist, with all the appearances of permanence and irrevocability, than it found itself for the first time around a table with other governments, treating with them as an equal amongst equals.

Therefore, in recommending Jewish statehood, the United Nations was clearly and consciously creating the objective conditions of eventual partnership, and thus our colleagues at Rhodes may be deemed to be embarked upon the most decisive adventure in Jewish statesmanship, the integration of the Republic of Israel into the environment in which it lives.

Unless Jewish diplomacy can succeed in this, its previous successes may count for very little indeed, for no amount of support in Europe or in America, in East or in West, in the old world or the new, can compensate for the lack of stable and secure relationship with the immediate world in which Israel must live, and whose acquiescence and peaceful outlook is a prior condition for the common pursuit of regional welfare.

We therefore enter in this new period conscious of an objective affinity between the interests and ideals of Israel and those of the neighboring states. The Near East presents a picture of degradation and squalor unparalleled in any other part of the globe in which political independence has been achieved. Grinding poverty, endemic disease, illiteracy, infantile mortality ravage the short and somber life of the common man throughout the Nile Valley and the fertile crescent. The squalor of the present insults the greatness of the past.

The Near East, for the good of its peoples, does not need the flamboyant nationalist crusades which the discredited has imposed upon it in recent years. The Near East needs scientific agriculture, it needs industry based upon human skill; it needs modern techniques of scientific progress; it needs advanced methods of social cooperation; it needs the application of capital resources to new projects of regional health, development, and resettlement.

These things which the Near East most requires in its own interest are the very things most characteristic of Israel's achievement. Therefore we do not tolerate the contention that the examples and exertions of Israel are alien to the genuine interests of the Middle East, and it is our duty to convey and to communicate to our people in Israel and to their sympathizers throughout the world a deep sense of regional responsibility.

The Security Council gave to the resolution in favor of Israel's admission emphatic and impressive support. The Security Council has had unparalleled opportunity to observe from its table the rise of the state of Israel, its successful fight against the invasion, its constant recourse to the principles of the Charter, its demonstration of the true prospectives of aggression and defense, its careful distinction between the legitimate and illegitimate use of force upon which the principles and the purposes of the Charter are based.

After this long process of hard and arduous controversy, that great institution recorded its unmistakable verdict. The nature of the support which Israel's independence and sovereignty secured on that occasion illustrates this great expansion in our internal and external recognition.

The broad foundations of that endorsement encourage us to hope that the Assembly will ratify what the Council has recommended and this banner of Israel which has been carried across so much bloodshed and anguish in the years of martyrdom will soon fly as the fifty-ninth in the free commonwealth of nations. [Applause.]

As we look around that table where the principles of the Charter are enunciated with varying degrees of eloquence, we see 58 states which came into existence by their own unilateral assertion, or by some successful act of secession in the near or distant past. One state alone exists in the world which came to birth at the behest and summons of the international community. That is the Republic of Israel alone. We possess the only international birth certificate in the political world of uneasy virtue.

Within that framework we have secured a certificate of independence. We have found international assistance in the localization and curtailment of conflicts. We have, on two occasions, seen the General Assembly refuse to revise or reverse its original historic decision.

Now the United Nations asks a further contribution in the use of an invaluable and distinguished servant of peace who presides over the processes of mediation at Rhodes. [Applause.]

This is the story of Israel's performance in this, the first year of its independent national life. In addition to this epic of military defense, to this pioneering enterprise in administrative construction, to this romantic advance toward diplomatic consolidation, there has been a fourth enterprise as momentous as any of these. That is this great and welcome flood of immigrants who crowd into Israel's ports from every quarter from displaced persons' camps in Europe, from battered remnants of once ancient communities, from countries in eastern Europe, from north Africa, and the Arab world, from all places where a mounting tide of racial or religious prejudice is undermining the foundations of Jewish security.

Their arrival creates a problem not merely of scale but of urgency. From the displaced persons' camps in Europe they are haunted by the associations of the most monstrous inhumanity ever organized by civilized man. From east Europe they are exercising a right of self-determination in favor of living within Israeli democracy where their capacities and ideals will be fully at home.

In north Africa there is a great wave of messianic fervor. Our people, who for countless centuries have lived in degradation and squalor of poverty and discrimination, have risen up to their feet and have rushed to the ports, for they have heard of the trumpet that was sounded in Zion last month when a free Jewish Republic elected the head of its state and demonstrated a legal and economic capacity to gather in the downtrodden and dispersed from wherever they would come.

There has been messianic movements in history that have ended in disillusion and despair, but this is a messianic fervor which, with your help and ours, shall be satisfied, sustained by the assistance of Jewish communities throughout the world. These new potential citizens of Israel will be integrated into the broad enterprise of our growing Republic.

Envisage the work of your movement in the prospectives of these events and see what a new stature it acquires. In the rehabilitation and the healing of immigrants who come to us wounded in body and spirit, in the salvage of the poignant remnants of the Jewish children of Europe, in the communication to the entire Middle East of modern standards of sanitation and hygiene, in the gathering together of all the races of that region upon the common solidarity of sci-

ence and health, in all of these ventures, your great movement has a noble task to perform.

It was a pioneer in that movement whereby the social and economic standards in Israel were raised above the depressed level of its environment. We believe that the example of its technical and social enterprise will be bound in the long run to overflow all frontiers and to comprehend all the sick and unhappy people of the Middle East in the embrace of this great healing enterprise. Therefore, the Hadassah movement may regard itself as having been a partner in one of the proudest journeys in human political endeavor. The horizons that open before you are immeasurably broader and more glorious than any of those that you have traversed in the past.

Israel cannot escape the vigilant scrutiny of its critics or the solicitudinous inquiries of its friends. It dare not fail to live up to the high expectations which it has raised. Its cultural and social standards must reveal the special purposes and the special spirit of this great liberal cause. Therefore, your movement advances upon a new year of its endeavor with the prospect and opportunity of making the second year of Israel's independence not unworthy of its first.

By your courage and resolution, by your steadfastness of purpose, by your sustained support to Israel's ideals, we shall fulfill our duty to the destiny of our people and the future of mankind. [Applause.]

Economic Conditions in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received this morning from Charles Murphy, of London, England, dealing with economic conditions in England under the present Socialist Government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON, ENGLAND, *March 28, 1949.*

DEAR SIR: The attached account of economic conditions in England under the present Socialist government respectfully submitted.

Yours truly,

CHARLES MURPHY.

DEATH OF A NATION—JOBS FOR THE BOYS

Seven hundred thousand civil (?) servants. Ninety percent drinking tea—reading and knitting.

Twenty percent Communist. Building up a "formidable" machine for the coming elections.

All "horselaughing" Uncle Sam. Advertising for more.

Two hundred thousand "superbums" now registered voters installed in the "doss houses'" all.

"Off the Road" drawing $7.50 on the "dole" known as "money for jam."

All under 45 and able-bodied. Only exercise running to the street bookmaker making bets on the dogs and horses.

One hundred and fifty thousand railroad men to get new uniforms free (nationalized railroads). "Boodle" for the "faithful cloth-ing manufacturers."

Nationalized industries $5,000 key jobs to "heels."

Phony street-paving contracts (private contractors "party" members). Swarms of bums loafing on the street everywhere.

Tribunals ("heels," $3,500) calling in the over 60 men and women inquiring why they don't go to work ("Boodle").

Street sweepers holding conclaves in alleys ("Jobs for the boys"). Double time Sunday.

Constructive conservatives known to the Labor Party as "Vermin."

Financial section of London praying for a financial Moses to appear and lead the nation out of this wilderness of inflation.

Basing-Point Capsule Pulled Out of Hat, October 29, 1940—Selective-Service Capsule Pulled Out of Fish Bowl, October 29, 1940—Monopoly Boys Enjoy Feast While Mothers and Fathers Watch the Gathering Clouds of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a famous philosopher once wrote, "the ability to discern that what is true is true, and that what is false is false, is the characteristic of intelligence."

Mr. Everette MacIntyre, who is Chief of the Division of Antimonopoly Trials of the Federal Trade Commission, testified before the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on November 16, 1948. Mr. MacIntyre, in his testimony on page 1159 of the hearings, presented an abstract of bids opened by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy Department on October 29, 1940, on several lots of rigid steel conduit, saying:

Incidentally, gentlemen, I would like to say I think that is precisely the day on which Secretary of War Stimson pulled the capsule out of the fish bowl to select the number of the first draftee, in the first peacetime draft we ever had.

The bids that were submitted here, the purchasing officer of the Navy Department testified under oath he had to likewise put in a hat and pull out of the hat the name of the successful bidder, because everything was matched.

In other words, it was by lot, just as the first draftee was selected. We had no low bidder. They were all on a matched basis. You will find that that matching on each of those lots with respect to each of a number of those respondents, that is that matching went down through the fourth decimal point in terms of cents per foot for the rigid steel conduit, and it was not such a small order.

Some of these items were for as much as 180,000 feet. Over 200,000 feet were involved on some items, for delivery to such naval supply depots as Sewell Point, Va.; navy yard at Norfolk; and the navy yard at Philadelphia.

The abstracts referred to follow:

No. 1—Abstract of bids—Schedule 3559, lot 400, opening Oct. 29, 1940—Pipe conduit, galvanized, rigid

NAVY YARD, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Item	Size (inch)	Quantity (feet)	Clayton Mark & Co.	Enameled Metals Co.	Garland Mfg. Co.	General Elec. Supply Co.	Graybar Elec. Co.	E. B. Latham & Co.	Republic Steel Corp.	Triangle Conduit & Cable Co.	Walker Bros.	Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.	Westinghouse Electric Sup. Co.
#2c	½	140,000	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496	0.0496
#3c	¾	180,000	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634	.0634
#4c	1	115,000	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913	.0913
#5c	1¼	30,000	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235	.1235
#6c	1½	19,000	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479	.1479
#7c	2	45,000	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990	.1990
NAVY YARD, NORFOLK, VA.													
#2d	½	18,000	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502
#3d	¾	15,000	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643
#4d	1	7,000	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925
#5d	1¼	7,000	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252
#6d	1½	2,500	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499
#7d	2	3,000	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017
NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT, SEWELLS POINT, VA.													
#2e	½	200,000	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502	0.0502
#3e	¾	200,000	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643	.0643
#4e	1	45,000	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925	.0925
#5e	1¼	20,000	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252	.1252
#6e	1½	20,000	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499	.1499
#7e	2	20,000	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017	.2017

(Tabulated from Federal Trade Commission's exhibit 719.)

Continuing his testimony, Mr. MacIntyre said:

There is an interesting story about the Navy Yard at Philadelphia and the bid there, particularly with respect to Walker Bros., one of the large units in the industry. Its factory is almost within sight of the Navy Yard at Philadelphia, less than 15 miles out, yet its quotations made here for delivery of its conduit to the navy yard 15 miles away was on the basis of a Pittsburgh price plus

the freight from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Philadelphia yard, including a phantom freight charge on the lot there involved of more than $25,000, although it was proposed that the conduit be delivered a distance of only 15 miles.

That is the thing that defenders of the basing-point system want legalized, and I ask you gentlemen, is it in the public interest that it be legalized?

This wasn't an isolated instance.

Think of the terrific import of Mr. MacIntyre's statement. The very day on which the Secretary of War selected the first man who was, with 12,000,000 or more others, to do battle in defense of our country in the steaming jungles of the far Pacific, on the rocky terrain of North Africa, on the beaches of Normandy, and in thousands of other places, the basing point and monopoly boys were having a drawing of their own. This drawing did not take place in the atmosphere of impending doom, but rather in an aura of pleasant expectancy.

The truth here is easy to discern. Every person who will pause long enough to read the above tables will instantly know that the identical prices set forth were not arrived at by sheer coincidence. Indeed, devious are the ways and methods but like an open book intelligence pierces the veil of secrecy by which the bidders, using the basing-point system, attempt to veil their actions and subordinate the antitrust laws to their purposes.

Now the basing-point and monopoly boys, hope, by raising the false issue of clarification, to provide an entering wedge by way of the moratorium, to resurrect the basing-point system, and to unsettle antitrust laws generally.

The moratorium bills are a threat to the antitrust laws and pave the way for even more crippling proposals which, judging by past experience, will promptly be brought forward if the bills now under consideration should pass. I have pointed out that the arguments before the Supreme Court in the Rigid Steel Conduit case—Craighton-Marks Co. against Federal Trade Commission, case No. 464, regular docket—were completed the week of March 28, 1949, and within a reasonable length of time the remaining issues will be clarified in an orderly procedure. Let us await this decision before we attempt to tamper with the anitrust laws by way of a moratorium on their enforcement.

Speaking of Speed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Speaking of Speed," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAKING OI SPEED

We have military planes that can beat the speed of sound. We have air liners that enable Americans to travel about 25 times as fast as their ancestors did a century ago.

But for real speed-up, consider the progress of Government spending the last hundred years.

In fiscal 1849–50, according to Northwest National Life Insurance Co. statisticians, the Federal Government spent $1,000,000 every 9 days. The country's population was then a little over 23,000,000.

In fiscal 1949–50, with population about six and a half times as large, the Federal spending rate will be 1,100 times as fast—$1,000,000 every 12 minutes.

Other governmental units aren't so slow, either. Mayor O'Dwyer's record-breaking $1,179,000,000 New York City budget, just announced, is bigger than any Federal budget before World War I, and calls for spending about a million dollars every 7½ hours.

Bradley's Idea Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in his suggestion that Army Day, Air Force Day, and Navy Day hereafter be assimilated into one National Defense Day, a great soldier and devoted public servant, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, has struck the right note. Efficiency, economy, and security alike require that the various branches of our armed services in modern warfare must increasingly operate as a team.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and the New York Times strongly endorsing the suggestion of the able Army Chief of Staff.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

BRADLEY'S IDEA RIGHT

General Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, made a sensible suggestion on the eve of Army Day. He told Jewish War Veterans at the Waldorf-Astoria that he would "happily propose we end it. For if in ridding ourselves of Army, Navy, and Air Force Days we could also rid ourselves of the competition they tend to kindle, then we might better join hands in a single National Security Day."

There still would be opportunity for the different defense service branches to recognize their history and achievements, and to note their part in the Nation's over-all defense team.

But he and Defense Secretary Johnson are right: The Nation's defense now must be a single, well-coordinated team. And the team will be as good as each component part.

We speak of "one Nation indivisible" in our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We must learn also to understand and believe that under modern, vital requirements, the Nation's defense planning and organization is one indivisible team.

We wholeheartedly endorse General Bradley's suggestion that Army Day, Navy Day, and Air Force Day be abandoned as separate observances, and that they be merged in one National Defense Day.

[From the New York Times]

FOR THE WHOLE TEAM

It was the United States Army itself that gracefully paved the way for the statement by Defense Secretary Johnson that the Army Day that we have observed this week would be the last of its kind. When the Army chose its slogan for the celebrations that have been going on this week it fixed on this: "The United States Army—part of the team—for security."

In those words the Army put no little emphasis on the fact that there was a team, and that the Army regarded itself as part, and only part, of it. What the Defense Secretary did was to carry that spirit one step further and indicate that henceforth it would be the team, and not any one part of it, that would be designated for public celebration. The announcement, at the close of the day's gatherings, was dramatically timed, and that timing served to point up the very thing that the Army had already expressed. The prompt response from Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, that he favored "anything to further the team spirit of the Nation's defenders" and the reference of General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, to the building of a "strong defensive team" give hope that our service arms will be enthusiastic in their support of this change in emphasis. What has been done by the Secretary is to provide a visible symbol for this team spirit. And that symbol should be as important for the public as it is for the services themselves.

Much of the discussion of unification of the defense services has laid stress upon its technical phases. Unification was presented primarily as an effort to avoid overlapping and waste, to end fruitless rivalries and occasionally dangerous noncooperation. What is needed, also, is stress upon the moral and emotional values of unity. This symbol places that stress. For all of us the very word "team" connotes a closely knit joint effort toward a common goal. We learned that meaning and connotation when we were small children. In times of stress it is a valuable part of our social character. At such times we, the civilians, feel that we, too, are part of the team.

It should be a good thing, then, for our morale as well as for that of the service that we celebrate the team as a whole, and that on Armed Forces Day we put all of the team on display.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert herewith an editorial from the Washington Post, April 1, 1949, entitled "Equal Rights":

EQUAL RIGHTS

The National Woman's Party is assembled in convention in Washington this week end to press its fight for passage of the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. Its zeal and persistence are worthy of a better cause. For in seeking to eliminate all distinctions in legal treatment of men and women, the proposed amendment

would sweep away a vast body of protective legislation applicable to women. For that reason all major labor organizations are on record as opposed to this amendment, and Secretary of Labor Tobin has likewise voiced opposition to it. Also included among the numerous and numerically strong organizations that regard the amendment as a threat to the welfare of women rather than a benefit are such outstanding women's organizations as the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, the National Women's Trade Union League, the National Board of the YWCA, and the National Councils of Catholic, Jewish, and Negro Women.

The foes of the equal-rights amendment are not unmindful of the fact that women are the victims of discriminations rooted in custom and prejudice which are not justified by differences in sex. But they realize that this kind of discrimination cannot be eradicated by legislation. Moreover, insofar as legislation is concerned, their aim is to revise or abolish only those laws that reflect an irrational sex bias. The women's status bill which was before the Eightieth Congress has been introduced again with that purpose in mind. It has the backing of 38 national organizations, with a membership of more than 28,000,000, composing the National Committee on the Status of Women. This bill declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government to abolish distinctions based on sex in Federal Government and its administration, "except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure or by maternal function." It also recommends that the States declare a similar policy and review their own laws and practices with the intention of bringing them into line with this new policy. An especially important provision of the bill calls for establishment of a presidential commission to study and report on all phases of the legal, economic, and social status of women and make recommendations for such legislative action as may be required.

The women's status bill outlines a practicable and rational method of dealing with problems of sex discrimination. That is shown by the fact that it is being actively supported by representative groups that have achieved notable victories over the years in battles to elevate the legal status and living conditions of women in industry and in the home.

In addition, I should like to include a list of organizations which have expressed their opposition to the equal-rights amendment:

American Association of Social Workers.
American Civil Liberties Union.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers.
American Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Teachers.
American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor.
Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers Union.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Communications Workers of America.
Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
International Women's Auxiliary of United Automobile Workers.
Machinists Union.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation of Post Office Clerks.
National Federation of Settlements, Inc.
National League of Women Voters.
National Women's Trade-Union League.
Textile Workers Union of America.
Oil Workers Union of America.
United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers.
United Packinghouse Workers of America.
United Steel Workers of America.
Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity.
Women's Society for Christian Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church (eastern division).
Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America (national board.)

The Federal Government Should Repay the Tax Loss to the States Where Extensive Federal Landholdings Have Depleted the Tax Base of the States and Subdivisions Thereof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House, a condition which is causing great hardship in many of the counties and other political subdivisions of Kentucky, and I am sure many other States.

Over a period of years, and during the last few years, at a greatly accelerated speed, the United States Government has acquired millions of acres of land in various sections of the United States for a multitude of purposes, thereby making such lands and improvements tax-free, so far as the States, counties, municipalties, school districts and other political subdivisions are concerned, wherein such lands and improvements are located. You can readily see what it means to these States and other political subdivisions to lose the taxes which they would ordinarily receive if such properties were privately owned.

The United States Government now owns more than 1,000,000 acres of land in the State of Kentucky which has been withdrawn from the tax rolls of the counties and other political subdivisions wherein such lands are situated, and as a result these counties and political subdivisions are now precluded from receiving any tax revenues whatever from said properties. This is working an undue hardship on the counties, municipalities, and other subdivisions, including school districts, and causing a great loss to essential local government and to the school systems in these counties.

There are 17 counties in my congressional district, several of them are considered as rural counties.

Some of them are very sparsely populated. For many years, in view of their relatively small populations and practically no industries other than farming, it has been very difficult indeed for these counties and their political subdivisions to render the type and character of service to their citizens which they are justly entitled to receive, due to the lack of revenue derived from taxes on the land and improvements situated within these counties. These counties, for a good many years, have been considered very poor counties. It so happens that most of the property taken over by the United States Government in my district is located in some of these poor counties, thereby adding to the distressing condition already existing in these counties with respect to furnishing adequate municipal government and school facilities.

For flood control and power development of Agriculture has taken more than 250,000 acres of land in four counties alone in my congressional district.

For flood control and power development, the Army engineers of the Department of the Army has taken over approximately 100,000 acres in 7 counties in my congressional district in connection with the flood-control and power-development projects known as the Wolf Creek and Dale Hollow Reservoirs. Most of the lands taken over by the Army engineers are the best farming lands situated in that section of my district. When the Wolf Creek Reservoir is filled these fertile farm lands will be lost and thousands of our best farms in that area will be lost and the farmers forced to leave their homes and find new places to live.

I am advised that the Wolf Creek project alone is considerably larger than the Norris Dam project in Tennessee, and this Wolf Creek Reservoir is all located in my congressional district. It furnishes no flood protection for the people in my district; whatever flood protection is afforded by the Wolf Creek Dam and Reservoir will be for citizens residing below the dam and outside of my congressional district. You can readily see what it will mean to these poor counties to have their best farms covered with water, with hundreds of their farmers moving to other locations and out of these counties, thereby losing the tax revenues from these lands owned by the Federal Government.

I am confident that this situation prevails in many other counties in Kentucky and in other States where the Federal Government has acquired millions of acres of lands in those States and counties. No one could have any idea just how disastrous this loss of tax revenues is to local counties, municipalities, and school districts until they go on the ground and see for themselves what a hardship it is working on these agencies.

I have discussed this situation with other Members of the Kentucky delegation in Congress and they feel as I do, that some relief must be granted to these counties and their political subdivisions that have lost large sums of taxes through the withdrawal of thousands of

acres of their lands acquired by the United States Government.

This important matter was recently considered by the Legislature of Kentucky in extraordinary session. The legislature passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make some provision for the payment of taxes to Kentucky and her political subdivisions on the same basis as if these lands and the improvements thereon, acquired by the Federal Government, were individually owned.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to have this concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of Kentucky incorporated in my remarks and printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Working in conjunction with other members of the Kentucky delegation, I have prepared a bill proposing to grant relief to these States and their local political subdivisions wherein the Federal Government has acquired vast acreages of lands and improvements thereon, and has taken such properties out of taxation, and I now ask unanimous consent to have this bill incorporated in full in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the bill we do not purpose that the Federal Government should pay taxes or an amount equivalent to the taxes on courthouses, post offices, customhouses, mints, penitentiaries, reformatories, or national cemeteries. However, I do feel that it is not right or just for the Federal Government to acquire millions of acres of land, and in many instances the best lands in the counties and other political subdivisions, and take such lands and the improvements thereon out of local and State taxation and cause a severe curtailment in the county and other local governments and a great hardship on the school districts involved, and not making any provision for the payment of taxes to these States, counties, and other political subdivisions the same as if such properties were privately owned.

We are called upon to appropriate billions of dollars to help put many countries in Europe and other sections of the world on their feet, economically and politically, so as to enable them to be self-sustaining, and at the same time, through the acquisition of all these millions of acres of land in the United States by the Federal Government taking such property off of the local and State tax rolls, we are curtailing services which these States, countries, and other political subdivisions are able to render to their citizens, and if continued will eventually bankrupt these counties and political subdivisions.

Senate Resolution 17

Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the State of Kentucky, its counties, and other political subdivisions thereof whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies

Whereas the Federal Government and agencies thereof from time to time have withdrawn from the State and its political subdivisions areas such as the Cumberland National Forest project, the Wolf Creek Reservoir project, the Kentucky Woodland National Wildlife Refuge project, the Tennessee Valley Authority projects, the Mammoth Cave National Park project, the Dale Hollow project, the Kentucky Forestland Utilization projects, the Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Camp Breckinridge, Camp Campbell, Fort Knox, Campbell Air Force Base, Lexington Signal Corps Depot, Goodman Air Force Base, Ohio River Ordnance Works, the Dewey Reservoir project, and many other lesser withdrawals which now total 1,000,000 acres; and

Whereas it will likely in the development of other projects in Kentucky in the future be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire extensive areas for Federal purposes and for administrative facilities; and

Whereas the State of Kentucky, its counties and municipalities have already lost and will continue to lose vast sums of tax revenues by reason of these withdrawals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Kentucky, in special session, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take steps to provide for the payment of the exact equivalent of taxes which would otherwise be levied on lands in the State and its political subdivisions were such lands not acquired by the Federal Government, and its agencies, with the exception of Federal buildings such as post offices, courthouses, and hospitals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, Alben W. Barkley; the Speaker of the House, Hon. Sam Rayburn; to each of our Kentucky Senators, and to each Member of Congress serving in the United States Congress from Kentucky.

Copy attest:

J. ERVIN SANDERS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

MARCH 30, 1949.

A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as hereinafter provided in section 3 of this act, all real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States or by any corporation, the majority of the common stock of which is owned by the United States, shall, commencing on the 1st day of January after the passage and approval of this act, and thereafter, be subject to taxation by the respective States, counties, municipalities, school districts, and other political subdivisions, and taxing units in which said real estate may be situated, and shall remain subject to taxation by such States, counties, municipalities, school districts and other political subdivisions in which such property is located, to the same extent, on the same basis, and at the same rates and at the same times as such real estate would be subject to taxation if privately owned: *Provided,* That the United States shall, with respect to such real estate and improvements thereon, have all the rights as to assessments, reassessments, appeal, and otherwise as a private owner thereof would have if such real estate was privately owned.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall eliminate or in any way affect existing or subsequent provisions for contributions by the United States to local units of the proceeds realized from the sale of timber in national forests.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not apply to real estate owned by the United States or by any corporation defined in section 1 of this act, primarily and substantially for the following uses or any combination thereof: Courthouses, hospitals, post offices, customhouses, mints, penitentiaries, reformatories, or national cemeteries.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any property with respect to which such power of taxation is waived in accordance with State law by the State or political subdivision in which such property is located.

SEC. 5. Within 6 months next following the date of the enactment of this act in the case of lands and improvements thereon held by the United States on the date of enactment of this act, and within 60 days next following the acquisition of any lands in any of the States by the United States after the date of enactment of this act, the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government having jurisdiction over such lands and improvements thereon for which payment is required under this act, shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the acreage and improvements thereon, the fair value of such property, together with such other information as he may deem necessary, to aid in the apportionment of such tax payments among the various States and political subdivisions thereof, and as may be required by the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make all payments herein annually after the close of the fiscal year to the treasurer or other equivalent official of the State for distribution to the counties, municipalities, school districts, and other political subdivisions and taxing units in said State wherein are situated lands of the United States, not specifically excluded in section 3 of this act, an amount equal to and in lieu of the taxes that would be levied against said property if privately owned.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. All determinations made by the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government for the purposes of this act shall be conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and to administer the same.

Walter Apfelbaum and Jordan Bittel, Winners of Georgetown University International Debating Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Florida is very proud that two of her fine young men, students of the University of Florida, have just won the Georgetown University invitational debating tournament, in which teams from 15 colleges and universities participated. These young men are Walter Apfelbaum, 18, and Jordan Bittel, 20.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Florida Pair Wins Debate Tour-

nament," published in the Washington Post of yesterday, telling about the victory of these two young Florida students.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY—FLORIDA PAIR WINS DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Two University of Florida students last night won the Georgetown University invitational debating tournament in which teams from 15 colleges and universities tangled with pros and cons for the last 3 days.

Taking the negative, Walter Apfelbaum, 18, and Jordan Bittel, 20, wrested a close victory from W. Jerry Roberts, 31, and Charles Harvey, 28, a University of Richmond team that upheld the affirmative in a much-explored subject:

"Resolved, That the Federal Government should adopt a policy of equalizing educational opportunity in tax-supported schools by means of annual grants."

When the Richmond and Florida teams took up the subject last night it was the one hundred and thirteenth hour of actual debate on the subject at Georgetown.

An estimated 5,424,000 words were expended by the orators in exploring the subject, tournament officials estimated.

But of the old-fashioned, wild waving of arms there was none last night. "Audiences are more sophisticated than they used to be," one debater said afterward.

Words flowed rapidly and evenly, however, and at least one veteran listener, the Reverend Eugene B. Gallagher, S. J., director of the Philodemic and Edmund Campion Debating Societies' activities at Georgetown, confessed after the first 1,000,000 words or so that he was "dazed."

To Apfelbaum from Miami and a junior at the University of Florida, and his teammate, Bittel, of Miami Beach, a senior, the John J. Toohey, S. J., challenge trophy was presented. The university will have to defend the trophy a year from now in the second annual Georgetown debating tournament.

To Roberts, Harvey, Apfelbaum, and Bittel were presented sterling silver gavel pins.

Roberts, Harvey, and Bittel together with Richard Gordon, 21, of Georgetown's Philodemic Society team, on the basis of a point system, were named the four individual champion debaters. Gordon, a junior at Georgetown, lives at 1383 Bryant Street NE.

The tournament trophy is named in honor of the Reverend Father Toohey, 76, veteran Georgetown debate coach who coached Philodemic teams through 17 undefeated seasons, 1921 to 1939.

Judges for the final debate were Philip J. Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States; Bolitha J. Laws, chief justice of the United States District Court for the District; and Joseph R. Jackson, associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Closing of the Veterans' Administration Branch Office No. 2, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter dated April 9, 1949, addressed to me by the American Legion, Department of New York, with respect to the closing of Branch Office No. 2 in New York City.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., April 9, 1949.

Hon. L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was with regret that we received the decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Carl R. Gray, Jr., which brought about the closing of branch office No. 2, here in New York City. While we knew that the elimination of such offices was being considered, we felt we had reason to believe, that because of the fact that here in New York State where we have 2,047,000 veterans residing which is approximately 12 percent of the veteran population of the Nation and further, that we have approximately 10 percent of the VA hospital bed capacity, which incidentally is more than the combined bed capacity of New England and New Jersey, that the branch offices in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia might be merged into one with its headquarters here in New York City. However, the Administrator decided otherwise and all branch offices were abolished and the various divisions with the exception of insurance and death claims were transferred to central office. The insurance and death claims divisions remained in the same office which is now called a district office and comes under the supervision of a district office manager.

We keenly feel the loss of this branch office because it means that we will have to resort to letter writing with officials in central office and judging from past experience, we are in for much delay.

While the closing of the branch office so abruptly was quite a shock to us, the real jolt came almost immediately thereafter when we learned that the Administrator contemplated setting up five or six area medical offices throughout the country and that New York would be placed under the jurisdiction of one to be located in Boston. This area as we still understand it includes the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

While in Washington attending our National Rehabilitation Conference the first week in March, the undersigned called upon the Administrator and asked that that office be located in New York City. We gave as our reasons that New York City was not only centrally located but that it was the greatest traveling center in the country and the medical center of the Nation. The Administrator disagreed with us on the medical center and advised us that Dr. Magnuson wanted it in Boston because that city was the medical center. He did, however, place the responsibility for the location upon the Medical Director, Dr. Magnuson, and suggested that we contact him. Dr. Magnuson was confined in a hospital at that time, so upon our return to New York we wrote the doctor and presented our case to him. A reply was received from the doctor under date of March 14 wherein he gave his reason for setting up the office in Boston as in the interest of economy and travel. (Copy of letter attached.)

We disagreed with both the Administrator and the Medical Director when they gave as their reasons that Boston was the medical center of the Nation and that economy would result in travel by having the office located there.

In support of our claims we submit herewith a table showing the mileage between New York City and the VA hospitals and Boston and the same points. Further, we submit a list showing the medical schools and hospitals located in and around Boston and New York City. We feel sure that after a perusal of these facts, no one will question the merits of our claim. There is just no comparison. There must be some other reason for placing this headquarters in Boston.

As stated previously, we feel and the facts will substantiate our claim that New York City is the medical center of the Nation at present. Further, vast sums of money have been appropriated by the city for enlargement of its present hospital and medical facilities. Plans are under way for the construction of several private hospitals and additions to hospitals now in operation. New York University has plans for a combined NYU-Bellevue medical center, to be located on First Avenue between Thirtieth and Thirty-fourth Streets, adjoining Bellevue Hospital, which is situated on the same avenue between Twenty-fifth and Thirtieth Streets. The site of the new VA 1,250-bed hospital runs along the avenue between Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth Streets. Directly across the street from Bellevue Hospital is located the New York Pharmaceutical School and around the corner, on Twenty-third Street, is the NYU Dental School. This picture presents but a part of the vast medical set-up located here in New York City. In addition to that, New York City is the greatest center for recruitment of medical personnel, an important point to keep in mind when it becomes necessary to staff these various installations.

So much for the medical side of the picture. In connection with the travel side, we would like to cite an example. Recently the chief medical officer, whose headquarters is now located in Boston, made a visit to the VA hospital located at Northport, Long Island. To get there he had to travel 229 miles from Boston to New York, then approximately 50 miles to Northport. Seventy-five percent of the other visitations to VA hospitals would entail similar excess travel from the office where it is now located.

These facts and figures are presented to you in the hope that you will join with us, in an effort to have the area medical office of the Veterans' Administration moved from its present location in Boston to New York City, where ample accommodations and office space are available in the VA district office, located at 299 Broadway.

Your cooperation will be appreciated by the membership of the American Legion in the State of New York and particularly by those who directly serve the veterans.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH P. PICCIRILLO,
Chairman, Department Rehabilitation.
GEORGE A. MEAD,
Director, Department Rehabilitation.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1949.

Mr. JOSEPH PICCIRILLO,
Chairman, Department Rehabilitation Committee, the American Legion,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PICCIRILLO: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 10, 1949, in which you outline the advantages of the location of the so-called district office in New York City.

May I state that it is not contemplated that any operative functions will be carried on in any installations other than our field stations and central office. However, in the interest of economy and travel we will have representatives with official stations at certain localities in the field. These in no sense will be a district office, but simply, as previously stated, official headquarters. The personnel on duty will be traveling the greater part of the time and these supervisory activities will bring the supervision of central office closer to the hospital and other medical activities in the field thereby assuring the finest medical service to veterans.

It has been decided that for those representatives visiting Veterans' Administration

installations in the New England and New York States areas, Boston, Mass., will be their official headquarters. Of course, a large percentage of their time will be spent in the New York area where there are a number of medical Veterans' Administration installations.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Boston:
- Boston University School of Medicine.
- Harvard Medical School.
- Tufts College Medical School.

New York City:
- Long Island College of Medicine.
- Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.
- Cornell University Medical College.
- New York Medical College, Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals.
- New York University College of Medicine.

New York State:
- Albany Medical College.
- University of Buffalo School of Medicine.
- University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry.
- Syracuse University College of Medicine.

HOSPITALS

Boston:	Capacity
Beth Israel Hospital, Boston	215
Boston City Hospital, Boston	2,537
Carney Hospital, Boston	258
Children's Hospital, Boston	353
Faulkner Hospital, Boston	161
Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston	449
Massachusetts Memorial Hospital, Boston	450
New England Hospital for Women and Children, Boston	260
Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston	250
St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Boston	316
United States Marine Hospital, Boston	463
Beverly Hospital, Beverly	207
Brockton Hospital, Brockton	151
Cambridge City Hospital, Cambridge	400
Mount Auburn Hospital, Cambridge	272
Chelsea Memorial Hospital, Chelsea	123
Union Hospital, Fall River	201
Burbank Hospital, Fitchburg	266
Holyoke Hospital, Holyoke	164
Providence Hospital, Holyoke	200
Lawrence General Hospital, Lawrence	233
Lowell General Hospital, Lowell	212
St. John's Hospital, Lowell	235
St. Joseph's Hospital, Lowell	170
Lynn Hospital, Lynn	316
St. Luke's Hospital, New Bedford	339
Newton-Wellesley Hospital, Newton	286
House of Mercy Hospital, Pittsfield	220
St. Luke's Hospital, Pittsfield	200
Quincy City Hospital, Quincy	384
Salem Hospital, Salem	265
Mercy Hospital, Springfield	400
Springfield Hospital, Springfield	285
Wesson Memorial Hospital, Springfield	112
Waltham Hospital, Waltham	185
Memorial Hospital, Worcester	215
St. Vincent Hospital, Worcester	277
Worcester City Hospital, Worcester	540
Worcester Hahnemann Hospital, Worcester	136
New York:	
Beth-El Hospital, Brooklyn	332
Beth Moses Hospital, Brooklyn	215
Brooklyn Hospital, Brooklyn	374
Bushwick Hospital, Brooklyn	125
Coney Island Hospital, Brooklyn	300
Cumberland Hospital, Brooklyn	400
Greenpoint Hospital, Brooklyn	300
Israel Zion Hospital, Brooklyn	507
Jewish Hospital, Brooklyn	660
Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn	2,520
Long Island College Hospital, Brooklyn	451
Methodist Hospital, Brooklyn	542
Norwegian Lutheran Deaconesses' Home and Hospital, Brooklyn	263
St. Catherine's Hospital, Brooklyn	344
St. John's Hospital, Brooklyn	250
St. Mary's Hospital, Brooklyn	320
St. Peter's Hospital, Brooklyn	201
Unity Hospital, Brooklyn	233
Wyckoff Heights Hospital, Brooklyn	197
Bellevue Hospital, New York	3,165
Divion I–Columbia University, New York	226
Division II–Cornell University, New York	205
Division III–New York University, New York	374
Division IV–Open Division, New York	207
Beth David Hospital, New York	190
Beth Israel Hospital, New York	408
Bronx Hospital, New York	383
Columbus Hospital, New York	300
Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals, New York	419
Fordham Hospital, New York	539
French Hospital, New York	313
Goldwater Memorial Hospital, New York	1,660
Gouverneur Hospital, New York	220
Harlem Hospital, New York	763
Hospital for Joint Diseases, New York	362
Jewish Memorial Hospital, New York	229
Knickerbocker Hospital, New York	165
Lebanon Hospital, New York	172
Lenox Hill Hospital, New York	620
Lincoln Hospital, New York	469
Memorial Hospital, New York	223
Metropolitan Hospital, New York	1,183
Misericordia Hospital, New York	236
Montefiore Hospital for Chronic Diseases, New York	556
Morrisania City Hospital, New York	511
Mother Cabrini Memorial Hospital, New York	205
Mount Sinai Hospital, New York	850
New York City Hospital, New York	830
New York Hospital, New York	1,093
New York Infirmary, New York	161
New York Polyclinic Medical School and Hospital, New York	422
New York Postgraduate Medical School and Hospital, New York	406
Presbyterian Hospital, New York	1,563
Roosevelt Hospital, New York	375
St. Clare's Hospital, New York	406
St. Francis Hospital, New York	425
St. Luke's Hospital, New York	508
St. Vincent's Hospital, New York	644
Sydenham Hospital, New York	252
Flushing Hospital, Flushing	319
Jamaica Hospital, Jamaica	227
Mary Immaculate Hospital, Jamaica	336
Queens General Hospital, Jamaica	757
St. John's Long Island City Hospital, Long Island City	268
Nassau Hospital, Mineola	275
Mount Vernon Hospital, Mount Vernon	260
Rockaway Beach Hospital, Rockaway Beach	125
U. S. Marine Hospital, Staten Island	1,050
St. Vincent's Hospital, Staten Island	246
Staten Island Hospital, Staten Island	300
St. Agnes Hospital, White Plains	177
White Plains Hospital, White Plains	215
St. John's Riverside Hospital, Yonkers	220
St. Joseph's Hospital, Yonkers	183
Yonkers General Hospital, Yonkers	163
Ideal Hospital, Endicott	126
Charles S. Wilson Memorial Hospital, Johnson City	350
Our Lady of Victory, Lackawanna	195
St. Luke's Hospital, Newburgh	225
New Rochelle Hospital, New Rochelle	309
United Hospital, Port Chester	214
Vassar Brothers Hospital, Poughkeepsie	250
Genesee Hospital, Rochester	262
Highland Hospital, Rochester	257
Rochester General Hospital, Rochester	387
St. Mary's Hospital, Rochester	390
Strong Memorial—Rochester Municipal Hospital, Rochester	732
Ellis Hospital, Schenectady	478
Crouse-Irving Hospital, Syracuse	273
General Hospital, Syracuse	170
Hospital of the Good Shepherd, Syracuse	195
St. Joseph Hospital, Syracuse	250
Syracuse Memorial Hospital, Syracuse	330
Samaritan Hospital, Troy	212
Troy Hospital, Troy	296
Grasslands Hospital, Valhalla	825
Albany Hospital, Albany	571
Memorial Hospital, Albany	157
St. Peter's Hospital, Albany	159
Binghamton City Hospital, Binghamton	500
Buffalo General Hospital, Buffalo	500
Allied Hospital of Sisters of Charity, Buffalo	375
Deaconess Hospital, Buffalo	333
Edward J. Meyer Memorial Hospital, Buffalo	1,107
Mercy Hospital, Buffalo	258
Millard Fillmore Hospital, Buffalo	444
Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital, Cooperstown	110
Arnot-Ogden Memorial Hospital, Elmira	217
St. Joseph's Hospital, Elmira	291

NOTE.—VA hospitals not included in above.

Hospital	In operation	Under construction	Planned	Capacity	Distance from— New York City	Distance from— Boston
CONNECTICUT					*Miles*	*Miles*
Newington	X			289	95	139
West Haven			X	900	70	159
MAINE						
Togus	X			864	429	200
MASSACHUSETTS						
Bedford	X			1,642	239	10
Framingham	X			1,100	218	21
Northampton	X			925	200	75
Rutland Heights	X			619	185	45
West Roxbury	X			316	239	10
Boston			X	1,000	229	
Do			X	1,000	229	
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Manchester		X		150	250	21
RHODE ISLAND						
Providence		X		99	185	44

Hospital	In operation	Under construction	Planned	Capacity	Distance from— New York City	Distance from— Boston
VERMONT						
					Miles	*Miles*
White River Junction	X			188	258	50
Total				9,392		
NEW YORK						
Batavia	X			294	402	[1] 602
Bath	X			414	294	[1] 523
Bath (domiciliary)	X			1,476	294	[1] 523
Bronx	X			1,509		229
Brooklyn	X			400		229
Staten Island	X			1,500	10	239
Northport, Long Island	X			2,705	40	269
Castle Point	X			613	63	292
Saratoga Springs	X			62	165	[1] 223
Sunmount	X			564	344	[1] 402
New York City			X	1,000		229
Brooklyn		X		1,000		229
Peekskill		X		1,965	40	269
Albany		X		1,000	142	[1] 200
Syracuse			X	1,000	289	[1] 347
Buffalo		X		1,000	436	[1] 494
Queens County			X	1,000		229
Total				17,502		
NEW JERSEY						
Lyons	X			2,234	40	269
Newark		X		1,000	10	239
Total				3,234		
PENNSYLVANIA						
Aspinwall	X			714	414	644
Butler (Army)	X			1,000	440	669
Coatesville	X			1,893	130	359
Lebanon	X			501	100	329
Do		X		545	100	329
Altoona		X		200	325	554
Erie		X		200	475	704
Harrisburg			X	200	195	424
Philadelphia			X	1,000	91	320
Pittsburgh			X	1,200	439	668
Do			X	1,250	439	668
Wilkes-Barre		X		475	100	329
Total				8,978		
DELAWARE						
Wilmington	X			150	118	347
Do		X		300	118	347
Total				450		

[1] Via Albany.

A Henry Wallace Hang-Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although secretaries come and go, their staffs continue on. This was never more forcefully illustrated than in connection with the fantastic program recently presented by the Secretary of Agriculture for the serious consideration of the House Committee on Agriculture. It reflects the thinking of a former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, an outspoken advocate of a completely controlled economy, always unduly and usually unfortunately influenced by those surrounding him.

It is my hope that this proposal to write every farmer in the country a check, presumably around electiontime, for the difference between what he received for his products and the amount which a government agency fixed as their price, will receive relegation to oblivion, which it so richly deserves. Certainly this should be its fate, unless it is intended to pay every working man and woman in the country the difference between the wages he or she draws and the amount which a government agency decides he or she should earn, and unless it be further intended to pay every businessman, large and small, the difference between his losses or his profits, if any, on the one hand, and the amount which the Government thinks, if any, should be his profits on the other hand.

Such nonsense is not the stuff of which this country was made or through which it has prospered. It represents ideas borrowed from those who control the economies of other countries which, without a single exception, do not enjoy a standard of living remotely comparable with our own.

Several days ago I inserted an editorial from the New York Times condemning in most vigorous and clear language the completely political and thoroughly unsound suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Editorial comment continues to be almost universally unfavorable. Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union and an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of April 8, 1949]

AS WE SEE IT—LOWER FOOD PRICES, HIGHER FARM INCOME, IS NEAT TRICK

The corn States Thursday got their gold star for good conduct in November. The Secretary of Agriculture unwrapped a new farm program and politically it's a daisy. It will raise farm income but lower food prices, it says here, which is the neatest trick of the Washington week.

How can either a dirt-farm Congressman or a sidewalk Congressman oppose a deal like that?

The only way we can imagine is by seeing the catch in it. This shouldn't be hard to do.

The bill would let the free market set prices on meat, milk, butterfat, eggs, poultry, fruits, and vegetables. These are the foods people prefer and should eat more of.

But if the unsupported market lets people buy them too cheaply, Uncle Sam would sit down and write a check for the farmer who produced them, covering the difference between what the Government thinks the farmer should have received and what the people were willing to pay.

There is no better recipe than a fat check to turn people into satisfied voters.

But don't go away, there's more to it than this. Where do meat, milk, butterfat, eggs, and poultry come from? They come from feeding animals and fowls corn, wheat, and other grains.

And this same bill jacks up support prices on these, along with cotton, tobacco, peanuts, soybeans, flaxseed, dry beans, peas, and wool. All the apparatus of loans, surplus purchases, and Government-built storage space would be continued and strengthened to raise prices on these.

Then how is the price of meat, milk butterfat, eggs, and poultry to come down, if the price of grains that produce them is propped higher?

There is more than a little flim-flammery here.

Besides this bill's hokum, it contains some ideas that surely need far more exploration than they have had.

There is the question of the Government's guaranteeing the income of one portion of our people regardless of other portions' price judgment on the value of their output.

And if that is desirable, is it good policy to attempt to freeze one portion's income at distorted wartime high levels—which is the effect of the new base period for computing parity, a price index of what farmers buy?

But the most reprehensible thing about the plan is that Secretary Brannan presented it to Congress without a single estimate on what the program would cost.

Without solid cost estimates, adequately documented, Congress really has nothing to work on. We have surely not come to the point that we buy every bauble that looks pretty politically without asking the price. Or have we?

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

THE POLITICAL MILL—NEW FARM PLAN LEAVES SOME DEMOCRATS PUZZLED—PRODUCTION PAYMENTS MIGHT RUN INTO BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The administration's new farm-aid plan, presented by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan with the blessing of President Truman, is about as understandable to Democratic Members of the Senate as the operation of a pyramid club, and if the administration hopes to get major support for the plan, it will have to let a lot of light in.

Coined in the plan is a new phrase, "production payments." To the run-of-the-mine citizen, it will mean a Government subsidy to farmers, designed to maintain high prices for them and at the same time permit consumers to buy foodstuffs at prices fixed by the old-fashioned law of supply and demand. In other words, it is enticement to farmers to produce plenty so that the supply will always equal or run ahead of the consumer demand, thereby assuring reasonable or low prices to the public.

Nobody has suggested yet how far down in his jeans Uncle Sam will have to dig to pay the farmers these production payments. It is well understood, however, that whatever Uncle Sam pays—and it may run into billions if prices of foodstuffs should go very low on the market—will come out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

QUICK ENDORSEMENT BY M'GRATH

The Democratic National Committee immediately put out a statement by Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH, of Rhode Island, chairman, giving the new farm plan superlative endorsement. In conclusion, Senator MCGRATH made this wholly understandable remark: "Without going into the technical explanation and the working details of Secretary Brannan's testimony (about the new plan), I want to emphasize again that this program tackles the farm problem in relation to the whole country." It is just those working details which need explaining.

Secretary Brannan, in his appearance before a joint meeting of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, stated the objective of the plan—the welfare of the American farmer. He made the trite assertion that if the farmer goes bust, the whole Nation does, too. No one will quarrel with his demand that the farmer be given a fair break. But he apparently is undertaking to set up a kind of endless chain whereby the farmer will produce all he can, or at least all that the Government thinks he should, and the consumer will buy all he can, or certainly as much as the farmer produces. This is supposed to keep everybody else working and making money and spending it.

WEAK LINK IN CHAIN

The weak link in the chain seems to be the requirement that the Government be ready at all times to step in and pay the farmer the difference between his cost of production, plus a fair income, and the price the farmer is compelled to receive in an open market. It is possible that any government budget might be knocked galley-west under the operation of such a plan.

The details of the plan are numerous and intricate. On of them is designed to help the family size farm and not to encourage the development of large industrialized farming.

Nobody knows, but it is surmised that operation of the proposed law will require the services of an army of Government agents, a tremendous amount of bookkeeping by both the farmers and the Government and finally, the strictest kind of control of the farmers by the Government.

ANDERSON NOT CONSULTED

The production payments appear to be limited to the more perishable crops, like fruits, vegetables, meats, poultry, eggs, and milk; and the old or present price-support method of commodity loans and purchase agreements will be used for commodities which do not appreciably deteriorate in storage, for example, grains and cotton.

Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico, who before he came to the Senate was Democratic Secretary of Agriculture and is now a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, was not consulted by the drafters of the new administration farm plan before it was revealed by Secretary Brannan. Mr. ANDERSON is saying nothing publicly about the plan—until the legislation to put it into effect has been presented and Secretary Brannan has explained its provisions. Other Democratic Senators admit they are mystified, and some of them just don't like the plan.

Extension of European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have followed the extensive hearings on this legislation, and looking back on the testimony presented and considering the magnitude of the program, I find it very difficult to understand the criticism by some Members of the House toward the work and recommendations of this committee. May I add my humble observations? I believe and have full confidence in the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, and the deliberations and fine cooperative and successful, conscientious work of the members of this committee. The measure unanimously reported out for favorable passage puts or should place the consideration of this measure favorably by the House beyond the doubt of the most dubious. The moneys thus far expended in the Marshall plan were judiciously allocated and have borne fruit.

Two years ago the American Government and the American people decided to help rehabilitate and reconstruct the economy of Europe. The effort has been thus far extremely worth while. But we should not stop now. The danger of disaster is not past. It would be utter stupidity to discontinue a working plan in the middle of its success.

I would like to call to the attention of this body, particularly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the noticeable improvement in east-west trade.

EAST-WEST TRADE

A steady upswing in Europe's east-west trade during the past year has served as a healthy stimulant to the ultimate recovery of Marshall-plan nations.

In 1945, east-west trade was virtually at a standstill. Last year, it rose to about 50 percent of 1938 and by 1952 the Economic Cooperation Administration hopes that trade between eastern and western Europe will be within reach of its normal prewar volume.

The increased flow of goods across the east-west borders is regarded by ECA as a life line to the economic goal of ERP nations. Polish coal is being burned to help meet their production targets. Eastern timber is going into their housing and construction programs, and eastern grain is boosting their food consumption.

The Marshall plan is supplying some of the money with which western Europe obtains part of its immediate requirements, but on the whole, east-west trade is being accomplished on a give-and-take basis with very little stimulus from ECA dollars. For example, ECA dollar authorizations for the purchases of Polish coal, Yugoslav nonferrous metals, and eastern German potash have totaled $12,751,000 thus far compared with the over-all figure of $1,163,000,000 which ERP countries spent for imports from eastern Europe in 1948. ECA prefers that these imports be obtained through direct trading, and authorizes dollars only when the need is urgent.

A major importance of east-west trade is that the barter method is saving ERP countries dollars through an alternative means of payment, such as exchange of goods, credit, or payment in some foreign currency. In order to be viable by 1952, western Europe must reduce her dollar deficit and restore her balance of trade. This can be achieved partly by the import of goods from sources other than dollar areas. ECA estimates that failure to maintain east-west trade would impose an additional aggregate cost of $5,000,000,000 in ERP aid, since western Europe would have to find means for importing commodities from other than nondollar areas. Besides, ERP countries need eastern Europe for an essential market outlet.

According to ECA figures, ERP countries are importing more than they are exporting. During 1948, it is estimated that exports totaled $788,000,000, as compared with $1,163,000,000 in imports from eastern Europe. In exchange for foodstuffs, coal, timber, and nonferrous metals, western Europe supplies the east with industrial products and machinery equipment.

On the whole, ECA views the expansion of east-west trade as one of the most important means for reducing the dependence of European countries on products from the Western Hemisphere and thus for diminishing the dangerous excess of imports over exports which has thrown the European economy out of balance. Of course, east-west trade is carried on by the participating countries only within the limits of security considerations and under strict export controls necessary for the national security of the participating countries and the United States.

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

Before the war, east-west trade comprised about 10 percent of the total trade of the ERP countries. The prewar figure for exports from eastern to ERP countries was approximately $1,300,000,000 a year. If computed at postwar prices, the figure would be considerably higher. ECA estimates that if present east-west trade developments continue—particularly if the recovery plans for the bizone are successful—1952 imports from the east may exceed the prewar volume.

Of all the commodities imported from the east before the war, coal, timber, grain, and potash made up over 50 percent of the trade. The end of dependence on American coal by 1952 depends on increasing production in participating countries and on the availability of coal from Poland. It is expected that by 1952 Poland may be a source of about 25,000,000 tons of coal for ERP countries, as compared with 13,000,000 last year.

Timber, which is needed for coal mines, pulp and cellulose, railroads and the building industry, is currently in very short supply since iron-curtain countries are exporting only slightly more than half of their prewar shipments. A World Bank loan, now under consideration, to provide additional timber equipment for some eastern countries would increase their export availabilities to about $60,000,000 of additional timber per year.

Before the war, eastern Europe supplied 25 percent of the net imports of grain for western Europe. ECA estimates, however, that grain imports from the east in 1948–49 will constitute only about one-third of the prewar supplies from that area.

Potash from eastern Europe, and chiefly the Soviet zone of Germany, is expected to play an important role in meeting increased requirements in western Europe. Imports from eastern Europe may account for as much as three-fourths of the net imports of the ERP countries throughout the ECA program period.

Monopoly Versus Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a speech by the

Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, made Sunday, April 10, at a dinner meeting of the Cooperative League of America, Jerry Voorhis, managing director, and John Carson, Washington representative:

Monopoly and democracy are incompatible. One is, in the words of Holy Writ, a "child of a bond woman," and that child is called monopoly and the path he builds leads into slavery. The other child is "a child of a free woman," and that child is called Democracy. That child builds paths toward freedom and in support of the dignity of men and women and children.

These two, monopoly and democracy, are utterly irreconciliable. They cannot live under one roof. If monopoly is permitted to thrive it will consume and destroy democracy and freedom. That is the problem we have before us in our country. It is the problem of this day and this hour. It is the challenge presented to United States Congress and to all Government officials as the Federal Trade Commission reported only a short time ago. Incidentally, in that report the Commission warned that the days are very few in which we can save our country and our people from the inevitable end of the monopoly road, and that end is economic totalitarianism.

We need not believe in any theory of economic determinism to accept what is a fact. The fact is that our political freedom is dependent upon our economic freedom. Our economic freedom is dependent upon the maintenance of a free market. We cannot hope to retain our political freedom if we permit our market place to become owned and dominated by monopoly interests.

The reports made some years ago by the Temporary National Economic Commission, of which the Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY, was chairman, proved that monopoly then dominated most of our industries. The statements made many times since by Senator O'MAHONEY and by others and the continuing stream of antitrust cases which pour into our courts, prove that monopoly condition has grown worse since the days of TNEC. In fact, the stories told before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress prove conclusively that the warning given to us only a short time ago by the Federal Trade Commission was a warning couched in very moderate language.

Our problem is, then, the problem of attacking this disease to society, this disease we know by the word monopoly. Turn to the hospital wards. When a man is sick, the first thing a good doctor does is to get control of the disease. He does that through medication. Our first effort in attacking this disease, monopoly, then should be to give adequate assistance to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and to the Federal Trade Commission. That is the medication we need. We must insist on adequate appropriations for these Departments.

Then the able physician in the hospital wards seeks to induce and encourage the sick person to begin to help himself. His full recovery always must depend upon his will and his ability to help himself.

One of the subjects we are discussing in this conference, I assume, is that of inducing people to help themselves through cooperatives. The analogy of the hospital ward runs true throughout.

As many of you know, there is one subject which has interested me and concerned me from the day I first came to the United States Congress. That subject is monopoly. Throughout my career I have labored to protect and encourage independent business organizations, and particularly what we know as small business organizations. I was much pleased recently to learn that cooperative representatives and the representatives of small business were conferring in one industry (oil distribution) and seeking for methods through which they could work together. I hope that these joint efforts will continue. I have heard repeatedly from your cooperative representatives in Washington that they would cooperate in every way to assist small business.

Tomorrow afternoon, I understand from your program, this conference will turn to a study of the electric power industry. That is well for me, because I was asked to talk with you a few minutes about the REA answer to monopoly.

Not so many years ago, one of our great Senators, one whom we shall not forget, George W. Norris, of Nebraska, determined to give to our farm people the advantages of electric power. I would like to tell you that story as it was told to me by one of Senator Norris' closest friends. He told how Senator Norris had been riding through Nebraska and had stopped to visit with a farmer friend. The farmer's wife was washing clothes with an old-style washing machine. She was laboring under a hot Nebraska sun.

"I made up my mind right there," said Senator Norris, "that I'd try to find some way to help these poor people, and particularly those good women, to get electric power into their homes."

Senator Norris began his famous fight to save Muscle Shoals, and the Wilson Dam power development. That was the fight which finally resulted in the development of what we know as TVA. Then Senator Norris, encouraged by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, turned to the development of what we know as REA.

It is an interesting fact that when Senator Norris completed the rural electrification bill, he admitted to a belief and a fear that he was merely helping the Power Trust.

"Of course, I know what will happen," he said. "The big power companies are going to borrow this cheap money from the Government and get control of rural electric lines. That is inevitable. But if I have to see that happen in order to get electric power into our farm homes, I'll submit to even helping the Power Trust."

My friend reminded the Senator that his REA bill provided for loans to political subdivisions, counties, or townships. The Senator said that was true, but he had little hope that counties or townships would develop that field. Then Senator Norris' attention was called to the provision of his bill which permitted loans to be made to cooperatives. The Senator shook his head, sadly, as he talked about cooperatives.

"Yes, I put that in the bill, but it just will not happen. That would be the finest development," he added, "but cooperatives have never developed in this country, as they should have."

Senator Norris predicted that night that 95 percent of the rural electric lines would be built by the Power Trust. Strangely, that was also the opinion of Morris L. Cooke, the first Administrator of REA. I only mention these facts to impress on you what can be done by people once they are encouraged to help themselves. And I should add that three of your cooperative representatives, Mr. Hull, of Indiana, Mr. Lincoln, of Ohio, and Mr. Bowen, of Chicago, came to Washington and induced Mr. Cooke to give a little bit of encouragement to cooperatives through putting, as they said, at least one little desk in the REA office.

The one little desk was placed in the REA office, and a few little people were appointed by Mr. Cooke to man the Cooperative Division of the first Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. Cooke was just as friendly to cooperatives as was Senator Norris, but the fact is that neither believed that cooperatives would develop.

We know what the result was. The rural electric cooperatives developed just about 95 percent of the rural electric lines and the power trust was proved to be utterly incompetent. There was one field in which monopoly had to surrender. We know how Norris' dream came true, how States soon boasted that majority of their farm homes were completely electrified. We know now that in some States more than 90 percent—as I recall—of the farm homes have electric power.

The REA principle, as I have tried to present it, is merely that of using our Government's power to provide credit to our people so that they can help themselves.

What can be wrong about any such proposal? These credit resources are the resources of our people. They belong to all of our people. They would be of no value if they were not supported by confidence in all of our people. And all that we now propose through the REA principle is that the Government—the trustee for all the people—shall take these resources and turn them back into the rural areas and the towns and cities of our country to help people to help themselves.

What can be wrong about a proposal that we shall use this Government credit, this resource, to develop an independent steel industry, or to develop independent cement industries throughout our country? We have proved, through REA, that the people are very capable, so capable in fact that in REA they developed many improvements on the work of the power companies.

I have complete confidence in the ability of people to help themselves. I have complete faith that the so-called little people of our country, the people who just go about doing their job every day, will prove themselves to be just about as capable of handling these so-called big jobs as have any of our industrial managers.

Recently, I offered in the House a housing bill, H. R. 2811. It has been described by some people as the REA-housing bill. I wish this conference could be continued through a week, or on into several weeks, so that you people might study such proposals as are in this housing bill.

What do we propose in this housing bill? We propose to create a Government agency which will do the work in housing that the Rural Electrification Administration has done in the rural electric field. We propose that this division of Government shall have authority and responsibility to develop new plans and new methods for housing. We propose that this division shall have authority to develop credit resources for those who need housing, either through getting cooperation from private mortgage lenders, or through getting credit from Government lending corporations.

I am interested in this bill for many reasons, but particularly for the reason that through this bill I think we will help people to obtain good housing accommodations which they can buy and own. I am interested in home ownership. It is time we should become interested in home ownership because home ownership is our greatest protection against the spread of political doctrines which might destroy our country. Just as the Rural Electrification Administration helped people to own their electric power lines.

Through this REA principle, I would hope, and in fact I would demand, that any independent business would have every encouragement comparable with that given to cooperatives. And again, I must repeat that there has never been an occasion when cooperative representatives did not propose to me that every method should be devised to encourage and help the small-business man. Incidentally, I have been told that in Sweden the small-business men prospered as cooperatives prospered. It is not difficult to understand why, because the Swedish cooperatives curbed and destroyed monopoly and

provided for a free market. Then the Swedish cooperatives, in many instances, became partners of or with other small business. That is the kind of a development I would like to see in our country, because I know, as you know, that this evil thing we know as monopoly is not going to be conquered unless we can arm every enemy of monopoly.

I would like to propose to this conference that a committee representative of the farmers and of organized labor and of cooperatives and of bona fide independent businessmen should be appointed to confer with Government officials for the purpose of exploring every possibility of making use of the REA principle. We have offered a way in the housing field. Some of my good friends in the House and Senate have offered proposals with reference to rural telephone services. Perhaps we can find a pattern which we can apply to the steel industry, to the oil industry, to the fertilizer industry, and, in fact, to every industry where monopoloy has thrived,

One picture has always remained with me as I have labored in this field. It is the picture of the small-business man and his great asset, which was the greatest asset of our country. That asset was good will and confidence. The consumers bought shoes in those days, because the shoes were made by their friend and neighbor. And the manufacturer of shoes had far more interest in gaining the good will and permanent friendship of the consumer of shoes than he had in making a profit.

We must struggle to return to that wonderful state for all of our people, even though the great mass industries and the monopoly interests make the return difficult. We must find methods through which people, the men and the women of our country, will have that supreme satisfaction of producing something which expresses their spirit. Unless we keep that goal in mind, we cannot serve the cause of freedom and democracy. Democracy is a thing of the spirit. It depends upon self-restraint. It depends upon the healthfulness of the soul, or the spirit. We must feed that soul and spirit if we would have it survive.

That is why I have been interested in this never-ending struggle against monopoly. That is why I have done what I could to help the bona fide small-business men of all kinds, both cooperative, small business and other kinds of small business. That is why I have become interested in the possibility of developing and expanding this REA principle. Perhaps we have discovered in the REA principle the finest weapon for an attack on monopoly. And this conference, if it could succeed in developing interest in that field would be remembered throughout the years to come.

Last Call for Mr. Bevin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, not since the destruction of Nazi Germany had any nation dared make anti-Semitism a major policy until Ernie Bevin became Foreign Minister of England. What motivates him, by what fantastic stretch of moral and intellectual gymnastics he arrives at such a position, I cannot say. I do not know how, in a Labor government, he can hold or pursue such policies. I know only that the foreign policy of Great Britain is keyed to a snide and almost obscene anti-Semitic attitude.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post Home News which reviews the most recent convolutions of the British delegation in the United Nations Assembly. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members will pay due attention to this brilliant piece of writing.

LAST CALL FOR MR. BEVIN

The British Government, which didn't give de facto recognition to Israel until after every other major nation had done so, seems determined to keep Israel out of the United Nations as long as possible.

There is no other sensible interpretation of British behavior at Lake Success last week. Britain's representative supported the unsuccessful Moslem attempt to delay advancement of Israel's candidacy for membership.

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin is very slow learning the facts of life. Beyond all doubt, Israel will enter the United Nations, but Mr. Bevin has so far refused to see either the fundamental justice or even the basis political common sense of making honorable amends for his injustices of the past.

This week begins with him still clinging to obstruction, and although we know that the cause of Israel can't be advanced by calling a statesman a dolt, we still wonder why anyone ever considered this dolt a statesman.

Yet, in the hope that Mr. Bevin can even now be instructed, let us list again three steps which the British Government should take—and take quickly—to render justice to Israel, to strengthen the cause of lasting peace in the Near East, and, by no means incidentally, to do Britain some direct good, too.

First. Britain should expedite, and not hamper, Israel's admission into the UN. No other single action will go nearly so far to show that at least once in a while the British Government not only talks about world democracy but is actually capable of doing something to advance it.

Second. Britain should enter into sensible trade agreements with this young and virile state. Israel has, among other things, potash for British industry and citrus fruits for the untanned residents of the cloudy British homeland. Israel, moreover, is a bigger potential market for British exports than the whole of the Arab Near East.

To implement trade agreements, Britain should drop immediately its cruel and senseless demand that Israel pay the costs of the ghastly Cyprus internment camps.

Britain should also, in common decency, turn over to the Israeli Government a just share of the cash which was raised by the sale of Palestine Government bonds and was shipped off to London nearly a year ago.

Further, Britain should release at once the sterling funds owned by Israeli citizens and now blocked in British banks.

The third step: Let Israel flourish unhampered by the ring of Arab and British arms which now surrounds it. The driving energies of Israel, progressively redeeming the desert for the good of mankind, should be free to work unchecked and unthreatened by armed prowlers who build and have built nothing whatever in this world.

In this connection, we are reminded that British opposition to an independent Israel stemmed in part from the notion that the Arab states had to be coddled because Britain might need them in a clash with the U. S. S. R. (At least, so it was said; quite likely, the pro-Arab basis actually had more to do with oil than ideology.)

But granting the British Government was once sincere in believing it could rely on Arab armies, how can it possibly think so any longer? The ineffectiveness, if not the worthlessness, of Arab military force has been shown to all the world.

If Britain ever needs an ally in the Near East, Israel with its sturdy farms, its modern approach to trade and industry, and its great body of men and women trained in all fields of modern science, could be the best possible. But, in probable fact, the building up of a strong Israel would of itself so improve the position of democracy in the Near East as to discourage effectively any military adventurers.

Meanwhile, let those who are really fearful of Russian threats in that quarter of the world ponder the fact that the Israeli Government is stanchly anti-Communist—so much so that it is being denounced by the Communist press everywhere, particularly here in New York City.

And so it seems obvious that self-interest alone—even if the British Government can find no higher motive—should justify Mr. Bevin in doing a quick about-face. What is really shocking, however, is that it is necessary for anyone to point out a course of action which any genuine lover of justice, any friend of freedom, should be able to see clearly for himself.

When Israel's admission to the UN comes up before the General Assembly, Mr. Bevin will be on trial before the bar of world justice. The representatives of the United Kingdom will have an opportunity to register their Foreign Secretary's present point of view.

Let us hope he has learned a little from the past. If love of liberty has not led him to right decisions, perhaps self-interest may.

Here's What Is Wrong With the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I offer another installment in my answer to the question now being presented to those of us who favor enactment of H. R. 2032, the Thomas-Lesinski bill repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and reenactment of the Wagner Act with certain amendments. The question put to us is "What Is Wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act?"

Of course, a great many things are wrong with it. It was wrong in its motives, which were revenge and punishment, not justice; wrong in its draftsmanship which was perpetrated in secret by a lawyer who was paid $7,500 for the job by the Republican National Committee, according to his own statement in the recent hearings before the House Labor and Education Committee. It was wrong in its provisions which, as I have shown in previous remarks, were loaded against labor and in favor of employers, and it has been wrong in its administration, which in the person of NLRB General Counsel Robert Denham, has been brazenly anti-labor in dozens of instances.

One of those instances was the Perry Norvell Shoe case, wherein the employer used the willing NLRB general counsel to break a strike. Let us see how NLRB General Counsel Denham, acting with all

the speed of a short-order cook, gave the employer what he wanted in the way of a basis for an injunction that was used to break a strike, despite the fact that the employer's charges were later found to be without merit.

Although the NLRB is years behind in its work and steadily falling further behind, the employer in this case, with the cooperation of NLRB General Counsel Denham, completed his blitz against the union between August 27, 1947, when he filed charges against the union, and December 12, 1947, when the NLRB trial examiner found no cause and dismissed the employer's complaint—after the strike had been broken.

To show how the NLRB moves with winged feet to serve employers and drags its feet when a union has filed a complaint against an employer, I invite the Members to examine the chronologies of the Perry Norvell Shoe case and the Dorsey Trailers case, as placed side by side in the record of the House Education and Labor Committee during its hearings on H. R. 2032:

PERRY NORVELL SHOE

August 27, 1947: Employer files charge alleging jurisdictional, strike and breach of contract.

October 6, 1947: Employer consults general counsel, files amended charge alleging coercion and restraint.

October 8, 1947: General counsel issues complaint against union.

October 20, 1947: Company fires all union leaders; notifies strikers that "United States Government has intervened" and orders them to return to work October 23 or be fired.

October 21, 1947: Hearing on complaint.

November 19, 1947: Employer obtains injunction against picketing.

December 12, 1947: Trial examiner finds no violation of contract, no violence, dismisses complaint, but its purpose was accomplished—the strike was broken.

DORSEY TRAILERS

November 15, 1946: Strike voted by Local 773, UAW-CIO, after employer refused to arbitrate grievance.

November 22, 1946: Employer refuses to bargain with union.

November 26, 1946: Union offers to end strike. Employer closes plant.

December 17, 1946: Three thugs, hired by plant superintendent and local chief of police for $50, beat up union's representative.

December 24, 1946: Union files charges of unfair labor practices.

January 6, 1947: Plant reopens. Three union organizers laid off. Employer still refuses to bargain.

April 23, 1947: Union files amended charges.

April 25, 1947: Complaint issues against employer.

June 2, 1947: Hearings on complaint.

September 19, 1947: Trial examiner files intermediate report with NLRB, finding violations.

April 30, 1948: Case not yet assigned by NLRB Washington office.

May 14, 1948: NLRB Chairman hopeful of action in near future. Case now assigned.

November 23, 1948: NLRB finds employer guilty of unfair labor practice in discriminatory lay-off of employees active in union; refusal to bargain on December 31, 1946, and thereafter; participation in assault on union representative. (A more flagrant violation of the act would be difficult to find); and NLRB orders employer to bargain, to reinstate discharged workers, and to pay backwages.

February 10, 1949: Company still refuses to bargain and to reinstate employees with back pay as ordered. Regional NLRB attorney transfers case back to Washington for enforcement.

March 11, 1949: General counsel's office still drafting brief, expecting to file petition in court in 2 or 3 weeks, but court action prior to fall term is now unlikely.

LOCAL 773, DORSEY TRAILERS, INC., ELBA, ALA.

The union was certified as the exclusive bargaining agent in this company on May 16, 1945, and signed a contract September 17, 1945. In the early fall of 1946 the contract was renewed with provision for union shop and check-off.

Shortly after renewal of the contract the company transferred certain employees to new job classifications but refused to pay the wage rates provided for such classifications under the contract. The grievance procedure was employed without satisfactory adjustment. The company refused to arbitrate the grievances.

A strike ensued, on November 19, 1946, but 1 week later the company rejected the offer of the union for the unconditional return of the strikers and shut down the plant until January 6, 1947. During this lockout the employees affected drew their unemployment compensation.

On December 17, 1946, a membership meeting was convened by the president of the local who called the meeting for the purpose of having a vote to determine whether the men in the plant still desired to be represented by the union. Shortly before the meeting convened at 2 p. m., three men accosted on the street and beat up severely with the jaws of a heavy pocket knife the international representative of the union, Jim Harden. These three men, W. L. Dewberry, Joe Collins, and David Burk, had been procured by Fred Harper, police chief of Elba, and Kimmie Dorsey, assistant superintendent of the company, for the sum of $50 to beat up Harden and to tell him to get out of town.

Later in the same afternoon the financial secretary of the union, Ben Logan, was told by the same three men that he would be shot unless he left town before sundown. The financial secretary, the union attorney, and the assistant regional director of the international union reported this threat to the sheriff in Elba, who made no move to make any arrest, but on the contrary stated to the financial secretary: "It has been reported to me that you are carrying a gun around here."

The three who had been procured by the Elba police and the company for this assault later testified in the Labor Board hearings concerning their employment for this purpose, and one of them testified also that he had been asked, but refused, to place a gun in Jim Harden's car, and that they had been offered money by the chief of police to run over Jim Harden with their automobile "even though they had to run up on the sidewalk to get him," and to burn the car of Ben Logan, financial secretary of the union.

Appeals by the union to the attorney general, the State bureau of investigation, the Governor's office, and the FBI produced no action. One of the three thugs appeared in local court, pleaded guilty for himself and one other, and was told that a fine of $104.50 against each of them "had been paid."

Excerpts from the testimony of the three men named above are attached hereto as an exhibit.

Upon the reopening of the plant on January 6, 1947, Jim Nevels, Ben Logan, and Leavy Boutwell, all officers of the local union, were not recalled to work. They have not been rehired, although they have applied for reinstatement.

Complaint issued by the NLRB April 25, 1947, against Dorsey Trailers, Inc., alleging unfair labor practices. Hearings were held in June 1947 at Elba, Ala. The trial examiner's report finds the company guilty of unfair labor practice in the assault upon Jim Harden and in discriminating against Jim Nevels, Ben Logan, and Leavy Boutwell. The case was sent to the National Board in Washington in September 1947, but was not assigned for Board consideration until some time subsequent to April 30, 1948, and prior to May 14, 1948.

In a letter dated May 14, 1948, Paul M. Herzog, Chairman, advised the union, "I can advise you that we have commenced analyzing the transcript of the hearing and the exceptions to the intermediate report in this matter."

Chairman Herzog also stated: "We are hopeful that formal action may be taken in the near future." This was on May 14, 1948. Six months later, on November 22, 1948, 2 years to the day from the employer's first refusal to bargain with the union, the Board issued its decision and order.

The Board found that this respondent locked out its employees illegally for 4 days in May 1946; that it illegally refused to reinstate three union officers on January 6, 1947 because of their leadership in the strike; that the employer illegally refused to bargain with the union on December 31, 1946, and at all times thereafter; and that it illegally participated in the assault on Jim Harden.

The Board ordered the respondent company to cease and desist from discouraging membership in the union, from refusing to bargain with the union, and to reinstate the three union officers with back pay to January 6, 1947, and to reimburse the employees locked out in May 1946.

As of February 10, 1949, the company still refused to comply with the act or the Board's orders. On that date the case was sent into Washington for enforcement by the Office of the General Counsel.

As of March 11, drafting of the brief by the general counsel was reported to be still 2 or 3 weeks from completion, and that court action against the company would not begin sooner than 3 weeks from date. It was held unlikely that the case would be heard before the fall term of court.

It therefore appears probable that the case of Dorsey Trailers, Inc., will be in court or awaiting its turn on the third anniversary of the refusal to bargain and of the slugging of Jim Harden by the company's hired thugs.

During all this time, and up to the present, the company refuses to bargain with the union, refuses even to accept mail from the union, continues to lay off employees without regard to seniority and in violation of the contract, and refuses to process grievances. While seniority employees remain laid off, new employees are hired.

Italy's Former Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Italy have through the past few years made manifest their loyalty and devotion to the cause of democracy. As a cobelligerent during the last phases of World War II, I witnessed personally the heroic contributions to the war effort by her troops and her citizenry. And, I can personally attest to the fact that despite the hardships the people were undergoing, they rallied with an inspired courage and a renewed moral strength to overthrow the threat of Communist domination.

Italy and her people have a profound respect and admiration for America and a deep-rooted love for the people of America. They know that America is the core of world democracy and the hope of the world in the struggle for peace.

Now two great questions arise—one the trusteeship of Italy's former colonies and the other whether Italy should be admitted to representation in the United Nations. And again Italy looks to America with hopeful appealing eyes, for she believes her requests have great merit.

A group of fine outstanding citizens of America, known as the Columbian Civic Club make the following appeal by resolution:

Whereas the UN Assembly, at its next session, will take under consideration the trusteeship of the former Italian colonies; and

Whereas Italy, by geographical position, tradition, culture, and ideology, and now as a party to the North Atlantic Pact, is a definite part of the alliance of western nations; and

Whereas by her victory at recent national elections, achieved in the face of tremendous communistic opposition. Italy established herself, not only as a democracy but as an impregnable barrier against the forces of communism; and

Whereas Italy's high rate of unemployment, due, in a great measure, to overpopulation, is being used as a basis for communistic propaganda, intended to strain her relations with the other western powers; and

Whereas the development of the African Continent will be a great contributing factor toward the social progress and economic rehabilitation of western Europe; and

Whereas Italy, prompted, not by selffish gain, but to relieve the sad state of her overpopulation, made great contributions in the development of her colonies, by the construction of railroads, airports, and seaports, by converting arid lands into rich farms, by transforming unknown places into industrial centers and, through the application of scientific knowledge, methods, and skills, raising the standard of living far above that which had been enjoyed by the natives and hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled there; and

Whereas by virtue of her enormous efforts and sacrifices in their development, and her proximity to her former colonies, and her technique, and her excessive population and manpower, Italy is deserving and qualified to undertake their further development; and

Whereas the awarding to Italy of the trusteeship of her former colonies will be a great step in her own economic rehabilitation and will further solidify the western nations against the common enemy; and

Whereas Italy is now the only friendly democracy which has not been given membership to the UN; and

Whereas by every action since she threw off the yoke of fascism, and joined forces with America and the other free nations of the world—first against nazism and then against communism—Italy has earned the moral right to be a member of and participate in the UN: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Columbian Civic Club in special meeting assembled, on this 4th day of April 1949, at its headquarters, 12 Hill Street, Newark, N. J., That—

1. Italy has every moral right to the trusteeship of her former colonies.

2. The UN would perform an act of supreme justice by awarding to Italy the trusteeship of her former colonies.

3. Italy's friendship to America and her many contributions toward the culture and way of life now enjoyed by our country has earned for her the sincere support of our delegates to the UN for the trusteeship of her former colonies.

4. Justice also requires that Italy be admitted as a member of the UN, so that her hopes and aspirations for her own future and for the peace of the world may be advocated by her own delegates.

5. That every means consistent with loyalty and propriety be employed to bring to the attention of the elected representatives and other leaders of our country, the moral considerations supporting Italy's claims and qualifications for the trusteeship of her former colonies, and her right to representation in the UN.

6. That a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, in the hope that he will consider it a respectful appeal for his powerful aid by way of accomplishing these purposes and objectives.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today the hush of mourning descended on our land.

President Roosevelt was dead.

Mr. Speaker, I can still hear that funereal silence.

I can hear the weeping of his people, the prayers that arose from high and from low for the repose of his great and gallant soul, the hush of expectancy while his people pondered and mourned.

In my memory I can hear his organ-like voice, I can recall his irresistible charm, his swift mind and swifter emotions.

It is time for us to pause again, not to mourn for the great man who has departed, but to take stock of ourselves. Have we lived up to the great expectations which Franklin D. Roosevelt had of his country and of his party?

Mr. Speaker, we have not.

Our commander in chief died in battle as surely as any soldier; and he left to us who remained behind the completion of his victories.

We have failed.

True, we carried his physical war of armed might to victory. We destroyed Nazi Germany and we destroyed fascist Japan.

But we are surrendering that victory to fear and bigotry. Our ideals of democratic processes are trailing in the dust of unworthy trepidation.

The political, social, and economic progress made possible from 1933 to 1945 by the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt stands as an enduring monument to the memory of one of our greatest Presidents.

But we could build another monument, we should build another monument—a monument of accomplished legislation dear to his heart. We should repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, restore the Wagner Act, pass the anti-lynching and anti-poll-tax bills, enact housing legislation, throw the silly antics being committed in the name of loyalty investigation out the window, pass FEPC, pass the federal aid to education and national health and science bills, and above all rise above the current fears of the future.

Who among us can ever forget the electrifying message of his first inaugural address:

So first of all let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.

By those simple and clarion words Franklin D. Roosevelt brought this country out of economic and social and political retreat into a great era of advancement.

Now, we are once more facing backward when we should face forward. The people spoke, last fall; they spoke with a thunderous voice. They spoke for Roosevelt and progress and for peace.

It is time for us, the elected Representatives of the people, Mr. Speaker, to turn our faces to the front and pursue without further delay or wrangling the high ideals of the New Deal; to cease our childish terror of entrenched privilege, and to renew our allegiance to our country.

Let me quote, in conclusion, two short paragraphs from President Roosevelt's election-eve address at Hyde Park, November 4, 1940:

The service of democracy must be something much more than mere lip service.

It is a living thing—a human thing—compounded of brains and muscles and heart and soul. The service of democracy is the birthright of every citizen, the white and the colored; the Protestant, the Catholic, the Jew; the sons and daughters of every country in the world, who make up the people of this land. Democracy is every man and woman who loves freedom and serves the cause of freedom.

Let's Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] recently issued a challenge on the floor of the House that those who are asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, point specifically to those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which they think are wrong. I take up his challenge.

The Taft-Hartley law represents the first shameful ugly step toward fascism in this country. Attacks upon labor unions and upon farmers' and consumers' cooperatives were the first step toward fascism in Germany and Italy the same as in America.

If I were a laboring man, instead of a professional man, I would belong to the union of my craft and sit in the front row. For a half century organized labor has battled for and won many of the proudest treasures of our American tradition and heritage. For example, the

40-hour week, workmen's compensation laws, the highest standard of living in the world, to cite but a few.

Labor unions and members of labor unions have helped to maintain the American way of life and those who would, by restrictive legislative enactment, destroy unions would destroy one of the most dynamic and vital forces of our democracy.

The Taft-Hartley law effectively curtails the constitutional rights of workers to be free from employer domination. It restricts the rights of workers to bargain effectively as a group for improved wages and working conditions.

The claim has been made that the Taft-Hartley Act emancipates workingmen and women from the domination of unions and union bosses.

It is somewhat curious that the National Association of Manufacturers has been so interested in protecting the welfare of workers claimed to be oppressed.

Collective bargaining, as we have known it under the Wagner Act, furnished labor and management a wide range of freedom of voice in reaching agreements. Now the Taft-Hartley law has established an entirely new pattern. The freedom of voice is eliminated and the ruling of a third party, the Government, becomes a decided factor. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to build agreements on a foundation of trust and mutual understanding. Labor relations are more likely to become embroiled in a maze of regulations and legal restrictions.

Most employers should now realize, and undoubtedly do realize, that the best way to achieve and maintain industrial peace in this free Nation is through collective bargaining. If our American way of life and free-enterprise system is to be preserved, employers and employees must solve their own problems themselves around the bargaining table.

Advocates of the Taft-Hartley law had much to say regarding high union initiation fees. Many unions provide their members with unemployment benefits, retirement funds, burial benefits and it would seem proper to compel new members, who become immediately eligible to such benefits, to pay an initiation fee to represent their share of what other members have paid. This is not extortion. No one claims our Government should be given the power to determine initiation or entrance fees into a church or a lodge or a fraternity? Why is it necessary to give it such power over union labor affairs?

The Taft-Hartley law requires unions to file very complete data with the Secretary of Labor. It is claimed that corporations are required to give such detailed reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I maintain that unions should not be run like corporations. Corporations are operated for private profit. Unions are not. Furthermore, corporations operated for private profit are almost invariably run by a compact, tightly run management group with limited liability. Except at the outset when security issues are floated, stockholders in corporations find it nearly impossible to learn how their corporations are run.

Another objection I voice to this law is the ban against direct contributions to political parties; and the provision of the Taft-Hartley law that unions may make no contributions nor expenditures in connection with any national election. It is well to know that corporations, through their officers, make huge contributions to their political favorites. The Eightieth Congress passed this law sponsored by the senior Member from Ohio of the other body that labor organized and unorganized is bound to oppose. Those who sponsored it seek to prohibit labor unions from publishing the congressional records of candidates in papers, circulars, or pamphlets supported in whole or in part by union dues, prohibit unions from using their funds to rent halls and hold meetings to discuss political candidates and their congressional records and to buy radio time to speak in support or opposition to any candidates. Is this not a threat to our political freedom? Is that not an infringement upon the right of free speech? Is this not a violation of the very first amendment of our Constitution, which provides:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

Under the Taft-Hartley law it is illegal for a union to set up funds for vacations with pay. Yet corporations may provide such vacations for their executives. Do the executives need vacations which those who work are denied?

One of the outstanding examples of the unfairness of the Taft-Hartley law is the method of voting for a union shop. The requirement of the law is that a majority of all eligible employees must vote "yes" in order for the union to win the election. In other words, every worker who fails to vote has his vote counted as a "no" vote. No candidate for office in the United States, no other issue on the ballot, must face such a test.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, which was a fine forward-looking law, prohibited arbitrary injunctions by judges. This salutary provision was, in effect, repealed by the Taft-Hartley Act. When a judge arbitrarily issues an injunction in a labor controversy he becomes prosecutor, jury, judge, and executioner combined in one person.

In many respects the Taft-Hartley law sets labor and management apart and prevents teamwork and cooperation in the field of collective bargaining. There are more than 30 separate procedural items imposed before the union is entitled to ask an employer to grant a union shop. Many of these items present virtual obstacles to collective bargaining. There are about 20,000,000 American employees working under various kinds of union security contracts. It is obvious what a widespread handicap this restrictive legislation presents. If this law is construed to require elections every year, as appears to be the case, the National Labor Relations Board would require not less than 20,000,000 man-hours each year to conduct the elections with respect to union-shop authorization. Under the Wagner Act, with only 7,000 elections a year, even the simplest kind of representation elections were delayed for periods of 6 months or longer.

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, asserted that labor's antagonism to the law at the outset has been intensified by recent developments in the field of labor-management relations which would bear out every charge made against this restrictive and oppressive law. President Green stated that the National Labor Relations Board, a Government agency created to protect the rights of labor, has been perverted by the Taft-Hartley law into a prosecutor of labor unions.

The Taft-Hartley law, according to United States Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, a leading liberal, is a "device for making unions so weak they cannot bargain collectively."

We must realize that labor, business, and agriculture are all interdependent and that our whole Nation cannot enjoy stable prosperity unless all groups receive their fair share of the national income. We must establish a decent standard of living as a minimum for every American, and constantly improve the distribution of our production so that all Americans benefit. A great abuse of the past was the fact that judges very frequently and very arbitrarily issued injunctions against workers and without the production of evidence to justify such high-handed proceedings. We should not, in this country, set up one set of standards for unions and another for employers. We should not promote Government interference in labor relations.

To require employees or union officials to furnish anti-Communist affidavits and to fail to make the same requirement of employers is discriminatory legislation which is unfair and should not be tolerated.

Under the Taft-Hartley law the United States Department of Labor has been weakened. The weakening in this Department of the executive branch of the Government has proved a severe blow to the workers. The separation of the Conciliation Service from this department and a change in its basic conception has alienated the confidence of union members. Furthermore, the Wage and Hour Division has been weakened to a point where it cannot make adequate inspections of the violations of the provisions of that law. We should not stand idly by and permit the lowering of the prestige of a once great department of our Government, devoted to the welfare of the laboring men and women the country over.

An example of the chaos caused by the Taft-Hartley law is the situation of the International Typographical Union, one of the greatest and oldest unions. For 75 years this union and its members had little, if any, trouble with employers, had very few strikes, customarily arbitrated differences, negotiated wage scales, and became known as one of the great democratic trade-unions of the world. Yet this situation was entirely disrupted by the Taft-Hartley Act. The union was forbidden to negotiate wage scales, working conditions, and rules in the shop by reason of the Taft-Hartley Act, and

strikes resulted in various parts of the Nation. Union printers previously steadily employed walked the streets jobless. Millions of dollars were lost to both employers and employees as a result of this reactionary law.

The Taft-Hartley Act is an anti-labor law. This is the judgment of Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor. The Secretary calls attention in particular to one unfair labor practice written into the law, that management can go into court and get an injunction in 24 hours, whereas in the case of an unfair labor practice by management it would take at least 12 to 18 months to get an injunction under the law. The Taft-Hartley Act is slanted against labor and it makes it extremely difficult to organize those twelve to fifteen million unorganized workers in the country who today work for sweatshop wages, and it makes it most difficult for labor unions to preserve the gains they have made and for the unorganized to organize.

Finally, I denounce the Taft-Hartley law for the added reason that Gerald D. Morgan, a Washington lawyer, testified he received $7,500 for his work in drafting the Taft-Hartley law. Of course, the National Association of Manufacturers paid this money.

This must be shocking news to fair-minded citizens who have been defending the Taft-Hartley law. The Republican Eightieth Congress, according to the testimony of this lawyer who received $7,500, abdicated its duties and powers to this lawyer and his employers.

The Republican National Committee paid him his fee and you may depend upon it, the money so paid was paid into the Republican National Committee by interests who secured special privileges in the legislation he drafted. We propose to repeal this act and replace it with a statute fair to workers, employers and the general public.

What Is Wrong With the Taft-Hartley Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in further answer to the question, "What is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act?" I offer the experience of the Murray Corp., of Detroit, Mich., and the UAW-CIO.

In 1947, immediately upon enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, that act caused 10 years of peaceful union-management relations to be broken by a strike in the Murray body plant in Detroit over the issue of union liability which had been created by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The so-called watchdog committee, created by the Taft-Hartley Act and chaired by former Senator Ball, made a study of the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act upon labor-management relations in the Murray body plant. Reporting in March 1948, the watchdog committee made a report and probably an inadvertent admission regarding the effect of the act, not only in that plant but upon labor-management relations generally.

I quote from page 177 of that report:

> With passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the company and the union each feels that its relations with the other are on the threshold of a new era.
>
> Efforts of the company to regain exclusive control of what it conceives are the rights of management and to restore a balance and equality to the bargaining relation will be vigorously resisted by the union as a challenge to its power and authority, a threat to its very existence.
>
> There is unquestionably to be a readjustment of the relation between the parties during the next few years, a new concept of the functions of union and management in the industrial economy.
>
> Achievement of this evolutionary cycle without open strife will be a severe test of collective bargaining.

It is not hard to translate this guarded language, and translate it fairly, into an admission that the Taft-Hartley Act is an incitement to industrial warfare. The words I have just quoted are an admission that the Taft-Hartley Act is an attempt to turn the clock back to pre-Wagner Act days, to cancel out the advances of peaceful labor-management relations they did achieve in 10 years of experience under the Wagner Act. Never mind the words "the threshold of a new era." The "new era" is simply a return to the old era of employer intimidation of employees and industrial espionage, terror, violence, and systematic campaigns to weaken and destroy unions so that labor can again be hired on any terms set by the employer.

Fortunately, the American people have refused to permit the Taft-Hartley Act to run its full course, to wreck its full evil effects during a period when, with a more plentiful labor market, antiunion employers would take the opportunities presented by the act to fight unions for the purpose of first weakening and then destroying them. I am confident that this House will shortly adopt the Thomas-Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, in substantially its present form, without the emasculating amendments which will be offered by those who still believe in Taft-Hartley.

Pacific Coast Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced H. R. 4190, a bill to provide for the allocation of shipconstruction contracts in such a manner as to keep alive at strategic points on each of our coasts the skills which are needed in the building of ships, the skills so essential to the national defense in times of emergency.

Almost everyone is familiar with the record of the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast during World War II. At one time, approximately one-half of our tonnage was being produced there. Few people, however, realize that it took 4 years, from 1939 to 1943, to train a nucleus of men to revive a dead industry and expand it to a full and efficient production. It was time we could ill afford to take.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time not a single ship is being built on the Pacific coast. There is no immediate prospect for the building of any such ship. The skills which we developed are rapidly being lost. The organizations which built our ships are rapidly disintegrating.

H. R. 4190 sets forth that it is desirable that 150,000 men should be engaged in the shipbuilding industry at all times and that of these at least 60,000 should be occupied on the Atlantic coast, at least 10,000 on the Gulf coast, and at least 30,000 on the Pacific coast. The Maritime Commission would be charged with the responsibility of keeping account of the numbers actually employed from time to time and of allocating additional construction contracts in such a manner as would cure any deficiencies in the number of men employed in each area.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 recognizes the necessity to our national defense of having shipbuilding facilities and skills at strategic locations on all coasts. The provisions of that act to accomplish this objective failed to be effective. H. R. 4190 endeavors to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so that this objective will be reached and the shipbuilding skills, facilities, and organizations will be kept alive and active on all of our coasts and in all of our strategic locations.

Our Glorious Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks, a splendid article written by Harry H. Schlacht appearing in the Boston Daily Record of April 6, 1949, entitled "Our Glorious Army":

OUR GLORIOUS ARMY
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today we salute the armies of America—the heroes of humanity, the soldiers of democracy. They are the guardians of our present. They are the defenders of our future.

Army Day will be marked with celebrations throughout the Nation. Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, a great American, is national chairman. This is an occasion for the rededication of our spirit to national patriotism. This is an occasion for the reconsecration of our might to the principles for which our fighters for freedom have so gallantly fought. They have been great in war. They have been great in peace.

Strong in our faith, stubborn in our resolve, invincible in our liberty, we liberty-loving Americans promise earnestly that the great traditions of our Army will live as long as the breath of life resides within us.

You have never drawn your sword except in honor. You have never sheathed your sword except in victory. You are the sons of those who braved the wilderness at Plymouth Rock, who carried the torch of freedom across the western prairies, whose blood flowed down the slopes of Bunker Hill and whose blood stained the snow at Valley Forge. You are the sons of heroes who crimsoned the sod at Gettysburg, consecrated the apple blossoms at Appomattox and liberated the downtrodden at Santiago. You are the sons of freedom whose blood flooded Flanders fields, and a thousand blazing battlefields in World War I.

Today your glorious story is written in white crosses and unmarked graves, in the sands of Africa and in the fields of France, in the valleys of Holland and in the mountains of Italy, in the hillsides of Germany, in the islands of the Pacific, and in the silent depths of the seven seas.

Our Army has sprung from the loins of a free people, ennobled and inspired by the cause of liberty. We are a peace-loving people. We are a peace-living people. American history records the part played by our valiant soldiers during peacetime—in opening the West for settlement, in mapping unexplored areas, in improving waterways for domestic commerce, in furthering science and industry, in providing assistance to those suffering from disasters.

We are not a nation of warriors. We are not a nation seeking territorial conquest. We have never sought through cowardly and treacherous infiltration to pollute and contaminate the ideological conception of any people. We have never sought to sap the vitality or to undermine the institutions of any government.

The spirit of America is the spirit of peace. It breathes the most diffusive benevolence. It inculcates the sincere good will. It presents for imitation the exercise of the most kind and friendly offices among men.

Let us all today cheer our fighters for freedom. Let us all today crown them with our applause. Let us say to every man in the service today, from private to general, from seaman to admiral, "God bless you all."

ECA Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, last June the House Appropriations Committee presented the appropriation for the ECA. We had spent two full months in the most intensive study of the needs of these foreign countries and knew what we were doing. In other words, the cut that was made was based upon scientific and intense study. At that time, people who knew nothing about it and who had not spent any time at all in studying it, made repeated statements that we had taken the meat ax to the appropriations. And they were able to deceive the Senate and ultimately force through conference a provision to the effect that all of the funds that were provided might be obligated by April 2, 1949. That date has arrived.

In 11 months to March 1, out of $5,050,000,000 of available funds they have actually shipped and paid for $2,900,000,000, leaving $1,300,000,000 yet to ship and a large amount of loan funds. Unquestionably enough to carry the operation along until the 1st of July and probably until August 15 or September 1. Thus it turns out that the Appropriations Committee was right and that they knew what they were doing and that those in the House, the Senate, the State Department, and the ECA who were proceeding without any idea of what they were doing, were wrong.

Instead of the Appropriations Committee taking the meat ax to the ECA appropriations, those who approached their responsibility from a dishonest and an ignorant standpoint were taking the meat ax to the American people. The result has been to encourage extravagance, to promote the complete socialization of industry in western Europe and in England and to keep them busy on projects which are utterly ridiculous and foolish, like building stations on French railroads and electrifying French railroads when there was no need for it, like digging up the streets in Belgian cities, like paying the deficit of operating the socialistic developments in western Europe and in England. If these people would go to work, with all the money that has been given them and all the food that has been given them, they could have already developed an arms-production program which would supply Britain and France and Italy with everything they need to protect themselves from their Communist neighbors.

The real meat of this situation is that those reactionaries who wish to destroy the United States by reckless spending and by promoting inefficiency in the countries across the sea are actually creating a situation where we will have complete socialism in those countries and that can result in nothing but a dictatorship. A dictatorship will result in communism and there will be no free countries left in Europe able to join us when World War III is thrust upon us. The way out of this situation is for us to reduce the amounts that we contribute to these foreign countries down to a point that we can afford to carry, and to a point where we are providing just what is needed rather than enough to promote socialism and communism in these western countries.

No forward looking approach to this problem can be made without the proper consideration of this situation. Those people are isolationists of the worst kind, who have voted for improper and ill-considered expenditures that are absolutely unneeded and that we cannot afford to make. Not only have they no grasp of the foreign situation but not an open-minded approach to it. It is time for America to wake up, to realize its responsibilities to itself and to the world and not to be led astray by idle dreamers and smart alecks.

We should adopt amendments here reducing the amount of these authorizations to something approaching the need. They need no money for the rest of this fiscal year. They do not need $4,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. We were told a year ago that the Appropriations Committee would go into the question of how much was needed and when the committee did and reported honestly and fairly, we were met with the statement, on the part of those who desire to raid the Treasury, that we had taken the meat ax to it.

In other words, in order to get their authorizations through they stated that it would be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee and when it was reviewed they went back on their pledge to the Congress.

For that reason, I feel that this authorization should be cut at this time while the bill is under consideration for that purpose.

I would support reasonable foreign aid. I cannot support a proposition that is based upon a racket and a raid upon the American people and designed to increase taxes and destroy the economy of our people.

Disposal of Certain Oil and Water-Color Paintings by War Assets Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on the 6th of April and again on the 13th of April 1948 the Department of State declared surplus to War Assets Administration a total of 117 oil and water-color paintings which had been acquired by the United States Government at a cost of $56,599.87.

Having received such declaration War Assets proceeded to dispose of these paintings in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The individual paintings were offered by the New York regional office and a total of 144 bids were received. These bids were opened at a public meeting and the successful bidders were selected in keeping with priority requirements. Since there were many bids or priority fair value claimants for each picture it was necessary to conduct a drawing among all priority claimants who had indicated a willingness to pay the fair value established by War Assets Administration or who had set a dollar limit at or above the established fair value.

As a result of this public drawing 11 educational institutions, 2 museums, and 1 public library were awarded a total of 112 of the 117 paintings at a discount of 95 percent of the established fair value of each painting on which they had bid.

Since neither bids nor priority claims at fair value were submitted on the remaining five paintings by educational and nonprofit institutions these paintings were awarded to the three highest veteran bidders. The acquisition cost of these five paintings to the United States Government amounted to $1,287.50 and their sale by War Assets Administration brought a return of $1,625.

After allowing the 95-percent discount to the afore-mentioned educational and

nonprofit institutions as provided for under WAA Regulation 14 the cash return received by War Assets Administration for the 117 paintings was $5,526.68. It should be pointed out, however, that if these paintings could have been sold to the highest bidder and not awarded to educational and nonprofit institutions at 95-percent discount of fair value the cash return to the United States Government would have been far greater than the $5,526.68.

Tears and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 8, 1949:

TEARS AND TAXES

The House of Commons was glum. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, a hard man and an honest man, had just presented the bill for the wonderful benefits His Majesty's Government were providing free to the people. The gentlemen gulped.

Said a Liberal member: "Taxation and tears." Said a Laborite: "Appalling." Said a Conservative: "Sobering."

The Labor Government, for whom Chancellor Cripps spoke, has promised the British people many gifts. Several basic industries, such as coal, have been nationalized so that their profits would belong to everybody. Food has been subsidized by the Government so it wouldn't cost so much in the grocery stores. Prices have been regulated. Medical care and other social services have been proffered to all. The full-blown welfare state where nobody has economic worries was just around the corner.

Now they were asked to look at the price of these gifts. It comes high. The profits from the nationalized industries proved largely illusionary. The social services cost more than anybody imagined. The food subsidies are eating the treasury out of house and home. The taxes on the rich, which run up to 97 cents on the dollar, proved not rich enough.

So there can be no reduction in anybody's income taxes. The Government will continue to take 45 percent and upward when taxable income of the worker passes the equivalent of $500. The retail sales taxes, which run up to 100 percent, will not be lowered. The Government will continue to limit wages.

Many taxes are to be raised. The Chancellor gave a list of excise levies, from telephone calls to match boxes, that will be boosted 50 to 100 percent.

British housewives are to have all this and price increases too. Food subsidies are becoming too costly even for a government that levies austerity taxes. Cheese and meat will go up 8 cents a pound; butter another 4 cents; many other items accordingly. It was either that or a still further $2,000,000,000 in taxes.

There was only one note of cheer. Sir Stafford could report that the Government managed to pay off $428,000,000 of its short-term debt. But that had to be done with United States dollars, from the cornucopia of ECA.

We aren't surprised that Sir Stafford's severest critics are his colleagues in the Labor Party. They would prefer not to tot up the cost. They wanted all promises and no pain.

Mayhap the British people will still want their socialized state, but it ought to be clear now that they cannot bring it forth without tears. Or in Sir Stafford's homely aphorism to the House: "We cannot have our cake and eat it."

An Illogical Deletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

AN ILLOGICAL DELETION

Beyond understanding is the action of the House Appropriations Committee in denying the request of the District Sesquicentennial Commission for $1,500,000 with which to carry out its mandate from Congress and the President. That mandate was implicit in the legislation creating the Commission. It was explicit in President Truman's statement to the Commission at its first meeting more than a year ago.

The President, speaking as a member of the Commission, set the pattern for the observance when he declared that the one hundred and fiftieth birthday anniversary of the National Capital is a matter of importance to all the citizens of the United States and a symbol to freedom-loving people everywhere. He called for a celebration next year in keeping with the high importance of the occasion. Under this authority, Commission officials have been making plans for what they hoped would be an adequate, but not extravagant, centennial program. In accordance with Mr. Truman's expressed wishes, all the States have been invited to participate. A national exposition, a pageant and similar events have been planned, with suitable temporary buildings to be erected in West Potomac Park. Only last week New York State appropriated $150,000 to finance its participation and created a 15-member commission to make preparations. Many other States have advised the District group of their desire to take part in the exposition and other phases of the program.

All of these preparations will be futile if Congress should fail to grant funds with which to plan and stage the Washington celebration. The Commission so far has been struggling along on a preliminary grant of $15,000. The Commission had asked for $3,000,000 additional as a minimum appropriation, but the budget provided for only half this amount. And now the House committee, without explanation, has knocked even this sum from the pending deficiency bill. Against the background of legislative and Presidential authorizations for the sesquicentennial, the deletion of the item does not make sense. The Star hopes that the Senate Appropriations Committee will restore the appropriation and that both Houses of Congress will go even further and grant the full amount sought by the Commission. Without adequate funds there can be no adequate observance—and an inadequate one would be a discredit to Washington and the Nation.

Slide Problems of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1949, on page A1888, my remarks were extended to include a well-considered discussion, by Capt. H. H. Little, on the Panama Canal sea-level project, published in the March 1949 issue of the proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers. That contribution presented a number of the most important features involved, which, I believe, had not been adequately covered in previous discussions, but dealt chiefly with operational and defense matters.

Recently another vital statement has been added to the symposium of views on the indicated subject. It was submitted by Prof. A. Casagrande, and relates to the engineering basis for the sea-level proposal, and is in the form of an elaboration of the "question of safe excavation slopes in the Cucaracha formation"—the geological feature, of sinister fame, and so well known in the building and operation of the Panama Canal. The same issue of the proceedings just named also carries Professor Casagrande's contribution.

This distinguished authority on geological subjects was first officially associated with the Panama Canal problem in 1940—the year after the third locks project was authorized; and again during the course of the studies made under Public law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress—acting as expert consultant in soil mechanics. He therefore speaks from the basis of his scientific background and experience. Currently, therefore, though stating that his previous opinions as to the stability of the Cucaracha slopes, upon which the sea-level plan was largely based, were the best that could be reached on the available evidence and knowledge then obtaining, Professor Casagrande now admits that some of the tacit assumptions upon which those opinions were grounded, are not tenable.

This recent discussion of the slide problem is of peculiar and important significance, as it represents—upon a further study—a vital change of viewpoint on the part of its author, from that held by him at the time of the formulation of the official report under Public Law 280. This present contribution by Professor Casagrande, and that of Captain Little, constitute valuable additions to the store of cumulative knowledge on this general subject, and merit careful study by all concerned.

All of which, I may suggest, further emphasizes the absolute importance of the most thorough, all-embracing, up-to-date, and objective studies before there are made final decisions touching the matter of increased or improved facilities at Panama.

Under leave granted, I am extending, as a part of these remarks, the indicated article by Professor Casagrande.

(By A. Casagrande, M. ASCE, professor of soil mechanics and foundation engineering Graduate School of Engineering, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.)

The prompt publication of the results of these comprehensive investigations is an invaluable service to the profession. Much of this work will also prove of great value to other engineering projects. In this discussion the writer wishes to elaborate on the question of safe excavation slopes in the Cucaracha formation, which is one of the topics in the seventh symposium paper, by Messrs. Binger and Thompson. The writer became acquainted with this problem officially in 1940; and, during the subsequent studies under Public Law No. 280 (79th Cong.), he concurred in the conclusions as to the slopes in the Cucaracha formation, believing at the time, and believing still that they are the best that could be reached on the available evidence and knowledge of the behavior of this material. It has been questioned during these investigations whether long-time effects may reduce the shear strength of the Cucaracha as a result of very slow swelling caused by reduction in load. This possibility received recognition in certain proposals by the special engineering division which were briefly as follows:

(a) Install telltale devices to observe movements of the Cucaracha and from these evaluate the action taking place and adopt corrective measures where called for.

(b) Undertake long-range field and laboratory studies of the long-time effects in the Cucaracha formation when project authorization is given by Congress. Until the sea-level canal would be opened to traffic, there would be a period of 10 years or more for such studies.

In the analysis of this problem it seemed agreed by all concerned, including the consultants, that with the proposed slopes forewarning of such slides as might occur would be given by observable evidences which would permit remedial action (unloading), and that it was unlikely that such slides would involve great quantities of material moving with rapidity into the Canal. Even if it is assumed that rapid movement would develop, the wide cross section of the Canal prism would admit a large volume of material without causing closure of the Canal to traffic.

Since the termination of the active studies by the Special Engineering Division in mid-1947, the writer has become increasingly concerned over the lack of knowledge of the long-time effects as they bear ultimately on the stability of the Cucaracha slopes.

Long-time effects influencing stability of slopes in Cucaracha: The Cucaracha clay shale is so difficult to test in the laboratory that the results of strength tests on this material have so far been of limited value. One was obliged, therefore, to rely on empirical rules derived from the behavior of the slopes and on the results of analytical studies of such slopes. Of special importance in these studies was the analysis of a model slope which has not failed, and of another slope which failed in 1907.

In figure 118[1] the cross sections through the Culebra slide areas are shown for three different dates, January 1912, July 1915, and March 1947. When comparing these profiles (together with numerous photographs and a detailed description of the slides contained in the report by the National Academy of Sciences[2] and in unpublished reports of the Panama Canal), one is struck by the extraordinary reduction in effective shear strength (that is, the average shearing resistance along the probable failure surface) which has gradually developed over many years. For example, in January 1912 the east Culebra slope, at the station shown in figure 118, had an effective shear strength of 42.8 pounds per square inch and the west slope, one of 29.9 pounds per square inch. Still higher values can be computed for earlier construction stages, since substantial sliding had already been taking place in 1911. By July 1915 the effective shear strength had dropped to 33.9 pounds per square inch and 18.6 pounds per square inch for the east and west sides, respectively. During the period since 1916 there has been no major slide. In 1940 the writer witnessed very slow movement toward the Canal along the banks of the west side which would indicate that the computed effective strength of 5.77 pounds per square inch would correspond to a factor of safety barely above 1.0. [Diagram omitted.]

Even if it is assumed that the early slides had already affected the clay shale as far as 1,000 feet inside the face of the slopes, it would be remarkable that the effective shear strength of such disturbed material would continue to drop in the course of 35 years quite gradually to about one-fifth or one-sixth of the value that governed the stability of the slopes in January 1912. However, the writer believes that in 1912 at least one-half of the mass bounded by the underlying Culebra and on the east and the west by faults, was not yet disturbed by the slides and that intermittently additional parts of the mass became involved in the movement. If the assumption is made that the strength characteristics of the undisturbed material have not considerably changed with time and that they are equal only to those governing the slopes in January 1912, then it can be shown that the mass should have come to rest with much steeper slopes than those existing today.

Based on the foregoing considerations the writer is forced to conclude that the strength not only of the disturbed material, but also of the undisturbed material, has been gradually and very substantially decreasing in the course of many years as a result of the reduction in normal stresses and the increase in shear stresses.

Many examples could be cited to show that in clay shales and still clays and substantial reduction in load due to excavation is followed by a long period of swelling. Whereas on this project the engineer's concern is the reduction in strength, the volume increase due to swelling is of importance in connection with several large earth-dam projects along the Missouri River where extensive deposits of clay shales form the foundations for the structures. For example, the Bearpaw shale at the Fort Peck spillway has been causing a continuous heaving of the spillway chute pavement with a maximum of about 2 feet since 1936, and the heaving is still progressing.

Whether the slow reduction in strength of the Cucaracha is caused by an ordinary swelling process which follows the theory of consolidation, or whether this reduction is the result of molecular adjustments to the reduced normal and increased shear stresses which gradually weaken the cohesive bonds without significant swelling of the entire mass, is a question that will require much research along the lines already contemplated before it can be answered. Such research should also answer the question whether measurable plastic deformations precede, for a considerable time, any major movement, a likely reaction for such a highly colloidal material. It may well be that by such observations the possibility of additional movements could be determined so far in advance that necessary flattening of a slope could be undertaken in time to prevent a slide. It is conceivable that slopes could be designed to be safe for a period of say, about 20 years, with the intention of flattening when the need is indicated by analysis of the observed deformations. Such a proposal is unorthodox, but it is what (for all practical purposes) has been done since about 1914 on the slopes, apparently without any special difficulty. If such an approach were followed in the design and construction of a new or improved canal, it would result in an earlier completion of the canal and would also have the advantage that additional flattening of slopes would be carried out only if, when, and where needed. The latter advantage is important because the stability characteristics of the Cucaracha seem to vary widely.

Comments on model slope and old slide used as criteria for undisturbed sheer strength: The presence of a layer of relatively strong and previous ash flow in the model slope indicates the possibility that the sequence of various layers is not identical with that in the Culebra slopes. Furthermore, even though the borings indicate layers of the soapy phase of the Cucaracha, it is not the mere presence of this material but its relative position to the stronger phases of the Cucaracha which determines the overall resistance to sliding. It is not difficult to conceive a distribution of strong and weak layers, or of faults and other irregularities, such as to interrupt a continuous shear surface through the soapy phase so effectively that the total resistance of this slope may be much greater than that of the Culebra slopes. If this slope had a real factor of safety very much greater than unity (which is a possibility), there would apparently be no rational basis for using this slope for derivation of those strength characteristics which govern much weaker slopes. However, for the purpose of the recent studies this procedure appeared to be the best that could be followed at that time.

In regard to the 100-foot cut that failed in 1907 with a slope believed to have been three vertical on two horizontal, the writer understands that the stability analysis of the slide checked the design criteria for a factor of safety of unity. If one takes into consideration the probable time effect, one is forced to the conclusion that, to begin with, this slope must have been very much weaker than the model slope which is still standing. In the writer's opinion the tacit assumption that for the purpose of analysis these slopes have similar strength characteristic is not tenable.

The Cucaracha clay-shale is so thoroughly slickensided that the usual differentiation between undisturbed and disturbed material can scarcely apply. Considering the extreme weakness of the finest-grained phases of the Cucaracha, and having in mind the rather rough topography of the Canal Zone, the writer is inclined to believe that some of the Cucaracha which has been affected by slides as a result of the construction of the Canal had been exposed to excessive shear deformations at some previous period and, therefore, must be considered as disturbed material. Whatever the causes of the slickensides, they represent disturbance of the material.

Many of the observed slides have moved slowly, showing only a small reduction in the effective shear strength before and after each movement. This condition is particularly significant when compared to the large difference between the maximum and residual (after failure) strength values obtained in all laboratory tests on Cucaracha because it makes it appear probable that the resistance of the banks to sliding had already the character of residual strength when the cuts were made. (This large difference was found both for the tests in the Canal Zone and for those made in the laboratory at Harvard University in Cambridge, Mass. The latter showed that the residual compressive

[1] Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal Under Public Law No. 280, 79th Cong., 1st sess., annex 4, fig. 6.

[2] Report of the Committee of the National Academy of Sciences on Panama Canal Slides, Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. XVII, Washington, D. C., 1924.

strength in all tests on Cucaracha was about one-half of the compressive strength, regardless of the time of loading.) [3] Adding to these observations the important time effects, the writer cannot escape the conclusion that the strength characteristics of the Cucaracha clay-shale are not similar to those that can be expressed by the Coulomb equation with constant c-values and ϕ-values. In addition, the basis on which these values were determined is open to objections.

Conclusion: Having thus critically reviewed the method of arriving at the slopes in the Cucaracha, the writer reiterates that the proposed design curve represents the best that could be accomplished with the tools and the knowledge available. The writer believes that the Special Engineering Division would not have been justified in spending more money on these investigations even if the necessary additional time had been available. However, as soon as construction of a new or improved canal is authorized by Congress, the additional investigations on the stability of slopes in Cucaracha should be carried out with special attention to the time effects. As recommended by the Special Engineering Division, it would then be necessary to explore and study thoroughly the materials in each slope, by additional exploratory borings as excavation of the slope progresses, with the purpose in mind that additional flattening of the slope will be undertaken if it is found that in any place the strength falls below expectations.

In addition, the writer recommends extensive observations on the pore-water pressures in the Cucaracha formation, and on the possibility of reducing these pressures by drainage measures (wells and tunnels) for the purpose of increasing the stability of slopes. The effect of time on the shear strength should be investigated also by long-time laboratory tests. Although this is a very difficult task, every effort should be made to bridge the large gap that now exists between the results of laboratory strength tests and the strength characteristics that govern the stability of slopes in the Cucaracha.

[3] Research on Stress Deformation and Strength Characteristics of Soils and Soft Rocks Under Transient Loading, Bull. No. 31, Soil Mechanics Series, Cambridge, Mass., June 1948.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act?

Let us take the history of labor-management relations between local 61 of the UAW-CIO and the Autopulse Corp., Ludington, Mich. The Autopulse Corp., after 7 years of fairly good labor relations with local 174, UAW-CIO, in Detroit, completely reversed its policy when it moved to Ludington, Mich., and began production in June 1947, the month the Taft-Hartley Act became law.

After firing workers who attended a union meeting November 26, the company vainly attempted to stop payment of unemployment compensation, and mailed vicious letters to each worker's home intended to induce him to vote no union in the representation election, March 30, 1948.

For 10 days prior to the election, plant meetings on company time and property were held, during which time workers were forced to shut off machines, stop work, and listen.

Workers were told that if they voted "no" it would be easy to get paid vacations, they would have steady work, and that if they voted "yes" immediate large lay-offs would follow, employees would be bossed by union big shots, and so forth.

A letter to employees March 19, 1948, from the corporation management contained this threat:

> If you are planning on a home, or have other reasons for wishing a steady income, why vote a mistake you may later regret?

Despite this campaign of attempted intimidation, the UAW-CIO Local 61 won the election and, after a costly strike, negotiated a contract now in effect.

But, to date, 14 months after the 28 employees were fired following attendance at a union meeting by 27 of them, the NLRB has not even set a hearing on the unfair-labor-practice charge.

Contrast this inaction with the short-order service rendered to employers by the Taft-Hartley NLRB general counsel and the Board itself.

By its failure to act in this and other instances of mass firings for union activity, the Taft-Hartley NLRB and the general counsel condone this method of smashing organizing efforts, particularly in the smaller plants.

Private Enterprise and the Western Printing and Lithographing Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in my own city of Racine, Wis. is located one of this country's leading printing and lithographic establishments. It is the perfect example of private initiative; the will of a few men in the beginning to develop and enlarge an idea by diligence and hard work until today this firm employes 2,116 employees and with branch plants at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, as a kid of 15 I well remember the time and the circumstances when this business came into being back in 1906. I did not then know its founder Mr. E. H. Wadewitz but as a "printers devil," I did know Mr. Roy A. Spencer who joined Mr. Wadewitz in 1907 and these two men were the spark plugs that have generated this great industry. I do not have the space to relate to full and complete story of the success of this business which rose from a very small beginning, after some discouraging setbacks, to a concern of outstanding national reputation. In 1948 this firm had its biggest year with a gain of 30 percent in sales over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, the Western Printing & Lithographing Co. has maintained the loyalty of its employees down through the years and this year at least 50 new members will become eligible for the 20-year club out of 2,116 employees.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will include a part of Mr. Wadewitz' annual report to the stockholders:

I hope that as the years go by and succeeding generations take hold of Western, that the principle of sharing profits with employees and giving generously to worthy charities will always rank of equal importance with the principle of paying dividends to stockholders.

It is interesting to all Westerners to take a look at the distribution of the Western sales dollars for the year 1948. This shows what actually happened to every dollar that the company collected during the year as a result of sales of its products and services to its customers.

The biggest portion of the dollar, or 69.9 percent went for wages and material. In other words, the company paid out almost 70 percent of the moneys it received for wages to the people who produced its work and for paper, ink, supplies, and material with which to produce that work. Expenses of doing business was the next biggest item, taking 7.2 percent of the sales dollar. This item was down from last year, in spite of the rising cost of doing business, due to the wider distribution of expenses over increasing sales. Next in line was taxes, which were higher than ever before in history in actual dollars and cents and took 6.7 percent of the sales dollar. Next in line was employee security and welfare (which included profit-sharing for production employees only, retirement, life insurance, hospitalization, and surgical insurance and other benefits) and this amounted to 4.9 percent of the sales dollar. Preferred- and common-stock dividends to stockholders during the year amounted to 1.8 percent of the dollar. Another 4.8 percent of the dollar, in the form of undivided surplus, was plowed back into the business as a necessity to finance our record 1948 sales. Revenue stamps for playing cards, which are purchased from the United States Government, represented 1.9 percent of the sales dollar. A reserve for contingencies, which is part of every intelligent business operation, required 1.6 percent of the sales dollar. And, finally, depreciation, which must always be charged off on aging equipment and facilities, took another 1.2 percent of every sales dollars.

Add all of these things together and you get 100 percent, or a full accounting of where and how every sales dollar received by the company was distributed in 1948. It indicates a fair return from the investment of the stockholders and a liberal share in profits, benefits and security for every Westerner.

Naturally, it takes a lot more sales in this day and age to produce the same dollar profits that were gained in former years. Material, labor, taxes, and expenses—the four biggest factors in the sales dollar—have all increased to a considerable degree and we must therefore promote and finance greater sales and produce more efficient work in order to assure even a modest profit in which all can share.

With special reference to the fact that employee benefits and security absorbed 4.9 percent of the sales dollar, as compared to only 1.8 percent paid out in the form of all dividends to stockholders, President Wadewitz had this to say:

"The question has often been asked me, 'Why doesn't the company pay larger cash dividends to stockholders, which are much less than the voluntary payments it makes to or for the benefit of employees, and the relatively large donations that are made each year by the company to charities and community welfare?'

"In 1948, we paid out 1.8 percent of our sales dollar in dividends. Voluntary payments to or for the benefit of employees amounted to considerably more than this figure. Donations were also a sizable item. I might go further than the voluntary payments referred to in the above question and include paid vacations and paid holidays, social security and unemployment insurance, which total a still higher sum. All told, in these categories, we spend almost three times as much as the amount we distribute in cash dividends to stockholders.

"I could even make the question stronger, by calling attention to the fact that last year we plowed back into the business earnings of 4.8 percent of our sales dollar, over and above dividends. I am sure, however, that we can all agree that profits left in the business make for job security and better jobs and more jobs, just as much as they add security and value to the stockholders' investment."

Here, then, is reiterated one of the effective long-term policies of the company, to plow back into the business a reasonable portion of the earnings each year, to help finance new sales and to assure production of more and better goods, in order to still return a fair profit. Here, too, is the advantage of the Western stockholder plan, whereby all stock in the company is held only by the employees or their nominees, with no individual owning more than 6 percent of the total stock. At the present time, there are 546 Western stockholders and they are all people with a direct interest in the company and the individual success of its employee personnel. They endorse the policy of putting earnings back into the business, to make all jobs better and more secure and to help spread the share of profits among the greatest possible number.

In commenting further on these policies, E. H. Wadewitz remarked: "Others may not agree with what we do here at Western but I feel that 41 years of steady growth is sufficient proof of the soundness of our policy. I feel that everything we do for our employees and for the cities in which we are located is all a part of our great American free-enterprise system as practiced at Western. I can only say to you stockholders, that the more of our profits we share with employees, the less Washington will impose on us. A sure return from bureaucracy to democracy would be provided by more companies doing the same thing as we do here. When the workman ceases to look to the politician for security, then we will be on our way back to the principles on which this country was built."

If we may be permitted a commentary at this point, we would say that in these remarks, the president of our company expresses abiding faith in the integrity of the type of American people who bear the name of Westerners. He places complete confidence in their ability to understand and appreciate the fact that in order to earn more, we must produce more and that there can be no sharing of profits unless profits are produced through conscientious work and efficient production. In this connection, Mr. Wadewitz added a note of caution:

"All of our ability and all our energies will be needed this year to meet the impact of an eager, jealous competition. As we grow bigger, more and more eyes look enviously at our markets and our products. So, to maintain our sales, job security for our employees, to protect our capital, and to assure the payments of dividends to stockholders, we must devote our unceasing energies to keeping Western on top."

This same thought was expressed by Messrs. Elmer G. Voigt, of Racine; Harold D. Spencer, of Poughkeepsie; and John M. Wolff, of St. Louis, each of whom addressed the stockholders' meeting at Racine. They emphasized the point that a real challenge was now presented to company employees in attempting to better the fine record of 1948 and each predicted a return to a strongly competitive condition in the industry which will call for the greatest ingenuity, hard work, and efficient production results in the future. They were confident, however, that proper teamwork, coupled with new equipment and facilities to produce a greater sales volume, would help the company to maintain its position of prominence and success.

E. H. Wadewitz, the man who started the Western organization on its way in a little basement print shop 41 years ago and whose social thinking throughout those 41 years has had so much to do with the establishment of present-day policies of the company, concluded his report on this optimistic note:

"I am happy to have been a part of this fine organization for so many years, to have played a part in its growth and to feel that its prosperity is being shared not only by a great body of employee stockholders but by every last employee of the company who has been with us for 6 months or more. I believe in Western—in Western policies—and in Western employees and stockholders. I believe we will set new records in 1949."

Mr. Speaker, here we have the American success story. Men with vision are directing this great industry; men who have been willing to share their success with their employees; men who have planned to provide security for their workers within the Western organization; men who are plowing back into the business a lot of money in order to maintain the leadership of this firm in its particular field; men above all who believe in the United States of America and the private enterprise system, the best on the face of this earth. Our hats are off to Western.

Remember Jefferson?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to submit a quotation from Thomas Jefferson, as follows:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money.

Queensview Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto from the New York Post Home News of Monday, March 7, 1949, an analysis of the Queensview housing project describing the new plan used in this enterprise. There is a vast need in the middle-income brackets for housing. Those of us who have been working for federally assisted public housing know that a balanced program must be carried out. The Queensview plan is an outstanding example of non-profit-cooperative housing to be built by private enterprise and a great service to families of moderate income who are too often neglected in today's building plans. It will be recalled that in the housing bill which I am sponsoring together with nine other Members of the House, H. R. 1973, an important title provides for direct loans of $3,000,000,000 to just such projects as this making even more of them possible.

NEW QUEENS CO-OP PROJECT WILL HOUSE 728 FAMILIES

(By Charles Abrams)

Here is an important announcement for those who need housing.

Fourteen eminent citizens have undertaken to build a cooperative housing project for 728 families. It is known as Queensview and I consider it one of the best housing opportunities in the New York City area. The tax exemption benefit should be more than enough to offset current high building costs and make the investment sound.

About 673 of the units are available. Applications will be closed after all the apartments have been sold, so I advise early investigation.

The sponsoring citizens are Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Howard C. Sheperd, president of the National City Bank, David Sarnoff of RCA, Bernard F. Gimbel, Gerard Swope, Mrs. Yorke Allen, Howard S. Cullman, Albert D. Lasker, the Very Reverend E. Roberts Moore, Louis H. Pink, Beardsley Ruml, G. Howland Shaw, Mrs. Mary K. Simkhovitch, and Thomas J. Watson, Jr., of International Business Machines. All are people experienced in housing or business. Alfred Rheinstein, former chairman of the city housing authority, may build the project.

The location is across the East River from about Seventy-ninth Street, 1 mile north of the Queensborough Bridge. The site is on 10¼ acres bounded by Thirty-third Road, Crescent Street, Thirty-fourth Avenue, and Twenty-first Street. Nearby will be one of the new self-supporting public housing projects, so that a whole new neighborhood of 16 square blocks will have been created when improvements are completed. The project will be 5 minutes from the IRT and BMT stations and 15 minutes in travel time from Manhattan.

The apartments will consist of 3½, 4½, and 5½ room units, each with 5 to 6 closets. The living room will be about 14 by 12½; the master bedroom about 11.1 by 15.9, another bedroom about 12 by 12, and the kitchen about 7 by 11. There will be two self-service elevators in each of the 14 buildings, community rooms, playgrounds, parking space, gardens and landscaping. The buildings

will be 14 stories each, built on only 13 percent of the site.

The average carrying charges and cash investment for the apartments are:

	3½ rooms (average)	4½ rooms (average)	5½ rooms (average)
Monthly carrying charges (rent)	$66	$76	$86
Development cost per apartment	9,550	12,100	14,550
Less mortgage allocation per apartment	7,450	9,550	11,650
Cash investment per apartment	2,100	2,550	2,900

The monthly carrying charges include gas and electricity, heat and hot water, all repairs, reserves, insurance, interest and amortization of the mortgage, and other contingencies, except redecoration and the replacement of ranges and refrigerators.

If you cannot afford to make the whole down payment at once, the National City Bank will make a 50-percent personal loan of the cash required, at 3.8 percent interest.

You get your money back if you change your mind before construction begins. Five hundred dollars must accompany each application together with $2.50 for credit investigation.

Occupancy will be ready about spring 1950.

Preference will be given first to veterans and persons with average annual incomes of $5,500 and under, but if you earn up to $6,950 you are eligible. In all other respects there is no discrimination of any kind.

The low charges are possible because:

1. New York City is giving a 25-year tax exemption on the improvements.

2. The Mutual Life Insurance Co. loan of $6,406,000 on the property is at 4 percent interest.

3. The sponsors are giving their services free.

4. The project will be conducted on a nonprofit basis.

5. The site will be acquired from the city at cost.

Applications are now being accepted at the offices of the Joint Queensview Housing Enterprise, 362 Fifth Avenue, Wisconsin 7-0500.

Is the Administration Fighting Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, after saving Russia during the war and then putting Stalin on his feet, the Nation was told that he and communism were planning to enslave the world; hence, for our own national security, we must "contain" communism and its influence, as personified by Stalin, within Russia and those countries now dominated by it.

In the effort to rehabilitate the war-torn countries and enable them to oppose communism, we gave or loaned them $23,783,000,000.

The ERP countries cover 23,162,999 square miles. In our country and its possessions there are 3,619,623 square miles—a ratio of 6⅓ to 1.

We and our possessions have a population of 142,098,454. The ERP countries have a population of 937,930,450, or 6½ to our 1.

If you are interested in comparing the per capita debt burden, as of 1946, of the individual in the countries to which we have extended aid, with our own, just note that the average debt burden upon each foreigner is $695, while your and my share of our debt is $1,830.

But that is not the whole story. To fight communism abroad and for additional Marshall plan money, the Congress is now appropriating another $5,550,000,000; will be asked for another one and one-half or two billion dollars to arm western Europe in support of the Atlantic Pact, which, from a practical standpoint, binds us to take part in any war in which any 1 of the 12 signatory nations becomes involved; and, for our own national defense, we are about to appropriate $15,000,000,000 for this year.

On top of the foregoing, veterans are asking for pensions; the present existing veterans' program may cost as much as $7,000,000,000 a year. Federal employees are insisting upon, and many of them getting, an increase in pay.

The national debt today exceeds $252,000,000,000, with an interest charge in excess of $5,000,000,000 a year.

And just remember that the national income is bound to be smaller unless the tax rate is increased, new taxes imposed. And who wants that?

IS THERE A BOTTOM TO THE BARREL?

A limit to what can be raised by taxation? Are we to continue to overspend until we wreck ourselves, create unemployment and bread lines?

One of the President's economic advisers is warning, as does Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, that we may spread ourselves so thin that we may in the end be unable to defend ourselves.

I vote to end this ruinous spending program, but am in the minority, as the record will show.

THE DOCTOR JEKYLL SIDE OF THE PICTURE

But the foregoing is the less unpleasant side of the picture.

During the past week, a Washington paper, quoting Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, as authority, stated that 88 undesirable employees of the State Department were released as the result of investigations carried on by a Congressional Committee of the Eightieth Congress, but that some have been rehired.

Last week, the same paper revealed that numerous former employees of the State Department, fired for loyalty reasons, are now on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization pay roll, which, it charged, and I quote, "has become a haven for Communists and their sympathizers booted out of United States Government jobs." That agency gets $3,000,000 annually of your tax money. Two of these former employees now receive a salary of $10,000 each.

The same publication further charged that 108 employees of the State Department had been ousted after being exposed as bad security risks. Twelve are now on the UNESCO pay roll.

But even worse, if that is possible, is the situation disclosed by the investigation of Robert E. Lee, former FBI official, who was in charge of investigations for a committee of the Eightieth Congress. As the result of his investigations, the State Department was forced to fire 64 homosexuals during the past year as bad security risks.

The Democratic Congress fired Lee's staff. The Republican minority has retained him, but, being in the minority, will have difficulty in giving him adequate assistance.

Why, when we spend billions abroad to "contain" communism; when we spend other billions because we fear Communists will overcome us; why, with a third world war by Communists threatening, did the last, and why does the present, administration furnish a harbor of refuge for Communists and homosexuals? If there is an answer, I do not know it.

Why court financial disaster; strip ourselves of national resources, send our youth to form a battle line on the eastern boundary of western Germany, committing ourselves to every war in Europe, while Communists and perverts find shelter and opportunity for treasonable action in the Federal Government?

God help us to prevent official political Washington becoming, if it is not already, another Sodom and Gomorrah.

Can Our Taxpayers Afford Such Waste?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting an article published in the Sun, Baltimore, on Tuesday, April 12, 1949, as follows:

HOOVER SAYS SERVICES PAD COST FIGURES—NOTES STARTLING WASTE, ASSERTS FUND REQUESTS ARE MILLIONS TOO HIGH

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Herbert Hoover testified today that the Army, Navy and Air Force were padding their money requests to Congress by millions of dollars. He also accused them of startling waste and extravagance.

The former President, appearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, cited an Air Force request for funds to build 910 family homes in Alaska costing $58,350 each.

He noted the Army wanted $100,000 each to modernize 102 M-26 tanks it doesn't even have.

Then, he said, there was a $30,000,000 clerical error in requesting $39,000,000 for 69 National Guard 155-millimeter howitzers which would actually cost only $9,000,000.

GOOD BOOKKEEPING URGED

And he submitted a report which declared:

"Applications (in the military budget) for hundreds of millions of dollars to retool industry should be examined with the greatest skepticism."

Hoover told the committee that what the Department of National Defense needed was a good bookkeeping system.

"At the present time," he said, "nobody can tell the cost of any particular function in the armed services."

Robert Patterson, former Secretary of War, following Hoover in the witness chair, told the Senators:

"It is no exaggeration to say that in World War II the cost in duplication, competition and disjointed effort directly traceable to the two-headed (Army-Navy) system ran to billions and billions."

BYRD CHARGES WASTE

Much of the public debt, Patterson said, is due to that division of authority and responsibility between the War Department and the Navy Department.

Hoover's testimony prompted Senator Byrd (Democrat, Virginia) to comment:

"The entire Military Establishment is permeated with waste and inefficiency."

But Hoover replied:

"Well, no one man is to blame, Senator. It's just that the system has grown up through the years until it's completely antiquated."

BYRD and Senator KNOWLAND (Republican, California) served notice they would demand a thorough overhauling of military budget practices after Hoover told the committee:

"It is difficult to escape the conclusion that some padding has been a fairly general practice."

UNITED STATES MIGHT LIVE ON "FAT"

The Senate group is studying changes in the law which combined the Army, Navy, and Air Force under a single department. Hoover was called to testify in the light of his knowledge as Chairman of the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization.

In submitting a report by one of his task forces, Hoover said the Federal Government now had about $27,000,000,000 in personal property, and he observed:

"We might be able to live on our fat for a while if we had it cataloged and knew where it was."

Among other things, the task force report said:

LACK ACCURATE KNOWLEDGE

"Our military budget system has broken down.

"Congress allocates billions without accurate knowledge as to why they are necessary and what they are being used for.

"The Army's original budgetary requests for 1950 included an item of $108,280,859 for 'tropical worsted uniforms,' which would purchase 838,000 uniforms at $129 apiece—enough for all the enlisted men in the Army, and then some.

"There was also an item of $213,519,000 for stock-piling of clothing and personal equipage, which would seem in part unnecessary unless vast amounts of surplus Army clothing accumulated during the war have been lost or dissipated."

The Hoover Commission urged appointment of three Assistant Secretaries of Defense to wipe out waste and inefficiency.

Voting Citizens' Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the March 28, 1949, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

CITIZENS' BUSINESS

When asked a few days ago whether he planned to return to politics, Jim Farley said:

"I've been interested in politics most of my life, and will be interested in it all of my life."

A great many good citizens worry a lot about the kind of men that are in politics. Maybe they should worry about those who aren't.

When nearly half the eligibles fail to vote and the President elected is short of 50 percent of those who do vote, the mandate he receives is less positive less impressive and less significant of the will of the people than a republic under universal suffrage is entitled to demand.

It is not necessary to agree with Jim Farley in political views to say that he is playing the part of a good citizen by taking an abiding and a permanent interest in politics.

The citizen who is indifferent to issues, and lets election day slide by without going to the polls, isn't entitled to much sympathy if the election result doesn't suit him, or is even positively injurious to him. He left unheeded the call to speak out now or forever after hold his peace when the result of any particular election in which he played slacker is being discussed.

Voting is citizens' business.

Extension of European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Economic Cooperation Act came before us during the last session of Congress I voted against it. It was a tough decision to make because my natural Christian instincts applaud any effort to alleviate misery and suffering. As some of you may know, the church of which I am the minister in New York City spends a large percentage of its budget annually for just that purpose—to alleviate misery and suffering. Back in the dismal thirties when people of this Nation were forced to walk through the valley of the shadow of a depression, it was my happy privilege to serve as the first director of relief for the community of Harlem, serving under Seward Prosser. I look back on the aftermath of World War I and for me the great thing that came out of that was the titanic job performed by Herbert Hoover in heading the Commission which rebuilt and fed Europe back to its feet. The American Friends Service Committee has quietly, in its Quaker way through the years, performed a monumental task in feeding the peoples of devastated areas. Nevertheless, I was against the Marshall plan in the Eightieth Congress and I must be against it now under the name of the Economic Cooperation Act.

As long as there is a Marshall plan there can be no successful United Nations Organization. For me, the crying need of our generation is a successful United Nations Organization. The Marshall plan is not a peace effort. The Marshall plan is a plan to build up the favored peoples of Europe, not for peace but to get them on their feet economically as quickly as possible so that they will be ready for another war and, we hope, as our allies. It also is a plan aimed at bolstering up our slipping domestic economy and again we hope by waving the flag of internationalism to cover up our serious sins of omission and commission on the home front.

There is absolutely no reason why the same ostensible objective of the ECA could not be accomplished through the United Nations Organization or if not, then through some organization such as the old Hoover Commission completely devoid of any of the overtones of warmongering.

As regards the problem of reconstructing in addition to feeding, may I ask what's happened to the World Bank? The World Bank was set up specifically for the exact purpose of nations to borrow money to reconstruct their economy. Mr. John J. McCloy sits in his office twiddling his thumbs with nothing to do while at his fingertips there are millions of dollars to lend. Just why then has this formula been forced upon us, and I use the word "forced" advisedly. Because of the pressure of hysteria built up by the instruments to control public opinion the Marshall plan has been forced upon not only the American people, but upon this Congress. I repeat, why? If the reconstruction of Europe had taken place through the processes of the World Bank, the money could not be controlled. That is, we could not be forcing upon Europe the surplus commodities of the United States, whether they wanted them or not; and we would not be putting our American capitalists in a position where they could bargain with European capitalists and enter into world monopoly and cartel arrangements.

I admit that the present bill before us, H. R. 3748, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, is not as bad a package as was presented to us a year ago on March 31, and then again for conference report on April 2. The iniquitous titles 2, 3, and 4 are not in this. There is no longer any question of aid to Greece, Turkey, and China, those repudiated and undemocratic countries. The question of military is not stated in the final act as it was when titles 3 and 4 were a part of it. Nevertheless, military aid is very specifically mentioned in the committee report of this Congress on page 19 as part of our general budget on international affairs and finance.

Now I am a pacifist and I must be against grouping the feeding and the reconstruction of Europe with military aid. So I am offering an amendment to make sure that there is no military aid in our European recovery program. I will go so far as to say that if this amendment is adopted, and it should be, even though I am not fully satisfied with the ECA, I will, nevertheless, vote for it. A year ago the war mongerers needed the one-package bill which included military aid. Today there is no need for that. We have thrown the Constitution out of the

window, we have signed the North Atlantic Pact and now we are not only entering into military alliance with Europe, we are not only going to take our already bankrupt Government and arm Europe but we have also taken away from the hands of the regularly designated body, the United States Senate, the power to declare war. The hour has arrived therefore for the good of America and European recovery to separate specifically the Marshall plan from military aid. If this is done, the atmosphere will be cleared up. The public will know that we really intend with this act to reconstruct Europe not reequip it for our battlefield.

In passing may I say that when the military-services budget comes before us it is my purpose to introduce an amendment which will state that none of the money for our military service shall go toward arming other nations.

Finally, I would like to say that somewhere along the line, since March 24, 1948, ECA has been cleaned up. I introduced an amendment then to strike out part of ECA which put America into the business of colonialism. It was defeated in the House, but in the final bill now that phrase is deleted (p. 89, sec. 115, subpar. 9) which would have put America into the business of colonialism.

It is also my purpose today to introduce an amendment which will prevent the Administrator of ECA from sending to Europe second-class goods—an amendment which will say that he can buy goods only where no discrimination is practiced. One such amendment was introduced a few weeks ago in connection with our Air Force bill and was defeated. Mark you, ladies and gentlemen, the very next day an order went down the line from the Pentagon instructing all purchasers not to buy any goods for the United States armed forces which came from individuals, firms, corporations, or partnerships that discriminated in employment. Now if we can do that for our armed forces, why should we not, above all, do that for goods which we are sending to Europe? Why send contaminated, damaged, second-class goods to Europe especially when we are striving to set up in Europe the maximum respect for our way of life. Any goods produced in a Jim-Crow factory are second class. If we are going to have a bipartisan foreign policy, we must stop our bipartisan Jim-Crow policy. They cannot succeed together.

Economic Chumps Act, American Variety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I opposed and voted against the so-called Economic Cooperation Act for several reasons, the most important being the refusal of proponents to effect a substantial reduction in this form of lavishing money on foreign countries.

This program constitutes one of the heaviest spending items in our budget and is therefore one of the heavy burdens on already over-burdened American taxpayers. There can be no question in the mind of any Member of Congress that economic conditions in this country do not justify a continuation of spending to the extent that we have indulged ourselves in recent years.

The admitted progress toward economic recovery, on the part of most of the nations now covered by the ECA tenet, made it a sane and reasonable undertaking to reduce the dollar aid to foreign lands and thus reduce the strain on the taxpayers of this Nation, whose ability to pay the bills, both at home and abroad, is steadily slipping. Amendments that would have pared even a comparatively meager $500,000,000 were beaten down—the American taxpayer must continue to pay through the nose.

Among other fair and reasonable amendments was one which would have provided that 20 percent of the moneys expended under this program must, in time, be returned to this country. But the passion for making multibillion dollar gifts blocked even this effort to introduce some semblance of business reason into this program.

Also rejected was an amendment that had for its purpose the withholding of aid to the Netherlands Government unless it halted the continuing rape and destruction of the Indonesian Republic. One member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, opposing this amendment, advanced the specious argument that fewer Indonesians had been slaughtered by the Dutch than American Indians had been killed in taking over the territory now comprising the United States. In other words, it is perfectly justifiable for the pot to call the kettle black if it suits the purpose of giving away money in Congress in the year 1949.

Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know how many American dollars, handed to foreign countries, are being used to finance the teas, assorted social brawls, and propaganda mills that are being operated in and around the various foreign embassies in Washington, particularly those which are the beneficiaries of the multibillion dollar handouts.

There is another little item in the so-called Economic Cooperation Act, 1949 style, which deserves at least passing attention. This provides for a guaranty to American investors in foreign countries that they will suffer no monetary loss on investments, earnings, or profits. It appears that an American dollar invested abroad and the owner of that dollar is destined to enjoy financial privileges not accorded to citizens who have money for investment purposes in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have yet to appropriate billions of dollars for the military defense of this country and for other operations of this Government. I intend to support every reasonable request of the armed forces in providing the weapons and supplies for the defense of this country. Therein lies our strength and the fulfillment of our first duty to the American people insofar as our foreign policy is concerned.

In terms of dollars, we should have authorized a substantially reduced ECA program that would have provided true, humanitarian relief and not a foreign WPA which will never have an end as long as tax dollars can be gouged from the American people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill, the great deviser of booby traps, has been eminently successful in his recent venture to these shores. Despite the much publicized austerity program, Churchill showed no signs of anemia. He looked well and he has done very well indeed, not only in behalf of his socialistic government—the handmaiden of communism—but in behalf of the other countries of Europe, whose markets the British will now proceed to capture.

And the gift of nearly another billion dollars to the British should enable that Government to make additional loans in the millions of dollars to Russia as well as expand the sale of locomotives, steel, and jet engines to the rulers of the Kremlin.

The Economic Cooperation Act, as approved by the House of Representatives, is misnamed. It should be labeled "Economic Chumps Act, American Variety."

United States Treasury and United States Markets Wide Open to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that our internationalists, interventionists, and one worlders have opened the Treasury to foreign nations, the next step is to open our markets to Britain. Under leave to extend heretofore granted I am inserting an article which appeared in the Sun, Baltimore, Tuesday morning, April 12, 1949, the title of the article is "United States Markets Lure Britain."

UNITED STATES MARKETS LURE BRITAIN—LONDON PLANS ALL-OUT SALES CAMPAIGN TO BOOST EXPORTS

(By Gerald Griffin)

LONDON, April 11.—Britain hopes to export $720,000,000 worth of goods to the United States and Canada in 1950, an increase of 30 percent over last year's total.

It proposes to tackle the job in an all-out sales drive, dividing the United States into four regions under trade consuls and business advisers and making use of marketing research and publicity campaigns.

TURNS FROM LUXURY MARKET

Instead of relying primarily on high-priced goods for the luxury market, as is the tendency now in many instances, Britain wants to reach wider sections of the American population who will buy lower-

priced products which still are of good quality.

These plans were outlined today to the House of Commons by Harold Wilson, president of the Board of Trade, who said the problem of exports to North America dominated all others this year.

Although the dollar gap has been narrowed, and is being met now by Marshall aid, he emphasized that in the next 2 or 3 years Britain must greatly increase exports to Canada and the United States if it is to become independent of European recovery program assistance without lowering its standard of living.

Wilson estimated that when the Marshall plan ends Britain should be exporting to Canada and the United States at a rate of £185,000,000 a year, based on mid-1948 prices. This is over 30 percent more than last year's total and more than double the 1947 figure, he noted.

NEEDED TO PAY FOR IMPORTS

Such a total is necessary if Britain is to be able to pay for American and Canadian products, such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which it needs to maintain its economy.

"The task of expanding our exports to North America," Wilson said, "is one of the greatest challenges in all our history to the merchant adventuring spirit of our traders."

"In detailing what the Government proposes to do," Wilson said, "regional offices for superintending trade consuls are being set up in New York, New Orleans, Chicago, and San Francisco."

"An experienced businessman," he said, "will be appointed as trade adviser to the trade consul in each region, and facilities will be provided for these officials to travel freely."

NECESSARY TO SPEND DOLLARS

Wilson said, "The Government recognized that it will be necessary to spend dollars in America to launch the vigorous selling methods and promised that dollar exchange will be allowed for such activities as market research, advertising, establishment of agencies, and the establishment of selling and servicing organizations.

"Financial help will be given to British exporters through the Government export credits guaranty department," he continued.

"We recognize," he remarked, "genuine risks and obstacles of the North American market have hitherto been too great for many exporters to pursue what would otherwise seem to them worth while new ventures.

"Therefore we encourage all exporters out to promote sales to North America, who are faced with special difficulties of this nature, to approach the export credits guaranty department for appropriate facilities."

COMPETITION RECOGNIZED

Largely because of competition offered by American goods it is recognized here that American markets are tough to penetrate, but it is emphasized on the other hand that no licensing restrictions are imposed on imports, that factors which count are price, quality, and service, and that British exports could be substantially increased and still would amount to only a small percentage of the total American consumption.

Wilson also announced to the House of Commons that British exports in March totaled £159,900,000, a new high mark which he placed at 162 percent of the 1938 level.

Imports also set a record in March, reflecting in part greater imports of industrial goods and materials, and the gap in visible trade accounts for the month was greater than in January and February.

Thomas Jefferson's Doctrine of Individual Freedom and Private Enterprise Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. H. CARL. ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, today our country will celebrate the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. "Tom" Jefferson was not only one of the greatest Americans of his time but his name enjoys an imperishable world renown, and it will always be spoken with reverence by those who exalt the majesty and freedom of the individual above the power of the state.

His individualism did not require the enhancement of adjectives, such as "rugged." It was his belief that a country is best governed which is least governed. He was first and foremost among the founders of the Republic who unreservedly embraced the principles of individual freedom and private enterprise, under which the young Nation of his time has since become one of the most powerful in the world.

That philosophy of life and government is still with us. The opening sentence of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946—being title II of the Research and Marketing Act—pays homage to Jefferson and the principles he espoused in the following language:

> The Congress hereby declares that a sound, efficient, and privately operated system for distributing and marketing agricultural products is essential to a prosperous agriculture.

This act authorizes "an integrated administration of all laws enacted by Congress to aid the distribution of agricultural products through market aids and services." One of the marketing aids for which Congress makes appropriations is that for the determination and certification of the condition—shrinkage or clean content—of wool for the benefit of wool growers having raw wool for marketing.

On January 14, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture announced by publication in the Federal Register his intention to establish the service described—the analysis of wool samples—to be done in a Government-owned, Government-operated laboratory. Mr. Speaker, I was at that time, as I am now, a member of the subcommittee having in charge the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. One of the privately owned laboratories, which has done a great deal of work in the analysis of wool samples, protested to me that they were being unjustifiably subjected to Government competition—that their laboratory was fully equipped and amply staffed to perform this work for the wool growers at a cost no greater, and possibly less, than it could be done by the Government.

At my instance, the subcommittee chairman was authorized to send a letter of protest to the Secretary of Agriculture, which halted, temporarily, the Department's proceedings. Ultimately, the Department was authorized to process the samples of the then current wool crop, but by the unanimous action of the House and Senate conferees, the Secretary was directed to explore thoroughly the possibilities of having the analysis work done for the Government under contract agreement by one or more of the privately owned laboratories.

The exploration indicated was carried on by the Department, and, while there were times when it seemed that an unwilling horse was being led to water, bids were sought and received and one of the bidding laboratories, namely, the United States Testing Co., of Hoboken, N. J., submitted a bid which was lower than the Department's estimate of the cost of having the work done by the Government.

I have been informed that today the Department will confer with the low bidder with a view to negotiating a contract for laboratory analysis of wool samples taken by the Government in connection with its wool-marketing work. It is, indeed, fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiation of this contract, which will have the effect of getting the Government out of a business which can as well be carried on by private enterprise, should begin on the birthday of the great advocate of individual freedom and private enterprise—Thomas Jefferson.

It is also refreshing to note, Mr. Speaker, that our subcommittee, in reporting out the Department of Agriculture bill for 1950, indicated its desire that the Department should, in expending the funds for carrying out the provisions of the Research and Marketing Act, use its contract authority to the fullest possible extent in preference to having the work done by Government personnel. This is but another declaration of the doctrine of free enterprise and, in my humble judgment, marks the path to continued prosperity and greatness as a nation.

Federal Housing Legislation and Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, when the United States Conference of Mayors met in Washington on March 22, the Honorable Dennis J. Roberts, mayor of the city of Providence, R. I., delivered an address entitled "Federal Housing Legislation and Cities." With the housing bill presently under consideration, I believe the mayor's address will be of interest to the Members of the Senate, and I desire to present it at this time and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most of you will agree with me, I think, that housing, traffic, and money are the

biggest post-war problems. At least, this is the case in Providence.

We have an old city. That means old dwellings and narrow streets—and big headaches.

We also have a conservative city, particularly in matters of money. Our general property tax rate has been held down to $25 a thousand, although last week I recommended to the people that it be increased about 15 percent as the best means of making ends meet these days.

In Providence we believe that careful planning is the first step toward making every tax dollar buy the most value for the city. We have done a lot of this since the war, and I believe that it will pay off handsomely in years to come.

That planning, of course, has covered our traffic problems. We are trying to get the State to build a modern express freeway across the city to drain off half the vehicles that now clog our downtown business district. As a first step in this direction, we ourselves are building, in the western end of the city an expressway which will be a key component of the over-all system. We are going to the legislature at this session with a bill to give the city full powers to develop an off-street parking program downtown.

We also have done a lot of planning as regards housing. That work now promises to pay off in the near future, when, as and if proposed Federal housing legislation is passed by Congress.

The Federal legislation I refer to is the bill known as Senate 1070, which is the 1949 version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for public housing and redevelopment.

I do not propose to discuss that bill with you. You already are familiar with its provisions.

What I want to do is to outline the basic ways in which the cities can avail themselves of the Federal money to be provided under that bill. Specifically, of course, I want to discuss with you what we have done in Providence to this end.

First. We have definite and detailed plans for housing developments.

Second. We have permissive legislation to enable them to undertake projects covered by S. 1070.

Third. We have money available.

These are the three basic steps a city must take in order to qualify for Federal money under the proposed Federal legislation.

These steps are absolutely essential. The Federal Government does not propose to plan programs for the cities, nor does it propose to carry out any programs. The Government will provide financial aid. But the cities must do the job.

Let's run over the actions we have taken in Providence to qualify under S. 1070.

First. Planning: Right after the war we did a comprehensive survey of housing requirements in Providence, particularly as regards veterans and their families, who were clearly entitled to first consideration in planning a housing program.

From this we derived much basic information about the size of the need and the rentals people could afford. Acting on this information, we went ahead with a city-financed middle-rental housing development for veterans. This is now nearing completion, and I shall have a word to say about it later.

Our full-fledged redevelopment agency also was set up after the war. This organization, working closely with our city plan commission, has dug deep into the housing problem and has come up with some excellent answers.

We have in Providence about 900 acres of vacant land which is considered suitable for housing development.

Another 300 acres of blighted area should be cleared and converted to good, modern housing. Some 150 acres of blight we plan to clear and convert to industrial use.

That is the broad picture. Now, here is what we have done so far in drawing specific plans for housing developments:

Of the 900 acres of vacant land, we already have earmarked 350 for development along carefully planned lines. These 350 acres comprise a total of 19 sites on which we expect to build housing for some 4,000 families.

Eight of these sites have been recommended for private development to produce 1,800 single-family garden-apartment and in-town apartment units. By July 1, we will have necessary information about two of these sites in final shape to enter definite negotiations with private capital to build the planned types of dwellings.

Four of the 19 sites are programed for middle-rental public housing, to take care of some 1,500 families. The first of these is Valley View, the fine veterans' development I mentioned earlier. In the near future 256 families will move into Valley View, and their monthly rentals will prove the soundness of our planning.

Our postwar housing survey showed that the average amount veterans could pay was $45 a month. The Providence Housing Authority, which is building and will operate Valley View for the city, drew its plans and set its sights on that target of $45 a month.

The development, as I said, is nearing completion and we are now able to figure where we are coming out financially. Ten days ago, the Housing Authority informed me that the average monthly rental for Valley View would be, not $45, but $45.85.

Thus, we overshot the target by 85 cents.

But I think you will agree that is not bad planning on a development involving nearly $2,850,000.

All of that money is city funds, as I told you, which we secured through bond issues, without waiting for the Federal Government or anybody else to come along to help us.

The plan is to mortgage Valley View to the local banks for some $1,600,000. This mortgage money will be used to make a start on a second development similar to Valley View. That second one will then be mortgaged, we expect, to provide the springboard for a third development of this type.

Finally, we have programed 7 of the 19 vacant-land sites for low-rent public housing to take care of some 1,500 families.

Two of these seven sites were purchased and cleared by the Providence Housing Authority before the war, following completion of two other developments which are being successfully operated today. Plans and specifications to house 398 families actually were drawn. Bids, however, exceeded the Federal funds available under the law at that time. Both developments thus were shelved in 1941.

But we still have those plans and they can be put out to bid again in a matter of a few days. This gives us two projects qualified for Federal money in the low-rental field as soon as S. 1070 becomes law.

We come now to the second main qualification for Federal housing aid—the matter of legislation. I do not want to go into details on this, since the specific provisions of the law should probably be tailored to the special needs and situations of each State and city.

There are, however, three fundamental provisions we have incorporated into our redevelopment act, which I suggest to you are essential if legislation is to give proper powers to your city.

The first is provision for setting up a full-fledged redevelopment agency, adequately staffed and charged with the duty of planning and executing redevelopment programs. Unless you do this, you are inviting inertia. The New York law, for example, merely provides that a corporation may be formed for redevelopment purposes—and that leaves the cities in the position of having to find somebody willing to form such a corporation.

Some legislation designates the local housing authority as the agency for redevelopment. This is all right as far as housing goes. But there are obvious shortcomings involved when you start thinking in terms of having a housing authority handle redevelopment of industrial areas.

If, on the other hand, you have a full-fledged redevelopment agency, you have somebody who is not only empowered but is directed to carry the ball and get things done.

Let me suggest, also, that enabling legislation should be broad enough to cover redevelopment not only of blighted areas but also of arrested subdivisions. We have this provision in our law and feel it will have important results as we go along. This type of provision, incidentally, was not in the old TEW bill, but is included in S. 1070.

Finally, I would suggest that every redevelopment act should contain a provision that is, I believe, contained only in the law under which we operate in Providence. This provision enables us not only to take property by eminent domain and write down the land costs; it also permits us to grant tax freezes that make it attractive for private capital to enter the middle-rental housing field in much the same manner that limited-dividend housing has been handled in New York City.

Third of the fundamental ways in which cities must qualify for aid under S. 1070 is the matter of money.

The money is essential because the Federal Government is willing to go two-thirds of the way in financing redevelopment, but not all the way. The cities must have the other third of the cost available before the Government will put up a penny.

By cost I mean the loss to be expected from transactions in which the city buys land at market prices and resells it at a lower figure to attract private capital, which is the typical pattern of a redevelopment operation.

Federal loans to finance redevelopment programs would be available under S. 1070, providing, of course, that a city qualifies properly in planning and legislation groundwork. But the Government expects to be paid back most of the face of these loans from the proceeds of land sales to private capital.

What it does not get back is the loss, and the Federal Government will foot two-thirds of this. However, before any Federal loans are made the city must have on hand enough money to pay the other one-third of the loss.

In Providence we have a revolving fund of $2,000,000 available for this phase of redevelopment. Issue of bonds in this amount was authorized by the voters at the last election for this specific purpose.

Here is the way in which the financing will work: Suppose we undertake a project which involves purchase of land for $1,000,000 and resale to private interests at a price of $700,000.

The city suffers a loss of $300,000. Of this, the Federal Government pays $200,000 and the city $100,000, taking from the redevelopment fund.

Obviously, on a 2-to-1 basis, we can make that $2,000,000 do the work of $6,000,000 with Federal help. Before we have lost that $6,000,000, we should have done perhaps fifty or even one hundred million dollars' worth of redevelopment in Providence—depending on the extent to which we have to write down land values to attract private capital.

There, in broad outline, is the redevelopment picture as we see it in Providence. We look forward eagerly to the enactment of S. 1070, which will enable us to really get our housing and redevelopment plans rolling toward physical reality.

We are in a good position to take immediate advantage of the new law for just one reason—we have worked hard and planned hard to get Providence ready.

One reason we have taken these steps of planning, legislation, and financing is that

it looked for a while as if Federal aid might not be forthcoming. We were resolved to go ahead with housing as fast as we could and as far as we could with our own money, limited as it is.

But even with the best will in the world, no city today can fully finance a proper housing program of its own. At least, I do not know of any major city that can afford such an outlay in these times of tight budgets.

Therefore, passage of S. 1070 with its Federal aid is essential if the cities are to give their people the kind of dwellings to which every American is entitled.

But, as I have outlined to you this afternoon, mere passage of the bill by Congress is not enough. You and I in the cities must organize to qualify for Federal aid.

The cities must develop sound and detailed plans, secure adequate enabling legislation, and must make available sufficient funds before Uncle Sam will put up a dime.

Naturally, those requirements are set up for the sole purpose of insuring the success of redevelopment projects. In Providence we welcome the challenge of meeting high standards like that.

We know that when we have laid the foundations right and have the Federal money to build on those solid foundations redevelopment will succeed and will be an incalculable benefit to the city.

On the public housing side also we are well prepared. Our housing authority is experienced in nearly 10 years of operating the two developments we built before the war.

It is acquiring postwar building experience at Valley View, our fine new middle-rental development for veterans.

It has plans ready to put out for bids under the public housing provisions of S. 1070.

In closing let me emphasize to you that we are making an across-the-board attack on the housing problem in Providence. We are doing this through close and active teamwork between the Housing Authority, the Redevelopment Agency, and the city-plan commission.

The Providence housing program is aimed at meeting the needs of all income groups, and I hope that within a comparatively few years we will have achieved this all-important goal.

Thank you.

Economic Consequences of British Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an address entitled "The Economic Consequences of British Socialism," delivered by Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the Economist of London, before the Economic Club of New York at New York City on Wednesday, January 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF BRITISH SOCIALISM

We are witnessing, in our times and within our own democracies, a great struggle of ideas. Western industrial civilization, as we know it, grew up under the domination of a system of ideas that we now call those of the right. It was a system of ideas that exalted material progress and production, and under it more wealth has been created than was ever before imagined. But it was also a system that took little notice of the miseries and the injustices that were the price of its progress. We have therefore in the last generation seen the rise of the opposite doctrines of the left, which exalt the security and social welfare of the individual, even at the cost of economic efficiency and the maximum creation of wealth. This is one of the great antitheses of our time, which reappears in innumerable guises. It is the antithesis between progress and security, between the efficiency of the economic system and its equity. It is the contrast between the gospel of work and the endowment of leisure, between the premium that our fathers put upon thrift and the stimulus that the present age gives to consumption. It is the conflict between Samuel Smiles and Karl Marx.

I do not believe that any of us can afford to be fundamentalists in this conflict. Life would be easier if one could say that one order of ideals is wholly right and the other wholly wrong. But I do not think it is so. We cannot simply go back to the nineteenth century. There is far too much of the logic of the twentieth century in the ideas of the left for it to be possible to sweep them aside. I am one of those who think that the movement to the left of the last 20 years has gone too far and that, if we are to hold to the course that history has set us, the time is due for a tack to the right. But there must be both elements in our twentieth-century society, and we shall spend the rest of our lives learning how they can be trained to double harness.

Of this great antithesis, the issue of the public ownership of industry, which I have been discussing with you, is only one of the manifestations. Indeed, it is not even one of the more important, for what are fundamental are the ideas and the aspirations of the left, not the particular piece of social mechanism through which they show themselves. I dislike the discount at which the present Government of my country values such things as enterprise, efficiency, and thrift. But the move to socialize industry is not the cause of this discount, it is one of its effects. If, therefore, you look upon socialism as an exotic disease, like typhus or beri-beri, the symptoms of which it may be interesting to have described by a visiting traveler, but which can be kept out of your own country by quarantine regulations at the ports, I submit you are making a great mistake. For one thing, it is not a disease, but a perfectly legitimate and responsible movement of human thought. And for another, though the manifestations of it may be different in different countries, it is a tendency that is present, in this twentieth century, everywhere where men are free to think. Or do you perhaps believe that enterprise and efficiency and hard work and thrift are not under attack in your own country?

I said "under attack," but that is the wrong word, for it suggests a battle. And this issue of right and left is not a battle that can be won by either one killing the other. It is rather a problem that has to be resolved by the mating of the one with the other and the birth of offspring that takes something from each but has its own life.

But there is a battle in the world today, a real battle to the death. It often appears in the disguise of a battle between different systems of economics. But that is a trap set by the enemy and designed to foster unnecessary quarrels in the ranks of those who oppose him. If the main difference between the Soviet system and our own were simply that they believed in the public ownership of industry and we did not, we could agree to differ and each mind his own business. But we know that is not what is at issue. It is human liberty that we cannot agree to differ about. It is not the public ownership of industry that we fear, but tyranny and the military aggression that follows in its wake. What divides us from the Soviets is not their views on the matters I have been discussing, but their views on my right to discuss them.

I have sometimes heard the argument in this country that, since communism means a complete loss of liberty, every Socialist experiment must mean some loss of liberty. That seems to me to be poor logic—unless you are prepared to admit that the American public-school system, the United States Post Office, the State banking commissions, and the Maritime Commission are all of them limbs of tyranny. Certainly nobody in England thinks the basic liberties are endangered by the Socialist experiments we have had. All of them will be submitted, within 18 months at most from now, to an election that will be as free—and, I would add, as unpredictable, as anywhere in the world.

Democracy, after all, is a system of trial and error. Perhaps all systems of government are that, but only democracy provides deliberate opportunities for the correction of error. If there be error in the Socialist experiments it will be corrected.

The lawyers have a doctrine of uberrima fides. I am no lawyer and perhaps I misconstrue it. But as I understand it the doctrine is that, within a jurisdiction, every court must accord the utmost faith to the acts of every other court. However queer and misguided the other court's decisions may seem to be, they must be accorded the utmost faith that all will turn out for the best. I suggest that we might do worse than evolve a doctrine of uberrima fides between free democracies. If you believe in democracy, you believe that it puts its errors right in the end. This experiment has not yet appeared before the court of first instance. Let us suppose that the American people were to elect to office an administration pledged to experiments of a novel and, as many people thought, dangerous kind, and suppose that that administration were reelected—I am only supposing—to a second, a third, a fourth and even a fifth term of office. Would you then despair of the Republic?

We think we know about as much about the practice of democracy as you do. Indeed, some people think you got the idea from us in the first place. I ask you to believe that what is proved to be error in the present Socialist experiments will be washed away, and that what is good will add one more stone to that great edifice of human achievement that we call the society of freemen.

Israel and American Citizens of Jewish Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to the Attorney General from Norman Buckner, of Pontiac, Mich., which raises an interesting question relative to a possible political link between the Government of the State of Israel and American citizens

of Jewish faith who are members of the World Zionist Organization:

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

The HONORABLE THOMAS CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

I

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the course of some correspondence with the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, former Under Secretary of State, I had occasion to refer to a possible, direct, political link between the Government of the State of Israel and the World Zionist Organization. Inasmuch as the various branches of the Zionist movement in the United States are all constituent members of the World Zionist Organization, the possibility exists that these several American Zionist parties are also linked, politically and directly, to the Government of the State of Isreal.

If upon proper examination these possibilities should develop to be realities, many American nationals of Jewish faith would, innocently, find themselves in the embarrassing and undesirable status of being agents of a foreign government. For, as you know, these Zionist parties carry on political activity and propaganda campaigns designed to affect the official position and actions of the Government of the United States in our relations with the State of Israel.

Although I did not write Mr. Lovettt on this matter in any detail, having made only a casual reference to it, Mr. Lovett suggested that properly, this was a subject to be presented to you and your Department.

Because of the potentially serious consequences to 5,000,000 of my fellow Americans of Jewish faith and, indeed, to the United States itself, I take the liberty of putting before you, in some detail, certain facts pertinent to the possibility of this political linkage.

If the evidence herewith set out, in even this superficial manner, seems to warrant your further investigation, I sincerely hope that you will explore the relationship between the World Zionist Organization, the State of Israel, the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the several American Zionist parties. If such a further exploration does seem warranted, I would be very glad to be of any further service that you might think it possible for me to provide.

II

These are the facts in the situation, with such documentation as I have at hand.

The September 1, 1948, issue of the official publication of the Zionist Organization of America, Spot News indicates that the question of political separation of the Zionist movement from the Government of Israel involved Zionists in a protracted discussion.

It is clear, to begin with, that there was formidable support for political linkage. Among those who supported such an organic political relationship was Napai, the party of Mr. Ben-Gurion and the strongest party in the government of Israel, as a result of the elections of January 25, 1949.

This official publication reports the proceedings of the meetings of the World Zionist Organization's Actions Committee (highest policy-making body of the World Zionist movement) held in Israel last summer.

The most important item on the agenda of those meetings was the discussion as to whether the Zionist movement should or should not be separated from the (then) provisional government of the State of Israel.

Mr. Ben-Gurion's viewpoint in favor of political linkage is corroborated in a dispatch credited to Palcor.

Similarly, Mr. Gruenbaum, a member of the Government of Israel, expresses his support of the policy of political attachment.

The importance of these reports is self-evident. Whether political separation is a legal fact, or not (and evidence will be adduced following to make an answer to that question, problematical, at least) the fact is that there were and are—in the Israel Government, powerful forces which believed in and fought for an organic, political alliance between the Zionist movement and the government of Israel.

The debate over this highly important policy seems to have been resolved in a compromise, the implications of which are extremely ambiguous. The specific nature of this compromise is reported in the September 8 issue of Spot News.

The precise nature of Mr. Kaplan's liaison rights and responsibilities are not here detailed. But that, in some measure, the important principle of political separation was not observed may be gathered from public statements, credited to or quoted directly from people in authority in either the Government of Israel or one or another party of the American Zionist movement.

1. Mr. Ben-Gurion is quoted in the Jewish Morning Journal of September 26, 1948, as follows:

"Our conversation then turned to the last meeting of the Zionist Actions Committee, at which the question of the relationship between the State of Israel and the people of Israel was so passionately discussed.

" 'It is a gratifying fact,' said Ben-Gurion, 'that the opinions of some of the American Zionist leaders concerning the separation of the Jewish State from the Jewish people was not adopted by the majority. Neither was the plan to transfer the center of Zionism adopted. Jerusalem remains the center of the Zionist movement, and the Jewish State will give its powerful support to it everywhere.' "

2. On September 10, 1948, Mr. Baruch Zuckerman, president of the American Labor Zionist Organization, is reported by the New York Times, as follows:

"ZIONIST SEPARATION LOST; ZUCKERMAN SAYS PRINCIPLE WAS DEFEATED IN TEL AVIV

"Baruch Zuckerman, president of the American Labor Zionist Organization and member of the World Zionist Executive, said last night that the American General Zionist delegates at the recent meeting of the World Zionist Actions Committee in Tel Aviv, Palestine, were not able to establish the principle of separation between the World Zionist Movement and the State of Israel.

"Speaking at a meeting of the Labor Zionist Movement in the Pennsylvania Hotel, Mr. Zuckerman declared that the American General Zionists had attempted to separate the World Zionist Movement from Israel by suggesting that Israeli citizens should not be members of the World Zionist Organization. He asserted that the Labor Zionists fought this proposal on the ground that Jews in any land share equal rights and privileges and said that this position triumphed because Finance Minister Eliezer Kaplan remains a member of the World Zionist Executive."

3. On January 17, 1949, Mr. Moshe Shertok is reported by Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times, to have said:

"We are a state and also a world people, and that gives us special international obligations."

4. Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America declared to the last annual convention of that body, in his presidential message:

"For an unspecified period we shall still have to be concerned with political affairs, though in a different and more limited sense than in the past. To be sure, the immediate struggle is by no means over; but assuming that a full and satisfactory settlement will now be reached, the position of the young Republic of Israel will be such, that it will need friends and the favor of public opinion. It will continue to be surrounded by Arab states and will have a substantial Arab minority within its own borders. Difficult problems may arise in its internal and external relations.

"It will then be necessary for appropriate agreements to be worked out between the World Zionist Organization and the Government of Israel regulating the manner and procedures by which we will assist and cooperate in clearly defined areas and under such rules and regulations as the Government of Israel may properly prescribe."

5. On November 14, 1948, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish agency declared in Boston:

"The anti-Zionist, if he persists in his agitation, will no longer be fighting an idea or a movement, but an established state. He will be endangering the security of a legally constituted state which is recognized by his own country."

6. Zionist adherence to this basic principle of political discipline from the Government of Israel was admitted in an article in the New Palestine (official publication of the Zionist Organization of America), as early as June 11, 1948, in an article, a portion of which reads as follows:

"From the minute a Jewish state was proclaimed, we are constrained from undertaking any political action in regard to Israel without the approval of the Jewish state."

7. On January 31, Mr. Ben-Gurion, according to a New York Times dispatch on February 1, 1949, said:

"We must save the remnants of Israel in the Diaspora (the dispersion of the Jews outside Palestine). We must also save their possessions. Without these two things we shall not build up this country."

If all of these statements are not legal proof of political attachment of the Zionist movement and the Government of Israel, there is then either a careless or a deliberate plan, in which members of that Government and American Zionists together use language and claim authority involving all Jews, which is highly misleading and dangerous.

III

Finally, more than language is involved in the actual practice of the several American Zionist organizations. Even a casual reading of the September 1, 1948, issue of Spot News indicates that the Zionist movement is operating as an agent serving the national functions and interests of a foreign state.

Some of those national functions of the State of Israel, being performed by Zionists, as agents of that state are:

1. Participation in determining the immigration policy of Israel.

(a) This includes active campaigns to enlist and train American boys and girls of Jewish faith for citizenship in Israel.

2. Participation in the national economy of Israel by promoting the investment of capital in that state (both public and private capital) and by promoting sales of Israeli products.

3. Active participation in "the development of Jerusalem" and in "questions concerning Jerusalem."

4. Mobilization and control of funds for banks in Israel.

5. Cooperation with the educational system of Israel in the promotion of education and cultural activities (Israeli?) "the world over."

IV

Considerably more evidence can be adduced. But I have already burdened you with too long a memorandum.

I sincerely hope, however, that this assembling of a few of the available facts may lead you to have the Department of Justice thoroughly and objectively investigate this situation.

Many Americans of Jewish faith—and of other faiths, resent this intervention in our

national life of this Zionist-Israeli-nationalism.

Many Americans of Jewish faith could be saved from innocently contributing to or participating in these programs of a foreign nationalism, if, upon investigation, it were learned that the Zionist parties in America were, in fact, agents of a foreign principal and were compelled to comply to the requirements set forth for such agents by the laws of the United States.

Renewing my assurances of a desire to be of any further assistance possible, I am

Respectfully yours,

NORMAN BUCKNER.

PONTIAC, MICH.

Improvement of Humboldt Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial appearing March 4, 1949, in the Humboldt Times of Eureka, Calif., regarding the necessity for the improvement of Humboldt Bay:

INERTIA IN PORT PROJECT

During the last 3 years there has been a vast amount of study and talk devoted to the matter of improvement to Humboldt Bay, particularly with respect to the bar and the principal channels of the harbor. But as the months go by with nothing happening other than the initiation of new studies and continuation of the talk, we must wonder if the situation is not held in the grip of inertia which may indefinitely postpone the needed work.

In analyzing the situation, it is to be borne in mind that there has been no extensive improvement work conducted in the local harbor since before the start of World War II. The postponement of such work during the war period was understandable, since the war effort demanded concentration on other projects and since ocean-borne shipping more or less at a standstill from all but the major ports during the span of hostilities. It is not so easy to dismiss the delay that characterized the postwar period, when facilities are again free for the purpose and as the smaller ports attempt to regain at least a portion of their prewar shipping.

Apropos of the situation, the Eureka Chamber of Commerce recently forwarded a letter to Congressman HUBERT B. SCUDDER outlining the problem in its general aspects and commenting on the apparent lethargy that has held up the project to date.

Among other things, it was pointed out that not long ago a Federal representative was sent to Eureka to make a study of the latest developments in the situation, in connection with the final report now being prepared for submission to Washington. The letter points out that "after spending 3 days here I am afraid that he was of the same opinion as before coming—namely that there still was not enough shipping to justify the expense."

To that response, the chamber directs attention to a pithy observation by Supervisor George Cole, who points out that deepening of the channels and improvement of the harbor must come first before we can expect any substantial increase in the volume of commerce from the port.

These two statements would, indeed, appear to symbolize the thinking on the part of the interests concerned, the Federal agency on the one hand and the local harbor interests on the other. The attitude of the Federal representative would seem to infer that improvement is to be postponed until the port regains its former status—a condition that, as noted by Supervisor Cole, is unlikely until ships can enter and move about in complete safety.

As a matter of fact, the port at present is being passed up by deep-water craft for the simple reason that they cannot operate in the shoaled-up channels. As a case in point, the big new tankers of the oil companies cannot be sent here with a full load, an uneconomical procedure.

In the letter the chamber advises Congressman SCUDDER that "the people of Humboldt Bay area will be indebted to you if you can work out a plan that will break loose the dormant status quo and set the United States engineers on the right course with reference to the * * * project." Undoubtedly the people, for whom the chamber is speaking, concur most heartily in this expression.

Prejudices in Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, we have in our city a writer of a daily column. It appears in the Miami Herald. His discerning, humane, and able attributes have made of him sort of an institution, admired and respected by his fellow townsmen. This man has experienced more of life's problems and pleasures than have most of us. He has traveled all over the world many times. He has associated with those in high positions as well as those in low, and by reason of his broad experience, his understanding of human nature is equal to that of anyone I have ever known. He is a real liberal, for he protects and cherishes individual rights and liberties. He is not fooled by false liberals who advocate State control and statism. His name is Jack Bell, and I am happy to be counted as one of his many friends.

Just the other day he wrote a little story about the problem of the races getting along with each other. It was so true, down to earth and practical, I thought it would be of interest as well as of instruction to those who would read it. I attach it to these remarks and recommend it to all.

THE TOWN CRIER

(By Jack Bell)

YWCA stages its third annual festival of nations at 7:30 tonight and Saturday night in the bandshell in Bayfront Park. Fourteen groups will participate: Armenians, Poles, Czechs, Italians, Filipinos, Swedes, Ukrainians Lithuanians, Greeks, Rumanians, Hungarians, British, a Latin-American club act representing eight nations, and an American square-dance group.

It's a highly colorful show in native costumes with native dancing and singing. It's free except for a collection that goes to YWCA work in war-torn nations. Miss Kay Laverty's in charge for YW.

COLLEGIANS DISAGREE

A group of students from University of Miami came in, seeking views on human rights. Next morning I spoke to a class at Miami Jackson High School, gathered to discuss human relations.

The high-school students weren't opinionated. They were searching for truth. The college folks are certain their conception of what's best must not be questioned.

They agreed it's unfair that Negro men are kept at unskilled trades regardless of ability, and deprived of union rights. But they disagreed when I said Negro women do quite well.

A position at $30 a week, no social-security deductions, food and lodging—figure that up. Most skilled white girls in offices don't do that well.

When I said I do not think Negroes should go into white neighborhoods to build homes, and vice versa, their reaction was violently opposite. They sincerely believe, quote the Bill of Rights as authority, and they're right.

DIFFERENT MAKE-UPS

But I still don't think it a good idea. The social and cultural make-up of white and Negro people in the United States aren't yet alike enough for unrestrained community mingling.

The Negroes are more spontaneous, musical, carefree and talkative. A Negro family in a white community would be bored to death, even assuming the whites had no prejudice.

These facts are plain, and it doesn't pay to ignore them. Yes, every man has equal rights under the Christian code we profess to follow, but don't. We might as well say everybody should be motivated by Jesus and thus end wars. It's true, but the whole Christian world has been seething with war since 1914. We've even drawn the heathen nations into it.

RELIGIOUS HATREDS

Think this over. Usually your best friends don't live next door, or across the street. One lives at Miami Beach, another in Coconut Grove and so on. There's nothing wrong with the guy next door. It's just that you know others with whom you're more congenial.

When we were kids on the farm we were ostracized because we were Irish and Mother was a Catholic. So we were forced to go elsewhere for social and cultural contacts. In later years we were invited to visit our neighbors—and found we hadn't been missing anything. They weren't much fun.

The Hurricane students were interested in minority groups, and racial, but not religious hatreds.

Well durn it, the Croats and Serbs hate each other, but it's primarily a religious hatred. The Indian Moslems murder the Hindus and vice versa. The non-Jewish Germans murder the Jewish Germans. Christian Armenians are ostracized in most Christian nations of Europe.

PREJUDICES RAMPANT

And look around you at the prejudices here. Add 'em all up and what have you got—racial and religious confusion, fear and desire to hurt those you think can't retaliate. Those who start wars think they're hitting nations which can't retaliate.

Prejudices—minority persecution—fanaticism; I don't know what motivates such unfortunate thoughts. Sometimes you know, often you don't, nor do you seek the causes. You just stay unhappy, often not realizing it's merely customary, a mark of social equality to cultivate prejudices.

So the Aryan capitalist bars from his club the Jewish merchant who sneers at the Negro who comes to his store. And the aristocracy of Haiti look down coal-black noses at half-breeds and whites.

Nuts! They're all crazy. Does that answer your questions, children?

General Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by members of the Sigmund Szczyglinski Post, No. 7123, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Newark, N. J., with respect to the observance of General Pulaski memorial day. General Pulaski died a hero's death on October 11, 1779, and it is only right that the day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in his honor. Numerous States have designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, and Sigmund Szczyglinski Post No. 7123 joins the many groups and organizations who have petitioned the Congress to enact the resolution now pending in the House and Senate:

RESOLUTION OF SIGMUND SZCZYGLINSKI POST, NO. 7123, VFW, NEWARK, N. J.

Whereas the United States of America has recognized its leaders in the days of its beginning by designating national holidays in their memory; and

Whereas in the history of the United States of America, there will always live the unbelievable and thrilling deeds of the Father of American Cavalry, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who fought oppression in his native Poland and took up arms against those who tried to suppress liberty and freedom. He came to the United States to offer his services in our Nation's critical hours and served with honor under Gen. George Washington, organizing the Pulaski Legion; and

Whereas Gen. Casimir Pulaski on October 11, 1779, died from wounds received in action on October 9, 1779 during the siege of Savannah, Ga.: be it

Resolved, That the members of Sigmund Szczyglinski Post, No. 7123, VFW, at their March 15 meeting at the Polish Educational Club, 255 Court Street, Newark, petition the President, Harry S. Truman, and Congress to designate October 11 as Gen. Casimir Pulaski Memorial Day and a national holiday.

ALFRED KRUSZEWSKI,
Commander.
STANLEY ZDYCSKI,
Adjutant.

Shipbuilding on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin with reference to shipbuilding on the Pacific coast.

Mr. Speaker, the security of this Nation makes it imperative that a reasonable number of shipyards be kept in operation in California, Oregon, and Washington. From the close of the First World War until 1938, shipbuilding had absolutely ceased on the Pacific coast. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 included a 6-percent differential for west coast shipbuilding, and with the amendment of 1938 to the Merchant Marine Act, which provided for negotiated contracts, shipbuilding was resumed. This was before war was imminent in Europe and before Hitler sent his armies into Poland and Austria. These laws are still on our statute books.

Today, and for sometime past, there has not been one new ship under construction on the entire Pacific coast from San Diego to Seattle, with the result that our splendid shipyards are again going to wrack and ruin. This certainly is not in keeping with our program of national defense. It cost hundreds of millions of dollars to rehabilitate shipyards on the west coast to meet the requirements of the last war. Forty-three percent of all ships built to win the war were built on the Pacific coast. To again permit these shipyards to go into decay would be a colossal blunder for which, in an emergency, we would again pay dearly.

The Chairman of the Maritime Commission suggests that additional laws are required which is not the case. If ships were built on the Pacific coast under existing law before war broke out, they can and should be built today in the interests of the security of our Nation.

Following is the editorial:

BUILD SHIPS IN WEST—NEEDS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE REQUIRE THAT PACIFIC COAST YARDS BE MAINTAINED IN OPERATION

It's encouraging to hear from west coast Congressmen that President Truman is favorably disposed toward their plea for shipbuilding in Pacific yards.

A delegation of legislators from the West asked the President yesterday if he would direct the Maritime Commission to allocate part of its shipbuilding business to western yards.

They requested a 15-percent cost differential so that they could compete, in bidding, with eastern yards which are closer to the principal sources of supply.

This could be arranged under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which gives the President authority to make such a requirement of the Commission.

And, according to San Francisco's Congressman WELCH, who has been in the forefront of the fight to keep western shipyards operating, Mr. Truman said he realized the necessity for maintaining the yards.

He should.

When he was in the Senate, heading a wartime committee which investigated Government contracts, he had a chance to study first-hand the extravagant waste which results when such an industry as shipbuilding has to build up almost overnight to meet the exigencies of war.

We will be a long time paying for the haste with which shipyards had to be put into operation in World War II. We needed ships more than we needed dollars, then, and dollars just didn't count.

And what was a far graver matter, even, than the monumental waste and confusion, was the fact that we came dangerously close to losing the war for lack of ships, and the fact that thousands of Americans sacrificed their lives while waiting for the "bridge of ships" to be built.

The root of the evil was in the fact that after the first World War we permitted the American merchant marine to disintegrate. We allowed the shipbuilding industry to dwindle to nothing.

The same mistake must not be made again.

And a cardinal fact which should be borne always in mind is the geographic reality that we are a two-ocean country, and we need a two-ocean Navy and a two-ocean merchant marine and this calls for the maintenance of up to date west coast shipyards.

It is not only a matter of justice that the West should not be discriminated against in the allocation of shipbuilding business.

It is a vital matter of national security to see that western yards are kept in shape to handle any shipping necessity which might arise.

McLemore Asks How Henry Wallace Became Expert on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, Henry McLemore, a fellow Floridian and writer of national fame, recently devoted his syndicated column which appeared in the April 4, 1949, Evening Star, to a timely and vital subject. In a strikingly effective manner Mr. McLemore defended the preparedness measures of our Government. As a veteran of the war in the Pacific, the author was both qualified and justified in taking to task those who have condemned our every step to prepare America for an unhoped for but possible emergency.

I want to signify my endorsement of this article by having it printed in the RECORD for the benefit of all the Members of this Congress.

MCLEMORE ASKS HOW HENRY WALLACE BECAME EXPERT ON WAR

(By Henry McLemore)

For a man who knows nothing about war, Henry Wallace talks more about war than anyone I can name offhand.

Why doesn't Mr. Wallace talk about something on which he is an authority?

Like, say, double-breasted corn with a chicken in every ear, or how it feels to run for the presidency and be magnificently repudiated by the people of the United States, or how it feels to be a failure as a magazine editor, or how it feels to be thrown out of the Cabinet.

Why does he make war his chief topic of discussion?

Has the man ever been to war? Has he ever been shot at? Has he ever led a patrol when every step called for every ounce of manhood in a man? Has he ever been hungry as a soldier? Has he ever been tired as a soldier? Has he ever been hit with steel?

ASKED ABOUT EXPERIENCE

Has he ever clung to the ground and prayed and prayed and begged that he would be man enough to take what was being asked of him? Has he ever been mad at the sight of friends all torn apart?

If he hasn't, let him stop talking about war.

In his speech against the Atlantic Pact he spoke of how it moved the hearts of America right up to the muzzles of the first gun fired in Europe. I don't want to keep asking questions, but has Mr. Wallace ever looked a muzzle in the eye? Has he ever had one shoved against him? Would he know a muzzle if he saw one? Could he fire a gun

of any sort? Perhaps he could, but only after announcing over national hook-ups that he was going to.

As I have said before when speaking of Mr. Wallace, he seems to think that he is the only man who believes that war is hell and gets people nowhere. Honestly, to listen to him talk you would think that he holds a copyright on the conviction that peace is to be desired. To listen to Mr. Wallace you would think that he is the only man who knows that pacts, be they Atlantic or Pacific, are not what most men and women in the world would want, and that a world that didn't have to have pacts would be the best sort of world.

Please, Mr. Wallace, there are millions and millions of people in the world who would like nothing better than to know that peace was here forever, and that all the millions poured into planes, guns, ships, rockets, etc., would be poured into education, health, housing, and the fight against intolerance. I think there are millions who suffer just as much as you do, have just as many heartaches, but who have something deep inside of them that makes them unable to turn against their country.

FIGHTERS KNOW ABOUT WAR

You wouldn't by any chance think that any mother, be she Russian or American, did not cry in her heart when she heard that her son had been killed? You wouldn't by any chance think that any man, who in fighting for his country, lost part of his body said to the medics that he loved war and only hoped he could get back into the battle?

No, Mr. Wallace. No, no, and no. Men who have fought know the misery of it. They hate war and all that it means. But they also know a thing or two. And one of the things they know is that it is mighty nice to be prepared and hold a gun in your hand when you have to defend yourself.

Ask the guys who were on Bataan. Talk to those who survived Wake. Ask the fliers who flew in the first and pathetic B-17 formations. Ask (Mr. Wallace) any of the men who had to try to fend off death with inadequate equipment.

My guess is, Mr. Wallace, that you'll never know how it feels to be an American when the chips are down.

If I am wrong, pardon me.

From the Russian Embassy to the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House a record that would provide good material for Robert Ripley of Believe It or Not fame. It is a record which ought to alert every loyal American to the danger to our national security existing within a department of our Government itself.

This may seem to be an incredible case, but a verbatim report taken from a Government loyalty file is the basis for this statement.

A typist once dismissed by the White House, where she worked as a correspondence secretary, when her supervisor caught her telling lies, was able to obtain work with the Soviet Information Bulletin, published twice a month by the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This same typist, after working a year inside the Soviet Embassy, where she had to be politically acceptable to remain, applied for and was given a position in the State Department of the United States Government. She gave as references when she applied for the State Department job two persons then employed in the Soviet Embassy.

The girl offered to work for $1,800 a year, although this was while the war still was in progress and stenographic help was extremely difficult to obtain. Her salary at the White House had been $2,760 a year.

The girl was hired on the spot and put to work in the State Department's personnel section, where she became dissatisfied within 1 month and requested a transfer to the office of one of the Department's top officials. The transfer was made as she requested, to the position of her choice, where she was placed in charge of receiving, screening, and distributing all cablegrams for the high official. She also handled important documents of international and economic significance.

All this is a matter of record in the Government's investigative agencies. It was all drawn to the attention of the men running the State Department, in a memorandum dated November 17, 1945, from the Office of Controls. The memorandum was sent to Assistant Secretary Russell. It also stated that the employee in question was a member of the Washington Bookshop, the character of which is known to most of us, and a subscriber to the Soviet Information Bulletin, even though no longer employed by that publication.

The memorandum suggested that the facts be brought to the attention of the official within the State Department for whom this girl worked; but there is no indication that any action was ever taken. It is to be presumed that this person, in spite of her background, went on blithely examining cable mail. The record indicates that she did so for approximately a year and a half after the above facts were made known.

On February 12, 1947, the Security Office of the State Department disapproved clearance for the subject to accompany the American delegation to the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers. Even after that she continued working at the delicate job of screening cablegrams and other vital documents.

In March 1947 the Civil Service Commission produced an investigation, 25 pages in length, pointing out a number of instances of untruthfulness on the part of the girl. This report stated that a former supervisor of the girl at the White House said he had caught her in several lies and would not recommend her for a position of trust and confidence. Other witnesses referred to her as a liar. The investigator himself remarked that—

> In the entire course of this investigation it is apparent that the subject exaggerates, deviates from truthfulness in varying degrees, and in a number of instances has made misstatements of facts so as to place herself in a more favorable position.

What happened after all of these facts had become known? Nothing—until April 9, 1947, when Assistant Secretary of State for Administration John Peurifoy reached the amazing conclusion that the girl should be transferred to other work where she would not have access to highly classified information. How long it took the Department to do this, or whether it was ever done, is not known, at least not by me.

Regardless, the fact remains that Miss Helene Yuhas—for that is the young woman's name—had all the time she needed to do this Nation irreparable harm, if such was her purpose.

Much has been said about employees being unjustly accused, particularly in the State Department, on grounds of loyalty. People write books about it; I recall one designated as "Washington Witch Hunt." Left-wingers and radicals make a great to-do about it, but we seldom hear about cases as open and shut as this one.

Is it fear of being attacked as unfair that leads responsible officials to coddle workers who lie and consort with those who are hostile to America in the present cold war? No one wants to believe that it is disloyalty in high places.

It is not comforting but greatly disturbing that the security of this Nation is treated as offhandedly as this case indicates. In my opinion, it is frightening and almost unbelievable. We might well speculate on what would happen to us in the event of a war with a nation that these radicals believe is so much greater and better than "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

This is how our internal security was guarded in the State Department only a little more than a year ago.

Jefferson's Religious Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this being the two hundred and sixth birthday of Thomas Jefferson, it is appropriate that we take special note thereof.

Of all our founding fathers who conceived and gave form to the Government under which we live, none should receive greater credit. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine the greatest American who has ever lived. One would hesitate to make such a decision. To many of us, Thomas Jefferson stands out above all others in his contributions to our form of government. We should pause today and give thanks to Almighty God for such a character as the sage of Monticello. May his spirit and leadership continue to guide us as our Government ventures into uncharted realms.

I submit herewith a splendid article which appeared in the Sunday Star, April 10, 1949, entitled "Jefferson's Religious Liberalism":

JEFFERSON'S RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM—HIS BIRTHDAY ON WEDNESDAY RECALLS OUR DEBT TO A CHAMPION OF THIS BASIC FREEDOM

(By Prof. W. S. Tryon)

As April 13, the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, approaches, and as the world shudders under the assaults against freedom of religious thought and worship, the role and rank of Jefferson as a champion of religious freedom take on momentous significance.

Every living American who believes in religious toleration, the separation of church and state, and the right of the individual to follow the dictates of his conscience, owes a debt—greater perhaps than he is even aware to Thomas Jefferson.

Always the friend of mankind and the enemy of every form of tyranny over the mind of man, Jefferson devoted a lifetime to the eradication of religious bigotry and coercion whether by state or church. It was he who gave voice to, and by his labor established, the chief cornerstone of those convictions which we today call the American way.

Jefferson never set down his religious beliefs in any formal treatises but characteristically scattered them through scores of letters to his friends. The statements are necessarily disconnected, yet, when taken together, a noble and consistent pattern emerges with clarity and forcefulness.

First and foremost each individual must eschew the Gothic idea of looking to the authority of the past for his religious beliefs and instead, rely entirely upon his own reason to discover his spiritual convictions. Jefferson had an abiding faith in the ultimate ability of man to choose good over evil when permitted a free exercise of his reason. "You are answerable," he wrote in a noble sentence to his nephew, "not for the rightness, but the uprightness of your decision."

THE LEGITIMATE POWERS OF GOVERNMENT

In the operation of this rational process there must be interference by neither state nor church. The legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others, and since it does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are 20 gods, or no God, there can be no rightful legislative control. Reason will support true religion by bringing every false one to its tribunal.

Jefferson likewise opposed rigid dogmatism by theologians. They had made a Babel of religion and their blasphemies had driven thinking men into infidelity. Their quarrels and their creeds had so distorted and deformed the doctrines of Jesus, so muffled them in mysticism, and falsehoods, and caricatured them into forms so monstrous and inconceivable, it were better they had never lived for had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as pure as they came from his lips, the whole civilized world would now have been Christian.

Jefferson never sought to advertise his views since, to him, a man's religion was his private affair. Though he declared he never had had an opinion in religion which he was afraid to own, nevertheless my great wish is, to go on in strict but silent performance of my duty * * * (and) to avoid attracting notice. Yet such opinions naturally led him into trouble. His prominence made it unavoidable that his ideas should become public. His words were often distorted and it was a favorite falsehood to label him an atheist.

Such an epithet was far from the truth. Never once did Jefferson speak of Jesus or of His ethics and morals save in the highest terms, extracting from the Gospels the very words of Jesus, with all commentary omitted, he declared the result to be the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man. Though he denounced Athanasius and Calvin, he spoke highly of the Quakers and he was by preference a Unitarian, expressing the hope that there is not a young man now living in the United States who will not die a Unitarian, though revealing that because the population of my neighborhood is too slender, and is too much divided into other sects to maintain any one preacher well * * * I must therefore be contented to be a Unitarian by myself.

In his liberalism Jefferson was never illiberal, though he once confessed to more anger than is authorized by the blessed charities which he preached toward those who distorted the ethics of Jesus, yet ordinarily he maintained an objective calm toward his opponents. Two of his bitterest antagonists he referred to as zealous churchmen but honest men; for the religious program in his University of Virginia he asked that clergymen of different sects might preach to enable the students to hear all sides; and he could write that all religions, I find, make honest men, and that is the only point society has any right to look to.

It was not all theory with Jefferson. On one of the most notable occasions of his life, he translated ideas into action. As early as 1776 he introduced into the Virginia Legislature bills to obtain religious toleration. Through long and arduous battle he obtained in 1786 what he regarded as one of his three memorable achievements for mankind, the statute of Virginia for religious freedom. "No man," it stated, "shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship * * * whatsover. All men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion." Thus Jefferson procured the first charter for complete religious liberty in North America, a model for other States and for the Constitution.

Jefferson was immensely popular in his own day as his long public career testifies. Author of the Declaration of Independence, Governor of Virginia, Secretary of State under Washington, and twice President of the United States, his liberal ideas carried him into the affection of the masses of the people.

Human Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Human Brotherhood, delivered by Myer Dorfman, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, on March 22, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nearly 200 years ago, the first President of the United States wrote these words to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, R. I.:

"The citizens of the United States have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation. All profess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoys the exercise of their inherent rights. For happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction; to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should conduct themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

With those words, George Washington truly stamped himself as the father of a system of free government that has been a beacon of hope for mankind these last two centuries.

If the world today finds itself living in fear and tension it is because the ideals pronounced by our forefathers have not, as they hoped, been carefully observed and adopted. The bigotry and prejudice they deplored are still in tragic evidence. Despite a series of wars which have resulted in successively greater destruction and loss of life, the international peace and friendship for which they worked all through their lifetime remains a distant dream.

In their great wisdom, our country's founders knew that peace between nations depends in the main upon peace of mind and soul among the peoples that make up those nations. If, as is just, Gen. George Washington is credited with being our country's first advocate of a sound, alert national defense establishment, it is because our first President was, above all else, a realist. He knew that peace could not be had for the asking alone. As a soldier who fought for the liberty and security of a people who had the will to freedom and independence, he knew that peace would demand devotion and sacrifice as great as any that have to be given during a state of war. He knew how high a cost attached to war. And he knew that there could never be any peace that would demand as heavy and as tragic a price as the waging of war.

Because of the heritage left us by Washington and the great commanders of the Colonial Army, the American soldier has always retained a unique character. He has never been an aggressor. He has never fought to take from others by force and violence the things that were theirs. Rather, he has fought as a liberator. He has borne arms against enemies who represented forces of oppression and subjugation. Having overcome these enemies, the American soldier has asked only to be returned to his own home and his own way of life. There, he has always joined with his fellow citizens to aid in the rehabilitation of the countries on whose soil he has fought, even when some of these countries took the field of battle against America.

Veterans are especially mindful that the image of George Washington graces the Army combat medal he himself originated—the Purple Heart.

There is a special significance in the Purple Heart Medal for American veterans of the Jewish faith. Only one class of serviceman is eligible for this award. That is the man who has sustained wounds in action while serving his country. No other qualification is demanded.

It is saddening to realize that here and there among us there arises an occasional bigot who sees fit to negate the principles that motivated Washington and the great leaders who followed him by applying in peace restrictions that never would be dreamed of in war. It is this fact that resulted in the founding of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America more than 53 years ago. In the ranks of those who founded our organization were many veterans of the War Between the States who emerged from that tragic conflict as holders of the Purple Heart. They included men who had come to this country from European states in which they were denied the basic human and civil rights we in America have come to accept as a matter of course. They came to America because of the great promise held out to all mankind by the great architects of the American Republic. And they cherished this democracy so dearly that they flocked to its colors when this country's freedom was under assault.

It is no coincidence that in all the wars in which our country has been engaged the ratio of Jewish men in the armed force has always been greater than the proportion of their coreligionists to the population as a whole. Jews have known prejudice and persecution longer than any other people, and they have suffered a greater mortality rate than any others. The great promise held out to them by Washington and the great Presidents who followed him was that America offered to freedom-loving men much more than a haven from oppression. It offered them the privilege of defending freedom in the honorable uniform of this country, not only for themselves but for all people.

For more than a generation the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America has been urging the adoption of legislation that would give this country a fully trained and equipped national defense establishment. We believe that the most practicable means of achieving that objective is through the adoption of a universal training law. Because we have not heeded the lessons of our past, we have been involved in two great wars in this century. Both times we had to accomplish miracles of training and preparation in brief periods of time before we sent our youth into battle. Because we had not prepared ourselves adequately, we paid a terrible price in blood and treasure.

Five times in the more than half-century of our existence as an organization we of the Jewish War Veterans have seen postwar periods of economic depression and social and political unrest. Each time we have seen a recurrence of international fear, suspicion, and distrust explode into war. We learned a long time ago that peace and security cannot be obtained at bargain rates. They have to be paid for in full, with work, with united purpose and united effort.

It is for this reason that members of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States have been among the organizers and charter members of every major American veterans' organization founded since the turn of the century. Today virtually our entire membership is on the rolls of one or more of the great general membership veterans groups. To our way of thinking, the organized veterans of America constitute one of the most effective deterrents to totalitarian land-grabbers abroad and their covetous front men in our own country.

So long as our organization is in existence—so long as it continues to maintain in peace the teamwork that marked its association in war with our fellow veterans of every faith and national origin—just so long will the enemies of America have to look elsewhere for easy conquest. For we believe firmly that a nation which cannot be divided from within is a nation that cannot successfully be assailed and subjugated from without.

We Americans have never failed to cope with our enemies in war. But too often—and at too great a cost in lives and resources—we have looked with short-sighted complacency at the military potential of regimented nations. We have paid bitterly for our unpreparedness because we have overlooked the fact that political fanaticism can produce soldiers sworn to fight and die with suicidal determination.

Because we are a Nation of freemen, America has never had to put so much as a single suicide squad into the field to overcome enemy fanaticism. Our victories have been the victories of freemen who need no dictator's order to tell them when to close ranks against oppression and injustice.

As veterans, we are deeply mindful that our obligations to our country's welfare and security did not cease when we exchanged a soldier's uniform for civilian clothes. In that, we believe we have adhered faithfully to the tradition that has come down to us from the earliest days of our existence as a Nation. In the ranks of those who fought to bring our country into being were men who survived to become the leaders of the Nation they helped to found through their military service.

A similar trend can be observed today, when the President of the United States, and many Members of the Congress and Senate, are men who have seen service in the armed forces of our country. As men who have come to grips at first hand with the most deadly of all threats to the American way of life—the waging of war against an enemy dedicated to the destruction of that way of life—veterans are specially alert to any threat to the American system. That is why these men, who have come to know and hate war on more intimate terms than any other element of the American population, are virtually united in their support of the establishment of a national defense system strong enough to guard us against any possible emergency.

But the strength of a nation lies in much more than its ability to repel attack. Our founding fathers established this country on a foundation of law and justice that has been an inspiration to all peoples down through the years. Not only their Declaration of Independence, but the Bill of Rights they wrote into our Constitution, are unassailable today as blueprints of a system on which other nations besides our own can—if they will—build a society based on the dignity of the individual and respect for human rights.

The greatest tribute that can be paid to the first elected leaders of our country is that nearly 200 years after their time we are still striving to make America the strong, secure, and united Nation of which they dreamed, and for which they worked. We are still trying to match with our law and legislation the ideals they expressed and lived throughout their lifetime. We are still groping for a path to the achievement of complete understanding and common effort against prejudice and intolerance.

Nowhere are these deficiencies more glaring than in present relationships between the nations of the world. As we in America continue to work for the reconstruction of shattered Europe and humane assistance to its war-weary peoples, we find ourselves confronted by a series of cruel negations of the ideal we pursue. In four countries of eastern and central Europe, Catholic and Protestant churchmen and Jews associated with Zionism have been subjected to shocking acts of injustice. In Hungary, a Catholic Cardinal has been sentenced to life imprisonment after a travesty that passed under the name of trial by jury. In Bulgaria, an equal mockery singled out as victims a number of Protestant ministers under circumstances open to the gravest doubt by American standards of law and justice. In neither instance were the victims accorded any recourse comparable to the rights of appeal and review that are so vital a part of our system. As evil the devices employed against the Catholic and Protestant religious leaders, the treatment of Jews in Rumania and Czechoslovakia was even more sinister. For no other crime than a belief in Zionism, these unfortunates were seized and suppressed without benefit of what passes for a legal hearing in those countries at this time. Particularly shocking was the action of the Czechs, a people whose devotion to our form of democracy has been unquestioned since the days when their government was founded with the help and encouragement of our country under the administration of President Woodrow Wilson. Obviously, the present masters of Czechoslovakia are not representative of a people whose liberalism and devotion to democratic principles have been a synonym for decency and understanding. We can only conclude that the blight which has overtaken Hungary and Bulgaria has also fallen upon Czechoslovakia. No longer will any opinion be tolerated unless it apes without question the doctrines prescribed by those in political power.

The action of these captive governments is further evidence that communism is not relaxing its total war against freedom of conscience and opinion. It was as much against these evils, as for the achievement of American independence, that the colonists worked and fought. They closed their ranks—these men of all faiths and creeds—to prove to the world that freedom is a common aspiration of all men of good will.

If we are to honor their memory, and to keep faith with the great tradition they left us, we must fulfull the obligation of bringing to our own society, and to the relationships between our country and others, the high moral standards and deep devotion to principle that marked the efforts of the great men who made us into an independent nation.

Our cities and towns are graced by hundreds of statues of these first American leaders. But the finest memorial we can build is to retain in our hearts and minds the traditions they left us and the ideals that made their names the enduring symbols of the human brotherhood and devotion to freedom that we know today by the name Americanism.

Congress Should Put on Pressure for European Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

CONGRESS SHOULD PUT ON PRESSURE FOR EUROPEAN UNITY

(By Edgar Mowrer)

In the process of authorizing a second slice of American money for the European recovery program, the American Congress has an opportunity to do these countries, and the world, a great favor. This favor would be to issue a warning that unless the several European governments are able to move toward unity, next year's appropriations for ERP will be drastically cut.

At the time the first appropriation was voted last year it was generally understood, though not explicitly spelled out, that the United States administration would press the European countries toward real unity. Actually, the United States administration has done nothing more than advise the foreign recipients of your money and mine to come together. Of real pressure, there has been no visible sign.

American officials explain that American pressure would have been intolerable to proud European governments.

This is certainly not true of the chief continental countries. They have privately been asking for pressure to be put upon them, since without such pressure they will find it difficult to override their vested domestic interests. But it is true of Socialist Britain. The British Socialists have demonstrated that they care more for full national independence and their socialist experiment than for American aid.

In practice, the American authorities have gone along with the British who wish to avoid or postpone a real European federation, rather than with the continental countries that are ready to federate.

THE BRITISH POSITION

My British friends will consider this an unfair description of their position. They

will point to the establishment of the European Council as proof that they are willing to go some distance toward European federation. And they will point to other signs that the European recovery program is showing fruit.

Economically, they will say that finally, large sections of the British people have gone back to hard work. Sir Stafford Cripps, they believe, now realizes that Britain cannot recover alone or impose a complete reversal of the former European trade pattern upon its friends, as outlined in the recent Cripps report. They will insist that the European countries receiving American help are about ready to adopt a common plan to avoid overlapping new capital investment.

Militarily, the British are proud of the western union, the coming North Atlantic Security Pact, the plans for standardized equipment, a single command, and a single defense plan among the North Atlantic countries. Shortly, they hope, arms production will be specialized so that each country will make only what it can best produce.

Politically, they have the European Council to show.

The trouble is that even those Englishmen like Winston Churchill who talk of a European federation do not mean a single federated European state. What they mean is something like the British Commonwealth, whose members are linked by nothing stronger than common sentiment and voluntary agreements.

EUROPE MUST BE A SINGLE MARKET

But the kind of European unity that is necessary goes far beyond a common army and a common foreign policy. It goes further than a plan to avoid duplicating new investments. What Europe needs most is to become a single market, where money, goods, and services flow freely, unimpeded by customs tariffs, quota systems, currency restrictions, etc. Such unity would naturally bring about a complete rearrangement of the European economy. But such a rearrangement is vital if the European manufacturers and food growers are ever to enjoy the kind of market that has enabled American producers to prosper.

In short, the argument between the British and the European continentals comes down to this: Is western Europe viable as a mosaic of small sovereign states unless these states are ready to introduce free trade among themselves?

If not, to use Governor Dewey's phrase, they must be prodded either into free trade or into full economic and political unity.

The American administration has failed to prod them—or has failed to prod hard enough. This leaves the Congress with a second chance. To me it would not seem to be unreasonable for the American legislators to couple granting the authorization for the second year's financial aid with Europe's acceptance of a move toward unity that is in Europe's own interest.

Such a move would put the European countries in a position to resist their Communists—and to resist the Soviet Union as well.

John E. Peurifoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "John E. Peurifoy Rises From State Department Ranks to New Top Post," written by Richard L. Stokes and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN E. PEURIFOY RISES FROM STATE DEPARTMENT RANKS TO NEW TOP POST—ELEVATOR OPERATOR IN CAPITOL BEGAN HIS DIPLOMATIC CAREER AS CLERK IN STATE DEPARTMENT—CREDITED WITH THINKING OUT THE HOOVER REORGANIZATION PLAN—NOW ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION

(By Richard L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The State Department's prize success story is that of John Emil Peurifoy. He began his Washington career 13 years ago as an elevator boy at the Capitol, and then sold smoking accessories over a counter at a local department store. Today, at the age of 41, he is tied with Dean Rusk for third place in the Department's hierarchy, with Under Secretary James E. Webb and Secretary Dean G. Acheson as his only superiors.

The Hoover Commission's reorganization program created brand new offices for Rusk and Peurifoy. They will continue to rank officially as Assistant Secretaries, but with the respective designations, for the first time in history, of Deputy Under Secretary for Policy and Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. Peurifoy already has the latter title, by departmental order; Rusk awaits confirmation by the Senate as Assistant Secretary. Peurifoy is the pioneer employee of the Department's civil service, as distinguished from its career service, to thrust his way into its loftiest brass. More than half its total personnel of 21,800, at home and abroad, is under his immediate direction.

His control is administrative. He has, for instance, no policy control over the Foreign Service, although he is the administrative boss of that elite corps.

Peurifoy is credited with having done much of the original thinking which later found its way into the Hoover report on reorganization of the State Department.

"I used to be a State Department clerk myself, and have never forgotten it," he explains. "I know what is happening down below and that these people carry the actual load of the Department. That thought was always foremost in my mind when we were planning the reorganization."

It was largely his sense of injustices of salary and status which caused him to advocate a merger of the Department's foreign and classified services into a single Foreign Affairs Service. His own case is in point. Whatever the title and authority, his pay, unless Congress intervenes, can never be more than its present annual figure of $10,333. That is tops in the civil service. But one of his subordinates, Christian M. Ravndal, director general of the Foreign Service, draws $13,500 a year. Peurifoy has perhaps a dozen career underlings whose stipends, running from $11,000 to $13,000, exceed his own.

During the San Francisco United Nations Conference, in 1945. Peurifoy was put in charge of arrangements. That was his first big opportunity.

OBTAINS FAVORITE WINES FOR SAN FRANCISCO DELEGATES

He went to San Francisco 3 months before the opening date, April 25. The war was still on. The city was the Nation's leading embarkation port and was bursting at the seams with crowded humanity. Peurifoy's task, among other things, was to find hotel rooms for 5,600 delegates and their aides, plan their food and favorite wines, insure their safety in cooperation with the Army and Navy, and establish cable and telegraph communications with every part of the world. He equipped halls for them, including multilanguage earphones. He was even haunted by a supposition that Japanese raiders might be tempted to bomb or shell the Conference.

By all accounts, his success was complete. An admirer pays this tribute: "It was not only the largest conference this country ever put on, but the best run." His reward was an appointment as special assistant to the Under Secretary—a post held by Acheson. In March 1947, Peurifoy was appointed Assistant Secretary of State. It was a title never before held by a man so young. Peurifoy was then 39 years old.

Already he had climbed at a record pace through the civil-service grades, from the lowest, P–1, to the highest, P–8. He accomplished this course, for which most men require 20 years, in 7. During 1941 he gained two jumps in 30 days.

There remained still another world to conquer, the Foreign Service. He vanquished its appalling entrance examinations and became eligible for confirmation as an officer of career diplomacy. He has never applied for this honor, though he lost civil-service protection and could be dismissed overnight, as a result of his Presidential appointment as Assistant Secretary 2 years ago.

Peurifoy was born August 9, 1907, at Walterboro, S. C. He was christened John after his father, a Federal district attorney. His middle name, which he detests, was fashioned by lopping the final letter from his mother's name, Emily. She died when he was 6 years old. Having been graduated from the Walterboro high school, he was appointed to the United States Military Academy, in 1926. During the second year his father died and he himself was hospitalized for many weeks with pneumonia. Forlorn and discouraged, the youth resigned from West Point and struck out for Kansas City, where he landed with $200 and an impulse to become an aviator. His money vanished into the hands of a fraudulent flying company. He tried in vain to enlist in the Marines and worked for several months as a private tutor. Then he was employed at a Kansas City bank.

In 1929 he went to New York, and for two years sold insurance. During 3 years he was assistant manager and cashier for the Childs restaurant chain. But he had always felt an attraction for Government service. Strangely enough, in his dreams, the State Department was his goal. The notion of trafficking with foreign countries appealed to him as romantic. He had an instinct that the biggest administrative job waiting to be done in Washington was overhauling that antique and stodgy institution.

He arrived in the National Capital in 1935, when he was 28 years old, and while seeking a post served the first of his two terms as an elevator operator on the Hill, at $90 a month. After 3 months, he succeeded in becoming a clerk in the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department.

On October 2, 1936, he was married to a Tulsa girl, Betty Jane Cox. They have two sons, one 8 and the other 3 years old. Just a year after the wedding, the Treasury job was shot from under him. Both he and his wife found work in a department store. He was dismissed 9 weeks later when the Christmas rush was over, and returned for another 9 months to his elevator at the Capitol. "Those were rugged days," he remarks with a sigh.

ACHESON CHOOSES PEURIFOY AS SPECIAL ASSISTANT IN 1946

At last, on October 1, 1938, he found himself in the State Department as a $2,000-a-year clerk in the division handling export licenses under the Neutrality Act. In 5 months he was assistant to the chief of the division.

Acheson, who has an acute eye for merit, has been quick to recognize Peurifoy's abil-

ity. As Under Secretary of State, Acheson promoted Peurifoy to be special assistant, in 1946. A year later, on Acheson's recommendation Peurifoy was made Assistant Secretary. And now Acheson again has picked Peurifoy, as one of the four men at the apex of the Department.

Peurifoy's far-flung responsibilities generally keep him at his desk for a 7-day week. The hours of at least 5 of them are from 8:30 a. m. to 7:30 p. m. Spare moments are given to bridge, playing with his children, and mowing the lawn or weeding the flower beds at his home in Arlington. Both he and his wife loathe the peculiar Washington institution of the cocktail party, and never attend one unless obliged to.

With all his strength, Peurifoy has a gift for friendliness and popularity. His door stands open to the humblest employees, and he takes pleasure in solving their difficulties.

Reply by Norman M. Littell to Washington Post Editorial "Assurance for Investors"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on April 8 there appeared in the Washington Post a rather lengthy communication by Mr. Norman M. Littell, formerly Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, with reference to the guaranty clause in the ECA Act. In that same issue of the Washington Post there was an editorial entitled "Assurance for Investors." Mr. Littell has written a reply to that editorial which unfortunately cannot be published in the Washington Post, since that newspaper is not now being published. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by Mr. Littell be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGARDING YOUR EDITORIAL, ASSURANCE FOR INVESTORS (FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1949)

More power to Willard Thorp's plan for bilateral agreements—so far as it goes. However, unless supplemented by the guaranty principle set forth in the Ribicoff amendment of the ECA Act, adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, it will be just another la-de-da plan of high hopes and will fall flat on its face in respect to vital areas of the world. I can well understand anyone subscribing to this seductive plan if he is not close to the laboratory of actual experience where the following fatal difficulties lie in ambush:

1. All countries in the world (with the negligible exception of three or four) have currency regulations restricting the conversion of their money into dollars in order to prevent the flight of capital. In such circumstances no American investor putting money abroad could even get his bait back. In no bilateral agreement negotiated by the State Department will any guaranty be given by a participating country that any investment in that country can be converted back into dollars at will. Why? Because a sovereign power cannot deed away by treaty future control of its own currency and fiscal policies. It is of the essence of sovereignty that Government cannot abdicate from the power to change fiscal policy to meet any future needs of the country.

Therefore, on the threshold of Willard Thorp's plan lies the same basic obstacle which was fully understood by Congressmen and Senators when the ECA Act was drafted and no such guaranty of convertibility was required of participating countries. The problem was partially met in the ECA Act by the guaranty clause for private investments, guaranteeing the convertibility of currency for projects approved by the Administrator.

2. Under the plan which you endorse, what will happen if a bilateral treaty, unsupported by any American guaranty to its investor, is disrupted or swept aside by revolution and the investor's plant is confiscated, seized, destroyed, or eliminated from the business picture by state monopolistic practice or decree?

This question opens the door on very dark scenes in American history. At such times in the past (with or without a treaty) the pulling and hauling which has immediately taken place, even under a strong idealistic administration like that of Woodrow Wilson, made the State Department a mere pawn of powerful interests whose investments were damaged in the turmoil abroad. During the first part of this century, through successive administrations, the State Department made itself in effect a negotiator of loans in the Caribbean countries and many South American countries. Once the State Department negotiated or approved a loan, the United States in effect became a guarantor because the Government approval was promptly advertised to American investors and a very strong moral responsibility was thereby assumed by the Government which led to numerous instances of military intervention to protect or collect loans.

The most striking example is that of Haiti, where marines were landed to protect American life and property in 1915, although for 111 years, from the very origin of the Republic of Haiti in 1804 to 1915, no American life had been lost and no property destroyed of which there is any record.

American marines landed at Port-au-Prince, marched to the vaults of the National Bank of Haiti, and carried away $500,000 in gold which was taken to New York on an American battleship and deposited in American banks.

It is impossible to review here the sorry tale of increasing encroachment by sheer military power, the occupation of ports, the control of elections, the forced acceptance of a treaty, the adoption of a new constitution, but the insurrections resulted in the killing of 2,000 to 3,000 Haitians and one of the sorriest pages in American history.

There were other instances in Cuba, in Santo Domingo, in Nicaragua, where the pattern of pressure on the State Department and back-stage formation of policy to protect American interests repeated itself again and again. Not until the Roosevelt-Truman period did we emerge into a firmer area of good-neighbor policy.

The amazing thing to the American public was how much had happened behind closed doors which even Congress did not know. In Haiti strict censorship was clamped on the press, and newspaper editors were put in jail by our own military authorities for venturing to criticize. A Senate committee of investigation had to go to Haiti and hold extensive hearings before the truth was finally known—years later. See hearings on Foreign Loans (68th Cong., S. Con. Res. 22, vol. 1, Feb. 25, 1925.)

You speak of "lollipops" which the Ribicoff amendment, approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee now proposes to give to private investors. Any well-informed taxpayer would prefer these well-defined guaranties for private investors to battleships, marines, and bluejackets which in the past have cost hundreds of millions of dollars—untold fortunes in taxpayers' money—not to mention the grimmer sacrifice of loss of life and principle in evil treatment of some of our neighbors. Such actions did not represent the will of the American people and were not approved by Congress.

If, under the amended guaranty clause, the approved investor is bailed out in the event of loss through one of the designated risks, two advantages follow: (a) The Government assumes the burden of negotiations with the defaulting country on the proper level of principle and long-range sanctions in the field of diplomatic relationships, free of the pressures for immediate satisfaction from the offending country, which in the past have too often resulted in machine-gun and battleship diplomacy. (Other countries have similarly resorted to force to collect debts during the exploitation of the twenties which we are trying to leave behind, the most famous example being that of the military occupation of Venezuela in 1901 by England, Germany, France, and Italy.) (b) Judicial determination rather than force of arms is invoked by the Ribicoff amendment in that the proposed guaranty clause would stand in the context of section 115 of the ECA act and article X of the bilateral agreements, both of which provide that the nationals of one country may proceed in the courts of another country in any case in which nationals have claims for compensation or damages, but in the final analysis each country can espouse a case of one of its nationals in the International Court or arrange for arbitration. Upon payment by the United States to a guaranteed investor, under the Ribicoff amendment, the clamor for protection stops, and the Government is subrogated to its nationals' claims to pursue diplomatic and judicial remedies.

Can anyone doubt that judicial determination of disputes is preferable to landing the marines.

3. In endorsing heartily the suggestion for negotiation of treaties, I do so in full recognition of the fact that treaties cannot work alone in much of the area of the world and, also, that guaranties cannot work alone. Even on the theory which Willard Thorp now advocates with your support, the great advantage of the proposed guaranty clause is that the negotiation of required bilateral treaties has already been completed with the principal countries of western Europe. We have a good running start. By article III, participating countries agree to respect the guaranties issued, and article X provides for submission of disputes to court procedure or arbitration. We joined with other countries in renouncing military intervention to collect debts at the Hague Convention of 1907 and again at Montevideo in 1933 in a protocol announced by Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt.

The proposal adopted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee is an implementation of these contrite statements and protocols which in our past history have been too frequently honored in the breach. Here is an escape to the juridical determination of disputes—imperfect and incomplete, but an excellent start on rounding the corner away from the inevitable temptation to intervention under the inevitable pressures at home.

4. Lastly, a fatal objection to the high-minded scheme which you endorse is that it is conceived without recognizing the point of view of hardheaded, practical-minded men whom you seek to entice into the arena of world politics to do a job of reconstruction and spread know-how of production. American private enterprise will not go abroad because we ask it please to go. It will go on the basis of incentives fitting into the pattern of business risks which it is accustomed to take with stockholders' money. It recognizes, as you very happily state in your editorial, that "the atmosphere has changed since the feverish speculation of the twenties",

and American investors "now know that they have some responsibility to the countries from which their profits will come."

Any number of examples could be given to prove this sense of responsibility, and even the most hardheaded know that the age is one of participation on a partnership or even minority basis and not exploitation abroad. We cannot explore new criteria here.

But American business has more security in the United States than in any other country in the world. To induce broader participation in aid of national policy, the guaranty of the American Government should be offered as to a limited number of risks lying on the level of foreign policy rather than on the private risk level. That is the theory of the guaranty clause amendment so wisely approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, as explained in my statement published by you on April 8.

5. In conclusion, let me deplore the great American tendency to make fresh starts in finding its way to a bright new world. President Harding, in his St. Louis address of 1923, naively suggested junking the International Court, to which many Americans objected. He said we would start one of our own.

We have ECA and its bilateral agreements. Why not go on from there? Pride of authorship in esoteric knowledge of a subject often has too much to do with advocacy of a plan. Let me suggest that both plans should be carried forward at once, using the guaranty clause in the ECA Act within its limits of $300,000,000 as a pilot plant. Let us recognize that the original intent of Congress has been defeated in that the guaranty clause, as originally drafted and as restated in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee draft of the ECA Act, has been, is, and would continue to be a complete failure because it does not offer enough protection to draw out the great untapped reservoir of American productive power for the service of our foreign policy and creation of more goods, employment, and hope for a free way of life among millions abroad.

Side by side with operations under the new guaranty clause, as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, let the State Department achieve what it can, where it can, by bilateral agreements which I fully recognize might well succeed alone in a limited number of countries, such as the new and healthy country of India, with unlimited raw materials, limited know-how and practically no debts to present credit risks.

President Truman has laid a cornerstone of American foreign policy for a generation to come in point IV of his inaugural address. Let us get to work on it without delay by means of whatever instrumentalities are at hand and any others which we deem it advisable to create as time goes on.

NORMAN M. LITTELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Economic Recovery of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the people of Finland have been making some remarkable economic progress in the past few years in the face of some very difficult situations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Finns on Their Feet Despite Two Wars," published in the New York Times of April 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINNS ON THEIR FEET DESPITE TWO WARS—SUGGESTION MADE THAT LEARNED STUDY HOW THE TINY NATION RECOVERS WITHOUT HELP

HELSINKI, FINLAND, April 5.—It is high time, apparently, that somebody appointed a learned commission to prepare a report on "Finland and her troubles."

The learned commission would have a tough job.

If it stayed in Helsinki, it would be likely to get trampled under the feet of people rushing to work. If it went to Turku, it would be dodging steel plates being swung into position to make new ships. Out in the country, it would run the risk of getting crushed under falling pine trees, as a new breed of pioneers clears virgin forests to build its homes. Anywhere it goes, it would be in peril of foundering itself on Finnish hospitality, with meat and cakes and butter and eggs washed down with aquavit.

And then, if it asked Finns about their troubles, the Finns would look surprised and say, "Troubles? What troubles?"

Problems, yes. The Russians, the Communists, the price of wood pulp and paper. But troubles? No, sir.

This doesn't make sense, of course, in present-day Europe. Here is a bantam-sized country that fought two wars in 5 years, saw most of its northland burned to the ground, lost a huge chunk of its best land and richest industries to the Russians, was forced to find homes and jobs for 450,000 refugees from the lost territory, saddled with a staggering load of reparations, and injected with Moscow-trained secret police and Communist agitators.

By all rules of common sense, it ought to be wallowing in despair, its people hungry and discouraged.

But there's no accounting for Finns. Finland looks about as downhearted as a Texas county with a "watch us grow" campaign.

With no help from the Marshall plan, and nothing from Russia more helpful than a kick in the rear, Finland has done the impossible—once more.

She is over the hump, after 9 years of war and war repair, and getting ready to burn the mortgage. And how did she do it? Let a learned commission answer that one!

Helsinki, the capital, is working at recovery as hard as most cities would work on an oil boom. It is all a-bustle with a dozen new industries, built from the ground up since the war, making everything from electric motors to paper-making machinery.

Its stores, in the last 6 months, have filled up with goods as if someone had turned on a faucet. Wool has just been de-rationed; clothing, except for cotton, is coupon-free; and the stores are having sales.

Housewives have thrown away their ration cards for everything except coffee and chocolate. They can buy all the butter and eggs they want. As for meat, there's even enough to spare some for Russia, who is buying beef.

Prices are fantastic—$3.50 for a garden-variety hotel luncheon of soup, leg of lamb, boiled potatoes, ice cream, and coffee; $8.50 for a cotton shirt; $21 for a man's lamb's-wool cap—but Finns pay them without undue shrieking. Finnish workmen are among the best-paid in Europe, and money is loose.

Helsinki, however, is a small part of Finland's recovery story. In every corner of the country, new factories are smoking and new hydroelectric power stations are grinding out kilowatts.

Lapland, where every house and fencepost was burned down by the Germans in their "scorched earth" retreat in 1944 and 1945, has been rebuilt from the ground up. Most of the 450,000 refugees have been settled in new jobs, and the farmers on new acres they have cleared themselves.

The peace treaty took from Finland one-fifth of her agricultural land, and one-third of her power resources.

Replacing the lost farm land has meant clearing virgin forests, uprooting the stumps, and building homes to go with the fields. But Finland has built 30,000 acres of new land, improved production on the old, and is once again feeding herself.

Half of the lost power stations have already been replaced by new ones, work on others is booming, and by the end of this year Finland will have more power than ever.

In the northland, laid waste by the Germans, 5,000 homes were destroyed, and 5,000 have been rebuilt; 13,000 barns were destroyed, and 10,500 have been rebuilt; 3,000 miles of highway was destroyed, and 3,000 miles have been repaired; 1,034 highway bridges were wrecked, and 940 have been repaired.

The losses Finland herself suffered were only a part of what the war cost, for Finland had to pay also for the damage we did to Russia.

The reparations total was fixed at $300,000,000—to be paid in goods at 1938 prices. So, having lost 77 industrial plants in the territory ceded to Russia, Finland had to create brand-new industries to pay reparations.

Finns are the first to say that they had help. Before Russia forbade them to join in the Marshall plan, Finland had received something more than $100,000,000 in loans, not gifts, from the United States Export-Import Bank.

Finland is one country that knows no one is going to help her with her task. Russia won't help; America can't.

Finland isn't worried. She hasn't a doubt about her ability to finish the job, and pay her debts, and be living in her old modest comfort by, say, 1952.

And this, as it happens, is when other nations will stop getting aid from the Marshall plan.

American Taxpayers Have Sent $92,169,000,000 to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the House approving Marshall plan (ECA) funds for the fiscal year 1950 of nearly $5,500,000,000, it may be well for each Member of Congress to review the over-all cost of our foreign-aid program to the American taxpayers.

At my request, the coordinator of information of the House of Representatives compiled for me the over-all cost of foreign aid, including unpaid balances of World War I loans as well as existing programs through June 1950 as presently budgeted.

The total amount of United States Government assistance and loans abroad (including unpaid balances on World War I loans) today stands at $92,169,000,000.

This total includes all lend-lease through March 31, 1948 ($50,205,229,787), plus $15,460,248,348 presently due on World War I loans, including interest to the date of last payment under its various debt-funding agreements. These two items, therefore, make roundly $65,665,000,000 on the total of $92,169,000,000. The balance of $26,504,000,000 in overseas assistance is summarized in table I, below.

Table II indicates the cumulative national distribution of the total sum of $91,169,000,000, including balances due on World War I loans, all lend-lease, UNRRA, and all other programs of aid and assistance by the Government.

The totals for each country do not include, of course, the vast sums supplied by voluntary assistance drives in the United States, such as CARE, Red Cross, international charities, and emergency assistance campaigns for reconstruction and rehabilitation in particular countries.

While nothing is contained in the official reports of the Government program to indicate the total of loans as against the total of outright grants, we can, however, approximate that of the grand total of $92,000,000,000 approximately $70,000,000,000 is in grants and $22,000,000,000 in loans.

Tables I and II follow:

TABLE I.—*A recapitulation of United States loans and grants to foreign nations (April 1949)*

Unpaid balances due on World War I loans (January 1948)	$15,460,248,348
Lend-lease (through March 31, 1948)	50,205,229,787
Marshall plan (through June 1950)	9,254,000,000
Army relief in occupied areas (through June 1950)	[1] 3,774,000,000
Treasury loan to Britain (1947 and 1948)	3,750,000,000
UNRRA (through March 1947)	2,700,000,000
Export-Import Bank loans (through June 1950)	2,007,000,000
Treasury subscriptions to International Bank and Reconstruction Fund (1946 and 1947)	1,585,000,000
Surplus war goods (liquidation agreements)	[2] 1,148,000,000
Philippine aid and war damages (through June 1950)	682,000,000
Greek-Turkish Aid Act (through June 1950)	607,000,000
China Aid Act (through June 1950)	520,000,000
Displaced persons, International Refugee Organization, contributions to United Nations, Palestine refugees, and other assistance programs (through June 1950)	477,000,000
Total	92,169,478,135

[1] This figure does not include any part of our direct occupation costs, only the civilian relief extended through the military services.

[2] In addition, the armed services disposed of some $6,434,000,000 of surplus goods and stores overseas, for which no liquidation agreements have yet been reported. In most cases these goods were funneled directly into foreign relief and reconstruction channels; but in other cases, liquidation agreements still are in process of negotiation.

TABLE II.—*Total distribution of United States loans, grants, and aids overseas, including unpaid balances on World War I loans (includes all Marshall plan estimates for fiscal 1950, but does not include any funds for rearmament under North Atlantic Pact)*

1. Austria	$885,118,000
2. Armenia	39,942,000
3. Belgium and Luxemburg	1,744,000,000
4. British Empire	44,679,000,000
5. China	3,446,000,000
6. Czechoslovakia	17,348,000
7. Denmark	234,792,000
8. Egypt	59,700,000
9. Estonia	25,903,079
10. Ethiopia	16,447,000
11. France and possessions	13,371,000,000
12. Finland	24,600,056
13. Germany (bizonia)	3,260,000,000
14. Greece	681,000,000
15. Hungary	64,000,000
16. Iceland	20,900,000
17. Israel	63,009,000
18. Italy	4,700,000,000
19. Iran	23,100,000
20. Iraq	7,805,000
21. Ireland	142,703,000
22. Japan	1,891,000,000
23. Korea	89,469,000
24. Latvia	10,713,000
25. Liberia	14,829,000
26. Lithuania	9,603,059
27. Netherlands and possessions	979,000,000
28. Norway	345,000,000
29. Philippine Islands	708,000,000
30. Poland	373,600,000
31. Portugal	11,647,000
32. Rumania	79,435,000
33. Russia	12,793,400,000
34. Saudi Arabia	46,200,000
35. Sweden	104,100,000
36. Trieste	35,200,000
37. Turkey	305,400,000
38. Yugoslavia	117,200,000
39. American Republics (13)	1,651,392,000

Punch-Drunk Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Saturday, April 9, 1949. The title of the editorial is the Tribune's own. It follows:

PUNCH-DRUNK REPUBLICANS

* * * * *

Last Tuesday the Illinois Republicans, for the most part, fell flat on their faces.

* * * * *

The Democrats won, in two of the biggest suburbs, Berwyn and Cicero. In Cicero their task wasn't made any harder by the fact that a Republican town board stymied a Republican president in his efforts to clean up gambling.

But the State Republican organization isn't in very healthy condition when the Democrats elect a mayor in Bloomington. They won not only in Bloomington but also in Peoria, Macomb, Urbana, and Quincy, and in Freeport under a local party label. Republicans retained control in Aurora, Galesburg, and Streator.

No doubt local issues played a part in most of these campaigns. It might be hazarded, for example, that Mayor Triebel, of Peoria, lost strength, by closing down a town whose citizens prefer running wide open. Mayors are beaten for reelection for a variety of reasons, but it is hard to believe that local issues worked everywhere against Republicans, and nowhere against Democrats.

The truth is that Illinois Republicans grew lazy and incompetent from 8 years of bellying up to the State patronage trough. Governor Green took the rap for their shortcomings, but they didn't deliver for him and they didn't deliver for the party.

Their slothfulness was betrayed 2 years ago when permanent registration of voters became effective down-State. Very few county chairmen made any real effort to get their voters registered. That was one reason why traditional Republican majorities down-State proved insufficient to counteract the votes piled up by the Democrats in Chicago.

The boys aren't just punch drunk from what hit them last November. They were punch drunk when they were hit, and they are still wafted along in a wonderful haze of self-appreciation.

No sectional reflections are intended here. The Chicago Republicans weren't called into action Tuesday. Give them a chance and they may fall on their faces, too.

The Battle of Words: Voice of America Must Be Improved To Win Masses as Well as Top Strata

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Information and Educational Exchange Act, provision was made for an Advisory Commission on Information to be composed of distinguished American citizens experienced in this field. It has now submitted its first report. A supplementary report was prepared by Dr. Mark A. May, of the Institute of Human Relations of Yale University, based on a personal study by Dr. May in Europe of how effectively the program is operating. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this very informative article reprinted from the Christian Science Monitor:

In the free countries of Europe excellent contacts have been established with Government officials, newspaper editors and writers, professional groups including lawyers, physicians, college and university professors, and other leaders in labor, education, art, and culture.

In short, information about the United States and its foreign policies is now being communicated fairly effectively to individuals with whom United States Information Service officers are personally acquainted, who come to our libraries for information, who read the press materials sent out from Washington, and who see our documentary and informational movies.

These people come mainly from the better educated classes. Many of them hold important positions of leadership.

MASSES NOT REACHED

Information about the United States is being communicated, but less effectively, to the middle classes who are reasonably well educated. But as one goes down to the lower

social and economic strata of the population, the communication of information thins out very fast.

We do not now have in Europe the staff and physical facilities that are necessary to reach the great masses of farmers, industrial workers, small shopkeepers, and the unemployed.

In countries that have a high percentage of illiterates (e. g., Italy, Greece, and Spain) it is certain that information about the United States is not reaching those who cannot read and have no radios.

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Behind the iron curtain the Voice of America is bringing information to a more representative cross section of the populations than in most free countries of Europe. The voice is reaching audiences that exceed the number of radio receiving sets.

In Poland, where there are fewer than 1,000,000 sets, the Voice reaches at least 2,500,000 people. Although the sets are owned mainly by upper and middle classes, who can afford them, yet important news spreads rapidly to an entire community.

The Voice is greatly appreciated not only because it brings in reliable news, but mainly because it brings hope and encouragement to freedom-loving people. It sustains morale, helps to ward off the despairing defeat, and counteracts Russian propaganda that the people of the United States are a horde of dollar-mad barbarians.

TREMENDOUS APPETITE

Effective as the Voice of America is behind the iron curtain, it does not satisfy the tremendous appetite for information about the United States. But the communication of information by press, movies, and personal contacts cannot be done as effectively in Russian-dominated countries as in free countries on account of government restrictions.

Although it varies in different countries, the restrictions are mainly censorship of press and movies, police surveillance of libraries, and the discouragement of all personal contacts with Americans, particularly USIS officers.

All Americans—in fact, all foreigners from non-Communist countries—are regarded as actual or potential spies; hence, contact with Americans by local people is considered treason. These restrictions make it exceedingly difficult to communicate information effectively to the upper and middle classes who desire it.

LIBRARIES USED

Many of them do, however, come to our libraries to read and to borrow books and magazines.

But the number of individuals who are getting information about the United States from books, magazines, movies, lectures, and personal contacts is a relatively small fraction of the populations. In some countries there are opportunities for reaching more of the educated groups that are not now being embraced.

I have first-hand information on three countries — Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The most general conclusion is that of all the existing radio sets in these three countries that are in working order at least three-fourths and perhaps more are tuned to the Voice of America broadcasts once each day.

In Poland the percent might run as high as 85 to 90. It must be remembered, however, that the number of radio sets per capita in these countries is much less than in the United States, where we have one radio for every two persons.

In Poland there are 950,000 registered sets for a population of 24,000,000, or 1 set per 25 persons. The estimated daily listening audience to the Voice is about 1,000,000.

In Czechoslovakia there are about 2,000,000 sets for a population of about 15,000,000, or 1 set per each 7 to 8 persons. The estimated average daily listening audience to the Voice is not less than 1,000,000, and on certain occasions might run to more than 2,000,000.

In Yugoslavia there are 250,000 registered sets for a total population of between 15,000,000 and 16,000,000, or 1 set for each 50 to 60 persons. No estimate was received as to the average daily listening audience to the Voice. Many of the sets are old and need replacement parts.

The relay of the Voice by BBC is heard best—yet in spite of these hardships, there is scattered evidence indicating that people listen in fairly large groups to one set.

INTEREST SHOWN

The fact that the listening audience in comparison to the number of sets is quite large is in itself evidence that these broadcasts are greatly appreciated. A young Yugoslav who recently made a trip into Bosnia reported that the "Voice of America is the only thing which sustains the people's morale."

The very fact that the United States cares enough about these people to send in daily broadcasts gives them courage and hope for ultimate liberation from their oppressors. * * *

A word will be said about Spain, which can hardly be classed as a free country. The Spanish people were well supplied with short-wave receiving sets by the Germans. The total number of sets in Spain is estimated at about 7,000,000—an average of 1 for every 4 people.

The Voice goes into Spain daily in Spanish at 11–11:30 p. m. Recently listeners were advised to write to the United States Embassy at Madrid for copies of programs of future broadcasts.

FLOOD OF REPLIES

A flood of letters came in from all over the country from as many as 50 cities.

Unfortunately, the United States officer in Madrid had no programs available in Spanish. I was unable to estimate the number of listeners to the Voice in Spain, but the USIS office estimates that it has a daily audience of from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000. * * *

The most effective American-operated radio in Europe in a foreign language is Radio RIAS in Berlin. This station occupies a large building which was formerly an office building of the I. G. Farben Co., some six or eight stories high, with probably not less than 100 rooms that are used as offices and studios.

It has a monthly pay roll of approximately 1,000 persons. It is run by the army, and has been organized to offset the effect of Radio Berlin (Goebbels' pride and joy), which is in the British sector but, oddly enough, controlled by the Russians.

LARGE NETWORK

Radio RIAS operates through a network of all the radios in Germany except those reserved for the armed forces and for relaying the Voice short wave behind the iron curtain.

In Italy there are approximately 2,500,000 radio sets, or 1 per 18 persons. A total of 135 minutes per week of VOA programs is relayed medium wave by Radio Italy. An additional 25 minutes a week is given to ERP news. Radio Italy reports events in the United States culled from Associated Press, United Press, and other news agencies. Also some of its cultural shows are devoted to American movies, sports, science, art, and culture, and several hours a week are devoted to American music.

It is estimated by the Rome office that from all these programs some 10,000,000 Italians hear something about the United States each week. Although this figure looks impressive, it must be remembered that the audience reached by radio in Italy consists of the upper and middle classes, leaving the lower classes, who are the easy victims of communism, relatively untouched.

Recently USIS officers in Florence reported to Rome:

"Radio does not reach the masses. Except for some regions in northern Italy, workers do not usually own radios. Radio listening does not occupy the important place in Italian life that it does in the United States."

In Greece, the Voice is relayed medium wave both from Athens and from Salonika. But outside the large cities the Greeks have very few radio sets.

SWEDEN ASKS BROADCASTS

At the present time the Voice of America is not sending broadcasts to the Scandinavian countries in their native languages. In Sweden I found a strong desire for medium-wave broadcasts of American news and information, both on the part of the American Embassy and on the part of the important Swedes, including those who operate the Swedish radio.

Newspapers and magazines printed in Europe get their information about the United States from several sources, including international wire services, their own foreign correspondents, American newspapers printed in Europe, and the International Press and Publications Division.

The International Press and Publications Division sends to USIS in every capital in Europe a large volume of information, including the daily Wireless News Bulletin and a wide variety of basic information such as news letters, comments, profiles, biographies, and feature stories.

PEOPLE DEFY POLICE

In the countries behind the iron curtain the press is severely censored, and little use is made of the Wireless Bulletin by newspapers. It is, nevertheless, translated and circulated to government officials, newspapers, writers, and political leaders, except in Yugoslavia where circulation of translations is forbidden. In Warsaw the Polish edition of the Bulletin is distributed from the library.

The Minister of Information objects violently to this form of public distribution. The library is watched by the secret police and visitors are intimidated in a variety of ways. The appetite for information about the United States is so great that many Poles risk imprisonment by coming to the library and taking out copies of the Bulletin, which is often done by wrapping it up in a Communist newspaper.

In Czechoslovakia the Bulletin is carefully read daily by Government censors. Five to 10 editions per month are confiscated because they carry items that are in violation of the Czech laws. In Czechoslovakia, however, the papers and magazines do use a fair amount of INP feature materials.

The USIS office in Yugoslavia has the unique honor of being the only USIS to be closed by government decree. This happened in September 1946. The office and library were reopened in November 1946 under an extremely restrictive agreement, the main features of which are that the Wireless Bulletin be distributed in English only and to the Ministers of the Government, the official news agency, and to a few other functionaries approved in advance by the Foreign Office.

It may also be distributed to other embassies. It cannot be exhibited on USIS premises nor in the library, where it is forbidden to exhibit "anything aiming against the interest of the Yugoslavian people and their laws." It is understood that the USIS is "to serve solely for giving information on the life of the people of the United States and on the development of their culture."

CIRCULATION JUMPS

By way of summary it may be said:

1. The dissemination of information concerning the United States and its foreign policy to the masses by the printed word is practically nil in the iron-curtain countries except for strictly nonpolitical feature materials that are mainly of a scientific, technical, and cultural character;

2. In the free countries satisfactory use of printed material sent out from Washington is being made by the press, particularly the provincial press and the magazines. Here, again, the greatest demand is for official documents, authentic texts of speeches, and scientific and cultural materials, including fashions, sports, movies, etc.;

3. In some countries, notably Italy, American weekly and monthly publications are gaining in circulation. The Italian edition of the Reader's Digest is now up to a circulation of more than half a million, which far outstrips any Italian magazine. The American newspapers—the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune and the Rome Daily American—both printed in English, have a fairly wide circulation among nationals who can read English.

In spite of this rather favorable picture, however, it must be remembered that in some countries the masses of the population, particularly peasants and industrial workers, are not reached by the press. In Italy, Greece, Spain, and Portugal a high percentage of the population is illiterate.

The great problem just now is to reach the people who do not receive or read newspapers or magazines, and who do not have radios.

Our China Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by Kepler Davis, rear admiral, United States Navy (retired), editor of the Forest Republican, published at Tionesta, Pa.:

OUR CHINA DISASTER

During the past weeks we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely upon the President and the Department of State.

The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming, unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the Nationalist Government.

So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers with the imperfections of the democratic system in China after 20 years of war that they lost sight of our vital stake in keeping China beyond the grasp of Russian expansionism.

THE REAL "RED HERRINGS"

President Truman has charged, and repeated the charge, that the facts uncovered by the House Un-American Activities Committee were "red herrings" to divert attention from alleged Republican deficiencies.

To our mind the true "red herrings" of 1948, and earlier were the stories of the shortcomings and corruption of the government of Chiang Kai-shek which were so widely publicized through America. "Red herrings" spawned originally in Red Moscow to blind us to the real issue in Asia. Lacking enlightened and competent leadership at the top, we fell for these diversionary tactics.

Our policy has not made sense. It has been shot through with vacillations, uncertainties, and confusion. We will now reap the whirlwind.

We have come to our senses too late. The cost now of stopping communism in Asia is probably too much. We have suffered a stinging defeat in the cold war.

Our last defeat, Pearl Harbor, took by surprise the top foreign policy level of our Government. However, a fairly good case can be made to justify their lack of awareness of an impending disaster.

WILLFUL BLINDNESS

No such pleading can be made for the Truman administration in its censurable blindness to the realities of the Far East.

A willful blindness by individuals who preferred to believe the "red herrings" of fellow travelers and their well-meaning dupes. Individuals who brushed aside the counsel and warnings of men of the stature, experience, and China background of Dr. WALTER JUDD, a distinguished Member of Congress, our ex-Ambassador Gen. Pat Hurley, numerous missionaries, churchmen, members of the armed services, and those who had done business in Asia for years.

Under a system of parliamentary government with a cabinet responsible to parliament, the Truman administration would probably be under obligation to submit to a vote of confidence following so costly a policy blunder in foreign affairs.

The Future Development of Southern California Depends Upon Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, water is becoming one of the most important issues in the Nation. Our Western States are dependent upon water for continuation and expansion of their agriculture, which contributes a vital part of the Nation's food supply, and for the continued growth of many western cities.

The Colorado River is one of the most important sources of water for southern California and Arizona. The Los Angeles-San Diego area depends upon the Colorado River for part of both its domestic and industrial supply. About 1,000,000 acres of farming land are irrigated with Colorado River water in southern California.

At the present time signs of future scarcity of water are appearing in the Los Angeles area, which is one of the fastest-growing regions in the United States. Industry multiplied here during the war, people are still migrating into the area, and a doubling of population is expected.

But water is the key to the future of our Western States, and their continued progress or decline is dependent upon an adequate water supply.

California recognizes the urgent need of the other Western States for water from the Colorado River and expects to share with them. But California must receive a fair share of the Colorado River to maintain the present cultivation of land for agriculture and to supply the daily needs of our growing population and expanded industry.

The following article entitled "Why the West Fights for Water," which appeared in the April 3 issue of the United States News and World Report, is an excellent survey of the Colorado River situation, and points out the reasons why water supply is an issue of such vital importance to the Representatives from our Western States:

A river and its water are touching off a battle that apparently only Congress can decide. Yet the developing story of the Colorado is just one of a series. Battles are looming over the Columbia, the Missouri, the St. Lawrence, and the Tennessee, among others.

Water is on the way to becoming a major issue in the United State politics. In the West, water resources are to determine which regions can grow, which will be held back. Water dictates location of new industries, such as atomic installations, chemical works, steel and aluminum plants. Cheap power from water brings up on a widening scale the issues of public versus private ownership of power plants and distribution lines.

In this light the story of the Colorado and its water takes on national significance. Decisions affecting the way the river's water is distributed will determine the future of industry and agriculture in southern California and Arizona. The decisions also may become patterns for settlement of water controversies in other areas.

The Colorado situation is this:

Water of the upper Colorado Basin is to be divided among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, according to a compact just approved by Congress. These States get title to 326,700,000,000 cubic feet of water a year from the Colorado and tributaries.

Another 65,340,000,000 cubic feet a year is reserved for Mexican use by a 1945 treaty. Nevada is given 13,068,000,000 cubic feet a year. Now the big issue is how Arizona and California are to divide up the remaining 366,775,200,000 cubic feet a year.

The problem is that not enough water exists to give both Arizona and California what they figure will be needed in years ahead. Right now, none of the States is using all the water it is entitled to. California is using only about half as much water from the Colorado as it hopes and plans to get in the next 10 years or so. Arizona, the upper-basin States, and Mexico are using only part of the water they are authorized to take. Nearly half of the Colorado is flowing into the Gulf of California without going into any direct use.

Within a few years, however, irrigation and power projects will be utilizing all the available water. Arizona is trying to increase her share of the Colorado water before California can get all the present surplus. California is trying to stop what it regards as a raid by Arizona on California's future water supply. In effect it is a race between States for the last water hole in that area.

Both States regard the race as a matter of life and death. The reasons are briefly told:

In southern California, the Los Angeles-San Diego area depends on the Colorado for part of the domestic and industrial water supply. The Metropolitan Aqueduct—457 miles long—brings this water into 13 cities from the lake behind Parker Dam. About 1,000,000 acres of rich farming land is irrigated with Colorado water. Californians say 3,500,000 people use Colorado water.

At present, southern California's water is adequate for needs except in scattered locations. But signs of future scarcity increase. Los Angeles is concerned about instances of

land sinking a little in places where ground water has been pumped out. Salt water is seeping into the land, where fresh-water tables fall below sea level. Dry wells are becoming more common. In dry spells, much irrigated land lies idle.

This part of California is one of the fastest growing United States regions. Industry multiplied during the war and people still are pouring in. A doubling of population is expected. But a definite ceiling will be set on the section's growth if water supply is not expanded. And the Colorado is the only source of additional water in sight.

Arizona, by contrast with southern California, is in the midst of an acute water shortage. The trouble is worse in central Arizona, where most of Arizona's 664,000 people live. There, farmers irrigate about 500,000 acres of land.

A 20-year dry period, and unusually heavy use of water during the war, depleted river reservoirs. Farmers increased pumping of underground water. They are pumping 48,626,028,000 cubic feet of water a year—at least a third more than should be taken to maintain ground-water levels. Ground-water reserves no longer can meet the need for suplemental water. About 170,000 acres of irrigable land gradually will revert to desert unless new water is found.

Arizona's spokesmen point out that the State faces the loss of one-third of its richest land. If that happens, 150,000 people can be expected to leave the State. Banks and businesses then would fail. Arizona's growth would come to an abrupt end.

Future use of the Colorado thus is the key to growth in southern California and Arizona. Fortunes of five other States in this region are tied to the Colorado, too. The Arizona-California dispute is hurting all of these States. It holds up the comprehensive basin plan, a program for opening the whole Colorado River area to industry, farming, and mining in decades ahead.

The Colorado plan is the joint effort of the Department of Interior, which is to provide capital funds, and the seven basin States. It is river planning on a scale that dwarfs the Tennessee Valley experiment.

The Colorado Basin area comprises one-twelfth of the continental United States. About 2,600,000 acres of former desert is irrigated. Power plants, such as the Hoover Dam installations, have a capacity of about 1,320,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power. This is only the beginning.

More than 130 new major irrigation, power, and flood-control structures have been laid out as possible beneficial projects. Not all can be developed fully because their peak water use, added to that of existing projects, would exceed supply by 24 percent. But, eventually, about 3,650,000 kilowatts of additional power capacity is expected to be installed along the Colorado and its tributaries. New irrigated acres will exceed 1,500,000, and another 1,120,000 acres will get additional irrigation.

The cost of all the projects planned is estimated at $2,185,442,000, in 1940 prices. Construction costs, now declining, still are almost double the 1940 level. First units of the central Arizona project, for example, would cost an estimated $738,000,000 at present prices—more than the Panama Canal. This is the project Arizona is trying to get approved at this time. It would bring 52,272,000,000 cubic feet of Colorado water into central Arizona and rescue that district from water famine. California is trying to block the program until after a Supreme Court review of the whole river case.

These cost figures show the stake the Federal Government is building up in the Colorado Basin alone. Irrigation and power projects are built largely with Federal money, though every dollar the Government spends is supposed to return to the Treasury except for a small fraction that is allocated as the Federal share of flood control. Revenues from sale of power are counted upon to pay most of the costs. Comparing investment and return another way, the official stand is that irrigation and power costs of these projects would create $1.30 in economic benefits to the Colorado region and the country for every dollar the Federal Government spends.

The Colorado Basin contains, in addition to irrigable lands, nearly one-fourth of United States coal reserves, vast deposits of oil shale, natural gas, vanadium, uranium, molybdenum, copper, gold, silver, phosphate, and other minerals. Unlocking these resources will add to basic United States wealth.

Other river-basin plans may be affected by outcome of the Colorado controversy. State water rights may be changed by a congressional decision, or by new Supreme Court interpretations of river laws. Conflicts over other rivers may be settled under rules made for the Colorado.

Texas and New Mexico have just agreed to a compact regulating use of the Pecos River, but only after a bitter fight. A fight is well-started in the Columbia River Valley, over the question of whether States or a Federal authority shall control that river system. A similar fight is under way in the Missouri Valley. There, conflicting interests threaten a battle among States as flood control and irrigation works alter the course of rivers.

There are other instances. It all shows what is to be expected as the trend to big basin-wide river programs reaches into new areas. The Federal Government is the financier. Federal agencies plan to spend about $2,382,619,000 over a 5-year period in five Western States alone, almost entirely for projects harnessing rivers. Other parts of the country, especially the Midwest, are demanding similar development of their river resources. But the Colorado case shows how the changing of rivers can touch off bitter interstate battles.

The Basing-Point Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my remarks, I include an article on the basing point decision by William Schoenberg, president of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers, appearing in the American Federalist, the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor:

THE BASING-POINT DECISION—GHOST TOWNS ARE IN THE MAKING IF IT STANDS

(By William Schoenberg, president, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers)

(The author of this article heads a union directly affected by last year's far-reaching decision of the United States Supreme Court in what is popularly referred to as the Cement case. While Mr. Schoenberg is speaking for his own organization, the stand taken on pricing by the Federal Trade Commission, backed by the sanction of the Supreme Court, has serious implications, as the author points out, for other unions and other industries.)

It was lately demonstrated that the power to select and to elect is not the exclusive prerogative of big business or of big politics—that it belongs to, and may be powerfully used by, the working people of this country.

We the people have resumed the responsibility to see to it that the United States shall have its Government administered by able, efficient men who are responsive to the will of the people and who will act under laws made by Congress. It will be our own fault if the Government is not what it should be.

Today labor is at the crossroads. Labor may choose the hard, narrow path of self-government, the democratic way, where guided by the laws made by a Congress that we elect, we shall go on to the satisfactions of proud and glorious freedom. On the other hand, we may choose the broad, easy, low road of bureaucracy, under which we will work and live subservient to interpretations, regulations, and orders capriciously dictated from day to day by mere appointees who are never directly responsible to the voters. The second way leads to the frustrations of ignominious slavery and to the tyranny of government by force—and the end of American free enterprise.

Is this not the time for our international unions solemnly to reaffirm belief and trust in the long-honored fundamental principle that the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government shall be independent?

The Constitution, in article I, provides that the legislative powers granted by the people to our Federal Government are vested in Congress. Those powers are to be exercised only by Congress. They must not be relinquished. They cannot be delegated.

By article II the executive power is vested in the President. He is to give information to Congress and to recommend such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. Also the duty is assigned to him to take care that the laws made by Congress are faithfully executed. He needs the assistance of administrative agencies, such as the Department of Justice headed by the Attorney General, the Department of Labor headed by the Secretary of Labor, and the various other departments of cabinet rank.

Subordinate to these there are many minor agencies designed and created to serve as aids to major departments. The Federal Trade Commission is one of the scores of such minor boards and bureaus.

By article III the judicial power of the United States is vested in a Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may establish. It is the duty of the courts, thus created, to determine controverted issues of law and fact and to apply the laws that have been made by Congress.

It is necessary and proper that subordinate administrative agencies should act in aid of the various departments of the Government, but that any such agency should attempt to exercise the legislative powers of Congress, the executive powers of the President, and the judicial powers of the courts is unthinkable under our Constitution.

Yet that is the very thing which the Federal Trade Commission has done and which the Supreme Court appears to have approved. It is intolerable to expect that Congress will supinely acquiesce in such behavior by any governmental agency which Congress has the power to curb.

In our consideration of the Federal Trade Commission's long efforts to destroy delivered pricing and to prohibit free competition under the mask of eliminating what it calls the waste of cross hauling by our railroads, we are not concerned with trying to defend collusion or conspiracy, or to fix prices, or to eliminate competition.

Nor are we interested in securing legislation to legalize any so-called basing-point system or any other system of pricing.

We are interested—vitally interested—in having our duly elected representatives in Congress, at the earliest opportunity, take whatever action is necessary to curb and to

prevent the repetition of acts of the Federal Trade Commission, the courts, or any other agency of the Government which has trespassed upon the legislative power of Congress or which sets itself up as the over-all policy maker for free enterprise upon which our whole people depend.

The freedoms which are characteristics of delivered pricing are among those which were guaranteed by the Constitution, under which American business and the American standard of living developed, and flourished. Should those freedoms be destroyed, what will happen to the American standard of living, to the future of American business, to the republican form of government created under the American Constitution, and to the wage earners?

Although section 8 of article I of the Constitution enumerates powers specifically granted to the Congress, including the power "to regulate commerce * * * among the several States," the Federal Trade Commission has presumed to exercise that power. In so doing it has created confusion approaching chaos throughout American industry and it has adversely affected the welfare of the working people. That is an example of bureaucracy in action.

Labor's stake in industry should be beyond the power of any such subordinate Government bureau to interfere with it.

Thousands upon thousands of workers and their families are deeply concerned with actions of the Federal Trade Commission to outlaw and destroy delivered pricing, and to forbid a seller to make lower prices to some customers to meet in good faith the lower prices—or delivered cost—offered by a competitor.

Delivered pricing means the freedom of every man who has something to sell to take that something to any place that he chooses and there put a price upon it and offer it for sale, coupled with the freedom of every buyer to request delivered prices and to buy at the competitive prices, which include delivery at his (the buyer's) location.

That is delivered pricing, an expression of a basic freedom, an attribute of free enterprise. Any attempt to restrain such a basic freedom is a threat to a free society and an approach to despotism. Nevertheless, the Trade Commission has sought to compel industry to sell only at uniform f. o. b. plant prices. Moreover, it has seized the power to carry its intentions into effect.

If American industries are to give up the freedom to compete for business wherever a market is found and compelled to abandon delivered pricing, and to sell their products at uniform prices at the original shipping point or place of manufacture, so that those industries will be confined to selling only in the nearby areas where they have a freight-cost advantage, hundreds of thousands of workers will lose their jobs and become displaced persons who must leave their homes in rural communities and seek jobs in the already overcrowded great centers of population.

Many long-established business enterprises will be compelled to close down or to move from their present locations closer to sources of supply. Disruption in present overstrained production will be inevitable. All of this will have very bad effects upon the general cost of living and the level of living standards.

In reality, those who will be most irreparably hurt are the thousands of workers who have established, built, and put their savings into modest homes, in the small communities where they have brought up their children, established schools for their education and churches for their religious worship, and where the small-town merchants and, in fact, the whole life of these little communities depend upon the pay rolls of one or a few manufacturing plants or business enterprises long established there.

These small American towns will be made into ghost towns, and their inhabitants will be compelled to become displaced persons.

How serious is this situation? How real and immediate is the danger?

This is not intended as a complete survey of what will happen to industry and to workers as a result of the Federal Trade Commission's rulings and interpretations, and arbitrary definitions which go beyond the laws made by Congress. In this brief article we must be confined to a few examples.

Dr. Alfred C. Neal, vice president and director of research, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, reported in Washington on December 10 upon a survey made in New England as to the effect of the Trade Commission's orders and the decisions of the courts thereon. The survey sought to ascertain the effects "of requiring a universal f. o. b. mill price system and * * * outlawing the practice of freight equalization." He said:

"Our best estimate," said Dr. Neal, "was that requiring uniform f. o. b. mill pricing would result in a loss of approximately 33,000 jobs in the region. This figure * * * takes into account only the direct short-term losses and does not take into account the loss involved in the secondary effects, which are concentrated on the transportation, service, trade, and professional lines."

Itemizing the effect on 10 specific industries, Dr. Neal reported that the direct loss of jobs was estimated as follows:

	Estimated job loss
Fabrication of iron and steel	8,800
Paper and allied products	6,350
Nonferrous metals and their products	6,000
Nonspecialized industrial machinery	3,800
Electrical machinery	3,000
Chemicals	1,800
Stone, clay, and glass	1,700
Food processing	1,650
Rubber and rubber products	450
Textiles	300
Total job loss (estimated)	33,850

New England is only one section of America. This is but an example of what will happen across the country.

H. W. Fraser, president of the Order of Railway Conductors, made a statement before the trade policies committee on December 7. In this statement he told of the plight of the Pennick and Ford Corn Products plant at Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

This plant, asserted Mr. Fraser, "is faced either with outright economic death or, at best, a difficult and perhaps hopeless struggle for survival." This would involve the closing of a plant that employs 3,500 workers, because it was estimated it would lose 90 percent of its present business to concerns having a freight-cost advantage in delivering to Eastern markets.

The bad situation of the western farmers who raise sugar beets and the evidence that, if beet sugar cannot compete in the East with the lower prices made there by cane sugar from Cuba, the beet farmers will have to turn to some other crop were also referred to.

Mr. Fraser said:

"I work in the railroad train service in Colorado. My family residence is there and I know the importance of the sugar-beet industry to the families on the land as well as to the workers in the sugar plants.

"It seems to me that, if we have to live with the idea set down in the Federal Trade Commission order, we will create our own uprooted- or displaced-persons problem.

"What of these workers, for instance, who have given their lives to the industries threatened by the order? They have made their homes, reared their families, or are doing so, in their various areas, and all of their family ties and friendships are there established.

"The workers in the railroad industry, as well as workers in other important established industries, should not be the victims of a highly experimental change which promises to produce confusion, dislocation, and economic upset that we can ill afford at this time, or at any time, if our national economic unity is to be served.

"I urge upon this committee the logic of recommending congressional action legalizing the continuance of absorption of freight charges by all producers in the same voluntary manner that this has been done throughout our industrial history."

Incidentally, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which administers railroad rates, unlike the Federal Trade Commission, encourages the equalization or absorption of cost advantages which one railroad may have over another by permitting competing railroads with the higher costs to lower their rates to meet the competition of roads having lower costs.

Telegrams were sent by the executive office of the Cement Workers International Union to 62 local cement unions in towns of 5,000 population or less. Replies from 60 of these unions showed a total of 15,674 employees in cement plants in these small towns. Dependent upon wages paid to these cement workers were 62,423 people.

Many of the replies revealed that additional workers and various small business in the community would be most adversely affected by a shut-down of the local cement plant.

It was estimated that of the total of 15,674 workers, only 1,406 would be able to get other jobs in or near their home communities. Most of the local unions reported in their replies that no other employment was available. Some stated that possibilities of getting other employment were nominal. Many pointed to the long years of seniority enjoyed by the union men and the skills developed which would be lost. Also mentioned were the adverse effects upon the local school districts, local churches, small local businesses. Many added that their towns were one-industry towns, that the men owned their own homes in these towns and that the whole community would be drastically affected.

The investigation clearly showed the danger of creating many ghost towns where cement plants are now located. Several unions representing workers in paper plants, though not solicited, also sent in telegrams telling of some 1,700 employees whose jobs were in jeopardy. Many similar towns throughout the country, dependent upon other industries, face the same fate.

Since then a large number of local unions of other industries, entirely separated from the cement workers, on their own initiative, have sent letters and telegrams to the cement workers' international office setting forth the difficulties they will experience if the rulings of the Federal Trade Commission remain permanently in effect.

Article VI of the Constitution of the United States declares:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof (by Congress) shall be the supreme law of the land" and "the judges shall be bound thereby."

Should this basic command be now discarded in favor of bureaucratic interpretations, regulations, and orders?

"The only way to enforce the law is the way prescribed by law," said William J. Gaynor. (Quoted in American Federationist, October 1948.) "That which cannot be done lawfully must not be done at all, by the police or any other public officials, from the President of the United States down. This is a Government of laws and not of men.

"We must be vigilant of every little approach to despotism, however little it may be. We must see to it that those whom we elect to office do not go outside of the laws, or set

themselves up above the laws, and do as they please.

"It has always been the case throughout the world that the officials who did this did it on the plea that the laws were not good enough; that they could do better than the laws prescribed.

"Beware of all such officials. We do not want officials who have any lust of power. We want officials who are very careful about exercising power. We want officials who are careful to exercise no power except that given to them by the people by their laws.

"There is no more dangerous man than an official who thinks he is better than the laws. The good man in office should be most careful not to set a bad example or precedent for his bad successor, who will come along sooner or later."

We are not interested in legalizing any so-called basing-point system of pricing or any other pricing system. Certainly, we are not interested in weakening the enforcement of the antitrust laws. We are interested only in stanchly defending the basic freedoms upon which the American Government and the American enterprise system and the well-being of our people depend.

If these rights are destroyed or invaded, then very soon some Government bureau will undertake to tell the wage earners of this country where they may and where they may not work—and for what wages. The freedom of self-government secured to labor through development of trade-unionism will thus be destroyed.

Since the workers in the mills and plants are an integral part of the industries involved, is it not incumbent upon our international unions to exert every reasonable and practical effort to bring about equitable relief from impending ill effects created by the acts and orders of any governmental commission or bureau?

Bold New Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in this week's issue of Newsweek. I commend it as "must" reading for those who vote for the ECA give-away program:

WHOSE BOLD NEW PROGRAM?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In his inaugural address, President Truman announced what has now become the famous fourth point—"a bold new program" for "underdeveloped areas," a program to "foster capital investment in areas needing development," to "greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations," and to "raise substantially their standards of living."

No sooner was this announced than the brains of Washington bureaucrats began to bubble with grandiose schemes for giving away still more of the American taxpayer's money to foreign lands. Our Government representative put the idea before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which adopted a resolution approving it. Now the ECA has set up a "colonial development division," and Deputy Administrator Bruce says that this new division is intended to carry out point 4.

Before we go farther with this idea it may be instructive to look into its origin. I do not know who sold the idea to Mr. Truman. But at least the record shows clearly where the idea came from in the first place. The following quotations are from a book published in 1944:

"America can underwrite a gigantic program of the industrialization of Africa, to be launched immediately. * * * It must initiate a general and steady rise in the standard of life of the African peoples. * * *

"Closely related socially, economically, and politically with Africa are the Near Eastern countries of Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Transjordan. * * * Here also a broad regional program of economic development is called for. * * *

"What is clearly demanded by the situation is that the United States take the lead in proposing a common program of economic development of the Latin-American countries. * * * For Latin America [such a program] opens the door for an immense leap ahead in progress. * * *

"For the United States especially it contributes a large part of the answer to that all-important question as to whether we shall be able to keep our national economy in operation. * * *

"The Government can do it, if free enterprise fails to meet the challenge and bogs down on the job.

"Our Government can create a series of giant industrial-development corporations, each in partnership with some other government or group of governments, and set them to work upon large-scale plans of railroad and highway building, agricultural and industrial development, and all-round modernization in all the devastated and undeveloped areas of the world. America has the skilled technicians capable of producing the plans for such projects, sufficient to get them under way, within a 6-month period of time after a decision is made. * * *

"On a world scale the combined projects could be self-liquidating in the period of a generation. They would become the best investments the American capitalist class had ever made in its whole history."

The book in which this proposal appeared 5 years ago was Tehran: Our Path in War and Peace (International Publishers). And the name of the author was Earl Browder, then still officially head of the American branch of the Communist Party (temporarily calling itself the Communist Political Association).

We need not point out here everything that is wrong with this proposal on political and economic grounds. We need not point out, for example, that every million dollars of capital we send abroad sets back our own capital development by just that much. And this at a time when President Truman himself insists that at least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our [own] productive facilities over the next few years, and when he complains that our own steel, oil, and electrical industries are not being expanded fast enough to suit him.

It is enough to point out for the moment that the idea for the bold new program comes straight out of the book of the then head of the Communist Party in this country.

The Montauk Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Edward T. Carvin, president of the Montauk Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., on the occasion of the club's diamond jubilee dinner. It is so seldom that an organization of its kind with a rich background and history celebrates its sixtieth anniversary that I thought it would be appropriate to insert in the RECORD the very interesting and somewhat nostalgic remarks by the club's very capable president.

Gentlemen, fellow members—you know we are all members here tonight to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of this grand, glorious, and beloved old Montauk Club. It is my fond hope that it will have many, many anniversaries.

The dinner committee has asked me to comment on the early history of the club—that is from 1889 to 1931. On December 14, 1889, formal ceremonies were held at the laying of the cornerstone of the new Montauk Club, and the first function in the new clubhouse was 14 months later, February 21, 1891. During those 14 months, the club had its headquarters at 34 Eighth Avenue. The first president of the Montauk Club was Charles A. Moore and he served from 1889 to 1901. We owe a great debt to Mr. Moore, and his associates, and I salute them tonight. By the way, Mr. Moore was associated with Manning, Maxwell & Moore, a great railway supply house, and they established another institution—they gave Diamond Jim Brady a job as salesman. Diamond Jim afterward sold steel railroad cars, made a lot of money, became quite a prominent figure—acquired quite a fondness for diamonds, food, and Lillian Russell. Jim seemed to run second as a suitor of the beautiful Lillian. During Mr. Moore's regime, the first of the famous birthday dinners to Hon. Chauncey M. Depew was held in the club, April 23, 1892. As you know, Mr. Depew was United States Senator, president of the New York Central Railroad, and, if I remember correctly, one time Ambassador to the Court of St. James. He was also considered the best after-dinner speaker of his time. Those Depew dinners were wonderful and most lavish affairs, and they brought much fame to the Montauk Club, both here and abroad. The last one was held on Senator Depew's ninety-second birthday.

On December 15, 1894, the famous "Arctic dinner" was held, guests including Gen. Adolphus W. Greely, United States Army, commanding the Greely expedition of 1882, 1883, and 1884. Chief Engineer George W. Melville, Chief of Bureau of Steam Engineering, and engineer of the lost *Jeannette*, and of the Greely expedition of 1884, Chief Justice Charles P. Daly, of New York, president of the American Geographical Society, and many leading figures of the Peary expeditions.

Other outstanding events during the time of Mr. Moore were the dinner to Hon. William J. Gaynor, at one time mayor of New York, a member of the club, who lived right across the street, where you will still see the old lamps that marked the residence of the mayor of New York in those days; in 1895 the dinner for famous editors, the guests including Charles A. Dana, of the New York Sun; St. Clair McKelway, a famous editor of the Brooklyn Eagle; United States Senator Hawley, of the Hartford Courant; that noted Congressman, Nelson A. Dingley, author of the famous Dingley tariff bill, editor of the Lewiston Maine Journal; George Cary Eggleston, of the New York World; Charles R. Miller, of the Times; Isaac H. Bromley, of the New York Tribune; and that wonderful old fellow, "Marse Henry" Watterson, of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

When the statue of General Grant was unveiled on Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, President Grover Cleveland was the Montauk Club's guest of honor.

On May 30, 1895, a formal reception was given to Gov. William McKinley, of Ohio, who the following year was elected President of these United States. McKinley made one of his notable speeches, supporting protective tariff, at this very dinner.

On Saturday, November 28, 1896, a dinner was given in honor of Lt. Gov.-Elect Timothy L. Woodruff, a strong member of the Montauk Club.

On March 13, 1897, a dinner to the justices of the appellate division. In addition to the justices, some of the distinguished guests were: Hon. Joseph F. Barnard, Hon. William J. Osborne, Hon. Augustus Van Wyck, Hon. William J. Gaynor, Hon. Jackson O. Dyckman, Hon. Joseph Aspinall, and Hon. Martin J. Keogh.

The tenth anniversary of the club, a half century ago, a dinner was given in honor of the president, Charles A. Moore, and Mr. Moore certainly deserved the honor. This dinner was held March 11, 1899. Also, in 1899, January 20, a dinner was given in honor of Rear Admiral Sampson, the guests, including the Secretary of the Navy, other naval dignitaries, and the commanders of the various ships which participated in the Battle of Santiago in the Spanish War.

The second president of the Montauk Club was Thomas H. Troy, a distinguished lawyer of his day, who lived right across the street on Eighth Avenue. Mr. Troy served from 1901 to 1904, and was succeeded by the colorful Timothy L. Woodruff. Mr. Woodruff was president of the club from 1904 until 1908. There is a legend, and they say it is true, that Timothy Woodruff just missed being president of the United States. In 1896, the Republican "boss" Mark Hanna of Ohio, was looking for a strong Eastern man as running mate for his presidential candidate William McKinley, and the idea was to get a man for vice president who could carry the important New York State for the ticket. The Eastern leaders suggested Tim Woodruff. Mr. Hanna said: "Isn't he the fellow who wears those loud vests?" And someone replied, "Yes, Tim does have a penchant for wearing very fancy vests." Hanna said: "Who else have you?" And they suggested Theodore Roosevelt. You know the rest of the story: McKinley was shot by an assassin in Buffalo, and Teddy Roosevelt became President of these United States. So, when the folks walked down those stairs out there and looked up at the portrait of Tim Woodruff that you will see there on the landing, the standard remark was, "there is the man who would have been president of the United States except for the vests he wore." You will note he had on a fancy vest when the portrait was made. You know about two weeks ago a writer and photographer from the Brooklyn Eagle came up here for material. After taking a shot of the directors, who were in session, they asked me to pose, looking up at the portrait of Mr. Woodruff. The photographer took a second shot, and said, "look up admiringly at Mr. Woodruff." I did the best I could but they called up in a couple of days and said the pictures were no good. I was sorry about that, as I might have had the unique distinction of being the only man actually caught looking up to a Republican since November 2.

The fourth president of the Montauk Club, and the last of the old-time era was Mr. William H. English, elected in 1908 and serving 23 years until 1931. Mr. English was a very wealthy man, head of a big printing company, a large real estate operator, particularly in the Garden City development. Mr. English loved the big dinners to Chauncey Depew and other such receptions. He entertained lavishly, spent a lot of money, and helped this club considerably. I remember a big dance we had at the Plaza Hotel in New York, and Mr. English and another member made up the deficit for the big show that was put on, which included Gertrude Lawrence and other stars. Mr. English once gave a lavish dinner in honor of some notable, and the dinner cost $4,400 for sixteen people. The table, a glass one with depth and flowers growing and blooming, birds flying around in the table, just an artistic thing that one could not forget. He had an opera star singing at this dinner. In fact, he brought over at various times many of the great Metropolitan stars, Madame Alda, wife of the great impresario, Gatti-Cazaza, Anna Case, Frieda Hempel, and I believe Mary Garden. These stars received from $1,000 to $1,500 each for appearance at this club.

Now, my good fellows, you cannot give those dinners for $4,400 today—what with inflated prices, high labor costs, confiscatory taxes, and what have you—and that places the present president of this club at a terrific disadvantage. Further, I do not think that I should attempt to eclipse Mr. English's course record for 16 people. Further if I did induce an opera prima donna to come over here and sing for a paltry thousand dollars, the opera-singers union would probably throw a picket line right around this building. So, I'll not take a chance.

Back in the early part of 1920, when it was not sure who would be the Republican presidential nominee, several of those most prominently mentioned were brought over here for dinner—Senators Warren Harding, Joe Poindexter, Hiram Johnson, and Governor Frank Lowden of Illinois. Senator Harding, who was the successful candidate, and who became President, was brough up to the club that day on an old-time fire wagon, that had been paraded that day by the famous shipbuilder William Todd. Todd brought his old-time company from Wilmington, and as I came from Wilmington, I well remember the fire company to which Todd belonged, the volunteer Reliance No. 2 Company of Wilmington.

Yes; Mr. English did wonderful things, and the members held him in great esteem. One of his memorable dinners was given to Bishop Thomas Molloy on his elevation to the head of the Brooklyn Diocese, the largest Catholic diocese, I believe, in the world. The bishop is a member of this club.

Mr. English retired in 1931 and the next president of the club was Mr. Frank C. Russell, former president of the Coffee Exchange. Our next speaker, Federal Judge Harold M. Kennedy will cover Mr. Russell's regime, but I would like to say that Mr. Russell came in during the darkest years of the club's history, and we owe the club's survival to his unswerving optimism and determination that the old Montauk Club should live.

While I have been talking only of the earlier history of the club, I would like to relate one recent incident. On the occasion of the Sunday schools anniversary day Judge Lockwood held a luncheon at the club, and the principal speaker was General Eisenhower. Other distinguished guests were Mayor O'Dwyer and former Ambassador Gerard. I had the pleasure of a little chat with General Eisenhower, and after praising the club he told me that he had read of the famous Depew birthday dinners that were held at this club over a period of many years.

Several Presidents' wives have been guests of the club, especially at the luncheons on Sunday schools anniversary days. Mrs. Hoover at one, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt at another, and more.

I would like to ask a few of our distinguished old-time members—men who have been members of this club about 40 years or more—to take a bow as I name them: Here is one—member of the Port Authority, distinguished by President Wilson and President Roosevelt, and one of the best known shipping men in the world—Eugene F. Moran.

Another Brooklynite who went far in the business world, vice president of the great Bethlehem Steel Corp., associate of that master steel tycoon, Charles Schwab—who was also a member of this club, a great lover of sports and all-round popular fellow—James H. Ward.

Here is a man who has been famous in the history of our country, an outstanding lawyer, Congressman, chairman of the all-important Appropriations Committee under the Wilson administration when war was first declared on Germany—a notable judge and parliamentarian—Hon. John J. Fitzgerald.

Also, former judge of the Supreme Court of New York, and now official referee, Peter P. Smith.

In conclusion I would like to praise the vice president of the Montauk Club, Benjamin W. Blakey, perhaps the leading citizen of Brooklyn, and, if you ask me, the number one member of the Montauk Club. Mr. Blakey has done more for the Montauk Club than anyone I know, but has always declined the presidency of the club.

Yours truly will do everything in my power that this grand old Montauk Club, famous for its high traditions, shall live to celebrate many more happy anniversaries. Thank you.

Address by Count Carlo Sforza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Count Carlo Sforza, Foreign Minister of Italy, on April 11, 1949, before the United Nations Assembly:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, you have agreed to my coming here to state before you the views of the Government of the Italian Republic on the final disposal of those African territories which for many years, before the advent of fascism, were under Italian control.

The best way for me to show you my appreciation is to be as clear and as short as possible.

And, indeed, it would be difficult for the Foreign Minister of Italy to do otherwise. You have been most courteous, and I am grateful to you, but I cannot forget that here I am only as a guest and that the rights of a guest are limited.

While the clauses of the peace treaty were often unduly hard on a nation which has sacrificed so many lives in the war of liberation against nazism and fascism, there was one provision, one only, which offered a prospect of hope and dignity: The promise to receive Italy as an equal among you for the great task that is entrusted to the United Nations. This did not happen. Most of you regret it; knowing it, I stand today in your presence most confidently; that is why I am sure that you are impartially resolved to do justice to Italy once you come to feel that justice is on Italy's side.

If I may venture to say so, the problem today is not to punish a nation like Italy, which in spite of enormous difficulties, both political and economical, has regained its place and has been received as an ally by some of the greatest nations of the world. It would be more true to say that the problem which confronts us today is among the most complex in contemporary history: It is

the problem of the reawakening of the peoples of Asia and Africa. It is against this background, I believe, that your Assembly, which truly represents all the peoples of the earth and in a certain sense embodies the ideals which we all share, will wish to examine the question which concerns us today. We Italians have been oppressed for centuries and we arose again in the name of democracy and the principle of nationality. Our national heroes were Mazzini and Garibaldi, who appeared wherever there was a struggle for the victory of the new ideals.

It looked as if, under fascism and nazism, the tides would turn and, at a dark moment, the successful dictatorships would prevent forever the achievement of these ideals.

That is why the present leaders of the Italian Republic felt, from the very beginning of the Fascist regime, that the stubborn struggle which they undertook against it was one which concerned all nations. That is why Winston Churchill recognized that one man and one man alone was the cause of this grievous deviation. And although the Italian Republic bears no responsibility for a regime which its leaders have always fought, we feel today an even greater interest in hastening and realizing the independence of the populations of Africa. But if this action is to be a real one and not purely verbal, that help which it is our duty to grant them must be mainly economical and technical. I was very happy when I learned from Mr. Bevin, during a visit which I paid him in London in 1947, that England, with its large experience, was studying a series of detailed plans for the economic development of Africa. The United States of America also shows a growing interest in this essential problem. Indeed, the more far-seeing minds in this country begin to feel that Africa is a neighbor and a neighbor which must be treated as such.

The United States of America has already indicated in point IV of President Truman's inaugural address, its readiness to give its powerful and generous contribution to this great common task. But we must not forget that this far-reaching plan could never be executed if human skill, labor, and experience were not equally available. And this Italy is capable and fully willing to contribute.

To deny Italy her share in this task would be not only, in our opinion, unjust to her; it would do great and irretrievable harm to the common cause, and first and foremost to the interests of Africa itself and of its peoples. The Italians—being a country of peasants and artisans devoid of any racial prejudice—are most apt to bring to Africa their ancient qualities and crafts.

It would sound like a paradox if, while such vast efforts are being planned for the development of Africa, some of its territories were left to decay.

As far as we are concerned, we are ready to contribute all our efforts to the technical improvement and economic development of Africa. We are also ready to prepare for independence, within the shortest possible time, those territories which might be entrusted to us. That this is no empty promise is shown not only by the fact that the Italian Republic takes this solemn pledge before you, but also because we always thought so; the man who speaks to you today was among those who in 1920, being as now Minister of Foreign Affairs, decided the creation of the Libyan Parliament, a revolutionary act for that time, an act that shows where the real Italian tradition lies.

But let us examine separately the various territorial problems which are submitted to your consideration. Your task is made easier through the fact that the British Military Administration in Tripolitania, Eritrea, and Somaliland, as well as the French administration in a western area, has been conducted in such a way as not to prejudice your final decision. This is a fact I am ready and even glad to acknowledge.

Somaliland: As far as this region is concerned, we note that a large measure of agreement seems to exist concerning an Italian trusteeship over it. We are ready to assume this responsibility and to fulfill all duties connected with it in accordance with the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. I may add, in this connection, that a small body of administrators and technical advisers have already received a full training to enable them to discharge their new duties. The first and foremost among them is to do promptly our best for the political, economical, and social progress of the populations.

Libya: On April 4 I said in my address at the signing of the Atlantic Pact: "No nation in the world can feel secure in its prosperity and peace if all its neighbors are not as safely marching toward the same goals of prosperity and security."

Now that even oceans are on the way of becoming small lakes, nowhere intimate solidarity among neighbors is a more evident necessity than in the Mediterranean. We Italians feel this so deeply that we have greeted with joy the rise of the new independent states of the Middle East. We know that their progressive development does not only revive ancient Mediterranean civilizations, but also enriches and strengthens the economic possibilities of Italy. Libya itself, in our opinion, must become one of the pivots of our friendly cooperation with the Arab peoples. That is why—if we are entrusted with the administration of Tripolitania—as I am confident we shall be, our loyalty to the duties imposed on us by the United Nations will be acknowledged to her in full accordance with the most obvious interests of our national future.

It has been objected from certain quarters that Italy would do well not to take upon herself the financial burdens which the administration of the territories would entail. May I recall, however, that Italy has for many years made in Libya conspicuous investments and that considerable numbers of Italians have worked and devoted their lives to the economic development of the country; it is on account of this, it is because of the assurance of common advantage both to the Arab and Italian communities, that Italy feels it her duty not to escape an arduous task since Italy is well aware that peace, prosperity, and fruitful development will be ensured to the territories entrusted to her care.

It is not an Italian, it is Mr. Foster Dulles, who has pointed out—I quote—that "the Italian nation has a surplus of population, of peoples who have demonstrated, in many parts of the world, their great capacity to develop vast places into productivity and we believe that the material welfare of the Italian people and of the inhabitants of Africa can be advanced by cooperation under sound administration."

Nobody can deny that Mr. Dulles' words are truth itself.

The Italian Government is of opinion that the Libyan problem should be solved at the same time in all its parts. It would be unfair to take final decision for one part of Libya, while postponing the same decision for another part.

The assertion has been made that Italy's return in Tripolitania as a trustee power might cause disturbances and even outbursts of violence. What is the basis for such an affirmation? Let us state some facts. Our settlers have always freely mixed with the local population in the towns as well as in the distant fields bordering the desert, and even now, notwithstanding the events of these last tormented years, a great many of them carry on constantly and in harmony with the Libyans their beneficial work.

There is more: Allow me to call your attention to the following facts:

1. At two different times, there were in Tripoli serious riots; in November 1945 and in February 1948. If anti-Italian feelings really existed among the Arab masses, there would have been riots directed also against Italians. In 1945, more than 100 Jews were killed and many more were wounded. In comparison with so many Jewish deaths only 1 Italian was accidentally killed and 3 wounded. The same proportions were recorded in the new uprising of 1948.

Is this evidence of hatred towards the Italians?

The masses do not reason politically; they follow uncontrolled instincts which reveal their profound tendencies.

2. Waiving aside these sad episodes, fortunately rare in the recent life of Libya, the most significant evidence of the popular Arab feeling toward us was offered last January on the occasion of the administrative elections in the city of Tripoli, the real and only political center of the territory.

On January 18, 1949, in the first free elections held in the territory under British administration, a substantial majority went to friends and sympathizers of Italy. The same has happened outside Tripoli, notably in Tarhuna.

The alleged hatred toward my country failed to materialize when frenzied crowds committed the worst acts of violence. It failed to materialize when in the secret of the ballots—assured by a democratic administration—the population said its final word.

Since it is my strong desire that a happy and serene atmosphere may prevail in the Mediterranean, and that Great Britain and Italy cooperate also on the North African coasts, allow me to quote a passage from a recent editorial published in the London Times. I quote: "Tripolitania is a desert country which needs, more than anything else, the restoration of her barren soil. It was this task which Italy had undertaken before the war with immense energy and skill and which she is now prepared to continue with all the patient labor of a peasant people. Her achievements in this work of reclamation compare with the best that has been done by the British in Africa or by the Jews in Palestine. Even now there is little or no hostility among the Arabs to the 40,000 Italians who remain there, most of them simple peasants whose way of life hardly differs from that of the Arabs themselves." So wrote the Times, creating a deep impression in England. I do not know who is the author of this article; but I want to thank him from this supreme world forum in the name of the many millions of Italians who since Mazzini's times have cherished the ideal of Anglo-Italian friendship.

ERITREA

It would certainly not be a solution to place Eritrea, that never belonged to Ethiopia, under its control. For very many reasons deep is my respect for Ethiopia, and of it I have given public proof. That is why I almost hesitate to quote again the editorial of the London Times I referred to above.

According to this article the annexation of Eritrea to Ethiopia seems—I quote—"based on exaggerated views of Ethiopian capabilities. It was illogical that a nation itself so much in need of help and education should be given control over a country of many religions and races (some of them more advanced than the Ethiopians themselves) and containing a highly civilized 'European' town like Asmara."

For my part I want only to add that the complexities of the problem seem to have been overlooked and should be reconsidered.

Of course, we want Ethiopia not only to feel secure but also to contribute her full share in the development of Africa.

She should be given an outlet to the sea, the only natural one being, for ethnical and economic reasons, Assab. On the other hand we feel confident that this committee will

acknowledge the impossibility of annexing Eritrea to Ethiopia as this would jeopardize the great advantages which in many decades of toil the Italian community has extended to the whole territory. We firmly believe that, whatever juridical guarantees might be devised to safeguard the status of the Italians in Eritrea, the inevitable decay which would follow in the steps of annexation on the part of Ethiopia would force them to leave the country.

Those who foresee the whole inevitable decay of Eritrean economy show more solicitude for the real interest of Ethiopia than those who do not hesitate to impose on her today charges beyond her actual possibilities.

It is therefore in the interest not only of Eritrea but also of Ethiopia and neighboring territories that we have requested to administer Eritrea under United Nations trusteeship and guide her toward self-government and independence.

We have always shown our readiness, however, that such a solution should take into account the interests of other powers and of Ethiopia itself. We have in this connection urged many times direct talks with Ethiopia and other countries interested in that area.

I refuse to believe that, even in the face of conflicting interests as well as of ethnical and religious differences, a fair compromise cannot be reached. A formula may be difficult to find; yet this is what diplomacy is for, and it would be indeed a strange and disheartening spectacle if we had to confess our inability to solve the problem.

I have now ended my statement; but I would like to add a few observations which apply both to Eritrea and Libya.

It seems to me that one of the main duties of the United Nations, which still remains the strongest hope for all mankind, is to avoid even the semblance of the principle of annexations or partitions based on conceptions of military security which the United Nations should guarantee in a different way. Suspicion and mistrust would arise if and when it might be contended—even falsely—that the United Nations consented to transplant to Africa certain old conceptions based on the balance of power and military requirements of which we Europeans have been the victims for centuries. On the contrary—and the present occasion is perhaps unique—we should reaffirm the principle of collective security and of the loyal cooperation of all the neighboring civilized nations for the development and welfare of Africa.

Gentlemen, the decision you are going to take is juridically independent of any treaty. But the practical reality is different; you are going to give your judgment, at least partly on the basis of the report of a Commission which was appointed by the four victorious powers in a moment when the passions aroused by war were far from being subdued.

I could give you a long list of the errors and contradictions which are to be found in the report of that Commission; still, I would rather remind you that the report itself opens at the first chapter by acknowledging—I quote—"that it had been impossible to verify the accuracy of all the information supplied."

But since moral voids mean more, to me, than statistical errors I will restrict myself to point out one lacuna which is to be found both in the report and in the more recent debates on the subject. Eritrea and Tripolitania have been transformed, not by a handful of recent immigrants, but in most cases by two or three successive generations of men and women who, of course, love Italy but are perhaps even more attached to the land they have made fertile, to the cities and villages they have built. These men are no more simply Italians, they are also Afrikanders, like their fellow-farmers and industrialists of South Africa. To chase them out of Africa after a toil of generations would result in an act of racial discrimination. I know very well that none of you would will it; it would just happen as a consequence of dealing with the whole question in diplomatic and not in human terms. But the fact would remain, and like all things unjust it would bear in due time its unhealthy fruits.

The first result would be this: half the world would believe that the most authoritative of all existing organizations working for peace, would have discussed, I will not say decided upon, a number of punitive measures, and these directed against the first nation which unanimously revolted against the dictator who had led her into an unjust war.

Remember that the peace of the world may still be in danger—in danger in the world of Jesus and in the world of Allah. Remember that one of the most difficult things to achieve, after a long and cruel war, is to think with a new mind and without old passions. Remember the best way to give force to a pact is to create the impression that we are inspired by generosity and justice.

Spence Bill Means Planned Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Spence bill, H. R. 2756, has been well analyzed in an excellent article by Felix Morley in the current issue of Nation's Business. Under permission to extend my remarks I include this editorial so that it will be available for all Members of Congress to read. The article follows:

THE STATE OF THE NATION
(By Felix Morley)

The so-called Economic Stability Act of 1949 is at present only a bill resting in the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, close examination of this truly extraordinary legislation is in no way premature. The political philosophy that it represents should be understood before the measure comes to a vote. Afterward, if the bill should be enacted into law, would be too late.

The code number of this economic stability measure is H. R. 2756. It was introduced, on February 15, by Representative BRENT SPENCE, of the Fifth Kentucky District, a veteran legislator now serving his tenth term in Congress and, by virtue of seniority, chairman of the committee which has his bill in charge.

Actual authorship of the Spence bill, however, is attributed to a small White House coterie, headed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, in which spokesmen for the CIO and the leftist Farmers' Union are dominant. The proposed legislation certainly bears on its face the stamp of having been drafted by special interests. For in establishing a planned economy it would bear down on business, at least in the first instance, far more heavily than on either agriculture or labor.

Although it is to be given an inside track on the legislative calendar of the Eighty-first Congress, the Spence bill is not regarded as an essential part of the Truman program. Paradoxically, this makes the measure the more significant. It is in the nature of a trial balloon, which can be withdrawn without prejudice to the President if the public reaction is adverse; but which could alternatively be pushed through to passage if the opposition exhausts itself on more obviously controversial issues, like repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and civil-rights legislation.

The Spence bill, in other words, is in the nature of a surreptitious but determined flank attack on the defenses of free enterprise. Precisely because unheralded and surprising, it recalls the adage that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In one respect the Spence bill was foreshadowed. President Truman served notice, in the election campaign and in his message at the opening of Congress, that he wants restoration of "stand-by" price controls. H. R. 2756 provides these controls, and indeed would automatically reenact many of the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. But the proposed legislation goes much further than price-fixing and indeed says frankly that:

"It is the purpose of this act to utilize the powers and resources of the Federal Government to assist in overcoming certain adverse conditions resulting in part from World War II."

The nature of these adverse conditions is never clearly defined, but there is no uncertainty about the remedy proposed for the undiagnosed disease. That remedy is a grandiose program of governmental planning in many respects strikingly similar to the great Stalin 5-year plan, authorized by the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. on March 18, 1946. Even in Russia an enabling act had to be adopted before centralized planning could really take over. The Spence bill is clearly that sort of preparatory legislation.

In his speech inaugurating the current Russian plan, Premier Stalin said that "special attention will be devoted to extending the production of consumer goods [and] to raising the living standard of the working people by steadily lowering the prices of all goods." Section 101 (c) of our proposed Economic Stability Act says similarly that it will "encourage maximum production and supply [and] discourage and prevent price movements which inflict serious hardships or impede economic stability."

Not merely the stated objective, but also the actual phraseology of the Spence bill gives more than a little evidence of having been modeled from the Soviet prototype. Both the Russian and the American legislation emphasize that—in each case—national security will be promoted, and the similarity does not stop there.

The Soviet law establishing the current 5-year plan places its administration in the hands of Stalin, for which reason it is known in Russia as the great Stalin 5-year plan. But the Soviet law authorizes Stalin to delegate authority for the administration of the undertaking to all or any of a council of 52 ministers. These are often highly specialized; thus there is a special Minister of the Agricultural Machine-Building Industry and another Minister of Electric Power Stations.

The Spence bill paves the way for the establishment of such ministries here. It provides (sec. 104, a) that:

"The administration of this act is vested in the President, who may delegate any and all authority hereunder to such department, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate."

Noteworthy is the fact that throughout this bill the word "Government" is used where "administration" is meant. Government, to the authors of the Spence bill, means the executive branch of Government and that branch only. Time was when the Government, in this country, meant collectively the Executive, the legislative, and the judiciary, with no one arm dominating the other two. Now Government is coming to mean the White House alone—as in Russia it means the Kremlin.

The powers which this legislation would place in the President are truly extraordinary—by traditional American standards. Under section 205 the Government would be empowered to construct new plant facilities, or expand or rehabilitate existing plant facilities whenever deemed desirable in the judgment of the President. And then comes a clause broader than the proverbial barn door:

"For the purposes of this section, the President is authorized to acquire real property and any right, title, or interest therein by purchase, lease, or otherwise, as he deems necessary."

It is a general principle that the more drastic the law, the more drastic must be the penalties by which it may be enforced. The Spence bill conforms to that principle. It would empower the President (sec. 302e) to make inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises or property of any person * * * as may be necessary or appropriate in his discretion. Fines of $10,000 or imprisonment for a year, or both, are provided in the case of contumacy by any person.

In spots the Spence bill is cleverly—perhaps too cleverly—drafted. It seeks to exempt farmers from the proposed price controls. It further says (sec. 406, c) that "an increase in wages * * * may not be considered as an increase in cost of production * * * until 6 months after the effective date of the wage increase." And the bill makes a great play of assisting small business at the expense of big corporations. But this attempt to ride herd on the sheep, with no coercion except for the goats, is not very impressive.

The objective of a completely managed economy, planned by appointed bureaucrats in the Russian manner, breaks through all attempts at concealment. And the provision that the act shall be entirely wound up by June 30, 1954, is not a particularly happy assurance. Another 5-year plan could easily follow the first one here, as has been the sequence in Russia.

Indeed this attempt to classify the Spence bill as emergency legislation gives the game away. It was drafted when insufficient production and rising prices could be used as an excuse for the regimentation proposed. Then the bill was introduced, recklessly it would seem, when heavy inventories and falling prices had come to the fore in the public mind.

This utter indifference to actual business conditions serves to emphasize the underlying objective of those who drafted the Spence bill. Clearly, this objective is to obtain legislative authorization for the establishment of a planned economy on the Russian model, wholly regardless of whether the economic arguments for such a dubious development will hold water.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am much concerned with the matter of universal military training and the manner in which such an obviously necessary defense is being batted from pillar to post.

So sure as I live and breathe, after every anesthetic has been tried to obviate the pain of being a patriot, there will come a day when every able-bodied citizen of the United States will have been trained also as a soldier.

I do not forget that "the liberties of Rome were safe while military information was generally diffused and every Roman citizen considered and felt himself a soldier." So, while temporarily supporting what looks like immediate necessities, I am for a program of universal military training, and go on record to that effect:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago a small group of people, some of them your ancestors, landed on the shores of this continent in the search for freedom from tyranny, oppression, and fear. They were a tired and weary group who had braved the unknown dangers of a long sea voyage fraught with peril, storm, and pestilence in the hope that in this land there would be a life worth living, a land yet unknown, but full of promise and hope that here man could raise his eyes to the skies and see his God in his own image and breathe into his lungs the freedom that man has, since time began, dreamed of. The landing here was not the end of the quest, but only the beginning. Through many years of hard work, sacrifice, starvation, death, and new life these people opened up a new world for others who followed, others who were seeking the same goal. Tyranny and oppression followed but did not stay in this bright, new land. Soon this way of life began to become apparent to all and suddenly a new Nation was born, a Nation of free people who understood the meaning of freedom and opportunity and individuality—and the sanctity of man.

Today that nation has almost reached greatness. It did not acquire this quality easily. Wars were fought, people died, man sacrificed again and again in order that his children would be able to enjoy the fruits and privileges that are inherent in a democratic world. The principles of freedom and democracy have been challenged over and over again, twice within our own lifetime. We, who today are responsible for the continuance of those freedoms and democratic principles, have witnessed the two greatest wars in the history of mankind. Each conflict was increasingly more devastating than the one preceding, each more costly in life and material wealth than the one before.

Today, we are again engaged in a struggle against tyranny, oppression, and fear. The eyes of the world, the hopes of the countless millions, rest upon us, beseeching us to provide not a haven but a bulwark against the force of communism which threatens to overrun them. There are some in this country who claim that we should not supply such a bulwark, that it is a thankless task to lend a helping hand. It amazes me how short-sighted these people are. They apparently cannot see that the real basis of America's greatness are the ideals which she stands for and fights for. Our democracy is and must continue to be a dynamic one.

Fortunately, the opponents of constructive action while highly vocal are relatively few in number. Our Nation has been able to proceed positively in its efforts for peace. Your Representatives in Congress have had your backing in proposing and adopting economic, technical, and military measures which would make the United States a dynamic force for world peace. In dollar magnitude, our greatest efforts have been along military lines. And for this reason I would like to discuss these military measures with you today.

The United States is confronted with the decision of how strong it must be in order to defend itself against its announced aggressor. In reaching this decision, we are confronted with the problems of method of maintaining our strength, what weapons to use, what strategic concept to adopt, and what will it cost. My thinking on these problems has been guided by the adoption of a set of principles, or truisms. Let us consider a few of them:

First, whatever warfare we can foresee, it is quite impossible to foresee any kind in which the citizens of the United States quit without fighting back. Agreeing on this, then, it is utterly impossible to foresee any warfare in which every citizen will not need every possible advantage we can give him, and it is equally impossible to foresee any warfare in which the able-bodied young men will not be needed in military organizations capable of performing known military duties in known jobs as parts of known teams, under organized direction.

Second, the oceans no longer promise us 2 years after war breaks out in which to get ready to fight, because the complexity of modern war requires a degree of teamwork training which was never dreamed of until quite recently; because the air age and the electronic age and the atomic age and the threat of bacteriological warfare carries a need for well-trained citizen forces-in-being everywhere to grapple with the paralysis of utter horror and terrific destruction no matter what the grisly details are when they are finally visited upon us.

Third, that our forces must be capable of swift and sufficient retaliation upon a common aggressor to deter him from war or to retard his advance until our citizen forces can be brought to bear upon him.

Fourth, that these forces must be citizen forces for military service in the common defense is a recognized obligation of citizenship. If we should attempt to keep a standing army in order to avoid this obligation its costs could not but have a crippling effect on our economy.

Let me repeat these principles chiefly:

1. America will fight back in any future war.

2. We will no longer have 2 years to prepare for war.

3. We must have regular armed forces, an air force in particular, ready to strike back against any aggressor, but that

4. Our real strength lies in a trained citizenry and not in large standing forces.

The military program now under consideration by your Congress is a comprehensive one and conforms in all but one respect to the principles I have previously mentioned. As you know, the over-all budget allotted to the National Military Establishment is approximately $14,000,000,000, about a third of the total national budget for 1950. From this fourteen billions each of the three services has been allotted about four and one-half billions.

This allocation of funds will permit the Army to maintain a regular strength of about 677,000 men, a National Guard strength of 325,000 to 350,000—a Reserve Corps strength of 230,000 and an ROTC of 134,500.

The Regular Army strength will enable us to retain our occupation forces at about the same relative strength and the over-all establishment will be so organized as to give us 10 Regular Army divisions. The National Guard will remain organized on a 27-division basis and greater emphasis will be placed on all our civilian components.

The Regular Navy and Marine Corps will have a strength of 527,000 officers and men. There will also be 281,000 reservists, 14,632 ROTC, and 4,311 other officer candidates.

The active fleet will consist of 731 ships, of which 288 will be combat. Five hundred and forty-nine vessels will be kept in reserve. Greater emphasis also will be placed on antisubmarine activities.

In addition to ships, the Navy plans to maintain 7,650 naval planes active. About

40 percent of the naval appropriations, or about $2,000,000,000, are budgeted for aviation.

The Air Force gets the largest share of the funds, and with it will provide 412,000 Regular officers and men, and 9,200 active aircraft.

With these men and planes the Air Force has decided to organize only 48 air groups, but they will be fully manned and equipped groups. Twenty-seven National Guard air groups will be maintained, consisting of some 50,000 men and officers. Plans for about 67,000 air reservists have also been included.

In addition to these three separate programs, funds have been allotted for industrial mobilization, and research and development.

Since military and naval strengths are best seen in a comparative light, it might be interesting to combine and compare these figures. Our naval strength of 731 ships, 288 combat, is larger than the combined navies of the world.

Our air strength of 7,450 naval and 9,200 Air Force planes totals 16,650. This strength will compare favorably with any other nation of the world and, if combined, for example, with Great Britain's air strength, is probably sufficient to give us air superiority in any area of the world in which we can support our Air Force.

Our Army strength of 10 divisions does not approach the Army strength of several other nations.

However, after appraising this whole program, I am forced to repeat that one vital element is lacking. That element is a trained reserve of citizens. Our Air Force and our Army is a one-shot military force and will continue to be a one-shot force until a sound program for building up our Reserve is adopted. Even with a $14,000,000,000 military budget, we cannot hope for anything better unless and until we have a system of training our citizens. Such a system has been proposed in the form of universal military training.

Everyone is familiar with the heated arguments that are being made right now by our Air Force for additional funds, additional planes and additional men. These Air Force leaders recognize that their present force is insufficiently backed up to provide even air security. And unless UMT is adopted to provide a trained citizenry and a trained air reserve, the Air Force will always be forced to ask for more money, more planes, and more men. I am myself a strong advocate of air power, a strong proponent of better weapons and better planes, but both better planes and better weapons require more men and better-trained men.

As we try to look into the future of our national security we cannot but realize that this period of international tension may continue for a period years. And we cannot afford to weaken our armed forces during this period. Yet, if we attempt to maintain the necessary strength in our regular forces alone during such an extended period of time, we will be courting national economic distress. From a viewpoint of costs alone the program of UMT is a vital one.

Many of you may wonder if a repetition of these reasons for UMT isn't passe since there is a Selective Service Act currently in effect. Actually, I feel just the reverse to be true. The best time to discuss and pass on such a proposal is when the immediate heat is off when we can dispassionately consider the aims and goals of our military programs. And I feel that the aims and goals of this program are sound ones. And they continue to be sound until the day that real world peace has been secured.

However, the overriding argument for universal military training has always been that it is the best manifestation to the world, friend and foe alike, of the will of the American people to resist aggression. We are on the verge of entering into a North Atlantic Pact. Plans are being made for the provision of arms to many of the signatory nations. The arguments as to how much arms are to be delivered and how many countries are to join, are not half so expressive of the American determination to secure peace as would be the enactment of the UMT law. The best expression of the will of the American people to obtain and maintain world peace is participation of our youth in such a training program. All the communistic propaganda which infers that Americans are willing to give of their dollars but not of themselves would have a positive refutation by such an enactment. In this way we would all be particpating in, as well as insuring national security.

Arms and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

ARMS AND TAXES

The problem of how much the Nation should spend on its armed services is one which is complicated by many factors, known and unknown, on a world-wide scale. It is not surprising therefore that Washington is of two minds concerning it.

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the administration's chief economic adviser, thinks the cost of rearming Europe should be squeezed out of our national military budget, otherwise we shall have to pay higher taxes with the discomforts and dangers incident thereto. Specifically Dr. Nourse thinks that we ought to make $15,000,000,000 cover our armed needs and Europe's too. He favors a tax set-up which can exist over a long period of cold war, if necessary, and which will "combine military preparedness with economic and financial preparedness, and last but not least, conditions of life that give the citizenry a deep conviction that theirs is a political, social and economic system that is worth defending."

The House Appropriations Committee, on the other hand, has aproved a national defense budget of $15,905,000,000 which is some $600,000,000 more than the President asked for about three months ago. It arrived at these figures by cutting the Army and Navy slightly and raising the Air Force appropriations considerably. And as we understand it, this recommended appropriation which approximates $16,000,000,000 does not cover arms to Europe.

Meantime the Soviet Union has been careful not to do anything drastic as retaliation against the signing of the Atlantic Pact.

The problem is so complicated that only those in highest authority with the most extraordinary facilities for surveying the world situation stand much chance of evaluating it properly. It seems to us that we should do what we can reasonably do toward rearming Europe without weakening ourselves, and furthermore that in our own National Military Establishment we should give priority to the air arm. Safety rather than taxes should, we think, be the determining factor, but we don't want to go broke in the process of playing it safe.

On the Two Hundred and Sixth Birthday of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, the foremost interpreter of the Democratic ideal, was born two hundred and six years ago. The name of Jefferson is attached to memorials in the form of monuments, cities, roads, schools, educational institutions, and organizations of all kinds and characters.

I feel, however, that the political beliefs of Jefferson are even more enduring than all these memorials and monuments; they are as true, firm, and constant today as when first enunciated. He stood for the dignity of man, protection for all under the laws, and education for the masses. He believed in equal rights for all and special privilege for none. Jefferson's views on royalty are epitomized in the following: "There is not a crowned head in Europe whose talents or merits would entitle him to be elected vestryman by the people of America." He recognized that everyone is born with a desire for liberty and freedom, which desire only is obtainable when the government has the consent of the governed. His life was one of service to the community, State, and Nation. Like all great men he was simple in his tastes, honest in his appraisals, forthright in his declarations and courageous in his espousal of democratic principles.

This age of ours sorely needs the counsel and advice of a man such as Jefferson, the distinguished scholar, patriot, and statesman. Our many problems which cry out for solution need his kind of treatment, deft touch and deep thought. I believe that he would make great and profound contributions to the settlement of the many controversies which confront us and the world and am certain that they would be as enduring and lasting as have been his other accomplishments.

Like all great leaders, he was the object of attack from the Tories of his day. There were too many Americans who were more steadfast to the recently defeated enemy, England, than they were loyal to their own country. They besought him to declare war against Napoleon Bonaparte who was at that time engaged in large military operations in Europe, but he held his ground and refused to yield in his neutrality.

The gentlemen in this Congress serving the great sovereign States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, the Dakotas, Montana, most of Minnesota, and portions of Colorado and Wyoming are here by virtue of his sagacity and foresight when, in 1803, he negotiated with Napoleon Bonaparte the Louisiana Purchase, comprising 828,000 square miles for $11,250,000 plus the cost of the French spoliation claims amounting to a total

final cost of about $27,250,000—about 4 cents an acre.

The America of his day needed a Jefferson who met the exigencies of the time. The huge part he played in the writing of the Declaration of Independence, his resourceful diplomatic efforts abroad in search of assistance to the cause of the Revolution and maintaining friendly relations with the French, his contributions to the Constitution of the United States—although he was in France at the moment of its consideration—the Bill of Rights, his stern opposition to the alien and sedition laws, and his remarkable works while Secretary of State were signposts and milestones in a distinguished career which was to be further heightened by two illustrious terms as President of a young and growing nation which needed, in positions of authority, high-minded men who possessed the great ability and determination which was his.

As a Democrat and a follower of Jeffersonian principles throughout my life's service, it is my fervent hope, on his two hundred and sixth natal day observance, that all those elected as Democrats and claiming loyalty to his principles—under their self-designated title—should actually follow his teachings. With his ideals in mind, our deliberations will be fortified by the judgment and spirit of one of the immortals, enabling us to make impartial decisions of benefit to mankind and our Nation.

Common Sense and the Interests of National Security Dictate West Coast Shipping and Shipyards Essential to National Best Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 9, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was honored to call in person for conference with the President of the United States about the subject of the condition of the tragic lack of west coast shipbuilding, I was a member of a committee of Representatives from the three Pacific Coast States.

Upon hearing our preliminary statement of our case in support of the need and necessity of immediate commencement of ship repair and shipbuilding on the Pacific coast, the President immediately replied to us, in substance, as follows, and said to us that we did not need to make effort to sell him on our case for he already realized that just plain common sense and the best interests of our Nation in the field of national defense, both dictated that west coast shipbuilding and the important know-how of shipbuilding must be preserved.

And the President is well aware of the facts and is manifestly in a better position to know the relative value of shipbuilding on the Pacific coast and the retention out there of the know-how in connection therewith than I am or you are. Furthermore, he forthwith assigned to our help and cooperation Mr. John Steelman, of his official staff. All this is very encouraging and is also concrete evidence that definite progress is being made.

I take pleasure in directing your careful attention to the accompanying statement by John Green, president of Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO, for your information.

My home is the great world-famous port of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif. It has earned the place of being the busiest hand-made port in the world. Long Beach and Los Angeles harbors are contiguous harbors, and together make a rapidly growing and vital harbor area; vital to both commercial and naval uses and needs.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, WITH REGARD TO THE BUDGETARY NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE; AND WITH SPECIFIC ATTENTION TO SHIP CONSTRUCTION, SHIP REPAIR, AND THE USE OF NAVAL DRYDOCKS AT THE MARITIME COMMISSION'S RESERVE FLEET SITES

The problem of a presentation of the requirements of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ending June 1950 is not a new one to this union. We have testified many times, before many committees of the Congress of the United States, regarding the problems involved in keeping the American merchant marine alive.

The problems of the American merchant marine are much more than those of a small segment of American industry. Unfortunately, these problems embrace questions underlying our entire economy. We first have to decide if we want an American merchant marine; and—if we do so decide—whether we are willing to foster the development of such American merchant marine.

Unfortunately for the deliberations of this committee, we feel that the question of the merchant marine has been bandied around too long since the end of the Second World War. The question has now become an urgent one, and the consideration of the budget of the United States Maritime Commission (in the last analysis, the budget of the merchant marine) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will mean the difference between life and death to the ship-repair and ship-construction industries.

We have no desire to testify concerning the administrative expenses of the Maritime Commission. We know little about such expenses. We cannot testify, therefore, concerning the purely administrative budget of the Maritime Commission.

However, we do know something, and desire to testify, concerning the allocation of funds to the Maritime Commission for—

1. Ship construction in fiscal 1950.
2. Repair of the Reserve fleet.
3. Installation of Navy surplus floating drydocks at the Maritime Commission's Reserve fleet sites.

Before we go on to the above three specific points, however, we would like to give you a little background as to the necessity for a merchant marine in the American economy.

As early as 1943, the national convention of this union issued a little booklet called "After the War—A World of Plenty" which was a postwar planning program for the shipbuilding and ship-repair industries. In this booklet, we pointed out that the future of those industries was uncertain, to say the least, and that the future of these industries depended, in the last analysis, on a progressive American foreign policy; we pointed out that, if we again allowed these industries to sink into the slump they were in prior to the Second World War, we would lose investments of over $17,000,000,000 made during the war, and countless untold further investments for training and utilizing skills of workers.

Two years after the issuance of this postwar planning report this union prepared and published a booklet called The Nation That Invented the Steamship Must Now Use It, which was sent to all the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress. In this booklet, we pointed out that our wartime fleet was designed for war and not for peace; that the vast majority of its ships were slow, uneconomical in their facilities for handling cargo, and wholly unbalanced for our needs in postwar trade; that America, in 10 years (if it did not balance its merchant-marine program) would be the only nation in the world with an old fleet, while all the other shipping countries would have fast, efficient, modern fleets; that turning the oceans over to foreign domination would mean iron curtains, not only for ideas, but for goods; that, if there were any further delay in America's shipbuilding program, the small corps of trained men we still had left in the industry would disappear.

We pointed out, in this program of ours, that world trade, which has been a major industry even larger than building or automotive sales, depends specifically upon our shipping; that we cannot count on foreign shippers and shipping to expand our world trade, particularly since "controlled" economies would use their ships as instruments of foreign policy, rather than as neutral carriers of our goods; that we required American ships to combat unfair trade practices of other flags (for example, look at the South African situation) and that we needed to keep up healthy competition in ocean-going trade.

We have no argument against the restrictive shipping policies of other nations without a merchant marine of our own.

We pointed out in this volume that no nation can operate a shipping or shipbuilding industry on a feast and famine basis, without an extreme waste of money and resources; that costs are increased by lack of continuous production in the yards; that investment is curtailed; that technological progress is blocked; and most important, that a steady pace of American shipbuilding would prevent us ever again from having to build up a merchant shipbuilding industry, in the event of another emergency, at the excessive cost of over $10,000,000,000.

We pointed out that the subsidies necessary to maintain a modern American merchant marine were infinitesimal for what they bought; that the Government recaptured the money on most of the operating subsidies; that the subsidies, at the very largest estimate that could be given, would amount to no more than one-third of 1 percent of United States world trade; and that, most important, these subsidies were not a tariff—they were not a concealed operation—they simply put American shipbuilders and operators on a par with the shipbuilders of other nations, where the standards of living were lower than ours.

The President of the United States has twice appointed committees to look into this problem of keeping the American merchant marine in operation. These committees have issued reports which, in the last analysis, have never disagreed with our claims. Innumerable bodies of unbiased representatives of American citizens, including the American Legion, chambers of commerce, the great majority of the American press—all are in favor of this program.

And yet we are now being forced to come before the Congress and to say to you that the American merchant marine and the American shipbuilding and ship repair industries are being put on a starvation diet; that the American shipbuilding and ship repair industry, to all intents and purposes, may practically go out of existence within this next year, except for a few isolated yards; that there will be one ship on the ways in 1951, if there are no further contracts let; that the ship-repair industry has lost over 20,000 men within this last month because of lay-offs due to lack of work, and that the shipbuilding industry has less employees than the minimum required for national defense purposes.

This union has no desire to keep appearing before the Congress like Cassandra, but we have no alternative.

I. THE BUDGET FOR SHIP CONSTRUCTION FOR FISCAL 1950

The Maritime Commission proposed a total of $299,000,000 for ship construction from June 1949 to June 1950. The Bureau of the Budget cut this request to $100,000,000, which is the amount which is presently before you for consideration. This is exactly the same as the budget for the present year—fiscal 1949.

The Bureau of the Budget suggested that the Maritime Commission give favorable consideration to the following projects out of the budget for fiscal 1950.

1. Construction of two passenger vessels for the Grace Line at a total cost of approximately $32,000,000.

2. Construction of two refrigerated fruit vessels of the yaque class for Standard Fruit & Steamship Co. for the New Orleans to Central American run at a total cost of $9,000,000.

3. Payment of the national defense features on 10 new tankers at a total cost of $23,000,000.

4. Construction of a flag liner for the Mississippi Steamship Co. for the Gulf-east coast of South America passenger trade at a total cost of approximately $14,000,000.

5. Construction of a cargo prototype at $5,000,000 and a naval auxiliary prototype at $10,000,000.

6. Allocation of approximately $7,000,000 for ship betterment, possibly on the Matson Lines *Monterey* if a buyer is secured, or possibly on passenger vessels for the Arnold Bernstein proposed service to Holland and Belgium.

The reduction of the requested appropriation by $199,000,000 meant that the following vessels would not be built, or even have their contracts let, in fiscal 1950:

1. Two vessels for Moore-McCormick for the North Atlantic-east coast of South America run at $31,500,000 each.

2. Two vessels for the Farrell Lines from the North Atlantic to South Africa at $11,000,000 apiece.

3. Three passenger vessels for the Agwilines for the New York to Cuba run at $13,000,000 each.

The current fiscal 1949 budget of $100,000,000 is expected to be allocated for the construction of the *New America* for the United States Lines on the North Atlantic route, for a number of national-defense tankers, and for the two Alexander Line experimental combination coastal passenger-freight vessels, as well as the authorizations already given on the American President Line vessels and on the American Export Line vessels. It is interesting to note that this proposal for fiscal 1950 certainly does not come anywhere near the proposal given by the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, nor does it come anywhere near the proposal necessary, we believe, for national-defense purposes.

The vessels eliminated would be seven passenger vessels, or vessels which could be converted to passenger carriers in an emergency. The vessels built, exclusive of tankers (for which only the national-defense features would be paid) would be three passenger vessels, two refrigerated cargo vessels, and two prototypes.

In its report, in November of 1947, the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine stated the following program was required for construction of passenger-cargo vessels, alone, for fiscal 1948, 1949, and 1950:

Year and route of service	Number of ships	Approximate gross tons per vessel	Approximate passengers per vessel
FISCAL 1948			
New York to Mediterranean	3	21,000	675
Round the world	5	13,500	180
Total 1948	8		
FISCAL 1949			
New York to Channel ports	1	50,000	2,000
New York to east coast of South America	2	18–20,000	600
Gulf coast to east coast of South America	1	12,000	230
Seattle to Alaska	2	6,000	300
East coast of United States to South Africa	2	8,000	300
Pacific coastwise (Los Angeles to San Francisco)	2	18,000	350
Total 1949	10		
FISCAL 1950			
New York, Boston to London	4	10,000	160
New York to Baltic ports	2	13,000	150
West coast to Pacific	2	18–20,000	600
New York to Puerto Rico	2	7,500	350
Atlantic coastwise	3	18,000	350
Total 1950	13		

We are nowhere near, in the proposal for fiscal 1950, even one-third of the requirements set forth by the President's committee. This union estimates that for national defense purposes alone, in the event of another emergency situation, we would need to build, for the fiscal year 1948, 20 passenger vessels; fiscal 1949, 5 passenger vessels; fiscal 1950, 15 passenger vessels; and in fiscal 1951, finish the construction job and start replacement. The passenger vessels to be built, necessary for national defense, should have a cruising range well above that of any present vessel in operation. They should be able to be converted immediately to defense purposes.

We do not see how the United States can expect its defense situation to be in a state of readiness without construction, within the next few years, of 50 new passenger vessels.

Unless the shipbuilding industry obtains new orders, some of the yards will be without work, starting as early as 1950. This estimate was given by the president of the American Bureau of Shipping.

As you will see from our subsequent discussion of the ship-repair industry, we cannot think that just because we have over 2,000 ships tied up in the reserve fleet, that these vessels, if allowed to rot away as they have been doing, will be any help at all in time of emergency.

Even if the cargo vessels in the reserve fleet are placed in perfect condition, the Congress must not forget that these vessels are totally inadequate to meet any emergency. The great majority of our reserve fleet is incapable of speeds greater than from 7 to 10 knots per hour. At a time when even commercial tankers are being constructed with 27-knot speeds, how useful can a 7-knot vessel be in time of crisis?

Congress is faced with two courses of action. Both of which, if this Nation is to have an adequate merchant marine, must be taken simultaneously and immediately. First, the preservation and repair of the reserve fleet; secondly, the construction of an adequate, more modern, and efficient merchant marine, and the eventual scrapping, as they are replaced, of the obsolete vessels.

The steel industry is still complaining about the shortage of available scrap of good quality. If Congress were to allow an adequate ship-construction program, we would be able to scrap, in time, the 1,000 obsolete Liberty ships in the reserve fleet. Peculiarly enough, no other government in the world seems to be as slow as this country in making sure that its emergency fleet is in a good stand-by condition. Great Britain is replacing its fleet with the best and most modern vessels possible. It is building over one-half the total tonnage under construction in the entire world. Sweden is outstripping this country. Even Switzerland is starting to have a merchant fleet, while we are neglecting our passenger fleet, our coastal fleet, and our reserve fleet.

The shipbuilding industry in this country today does not have one-half the skilled mechanics necessary to train other shipbuilding mechanics if any emergency should arise.

There are some people we know who have blamed the shipbuilding industry for the cost of shipbuilding in this country. This union has sometimes wondered how much an automobile would cost if the Ford Motor Co. today had a contract for 60 cars, and could see no prospect of building any more for another 10 years. Who is to pay the cost of overhead for the shipyards of this country? How can materials be scheduled, or the full skills of workers utilized, when today there is work and tomorrow there may be none? What incentive is there for technological progress?

We think the request made for the ship construction budget of the Maritime Commission is woefully inadequate both for national defense purposes and for the purpose of keeping this industry on an even keel.

II. THE SHIP-REPAIR INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

When we were speaking before the Congress of the United States in 1943, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, we were never quite as urgent in our worry concerning the ship-repair industry as we were concerning the shipbuilding industry. The reason for this was simple. Ship repair was helping to preserve the skills of mechanics in this country. The industry was operating at a normal level.

We felt that, because the ship-repair industry (inclusive of ship conversion) was operating at a normal level, it would help to keep in steady employment a number of major shipyard skills. It is true, and was proven in the last emergency, that ship-repair mechanics can be transferred to ship construction operations with no loss of efficiency. After all, the ship-repair mechanics of Alabama Drydock operated the shipbuilding yard, when that was built. The ship-repair mechanics of Bethlehem-Staten Island proved their skills on ship construction.

However, within the past month, the ship-repair industry in this country has been riddled with lay-offs, uncertainty, unemployment, and rumors of greater unemployment. Over 20,000 ship-repair workers have been laid off in the last month, with no prospect of getting back to work again.

We could understand this lay-off if there were no work, but we confess we are in a complete quandary. According to the report of the United States Maritime Commission, over one-third of our reserve fleet requires repair immediately. So we find ourselves in the peculiar position of having a ship-repair industry lay off workmen vital to national defense, while, if an emergency were to arise, the fleet would not be able to be used, because the work which would have kept these

workmen on the job was not done. We will admit that this sentence reads like a merry-go-round, but, at this point, we are beginning to feel that the entire planning for the merchant marine in the United States has more of the characteristics of the famous "Labyrinth." On page 16 of the statement issued by the House of Representatives' Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries concerning "correspondence between Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland, chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Admiral W. W. Smith, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, concerning the installation of Navy surplus floating drydocks of Maritime Commission reserve-fleet sites," the following statement appears:

"Of the 1,900 permanent reserve Commission vessels now in the reserve fleets, approximately 1,000 require repair. For the most part these are vessels that were withdrawn from service shortly after the end of hostilities. At that time it was deemed not advisable to make the repairs, inasmuch as it appeared that the Commission would have at least 1,000 vessels more than the total specified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as necessary to be held for a national emergency. If such had been the case, the 1,000 surplus vessels would undoubtedly have been scrapped. An unanticipated demand from abroad resulted, however, in sales for foreign-flag operation of hundreds of vessels more than was anticipated. Consequently, these vessels at the reserve fleets which are in need of repairs now form a vital part of the necessary number of ships to meet the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"A study of information on the physical condition of these 1,000 at the time they were taken out of service indicates that there is a need for repairs averaging $180,000 per vessel to place the hulls and machinery in sound condition. It should be understood that such repairs to 1,000 vessels constitute a huge block of work and that if the work were to be undertaken at the present time it would require about 1 year, fully utilizing all drydock time that commercial facilities would have available after giving priority to the use of their drydocks for normal servicing of the operating merchant marine. It is the Commission's point of view that the repair of these vessels should be undertaken at an early date in order that in these unsettled times the Nation may be assured that all of the vessels held in permanent reserve for national defense purposes will be readily available for use in the event of an emergency. It is emphasized that the word "repairs" refers to actual damage and wear resulting from operation of the vessels, and in no manner refers to deterioration. "Deterioration" as used throughout this report refers specifically to a condition that will develop if for any reason the vessels are not properly cared for after they are laid up.

"In April 1948 the Commission requested that $165,000,000 be made available to undertake the work of placing all vessels in the reserve fleets in sound condition. This sum was deemed sufficient to cover all costs in connection with the repairs, including towage from the reserve fleets to the commercial yards and return. It was proposed that every item of repairs would be accomplished at commercial facilities, since the Commission has not, and never has had, any desire or intention of entering the repair business.

"In July 1948 the Commission was advised by the Bureau of the Budget that its request for $165,000,000 had been carefully considered in relation to the total defense program, but that the repair of these vessels was considered to be of insufficient priority to warrant action at that time.

"In its designation of vessels for inclusion in the permanent reserve for national defense, the Maritime Commission consults with the Departments of the Army and Navy, and all nominations are considered also by the Joint Army-Navy-Maritime Commission Plans Committee. That committee, being directly interested in the condition of vessels in the permanent reserve fleets, has recently urged that funds be requested for the repair of some 258 reserve-fleet vessels of types that would be in first priority demand in case of an emergency. The estimated cost of the repair of these vessels is $50,000,000. The Commission proposes to request such funds as soon as it assembles data with respect to the specific condition of the vessels.

"This information with respect to the repair status of vessels in the permanent reserve fleets is included for the purpose of giving a clear picture of the program for the preservation of vessels in the reserve fleets as differentiated from a repair program. While the two are related in a broad sense, they are separate and distinct in actuality."

Please note the first underscoring—1,000 vessels in the reserve fleet that we now think necessary to meet the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in vital need of repairs and are not going to obtain them. Even the Commission itself has estimated that these repairs would take an entire year to make.

Not even the 258 vessels, of types that would be in first priority and would be demanded in case of emergency, have been repaired, nor has there been any request made for moneys for such work, nor has the Bureau of the Budget included any estimate of funds required for repair—something over $50,000,000.

The United States should not feel very safe with this condition presently prevailing within the reserve fleet. We would like to point out that, as time goes on, this condition is going to prevail concerning more and more of this reserve fleet.

We are evidently pursuing a policy of not building ships because we are dependent on our reserve fleet; and then allowing the reserve fleet to sink into a condition where it could not be used.

Need we point out that the facilities and the labor are available for taking care of the vessels in the reserve fleet? A layoff of 20,000 men in 1 month presumes labor available. Empty ways presume facilities available. We are going to pay out in unemployment insurance about one-half the cost of preserving the reserve fleet. We might just as well go ahead and do the job while we are at it.

We presume the Congress does not again want to be placed in the position of depending on a reserve fleet which the Joint Chiefs of Staff will have to certify as unsafe in a time of national emergency.

III. INSTALLATION OF NAVY SURPLUS FLOATING DRYDOCKS AT MARITIME COMMISSION RESERVE FLEET SITES

In addition to the moneys requested for the ship construction fund of the Maritime Commission, and the moneys not requested for the ship-repair operations necessary to repair the reserve fleet, the Maritime Commission will request a total of over some $50,000,000,000 to install floating drydocks, which are surplus to the Navy Department, at reserve fleet sites. The Commission will utilize these drydocks to carry on the bottom hull preservation work of reserve fleet vessels at the sites themselves, instead of doing such work in commercial ship repair yards.

This Union has no quarrel with any real attempt by the Maritime Commission to save money in the hull preservation of reserve fleet vessels. However, we do question whether money will be saved—whether this might not be the beginning of a partial governmentalization of the ship-repair industry—and whether this entire problem might not lead eventually to nationalization of the industry.

The Martime Commission claims that the difference between the hull preservation of the reserve fleet vesels at its own sites and in commercial yards will be close to $48,000,000 in 20 years—or an average of $2,400,000 a year.

First of all, we would like to point out that a saving of $2,400,000 a year is very small when compared with the cost that would ensue if the ship-repair industry were allowed to fall into the doldrums, and we would have to build it up again in time of emergency. Although faced with a lack of data, this union has estimated that to build up the ship-repair industry in time of emergency would cost close to $5,000,000,000. It cost the United States over $17,000,000,000 to build up the shipbuilding and repair facilities at the time of the last emergency. If we had another emergency in 4 or 5 years this cost would be raised immeasurably because of the rise in prices. If facilities are again allowed to rust away in idleness the restoration of total facilities would probably cost close to $25,000,000,000, and repair would probably require one-fifth of that amount. Therefore, if $48,000,000 in 20 years, or $2,400,000 a year, would serve to keep the private repair industry going, it is little enough money compared to $5,000,000,000.

We further question whether hull preservation of reserve-fleet vessels at the site is going to prove possible without a tremendous expenditure of moneys which the Maritime Commission has not envisaged.

At present there are the following permanent reserve fleet sites in this country, and the number of vessels therein:

James River reserve fleet, Lee Hall, Va.	450
Wilmington, N. C., reserve fleet	425
Mobile reserve fleet, Bay Minette, Ala.	465
Astoria, Oreg., reserve fleet	220
Beaumont, Tex., reserve fleet	415
Suisun Bay, Calif., reserve fleet, Benicia, Calif.	367

At present there are the following temporary reserve fleet sites in operation: Tomkins Cove, N. Y.; Baltimore, Md.; Cathlamet Bay, Oreg.; Olympia, Wash.

It should be noted that the temporary reserve fleet sites are very near large ship repair centers. In order to get the vessels from the temporary reserve fleet sites to the permanent reserve sites, one would have to tow the vessels all the way down to the permanent sites through the port areas. I think we can very readily maintain that where ships are taken out of the temporary sites to be placed in permanent reserve, the Maritime Commission would save a good deal of money by having the ships examined, their hull bottoms cared for and necessary repairs made in the ports where they are already stationed.

The reason for this is the following: If the Commission waits until the vessels reach the permanent site, and the vessels' hull bottoms are then scraped and damage is found, the Commission will have to tow the ships back again to a port area to be repaired. To us, this seems like paying double towage. Therefore, money would be saved by having the vessels in Tomkins Cove have their hull bottoms preserved in the port of New York; by having the vessels in Baltimore have their hulls preserved in Baltimore, etc.

Further, we are very much concerned by the Commission's statement on page 19 of the report mentioned in section 2 hereof that—

"In an earlier part of this report the subject of repairs to reserve fleet vessels was discussed. It may be stated again, however, that a sizable number of vessels now in the reserve fleets are known to require bottom repairs, and it is expected that others will be revealed at the first bottom inspection. Except in cases where bottom damage so re-

vealed is of a trivial nature, it will be definitely to the Government's advantage carefully to draw up specifications for the bottom repair work and to obtain the greatest amount of competition possible for the accomplishment of the work."

Our knowledge of the industry leads us to believe that it is precisely in cases where bottom damage is perceived to be of a disastrous nature—such as sprung plates—that the ship would have to be repaired on the drydock. The reason is that the safety regulations of the United States Coast Guard would never allow a vessel having extensive damage to be towed on the high seas, for example, from North Carolina to Virginia, or from Alabama to Louisiana or Mississippi. Would it not be safer for the Commission to have both the restoration work and preservation work done in commercial shipyards in a port area, then survey of the vessel while it is standing in the yard where it has been cleaned, and then obtain competitive bids from the yards in the port area, if the vessels need repairs?

Certainly, the Commission's own estimate that 1,000 of the reserve fleet vessels need repair now would lead us to believe that the Commission will be forced by Coast Guard safety regulations, if not by anything else, to go into the repair industry at the reserve fleet sites, because the ships will not be able to be towed on the high seas. Towing a ship from one repair yard to another in the same port is not towing a ship for 97 miles. The Commission will have to make the major repairs at the drydock sites in order to render the vessel sufficiently seaworthy to go to a repair yard.

In view of the above, it would seem that the Commission's estimate of the employment of 360 men at all reserve fleet sites is extremely low. There will have to be a crew of repair workers present to render vessels needing repair, seaworthy enough to be towed to repair yards.

We have absolutely no quarrel with the method which the Commission wants to use to preserve these vessels. We merely question the labor force it thinks necessary.

We are forced to question many other statements made by the Commission.

Despite the fact that Mobile, Ala., has two ship-repair yards, or yards which can be used for repair yards—Alabama Drydock Corporation and Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation—the Commission seems to indicate on page 32 of its report that it has figured towing charges from the Mobile reserve fleet to New Orleans, La., a distance of 220 miles.

Further, the commission seems to indicate, on page 34, that the reserve fleet presently located in Beaumont, Tex., might have to be towed to Galveston, instead of to Beaumont itself, which has a ship repair yard. The commission nowhere seems to indicate that the vessels in the temporary sites could easily be taken care of in the port areas right near these sites.

We are also at a loss to know how the commission arrived at its estimate of cost for the hull preservation in commercial yards. This estimate seems to be quite high. The commission has not entered into the costs to itself, the cost of the drydocks, or the cost of moving the drydocks to the reserve fleet sites, through the Panama Canal. We can understand the commission's not entering the costs of the drydocks in its estimates of commission costs, but we have received an indication from the Navy that the costs of moving three of the drydocks through the canal would not be paid for by the Navy.

This entire problem of costs is highlighted by the difference which the commission is assigning to costs of labor and materials in favor of its own operations, as against those of commercial ship repair yards. We know that Government agencies have to pay going rates for work to Government workers. The difference in cost seems to be quite high—a bit too high to be counted as a difference in cost of materials and of overhead alone.

We do not think it possible that the commission is proposing to cut rates, but the figures would seem to stand careful scrutiny. It does not seem probable that the cost of materials to the commission is so much less than the cost of materials to private yards that there can be as much of a difference as $3,500 between the cost of sandblasting in the Norfolk area by commercial ship repair yards, and the cost of the same sandblasting at the commission's reserve fleet site in Wilmington.

The commission has made one more statement which causes us great alarm. This is contained on page 13 of the booklet referred to.

"Furthermore, it is believed that the Commission can more closely control the standard of performance of the work as a Government activity than under a commercial contract."

A statement such as this is quite unbelievable when coming from a Government agency. Is it that the Commission is herewith accusing its inspection staff of laxity in favor of the commercial yards? Does the Commssion trust its own inspection staff? Has the Commission had experience of dereliction from duty on the part of its inspection staff? All these things would seem to be indicated by the Commission's statement. We should infer, in all seriousness, that the statement urges that an investigation should be quickly made of the actions of the inspection staff of the Maritime Commission. This statement on the part of the agency is truly shocking.

If the repair yards of this country have been guilty of improper workmanship, the union representing the workers in these yards wants to know it—and know it soon. There is no desire on the part of organized labor to defraud the Government of the United States of its just and rightful due, particularly in matters concerning the national defense as closely as these.

The above are some questions which have come to our minds in viewing this problem of transfer of the floating drydocks to the reserve fleet sites. We cannot risk any danger of damage or loss to our reserve fleet. We are already risking this danger because of the known nonrepair status of most of the fleet.

We believe truly if the Commission should undertake the bottom preservation of its own vessels, the repair damage found—once these hulls have been scraped—will be so extensive that the vessels will have to be repaired at the reserve sites in order to be made sufficiently seaworthy to be towed. Therefore, we say tow the vessels to the yards, and have the hull preservation done in the port where the vessel will be repaired.

This may sound to the Congress very much as if we are advocating monopoly. We clearly recognize the fact that it will be extremely difficult for a yard in another port to underbid a yard in the port in which the vessel is already laid up—because of the towing charges. However, in the ports where this work would be done, with the exception of the Port of Norfolk, there is sufficient competition between two or more repair yards to make for a competitive bid. We know that Alabama Drydock Corp. and Gulf Shipbuilding Corp. would bid against each other.

However, in order to guard against any possibility of collusion on these types of bids, we would respectfully suggest that the Commission be instructed to fix a standard maximum price, beyond which it will not go for the hull bottom preservation. This would definitely serve to put the commercial yards under notice that, just because the ships are in the port, is no indication that they will obtain the work if they think they can charge what the traffic will bear. We think that the fixing of a standard maximum for the hull preservation can easily be done by the Commission. The Commissioners claim that they have already made cost estimates from these ports. Surely they can establish a price based on going wages in these parts.

The saving of $2,400,000 a year might well be carefully balanced by the Congress, as against the cost of paying unemployment insurance to ship repair workers, and as against the cost of rebuilding the ship-repair industry, if it is allowed to go into another slump.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN GREEN,
President, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO.

Four Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Evening News, the newspaper published in Newark, N. J., the home of my distinguished colleagues from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO and Mr. ADDONIZIO, on Tuesday, April 12, 1949, carried an editorial on President Harry S. Truman—"the modest man in the White House." It is not for me to speak words of praise in behalf of our great leader. His accomplishments in the face of what seemed insurmountable obstacles are matters of record. But it would be ill-fitting indeed if I did not add that the clay out of which he is fashioned is such that no man can deny him a place in their hearts—as an apostle of peace.

The editorial follows:

FOUR YEARS

Four years ago this afternoon President Roosevelt died. Four years ago this evening at 7:09 o'clock, Vice President Truman was sworn into the office of President. Dazed, fearful and uncertain, he felt that the burden of unimaginable responsibilities had fallen upon his humble shoulders, for the war, although drawing to a close, had not been won, and there was still peace to be made.

But now Mr. Truman has completed four years in the Presidential office—as time goes, a normal Presidential term. Since that fateful afternoon and evening of April 12, 1945, the American people and most of the world have followed the dual and parallel development of his policies and of his varied personal phases as an individual in dealing with the tasks of statesmanship.

This is not the occasion for a detailed review of Mr. Truman's stewardship. Like most Presidents, at least since World War I, Mr. Truman is described as placing special emphasis upon the accomplishments of his administration in the field of foreign affairs, which, as here applied, means accomplishments toward peace.

He is said to regard the announcement of the Truman doctrine (he himself calls it Greek-Turkish aid) on March 12, 1947, as the critical moment in the relation of the western countries to the Soviet Union. At that point there was initiated a program of resisting Soviet expansion with a counterbalance of force and economic recuperation. This found large expression, on the economic side, in the Marshall plan. On the side of defense, what began as resistance to Soviet threats in the eastern Mediterranean has been enlarged into the great regional arrangement of the Atlantic Pact.

All of this represents a profound departure from earlier American traditions. That its sponsor was himself a midwesterner, a region supposed to have strong isolationist tendencies, is a sign of the general acceptance of American responsibilities in an unstable, threatened world. That both parties support those policies does them honor and gives the Presidential voice great weight in the councils of the western countries.

If these are the lines of Mr. Truman's thought, on the anniversary of his predecessor's death and his own assumption of office, the Nation will be content to have it so. There is cause for optimism about peace, and this must bring true, inner satisfaction to the heart and purpose of the modest man in the White House.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, what I know we have all had some misgivings about, the distinguished radio commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr., rendered signal service in calling to public attention night before last; namely, the continuing status of the Federal social security fund. I am aware that the United States Government has an obligation of $8,500,000,000 set up currently, but this is not the kind of arrangement that any of us would favor, say in respect to any personal insurance funds upon which we were relying. As I understand it, this fund is virtually based upon a Government IOU, which posterity will be called upon to make good through taxes. There is some limit to taxation. While we are engaged in shoring up the finances of other governments, I would like to feel that this social security fund upon which so many of our citizens are depending to protect the twilight zone of their lives is also shored up adequately.

Let's End Defense Waste Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD IRVING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to an exceptional editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Tuesday, morning, April 12, 1949, commenting upon the real and urgent need for screening every appropriation request by the National Military Establishment and its related branches of the armed forces.

Several weeks ago I called to your attention the great economy in Government expenses which could be effected by adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. At that time I was not aware that the Commission had unearthed the facts reported in the following editorial.

It is my frank opinion that the committees of Congress which are responsible for recommending methods and means for economizing in Government expenditures should recognize these revelations as proper justification for investigating thoroughly every proposal made for money to be expended by the armed forces. If these few facts are correct, as I presume them to be, there must be other glaring examples where substantial savings can be made.

During the war my fellow townsman, now President of the United States, contributed much to the progress of the war effort, saving countless millions of dollars, and making our national efforts more effective and efficient. I am certain that the great work of the Truman committee could well be continued in this Congress and succeeding Congresses for the plain and simple reason that we do need the most adequate defenses possible but at the same time must exercise every precaution to see that the civilian population is not left feeble and bankrupt in the process.

The editorial to which I referred a moment ago is as follows:

NO EXCUSE FOR SERVICE WASTE—END IT

At the moment when Congress and the Nation are called upon to deal with the momentous question of rearming western Europe it is shocking to hear from former President Hoover charges of heavily padded budget estimates of the armed forces.

Preliminary congressional approval has been given to proposed outlays for a single year in excess of $16,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

For just what purposes? In a broad sense, apparently, nobody knows. The nubbin of Mr. Hoover's testimony before a Senate committee yesterday was that budgeting and accounting methods of the services are so cloudy and confused—so uncoordinated—that no clear, understandable picture of proposed service expenditures is possible.

He said emphatically that neither Congress nor the American people are in a position to analyze these budget proposals.

The crying needs of national defense and the vast problems imposed upon the United States to bolster a stumbling, weakened world, imperatively prescribe that the billions we spend be related to exact needs, by no means excluding the need to protect the economic resources of our country.

There should be no disposition to slash defense expenditures without rhyme or reason. On the contrary, the necessity for the strongest defense organization we can provide is plain. But this certainly does not justify waste and extravagance.

Mr. Hoover isn't speaking out against defense, but against waste, whether intentional or otherwise; whether due to overweening service ideas or the loose system under which budgets are devised.

His Commission has pursued tangled and obscure trails through the huge network of Government agencies and departments. It has urged general reforms and reorganizations over which Congress is dawdling.

It is estimated that several billion dollars could be lopped off Federal outlays annually if these economies and reforms were adopted.

Why shouldn't they be adopted? We need those billions for European recovery and for a strong, adequate defense team. The North Atlantic Security Pact poses a possible requirement of close to $2,000,000,000—as a starter—toward rearming western Europe.

We can't turn our backs on these requirements. But we should set our faces against sheer waste and foolishness. Economies that might be effected—in billions—could make our tasks more certain of success and probably remove any need for higher taxes.

The Hoover Commission brought to light some significant things as a result of a Defense Department survey conducted by a task force headed by Frederick Eberstadt. Mr. Hoover mentioned some of them yesterday.

He cited Air Force plans to build houses in Alaska at $58,350 each; more on Guam at $48,000 apiece. He mentioned a "clerical error" that listed a National Guard appropriation for sixty-nine 155-millimeter howitzers at $39,000,000, instead of $9,000,000. He noted an original budgetary request for 1950 of $108,290,858 for "tropical worsted uniforms" which would purchase 838,000 such uniforms at $129 apiece—far more than enough for all the Army's enlisted men. And Mr. Hoover again called attention to an Army request of $100,000 per tank to modernize 1,215 M–6 tanks, of which 102 had already been turned over to the Marine Corps.

That list alone ought to stir up plenty of action, both in the Defense Department and in Congress, to put service budgeting on a sound basis and keep it there.

There should be no skimping of genuine defense needs. But overlapping of defense measures, excessive administration costs, outrageous waste, and mere mistakes must be eliminated. That is essential both for the security of the Nation and for its economic stability.

Spending Rises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of April 5, 1949:

SPENDING RISES

An indication of what the country faces in the way of increased expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 is clearly seen in the first five appropriation bills reported out by the House committees considering them.

The total recommended in these initial bills is almost $1,000,000,000 more than was actually appropriated for them for the fiscal year 1949. It is an increase of 18 percent over the needs of these departments for the current year.

If there is any place that expenses must and can be cut it is in what are usually referred to as the ordinary functions of government. The five agencies included in the first recommendations to be made are included in this ordinary functioning.

Prices—the Government as well as individuals certainly must be aware of this—are tending to stabilize and even to come down in many instances. Thus it is not a time to increase appropriations. It is a time to hold them at current levels, or even to cut them back. The shooting wars are over for a while. The cold wars are being considered in separate appropriations. Why, then, do agencies such as the Treasury, the Interior

Department, and so on need to increase their demands and why do these demands need to be met?

There is no desire by any informed or interested American to skimp his Government where any legitimate need is demonstrated. The Hoover reports, however, have revealed mountains of waste through the great, huge governmental structure that some day must be eliminiated. Why not begin now?

Of course, with the President having in these times reversed his traditional function as watchdog of Government waste to become the foremost advocate of increased spending and squandering, perhaps Congress cannot be expected to be too efficient in cutting back expenses. But if it doesn't, then there is no one left to protect the American taxpayer against the patent evils of spending. It is clearly up to Congress if any economies worth the name are to be effected.

GI Benefits for Personnel Who Remained on Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call attention of the Members of Congress to the lack of educational benefits for officers who have elected to remain on extended active duty, as provided by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Letters of inquiry have been received from many officers of the armed forces who are not considered to be eligible for educational benefits as now provided by title II of Public Law 346, because they have not been discharged or relieved from active duty. After having received a number of inquiries, the Veterans' Administration was asked to furnish an interpretation of this matter. This interpretation agreed with the statements given in the letters of various officers.

Under present military regulations it is possible for Reserve Officers to remain on active duty, without separation, for an indefinite period. This service, in many cases, would continue longer than some of the benefits under the GI bill. Therefore, the individual would never be eligible regardless of service.

An officer who was integrated into the Regular personnel of the armed forces is considered eligible for educational benefits under the GI bill because of his momentary separation from the service.

It is apparent that it should definitely be determined what makes an individual a veteran. Is it the possession of a piece of paper showing complete separation from the service, or is it the service he rendered to his country?

H. R. 3871, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by extending benefits of titles II and III to certain persons who have continued on active duty would remedy this situation by allowing benefits under the GI bill to go to persons who have remained on active duty. I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to this injustice and hope that legislation correcting this unwarranted discrimination will be enacted.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4230, authorizing appropriation of funds to assist parents in discharging the serious responsibility of educating their children. In considering so-called Federal aid to education, I believe we have become victims of terminology and have lost sight of the real basis for such assistance; we have let language cloud the principles which have always been an integral part of the American democratic system. We have lost sight of the human person in following the trend toward institutionalism. We talk about schools rather than children, the State rather than parents.

I think we need to carefully reexamine our philosophy of education and return to the basic truths upon which the education of our children is based. Education is for the child, first and foremost. If this is true then it is comon sense that the first right in the education of children is the right of parents. This is a right older and prior to any government, and it is a sacred right that must be protected and fostered by our Government, whether it be local, State, or Federal. Since right always imposes responsibility, parents have the first responsibility in the education of their children. It is our work as lawmakers to assist and encourage parents in fulfilling their responsibility. It is not our function, nor must it be our intention, to relieve parents of that obligation entirely—to make education solely a function of government. This is the very real danger many opponents of Federal assistance rightly call our attention to. Assistance must not mean control.

At the same time, we must assume our responsibility of assisting parents in providing for the education of their children. This is the true function of any government in education—to protect and encourage the prior right of parents. Parents are handicapped in discharging their duties today because of social and economic conditions beyond their immediate control. This is a time of crisis in education and we must accept our responsibility in the matter; we must provide the assistance necessary if parents are to insure at least minimum tools essential to an educational system.

Every bill dropped into the hopper of this House should have as its ultimate object the common welfare of the people of the United States. But always the common interest is aided only as the individual interest is safeguarded. So too, in the matter of education, we will all benefit to that degree in which our children are benefited through Federal assistance. Our first concern in education cannot be the school as an institution, but it must rather be the child as a person. We assist the school only as we assist the child. In helping our children we then serve the greater good of our Nation because our greatest asset is an educated and informed citizenry, intellectually and morally equipped to face the grave problems confronting each of us in these times.

This bill, providing for auxiliary aids, only gives assistance where it should be given and still leaves the major responsibility to parents to whom it rightly belongs. It minimizes the danger of Federal control by providing only the tools to which all children are entitled. It would provide every child in the United States with the minimum material essentials of an educational system, and it leaves to parents the basic responsibility of controlling and providing for that system as such. Here too, it offers a secondary assistance that cannot be discounted. In making educational material assistance available to all it releases funds expended from regular revenues for the operation and maintainence of the basic school system. This is a secondary benefit resulting from the primary purpose of the bill—to assist parents in discharging their educational responsibilities. To keep the first responsibility where it belongs we must insist that the same amount of funds now spent on local education continue to be spent under the provisions of this bill or we nullify our primary intention of benefiting the child through assisting the parents.

This bill would insure equal opportunities for all children in the United States in providing transportation for educational purposes, library facilities, textbooks, and other reading materials, visual aids and other instructional materials, school-health programs and facilities. The purpose of this bill is broad and fully meets the responsibility of the Federal Government in assisting parents to provide such services and facilities as are vital to an adequate educational program. I think it is a realistic and practical solution to a problem that has harassed this Congress for a number of years.

As comprehensive as it is in method, it scrupulously avoids any interference or violation of the rights of parents and the individual States. Furthermore, this bill does not create any new agencies nor does it expand or limit the functions of existing agencies. Its simplified administration is designed for utmost efficiency and economy through direct payment to participating schools on the basis of certified average daily attendance records. This is in keeping with the avowed principle of assisting parents rather than assuming or usurping the rights and duties of lower units of government in the realm of education.

Basically, this bill is a simple and clear statement of Federal policy and its mechanics are administratively feasible

without a legion of interpreters and bookkeepers. Simply, it would provide $10 per pupil for all schools, to be spent exclusively for auxiliary aids as they are defined in this bill. The total appropriation of $300,000,000 would be more than sufficient if we accept the estimated enrollment of 26,635,000 children in all American elementary and secondary schools in 1950. According to Census Bureau forecasts the enrollment will continue to climb each year until it reaches the thirty-four-million mark in 1960. Under the provisions of this bill the annual appropriation would remain at its present amount while the per pupil payments would be proportionately lowered in years in which the average daily attendance exceeds the thirty-million mark which would require the full appropriation.

There is no need to go into the sad facts of the education problem again. We have seen the problem face to face in our cities, towns, and rural schools. The time for a flattering word or a noble gesture is past; we must fulfill the grave responsibility we have to the parents and children of this Nation.

Trusteeship of Former Italian Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure in including a timely resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., with respect to the trusteeship of the former Italian Colonies and for Italy's admission to the United Nations. There has always been a great spiritual and physical kinship between Italy and the United States, and Italy looks to our great country, the hope and protector of human decency and freedom, to support her cause. This resolution sets forth the compelling reasons for awarding to Italy the trusteeship of her former colonies, and it is earnestly hoped the United Nations will recognize the justice of her claim:

Whereas the UN Assembly, at its present session, will take under consideration the trusteeship of the former Italian colonies; and

Whereas the development of the African continent will be a great contributing factor toward the social progress and economic rehabilitation of western Europe; and

Whereas Italy, prompted, not by selfish gain, but to relieve the sad state of her overpopulation, made great contributions in the development of her colonies, by the construction of railroads, airports and seaports, by converting arid lands into rich farms, by transforming unknown places into industrial centers and, through the application of scientific knowledge, methods and skills, raising the standard of living far above that which had been enjoyed by the natives and hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled there; and

Whereas by virtue of her enormous efforts and sacrifices in their development, and her proximity to her former colonies, and her technique, and her excessive population and manpower, Italy is deserving and qualified to undertake their further development; and

Whereas the awarding to Italy of the trusteeship of her former colonies will be a great step in her economic rehabilitation and will further solidify the western nations against the common enemy; and

Whereas the city of Newark numbers among its population 125,000 loyal American citizens whose sense of fairness, and natural sympathy for Italy, recognizes her pressing need for additional territory and the opportunity for useful and peaceful expansion: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That—

1. Italy has every moral right to the trusteeship of her former colonies.

2. The UN would perform an act of supreme justice by awarding to Italy the trusteeship of her former colonies.

3. Italy's friendship to America and her many contributions toward the culture and way of life now enjoyed by our country has earned for her the sincere support of our delegates to the UN for the trusteeship of her former colonies.

4. Justice also requires that Italy be admitted as a member of the UN, so that her hopes and aspirations for her own future and for the peace of the world may be advocated by her own delegates.

5. A copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

6. A copy of this resolution be sent to the elected representatives of our State in Congress.

Legislation Needed To Improve Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, there is ever increasing evidence of the need for improving intergovernmental relations—that is, the fiscal and other relations between and among the Federal Government, State governments, and county and municipal units. These relationships have become increasingly important and more and more complex. Involved are such fundamental matters as tax revenue sources, grants-in-aid, duplication of activities, overlapping authority, and costly, inefficient governmental operation at the various levels.

Recognizing the need for a thoroughgoing study of these problems so that adequate legislative solutions might later be found, there was introduced into this House on February 7, 1949, by the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], H. R. 2389. This bill by Mr. BOGGS provides for the establishment of a temporary national bipartisan commission to study all phases and aspects of intergovernmental relations and to submit recommendations to the President and the Congress for improving the existing patternless situation.

Interest in this vitally important problem is sufficiently great in both Chambers of the Congress that on the same day Mr. BOGGS introduced H. R. 2389 an identical bill, S. 810, was introduced into the other body by eight distinguished Senators, representing both major parties. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I introduced into this House on March 3, 1949, H. R. 3184, which is identical with H. R. 2389 and S. 810, and H. R. 3944, which is also an identical bill, was introduced on March 31, 1949, by the distinguished Representative from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements may soon be completed by the respective committees for adequate hearings at an early date on these measures. It is also my hope that this legislation will be enacted so that the Nation, the States, and the other political subdivisions of government, as well as the people themselves, may be enabled to enjoy the benefits which I am wholly confident will be forthcoming if the proposed National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is established.

This proposed legislation is attracting more and more attention and interest. In that connection and as a part of my remarks I include an article by the able Washington correspondent, Mr. Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the April 8, 1949, issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. I may also say, Mr. Speaker, that this same article by Mr. Alexander appeared in numerous other newspapers throughout the Nation.

BOGGS WOULD SIMPLIFY TAXES

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—Staff members of the Hoover Commission say they will have done well if between 10 to 20 percent of the group's recommendations ever get put into practice. Yet such is the capital's fondness for appointing commissons that the Eighty-first Congress may give us another fact-finding group of similar scope.

This possibility lies in H. R. 2389 by Representative BOGGS, lone Member of the House from Delaware. The Boggs bill is a preliminary effort to unscramble the prodigious omelette of intergovernment affairs—the indescribable mix-up of Federal, State, county, and municipal responsibilities.

Nobody really knows how many millions of dollars and miles of red tape are involved in the overlap of taxing and spending under our multigovernment system. The Hoover Commission made a tentative pass at this enormous subject, but did not publish its task group report.

FOURTEEN DETECTIVES

BOGGS, who was brooding over the problem before the Hoover Commission touched it, wants to take it from there. His bill calls for a 14-member group which would report its findings to Congress by February 1952.

The unsuspecting founding fathers, who innocently preserved home rule in the Constitution, never dreamed how many "home" governments would be developed. There are now 155,000 government units within the United States, of which 108,000 are school districts.

Education was the beginning of this confusion. Early last century the Federal Government began making land grants to schools. Monetary grants followed, and the great game of put-and-take was on. In 1913–14 the game got its biggest boost. The Federal Treasury began to collect income taxes, and the Agriculture Department began its extension service. From then on things moved fast. Bills for grants-in-aid to States and localities now run about 300 per con-

gressional session. There are three types of grants for education, three or more for public assistance, and over a dozen types for public health. About 40 percent of all funds spent by the States comes from Washington.

PENNSYLVANIA'S LAW

Meanwhile the local governments also reach directly for the taxpayer's pocket. Pennsylvania has a law which allows 3,591 subdivisions to levy taxes—cities, boroughs, townships, and even school districts get a whack at the miserable citizen. Not long ago a group of corporations reported that it cost them 9.5 cents to figure out every dollar owed to the State, and 4.7 cents to make up an account of their Federal tax dollar.

The Boggs bill doesn't blame anybody for this baffling state of the Nation. Such things just happen to a country which demands both Federal unity and local rights. But competition for the taxpayer's dollar has become a free-for-all. The brokerage fee extracted by the various taxing agencies is eating up the capital. Something has to be done. A few days after Representative Boggs dropped his bill in the hopper, a group of eight Senators sponsored a companion measure.

All This and Taxes, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer for April 8, 1949:

ALL THIS AND TAXES, TOO

No one can accuse Sir Stafford Cripps of being soft, or of attempting to conceal the harsh facts of economic life from the British people.

In his presentation to the House of Commons of a budget which continues for another year the bleak austerities of the past, the Chancelor of the Exchequer said that as long as Britain continues its expenditures for defense and social services at the existing levels, a very high rate of taxation will continue to be necessary, regardless of what government is in power.

Thus the cost of the Labor Party's version of the more abundant life will continue to be a heavy burden on Britain's taxpayers, and it may become heavier in the future, Sir Stafford warned, because defense expenditures may rise, and the social services, including socialized medicine, constitute a permanent and continuing obligation, the costs of which are constantly increasing.

Under the new budget the very high income and purchase taxes are to be continued, the surcharge on local telephone calls has been increased from 15 to 50 percent, the tax rate on football betting pools has been advanced from 20 to 30 percent and a halfpenny has been added to the tax on a box of matches.

Moreover, a reduction in food subsidies will be reflected by increases in the cost of meat, cheese, butter, and margarine.

The only tax relief immediately affecting consumers is the reduction by 1 penny in the cost of a pint of beer, but this reduction was so slight that brewery stocks dropped as much as 5 shillings 6 pence a share.

A dispatch to the New York Times reports that Sir Stafford's budget caused dismay, anger, and alarm among various segments of the British people, many of whom apparently had anticipated that it was time for the various socialistic measures of the Labor Government to begin paying off in the form of a higher standard of living.

There was considerable speculation as to the reaction in the trade-union movement, some leaders of which said it would be difficult to hold off any longer demands for wage increases which would be inflationary.

Obviously, a general wage increase in Britain not only would wreck the austerity program, but would jeopardize the social services in which the Labor Government takes such great pride.

The time is coming eventually, and this may be the time, when there will have to be a show-down between British labor and the Labor Government. So far the two have cooperated, since the Labor Government's greatest mainstay has been the trade-union movement. But if the unions were to insist on wage increases which would wreck the socialist program of the Government, the latter would be compelled to choose between using force to obtain compliance or abandoning its socialistic experiments.

The chances are that as long as the British economy is being bolstered through American aid, some way will be found to keep the trade-unions in line and to continue the socialization of Britain. But when American aid is finally terminated, Britons will have an opportunity to determine whether their own resources are adequate to support a controlled economy without resortinng to police-state methods.

Cooperative Research Program in the Field of Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared entitled "A Cooperative Research Program in the Field of Stream Pollution," together with correspondence passing between me and the Department of Agriculture on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THE FIELD OF STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. President, I should like to take the time of the Senate for just a few moments to discuss one of the most critical problems facing our Nation today, but one which has in the past received all too little of the attention of the Congress. I refer to the stream-pollution problem.

In this field, as in many other fields, we on this blessed continent have acted like a prodigal. We have dissipated the heritage which our forefathers gave us. We have befouled the waters of our Nation. We have stripped our forests. We have ravaged our soil. The stream-pollution problem which plagues Wisconsin and virtually every other State of the Union is one aspect of the over-all conservation problem facing the Nation.

This problem is not one for mere talks or for letters or for repetition of empty platitudes. It is a problem requiring constructive and decisive action.

In the last Congress, preliminary action was taken to help States and localities meet the pollution menace. But this is only a beginning.

Along the line of further constructive action, I have been in correspondence with the Department of Agriculture regarding the launching of a Government-industry cooperative program for research into the utilization of industrial wastes in order to end stream pollution. In a letter of April 1, 1949, Secretary Brannan wrote to me that in accordance with my suggestion to the Department, he (Secretary Brannan) "asked the Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, to initiate interbureau discussions along the lines" indicated in my correspondence with the Department.

I ask unanimous consent that following these brief remarks there be included the principal letter which I wrote to the Department regarding this cooperative research program and the Department's previous answer to me.

There have been many excellent treatises written on the stream-pollution problem. The Izaak Walton League in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation has been among the leading organizations fighting a valiant battle to cope with this menace. The famous magazine, Sports Afield, has carried a series of vital articles entitled "Running Sores on Our Land," by Bill Wolf, which has discussed the pollution problem and constructive answers to it.

Recently I received a communication from William Cook, of Stevens Point, Wis., a former president of the Wisconsin division of the Izaak Walton League. He in turn enclosed a letter which had been written by A. D. Sutherland, present president of the Wisconsin division of the league. I should like to quote a few excerpts from Mr. Sutherland's letter:

"The Izaak Walton League is dedicated to a defense of our resources. We believe life itself is dependent upon forests, clean waters, and soil. The destruction of the forests of Wisconsin and generally throughout the United States gave birth to the Izaak Walton League. * * * The pollution problem is of great importance. The health of our people is involved. (Polluted) water causes many dreaded diseases. * * * Even though injunctions and criminal prosecutions (against pollution) are a remedy, the Izaak Walton League believes the rule of reason should still apply. We have presidents of two corporations on our committee on water pollution. One is the father of two boys stricken with polio after bathing in polluted waters. * * * We have many manufacturing members on our league, and they have given their time and attention to this problem. They want pollution stopped."

I could proceed and quote from many other sources, pointing out the menace of pollution. I could quote at length from various editorials in Wisconsin newspapers—from the Milwaukee Journal, the Waukesha Freeman, the Fon du Lac Commonwealth Reporter, the Green Bay Press Gazette, and many other papers in my own and other States, on this grave threat which we have tolerated for so long. I could point out facts such as that 57 communities in my own State have no sewage treatment whatsoever. Fortunately, they represent only 9.3 percent of the total urban population of Wisconsin. Yet, Wisconsin has an excellent committee on water pollution and has made splendid progress in this field.

This is not a suggestion calling for recriminations or cheap accusations. As the previous excerpts I have read indicated, farsighted leaders of agriculture, industry,

municipalities, are working with conservation groups to meet this problem. The Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association, for example, recently wrote to me of its efforts along this line, and I have had communications from paper manufacturers and others pointing out their efforts toward cooperation.

Here is a vital Federal interest which I believe can be supplemented by the cooperative research program, which I hope we of the Eighty-first Congress can launch. It is my plan to introduce legislation for such cooperative research as soon as all of the technical problems involved in drafting can be worked out. It is my hope that the world-famous Forest Products Laboratory at Madison can spearhead the research to which I am referring. But the finest engineering branch of Wisconsin and the Nation will be challenged to assist us.

I have confined my remarks principally to the Wisconsin situation because I am naturally most familiar with the facts in my own State rather than other States of the Union. But I am sure that other Senators could point out similar facts, particularly our able colleague, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who has worked valiantly in this field.

I earnestly trust that those Senators and Congressmen who will have close contact in their committee work with conservation work—that they will give their particular attention to the stream-pollution problem. Adequate funds will, of course, be necessary to implement legislation already enacted. Recently Mr. Carl Shoemaker (one of the most expertly qualified individuals in this country in the field of fish and wildlife conservation and director of the National Wildlife Federation) was appointed to the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, representing the conservation groups. He has reported to me that this pollution problem is going to take a tremendous amount of special understanding, time, energy, and labor. Yes, funds if it is to be met adequately. Right now a deficiency appropriation is called for to aid the Public Health Service fulfill its responsibilities.

Future generations will rise up to curse us or to bless us, depending upon how we act. It is my prayer that we will act with foresight, with vision, with constructive deeds and not mere empty words.

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PART A—LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR'S ORIGINAL SUGGESTION FOR RESEARCH PROGRAM PARTICULARLY THROUGH FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY AT MADISON

MARCH 14, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is again made to your letter of February 14 and our acknowledgment of February 28. The Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry has long recognized the importance of developing means of utilization of agricultural residues and wastes. Such residues and wastes vary widely in character—corn stalks, corn cobs, cereal straw, and food-processing wastes are but a few. Many of these wastes are involved in stream pollution.

Wherever possible attempts are made to convert these wastes into a product of value to at least return the cost of disposal. Where this is not possible we at least attempt to eliminate the nuisance or health-hazard elements.

Among the investigations of the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry might be mentioned: Development of method for use of citrus processing plant waste liquors to produce feed yeast; elimination of stream pollution through dairy products plants; investigation of effluents from potato starch factories; utilization of wastes from pear canneries, cannery plant effluents, sweetpotato starch, and waste waters. Other types of wastes connected with commodities upon which work is being done by the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry and upon which wastes investigations are not but should be carried on are: Tannery wastes, wastes resulting from cotton mercerization and cotton dyeing, waste waters resulting from stabilization of soybean oil by use of citric acid, poultry eviscerating plant wastes, and wool scouring.

Pulp mill wastes

With regard to the pollution of streams by the effluent of pulp mills it is assumed that you are principally interested in the sulfite mills to which the greatest problem attaches. There are two ways in which this problem can be attacked. First through the recovery of the byproducts and their use in the pulp plant itself such as the reuse of the chemicals and the use of other solid materials for fuel. Second, the recovery of the byproducts and their sale to outside parties. The first would seem to hinge upon a modification of the usual process involving a switch from the present lime base to a soda, magnesia or other base. Considerable work has been done upon this by the Forest Products Laboratory and a great deal has been done by the industry itself. The research work is very costly and the change-over of existing mills to a new process is very high in the way of capital investment. The industry has a large stake in this because many of the mills could be closed down and communities impoverished if the laws now on the statute books relating to stream pollution are enforced. The solution of the problem cannot be worked out at the Forest Products Laboratory alone but needs the best cooperation of the chemical engineering brains in the industry and the try-out of various proposals on mill scale.

If this approach were to be made it would seem to us a matter of national action under some cooperative arrangement between industry and Government for which a very large sum of money would be required over a number of years. It is a project in which the Forest Products Laboratory might be a logical central agency and directive research organization.

Yeast production

Referring now to the second alternative the waste sulfite liquor contains essentially all of the lignin orginally present in the wood combined with calcium bisulfite, sugars, and small amounts of certain acids derived from sugars, as well as furfural, volatile aldehydes and venillin and terpenelike compounds. There is at present some optimism as to the recovery of the sugars for the production of feeding yeast for livestock and poultry. A group of pulp makers in Wisconsin, as you may know, have placed in operation of $500,000 experimental plant to transform sugar from sulfite pulp liquor to yeast. So far the cost has been greater than the return for the product. There has been some minor recovery of lignin. The removal of such materials means a reduced biological oxygen demand in the streams in which the effluent is discharged. It would seem to us that work on the production of yeast, molasses, or alcohol from such sugars, and basic work on the chemical make-up of lignin, all are important in creating a profitable outlet for these byproducts of the sulfite mill. Once conversion processes to useful goods needed in quantity are worked out it would seem logical that recovery for such markets would follow. The Forest Products Laboratory is doing work along these lines. Its funds for the purpose are limited, however. Incidentally the approach to an understanding of the character of lignin and its conversion to useful products alone represents costly research on which might profitably be spent as much as the laboratory has available now for the entire chemical field.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this or other matters, please let us know.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

PART B—LETTER TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN RESPONSE

MARCH 15, 1949.

DEAR MR. LOVELAND: Thank you for your letter of March 14 in response to my inquiry regarding work of the Department of Agriculture on the utilization of agricultural residues and wastes and industrial wastes which are polluting the Nation's streams. I appreciate your report on this matter and I would like to follow it through to the greatest possible extent.

As I have previously indicated (when I introduced Senate bill 1118 to give business tax advantages if they develop facilities to treat industrial wastes), I have been appalled at the terrific pollution of the Nation's waters because of these waste products and I am afraid that we, as a people, are "missing the boat" in meeting this problem adequately, notwithstanding the antipollution legislation that we have already adopted.

It is not a subject for speeches or letters or talks, but a subject which I am sure you will agree, for constructive action in order that we can preserve the Nation's wildlife and water heritage.

I am particularly interested in that phase of your letter in which you indicate that a program of national action under some cooperative arrangement between industry and Government should be worked out. For example, utilizing the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison as a central agency and directive research organization. I am interested, too, in your comment that a vast amount of Federal funds would be involved for the Forest Products Laboratory and similar vital research institutions.

I should like to introduce specific legislation

My question is, therefore: What specific cooperative arrangements between industry and Government does the Department of Agriculture feel should be worked out in specific legislation and how much specific funds would you initially propose be spent? In other words, I should like to introduce specific legislation for research funds and organization.

Research serves economy

I assure you, of course, that I do not make this comment without due consideration of the fact that our national budget is already at a staggering level and I, for one, have urged and will continue to urge economical reduction of Federal appropriations. It seems to me, however, that the record of the Forest Products Laboratory, for example, has proven that research funds of this type repay themselves many times to the American taxpayer and thus instead of continuing drains on the Federal Treasury, actually result ultimately in an increase of revenue for the Treasury because research of this type creates jobs, creates wealth, creates Federal revenue. In addition, no one could put a dollar sign on the value of preserving the Nation's streams unpolluted and preventing the further mass death of wildlife.

With all of this I am sure you agree and I mention it only as a clarification of the fact that I, as a United States Senator interested in economy, am prepared to support you to the fullest extent on any sound suggestion that you may care to make for specific cooperative action between industry, agriculture, and Government on this problem.

Research has contributed to a tremendous extent for the amazing standard of living

which we as a people have achieved and research will help us to maintain that standard.

Let us plan for specific program

I would appreciate, therefore, if your Department could initiate a series of discussions within and between its bureaus and with my office so that we can plan for specific rsearch legislation with an adequate but not extravagant amount of funds in which we could tap the finest engineering brains of the Nation both in Government and private industry toward the solution of this critical problem.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Thirty-ninth Anniversary of Approval of Esperanto Language by Maryland Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Maximiano Marmito Villareal paying tribute to the Maryland State Legislature on the thirty-ninth anniversary of the approval of the Esperanto language by the Legislature of the State of Maryland; and I also ask unanimous consent that a clipping from the Baltimore Sun of April 12 on the same subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and clipping were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPROVAL OF ESPERANTO LANGUAGE BY MARYLAND STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. Maximiano Marmito Villareal, of the Philippines, pays tribute to Maryland State Legislature on the thirty-ninth anniversary (April 11, 1949) of the enactment and approval by that legislative body of the international language Esperanto, on April 11, 1910. Mr. Villareal is former director of publicity of the Esperanto Association of North America and a life member of the Little Congress of the United States, whose membership is composed of officials and employees of the legislative branch of the United States Government.

Mr. Villareal's statement follows:

"This thirty-ninth anniversary of the enactment into law by the Maryland State Legislature of the international language known as Esperanto, on April 11, 1910, marks one of the greatest achievements and most brilliant pieces of legislation that any legislative body has ever enacted in the history of the world. Esperanto is the successful creation of Dr. Lazaro Ludoviko Zamenhof, of Poland. It was purposely invented for the use of the people of the world as their second language, which they may communicate with one another with facility. This pioneering action of Maryland State Legislature should serve as a most inspiring example and a challange to parliaments and legislatures of the world, particularly to the states which are members of the United Nations and whose delegates daily encounter problems of language difficulty.

"The wisdom of the action taken by the Maryland State Legislature nearly 4 decades ago should serve also as a guiding light leading the way toward reaching the goal of world understanding between different people of different languages who want to achieve a lasting world peace. This was the ultimate objective of the genius inventor of Esperanto.

"On this thirty-ninth anniversary of the enactment and approval by the Maryland State Legislature of the Esperanto international language, all men of good will in the world should take this opportunity to pay tribute to Maryland State Legislature for its brilliant pioneering action taken for the benefit of mankind. It would be also an honor if Marylanders were added to the over 10,000,000 signers of a petition recently received by United Nations authorities urging the adoption of the Esperanto international language as the second language of the world."

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1949]

MARYLAND COMMENDED FOR O. K. ON ESPERANTO

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Maryland was commended today by Maximiano M. Villareal for its action in 1910 officially approving the Esperanto international language.

Villareal is former director of publicity of the Esperanto Association of North America.

Recalling that the Maryland Legislature acted on April 11, 1910, Villareal said:

"All men of good will in the world should take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Maryland State Legislature for its brilliant pioneering action taken for the benefit of mankind."

"It would be also an honor if Marylanders were added to the over 10,000,000 signers of a petition recently received by United Nations authorities urging the adoption of the Esperanto international language as the second langauge of the world," Villareal said.

Esperanto was created by Dr. Lazaro Ludoviko Zamenhof, of Poland, as an international language.

North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Washington news letter of Hon. EARL WILSON:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER

(From your Congressman, EARL WILSON)

For better or for worse, the United States is now married to the North Atlantic Mutual Aid Pact. When the United States Senate has approved the pact, the marriage will have been consummated, and we will be entitled to all of the doubtful privileges as well as the tremendous responsibilities of a full-fledged military alliance with the other nations of the North Atlantic community.

The pact has just been signed here in Washington by the United States Secretary of State and by the foreign ministers of 10 other nations. The only thing remaining to make the pact official and binding is ratification by the United States Senate. Favorable action by the Senate is doubted by no one on Capitol Hill, but ratification will come only after a rough and rocky debate. As I stated in this column last week the signing of this pact launches this Nation upon a new and bold departure from our traditional foreign policy. The wisdom of this venture will be questioned carefully by Members of the Senate who will be responsible for making official this far-reaching commitment.

When the pact is stripped of its diplomatic phraseology and boiled down to its essence, it emerges as a peacetime adaptation of the lend-lease idea with Marshall plan refinements. When this definition is translated into "hill talk", it means that you, you, and you—the American taxpayers—are going to pay for the rearming of most of our wartime friends in Europe. Why? Because our Government fears a war with Soviet Russia and wants some friends on the Continent ready to absorb the shock of the first blows.

Really, our hopes for the pact are twofold. First, we hope it will preserve at least the synthetic peace, or armistice, which we now enjoy by confronting Russia with the unified strength—political, economic, and military—of the 11 nations which have signed it. The signers of the pact hope to convince Russia that together they are bigger and tougher and thereby prevent Russia from starting world war three. Our second hope for the pact is that should Russia start a war, the signers of the pact will be ready and able to overcome the armies of the Kremlin and prevent the Communist hordes of Asia from consuming the Western World.

Capitol Hill opinion on the merits of the pact is divided into two camps. Those who favor the pact say it is a treaty to preserve the peace; that it will prevent war because it serves notice on any would-be aggressor that Uncle Sam will fight if any of our pact partners are attacked. It is pointed out by those who think the pact should be approved that World Wars I and II might have been prevented had Germany been convinced, prior to the outbreak of hostilities, that the United States would fight on the side of France and England. It is further contended that, unless we offer moral support and financial aid to our friends in Europe, they will be forced to go over to the side of Russia or at least compromise with the Kremlin, and, therefore, their military assistance to us would be lost in the event of war.

Those who oppose the pact claim that it is an out-and-out military alliance aimed directly at the Russians; that it will offend the Russians and force them to speed up military preparations; that it divides the world into two military camps and will result in unleashing the dogs of war once again. Those in opposition contend further that the provisions of the pact entangle us forever in the old quarrels and hatreds of Europe; that we are saddling ourselves with a bunch of poor relations who will ride us down the road of economic destruction, and that the pact is a one-sided deal in which we trade hams for wieners.

It is not within the scope of any individual to predict the end result of this new policy, for no one knows just what effect it will have upon unpredictable Soviet Russia. It is hoped that it will deter the Kremlin's warlike activities and preserve the peace. That is the better part of the new plan. The worse part is that it will turn the cold war into a hot war between the East and the West. At best, this new North Atlantic Military Pact is the latest effort in the trial-and-error method of stopping war and dispelling rumors of war.

Without wishing to be too pessimistic, it is well for us to remember that peace treaties, pacts, and alliances have not prevented man from participating in the bloody sport of war in the past. Someone has said, "The past is prologue." Unless and until human nature undergoes a change of heart, man will probably continue to throw stones and wield clubs against his enemies, both real and

imaginary. Nevertheless, we hope this new North Atlantic Pact works. God knows it had better work or man, the biped ruler of this earth, may find himself stripped of all semblance of modern civilization. Time, the arbiter of all things man-made, must be the judge.

ECA's Big Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the New York Journal of Commerce:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 9, 1949]

ANGLO-UNITED STATES FIGHT FOR OIL OUTLETS IN EUROPE BARED—ECA AIDE BARS USE OF AID FUNDS TO BUILD UP RIVAL PLANTS ABROAD

(By W. M. Jablonski)

An intensive battle shaping up between British and American oil companies for marketing outlets in Europe was brought out into the open here yesterday by an ECA official.

Walter J. Levy, consultant for ECA's petroleum branch, declared that his agency was fully aware of the "grave and serious problem" confronting American oil companies as a result of the European dollar shortage and the huge expansion program mapped by British companies for their sterling oil.

HAILED BY INDUSTRY

He assured oilmen, however, that ECA did not intend to use its funds to "duplicate existing (American) facilities unnecessarily."

His statement, made at a meeting of the National Federation of Financial Analysts Societies, was hailed by oil-company officials here, many of whom had been growing increasingly concerned whether American taxpayers' money would be used to help drive American oil investments out of Europe.

ECA's belief, Mr. Levy stated, is that "it is in the economic, political, and strategic interest of the United States that these (American) companies maintain their oil interests world-wide and obtain fair and equitable treatment in the oil markets of Europe."

REFINING PLAN TOO OPTIMISTIC

He added:

"In this process of making Europe self-sustaining somebody may well get hurt, but I believe it is imperative that no vital interests of the United States be sacrificed and that no legitimate business interests be hurt unnecessarily."

Describing the original refinery-construction program submitted by individual European countries last fall as too optimistic, Mr. Levy said ECA has asked OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) to scale down the individual programs more in line with the future needs of the world oil economy.

The original program, he said, called for a refining capacity of nearly 66,000,000 tons in Europe and an expansion of European-owned overseas refining capacity from 54,000,000 tons to 72,000,000 and their crude-oil production outside Europe from 75,000,000 tons to 114,000,000 by 1953.

OVEREXPANSION SEEN

Such a program would obviously result in overexpansion of facilities, the ECA officials said, since it presupposes an increase of 14 percent in world oil demand during this period as against only 6 percent forecast for Europe and the United States. European consumption, he said, is expected to rise from the prewar 30,000,000 tons annually to 46,000,000 by fiscal 1949 and only 60,000,000 by fiscal 1953.

"We think it would make very little sense to duplicate existing facilities unnecessarily," Mr. Levy declared.

"Nor does it appear economically sound to expand nondollar oil production to such an extent that it would drive most of the dollar oil out of European markets if such displaced dollar oil would in turn drive nondollar oil out of dollar markets. In the end nobody would gain, certainly not the United States taxpayer, and trade chaos would be superimposed on world-wide confusion."

OIL VITAL IN RECOVERY

On the other hand, the ECA official stressed that expansion of refineries in Europe and of crude-oil production controlled by British companies outside of Europe remains "one of the most effective means of reducing Europe's dollar deficit." Oil alone accounts for 20 percent of the $4,200,000,000 deficit estimated by ECA for fiscal 1950.

Mr. Levy pointed out that even though ECA does not believe that the original plans of the OEEC countries will completely materialize, oil refining in Europe and oil production outside of Europe will still make an extraordinary contribution to recovery.

He said the British estimate that an investment of about $2,000,000,000, perhaps 40 percent in dollars and 60 percent in sterling and other countries, will result in an increase in the annual value of crude oil and refining products output by British companies of nearly a billion dollars by fiscal 1953.

Noting that Europe will probably still have a dollar shortage when the ECA program is ended in 1953, Mr. Levy said that the problem facing American companies, thus, is one of "maintaining outlets for dollar oil in Europe even though the dollar resources of the importing countries are severely limited and even though sterling oil will compete with dollar oil for such outlets."

CHIDES OILMEN

He offered no concrete proposal to solve the dilemma, but expressed conviction that a combination of "skillful planning" by the oil companies in the next few years and cooperation between Government and industry should help "solve the problem confronting the American exporter in general and the American oil industry in particular."

Mr. Levy chided those oilmen who say they would be better off without ECA.

Without ECA, he pointed out, the "obvious thing for a country like Great Britain to have done would have been to develop its one great imperial asset, and that is oil, for all it was worth.

"Without ECA, therefore, the European countries would have had no alternative but to buy British oil to the limit of its possibilities, and those possibilities are great, indeed," he continued.

"There would have been no chance to work out a solution in good time which would permit the American oil industry, with foresight and judgment, to maintain its important and vital role in the oil production and marketing centers overseas.

"Without ECA, we would have had not only political chaos in Europe of an unheard of magnitude but the dollars already spent—and what we have spent on oil up to now is a very sizable amount—would not have been spent; the American oil industry would already have lost a major share of its present exports with serious repercussions on our foreign and domestic production and, I believe, on prices."

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 16, 1949]

PETROLEUM COMMENTS

(By W. M. Jablonski, petroleum editor)

ECA'S BIG DECISION

How far should American taxpayers help finance expansion of European oil facilities at the expense of existing American oil investments abroad?

That is the question now confronting ECA.

Complex and far-reaching in its implications, the ECA petroleum issue presents something of a dilemma:

1. Europe wants to expand its own oil-refining facilities at home and European-controlled production of "sterling" oil (principally British and Dutch) in the Middle East and Caribbean. This would eliminate need for importing dollar oil and make it possible to export sterling oil into dollar markets.

2. It wants ECA to help finance at least part of this expansion program (estimated at $1,500,000,000).

3. Expansion of such "sterling" oil facilities to replace dollar oil imports undoubtedly offers one of the easiest ways of aiding Europe's recovery oil accounts for a large proportion (20 percent) of the present dollar deficit, and a dollar shortage is expected to continue even after the ECA program is ended.

4. However, expansion of such sterling oil facilities will tend to freeze out dollar oil from European markets, displace large existing American investments there as well as the big dollar oil investments built up in the Middle East to supply these European markets.

The program presented to ECA by individual European countries call for tripling Europe's refining capacity by 1953, plus boosting European-owned refineries abroad by about 33 percent and expanding European-owned foreign crude oil production by 52 percent in the same period—far exceeding anticipated European consumption.

ECA recently asked these countries to revise their programs more in line with their future needs. It is obvious, however, that even if the program is only partially carried out, it would still have a far-reaching effect on American dollar oil investments in Europe and the Middle East—and, incidentally, tend to encourage a monopoly of a few big "sterling" oil companies in large areas of the world.

Indirectly, too, this program would also help finance expansion of these sterling oil companies in other markets such as South American, since the dollars supplied by the United States to such companies in Europe will release funds for further expansion in other areas.

If carried out to its extreme, the program could also have repercussions on the domestic American oil industry as overexpansion of facilities in the Eastern Hemisphere would tend to depress world oil markets.

That ECA is aware of the gravity of this outlook was made clear here in a recent talk by Walter J. Levy, chief of ECA's petroleum branch. His speech was refreshing in its frankness and realistic appraisal of the "grave and very serious problem" facing American oil companies as a result of the "expansion program * * * of the British oil industry".

"In this process of making Europe self-sustaining," Mr. Levy declared, "somebody may well get hurt, but I believe it is imperative that no vital interests of the United States be sacrificed and that no legitimate business interests be hurt unnecessarily."

While Mr. Levy outlined the problem, he left unanswered what is to be done.

Certainly Congress never intended ECA to use taxpayer money to sacrifice private American investments abroad and build up their foreign competitors. On the other hand, the ECA program, designed to halt the trend to

communism in Europe, is an important instrument of American foreign policy, and oil is an important part of that instrument.

There is no easy, ready solution. There should be some area, however, within which the over-all policy of fulfilling ECA's aims could be reconciled with important American investments abroad, without sacrificing either. It is a problem that should command the careful attention and cooperation of top level leaders in both industry and government.

Civil Rights in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a humble pride that I point out that I am a life-long resident of the State of New Jersey. And, justifiably, I am proud of its great citizenry as a forward-looking people. They are a people who in the spirit of our Declaration of Independence sincerly believe that all men are created equal and that preserved to them are certain inalienable rights regardless of race, color, or creed. This is the spirit which has made America great. This is the spirit which will preserve for us a solid Union, a prosperous and peaceful America. And, it is hoped that this great lesson will be learned by the peoples of all the world, so that one day, fear hatred, and insecurity will disappear like clouds from the face of the earth and the hopes of man will have been realized.

Some weeks ago, the legislature of my State enacted a civil-rights bill. Partisan politics or sectional differences did not prevent passage of this necessary legislation. Republicans and Democrats alike saw the need for passage of legislation which would make possible that free Americans—regardless of race, color, or creed and station in life—be permitted to live in harmony with one another and each one in his way to pursue happiness. The great city of Newark, which is a melting pot of peoples of all races, creeds, and colors, where there are rich and poor, through its duly elected commissioners, adopted the following resolution. It is fitting it be included herein under leave already granted:

Whereas our founding fathers adopted the principles of equal rights and personal liberty as basic ideals of our democracy; and

Whereas a great Civil War was fought to perpetuate these principles; and

Whereas discrimination of any kind has no place in our way of life and, for the future welfare of our people, must be attacked wherever and whenever it is found; and

Whereas the legislature of our State has adopted the civil-rights bill which pronounces and supports these principles; and

Whereas the people of the city of Newark, who come from every race, color, creed, and station in life, have always demonstrated that free Americans, no matter what their belief, can live in harmony with one another; and

Whereas in various sections of our country there is a strong tendency to violate the fundamental rights of our citizens, and it is necessary that Congress also adopt measures by way of safeguarding all of the people in the pursuit of the way of life guaranteed by our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. That the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark commend the Governor and Legislature of the State of New Jersey for having passed the civil-rights bill.

2. That Congress, through its recognized leaders, be urged to adopt a like measure.

3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America.

4. That a copy of this resolution also be forwarded to the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
VINCENT J. MURPHY,
MEYER ELLENSTEIN,
JOHN B. KEENAN,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.

Adopted at a meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., April 6, 1948.

Certified to by me this 6th day of April 1949.

H. J. REICHENSTEIN,
City Clerk.

The Grand Old Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, with the idea in mind that everyone, regardless of politics, should strive to get the Republican Party back on its true political course, so that it can again take its helpful place in American politics, I have responded to the urge to suggest the following thoughts for the serious consideration of the unselfish party leadership, and the innocent rank and file of that formerly great and formerly respected and respectable party.

The control of the minority party, in my opinion, is in the selfish clutches of men who are operating none too cleverly behind the scenes. There was nothing wrong, as I see it, with the Republican Party, as a party, in the early years of its political life. It had a great founder in the person of Abraham Lincoln. At that time it was the true party of freedom in these United States. Its founder gave to this Nation and to the world a great document of human freedom, the Emancipation Proclamation, and he also summoned up all of the necessary courage to make his daring proclamation, during his short political leadership a reality instead of a dream. Also in those bygone days it was the party of all patriotic, just, and freedom-loving people. As time wore on the high purposes of the founder of the party seem to have been buried and forgotten as the years rolled on, each passing year being worse than the preceding year, until now in its present hands it is the party of the classes instead of the party of the masses, and it is now squeamishly flirting with civil-rights slavery and industrial slavery.

The Grand Old Party has ceased to be grand in its present-day doings and sayings. It is grand only in ancient and almost forgotten retrospect.

Cannot the good and the true members of the Republican Party dispossess the present-day usurpers of their vote-blasting control, and return party control into cleaner, better, and more deserving hands? I certainly hope so, because our Republic contemplates the existence of two strong, well-meaning and well-doing political parties, so that if one party does not act in the interests of the Republic the people may look to and select the candidates of the other party as their public servants. Two such strong parties would do much to discourage splinter political parties who flourish most when there is only one strong political party.

For the purpose of showing the discouraged viewpoint of a Republican newspaperman, and not for the purpose of agreeing to everything appearing in the proffered item, I now set forth an editorial by Harold G. Stagg, which appeared in a Washington newspaper, the Vet Times, on April 9, 1949, at page 5 thereof:

GRAND OLD PARTY
(By Harold G. Stagg)

It seems that almost everyone is writing a book, a magazine article, or making a speech these days on that fascinating subject, What's wrong with the Republican Party.

By birthright, my allegiance belongs to the Republican Party, but I must confess that when I get in a voting booth I'm the greatest little ticket-splitter you ever saw. I haven't voted for a Republican presidential candidate since Wendell Willkie ran in 1940 and the last Republican Congressman to get my vote was a personal friend.

I've known for years what's wrong with the Republican Party, but if I wrote a book no one would read it. I've told a lot of Republicans what I think is wrong, but do they listen? Not on your life.

The April issue of Fortune magazine announces that it plans to hold periodic open hearings on the future of the Republican Party. What future?

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, the Ohio Republican, is the first witness called by Fortune to keynote GOP planning for 1952. TAFT starts right off by admitting that the Republicans lost the last three national elections because of poor presentation to the electorate.

"The Republican Party has not done a very good job of explaining its principles of American history and Government," says the Ohio Senator who—love him or hate him—is still one of the few bright lights in the GOP.

That statement, however, is the understatement of the year—bar none.

The Republican Party is consistent in doing a fantastically lousy job of selling itself to the public. There is no excuse for the ineptness, the incompetence, the downright stupidity of the public relations division of the Republican National Committee.

But even those fellows have an alibi.

It's a pretty tough thing to sell the politically wise American people a bill of goods—particularly when it doesn't carry a price tag and when most of the visible samples offer the people something they don't want.

I'll never be invited to testify in Fortune's open hearings, but unless the Republican officeholders and spokesmen change their tactics pronto I can predict the outcome of the 1952 election right now—a sixth consecutive term of office for the Democrats.

There are few men of vision active in the councils of the Republican Party today. A few who show evidences of vision are too often blinded by party politics, by lack of courage, and by lack of a cause celebre.

Yet there is a cause celebre made to order for all good Republicans. That is to rid the party of the stuffed shirts, the poisonous reactionaries, the bitter-end obstructionists, the mental lightweights, the financial heavyweights, and the host of incompetents who issue statements from Republican National Committee headquarters that send shivers up the spines of the intelligent.

How can the Republicans expect to win elections when they keep trying to jam down the throats of the American people candidates who have been rejected time and time again?

How can the Republicans expect to win elections when the men in public office who are symbolic of Republicanism make the headlines only as obstructionists—obstructing not necessarily the opposition Democrats, but obstructing the American people in their normal progressive march toward a better life?

If the American people say they want more and cheaper houses—the Republicans block housing legislation.

If the American people say they want more and better educational facilities for their children—the Republicans block Federal aid to education.

If the American people say they want fair working conditions for organized labor—the Republicans block labor reforms.

If the American people say they want more and better social security—the Republicans block social-security legislation.

If the American people say they want lower prices and better products—the Republicans block anti-inflationary legislation.

You'd think to hear the Republicans rant in Congress that this country was populated entirely by a mixture of high-minded millionaires, real-estate lobbyists, and Treasury-raiding Socialists. Instead, it's populated by people who vote for the things they want and the things the Republican Party won't give them even when its platform pledges that it will.

What the Republican Party needs—if it wants a future in the United States—is a modern-day Charlie Michelson with a feel of the public pulse. Smart politicians don't hire ex-generals to woo the affections of ex-GIs, but the Republicans did.

And what the Republican Party needs—if it wants a future in the United States—is to put a damper on the loud-mouths in Congress who too often aline the GOP against the people in favor of the few—and give some of the more promising newcomers like BALDWIN of Connecticut, IVES of New York, and LODGE of Massachusetts, a chance to be heard.

Until then, the one thing really wrong with the Republican Party would seem to be the Republicans.

I do not and cannot rejoice at the present hopeless plight of the Republican Party. It has my sincere sympathy, and I extend to it my best wishes, and express my fondest hopes that it will soon be resurrected from the tomb or hide-out of selfishness, where it has been imprisoned and held for ransom by antisocial men and interests entirely too long for its own good, and for the well-being of the Nation as a whole.

In conclusion I earnestly say that the grip of bad big business and bad big men must be disengaged from the leadership of the present-day Republican Party.

Our Economic Problems Require Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the following timely and challenging editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call:

OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS REQUIRE STUDY

Some economists who watch the international situation very carefully are of the opinion that in the next few years more and more American industries will establish branch manufacturing establishments abroad, as some have already done, and managers of American-owned factories in Europe and Asia will in increasing quantities be sending their goods into the United States, where they will come into competition with consumer goods made by American workmen. The reason for this alien-branch idea is said to be the increasing cost of living in the United States, with higher taxes, higher manufacturing costs and higher wages, and that manufacturers who build abroad will be seeking to get away from the conditions which handicap them here.

It will be too bad indeed if conditions in the United States should make it better for our producers to make their goods abroad and then send them back to the United States. Such a procedure would be unhealthy to the Nation and could not last long for several reasons. In the first place, if too many goods of this kind come from abroad we can expect remedial legislation in the way of tariffs or other restrictions. In view of this it will be well for our industrial and labor leaders to give this subject serious study, and our economic experts at Washington should cooperate with them in seeking to bring about conditions which will not seriously affect our industries.

Another thing to be considered by our industrialists is the fact that many of the European countries are steadily becoming more socialistic, and the day may not be far distant when a privately owned industry will not be safe in one of these countries. As far as the administration and Congress are concerned, it would be most helpful if real governmental economy was brought about, our tax burdens become less heavy, and the cost of living is reduced, so that production in the United States can be increased and provide employment for our rapidly growing population.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most significant indications of popular support for President Truman's national health-insurance legislation was a poll of leaders of citizens' organizations published in the current American Druggist. It showed that 67 percent of these leaders favor the President's program.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the poll is that it comes from a trade magazine which is opposed to the President's health program and carries in the current issue an editorial urging druggists to campaign against that program. But the magazine does not discount the importance of its poll. On the contrary, it says the poll "foreshadows the possibility of broad grass-roots support for the Truman program."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this story from the March issue of the American Druggist in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION LEADERS STRONGLY FAVOR TRUMAN HEALTH PLAN—67 PERCENT OF EXECUTIVES OF CITIZEN GROUPS, REPRESENTING 40,000,000 PEOPLE, FAVOR PLAN—QUESTIONNAIRE WAS SIMILAR TO THAT SENT TO PHARMACISTS BY AMERICAN DRUGGISTS

(By Maurice Mermey)

As of today, national health insurance is regarded with favor by a majority of citizen organization leaders in the United States. Characterized as opinion factors, because they are an effective force in molding opinion and influencing action on public issues, these organizations comprise thousands of national, State, regional, and local groups. They have a combined membership of approximately 100,000,000; and, even after eliminating duplicate memberships, their rolls include between 30,000,000 and 40,000,000 individual citizens.

In order to learn what these leaders know and think of national health insurance, American Druggist turned for cooperation to Resolved, a monthly newsletter of the citizen-organization field published by Baldwin and Mermey. The 1,500 presidents and program chairmen of citizen organizations on the Resolved mailing list were sent precisely the same questionnaire which American Druggist previously distributed to retail druggists. Responses were received from 360, or 24 percent, of these leaders. Here are the high-light results of the citizen-organization survey:

Of those leaders who expressed an opinion, 2 out of 3 favor national health insurance, while 1 out of 3 either favors the present system or considers the Truman proposal dangerous.

Of those who respond, 1 out of 8 expressed no opinion.

Of those who responded, 4 out of 5 gave the correct answer as to how national health insurance would operate.

Of those who gave the correct answer, 7 out of 10 favor national health insurance.

Of the organizations with which the 1,500 leaders are affiliated, 650 are national, 475 State, 325 local, and 50 are regional groups. As compared with the fact that 79 percent of the valid responses gave the correct answer as to how the program would operate, 67 percent of the leaders polled should have been familiar with the subject because they belong to organizations which deal with social, economic, or health and welfare issues, or have general programs of which national health insurance should be a part. On the other hand, 500 organizations, or 33 percent, deal exclusively with international, interracial, and similar issues, and not with matters related to national health insurance.

The significance of these organizations' support for or opposition to the Truman program lies in the fact that they include such

groups as the National Board of YWCA's, National Council of YMCA's, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, American Association of University Women, Congress of Parents and Teachers, League of Women Voters of the United States, National Education Association, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, American Legion, American Jewish Congress, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and National Association of Consumers. State, local, and regional groups are, in large part, branches of these and other national groups; those which are not concerned primarily with local issues.

Encouragement will be found by those advocating the Truman program in the fact that 182 leaders, or 67 percent of those who took a position, favored national health insurance. This is, indeed, a significant figure, for it foreshadows the possibility of broad grass-roots support for the Truman program. Advocates will also be heartened by the fact that leaders with knowledge of the program favor it more than do other leaders, as witness the statistics shown below.

Of the 242, or 79 percent, who answered question 1 correctly: 166, or 69 percent, favor the Truman proposal; 68, or 28 percent, favor the present system; 8, or 3 percent, take other positions.

Of the 25, or 8 percent, who answered question 1 incorrectly: 13, or 52 percent, favor the Truman proposal; 10, or 40 percent, favor the present system; 2, or 8 percent, take other positions.

Of the 41, or 13 percent, who didn't know enough about national health insurance: 3, or 7 percent, favor the Truman proposal; 5, or 12 percent, favor the present system; 33, or 81 percent, have no opinion.

Opponents of the Truman program may also find rays of light in the survey's findings. A pattern o fstrong citizen-organization support for social issues is reflected in our Catalog of Attitudes which lists the positions these groups have taken on 200 national issues. In respect of national health insurance, the catalog lists support by 37 groups (excluding farm, labor, business, and professional) and opposition by only 4. The survey, on the other hand, shows a less decisive pattern, with one leader opposing the Truman program for every two favoring it. Also, of 52 questionnaire replies which were invalidated (incomplete, more than one answer per question, etc.) 30 leaders favor the present system and only two favor the Truman proposal. Let it be understood, however, that these are merely rays; for, by a very substantial majority, citizen organization leaders beam on the Truman program.

Significant of the interest in the subject and in the questionnaire is the fact that comments accompanied 124, or 34 percent of the replies. Twenty-four leaders commented unfavorably on the questionnaire, some criticizing the word "compulsory," others criticizing what they regarded as inadequacy of alternatives offered in both questions, still others questioning the survey itself as being premature. Another 25 commented unfavorably on the socialized-medicine aspects of the national health insurance proposal, while 28 commented unfavorably on the campaign of the American Medical Association or of organized medicine in general. Of this latter group, 12 favor the Truman proposal and 6 favor the present system.

The opinions which citizen-organization leaders express respecting national health insurance, or any other public issue, does not necessarily coincide with the positions which may be taken by their groups. On the other hand, our experience in this field indicates that views and positions will coincide in the overwhelming majority of cases. Accordingly, advocates of the Truman program can be satisfied with their score among citizen organizations, while opponents have much work and soul-searching ahead as regards this large and important area of public interest.

Winning Theme Song of United States Treasury's Peacetime Savings Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me regarding the announcement of the winning theme song of the United States Treasury's peacetime savings-bond drive.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF WINNING THEME SONG OF UNITED STATES TREASURY'S PEACETIME SAVINGS-BOND DRIVE

Mr. President, I should like to take just a few moments of the time of the Senate. It is my pleasure to announce the winning theme song for the new peacetime savings-bond drive of the United States Treasury Department. This drive will open on May 16, and it will extend through June 30. The previous bond song Any Bonds Today by the great composer, Irving Berlin, was, as we all recall, written especially for wartime use.

Now the new song will be entitled "Keep America Saving." This song was written by Frank H. Thorne, a Chicago industrialist. Mr. Thorne is a member of the Chicago chapter of the fascinating organization known as the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America. Mr. Thorne is past international president of this society and currently a member of the society's executive committee. He sings bass with the Elastic Four, international barber-shop quartet champions of 1942.

I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to Mr. Thorne, and I am sure that Members of the Senate join me.

Incidentally, Mr. Thorne is author of the society's theme song, Keep America Singing, something which his organization of over 26,000 members, including the President of the United States, strives to do.

I have a particular pride in this organization, because its international president is O. H. King Cole, president of a Manitowoc, Wis., company. My own State of Wisconsin has 32 of the society's 565 chapters. Wiscousin contributed 2 of the 43 bond-song entries, and I hope that I will have an opportunity to hear them at many bond rallies in the Badger State. These songs are Buy a Bond, by Cleve N. Akey, of Wisconsin Rapids, and Buy Bonds Today, by Edward Berg, of Milwaukee.

I will not presume to take the further time of the Senate in describing more of the details of this intriguing subject. I do, however, want to say that the society's approach in preserving this wonderful heritage of American barber shop quartet singing is certainly to be congratulated, particularly as it contributes to a wonderful effort like the Treasury Department's Opportunity Drive in selling savings bonds to our people.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point some supplementary facts on this fine work.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON SPEBSQSA

Here are the winning lyrics of Frank Thorne's theme song:

"Let's keep America saving
Let's be fair, do our share
Buy a Bond!
Keep America saving
Three gets four, who wants more?
Buy a Bond!
Far and near, throughout the year
We can help Uncle Sam
Do the things he's planned.
Let's keep America saving
If we save, we'll be strong
So let's all come along
We just can't go wrong."

I should like to mention that over 2,000 quartets have volunteered their services to the United States Savings Bonds Division to sing at savings bonds rallies and functions of all kinds during the opportunity drive to sell $1,040,000,000 worth of Series E Bonds.

International President O. H. King Cole of SPEBSQSA assured National Savings Bonds Director Vernon L. Clark last January that his barbershoppers would produce a theme song for the spring bond drive. King Cole appointed able Ed Place, of Washington, D. C., to direct a bond song contest for the society in cooperation with the Treasury Department. The result was that 43 songs were turned over to Mr. Clark on February 23, on the occasion of a savings bonds dinner at the Mayflower Hotel attended by both President Truman and Secretary Snyder.

On February 28, Congressman LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois, member of the society's Bloomington, Ill., chapter listed the entries in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Ed Place's own composition, Bonds for Happiness, which received honorable mention in the contest from the judging committee, headed by the popular Fred Waring, was sung for the President on that evening by the Treble Shooters Quartet of the District of Columbia chapter of SPE3SQSA.

Waring, a member, by the way, of Manitowoc and Sheboygan, Wis., chapters was assisted by Oscar Hammerstein II and Perry Como, both well known to America's music lovers.

It is my pleasure to announce additional awards of the judges, as follows: Second-place, Buy a U. S. Bond Today, by Howard Liffick and Joseph E. Martin, Benton Harbor-St. Joe, Mich.; five other honorable mentions: Brother, Sign Up for Bonds, by Willis A. Diekema, Holland, Mich.; Buy, Buy, Buy A Bond Today, by Alfred F. Girard, Providence, R. I.: Freedom Rings, by Pat Sands and Ed Cronin, Boston, Mass.; If You Want Four Dollars, Francis Stroup, Laramie, Wyo.; and Buy, Buy Another U. S. Savings Bond, by R. H. (Dick) Sturges, Atlanta, Ga.

The savings bond campaign is a great volunteer program operating in every community in the land. The whole heart of this program is volunteer service. I am sure that the Nation appreciates the efforts of the barber shop quartet singers to compose and sing their good old songs to enhance the opportunity drive.

I am glad that the Treasury Department has invited King Cole to its national volunteers dinner here at the Hotel Statler on April 19, with President Truman planning to attend together with other prominent Government officials. Spreading harmony is a great work, and I hope King Cole will continue his leadership in this direction.

Lastly, I should like to say that on May 23, at the National Press Club, Keep America Saving will be sung for the first time by the

Press Club chorus of 62 voices and by the Washington chapter of the National Capitol Chorus, representing 125 SPEBSQSA voices. Good luck and good singing, fellows.

Addresses Incident to Award by Spanish Government to Very Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of Maryland's outstanding educators, the Very Reverend Francis X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore, and former editor of the Jesuit weekly, America, was honored recently by the Government of Spain with the insignia of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, with the rank of commander.

This award is the highest and oldest insignia of distinction of the Spanish Government. It was presented to Father Talbot in recognition of services rendered in the cause of humanity to the people of Spain.

Because the addresses made on that occasion by Father Talbot and by Mr. William J. Casey, general chairman, the sponsoring committee of Baltimore presented such a clear and authoritative picture of the relation of Spain to the world situation, a relationship which is very much in the minds of everyone these days, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these speeches be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF THE VERY REVEREND FRANCIS X. TALBOT, S. J.

At the Spanish Embassy on Sunday afternoon, I indicated the single reason why I might possibly deserve any distinction. I can take credit only for this, that I made an editorial decision in July 1936, when the issues were nebulous and the facts available to me were scanty. I can take credit for this, that I was one of the very few editors of national publications in the United States who properly evaluated the clash of ideologies and forces in Spain 15 years ago. I can be a bit self-satisfied tonight, when all the facts are available and the issues are history, that I was completely and irrefutably correct in that editorial decision. Whatever else I may have written or spoken or done was derived from that decision and performed through a sense of duty.

Lest I appear cryptic, I shall indicate briefly my reasons for espousing the Nationalist cause in Spain from the very beginning. As an editor of America, the national Catholic weekly, I was obliged to keep myself informed about world events. My attention was focused on Spain in 1931 when King Alphonsus went into voluntary exile, and the republic was proclaimed. I observed the struggle of the parties of the left and the parties of the right to establish a stable government. But then, about 1934, I clearly discerned in the Republican movement the growing strength of the Communists, the Marxist Socialists, the Syndicalists, and Anarchists, the chaos they were causing in the social, economic, religious, and political spheres, their increasing acts of aggression and violence against the soul and the nature of the Spanish people. I recognized the aim of Stalin in following the Lenin line by setting Europe ablaze at both ends, and the strategy of duping the liberal elements and sowing discontent in the depressed elements. Moscow was clearly planning, I judged, to seize the Government of Spain by patient impenetration and, if this failed, by violence and bloodshed.

Then occurred the elections of February 1936. A contested tally gave a slight margin to the parties of the left. Manipulated by-elections increased the leftist majority in the Cortes. Feeling its strength, the Communist spearhead directed the Government in a systematic destruction of freedom of speech and of the press, instigated the gradual suppression of religious education and liberty, and planned, by an open secret, to beat down all political opposition through gerrymandered elections. The Sovietization of Spain was well underway.

All of these parliamentary aggressions were accompanied by acts of violence. From February till June 1936, during the 4 months of the leftist regime, 113 general and 218 partial strikes were called, 170 churches were destroyed by fire, 69 clubs were battered down, 10 newspaper offices were burned, and attempts were made to fire 294 public buildings, of which 251 were churches. There was an unrecorded number of political assaults and murders.

By the summer of 1936, the seizure of dictatorial power by the Communist-inspired leftist was imminent. It was then that the military under Gen. Francisco Franco revolted against the political junto that was corrupting society, poisoning the roots of religion and branding on Spain a foreign, totalitarian ideology. It was then that I, as the newly appointed editor in chief of America, made my decision against the Marxist junto gripping Spain and in favor of the insurgents. There were but few American editors, publicists, organizations on the side of myself, Father Thorning, and other Catholic spokesmen. Everyone of importance in the United States shouted down the rebellious Nationalists and swung public opinion violently in favor of the Leftist Republicans. It was on the Spanish question in the United States that the Communists in the United States reached their highest peak of influence. And as the Nationalists in Spain battled communism by guns, so I and my associates assailed American communism by words.

Looking back, I can well understand the position of our American leaders and people. They were well fed with the volume of propaganda sent out by the Republican government which completely controlled all the vehicles of communication. They were permitted to hear scarcely any of the truth in favor of the Nationalists. They were misled by the American propagandists who saw in Spain—not two deadly enemies to world peace and human freedom—but only one. They cried out in horror against fascism in Spain. And so did I. But they did not comprehend the equal and greater menace of communism in Spain.

Now, perhaps, they are able to read completed history more clearly than they read history in the making, 13 years ago. Now, undoubtedly, they are convinced that communism is as deadly as fascism and nazism. Now, when they read history backward they must understand what Spain would undoubtedly have been, if the Marxist, atheistic totalitarianism had vanquished the Christian and traditional Spain.

Today there would not have been a free Spain seeking friendship with the United States and the western democracies. Rather, Spain would have been first on the list of the enslaved nations. There used to be a free Poland and a democratic Czechoslovakia, an independent Bulgaria, and a self-governing Hungary. But these and other nations have been throttled by the iron hand of communism and enslaved behind the iron curtain. Spain saved herself from this fate.

I need not belabor the point that Moscow sought Spain as its first conquest in world revolution. The first clash of the Fascists and the Marxists was in Spain. The first battlefield of World War II was on Spanish soil. The first violent conflict between the ideology of communism as against that of western Europe and the United States, burst open in Spain. The first people of Europe to experience the vehemence and violence of atheistic communism were the Spaniards. By saving itself, Spain may one day be credited with the verdict that it helped save the Christian and democratic nations that are now engaged in a cold war, and may be involved, God avert, in a burning and a bloody war. Our way of the future, as the other speakers have attested, is that of friendship for Spain as a weapon of defense against world aggression.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF MR. WILLIAM J. CASEY, GENERAL CHAIRMAN, THE SPONSORING COMMITTEE OF BALTIMORE

The outbreak of 1936 in Spain was a clash of ideologies not then understood in the outside world. The citizens of Spain in this civil conflict were seeking to halt a political group that had seized power and was professedly and energetically moving to sovietize Spain; that was building up a dictatorship, and to this end setting loose appalling destruction of life and property. This was of terroristic design and aimed at crushing the individualistic and social aspirations of the people.

The outside world at the same time was being cleverly deluded with the fiction that the then powers of government were waging the battle of world democracy. As the facts were uncovered, those in control were exposed as strongly communistic and as seeking absolute power to establish and perpetuate a totalitarian state. In the meanwhile, so misled was the world's understanding of the real issues that the then Madrid Government had enlisted the sympathies of people of the world attached to democratic principles, who were even beguiled into condemning as rebels the people of Spain actually fighting to recover their liberties.

Many Americans at the time were nevertheless puzzled at Russian planes manned by Soviet combatants and Russian war matériel that joined the Madrid government in its warfare against what subsequently developed to be two-thirds of the people of Spain. At the outset of this conflict the man who is being honored tonight set out with his genius for exploration to get at the real truth. He uncovered the fraud then being perpetrated in the United States by the propaganda of lies and misrepresentations. In a challenging and comprehensive manner he prepared his findings and under the aegis of a large group of eminent Americans this was given publication. The curtain was thus lifted. Vigorously pursuing his self-appoint d task through broadcasts, public lectures, the press, illuminating articles and editorials in America, of which he was then editor in chief, Father Talbot organized and set in motion an informed public opinion that checked our country from going all out in accepting the fraudulent propaganda being handed out in this country with all of the ingenuity of the Soviet pattern and even with the use of American dollars contributed by the unwary.

In this aggressive campaign for spreading the truth Father Talbot recognized that words alone were inadequate and as chair-

man headed and gave direction to the Spanish Relief Fund which raised over $100,000 for the relief of the children, the aged and stricken people of Spain, at a time of their most desperate plight from the evils set loose upon them.

The destructive warfare is now over and what do we find? A Government to be measured by its performances. Rebuilt cities, highways, social reforms long delayed coming into realization, a more united and purposeful people in backing their Government; these are the facts of today. Steadily gaining ground is the Christian social group of young intellectuals, interested in land reform and social advancement, largely inspired by the Pope's encyclicals.

The radical groups, while losing ground, still maintain their Soviet contacts. The Government has the backing of the people and the army. An era of stability and progress is now substantially under way.

The blunders of world authorities in their attitude towards Spain are now giving way to a more enlightened and realistic approach. For example, turn to this statement of Winston Churchill:

"It is a great mistake to allow legitimate objections to Franco and his form of government to be a barrier at this time between us and a country with whom we have many natural ties. It is folly." Then Mr. Churchill adds with a little rueful hindsight, quote: "It is true that I agreed at Potsdam that Spain should not be invited to join the United Nations, but I said that in hope of obtaining full Russian cooperation in a real instrument of world peace. Time has passed since Potsdam and we have now a different relation with Russia."

A few months ago one of America's most sagacious minds in the field of politics, a man noted for his intellectual honesty and forthrightness, James A. Farley, had this to say:

"It is not a matter of whether we agree with the politics within Spain. It is simply a matter of whether Spain is essential to the security of the democracies, and any military man will tell you that it is."

Can we interpret less from such statements of these two master political minds than that Spain is an essential link in the North Atlantic Security Pact, now in process of enactment as the hope of the civilized world for preventing a third world war? Further, don't these declarations suggest to our common sense that with an awareness of the reconstruction so definitely in sight in Spain, our planning for world peace is incomplete unless linked to Spain? The hard economic conditions yet to be overcome there, particularly the severe and increasingly difficult problem of restoring foreign commerce because of the shortage of foreign currencies, plainly indicate that our lavish expenditure of American dollars under the Marshall plan should include a share for Spain. Our country could give a great lift towards perfecting the North Atlantic security pact by fully embracing Spain in our international relations, including the Marshall plan, and bringing its strategic position as to the Mediterranean sector into the formidable alliance for world safety to be established by the pact.

Momentous days are just ahead in Washington for the completion of the security pact. Heartening news comes from essential strategic sectors of decisions to join the pact. Exciting as to this evening's event is the announcement that Portugal is to become one of the parties. There already exists a defense alliance between Portugal and Spain. What more fitting prayer could go up from this distinguished gathering than that Father Talbot's honor may be climaxed by Spain now finding and accepting a pressing and unanimous welcome as a partner in this compact for enduring world security.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an article published in the Washington Times-Herald on Friday, April 1, 1949, which I think will be of interest, since it deals with the important subject of small business.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAYBOOK

(By Tris Coffin)

The spunky National Federation of Small Business is tieing on the gloves for a showdown scrap with the powers that be in the Senate.

George J. Burger, the federation's hard-driving and single-minded Washington VP, threw out the challenge in a smoldering letter to Senate leaders. He is trying to break the deadlock that keeps the ruckus over a Senate small-business committee tied up tight in the Rules Committee.

Weeks ago, the Senate bigwigs argued that no special committee should be named to keep a lookout for small business. This was backed up by the powerful banking committee, which said, sure kids, a subcommittee could handle all small-business affairs.

But Burger didn't take this lying down. He stormed up on the Hill like a cyclone and pinched and prodded other Senators to challenge this ukase from on high. So the question of an independent committee is now stewing in the Rules Committee.

Burger's letter is addressed to the rules chairman, scholarly CARL HAYDEN; majority leader, SCOTT LUCAS, and old KENNETH MCKELLAR, Appropriations Committee bossman.

In a whack at the Banking Committee's pious statement that it could look after small-business investigations on a $60,000 budget, Burger slugged: "This would amount to less than 2½ cents per small-business institution.

"If this would be the extent of the Senate's aid to small business for a year, we state it would be a waste of public funds, and small business isn't interested in any lip-service relief.

"Small business isn't asking for charity or a subsidy. All it wants is just this: That where its problems are justified by factual evidence it will have a duly constituted body in the Senate empowered to explore the individual problems and then make the proper recommendations direct to the Senate. Small business needs this encouragement at this critical time in its business career."

With this off his chest, Burger snaps in his low, fast chant like an auctioneer, "We'll call a spade a spade."

Senator LUCAS was the front man for those against a separate investigating committee in the earlier battle, but he has passed the word along quietly that this time the boys can get someone else to lead the forces against Burger and company. He's got too many bruises to treat.

Basing-Point System Loses Ground—Reclamation Bids Show Wide Variance at Destination—Phantom Freight Charges Give Way to Actual Freight Rates—Small Business Fears Moratorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have shown many times the exact pattern of bids which the Cement Trust inflicted upon the buying public prior to the Supreme Court decision in the cement case on April 26, 1948. I have also shown the price pattern of bids subsequent to the Supreme Court decision which indicates that buyers of cement now have an opportunity to make a selection of a supplier on a competitive basis.

The whole basing-point question revolves around the theme of the public interest. I have maintained, based on facts which have been available to me, that basing-point systems of pricing in any commodity are not in the public interest. Such systems by their very nature are monopolistic and cannot be successfully operated except by collusion behind a curtain of secrecy. I have demonstrated that the utmost care is exercised by members of industries using the basing point and similar systems to guard against public knowledge of the operation of such pricing devices. The basing-point system in the cement industry and the rigid steel conduit industry came to light only after a long period of search and investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. If we now undertake to forge a shield by way of a moratorium, however innocuous its purpose, we shall have subjected small business enterprise to the mercy of monopoly and unfair trade practices.

I desire at this time to further inform the Members of Congress of the pattern of cement prices since the Supreme Court decision. I am including tables of bids received by the Bureau of Reclamation for certain projects under the Bureau's supervision. The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Specification No. 2291, 40,000 barrels of portland cement in bulk, for the Boise-Anderson Ranch project, bids opened June 24, 1948—Destination, Mountain Home, Idaho*

Bidder	Per barrel price, f. o. b. mill	Freight rates	Per barrel destination price
Permanente Cement Co	$2.65	$2.0868	$4.7368
Oregon Portland Cement Co	[1] 3.05	.8648	3.9148

[1] Oregon, 0.10 cent per barrel discount; Permanente, no discount.

NOTE.—Maximum price increase at time of shipment, Permanente 0.20 cent, Oregon 0.15 cent.

TABLE II.—*Specification No. 2447, schedule No. 1, 280,000 barrels, type 2, portland cement, and schedule No. 2, 512,000 barrels, type 2, portland cement, for Columbia Basin project, bids opened Oct. 26, 1948—Destination, Odair, Wash.*

Bidder	Per barrel price, f. o. b. mill	Freight rates	Per barrel destination price
A. Permanente Cement Co., Oakland, Calif.	[1] $2.65	$1.1381144	$3.7881144
B. Permanente Cement Co., Seattle, Wash.	[1] 3.05	.6392	3.6892
Superior Portland Cement Co.	3.00	.6392	3.6392
Ideal Cement Co.	3.50	1.998816	5.498816

[1] Net price, others 0.10-cent barrel discount.
A. Bid on 396,000 barrels.
B. Bid on 396,000 barrels.

NOTE.—(No. 1). Total required 792,000 barrels—other bids on total quantity.

NOTE.—(No. 2). Maximum price increase at time of delivery, Permanente, Oakland, 0.20-cent barrel, others 0.15-cent barrel.

TABLE III.—*Specification No. 2493, 37,500 barrels of portland cement in bulk, for All-American Canal Boulder Canyon project, bids opened Dec. 21, 1948—Destination, Mecca, Calif.*

Bidder	Per barrel price f. o. b. mill	Freight rates	Per barrel destination price
Permanente Cement Co.[1]	$2.95	$1.8612	$4.8112
Monolith Portland Cement Co.	3.62	1.0152	4.6352

[1] Maximum price increase at time of delivery 0.20 cent; other, none.

TABLE IV.—*Specification No. 2591, item No. 1, 72,000 barrels of portland cement, for the Columbia Basin project, bids opened Mar. 15, 1949—Destination, Adrian, Wash.*

Bidder	Per barrel price, f. o. b. mill	Freight rates	Per barrel destination price
Permanente Cement Co.[1]	$2.999607	$1.0152	$4.014807
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	3.45	.678	4.1268
Spokane Portland Cement Co.	3.45	.7144	4.1644
Ideal Cement Co.	4.50	1.9552	6.4552
Carroll Mill Co.	----------	----------	[2] 4.80

[1] Permanente, no discount, others 0.10 cent per barrel discount.
[2] Bid includes delivery to job site in bags—informal bid.

TABLE V.—*Specification No. 2597, 3,000 barrels of portland cement in paper sacks, for Paonia project, bids opened Mar. 22, 1949—Destination, Somerset, Colo.*

Bidder	Per barrel price, f. o. b. mill	Freight rates	Per barrel destination price
Permanente Cement Co., Oakland, Calif.[1]	$3.05	$3.91248	$6.96248
Permanente Cement Co, Seattle, Wash.	3.45	4.11008	7.56008
Superior Portland Cement Co., Inc.	3.45	4.11008	7.56008
Ideal Cement Co.	3.55	1.292	4.842

[1] No discount, others 0.10 cent per barrel.

NOTE.—Maximum price increase at time of delivery: Permanente, Oakland, none; others, 0.15 cent; Ideal, 0.30 cent for unshipped portion after first year of contract.

BIDS WITHOUT BENEFIT OF BASING POINT

The foregoing tables enumerating great quantities of cement purchased by the Bureau of Reclamation, without benefit of the basing point, are indicative of the pattern of bid prices which have come to my attention from many sources. The claim has been made that the moratorium proposals are not intended to revive basing-point pricing. This claim of intention is undoubtedly sincere. However, the industries which used the basing-point system prior to the Supreme Court decision, according to the newspapers and other publications, definitely intend to use the basing-point system if a moratorium is declared. Articles which I have read speak of the expectation of again adopting the basing-point system if granted immunity by a moratorium.

SMALL BUSINESS FEARS MORATORIUM

Many organizations composed of small-business institutions, including the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., the National Food Brokers' Association, the Associated Retail Bakers of America, the National Candy Wholesalers' Association, Inc., the National Farmers Union, and the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., have voiced disapproval and fear of the proposed moratorium bills. These and other organizations interested in protecting the American economy from the insatiable appetites of monopoly are trying to make their protests heard. There is no doubt that the Congress is interested in the preservation of small business. This has been demonstrated time and again by the inclusion of small-business provisions in many acts of Congress, and only 2 days ago by the inclusion of a special small-business section in the economic cooperation bill.

MEMBERS ASKED TO STUDY BID ABSTRACTS BEFORE AND AFTER THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

I earnestly request that Members consider the tables above, showing different bid prices on cement after the Supreme Court decision on April 26, 1948, and tables, which I have in the past and will in the future bring to their attention, which show identical bid prices before the decision.

If, perchance, we, as Members of Congress, were moved to pass a moratorium bill on every construction of law by the Supreme Court, we would shortly plunge our country into such a chaotic condition that no man could determine with any degree of accuracy what was law and what was not law. We are a law-abiding people and we like to know what the law is and we do not like to cast shadows of doubt upon its interpretation. Turning aside arguments, whether plausible or otherwise, that the moratorium is intended to clarify existing law, the fact remains that even among the proponents of a moratorium, doubt exists as to its meaning. There is only one way, and that is the straight and direct way of allowing sufficient time for doubts, which may prevail in the minds of some people as to the existing antitrust laws, to be resolved by the orderly method of judicial procedure. When that is done let us set our sights to strengthen the antitrust laws for the protection of the American economy, and particularly the small-business segment of our economy and not turn the clock backward by way of moratoriums.

Britons See Chicago, Wonder About Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Britons See Chicago, Wonder About Exports," printed in the Chicago Daily News of April 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITONS SEE CHICAGO, WONDER ABOUT EXPORTS

(By Phil S. Hanna)

American mass production methods are ideal for the United States, but they would have limited application in Britain, so thought Sir Maurice Denny, British shipbuilder, one of a party of 21 Britons on American tour.

"With your 145,000,000 people you folks have a market within your own shores—but we, with one-third of that number, must find exports to live. If we adopted your mass-production methods we would have to double or treble our exports," Denny added.

But one of the American hosts replied: "We are building up surpluses of many of the same things you manufacture—if we both export, who is going to buy the combined output?"

ANSWER DIFFICULT

That question was not so readily answered. Cuthbert B. Clegg, British textile operator who has one plant said to be as modern as anything in America, frankly acknowledged that it was a knotty problem.

Another visitor was asked: "If the United States lets enough of your surpluses in to keep your factories operating, how can you expect us to keep on supplying ECA recovery funds?"

In confidence, the visitor replied: "That is the pesky part of the world situation today. America is doing the most Christian-like act in history. But after seeing your productive capacity I am bound to say that if world markets cannot be developed you are running the risk of finding yourselves in the same boat we are in."

DEMAND LIMITED

The nations that can pay for exports, he added, do not need them to the extent necessary to absorb United States and British surpluses and those who need them are unable to pay.

In the last 25 years many of the normal importing countries—India, for example—have made great strides toward self-containment. There is also danger of new cartels, he concluded.

It was thrilling to hear a tablemate at the Blackstone meeting declare that "we are be-

ing served as much meat at this one meal as Britons get in a week."

But the economic views given off the record gave me something to think about as regards the United States situation.

Science and a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Science and a Lasting Peace," by Waldemar Kaempffert, published by International Latex Corp. as a public service in the Washington Post April 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AND A LASTING PEACE

(In view of Mr. Churchill's speech of March 31, 1949, it is noteworthy that the International Latex Corp. first ran this article as its editorial advertisement on March 22, 1944.)

(By Waldemar Kaempffert)

Despite the reluctance of the great powers to yield their ancient sovereignties in the interest of world unity, the signs are plain enough that, as science and technology sweep on, unification proceeds rapidly.

It means something that an Englishman, a Frenchman, an American, an Australian are scarcely distinguishable so far as their clothes are concerned. It means something that automobiles are very much alike; that electric lights in millions of homes here and abroad glow in accordance with the same principle. It means something that Hottentots, Chinese, Americans, and Englishmen rock with laughter at the same film or thrill to a symphony short-waved from New York to London. It means something that in all advanced countries people travel in similar trains, steamers, or planes, cook by gas supplied by a gasometer, suck dirt out of carpets by electricity shot from a central station. It means something that mass production and standardization, which are the hallmarks of a developed industrial technology, have been adopted by every industrial nation. At the bottom of all this lies the conviction that science and technology are good in themselves and are worth cultivating for social and economic reasons.

A WORLD-UNIFYING FORCE

Clearly, we have in science a world-unifying force that should be systematically and rationally applied. Already there are in the world perhaps 250,000 first-class research chemists, biologists, physicists, and engineers. These men and women in normal times meet in international conventions and give freely of their knowledge to the world. No questions are asked about the race, nationality, or creed of these internationalists. We have here the nucleus of an organization that could weld the world psychologically and socially into a unit.

Science ought to be discussed at the peace table and not just politics, spheres of influence and economic rights—the kind of science that will really usher in a new order. Science has never had more than half a chance. It has had to develop in the face of frustration, even of downright suppression. Let us then at the peace table organize research on a world-wide scale with the intention of raising all countries to a single high intellectual and economic level, of giving all peoples a common outlook, and of thus preparing them for the acceptance of a single political order. We need experience in thinking and acting together if we are to convince ourselves that more is to be gained by regarding the land, the sea, and the air as a whole than by regions and countries.

Suppose, therefore, we organize a World Scientific Commission and suppose that we finance it by contributions from participating nations. One quarter of 1 percent of prewar budgets would be enough.

The Commission would first map out what has been accomplished. Gaps in our knowledge would appear. The program of research would be framed to fill them as well as to advance existing knowledge. As the results poured in some of the major disgraces of our scientific record would be expunged.

It is a disgrace that millions must still groan with arthritis. It is a disgrace that the conquest of cancer is not yet in sight. It is a disgrace that we have only the vaguest notion of what happens when a piece of beefsteak is chewed and digested. Because we know so little of the mechanics of heredity—why we inherit blue eyes or stub noses and some afflictions from our parents—it is a disgrace that we cannot pick out of the American population the 18,000,000 who are themselves mentally sound but who are believed to be the carriers of mental disease that can be passed on. It is a disgrace that millions of chemical compounds remain to be discovered—compounds of immense potentialities in medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is a disgrace that we cannot predict what the weather will be a fortnight hence in Chicago and New York.

FRUITS OF ORGANIZED RESEARCH

If we organize research to remove these and many other disgraces we shall not only improve the lot of mankind but change world outlook. Enlist the aid of the sociologist to predict the consequences of discovery and invention, so far as that is possible, and it lies within our power to direct social change, to imbue the world with new social purpose, to prepare the world for unity.

No vast palace of research is necessary. Universities that accept grants under the plan would still conduct research on their own account. So would the great foundations and industries. The Commission would be fully aware of its social function, meaning that the unknown would be penetrated with no thought of profit yet with the conviction that direct material and intellectual benefits would accrue. The Commission would concern itself not with inventions as such but with the discovery of principles that inventors, engineers, physicians, and farmers could apply.

Year after year the work would go on. The lagging biological sciences would receive an enormous impetus, and the social scientists and psychologists would be able to make field studies and conduct experiments on a scale unprecedented. We want to accelerate the process of unification that has begun with steamships, radio, airplanes, motion pictures, and engineering.

SCIENCE AND HUMAN PROGRESS

The World Scientific Commission must concern itself with the broad pattern of education as well as with the organization and support of research. That pattern must be shot through and through with social purpose. What does relativity mean to me? Why are physicist. bombarding atoms? What good will it do when they find out how matter and how the universe is put together? Such questions probe deep into meanings that are rarely revealed in the classroom. Both the social point of view and the scientific approach to any problem must be acquired by the masses of Asia, Europe, and the Americas. It may take decades, but the project is worth undertaking.

Give us international cooperation in science, and soon there will be cooperation in other fields. For invariably change in science means social change, so that new discoveries in turn call for cooperation in government to make the most of them. With peace maintained by an international police force and experience in cooperation gained by the international organization of science (the one subject on which we can agree), the world will begin to think of unity, not as something utopian but as something necessary.

Presented as a public service by—
INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORP.
DOVER, DEL.

Address of Rev. William J. Smith, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech to the Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn Council, No. 60, April 10, 1949, by William J. Smith, S. J., director, Crown Heights Associated Activities, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Humanity is faced today with perhaps the greatest challenge and crisis that man has ever known. The saddest part of the whole picture is that so many of our world leaders seem to understand neither the problem nor the answer.

We fought a world war to guarantee peace and prosperity. We got a cold war with half the world starving. We established a United Nations to solve all international problems and not one of the member nations has yet been able to provide liberty with security at home.

The United States of America, the mightiest of them, has succeeded in developing the greatest industrial empire the world has ever seen; we have yet to build a sound social order wherein liberty and security are assured at the same time.

Two essential factors are necessary for any human society. Liberty and security. The citizens must be freed of the fear of scarcity and want if a stable and permanent human society is to be maintained. At the same time they must have sufficient liberty to develop the potential for progress which they possess in soul and body.

As a matter of fact, practically every nation in the world is now struggling with this basic riddle—how to bring into balance these two vital elements—liberty with security.

In God's original design there was no problem. The arrangement was as simple as the mind of God could make it. The Creator would guarantee an abundance of the necessities of life for all. Nature would provide spontaneously for the needs of God's children.

The creature, on the other hand, respecting the sovereign supremacy of the Almighty,

would use the precious gift of liberty as God had decreed. Cooperating with God's grace, man would use his natural powers of intellect and will to restrain any inclination to overstep the limits of human rights that had been laid down by the Creator. He would not usurp the place of the heavenly Father in human affairs.

The modern world, however, knows not peace nor liberty nor security. Our every ill, our every evil, our every fear and danger is due to ignorance of one very short, simple sentence.

"This is God's world." That short sentence contains the answer to every social problem that besets the human race. It is because this simple truth goes unrecognized, unrealized, and unwanted that large segments of humanity have today become a seething mass of discontented, suffering, sorrowing human beings.

We have never experienced the full meaning of that simple statement—"This is God's world." Almost from the beginning of human history, God's creatures decided to rewrite the blueprint for human society. We would remake the world, not in God's image and likeness, but in our own. The only world we have ever seen is the demoralized world of men in revolt, not the divinely designed social order intended by the Creator.

Adam was the first liberal. He would have unrestricted personal liberty regardless of the consequences. Yes, I know it is not popular to speak of the Father of mankind. You get into theology. That's God's world and the modern generation wants none of it. We do speak of Adam, nonetheless. If you believe in God, you must accept Adam. He is the key to the present condition of the world. He was the world's first rugged individualist. He was the first to abuse that mighty, mysterious gift—the terrible power of liberty, the freedom even to deny or to defy God Himself.

Every godless so-called liberal ever since has been guilty of the same error. Freedom, the liberty to do as you please, is the only virtue in the godless liberal's book. Order, authority, spiritual obligations have no meaning for him. He is a sovereign, a supreme being in his own right.

Adam was the first liberal and his unregenerated decendants are legion. It is true, life without liberty can be a living death; but life without God denotes a dying humanity.

Human beings, devoid of divine assistance, are incapable it seems of enjoying true liberty together with security.

Overstressing either one or the other, we will plunge into an irrational individualism leading to chaos or succumb to the servitude of dictatorship. The one moral power in the world that can bring both into balance is one whose authority is flouted and whose teachings ignored, misunderstood, or calumniated—I mean the Catholic Church.

Yet unless liberty and security can be brought into balance no sound human society can be maintained. The conflict between the two was not of God's making. It is man-made. The contradiction dates back to the beginning of the human race. The problem is not merely an economic one; basically it is spiritual, just as man is primarily a spiritual being.

Study the case histories of individuals, scrutinize the movements of the world which have changed the course of history and you will find the strains of that same struggle running through every page.

To treat the subject adequately we would have to study the history of every nation in every period. We have time merely to hit a few of the high spots.

With the coming of Christ, a new era dawned upon the world. In that day the masters of the Roman Empire were the lords of all they surveyed. Rome ruled people and things, men and money, with an iron hand.

Only the slave labored. If you can call slavery security, he had it. The freedman enjoyed whatever liberty the minions of Caesar wished to give him. His security was gained at the expense of the loss of liberty to the slave.

Gradually the church transformed this servile state. The institution of slavery withered away and the means of production came into the hands of the freedmen. The State as we now know it had not yet evolved. There was no protection against marauders and aggressors. The property-less laborers and the smaller landowners sought security by pledging themselves to live and work for and defend a feudal baron. Liberty was sacrificed for security. The age of feudalism arose.

Side by side with it, however, under the inspiration of the church and the acceptance of her teachings, the Guilds grew up and flourished. For 700 years, men knew the meaning of a just wage, an honest price, a decent profit. They did not try to hide injustice behind an automatic law of supply and demand or the phoney slogan of free enterprise. Employer and employed lived in an harmonious industrial society with justice and charity as the guiding principles of their actions. They recognized that personal liberties must be used to serve, not to enslave their fellowmen.

By the thirteenth century, Christendom was united spiritually, socially, economically with the bond of one faith, one obedience, one philosophy of life, one Lord, one baptism. Through the influence of the church, the western world had achieved at least an approximation to a balance between the twin weighing pans of liberty and security.

Came the sixteenth century. No doubt a hundred causes contributed to the upheaval which today goes by the name of the Protestant Reformation. Many of my non-Catholic friends are surprised when I tell them that the religious rebellion of the sixteenth century was led by Catholics. The revolt was one from within, not an attack from without. We should not forget that. A complexity of causes entered into it. Basically, however, it was the conflict of liberty versus security reasserting itself.

Abuses, both in the temporal and spiritual world, were widespread. No one who has a regard for truth should deny it. But it was not only the abuses that became the target of these rebellious Catholics. The whole principle, nature, and tradition of spiritual life was under fire. The bolt to individualism, away from spiritual authority, was a break with the established order of Christian civilization that had endured for 1,600 years.

The sovereignty of the church, not in any temporal affair, but as a spiritual authority, was challenged. As Adam, intent on enjoying an excess of liberty, chose to subordinate God's will to his own, so too, his sixteenth century descendants decided to supplant the teaching authority of the church by the private and personal judgment of each individual.

A book, the Bible, was to become the sole norm and guide of faith and morals. The church had guaranteed spiritual security to its membership through the instrumentality of a divinely protected infallibility. The freedom of the individual was necessarily restricted within the boundaries of God's revelation as interpreted by the infallible voice of the church. Sixteen hundred years of unity and spiritual security were interrupted as personal liberty proclaimed its protest against the restrictions imposed by faith and morals.

That revolt still rumbles on. The greatest reason for it in the present day is the contradiction of men who call themselves Catholic, but fail to follow the teachings and principles of the church.

In quest of greater liberty, these dissident Catholics in the sixteenth century cut the moorings that bound them to the bark of Peter. The Western World, outside the church, was set adrift on the shoreless ocean of individualism.

It has been tossed and buffeted by contrary winds and tumultuous waves ever since.

The French Revolution of 1789 was a raging storm that blew the untrustworthy vessel farther out to sea. God knows there was need of reform in France at the time, but not revolution; certainly not the kind of revolution that took place.

On the economic horizon a new phenomenon was seen to be emerging. Capitalism! Capitalism? What praises are sung in its honor! What mystic wonders we attach to the name! It was the same old issue with a streamlined front. The banner of rugged individualism was raised aloft. Social responsibility? Human rights? Nonsense!

Capitalism was nothing less than the individualism of the sixteenth century applied to economics. Today we see some of its effects full-grown. Monster corporations—48 of them worth more than $1,000,000,000 apiece—any one of them with greater assets than 38 individual sovereign States—challenged constantly by giant trade-unions in a self-perpetuating class warfare. Is there any wonder that the bishops' committee of the Catholic hierarchy said in its 1940 message that the system has been predicated on false principles? Or that they should have characterized it in these words:

"They call it free enterprise—but the freedom is for those who possess great resources and dominating strength rather than for the weak or those who depend simply on their own labor for their well-being."

Was Pius XI wrong when he wrote in his famous social encyclical—

"Free enterprise is dead; economic dictatorship has taken its place; desire for gain has been supplanted by a lust for power."

Forty-eight billion-dollar corporations in America, 250 of them own and control two-thirds of all the manufacturing facilities in the Nation. What voice have the working people or the public in the present system? Individualism has built a frankenstein.

Monster corporations versus giant unions in conflict. Liberty for the few; the security of all constantly in jeopardy.

My repugnance for communism is too well known to need repeating. Today, however, we see the strange and horrifying spectacle of atheistic communism clinging to and claiming a monopoly upon the principle of solidarity, while non-Communist America is riddled with economic strife and the Christian world is split into conflicting sects because of the corrosive principle of individualism.

It all began as a spiritual revolt, a dissension in the ranks of the Catholic world. But it could not be confined to one phase of human activity. The spirit spread into every sphere of human living. We witness it now in literature, in the drama, in education, in labor, in industry, in entertainment, in international affairs. It is no longer simply a question of a difference of religious convictions.

The individualism of the sixteenth century has become the intolerance of the twentieth century.

"Keep God out of business, out of politics, out of education, out of industrial relations; out of everything," we are told.

"Don't mention His name in peace conferences; you will offend Russia."

"Keep the preachers in the pulpit and the priests behind the altar rail. That is their world and this is ours!" No, my muddled liberal, this is not your world, any part of it. It is God's world, all of it, and the church will not be muzzled. Nor will we ask Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Joe Stalin, or any of the fellow-traveling clerics on the Com-

munist band wagon when or where or of what we may speak!

National and international life on all planes and in every phase show signs of the dissolution which began when the solidarity of Christendom was shattered and disrupted.

No voice but that of the Vatican still proclaims the complete, unabridged and untampered-with doctrine of Christ. No voice pleaded harder for peace in our day. Yet how feeble it sounds in a world of harsh hatreds and godless liberalism.

We have seen a Second World War—rulers of the nations mocking the Prince of Peace—thumbing their noses at His vicar in the Vatican—and now some have the audacity and the effrontery to say that the Vatican was the cause of war and the instigator of a new one.

What difference is there in this accusation and the one leveled against Christ by the Scribes and Pharisees when they charged Him with working divine miracles through the power of the devil? There is no difference. Both utterances proceed from the same spirit.

The culmination of individualism, by a cruel irony, seems to be reaching its climax in a contrary, paradoxical opposite—the collectivism of Karl Marx—communism.

Some there are who tremble at the thought of a communistic conquest of the world. They shudder at the sight of the hammer and the sickle. Those who live intimately beneath the symbol of red slaughter may well fear the ghastly shadow that it throws upon their lives. But there is no deep mystery about communism. Cardinal Cerejeira, Patriarch of Lisbon, summed it up in a recent radio speech in a couple of sentences:

"Communism," he said, "is a scourge sent into a de-Christianized society because it has failed to translate into practice the Christian doctrines of social justice and to make the brotherhood of man a reality.

"Although Christian by tradition, Western civilization is dominated by secularism which has deprived society of Christian spirituality * * *. Viewed in this light, communism is nothing but the last, logical step in the process of de-Christianization.

"It cannot be exterminated by police measures."

He might have added "Nor will it be deterred by diplomacy, boasting about democracy, or resting our hopes on the devastating power of the atom bomb."

St. Paul knew about communism years ago.

"Our wrestling," remarked the intrepid apostle, "is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in high places."

What defense does he recommend?

"The armor of God"—"the breast-plate of justice"—"The shield of faith"—"the helmet of salvation"—"the sword of the spirit."

"Protest meetings are all right," I imagine he would say, "but I don't think you can lick an Archangel with a speech, a placard, or a slogan."

It is right and prudent to make use of every possible ordinary human means at our disposal to counteract the aggressions, insidious or open, which are used by an enemy of humanity. But we might as well face the facts. Communism is not an ordinary evil. It is an extraordinary, universal, diabolical conspiracy to overthrow the entire existing order of human society with one fell swoop. It is the scene of Lucifer versus Michael reenacted through human agents. It is the culmination of all the revolts of man against God concentrated in one international movement.

To date we have been attempting to meet the menace with a comfortable kind of Catholicism, by a diluted Christianity shot through with secularism and aided by an odd assortment of pagan allies.

Do you think that the Western World has what it takes to measure up to the awesome responsibility that now faces it? I am fearful, as things stand today, that we are weighed in the balance and are found wanting.

It seems to me that the choice of two alternatives is already upon us. We must choose now to rise to the heights of heroism or await the impending era of martyrdom.

The non-Communist world stood united in protest against the unjust sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty. The sainted prince of the church is still in prison. World opinion has had no effect upon the fate of Archbishop Stepinac. The persecution of Protestant ministers in Bulgaria has not been halted for an hour by the reaction of the world to the previous trials.

Communist leaders in Italy, France and England and the United States have within the past few weeks announced their intention of supporting the Soviet Union should war come upon their homelands. The red rulers of Russia in Moscow have given not the slightest indication that the future holds anything different. Satan is determined that he will conquer God's world at any cost and Stalin is his prophet. The human race, down the years, has been clamoring to be free from the yoke of the Creator and to be secure in its own conceits. It looks very much as though the Almighty is permitting us to have our way.

A Christless civilization is witnessing on every front the triumph of secularism.

It may well be that communism is destined to engulf the world. Similar scourges have not been unknown in history. It may well be that in spite of every effort which we, as individuals, can make, the forces of evil may still claim a toll of carnage, suffering and destruction never witnessed before. God will not hold us responsible for it. No single individual can be held accountable for the general deterioration of the world. We play but a part, the role of one son of God. We help or hinder the kingdom of God by our individual lives. Our one great concern is to play that one part well.

We must choose between a philosophy of morality and a philosophy of might. Justice demands that every man receive his due. But justice is not enough. Blended with justice must be charity—and charity does not inquire whether the subject of our attention be worthy or unworthy. We serve our fellow man regardless of race, creed or color—because he needs our help. Justice will remove grievances. Only charity can supply the bond of unity that will restore the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. "Do good to them that hate you." "You are your brother's keeper."

Armed Forces Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under 5-day general leave requested and secured yesterday by Mr. MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which presented to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and also to the House of Representatives, House bill 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950, I submit the following communication received by me from one of my Omaha constituents, Arthur C. Storz, Jr., who during World War II was an officer in the United States Air Force, and who as such officer distinguished himself in such service with great honor and credit to himself and to the benefit of his country. As an exceptional flyer with great experience in action, I feel that this contribution might well merit the serious consideration of the Members of this House of Representatives, as well as all interested people in the armed forces of this Nation and also the people generally.

LETTER OF ARTHUR C. STORZ, JR.

You gentlemen in Congress are now approaching a decision on which the very freedom of our country may depend. You are deciding, in the event of war, the weapons we will use and who will use them. In other words, you are choosing our first line of defense.

In choosing our first line of defense, I think you should keep in mind that the best defense is a better offense. Now, which branch of our services, the Army, Navy, or Air Force, is able to give us the best offense?

As you gentlemen very definitely know, we cannot avoid a choice of arms by buying all kinds of weapons. We cannot maintain the world's largest Army, the world's largest Navy, the world's largest Air Force, and still remain economically healthy. For this reason, we must build a force which, in case of aggression, can hit the Russians fastest and hardest.

According to Mr. William Bradford Huey, one suggested formula is for a big Army, with lesser appropriations for the Navy and the Air Force. This calls for universal military training, as well as the equipping of 45 western European divisions, and the maintenance of 18 combat divisions of our own. Is this realistic? The Russians have 300 divisions and limitless terrain. The big-army plan, with total conscription of American youth, is not the formula for peace.

The second possible formula is for a big Navy, with lesser appropriations for the Army and Air Force. This calls for construction of gigantic aircraft carriers (in 4 or 5 years' time), the formation of huge task forces, and, in general, the strategy of the recent Navy war against Japan in the central Pacific. Now, is this realistic? Why should the Russians fear warships, even supercarriers? Spreading over one-fifth of the earth, the sources of Russia's power cannot be seriously damaged by carrier aircraft. Our Navy does not possess a single airplane which can be launched from a carrier today with an atom bomb. Offensively, the Navy's weapons—short-range bombers carrying old-fashioned TNT, highly vulnerable mammoth aircraft carriers, ponderous outmoded battleships—have lost their relative importance in an air atomic age against the vast, continental land power with a first-rate Air Force. Obviously, it is like comparing a horse and buggy with any of our modern automobiles.

The third alternative is the air-atomic formula, which calls for the world's most powerful striking Air Force, with lesser appropriations for the Army and Navy. This is realistic. An air-atomic force is an offensive weapon, with which aggressors can be made to suffer, hence, an impressive argument for peace. With an unchallengeable Air Force we would have, in readiness, the one means with which we can immediately deliver our atomic, radiological, bacteriological, and psychological weapons to Russia's heart. By adopting this formula, we can assure our allies and the Kremlin that we intend to maintain a constant, well-advertised, undisputed, 5-year advantage over Russia in air-atomic weapons. This is our one best chance to get protection without bankruptcy. This is the only factor which can offset an aggressor. It is the world's best hope for peace.

The air-atomic formula is supported, of course, by the air officers; but it is also supported by many Army officers, a few Navy officers, and by the overwhelming majority of the American people. It is opposed uncompromisingly, for obvious and quite human reasons, by the Navy, by industrial suppliers of the Navy, and by interested civilian Navy advocates.

It isn't easy for the Navy to take second place after 150 years of being our efficient and only first line of defense. Up to the beginning of World War II, the only arms we maintained in readiness were defensive arms to repeal an overseas invasion. This means that only the Navy was kept ready to fight; and the Navy probably got the lion's share of our defense appropriations.

During World War II, aviation came into its own, and gentlemen, before it was over, the Air Force became not only our first line of offense, but our first line of defense. A Navy will, of course, be essential if the Russians, despite all our efforts to stop them, force us into war. To protect our shipping from submarines and land-base bombers, we shall need fast destroyers, numerous small aircraft carriers and antisubmarines. We shall need improved models of the Navy craft we used against Germany, not Japan. The solid blue water sailors of the Navy know this is the Navy's proper role. They resent the wasteful efforts of the air admirals trying to duplicate the role of the Air Force. They believe the Navy should be a Navy. Even Secretary of Defense Forrestal says, "Responsibility for strategic warfare belongs to the Air Force and responsibility for antisubmarine warfare belongs to the Navy." The Navy strategy for survival has been to grow so big that no Congress can remove it. The Navy, for instance, has been authorized to bring its air strength up to 14,500 planes—more than the Air Force planned to operate in the 70-group program that has been denied it so far. Yet, except for use against submarines and bombers attacking our shipping, these Navy planes would be of little value in a war with Russia. They are short-ranged; they are designed to sink nonexistent enemy ships; they can't carry atomic weapons. How many Navy airplanes did we use against Germany—a continental power like Russia? Only those that hunted submarines.

The Navy is now building a mammoth superaircraft carrier. Authorization for this was obtained by a combination of pressure and deliberate misrepresentation. We were led to believe that this carrier, in 1952, could handle airplanes carrying the atomic weapons. As a matter of fact, the new carrier, even if it can manage to launch a plane big enough to carry the atomic bomb, it will not be able to land the plane back on board. This carrier will cost more than $1,000,000,000, with the plane complement, and the scores of support vessels, without which it cannot leave port. They will stand an excellent chance of sinking it if it ever ventures within their striking range. According to last week, that would be all the way around the world.

In 1948 the people defeated the Navy lobby. The program for the 70-group air force was before Congress. The Navy, supported by Defense Secretary James Forrestal, opposed it bitterly. Congress almost unanimously repudiated the Navy and Mr. Forrestal and authorized the 70-group program.

Now, the same old battle is joined again. Mr. Forrestal, the Maginot minds, the battleship admirals, and the vested interests are trying to rob us of the victory we won in 1948. They want the Air Force to be reduced, instead of expanded. Instead of increasing our present 59 groups to 70, as authorized by Congress, the Navy lobby determined that we shall reduce them to 48, but the American people want the Air Force to come first in our military planning. Not because we aren't proud of the men in the Army and Navy, but because we live in an air-atomic age, confronted by an enemy who can be stopped only with air-atomic weapons. The Air Force is the pay-off weapon; this is our atomic fist; this is the only force with which we could strike atomic blows at Moscow within a few hours.

Our Strategic Air Force is our war-preventing force, our force of peace. Here is the present condition of the Strategic Air Command. They have six groups, the crews of which are magnificently trained, alerted, ready for action. Eight more groups have been activated and are now in the long, tedious, expensive process of training. They are approaching readiness. The other six groups cannot be activated until additional funds are available.

The basic equipment for the strategic air command in the fourth year after the war is still a modified version of the B–29. This is not because the Air Force is satisfied with it. The need is for faster, longer range bombers, so that we may dispense with foreign bases altogether. But, such airplanes come slowly, expensively, with vast effort—and while money is being poured out abroad, adequate funds for improving our bombers are not available at home.

The B–36 and the B–50 are quickly approaching operational use. Our jet bombers are still experimental. Only last week an American Air Force bomber completed a nonstop flight around the world—the most astonishing flight in history. In 94 hours, 1 minute, the plane, a B–50, aptly named Lady Luck II, flew 23,452 miles. It was refueled four times from the air, maintained an average speed of 239 miles per hour. The flight was immediately accorded a dramatic place in the strategy of the cold war. It means that the plane could have dropped an atomic bomb any place it pleased and still get back to its base in the good old U. S. A. It means, too, that the American Government apparently is through salving Russia. The flight could have been stopped by the State Department, but was not. Finally it meant, experienced observers said, the Government has recognized that military readiness to strike back any time, anywhere, is an absolute essential of peace.

Now, is this a place to save money? Are 360—or 600—airplanes too many for this force? Should we not have 1,000 or 2,000 of the finest long-range bombers procurable, ready now and always to defend the Nation? Should we halt the training of crews? Is not our strategic Air Force the exact spot where we should concentrate our money and our effort? Should not this force be given 1–A priority? Should we not resolve that each year our strategic Air Force planes will become faster and deadlier, the range extended, the crews better trained, so that no aggressor will dare break the peace? There is no point in our spending $1,000,000,000 a year on atomic research unless we intend to develop the world's best air force to deliver the atomic weapons.

The Wood Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. WOOD, OF GEORGIA

I have today introduced a new bill to establish a fair and evenly balanced national labor-management policy. The new bill is designed to meet many of the criticisms that representatives of organized labor have directed at both the existing Taft-Hartley Act and my previous bill (H. R. 3228) and that have appeared to me and some of my colleagues as having merit.

While the new bill repeals the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, the bill incorporates the best features of that act. All of the variations from the 1947 legislation which the bill proposes—and there are many—are of a liberalizing nature. No provision of the bill seeks to tighten the 1947 legislation in any manner. It eliminates all of the provisions of my previous bill (H. R. 3228) that had a tightening effect.

Important variations between my new bill and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, are as follows:

1. The bill abolishes the requirement that before a labor organization may make a union shop or maintenance of membership contract with an employer a majority of the employees subject to the contract must have authorized it in an election held by the National Labor Relations Board.

2. The bill permits unions to compel employers subject to a union-shop contract to discharge employees whom the union has expelled for participating in wildcat strikes or for being a member of the Communist Party or some other subversive organization.

3. The bill makes clear that it is not an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify a union that he has places to fill.

4. The bill specifically makes employees on strike eligible to vote in representation elections even though they are not entitled to reinstatement, subject to reasonable time limitations.

5. The bill deprives employers of their right to invoke the act unless they file with the Board affidavits disclaiming membership in the Communist Party or other subversive organizations.

6. The bill permits struck-work clauses in union contracts to be carried out within reasonable limits without violation of the secondary boycott provisions.

7. The bill relieves unions of liability for damages for refusing to handle struck work under similar circumstances.

8. The bill abolishes provisions of existing law requiring the general counsel of the Board to seek injunctions in secondary boycott cases, and substitutes therefor a provision giving him discretion to apply for injunctions against any unfair labor practices, either on the part of employers or labor organizations, before or after the issuance of a complaint.

9. The bill eliminates that provision of existing law which makes a mere failure on the part of employees to comply with the statutory 60-day notice requirement a forfeiture of their rights under the act.

10. The bill clarifies the application of the 60-day notice provision of existing law to reopening clauses of collective-bargaining contracts.

11. The bill gives to unions a grace period of 120 days after the close of a fiscal year within which to file with the Secretary of Labor the financial data which the present law requires.

12. The bill eliminates the cumbersome and ineffectual procedure of existing law which provides for compulsory but unenforceable arbitration of disputes over the assignment of work tasks, thus permitting the Board to handle these disputes effectively under the regular procedure set forth in the complaint and representation sections.

13. The bill clarifies the provisions of existing law relating to strikes and lockouts which jeopardize the national health and safety by enabling the President, when the President finds it necessary, to apply to the courts for immediate protection of the public, without awaiting the report of a board of inquiry, and at the same time making available more effective means of bringing about settlement of the matters in dispute.

14. The bill eliminates the requirement that employees must vote on the employer's last offer, thus doing away with the referendum, which the Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Joint Committee found to have served no useful purpose.

15. The bill contains numerous technical changes made necessary by the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

The 16,000 Veterans' Administration Hospital Beds Ordered Canceled by President Truman Will Cost the American Taxpayers Nearly $13,000,000 or the Cost of 3 New 200-Bed Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the committee's refusal to cancel contract authorization in the amount of $237,000,000 to be used for the construction of veterans' hospitals at various points in the United States, we who opposed the 16,000-bed-reduction order of the Veterans' Administration have won a partial victory.

In mentioning the fact that we have won a partial victory, I do so because I am fearful that the language contained in the bill, while it retains the $237,000,000 to cover the construction program, does not make it mandatory that the President shall proceed with the program.

I am not sure whether it is possible to write into the bill a mandatory provision and for that reason, I want to bring to the attention of the Committee a few pertinent facts regarding the 16,000-bed-reduction order issued by Administrator Gray, of the Veterans' Administration, at the request of the President of the United States.

Like the average Member of Congress, my home state of Pennsylvania has suffered as the result of the loss of 1,450 beds because of the complete abandonment of plans to build a new hospital, and a reduction in the number of beds in other hospitals under construction. This reduction of 1,450 beds came at a time when hundreds of veterans were in State institutions because of the crowded conditions of Veterans' Administration hospitals in Pennsylvania.

Aside from the Veterans' Administration hospital in Pennsylvania, let us look at what actually happened as a result of the 16,000-bed-reduction order. Based on information furnished me by Veterans' Administrator Gray, the over-all estimated cost and savings as a result of the order are as follows:

	Number of hospitals or major bed-addition projects	Number of beds	Estimated cost
Original program [1]	100	54,498	[2] $1,119,582,842
Revised program [1]	76	38,382	840,382,560
Net savings	24	16,116	279,200,282

[1] Includes purchased hospital at Butler, Pa.
[2] Congress had authorized $1,064,278,931 for this purpose.

Your attention is invited to the fact that the Veterans' Administration has abandoned plans for constructing 24 new hospitals. In addition, through the cancellation of these 24 hospitals and the revision of plans for others under construction, the loss in beds amounts to 16,116. The Veterans' Administration claims credit for the saving of a little better than $279,000,000.

Let us develop at this point, how much it cost the American taxpayer to enable the Veterans' Administration to report a saving of some $279,000,000.

First, almost every community where a hospital was to be constructed but has been canceled, huge sums of money were spent in providing sites, utilities, and so forth, for the hospital. For an illustration, let us take Salisbury, N. C., located in the district of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON. The community of Salisbury floated a bond issue in the sum of $350,000 for the purpose of upholding its end relative to the construction of the new hospital. On January 10, 1949, the Veterans' Administration canceled the 921-bed Veterans' Administration hospital and in so doing, not only left the community of Salisbury "holding the bag" to the tune of $350,000 but an expenditure of $1,030,000 made by the Veterans' Administration was thrown away when the hospital was canceled. No doubt the other 23 communities where hospitals were canceled have had an experience similar to Salisbury, N. C.

Mr. Chairman, I want to insert at this point exhibit A, which reveals that the Veterans' Administration, to save a little better than $279,000,000, actually took a loss of $10,014,000. This table will also show the number of beds involved, cost of sites, technical services, and incidentals in connection with the 24 hospitals that were canceled. Let me add, that the overhead of the Veterans' Administration which no doubt would amount to a considerable sum is not included in the following figures:

EXHIBIT A

Estimated obligations incurred on 24 eliminated hospitals

	Number of beds	Type	Total	Technical services		Site [1]	Other [1 2]
				A/E contracts	Other		
			Thousands of dollars	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*
Total (24)	11,171		10,014	5,432	1,971	1,400	1,211
19 assigned to Corps of Engineers	8,671		9,859	5,432	1,826	1,390	1,211
(1) Americus, Ga	250	Tuberculosis	331	238	61	[3]	32
(2) Charlotte, N. C	500	General medical	374	187	63	[3] 65	59
(3) Chattanooga, Tenn	500	do	441	282	72	[3] 27	60
(4) Decatur, Ill	250	do	329	180	73	[3] 44	32
(5) Detroit, Mich	500	do	513	250	79	[3] 76	108
(6) Duluth, Minn	200	do	274	182	62	[3] [4]	30
(7) El Paso, Tex	500	Neuropsychiatric	456	271	83	[3] 57	45
(8) Gainesville, Fla	1,000	do	1,006	643	254	[3] 37	72
(9) Grand Rapids, Mich	200	General medical	369	168	64	[3] 32	105
(10) Greenville, S. C	200	do	303	150	60	[3] 33	60
(11) Harrisburg, Pa	200	do	347	159	57	[3] 70	61
(12) Houston, Tex	1,000	Neuropsychiatric	1,604	556	169	[3] 686	193
(13) Klamath Falls, Oreg	200	General medical	297	154	94	[3] 18	31
(14) Mound Bayou, Miss	200	do	231	130	69	[3] 2	30
(15) Norman, Okla	750	Neuropsychiatric	606	407	111	[3] Transfer	88
(16) Salisbury, N. C	921	do	1,030	693	207	[3] 59	71
(17) Tallahassee, Fla	100	General medical	244	160	59	[3] 25	[4]
(18) Toledo, Ohio	1,000	Neuropsychiatric	825	474	129	[3] 152	70
(19) Tupelo, Miss	209	General medical	279	148	60	[3] 7	64
5 assigned to Veteran's Administration for design	2,500		155		145	10	
(1) Columbia, S. C. (addition)	200	General medical	19		[5] 19	[3]	
(2) Memphis, Tenn	1,000	Neuropsychiatric	1		1		
(3) New York, N. Y	1,000	Chronic	6		6		
(4) San Diego, Calif	200	General medical	129		119	[3] 10	
(5) Thomasville, Ga	100	do	0		0	[3]	

[1] Obligations for sites and fixed equipment in the main can be salvaged by the Government.
[2] Represents primarily obligations for fixed equipment.
[3] Site acquired.
[4] Less than $500.
[5] Includes approximately $16,000 obligated by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned several times that the plans for hospitals under construction have been revised. There cost to be incurred by the Veterans' Administration for changing the plans is $2,739,000. The following table tells the story in detail with regard to redesigning the 15 hospitals under construction:

EXHIBIT B

Estimated obligations incurred or to be incurred for specified categories of costs on 15 hospitals altered in size

	Bed capacity		Type	Estimated design costs			Estimated obligations incurred and to be incurred for sites	Estimated other obligations incurred prior to redesign
	Previous	Revised		Estimated obligations to be incurred for redesign	Estimated obligations incurred prior to redesign [1]			
					A/E contracts	Other		
				Thousands of dollars	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*	*Thousands of dollars*
Total 15 altered in size	14,445	9,500		2,739	3,494	1,068	7,712	193
Total 10 assigned to Corps of Engineers	9,445	6,500		1,813	3,494	928	5,622	193
(1) Cincinnati, Ohio	750	500	General medical	[2] 149	233	63	[3]	
(2) Kansas City, Mo	745	500	do	35	524	110	[4] 50	
(3) Louisville, Ky	750	500	do	[2] 150	227	85	[4] 8	[5] 193
(4) New York, N. Y	1,000	1,250	do	643	25	60	[4] 2,969	
(5) Philadelphia, Pa	1,000	500	do	[2] 155	400	89	249	
(6) Pittsburgh, Pa	1,250	1,000	Neuropsychiatric	20	564	112	[4] 106	
(7) Pittsburgh, Pa	1,200	750	General medical	25	441	148	186	
(8) St. Louis, Mo	1,000	500	do	[2] 156	380	90	[4] 166	
(9) Syracuse, N. Y	1,000	500	do	[2] 155	410	85	288	
(10) Washington, D. C	750	500	do	325	290	86	[4] 1,600	
Total 5 assigned to Veterans' Administration	5,000	3,000		926		140	2,090	
(1) Atlanta, Ga	750	500	General medical	150		2	120	
(2) Chicago, Ill	1,000	500	do	157		27	987	
(3) Cleveland, Ohio	1,250	1,000	Neuropsychiatric	318		8	264	
(4) Cleveland, Ohio	1,000	500	General medical	152		10	622	
(5) Oklahoma City, Okla	1,000	500	do	149		93	97	

[1] Obligations for topographic, subsoil, and utilities studies as well as a substantial portion of the obligations for final working drawings and specifications can be salvaged by the Government for use on revised projects.
[2] It is planned to have redesign accomplished by the Veterans' Administration.
[3] Proposed donation.
[4] Site acquired.
[5] Primarily fixed equipment.
[6] Approximately $140,000 was obligated prior to cancellation of original A/E contract; balance represents estimated settlement cost on current A/E contract which is in process of being canceled.

NOTE.—Veterans' Administration overhead costs are not included in the above figures.

Mr. Chairman, let us see how much it cost the taxpayers of America to actually make a saving of a little better than $279,000,000 claimed by the Veterans' Administration as a result of the 16,000-bed-reduction order.

(a) 24 hospitals eliminated (already expended by VA)	$10,014,000
(b) Cost of redesigning 15 hospitals	2,739,000
Total	12,753,000

Thus, it is seen that in carrying out the 16,000-bed-reduction program the Veterans' Administration sustained a loss of $12,753,000.

Nor can we stop here. According to General Gray, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the cost per bed of the entire hospital-construction program averages $22,000 per bed. Thus, the money wasted by the Veterans' Administration in putting into effect the 16,000-bed-reduction program would have provided approximately 600 beds, or the number sufficient to equip three new 200-bed Veterans' Administration hospitals.

If the decision of the President in canceling 16,000 beds was in the name of economy, the American people and the veterans in particular have been shortchanged.

American Ideology Said Losing Ground in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Albert Ravenholt, correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, including the printed title of the article, which appears above. This article was in the Hong Kong Standard on March 23 and was forwarded to me by a very dear friend of mine who has had much contact with China. He lived there a number of years and I have great faith in his appraisal of the situation in China.

In a letter to me under date of March 24 he stated, "I am enclosing a clipping to you which I commend very seriously, and with approval, to the attention not only of you but to whomsoever you would care to extend it."

Since the letter did not contain a statement that I might publish this, I am not disclosing the name of this individual. However, his experience with China and Chinese and his unimpeachable integrity and training would lead me to believe that his appraisal of the article would be correct.

For the information of the Members of the House, I am placing this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

AMERICAN IDEOLOGY SAID LOSING GROUND IN CHINA

(By Albert Ravenholt)

SHANGHAI.—One of the reasons American ideas are losing out in China can be found in the bookstores of Shanghai and other cities.

Few of the fundamental books on American thought, Government, and science are available even to Chinese who can afford them. Majority of such works have never been translated into Chinese and are not published here.

Meanwhile, literally millions of copies of Russian publications translated into Chinese are distributed throughout the country. They have been a major factor in orienting non-Communist Chinese to the Soviet way of thinking.

UNITED STATES AID

The aid which the United States has given to China during recent years is calculated in billions of dollars. But since VJ-day only $10,000 has been budgeted for translating into basic ideas of American life. That sum was allocated to the United States Information Service in 1945–46 and permitted the translation of 22 books. It left no funds to cover the cost of publishing.

Every year since then the USIS has presented a budget which would permit a few of the more important American books to be brought out in Chinese. Information offi-

cers here have prepared "critical" lists of several hundred books which would help Chinese understand how Americans think. But each year the requested funds have been refused by the authorities in Washington.

This failure to make available in Chinese the best America has to offer has had serious consequences here. It has greatly facilitated the anti-American campaign of the Chinese Communists. Many young Chinese have come to consider American culture as essentially a gadget civilization.

MIDDLE-ROADER

One rather prominent Chinese middle-of-the-roader expressed it to me this way: "You know, no American thinkers have made any important philosophical contributions in the last 10 years." He had never had access to books that might make him think otherwise.

The American failure to send to China ideas of lasting value along with cotton, rice, and medical supplies is most apparent in the universities, colleges, and middle schools. These schools are relatively much more important than similar institutions in the United States. While the great mass of Chinese remain illiterate, these schools will provide the leaders, regardless of what government rules China.

During and since the war with Japan these schools have been desperately short of all kinds of books. Some have lacked even the most rudimentary textbooks. To a considerable extent this shortage of books has been responsible for the poor quality of Chinese education in recent years.

RUSSIANS MOVE IN

Chinese commercial printers translate and publish only those popular foreign-language books assured of a profitable sale. They have included American best sellers such as Gone With the Wind and Forever Amber. The market is too uncertain to permit commercial houses to bring out scientific, technical, and historical works.

Soviet representatives in China have taken full advantage of this opportunity. In Shanghai, the Russians maintain the Epoch Publishing Co. Russian books ranging from outright propaganda to classics are translated into Chinese. A few are illustrated and printed on glossy paper. But most Chinese translations of Russian books are published in large, cheap editions.

These Russian books are sent out through an elaborate distributions system. Many are sold in regular Chinese book stores at prices slightly below cost of books. They are a tempting bargain for the ordinary Chinese reader with a thin pocketbook. Other translations of Soviet writings are distributed to book stores near the campuses of Chinese universities. There they are sold for a price Chinese students can afford to pay. And the students buy them in large numbers.

Within its regular budget the USIS has been able to translate a limited number of articles by American writers on contemporary events. These are published as pamphlets in Chinese and English. They have included such accounts as Drew Middleton's Report on Russia. The pamphlets sent out have been eagerly accepted by the Chinese schools which have used them for classes studying English. It's safe to assume that the students working with them learned more than English.

These efforts have been puny compared to the need.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a large number of resolutions urging the adoption of the pending resolution to create a special memorial day each year for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. These petitions have come to me from the rank and file of the people, not people of Polish descent alone, though they have communicated in very large numbers, but people of every rank and station.

I have urged favorable action on this resolution. It should be a legislative must for this session of Congress. It is not necessary for me to emphasize the outstanding zeal, idealism, and loyalty to the American cause of this great Polish figure of Revolutionary days. It is not possible to measure his magnificent contribution. He exemplified in his life and activities the spirit of human liberty itself, and his unselfish assistance in the establishment of our own free Government will be remembered by the American people as long as this Nation exists. It is most fitting that his anniversary day be properly and appropriately commemorated, and I hope that the leadership will recommend early favorable action on the pending resolution.

Resolution relative to General Pulaski's Memorial Day now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Polish Women's Citizen Club of Three Rivers, Mass.—

1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of Massachusetts, and to the Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts.

Mrs. NELLIE MOTYKA,
President.
MARY V. JAJUGA,
Vice President.
ANNA R. KULIG,
Secretary.
EDNA S. FRYDRYK,
Secretary.
BERNICE I. TENCZAK,
Treasurer.

Resolution relative to the General Pulaski's Memorial Day now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Selectmen, town of Palmer, Mass.—

1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of Massachusetts, and to the Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts.

JAMES H. FITZGERALD,
HERBERT W. BISHOP,
PETER F. WARAKOMSKI,
Board of Selectmen.

Relief Flights in Snow-Bound Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I made some critical remarks here on the floor of the House with respect to what I thought was extremely costly operations of the so-called hay lift, or hay ride, during the terrific storms in the West this past winter.

Some official in the Air Force took exception to what I said, expressing the view that any air operation of the kind engaged in over the snow-bound areas of the West is expensive business.

I am willing to admit that I know little about cost in the operation of aircraft. Therefore, I am inserting at this point a short statement prepared by the Air Force showing what their operations were and the approximate cost.

If one human life was saved—and I think they did save human life—there is not much we can say about the cost. Furthermore, their report shows that the greater part of the cost will be absorbed in their normal expense of operations. That is to say, if they had not been engaged in this emergency work the planes and personnel would have been flying somewhere else.

FACT SHEET ON "OPERATION HAYRIDE"

The Air Force's participation in disaster relief operations in the snowbound Western States lasted approximately 1 month—from January 24 to February 25. The relief flights took place in the various snow-bound sectors of Arizona, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota. The number of planes engaged on the project varied, but at one time 116 planes—most of them cargo transports of the C-82 and C-47 type—were active in the flights. USAF personnel active in the operations varied between 300 and 500.

SUMMARY

Tonnage of hay and feed dropped or delivered: 4,577.56 tons (this includes 1,879 tons of cattle feed, regular food rations, medical supplies, and emergency medical equipment carried by planes in just the Nevada-Utah area).

Additional items transported: 458 passengers; 5,000 blankets; 77 "weasels" tracked vehicles; 1 radio beacon; 200 pounds of medical supplies; 5,000 cubic centimeters of blood plasma; ½ ounce of radium (worth $500,000); 875 gallons of fuel oil (dropped in small cans); 2,250 pounds of special parts for tractors, plows, etc.

Reconnaissance flights: 217 hours.

Supply flights: 5,496 hours; includes reconnaissance hours.

Cost: $1,300,000 "constructed"; final reports due Tuesday. Almost all of these operational costs can be absorbed into the normal annual programed flying hours scheduled for these planes.

The above figures also reflect other relief activities such as the ground equipment furnished by the commanders of various bases to clear roads, carry supplies to isolated communities, and provide clothing for other snow victims.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, Pan-American Day is the occasion on which we celebrate the friendship existing among the 21 sovereign American Republics, a friendship which has been cemented for more than half a century—by the International Conferences of American States and other inter-American gatherings. At these conferences arguments and discussions on questions of interest to all have generally resulted in agreements which represent mutual compromises and which have brought about better relations between the states.

This half a century of effort was consummated in two conferences held in 1947 and 1948, when three agreements forming the pillars of the inter-American system were signed. The first of these is the treaty of reciprocal assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947. This treaty gives permanent form to the principles of hemispheric solidarity embodied in the Act of Chapultepec approved in Mexico City in 1945. It lays a clear obligation on the parties to take positive action beyond mere consultation to assist in meeting an armed attack against any American state. It not only covers armed attacks but any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America. It is also completely consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States Senate ratified the treaty on December 8, 1947. Our ratification was the second. The fourteenth ratification, deposited by Costa Rica and received on December 3, 1948, brought the treaty into effect with respect to the ratifying states. The usefulness of the treaty was promptly demonstrated when within a few days after it became effective, Costa Rica demanded that the Council of the Organization of American States halt an invasion of its country from Nicaragua, and a peaceful settlement of the dispute was accomplished by the Council.

The other two agreements were signed at Bogotá in 1948. The first of these establishes the Organization of American States with a Charter which is already largely in operation. It confirms the legal existence of a de facto system that has been functioning since 1890. Moreover, it, too, is entirely compatible with the United Nations being a regional agency as provided by the United Nations Charter. The Pan American Union becomes the central and permanent organ of the organization and continues to function at Washington.

As stated in article 1 of the Charter, the object of the Organization of American States is to achieve an order of peace and justice on the American continent, promote the solidarity of the member States, strengthen their collaboration and defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence.

In the organization of American states, all the members are one another's peers; they have equal rights and equal obligations. The foremost power has only one vote in its assembly halls, exactly like the poorest and weakest. All matters are decided by majority vote, even the sanctions to be adopted against an aggressor state. Thus no single state can block a decision that is adverse to its interests if that decision is backed by a majority. Another basic precept is that no state or group of states has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another state, directly or indirectly.

In the opinion of Dr. Lleras, secretary general of the organization of American States:

> The organization is today, in spite of its shortcomings, the most perfect instrument of its kind that ever existed between sovereign nations. The Charter, in comparison with any analogous document of any era, is the most advanced that has been signed spontaneously, in complete unanimity, by the 21 states associated under its provisions to enjoy the rights they concede to one another mutually and to meet the obligations that they assume therein.

The third agreement is the American Treaty of Pacific Settlement, also signed at Bogotá. It is designed to coordinate and improve the various treaties on Pacific settlement concluded by previous inter-American conferences. The treaty prescribes the various methods to be employed in settling disputes. It goes still further; it foresees no controversy that cannot be solved definitively within a reasonable length of time. It refers the contending parties to the International Court of Justice or to compulsory arbitration, if the matter is without the competence of the court. However, a matter is subject to settlement, before it reaches this stage, by a series of peaceful procedures, which include mediation, good offices, conciliation, and investigation.

The signing of these three agreements represents great progress in inter-American political relations and should go far toward preventing war in this hemisphere, at least, as far as the American states themselves are concerned. There remains much to be done in other fields, especially the economic, and plans have been made for a conference to be held in Buenos Aires to work out details for cooperation in economic matters. The economic agreement of Bogotá established the general lines along which economic cooperation will develop but it will be the task of the Buenos Aires conference to define specifically the procedures to be employed.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly supporting the European recovery program, H. R. 3748.

This is what is commonly known as the Marshall plan, which was initiated last year by the Congress under the leadership of Secretary of State George C. Marshall. At that time, although World War II was over, the democracies in western Europe were tottering on the edge of economic bankruptcy. The rising star of the Russian bear was reaching out to engulf them. A number of the small countries in Europe had already been overrun by the Communists. Particularly Greece, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and France were weak, economically. The Communists were about to take over the Italian Government. It was necessary that something drastic be done to help these countries save themselves and build up their internal affairs, economically.

Secretary Marshall worked out the plan whereby our country would help the democracies of western Europe help themselves. We would furnish them supplies, raw materials, and money to purchase raw materials so that they could rebuild their industries that had been torn down by the ravages of war. It was not to be a loan or a gift of money; it was an investment in future world order and economic stability.

The object of the European recovery program is the restoration of the free nations of Europe to that self-sustaining basis which alone can insure the continuance of their independence and the freedom of their domestic institutions. Its purpose is economic recovery of the world.

In seeking to insure the freedom of peoples by strengthening their economic base, the bill envisages a broad effort of economic collaboration and self-help among the nations of Europe qualifying as participants. It envisages that for 4 years those nations may call upon the United States for extraordinary assistance to redress the gap between their needs and their capability to provide for themselves, if they are to attain a self-sustaining basis.

The recovery program has done much to achieve its goal. Great strides have already been made in bringing economic stability to the democracies of Europe. A far better job than was expected by the most enthusiastic backers of the Marshall plan has already been accomplished. We can ill afford to stop this great program before it has reached its ultimate goal, even though the countries that are being helped are well on the road to recovery, economically.

This is not an appropriation of moneys, but is an authorization which sets a top ceiling of the sums that may be appropriated later on.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $1,100,000,000 for the period April 3 to June 30, 1949, and $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. It also authorizes a public-debt transaction of $273,300,000 to be made available for guaranties of American investment in projects helpful to the European recovery program. The new authorization for guaranties is for $300,000,000 minus such sum as has already been allotted for guaranties made or in prospect, which is $27,700,000.

It is now contemplated that it will not be necessary to continue the so-called Marshall plan for the full 4 years as originally planned, due to the great strides that have been made during the life of the program. Even western Germany is in much better shape economically and is almost ready to embark on a course of its own, as a free country, but under the supervision and guidance of the United Nations. The one distressing point in the over-all world picture is that of China. Instead of a free people gaining in China it has been the reverse. The Communists are overrunning the land and the situation looks almost hopeless at this time, although last week the Congress voted token aid for free China.

As stated before, this bill is merely an authorization for the continuance of the Marshall plan, and it will be necessary in the near future for the Congress to appropriate the necessary money to carry through the program.

Although the present authorization expired April 1 of this year there will be no stop in the flow of materials and implements in the carrying on of the program, due to the fact that sufficient purchases under the first year's program have been made to keep the goods flowing over to Europe. In other words, the pipe lines were full of goods already contracted for but not delivered and there has been no interruption in the program.

Protecting Our Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY and his Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, and the whole Appropriations Committee for a realistic correction to a problem in the Southwest that is contributing to unemployment among our own American people.

I refer to a recent appropriation that will allow the Immigration and Naturalization Service to detail additional enforcement officers to the Mexican border to prevent and apprehend Mexican nationals who enter the United States illegally.

I have been informed that 25 additional enforcement officers are being added to the southern California district where we are being overtaken with unemployment and serious economic conditions. The gravity in our State is reflected by recent statistics which reveal that in Los Angeles County unemployment has increased from 185,000 in February to 194,000 in March. Out of a labor force in San Diego County of 172,000, we have 17,500 unemployed. In San Diego public-assistance cases have increased 18.7 percent from June to December of 1948.

The development of commercial agriculture in the Southwest shortly after the end of the First World War created a new gap in the labor market for farm employment and Mexican nationals eagerly crossed our borders to seize upon this opportunity to supplement their meager incomes. Many came illegally and often with encouragement from United States ranchers and farmers direly in need of this type of labor. During the years immediately preceding World War II as additional acreage was open the influx of these seasonal agricultural workers took on major proportions. The Government of Mexico and the United States entered into agreements providing for the official recruitment of Mexican agricultural workers. These agreements, which were confirmed by Public Law 45 in 1943 and Public Law 229 in 1944 originally provided for a maximum recruitment of 50,000 workers and subsequently the figure was increased to 75,000.

Recruitment continued under similar agreements after the cessation of hostilities in World War II and at present negotiations are pending looking to a renewal of the agreements. In the meantime, however, the Mexican Government will not permit its nationals to enter the United States for temporary seasonal employment and ranches and farmers in the West and Southwest are complaining concerning "crops rotting in the field while the world starves" and about Border Patrol Inspectors rounding up illegal workers found in their employ. The result of this inability of Mexican farm laborers to effect legal admission to the United States has been to increase the number of workers who enter surreptitiously and the United States Immigration Service is hard-pressed to enforce our immigration laws.

Every effort is being made by that agency, with the personnel available, to apprehend aliens who endeavor to enter the United States illegally. During the first 7 months of the current fiscal year approximately 159,321 Mexican nationals who had entered or were attempting to enter the United States illegally were apprehended in Mexican border districts. During the last two fiscal years the Border Patrol apprehended 193,852 and 194,954, respectively. This is exclusive of those apprehended in the interior of the country. More current statistics show that 5,000 nationals of that country were apprehended in the three immigration border districts of San Antonio, El Paso, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif., during the last week of February 1949.

I have been informed by Commissioner Watson B. Miller that his officers will not go onto the farms in search of Mexican nationals who have entered illegally but will confine their activity to the streets, highways, and places of social gathering. By returning these people, we will be able to provide more employment for American citizens and for the Mexicans who are legally entitled to be in the United States, and this policy should not disturb the farmers nor create a labor scarcity.

There may be other approaches to a solution of the problem and I would be the last one to suggest that our permanent immigration policy should be affected by a temporary sectional business

recession but it would appear that this immediate condition could be alleviated by a prompt successful completion of pending farm labor negotiations with Mexico and by authorization of funds, such as recently done by the House through the recommendation of Mr. Rooney's Subcommittee on Appropriations, to provide immigration officers in sufficient numbers to cope with this grave situation.

Chicago Tribune Versus Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today another strike ties up the Washington newspapers. The newspapers in Chicago and some of the surrounding area have been engaged in a disastrous strike for over 18 months and it is still continuing. Thousands of newspaper employees have been idle during this period of time. Millions of dollars have been lost by the newspapers, the unions, and the members of the unions. The Taft-Hartley Act has promoted untold chaos and bitterness in labor-management relations as it pertains to the newspaper business. The newspapers and unions in the District of Columbia are now in the throes of a second strike within a week.

I am herewith submitting an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of November 22, 1947, wherein they state editorially that they were opposed to outlawing the closed shop as provided in the Taft-Hartley bill. The same editorial could apply to every industry in America as far as the closed shop is concerned.

AFTER 95 YEARS

"In 1852, the Chicago Tribune entered into contractual relationship with Chicago Typographical Union, No. 16, which has continued until this day, without interruption of so much as an hour."

We are quoting from a memorial presented by the union to the Tribune on its hundredth birthday last June. The union went on to speak with pride of "this unparalleled record of industrial peace extending over 95 years."

We regret that this record, as a matter of great pride to us as well as to the union, has now been interrupted. It has been interrupted because the union now wishes us to proceed on the theory that the Taft-Hartley law is not the law of the land.

When the law was under discussion in Congress, as our readers will recall, we advised against outlawing the closed shop. We did so, among other reasons, because we knew that the closed shop worked well in our own plant and had worked well for half a century or more.

Congress did not take our advice. Neither the Tribune nor the typographical union writes the laws of this country. Congress does. We will risk a great deal in the interest of uninterrupted service to our readers and advertisers, but we will not violate the law of the United States.

The Tribune hopes that the present difficulties will be resolved speedily. We shall continue to make every effort to come to an understanding with the union. We have faced a good many problems of many sorts in the course of a hundred years. In solving them, we have never before lacked the cooperation of the printers' union. We hope that this time we won't have to find a solution in spite of our friends in local 16.

Pennsylvania Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Pennsylvania Week, by Hon. Floyd Chalfant, delivered before the Lyons Club of Greencastle and Waynesboro, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pennsylvania Week is more than an idea.

It is a working force, aimed toward certain attainments in a State of which we are proud.

It is a period of concentration on what we have and do in the Keystone State, and a period of effort to improve.

The germ of the idea came with the first thought that Lions, Rotary, and Kiwanis in Pennsylvania might be persuaded to have talks simultaneously about affairs in their own communities.

But the germ of an idea for a day in 1946 expanded until it became a thought for an entire week.

Governor Martin and his cabinet endorsed the idea of Pennsylvania Week enthusiastically, and early in 1946 the committee he appointed laid plans for the first celebration.

He asked general cooperation. Churches of all faiths and denominations, newspapers, industry, mercantile interests, agriculture, schools, units of government—all cooperated.

A great meeting was arranged to inaugurate the 1946 week at the Forum in Harrisburg, with the Governor to be the speaker. Arranging the program was a task, because it had to move on the split second.

We timed it for the Governor, with escort, to leave his office 5 minutes before the program was to begin. He had worried about having a crowd, but we had the Forum packed.

He was nervous about the time element, too. At the stage entrance he was held back a moment while synchronized watches were checked.

"Shall I go on?" he asked, and threatened irritability.

"Just a moment," I dared caution the Governor.

At 2 minutes before the program was to begin the Governor was permitted to walk on the stage with his party. Precisely on the hour, the program began. He spoke to the split second, the prayer was to the split second, the music was to the split second, almost the applause of the crowd was to the split second.

But the meeting was a grand success.

One of the cabinet officers could not attend. He was to deliver a speech in Wilkes-Barre. In his zeal this man somehow had overlooked it was Pennsylvania Week. In his car en route to Wilkes-Barre, the present Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. James H. Duff, happened to recall, "this is Pennsylvania Week."

He literally tossed his speech out of the car window, and in the few moments before arrival had pieced together another on Pennsylvania Week. It was a good one, too, although it never appeared in type.

At that moment Mr. Duff became one of the most ardent supporters of Pennsylvania Week. When he went into office as Governor, he was determined that Pennsylvania Week should be continued and improved upon.

The first Pennsylvania Week has furnished a pattern for succeeding Pennsylvania Weeks. What is going on this week in the main is the same that went on that first week back in 1946.

But, you may ask, why Pennsylvania Week, when already we are loaded up with more weeks to celebrate than there are weeks in the calendar?

Simply this to acquaint the people of Pennsylvania more fully with the greatness of their own State—its resources, its development, its history, and its potentialities for the future.

It is basic that Pennsylvanians must have a thorough understanding of their own greatness and achievements, in order to appreciate fully their own possibilities.

Pennsylvania Week has been designated at a time when the people of Pennsylvania may focus their attention upon knowing their home State and their home communities, and the great variety and possibilities to be found there.

Massachusetts has its Plymouth Rock, which it keeps in a cage, to mark the spot where the Puritans landed in their quest for freedom.

But Pennsylvania has its Independence Hall where the cause of freedom was proclaimed and our Government started, and it has its Liberty Bell where people may approach close to see and be inspired.

Virginia rejoices that it is the land of Presidents.

But Pennsylvania has hallowed ground, for on its soil first prayers were said as the principles of freedom of worship, freedom of the press, fredom of speech, and freedom of assembly were written into the first Constitution of the United States of America.

New York boasts it has the largest population of any State, and the largest city in the world.

But Pennsylvania, with a population over 10,000,000, is the only State with 2 of the Nation's 10 largest cities, and it also contains more small cities and towns than any other State.

Some other States may tell of their water resources.

But Pennsylvania points to natural water resources beyond compare, while some of these other States in their desperate search for water can only refer to man-made means of irrigation to make things grow.

New England may boast of good roads, the great Southwest of its grazing grounds, or the Middle West of its growing grain, California of its gold deposits, Oklahoma of it oil.

But Pennsylvania has more improved roads than 10 of the New England and Eastern States, including New York, New Jersey, and Maryland. It has its grazing grounds of purest green to produce the best of dairy foods, and it is common knowledge that Pennsylvania's grains are among the world's best, while anthracite production alone is far greater in value than all the gold California and all the other States may produce, and Pennsylvania oil is seized upon avidly by the residents of the oil States themselves as the best oil.

One could go on indefinitely pointing out amazing contrasts. Titan of industry and a leader in agriculture, Pennsylvania is also the home of natural beauty, scenic wonders, diversified recreation, and historic shrines by the hundred.

Founded in the tradition of racial and religious tolerance, Pennsylvania has maintained a high place in the religious and cultural life of the Nation.

It has more than 13,000 churches with more than 5,000,000 communicants. The first law ever enacted in Pennsylvania was a guarantee of religious freedom.

And since that early time when William Penn proposed that every man should have a right to worship God as he saw fit, Pennsylvania has clung tenaciously to its concepts of religious liberty and freedom.

While some of the States around us have seen fit to lift some of the puritanical restrictions of early days, we in Pennsylvania have been slow to accept a change from a way we know to be right. We have not forgotten the Sabbath, nor given legal sanction to questionable forms that might rob us of our traditions. Pennsylvania stands today the keystone in our guardianship of religious liberty just as it stood as the keystone in those other days in the fight for the four freedoms. We must not forget.

Pennsylvania is an industrial State because our forebears were a hard-working class with vision. It is an agricultural State because it has been richly endowed of nature, and again because of the qualities of our people who have worked in appreciation of what God has given.

It may seem beside the point, but it is true that Pennsylvania has more farms than all of England and Wales.

And since we are mentioning some of Pennsylvania's firsts, do you know that Pennsylvania outproduces every other State in more than 50 major industries? It has one-tenth of all the manufacturing employment and pay rolls in the entire Nation.

Pennsylvania has an abundance of raw-material resources and produces more power than any other State.

Pennsylvania has more than one-third of the Nation's steel plants.

It has game for the hunter, fish for the fisherman, trails for the hiker, recreation of all sorts in its mountains and in its dells for all of the people.

And, again, do you know, Pennsylvania has more accredited colleges and universities than any other State, and has one of the finest public education systems in the world.

Also, how many of us are aware that Pennsylvania possesses a State police system that is famed the world over as the best?

Pennsylvania literally has everything. A man by the name of Smith came from Kansas a few years ago to visit his brother in Wilkes-Barre. After his trip through the State, he exclaimed "Pennsylvania has everything." This became the State slogan, given us by a man from Kansas.

A young woman from California visited relatives. She, too, saw much of the State, then came down into the farming country. As she boarded the train en route home, she exclaimed of the wonders.

"In Pennsylvania God has given you everything," she said. "In California, we have to make our own way."

Is it any wonder that we who live in Pennsylvania this week are turning to an exposition of our wonders?

In every section of the State something is being done to call attention to what Pennsylvania has and does.

Every crossroads in this great Commonwealth has something of interest to invite our friends to these crossroads to get them to see and to enjoy something of our life. It is a great State in which to live and in which to work.

A prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. W. Emory Hartman at the opening of the first Pennsylvania Week in 1946. From the State Forum at the capitol in Harrisburg, he spoke this vital invocation of thanksgiving, which may continue to be our prayer down through the ages:

"We thank Thee, Father of us all, for Pennsylvania's heritage of freedom; for her free churches and free schools; for freedom of inquiry in her colleges and universities; for her freedom of press and freedom of assembly. May the spirit of liberty and tolerance that permeated our great founder imbue us still."

Do We Need a Political Realinement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article entitled "Do We Need a Political Realinement?" by Mr. Oren Root, which appears in the April 15 issue of the Commonweal. I call this article to the attention of all Senators, and recommend it for reading on the part of all who are interested in the preservation of our two-party system. The article is a very significant one.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE NEED A POLITICAL REALINEMENT?

(By Oren Root)

One sometimes hears the wish expressed that there could be a realinement of membership in the major political parties in the United States. The Democratic and Republican Parties are too much alike, it is said. Why can we not shuffle things around so that all liberals, progressives and the like are in one party and all conservatives, reactionaries and the like in another? Then things would be clear—so this view goes—and we would no longer be faced, as we so frequently now are, with a choice between Tweedledee and Tweedledum.

This is a plausible position, and one must sympathize with the sentiment behind it: that political parties should be something more than coalitions of divergent forces held together by the desire for power, that they should be founded on principle, that they should stand for something. There are, however, a number of powerful and persuasive arguments to the contrary which should not be overlooked. The purpose of this article will be to review and analyze some of those arguments.

It seems safe to say that the kind of realinement suggested would involve a major change in the political methods and traditions of the United States. Historically, the great issues which have divided this country have not divided it vertically between parties, but have cut horizontally across parties. The issue of civil rights, for example, is not an issue between the Democratic and Republican Parties, but is an issue within each of those parties. The same was true of the pre-World War II interventionist-isolationist issue. Because the sitting President at that time happened to be an interventionist and a Democrat, the interventionist tendency was somewhat stronger in the Democratic Party and the isolationist tendency somewhat stronger in the opposition party. Even so, one has only to remember the Senator Wheelers on the one hand and the Willkies and Stimsons on the other to perceive that the issue of the war was not an issue between parties.

There are many other examples: prohibition, the issue of our entering the First World War, ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, the issues revolving around immigration quotas, and others. The only great exception was the issue of slavery. The Republican Party was founded and came to power in absolute and united opposition to the spread of slavery. On that issue the country was divided vertically and not horizontally. The result, let us never forget, was the Civil War.

The fact that these great issues, the slavery issue excepted, have been issues within parties and not between parties has not prevented their being discussed and resolved. They have been discussed and resolved, but the process has gone on simultaneously within both parties, often with varying results in various parts of the country. Thus, at one time the Democratic Party was wet in New York but dry in Virginia, while the Republican Party was dry in Kansas and wet in Pennsylvania. Ultimately, in 1932, the Democratic Party swung decisively into the repeal camp while the Republican Party continued to straddle. The Democratic Party had resolved the issue in a way which the country approved, while the Republican Party had not, and this, almost as much as the votes cast against the depression, was responsible for the Roosevelt landslide of that year.

Another conclusion which it seems safe to draw is that today any realinement such as has been suggested would tend to be along economic lines, so that it would find this country divided essentially on a class basis—all the workers in one party, all ownership and management in the other—one party representing all those with incomes of more than, say, $3,500 a year and the other party all those with less. If anybody can think of a more tragic eventuality than that he must indeed have a good imagination. As early as 1904 Theodore Roosevelt foresaw precisely this danger. Writing in that year to Philander C. Knox, Roosevelt asserted: "It would be a dreadful calamity if we saw this country divided into two parties, one containing the bulk of the property owners and conservative people, the other the bulk of the wage workers and the less prosperous people generally; each party insisting upon demanding much that is wrong, each party sullen and angered by real and fancied grievances." Roosevelt's efforts to make the Republican Party a servant of all the people rather than of special interests were inspired in large measure by his desire to prevent the very kind of realinement which some people today believe to be desirable.

Another result of the kind of realinement which has been suggested can best be expressed in the alternative, because, if all liberals were in one party and all conservatives in another, one of two situations would ensue. In the first situation, each party in turn would come to power from time to time, on the National, State, and municipal levels, with consequent violent swings of policy from right to left or vice versa every time there was a change of administration. It should be noted that the changes of administration might come about for reasons having nothing to do with ideology, as, for example, on account of corruption or inefficiency in the party in power; but inasmuch as the only alternative to the party in power would be a party which, by our supposition, held strongly opposing views, the violent swings in policy would follow nevertheless. This would be quite different from the present situation, where changes of administration are always moderated by the divergence of views within the party coming to power. If, for

example, the Republican Party had won the national election last November, liberals would have attached great hopes to the moderating effect upon any swing to the right which would have been exerted by the more forward-looking members of that party. Likewise, there can be no doubt that conservatives in the country are today finding considerable solace in the brake upon the Truman program which is being applied by the old-line members of the Democratic Party.

In the alternative situation which might ensue, one party would be so much more in tune with the needs and desires of the people than the other party that the latter would never be elected at all. The immediate consequence of this would be one-party government, the evils of which in a democratic system do not need to be spelled out. The ultimate consequence would inevitably be a division of the party in power between right and left, or between the clique close to the throne and the clique away from the throne, or between geographical section and geographical section, so that in due course we would be right back where we started, except that the names would be different. Aside from the evil effects of the period before we thus went full circle, this eventuality would have the added danger that instead of splitting into two parts the ruling party might split into three or four or more parts, so that we would end up with government by party blocs, as in France.

Lest what has been written above has frightened any reader, let it be said that there does not seem to be any likelihood of the suggested realinement coming about in the near future. The principal reason for this is that, partly because the United States is so big and partly because Americans are by nature more interested in concrete solutions than in political ideologies, people become Republicans and Democrats for reasons which frequently have very little to do with political ideology. In the first place, tradition and inheritance have their effect upon the choice of party which a man or woman makes at an early age. This may not be an intelligent basis for choice but it is a natural one. Then, too, many a person choice is influenced by the local conditions in which he or she comes of age: one will become a Republican because he lives in New York and is scandalized by the machine politics of Tammany Hall; another will become a Democrat because he lives in Georgia and the only effective way to fight for progress there is to fight within the Democratic Party—and so forth. Or a person's choice may be affected by the particular leader who dominates the national scene at the moment; that person begins to think seriously about political matters. It would be interesting to know, for example, how many Americans in their sixties are Republicans because they came of age in the era of Theodore Roosevelt and how many others are Democrats because their political awareness developed in the day of the other and Democratic Roosevelt.

Later in life an individual whose political affiliation has been made on some such nonideological basis as here outlined may discover that on the ideological issue of the moment he is not in sympathy with the dominant group of the party to which he belongs. If he is just an ordinary voter he can easily transfer his allegiance to the opposition major party or he can go to one or another of the minor parties which spring up from time to time and which frequently are devoted to some clear ideological concept. But if he is active in political life it would ordinarily be political suicide to try to change parties. He would risk being considered a turncoat by the party he left and an opportunist by the party he joined. He would move out of associations where he was known and with which he was familiar into associations where he would be a stranger. Besides, a few years later the issues might have so changed that he would want to shift back again. Sometimes, under peculiar and exceptional conditions, a transfer of party allegiance has been successfully made in American life. LaGuardia, Henry Wallace, and Wendell Willkie are outstanding examples. But they are the examples that prove the rule.

What then is such a person to do? The answer, under our system, is to stay in his party and fight within that party for the principles in which he believes. This is what he should do both out of practical political motives and because the result, for the reasons set forth forth in the earlier part of this article, is good for the country. This, at the moment, is what Senator MORSE, Senator IVES, Congressman JAVITS and a growing number of other leading personages are doing within the Republican Party and, approaching the matter from the other side of the issues of the day, what Senator BYRD, Senator GEORGE and others are doing within the Democratic Party.

The compromises which this kind of program makes necessary are irritating to crusaders and idealists. In this particular period of history they are especially irritating to those of us Americans who class ourselves as liberals and who believe that government should serve the interests of all the people rather than those of a favored few. The real goal for liberals in the United States, however, should be not a realinement of parties but victory of the progressive wing in both parties. What vistas would unfold before a United States in which the Republican and Democratic Parties—both truly committed (not in platform words but in actual performance) to the welfare of the average man, not only within the country itself but throughout the world—differed only as to how that objective could best be obtained. So long as there is any hope of achieving such a condition, liberals in both parties owe a duty to carry on the fight where they are. If the day ever comes when in either party all such hope is gone—well, sufficient unto that day is the evil thereof.

Medical Care for Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that American industry should be pushing as hard as American labor for a better health-insurance program—because one of the greatest wastes in all industry is absenteeism from sickness. In that connection I found a story in the New York Times of April 3 very interesting:

In the offices of a big New York business concern on lower Broadway there is a large room where 160 employees do tabulating procedures that are essential to its operation. Each day, however, an average of eight of the computing machines are idle, their operators having failed to report to work because of illness.

Although this percentage of absenteeism because of sickness may seem high, it is, in reality, only average, for each employee in the United States is absent an average of 12 days a year because of illness. The time lost due to sickness costs this country $8,000,000,000 a year, and reduces the Nation's productivity by approximately 5 percent. There is also an additional 2-percent loss of productivity due to the existence of latent or chronic diseases, undiagnosed and consequently untreated.

Today management is recognizing more and more that the most valuable asset in an industrial investment is manpower and that good health, high morale, and maximum output are so closely interrelated and interdependent as to be practically inseparable. Surveys by many business advisory groups have shown that medical care for personnel tends to promote efficiency, reduces occupational disease, lessens accident frequency, cuts absenteeism, decreases labor turn-over, lowers compensation costs, and improves labor-management relations. Many employers recognize that it is just as sound a business practice to invest in the health and productivity of their employees as it is to set aside reserves for depreciation and replacement of equipment.

As Dr. John J. Wittmer, assistant vice president of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York and director of its excellent medical program, said recently, "It is certainly the responsibility of industry to see to it that manpower receives such care and consideration as is appropriate to its top position in the scheme of our industrial economy. I can't conceive of a plant manager in this day and age, ordering, installing, and operating mechanical equipment without (1) determining exactly what was required of the equipment, (2) securing the best equipment for his needs, (3) having it installed by competent mechanics, and (4) establishing an operational maintenance program to insure optimum efficiency and useful life. Is there any moral or practical reason why we should do less for the individual, without whom the equipment could not have existed, let alone be operated?"

In addition to the Consolidated Edison Co., some other outstanding medical programs in industry are operated by General Motors, American Tobacco Co., Union Carbide & Carbon Co., the American Brake Shoe Co., the Texas Co., and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

As the primary purpose for the existence of business in our economy is to make a return of its invested capital, it is logical that business must consider the establishment of industrial medical services from the standpoint of their cost and return. Some industrial physicians, statisticians, and executives believe medical services should be economically justifiable entirely on a monetary basis, while others believe that the industrial relations factors are sufficient for justification of the cost of such services.

The cost of industrial medical services vary, of course, and are dependent upon the type and scope of services given, the prevailing costs of salaries, equipment and supplies, administrative methods and the number of employees given service. For example, the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, provides a complete medical program for its employees outside of the country, and a highly specialized diagnostic service for those who are employed within the United States. Similarly, it is difficult to generalize on the economic return to a concern making an investment in medical services.

One example, however, is that reported in the recently published 2-year cross-sectional survey of industrial health facilities in 227 plants in 33 States, conducted by the Industrial Hygiene Foundation. In an excellently supervised and maintained health department of a chemical industry, the average annual cost of its medical department, including safety and health activities, was $21,335. With 1,225 employees, this meant an annual cost of $17.42 an employee, or 0.68 percent of the annual pay roll of $4,125,000.

In reporting their pay-off, plant officials pointed out that the number of accidents a year in their plant was 1.3, as compared

with a national average of 36. On an average cost of $500 for each accident, they estimated this saving at $17,350. Although the national average of the number of days lost annually in a plant of this size and type of industry is 3,000, this plant averaged 425.

Based on the rate of $1 an hour, this meant an additional saving of $20,600. As their insurance premium is only 42 percent of the national average for a plant of this size and type of industry, savings in insurance payment amounted to $16,250.

During the year, sickness absenteeism in this plant was 4.16 days, as compared with a national average of 7 in similar industries. Based on an average charge of $1 an hour, the company saved $27,832. Labor turnover in this plant was also reduced by 50 employees over the national average, which the company estimated saved them $5,000.

Totaling these, the company estimated they had a return of $87,032 on their investment of $21,335, or $4.08 for each dollar spent.

The experience of this one company cannot, of course, be directly related to other concerns. However, it is estimated generally that competent medical or health services can cut the losses due to sick absenteeism and latent illness by about 50 percent. One large New York company, for example, has cut down its sick absenteeism from an average of 12 to an average of 6 days, saving an estimated $1,500,000 a year. Reports from 1,625 smaller companies show that in the plants of 500 workers, health programs have saved each an average of $30,510 a year.

The value of a good industrial medicine program cannot be measured by the yardstick of monetary savings alone, for such a program pays human as well as dollar dividends. We need not only industrial medicine but medicine in industry.

Hearings Schedule of the House Committee on Public Works on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted in the House today to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following schedule of hearings on rivers and harbors and flood-control projects to be conducted by the House Committee on Public Works:

RIVER AND HARBOR HEARINGS

The House Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on river and harbor authorizations for all projects on which the Chief of Eengineers has submitted favorable reports since the passage of the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, not included in the River and Harbor Act of June 30, 1948, on Tuesday, April 26, 1949, at 10:00 a. m., and will conclude the hearings on Tuesday, May 10, 1949. All proponents and opponents, including Senators and Representatives, will be heard following the presentation of the individual project by the Chief of Engineers or his assistants. All witnesses desiring to be heard should submit their names to the clerk of the committee, indicating the projects in which they are interested, as they will be heard as the individual projects are called for consideration.

1. Tuesday, April 26: Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with a report covering the river and harbor program, authorizations, appropriations, and balance of authorizations, with his recommendations. He will be assisted by Maj. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and Col. Wayne S. Moore, resident member, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and other assistants.

Projects including harbors along the States of Maine and Massachusetts:

Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and Pool at Biddeford (H. Doc. 49, 81st Cong.).

Scarboro River, Maine (H. Doc. 69, 81st Cong.).

Mystic River, Mass. (H. Doc. 645, 81st Cong.).

Mattapoisett Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. 664, 80th Cong.).

Winthrop Beach, Mass., shore protection (H. Doc. 764, 80th Cong.)

2. Wednesday, April 27: Projects including harbors along the States of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey:

Stonington Harbor, Conn. (H. Doc. 667, 80th Cong.).

Eightmile River, Conn. (H. Doc. 666, 80th Cong.).

Fire Island Inlet, N. Y. (H. Doc. 762, 80th Cong.).

East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y. (H. Doc. 749, 80th Cong.).

Jamaica Bay (Mott Basin), N. Y. (H. Doc. 665, 80th Cong.).

Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., at Leonardo (H. Doc. 108, 81st Cong.).

3. Thursday, April 28: Projects including harbors along the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia:

Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Md. (H. Doc. 712, 80th Cong.).

Hellens Creek (Calvert County), Md. (H. Doc. 663, 80th Cong.)

Governors Run, Md. (H. Doc. 670, 80th Cong.).

St. Patricks Creek, Md. (H. Doc. 671, 80th Cong.).

Potomac River (water chestnuts), Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. 113, 81st Cong.).

Rappahannock River, Bowlers Wharf, Va. (H. Doc. 109, 81st Cong.).

4. Friday, April 29: Projects including harbors along the State of North Carolina:

Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, Marshallburg, N. C. (H. Doc. 68, 81st Cong.)

Pamlico Sound, Taylors Creek, N. C. (H. Doc. 111, 81st Cong.).

Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C. (H. Doc. 87, 81st Cong.).

Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet, I. W. W. at Fairfield, N. C. (H. Doc. 723, 80th Cong.).

Far Creek, N. C. (H. Doc. 770, 80th Cong.).

5. Monday, May 2: Projects including harbors along the States of Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida:

Brunswick Harbor, Ga. (H. Doc. 110, 81st Cong.).

St. Marys River, Fla. and Ga., and North River, Ga. (H. Doc. 680, 80th Cong.)

Savannah River, Ga. and S. C., (S. Doc. 6, 81st Cong.)

Fernandina Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. 662, 80th Cong.).

Horseshoe Cove, Fla. (H. Doc. 106, 81st Cong.).

Lake Worth Inlet, Fla. (H. Doc. 704, 80th Cong.).

St. Augustine Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. 133, 81st Cong.).

St. Petersburg (Bayboro) Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. 70, 81st Cong.).

Palm Beach, Fla., Beach Erosion Study (H. Doc. 772, 80th Cong.).

6. Tuesday, May 3: Projects in the States of Texas, Iowa, and Wisconsin:

Little Bay, Fulton, Tex. (H. Doc. 114, 81st Cong.).

Mississippi River at Davenport, Iowa (H. Doc. 642, 80th Cong.).

Mississippi River at Alma, Wis. (H. Doc. 66, 81st Cong.)

Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis. (H. Doc. 71, 81st Cong.)

Kenosha Harbor, Wis. (H. Doc. 750, 80th Cong.).

Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa (H. Doc. 733, 80th Cong.).

Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa (S. Doc. 197, 80th Cong.).

Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex. (H. Doc. 768, 80th Cong.).

7. Wednesday, May 4: Projects in the States of Michigan and Missouri:

Manistique Harbor, Mich. (H. Doc. 721, 80th Cong.).

Grand Marais Harbor, Mich. (H. Doc. 751, 80th Cong.).

Trenton Channel, Detroit River, Mich. (S. Doc. 30, 81st Cong.).

Mississippi River at Hannibal, Mo. (H. Doc. 67, 81st Cong.).

8. Thursday, May 5: Projects including harbors along the States of Oregon and California, and in the Virgin Islands:

Westport Slough, Oreg. (H. Doc. 134, 81st Cong.).

Redwood City Harbor, Calif. (H. Doc. 104, 81st Cong.).

San Joaquin River, Stockton Channel, Calif. (H. Doc. 752, 80th Cong.).

Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I. (H. Doc. 771, 70th Cong.).

9. Friday, May 6:

Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (H. Doc. 758, 79th Cong.).

Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky., W. Va., and Va. (H. Doc. 264, 80th Cong.).

10. Monday, May 9: River and harbor projects on which increased authorizations are needed, and all other river and harbor projects eligible for consideration by the committee.

11. Tuesday, May 10: Senators and Representatives who have not previously appeared or who desire to make other and further statements.

FLOOD-CONTROL HEARINGS

The House Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on flood-control authorizations for projects on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports since the passage of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, not included in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, including the projects hereinafter mentioned and including projects on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports to the Director of the Budget, on Monday, May 16, 1949, and will conclude the hearings on Thursday, May 26. All proponents and opponents of a project, including Senators and Representatives, will be heard on the day scheduled for the consideration of that project following the presentation of the Chief of Engineers, the Assistant Chief of Engineers, or the representative of the Civil Works Division, Corps of Engineers. All proponents and opponents should submit their names before the hearing to the clerk of the committee, indicating the projects in which they are interested.

1. Monday, May 16: Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with a report on the status of national flood control and flood control along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, with authorizations, appropriations, and balance of authorizations, with his general recommendations. General Pick will be accompanied by Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and Col. Herbert C. Gee, of the Civil Works Division, Corps of Engineers. Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer of the lower Mississippi Valley division, and other division engineers as desired by the Chief of Engineers will attend when projects under their supervision are considered.

Eastern United States area including New England, North Atlantic, and Southwest Atlantic, and including streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

(a) Additional authorization for comprehensive plans for the Connecticut River; for the Lackawaxen River; for the Savannah

River; for projects for central and southern Florida, for Georgia, South Carolina, and other Atlantic States.

(b) New reports: Anacostia River and tributaries, District of Columbia and Maryland.

(c) Special bills and survey authorizations.

2. Tuesday, May 17: Ohio River Basin or Great Lakes area, including additional authorizations for the approved comprehensive plans.

(a) New reports: Upper Allegheny River in and around Bradford, Pa. (S. Doc. No. 20, 81st Cong.). Lost River at Orleans, Ind. (H. Doc. No. 105, 81st Cong.).

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

3. Wednesday, May 18: Missouri River Basin and Red River of the North, including additional authorizations for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the approved comprehensive plan and for the Red River of the North.

(a) New reports: Elkhorn River, Nebr.; South Platte River and tributaries, Colo., Wyo., and Nebr. (H. Doc. No. 669, 80th Cong.); Yellowstone River and tributaries, Wyo., Mont., and N. Dak.; Kansas River, Colo., Nebr., and Kans.

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

4. Thursday, May 19: Southwestern United States, including additional authorizations for approved comprehensive plans for the Arkansas River Basin and for the middle Rio Grande in New Mexico.

(a) New reports: Grand (Neosho) River, Kans., Mo., and Ark. (H. Doc. No. 442, 80th Cong.).

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

5. Friday, May 20: Pacific Northwest area, including additional authorizations for approved comprehensive plans fo rthe Willamette River Basin.

(a) New reports: Columbia River and tributaries, Oreg., Wash., Mont., and Idaho; Albeni Falls project, Idaho (S. Doc. No. 9, 81st Cong.); Green-Duwamish River, Wash.

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

6. Monday, May 23: Pacific Southwest and Hawaii, including additional authorizations for Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kaweah and Tule River Basins.

(a) New reports: Santa Ana River, Calif. (H. Doc. 135, 81st Cong.); Kawainui Swamp, Hawaii.

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

7. Tuesday, May 24: Mississippi Valley, including the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, and the upper Mississippi River and tributaries, and including additional authorizations for the approved comprehensive plans along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and tributaries, and the White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.

(a) New reports: Mississippi River at Canton, Mo. (H. Doc. 107, 81st Cong.); Mississippi River in the vicinity of Cape Girardeau, Mo.; St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo. (H. Doc. 132, 81st Cong.); Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto, Ark.; Cache River Basin, Ark.

(b) Special bills and survey authorizations.

8. Wednesday, May 25: Proponents and opponents of other projects in other basins or regions.

9. Thursday, May 26: Senators and Representatives in Congress to submit statements respecting other projects than the individual projects on which they may have previously submitted statements.

Appropriation Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, I insert table showing the bills in which appropriations were carried for the fiscal year 1949, the requests for 1950, the House action, the increase or decrease above the budget, and the increase or decrease in 1950 above or below the 1949 bills.

The result is a net decrease below the budget of $299,388,850 and a net increase above last year's appropriations of $4,216,360,749.

The table follows:

Appropriation comparisons, exclusive of foreign aid and legislative

	1949 approved [1]	1950 request [2]	House action [2]	House action versus 1950 request		House action versus 1949 approved	
				Increase	Decrease	Increase	Decrease
Independent offices	$6,787,102,402	$7,775,566,830	$7,104,571,603		$670,995,227	$317,469,201	
Civil functions	641,575,666	767,733,220	593,292,270		174,440,950		$48,283,396
State-Justice-Commerce	511,129,662	740,023,456	684,616,102		55,407,354	173,486,440	
Labor-Federal Security	1,866,053,700	2,235,065,685	2,211,794,085		23,271,600	345,740,385	
Treasury-Post Office	2,244,727,680	3,172,666,750	3,072,817,903		99,848,847	828,090,223	
Agriculture	577,546,953	726,879,908	943,117,979	$216,238,071		359,332,955	
District of Columbia	99,729,483	103,321,427	98,923,621		4,397,806		805,862
Government corporations	38,479,061						38,479,061
Interior	407,836,974	616,805,020	536,461,908		80,343,112	128,624,934	
Armed services	11,403,477,413	13,219,835,700	13,849,361,800	629,526,100		2,445,884,387	
Deficiencies	2,034,554,306	1,776,302,974	1,739,854,849		36,448,125		294,699,457
Total	26,612,213,300	31,134,200,970	30,834,812,120	845,764,171	1,145,153,021	4,598,628,525	382,267,776

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Aug. 17, 1948. [2] House reports.

NOTE.—Net decrease of $299,388,850 or 0.9 percent; net increase of $4,216,360,749 or 15 percent.

Economics of World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by C. M. Weyand, vice chairman, world affairs committee, Detroit Board of Commerce, and executive assistant, Nash-Kelvinator Corp. The article appeared in the Detroiter, a magazine published by the Detroit Board of Commerce, under date of April 11, 1949:

ECONOMICS OF WORLD TRADE

(By C. M. Weyand, vice chairman, world affairs committee, Detroit Board of Commerce, and executive assistant, Nash-Kelvinator Corp.)

World trade is essentially world economic cooperation. The world pattern viewed from the angle of natural resources and native genius of peoples provides infinite variety. The obvious result is world economic interdependence. Trading between the countries of the world is the vehicle which moves the surplus materials and products from one part of the world where they are in excess of requirements, to some other world area where they are vitally needed. Food grains, metals, rubber, lumber, coffee, spices, manufactured goods, these and countless other materials and products make up a ceaseless stream of goods continually moving across national boundaries, required to complete the economy of some other place other than place of origin. No nation, no trading area, is economically sufficient unto itself.

From the dawn of history when the camel trains moved across the deserts of the East, trading handicraft for foodstuffs, down through the centuries where the sailing ship braved the Atlantic and sought the wealth of the Far East and finally a new world, has continued this ceaseless urge to find areas of trading where the surplus of goods of one land could be exchanged for those of another, resulting in increased wealth and higher standards of living; in short, a better and a more complete life.

It is true that in the era of discovery and exploration at the close of the Middle Ages, and the early centuries of the Modern Era, international trading was characterized often by exploitation and unfair exchanges. Far-off trading posts were secured by force and grew into colonial possessions with little consideration given to the rights of conquered peoples. But this era passed and world trading grew up. The age of piracy gave place to international rules and regulations which provided in the field of world trading the practice of business ethics common in domestic trading.

In those relatively happy days before World War I, and for a time between the First and Second World Wars, most nations found no serious difficulty in securing their necessary imports. The foreign credits which they earned through services rendered or exports made could readily be converted into the exchange of those countries from which imports were received. The international exchange of commodities, goods, and services, became increasingly a basic requirement of the economic and social well-being of every country. So, today, all countries without exception, including those most favored by nature and the genius of its citizens, must

secure from abroad a complement of their requirements.

Before the two world wars, the productive capacity of western Europe equaled that of the United States. The senseless destruction of these wars set back the economic clock of progress to such an extent that we do not yet see the answer to the problems that these world wars have created. Western Europe which before the First World War was a paradise of good living, with economic stability, balanced foreign trade, and peaceful progress, is today the problem spot of the world. Teeming populations seemingly unaffected by the loss of human life caused by these wars, find it practically impossible to maintain their economic security and well-being. The widespread destruction of the means of production have left those countries incapable of producing those surpluses which they can use as a medium of exchange for the materials and goods which they require from abroad.

In the final analysis, wealth from outside a country's borders can only be secured for wealth of equal value within a country. This is the essence of international trading. Those uninformed as to the function and technique of world trading were accustomed to gloat over statistics showing favorable balances indicating the exports of the United States greatly in excess of imports. Such misguided enthusiasts are rapidly disappearing as the economics of world trade become more generally understood. The postwar period has driven home a much needed lesson—while a country must give in order to receive, it is equally true that no country can continue indefinitely to give unless the account is progressively showing evidence of working toward a balance.

With amazing accord the American public has supported Government appropriations for relief and economic reconstruction abroad. The ordinary citizen has lost track of the number of billions of dollars expended by the Government for foreign trade, but he is becoming increasingly troubled by its effect, high-lighted by higher taxes and higher living costs. Other countries are extending aid to less favored neighbors, thus giving the world scene a pattern of world economic cooperation unparalleled in world history.

But the imbalance between United States exports and imports and similar imbalances between other trading areas of the world, continue to be a matter of grave concern. Only time will give the complete answer to the question of whether postwar reconstruction aided by economic generosity, is to be recorded as an"Operation Rat Hole" or an economic stimulant productive of world economic stability and balanced foreign trade.

There is no magic formula which will maintain high levels of world trade in defiance of economic laws. Artificial stimulants in terms of gifts and loans may help for brief periods, but over the long period no world market can continue to draw goods and services from other markets in excess of goods and services it can provide as a fair exchange.

As far as the United States is concerned, our problem is to increase imports. We must assist the debtor nations of the world to earn dollars. Therefore, the extension of the principle served by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act must be continued and extended. We must remove the barriers to international trade. We must increase our imports. Much has been accomplished in lowering American tariffs, but our tariff wall is still too great a barrier to imports. In the year 1948, we bought over $7,000,000,000 worth of goods from abroad; but in the same period, we sold over $12,000,000,000 worth abroad. We cannot indefinitely operate a Marshall plan to provide dollars to balance the account. Common sense indicates that the wiser policy is to assist the world through our increased imports to earn the dollars which they require for their purchases from us.

It's Time To Slug Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a powerful and fighting editorial that appeared in the April issue of the United Automobile Worker:

IT'S TIME TO SLUG BACK

Reactionary forces in America, reviving from the coma induced by the November 2 election results, have launched an all-out campaign against the welfare and living standards of the American people.

It is a two-pronged attack, aimed at 1949 collective bargaining demands on the one hand, and at the Fair Deal legislative program on the other.

It is a scarce campaign. The campaign strategists pick out the developing danger signals in the national economy, exaggerate them, and attempt to paint a gloomy picture that shows the whole Nation marching down the road to depression and attendant mass unemployment. They point to the approximately 3,500,000 unemployed, to slightly declining prices, to the cut-backs in production in some of the soft goods industries—shoes, textiles, clothing, light appliances.

MUST LABOR BACK DOWN?

And the conclusions they draw from these developments are that labor unions should trim down or withdraw their economic demands and that Congress must forego the much-needed social legislation encompassed by the Fair Deal program. Because, they say, these collective bargaining demands and this proposed social legislation are discouraging and depressing to the captains of free enterprise. We are told, of course, on other occasions that these same captains of industry are bold, adventurous pioneers, whose sole concern is the welfare of the Nation and who have never a thought for profits except as they serve to sustain and provide for unfortunate widows and orphans. Now they tell us that they can't do business very well if they are discouraged and depressed by union demands to improve living standards and acts of Congress that provide human security and a stable economy.

Some of these free enterprisers have even appeared before the President's Council of Economic Advisers and have said, in effect:

"The psychology of the workers will change for the better if there is a long line at every hiring gate, and our ability to get greater production out of them will improve if there is mass unemployment outside the factory gates."

That is the attitude of the men who profess to be the guiding geniuses of our vast economic machine. There can be little question that there is a deliberate campaign afoot in America to create a partial recession so that the masters of industry and finance can get the political and economic advantages which they think will flow from such a recession.

INIQUITOUS WEDDING

In Washington the handmaidens of economic royalty who sit in Congress have stripped off all pretense of responsibility to the people who elected them and have shut out of their minds the disturbing memory of November 2, 1948. The Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans are no longer living in sin; their formal though unsavory marriage was consummated during the recent filibuster. Mr. and Mrs. Dixiegop are now holding open house on Capitol Hill. In return for GOP assistance in wrecking the civil-rights program, the other spouse of the new union is doing its (it is impossible to distinguish the sex of the parties to this marriage) best to help torpedo the rest of the Fair Deal program. They tried their best to emasculate the new rent bill. They are now training their guns on efforts being made to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, enactment of a broader social-security program, a higher minimum wage, a national-health bill, Federal aid to education, and the other decent and constructive legislation called for by President Truman and the vast majority of the American people.

TAKE THE OFFENSIVE

The only answer we of the UAW-CIO can find for ourselves, other members of organized labor, and liberal-thinking Americans outside the union movement, is to take the offensive.

All the reasons for which we drafted our demands in the first place and all the reasons which made President Truman's legislative program necessary remain unchanged.

As a matter of fact, all of the negative economic facts in our economy merely sharpen and point out more clearly the necessity and the compelling need for the things we are fighting for.

As President Reuther told the international executive board at its March meeting:

"Unemployment has increased because we haven't got enough purchasing power in the hands of the people. If we permit the fact that unemployment is growing to be used to divert us away from our drive for wage increases and other economic gains, then we will intensify the forces that make for unemployment in the first place."

DRIFT TO DEPRESSION

And if we permit the Dixiegop coalition in Congress to weaken our fight for improved social legislation, we will be permitting the Nation to drift into the chaos and tragedy of another depression.

The UAW-CIO calls upon its entire membership to mobilize our maximum strength to back up our 1949 economic demands. We call upon them and their families and neighbors to make known to their Senators and Congressmen their support of the Fair Deal program and their determination to use their votes to see that people who will support that program are elected to office and kept in office.

NO TIME FOR TIMIDITY

This is not a time for men of little faith and less courage. It is not a time to be frightened by the scare campaigns and threats of big business. It is a time for courageous, constructive, aggressive action.

The officers and board members of the international union are prepared to lead that kind of fight. They ask for, and are confident of receiving, your vigorous support.

Earthquake Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the earthquake which yesterday struck the States of Oregon and Washington, killing 8

persons, injuring 65, and causing property damage estimated at $10,000,000.

This is the second major disaster to strike these two States within the last 11 months. The first tragedy was that of the disastrous Columbia River floods of May and June of last year which took a toll of nearly 20 lives and caused $60,000,000 of property damage.

Last year's Columbia Valley flood was one of the most disastrous in the history of the Nation. Now, even before our people have fully rehabilitated their communities from the damages of that flood, they have been struck by another disaster of great magnitude.

The Washington delegation has offered its fullest cooperation to the Governor of the State of Washington, Arthur B. Langlie, in being of help in any way he deems necessary. Furthermore, we have been assured of the fullest cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Community Facilities from its deputy commissioner for planning, Arthur D. Morrell. For this we are most grateful, knowing the excellent job that agency performed for the people of our region following last summer's disastrous floods.

Appropriations on ECA Bill Should Be Carefully Scrutinized and Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizing the expenditure of money for what is described as Eupropean cooperation is an important piece of legislation. It is important because of the purpose for which it is proposed to be used and because of the amount of money involved.

This bill does not, of course, appropriate the money. As above stated, it authorized the payment of funds provided Congress sees fit to make appropriations therefor. Such appropriations as Congress deems necessary will be considered later.

In view of the fact that our Government has already committed itself on this policy and has agreed to help the countries included in this program, it becomes a question of carrying out such promises. We have been told by proponents of this legislation and by the Administration that the assistance provided under this program is for the purpose of helping these countries to help themselves, and most important of all, it is expected to help prevent such countries from the overrun of communism.

Appropriations implementing this measure will be submitted at a later date. I think it is extremely important when such appropriations are submitted that all of the items contained therein be carefully scrutinized and examined. We should make sure that the assistance granted under this legislation goes to the people to whom it is assigned.

It is also important that we make sure that it goes for commodities and goods that are really needed by these countries and not for the purpose of favoring any particular group so that they may have a chance to dispose of a surplus of goods, or building up trade in favor of any certain interests. In other words, see to it that these funds are to help the folks affected, and not especially to help people who want to sell their goods. Of course, the money should be used to buy American goods because American money is being spent.

It is also important that the expenditure of such funds be handled just as economically as may be done. Furthermore, if it develops that it is unnecessary to spend as much money as is allowed under this bill, then all savings possible should be made.

I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], who suggested we save only a small part of the funds allocated hereunder. I thought he made a good case, but the majority of the House deemed otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, we hope and pray that the legislation approved today will be for the good not only for the people who receive these benefits but for the people of our own country as well. Personally, I am deeply concerned with regard to the tremendous expenditure of the taxpayers of this country in its attempt to bring about a better understanding between the nations of the world.

Figuring ERP Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto an excerpted table from page 18 of the committee report on H. R. 3748; together with an excerpt from page 72 of the book entitled "European Recovery Program—A Report on Recovery Progress and United States Aid" issued by ECA, February 1949. Taken together they illustrate the methods of figuring ERP assistance for the individual participating countries referred to in my remarks on page 4396 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1949.

European recovery program—United States aid, 1948–49 and 1949–50

[In millions of dollars]

	1948–49			1949–50	
	Requested by national governments	Recommended by OEEC	ECA proposed allotments	Requested by national governments	ECA illustrative allotments
Austria	339.3	217.0	215.2	217.0	197.0
Belgium—Luxemburg and Belgium dependencies and overseas territories	358.2	250.0	247.9	250.0	200.0
Denmark	149.9	110.0	109.1	110.0	109.0
Free Territory of Trieste	22.0	18.0	17.8	12.8	12.0
France and dependencies and overseas territories	1,114.9	989.0	980.9	890.0	875.0
Germany: Bizone—					
Total aid	1,083.0	1,051.0	984.0	912.1	880.6
Less GARIOA	−637.0	−637.0	−573.4	−539.7	−476.6
ECA aid	446.0	414.0	410.6	372.4	404.0
Germany: French zone	100.0	100.0	99.2	100.0	115.0
Greece	211.0	146.0	144.8	198.1	170.0
Iceland	11.0	11.0	5.2	10.0	7.0
Ireland	111.0	79.0	78.3	75.4	64.0
Italy	799.5	601.0	555.5	610.1	555.0
Netherlands and dependencies and overseas territories	657.0	496.0	469.6	507.0	355.0
Norway	104.0	84.0	83.3	131.8	105.0
Portugal	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.6	10.0
Sweden	109.0	47.0	46.6	70.7	54.0
Turkey	85.3	50.0	39.7	94.2	30.0
United Kingdom	1,271.0	1,263.0	1,239.0	940.0	940.0
Commodity reserve [1]			13.5		
Aid allotment, total	5,889.1	4,875.0	4,756.2	4,690.1	[3] 4,202.0
Administrative and other nonaid expenditures [2]			67.3		80.0
Grand total	5,889.1	4,875.0	4,823.5	4,690.0	4,280.0

[1] Represents purchase price of goods procured or to be procured by U. S. Government agencies, but not yet authorized for procurement by participating countries.
[2] Consists of dollar costs of strategic materials, ocean freight on relief packages, technical assistance, investment guaranties, administrative expenses, and confidential fund.
[3] Rounded downward to $4,200,000,000 in total request.

2. ECA REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR 1949–50

It has been necessary for the ECA to prepare a preliminary and illustrative division of aid among the countries for the fiscal year 1950 and to arrive at a total figure before the OEEC has screened the individual national programs and made its own recommendations. As will be seen later, the OEEC has had had an opportunity only to arrive at a preliminary estimate of the total dollar aid needed for western Europe as a whole. During the few months of its existence, it has completed its first annual program and has done considerable work on the long-term program. Since the latter should be the framework within which each annual program is fitted, the OEEC wisely gave priority to the work on the long-term program.

The ECA made its estimates on the basis of the individual national programs submitted by each of the participating countries to the OEEC. The total request of the participating countries for United States aid in 1949–50 amounted to $4,690,000,000. This reduction from the OEEC program figure of $4,875,000,000 for 1948–49 was achieved almost entirely by lower requests for aid from the

United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, from France and the bizone. The other countries either requested amounts of the same magnitude as they are receiving in 1948–49 or asked for greater aid. Among the latter were Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Greece, and Turkey. Portugal submitted a request for aid for the first time.

Employing the method of analysis described in an earlier section of this chapter, the ECA arrived at an estimate of $4,200,000,000 as the amount of aid required by the participating countries for the fiscal year 1950. This ECA estimate can be compared with the recommendations of the OEEC for the second program year. As noted before, the method employed by the OEEC in making its recommendation for 1949–50 differs substantially from that used by the ECA. The national programs are submitted by the participating countries to the organization were statistically summarized into a consolidated balance sheet and the OEEC applied certain rough criteria to the resulting consolidated-import program. Chief among these was that consumption levels should not exceed 1948–49 where such increases would involve additional dollar expenditures. However, the OEEC recognized that there may be special cases in which an increase in food consumption over the 1948–49 level might be justified and, consequently, allowed in its revision of the consolidated-import program for an increase of 2.5 percent. The net result of the difference between the modest increase recommended by the OEEC and the rather large increases proposed by the participating countries in their program submissions was sufficient to reduce the magnitude of the OEEC consolidated-import program by $216,000,000. Other reductions were made by the OEEC in the total proposed import of certain consumer goods and industrial equipment and the estimate of freight costs were correspondingly reduced.

As a result of these various reductions, the OEEC arrived at a figure of $4,347,000,000 of ECA aid necessary for 1949–50.

It will be seen that the approach employed by the OEEC is wholly different from that of the ECA. The OEEC screened the consolidated totals for all of the participating countries as a group; the ECA screened the program of each individual country and then added the results of its individual appraisals together in order to arrive at a total aid figure for the whole group of countries. Specifically, the ECA method has made possible a more rigorous appraisal of the national programs and, in the case of some countries, the aid figures arrived at by the ECA are less than sufficient to cover their etxernal dollar deficits. Taking account of these differences in approach, the OEEC figure of $4,347,000,000 does not diverge markedly from the ECA figure of $4,200,000,000.

The determination of the actual distribution among countries of such funds as the Congress may decide to appropriate for European aid during the fiscal year 1950 will develop in two steps. The assembling of new national submissions, the making of forecasts, and the formulation of policy judgments for the best utilization of European resources has been and will continue to be the responsibility of the OEEC. The report of the OEEC and its recommendations for the division of aid, when completed, will be reviewed both by the European organization of the ECA and by the Administrator's staff in Washington prior to final decision by the Administrator. It would be only then that the program for the division of aid for the fiscal year 1950 would be promulgated and even that program would be subject to continuous review and adjustment in the light of actual events. The participating countries are wholly familiar with this procedure and will, therefore, understand that the text and statistical tables for 1949–50 in his document may not be used to support any request, either to the OEEC or the ECA, for aid in any particular amount for any country or for any particular purchase or payment.

ECA Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the ECA bill, I submit the following further observations:

In the debate of April 12 on the extension of the European recovery program, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] asked whether it was the intention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to take to the Nation word that the maximum of authorization must be the amount to be appropriated later in the appropriation bill.

I assured him then that the figures presented by the committee were indeed subject to the scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations in the light of later developments in the relevant data.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] addressed a similar question to my colleague [Mr. JUDD]. He asked what assurance might be given that the performance of a year ago would not be repeated and that subsequent examination of the figures by the Appropriations Committee would not be taken as a violation of obligation undertaken in the authorization. Mr. JUDD reassured Mr. HALLECK that there was no intention to make the figures binding upon subsequent action.

I believe these sincere questions deserve deliberate answers, and I am therefore taking this additional occasion to state my views for the RECORD.

Let us first review the facts of the situation of last year referred to by the gentlemen.

In the development of this program the participating governments initially requested $8,300,000,000 for 15 months of operation.

The Administration reduced this request to $6,800,000,000, reviewing the figures in a realistic reappraisal of needs and balancing them against American availabilities.

When it became apparent that the Congress would wish to authorize for only 12 rather than for 15 months, the request was reduced to $5,300,000,000 for 12 months.

The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 accepted that figure as the authorization. It provided that $1,000,000,000 thereof should be realized from the sale of notes by the Administrator to the Treasury.

As I recall it, the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations last June recommended a new appropriation of $4,000,000,000 for European recovery.

To this were added the $1,000,000,000 to be realized from the sale of notes. An additional $55,000,000 was available through the interim-aid appropriation (subsequently reduced to $10,000,000).

Thus, the committee showed that the $5,055,000,000 available for the European recovery program as a result of its action was only $245,000,000 less than the $5,300,000,000 asked by the Administration and approved by Congress for the first 12 months ending April 3, 1949.

The committee went on to stipulate, however, that the total funds thus made available should be made to last for 15 months or through June 30, 1949. For this period the Administration had estimated Europe's minimum recovery needs not at $5,300,000,000, but at $6,800,000,000.

This represented a reduction of the magnitude of 21 percent. The Economic Cooperation Administrator, Mr. Paul Hoffman, immediately pointed to the significance of the reduction. The effect would be to cripple the recovery aspects of the legislation, he said, and thereby the program would be deprived of the very reason for its existence.

I recall—and my files confirm my recollection—that the press and public leaders of this country reacted in a similar way. There was immediate recognition of the principal effect of the Appropriations Committee's action—a basic alteration of the intent of the Congress.

No one stated the issue more succinctly than did the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. VANDENBERG, whose remarks I now quote in part:

> The practical effect of the House bill is to repeal, by indirection, the intent and purpose of this legislation and to reverse this established American foreign policy both at home and abroad. * * * this Congress, as a matter of intelligent self-interest, cannot afford to throw our attitudes into doubt and thus to multiply the terrified confusion of a world in which the forces of aggression and subversion thrive upon confusion. We must not feed the very fires we would put out. * * * any such cynical reversal would be a major policy decision which should not be made through the back-door of an appropriation bill. Indeed, it should not be made at all.

Fortunately, the strength of public opinion behind the viewpoint expressed above was such that the judgment of the Appropriations Committee was substantially reversed.

The Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 kept the figures at approximately the level of the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, but it added language making it permissible to spend the sums within a period of 12 months if it should be found necessary to do so by the President. Thus, the Chief Executive was given an option to see that the intent of the Congress as specified in the organic act should be carried out.

We know now, on the basis of a year's performance under the European recovery program, that the figure contemplated in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for 12 months was basically sound. To have reduced it drastically would have been an error of grave consequence. Fortunately, the force of American public opinion made it possible to avoid that error.

It is possible for a change in quantity to become a change in quality. It is possible for a question of dollars to become a question of basic policy. It is possible, by trying to cut the dimensions of a program, to eliminate all the virtues that justify it.

Fortunately, the better judgment prevailed last year, and I believe almost all of us are convinced now that it was the better judgment that prevailed.

On the basis of what happened a year ago, and of what has happened subsequently, I for one am willing to say that I would not want the basic objectives of the European recovery program tampered with by a drastic reduction of its resources.

The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the bill to extend the program gives sufficient indication that we not only expect, but indeed will welcome, scrutiny of the data when the Appropriations Committee reviews the figures. Our report attempts to point out to the other committee possible opportunities to save in the light of price data not available at the time of consideration of H. R. 3748.

Review of the factors is one matter. Reappraisal of the objectives and reduction of the scope are quite a different matter.

The Committee on Appropriations fulfills an invaluable service when it applies to the data of a program such as this an expertness and an experience not available to the members of a committee which is preoccupied with policy considerations. But when the Committee on Appropriations carries its functions to the length of attempting to supplant the judgment of the policy committee on what the scope and purpose of a policy should be, I believe it goes beyond its jurisdiction.

The public criticism that occurred a year ago over the attempt to alter the nature of this program by drastically cutting its resources should not leave a feeling of dismay or sensitivity.

We are all here trying to serve the will of the American people. That will has a way of making itself known when it is crossed. None of us here can promise to temper the wind of criticism that is likely to blow when an attempt is made to reverse a public decision.

Clear Channel Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Ward L. Quaal which appeared in the Mining Journal, Marquette, Mich., April 9, 1949.

(By Ward L. Quaal, acting director, Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, Washington, D. C.)

Farmers throughout all sections of America have fought many years for rights they believe to be justly theirs as against the discriminatory advantages enjoyed by city dwellers, and have effectively organized for the security of these rights. In one all-important field, however, they have not made their voices heard and have seen their rights whittled away without hardly a protest, namely, in the matter of radio service. Radio service is, of course, important to all people but to none more so than the person dwelling in rural and sparsely settled areas who does not have ready access to the entertainment, education, information, news, and religion available in cities. The great contribution of radio to our civilization is, or should be, that it brings these advantages to remote listeners everywhere.

The farmers have failed to give more than passing notice to a United States Senate bill which, if it became law, would deprive them of much of the service they presently receive through the great medium of radio and would prevent a badly needed improvement in that service.

Senate bill 491 threatens to do exactly that. There is no need to be greatly concerned with the welfare of people who reside in the larger cities having radio stations or those living relatively close to such cities. The persons whose radio reception would suffer are those residing in communities where there are no radio stations—areas which cannot economically support stations of their own and rural areas removed from cities having radio stations.

IMPORTANT IN UPPER PENINSULA

In Michigan's Upper Peninsula and the northern sector of the Lower Peninsula, radio reception has never been consistently good. In fact, radio engineering experts term it one of the most difficult to serve of all regions. In Michigan alone, over 456,000 persons would be without nighttime radio service were it not for the class of radio station known as clear-channel stations.

Nation-wide, the people residing in 75 percent of the area of our country are solely dependent upon clear channel stations for their only nighttime broadcast service. All of these people reside principally in small towns and rural sections which are scattered over virtually all of the States.

Wayne Coy, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, speaking in Boston on January 25, 1949, directed attention to incomplete radio coverage, stating, "This is a big country and a lot of people live in it. Some 20 millions of those people have never had adequate radio service."

CLEAR CHANNEL VITAL

Chairman Coy's statement points up the most important unsolved problem of Federal regulation of broadcasting, namely, how to provide these millions of people in large rural and sparsely settled areas, including those in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and the northern sector of the Lower Peninsula, with service somewhere near comparable to that enjoyed by city listeners practically everywhere. The latter receive strong, clear signals, day and night, not merely from one, but usually from four up to as many as 20 stations located in their respective communities, with a corresponding choice of programs. Rural listeners in the inadequately served areas, however, insofar as they receive any service at all, must be content with weak signals, marred with static for most of the time, from a comparatively few distant stations. They are not afforded their fair share of radio's great contribution to our civilization, the opportunity of listening to programs produced in the great centers of culture, information, education, and entertainment.

There is only one effective way to remedy this defect. It is by retaining what are known as clear-channel stations and permitting, indeed requiring, them to increase their power so as to provide the sort of signal that is necessary for improved service.

Here is why 26 clear-channel stations (technically referred to as class 1-A stations) are the primary source of nighttime radio pleasure for 50,000,000 distant rural listeners.

HIGHWAY THROUGH AIR

A radio channel is a road through the air, the highway along which programs travel from the station to your receiving set. Only 106 channels are available for use by 2,147 United States radio stations (including Hawaii and Puerto Rico).

On some of these channels—all shown by number on the radio dial—the Government allows from 2 to as many as 156 different stations to broadcast simultaneously day and night.

Signals and programs from different stations using the same channel—the same path through the air—interfere with one another. To be heard at night free of such interference over even a small area, stations on shared channels must be located some distance apart, their power limited and other technical devices employed.

Known as local and regional stations, they serve only cities and small surrounding areas. Regional stations, with a few exceptions, are heard over a distance of less (usually much less) than 35 miles at night, free from interference. Local stations have a nighttime interference-free radius as low as 2 miles and rarely in excess of 10 miles. These local and regional stations serve only 25 percent of the country's area at night. The remaining 75 percent of the country depends, and must continue to depend, upon clear-channel stations for nighttime reception.

THEY ARE PROTECTED

Only one station is allowed to use a class 1-A clear channel at night, when radio waves travel farthest. As a result, there is no other station on the same channel to scuttle its program with interference. Given this protection the clear-channel station is able to reach out and cover farm areas and small towns.

The Senate bill (S. 491) now before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would, if it became law, endanger this service to the rural folks. The residents of our rural areas and our small towns face a loss or serious impairment of their highly coveted radio service unless action is taken to defeat this measure in Congress. The threat becomes more alarming when one examines closely the provisions of the Senate bill. It would require duplication of stations on the clear channels, thereby causing interference which would lead to deterioration of service to the remote areas. Secondly, the bill, if it became law, would limit maximum power of United States stations to 50 kilowatts, thus foreclosing any reasonable possibility of improving the present inadequate service. At the present time, Mexican stations are operating with power far in excess of 50 kilowatts. If the United States clear channels are broken down, we will sacrifice the exclusive use of our clear channels to other North American nations.

It is imperative that our clear channels be retained and that higher power be granted, for only in this way can service to rural and small-town America be maintained and improved.

In the past, whenever attempts have been made to secure higher power, it has precipitated bitter attacks by certain interests. In October 1924 when United States stations were asking for an increase in power from 1 to 5 kilowatts, John Shepherd, of Boston, later president of the National Association of Regional Broadcasters, in opposing the increase, said: "If the power is increased without any limitation of hours or season, it will result in less enjoyment to millions of people, and for that reason it should not be done at this time." Other persons joined Mr. Shepherd in his attack. Some declared that "the use of anything more than 1,000 watts (1 kilowatt) would mean the blotting out of

small competitors." The same interests opposed increases to 50 kilowatts in 1930 and have been opposing power in excess of 50 kilowatts ever since.

Mr. Shepherd and his colleagues have seen their fears vanish with the years, for in 1924 there were only 535 stations in the United States and today there are 2,147. During these past 25 years, American listeners have been better served with each increase in power. There are today 338 5-kilowatt stations, 35 10-kilowatt stations, and 73 50-kilowatters. Keeping in mind the fourfold increase in radio stations in the Nation since 1924, it can hardly be stated that the small competitors were blotted out. The arguments of the opponents of higher power, if applied to aviation, would have prevented the public from enjoying faster and more comfortable air transportation, and, if applied to any other business, would require that the clock stand still on any advance in civilization.

One of the many reasons why power increases do not hurt the smaller station is the importance of local appeal to the listener. There is a natural tie to the home-town station, a loyalty which cannot be severed merely by the signal strength of a distant station.

Fear of signals from distant stations becomes even more absurd in considering the advertiser's needs. The advertiser prefers a local outlet in a market of any importance to him. It is impossible for the programs of WGN, WLS, WMAQ, or WJR to merchandise a product in Marquette, Ishpeming, Negaunee, Escanaba, Gladstone, or any other remote city. WGN cannot sell autos for dealers in Ishpeming and Marquette, nor can it sell clothing for dealers in Escanaba. Only the local stations can merchandise the area in such a way as to bring sales success to the local business houses. For these reasons, local radio stations will continue to prosper. They serve their communities well.

An increase in power above 50 kilowatts will render no injury of any kind—technical, economic, social, or otherwise. On the contrary, the public, all classes of stations, and the industry generally will be greatly benefited. Higher power on our clear channels will give the neglected rural and small-town listener the improved radio service to which he is entitled.

Directors: Pay More Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Forbes Magazine of Business for April 1949. The opinions given in this article are substantiated by a large volume of mail which I have received from stockholders, citing instances in which small or no dividends have been paid despite large corporate profits.

DIRECTORS: PAY MORE DIVIDENDS

Every corporation's executives and directors should weigh these facts when they next meet to determine their concern's dividend payments. These figures were prepared for the joint committee of Congress now studying profits:

In 1926 corporate profits after taxes were $7,300,000,000. Dividend payments amounted to $4,800,000,000.

In 1948 corporate profits after taxes were estimated at $20,300,000,000. Of that sum $7,300,000,000 were distributed as dividends.

In 1926 companies paid in dividends an average of 58.9 cents of every dollar of net income.

In 1929 companies paid out as dividends 69.2 cents on each net income dollar.

In 1938 a high of 75.8 cents was paid out of each dollar of net income.

In 1946, 43.7 cents.

In 1947, 38.1 cents.

And in 1948—the lowest amount in history—the share of each profit dollar distributed to stockholders was only 36 cents.

This publication warned last year, and it more earnestly warns management again this year, that such disproportionate withholding of investors' money for whatever fine purpose is short-sighted, unjustified, and is bound to bring on legislated, forced distribution of greater profit percentages. It is for the investor to decide if he wants more of his money put into a particular company, not the managers of the money he has already invested.

No thinking stockholder advocates anything like complete profit distribution; investors want sound companies, with reserves for emergency, with proper funds for modernization, for sensible expansion.

But they are surely entitled to more than one-third of the profits their investment earns. They get no dividends when there are no earnings, as a rule; they should get fair dividends when there are record earnings.

Isn't it plain that one very real reason equity capital is so hard to locate these days is the lack of equity in sharing profits with the man whose money makes them possible? Except for the handful in the sky-high tax brackets, a greater return on their holdings would have much appeal to most investors.

And if the exchange's new effort to attract small savers to stock buying is to succeed, a greater return, a more reasonable share in profits when they are earned, would certainly add tremendous lure.

If managements don't act themselves along such lines, there are indications Congress will.

The following letter is self-explanatory:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 6, 1949.*

Mr. OTIS H. ELLIS,
Executive Director, Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: Thanks for your letter of April 4.

Thought you might be interested in an article in the Forbes magazine, which is a magazine of business, April 1 issue 1949, on page 12, entitled "Directors: Pay More Dividends." When a magazine of this stature writes an article such as this it is evidence that a large number of investors feel that the management of corporations have not given the stockholders the proper consideration.

I trust that your committee will carry through on your ideas as to forcing corporations to pay the stockholders their just proportion of earnings each year, whether the earnings be large or small, and that also management be forced to take up with stockholders the matter of plowing back earnings into properties, equipment, etc. As it is handled now management seldom asks the stockholders, who are the real owners of the corporation, what they want to do with the earnings, but assumes the prerogative of being the sole judge as to what is best for the corporation, which as I see it, is entirely wrong.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD A. MERRILL.

Address of Hon. Tom C. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, south Texas continues to contribute to the welfare and stability of our country and the world. We have been blessed with great natural resources and with people who have the imagination and the courage to work for peace, progress, and prosperity. We are proud of our home, of our democratic heritage, and of the contribution we are making and will make to the world. Last week Corpus Christi played host to the Democrats of south Texas and our friends from throughout the State. We were honored to have as our guest the Honorable Tom Clark, our great Attorney General. He delivered an outstanding address, and I am pleased to share it with you who were not privileged to hear it.

It is good to be among Democrats—especially the south Texas variety.

I know of no other region in the Nation that produces a sturdier or stronger breed of Democrats.

Maybe it's the climate. Democrats around here seem to have many of the characteristics of the cactus plants—their roots go deep, they stay alive the year round. While other political specimens wither and die the Democrats just grow healthier, and when a man tries to kill them out he finds they multiply.

Texas too has a strong representation of Democrats in the Congress. We can take particular pride in the remarkable representation we have there. Two great Texans represent you in the Senate. The voice of TOM CONNALLY is known and respected throughout the world—on both sides of the iron curtain—as an able, fearless advocate for democracy. By his side today stands one of the most vigorous, hard-hitting, loyal public servants ever to represent Texas—a man whom you folks and all Texans know well as your friend—LYNDON JOHNSON. The Nation is fortunate that Texas has two such capable men participating in the law-making of the Nation and the peace-making of the world.

On the other side of the Capitol Texas is represented by a great delegation of alert, forthright Texans, headed by the number-one Democrat of Texas, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the ablest lawmaker in the land.

We—Texas and the Nation—are most fortunate to have our friend JOHN LYLE as your Congressman. You have 23 effective representatives—including some of the most powerful men in Washington—working together as a team. And you have young men of great capacity and impressive sincerity, such as LLOYD BENTSEN, of the valley, there to carry on the tradition of outstanding representation which our great State has enjoyed through the years.

The Democratic Congress is an assembly of wise, intelligent men who are progressive because they are independent. You need not worry about the laws they will write or the actions they will take.

Mary and I have looked forward with real enthusiasm to this visit in Texas and 110-year-old Corpus Christi. We revel in again celebrating the glorious victory of November and the part Texas had in it. We wanted to be among Texans again and hear Texas talk. We knew we would get a shot in the arm from

the invigorating spirit of growth, ambition, and optimism which fills the minds and hearts of Texans.

Fifteen years ago, even 10 years ago, Corpus Christi was nothing but an outpost. Today your city is the capital of the vast region of south Texas, including the Magic Valley.

Texas has had vision—planning for tomorrow.

Because of this, Texas has industry. It will have more.

Texas has a thriving, prosperous trade. It will have more.

Texas has phenomenal growth. That will continue.

Texas has, above all else, opportunity, and today there is no limit on what that opportunity can mean to you, to Texas, to the Nation, and to all the nations which rim this Gulf, the doorstep of Corpus Christi. Your city is representative of Texas progress.

Opportunity has been reborn all over the land. That is an important thing for us to remember. It has not been an accident or a coincidence that freedom of opportunity has been restored to the American heritage within the span of four Democratic administrations.

Wherever you find opportunity in America today, whether in Corpus Christi or any of thousands and thousands of other cities and regions, that opportunity was created by the hard work, intelligent planning, tireless determination, and great faith of the people working as a team.

Two great modern-day Presidents—Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman—two great Democrats in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, and Woodrow Wilson—had faith in the people, and the people had faith in them. Together we have worked out a happier, more prosperous way of life—the American system.

We Americans do not forget our friends, and from long experience the people have learned that Democrats are their friends.

Did you ever think back over our history and realize that every time our country has faced a crisis the people reached out and made a Democrat their President?

Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our party, author of the Declaration of Independence, gave to the Nation the Louisiana Purchase, guaranteeing to America forever a place in the world of great powers.

Andrew Jackson, who returned the government to the people, drove the money changers from the temple of finance, and was a friend of Texas and Sam Houston, and the idol of the American people.

Grover Cleveland, who restored honesty to government; his credo was: "A public office is a public trust."

Woodrow Wilson, who pioneered a new freedom which might have—but for a small group of selfish obstructionists—prevented the Second World War.

Franklin Roosevelt, whose courage and determination restored prosperity and security to a bankrupt nation and made human dignity and individual freedom a reality.

Harry S. Truman, whose great role recast the foreign policy of the United States. It was he who decided that the power of the United States should be used affirmatively in the interests of a decent world. The whole hope of western civilization was in the balance. Harry Truman acted promptly in the Rio Pact, the Truman doctrine, the European-recovery program, and the North Atlantic treaty. And along with these great decisions—made by your President—he gave the world point four of his inaugural address, a program for applying American know-how and resources to the resuscitation of the backward areas of the world. With this planning—this program—aggressive communism is being routed, the disaster of another war averted, and permanent peace—we hope—achieved. As the Washington Star—an independent Republican newspaper—said only this week:

"Once again, in a time of great need, the American system has produced a President who had the wisdom and the courage to make the right decision and the strength of character to act upon it."

These great Democratic leaders had one notable characteristic in common. Unlike some of their contemporaries, these Democrats were not so worried about the past as they were determined to breathe justice, equality under the law, and opportunity into human lives.

That, I would say, is the fundamental belief which distinguishes a Democrat from a Republican. The true Democrat works today while planning for tomorrow.

Some folks ridicule us for this. They accuse us of being starry-eyed dreamers and impractical planners scheming to control the lives of every person and organize their thinking as well as their work. They seem to believe that it is alien to the American way of life for any administration to concern itself with its citizens of today as well as tomorrow.

I say they are wrong. I say they are overlooking the basic spirit of the American dream—a spirit that is neither Democratic nor Republican, but plainly and simply American.

Some folks like to say we do too much planning. They imply that we aren't practical. They fail to recognize that planning is a businessman's word. Show me a good businessman and I'll show you a man who plans for the future. It is the only way a man can stay in business successfully. The Democratic Party is the only party which has recognized this and adapted the principles of good business to the affairs of Government.

When our critics scoff at us or shout alarms about us because we are planning for the future, they ignore the fact that the only occasions when we have been plunged into chaos have been those occasions when the Government had made no preparation for the future but was operating day to day.

Democrats believe an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Unfortunately, some are never willing to pay for the ounce of prevention and never convinced they must buy the pound of cure. When a Democrat suggests we need that ounce of prevention, he is denounced for an alarmist. When he says we need the pound of cure, he is tagged as a spendthrift, a Socialist, or maybe even a Communist.

But names never hurt anyone. When I hear or read vilification of myself I am reminded of a little verse: "To those who talk and talk this motto should appeal: The steam that blows the whistle never turns the wheel."

No matter what our critics say about us, no matter what names they call us, the Democratic Party and the people still understand each other—and they get along together quite well.

A few weeks ago I was reading a Texas newspaper which had an account of a speech delivered at Austin by our own great American, SAM RAYBURN. Speaker RAYBURN told that assemblage of Democrats in Austin just what he told President Truman after the elections last year.

The Speaker said:

"I don't know whether there will be a recession in 1949, but I know there is nothing in our fundamental economy except fear to bring about a depression."

That remark by Speaker RAYBURN is one which all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike, and particularly you businessmen—should consider soberly.

Fear is a terrible thing always, and it is dangerous. It reduces strong men to the illogic of a frightened child awakened by the sound of the wind blowing through an open window. Fear is inflammable. It leaps from person to person, neighbor to neighbor, burning more brightly as it goes.

Since the elections last November there has been a lot—in fact, far too much—scare talk. It did not start down here, but I am sure you have heard it. Scare talk about depression. You have heard the loose predictions that a recession is just around the corner. You have heard men predict all sorts of dire things because of what they think the Democrats will do.

The singers of economic blues and the predictors of dire things are surely short-sighted if they think Texans scare easily. Nor have we forgotten the pollsters' depression of 1948. The November 2 prediction crash. Now that was a depression—the biggest depression in the history of forecasting.

All these panic provokers had to do in order to get the truth about our national economy was to make a simple inquiry. They would have found that there were over 300,000 more persons employed in January 1949 than in January 1948.

And remember this—there were over 100,000 more people employed in January 1949 than in any other January in our country's history. In February—a seasonal month of cold and wintry weather—there were over 30,000 more persons employed than in February 1948. And last month—March—the number of employed increased 479,000.

Looks like the depression forecasters are in the same boat with the pollsters.

Look at business: Earnings in 1948 were 30 percent higher than in 1947; corporate profits the highest in history. Personal income of the people, yours and mine, passed $213,000,000,000, by far the greatest in history. Texans alone earned over $8,000,000,000. Around 60,000,000 people have been continuously employed.

Let's just take inventory, for a moment—right here in Corpus Christi.

Don't you have here more than you have ever had before. You have by careful planning balanced your industry and economy until now there is no reason to worry about your ability to produce more and more goods—nor your ability to sell those goods profitably and quickly.

Your primary concern is whether your consumers, present and potential, have the power to buy those goods. Unless that buying power is present then your prosperity cannot survive.

That was the cause of the depression back in the thirties, the ability to produce and the talent to sell was present, but the power to purchase was gone. Though the Democratic Party inherited a legacy of chaos, collapse, and confusion, it worked, and worked, until today we have unparalleled prosperity. No one wants to return to the economic conditions of the thirties.

If you want to know what the Democrats will do now, if you want to know what the fair-deal program of President Truman means today, I will tell you—it means that the Democrats intend to keep our present-day production levels—yes, and multiplying still more in the future

It can be done, and the Democratic Party will do it.

We believe that by wise, intelligent planning, by bold, courageous action, prosperity can be maintained for a peaceful society.

For example: The Democratic Party believes that you here in Corpus want and should have assistance in expanding your port into a busier, greater gateway to the world. I join your businessmen in the belief that with the proper assistance you can make Corpus Christi a hub of the hemi-

sphere. Are we of the Democratic Party idle dreamers and reckless planners when we agree with you and when we seek to give the Government the power to lend you a helping hand? I for one do not believe we are.

This is not a new way of running this business of government. It is older than our Nation, older even than the recorded history of the North American Continent. Throughout the pages of history, every strong, progressive government has been one which worked for the people.

The Democratic Party, from the age of Jefferson on to the present, has recognized the importance of a working alliance between Government and the people.

We have started building prosperity by developing earning power and buying power at the bottom; we have recognized the folly of concentrating wealth at the top, praying that the wealth will "trickle down."

This is not socialism.

This is not extravagance.

This, I say, is Americanism—the true American way.

You merchants and businessmen and farmers—think, for a moment, what this has meant to you. When a man comes into your place of business today, you can be almost positive that he is coming in to buy, not to beg.

The Democratic Party which won the election last fall, and today holds the reins of government, is the same party in spirit and in purpose as the party which brought us to this era of prosperity. And we didn't do it with promises—we did it with performance. The Democratic Party still has just one goal—the greatest good to the greatest number—and we have no favorites, no enemies. As the rain falls on the just and the unjust alike, the spirit of the Democratic Party permits no narrow prejudices to guide its efforts to make life more rewarding for all Americans.

The Democratic President who sits in the White House—that straight-forward, courageous man from Missouri who fears nothing but God—is not concerned with planning for the left or the right, but with planning what is right and casting aside what is wrong. The Democratic platform is the blueprint. It has not been filed away in the cabinet of forgotten political pledges. Our great leaders—Texans and others alike—are shaping into a living, dynamic reality the progressive plan and program adopted in the City of Brotherly Love—headed by our capable and beloved Vice President, Alben Barkley, this team is busy in the Eighty-first Congress. We can talk about our party's accomplishment there for today it has progressed further in the adoption of its program than any Congress in history. By the 17th of this month all appropriation bills—save one—will have passed the House. The Economic Recovery appropriation will be on the statute books, the Rent Control Act will be in full operation—the creation of a Department of Defense, with a full complement of under secretaries and assistants, will be history. Together they are rapidly forging new legislation for veterans' care, educational aid, labor, housing, medical welfare, and other humanitarian purposes. They will become the law, make no mistake about that. If we are to keep our freedom we must carry out this program. Freedom must be guarded every day, its reality by each individual improved and enlarged. It must be earned by each generation again and again. Harry Truman and Alben Barkley are showing the way. Americans of good will are backing their, and the Democratic Party's, efforts. In a world where freedom is in peril let us thank God for America, for Texas, and our leadership. The future is ours—with God's help we shall make the most of it.

Not All Newspaper Editors Opposed Veterans' Pension Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, fortunately for our veteran population, all newspaper editors were not duped by the false and misleading propaganda disseminated by the social planners against the veterans' pension issue.

Reliable information on the pension issue is now available to all Members of Congress and to the American people. As a result the cost of pensions to needy veterans is recognized by all thoughtful Americans as a necessary aftermath of war.

The North Pittsburgh Times published in Pittsburgh, Pa., is one of the few newspapers in the Nation which had the courage to refresh the memory of its readers with regard to the roseate promises made to veterans when dark war-clouds hovered over our land.

In the April 7, 1949, issue of the North Pittsburgh Times the editor discusses the subject of veterans' pensions, and his observations are of timely importance and worthy of the most thoughtful consideration.

The editorial is as follows:

WE'LL PAY OUR SHARE

So far as we can discover, the Times is about the only paper in western Pennsylvania that is not opposed to pensions for veterans. We make no apology for that stand, rather we elect to champion it.

We start out on the premise that pensions are part of the cost of war. There has never been a war in American history that did not result in pensions or bonuses for the veterans of that war. There never will be one that does not so result. Right or wrong you can mark it down that wars result in pensions. And we think it is right.

Certainly, there are veterans and veterans. There are those who went through the hell of modern combat; there are those who only underwent the trials of an officer's club or a glorified amusement program; and there are those who sat behind a desk in complete security. But which one wasn't uprooted from all of his normal pursuits and assigned his duties subject to military discipline?

Of course, many taxpayers object to paying pensions. Of course, the total bill frightens them. But they weren't frightened in the same way when they were urging the lifting of the arms embargo, short steps to war, and the unconditional surrender of dictators. Oh, no. When trade and commerce were threatened, when the wrong ones were winning, and when our security was jeopardized, we wanted to get into war—and we voted for those who would get us into it.

All that may have been good and wise, but now our tune has changed. It reminds us of the sick sinner who hunts out a saint or of Kipling's Tommy Atkins. We are all for everybody else sacrificing when we are in danger or our welfare is threatened; then when the danger is gone, we aren't so anxious to pay the check.

Please tell us this: We invite your response. How can a Member of Congress vote for the Marshall plan, the new lend-lease, or the improvement of backward countries and vote against pensions for needy veterans? Ask yourself that one. To be sure, the Marshall plan is good business; it is, in fact, good national defense. So is the North Atlantic treaty, and the building up of backward countries may pay dividends, but we also have to pay our bills. And whether we like it or not, one of those bills is pensions for needy veterans.

Granted, you can throw out Members of Congress or members of the General Assembly who vote for pensions. But you can't put people in their places who won't do the same thing. The best, from a tax-saving viewpoint, that is possible is someone who will keep pensions within reason.

In that connection, the veterans' organizations must help. As they served in war, so must they serve in peace. They must keep their requests within realistic bounds. Their sacrifices and the sacrifices of their comrades must not be rendered in vain because of exorbitant pensions. No matter how just their claims, prudence dictates that they must be tempered by the ability to pay. Our freedom can only be lost by economic collapse. Economic collapse can only come from prolonged excessive taxation.

We could go on and on. The matter, however, can be summarized. Needy veterans deserve; they should have the help of a grateful Nation. Veterans generally should limit their righteous demands to what the traffic will bear. The Nation is not without a sense of obligation. What is right will be done to the limit of ability. We only urge that the taxpayer remember pensions are a part of the cost of war and that veterans remember that all of the costs of their sacrifices can't possibly be paid.

By way of a footnote: We just can't stand the glorification of war veterans in Congress with incomes of $15,000 and up, who vote against pensions for their needy comrades, whose problems they always understand in campaign speeches.

American Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to realize that there is an ever increasing interest being taken by Congress in building up our merchant marine. One of the latest indications of this growing interest is the building of a new superliner in the near future under authority and funds already provided for.

In this connection and as part of my remarks I include an editorial published in the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J., April 12, 1949, entitled "Third Step Toward Real United States Maritime Fleet," reading as follows:

THIRD STEP TOWARD REAL UNITED STATES MARITIME FLEET

This country's postwar passenger shipbuilding program has advanced another long step with the United States Lines' authorization of the first American superliner.

The new vessel is to be built at Newport News, Va., at a total cost of $70,373,000. She is to be delivered some time during 1952. Her cruising speed will be between 28 to 30 knots, so that for the first time an American-built ship will be able to challenge for speed

records on the North Atlantic, the area she will serve.

The superliner will gross only 48,000 tons, which is little more than half the size of the *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*. But she will carry a crew of 1,000 and luxury accommodations for 2,000 passengers, and will be able to pass through the locks of the Panama Canal, which the two *Queens* with their broader beams cannot do.

At present our largest merchant liner is the 26,000-ton *America*, and it has been more than 50 years since the United States has built a large luxury ship to compete with the best of those under foreign flags.

The new vessel will be built for easy conversion to use as a troop transport, and will incorporate many of the latest defense features, of which her high speed is one of the most important. She will be able to carry an entire division at one time.

The Government, from the $203,000,000 fund granted the Maritime Commission by Congress, will pay the major portion of the ship's cost—$42,285,784. The steamship company will pay $28,087,216. Since the Navy would probably have had to build such a vessel entirely from Government funds if this one were not constructed, this division of costs does not appear to be a bad bargain.

Authorization of the superliner is the third key move this year toward laying the foundation of a great new American passenger fleet, the value of which has been well demonstrated both in war and peacetime.

The first step in this program was taken only recently here in Camden when the New York Shipbuilding Corp. laid the keel of the *President Jackson*, one of three 12,600-ton passenger-cargo vessels for the round-the-world trade of the American President Lines.

The second came a day later at Quincy, Mass., when the Bethlehem Steel Co. laid the keel for the first of two 20,000-ton express liners to sail between New York and Italy.

Building of all these ships is most significant to the Nation.

They will enable American companies to compete more adequately on the high seas for commerce, passenger, and cargo with the government-subsidized ships of foreign countries.

They mean much in the survival and revival of our stagnant shipbuilding industry, keeping skilled labor at work and available for emergency and keeping shipyard plants from rusting away.

They will provide the Nation with ships specially designed for quick conversion to transport use so that we will not have again to rely solely on uncomfortable and insufficient cargo vessels for that purpose.

It is cause for congratulation that restoration of a real American fleet to the seas is under way, and that it is being accomplished so largely through private enterprise.

"Fixing" of Athletic Contests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Resolution No. 13 adopted by the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois on April 6, 1949:

Whereas all sports-minded Americans have been shocked by the brazen attempts of certain disreputable individuals to fix athletic contests and sporting events by bribing participants therein; and

Whereas these nefarious activities tend to bring all sports into disrepute and, unless effectively checked, may cause the ruin of American athletics; and

Whereas sporting events provide needed entertainment for millions of Americans, and participation in wholesome athletic endeavor builds strong bodies and inculcates lofty moral ideals among the youth of America, so that sports may truly be considered the backbone of our Nation, and their protection a matter of national concern; and

Whereas the laws of the several States are inadequate to cope with the menace of bribery where interstate activity is involved, unless supplemented by effective legislation on a national scale; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to exert its earnest efforts to preserve the American sporting heritage by the prompt enactment of a stern and effective law designed to eliminate attempts to influence the results of sporting events and athletic contests by bribing competitors or officials; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be prepared by the Secretary of State and forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Illinois, and to each of the Representatives in the Congress of the United States from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, April 6, 1949.

SHERWOOD DUNN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

I Made a Great Error, Thank God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since the publication of my article, Why Cannot the Republican Party Learn Anything Anymore, which article appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, April 8, 1949, I have received a communication, dated April 12, 1949, from Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., chairman of the Republican National Committee, 1337 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C., as follows:

DEAR MR. O'SULLIVAN: I have read your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 8, 1949. I assume that you would not knowingly misquote a colleague and, therefore, I take this opportunity to call to your attention a statement attributed to me at Omaha which never happened there or anywhere else.

I have never used the phrase or reference, "better people with better minds," and while it may have helped the context of your article, it would not have been inserted, I am sure, had you first checked the information.

I am not in any way interested in a retraction, but simply wanted to mention as one colleague to another that the statement was not made by me, and I trust that you will be good enough to accept my word to that effect and that the reference will not be made again.

Naturally I accept the word of my colleague that he never used the phrase or reference "better people with better minds," even though I was rather reliably, but quite apparently incorrectly informed about my colleague's Omaha statement. I shall be in Omaha in a few days and will check carefully the source of my information and if it had any basis in fact I shall make a further report to my worthy colleague and will have something further to report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It goes without saying that I rejoice and that I am very much relieved to learn that my worthy colleague has not claimed at any time or in any place that the Republican Party is composed of the "better people with better minds," and I feel sure that it is the truth that the people in the Republican Party are neither the better nor the brainier, and I am sure that the experiences of the past 20 years have disclosed so undisputably that to be the fact.

For the Democratic Party, since there is now an open claim, I now appropriate the thought that it, and it alone, contains the "better people and the better minds," and I shall not deny to anyone that I made that statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in every other place where I have spoken or may hereafter speak, and I pledge you that I shall never again say that the Republican leadership has ever made the claim anywhere that its party is composed of the "better people with better minds" because that is surely not true and cannot be claimed by its leadership.

Address by Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a copy of a speech delivered by me several months ago in the city of Shreveport, La., to a large gathering of junior chamber of commerce members. I later broadcast this address. I think the printing of it is timely now as it is on flood control and especially covers the magnificent work of the Army engineers both in peace and in war. It is as follows:

Flood-control bills will still pass Congress and the work will still continue. The heavy demand for American money from foreign sources and the pressure of one succession of crises in the battle of Berlin leave little doubt in my mind that we must fight our way forward for everything which we can obtain from Congress on flood control and river development. I expect to fight for every project which will aid in the development of our valley and which will aid in making it safe from annual floods and crevasses. I believe with reasonable certainty we can hope to obtain funds for the com-

pletion of the Bayou Dodcau Dam and Reservoir project which will involve some $400,000. I intend to press for more money on the Shreveport-Bossier City levee and revetment work which will need some $400,000 more. Certainly, at this point in the valley, we want to see an appropriation for five or six million dollars for the Texarkana Reservoir which means so much to us and another $1,000,000 for bank-protection work on Red River below Denison, Tex., to the mouth of the river. I am most anxious to witness the beginning of the Ferrel Bridge project in Texas with at least a million dollars and the Mooringsport Reservoir (Caddo Lake project) begun with another $1,000,000.

On the Overton waterway project, we face a hard battle. We will be most fortunate if we obtain any money for this project; but with the knowledge of the extreme importance to the entire valley of this water navigation, I am going to do my best to obtain in the House money necessary to continue the planning work on the project. Any amount, even as low as $300,000 will be most satisfactory to me. It is not necessary that I again say this project and others like it in Louisiana took a tremendous setback with the death of Senator Overton for whom the project is named. We must therefore reorganize our forces and do the best we can to push this matter to the fore in Congress at an early date.

I do not believe that I have to sell any person at this meeting upon the vital importance of flood control. A large part of the future of not only Shreveport but of the entire Red River Valley is tied up with the progress of valley development. Our work in this respect has already added untold millions in wealth—increasing assessments on land and making available additional land suitable for agricultural purposes in many parts of the valley. I do not have to refer to the increase in land values in parts of Bossier City and Shreveport, especially in the Broadmoor section of the city resulting from fin work done by the Army engineers in this section of the Southwest.

This work of flood control is tied up with other important work of the Federal Government. There is, for instance, the soil-conservation work. While these great rivers which traverse our State bringing the floodwaters of many sections of the Nation down upon us are being turned into benign forces for good, they are also at times some of the most destructive forces with which we have to contend. I do not refer entirely to the matter of floods, as destructive as we know floods are to our people and to property. I refer also to land erosion and soil wash. This has become, and is now, a tremendously important problem throughout the United States. The other day I had the opportunity of making an inspection of Red River from Denison to the mouth of the river. As this inspection ended in south Louisiana, our party proceeded from New Orleans to the mouth of the Mississippi. At this point, we had the experience of watching the dredging work being done to maintain a 40-foot channel in the river at this point.

I was much impressed at the line in the water which marks the end of the Mississippi and the beginning of the Gulf of Mexico. It is clear, sharp, and distinct. You can see it easily. The ugly, muddy water of the Mississippi River dumps its load of silt at that point and, clearing up, becomes a part of the Gulf of Mexico. This silt, which is literally dumped on the bottom of the river at this point, keeps up the age-old process of filling up the bottom of the river. The engineers are under instructions to maintain a 40-foot channel; and for this purpose, they have acquired at a cost of some $5,000,000 a specially designed boat which scoops the mud from the river-bottom and loads it in the hold of the boat. This is done by means of huge tubes which are lowered into the water and rest on the bottom. A large sleeve or mechanical shoe sucks the liquid mud from the bottom into the boat. In 45 minutes, they told me, 6 tons of silt is loaded in the boat; and it is then hauled some 12 miles out to sea to the deep water where it is dumped into the bottom of the Gulf, being lost forever to our people. This process of lifting the silt from the bottom of the river and dumping it into the deep Gulf continues 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 9 or 10 months each year. It is almost endless; and in the course of 1 year alone some tons of the richest soil God Almighty ever gave to mankind is lost forever to useful pursuits.

You ask, perhaps, what is this to me? What have I got to do with the mud on the bottom of the Mississippi River at its mouth 100 miles below New Orleans? My answer is this: That mud is your farm. A large part of it comes from the Red River Valley. I can identify it by its color. It is the rich top 7 inches of our soil, the soil which nature has been building up throughout the ages and eons of time. It is the best part of your land—and I know you here well enough to know that many of you have farms. That silt being daily scooped from the bed of the Mississippi and dumped into the Gulf is the top part of your farm—the richest part of it—and the part which cost you most when you bought it and the part which is of greatest service to you in using the farm. It is said that a 180-acre farm flows down the Mississippi River past New Orleans every day in the year. Certain enough soil flows down the Mississippi each day to fertilize and enrich a 1,000-acre farm each day.

The Army engineers are doing a fine job keeping open the south pass at 35 feet and the southwest pass at 40 feet depth. It is not an easy one to keep the river open as our farms literally flow down the river. It is a most important one. And, generally speaking, I think the Army engineers have done a most creditable job in our river and harbor work. They now have the years of experience behind them; and we must not permit this work to be taken from them and given to other agencies.

Several weeks ago President Herbert Hoover came out with a report which is most disturbing to me. The Hoover report recommends the consolidation of all Federal building agencies into one huge Department of Public Works. Ordinarily I am in favor of consolidations. I am not in favor of this particular recommendation and I propose to fight it.

This report, as I understand it, will have the effect of taking from the Army engineers all civil functions. It will mean that the agency which has had control of this type of construction since the origin of Federal flood control and river and harbor work would now give it up; and all of the wealth of experience obtained throughout the years by this agency will be lost. I think it is certainly a mistake to make this type of change in our Government.

This matter is much more important than this. The river and harbor work was originally placed under the Corps of Army Engineers because it is a peacetime work; and the Corps of Engineers was available for this purpose. The Army engineers could very easily have given up this work; and accepted throughout the years a much more uneventful existence by confining itself to Army service duties. Such an attitude would have taken from availability some of our finest engineers during times of peace. It would have retarded much and by many years the progress of our flood control and our rivers and harbors program. It would have postponed the day when we in the Red River Valley could have expected to make our people and our homes floodproof from the disastrous effects of the constant deluge of high water which comes from the States located above us. Such a course might easily have proven disastrous to our whole program.

But I think the recommendations of the Hoover report are even more objectionable to us from a defense viewpoint. The Corps of Engineers is one part of our defense system which performs a similar type of service both in peace and war. It is true that in time of war the hazards of the service are immensely increased. It is true that some of the problems are immensely magnified and the conditions of living are altered. It is true that in times of peace the building program of the Army engineers calls largely for careful planning, skill, and efficiency of service. These are qualities needed also in time of war. War calls also for physical strength, valor, and courage. It calls for patriotism of the highest order. But in the performance of its wartime duties, the Corps of Engineers relies upon the experience gained in times of peace.

I was told that this was the case before the Second World War. During the months of November and December of 1944 when I was in Europe at the request of the Army to inspect conditions at the front and make a report to Congress, I had occasion to make an inspection especially of the work of the Army engineers. On one particular occasion, I was taken to the front by an engineer colonel, whose home is in Washington State, as I recall. He is now retired and gone back to his home. A very able officer, he completely lacked the quality of fear. On the occasion to which I refer, the colonel took Congressman DAVIS and myself along the great Albert Canal. A look at the map shows us at once the importance of the Albert Canal to Europe as one of its main waterways. It connects the great port of Antwerp, Belgium, with the Meuse River. It was therefore desperately needed by our people as a means of supply to our entire Army which at that time occupied positions facing the Rhine River in its desperate drive on the Ruhr Basin and on the great German steel and industrial center in the Ruhr Valley.

Some 55 bridges over this canal had been wrecked by the retreating Germans and these bridges had to be repaired; and what was equally important, the debris from this wreckage had to be removed from the bottom of the canal if it were to be of any service or use to our troops. Canal boats had been destroyed in the channel of the canal. Canal locks had been injured—luckily for us not very seriously injured—and had to be repaired. At points the sides of the canal had been shattered and thrown in the bottom of the channel. Much work had to be done—and under most difficult conditions. The canal paralleled the front line and, at that time, it was located almost within rifle range of the front German lines.

As combat engineers manned the guns, others went to work like beavers to clean the canal and repair the damages. I saw a crew of engineers on one bridge, taking time successively working on the damaged bridge and manning the antiaircraft guns. If you want to see men really work, watch them when they are under fire. They turn out more work in 10 minutes than you would think possible in an hour. They literally perform miracles; and these engineers did that very thing. In an unbelievably short time, the canal had been cleaned and, although not completely repaired, was in such a shape as to sustain water traffic. Before the Germans realized it, this great waterway (the most important from our standpoint in all Europe) began to move heavy war munitions from the great port of Antwerp, Belgium, southward, dropping it off at various points along the lines for our truck transportation units to pick up and move to the units where it was badly needed.

As I saw our combat engineers perform these miracles of repair to roads and bridges

and airports, I realized then the need at the front for the heavy dirt-moving machines which we saw daily along the banks of the lower Mississippi and the Red. I had seen bulldozers, caterpillars, draglines, and other heavy equipment which we see in use in Louisiana at work along our water-swollen rivers for days moving up to the front. I began to wonder what was the need for all of this equipment and why place this slow-moving machinery on roads already crowded with men and artillery and ambulances moving to the front. It was only after I saw this equipment actually in use by our engineers that I realized this was just as important in the winning of the war as was ammunition.

As I stood there on the banks of the Albert Canal, my mind slipped back to scenes in Louisiana during periods of high water and during times of crevasses. The rush, the frenzy, the maddening haste was all there, although on a much larger scale; the equipment and the machines were present; and the men were in uniform and worked at unbelievable speeds. The same routine and methods were in use in repairing this canal and cleaning the river with which it connected as was used in flood-control work in the United States. The same general principles of organization and of planning were present; the same materials were needed and the same knowledge and training was necessary.

You learn fast on the front and under fire. You either learn fast or you don't learn at all. So it didn't take me long to learn that the basic experience and training that our Corps of Engineers receives as it works out its problems of flood control and of navigation in California, Connecticut, and Louisiana paid huge dividends in valuable service and made possible a superb record in the late war. Others may cry about consolidation; but for my part I think the training which our Corps of Army Engineers receives in its peacetime civil-functions program is worth more than all the savings which the wildest advocate of efficiency and consolidation would predict. More than this, I think this training makes possible superb efficiency and performance when the dark clouds of war lower upon our continent. It is a guaranty of readiness in an emergency and an assurance of training in war emergency. Consolidation may add to efficiency of Government in time of peace; but it takes from it in time of war.

My friends, the Corps of Engineers has a glorious history in war as well as in peace. I would not see them disturbed or disrupted one iota. It was a colonel in the Army Engineers who set foot in Normandy 24 hours before D-day. It was the combat engineers who cleared the way, clipped the first barbed-wire entanglements, repaired the beaches, rebuilt the bridges and cleaned the roads so that our troops could proceed from the beachhead in Normandy to higher ground and to more protection. It was our peacetime trained Army engineers that spilled their blood at the first landings in Normandy and at the last surrender of the last Jap in the Orient. Billions of dollars of construction was handled by them. Thousands of airports were built by them and countless other installations desperately needed to win the war as quickly as possible.

It is not surprising, then, to see as one lands on the now historic Omaha beachhead in France a small stone shaft, already constructed, to the memory of the First Battalion of Army Engineers. It is located where the First Engineers landed on hostile shores and stands as a silent marker to the glorious performance of our Corps of Engineers who, while trained in times of peace in their active work for flood control and rivers and harbors, yet are fully able and ready to immediately divert their experience and background to the critical demands of war. I would not take one jot or tittle from any other branch of service; but I certainly feel the time is ripe to acknowledge a job well done by our engineers.

The Hoover report makes a mistake in seeking to disrupt this organization. It will bring about inefficiency rather than efficiency. It will take from our Corps of Engineers the training and experience which is priceless in our hour of crisis. It brings to us no assurance of economy or efficient public service. It is faint reward to men who have such a remarkable history of performance during the times of need in the past. I am, therefore, going to vigorously oppose the Hoover report to consolidate into one agency all Government construction.

Establishing Two-Price System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of New Castle, Ind.:

ESTABLISHING TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

Obviously, the new farm program suggested by Secretary Brannan is a definite introduction of a two-price system, one guaranteeing the farmers high prices and the other giving consumers the hope and benefit of low prices. Naturally this cannot be done without someone paying the bill, and that someone is the taxpayers who will pay for the subsidies the Government dishes out to maintain prices, to the farmers on the one hand and trying to retain the good will of the consumers on the other with lower prices. Under such a plan, if the Government decides the farmer is entitled to 35 cents a dozen for eggs, which they are costing the consumer only 25 cents, the Government makes up the 10 cents difference.

The thing might even be extended to other lines. When automobile sales slump, why not let the consumer have a new car for $1,000 and let the Government pay the manufacturer the difference? The principle is exactly the same. The New York Times sees it this way:

"As for the old 'parity' that would be supplanted by a new and startling concept of 'normality,' the administration would set as its target a 'minimum income' goal designed to assure agriculture as much buying power as it had in 'the first 10 years of the previous 12-year period.' Put more nakedly, the target for 1950 would be the average farm income for the wholly abnormal war and postwar years, 1939–48, when both production and prices were the highest in the Nation's history. The average farm income for that decade was $26,234,000,000, compared with $7,877,000,000 for 1939.

"Only one logical explanation suggests itself for the sudden emergency out of nowhere of this proposed new adventure in agricultural planning with its economic legerdemain and its promise of unprecedented largess to the farmer. It has all the earmarks of a heavy-handed attempt to repair the political damage sustained by the administration as a result of the recent decline in farm prices, and at the same time to top the Republican bid for agriculture's favor represented by the comparatively conservative Aiken law."

Weakening Our National Security Can Please None Save the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for several months past, a widely read, and, unfortunately, widely believed publication, Reader's Digest, has been running a series of articles by one William Bradford Huie, sharply critical of policies of Congress and the national military establishment, and portraying a dangerous foreign policy.

I have no quarrel with the right of anyone to express opinions—even opinions which I do not share—provided they are produced from irreducible truth. The Huie articles not only evade the truth, they employ deliberate falsehood to bolster a preconceived opinion. I say "deliberate" falsehood, since much of the opinion and most of the supporting testimony is merely a condensation of opinion and false witness contained in the discredited book The Case Against the Admirals, written by Huie. A rather detailed listing and refutation of the half-truths and outright falsifications contained in that book was placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by me on March 6, 1947.

I am surprised that a magazine with such an efficient research department and with such a splendid reputation for integrity as Reader's Digest has published these articles. And it is only because of the previous high repute of the Digest that I deign to take the time of my colleagues with this discussion of the articles and Huie.

The articles in question criticize the size and role and missions of the Navy, Army, and Air Force. We know these missions will not be determined by magazine articles or gossip columnists. It is done by the President, upon recommendation of the National Military Establishment, and by the Congress. Phonies like Huie, when given the audience supplied by Reader's Digest do nothing but impair public confidence in the acts of Congress.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is the Huies and the de Severskys and the gossip columnists who are interfering most with the smooth working of our unified national defense. The Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries for Army, Navy, and Air and the chief military heads of each service have all been working together to iron out the difficulties of the unification program as authorized by Congress. Our national security is unified. We all know that in the beginning there have been bugs, and there are still some bugs to come. This unification was a revolutionary departure from custom, and it could not be implemented overnight. But it is working and the three services are in agreement over fundamental concepts.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress, and particularly those of us on the Armed Services Committee, know that there is no snarling fight between the services. But the Huies and other sensation-seeking writers are giving the impression there is. When they do they retard the smooth working of our national defense set-up, and that weakens our security. Weakening our national security can please none save the Kremlin.

I keep returning, however, to the question of why Reader's Digest, with its wide facilities for research, is publishing the Huie articles. I am sure they are fully familiar with Huie's background. That, alone, should have had led them to check thoroughly the supporting statements Huie puts in his articles. Had that been done, the articles could never have been printed, unless Reader's Digest wants only to sabotage our national security.

This is not the first time Huie has written something for profit which was based upon untruths. In 1941 Huie—now an expert on matters of national defense—was an export on sports—intercollegiate football to be exact. In that year Collier's magazine published an article by him, How To Keep Football Stars in College. It was an indictment of the University of Alabama, the alma mater of some of our most distinguished colleagues here in Congress. Collier's was immediately faced with threats of libel suits. It made an investigation, and, on April 5, 1941, published an apology, which read, in part:

> On the basis of information which was considered reliable * * * (Collier's) accepted and published the article in good faith. Searching inquiry did not confirm Mr. Huie's statements * * * Collier's is convinced that a serious injustice was done the University of Alabama, its faculty, its athletic coaches, its students, and its alumni by publication of the article referred to, and for this reason we sincerely regret its publication and are happy to make this statement.

It was profitable, in 1941, for Huie to be an athletic expert and write about subsidization—without bothering to obtain facts.

A little later, in 1942, Huie turned up as an authority on another subject, and he may have the proper background for it. In 1942 he published one of those sexy novels which clutter up our bookstands.

It was about this time Huie began acquiring his only experience with military matters. After the Collier's article he was hired by American Mercury as a ghost for Gen. Hugh Knerr, now Inspector General of the United States Air Force, and then a colonel in the Army on inactive duty, and A. P. de Seversky. In 1943 he came to the Navy Department seeking information on the construction battalion organization—the Seabees.

This was the time when the commanding officer at Camp Perry, Williamsburg—the Seabee boot camp—was under criticism in the press and in Congress for raising hogs. Huie was alarmingly frank in stating that his article would be unfavorable. He was also alarmingly frank in telling Bureau of Yards and Docks public-relations officers that his draft board was breathing down his neck. The upshot was that he enlisted in the Seabees, was given the rating of chief carpenter's mate, and sent to Camp Perry where he was given a public-relations assignment.

Next he was sent to Alaska with a Seabee battalion for public-relations duty. There he began issuing press releases without clearing them with the commanding officer and using Navy communications for his own purposes without obtaining permission. Those of us who have served with the armed forces can well understand the reaction of the commandant. When Huie was called on the carpet he informed the commandant that as public-relations personnel he was responsible not to the local command but to the Secretary of the Navy. The commandant, looking at Huie's rating badge, decided he would no longer have a public-relations assignment, and assigned him to a detail chopping firewood. Huie squawked. Bureau of Yards and Docks had him returned to Washington.

Here Huie again applied for a commission, and it was granted, and he became an ensign and was quickly spotted to junior grade lieutenant. He was then ordered to Europe to send back material for Navy Department press release on Seabee activities and Bureau of Yards and Docks equipment, such as mulberry. He went ashore at Normandy on M-plus-five. Nothing was heard from him for some time, when there showed up in the Navy Department Office of Public Relations some articles written by Huie for American Mercury. These were frozen and Huie was informed (1) as a Navy public-relations officer he could not write for personal profit, using material obtained in line of duty, and (2) material prepared by him must be made available to all media, and not channeled to one particular publication.

Whereupon, Huie, when he returned to the United States, requested that he be permitted to resign his commission on grounds that he was not cut out to be a naval officer and lacked the technical knowledge to discharge his duties. His request for permission to resign was turned down, and he filed another request, seeking inactive duty. This was granted and he was returned to inactive duty, even though the war was still in progress and its end not in sight.

These, then, are the qualifications of a man who is being passed off by Reader's Digest as an expert on national security—one of that group of armchair strategists and Monday-morning quarterbacks who pontificate military strategy and tactics on the basis of half-truths and outright untruths. The Congress of the United States determines national security policy. What kind of policy would we write here in the Capitol if we depended on gossip columnists, armchair strategists, and Monday-morning quarterbacks. We do not write military policy until we have thoroughly examined and investigated every item of supporting testimony that has been offered—not once, but four separate times. The legislative committees of the House and of the Senate each conducts its own separate investigation into the facts of military life. Once a policy has been determined, the Appropriations Subcommittee of each House conducts further exhaustive studies before providing the money to implement policy. Thus the military policy of this country is determined on the basis of irreducible truth.

The Reader's Digest and Huie are not satisfied with that democratic and constitutional means of civilian rule of the National Military Establishment. Because of some petty gripe against the Navy, they are urging a Maginot-minded theory of national security which can serve no useful purpose but to impair the confidence of the people in the ability of Congress as an institution to discharge its duties. And that, Mr. Speaker, is playing only into the hands of the Kremlin.

As previously stated, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the right of anybody to have an opinion, provided that opinion is based on fact. Reader's Digest and Mr. Huie have presented these articles and given the impression that supporting arguments contain a listing of facts. Any perusal, not even too careful, by informed persons, indicates that they are shot through with half-truths and outright untruths. I should like to call your attention to some of the more flagrant misstatements in the Huie articles.

Huie said Russia has no naval or merchant fleet worth mentioning. This is not true. The Committee on Armed Services of the House has announced that Russia has the largest, most modern submarine fleet. She is building 45,000-ton battleships—larger editions of the German pocket battleship. She has a surface fleet sufficient to contest the Baltic, eastern Mediterranean, Adriatic, and western North Sea. Her merchant tonnage is almost equal to that of Japan on December 7, 1941.

The Air Force can give Moscow and Magnitogorsk multiple doses of what struck Hiroshima, reports Huie. This is true only if Russia stays behind her own boundaries and offers no resistance. In the face of resistance, United States bombers must have advance bases in order to have fighter protection. Mr. Speaker I have the greatest admiration for the skill and abilities and potentialities of the Air Force, but, like Generals Bradley and Vandenburg, I realize that one weapon—the long-range bomber—cannot, single handedly, win a war.

Huie said none of Russia's vital industry is within range of naval weapons. This is untrue, and largely an academic question, since such an attack by the Navy is strategic and stragetic bombing is but a secondary role for the Navy and is carried out only when the Air Force requests and directs it. If the Air Force is denied close-in air bases, only carrier-based aviation could get at Russia's vital industries. There is no military target on the Eurasian land mass out of range of existing naval aircraft operating from carriers up to 300 miles from the coast.

Huie said the Navy's answer is that it will not be relegated to such a secondary role. He was discussing the Navy as a transporter of troops and equipment and in connection with its antisubmarine warfare. I do not know what he was talking about when he spoke of the Navy's refusal to be relegated to a secondary role. The mission of each of the three armed services was determined, by unanimous agreement, at the Key West and Newport conferences. Moreover the Navy has publicly and enthusiastically announced its emphasis on antisubmarine warfare.

Huie said you do not fight submarines with big carriers, you use jeeps. As a Congressman and as a Reserve naval officer, who saw combat service in two world wars, I should like to observe that you fight submarines with everything you have. Submarines are combated in two ways: First, you try to destroy submarines in the open sea; and second, you destroy them at home in their pens. If you have close-in air bases shore-based aircraft can be used against submarine pens, as was done against Germany. Otherwise you send carriers out to bomb these pens, as was done against Japan.

Huie said the Navy does not have enough roles to justify its present size. Huie might think the Navy does not but the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which recommended the size of the three services, and the Congress, which set the size, think so.

Huie said we are now buying more planes for the Navy than we are for the Air Force. That is like saying there is more food in a dish of peas—containing many individual peas—than there is in a T-bone steak, which is just one steak.

The real determination is air-frame weight, as was brought out in the hearings before the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, when we were proposing the 70-group air force. I might say, in this connection, to illustrate the close integration of the armed services, that we called the Navy in on the 70-group proposal and they did not oppose it.

But to get back to the difference between the Air Force and the Navy in the matter of aircraft. In terms of airframe weight, in this year's appropriation, the obligational authority for the Air Force will be about 27,000,000 pounds, and the equivalent figure for the Navy will be 7,700,000 pounds, which is about 3½ to 1. This determination was made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and is based upon the requirements of each service to carry out its assigned mission.

Huie said naval aviation is short-ranged. This, of course, is completely false. The range of naval aviation is the radius of its aircraft plus the range of its carriers. Naval aircraft, during the war, ranged to the Japanese homeland. They are at present ranging to the eastern Mediterranean. The range of Air Force strategic bombers is the distance from the United States of its advance bases plus the range of the planes themselves. Range and radius are two distinct terms, which Mr. Huie has confusedly mixed up and misused.

We have, according to Huie and Reader's Digest, the largest, most efficient submarine fleet in the world. I agree about the efficiency of our submarine fleet, but not about its size. Russia has nearly 300 submarines. The United States has 80 active and 100 in reserve.

Huie says the Navy plan calls for the construction of at least six supercarriers. This is not true. I was a member of the subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Hess, which authorized the 65,000-ton carrier. The Navy asked for authority, which was granted, to build only one prototype supercarrier. To further illustrate the integration existing in the armed services, we sought testimony from the Air Force on this bill. We were informed that the Air Force saw nothing in the supercarrier that represented an overlapping of their mission on the part of the Navy.

Next, I want to read a direct quote from Huie's article in the December Digest:

> On the day that 2,800 men died at Pearl Harbor these admirals were still restricting * * * land based bombers from Hawaii to no more than 300 miles at sea.

That is completely false. In the first place in 1941—and now—the Navy had no authority whatsoever to restrict the range of planes other than their own. Secretary Symington of the Air Force stated quite definitely in Hawaii, on June 29, 1946, that it was the Secretary of the War and his staff in 1937 who had ruled that Army planes should have only a 300 mile off-shore radius.

Reader's Digest and Huie said that the Navy Industrial Association and the Navy League of the United States were organizations through which the Navy carried on propaganda, and stated that the Navy League jumped when Navy Public Relations cracked the whip.

Navy Industrial Association is composed of industrialists with Navy contracts. They were, for a time, members of the Navy Council, an advisory and consulting group composed of organizations with the common aim of promoting naval interest. NIA resigned from Navy Council offering as its reason that it did not share that common aim.

As for the Navy League, they were at one time banned from entering any Naval Establishment on orders from the Secretary of the Navy. Neither of these historical facts sounds like organizations being used for Navy propaganda.

Huie told his Reader's Digest audience that the Navy looks after the health of Congressmen. Congress hires its own medical officer. For a number of years the medical officer has been Dr. George Calver, a retired rear admiral in the Medical Corps, who entered the Navy as a Reserve. Huie also refers to the fact that some of us have gone to Bethesda Naval Hospital. Military hospitals are operated on an interservice basis, open to members of all services, regardless of which one is in charge of a particular facility, and available to civilian Government officials needing hospitalization. We can go to Walter Reed or a Public Health Service hospital just as readily as we go to Bethesda. In fact, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] is now in Walter Reed.

Huie has gotten himself completely involved in his various discussions of the 65,000-ton carrier, and by his own assertions admits his statements are false.

In his first article, published in the December issue of the Digest, he said:

> Instead of taking off from a vulnerable strategic carrier in the North Sea with six B–29's, why not take off from Iceland or England with 60?

As everyone knows, the B–29, which Huie assumes can and will take off from the big carrier, is the same plane that delivered the atom bomb to Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Bikini. Yet in the March issue, he makes the assertion that atom-bomb planes cannot take off and land from the carrier.

The Navy makes no contention that the B–29 can be operated from the big carrier, but planes capable of carrying the atom bomb can take off from and land on even smaller carriers. Members of Congress have observed the operation and considerably more than six can be in the bombing groups.

Huie, when repeating misstatements of fact, should at least be consistent. He, has furthermore, misrepresented the cost of the big carrier, putting it at more than a billion dollars. He reaches this figure by citing the cost of ships which would operate with the big carrier in a task force, ships already built and operable.

Huie, in trying to present the Maginot-minded thesis of a single-instrument national security force, is also very inconsistent. In his March piece he claims the Air Force is not satisfied with the B–29, the B–50, or the B–36, yet, in the same breath, he urges a 2,000-plane fleet of these types.

He is further inconsistent in his own arguments, when, in the January issue of the Digest, he reasoned (1) we should not have a Navy because no potential enemy possesses one and (2) we should also not have an Army because the potential enemy has too big an Army.

I am not going to discuss too much his January article, because I am sure if the same piece had appeared in Pravda we would be at war now. The State Department was very much concerned over the reaction to the January piece, and I, for one, do not wish to give it further circulation.

Huie and the Reader's Digest in April recount elaborate tests of bombing against the battleship *Utah* off the California coast. The results of these tests were described by Huie as sensationally successful, but he said are kept secret by evil individuals. Before the war the Navy carried out intensive bombing training and testing on the *Utah*. Undoubtedly Army Air Force planes participated. I have no idea what Huie means about sensationally successful, but it should be recalled that the *Utah* was used as a radio-controlled target and was uninhabited. Yet she did not sink until Japanese naval aviation sank her at Pearl Harbor.

Most of the misstatements I have mentioned here are old and familiar. Huie used them in his book, The Case Against the Admirals. For a detailed listing of the errors in that book, I refer to an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1947. I could list many more misstatements and half truths from the Reader's Digest, but I think those mentioned are sufficient to prove the point that Mr. Huie is merely writing a line which at the moment appears profitable. He told the Washington Pen Club he does not have the convictions he portrays in his articles.

Mr. Huie is from Alabama. Down there they know him for what he is. I call your attention to an editorial from the Brewton Standard, a newspaper published in Brewton, Ala., as an expression of the regard for Mr. Huie held by some Alabamans. I include this editorial as a part of my remarks.

[From the Brewton (Ala.) Standard of November 18]

ALABAMA CONTRIBUTES TO THE FIELD OF LITERARY ARTS

According to the latest hot dope, Alabama is making another contribution to the field of literary arts, this time with a military angle. William Bradford Huie, "widely known authority on air power and naval history," and native of the State, is going to expound on how the United States Navy is out to steal the show from the Air Force.

It is nice to find that Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, has graduated to the upper brackets. In fact, Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, has gone a long way since his mud-pie days when he was an authority on athletics. Back about 1940, Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, was a peanut-sized pundit on football as it is bought and paid for in the Southeastern Conference.

In those days, Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, exposed the hideous fact that some college ball players get paid for their talents. He did this so vividly that the magazine carrying Mr. Huie's article was promptly threatened with a court suit. Rumor hath it that this periodical was happy to settle out of court.

Unless memory serves us wrong, Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, put in time during the last war with the United States Navy. He was probably a widely known authority on the back end of a Liberty ship with a gun crew, or maybe he was a junior officer on some other kind of ship. It further seems that Mr. Huie, widely known authority on air power and naval history, didn't like the Navy because the Navy didn't appreciate his peculiar talents as a widely known authority on sports, such as football.

But since then, he has graduated. He is now a widely known authority on air power and naval history. It is to be assumed that he has stood on the bridge of a battleship, that he directed carrier strikes, that he has been on extended submarine patrols, that he has even ridden in the captain's gig and the admiral's barge. But to become a widely known authority on air power and naval history he must also have flown B-29's, piloted jet planes, gone on fighter strikes, and held the door while an Air Force general climbed into his plane. Certainly a widely known authority on air power and naval history had done all these things.

Timothy J. Crimmins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article from the Worcester (Mass.), Telegram, concerning the resignation, of Chief of Police Timothy J. Crimmins of Palmer, Mass., who is concluding a long, honorable, and distinguished service to his community of more than 40 years. The article briefly outlines his career and some of the episodes which have marked this fine gentleman as such a capable and efficient law enforcement officer.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to acknowledge his outstanding service and to wish him health and happiness, relaxation and a long life. He has performed his duties efficiently and well. He has earned the gratitude of all. May he enjoy many years of peaceful and happy retirement which he so abundantly deserves.

PALMER POLICE CHIEF RESIGNS

PALMER, Thursday.—Chief of Police Timothy J. Crimmins, 72, after 45 years of service, submitted his resignation to the Board of Selectmen last night, effective June 30. He will receive a pension under provisions of a retirement act adopted by the town 2 years ago.

Appointed to the force April 11, 1904, he has served the town continually since. When, in 1916, growth of the town required a change from the system of individual patrolmen to an organized police department, he was the unanimous choice for chief.

During his service, only seven murders were committed within his jurisdiction and in every case he apprehended the criminal and obtained a conviction. The record also shows that of all the automobiles stolen or unlawfully used in this town since 1904, only one is unaccounted for.

DANGEROUS WORK

Many of his arrests were made under particularly dangerous circumstances. One was the apprehension of the man who killed William Green in North Wilbraham in 1917. Tracing the criminal to his home, Chief Crimmins, who had with him Dr. Daniel W. O'Connor as a deputy, found the door barricaded. When a demand that it be opened was refused, Chief Crimmins kicked the door down only to find the murderer facing him with a sawed-off shotgun. A quick shot from the chief's gun broke the man's arm.

In 1927, a child's body was found stuffed into a barrel at the Thorndike Street dump and within 10 hours Chief Crimmins had identified Albert Doe as the killer and had placed him behind bars.

On a more recent occasion, he disarmed and arrested a bandit who had held up a local store a short time before, bringing in his man after a strenuous battle.

Chief Crimmins was born at Wire Village, Spencer, the son of Daniel and Hanora (Mansell) Crimmins. He came to Palmer Center with his parents when he was 6 months old. He received his education at the old district school in Palmer Center and while still a boy went to work in the mills at Thorndike.

EARLY CAREER

He later worked for Armour & Co. and in the old Holbrook grain store, and afterward as a section hand on the Boston & Albany Railroad. He also worked for a time for the contracting concern of M. J. Dillon. He was employed as a hod carrier at the same time that his life-long friend, the late Judge David F. Dillon, then completing his college courses, was working as a bricklayer for his father.

Chief Crimmins has four children, Daniel W. Crimmins of Palmer, and Margaret M., Alice L., and Mary E. Crimmins, all at home. His wife, the former Mary Whelan, died in 1927.

Chief Crimmins has made no announcement as to his plans after retirement.

Cost of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of New Castle, Ind.:

COST OF WAR

When many people talk glibly of the possibility of a third world war, it is wise to attempt to assess the cost of the last conflict. Nothing resembling an exact accounting can be made—there are too many imponderables and intangibles, which permit of only an informed guess. One of the most thoughtful efforts to arrive at the cost of World War II appears in Harper's magazine for April in an article by C. Hartley Grattan, long a student of the economic implications of war.

Mr. Grattan concludes that about 10,000,000 members of armed forces lost their lives. The last war was unique in that civilians suffered a heavier mortality than did men in uniform. The casualties from bombing; the planned extermination of whole categories of civilians; the terrible death rate among slave laborers; the losses in underground movements—these and other causes probably were responsible for 30,000,000 deaths. Thus, the total human cost of the war was 40,000,000.

The total the material cost brings the analyst to extremely difficult ground. The most obvious and easily unearthed cost is the money actually spent for military purposes by victor and vanquished. This is recorded in national budgets. It came to more than a trillion dollars—$1,117,000,000,000. Next we must arrive at the cost of the physical damage which was done during the long course of the conflict. Factories, power plants, transportation systems and whole industrial regions were razed on a wholesale scale. Both sides concentrated on attacking dwelling areas—people who have no place to live especially in severe weather are of small value as workers. Mr. Grattan arrives at the figure of $2,234,000,000,000 (over two trillion) to cover the cost of direct destruction.

But this is not all. There is another economic cost, which is the most difficult yet to estimate. That cost is found in the depletion of natural resources, the disorganization of economic systems, the value of labor and material seized and carted off by invaders, and so on. Mr. Grattan places this cost at $650,000,000,000. Adding all the costs up, we

have a final, incredible figure of $4,000,000,000,000. And this, as he says, leaves out the moral cost of war, which is beyond statistics.

Cut in Funds Will Bring Hardships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the fact that the 1950 appropriation bill for the Interior Department as it passed the House of Representatives a few days ago carried $56,256,658 to finance the various Alaskan programs under the jurisdiction of that department. This will mean real progress toward the development of the Territory. It will mean the extension of the work that has been so successfully begun in the last 2 years.

I do not detract from my appreciation and that of all Alaska for this consideration of its problem when I say that I sincerely regret some of the reductions that were believed necessary in the budget estimates. I hope, for example, that the Alaska Railroad rehabilitation item can be restored. I am equally hopeful that increases can be made on the other side in some of the smaller items in the bill, including the loan fund under the Alaska Native Service of $500,000 which is sorely needed.

The importance of these small items often is overlooked or underestimated. Let me give an example: In the Indian Service request, under the caption of "Alaska native service," was an item for education of the natives of Alaska, for which the budget estimate was $1,703,740. The bill as it passed the House carried $1,676,305, a reduction, one might say, of only $27,435. Many would wonder how such a small reduction could be of concern even to me, but let me quote from some reports that have been received by the Interior Department from Mr. Don C. Foster, general superintendent of the Alaska native service. These are routine reports for February. Under the heading "Nutrition program at Beaver," which, by the way, is a village on the Yukon River approximately on the Arctic Circle, Mr. Foster says:

Although no school has been operated at Beaver during the past year, nutrition and home-economics supplies which were in the school when closed have been used to provide much-needed relief for a small group of children in this community. Much credit is due to Charles W. Schultz, a local resident of Beaver, for his assistance with distributing this food to needy families. This was done purely as a public service by Mr. Schultz without compensation. He has been most meticulous in securing receipts from families to whom food was issued. We anticipate that the school will be open at Beaver during fiscal year 1950 and that the children of this community will have the benefit of a regular lunch program.

Let me read the letter from Mr. Schultz, dated January 28, 1949:

DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.
GEORGE A. DALE.

DEAR FRIENDS: Am sending you receipts of the food I let the natives have—hungry children at Beaver and the vicinity there. Isn't much left only some flour, coffee, and some old dry fruit and part of a case of milk which is spoiled, all the milk wasn't very good, had been frozen before I moved it to my cellar.

I gave John Luke some of the food for cleaning off the snow off the roofs. Hope this will be satisfactory as it had to be done—the wood shed was about to cave in.

The natives are hard up here this winter. I know many of the children are underfed. I help them what I can, but I am too old to help them much. Too bad we didn't have a teacher here this winter, hope we will have one next winter. Should have one early enough so they could put in the gardens which would help the natives a whole lot. I have a tractor and plows and harrow, and could help. There is some seeds at the school, of course they are old, but some of them may be good. Well, I guess I have said enough. Best wishes to you both. As ever,

Yours truly,
CHARLES W. SCHULTZ.

Let me also quote from a letter from Don Foster under date of February 11, 1949, to Mr. Schultz:

CHARLES SCHULTZ,
Beaver, Alaska.

DEAR MR. SCHULTZ: Again our thanks to you for your public-spirited services in behalf of the people at Beaver. We regret that there were not more food supplies available to distribute to the native children. We have turned over the receipts you supplied to our Property Division. It was entirely satisfactory for you to give the food to John in exchange for his labor in clearing the snow from the woodshed. The remaining flour and coffee should be distributed as you see fit.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved funds for reopening the Beaver school during the coming year. If this money is now appropriated by Congress we can be reasonably sure of having a teacher for you by late summer. There is no hope of having a teacher there in time to start the gardens as we do not have sufficient money to pay their transportation before July 1. If people are interested, however, we would be glad to have you distribute among them the seeds which are in the schoolhouse so that they can start gardens of their own.

Thank you again for your assistance. Much as it has helped us it has been even more help for the children of your community and I am sure you must feel a great deal of satisfaction knowing that your service has made the winter a little easier for some of the youngsters.

Sincerely yours,
DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go back and note that a reduction of $27,435 was made in the item "education of natives" in the appropriation for the Alaska Native Service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I do not know whether a school teacher can be sent to Beaver unless that amount is restored. It will not require $27,000 to finance the school teacher at Beaver, not more than one-fourth or one-third that much, I presume, but these funds, I would like to impress upon the House, mean activities that have a purpose in the field. I hope that Mr. Schultz' letter will be kept in mind in considering restoration of budget cuts when the time comes.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting the testimony presented by Marjorie Shearon, Ph. D., before the Ways and Means Committee, on social security as proposed under H. R. 2893, and old-age assistance under H. R. 2892, as follows:

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE WITNESS

I am appearing in the public interest in opposition to H. R. 2892 and 2893. My qualifications as an expert are as follows: I spent 9 years in the executive branch of the Government, 5 in the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board, 4 in the Public Health Service. From 1945–47 I served as Senate consultant on social security and health and in 1947 was health consultant to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In 1937 I wrote the economic brief, Economic Insecurity in Old Age, which was used by Robert Jackson in defending the Social Security Act before the Supreme Court. It has been said my brief was largely responsible for the favorable decision upholding the act. In 1941 I served as consultant to a Senate subcommittee which investigated the administration of old-age and survivors insurance. For the past 17 years I have been engaged in research, administration, and legislative activities at Federal, State, and local levels. More recently I worked with the Senate during more than 50 hearings sessions on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills for social-security medicine in 1946, 1947, and 1948. I am editor of American Medicine and the Political Scene, a weekly news release dealing with social security, health, and medical legislation, public finance, and the operations of the Federal Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY AFTER 14 YEARS

Having had an opportunity to study at close range the operations of the various social-security programs, and having for many years worked on legislative proposals and research reports for Congress, I am fully aware of the complexity of the problems now confronting you. Fourteen years ago I thought the Social Security Act was an inspired piece of legislation which would help the American people to attain at least basic security against the major catastrophes of life. I thought it would aid the States and would do away with the disgraceful social work means test in public-aid programs. But after observing how the program has operated, I have been forced to the conclusion that the Social Security Act cannot be made financially sound, administratively feasible, or socially desirable. It is riddled through with inequities and anomalies. It is an inducement to administrative abuse. Instead of reducing programs for public charity, it has fostered them. Already, before the program is fully operating, there has been built up a vast body of administrative law regarding

definitions and the rights of employees and employers. The OASI trust fund has been raided. There is a $7,000,000,000 deficit. Trust fund reserves have been siphoned off and I O U's substituted. Wherever you turn, in viewing this law and its administration, you are confronted by abuses, dilemmas, and seemingly insoluble legislative problems. Mounting costs present a serious threat. Special pleaders, asking you to promise benefits for 50 years hence, say they would not presume to tell the Members of Congress how the benefits are to be paid for 50 years from now. The presumption is in asking the Congress to promise paradise unlimited without simultaneously furnishing data on the limitless costs of paradise unlimited.

QUESTIONS

While I shall make certain detailed recommendations regarding the language of H. R. 2893, I think it is more important to raise a number of questions which I believe the committee should face before taking any action on either bill. The Social Security Act is unquestionably the most far-reaching law on the Federal statute books. It already affects every person in the country. It strikes deep into the roots of our national customs, our fiscal policies, and our economic stability. It resulted in Supreme Court decisions in 1937 which were based not on legal precedents, but on social and economic considerations. The law has brought about serious conflicts between and among the three branches of Government. If it remains in force, I believe it will result ultimately in a transformation of our form of government into state socialism. Therefore, I think the first question before this committee should be not how much social security, how much coverage, and what taxation, but rather: Do we wish longer to try to achieve social security, to the extent that it is achievable, through the operations of the Social Security Act? Should not the act, in whole or in large part, be repealed and a fresh start made?

Second, should we any longer countenance the drafting of our social legislation along lines laid down by the International Labor Organization for the Socialist and Communist countries of Europe?

Third, should we withdraw from the International Labor Organization because of its Socialist domination and the principles for which it stands?

Fourth, should we not substitute a sound, moderate, workable retirement system for the entire population on a strictly pay-as-you-go basis? I agree with Mr. Williamson that some flat sum, such as $30, possibly $40, a month should be paid by the Federal Government to every person who applies at age 65 with proper credentials. The retirement annuity should be truly available as a right, no question asked. It should be a floor of security, not a ceiling of luxury. The amount should not be large enough to discourage private initiative. No attempt should be made to make it adequate. The philosophy of social adequacy advanced by Commissioner Altmeyer is the philosophy of the welfare or police state. There should not be a work test for eligibility to the Federal retirement annuity. Everyone should be encouraged to work as long as he can, both for his own good and to reduce the social charge for his upkeep. Taxes paid into the OASI system thus far could be returned or credited.

Fifth. Should not the Federal Government get out of the relief business as Harry Hopkins said it would back in 1934? Return the public assistance programs to the States and to budgetary realities. It is absurd in an era of great national prosperity to have built up a relief load of 5,000,000 persons on which the country is spending $2,000,000,000 a year. This does not include expenditures of between $4,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000 annually on various social insurance programs and veterans' pensions and compensation. All told, we are now spending between $6,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 from the public treasury for the support of persons who are sick, disabled, aged, unemployed, or otherwise dependent. Administrative policies have encouraged large relief rolls and have acted as an inducement to recipients of public assistance to remain as public charges in perpetuity. In the early 1930's it was regarded as a disgrace to seek public or private charity. Under the leadership of the Federal Government, the people have been taught to believe that Government hand-outs are socially acceptable and without stigma. A reversal in policy would be good for the country.

Sixth. Should we not drop some of the Social Security fictions? Social insurance is neither social, nor insurance. It is a taxing device for the exploitation of new revenue fields through regressive, instead of, progressive taxation.

Social security taxes on employees and employers are taxes, not contributions or premiums. They are just one more income tax. They are collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and are paid into the Treasury. After they reach the Treasury they are used the same as any other internal revenue. They are spent currently as received. A bookkeeping device has been inaugurated to make everything look all right. Of course, everything is not all right. Even Mr. Linton conceded that it would not be proper to use the funds recklessly simply because they were available. Many persons think the funds have constituted a big inducement to the Federal Government to spend lavishly on social experiments rather than carefully on the essential functions of Government.

Seventh. Is there any feasible way to make the Social Security System actuarially sound? If you tax the public enough to pay for the benefits you have already promised and are being asked to promise, you will build up enormous reserves which it is generally conceded is undesirable. If you keep taxes low and have only a contingent reserve, the next generation will be faced with crushing taxes to meet the deficits you are now creating. On the other hand, are you prepared to say to the people in all honesty: "This total program for social security will cost, when mature, some 20 to 25 percent of payrolls. It may even cost 40 or 50 percent as similar programs have cost elsewhere. Do you wish to pay such taxes for social security under Government auspices or would you prefer lower taxes and fewer Federal benefits in cash and kind?" The question should be squarely presented to the people now, on a nonpolitical basis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After long study of these problems, my own recommendations are as follows:

1. Repeal the Social Security Act. Enact retirement and other cash-benefit legislation with flat monthly benefits, a 3-percent tax on all wage, salary, and other earned income and no tax exemptions. This would enable the Federal Government to give $30 a month to every person at age 65, on proof of age. States could give as much additional as they thought wise, either with or without a means test. Veterans could be brought in on the same terms with an addition of possibly $20 a month as an indication of gratitude for services rendered in time of war.

2. Abandon the costly, cumbersome, useless wage-record system in Baltimore. Charge it up to profit and loss or to experience. The weighting of the social-security formula from the very start tended to wipe out much of the relation between taxes paid and benefits received. It was good for publicity and propaganda purposes to say that benefits were geared to earnings. Actually, the more a man earned in wages and salary and the more he paid in taxes, the less he received proportionately in benefits. Each revision of the system tends to obliterate the relation between wages and benefits, which are mostly fiction, anyway. Let us be honest about it. Let us admit that the Baltimore operations are one vast boondoggle. The machine installation may be the joy and pride of the International Business Machines Corp., but it is also a great expense to the American people. Furthermore, the administrative cost to American business for collection of taxes, record keeping, legal advice, etc., must be a staggering charge on the economy. One businessman told me he had to employ 1 additional clerk for social-security operations for every 16 employees; another man said it was 1 for 12 employees in his organization. I believe the charge on the economy may well be over $1,000,000,000 at present for administration of the Social Security Act in addition to what the Government is spending. These things were not foreseen when the law was passed, perhaps because no one could have predicted the number of schemes administrators could devise to make administration complicated and costly.

3. Abandon the trust-fund fiction and temptation. Collect social-security taxes as part of income tax, without making the taxpayer go through extra computations. Earmark 3 percent, if that seems desirable. However, if we are going to accept the theory that society owes a certain amount of protection to the aged, disabled, and dependent we might as well make a social budgetary charge each year on the general revenues and be done with it. If this is not done, Congress, public officials, and pressure groups will be involved in interminable disputes over the amounts to be charged to general revenues and to social-security taxes. In any event, the Government will be called upon to meet all deficits from general revenues and to finance more and more programs from the general fund.

4. Withdraw from the International Labor Organization. (This is discussed further below.) This committee should carefully study the philosophy of social security promulgated by the International Labor Organization and now being followed in legislative proposals offered to the Congress by the Social Security Administration. For instance, do you approve the principle that social-insurance cash benefits are to be paid only to replace wage jobs? You were surprised when Commissioner Altmeyer explained that the Social Security System is providing wage-loss annuities at 65 or later, not retirement annuities. Similarly, maternity benefits are intended only for women who suffer a wage loss during maternity. That is the ILO philosophy.

5. Abandon the work test as an eligibility requirement for OASI benefits, if you retain the present Social Security Act. It is socially undesirable and economically wasteful.

6. Cease discrimination against women with respect to the age at which retirement benefits shall be received. First of all, there is little accurate information about the ages of women married to men 65 and over who are in receipt of OASI benefits. I believe the age differential between the sexes is only about 2½ years. However, it does a great disservice to workingwomen, and that means one-third of women of working age, to set 60 as the retirement age. Employers, who already discriminate against older women, will surely jump at the opportunity

not only to retire women at 60, but to refuse to employ them at 50 or 55, because they would be too near retirement age. Furthermore, it is assumed that the majority of women at age 60 are dependent on some man. As a matter of economic reality, even many married women are no longer dependent on male workers at any age. Frequently the chief reason why they are working is that they have taken over all or part of the economic burden for support of the family, including the male upon whom they are supposed to be dependent. The ideas about women reflected in H. R. 2893 are antiquated. Old World ideas that have no place in this country. I recommend, therefore, that whatever is decided about retirement age, and eligibility for benefits be the same for both sexes. Women should certainly be permitted to work as long as they wish and can find jobs. I found during the war that age was no deterrent for women. They found clerical and other jobs at age 70 and above. They are ingenious in developing occupations for themselves, and I surmise they would like to be permitted to work out their own salvation without interference from the Federal Government, however well-intentioned that interference is.

7. It is unfair to compel the self-employed and other groups to come into the system unless they so desire. Let them decide after the rates of taxation and the benefits have been truthfully explained to them by some informational service other than that of the Social Security Administration. Perhaps no other group would suffer more under the social-security system than the self-employed. Most of them could presumably provide for their own retirement far more satisfactorily than the Federal Government can. A farmer, physician, lawyer, or writer would presumably prefer to have his money as he goes along to put into his business than he would to pay several hundred dollars a year in extra taxes over a 40-year period only in the end to be told he cannot have his old-age and survivors insurance benefit unless he gives up his business or profession.

The Federal officials who drafted H. R. 2893 have made the initial taxing rate for the self-employed 2¼ percent of income. This is 1½ times the amount paid by an employee. This change of heart by the Social Security Administration, which formerly advocated charging the self-employed twice as much as employees, may be viewed as a bribe to entice the self-employed into the system. However, there is no guaranty that the tax rate will not be quickly upped to twice as much as for employed persons on the ground experience has shown 1½ times the employee tax was too low. Furthermore, as the taxes on employees and employers rise over the years, they will also rise on the self-employed who may, before long, find themselves paying 7 or 8 percent for old-age and survivors insurance. In addition, if farm labor is brought in, the farm owner will find his income greatly burdened with his own taxes plus his share for all hired labor.

I believe that inclusion of the self-employed in the social-security system would force many small businesses to fold up. It would introduce innumerable anomalies.

8. Expansion of the social-security system in the manner proposed would constitute a great threat to the entire insurance industry of the United States. It is true that life-insurance representatives have told you of a temporary increase in their business as a result of the Social Security Act. However, as the system takes up more and more of the worker's income in taxes, there will be nothing left of his disposable income for savings in the form of life insurance, home ownership, cash savings, and investment in securities. He will have hard scratching to make ends meet. That is part of the ultimate course of social security—it turns the major portion of the worker's income over to the Government, deprives him of freedom of choice in the way he shall spend his earnings, and makes him increasingly dependent on the state. If you establish a system of cash benefits for temporary and permanent disability you will wipe out most of the health and accident insurance business of the country, because people will not have enough money to buy private insurance and pay the heavy taxes which you or future Congresses will be forced to levy.

The United States has developed a great private insurance industry. More insurance in private companies is held in the United States than in all the rest of the world. The reason for that is that while the rest of the world was following Bismarck's plans for social insurance, the United States followed the way of free and independent people who made provision for their own contingencies without seeking Government intervention. Do you wish to throw out private insurance for the sort of social security they have in Russia, Germany, Italy, or Great Britain?

9. I suggest that the committee find out why the Social Security Administration is now recommending that cash sickness benefits be tied in with OASI after recommending for years that they should logically be united with unemployment compensation. Is it because the Social Security Administration wants to keep a strangle hold on the sickness-benefits program and fears it will lose out to the States?

10. I think the committee should not place too much reliance on cost-of-living indexes. The Labor Department has been changing its social philosophy about cost of living, especially since Ewan Clague, an Altmeyer man who was formerly Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board, became Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. When any index plays a part in social legislation, you may expect it will be tampered with to fit changing ideologies.

THE ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

It will be recalled that Bismarck in the 1880's was responsible for enactment of a series of so-called insurance laws. Bismarck translated into law the theories of his economic advisor, Prof. Adolph Wagner of the University of Berlin, who is credited with having done more than anyone else to give to state socialism its scientific form and scientific foundation. Professor Wagner's social philosophy and total program for state control were outlined in an article published in 1887 in which he advocated (1) public ownership of banking, insurance, communications, and utilities, and (2) state "insurance against sickness, incapacity, and old age." He likewise proposed and justified a new scheme of taxation, the pay-roll tax, that would not only serve the legitimate purpose of raising revenues but would at the same time fulfill the purpose of what he called "regulative interference" with the lives of the people.

This interference was to operate by regulating first the distribution of income and wealth, and second the purchasing power and living habits of the lower classes. The latter form of interference was to be accomplished by "administrative measures, and eventually compulsion." Professor Wagner stated: "This two-sided policy of taxation I call social. The second side here advanced * * * is based, as concerns the mass of the population, the lower laboring classes, on the assumption that in the truest interests of the nation a guardianship may and must be established over the national consumption or over the application of income to personal purposes." [1] These social-insurance laws, as they were called, were hailed "as the high-water mark of German State Socialism." [2]

Bismarck's social-insurance laws were designed primarily to raise revenue and to attach the workers to the German State. In return for accepting the principle of compulsion and of control by a powerful bureaucracy, the lower classes were promised certain pitifully small cash benefits and free services which they might claim as a right. The benefits have been aptly described as "a series of small bribes." [3] The workers were led to believe they were getting something for nothing, because their employers were compelled to pay part of the social-insurance taxes. At the start there was no state subsidy. The Government provided the compulsion and the interference; labor and management footed the bills. The social-insurance system thus set up in the 1880's include wage loss as well as cash benefits during old age, sickness, extended disability, maternity, death benefits, and free medical care.

During the succeeding 35 years many countries followed Germany's lead. Ministers of finance were attracted by the ease with which taxes could be extracted from workers before they could lay hands on their wages. Bureaucrats delighted in ever-expanding governmental programs which gave them jobs in perpetuity and great power over people.

In 1919, at the end of World War I, the League of Nations was created. One of its subsidiary organizations was the International Labor Organization set up in the same year in Geneva. The United States did not join either the League or the ILO. The first director of the ILO was Albert Thomas, leading French Socialist of his day. For 15 years he devoted his life to organizing and shaping the ILO as a Socialist organization. He traveled throughout the world preaching the gospel of Geneva and urging nations to join the ILO. The United States was not overlooked during these missionary travels. In 1934 Secretary Frances Perkins suggested to President Roosevelt that the United States should join the ILO. He approved and suggested that she take the matter up with Congress. In the closing sessions of the Seventy-third Congress a bill was introduced authorizing the President to accept membership in the ILO. The bill passed through the Senate without discussion, and was rushed through the House without hearings and reports. The United States thus became a member of the ILO in 1934 and in so doing committed itself to work for enactment of social legislation developed along the lines laid down in Geneva.

Plans were immediately made to draft an economic security bill. A few weeks after the ILO bill was passed, the President appointed the Committee on Economic Security, the members of which were: Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, chairman; Harry Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury; Homer Cummings, Attorney General; and Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. Two consultants from the ILO were brought to this country to help draft the economic security bill in accordance with ILO principles. It was so drafted. After prolonged hearings in 1935, the original bill was redrafted and was finally passed on August 14, 1935. Few people in or out of Congress realized at that time that the Social Security Act was not in reality of American origin. Instead, it hewed closely to the Geneva line.

I mention these facts because they have a direct bearing on the provisions in the bills now under consideration. In 1944 the General Conference of the ILO, meeting in its

[1] Quotation from article in Tubinger Zeitschrift published in 1887 and quoted by Dawson, William, Bismarck, and State Socialism (London), 1891, pp. 156-158.

[2] Dawson, W. H. loc. cit, p. 109.

[3] Russell, Bertrand, German Social Democracy, 1896 (London), p. 107.

twenty-sixth session, in Philadelphia, on May 10, adopted a declaration of aims and purposes of the ILO and of the principles which should inspire the policy of its member nations. These aims, purposes, and principles had been thrashed out the preceding year in Ottawa, Canada, under the guidance of "Cradle-to-Grave" Sir William Beveridge, Arthur J. Altmeyer, Wilbur J. Cohen, Isidore S. Falk, and other officials of the Federal Government. At that time elaborate recommendations were made covering every phase of social security—the whole range of cash benefits, free medical care, benefits for the armed services, public works, etc. There was prolonged discussion of methods of financing and of administration. The long-range objective in many instances indicated that ultimately programs would be financed entirely from general revenues after a period in which taxes would be shared by employees and employers. It was frankly stated that where a whole population was covered for medical-care benefits the program might appropriately be financed out of general revenue.

The Members of Congress, and of this committee in particular, should realize that the ILO program, as outlined in 1944, is a stupendous one. Long before the members of this committee consider social-security proposals, the principles of the bills are mapped out by representatives of foreign countries whose ideologies are repugnant to us. As one studies these alien suggestions, one is reminded again and again that the stage had already been set by a crusading Socialist when, in 1934, this country entered the ILO in the role of a novice among a group of experienced left-wing actors.

As a member nation of the ILO we are obligated to make every effort to conform our national legislation to the Geneva principles. After the ILO adopted the 1944 declaration of principles,[4] these were sent to the President who forwarded them to the Congress in a special message on May 24, 1944.[5] The declaration of principles was written into the ILO constitution which was approved by the Congress in 1948. We are now doubly committed to make every effort to conform our social legislation to those principles. We are committed to furthering programs which will achieve, inter alia, "the extension of social security to provide basic income to all in need of such protection and comprehensive medical care."[6] I urge the committee to study these principles very carefully with a view to understanding what the over-all program is that you are furthering.

If this committee will take the time to study the activities of the ILO, you will find that Federal officials, under the leadership of Commissioner A. J. Altmeyer, who is the United States representative to the ILO, are working assiduously to impose on this country a program of national compulsory social insurance of the type now in existence in Socialist and Communist countries in Europe and in South America. If you will look back over the past decade you will see these trends in social security in this country: Pressure for extension of coverage, larger benefits, higher taxes, more programs. When the whole population is covered, there ceases to be any reason for special social-security taxes. The social-insurance fiction is dropped and the program is financed from general revenues. Other countries are in various stages of transition from "social insurance" to straight state socialism or communism. Congress, under pressure from the bureaucrats and from other vested interests, gives a little here and a little there. Before any more concessions are made, I urge you to study the Geneva blueprint that this country is following under the aegis of the Social Security Administration.

The bills which have been presented to Congress from the Social Security Administration are predicated on these principles as final objectives, in accordance with Geneva dicta: universal coverage, including self-employed and other groups currently mentioned at these hearings; a slow transition from a theoretically self-supporting system, financed by employees and employers, to one depending on deficit financing with increasing Federal subsidy (such subsidy is now being obtained through the device of charging interest on the trust-fund investments); Government "insurance" against the contingencies of (a) sickness, (b) maternity, (c) invalidity or permanent disability, (d) old-age dependency, (e) death of the breadwinner, (f) unemployment, (g) emergency expenses, and (h) employment injuries. This committee has been surprised to learn that our old-age and survivors insurance provides only wage-loss annuities instead of retirement annuities. This would be no surprise if you studied the ILO theory regarding social insurance. The range of contingencies supposed to be covered by social insurance is "all contingencies in which an insured person is prevented from earning his living."

This country is already so deeply involved in the Socialist program of national compulsory social insurance for the entire population, that I strongly urge the committee to consider whether, in pursuing and extending this program, you are taking irrevocable steps in the wrong direction. If you adopt this system for our country, it must be compulsory, universal, and, ultimately, federally administered. Furthermore, if you adopt pieces of the program, you will finally have to accept the whole thing. Thus, if you enact into law provisions for cash benefits for sickness and permanent disability, you will have to nationalize medicine because you will need the physicians, dentists, other health personnel of the country to police the cash-benefits program. The further you go the more deeply are you mired.

COSTS

Throughout these hearings, members of this committee have sought information about costs. You have teased a little information out of Federal officials here and there, but no one would give you the whole picture. You might not be able to stand the shock. However, I submit that it is dangerous to enact piecemeal legislation without knowing where the whole program is heading, how much it will cost, and what it is likely to do to the economy.

It would be unwise to consider the two bills in a vacuum without seeing them in relation to the other proposals of the administration, namely, those for national compulsory social security medicine and those for cash-sickness benefits. A fair estimate of the cost of all these programs when fully operating is from 20 to 25 percent of pay rolls, thus:

	Percent of pay rolls
Unemployment benefits	4.
Medical care and hospitalization.	5 up.
Dental care, home nursing, certain drugs.	1.
Temporary disability and maternity benefits.	2 to 3 up.
Old-age, survivors, and permanent disability.	10 to 12.
Total	22 to 25 up.

The cost would be met by taxes of 6 percent on employers, 6 on employees, and 6 to 8 on self-employed. The deficit would be made up out of general revenues obtained by increasing income taxes. We all recognize that Government estimates are on the low side and are heavily weighted with favorable factors. This is done not to alarm Congress or arouse public indignation. Taxes are appealingly low at the start; benefits are glamorized. But it would be helpful to this committee if, instead of assuming high wages, rising over the years, and full employment, we were to look at costs if there should be a major depression. (At this point I should like to introduce into the record an editorial which appeared in the The Star of March 29, 1949, and two letters appearing in the same paper on April 7 and 9.)

You may gain some idea of the costs of such fantastic programs by looking at what has happened in other countries. New Zealand passed a comprehensive social-security law in 1938. The law provided all types of cash benefits and a wide range of "free" health services. After 6 years of operations the total cost of all social-security benefits amounted to 40 percent of all the national revenues.[7]

Even before it was possible to put all the programs into effect the Government was being asked to contribute nearly as much from general revenues as was raised through social-security taxes. The social-security system was so near financial collapse at the end of 5 years that the social-security tax was increased and the subsidy from the general fund was increased 157 percent from one year to the next.[8] Similar difficulties face the Labor Government in Great Britain where, for instance, the cost of the national health service, exceeding all Government expectations, was 38 percent higher than the official estimate. Social insurance "contributions" in Great Britain are now taking 40 percent of earnings. Russia passed a social-insurance law in 1911 at the same time as Great Britain. In 1937 they changed over to a program financed entirely from general revenues. It took Great Britain 35 years to go from small social-security taxes and moderate compulsion to large taxes and all-out compulsion. Several decades are required after initiation of a social-security program before a country goes completely Socialist or Communist and nationalizes the programs. The social-insurance fiction, with taxes shared by employers and employees is then dropped. Nationalization is the final step.

SOCIAL INSURANCE TRUST FUNDS

The OASI trust fund and other social security trust funds should be thoroughly investigated before any expansion of the program is authorized. One of the unexpected results of these funds is that they have resulted in a government within the Government, a budget within the budget. I wish to call your attention to the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948. On pages 398 and following (table 2) is a record of receipts and expenditures of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1798 through 1948. Beginning in 1937, receipt of taxes destined for the trust funds is not shown in the consolidated table of receipts and expenditures, nor are expenditures shown. The Secretary explains on page 16 of his report that such receipts and expenditures are shown in the daily Treasury statement under the title "Trust accounts, etc." As you study his report and the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 1950, you will discover two parallel budgets—one for trust fund income and expenditures and the regular budget for all other income and expenses of Government. In this way, you do not see total outlays all in one place. I think

[4] Declaration, Recommendations and Resolutions adopted by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-sixth Session, Official Bulletin, ILO, June 8, 1944, vol. XXVI, No. 1.

[5] Doc. 261, H. R., 78th Cong., 2d sess., May 29, 1944.

[6] The Constitution of the ILO, Annex III (f).

[7] Shearon, Marjorie, New Zealand's Free Medical Benefits, 1948, pp. 26-28.

[8] Communication from Press Secretaries, Ltd., London, dated April 7, 1949.

this is an inexcusable subterfuge and tends to confuse the unwary. The United States budget for 1948, for instance is given as $33,791,301,000 (pp. 1386 and 1394 of the Budget). However, if one adds trust fund expenditures of $6,809,573,000, it makes total expenditures for 1948 $40,600,874,000. In view of the fact that social-security taxes are paid into the Treasury and are spent like any other revenue for current operations, I believe we should drop all the double bookkeeping and present one consolidated budget.

With respect to the size of trust funds, it is interesting to note that these now account for over $30,000,000,000 (Report of Secretary of Treasury for 1948, p. 19). These various trust fund operations constitute what I call the government within the Government, the budget within the budget. The assets in the OASI trust fund on June 30, 1948, were as follows (Report of the Secretary of the Treasury 1948, p. 562):

Special Treasury certificates of indebtedness, 2⅛ percent maturing June 30, 1949	$7,709,000,000.00
Treasury bonds, bearing interest at 2¼ to 2½	2,227,779,256.82
Total investments	9,936,779,256.82

Now the interesting thing about this OASI trust fund is that there is so little available cash left. At the end of October 1948 this was the situation:

Status of OASI trust fund, 1937–48

[In thousands]

Receipts:	
Appropriations, roughly equal to social-security taxes	$11,848,898
Interest received	1,041,543
Total	12,890,441
Expenditures:	
Benefit payments	2,230,722
Administrative expenses	296,572
Total	2,527,294
Assets:	
Net total of U. S. Government securities in fund	10,255,761
Cash on hand	107,386
Total assets, October 1948	10,363,147

There was only a little over $100,000,000 either in the form of cash or as a credit of the fund account. All told, nearly $12,000,000,000 had been received. Over $1,000,000,000 had been taken from the general fund and put into the trust fund as interest over the 9-year period. Interest payments now amount to about $200,000,000 a year out of general revenues. This interest is paid by all taxpayers, even those not under the social-security system. I believe this charge is unjust and that it is to all intents and purposes a Federal subsidy to the OASI. If we abolished the whole trust fund idea and put social security on a pay-as-you-go basis, these anomalies would be cleared up and would result in a reduction in taxes.

CONCLUSIONS

I strongly urge the committee to study the whole social-security program for a year before taking any action. Special attention should be paid to the International Labor Organization, its constitution, and our commitments. A careful study of long-range costs of the whole social-security system should be made with no help, advice, or professional prompting by any member of the Social Security Administration. Trust fund operations and implications should be reviewed. Consideration should be given to repeal of the Social Security Act in whole or in part and creation of a bona fide retirement plan for all persons at 65, on a pay-as-you-go basis. We should not make future commitments of benefits or taxes. It is ridiculous for us here today to be making plans for people who will be living in the year 2000. Above all, I urge the committee to study the traditional relationship throughout the world between comprehensive compulsory social-security programs and either state socialism or communism.

The Late Hon. Andrew L. Somers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on April 6 when the sad news was announced in the House of the death of our beloved Member, ANDREW L. SOMERS. Had I been present I would have joined with those other Members—his many good friends—in expressing my heartfelt regret that we had lost a distinguished and able Member.

ANDY and I were elected to Congress in 1924. He was then a handsome, enthusiastic young man, full of the joy of living, with the ambition of serving his country and the good people of his district, for whom he always expressed the kindest sentiments of devotion and loyalty. During all the years that followed, during many of which he suffered greatly, he was a credit not only to his constituents but to his country. Extremely modest, few Members of recent years, because of his long illness, had the opportunity to know ANDY SOMERS or to appraise his many gifts of mind and heart. Always shrinking from publicity and shy with strangers, it was difficult to know the man, but those of us who knew him well admired his ability and loved him.

I recall his brilliant presentation of the very important Gold Reserve Act of 1934, when he was chairman of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. During my 25 years in the House, I have never heard a more complete and forceful discussion of any bill to come before the House. I recall on that occasion, when he had completed his explanation of the bill, the Members on both sides of the House stood in tribute to the man. His presentation of that bill was just about as nearly perfect as anything I have ever heard.

Unfortunately, his health did not permit him to be the leader he should have been. In a recent conversation I had with him he told me of his ambition as chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, an ambition to be an outstanding chairman and to make a great contribution to his country in that capacity. Trained in rational thinking, ready in debate, convincing in his appeal, and emotionally sensitive, I believe, had he been given the time he would have helped to solve many of the great problems before that committee, problems too often misunderstood by many of us in the East, but about which he seemed to have complete understanding. The problems of the Indians and of the great Southwest appealed to his sense of fair play and he was as intensely interested in helping the forgotten Indian as he was in assisting an unfortunate in his own district.

ANDY SOMERS had a very great interest in people, and it gave him real pleasure to work with people. He believed in democracy, and he practiced democracy. We shall miss him in the days ahead, but we shall rejoice that his days of suffering are gone and pray that his soul may rest in peace. To his wife and family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their great sorrow.

Numerous Dangerous Wells and Cisterns Are at Old Greenville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Daily American Republic, Poplar Bluff, Mo., of Tuesday, April 12, 1949:

NUMEROUS DANGEROUS WELLS AND CISTERNS ARE AT OLD GREENVILLE

The tragic death of little Kathy Fiscus in an abandoned well at San Marino, Calif., has caused persons all over the Nation to demand that all abandoned wells and cisterns be permanently sealed.

In Poplar Bluff an abandoned well is found now and then when the old coverings give way, but their most dangerous place in this part of the State, according to those who know, is at Old Greenville.

One former resident of Greenville said yesterday he believes there are at least 300 wells and cisterns in old Greenville which are very dangerous.

Fishermen pass through the old town site, bird hunters frequent that area in the fall, and there are many cases where children play around through the area that was once the thriving Wayne County seat.

"The only way I could locate my old home site," that former Greenville resident said, "when I went there some few weeks ago, was by a well. It had been covered over but the covering had rotted away."

He said the area is now owned by the Federal Government which apparently has done nothing toward closing the old wells and eliminating the hazard.

The Case Against Present Panamal Canal Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr.

Charles L. Wheeler, entitled "The Case Against Present Panama Canal Tolls." The article is as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST PRESENT PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

(By Charles L. Wheeler)

The urgent need for a reduction in the tolls charged by the Panama Canal has long been evident; only recently has the possibility of effecting a change been more than remote. A month ago, House Resolution 44 empowered the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to examine tolls charged by the Panama Canal with particular attention to proper accounting and allocation of costs. Such examination may well be the forerunner to an intelligent and far-sighted revision of tolls, if the most is made of the present opportunity.

A few figures will prove the importance of Canal tolls not only to the shipping industry but to the economy of the coastal States as well.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, total tolls collected amounted to $17,596,602. Of this amount 51.1 percent was paid by American-flag ships. It is equally significant that 26 percent of the entire tolls bill was charged against our intercoastal lines. Of this amount, iron and steel manufactures moving intercoastally paid tolls amounting to $913,197 during 1947. Lumber and mill products moving to the east coast from the Northwest were charged $872,744 for the same year, and canned food products contributed a total of $335,508.

The unhappy plight of the intercoastal trade is well known. Today the volume of shipping on that route is 40 percent of the prewar figure—and that 40 percent is operating at a loss. It is estimated that the intercoastal carriers lost a total of $7,500,000 in maintaining operations during the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1948.

At present rates, the Canal toll for the intercoastal round voyage of a C–3 is $13,826, or almost as much as the entire monthly wage bill including overtime and all other supplemental payments. Fourteen thousand dollars a voyage can mean the difference between the revival of the intercoastal trade to its prewar level, or its gradual abandonment in the face of mounting losses.

The intercoastal trade is not alone in the difficulties it is experiencing. Our entire merchant marine is finding it increasingly difficult to meet the renewed competition of low-cost, foreign-flag operators. And in two world wars it has been our merchant marine that has supplied the vital nucleus of trained personnel and available shipping which are invaluable in time of emergency. It would be false economy to let this part of our economy deteriorate, when its importance from the standpoint of national defense is beyond question.

There are two general misconceptions with regard to the Canal, and the first of them revolves around the question of tolls. It is widely believed that the tolls charged are barely sufficient to cover the actual out-of-pocket costs incident to Canal operation. Actually, the reverse is true. The Governor's report for fiscal 1948, just released, indicates a net revenue from operation of the Canal and its business units of $2,622,672.75. Such sizable profits are not out of line with past performance.

Over the life of the Canal, toll revenues have exceeded expenses attributable to transiting by over $274,000,000. To put it another way, commercial tolls, plus tolls forgiven on Government vessels, have been sufficient to pay all operating and maintenance expenses on the basic Canal and its cost of construction, with a profit remaining of over $2,000,000.

The matter of forgiven tolls is worth special attention. From the first, American warships have been allowed to transit the Canal without charge. The result has been an undercollection averaging $1,000,000 annually from 1914 to 1942. A further undercollection of approximately $43,000,000 occurred between 1942 and 1947 for a total short-charge of some $73,000,000 to date. The result has been the curious spectacle of a Canal built primarily for national defense with nearly 100 percent of its capital and operating costs charged against commercial shippers.

The Kiel Canal affords the closest parallel to the Panama Canal in origin and employment. Built primarily to increase the mobility of the German Navy, its employment by commercial shipping was always secondary. Shipping tolls prior to the First World War paid for less than 1 percent of the initial cost of construction. In 1919, the capital investment was written off as a military expenditure and subsequent tolls reflected nothing but operating costs and such sums as might be needed for commercial betterments.

It is true that the accounts of the Canal purport to show an accumulated loss from operation, but this result is arrived at only through application of an interest charge at the rate of 3 percent of the total cost of the Canal. This charge is at present in excess of $15,000,000 annually.

It is manifestly unfair to make this charge solely on the basis of commercial use, when the semimilitary nature of the Canal is self-evident. Needless to say, such practice is unique as far as our Government is concerned.

The second general misconception concerning the Canal is based on the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. The object of the treaty was simply to establish certain principles of neutrality, but it is supposed to contain a specific guaranty that our intercoastal vessels will never be exempt from tolls. No such guaranty exists, though through constant repetition the originators of this myth probably come to believe it themselves.

The wording of the treaty itself is worth examining. Article III which is customarily cited as bearing on the intercoastal toll position merely states that there shall be no discrimination against any nation—in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic. But the intercoastal movement of cargoes is exclusively an internal transportation affair, open only to American vessels. Toll concessions granted in this trade could by no stretch of the imagination be considered discriminatory against foreign shipping. Congress followed an identical line of reasoning in the Panama Canal Act of 1912 which specifically exempted our intercoastal vessels from tolls. Although this legislation was rescinded 2 years later, Congress took pains to reserve all treaty rights in future toll legislation.

Many suggestions have been made for restoring a measure of vitality to our intercoastal shipping. The most effective immediate assistance would be through the elimination of all tolls on transits of intercoastal domestic vessels. The forgiven tolls should be treated as revenue as are forgiven tolls on Government vessels, and would not therefore act as a burden on other vessels using the Canal.

It is clear that there is no treaty obligation against removing these tolls, and that considerations of national defense and our domestic economy both underline the necessity for such action.

In the past tolls have been fixed without regard to the fact that the Canal is one of our greatest military assets. Its worth from the standpoint of national defense would on the very least equal its commercial value. If such a 50–50 division were made, it follows that present tolls could be cut 40 percent and still leave a wide operating margin.

Such a toll reduction is more than justified by past earnings of the Canal, by its semimilitary nature, and by the fact that 51 cents out of every dollar of tolls collected comes at present from the pockets of our own hard-pressed shipping industry.

Finally, there is every reason to believe that reduced tolls would result in increased traffic through the Canal, and that actual loss of revenue would accordingly be decreased.

It has taken years of effort on the part of the shipping industry and a serious depression in our domestic steamship operations to obtain the investigation called for in H. R. 44. We must not let our hard-won opportunity slip through our fingers; we must push most vigorously for the removal of intercoastal tolls, and for the reduction of other tolls by at least 40 percent.

There is not much time to secure this action, for the report of the investigating committee must be submitted prior to June 30, 1949.

Favorable results will be obtained only if the civic organizations, port authorities, importers, exporters, community interests, labor and management groups, propeller clubs, and similar organizations in the principal coastal cities band together in demanding a revision of tolls while it is still not too late to help our shipping industry.

Economy, Efficiency, Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on Tuesday, April 12, that will well repay the reading:

ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY, SECURITY?

The House Appropriations Committee has approved a national defense budget of $15,909,116,800, which is $631,252,100 more than President Truman requested when he submitted the largest military budget in our peacetime history.

This action was taken in the interest of economy, efficiency, and security, according to the committee.

Economy! That must have been a slip of the tongue, or tapped out on one of the typewriters used during the campaign.

Efficiency? The Military Establishment could use a lot of that, but will more money buy it? It never has.

Security? We want that, too. But spending for military security is building on sand if our economic security is being undermined. And slaphappy budgeting is working in that direction.

The Senate has just passed the $5,580,000,000 appropriation for European recovery, which is the amount the Truman administration recommended. We would not quarrel with that action but for the fact that new items not included in the budget have yet to be considered. In a few days, for instance, the President will ask Congress for $1,250,000,000, and possibly more, to arm western Europe. That was not provided for in the budget.

Unless this money to arm Europe is taken out of the European recovery fund or our own defense budget, new money must be found, and where? It isn't in sight unless new taxes are voted. And is this a time to vote new taxes? It certainly is not. Yet the dubious alternative will be deficit financing.

The Marshall plan, North Atlantic defense measure, and our domestic military program all come under the heading of security, and should be grouped together in the over-all budget. Instead of doing that, the President and Congress are using the piecemeal approach, dealing with one problem at a time.

Relative needs cannot be appraised and balanced against one another under this method, nor can a ceiling be maintained over the total budget. It is a sure way to build up a deficit.

We believe in the Marshall plan. We believe in the North Atlantic defense program. We want a sound national defense establishment. But this country should not go beyond its financial depth in supplying any of these needs. That is not economy, it isn't efficiency, and it is not buying real security.

Is There a Housing Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Is There a Housing Shortage?" It is my firm belief that the statements contained in this article will be of definite interest to those who are concerned with the housing program:

The article follows:

IS THERE A HOUSING SHORTAGE?

The country is being flooded with propaganda against the housing bill, S. 1070, and its counterpart in the House of Representatives, H. R. 4009. It all comes from the same old sources, a mere handful of high-pressure organizations who have always consistently opposed all housing reforms or innovations suggested (even including those which they eventually came to support with enthusiasm, such as FHA), and who would certainly today oppose any effective solutions to the housing problem whatsoever. Why? For the simple reason that these are the interests who would profit, by and large, from a continuing shortage of decent homes.

And for the most part this flood of pamphlets uses the same old arguments except for one new note. Instead of merely promising, as always, that "private enterprise can do it," they're now making a much bolder claim: "Private enterprise has done it."

"The acute phase of the housing shortage is over," said Thomas Holden in one widely circulated leaflet.[1] And he is echoed by the United States Savings and Loan League and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The problem is solved, therefore no need for reform.

And a lot of statistics have been put together and printed in order to prove it. So, since many of us come from cities where neither the shortage nor the slum problem seem to be much improved, if at all, it may be worth taking a glance at some of the statistics in one of the primary source books of the antihousing lobby, prepared by Miles L. Colean for the Construction Industry Information Committee of the Producers' Council.

It starts right off with some fine big figures to show that we have provided more new dwellings since 1940 than we did during a comparable period in the booming 1920's. "In 1948 alone," writes Mr. Colean, "new construction and conversion operations established an all-time annual record in providing an estimated 1,200,000 additional nonfarm units." A fine figure indeed, and remarkably close to the widely used estimates appearing in a long series of congressional reports, to the effect that we need a regular home-building rate of 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 dwellings a year to solve the shortage within the reasonable future and thereafter tackle the long-delayed replacement problem." The intended import of Mr. Colean's figure is clear. Surely anyone who would criticize such an industry, or try to reform it, must, as Mr. Holden suggests, have purely subversive intentions. Those dangerous subverters, Fortune, the Wall Street Journal, and Senator TAFT, must all be wrong.

But let us look at this "record" a little more closely.

A more familiar figure for 1948 acomplishment in residential construction is the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimate, based on local records, of 926,000 dwelling units actually started. This was a pretty fair accomplishment in itself, but it was not a record (although it is higher than is anticipated for 1949 unless we get some legislation passed very quickly indeed).

Mr. Colean must also have been cognizant of the fact that the residential building rate has been falling off, because the first thing he did was to translate the official BLS figure from "starts" into "completions," which meant that the recent slight decline did not have to be taken into account. This device (of which I am not really very critical—anyone arranges figures somewhat, I suppose) brought his figure for new construction up to about a million units.

On top of that, however, he added an estimate of 200,000 dwellings provided by "conversion," that is by cutting up big old mansions into several flats or transforming nonresidential structures into homes.

Now this might well strike one off-hand as a pretty large figure. It might seem that most of the readily convertible structures would have been tackled during the war or shortly thereafter. And the author gives no source of explanation.

And then, should you look further, a curious contradiction might come to your attention. The same author, Mr. Miles Colean, produced another pamphlet for the Producers Council, just 6 months before this one, in August of 1948, called an Analysis of Future Housing Demand. In this earlier publication he was not trying to prove that the industry had established any records or solved the housing problem. At that time he was more interested to warn the building industry against "over expansion" (a curious viewpoint which I will not, however, take the time to discuss in any detail today). But in this study also he needed an estimate of the current rate of conversions.

The figure he used was, strange to say, just exactly one-quarter of the 200,000 figure he used in February of this year. His estimate of the number of dwellings to be provided by conversion in 1948 was, and I quote him, "based on an annual rate of 50,000 conversions." And this time he gave a source, as follows: "According to the Office of the Housing Expediter, 64,500 conversion units were placed under construction and 45,300 completed during the calendar year 1946."

Now I know that figures are slippery, and our basic facts about the housing problem are so inadequate that they can often be interpreted in quite different ways with the utmost sincerity. But a 400-percent markup of an estimate within a 6-month period is nevertheless pretty steep. And a figure based on the final estimate, however it may have been arrived at, is hardly a very conclusive argument in support of the theory that the housing shortage has been solved, or in opposition to S. 1070 and H. R. 4009 which many of us are convinced is badly needed from our direct personal experience, whether we have had time to put together any figures or not.

This particular figure, on conversions, is of course not very important in itself. It is merely an example of why we should not be overly impressed with all this flood of fine figures and expensive printing. Other and perhaps more serious questions could be raised about Mr. Colean's figures but I will not take your time with them here. Suffice it to say that the loudly proclaimed "proof" that our slums have been disappearing since 1940 is at least as vulnerable as the evidence that the shortage has already been solved. And it may be doubted that the Census Bureau would claim that their recent surveys, based on very small samples, are scientifically adequate for any such complicated manipulation as they have recently been subjected by Mr. Colean and others.

As far as the shortage is concerned, there probably was a slight alleviation in 1948 considering the country as a whole, although there is little or no indication of improvement in most of our big, growing cities and metropolitan areas. The recent testimony of mayors and other local officials from all over the country is pretty strong evidence on that point. Even according to Mr. Colean's own figures, there were at the end of 1948, 2,200,000 married couples living in other families' households or in transient quarters. And, judging from most of the larger cities' continuing stand in favor of rent control, despite the terrific pressures from the other side, there is little evidence that vacancy rates have even begun to decline in most of the more heavily populated areas.

But it is high time that the tide is turned. For this shortage is no little fly-by-night temporary emergency. It has been building up ever since 1929, for from that time until last year we regularly and steadily failed to build as many new dwellings as there were additional families, let alone allowing for replacement of the old outworn stock of slum homes. By 1939 most big cities were already feeling a severe shortage even though it was still partly hidden by unemployment, which always causes considerable so-called voluntary doubling up.

On the significance of the deep roots of our current problem I might quote James Felt, a most successful and respected member of the Real Estate Board of New York. In a recent statement on the Core of the Housing Dilemma (which he says reflects "the very valuable advice and suggestions of Gen. Otto Nelson, Mr. Alfred Rheinstein, and Mr. Beardsley Ruml") he writes:

"Foremost among the domestic problems confronting our country is the provision of adequate housing. While our housing shortage is generally blamed on World War II, it is actually due to basic defects and inadequacies which have plagued the housing and construction industry for many years. * * * The industry's many shortcomings * * * are all symptoms of one basic defect—extreme fluctuations in house production. This is the underlying cause of our housing predicament. Only a relatively stable output will make possible an efficient industry. * * * The production of most commodities is aimed to keep up with effective demand rather than basic needs. * * * A man may have a car during a prosperous period and do without one in a slump. But a family needs a home and should have a home year in and year out. That is why the volume of house production must bear some relationship to basic need which can be measured and anticipated—not solely to effective demand, which is unpredictable.

It is in this light that the current housing statistics should be closely scrutinized. The "effective demand" for $10,000 to $20,000

[1] Housing Dictatorship and Soft Socialism, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, March 1949.

houses is beginning to fall off, by every index. January and February "starts" were lower than last year, and Mr. Thomas Holden himself, in his Architectural Record for December 1948, predicted an over-all decline in residential construction for 1949. And this is happening while the shortage is just about as bad as ever and the worst old slums are coming back into use instead of being demolished.

The immediate social need for the housing program envisioned in S. 1070 and H. R. 4009 is obvious to everyone who has a heart to feel and eyes to see, whether he uses them to get cross-eyed over statistics or not. But it is almost as necessary to the welfare and steady prosperity of the country if it is considered wholly from the angle of over-all economic and fiscal policy. We'll do it anyway if and when a depression descends on us; we all know that. Why not do it now, when it will both help to solve the housing shortage and forge a powerful weapon against the very possibility of depression?

As Fortune said of the current bill's ill-fated predecessor, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866 of the Eightieth Congress, it "supplements private enterprise at its weak points and strengthens it where it could be strong."

In the heat of their misguided emotions, the antihousing lobby has been falling, as a matter of fact, into much larger and more glaring inconsistencies than any little discrepancy in statistical usage. For long years they regularly attacked the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as inflationary. And now they are still making the same charge against the present bills, S. 1070 and H. R. 4009. "Public housing is inflationary" says the Savings and Loan League and all the other opposition pamphlets sing the same tune.

But I need hardly point out that these same organizations and their close confreres have been singing quite a different tune, and most vociferously, in connection with other legislation recently considered in Congress. To hear them in that role, one would think that a major depression had already descended on us.

But there are others, and not only among the administration's supporters by any means, who have seriously studied the fiscal aspects of the housing problem and therefore do not need to veer from side to side, or try to play both ends against the middle. Let me quote from an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune for March 4, 1948, an editorial which is still more timely and urgent today than it was a year ago when it was written:

"Accepting the widespread need for housing for all income levels, we need a comprehensive program to meet this need. Houses now being built concentrate on serving the upper third income bracket. Little is being built for the great middle market, and virtually nothing at all for the lowest third who can be reached only by Government subsidies. Nothing could be more inflationary than the present housebuilding boom. Current building is skimming the cream from the housing market and, given the peculiar economics of the building business, the only question is when that market will break.

"Certainly a balanced building program, with a substantial share of housing for middle- and low-income groups would be less inflationary and more likely to lead to the sustained high level of productivity over a long period which all experts agree is needed to overcome present housing deficiencies."

In sum, here is one issue which is truly bipartisan in the best sense, S. 1070 and H. R. 4009 which are pending in both the Senate and in the House of Representatives are supported equally by honest liberals and by honest conservatives, by everyone in short who has studied the problem and has his country's welfare at heart.

GOP Trying To Talk Fair Deal to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Doris Fleeson entitled "GOP Trying To Talk Fair Deal to Death," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1949:

GOP TRYING TO TALK FAIR DEAL TO DEATH—REPUBLICAN SENATORS FILIBUSTER ON EVERY ISSUE, BUT ARE NOT UNITED

(By Doris Fleeson)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The real filibuster of the Eighty-first Congress is under way in the Senate.

Republicans opposed to the entire Truman program are conducting it. It consists of extending debate day after day by long speeches more or less relevant to the issue and continuing long past the hour when it is apparent that the Senate has made up its mind. The classic example is the 15-day ECA debate in which a dozen isolationists consumed three-quarters of the time and at the end registered only 7 noes as compared to 70 ayes.

The Democrats realize what is going on but they are powerless to stop it. They pretend to be brave about it and insist that, in the end, it will prove fatal politics for the Republicans.

Nevertheless, they are tense and annoyed. They realize that to pull a clear-cut creditable record out of the confusion will test their endurance, their nerve, and their brains.

The situation represents in a sense a war of nerves in which the victors will be proclaimed by the American people in the 1950 election. Meantime every piece of legislation becomes a major crisis, a wearing and time-consuming struggle. This is hard on all the Members of the greatest gentlemen's club in the world which prefers to do its work in a less militant atmosphere.

Some Republicans frankly dislike the trend and privately damn their minority leader, Senator WHERRY, whom they blame for this strategy. This group would also prefer to play down their southern allies of cloture-civil rights fame.

So far the elder statesmen of the party, Senators TAFT and VANDENBERG, are keeping their counsel. Faced in caucus with a real split in the party, they have acceded to the course of not making any issue so far as a party matter. The result is that many Republican Senators, like some Democrats, are playing by ear and that Senator WHERRY himself has veered far right of TAFT-VANDENBERG stands. It has been suggested that the Republicans really have a TAFT center, a VANDENBERG left, and a WHERRY right.

TAFT THE WHIP-CRACKER

It is quite possible that TAFT, on domestic issues which greatly concern him and in which he personally has much at stake, will soon do a little whip-cracking. These include Taft-Hartley repeal, housing, and aid to education. TAFT in the role of rescuer of the Senate from the verbal morass in which it is floundering would earn rather widespread gratitude.

The Democratic leadership's obvious plight led to a week-end flurry of reports that majority leader LUCAS was disgusted and ready to quit. These are false. Some of his colleagues have been sharp with LUCAS about timetable and other blunders. But in the main they appreciate his hard task and are not inclined to ride him.

The worst feature of it all to elder Senators is the tendentious quality of the tedious debates, the poor attendance of Senators and the lack of a real exchange of views. They feel that too often the Senators apparently want only to get their harangues printed, their refusals to yield for questions indicating that they are not really interested in the opinions of others.

The Truman Circus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD some short articles by William Robert Plumme. They follow:

THE TRUMAN CIRCUS

I. PRESIDENT CALLS FOR FASCIST MACHINERY TO PROTECT AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By William Robert Plumme)

President Truman's program as revealed in his message to Congress on the state of the Union and the national economy have been described as socialistic. Socialism, however, aside from its close connection with communism, is also a nice word for fascism.

It has not been in error that Communists have said fascism was the halfway mark toward communism. Advanced in the middle 1930's, as an excuse for their support of the New Deal, it was meant, no doubt, to placate those left-wing thinkers who recognized the New Deal for what it was and is, even while remaining under some myopic illusion regarding the true nature of communism. The dream often seems so much fairer than the reality. The New Deal, of course, was also accused of following the 1932 platform of the Socialist Party.

Neither should it be considered as accidental that Mussolini was an ex-Socialist, nor that Hitler's program for a state-controlled economy was called national socialism. Like our own New Deal, both were based upon a combination of syndicalism and a sort of watered-down socialism sometimes called Fabian socialism.

Under the first, the economy of the Nation is broken down by a series of general strikes, such as those which have occurred both in France and in Italy. In Italy such strikes preceded the advent of fascism. The same purpose may be seen behind the Nation-wide strikes pulled by some of our labor unions here—namely the great family of CIO.

Fabian Socialism, on the other hand, is the peaceful voting into existence of a socialistic state in the manner in which it has been taking place in England under the Labor Ministery.

The tactics of the former, however, can be combined with the latter as is being demonstrated by our New Deal-CIO tie-up.

Government control is fascism

The economic base of fascism is government control of the nation's economy—of

the means of production. Price fixing, wage setting, the control of working conditions, the allocation of materials and manpower, compulsory "vocational guidance," the control of the investment market, and of imports and exports are all part of such a regime, as, indeed, they are of all forms of despotism. The medical profession, of course, is also socialized.

The great difference between fascism and communism is that under the former ownership remains in the hands of its investors and managers; management, however, is deprived of its freedom to produce, and the opportunity to improve production, both in quality and quantity, while the public is deprived of its freedom of choice, and the benefits of competition. Government rather than competition and the customer set the standards for production.

It is a serfdom in which government enjoys all of the benefits of a totalitarian economy without any of its responsibilities, and the well being of everyone becomes dependant upon the benevolence and omniscience of a legion of selfish, unfeeling, unknowing, ignorant and self-seeking administrators acting at cross purposes for reasons of personal advantage.

Communism merely does away with the mockery of private enterprise, replacing it with one of public ownership by the people, for it takes possession in the name of the people, who only occasionally and on some matters may be permitted to vote "yes."

Actually, however, the term "people" as used by the Communists has never been defined. Whether it means all of the members of the society, the Communist Party, or the highest levels of policy making in the management of industry and government has never been stated.

The President's message, however, did not call for a full-fledged Fascist state. A few of the assortment of measures for that have been left out. But it made a good start. It is to be remembered that neither did national socialism in Germany spring into being full grown. It too was enacted piecemeal.

Absent, for instance, are import controls—obviously out of line with the stated aims of the reciprocal trade agreements—which, however, do actually hide a good deal of controls on imports just the same.

The allocation of labor, is also absent, partially because the Taft-Hartley Act must first be repealed. But in January 1945 after the Germans had made their break through at Ardennes Forest, that incident was used as an excuse by the administration for the reintroduction of a bill labelled "must legislation" to meet the new emergency. Later its real purpose was revealed, i. e., the control of our labor supply after the war was over.

Fascism in Britain

The allocation of labor is in effect in Brittain where it is known as the Breckinridge plan. Its name in Hitler's Germany is not known to this writer, if, indeed, it had a name.

Thus the democracy which today exists in England, and which some people insist upon calling socialism is in reality full fledged fascism on the high road to communism through the nationalization of some key industries.

The rest—the allocation of materials in short supply, selective price and related wage control, export controls, the control of farm production and the control of credit—are all there in the President's program. Some are watered down to be sure, but in principle are just as deadly to the system of free enterprise, and the freedom of self-government. Credit control, for instance, is not a very far cry from the power to conscript capital—once desired by President Roosevelt as a wartime power.

THE TRUMAN CIRCUS

II. PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM A HODGEPODGE OF CONTRADICTION—SMALL BUSINESS HIT

(By William Robert Plumme)

From the standpoint of political science the program of President Truman, as enunciated in his message to Congress, is pixie-eyed; from the standpoint of political economy it is ruinous; while from that of political philosophy it is full of contradiction.

Thus the President states: "We must assure small business the freedom and opportunity to grow and prosper," and at the same time wants to saddle it with an allocation of materials, and an increase in taxes for the middle-income brackets, i. e., the owners of small businesses.

While President Truman admits that personal savings increased in 1948 over 1947, and that a larger proportion was invested in housing, unincorporated business and farms, he fails to mention the important role the Eightieth Congress played in making this possible through tax reduction. Nor did he mention the important part tax reduction, with its consequent expansion of business, played in providing 1,000,000 more jobs for the Nation's increased work force.

His feelings on the matter, however, are plain since he wants to increase taxes. This fits in with the New Deal's traditional policy of using syndicalistic tactics to create an economic impasse which, in turn, serves as an excuse for advancing socialistic measures to solve the new emergency.

No doubt this adds to small businesses "incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare." Small business might like the pat on the head, but it must remain gravely concerned over the knives he is sharpening. It cannot be blamed for being afraid to turn its back.

Small business provides most jobs

It should not be forgotten that small business provides most of the Nation's income and wealth, and is the backbone not only of our economic freedoms but of our political institutions and liberties as well. Destroy small business and you destroy this Republic of ours, and everything it stands for: freedom of opportunity and enterprise, the pursuit of happiness, and even the ability to enforce the bill of rights.

Freedom of enterprise and self-government are like Siamese twins. Each perishes without the other. It is equally true that economic monopoly and despotism are part of each other.

In line with the President's policy for "a fair distribution of opportunity" "business will have the help, and encouragement of Government" with price fixing, allocation of materials, export controls, credit controls, the lowering of tariffs on imports through reciprocal trade agreements, and more taxes, if the President has his way.

"Small business has been losing ground to growing monopoly," stated the President. Granting that this is true, which party has been in office these past 16 years.

A report issued by one New Deal Attorney General accused the steel industry of being almost completely integrated, and monopolistic in character. Many such reports have been issued under the New Deal without subsequent action. In the case of the steel industry, however, United States Steel was permitted to acquire a steel plant out West, built at Government expense during the war, from one agency of the Government whose members are responsible to the President of the United States. Then another agency of Government whose members, likewise, are responsible to the President of the United States, the Justice Department stepped in with antitrust proceedings against the corporation. The New Deal packed Supreme Court, of course, found in favor of United States Steel.

If President Truman was sincere in his complaint against this "growing monopoly" he could have prevented United States Steel from acquiring the plant in the first place.

Thus the President has uttered the strongest indictment against his own party, his own administration, and the men who hold office under him, and the strongest reasons against granting him the power to allocate materials, which he seeks.

Allocation hits small business

During the war Congressmen were kept busy with complaints of small-business men, who after having been awarded war contracts and sometimes with the highest priorities by the military services, found themselves being discriminated against and hamstrung by the Washington bureaucrats.

As one high-ranking Washington bureaucrat stated with regard to a businessman with an AAA priority from the Navy: "Why, he is just a little fellow." Yet this little fellow who was able to produce his product cheaper than some of his big competitors was unable to obtain the necessary materials. The high-ranking bureaucrat had come to the Government from one of these competitors.

The reconstruction of the power of Government to allocate materials would recreate such situations, and for two reasons: First, many of the administrators would have to come from big business itself and, as in the past, would represent the interests of their old organizations, rather than the general welfare. The rest would seek to curry favor with the giant corporations. In the past they expected to and did go to work for their organizations when they left Government, their jobs with the war having come to an end. Of course, in leaving they issued statements declaring it impossible for them to get along on their salaries of from $6,000 to $12,000 a year, a chant which was taken up by their friends outside of Government.

Under such conditions, who would represent or care about the multitude of little fellows, who, collectively, produce more, provide more jobs, and contribute more to the general welfare than all of the big business organizations put together.

Bureaucracy always despotic

The truth of the matter is bureaucrats never have and never will represent either the public in general, nor business as a whole. Bureaucratic control of a Nation's economy has always left the small man on the outside looking in. This was true in ancient times. It was true in the days of the king's courtiers, and it is equally true today. They have never created anything by economic waste by compelling businessmen to scurry all over the place in order to obtain materials which otherwise would have been easy to get at.

There has been every indication that the E. R. P. has been following a similar practice of favoritism, despite provisions in the act intended to give everyone an equal opportunity at obtaining contracts. It has been disclosed that in some fields certain favored business organizations have received contract preferences at the expense of their rivals. Recently President Truman himself promulgated an order to Paul G. Hoffman to ignore these provisions in the act altogether.

THE TRUMAN CIRCUS

III. PUBLIC HIT BY PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

(By William Robert Plumme)

As a cure-all for inflation, President Truman has called for an assortment of controls, which have never worked anywhere, nor at any time in the history of mankind. He

wants increased taxes on corporate and individual incomes, gifts and inheritances, excise, and fresh social-security taxes.

Now who is the President trying to kid? Who does he think is going to have to pay these taxes? Ultimately it must be the consuming public, either over the counter or out of their pay envelopes.

For labor it must mean another decrease in purchasing power—reason enough to start fresh demands for pay hikes, and set off another inflationary spiral.

For small business and the middle income group it means a decrease of savings, a decrease in the funds which otherwise would be available for the expansion of small, unincorporated businesses.

Yet an expansion of these businesses must take place if they are to contribute their share toward the accommodation of the yearly addition of 1,000,000 persons to our labor supply which the President indicates will occur. The voting of new taxes would be a body blow to the Nation's small business organizations in their effort to compete with the growth of monopoly to which he referred in his messages to Congress. But it would be in keeping with the syndicalistic tactics of the New Deal-CIO alliance in their drive toward a fascist state.

Far from acting as a depressant upon inflation, increased taxation with a record peacetime budget merely means the transfer of purchasing power from the consumer to Government, with an accompanying lowering of the general standard of living. With labor seeking to recover through increases in wages, it means stepping up the pressure of inflation, not its decrease.

And if the other pet bogey of the President, deflation were to set in, instead of purchasing power being in the hands of the American people where it ought to be, Government would be compelled to step in with a new spending spree. This presumably would lead to more taxes, or else to deficit spending which also means more purchasing power in the hands of Government and less in the hands of the public.

Such a policy in Government must inevitably lead to more and more control over our lives until we become reduced to a position of political and economic servitude. It may be viewed as another tactic in the syndicalistic approach to socialism, i. e., fascism.

Government-created inflation

Depressions may or may not be man-made as the President claims but the recent inflation was most certainly Government-made.

Time was when the Nation's currency was backed by gold, and exchangeable therefor. The New Deal had to take the Nation off the gold standard before it could indulge in its first spending spree, domestic and foreign.

There is, however, another commodity which can back up currency, being exchangeable therefor, and that is merchandise on the shelves or property such as machinery, homes, land, etc. If the supply of goods increases in relation to the supply of money, prices go down; but if the supply of money increases in relation to that of goods, prices must go up unless price controls are clamped on.

This is commonly called the law of supply and demand, and it operates in Communist Russia just as strongly as it does in capitalistic America.

During the war, money was paid out as wages for labor, etc. Most of the goods produced went off to war and to other countries. With price controls in effect, despite high taxes, there developed an excess of money in the hands of the public which was not backed by goods on the shelves, and never shall be so backed.

Sooner or later this pent-up excess purchasing power would have to be released, if nowhere else, then in black-market operations. The effect would have to be inflationary since the new goods on the shelves were backed by fresh money paid out for labor and other services.

A continuation of price control would not have been a solution. It could not skim off the excess purchasing power. As a remedy it was worse than the evil since it created the bottlenecks and shortages which inevitably follow in the wake of Government controls, thereby creating more inflationary pressure, the ratio between cash in the pocketbook and goods on the shelves becoming even greater.

The Soviet Union solved the problem by deflating the value of its currency, by taking purchasing power away from those who had been saving their money rather than spending it.

Public pays and pays

In our own case, the public having paid for the war once in the form of shortages, has been called upon to pay for it all over again in the form of inflation, and is being called upon to pay for it yet once again as it picks up the tabs on $252,000,000,000 of debt plus additional charges of interest.

This has proven very perplexing to a lot of people, but the President in his message forgot to touch upon the matter.

Not content, however, with the inflationary effects of wartime deficit spending, the omnipotent holy holies of Washington saw fit to bid up the price of grain in its purchases for shipment to Europe last spring and called for price controls as a solution for their own acts.

Likewise, a bottleneck in home construction was created by one Government agency's purchasing and hoarding of cement still in short supply, and so necessary for the construction of homes, roads, and dams. Whereupon another bureau called upon Government to enter the field of home construction and provide the housing which they accused private builders of being unable to produce.

Col. Edward C. Kavanagh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein copy of a letter conferring a high French decoration upon my distinguished friend, Col. Edward C. Kavanagh:

FRENCH EMBASSY TO THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 16, 1949.

Col. EDWARD C. KAVANAGH,
Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLONEL: I have the honor to advise you that by decree dated January 12, 1949, you have been named Chevalier in the Order of the Legion of Honor.

I am happy to be able to congratulate you for this well-merited distinction which you must consider as evidence of the gratitude of the French Government for the inestimable services you have rendered to France in the course of the First and Second World Wars, thus helping to maintain and reinforce with admirable devotion, the friendly relations between France and the United States.

Please be good enough to accept, my dear Colonel, the assurance of my highest regards,

HENRI BONNET,
French Ambassador to the United States.

The European Recovery Program, the World-Wide Struggle Against Communism, the Necessity of Keeping America Solvent, and the Further Necessity of Military Preparedness of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration the European recovery program commonly known as the Marshall plan. We are beginning the second year of the operation of this program. After extensive hearings before the committee whose duty it is to write this bill and refer it with its recommendations to the Members of Congress, we find that it reaches the floor of the House for debate after having received the unanimous support of all members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans.

Members of both parties have stated to us the absolute necessity of continuing this program and they state in substance that we must not abandon the countries in Europe and England who are steadfastly resisting the spread of communism and who believe in free government and who believe in God and the church.

They have stated to us that in case of war, which we all hope can be avoided, that these countries will be our first line of defense. Realizing that there is a division in the world today, that peoples and countries everywhere that believe in freedom and the Republican form of Government and who believe in God are arrayed on one side against communism which curses God and defies religion and hopes to destroy it and who have declared themselves as being against free government, it appears to me that there is nothing left for us to do but to take the recommendation of all members of this committee from both parties and to proceed along in our bipartisan foreign policy and vote to support this bill.

America can no longer live by herself. Modern means of communication and transportation have made us close neighbors to the rest of the world and if communism sweeps over the earth, America may go down with the rest of civilization and it would take us a thousand years to get back to our present standards of living.

While this is true, we must give some thought and be concerned about the solvency of America. If we so weaken our financial structure, and if we place too great a burden upon the backs of the taxpayers of America, we may get in such a situation that we could no longer protect ourselves or help other Christian, freedom-loving nations.

No one from either side of the aisle has introduced any amendment or any bill to discontinue the European Recovery Program. All we have in the way

of an amendment is that the huge sum requested in this bill be reduced approximately $500,000,000 which represents an approximate cut of 10 percent.

I favor this amendment and this cut in the appropriation for the Marshall plan. I think it is time that we should notify all of our free nations in Europe that the United States cannot continue to meet every request that is placed upon us even though there appears to be a desperate struggle going on and desperate need for the funds. It is my opinion that if we reduce the amount of this bill by 10 percent it will let every European country know that they themselves must exert greater effort and greater economy and that we are reaching the end of our ability to support and aid them in their recovery program.

Another reason why I think we should cut this appropriation 10 percent is that in our own domestic economy and especially in our appropriations for public works in America this Congress, at the present session, has agreed to cut the appropriation bills, not 10 percent, but 15 percent. We did this because we though that prices of all sorts of goods and commodities were going down, that money would purchase more, and because we felt that rigid economy was necessary to keep this Government solvent.

Under these conditions, while everybody realizes the necessity of supporting the European recovery program, I shall vote for the 10 percent reduction and then I shall vote for the bill whether the amendment carrying the reduction is passed or not, because it seems to be absolutely necessary to stop the spread of communism in Europe.

We will have up for consideration on April 13 a bill providing for appropriations to carry on our armed forces program and permit them to expand so as to secure this country in case of war. This bill will provide for the largest amount of money in the peacetime history of America. It will be necessary to appropriate to the various branches of our armed forces a little short of $16,000,000,000. That, added to the sum necessary to support the Marshall plan for another 12 months, will exceed $20,000,000,000 of American money.

All Members of Congress realize that our needs are desperate, that America is at the crossroads of her history, and that we must be prepared in case of war. If these were not the facts, it is my belief that no Member of Congress would be for these huge appropriations and these enormous spending programs. They will tax the ability of the American people to meet them and they will entail much sacrifice and hardship upon every American citizen.

On the other hand, the Committee that has prepared and presented to Congress the bill calling for approximately $16,000,000,000 for our Armed Forces to secure this country brings us a unanimous report. All Republican Congressmen and all Democratic Congressmen say that this program is necessary to preserve America.

We all know that Russia is on the march, that her world-wide plans are designed toward revolution and the overthrow of all Republican forms of government and all Christian people by force.

We undertook to reconcile the differences of the various nations of the world and to build a lasting peace through the United Nations Organization. For many months the United States and other free countries struggled with Russia to agree upon a program of peace. Thirty different times Russia has blocked the efforts of the other nations of the world to bring about a lasting peace. Russia does not want peace. She is on the march and has already overrun and captured and subjugated the peoples of 15 nations against their will.

Recently the Communist organization in France, in Italy, and in our beloved America declared to the world that in case of war, they would support Russia against their own homeland. Counting her own people and the people she has conquered in Europe, Russia now has over 200,000,000 people in Europe. Counting the Communists in Korea and the people in China that have recently come under the world-wide sweep of communism, Russia has more than 200,000,000 people across the Pacific.

It appears that America alone is holding aloft the torch of Christianity and free government. We have less than 150,000,000 people. We cannot afford to allow Russia to conquer the balance of Europe, and neither can we afford to allow her to conquer the rest of China, India, and the Orient. Our situation is desperate. We must make the protection and security of this country our first concern, This overcomes and overrides our great desire to economize in America.

We are convinced from the exhaustive studies and reports of this committee that it is absolutely necessary that we appropriate these huge sums totaling approximately $16,000,000,000 for our armed forces and in excess of four billion for the European recovery program.

Because of the afore-mentioned reasons, I shall support both programs. I think that our committee that reported out the bill providing for funds for our armed forces acted very wisely in placing great emphasis upon building the strongest Air Force that the world has ever seen. Our very lives, our security, and the future of this country depends upon the military might of this country, the atomic bomb, and the uniting together of all peoples everywhere that are willing to resist the blood-thirsty dictator of Russia who designs to conquer the world.

On the Legal Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a radio address by Mr. Fraser S. Gardner, national legislative chairman of the Army and Navy Union, the Nation's oldest active veterans organization. Mr. Gardner has long been active in veterans' organizations, and since 1944 has presented a radio program entitled "for the veteran." His words, therefore are entitled to consideration by veterans and by Members of Congress.

The address follows:

At the close of World War II, almost 20,000,000 men had risked their lives, broken up their families, suffered economic, physical, and psychological injury to help maintain the freedoms of America. They had looked to us, here at home, to provide them with the means to win it—the guns, the transports, the equipment.

When they turned homeward, victorious, they looked to us and to the new and powerful resources of rich America for jobs. They also looked to us for the way back, back to a normal productive life in the environment of peace and security. They sought it in the same way as their civilian neighbors, in an expanding economy that provides good jobs for all employables, not because they are veterans, but because they are men. They did not find it in a mustering-out pay check, a preferential rating for nonexistent jobs, or even in more than generous unemployment allowances. Those who have "found" themselves have done so only by waging another war, that of "dog eat dog," and then to linger in the fear that the boom is over, the bust is here. Not yet do we have any assurance of a continuing profitable economy.

So far all the programs for employing the returned servicemen in our industries have been predicated on the general assumption there would be a job for him to do. And, so far, of course, that has been true with the majority of our veterans choosing to go into industry. During the past 3 or 4 years management and labor, as well as local and Federal Governments, have taken steps to help the veteran find the kind of job he specifically wanted. Most of these steps involved some form of veteran preference, either State, Federal, or both. But the economic future of the veteran cannot be solved solely through preferential treatment and Government aid. The jobs have not only got to be there, they must remain there. The crux of the problem lies in planning for an economy of abundance, a prosperous America.

In the course of the war we geared our economy to an unprecedentedly high level of production, and we cannot, we must not, sink back into a lower level of production without inviting unemployment and economic stagnation. In these postwar years, therefore, we must achieve peacetime enterprise and the production of consumer goods and services on a wholly new scale.

It was my supposition 4 years ago that this country would be unable to utilize in the questionable period ahead, anywhere near the amount of products which we were then manufacturing for war purposes. In fact, an enriched standard of living and full and continued peacetime employment cannot be achieved wholly by the production of things. As one suggestion today the approach to them can be greatly aided, however, through an expansion of the social services which make a fuller and healthier community existence—medicine, education, recreation, religion, child care, youth programs, and the like. And these can be supplemented, of course, by soundly conceived projects for the development of our natural resources; the harnessing of rivers to promote navigation, irrigation, and power; the construction of bridges, highways, and harbors; the conservation and exploitation of soil and forests and mineral reserves.

Stimulation of small business, civic development, and public works, full use of America's gigantic productive resources, incentive taxes, expansion of foreign markets,

low tariffs—all of these and more are necessary to assure the veteran sustained, suitable employment. A continuing healthy overall economy will obviously provide a healthier chance for the veteran than a sick economy with so-called preferential treatment. Most veterans instinctively sense this fact.

Disabled veterans should, of course, continue to be entitled to extra protection and preferences for both public and private employment. Their pensions are still not large enough for handicapped veterans to live on without outside income.

Disabled veterans have the most to fear from a scarcity economy and unemployment, because they are for the most part marginal employees, the last to be employed and the first to go when contraction begins. Their only hope for a decent income and a job, unless preference for them can be really effective, lies in an expanded economy for America, with jobs that last for all.

But, even though we might be successful in securing effective preference for the employment of veterans—disabled or able-bodied—which we have done rather well, the welfare of any one group of Americans is inevitably linked up with the welfare of all other groups of Americans and, therefore, we must strive to cooperate together toward the objective of full, useful employment for all Americans.

As I see it, we face a momentous choice in this postwar period. Having experienced full employment during the war, the American people will not tolerate protracted heavy unemployment again. If we cannot get reasonably full employment in one way we will try to get it in another. Thus, the choice appears to be whether we shall achieve our goal by general planning and general management of our economy, creating general conditions in which the people will make their own permanent jobs through private enterprise, or whether failure to do so in that way will lead us into detailed control and management of all our economic activities. If we are to do it by the general conditions we create we must do adequate planning to that end and do it now. Sustained full employment will not just happen.

Irregular Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to me from Mr. Jack Scavenius, president of Mount McKinley Airways, Inc., Anchorage, Alaska:

Because of your continued interest in the problems confronting irregular air carriers in Alaska I am again writing you in further explanation of my viewpoint in these matters and submit the following for your information and consideration.

In reply to my letter to the Civil Aeronautics Board of January 10, a copy of which I sent to the chairman of the Board, Mr. Joseph J. O'Connell, I received a letter from Mr. O'Connell dated February 1, in which he states, among other things: "However, it may be pointed out that there is considerable doubt, at least insofar as available information would indicate, whether additional regulations would have prevented that accident." In my reply to Mr. O'Connell dated February 28, I state: "Having read over the most of the available information concerning the Yale student accident, I agree with your statement but the fact still remains that had the Administrator vigorously enforced present safety regulations, inadequate as they are, this particular operator would either have been out of business 2 years ago or at least he would have been forced to operate in a manner conforming to present safety regulations and common sense."

Approximately a year and a half ago I told the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce that in my opinion the Civil Aeronautics Administration was guilty of gross dereliction of duty. I stated at the time that I was convinced that the local inspectors were doing their level best but, of course, the policy governing the action of the local inspectors comes from Washington.

There are today numerous operators who constitute a potential danger to the public due to their type of operation. Overloading is still prevalent. I have, during the past 2½ years, seen any number of operators, whose idea of maintenance is an occasional mechanic with a tool kit when something goes so badly wrong that it absolutely has to be fixed.

As an example, just about a month ago one operator told me that he feared that C. A. A. was going to get tough and require turn-around checks here in Anchorage. I asked him, rather amazed, if he flew his airplane from Seattle to Anchorage, a distance of some 1,500 miles, let it sit on the field at Anchorage for maybe 2 or 3 days, load it up with passengers and fly it back to Seattle without a check and he cheerfully stated, "Oh, yes, we never check our airplanes in Anchorage."

Mr. O'Connell stated further in his letter that he was sure that the Administrator would wish to be advised of any cases known to me in which enforcement of safety regulations may have been less rigorous than necessary. This, of course, is not possible for me. Being an operator myself, I do not have the time nor the inclination to be detective or stool pigeon for the Administrator. I could fill several pages with violations known to me that have taken place during the past 2½ years but I would, of course, not be able to produce any proof that would stand up in court.

It is not my purpose to get anyone in trouble but these abuses and violations are known to most everyone in the industry and it certainly must be known to the Administrator. The most important thing to me and to the industry as a whole is to get these things cleared up. The period of leniency and education should be over and the operator who wishes to operate in a safe and conscientious manner should be encouraged and helped, while the operator who insists on being an outlaw should be vigorously prosecuted.

As an operator of a noncertificated, irregular carrier I am, of course, very anxious to see the nonscheduled operators get a chance to survive and prosper. But there has been too much irresponsible talk about how the nonscheduled operators have been able to make a profit without subsidies. But the fact remains that some of these operators forget that the reason why they have been able to operate at such a low cost is partly that they have been able to obtain airplanes, engines and accessories, and so forth, from war surplus and partly because they have operated with inadequate maintenance and substandard personnel.

I firmly believe that there is a place in the picture for the nonscheduled operator and that this type of operation should be fostered and encouraged. But I equally firmly believe that strict enforcement of safety regulations is necessary and I further believe, as previously stated, that the present safety regulations governing nonscheduled operations are pitifully inadequate.

I have sent the above letter with my original letter to the Board, to the members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also to the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to Governor Gruening.

Sincerely yours,

MT. MCKINLEY AIRWAYS, INC.

By JACK F. SCAVENIUS.

Are the Slums Disappearing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in one of the pamphlets—Housing Dictatorship and Soft Socialism, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, 1949—now being circulated by the opposition to S. 1070, the slum clearance, public housing, farm housing, and housing-research bill of which H. R. 4009 is the counterpart in the House of Representatives, Thomas J. Holden claims that the widely accepted national estimates of slum conditions and replacement needs are greatly exaggerated, and that the slum problem is rapidly diminishing. He questions the validity of figures used in numerous congressional documents, which are based on the enumeration and tabulation of substandard housing conditions in the United States Housing Census of 1940.

No evidence has ever been brought forward—

He says—

to show that the 1940 census enumerators ascertained, or were sufficiently qualified as experts to judge, whether any or all such units should be classified for demolition or were susceptible of improvement.

And he further claims, somewhat inconsistently, that—

Repeated Census Bureau surveys have shown that there has been steady progress in repairing, modernizing, or otherwise improving existing dwelling units.

It is quite true that the Housing census does not provide the basis for a scientific evaluation of slum conditions, and no one claims that it does. These data have only been used as a rough index, and their limitations were discussed last year by a joint committee of the National Association of Housing Officials and the National Public Housing Conference, as follows:

For national estimates of housing quality we can only rely on census counts of dwellings "in need of major repairs" or lacking in minimum sanitary facilities. By this crude measure, at least one-third of our homes were substandard in 1940. Some of these structures were, of course, capable of repair or modernization and the current census sample surveys indicate that general prosperity has encouraged such improvement. But the vast majority require replacement and many that were virtually abandoned in the thirties are full to overflowing today. Furthermore, the census does not take into account many

equally serious factors—light and ventilation, fire safety, neighborhood conditions—which can seldom be remedied except by wholesale reconstruction. "The detailed Appraisal Method for Measuring the Quality of Housing recently developed by the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association for the qualitative analysis and classification of urban housing on a scientific basis has only been used thus far in a few sample areas. But the results indicate that dwellings requiring demolition are at least as numerous as the dwellings roughly termed 'substandard' on the basis of the 1940 census." (A Housing Program for Now and Later, National Public Housing Conference, 1948.)

In the meantime, however, an exhaustive official study of several blighted areas in my home city of Milwaukee, utilizing the American Public Health Association techniques, has been published. And the results prove beyond question that, for this typical American community, the dwellings requiring outright demolition in the interests of civic health and welfare are not less but more numerous than the rough census gage would have indicated.

The Milwaukee survey covered 221 blocks in three areas, totaling 11 census districts. Twelve thousand and fifty homes were visited, the vast majority of them analyzed room by room. And the results proved that 100 of these blocks, containing 5,057 dwellings, were too far gone or too inherently bad to be capable of modernization or rehabilitation on any sensible or economic basis, and that they therefore require outright demolition. An official recommendation to this effect was made by all the city departments concerned, through the Redevelopment Coordinating Committee. Under the machinery provided by the Wisconsin "blighted area law" these blocks will be scheduled for clearance and reconstruction as rapidly as feasible, with only "interim enforcement" to be applied by the Health Department in the meantime. (As Milwaukee city fathers have regularly testified in Washington, the actual rate must depend on the provision of Federal aids for housing and slum clearance similar to those in S. 1070 and H. R. 4009). The committee likewise determined, on the basis of the survey, that the remaining 121 blocks may yet be saved by systematic rehabilitation and modernization, but even here a large number of scattered structures will have to be torn down in the process.

How do these up-to-date findings, based on the most scientific appraisal techniques available and handled throughout by trained inspectors compare with the findings of the 1940 housing census for the same areas? Surely this is as good a test as could be made of the validity of the census as a rough index of replacement needs.

Thirty specific items applicable to each dwelling are included in the American Public Health Association schedule, and eight items dealing with the quality of neighborhood environment. These are evaluated through a very refined system of penalty points and over-all scoring. As for the scientific care with which the survey was carried out, the following may be quoted from the report:

A consultant in housing appraisal from the staff of the committee on the hygiene of housing of the American Public Health Association was employed by the city of Milwaukee for a period of about 4 weeks in August 1945, for the purpose of training a few key people in the health department and the land commission in the proper use of the appraisal method. Two sanitation inspectors of the health department then trained several other sanitation inspectors in the use of the method. Field appraisal began in September 1945 and was carried on intermittently during 1946, with delay due to a shortage of personnel. Then, the common council authorized the creation of eight positions in the health department for 1947 in order to permit housing appraisal and housing ordinance enforcement. * * * After a training period of approximately 4 weeks the inspectors began actual field appraisal work in July 1947. The remaining seven census tracts were completed by the middle of February 1948. The processing and analysis of data was completed by the end of March 1948. (Blight Elimination and Urban Redevelopment in Milwaukee, report of the Redevelopment Coordinating Committee, city of Milwaukee, June 1948.)

The answer is clear.

In these same 11 census districts in 1940 the enumerators found 4,748 dwellings which were either in need of major repairs or lacked minimum sanitary facilities. This figure is just slightly smaller than the 5,057 dwellings now scheduled for demolition in these districts. But it must be noted that the 5,057 dwellings are all located in the 100 blocks now planned for over-all reconstruction, while other substandard dwellings requiring eventual demolition are found elsewhere in the area.

The 1940 census was a pretty good index, it would seem, if somewhat conservative. And the slums will not even begin to disappear until something like S. 1070 is enacted.

Better Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the working men and women of this country deserve a better system of social security, and action by Congress on this important subject is long overdue. No program is more vitally associated with the welfare of our working people than an adequate pension at retirement age.

For years we have been talking about the shortcomings of these laws. But to date nothing has been done about it. Americans who have reached retirement age are trying to exist on pensions as low as $27 a month. This is a lower scale than that provided for people of European countries who are the beneficiaries of our foreign-aid program. If we can afford to be generous to peoples of other lands we can at least afford to be fair to our own people. Social security in the United States today is a farce. The rates are so miserable and inadequate that those who are receiving aid under the program cannot maintain themselves on decent American standards.

I sponsored legislation in the Seventy-eighth and Eightieth Congresses and again in this Congress to extend, revise, and improve the social-security system. This Congress should not adjourn until favorable action has been taken to make these laws fair and workable.

PROTECTION FOR ADDITIONAL GROUPS OF WORKERS

My bill, H. R. 2033, would make old-age and survivors insurance available on a voluntary basis, to three large groups of workers now excluded from the system. These groups are: State, county, and municipal employees, employees of nonprofit institutions, and the self-employed.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PROGRAM

My bill would abolish many of the provisions that now restrict the old-age and survivors insurance program so that it cannot fulfill its original purpose. This bill would establish contributory social insurance as the primary method of affording basic protection against the economic hazards of old age and premature death by, first, providing adequate benefits based on today's living costs and wage levels; second, liberalizing eligibility requirements to enable a larger proportion of older workers to qualify for benefits; and, third, making the protection of the program available to three large groups of workers now excluded from this protection.

Self-employed: There are about 9,500,000 persons, including business and professional people, farmers, and others who earn their livelihood by means of self-employment. Many of these, because of low or irregular earnings or losses of savings in later years, are unable to provide for their own security in old age or protection for their survivors by savings or purchase of private insurance. For such persons, opportunity to obtain old-age and survivors insurance coverage is essential. Others would be enabled to supplement whatever protection they obtained from private sources through coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system. Furthermore, the basic protection of the system would be available to persons shifting from the status of employees in covered employment to self-employment.

State, county, and municipal employees. In April 1947, employees of the States and local units of government numbered nearly 4 million, almost half of whom were not covered under any retirement system. Moreover, many State and local systems do not provide survivorship protection, or are otherwise inadequate.

Whether State and local employees in a State were afforded old-age and survivors insurance protection would be optional with the State, as in order to obtain coverage for its employees, the State must consent to the imposition of the Federal tax. Although the provision in the bill is intended primarily to provide protection to public employees in States without retirement plans, it would make possible the supplementing of State and local plans and, in addition, these employees would continue to have the basic protection afforded by the old-age and survivors insurance system, even if they

shifted from public employment to work in private industry or from one governmental unit to another. Similarly, employees in private industry could accept jobs with State or local units of government without loss of their old-age and survivors insurance protection, if the public employment is in a State that exercised the coverage option.

Employees of nonprofit institutions: There are about 1,000,000 employees of nonprofit institutions and it has been estimated that probably not more than two-fifths of this number are covered by formal retirement plans.

Under existing law, a retired worker on whose wages old-age and survivors insurance taxes have been paid for 12 years receives a monthly primary insurance benefit of $28, if his average monthly wage was $100. The formula in my bill would provide this beneficiary $46.20 per month. If his average monthly wage was $200, he now receives $39.20 per month.

This amount would be increased to $63 under the bill. Also, the minimum primary benefit would be increased from $10 to $20 per month, and the maximum monthly benefits payable on a wage record of a worker from $85 to $120 per month.

Age: The bill would provide benefit payments beginning at age 60 (instead of age 65). Workers could exercise the option of retirement at the earlier age, but undoubtedly the vast majority would continue in employment, for even under the proposed higher benefits there still would be incentive to remain in employment, as benefits would be small in relation to normal earnings.

Under the provisions in the bill, failure to work after age 60 would not result in a decrease in the monthly average wage and, in turn, a decrease in the amount of the benefit payments. Moreover, the number of quarters of coverage required to be eligible for benefits would not be increased after a worker attained age 60, thereby enabling a greater number of older workers to qualify for benefits than can now qualify under the present provision.

Insured status: The bill would liberalize the present provision which requires a worker to have been in covered employment at least one-half the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 to acquire fully insured status. This provision keeps many older workers from being eligible for retirement benefits. Under the provision in the bill older workers would be eligible to receive retirement benefits if they had worked in covered employment one-fourth the number of calendar quarters elapsing after 1936. Thus today a worker would need 12 quarters of coverage (instead of 24 quarters) to qualify for retirement benefits. No change is made in the existing provision that upon the completion of 40 quarters of coverage a worker obtains a fully insured status on a permanent basis.

Survivor benefits: My bill provides for continuing a wife's benefits as one-half of the primary insurance benefit, but survivor benefits would be computed at the rate of three-fourths of the primary benefit for one child and one-half for each additional child—instead of one-half for each child—and parents' benefits at the rate of three-fourths the primary benefit for each parent—instead of one-half for each parent.

This provision would substitute, for the various methods now used, a uniform ratio to the primary benefit for all survivor benefits paid to a sole beneficiary and for all two-person and three-person beneficiary groups, except when the groups consist only of children.

Widows without children: My bill would provide for the payment of survivor benefits to widows of insured workers without meeting an age requirement, even though these widows do not have children of the deceased workers in their care—instead of paying benefits to widows only if they have attained age 65 or have such children in their care. This provision is designed to afford protection to the many widows who have never been a part of the labor market and because of age or other causes are unable to obtain employment upon the death of the breadwinner.

Earnings by retired workers: Under the provisions of my bill, all beneficiaries would continue to be eligible for benefits if their earnings in covered employment did not exceed $35 per month—instead of terminating benefits when a beneficiary earns $15 or more per month.

Socialized Medicine—Is It Good Medicine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address entitled "Socialized Medicine—Is It Good Medicine?" made by me over five stations in my district:

Last week when I talked to you on ECA—What We Can Really Afford, I told you the spending spree of the Administration was still on. Let me illustrate that point some more. One of the spending schemes is for socialized medicine—a medical OPA, which is being presented to you taxpayers under the innocuous title of compulsory health insurance. Under this scheme, you are led to believe that you will get something for nothing. You have to get behind the propaganda that is flooding the country to see what this so-called compulsory health insurance really means. According to the New York Times, and I quote, "This is the most radical reform yet to be broached by the Truman Administration."

What you are really being asked to decide is whether you will accept the idea of socialized medicine, the product of socialistic and communistic countries and leaders which will tax your weekly wages for Government-controlled medical care—or the American voluntary system of individual responsibility.

Under this socialized-medicine plan of the administration, you would pay through a tax taken from your wages, in addition to the amount contributed by your employer, along with the present social security and Federal income taxes. If you or a member of your family needed a doctor or hospitalization, theoretically you would get it for nothing. But here is the catch—

You would have to go to a doctor or a hospital which had joined the Governmental system. If not, you'd either have to take another doctor—or hospital—and pay for it yourself. You'd be paying twice because you would already be paying the compulsory health insurance tax. You see, there is always a joker in any scheme which says you can get something for nothing.

Of course, every worker will be supporting additional Federal bureaucrats and file clerks. You can imagine how many will be employed to take care of 150,000,000 people.

Suppose you or a member of your family were ill. You would probably find yourself one of 100 or more patients—half of them with imaginary ills—who were bent on getting everything they can for their money.

In desperation, you would probably consult one of the private physicians who have refused to join the assembly line, and pay him while, week after week, for the rest of your life, you would still be paying the Government.

This socialized medicine is not a new plan. It's been tried in every country from England to Russia. So busy have the doctors become in England, under socialized medicine, that one of them is reported to have hung out a sign reading, "Please have your symptoms ready."

Aside from the fact that the Government could not possibly guarantee that you could have your own doctor and the hospital of your choice, the pending scheme, if passed, could not promise you any results under 3 years. In the meanwhile, your taxes for this socialized medicine would start immediately. The Government says it would take 3 years just to "tool" up on this program.

And where would the doctors come from to carry on this so-called compulsory health insurance? With the shortage of doctors as it exists today, more and more of them would be forced into public clinics and group practice. The close personal relationship between doctor and patient thus would be largely destroyed.

If you needed a specialist, under socialized medicine, you could have one in theory. But you would first have to get your regular doctor or—and mark this well—a Government official to approve your case and after all this red tape you still might not get the specialist you want, but someone assigned to your case.

And what would be the cost of such a plan? Well, the cost is predicated on your income. For that first 3 years when you will not be getting any service—while the Government is tooling up with fever charts and pills—you would be paying one-half of 1 percent of your salary up to $4,800 a year. But in 3 years that percentage would be 1½ to 2 percent so that a family with an income of $4,800 or more would be paying from $72 to $96 a year. How does that compare with your doctor bill last year?

But this isn't the end. The master cooks who are brewing this socialized-medicine scheme admit that the tax may increase to 3 or 4 percent a year. Even this much tax out of your wages and salaries wouldn't pay the bill, so the rest of the cost would come out of Government general funds—which, in turn, means more taxation to take care of those Government costs. Eventually, this so-called compulsory health insurance would cost from 5 to 15 billion a year.

And what do the doctors get out of this? They could stay out of the scheme and hope to get private patients. Or they work for the government at a flat salary of so much per patient. Any good doctor would be so loaded up with patients he couldn't possibly handle them all. He'd have to have an

assembly line and, like the English doctor, tell his patients to have their symptoms ready.

This is the socialistic or communistic way of doing things. What is the American way?

Millions of families maintain health and accident policies in commercial insurance companies. Many more millions are following the same voluntary health insurance plan in nonprofit organizations such as the Blue Cross, the Blue Shield, and others.

Altogether some 70 to 75 million Americans are protected through voluntary health insurance; 53,000,000 carry hospital insurance; 37,000,000 have surgical expenses covered, while another 6,000,000 have other kinds of medical insurance.

Roughly 160,000 physicians and surgeons are providing better service in the United States than in any other country in the world. Our doctors take a personal interest in their patients. I remember my own family doctor, whose very presence brought comfort and relief whenever illness struck. If the doctor was there—we knew everything would be all right.

Many of you have those memories and know right now how much you depend on that personal relationship you have with your own doctor. These socialized planners would destroy this confidence and relationship overnight, if they had their way. You'd be just one in an assembly line, with a ticket in your hand—sent where a government clerk thought you ought to go—your illness just half diagnosed by a doctor overworked with too many patients and too many forms to fill out for other Government clerks to process.

Under socialized medicine, doctors would be too busy prescribing aspirins to those neurotics with imaginary ills to study individual cases or to do the research work that has made us one of the healthiest nations in the world.

There is a constructive way of attacking health problems rather than "pink pills" prescribed by the Government. Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, cautioned, "Let's not tear down a fine big house with a leak in the roof, and then build a wonderful new jail to live in." Let's fix the leaky roof.

We can do this by giving Federal aid to States to provide medical care for those unable to pay for themselves. This would probably include not more than 20 percent of the population and would cost around $250,000,000, instead of billions.

Next—and very important—Federal aid should be given to medical schools and students so that we can have more doctors. We need and must have these new doctors, not overburden the ones we have already with miles of Government red tape.

And finally, there should be Federal aid for the inspection of the health of school children. Let's use Federal funds to help those who can't afford to pay their doctor's or hospital bills. We can do this without destroying our entire medical professional.

Everybody wants good health. Everybody is entitled to adequate means to care for health. Approximately 80 percent of the Nation is economically able to meet their personal medical expenses. The 20 percent who are not able to pay need and should have a helping hand, but in providing for them let's not destroy our entire medical profession.

To take care of that minority who need our help, are we going to establish a compulsory, freedom-destroying Government project? Does it have to be Government? I say, "No." What do you think?

Socialized medicine results in two sorts of medicine, really. Good medicine for the well-to-do who can afford to pay a private doctor regardless of health taxation. And bad medicine for the wage earner who feels he can't afford to pay twice for medical expenses. Remember, you never get anything for nothing in this world.

Oriental Fruitfly in Hawaii Serious Threat to Fruit- and Vegetable-Growing Areas of Pacific Coast, Southwest, South, and Southeast—Legislature of Hawaii Asks for Federal Assistance To Carry on Fight

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, to Members of Congress from areas where the growing of fruits and vegetables is an important industry, I recommend a careful reading of the enclosed resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

"To be forewarned is to be forearmed."

If this pest, the oriental fruitfly, ever becomes established on the mainland, the sum of $2,000,000 would become insignificant in the fight which would then become necessary for its eradication.

We of Hawaii know of the damage it can do. The time to fight it is now.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 34

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate funds for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests

Whereas when Hawaii was the base of military operations in the Pacific area during World War II and civilian authority was superseded by martial rule many serious fruitfly pests including the oriental fruitfly (Dacus dorsalis hendl) were introduced into the Territory from the Southwest and West Pacific areas due to the absence of proper inspection of incoming cargoes by sea and air and the absence of other protective measures against such fruitfly pests; and

Whereas the discovery of larvae of the oriental fruitfly (Dacus dorsalis hendl) in the vanda orchid and the embargo of shipments of this orchid from Hawaii effective March 23, 1949, in addition to many other products previously quarantined, points clearly to vastly increased potential danger to American agriculture; and

Whereas this danger is of such nature as to necessitate, in the national interest, an expanded emergency program of study and development of remedial measures, involving the oriental fruitfly and other fruit and vegetable flies; and

Whereas the oriental fruitfly has proven itself, in the 34 months since it first appeared in the Territory of Hawaii, to be one of the more destructive of insect pests attacking fruit and vetegtable crops ever to appear in the United States and incorporated Territories; and

Whereas the oriental fruitfly multiplies with extreme rapidity and exhibits exceptional vitality, having been found almost simultaneously over the entire 250-mile extent of the major Hawaiian island chain; and

Whereas such fruitfly pests attack almost all fruit crops to which it has been exposed, puncturing the skin and depositing eggs which develop into maggot-like larvae which soon result in the fruit becoming masses of pulpy decay; and

Whereas this and similar fruitfly pests damage a wide variety of vegetables such as tomatoes and eggplant, and also the young bolls of cotton, and do damage to certain commercial flowers, growing nuts, and many other crops; and

Whereas these pests have been regarded as primarily tropical, various of them show considerable adaptability, being found in large numbers at cooler temperatures on the slopes of Hawaii's mountains; and

Whereas they adapt themselves to and live in a wide variety of wild plants in inaccessible areas; and

Whereas the oriental fruitfly particularly attacks not only growing fruit crops in the field, but may do extensive damage to such agricultural produce in transit to markets and actually when on display in markets; and

Whereas Hawaii's efforts to achieve needed diversification of its agriculture through expansion of noncompetitive tropical crops is blocked by lack of adequate control of fruitfly pests, even though the two major crops of Hawaii have leaned but slightly on Federal funds for these purposes in the past; and

Whereas due to the introduction of many of such fruitfly pests into Hawaii as a result of the war effort of the entire United States, it is just and equitable that the expenses of eradicating such pests should be borne by the entire United States; and

Whereas agencies of Federal Government promptly spent millions on the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly when it appeared in Florida 20 years ago; and

Whereas Oriental fruit fly ravages in Hawaii are but one of the several extraneous effects of the World War II which have disrupted and injured the economy of the Territory of Hawaii, because war influences sharply curtailed basic Hawaiian agricultural industries during the period of hostilities while agriculture expanded in the continental United States; and

Whereas placing of quarantines on shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables from Hawaii and other infested areas has already been carried to extreme measures, such as the recent placing of an embargo on shipments of vanda orchids although there is considerable doubt among entomologists that a viable larva or egg could be transported on vanda orchids under conditions which would permit transfer on arrival to other plants upon which they could complete their life cycle; and

Whereas quarantine measures are negative only, and cannot guarantee that this or similar insect pests may not reach the continental United States through Central American countries or by other routes; and

Whereas only immediate and thorough study and research by adequately staffed and financed agencies can accomplish the control and eradication of the said fruitfly pests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to appropriate a sum of not less than $2,000,000 to be expended by appropriate agencies of the Federal Government in carrying out prompt, large-scale, affirmative measures to combat, and to seek to reduce, control or eradicate, the oriental fruitfly and other similar fruitflies, in cooperation with experienced Hawaiian and other agencies; and be it further resolved that it be, and it is hereby, respectfully suggested to the Congress of the United States of America that the aforesaid minimum appropriation should be allocated to concurrent, large-scale, intensive studies as follows:

(A) $250,000 to the expansion of the explorations in quest of parasites destructive to fruitfly pests, now in progress in the western Pacific area, India, and in South Africa, it being apparent that if success is to be achieved by this biological control method, the prospect of early progress will be greatly enhanced by an increase in the number of missions in these and other fields, with in-

creased facilities for reception, rearing, testing, and liberation of parasites and predators.

(B) $150,000 to studies of the biology and ecology of fruitfly pests, especially the oriental fruitfly, since comparatively little is now known of how it lives and how it responds to different conditions and environments, and such information is vital to control and possible eradication in any area in which it may appear.

(C) Five hundred thousand dollars to the study of sterilization and fumigation of fruits, vegetables, and flowers, since there is a wide area of unexplored or only partially explored possibilities for physicists, chemists, and biochemists with adequate laboratory equipment, including use of fumigants and gases, supersonic or ultrasonic waves and electromagnetic rays; and, furthermore, development of successful methods will stand for years to come as a vital safeguard to all agricultural areas which may be threatened by these or similar pests.

(D) Five hundred thousand dollars to intensive studies of methods of area treatments and controls, such as spraying from aircraft, various uses of chemicals, and eradication of host plants, inasmuch as such controls will be immediately needed should the fruit fly or a similar pest appear in any area in the continental United States unprotected by ocean barriers.

(E) Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to intensive development and testing of new insecticides since there are already thousands of new chemical products of laboratories developed during the war which have yet to be properly tested against these specific insects under various conditions.

(F) Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars to research in disinsectizing materials and procedures on local and global common carriers, since rapid development of air travel has brought all continents within a few hours of each other; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the members of the respective Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the members of agricultural subcommittees of the said Senate and the said House of Representatives Appropriations Committees, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

Another Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the international swindle continues under the leadership of the State Department. The ECA authorization appropriation bill for $5,580,000,000 to exploit the American taxpayer is bad enough, but the swindle does not stop at this point. Let the honest taxpayer, the forgotten man, read the editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 14, 1949:

ONE ECA BLUNDER

That the House of Representatives should have voted 354 to 48 and the Senate 70 to 7 to authorize an appropriation of roundly five and a half billion dollars for the Economic Cooperation Administration to disburse in 15 months seems to forecast an actual appropriation not much short of that sum. The Appropriations Committees can and probably will chip off bits here and there; they are not likely to affect the impact of ECA's second year on the United States Treasury and on our own domestic economy.

But the Appropriations Committees can correct a blunder made by the drafters of the ECA measure, one which involves the principles of sound financial policy. Both chambers have gone along with the State Department's mistaken belief that it is part of ECA's mission to guarantee private American capital against certain risks in foreign investment The House bill authorizes a new appropriation of $272,000,000 for this purpose and renews an unobligated balance of $28,000,000 from a previous similar authorization. The Senate bill contains a provision of the same sort.

Specific risks from which American investors abroad may be thus protected are obstacles to the conversion of profits from local currencies into dollars and loss of principal through either nationalization or political disturbances. Will our private citizens, being on notice from their own Government that outside investment in Marshall-plan countries is still hazardous, put their capital at risk where it seems probable that they will have to fall back on this guaranty?

Whether they will or not, they are not in justice entitled to protection at the expense of the general body of Federal taxpayers. These guaranty provisions of the ECA bills are obviously intended to breathe life into President Truman's bold new program for developing the backward regions of the earth and raising the world's living standards. That program is not as new as it is bold. When so-called private capital obtains a Government guaranty of the results of its venturing it ceases to be private capital and takes on the character of a Government loan or grant. The only boldness in the program is calling it new.

Perhaps a $300,000,000 guaranty fund is a picayune thing in these times. It is still big enough to set an evil precedent.

What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture is again lost in the dismal swamps. Since 1932, outside of war prices and good crops, agriculture has been receiving lip service and spasmodic help—subsistence help. No permanent, beneficial legislation has been enacted. If the Department of Agriculture ever hits upon the right solution, it will not be by the law of averages but by accident. If a batter swings at a ball often enough, then he will eventually hit it.

The Department of Agriculture has made so many blunders that it is time it came back to earth. All during the time that the Department made these blunders a perfect solution was before it. I have reference to cost of production—100-percent parity—for that percentage of the agricultural products domestically consumed each year and the world market for the surplus.

If that legislation had been passed, then long ago the farmers and farm organizations would have prevented overproduction of any particular product. They would have seen to it that they got cost of production for 100 percent of their crops. They would naturally produce those crops which were in short supply and not in surplus.

In place of that, ever since 1933, the Department has advocated first, 65-percent parity, then 75 percent, later 85 percent, and Congress finally raised it to 90 percent in spite of the Department's protest. This parity was based on the obsolete and outmoded bogus formula of 1909–14. All the time agriculture was entitled to at least 100-percent parity—100-percent justice.

Now that all segments of agriculture are demanding cost of production—100 percent parity—the Secretary pulls another boner. He suggests that the farm products be sold on the open market—the world market. In other words, the American farmer is now to compete with the peon labor of Latin-America, with the coolie labor of the Orient, and with the slave labor of Russia and other European nations. In the next breath the Secretary assures the farmers that he will compensate them with subsidies, and then proclaims to the consumers that he will in that way bring down the cost of food.

It makes one wonder just how the mind of the Secretary functions. Surely he adds insult to injury when he tells the farmer, "You will have to sell your food products in competition with the Latin-American peon, the Japanese and Chinese coolie, and the slave labor of Russia and other nations." This although he gives them lip service and says that he will compensate them for feeding the Nation out of the United States Treasury—out of the taxpayers' money. This would give the Secretary an opportunity to regiment agriculture with a vengeance.

Fortunately the American people are not that gullible. Both the producers and the consumers know that they would get the short end of the stick. The farmers and the consumers know that subsidies have to be paid out of increased taxes. They know that they pay the Nation's taxes. They know that for every $1 of subsidies, they will in the end have to pay back $2 in taxes. This because of the interest, administration, collection, and distribution expenses. The Secretary ought to know that he cannot pull himself out of a hole by his bootstraps.

The farmer also knows that the farm population has decreased from 30,000,000 to 19,000,000 while the general population has increased 20,000,000. He knows that while agriculture used to elect one-third of the Members of Congress, it is now about one-seventh. Therefore, he realizes that he must get permanent legislation—cost of production—a floor, not a ceiling.

The farmers know that under the Secretary's scheme many people living in

industrial centers could easily be fooled into believing that agriculture was responsible for the high taxes. They could be led to believe that the pennies squeezed out of their earnings were the result of the few pennies that the Secretary, under his scheme, would dish out to agriculture.

I know of no better way of concluding my remarks than by closing with an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, dated April 11. Here is the editorial:

THE FRAUDULENT PROMISE OF CHEAPER FOOD COSTS

One thing that makes so many of the new Government schemes obnoxious is the considerable element of pious and political fraud which they contain. Take the new farm plan proposed by the Truman administration. Take the already constant claim by its partisans that it will lead to cheaper food.

It will not lead to cheaper food. The claim that it will is fraudulent. The new plan will not cut the cost of farm lands. It will not cut the cost of farm labor. It will not cut farm interest rates nor farm taxes. It will not cut the cost of farm machinery. It will not cut the cost of fertilizers or that of feeds. It will not cut freight rates on foods. It will not cut the marketing costs of foods.

The new scheme will not reduce by a single penny a single one of the multitude of economic costs which go into the food finally eaten by the consumer. This and other elements of the Truman program guarantee, indeed, a steady increase in many of these costs.

What, then, do the administration men mean when they say the new plan will produce cheaper food? Why, they simply mean that the consumer may have to pay less for food in retail prices. But that is only because more will be paid for food by the United States Treasury and out of taxes.

The core of the new scheme is a prodigious subsidy for farmers direct from the Treasury to complement returns they get from lower prices in the market. But the subsidies paid to the farmers are part of the economic cost of food. And, as stated, those costs cannot possibly be cheaper and may be expected to rise.

True, the food subsidies will come to a considerable extent out of the yield of the progressive income tax. In this way higher-income people will pay a greater share of the food subsidies than lower-income people. In other words, the Brannan scheme is a way by which higher-income people can be forced to pay directly for the groceries of lower-income people who hitherto have been proud to pay their own way and looked on the consumption of Government-bought groceries as the mark of pauperism.

How big will these tax subsidies be? On this point Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is candid enough to say he has no idea. But this we do know. The income level which Mr. Brannan proposes to guarantee to the farmers is the average level of income they have enjoyed since 1939. That happens to be the highest level of income the American farmer has ever had. Now Mr. Brannan wants to make this exception, this inflated income level, the standard for all the future.

No one will deny the administration a right to propound new farm plans as the present farm plan wavers in a time of declining prices. The debate is just beginning and no doubt respectable arguments can be offered for the administration plan. But the claim that it will bring cheaper food is a fraud.

As We Remember It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial appearing in the Daily Review, of Hayward, Calif., for March 28, 1949, entitled "As We Remember It."

A joint Army-Navy board was created by a resolution adopted by the Congress to study the matter of an additional crossing of San Francisco Bay.

After exhaustive studies this board made a report in which it recommended the building of a combined causeway-tube-type crossing from a point in the vicinity of the foot of Army Street in San Francisco to a point in the vicinity of Fifth Street in Alameda with the recommendation that a tube be constructed in connection with this project under the Oakland Estuary which separates Oakland from Alameda.

The State toll-bridge authority seeks to disregard the recommendations of this joint Army-Navy board and as a result a controversy has arisen between those who would accept the findings of the joint Army-Navy board and the proponents of the toll-bridge authority who want to build a bridge parallel to the present San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge some 300 feet northerly of it. The editorial contained herewith is pertinent to this controversy:

AS WE REMEMBER IT

We cannot help but admire the skill of Dave Hope, of the Oakland Tribune, in continuing to battle for a parallel crossing after so-called final and decisive action has been taken to ask permission to build the twin crossing.

Dave reports "the parallel bridge is supported * * * by governmental agencies in the Eastbay. Opposition to the bridge is now confined almost entirely to certain political influences in San Francisco."

Let us now inquire what are "governmental agencies" in the Eastbay? Are they the Alameda County Board of Supervisors and the Oakland City Council, by any chance?

And what are the "political influences" in San Francisco? Are they the supervisors and mayor of the city and county of San Francisco, the supervisors of the county of San Mateo, the mayor of Piedmont, the council of the city of Hayward, and the council of the city of San Leandro?

The former group want the parallel crossing and are called governmental agencies in Dave's dictionary. The second group officially is for the southern crossing and is defined in the Hope dictionary and geography as "political influences in San Francisco."

Dave relates some other interesting things.

Our readers remember how the State's department of public works and the United States Joint Army-Navy Board of Engineers disagree about where the crossing shall be put.

Dave sees no disagreement.

He says in Sunday's Oakland Tribune:

"Both reached agreement in selecting the bridge and the Alameda to Army Street crossing as the final and most feasible solutions."

It seemed to us that the Army-Navy board (1) looked at 29 proposals, (2) said no second bridge would have been necessary if we had been smart enough to have a rapid transit system worthy of the name, (3) decided that only one more was needed, and (4) after a close decision recommended that the southern crossing should be that one bridge.

On the other hand, it seemed to us, the State came out with a decision for only one bridge, which should be the parallel crossing. Faced with the findings of the Army-Navy board, it reconsidered and gave ground. It said the parallel bridge should be built now, and the southern crossing in the sweet by-and-by.

The Federal authorities which handle such matters warned us that while immediately approval would be given to a southern crossing, a new study might be necessary if the State came up with a "final" decision to apply for a parallel bridge. That warning was issued months ago. If it had been heeded, we might well have been started on our way to a second crossing of San Francisco bay.

As it is, there is danger of delay after delay while the State fights to force its parallel bridge through against strong local opposition and against the continued recommendations of the Army and Navy for a southern crossing.

That's the way we remember it, but of course we don't use Dave Hope's dictionary and geography.

Should We Finance National Socialism in Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me over radio station WBAL, Baltimore, Md., on April 16, 1949, on the subject Should We Finance National Socialism in Europe?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE FINANCE NATIONAL SOCIALISM IN EUROPE?

Good afternoon. I wish to thank radio station WBAL for this opportunity to speak to you and to think with you on an important issue of the day. Congress recently authorized the continuation of the European recovery program, the so-called Marshall plan, for a further 15 months. The amount of money to be spent will be fixed later when the appropriation bill is passed. I do not intend to discuss the merits of the Marshall plan as a whole, many of the objectives of which are good. I shall address my remarks to a single phase of it. I shall discuss with you this afternoon whether any part of your money to be appropriated by the Congress should be used to finance or implement experiments in socialism in the countries of western Europe. By carrying on these experiments some of the governments of Europe are acquiring and operating basic industries.

This is spoken of as the "nationalization" or "socialization" of industry. I am particularly glad of an opportunity to discuss this question with the people of the Free State of Maryland, well known as you are in my own State of Missouri for your insistence on fair play and toleration.

I. MARSHALL-PLAN MONEY HAS ACCELERATED THE NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN EUROPE

Several of the countries of Europe are far down the road toward a completely socialized state. England has already socialized 10 of her important industries. France has socialized 23 of them. This process of socialization in both countries has been accelerated to a great extent by the use of Marshall-plan money. Under the Marshall plan each of the participating countries of Europe submits a plan of what it proposes to do by way of internal reconstruction and relief. The United States makes up the deficit in these national plans. What each nation does internally is supported by the money of the American taxpayers. I shall discuss particularly the case of Great Britain; not because of any dislike of the British, but because Great Britain is a typical case and by far the largest beneficiary under the Marshall plan. The American taxpayers have already contributed under various plans, most of them now unhonored and unsung, over $44,000,000,000 to Great Britain.

The Marshall-plan funds go from America in the form of raw materials for Britain's socialized industries and in many other ways. If the United States had not financed the British socialist program, it could not have been carried out. It was American money (your money) that saved Britain from the inevitable unemployment and lower standards of living which would have come under the socialist program.

Socialism and communism are fruit of the same tree, which has its roots in the theories of Karl Marx. They have the same objective, which is the nationalization of all industry. The Communist is willing to resort to any means, including force and violence, to attain this end. The Socialist prefers that the nationalization of industry be obtained by peaceful or democratic methods.

Communism is the form of Marxism which has developed in Russia. The adherents of communism are in control of the Government of the U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Socialism is a form of Marxism that has been developed in England and in some of the other countries of western Europe. The British Labor Party is in control of the Government of Great Britain.

And so we are met with this strange paradox. The United States is spending billions of dollars to stop Marxist communism, but at the same time is spending billions of dollars to subsidize Marxist socialism.

As Winston Churchill has said, the Socialist parties in every European country are the handmaids and heralds of communism, and prepare the way at every stage and every step for its future advance.

II. DOES MARSHALL-PLAN MONEY RETARD THE NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN EUROPE?

It has been argued by one of the apologists for the Marshall plan that the Marshall plan is the way to check the advance of socialism in Great Britain. He thinks that the Marshall plan will make the British so happy and contented that they won't want socialism. I believe he went so far as to characterize as childish the suggestion that the money of the American taxpayers should not be used to finance and implement socialism in Great Britain.

Let us look at the record. Keep in mind that the Marshall-plan law was signed by the President on April 3, 1948. Did the socialist Government turn back from its program in view of the golden prospect of Marshall-plan money flowing from America? Quite the contrary. A month after the Marshall plan was adopted, on May 17, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain and head of the British Labor Party, assured the party at its annual conference: "We intend to carry on the work to which we have set our hand and with your help we shall win through." On November 2, 1948, Hugh Dalton, former Chancellor of the Exchequer, put it this way: "We shall obstinately persist in carrying out the promises which we made to the electors." But it may be said that was last November—maybe the program of the party has been changed since then. Let us see.

After all, actions speak louder than words. The British socialists are now taking steps to nationalize the iron and steel industry. A few days ago Prof. Harold Laski, the brain truster of the British Labor Party, was in Washington. He said that there are three industries his party plans to nationalize next, but nothing except force would cause him to reveal what they are.

And to bring the record right down to date, on April 12, last Tuesday, a 5-year program for the socialist party in Great Britain was announced. In addition to the industries already nationalized, it is proposed that the Government take over the cement industry, all suitable mineral deposits, cold-storage facilities not already publicly owned, sugar manufacturing and refining, and appropriate sections of the chemical industry—and this will be of particular interest to Baltimore people—two great insurance companies, the Prudential Insurance Co. and the Pearl Insurance Co., both of which have vast investments in other business enterprises.

Does this look like the socialist party is turning back from its program? Who knows better what that program is than the leaders of the socialist party themselves? And remember this: If the United States does not finance the program for further nationalization, it cannot be carried out.

It is also sometimes said that we should not place any strings on the Marshall-plan money because the United States should not interfere in the government or in the economy of a foreign country. But bless my soul, the whole Marshall plan is an interference in the economies of other countries on a gigantic scale. We said to Spain at the outset: "We don't like your Government. You can't have any Marshall-plan money unless you change it." We interfered in the Italian election in 1948. The American Ambassador made campaign speeches, and the Attorney General of the United States addressed the Italian people over the radio on the eve of the election. I do not mean to criticize this, but I do say that it is entirely too late for us to hold up our hands and say with sanctimonious piety: "Of course, we do not wish to interfere in either the government or the economy of a foreign country."

III. COMPETITION WITH NATIONALIZED INDUSTRY IS UNFAIR TO THE AMERICAN WORKINGMAN

I am concerned about this use of your money because we are creating competition abroad that will rise to plague us. The American businessman and the American workingman have always prided themselves upon their ability to meet fair competition anywhere and at anytime. All we have asked is an even break. But we Americans have always insisted that competition be fair. We have put antitrust laws and anti-monopoly laws on our statute books to insure that the competition among ourselves is fair. Now we are helping to create in Europe great national monopolies and setting them up in business to compete with American industry and American labor on unequal terms. Nationalized industries have an advantage over private industries in competition with them, and here is the reason. Nationalized industries enjoy freedom from taxation, the advantages of monopoly and government financial support. Such competition threatens to imperil the welfare of the American workingman.

Let us take the overseas air lines as an example. The American air lines crossing the Atlantic are having great difficulty in making both ends meet. They find themselves unable to buy the finest planes and the latest equipment for a very good reason: they are losing money. On the other hand, the British Overseas Airways, owned by the British Government, have recently contracted for 10 Boeing Strato-Cruisers, at a cost of $1,500,000 apiece, to be paid for out of Marshall-plan money; of course, I mean, your money. And so American taxpayers are giving equipment to foreign overseas government air lines, and expecting American private enterprise to compete with them. No wonder the American private enterprise in competition is discouraged, and unattractive to thrifty investors.

When the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was considering this matter, Senator GEORGE said to Mr. Hoffman, the Administrator of the Marshall plan: "You may be putting a whole lot of industry in this country out of business." Later, the great Georgia Senator said: "I have warned you." Mr. Hoffman's comment was: "Sir, I cannot tell you how little concerned I am about European competition." With due respect to Mr. Hoffman, let me make this clear: I believe the time has come for us to be concerned about American industry and American working people. I believe we of the American Congress should say to our fellow citizens, who earn their bread: "Our friends, we can tell you how much concerned we are about unfair European competition in the years to come."

I cannot avoid the conclusion that when we think this thing through—at long last—we shall decide not to permit your money, earned under a system of free enterprise and personal initiative, to be frittered away in experiments in socialism on the continent of Europe or in the British Isles.

Tribute to Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota, by E. L. Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast over Station KPRO, Riverside, Calif., by Mr. E. L. Delaney, who is one of the best known radio commentators of the Pacific Northwest. In his broadcast, Mr. Delaney refers particularly to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and pays him a well-deserved tribute.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The "lone ranger" of the United States Senate can take credit today for news which affects the pocketbook of everyone in this country. That "lone ranger's" name is not mentioned in connection with the Washington dispatch of today, but those who have

followed his efforts over a period of years—and particularly in recent months are well aware that Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota is to be thanked as much, if not more, than any other individual in the Senate for the encouraging item which is featured in today's news.

The item is to the effect that the United States has prevailed upon the French and the British to alter their stand as regards the destruction of plants and the dismantling of industries in Germany. We are informed from Washington that all or part of 159 steel, metal, and chemical factories which were marked for dismantling will not be removed.

It is even hinted that there is still another plan in the drafting process—which is still secret, but Army Secretary Royall, says will be made public soon. It is expected to lift the restrictions on 10 German industries—shipbuilding being one of them.

To the average person in this country these items of today's news may not appear to affect them to any appreciable extent. Precisely the opposite is true. For every million and hundreds of millions that we can save in this profligate program for European recovery which has been urged by the present administration, means just that much less in the Federal tax burden—which falls on every one of us.

The State Department explained today that the equipment which will be left in Germany is located in 32 plants in the steel industry, 88 metal-working plants, 32 chemical plans, and 7 other factories in the metal industry.

In explaining the decision on the increase in steel-making capacity the State Department said that it was done to obtain greater flexibility and economy of operation in the industry, even though the actual use of this capacity cannot exceed the maximum production of something over 11,000,000 tons set by the western occupation powers.

This alteration in the previous program as set up by the Western Powers was made on the recommendation of the United States following a study of German industrial problems made by a group of American businessmen. The State Department stated further that the agreement was made in order to bring the reparations dismantling program into harmony with the European recovery program.

That is what might be referred to as an understatement. It discloses but part of the truth and the real situation. But what it proves as conclusively as anything is that for four long years the State Department has been carrying out a program that was based on a hate-biased policy, conceived in the councils of the vicious minority pressure group which, during and immediately following the war, exerted such nefarious influence on the administration and the State Department, bringing incalculable loss to the American taxpayers. The fact that the policy and program has now been reversed is indisputable proof of the folly of the previous course of action. For now the State Department announces officially that the change in policy will be in harmony with the European recovery program.

That is the very thing which Senator LANGER emphasized time and time again—and I may say that often he was the only Senator who waged a relentless battle to end that insensate dismantling of factories, which were in no sense war potentials—but which were necessary for the industrial recovery of the whole of western Europe. There were those in the Senate—and no small percentage of the press—who took pains to depreciate all his efforts toward aiding this country by rehabilitating Germany and establishing sufficient industry that they be put on their feet and taken off our backs. Senator LANGER, his critics charged, was playing politics, championing the minorities, placating those in his State who are of German ancestry. What his critics could not do, however, was to disprove the logic of his arguments for a sane and business basis on which to build up European economy. And that sane policy demanded—in fact, it was absolutely necessary that the vital industries which the Western Powers had listed for dismantling—be retained for the very program of European recovery now undertaken.

Just 8 days ago, on April 5, Senator LANGER made a speech in the Senate in which he told that body very bluntly that they were being asked to vote billions for European recovery, and yet those same Senators were not given the vital information they should have been given as regards the status of Europe's economy and what was to be done toward rehabilitating their industries. He said in part: "Actually the dismantlement of German industry continues to be such a secret that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee themselves were told that the United States policy could not be publicly revealed. How are we justified, as Members of the Senate, in underwriting the ECA's request for billions in appropriations for Europe as a whole, because we have not the slightest notion of what our basic policy toward the recovery of Germany's economy actually is. Not a Senator on this floor can tell because it is a secret."

The Senator said further—when demanding that there be a sound policy adopted in the German situation: "On March 12, 1947, President Truman called for an all-out offensive against communism and declared that we were going to take every possible step to end the confusion and suffering in Europe which was providing such a fertile ground for the spread of Soviet influence. My opposition to the Truman doctrine was based entirely on its double-dealing implications, which are now borne out by the fact the President continues to implement these outrageous policies of destroying the German industrial potential upon which the whole of Europe is dependent, both for goods, and for markets, and for economic, social, and political stability."

The destructive and of course costly policy in its relation to the American taxpayer, was the aftermath of the so-called Morganthau plan, a document that was never made public officially; the reason being that it was so outrageous and such a betrayal of all American principles, as well as imposing such tremendous financial burdens on the American people, that it would have been suicidal for the makers of the plan to reveal it at the time it was entered into, which was September 1944.

Now, at long last, a measure of sanity has prevailed and the State Department in today's announcement concedes that the policy it had been following was utterly ruinous for the economy of Europe. What they did not stress however, is that it was also ruinous for the economy of this country. Of course that point was not emphasized.

Although there were others in the Senate and House who battled for the ending of the policy in Germany which spelt ruin to both European and American economy, it was Senator LANGER who took the brunt of the attack and no little abuse from those who refused to accept the logic of his arguments and could not refute the incontestable facts with which he documented them. It is encouraging to know there are some who will wage continued fights for what they believe is a just cause, and certainly LANGER could not be accused of doing any political horsetrading, for he is neither Republican nor Democrat, but one of those independents; sad to say there are not more who can claim to be independent.

Therefore it must be a bit heartening to him to learn that today the State Department has admitted that he has been on the right course all the time in this matter. I will be too much to expect that the State Deparment will make that concession to his judgment a matter of record, but the decision as regards the plant dismantling and the announcement is record enough. So, the "lone ranger" wins again.

There is in this, however, a factor which is carefully played down at this time, but which bears an important part in the decision of the United States, Britain, and France as regards the operation of the factories in western Germany.

The underlying motive which brought about a turn-about decision on the part of our Government is because persons such as Senator LANGER and some others, pointed the necessity of it and besides there was clamor on the part of the minority who opposed the profligate European recovery spending, when millions and perhaps billions could be trimmed from it by permitting Europe's own economy to function with something approaching normalcy.

But that does not explain the reverse position of France and Britain. They are not at all concerned with how much the American taxpayers are burdened to maintain their economies. And furthermore neither Britain nor France gives anything. The record of history verifies that. They make concessions only when it is vitally necessary for their own security or interests.

At long last both France and England are forced to concede—for all the world to know—that they desire Germany and German industry as a bulwark to aid them in the possible conflict with the Soviet. That is not stated officially, but only the most naive will think otherwise.

The industries of the Ruhr—although classed as being anything but war potentials—would be essentials in the event of war. For in war—there is little that does not contribute to the war effort. Although the plants now listed to continue operation in western Germany—make only dishpans or baby-buggies—they are needed in wartime and the baby-buggies are easily converted into some other vehicle which can be of use to a belligerent. Both France and Britain recognize the necessity of having that productive area working—now—in operation. When the time comes—if it should—it can be quickly converted into producing the thousand and one articles necessary for pressing a war.

That is the reason the French and British have made their generous concessions—regardless of the camouflage of words that may be released to mask the real truth. Besides, they also understand that it is vitally necessary that the German workers be kept busy and afforded a reasonable standard of living—through their labors—if they are to be prevented from switching to the Reds. Idle hands and unemployment supplies fertile ground for the sowing of Communist seeds.

One Day in a "Do-Nothing" Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on April 15 the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, wrote a column entitled "One Day in a 'Do-Nothing' Congress." I wish that

everyone in the United States could read it, because I think it is well worth the effort.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—ONE DAY IN A "DO-NOTHING" CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries no editorials. But its transcript of the proceedings of April 13 in the House and the Senate constitutes a sweeping refutation of the charge that the Eighty-first Congress is dragging its feet. Though the Legislature at this stage of a session must exercise its judgment on many matters every day, the grave and intricate nature of those which were considered and disposed of on this occasion emphasized the unusual burdens the present state of the world has laid on the minds and bodies of its Members.

A WORKING CONGRESS

The committees, of course, have done the arduous spade work on bills before they reach the floor. But Members of the Senate and the House who have labored in these committees must then defend their work on the floor. And in addition they must spend hours on local matters in their offices and be available for constituents who want to see them personally. A few Senators and Representatives are accomplished gold brickers. A few don't study the issues they must pass on but, like the peers in Iolanthe, "leave their brains outside and do just as their leaders tell 'em to." However, as a group the Members of Congress work hard at their jobs.

Today's typical issue of the RECORD makes this plain. The Senate, after receiving a number of communications from the Executive and the House, and confirming an Under Secretary of Defense and other appointees, had a long debate on the proposed TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, which raises complicated questions of public policy and the Constitution, and disposed of two hostile amendments. It then approved the conference report on rent controls in the District of Columbia and was working on the administration's National Housing Act at 7:19 p. m. when it recessed. Meanwhile its conferees on the bill to authorize expenditures for the next 15 months of the Marshall plan were coming to agreement with the House on this measure.

A HEAVY DOCKET

That was a full day by any test for a legislative branch. But the House dealt with an even heavier docket. First, there was the extra appropriation for the Veterans' Administration in this fiscal year, an item of almost $600,000,000, which, because of its urgency and the voting power of its beneficiaries, was promptly approved. Then the House took up the appropriation or $15,910,000,000 for the National Military Establishment in the next fiscal year. For hours its most responsible and informed members labored with the intricate and serious problem of how best to balance our security weapons: whether the Navy should have more; whether denying it would cripple naval aviation to the danger point; whether it is sound military policy to increase by $787,000,000 the fund for the Air Force and absorb $334,000,000 of this by cuts in the budget of the Army and the Navy.

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

An inspection of the debate will show how earnestly the speakers and the Members whom they addressed dealt with this great issue of our times, which the House at length resolved by supporting its Committee on Appropriations. Not surprisingly, in view of the subject, there was some reckless discussion of how to defeat Soviet Russia if war shall come, and one or two of the most responsible Members indulged in armchair strategy that will help Moscow propaganda that the United States is suffused with the psychology of aggression. But these lapses of judgment do not diminish the fact that the House was faced with hard and laborious decisions, and made them in the span of 1 day.

This branch also received the President's request for a Columbia Valley Authority, as did the Senate; listened to attacks on Federal public-power policies in Washington State and on the British film quota; filed for early and favorable action the agreement on the ECA bill (that came today); heard a criticism of the administration's labor-relations bill; and wearily adjourned at 6:26 p. m. until 11 o'clock this morning after Representative POWELL, of New York City, had spoken for some minutes on the "most flagrant injustice" which, he said, "is about to be perpetrated" upon the "defenseless people" of Ethiopia by returning Somalia and Eritrea to Italy.

ISSUES ALL COMPLEX

The processes of Congress are deliberate, but hardly any matter that is before it at this time lends itself to rapid action if there is to be any measured consideration of the general welfare. The issues were never more serious, and on almost every one there is honest division of opinion which produces large minorities. To put such matters in legislative form, with due regard for the costs they impose on the taxpayers and our economic system, and with due regard also for the effect of some of them on the chances for a durable world peace, means long and crushing labor. And after that the American governing principle requires that those committee members who dissent, or who have not been on the drafting committees, shall have their opportunity for debate before the final votes are taken.

The consequence is that time inevitably is consumed in a quantity which seems excessive to those already convinced of what they want from Congress. But, as the above sample exhibit of a legislative day should persuade reasonable persons, this Congress, far from doing nothing, is sweating at its bench and doing quite a lot.

Monopolistic Origins of Basing-Point Pricing in Cement—History Reveals Collusive Aspects of the System—Cement Dealers and Small Business Generally, Victims of 50 Years of Conspiracy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal arguments persistently advanced by apologists for the basing-point system is that, far from being the product of conspiracy, the system came into being as a result of natural process and is nothing more than a natural development. Like most of the older arguments invented by the paid apologists for this vicious system, it is completely at variance with the facts, which prove conclusively that the basing-point system was originally created and later brought to its full fruition by means of illegal collusion and conspiracy. Let us take a look at the record of the cement case.

Portland cement manufacture in the United States began in the Lehigh Valley at Coplay, Pa., in 1878. By 1900 it had spread to the Middle West where the Illinois Steel Co. already was producing cement from steel-furnace slag. The absorption of this company by the United States Steel Corp. in 1901 automatically put Big Steel into the cement business and in 1906 United States Steel Corp. organized Universal Portland Cement Co. to own and operate its growing cement production in Illinois, Indiana, and western Pennsylvania.

BASING-POINT PRICING AIDS MONOPOLY EXPANSION IN STEEL AND CEMENT

These four important interests were the leading factors in the early development of basing-point pricing in cement. With United States Steel Corp. an important factor in both steel and cement it is not surprising that for several years after 1900 the establishment of a single basing-point system of pricing became the objective of leaders in both industries.

The first attempt to establish a basing-point system in cement was made by a single company acting alone, and because it did not have the concerted support of the rest of the industry it failed. Thus, when Atlas Portland Cement Co. built a plant at Hannibal, Mo., in 1901, it announced that it would quote prices at destinations, and B. F. Affleck, of Universal Atlas Cement Co., testified in 1936 that—

> For a time these prices were based on Lehigh Valley base plus freight, the difference between the freight from Lehigh Valley and from Hannibal going to increase the profit of the Hannibal plant, the customers paying no more but getting better service. (Hearings, Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, 1936.)

What Mr. Affleck did not say was that Atlas abandoned Lehigh Valley-plus pricing at Hannibal only because some Middle West producers undercut its prices and took away its business. The failure of this early attempt clearly demonstrated that without concerted support of all members of the industry, which can generally be obtained only through collusion, the basing-point system cannot succeed.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM REQUIRES UNIFIED ACTION

When this attempt by an individual firm had failed, attention was turned to bringing about concerted action through trade-association agreements. In 1902 the Association of American Portland Cement Manufacturers was formed, and in 1904 it began to study what might be done to stabilize cement prices. In 1908 it recommended that cement be sold only on the basis of prices at destination, but it did not stop there. In 1910 an association report stated:

> The situation in Michigan is very satisfactory and growing more so. There was a chaotic state there early in the year. There was no unity of action at all among the mills until they formed a little association which

comprises all Michigan mills and one or two across the border. This resulted in a free exchange of views and an understanding to the effect that Lehigh prices should govern the prices out there. This understanding has been observed. The price today, based on the Lehigh price of 80 cents, makes Detroit a price of $1.25 delivered (37 F. T. C., p. 154).

Multiple-basing-point pricing followed when local efforts to establish a single basing point failed. Where local producers could not agree on Lehigh Valley plus, they could agree to observe some local basing point plus. This, however, required: First, concerted action within each basing-point area to use the same base price; and, second, cooperation from producers outside each basing-point area to prevent price competition from other basing-point areas.

BASING-POINT PRICES MADE EFFECTIVE BY ADHERENCE TO SYSTEM

The required concerted action was accomplished by industry-wide observance of an understanding, which constitutes the essence of the basing-point system, namely, that the minimum selling price for cement at any given destination shall be the lowest combination of basing-point price at any recognized basing point plus published rail freight rate from that basing point to the destination. Nothing short of this will attain the basing-point-system objective of identical destination prices. Adherence to this method of pricing necessarily is a matter of systematic observance by each individual company in pricing every invoice.

LEADERS IN CEMENT INDUSTRY GANG UP ON SMALL BUSINESS

In 1915, when multiple-basing-point pricing was definitely established in the area from Illinois to Washington and south to Colorado and Kansas, it was done by agreement among the following three important cement manufacturers:

First. Lehigh Portland Cement Co., with plants at Mason City, Iowa; Iola, Kans.; and Metaline Falls, Wash.

Second. Cement Securities Co. and three subsidiaries—Colorado Portland Cement Co., operating in Colorado; Union Portland Cement Co., in Utah; and Three Forks Portland Cement Co., in Montana.

Third. International Portland Co., Ltd., operating at Irvin, Wash.—37 F. T. C., page 155.

On January 28, 1915, the general sales manager of Colorado Portland Cement Co. instructed his affiliated company, Three Forks Portland Co., how to put the system into effect. He named four controlling basing points to be used throughout the territory and named the base price applicable at each. He outlined the method of computing the destination price at any delivery point as the lowest combination of any one of the four basing-point prices plus freight from that point to the destination. As to what other industry leaders would do, he stated:

> You need have no fear whatever of the Lehigh people taking any business except on this basis, as their Chicago office is now in complete charge of their Spokane factory, and will be responsible for every action of every one of their employees, and you may rest assured that Mr. Brown, as well as the others, understand this perfectly. Mr. Gowan gave me his personal guaranty of this and I in turn gave him my guaranty of our adherence to this. Of course nothing has been said to the International people regarding this, as, in the first place, I have had no opportunity, and, in the second place, our Chicago friends seem very certain that the International people would not quote lower than that basis (37 F. T. C., p. 155).

To cover up and keep this unlawful agreement secret the representative of Three Forks was advised:

> While on this subject I want to call your attention to the fact of not letting anyone know that any understanding, whatever, has been agreed upon, and especially never mention this to any of our customers, but simply say to them that we have reason to believe that no lower price will be named than those we are quoting, because we know the basis to be practically cost to manufacture, at basing points, and no exceedingly high profit can be made by the plants operating at those basing points. Please caution your salesmen particularly in this regard (F. T. C. 37, p. 156).

By such clearly collusive action among leaders of the industry, multiple-basing-point pricing became the established method of pricing practically everywhere in the cement industry prior to the formation of the Cement Institute in 1929. Thereafter it became one of the customs and usages which the institute sought to maintain before, during, and after the code period.

SUPREME COURT, APRIL 26, 1949, UPHOLDS FTC FINDING OF COLLUSION AND RESTRAINT OF TRADE

Based on a record replete with evidence of such concerted activities and their effects, the Federal Trade Commission made its general finding in the Cement Institute case in 1943 that—

> These long-pursued restrains of competition have contributed to, if not created, the belief now generally held by respondents that free and open competition is impracticable for the cement industry and have fostered among the respondents a philosophy of seeking not to excell others in quality or price or in affording terms of sale that would be more attractive to purchasers (37 F. T. C. p. 144).

The Supreme Court's decision, on April 26, 1948, in the cement case, supported both this and the further conclusion that the concerted activities by which the industry established and maintained multiple-basing-point pricing were unlawfully collusive and trade restraining.

Yet, although these facts concerning the collusive character and origin of the basing-point system are clear and indisputable, we find that spokesmen for the basing-point monopolies are trying to convince Members of Congress that they are firmly and resolutely opposed to conspiracy; that they have no thought of legalizing conspiracy, and that they are only seeking a clarification of the law. If this were true, why are these estimable gentlemen moving heaven and earth in order to try to get the Congress of the United States to legalize something which had its origin in unlawful agreements, was nurtured by collusion, and cannot exist without conspiracy.

SMALL BUSINESS CANNOT SURVIVE UNDER BASING-POINT MONOPOLIES

For 50 years small business generally, and especially cement dealers, have been the unwilling victims of this now outlawed conspiracy. To estimate with any degree of accuracy the number of illicit dollars which have poured into the treasury of the Cement Trust, would be wellnigh impossible. But, let us see to it that history does not repeat itself in the cement or any other industry, by passing any law under the guise of clarification which will, in effect, perpetuaute a system so inimical to our economy and to small business in particular.

Development of Synthetic Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we are all very greatly interested in the development of synthetic oil. About a year ago I placed in the RECORD an article concerning a plant erected for this purpose south of Pittsburgh. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. E. V. Murphree, president of the Standard Oil Development Co., showing the progress of that installation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARD OIL DEVELOPMENT CO.,
New York, N. Y., April 14, 1949.

The Honorable EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I note your interest in the research we are carrying out with the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., as indicated by your reference to it at the February 21 hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on the reciprocal trade bill and oil imports. I therefore welcome the opportunity of reviewing for you briefly some of our activities on this and related projects.

Petroleum substitutes have been of interest to us for many years. Practically from the founding of the Standard Oil Development Co., research affiliate of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), nearly 30 years ago it has engaged in research on possible substitutes for petroleum products derived from nonpetroleum sources of one sort or another. In the early twenties the development company carried out extensive tests on shale oil; and in the late twenties it initiated large-scale work on hydrogenation which, as you know, is a method of converting coal to liquid products, which has been receiving much attention by the Bureau of Mines in recent years.

Research on petroleum substitutes had to give way to more pressing problems during the war. However, it was resumed in 1945, and intensified in the following years in view of the unprecedented postwar petroleum demand. In spite of the fact that the present situation has greatly lessened the urgency of the research and eliminated the economic incentive, research has continued.

Our interest in the Fischer-Tropsch process for converting coal to oil dates back to

1938, soon after commercial application of the process in Germany had been demonstrated. Since that time research has resulted in many improvements in the process. The Fischer-Tropsch process is a two-step process. In the first step coal, or as an alternative natural gas, is converted into a mixture of carbon monoxide and hydrogen, known as synthesis gas. In the second step the synthesis gas is converted by means of a catalyst into oil products. For either coal or natural gas, therefore, there are two phases to the development of the process; one being to develop as cheap a method as possible for making the synthesis gas from coal or natural gas; and the second to improve the process for converting the synthesis gas into oil products. This second step is essentially the same whether natural gas or coal is used for preparation of the synthesis gas. The first step, that of producing the synthesis gas, is quite different, depending on whether coal or natural gas is the raw material.

The Standard Oil Development Co. has done a great deal of work on the second step of the Fischer-Tropsch process involving the conversion of the synthesis gas into oil products. The catalyst originally employed in Germany has been replaced by one permitting the production of high-octane gasoline. Through substitution of the fluidized solids technique developed for catalytic cracking, the cooling surfaces required in a Fischer-Tropsch synthesis unit have been reduced to around 1 percent of their original size, thereby greatly reducing the cost and steel requirements for a plant. The Standard Oil Development Co. also carried out work on the production of synthesis gas from natural gas as well as from coal. Up to the present time the expenditures of the Standard Oil Development Co. on the Fischer-Tropsch process have been around $10,000,000. In 1946 samples of both synthetic gasoline and Diesel fuel, made by the development company on a small scale from natural gas, were tested by the Navy at Annapolis. The fuels were completely satisfactory.

The success of the fluidized-solids technique in catalytic cracking suggests its possible use in coal processing not only for the production of synthesis gas for further conversion to oil products but also for carbonization and gasification processes in which the coal and utility industries are normally interested. Following favorable results of exploratory work on the application of the fluidized-solids technique to coal gasification, the development company and the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. concluded that a pilot plant was needed to carry the research step further to obtain sounder engineering data.

Library, Pa., was selected as the site for the pilot plant. Contract for the pilot plant was awarded in August 1947 and the installation completed a little over a year later, on October 10, 1948. Except for a few delays incident to usual operational difficulties which have to be overcome when starting up any new pilot plant, experimental work has been progressing satisfactorily.

From an experimental standpoint we feel that the work that has been carried out by ourselves and others on the conversion of synthesis gas into oil products has resulted in the development of a satisfactory process for this step of the operation. We feel that a considerable improvement can be made over existing processes for conversion of coal into synthesis gas and the cooperative research program between Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and the Standard Oil Development Co. is vigorously pursuing this objective.

From an economic standpoint we do not believe that the processes for conversion of coal into oil products in its present state of development are competitive with the manufacture of such products from petroleum. No commercial plants for making oil from coal are known to be planned or under construction in this county at this time. One commercial plant is reported to be under construction for making synthetic oil products from natural gas. We hope that the information being obtained through the cooperative research program between the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and ourselves will make some real improvements in methods for production of synthesis gas and hence in the over-all process for conversion of coal to oil. We do feel, however, that more substantial improvements than those we now foresee are needed to make the production of oil products from coal competitive with their production from petroleum under present price structures.

The petroleum situation in recent months has changed greatly from that of the last few years. Exploration and drilling have proceeded at high rates; intensive refinery expansion has been under way; and refinery output of petroleum products has steadily mounted. (Proven reserves in the United States are now higher than they have ever been before.) Above ground stocks of crude oil and products have been replenished, and production has now largely caught up with demand. The urgency of developing petroleum substitutes has, therefore, diminished. However, the cost of crude-oil production has been increasing and it is possible, should costs continue to mount, that synthetic oil capacity on a large scale will in time become competitive with liquid fuels produced from petroleum. When the time comes, it is expected that many economies in the construction and operation of a commercial oil-from-coal plant will have been realized through development work on improved methods of gasifying coal such as that under way at the Library pilot plant.

Very truly yours,

E. V. MURPHREE.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., to Hon. JOHN H. KERR, chairman of the Deficiency Committee of the Committee on Appropriations. The letter concerns the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. I think it presents a very clear statement of the efforts being made to eradicate the disease, and for that reason I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN H. KERR,

Chairman, Deficiency Committee of Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice in an Associated Press report that your committee on April 6, rejected a request for money to build a laboratory for research in foot-and-mouth disease.

My interest and the interest of the industry in keeping North America free of foot-and-mouth disease is, of course, very great. For that reason, I though it might be of some help to your committee and that you might even reconsider your action if I could give you my views, which are shared by many other members of the industry.

The campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico has been very well reorganized and is being carried on very efficiently by the Mexico-United States Commission, and they have in the process succeeded in making a high quality vaccine in immense quantities. I believe that in March they had produced in excess of 2,300,000 doses. They have also carried out the gigantic task of vaccinating 2,400,000 cattle this same month. At the present stage in this war against the dread disease, it has become clear that it is of vast importance to improve the vaccine so that it will confer immunization for a longer period of time; in fact one might even hope that a vaccine that would give permanent immunization would come from these efforts. The present vaccine has been proven to be good for only 4 months under certain conditions, whereas it had been hoped that it would be good for 6 months or longer. No research looking toward the improvement of the vaccine can be carried on in this country at this time as no facilities are available, and even if facilities are provided here it would be at least 2 years before any productive work could be accomplished. Therefore, it is apparent that the best place this work can be done immediately is in Mexico where substantial facilities are available and where the battle is actually being fought.

I am informed that Dr. Clarkson, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, has stated that emphasis has been placed up to now by our research scientists on the production of the necessary vaccine to carry out immunization work in Mexico. Meanwhile research scientists have been working in Europe; but only recently, when it became apparent that a better vaccine was needed, have any of our research scientists gone to work on the ground in Mexico to try to develop it there; that two more of these scientists are due to go to Mexico this month, and in another 6 months more will be sent there. Dr. Clarkson stated quite frankly that enough has not been done along these lines. He also said that the present prospects for eradicating the disease in Mexico are more promising than they have been at any time. The atmosphere of the people in Mexico has been developed favorably to carry on the work and the methods employed up to now have been successful in eradicating outbreaks in outlying areas and it has been possible to contract the quarantine lines so that in many places the northern limits are now farther from our border than they were a year ago. It is my feeling that it would be of great benefit to take advantage of this present atmosphere and organized effort to tremendously speed up our research effort on the ground in Mexico. It is one of my purposes in writing this letter to emphasize that the question of eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and the question of building a research laboratory in this country are entirely separate and should be considered separately. Both are very necessary for the immediate action but for entirely separate reasons.

As stated above, we have a war going on in Mexico and the battles are being fought with ammunition that we do not feel is as good as could be produced if sufficient efforts were made in Mexico to improve it. In the case of the proposed building of a laboratory here, the real need for such a laboratory is that we know that the threat of foot-and-mouth disease invading this country is a continuous one, and so far as we can see now an everlasting one. We may have a number of outbreaks in this country that are purely chargeable to negligence at any time. Such outbreaks may have no connection with Mexico, just as the prior outbreaks in this

country had no connection with Mexico—they may be caused by accident, by design, by sabotage, or by war.

It is probable that vaccine will always be used as a supplement to slaughter and burial and quarantine, and for this purpose we would have to manufacture our own vaccine as sufficient vaccine would probably not be available from any other source, and we would also have to be prepared to manufacture vaccines to immunize against any of the known types, which may be different from those which at present exist in Mexico. Therefore there are two entirely different efforts that should be made at once in connection with keeping this country free of foot-and-mouth disease—one is the speeding up by every possible means on-the-ground research in Mexico, and the other the building of a laboratory at the safest possible location to insure the future health of our livestock.

From the Associated Press report yesterday your committee is quoted as saying: "In order to conduct the proposed research it would be necessary to introduce the disease into the United States and thereby increase the hazard of an outbreak among the livestock of the country." One would get the impression from this statement, assuming it to be correct, that the main reason the committee turned down the requested appropriation was that the laboratory was going to be built on the mainland of the United States and proper safeguards would not be afforded. Since the original bill authorizing the construction of a laboratory, provided that it must be located on a coastal island separated from the mainland by deep navigable waters, Dr. Clarkson was asked by telephone if there had been any effort made by the BAI to modify this in order to secure the location of the laboratory on the mainland. Dr. Clarkson stated that the BAI was not seeking to change the location of the plan, but wanted to go ahead with the construction on one of the several islands which they considered satisfactorily located off the northeast coast of the United States. Furthermore he said that the BAI was as anxious as we to have it in a place where there would be adequate safeguards to remove all possible risk of this most infectious virus escaping to the mainland.

I feel satisfied that by locating it on an island as provided for in legislation of April 1948 such adequate safeguards would be provided, but I would not be willing to take the risk of locating similar facilities on the mainland.

I hope that you will take every means at your command to stimulate sending these research scientists to Mexico and reconsider your decision of April 6 with respect to the long-term research laboratory project.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT J. KLEBERG, Jr.

Marshall-Aid Countries Reported Overproducing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Marshall-Aid Countries Reported Overproducing," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star of yesterday. I think Mr. Brown is a writer of sufficient reputation and responsibility at least to invite attention to his article, particularly his statement as to the so-called Schuman report. Certain of Mr. Brown's statements are inaccurate, for instance, that we now have a high tariff, because we obviously do not.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL-AID COUNTRIES REPORTED OVERPRODUCING—EUROPE'S DEMAND RUNS BEHIND EXCESSIVE OUTPUT MADE POSSIBLE BY MACHINES AND EQUIPMENT SENT BY UNITED STATES

(By Constantine Brown)

The European recovery program has been so successful that the countries which have benefited from it today are burdened with overproduction.

Unfortunately, there is not sufficient deman in Europe for the goods which are being produced in excessive quantities and the chances are that they will have to be sold in the United States. Thereby they will have the unexpected effect of increasing unemployment in this country.

These facts come out of a document which French Foreign Minister Schuman presented to Secretary of State Acheson during his visit in Washington to sign the Atlantic Pact. Because of its explosive content the document still is being kept top secret.

Although the great proportion of ERP funds have been utilized to provide consumers' goods, what machinery and equipment we have sent to continental Europe to rehabilitate its light industries have been used effectively.

LUXURY PRODUCTION UP

As a result, the luxury industries of France, Belgium, and Italy have reverted to their prewar level of production. French perfume, Belgian lace, and Italian, French, and Belgian textile industries, which had a place of their own in the world's prewar economy, now are back to what they used to be before 1939.

Lyons and Milan again are producing their fine fabrics, used principally for luxury purposes, and Bruges and Brussels once more are in full swing turning out lace and similar commodities. French vineyards are ready to provide the world with excellent wines, champagnes, and brandies.

Before the war a large part of the production of these goods was consumed in Europe itself, but now financial and currency crises in those countries prevent former consumers from purchasing them. Under the ERP this contingency was taken into consideration when it was provided that the surplus of one nation should be absorbed by the other members of the Marshall plan organization.

French and Italian economists went to London to discuss their problems of overproduction, which within a few months may become acute and cause a scale of unemployment which would play into the hands of native Communist agitators.

Unfortunately, according to the report presented by Mr. Schuman to Mr. Acheson, they found little sympathetic response from the British Government and particularly from Sir Stafford Cripps, the British economic dictator.

CRIPPS EXPLAINS AUSTERITY

The representatives of the principal continental European republics urged the British to relax somewhat their austerity program and accept some of the luxury goods being produced. They expressed their willingness to accept in exchange some of the heavier goods produced in the United Kingdom, including whisky, which normally has only a limited market in continental Europe.

Sir Stafford was adamant. He explained, according to the French, that austerity is necessary to Britain these days and the British people are not ready yet to make use of the fancy goods produced by the Latins. Not only was Stir Stafford unwilling to accept luxury and semiluxury products from the continent, the French say, but the British Government even placed obstacles in the way of exports of butter and fresh vegetables, of which there is a superabundance in France today.

It appears that the harshness and predatory policies of the Nazi occupation forces did not seriously deplete Normandy's stock of cattle, and today their number exceeds that of 1938. Paris and other large cities which could purchase such luxuries as butter, eggs, cheese, and fresh vegetables in adequate quantities only on the black market have them now at relatively low cost. But even now much of the dairy production is wasted, because the quantities available exceed the demand by far and Britain keeps only a crack of its import door open.

The French argument that the ERP agreements provided specifically for the absorption of overproduction had no effect on the stubborn British economic dictator, who remained adamant in his view that the gates of Britain must be kept closed until such time as he decides that the austerity policy can come to an end.

Under these circumstances European countries are preparing to dump their surplus production on the United States. Britain is expected to join them by offering the American people whisky and leather goods at far lower prices than we are paying today.

The reason this program has not yet been adopted is that American tariffs are still high and the Europeans expect that the United States may decide to lower them through reciprocal trade agreements. But even if tariffs are not lowered by next summer we must expect an avalanche of luxury goods in this country, manufactured by the Europeans. Prices may be cut sharply.

From the point of view of the American purchaser who is accustomed to luxury goods this may be good news. But American economists frown at the idea of an influx of foreign goods into the United States at this time.

NEW TEXTILE CRISIS

Our own textile industry is in the midst of a new crisis. Reports from New England and some of the States in the South indicate that mills are slowing down considerably. The distillers over the Nation are disturbed by the fact that they will have to meet the competition of Scotch whisky and French brandies at a price lower than the cheapest American product. Growers in California, New York, and Ohio will worry when they hear that French and Italian wines and champagnes will be offered in the American market at prices with which American producers will have difficulty competing.

The legislators who approved ERP were assured at that time that there was no serious risk of European dumping in the American market, since it was provided in the agreement that the signatories would absorb the overproduction of each other.

Because of certain considerations of a politico-strategic nature Europe was not provided with tools for her heavy industries. But since ERP was not regarded as another UNRRA, and its purpose was to put the beneficiary nations on their feet economically, we did provide them with the machinery to start the wheels of their light industries again. This has been done and has succeeded more quickly than was anticipated.

Unfortunately only a limited market is provided in Europe itself. South America is able to use only a small part of western Europe's output and Asia provides no outlet at all. In the days before the war luxury

and semiluxury goods had a fair market in some parts of China, Singapore, and India. These now are completely closed.

The only present outlet for Europe's goods is the United States, which will have to absorb more than it did before the war if it is to avert an economic crisis in Europe. This comes at a time when he faces a less advantageous position than we held in the past, confronted with an industrial and economic recession and heavier taxes than before.

FRANK TALKS URGED

Thus the fears of some opponents of the Marshall plan may be borne out. That is to say, after we have provided Europe with the means to stage a limited economic comeback, we shall have to consume the goods which we have helped Europe produce, probably at the expense of American labor.

The suggestion is being made in some quarters in Washington that the administration talk frankly to the British Government and warn them that they must live up to the agreement which provides for unhampered exchange of goods among the nations which benefit from ERP appropriations.

What success this will have is uncertain. The British Labor Party is worried about its latest electoral setbacks and is intent on proceeding with even greater nationalization of some industries within the next 2 years. During that time it feels that it must stick to the austerity program, which is part and parcel of its closed economic policy. A change of attitude might jeopardize its position as the government of Britain.

Sir Stafford is known to be an obstinate person who is determined to put through the industrial nationalization program, even if he realizes that the policies he must adopt toward that end might be hurtful to Britain's present allies.

Meanwhile, the economic survey presented by Foreign Minister Schuman is being kept secret lest it influence adversely the American people and the policy of cooperation with western Europe.

Address by Harold Stassen Before Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Comment by George Sokolsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky recently published, commenting upon an address by Mr. Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, at the midcentury convocation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I personally was very much impressed with Mr. Stassen's speech and I thought that Mr. Sokolsky dealt with it in a manner which should interest the Members of this body and the general public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

A number of notable speeches were delivered at the midcentury convocation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but most of them were overshadowed by Winston Churchill's personality.

Among the addresses that seemed underplayed was that of Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, who approached American problems from the standpoint of a nation with a continuing philosophy of life.

After analyzing the conflict among various ideas of life and government he applied his conclusions to Asia, as follows:

"Relating this inescapable situation to one specific problem before us, we must conclude that we are foolhardy to contribute by our inaction, or by our withdrawal of aid, to the Communist domination of China.

"We should move, and move promptly, to bolster the southern half of China, to assist by materials and by counsel in maintaining the independence of Canton and of the four provinces of Kwantung, Kwangsi, Fukien, Hunan, and of Formosa and Hong Kong."

The argument usually made by the State Department is that it is impossible to support a government ridden by graft. It is the same kind of argument as justified the support of Red fascism to the tune of $11,000,000,000 and the rejection of Spanish fascism.

It is the same kind of argument which makes it right to support British imperialism in the Middle East but to oppose Dutch imperialism in Indonesia. It is a fatuous argument unrelated to reality.

After all, the so-called corruption of the Nationalist Government is a question of the form and character of government. Are we to enforce our concepts of government upon other peoples? We provide Marshall-plan aid to imperialist Holland, to socialistic England, to France whose economic and political system is beyond description in accurate terms.

Nor is the argument sound that we need only aid Europe and that there can be security for us in an Asia completely under Russian control.

I suggested to Winston Churchill recently that Soviet Russia will raise at least 40 divisions among the Chinese to police the satellite countries in Europe.

He pooh-poohed the suggestion, yet nothing is more likely. For some of the Russian satellites and puppets are becoming recalcitrant and it is sound policy for the Kremlin to use Asiatics to keep Europeans in line. Lenin did it when he employed Mongols and Buriats in the early days of the revolution to keep Russians in line.

So when Harold Stassen proposes support to the government of South China, he is sound.

He says: "Giving due consideration to European needs and to our own total economic situation and capacity, we should regularly invest a portion of our resources in Asia for the resistance of communism.

"The amount should be a minimum of a billion dollars a year. It should be administered on an Asia-wide approach, preferably in relation to local provinces and individual projects and in underwriting private endeavor, rather than being funneled through any central, major government.

"Clearly the Marshall plan in Europe has been the most significant single right thing we have done since the end of the war. It is high time that we have a parallel MacArthur plan in Asia."

One of our major difficulties in the pursuit of policy is that the American people have not yet caught up with the role that we actually have assumed in the world. Whether the people approve of that role is another matter.

Whether they would have approved of it, had they known the truth, while it was in the making at a dozen international conferences is neither here nor there. The historic fact is that the United States has, since 1939, become a vast empire.

Such a position involves a universal program and policy. The Monroe Doctrine and the open door policy in China seemed at one time permanent, but they were at most regional programs. "Freedom of the seas" came closest to a universal policy.

Otherwise, we pursued hit-and-miss relationships, generally, but not always, following Great Britain. Our new situation and the decay of the British empire force upon us a new role for which we are not ready. Lacking this, we suffered so severe a defeat in China.

Development of Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by C. F. Byrns concerning a bill recently introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and sponsored by several other Members of the Senate, dealing with the plan for development of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins. It is an excellent editorial written by one of the leading editorial writers of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Smith (Ark.) Southwest American Times-Record of April 9, 1949]

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Arkansas' Senators JOHN MCCLELLAN and BILL FULBRIGHT will join as coauthors with Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, in sponsoring a bill to create a United States commission to make a basin-wide, comprehensive plan of development of the Arkansas, White and Red River Basins. This information comes to me from Don McBride, former head of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, now helping Senator KERR on the new commission plan.

Senator KERR's bill is now in final form and will be introduced soon. In my judgment, it represents the most intelligent approach yet made to the full development of the basins of these three streams which affect the economy of eight States—Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Kansas, New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado.

The United States commission proposal will preserve all the rights of the States and their people and the separate functions of all the Federal agencies dealing with resources—the Corps of Engineers, of the Department of the Army; the Bureau of Reclamations of the Department of the Interior; the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture; and the Federal Power Commission. It will achieve a comprehensive program, integrating the plans of all these agencies. It will embrace development projects for the upper reaches of the streams as well as the lower sections which have had most of the attention. It will present to Congress a broad and understandable picture, which can justify the enthusiastic support of all the Senators and Representatives and the people of the eight affected States.

In contrast to this approach is the new Missouri Valley Authority bill recently introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana. It would set up an authority appointed by

the President and operating in a world of its own, making its own rules and in the main superseding State and local governments. Patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority program, it goes considerably further to the left, giving to the proposed authority broader powers and less responsibility to the people, their State governments, and the Federal Government.

I think the people of the Southwest overwhelmingly prefer the approach of the bill which will be offered by Senators KERR, MCCLELLAN, and FULBRIGHT. I know I do.

A serious problem in the development of our rivers has been the diversity of agencies dealing with rivers, forests, and soils, and the electric power which can be generated by river-control projects. That diversity is the chief argument for the authority method of development. Authority advocates believe the way to overcome the difficulty is to put all power in the hands of an appointive board to plan and to construct and to operate, without much regard for the wishes of the people affected.

This new proposal for the Arkansas, White, and Red Basins meets the difficulty of diverse agencies by setting up a commission to integrate the plans of all agencies and to evolve one plan which embraces the parts of all of them which all concerned can agree upon. The detailed planning, the construction and finally the operations would be left in the hands of the established agencies, with all the existing protections of local and State authority and interest. It is a much sounder approach.

The proposed new commission would exist only until its planning work is complete. Then it would go out of existence. It would not supplant any existing agency. It would represent the four Federal agencies involved and the people of the eight States. The President would appoint one person from each of the four Federal agencies and eight persons representing the eight States, and a chairman who lives in the area. The representatives of the States would be nominated by the governors of those States.

The cost of the commission's study is not estimated in the bill. It need not be excessive. The benefits of such a coordinated program can be tremendous, in speeding up construction and in fitting all the parts of a complicated program into a single, integrated program.

Guaranteed Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Guaranteed Farming," published in the Washington Post of April 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARANTEED FARMING

In the pressure for space following intermittent suspension of this newspaper, the prize exhibit of the Fair Deal has not yet had our comment. We refer to Secretary Brannan's plan for perpetual prosperity for agriculture. This is a scheme, a most ambitious scheme, that looks like a magical effort to give something to everybody. To farmers he promises subsidy payments designed to equate them with other economic groups. To consumers he promises lower prices by allowing agricultural commodities to find their own market level. To the public he holds out the assurance that this program would cost no more than the present system of price supports by which the Government keeps agricultural prices up artificially.

The hitch, of course, is the two-price system that would be created by the Brannan plan. Mr. Brannan uses as a lure the prospect of buying milk at 15 cents a quart. This might be all the consumer would pay directly. But the Government would then make up to the milk producer the difference between the market price and what, under the Brannan formula, was considered necessary to bring a fair income. The consumer would pay for this, too, through taxes, and to that extent the 15-cent price tag on milk would be deceptive.

There is, to be sure, a superficial plausibility about the Brannan program. For one thing, it would recast the farm parity formula in terms of present-day prices instead of as a percentage of 1909–14 prices. Furthermore, theoretically it would end the squeeze in which the consumer pays high prices and then pays taxes to keep prices high. However, it would substitute for price supports a thorough regimentation of agriculture. Far-reaching production and marketing controls would be necessary over virtually every crop, and if estimates proved faulty the system could become a terrific millstone. The consequences of tampering with the delicate ratios in livestock feeding, for example, could be disastrous. Nor does the plan give any assurance that overproduction would be effectively checked; indeed, subsidies unrelated to supply might encourage gluts.

The Brannan approach would scuttle the long-range Aiken farm program before that program has even been tried. The Aiken law is the first real effort to relate price supports to supply. Beginning in 1950, Government supports will range from 90 percent down to 60 percent of parity, depending on supply. These flexible support provisions have been under constant attack from groups seeking to peg supports of specific commodities at 90 or even 100 percent of parity. In this respect the Brannan program looks like a political sop, for its effect would be to fix most ·upport prices rigidly at above 90 percent of parity.

Farm income has a direct relation to the health of the remainder of the economy, and no one can wish for a return of the days of nonprotection of farm prices. Agricultural price supports are accepted as a necessary compensation for the fact that the farmer, alone of all producers, cannot reduce his production when prices fall. The question is not whether there should be price supports, but whether farmers should be singled out for guaranteed income. The theory behind the Aiken law is to provide a variable floor against depression. If this is to be jettisoned in favor of a rigid system to subsidize farm incomes, how long will it be before other economic groups also demand an income subsidy?

After College, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "After College, What?" written by James P. Lynch, editor of the Exeter News-Letter. It is a very appealing, interesting article which I think is worthy of the attention of the readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER COLLEGE, WHAT?

(The tempo of the times is fast. Men find that their lives seem shorter and shorter. Everyone hurries. There is less and less time for a man to experiment. We have to make decisions earlier in our lives, and economics force us to carry them through. For this reason, and for the old reasons often given that students decide early what they are going to do, the Review is running a series of articles on the various professions. We have asked men prominent in their vocations to write essays, answering such questions as, "What does your vocation offer to young men today?" and "How does your profession fulfill your youthful ambitions and idealism?" The first three of these articles appear in this issue. The purpose of this series of essays, written by men who know their fields well and have gone far in them, is to give the students at Exeter some indication of the possibilities of the vocations open to them. The time for decision for most of us it not very far off, and we cannot afford to choose wrong.)

(By James P. Lynch, of the Exeter News-Letter)

This is your America. The land that offers you so much and asks for so little in return. The land that has become great because its people are great.

To its youth it offers countless opportunities. The avenues of approach to the road to success are many. In fact, because of this, it is rather difficult for some graduates to decide on what avenue they desire to travel.

To those that choose the field of politics they will find before them a field rich in adventure, abundant in fame and opportunities, and last but not least, a chance to help in promoting the political leadership of the American Government.

The political leaders of America look upon college graduates, not as energetic youths with fresh sheepskins seeking a start in life, but rather as young Americans who will soon be running the Nation. They expect a lot from you because this is your America. They know you can do the job equally as well, and probably better, than themselves. They are hoping that you will be active in politics.

To the young man desirous of entering this field he is more fortunate than his forebears. In many of the colleges and universities throughout the Nation he has a chance to join political groups and discuss the topics of importance that are confronting the Nation.

These groups are similar to the many Young Republican and Young Democrat Clubs that are scattered over the 48 States. For a young man starting off in politics these clubs offer an excellent opportunity to learn the fundamentals of politics. In most States many leaders of their respective parties are graduates of the young group.

The clubs play an important part in elections and give the young members a ringside seat for the presidential race. In the last presidential encounter both candidates sought the help and advice of the young groups in their party.

Last year, prior to both conventions, the spotlight was for the most part on the Republican candidates. This was due chiefly because of the number of important candidates. It was surprising to notice the number of young people taking part in this great affair. You must realize that these people

were supporting the candidates individually and not as an organization. No group supports any candidate until after the nomination.

Of all the candidates, Stassen led the field in the support from the younger element.

Editorial From New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is starting an investigation of the entire domestic transportation situation, including railroads as well as other transportation agencies.

A very timely editorial appeared in the New York Times of April 11 which accurately points out certain important factors in the problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Laurence F. Whittemore, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford, asserts that the time has come when American railroads should be relieved of the obligation to furnish local service for which they are no longer the most effective medium. Speaking before the Providence Chamber of Commerce, he declared that the carriers must be freed from the type of regulation and thinking which renders them unable to change their pricing and service to meet changing conditions.

We agree with Mr. Whittemore that our present system of railroad regulation is a good deal of an anachronism. Basically, its philosophy stems back to the nineteenth century. It rests, therefore, to a very considerable degree, on the theory that the railroads are still a natural monopoly instead of a form of transportation that is compelled year after year to face increasing competition, some of it heavily subsidized by the Government itself. Since the Second World War alone a minor revolution has occurred in the movement of the nation's freight. Texas grapefruit, once hauled by rail, now comes North on rubber tires; cotton cloth is trucked from Southern mills to New York's garment center overnight, and fish is carried from Seattle to the east coast in vehicles equipped for refrigeration. The number of class one interstate trucking enterprises has more than doubled since before the war; their total revenues have risen from $700,000,000 in 1939 to more than $2,500,000,000.

To the extent that this development represents progress and evolution through competition it is, of course, to be applauded, and not decried. It is in the interest of the community as a whole to employ whatever form of transportation is most efficient and economical. But there are two other points that should be considered in this connection. The first is that we don't have a fair competition when one competitor is regulated as a monopoly and the other is not. The second is that it is imperative for our railroads to be preserved as a progressive and basic part of our transportation system.

Some will profess to see the answer to this problem in Government ownership of the railroads. But that would merely be to substitute for the present policy of duplication and confusion one of deterioration and decay. What is called for is a genuine national policy which will preserve the inherent advantages of all competing forms of common carriers as a unified and coordinated transportation system. This cannot be achieved until we are prepared to set up a single transportation authority for that purpose.

Cites Dangers in Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Col. Charles L. Hall, United States Army, retired, in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Thursday, April 14, 1949:

CITES DANGERS IN BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Col. Charles L. Hall, son of an Army officer and author of the following article on the Bipartisan Conspiracy, was graduated from West Point in 1908. His entire service was with the corps of engineers. He served on the general staff in France in World War I, receiving the Distinguished Service Medal and the Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster. During World War II, he served as engineer of the Ohio River district. He retired for age in 1947, but remained on active duty until retired for disability in 1948. He was district engineer at Rock Island, Ill., from 1927 to 1930.)

(By Charles L. Hall, colonel, U. S. Army, retired)

Robert Louis Stevenson once said that man did not live by bread alone, but principally by catchwords. The American people are now living by the most singular catchword ever composed: "bipartisan foreign policy."

There is no foreign policy, bipartisan or any other kind.

Try to find out whether Germany is to be put on its feet, or not. Try to find out how the expanded population of Germany is to be supported without either the access of a correspondingly expanded heavy industry to east European markets, or direct and fierce competition with Great Britain and France in non-European markets. Try to find out if western Germany is to have a military force capable of meeting the new east German military police.

What we have now is a bipartisan conspiracy to conceal from the American people the absence of a foreign policy. By stretching the word "policy" to its elastic limit we might say that we have a bipartisan agreement to conceal the fact that we are following two diametrically opposed policies. Neither of these has ever been formally avowed by the executive agents who sponsor them. Public opinion has been given no opportunity to pass on them, or even to know that two divergent policies exist.

OPPOSING THEORIES

To these two opposing policies, or rudimentary foundations for policies, may conveniently be given the terms French and German. Under the French policy the Russian advance is to be resisted by Great Britain, France, and the Low Countries, subsidized by American money and supported by American man power, partly present in Europe and partly in reserve.

Germany is to be kept poor and weak, with just enough strength to support its population and pay the cost of foreign overlordship. There are to be no German soldiers.

Under the German policy the strength of Germany is to be fully developed economically, and partially developed militarily, so as to reduce the constant drain on American strength caused by the expense of the French policy. However, though American subsidies will be smaller under the German policy, nobody expects western Europe to be self-supporting until trade between it and eastern Europe becomes as large as it was before the war.

FRENCH MILITARILY WEAK

The disadvantages of the French policy, which has already been partially adopted, are obvious. France is nearly a third communist, and no serious military student believes that an army with more than a quarter of its strength fifth columnist can be relied on. After all, Hitler conquered France with a loss of 18,000 men, and all historians remember how little use the Czech troops in the Austrian Army were.

The military strength of the alliance will depend on Great Britain and the United States, its economic strength, for the daily business of living, will depend on American help for an indefinite period. Military equipment must either come from the United States or be provided by western Europe in exchange for compensating American materials on a lend-lease basis, since Germany is not to be allowed to furnish either military material or capital goods in excess of the amount required for daily food. We will never get free of the cost of supporting western Europe.

The great advantage of the French policy is that it will never of itself cause a war. Why should it? No matter what blood transfusions we give to a French army the Russians will always laugh it to scorn. The British manpower cannot, in view of the demands of the Navy and of the Colonies, provide much more than a token army in comparison with the Russians.

RUSSIAN ROLE EASY

We already have shown that the American people will not provide a genuine national army for permanent service on the European Continent. All the Russians have to do is to stand by and watch us waste our substance in subsidizing an international force lacking the spiritual vigor to do anything except to put up a delaying defensive while yelling to our country to come to its rescue. The Russians probably could be in Gibraltar before a properly trained American corps at war strength could start for Europe.

The advantage of the German policy is that it puts German economy to work for the benefit of the Continent on terms which will stimulate the German people to action, and that it takes military advantage of German manpower and talent. It voids the stupidity of maintaining what is, in essence, a military coalition without making full use of all potential supporters. It will assuredly reduce American expenses on the Continent and offers a little (not much) hope of enabling us to quit Europe economically, though not militarily, in 1952.

MAJOR HAZARD OBVIOUS

It has one conspicuous disadvantage. It may blow up in our hands like a torpedo. As long as the Russians behave the way they do now the Germans will be on our side as the lesser of two evils. But suppose the Russians, when Germany is gotten part way up on its feet, say something like this:

You have had a very rough deal. Slav solidarity, however, prevents our thinking of returning the eastern provinces. But we recognize that you must have more room. The French birth rate is low. We will be

glad to help you push your frontier a hundred miles into France, the inhabitants of this area to be expelled. We are free to admit that this will help us, since you can no longer hold a grudge against us for what we did to you. But you know how weak France is. With our help this new land can be gotten cheaply. It's better land than the lost eastern provinces. You can't imagine the French or English doing anything to help you get East Prussia back.

What answer will we make? Of course we can say that the Russians are too scared of latent German power ever to permit such a deal. It's better not to be too sure of that.

ATTEMPT TO COMPROMISE

Naturally the American diplomats recognize the inevitable bankruptcy of the French policy and the danger to world peace of a German policy. So they try to compromise.

Between France and Germany there can never be a compromise freely accepted by both sides as a permanent arrangement. From the end of the Franco-Prussian war in 1871 to the beginning of the First World War in 1914, all the men of good will in Europe spent their time looking for some Franco-German compromise. The French were willing to agree to any scheme which assured France of revenge for its defeats in 1870. The Germans were willing to agree to any scheme which protected them against such a revenge. Between the two World Wars the Germans were agreeable to any plan which gave them a free hand in central Europe and the French were prepared to support any scheme which would keep Germany weak.

For us there is of course another policy possible. We can fall back on the doctrine set forth by George Washington in 1796: to allow the status of Europe to be determined by the operation of the purely European forces involved. To this doctrine we can properly give the name of the American policy. Under a government by doughfaces an American policy is not—to put it mildly—very fashionable.

But no matter how weak the adherents of the American policy may be politically, they are not entirely without weapons. The Government is committed to the Atlantic Pact. A treaty of alliance requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. On a treaty there must be hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. One single committee member not a "doughface" can force the official witnesses to say whether the treaty is meant to back up a French foreign policy or a German one.

WEAK GERMANY DOOMS PLAN

Through expert examination of certain readily available professional witnesses it should be possible to show that a military alliance based on the French Army is wholly ineffective. It is, of course, no trick at all to show that a western Europe with a weak Germany can never pay its way.

It is too much to hope that, whatever the skill displayed by the minority, the treaty can be defeated. But if the proponents of an American policy can find one Senator of the stature of the late Philander C. Knox to lead the attack they can accomplish a great deal. They can prove to the American people that the Atlantic Pact—unless accompanied by universal service in America of the pre-1914 German type—is wholly useless as a means of holding western Europe against attack, and merely mortgages our children's lives to prevent the Russians (or more probably a Russo-German task force) from reaching the Pyrenees without precipitating a third world war.

CHANCE TO BE COUNTED

Especially they can make all contemporary American politicians stand up and be counted in daylight.

If those who believe in an American foreign policy stay on the job they can outline the probable future course of events so clearly that no politician who votes for the Atlantic Pact will have any excuse when it blows up.

After that maybe we can again adopt the policy of 1796—George Washington's policy—under which this country prospered for over a century.

What About Federal Aid for Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What About Federal Aid for Schools?" by Henry F. and Katherine Pringle, published in the April 16, 1949, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I have had made an estimate of the cost of printing in the RECORD, which will be $243.75. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask for insertion of the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS?

(By Henry F. and Katharine Pringle)

(Battered by rising costs, a teacher shortage and a bumper crop of war babies, our vaunted system of free elementary education is slipping badly. The colleges are also hard pressed. Will Uncle Sam have to come to the rescue?)

The connection is direct between Eddie Burns, who lives in a small town in the Middle West, and the current congressional debate on Federal aid to education. Eddie is 17, an alert and pleasant youth employed in a filling station. His grades in grammar school were excellent. He went on to high school, but soon his interest in his studies slumped. The classes were jammed to suffocation, with students perching on window sills. Eddie received little or no personal guidance from poorly trained, hard-pressed teachers. The Burns family needed money, so Eddie took a job at 16.

Sometimes, during the summer months, a sleek convertible slams to a stop in front of one of the filling-station pumps. Susie Smith, also 17, leans out with a "Hi, Eddie, fill her up." Susie is an amiable, extremely attractive girl. She and Eddie were classmates in grammar school, But on finishing the eighth grade she was sent to an excellent private school in the East. There, enough facts and figures are being packed into her pretty head so that her entrance into Vassar a year hence is fairly certain.

What is troubling the more earnest Members of the Senate and the House is the knowledge that there are tens of thousands of Eddies in the United States who ought to go to college, and also tens of thousands of Susies who should probably stay at home. For if Eddie's scholastic abilities had been tested by the methods brought to high efficiency in World War II, he would have been rated extraordinarily intelligent. Susie has no particular talents, except for marrying a nice man, but Eddie was a potential doctor, engineer, or scientist. His talents, now doomed always to remain hidden, are gravely needed in the United States.

"I feel quite certain," President James B. Conant, of Harvard, told a Senate committee last year, "that we are not developing in many sections of the country all the latent talent we should."

Eddie Burns and Susie Smith are imaginary characters, of course. The break-down of American education—the education open to all, which countless orators have hailed as the core of our democratic system—is all too real, however. Badly paid teachers are quitting the elementary grades in unprecedented numbers. High schools do not exist in many rural areas and are overcrowded nearly everywhere. Equality of opportunity for brains, if we ever truly had it, seems to be a gradually vanishing ideal. Even the wealthier States, faced with diminishing sources of taxation, are finding it impossible to appropriate adequate funds. And that is why the idea of Federal aid to education long distasteful because of fear of policy control by Washington, is gaining increased support on Capitol Hill.

The files of presidential commissions, State investigations and congressional committees are packed with case histories which prove that competent children are being incompetently taught; that children unable to benefit clutter the higher grades; that before World War II less than one-third of the boys and girls really eligible for the colleges were enrolled in them; that countless others went to college with few qualifications beyond the bank accounts of their parents.

The University of Minnesota made a study some years ago which demonstrated the tragic loss in able young Americans. Among the students in every typical high-school graduating class are two—let us call them Fred and Bill—who rank among the top 10 percent. Fred's parents are fairly well off, and he will go to college, but the pressure of economics will force Bill into a job. For every high-school graduate in the upper 10 percent who entered college, the Minnesota investigation revealed, another in the same intellectual bracket did not go.

Rising costs of tuition, fees, textbooks, and board and room have nullified, in the words of the President's Commission on Higher Education, "the comfortable idea that any boy can get a college education who has it in him." According to census tabulations, the average American family income in 1947 was $3,000; 4,000,000 families received less than $1,000; and 6,000,000 between $1,000 and $2,000.

It is true, of course, that boys and girls fortunate enough to live near State or city colleges pay low tuition fees, if any, and can be supported at home. It is also true that many ambitious students still wait on table or tend furnaces as they have always done. But the struggle is far harder than in our own college years. A young girl who graduated in February from a New York City high school, so gifted that several of her poems have already been published, announced that she would have to go straight into business. And this was in a city with four tuition-free colleges.

Sometimes, by the accident of fortune, a talented youngster is salvaged in time. In April of 1948, Jesse P. Bogue, of the American Association of Junior Colleges, told a subcommittee of the Senate that he favored financial assistance to the schools. Calling also for a system of Federal scholarships, he related the story of a boy in a mountain district of the South. The lad had displayed striking mathematical ability, but had no money whatever for college. His neighbors, most of them equally poor, managed to finance his 2 years at the State junior college. Then he was drafted, Army aptitude tests confirmed his mental stature. He was assigned to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for research on rockets and was excused from combat duty. Today he is a

civilian expert at a naval experimental station.

Educational circles appear in the main to be convinced that such fortunate cases are the exception, that increasing waste of our intellectual resources can be avoided only through Federal funds. The United States, they point out, spends only 1.5 percent of its national income on schools. In political circles a conviction is growing that democracy is in danger unless the schools are drastically improved. Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, remarking that the principle of States' rights was most zealously regarded by his constituents, nonetheless called for Federal grants and warned of disastrous penalties if educational neglect of millions continued.

"If we cannot achieve a fuller realization of democracy in the United States," warned the President's Commission on Higher Education, "we are not likely to secure its adoption willingly outside the United States."

The burden of educating the Nation's boys and girls will grow heavier in the years ahead, for the simple reason that there will be more of them. The 7,000,000 births anticipated for the years 1941 to 1946, inclusive, soared to 17,000,000. The Census Bureau estimates that an additional 10,000,000 children will be attending our elementary and high schools by 1959. Meanwhile, more than 350,000 teachers have left their posts since 1939, chiefly because of the low pay scales, and upwards of 1,000,000 new ones will be needed within 10 years to handle the rising flood of students.

The friends of Federal aid to education offer staggering columns of statistics to prove their case and, behind the figures, story after story of the vanishing American dream of proper schooling for all who are qualified. In Little Rock, Ark., the wealthiest school district in the State, one class of 30 children had five different teachers in a single year—to their resulting confusion and bewilderment. In the country as a whole, 2,000,000 boys and girls are being taught, if the word can be so used, by teachers who hold no certificate of any kind. Another 2,000,000 children of school age are enrolled nowhere—because the schools are so bad or because bus facilities are not available.

In World War II, 1,200,000 boys were rejected by Selective Service because of educational deficiencies.

The Nation's capital does not hear from grass roots America as often as it likes to imagine. Last year, however, during the investigation into Federal aid to education, it listened to a procession of witnesses from the foxholes of poverty. They were principally teachers.

One witness was Mrs. Flora Harriman, teacher and principal of a three-room school at Hampden, Maine.

She testified, "I am the only teacher of 30 boys and girls. Besides my teaching, I am responsible for part of the janitor work * * * Besides tending the furnace, I must see to the cleaning of our rooms, washing windows, care of our old-fashioned dry toilets, scrubbing the drinking fountain, displaying the flag and looking after the snow that works into the basement—all are mine to do. These extra jobs * * * rob the boys and girls of time that belongs to them."

Another witness was Miss Authelia Gumm, of Summersville, Ky. She said that her salary, one of the highest in the State, was $138.80 monthly for 8 months. For the past 5 years she had supplemented her earnings by making income-tax reports.

Miss Gumm said, "My school is housed in a brick building containing three classrooms. * * * The building is heated by wood stoves. If the weather is extremely cold, the fires must be started at 7 o'clock each morning. * * * The board of education allots only enough funds to buy six cords of wood per room. * * * If the supply runs out, the teacher or the community must supply the amount needed. This is a time which tries the teacher's soul.

"Most people think a teacher's day is from 8 to 3:30. As a matter of fact, my hours are from 7 to 4:30. I arrive an hour early to build fires. I remain an hour after school to clean the building and get it ready for the next day. Isn't it strange that I still love to teach?"

A third witness was Samuel R. Levering, an orchardist from Virginia, who said that he favored the general principle of Federal aid to education.

He went on, "Let me say this frankly: I am not proud of the school record of my own State of Virginia. We are fortieth in the relative effort we have made, relative to our income. * * * This is our situation in my home county. We have a school there which is supposed to have a principal, a high-school teacher * * * and three grade-school teachers. At this time and for this year we have no principal, no high-school teacher * * * [and] of the three grade-school teachers, only one has a certificate; the other two are qualified only to the extent of graduation from this poor rural school.

"The only way that some of us see to get decent education is to send our children away to private school or perhaps have them live in Washington with relatives and attend the Washington schools. * * * We would much prefer to build up the schools in our own locality, because it is not fair * * * for our neighbors to have no education for their children."

Then there was Mrs. Nannie Rucker, who said she was typical of many teachers in the Negro primary schools of Tennessee. Her own school, in Rutherford County, was in a share-crop area where most of the families had from 4 to 12 children. Many of them, said Mrs. Rucker, had never seen a post office or a train and had never been in a town. She regarded broadening their horizons as part of her duties. Her salary was $133 a month for 8 months, although an increase was pending.

Mrs. Rucker described the temptation to abandon her profession, "Many of my fellow teachers * * * have left to accept better-paying jobs elsewhere. I have been sorely tempted. Only recently I was offered a position as a maid for an elderly lady, which would have paid me considerably more than I now make. * * * I have remained in the teaching profession because I believe it is my calling. I enjoy working with children."

The facts appear to be beyond controversy. But why can't the schools be improved without sacrificing the American principle that basic education is the function of the village, the town, the city and, at last resort, the State? The answer lies in the inequities in the income, or wealth, of various sections of the Nation and in the drying up of State sources of taxation. Four years ago, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, opposed Federal assistance. At this session of Congress, however, as in the Eightieth, he is sponsoring legislation which would provide $300,000,000 in aid, most of it to go to the poorer States.

"Today the States are exercising every power they can exercise," he has declared. "They have sales taxes, they have every form of tax they can think of. * * * A State has no access to the principal sources of taxation."

Some of the States would have to abandon highway, health, and many other services if they were to spend sufficient sums on their schools. Arkansas, as an example, devotes a slightly greater percentage of its income to education than does New York. Yet, New York expends an average of about $200 per year per child, while Arkansas can spend only $60. Another example: Mississippi apportions 3.41 percent of its income for education, with its schools far down on the list in quality. New York, with excellent schools, allocates only 2.61 percent of its annual income. The South, contrary to popular belief, has made more energetic attempts than the United States as a whole to divert increased tax funds to education. But enough money is simply not to be had.

The friends of Federal aid argue with persuasive evidence that education can no longer be regarded as a local problem. Some 8,000,000 Americans moved out of their home States during the war years. Dr. Conant pointed out during his testimony in the Senate hearings that we are a mobile people.

"The future citizens of many of our wealthy cities are now being educated in our poorer States," the head of Harvard observed. "In terms of self-interest of these relatively prosperous communities, money is well spent in the education of their future residents."

At one point in the hearings the scene shifted to Kentucky, to an area of the State where migrant workers pick strawberries and other crops. Hardly a third of the children had finished the first grade, investigation disclosed, although their ages ranged from 12 to 15. Many of these forlorn youngsters had received less schooling than their parents, a shocking reversal of the American boast that each new generation is better educated than the last.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, stated that "the people at home" simply could not comprehend, because of their limited education, such problems as the importance of assistance to Europe. They persisted, he said, in believing that everything we do is for charity. General understanding of the Marshall plan and of American foreign policies in general, said the Senator, is the only hope for the survival of western civilization. To me, that is an all-important consideration in support of this bill.

No measure providing for financial assistance to the schools can conceivably be passed by the Eighty-first Congress, or by any session of the discernible future, without ironclad stipulations that the funds are to be spent by the States without control or interference—except for auditing—by Washington. A bipartisan measure, which was introduced last year and was passed by the Senate, expressly forbade Federal dictation of any kind. So does an identical proposal, now under debate.

On the other hand, the States will not be permitted to reduce their own school allocations, nor will local communities. Details of the current bill are still subject to revision. But the final bill is certain to specify that a minimum percentage of the State's total income—that is to say, the annual income of all its citizens—must be spent for the schools. Nothing is said about segregated schools, in the South or in the District of Columbia. But the measure most likely to pass in this session provides that "a just and equable apportionment of funds" must be made where schools for minority races exist. So the bill will most certainly be a major forward step in the education of Negroes.

Fear of Federal interference with the Nation's schools has probably been exaggerated. Education is not mentioned in the Constitution, but Washington has been involved in educational matters from its earliest days. Public lands were ordered to be used for the support of schools. Other large areas provided endowments for land-grant colleges. More recently the Smith-Hughes Act assisted the States in setting up vocational-training programs. Uncle Sam has been spending hundreds of millions for the highly successful GI college program. All in all, the Bureau of the Budget has estimated, a total of $1,772,000,000 was spent in 1946–47 for post-high-school education. The Federal-aid bill now under discussion reverses, if it does anything, a trend toward a degree of control. The measure offers no inducement for agricultural or vocational training.

Several States have scholarship systems, and there is no evidence that they have been

tainted by politics. New York has for many years awarded scholarships to high-school graduates on a competitive basis, with no restriction on the institution to be attended, so long as it is located in New York. We asked the presidents of Cornell and Syracuse Universities, the chancelor of New York University, and the former acting president of Columbia University whether they had ever experienced any interference on the part of State authorities. All answered in the negative.

"I do not feel there need necessarily be any interference in connection with the extension of Federal aid to the colleges and universities," commented President Edmund E. Day, of Cornell. "The scholarship programs of New York State and of the National Youth Administration and the GI program have created no trouble so far as I know."

"New York University has had wide experience with Federal scholarships," stated Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, of New York University, "and there has never been any interference, nor has there been any from Albany in the case of the New York scholarships."

"I have no concern at all about such a proposal," declared Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal, of Columbia. "I have never been aware of any interference in Albany."

No such unanimity greets the possibility that the bipartisan bill for Federal aid to the country's schools may be amended to include private schools. In Vermont a small percentage of the high schools are technically private but receive public support. The real issue, of course, is whether Federal funds can be paid to parochial schools. The Catholics who support these schools have a case. All the children of school age in the State, not merely the non-Catholics, are counted as one of the bases for determining the size of the Federal grant to a State. In some communities Federal and State funds are used for school lunches in parochial schools and also for bus services. Veterans are allowed to attend denominational institutions of higher learning. The use of Federal funds by the States to increase teaching salaries in private schools is almost certainly, however, in violation of the first amendment. In any event, interjection of the religious issue may endanger passage of the measure.

A much broader, if less immediate, issue is how far spending Federal money for local education will ultimately go. In the summer of 1946 President Truman appointed a group of prominent Americans to a Commission on Higher Education and requested that they consider "ways and means of expanding educational opportunities for all able young people" and, in general, examine the adequacy of higher education in the United States. Eighteen months later the Commission issued a series of voluminous reports which called for a greatly expanded Federal program. Enrollment in high schools and colleges had shown phenomenal growth since 1900, the Commission announced, "but we are forced to admit * * * that the educational attainments of the American people are still substantially below what is necessary either for effective individual living or for the welfare of our society."

"In 1947," the Commission continued, "the people of the country spent $1,000,000,000 for their colleges and universities, but this sum represented less than one-half of 1 percent of the value of the gross national product. And it did not provide equality of opportunity."

"For the great majority of our boys and girls," one section of the report declared, "the kind and amount of education they may hope to attain depends not on their own abilities but on the family or community into which they happened to be born or, worse still, on the color of their skin or the religion of their parents."

A major goal of American democracy, according to the Commission, is "equal educational opportunity for all persons, to the maximum of their individual abilities and without regard to economic status, race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or ancestry." But this, the Commission made clear, does not mean "equal or identical education for all individuals." The Commission's plan does mean, however, that in due course the Federal Government will be asked to foot a large part of the bill.

Probably the most important recommendation of the President's Commission is for the creation of Federal scholarships, to be awarded on the basis of merit and financial need. Because of the pressure of other business and the cost of such a scholarship program, action is not likely at this session of the Eighty-first Congress. But the proposal has already won wide support, including that of the immensely influential National Education Association. As in the case of aid to lower education, no kind of Federal control would be tolerated in connection with the scholarships. For an estimated cost of $100,000,000 for the first year, according to the NEA, college doors would be opened to between 200,000 and 250,000 students.

Funds now available at public and private colleges for scholarships and fellowships are woefully low. In 1946–47 slightly more than $21,000,000 was awarded to 113,000 students—an average award of $187. The President's Commission goes further than the NEA. It suggests an initial appropriation of $120,000,000 and assistance to about 300,000 boys and girls. Again, the States would administer the grants, with the number of scholarships assigned to each depending on the number of high-school graduates and on the proportion of 18- to 21-year-olds in the State. Winners of the awards would be allowed to attend any institution of higher learning, whether public or private.

How, in actual operation, will the plan work? Let us return to Eddie Burns, of the filling station. If the system of Federal scholarships had been in existence, he would have had a compelling incentive to finish high school. At some point in his senior year he would have consulted his principal about his possible chances. The principal would have had at hand application blanks from the scholarship board which the President's Commission suggests should be established in each State. Eddie would probably have had to prove that he had little chance of going to college without an award. And this question of need, as everybody admits, is a tricky one. The youngster with a number of brothers and sisters of college age is obviously more eligible for financial help than an only son or daughter, unless the family income is quite large. A father with three qualifying sons and an income of $6,000 has a greater burden than a parent with one child who makes only $4,000.

Such details, however, must be worked out by the State agencies recommended by the President's Commission. In any event Eddie Burns would be required to submit data on the grades he received in high school. His principal and teachers would send in letters commenting on his personal qualities and potentialities. He would take scholastic and aptitude tests. The award, in the words of the Commission's report, would depend upon the applicant's "ability, character, sense of responsibility, and such other factors as may be adjudged pertinent." If Eddie happened to live in a State where educational standards were below the national average, it is conceivable that less might be asked of him on the various tests than in the top-ranking States. In any case, however, his higher education would be assured if he was one of the fortunate recipients of a scholarship.

No discrimination as to race or creed will be tolerated in the proposed scholarship program. A ceiling of $800 will probably be placed on the grant for any one college year. But Eddie Burns can go on to graduate work at a higher stipend, if he is qualified, according to the Commission's plans. And he can enroll at the University of Illinois, Harvard, Yale, or any other institution at which he can meet the entrance requirements. If he likes, he can matriculate at Columbia and so be near Susie Smith, who certainly would not qualify for any Federal scholarship at all.

The merits of the proposed scholarships are perfectly obvious. It seems to us, however, that there is danger of wrecking all plans for Federal aid to education by asking for too much. The President's Commission believes, for example, that expenditures for higher education must reach $2,500,000,000 by 1960. And in addition to this, it proposes enormous sums for new buildings to take care of greatly expanded enrollments. The buildings and other equipment of American colleges were valued at about $4,000,000,000 in 1947. In 10 years, the Commission calculates, some $12,800,000,000 in physical plant will be required. The United States Office of Education submits an even more alarming figure. By next year, it has asserted, 265,000,000 additional square feet will be needed to provide accommodations for the expected students.

Even the most fervent advocates of equal opportunity for brains will also be likely to question the Commission's pronouncement that the Nation must plan immediately for a minimum college-and-university enrollment of 4,600,000 students by 1960—double the number of boys and girls in attendance in 1946–47. The Commission believes that there is no dearth of potential talent and it insists that there will be plenty of professional and semiprofessional jobs open in another decade to absorb the greatly increased number of college graduates.

On the consummation of this bright hope the experts differ sharply, however. The able minority will always get the jobs they want. But will there be openings enough for so very many holders of bachelor's degrees? The 1940 census indicated that barely 5 percent of all the jobs in our entire labor market attracted college men and women. The Veterans' Administration has already issued a warning that 50,000 engineers will receive degrees next year, with positions assured for barely 7,000 of them. Chemistry and the law are similarly overcrowded. So are executive posts. Even teaching, great as is the need, may not be able to accommodate all the young people who seek to enter that profession.

It is a safe bet that today most boys and girls go to college with the hope of improving themselves economically and with the conviction that they will land well-paying white-collar jobs along with their diplomas. The sincere, well-meaning proponents of higher education will do the young people of the country no real service if, in their zeal they exaggerate the numbers who should attend college. Frustration and unhappiness lie ahead for some college students if they are misled into searching for goals which do not exist.

The President's Commission is aware of this problem, but its answer probably will not satisfy the more realistic voters. The danger, it has declared, is not that individuals may have too much education, but that they may obtain the wrong kind. Education should not be limited to an intellectual elite. Nor should it be denied those who do not look toward professional careers. The goal, as the Commission defines it, is "education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living."

The fact remains that in all probability there will not be jobs for all the college graduates and that there will be cruel disappointments. The college man who has to drive a laundry truck for a living may take a dim view of his education "for a fuller realization of democracy."

Future of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I prepared and which has been published in the March-April issue of the Northwest Republican, issued in Minneapolis, Minn. The subject of the article is the Future of the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What's right and what's wrong with the Republican Party? Everybody seems to have their own idea as to what is wrong with the Republican Party. Obviously, the basic thing that is wrong with us is that we have been licked four successive times in presidential elections and that we lost control of the Congress after but a single session of control.

Any party, however, that can win the loyal support of 22,000,000 voters, that can elect 42 United States Senators and 171 Representatives, any party that can fight as hard as the GOP is fighting against the pell-mell rush to state socialism, any party that achieves a constructive program as we did in the Eightieth Congress—any party like that—can't possibly be as bad as all the critics say we are.

But there is no blinking at the fact that we have not produced a program to win the support of the overwhelming mass of our people, and we have got to get busy in doing so.

What do we need, therefore? Briefly, I humbly think these points:

1. A constructive, conservative forward-looking specific program of national legislation based upon the legitimate needs of all segments of American society—labor, management, agriculture, old folks, young folks, men and women, veterans, and others.

2. Less me-too-itis, less trying to mimic the Fair Deal program of radical, alien-minded suggestions.

3. On the other hand, less practice of being "agin" everything simply because it is recommended by the other fellow; but rather a careful sifting out of those items on which bipartisan support would be a farce and a fraud from those items on which we can unite with the Democrats.

4. Healthy, constructive criticism within the party, but insofar as possible, unity in our ranks in our relation to the administration.

5. More grass roots, doorbell ringing and less hot air in a few sterile meetings in which we convert only ourselves and other folks who are already Republicans.

6. A vigorous, continuous public-relations program to sell our constructive Republican policy to the American people.

7. More free debate, more real constructive grass roots sessions within our party, evaluating the Republican program, rather than allowing simply a few leaders to try to tell the party what it should or should not do.

8. More teamwork, less backbiting, sniping, and movie-star theatrics by a few Republican leaders who are more interested in their own personal fortunes than in the welfare of the party.

These are but a few suggestions. What do you think, fellow Republicans?

A Moratorium for the Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by W. K. Kelsey that appeared in the Detroit News of April 5, 1949:

THE COMMENTATOR
(By W. K. Kelsey)

A MORATORIUM FOR THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM

Last week a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee finished hearings on a bill introduced by Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, which calls for a 2-year moratorium on the enforcement of the basing-point system of price quotations.

The Justice Department has informed the committee that it has no objections to the Myers bill. However, three of the four members of the Federal Trade Commission are opposed to the moratorium. It is only a few weeks less than a year since the Supreme Court upheld the FTC in a long-fought, hard-fought case against the basing-point system in the cement industry.

The reason and excuse for the Myers bill is to give Congress time to consider legislation which would legalize the basing-point system where there is no price conspiracy. In other words, industries employing the basing-point system, found illegal by the Supreme Court, could continue to operate under it for 2 years without coming to grips with the Federal Trade Commission or with the courts. Meanwhile these industries would bring pressure on Congress to make the basing-point system lawful.

The basing-point system is this: One or many basing points are recognized by the industry, at which the delivered price of its product is fixed at the same price to the purchaser, no matter how far he may be from the mill.

That is to say, if the mill were at Adrian, the price quoted to the Detroit purchaser and the price quoted to the Cheboygan purchaser would be exactly the same, though Detroit is much nearer the mill than Cheboygan.

In other words, the producer absorbs the freight rate, whatever it may be. Actually, the nearby customer helps pay the freight to the distant customer.

FOUND ILLEGAL BY THE SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court's decision was six to one, Justice Burton dissenting, and Justices Douglas and Jackson taking no part. The majority was impressed by the findings of the FTC on the evidence:

"When the Commission rendered its decision there were about 80 cement manufacturing companies in the United States operating about 150 mills. Ten companies controlled more than half the mills and there were substantial corporate affiliations among many of the others. This concentration of productive capacity made concerted action far less difficult than it otherwise would have been. * * * The use of the multiple basing-point delivered price system by the cement producers has been coincident with a situation whereby for many years, with rare exception, cement has been offered for sale in every given locality at identical prices and terms by all producers. Thousands of secret sealed bids have been received by public agencies which corresponded in prices down to a fractional part of a penny."

One of the exhibits quoted contained the bids for cement to be delivered to the Government at Tucumcari, N. Mex. There were 11 bidders, and each bid the same price per barrel—$3.286854.

The Court also quoted an instance in which, during the depression, a cement producer went out of line to get business. So the others ganged up on him, making his plant an involuntary base point, and cutting their prices to meet his. He fought. Gradually the base price fell from $1.45 a barrel to 75 cents, an unprofitable figure for the culprit. So he gave up and promised to be good. Cement in that locality then bounced back to $1.15, later to $1.35, and finally to $1.75.

Small business, which is fighting the Myers bill and will continue to fight against the basing-point system, asks: "Where's the competition under that system? Where's the American system of free enterprise? Why shouldn't a purchaser at the very door of a plant be able to buy the product more cheaply than one hundreds of miles away? That would promote decentralization and real competition between producers."

THE QUESTION OF MONOPOLY

On the other hand, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, author of another of several bills introduced to legalize the basing-point system, told the Senate subcommittee that since, in accord with the Supreme Court's decision, the cement industry has quoted prices f. o. b. mill, they have gone up nearly 30 percent. To whom? To the nearby purchaser? If so, an explanation should be given.

Senator JOHNSON added that the decision has encouraged monopoly, because buyers now have no choice but to purchase at the nearby plant. In the old days before the founding of the Cement Institute, this would have meant one of two things, if buyers thought they were being held up by the local company. They would have shopped around among plants a little farther away, to see if one or more of them would not undercut the local boy to steal some of his business. Or some bright chap, seeing the possibility of profit, would have built another mill. In either case there would have been competition, not monopoly.

But if the basing-point system is made legal "where there is no price conspiracy"—and such conspiracy is hard to prove, since it is conducted secretly and often by tacit understanding, as when one company raises or lowers its price and the rest follow automatically—competition will go out the window and monopoly will be stronger than ever. That is why small business fights the Myers bill. It wants to continue in operation without becoming a mere agent for a trust.

Federal Income Tax Laws—United States Tax Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at its regular monthly meeting on April 8, 1949, the Lawyers Club of Atlanta adopted a resolution in behalf of House bill H. R. 3113, and a resolution in behalf of House bill H. R. 3224. Hon. E. Smythe

Gambrell, president of the club, forwarded these resolutions to me, and under leave previously granted, I insert these resolutions herewith:

Whereas the Federal income-tax laws have discriminated in many respects against earned income; and

Whereas employees and officers of corporations may have the tax benefits of a qualified pension plan, which plan, however, is not available to professional men and other wage earners; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress H. R. 3224 to allow a deduction up to $10,000 but no more than 15 percent of a taxpayer's earned income if he invests such sum in special non-assignable United States Government bonds. When the bonds are redeemed they would be income in such later year redemption, thus allowing individual wage earners and professional people to establish a pension plan for themselves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, upon recommendation of the executive committee and upon vote of the members of the Lawyers Club of America, Inc., That the club does hereby approve H. R. 3224; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the club is hereby directed to forward to all Georgia Senators and Representatives a copy of this resolution.

Whereas there is now pending in the Eighty-first Congress a bill, H. R. 3113, which would change the United States Tax Court from an independent executive agency to a statutory court of record; and

Whereas it is in the public interest that the United States Tax Court should be a statutory court of record not unlike the other Federal courts: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lawyers Club of Atlanta, Inc., upon the recommendation of its executive committee and upon vote by the members of the club, does hereby approve changing the United States Tax Court from independent executive agency to a statutory court of record; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the club be directed to write each of the Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate from Georgia enclosing a copy of this resolution and urging that the Georgia Congressmen support H. R. 3113.

Money Spent by the United States for Foreign Aid Since World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell showing the amount of money spent by the country for foreign aid since World War I.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

If any of you Americans happen to be interested in how much you've been tapped on your personal United States bank roll to save foreigners since Woodrow Wilson decided we should make the world safe for democracy and Franklin Roosevelt ordered that we should impose the four freedoms everywhere in our time, we commend attention to an official bank statement.

We got the bad news just as Mr. Harry Burke of the United States Senate secretariat was getting into a taxi on Capitol Hill, all hell-bent for the White House where President Truman was waiting to put his signature on the $5,500,000,000 grab on the Treasury to carry on the Marshall plan until June 30, 1950.

The bad news is that every citizen of the United States of America, and this includes infants, jailed criminals, the insane and the senile and the incurable invalids are being slugged $650 a head of United States cash to help out foreigners.

The Government figured that the average United States family consists of five—father, mother, and three children. This means that the average head of a United States family kicks in $3,200 to carry out the overseas policies of Wilson and F. D. R.

For the up-to-date statistics on our operations as world-savers we are indebted to Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, a Pennsylvania Republican, who incidentally fought in both World Wars and three times was commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The statistics produced by VAN ZANDT to let the American taxpayer get an honest accounting were assembled by the House of Representatives official information staff. They show that the present over-all cost of our foreign-aid program is $92,169,478,135.

And if this cost of $650 a head is peanuts in these inflated days, remember that even in 1948 the cost of running this Government was only forty billions, or $268 per capita. And in balmier, more tranquil days—like 1915, the cost of running the Federal establishment before we got snarled with blood in Woodrow Wilsons's foreign entanglements, was only $7.56 per each citizen.

Of that ninety-two billions in hand-outs, about seventy billions has been outright grants—gifts is the proper word. The other twenty-two billions gets the prettier classification of loans. That listing is of course silly, for of that twenty-two billions more than fifteen billions is the money (on paper) still due us on unpaid balances of World War No. 1 loans.

Lend-lease $50,205,229,787; Marshall plan (through June 1950) $9,254,000,000; relief in occupied areas, displaced persons, etc., $4,251,000,000; Treasury loan to Britain (1947–48) $3,750,000,000; UNRRA $2,700,000,000 and Greek, Turkish, China aid $1,127,000,000.

Who got the bulk of this United States largesse? Well $44,679,000,000 went to save the British economy for socialism and $12,793,000,000 went to the Soviet Union.

Here are the official figures provided for our congressional guidance. Read them and, we suggest, weep:

Tables I and II follow:

TABLE I.—*A recapitulation of United States loans and grants to foreign nations (April 1949)*

Unpaid balances due on World War I loans (January 1948)	$15,460,248,348
Lend-lease (through March 31, 1948)	50,205,229,787
Marshall plan (through June 1950)	9,254,000,000
Army relief in occupied areas (through June 1950)	[1] 3,774,000,000
Treasury loan to Britain (1947 and 1948)	3,750,000,000
UNRRA (through March 1947)	$2,700,000,000
Export-Import Bank loans (through June 1950)	2,007,000,000
Treasury subscription to international bank and reconstruction fund (1946 and 1947)	1,585,000,000
Surplus war goods (liquidation agreements)	[2] 1,148,000,000
Philippine aid and war damages (through June 1950)	682,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid act (through June 1950)	607,000,000
China aid act (through June 1950)	520,000,000
Displaced persons, International Refugee Organization, contributions to United Nations, Palestine refugees, and other assistance programs (through June 1950)	477,000,000
Total	92,169,478,135

[1] This figure does not include any part of our direct occupation costs, only the civilian relief extended through the military services.

[2] In addition, the armed services disposed of some $6,434,000,000 of surplus goods and stores overseas, for which no liquidation agreements have yet been reported. In most cases these goods were furnished directly into foreign-relief and reconstruction channels; but in other cases, liquidation agreements still are in process of negotiation.

TABLE II.—*Total distribution of United States loans, grants, and aids overseas, including unpaid balances on World War I loans (includes all Marshall plan estimates for fiscal 1950, but does not include any funds for rearmament under North Atlantic Pact)*

1. Austria	$885,118,000
2. Armenia	39,942,000
3. Belgium and Luxemburg	1,744,000,000
4. British Empire	44,679,000,000
5. China	3,446,000,000
6. Czechoslovakia	17,348,000
7. Denmark	234,792,000
8. Egypt	59,700,000
9. Estonia	25,903,079
10. Ethiopia	16,447,000
11. France and possessions	3,371,000,000
12. Finland	24,600,056
13. Germany (Bizonia)	3,260,000,000
14. Greece	681,000,000
15. Hungary	64,000,000
16. Iceland	20,900,000
17. Israel	63,009,000
18. Italy	4,700,000,000
19. Iran	23,100,000
20. Iraq	7,805,000
21. Ireland	142,703,000
22. Japan	1,891,000,000
23. Korea	89,469,000
24. Latvia	10,713,000
25. Liberia	14,829,000
26. Lithuania	9,603,059
27. Netherlands and possessions	979,000,000
28. Norway	345,000,000
29. Philippine Islands	708,000,000
30. Poland	373,600,000
31. Portugal	11,647,000
32. Rumania	79,435,000
33. Russia	12,793,400,000
34. Saudia Arabia	46,200,000
35. Sweden	104,100,000
36. Trieste	35,200,000
37. Turkey	305,400,000
38. Yugoslavia	117,200,000
39. American Republics (13)	1,651,392,000

Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of peace and war, delivered by Hon. William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, at a dinner forum under the auspices of the Nation Associates, in New York City on April 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peace is more than an absence of war. Peace is a method of solving problems by amicable means. Peace is the substitution of law for force, the use of conciliation and adjudication in lieu of armed conflict.

When the problems within a nation simmer and boil and go uncared for, revolution follows. That was the course we took in the birth of this Nation. And so it will be throughout time.

Government is the most advanced form of social cooperation. Where there is a government that is responsive to the needs of the people, there is peace. If the government of a nation is not responsive, there may be law and order and the outward appearance of peace. But the inner tensions feed the forces of revolt.

As between sovereign states war has always been an instrument of policy. It will remain such in spite of increasing horrors until a system of law can take its place. In other words, it will remain such until a form of government is fashioned on a world scale to handle the quarrels and disputes of peoples and nations. Until such a system of law is provided, no nation would hazard the sacrifice of its right to wage war. A proposal to abolish war without more ado is to proclaim that there is nothing worth fighting for. But there always will be something for which men will give their lives so long as freedom is insecure. And freedom will always be insecure where there is no machinery of government to administer justice and effectuate peaceful settlement of disputes and to allow for bloodless change. In other words, law is the only known substitute for war.

But even though there is today no system of world law that can be substituted for force, we need not sit supinely by and accept war as inevitable. There are instruments at hand that can go far to eliminate the conditions under which conflicts and tensions develop between peoples of the world.

The world is on the edge of great change. On all continents a spirit of unrest stirs the people and makes rulers uneasy. It is a protest against illiteracy, disease, poverty, and misgovernment. It sweeps the world, proclaiming against injustice and feeding on discontent.

That spirit of unrest has received great impetus from the democratic countries, particularly from the United States. We, the democrats, have not been purposeful instigators or promoters of the movement. We have not had agents abroad fomenting discord and revolt. But the influence we have exerted has had that effect in two respects.

1. The ideals of liberty and brotherhood which democratic people espouse are contagious. The people of the world have been aroused by them. They have whetted the appetitie for freedom the world over.

2. Through our mastery of the machine and the free-enterprise system, we in the United States have produced a great abundance of material goods. We represent the land of plenty where poverty can be abolished and where the lowliest of men can have the comforts of life. Other people, too, want an economy of abundance.

We represent, in other words, a system where the common man can live in relative freedom and receive a fair share of the bounty of the earth.

And so we exert a powerful force in the world. We are agents of change, though perhaps unwitting ones.

But while we have given impetus and drive to the forces of unrest in the world, the Soviets have capitalized on them and sought to turn them into a revolution along class lines. They have activated those forces with an ideology and with propaganda; they have employed a vast network of agents to promote revolution.

Lasting peace requires that the democracies regain the initiative. Under democratic influences the world-wide spirit of unrest can be the means of building cooperative habits of peaceful collaboration. War in this atomic age will never become an instrument of aggression under truly democratic regimes. It will become such only under the domination and direction of totalitarian management.

If the democratic forces are to direct the unrest of the world into peaceful and constructive channels, a positive program is needed. That program must operate at two levels—it must supply the ideology for the movement and implement it with popular understanding and organization; it must fashion concrete and specific measures to deal with the social injustices on which the forces of revolt thrive.

First. An example of the first of these—the ideology—is illustrated by the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Assembly represents all tongues and all races. It is, indeed, the people of the world expressing their hopes and desires. It serves as a meeting ground where the representatives of all nations and races can develop sympathy and understanding of common problems and establish cooperative habits of work.

The declaration marks the revolt of man against his loss of freedom to the totalitarian god of authority. It is a universal bill of rights. It recognizes that there are limits beyond which a state may not go in regulating the conduct of individuals. It seeks to preserve for man his dignity, his privacy, and his conscience. It proclaims his right to religious liberty and to free speech and expression, his right to vote, his right to work and to free choice of employment, his right to education, to fair trials, and to equal justice under the law. It is a twentieth-century declaration of independence for peoples of all nations. It reflects democratic, not totalitarian, values.

The principles endorsed by the declaration have, of course, no legal sanction, for there is no instrument of government to enforce them. The manner in which these rights will be implemented in the various nations that approved the declaration will vary. They will have greater vitality in some than in others. But the declaration has great value, though there is no law to enforce it. It supplies a program behind which the democratic influence can be mustered the world around. It can help give a rich spiritual content to the forces of change that sweeps the world. It crystallizes the ideals of justice in democratic terms.

The struggle for justice is a never-ending business. There will be a struggle to attain it as long as men lust for power. It is the power of a few men over many which is the source of injustice. It may be landlords or cartels or banks on the one hand, or a political clique or a political party or a ruling class on the other. The eternal struggle of man for justice is the fight to keep any one group, whether in government or out of government, from being too powerful. It is the struggle to keep political and economic power diffused among many groups and to prevent its concentration in the hands of a single clique.

The ability of a people to attain justice for themselves is dependent on their capacity for self-help. A benevolent totalitarianism, if such a thing can be imagined, may proclaim that justice can be superimposed from above. But the history of the world shows that power is a heady thing and that if it is to be exercised with tolerance and understanding, it must be constantly reclaimed by the people and granted anew to different hands.

These are some of the ideas to which the declaration gives great impetus. The principles of the declaration reflect democratic values and can give democratic direction to the change which the world faces.

We in the United States have work to do at home in order to make these principles vital components of our community life. The fact that we are progressively narrowing the areas of injustice makes us alert to the problems of others. Thus the United States has a special responsibility to promote these principles among the international community.

Second. But if the democratic nations are to take from the Soviets control of the direction of the forces of unrest, more is needed. General principles must be furnished with specific programs of political action. Ideas of justice and freedom must be at work in the daily lives of men if they are to be meaningful.

We must therefore encourage and promote measures that will relieve the tensions and conflicts which result in unbalance and upheaval. We must translate principles of freedom and justice into specific and concrete ideas—into ideas as definite as bread and land.

Gandhi said, "It is the fundamental law of nature, without exception, that nature produces enough for our wants from day to day; and if only everybody took enough for himself and nothing more there would be no pauperism in this world; there would be no man dying of starvation."

That idea will not be denied. It presses for acceptance in every continent. It underlies the seething unrest throughout the world.

That problem carries back to the land—to a fair distribution of its bounty, to nurturing and conserving the earth against the forces that destroy its fertility.

Top soil is the main source of the world's food supply. It is only in top soil that the green leaf flourishes—the leaf that transforms energy from the sun through the magic of chlorophyl. The world's top soil is becoming precariously thin, as the experts have shown. The world's food supply is dangerously low. We live on a narrow margin of safety if the people of the world are to be put on an adequate diet.

The loss of top soil has been tragic. Overgrazing and unscientific methods of farming have deprived great segments of the earth of its fertility. That has been going on apace with the increase of the world's population. In Israel 3 feet of top soil were through the years washed into the Mediterranean. As Lowdermilk shows, it took all the miracles of science to reclaim that desert and transform it into a garden. It has been done and Israel

flourishes. But it took a high order of intelligence and organization, as well as large investments, to accomplish it.

It will take the same degree of intelligence and forward planning to salvage other deserts of the world and to prevent the further depletion of the rich valleys and hillsides of the earth.

The world's problem of poverty and hunger also goes back to things other than land—to wages, housing, exploitation of natural resources, and all the many factors that bear on the standard of living of a people. This means at times vast hydroelectric, irrigation, and reclamation projects. It means industrialization, new methods of farming, and the use of science and technology to exploit the raw materials of a nation.

Some of these undertakings require outside capital; many more require the import of technicians and entail supervision and direction at the professional level. They are all part of what the President has called "a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

As we give our aid in these programs of reconstruction and rehabilitation let's make certain that they promote democratic solutions of the problems. We can negotiate bankers' terms for loans that will put the projects on a sound business basis. We can also negotiate terms that will put these undertakings on a sound democratic basis so far as human rights are concerned. We can take steps to have the dollars or technical skills that we offer directed against the forces of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and misgovernment. The new industrialization or reclamation project must be utilized for the benefit of the multitude, not merely for a few at the top. If land reform is involved, others may be persuaded to take a leaf from our own book of experience in the homesteading of public lands or in the 40-acre law and to insist that the holdings of any one person be restricted. We can back local democratic groups by requiring that some profits from new industrial projects be reinvested in the land where they were made for education, housing, and the like. We can take measures to avoid the creation of new misery through growth of sweatshops. We can tie soil conservation and reforestation to reclamation and hydroelectric projects.

We can, with foresight and shrewdness, do much to make sure that our dollars work in the democratic cause the world over. We can do much to make sure that the terms which we exact for our commitments protect human rights as well as our investment.

If we neglect these things, we let the Soviets retain the initiative in marshaling and directing the forces of unrest loose in the world.

Ideas are even more important than dollars in this undertaking. It is the weight of our prestige and influence that is significant. If we throw it on the side of human rights the world over, the tide will turn and we will salvage even the wastelands of the world for the democratic cause. If we throw it on the side of reaction and vested interests, the democratic cause will lose as steadily in all areas as it has in China since the war.

As a result of Soviet tactics, the democratic forces of the world have been drawn more closely together in days of peace than ever before. The challenge we face is to use this new solidarity to give direction to the unrest at work in the world. If those forces can be guided into democratic channels, the prospects of collaboration among the peoples of the earth in the works of peace will become immeasurably brighter.

Salute to Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a salute to Burma, which I made in commemoration of her first anniversary of independence, April 16, 1949. This salute was broadcast to the Burmese people through our State Department.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO BURMA

In this world of great thrills and unexpected happenings on such a grand scale, sometimes we fail to note very important events. When I saw the first delegation from the new state of Burma come to the International Labor Organization Conference in San Francisco last summer I realized that I was seeing what I have often thought the French people saw when they noticed for the first time our Benjamin Franklin and our Thomas Jefferson.

The birth of a new nation means much to the people of the world, as much as to the people of that nation. Burma's growth and her past history both teach us that an independent Burma can and will take her proper place in the sisterhood of nations. She has much to contribute and also much to learn. What nation has not?

My hope for the great cosmopolitan world is that each nation will retain those things which have made it great, but also be in a position to receive from other nations those things which have made them great. The different cultures of the earth should be preserved. A unified spirit should be sought.

I congratulate Burma on her first anniversary (April 16, 1949). I believe that she and her people will preserve their own culture and lend to the nations of the world what in it is good, and that she and her people, in turn, will take the good things which the other peoples of the world have to offer.

The Need for More Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "We Need More Electric Power," delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson, before the Economic Action Conference, at Washington, D. C., on April 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED MORE ELECTRIC POWER

Now that the one-cent sales have returned to the supermarket, I am reminded of another standard advertising practice of an earlier day which we haven't seen for a long time.

I am thinking of those electric utilities company ads urging us to banish drudgery from our lives for all time. What happened to those posters promising the completely electrified kitchen and the fully electrified farm? Where are those four-color oil reproductions depicting the new life of leisure in which men and women are freed for fun and cultural pursuits while machines and appliances—running on electric power—milk the cows and prepare the evening meals? I also miss the chamber of commerce and State Development Commission ads wooing new industries with promises of plenty of cheap power.

The fact that these billboards have disappeared and have not yet returned should be proof enough that we have a power shortage. Obviously no utility company is encouraging anyone to use more power. They don't have the power to offer to new customers and for new uses. They don't have even enough to supply their present customers.

Of course, we are hearing some part of this story from the electric appliance people. Their washing machines, refrigerators, toasters, and ranges aren't selling too well at present prices. But they can't aspire to the strident pitch of the old days. Because of the power shortages, too many people in too many sections of the country are being asked to cut down on use of these appliances.

I want it understood that I am not belittling these ads painting a rosy future for America. I believe in them and sincerely regret their passing. They represent a faith in America and in America's capacity to grow. It would be a dangerous thing if these ads did not come back. They are one of the signposts of a prosperous economy.

Prosperity is not something that can be achieved and then nailed down and kept without further effort. A prosperous economy has to keep moving forward or else it goes into a tailspin. There is a parallel with the airplane which is a useless collection of nuts and bolts standing still on the ground. When moving forward in the air, however, it comes into its own and serves a useful function. To stay up it has to keep going forward. If it doesn't move, it sinks—and it can't move backward.

To keep our prosperity in flight, we have to keep moving forward toward the rosy future that used to be suggested in the utilities ads. Today's level of production won't provide sufficient goods for the increased population next year and next decade. There will be more people needing goods and each person will use more goods as his standard of living advances. What was good enough for grandpa is not good enough for us. Nor will our grandchildren be satisfied with what we accept today.

There are some materials we call basic commodities because each of them is indispensable to the manufacture of thousands of other commodities. Steel is a good example, and so also are aluminum, oil, coal, and electric power among others. If we are short of these basic commodities, industries which use them cannot operate at capacity, cannot employ as many workers as they might. These workers without pay checks can't buy as much as they would like. Retailers can't sell as much, so they cut down their orders to manufacturers. Manufacturers of cloth-

ing, shoes, household furnishings, and other consumer goods cut down production and throw more workers out of jobs. This is the spiral path leading to depression. A shortage of steel or coal or oil or electric power can force us onto that downward path.

That is why electric power in adequate quantities and at reasonable rates is one of the main requisites for maintaining true prosperity. In determining what are adequate quantities of electric power these utilities ads can help us. They portray the kind of life Americans want. They represent a dream which unfortunately can't be translated into kilowatts this decade or the next. But that dream should be in our minds as an ultimate aim while we are setting the realistic goals for the next few years.

It is on that basis that I want to start this examination of how much more electric power we need. Certainly we can't measure our real needs merely by the unmet demands of this year, large as they are.

Today we are using an average of about 1,500 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually in those houses and farms over the Nation which have electricity. Some don't, you know. And don't forget that many millions of people have to be using a lot less than 1,500 kilowatt-hours to make that a national average. In some areas we are using as little as a few hundred kilowatt-hours. In others, such as around Tacoma, Seattle, and Chattanooga where cheap power prevails, we are using between four and five thousand kilowatt-hours. The States using little power are far from realizing the dream of life without drudgery. Even the areas with the highest average power consumption have a long way to go in making the fullest use of electricity. House heating by electricity is known there but not widely practiced. The same is true of hot-water heaters. So, bringing the national average consumption up to the Tacoma rate is a realistic goal.

About 30 percent of our farms and a goodly number of homes still have no electricity at all. There the oil lamp and the kerosene stove, the hand pump and the spring house for perishables still survive. Certainly bringing electricity at last to such places is a realistic goal.

Industrial requirements provide another yardstick. Even including the great depression of the thirties, production in this country has increased on the average of 2½ percent a year for the last 30 years. At the same time production and consumption of electric power has doubled every 10 years. If we are to maintain full employment for our expanding population we shall have to maintain an even higher rate of growth. This means an increase of perhaps one-third in total production in the next decade. If we are to turn out a third more goods in 1960, we must again double our power capacity by that date.

Certainly we don't want a recurrence of the present situation in which many industries cannot meet their full quotas of production simply because power is not available. You are all familiar with the plight of the aluminum industry which had to cut its production 1,000,000,000 pounds or almost 50 percent because the plants couldn't get economical electric power. You are also aware that there is a critical shortage of aluminum and that aluminum producers now want to expand their production by upward of a billion pounds a year—but they can't get an adequate supply of economical power. Unless Congressmen are planning to legislate a substitute for aluminum in planes, their 70-group or even 58-group air force won't get far without greater aluminum production.

To translate these domestic and industrial requirements into real economic demand for power is going to require lower rates than we now have. As long as we pay 3 to 5 cents a kilowatt-hour for electricity in our houses, we are going to have to think twice before using more of it. However, when all of us can have an average residential electricity rate of around 1½ cents a kilowatt-hour, as people in Tacoma, Wash., and in the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere now have, then we can afford to buy electric appliances which will point the way toward a higher standard of living and elimination of drudgery. Until 1947 increased consumption of electricity resulted in a steady lowering of power rates. Since then, however, rates have risen. This is a trend we must reverse so that people can afford electric brooders and milkers, deep-freeze units and mixers, and so that industries will continue to expand in cheap power areas.

For a good example of how lower rates increase consumption look at the area served by the TVA where people are using almost 80 percent more electricity than the national average. They are paying less money for this larger amount than the Nation elsewhere has to pay for less power. In the TVA region the average residential electric bill is $41 a year for almost 2,700 kilowatt-hours; in the Nation as a whole householders have to pay $46 for only 1,500 kilowatt-hours. In Chattanooga, Tenn., a small business enterprise—say, a large laundry—which uses 100,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month, will pay a monthly electric bill of $1,010. In New Haven, Conn., the same bill would come to more than twice as much, or $2,113.

Another measurement of power requirements is the reserves of generating capacity. The power industry has generally considered 15 percent of the total generating capacity as the minimum adequate reserve. Even during World War II class I utility systems maintained 18 to 19 percent reserve capacity. Over the Nation today the reserve generating capacity has shrunk to less than 5 percent. The amount of generating capacity needed to more than triple our present reserve position must also be considered in estimating our requirements.

In assessing requirements we must always keep in mind the needs for national security. War consumes unbelievable amounts of power. If we hadn't had available the millions of kilowatts of capacity at TVA's projects, Grand Coulee and Bonneville—which up to that time had been characterized by some as white elephants—there is no telling where we would have found the electricity to make possible much of our aluminum, shipbuilding, and atomic-energy production. Today we have no such leeway. If suddenly, for security reasons, we should need large blocks of electric power, we could obtain it only by reducing the supply to thousands of homes, farms, and factories. In America that just won't work. Americans are already well into the electric age; it is too late to turn off the power now.

These are some of the measurements for totaling up our requirements for additional electric power. Let me repeat them:

1. Electric service available to every home and farm and each consumer using enough electricity to eliminate much of the toil in our daily lives.

2. Sufficient electricity to enable industries to maintain that rising level of production which guarantees to all of us full employment and a higher standard of living.

3. Consistently lower rates to make possible the purchase of large blocks of electric power for these uses.

4. Safe margin of reserve capacity—at least 15 percent.

5. An additional margin of capacity available if needed for security reasons.

All these requirements must be added to the amount of power being produced today to estimate how much power we will need in the next 10 or 20 years.

It is obvious that we cannot measure our power needs by shortages alone, intense as they have been for the last two winters. These shortages are only a measure of how seriously behind we are in meeting our power requirements. But the amount of shortage is an inadequate measurement of how much more power we need.

Let me take a moment, however, to remind you of the magnitude of last winter's shortages so that you will be aware of how far behind we are.

Let us take the situation in the Pacific Northwest as an example because there is a region where the use of electric power is so widespread that a shortage has particularly severe repercussions. If the public had not been urged to cut its consumption of electricity during late afternoon hours last winter, there is no question but what the overloaded power network covering four States would have broken down completely. This appeal for voluntary restriction was made only after the utilities had already discouraged new customers, had refused to sell power for house heating, had forced lumber mills and other industries to curtail output, and had cut the supply of power to aluminum plants by more than 10 percent.

Bonneville Power Administration, the public agency which distributes all power from federally constructed dams in the region, had to turn down inquiries from over 20 companies who required about half a million kilowatts of power. These companies, if able to expand as they wished, would have employed about 3,000 workers directly and their operations would have resulted in employment of another 3,000 indirectly. Inasmuch as unemployment in the area is running about three times the national average, the loss of these job opportunities was a serious blow to the regional economy.

Temporarily the crisis in the Pacific Northwest has passed. But it will return again this winter and every winter through 1953 at least. Dams and power plants under construction and proposed won't be ready to produce until that date. Here's a measure of how long it takes to build a hydroplant. Let's remember that lesson and start building now for the years ahead.

In up-State New York the largest electric utility was forced to reduce power to all major users by 15 percent last winter. In Cleveland 350 large power users were asked by the electric utility voluntarily to reduce by 15 percent their consumption of power during peak periods. The country lost 72,000,000 pounds of aluminum because half of an aluminum plant in Arkansas was idle all year for lack of power.

In California a State emergency power director was appointed by the Governor, and the legislature continued daylight-saving time through the winter to reduce power demands. Electricity delivered to consumers was cut by 10 to 20 percent and many manufacturing plants were forced to reduce the workweek to 4 days. There were intermittent suspensions of irrigation pumping because of interruptions in power delivery.

In 1948 total capacity of the Nation's power system for production of power was about 55,000,000 kilowatts. A realistic summing up of our requirements indicates that we must double that capacity in the next 10 years, just as we have doubled it each decade for the last 40 years. By 1960 the United States must have a generating capacity of well over 100,000,000 kilowatts.

In producing this additional power we should be giving considerable thought to what kind of fuel we use. Today about 70 percent of our power comes from steam plants fueled with coal or petroleum, both exhaustible products which are becoming

scarcer every year. Only about 30 percent of our electricity is generated from water power. We have, however, approximately 77,000,000 kilowatts of undeveloped water power now wasting into the oceans. Much of this power could be developed in connection with multipurpose dams which also serve irrigation, navigation, and flood-control purposes. This water power is inexhaustible—it will never run out. We should use it extensively for generating electricity and save the scarce petroleum for the planes and motor vehicles, which won't accept substitutes.

In making up our power program, therefore, we should figure that at least fifteen to twenty million out of the 60,000,000 kilowatts or so to be added ought to be developed in hydroelectric projects. Most of that work will be done by the Federal Government in connection with multipurpose dams. Most of these dams are so large that they take 5 years to build and sometimes up to 10 years for complete installation of generating plants. Obviously, then, if we are to meet this kind of goal we have to start acting now.

When the Federal Government first concerned itself with supplying power from huge dams there was considerable hue and cry from big business with the usual accusations of communism and socialism. Since then dollars-and-cents accounting has forced business to risk the charges of association with what they have labeled communism. In actual fact, big business interests have been among the first to rush into the areas which are now served by cheap public power. You might say that they have been unduly eager and somewhat hoggish. They have taken as much of this low-cost power as they could get; to some extent they have crowded out the smaller businessmen who are not so well prepared financially to move in on a good thing so quickly.

The proper role of the Federal Government is to smooth the road so that all the competitors in free enterprise will have an equal opportunity to move forward. One of the things that industry, big and little, needs is electric power. Therefore, the Federal Government's job in the power field is to make sure that everyone—domestic users, farmers, and industrialists—has an equal opportunity to get as much power as he needs and to get it at reasonable rates. Then free competition can freely operate, and we can resume our progress toward the age of electricity.

Even during the height of the power shortage there were utility executives who claimed that we had adequate power-generating capacity. Perhaps they have lost faith in the rosy future for America which was depicted in their old-time ads. We haven't. We plan to go ahead. We want to make real the slogans of "better living, less drudgery," "more jobs and more production," which we used to see in those advertisements. We have faith in a growing America.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the recent reports filed by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have had an effective influence on the trend of public opinion concerning river valley development. These reports clearly show that the present rival operations of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, along with other smaller Federal bureaus, are producing very injurious results.

In this connection I have just received two editorials dated, respectively, January 20 and January 28, 1949, dealing with the subject, and appearing in the Montana Kaimin, a publication of the students of Montana State University. Sometimes youth, free from the economic prejudices and ingrained political maneuverings of their elders, can see more clearly the vital issues confronting our country. I therefore commend these thoughtful editorials and ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Kaimin of January 20, 1949]

MVA To CONTINUE BATTLE

This newspaper received correspondence earlier in the week from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY. Of special interest to the Kaimin was the postscript on his letter which said that it was Senator MURRAY'S intention to reintroduce the MVA bill again in the near future.

Not only the Kaimin is interested in this news but we presume a number of other papers around the State will take special interest in the Senator's statement. The last time the Missouri Valley Authority was on the docket a number of dailies were instrumental in defeating the measure by playing down its favorable aspects. However, Senator MURRAY and a number of other congressional leaders have been working for this proposal since the Seventy-ninth Congress and it will be introduced again. The Authority has been modified several times since then and has been subjected to numerous subcommittee debates and many hearings.

ORIGINAL MVA PLAN

The original MVA called for "unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods; the promotion of family type farming; the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area; the strengthening of the national defense, and other purposes."

The proposal would have provided additional electric power and at reduced rates. One of the main arguments for MVA in some manner of its original form was to make the State of Montana and the entire Missouri Valley more conducive to industry. With the power and facilities the Authority provided much could have been done toward making this industry a reality.

The bill didn't receive a favorable press in Montana but back in 1945 at a Senate subcommittee hearing of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Senator CHAN GURNEY (Republican, South Dakota), opposing the bill, said he had never seen so much propaganda. Senator MURRAY explained the reason as follows:

"That is the only way we have of offsetting them * * * (company presses). Do you want us to lie down and quit because the power people have all these newspapers? * * * All papers dominated and controlled by the power interests are against the Missouri Valley."

He specifically mentioned papers in Butte, Billings, and Missoula.

COVERAGE PROMISED

Congressional records and subcommittee hearings which are on the record have never been utilized by the Montana press. In view of the fact that Senator MURRAY plans on revitalizing the issue the Kaimin will actively cover the aspects, all of them, of the MVA, including testimony and information taken from congressional hearings.

The passage of MVA, as Joseph Kinsey Howard, prominent author said, "would be the biggest thing that has happened for Montana since a half-breed named Beneetse stumbled upon gold there nearly a hundred years ago; because it reestablishes and reunites, as a regional concept, the western frontier."—P. A. H.

[From the Montana Kaimin of January 28, 1949]

PICK-SLOAN WEDDING NOT WORKING

The great Missouri River Valley, potentially one of the Nation's greatest resource basins, is being mismanaged at the present time by slap-dash, jealous, back-biting competition. The main reason for this situation is because two big bureaus and more than 10 separate smaller Federal agencies are continually getting in each other's hair.

These two large bureaus, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, have attempted in the past several years to combine talents and work toward a common end—development of the Missouri Valley. The unique working agreement, primarily a flood-control plan, goes under the label of Pick-Sloan, General Pick representing the Army faction and Sloan the Bureau. Two separate plans now exist instead of the intended one, and the political generals and political water engineers are continuing to fight each other to a scoreless tie.

Many of the proponents of the Pick-Sloan plan, at least those who knocked Senator MURRAY'S MVA proposals, are beginning to realize after several years of mismanagement and confusion under this coordinated policy that many basic problems of the big Missouri have not been adequately answered. There is practically no major part of the irrigation program, the navigation program, and the flood-control program that is not subject to serious questioning from many residents of the region. The costs resulting from bungled planning have been questioned.

In addition to these, the lack of a program for industrialization, soil conservation, and forest work, as essential parts of the entire development of the valley, has been questioned. The question of whether the Montana Power Co., politically strong in this area, will pay enough for the enormous increase in firm energy that it will get if it takes over the Canyon Ferry Dam is still unsettled and has been almost practically ignored. There are other problems, at least a dozen, that haven't been adequately studied or answered because of the shotgun wedding of the Pick-Sloan plan.

The whole job of the Missouri Valley development should be looked at again by a single board which is above the existing self-interested agencies. It should recommend a single plan and a single development master that will do the best job for everybody concerned—a plan that will bring industrial and agricultural development to the State of Montana.—P. A. H.

Suggested Changes in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, Mr. Henry Hoke, who has had wide experi-

ence in the field of direct-mail advertising, has sent to me an article he has prepared on suggested changes in the Post Office Department. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD and have it referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is presently concerned with a proposed increase in postal rates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER FROM HENRY HOKE

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You must get terribly bored with the anguished wails of the ax grinders. No matter what you do, you are deluged with complaints from those who think that what you do will hurt them.

Your discussions of postal rate changes have set off a verbal and editorial barrage of wailing from so many seemingly unrelated sources; it's a wonder you can hide your impatience or bewilderment as well as you do.

All sorts of organizations are raising war funds for lobbying in Washington, for making drives to stop rate increases. Editorials, news columns, and bulletins carry dire warnings that this group will be put out of business, that group will be put out of business. You'll be put out of Congress, and what not. Individuals, representing these groups, appear before your hearings all singing the same tiresome dirge: "We'll be put out of business; you can't do this to us."

I think the members of the committees have shown remarkable calm, patience, and statesmanship in asking these moaners "What do you suggest?" But the suggestions have been few and far between. Nobody seems willing to suggest, to compromise or to help you and the post office solve a really serious problem. If we could all start planning for all of us instead of just for me.

It all reminds me of the hearing some years back when the theatrical people brought Walter Hampden and other stars to warn you that your amusement taxes would darken the marquees of every theater, throw thousands out of work. The fur people, the jewelry people staged similar, but not so glamorous, melodramas. None of the predictions came true.

No matter what you do about postal rates, within the reasonable limits possible under legislative procedure, no one will go out of business solely because of postal rates. If postal rates are the determining factors for staying in business, then there is something wrong with business. What you may do about rates may make business uncomfortable, may force readjustments, may make business more difficult, but we'll all survive somehow.

I think it's high time for all users of the mail to stop howling about being put out of business and instead to join with you, their representatives, in working out some sensible plan for the post office.

Someone should speak in defense of the post office, in defense of Congress, for there are two sides to every argument.

At the risk of being labeled a traitor to my side (whatever that is) I respectfully submit a few suggestions which might help to clear the air.

First. An optimistic note.

A post office department can actually be operated on a balanced budget. I can prove it. I am reproducing below the itemized figures from the 1948 report of another post office department.

Better than sixty-three million profit in 8 years.

That's the Canadian Post Office Department. Since 1902, a space of 46 years, the Canadian Post Office has lost money in only 10 years. 1915, 1922, 1925, 1927 to 1932, and 1939. But the total losses in those 10 years were not as great as the profit during only the last two fiscal years (1947 and 1948).

Report of the Deputy Postmaster General

Fiscal year	Net revenue	Expenditure	Deficit	Surplus
1941	$40,383,366.45	$38,699,673.76		$1,683,692.69
1942	45,993,871.83	41,501,869.04		4,492,002.79
1943	48,868,762.24	44,741,987.13		4,126,775.11
1944	61,070,919.37	48,485,008.65		12,585,910.72
1945	66,071,815.89	54,629,281.07		11,442,534.82
1946	68,635,559.07	57,729,645.67		10,905,913.40
1947	72,986,624.19	64,213,049.78		8,773,574.41
1948	77,770,967.33	67,943,475.57		9,827,491.7

Of course, Canada is smaller. A population of about 13,000,000 compared with our approximately 145,000,000. About one-eleventh our size. And their gross postal revenue is only about one-seventeenth of ours. But Canada needs 11,982 post offices to take care of its people, compared to our 42,000 post offices. That is, Canada needs a bigger plant, in terms of population, than we do, and yet it has learned to run its post office department on a better than balanced budget. It's true that Canada does not have the masses of low-rate mail nor some of our complexities, but it has elements within its service which deserve most serious consideration on your part. American ingenuity should be able to devise a system whereby our Postmaster General could submit a comparatively satisfactory annual report. I suggest that our friendly neighbors be invited and urged to show you how they do it.

Second. I would like to suggest three specific steps or methods of tackling our post office problems.

Step one: Set up, once and for all, a definite method of dividing the functions of the post office into two groups.

(a) Those covered by appropriations out of general taxes.

(b) Those covered by income from the users of mail.

Much of all our trouble lies in the absence of any such structure.

The Department of Agriculture, for example, costs the Government approximately $840,000,000 a year—but that is not considered a loss. The Congress fixes an appropriation to cover that cost.

The Post Office Department is a necessary adjunct of Government. The Government could not function without the post office.

There are some 42,000 post offices in the country. One hundred and twenty-nine of those offices account for more than 63 percent of the total postal volume.

There are 33,614 third- and fourth-class offices in the country, where the total revenue rarely, if ever, is enough to pay for salaries, let alone the cost of supplies and overhead. No one knows for sure, but there are only a thousand or so post offices where receipts are enough to pay bare operating costs. But could all the rest be eliminated? Surely not. All or most of the offices are necessary to keep Government functioning.

How much is the post office worth to the Government? How much of the post-office work should be covered by appropriations? Why not find out?

There are three groups of post-office governmental functions:

(a) Service for other agencies.

(b) Handling mail for executive branches.

(c) Handling mail for Congress.

Postmasters are custodians of Federal buildings in which post offices are located. They are landlords for other agencies. Postmasters conduct civil-service examinations for all agencies. They sell stamps and bonds for the Treasury. They post bulletins for other agencies. The Post Office Department is errand boy and general flunky for nearly every other agency of the Government, and yet it is supposed to charge the public enough to pay for all these services. The post office should be reimbursed by definite appropriations for these services, in some such way as Canadian postmasters are reimbursed in commissions for some of their work.

The same system should apply to mail handled for executive branches and for the Congress. Not only in Washington, but all over the country, the post office is deluged with free mail. I'm not disputing its worth. Let's admit it is all necessary. In every hamlet. county agents mail important bulletins to farmers. Other agencies keep up the flow of contact between Government and citizens.

Surely, we have enough brains in this country to find out how much of the cost of post-office service should be allocated to the appropriations of other executive branches. Once you find out what the figure or percentage should be—10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, etc.—then you can proceed to step No. 2 with some semblance of sanity.

Once you find out how much Congress should appropriate for the congressional frank, there will not be so much criticism of the widespread use of the franking privilege. But you shouldn't ask commercial buyers of mail service to pay for far-flung functions of Government. That is a job for all the taxpayers, including you and me and everyone else.

In brief, set up the post-office accounting system in two parts:

(a) Operations covered by appropriations which should be fixed by appropriation committee of the Congress.

(b) Operations covered by revenue (which should be self-supporting).

Step two: Fix rates for the various classes of mail by a businesslike rate-fixing, permanent commission instead of by legislation.

This would avoid the high-pressure ballyhoo which surrounds the rate-fixing of Congress.

The public-servicing function of the Post Office Department is a business, just like freight, passenger, or public utility rate-fixing. Congressmen, and this is not disrespectful, are too busy to enter into every detail of intricate rate-fixing. An experienced commission, working with Government and the public, could establish equitable rates subject to checks in procedure and personnel by Congress.

Consider the present confused situation.

In an effort to meet a deficit, it is proposed to raise the lowly postal card from 1 to 2 cents.

And yet postal cards are part of first-class mail which pays a tidy profit each year. Who knows for sure whether they should be raised or not?

Post and postal cards are the poor man's method of communication. They are used by thousands of small-business people as the only method of telling prospects and customers about goods or services for sale.

Let's look at it this way: There are 190 1-cent Government-stamped postal cards to each pound. The post office gets $1.90 for each pound of cards used. And yet some selfish ax-grinders howl that they will be put out of business if they must pay a mini-

mum of one-fourth cent per piece, or if their rate is raised from 1½ to 2 cents a pound.

Suppose, for example, there are four pieces of a typical second-class publication to a pound. Would a minimum postal rate of $2.50 per 1,000 pieces (which weigh 250 pounds) be too extreme when compared with $10 for 1,000 postal cards which weigh just over 5 pounds? Sounds sorta silly, but that's what a lot of people are howling about.

Until rates of various cl sses can be adjusted equitably * * * why tax the poor man's postal card an extra cent when 5 pounds of them now bring in $10, while 50 times more in bulk of another class bring in a lot less per thousand?

Consider third class: Who knows exactly what the rate should be? Canada seems to get along very nicely on a 1-cent minimum. And why, without very serious study, should the Post Office discontinue the commercial bulk rate which has saved millions of man-hours in sorting, facing, handling, and dispatching? It doesn't make sense. But if a serious commission studied those rates, adjusted the inequalities, I'd predict that the commercial users of the mail would accept those rates and make them work.

It is certainly unjust to ask one group of advertising users to accept a $10 per thousand (piece) boost when another group howls against a $2.50 or $5 per thousand boost. Especially when there can be no comparison in weight. The costlier rate weighs less than the lower Alice in Wonderland would be confused, too.

The second-class rate situation is a mess. I don't know what the rates should be. No one does. I'm not fighting the publishers. I'm a publisher myself, in a small way. But I think the publishers' representatives before your hearings made a ridiculous showing when they pleaded for no increases whatsoever.

My trade publication runs about 3½ copies to the pound. We mail about 4,500 per month. My postal bill runs about $24 per month, or just a trifle over one-half cent per copy.

That is, we mail 4½ ounces for one-half cent. That weight is equivalent to 54 postal cards which at present rates brings the Government 54 cents. For delivering 54 of my magazines (weighing 243 ounces or fifteen-plus pounds) the post office collects 27 cents, while the post office gets 54 cents for 54 postal cards weighing 4½ ounces, or 54 cents for 54 third-class mailing pieces weighing about 60 ounces. It just doesn't make sense.

I'm ashamed of my postal bill each month, and I think a lot of second-class permit holders feel likewise if they had the nerve to speak out.

A long, long time ago, a former Third Assistant Postmaster General confided in me, "Henry, second-class rates are a parasitical growth on the structure of government, and nothing can be done about it." I've never forgotten that description, but I think it's time for the publishing industry to grow up.

All this talk about second-class rates being established to promote education and culture is as outmoded as the horse and buggy. All this high talk about publishers being interested solely in informing the public, increasing culture, improving education, is downright dishonest. The old myth that magazines are produced for the readers is what it is—a myth. The real truth is that publishers are in business to make money. Most magazines are produced for the advertisers. All arguments that a free press demands a subsidy are silly. All arguments that any increase in postal charges will fall on the readers of publications are absurd. The increase, whatever is justified, should be borne by the advertiser. For him the vehicle was created.

I don't know what the second-class rates should be. Surely it's evident they should be higher. My rate should be higher. Why doesn't the publishing industry stop grafting on the Government and help work out a satisfactory rate?

The Postmaster General seems to be on the right track in his recommended sliding scale (which has caused the most howls). The more advertising, the larger the rate. Why not? The less education, culture, and information.

Publishers generally might be agreeable to a new rate for "red-tag service." Users of penny postal cards, threatened with a 1-cent (100 percent) increase would be boiling mad if they knew all the inside dope about magazines of urgent news interest which get red-tag service, which means better than first-class mail service. And yet those magazines weigh 1,000 percent more than the postal cards and pay about the same or little more than the postal-card rate.

Concerning all the inane hullabaloo over small religious, fraternal, etc., publications being forced out of the mail if they have to pay a decent postal rate—that's a debatable question. If any organization can't stand $2.50 minimum for a thousand copies it mails then perhaps it should go out of business. It costs a lot more to mail a postal card.

Some of my publisher friends will dislike these statements. But if they would face the facts and the truth, this rate situation could be licked. Everyone should want to pay his own way—the postal card and third-class mail users should pay their own way, but that way cannot be estimated until step one (previously mentioned) is taken and until the loss-producing subsidy on second class is adjusted sanely. One group should not be taxed at the expense of another for political or any other kind of expediency.

Mr. Congressman, it's a mess which only a rate-fixing commission can handle. That would relieve you of almost all political pressure.

You already have such a plan before you in H. R. 1008, presented January 6, 1949, by Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Why not consider that resolution at once before the rate situation gets into more of a mess than it is now?

Step three: Authorize the establishment in the Post Office of a sales and publicity department.

That's where you can learn many things from our Canadian neighbors.

The Canadian Post Office has such a department. Sixteen public relations officers are stationed throughout the Dominion. These men and their assistants contact all commercial users of the mail. Show them the newest wrinkles, teach them how to use the mails properly. Give them case histories. They sell directory services and handle householder mailings. In other words, there's a special department to promote sales.

They work on the simple principles of all business that increased production reduces cost per piece. Increased revenue decreases overhead. It has brought tangible results in Canada.

Why can't we have such a set-up in the United States Post Office? Why not bulletins like the one pictured here? Every Member of the Congress should try to get hold of a copy of the Canadian sales bulletin.

Take the strings off the post office. The post office has tried at times to be promotion-minded, but every time some selfish lobby has stopped it, claiming the post office had no right to sell a form of advertising. That is the bunk. The mails are used by all types of advertisers including those who advertise in publications. Let's grow up. Be modern. Let's sell the post-office services just like any other business.

These three steps, Mr. Congressman, if taken soberly and sanely would solve a lot of the headaches:

1. A balanced structure between governmental functions and service to the public.
2. Equitable rate-fixing by a commission.
3. Establishment of a sales and public-relations division.

These are my suggestions—after 30 years of using the mail, after more than 20 years of close and friendly contact with the post office, and after attending countless hearings where the ax grinders wailed and moaned.

Sincerely,

HENRY HOKE.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated March 30, 1949, which I received from Mr. Le Grand P. Backman, president of the Board of Education of Salt Lake City, concerning Federal aid to education, and also my letter in reply dated April 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. *March 30, 1949.*

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senator from Utah, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Board of Education of Salt Lake City at a regular meeting of the board has made it a matter of record that the members of said board are unanimously opposed to the proposed Federal aid for education. It is the consensus of opinion of the board that Federal aid for education is but an additional infringement of the Federal Government on individual rights and one more step of socialization of the American way of life.

Local autonomy and complete supervision, control, and administration of our own schools will preserve our national heritage and keep our children unhampered from regimentation, and will act as a bulwark against the aggression of foreign influences and ideologies that are contrary to our God-given rights of free agency, and the desires and hopes of the founders of our great Nation.

We trust that your influence will be exercised against any legislation contrary to this expression.

Assuring you of our best wishes in your important calling to serve the people of this fair State.

Yours very truly,
LE GRAND P. BACKMAN,
President of the Board of Education of Salt Lake City.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
April 9, 1949.

MR. LE GRAND P. BACKMAN,
President, Board of Education of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City, Utah.

MY DEAR LE GRAND: I have your letter of March 30 in which you inform me of the

board's unanimous opposition to the proposed Federal aid to education program.

First of all, I have been a sponsor of the Federal aid to education bill for 14 or 15 years. Therefore, you may rest assured that I will not do as you suggest, use my influence against this legislation. I am for it because it is necessary and essential to the welfare of the Nation. The Salt Lake City Board of Education should know that if the Federal aid to education bill becomes law, it does not have to receive any money from the Federal Government. Nothing is forced upon the States and I am sure the States will force nothing upon the districts or the cities that do not want it. I am happy that Salt Lake City does not in any way need Federal aid, but for Salt Lake City to be opposed to this legislation because they do not need it where the rest of the country needs it so badly seems to me to be a little bit inconsiderate.

Your letter is one of hundreds I have received on this subject and many of them are from the State of Utah, showing the need for this legislation. I have probably received thousands and thousands of letters both for and against Federal aid to education, but never do I remember receiving anything quite like your second paragraph. To assume that the United States, in recognizing the fact that a trained citizenry is essential to our democracy, would pass a law which would permit "aggression of foreign influences and ideologies that are contrary to our God-given rights of free agency" is startling. Does the United States exist to destroy itself? The bill specifically provides that the Federal Government will have nothing to do with the administration of the schools. It merely grants aid to the schools and leaves the administration to the States.

If receiving money from the Federal Government has an ill influence upon the school systems of our country, they would have been ruined long ago because the schools of the Nation have from the very beginning received grants-in-aid from the sale of public lands. Our Utah State Agricultural College receives financial support every year and has done so since it was established. As an administrator of the fiscal functions of the University of Utah I received hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Federal Government for various purposes on the campus. I have on my desk now a letter from the United States Public Health Service which states that "the University of Utah has received $1,250,000 since 1946 for use in its medical school." The Salt Lake City Board of Education has approved the ROTC program in some of the Salt Lake City schools. The University of Utah, the Utah State Agricultural College, and the Brigham Young University, and, I am sure, several of our high schools and our junior colleges are today receiving thousands and thousands of Federal dollars in return for instruction given under the soldiers' education bill. You may recall that I was the author and original sponsor of this act which eventually became a part of the GI bill of rights. Never once have I seen or have I heard it suggested that any official of any of these institutions has ever felt coerced or dominated by any suggestion of Federal control. I am sure when I became responsible for the establishment of the ROTC unit in the University of Utah, no member of the Salt Lake City Board of Education or no member of the teaching staff of the Salt Lake City schools came and warned me that this cooperation with the Federal Government would bring about Federal control.

I am afraid that the facts and the experiences of the 48 States in the Union are all against the opinion of the Salt Lake City Board of Education. Let me repeat, Salt Lake City has never had ROTC forced upon it, and I am sure that no member of the University of Utah faculty has ever felt under restraint because of such Federal aid. Not one cent of Federal money has been imposed upon any school. The school need not in any single way cooperate with the Federal aid to education bill if it becomes a law. Any institution can withdraw at any time if it wants to. The Federal Government offers cooperation. There is no pressure, no force, no desire to dominate either the theory or the practice of the States in their educational processes.

Two world wars and the administration of a Selective Service Act in each of them has taught us more conclusively than anything else that our country's outstanding need is education and an equalization of educational opportunities. The Selective Service System has been spoken of and the democratic way in that every young man becomes equal to the call with all others. That is all right in theory, but in fact it was not borne out because certain standards were set up before persons became eligible to be called. Because of these standards, taking the Nation as a whole, 5 out of every 10 men called were rejected for some cause or another, sometimes for health, but more often than anything else for an inability to read or write. At the first of the Second World War no illiterate was accepted. This cut into the list of persons called so strongly in some States that protests were made and the Army had to accept some men who could not read and write. These persons had to be put in Army schools at a tremendous cost to the Government compared with the cost of ordinary fourth- and fifth-grade education. Our statistics show that in those States like Utah and the other Intermountain States where public education has been in existence even longer than statehood, 7 out of every 10 boys called under the Selective Service Act were accepted. That proves that education benefits health and aids in the development of the student. But in those States where educational standards are not good, only 3 out of every 10 boys called were accepted. The trained boys have to bear a greater proportion of the liability to serve in wartime. Under the peacetime draft that is going to be the same. The knowledge of this has brought about almost universal support for the equalization theories in the Federal aid to education bill.

I thank you for your last sentence wherein you say "assuring you of our best wishes in your important calling to serve the people of this fair State." I know of no way I can serve the people of Utah or the people of the Nation better than by giving them the opportunities which will come to them as a result of the passage of the Federal aid to education bill and its coordinate companion bill, the national school health services bill. As I told the people of Utah in my broadcast over KSL on the night of April 6, I can conceive of no legislation that will benefit the people of our country in the next generation more than the three bills which I am sponsoring, the National Science Foundation bill, the Federal aid to education bill, and the national school health services bill, if they become law.

I trust that the board of education will not refuse to affiliate with the benefits of the National Science Foundation when that activity is established. I trust it will not refuse the Federal money to bring about proper examination of all of the pupils and all of the students in the State of Utah, which will be provided by the school health services bill. If the board of education refuses to cooperate it is only the people of Salt Lake City and their children that will be hurt.

Thanks for writing to me, Le Grand. I am sorry to say I cannot agree with your letter.

Most sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS.

Hoover Commission's Analysis of the Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, few things have aroused the interest of the people of the Missouri Basin States so much as the Hoover Commission's analysis of the Pick-Sloan plan for Missouri Basin development.

The tone of newspaper comments on the Pick-Sloan program has changed tremendously. Editors who once felt that perhaps the criticism aimed at the Pick-Sloan program was partisan are now taking a different attitude. Recent editorial comments range from surprise to bitterness over the hoax which that program has imposed on the public. I am advised that only two Governors—Peterson, of Nebraska, and Mickelson, of South Dakota—have appeared in support of the Army engineers' request for appropriations.

I have just received an article dated April 6, 1949, taken from the State Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., which reflects this new attitude. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLASTING PICK-SLOAN

(By Roscoe Fleming)

HOOVER COMMISSION HEAPS CRITICISM

Never has a major United States program been so riddled as the Hoover Commission task force on natural resources has riddled the Pick-Sloan project in the Missouri Basin. All past criticism pales, compared with that in the detailed analysis now out.

Our little local and congressional politicians have defended Pick-Sloan and even extolled it. Our little governors have stood up and praised it like children reciting for candy. Critics have been ordered to go 'way back and sit down, and loftily told they didn't know what they were talking about.

Now a body that includes such members as former Governor Carr, of Colorado, and Miller, of Wyoming, doubles all previous criticism in spades. The best they can say for it is that Pick-Sloan will do some good.

They say in effect that this gigantic project, which can mean progress or stagnation throughout one-sixth of the Nation's area, is run by people so bedeviled by haste and lack of data that it's almost a miracle when they are as much as 75 percent right. (And as we know, these mistakes always result in underestimated cost and overestimated benefits.)

They say that present estimates indicate a cost of $6,300,000,000, or $20 an acre for the whole basin area, on a project that started out at $1,368,000,000. (NOTE.—If all Agriculture Department recommendations are included, the cost may be nearer $10,000,000,000. And some irrigation plans may cost $500 an acre. One actually is estimated at $263.)

They say Pick-Sloan was no more planned than if a group of architects, each assigned to work separately on his own wing of a big

building, should decide later to join up their sections and "lay on facilities for heat, water, electricity, and elevators after the rest had been planned."

They are talking, remember, about the most gigantic land-and-water rehabilitation scheme in human history. Its good or bad accomplishment can mean permanent progress, or stagnation, for our valley. It will also affect the Nation's safety.

Yet the report portrays 24 "participating" Federal agencies as pulling and hauling all over the basin, duplicating, contradicting, back-biting; each having to go back to Washington for final instructions, and in many cases clear to Congress. There are so many thousands of Federal workers that they almost stumble over each other.

We hardly realize either, here in the semi-arid West, that out of this anarchy one agency has seized a sort of temporary dictatorship. (The report, more polite, calls it "dominance.") This "dominant" agency is the Corps of Army Engineers, perhaps least fit of all to understand, to appreciate, or to "dominate" the problems and the solutions of our arid West, where water conservation is all-important.

Maybe we'll realize at last why down-river interests centered at Omaha and Kansas City, which have always regarded the Missouri River as their private property, have had that smug cat-that-ate-the-canary air about the way this Pick-Sloan thing has gone so far.

We westerners have relied on the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment which purports to save for dry-land uses water that originates west of the ninety-eighth meridian. But the report points out that no one can tell whether this provision is indeed constitutional and can be enforced—barring a court test which is sure to come.

So far the enormous and tragic meaning—for the West—of the report seems to have fallen on deaf ears. For example, Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, merely says all that's wrong with Pick-Sloan is that neither the Army nor the Bureau of Reclamation has enough men or money to give Nebraska everything it wants. Heaven help the West, if such statesmen represent its best defense.

Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Genocide," written by Raphael Lemkin and published in the March 1949 issue of the World Alliance News Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENOCIDE

(By Raphael Lemkin, Yale University Law School)

An event of great importance to the civilized world took place at the recent session of the United Nations in Paris, when, under the leadership of the American and Australian delegations, the convention on the crime of genocide was unanimously adopted by a jubilant Assembly. The hideous crime of destroying religious, racial, national, and ethnical groups was finally outlawed by international action.

Throughout history, men blinded by hatred and intolerance inflicted death and tortures on other men only because they believed in another God, adhered to another culture, or belonged to another nationality or race. The attempt made by Rome to destroy the early Christians was the first great challenge of organized brutality to the free spirit of man. Christianity came forth from this ordeal victorious. True though it may be that religion cannot be destroyed, it is equally true that persons belonging to religious groups can be burnt alive, quartered, hanged, and mutilated. This mass destruction, directed against members of religious groups, may be so thorough and systematic that the group may cease to exist. Many instances of destruction of religious groups could be cited not only in different periods of history but also in different parts of the world right at the present time.

Every type of genocide, whether directed against a religious, racial, ethnical, or national group, is detrimental to humanity, not only because it shocks the human conscience but also because it deprives the world of the potential moral and cultural contributions of the human group slated for annihilation. We should never have had a Bible if the Jews had been exterminated before creating it. We should never have had the philosophy of the French enlightenment, which laid the foundation for modern democracy, if the French nation had been slaughtered through an act of genocide. Such examples could be repeated. In the present crisis, the losses which the world might suffer from a mass destruction, especially of religious groups, could be especially costly. True religion engenders peace in the heart of man. The cooperation and solidarity of millions of peaceful hearts throughout the world is the best guaranty of international peace. Genocide is, therefore, a danger to peace.

The convention on genocide is the product of 2 years of work and long discussion in the United Nations. The authors of the convention took into consideration the historical examples of the techniques of mass destruction and also the realities of international life. In the convention a human group is considered as an organic entity, and as such can be eliminated either by acts of violence leading to the immediate death of its members or by measures designed brutally to interrupt its continuity. To the first group belong such measures as killings, mutilations, incarceration in concentration camps in conditions endangering life, etc. This is physical genocide. To the second groups belong such acts as compulsory sterilization, abortions, and stealing of children. This is biological genocide. From the point of view of genocide, there is little difference between direct killings and such techniques which, like a time bomb, destroy by delayed action.

As to implementation, the General Assembly had to follow a wise course, taking into consideration, on the one hand, the existing sensitiveness of states regarding their sovereignty and, on the other hand, the necessity of impressing upon the world that genocide must be dealt with by effective measures. Legal institutions already accepted by all civilized nations and familiar to them were chosen for implementation, existing law being adapted to cover the newly formulated international crime of genocide. It should be noted that the provisions concerning the eventual international penal court are left for future decision and their implementation will actually depend on the gradual growth of international life. Under the convention, every nation undertakes the obligation to punish cases of genocide by its own existing courts. If a contracting party fails to do so, it faces the disapproval of the International Court of Justice, which, under international law, has power to pronounce itself on treaty violations. Moreover, all organs of the United Nations and not only the Security Council will act for the prevention and suppression of genocide.

The convention as it now stands is a great step forward because it translates human decency into law and, especially in the field of international law, gives expression to universal conscience. The convention is now subject to ratification by the parliaments of the world. Public opinion throughout the world supports the genocide convention. The interest in this action is especially great in the United States, where it is based not only on the great generosity and compassion of the American people but also on the tradition of United States foreign policy, which has always been opposed to mass violence in international life. In 1902 Theodore Roosevelt denounced the trade agreement with the Russian Czar in protest against the pogroms against the Jews. President Wilson tried hard, both during and after the First World War, to save the Armenians. If men and women of good will throughout the world will lend their support to the convention now in this crucial stage of ratification, it will become a living force in our civilizaton—a force of lasting significance.

An Old and Evil Scheme Seeks To End Our Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, E. T. Leech, editor of the Pittsburgh Press, in his Sunday's paper, has a signed editor's comment which I feel should be read by every American.

He refers to some things under the head of fancy bait such as security, socialized medicine, bonuses, guaranty of a job, and special favors to special groups.

He brings out the point that the advocacy of such things is not liberalism, but that real liberalism is the preservation of the freedom and dignity of the individual.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR'S COMMENT—AN OLD AND EVIL SCHEME SEEKS TO END OUR LIBERTY

(By E. T. Leech, editor, the Pittsburgh Press)

Those who love and want to keep our way of life forever are making a bad error. They talk about getting back to the American system, or returning to the American way, or similar phrases. They mean well; but such talk is harmful and inaccurate.

It carries the idea of retracing our steps, of returning to something which is past. Actually just the opposite is meant. For the American kind of government has involved constant change—always going ahead and making progress. Never going backward.

It is the strong central state—the one which runs people's affairs and upon which they must depend for benefits and decisions—

which represents going backward. The American scheme is the easiest in the world under which to go forward.

No other government ever has changed so rapidly or so much as ours has under the Constitution. Immense alterations have been carried out. Only once—in abolishing slavery—did these reforms come through violence. No other nation can show such a record.

OLDEST FRAUD

But now we are beset by what is called a new philosophy. It calls for a powerful central state to do our planning, run our affairs, and dole out our benefits—the latter by collecting and spending our money. This scheme, which has swept much of the world, is pictured as something new and progressive. It is nothing of the kind. It is the oldest fraud in history.

From the time when man emerged from savagery he was under the rule of the state. The whole story of civilization has been one of individuals struggling to free themselves from the tyranny of government. Not until the American Constitution was established did this ever happen on any large or long-time scale.

Under this system of free individuals, America outdistanced the whole world. Yet now we are asked to give it up—to go back to the ancient plan of the all-powerful state; to let Government run our affairs and assume responsibility for our security.

NEW FRILLS

The scheme is dolled up with new frills and fancy phrases. Tempting bait is used to attract public support. Government, we are told, will give us security through law. It will pay our doctor bills, give us bounties and bonuses, guarantee our jobs, care for our old age, and grant special favors to special groups.

To do all this, Government has to run things. It must take more and more of our income through taxes to pay for what it thinks we should have. The price of this system is surrender of personal freedom.

Most of the world never had freedom, or has surrendered it. Much of it looks to us—who still have the strength which only freedom can give—for help and support. It is our rugged, free economy which today bears the burden of keeping liberty alive.

Yet even at home we are under great pressure to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs—to go far backward to the old curse of the all-powerful state. Loud voices cry for us to adopt some form of the old plan which has done, and is doing, such a miserable job elsewhere.

IT ALWAYS FAILS

The biggest problem in combating this scheme is to get Americans to realize that it isn't either new or liberal. It has been tried under every variety of names and trimmings. But basically it's always the same—state control. And it always has failed in the end.

America's first radicals and liberals knew this. They feared government. They wanted the bare minimum of it. Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln were of that school. Liberalism in this country was founded on supremacy of individuals over the state.

Young people in particular are tempted by change. The swing to an all-planning, all-bestowing state is in truth a vast change. But not a liberal one. It means going back—far back—to the sort of think which this Government was created to prevent.

Preservation of our basic way of living, of our personal freedom, and our sense of individual self-reliance and responsibility is a great cause. It is a noble and progressive cause. For it means defending the dignity of man and his personal freedom to improve and go forward.

Yet this cause of late has lacked strong leadership. No party has upheld it. Politicians have been flirting with state controls as a lure to get votes. But there are many signs that millions of Americans yearn for leadership in a struggle to save our free life from a plunge into the old morass of state domination.

The Coyote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the last session of the State Legislature of South Dakota passed legislation designating the coyote as the official animal of South Dakota. Long known as the Sunshine State, South Dakota thus is also destined to be known in some quarters as the Coyote State.

Mr. President, in many respects the coyote is a completely misunderstood animal. Some fail to understand its good characteristics. For that reason I take pleasure in calling attention to a story from the pen of Badger Clark, and published in the Huron (S. Dak.) Plainsman. Mr. Clark, in addition to being a great poet, is a noted naturalist and a learned observer of animal and bird life.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BADGER CLARK DEFENDS COYOTE AS STATE ANIMAL

Badger Clark in letter to Huron Plainsman: "I note that you are grieved at the legislature's adoption of the coyote as a State animal. On the contrary, I think it an excellent choice.

"The prejudice against the coyote is based on his failure to conduct himself like a civilized man, and respect the rights of property, which is a little absurd. The only law he knows is the law of his fathers, that game belongs to him who gets it. Slinking beast? Naturally, for he is in the enemy's country. A military scout in hostile country slinks, for the slinkin'er he is, the more likely he is to complete his mission and return to headquarters for commendation and decoration.

"In the matter of killing, I think that the coyote is a more moral fellow than the average man. When he picks up a chicken, or other piece of animated fresh meat, it is because he is hungry, or knows that his family is hungry at home. A sportsman, on the other hand, takes his gun and goes out to the field full of good food up to his Adam's apple, and then kills to the limit that the law allows, not that he needs the meat but just because of the savage delight that he takes in killing.

"The coyote's private life is above reproach. You suggest the bull as a possible State animal. The bull! Horrors. What a critter to represent us before the world. An amoral and utterly irresponsible character, who has a hundred mistresses and doesn't care a hoot for any of them, while he regards their (and his) offspring with contemptuous indifference.

"But the coyote marries monogamously. I don't know whether there is any ceremony or not, but the partnership lasts longer than some I've seen that started with a big church wedding. His wife is his equal, his soul mate, his alter ego, and they hunt together, often cooperating, it is said, in running down a long-winded jackrabbit. And when the missus has to stay at home with the babies, Mr. Coyote hunts not only for himself, but for his family.

"He is keenly intelligent. Not long ago, here in the State park, a coyote crossed my trail. He stopped in front of me, not a hundred feet away, and looked me over and grinned at me. Then he trotted on for some distance and paused to grin at me again. Finally, just before he vanished into a line of woods, he looked over his shoulder and gave me a deliberate farewell grin. He knew perfectly well that I was unarmed and harmless.

"To me the most attractive thing about a coyote is his voice. I always go to the door and listen when I hear him at night. His notes seem to soar up to the stars and give an indescribable impression of wildness and freedom—the voice of the old West, the voice of a younger world. In our unhappy, overcrowded century, when the slow, steel tentacles of collectivism are gradually closing about us all and freedom is fading away, the coyote's song is as sweet and as sad as any music I know.

"Most of the coyote's traits of character have survival value, as the scientific people say. Above all, he is tough and resourceful, taking the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune in his stride. For three-quarters of a century every man's hand has been against him, yet he not only survives but has extended his range.

"Whatever comes, he can take it and nothing can down him. Considering this, and calling up memories of my fellow citizens as I knew them during the dry and dreary thirties, it seems to me that the coyote has the marks of a real South Dakotan."

Clare Boothe Luce First To Suggest Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article entitled "Clare Boothe Luce Broached Idea for Atlantic Pact in 1943," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of April 13, 1949. This article concerns the contribution made by one of our leading citizens in the field of foreign affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARE LUCE BROACHED IDEA FOR ATLANTIC PACT IN 1943

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Who was the first to suggest the Atlantic Pact?

The question came up at a gathering of newspaper people here and the answer—verified by records—surprised some who had forgotten.

It was not Franklin Roosevelt, not Winston Churchill, not Secretary Marshall, not Harry Truman.

It was Clare Boothe Luce, Congresswoman from the Fourth Connecticut District (Fairfield County).

The idea was suggested by her on the floor of Congress in one of the early speeches in her first term. It is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1943.

It was an unexpected speech in which Mrs. Luce, taking the floor, began by criticizing the lack of any consistent foreign policy by the United States and then urged that Americans stop thinking of their frontier as the Nation's shoreline or water's edge, but think rather of their frontier as being the other shores which that ocean touched.

LET'S LOOK AT MAP

"Look, please, at the map," Mrs. Luce declared at that time, "and remember * * * this is an air world we are living in and that, in the future, we shall need to surround ourselves with as wide a margin of physical protection as we can."

She pointed out, "The British Empire is America's natural buffer state," and added:

"As France has stood between England and Germany for centuries; as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans have stood between Russia and Germany, so there, my colleagues, on the globe stands the farflung British Empire between the United States and all its real or potential enemies in Europe," which is exactly how the Atlantic Pact, signed April 4 by 12 nations in Washington, would affect the United States.

It is interesting to note that newspapers the next day reported catcalls and rebel yells punctuated the House session while Mrs. Luce spoke, so that she was unable to complete her 30-minute prepared talk because of interruptions from Republicans who liked her remarks and Democrats who objected.

HOT DEBATE FOLLOWS

A spirited debate followed with Luther A. Johnson, veteran Representative, her principal critic, who charged that once again Mrs. Luce had come before the House with "beautiful and devastating phrases based largely on her own views and frequently unsupported by logic or facts."

This was not the first instance in which ideas offered for consideration by the former Congresswoman, ignored or criticized at the time they were propounded, were used later minus any credit line.

Mrs. Luce preceded former Secretary of State Marshall by 2 years with an over-all plan for saving Europe, and the proof may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 4, 1945.

Another case of Mrs. Luce "getting in Dutch" for being ahead of the bandwagon was her recommendation to Congress January 18, 1945, following her visit to the Italian front, in which she asked that a limit be put on front-line duty for the ground troops just as there was for men of the Air Force.

Her male colleagues in the House laughed and tittered at the idea of a woman going overseas and coming back with notions on how to run the Army. And the Army itself "raised Cain."

(A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house.)

SUGGESTION FINDS FAVOR

But what happened a year and a half later in September 1946? Out came a report by psychiatrists of the War Department which showed that the toll of psychoneurotic cases among the infantrymen could be reduced in the next war by a 120-day limit on front-line duty.

The New York Sun, which printed the report in detail on September 11, 1946, headed the story: "Breaking point of combat GI's was learned too late by Army." What Mrs. Luce had reported to Congress on the Fifth Army soldiers in Italy, and what she had recommended, were one and the same found in the War Department document.

The Dutch Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dutch Problem," from the Washington Post of April 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUTCH PROBLEM

It is heartening to note the Acheson effort to take advantage of the presence in Washington of Foreign Minister Dirk Stikker and promote a Netherlands-Indonesian meeting. Indonesia is a sizable cloud over both the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic security pact. Subsidies of goods and arms to Holland are hard to justify while Holland is keeping up a military blockade in Indonesia. The misgivings on Capitol Hill are loud enough, surely, to be heard by Netherlands officials in America.

Whether the Dutch people are equally receptive is another matter. On the basis of evidence, they are probably in a state of ignorance, as they are about both the facts of the police action and the circumstances of the underlying dispute. Newsprint is short in the Netherlands, and honesty of reporting from Indonesia has been suspect ever since the Dutch delegation at Lake Success stood revealed before the world as the victims of misinformation. The point is pertinent because most American newspapers are in periodical receipt of private and public communications from the Netherlands aimed at enlightenment. Most often they contain tales of misconduct by the UN Good Offices Committee which we find quite at variance with truth.

The air of injured innocence which is accompanying these myths out of Holland is pathetic. However, it is said to be dissolving rapidly as a major fact is impinging upon Dutch consciousness. This is that the Dutch have a bull by the tail. They have hitherto insisted that the animal is a bear with a big B, but the pretense, though swallowed avidly enough by diehards of a dying imperialism and by commiphobiacs, is invalidated by the evidence of all American officialdom in contact with Indonesia. Nowadays the real shape of the animal is coming to be appreciated in Holland. In other words, the people are beginning to ask questions about the line on which they have been fed, and to wonder why the Indonesians refuse to be pacified by bayonets. This is all to the good. It will help to soften the stubbornness that the Security Council has encountered from the Dutch in the effort to return Indonesia to peace and start the parties afresh on the path to the working out of Indonesian independence.

The position of the Security Council is now based on a resolution accepted on the proposal of Canada. Canada, always a quester for formulas at international gatherings, wanted a preliminary round table conference of Dutch and Indonesian Republicans with UN officials in attendance. Such a proposal would have been doomed from the start if left to be carried out by Dutch officials in Indonesia. If the Netherlands, in spite of international recognition of the Indonesian Republic, think of the trouble in Indonesia as an internal problem for the Dutch themselves, the Dutch in Indonesia appear to think of it as an internal problem for the Dutch in Indonesia. The tail has been wagging the dog in this matter on several occasions.

Perhaps the dispatch to Indonesia of Dr. J. H. van Royen is a sign of a fresh determination on the part of the Dutch to join authoritatively in the quest for a solution. Dr. Van Royen is the man for the job. In spite of being the unconscious carrier of misinformation, he has suffered no detraction from the general esteem in which he is held by his Lake Success colleagues. But there can be no approach to a solution till one party regains the freedom enjoyed by the other—till, in short, the captured Indonesian leaders are released, enabled to talk freely with their colleagues, and allowed to return for consultation to their capital at Jogjakarta.

M. D. Anderson Cancer Foundation, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, out of the raw material of an intense and trying personal encounter with the quiet ruthlessness of cancer, Mr. Paul Bolton, one of Texas' outstanding newspapermen and radio commentators, recently fashioned a sensitive and eloquent broadcast. In simple but persuasive terms, the broadcast presents a convincing plea for assistance to such fine research institutions as Texas' own M. D. Anderson Cancer Foundation in Houston, where the battle against cancer is being waged today. I ask unanimous consent to place Mr. Bolton's broadcast script in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This evening, I am going to make a special report on cancer. To make it, some rules must be broken. Such as the rule that broadcasts — soap operas excepted — must avoid unpleasant subjects. And the rule that news reports should not dwell more than 2 or 3 minutes on a single subject. And the rule that personal opinion should not be reflected in news reports.

This is a report on legislation which may not survive the current economy movement in the legislature—legislation to make available to Texans a cancer treatment which, otherwise, they must go to New York, Boston, Minnesota, or California to get.

I personally believe this legislation should survive. To explain, I shall have to tell parts of a personal history, as impersonally as I can.

First of all, I have no selfish interest in this legislation. The shock of the word malignant sent us flying to the Mayo clinic, in Rochester, Minn., a thousand miles to the north. Whatever the legislature does will come too late to help or hinder me or mine.

The legislation is this: The State board of control recommended that $1,000,000 be spent to build, at the M. D. Anderson cancer foundation in Houston, a specialized research building; that some three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars be spent to equip it.

This recommendation, at this time, lacks legislative approval.

Research would be in the field of radioactive isotopes. Two big words which meant very little to me until a few months ago. My hope tonight is to cut those two big words down to our size by telling you what they meant in one case.

Before deciding to make this attempt, I sought encouragement from the mother of a child afflicted with cerebral palsy. She has become a vigorous, effective worker for all crippled children. I told her of my doubts. Her reply went like this:

"That's how we felt; some sense of false pride, a sort of prigishness about discussing our personal affairs. Then we decided, 'Why not try to turn our own worry and misery into constructive channels, and perhaps help some other family to avoid them?'"

I fervently hope her advice is good.

Cancer struck a member of our family. Without warning, without pain. It struck the thyroid gland. The thyroid lies like a butterfly on each side of your Adam's apple. It controls your energy. Too much, and you're overactive. Too little, you suffer from chronic fatigue. A faulty thyroid may develop what is called goiter. A goiter may be malignant.

I speak, you understand, in layman's language. In this case, the malignancy was discovered by very fine surgery, here in Austin. After two more surgical explorations, the specialists at Mayo's decided to use radioactive isotopes of iodine.

Now, you must understand that the thyroid gland absorbs iodine—grabs it up out of the bloodstream. When we made the atom bomb, at a cost of some $2,000,000,000, other discoveries were made. One was that certain elements could be made radioactive. To explain what this means, I could quote from learned scientific reports; but the explanation which served me best came in a letter, intended to make the meaning clear to my 8-year-old son. This letter to Christy starts off like this:

"I am still in the hospital, after drinking a glass full of what tasted like water, but was called radioactive iodine. I'm not sick; I'm dressed and up and doing things. But all the time the radioactive iodine is changing things in my body.

"It is a long story," the letter goes on; "you know, we all start out from two cells, which split and grow until there are millions of cells, all joined together to make the human body. We don't know why these two cells divide and divide and make up all the different parts of the body. That's something which makes life mysterious and wonderful.

"Sometimes some of the cells start acting up. It is as though they went crazy. They start dividing again, and growing, for no reason. Where there are supposed to be only 10 cells, suddenly there are 20. That's what made the lumps in my neck."

The letter continues: "When you think of how many people there are in the world, this doesn't happen very often, and that's surprising, too, when you think of all the different parts of the body, each made up of cells. Remember, we don't know what makes these cells grow. When they do start acting up, we want to have the growing part cut out, because it is something that wasn't meant to be there. But doctors can't see the individual cells while they are operating. They're too small to see except under a microscope. So they don't always get all the cells out. And if one cell is left, one wild cell, it will start dividing and growing and make another lump. That's what happened to me. Each time the doctors left something they couldn't see. It grew. So the doctors decided to try something else to get rid of those cells."

Here the letter to my son explains how the thyroid gland absorbs iodine, and the cells which started growing in the thyroid gland have that same craving for iodine. "Iodine," the letter goes on, "is an element. Everything in the world is made up of elements. It used to be that man thought these elements didn't ever change. Then they discovered that some of them are constantly changing. There was another surprise. They found that as these elements change they give off energy—energy like the heat of a fire burning. Radioactive isotopes is a way to describe an element changing. Radioactive iodine is called radioactive because it's giving off active rays. It's giving off energy all the time. You can feel the heat given off by a fire. Doctors have a machine called the Geiger counter which can feel the waves which the energy makes around my neck, where the radioactive iodine has been grabbed up by these hungry cells."

Then, in language which anyone can understand, the letter says: "This radioactive iodine plays a dirty trick on the thyroid cells. It kills them dead. They can't stand the radioactiveness of the iodine. Nobody knows why.

"Scientists have known for a long time where to get elements. They haven't known very long where to get elements changing. Now, some of these elements changing—these radioactive isotopes—are being made. They are doing this at one of the biggest plants in the world, Oak Ridge, where they made the atom bomb. The atom bomb, you know, was made of another element changing—uranium."

Then the letter, from which I have quoted only portions, concludes: "Elements changing means that they are shooting off things the scientists call neutrons and electrons which are bombarding the wild cells in my neck."

Now you must understand that any element which has been made radioactive is potentially harmful; at least, scientists can't afford to take chances. Radioiodine is shipped from Oak Ridge in lead containers because lead is the only thing which holds in the rays. It's shipped by special airplane. Only a small amount is kept on hand at any hospital. That small amount is protected by lead shields. It is kept in a laboraotry isolated from other parts of the hospital. Those who work in the laboratory wear sensitive recording devices on their wrists which tell them when they are picking up too much of the radiation from the very air. When doctors handle a glassful, to give to a patient, they use forceps 3 feet long. The patient who drinks that glassful is temporarily isolated. The waste materials from the patient's body must be carefully disposed of, because the scientists don't know what effect radioactive materials might have on marine life if those wastes got into water streams. Nobody knows very much about them, so every precaution must be taken; that's why a special place must be provided if Texas is to have access to this treatment.

And a reason for research is, that the surface has only been scratched. Some success has been achieved with iodine, but at Mayo's, one of the Nation's leading centers, only some 40 cases have been treated—including, incidentally, several from Texas. A doctor at Anderson's put it like this: "When the first oil well was drilled, the people who drilled it knew they had something, but they didn't quite know what. In the use of radioactive isotopes, we have drilled only the first oil well."

Perhaps the first oil well could be called the still experimental use of radioactive iodine. Scientists are experimenting with the use of radioactivated gold, calcium, phosphorus. But the trouble with the simile of the oil well is that men who drill for oil get rich rewards in terms of cash. They could use the cash to drill more wells. In exploring the use of radioactive isotopes, you get back no cash returns. The State's investment will be repaid only in terms of human lives, and in cutting down fear and heartbreak. It is not the type of endeavor to which we could look to free enterprise to back with its capital. We can look only to private charity—and the State.

A sort of case could be made out for cash return on this investment. I'm told that one doctor in Dallas is using radioactive iodine in limited fashion; at Galveston and Houston they are experimenting; but for the State, its use is limited. That goes for the entire Southwest. We have the opportunity to make Texas a research and treatment center for the South and West. It would be a new and important industry, drawing customer-patients from all surrounding States. That's one example of cash return. Another approach is to figure the earning capacity of individuals. I am told 10 patients now await radioactive treatment at Houston. If each had an earning capacity of $100,000, by saving them you have restored to the economy the cost of the special building.

But it is futile, and indecent, to attempt to justify this expenditure in terms of dollar return. It can be justified on the theory that the State, any unit of government, is simply an agency through which the people accomplish those objectives for human betterment which would not otherwise be accomplished or which would be insufferably delayed. The atom bomb's only justification which I have ever heard is that it saved the lives of many American boys who otherwise would have died. In the war, 280,000 Americans were killed in battle. And during the war years, 607,000 Americans died of cancer.

As for the cost, Texas does not, of course, have the $2,000,000,000 which all America spent to make the atom bomb; and Texas is asked by this legislation, to spend only $1,325,000. Always comparisons are odious; yet, let's measure this expenditure in terms of others more familiar. It's proposed to spend just a little more than the legislature has voted to spend each month, from now on, for farm roads. It's proposed to spend approximately one-sixth of what we spent, last month, on old-age pensions or other public welfare. It's proposed to spend approximately one-third of what we are spending on renovating the State prison system. It's proposed to spend less than we take in, in any single month, from the sales tax on cigarettes; the approximate amount which we Texans pay to the State each month as the tax on whisky.

I appreciate, almost as well as a member of the legislature, the intensely difficult job of fitting outgo to income. I have been watching that process for almost a score of years.

I started writing this broadcast some 2 weeks ago. Rereading it, I find a misstatement. At the beginning, I said: "I have no selfish interest in this legislation; whatever the legislature does comes too late to help me or mine."

During the 2 weeks since I first put down those words, I have realized why I do have a selfish interest. I was brought up to repay all my debts, financial and otherwise. In 6 months, I have piled up an enormous debt, one most difficult to repay: Gratitude to surgeons and their skill with their hands; to doctors, technicians, to friends who offered me their blank checks, to the scientists I will never know whose research finally led to radioactive iodine, to whatever divine providence there be who provided me with the funds when the need was urgent. Those people who now wait at Houston for treatment—no one with cancer would wait if any other course were open to him, and I realize that except for the grace of God, we would be standing there with them waiting. So my selfish motive tonight is to rid myself of at least a part of the debt I owe.

"An Idea Whose Time Has Come"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Mrs. Eleanor B. Allen, member of the Board of Education, Los Angeles Schools, has written an article entitled "An Idea Whose Time Has Come." It is thoughtful and it plans community responsibility in our schools for sentiment of the heart as well as the mind. It is worthy of widespread distribution, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles School Journal of January 10, 1949]

"AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME"

(By Eleanor B. Allen, member, Board of Education, Los Angeles City Schools)

Victor Hugo: "Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come."

What is it that is arousing millions and setting them on the march? As totalitarian forces endeavor to shackle the democratic idea, freemen have become alerted the world over.

We are conscious, as never before, that the conflicts between individuals in the home and community and between groups on the national and international level have, through the ages, been a conflict of ideologies. On the community level, the results are broken homes and shattered relationships. On the international level, these conflicts result in wars, "cold" and "hot."

"Ideology" is a word we have had to learn to understand today as we learned in the thirties the meaning of totalitarianism. An ideology is ideas in action. It is that concept of a way of life which mobilizes men and nations. An ideology is to nations what faith is to an individual. It is a way of life which inspires a people and for which men will live and die.

Today, two basic ideologies are at war. They are called by various names: right versus wrong; principle versus self-interest; God-inspired democracy versus atheistic materialism. Each of us in our daily living, consciously or unconsciously, contributes to one of these ideologies.

We have witnessed the result of youth fired with an idea. Germany trained young Nazis willing to die for a doctrine of superrace and human slavery. Russia has produced a race fired with the doctrine of superclass which ends in slave camps. "Militant materialism," Lenin called the doctrine of communism. Youth, both inside and outside of Russia, trained in nondemocratic philosophy, live and fight and are ready to die for communism.

For what are democratic free nations of the world training their youth? Are we creating a passionate devotion to democratic principles in our young people? Are we making our youth pioneers of a great idea? Can we match the passion and plan of the totalitarian idea?

Free public education in America was established to perpetuate the idea of democracy. Public schools with compulsory attendance exist so that increasing numbers of individuals may have the opportunity to know and assume the duties that come with the privileges of a free society.

Education in a democracy must create and develop the type of citizen capable of bringing to a reality the idea of a government of free peoples, who, under God, can live together regardless of their color, creed, or class, in mutual benefit allowing each other equal privileges to pursue life, liberty, and happiness.

We have taught our children a great deal about democracy, but to have an ideology means ideas must be translated into action.

Individuals and groups of people have converged on public education demanding better cultural relations, greater world vision, increased human understanding or—to put it simply—people are demanding that we teach our children how to live together.

People are realizing that in an age of educational skills, human behavior and attitudes have not kept pace with scientific advance.

Education has done a matchless job of equipping us to make a living and surmount material obstacles. However, in so doing, without developing equally the intangible characteristics of unselfishness and neighborliness, we have played into the hands of the materialistic philosophy of "get."

Science has advanced to get us all the short cuts to easy living. (Even radio boasts a program of Easy Listening.) Science has advanced to get us things. Science has advanced to get us places quickly. Science has done its crowning best by getting us the split atom. Science has now got us a world we are afraid to live in.

We think it is the disintegrated atom we fear. What we really ought to fear is the disintegrated Adam. In a mad race to get things and places, education has not kept pace in getting us the kind of a whole, integrated, sane, moral, and unselfish Adam capable of handling the tools sharpened by science.

We must not minimize the fine character-building programs sincere educators have untiringly worked for. But, we do honestly face that their effectiveness has not outweighed or even balanced the materialistic side of education. Somewhere along the line, we have failed to make these high ideals real in the hearts of youth.

A program of learning is only real when it results in satisfactory behavior and attitudes. We have obviously been teaching the mind. Now, we are learning we must change the heart.

Materialism, which exists wherever there is self-interest in any of us, has been capturing the imagination of many unsuspecting educators. It has subtly and quietly deflected the true purpose of education from the idea of making a life in a democracy to making a living in a society where "everyone for himself and the devil take the hindmost" is a doctrine. Such a society must eventually create the police state to save us from each other.

An education system which fails to deal with what is dishonest, impure, and selfish in a child, leaves him not free to think or act, but a slave. He will be a slave to his own desires and self-interests. He is at the mercy of all propaganda because he will have no power of discrimination.

The age of free thinking and free self-expression, without developing spiritual convictions through education is gone. Our children have a right to be taught not only how to think but to be taught the moral and spiritual standards by which they are to measure what to think.

We must never teach our children what to think. But we can teach them the principles of a free society—honesty, unselfishness, neighborliness, moral cleanliness, and obedience to God—as guides for their thinking and actions.

Recently a high-school girl attended an "aud" call in her school. The young people themselves undertook the job of facing the problem of dishonesty in their school, and finding what to do about it. This girl was convicted of her own dishonesty as she listened. Encouraged by the other young people, she went to her girls' counselor. She returned a hall pass and absent excuse she had been given after bringing a note with her mother's signature which she had forged. The counselor reports this girl has become an outstanding leader in her class where up until that time she was the counselor's outstanding problem.

In another school two girls, arch enemies, whose leadership had divided their school into warring cliques, were in the same class in orientation. One day they stood up before the class, hand in hand, and said, "What we have been studying about together has made us see that our fight here in school is part of the trouble with the world, and if we want the world to be different we've got to start being different ourselves." The girls had decided to make up and the counselor reports an about-face in the girls' attitude.

Where democratic principles become real in the hearts of children we know the world will be different. Learning programs that reach the heart change them as well.

This is an area of education that we have failed to develop adequately until now. Previously, people believed it the prerogative of home and church. But today, the power of an idea taking hold in the minds of men, as they see their freedom threatened, has resulted in the upsurgence of a public demand that our schools change their direction and take responsibility for moral and spiritual training.

Our sound educators have long and patiently awaited this demand from the public, and this assurance of support from the home and community. They want to go to grips with the weaknesses of curricula which teach well the learning skills of the head and hands, but which leave the hearts of too many of our children selfish, greedy, calculating and unloving. A few teachers are pioneering and finding the secret of how to do this.

Democracy is coming into its great hour as educators, parents, and citizens begin to understand that democracy is not a political concept but a way of life. It is not a process of government in some far-off capital, but is a matter of how a citizen lives where he is.

Democracy depends not only on governmental structure, but on the structure of sound homes maintained by husbands and wives who are honest with each other and their children. Democracy lives not in signed documents and peace treaties, but it lives when individuals can work together in harmony and as a team in factories, offices, stores, and schools, trusting one another.

Democracy does not only depend on the honesty of men in office, but its very existence depends on whether sweaters and lunch boxes, pens and nickels can be found where they were last left, and whether John is willing to admit he cribbed in the exam and decides not to do it again.

Democracy doesn't depend on who is elected to Washington, but whether our children in school elect to be clean-living in their thoughts and actions. Democracy depends on the youth in our schools deciding that it's smart to apply in their own lives the faith in God that our great men and documents of history claimed for our Nation.

In some schools, a moment of devotion—when teachers and pupils bow their heads as God's blessing is invoked on the events of the day—has been lauded by teachers as one of the most enriching additions to the school experience. Quiet consideration of the plans for the day, and each child's responsibility in them, has promoted efficiency and friendly school spirit. In the NEA National Journal, the article entitled "When Children

Listen," reports that such procedures have eliminated cheating in an arithmetic class, and increased skills in others. Following one such occasion, a high-school boy was convicted by his conscience for taking money from his teacher's drawer. He returned it to her.

We have too long made democracy a thing of the head when in reality it must become a fighting faith of the heart.

The hour has come when we realize that education for freedom is not barren of religion and faith but is one with the rich spiritual depths of every-day living. We no longer bend the knee to the bigot and defer to the atheist. We realize that to deny our school children the teaching in their classroom that the will of God must be their will and His commandments their yardstick, is to open our Nation to the onslaught of human dictatorship and the rule of tyrants.

"Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come."

Building Armed Services Into a Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Building Armed Services Into a Team," by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BUILDING ARMED SERVICES INTO A TEAM

WASHINGTON.—One of the most asked and least answered questions in Washington is: How can the joint military chiefs be brought to function more as a team and less as a group of competing attorneys, each pleading for all he can get for his own service?

Before he resigned as Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal once remarked in conversation that under normal circumstances it would be reasonable to expect that it would take three or four generations of Joint Chiefs—that is, three or four sets of Joint Chiefs serving over a span of a dozen years—before the topmost leaders of the three services outgrew the limitations of one-service prejudice and one-service thinking and really began functioning as national defense chiefs, with a loyalty to the national defense establishment even greater than their loyalty to the three services which make up that establishment.

Mr. Forrestal is asking for a lot, but he is not asking for too much, and, furthermore, the Nation can't afford to wait for three or four generations of Joint Chiefs to bring this about. One adequate reason the Nation can't afford to wait is that we are not living in normal circumstances. We are simply not a normal world and certainly not a peaceful world. The need for a really integrated team of Joint Chiefs is so great that its development has got to be speeded up.

How? That's the question.

Now, since the present members of the Joint Chiefs are preeminently honest, competent, and patriotic men, it must be that there is something in the military system itself which makes breadth of view extremely difficult to attain. If this assumption is correct—and there is ample evidence that it is—then can't some steps be taken, where they will do the most good, to promote a national defense loyalty over and above a service loyalty?

The central problem is that from the moment a young man decides to begin training to be an officer in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, nearly everything conceivable is done to breed into him a one-service mentality and virtually nothing is done to train him to have the breadth and grasp and understanding and loyalty to a national defense concept, to a national defense team.

The result is that young officers are given a one-service indoctrination before they have even started at the bottom of their careers, and by the time they have reached the top it's almost too late.

No one questions that there is great merit in preserving service entity and service esprit de corps in the operation of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. While preserving separateness in operation, the need is to achieve real unification at the top and train young men at the bottom to the concept and to a loyalty as national defense officers.

How to do this?

1. Take the uniforms off the officers when they begin their service at the top as members of the Joint Chiefs. Appoint senior officers to the Joint Chiefs who are not the operating heads of the services and who, being ready for retirement after this highest service, will not be looking for service preferment in the future.

2. Don't put any uniform—unless it be a national defense uniform—on the officers-to-be during the period of training. Give all future officers the same basic technical and educational training at West Point, at Annapolis, and at a third military academy which would be necessary to produce sufficient officer material for the three services. Then turn over one-third of each of the graduating classes of the national defense academies to the Army, Navy, and Air Force—so far as possible in accordance with the choice of the graduates themselves.

Obviously there will be service leaders who will hold up their hands and scream bloody murder at these suggestions. Some Navy or Air Force partisans will say you have got to train a naval officer or an Air Force officer from the time he is out of rompers. This is buncombe, and I can give you highly placed military men who know and will say it is buncombe.

The need is to remove service pride and service prejudice from the top and from the bottom. The need is to unify at the level of combined strategy-making and to train future officers in the spirit of unification before they are put into the three services.

Frankly, these are not my ideas. They are ideas I have heard favorably discussed by military leaders who have achieved a rank of independence. It seems to me that they deserve to be more than just discussed. They deserve to be acted upon.

Assistance to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we all recognize that one of the most important challenges facing our Nation is securing justice and equity for our ex-servicemen.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement by Mr. Fraser S. Gardner, as published in the Army and Navy Union News.

Mr. Gardner is national legislative chairman of that organization and is an authority on veterans' affairs, having served as past national officer of major veterans' organizations in addition to having discussed veterans' affairs on the radio and elsewhere.

I believe that Mr. Gardner's comments will be of interest to my colleagues and to all American ex-servicemen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE LEGAL SIDE

(By Fraser S. Gardner)

There are 10,000,000 things a man in uniform can never forget—10,000,000 things he cannot discard along with his uniform. He could not explain these things to you in words of 2 or 10 syllables. They are the things that have changed him. They are the things which can separate him forever from you, unless you understand that even though he is home, without a uniform, he is still a soldier or sailor, and is different—and may be so forevermore.

Any man who has been in the armed forces of his country, whether or not he has suffered a wound, an injury, a disability, has undergone a basic change in his entire mode of living. He has been removed from all home and family responsibility. He has been responsible only to his superior officers. His law has been the law of war—to kill or be killed. To obey orders and to destroy the enemy. This has been his life and his purpose in life. It is a far cry from normal life and normal responsibility, such as we daily experience, and yet I firmly believe to the servicemen and veteran, home, wherever it is, is the most sacred spot in all the world. Home is where his thoughts and his love, his dreams, and hopes are centered. They came back again to take up life where they left it, and they expected to find things the same. For they thought of themselves as being still the same boys who went out from our homes, but they are not the same boys who were proudly waved away.

Since last they saw their homes they have seen a new world. They have visited lands of which some had never even heard, and have lived among people of strange customs and observed their cultures, studied their lives, and judged their views.

They have lived through lonely, tragic days and seen horrors, and experienced never-to-be-forgotten moments. They have seen men killed and some have killed men. They have come back to our homes, to our towns and our farms, to our shops, and offices, and they have brought to our smug communities a cosmopolitan outlook such as we have never known before.

They are not the same boys who went out from our homes and no amount of wishful thinking will make them so. Our boys have now become our men. Though they returned to the things of which they dreamed while they were away, they unconsciously expected some of those things to have kept pace with their own changed views. Having analyzed political attitudes from the vantage point of distance, they have dared to suggest changes.

They do not hesitate to see that their voice is heard in political issues. They have witnessed economic structures in many phases, and now are determined that the future shall be more wisely planned. After having experienced life on varied levels, they have formed new opinions of the social order.

They have come to grips with life and death and formed new estimates thereof. Although they came back to give all a chance, they are ready to reject that which does not satisfy them. These young men are the potential leaders of this country. They are the potential strength and backbone of the new world they fought for. That one simple truth we all must realize.

Rightly, our young veterans have expected jobs that would assure them financial stability, for, during the years they had been away, they had no opportunity to establish a home and to raise a family. While he was away, others were assured of the security of their homes and their jobs, by the very fact that he was fighting to protect them. After all, the men whose lot it was to be away in service had no more personal responsibility for the safeguarding of America than did those whose lot it was, for one reason or another, to remain at home. As to the disabled ex-member of the armed forces, we have heard much, and will hear more, about the various rehabilitation programs of the military and naval service, as well as the Veteran's Administration program in the same field. Thanks to the progress of medical science, blood plasma, penicillin, and sulfa, comparatively many more lives were saved in the just past war than in any war in history. The rehabilitation program of all Government sources takes care of the disabled men who came back, returning them to their homes in as normal a condition as their disabilities will permit. According to the War and Navy Departments, and the Veteran's Administration, the goal of their rehabilitation program is to restore the disabled individual, as far as possible, physically, mentally, and economically. And that takes more than just good medical treatment. Modern medical care and surgical skill may have saved the life of the soldier wounded in battle, but the obligation does not end there. To rehabilitate means to restore to a former rate, rank, state, or privilege.

That demands our going all the way. We must help the disabled veteran to overcome all mental hazards, as well as his physical handicaps and restore him to a full and useful life. Rehabilitation of the disabled veteran must be continued long after discharge by agencies equipped to serve, by family and friends, and by the public in general. They will be rather keyed up, in many cases, because they lived and led an insane kind of life, a life understood only by those who lived it. It is my firm belief the one thing, a big thing, these men will always welcome, probably more than anything else, will be to get hold of a broad, warm understanding hand, a hand that will actually help him make contact with things that are real and genuine, peace and quiet, communion with nature, security, independence, and a chance to create his own destiny. Nothing, no sense of pride or self-consciousness, or doubt, should make any of us hesitant or reluctant in our effort to understand the new veteran—the World War II Johnny who has come marching home.

It is indeed our duty to help him completely through the transition period, be it 10 days or 10 years, from an active fighting life to that of a dignified, proud, self-sustained, successful citizen. Remember, there are almost 150,000 veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals alone. This does not include the hundreds of cases of veterans not yet completely restored to the way of life they seek and deserve. Your understanding, in action, will be a total success if you understand that he expects to be treated in the same manner you would treat any other normal human being, just as you would be treated.

"When he comes back," was on the lips of millions who remained at home during the latest war. It was said in many languages by people of many lands, by mothers and fathers, by wives and sweethearts, by brothers and sisters, and by little children. It was the preface to millions of hopes. It entered the language of our prayers. It called up cherished pictures of the past. It set us to making plans. At the thought we should renew our promises, unspoken but hallowed by a thousand repetitions in our minds, to make real, and make stick, the home and peace and freedom and opportunity for which the veteran fought. Done with danger, horror, and fear, he will turn zestfully, with your understanding and mine, to school and friends or to his work and family and again find happiness and security. Tomorrow belongs to those who prepare for it today.

The Medway Plan for World Peace Through World Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Medway Plan," delivered by Rt. Rev. Joseph L. O'Brien, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Charleston, S. C., and director of education, diocese of Charleston, S. C., at the summer sessions at Misericordia College, Dallas, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEDWAY PLAN

(By Rt. Rev. Joseph L. O'Brien, S. T. D.; LL. D., director of education, diocese of Charleston, S. C.; founder and rector emeritus of the Bishop England High School; special lecturer (summer sessions) Misericordia College, Dallas, Pa.; pastor, Saint Patrick's Church, Charleston, S. C.)

Sweet, indeed, has been the incense rising, these years back, to heaven's gates, the incense of brotherly love manifested by the people of these United States to their brethren in the war-ravaged countries of Europe during the harrowing years we have been trying to find a road back to peace.

Many and various organizations have joined hearts and hands in swinging golden censers laden with prayers and gifts, and citizens of all ranks, men, women, and children have rejoiced greatly in the opportunities offered to bring some little comfort and cheer to their brethren overseas still living in the shadows of devastation and want. And all this is only the living up to the tribute paid to Americans by James Bryce in his great book, the American Commonwealth, published in 1888, wherein we read: "There is in the United States a sort of kindness, a sense of human fellowship, a recognition of the duty of mutual help owed by man to man, stronger than anywhere in the Old World."

Various plans of raising money and supplies for distribution among the needy were worked out and carried through in earnestness and enthusiasm under the leadership of great-hearted men and women bringing grace and blessings to the givers and comfort and solace to the recipients.

Of a truth, the American people have been father and mother, sister and brother to their fellow men in the earth-scorched lands of invasion and ruin.

Among these many relief plans, there is one, unique in its Christlike basis, in its manner of operation, in its personalized service, and in its simplicity of contact. It is the fruit of the labor and prayer of a big man with a big heart who was fortunate in finding a few friends to work with him and to guide him by their earnest cooperation and enthusiastic support, men who knew the European scene at first hand and who understood the depths of despair into which the souls of men had fallen.

This plan is known as the Medway plan, founded, organized, and developed by Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, Conn., and Charleston, S. C., a retired economist, who in the days of his retirement—which he could have rightly counted on as twilight days of easeful peace—has used his time and his energy and his means to bring about the biggest work of his long and useful career.

The Medway plan has passed the experimental stage. It has proved its worth. What Charleston, what Columbia, and other cities and towns in the South have done; what cities and towns in various other parts of the country have done prove the workability of the plan and its success in spreading the doctrine of brotherhood, a word that has gone out of fashion in the Old World—among the surviving victims of the whirlwind.

There is a spectre overshadowing Europe today—the spectre of communism—backed by the might and power of the U. S. S. R.

Communism will not be stayed or defeated by the atom bomb, or any other scientific weapon aborning in the minds of men. Communism, especially the European brand, takes root and thrives in the wake of decadent Christianity in lands once fair, now dunged with rotten death. Communism is naught but the evidence of the unfulfilled tasks of Christianity. Communism is hate, violent hate, and atheism, and bloody revolution. There is only one cure for violent hate; and that is ardent love. The Medway plan is a heart-warming exemplification of love, at once ardent and practical. Through the Medway plan, heart speaks to heart and loving hands reach out across the seas in open generosity.

From Flers-de-l'Orne, the town in France adopted by Charleston, S. C., Mr. Bennett has a letter which shows how love wins out in a hate-inspired conflict. Red Day in May was being celebrated in the town. The Communists gathered in one end of a park to celebrate the day in their manner. Another crowd gathered at a distance in another area. For Flers like all France has been a battleground in a cold war of ideas between French tradition and Soviet communism. Where the year before the town was about evenly divided in allegiance, on this day an audience of only 30 was gathered around the loud-speaker blaring the glories of communism. The traditionalists to the number of 2,500 attentively listened to their several speakers extol the virtues of free government and world peace; they heard how their brothers far across the sea, in Charleston, S. C., had sent them help in the name of democracy and of democracy's god. Love, brotherly love, was winning in the battle of ideas.

There are those who would make the United States the arsenal of democracy, and those who would make the United States the bread basket of democracy, and still others who would make the United States the banking house of democracy, and on such pillars they would build the battlements of the new unity of mankind. And there are those, and they of the Medway plan are of them, who would go beyond all that and make the United States the foster mother of world democracy, the international alma mater of a broken, hungry, naked, homeless, disillusioned, and dispirited world—the mother whose foster-children in adopted villages, towns, and cities the world over would learn through the personalized interest and brotherly touch of

their brothers and sisters in the United States the lessons of love needed to reestablish peace and good will again on earth.

Always and ever after a war the attempts to secure peace and good will among men and nations is carried on by those who fought for and controlled the destinies of the nations involved; by men who were weary and worn, old and tired, disillusioned and suspicious, and only lately at one another's throats. They set to work from no common ground of understanding, friendship, or love. History attests that all such efforts for lasting peace are foredoomed from the start to failure.

It is time for us to take the long view and start the search for peace early enough—with the children of the world; to give the children of the nations of the earth the opportunity of becoming friends, foster brothers and sisters of the cherishing mother of this broken world of ours—the United States of America. The friendship, knowledge, sympathetic interests and understanding begun now will grow in a few short years into such unbreakable bonds of brotherhood and love that there will be no room for war and conflict in their hearts and minds.

A vehicle is at hand to help the children of the world to reach into each other's hearts; to grow together—not apart; to come to understand each other; to promote that spiritual atmosphere in which, alone, true helpfulness, tolerance, friendship, and a firm determination to work together for human freedom everywhere can grow with any hope of a fruitful harvest,—through negotiation, not war. That vehicle is the program of action sponsored by the Medway plan, already adopted in some 60 American cities. Medway plan is not an agency or an organization. It is simply a mode of action already at hand for every American citizen to take to heart.

There are those who think we are now at the start of the next war cycle. The United Nations carries the world's hopes and prayers for world peace, implemented now by the North Atlantic Pact. Now is the hour for us all to start to condition the future makers and the keepers of peace by doing what never was tried before—the gathering of the children of all nations into one growing family under the one God of all men. Growing up in that one-world-family they will gradually learn the true meaning of human freedom and world peace. They will possess at maturity what we now lack. They will know what health, food, clothing, and shelter mean; they will understand how their world must find peace, love, faith, light, and joy. The children can start now as active partners in building their world of tomorrow. That is the new way, the only way to find the road to peace, for the children of today are the peacemakers of tomorrow. It has been said that there is a gate in every wall. May it now be true that the children of tomorrow will march through the gateway to world peace breeched through the wall of human stupidity by the good will developed in the world family by the foster children of mother America?

A children's crusade carried through with all the enthusiasm of youth under the guidance of men and women who still retain a spark of the enthusiasm and idealism of their own youth.

Is that ideal beyond our reach?

It can be done, if we have the will to do it. The children of today can be led along the highway of peace, if we of this confused generation set out resolutely to lead them. If every family with children in our grade and high schools would, through its own beloved young ones, get in touch with the children of other countries and take two or three of them into the family circle through letters and little gifts of basic needs; if this adoption was carried on and on in the continuity of family interest rather than in the spasmodic and sentimental way so characteristic of much of our effort at international altruism; if we canalized the potential power and love latent in the boys and girls in the schools of the areas devastated by the whirlwind of war, beyond all doubt we should eventually sow in the hearts and souls of the children now growing up in the war-ravaged countries the seeds of liberty and freedom, the foundations of the American ideal which is the heritage of our own boys and girls, and thereby we should be laying the foundations of world peace through world brotherhood.

"Every American who helps at least one European to understand America, her objectives, and her methods of achieving them, has made a personal contribution to the most vital cause of our time," says Andre Visson in his analysis of international misunderstanding in respect to the United States in his recent work, As Others See Us.

The most vital cause of our time, what is it? Visson continues: "To make Europeans realize—and incidentally confirm it to ourselves—that while America and western Europe frequently speak a different economic language and travel along different cultural roads, they are steadily moving toward the same political and even moral objectives. We must understand that what brings us together is our common belief in human dignity and in man's right to freedom."

Let us begin with the children. And the Medway plan did begin with the children and to date has 25,000 of them under its care and in touch with their foster brothers and sisters in the United States. The Medway plan has on hand now the names and addresses of 30,000 more youngsters in war-torn lands waiting for you and your friends and your friends' friends throughout our land of peace and prosperity to take them to heart, to stretch their hands to them, to take them into their family circles through correspondence carried on by our American boys and girls who will give them an intimate picture of the American belief in "human dignity and in man's right to freedom." The opportunity for this form of brotherly cooperation challenges us Americans today. It is our manifest destiny. For weal or for woe, history will irrevocably record our decision.

Atlantic Pact and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Atlantic Pact and the United Nations," by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

ATLANTIC PACT AND THE UNITED NATIONS

WASHINGTON.—Clark M. Eichelberger, than whom there is no stronger American supporter of the United Nations, does not view the North Atlantic security pact as injurious to the UN nor as out of keeping with it.

Writing in the Nation magazine, Mr. Eichelberger, who is director of the American Association for the United Nations, makes this useful appraisal of the relationship of the pact to the UN:

"The effect of the Atlantic Pact upon the United Nations will partly be determined by the arguments used in presenting it in the Senate. There will be universal support of the major objective of the pact—to give assurance to the nations of western Europe that if they are attacked, this country will not wait for a *Lusitania* or a Pearl Harbor.

"Such assurance, however, must not be given in a way to increase insecurity in the rest of the world, for that would weaken the security of the Western Hemisphere. On the other hand, if the pact is so defined and presented as to strengthen the security systems of the entire world, the security of western Europe will be doubly enhanced."

In effect, Mr. Eichelberger is saying that, in his judgment, the Atlantic Pact will be a source of strength to the UN if its signatories, in announcing that they will join in the common defense of the Atlantic community, are not thereby announcing that they intend to leave other independent nations undefended if attacked.

There are three developments which contribute an answer to Mr. Eichelberger's question:

The text of the proposed treaty, which was not available when Mr. Eichelberger wrote his article, shows that the 12 nations signing it explicitly reaffirmed their responsibilities under the Charter.

In his exposition of the pact, Secretary of State Acheson was careful to emphasize that neither the United States nor any of the signatories are reducing their obligations to come to the aid of an attacked country so far as the veto-laden Security Council permits them to do so.

For the United States, particularly, Mr. Acheson has publicly taken note of the possibility that America's special concern in the security of the North Atlantic area might be misinterpreted as implying a lessening of American interest in the security of countries in other areas. To this he replied:

"In the compact world of today, the security of the United States cannot be defined in terms of boundaries and frontiers. A serious threat to international peace and security anywhere in the world is a direct concern to this country. Therefore, it is our policy to help free peoples to maintain their integrity and independence not only in western Europe or the Americas but wherever the aid we are able to provide can be effective."

Some questions have been raised as to why the proposed treaty relates itself only to article 51 of the Charter and omits reference to the regional arrangements articles of the Charter despite the fact that the pact is described officially as a regional agreement.

The official explanation of the State Department is that article 51 makes express provision for individual and collective self-defense. Since the dominant purpose of the pact is individual and collective self-defense, its framers chose to rest it on that charter provision which most exactly describes its purpose.

The right to create the Atlantic security pact does not stem from the Charter. Self-defense is an inherent right of nations, and the Charter simply declares that nothing in its provisions shall impair this inherent right.

It is quite likely that there is a further incentive for not linking the Atlantic collective defense pact to the regional agreements chapter of the Charter. Here it is stipulated that the Security Council must be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements. What constitutes activities under

this clause never has been defined. If it means advising the council when consultation takes place among the Atlantic Pact members or when measures of defense must be taken, the signatories bind themselves to keep the council fully informed. But the Atlantic nations are not obligating themselves to inform any potential aggressor in advance what are its strategic plans for defense.

The pact is designed to increase stability in an unpeaceful world. To achieve that end will be to help create conditions under which the United Nations can function more effectively.

Chief Joseph Dam on Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made last week before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of sufficient funds for Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH.

(Testimony by Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, Senator from the State of Washington, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Capitol, April 1949, on the need of an appropriation in the amount of $21,375,000 for construction of Chief Joseph Dam during fiscal year 1950)

The continuing shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest represents a serious impediment to the expanding needs of the civilian economy and is a very serious handicap to production which is essential to national security.

The effect of this shortage will not only hamper and discourage industrial development but will also prevent full utilization of electrical conveniences in the home and on the farm.

During World War II, the Pacific Northwest expanded in industrial activity, bringing about an increase in population and small businesses which serve the people of the area. All these factors increased the demand for electric power. It was expected that this demand would drop sharply after termination of hostilities, because of curtailment of operations designed to further the war effort. However, such has not been the case.

Except for a brief decline after World War II, there has been a steady growth in power demand since 1935. During this period commercial energy requirements increased from 558,800,000 kilowatt hours in 1935 to 1,639,973,000 kilowatt hours in 1946. Energy requirements of rural and residential customers increased in even larger percentages over the same period from 743,579,000 to 3,151,776,000 kilowatt hours. The demand for power generation had increased to 2,988,000 kilowatts in 1946 and in 1947 reached a figure of 3,647,000 kilowatts.

In December 1948, the peak month, nearly 200,000 kilowatts of peak loads could not be met. Assuming a normal growth in population and industrial activity, it is conservatively estimated that 4,500,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity will be needed by 1960.

In addition to the commercial and domestic aspects, there is also the national defense side of the picture.

Aluminum is one of the materials that would be needed in large quantities in case of an emergency. At the present time, aluminum is being produced at four times the prewar rate, and still falls short of total demands for the product. Of a total of approximately 600,000 tons of pig and ingot aluminum produced in 1948, about 280,000 tons came from plants in the Pacific Northwest. The output cannot be increased and, at the same time, a price close to the present market maintained because of lack of low-cost electrical energy. Any increase in price will be felt in the national-defense program, particularly in the cost of a 70-group air force.

The Munitions Board and the National Security Resources Board have concluded that the best solution to the problem is to expedite construction of power projects in the Columbia River Basin where the power potential is enormous.

One of the most outstanding of these projects is the Chief Joseph Dam, located on the Columbia River about 50 miles below Grand Coulee. An initial capacity of 960,000 kilowatts is planned, with provision for expansion of the powerhouse to 1,600,000 kilowatts, if and when required. The project is particularly attractive in that there are no irrigable lands to be inundated by its pool, nor is there any fish-passing problem. Plans already are being laid to use Chief Joseph power, mostly secondary power, for irrigation purposes. Thousands of acres of land can be irrigated in the area as far south as Wenatchee, where rich soil awaits only water pumped from the Columbia and Wenatchee Rivers. The water would be pumped directly to the land.

Being immediately downstream from Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph will produce substantial reregulating benefits. Grand Coulee should be operated on a relatively low load factor in order to make maximum use of its installed generating capacity and large water storage. Without the Chief Joseph Reservoir to reregulate the Grand Coulee releases, low-load-factor operation will create large waves in the river which might do extensive damage at downstream points.

The President's budget for some unknown reason only included $5,000,000 for initiation of construction of the Chief Joseph Dam project during the fiscal year 1950.

This amount will permit only minor operations to be commenced. With this sum and adequate appropriations in subsequent years, 192,000 kilowatts of power can be placed on the line in December 1956. This date is 1 year later than that which the Bonneville Power Administration estimates power from this project should be available to be of greatest assistance in alleviating the power shortage. After 1956, the present program of the Corps of Engineers contemplates placing there three generators, each with 64,000 kilowatts capacity, on the line each year until a total of 960,000 kilowatts has been installed.

In order to meet the Bonneville Power Administration schedule date of December 1955, an appropriation of $21,375,000 will be needed in fiscal year 1950.

This would permit award of a contract for a substantial amount of work on the dam itself, in addition to the minor operations, such as access roads, temporary housing for construction employees, and land acquisition, which would be accomplished with the $5,000,000 recommended by the President. The Munitions Board, the National Security Resources Board, the Secretary of the Interior, the Bonneville Power Administration, and private power interests in the area all recommend an immediate start on this project.

The availability of a large block of power from Chief Joseph Dam in December 1955 will be of immense value in alleviating the shortage of electrical energy.

It has been estimated that a delay of 1 year on Chief Joseph Dam might possibly prolong the shortage for at least 2 years more.

In view of the retarding effect of prolonging the existing power shortage on industry, national defense, and the needs of the general public, I recommend that the Corps of Engineers be provided with funds in the amount of $21,375,000 for fiscal year 1950 for application to the expeditious construction of the Chief Joseph Dam.

Before concluding my testimony, it may interest my colleagues to know that this potentially great multiple-use dam, which will be more than 200 feet high and 1,628 feet long, is named for the most famous Indian chief in the history of the Pacific Northwest and one of the greatest in American history.

American Army officers often have termed Chief Joseph the "Indian Napoleon."

World Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview of the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] by commentator Ed Hart, on the subject World Peace? on April 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Ed Hart speaking from Washington. Peace, Eastertime, cold war, fifteen billion military budget—peace, Eastertime. Throughout the ages man has been seeking a formula for peace. Yet, in a little over a generation 50,000,000 people have been slaughtered. We've seen a League of Nations die, to be replaced by a frail United Nations. Were our hopes born only to die again? Is there any formula for peace?

To discuss the subject our guest is Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. Though diminutive in size, she is anything but that in charm and considered judgment. Why is it, Senator SMITH, that man can build atomic bombs and $165,000,000 airplane carriers, but he can't seem to erect a firm foundation for peace?

Senator SMITH. It seems to me that technologically we are several hundred years ahead of ourselves socially, morally, and even spiritually. Our human progress has just not kept up with the pace of our machine progress. Science has run ahead of our hearts.

Mr. HART. Well, are there any practical steps that we can take to catch up with ourselves—so that we might permit ourselves to live a little longer?

Senator SMITH. This is an era of challenge, Mr. Hart. It is a time for soul searching—a time for self-appraisal and a time for hard, earnest thinking. The hopes and threats created by the atomic bomb call for action.

1. A long-term course directed toward the establishment of world government.

2. An intermediate course directed toward the support of the United Nations.

3. A short-term course directed toward the use of diplomacy, public and private, for the easing and reduction of international tensions.

Mr. HART. You mention world government first. Isn't that a bit impractical at this stage of world history?

Senator SMITH. Well, to be realistic, we must recognize the fact that world government requires as its foundation a moral and psychological sense of world community, and that foundation does not presently exist. To impose or to negotiate a world government under existing conditions of prejudice and hate would do nothing more than set the stage for world civil war. Our minds and hearts are not yet prepared for a world of law, justice, and mercy.

Mr. HART. Is that why the United Nations doesn't seem to be doing so well?

Senator SMITH. Give it time. After all, the United Nations is a living symbol of world association and cooperation.

Mr. HART. Cooperation? There are some discordant tones emanating from Lake Success fairly frequently.

Senator SMITH. Yes, Mr. Hart; but at Lake Success we do have a forum where all nations can engage in even the bitterest of arguments and thrash out their differences through practical compromise—rather than resort to war.

Mr. HART. Who knows, Senator SMITH, maybe someone would veto war.

Senator SMITH, here in Washington we recently witnessed the signing of the Atlantic Pact by a host of foreign ministers—a military defense pact. Harold Stassen has suggested an Asiatic pact. In your opinion, are these military pacts definite steps on the road to world peace?

Senator SMITH. I regret that they are necessary in today's world—but not tomorrow's world. They are at best only stopgaps on the way to peace—like UNRRA and ECA have been. One is lifesaving, one is military, but both are necessary.

The broad objectives of peaceful living cannot be accomplished by diplomatic and governmental contacts working alone. They must be supported by the establishment of relationships among individuals and among their cultural and commercial organizations which must provide the means of reconstruction, economic security, and improvement in the material standard of life.

Mr. HART. Former French Prime Minister Herriot once pointed out to me the tremendous cost of peace. Do you think that the average American, Englishman, Frenchman, or Russian, realizes that peace has a price tag? That peace, like war, costs something?—and do you think that the average citizen of any great nation is prepared spiritually and mentally to pay that price?

Senator SMITH. Peace does have a cost, Mr. Hart. Like anything of value the price is high. It involves individual and national sacrifice—not appeasement, sacrifice—by every great nation and by every individual that lives in those great nations.

But seldom do we make sacrifices for strangers. We cannot know our neighbors by locking the doors of our houses and barring them from our homes.

Mr. HART. You're asking us, Mrs. SMITH, to give up some preconceived notions. What a sacrifice.

Senator SMITH. Yes, but there is too much hate between races, creeds, and colors, and even inside the groups themselves. The moral and psychological basis for world peace does not yet exist even here at home. There must be a profound change in human attitudes if we are to succeed in establishing a just and durable peace. No longer can we afford the luxury of private indulgence in hatred, prejudice, and contempt for other human beings. If the preparation of the necessary moral and psychological basis for world peace seems impossible, then world peace itself is impossible.

Mr. HART. Mrs. SMITH, aren't you asking that we abandon our prejudices—and even our hatreds? Mrs. SMITH, that price is too much.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Hart, we need the fearlessness to lay aside our comfortable old prejudices. We need the tolerance to let others live by their lights as we try to live by ours. We need to stop living by fear.

Mr. HART. But it is said, Mrs. SMITH, the Russians just won't let us do that—that you just can't do business with Stalin.

Senator SMITH. I admit the job seems insurmountable. Maybe it is insurmountable. But I'm not so sure that we have exhausted all explorations. You know, Mr. Hart, you never accomplish anything if at the outset you say it can't be done. We in Maine don't make friends of our neighbors by harsh name calling or throwing brickbats at each other.

Mr. HART. Do you think it's worth while doing some more tedious exploring?

Senator SMITH. I do if we could just find some common ground to begin with—perhaps seemingly insignificant common ground, and then work hard from there.

Mr. HART. Mrs. SMITH, do you feel that women are meeting their responsibilities in the matter of war or peace?

Senator SMITH. I must admit that they are not, Mr. Hart. There aren't enough in public life. Generally speaking, they lack interest and aggressiveness—the necessary ingredients of leadership. They cannot become leaders of the world until they become leaders within their own nation. It is regrettable that so few women have been chosen to participate in the United Nations. It is amazing when one realizes that women constitute at least one-half of the world's population.

Mr. HART. You, speaking as a woman and a leader, have said publicly that "We need to stop living by fear." What concrete steps might be taken by women to keep the world from living by fear?

Senator SMITH. Wars are man-made. Peace could be woman-made. But the blunt truth is that women have merely echoed the same fears of men who make war. I just have a notion—maybe it's a woman's hunch—that were there a half dozen outstanding American women—women versed in world affairs—to sit down with a similar group of women from France, England—and, yes, even Russia—to discuss means of attaining world peace—that they could get somewhere. They might avoid the seemingly dangerous impass that men have created to the moment.

Mr. HART. Maybe, Senator SMITH, you've started something. Perhaps you've hit upon an idea that is well worth exploring—and yes, even carrying out.

Senator SMITH. It seems to me that the women of each major nation could select representatives to a women's world group that would meet, say in Paris or Geneva——

Mr. HART. And that they hold a world peace conference of their own——

Senator SMITH. Yes; the agenda would be to determine specific ways and means of moving in the direction of world peace.

Mr. HART. Mrs. SMITH, without appearing too skeptical, would they produce more than the pious platitudes of men—platitudes from alleged statesmen that we have heard so frequently in the not too distant past; platitudes immersed in hypocrisy?

Senator SMITH. Well, I don't know, Mr. Hart. But the men have been given their chance, why not let the women have theirs? At least it's worth a try, for were it to do nothing else it would bring to the women as never before an awareness of their own individual responsibility in this matter of avoiding war and securing peace, of halting world suicide and making peace a reality instead of just a hope.

Mr. HART. Mrs. SMITH, if I were a Senator, I would offer a resolution. Thank you, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. If more women, yes, if more men thought as clearly about war and peace as you, ours would be a better world.

This is Ed Hart saying good-by from Washington.

What Lewis and Clark Could Not Have Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening study on the place of the Middle Border in the growth of our country.

WHAT LEWIS AND CLARK COULD NOT HAVE KNOWN

A SURVEY OF MIDDLE BORDER REGIONALISM

Many definitions have been given for the middle border region since the late Hamlin Garland furnished the name to be applied to that part of the country. All are to some degree inaccurate since it is impossible to settle regional boundaries as we would that of a particular State. The heart of the middle border consists of the three States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska in their entirety, with an eastern and western half-circle drawn around them having within its limits portions of western Minnesota and Iowa, and eastern Montana and Wyoming. It is the upper Great Plains region—an area surrounding the greater portion of the Missouri River. The particular historical stage of cultural development should enter into our definition and in keeping with this, perhaps the best definition that can be made of the middle border, or of any region, for that matter, is that it is a state of mind, or, better still, a way of life.

With the historical evidence available to us we cannot be at all certain as to just who the first white men were who traveled over these plains. We do know that such French explorers as the Verendrye brothers, Francois, and Louis-Joseph, and Jean Baptiste Truteau explored this region before it passed into the hands of the American people through the Louisiana Purchase. It remained, however, for the governmental exploring team of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, with a small group of 43 men, to furnish us with the first descriptions of the area to prove of value. Between the years 1804–06 these intrepid explorers, following the natural waterway of the Missouri, bisected the middle border and came into contact with many of the Indians then inhabiting the region. Even a hasty perusual of their journals will make evident the fact that the dryness of the country made an impression upon them. The word "treeless" was often set down, and they seemed to feel that much of the soil was sterile. They did avoid the use of a word which was later mistakingly applied to the region because it was new to the experience of Americans—the word "desert." They aften mentioned the wind and culturally speaking were annoyed by the music of the Sioux.

The pathway which Lewis and Clark blazed was followed in the years to come by thousands. The beginning trickles of mountain

men up this river is one of the most glamorous and intriguing historical events in frontier history. Manuel Lisa and the leader of the Astorians, Walter Price Hunt, were in the field within several years of the Lewis and Clark expedition. They were followed by Ashley's men, including the neglected but justly outstanding Jedediah Strong Smith. And what American studying the fur traders has not thrilled to the story of Hugh Glass and his struggle with the grizzly in Dakota in 1823?

Close upon the footsteps of these early traders came a group of frontier artists who followed the path of the Missouri across the prairies and brought to the region its first tradition of formal art—an art that has developed into something distinctly the middle border's own. The first to arrive was George Catlin, who traveled up the "Old Muddy" in 1832 on the now famous steamboat *Yellowstone,* which had made the first steamboat trip to the upper Missouri the year before. Catlin visited extensively at Fort Pierre, Fort Union, and Fort Clark. The following year the young Swiss painter, Charles Bodmer, accompanying the distinguished scientific naturalist, Prince Maximilian, of Wied-Neuwied, painted many scenes around Fort Pierre and Fort Union. Rudolph Kurz, another Swiss, painted on the middle border in the forties. "Near-sighted and speaking with a German accent, he was referred to as 'the Dutchman' because he was more interested in painting Indians than in cheating them out of their furs." [1] Charles Wimar, youngest of the first generation of Indian painters, and perhaps the most accurate, made at least three trips up the Missouri in the early fifties before his tragic death at the age of 34. John James Audubon, the great naturalist, spent some time at Fort Pierre and Fort Union in 1843 painting many of his famous bird studies. In later years came Edwin Willard Deming, who is said to have been able to paint "what the Indians thought but did not tell in the days before they lost their heritage." And finally, one cannot overlook the justly world-famous Frederic Remington nor the cowboy artist Charlie Russell. These art beginnings have been followed down to the present with the works of such famous native sons of the middle border as Harvey Dunn, Levon West, and Charles Hargens, while those of other westerners, Nancy Coonsman Hahn, Ben Albert Benson, and Grant Wood, have found a place for themselves in the Friends of the Middle Border Art Gallery.

Although it is necessary, in order to have a better idea of this region, to discuss the main points in its history, it will not prove possible to enumerate in any detail the points of resistance of the Sioux Nation to white pressure and their eventual defeat and placement within the reservation system. This drive was, however, unique in the history of the United States. Before it had been a matter of pushing the Indian farther west. Such was not the case here. The bypassing of the rich, although seemingly barren prairie lands, for the more familiar habitat of the west coast meant that this region when it could eventually be settled would be done by an advancing tide of miners and cattlemen from the West, and with an ever greater number of immigrant farmers pushing out over the Mississippi River from the East. The middle border was truly America's last great frontier.

The prairie country whether approached from the East or the West offered such a violent contrast to the land previously conquered as to bring about marked changes in the manner of pioneering and of living. There was nothing in the experience of the frontiersmen to guide them as they crossed the Mississippi onto the Great Plains. Thus the middle border could not be conquered until new techniques were developed to overcome the lack of trees and the semiarid character of the land.[2]

Railroads were necessary as an adequate network of rivers for transportation was lacking. Materials for homes were nonexistent until the homesteader turned to the natural soil and erected his sod houses. The farming frontier could only advance at the expense of the cattle frontier and this meant fencing. The wooden fences of the East were impossible. In 1870 it was estimated by the Government that it would cost as much as $8 an acre to fence in land in Texas. And even then the dryness of the atmosphere gave them a life expectancy of only 10 years. In 1873 the way was made clear by the invention of the two-strand barbwire fence by Joseph Glidden in De Kalb, Ill. Water was essential, and, since springs were too few and too muddy, the pioneers had to wait for well-driving or well-digging equipment. Here the curse of the country—the ever-present wind—proved a blessing, for windmills, though relatively expensive, could be used.

And finally settlement had to await adequate farm machinery. Farming on the middle border was extensive, not intensive, with a short harvest season; and improved farm machinery was necessary. Iron plowshares proved too brittle for the tough prairie sod. In 1868 James Oliver came along with the answer—the chilled steel plow. The farmer had to be mounted and in the early seventies the sulky plow was introduced, followed in the middle seventies by the gang plow. The McCormick reaper, while better than a cradle scythe, was still too slow for the plains and a mechanical tying device was needed. In 1873 the first improvement was made with the wire binder, but since the wire had to be removed before threshing it remained for the twine binder in 1878 to solve the problem. The header came in the late seventies, while the combine did not reach the plains until the nineties.

Even then man had to reckon with the caprices of nature. Prairie fires, grasshopper visitations, drought, blizzards, and the bleak monotony of the barren landscape took their toll. This vast, undulating prairie, which writers have likened to the sea, made a definite though hard to define impression upon the souls of the people who inhabited it. Can anyone having read Ole Rolvaag's epic Giants in the Earth, ever forget Beret Hansa's pathetic outcry upon first seeing the country? "Why there isn't even a thing that one can hide behind."[3] This was no easily conquered region and as much as it thrilled and attracted some so it also repelled many a sensitive woman. It took time to adjust; and the loneliness, the howling of the wind, and the unbroken expanse of level land as far as the eye could reach proved a maddening thing to combat. Moreover, the average woman who had been used to an immaculate house never felt at home in a hole in the ground or in a home made of dirt above the surface, and it was not easy to get used to the lack of trees, of shrubbery, of flowers. It has left its mark upon all.

One of the most prized possessions of Friends of the Middle Border is a magnificent painting by Dakota-born Harvey Dunn, called Dakota Woman. It is the sort of painting that comes from the very soul of the region. The women who homesteaded Dakota Territory, were long on work and short on culture as we know it, but they would have understood what Harvey Dunn was trying to say in this painting. The finest word description of it is by Elmo Scott Watson, who says: "I think you sense the real greatness of these people when you gaze upon Harvey Dunn's Dakota Woman. For here is symbolized the American pioneer spirit—the courage to face every danger in the westward push across the continent, the cheerful endurance of hardship and privation, the resilience and never-say-die quality which rose above every reverse and every disaster and kept alive hope for a better day tomorrow. Dakota Woman is a tired woman, a woman worn with the unceasing toil and monotony of her drab life. But she is not a beaten woman. Her chin is up. Oblivious to the bleak and barren prairies that stretch endlessly before her, she gazes into the distance and sees there a future for her child that will be a better life than she has ever known.[4]

Perhaps too sad, too gloomy a picture of life on the middle-border frontier has been painted. For those who seek it, and especially for those who were born there, there is a beauty that is as great as any that can be shown in the East. As Theodore Blegen has phrased it [5]—the blood-red sunsets, rain that leaves the prairie fresh with the promise of growth, winds that turn fields of broad-bladed wheat into billowing seas, the sight of prairie flowers, the sound of meadowlarks. And then there are our beloved Black Hills—the sacred mountains of the Sioux—that mountain cluster on the western side of the Bad Lands that is loved so much, perhaps because the rest of the land is so level and so treeless.

This regional approach not only to history, but to all of the social sciences is becoming more significant in modern life. Each region has a history of its own, a distinct way of life determined by the character both of its inhabitants and of its physical environment. Each of these regions within these United States is different from the rest. All of them together produce something different from that of Europe. The influence of geography is not all important but it is so important that when you take the easterner, and the immigrant from Scandinavia, and from Germany, and the Russian Ukraine and place them out on the prairies, despite the influence of their old environment they will become distinct members of middle-border society. Today we have a middle border which taken together with that of the other regions goes to make up a distinctive American culture. Each region has made its contribution to the whole. Or as Stanley Pargellis has phrased it, "True patriotism springs from the soil and the streets where a man lives, from the rocks and the rills he knows. If that local affection is wanting, the larger national affection, in any sense which is real and lasting, must be wanting, too." [6]

Mitchell, S. Dak., is located within the middle-border region near the Jim and Missouri rivers, on one of the main highways from the East to the Black Hills, Yellowstone, and the far West. It is in many ways a gateway to the West. In 1939, a group of men devoted to the American dream of creative self-development, gathered in Mitchell to found friends of the middle border. Among this group was the late Hamlin Garland, then dean of American Letters, a man who could remember his own youth on a Dakota homestead; the western novelist, Stewart Edward White, who started his career in the Black Hills; James Truslow Adams, the famous American historian; Paul Harris, founder of Rotary International; John Dewey, American philosopher of pragmatism; Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota; Leland Case, editor of the Rotarian magazine; Gutzon Borglum, sculptor of the Rushmore Memo-

[1] James A. Van Kirk, Middle Border Bulletin, IV (autumn 1944), 4.

[2] Much of the following information comes from Walter Prescott Webb, The Great Plains (Boston 1931).

[3] O. E. Rolvaag, Giants in the Earth (New York 1927), 29.

[4] Elmo Scott Watson, editorial, Middle Border Bulletin, II (winter 1943), 2.

[5] Theodore C. Blegen, Norwegian Migration to America, II (Northfield, Minn., 1940), 509.

[6] Stanley Pargellis, Newberry Library Bulletin, I (November 1944), 8.

rial; Clinton Anderson, Dakota-born former Secretary of Agriculture, now United States Senator from New Mexico, and many local friends.

Since then, within the framework set up by these men, there has been assembled visual evidences of the historical and cultural development of the region. The most unique development has been that of the art gallery. It is now the only one within the States of Montana and North and South Dakota. Representative works from the artists already mentioned have been gathered, as well as such collections as one showing the design and beauty of native Sioux beaded work. The gallery's scope and significance has been greatly enhanced by the result of a letter from James Truslow Adams to fellow members of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. It said in part: "The movement came straight out of the grass roots in the good old American fashion * * * the growth has been vigorous and indicates that both the movement and need are vital." [7] The amount of color and romance that such exhibits can bring into the lives of people—most of whom have never seen an art gallery is extremely important. And it is impossible to measure its effect upon the lives of the children, who have never seen a good picture or statue, and who suddenly realize that this culture is a part of their own heritage—not just a European or eastern importation.

A great deal of research is going into the rediscovery of the musical heritage of the region. Songs of the Sioux, folk songs of the Canadian voyageur; barrack-room ballads of soldiers stationed up and down the Missouri in frontier forts; the folk songs of the homesteaders; the songs the cowboys sang to their cattle; religious and secular songs of the German and Norwegian immigrant; as well as the more modern compositions of such composers as Clarence Loomis, distinguished for his operas and harmonizations of Stephen Foster's melodies.

The library is being set up so that it will lend itself to the person attempting to do research. The idea being the preservation of books for use. The museum includes such long-range plans as a "Middle Border Village" with a Sioux encampment nearby. Also contemplated is a memorial chapel in honor of Jedediah Smith and "Preacher" Smith, two notable religious figures in the early history of the West.

The concept behind the Friends of the Middle Border that "from what we have we make what we want," is at its most fruitful if it can be brought to bear upon the lives of our youth—the so-called growing edge of society. This attempt to make the institute a constantly growing medium in the lives of the people will be expanded in the future to enter the classrooms of not only the colleges of the region but down through the secondary and primary levels as well. The motto, "What is past is prologue," is being brought to bear upon the entire spiritual and cultural heritage of the area.

An independent nonprofit organization, the Friends of the Middle Border has been content over the past 10 years to grow steadily, building up its collections, expanding its contacts. Events of the past few months have drastically changed this picture and made possible the great expansion of the future. James Earle Fraser, the distinguished sculptor, whose statue The End of the Trail has thrilled all, has been interested in the work of the FMB from an early date. Many of the experiences he had as a boy at Mitchell helped to inspire his statues as well as the "buffalo nickel" which he designed.

Now he is so thrilled at the work that is being done that he has agreed to place in the gallery the 16-inch original of The End of the Trail, that he is doing for the Metropolitan Art Museum. Nor is this all, as he has also volunteered to place a number of plaster casts of his famous statues in the art gallery. A recent letter mentioned one of Meriwether Lewis: "A standing figure which was done from my memory of a trapper who stood at the top of a mill dam on the Jim River. The mill was east of Mitchell. * * * I think it is one of my best works." [8]

Harvey Dunn, a native South Dakotan, and one of the foremost illustrators in America today, has made the magnificent offer of giving to the Friends of the Middle Border a representative collection of his paintings as soon as a building is erected to exhibit them in.

In the face of these truly outstanding gifts, those of Fraser's and Dunn's will make it one of the most important regional collections in America, the friends of the organization have launched a financial campaign of $30,000 so that the first unit of the proposed building will be up by spring, in time for the tourist trade. An important factor is that due to the small admission fee that will be charged tourists, the institute should be self-supporting from the start.

Thus we have an organization growing upon the middle border that is truly amazing not only in its concept of its responsibility to the people of that region but in its attempt to take what is available and by using the resources of the American pioneer to grow from there. It seeks to enrich and guide the cultural pattern within the lives of the people of the region by making them aware of their own cultural past and by encouraging them to cultivate their own peculiar regional talents. It will point the way of life for our people, serving them for their own particular needs, molding their ideals, perpetuating their dreams and aspirations, thereby creating, forming, and developing a middle-border type. It seeks to correct a serious psychological condition common to second- and third-generation descendants of pioneers in a country not favored economically. It is the green-pasture complex. A feeling that since the Indians and the soil have been subdued, one must go elsewhere for the thrill of achievement.

It will try to maintain within the lives of the sons and daughters of the middle-border pioneers the solid virtues hammered into a pattern of conduct by the natural forces of the region, so that the self-reliance, the neighborliness, the fortitude, the courage of the frontiersman may continue to be turned to the further uses of American society within the framework of a world society.

As Elmo Scott Watson has phrased it: "There Americans of all classes and creeds will come and find a fountain of inspiration from which to refresh their faith in their heritage." [9]

ROBERT PENNINGTON,
Executive Secretary, Friends of the Middle Border.
MITCHELL, S. DAK.

[7] James Truslow Adams, Middle Border Bulletin, III (winter 1944), 1.

[8] James Earle Fraser to writer, February 21, 1949.

[9] Watson, op. cit., 2.

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keep Taft-Hartley Gains in Labor Law Revision," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP TAFT-HARTLEY GAINS IN LABOR LAW REVISION

When it returns to Washington after the Easter recess, the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to write a sane and sensible labor law, and help end the uncertainty in the ranks of both labor and management about the future regulation of their relations with one another.

Action on this question is long overdue, whether the Taft-Hartley Act is retained in substance, or modifications are voted. Until the question of revision is decided, bargaining over labor relations will be hindered by the possibility of a sudden and important change in the rules.

Experience under the Taft-Hartley law during the past 2 years has indicated that some changes are desirable. But it has by no means borne out the contention of the administration that the entire law should be scrapped, and labor relations returned to the unfair and uneven conditions prevailing under the old Wagner Act.

Instead of the administration bill, which amounts to a slightly watered-down Wagner Act, the House would do well to use as a basis for discussion the measures offered last week by Representative JOHN S. WOOD. While seeking to get rid of some of the cumbersome provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, this bill would retain many of the protections for both sides embodied in the present law.

The Wood measure would keep the weapon of injunctions against national emergency strikes. It would keep the anti-Communist affidavit, and extend its requirement to employers. It would keep an independent conciliation service. All these have proven beneficial in the past, and all would be thrown out if the administration measure is enacted.

The American people are not so much interested in extremist campaign slogans as they are in a just labor law which will permit uninterrupted employment and production. Abuses of power by some labor leaders led to passage of the Taft-Hartley bill, and those abuses could be revived if the law is discarded.

Progress in stable labor relations should be Congress' goal. It does not lie in turning the clock back in labor legislation, but in recognizing the demonstrated benefits of the Taft-Hartley law, and acting to get rid of its shortcomings.

The Dutch-Indonesian Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a letter regarding United Nations action in the Dutch-Indonesian controversy, sent by 25 Senators to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Senate has amended the Economic Cooperation Administration Act to provide that assistance shall not be given to any state "against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

In the debate preceding the passage of this amendment it was the overwhelming expression of the Senate that the Netherlands Government has acted improperly and against the interests of world peace and security in the employment of military force in Indonesia and in the consistent refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions calling for cessation of hostilities and other steps for peaceful settlement of the dispute in Indonesia.

In view of these facts, we, the undersigned Members of the Senate, respectfully urge that you direct the Secretary of State and the United States delegation to the United Nations to take immediately those steps necessary to assure United Nations enforcement of its resolutions pertaining to the Dutch-Indonesian conflict.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, GEORGE W. MALONE, OWEN BREWSTER, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, IRVING M. IVES, KENNETH S. WHERRY, ZALES N. ECTON, HUGH BUTLER, STYLES BRIDGES, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, HARRY P. CAIN, CHARLES W. TOBEY, WILLIAM E. JENNER, HOMER E. CAPEHART, WAYNE MORSE, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, GEORGE D. AIKEN, WILLIAM LANGER, EDWARD J. THYE, RALPH E. FLANDERS, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, GUY CORDON, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Public Gags on Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 11, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the location of a second crossing of San Francisco Bay is still acute.

The following editorial from the Observer of April 2, 1949, a weekly newspaper published in Oakland, is pertinent to the issue.

The Observer occupies a niche in the life of the East Bay section that is best evidenced by the fact that it will soon be 40 years old. It is an independent paper that I have always found fair and hard-hitting.

PUBLIC GAGS ON PROPAGANDA

The flagrancy with which the California toll-bridge authority has jammed its recommendation for a twin bridge down the public throat has at last aroused sufficient indignation to instigate further investigation into the whys and wherefores of their determined action.

The rank and file of citizens have never had an opportunity to evaluate impartially the two types of crossing. From the first, Alameda County residents have had their information biased and the working models of the bridges as presented by the State were rigged for the benefit of the State's favored crossing. Two incidents this last week have inflamed civic associations and citizens—who resent being used as dupes for selfish interests—to a white heat. At the opening of the so-called public hearing of the State toll-bridge authority held in Sacramento last week newsmen were handed mimeographed releases of the recommendation that would be made. That this release was prepared well in advance of the hearing and newsmen were requested not to make it public until the meeting was adjourned, is typical of the high-handed methods that have been used for the last 3 years by the State authority.

Action taken by Senator KNOWLAND and Congressman JOHN ALLEN in Washington the following morning requesting that a permanent right-of-way be granted across Yerba Buena Island is indicative of their certainty of the results. These proposals were put before both Houses despite the fact that three local Congressmen—MILLER, WELCH, and HAVENNER—have asked Army, Navy, and defense offices to make a further investigation of local conditions.

These, as well as many other incidents, have whipped up active resentment to the public-be-damned attitude, so that now civic associations have requested an inquiry be made into the ulterior motive behind the twin span. The last-minute switch that was made by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce favoring the parallel span was almost as much of a surprise as the spineless backing down of Alameda City officials, Times Star, and chamber of commerce. That influences invisible to the naked eye were boring into these, as well as many other, groups, is an obvious conclusion. The construction of the next crossing to San Francisco Bay has vital bearing on the economic and physical well-being of nearly 2,000,000 people—these factors must not be disregarded by the machinations of selfish interests. It is our belief that further investigation, which will be made by the committee appointed at the request of Assemblyman Dolwig, of San Francisco, the newly aroused interest of Assemblyman Randall Dickey and Francis Dunn, of Alameda County, and others who have taken up cudgels in the bridge fracas, may unearth damaging evidence of collusion to bilk the people.

In the meantime Mayor Robinson, of San Francisco, 500 civic associations on both sides of the bay, and the recently formed Bay Bridge Commuters' Committee have urged that President Truman give attention to the controversy from a national defense and safety point of view.

Sunday in the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of a valued friend of mine of many years, Mr. Harry L. Bowlby, D. D., who is general secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance in the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States entitled "Sunday in the Constitution of the United States—The United States a Christian Nation."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNDAY IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—THE UNITED STATES A CHRISTIAN NATION

The Christian Sabbath, under the common name of Sunday, is in the Constitution of the United States. It was by no mere chance or coincidence that this institution was embodied in that charter of the Federal Government, article I, section 7, paragraph 2. It was not accidental that on February 29, 1892, the United States Supreme Court, in an opinion handed down in the case of *Holy Trinity Church* v. *The United States Government*, declared that our Republic is a Christian nation.

What does the Constitution of the United States say about our Sunday? In article I, which deals with the legislative and law-making processes, section 7, paragraph 2, is defined the powers of the President as to signing or vetoing bills passed by Congress: "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to the House in which it shall have originated. * * * If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

HISTORY OF THE NATION SO ATTESTS

The entire history of our country from 1620 to the beginning of the twentieth century in particular, gives convincing evidence that it is a Christian Nation. The framers of the Constitution had a background of Christianity that could not be ignored or bypassed. Just as the discovery of the New World in 1492 opened a new epoch in history, so the landing of the Pilgrims in the *Mayflower* vessel at Plymouth Bay, began a new era in world history. It was that event which gave the religious flavor to the Colonies; it was that little band of a few more than 100 men and women who began to shape the course of things to come in the Northern Hemisphere. Visits to the New World had been made before that historic date, 1620, but they did not give the color and show the true character of the Christian faith. Ponce de Leon came in 1512 in search of the fountain of perpetual youth, the French Huguenots in 1562, the Spanish traders in 1564, the English colonizers in 1586, and the English settlers to Jamestown, Va., in 1607. None of these ventures gave a distinctive religious complexion to the Colonies.

What did happen when the *Mayflower* with its more than 100 souls dropped anchor in Plymouth Bay? It was Saturday evening. They remained aboard the ship, held their seasons of prayer that night in preparation for the Sabbath day. Nor did they leave the boat though hungry for land that Sabbath Day, they remembered the day and kept it holy. They had brought the Lord's Day with them. They, and others who came here in that formative period, set up their homes and built their churches and from that beginning sanctuaries and schools sprang up over the land named New England. The Sabbath and the sanctuary became foundation stones in the colonial life and chiefly upon them and

the Word of God in due course, the superstructure of this Republic was erected. So thus early the Christian religion became established in the Colonies, later to spread throughout the Northern Hemisphere of the New World.

In these far back generations men of God, ministers of the gospel, established academies and colleges for the primary purpose of educating young men for the ministry. All higher institutions of learning for more than 150 years were the creations of a Protestant clergy up and down the Atlantic coast—Harvard, 1636; William and Mary, 1693; Yale, 1701; Princeton, 1746; University of Pennsylvania, 1751; Rutgers, 1755; Columbia University (King's College), 1753.

It is also a significant fact of present-day moment that, following an ardent appeal for the strengthening of the provision in which Sunday was included in the New Jersey 100-year-old constitution, the Governor being given 5 days in which to consider bills, Sundays excepted, the constitutional revision convention recommended the following which is incorporated in the new constitution of that State adopted by the people in the general election on November 4, 1947: Article V, executive, section I, 14 (a) If a bill shall not be returned by the Governor within 10 days, Sundays excepted, after that it shall have been presented to him, the same shall become a law on the tenth day unless the house of origin shall on that day be in adjournment. (b) If on the tenth day the legislature is in adjournment sine die, the bill shall become a law if the Governor shall sign it within 45 days, Sundays excepted, after such adjournment.

OUR REPUBLIC, HOW FORMED

It should be readily seen that this great Republic, now considered by practically all the nations of the world the greatest nation on earth, was conceived in Christian faith, born to Christian precepts, cradled in Christian hope, nurtured in Christian culture, matured in the practice of Christian ideals, waxed strong in Christian and civic service and power, and has put to flight the enemies of the right to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Those men of God, knowing how rightly to divide the word of truth, understood and practiced the faith once delivered to the saints.

Classic prose and poetry attest the valor and virtue of those who builded better than they knew; who made full proof of the truth expressed in the Thirty-third Psalm: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance." Literature is filled with references to the savoring influence of the faith of the founding fathers. The immortal spirit of liberty, the watchword of the colonists and builders of the young republic, brooded over the Declaration of Independence, and the triad of life, law, and love imbedded therein, gave it everlasting life. Daniel Webster in 1834 emphasized that truth when in the Congress of the United States with deep emotion and in silvery tones he proclaimed "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable." Our national hymn, exalts it:

"My Country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrim's pride,
From every mountain side,
Let freedom ring!"

In her poem Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, Felicia D. Hemans sings:

"What sought they thus afar?
Bright jewels of the mine,
The wealth of seas, the spoils of war?
They sought a faith's pure shrine."

HOLD FAST, GUARD WELL, THESE INSTITUTIONS

As the Christian Sabbath and the Christian Church are the bulwarks of the Christian faith, what shall the present day answer be to the perils of these priceless institutions? Let that answer be found in their removal. The future of the Christian inheritance depends on the protection of these institutions. The welfare of home, community, State, and Nation, is involved. If we save our Sabbath, we shall make secure our sanctuaries. The people of the Nation have a stake in the Sabbath and the sanctuary. Our highest Court has declared "this is a Christian Nation." It is ours to prove it a reality.

How Much Can We Do With Safety?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Can We Do With Safety?" from the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH CAN WE DO WITH SAFETY?

As one ponders the spending program being urged upon Congress, the adjectives used in ballyhooing a circus come to mind—most stupendous, gigantic, and colossal.

The proposals for using the funds of the people of the Nation are all of these and more, too.

The House has just approved a defense program which calls for the spending of more than $15,000,000,000, an unheard of sum in this country during times of peace.

The Marshall plan expenditure of more than $5,000,000,000 has been authorized.

The Department of Agriculture proposes a new farm program, estimates on the cost of which are not available. Even if it should be adopted with its possibilities of hundreds of millions, if not a few billion, the farm program in effect now carries obligations of about $2,500,000,000—with $4,000,000,000 in prospect.

A proposal that the European nations signing the Atlantic treaty be rearmed means an expenditure of billions more. Cost figures mentioned tentatively are $1,250,000,000 or even $2,000,000,000, but that will just be a start.

The interest on the public debt of $252,000,000,000 will amount to roughly $5,000,000,000.

Then there are more billions for the care of war veterans.

Then hundreds of millions more for Federal aid to schools, for medical care, and numerous other schemes.

It is easy to spend money if you have it.

The ordinary citizen must shape his plans according to the size of his purse.

The Government, of course, does not need to be quite as careful as the ordinary person in the matter of finances, but it does seem there is or should be a limit.

The sensible thing for the Government to do at this stage of the game would seemingly be for the leaders to study the situation and then decide where the money available can be spent to the best advantage.

More and more taxes will be necessary if some such course is not followed.

Due to world conditions, especially the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, billions must be spent for adequate defense. Aid to European nations is held necessary. Now additional billions will be required for rearming Atlantic treaty nations. This, too, has general approval.

In view of the financial plight of the United States, with a public debt of $252,000,000,000 and obligations for a budget already exceeding $40,000,000,000 annually, it would seem that the time has come for a bit of paring of appropriations all along the line to furnish the funds needed for vital things.

Unless something of the kind is done, we are headed seemingly for the most gigantic, stupendous, and colossal bust in the history of the world.

British Drive To Promote Sales in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "British Map Drive To Push Sales Here," by Clifton Daniel, from the New York Times of April 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH MAP DRIVE TO PUSH SALES HERE—LONDON PLEDGES FAVORITISM TO EXPORTERS IN DOLLAR MOVE—PROMOTION OUTLAY SET

(By Clifton Daniel)

LONDON, April 11.—An unprecedented effort to sell British goods in North America—the most difficult market in the world—was announced in the House of Commons today by Harold Wilson, president of the board of trade. He was promised generous Government support for the campaign.

Reminding the House that Britain's main trade objective this year was to increase sales to dollar countries he called for vigor, aggressiveness, and imagination in the dollar drive and said that the Government would show open favorititsm and outright discrimination to exporters dealing with the United States and Canada.

"The task of expanding our exports to North America," he said, "is one of the greatest challenges in all our history to the merchant venturing spirit of our traders."

The 33-year-old boss of Britain's production and export drive was speaking in renewed debate on the misery budget for 1949–50 introduced in the House last Wednesday. For a short time at least Mr. Wilson diverted attention from the harsh realities of the budget. He pointed instead to new horizons of accomplishment for British industry, which already has achieved prodigies of output.

In March, Mr. Wilson said, total exports were £159,900,000 ($640,000,000) and represented another new monthly record for Britain. However, it was still imperative, he added, to seek a solution of Britain's dollar shortage by increasing exports to North America.

The proportion of Britain's total exports to North America, he added, was only 7 percent—lower than before the war. He said that British sales to North America amounted to only £1 against nearly £19 in Australia.

With the objective of raising those percentages, Mr. Wilson outlined a program of eight points. They were:

1. The Government would give industry and trade a clear lead as to the importance of the North American market.

2. Specific export objectives for various commodities would be fixed.

3. The Government would give every assistance and even open favoritism to those selling to North America.

4. The Government would provide improved service to exporters, including installation of a trade consul in each of four major regions in the United States. He said that consuls who already were at work would receive the support of experienced business men and that an adviser for the New York region, C. D. McCarthy, already had departed for his post. Mr. McCarthy was lent to the Government by the Property Investment Co. He has oil and shipping interests.

5. Reasonable allocations of dollars would be given for sales promotion in the United States and Canada.

6. Additional export credits would be provided.

7. Government assistance would be given for market research in an effort to open new markets in the West and South and to sell to a wider section of the American public.

8. A special publicity campaign would be undertaken to encourage sales to America and a conference of all concerned would be held after Easter.

From Zion's Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "From Zion's Hill," delivered by Rabbi Morris Gordon at the Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church, Minneapolis, Minn., on February 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM ZION'S HILL

Our service this morning commemorates three important national occasions—Washington's Birthday, Lincoln's Birthday, and Brotherhood Week. These three, in their chronological order, depict three basic stages in the development of our democracy.

In the first instance, we gained our independence; this gave us the right to be free. Under Lincoln's inspired leadership, we guaranteed the right of freedom to every member of our society, regardless of the color of his skin. From the heart of the great humanitarian Roosevelt came the first brotherhood proclamation, striking at the very soul of freedom. It is not enough to grant men the right to be free; it is not enough to put that promise on paper. We must put it to work in our places of business; we must fashion it in our homes and apply it to daily living with our hearts. We must so live together as Americans that we recognize that every one of us is created in the image of the Divine; that in every human being there beats a spark of the eternal soul; that all of us are children of one Father in heaven; and that the fatherhood of God has meaning only in the brotherhood of man.

These three pillars in the progress of American destiny have been closely paralleled in modern times in the newest, and in some sense oldest, little democracy on the face of the earth—the state of Israel. This morning let us discuss the similarity in struggle. Let us note the promise in both to the present. Let us read the signposts pointing to tomorrow.

STRUGGLES FOR INDEPENDENCE—PILGRIMS AND PIONEERS

Our Pilgrim Fathers were propelled to this continent because they were persecuted; because they were refugees; because they were pioneers. Tempest-tossed they came to light their lamp of liberty but there was no golden door to bid them enter. Of these three factors of their common fate, their refugeeism served more than any other to forge the iron of their soul into the steel of indomitable character. The renowned historian Lecky says: "Great moral causes lie at the root of the greatness of nations. It is probable that no nation ever started on its career with a larger proportion of strong characters than the English colonists in America. * * * America was preeminently the home of the refugee and this fact is perhaps the most important in its history." Whichever fact may have been the most important in weaving the fabric of their faith, their faith was expressed best in their death-defying pioneering spirit. A less hardy lot, facing winter's icy indifference; penetrating cold, lacking food and warmth; seeing fathers, mothers, children die; losing half of their number in their first year in a new land; would have packed their paltry belongings to return rather to face persecution than decimation. But not our Pilgrim Fathers. They met every obstacle as a challenge to achievement; to show the stuff they were made of. They stayed on to create a continent which became a blessing to millions of refugees who came to its hospitable shores.

How strikingly similar the story of Israel. Jews came to this little land, fleeing from the most horrescent persecution ever plotted in history. Even the 98 cents worth of chemicals which are found in every human body were not allowed to be interred with their bones. A new soap appeared on the market—human soap. A new material for lamp shades—human skin. Out of the horrible nightmare of the Nazi continent, only a few brands were plucked from the fire. Out of 7,200,000 Jews, 1,200,000 now remain alive in all of Europe. Is it a wonder that these refugees, even when they were denied entrance to their only haven of refuge on earth, Palestine, kept coming in leaky boats, in unseaworthy ships, and when barred by bombs and bullets, they plunged into the sea to swim—and some to drown in the very sight of the land of their hopes.

The spirit of pioneering gained new significance in Israel, for here it was tried on an arid portion of the world's globe which had stubbornly refused to submit to man throughout the ages. The fiery champions of freedom in the UN, Granados of Guatamala, in his new book, The Birth of Israel, depicts a scene capturing the spirit of the pioneers of the desert. He describes how he and a group of UN officials took their first trip from the cool climate of Jerusalem to the blistering heat of the desert of Judea. As they rode along they had to cover their faces to protect them against the unbearable heat of the grueling sun. The blinding sand stretched on for miles with no sign of life to break the suffocating monotony. Suddenly they seemed to behold a mirage in the distance. They blinked their eyes, opened them again and found the miracle still there. There was a sign in Hebrew: "House in the Desert." They were welcomed by youngsters whose courage defies the imagination of man. Scientists had proclaimed this sand unproductive; this wilderness uninhabitable. Young people with faith in their hearts and strength in their hands defied the portentous predictions of science to make the desert blossom like the rose. Every settlement is an act of faith. Every settler is a prayer in action.

Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk, American Research Chief of our Department of Agriculture, states that Jewish effort in this respect is the most remarkable he has seen:

"We are astonished. The far-reaching works of reclamation now being conducted in Israel not only provide an example to other countries in their need to restore wasted lands, but are vitally important for hundreds of thousands for whom they mean the only chance for security and human existence."

Persecution, refugeeism, pioneering—these were the prongs which molded our Pilgrim Fathers into a people; which spurred them to revolt under Washington, a puny handful pitted against a might foe. With the slogan of the Bible on their lips—"Rebellion to tyrants spells obedience to God"—they cut the navel cord binding them to their Mother Empire and gained a new birth of freedom, which God willing, may never perish from the earth.

In like manner, a handful of Jews, propelled by the same basic principles, standing alone in a world of indifference; less than three-quarters of a million against 31,000,000 Arabs, armed with planes, tanks, and guns by the very Empire from which our American forefathers had to free themselves by force; rose to defend the honor of the UN; to protect that little portion of Palestine which was guaranteed to it by the highest tribunal in the world.

The slogan of the Israeli soldiers, sung in the language of the Bible as they marched to battle was: "Nevertheless and in spite of everything we will win through to victory."

The heroes of our Revolutionary War fought beneath our flag of red, white, and blue. The heroes of Israel fought 'neath a banner of white and blue. Yet when this flag covered the body of a soldier on the battlefield it was tinged with the blood of his wounds and it took on the colors of our ensign—red, white, and blue.

The law of human achievement seems to proclaim that nothing worthwhile is gained without effort; no great ideal realized without struggle. Surely the struggles for independence, in America in 1776, and in Israel in 1949, though separated by time, could never have been more closely related in spirit.

FREEDOM'S NEW DIMENSIONS—SLAVES AND SOULS

Abraham Lincoln was not satisfied with the state of our country's independence. Though it gave us the right to be free, some exploited this right to deny others their liberty. With impassioned fury he cried aloud "a State cannot exist half slave and half free." Like Moses of old he pleaded that a people be liberated from bondage. America climbs another rung on the ladder of liberty and grants physical freedom to its slaves.

Israel, too, has its slaves. Men, women, and children still shackled by the Nazi chains of degrading emotions; by illusions of fear, and hatred; by obsessions of ghosts of loved ones who continue to stalk in the hidden lairs of their memory. To them Israel brings a new type of liberation—psychic freedom. Freeing the mind from mental misery; healing the heart of its wounds; bringing hope to the hopeless; this is the noblest project of human rehabilitation that can be fashioned on earth.

Israel lavishes its greatest love on its children. In every colony the most beautiful building, the best equipment, the most tender care is given to the young. Here the

Montessori system is followed. The children's rooms are cut down to their size; the showers, the beds, the mops, the brooms, the spades, and the shovels—are all made so that the children can use them. They learn to become useful citizens of their new State even as tiny tots.

Here is David, a refugee child. We find him busy making shoes. "Why did you decide to become a shoemaker, David?" Then as you look down at his feet you see you shouldn't have asked this question—for he has no feet. David had walked practically halfway around the world to get to Israel. He literally wore off the bottom of his feet by walking. Now he finds release for the pent-up emotions of his lifeless limbs by seeing other children run around in the shoes he makes for them.

Here in a "kibbutz," in a farming settlement in Israel we see the miracle of a soil transforming a soul. Children with faces frozen by fright, free to laugh again; arms hanging heavy with hunger—free to love again; hearts deprived of every vestige of human dignity—free to live again. To live, to love, and to laugh—gifts our youngsters take for granted—gifts—these orphans of humanity have always dreamt about, now given them in the land of their dreams.

Lincoln brought freedom to slaves. Israel brought freedom to souls. Both added new dimensions to the destiny of one of democracy's noblest ideals.

BROTHERHOOD BORN—NOW REBORN

The crowning concept of our country's quest for liberty is real brotherhood—the kind that cuts through the superficial layers of pronouncements on brotherly love and touches the very heart of daily human relations. It reaches into religion, it weaves its way into every nook and cranny of society.

To religion it says: It is high time we begin to recognize that not only my religion is worthy of reverence, but my brother's religion is worthy of respect too. There is no monopoly on eternal truths. Remember Micah's warning: "Walk humbly with thy God."

There is a story of a group of mountain climbers who were told that at the top of a certain mountain one can catch a glimpse of a beautiful golden sunrise. They formed a circle around the mountain and each began to ascend toward the summit. Suddenly one chap beckoned to another and said: "Come on my path, it's straighter than yours." A third fellow called to the two of them and said: "Come here, try mine." Soon the leader noticed what was happening and called out: "Say there, if you keep zig-zagging back and forth you'll never get to the top. Keep climbing straight ahead and we will all meet at the golden summit at the same time."

And so each religion is but a pathway leading to the golden gates of the Divine. The gates are open wide enough to receive all who have clean hands and a pure heart. Let each of us then walk on his own path, but let us keep the circle intact; let us walk hand in hand on the highway to heaven.

When we speak of religious brotherhood, we think of the land of Israel. It was here on the hills of Zion that brotherhood was born. It was from the fiery lips of inspired prophets that its teachings were imparted to the heart of man. Malachi caught the kernel of the entire message when he said: "Have we not all one father, hath not one God created us all, why then do we deal treacherously every man against his neighbor?"

But brotherhood is not something which is limited to the past. It is guaranteed by the newly adopted constitution of Israel, one of the most advanced social texts of our time. It grants equality to every man, woman and child within its borders, be he Arab, Christian or Jew. It is interesting to note that Arab men and women voted in the recent elections. For Arab women it was the first time they voted in history. Some day Arab children will bless the children of Israel for bringing a measure of freedom to them ever denied their fathers.

Religious brotherhood was evinced when Israeli soldiers guarded shrines sacred to all religions at the risk of their own lives. Fights ensued between soldiers whose curiosity got the better of them and the guards, but on no condition was anyone allowed to desecrate a holy shrine.

In fact a young Jewish officer was assigned to guard the city of Nazareth. Today we should pay him tribute for the fact that the pastoral beauty of this holy city has come through untarnished in a surrounding of terror.

Brotherhood in Israel has reached into the center of its economic pattern. It touches at the very heart of the problem which faces mankind—to evolve a pattern of life giving man a proper combination of liberty and security. Totalitarian states give security without freedom. Democratic states give freedom but too little security. In Israel, in the kibbutzim and moshavor, in the colonies and settlements, a new way of life is slowly emerging, endeavoring to reach a medium between the two.

Ellen Thorbecke, a noted English writer, has this to say in her latest book entitled the "Promised Land":

"In Palestine many thousands are living a new form of social life and have made a success of it. New it is because people put an ideal above their personal interest. New it is because of the far-reaching social rights of the individual. It is the realization of the wisdom of the prophets and the teachings of Jesus which were meant to save mankind. People are waiting and hoping for something that will fill their hearts with hope; that will give them back their belief that man is good; that will give them courage to build up something worth while and lift them beyond the mere struggle for existence. In Israel there has been brought into being a form of life that answers the deep hopes of so many men and women in Europe, in America, and elsewhere. Can it be that the light will once again come from the East?"

AN AMERICAN SPEAKS

Friends, even as I speak here this morning, I can see a question being formulated in the minds of some of you: "What relationship do I in this country have with this distant land? How does my status as an American tie in with the state of Israel?

I know that I speak for every Jew; I know that I speak for every Zionist when I say—I am an American. This is the only land which claims my allegiance. This is the land in which I live and will continue to live. This is the land for which I fought and, God forbid, if need be, I would fight for it again.

My American heritage has taught me to cherish independence, freedom, brotherhood, in the never-ending progress of our democratic dream. I applaud the efforts of any people that would make these principles more meaningful to me. The gallant little state of Israel has brought new daring, new depth, new dignity to the concepts I hold dear. It makes me a better American because it reaffirms my faith; it strengthens my determination to keep my country moving forward until it reaches the highest potentials of its own promise.

Independence, freedom, brotherhood are infectious. No borders can contain them; no barriers restrain them. Rising out of my country's heart they can reach into any corner of the world; rising up in any corner of the world they can reach back into my country's heart. There are those who think that the little land which once brought religion to humanity can now point the way in applying its truths to the art of daily living.

Pierre van Paassen phrased this thought so beautifully when he said:

"The ancient lamps on Zion's hill are being rekindled as a light to all mankind."

The prophet Isaiah, standing on one of these hills in Judea, over 2,000 years ago, spoke these immortal lines:

"For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of God from Jerusalem."

The day will yet come when: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."

Pennsylvania's Flood Control and Waterways Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony I presented yesterday morning to the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee in regard to appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors work in Pennsylvania in the coming fiscal year beginning July 1.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA'S FLOOD CONTROL AND WATERWAYS PROJECTS

(Testimony by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, before Senate Appropriations Subcommittee considering H. R. 3734, civil-functions appropriations bill for 1950 fiscal year (beginning July 1 1949), Wednesday, April 20, 1949)

INDEX TO STATEMENT

1. Effect of House of Representatives cuts in budget recommendations—flood-control construction: Conemaugh Reservoir; East Branch, Clarion Reservoir; Punxsutawney; Sunbury; Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township; Williamsport. River-harbor construction: Monongahela Lock No. 2; Schuylkill River culm removal; Morgantown Lock and Dam.

2. Need for restoration of cuts in above projects.

3. Other budget items—Flood-control planning: Bear Creek Reservoir; Prompton Reservoir; Shenango Reservoir. Flood-control maintenance: Crooked Creek, Loyalhanna, Mahoning Creek, Tionesta and Youghiogheny Reservoirs, Johnstown, York, Codorus Creek, and Indian Rock Dam. River and harbor maintenance: Schuylkill and Monongahela Rivers, Erie Harbor, Delaware River. Examinations and surveys. Lock maintenance and care: Ohio, Allegheny, Monongahela.

4. Overbudget or nonbudget requests: Williamsport flood control, Delaware River maintenance, Bradford flood control.

The members of this committee over the years have demonstrated many times their broad recognition of the importance of the civil functions program in relation to the lives and safety and health and welfare of our people and of the commerce of the Nation.

The people of Pennsylvania, particularly those in areas subject to or susceptible to floods owe this subcommittee of the Senate

their heartfelt gratitude for the many instances, particularly since I have been in the Senate, in which the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has saved important Pennsylvania projects from reductions in funds or from being left out of some of the bills entirely.

To cite just a few such instances: The immense Conemaugh River Reservoir which is the most important single link in the chain of reservoirs being thrown around Pittsburgh to protect it from devastating floods might not yet have been started if the Senate, at the request of Senator Guffey and myself, had not insisted on putting this project in the first list of flood-control projects to be started after the war. The deficiency bill which contained an initial appropriation for this project in late 1945 or early 1946 had passed the House without any provision for the Conemaugh Reservoir.

Nearly all of our going projects for flood control in Pennsylvania suffered severe cuts in the House last year and the year before and the Senate restored the money, sometimes successfully, sometimes, like last year, only partially successfully due to refusal of the House conferees to go along with the full amount.

I want you to know that I appreciate what you have done for us in those past years and I know that the people of Pennsylvania who suffer from these periodic floods recognize that this subcommittee of the Senate has been a great and good friend to our State and to the lives and safety of our people.

In my testimony today, I am asking first for a complete restoration of all of the funds for flood control and rivers and harbors projects in Pennsylvania as cut by the House Appropriations Committee and sustained by the House. I am familiar with the fact that in enforcing an across-the-board cut of 15 percent in appropriations for this work, the House committee did so on the theory that construction costs in the coming fiscal year will drop approximately that degree and that, therefore, every bit of work contemplated on these projects in the original budget recommendations could still be accomplished. I recognize that it is the intent of the House committee, as shown in their report, that the engineers should do every bit of the work under this reduced appropriation that they had contemplated doing under the original budget recommendations, and that if they find they cannot do so, they are not only authorized to—they are directed to—come before the House committee for a deficiency appropriation to enable them to complete that amount of work in the coming fiscal year of July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950.

Since the same subcommittee of the House handles civil functions and deficiencies—as in the case here in the Senate of your subcommittee—it sounds on the surface to be a reasonable enough sort of position to take and is based certainly on no animosity toward the civil-functions program or the contemplated work schedules of the Army engineers in the coming fiscal year. The House committee, in fact, goes so far as to say that they believe just about all of the work in civil functions next year, as recommended by the Army engineers and the Budget Bureau, has their full accord. That is reassuring.

However, in proceeding further to recapture into the Treasury substantial funds which the House committee anticipates will remain in a category of unobligated funds as of this coming June 30, the House committee completely disrupts the whole program of the Army engineers and thereby enforces, as the engineers' spokesman have already testified before you, a reduction in available funds for flood-control and waterways projects this coming fiscal year far in excess of 15 percent. The over-all reduction, according to General Pick, comes to 23.36 percent and is the equivalent of a 26-percent reduction on flood-control funds and a 37-percent reduction on river and harbor construction projects.

I think the engineers' explanation before you of how this cut operates is clear enough to you, but I think this one point should be emphasized:

In recapturing what are presumed to be unobligated balances—although the engineers insist that under their methods of bookkeeping these funds are not unobligated but are actually clearly earmarked for specific work on specific projects—the House apparently felt that where there was what it regarded to be an unobligated balance on a specific project, it should be recaptured from that project, although it did, of course, allow the engineers some leeway.

But this is what happens: So-called unobligated balances taken from specific projects are then spread out over all of the projects. The engineers insist on doing a specific amount of work on each of the projects in the bill. They do not agree to reduce the amount of work they plan on this or that specific project merely because there is or might be some present funds earmarked for that project which would be recaptured under the House bill. As a result, we will find that on flood-control projects where there will be no significant unobligated balance as of June 30 of this year, even under the House method of determining what constitutes unobligated balance, the engineers will proceed to enforce this same across-the-board cut approximating 26 percent in order to take money and transfer it to other projects which would be cut much more than 26 percent in the absence of such an evening-up process.

Conemaugh Reservoir

Specifically, in regard to Pennsylvania projects, taking the biggest one first, Conemaugh River Reservoir, for which the budget provides $8,500,000, the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 of 1949, according to page 351 of the House hearings, would be about $334,800. Under the House committee's reasoning, then, this appropriation should have been reduced by that amount, leaving $8,165,200 and then a 15-percent reduction of that would leave just about $7,000,000, or actually $6,940,420. The engineers, however, report that they will be forced under the House action, and unless it is reversed by the Senate, to cut this project to $6,324,800, or a total reduction under the budget of $2,175,200 and an amount $615,620 less than the House report indicates this project was to be cut.

What happens to that $615,620? It would go to some other project or projects with proportionately larger unobligated balances as of June 30 of this year, in order to bring other projects into a form of parity in relation to the budget requests with Conemaugh and others with proportionately smaller unobligated balances. This is merely spreading the poverty.

Now let us look for a moment at what constitutes unobligated balance as applied to this $334,800 in the case of Conemaugh. Unobligated balance is defined by the engineers as consisting of funds which are reserved for (a) Government costs of supervision and inspection on contract work under way; or (b) force-account work now under way; or (c) land acquisition needed to coordinate with the construction work under way; or (d) additional contracts for supplies and equipment to be furnished by the Government in connection with work now under way.

How funds so earmarked can be regarded as surplus in this fiscal year, I do not understand. Taking away this money, not only in the case of Conemaugh but in all of the projects so affected, must inevitably result in the reduction of work which can be accomplished in the coming fiscal year. When the House committee therefore says that the engineers should do the same amount of work as they had originally contemplated with 26 percent less money, they are ordering the engineers to perform a miracle, and that is not generally regarded as a function of the Engineering Corps.

The hearings and the debates in the Congress on civil functions always reflect the highest kind of congressional praise for the work of the engineers, for their fidelity and loyalty, for their conscientiousness, and for their determination to get value received for the tax moneys they spend. This bill, however, in effect, says to the engineers that although we like you fine, and think you're wonderful, we don't trust you to have some money lying around in various accounts and so we will take back from you all of the appropriations that you do not actually spend in this fiscal year—that you do not actually pay out by check, that is—and then when you run short sometime during the coming fiscal year, run out of money, you come to us and we will dole you out an occasional dollar to make up for what we are taking away from you now. This sort of piecemeal hand-out of money prevents the engineers, under Budget Bureau supervision, from counting on any of this money until it is actually appropriated, and, as a result, they cannot plan ahead with any degree of efficiency, but can only schedule work which they actually have the money in hand to pay for. In addition to making for inefficiency and no doubt for higher ultimate costs, this type of financing will inevitably cause delay in the progress of work during the next fiscal year as the engineers are required to wait before proceeding on new work until one or another deficiency request has been approved by the budget, submitted to the Congress, subjected to examinations and hearings, and finally, perhaps acted on long after the construction season in which it could have been used might have passed.

So I heartily concur in the request of the engineers that you let them function as they have functioned so splendidly in the past, scheduling their work as they find it efficient to do so, and proceeding as rapidly as possible on the work load they face.

Other projects

I mentioned the effect of the House action on Conemaugh Reservoir in cutting it back from $8,500,000 to $6,324,800. Let me list the other cuts in Pennsylvania under a House bill which presumably would permit the same speed of construction which the budget figures originally contemplated:

East Branch Clarion River Reservoir would be cut from $2,500,000 to $1,860,200;

Punxsutawney dikes, cut from the budget figure of $810,000, which is the amount regarded as necessary to complete a project which has already had $3,020,000 spent on it, to $602,700;

The Sunbury diking system, an estimated $7,300,000 project on which $4,256,300 has been spent, would be cut from $2,000,000 to $1,488,200;

The Wilkes Barre-Hanover Township dikes, for which $380,000 was requested in order to finish a $4,000,000 project, finish it completely, would get only $282,800, which manifestly would not be enough to do what the budget thought $380,000 was necessary to accomplish;

The Williamsport dikes, estimated to cost altogether $17,000,000, would be cut in this fiscal year under the House bill from a budget recommendation of $2,110,000 to $1,570,100.

They are flood-control projects in Pennsylvania affected by these cuts.

On rivers and harbors work in Pennsylvania, or of vital interest to Pennsylvania:

The work in the coming fiscal year on Lock No. 2 in the Monongahela River at Braddock, Pa., would get only $3,091,000 instead of $4,500,000 as recommended in the budget,

and which would have speeded up this $12,000,000 project substantially toward completion;

On the Schuylkill River, a project which is very close to my heart, since I was sponsor of the legislation which authorized it, an initial $500,000 appropriation is being cut to $343,000 for a start of Federal activity on a long-range Federal-State culm removal program, estimated to cost the Federal Government altogether some $17,000,000 and the State of Pennsylvania perhaps twice that much;

Another project, this one located in West Virginia, but of extreme importance to Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania coal and steel industries particularly, will be seriously affected by the House bill. It would cut the appropriation for the coming fiscal year on the $8,400,000 Morgantown Lock and Dam in the Monongahela River from nearly $4,000,000—actually $3,953,700 under the budget—to only $2,716,000.

Need for restoration of reductions

As I said, my first purpose here today is to request the restoration of these cuts, and from the engineers' testimony it appears that the only sure way of accomplishing that is by reversing the whole philosophy of the House action, not only by eliminating the 15 percent across the board cut on the total construction fund, but by striking out of the bill any references to the recapture of so-called unobligated balances on the books as of June 30 of this year.

In other words, if we want these projects to be prosecuted at the pace the Budget Bureau recommended and the Army recommends—and the House committee does, too—then the full amount requested by the engineers and budget must be made available.

I myself do not think that the engineers will refuse to award contracts to the lowest bidders merely because they have enough money to pay a higher cost on any of these projects. I do not think the engineers would become extravagant with their appropriation in case construction costs should actually drop while their fund remains at the original recommended figure. I have enough confidence in the engineers and I think the members of this committee do, too, to be convinced that they will take advantage of every opportunity to cut costs wherever possible and to save money wherever possible.

The argument of the House committee on this appropriation reminds us of the argument that was used in the Senate recently in behalf of an amendment to reduce the authorization for the European recovery program, the Marshall plan, by 10 percent on the theory that costs would probably drop by that percentage. The Marshall-plan bill, to which we devoted so much debate, of course, carried no funds with it, but merely set a ceiling on the amounts which could be appropriated for this program in the coming fiscal year. What the proponents of the 10-percent cut wanted us to do was to take a chance that costs would drop by 10 percent or so and to bind the hands of Congress for the next 15 months or so from providing any funds for ECA over and above the proposed reduced ceiling.

I think when the Appropriations Committee finishes its review of ECA requests, it will do very little cutting because our price structure, while leveling off in many respects, is still far from a substantial decline. I would like to think that costs for flood control will fall quite a bit in the coming fiscal year, but it should be remembered that much of the work which will be done in the coming fiscal year is under contracts now in effect—contracts which would continue and which would not be influenced either by an increase or a decrease in construction costs. Any long-range construction program operates in substantially that fashion.

It must particularly be remembered that practically none of the work contemplated under the Budget recommendations for civil functions is for brand-new projects. We are seeking now to complete projects which have been under construction since the end of the war, or, in some cases, since before the start of the war—projects which were interrupted by the war.

To recapitulate on this phase of my testimony, I want you to know that I vigorously support the full Budget amount for the following flood-control projects in Pennsylvania: Conemaugh River Reservoir, which will do as much for Pittsburgh and the whole Ohio Valley, providing defense against future floods, as all six of the existing reservoirs combined now accomplish in flood protection for that area. The work on Conemaugh up to now has been largely the relocation of railroad tracks and bridges, but actual construction work is scheduled to start very shortly after a gala ground-breaking ceremony sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on May 9. If all of the members of this subcommittee have not received engraved invitations, and offers of a special railroad car or a special plane to take you to that event, then the Pittsburgh chamber has been most derelict in showing its gratitude to its real friends.

East Branch Clarion River Reservoir, a project of great importance to the people of Elk County, Pa., who, like the people of Pittsburgh, can thank the Senate of the United States for having reversed the action of the House of Representatives several years ago and for having placed this project on the approved list for construction funds shortly before the Budget Bureau clamped down an almost iron-clad rule against any new construction projects of sizable scope. It got in just under the wire and has been maintained at a fast construction pace only because of Senate understanding and generosity.

Sunbury, Pa., a project which, in 1947, was cut severely by the House, but, thanks to the Senate that year, received its full appropriation. The justification on this project clearly shows its importance. With the full appropriation this year—the 1950 fiscal year—this project can be completed and in effective operation sometime before June of 1951. It will begin then to pay us real dividends in the protection of lives and property.

Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township dikes, for which only $380,000 is necessary to complete an already worth-while project, one which has already saved the city of Wilkes-Barre millions of dollars in recent threatened floods. Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, who represents that area in the House, gave a most graphic account of the necessity of the completion of this project to its original recommended height at page 878 of the House hearings, telling in there of the magnificent efforts on the part of the local citizens to sandbag the dikes at Wilkes-Barre an additional few feet when floods threaten. As he pointed out, however, with every employee of the city of Wilkes-Barre working 24 hours a day, and with 1,000 additional emergency workers pitching in to help out, it would still be impossible for the local community to sandbag the wall to the necessary height after receiving warning of a pending flood.

Similarly, the appropriation in full budget amount will complete the Punxsutawney dikes in the coming year.

Williamsport dikes, Pennsylvania, about which I will have more to say later in this presentation. As I pointed out, the House bill means a cut on this work from $2,110,000 to $1,570,100, and I particularly want this cut restored, but I have a further request to make, which I shall tell you about in a few minutes.

On rivers and harbors work, I particularly ask that the full budget amount for the Monongahela River lock No. 2 replacement work at Braddock, for the Morgantown lock and dam in the Monongahela in West Virginia, and for the Schuylkill River culm-removal program be restored.

The Schuylkill River budget request of $500,000, which is, of course, a very modest amount in relation to the total estimated Federal cost of $17,000,000, is for work which cannot be started until the State of Pennsylvania has accomplished at least one half of the vast amount of work it must do in cleaning up the foul-smelling, coal-saturated Schuylkill River under its phase of the program. I urged the administration to include a modest initial appropriation for the Schuylkill for the fiscal year starting July 1 so that the Army engineers could go into action immediately when the State had complied with its required preliminary work. It will probably be late into the fiscal year before the State can comply with the requirement set out in the enabling legislation, and that would probably be too late to enable us to get a deficiency so that there would be an unnecessary delay in the initiation of the Federal phase of the project. Therefore, I most vigorously urge, not only that the project be retained in the bill, but that the full budget amount be granted.

As I said earlier, I consider this project a very close and personal one to me not only because I was sponsor of the original enabling legislation and appeared before both the House and Senate Committees in the Seventy-ninth Congress to obtain its approval, but because I am a resident of Philadelphia, and like all residents of Philadelphia, look forward hopefully to the day when this abominably neglected and abused river is restored to some of the beauty and cleanliness it once enjoyed.

Although the House did not disturb budget recommendations for other civil functions activities in which I am interested, I want to be sure to call to the attention of this committee my interest in them and my hope that this committee will also approve at least the full budget recommendations for flood control and rivers and harbors maintenance, for lock management and care, for preliminary examinations and surveys and contingencies.

In the previous 2 years there were some serious cuts made in these items by the House but the money was restored by the Senate, and although we could not always get the full amount through conference for each item, this committee has always been most understanding of the importance of this work and has done its best to give us the necessary funds for it. Since there were no important House cuts this year on these items, the big hurdle in past years of obtaining House approval for the budget recommendations is removed.

Planning

Just for the record, I want to be recorded as endorsing the full amount in the budget for flood control planning which means, among other things, $90,000 for Bear Creek Reservoir, which will bring the plans to about 80 percent completion; $65,000 for the Prompton Reservoir in the Lackawaxen River flood system which will complete 90 percent of the planning work; and $50,000 for the Shenango Reservoir, which will bring the planning work on that project to 50 percent of completion. All of these projects are extremely important to those areas and I hope we can get them into construction as soon as possible.

Maintenance

The flood control maintenance fund—an irreducible fund which provides for the operation of projects now in use—includes

$65,000 for Crooked Creek, $60,000 for Loyalhanna, $56,000 for Mahoning Creek, $56,000 for Tionesta, and $80,000 for Youghiogheny River reservoirs, all in the Pittsburgh-Western Pennsylvania chain of effective reservoirs, and also $4,000 for Johnstown and $12,000 for York, Codorus Creek and Indian Rock Dam in the York area.

The river-and-harbor maintenance fund, in addition to the Delaware River item which I discuss a little later in my statement, includes, among items of particular interest to my State, $570,000 for continued maintenance dredging on the Schuylkill at Philadelphia, $125,000 for the Monongahela, and $58,000 for Erie harbor.

Other activities

There is $19,000 in the budget for examinations and surveys to be conducted by the Philadelphia district on river and harbor work and $65,000 for contingencies, while the Pittsburgh district will get $25,400 for contingencies on river and harbor work. Of the total budget for lock management and care, $6,367,900 is allocated to Ohio River locks and dams, $302,900 to Allegheny River, and $1,109,600 to Monongahela River locks and dams through which pass annually simply incredible tonnages of coal to the Pittsburgh area steel mills. All of these items are, of course, important to a free-flowing commerce on our waterways.

Special requests

Up to now I have been devoting my testimony to a plea for general restoration of cuts made by the House in budget recommendations. I have a few special requests to make which go beyond the budget. I think they can be fully justified and I would indeed appreciate any help given by this committee toward obtaining these additional funds.

I shall not list them by importance or priority because they are all important.

Williamsport dikes

First, I respectfully urge an additional appropriation of approximately $2,000,000 for the dikes at Williamsport, Pa. The House heard testimony on this item at page 1102 of the House hearings from E. L. Gosnell, chief engineer of the Reading Co. He discussed the request from the standpoint of its importance not only to the Reading Railroad but to the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Erie.

The current budget recommendation for Williamsport of $2,110,000 will complete just about all of the flood-wall construction for the city of Williamsport proper and for South Williamsport across the river. If only the full budget amount is granted—and I say we need at least that much as a minimum—there will be needed in future years $7,245,300 for the Newberry section on the right bank of Lycoming Creek. The flood wall around Williamsport proper could well divert stream flow in high water into the Newberry section and wash out all of the railroad lines and threaten a great many residences. The railroads themselves have already expended large sums in raising and protecting their tracks, but until the levees are built on the Lycoming Creek, the health of the city remains in danger because of the disruption of transportation and supply lines. And, as I said, many residences are in danger.

I have promised the people of Williamsport I will do my utmost to expedite the completion of the Williamsport project well ahead of the present schedule completion date which would be by about the end of the 1952 fiscal year. We can speed that up by a whole year if this committee will grant my request for the additional appropriation I seek of $2,000,000, making a total this coming fiscal year of $4,110,000, so that a lesser amount of about $3,500,000 would complete the project by mid-1951.

The members of this subcommittee would, I am sure, be deeply gratified to know how appreciative the city of Williamsport is to the Federal Government and to the Congress and particularly to this committee of the Senate for what has already been done for them on flood-control protection. Their dikes are still virtually useless against floods because of the closures which remain to be completed in the coming fiscal year, and although they had the distressing experience in 1946 of seeing heavy floods pour through the gaps in their uncompleted dikes, they have been most patient, and are most grateful for the progress which has been made.

A community such as that has a real understanding of the problems of the Congress in expending Federal funds and recognizes that it takes tax funds in large amounts to do this kind of work not only in Williamsport but in the other communities included in past and present flood-control appropriations.

Delaware River Channel

Second, I request that the subcommittee add $4,000,000 to the item of rivers and harbors maintenance to be earmarked for the present and contemplated channel maintenance work in the Delaware River at Philadelphia. There is at present allocated out of the $53,000,000 maintenance fund for rivers and harbors an amount of $4,110,000 for this work. My request, therefore, would just about double the budget amount.

You are justified in looking skeptically at such a large request. I hope you will look carefully. You will find that although the authorized channel in the Delaware River below Philadelphia is 40 feet, the present controlling depth is only 34 feet. There are circumstances in which it goes down to even less, to 32½ feet.

I have quite a comprehensive report here explaining what this means in terms of the newer deep-draft tankers which are now being constructed and which Philadelphia of course will want to be able to accommodate in our waterway system. Oil imports to the port of Philadelphia now come to 50,000,000 barrels a year on which taxes in the form of customs total $5,500,000—or enough, more than enough, in 1 year to provide for this additional fund that I am asking.

The channel was completed in 1942 and during the war was allowed to shoal up until it is now in its deplorable situation where we face a possible maritime disaster in case a ship should get stuck on these shoals and turn around in the channel, swing around and block the channel. A 660-foot tanker could just about close up that channel completely and it could set off a disastrous explosion if it should slew around into another tanker.

This matter was called to the attention of Philadelphia Members of Congress too late for them to take it up with the House Appropriations Subcommittee which had just completed hearings on the civil-functions bill. An attempt was thereupon made by Congressman GREEN, of Philadelphia, to add an additional $4,000,000 to the bill by amendment from the floor. I believe that if there had been a full attendance in the House that day the amendment would have been agreed to. Instead, it was defeated by a vote of 38 yeas and 54 nays—substantially less than a quorum—in the Committee of the Whole House.

According to Maj. Gen. R. C. Crawford, former Acting Chief of Engineers, in a letter to Congressman GREEN, the $4,110,000 now allocated in the maintenance fund for the Delaware River channel will not complete the restoration of the authorized 40-foot channel. He reports that to accomplish such a program of maintenance dredging, additional funds in an amount of approximately $4,000,000 would be required.

He also stated that Army engineer experts will be prepared to answer any questions from members of this committee concerning this work and I ask now that you direct such an inquiry to the engineer representatives who are here today.

Bradford flood project

Third, I am today asking this committee to write into the item for flood-control planning an additional amount to provide for extensive planning work on a flood-control project at Bradford, Pa. This project, like so many in Pennsylvania, is important not merely to the protection of property, but primarily to the protection of lives. Bradford is an important producing area and refining area of that great crude oil, Pennsylvania crude. Floods in this area are extremely dangerous since they float on top of the water great quantities of oil which, if ignited, could cause the most horrible kind of tragedy.

Strictly speaking—and I know I must be honest with you on a matter like this—this project has not yet been formally authorized by Congress. That is because of a technicality. It will, I am sure, be included in the next authorization bill. I have introduced a bill, S. 625, to authorize it. I introduced a similar bill last year. According to the ranking members of the Senate Public Works Committee of last year, it was not included in the omnibus bill only because it had not yet been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

The reason this urgent emergency project had not cleared the Budget Bureau in time was that after a survey had been made of flood damages in Bradford and vicinity under a resolution I had introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and just as the engineers were about to make their preliminary report on it, a new flood, just 2 years ago this month, on April 5, 1947, swept down Main Street of Bradford to a depth of 6 feet, spreading over 650 acres of the business and residential sections of Bradford. A year ago another flood swept into Bradford. These floods were responsible for a delay on the part of the engineers to provide them time to resurvey the damage in order to have all of the relevant data on the need for this project. When the report was finally submitted, it was too late for routine clearance by the Budget Bureau prior to action by the Senate Public Works Committee on the omnibus bill.

However, the committee did hear testimony from the engineers on this project and members of the committee told me later they were sure it was worth while and would be included in the next bill. But if we wait until authorization legislation passes, it will mean a delay of at least another year before the engineers can even begin planning work on this very urgent lifesaving work. In view of the danger to safety and in view of the succession of damaging floods which have occurred in Bradford in recent years, I do not think we dare wait another year to start the planning work.

This project, as Senator MCCLELLAN no doubt remembers, has a class 1 endorsement by the Rivers and Harbors Congress, of which the Senator from Arkansas is president. I think the people from Bradford have been in frequent communication with him on this project. An attempt was made in the House to obtain an initial appropriation of $1,500,000 for the Bradford project, but, unfortunately, most of the debate on the proposal seemed to have been devoted to critical references to the super-economy views of the sponsor of the amendment, Congressman RICH, in whose district Bradford is located, and very little attention was paid to the merits of his amendment. The people in Bradford are informed that it will take about 9 months to do the necessary engineering and planning work for the project, planning work which would cost, I un-

derstand, about $400,000. If, at the same time, funds were available for the actual start of construction work on the lower part of the project, which is, I understand, a straight channelling job composed almost entirely of dirt removal, it would save the community in any one flood just about dollar for dollar on the entire cost of that phase of the work—dollar for dollar, that is, in each flood, for it would lower the flood level by at least 3 feet.

There is a further factor here which has been called to the attention of Senator McCLELLAN, I understand, and it has also been called to my attention, and that is that before a request can be made to the State of Pennsylvania to share a substantial proportion of the $1,500,000 non-Federal cost of this project—the State may participate up to 50 percent of the non-Federal costs—the Corps of Engineers must first have designed the working plans for the project and appropriations must have been provided by Congress.

Therefore, if we can get an appropriation in this bill, particularly for planning, but also for some initial construction, we will have saved a further delay in Bradford's dealings with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Appropriation of planning funds for projects which have not yet been authorized is, I concede, rare and unusual, but it has happened, it has been done several times in recent years in connection with emergency work, and this is certainly an emergency job.

While no new projects generally speaking are included in the present bill for initial construction funds, I believe this committee would be performing a most worthy public service to a fine community and to Americans whose lives are in danger if it can provide for this one phase of the work on the lower project which I described. Perhaps it can be done under the emergency features of the bill. I leave the mechanics of that to the committee knowing it will do its best. As I said, the figure of $1,500,000 is the one I have been asked to submit to the committee on behalf of Bradford and I certainly endorse it.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to thank once again the members of this subcommittee and through them the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee not only for the opportunity to be heard on these appropriation items which so intimately affect so many people in my State, but for the fine way over the years in which I have been in the Senate in which you have responded to my requests on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania for adequate appropriations to protect the lives and health and safety of our people and to maintain the flow of commerce on our rivers.

Citizen Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able article by James Marshall, of New York, a distinguished American educator, published in the American Political Science Review for February 1949. Mr. Marshall here presents a valuable study of international affairs and the growing part being taken by citizens of the country in the field of diplomacy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Political Science Review of February 1949]

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

(By James Marshall, United States National Commission for UNESCO)

One wonders what the ghosts of Talleyrand and Franklin would say were they to visit the diplomatic conferences of today. Where is the suave approach, the graceful phrase concealing bloody warnings dropped by a king to the music of a minuet or passed by an ambassador to a minister of state over the after-dinner port? How surprised they would be at the blunt Bevin with his frequently unconcealed ill humor, at Molotov, rude and blustering, at Byrnes publicly changing his course in midstream, at Marshall announcing state policy in speeches rather than to plenipotentiaries or through official documents.

How surprised Talleyrand and Franklin would be to think of international relations carried on pursuant to slogans such as "open covenants openly arrived at." How their shrewd eyes would have twinkled at the credulity of people who believed that they had democratized foreign affairs through such a slogan. The old-school diplomats would scarcely have confused headlines which report in large black type the speeches of the diplomats, or the political gossip columns which purport to repeat the whispered asides of statesmen, with covenants democratically negotiated.

The fact is that although we have gained publicity for foreign affairs, and that in itself is important, we have not democratized foreign affairs. They are still the business of technicians. They remain the preserve of foreign offices.

Of all administrative departments, the diplomatic and the military have been the least receptive of democratic patterns. As to foreign relations, this has been the result of two fallacies: (1) the idea that things diplomatic are necessarily and essentially top secret; (2) the misconception that the Bevins, the Molotovs, the Byrneses, and the Marshalls can conduct foreign relations without being required to give a blow by blow accounting to public opinion. The former is untrue; the latter no longer possible. But we still romanticize about the confidential character of the material of diplomacy and the skillful intrigue which we deem to be the art of the statesman.

There are, however, in certain democratic countries roots from which more democratic foreign relations could grow. The great institution of the question put by a member of the House of Commons to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Foreign Affairs not merely brings information to the public, but inevitably humbles any would-be autocrat in the British Foreign Office. The equally important institution of congressional hearings also has a sobering effect on administrative officers. For a congressional committee can not only call the Department of State on the carpet, it can give an opportunity to the interested public to express its views concerning the principles of foreign policy and the conduct of foreign relations.

Such parliamentary questions and committee studies represent one aspect of democratizing administration. They afford the opportunity for a public canvassing and examination of the acts and aims of the administrators. They make the public partners in knowledge; they give to the public the facts upon which they may base critical analyses and make recommendations to the administrators. They fall short, however, of a most fundamental element in democratic procedure. For to be able to question administrators after the fact, after they have acted, is insufficient. Action itself remains untouched by the democratic process. Not until there is broader participation in the planning, the development, and the execution of foreign policy can it be said that the people take part in their own foreign relations.

Occasionally, in especially dramatic situations, the people make their opinions felt. Thus it was the strong popular reaction to the bypassing of the United Nations by President Truman that resulted in the Vandenberg amendments to the proposals to aid Greece and Turkey. But in most situations it is the middle levels of foreign offices which, untouched to any great degree by the lay public, mark the trails which become the roads of international policy.

"How can you expect the layman to take part in the planning, development, and execution of foreign policy?" the foreign-office official will inquire. That is the question asked by technicians in all fields. The jurist asked it as to lay arbitrators; yet we know today that commercial transactions are facilitated by arbitration, and labor disputes which are sometimes fought but rarely settled in courts are more frequently solved in a satisfactory manner by lay arbitration or mediation. The physician and the psychiatrist often ask similar questions of education; yet we know that public health and mental hygiene cannot progress except as teachers devote themselves to these problems in the schools. The engineer and the plant manager put the same question in industry; yet we know now that the psychological effect of worker participation in planning is to increase efficiency.

Professional pride, professional defensiveness, tends in every field to discount the layman. It tends to build up a cult of expertness, an almost mystical cloud-throne guarded by the cherubim of a special technical language. In the field of politics, in its extreme form, this separatism of technicians leads to the police state with its NKVD's and its Gestapos to liquidate presumptuous laymen. In its more moderate expression, the political technician and the bureaucrat simply treat the layman as one who lives on the wrong side of the tracks of wisdom.

Fortunately, we have had some recent successful experiences in the participation of laymen in foreign relations. These may not supply sufficient criteria for final judgment as to the effectiveness of democratic procedures in that field. But they point a way. Just as we can say that a citizen army can be a topflight instrument of war, we now can add that there is evidence that a citizen diplomacy is a promising implement of peace.

In 1945, the State Department invited three or four voluntary organizations especially interested in the agenda to send representatives to the Chapultepec Conference held in Mexico City by the Western Hemisphere nations. This was a first hesitant experiment in citizen diplomacy. At the San Francisco Conference, the United States made another trial of this new technique. It invited 42 national organizations to send consultants to the conference which was to draw the United Nations Charter. These organizations represented, among others, labor, business, agriculture, education, lawyers, women, veterans, religious, civic, and peace groups. They represented 30 to 40 million Americans associated in voluntary organizations expressive of their interests as private citizens.

Almost daily during the course of the San Francisco Conference these consultants met

with members of the American delegation, their advisers or technical experts, and discussed conference developments with them. They submitted memoranda on various points at the request of the delegation. They gave the delegation the feel of the Nation on issues which arose—a much more personal and direct feel than could be had through the filter of editorial writers and commentators.

These consultants, these laymen participating in the planning and development of critical international relations, made a number of specific proposals to the American delegation which found their way into the Charter. For example, under the leadership of Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, the efforts of the consultants resulted in the inclusion of the human rights provision. The inclusion of education in the field of the Economic and Social Council was in large measure due to the work of the consultants led by Dr. William G. Carr and Dr. George Zook.

The presence and participation of these consultants at San Francisco contributed immeasurably to American understanding of the Charter, to American eagerness to join the United Nations, and to the overwhelming approval of the Charter by the Senate. The support of the UN by the people of this country is largely attributable to the challenge given to the consultants by their invitation to the San Francisco Conference. Furthermore, these consultants, and more indirectly the organizations they represented, had staked out something of a vested interest in the United Nations as a result of the time, thought, and effort they had devoted to the creation of the Charter.

A second instance of the democratization of foreign affairs is to be found in the United States National Commission for UNESCO. This institution grows out of the provision of the UNESCO constitution. Article VII provides that "each member state shall make such arrangements as suit its particular conditions for the purpose of associating its principal bodies interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters with the work of the organization, preferably by the formation of a national commission broadly representative of the government and such bodies." Such national commissions, or national cooperating bodies, according to the constitution, are to act "in an advisory capacity to their respective delegations to the General Conference and to their governments in matters relating to the organization and shall function as agencies of liaison in all matters of interest to it," and are to be consulted by their governments in the selection of delegates to UNESCO. These clauses stem largely from proposals made in this country and pushed by the United States delegation to the conference in London which prepared the draft of the UNESCO constitution in 1945.

How did the State Department treat the opportunity to apply on a permanent basis the experiences with the consultants at San Francisco? How did it make use of this invitation to gain popular support for UNESCO and bring democratic procedures into one phase of international relations? It drew closer its cloak of bureaucratic pride. It consulted its little entourage of trusted advisers, who regarded not only diplomacy but also education, science, and culture as the domain of the expert. It caused to be introduced into Congress a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of State to designate, for such periods of service as he may determine, not to exceed 30 persons broadly representative of the educational, scientific, and cultural interests of the United States, to serve on the National Commission.

In other words, the Department of State intended to keep a tight hold on popular participation through hand-picked individuals. But this is quite different from the United States associating its principal bodies interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters with the work of the Organization. The bodies themselves could be represented only by persons of their own choice.

A number of organizations which had been urging the establishment of UNESCO appeared before Congress to protest this attempt to create a house organ of the State Department out of the opportunity for popular participation in our international cultural relations. The whole point of a national commission would have been missed if the principal bodies in this country interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters had been omitted. The voice of UNESCO would rarely reach the schoolroom or the woman's club or the laboratory except through the releases of the State Department or the pronouncements of its 30 representative favorites. Nor would the desire of great numbers of people to participate in the development of the UNESCO program, in playing a part in international relations in their own fields, have been tapped by the official plan.

The Congress was induced to change the proposed organization of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. It provided for a National Commission of 100 members, 40 of whom were to be outstanding persons selected by the Secretary of State, including not more than 10 Federal Government employees, not more than 15 representatives of State and local educational, scientific, and cultural interests, and not more than 15 persons chosen at large, and 60 representatives of principal national voluntary organizations interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters. The Commission is vested with power to review periodically the list of organizations designating representatives in order to achieve a desirable rotation among organizations represented.

In addition, the National Commission is directed to call general conferences for the discussion of matters relating to UNESCO, to which conferences organizations actively interested in the problems of UNESCO shall be invited to send representatives, and special conferences of experts to consider specific matters relating to UNESCO. In this way, representatives of popular organizations and experts, as well as individual national and local leaders, are enabled to take part in the development of policy and the domestic operation of the program of UNESCO.

The first meeting of the National Commission took place in September, 1946, with leadership taken by the representatives of national organizations. The interest was intense, and the National Commission spent the greater part of 3 days in developing a program for the American delegation to the UNESCO conference. At the conclusion of the Commission meeting, the executive committee met with Assistant Secretary of State William Benton to discuss the names of possible delegates to the UNESCO conference to be held in Paris in November, 1946. There was also discussion of the principles to be applied in the selection of the delegation. As selected, the delegation was made up largely of persons who were members of the National Commission and almost entirely of persons who had been discussed and supported by the executive committee.

At the conference of UNESCO held in Paris in 1946, the American delegation was in large measure successful in establishing its point of view on the program of the organization. This does not mean, of course, that the American delegation had its own way in everything. It did not. But because of the preparation that had been made by the National Commission and the staff of the State Department, it was one of the best prepared, if not the best prepared delegations at the conference on matters of program and policy. Where the United States delegation failed was on points that had not been discussed by the National Commission—the matter of administration, the matter of budgeting, the matter of the appointment of the Director-General.

The failure of the United States delegation in these respects was due in part to the inadequacy of the State Department's political preparations, that is, its understanding of the temper of other delegations. But above all, it was due to the fact that the delegation itself was not adequately prepared. And in the case of the director-generalship it can hardly be said that the delegation had its heart in supporting the American candidate. There was no one who did not respect him, but there was unquestionable resentment in the delegation that the important matter of policy involved in the selection of a Director-General had never been discussed with the National Commission. The Department had therefore failed to gain both the immediate wholehearted support of its delegation and the support of the people at home who must play a fundamental role in making UNESCO effective in this country.

At the Mexico City Conference in 1947, there was another example of the danger of leaving cultural relations to State Department determination. The United States abstained from voting on the resolution to admit Hungary to membership in UNESCO. Although the United States delegation was almost unanimously opposed to bringing into UNESCO the political problems that beset the United Nations, State Department policy overrode these objections and directed the delegation to refrain from voting because United States policy in the United Nations had opposed the admission of Hungary. This was an unfortunate introduction of power politics into the cultural field, which most of the law members of the delegation and some of the departmental advisers appreciated. It is unfortunate that the United States National Commission did not have an opportunity to express its view on this point.

Certainly the lesson of the consultants of San Francisco had application here. Their participation demonstrated the strength of the following that could be developed throughout the country when representatives of great popular organizations took part in the conference.

There are, of course, thousands of organizations in this country which cannot find a place in the limited membership of the national commission for UNESCO. They, too, have a part to play in broadening international understanding through education, science, and culture. Under the provisions of the enabling act, there have been a national conference in Philadelphia and regional conferences in Denver and San Francisco in which members of these organizations found opportunities to become acquainted with the work of UNESCO and to bring to the national commission their views on the policy which the United States should pursue. The conferences were successful, hundreds of organizations and thousands of people having participated.

In connection with UNESCO, as at the San Francisco Conference, the United States has set up a pilot plant on citizen diplomacy. Other nations have been slower to create national commissions. Some of them are working with "national cooperating bodies" interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters. But great interest has been shown in the United States National Commission. Just prior to the 1948 meeting of UNESCO in Beirut, a meeting of representatives of national commissions was held. It was presided over by Milton S. Eisenhower, chairman of the United States National Commission.

Votes or plebiscites on the question of war or peace are impractical. Events move at times too rapidly to make them appropriate. Momentary passions may even make them dangerous. Nevertheless, if we believe in the democratic principle that in the long run the people themselves rather than those who occupy places in their governments are the best judges of what is good for people, we must give the public better access to technicians of foreign affairs. This can best be done by admitting the people themselves more and more to the planning stages of foreign relations and to greater participation in international conferences. Secretary Byrnes would have been greatly strengthened in Paris at the meeting of Foreign Ministers if he had been accompanied by a group of consultants such as was present by invitation at San Francisco. General Marshall would have benefited in Moscow from a similar arrangement.

Such participation must be inadequate when limited to hand-picked individuals. Such persons will inevitably tend to represent views which the appointing officials wish to hear. Courtiers and kitchen cabinets soon lose their sensitivity to the pulse and heartbeats of the mass of the people. Where there are voluntary bodies, their representatives will give a more genuine picture of the ideas of the people themselves. Such voluntary bodies will prove the backbone of any organized popular participation in international affairs.

The Information and Educational Exchange Act (the Smith-Mundt bill) recently adopted by Congress provides for the participation of laymen in the informational and cultural relations of the State Department. Two commissions are set up to represent the public interest, the commission on information and the commission on educational exchange. They are, among other things, directed to "formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this act." Thus for the second time Congress expressed its confidence in laymen to help formulate foreign policy.

Again, in the Foreign Assistance Act, provision has been made for a Public Advisory Board consisting of the Administrator and 12 additional members appointed by the President subject to senatorial approval. It is unfortunate that neither act goes one step further, permitting voluntary organizations to nominate members of the two Commissions and of the Public Advisory Board.

Both at the San Francisco Conference and in the United States National Commission for UNESCO, business, agriculture, labor, education, science, the arts, higher learning in the various fields of culture, the churches, and women's groups have demonstrated their capacity to bring to the responsible public officials the voice and support of the American people. These experiments—and the provisions of the Smith-Mundt bill—indicate the road to democratizing foreign relations, one of the most resistant fields to the entry of the layman.

It is questionable whether peace can be preserved by the efforts of technicians, even the most high-minded. They sit alternately on pedestals and in anxious seats, neither of which is favorable to a free flow of understanding with the public in whose name they purport to speak. If, however, as the constitution of UNESCO proclaims, "wars begin in the minds of men, and it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," the great resource of the minds of laymen must be tapped and conduits prepared through which their energies may flow to the maintenance of an affirmative peace.

If, as we commonly believe today, it is men rather than states that are the ultimate foundations of good will, then every possible means must be explored to enable men to plan and participate in the expression of international good will. We shall continue to require the skills of Talleyrands and Franklins. But to be effective in maintaining peace, they must now speak the minds of citizen diplomats, of great masses of people, rather than of dynasties, political parties, or ruling groups.

Retirement of Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, has announced with regrets the retirement of Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons from the United States Army.

As a member and later chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and later a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I have had long and intimate contact with General Persons as he served through the years, first in the position of Chief of the Army's Legislative and Liaison Division and afterward in the position of Director of Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

General Persons was preeminently qualified for the delicate and difficult work of liaison between the Army and the National Defense Establishment on the one hand and the Congress on the other hand. He possessed the genius of tactful approach, of sympathetic understanding, of reconciling differences and attaining the objective. No man could have been more devoted to his task or more indefatigable in his efforts.

There is no way to measure the fine and exceptional service that he rendered the country. We know that during the war years, when it was of the utmost importance that there be the closest of cooperation between the Congress and the Military Establishment, he contributed greatly to such an accord and to the wonderful results that the effective cooperation meant in the winning of the war. He was the Military Establishment's general on the legislative front, and this front never failed to do the needful and to make its full contribution.

Since the war General Persons has continued his outstanding service amidst the tremendous and difficult problems that have confronted the Military Establishment. As one Member of Congress, I am loathe to see this fine soldier, patriot, and American leave the Military Establishment. He richly deserves the thanks of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the release of the National Military Establishment, Office of the Secretary of Defense, under date of April 4, 1949, and the release of the National Military Establishment, Department of the Army, April 5, 1949, with reference to General Persons' retirement.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT,
OFFICE, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1949.

GENERAL PERSONS TO RETIRE IN JULY; SERVED AS DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON FOR OSD

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson announced today that Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, United States Army, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, will retire in July after 32 years of service in the Army to accept the position of superintendent of Staunton Military Academy at Staunton, Va.

"I will be sorry to lose General Persons' services in this office, but I feel that I should not insist that he alter his arrangements with Staunton Military Academy, which had been completed before I became Secretary of Defense," Mr. Johnson said.

"General Persons had intended to retire about the 1st of June in order to take over his new responsibility at the earliest possible date. He has agreed to remain for approximately a month longer, so as to continue his liaison with the Congress on the important legislative program for the National Military Establishment. Staunton Military Academy, which has a distinguished tradition and reputation, is fortunate in obtaining the services of General Persons as its next superintendent."

General Persons was born in Montgomery, Ala., and was graduated from the Alabama Polytechnic Institute with a degree of bachelor of science in electrical engineering in 1916. He also holds the degree of master of business administration from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

He entered the Army as a second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Reserve, during World War I, and served as a battery commander on the western front in France and later with the occupation forces in Germany. He was commissioner in the Regular Army in 1917.

Under his guidance, the first integrated legislative program for the Army, Navy, and Air Force has been prepared and presented to the Congress this year. Before he became Director, Legislative Liaison of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, he served in a similar capacity in the Department of the Army, including the entire period of World War II. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit for his services during the war, and he also has the decorations of Grand Officer of the Cross of the Sun (Brazil), the Order of Abdon Calderon (Ecuador), and the Medal of War (Brazil).

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1949.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS

Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall today expressed 1 'gh appreciation for the 32 years of service of Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who will retire from the Army in July to become superintendent of Staunton Military Academy at Staunton, Va.

Following announcement of General Person's imminent retirement by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, Mr. Royall said:

"On General Persons' re'irement from the United States Army after a distinguished career spanning two World Wars and 32 years I wish to express my high appreciation for his services to his country and to the Army. Qualities of leadership, perseverance, fortitude and high professional skill mark his lifetime of devotion to duty.

"I cannot overestimate the importance and value of his contribution to the war and

post-war work of the Army as chief of the Army's Legislative and Liaison Division in the crucial years between March 1942 and July 1948. He has demonstrated that same high competence and devotion since he assumed the duties of director of Legislative and Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of Defense in July, 1948.

"General Persons' executive ability and professional skills have been of enormous value in the establishment and maintenance of an understanding relationship between the Congress and the Armed Services. It is, of course, unnecessary for me to state how supremely important such understanding is at the present juncture of world affairs.

"I know that General Persons can be relied upon for assistance and advice to both the Army and the entire National Military Establishment should future need arise."

Southern Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Massachusetts Editor Takes Honest Look at Southern Textiles," published in the Daily Mail, of Anderson, S. C., of the issue of April 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS EDITOR TAKES HONEST LOOK AT SOUTHERN TEXTILES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following editorial is from the Berkshire Evening Eagle, published at Pittsfield, Mass., in the heart of the New England textile district. It is a refreshingly candid statement of the obvious advantages of the South as an industrial area, and answers northern critics who have lambasted the South each time a new industrial plant has taken wings from New England to this area.)

There is very little comfort for Berkshire County or any other part of New England in the report in Thursday's Eagle by John E. Kelly on the textile industry in the South, particularly South Carolina. The tendency of cotton mills to move South has been understandable; it seems only logical for the mills to be established near the source of supply, and avoid unnecessary shipping. But in woolen manufacturing the Southeast has no great advantage in proximity to raw material and it is impossible to rationalize the competition.

The chief value of Mr. Kelly's article, unpleasant as it is, will be to induce us to stop kidding ourselves, and to face the truth. It is evidently false that southern mills are obsolete and unsanitary, ramshackle relics of the reconstruction era; on the contrary, a large proportion are new. It is untrue that southern mills pay starvation wages, the wages seem to be almost, if not quite, on a par with wages elsewhere. This means, in effect, that they are higher in purchasing power, because of the milder climate. This fact is always minimized by those who demand a uniform wage country-wide. But it stands to reason that living costs are cheaper where gardeners plant peas in January, and where peach trees bloom in February, than in New England where the March mud is 2 feet deep and where freezing temperatures and snowstorms are not infrequent in April. The need for less clothing for individuals, and for less fuel in the factories and homes is a factor that is of great financial importance.

There are, finally, the lower taxes and the different attitude of the powers that be. The attitude taken all too often by labor and by national administrations in Washington that are favorable to labor is that industry is a rapacious monster whose principal duties are to pay most of the taxes, to provide jobs for the workers whether it makes any money or not and whose desire for profits is a form of depravity that must be discouraged as much as possible. In the circumstances, it is understandable why businessmen seeing welfare and unemployment benefits constantly rising in the regions where they are situated, turn a responsive ear to the blandishments of communities where their taxes and other expenses will be less and where they are not only welcome but ardently desired.

Statement by Hon. John C. Stennis, of Mississippi, Before Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made yesterday before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, along with other Members of the Senate, who have a major interest in agricultural problems, I have been highly pleased with the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture as approved by the House of Representatives.

4–H CLUBS

Most of the great programs conducted by the Department for the benefit of the American farmer and the general public have been granted adequate funds to continue successful operation, and a sound expansion has been outlined for some of them. I have been particularly pleased with the $1,000,000 increase in payments to States for the extension service. These funds will be largely used to provide better support for 4–H Club activities. There can be no better investment of public funds than for work such as this, which is producing better farmers and homemakers and better all-around citizens among our rural youth.

In voting this increased appropriation which completes the final increment of the Bankhead-Flannagan Act and brings to a total of $26,966,950 annual funds available for payments to States for extension service, it is my suggestion that the Congress call upon the Department for a full report of these areas in the country where 4–H work is not available for every rural youth.

The Extension Service not only needs sufficient personnel to carry on this work, but it needs highly trained, highly capable personnel. The agents and the assistant agents who handle the 4–H programs should be real leaders in their community, capable of offering a real incentive to the farm youth to become the most active type of useful citizen. If a survey by the Department shows any field where this item of our extension work is not adequate, the next session of this Congress should eliminate the deficiency.

The allowance of the full budget recommendations for provisions of the Research and Marketing Act is another demonstration that the present Congress is a firm friend of the American farmer and well responsive to the needs of developing our farm economy to a basis of equality with other phases of our economic life.

SOIL CONSERVATION

In this connection I hope that the committee will see fit to increase the allocation for soil-conservation research made by the House. The budget estimate was reduced in this case by $657,000, and I believe that the greater part of these funds could be very profitably expended during the coming year. We have made great progress in soil-conservation research, but there are still many unknowns that need to be explored for the very detailed benefit of our farm land. In those areas where our land is still wasting away despite the adoption of the most modern conservation practices, there must be a field for broader knowledge.

EXPERIMENT STATION RECORD

I note that the budget allowance for experiment stations has been approved. In this connection, however, I would like to ask the committee to add one small item that was originally omitted when the Congress failed to provide funds in 1947. I refer to the publication of the Experiment Station Record. This publication, a complete index to the experiment station work in all 48 States, once provided an invaluable service not only to research workers in the field, but to all agricultural students. Perhaps its publication can be resumed without any specific appropriation, but whatever step is necessary, I hope the committee will look into the matter.

FORESTRY

The House has reduced by $1,518,500 the amount estimated for national forest protection and management, and the total approved is more than $200,000 less than the sum appropriated in 1948. I ask this committee to give serious consideration to restoring at least the major part of the budget estimate.

In my section of the country we do not have national forests on the order of the great reservations in the West, but we do have some very fine areas, several in my State, which have just begun to reach a stage of development which demonstrates conclusively the worth of these great programs for the conservation of our natural resources. This stage of their progress is no time to retrench our activities in the field.

To provide a specific illustration, it has been the example of the development of the national forests in the southern part of my State which has provided the major incentive for the establishment and rapid growth of a system of forest farming on much of the worn-out farm land of that area. Today farmers who never received an adequate return from regular farm operations on this land are leading the way in timber production. If this development of forest farming continues over Mississippi, our State will progress to a much richer and more balanced agricultural economy. The demonstration of what could be done in the national forests can take major credit for this most laudable development.

The House very wisely increased the funds for private forestry cooperation, but this over-

all development should not be neglected. At the same time, there should be a larger appropriation for forest development, roads and trails, and for forest-fire cooperation. One of the greatest aids in the development of private forestry which the committee can supply is more adequate cooperation with State and local government, and private interests, in preventing forest fires.

COTTON CLASSING

On page 53, line 2, of the appropriation bill, the House established the following legislative provision in the bill: "*Provided*, That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support."

It is my understanding that action was taken to alleviate the acute cotton-classing bottleneck that developed during the harvesting and marketing of the 1948 crop.

I can report from personal knowledge that the classing services provided by the Department during this period were simply not sufficient to come close to meeting the great demand without very trying delays. The few available classing stations were swamped with samples for classification, and many farmers living long distances from the stations could not afford to take the long trips necessary to cut down some of the delay. As you know, cotton must be properly classed before it can be placed on a Commodity Credit Corporation loan. The CCC loans of last year saved the cotton producers of the Nation from a disastrous price season, but many small cotton farmers had to sell their cotton outside the loan system, at a loss of several cents per pound, because they could not afford to wait through the long period for classing.

When the small cotton farmer in the South picks and gins a bale or two of cotton, usually he needs the money right away for food and clothing for his family. If we are going to give him the benefit of price supports for his product, we should not deprive him of this benefit through failure to properly adapt the system to his needs.

I have been informed that the legislative provision written into this appropriation bill by the House will take care of the shortage of cotton-classing stations. I urge this committee to carefully investigate this matter, and receive the same assurance before it takes final action on the appropriation for the service.

If the committee is not fully satisfied, I urge it to make an appropriation adequate to meet the needs of expanding the classing service. It has been estimated that $400,000 would be needed.

Some action should be taken to remedy the situation, or the Congress will have failed in its responsibility to the small cotton farmer.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address concerning reclamation, delivered by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] before the seventeenth annual convention banquet of the National Reclamation Association, on November 18, 1948, in Oklahoma City, Okla.:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is certainly one of the greatest associations that I have ever had the opportunity of being acquainted with and learning of your wonderful program. You and I are conscious of the fact that Oklahoma and the West and America are the product of two things: people and resources.

You and I know that the Oklahoma and the West and the America of tomorrow will be the product of two things: people and resources.

As people become better educated and better trained—as they increase their knowledge and develop wisdom, they are able to more profitably use and develop their natural resources.

As our natural resources are more fully developed and properly conserved, they will provide better opportunities for the progress, prosperity, and security of the people.

As Americans we live in the midst of and are blessed by the greatest variety and most abundant quantities of natural resources in the most favorable environment of any people in the world.

The greatest and most important of these resources are soil and water.

For over 300 years we have traveled happily, but carelessly, along the high road to prosperity, too little aware that our objectives, no matter how desirable, were being gained at a cost far too high, and unnecessarily so.

I would like to take a leaf from the history of the American Indian. He was the world's greatest natural conservationist. I do not know how many thousand years unnumbered tribes lived in and off of the natural resources of this continent.

When the White Man came, took possession and began to use these resources, they had been so completely conserved that their use over thousands of years had not depleted or destroyed, but conserved and added to.

Today, after 300 years of the White Man's occupation our Indian brothers can properly inquire: What of the millions of acres of top soil, eroded and lost? What of the streams, polluted and silted? What of the timber, used but not replaced?

Under the Indian's rule, soil and water lived together as friends. The soil uneroded by the water. The water unpolluted by the soil. Today the White Men and Indians live together as brothers, but for 300 years we have seen unceasing conflict between soil and water. We have permitted the water to attack, erode and destroy and wash away millions of acres of our most valuable soil. We have seen the soil wash into and fill the channels of streams, thus making certain that every recurring rain or flood would do it damage sooner and easier and to a greater extent.

Every year there is some flooding everywhere and terrible floods somewhere.

Every gallon of water that moves across and out of a State without having been properly used is a public loss.

Every particle of soil carried away is a public tragedy.

To permit continued erosion of soil by uncontrolled water and the ensuing loss of both the soil and the water is to encourage general poverty and invite national disaster.

On the other hand, by adequate conversation and rebuilding of the soil and through proper conservation and use of water we can guarantee for ourselves and our children the essential elements that will insure improved health—increasing wealth—and enlarged national security.

I was Governor of Oklahoma in May 1943, when the most devastating floods I have ever seen invaded northeast Oklahoma. Your distinguished secretary-manager, Don McBride, and other farsighted men interested in the future of Oklahoma and its people went with me as I visited the valleys where these awful floods had struck with such terrible fury.

We saw the floodwater recede. We saw the lands dry out. We saw the farm families who had been compelled to flee their homes, as from a pestilence, return—repair the soil and plant a second crop. We saw June and July come and give promise of harvest. But in the latter part of July and August we saw a withering drought burn up and destroy the second crop as completely as the floods had ruined the first.

We asked ourselves then and have continued to repeat the question since "How long before the intelligent, enlightened people of Oklahoma and across the Nation will arise in their wisdom and power and develop a program to prevent the destruction by water in flood times, and control and save it for its life-giving value in dry times?"

One time the great Sam Jones was asked the question: "How do you know that you have religion?" He answered: "I was there when I got it."

You and I have been there when the destruction from uncontrolled water took place, and when the loss of production because of the lack of water was happening.

In the light of this knowledge and its significance, we cannot escape our responsibility to solve this great and pressing problem.

Yonder in the twenty-sixth chapter of Genesis we learn in the early dawn of the life of the race, water was a controlling factor. "And Isaac digged again the wells of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham, his father.

"And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water.

"And the herdsmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdsmen, saying 'The water is ours.'

"And they digged another well and strove for that also.

"And he removed from thence, and digged another well; and for that they strove not; and he called the name of it Rehoboth; and he said, 'For now the Lord hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.'"

We have such an abundance of water that if we will adequately conserve it and equitably use it, we do not need to waste our substance or time in striving with each other for it.

There is enough for all, and to spare.

I want to congratulate your great association upon your realization of the enormous value of the proper use of water and upon your purposes to develop that use. I commend you for your spirit of willingness to cooperate with our great Bureau of Reclamation and every other appropriate agency of the Government and other associations and individuals seeking to conserve and utilize our water resources.

You come from many places, all of which are interested specifically in the development of their own projects and generally in the development of all worthy projects. We here are vitally concerned with the vast watersheds of the Arkansas and the Red and their tributaries. We are dedicated to bring about their development on a basis commensurate with their value and importance and as a part of the over-all program for the development of the resources of the Nation. We believe that here, as on the mighty Missouri, the program must be basin-wide in scope, but comprehensive enough to insure the development of the small projects simultaneously with the larger and greater ones.

As a private citizen and as a public official, I have come to know, to like, and respect

the capable men who make up the Corps of Engineers—the Reclamation Service and those in and out of our Government, who are striving and working for the conservation and rebuilding of the soil.

It is our purpose and the purpose of our people to work with these existing agencies of Government in the development of our soil and water resources.

We are aware that these agencies of Government are entitled to public support to the extent, but only to the extent, that they are willing and able to effectively and cooperatively serve the interest and welfare of the people.

Saving and rebuilding the soil and conserving and using the water are so important in the life of this Nation as to be almost, if not entirely, sacred. They should and, in my opinion, will be lifted above the level of human jealousy or partisan identification.

There is, in my opinion, a justification for the development of a bipartisan program to insure these objectives as great as the necessity and justification for a bipartisan program with reference to our foreign policy.

I thank God for the wisdom of the American people that has led them in seeking and finding the patriotic goal of a united effort to achieve peace in the world.

I pray that a similar wisdom will show us the necessity and the opportunity for a united effort and purpose to achieve the most important objective of our peacetime domestic economy, namely: adequate conservation and rebuilding of soil, complete conservation and use of water.

My fellow Americans, there is a rainbow across the western sky. There is a star high above the Western World. It is the rainbow of reclamation and irrigation. It is the star of a wonder program to harness and control, conserve and use the mighty tides of the Nation's priceless water.

Godspeed to you in the accomplishments of your worthy purposes.

What Are We Being Spent Into?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "What Are We Being Spent Into?" written by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and published in the Reader's Digest for May 1949, together with a cogent editorial entitled "One Brave Man," from the Omaha World-Herald for April 20, 1949.

The article is a timely and an illuminating discussion of a subject vital to the welfare of all Americans, and particularly significant because of the concern existing at this time in the minds of so many Americans as to the future financial course of Government.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest of May 1949]

WHAT ARE WE BEING SPENT INTO?

(By Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, United States Senator from Virginia)

Two facts vitally affect the income, the savings, and the future of every American: The increasing rate of speed at which the Government spends what we make;

The Government's plans to spend not less of what we make but vastly more.

Spending measures are now before Congress which—looking innocently small at first glance—are due to amass, for us and our children, the most gigantic bills in the peacetime history of any nation.

Disarmingly labeled "A bill to provide a national health-insurance and public-health program" Senate bill (S. 5) provides that, to all intents and purposes, the Government put doctors on the Federal pay roll and provide free medical care for 85 percent of the people of the country. Collected in pay-roll taxes, the cost of this free program, in the first year, will be about $4,000,000,000. Eventually it is due to cost, every year, $10,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000.

With a relatively modest $300,000,000, it is proposed this year to launch a program of Federal aid to education. After 1950 the annual cost will rise sharply and, as the States shift their educational responsibilities to the Federal Government, it may reach three billion a year.

Launched as an emergency depression measure, the Federal school-lunch program has become, like most emergency measures, a permanent Government policy. Last year it cost $70,000,000. Now the Secretary of Agriculture reportedly wants free lunches for every school child in the land. That would cost nearly half a billion dollars in 1950 and at least $550,000,000 annually by 1955.

For the less well-to-do American families—adults as well as children—the administration is backing a free-food program. The first year's cost of that undertaking is estimated at $1,000,000,000.

The plan before Congress to expand the public-housing program calls for a maximum of only $185,000,000 in the first year. It could end up costing us billions.

With powerful veteran backing, a veterans' pension bill has been offered which would require, in 1950, an estimated $120,000,000. This would boost the annual cost of veterans' benefits not so many years ahead to an estimated eight to ten billion dollars.

A 7-year reclamation plan, lately unveiled by the Department of the Interior, would cost us only $312,000,000 in the first year, but almost four billion by the end of the seventh. In January 1948 the total cost of the proposed waterways development in the Missouri River Basin was officially put at four and one-half billion dollars. In July 1948 the official total was put at six and one-half billions—a $2,000,000,000 jump in 6 months. Last year, for the development of the water resources of our river basins, Congress appropriated a little more than $1,000,000,000. Plans have now been officially blueprinted which, to complete, will cost at least fifty-seven billions.

The spending propagandists declare that 75 percent of this year's Federal budget is for national defense, foreign aid, and to pay the cost of past wars. Statesmanship will fail disastrously if it does not find the road to peace and a consequent reduction of these expenditures.

But the real threat to our earnings and our future is in the remaining 25 percent. And, as my grandfather used to say, the tendency of everything is to become more so. Once under way, the foot-in-the-door proposals concealed in that 25 percent could easily cost us more—in addition to defense, foreign aid, and war—than this year's total budget.

There is a point at which, by taking out of the hands of the people so much of the fruit of their labors and the means for increasing their production, the very size of government spending becomes a menace to a free economy and, thereby, to all freedom. How far past that danger spot is our Government prepared to take us? What sort of America are we being spent into?

The burden of proof, says Henry Hazlitt in Newsweek, is on the spenders. "And it is not enough for them to prove, even if they could do so, that everything that these expenditures will buy is needed. They must prove that the citizens of the country need each of these things even more than they need the things for which they would spend their own money if it were not taken away from them in taxes."

In his first campaign for the Presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed great alarm at the dangerous and appalling increase in the Federal Government's spending. "The most reckless and extravagant," he called it, "that I have been able to discover in the statistical record of any peacetime government anywhere, any time." The increase which so stirred Mr. Roosevelt's wrath in 1932 amounted to $1,000,000,000 in 4 years—an average, per year, of $250,000,000. One billion dollars is more than our entire Federal Government spent in any peacetime year up to 1917. But with our national debt now past the quarter-trillion mark, $1,000,000,000, as Federal spending goes, has ceased to be a startling statistic.

As for the $250,000,000 annual increase which Mr. Roosevelt so vehemently deplored: This year, 1949, the Government proposes to increase its spending over last year not by a mere quarter of a billion dollars but by 25 times that amount. This year's increase in spending—the increase alone—totals more than the Government spent for all purposes in any peacetime year up to 1934 save one.

By the puny standards of those days, the most alarming period of New Deal spending was in the 5 years from 1935 through 1939. This year's proposed $42,000,000,000 budget is more than was spent in all those 5 years. It is more than the total national income of the United States in the year that Mr. Roosevelt was first elected.

On a per capita basis that much spending is equivalent to a burden—in this one year—of $1,420 for a family of five. That is almost half as much as the average American family earns in a year. It is more than the entire annual earnings of 6,000,000 families.

With an argument as sound today and as unheeded as it was in 1932, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay. They pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or in broad unemployment throughout the land."

Last year our national income was the highest in our history. Does that mean that we are increasing our earnings at a faster rate than the Government is increasing its consumption of them? On the contrary, every year the Government takes away from us not only a larger number of the dollars we have earned but a larger proportion of our total earnings.

Frankly conceding we are now paying for past wars and future defense, the fact remains that what the Government took away from us in 1939 amounted to $37 for every man, woman, and child in the country. Last year it took more than seven times that much. Did our national income in those 10 years go up by seven times? Not at all. It increased by only three times. Thus, for every additional dollar we earned, the Government took two and one-third dollars. Its spending of our money, in other words, was increasing at a rate two and one-third times faster than our earnings.

The Government's biggest slice of what we make comes from personal income taxes. There the Government is gaining on the citizen with truly giant strides. Almost half of our income taxes comes out of those whose annual earnings are under $6,000.

For every dollar paid in income taxes in 1940, the Government this year will take about $14. The Federal budget this year will almost equal the total 1947 earnings of all the people living in the 17 States comprising the western half of the United States and including California and Texas.

Thus the boundaries of our economic freedom and of our right to the pursuit of happiness are shrinking. Every year less and less is left to us to use as our own, to buy a home or a life-insurance policy, to invest, set up a business, or save for the rainy day. The figures reveal a startling story of the draining dry of the springs of increased production and prosperity.

As the Government takes more and more of our total earnings, each year the amount of money which is left over and can be productively employed for the maintenance and expansion of our economy is dangerously diminishing. Out of our total income in 1944, the American people had $34,000,000,000 left—after taxes and the tax-inflated cost of living—to save and put to productive use. In 1945 we had the same income but the amount left over had been cut to $26,500,000,000. In 1946, it was down to $11,800,000,000. In 1947, though our income was the highest in our history, an even smaller amount of it—$8,800,000,000—was left over to save, invest, to expand production.

No plan can, overnight, bring Government spending down to a safe level. We are committed to the expenditure of vast sums for foreign aid. Prudence requires the strengthening of our national defense. We are engaged in many undertakings here at home which we could not and would not choose to liquidate.

But what a spur it would be to America's confidence, energies, and productive genius if our national administration were to announce its determined purpose:

1. To make the saving of the people's money a major objective of government;

2. To spend, henceforth, solely for projects which are demonstrably necessary, which cannot be postponed or done for less, and which only the Federal Government can undertake;

3. To seek to safeguard and enlarge the area in which every law-abiding American is free to do with his own—his money and abilities—what he chooses to do.

The crucial requirement is not that the Government's spending, this year, should be reduced by any specific amount, but that the trend toward increased spending should be resolutely resisted and, by cutting down, postponing, and cutting out wherever possible, definitely reversed. This can be wisely done only by insisting, as a Senate colleague recently said, "that every dollar spent by the Government is not only a dollar well spent, but a dollar necessarily spent."

The Nation owes a debt of lasting gratitude to disabled war veterans, and has the duty of providing adequate care for them. But is it necessary to provide for hospitalization for a major portion of all our people? The scores of new construction projects proposed by the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers may all be good. But at a time when the costs of such construction are far above normal, are they necessary? The Interior Department's plan to double the croplands irrigated by its reclamation projects in the Northwest is probably desirable. But in a period when our crops are already so large that the Government is paying out money to keep prices up, is it necessary?

There is probably not a single item in the whole, vast list of Federal spending projects where the test of necessity, if honestly applied, would not produce confidence-inspiring savings. For every dollar thus saved the American people would be, by that much, a freer people, and a more soundly productive America would be that much stronger in the cause of freedom.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of April 20, 1949]

ONE BRAVE MAN

Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, comes forward, in the Reader's Digest, with a firm conviction:

"What a spur it would be to American confidence, energies, and productive genius if our national administration were to announce its determined purpose"—to do what?

Simply this:

"To spend, henceforth, solely for projects which are demonstrably necessary, which cannot be postponed or done for less, and which only the Federal Government can undertake."

That is a drastic proposal. It would cut public spending to the very bone. If adopted and put into effect not alone by the national administration but by the governments of States, municipalities, and other local spending units, it would save to the people not alone billions but tens of billions of dollars which now are taken out of their pockets and turned over to government to spend.

There is no hope, it must be admitted, that our national administration will give any consideration at all to the proposal of this economy-minded Virginian. And very little that it will be adopted as a guiding rule by many States and cities.

And this not because it is an unsound proposal. But because practically all government in the United States, from the lowest unit to the highest, is carried along by a tempestuous spending and taxing spree. A spree during which little or no thougnt is given to the future of the Republic.

Senator ROBERTSON calls attention to the increasing rate at which the Government spends what we make, and to the Government's plans to spend not less of what we make but vastly more.

As late as 1944, he tells, after taxes and inflated living costs, the people had $34,000,000,000 left to save and put to productive use. Only 3 years later, in 1947, though our income had mounted to the highest in our history, less than $9,000,000,000 was left. Since 1940 collections from income taxes have been multiplied 14 times.

Such is the hurricane of spending that threatens to sweep away the earnings and the instruments and means of production of the American people.

Right now the Congress is considering enormously increased spending for public health, education, and housing. Even Senator WHERRY thinks this program desirable, though he is fearful of plunging the Government into red ink.

And Senator TAFT, fighting a rear-guard action, temporizes with bills of his own to increase the spending, only on a more modest scale than Mr. Truman demands.

But no one, apparently, stops to ask, as Senator ROBERTSON urges: "Is it demonstrably necessary? Can it be postponed? Can only Government undertake this project?"

Americans are not hard-hearted Hannahs. They have a highly developed social conscience. They are giving right now for social welfare immensely more than ever before, immensely more than any people on earth ever have done. And they are doing it at a time when there is more nearly full employment, at higher wages, than has hitherto been dreamed of. They are doing it when there is less of grinding poverty, when the public health is better, when education is on a higher plane, when there is far less hardship than ever before.

They are faced now with plans for enormous additional spending to eliminate hardship entirely, though it was in hardship and its brave endurance that this Republic was built and out of which the resolution, courage, and independence of Americans grew to make them great. Plans to compel the industrious and thrifty to support, in assured comfort, the indolent, the shiftless, the profligate, even though they make no effort to support themselves. And plans, in doing this, to spread public and private bankruptcy broadcast, so that none can longer suppport either themselves or others.

That is the situation. It is plain and undeniable. Everyone can see it. Yet there are very few in public life, too few even in private life, to heed such warnings as Senator ROBERTSON'S or to give so much as faint-hearted support to his proposals for calling a halt. Even those known as conservative leaders, such as Senator TAFT, temporize, while others shrink from speaking out. The fear of the pressure groups—who unwittingly threaten their own destruction—has become all but universal.

Fear, not courage, is in the ascendancy.

But it is heartening that one man in public life, a Democratic Senator at that, dares to brave the devastating storm.

Achievements of Home-Demonstration Agents in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Progressive Farmer, Miss Sallie Hill, home department editor, reviewed some of the great achievements of the many fine home-demonstration agents in the South. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive Farmer of March 1949]

FARM FOLK CAN LIVE BETTER

(By Sallie Hill, editor, home department)

At the outset, perhaps I should tell you that I have a double purpose in writing this article. I want to pay tribute to the leaders of a new type of farm-home education—the largest volunteer adult education program for women in the world. Home-demonstration work, which started about 35 years ago, is taken for granted by most of us southern farm folks. Therefore, I was genuinely shocked recently, when a radio commentator remarked, "I never heard of a home-demonstration agent." Accepting this gentleman's woeful lack of information as a sort of challenge, I am dedicating this page to a brief presentation of home-demonstration agents and their work.

To give you an idea of the varied subject matter and far-reaching effect of this program, we give you a few excerpts from the annual report of Home Agent Rowena I. Sullivan, Simpson County, Ky. From demonstrations presented in farm homes and sponsored by the home agent, 206 enrollees accomplished the following.

They slip-covered 61 pieces of furniture and repaired 62 pieces. Ninety-four rooms in Simpson County homes were completely rearranged to make them more attractive. Woodwork was painted in 225 rooms; walls

were refinished in 164; and floors were refinished in 282.

With so much improvement, the natural follow-up was new and better furnishings. This included 99 new rugs, 195 new or reconditioned window shades, and 149 pairs of curtains, and 69 pairs of draperies made by the homemakers. They also added 69 pieces of new furniture and 92 pieces of refinished furniture. They made 56 rugs.

Home management was not overlooked by these 206 homemakers, either. They remodeled 30 kitchens and improved 13 others. New equipment was added, too—147 major items and 197 smaller articles. The homemakers are also striving to improve their working habits. Now, 156 of them have learned to sit for most of their work and 83 eliminate unnecessary tasks from their daily routines.

Good cooks welcome new recipes, and Simpson County homemakers tried 1,011 new recipes, 183 plan meals ahead, 206 plan their menus to include more green and yellow leafy vegetables, and 183 plan their meals to include all basic seven foods. They canned 10,861 quarts of meat, fruit, and vegetables; froze 5,583 pounds of meat and 1,181 quarts of vegetables; and put up 2,494 pints of jams, jellies, and preserves.

In their landscaping, 26 improved walks and drives, 36 added lawn furniture, 23 repaired or painted outbuildings, 93 put their names on mail boxes, and 18 improved the entrances to their farms. These 206 rural women set 935 shrubs and rosebushes and 140 trees.

Sewing is a regular job of these farm homemakers. They made 1,262 new garments, remodeled and mended 3,061 articles, and made 230 items of household linens.

These rural women read approximately 20,858 magazine articles, probably made possible by their exchange of 1,152 magazines. Sixty of them read their Bible daily.

Let us remember, too, that the activities of these 206 volunteer members are far-reaching—they serve as object lessons for their friends and neighbors. Many of their projects "catch fire" and spread throughout an entire county.

Take the case of Eva Minix in Rockingham County, Va. With praiseworthy efficiency, this agent campaigned for better kitchens. I recently visited that county and saw some remarkable results—375 families remodeled or improved their kitchens. At the same time, 370 families improved other rooms. Some 2,000 pieces of major equipment were added—ranges, home freezers, washing machines, refrigerators, etc.

Down in Coahoma County, Miss., home freezers have caught on to such an extent that Home Agent Judson Purvis can point to 236 new ones purchased this past year.

We take you now to Halifax County, N. C., for Home Agent Florence Cox's report of the Women's Curb Market. There $17,384.94 worth of home products were sold on the market, and $20,921.23 worth of products were sold by club members outside the market.

Looking in on Anna Heist, St. Johns County, Fla., we learn that 164 homes were electrified in 1948 and that 650 pieces of home equipment were added, much of it electrical.

Passers-by in Kershaw County, S. C., may well ask, "Whose attractive farm home is this?" Margaret Fewell, the agent, reports that 750 families have improved their grounds. Home improvement was a chief concern of Elizabeth Tuttle, of Forsyth County, N. C.; 1,548 homes were improved, 18 families were assisted in constructing a house, and 130 others helped with remodeling.

Gayle Roberts, of Tarrant County, Tex., reports that 112 women have applied work-simplification methods to their household tasks. And five women have met the irksome dishwashing job by purchasing electric dishwashers.

In El Paso County, Tex., Home Agent Irma Sealy reports that 318 families now have home freezing units to help preserve their food.

Homemakers of Stewart County, Tenn., have been turning to art, according to Ophelia Elam, home agent. They etched 777 glass articles; made 228 corsages, 428 aluminum trays, and 337 pieces of shell jewelry. In addition, 256 new homes were built in the county. Pine Hill, a community of 50 families in Knox County, Tenn., was an active center for improvement, too. Ruby McKeel, home agent, reports that 15 rooms were papered, 12 houses screened, and 36 major pieces of home equipment were purchased.

SEEN AND HEARD

Like a brisk March wind, community-improvement contests have swept across 619 Tennessee communities. And what is it all about? Simply this: farm families are engaged in a program which fosters community planning, organization, beautification, and development. Businessmen in Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga, and other cities offer prizes for high records. Both farm folks and businessmen acknowledge the splendid yeoman service of the Tennessee Extension Department in achieving their enviable records. The annual dinner and award celebration in Knoxville honored 190 east Tennessee communities in 25 counties. Relph McDade, Tennessee extension worker who had served as a judge in the counties, made these meaningful comments: "We saw the democratic process at work * * * a lot of grass roots. We felt the impact of a rural purchasing power * * * we got a feeling of a reserve of fertility * * * of a sound system of farming. * * * If this country has hardships, these farm families have a reserve of power and ability to get along. We saw communities cleaning up the countryside * * * and they will do much more. In Washington County, I saw 22 improved kitchens on which about $24,000 had been spent."

ON TO NASHVILLE

"I wish that the results of this contest could be spread across the land." The foregoing statement was made by the Honorable Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, as he addressed some 600 farm folk and businessmen at the middle Tennessee community improvement award dinner in Nashville recently. "Two things are important," Mr. Davis continued, "being good neighbors and taking care of our land to get full use of our resources."

Sponsored by the Farmers Club of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, the dinner honored representatives of 200 communities and 37 middle Tennessee counties. Just here we shall let the record speak—we refer to the 1948 report as compared to the 1947 record from these 8,226 farm families: Church and Sunday school attendance, which is listed first in community planning, shows more than a 10-percent increase. As for general civic and community work, more than 20 percent more individuals took part this past year. For their family food supply middle Tennessee farm folk did almost 69 percent more quick freezing this past year. At the same time, they kept up their high record of food production and canning.

Can farmers afford to improve their farms and homes? Just listen to the astounding answer from these enterprising folks: In 1948, 45 percent more families installed running water. As for bathrooms, there was more than a 69-percent increase in installation. And who can deny that these are high-voltage folk—107 percent more families installed electricity in 1948.

It all cost money, of course, and here is the astounding account as rendered: 79 percent or more, or $3,734,077, was spent for all buildings and repairs. The purchase of electrical appliances adds up to almost 46 percent and set farm folks' bank accounts back $1,109,932. And now comes the breath-taking part of our story: Furniture and home furnishings involved a cost of $1,325,-165, or an increase of 144 percent. To put it another way: the average family spent $750 for improvements, or twice as much as they did for farm machinery. Did we forget to add that the sponsoring groups awarded generous prizes? But most of all, I keep remembering the spirit of unity and the joy of accomplishment expressed by these farm folk.

Economic Situation in Europe and the United States Under the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Marshall Plan Letter," written by Harold G. Stagg and published on March 17, 1949. The article deals with the economic situation in Europe and the United States under the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE CRISIS?

United States traders should take close look at long-range outlook for American trade.

Analysis by the Marshall Plan Letter of export-import picture as related to major ERP countries, other United States markets, indicates that although short-range outlook is good compared to prewar years but not 1947 bonanza, long-range outlook holds serious threat to United States exports which will become increasingly evident in 1950; reach acute stage by 1952.

European recovery objectives, which in final showdown involve reducing imports from United States by thumping 40 percent, capturing half of United States markets in Latin America, are probably overambitious. But fact remains that impact of trade shifts in next 3 years will be an acute shock to present United States trade pattern; require some difficult decisions.

Government trade experts predict that United States exports in 1949 will average $1,000,000,000 a month—close to 1948 levels—although sharper competition will face American traders in almost all world markets.

Trade pattern of last half of 1948 is likely to continue for next year as result of heavy spending of ERP dollars, although thereafter drives of all western European countries to cut imports from this country will become matter of urgent concern not only to producers already suffering from end of extraordinary 1947 demand but to entire domestic economy.

Price declines in United States will have little effect on the short-range picture. Although European buying in this country is encouraged by price decreases here, this is offset for most part by fact that European exporters will receive less for their products sold here; supply of earned dollars is proportionately reduced.

ECA is also committed to reducing its appropriation request if price declines continue this year. Economy advocates in Senate, headed by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, Georgia, will demand that ECA review, reduce its spending plans in June if con-

tinued slump in commodity prices is then evident.

Trade problem is complicated by fact that Europe is aiming, not only at reducing imports from United States, but at increasing its exports to this country and to rest of Western Hemisphere.

This export campaign is already causing trouble. Some United States suppliers complain they are losing markets in Latin America; some domestic producers have become concerned at threat of European competition in United States.

Despite fact that increase in European exports to United States is one of keystones of Marshall plan, hot tug of war will occur in Senate over upcoming extension, strengthening of President's powers to negotiate tariff reductions under reciprocal-trade program.

The administration is adjusting slowly to the conclusion that end of postwar shortages in this country requires new assessment of trade policies, and although some tariff reductions will be made at conference next month in France they will not be as far-reaching as desired by ERP countries.

Building long-range markets for United States exports will require aggressive action in next year, as European imports are limited more and more to a few products which can be obtained only in this country.

For example, France plans to cut its imports from United States to about $365,000,000 by 1952, compared to prewar level of about $900,000,000.

France's exceptional postwar imports of coal, bread grains, and dairy products are already being substantially reduced; coarse grains, fats, and machinery will feel the pinch next.

By 1952, France hopes to restrict dollar purchase to oil (from Middle East), $115,000,000; copper, $15,000,000; cotton, $85,000,000; machinery, $55,000,000; leaving only $95,000,000 for other miscellaneous purchases.

Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg are moving rapidly toward economic union; not expected to be completed until mid-1950, and traders should begin analyzing export opportunities to these areas as a unit.

Imports by Benelux from United States will continue at present rate of about $700,000,000—four times prewar rate—for next year then move downward to 1952 goal of about $500,000,000.

Exports to this country from Benelux, on other hand, are programed to rise from present level of about $100,000,000 to nearly $250,000,000.

Italy plans to move rapidly toward a considerable change in its supply markets. Imports from the dollar area, which amounted to 44 percent of total in 1947, will be reduced to 15 percent by 1952, while purchases will be increased in other areas.

Italian exports to this country, now at 6 percent of total, are programed to reach 10 percent of total by 1952.

Bizone Germany, now making nearly 50 percent of its purchases in United States, will begin cutting this proportion late this year, with objective of reducing United States share of imports to about 15 percent of total.

However, United States may be able to continue actual volume of its exports to Germany at a high level, if recovery there proceeds speedily enough to permit planned 75 percent over-all increase in German imports in next 3 years.

United Kingdom, whose trade plans are being urged as guide for other ERP countries, is making giant strides in reducing its purchases from the United States, cutting its imports from this country 42 percent in 1948, now planning further 17 percent reduction by 1952.

These factors will compel Congress to approve continuance of foreign aid after 1952, although emphasis will be placed on guarantees of purchases in United States as prop for domestic economy, and horizon of aid will broaden to encompass backward areas of world, in line with President Truman's point 4.

WORLD PROGRAM

Administration interagency team, making slow, halting progress in blueprinting President's world program, will be spurred, as facts on threatened trade crisis outlined above crystallize.

Feeling in some administration circles that plan is premature is being challenged by economic experts who believe that the program should be rushed before it is too late.

Truman's "bold new program" task force is considering a confidential report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation which indicates that territories of ERP nations, particularly in Africa, offer alluring possibility of greatly increased exports of United States capital goods in early phase of program, consumer goods later.

Stumbling block, however, is covert resistance of European nations to direct participation of United States private capital.

Report is vague on investment outlook in colonies, implies that mother countries will continue to expand basic industries, leaving secondary fields to private capital.

French, for example, don't want foreign firms to hold controlling interest in any projects in their overseas territories; British will approve only permanent United States investments.

ECA strategic materials division has reported sub rosa that some ERP countries discriminate against United States investors either by legislation, regulation, or obstructionist tactics outside the law, in preserving development of colonial areas for their own nationals. This is in direct violation of equal access clause of bilateral agreements signed by ERP countries as condition for ECA aid.

Officials of the American Trade Association in French Morocco have charged, for example, that French officials are using Marshall plan red tape to freeze out American business interests in that territory.

ECA's official attitude is to deny any discrimination against American traders, but, when pressed, the recovery agency passes the buck to the State Department.

Colonial production plans are focused on world short-supply commodities which Europe now imports from the dollar area and goods which can be sold for dollars.

British and French will boost production of palm oil, vital to United States stock pile, if they can procure enough modern mills and band presses. British West Africa, growing nearly half world supply of cocoa beans, hopes to earn nearly $100,000,000 annually through sales to the United States, but first must conquer "swollen shoot" disease. New planting is being tried experimentally in Malaya and Borneo.

French are hoping to double wheat production in North Africa by 1952, are seeking tractors and heavy agricultural machinery.

French are also laying ground work for intensive cultivation of cotton in equatorial and West Africa, hope to obtain yield of 50,000 tons by 1952.

African exports of timber will be emphasized. Belgian Congo is now planning two new peeling plants, veneer plant, and several pulp factories.

Work on French Guiana lead deposits is beginning, with 250,000-ton annual export to North America contemplated. Madagascar expects to produce 15,000 tons of graphite yearly by 1952. Belgian Congo plans zinc refinery with annual capacity of 35,000 tons of pure zinc.

Integrating United States world recovery program with these projects is only one of important tasks set for Truman's planners. Vast potential scope, importance of point 4 is being slowly realized with good possibility that when it finally emerges, it will loom bigger, broader than the Marshall plan. Action on world-aid program, however, will probably continue to lag until attitude of United States business is clearly defined, and responsibility for developing realistic blueprint is clearly placed, instead of being scattered, as at present, all over the Washington map.

OIL PRICES

Notwithstanding protests from principal United States oil companies that shipper's declarations on United States crude oil imports from Middle East do not represent sales prices, Administrator Hoffman has instructed new team of oil-price investigators to consider prices on shipments to any market, in determining whether ECA is being charged a fair price on oil procured in the Middle East by ERP countries.

Investigators are attempting to discover why price range on shipments from Middle East to the United States range from $1 to $1.75 a barrel while ERP countries are charged $2.03 a barrel.

Although Hoffman will continue to press for lower prices for Middle East oil, he will not approve request of independent oil producers that United States suppliers be given preference, arguing that procurement should continue in Middle East to conserve United States oil resources.

INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM

Imports from United States of industrial items by the principal ERP countries in second year of the recovery program, beginning July 1, 1949, are detailed in chart below. Tabulation is based on official estimates of top ECA industrial experts.

ERP industrial imports from United States are estimated at $2,194,000,000. Column in chart headed "total" shows the over-all imports from this country by Austria, Benelux, Denmark, France, Trizone Germany, Greece, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Trieste, and United Kingdom. Projected purchases by the six areas which will do the heaviest spending are also listed specifically.

Note that oil purchases from United States companies in the Middle East and other offshore sources are listed as imports from United States.

No tabulation is provided on aluminum imports since ECA intends to bar any such purchases from United States in next fiscal year.

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	Total	Benelux	France	Trizone Germany	Italy	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Coal	94.3	0	31.3	0	40.0	5.0	0
Oil and products	525.7	32.6	112.2	9.9	38.1	16.5	183.0
Steel raw materials	9.2	3.4	1.2	.6	1.5	.3	.1
Steel products	106.4	2.2	2.4	2.5	7.0	16.5	17.0
Copper	40.4	0	5.2	7.4	5.2	7.3	3.5
Lead	.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zinc	8.9	0	.4	.4	0	0	7.6
Pulp and paper	26.2	3.1	2.0	10.0	1.7	.3	6.5
Lumber	38.0	7.2	1.3	6.0	3.6	3.0	10.3
Farm machinery	85.0	4.7	14.4	0	.6	8.3	24.8
Machinery	796.5	78.0	160.0	46.8	115.0	80.9	94.8
Other industrial items	463.4	55.5	51.2	51.1	47.4	33.6	93.8
Total	2,194.1	186.7	381.6	134.7	260.1	171.7	441.4

As noted in MPL (March 3), largest industrial purchases will be machinery and equipment, estimated at $796,000,000.

This procurement will be divided as follows: Iron and steel equipment, $104,500,000; textile machinery, $110,300,000; power plants and transmission machinery, $54,600,000; metalworking machine tools, $75,700,000; coal-mining machinery and construction equipment, $14,300,000; petroleum equipment, $22,900,000; woodworking machinery, $2,600,000; trucks, $20,500,000; other inland transport, $62,600,000; other machinery, $328,500,000.

HAROLD G. STAGG, *Editor.*

Proposed Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the Wyoming Eagle, published at Cheyenne, Wyo., April 18, 1949, concerning the Columbia Valley Administration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRANE AND BISHOP LASH PROPOSED AUTHORITY AS INVASION OF STATE RIGHTS

CHEYENNE, April 18.—Top Wyoming officials lashed out today at President Truman's proposed Columbia Valley Administration, labeling it "an invasion of States' rights."

Gov. A. G. Crane and State Engineer L. C. Bishop pointed to Wyoming's special interest in Columbia River development and called for undivided opposition to the plan by all Western States.

Dr. Crane commented that in principle he opposes the danger to States' rights and States' action involved in the far-reaching Columbia Authority.

"The States are able by compact and discussion to provide and undertake the development of this vast region," the Governor said.

He added that State action is a somewhat slower process to settle the questions involving water and land but emphasized that that process is a better way of deciding them.

"Water means too much in this territory to allow its development to be handled by a commission, often without any action by the States," Crane said.

"The big rivers of the West rise in Wyoming and this gives Wyoming a special interest. Turning all such questions over to a small commission should be opposed by the Western States."

Bishop said Wyoming has a large stake in the Columbia River Basin and added he will urge the State's congressional delegation to seek recognition of that interest.

Bishop disclosed that Wyoming annually provides some 5,000,000 acre-feet of water for the Columbia River system through the Snake River and its tributaries.

The State engineer called the proposed CVA "another commission to take over all natural resources, including our water" and criticized tentative proposals that would give commission members annual salaries of $20,000.

If the present proposal is to meet with approval in Wyoming, he continued, it must give the State more authority than was given in any legislation proposed previously.

Moreover, he said he will recommend that if there is to be authority legislation, salaries of commissioners should be limited to that drawn by Members of Congress.

Financing Georgia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there appeared in this morning's issue of the New York Times a letter from a distinguished American educator, Dr. William F. Ogburn, which calls attention to some salient facts about education in Georgia which should be of interest to all of us, in view of the forthcoming discussion of the Federal aid-to-education program. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCING GEORGIA SCHOOLS—PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE IN RATIO TO INCOME ANALYZED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your editorial of April 10, "Education in Georgia," you cite figures showing the small amount of money spent in public-school education in Georgia and other States, and at the same time point out the large sums spent in New York. You then discuss the behavior of the Georgia State Legislature and of the Governor in negating increased expenditures. The inference is that the people of New York are acting quite handsomely, while the behavior of the Georgians is deplorable.

I am sure that your readers will regret with you that public education in Georgia is so meager. However, it seems to me the impression that Georgia's effort is so pitiful as compared with that of your own State is misleading. For you might have said, truthfully I think, that Georgia's effort to educate her children is as great as New York's as is shown with the following additional data.

The expenditure per pupil in 1947–48 in New York was $251, while in Georgia it was $81. (I do not understand your figure of $58 for Georgia in 1946–47. In 1945 the amount was $65.) But you do not observe that there are many more children to educate per 100 working adults in Georgia than in New York. In Georgia there are 118 such young people 19 years old and younger, while in New York State there are only 78. If 100 of the labor force in Georgia had as few dependents as they have in New York, Georgia could spend $123 per pupil.

INCOMES COMPARED

Furthermore, the per capita income in Georgia is much less than in New York. Poorer people can hardly be expected to spend as much on education as the richer. In Georgia in 1946 the average income payment to a person was $809, while in New York it was twice as much, $1,633. If the Georgians had as much income per person as the New Yorkers and as few young dependents they could have spent $246 per pupil, which is approximately the same as New Yorkers spent. In other words, the people of Georgia are putting forth about as much effort as are the people of New York, in view of their capabilities and responsibilities.

The point is, I think, of more than technical interest. The South's recent appeal to States' rights is a gesture for a let-up in the continuing barrage of criticism from outsiders, that is, those not familiar with conditions in the South, who are telling Southerners how to run affairs in that region. These critics seem to assume that what is feasible in their locality is feasible elsewhere, a phenomenon usually called provincialism.

MIGRANT PUPILS

A sensitive Georgian might remind New York that Georgia not only educates her children but spends millions every year educating the citizens of New York. In 1940 there were 1,500 migrants, net, to New York State who in 1935 lived in Georgia. If around 1,000 adult workers come from Georgia each year to New York and if it costs around $4,000 to rear and educate these workers, then Georgia contributes $4,000,600 to New York, for it would cost New York that much and more to rear and educate in their State this amount of skill. If New York paid Georgia for these imports, then the salaries of the school teachers could be raised 10 or 15 percent.

The message of your editorial is still true that the children of Georgia should get a better education. The answer lies, I think, in grants-in-aid, in birth control, in the southward migration of industry, rather than in exhortation or criticism.

WILLIAM F. OGBURN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 18, 1949.*

Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, Before National Congress of Rivers and Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the National Congress of Rivers and Harbors at Washington, D. C., on April 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members, and friends, I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to appear here today. Yours is a hard-working organization which has done much to advance the improvement of our rivers and harbors and to encourage the development of our water resources in the interest of flood protection and other beneficial water uses.

Today let's discuss the program of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate. I shall be speaking for all practical purposes on the subject which is of major interest to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. The legislation concerning flood control, improvement of rivers and harbors, and other water-resources developments makes up the greater part of the work of our committee.

I should like to make it clear at the outset that the legislation which comes before Congress on flood control and rivers and harbors improvement is developed through a process of teamwork—a complete cooperation between the two legislative bodies—the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I can assure you that during my tenure as chairman of the Senate committee there will continue to be wholehearted cooperation and coordination of our efforts with those of our counterpart committee in the House. It will be toward the common objective of beneficial legislation for the advancement of water-resources development.

Without this close teamwork we would be unable to accomplish the good progress that has been made in the past. This unanimity of effort is due in no small part to our very good fortune in having the excellent leadership in the House committee—leadership in the person of an authority on flood control, Congressman WILL WHITTINGTON. I know that you are well acquainted with his abilities. He has been associated with your organization for such a long period. But it gives me heartfelt pleasure to have this opportunity to add my expression of esteem for the dean of water resources leaders in the Congress.

Last year Congress passed an emergency flood-control and river-and-harbor bill containing only a relatively few new projects. These were projects which, for various reasons of urgency, could not await the formulation of a more comprehensive bill.

It is now 3 years since the last comprehensive flood-control and river-and-harbor bill was enacted by Congress. During the intervening period excellent progress has been made by our engineers in carrying forward the authorized program.

Although there is still a substantial backlog of individual authorized projects which have not yet been placed under construction—the progress on most phases of the program has been so satisfactory that there is now a definite need for further authorizations—further authorizations to increase the appropriation ceilings for comprehensive basin-development programs; and to authorize numerous new projects which have been investigated and recommended by the engineers subsequent to passage of the last comprehensive bills.

The number of individual bills for surveys, new projects, and extensions of basin programs now before our committee may be taken as an indication of the need for further authorizations at this time. We now have some twenty-odd bills before our committee. And I believe there are many more bills before the committee in the House of Representatives.

The objective of our committee will be to consider—in full cooperation with the House committee—the additional needs of approved basin programs and all other localities where improved navigation channels, flood protection, and other water resources developments are needed and have been recommended to Congress by the engineers. This will be done with a view of rounding out the previously authorized program in order to permit uninterrupted progress on a Nation-wide basis for a period of 2 or 3 years until the time may come for the next congressional authorizations.

I am sure that the committee will continue its approach to the improvements of our rivers and streams for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and related purposes on the basis of the optimum economic utilization of the water resources of each river basin for all beneficial purposes.

It is gratifying to know that our engineering experts have recognized the need for this river basin or regional development approach. With the rapid growth of our Nation during the past few decades, it has become increasingly apparent that we must conserve our water resources and undertake a carefully coordinated development of those resources if we are to satisfy all of the needs of the people.

We owe a debt of gratitude to our engineering experts for their foresight and wisdom in presenting recommendations to Congress based on this concept of basin-wide conservation and development before any substantial irreplaceable damage could result.

The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission have pooled and coordinated their efforts to develop comprehensive plans for the conservation and development of many of the principal river basins of the country. For example—the Missouri River, the Arkansas and White Rivers—and many others throughout the Nation.

Many of these programs are progressing rapidly. But they are being carried forward with complete flexibility to reflect any further improvements in technique gained by past and current experience, and to include any modifications called for by changes in physical and economic conditions.

Some of these basin programs are still in the study stage. One such program—that of coordinated development of the great Columbia River Basin in the Northwest—has just been completed. It is expected to be available to the Congress for consideration this year.

It is likely we on the Hill will get a bill from the administration dealing with the Columbia Valley. The committee has one for the Missouri Valley and another for the Savannah.

Of course, no one Senator can speak for the Congress in forecasting its future legislative course. But, I can say for my own part, it will be my earnest objective to work in unison with my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to bring forth sound and constructive legislation—legislation to supplement the great water resources development program which has already proved its worth to the people of our country.

We have seen the Authority in operation in the Tennessee Valley. The Missouri's Pick-Sloan plan is another approach. The objective is the same. I am interested only in the end result. I want to give any approach a fair look. Of late I have begun to wonder about coordination and integration designed for the small valleys lying in a single State as well as the big ones.

I want just a few minutes to comment here on something on which I know we all have an interest. It is something much in the public eye of late. I am referring to the Hoover Commission's proposal—the proposal to take civil functions out of uniform and combine them with other activities into a single Department of Public Works.

I think we can well understand the anxiety and sincerity of purpose in the Hoover task force. They were men who were irked with some of the overlapping they think they saw in the Government. To combine public construction projects into a single head sounds wonderful. It sounds more realistic.

But I think we want to stop for a moment and look beyond a mere simplification of Government activities in the civilian field. The problem is really a deep one.

In stripping the civil functions from the Army Corps of Engineers, would the desired unification be achieved? Or would such a circumcision be a painful operation to this Nation in her hour of need?

I am thinking now of Australia and of the great Republic of France. We all recall the corps of engineers employed by that military genius, Napoleon. It was a wonderful group of men. Much of Napoleon's prowess on the field of battle came from the strength of that corps. Later on France separated the civilian work from the military engineers, and a few short years saw that civilian engineer organization so enmeshed in French politics that the corps failed to operate at all in the hour of necessity. The task force need have looked no further than to France, Britain, and Australia to see that what the Hoover Commission proposes has a more devastating effect than the good that might come out of it.

In Australia they had a system whereby military engineers were assigned to private construction projects and to construction work of the department of public works. The British have much the same system today.

In Australia they had two military engineers acting as liaison officers in the department of public works. Shortly after the war broke out both officers died. It may sound incredible to you, but when those two men died the Australian Government had no one else well enough posted to make any effective use of the civilian engineers, and they had to depend on the Americans for assistance.

In France the Government once trained both civilian and military engineers. After the civilian engineers were separated from the military, each group was trained only in its own respective field. It was impossible to weld the two into an effective wartime unit. The civilians could not fit into the military requirements. The military had not the broad experience that they would have acquired with the civilians. Neither could operate.

The British assigned their military engineers to private construction jobs and to work with the public-works projects. But the military, under this system, did not get adequate training. It did not shoulder to any degree the responsibility for administration and planning activities.

Time after time in the last great war, the British military engineers were unable to cope with the engineering problems assigned to them. Once again the Americans Corps of Engineers supplied that know-how. Any officer from the Corps of Engineers of our Army will tell you that the lack of ability and training of the British engineers was appalling to them. The British will admit it to a very large extent.

Just before General Wheeler stepped out as Chief of the Corps of Engineers the British Commandant of the British Corps of Engineers came to him. The visitor went into the American corps program very carefully. He said upon leaving for home that he would propose to the British Government that a system just like ours be instituted in England. The purpose—The British corps, like our own, could be a great weapon for the defense of England if the need arises.

Actually, the picture of the Corps of Engineers from the military side in the controversy has been clouded. The corps has about 2,500 commissioned officers who at one time or another are exposed to work of the civil functions during training in the corps. Only about 200 appear on the rolls at any one time in the civil functions activities.

Actually there are two sets of personnel records maintained for the commissioned officers. One set covers his military service. The second covers his service on civil functions. The corps is dedicated to keeping the whole pool to a point where every officer has at least 5 years in major civilian construction.

In the Corps of Engineers for civil functions is a reservoir of 9,000 professional engineers—civilians. Now, this is significant—of that 9,000, the great majority are reserve officers. So, if war brings the occasion, those men will need but change clothes—the suit goes into moth balls, and out comes the uniform—and the military Corps of Engineers—the boys who blasted through the road at Ledo, which the British said could not be done—will be in the field again performing a large number of those miracles that make the American military might a wonderful and outstanding thing.

It seems to me that so long as we have an Army—and so long as there are problems of

military landings and the building of airports and roads and the hundreds of thousands of other things that go into wars and defense—we have got to keep that corps going. If the corps must train itself, then we will have to assume a heavy military budget for the training of this nucleus of experts. We'll spend millions and millions of dollars in keeping them in uniform. Millions in letting them practice heavy-scale construction in a desert or somewhere else on something that is of no value outside of special training. We've got to have the corps. There is just no argument on that.

So why not let the corps do just what—in the way of civil functions—the Congress finds reasonable and necessary.

Actually, I think we are making a great saving of money through the present system. The Hoover Commission's proposal would cost us considerably more. Just weigh the few remarks I have just made.

So far as I am concerned, I want to build those things which are not only feasible but should be had.

I want to thank your president, my colleague in the Senate and on the committee, JOHN L. MCCLELLAND, for the invitation to appear here today. He is a fine man. I lean heavily upon him in the committee.

It was nice to see you. I hope your organization goes on and on and on.

Thanks very, very much.

Capital Life & Health Insurance Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Lester L. Bates, president of the Capital Life & Health Insurance Co., celebrating the opening of the new home office building in Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, the Capital Life & Health Insurance Co. is honored to have you join with us today in celebrating the dedication of our new home office building. To each of you we extend a cordial welcome. We appreciate your presence and your participation, which is indicative of your interest in our progress, and the progress of our State and Nation.

We are proud, indeed, of the progress our business has made in the years of its brief existence. But we are prouder still of the democratic system under which we live that has made such progress possible—a system of liberty, justice, and freedom; a system which protects the initiative and energy of the individual—a system of free enterprise.

At another dedication—that of the historic Bunker Hill Monument—the great Daniel Webster said, "Our history proves that the democratic form of government is practicable, and that with wisdom and knowledge men may govern themselves; and the duty incumbent on us is to preserve the consistency of this cheering example, and take care that nothing may weaken its authority with the world, for the last hope of mankind rests with the United States of America."

That is a sobering thought and one which is more true today than when uttered by Webster many years ago. World conditions in this hour are more confused and the threats to our freedom more numerous than in the day of Daniel Webster. An old French philosopher once said, "Every nation must pause from time to time and refresh itself at the wellsprings of its origin lest it perish."

The time has arrived when we should pause and refresh ourselves in the doctrines, principles, and ideals of our founding fathers.

The ideas and ideals upon which democracy rests are the sacred worth of the individual; equality of opportunity and equality before the law; justice, which is the maintenance of that which is right; christian brotherhood, which is the practice of the Golden Rule in everyday life—the promotion of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God; and unselfish service, which is the mark of greatness and freedom.

But no democratic form of government will automatically remain pure and vigorous. Every generation is faced with the necessity of saving society. Its accumulated moral strength will subside and ultimately end in a false democracy, if not actually in a dictatorship, unless its strength is refreshed or renewed in each new generation.

Recall the warning of Daniel Webster, "The last hope of mankind rests with the United States of America." Are we so accustomed to the justice, the tranquillity, the blessings of liberty secured for us and our posterity that we take them for granted or as a matter of course? Will the forces that have ruined former attempts at self-government ruin ours? Are we to lose our freedom?

The primary cause of loss of freedom, as historically demonstrated, is too much regimenting, controlling, and "Santa Clausing" by the government and other agencies. Freedom of choice and freedom of initiative are indispensable to progress. Anything that impairs or restricts individual initiative, independence, or self-reliance leads to a loss of national freedom and democracy. Compare the material progress alone in the United States for the past 150 years with other countries, ages, and civilizations, and you will find that more substantial progress has been made here than was made in the 2,000 years preceding. It is not accurate to say that this is because of our unlimited natural resources, for the savage Indian had the same resources. Neither is the explanation found in our greater industry, for all over the world and through all ages human beings have generally worked harder than Americans work. We cannot claim it is because we are inherently superior, for that is probably not so, even though it flatters our ego to think so.

The true reason lies in the fact that Americans have been free to seek the truth in their own ways; free to worship; free to investigate; free to express opinions; free to reach their own conclusions and to announce their own convictions; free to invent and to make the best possible use of inventions; free to exert their own efforts and apply their energies to their business. It is this freedom of initiative and the virtue of self-reliance that has nerved Americans to create the greatest Nation in the world.

Take away the incentives to excel and to achieve, take away the necessity to dare and to do, take away the freedom to produce and the encouragement to create, and you have taken away the secret of human progress.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the verdict of history. When the Roman Government began to provide food and amusements for its citizens and to do everything for them, then Rome was on its way out. When the Government of France began to issue orders defining exactly what businessmen might do and not do, then France was on the slide. When Spain became a government of bureaucrats, each bureaucracy limiting and restricting the freedom of its citizens, then Spain had passed the zenith of her power and glory.

So it is with every nation. Self-government is lost because the freedom upon which it rests is lost. When a government undertakes to do every thing for the people—to order their businesses and private lives, to prescribe their economy and their production, then the cost of government mounts. The natural consequence is such an increase in taxation that the nerve of business adventure and business initiative is lost. It is pleasant to have the Government take from us the necessity of arranging our own affairs while we work and to provide for us when we loaf—that is, it seems pleasant until we awaken to the fact that the very Government that we thought was doing everything for us is headed toward the destruction of the blessings of liberty and self-government, which, according to its preamble, the Constitution of the United States was adopted to insure.

The founding fathers of our democracy knew that the soundness of our country's economic structure was interwoven with the protection of the individual citizen's right of free enterprise. The spirit of free enterprise, which has made America the richest and most powerful nation in mankind's history, must not only be preserved but developed in keeping with the demands of the age.

It is to this right of free enterprise that this building is hereby dedicated. May it stand as a monument to the ideals and principles of free and unrestricted initiative, and may the rendition of true and unselfish service be the purpose and goal of the institution for which it stands.

Peace and Security Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Peace and Security Come First," delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I chose as my subject tonight, Peace and Security Come First.

As long as I can remember I have been taught that the original functions of government in our old Massachusetts Bay Colony were threefold. First, the maintenance of a defense against external enemies. Second, the maintenance of security from internal forces. Third, the raising through taxes of money to pay for these two services. The services required of our Government with an ever-increasing population have grown enormously; yet the fundamental responsibilities of government remain unchanged today 300 years later.

Truly today, peace and security must come first. We have won the shooting part of the biggest war that the world has seen in all its turbulent history; yet we do not live in a world at peace. We do not feel secure in our daily lives. That feeling of insecurity has stimulated the leaders of our Government to efforts never conceived by our early colonists in their search for peace. Our

diplomats have formed a pact of mutual assistance with the South American Republics for the collective defense of the Western Hemisphere. We have signed and ratified the Charter of the United Nations. We have high hopes that this body will help us to maintain peace, but we want to remember what is often forgotten—the United Nations was never conceived to obtain peace. Peace treaties are written by countries who have fought a war. The United Nations was conceived by draftsmen to maintain peace in the world after the treaties have been signed. Those treaties are not yet signed. So we must be patient and everlastingly have the will to make the United Nations a truly functioning body. Remember—the more we sit around a table and talk, as we are now doing at Lake Success, the less likely we are to dig ourselves into trenches and shoot.

The economy of England, France, and other European countries was badly damaged by the war. Factories were bombed out. Machinery was worn out. Trade balances throughout the world were decimated. So, the ECA was conceived. As a result, we have in this Congress, and the last, authorized over $10,000,000,000 to help these friendly nations in Europe to help themselves in order that they may again become self-supporting and trade with us and the other nations of the world. We have taken these steps with the fundamental idea of building up our own security so that our way of life may again go forward.

But, we are beginning to feel pretty sure that what we have done up to this time is still far from enough. So, Senator MARTIN and I were privileged to witness in Washington recently 12 foreign ministers sign the North Atlantic Pact. That is the first time so many foreign ministers have been in Washington at one time. We have taken the lead in formulating this pact because we hope that it may become an additional factor in assuring our own security. We in the Senate have yet to ratify it. We have yet to learn whether it is to be implemented with a supply of arms to those signatory countries that request this help. We Senators must exercise our judgment to determine just what the effects of the pact may be upon our destiny. Does it in fact improve our chances for greater security for our people? Does it violate the Constitution by depriving Congress of the right to declare war? Should we in the interest of our own security stretch our strength over the Atlantic—across the Rhine, to the northern tips of Norway—in case of attack? Will it stretch our strength too far? What will it cost? Should we confine our efforts to economic aid? Should we do more in China and Asia? Like many other Senators, the more I think about it, the more questions occur to me. While I am heartily in accord with the pact's aims, I want to know the answers to all of them before I determine how to vote.

But, of one fact we are certain. We know that pacts in and of themselves are not enough. We have come to the reluctant understanding that we must be strong in order to convince certain nations in the world that we mean what we say, that we are willing to battle if necessary to carry out what we believe is right.

We have today in our Army, Navy, and Air Force about 1,600,000 of our boys and girls. The House has appropriated nearly $16,000,000,000 for 1950 to equip these boys properly to fight successfully if they have to fight and to give them the best protection we know how. A B–50 has flown around the world without stopping. A B–36 has attained enormous speeds at 40,000 feet above the earth. Jet planes have flown faster than the speed of sound. Submarines can travel at fast speeds under the water. A schnorkel device permits them to remain under the surface for a week at a time. The Army needs new, up-to-date tanks. We need all these things in quantity if we are to defend ourselves properly. Yet their cost is enormous.

And, in addition, we are asked to appropriate almost a billion dollars for increased production of atomic bombs and the development of atomic energy. Think how the development of that terrific force of destruction increases the dangers of our own destruction in the days to come. At the same time, its peacetime use can lead to a better life for all of us.

We must remain strong if we are to be effective. I visited the death camps at Buchenwald and Dachau while the fighting was on. I saw those piles of human dead. I watched the atom bomb explode at Bikini Lagoon. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate I visited Trieste, Athens, Berlin, and Munich. Those visits have filled me with the knowledge of what lack of security can mean. We read of the daily possibility of easy fights across the North Pole—of the ever-shortening distance from Maine to Moscow—or of the possibility of guided missiles of death and destruction. I can sense, as you can sense, the emotional feelings that these facts stir within us here in the United States.

We have seen recently in the papers statements from Russia concerning the North Atlantic Pact and how it is built only for war. I would like to remind you of this fact. Since 1945 up to and including April 6, 1948, Soviet Russia has concluded 10 treaties of mutual assistance and cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socalist Republics and other governments. If you will read the language of these treaties, I think you will find it clear that they parallel in many ways the language and purpose of the North Atlantic Pact. How can these countries' leaders complain about our purposes in signing the North Atlantic Pact? If we are to believe in any way in the sincerity of these treaties, they are treaties to strengthen the trading opportunities and the military defenses of the totalitarian governments.

If we are not willing to keep enough of our boys in service—if we are not willing to arm them adequately—if we are not willing to continue effective aid to Europe and at the same time maintain progress in this country both in our industrial program and in the field of agriculture, we may well lose the cold war that we are fighting. Today we must understand, as we did during the war, the need of our unflagging efforts to keep this country strong—to keep it moving forward—to keep it sound in order that we may turn it over to our children with the same security with which our fathers turned it over to us.

If we think of peace and security being our first objective, we must also think of it in connection with protection from internal forces.

Today I construe these forces to mean the efforts of Government to help improve our individual and family life in various communities throughout the length and breadth of our great country. The internal forces from which our Government needs to protect us today are not physical forces as such. The average American citizen wants security. He wants a better family life. He wants better education, better health, better housing and a stable dollar. We all of us want to continue to work to gain those objectives and I, for one, shall do so. Through our industrial system of free enterprise we have gained the highest standard of living the world has ever known and I am sure it will go higher. But, as we face and think of all these objectives, we want to remember that they must be accomplished within the limits of our system of government as we know it—a government of service and not of dictation—a government which permits man to live freely and to think and act as they believe best for them and for their family. But as we seek these objectives we know they cannot be maintained without peace and security in the world.

Finally we come to that third function of government—the payment of taxes. Our country will never keep its strength, will never remain a world power—our enemies will win the cold war—if we do not keep the cost of our Government within the ability of our citizens to pay. Today our over-all Government costs us some 52 billions of dollars a year. With the productive economy running at 260 billions of dollars, we are paying out approximately 20 percent to maintain our services of government. To reach 260 billions in the last few years our productive economy has been stimulated first by the war effort and then by replenishing the lack of peacetime products exhausted through the war years. We cannot expect this high demand for our products to remain thus forever. It is already slowing up all along the line. What may become our normal peacetime productive capacity is yet to be determined. On the other hand, the increasing demands of our Government are becoming only too clear. Our system of free private enterprise and freedom of opportunity for all will be carried on with ever-increasing difficulty if Government takes too great a proportion of our annual earnings and leaves too little in the hands of our citizens. Then the initiative, freedom, and energy of our individual citizen is lost and the Government soon becomes the dominating force rather than an instrument of service. That is the philosophy that we who are in this room tonight know and feel only too strongly.

There is no group who comprehends more deeply the problems that involve our Government today to obtain the security of our country and the peace of the world than you good people. You understand, as do we who are in Congress, the responsibilities that we in this great country, as citizens of the strongest nation in the world today, have toward mankind. We want people in other nations to understand us. We need them as friends. We want them to respect our way of life and to believe that this system is an example which is worthy of their effort.

In the hearts of all of us lies the hope that the iron curtain will fall back if we work together—if we continue to try to give the opportunities that come from life in a free country to all people who want to think and act and live as they want to live in a country where people build their governments to serve them.

We must continue to do our part to see that these people are encouraged to resist domination by force and be told what they shall do, what they shall think, and what they shall see. That is the goal that we who are in responsible positions in Government must constantly keep before us. That is the objective toward which we need your help if we are to succeed.

We and the other peace-loving nations of the world must try and persuade those who might seek war that—in the words of Livy—"Better a certain peace than a hope for victory."

Long-Range Program for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

on the long-range program for agriculture, prepared by me and presented in a radio interview broadcast by Upton Close on the Washington Watchman broadcast, on April 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture I am glad to consider our long-range farm program in the light of the proposals the Secretary of Agriculture presented to Congress when he appeared before a joint session of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees on April 7.

We are all concerned about the future of the American farmer because our entire national economy is so dependent upon a stable and productive agriculture. Basically, we must build an agriculture that is sound as a means of livelihood and that assures the type of farm life which is both attractive and secure.

Agriculture, in turn, depends upon other segments of our economic life. When men and women have full employment there is a good demand for food and fiber produced on the farm. Under such conditions business and industry likewise prosper.

An ample supply of the products of the farm, at stable prices to the consumer, is a primary objective of any so-called farm program. In fact, we recognize that one of the factors in the demand for farm products is the improvement of the nutritional standards and food consumption of the American people as a whole.

The desirability of these objectives is readily acceptable. To us in Congress, charged with the responsibility of putting them into law, the mechanics of attaining these ends are important. We realize that it is one thing to describe a desirable economic goal; it is another thing to reach it.

Great advances have been made through the years in working out a national farm program with these objectives in mind. The parity-price support program has developed from the recognition that farming is hazardous and uncertain with severe fluctuations of production and income. Experience has shown that even a small surplus can ruin the farmer's market.

The end of the wartime period required a reexamination of the entire agricultural program and this was done in the Eightieth Congress. In the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1948, Congress recognized the continued need of placing a floor under agricultural prices and of replacing wartime legislation which was more for the specific purpose of increasing production than of establishing a permanent farm program. The most significant feature of the new legislation is that the price supports are provided on a flexible basis which is intended to be self-adjusting to the supply of farm products. This plan does not go into effect until January 1950, and we have not had an opportunity to see how well it will work for the good of the producers and consumers of this country. Unfortunately, the Aiken Act is not properly understood. In fact it was thrown into eclipse by a political smoke screen in the fall of 1948. And now, before its provisions have been tried, we are offered a new farm plan involving direct subsidy payments to the producers to assure them parity income while seeming to hold out the promise of lower prices to the consumer in the market price. This may be a better program. It may prove to be a desirable supplement to the present laws. That is what we are trying to determine.

In considering the new recommendations which the Secretary of Agriculture has offered, it is important to determine exactly how his farm plan differs from or fits into those already enacted. I should like to have clearly brought out why Secretary Brannan feels that his new program is superior to the provisions of the Aiken Act, which the Department of Agriculture strongly approved last year. I should like to have him indicate specifically in what manner his income support standard differs from the parity formula in the law passed in the Eightieth Congress and why it is better, if it is better. I think it is extremely important to have some idea what the relative cost of this subsidy program will be.

Does the new plan mean more regimentation for the farmer. How does the Secretary of Agriculture propose to audit the operations of 6,000,000 farmers in order to determine whether they have sold in excess of 1,800 units in accordance wtih the formula he presented the committee on April 7? What conditions as to accepted farm practices and soil conservation does the administration expect to impose before the farmer becomes eligible for the support-standard payments?

Only a sound study afforded through public hearings will bring out the answers to the searching questions that must be asked.

If the plan proposed by Secretary Brannan appears to be a further improvement in our agricultural program for the benefit of all, I will support it; but first, I want to be quite certain what it is likely to do and how it will work.

Address by Adela Thomas Before Pan-American Liaison Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Adela Thomas, from the Argentine Republic, before the Pan-American Liaison Committee on March 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. President, distinguished ladies, in the first place may I ask you to be patient and kind with me in my effort to speak to you in view of my poor knowledge of your language. I am not an intellectual woman, but only an Argentine woman just like thousands of women in my country, who long, with all their hearts, for closer ties, and for a better understanding between our two peoples, so far apart yet so similar in many respects.

Only because of this longing and because of the fact that a well-merited homage is being paid to a distinguished fellow countrywoman of mine, Mrs. Enrique P. Corominas, have I been unable to refuse the kind and cordial invitation of Mrs. Thomas Burke to give you a short talk this afternoon on the cultural development and the aspirations of the Argentine woman.

Our two countries, the United States and the Argentine Republic, are similar but situated on opposite sides of the Equator. Both have the same climate, the same flora, and the same fauna. They differ in the fact that your country was colonized by men of the Saxon race and ours by men of Spanish blood.

But down there, just the same as up here, people from all parts of the world flocked to its welcoming shores, determined to develop with their honest toil and to seek profit from its immense natural resources. And, under the protection of the preamble of our Constitution, they began a new life.

What was in the beginning an honorable Spanish tradition gradually came under the influence of traditions from other lands, and the early patriarchal life was slowly transformed into the modern dynamic and strenuous life of the new Argentina.

Down there, just as up here, a new race was formed, made up of the conglomerate of immigrants from all the nations of the world.

Woman, the center of the life of man and of the home, could not escape this evolution, and, naturally, the woman who, as mother, wife, or sister, conceived of her world as being within the walls of the large patriarchal house moved step by step toward the realization of her aspirations for a more modern life and one more useful to her kind.

Many years ago she began to feel the need, the spiritual urge, to know more than the frivolous novel read in the security of her home. In the early years of this century the bolder ones dared to enroll in the universities to win for themselves a diploma which hitherto had been obtainable only by men.

The secondary schools for young ladies began to appear and at first, the Argentine girl studied only to become a teacher. Later she was attracted by the severer courses leading to a high-school diploma and to preparation for a business career. New horizons opened up before her and with her diploma, little by little she began invading the universities. Soon these were turning out women doctors, engineers, lawyers, dentists, and professionals in many branches of learning.

Thanks to her prodigious natural resources, Argentina continued her forward march among the nations of the world, and her women at the same time widened the sphere of their aspirations. And so today, an appreciable percentage of them pursue the most diverse courses, at least in secondary education. Very few of them are content with an elementary-school education, thousands of them entering the higher schools from which they graduate as teachers of science, literature, or languages, economics, business, secretarial work, stenography, typing, and so forth.

The vocational schools turn out a large number of excellent dressmakers, hatmakers, seamstresses, and specialists in home economics.

Others prefer some specialized training and dedicate their lives to teaching the blind, deaf mutes, or the mentally retarded.

The schools of beaux arts of the country receive each year a large number of girls who aspire to become good painters, sculptresses, or draftswomen. The institutions teaching languages attract many pupils of the female sex. There is a great deal of interest in learning the more common modern languages and especially English, which holds first place. Rarely do you meet a young girl of the modern generation who does not know your language, or who is not studying it, with enthusiasm.

The Argentine-North American Institute, the Association of English Culture, and the British Lyceum, to name only the three principal ones in Buenos Aires, and not to mention the large number existing throughout the country, have thousands of girl students.

The schools of manual arts and crafts teach bookbinding, interior decorating, fashion designing, etc. There are also many courses offered in social welfare and public health.

In the arid field of mathematics, many Argentine women have made their mark; the same is true of their work in the biological and natural sciences.

Poetry and prose have their great devotees whose works are very popular.

Coming to the field of music and kindred arts, one of our national conservatories of music, that in the city of Buenos Aires, to mention only one example, prepares talented pianists, violinists, singers, etc. The same conservatory also offers courses in declamation, acting, and ballet dancing. A number of Argentine women pianists have won world-wide acclaim.

In winter in Buenos Aires, a winter that is cold but lacking the beauty of the snow your winters have, lasting from May to September, we have the opera season in the Teatro Colon, one of the most sumptuous opera houses in the world. The greatest vocal celebrities appear in it and to listen to them is considered one of their keenest pleasures by the Argentine women, and they prepare for it with great enthusiasm. The same holds true with respect to the appearance of renowned concert artists who come each year to display their art before the critical Argentine public.

The Argentine women of average culture and, of course the highly cultured also, are expert critics. Both of them are able to judge with equal east the technique of a classical or modern pictorial style, or a symphony by Stravinsky, or the latest fashion model that has come from New York or Paris, or the equally chic gown, made for them by their Argentine dressmaker. They are exacting in matters of art, and frivolously so in fashions. They have a vast fund of knowledge in the most diverse fields, the result of their curiosity and investigation. They have the keenest interest in what is going on the world over. The Argentine and foreign newspapers and magazines nourish their yearning for knowledge.

The classical works of the literature of the world are read and understood by many of our young women. For them, Plato, Aristotle, and Shakespeare are no mystery. English and North American books are highly appreciated: Cronin, Pearl Buck, John Steinbeck, and Ernest Hemingway are their favorite authors. All of us have read Edgar Poe, Walt Whitman, and Longfellow.

We have women's clubs where my fellow-countrywomen meet, just as you do, to exchange ideas, listen to lectures or concerts, or to play bridge.

And the Argentine woman not only studies, but she works, and she works hard. The factories employ many women as skilled workers. They are also expert saleswomen, and are efficient employees in government and private offices, holding positions formerly filled by men. There are women brokers, realtors and merchants. They also manage with equal ease their own properties and drive their own automobiles.

Whenever permitted by her work, the Argentine woman makes herself skillful in the various sports, entering into them with enthusiasm in the hundreds of athletic clubs available.

With all these aspirations to improve herself intellectually, how could the Argentine woman remain indifferent to political affairs? She could not, and she takes great interest in the current problems of the world. She knows the geography of the world and the political complications thereof. She is acquainted with the clauses of the treaties of Chapultepec and of Geneva, and with all work of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris last autumn; she applauded unreservedly the brilliant labor there of our Secretary of State, Dr. Juan A. Bramuglia. An Argentine woman, whom you all surely know, Mrs. Oscar Ivanissevich, was appointed to head the Argentine women's delegation to the Inter-American Conference in Bogota.

But we were still denied a supreme right, which we have now obtained under the leadership of the wife of our President, Mrs. Maria Eva Duarte de Perón. I mean that now we have the right to vote. Henceforth, we shall express through the ballot boxes in free elections, as free as those here in this country, our personal opinion as to whom we wish to have govern us.

In view of her high cultural level, the Argentine woman, because of her own convictions and her reasons therefor, will elect her representatives just as you elect yours. I wish to remind you that both of our countries are governed under similar constitutions.

In the field of charity and social service, the Argentine woman is doing very noteworthy work. Founding hospitals, homes for the blind, aged, and invalids, she has always given her assistance generously to all work of a humanitarian nature. As an example, I might mention what a group of us women are doing in Patagonia, a work that we are carrying on without publicity and on a small scale. Patagonia forms a large part of Argentina, situated in the southern extreme thereof. Many children there need spiritual and material aid; they are descendants of those Indians who formerly were masters of all this American Hemisphere. They are no longer Indians, very few of whom remain in our country; they are pure Argentines, children of those gauchos who made our country famous.

I wish to explain to you, parenthetically, that the gauchos have disappeared. The gaucho, of mixed Indian and Spanish blood, who worked on the ranches as an expert horseman to drive the cattle from one place to another, who was a small eater and drinker and an untiring worker, has given way to the gaucho of the present day in whose veins runs European blood and whose hair is fair and whose eyes are light.

And so it is that many of these children are being helped by our social-welfare institution, which is called the Nahuel Pan Workshop (named for an old Indian chief who was very famous in Patagonia) which we founded 8 years ago. I lived in Patagonia for several years, and hence I saw the need of carrying on works of charity. Until coming to this country a year and a half ago, I was vice president and general secretary of the Nahuel Pan Workshop.

Clothing and medicine are being sent every year for these children especially. They are taught sewing and religion. We give aid to the parents by teaching them a practical and modern way of life, and how to take advantage of the resources of the region for their sustenance; we give them employment whenever they require it. We send the children to schools in which they live, paying for their clothes and their traveling expenses from and to their homes.

We visit the wretched huts in which the people live and provide them with medicine and medical care in case of sickness.

At Christmas-time we send them sweet things to eat and toys—all this is done with funds contributed by our members and with the donations we receive.

Speaking of charitable works, I cannot fail to mention the great work, unknown by most Americans, which is being done by our First Lady, Mrs. Peron. An indefatigable worker, she begins receiving early in the morning all those who need material or moral assistance and, with kindness and patience, she listens to their problems. She evades none of these, however complicated it may be, and always finds a satisfactory solution.

She is the directress of the Maria Eva Duarte de Peron Foundation, which is an institution founded for the purpose of helping poor people to whom the assistance given by the government is not sufficient.

She gives aid in the form of money or foodstuffs, provides work tools and implements, awards scholarships in universities and special grants to impecunious students.

She builds dwellings for poor families, and founds charitable institutions, schools, rest homes and hospitals.

Permit me to tell you about some of the work she has already accomplished to show you that she is an Argentine woman completely dedicated to the task of doing good.

She has founded two homes for homeless women, with or without children.

She has sent to schools in the interior of the country 200,000 outfits of clothing.

The foundation, of which she is president, has at its command the services of physicians, dentists, health visitors and many traveling clinics which extend their operations to the most distant places in the country.

She has opened 4,000 school lunchrooms in which many children are fed every day. She has also founded public libraries for workingmen, schools for adults, school homes, school clubs and a polyclinic for children.

Outside the confines of our country, her charitable work extends as far as Europe whither she has sent food and clothing to the regions devastated by war.

Who knows whether this great work may not have impeded the advance of communism in my country? At a meeting of high-ranking leaders of the Soviet Union held not long ago in a European city to receive reports on Communist activities in South America, it was revealed that Argentina is the country in which communism has made least progress.

I shall conclude this talk to you on the Argentine woman of today by speaking on one aspect of her activities upon which I have not yet dwelt. Above all her other attributes, the Argentine woman is a self-sacrificing mother. She usually has many children; the homes of most young couples are brightened by three or four children. Seldom is one found with only one child, and there are many families with as many as 10 children.

As a rule, the Argentine girl marries when very young, and she devotes herself wholly to her family first of all. If she works outside her home, her mother, sister, or some other relative takes care of her children while she is so employed. Argentines as a people are imbued with a very strong spirit of family unity and with a desire to be of assistance to their fellow beings.

I should like to tell you much more about the activities of my fellow countrywomen in that distant part of this same hemisphere, but I do not wish to strain your patience further.

The women of this great country and those of mine are all sisters, daughters of a new and vigorous world, a promise for the world of tomorrow.

And now, let me speak to you as elder sisters to beg you, with the help of God, to unite our hearts in a great friendship based upon a deep understanding, in a solidarity of sisters, in a will for peace and unity above everything else.

American Foreign Policy in the Asiatic Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me with reference to

American foreign policy in the Asiatic area.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
April 20, 1949.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: There has been a good deal of discussion concerning American foreign policy, particularly as it pertains to the mainland of Asia and the East Indies.

Recent events in China have brought into sharp focus the complexity of the problem of a policy in Asiatic areas as well as failure of our Nation to have any consistent foreign policy in Asia.

Repeatedly competent observers of international events have warned our Nation of the importance of developing a sound and consistent foreign policy pertaining to the nations in the Asiatic area. Recent events in Burma, French Indochina, Indonesia, China, and India compel our Government to direct its attention to these troubled and explosive regions. The cold war in Europe has diverted our attention to the European theater despite the fact that we consistently talk in terms of one world.

Surely the memory of Japanese aggression, Chinese civil war, and the freedom of India should remind us that Asia cannot be ignored. Then, too, the diplomatic and moral problem with which we are faced in Indonesia and our relationships with the Dutch Government call to mind the difficulties that we face in formulating a consistent worldwide policy that conforms with our ideals and our position of world leadership.

Frankly, we need friends in Asia. We need to bolster up those forces that are aspiring to democratic goals. We need to recognize the tremendous potential of wealth and power as well as the real facts of population and race that exist in the Asiatic area. What to do in China is a question mark and will remain so for some time to come. The other potential great power in Asia is India. This nation is still preserving its freedom. India still remains free from Communist conquest or successful infiltration. India is blessed by the leadership of a humanitarian and a man of democratic instincts, Pandit Nehru.

India is strategically located for purposes of geopolitics. In other words, geographically she is a pivotal nation in our relationships with the Near East and the Far East. She represents a great potential industrially and commercially. She is a republic with a constitution that points in the direction of individual freedom and responsible government. She is a leader in the southeastern Asia area. The recent conference of southeastern Asiatic states called by Pandit Nehru is ample testimony as to her strategic and vital role in Asiatic affairs.

Likewise, India is a member in good standing of the United Nations. She has played a consistent and devoted role to the principles of the United Nations Charter. Up to this time, she has alined herself in the United Nations deliberations on the side of the Western Powers. She has a deep friendship for the United States.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I call to the attention of our Government the importance of a positive and constructive foreign policy along with economic aid for India. It is the purpose of this letter and of the attached statement which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to direct your attention to this new force in Asia, a free India. We, as Americans, must begin to think about this country and to act in terms of strengthening our relationships with her.

It would be presumptuous on my part as a freshman Senator to attempt to formulate a detailed program. I would suggest, however, the consideration of (1) educational opportunities for Indian students in our country on the basis of scholarships provided by our Government, (2) direct financial assistance under the same terms as our ECA or Marshall-plan program, (3) possibly this should precede the second point—the application of the fourth point of President Truman's inaugural address foreign-policy statement, namely, technical, scientific, and financial assistance to the underdeveloped areas.

I would appreciate your views on this subject and any comment that you may feel free to make.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

INDIA—A BULWARK OF DEMOCRACY

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in the Senate of the United States, Friday, April 8, 1949)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the past weeks we have had our eyes on Europe. The only time we've turned around to look at the other side of the world—what we might term our rear, in cold war terminology—came Tuesday, April 5, when this body voted aid to China.

I do not choose to talk about the wisdom of aiding China today. But I do want to turn our thinking back in that direction. We have many reasons for helping Europe. One is their great need, a serious shortage of what they need for life, partly caused by our common war effort. Another is the encouragement we seek to give toward a world of greater cooperation and unity, at least of the democratic countries. The third reason is the threat of totalitarianism which often steps in where men and women lack the necessities of decent living.

All of these same reasons for aiding Europe apply to another country—to India. India has need. India fought beside us in the great second World War. India should be brought into the councils of democratic world organization we are forming around the framework of the Atlantic Pact. Not only is India a nation of ever-increasing democracy, but her leaders today are among the great and wise men of our time. Finally, the threat of communism and the military threat of the Soviet Union has and may in the future press sharply down on the 300,000,000 people living in the rich peninsula.

China is an enigma. No one is sure what is happening—what we ought to do about it or what will happen if we do nothing. There is no question in India. She is a great and rich country, worthy of our help and needing it sorely.

Eighty-five percent of her people are poverty stricken and illiterate. India's national income was only $13,636,300,000 for her 337,000,000 people as compared to our approximately $224,000,000,000 income in 1948 for only 140,000,000 people. Her per capita income, then, was about one-fortieth of ours.

But India is making strides ahead and needs only investment and help to become a wealthy nation. She reclaimed 32,306 acres of wasteland for agriculture in the fiscal year 1947–48 and is now working to reclaim 100,000 acres more. The United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization director, Norris Dodd, praised her plans for increased food production and said that if the plans succeed, India can become self-sufficient in food.

Industrial production is increasing, too. Production of electrical supplies, Diesel engines, bicycles, superphosphates, caustic soda, soda ash, bicycle tires, sugar hydrogenated oils and soap are at a new peak in India in 1948.

India needs supplies to feed her expanding economy. Yet she has been forced by a dollar shortage to cut down her imports from hard-money countries. Her deficit balance of trade with hard-currency countries was $93,000,000 in the last 9 months of 1948. She will have to make this up through the international monetary fund. Her deficit in trade with this country in 1947 was $147,000,000. Our imports from India have dropped, causing this unfavorable trade balance between us, in spite of the fact that India's world-wide trade balance is favorable by $100,000,000.

Now for that small gap between what India sells us and what we sell her, India has been forced to cut needed imports from dollar areas. But her imports were not luxury goods that could readily be cut. What India wanted to buy from us were basic needs—food and industrial equipment which are absolutely essential if India's 300,000,000 are ever to rise above their poverty and illiteracy.

Because we are closing one eye and keeping the other focused on Europe we have overlooked our good friends in India, in Asia where the real struggle for men's minds is taking place. Seven European nations have received more ECA funds than India would need to continue importing according to plan from dollar areas. And whereas each of the seven nations have received substantially more than India would need, the combined population of those countries is scarcely greater than the total population of India.

There are practical reasons to help India. She is the second largest producer of vital manganese—and the first is the Soviet Union. She has 20,000,000,000 tons of unexploited iron ore and 60,000,000,000 tons of coal. Her steel production is seventh in the world and she produces nearly all of the world's mica, much of the tungsten, thorium (needed in atomic energy production) and lac (the basic ingredient of shellac).

In the alliance of free, democratic peoples, India deserves an important position. While she has looked at herself as a neutral between the great world blocs, she has found it necessary to put down Communist riots and strikes and she is working toward fuller democracy. More important, India represents the free people of southeast Asia and represents, too, the colored peoples of the world.

Militarily, her position is on the front line against the Soviet Union. She has a volunteer army of 300,000 men, an air force of 8,700 men, 6 fighter squadrons, 1 transport squadron. Her navy has 1 cruiser, 4 sloops, and 12 mine sweepers.

In maintaining Asian stability, India is essential. As her Ambassador to the United States (Sir Benegal Rama Rau) said last October in New York, "It is no exaggeration to say that on the economic and political stability of India depends the prospect of maintenance of peace in Asia during the next decade, and consequently the maintenance of peace throughout the world." He went on to say that while communism was still weak in India, receiving only a handful of votes, "there is, however, one danger to be guarded against. The Indian Union will have a completely democratic system on the basis of adult suffrage. You can easily realize the significance of this in a country, the vast majority of the population of which is on a low standard of living if not on the margin of starvation. All of these men and women will now exercise their vote, and it is obvious that they will not tolerate the democratic system unless in the immediate future the government elected under this system can improve their economic status and rid them of the fear of starvation and misery. If the standard of living is not raised, there is every danger of India falling under the influence of some other system, whether it is communism, or fascism or some other ism. The agriculture and industrial development of the country is, therefore, a matter of great urgency both from the political and the economic points of view."

India is not a question mark. In every way she belongs in the family of free nations. Her needs are no secret, they are all too evident. What must we do to help her and to encourage India's participation with the rest of the free world?

We must first recognize her needs as equally crucial as Europe's needs. Secondly, we must recognize India's legitimate interests and her grievances against us. We must recognize the self-government aspirations of southeast Asia colonies and avoid aid or comfort to European nations now putting down revolts and attempts at self-government. They will not trust us until we take that step. Nor will they trust us until our attitude right here at home toward our own colored citizens has changed to one of friendship and equality.

No one will be free and prosperous in this interdependent world until all are free and prosperous. Our Atlantic Pact and European recovery program are only half of the fight. Let's turn around and face our other friends and bring them into the councils of the free and help them to a standard of living that can truly make them free.

The people rising to greatness and strength are there—in Asia and Africa. We should be their friends and they will be our friends. Let us act in every way like friends—in our aid to them to start on the road to more prosperous life, in our immigration laws and in our attitude toward their nationals in this country and toward our own citizens in their race.

The future lies across the Pacific. We are letting the future escape us until we recognize the fact.

Let us help India and work to cement friendships with the other Asian democracies. Free peoples everywhere must get together in a friendship and cooperation.

Increased Postal Rates on Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have some 40 excellent newspapers which are published in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The editors and managers of these fine publications are deeply concerned as to the adverse effect of the proposed increase in postage rates on their subscriptions.

I have received from H. K. Williams, general manager of the Dunkirk Printing Co., Dunkirk, N. Y., which publishes two outstanding newspapers, a letter giving a careful analysis of the effect which the proposed increased postage rates will have on the two publications. Inasmuch as the study made by Mr. H. K. Williams may be of interest to other publishers similarly situated, I am, under consent heretofore granted, extending as a part of my remarks the letter to which I have referred:

DUNKIRK PRINTING CO.,
Dunkirk, N. Y., April 15, 1949.

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DAN: It occurs to me that while you might have received many letters in regard to the change in postage rates from a general standpoint, that it might be of interest to you also to see how it would affect the smaller newspapers; namely, the Observer and the Grape Belt according to the proposed H. R. 2945.

Accordingly, I have selected a particular day; namely, April 8, for both papers and tried to work out what the change in rate would mean.

The first is for the Grape Belt and is based on 2,724 copies, including complimentary copies which is the average for March 1949. One hundred and four issues for the year, subscription price $2.25 per year.

20 pages—60 percent advertising

	Present		Proposed first year	Proposed second year
	Pounds	Cost		
Zones:				
1	83	$1.25	$4.98	$7.47
2				
3	15	.30	.90	1.35
4	7	.21	.63	.95
5	7	.28	.63	.95
6	4	.20	.48	.72
7	2	.12	.24	.36
8	7	.49	1.04	1.56
1½ cents	72	1.08		
1 cent	226	2.26	10.04	15.06
Free	334		3.34	5.01
Total		6.19	22.28	33.43
Yearly cost		643.76	2,317.12	3,476.72
Increased yearly cost			1,673.36	2,832.96
Average increase per subscription			.61	1.04

In order to take care of the additional cost of mailing, this would change the rate of the Grape Belt from $2.25 per year to $2.86 per year the first year, and the second year from $2.25 to $3.29 per year. In the case of the Grape Belt we have been faced with a decrease in sales and we feel that to add this amount to the subscription price would, undoubtedly, decrease very materially the number of subscriptions.

The second is for the Observer and is based on 367 mail copies including complimentaries for March 1949.

18 pages—60 percent advertising

	Present		Proposed first year	Proposed second year
	Pounds	Cost		
Zones:				
1	12	$0.18	$0.72	$1.
2				.08
3	9	.18	.54	.—
4	6	.18	.54	.81
5	4	.16	.36	.81
6	3	.15	.36	.54
7	1	.06	.12	.54
8	2	.14	.27	.18
1½ cents	19	.29		.41
1 cent	72	.72	2.88	4.—
Free	8		.08	.32
				.12
Total		2.06	5.87	8.—
Yearly cost		634.48	1,807.96	2,713.81
Increased yearly cost			1,173.48	2,079.48
Average increase per subscription			3.19	5.66

In the case of the Observer you note that while this covers only 367 copies which go through the mail, it would mean an average increase for mail subscribers within the county of from $8.75 per year to $11.94 per year, or $3.19 the first year, and the second year from $8.75 to $14.41 per year, or $5.66. A corresponding average increase in the other zones would result so that in Zone 8 it would change the subscription price from $17 per year to about $22.66 per year, which we believe is prohibitive.

Needless to say, the additional charges would have to be passed on to the subscriber as we would be unable to absorb them. We hope that some other means will be found to keep the Post Office Department from going so far in the hole.

With kindest personal regards to you and Mrs. Reed.

Sincerely yours,

DUNKIRK PRINTING CO.,
H. K. WILLIAMS,
General Manager.

Major Problems in United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Major Problems in the United States Foreign Policy," delivered by Hon. Francis B. Sayre, representative of the United States in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, at the Third Annual Conference on Public Affairs, at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on March 5, 1949.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate as to the probable cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $187.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR PROBLEMS IN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

It is an honor and a privilege to be invited to meet with you, representatives from some 50 colleges, in this Conference on Major Problems in United States Foreign Policy. I am particularly delighted to have the chance of discussing these problems with you; for America has a right to look to her college-trained men for wise leadership and help in the days ahead. As frankly and as simply as I can, I want to lay before you the fundamental issues as I see them.

We are living in an age of problems because we are in an age of revolutionary change. Sometimes I am sure you feel, as I do, that there is not a corner of the world that is not boiling today with unprecedented events. Our country's relationships with over 50 different nations present over 50 different problems, some small and some great. But there is only one today that is really paramount. It overshadows and colors and generally distorts every other one with which we have to deal.

The supreme problem of our time is the struggle between Communists and freedom-loving peoples. The issue depends upon whether communism constitutes, as claimed by the Soviet Government and its followers in other countries, a means of deliverance and of human progress, or whether it marks the pathway to human bondage, the inevitable concomitant of the police state. What shall be America's attitude and what her concrete program? The answer to this fundamental issue must inevitably determine and shape during our time the foreign relationships between the Soviet Union and its satellites on the one hand, and all democratic and free countries on the other.

Our western world, endowed with the priceless heritage of Greco-Roman civilization, for centuries has fought and sacrificed in the age-old struggle for human freedom. We have come to believe in this as one of the most precious things in life. Today our

western civilization is struggling to defend against virulent attack human liberty, the rights of small nations, the rule of law and of right and of conscience as opposed to might.

The Soviet leaders, whatever their professions, have in their concrete deeds violated and denied the right of freedom. Emerging from the Second World War, Soviet Russia has brought under its rule some 500,000,000 people of over 12 countries by methods of terrorism and fear. Human freedom no longer exists among those peoples who once formed the independent states of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania, but who now are living repressed under Soviet rule. Human freedom, as we understand it, no longer exists in Poland, or Czechoslovakia, in Hungary or Bulgaria, or in the other countries behind the iron curtain. The Soviet Government is seeking by every ruthless means to extend this rule. Its followers are attempting to overrun China. It is seeking, like an octopus, to envelop Greece and Korea. It is attemping, through its agents, to work its way into Indonesia. It is attempting to threaten Norway and Sweden and Italy and every country where weakness offers opportunity. Those whom it has enveloped have lost freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, freedom of religion, and even in many cases freedom of movement.

The head-on conflict between these two great forces—communism against free democracy—is the supreme issue of our day. Make no mistake about it. The forces of communism are bent upon wrecking those countries which uphold western civilization and the philosophy upon which it is built; and, although the Communists may not be putting soldiers in the field, they are just as surely waging active war against western civilization with all the forces and methods at their command. The Communists, in truth, are today working out new tactics for gaining their objective of world mastery which, unless effectively combated, are potentially more deadly than the old-fashioned method of battleships and guns. Our supreme problem of foreign policy is how we, in our own self-interest, can best assist those who, like us, are determined to defend human liberty and the noble heritage of western civilization against the insidious attack of communism.

The fundamental conflict, you see, is not between two great peoples. It is a struggle between two fundamentally conflicting philosophies—belief in a world of moral law and ordered justice as against a world of terrorism and the rule of sheer force. In this there is nothing new. From time immemorial this struggle has been going on; and it is only because peoples through the years have felt that human freedom and a rule of law are more precious than life itself and have again and again been willing to fight and die, if need be, in their defense that western civilization as we know it has evolved.

How are we to meet this paramount problem of our day? What practical and concrete steps are we to take?

Two opposite courses have been advocated—the one a policy of compromise, the other a policy of war.

Those who support the first course point out the undeniable fact that we cannot rid ourselves of the problem. We have to learn to live together, whether we like it or not. Therefore, they say, there is compelling necessity for us to work out some kind of compromise.

But the experience of the last few years, and particularly the experience at Paris last autumn in the General Assembly, shows the futility of trying to reach a compromise with the policies at present being followed by the Soviet Government. As long as these are pursued, the differences are too radical and too basic.

You can't, for instance, compromise on the issue of freedom of religion. Either you have it or you do not have it. Restraints and curbs, even though partial, spell denial of freedom. A secret police with despotic power, even though that power is curbed, is still a secret police subject to all of its abuses. Government, unchecked by constitutional safeguards of law and by courts freely accessibly to all, is, and always will be, despotism. The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the trials currently being staged in Bulgaria reveal the hollowness and the mockery of so-called justice when the decisions of courts depend not upon law but upon orders from state dictators. The philosophy that the state is supreme over everything else cannot possibly be reconciled with a philosophy built upon the supreme value of human personality.

With the great masses of Russian people we have no quarrel. But, unhappily, we have no way of reaching them. For centuries they have been kept in ignorance and darkness, largely cut off from vital contacts with other peoples. They were scarcely touched by the great civilization of Rome. The Renaissance and the humanistic movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, sweeping across western Europe, never reached the rank and file of Russian people. Their present Government is still keeping them separated from the warm currents of human intercourse flowing outside. The Soviet Government is isolating itself in the world as it is isolating itself in the United Nations. Manifestly, it is either not yet alive to the international responsibilities of the twentieth-century world or, if it is, it has determined that such responsibilities are in conflict with its own ambitions.

There should be no insoluble problem standing between East and West. The Russian people fought valiantly as our allies during the last war and helped to win the victory. Between our two peoples there has always been a strong tradition of friendship.

If the Soviet Government makes clear by action rather than by words her respect for fundamental human rights and her willingness to cooperate in the building of a world based upon law and human freedom, the United States stands always ready to meet her more than halfway. A simple change of conduct in Berlin or at Lake Success would pave the way. Then we would have, not compromise but cooperation.

A second and very different policy from that of compromise is a frank recourse to arms. As already suggested, our experience of the past 2 years makes it clear that compromise with the present policies being pursued by the Soviet Government is impossible. It is equally clear that the Soviet Government is bent upon aggressive action; and, since the appeal to reason has proved utterly unavailing, it is argued that there is only one practical way to stop the Russian advance—superior physical force. Therefore, the conclusion is reached that, since American foreign policy must, above all else, be realistic, the only course open to us is the protection of our Nation and our civilization by armed force. The United Nations, it is argued, has again and again manifested its impotency and its inability to prevent Soviet aggression. Czechoslovakia cried to the United Nations. But Czechoslovakia is in chains and Jan Marsaryk is dead. Hence, it is said, armed force is the only answer. That is the only language the Russians understand. Let us be realistic.

But the trouble is that such a policy assumes that a smashing victory over Russia would destroy communism. That is not true. The conflict is not between two peoples, but between two fundamentally opposed philosophies. It is not as simple as if we were back in the nineteenth century fighting an enemy within their own borders. Our real enemy is communism. Ideas cannot be downed by force. War is not a practical way to stop the spread of communism. Communism battens on war.

Moreover, a third world war could only be a tragic catastrophe to the civilization we would give our lives to protect. Out of the ghastly ruins of such a war communism or something uglier would lift its head.

The scrapping of the United Nations by the resort to arms therefore offers no positive solution to the problem now facing us; nor does it assure the real protection of western civilians.

In what direction, then, must we turn?

All of the Western World is looking to the United States for leadership. Our vast preponderance in wealth, in natural resources, and in population, and also our history and present strategic position thrust upon us, whether we like it or not, responsibility for leadership. Once before the youthful American Nation, consecrated to the ideal of human liberty, was the hope of the world. Now, in a far more crucial struggle, the eyes of all who believe in human liberty and democracy are again upon us. Grounded in the faith of our fathers, believing passionately in human freedom and in the brotherhood of man as taught by the Christian religion, we dare not fail. But which way shall we lead?

Since a genuine solution is to be found neither in compromising with the present policies of the Soviet Government nor in the opposite course of a resort to arms, wise leadership, it seems clear, must struggle to find some middle course other than compromise and other than war. Such a program the United States is boldly developing. Its main points are these:

First. We must consecrate ourselves wholeheartedly and unswervingly to the support of the United Nations.

The nineteenth-century world of separate and more or less isolated national units is gone. That was a world which knew nothing of modern electricity or airplanes or radios; when it took more than a week to get news across the Atlantic Ocean. Out of such a world were naturally evolved theories of national sovereignty absolute in its nature and practices based upon the geographical fact of comparative isolation. But under the facts of today nations can no longer live separate, isolated existences, competing each for selfish, superior power over rivals. We have reached an age when, whether we like it or not, if our civilization is to survive, collaboration among peoples for the service of humanity must take the place of power politics for selfish national ends. Call it humanitarianism—the service of humanity—or call it by the Christian name of brotherhood—this is the goal toward which our twentieth-century world is moving, and must move, if we are to survive.

The Nation which plays a lone hand for stakes of selfish power is bound to lose in the twentieth-century world. The dice are heavily loaded against her. The United States, dreaming of economic self-sufficiency, attempted a long-range policy of selfish isolation in the years between the two world wars. In spite of our matchless power and wealth, the attempt ended in utter failure. The iron curtain is another attempt. It also will end in failure.

Since the Second World War a new world is emerging—a world built upon global concepts of international obligation.

The international trusteeship system is an instance of this twentieth-century trend. Under the United Nations the old nineteenth century colonialism is being supplanted in the trust territories by a new machinery, to prevent every form of human exploitation, and to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of some 16,000,000 inhabitants.

Or, again, take the recent resolution now before the Economic and Social Council to

find practical means for raising the standards of living in underdeveloped areas by providing needed technological and other assistance.

Under twentieth century realities we are coming to realize that unless we can achieve uninterrupted and effective international collaboration, our present civilization, built upon the increasing interdependence of all peoples and races, cannot possibly progress. And the United Nations is today the only organized governmental world machinery in existence for making possible effective international collaboration. It is the hope of the world.

I well realize the current feeling of frustration in many minds about the United Nations. But the United Nations is a growing organism. For one so young, it has displayed a surprising and unexpected vitality and strength. Its very imperfections are a challenge to your generation. It can be improved.

The one chance of winning Russia to reason is through the debates within the United Nations.

If I may digress for a moment I would like to tell you what happened last autumn during the General Assembly meeting in Paris. In spite of the pessimistic reports that went out, the meeting achieved telling and substantial results. The chief protagonists were talking and not fighting. Each was forced to lay before the bar of public opinion its actions and its policies and to find justification for them insofar as possible. The votes taken at Paris were highly significant.

First of all, the General Assembly approved the International Control plan developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. The vote was 40 to 6, only the Soviet bloc voting against. One may hope that, as a result of this overwhelming expression of world opinion, the Soviet Union may find a way to reconsider its position so as to permit atomic energy to be controlled for peace.

Another important vote was taken on the armaments question. The Soviet proposal to reduce armaments by one-third, without any system of effective international inspection and verification, convinced practically everyone of the insincerity and hypocrisy of Soviet aims. The Assembly, instead, passed a constructive resolution looking toward the checking and publication of full information with regard to existing armaments by an international organ of control. The vote was 43 in favor and only the Soviet bloc against.

Next, the General Assembly, over the protest of the Soviet Government and its satelities, voted 47 to 6 to place the guilt for the border disturbances in Greece squarely upon Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Although the Greek case is not settled, the Balkan Commission has been reconstituted for another year. It is doubtful if Greece would be independent today were it not for the United Nations.

A fourth important vote, 48 to 6 this time, declared in unequivocal terms the legality of the Government of the Republic of Korea which had been set up with the assistance of a United Nations Commission.

From these examples you can see how the debates at Paris helped to consolidate and unify the policies of those countries genuinely seeking world peace, as they illumined the hypocrisy of those nations seeking purely selfish ends. The practical unanimity recorded in vote after vote, with only the Soviet bloc voting in opposition, was convincing proof of solid achievement. The Kremlin cannot afford to ignore what happened in Paris.

The recent achievement of a truce in Palestine was brought about through the patient striving of the United Nations. Were it not for the United Nations there seems little doubt but that Jew and Arab would be fighting on the plains of Palestine today. Indeed, without the United Nations, the area of sanguinary fighting by this time might well be extended in the Middle East considerably beyond the confines of Palestine.

To consolidate and unify the policies and thus to strengthen the action of those countries seeking a world peace based upon law, it is a cardinal principle of American foreign policy to fortify and wholeheartedly support the United Nations.

Second. The United States will continue to throw its full weight behind the program for European economic recovery. As a result of the most disastrous and destructive conflict in history, the nations of western Europe were left at the end of the Second World War economically prostrate. Unemployment and economic ruin stared them in the face.

Since the end of the war already much has been accomplished in the way of industrial rehabilitation. But much remains to be done. Unless the countries of western Europe can be successfully assisted to their feet so as to permit again the effective functioning of their machinery of production and thus enable them to regain their economic strength, it will be most difficult for them to withstand Russia's advance or contribute to the defense of western civilization.

We have heard the Soviet propaganda that the shipments of American machinery and industrial goods to Europe are being made to dump unneeded surpluses for the economic advantage of the United States. But the fact that large proportions of these goods are in short supply and vociferously demanded by important American industrial and agricultural groups gives the lie to such a smear campaign. It is sheer nonsense to claim that such shipments are a phase of economic imperialism to gain an American stranglehold over European industry. The American objective is manifestly not to weaken, but to strengthen the European economy and to assist in building it again into a highly productive and self-reliant economy. The Marshall plan is built upon the hard-headed realization that in our twentieth-century civilization no nation can live unto itself alone, that we all sink or swim together, that not even the wealthiest nation can prosper if large populations are desperately hungry and in need in other parts of the world, that the wisest and most rewarding, if not the only safe, national policy today is a humanitarian policy. As part of the project, so that these deliveries will not lead to pauperization and permanent dependency, the shipments are being made on the express condition that the receiving nations themselves collaborate in determining what their own contributions shall be, each to the other, in order to build up a unified Europe, and in planning the organization of a European economy which will become at the earliest date possible independent of further American aid.

The United States is equally concerned in the proposed regional arrangement of western Europe, the so-called western European union. The objective of this cooperative enterprise is not the setting up of a military alliance to threaten the security of other states. It is not a move for selfish power to impose its will through armed force on unwilling peoples. It is rather a cooperative movement by free peoples, through common effort and collaboration, to crash through much of the outlived political and economic nationalism which once held them apart. It is a movement of great promise and of hope. It is an effort in the spirit of the twentieth century to give to peoples a freer and more spacious life and at the same time a higher degree of security under which to work.

It is one of the fundamentals of United States policy to support and, insofar as possible, to assist in those regional arrangements, set up under chapter VII of the Charter, for the strengthening of peace foundations to make possible a more gracious life for men and women everywhere.

Third. Although, as I have already suggested, superior armed force alone will not afford to twentieth-century life the security which is necessary if our civilization is to progress, nevertheless, as long as the present east-west conflict continues, we cannot afford to strip ourselves of our defenses. In frontier days men of peace often found it necessary to build stockades against attack. Both for our own sake and for that of freedom everywhere we must keep our Nation strong to resist aggression.

Western Europe and the United States have the heritage of a common civilization to defend. It is the very manifest interest of the United States to make common cause with western Europe in lessening the chance of Soviet attack. If the United States can strengthen the capacity and the will of freedom-loving nations to defend themselves against aggression, it thereby increases to that extent the power of the United Nations, in the words of the Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

The organization of a well-armed North Atlantic Security Pact is not a resort to arms. Its purpose is precisely the opposite—to prevent war by making the Soviet Government realize the futility of attack.

In the formulation of a proposed North Atlantic Pact it has been made unmistakably clear that the purpose of the pact is defense and not offense. A North Atlantic Security Pact must be understood as part of a program not to supplant, but to operate under, the United Nations.

Fourth. More important than all else must be a policy of aggressive activity throughout the world for the establishment and the strengthening of the fundamental principles in which we believe—human freedom, justice, genuine world brotherhood. We must be missionaries for human freedom.

The ultimate issue between the forces of communism and democracy will be decided not by armies and atomic bombs. Those philosophies and those basic ideas will ultimately triumph which contain within themselves the inherent power to capture the imaginations and stir the deep desires of men and women throughout the world. How vital is man's faith in human freedom? If this be his ultimate desire, no communistic aggression, no hypocritical propaganda, no terrorism or trickery, can ultimately capture the citadel of man's soul.

Again and again history has proved that ideas and ideals are more powerful than armies—that no dictator can make himself supreme master of the world by force alone.

Western democracy has swept the world because in our experience men and women have believed in human freedom and justice and democracy so passionately that they have been willing to die for them. These will surely triumph over communism too if only we aggressively and passionately carry them into the four corners of the world. History down through the centuries has proved again and again that there can be but one outcome to a struggle for selfish power against forces fighting to protect and advance human rights. Those genuinely serving humanity always emerge ultimately triumphant.

Our task then must be to find a way to prevent war from blazing up, and to spread the faith of democracy and human liberty. Our policy toward Russia must be one of firmness, but at the same time one of understanding and of tolerance. We need Russia's assistance and cooperation in reconstructing Europe and in the gigantic job of building a lasting peace. We must win the Russian people's help if we can. We have no right to conclude that this is impossible.

America is a Christian nation. American foreign policy must be foundationed essentially upon Christian fundamentals. Upon that path we must go forward unflinchingly

and unafraid. Otherwise, we must forfeit our leadership.

In conclusion, then, may I recapitulate in summary form the four cardinal points in American foreign policy:

First. To build up and fortify in every way possible the youthful and developing United Nations Organization.

Second. To continue our full support to ERP and to the movement toward a western European union so as to help unify and strengthen the countries of western Europe.

Third. To assist in establishing an effective North Atlantic Security Pact under the Charter of the United Nations in order to make strong the bastions of human freedom and thus to lessen the likelihood of war.

Fourth. To find ways and means of aggressive action to spread and strengthen the basic principles upon which rests our civilization. America, as a Christian nation, must base its policy unswervingly upon right and justice and humanity. We must believe, in the words of Lincoln, that right makes might; and in that faith we must dare to do our duty as we understand it.

I often think of the verse of Martin Luther, that doughty old fighter, who could not be downed:

"And though this world with devils filled
Should threaten to undo us,
We will not fear for God hath willed
His truth to triumph through us."

With closer political and economic understanding among the free peoples of the world may come a great upsurge of the forces of democracy. The consequences could be electric. Democracy, foundationed upon the deep desires and will of the great masses of mankind, is an unconquerable force.

The time is big with opportunity. Destiny is in the making. The issues call for men of vision and men of courage.

Creeping Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 12, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Manifesto of 1848 is now installed by this administration apparently as a national program. This devastating system for destroying free enterprise, regimenting the people, distributing wealth, and driving toward the nationalization of industries is now being stealthily promoted through proposed legislation to supplement legislation along this line which has already been enacted into law. The people will soon be as helpless in the network of communism as flies entangled in a spider's web.

I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement by Dr. Arthur A. Smith, professor of economics at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex. I hope that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take time to peruse this very able analysis of the situation as prepared by Dr. Smith:

ECONOMIC CENTRALIZATION HELD PATH TO COMMUNISM

(By Arthur A. Smith, professor of economics, SMU)

Watch the Communists' trial in New York. It should reveal to America some startling facts about the subtle workings of those who would destroy our economic order.

In the meantime it would be enlightening for you to read the Communist Manifesto. Your public library has a copy somewhere. In this document you will find the essence of the Communists' program and of their operating techniques.

One passage from the manifesto is particularly significant. Here it is: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy, by degrees, to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state."

Although the manifesto points out the measures to be used in reaching the above objective will be different in different countries, in the most advanced countries the following will be applied:

1. Abolition of property in land.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state.
8. Equal obligation of all to work.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools.

PLAN CREEPING REVOLUTION

It is interesting to note that, contrary to general belief, the Marxian philosophy of change is not revolutionary in the popular sense of the word. Even though Marx uses the term "revolution," the process of communism is a creeping process—by degrees. It is subtle. Some branches of Marxism do believe in militant methods, but the strongest branches adhere to no such technique. Instead, political processes are to be used.

Now in the light of this, let us examine what has happened in America over the years since the Communist Manifesto was written in 1848.

Under the guise of one thing or another—now supported by the Democrats, now supported by the Republicans—step by step some of the objectives of the manifesto have been realized in this country. Many people fear our two great political parties are not worthy of their names, that they have not stood consistently for anything—except vote-getting. In the subtle process of socialization, each party has been gullible. To get votes, each at one time or another has stolen planks from minority parties—not the least of which is the Socialist Party.

Let's check the score:

We have a heavy progressive income tax. It might become heavier.

Although banks have not been nationalized in this country as in England, government control of credit processes has been increasing. Today the United States Treasury is a dominant force in the trend toward centralization of credit. Credit is too powerful an instrument for the centralists to leave in individual hands. It is a fair guess that the first great business to be nationalized (unless the trend is checked) will be the banks.

We have not abolished all right of inheritance in this country, but we have greatly impaired it through steeply progressive death taxes. There is talk of even higher rates.

Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels is just another way of saying confiscation of the property of all who do not agree with the party. That must be deferred a while yet.

STRICT COMMUNICATION REGULATIONS

The means of communication and transport are not in the hands of the Government yet, but they are strictly regulated. Probably these will be the second great industry (next to the banks) to become nationalized, if the trend is not checked. By virtual subsidization of their competitors, Government has been slowly choking the railroads into such weakened financial position that ultimately the excuse can be found to nationalize them.

Although Government ownership of factories has not progressed very far, we do have the TVA, and there is talk of the Government's going into the steel business. Government ownership of the coal mines, the tidelands, and all subsurface mineral rights is strongly advocated. How long it will be until such is a reality, we do not know.

Agriculture, the great industry that we have always regarded as the bulwark of individual enterprise, has long since sold out to Federal regulation. It is only a matter of months until the farmer will be told what and how much to produce.

The professionals are up next—socialized medicine and Federal aid to education. Will the ministers be in line immediately following? And then the family?

Supposedly we have been fighting communism, planned economy, etc. Yet right in our midst we have steadily adopted their very principles.

How has it happened? Well, we have allowed ourselves to be divided and conquered. And very few of us can truthfully say that we have been consistent in our defense of the American way. We have permitted ourselves to be bought. Our own selfishness has been our undoing. The farmer has been strongly in favor of parity and subsidy. The banker wants the Government to support bond prices: he likes the FHA, and he now rather likes the FDIC. Labor wants minimum-wage laws, etc. The merchant outwardly believes in competition, but he vigorously supports retail-price maintenance, and thinks the merchant who cuts prices is a striped kitty. The none-too-rich fellow believes the rich ones ought to be socked with high taxes until he gets rich. Contactors rather like to think of great public housing programs in the offing. And so it goes, ad infinitum.

Lots of good people in Dallas bitterly oppose so much Government spending, but ardently favor local projects if Uncle Sam will pay the bill. It's a cumulative process.

Something has happened to us locally—at the grass roots. Instead of first trying to solve our own problems, as in the old days, we run to Washington.

"He who pays the fiddler chooses the tune." Washington will dictate the terms, even to school teachers under Federal aid.

The Cornerstones of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able address delivered on Saturday night in Pittsburgh, at the annual meeting of the Amen Corner by Gov. William Munford Tuck, of Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CORNERSTONES OF DEMOCRACY

No man can visit this rich and productive region of western Pennsylvania without being inspired with renewed faith and confidence in the American way of life. Here you have demonstrated vividly the results that can be achieved under our system of free enterprise and individual initiative. To millions in other lands you in this area stand as the symbol of American industrial might and achievement.

Our people as a nation represent an even greater and more important symbol to our sister states of the world. America, founded and developed as a land of freedom and opportunity, stands today as the last great bulwark against dictatorship and tyranny. Thousands of her sons have fallen on the battlefields of the world in defense of the principles of our free government and our free society. Millions ever stand ready for the call to arms should inimical forces venture to attack us. Yet these same patriotic citizens, plus other millions of Americans, seemingly fail to recognize the arrival of conditions within our own borders which, if continued unchecked, can just as effectively as the arms of an aggressor rob us of our heritage as a free people.

I can conceive of no greater service that might be rendered than that of arousing the citizens of the United States to the dangers that lurk in the shadows of our outwardly placid society. We all have been wont to accept our freedom and our individual liberties as a matter of course. We have given too little thought and attention to the great sacrifices involved in their establishment and even less to the absolute necessity of renewed vigilance for their protection.

The chapters of history written in this century are filled with proof of the doctrine that no government can long endure which disregards the freedom and the rights of the individual. Time and again we have seen the victims of oppression succumb by reason of inner national decay, apathy, or a complete absence of alertness to the influences which finally undermined their economy, their national morality, and their character as individual citizens. In fact, no nation has ever been long subjugated without first having been sapped of its strength and will to resist by inner erosion.

We, in America, despite our proud boasts, are not immune to such contagious and pernicious influences.

The first and most effective antidote is an alert and active citizenship, armed with the will and the determination, as well as the courage, to preserve for ourselves and all posterity the priceless liberty and free institutions which always have been ours. I have heard expounded the fallacious theory that modern civilization requires a fundamental change in our form of government. On the contrary, strict adherence to the philosophy and the principles of our constitutional system is the only means by which the blessings we enjoy can be conveyed to our children and the succeeding generations. With the leadership and encouragement to which the people of America are entitled, and in the past have been accustomed, we can yet drive from the structure of our national life the termites of selfish interest and un-Americanism.

The inroads of these unwelcome elements may have come about in part because of the normal inertia of the people. So long as their national affairs move forward without startling and shocking jolts they are inclined to assume that all is well. Under such circumstances they are prone to go to the polls only to register a protest against an individual or some particularly obnoxious scheme, rather than to cast a positive vote for principle.

Furthermore, Americans have been content, all too frequently, to yield their responsibilities and their rights to a pampering Federal bureaucracy. The bait of free money, something for nothing, cradle-to-grave security, and an over-all paternalism have tended to undermine the hardy characteristics of our citizens and convert them into supplicants at the altar of the Federal Treasury. Many of them are there today, like fawning sycophants at the feet of a political overlord.

One of the grave threats to our sound Government and our American way of life is this trend toward a benevolent but strong central authority. Those who advocate this cloak themselves in the garments of the public interest, but in truth constitute a Trojan horse crammed with the potentialities of self-destruction and ready to tear at the very vitals of the Nation.

I am proud to report that we in Virginia, where American democracy was born, have striven consistently to uphold the structure of our constitutional government, built upon the twin cornerstones of State and local self-rule. The manner in which the leadership of our Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States has stood for principle, above all other considerations, has inspired and emboldened right-thinking people everywhere.

Our forebears, and many of our distinguished Virginia contemporaries, have not hesitated to point to the fallacies of greater and greater Federal largess and Federal control. Neither have our Virginia administrations since the turn of the century sought to lull our people into the false comfort that we could offer them something for nothing, or that we could render the services they themselves demand without imposing the tax levies necessary to produce the money. We subscribe to the theory that government cannot produce happiness and contentment. We believe that these blessings must be attained by the people themselves. We believe the fundamental obligation and responsibility of government is the maintenance of law and order, and that the individual members of society should have the fullest possible rein in shaping their own destinies.

Unfortunately, this philosophy has not flourished at the highest echelon of government. Despite the fact that under the Constitution it possesses only those powers delegated to it, the tendency has been for the Federal Government to gather unto itself all manner of additional powers by indirect and ofttimes subtle methods. The fault not always has been that of any one individual, or any small group of individuals; it frequently has been the fault of the citizens of America who have encouraged their elected representatives to adopt the policy of grab-barrel politics, irrespective of the effect on the general welfare.

The founding fathers did not conceive of government as a means of providing board and room and support for life for the citizens uniting in its establishment. Our Government was set up to protect our rights and privileges and to help guide us into the most direct paths to their enjoyment.

There are those who have an entirely different conception of the purposes and functions of government. They view government as the means to a planned economy, to a universal and uniform administration of public services, regardless of whether Federal, State, or local in character and responsibility. Under the impetus of this philosophy in high places, there has grown up a governmental colossus which now touches in some form or another the daily lives of practically every citizen of the country. The talons of this bureaucracy extend into the factories, the State capitols, the county courthouses, and the very homes of all the people. The feeding and fattening of this monstrous Frankenstein has demanded an ever-increasing number of dollars, until, in the language of the bobbysoxers, it now runs in zillions, and yet the appetite remains unsatiated. Each dollar creates more demands and at the same time destroys the will and the capacity to resist on the part of both Government and the people. The tentacles of the octopus grow longer and stronger as the lifeblood of the States and the localities is squeezed into the Federal feeding trough.

I am thinking particularly of the program of Federal grants-in-aid and the gradual usurpation of the functions of the States by this method of indirection. Since the day our system was established the levels of government closest to the people have constituted the first line of defense against loss of our liberties. That was recognized in the fact that the Federal Government was the recipient only of certain delegated powers. The rest were reserved by the States. The advocates of Federal grants ignore these unchallenged principles and endeavor to lure the States and the localities into abject surrender and capitulation by grants and other mislabeled Federal appropriations, ostensibly for indispensable public services. Their cry is that, unless the States do these certain things, then the Federal Government must act for them. This is absolutely contrary to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. There is no just basis whatever for their claim to Federal authority over the internal affairs of the States, whether the would-be intervention pertains to voting qualifications, the education of our children, the public health, or some other matter of which we legally and rightly have jurisdiction as member States of this Union.

Fundamentally, the grants-in-aid program is built upon two major fallacies. First, all the funds the Federal Government ever had or ever will have came or will come from the taxpayers of the various States. There is no other source for its income. Whatever the Federal Government allocates in grants to the States, or the localities, comes from the pockets of the people of those same States. But before any money is returned to the States and their subdivisions, it passes through the Federal processing plant. The substantial toll exacted for this service contracts the original tax dollar into a mere fraction by the time it drops into the State or local treasury.

The second major fallacy is that the people of the States and their counties and cities are unable to provide the necessary services unless the Federal Government steps in with this so-called Federal aid. Aside from the fact that the setting of standards for State services is none of the concern of the Federal Government, there is another good reason why the Federal Government should keep out of these State activities. With very, very few exceptions, I am convinced that the whole list of existing grants-in-aid programs could be eliminated today—together with the Federal taxes that finance them—and the States and their localities could shoulder them in their entirety with better service to the public and a lesser expenditure of public funds.

The proposals for further expansion of the Federal-aid system also ignore other fundamentals of the national economic picture. The Federal Government is now saddled with the greatest national debt in all history. It requires enormous sums annually merely for the payment of interest charges. Any sound businessman would be directing a substantial portion of his income toward retirement of his debt before undertaking expansion of his plant. The Federal budget and the Federal Government are not above and beyond the purview of sound business practices. They should be the exemplification of the soundest fiscal policies.

It is a startling fact that in 1 year the Federal withholding tax on the pay of employees of the Commonwealth of Virginia

alone—not taking into account the millions of dollars paid by individual and corporate income-tax payers outside of the State agencies—amounts to $600,000 more than is returned to the State for a dozen Federal grants-in-aid programs. These include game protection, education in agriculture, mechanic arts and vocational training, marketing, research, agricultural extension work and home economics, experimental work in agriculture, industrial rehabilitation, aid to the blind, and mental hygiene.

Total internal-revenue collections in Virginia in a single year are seven times the entire State appropriation from its general fund for the maintenance and operation of all our State agencies during the last 2 years. Yet we are meeting, and always have met, in a satisfactory manner the responsibilities and obligations of our State services.

No doubt a similar picture exists in most of the other States. It is a grave and most disturbing situation.

Were the issue simply which level of government is to dispense the funds, the problem would be less alarming. The danger lies in the concentration of power in the Central Government, the weakening of the State and local governments, and ultimate destruction of the will and the power of the lower units of government to act for themselves in meeting their own problems. Control of the purse means control of the activity, sooner or later. No matter how many assurances are put down on paper that this or that Federal-aid program will be administered under State supervision, there is no assurance that this arrangement will not be changed by the next Congress. Control of the funds is the first step; tight control of the manner in which the funds are used invariably is the second.

If the Federal Government itself is to remain equal to the problems and tasks assigned it under the Constitution, it must recognize the necessity of the State and local governments continuing virile and strong.

It is significant that in every nation where communism has gained the mastery of the government and the people, it has come after the establishment of a strong central authority and the destruction of the rights of the people to manage their local affairs.

Only a few days ago I participated in ceremonies in our beautiful capitol square in Richmond dedicating a marker to the tenth President of the United States, John Tyler, of Virginia. In the course of my remarks on that occasion I recalled that President Tyler resigned from his seat in the Senate of the United States rather than cast his vote contrary to his convictions and his sense of public duty. In announcing that decision, he wrote this memorable declaration of principle: "I shall carry with me into retirement the principles which I brought with me into public life, and by the surrender of the high station to which I was called by the voice of the people of Virginia, I shall set an example to my children which shall teach them to regard as nothing place and office, when either is to be attained or held at the sacrifice of honor."

His voluntary retirement from public office at that time did not deter him from accepting the duties of further public service, in both lowly and exalted capacities. After he had left the Presidency and returned to his home in the historic Virginia county of Charles City, the people called their neighbor and friend to further duty as a county overseer of roads. He was not too proud to accept this humble position. His thought was not for political preferment but for service to his fellow citizens.

There never has been greater need for men and women of similar courage, determination, and high principle who are willing to make the sacrifices so necessary for the defense and the preservation of our liberties. The need extends into all levels of government and into all walks of life.

If the American people want socialism, regimentation, and governmental paternalism at the cost of their freedom, then my voice is raised in futile protest. If the people of this land of unsurpassed resources and a heritage of liberty unequaled on earth want to continue to breathe the air of freedom, then they must awaken to the perils that threaten to engulf them.

They must rededicate themselves to the cause of right, justice, and freedom, and with these as their brick and mortar make certain that the temples of our democracy—the State and the city and the county governments—are not toppled into the abyss of a lost liberty.

Development of Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on Missouri River development, published in Look magazine of April 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD, MUD, DUST, AND DISASTER

WANTED: A MISSOURI COMPROMISE THAT WILL HOLD WATER—"A SHOTGUN WEDDING," THAT'S WHAT FOES CALL THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN—PICK-SLOAN FIGHTS BACK WITH A 6-YEAR PLAN TO BEAT THE RIVER

(By William B. Arthur)

The rampaging Missouri River and man are fighting it out in the West.

The struggle has been long, disheartening, and seemingly unending, with man unable as yet to prevent disaster. And every time the river triumphs, it high lights another long battle in Washington among men who can't agree on a single plan to control the river.

The river's tactics are simple. It either gives man too much water, with page 1 headlines like this: "Thousands homeless in Missouri River flood."

Or it gives man too little water, with headlines like this: "Drought toll mounts in Great Plains."

The river won't compromise. Neither will the men who are battling it out in Washington. On one side are those who believe the river must be fought with a Missouri Valley Authority similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

On the other side are those who call MVA everything from socialistic through pinkish, totalitarian, and unrealistic, to communistic. Present tactics, they say, of fighting the river with an alliance of Federal and State Government agencies cooperating in a democratic manner at a grass-roots level, are sufficient to turn the tide of battle.

To this "grass roots" attitude, MVA proponents say "tommy rot." Yet whatever the merits of either argument, the terrible problem remains.

I've seen the Missouri River and know of the destruction it can inflict. I've seen how its water and mud have covered Missouri Valley farms, streets, and living-room carpets. This river has gone on a rampage a dozen times since 1844; six times since 1940. In the past 45 years, an estimated 800 lives have been taken by the river. Millions of acres of land regularly are covered by Big Mo's floods, with property losses totaling a billion dollars.

Droughts, too, are not uncommon to the Missouri's 519,635-square-mile basin. You still can see evidence of the last great one in the 1930's. At that time, particles of rich soil were blown across the country to the Capitol in Washington. More than 300,000 farmers vacated the valley for green pastures elsewhere. It cost the United States $1,246,000,000 to aid those who were left.

You can see why they call the river Big Muddy by looking at it almost anywhere along its 2,470-mile course. Valley residents told me that the water's too thick to drink, and a mite to thin to plow. And they aren't far off. Big Muddy pours 100,000,000 tons of good earth a year into the Mississippi River, a few miles above St. Louis.

The stakes are high in this fight. Valley residents proudly told me, "You name it, we've got it," as they enumerated their areas' resources. But how long they'll be able to list them, including such things as one-half of the Nation's wheat, depends upon the Government's ability to stop the floods and erosion and to control the droughts that are a constant plague.

What is the Government doing?

Congress finally acts

Until 1943, little was accomplished in the fight against the river. But in that year a disastrous flood brought demands for action.

In 1944 Congress passed a new Flood Control Act authorizing the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to begin work on a program of valley development. The program authorized was one which had been threaded together earlier from separate and widely conflicting plans drawn up by the engineers and the reclamationists.

The Corps of Engineers' plan, primarily for flood control and navigation, had been developed by Col. Lewis A. Pick, then division engineer of the corps' Missouri River division. It was known as the Pick plan.

The Bureau of Reclamation plan for irrigation and hydroelectric power had been developed by W. G. Sloan, then assistant director of the Bureau's region six in the Missouri Valley. It was known as the Sloan plan.

The amalgamated program, authorized by Congress, became known as the Pick-Sloan plan.

Big Mo is divided up

At that time, and continuing until now, critics of the Pick-Sloan plan contended that the two agencies got together in a "shotgun wedding" because it had been suggested that a Missouri Valley Authority be established to develop the valley. Such a suggestion, if carried out then, might have eliminated the well-entrenched engineers and Bureau of Reclamation from their leading roles in valley development.

The Pick-Sloan plan, in effect, split the river, with the engineers assuming basic responsibility for the lower basin; the Bureau, the upper. It calls for the creation of 105 reservoirs along the Missouri and its tributaries to hold water for irrigation, flood control, and navigation, and the generation of electric power.

Congress itself stepped in to settle one of the knottiest problems concerned with Pick-Sloan development. The Corps of Engineers proposed to deepen the Missouri's navigation channel from 6 to 9 feet from Sioux City, Iowa, to the river's mouth. Up-river residents claimed that such a project would take water away from irrigation; that there wasn't enough water in the river for both. An amendment was passed giving up-river residents priority on the water.

Pick-Sloan seek teamwork

Pick-Sloan forces foresaw that their program lacked an integrated, dynamic view of the valley as a whole. So in 1945, they formed a Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee to tie together all projects concerned with valley development. On it, they placed representatives of the Corps of Engineers, the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of 5 of the 10 basin States. The committee holds monthly meetings, with representatives of other Federal, State, and local government agencies invited to take part in its deliberations.

Colonel Pick, who during the war directed construction of the Ledo Road through Burma and became a major general, was elected committee chairman.

MVA versus Pick-Sloan plan

During the past 3 years, $1,229,165,907 has been either spent or earmarked for spending under the Pick-Sloan program. And during the past 3 years, criticism has been heaped on both the manner of spending and the results. Strong groups have been organized to oppose Pick-Sloan in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority. They include such organizations as the Congress of Industrial Organizations, affiliates of the American Federation of Labor, and the National Farmers Union. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, became the No. 1 MVA spokesman in Congress. He regularly called for the creation of an MVA to weld the entire basin into a comprehensive plan of development under a single responsible leadership.

"The Pick-Sloan plan is fantastic and impractical," MVA's backers assert. "The kind of slap-dash, haphazard, so-called planning which has characterized the official programs for the Missouri River thus far is not consistent with the welfare of this country."

"Here," the MVAites assert, "are some of the Pick-Sloan follies:

"The Corps of Engineers' program for navigation has increased flood danger along the river's lower reaches. By narrowing the channel, they have made it incapable of holding as much water as it used to hold. Twenty years ago, rain would raise the river a few inches. Now, it raises it from 2 to 4 feet.

"The plan neglects upstream-watershed control, a vital necessity if floods are to be abated at their source.

"It neglects water and soil conservation on farms and ranches, general reviews of land use, development of mineral and other raw-material resources, recreation facilities, fish and wildlife conservation, and social and economic measures for diversification and stabilization of the means of livelihood.

"In an area already starved for electric power, and losing industries and people because of it, the Pick-Sloan program for power-generating facilities is woefully inadequate. Rates will be too high.

"The Pick-Sloan alliance is tramping on the rights of Indians.

"The Inter-Agency Committee is little more than a debating society. It has no legal status. Its members still must run to Washington when decisions are needed."

Pick-Sloan criticism, however, hasn't been confined to the MVA forces. Recently a task force of the Hoover Commission investigating the Nation's natural resources reported that some of the unanswered questions concerning development plans (along the Missouri) is whether there will be sufficient water for purposes of navigation, irrigation, water supply, and power development.

"It is nothing short of a calamity that there should be grave uncertainties on this score at this late date."

Pick-Sloan proponents are fighting back. In 1948 the Inter-Agency Committee issued what it terms its "6-Year Program for Valley Development." "This program," the committee contends, "answers the criticism which has been heaped upon us. It brings into being a well-rounded plan for development of the valley as a whole, including upstream watershed control, water and soil conservation, recreation facilities, and all the other things our critics claim are lacking."

Under the 6-year program, which requires congressional authorization, $6,500,000,000 more would be spent for valley development, beginning with the fiscal year 1950.

General Pick, who recently became the Army's Chief of Engineers, told me he believes the Inter-Agency Committee "is the greatest team ever assembled in the United States for the development of an area for the good of the people.

"All of our actions are a democratic process, open and above board. Everyone is given the opportunity to be heard. The people of the valley don't want an authority. They want to work out their problems themselves in a spirit of genuine cooperation.

"Together, we are driving ahead to make the Missouri a river of gold for America. Our objective is to put the river to work for the people."

Another stanch Pick-Sloan supporter told me he believes the river is too big for the TVA type of treatment. The interests of the valley's people are too divergent. They must be reconciled, and an authority is no way to do it. Our opponents fail to see that what we have is a new approach to watershed development. TVA was a new approach, too, and it worked. It worked because it was designed to meet the particular needs of the Tennessee River Valley. Our program is designed to meet the particular needs of the Missouri Valley.

In the midst of the pros and cons, and in the midst of a new Missouri River flood, Senator MURRAY recently introduced his third bill calling for an MVA. In it, he proposes establishment of a Government corporation to be known as the Missouri Valley Authority, headed by a five-member board of directors. A general manager would supervise operations. An advisory board consisting of representatives of Government agencies, governors of the basin States, and basin citizens would examine and pass upon all plans presented to the President and Congress. And, compromising with his previous bills, the new one would permit Government agencies engaged in valley work to continue under MVA's direction.

The Pick-Sloan versus MVA controversy thus enters another round in a long-drawn-out struggle. It has risen and fallen in its intensity with the ebb and flow of the Missouri River. No one knows for certain what the outcome of this controversy will be. But an increasing number of legislators in Washington agree that the time has come to decide whether to cast the weight of action and money behind Pick-Sloan or to throw that program aside and establish an MVA. Division, they agree, won't hold back Big Mo's water.

Thomas Jefferson on Fundamental Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, every public official from the President and down, and every citizen of these United States should daily read and follow the following fundamental truths written by Thomas Jefferson about 150 years ago:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of public money.

Management-Labor Relations—Analyses of Wood Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two analyses of the so-called Wood labor bill. One analysis has been prepared by the A. F. of L. and one by the CIO. I do not accept the recommendations of organized labor in respect to certain labor views, but I certainly agree with labor that the Wood bill is an unacceptable compromise of the labor-legislation issue. I hope we can work out some amendments to the administration labor bill on emergency disputes, secondary boycotts, closed shops, welfare funds, free speech, unfair labor practices of both unions and employers, financial accounting, and the other issues I have mentioned in committee hearings, which will give us a fair and sound labor bill. We need to take the labor issue out of partisan politics. Neither the administration labor bill nor the Wood substitute bill will accomplish that result.

There being no objection, the analyses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF SECOND WOOD BILL (H. R. 4290) AND COMPARISON WITH TAFT-HARTLEY

(Prepared by Woll, Glenn & Thatcher, general counsel, American Federation of Labor)

There is little, if anything, to choose from between the second bill submitted by Congressman WOOD (H. R. 4290, introduced April 14, 1949) and the Taft-Hartley Act. The one is as bad as and, in several important respects, worse than the other. In fact, while the Wood bill does throw several sops in labor's direction, in reality the bill enlarges and strengthens the most objectionable feature of that act, namely, the use of injunctions both as against alleged union unfair labor practices and in connection with so-called national emergency strikes. As will be more fully discussed later, the new bill permits the general counsel to file suit for injunction in the Federal courts merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed an unfair labor practice, and without further investigation, and the

courts are empowered to issue injunctions in such cases in their complete discretion and without any standards to guide them or safeguards to protect against indiscriminate or arbitrary orders. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the general counsel can seek an injunction merely upon filing charges only where violations of section 8 (b) (4), relating to secondary boycotts, are charged, and then only after a full investigation has shown the existence of facts making it reasonably certain that the charges are true. Furthermore, in respect to the national emergency injunctions, the new bill permits the President to apply for an injunction immediately upon the threat of strike and without the requirement that a board of inquiry be assembled to investigate the dispute and make findings prior to the issuance of the injunction as is required under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The few safeguards on the issuance of injunctions in cases involving jurisdictional strikes that are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act are eliminated under the new Wood bill, and under that bill either the board or the court has complete discretion to issue orders respecting jurisdictional strikes without even affording the parties to the dispute an opportunity to settle the jurisdictional dispute for themselves, as was permitted under Taft-Hartley.

The following is a provision-by-provision comparison of the new Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, showing what, if any, changes are made in respect to each of the various provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act. the analysis follows the same form as that followed when the Thomas bill was compared with the Taft-Hartley Act in a previous analysis made by this office. The following provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are retained, strengthened or modified by the Wood bill as indicated:

1. Disenfranchisement of economic strikers—modified so as to permit an economic striker to vote in a representation election but only if he has not been permanently replaced for a period of 90 days prior to the election. In other words, if the economic striker has been replaced for 90 days, he cannot vote.

2. Blanket prohibitions on restraint or coercion by unions—retained and strengthened by permitting injunctions merely upon the filing of charges and without investigation or issuance of complaint as required under Taft-Hartley.

3. Broad prohibitions on secondary boycotting—retained completely, with the very slight exception that union employees engaged in a lawful primary strike may induce other union employees to assist them in the following limited situation: Where these other employees are employed to work on products ordinarily made at the struck plant, as in a case where such products have been jobbed or contracted out, but even then only if these other employees are members of the same local union as the employees on strike and have a contract with their employer permitting them not to work on struck goods. As can readily be seen, cases where the employer has agreed that his employees need not work on struck goods, and where the employees engaged in the primary dispute are members of the same local union as employees making or working on products for the struck plant, will be very few and far between, so in practical effect the so-called broadening provision is meaningless.

4. Prohibition against jurisdictional disputes—retained and strengthened against unions by eliminating opportunity for parties to settle their own dispute and by permitting court injunction merely upon filing of charges and without issuing of complaint or other investigation.

5. Ban on closed shop and restriction on union shop—retained in most respects, strengthened in others, and modified in some. Under the Wood bill, all closed-shop agreements requiring membership in the union earlier than 30 days after employment are outlawed, and this even includes agreements which might have been valid under the Taft-Hartley Act, such as those entered into prior to the passage of that act and made effective for a period of years. While the Wood bill does eliminate the useless union-shop election prerequisite, it permits employees in a bargaining unit to rescind the authority of a union to enter into a union-shop agreement by majority vote. The bill further permits the employer to discharge an employee under a union-shop agreement for two reasons in addition to failure to pay dues and initiation fees, namely, where the employee was expelled from the union for engaging in a wild-cat strike or for being a Communist or for being affiliated with a Communist or similar organization. Further, the employer is permitted to notify a union "of opportunities for employment," but since the prohibitions on the making and use of union-shop agreements are very specific, it is impossible to see any material benefit whatsoever which could be derived from this provision. In all other respects to the prohibitions on closed-shop agreements and the restrictions on union-shop agreements are identical with those under Taft-Hartley, including the provision making the hodgepodge of State anti-closed-shop laws paramount to the Federal law.

6. Exclusion of supervisors from all protection against employer discrimination and refusal to bargain—retained.

7. Proviso permitting employer to use free speech to abuse unions if no threat of reprisal—retained.

8. Non-Communist affidavit and other filing requirements—retained as to unions and extended to include employers.

9. Restrictions on excessive initiation fees—retained.

10. Restrictions on featherbedding—retained.

11. Definition of good-faith bargaining—retained.

12. Employer petitions and decertification provisions—retained.

13. Opening of Federal courts to damage suits for breaches of contracts and for violation of secondary-boycott provisions—retained, with slight limitation discussed under secondary-boycott paragraph (No. 3) above.

14. Restrictions on welfare funds and check-off—retained and strengthened by making check-off authorization automatically noneffective at the expiration of 1 year from the date of its execution, thus eliminating automatic renewal and making it necessary to procure new authorizations each year.

15. Craft unit proviso—retained.

16. Provision for 60-day notice of termination or modification of existing agreement—retained, except that an employee striking in violation of the 60-day clause does not lose his status as an employee.

17. Separate conciliation service—retained.

18. Provision for enjoining strikes in emergency situations, 80-day "cooling-off" period and "last offer" election—strengthened by permitting injunction at any time a dispute is threatened without investigation or fact-finding by Presidential board. However, useless last offer election is eliminated. Under the Wood bill, the safeguards inherent in an investigation by a board appointed by the President, which makes an investigation and issues findings of fact prior to the issuance of an injunction, are entirely eliminated. The board now functions only after the injunction is obtained. Thus, the Wood bill makes it impossible for the President even to attempt to settle the threatened national emergency by the appointment of a board of inquiry without first obtaining an injunction. Under the injunction the court can order the parties to the dispute to use their best efforts to settle it, under threat of contempt of court if they fail to do so. The Wood bill, therefore, would arouse all the antagonisms that are automatically induced by the issuance of any injunction in a labor dispute before the President is empowered to even try to bring about conciliation or settlement of the issues.

19. Restrictions on political contributions by labor organizations—retained.

20. Separation of powers as between board and general counsel—retained, and powers of general counsel greatly expanded by giving him absolute discretion to seek injunction in any case where charges may have been filed.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing section-by-section comparison of the Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, it can be readily seen that, if anything, the Wood bill is more vicious and more oppressive than the Taft-Hartley Act and should be as strenuously opposed. Wherever the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act are loosened, it is for the most part in unimportant respects, and, on the other hand, the most objectionable of the Taft-Hartley Act provisions—those dealing with injunctions against labor organizations—are considerably strengthened. If the foregoing analysis is compared with the analysis of the Thomas bill appearing in the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service for April 12, 1949, it can be seen that the Wood bill could not, under any circumstances, be considered in any way an adequate substitute for the Thomas or Lesinski bills.

CIO SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE REVISED WOOD BILL, H. R. 4290

President Philip Murray, of the CIO, branded the original Wood bill as being more viciously repressive of labor's basic rights than the Taft-Hartley Act itself. Congressman WOOD, of Georgia, has now revised his original bill purportedly to meet some of the objections of labor to the original draft. Our analysis of the revised bill, however, demonstrates that the present Wood bill (H. R. 4290) still reenacts most of the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and in several important particulars strengthens Taft-Hartley provisions to make them even more objectionable to labor. No one who reads the Wood bill will be deceived by the language which purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. This statement in the bill is mere sophistry. The Wood bill is the Taft-Hartley Act plus additional antilabor prohibitions. The few concessions in the Wood bill purporting to eliminate or change Taft-Hartley provisions are inconsequential and insubstantial. They constitute window dressing which will deceive no one.

The CIO regards any vote that may be cast for the Wood bill as a vote against labor and against the public interest. The CIO calls upon the Congress to pass the Thomas-Lesinski bill, which is truly a Taft-Hartley repeal bill.

The following is an analysis of the salient provisions of the revised Wood bill:

1. The discretionary right of the general counsel of the NLRB to obtain injunctions is retained and, in fact, enlarged by permitting injunctions to issue merely upon a filing of charges that an unfair labor practice has been committed and without investigation, proof, or hearings. This would extend rather than curtail government by injunction, which is conceded to be one of the outstanding abuses of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under this provision the Norris-LaGuardia Act would become a virtual nullity.

2. The disenfranchisement of economic strikers imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act, and conceded even by Senator TAFT to be unjust, is substantially retained in the Wood bill through the device of permitting eco-

nomic strikers to vote only if they are not replaced 90 days or more before the election. Obviously, employers by delaying petitioning for election until 90 days after the hiring of strikebreakers can still effectively prevent economic strikers from voting in Labor Board elections.

3. The Taft-Hartley Act language which has been interpreted to prevent peaceful picketing by labor unions is retained by the provision of the Wood bill prohibiting restraint or coercion by unions.

4. The ban on secondary boycotts provided in Taft-Hartley is modified only to a very limited extent. The modification permits a union, if its collective agreement so provides, to refuse to work on struck goods where the striking employees are members of the same union. Most justifiable economic boycotts are, therefore, still prohibited. The provision of the Taft-Hartley Act making it mandatory for the general counsel to seek injunctions in secondary-boycott cases is modified to give the general counsel discretion whether to seek such injunctions. But as pointed out above, this discretionary right is extended to permit injunctions to be issued merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed this or any other type of alleged unfair labor practice.

5. Unions continue to be subject to unwarranted lawsuits in the Federal courts, as permitted by Taft-Hartley.

6. The check-off provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are made more restrictive by making it necessary to procure new check-off authorization cards each year, thus burdening unions with this additional unnecessary administrative burden not now required under Taft-Hartley which permits automatically renewable check-off cards.

7. While the Wood bill purports to eliminate the Taft-Hartley requirement for a union-shop authorization election it provides that 30 percent of the employees can petition for an election to prohibit a union shop and retains most of the other complicated Taft-Hartley election procedures, including employer-election petitions and decertification provisions.

8. The Taft-Hartley Act permits discharge for nonmembership in a union under a union-shop agreement only if the employee was discharged from the union because of failure to pay dues. The Wood bill, while permitting discharge also for expulsion because of Communist affiliation or participating in a strike in violation of a contract, would not permit discharge for expulsion from the union because of antiunion activity, embezzlement of union funds, or other recognized intolerable practices.

9. The Taft-Hartley provision making more restrictive State laws against union security superior to the Federal law is retained.

10. The Wood bill would make illegal closed- or union-shop agreements entered into prior to the Taft-Hartley Act and continuing for a term of years. Such agreements are prevalent in industries enjoying stable collective-bargaining relationships and their validity was recognized and preserved by Taft-Hartley. The Wood bill in this as in other respects goes beyond Taft-Hartley. Furthermore, the general prohibitions against all closed-shop contracts is retained although it is declared not to be an unfair labor practice for an employer "merely to notify a union of opportunities for employment." This vague language does not realistically meet the need of legalizing the hiring hall and other similar forms of union security.

11. Taft-Hartley restrictions on collective bargaining in relation to welfare funds are preserved.

12. The Government's power to seek injunctions in national emergency strikes is broadened by providing for the issuance of such injunctions even before the appointment of an emergency board rather than as in Taft-Hartley after such appointment.

13. The agency definition of the Taft-Hartley Act under which international and local unions have been held responsible for acts not actually authorized or ratified is retained.

14. The Taft-Hartley restriction on political contributions and expenditures by labor unions is retained.

15. The so-called free-speech provision of Taft-Hartley which goes far beyond the legitimate protection of the constitutional right of employers to free speech is retained.

16. The Wood bill, like the Taft-Hartley, would preserve the general counsel of the NLRB as a labor czar by continuing the present separation of powers as between the Board and the general counsel first introduced in the Taft-Hartley Act. This is contrary to the unanimous expert opinion that the NLRB, like all other similar administrative agencies should be restored to the procedures prescribed in the Administrative Procedure Act.

17. Like Taft-Hartley, the Wood bill provides for a separate Conciliation Service rather than for the return of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor where it properly belongs.

18. Numerous other provisions of the Wood bill are Taft-Hartley provisions like the individual-grievance clause, the exclusion of supervisors from the protection of the act, the jurisdictional dispute section which, in fact, is made more unworkable by limiting the opportunities for parties to settle their own disputes and the non-Communist affidavit requirement which is enlarged to require such affidavits by employers as well as unions.

The Marshall Plan and the American Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Call a Halt," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of April 21, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO CALL A HALT

Reperesentative CANNON, Democrat, Missouri, says he plans to draft a single appropriation bill providing funds for the Marshall plan and for arming western Europe. His approach, it seems to us, is not quite the right one but it contains the germ of a good idea.

The Marshall plan is an economic measure. The proposal to arm western Europe is military. Basically, the stated purpose of the Marshall plan is to offset dollar deficits in European countries supposedly working back toward solvency. Sending tanks and planes and guns to Europe will have no effect on these dollar deficits.

However, if Mr. CANNON were to tie together American defense spending and arms for western Europe (the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact) it would, it seems, make very good sense. Both of these programs are military. Both have the same purpose—the defense of the United States and western Europe against attack. The pact was supposed to increase this country's security, not diminish it.

As of now, the American armed forces seem to be committed to a we-can-lick-anybody-and-do-it-all-alone policy. The proposal to arm Europe should mean a modification of this policy. To illustrate: If a billion dollars worth of arms for western Europe will arm 300,000 men, then this country's required force should go down by 300,000 men.

Unhappily, this consideration does not seem to appeal to the brass in the armed forces. They apparently prefer to pile one defense program on top of another, just as they have piled an overblown Navy air force on top of a huge Air Force air force. And so far no one in the administration or Congress has risen to challenge them.

The time has come to challenge. None of the armed forces has shown the slightest disposition to prune itself—far from it. If any pruning is done, it will have to be done by congressional committees that will require the generals and admirals to justify their demands in detail, to take into account what other countries are doing to defend themselves.

Indeed, it appears that considerably more than the cost of arming Europe could come out of the American defense budget. The Hoover Commission has charged that, as of now, about $1,500,000,000 is wasted (approximately the estimated cost of arming Europe), and revelations of frenzied spending indicate that even this estimate may be low.

In wartime, the armed forces got used to getting whatever they asked for—and no questions asked. The time has come for civilians to reassert their authority over the presently high-riding brass, according to the American tradition. If they do not, the people face a tax raise or a ghastly deficit and, in the long run, ruin.

Top-Flight Executives for Government Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: Top Men for United States Posts," written by Harlan Trott and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 22, 1949. The writer of the article expresses some of my own concern at the slowness with which the top-pay bill is being considered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: TOP MEN FOR UNITED STATES POSTS
(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Wanted: Top-flight executives for Government posts; must be made of iron and have an elephant hide; only those reconciled to the fact the pay is not worth the ribbing need apply.

This is the ironic twist President Truman gave in effect to the difficulty of finding replacements for Army Secretary Kenneth Royall and several other Federal officials whose resignations are on the President's desk.

Mr. Truman told news correspondents April 21 that he had persuaded Barry Bingham, Louisville publisher, to succeed David K. E. Bruce, of Baltimore, as head of the Economic Cooperation Administration mission to France. Mr. Bruce becomes ambassador to France.

FREQUENT CHANGES

The President's reference to elephant-hided men of iron came in answer to a reporter's question whether the President anticipated any other changes in his defense set-up.

Mr. Truman said he couldn't answer that, although in Government, of course, there always are changes because officials simply can't stand up under the combination of long, hard work, poor pay, and kicking around by Congress and newspapers.

Two prominent business executives and a Government official have been mentioned as possible successors to Mr. Royall, who departs April 27.

Speculation centers around Curtis E. Calder, chairman of Electric Bond & Share Co.; John M. Franklin, president of United States Steamship Lines; and John E. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State.

Both Mr. Calder and Mr. Franklin served in the Government during World War II. The former was Director General of the War Production Board. Mr. Franklin was Assistant Chief of Transportation for the War Department.

THREE JOBS VACANT

Mr. Royall's departure leaves three top Pentagon jobs to be filled. Undersecretary of the Army William H. Draper, Jr., resigned February 19, and Assistant Air Secretary Cornelius V. Whitney left April 11 to become Under Secretary of Commerce.

Navy Secretary John L. Sullivan has been reported as wanting to step up to a Cabinet post or quit the Government. There also has been some talk that Air Secretary W. Stuart Symington might get out.

The White House must find two replacements for the Atomic Energy Commission, W. W. Waymack, Iowa editor, resigned some time ago. Now, Mr. Truman is confronted by the task of filling another vacancy caused by Dr. Robert F. Bacher's resignation. Dr. Bacher is the only nuclear physicist on the Commission.

CONGRESS UNPREDICTABLE

Admiral W. W. Smith's term as Chairman of the Maritime Commission has expired with no sign of a successor in sight as yet. This 6-year appointment pays only $10,000. Able men invariably have to forsake private employment at much higher incomes to take these Federal posts.

The inconsistencies of Congress are a baffling deterrent in many instances. The Federal Communications Commission's Enabling Act for example, provides that members shall receive $12,500. Congress has turned right around and knocked the salary down to $10,000 through its appropriating powers. Why pay the FCC members $12,500 when other commissions pay only $10,000, Congressmen ask.

Then to confuse the picture a little more, Congress proceeded to raise the President's salary $25,000 and throw in a tax-free expense account of $50,000 for good measure—but ignore all the top appointive officials around him.

FTC SHIFTS ARE DELAYED

Meanwhile the leather-indexed folder on the President's desk gets fatter and fatter with files on prospective appointees. Garland Ferguson's term has expired on the Federal Trade Commission. Congress refused to act on the President's reappointment for one reason or another.

Meanwhile Robert E. Freer resigned from the Commission and Mr. Truman delayed for months before sending up John Carson's name as a replacement.

This time it was Congress' turn to raise a fuss. A cry went up that Mr. Carson was a radical, or something equally opposed to free enterprise, in that he was head of a cooperative movement. There is talk now that Mr. Carson will not be confirmed. But the President is sticking by Mr. Carson the way a Missouri mule sticks to his four tracks.

ECA CHOICE PRAISED

Unless Congress acts to raise salaries at the commission level more nearly in line with the times, observers here think Mr. Truman is going to have trouble replacing Mr. Royall and the other service secretaries should they resign. One reason is that the posts have lost importance since the Unification Act of 1947 set up the top military post of Defense Secretary.

Out of the current job shuffling the administration gains only one newcomer. But the general reaction here is that the new head of the ECA mission to France is an extremely able man. Mr. Bingham began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Louisville Courier-Journal after leaving Harvard.

While in college he met Mary Caperton, a Radcliffe girl who became his wife. Mrs. Bingham was the Christian Science Monitor's Radcliffe reporter during part of her undergraduate days.

Since 1945 Mr.Bingham has been editor of the Courier-Journal as well as president of the company which publishes that paper and the Louisville Times.

The State Department's Policy Toward China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials. One is from the New Hampshire Morning Union entitled "BRIDGES Is Right," and the other is from the New York World-Telegram entitled "Misinformation About China." Both of these editorials refer to the Secretary of State Acheson's letter to Senator CONNALLY and to my comments on same.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Hampshire Morning Union, Manchester, N. H., of April 18, 1949]

BRIDGES IS RIGHT

Senator STYLES BRIDGES is right in demanding an inquiry to find out what the State Department's policy really is regarding China, or whether it has any policy at all.

The campaign by Communist sympathizers in the United States to discredit the Chinese Nationalist Government and promote the interests of communism in China is well known, and it would not be surprising—indeed, it is logical to believe—that this campaign has found its way into the Government.

Remembering Secretary Acheson's association at the close of the war with a policy of coddling Russia, one has reason to entertain some doubts concerning his ability to judge the implications of Soviet communism today. We do not believe that Mr. Acheson is pro-Communist or pro-Soviet, but his mistaken interpretation of Soviet-American relations in 1945 must create some skepticism regarding his discrimination in judging Soviet aims today.

Acheson's stand against the proposal now before the United States Senate to give Nationalist China military and economic aid follows largely the line of pro-Communist propaganda in the United States. It is the purely defeatist attitude that no help we can give to China will save her from complete Communist domination.

Are we to sit idly by while southern China and all southeast Asia slips under the Soviet Communist grip?

That would be rank folly. There is absolutely no assurance that the cause of a free China is hopeless. Competent observers like General Chennault promptly dismiss that idea. They are confident that with reasonable help south China can yet be saved from Communist domination, and that eventually the whole country can be redeemed from the Communist grip.

It is not the true American spirit to accept defeat as complacently as Secretary Acheson does. If this weak-kneed attitude is to dominate the State Department's policy with relation to Soviet expansion, we are in a pretty plight indeed. China has moved close to the Communist abyss because of the gross blundering in United States policy in trying to play a game of appeasement with the Chinese Communists, and then when that did not work deserting a valiant ally.

But as Senator BRIDGES says there is no reason why at least part of China should not still remain free. The Senator has not put the matter too strongly when he described Acheson's statement on China to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a "thoughtless, tactless, unfriendly, and damaging act."

The time has come when this situation should be aired thoroughly. Is the State Department's unfortunate, bungling attitude a result of incompetence—or of prejudice—or is it the work of subtle pro-Communist influence? That question should be answered now definitely.

[From the New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram of April 16, 1949]

MISINFORMATION ABOUT CHINA

Writing to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State Dean Acheson said that although China had received over $2,000,000,000 in United States assistance since VJ-day, the Communists now hold almost all the important areas of China from Manchuria to the Yangtze River.

The Communists have captured the bulk of the military supplies shipped by this country to the Nationalists since VJ-day, he added.

This would seem to mean that we have given China more than $2,000,000,000 in military assistance since VJ-day, and that most of it has fallen into the Communists' hands.

Neither conclusion is correct.

The $2,000,000,000 figure used by the State Department to discredit Chiang Kai-shek's government is made up of three major items: (1) Lend-lease, (2) the value of surplus military goods sold to the Chinese, and (3) the American contribution to UNRRA. None of this was assistance in the war against the Communists. Mr. Acheson should correct any impression that it was.

Lend-lease expenditures since the war's end, largely in services, included carrying out the terms of the Japanese surrender agreement. Chinese troops did the job there that our own troops did in Europe. We also charged China the cost of flying supplies over the hump during the war. Our service charge against China was $607,000,000, against Britain it was $426,000,000, against Russia $79,-

000,000. Yet, although we used Chinese troops and Chinese labor, the Chinese were credited with only $3,600,000 in reverse lend-lease against $191,000,000 for Belgium.

Much of the surplus property sold to China was in junk condition, and its value was questionable. But we have President Truman's word that no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available.

UNRRA supplies were divided between the Nationalists and the Communists.

We have given China almost no military assistance in the war against the Communists. No heavy equipment. Only about $9,000,000 in small-arms ammunition.

Anything the Communists have captured must have been delivered to China before VJ-day. We maintained an arms embargo against China from March 1946 to May 28, 1947, while we were trying to force a Communist coalition there. No military funds were voted until April 1948. Only one of the three ships carrying the initial cargoes under this program reached the Chinese mainland. Two docked at Formosa, out of Communist reach. By that time Nationalist China had collapsed.

It may be too late to save China from communism. But it was not too late in 1946 or in 1947, when the State Department opposed military aid for China just as it does today.

Protest Against Increase of Postal Rates by Warren Zimmerman, of Lawrence, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Mr. Warren Zimmerman, a prominent businessman of Lawrence, Kans., has written an article for the Lawrence Daily Journal-World in opposition to the proposed increase of postal rates.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
SPEAKING OF POSTAL RATES

EDITOR JOURNAL-WORLD:

I was interested in a recent article in your paper by Mr. Frank M. York concerning an editorial a few days previously in the Journal-World relative to postal rates, that gentleman endeavoring to justify some of the prevailing, as well as proposed, outrageous charges the department would inflict on the public, which, after all, pays for it—provided it will pay.

Checking over just three of several recent mailing experiences since January 1, 1949, when the last big advance was made, and not considering the proposed additional 400 percent increase as a method of strangling the press of the Nation, it is interesting to note the terrific charges the Government is already levying as many believe in the form of punitive measures against free speech. Here are just three examples of several jobs mailed, all of which run practically proportionate, for one to think over. The first figure represents the Kansas Color Press charge for printing the jobs, the second figure the postal charges for third-class matter:

Our charge to patrons, $159.97; postal charges $240.24.

Our charge to patrons, $653.61; postal charges, $1,008.14.

Our charge to patrons, $491.42; postal charges, $814.10.

In considering all charges the public should understand that a great paper mill in Canada went far out into the woods, chopped down the trees, transported the raw material hundreds of miles at great expense to its manufacturing point; ground those logs into pulp and put that into a finished product in the form of paper; shipped that paper from Kenora, Canada, to Lawrence, Kans., and made its usual profit on its part of the jobs. The Kansas Color Press handled all this roll-paper stock; stored it until needed; composed all the printing forms necessary to get them into the stereotypers' hands who supplied the plates for the press-work and printing; the jobs were printed by our firm and we made our usual and regular profit on same. In other words, two firms got a good profit out of those jobs after all expenses were paid and the customer got his printing at the prices quoted. Then take a squint at the postal rates for simply handling the jobs. Yet here we have our Government coming along and asking for 400-percent increases in rates.

Does anyone think the postal handling of such work is more expensive, is a harder job or requires more brains and ability than the producing of finished paper from the raw material and the costs entailed by printing same?

We think there isn't a business firm in the United States that would dare attempt such a charge for its services, while at the same time we are firm in our convictions that if the Postal Department was turned over to executives of business experience they could and would operate the entire system, pay the Government a good lease for the opportunity, handle the job better, and make a handsome profit for themselves, at the same time giving the public a reduced price for the services.

The power to tax is truly the power to destroy. No more effective measure can be introduced for the ultimate elimination of getting the printed word to the thinking public than this steadily increased taxation system of printing-press strangulation, which has the possible, if not the positive, purpose of finally reducing the American citizen to the quid pro quo or yes man of the Russian pervert or the Mexican peon. Keep enlightenment away from the public long enough and it will soon be easily controlled. A generation or two of that kind of life and the rulers in Washington will be showing Joe Stalin tricks at herding the populace the latter never dreamed about.

But our sympathy goes out to the poor, overworked, understaffed postal force the Nation over. Seeing the gravy train running by for a good many years, who can blame that membership for wanting to hop on. Once when we were younger we endured the life of a postal employee for almost 10 full months. Wearying of the job and having just about broken down physically from its exactions (and if you believe that you will believe anything we tell you) we quit that life and got over into the printing business where we reasoned the fields were lusher and the labor less. What a sucker we were for not continuing our postal career, particularly if that 400-percent increase is put across.

WARREN ZIMMERMAN.

The New Twist in the Communist Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday on the floor of the Senate we had an interesting and informative discussion of the perils which communism has brought to our shores. I take this means of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country a highly significant and informative broadcast recently made by Jack Beall, as one of his talks in a series of broadcasts on communism—what it is, how it operates, how it is controlled, its conspiratorial apparatus, and what it means to you and your family. This is the Eighty-fourth in a series of such broadcasts which Jack Beall has made over the network of the American Broadcasting Co.

The text of this broadcast reports a new twist which Mr. Beall believes to be taking place in the Communist line. Perhaps, it is more accurate to say that Mr. Beall discusses new light which has been focused on a traditional aspect of the Communist line which at times has been obscured from many because, as always, there is little relationship between what communism says and what communism does. In all events, I feel that many will be interested in Mr. Beall's analytical discussion of current Communist activities.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. A new twist in the Communist Party line has taken place and it has to do with the attitude toward Jews. It has particular reference to Zionism.

I must say that there has never been any real change in attitude toward Zionism inside the Soviet Union. In spite of the world-wide propaganda that the Soviet Union was a paradise for Jews, the policy of the Soviet Union has always been one of violent opposition to Zionism and a Jewish national home. One of the things which Stalin did when he was Commissar of Nationalities—way back there in 1919—was to issue a decree forbidding all Jewish communes on the territory of the Soviet Union. You won't find this decree or the language I am about to quote in the collected works of Josef Stalin which has recently been issued by the Soviet State Publishing House. These quotations have more recently been dropped out, because it would not serve state policy. But, in 1919, Stalin wrote: "The Jewish communes and their central bureau gather and group around them manifest enemies of the interests of the Jewish working class and of the achievements of the October revolution. (They) conduct a harmful policy * * * assume governmental functions (of cultural-educational nature and social security) and give a distorted education." The Soviet rulers have recently permitted only one Jewish language newspaper to function in all the

Soviet Union; they closed down Jewish schools and hospitals and old peoples' homes and they broke up every organization which even remotely could be suspected of fostering Zionism. It is actually a crime to be a Zionist in the Soviet Union. You can be sent to prison or to Siberia for it. Dr. Julius Margolin, a Zionist leader of Poland who, himself, spent 5 years in Stalin's slave camps records: "My most shocking encounters in the Soviet camps were meetings with people who had been sentenced solely for having been Zionists in their youth. Before me were old men and women, broken, without hope or faith."

So much for that basic attitude in the Soviet homeland, the so-called paradise for Jews.

During the recent war, the attitude somewhat softened. But when the war was over, it hardened again. The Soviet Union saw a chance to make capital with the Arab world in taking up the old fight against Great Britain. The Zionists were called the vanguard of British imperialism and the bet, then, was on the Arab to oust the British from Palestine. In July of 1946, Victor Lutsky, the Soviet expert on Palestine, lectured in Moscow, strongly assailing the Jews and the Zionists for trying to make a Jewish-capitalist state out of Palestine. He declared that the Arabs, having lived there for many centuries were entitled to call the country their own. But in 1947, with a rapidly rising move by Palestinian Jews for independence, Stalin shifted his bet. He saw a chance to oust Britain from the Holy Land and perhaps install a government there which would be friendly to the U. S. S. R. In the United Nations, the representatives of Stalin supported the partition plan. For a period from 1947, up to last fall, the line was ostensibly pro-Israel and pro-Zionist. It served to confuse many Jews. The gullible believed that the U. S. S. R. was Israel's true friend. It caused embarrassment to Britain and to the United States. But with Britain out and the new state of Israel established, came the new attitude of the U. S. S. R.—really just a reversion to the old line.

The first open manifestation came last fall when Ilya Ehrenberg, the very prominent Soviet journalist, wrote a piece for Pravda. He criticized Israel, Zionism, and the Jews, and, among other things, said that "Israel's bourgeoisie is no better than the bourgeoisie in other countries."

Shortly thereafter began a campaign to eliminate Jewish intellectuals from cultural life in the Soviet Union. The campaign was cloaked under the guise of purging homeless cosmopolitans. But that was another name for Jews, as it very quickly turned out. Fifty individuals were attacked, and, of those 50, 49 were Jews. And in order to make it sufficiently clear, the press of the Soviet Union—the land where there is no discrimination—the paradise for Jews—the Soviet press referred to the purge victims, first by their Russianized names and then put their original Jewish names in parentheses afterward. It spoke of the "malignant, putrid story written by homeless cosmopolitan Melnikoff (Melman)." It spoke of the "cynical, impudent activities of B. Yakovleff (Holtzmann)." The purge of literary figures even extended down to the lower depths of the Soviet literary field—sports writers. But it seems that Jewish sports writers are not homeless cosmopolitans—they are called passportless wanderers, and these wanderers got the full treatment: G. Yasny—Jewish name, Finkelstein; V. Victoroff—Jewish name, Zlochevsky; and A. Svetoff—Jewish name, Sheidlin. I think that this is highly significant. Here is a press, run by and for the Government—the directors of which never make a move or a departure from their fixed policies without first clearing it with the Communist Party control chief—here is a Government press attacking Jews—remember 49 out of the 50 attacked were Jews—and reinforcing its point by printing Jewish names in parentheses after the Russian name. Can you imagine a paper of reputation in the United States doing that? I have never seen it done outside of some frankly anti-Semitic sheets and pamphlets.

If this were not enough to show the official displeasure with Jews, the next step was very, very plain. The Government closed down the one Yiddish-language daily in the Soviet Union—the one called Einigkeit. Thus, several million Russian Jews do not have a single language daily of their own. And along with it, the publishing house which had occasionally printed a book in Yiddish was closed down. Another Jewish periodical—a monthly, I believe—called Der Stern, was also suspended.

You would think that even Communist Jews would resent some of these things. Apparently there was confusion and resentment for a while, on the staff of the Morning Freiheit—the Communist paper in New York which is printed in Yiddish. Moshe Katz, a staff member, dared to take issue with the Ilya Ehrenberg article in a piece he, Katz, wrote for Freiheit last January. The Freiheit itself in its editorials did not come out strongly against Zionism at the time the shift was made by the Kremlin. But now both Mr. Katz and the management of the paper have made their submission to Moscow. Mr. Katz has written a letter, published in the paper, in which he tells his Jewish readers of the Communist faith that Zionist leaders, both inside and outside Israel, are preparing to transform Israel into a bastion of Jewish reaction and as a prop of Anglo-American imperialism.

The Freiheit Association, the publisher of the paper, came out with a statement explaining that its failure to toe the line of Moscow instantly was the result of "constant pressure of bourgeois nationalism on Jewish life in America."

I suggest that the best proof of the change of line against Israel and Zionism by Moscow is the change of line which the Communist daily, Morning Freiheit, has been forced to take, even against what it considers its own best publishing interests.

This is a small thing, which causes scarcely a ripple outside of a comparatively restricted circle. But it is a big thing, actually. With it you see a Communist line change—you catch it in the very act. The Soviet Union has found that the former temporary line, which was taken up for tactical advantages, has served its purpose. It now reverts to its long-time but, for a while, concealed line, of anti-Zionism. I don't see how it can fail to move and shock the Jewish community all over the world—especially those who had been taken in and confused for a time by a seeming friendliness on the part of the Soviet Union toward Israel and Zionism. I don't see how those who have been big Zionists and, at the same time, big defenders of the Soviet Union's foreign policy can now continue to ride those two things abreast. The parting of the ways has come. They have either got to be Zionists, or Communist supporters. Even split personalities will have difficulty in Roman-riding two horses, when they go off at wide angles.

Along with these events, there have been deep stirrings in the satellite countries, over Zionism. At first, the general rule was to permit emigration to Palestine. Many difficulties were put in the way. But until recently, they were letting a certain number of Jews get through the iron curtain. Many more wanted to go than were allowed to leave. It didn't look too good in Rumania, for example, to have so many people who preferred Israel to the blessings of Pauker's "people's democracy." Tension rose at the end of November 1948. Then anti-Zionist riots broke out—staged by Communists. The Zionist headquarters were stormed and seized. Many people were arrested. Then a fortnight later, all Zionist parties were dissolved. The Communists announced that it was done voluntarily but not many people will believe that one. Delegations were appointed in Israel to try to get to Bucharest and break the deadlock. The delegations were refused a visa into Rumania. Last February, an almost-riot took place, when a rumor got started in Bucharest that the Israeli Legation had started to register people who wanted to go to Palestine. Thousands of Jews surged into the streets around the Israeli Legation. The same rumors got started three times later and the same thing happened, each time. It proved to be more than the Rumanian Communists could stand. They arrested seven Israelis, charging them with organizing the demonstrations. Moshe Sharet, Foreign Minister of Israel, sent a note to Anna Pauker asking for a review of the whole situation but nothing has come of it.

A recent publication gotten out by the Jewish Labor Committee, and entitled "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," tells the story of why the Jews want to get away from the satellite countries. I understand that the publication will be sent to anyone who wants it. The title is "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," and it is gotten out by the Jewish Labor Committee. If you want it, write to me and I will turn your requests over to the proper party. I regret that I haven't the time here to go into the really outrageous treatment which Jews have received in countries dominated by the Soviet Union—the country which has posed throughout all the years as the friend of the Jew and the country where no anti-Semitism is practiced or permitted. It should open some eyes.

In the United States there is a Jewish organization which has its eyes very wide open to the facts as they relate to the Soviet Union. I am happy to see it get a good start in American life. It is to have a luncheon on the 2d of May, at the Hotel Martinique, in New York, to celebrate its anniversary. The organization is called The American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc. Its chairman is Alfred Kohlberg, importer and publisher, and its executive director is Rabbi Benjamin Schultz.

On the board of directors are some of the best fighters against communism in this country—and they are all Jews. And it reminds me to say this to you—and I mean it most sincerely. A lot of people are constantly writing in to me or saying in my presence that communism is a Jewish movement—that most of the people connected with communism in this country are Jews. I would like to cite the fact that even though there were some Jews—a large number of Jews among those who participated in the October revolution in Russia, there are only two Jews who now are among the ruling group of Soviet Russia. And as for this country—it is true that a large number of Communists are Jews—larger than the ratio of Jews to the total population would suggest. But I make this point—the same thing is true of anti-Communist Jews—a far greater number of Jews are active anti-Communists in this country than the ratio of Jews to the entire population of the country would suggest. Jews have been active in both camps—but there has been far too much emphasis on the Communist side and not enough on the other. Where do you find bonnier fighters against communism than Alfred Kohlberg, Isaac Don Levine, Eugene Lyons, George Sokolsky, Benjamin Gitlow, Benjamin Mandel, Ben Stolberg, Prof. Sydney Hook, Prof. Harry S. Schwartz, Congressman Abe Multer, Jerzy Glicksman, Morrie Ryskind, of the movies, Sol Levitas, of the New Leader, and Abe Kahn, editor of the Jewish Daily Forward,

and many more I haven't time to name? And most of them are on the board of this comparatively new organization—the American Jewish League Against Communism.

If anticommunism should be bereft of these activists, I do not know where their like would be found. In those men I've just named, I dare say you have fully one-quarter of the big names in the fight against communism in this country. If some of you persist in saying that communism is a Jewish movement, I might make reply—with far greater accuracy—that anticommunism is a Jewish movement. I only wish as large a proportion of "us gentiles" were enlisted as strongly and as effectively in the fight.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Address by Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, at Annual Award Dinner of Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by me last evening in New York City before the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's remarks, delivered before the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, will, without objection, be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

It is impossible adequately to express my humble gratitude for the distinguished honor which the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association has done me with this award. I would not dare pretend that your generous citation is warranted. I prefer to look upon it as a token of our common interest in those ideals of peace with honor and justice for which your rugged patron was the prime exemplar of his day and age.

As a lad of 16 I lost my first job because I briefly knocked off work, without leave, one afternoon in order to see Theodore Roosevelt in a parade which welcomed him to my home town as a candidate for Vice President in 1900. I just had to see my hero. Nearly half a century has passed. I have not changed my mind. He was one of the superlative Americans.

His concept for his country was a square deal for all its citizens with special privileges for none. His decisive character drove him into relentless action for these ideals. He lived and died a strenuous warrior for justice—at home and abroad. He loved America. He gave it all the loyalty of his great heart. He kindled the moral imaginations of his countrymen. He lifted their horizons. Would that he were here today.

In the brief time at my disposal I want to consult his memory with reference to the paramount problem of this critical hour—the course his country should follow when the world longs for a peace that is denied to it by Communist imperialism. It would be unforgivable for anyone to assume to assign him specific attitudes as of today. But he would be the last to deny us consultation with the precepts which he wrote into our national inheritance.

Let us remember, first of all, that he was a man of peace. Peace with righteousness was his dominant passion. That was his favorite word. We are prone to speak of peace with justice and with honor. A thousand times he spoke of peace with righteousness. "I abhor war," he said. "I put peace very high as an agent for bringing about righteousness. But if I must choose between righteousness and peace, I choose righteousness."

He practiced what he preached. Through skillful negotiation he brought the war between Japan and Russia to an end. He deserved and won the Nobel peace prize. He proposed a World Peace League with particular emphasis upon juridical peace. He wanted democratic nations to severally guarantee each other against violation. We struggle today in the lengthened shadow of his prescience.

I repeat he was a man of peace above all else—just as his Nation today, in all of its international adventures, hopes and prays and strives for peace. No matter what the national security requires in defense against potential aggressors, the end result we seek is peace—and no amount of self-serving international slander can make it otherwise. We want a live-and-let-live world.

But Theodore Roosevelt had no illusions about peace. Referring to the 15 years after the first Hague Conference, he said:

"These years have seen immense increase of war. These facts furnish no excuse whatever for our failure to work zealously for peace, but they absolutely require us to understand that it is noxious to work for a peace not based on righteousness, and useless to work for a peace based on righteousness unless we put force back of righteousness."

And so this man of peace was virile in his defense of it. He sent the American battle fleet around the world as a hint to foreign jingoes that though America "spoke softly" it carried a "big stick." He said: "I stand for the safety that is obtained by the performance of duty, not by the sacrifice of duty." He said: "It is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong." He said, "Let us not boast, not insult anyone, but make up our minds coolly what it is necessary to say; say it; and then stand to it, whatever the consequences."

This man of peace fought for righteousness in the Spanish-American War. Subsequently he instantly saw the challenge in World War I. He personally sought to fight again. Because of age he was refused a combat commission. But his four sons went to France. Two were wounded. The youngest was killed. One of my most precious possessions is a longhand note from him thanking me for an editorial I had written on this theme. "When you speak of my boys," he wrote, "you hit me where I live."

I have my own conviction as to what this man of peace—rugged, righteous peace—would say if he were here today. But I leave each of you to your own conclusions. I simply quote:

"Above all let us remember that words count only when they give expression to deeds or are to be translated into them. The leaders of the red terror prattled of peace while they steeped their hands in the blood of the innocent; and many a tyrant has called it peace when he has scourged honest protest into silence. Words must be judged by deeds."

And I give you his magnificently thrilling apostrophe to the conscience of his country—his challenge to every patriot-heart which beats in the sublime American tradition of keeping dates with destiny. Said he:

"My countrymen, I believe in you with all my heart. I am proud that it has been granted me to be a citizen in a nation of such glorious opportunities. We have no choice, we people of the United States, as to whether or not we shall play a great part in the world. That has been determined for us by fate, by the march of events. We have to play that part. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill."

I submit, my fellow Americans, that these words were written for the ages. I submit that never did they burn with greater glory—never did they more accurately define reality—never did they more vividly point the goal—than they do tonight in our peace-travail of 1949. We have no choice as to whether or not we shall play a vital part in the world. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill. His memory bids us play it well. I dare to think we will.

And how do we "play it well"?

There are conscientious differences of opinion. No sane man can say: "I know the answer." We must choose between calculated risks. We must neither overextend ourselves nor overpromise others. One choice, however, is denied to us unless we are ready for suicide. Theodore Roosevelt said it all half a century ago. We cannot withdraw within ourselves. The most powerful nation on earth either justifies its preeminence or loses it. It either stands or falls. No matter how feverishly we might seek to insulate ourselves, if world war III ever starts, it will be aimed at us. These are the facts of life. They are sharply different facts than they were before Pearl Harbor and Hiroshimo. It were best for us to acknowledge them in advance and act accordingly—not only for the sake of all the precious freedoms personified by western civilization, but also and particularly for the sake of the survival of the United States of America.

How do we "play it well"?

1. We see to it that our international conduct is scrupulously and fearlessly honest; that it never seeks unfair advantage; that it never gives needless offense; that it always welcomes good-faith negotiation; that it is as friendly as it is firm; that it is as dependable as it is fair.

2. We ever prove our devotion to the end reseult of just the honorable and righteous peace—without a thought of conquest over 1 inch of foreign territory or over one alien soul.

3. We cooperate with like-minded, peace-living, independent nations to preserve our common inheritance of freedom—as exemplified in the Marshall plan and as spelled out in the principles and purposes of the United Nations and in the Rio and Atlantic Pacts. Particularly in the latter we discourage any potential armed aggressor's mistaken concept that he can "divide and conquer" this community of freedom. We advise him in advance that he cannot win.

4. We crave a brotherhood of good neighbors with every other people on this anxious and unhappy globe. But we shall not be booby-trapped. There is no trace of Munich in our souls.

5. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, we make up our minds cooly what it is necessary to say; say it; and then stand to it, whatever the consequences.

6. Learning from the past we must be ready for the future. This means a plan for war if an armed aggressor attacks. But even more important and even more difficult, it means a plan for peace which as yet only dimly emerges on the trestle board of time.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, peace could be so near though it often seems so far. There will be no world war III unless Communist Russia starts it; and there will be no prior armed aggression upon the Soviets—least of all from the United States—to provoke any such calamity. The truth is that this whole earth—barring only Moscow and its satellites and its fifth columns—is demonstrably ready

and eager to "live and let live" in a free world of freemen under the authority of the United Nations. We are continuously prepared to demonstrate our own good faith in this behalf—as we do, for example, with our spurned proposal for 40 years of mutual defense against resurgent nazism.

There can be no rational doubt about our attitudes. Though the peoples of the earth are constantly reminded of the atom bomb's catastrophic threat to humankind—a prospect which would give even madmen pause—yet the civilized world's greatest tribute to its confidence in the United States is its lack of fear that our A-bomb monopoly will be misused. No amount of self-serving, anti-American propaganda—no conspiracy of slander against our international motives—can wipe out this simple but overwhelming demonstration of supreme faith. Incontestably, there it is. And it is further warranted by our programs, unprecedented in human history, to help other nations help themselves.

But there is another force of even greater potential to the lives of men and nations—and it is entirely in the hands of Soviet Russia's rules. It is, ironically, there monopoly in the peace destiny of the years that lie ahead.

Greater in its effects than our whole storehouse of atom bombs would be an announcement tonight—backed by deeds to give it some belated semblance of reality—that Moscow seeks to heal the East-West breach in world relations; that communism is ready to drop its plans for external conquest and subversion; that the Politburo is truly ready for mutual, good-faith efforts to create a livable world in which free self-determination shall decide any nation's accepted ideology; and that effectively disciplined, adequately supervised, universal disarmament shall be the world's progressive goal on a new agenda of hope for the people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and for all the other people in a friendly world. Even to lift the Berlin blockade would be startling sunshine in a dismal sky.

Perhaps I speak in idle fables. Perhaps I fail to account for the Kremlin's suspicions of our own purposes. Perhaps the Marxian conflict is an inevitable denial of peace. Perhaps righteous peace cannot be put dependably on paper. Certainly we have learned that merely putting it on paper is not enough—as witness the fact, for example, that not even the Litvinov agreements upon which we based our recognition of Russia 15 years ago have been honored. But regardless of discouragements the pursuit of righteous peace must ever be our open-minded aim and prayer. At least I have summed up the paramount problem of the world in a single paragraph. I have put responsibility where it belongs.

Mr. Chairman, Theodore Roosevelt carried a friendly and righteous "big stick." Yet, he also won the Nobel peace prize. He thus personified the double role which I would assign to my country tonight.

Again, I thank the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association for its distinguished consideration.

Mismanagement of National Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Avert the Danger," published in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of April 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVERT THE DANGER

Over the past 16 years we have warned repeatedly of the dangers of Government wastefulness, of the inevitability of catastrophe as the sequel to an inflation deliberately forced upon the Nation in the name of recovery, of the folly of debt financing. We have stressed the disaster that will follow if commitments made to obtain high-priced material and services must be met at a time when prices (and incomes) have returned to lower levels. And, because the conditions and policies against which we have warned are not matters of necessity but of administrative choice, we have urged economy and efficiency and debt reduction—as remedies and as preventive measures.

Because the need for these is so immediate and so pressing, we are encouraged by an editorial statement in the widely read Detroit Free Press, bearing emphatically and logically on the same associated subjects. It appears under the heading, "The Great Danger," and is as follows:

"This country is faced with the gravest danger in its history.

"It is a disaster worse than war.

"For we have always been able before to rebuild after war and to grow mightier.

"That time has gone.

"The imminent danger with which we are confronted transcends all political differences.

"The cold stark ugly fact is that the United States is rapidly drifting into national bankruptcy.

"Unless something is done to stem the tide we will be, within a very few years, no better off than the nations of Europe.

"It is this condition for which the Moscow Communists are patiently and hopefully waiting.

"They know what is coming unless we wake up. They can well afford to wait.

"The insidious enemy which is serving Moscow now as the deadliest of fifth columnists is mismanagement.

"It is bitterly ironic—but a great laugh for Stalin—that America upon whose altars we have placed the god of efficiency is dying of dry rot because of gross and stupid inefficiency.

"The most powerful business corporation in the United States would go into bankruptcy within a year if it were so wretchedly managed as is the business of our Federal Government today.

"There is this difference, however: The private corporation, mismanaged and criminally extravagant, would pay for its own sins and go broke; but the Government does not go out of business. It simply borrows more money which has to be paid through taxation until all business ceases, the factories remain idle and the people starve.

"Eighteen years ago it cost $4,600,000,000 to run the Federal Government.

"Today it costs $41,858,000,000.

"Under President Hoover there were 300 agencies.

"Today there are 1,800.

"The reason for this?

"Lack of organization and the fight of the bureaucrats of both parties to block reform.

"In 1931 Hoover begged Congress to give him authority to get the Government on a working basis. Both Republicans and Democrats rejected the proposal for just one reason:

"It might affect the soft jobs of political parasites of both parties.

"Ten times Hoover pleaded and 10 times was he refused.

"Red tape was killing the Nation.

"With the second war over in 1945 it was obvious to everybody regardless of party affiliations that something had to be done.

"President Truman and the Congress agreed.

"To eliminate politics it was also agreed that there should be six Democrats and six Republicans on a commission to draw up a plan of reform.

"It was unanimously agreed that Herbert Hoover was the one man in all the United States best qualified to head the group.

"Mr. Hoover is 73 years of age. He has no political ambitions of any kind. Regardless of party lines he has served the Nation under President Truman faithfully and brilliantly both in war and peace.

"The Commission has drawn the best brains from all walks of life in the United States.

"Never before, not even in time of war, has there been such a galaxy of experts on management.

"For 2 years these experts have studied our Government. Now they have ready 15 separate reports. All of these mesh into one magnificent presentation of what is needed to save us from national bankruptcy, and to meet Moscow.

"No American of intelligence can read these reports without gasping in horror at our dangers.

"Yet there is a grave possibility that the greatest task of its kind ever accomplished in the history of America will go for naught.

"The mean and petty politicians of both parties are seeking to destroy it for their own selfish ends.

"As Hoover stated to the Senate committee, the danger is as it was in all other such efforts, 'They died of grasshopper bites.'

"Here, then, is the call to the American people of every honest shade of political belief.

"Here is the challenge to save us from the fate for which Moscow is waiting.

"Shall we continue to drift?

"Or shall we be aroused in time by a mighty outburst of public sentiment?

"The people of America have crusaded for war bonds, for Red Cross, for community chests, for every worthy effort devised by the mind of man.

"Twice in one generation they have gone to war to fight for human liberty. They have poured forth the lifeblood of their youth and their treasure. They have willingly and without protest taken upon their backs the most staggering burden of debt history has ever recorded.

"Has all this been in vain?

"The Bible has said that where there is no vision the people perish.

"Will the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the AFL and the CIO, the church leaders of all denominations, every civic-minded group, every noonday club, every individual citizen, unite as we have always done in war, to campaign against the evil which is destroying us?

"Will there come a clarion call for battle?

"Only public opinion can save the United States from the bureaucrats who stifle us.

"The politicians of neither party will move unless they hear the mighty roar of an aroused populace. That is what they dread, the only thing they fear.

"'Public sentiment is everything,' said Lincoln. 'With public sentiment nothing can fail. Without it nothing can succeed.'

"Our one hope is the people themselves.

"Facing the Communist horde, surrounded as we are by darkness and chaos across the world, this must be a holy crusade, a fight for God, for country, and for humanity."

Our New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on Friday, April 22, by Benjamin M. Namm, of Brooklyn, immediate past president of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, before the Piedmont Sales Conference, held at Charlotte, N. C., which reflects the concern widely held among independent businessmen and Americans generally over pressures existent today to substitute State socialism for our traditional freedoms.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW HORIZONS

There are a number of reasons why I always am pleased to come to Charlotte. Any merchant can profit from even a casual visit to your great retail stores and this is particularly true when they are in the process of organizing a series of great sales to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of your fair city. Charlotte was, I understand, settled in 1750, although it was not incorporated until 16 years later.

The main attraction here, however, has always consisted of your many fine citizens.

And, I would like to pay tribute to the publisher and editors of your great newspaper, the Charlotte Observer. Its timely editorials have reverberated not only throughout the South but also throughout the entire land. Let me quote: "The choice lies between European state socialism and American private enterprise." This they have said, time and again, and never were words more truly spoken.

LEFT OR RIGHT

This great land of ours is indeed at the crossroads. One road leads sharply to the left and is beset with the obstacles of regimentation, bureaucracy, and statism. The other road, which is on the right side, is paved with the solid blocks of incentive, individualism, and democracy.

The theme of your conference is New Horizons for Selling. It suggests the lines in Edmond Rostand's Chanticleer which are as follows:

"And sounding in advance its victory, my song sets forth so clear, so proud, so peremptory, that the horizon, seized with a rosy trembling, obeys me."

Yes, we need a new horizon for selling. We men and women of business need a song of economic freedom so clear and so challenging, that the crimson-tinged horizon will obey our call.

Let me put it briefly: During the past decade, American business has done a fine job of creating mass production and mass distribution. Unfortunately, we have done a sorry job of creating mass understanding.

The greatest single lesson that we must learn is to sell our system along with our products.

Last month, Fortune magazine said:

"Soft socialism threatens the United States of America—this kind of socialism is technically different from the old-fashioned brand. But it leads to the same result—a vast and dangerous increase in the power of the state over men's lives."

Over 14,000,000 families, almost 40 percent of our total population, now receive regular monthly checks from our Federal Government. We have over 2,000,000 Federal employees, four times as many as we had 10 years ago. It costs us as much to maintain our Federal Government, with its 1,816 sprawling departments, agencies, and bureaus, as it costs us to feed every man, woman, and child in the country.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN BUSINESS

Our Federal Government is involved in business-type enterprises to the staggering total of $164,000,000,000. This amounts to almost $1,200 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The enormous scope of Federal participation in business was revealed in the recent report of the Hoover Commission which said:

"The Government owns or has financial interests in concerns which engage directly or indirectly in lending money, guaranteeing loans and deposits, writing life insurance; producing, distributing, and selling electric power and fertilizers; operation of railroads and ships; purchasing and selling of farm products, and smelting and sale of metals.

"The Government's direct investment in these enterprises is in excess of $20,000,000,000, and there are further authorized commitments to supply about $14,000,000,000 to them. In addition, the Government guarantees directly or indirectly about $90,000,000,000 of deposits or mortgages, and the life insurance written by the Government approaches $40,000,000,000."

It is significant to note that our Federal Government is now involved in business-type enterprises to an amount exceeding, in dollar volume, all the goods and services sold at retail in the entire country during the past year.

THE LAST FRONTIER

It must be apparent to all that this precious land of ours, along with Canada, now represents the last great hope for free and private enterprise throughout the world. Virtually all of the other countries are engulfed in some form or other of controlled economy, varying in degree from attenuated socialism to full-fledged communism.

Russia is an expanding imperialism which boasts of the fact that it dominates 180 different nationalities. It is ruled by a revolutionary dictatorship whose cardinal doctrine is the inevitability of war between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states. That doctrine was subordinated when Russia was attacked by Hitler and needed bourgeois help. But Marshal Stalin revived the issue clearly in his famous speech of February 9, 1946. The imminent downfall of capitalism for which he then called has been reiterated since then, day in and day out.

France, ravaged by two wars in 20 years, has been too torn with internal strife to plan an effective role in the world struggle. One-third of her voters belong to the Communist Party. Their leader, Maurice Thorez, said, a few weeks ago:

"In the event of war, French workers will receive the Soviet Army with open arms and do everything to render war against the Soviet Union not just difficult but impossible."

This utterance was promptly paraphrased by Palmiro Togliatti, the leader of the Communist Party in Italy. Communist leaders throughout the British Empire then made similar statements.

ENGLAND'S SOCIALISM

Commenting upon the results of socialism in England several months ago, the London Sunday Times editorialized as follows:

"In England there is no incentive to bold undertakings * * * Today it is safer to be a bureaucrat than a maker and the young men know it * * * Socialism is competition without prizes, boredom without hope, war without victory, and statistics without end * * *. It takes the heart out of young men * * *. It is not only politically false but morally destructive."

Ten years ago, England still had 11,000 individuals with net incomes exceeding $20,000 per year. Today, thanks to socialism, there are less than 250 of these "capitalists."

Winston Churchill said recently:

"We in England shall be voting (in 1950) not only for freedom from stifling and paralyzing socialism but also for bare survival. Another Socialist Parliament would seal our fate in world history and close by our own actions, amid self-inflicted gloom and squalor, the marvelous story of Britain's greatness."

Unfortunately, our own political leaders have not followed the economic doctrines which Mr. Churchill has been preaching ever since he first took public office. Instead, they have lent a ready ear to England's leading liberal "economists". First came Lord Maynard Keynes and his twin theories of "pump priming" and "deficit financing." Then came Sir William Beveridge and his welfare program which promised "Security to all from the cradle to the grave." Not to mention the ubiquitous Prof. Harold Laski.

DISASTROUS RESULTS HERE

Thanks largely to our own pump priming and deficit financing, the American dollar is now worth about 50 cents. This is primarily due to the continuous disregard of timely warnings by such sound economists as Bernard M. Baruch who repeatedly admonished, "Stop increasing the money supply." Incidentally, this money supply has almost tripled in the last 10 years.

Thanks largely to our own emulation of England's socialistic measures, our people have suffered the loss of much individual initiative. A recent survey showed that, out of every five people queried, two preferred a job with some Government agency rather than a job in private enterprise. My namesake, Benjamin Harrison, is said to have warned that it was "the duty of the people to support the Government." More recent leaders seem to have encouraged the bizarre belief that it is "the duty of the Government to support the people."

Meanwhile, our Government has discouraged capitalism by hamstringing private investment through unwise tax policies. In the past 20 years, the top surtax rate on personal income has jumped from 20 percent to 88 percent. The minimum rate on estates has jumped from 20 percent to 77 percent. The flat corporation rate has jumped from 11 percent to 38 percent, with the end not yet in sight.

These heavy levies, including double taxation on dividends, have virtually dried up our country's risk capital and venture money, upon which business replacement and expansion is almost entirely dependent.

In 1948, the 420,000 corporations in the United States needed more than $25,000,000,000 for expansion and improvements, less than $1,000,000,000 of this was available by investments in common-stock issues. Almost two-thirds of this money came from retained earnings and the balance from institutional loans.

Yes, it would seem by all this that we have made a deep foray down the road which the Charlotte Observer has labeled "European State Socialism" in contradistinction to the road marked: "American Private Enterprise." Only a few months ago, a distinguished Justice of the United States Supreme Court revealed his own private choice by saying: "The human welfare state is the greatest political invention of the twentieth century. All groups in society—farmers, businessmen, and the professions—are its beneficiaries."

SOCIALISTIC MEASURES IN VARIOUS STATES

Let us now examine the tendency of our individual States to legislate along socialistic

lines. Colorado enacted a social-welfare program a few years back that had the State on the verge of bankruptcy, until the law was changed.

California has recently enacted the world's most luxurious old-age-pension plan. It will cost about $125,000,000 annually, or $42 per capita. This amount is added to what had previously been considered a rather costly program. Incidentally, all these pension payments (only 5 years' residence being required) become a first lien on any money in the State treasury. They take precedence over money for schools, highways, prisons, asylums, etc. And the law forbids anyone to sue a pensioner for any debt he may incur.

In Oregon last November, the voters adopted an amendment to the State's constitution. Under this amendment, the State was called upon to pay every man over 65 and every woman over 60 a pension of $50 per month, regardless of need. Fortunately even a constitutional amendment can be made inoperative by a legal opinion and such an opinion was issued and supported by the legislature. Without such an opinion over $100,000,000 would have been added each year to that State's usual budget of $35,000,000. Security almost meant bankruptcy in Oregon.

Getting nearer to your own South, the Governor of Florida opened the current session of his State's legislature a few weeks ago with a prayer:

"The State faces a financial crisis of unprecedented proportions," he said. "Only God's guidance can save us from the disgrace of insolvency."

THE EFFECT ABROAD

News of this nature must, when it reaches the Kremlin, sound like money from home to Uncle Joe Stalin and the men who comprise his Politburo. It seems to fit precisely into the revolutionary pattern laid down by their arch-hero Nikolas Lenin who said in 1920: "The best way to destroy the capitalistic system is to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation, government can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of its citizens."

Yes, the Communists in Russia undoubtedly believe that the economic trend in this country is something for them to cheer about. But you and I know, of course, that they have another think coming.

For years many Americans and most Europeans looked upon socialism and planning as the wave of the future. Today, the vast majority of Americans have come to realize instinctively that the American system of free and private enterprise, although far from perfect, is still the greatest economic system ever devised.

Russia has never realized this instinctive common sense of the American people. Our mistake, on the other hand, has been that we took it too much for granted. We failed to understand that instinct alone is not enough to guide a nation of people, and that instinct alone is not enough to run the most complex economy in the world.

THE EFFECT AT HOME

Yes, we capitalists have made a serious mistake. We have remained passive during a critical period in which the unorganized majority of liberty-loving Americans were being propagandized and high-pressured.

During that period, the highly organized minority groups really went to town. Communistic doctrines, socialistic cure-alls, political quackery, and half-baked theories were the order of the day. Some of them worked on minds of the uninformed like yeast in a loaf of bread.

Taking full advantage of the fact that business was making little or no effort to sell its system along with its products, the enemies of business gave no quarter. They were adept with the use of lies, distortions, and half-truths. They were old hands at smearing, name-calling, and ridicule. Let us not underestimate the success of their efforts. They actually succeeded in making tens of millions of our citizens believe that democracy does not work here. They continuously made the businessman of our country appear as the villain, not the hero, of the great American story.

WHY SEEK UTOPIA WHEN WE HAVE THE PROMISED LAND?

Contrast the illusory utopias of socialism with the Promised Land in which the American people already live. Consider the degree of consumer ownership in this country of the great modern conveniences. And consider at the same time, if you will, the ridiculous ease in terms of hours of work which makes such possession possible. Also the fact that anyone can get these things if he's willing to work for them. The statistics are prodigious and the conditions they reflect might be called the miracle of every street. For example, over 30,000,000 cars are running over our roads, representing 85 percent of the world's automobiles. Fifty-four percent of the telephones in existence are here in the United States, more than 36,000,000 of them.

Folks in the United States own over 37,000,000 radios, over 20,000,000 electric washers, almost 5,000,000 electric ranges, more than 16,000,000 vacuum cleaners, and not quite 24,000,000 electric refrigerators. These figures are illustrative of myriad satisfactions in other fields of merchandising and service. They are paid for in terms of labor, of which the typical unit might be the cotton shirt, which it takes an American workman 3 hours to earn, whereas his opposite number in Russia would have to serve 320 hours.

And everything else that we produce is available to all on the same easy terms. This sounds like an advertisement—and it is—an ad for America.

But the requirements of our people and the satisfaction of those requirements as the normal outcome of our scheme of things is a sufficient demonstration of the practicality of our handling of the facts of life on a continental scale. You have lately read the estimates of the Bureau of the Census that there are now 148,000,000 people in this country. The Department of Commerce calculates that, this year, these people will spend $130,000,000,000 in stores of one kind and another. They spend a good deal more than that but that is what they are buying in stores. It's about 72 percent of their total expenditures for goods and services. It's $878.37 per capita, for every man, woman, and child in our population. It will take place in the stores of 1,771,000 retailers and will engage the services of 7,500,000 men and women, or over 5 percent of all Americans.

TELL THE PEOPLE THE TRUTH

Abraham Lincoln once said: "I have complete faith in the common sense of the American people. Tell the people the truth! Then the Nation will be saved."

We men and women of business can help save the Nation if we tell the people the truth. Especially those people who are not too familiar with the economic facts of life and therefore become easy prey for leftish propagandists. But so much for generalities and now for a few specific suggestions:

1. Let's tell the public the truth about profits. Contrary to belief, net profits are anything but high. They average less than 5 cents of the customer's dollar. Even that figure is illusory and should be weighted to reflect inventory gains (which are subject to sudden reversal), and inadequate depreciation reserves (which are based on old costs and not replacement costs).

2. Let's tell the public the truth about monopoly. Contrary to belief, American business is not controlled by a chosen few. It is owned directly by 14,000,000 individual stockholders and indirectly by 80,000,000 policyholders and depositors. There are 5,000,000 business firms and 6,000,000 farms.

3. Let's tell the public the truth about wealth. Contrary to belief, the bulk of our national income does not go to rich people. Eighty-three percent goes to people whose incomes are less than $5,000 per year. Less than 5 percent goes to people whose incomes exceed $25,000 per year.

4. Let's tell the public the truth about dividends. Contrary to belief, stockholders and management do not get more for their share than labor. Labor receives four times as much as stockholders and management combined.

5. Let's tell the public the truth about wages. Contrary to belief, prices have not risen faster than wages. The consumer price index was 99.4 in 1939 and it was 170.9 in January 1949, an increase of 72 percent. Average earnings were 63 cents per hour in 1939 and $1.37 per hour in January 1949, an increase of 116 percent.

6. Let's tell the public the truth about taxes. Contrary to belief, business cannot afford to pay more taxes. On the contrary, it is being overtaxed and forced into a progressively weak financial position.

7. Let's tell the public the truth about capital. Contrary to belief, business does not have plenty of capital. Its plant and equipment is rapidly becoming antiquated. It is in great need of additional working capital and until this situation is remedied, the job of every workingman is being jeopardized.

8. Let's tell the public the truth about inflation. Contrary to belief, inflation is not the result of high prices. On the contrary, high prices are the result of inflation. Deficit financing and monetary tinkering by Government agencies are the primary cause of inflation and resultant high prices.

9. Let's tell the public the truth about losses. Contrary to belief, during the years between World War I and World War II, more business concerns reported an annual loss than a profit. One out of every three new retail establishments closed down the first year of operation.

10. Let's tell the public the truth about price control. Contrary to belief, virtually every merchant who operated under Chester Bowles' OPA will testify that these controls resulted in artificial shortages, decreased production, quality deterioration, black markets and higher prices than would have otherwise prevailed.

CONCLUSION

An informed America, which knew the true score on these and similar questions, would never turn to the left. As Dave Ovens once said: "No man would ever enter the door marked 'state socialism' if the price of admission was clearly shown above the door."

That's our job, ladies and gentlemen, to reveal the high price of admission and to rip off the phony labels and to debunk all the lying claims. We can't do the job, however, by maintaining a dignified silence as in the past. We need to take off our coats, and even our vests, to sell our system along with our products—and sell like we never sold before.

In my humble opinion, the great rank and file of American consumers, working people, farmers, and small investors are hungry for facts about business. They instinctively hate regimentation and collectivism and they are eager to be sold on the American way of life. For many years past the Communists have been busy selling America short. During the years ahead it's up to us to sell America on the long side.

There's a passage in the Good Book which says: "For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battle?" Heretofore, the trumpets of business have given a most uncertain sound. But if our

trumpets sound a ringing note so clear and so compelling that none may fail hear, then we will surely find this new horizon of democracy and prosperity that this conference is so gloriously seeking.

Charity Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Curb the Charity Trust Racket," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 22, 1949, embodying an editorial from the Washington Post, the subject being the so-called charity trusts, which were under investigation during the last 3 months of 1948, and because of which the taxpayers are being burdened with billions of dollars of taxes from which they would be freed if a law were placed in effect to tax so-called charity trusts, which, in the last analysis, are pseudo trusts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO CURB THE CHARITY TRUST RACKET

After probing the tax-dodging of Textron, Inc., Tobey committee proposes to make tax-exempt charitable trusts pay off 85 percent of each year's income and undergo publicity; newspaper believes such a law would be "a powerful deterrent to unethical practices."

[From the Washington Post]

The tax-exemption privileges accorded religious, educational and charitable institutions, labor unions, and farmer cooperatives have been the target of constant attack in recent years. The complaint is that these tax-exempt organizations frequently engage in business activities and thus have an unfair competitive advantage over concerns subject to Federal income taxation. The problem thus raised has engaged the attention of Congress for some time, and a strong case exists for remedial action to restrict or abolish forms of tax exemption that foster unfair competition.

However, the Tobey committee's investigation of the so-called charitable trusts connected with Textron, Inc., deals with a different problem—that of tax avoidance. This inquiry has uncovered really shocking evidence of the ease with which supposedly charitable organizations can be used by astute businessmen to escape payment of taxes and obtain other advantages from the employment of trust funds at the expense of the ostensible beneficiaries.

By devious financial maneuverings, Textron was able to acquire risk capital through trusts set up or suggested by its president, using them in all sorts of business transactions, including sales and leases of plants and equipment, and loans to the company and its affiliates. A witness who organized one of the Textron trusts admitted that the provisions of the trust indentures made it possible for a manufacturer to avoid taxes, have funds "at his beck and call" and "milk" the trusts of their assets.

That the milking process was thorough is indicated by the fact that of the millions of dollars received by the Textron trusts, only an infinitesimal portion was paid to the beneficiaries.

For example, the Rhode Island Charities Trust, allegedly established for the benefit of the Providence Community Chest, had net earnings of about $4,000,000 during a 3-year period, although its total contributions to the Chest amounted to only $85,000. During that same period payments to trustees and bank charges totaled $140,000.

Another trust, established for benefit of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has never paid that institution a single dollar

There is reason to believe that countless other groups are using charitable foundations as a means of tax avoidance and for other ulterior purposes. Senator Tobey has accordingly introduced a bill which provides that no charitable trust shall receive the benefits of tax exemption unless it has actually paid the beneficiaries 85 percent of its annual gross revenue.

This restriction would put an end to the practices indulged in by pseudo trusts of the Textron type. Yet it would allow a reasonable margin for overhead expenses of bona fide charitable trusts.

The bill also requires all trusts which invest their funds in or make loans to manufacturing concerns engaged in interstate commerce to register with the Secretary of Commerce and make periodic reports to the beneficiaries and to Congress. Publicity of this sort would be a powerful deterrent to indulgence in the unethical practices revealed by the Tobey committee's pioneer survey of a neglected but fertile field of tax avoidance.

The Kravchenko Trial in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Courtroom Victory in Paris for Kravchenko Was Russian Defeat," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, pertaining to the Kravchenko trial in Paris. For the first time in history communism has been forced to defend itself in a court of law and the verdict of the jury has been "guilty as charged." I refer to the recent sensational libel suit in Paris, France, in which Victor Kravchenko, author of I Chose Freedom, brought suit against a Communist newspaper in France and in which the Soviet Government interested itself intensely in a vain effort to discredit and disprove the evidence which Mr. Kravchenko set forth in his startling book describing tyrannical conditions in Russia under the Communists.

I am including with these remarks, Mr. President, an interesting and informative detailed report of that trial written by an eyewitness, Mr. Volney D. Hurd of the Christian Science Monitor.

It happens that the junior Senator from South Dakota was an early and regular consultant with Mr. Kravchenko as he was planning the prosecution of this lawsuit and I was among those working with the American and French Governments to make it possible for Mr. Kravchenko to leave this country and to return so that he could be in Paris for this epochal trial of communism. Moscow made every effort to prevent the trial from being held and to win the lawsuit for its Communist sheet in Paris once it was clear the French authorities were insisting that the trial be held. In spite of everything, however, the trial resulted in a clear-cut convincing victory for Kravchenko and a devastating defeat for communism through its inability to disprove a single assertion made in I Chose Freedom.

Thus today communism stands convicted in a court of law as the ruthless, godless, aggressive, and conspiratorial tyranny which it actually is and American Communists are once again highlighted and labeled as the treasonable characters which they actually are.

America owes to Victor Kravchenko a great debt of gratitude for his courageous insistence that this trial be held and he has rendered the cause of freedom throughout the world a signal service by risking his life and his reputation by going to France and prosecuting this case at his own expense. I hope citizens generally will read carefully the report from the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURTROOM VICTORY IN PARIS FOR KRAVCHENKO WAS RUSSIAN DEFEAT

(By Volney D. Hurd)

PARIS.—Regardless of the bizarre elements in the case against the French weekly Les Lettres Francaises brought by Victor Kravchenko, author of I Chose Freedom, the case gave a considerable fillip to the Western cause in France.

Newspapers in the United States took the case quite in stride. Cables confirm this. But for the Continent, it was a major piece of business. A minuscule but dynamic David critic of Russia seemed pitted against a veritable Soviet Goliath. It seemed that here the West was challenging the Soviets on a major propaganda battlefield.

As the trial proceeded eyes began to open at the success of Kravchenko and the maladroit showing of the Communists. The very charges in the French publication that he was too ignorant to write such a story of conditions in Russia was belied before everyone by his brilliant wit and swift rebuttal.

And when Kravchenko so embarrassed a Russian general, sent to Paris from Moscow by the Soviet Government as a witness, that the latter became confused with his set-piece speech and had to leave the courtroom, the French cheered.

LOSS OF FACE

If Moscow had been wise enough not to have recognized the case officially, it would have saved much loss of face. But, unfortunately for a police state, everything is tied to the Government. Witnesses who come out must be recognized, therefore, as virtually Government witnesses. Whatever they do reflects right back on that Government. And Moscow, in addition, made it clear that these were Kremlin-backed people.

To Americans, Kravchenko's book was just one piece out of thousands on what goes on in the Russian state. The press has well served the American public in this direction.

But in France the press had published little detail of Soviet control and Communist bureaucratic method. And so the Kravchenko book was a sort of all-in-one-piece exposé which stirred the French public with a new sense of what is behind communism. To France it all seemed almost beyond belief.

But here was Kravchenko, who had quit his post on a Soviet purchasing commission in Washington to attack the Soviet regime in his book. France always has had a deep feeling for the man with a cause, particularly if that cause has humanistic overtones.

He had come to a country which had been on the verge of falling into the Communists' hands for several years. This caused no end of admiration. His bearing at the first press conference, too, captured the French. He bounded around, literally asking to be let at his accusers, and said he was fighting the Soviet Government itself.

SOUNDING BOARD

The very disorder of French courtroom procedure set up a spotlight which kept the Continent's attention riveted on this scene for weeks. It was almost as big a sounding board as the United Nations and 100 times more dramatic and exciting. As the case proceeded there was little doubt about the judgment. The Communists never made a case for themselves and Kravchenko delivered challenge after challenge to Soviet Russia which were reproduced practically everywhere in France and much of the rest of the Continent.

The French court ruled that Kravchenko had been libeled. It ordered Claude Morgan, editor and publisher of the newspaper, to pay costs of the 3 weeks' trial, estimated at $18,000, fined him $300, and awarded Kravchenko $150 damages.

It also ordered M. Morgan to print the court's decision on his front page, and advised Kravchenko to abandon his Russian nationality.

The fine against M. Morgan was significant because the court thus ruled that he also had committed an offense against the state.

Kravchenko, who had demanded 10,000,000 francs ($30,000) damages, hailed the decision as a "moral victory."

There is no doubt that this trial contributed definitely to the whole Communist recession which has been taking place in recent months. The dross of its courtroom fireworks have burned off, and the pure grains now stand out. It was not merely a victory for Kravchenko, it was one also for the West.

Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative letter on the subject of aid to education, written recently by Dr. Edgar Fuller, formerly commissioner of education for the State of New Hampshire, and former Acting Chief of the Aviation Education Division of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who now is Executive Secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers. The letter appeared in the New York Times for April 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AID EDUCATION—PENDING BILL DEFENDED AGAINST CHARGES OF FEDERAL CONTROL

(The writer of the following letter, formerly commissioner of education for the State of New Hampshire and former Acting Chief of the Aviation Education Division of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, is executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Benjamin Fine's article in the Times of April 17, in which he relayed the argument of the United States Chamber of Commerce against Federal aid to education, merely rehashes old arguments which have been completely answered time after time.

Only a few decades ago, national, State, and local chambers of commerce consistently opposed educational budgets. Local chambers relaxed first, and now very commonly support adequate budgets for public education. More recently, some State chambers of commerce have seen the light, and are willing to pay to preserve the American public-school system which is probably the most important hallmark of American democracy. The United States Chamber of Commerce stands more and more alone in preferring the protection of concentrated wealth to the adequate support of public education everywhere in the United States.

EFFECT OF FUNDS

Our educational slums persist. Recent experience in Georgia, Nebraska, and elsewhere indicates that they will continue to persist until Federal aid is provided. The chamber's argument that Federal aid is not needed is obviously untrue. The chamber immediately admits this, of course, by contending that $300,000,000 of Federal aid annually is not enough to solve the problems of American education. Not enough, true, but helpful.

The statement that Federal aid would retard necessary consolidation of local districts is false, unless any financial support at all from any source is similarly regarded. Federal aid would probably be added to State aid in many States, and the combined funds presumably would have no more effect on district reorganization than does present financing. Some States would undoubtedly distribute the Federal funds to local districts on a basis which would encourage sound local district organization.

The $300,000,000 of Federal aid proposed by S. 246 for distribution each year would amount to only about 10 percent of public elementary and secondary school costs in the country. The States are already supplying, on an average, more than three times as much. Since the Federal-aid funds would be distributed by the States according to State plans, the argument that local initiative would be undermined has no more strength than the argument that State aid undermines such local initiative. The chamber says it approves increased State aid. The truth is that local initiative is often extremely weak because of financial nonsupport. Federal aid would revitalize local initiative in thousands of school districts.

BASIS FOR CONTROL

The argument of the chamber which deserves most careful consideration is that Federal aid to education will lead to Federal control of education. The Thomas-Taft bill (S. 246) and similar legislation is based on the theory of State and local control and provides every possible protection against Federal control of education. The bill is revolutionary in this respect, since none of the other numerous Federal aids to education has ever gone so far in protecting against Federal controls. The cliché of Federal control ought to be exposed as the red herring it is.

Federal control of education may grow out of: (1) Constitutional requirements as interpreted by the courts, (2) special Federal aids for special educational programs which require Federal controls to insure that the Federal funds are spent for the defined special purposes, (3) provisions in the Federal statutes for exercise of discretionary controls by Federal officials, (4) provision for detailed reporting to the Federal Government, stimulated by excessive funds for Federal administration, (5) direct Federal dealing with 102,000 local school districts, most of which are entirely unable to resist Federal encroachments except as they are protected by dealing through their respective State educational agencies, and (6) vesting of administration of Federal aids to education in noneducational Federal agencies, which deal far more on the basis of control and far less on the basis of educational assistance than does the United States Office of Education.

YARDSTICKS FOR CONTROL

There are several rather simple tests for measuring Federal control of education. One is the presence or absence of Federal employees in local schools or institutions. If Federal agents are to be found there on other than special occasions there is almost certainly undesirable Federal control of education. Superintendents and other administrators know from experience with many Federal-aid programs, which have been applied to numerous aspects of education, that the presence of Federal agents in local schools and institutions is a condition which accompanies Federal control and Federal domination. The Thomas-Taft bill would never permit such violations of State and local autonomy in education.

Another fairly certain indication of Federal control of education can be found in the amount of Federal funds spent to administer Federal-aid programs. If a great deal of money is spent for Federal administration, there is likely to be undesirable Federal control. The Thomas-Taft bill now before the Congress makes no allowance for Federal administrative expenses, but the President's budget has suggested $250,000 per year for the United States Office of Education to administer the distribution of $300,000,000 annually. This is an administrative cost of one-twelfth of 1 percent. It should be compared with the administrative costs of some present Federal-aid programs which have objectionable Federal controls attached.

For instance, administration of the Landis Act, under which $2,900,000 emergency aid for maintenance and operation was distributed at Federal discretion directly to certain local school districts by a noneducational Federal agency in 1949, cost $100,000 for Federal administration. This is well over 3⅓ percent for Federal administration; a cost of 41 times as great per dollar of grants distributed as would be the case under the Thomas-Taft bill. Numerous similar illustrations could be given.

FEDERAL LAWS

Congress has been passing bills for a long time providing Federal aid for special aspects of education. It has often passed such laws with outright Federal controls attached. Now a bill is proposed to aid public elementary and secondary schools which forbids such controls and provides for administrative arrangements which are the best possible protection against them. It is ironic that the United States Chamber of Commerce and others who are opposed to the adequate support of public education everywhere in the United States should attack the the Thomas-Taft bill on the ground that it may lead to Federal control.

An honest approach on the issue of Federal control of education would lead the United States Chamber of Commerce and other opponents of universal and adequate public education to oppose the Federal aids to education proposed or now in effect which do have objectionable Federal controls attached, and to support those which, like the Thomas-Taft bill, do not permit such Federal controls.

EDGAR FULLER.

WASHINGTON, *April 19, 1949.*

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from The Dalles Chronicle, the first entitled "Socialized Medicine," published in the issue of April 7, 1949, and the second entitled "Socialized Medicine II," published in the issue of April 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Dalles Chronicle of April 7, 1949]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of two editorials to appear in the Chronicle outlining the faults of proposals to enact compulsory health insurance.)

Before the United States Congress is Senate bill No. 5, which would, if passed, compel the American people to pay for national health insurance.

The legislation would place administrative powers under the Federal Security Administration, the director of which would supervise payments to doctors for medical services rendered to the population.

In short, the proposal is not socialized medicine in entirety, as many of us believe, but a plan of compulsory insurance to be paid by withholding from wages and by contributions from employers—the same method used to finance social security.

More than 90 percent of the American medical profession has denounced the bill because it sets up the Government as the insurance company and arbiter, and is the opening wedge in the bureaucratic drive toward socialized medicine.

If the bureaucrats desire merely health insurance, even they will be forced to admit that private insurance companies are already doing a magnificent job in the field, and certainly handle claims more efficiently than could Government. Therefore it is evident that the bureaucrats of the Federal Security Administration, led by power-hungry Oscar Ewing, recognize the proposed legislation as a significant step toward socializing a great and vital profession.

We are not attempting to apologize for the American medical profession. The member doctors in years past have been notoriously indifferent toward public relations; they have established a labor union with rigid rules of conduct that are wholly uncompromising and at times inimical to the public interest. (For instance, it is almost impossible to prove malpractice against a doctor in a court of law, for the profession's ethics rule that no doctor may testify against another.)

Doctors are often accused of excessive commercialism, with consequent high fees and a tendency to favor cases with higher fees in the offing. There is an almost endless list of complaints against the profession, and doubtless many of them are valid.

Despite any faults of American medicine, the fact is that this Nation has today the highest standards of health in the world; the United States has more doctors and more hospital beds per capita; the ability of the average workingman to secure good medical care is unsurpassed by any other country.

Experience of other nations, notably New Zealand, Germany, and England, proves the utter futility of attempting to improve medical services through Government administration.

Admittedly there are many defects in private medicine, but we must remember that the medical profession is subject to human error the same as any other business. No useful purpose can be served by adding bureaucratic bungling to present defects.

By and large American doctors are serving the Nation well. Of course they sometimes lend themselves to the more commercial aspects of their profession, but after all we're living in a society that has been built through individual initiative given fuel by incentive.

Socialistic medicine enables the poor doctor to earn as much, or nearly as much, as the good doctor, to the disadvantage of the patient. In medicine we are dealing with human lives, and cannot afford to let Government interference force us to accept inferior medical service.

There might be some reason to consider socialized medicine if its proponents can give us even a reasonable basis for supposing that we will have better medical care. But thus far we have only the tragic deterioration of British medicine as an example.

The greatest danger of the proposed compulsory insurance plan is the further extension of bureaucratic control over the lives of all of us. Power-mad, parasitic politicians welcome such a plan as another means of perpetuating their blood-sucking of the Nation's wealth.

At least 200,000 administrative personnel would be required to handle the paper work of a compulsory insurance scheme. And the additional cost would be not only sheer waste, but a block in the path of progress of medicine.

Politicians, no matter what kind of propaganda they may issue or how many misleading statistics they may use, cannot give us better medicine. Only more research and a continued incentive for capable men to enter the profession will provide better care for our people. We have thus far produced in this Nation the world's highest standards in the number of doctors per capita and the number of good hospitals, and we have continually led the world in the twentieth century in medical research. Why change a good system for one that has already proved itself bad?

R. S. H.

[From The Dalles Chronicle of April 8, 1949]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—II

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of two articles outlining the faults of proposed plans for compulsory health insurance.)

The term "health insurance" is a misnomer. Such insurance is not designed to give the Nation better health, but merely to pay the bills when medical care is necessary.

There are already a great number of charity hospitals to care for those who cannot afford to pay for their own care. The average American with a living income today secures adequate medical services.

We must admit that all of us at one time or another consult physicians unnecessarily. If medical care is free, naturally we'll ask for treatment of such simple ailments as common colds, etc. Doctors will then be burdened with trivial matters and will be unable to devote sufficient time to illnesses requiring their attention.

But the bureaucrats would have us believe that by some magic conjured by their special formula of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, we can have all the medical care we want for free.

Their proposals are so ridiculous that our only answer is "Nuts." New Zealand has found, after 10 years of socialized medicine, that 40 percent of all revenues collected by the Government must go to pay for socialized medicine.

Of course the politicians love it. They can tell the people that they must have more taxes or the Nation's health will suffer. Naturally the bureaucrats will have their fingers in the money with their usual expense accounts, friends on the pay roll, kickbacks from doctors who want more business, etc.

Do we want politicians running American medicine? Certainly not. But if we enact legislation compelling us to pay for medical insurance, we are opening the door to further bureaucratic encroachment in our daily lives.

Worst of all, the Washington politicians are already using our tax money to convince us that we need socialized medicine. Last year the Federal Security Agency (which would administer the insurance scheme) spent more than $2,000,000 of our money propagandizing the American public in favor of its base proposals.

The Agency further twists facts and figures to suit its purposes. For example, it cites the 36-percent-rejection rate of men called for military duty during the war.

The bureaucrats would have us believe that 36 percent of our young population is in poor health, that we must have socialized medicine to bring our health standards up to what they consider a reasonable level.

The fact is that the rejection rate was actually 28.4 percent (counting enlistees as well as draftees), and of that percentage 20 percent were rejected for conditions and ailments that even the best medical care could not cure, such as illiteracy, subnormal intelligence, venereal disease (a social, not medical problem), flat feet, poor eyesight, etc.

But the bureaucrats, knowing that public opinion on their side would force the Congress to enact their legislation, cleverly twisted the facts to convince the American public that we need a drastic change in the medical profession.

This is just another example of politicians propagandizing us to seek the road to state dominance over the life of the individual. They are constantly telling us that for our own good we need free medicine, public power, Government ownership of basic industries, and gigantic welfare programs designed to make the American citizen wholly dependent upon the Government for his very existence.

When the bureaucrats can convince us on the basis of sound logic and accurate statistics that we will have more and better medical care with Government regulation, we will be willing to consider their proposals. But they cannot, and they know they cannot prove their theories under the light of logic.

The way to seek better medical care is through incentive to doctors to satisfy their patients, and through freedom of action that will promote more research, better methods and more facilities. We don't want meddling politicians to destroy what we have already built.

R. S. H.

Robert N. Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from three different articles relative to the National Labor Relations Board and Mr. Robert N. Denham, written recently by a prominent attorney, Mr. Charles H. Houston.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Charles H. Houston)

The National Labor Relations Act gives the American industrial worker governmental protection in his freedom to organize, bargain collectively, and be protected against unfair labor practices on the part of his employer. It is labor's "Bill of Rights."

But no law is better than the man who administers it. The key man in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act is Robert N. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board. Under the Taft-Hartley revision of the original Wagner National Labor Relations Act, the general counsel has full and exclusive control over all investigations of complaints and exclusive power of prosecuting alleged violations of the Act. There is no power in the Government to force the general counsel to prosecute if he is unwilling to do so; and if he is unwilling to prosecute, there is no way for the worker to get his case before the National Labor Relations Board. Denham has more power than a czar.

Denham has been accused of being both anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. He is definitely anti-Negro.

Denham is 64 years old, born in Missouri; graduated LL. B. from the University of Missouri in 1907 and took his master's degree at the University of Michigan. He practiced law a short while in St. Louis, then spent 2 years in Texas. From Texas he moved to the State of Washington. He saw service in World War I as an officer in the Air Force, commanding lumberjacks in the timber country of Oregon. After World War I he ran a sugar plantation in Puerto Rico, a sheep ranch in Idaho, cotton plantations in Mississippi, and had business interests in Florida, Texas, and North Carolina. His contacts with Negroes have been limited almost to a boss-worker relationship, and his attitude toward them follows the plantation pattern.

Prior to his appointment as general counsel, Denham was a trial examiner for the National Labor Relations Board. The trial examiner goes into the various States and holds hearings on alleged violations of the National Labor Relations Act, and makes findings and recommendations to the entire Board.

In 1942 Denham acted as trial examiner in the famous *Henry K. Phelps, Jr., trustee* case (45 N. L. R. B. cases 1163), involving the discharge of certain white and Negro workers in a Louisiana oil refinery for union activities. Denham's own report on the case is the best proof of his anti-Negro bias.

The employer did not want the CIO union in the plant, and particularly opposed the organization of the Negro workers.

On page 1190 Denham reports Clanton, a white boss over Negro labor at the plant, speaking to a Negro worker as follows: "How come you ain't my nigger any more? * * * I am not mad with you all because you went up there and testified against me or anything like that. I know you all got up there and them white folks doped you all up and got you all to say all those things." Denham commented: "This latter appears to be a sample of the manner in which Clanton in particular has approached the Negroes who are now working. It is the southern overseer's way of controlling their Negroes and of warning them against a given line of conduct." Denham accepts this as normal.

On the next page (1191) Denham says: "It was Clanton's job to 'push' the Negro crew and a good 'pusher' of such a crew must of necessity keep after it aggressively and practically all the time." In other words, Denham expressly approves slave-driver tactics to make Negroes work.

On the following page (1192) Denham reports that when Clanton fired one Negro worker and told the gang that if it "did not give him better work he would fire them all and hire new ones," another Negro worker laughed. When Clanton heard this he fired the man who laughed. Denham approved the firing, saying: "It was entirely a disciplinary measure and for cause."

Denham stated (p. 1187) that "close and intimate contact with the Negro has taught the white overseers to recognize when a Negro is lying, notwithstanding that the formula upon which such recognition is based appears to be indescribable."

On page 1188 Denham reports the testimony of a Negro worker whose white boss (Roy) was questioning him about attending a fish fry given by the union: "And he asked me did I go to the fish fry, and I told him 'Yes, sir,' and he said, 'Well, next time you go to a fish fry, you see me.' I says, 'Well, boss, I didn't think I had to see you to go to a fish fry,' and he slapped my jaws and shoved me around and kicked me, and so I ran off." The worker was then asked if he was afraid of his boss. He replied, "Oh, I would say that I was afraid of him all right, on my job out there, if he tells me to do anything. * * * When he tells me to do anything, I confine myself to that, I was afraid of him all right, because he was my boss."

Denham never protested this brutality in his report, and never referred to it as creating a constant state of terror. He found some of the Negro workers had been discharged because of union activities and recommended their reinstatement and back pay, but he said nothing about the constant abuse of the Negro workers as constituting a steady reign of terror.

Denham's anti-Negro expressions in the Phelps case were sharply criticized by some of his associates, but he never modified them.

This is a pen picture of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, using his own words. By every standard he is unfit to hold any office under the Fair Deal program.

* * * * *

Last week I commented on the anti-Negro bias of Robert N. Denham. * * * His printed report is bad enough, but the typewritten transcript of testimony in the case shows that Denham did not limit himself to presiding impartially at the trial but injected himself into the examination of witnesses to bring out his own preconceived prejudices against southern Negro workers, and to try to make the witness agree with his own views. * * *

* * * * *

I do not know Mr. Denham personally and there is nothing personal in my opposition. But he occupies a spot no confirmed Negrophobe should occupy. As general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, all complaints of Negro workers against either employers or unions under the National Labor Relations Act come under Denham's jurisdiction. A man who believes, as Denham does, that southern Negro workers are lazy, shiftless, have to be pushed and driven to do a full day's work, and cannot be depended on to tell the truth, is not the type of person for such a position or any other position under the National Labor Relations Act.

During my investigation of Denham I continued to hear reports about his being anti-Semitic as well as anti-Negro. * * * Denham was hostile to the appointment of Jewish lawyers as trial examiners on the National Labor Relations Board staff. He has openly taken the position that Jews were not capable of understanding things the way white gentiles do, and that they should not be selected for important public positions.

Denham's anti-Semitism is exceeded only by his Negrophobia. Yet this is the man who has authority to pass on every complaint of a Jewish or Negro worker under the National Labor Relations Act, and to decide whether the complaint shall be prosecuted or dropped.

* * * * * *

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth Amendments have been on the books since reconstruction, but they have not been enforced. Nothing was wrong with the Amendments; the trouble has lain with the men who are supposed to enforce them.

The National Labor Relations Act is no better than the general counsel who is its chief enforcing officer.

Right now we have a particularly bad combination: a Taft-Hartley Act which needs amendment, and a general counsel who needs to be removed. Denham must be removed if minority workers' rights are to be given full protection under the present Act or any future changes in the Act. He must be removed not only from his position as general counsel but from every other position where the rights of minority workers have to be submitted to his anti-Semitic and anti-Negro prejudices.

On his record, Denham must go.

Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Is Johnson Running for President" written by Marquis Childs and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS JOHNSON RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT?

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—On the day that Louis Johnson was sworn in as Secretary of Na-

tional Defense in an unprecedented and highly publicized mass ceremony, a dinner was given in his honor. On the dais were President Truman, Chief Justice Vinson, and other notables.

At an appropriate moment from the rear of the room came cries of "Lou in '52." Thus was heralded the driving ambition of the new Secretary. As one of Johnson's close friends put it:

"Lou has been running for President for a long time. But he really began in earnest when this job put him in the public eye."

Now, if ambition were a crime in this intensely competitive Capital, a number of otherwise law-abiding citizens would go to jail. Perhaps under the spur of ambition Johnson will take the difficult decisions that his predecessor in the office tragically failed to take.

HARD-BOILED OPERATOR

Certainly, he has begun with a rush that is causing a great clatter in the Pentagon Building as offices are switched about in accord with Johnson's concept of unity on that battle front. But the suspicion is growing that one of his goals is to build up his own personal machine.

He is an operator in the hard-boiled tradition of American Legion politics. His first appointment was that of Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the Legion in 1946–47, to be his personal assistant. Griffith thus far has been serving without pay, but it is understood at The Pentagon that when Congress passes the new unification bill requested by the White House, he will be made an Assistant Secretary.

GRIFFITH, A SABOTEUR

As Legion commander, one of Griffith's most conspicuous public acts was to sabotage the housing program, being advanced in 1946 by Wilson Wyatt of Lousiville, Ky., who was then Housing Expediter. At a strategic moment in the housing fight, Griffith visited the White House. He announced publicly that the Legion opposed the administration program.

Johnson is reported to be privately pushing his friend, Floyd Odlum, the utilities operator and promoter, for Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. This is the post to which President Truman named his old friend, Mon Wallgren, but the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to report the nomination to the Senate.

While Mr. Truman says publicly he will stick to Wallgren, it is widely conceded that the appointment must eventually be withdrawn. Odlum called on the President at the White House last week.

CORPORATION BACKGROUNDS

In these matters the President is said to feel, with considerable irritation, that the Senate seems to expect him to appoint angels from heaven who have had no prior connections of any sort. Wallgren was rejected because it was felt he did not have enough business background. If Odlum's name goes to the Senate, there very likely will be an inquiry into the closeness of his connections with the aviation industry, and it seems to me properly so.

Odlum is president of the Atlas Corp., a holding company. Atlas, according to a report to the Securities and Exchange Commission last December, owns 418,200 shares of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. This is slightly less than 20 percent of the total, and considered equivalent to control.

Johnson, prior to his appointment, was a director of Consolidated Vultee. So also is Victor Emanuel, utility-investment tycoon who has had so much to do with moving President Truman's friend, George E. Allen, and several other figures out of the Roosevelt-Truman administration into directorships of large corporations.

THE B-36

Johnson recently approved a shift of approximately $157,000,000 in Air Force funds from other types of aircraft in experimental production to the B–36 which is made exclusively by Consolidated. This decision was said to have been approved by James Forrestal before he retired as Defense Secretary.

This may well have been a wise and inevitable move. Those with expert knowledge believe that in the past funds have been spread too thin over too many types of planes. Despite much criticism, the B–36 seems to have established its reputation.

But when all this has been said, there would seem to be a question of the propriety of the decision being taken by one whose self-interest must be, directly or indirectly, so involved. It raises, too, some pertinent questions about the relationship between Government and so-called free enterprise.

The Jews of Eire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Philadelphia Jewish Time and brought to my attention by Mr. Charles Goldman of Lynn, Mass.:

OUR JEWISH COMMUNITY—HERE'S TO THE IRISH

(By Arnold R. Ginsburg)

My Irish secretary, who frequently types up this column, almost kicked me out of the office on St. Patrick's Day because I had forgotten to wear a green tie. She warned me about it the day before, too, and I fully intended to wear the Irish color in tribute to this wonderful group of Americans. Not only did I forget the green but I came in wearing a red tie which Miss Fahy tells me is almost as bad as wearing orange. Perhaps this column will show that my heart is in the right place.

You may be interested to know that an Irish rabbi, who speaks with a light Irish brogue, last week became spiritual leader of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I., which has the oldest synagogue building in the United States. Rabbi Theodore Lewis, born and educated in Dublin, came to Newport from the Adelaide Road Synagogue, the largest in Dublin, where Irish Jews offer prayers every Saturday for Eire, the Irish Free State, and its president, Sean O'Kelly.

As Rabbi Lewis says, the 7,500 Jews in southern Ireland are devoted to the "auld sod." An Irish Jew, Robert "Bobby" Briscoe, is a member of the Dail Eireann, the lower chamber of the Irish legislature, representing a constituency that is almost entirely Roman Catholic.

According to an Irish legend, the prophet Jeremiah and his disciple Baruch visited Ireland about 580 B. C. Some connect the people of Ireland with the 10 lost tribes.

IRISH JEWS

There was a permanent Jewish settlement in Ireland as early as 1232 but this existed for only some 60 years. Jews did not again live there until about the year 1655.

The 7,500 Jews of Eire are only a very small part of the population which numbers about 3,000,000. Most of the Jews are concentrated in Dublin, the capital of Eire, where there are two large and four small synagogues, some five charitable organizations, and a Talmud Torah. Smaller groups of Jews, ranging from 40 to 350 in number, live in the Irish cities of Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, each city having a Jewish congregation and a rabbi.

By reason of their small number, the Jews of Eire have not taken a big part in the economic and civic life of the country. Very few are engaged in the professions. Most of them are small shopkeepers and tradesmen.

It is also a matter of interest that Rabbi Isaac Halevi Herzog, chief rabbi of Palestine since 1936, had previously been chief rabbi of Dublin from 1919 to 1925, and chief rabbi of the Jewish community of the Irish Free State from 1925 to 1936.

AMERICAN IRISH TEACH US A LESSON

Coming back to the American Irish, however, I cannot refrain from pointing to them as a fine example of what Americans should be like. They participate in and contribute to almost every area of American civic, economic, social, cultural, and communal life. Their loyalty to America is unchallenged. And yet, our Irish fellow-citizens remember with pride their country of origin.

It is now an honored American tradition, which no true American Irishman would forget, to wear the green and to parade up Fifth Avenue on St. Patrick's Day. By and large, the American Irish are observant Roman Catholics.

Here, then, is a large and loyal group of American citizens who are not afraid to pay their respects openly to the Irish Free State, to honor Irish traditions, and to give faithful observance to their religion.

I have never heard or seen any American Irish worry about his distinctive traits or traditions. No one impugns his loyalty to America notwithstanding his proper interest in Eire. There is no anguished desire here to assimilate, to be exactly like the next fellow. Why should there be?

The story of the American Irish should teach an important lesson to those American Jews who would rather be anything else but Jews, who prefer to hide their Jewishness and who worry about their proper interests in Israel.

America is and was intended to be a land of many peoples with diverse interests, religions, and cultures living together with a common passion for democracy and the American way of life. If we were all the same, life here would be drab and monotonous. America is, if anything, a mixing bowl—not a melting pot.

Comparison of H. R. 3190 With H. R. 4272

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following chart comparing H. R. 3190 with H. R. 4272:

Chart containing section-by-section comparison of H. R. 3190 with H. R. 4272

Sec.	H. R. 3190, as reported	H. R. 4272
2 (a) and (b) (finding and declaration of policy).	Same as present act except that there is added in sec. 2 (b) the statement that Congress is exercising its power to regulate commerce with "foreign nations" as well as its power to regulate commerce among the States. This change is made for purposes of consistency with the extension of the minimum wage provisions to seamen.	Same as H. R. 3190. Reference to "foreign commerce" in sec. 2 (b) is for purposes of consistency with change in definition of "commerce" in sec. 3 (b), which covers importers of goods from foreign lands even though they do not thereafter ship the goods into another State.
3 (Definitions)	The definitions in the present act are unchanged except the definitions of "commerce," "oppressive child labor" and "wage". The definition of "commerce" is changed to cover an importer of goods from a foreign land even though the goods imported do not thereafter move into another State. The definition of "oppressive child labor" is amended to prohibit a parent from employing a child in his custody under 16 in an occupation particularly hazardous for children between 16 and 18. The amendment closes a loophole in the present definition whereby a parent may employ such a child under 16 in such an occupation, even though he could not employ a child 16 or 17 in the same occupation. The definition of "wage" is amended to include tips for which records are kept by the employer in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Labor. The definition is also amended to provide that board, lodging and other facilities furnished the employee may not be included in wages, if the facilities are an incident of and necessary to the employment and practically available only from the employer. This would require the payment of the minimum wage free and clear to such employees as seamen, meal service employees on common carriers, or employees in isolated lumber camps.	The changes in the definitions of "commerce" and "oppressive child labor" are the same as those in H. R. 3190, but the administrative authority over the child labor provisions of the act is taken from the Secretary of Labor and given to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division. The definition of "produced" is changed so as to insert the words "closely related" before the words "process or occupation". Also the word "indispensable" is substituted for the word "necessary." By virtue of these changes the Administrator and the courts will no longer be able to hold covered local retail and neighborhood businesses on the ground that some of the customers of such businesses are engaged in the production of goods for commerce, notwithstanding that all of the goods or services of the local businesses are sold or rendered within the State to customers located within the State.
4 (Administration):		
(a)	Transfers administrative authority under the act from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor. The Wage and Hour Division is continued as a bureau in the Department of Labor headed by an Administrator subject to the direction and control of the Secretary. The Administrator's salary is increased from $10,000 to $15,000 per year.	Leaves administrative authority under the act in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division. Increases his salary to $15,000 per year.
(b)	Confers upon Secretary of Labor authority to appoint employees including attorneys to carry out his functions under the act.	Gives such appointive authority to the Administrator as in the present act.
(c)	Gives the Secretary of Labor unlimited rule-making power including the power to define any term used in the law. Also provides that no liability or disability shall be imposed upon any employer acting in good faith in conformity with any regulation or order of the Secretary.	No such rule-making power given to the Administrator. Sec. 4 (c) of H. R. 4272 provides that no liability, disability or *punishment* shall be imposed upon any employer acting in good faith in conformity with any *written* regulation, order or *interpretation* of the *Administrator* or the *Secretary of Agriculture*. [The italicized words represent the differences between this subsection and the like subsection in H. R. 3190. The reference to the Secretary of Agriculture is necessary because he is given authority to define the term "area of production" in secs. 7 (c) and 13 (a) (10).]
(d)	Certain technical revisions, relating to the place of exercise of duties and powers under the act, required by the revision of sec. 4 (a).	Unchanged from the present act. [This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 4 (c) of H. R. 4272.]
(e)	Certain technical revisions relating to annual reports required by the revision of sec. 4 (a)..	Unchanged from the present act. [This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 4 (d) of H. R. 4272.]
5 (Special industry committees for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands).	This section establishes the industry committee technique for fixing minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands below the general minimum prescribed in sec. 6.	Same as H. R. 3190 except that minimum wages fixed for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are made applicable only to employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for interstate commerce.
6 (Minimum wages)	(1) Minimum wage provisions extended to *all* employees of *every* employer engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.	(1) No such extension. Minimum wage is limited as in the present act to *employees* actually engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.
	(2) Establishes rigid minimum of 75 cents per hour	(2) Establishes minimum hourly rate of 65 cents up to Dec. 31, 1949. Thereafter the minimum wage is to go up or down each year in accordance with fluctuations in the Consumer Price Index determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Any rate set under this formula is to stay in effect for a full calendar year. In no event can the minimum wage be set at less than 50 cents per hour.
	(3) Allows payment of piece rates to home workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands just as in the present law.	(3) Same.
	(4) Sec. 6 (b) is one of the several provisions needed for permitting wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to be less than the general minimum prescribed in sec. 6 (a). Sec. 6 (b) also preserves existing wage orders for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands until superseded. Such wage orders, however, are extended so as to apply to every employee in an industry subject to the wage order and not simply to employees in the industry engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.	(4) Same except that existing wage orders are applied only to employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.
7 (Maximum hours):		
(a)	Overtime provisions extended to all employees of every employer engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.	No such extension. Overtime provisions limited as in present act to employees actually engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.
(b) (1)	Overtime exemption granted to employees employed under bona fide union contracts limiting employment to 1,040 hours during any period of 26 consecutive weeks. Overtime must be paid after 10 hours in a day or 50 hours in a week.	Same.
(b) (2)	Overtime exemption granted to employees employed under bona fide union contracts guaranteeing annual employment. Overtime must be paid after 10 hours in a day or 50 hours in a week.	Same.
(b) (3) (a)	Overtime exemption granted for 14 weeks per year to seasonal industries. Overtime must be paid after 10 hours in a day or 50 hours in a week.	Same.
(b) (3) (b)	Overtime exemption granted for 14 weeks per year to various agricultural processing industries and to the first processing or canning of fish, if the Secretary of Labor finds that such industries are characterized by marked annually recurring seasonal peaks of operation. In the case of the fresh fruit and vegetable industries the Secretary may allow the exemption for 20 weeks per year. Overtime must be paid in each case after 10 hours in a day or 50 hours in a week.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 7 (c) which is almost exactly the same as the sec. 7 (c) contained in the present act. The only differences between sec. 7 (c) of the bill and sec. 7 (c) of the present act are (1) the addition of the first processing of "buttermilk" to the dairy products exemption, and (2) the transfer from the Administrator to the Secretary of Agriculture of the authority to define "area of production."
(c)	*Outlaws* Belo type contracts except under conditions impossible to meet.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 7 (e) of the bill. It specifically *validates* Belo type contracts if the duties of the employees necessitate irregular hours of work. The contracts may be made either individually with the employees or with unions, but must specify a regular rate of pay of not less than the minimum provided in sec. 6 (a) and compensation at not less than time and one-half such rate for all hours worked over 40 in a week. The contracts must also provide a weekly guaranty of pay for not more than 60 hours based on the rates so specified.

Chart containing section-by-section comparison of H. R. 3190 with H. R. 4272—Continued

Sec.	H. R. 3190, as reported	H. R. 4272
7 (Maximum hours)—Continued		
(d)	Defines regular rate as all remuneration for employment except certain specified types of payments.	Same.
	The exceptions are:	
	(1) Gifts and payments in the nature of gifts made at Christmastime or on other special occasions.	(1) Same.
	(2) Payments not made as compensation for hours of employment, such as payments for occasional periods when no work is performed due to vacation, holiday, etc., and traveling expenses.	(2) Same.
	(3) Sums paid in recognition of services performed during a given period of time if the payments are not pursuant to any prior "contract, agreement, promise, arrangement, or a custom or practice causing the employee to expect such payments regularly"; or if the payments are made pursuant to a bona fide profit-sharing plan, meeting the requirements of the Secretary of Labor; or if the payments are so-called talent fees defined by regulations of the Secretary paid to performers.	(3) Same except for following differences: The words "arrangement, or a custom or practice" are stricken from this paragraph of the bill. The Administrator is given no authority to issue regulations dealing with profit-sharing plans or with talent fees.
	(4) Contributions pursuant to a bona fide old age, retirement, accident, etc. plan for employees.	(4) Same.
	(5) Premium compensation for hours in excess of 8 in a day or 40 in a week or in excess of the employee's normal or regular working hours.	(5) Same.
	(6) Premium compensation for Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, regular days of rest or the 6th or 7th day of the workweek where the premium rate is not less than time and one-half the rate in nonovertime hours on other days.	(6) Same.
	(7) Premium compensation for work *outside* the basic normal or regular workday (not exceeding 8 hours) or workweek (not exceeding 40 hours), which premium is paid to the employee pursuant to his employment contract or a collective bargaining agreement and which is not less than time and one-half the rate established by the contract or agreement for like work performed *during* the workday or workweek.	(7) Same.
(e)	Permits overtime payments at time and one-half the hourly or piece rates applicable during the overtime hours.	Same except that this provision appears as sec. 7 (f).
(f)	Permits the premium compensation paid under pars. (5), (6), and (7) of sec. 7 (d) to be credited toward overtime compensation due under the act.	Same except that this provision appears as sec. 7 (g).
8 (Wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands).	Prescribes procedure for issuance of wage orders for industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands permitting the payment of less than the statutory minimum. This section states the policy of the act to be to reach the objective of a 75-cent minimum wage in such industries as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment.	Same except that the policy of the act is stated to be to reach the objective of the minimum wage prescribed pursuant to sec. 6 (a) (2), i. e., the minimum wage tied into the Consumers Price Index.
9 (Attendance of witnesses)	Same as in present act except for a change making reference to the Secretary of Labor instead of to the Administrator and the Chief of the Children's Bureau.	Same as in present act except that reference to the Chief of the Children's Bureau is stricken.
10 (Court review)	Same as in present act except for changes to make the section refer accurately to the United States courts of appeals, in which review of industry wage orders for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be obtained, and to substitute references to the Secretary of Labor for references to the Administrator.	Same as present act, except for changes (1) to refer accurately to the United States courts of appeals, and (2) to substitute the "preponderance of the evidence" test for the "substantial evidence" test in according finality to the Administrator's findings of fact.
11 (Investigations, inspections, and records).	Same as present act except for substitution of references to the Secretary of Labor for references to the Administrator and the Chief of the Children's Bureau.	Same as present act except for striking out all references to the Chief of the Children's Bureau and placing in the Administrator full power under the act to bring actions to restrain violations thereof, including violations of the child-labor provisions.
12 (Child-labor provisions)	Extends child-labor provisions so as directly to forbid employment of child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.	Same.
	Also extends child labor coverage to all employees of every employer engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.	No such extension.
	Also continues existing provision barring shipment in commerce of goods produced in an establishment where child labor is employed.	Same except that *innocent* purchasers of goods produced in violation of the child labor provisions are permitted to ship or deliver such goods for shipment in commerce.
13 (Exemptions):		
(a) (1)	Wage-and-hour and child-labor provisions made inapplicable to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the consumer.	No comparable provision. [Such provision is unnecessary in this bill, for such bill does not bring newsboys under the coverage of the Act in the first instance.]
(a) (2)	Wage-and-hour and child-labor provisions made inapplicable to any employees of a retail or service establishment. Following limitations are placed upon the exemption. First, the employer must not have a total annual volume of sales or servicing in excess of $500,000. Second, at least 75 percent of the establishment's selling or servicing must be (1) to private individuals for personal or family use, (2) to farmers, or (3) of goods or services not differing materially in type or quantity from goods or services normally sold or rendered for personal or family consumption.	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to any employee employed by a retail or service establishment more than 50 percent of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is made within the State in which the establishment is located. A retail or service establishment is defined as meaning an establishment 75 percent of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services (or of both) is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the particular industry. The discriminatory limitations on the exemption found in H. R. 3190 are eliminated.
(b) (1)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to executive, administrative, professional and outside salesmen employees.	The comparable section is sec. 13 (a) (1), which grants wage-and-hour exemption to the same categories of employees and also, as in the present act, to employees employed in a local retailing capacity.
(b) (2)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to catching, harvesting, etc., fish but denied to processing, canning and other on-shore fisheries operations.	The comparable section is sec. 13 (a) (4). This leaves the present wage-and-hour fisheries exemption intact, including exemption for processing, canning, and other onshore operations.
(b) (3)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to employees employed in agriculture.	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (5).
(b) (4)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted employees affected by regulations or orders issued under sec. 14 relating to learners, apprentices, etc.	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (6).
(b) (5)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to employees of weekly or semi-weekly newspapers with a circulation of less than 5,000. [Under present law the maximum circulation requirement is 3,000.]	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (7).
(b) (6)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to switchboard operators employed in a public telephone exchange which has less than 500 stations.	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (10).
(b) (7)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to employees of employers engaged in the business of operating taxicabs.	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (11).
(b) (8)	Wage-and-hour exemption granted to employees or proprietors in a retail or service establishment (meeting the new tests for determining what is a retail or service establishment) engaged in handling telegraph messages under an agency arrangement with a telegraph company where the telegraph-message revenue of such agency does not exceed $500 a month.	Same. The exemption is found in sec. 13 (a) (12).
		This bill also continues in sec. 13 (a) (8) and (9) the present wage-and-hour exemptions for employees of local trolleys and motorbus carriers, etc., and for employees employed within the area of production engaged in handling, packing and various other operations upon agricultural commodities, or in making cheese, butter or other dairy products. The Secretary of Agriculture, not the Administrator, is given the authority to define "area of production." These exemptions are completely eliminated by H. R. 3190.

Chart containing section-by-section comparison of H. R. 3190 with H. R. 4272—Continued

Sec.	H. R. 3190, as reported	H. R. 4272
13 (Exemptions)—Continued		
(c)(1)	Overtime exemption granted any employee who during the greater part of a workweek is a driver or driver's helper riding a motor vehicle in performance of over-the-road transport operations as defined by the Secretary of Labor.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 13(b)(1). As in the present act, overtime exemption is granted to any employee with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service pursuant to the Motor Carrier Act. This includes loaders and mechanics as well as drivers and drivers' helpers.
(c)(2)	Overtime exemption granted to employees of an employer which is an express company, sleeping-car company or carrier by railroad subject to pt. I of the Interstate Commerce Act.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 13(b)(2). Overtime exemption is granted, as in the present act, to any employee of an employer subject to pt. I of the Interstate Commerce Act.
(c)(3)	Overtime exemption granted to employees employed as flight personnel on an aircraft operated by a carrier by air subject to title II of the Railway Labor Act.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 13 (b) (3). Overtime exemption is granted to any employee of such carrier by air and not only to flight personnel.
(c)(4)	Overtime exemption granted to any employee employed as a seaman.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 13 (a) (3). Seamen are exempt from both wages and hours as in the present law.
(d)	The child-labor provisions are rendered inapplicable to (1) any employee in agriculture "outside of school hours" for the employee's school district, and (2) any child actor or performer.	This subject matter is dealt with in sec. 13 (c). The child-labor provisions are rendered inapplicable to any employee in agriculture "while not legally required to attend school" (as in the present act) and also to any child actor or performer.
14 (Learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped workers).	Authorizes employment of learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped workers at rates lower than the statutory minimum under special certificates issued by the Secretary of Labor.	Same except that certificates are issued by the Administrator.
15 (Prohibited acts)	Same as present act with following exceptions: Innocent purchaser is allowed to ship in commerce any goods produced in violation of the wage-and-hour provisions of the act. It is made unlawful to violate any regulation or order of the Secretary issued under the unlimited rule-making authority granted the Secretary.	Same as present act except for provision allowing innocent purchaser to ship in commerce goods produced in violation of the wage and hour provisions of the act.
16 (Penalties)	Subsections (a) and (b) remain the same as in present law. Subsection (c) is new and gives the Secretary of Labor authority to (1) supervise back payments due employees, and (2) bring back pay suits on behalf of employees.	No comparable provision.
17 (Injunction proceedings)	Same as present law except for elimination of unnecessary reference to 28 U. S. C. § 381.	Same as H. R. 3190 except that no authority is conferred upon the Administrator to bring back-pay suits on behalf of employees.
18 (Relation to other laws)	Same as present act.	Same as H. R. 3190.
19 (Separability of provisions)	Same as present act.	Same as present act.
	Sec. 3 of H. R. 3190 amends the Portal Act by (1) substituting a 4-year statute of limitations for the present 2-year statute on back-pay suits by employees, and (2) transferring the duties of the Administrator under sec. 10 of the Portal Act (relating to reliance on administrative rulings, etc.) to the Secretary of Labor.	H. R. 4272 contains no such provisions. The 2-year statute of limitations is left intact as is the Administrator's authority under sec. 10 of the Portal Act.
	Sec. 4 (a) of H. R. 3190 makes the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in general effective 120 days from the effective date of H. R. 3190.	Subsection 3 (a) of H. R. 4272 makes the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in general effective 60 days from the effective date of H. R. 4272.
	Sec. 4 (b) of H. R. 3190 provides for the carry-over of the orders, regulations, agreements, or interpretations of the Administrator or the Secretary of Labor, where not inconsistent with this bill, from the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949.	Sec. 3 (b) of H. R. 4272 provides the same.
	Sec. 4 (c) of H. R. 3190 contains a saving clause with respect to any penalty or liability arising out of any act or omission occurring prior to the effective date of H. R. 3190, but bars back-pay suits for any such liability after the expiration of 4 years from such effective date.	Sec. 3 (c) of H. R. 4272 contains a similar saving clause but bars back-pay suits after 2 years.
		Sec. 3 (d) of H. R. 4272 provides that no amendment made thereby shall amend, modify, or repeal the Portal-to-Portal Act. Such a provision is necessary since sec. 16 (b) of the proposed Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 reenacts the employee's right to collect liquidated damages in back-pay suits and such reenactment might otherwise be held to supersede sec. 11 of the Portal Act, authorizing the court in its discretion not to award liquidated damages. No saving clause as to the Portal Act is in H. R. 3190 although it, too, in sec. 16 (b) reenacts the employee's right to liquidated damages.

Incomes and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include some very timely and appropriate statements from the pen of Mr. Francis B. Taylor, State news editor, News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., contained in two letters, which information I believe will be of general interest to the public, as follows:

THE NEWS AND COURIER,
Charleston, S. C., February 18, 1949.

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MENDEL: Thanks for your reply to mine of the 15th.

I have no objection to my letter going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There's just one point about it that might deserve correction—that $1 a day for milk, I find from my wife, is for us and two of the "chillun"; when No. 3 begins to drink cow's milk, the bill will go up around $1.25 a day. That, incidentally, is due in a couple of months. Mebbe the Taylors think milk is too good a food. Should I put 'em on tankage?

One other thing: I rejoice that you recognize the need for holding down individual taxes on income. It seems to me, however, that any spending or social programs that increase the cost of doing business will nullify whatever gains downward price trends might make.

So, more taxes on corporations and workers for social security and health will price me and the other lobsters like me out of the market place just the same. That's no social gain.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS B. TAYLOR,
State News Editor.

THE NEWS AND COURIER,
Charleston, S. C., February 15, 1949.

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MENDEL: Take a deep breath. Here it comes.

There are evidences increasingly ominous to my way of thinking that bad times are in store for the American people.

What disturbs me is the trend that is showing itself more and more clearly toward throttling the opportunities for the man in the street to get along.

This is me talking and not reflection of an editorial line of thought. What I want to put over is a synthesis of what I am experiencing in my own daily life and what I discover in the signs and portents.

First off: Despite a pretty good income—more than I've ever had before—I have less left over at the week's end than even before. In the face of this (and remember I am not alone) Congress is asked by the President to extract still more taxes from me and my kind. There are no extenuating circumstances offered or promised for this.

The people must be taxed more, the party line sings, because in time of plenty it would be naughty to engage in deficit financing.

How would it be for Uncle Sam to pull in his horns the way I am having to do? If the present tax take (which already is too much) does not meet the spending plans, why not cut the spending plans? I mean really cut them.

Consider:

I would like to buy an auto. I cannot, because they are more than twice the prewar price.

I would like to build a house. I cannot, because materials are twice or thrice the pre-

war price and labor has become so nonproductive that, in the face of sharply higher wages, workmen do less than their prewar daily stints.

I have three children. They need food, clothing, and medical care. I want to pay for what they get and I don't want it to come via a Federal bureaucracy. Brother, I've been treated by service medicos and Oscar Ewing's socialized medicine won't smell any sweeter because my pay envelope is robbed to pay for it.

Do you know that milk for my family costs $1 a day? Do you realize that Congress is keeping the price of milk that high? Do you realize that besides paying all that to the milkman, my pay envelope is nicked for an extra something to the farmers and the vast army of "guvmint" workers who operate that swindle?

When the farm price-support program runs the price of tobacco out of sight, I'll quit smoking. Already, I've had to cut down. I cannot ration milk for my children. Not yet, anyway.

I can cut out drinking whisky. The combination of State and Federal liquor taxes already has reduced my purchases of demon rum, a good bit of which I used to buy to serve my friends. I cannot let my "chillun" run barefoot and their shoes are double or more than the price of 3 or 4 years ago.

Multiply me by several million people and then try to figure out what all this will mean in lower employment, reduced rail, water, and truck transport, and business activity generally on which taxes are paid.

Just because the political ambitions of Members of Congress and the administration are tending to reduce the tax take, are you going to vote for higher taxes on incomes?

I want to know your answer to that last question. It is important. I want people like me all over the country to ask their elected representatives similar questions.

There's another matter: extended social security. Don't expect to make me a tax collector. I hire a servant now. The chances are I won't have one if my wife or I is to be required to be an unpaid revenue agent. It would be cheaper and less trouble to do the housework ourselves (and we would buy less food, too).

There is only one mandate for all this malarkey coming out of the White House. It comes from the loafers and wasters, who'll vote for anybody who promises to give them something that belongs to somebody else. If Congress fancies itself the representative of that ilk, the rest of us will be aroused ere long.

Why in time doesn't the Federal Government give some consideration to the people who pay their keep, instead of pandering to the element which contributes next to nothing?

It is no use for Mr. Truman to spend tax money hiring economic advisers. They are not worth their salt. Lop 'em off the pay roll along with about 1,000,000 of the other parasites doing no useful work at the taxpayers' expense.

Inflation, deflation, recession, depression; boom or bust. Whichever of these disagreeable fates is to befall us, the blame will rest almost entirely upon the political motives of a really rather stupid Federal administration and its rather undiscerning friends in Congress.

You are preparing to tax me right out of the marketplace. When my shopping is confined solely to the sidewalk side of the show windows, I'll have plenty of company. Then who'll pay the taxes to support the expensive projects now being dreamed up in Washington?

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS B. TAYLOR,
State News Editor.

Why Not a Sensible Policy Toward Spain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appears in the May issue of the Reader's Digest, of which our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, is the author and which is entitled "Why Not a Sensible Policy Toward Spain?"

Recently I made a trip to Spain as the ranking Democrat on a committee headed by Mr. SHORT. Mr. SHORT's observations in my opinion reflect an accurate picture of conditions and indicate a sensible approach to the Spanish question at this time. It is a most timely article and one which I trust every Member of Congress will carefully read.

Mr. SHORT is a student and a scholar of world renown. He has been educated in the leading universities of the world and he has traveled extensively over all continents. If any Member of the Congress is qualified to speak on this subject, I consider Mr. SHORT the one.

I enclose herewith the article by this distinguished scholar, statesman, and world traveler.

WHY NOT A SENSIBLE POLICY TOWARD SPAIN?

(By DEWEY SHORT, United States Representative from Missouri)

Why do we do business with Stalin, but refuse to do business with Franco? The answer may be in Alice in Wonderland; it isn't in the book of common sense.

We have no Ambassador in Madrid. General Franco's unofficial Ambassador at Washington, José Felix de Lequerica, has refrained from presenting his papers of accreditation to avoid a possible rebuff. Our trade relations with the Spanish people are suspended in contradictory vagueness.

Yet Great Britain has negotiated a $320,000,000 trade agreement with Franco's Government. France has provided a $40,000,000 credit to Spanish railroads. Sweden, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, and other nations have made commercial compacts, and all 16 Marshall-plan countries are stepping up their trade relations with Spain. Thus, American tax dollars, donated by the Marshall plan, are being used by other nations to promote an exchange of goods with Spain.

Our attitude toward Spain is no less fantastic and self-defeating in other ways.

The food-raising potential of Spain and its important textile industry are reckoned in the over-all plans for feeding and clothing western Europe; 3,000,000 tons of these goods provided by Spain last year reduced the strain on our own industry and transport facilities. Clearly, it is in our interest to expand Spanish production and exports of those items. They could be at least trebled, if only Spain could obtain—not as a handout, but by purchase—sufficient American fertilizers, farm machinery, transport equipment, and, above all, cotton.

It is no secret that our military high command, in calculating the European-defense equation, assigns an important place to the Iberian Peninsula. Our aid to Greece and Turkey against Communist expansion—in fact our whole Near East policy—is obviously intended to safeguard the eastern doors to the Mediterranean. Common sense demands similar attention to the western door, to which Spain holds the key.

There we have the best clue, incidentally, to Moscow's inordinate interest in the internal affairs of Spain. If the friends of the Kremlin should ever obtain a foothold on the Peninsula and on the Spanish-African coast opposite, the Mediterranean would become a Red lake.

Spain's geographic position clearly makes it a bulwark and beachhead against aggression from the East. The Pyrenees make the Iberian Peninsula a natural fortress the availability of which in an hour of crisis may spell the difference between victory and defeat.

That fortress is today defended by an army of some 400,000, with 2,000,000 veterans available for reinforcement. Modern airfields suitable for our largest bombers are being constructed. Here is a primary base of operations—and without the hazard of pro-Soviet fifth columns which unhappily must be taken into account in most other Atlantic countries. At a time when western Europe is shaping up military plans in a realistic spirit and an Atlantic Pact is being hammered out, a strong and friendly Spain would be a valuable military asset.

Our anti-Franco policies cannot be explained by belated questions about the origins of the Spanish Government in bloody revolution, for on April 1, 1939, we unconditionally recognized the Franco regime. Virtually all other great powers had established unequivocal relations with Madrid at that time.

Neither can our perplexing behavior be accounted for by the character of the Franco regime. If the idea is that full diplomatic intercourse implies moral approval of a foreign government, how explain our present normal diplomatic relations with governments of every conceivable tinge—from Argentina to Soviet Russia? We support unabridged political contacts not only with recent enemies like Italy but with the Governments of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia whom we have publicly accused of usurping power through terror.

Can our attitude toward Spain be justified perhaps on the basis of Franco's record in the recent war? The behavior of all neutrals on the European continent was of necessity opportunist; their first purpose was not to cut the bridges with either of the possible victorious coalitions.

While Dr. Goebbels' Diary was denouncing Franco for his refusal to help the Nazis, Prime Minister Churchill could tell the House of Commons in 1944: "There is no doubt that if Spain had yielded to German pressure our burdens would have been much heavier. Spain's power to injure us was at its very highest when United States and British forces descended upon northwest Africa."

At the same time President Roosevelt, in a personal letter to Franco, wrote: "Your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word. * * * I believe the Spanish Government and the Spanish people wish to maintain neutrality and remain outside the war." That neutrality fitted perfectly into our best military interests.

On December 10, 1948, Mr. Churchill reaffirmed this fact in Parliament. "Spain," he said, "refused to aid the Germans to take Gibraltar and enter Africa, and the way Hitler and Mussolini were treated by General Franco is a monumental example of ingratitude."

Some 4,000 American fliers forced to take refuge in Spain were released to fly and fight again; the Franco government did not intern

them—which is more than can be said for other neutrals and, for that matter, for Soviet Russia. Franco was reproached for his policies in the war only by Berlin and Rome. At no time did Spain collaborate with the Nazis in the overt manner of Soviet Russia between August 1939 and June 1941. To use the war record as a pretext for boycotting Spain makes no sense.

How does it happen, then, that we helped keep Spain out of the UN, that we do not restore normal diplomatic representation, that we consent to the exclusion of Spain from the European recovery program and the Atlantic security plans?

The answer is simple. It was embodied in the recent House of Commons statement by Mr. Churchill: "I say there is certainly far more liberty in Spain under Franco than in any countries behind the iron curtain. The great mistake is to allow legitimate objections to Franco and his form of government to be a barrier between the Spanish people and the Western Powers with whom they have many natural ties. So far from leading to the downfall of Franco, it has consolidated his position at every stage.

"It is true that I agreed at Potsdam that Spain should not be invited to join the United Nations, but I said that in hope of obtaining full Russian cooperation in a real instrument of world peace."

Though other neutrals were admitted, the doors of the United Nations were slammed in Spain's face to appease Moscow. The UN Assembly recommendation to withdraw the heads of diplomatic missions from Madrid was another act in that tragicomedy of appeasement.

The futility of that appeasement has been proved and generally acknowledged. In nearly all other respects it has been abandoned. But ostracism of Spain continues through sheer inertia. It is carried to such ludicrous extremes that Spain is not invited to international conferences on such subjects as civil aviation, health, and saving life at sea.

In his original announcement of the European-recovery proposal, Secretary Marshall declared: "Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine." Nevertheless, Spain was kept out—to make it easier for the Kremlin to come in. And though Russia not only refused to join but compelled its satellites to reject our offer and set up its Cominform to sabotage the American effort, Spain still remains beyond Marshall plan bounds. In the midst of a fateful cold war against communism, the most anti-Communist nation is isolated to please Moscow.

There is a vocal and persistent anti-Franco minority in this country that constantly attempts to spread the myth that American public opinion would be offended by the ending of our present policy toward Spain. Any fair sample of public opinion will show that such a claim is without foundation, and, in fact, that a majority would welcome a change in our present policy.

Mr. Churchill spoke of "natural ties" which bind England to Spain. Those ties are greater and more significant for our own hemisphere. Nearly all the Latin-American countries have deep-rooted cultural and sentimental attachments to Spain. Regardless of their political systems, they resent the humiliations heaped on their mother country. They are fully aware that the political and economic sanctions imposed on Spain were Moscow-made in the first place and have been maintained largely by pressure groups taking their cues from Moscow. They can no more reconcile this with our intensive anti-Communist professions than logical-minded North Americans can.

The time has come to establish normal relations with Spain. The present ambiguous policies are a continuing triumph for the Kremlin. Strategically, commercially, politically, Spain is indispensable to the Marshall plan's success, to victory in the cold war and to security if we are forced into a shooting war.

Robert N. Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Miss Marjorie McKenzie, a prominent columnist for the Pittsburgh Courier, relative to Robert Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURSUIT OF DEMOCRACY

(By Marjorie McKenzie)

To the bonfire which has been a-building under Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and which may blast his hopes for reappointment, I cheerfully add my few sticks. The range of complaint against Mr. Denham is so wide that a random choice of grounds for ousting him might turn on his racial bias, his reactionary attitudes toward labor, or his questionable theories and practices as a representative of the executive branch of Government.

Mr. Denham came into power with the Taft-Hartley Act, as its chief administrator, after he had languished for 9 years in obscurity mixed with disfavor as an NLRB trial examiner. A very damaging Denham profile was done by Collier's magazine in the November 1, 1947, issue. * * *

It is difficult to see the evil that is Robert Denham apart from the evil that is the Taft-Hartley law, so well do they complement each other. The law strips the members of the Board, that is the Board itself, of most of their former power under the Wagner Act and vests it in the general counsel, who has become thereby what one Senator has called America's labor "gauleiter." Actually, "fuehrer" would be a more accurate term, since Denham is not a local but a national tyrant. Denham decides whether a case may be heard before a trial examiner, but, even worse, determines what cases the Board itself may hear. When employers want injunctions against their workers, it is Denham's loving task to apply therefor to a Federal court. * * *

A despotic general counsel or a reactionary board under the Wagner Act could have done great harm to worker security and freedom, but the essential safeguards of the law would have cushioned labor against permanent losses. Under Taft-Hartley, where one man is given more power over labor than ever existed in public or private hands, it is disastrous that he should be the wrong man. The pattern, the framework, the record are gone. Dealings between labor and management become extralegal and union activity goes underground in an atmosphere of guilt and potential violence. What decisional labor relations remain concern those situations which are all white or all black and provide no guidance for the gray bulk in between where the skills of an agency such as NLRB once was, are most useful.

The case to which reference is usually made to document Mr. Denham's Negro prejudices is the Phelps Case * * * in which he served as trial examiner. That part of the report which describes the firing of five Negro workers because of their union activities is so full of stereotyped ideas about southern Negro workers in general that it possesses burlesque qualities.

It is almost incredible that a lawyer, no matter what his limitations, could have produced this section, commenting on the disposition of Negroes to lie and their love of fish fries, as part of his serious professional work. The Collier's article states that some of Mr. Denham's judicial reasoning about Negroes was cut out of his final report by his superiors. The fact is that they did tell him to delete it, and he did, but he later reinserted it and it appears in the record.

Though it is important to document Mr. Denham's anti-Negro feeling, it is unnecessary to rely on it as a reason why Negroes should oppose his reappointment. Negroes, as workers, have an interest in seeing that the administrative process functions as it was meant to function. Robert Denham has demonstrated his unfitness to interpret labor-relations issues and to personify the Government in settling labor disputes, even under so strict a law as the Taft-Hartley Act. With a new and more liberal labor law in sight, he obviously must be replaced by a more sympathetic administrator.

Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—the misnamed Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—and to urge that this body quickly pass the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, without weakening amendments.

The reasons why the Congress should take this step are legion. The Taft-Hartley Act has been on the statute books for nearly 2 years. Rarely in the entire history of our country has any law been so completely discredited, on the basis of day-to-day experience, as this measure which moved through the Eightieth Congress on a fearsome wave of antilabor hysteria.

The months since adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act have exposed the sinister purposes of its sponsors. It has been shown that this was a law not written of, by, and for the people but of, by, and for the great corporations of this country. It was not written to produce sound labor-management relations, but to place every advantage of power, prestige, and the influence of Government on the side of employers. It was a vindictive law, a law to punish working men and women for the allegedly heinous crime of joining a union; of using their union for decent, democratic collective bargaining. It was a loaded law, full of

weasel words, of strange phraseology—of special-interest phraseology, if you please; the Taft-Hartley law was purposely loaded with but one intent—to give management a disastrous, undeserved advantage over the unions with which they deal at the bargaining table.

This is not a law that can be corrected by a few amendments. Such a course would be as futile as to attempt to drain the Mississippi River with a tablespoon. The inequities of the Taft-Hartley Act run through every section, indeed, through every sentence of the statute. It was designed that way. Lobbyists who saw dollars and cents for themselves and for the superprofits of the corporations which they represented, made certain that the Taft-Hartley Act was an expert job of freezing antiunionism into the legal document which they rammed through the sadly misguided Eightieth Congress.

The Taft-Hartley Act was nothing new. It merely incorporated antiunion attitudes which had been floating around the front offices of big business for a generation.

Back before the First World War, some narrow-minded thinkers for big industry developed the so-called "American plan." It was a wrong title. It should have been called the "Un-American plan"—for it was clearly and simply and admittedly designed to thwart the growth of unions in this country of ours. This "Un-American plan" was a mixture of powerful persuasion by employers, who had unlimited right to hire and to fire, together with brutal force when necessary, to deprive workers of their right to join a union. It was the era of the injunction, the yellow-dog contract, the blacklist, the coal and iron police, evictions from company-owned homes, violence against workers and their families.

Yet, nevertheless, unions grew, for the need was apparent and workers' conditions were desperate. Despite this atmosphere of repression, they joined unions and they sought the benefits of collective bargaining.

After World War I, these antiunion employers tried a new device. Men who had used inhuman brutality against workers suddenly decided that workers needed "protection" from their own unions. They drew a fearsome, if inaccurate picture, of the "curse" of union-management agreements and of union security. Under the auspices of the National Association of Manufacturers, they threw all their propaganda artillery behind the so-called open shop. The "open" shop was "open" only to exploitation and antiunionism. It was a closed shop to the right of workers to join unions of their own choosing, or to make those unions anything but the palest carbon copy of an effective, functioning organization.

The open shop, and the weakened union organization which it brought about, contributed directly to the severity of the depression which gripped this country during the Hoover Administration and which continued for many years. Unions weakened by the open shop drive of leading sections of American industry were too anemic to fight wage cuts, to fight sweat shopping, to fight every form of human degradation that developed during the depression years.

The breadline, the women and children working for pennies an hour—that was the end result of the successful open-shop campaign which the NAM and its cohorts sold to the American public in those years between 1920 and 1933, when a great humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, gave this Nation its great New Deal.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act was hailed by working men and women, and by all fair-minded citizens, as a magna carta. And with good reason. For it provided a minimum—just a minimum—of protection to workers in their God-given right to search for security and for a little better standard of living.

Those spokesmen for industry who loved the open shop, and its brutality and its union busting, attacked the Wagner Act as one-sided. Of course, it was one-sided—for it was a redress of scandalous grievances. It prohibited employers from interfering with the growth of development of workers' trade-union organizations. It prohibited employers from discriminating against union members by dismissals or other forms of penalty. It merely provided that employers must bargain—but not necessarily reach agreement—with the representatives of union men and women.

It was one-sided only in the sense of that in this democratic government of ours, we have always striven to protect the weak and the exploited; to prevent practices to tear down the decent structure of our society.

There was no need for the Wagner Act to be two-sided, as many uninformed industrial spokesmen have maintained.

There was, and there is, no need to protect employers from interference by their employees with management's right to join the trade association of its choice. No employer has ever been fired by an employee because he joined the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce. No employers' association has ever had its treasury raided, its activities halted by sudden, sweeping injunctions, won by workers. No employer has ever been refused work because he was active in the Rotary Club or because he dared to say in public that his corporation might benefit by affiliation with a trade association.

In other words, the Wagner Act was a law to protect the rabbit from the hunter. There is not, and there never has been, a need for a law to protect the hunter from the rabbit.

Yet that is precisely the nature of the Taft-Hartley Act. It has protected corporate hunters from union rabbits. The effect of it has been to weaken the rabbits still further, and to aggrandize the hunters more than ever before.

The Taft-Hartley Act, with its scores upon scores of provisions, has a direct influence upon each and every phase of collective bargaining throughout our land. Sometimes the influence of the Taft-Hartley Act has been direct, and unions are faced with injunctions, with sweeping orders that prevent men and women from what we have always regarded as their basic constitutional rights.

Sometimes the Taft-Hartley Act's influence is indirect—it is the shadow across the collective bargaining table that permits the employer to get all the benefits and the unions to make all the concessions.

Mr. Gerhard Van Arkel, the former counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, had this to say about the hidden effects of the Taft-Hartley Act: "The assurance of Federal support in union-busting activities is valuable to employers, even where not exercised—for it enjoins unions to tread softly and speak meekly lest these powers be invoked."

Mr. Fred Hartley, a former Republican member of this body who showed uncommon good sense when he decided not to run for reelection in 1948, said the same thing, but even more directly. "There's more in this law than meets the eye," former Representative Hartley assured businessmen shortly after the law was passed.

But men—leading American citizens who have devoted their careers to building harmonious equitable relations between labor and management—know that the Taft-Hartley Act is dangerous law.

Dr. William Leiserson is a former member of the National Labor Relations Board. He is a former member of the Railroad Mediation Board. He is the author of a number of volumes which are standard works for students in this field. What does Dr. Leiserson say about the Taft-Hartley bill? At the Senate Labor Committee hearings on this subject, he made his position clear. He said: "I just think the Taft-Hartley Act is no good. The Thomas bill (which is the Senate's identical version of H. R. 2032) is the kind of a bill we need at this time," Dr. Leiserson testified. "The Taft-Hartley Act needs to be repealed."

I am not a lawyer. I confess I cannot recite by heart every section of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the countless legal citations on the subject. But I am impressed by statements by reputable experts such as these, and by my own experience in human relations, which is what labor-management relations really are.

After all, many of the so-called experts who described the Taft-Hartley Act as the perfect bill when it was passed in 1947 seem to admit that the model has imperfections. I read in the newspapers a few weeks back that Mr. Philip Murray, the respected leader of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and of the United Steelworkers of America, charged that Senator TAFT, himself, had admitted that at least 18 sections of the Taft-Hartley Act were unwise or unworkable.

Now I expected that the Senator from Ohio would indignantly deny the charges made by Mr. Murray. But the opposite

happened. Senator TAFT, according to the newspaper stories I saw, told reporters out in Ohio that Mr. Murray underestimated. The Senator from Ohio told newspapermen there were probably 50 sections of the Taft-Hartley law that need rewriting.

That statement impresses me, just as the statements of people like Dr. William Leiserson, Mr. William H. Davis, the former head of the War Labor Board, and other experts have impressed me.

When the independent experts agree the law is no good; when labor spokesmen offer chapter and verse to show why the law is no good for their cooperative relations with management; when the sponsor of the law admits it is ridden with imperfections—these add up in my mind to the fact that this law should be removed from the lawbooks.

These statements, and some of the things that have transpired during the course of the hearings before this Congress, convince me that the Taft-Hartley Act was a political law designed—though the people did not take the hint last November—to bring a consistently unsuccessful political party back to power. They convince me it was written to give additional advantages to corportations in their day-to-day dealings with labor unions.

Mr. Gerald Morgan appeared before the hearings of the House Labor Committee and boasted that he had actually written the Taft-Hartley bill. Who paid him? The Republican National Committee. And they paid him $7,500 for that little chore.

That sounds like political legislation to me.

A former member of the National Labor Relations Board appeared before the hearings of the Senate Labor Committee, posing as an independent expert. And then it developed he was receiving a $3,000-a-month retainer from the General Electric Co.; another monthly retainer, of size unknown, from the General Motors Corp.; and a third allotment of money from a printing trades industry group.

That sounds to me as though Taft-Hartley law is a corporation bill, and that they are curiously eager to keep it on the statute books.

There might be an argument for the Taft-Hartley law if, despite all these adverse circumstances, it had worked for the benefit of labor, industry, and the national welfare. But the Taft-Hartley law has failed. It has strained, not improved, labor-management relations. It has limited the constitutional rights of working men and women. It has, by its operations, upset the delicate balance between wages and prices and profits, and thereby threatened our economic stability. It has weakened us as a nation in the eyes of the people overseas who look to the United States for democratic leadership. It is criticized by independent experts, and apologized for by its supporters.

Clearly, the Taft-Hartley Act has earned the right to repeal. The people of the country want it repealed. They said so in the election results last November, in a mandate as clear as any in the history of this Nation.

The Lesinski bill will repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. It restores the Norris-LaGuardia Act—passed under a Republican administration in 1932—which removed discord-producing, inequitable injunctions from the field of labor-management relations. It restores the Wagner Labor Relations Act, under which collective bargaining and the welfare not only of workers but of all the people, steadily improved. It recognizes and deals with the problems brought about by some forms of boycotts, or jurisdictional strikes and national emergencies disputes.

The Lesinski bill should be passed, and passed quickly. It should not be burdened with a host of amendments designed to convert it into a new Taft-Hartley law with a new 1949 look.

When it is passed, the people of this country will know that the Fair Deal program, for which they voted in overwhelming numbers last November, is on its way to realization. Passage of the Lesinski bill without amendments by this body and passage of the companion bill in the Senate, will prove once again the glorious effectiveness of our American form of democratic government. It will strengthen the morale of all our people, and it will pay immediate dividends to the men and women in the shops and factories—and in the front offices, too—of American industry.

The Lesinski bill deserves the support of every one of us who values peace in industry, stability in the economic system, and an effective democratic United States of America in the troubled world of today. Thank you.

Colonial Airlines' Splendid Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the postwar years many have criticized our certificated air lines and each plane crash continues to receive front-page publicity in glaring headlines. I have frequently been critical myself in my remarks from the floor of the House, and I expect to continue to be critical whenever I consider it warranted as a constructive measure. Today, however, I want to take this opportunity to extol the remarkable safety record of one of the air lines which deserves the highest plaudits of the House.

On April 19 Colonial Airlines entered upon its twentieth consecutive year of regularly scheduled commercial operation without experiencing a single fatality to either passengers or flight crew. Colonial operates from United States terminals at Washington and New York to Ottawa-Montreal, Canada, and to Bermuda, serving 18 intermediate points in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, and Vermont. Its operations to Canada are over mountainous terrain, where severe weather conditions are experienced throughout the winter months, and its flights to Bermuda are over water. Such operating conditions make all the more remarkable its unmatched record of 250,545,622 passenger-miles flown over a period of 19 years without one fatal accident to mar that perfect record. During this period Colonial completed 400,000 landings and take-offs. That achievement deserves the recognition of Congress and high tribute to the management, flight crews, and maintenance employees of Colonial.

Such a record cannot help but instill public confidence in the safety of aviation so that the entire air transportation industry has been a beneficiary of Colonial's faultless record. The Civil Aeronautics Board has consistently denied this splendid company route extensions which it requested to improve the economy and efficiency of its operations over its present route structure, which was inexpertly conceived and designed by that Board. Surely Colonial's fine contribution to safety in air transportation is deserving of greater consideration and just reward by this Government agency.

New Jersey's Great Growth, Her Historical Landmarks, Her Friendly Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey's well-known columnist, Morris Mogelever, whose writings appear in several New Jersey newspapers under the caption "The State we're in," has written the following article describing the State's remarkable growth since 1940, its historical landmarks, and its appeal to visitors:

TRENTON.—The next New Jersey census in 1950 will show our grand State has rivalled California for population growth since the last 1940 census. Percentagewise, the population of New Jersey now stands at 5,000,000 people, an increase of nearly a million folks.

And so to the newcomers from all parts of America welcome to our fine State—a State that is unexcelled for diversity of its physical structure. New Jersey has a striking variety of climate, topography and plant life; rock-strewn mountains in the northern part, wooded hills and cultivated fields in the central counties, 130 miles of the finest ocean beach in the world, and a pine forest of 1,875 square miles in south Jersey.

Although forty-fifth in area, New Jersey ranks sixth in the country industrially. And, no part of the State is more than 125 miles from New York and Philadelphia, two of the three largest consuming centers in the country.

To the stranger within our borders, who would like to get to know Jersey better, and appreciate its interesting places and historic landmarks, and for those who would like to explore the past or present by automobile on a week end, or a study, here's a brief round of places to see:

Trenton: Old Barracks on South Willow Street. Built 1758 for troops during French and Indian wars. State Museum open Sundays 2 p. m. to 5 p. m. Eight miles west of this city is a memorial park at Washington Crossing on the Delaware, and, 12 miles north of this city is Princeton, home of Nassau Inn, battle monument, and the university.

Rock Hill: Sixteen miles north of Trenton in this spot is the house occupied by General Washington until the declaration of peace was signed in November 1783. During these months the Continental Congress was in session at Princeton. Here, Washington wrote his farewell address to the Army. It is open Sundays from 2 to 4 p. m., and daily from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m.

Plainsboro: The kiddies will enjoy the only retolactor in the world on the Walker-Gordon farm, located on United States Route 1, 43 miles from New York on the road to Philadelphia. It's a slow-moving merry-go-round on which 240 cows an hour are washed, dried, and milked. The visitor may see every step of this fascinating operation.

Somerville: Duke's Park, 1 mile south of Somerville on Route 31 is the Duke estate, left by the late James B. Duke, the tobacco king. Parts of this estate are open to the public.

Flemington: Can be reached by Routes 12, 29, and 30. It's a quaint old village. In the old cemetery on Bonnell Street is the only monument in the State erected to honor an Indian by white men—Indian Chief Tuggamircan, who died in 1750.

Bound Brook: Visit Washington Rock about 4 miles east of this community off Highway 29. This point offers one of the finest views of New Jersey. Also WJZ transmitting station on River Road, which is open to visitors.

New Brunswick: Visit Rutgers University—eighth oldest in the Nation. Bucceleuch occupied by British in 1776–77, now a showplace, is open to visitors 3 to 5 p. m. Sundays.

Menlo Park: Here, Thomas Edison operated his laboratory from 1876 to 1886. The Edison Tower rises 131 feet above the ground—2 miles north of Metuchen on Route 27.

It is maintained by the Edison Foundation. The tower enclosure is open to the public weekdays 1 p. m. to 8 p. m., and Sundays from 10 a. m. to 8 p. m. Admission 10 cents.

Newark: Visit the Newark museum at 43 Washington Street; Newark public library; Newark airport.

Morristown: Washington lived here for more than a year. See his headquarters in National Park, any native will be happy to point out the place. See also the Seeing Eye Home, one of America's unique institutions. Also see the historical museum open daily, except Sunday.

Paterson: Visit Lambert Castle on Garret Mountain in the western section of the city, maintained as a museum by the county historical society. Open weekdays and Sunday 10 a. m. to 5 p. m. Admission free. Excellent panorama of surrounding country is afforded from the town. Also see the Holland submarine, the first in the world at West Side Park. And the city museum, 268 Summer Street, is a natural history museum. And the Dey House, at Preakness, 5 miles west of the city, served as Washington's headquarters on several occasions.

Elsewhere in the State, on Route 46 is the Delaware Water Gap, one of the best known scenic features in eastern United States. It is a gorge 1,200 feet deep, and less than a mile across through which the Delaware River flows.

In north Jersey there are hundreds of famous lakes, particularly Greenwood Lake, northern Passaic County, Lake Hopatcong in Sussex, Lake Mohawk, Swartswood Lake, Culvers Lake in Sussex which are devoted to recreation.

And, along the Jersey coast from Sandy Hook on Route 36 through the Highlands to Sea Bright, Long Branch, Asbury Park, Belmar, Bradley Beach, Spring Lake, Sea Girt and then to the extreme south to Atlantic City, Cape May, Wildwood, the visitor will find a summertime mecca for bracing ocean air.

Truly, New Jersey is a great State for all to work in and enjoy, and to the thousands who have recently settled in this section, happy living is our wish.

Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., April 3, 1949:

NECESSITY OF ETHICS ROOTED IN CHRISTIANITY STRESSED BY CHURCHILL—NOTEWORTHY THAT HE TOLD SCIENTISTS WORLD SIMPLY CANNOT GET ALONG ONLY ON WHAT THEY HAVE TO OFFER

(By John Griffin)

Winston Churchill's speech in Boston Garden Thursday night revealed clearly how far the split between the English-speaking peoples and the Russians has grown. While the former Prime Minister expressed the hope that a peaceful solution can be worked out, the whole tenor of his address was one of defiance.

And his statement that the Russians would long ago have attacked London if it weren't for the threat of the atom bomb, indicated that, whatever his words of hope and optimism may have been, he actually believes the Russians cannot be trusted and must be opposed with overwhelming force.

The olive branch that he was offering wasn't much more than a twig. His hopes appeared, inferentially at least, to rest on the possibility that when Stalin retires or is taken by death, Russia will be thrown into a turmoil which may result in a breakup of the power of the Politburo.

Barring that event, he was saying, the only hope lies in the North Atlantic Pact and the atom bomb, particularly the latter. It is a rather appalling prospect, any way you look at it.

But it has to be faced. If the English and Americans have lost all faith in the peaceful promises of the Soviet leaders, as they obviously have, it is logical to assume that the only alternative is a constant preparedness to use all the modern weapons as a guaranty of peace, if not a pleasing peace, at least not a fighting war.

EXPECTED NEW PROPOSAL

There was a curious disappointment in the Churchill speech, which was due to advance reports that he was ready to make a far-reaching proposal of a sort of United States of English-speaking nations.

This was evident among the newspapermen present from many parts of the country. There was a large group of Washington correspondents, several journalists from England, and correspondents from the larger papers throughout the East.

They were attracted by the expectation that Churchill had a new proposal. He had indicated that in interviews given upon his arrival in New York a week or so ago. At that time he pointed out that his Fulton, Mo., speech, which was a forerunner of the North Atlantic Pact, had already been superseded by a new need, and the conclusion-jumpers decided he would carry the idea of a treaty to the English-speaking nations at least one step further.

The occasion appeared made for such a presentation, and when it did not come, there was a decided let-down. It was probably best described by one Washington correspondent, who closed his story by saying, "This was once when the man and the occasion did not meet."

INTERPRETED TRUMAN'S ABSENCE

There will be wonder as to why he did not undertake a new proposal. The fact that President Truman called off his own scheduled appearance at this meeting had meant to many people that Churchill was about to spring a sensation which might appear, from the very fact of Mr. Truman's presence on the program, to have the President's support.

Actually it is pretty well known in Washington that the President's reasons for canceling his appearance was due to several factors. One was the report of his advisers that he could have beaten the filibuster recently by staying in Washington.

Another was that his principal speech writer is seriously ill. And it became clear that if he didn't come to the M. I. T. program, he couldn't very well show up to receive an honorary degree at the Boston College convocation a couple of weeks later. To be consistent, he had also to cancel two April appearances in New York.

A consideration that might have played a part in Churchill's decision to make no further proposals of union is the fact that he is a representative of a minority group in England nowadays. As one of the great men of the world and the great wartime leader, he still enjoys enormous prestige, but politically his star has dimmed in his own country.

What he had to say about the difficulties with Soviet Russia was sensational in itself, but apart from the charge that Russia would not have hesitated to attack London except for the atom bomb, his remarks were about what has been said many times before.

MOST SIGNIFICANT THOUGHT

General Eisenhower, at least 3 years ago, expressed the belief that Russia's aggressive refusal to reach honest agreement with the western nations was due to their fear of the friendship of the west. As it was then stated, "The Russian leaders cannot afford to have friendly borders," which is saying that in order to keep their people in subjugation, they must convince them that they are beset by enemies.

They don't want the Russian people to know what life is like outside of Russia. It would be difficult to convince the people then that they must submit to eternal hardship.

But there was one aspect of the Churchill speech which was noteworthy. It was his affirmation of the necessity for the exercise of Christian virtues and Christian ethics. He was speaking before what was the most distinguished gathering of scientists in many years, and some men of science seem to think that science is all.

They sometimes forget that there is a greater power, and that the world cannot get along simply on what science provides. If science were the be-all and know-all of existence, there would be no hope for humanity. Churchill's insistence upon the fact of God and the need for acting in accordance with Christian ethics was a timely thought.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Jewish Advocate, Thursday, April 21, 1949:

STEPHEN S. WISE, SPIRIT OF ELIJAH—A PRINCE OF ISRAEL IS DEPARTED

(By Rabbi Joseph S. Shubow)

A monarch of the mind is gone from this vale of tears. A giant of the spirit departs from the arena of human struggle. The passing of Dr. Stephen S. Wise will be a shocking tragedy to all men who love freedom. Christians as well as Jews, white and black, believers and nonbelievers, scholars, sages and saints, as well as millions of common men—men who earn their livelihood by the sweat of their brow—will weep for this great prince of Israel.

Dr. Wise crowded into his life the achievements of a veritable host of men; his attainments and accomplishments bear no comparison with lesser men, any more than one can say that Homer, Virgil, Dante, Cervantes, Shakespeare, and Goethe wrote so many times better than less gifted writers, or that Demosthenes, Cicero, Amos, Jeremiah, and Isaiah have spoken so much more powerfully than weaker men, or that Philo, Seneca, Maimonides, Spinoza, Kant, and Hegel have thought so many degrees more clearly than less brilliant minds.

In the realm of genius, be it mental or moral, intellectual or spiritual, there can be no fair comparison. The rare and extraordinary phenomenon of a truly great man stands out unique, overpowering, awe-inspiring, solitary if you please, and defies all comparison. Such a one was he whom Jews and gentiles throughout all the four corners of the world, notably our great country, the United States of America, and the state of Israel, delighted to honor on his seventy-fifth birthday, a few weeks ago, for all declared him to be what the late Dean C. Baron Russell Briggs, of Harvard, said of the unforgettable Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University for 40 years, "a leader of men by divine right."

Everybody in America and millions across the seas knew the name of Dr. Stephen S. Wise. He was known to humble porters, hotel clerks, station masters throughout the land, as well as to statesmen, sages, publicists, and divines; in Europe crowned heads, presidents, and premiers have known his name and have heard his voice; and so have dictators, tyrants, oppressors, and self-seeking politicians; they, too, have heard his voice and quaked and shivered, for he has ever spoken in violent denunciation of greed, duplicity, cruelty, bigotry, and hatred. He spoke in the name of standards unsullied and ideals sublime. His was a true and authentic Hebraic and American voice. It was an echo from Sinai and the hills of Judea and also from the plains and the mountains of America.

The emergence of the Nazi regime of murder, arson, mendacity, and ferocity, reminiscent of the old-time Furor Teutonicus, made of Dr. Wise a veritable arsenal of weapons forged against the ruthless pagan tyrants of humanity and the vicious, cowardly despoilers of the Jews. This one man was the moral and spiritual equivalent of a great host, a huge array of implacable foes of that cruel, cowardly, murderous, piratical crew that stifled all life, liberty, and happiness in the land of Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Heine, Mann, Emil Ludwig, Feuchtwanger, and Einstein. Dr. Wise had a double case against the Nazis because of their degrading all humanity in general and because of their sadistic degradation and wholesale slaughter of the Jews. Throughout those troublous times and terrible years, he toiled indefatigably day after day, without rest or comfort or the slightest thought of self, in order to eliminate what the sages of Jewish history called the Gezerah Baah, the evil decree.

He always sought peace, but never peace at any price, ever "peace with honor," in Disraeli's old phrase. For him it was never a question of respect shown and opportunities given a few more Jewish or Negro lawyers, physicians, students, or merchants; for him it was always a question of the core of religious idealism; Christianity, Judaism, and all religious and moral teachings of the human race were on trial. He said, with the celebrated Viennese Jewish scientist and moral philosopher, Popper-Lynkeus, that as long as a single man goes hungry, unsheltered, and unclothed because of bigotry, we can take all our books on religion and morality and throw them into the fire. And here there can be no compromise for him, who regards life when robbed of all honor, fairness, and decency, worse than a thousand deaths.

THE FREE SYNAGOGUE

In 1932 the Free Synagogue of New York, which he founded, celebrated its silver jubilee. That marked a great event in the history of American Israel and religious development in general. When he organized the Free Synagogue he was in his early thirties—brilliant, dashing, eloquent—with respect for learning and stirred by a great religious idealism; his pulpit, which for many years was Carnegie Hall, became the most celebrated in the land. All America listened to his sermons and preachments, long before the radio brought religion to the home. His vision has been that of only the most spiritually blessed of men. He crowded into a single ministry the service and activity of many great men.

Along with his love of God and America, his ruling passion was the Zionist movement. He and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel, his intimate friend and coworker in the sacred cause of the redemption of the exiles, were the last survivors of the epoch-making leaders who created the modern Zionist movement. And in his unerring prophetic sense, he always said he would live to see the Jewish state as Dr. Theodor Herzl once told him at a Zionist Congress.

HIS LOVE OF ZION

Dr. Wise's amazing, superb, and consistent devotion to the Zionist movement from its very inception is a fact that can never be adequately appreciated even by those Zionists who know more than the superficial facts. He espoused the Zionist cause when it was not only unpopular, but carried with it a most unsavory stigma. In those early benighted days, Zionism was looked upon as undesirable, alien, un-American, at its best, indissolubly associated, in the minds of the so-called better Jewish elements, with the malodorous Ghetto, and at its worst identified with atheism, anarchism, radicalism, and general rebelliousness. Dr. Wise, seeing the traditional glory of the Zionist ideal and viewing the misery of his European, Asiatic, and north African coreligionists, vowed eternal fealty to the oath of Zion: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither." He threw in his lot with the immigrant Jews who spoke Yiddish or English with an East-side accent, but who burned with a love for the prophetic ideal recrystallized and revitalized by the magic personality of Dr. Theodor Herzl.

Dr. Wise did not wait until the movement became socially correct and acceptable. He discerned at once the powerful elements of national revival that the ideal harbored and he enlisted immediately under the banner that a kindred prophetic soul had unfurled. And from that day to the end he gave of his rich and bountiful talents to this great ideal with a most unflagging devotion, a burning zeal, and an unshakable optimism.

Older Zionists never tire of telling with joy and pride of the distinction and recognition the valiant and impressive young Dr. Wise brought to the Zionist ranks. All that the fervent and intellectual Yiddish speaking Zionists were brilliantly and powerfully proclaiming in the ghetto, but confusedly and ineptly uttering to the Americanized Jews, was now a richness of color and originality of interpretation by the striking young American rabbi, whom they regarded as a glorious blend of Apollo and Isaiah. They prayed for a prophet who would translate their spirit, interpret their ideal, and turn into glory their broken accents—and such a spokesman and champion they found in Dr. Stephen S. Wise, who remained the most significant and the most eloquent proponent and interpreter of the cause in America.

Not until a great biography is written of him, after the manner of Morley's Gladstone or Monenpenny and Buckle's Disraeli, will it ever be known how in a thousand and one ways he had been instrumental in gaining a point or a concession or recognition for Zionism from Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, and how he wooed and won for Zionism some of the most outstanding American personalities through the charm and magnetism of his own personality and through his contagious devotion and irresistible persuasiveness; and especially what endless personal sacrifice he made for the Zionist ideal.

DEVOTION TO DEMOCRACY

A vital aspect in the service of Dr. Wise was his uncompromising devotion to democracy and he applied it to the management of the Free Synagogue. A warrior against special favor and privilege, he could never be reconciled to the unprophetic profit basis which had become the rock on which many houses of worship were built. This money qualification for membership and leadership in the House of God Dr. Wise regarded as utterly incongruous and incompatible with the spirit of the teachings of Israel. He taught that aristocracy among Jews was always based on learning, charity, piety and that these were as often, if not more often, found among the lowly circumstanced.

DEMOCRACY IN THE SYNAGOGUE

Though men of great wealth and high social standing were inevitably drawn to the Free Synagogue, it was the man of moderate means but of sincere intentions who was given an equal opportunity for service and recognition. This virtually marked a new era in the history of the American temple. A man arose who proclaimed that the house of prayer was not to be a fortress of the opulent and privileged, but a citadel of all those who truly sought God. This attitude may yet revolutionize American Judaism and all religion. Prohibitive dues and exacting fees have often made of the temple a rich man's club. Dr. Wise preached that each man could bring as an offering what his heart and purse would allow, kemathriath vado, according to his ability to give. The synagogue thus becomes a true temple, dedicated to the All-High with a clean conscience and a contrite heart as the prerequisites for admission, rather than being an exclusive club or high-priced theater, where the amount of one's bank account determined one's proximity to God. The House of God was never meant to be a house of favor and privilege.

PULPIT FREEDOM

Virtually as a corollary of the thoroughly equalitarian and democratic spirit of the church and synagogue follows the incontrovertible principle of pulpit freedom, for it is clear that if the church or temple is the creation of a few men of power and opulence, they will inevitably look upon the minister or rabbi not as their free and independent spokesman, but as their mouthpiece; not as a free and inspired preacher and teacher who interprets the truth as he best sees it, but rather as a hireling or circus barker or ventriloquist's dummy. It is a pity and a shame that many clergymen have become toys and pawns in the hands of the Engastrimanteis, or belly prophets. On this point, as on ever so many others, Dr. Wise would no more compromise than he would barter with the devil or sell his soul.

Pulpit freedom, he maintained, is a sine qua non for regenerating the faith and for making our religious ideals applicable to our daily lives. A synagogue and church, open to the masses as well as to the classes, would become the safest guaranty of the prevalence of the prophetic spirit, for though the common people may stray from the path of righteousness, they inevitably recognize the honest soul and the true character and will instinctively follow the word of him who is a respecter of ideas rather than of persons and has the good of all the people at heart rather than cater to the wishes of the favored few.

CREATED JEWISH CONGRESS

As another indication of his democratic spirit, we have his creation, with the other great prophet, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, of the American Jewish Congress, and later by himself and others, of the World Jewish Congress. This is an epic in itself. He wanted Jewish rights protected everywhere, be it against the Ku Klux Klan of America, the Nazis of Germany, the Cuzists of Rumania, or the Endecks of Poland. Wherever anti-Semitism flourished and bigotry raised its ugly head, there he focused the world's attention through the glare of what Woodrow Wilson called pitiless publicity.

He saw how Jewish rights were insufficiently protected by those self-appointed notables who spoke with muffled voice and his heart bled. He wanted representation on a purely democratic basis; only then would they speak with vigor and firmness like men. All of Jewish life became his pressing concern. No event, no problem, no question of Jewish or general import, escaped him. This guardian of Israel neither slept nor slumbered.

CLEANING UP NEW YORK

There are indeed many other aspects of Dr. Wise's extraordinary career which entrance and fascinate. Suffice it here but to mention his Herculean efforts in the hope of purging the political life of the greatest city in the world has known of a foulness and corruption as stenchant as the Augean stables which only a Hercules could cleanse. What was achieved by him and his highly gifted and great true friend, Reverend John Haynes Holmes, in this direction, is public record. Perhaps millions of dollars and thousands of lives were saved due to their militant moralism.

In this connection, it is of interest to note what tender affection and wonderful comradeship there existed between Dr. Wise, the Jew, and Dr. Holmes, the Gentile, united together in an effort to bring sanity, cleanliness, amity and true fellowship among their fellow men and their readiness to eradicate every evil and deviltry that mar man's life. And what was equally magnificent was to see each one refer to the other as the better man, as if there were degrees and gradations in supreme excellence of character and genius. One is reminded of the famous statue of Goethe and Schiller with the wrath of glory gently held by both and each proclaiming to the other: "You deserve it equally for your extraordinary service to your fellow men."

SOCIAL SERVICE

The Free Synagogue has also become celebrated for its social-service department, which has rendered aid to the sum of $100,000 per year. Dr. Wise at the very founding of his congregation considered this work as an integral part of his program. And due to the help of Dr. Wise's able and devoted associate, Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, this department has been regarded as a model throughout the land.

CHILD-ADOPTION BUREAU

There is also the child-adoption department, which used to be conducted by Mrs. Wise herself, of blessed memory, a celebrity in her own right, having attained wide recognition as an artist and writer of high quality. For years this very charming, highly cultured, and most noble woman devoted her days to making the homes of those not blessed with offspring ring with laughter and joy of children. She was ever the soulful and sympathetic companion of her celebrated husband.

JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

There is one more aspect of Dr. Wise's service which may in the long run prove of most permanent value, and that is the Jewish Institute of Religion, which he founded in 1922. For years the friends and admirers of Dr. Wise urged him to establish a school of learning and training for promising young Jews who would be prepared for the rabbinate by the most eminent masters available and who would have the wonderful privilege of the daily contact and lasting influence of Dr. Wise himself. There are over 200 graduates to date, serving God and man throughout the land. Many served with distinction as chaplains during the World War. When the institute was founded in 1922 Dr. Wise repeatedly tried to obtain others to accept the presidency, but fortunately his friends finally prevailed upon him to take the leadership himself. And his achievement and influence in the brief period of a decade and a half have been incalculable. With the help of his graduates and with the militant spirit for a modern, genuine, scholarly, unapologetic, and avowedly national Judaism and true religion burning in their souls, the long fight that Dr. Wise waged for the ideals and visions he first beheld will become easier and more certain for victory.

There is the old beautiful legend, that the fiery prophet Elijah never died, but ascended to heaven in a flaming chariot and continues to reappear from generation to generation. When we looked upon the prophet of New York we intuitively felt the spirit of Elijah was still alive and still roamed the streets. We shall not so soon look upon his likeness again.

Money Makes the Mare Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1949, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 48, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," which was printed for the use of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the House of Representatives. Seven thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate. The remaining 20,000 copies shall be sold through the Government Printing Office at a price approximating the cost of printing.

In commenting on this book in the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., the brilliant and patriotic Rev. Henry F. Wolfe, who celebrates his silver jubilee on May 4, 1949, said:

If our congressional leaders in Washington will appropriate moneys to put this book in the hands of every honest-to-God American, inflation, depression, and world war III will vanish overnight. After you read it, you will be a red-hot American and you will do your best to get your congressional leaders to get this book published and placed in the hands of all Americans.

SOUND MONEY: A CURB ON WAR

All wars are economic. All depressions are the result of unsound economic and monetary policies. Sound money is the first requisite of peace and economic recovery. If it were possible to make a book on sound money a best seller so that everybody would be reading it and discussing it, wars and depressions would be eliminated.

Frank Waldrop, editor of the Washington Times-Herald, in commenting on this book said: "It is not dull reading. Quite the opposite"; and it "tells you some facts about money in language anybody can understand."

This book could become a best seller if the Congress would make it available at a reasonable price, based on the cost of printing and distribution. The cost of printing in quantities of 10,000 is 22 cents per copy; and the great majority of those requesting copies have offered to pay for them.

In my opinion, sound money is the most important question before the American people today because, unless money is sound and dependable, nothing can be sound and dependable. Money is sound only when currency in circulation is backed by monetary reserves adequate to insure redemption at face value on demand.

SOUND MONEY OR SOCIALISM?

All thoughtful Americans deplore the drift toward socialism, regimentation, and a controlled economy, but all efforts to combat it will be futile until we replace our so-called managed currency with sound redeemable currency. For currency that is not redeemable is fiat money, and the only way that fiat money or managed currency can work is through collectivism or completely Government-controlled economy. This means complete coercion of individuals, controlled production, rationing, and price fixing.

THE THREE FUNCTIONS OF MONEY

Real money has but three simple functions: (1) A measure of value; (2) a medium of exchange; and (3) a convenient way of storing the equivalent of goods and services. The most important function of money is to serve as a constant, invariable measure of the value of goods and services, and when it fails to do that, we have economic chaos such as exists throughout the world today.

MANAGED CURRENCY OR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT?

Rather than being an accurate yardstick to measure the value of commodities, money itself has become a commodity—to be bought and sold, made cheap or dear—by the manipulation of a group of international bankers who control the International Monetary Fund to which we have delegated the control of our money in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States which clearly states in article I, section 8, clause 5:

The Congress shall have power * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

Right now is a most appropriate time to recall the admonition of President Garfield:

Whoever controls the money of a nation controls its industry and commerce.

WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT

The four principal objectives of the American people are: World peace, economic stability, national security, and constitutional government; and all four are predicated upon the adoption of a sound monetary system. Until the world is able to use one standard of value again—whether it be measured in gold alone or gold and silver joined at fixed and proper ratio—there can be no economic stability in the United States or elsewhere.

At a time when the American people are being propagandized into pursuing a course which many fear will inevitably lead to economic collapse and world chaos, can we afford to ignore the printing of this book which, in the minds of many people, offers a solution to our problems?

Be that as it may, I have complete confidence in the intelligence, integrity, and judgment of the American people to correctly appraise this book and make the right decisions; and feel, therefore, that it should be made available to all who desire to read it.

I trust that my colleagues will concur in my views and give their support to House Concurrent Resolution No. 48.

Principles of the American Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Soterios Nicholson:

PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

By Soterios Nicholson

"WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES"

The United States is a Republic of 48 States, the District of Columbia, and outlying Territories.

The Government of the United States combines both the democratic and republican principles of government.

A. Democratic because the power rests in the people.

B. Republican because this power is exercised by representatives of the people.

The Declaration of Independence was adopted by Congress on July 4, 1776. It proclaimed that the 13 colonies were from that day forward free and independent States, no longer under any allegiance or obligation to the British King, that they had full power to make war or peace; the right to take any action which other independent States had a right to take.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The War of Independence freed the American Colonies from Great Britain. For 8 years (1781–1789) the people of the 13 newly independent States tried a plan of Government known as the Articles of Confederation.

This was found to be unsatisfactory, the confederation having little power. It had no chief executive to enforce laws, no plan or power to collect taxes, and it could not settle disputes between States.

In 1787, the constitutional convention was established. Finally, Gouverneur Morris wrote the final draft of the American Constitution.

In it, the preamble expressed the purpose of the American Government:

"We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common Defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The National Constitution guarantees (1) freedom of speech; (2) freedom of the press; (3) freedom of worship; (4) right to assemble peaceably; (5) right to life and liberty; (6) right to a speedy and public trial; (7) right to hold property; (8) right to petition the Government.

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. Our "Ladder of Laws": The National Constitution, treaties, acts of Congress, State constitutions, State laws, county regulations and rules, city and village rules and regulations.

The Constitution gives to the Central Government of the Nation the authority to make laws on almost all subjects which are of common interest to all the people.

It provides the Government with authority to put those laws into effect.

It provides for the organization of the Government group. It sets up a Federal system of government.

It provides for contacts with other groups; with State governments; with foreign countries, by giving the President the right to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls.

It explains the relationship which should exist between the several branches of the National Government.

Laws of the United States are made in pursuance of the Constitution, and treaties made under authority of the United States.

The Constitutional Convention decided that three branches of the Government should be established:

The legislative, which makes the laws

The executive, which operates the Government and puts laws into effect

The judiciary, explains the laws and settles legal questions.

Each branch represents the people separately * * * each has limited powers, independent of each other, except for certain "checks and balances."

The Bill of Rights consists of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, adopted in 1791. These are:

First amendment: Forbids Congress to interfere with religion, free speech, a free press, with the right to assemble peaceably, or to petition the Government.

Second amendment: Guarantees to the people the right to have weapons.

Third amendment: Guarantees against lodging soldiers in private houses in time of peace without the consent of the owners.

Fourth amendment: Provides that there shall be no search or seizure of persons, houses, goods, or papers, without a search warrant.

Fifth amendment: Declares that there will be no trial for serious offenses without a grand jury indictment, no repeated trials for the same offense, condemnation without trial, no one compelled to witness against himself, and no property taken for public use except at a fair price.

Sixth amendment: Requires a speedy and public trial for criminal offenses in the district where the crime was committed, a fair jury, a plain statement of the accusation; gives the accused the right to be represented by a lawyer and to compel the attendance of his witnesses, and requires all witnesses to testify in the presence of the accused.

Seventh amendment: Provides that in lawsuits about anything valued at more than $20, a trial by jury shall be allowed.

Eighth amendment: Prohibits too large bail or fines and cruel or unusual punishments.

Ninth amendment: Declares that rights not stated in the Constitution are not therefore taken away from the people.

Tenth amendment: States that powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States are reserved to the States or to the people.

The Constitution fixes the terms of President and Vice President at 4 years, of Senators at 6 years, and of Representatives at 2 years.

THE EXECUTIVE

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States."

The term of the President commences at noon on January 20. His term of office is for 4 years. His salary is $75,000 and allowances. He is elected in November of every fourth year. He must be a natural-born citizen, at least 35 years old, and at least 14 years a resident of the United States.

His chief power and duty is to enforce the Constitution, the laws made by the Congress, and treaties. Among his other powers are: To veto bills, to recommend measures to Congress, to call special sessions of Congress, to appoint Federal judges, to appoint representatives to foreign countries, to appoint heads of departments and other officials, to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Candidates for the office of President and Vice President are chosen at conventions held by the principal political parties (of which there are now two of major size: Democrats and Republicans).

The voters of each State select as many presidential electors as the combined number of Congressmen from the State. These become known as the electoral college, and vote for the candidates for President and Vice President of the party which the elector represents.

In case of the death of the President, his resignation, inability to use the powers or do the duties of his office or his removal, the Vice President is given the right and duty of taking his place. Other successors to the office are, in sequence: The Speaker of the House of Representatives, President pro tempore of Senate, the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of National Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in the order named.

To help the President enforce and administer the laws, executive departments have been created. Heads of these departments form a council called the "President's Cabi-

net." Each department head is responsible to the President.

Cabinet members are chosen by the President and approved by Senate. Each member of the Cabinet holds office as long as he satisfies the President. He operates under authority delegated to him by the President.

Each department is divided into many divisions, bureaus, offices, or services. The Cabinet is recognized as constituting the President's regular board of advisers.

Law-making and enforcing agencies of the Government are provided in the Constitution. The first article arranges for the establishment of a Congress and defines its power to make laws.

THE LEGISLATIVE

The Congress of the United States is the legislative branch of the National Government and consists of two branches: the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Each State is represented by two Senators. These are elected by the voters of the States. Before 1913, Senators were elected by State legislatures. Senators are chosen at the national election held in November of each even-numbered year, but only one-third of them are elected at any one election. The term they serve is 6 years.

In the House of Representatives, the number of Members is determined by the Congress. A provision was included in the Constitution for the periodic enumeration of the people * * * this is called a census * * * so the number of Representatives could be changed as the population varied.

The House of Representatives has consisted of 435 Members since 1910.

Representatives are elected in November of even-numbered years to serve 2 years. Members can be reelected for each term.

Among the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Congress are: To lay and collect taxes; to borrow money; to make rules and regulations for commerce between the States and foreign countries; to coin money and control counterfeiting; to make a uniform rule about naturalization; to establish post offices; to issue patents and copyrights; to set up a system of Federal courts; to declare war and to raise and support armies and the Navy; to provide for calling out the militia to enforce Federal laws, to suppress lawlessness, or to repel invasion; to make all laws needed under the Constitution.

The Constitution provides that the Vice President of the United States shall be the President of the Senate. The House of Representatives chooses its own Speaker.

Each House of Congress arranges for a number of committees of its Members which concentrate upon the important subjects of lawmaking.

The Ways and Means Committee is the most important committee in the House of Representatives. It not only has original jurisdiction of all tax measures, it also serves in the capacity of a policy-making body, and as the Committee on Committees it determines the membership of the other committees of the House of Representatives.

Other leading committees include: Agriculture, Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Commerce, Finance, Foreign Relations, Judiciary, Labor, Rules, and Military and Naval Affairs.

Each committee has a chairman, usually a Member of Congress who has served for some time.

Every bill introduced in either House of Congress is referred to an appropriate committee for study. The committee, after study, may recommend it to Congress in the form in which it was introduced; change it slightly; rewrite it; or fail to report it in any form.

After a committee reports a bill back to its House in Congress the Members of Congress discuss it in debate and then vote upon it. When a bill is passed by one House, it is sent to the other House for action. If the measure is passed by the second House with amendments, it must be returned to the House in which it was introduced.

If the amendments are not acceptable, the measure can then go to a conference committee made up of Members of both Houses. When the points of difference are adjusted they are then presented to each House for approval.

After a bill has been passed by both Houses of Congress it is sent to the President of the United States. The President may approve the entire bill or disapprove it (veto it). If the President fails to sign the bill within 10 days after reaching him (not counting Sundays), it becomes law without his signature.

If the President vetoes a bill, while Congress is in session, it does not become a law unless each House passes it over the President's veto by a two-thirds vote.

When the President signs a bill it is then sent to the Secretary of State to be given a number.

Congress may also conduct investigations, using one of its regular committees or appointing a special committee.

A session of Congress must terminate by January 3 so that the annual session of the current year may begin.

Special session of Congress may be called by the President on extraordinary occasions.

A third branch of the Federal Government is the judicial.

It is made up of the Federal courts. These courts explain and interpret the Federal laws, settle lawsuits between citizens of different States and punish some kinds of law-breaking. They explain the meaning of the Constitution.

Regular courts of the United States consist of a Supreme Court, 10 circuit courts of appeals, about 94 district courts. Special courts are one Court of Claims, one Court of Customs, one Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and other estaolished at different times by Congress.

Decisions of the Supreme Court are final. For more than 70 years the Supreme Court has consisted of a Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices.

STATE GOVERNMENTS

State and city governments are modeled on that of the Federal Government. There are three general branches—executive, legislative, and judicial.

The governor is the chief executive of the State. He is elected by the people of the State, his term of office being either 2 years or 4 years, according to State laws. New Jersey governor's term is 3 years.

If a governor dies or is removed from office, the State usually provides that his place be taken by the lieutenant governor.

The executive branch of the State includes other officers such as the secretary of state, attorney general, State treasurer, State auditor or comptroller.

The lawmaking branch of the State is called the State legislature or assembly. It consists of two houses except in Nebraska only one. In most States, the legislature meets every 2 years, in a few States they meet every year, and in one State, Alabama, once in every 4 years. The governor may call them in special sessions.

Each State has a system of law courts called the State judiciary. The State courts have authority to try two general classes of cases—civil and criminal.

Each of the government groups must be supported by the people who are its members. This is done by means of taxes and excises. All money paid as taxes is to be used for public purposes.

The United States, most of the States, and many cities, operate on a budget system, which lists the needs for which money must be expended, how much each need will cost and an estimate of where the money is coming from.

Among the taxes imposed by the Federal Government and in varying proportions by many of the States and cities are: Income taxes of persons and business organizations, inheritance taxes, taxes on the manufacture and sale of certain products, tariff laws providing customs fees, transfer taxes and other legal charges, capital taxes of corporations, social-security insurance.

There are other taxes, not universal, such as sales taxes, business taxes, license fees, fines, special assessments.

Taxes represent our share of the costs of government, our own government.

Against them may be credited the great advantages enjoyed by the American citizen. benefits that attach themselves to every activity in his personal, business or public life, that create a country of opportunity, safety and comfort for a man and his family.

Here is the American's creed accepted by the House of Representatives on behalf of the American people:

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its law; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Housing Hokum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, during our Easter recess I was greatly amused by newspaper articles and radio broadcasts of a visit made by Members of the other body to the slum areas located in what was termed "a stone's throw" from the Nation's Capitol. This tour was taken, it was explained, to whip up support for housing legislation.

There was nothing original about the idea of such a tour. Twelve years ago, in 1937, Members of Congress were taken on such a tour and to that same particular alley which is so located that anyone standing in a certain spot can have his picture taken with the Capitol dome showing in the background. Such photographs were used in 1937 by New Dealers and associated persons with the self-styled deep consciousness of the need for social progress, to put the heat on Congress to pass housing legislation. This was passed and $800,000,000 was voted. Every dime of it was spent in less than 3 years but the same slum area that was pictured then remains.

It is true that a lot of low-cost housing was built with the $800,000,000 voted by the Congress in 1937, but the slums eliminated in city after city were merely moved from one section to another. People who lived in the slums moved to

other slums and the low-cost housing projects were occupied by those who had been living in other good houses who found they could get cheaper rent, or by persons of means and "pull" who wanted to live at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Now, more than a decade later, Mr. Speaker, the Fair Dealers have sponsored another tour into the slum area near the Nation's Capitol. The same alley is there, different residents live there, but they cannot be moved because landlords are under rent control and cannot either move their tenants to change the character of the houses, or charge enough rent to make improvements to the dwellings feasible.

In 12 years the New Deal housing legislation did not change a single brick in this famous alley. The slum is still there. If Congress had voted $10,000,000,000 for housing back in 1937, that slum would still be there.

As a matter of fact, a recent investigation showed that approximately half of the people in that slum area own automobiles ranging in cost from $500 to $2,500. Many of them have had plenty of chances to move to other places but did not accept the opportunity.

The same powerful oratory is at work in this Congress as was heard in 1937 and the same so-called social consciousness is at work in the same hearts. The only difference today is that the Fair Dealers want to spend three or four times as much as the New Dealers spent.

The Fair Dealers would put the Federal Government in the housing business and construct houses. Thus, the wild-spending bureaucrats would go out and compete with private individuals who have been waiting for prices to fall so they could build, for materials and labor. The price of building a home, every competent real-estate man will tell you, likely will be higher a year after the Government goes into the building business than now.

Expensive low-cost housing—the real cost of which we will never be able to determine considering the double bookkeeping employed by the bureaucrats—will again be made available to those who have political pull or are just plain lucky enough to get it. Millions of Americans will be paying not only their own rent in private homes, but will be paying their brother's rent when he lives in Government subsidized homes. That rent will be stuck on their tax bill whether they have a social conscience or whether they just want to live and let live.

There are those who are actually economically naive enough to believe that this will bring more good housing to the American scene. I wish I could believe that it would. It is certain that fewer homes will actually be built if the Government enters the housing field. Private investment capital will most certainly get out of the housing business as fast as it economically can do so. The net result of the housing bill, if it passes, will not be more homes available to all the people but a few good homes available for a few lucky persons or those with political influence.

The people who now live in slums may be forced out of the slums to make way for the low-cost housing projects but none of them will be able to get a room in the new projects. They will go to other slums or live in makeshift structures on the edge of town and create another slum area.

The Government is only now selling Greenbelt, the Tugwell-built town near Washington, and several other housing projects similarly dreamed up at the expense of the taxpayer by the New Deal in the 1930's. The Government is taking a terrific loss on this Tugwell-built town and, in fact, has sacrificed some $100,000,000 just to prove that cannot change the character of the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, Congress is now asked by the do-gooders to put up more millions of dollars to prove the same age-old facts. Will the people in every State eventually awaken to the stupidity of such a process? Thoughtful persons can only wait and wonder.

Broadcast by Henry J. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast made by Mr. Henry J. Taylor and some questions from his listeners with his replies:

CRONY AND CORRUPTION

Own anything? Want to be independent—lick nobody's boots? Interested in your future success?

This is a free country. You only live once. Stand up and make yourself heard.

As a nation we've arrived where we are because an American has the right to keep the proceeds of his efforts. Yet everybody who owns anything—everybody who wants to be independent in your land and mine—is being milked dry, getting an awful kicking around.

Can 10 percent be cut from the Marshall plan? Oh, no.

Can $3,000,000,000 be saved by cutting Government overhead—as is clearly shown in the Hoover report? Oh, no.

Instead, political spenders keep on saying taxes must go up. The more they spend, the more they tax. They call on everybody but themselves to sacrifice. Working people and thrifty people are the goats.

LIVING ON THE FAT OF THE LAND

In any socialist state, the political leaders live on the fat of the land, regardless of what happens to the welfare of ordinary folks. They enjoy high living and enormous tax exemptions, which they vote themselves at the same time that they're slapping more and more taxes on everybody else.

If they get sick, they enter beautiful suites in Federal hospitals and charge it to the taxpayers. If they want to take a ride, they call out a battleship and sit on the sun deck, while you and I pay and pay. If they want a vacation, a house, a car, a special train, riding horses, or admirals or generals to carry messages about who's supposed to come to dinner, they just charge it to the taxpayers, and eliminate the tax on their own enormous allowances for good measure.

That's what's called a planned economy. What it amounts to is government by crony and corruption.

THE PLAN BEHIND A PLANNED ECONOMY

Will high-living politicians, who slap on higher and higher taxes until they may drive you out of business entirely, pay back the losses? Will they give up a battleship to ride on, or a single million-dollar airplane to ride 'n, to make it a little easier for the taxpayer who foots the bills? Oh, no.

The whole tax racket is a politician's paradise. That's what's called a planned economy. They keep on planning to put taxes up, although you know and I know that Government spending and waste should and could come down, and taxes could come down.

THE PENDERGAST PAVING PLAN

I grew up in Kansas City. There, in my home town, Tom Pendergast, prior to his final residence in Leavenworth Penitentiary, operated a planned economy.

For 10 years in our town Twelfth Street and Thirteenth Street were always being paved and repaired. Pendergast would order the paving blocks ripped up from Twelfth Street to pave Thirteenth Street. That left Twelfth Street unpaved. So a few months later, Pendergast would rip up the blocks from Thirteenth Street to pave Twelfth Street, distributing patronage and plunder all the while.

Back and forth, back and forth, these paving blocks traveled, for 10 long years. All the while Pendergast kept saying, "Taxes must go up." So it is, always, in a planned economy.

MANAGEMENT A TARGET

Next, the campaign designed to further socialize you includes attacks on any kind of management except political management. Politicians and organized pressure groups propose to manage your life, your work, your future. That's also included in what's called a planned economy. It hits every one of us. Your pay, your security, your independence, your hope for the future are involved.

This is the stake you have in individual management: You're working in a place that needs good management—not political management—so that you can hold your job, and progress, as a free citizen. Neither the men and women in an enterprise, nor the capital, can be effective without good management. Nothing else is so important to the employee's welfare, the investor's welfare, or the public welfare.

So the next time you hear some law proposed—like higher taxes, or the closed shop, or other reactionary measures that are all a part of this attack on you—ask yourself this question: "What happens to the experienced, responsible management? If they kill off the management, what happens to me?"

For people prosper when business prospers—and at no other time.

MORE RUBBER MONEY?

Accordingly, there are three main prongs in this campaign: the tax attack, the management attack, and, third, the confiscation of your savings and insurance through laws permitting more and more rubber money for political purposes.

I'm sorry to say that any one of us who thinks the politicians got that one out of their systems when they devalued everybody's savings in 1933 may be mistaken. For example, while attention was being diverted by the recent filibuster maneuvers about civil rights, a sleeper bill was very quietly introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. It is House of Representatives bill 2573.

This is a plan, to be held in reserve, for further and further watering your money, your savings account, your life insurance policy value, by again juggling the price of

gold upward to $56 an ounce and silver up to $3.50 per ounce.

In short, this prong of the three-pronged attack on you who have anything is a political ace up the sleeve, a second money devaluation. Incidentally, it would put the value of just the silver alone, in the present 25-cent piece, up to 65 cents, making bootlegging of silver quarters a black-market bonanza. But perhaps the big brains that thought that bill up—and wish to plan everything in America—haven't figured that out.

Doesn't all this sometimes sound like Ponzi's plan?

LOOK BEHIND THE SLOGANS

But take heart. Clear thinking of progressive Americans can stop these steals. Is it liberal to steal things from people? Is it liberal to say taxes must go up, when expenses should come down? Is it liberal to smear independence and thrift?

The people's eyes must be opened. The curtain must be lifted on the sham and shame that masquerade behind catchwords, and such false slogans as "Human Rights," when human rights are actually being abused.

When that is done, the truth about this three-pronged attack against you will be driven out into the open, and the whole swindle of socialism exposed. From that day forward your future can be boundless in your land and mine.

(From questions received through the mail from listeners, Mr. Taylor selected the following for comment on this program.)

GENERAL M'NARNEY'S APPOINTMENT

Question. I was shocked by revelations of incredible confusion and waste in our national defense, in your recent Reader's Digest article and broadcasts. You say that through our wastefulness at home and all over the world, Russia expects us to knock ourselves out in our own gymnasium. I think that is exactly what we are doing.

Answer. The Hoover investigation committee agrees. The committee says that enormous savings are possible in the Army, Navy, or Air Force without reducing their combat efficiency but, in fact, increasing it.

The premium upon economy and coordination, therefore, becomes more important than ever. Our national security depends on it.

Defense Chief Johnson's appointment of four-star Gen. Joseph T. McNarney to an important place in the Pentagon Building is a very valuable step forward. He is an able man along reorganizational lines. In fact, he originally reorganized the War Department, just before the war.

This is no time for the United States to be anything but the strongest nation on the face of the earth.

A GOOD PLACE TO LEAVE

Question. I took my high school teacher a printed pamphlet of one of your broadcasts. She is still arguing with me about what you say regarding living conditions under communism in Russia.

Answer. Certainly, she can at least remember that thousands try to steal out of the Soviet Union every day. I saw this in Germany myself. They risk their lives, swim canals, tunnel under barbed wire, risk death by hunger or bullets, to get out of Communist Russia.

Why do they do that, if it's such a good place to live? They even steal airplanes to get out, as you know. Your teacher can verify that.

But did you ever hear of thousands of people from the free Western World doing anything like that to get into the Soviet Union?

WISHFUL THINKING

Question. Do you think the Soviet Union, with its low standard of living, will blow up in revolt from within?

Answer. No. I'm convinced we should warn ourselves against any easy thinking that our country's Russian problem will be solved for us by revolt from within.

The Kremlin tyrants, unfortunately, can stay in control of the tragically oppressed Russian people a long, long time—just as long as the Kremlin planners control the people's food supply, the secret police, the concentration camps, and the army. They can do just what the Nazis did in Germany.

THE HIGH COST OF DRAFTING

Question. How many men have been drafted, and how much did it cost to induct them?

Answer. Up to February 1 only 35,000 men have been drafted. Based on what the Selective Service System is spending in the fiscal year, the cost of each induction has been about $785 per man. That's how high the draft cost has been.

BUSINESS FAILURES ON THE INCREASE

Question. I am a small-business woman. I've already let out seven people. Higher taxes would drive me to the wall and cost me my life's savings. Help me, Mr. Taylor. I'm afraid my little business will fail.

Answer. You're up against a tough proposition, but stick with it, and hope and hope—like every big company and small company that is trying to operate over a long pull.

The number of business failures has been increasing. They averaged 53 a week in 1947. But the average now is 164 a week. Last week the number, sadly enough, hit a new high of 210. This was the largest number of failures in any week in 7 years—since 1942.

Business and trade and employment need encouragement now, not a series of reckless knocks on the head through labor laws, or taxes, or anything else.

THE CLOSE PROFIT MARGIN

Question: You say automobiles in our country are manufactured at a close margin of profit, averaging $75 per car. I don't buy a car every day, but I do deal daily in stores. How about that?

Answer: The profit side of our economy is dangerously low per unit of sale, propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding. This is equally true in stores.

A coast-to-coast survey by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, covering 228 department stores doing over $2,500,000,000 in business a year, shows they've netted less than 4 cents profit out of each dollar they took in this year.

Increased taxes would cut buying further, make people have less. Because of lower take-home pay they would buy less.

It would be the easiest thing in the world to tax us into a bust that way. For when business falls jobs fall, as anyone should know. When prosperity goes out the window depression comes in the door, but we don't want that in your land and mine.

No Depression—Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by George Soule appearing in the April 25 issue of the New Republic, entitled "No Depression—Yet."

IT'S NOT A DEPRESSION—YET

(By George Soule)

Perhaps the best way to find out whether we are sliding into a depression would be to poll a list of forecasters and then take a position contrary to that of a majority. Most of them were wrong in 1929, 1937, 1945, 1946, and 1947. Yet their judgment might be as good as that of a tossed penny: by mere chance they might be right. Anyone who is asked to make public a prediction would be safer to go back into his burrow like the groundhog, which looks for his shadow but says nothing.

Words like inflation, deflation, recession, depression are bandied about without much precision. Of course we have not got rid of the business cycle. The curve of aggregate business activity, charted with care by statisticians, will continue to show oscillations. But that does not tell us much about what we really want to know. Even if it were certain that we had passed the peak of the curve and were on the downgrade, the most important questions would remain. Recessions come in all styles and sizes. Some are long, some are short; some have sharp breaks of prices, others gentle declines; some are marked by severe restriction of production and employment, others are so mild that they are barely noticeable at the time and appear later merely as a statistical dip when compared with what preceded and what followed.

The least hazardous guess is that inflation in the sense of rapidly rising prices has temporarily run its course. The general index of wholesale commodity prices has been falling since last August. At latest report it was about the same as the 158.5 level of October 1947, after having bulged to 169.5 in the meantime. It is now down almost to the inflationary peak of 1920, which was 154.4. How low this is may be seen by comparing it with the 100 of 1926, the 64.8 of 1932 and the 78.6 of 1940. The index has not previously fallen consecutively for 6 months since 1938.

The greater part of this decline was occasioned by the drop in farm products and food. By contrast the prices of coal, glass and clay products, metals—such materials as go into automobiles, housing, fuel, and power—increased substantially. But these increases now seem to have come to a halt, and some declines have appeared, as in steel scrap and oil. Textile products have recently been falling, as has the average of all nonfood products.

Unless demand markedly increases, there is no reason to expect any important reversal of this downward tendency of wholesale prices, since crops are abundant both here and in Europe, and the supply of some other commodities has been creeping upward. But there is no reason to expect a precipitate drop either, like that from the 154.4 of 1920 to the 97.6 of 1921. During that deflation the prices of crops were cut in half. Now farm products have bumped into Government supports, which did not exist in 1920. There was no Marshall plan after World War I. If we agree to call what happened then deflation, we do not have it now. I would be inclined to say that even disinflation is too strong a word. Maybe it is just exflation.

The consumer's price index began to fall in September, and has eased off from 174.5 at that time to 169 on February 15, 1949—a magnificent decline of 3.2 percent. The cost of living is still 26.8 percent higher than in June 1946, when price control collapsed, and 71.4 percent above August 1939, just before the outbreak of war. The drop has come mainly in foods, apparel, and house furnishings. Rent, fuel, light, and miscellaneous items have been creeping up. The widely heralded cut in prices of General

Motors cars amounted to about 1 percent, after a 6-percent increase near the end of last year. Even if some retail prices should fall a little more, no substantial relief is in sight. After World War I, when the collapse of wholesale prices was the sharpest ever experienced, the cost of living fell only 12 or 13 percent in 2 years. The same percentage fall now would bring the index down to about 150—higher than in 1946. Not so great a drop is now likely.

No consistent decline is shown in the overall figures of production or employment. At the end of 1948 the index of industrial production was close to the highest point attained since the end of the war—in December it was about 92 percent above the level of 1935–39. Nonagricultural employment was also near its top, 50 percent above 1939. Factory pay rolls were close to their all-time high. Whatever may come, this situation can hardly be called even a Truman depression. To be sure, there were numerous reports of lay-offs in January and February, somewhat more than is customary at this time of year, but the total number employed remained larger than in the same months of 1948. If employment recovers in the spring, as usual, the little dip will be regarded as a normal seasonal movement rather than as part of a downward trend.

If a general business recession, even a moderate one, is in store, the signs of it must be sought elsewhere than in these statistics. There are a number of slackening markets which may or may not be significant of trouble. It is these which attract attention because they offer such a bright contrast to the days when there was not enough of anything to satisfy the demand. Retail trade declined a little toward the end of 1948. Men's apparel and women's dresses have suffered. For the first time in years excess stocks were offered in post-Christmas sales. The outlook in the textile industry is so uncertain that the union, after having suffered adverse arbitral decisions in its demand for higher wages, called a halt. Some new houses cannot be sold at the prevailing high prices. Kaiser-Frazer and Hudson have cut production and laid off men. Other cars in the higher price brackets can be obtained without waiting. The used-car market has been slipping. Many other consumers' durable goods have caught up with demand at existing prices.

Slackening demand in any part of the economy, reflected in unemployment, can pyramid into slackening demand in other parts. It does not necessarily do so. All through the prosperous 1920's, for instance, we had sick industries like agriculture, cotton textiles and bituminous coal. The business cycle itself is not a parallel movement of all industries on a common front; always some factors are on the way down while others are on the way up. What happens in the aggregate depends on the total balance of the economy. If the body is in a healthy condition, local sources of infection are less likely to spread. Let us turn, then, to a broader view of the economic balance.

Consumers are buying much more than before the war, but there is much more to buy. The gross national product has grown in both money and real terms. The share of this product which went to consumers in 1947 was 71 parcent; in 1948 it was 70 percent. But in 1939, consumers took 75 percent of it, and in 1929—a year of high prosperity and heavy investment—76 percent of the product went to consumers. Government is now absorbing a larger share than it did in either of these earlier years, but equally marked is the unusually high proportion of the product which has been going to supply the purchases of capital goods for business investment. Private capital expenditures in the United States have been running at about 15 percent of the gross national product.

There is a controversy as to whether this level of capital investment is too high to last. One school argues that it is. The President's Council of Economic Advisers contends that it stems mainly from making up the deficiencies in industrial growth which occurred during and before the war, and that the percentage of our total product which goes into capital is likely to shrink, perhaps to 11 or 12 percent. Others maintain that businessmen will continue to invest at the present rate for a long time to come unless the Government or labor does something which chills their delicate confidence—something like raising taxes or using bad words like socialism.

As long as the present level of investment does continue, we need have no worry about any severe recession. But if investment should taper off, then consumer or Government purchases would have to increase to take its place, or there would not be enough demand to avoid serious unemployment. The Council of Economic Advisers believes that within a few years consumers will have to absorb about 75 percent of the national product if that product is not to shrink. At the present growth of production, this would mean an increase of consumption at the rate of 4 percent a year, or 3 percent per capita.

That is why the recent hesitancy of retail sales causes some alarm. Ever since 1946, the average level of real wages has been slipping. While some have received wage boosts sufficient to cope with the rising cost of living, many other consumers with less easily changed wages and salaries, and those with fixed incomes, have been falling behind the procession, as they always do in an inflationary period. Some have spent their war savings. Others have extended their borrowings to buy cars or houses. Consumers' disposable income per capita (annual rate at 1947 prices) was $1,288 in 1946, $1,208 in the first half of 1947, $1,200 in the second half of 1947, and $1,200 in the first half of 1948. If the amount bought by consumers does not increase from now on as the capacity for producing goods destined for retail markets grows, we are in for trouble. Business would not for long keep investing at the present rate if it could not sell the goods to be produced by the new machinery and factories.

Business, raising the prices of its products while demand exceeded supply, accumulated tremendous and steadily growing profits. A large part of these profits was used for expansion. Now that prices have started to fall, business could keep production and employment high by letting prices drop to the point where consumers could buy everything that could be produced, even if this meant somewhat lower profits. In that case investment might go on without any marked halt, though at a lower percentage of the total product. But if business tries to hold up profits by maintaining prices at the expense of the volume of sales, there will be more unemployment, diminished national production, fewer profits, and a sharp drop in investment.

Shifts in the amount of capital investment mark the swings of the business cycle; this is one of the most volatile factors in the whole economy. What is the present outlook for investment?

A survey of intentions by the McGraw-Hill Co. indicates that investment in productive equipment planned for 1949 is almost as high as in 1948. But it is of a different character; instead of being mainly for expansion of capacity, it is more largely to replace old machinery with up-to-date equipment.

Business is already holding off on construction because of high costs and other uncertainties.

Housing accounts for more than half of total construction and has been running between one-fifth and one-sixth of total gross investment. The value of residential contracts awarded has been falling ever since last July. The number of new dwelling units started has been falling since last spring. The housing shortage is far from made up, but not enough people can buy at the prices asked, and mortgage money has been running low.

The growth of business inventories, which rose steadily after the war, has flattened out, especially in nondurable goods. A drop of inventories would be one of the surest signs of recession. During the years between World War I and World War II the fluctuation of inventories alone accounted for about half the difference in the flow of investment between the top of prosperity and the bottom of depression.

Foreign investment, though far smaller than domestic, has already shrunk substantially and is likely to get smaller as the Marshall plan progresses and our imports increase.

There is, therefore, no certainty of expansion in a single one of the great categories of investment, and a fall is occurring in one of the most important—housing construction. If a decline of private investment should acquire momentum, the storm warnings would be flying.

Government and the banking system provide the channels through which money is poured into the economy or is drained out of it. The pouring in of money increases demand; the draining out decreases it.

The war expenditures of Government, financed to a large extent by the expansion of bank loans and investments, were the primary source, first of full employment, then of inflation. Ever since 1946 Government has been playing a restrictive role. Instead of having a deficit, it has taken more money from the public than it has paid back. By tending to decrease the amount of purchasing power, this would bring deflation if spending were not at the same time increased in the private sector of the economy by the use of accumulated savings and new borrowing from the banks.

In 1947 Government exerted $6.7 billion of counter-inflationary pressure. (The figures include Federal, State, and local governments.) In the first half of 1948, Government was taking in money at an annual rate of $12,000,000,000 more than it was paying out. In the second half of 1948, Government cash surplus declined to the annual rate of $2.8 billion. The effect of reduced taxes and higher defense expenditures was beginning to be felt.

The fact that last year inflation still continued, in spite of the anti-inflationary fiscal policy, may be regarded as a measure of the latent upward tendency in the private sector of the economy. Perhaps the leveling off in the latter part of the year could be attributed in part to a delayed effect of the Government surplus.

Unless taxes are now increased, there will probably be a Federal deficit in 1949. Already the anti-inflationary pressure of Government has been reduced by some $10 billion within 6 months. There is little doubt that a sufficient increase in public expenditures, without a corresponding increase in revenues, could start the inflationary spiral upward again. On the other hand, a sufficiently large surplus could reinforce any deflationary tendencies in the economy. Where to draw the line, and just when to shift the pressure from one side of the balance to the other, is the puzzle.

As far as the banking system is concerned, it can either apply the brakes or pull out the throttle according to need. Until recently it has been gently applying the brakes. Still stronger downward pressure could be exerted if the Federal Reserve banks should start to sell Government bonds, since this would reduce bank reserves and compel a restriction

of bank credit. The authorities of the system have been opposed to this measure, but instead have stiffened the requirements for banking reserves. The power to do so, which expires in June, they want renewed. On the other hand, if circumstances should require a relaxation of credit restrictions, they have almost unlimited scope. The gold reserve would support an expansion far greater than that which we have had. No recession need be caused by any banking crisis. Fear of the unused inflationary possibilities in the banking structure has been the chief concern.

We are not in a depression. There is some chance that the economic tide has started to recede. Any recession will be moderate if business allows prices to fall so as to maintain and increase consumer demand, instead of keeping prices up, cutting production, and laying off men.

There is also a chance that inflation will be resumed, as it was after the dips in early 1947 and 1948. In this case the absence of a surplus in the Federal budget would be a severely aggravating factor. The longer inflation continues, the greater will be the distortion in the pattern of consumers' incomes and purchasing power. For this and other reasons, the greater will be the danger of a really severe depression to follow.

A higher tax on corporate profits would be appropriate to either inflation or recession. If inflation does continue, the tax can yield a budget surplus which will be counter-inflationary. If deflation is in process, profits will shrink, the yield of the tax will rapidly drop, and the needed budget deficit will appear.

The Federal Reserve Board, if fortified with renewal of its present powers, would be in a position to move quickly in either required direction.

The stand-by anti-inflationary controls which the President asks, such as allocation of scarce commodities and price control in special cases, will do no harm if they do not have to be employed; their absence might do a good deal of harm if they should be needed.

A large public-housing program, if now authorized, would take some time to get under way. It might be just what was required to fill in a slump in building. In any case it would supply a want which the private builders cannot satisfy.

The social-security program is, by and large, countercyclical, and its extension would emphasize its effect. Higher minimum wages are required to help repair the present distortion of incomes.

Whether we are to have a depression, more inflation, or a mild and salutary readjustment will depend largely, not on blind fate, but on what we do. Good business policies can supply part of the answer; good government policies the rest.

Radio Address of Secretary-Treasurer George Meany of the American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by Secretary-Treasurer George Meany of the American Federation of Labor, April 23, 1949.

Mr. Meany's address is a penetrating analysis of the provisions of the second Wood bill and quite clearly sets forth the A. F. of L.'s position on this proposed legislation.

The address follows:

When the House of Representatives returns from its Easter vacation next week, the first important business scheduled for its consideration is the new labor bill—the Lesinski bill. After long hearings and careful consideration, the House Labor Committee approved the Lesinski bill in its present form. It calls for the repeal of the obnoxious Taft-Hartley Act and the restoration of the original Wagner Act with several amendments intended to protect the public interest when labor-management disputes arise.

In my opinion, the Lesinski bill is an honest attempt to carry out the wishes of the American people as expressed in the 1948 elections. The results of those elections, both for executive and congressional offices, provided a clear and unmistakable mandate for the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the substitution of a new law which would be fair to both management and labor, while safeguarding the interests of the public.

But the surviving elements of the reactionary groups in both parties whose policies in the Eightieth Congress were so overwhelmingly repudiated by the voters in 1948, are unwilling to permit a show-down vote on this major issue. They have rallied their scattered and defeated forces into a tight coalition for opposing repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act by every device, maneuver, and strategy in the complicated book of legislative procedure.

The coalition's first weapon is confusion. In an attempt to mislead and confuse Members of Congress, the coalition forces have trotted out a so-called compromise measure, known as the Wood bill and have arranged to force a vote on it before the provisions of the Lesinski bill can be considered and voted upon by the House of Representatives.

What is this Wood bill? I venture to say that not one out of a hundred Americans have ever heard of it. It was never even given a public inspection before a congressional committee. Thus, Members of Congress are not too familiar with its provisions. Its sponsor, Representative JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, calls it a Taft-Hartley substitute which, he says, is "fair and evenly balanced" between labor and management and contains many changes, "all of a liberalizing nature."

Unfortunately, the record tells another story. It reveals, first of all, that Representative WOOD originally introduced a bill which was a duplicate of, instead of a substitute for, the Taft-Hartley Act. It reveals, further, that when the coalition forces discovered that this Congress would not find Taft-Hartleyism attractive even under another name, they tried to give the Wood bill a "new look" by hasty revision of a few of its provisions.

When this "new look" Wood bill is carefully scrutinized, it becomes apparent that it is coming apart at the seams and that the old Taft-Hartley slip is showing its ugly colors all over again. In other words, the Wood bill is a transparent disguise for Taft-Hartleyism at its worst.

For instance, the evil of injunctions which was restored by the Taft-Hartley law is enlarged, strengthened, and made even more repugnant to free American workers by the Wood bill.

Under Taft-Hartley, if charges were filed accusing a union of committing unfair labor practices, the general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board was directed to conduct a preliminary investigation of the charges and if he found there was real basis for them, it was his duty to apply to the Federal courts for an injunction restraining such practices.

However, the Wood bill has streamlined that procedure considerably. It permits the general counsel for the NLRB to ask for injunctions the moment charges against a union are filed, without even bothering to check up on the accusations.

The abuses that such procedure would lead to, and the opportunities it offers a few unfriendly employers or officials to harass and destroy established unions of American workers are so obvious that I cannot conceive of any fair-minded Congressman voting for such a bill.

As bad as it is, the Taft-Hartley law does contain a few safeguards against the issuance of indiscriminate injunctions in cases involving jurisdictional disputes. These safeguards are eliminated entirely by the Wood bill. The National Labor Relations Board and the courts are given complete discretionary authority to issue restraints against jurisdictional strikes without even affording the parties an opportunity to settle the dispute themselves.

Now let us examine some of the "liberalizing changes" in the bill of which Congressman WOOD boasts. One of these deal with secondary boycotts against which the Taft-Hartley law lays down a sweeping prohibition. The Wood bill, however, does legalize one type of secondary boycott, if the work in a factory on strike is farmed out to another plant, if the workers in the second factory are members of the same local union as the first and if the local union has a contract with the second factory providing that its members may refuse to work on struck goods. When all those "if's" in the Wood bill are added together, the result is that not one boycott in a hundred thousand would ever be held legal.

One would imagine from the attitude of both the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill that secondary boycotts are an evil that should be eliminated. On the contrary, history shows that the boycott has been the most powerful weapon available to unions in their fight to eliminate sweatshop conditions and to raise American standards of living to their present level. The Lesinski bill recognizes this truth by providing that secondary boycotts should be held illegal only when they are invoked in furtherance of a jurisdictional dispute or when a losing union in an official election at a plant attempts to boycott in retaliation for its defeat.

There are two other changes in the Wood bill that deserve brief comment. Under Taft-Hartley, the closed shop was banned in future contracts but provisions in existing agreements between labor and management were allowed to remain in force for the duration of the contract. The Wood bill goes one step further in making even those prior contracts illegal.

The Taft-Hartley law set up a mechanism for employe elections to determine whether they preferred a union shop. No union security provision could be included in a labor-management contract without such direct and advance authority from a majority of the workers themselves. Well, in the thousands of such elections which have been held since the Taft-Hartley law became effective, the union shop has won in more than 99 percent of the cases. So now the Wood bill eliminates the elections altogether. Apparently, some employers found it more difficult to refuse to grant a union shop after their workers had voted overwhelmingly for it.

As against these changes, which go even beyond the Taft-Hartley Act in their vicious and malicious attacks against organized labor, the Wood bill throws the Nation's workers a sop by providing that employers as well as union officials will henceforth be required to sign non-Communist affidavits.

The American Federation of Labor does not object to this change, but it fails to see any great boon that it confers on the workers of our country.

So far I have dealt only with the changes, or the "new look" in the Wood bill. Now let's see what it keeps from the "old look," what it picks up word for word from the Taft-Hartley law.

The Taft-Hartley proviso permitting employers to abuse free speech in attacks against unions is retained in full.

Unions are still left subject to the danger of damage suits in the Federal courts.

Restrictions against welfare funds, which have brought relief to unemployed and injured workers and have come to the rescue of the families of many other workers killed on the job, are kept just as tight and as cruel as before.

The Taft-Hartley law's attempts to suppress and bottle up political activities by unions remains unchanged.

The tricky and precedent-shattering paragraph making State laws paramount to the Federal law when their restrictions against union security provisions are more sweeping than the Federal law, stays as it was.

Exclusion of so-called supervisory employees from union protection against employer discrimination or refusal to bargain, stands identical with the Taft-Hartley law.

The whole Taft-Hartley list of prefabricated unfair practices imposed against unions in an effort to weaken and regulate them to the point of ineffectiveness is reincorporated in the Wood bill.

Thus, it becomes obvious that the new look in the Wood bill is an utter sham. In some respects, indeed, the Wood bill is far more dangerous and repressive than the Taft-Hartley and in not a single respect does it offer any hope of substantial improvement.

Within 2 years' time, the Taft-Hartley Act has become thoroughly discredited. The last election proved that support of Taft-Hartleyism is political poison. Not even Senator TAFT himself favors keeping his own legislative monstrosity unchanged.

Therefore, the American Federation of Labor considers it necessary at this time to point out bluntly and emphatically to all Members of Congress that labor will regard a vote for the Wood bill as a vote to retain Taft-Hartleyism. We urge all Members of the House of Representatives to defeat the Wood bill overwhelmingly and to approve the well-considered, fair and honest Lesinski bill.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, public medicine—free medical care—supported by tax on pay rolls has been demanded by the President. Let there be no mistake the President's health plan is no social experiment. It will be a final surrender and Government will take over the major responsibility for distributing and financing medical care. When this is done, there will be no turning back no matter how great the confusion or how bitter the disappointment. The American people will be disappointed with the quality of the medical care they receive from the Government. There should certainly be no hasty and ill-considered acceptance of any compulsory Government-controlled health insurance program.

The resolutions included with these remarks indicate that the public is being aroused as to the dangers of Government interference in the private lives of our citizens. They realize that if medicine can be socialized, then law, and every other business can, and no doubt will follow in the same steps.

The big joker in the President's program is the scheme that makes the individual feel he is getting something free—something for nothing. The proponents of this plan do not tell the truth. In practice the patient does not have a free choice of physician and the physician does not have freedom in the practice of medicine.

Every worker will have the cost taken from his pay envelope and this cost must be added to the price of everything he buys. He will be supporting a whole host of filing clerks in order to keep up the paper work on the health of 140,000,000 people. When he is ill, he will find he is only one of 40 or more patients who want service for his money, and whom the physician must examine very superficially in a short time. When he really becomes ill, he will discover that the slap-happy methods of overworked doctors whose fees are assured, and who must look to the Government for pay, will give this same ill patient not better, but worse care. The patient will undoubtedly consult a private physician, who does not join the assembly line, in order to get a good quality of medical care.

Mr. Speaker, we must not disturb that personal relationship between physician and patient. It seems quite possible that some of the States will need assistance in the care of the sick and the needy. This assistance should be enlarged and improved, but upon a State basis. Keep these problems close to home and they will be better administered than when directed from an all-powerful bureaucracy in the Nation's Capital.

MORRILL, NEBR., *April 21, 1949.*
Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With the issue of socialized medicine coming up, we want to go on record, as some of your constituents, as opposing the socialization of medical care or socialistic practices of any kind. We are not capitalists but we do believe in the capitalistic system of government. We want to be free to choose our doctors, our treatment, our medicine. We want our doctors to have something to work for so that they will keep abreast of the most modern and efficient methods of caring for all ailments.

We want our doctors to have a personal interest in our particular troubles. Furthermore, we believe we are capable of paying our own doctor and hospital bills but we do not care to pay for those neurotics who are constantly seeking medical care when it is not necessary.

On the other hand, we have never known a doctor to turn away an ailing or hurt person due to their inability to pay. We have many charitable institutions who help the needy secure medical care and they do this at a lesser cost and more efficiently than a Government agency could handle it.

It appears that socialized medicine is only another step toward complete socialization and another freedom lost, so please work against all socialistic measures and work for a more democratic and free Nation. We believe that in doing this you will go on record as being definitely opposed to socialized medicine and will vote accordingly.

Sincerely,

Signed by 17 women from Morrill, Nebr.

THE COLUMBUS LIONS CLUB,
Columbus, Nebr.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the standards of medical care in the United States of America are unsurpassed in the world, and the medical profession in the United States is of the best under our free and democratic form of government; and

Whereas any person now unable to pay for medical and surgical treatment is generally taken care of by physicians and surgeons without charge, and no person in the United States need be deprived of medical care because of voluntary assistance of physicians and surgeons and locally controlled agencies; and

Whereas there is a bill now before the Congress of the United States to socialize medicine, hospitals, and other health agencies, and which if passed will be an entering wedge destroying entirely our American way of life as we know it, and for which our forefathers died to establish; and

Whereas the adoption of such a program in whole or in part will entirely change our democratic way of life, and will inevitably lead to further state socialism, and make all of us more and more vassals of government: Wherefore be it

Resolved by the Lions Club of Columbus, Nebr.—

1. That the club and all its members respectfully request the Congress of the United States not to impose upon the citizens of the United States any form of compulsory health insurance under whatever name or guise.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Nebraska Senators and Representatives in Congress, and that they be urged to use all effort to defeat the enactment of any legislation of this nature, and to use all effort to stop the trend now seeming to be uppermost in the minds of the democratic leaders to lead our country down the road of state paternalism and oblivion.

Signed this 18th day of April 1949, at Columbus, Nebr.

O. LEE GRACE, *President.*
JOHN ARMSTRONG, *Secretary.*

Our Foreign Policy—Senate Debate on Atlantic Pact Could Be Forum for Analysis of United States Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared recently in the Washington Star:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY—SENATE DEBATE ON ATLANTIC PACT COULD BE FORUM FOR ANALYSIS OF UNITED STATES STAND

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The Senate could, and should, become the forum for a careful analytical review of our whole foreign policy when it begins to consider the Atlantic Pact in the near future.

It is the logical time to take stock, for this military alliance with western Europe is a departure for us. It is certainly, too, not the place at which we expected to arrive when we

looked forward from creation of the United Nations at San Francisco only 4 years ago. It would be wise to try to find out how we got where we are today as a possible help in going on from here.

It represents a backward step from the United Nations into outmoded concepts of armed alliances which so many of us thought had been shattered by the second world war in our generation, only to find ourselves deluded after so short a time.

The debate on the Atlantic Pact offers a splendid opportunity to talk about strengthening the United Nations into a real world government, which was the original objective, instead of weakening it by a secession movement such as the Atlantic Pact.

At best the UN was comparable to the Articles of Confederation of our American Revolution era. While that loose confederation which lacked essential authority somehow carried us through the Revolution, it had to be transformed into a strong Federal Union only 6 years thereafter when we ran into the problems of self-government as an independent Nation—such problems as the world itself faces today and on not much larger or different scale, for the air and radio-connected world today is much smaller than our colonies were then.

BOLDNESS NEEDED TODAY

Cynics here and the world over, looked with unconcealed skepticism upon the group of men who gathered at Philadelphia to write a Constitution that would bind together such diverse elements, refusing to believe that men, however able and skillful and earnest, could be so bold and original. Such boldness is needed today, nor is it too much to ask.

Twice since World War I our Senate has initiated movements for international peace and concord—first in the 1922 Arms Limitation Conference here in Washington which it proposed to the President in a rider on a naval appropriation bill, second in the 1933 World Economic Conference in London which it recommended by resolution. If each had succeeded as fully as it might, much that has happened since might not have happened. But in both instances American idealism and leadership expressed themselves, as they could again.

By the time the Senate begins to consider the Atlantic Pact it is expected to have before it a resolution sponsored by a number of Senators and House Members beseeching President Truman to call a constitutional convention of the nations of the world to establish a real world federation. The public pressure behind this movement is indicated by adoption of similar resolutions by a number of State legislatures.

Such a resolution offers the opportunity for Congress to take the initiative again.

DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY

Debate on the Atlantic Pact would be a good time, too, to take another look at our war aim to promote democracy elsewhere which, upon examination, we would find slightly tarnished here and there, notably in Germany. There the influence of our policy has been less toward encouraging the democratic elements than to encouraging those elements, represented in the big business and financial monopolists and cartelists, who picked Hitler for their stooge, appropriated the military for their purposes, exploited the German people and started a war to establish their system all over Europe and the world. There's not a democrat in the whole cynical and sinister lot.

Some of this story is told in a report submitted to Army Secretary Royall a few days ago by the special commission he sent to Germany late last year to investigate abandonment of our program designed to break up the cartels which supplied Hitler's armies. It is not a pretty story. Some of it is not complimentary to some key officials in our regime in Germany.

American Ideals of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Soterios Nicholson:

AMERICAN IDEALS OF GOVERNMENT

By Soterios Nicholson

"Ideals are like stars. You will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But, like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guide, and following them, you reach your destiny." (Carl Schurz.)

Ideals are intangible. They are difficult to explain, even to ourselves. They are hard to write about, except in flowing generalities; they provide thought for seemingly endless discussion.

Yet, ideals have been the motivating forces for all the great events of life and history. Nowhere is this more evident than in the history of our own country.

The United States was founded by those to whom ideals meant more than comfort or material success. The thousands who fled from oppression and want in other lands to America's shores were following a dream, a future that gratifyingly grew into certainty as their ideals became the foundation of American Government.

What are the American ideals? We shall try to answer this vital question as best we can.

From the earliest beginnings of American history, ideals of democracy and fair play have been evident in every phase of life. One of the first events to make America stand out as an exponent of the rights of the people was the Boston Tea Party.

You will remember, the British Ministry wished to allow the East India Company to send to America a large quantity of tea, subject to a tax of 3d a pound.

Even though tea was urgently needed, the people determined to oppose its landing because of the unfair tax which had been imposed. After refusal of the company to return the tea to England the people took the matters into their own hands.

A group of men, disguised as Mohawk Indians boarded the ships and emptied into the harbor several hundred chests of tea.

Thus, in a dramatic event, exceedingly daring in those days, was the American principle of "No taxation without representation" visualized for the world to see.

The word "democracy" is a combination of two Greek words, which, written in English, look like this:

PEOPLE TO RULE

Aristotle said: "Democracy arose from men's thinking that if they are equal in any respect they are equal absolutely."

From the day the Declaration of Independence was passed on July 4, 1776, it became the great Charter of Democracy.

Opening sentences: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

The Government of the United States has been established and continues to function on the principle of maintaining the rights of the people. Thus, a great ideal of the human race has become an actuality—one that is looked upon with envy and longing by distant peoples everywhere.

The ideals of humanity are universal. They represent different aspects of hunger for the "square deal" which has become a definite part of American thinking. Different people give ideals varying interpretations according to their needs and desires. Basically, ideals of mankind represent the fundamentals of living.

Foremost among these ideals are: Liberty—political, economic, religious, and social: Equality—in opportunity, education, and privileges: Fraternity—among men of all classes.

American democracy extends a fair opportunity to all, it gives every interest a fair hearing, and it establishes its standards through discussion rather than through physical power.

Teamwork is its rallying cry. It is a form of life that is controlled by its citizens through their government. As Henry Emerson Fosdick proclaimed:

"Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people."

Democracy, as practiced in America, is not only a government of the people, for the people, it is a way of life.

Abraham Lincoln said:

"That we here highly resolve that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from this earth."

And elsewhere he declared:

"No man is good enough to govern any other man without that man's consent."

Theodore Roosevelt, former President, explained:

"Our democracy means that we have no privileged class, no class that is exempt from the duties or deprived of the privileges that are implied in the words 'American citizenship'."

America is a land of surprises. It is a nation of practical doing. The American ideal is one of constant change for the better, for improved living conditions, independence of action, and of vision for the future.

The American ideal is activity and energy, readiness to change, demanding improvements of living conditions, freedom of rule, independence of action, willingness to correct wrong, and to see future possibilities.

Democracy as practiced in the United States is not only a form of government it is a conscious movement to realize the highest social ideals which the race has reached.

Throughout American history the same allegiance to the idea of equality has been the basic reason for our development. Every war in which Americans have participated has been in defense of that principle.

Another President, Herbert Hoover, speaking of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, expressed it this way:

"Of vastly more importance than even the machinery of government was the inspired charter of the rights of men which it guaranteed. Under them, we hold that all men are created equal, that they are equal before the law and that they should be safeguarded in liberty, and as we express it latterly, in equality of opportunity to every individual, that he may achieve for himself and for the community the best to which his character, his ability, and his ambition entitle him."

A. S. Sachs:

"Democracy is a political principle, the aim of which is that government shall not be controlled by one class or group, but rather by the whole populace."

Preamble to the Constitution:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common Defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Assumptions implied in democracy:

1. The dignity of man and the importance of treating personalities upon a fraternal rather than a differential basis.

2. The perfectibility of man, or confidence in the development more fully as time goes by of the possibilities latent in human possibility, as over against the doctrine of fixed caste, class, and slave systems.

3. The gains of civilization and of nations viewed as essentially mass gains—the product of national effort either in war or time of peace rather than the efforts of the few.

4. Confidence in the value of the consent of the governed expressed in institutional forms, understanding, and practices as the basis of order, liberty, and justice.

5. The value of decisions arrived at by rational processes, by common counsel, with the implications, normally, of tolerance and freedom of discussion, rather than violence and brutality.

The implements of democracy have been the suffrage, the representative council, the apparatus of civil liberties, sound administrative organization, and systems of adjudication.

American ideals have been annunciated by the different accomplishments of good government throughout American history.

There are too many to detail here—but to such ideals can be traced forward steps as the freedom of the slaves; the acceptance of sections of land which had been oppressed by their former governments, as part of the United States with all the privileges and opportunities of the original States; development of our cross-country and intertwined-transport system; opportunities for free schooling to all; equal chance for every individual in government or business life, etc.

Truly, as Emerson said: "America is another name for opportunity."

There are about 140,000,000 people in the United States. Of these, about 5,000,000 today are not citizens of the country. In other words, 96 to 97 in every 100 persons are citizens.

Most of these nearly 5,000,000 noncitizens, who have come to this country as immigrants, intend to make their homes here for the rest of their lives. By the generous system of American democracy they can live here in safety and happiness.

Every law-abiding person in the United States is free to live the kind of life which he chooses and can afford to pay for, provided that he does not interfere with the rights of others.

As the Government itself points out, he is free to come and go anywhere in the country. He is free to choose between many kinds of jobs, to work at his job, or, if he does not like it, to look for another.

He is free to hold, sell, or exchange his goods as he likes. He has the advantage of our widespread system of public and private schools and can get a good education. He is free to discuss his problems with his neighbors.

He is a person of independence. He may decide for himself what kind of a home he will live in, and he may direct his own home life, as long as he does it peaceably.

Every person is free to work as hard as he likes for his own personal good and for that of the community, State, and Nation, according to the part he decides to take in government, home, church, business, or other activities.

American ideals gather about big things—they flourish in this land of immensities. The man in America has discovered that in this land of promise it is easier to do the big things than the little things.

The manner in which ideals become realities of life in the United States, may be summed up in the words of Henry Ford, himself an idealist and a successful American, who said: "An idealist is a person who helps other people be prosperous."

Pledge of allegiance: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Wars Take Three-quarters of $42,000,000,000 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Farmers Union Herald on April 18, 1949:

WARS TAKE THREE-QUARTERS OF $42,000,000,000 BUDGET

It's no simple matter to figure out the proposed national budget for this year. But one thing stands out clearly—75 percent of the money the United States intends to spend in 1949 goes to wars, past, present, and future.

President Truman's budget message is for about $41,900,000,000 dollars, the largest peacetime budget ever presented.

This peacetime budget divides like this:

For national defense (Army, Navy, Air Corps, atom bombs, and the like): $14,300,000,000.

For past wars (veterans' aid, foreign aid and interest on the wartime-accumulated debt): $17,700,000,000.

For running the Government (farm aid, health, public works, and general administration): $9,900,000,000.

These figures make cold shivers run down the spine. It is so high, in fact, that it scares some of the people who favor stepping up the cold war with Russia.

David Lawrence, a conservative columnist in United States News magazine, says bluntly: "Present prosperity is underwritten by billions being spent for armaments. Ending of the cold war would bring economic upheaval in the United States."

The top-heavy war and military budgets are subsidizing American business, in other words. Yet big business, thus subsidized, complains bitterly that public health, public housing, and social-security projects are too expensive.

When the new farm bill was presented to Congress last week, the big business spokesmen immediately cried "It costs too much." It always seems to cost too much to help those who need it.

The present tax burden, in the eyes of big business, should be used only for the payment of war debt and preparation for another war. The fact that they profess a desire for peace doesn't mean that big business would sacrifice their profitable cold war contracts for genuine peace.

Earlier in the year, proposals for an excess-profits tax were heard. This tax would be placed on the industries which are growing fat on military expenditures. It would be insurance against big business, or anyone else, profiteering from the cold war. But such a storm of protest arose from businessmen that the proposal has been smothered.

Just imagine what could be done in 1 year with what the military now spends—with no hope of bettering the lot of the people.

New schools, highways, flood control and soil conservation, sewers, hospitals, airports, and public housing is just a partial list of the things that could be built with 14.3 billions of dollars.

Thomas Stokes, a respected syndicated Washington writer, puts it this way: "Perhaps, slowly, people will begin to wake up, individually. And, perhaps eventually, they will raise their voices collectively in a great tornado of public opinion and force those, who are our leaders, to do something about war."

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was submitted to the voters of this country last November. President Truman let everyone know that he stood for repeal, that if reelected he would advocate repeal of that punitive measure. His opponent defended the Taft-Hartley Act. The question was clearly drawn and the voters cast their ballots for repeal.

This was a heart-rending blow to some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle and to certain reactionary corporation officials for whom they devised and enacted this law. They had failed to win majority support for the Taft-Hartley Act.

The question inevitably arose as to how they could recover their position. How can you convince a Congressman that a majority of the people favor something that the majority opposed in last November's election?

The answer was the loaded questionnaires which have been coming into our offices—with all questions phrased so that most people would give the answer the framer desired. These questionnaires were supposed to convince us that people who voted for President Truman last November are now opposed to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. If we are to accept this supposition, we must believe that the loaded questionnaires come from working people who did not vote Republican last November. And we have to suppose that these working people understood that in filling out the questionnaire they were defending the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have not been convinced on either count.

In the first place, I have checked the names signed to questionnaires mailed to my office. To the best of my knowledge, most of these signers voted with the minority last fall. They are still in the minority. These questionnaires have merely given a few reactionary, antilabor Republican voters a second chance to vote against collective bargaining.

In the second place, the framers of these questionnaires have been afraid, or too wise, to ask the question: Do you favor the Taft-Hartley Act? Do you advocate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act? In the questionnaire published and circulated by General Electric and in the

other questionnaires the Taft-Hartley Act is not mentioned. No one who fills out these questionnaires is supposed to know their purpose. Let me ask a question: If the people favor Taft-Hartley, why should its defenders be afraid to mention it by name?

Questionnaires are faulty at best. Questionnaires that attempt to deceive or confuse do not take in many Members of Congress—or I am greatly mistaken at the caliber of my colleagues.

One of the best contributions to the battle of the questionnaires over Taft-Hartley appeared recently in the Machinist, official organ of the International Association of Machinists. I would like to submit it for the RECORD. It makes no attempt to deceive anyone. I ask you to read the questions and to ask yourselves, How many working people in your own district would make pro-Taft-Hartley answers to these questions? They follow:

1. Do you believe labor laws guaranteeing the right to strike should make it more difficult for union members to win a strikes? ☐ Yes. No ☐.

2. Do you believe labor laws should give the President the right, through the courts, to force employees to remain at work during a wage dispute without impounding the employer's profits? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

3. Should labor laws give the Government the power to decide which craft shall be hired on a particular job? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

4. Should labor laws prohibit union members from refusing to handle struck work as a means of supporting brother unionists who have a legitimate economic dispute? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

5. Should labor laws set up a different standard for democratic procedure than other laws? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

6. Do you believe that labor laws should assume that trade-unions seek to avoid collective bargaining? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

7. Should labor laws recognize that when a management official gives his own employees his advice about union activity, he is putting them on warning? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

8. Should labor laws seek to police the internal affairs of trade unions and employer corporations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

9. Do you believe that Communist activities should be outlawed only in trade-unions? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

10. Do you believe that labor laws should require local unions to publish detailed financial statements that disclose to the employer the exact financial status of the union? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

11. Should labor laws encourage an employer to sue a trade union in a court of law every time he has a grievance against union members? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

12. Do you believe that labor laws should assume that union members and not the employer are responsible for full production in the shop? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

13. Should labor laws recognize the right of union members to refuse to work with scabs and free riders? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

14. Do you believe labor laws should permit union members to warn scabs and strike-breakers that they will be boycotted socially and ostracized? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

15. Do you believe labor laws should hold management responsible for the illegal anti-union activities of the foremen and supervisors? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

16. Do you believe labor laws guaranteeing the right of employers to organize should encourage individual employees not to join a union? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

17. Should labor laws assume that union members and employers are financially equal and should therefore be regulated equally by law? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

18. Should labor laws permit only scabs to vote in an election to choose a bargaining agent during a strike? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

Taxes Versus Plums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of April 19, 1949:

TAXES VERSUS PLUMS

One of the major issues of this generation is the struggle between the American taxpayer and Uncle Sam's pay roll.

Thus far, the taxpayer has been fighting a losing battle. If present trends continue, the final result can only be the bankrupting of American economy.

The recent report of ex-President Herbert Hoover, emphasizing the terrific waste in Federal jobs, merely high lighted an evil which has been growing for many years.

Democratic Senator BYRD has been filing reports which reached the same conclusion for more than a decade. Senator BYRD's pleas for carving the Federal staff back to reason fell on deaf ears.

So, apparently, has the recent report by Mr. Hoover.

This is almost astounding.

President Truman has threatened, over and over again, to increase the tax rate by some $4,000,000,000. His leaders in Congress have been insisting that this will be necessary to balance the budget.

Two outstanding public figures, representing both political parties, and both of them eminently qualified to judge the matter, now are in agreement that virtually all of the predicted shortage in Government revenues could be met by the simple act of dropping from the Federal pay roll the job holders who are not needed.

One would expect that the American taxpayers would rise in a body to demand that the administration resort to the obvious reductions in expenses, in preference to a further increase in our staggering tax burden.

One would think that businessmen and business organizations, familiar as they are for the need for economy and watchfulness in their own operations, would take up the cry for the needless waste in public business which threatens another tax boost—almost inevitably to be aimed directly at these groups.

One would feel confident that some or all of the various elements in our national life who are out of sympathy with President Truman's socialistic program would stand up to demand that he set his own house in order before attempting to remodel all American life. Yet the Dixiecrats, the farm organizations, the Wallace-ites, labor's political groups, the women's clubs—not a single one of these has seriously raised the question of why America should be taxed to extermination merely to keep the White House well-stocked with political patronage.

Even the Republicans in the main, have been largely silent on this issue—although it is a Republican ex-President who now has, reraised the question, and although the figures show it may have been nothing at all except the swollen Federal pay roll which defeated the Republican Party in the last three national elections.

Back in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt campaigned against President Hoover on the grounds that the latter was guilty of "mismanagement" (October 19, 1932).

At that time the Federal pay roll was 583,000; the ordinary annual expenditures (budget) of the Federal Government stood $4,535,100,000; and the national debt was $19,487,010,000.

Today the regular Federal staff is well over 2,000,000 (with at least half a million more jobs that don't show up on the list, although the taxpayers pay for them); the annual spending is $45,000,000,000 plus; and the national debt is $257,000,000,000.

After 16 years of the New Deal, it is interesting to look back on the speeches which elected Mr. Roosevelt and started the whole thing. They have the material for a political "refresher course" for those (of whatever party or faction) who hope some day to convert enough voters to get themselves elected nationally, in place of Mr. Truman.

Here are some of candidate Roosevelt's stump-speech remarks:

"I accuse the present (Hoover) administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history—it is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission. * * * Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners, have been retained at the expense of the taxpayers." (Sept. 29, 1932.)

" 'We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.' " (Democratic platform, quoted by Mr. Roosevelt July 30, 1932.)

"I shall approach the problem of carrying out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of current Federal Government operations by 25 percent." (Oct. 19, 1932.)

"And I propose to use this position of high responsibility (the Presidency) to discuss up and down the country, in all seasons and at all times, the duty of reducing taxes, of increasing the efficiency of Government, of cutting out the underbrush around our governmental structure, of getting the most public service for every dollar paid in taxation." (Sept. 29, 1932.)

"I hope that it will not be necessary to increase the present scale of taxes * * * Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production." (Oct. 19, 1932.)

As everyone knows, Mr. Roosevelt kept none of these promises. Federal jobholding is 400 percent more than in 1932; the tax rate is 10 times as heavy; and the national debt is about 1,300 percent larger now than then.

But there is a most interesting lesson for those engaged in politics to be learned from this part of the Roosevelt campaign in 1932.

For one reason and another that was the last time a candidate went before the American people earnestly and apparently sincerely promising to run the Federal Government efficiently, economically, and with a much smaller pay roll.

He won. Whether or not he made good on his promises (he didn't) is neither here nor there. He offered the American people a reduction in the cost of government, and they bought it by electing him.

What makes this point all the most impressive is that the Roosevelt pledge of economy in government is one of the old two points which come to mind wherein the Democratic platform of 1932 and the Roosevelt campaign of that year differed materially from what was offered by the Republican Party—the other principal difference being that the Democrats promised to repeal prohibition.

Here is a key election in American history, the election which broke the almost unin-

terrupted domination over this country by the Republican Party since the Civil War—and one of the key issues in that victory was the Roosevelt promise to reduce government costs, at a time when the need for it was trifling compared with today.

Are we to assume that the American people's thinking has changed so fundamentally that they would ignore a similar appeal today? This is inconceivable.

The fact of the matter is that the simplest, most understandable issue in politics today, and the one with the widest appeal, is that of waste and extravagance by the Truman administration; and that the phase of this issue which is easiest for the average citizen to grasp is this matter of financing thousands of political workers at the taxpayers' expense by giving them unnecessary Federal jobs.

Translate it into the terms of your own life.

Do you think it is right for Mr. Truman to raise taxes, when all he needs to do to "balance his budget" is to drop the employees he doesn't need from the Federal pay roll?

And isn't it a self-evident fact that if Uncle Sam's hiring of political favorites, regardless of whether their services are needed in the public business, is permitted to continue, it can finally result in only one thing—the bankrupting of the Nation?

Not all the pay roll consists of loafers and political hacks. That's perfectly obvious. As a matter of fact, there are thousands of sincere, "career" persons who work just as hard in their public jobs as they would in private ones—and who, in some cases, probably receive less for their services.

The truth is that the padding of Uncle Sam's pay roll for political purposes is an injustice, first of all, to these career employees. The workers have to do the work for the drones as well as for themselves. And the fact is that it is is the political favorites who wind up getting the well-paid "plums" and the sinecures.

The purpose of pushing the Federal pay roll so high is conspicuous. It is to permit the hiring of enough political workers to control elections. This in itself is outrageous. It is a stultification of the word "democracy" to permit a hired pay roll to defeat the will of the public at the voting booths.

From both financial and moral grounds, all hands in America ought to turn in to demand that Congress enact the Hoover recommendations—and thereafter force the President to live up to them.

Basing-Point System Absorbs Gasoline Tax—Dollars That Should Build Highways Pay for Phantom Freight—Basing-Point Bids on Cement to State Highway Departments Were Identical Before Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, shortly after the turn of the century the automobile added impetus and urgency to the program of highway building in the United States. The several States expanded their road construction and maintenance budgets to proportions never dreamed of in pre-automobile days. Aid was sought from the Federal Government and by progressive steps the Congress of the United States increased its appropriations in the interest of our expanding network of modern highways.

We all are familiar with the increasing rightful petitions of our compatriots to build more and more highways in the rural, as well as in the urban areas. Men and women with automobiles wanted to go places. Additional revenue was sought to satisfy this demand, and the legislatures of our several States concluded that a fair and equitable method of taxation would be a gallonage tax on gasoline. With the increasing use of motor vehicles in business, as well as for pleasure, the sums derived from the gasoline tax assumed proportions far beyond expectations. And, so our highways were built and are being built today.

CEMENT TRUST TAKES ITS TOLL

Cement then as now was of great importance in the construction of highways. All the while the automobile industry was expanding and developing, and new oil fields and refining techniques were being discovered to fill the unceasing demands for more and more petroleum products, the cement, steel, and other trusts were perfecting the basing-point system of pricing. Thus, on the one hand, our people were taxing themselves to build highways and bridges, and, on the other hand, the Cement Trust was figuring ways and means to take its unearned slice of the tax money in the form of phantom freight. To the Federal Government, to the State highway departments, to the general highway contractors, and to the subcontractors on highway work, the cement industry through the years offered noncompetitive identical bids on by far a majority of the highway projects built in the last several decades. There was no escaping the basing-point system until the Supreme Court upheld the findings of the Federal Trade Commission on April 26, 1948.

As an excellent example of the basing-point system of pricing, I include a table of bids on approximately 40,000 barrels of cement to the Virginia Department of Highways—Inquiry No. 6706, closing date June 17, 1947—for delivery during the period of July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948. The table follows:

[Prices quoted are for type II cement. Type III cement, plus 50 cents per barrel. Discounts, 10 cents]

County	Destination	Lawrence Portland Cement Corp., New York, N. Y.[1]	Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa.[2]	Lone Star Cement Corp., Norfolk, Va.[3 4]	North American Cement Corp., New York [5]	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.[5]	Universal Atlas Cement Co., Philadelphia, Pa.[5]	Whitehall Cement Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.[6]
Accomack	Makemie Park	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78				$2.78
	Tasley	2.78	2.78	2.78				2.78
Albemarle	Charlottesville		2.75	2.75			$2.75	
	Esmont	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
	Mechums River		2.75	2.75			2.75	
Alleghany	Covington		2.72	2.72			2.72	
	Clifton Forge		2.68	2.68				
Amelia	Amelia	2.86	2.86	2.86	$2.86		2.86	2.86
	Jetersville	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86		2.86	2.86
Amherst	Amherst	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	$2.86	2.86	2.86
	Lee Siding, Monroe	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	
Appomattox	Appomattox	2.91	2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	2.91
Arlington	Alexandria	2.63	2.63	2.63				
	Rosslyn	2.63	2.63	2.63				
Augusta	Staunton		2.68	2.68			2.68	
	Verona		2.68	2.68			2.68	
Bath	Hot Springs		2.79	2.79			2.79	
	Millboro		2.62	2.62				
Bedford	Bedford	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
	Moneta	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
Bland	Rocky Gap		2.91	2.91		2.91		
	Bastian		2.91	2.91		2.91		
Botetourt	Troutville	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	
Buchanan	Grundy		2.80	2.80		2.80	2.80	
Brunswick	Alberta	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
	Lawrenceville	2.86	2.86	2.86				
Buckingham	Dillwyn	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
Campbell	Lynchburg	2.83	2.83	2.83		2.83	2.83	
	Altavista	2.91	2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	2.91
Caroline	Milford	2.75	2.75	2.75			2.75	
Carroll	Galax	3.01	2.93	2.93		2.93		
Charles City	Roxbury	2.78	2.78	2.78				
Charlotte	Drakes Branch	2.90	2.90	2.90		2.90	2.90	2.90
	Keysville	2.90	2.90	2.90		2.90	2.90	2.90
Chesterfield	Highway	2.78	2.78	2.78				
Clarke	Boyce		2.57	2.57	2.57		2.57	
	Berryville		2.57	2.57	2.57		2.57	
Craig	New Castle		2.79	2.79			2.79	
Culpeper	Culpeper	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	
Dickenson	Fremont		2.78	2.78		2.78		
	Haysi		2.78	2.78		2.78		
Dinwiddie	DeWitt	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
	Petersburg	2.78	2.78	2.78				
Elizabeth City	Hampton		2.67	2.67				
Fairfax	Fairfax	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71		2.71	2.71
	Vienna	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78		2.78	
Fauquier	Warrenton	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	2.75
	Bealeton	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	2.75
Fluvanna	Palmyra	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
	Fork Union	2.82	2.82	2.82			2.82	2.82
Franklin	Rocky Mount	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
Frederick	Winchester		2.57	2.57	2.57		2.57	
	Gainesboro		2.68	2.68	2.68		2.68	
Giles	Pembroke		2.90	2.90		2.90	2.90	
	Pearisburg		2.87	2.87		2.87	2.87	
Goochland	State Farm	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
	Maidens	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
Grayson	Fries	3.01	2.93	2.93		2.93		
Greensville	Emporia		2.78	2.78				

Footnotes at end of table.

[Prices quoted are for type II cement. Type III cement, plus 50 cents per barrel. Discounts, 10 cents]

County	Destination	Lawrence Portland Cement Corp., New York, N. Y.[1]	Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa.[2]	Lone Star Cement Corp., Norfolk, Va.[3 4]	North American Cement Corp., New York [5]	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.[3]	Universal-Atlas Cement Co., Philadelphia, Pa.[3]	Whitehall Cement Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.[6]
Greene	Barboursville	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78			$2.78	
Halifax	Halifax	2.93	2.93	2.93		$2.93	2.93	
	South Boston	2.93	2.93	2.93		2.93	2.93	
Hanover	Ashland	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
	Hanover	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
Henrico	Richmond	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
	Fair Oaks	2.82	2.82	2.82				$2.82
Henry	Martinsville		2.94	2.94		2.94	2.94	
	Bassett		2.94	2.94		2.94	2.94	
Isle of Wight	Windsor		2.67	2.67				
James City	Williamsburg		2.71	2.71				
	Toano		2.74	2.74				
King William	West Point	2.86	2.86	2.86				2.86
	Lester Manor	2.86	2.86	2.86				2.86
Lee	Ben Hur		2.78	2.78		2.78		
	Dryden		2.74	2.74		2.74		
Loudoun	Leesburg	2.82	2.82	2.82	$2.82		2.82	2.82
	Purcellville	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82		2.82	2.82
Louisa	Louisa	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
	Mineral	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
Lunenburg	Victoria	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	
Mecklenburg	South Hill	2.86	2.86	2.86				
	Boydton	2.90	2.90	2.90		2.90		2.90
Montgomery	Radford		2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	
	Blacksburg		2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	
	Christiansburg	2.91	2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	
Nansemond	Suffolk		2.61	2.61				
Nelson	Afton		2.68	2.68			2.68	
New Kent	Providence Forge		2.74	2.74				
Norfolk	Norfolk		2.39	2.39				
	Portsmouth		2.39	2.39				
Northampton	Cape Charles		2.67	2.67				
Nottoway	Burkeville	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
	Blackstone	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	2.86
Orange	Orange	2.78	2.78	2.78			2.78	
Page	Luray	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68		2.68	
Pittsylvania	Danville	2.94	2.94	2.94		2.94	2.94	2.94
	Chatham	2.91	2.91	2.91		2.91	2.91	2.91
Powhatan	Dorset	2.82	2.82	2.82				2.82
Prince Edward	Farmville	2.86	2.86	2.86			2.86	
Prince George	Hopewell	2.78	2.78	2.78				
Princess Anne	Virginia Beach		2.50	2.50				
	Kempsville		2.55	2.55				
Prince William	Manassas	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71		2.71	2.71
	Occoquan	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71		2.71	2.71
Pulaski	Pulaski		2.90	2.90		2.90	2.90	
	Dublin		2.90	2.90		2.90	2.90	
Roanoke	Roanoke	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	
	Salem	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	
	Starkey	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
Rockbridge	Lexington		2.75	2.75			2.75	
	East Lexington		2.75	2.75			2.75	
Rockingham	Harrisonburg		2.68	2.68	2.68		2.68	
	Broadway		2.68	2.68	2.68		2.68	
Russell	Cleveland		2.74	2.74		2.74		
Scott	Gate City		2.57	2.57		2.57		
Shenandoah	Strasburg		2.61	2.61	2.61		2.61	
	Edinburg		2.64	2.64	2.64		2.64	
Smyth	Marion	3.01	2.78	2.78		2.78	2.78	
Southampton	Franklin		2.67	2.67				
	Drewryville		2.74	2.74				
Spotsylvania	Fredericksburg	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	2.75
	Dahlgren Junction	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	2.75
Stafford	Brooke	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75		2.75	2.75
Sussex	Waverly		2.74	2.74				
Tazewell	Tazewell		2.83	2.83		2.83		
	Burkes Garden		2.83	2.83		2.83		
Warren	Front Royal		2.61	2.61	2.61		2.61	
Warwick	Newport News		2.57	2.57				
	Lee Hall		2.67	2.67				
Washington	Abingdon		2.74	2.74		2.74		
	Bristol		2.71	2.71		2.71		
Wise	Norton		2.74	2.74		2.74		
Wythe	Wytheville		2.86	2.86		2.86		
	Jacksons Ferry		2.93	2.93		2.93	2.93	

[1] Types I and III only not guaranteed, subject to increase.
[2] Subject to increase, 15-cent maximum. Not guaranteed.
[3] No type III.
[4] 10,000 barrels only. Subject to increase not exceeding 15 cents.
[5] Subject to increase not more than 15 cents per barrel.
[6] Subject to increase not exceeding 15 cents per barrel, 10,000 barrels.

MORATORIUM SHOULD NOT BE PASSED

It will be noted that the bids are from 7 cement manufacturers to 134 destination points in 82 counties of the State of Virginia. Mark well the accuracy of the basing-point estimators in their secret hideaways. Only one man made a mistake, and he erred, not on the side of reducing the price but in three instances, for reasons of his own, he increased the price. This, unfortunately, is not news. Had he reduced the price below that of his noncompeting brethren, that indeed would have been news.

The basing point and monopoly boys continue to urge upon the Congress the passage of a moratorium; the excuse is that it will give Congress additional time to study the needs for substantive amendments to antitrust laws. The basing-point proponents claim they want the moratorium in good faith so as to feel free to use individual delivered-price systems and to absorb freight in free and open competition. Of course, they can do that now, and they know it as well as anybody. All such statements are in general terms and never get down to the factual background as to what they really want legalized. They do not say basing point, but that is what they mean.

SMALL BUSINESS RENDERED DEFENSELESS BY MORATORIUM

If Congress passes a moratorium bill, amended to the extent that its phrases sound innocent and virtuous, it will, nevertheless, be the opening document which will serve to arm monopoly and basing-point lawyers with arguments that will last for years. I sincerely hope, on the basis of the evidence patiently gathered by the able servants of the Government in its effort to protect the people from rapacious monopolistic practices by big business, that the moratorium bill will not pass. Small business has absolutely no chance to defend itself under the basing-point or similar systems. Small business can only survive in free and open competition with an equal opportunity to buy and sell in nondiscriminatory markets.

Basing Point Defeat in Cement Case—Anniversary of the People's Defeat of the Cement Trust—FTC Upheld in Rigid Steel Conduit Case Yesterday—Small Business Must Continue To Fight Mortatorium—Different Instead of Identical Bids After Basing Point Outlawed

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the victory of the people over the Cement Trust. One year ago today, April 26, 1948, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Cement case which outlawed the vicious and collusive basing-point system. One month later on May 25, 1948, the Cement Trust petitioned the Supreme Court for a rehearing. This petition was denied on June 7, 1948, thereby ending a long chapter of diligent effort by the Federal Trade Commission to eliminate unfair trade practices and the collusive basing-point pricing in the manufacture and sale of cement.

Small business all over our country has a right to celebrate this victorious battle against monopoly and greed. The winning of that battle, however, did not win the war against the Cement Trust because immediately the Congress became the focal point of attack. Monopoly was on the march again, sounding the battle cry of "moratorium."

RIGID STEEL CONDUIT CASE

Yesterday in a 4 to 4 decision the Supreme Court issued the following order

in the Rigid Steel Conduit Case: Docket No. 464 Clayton-Mark & Company versus F. T. C.—per curiam:

The judgment is affirmed by an equally divided court. Mr. Justice Jackson took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is thus affirmed and the order of the Federal Trade Commission is upheld. The powerful monopolies which have used the basing-point system as a creature to stifle competition and destroy free enterprise are again deprived of this most effective weapon.

The New York Journal of Commerce this morning states in part:

Vigorous competition is already a fact in many industries which use the basing-point system, and if freight absorption is banned, outright cuts in basic prices will be the only avenue through which individual companies will be able to book sufficient business to support their operations.

Later in the article the further statement is made:

If Congress approved the moratorium bill in its present form, it is expected that the steel and cement industries, which abandoned freight absorption a year ago, will resume that practice immediately.

What these statements really mean is that immediately upon the passage of a moratorium bill the cement, the steel, the rigid steel conduit, and all other industries heretofore using the basing-point system, will immediately initiate the practice again. It doesn't make much difference what the bill says if it becomes law, because the basing-point and monopoly boys will immediately tuck the basing-point ball under their arm and head for the goal line and dare anybody to try and catch them.

This morning's Wall Street Journal quotes Mr. Earnest T. Weir, chairman of the National Steel Corp., as saying:

It is apparent that the only possible remedy is action by Congress. The effect of this decision if allowed to stand unchanged will be so serious on the industry and trade of the country that Congress is confronted with necessity for prompt passage of clarifying legislation.

Thus, one of the proponents of the basing-point system grasps the opportunity to spread alarm among businessmen throughout the country. The principal issue is the renewal of the basing-point system of pricing which has served to concentrate the power of life and death to small business throughout the country in the hands of a favored few who, until the Cement decision, enjoyed immunity in carrying on the nefarious practice of charging phantom freight and the equally vicious practice of destroying competition through the use of the basing-point system.

Unfortunately, the phrases "delivered price" and "freight absorption" have become, by design of the moratorium proponents, phrases which many are persuaded to believe are synonymous with "basing-point system."

A delivered price, a real bona fide delivered price, has something added to the f. o. b. price, namely, the freight to destination, handling charges, and profit; or a delivered price guarantees delivery of an article in trade or commerce. Until the Federal Trade Commission action against the Cement Trust, all cement was quoted at destination prices, an entirely different matter than a delivered price. The destination price was charged on the invoice and the actual freight deducted in making payment of the bill for cement or other article bought under the basing-point system. In by far of the majority of cases, the buyer paid phantom freight and no actual freight was absorbed. The basing-point system used arbitrary base points so that the mill or factory net price was more often than not higher than the alleged or mean f. o. b. mill price.

Freight absorption is not an appropriate phrase to describe the acts that occur in the use of the basing-point system. As many times, or perhaps more times, that a factory or mill absorbs freight under the basing-point system, it adds that unearned increment phantom freight. True, freight absorption is the equalization of actual freight charges with one's competitors in a free and open market. There is no market free or none open under the basing-point system.

Time stands still as we watch small business enterprise slowly but surely succumb to the hard and rigorous hand of monopoly. The Supreme Court decisions in the Cement and Rigid Steel Conduit cases stays the hand of monopoly momentarily. Shall we, the Congress, stand firm on the side of antimonopoly and antiprice discrimination, or shall we too succumb to the rising tide of the concentration of power and pelf?

NON-BASING-POINT PRICES AFTER THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Today I have placed in the RECORD a table illustrative of basing-point prices submitted to the Virginia State Highway Department, prior to the Supreme Court decision. That table showed destination prices which were identical in all instances except three by one company which, for reasons of their own, increased its price a few cents to three destination points. In other instances this company quoted the same price as its alleged competitors.

In addition, I also offer for the benefit of my colleagues an interesting table of bids after the Cement decision on approximately 12,000 barrels of cement to the Virginia Department of Highways—inquiry No. 7320, closing date September 14, 1948—for delivery during the period of October 1, 1948, to March 31, 1949. The table follows:

[Prices quoted are for type II cement (approximately 12,000 barrels). Type III cement, plus 50 cents per barrel. Discounts, 10 cents]

County	Destination	Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa.[1]	Lone Star Cement Corp., Norfolk, Va.[2]	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.	
				Type II	Type III
Accomack	Makemie Park	$3.68	$3.41		
	Tasley	3.68	3.41		
Albemarle	Charlottesville	3.19	3.60	$3.73	$4.13
	Crozet	3.15	3.60	3.73	4.13
Alleghany	Covington	3.15	3.79	3.73	4.16
	Clifton Forge	3.11	3.79	3.69	4.16
	Iron Gate	3.11	3.79	3.69	4.16
Amelia	Amelia	3.45	3.53	3.73	4.16
	Jetersville	3.42	3.53	3.73	4.16
Amherst	Amherst	3.34	3.64	3.69	4.16
	Lee Siding, Monroe	3.34	3.60	3.61	4.16
Appomattox	Appomattox	3.38	3.60	3.69	4.20
Arlington	Alexandria	3.45	3.60	3.80	3.97
	Rosslyn	3.45	3.64	3.80	3.97
Augusta	Staunton	3.11	3.68	3.69	4.13
	Verona	3.11	3.68	3.73	4.13
Bath	Hot Springs	3.26	3.83	3.73	4.20
	Millboro	3.04	3.79	3.69	4.16
Bedford	Bedford	3.38	3.64	3.57	4.20
	Moneta	3.38	3.64	3.61	4.20
Bland	Rocky Gap	3.49	3.83		
	Bastian	3.49	3.83		
Botetourt	Troutville	3.34	3.68	3.54	4.20
Buchanan	Grundy	3.61	4.02	3.54	4.54
Brunswick	Alberta	3.49	3.49	3.73	4.16
	Lawrenceville	3.49	3.49	3.76	4.20
Buckingham	Dillwyn	3.38	3.60	3.76	4.16
Campbell	Lynchburg	3.34	3.60	3.61	4.16
	Evington	3.34	3.60	3.61	4.20
Caroline	Milford	$3.38	$3.53	$3.76	$4.09
Carroll	Galax	3.51	3.87	3.54	4.35
Charles City	Roxbury	3.45	3.41		
Charlotte	Drakes Branch	3.42	3.53	3.73	4.20
	Keysville	3.42	3.53	3.73	4.20
Chesterfield	Highway	2.45	3.41	3.76	4.13
Clarke	Boyce	3.34	3.79	3.76	4.01
	Berryville	3.38	3.79	3.76	3.97
Craig	New Castle	3.26	3.79	3.73	4.20
Culpeper	Culpeper	3.36	3.60	3.73	4.09
Dickenson	Fremont	3.61	4.02	3.38	4.47
	Haysi	3.61	4.02	3.38	4.47
Dinwiddie	DeWitt	3.45	3.49	3.76	4.16
	Petersburg	3.45	3.41	3.76	4.13
Elizabeth City	Hampton	3.53	3.26		
Fairfax	Fairfax	3.38	3.64	3.76	4.01
	Vienna	3.64	3.79	3.95	4.09
Fauquier	Warrenton	3.38	3.64	3.76	4.01
Fluvanna	Palmyra	3.34	3.60	3.73	4.13
	Fork Union	3.34	3.60	3.73	4.13
Franklin	Rocky Mount	3.38	3.79	3.61	4.24
Frederick	Winchester	3.34	3.83	3.84	3.97
	Gainesboro	3.49	3.91	4.09	4.13
Giles	Pembroke	3.45	3.79	3.50	4.32
	Pearisburg	3.45	3.83	3.50	4.32
Goochland	Maidens	3.38	3.49	3.76	4.16
Grayson	Fries	3.53	3.87	3.54	4.35
Greensville	Emporia	3.45	3.41		
Greene	Barboursville	3.26	3.60	3.73	4.09

Footnotes at end of table.

[Prices quoted are for type II cement (approximately 12,000 barrels). Type III cement, plus 50 cents per barrel. Discounts, 10 cents]

County	Destination	Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa.[1]	Lone Star Cement Corp., Norfolk, Va.[2]	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.	
				Type II	Type III
Halifax	Halifax	$3.45	$3.60	$3.69	$4.24
	South Boston	3.42	3.60	3.69	4.24
Hanover	Ashland	3.38	3.49	3.76	4.09
	Hanover	3.38	3.49	3.76	4.09
Henrico	Richmond	3.38	3.41	3.76	4.13
	Fair Oaks	3.45	3.49	3.76	4.13
Henry	Martinsville	3.42	3.68	3.61	4.32
	Bassett	3.45	3.68	3.61	4.32
Isle of Wight	Windsor	3.53	3.26	----------	----------
James City	Williamsburg	3.49	3.30	----------	----------
	Toano	3.45	3.34	----------	----------
King William	West Point	3.45	3.53	----------	----------
	Lester Manor	3.45	3.49	----------	----------
Lee	Pennington	3.61	4.02	3.43	4.54
	Ben Hur	3.68	4.06	3.38	4.54
	Dryden	3.61	4.02	3.31	4.54
Loudoun	Ashburn	3.64	3.83	3.99	4.13
	Leesburg	3.59	3.83	3.99	4.13
	Purcellville	3.64	3.83	3.99	4.13
Louisa	Louisa	3.34	3.53	3.73	4.13
	Mineral	3.34	3.53	3.76	4.13
Lunenburg	Victoria	3.45	3.49	3.73	4.20
Mecklenburg	South Hill	3.49	3.49	3.76	4.20
	Boydton	3.45	3.53	3.73	4.20
Montgomery	Radford	3.45	3.79	3.54	4.32
	Blacksburg	3.38	3.79	3.54	4.32
	Christiansburg	3.38	3.79	3.54	4.24
Nansemond	Suffolk	3.49	3.19	----------	----------
Nelson	Afton	3.11	3.64	3.69	4.13
New Kent	Providence Forge	3.45	3.34	----------	----------
Norfolk	Norfolk	3.49	[3] 2.73	----------	----------
	Portsmouth	3.49	[3] 2.73	----------	----------
Northampton	Cape Charles	3.64	3.26	----------	----------
Nottoway	Burkeville	3.45	3.53	3.73	4.16
	Blackstone	3.45	3.49	3.73	4.16
Orange	Orange	3.26	3.60	3.73	4.09
Page	Luray	3.26	3.79	3.76	4.01
Pittsylvania	Danville	3.45	3.64	3.69	4.24
	Chatham	3.38	3.64	3.69	4.20
Powhatan	Dorset	$3.45	$3.49	$3.73	$4.13
Prince Edward	Farmville	3.38	3.53	3.73	4.20
Prince George	Hopewell	3.45	3.41	3.76	4.13
Princess Anne	Virginia Beach	3.61	3.03	----------	----------
	Kempsville	3.61	3.11	----------	----------
Prince William	Manassas	3.38	3.68	3.76	4.01
	Occoquan	3.45	3.60	3.84	4.01
Pulaski	Pulaski	3.45	3.79	3.50	4.32
	Dublin	3.45	3.79	3.50	4.32
Roanoke	Roanoke	3.34	3.68	3.54	4.20
	Salem	3.38	3.68	3.54	4.20
	Starkey	3.38	3.68	3.54	4.20
Rockbridge	Lexington	3.19	3.68	3.61	4.16
	Vesuvius	3.19	3.68	3.61	4.13
Rockingham	Harrisonburg	3.15	3.68	3.73	4.09
	Broadway	3.19	3.68	3.73	4.09
Russell	Cleveland	3.57	3.91	3.34	4.43
Scott	Gate City	3.61	3.91	3.12	4.43
Shenandoah	Capon Roads	3.34	3.79	3.84	4.01
	Strasburg	3.34	3.79	3.76	4.01
	Edinburg	3.26	3.79	3.73	4.01
Smyth	Marion	3.53	3.87	3.38	4.35
Southampton	Franklin	3.49	3.26	----------	----------
	Drewryville	3.45	3.34	----------	----------
Spotsylvania	Fredericksburg	3.45	3.53	3.84	4.01
	Dahlgren Junction	3.45	3.53	3.84	4.01
Stafford	Brooke	3.45	3.53	3.84	4.01
Sussex	Waverly	3.49	3.34	----------	----------
Tazewell	Tazewell	3.49	3.87	3.50	4.39
	Burkes Garden	3.49	3.87	3.50	4.39
Warren	Front Royal	3.34	3.79	3.76	4.01
Warwick	Newport News	3.53	3.14	----------	----------
	Lee Hall	3.49	3.26	----------	----------
Washington	Abingdon	3.53	3.87	3.31	4.39
	Bristol	3.57	3.91	3.27	4.39
Wise	Norton	3.61	4.02	3.31	4.47
Wythe	Wytheville	3.45	3.83	3.46	4.35
	Jacksons Ferry	3.49	3.83	3.54	4.35

[1] 8,000 barrels only.

[2] No type III.

[3] Plus switching.

The bids shown above are from 4 cement manufacturers to 135 destination points in 82 counties in the State of Virginia. The destinations, with one addition, are the same as I have shown in the table elsewhere in the RECORD on bids prior to the Supreme Court decision.

BASING-POINT OPPONENTS SHOULD RENEW THEIR FIGHT AGAINST THE MORATORIUM

On this anniversary of the outlawing of the basing-point system, I have shown it is possible for highway departments to secure competitive bids. Previously, I have shown that it is possible for other governmental bodies to secure such bids. Under the basing-point system, as you well know, it was virtually impossible to secure bids which were other than identical to any given destination.

The battle cry of "moratorium" is shouted louder than ever this morning. All the more need now that the opponents of the basing-point system, who I believe are by far the majority of businessmen and consumers in our country, redouble their efforts to prevent the passage of the moratorium bill. I am sure the cement, steel, and rigid steel conduit trusts will exercise every effort, every argument, and every resource to obtain a legislative rack upon which to hang their smartly creased basing-point hats.

War Crimes Lawyer Finds Nazi Thinking Unaltered—Cites Personal Experience To Illustrate Problem of Getting Germans To Take Charitable, Democratic Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Bigelow Boysen, that appeared in the Sunday Star, April 24, 1949:

WAR CRIMES LAWYER FINDS NAZI THINKING UNALTERED—CITES PERSONAL EXPERIENCE TO ILLUSTRATE PROBLEM OF GETTING GERMANS TO TAKE CHARITABLE, DEMOCRATIC VIEWS

(The author, a lawyer, is just back from Germany, where he was assigned to defend 13 Nazi war criminals and prosecute 13 others. He and his wife traveled through the western zone looking for signs that the Germans have changed their way of thinking since the war.)

(By Bigelow Boysen)

Are there any Americans so gullible as to believe that the United States occupation of Germany has converted a single German Nazi into a peace-loving citizen? I hope not, because in spite of all the cigarettes and well-intended effort which symbolize our policy in Germany, a physical occupation which leaves moral regeneration out of the prescription has not yet and never will transform the state of mind called "German nationalism" into charitable, democratic thinking.

I searched the western zone for two solid years, looking for a converted, enlightened regenerated German and never found a single specimen whose transformation could be traced to our occupation of his country. Those few who have broken away from the mystic belief of German racial superiority, with the selfishness and ruthlessness which go with it, have invariably found their new freedom through the Bible. Only insofar as our occupation policies have guaranteed to the German people free use of their Bible and other religious activities, can we consider our presence in Germany to have been effectual in even these isolated cases.

HAS OCCUPATION FAILED?

Whether our occupation has been a waste of money and effort depends upon the point of view from which we regard its purpose. If that purpose was to restore Germany industrially for the relief of the American taxpayer and at the same time to hold Communist influence in western Europe to a minimum, then our occupation must be voted a success. But if our real purpose (and this must certainly have been the original purpose) was to seek out, uproot, and destroy

the evil seed of Germanism, which has regularly erupted through Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Hitler, in lust for world domination, then our occupation must be regarded as a total failure.

Here are three instances of present-day German thinking, which prove how helpless a purely physical occupation is to deal with the mental problem:

My wife and I once asked our German neighbor in Munich, who is a teacher of English in an interpreter's school there, why she had never in the 2 years we had known her, expressed a single word of regret for the known cruelties practiced by her armies, her Gestapo, and her SS organizations in the eastern territories which Germany overran after 1939. "Oh, those people (meaning the Slavic races) are uneducated people," was the quick and unconcerned reply. It reminded me of the German Minister of Interior's published statement of October 1943:

"What happens to a Russian, a Czech, does not interest me in the slightest. What the nations can offer in good blood of our type we will take. If necessary, by kidnapping their children and raising them here with us. Whether nations live in prosperity or starve to death interests me only insofar as we need them as slaves for our kultur, otherwise it is of no interest to me."

WIDOW'S ATTITUDE

Illustration No. 2 concerns a German widow. Her former husband was executed in October 1948, by the American occupation authorities. He had been the commander of Dachau concentration camp during the years 1941–43. I was called upon to defend him in the trial for his life as a war criminal before an American tribunal. His sentence to death, which followed after a trial based upon recognized judicial processes, was appealed and reappealed for 2 years, and even taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. But these lessons in democratic or American justice were wasted as far as this German woman was concerned. She still accuses us of having murdered her innocent husband. The day after he had been hanged she wrote to me as follows:

"DEAR MAJOR: Herewith I am sending you the last greetings of my husband from October 22, 1948, 0800 hours. * * * At 0800 hours he was convinced there wouldn't be any more chance. My husband said and wrote to me that he, as a sincere German, dies innocently. * * * On Thursday, October 21, 1948, between 2000 and 2100 hours, I said good-by to him. * * * No tears were shed; my husband was calm and prepared and I was courageous. The time of the execution was 1000 hours. I was sitting in the hotel with the watch in my hand and waited until my husband was murdered and had finished suffering. It is so easy to write and so hard to speak about it—to be in the position that one can't help one's dearest, but to be forced to wait until it is too late, then merely take care of all formalities—I think only those people that went through it can understand it. Two hours before the execution 800 men (convicted war criminals imprisoned in the war-crimes prison at Landsberg, Germany) sang the German national hymn."

CASE OF SELFISHNESS

That woman had lived with her husband for 4 years just outside the wall which surrounds concentration camp Dachau. Yet to this very day she is morally blind to her husband's guilt as commander of that camp for the crimes practiced by his subordinates during all those years, on the thousands of human beings who passed through the gates of Dachau and never came out. Perhaps those inmates were the racial inferiors of whom Himmler, her husband's superior officer in the German SS, had this to say:

"Whether 10,000 Russian females fall down from exhaustion while digging an antitank ditch interests me only insofar as the antitank ditch for Germany is finished. * * * We must realize that we have 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 foreigners in Germany. * * * They are none of them dangerous so long as we take severe measures at the merest trifles."

The third illustration involves a bright little German girl of 6, named Rose Marie, who was the daughter of a well-to-do farmer who lived across the pasture behind our house on the outskirts of Munich.

One evening my wife and I visited these neighbors and took along some chocolate for the child. Although the house was large, the entire family, including the big, friendly English sheepdog, was congregated as usual in the kitchen. The farmhands, parents, and all present watched with interest as the child grasped the chocolate. Her dog, Karo, drooled hopefully, expecting to be remembered by his playmate. But what happened? Instantly Rose Marie fled from the kitchen to her bedroom. We wondered why. But her mother knew why and told us with pride that her child had disappeared to hide her candy. Soon, Rose Marie returned, but refused to tell anyone where her candy was hidden. Her mother's plea for a little met stubborn refusal. Rose Marie gave us all to understand that no one would know where it was, and no one would ever share in it—not even the shaggy dog she loved to play with.

Shocked to find this child's nature so early tainted by selfishness and unwillingness to share with others, we turned to her mother for an explanation. "Isn't she clever?" was the answer.

WHAT TO DO?

In a very few years Rose Marie will be an adult German woman. If no one at school corrects this selfishness and refusal to share with others, it is very easy to see how the grown-up Rose Marie could some day listen with approval to a new German leader repeating the same words spoken by Herman Goering in 1939:

"God knows you are not sent out there (German-occupied countries) to work for the welfare of the people in your charge, but to get the utmost out of them, so that the German people can live. That is what I expect of your exertions. This everlasting concern about foreign people must cease now, once and for all. * * * It makes no difference to me in this connection if you say that your people will starve."

What's to be done about it?

First, let's all take a good look at the problem and recognize that a purely physical diagnosis for the recovery of Germany economically leaves the mental and moral causes of her disease untouched. Once we realize that our efforts should be directed mainly toward Germany's spiritual and moral regeneration, we will at least have the basis for a competent cure. Surely we could then decide upon the right way to instill in her a new concept of the brotherhood of all mankind. Without this concept, the shells and outside structures of democratic institutions, and all the foreign constitutions and bills of rights in the world, are worthless to the German people and deceptive to a hopeful world.

NEED DIVINE AID

Perhaps our first step to bring forth in Germany a respect for other nations should begin by obliging her youngsters to study the Bible. Legal refinements which have developed recently in the United States regarding constitutionality of compulsory Bible study in public schools may be proper for the people of America, born and bred as they are to think for themselves. But no such technicality at this early stage in the democratic reeducation of Germany should be permitted to stand in the way of transforming the great numbers of her militarist-minded people into progressively charitable citizens of the world. Certainly we need God's help to this end, and what better tool could we find to gain that help than the Luther Bible that was given to the world by Germany when her spiritual impulses made her great?

Judge of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Ill., Opposes H. R. 2892 on 14 Grounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, presiding over the Juvenile Court of Cook County in Illinois is the Honorable Robert Jerome Dunne, judge of the circuit court and distinguished son of one of the greatest governors in the history of Illinois, the Honorable Edward F. Dunne, in whose administration during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson it was my high privilege to serve as lieutenant governor. The outstanding public service of Judge Dunne and the national attention that has focused upon his accomplishments in the vitally important but difficult field of juvenile delinquency have won for him the admiration of all the people in Chicago in a measure comparable to that given in another generation to his great father.

Judge Dunne has written me a letter in which he states with much force the 14 grounds upon which he bases his opposition to H. R. 2892. Because of the standing of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, servicing the second city of America, and the wide experience and high character of Judge Dunne, I trust his letter will be widely read by my colleagues and receive their thoughtful attention.

The letter follows:

JUVENILE COURT OF COOK COUNTY,
Chicago, April 20, 1949.

Representative BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: As presiding judge of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Ill., I wish to express my objections to the proposed legislation introduced in the House of Representatives on February 21, 1949, by Mr. DOUGHTON, better known at the present writing as H. R. 2892:

1. The establishment of a single State agency to administer the State plan under the proposed legislation will either duplicate the work of the juvenile courts throughout the country or limit the sphere of their activities as hereinafter pointed out.

2. The establishment of such a State agency will place the Federal Government operating through the State agency in the position of a juvenile court in the removal of children from their own homes, and in the placement of them in temporary care homes, foster homes, and institutions, without a trial and without the usual safeguards which have become acceptable to the American way of life.

3. The establishment of a single State agency to promote the well-being of chil-

dren whether in their own homes or elsewhere, and to help them overcome problems resulting from parental neglect will put the Federal Government, acting through the State agency, into competition with the juvenile courts in the exercise of supervision over neglected and dependent children.

4. There are no sanctions provided in the proposed legislation whereby the State agency can compel the placement of any child in need of assistance in a temporary-care home, a foster home, or an institution, but it can deny assistance unless the placement of the children is accepted by the parents.

5. Under these circumstances, if the State agency denies assistance and refers the matter to the local juvenile court for a judicial determination of dependency and neglect, the judge of the juvenile court may uphold the parental right to the custody of the children, and the State agency could still refuse assistance because the terms of the decree are not acceptable to the State agency.

6. Since there will be a single agency within each community to administer the proposed act, a placement of a dependent child in a foster home by a juvenile court would prevent the court from obtaining direct assistance for the child from any other public agency (in Chicago, for example, from the Chicago Welfare Department) and the placement of the needy child, when approved by the court, would be at the mercy of the administrative board to grant assistance or withhold it. In this way the action of a judicial tribunal would be rendered nugatory by the refusal of the State agency to recognize the placement.

7. After a child has been removed from his own home by the beneficient action of the State agency there is no means provided in the proposed legislation by which a parent can obtain custody of the child so placed, without court action, and if court action is resorted to, State aid may be withdrawn.

8. The State agency in the placement of dependent and neglected needy children in temporary-care homes, foster homes, and institutions, will be competing with the local juvenile court and the private child-placing agencies to obtain the same available foster homes.

9. To the extent that the available foster homes are taken over by the Federal Government the operations of the private agencies will be impaired, and they may even be driven out of business, resulting not only in a shortage of institutions and foster homes locally, but resulting in a terrific loss to the Government in supporting these children who now, to a great extent, are being cared for by funds provided by private charities.

10. To the extent that the private foster homes are taken over by the Federal Government, the new social-welfare program will impede the work of the juvenile courts in caring for children whose parents, through unfitness, have neglected them, and this in turn will result in expensive delays, inimical to the welfare of the child.

11. If the Federal Government, acting through the State agency, cannot obtain sufficient homes to provide care under a greatly expanded program of child welfare, such as is called for under the proposed law, the States will be called upon to provide necessary care in State institutions, which will separate children from their parents by walls as well as by distance which, in my humble judgment, smacks of complete socialism and a communistic form of government.

12. Experience has proved beyond question, that professional social workers in their zeal are apt to seek an ideal placement of children without reference to parental unfitness. The proposed amendments will encourage this by allowing an administrative board to place needy children in foster homes without court action, and this, in my opinion, will tend to undermine the security of the home.

13. Too much emphasis is being placed upon taking children away from their parents by this sort of legislation, whereas emphasis should be upon safeguarding the security of the child in his own home except by court action.

14. Experience has proved that where parental responsibility for rearing a family is lifted from parents and placed on foster mothers, the incentive to maintain a home is weakened and the barriers staving off desertion, abandonment, immorality, and licentiousness are threatened.

I think the proposed legislation beyond doubt is opened to each and every one of the above criticisms, and if it is enacted into a law, the strongholds for the protection of children which have been developed over a period of 200 years, through the protection of the courts of chancery, will be destroyed.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT JEROME DUNNE,
Judge.

The American People Need the Facts About Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the widely respected Capital Times of Madison, Wis., brings to light some pertinent facts about the British national health service plan and offers some good advice to the American Medical Association and other opponents of the President's health program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD as follows:

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED THE FACTS ABOUT HEALTH INSURANCE

Not long ago the New York Times reported from London that one of the biggest problems with the compulsory health insurance system operating in Britain is that it is too successful.

Recently the conservative Associated Press carried a story from London in which it pointed out that Winston Churchill is on the skids as leader of the Conservative Party because of his uncompromising opposition to Labor Government reforms.

"Churchill's threat to seek a vote of censure against the Labor Government over soaring costs of the popular national health service was described by many as a blunder," the AP said.

Yet, the medical politicians in this country, who are fighting compulsory health insurance, would have us believe that the health service system of the British Labor Party has been foisted on the innocent and abused British people by a bunch of scheming bureaucrats.

The plain fact of the matter is that the present health service in Britain is immensely popular, as the AP says. Since 1945, when the Labor Government went into power, there have been 31 by-elections and the Conservative Party has been unable to win back one of them from the Labor Party. An important issue in all these elections has been the health service system.

The AMA would have us believe also that the doctors in Great Britain are opposed to the plan so intensely that they are boycotting it. The fact is that more than 90 percent of the doctors are in the plan.

Let's get down to cases on this question of health insurance. The AMA can do a great public service by presenting the facts about the weaknesses of the compulsory health insurance bill, a service they are not doing with their present campaign of bogey stories and misrepresentations.

The AMA should know from its experience in opposing voluntary health insurance plans in the past—plans which it has since accepted—that the American people are not going to be scared or kidded out of a program that provides adequate medical care.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution from the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the United States:

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN
CITIZENS OF GERMAN DESCENT IN THE
UNITED STATES, BRANCH NO. 4,
Buffalo, N. Y., April 23, 1949.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed you will find a copy of resolutions which were adopted by our Branch No. 4.

We urge you to read these carefully and do all you can to avoid any racial discrimination which would exclude all persons of German ethnic origin.

Expellees should be included in the displaced-persons bill.

Thanking you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. FOELL,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MEETINGS HELD BY BRANCH 11, BROOKLYN, N. Y., AND BY BRANCH 5, PHILADELPHIA, PA., OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GERMAN DESCENT IN THE U. S. A., INC., BROOKLYN, N. Y., FEBRUARY 17, 1949, AND PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 24, 1949

Whereas 6,000,000 Germans from East Prussia and east of the Oder-Neisse line, 3,000,000 from the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia, 700,000 from Rumania, 500,000 from Hungary, 600,000 from Yugoslavia, and 1,000,000 from prewar Poland have been totally robbed and forcibly and brutally expelled from their homes and homelands into shrunken Germany for no fault of theirs whatever; and

Whereas these expellees, millions of whom died of abuse and hardship during their expulsion and since, are the victims of policies made with the complicity of the Government of these United States in the Potsdam agreement of July 17, 1945, and are therefore, in part this country's charges; and

Whereas these victims of the Potsdam agreement were in a racially discriminatory manner heartlessly excluded from the assistance of UNNRA and of IRO; and

Whereas in so-called DP law 774, under section 12, the relatively small percentage of expellees of 27,000 annually were granted this

admissibility only at the quota expense to which German and Austrian nationals are legally and justly entitled; and

Whereas in a shameful discrimination against even this small number of admissible expellees, "not one expellee has been admitted to date to this country under section 12 of the present act," as reported by the Reverend William F. Kelly, director, Brooklyn Diocesan Resettlement Council; and

Whereas there are now being brought before Congress bills to amend the existing law, 774, some of which are calculated in a vicious racial discrimination to exclude all persons of German ethnic origin: Be it resolved;

1. That the provisions for persons of German ethnic origin so-called under section 12 of Act 774 be retained, and that the numbers now provided for be doubled and the period of time for which this section is effective be extended to June 30, 1952;

2. That expellees, that is, DP's of German ethnic origin, be admissible without regard to quota limitations, and in any case be not as heretofore forced from the regular German and Austrian quotas, which discriminatingly deprives nationals of those countries of their rightful quota;

3. That the discrimination in extending visas which resulted in the curious failure to admit a single person of German ethnic origin among the 3,400 DP's so far admitted be retroactively corrected;

4. That in future, visas issued be made available to each group and element in the proportion which such group or element bears to the total number of displaced persons and expellees; and

5. That in issuing visas in accordance with the quotas set for groups, as directed in sections 2 and 4 of this resolution, priority preference be given to the relatives of United States citizens among the expellees.

Ownership and Control of Lands Beneath Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal ownership and control of lands, fish, and other resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States

Whereas the State of South Carolina owns and possesses more than 1,000 square miles of land beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to the Federal powers over navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

Whereas State ownership of this property is a potential source of revenue for our State, the loss of which would be a great injury to the State and our people, for whom it is held in trust; and

Whereas after over 100 years of recognized State ownership without interference with the delegated Federal powers, certain Federal officials are now suing other States for similar property and advocating Federal seizure of the lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the senate concurring):

That the State of South Carolina favors continued State ownership and control, subject only to the delegated Federal powers, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end.

That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property.

That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of our delegation in Congress.

Uniformed Firemen's Association—Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, and the former Postmaster General of the United States, at the thirtieth anniversary rally of the Uniformed Firemen's Association of Greater New York, Madison Square Garden, March 30, 1949:

They tell the story about a politician whose telephone rang late one night to announce that the river was overflowing and flooding the area. Hurriedly, he dressed and ran out to join the rescue crews. Next morning, haggard and tired, he watched the debris floating downstream — household goods, chunks of lumber, small animals.

But one object caught the politician's attention. It was a straw hat. And instead of floating downstream like everything else, this hat would go downstream about 20 feet, then float upstream 20 feet, then down again, then up.

It was a mighty odd phenomenon, and finally the puzzled politician turned to a friend and asked:

"How is it that straw hat keeps going up and back, up and back, instead of floating downstream with the rest of the flotsam?"

"Oh, that?" answered the friend. "Why, that's Farmer Jeb. Last night he made up his mind he was going to mow his lawn today, come hell or high water."

That's what I like about the Uniformed Firemen's Association. Once they make up their minds to go after an objective they'll stick it through—come hell or high water.

They're good trade-union men, good civil servants, and good members of the community. And, so far as I can see, when they decide on an objective they don't overlook the public interest.

I've traveled widely through the world, and I've headed up a Government Department, the post office, which was manned by a uniformed force. I know a little about the problems which civil-service employees face.

And I want to go on record unequivocally, without any ifs or buts. Civil service and the merit system are essential ingredients of a democracy. A government that works well is one in which civil service occupies an important place, where merit and fitness rule the choice of the men and women who are paid out of the funds of the whole community. The people have a right to expect full service for their dollars. In return they have a responsibility to see to it that the security of the civil servant is not jeopardized. They have a responsibility to see to it that their essential services are manned not only by competent personnel, but in such a manner that one man doesn't have to do the work of two while getting paid for doing the work of one.

The people of this country, and of this State, and of this city, have a right to demand the best possible services. To get the best possible services they need the best possible employees. And to get the best possible employees, we—all the people—have a deep responsibility to provide, first, rates of pay and quality of working conditions that will attract such people; and, secondly, we must provide security.

I am somewhat familiar with the steps now being taken by your organization, and by others of a like character, for your future security and well-being. And speaking as a New Yorker who has great pride in the city and its people, I sincerely hope that your request will be given the strongest consideration by those charged with the responsibility.

The growing importance of the civil-service worker in the affairs of the city, the State, and the Nation, is a matter which should be more fully recognized. We like to speak of our Government as the best in the world, the most smoothly functioning. The reason our American Government is so well run, the reason why—if the future should bring us war we can rely completely on the unselfish efficiency of our public servants—that reason is precisely because of our civil service and its emphasis on merit and fitness. And among the outstanding exemplars of the merit system are the firemen of New York City.

Whenever I travel in the United States, when I hear two words, I know they refer to members of the police force. These two words are "the finest." And they refer not just to any police force, but specifically to the police of New York City. I would like to propose a synonym for New York City's firemen, a symbol by which they should be known everywhere and to everyone at all times. My suggestion is, ladies and gentlemen, that hereafter, whenever you think of New York's firemen, who protect the city with miraculous efficiency, and often—more often than the public knows—at the cost of their lives, we think of them as "The Valiant."

That's the term they used to apply to the knights of old, if you remember your King Arthur stories. It means brave, it means facing danger, it mean being heroic, and it means being gentlemen. The definition applies perfectly to the firemen of New York City. I nominate them as recipients of this new name—"The Valiant," and I hope all of you in the audience will from this day on publicize the word.

And to you, John Crane, president of the Uniformed Firemen's Association, please accept this symbol on behalf of myself as a sincere friend, and I am sure, I speak on behalf of all the citizens of this city.

Address by the President of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto the text of the address by the President of Israel, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, at a great reception tendered to him at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, on Saturday, April 23, in the name of the Weizmann Institute of Science at Rehoboth in Israel. In the course of his remarks, Dr. Weizmann pledged Israel to insure the safety of the holy places, the right of free access to them, and full security for religious institutions of all faiths in the exercise of their functions and "to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection."

The expression of views by Dr. Weizmann on this distinguished occasion, and the pledge of Israel's cooperation with respect to the holy places, of such profound interest to men of all faiths, should prove of interest to the members. There is also appended hereto an editorial of the New York Herald Tribune on this address appraising its importance, and approving its purport:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

I am deeply moved by the sight of this large and impressive gathering. I am conscious that in honoring me by your presence here tonight you pay tribute to the two causes which have commanded my devotion throughout my life—the cause of Israel's rise to independence and the cause of scientific progress and research. These two interests which I pursued so long in parallel but separate channels have now converged in the Institute of Science which has sponsored this occasion tonight. For at our laboratories and libraries at Rehoboth, in the gentle beauty of the coastal plain, we dedicate ourselves at once to the universal principles of science and to the special needs of Israel as a state confronted by urgent economic and social tasks.

Few events in the history of our generation have evoked a wider or more ardent sympathy amongst the peoples of the world than the emergence of Israel as an independent state after 2,000 years of homelessness. Surely, it is no ordinary episode. So many high issues are here involved. Here we have the gallant struggle of a people which lost 6,000,000 of its sons in the cause of the victorious United Nations against the Nazi tyranny; the establishment of democracy in an area where the ideals and institutions of democracy are little known; the revival of one of mankind's oldest cultures; the creation of a home of social and scientific progress in a region where desperate squalor and degradation prevail; a successful defense against aggression; the realization of an international judgment made by the United Nations 18 months ago; a great ingathering of exiles; the auspicious beginnings of Arab-Jewish peace—all this has happened in the one crowded year since I last left these shores for Israel. It is proper to feel humility at this great hour of Israel's fortunes. Yet I confess that is a humility not unmixed with pride. I am naturally conscious of much imperfection in Israel still; yet in the light of these splendid events the idea that my people's rightful claim to a modest equality in the family of nations is still a matter of doubt, appears to me unworthy of any serious or sincere mind.

Your excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is a source of special pleasure to me to celebrate this occasion in the United States. Israel will be eternally grateful for the wide support which it has received from the Government and people of this great country. On many crucial occasions this support has been expressed by the deeply human statesmanship of President Truman, who was the pioneer in the recognition of our state. It will be my privilege a few days hence to express my people's gratitude to the President in person.

I recall that in those fateful early days we were quick to receive the recognition and consistent support of the Soviet Union; ever since that time we have pursued—and will continue to pursue—a policy of friendship to all the nations, whether or not they diverge amongst themselves in other aspects of their policy. From the earliest days we were warmly supported by the states of eastern Europe, South America, and the British Dominions, whose distinguished representatives I am happy to greet this evening. In recent weeks Israel has been privileged to establish official relations with governments of western Europe, and the entire American continent, as well as making its first steps toward recognition in the continent of Asia. Above all other objectives my Government will cherish and pursue the goal of lasting peace between Israel and the Arab states.

I should like to say a special word of welcome to the representatives of the United Nations present here tonight, and especially to the eminent president of the General Assembly. Dr. Evatt has played a momentous role in all the processes which culminated in the birth of Israel within the shelter of the United Nations. The cause of international cooperation owes much to his high qualities of intellect and zeal, and I deeply appreciate his eloquent words tonight. The doctrine of universal peace entered the records of civilization as the inheritance of Israel's prophetic literature. It is the cornerstone of the Charter.

Recent events have also created an intimate relationship between the early days of Israel's independence and the most successful effort yet achieved by the United Nations in the solution of an international conflict by judgment, conciliation, and mediation. It is therefore a happy omen to have amongst us the Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, whose name is almost a synonym for the ideal of world peace. The confidence of world opinion in the practical value of skillful mediation has been greatly strengthened by the brilliant accomplishments of another of our guests this evening—Dr. Ralph Bunche.

It is noteworthy that the statement whereby the Government of Israel secured parliamentary confidence pledges our foreign policy to seek its expression through the procedures of the Charter. Despite its small size, Israel evokes moral and intellectual influence throughout the world which may well be deemed worthy of being harnessed to the general strength and prestige of the United Nations.

At this season it is natural for the world to turn its thoughts toward the Holy City of Jerusalem. Within a single year Jerusalem has been rescued from the condition of violence, anarchy, siege, and famine in which it was abandoned last year. Its people have passed through unforgettable sacrifices and ordeals. I have been deeply impressed with Jerusalem's recovery since that time. It is a special pride to record the part played by the Government and people of Israel in restoring the city's life and security, establishing a regular and effective administration, renewing its food and water supply and reviving the cultural and educational primacy befitting its tradition. This achievement, at the cost of many young and precious lives, deserves the applause of all devout and reverent men to whom the neglect and humiliation of Jerusalem last year must have been a deep reproach.

The Government and people of Israel are conscious of the international interest in the safety of the holy places and the right of free access to them. We pledge ourselves to ensure full security for religious institutions in the exercise of their functions; to grant the supervision of the holy places by those who hold them sacred; and to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection.

Just as we are resolved to give complete and practical expression to the universal interest arising from the holy places, so we expect that the international community will understand the direct and inescapable responsibility which Israel bears and exercises in the daily life and administration of Jewish Jerusalem. I am satisfied that no real incompatability exists between the interests and concerns of Christianity to which His Holiness the Pope has recently given eloquent expression, and the aspirations of the people of Jerusalem to assure their government and security in conformity with their national allegiance. If theirs is a genuine desire to reconcile these two interests, a harmonious solution can swiftly be secured with international consent.

Ladies and gentlemen, it should not be imagined that this record of advance in so many fields signifies that Israel's main tasks are over. Nothing has been more impressive in recent months than to observe the welcome flow of Jewish immigrants by their tens of thousands into our open ports. With their arrival a terrible chapter in human suffering is about to be closed. They come destitute, haunted by the terrible memories of martyrdom, very often still stunned and demoralized by the ordeals through which they have passed. To secure their transportation and absorption in productive work is an immense task, the successful completion of which depends entirely upon the outcome of the United Jewish Appeal, which merits the fervent support of American Jewry.

I cannot possibly exaggerate the importance of a successful campaign for the United Jewish Appeal this year. It is the one really decisive test of American Jewry's devotion to the cause of Israel and the Jewish people. No less than 23,000 of our people have come to our shores in the first 16 days of April alone. We receive them on the solemn assumption that American Jews will assist us in providing the resources without which the very generosity of our immigration policy will crush the economy of our state.

If Jews in this country are the partners in Israel's pride, let them share in its travails which it has endured not for Israel itself, but for the life and dignity of our people.

This great increase in our population compels us to give urgent attention to the conditions necessary for our people to maintain a dignified standard of life. In order to make up the disparity between the needs of our immigrants and the limited resources of our country, great schemes of industrial and agricultural development must be undertaken. These, together with the settlement and irrigation of the Negeb, can help a swift expansion to take place in Israel's economic opportunities. The Weizmann Institute is engaged in an investigation of the Negeb's potentialities. Our first conclusions indicate that both the Negeb's agricultural

possibilities and its industrial resources can be more hopefully evaluated than they used to be.

A country such as Israel can only develop industry based on the skill of its people and the application of the results of scientific research. The Institute of Science at Rehovoth has already played an honorable part in every crisis of our State. The processes worked out there have enabled good results to be obtained from advanced agricultural methods. When the country was at war the workshops and laboratories at Rehovoth were a potent aid in its defense. Now as we stand on the threshold of great industrial development, it is certain that only scientific research can reveal new possibilities for the manufacture of exportable goods.

While we shall not neglect the needs of pure science, I am especially conscious at this time of the urgent need for applied research, harnessed to a swiftly developing economy. Moreover, high standards of production, health and education in an Israel dominated by a scientific spirit cannot fail to have a deep effect upon the surrounding Arab world. We enter upon our task with a deep sense of regional responsibility, hoping that the Arab peoples will soon join us in the common pursuit of peace and welfare. The development of the Middle East holds out great hope for a common regional solution of problems of economic recovery, social stability, and refugee settlement. The problem of resettling refugees in conditions favorable to their free and peaceful life requires urgent attention by all the Governments concerned.

The glaring light of public attention is focussed upon the State of Israel. More is expected of it than is usually demanded of such small states born in the throes of adversity and crisis. The cultural traditions of our people encourage the world to expect a corresponding achievement by Israel in modern times. We cannot hope to surprise the world with any manifestations of material power, and Israel has no deeper longing than to turn its energies into the arts of peace. In this generation, as always before, Israel must make its mark through the achievements of its mind and spirit. I pray that the coming years of independence will be not unworthy of the first, and that Israel will remain forever faithful to its most universal and significant ideals.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1949]

PRESIDENT WEIZMANN ON JERUSALEM

President Chaim Weizmann, at the dinner given in his honor on Saturday, made clear Israel's position on the problem of Jerusalem, and also indicated that a harmonious solution can swiftly be secured with international consent.

Dr. Weizmann asked that the international community understand the direct and inescapable responsibility which Israel bears and exercises in the daily life and administration of Jewish Jerusalem. But he also pledged Israel to insure full security for religious institutions in the exercise of their functions; to grant the supervision of the holy places by those who hold them sacred; and to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection. This is less than the separate international administration for Jerusalem and its environs, which was projected in the original Palestine plan of the United Nations Assembly, and which was repeated in later directives. There are many who will regret that the UN was unable to establish this neutral control at the outset, and so avert the fighting which raged in Jerusalem, the siege and countersiege of the Holy City. However, the suggestion of Israel's President does offer the elements of a practical compromise.

Religious institutions would be left in the hands of their founders; the holy places in new and old Jersualem would be under the immediate control, in Dr. Weizmann's words, "of those who hold them sacred." And some form of UN commission, with headquarters in Jerusalem and a sufficient staff, could be made available to see that the rights of all religions were fully maintained. Doubtless, the task of carrying on this system, and coordinating it with Israeli and Arab secular administration of the divided city, would be delicate. But it is doubtful whether the complications would be much greater than those involved in full UN control of the Jerusalem area. In any case, good will and good sense could make the plan work, and no international arrangements are proof against the lack of these qualities.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been heard in recent months of the wonderful benefits which would accrue to our citizens through the passage of compulsory health and medical insurance. It seems that not all our people are so gullible as the administration would have us believe. A group of sensible, thoughtful citizens has presented to me a resolution expressing opposition to such a plan, and detailing the fallacies of a coumpulsory health program. I commend them for this presentation and insert the resolution in its entirety:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American workingman, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprises and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mothers' Group of the Torrington Council of Catholic Women does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Connecticut, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Dated this 18th day of April 1949.

HOPE H. CHIDESTER,
President.
MARGARET G. MCMAHON,
Secretary.

The Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 25, 1949:

THE JEWISH APPEAL

Every American friend of the young state of Israel, and all who are aware of what Europe's Jews have suffered, should feel impelled, both in mind and heart, to give the most generous support to this year's United Jewish Appeal. For the appeal—which will be formally launched on the local front tomorrow—is aimed at attaining objectives that are humanitarian in character and of great historical significance in terms of opening up a new era of peace and well-being in the Middle East.

As a Nation-wide undertaking carried out in behalf of the joint distribution committee, the United Palestine Appeal and the United Service for New Americans, the 10-year-old UJA seeks to raise a total of $250,000,000 in the weeks immediately ahead. This sum, though the biggest to date in the UJA's history, is described as the irreducible minimum needed to make the most of the challenging opportunity to establish Israel on a firm footing in 1949 and to put an end to the last tragic phases of the sufferings of the Jews in Europe.

Translated into human terms, the UJA's success will make possible many splendid accomplishments. For one thing, it will mean that Europe's Jewish displaced-persons camps will be emptied before the end of the year and that new homes will be found for the 100,000 still languishing there. It will mean, too, that the Israeli Government in 1949 will have the wherewithal to cope with an influx of over 200,000 immigrant Jews. Further, wholly apart from its bearing on Israel, it will mean such things as much-needed help for Jewish communities in western Europe, measures to improve the deteriorating position of 1,000,000 Jews in North Africa, and aid for thousands of refugees expected to come to the United States under a revised DP law.

All this represents only a sketchy summation of the program to be carried out with the funds sought by the United Jewish Appeal. On grounds both of traditional humanitarianism and enlightened self-interest, the Nation has every reason to respond generously to the UJA.

Resolution Protesting Imprisonment of Hungarian Prelates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously joined with the people of my district in the protest against the infamous treatment of Hungarian church leaders by the Hungarian Government. The protests of the people of Wisconsin are further voiced in a resolution passed by the State assembly, which I desire to include in the RECORD. I cannot reemphasize strongly enough the complete travesty of justice suffered by all Christendom at the hands of the ruthless, godless forces in control of that unfortunate country. The resolution follows:

Resolution requesting the President and Secretary of State to protest the imprisonment of Hungarian prelates

Whereas the Hungarian Government has unjustly arrested and imprisoned His Eminence, Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of Hungary, Hungarian Lutheran Bishop Lajor Ordass, and the leaders and officers of other Christian denominations; and

Whereas the arrest and imprisonment of these intrepid champions of human rights and freedoms is a bold and brutal challenge to all Christendom and to all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas any and all attacks on freedom of conscience and worship wherever made should be resisted by all peoples of all faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this assembly register with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, its strong protest against the unjust arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, Bishop Ordass, and all those who are being persecuted for their religious convictions and belief in Hungary, to the end that representations be made to the Hungarian Government for their immediate release and the full restoration of their civil and religious rights; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, Secretary of State, both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

A Friendly Analysis of the Columbia River Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, there are now four major proposals before the Congress of the United States aimed at the problem of better coordination of the planning, construction, and operation of the Government's—and the people's—multi-billion-dollar stake in the Columbia River region. For all practical purposes, only three of these need be considered, since the original bill for a Columbia Valley Authority, although introduced on the opening day of this Congress by Representative HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, has been abandoned. However, since so much discussion has centered around the original Authority bill—and since it is the pattern from which all the modifications have been cut—I think it should be included in this analysis, so that the others will fit into a proper perspective.

The Columbia Valley Authority bill is identical with the proposal originally sponsored by Congressman—then Senator—HUGH MITCHELL in 1945 and later sponsored in the Eightieth Congress by Senator TAYLOR, of Idaho. It was patterned very much after the set-up of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its contents, I think, are quite well known.

The second proposal is my own bill for a Columbia Interstate Commission, which I have developed after an independent study of the problem dating over many years. In it, I have sought to accomplish the same general purposes as the CVA bills but to provide by law a much greater degree of local control over policies governing the development of the Columbia River.

The third suggestion is the Truman administration's new bill for a Columbia Valley Administration, which was drafted by several Government departments at the President's request this year and introduced by Congressmen MITCHELL and JACKSON in the House and by Senators CAIN and MAGNUSON and 17 others in the Senate. I want to stress right here that the new administration bill is a very much milder proposal than the original C. V. A. bills and does not go nearly as far as the advocates of a Pacific Northwest superstate would have liked.

Finally, there is the Joint Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation plan, which is based on the separately devised studies of these two Government construction agencies, and which was announced by General Pick and Secretary of the Interior Krug on April 11. Basically, it would adopt the compromises between the Army's 308 report and the Interior Department's long-range program announced in February 1947. All projects would be planned, built and operated by the present agencies, with the necessary coordination provided by the existing Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee. This has been called—in some quarters—a States' rights plan—but it actually gives the States no more authority or participation in Columbia River development than the administration bill. It gives the States much less real control over development policies than my C. I. C. bill does.

It is the declared intention of each of these four proposals to clarify the policies and coordinate the procedures according to which the resources—chiefly the water resources—of the Columbia River region shall be developed. The differences lie in the means to be taken toward the same end and in the point of view of the persons proposing those means. They all recognize in common that—up to now—we have a hodgepodge of governmental activities, competing against each other, subject to confusion and misdirection, resulting in prolonged delay of needed activities and overlapping administration of others.

Tonight I want to discuss just the basic organizations proposed in these four plans and the general policies according to which development would be carried out under each of them. Next week, I will go more deeply into the specific provisions relating to State water rights, irrigation, fisheries, taxes, the provisions relating to employees of the agencies to be set up, and so forth.

The original Authority bill would have set up a strong Government corporation, empowered to undertake almost any activity its three-man board of directors decided was in the best interests of the region. Although individual projects would have to be approved by Congress, there was no provision whatever for local control or participation in planning or operation of the Authority. It would have swallowed up the Bureau of Reclamation, Army Engineers, Bonneville Power Administration and most of the activities in the Pacific Northwest of the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Soil Conservation Service and several other agencies. It had broad powers of condemnation of existing utility systems, of privately owned land, and even State properties. It was not subject to the national reclamation laws, the flood-control laws, civil-service regulations, national labor relations laws, or even the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. While it paid lip service to the subjects of States' rights and fair treatment of its employees, the Authority could not legally have been made to carry out those provisions if its politically appointed bosses decided to do otherwise.

In drafting the new administration bill, many of the criticisms of the original Authority proposal were heeded and the Government has sought to mollify CVA critics with a number of important changes. However, there still are basic defects which, I am sure, will have to be rectified before Congress will accept even this modified version. Among the major improvements over the old CVA, it would require that two of the three directors be residents of the area, although the people of the region would have no part in selecting them. It provides for an indefinite number of advisory bodies, to offer local assistance on different types of activities, but gives those bodies no specific form, composition or authority. In other words, the directors could either take their advice or ignore it. It provides for public hearings and a much-improved budgetary procedure, and makes provisions for payments to State and local governments for tax losses. Instead of junking all previous plans for development, which the old CVA would have done, it provides for carrying on without delay all presently approved projects, with additional plans to be made on an annual basis. This is one of the many provisions of my CIC bill which have been incorporated, in one form or another, into the administration proposals. A very radical difference from

the original CVA is that the administration bill requires the Corporation to carry out its major construction activities through the existing agencies, such as the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. It would take over the Bonneville Power Administration and the operation of other completed projects in the area—again copying the provisions of my bill and one of the CIC's chief distinctions from the original Authority proposal. I shall discuss this provision at greater length next week. Finally, for the first time, the administration bill accepts my requirement that any new agency must make adequate provision for existing resources, such as our great fishing industry, which previously have been given no protection except in my Columbia Interstate Commission bill.

The provisions of the new CVA bill relating to distribution of electric power also have been greatly modified, although it still is a strong public power bill. No longer would the CVA have authority to condemn and take over private power systems. But it would be able to purchase such systems by negotiation for resale to a public agency, such as an REA cooperative, or a public utility district, or a municipal power agency. This provision could, of course, be used as a squeeze play to force private power companies into a position where they had no other choice but to sell out. In contrast, my CIC bill specifically prohibits the Federal corporation from going into the local distributing business, although it does provide the main transmission lines from Government plants to make power available to any cooperative, public utility district, or other agency that wants it at a fair price. There is another provision which my bill may have forced into the administration proposal—that is a clarification of the priority to be given to rural and home consumers in the sale of power. Under the present Bonneville Power Act and the earlier authority bills, statements have been included which say that priority was being given to family consumers. In the actual operation, however, the public-preference priority has too often been exercised to provide power for new industries, while hundreds of farmers are still waiting for power. I changed the wording of my bill so that this priority could be exercised only for actual home and farm use. Now, I see, the administration bill has followed suit.

So these, in general outline, are the principal features of the four basic proposals for Columbia River development now lying before Congress. They have been referred to the Public Works Committees of the House and of the Senate, but no indication has been given as to when—if at all—hearings will be held on them. If the subject is taken up at all, it is probable that all four will be considered jointly, so that the committees and the Congress—and the public—can have the benefit of full discussion of the merits and disadvantages of each. Then the committee probably would write an entire new bill, incorporating the most acceptable provisions of these four different approaches in the hope of devising a program actually tailored to the peculiar problems and needs of the Pacific Northwest.

Next week I will discuss a number of the specific provisions of these bills, outlining some of the things that I believe are essential in any proposal which would be satisfactory to our people. For, in my opinion, no such legislation should be enacted which does not take fully into account the desires and hopes and rights of the people who live in the region served by the workhorse of the Northwest, the Columbia River.

Fooling the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared recently in the Coatesville (Pa.) Record. This editorial points out that the President and his satellites did not hesitate to digress from the facts in their program of garnering the farm vote. I believe it also important to call attention to the outstanding service being performed by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS in setting the public right concerning misrepresentations which were made by the President's aides during the recent campaign. The editorial follows:

FOOLING THE PUBLIC

According to Ray Tucker, in his article on this page the other day concerning Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, even candidates for the Presidency of the United States do not hesitate to stoop to wrong information in their search for votes in an election.

Mr. Tucker points out that when the President, in his campaign, informed farmers that the Eightieth Congress had sold them down the river through refusal to provide increased grain capacity storage, he was giving them information which was absolutely false. But the farmers swallowed it, and some of the farm States which are normally Republican cast their electoral votes for Harry Truman.

Not so long ago we discussed this question with a "gentleman farmer." He is president of an insurance company, but had a large farm which he operates, not as a plaything, but for a profit. He said that when President Truman was running for the Presidency, he attended meetings of farmers in his home State of Indiana, and all the farmers were "sold" on the idea that Mr. Truman was honest in his appeals to the farmers, and that he could do something to keep farm prices high. This gentleman pointed out to the other farmers that Truman had also promised the housewives to bring food prices down to a fair level, but they laughed that one off and the district went for Truman.

"I attended one of the meetings of these same farmers early this year," said this insurance president-farmer, "and they were down in the dumps. The bottom had fallen out of the prices of many of their crops. I could have said, 'I told you so,' but I refrained. But some of them told me following the meeting that I was right and they had been wrong."

But the big mistake in the campaign last fall was made by the Republicans, who failed to take advantage of the propaganda put out by Truman. It was known to the Republican candidate and his followers, because former Banking and Currency Chairman Jesse Wolcott, of Michigan, had sent a 20-page report to Governor Dewey.

For some reason known only to the high Republican command, this report was not used. The GOP candidate might have pointed out that while the Trumanites were declaring there was a shortage of grain capacity storage it was due to the Truman policy of preventing the shipment of grain to places where there was plenty of storage. He could have made it clear that the Government itself was selling portable grain bins, available to anybody who wished them, and he could have charged that both the President and his Secretary of Agriculture were deliberately double-crossing the farmers.

The vice-presidential candidate, Harold Stassen, should have known that the information being given out at Washington was incorrect. After all, he knew that in his own State there was grain storage capacity available at the time Washington was blaming the Eightieth Congress for a shortage.

But there is nothing funnier or more complicated than politics. Dewey and his cohorts may have failed to grasp the significance of the situation, or they may have had the idea that it was wrong to use it. Stassen, possibly, in view of his 1952 aspirations, may have felt that Dewey's defeat would not be such a big disappointment.

But the whole story is a disgrace.

One loses confidence in political campaigns after discovering that even the President of the United States does not hesitate to give out wrong information in his campaign for votes.

Father Junipero Serra, Missionary and Teacher Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege and pleasure to participate in brief exercises on Sunday, April 24, 1949, in Statuary Hall, the purpose of which exercises was to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the departure of Father Junipero Serra from Spain to America. This man did a remarkable work during his own lifetime in the new and romantic country known as California. As is the case with all great men, his shadow extended far beyond his own lifetime. His attitude and spirit in laying down his life in an effort to teach and Christianize the Indians is having a great influence on people today. A large program is under way in California to restore the 21 missions which were built as the result of the efforts and program of Father Serra. The life of this great padre is an inspiration to many people and especially to many priests of the Catholic Church.

With us at these ceremonies were Rev. Fr. Virgil Cordano, O. F. M., and Franciscan friars from Holy Name College of Washington, D. C., and others from various Catholic orders. Father Cordano happens to be from my congressional district and I wish I could claim

him as a constituent, but he now resides in Santa Barbara.

Father Cordano delivered a very inspiring and informative address. It was my honor and pleasure to represent the California Society of Washington and in that capacity to make a short speech concerning Father Junipero Serra, and to place a wreath at the base of the statue of Father Serra in Statuary Hall.

Junipero Serra is one of the representatives of California in Statuary Hall. The people of California can well be proud of this representative in the Hall of Fame. His life was a true reflection of the real Christian spirit whose cardinal principles are the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God. In our complex civilization of today that spirit is more needed than ever before. Freedom, security, and opportunity can best flower in a civilization motivated by Christian principles. By living the true Christian life, people of the world can become men of good will and strife, turmoil, jealousy, and violence be banished from the earth. This is what Junipero Serra desired and what we need and want today.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the addresses delivered by Father Cordano and myself:

ADDRESS OF HON. LEROY JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA

It is appropriate that we today, in this historic Chamber, honor the memory of Father Junipero Serra. Two hundred years ago he left Spain for that great western empire known as America. Why did he go to this great unknown continent which was then practically a limitless wilderness? It was not to get rich which frequently is the motive of pioneers and adventurers. It was not to make explorations for geographic or scientific purposes. He went to teach and Christianize the Indians of America. We should always bear that in mind when we think of this great character. He wanted merely to increase the intelligence, knowledge, morals of the Indians, and above all, to make them familiar with the Christian religion. He wanted to develop the personality of every individual and to dignify his existence as an image of God. That is the special and important significance of the pilgrimage of Father Serra.

The physical evidence of his work is found in the 21 missions that were built in California; nine under his specific supervision.

Two hundred years have passed since Father Serra made his eventful and uncertain journey. His personal efforts produced some good results. But have we in the intervening two centuries progressed along the lines of the endeavors of Father Serra? As to our own Nation we can give a weak affirmative answer. We undoubtedly have built a civilization that dignifies the individual, gives him more personal freedom, a better standard of living and more equitable distribution of the Nation's wealth. But as a country we also have failed to furnish the leadership that would make world peace more likely. The world as a whole seems to me to have made little progress in a spiritual way during these two centuries. An interminable number of wars, including two within our time, have been fought. War is merely legalized murder and certainly Christianity or an enlightened world opinion would not condone murder. The Christian spirit has not been very prevalent in the conduct of the foreign offices of the civilized countries of the world.

Today we are menaced by the threat of a philosophy that does not recognize nor believe in a God; that bases its conduct and program on a purely materialistic philosophy and that also believes it to be its mission to bend every nation and group to its way of thinking and living. If this cannot be done by peaceful persuasion or penetration then it must and will be done by force.

If we could get the people and the countries of the world back on the pathway of Father Serra, our hope and aspiration for peace might be realized. The peoples of the world want peace, above all else. But roadblocks are placed in the pathway to peace by designing dictators and would-be agents of the people. If we could only get representative government throughout the world, we would have no wars. If the foreign offices of the various countries throughout the world would practice Christian principles in their dealings with their neighbors in the family of nations we would have no war.

We cannot win the peace by armaments alone. They may be necessary in this transition period but in the long run we must have good will and mutual confidence among the family of nations to make peace permanent. This is nothing more than practical Christianity in Government. If there has been 200 years of Father Serra's efforts in every Nation of the world, we would not today be worrying about war nor would we be suffering from its aftermath. If we teach and preach and thus make men more intelligent, tolerant and religious this may reflect itself in the conducts of governments. Then the beginning of lasting peace will be here. Then indeed can Father Serra's dream of a peaceful and Christian America be translated into a peaceful and Christian world.

For these and other reasons I consider it a distinct honor and a deep pleasure to place this wreath at the foot of the Statue of Father Junipero Serra, on behalf of the California Delegation in Congress and of the California State Society of Washington.

ADDRESS OF REV. FR. VIRGIL CORDANO, O. F. M., OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Padre Junipero Serra is admired and extolled today as a spirited colonizer, an untiring builder of missions, and the bearer of culture and civilization to our Western States. He was all this and as such he is an inspiration to many today.

But to me and others who go about in the same brown robe, white cord, and open sandals as did this gallant apostle of California, Padre Junipero Serra is above all a man of God, a priest, and a Franciscan friar. In the name of his successors along the Pacific coast and all in the United States who belong to the same Franciscan family and labor in our 48 States, I wish to add a word of praise for one who is an inspiration to us in our work of instilling the love of God and our fellow man in the citizens of these United States. We do not claim to be discoverers of new lands and tireless builders of material structures, but we have united ourselves with Padre Serra in bringing God to men and men to God, the soul of true culture and civilization. With Serra we know that a civilization without religion is like the house of the Gospel which was built upon sand. The rain fell and the floods came and the winds blew and beat against that house and it fell, utterly ruined.

Rather, Serra was like the wise man of the Gospel who knew that if his house were to stand it had to be built upon rock. Spanish soldiers came to our shores to extend the frontiers of the native land, but Serra left the comforts of home, his fame as a preacher and renown as professor to extend the Kingdom of God, the rock that would support the frontiers of his nation.

The civil ruler brought the Spanish flag to our shores; Serra carried the Christian cross, believing that if he planted the cross on our land the flag would ever wave over it.

If he raised up a material building it was to point heavenwards to the stars; when he tramped the dusty trail called the "El Camino Real" (The King's Highway) it was to bring men the knowledge that there was another royal road to be traveled to a far country above; while the governor claimed the land for Spain, Serra claimed its inhabitants for Heaven.

His was the fortune of having lived long enough to see nearly 6,000 Indians converted from paganism to Christianity, from barbarism to civilization. He himself personally supervised the construction of 9 missions, confirmed over 5,000 of his people, and walked over 13,000 miles in search of souls in need of God. Besides raising up 9 of the 21 missions that remind the traveler of today of a glorious past he reared up structures not built with hands, for while the Indians worked and rested with him, conversed and prayed with him, they were unconsciously clearing away from their hearts the thicket of superstition, the bitter weeds of hatred and revenge and filling their hearts with the love of their Creator and their fellow man.

At the present time California is commemorating the centennial of the discovery of gold and its rapid rise to statehood. Many names will be held in high honor and gigantic deeds will be retold. But we must sing the praises of this valiant man of God, Padre Junipero Serra. One of the reasons why Spain sent colonizers up the coast of California was the fear she had of the downward march of the Russians from the north. If it were not for the undaunted spirit of Serra, California must have been left to be absorbed by the enemy creeping down from the north. There is a lesson in this for us today. To insure our civilization we must build fortresses, not only material edifices but spiritual edifices; we too must implant the cross of Christ in the hearts of the irreligious of our Nation. Serra brought the saving cross to our shores and holds it aloft in our Capitol, for in it is salvation for the individual and our beloved Nation. If it is planted in our midst the flag of the red, white, and blue will ever wave over this land of the free.

Lincoln, Martyred Friend of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observation of the anniversary of the untimely assassination of Abraham Lincoln, on April 14, 1865, at the Ford Theater here in Washington, Mrs. Doyle and I attended and heard a remarkable lecture by Dr. Robert L. Kincaid, president of the Lincoln University, and I felt certain that the following address by this distinguished educator and resident of what is commonly termed the South of our beloved Nation, would be of interest and inspiration to all.

The life and service of Abraham Lincoln has long been my guide in the history of America, and it is again my pleasure to be presently serving as president of the Abraham Lincoln Club, in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. Recently, when the Abraham Lincoln Club, of Washington, did the honor of electing me as one of its board of directors, I again renewed my decision to, in every

way possible, perpetuate the worthiness and righteousness of this citizen of the ages, therefore, I am pleased to share the text of the address which I heard, with you:

LINCOLN, MARTYRED FRIEND OF THE SOUTH

We meet today where an event occurred which shall never be forgotten in the annals of mankind. We are at the place where the life of a great national leader was extinguished. Mortality ended for Abraham Lincoln April 15, 1865, and an immortality began which has been an inspiring influence for all freedom-loving people. By this meeting today we bridge the long span of years between this memorable past event and the living present. The great personality of long ago who set humanity farther along the road toward the attainment of universally desired goals is still alive and pleading the cause for which he sacrificed his mortal body.

To those of us who are not privileged to visit this sacred memorial often, the presence and inspiration of Abraham Lincoln is especially near today. Our thoughts easily conjure up the dramatic circumstances of that tragic hour 84 years ago when one of the world's greatest leaders passed into eternity. But it is not so much that event which is recalled at this moment, as it is the great deathless heart which beat in unison with the hopes of all free people and encompassed the ideals and principles which have made this country the greatest and most powerful force in the world. Here in this moment we can see in majestic perspective the towering figure of a lonely man still walking among us and still speaking for peace, understanding and good will; still inspiring and leading us confidently ahead in a confused and turbulent period of history. Truly we may say such leaders as Abraham Lincoln never die.

As a southerner and a descendant of a Confederate soldier and as the present head of an institution which is a living memorial to Lincoln in the heart of the South, I can speak of the universality of the Great Emancipator. For more than 30 years I have lived in close association with the spirit of Lincoln, and intangibly but positively the lessons of his life have become a part of my inheritance as they have in the lives of many thousands of others who have found the opportunity for broader and richer living at Lincoln Memorial University.

Through such institutions at the one with which I am associated and through the innumerable Lincoln shrines as this which our Nation preserved, we can translate Lincoln's life and memory into the lives and consciousness of all our people. In that way, we can build a stronger, more dynamic America. If we can live thus, close to the great leaders of America and try to preserve the principles of freedom and democracy which they won for us at so great a sacrifice, our Nation cannot swing far from its orbit and all peoples everywhere can look upon America as a fixed and guiding star in the firmament of the world.

As we turn to a contemplation of the tragic event which occurred at this place 84 years ago, it is easy to recall the shadow of sorrow and distress which spread over our torn and bleeding country. Although we were then still divided and fighting among ourselves, the assassination of Lincoln ran through the North and South like a great blighting disaster. There was weeping and sorrow in millions of homes throughout the land, and even in the rebellious sections of the South there was something of the same feeling of horror.

I have had occasion in recent years to make a study of the place Lincoln holds in the South. We know that there were great segments of the southern region which were dominantly Union in sentiment and that even throughout the areas where there was the greatest suffering because of the war, extreme hatred of Lincoln did not exist except in isolated cases. During the war the southern leaders played up the horrors of the war and attributed to Lincoln, as the national leader, much of the suffering which came to the South. On the other hand, calm reflection on the part of all the southern people made them admit that Lincoln's policies could scarcely have done otherwise. When the news of his assassination swept throughout the South, any feeling of hatred which the southern people may have previously possessed gave way to distress and fear of the reprisals which might follow.

I have been interested in the general reaction of the southern press and leaders in the South immediately following the assassination. While ministers throughout the North were holding memorial services deploring the dastardly act of John Wilkes Booth and declaiming upon the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, similar services taking a different form were held in many churches throughout the South. I believe that the views of Dr. J. Lansing Burrows, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., were somewhat typical of those held by leading ministers throughout the South. On Sunday, April 23, 1865, Dr. Burrows devoted his entire sermon to the assassination of Lincoln. Although he presented the usual viewpoint of the South toward the Civil War, he saw in Lincoln's assassination an omen of great evil. Said he, "If the deed was a calamity to the North, it was a more harmful calamity to the South. * * * We have even more reason to mourn over the murder than the people of the North. Its tendencies are to inflict a deeper injury upon us than even upon them." On the following Sunday, June 1, 1865, which had been appointed by President Johnson as a day of humiliation and mourning, Dr. Burrows observed the day in his pulpit quite appropriately, and had this to say: "We have no feelings but those of horror and indignation and grief in contemplating this deed of infamy. * * * Whatever may have been our views of the political doctrines and policy [Lincoln] represented, we have but one voice and one heart, of profound and abhorrent condemnation of the brutal criminality of those, whoever they may be, who are directly or remotely implicated in the atrocious deed. And this I am glad to know, for the honor of humanity and Christianity, is the universal voice of the people of this city and State."

I give you these quotations from Dr. Burrows because the examination of other sermons preached in southern pulpits indicates that he was reflecting the attitude of most of the southern people toward the tragic passing of the President.

Let me also give you the tribute of one northern soldier temporarily located in Knoxville, Tenn. This soldier, John S. McGraw, of the Indiana Volunteers, was in a Knoxville hospital on April 16, 1865, when the news of the assassination was received in that southern community. Knoxville was about evenly divided in sentiment during the war, but east Tennessee was predominantly Union in sentiment. Mr. McGraw, in writing to his wife, stated that the assassination had struck with dismay the people of this community. He said, "Everyone that I have seen looked downcast and sorrowful. I have never seen anything cause such a general gloom over the people as this. Everyone seems to be horror stricken at the perpetration of the deed and filled with the baneful spirit of revenge at the cowardly and dastardly act. Everyone seems to feel as our country has lost her best friend and greatest man, and I think myself that in the history of this country Abraham Lincoln will be ranked among the best and greatest. His death is a sad blow to our unhappy country at this time when everything is unsettled. My eyes have been filled with tears several times today as I sat in my room and heard the gun booming at regular intervals of half an hour through the day."

Typical also was the feeling in Louisville, Ky., another southern city where sentiment was divided. Memorial services were held at many places in the city. Prominent among those who took the leadership in these tributes to Lincoln was Joshua Fry Speed, Lincoln's most intimate friend. The entire Speed family had remained loyal during the war, but they were southern in background and sentiment. They represented the attitude of thousands of families throughout the South who loved their native land but deplored the circumstances which brought about war.

A few years ago I found in the archives of the courthouse in Knox County, Ky., near the Tennessee border, an account of a memorial service held in Barbourville, April 17, 1865, which reflected the great sorrow of the people in that section. In this isolated mountain community a single telegraph wire, used for military purposes, brought the news of the assassination of Lincoln. Court was in session on Monday morning. Hundreds of people from the surrounding communities had gathered for the trials which were in progress. Immediately upon the receipt of the news court was adjourned, and a court attendant went outside and announced to the assembled throng that a meeting in the courthouse would be immediately held for an important announcement to be made. The little county courthouse was packed and jammed with people. A young attorney, David H. Lytle, took the rostrum and made an address to the crowd which in the passing of years has proved to be prophetic in its summation of the life and character of Abraham Lincoln. Since it is not long, I would like to quote in full that brief address from a native Kentuckian who was a true patriot and lover of his country:

"Fellow citizens of Knox County, I appear before you this morning to make to you in a formal manner the awful announcement that the President of the United States has been assassinated, and that his lifeless remains now lie pale in death—not at the base of a statue but in the Capitol of a people determined to maintain their national life and the integrity of the Union—not muffled in a cloak, but wrapped in the flag of his country.

"Who could have thought that at a moment when a morning so bright had just dawned and the hopes of the patriot beat so high that a night of such melancholy gloom would overspread our national sky? Brutus showed his solicitude by stabbing his friend. Rebellion has showed its folly by shooting Abraham Lincoln, whose heart was throbbing with anxiety for the moment to arrive when he could safely astonish the world by his clemency, and guild the southern sky with an unfading bow of hope.

"Unfortunately the American people did not know the goodness of Abraham Lincoln before his election to the Presidency, and they have only learned it as it has beamed forth amidst the fiery ordeal through which he has been called to pass. If it had been known that he would make good the immortal declaration of the second father of his country, "The Union must and shall be preserved," and that he with glad heart, where he could safely do so [could] rejoice the family circle by returning the rebel son, causing the father and mother to exclaim, 'This, our son, was dead and is alive, was lost and is found,' and that he could conduct the American Nation from the bondage of civil war to the heights and overlook the promised land of peace and union, his pathway to Washington city would have been strewn with flowers instead of daggers, and the Nation would have been saved from this

calamity and disgrace, and your little city this day instead of being covered with the weeds of mourning and woe would have been lighted with the bonfires of rejoicing.

"But, fellow citizens, as he has conducted us through the Red Sea and has left us on the mount, we must give his successor a cheerful and hearty support, and he will conduct us safely to the promised land of union, liberty, and law."

We cannot say that this simple and eloquent tribute to Lincoln from the heart of the Kentucky hills was truly representative of the feeling in the entire South. That was most certainly not true. But I quote the humble Kentucky lawyer to show how Abraham Lincoln in four short years had become the idol of the common people in many southern sections who loved liberty and the Federal Union. These hill people in southeastern Kentucky had scarcely heard of Lincoln when he was nominated for the Presidency. That Lincoln was of their own kind, had come up the hard way, and spoke their language, was soon evident after he was installed as President. At first Lincoln was accepted by these Kentuckians because he was the titular head of the country they loved. But as the trying days of the war wore on, more and more Lincoln won the affection and finally the undying devotion of these hardy individualists of the southern hills. Now that his death had come in the very hour of triumph, they were shocked and horrified, and their sorrow was great indeed. Abraham Lincoln to them on this gray Monday morning after the tragedy, had become the martyred savior of their torn and troubled world.

Historians for nearly a century now have been writing about the Civil War and its blighting consequences upon our country. Long since have we had a full recapitulation of causes and effects of this tragic era of our national life. There is nothing more to be said, nothing more to be written in tribute to the brave men who gave their lives in a useless conflict. We have built our monuments to the heroic dead of our North and our South. We tell and retell their exploits, merging into one united whole the story of their struggle. Victor and vanquished alike take their place side by side in our universal tribute, and the tragedy of the sixties is now softened and sweetened by the mingled tears of united countrymen.

But as we come to this place where occurred the last act in that awful drama of the Civil War, we think of another phase of the tragedy which most people were slow to understand at the time. If the South could only have understood that Lincoln did not hate, did not desire war, did not wish to destroy the South's traditions and institutions, even the cursed institution of slavery, and that his sole desire was to preserve a strong union of free and independent States, the course of history would have been different. Indeed to me the great tragedy of the sixties was the failure of the South to accept Lincoln as their friend and their President.

Lincoln came to the Presidency virtually unknown in the South. He was accepted as the titular head of a party which the South believed was pledged to destroy it economically and politically. But Lincoln himself was not pledged to do that. He stood upon certain inflexible principles which could not be compromised, but none of those principles would have weakened the South in any particular. For Lincoln there could be no extension of slavery, there could be no withdrawal from the Union of States which had adopted as their charter of liberty, the Constitution of the United States. But beyond that, Lincoln was willing and anxious to work out the internal problems of the South within the framework of the Constitution.

It has often been stated that the South had no greater friend than Lincoln. The verdict of history now attests that. But passions, bitterness, and narrow sectionalism prevented that acceptance in those dark days. Lincoln was of the common people. His forebears had lived long enough in Virginia and Kentucky to gain the flavor of the South. He himself grew up in the atmosphere of freedom and independence which the frontier nurtured with lavish abundance. Combine that southern heritage of Lincoln with the stalwart ruggedness of the western frontier and you have the leader who came into power at a time of supreme crisis. Wise, tolerant, understanding, sympathetic with all groups, and intensely devoted to the ideals of the founding fathers, he represented all sections of the country with objective consideration of what was good for the whole.

Perhaps it was inevitable that this comparatively unknown national leader could not turn back the forces which for generations had been rising toward the irrepressible conflict. Perhaps in our national life some fundamental issues had to be settled in war, rather than by peaceful methods. If only the South could have taken Lincoln as their leader, rather than rejecting his earnest efforts to appease and compromise on the basis of his convictions which history has proved to be right and just, we could have avoided the awful holocaust which set our Nation back for half a century.

But there is no need to speculate upon this eventuality. It is rather for our people to turn from what might have been to what was and is, and to take from the story of our glorious Nation the lessons we need to make a part of our life and philosophy. We need no longer think of any of our national leaders as sectional or partisan. They belong to all our people, and their lives and contributions make up the magnificent record of our Nation.

All of us have our own particular heroes. We love our country in proportion to our respect and veneration for the men and women who built our Nation. I suppose that is a natural, human attribute. We read our history, we thrill over the exploits of our heroes, and we come to love and respect our country's institutions and privileges because of the labor and sacrifices of those who have gone before.

For me, a southerner, there are many national heroes whom I cherish. Strangely, perhaps, I have upon the walls of my study, side by side, the pictures of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee. To my friends in the North that may be hard to explain. But it is easy for me to reconcile that apparent incongruity.

My regard for Robert E. Lee is not because he was a vanquished leader of a lost cause who should have led his armies to victory. It is rather that he was a great patriot who possessed noble attributes of character and greatness. No one can read the story of his life without drawing from it an abiding inspiration. No one can deny that he was activated by unselfish patriotic motives when he faced the supreme decision which turned the course of his life. We may regret his decision, but we cannot say we would have done otherwise had we been in his place.

My acceptance of Abraham Lincoln came later in life. Admiration of southern personalities and traditions did not prevent me from turning to the study of Lincoln with genuine enthusiasm. It was Sandburg's Prairie Years which brought to me the revelation of Lincoln's expanding greatness. In the last two decades, Lincoln has become a growing, living personality whose life and ideals I would cherish as a guide and inspiration for all peoples of all the world. Charles Evans Hughes once said that a course in the study of Abraham Lincoln should be given in every college in America, that no young man or young woman could make the study of Lincoln a part of his heritage without being a better American. If what Hughes said is true, surely the many millions who revere the memory of Lincoln are better citizens.

So today, at this shrine, we come together as representatives of all sections, all groups, and all classes, that we may more sensibly feel the immortal spirit of Abraham Lincoln. He speaks to us in his deathless messages of hope, peace, and understanding. He lives for us in indestructible glory. He challenges us in this era of world stress and ideological conflicts. Upon his ideals and principles we have built a strong Nation of a free and democratic people, and we can be stronger still if we do not depart from the sure course which he charted in the long ago.

Out of Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

OUT OF TUNE

As a singer, Paul Robeson, Negro baritone, is more than good and never—they say—gets off the key. Which can scarcely be said for his speech this week before the Communist-inspired "World Peace Congress" in Paris. His people, he declared, would not fight for America but would "fight for friendship with Russia, the Eastern democracies and a free China."

Naturally, Cincinnati Negroes challenge Robeson's right to speak for them and others of their race in this country. To their statements we add a word: The so-called Eastern democracies, notably Russia itself, are all slave states. There are 35 Negro colleges in America sustained by their own people and by private benevolence. There are no such colleges for any race—white, yellow or black—in Russia. Our Negro population of 14,000,000 has 70,000 of its sons and daughters in college, not nearly enough, and yet greater in proportion than in Russia's 194,000,000. The daily wages of Negro war workers in the Wright plant at Lockland were more than the weekly wages of Russians.

The American Negro, Dr. Ralph Bunche, as UN mediator in Palestine, was associated with Count Folke Bernadotte of the Swedish royal house, succeeded him when Bernadotte was assassinated, and himself wrought peace between Jew and Arab. No such honor was ever paid by Russia to a member of any of its racial minorities, and what Russian of any race has made a comparable achievement?

Wealth? "We are determined," says Robeson, "to share this wealth," built, he continued, by the labor of Negroes and immigrants. Well, all of us would like a little more, and Communists, of course, would like to "seize it" from somebody else. However, one statistic is in point. So far as the possession of automobiles is a measure of individual well-being, and it may be as good a yardstick as any other, these are the facts: The 14,000,000 American Negroes own more automobiles than the 194,000,000 Russians, plus all the Negroes in Africa living under European control.

Meanwhile, as counterpoint to Singer Robeson's Paris dithyrambs, the annual campaign in this country, to raise $1,400,000, to meet the needs of 31 Negro colleges associated in the United Negro college fund, proceeds apace. Although he had other thoughts, our guess is that Robeson has helped it.

Successes and Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Walter Lippmann that appeared recently in the Detroit Free Press:

SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—Mr. Acheson, as he takes stock and looks ahead to what is coming, might well feel, it seems to me, like a trustee who finds that the main investments are showing a nice profit but that there are a lot of sick cats and dogs in the portfolio.

He can have every reason to be confident that the great decision to redress the balance of power is successful: That a shooting war brought on by outright military aggression has been made impossible, by the measures which began with the dispatch of the fleet to the Mediterranean, were reinforced by American rearmament, and are now culminating in the Atlantic Pact.

He can feel no less confident that the funds invested in European recovery are achieving their main purpose: That Great Britain and France are recovering and will, therefore, be able to play their necessary part in the poltical and economic reconstruction of the Western World.

But when Mr. Acheson turns from these large and promising achievements, and looks at Germany, Japan, China, Greece, Iran and Korea, the picture is not so pretty.

All the public-relations officers and all the visitors, who have had the VIP treatment, are unable to cover the fact that in these places things have gone or are going badly. They are the headaches of United States foreign policy.

Looking at the successes of our foreign policy, which are very great, and then at the failures, which are unpleasant and dangerous and costly but not fatal, can we not say that the difference between them is just about what we might have expected?

POOR IMPERIALISTS

This country is a great power separated from Europe and Asia by the oceans, and never until the past few years involved closely and directly in the affairs of Europe and Asia.

When we participate, remembering the distance and aware of our unfamiliarity with the complex details—when we approach the old world as guarantors against aggression, as sponsors of recovery and reconstruction—we do well.

We are doing what we are able to do, what we know how to do, what geography and history and a true estimate of our interests, fit and permit us to do.

We are true to the distinctively American relationship to the Old World. We are in character. And though our power and our responsibilities are greater than they have ever been, they are a development, and not a break with, the American tradition.

But when we go into Germany, Japan, Greece and set out to govern, to administer, to play politics, we are in a realm which is alien to our experience, to our habits and our ideals, and to our instincts.

We have tried to persuade ourselves that we can rule over alien peoples, and that we can reform them and educate them, and make them over in the image of ourselves. But we do not really believe it, or honestly think that we or anyone else can do it.

For we are not an imperial people who feel it their mission to rule over other peoples, and when we have to act as if we were, we make a hash of it—thank heaven.

AN UNAPPETIZING JOB

Even the ablest and the best men among us could almost certainly not succeed. But the ablest and best will not stay in Germany and Japan and Korea and Greece.

A few of them have tried it. They go with high purposes, they stay for a while, and then come home and take a long hot bath, feeling that if that sort of thing has to be done, they do not want to do it.

So there are left to do these jobs the soldiers who are ordered out there, and civilians who could never dream of having comparable power, responsibility, or privileges at home.

Need we, then, be astounded when gradually the truth seeps out, as at last it is beginning to, that we have not created a new democratic Germany and Japan in which the people love us, admire us, and wish to imitate us?

As the truth becomes more generally known, is recognized, and is not obscured by propaganda, the relations of this country to the Old World will improve.

For then we shall be able to distinguish the enduring policy of participation in the maintenance of peace and in the reconstruction and development of the earth—from the passing entanglements of military government, intervention, and of a bastard imperialism.

Illinois Is Proud of Her Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was my privilege to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph praising the fine record of Illinois' senior Senator, the Honorable SCOTT W. LUCAS.

Today I have the added pleasure of calling to the attention of the House membership through an editorial which I will insert in the RECORD the already amazing record made by Illinois' junior Senator, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS.

Illinois is justly proud of her two United States Senators.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, of Friday, April 22, 1949, commenting on the record of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. It follows:

EXPERIENCED FRESHMAN SENATOR

All within the space of a week:

Thomas Stokes, Pulitzer prize-winning Washington correspondent, wrote in the New York World-Telegram of the excellent reception accorded Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, when he addressed the Senate on the subject of civil rights.

Washington Columnist Jay Franklin reported the stir created by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, when they suggested that all members of the United Nations be invited to join the Atlantic alliance.

The Associated Press distributed a Washington dispatch recounting how Senator PAUL DOUGLAS made effective use of charts, photographs, statistics and cold logic in a plea for a Federal long-range housing bill.

Thus the junior Senator from Illinois attracted attention with his knowledge of, and interest in civil rights, housing, and foreign affairs. PAUL DOUGLAS is the junior Senator from Illinois, but in the Senate he is a freshman who registered in January—a first semester freshman.

Ordinary new members of the Senate are content to watch and listen for a while before joining in debate. Their elders account that proper, respectful behavior for a newcomer.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS is a newcomer to the Senate but he has been interested in, and familiar with public affairs for a quarter century. As a college professor, as a member of the Chicago city council, and as a lecturer and political candidate, he kept himself informed and spoke his mind. He has come to the Senate admirably equipped for public service. There is no occasion for him to mark time when his talents are needed.

Spiritual Vitality of the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered as guest speaker at the annual commemorative services for the martyrs of the 1916 Easter week massacre in Ireland at the Clan-Na-Gael of Greater Boston, Banquet Hall, New England Mutual Building, Boston, Mass., on Easter Sunday night, April 17, 1949:

Mr. President, Mr. Toastmaster, our reverend guest, Bishop Wright, members of the Clan-Na-Gael, and to all whose hearts beat in sympathy with the passionate yearning for independence under God, which is the mark of Irishmen everywhere, we meet on a night which crowns that great Christian festival of Easter. It is by no small coincidence that the Irish are, at the same time, a deeply religious people, and a proud, individualistic people. Famed for his humor, his generosity, and the openness of his heart, the Irishman understands that he cannot help his fellow man if he himself is in chains. Where others of lesser faith surrender to despair and despotism he fights on. In this, there is a lesson for men and women all over the world whose present plight seems to offer no hope of liberation.

Let them look to the Irish, who are human beings like themselves, and who for hundreds of years suffered from oppression without yielding their sovereign rights as men.

The clay gods of the Kremlin must be puzzled as they look at this small country which confounds all their formulas for subjecting people to slavery. This small country where, for every brutality of the oppressor, the will to overthrow tyranny grew stronger. Here was the heart of family life and family virtues which material power could not destroy. The Irish reared their children with spiritual strength and sent them forth to all corners of the globe, and wherever they landed you found them in the forefront of

those who work and sacrifice and win in freedom's name.

The Communists believe that the life of any individual is determined by heredity and environment exclusively. In return for back-breaking work, they give a minimum of food, shelter, clothing, and strictly supervised recreation. Under them, a man lives and dies in absolute service to the self-appointed gods of the state without a mind, a spirit, a conscience of his own. He becomes a mechanical thing without free will, and without that opportunity for inner development that leads to an awareness of divinity and of the happiness he can earn in the eternal kingdom of God when he has completed life's journey.

To the Communist, worship of the state, for the brief span of any life, is the only meaning of existence.

And they dare to call this paradise!

If any evidence were required to prove the genius of the Irishman, it is here in his singular determination to have nothing to do with such nonsense.

For he has the gift of imagination, and that extra perception that reveals to him a wealth of human and spiritual values in the unfolding experience that we call life.

He believes in the fellowship of progress, working and growing side by side with other men, but he is first to fight against slavery in any form.

His is the social justice of Christianity, warmed by faith and hope and charity, leading to the true development of a human family beholden only to the fatherhood of God.

It was this abiding belief in the dignity of the individual, nourished by the teachings of the Son of God that has sustained the race in its long and succeeding efforts to attain freedom.

This is the mark of its spiritual courage, which we revere and in which we rejoice.

In times of great stress, men and women of exceptional character are developed. These few and their sacrifices become symbols of the vast but unexpressed yearnings of the many. Deep within the heart of the average man are goals which he longs for but can never realize. This has been the experience of Irishmen as individuals for centuries. Their minds were tortured by the unhappy lot of their homeland. Although they sent money and gifts to their relatives in the old country, neither were satisfied with this holding operation. The Irishman is a man and not a machine. In keeping with his God-given dignity he needs freedom as much as he needs food and clothing and shelter. He must exist, in order that he may live, but the latter is always the earthly goal toward which he strives.

From the lips of our forefathers we have heard the story, passed on from generation to generation, of the famines which ravaged the land. Those were hard and bitter times, and it is not easy to forget the oppressors who were responsible for the sufferings inflicted upon the people.

For years on end they endured the ache of hunger, and many were the young who died in their infancy. In spite of this ordeal, the race survived, sending its youth to other lands where they thrived on the opportunities which were granted to them and of which they made the most.

Those who remained in Ireland to face a dreary and hopeless future did not give up the fight. Famished and poverty-stricken as they were, they did not bend the knee to the alien conqueror and his unremitting oppression.

The finest testimonial to the undying spiritual vitality of the Irish people is that, through this long agony, they never surrendered their claims for freedom. And what was the unifying faith which sustained them? Constant devotion to the teachings of Christ, as brought to them by Patrick their patron saint; this was the flame of truth which lighted the way through the darkness and which all the material power in the world could not extinguish.

There were many times when you and I felt so helpless about the situation. There was little that we could do to rid Ireland of the chains which enslaved her. Perhaps it was we who needed encouragement. It was not enough to mourn for Ireland. Positive action was necessary to show to England and the world that the initiative for freedom had not lessened in its ardor and in its capacity for sacrifice.

As an outlet for our frustration and as an inspiring example of the indomitable human spirit, it was necessary for some men to stand forth and do the things we wanted done but could not do ourselves. We vaguely recalled other instances in history. There was the small band of ancient Greeks at Thermopylae. And the beleaguered Texans at the Alamo. And many others where the few did count the cost but resisted to the end, and in so doing won a moral victory which gave heart to all freemen. Although the few, against great odds, are defeated, their faith and their courage sets in motion a rallying tide of effort in emulation of their sublime example. We are stirred from our complacency. We wish to measure up, as fellow human beings, to the high resolve they have demonstrated with their lives.

And so it was in that memorable Easter week of 1916 in Ireland. Shortly after noon on Easter Monday, the Irish Republic was proclaimed at the base of Nelson's Pillar in Dublin. It began with these words:

"Irishmen and Irishwomen: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom."

The proclamation asserts the inalienable right of the Irish to nationhood and details the fact that in every generation her sons and daughters have given voice to that right. Six times within the 300 years preceding they had fought and bled for their freedom only to be crushed by overwhelming power. It concludes with these ringing words: "We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonor it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valor and discipline and by the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called."

This was signed by such men as Clarke, McDermott, McDonagh, Pearse, Kent, Connolly, and Plunkett, who but a short time later were to become martyrs to the Irish cause and whose names would become enshrined forever in Irish hearts.

The revolt was foredoomed to failure partly because the British intercepted a vessel bringing 20,000 rifles, together with a million rounds of ammunition, and partly because some objected to a revolution at the time, faced as it was with inevitable defeat.

Perhaps these few hundred men and women thought that their gallant sacrifice would stir the imagination of the world, which it did, and enlist such public sympathy for their cause that British policy in the end would capitulate to the moral fervor which outlasts the physical defeats of the moment.

They did not turn back.

Although their bodies might forfeit the precious gift of life, their spirits would endure and would someday be vindicated by a free and united Ireland.

One thousand men in Dublin against 20,000 British supported by artillery, with British reinforcements moving up steadily. This was the picture after the insurgents seized the post office and other strategic points by surprise.

The center of the city was raked by artillery and machine-gun fire while noncombatants huddled in tenements or offices, pinned down by the fierce street fighting. Fires broke out and many were the victims of flames as well as bullets.

Finally, the surrounded insurgents ran out of ammunition. On Saturday, the week-old rebellion came to an end with an order to surrender signed by Padraic Pearse reading and I quote: "In order to prevent further slaughter of unarmed people and in the hope of saving the lives of our followers, now surrounded and hopelessly outnumbered, members of the Provisional Government at present at headquarters have agreed to unconditional surrender, and the commanders of all units of the Republican forces will order their followers to lay down their arms."

The battle of Dublin was over, but in many ways, this only marked the beginning of the tragedy. For the Government, heedless of the best opinion in England, inaugurated a program of ruthless reprisals. Field general courts martial were set up. They were brief, rarely lasting over a quarter of an hour. Sixteen leaders were summarily executed, one of whom, James Connelly, wounded in the fighting, was propped in a chair and shot. Three months later, Sir Roger Casement was hanged in London.

Although there were many in Ireland who disapproved of the rebellion, the events which followed, changed their minds. Houses were wrecked without warrant, men and women were shot down in cold blood by nervous English soldiers, and hundreds were thrown into jail who had never participated in the uprising.

This terrorism stirred up righteous resentment among all the people, uniting them in their determination to throw off this alien yoke once and for all.

The Easter martyrs had not died in vain. "Never slacken," became the watchword.

Employing every stratagem of resistance, the Irish balked the occupation government at every turn. After World War I was over, they tackled the job in earnest. This time, having learned from bitter experience, they organized. Underground activities became professional in scope and effectiveness. In time they made conditions so expensive and uncomfortable for the British, aided in no small measure by the mounting pressure of world opinion, that Britain compromised. Eire came into being with self-government, but still tied to the British by tenuous strings which the Irish will break forever within a few short hours.

The six northern counties of Ulster remain unnaturally separated from the heartland. I maintain that this is a fictitious situation supported by those who wish to keep Ireland divided. But they shall not prevail. All the world knows that Ireland truly means the whole island and not any subdivision thereof. As long as Ulster remains apart, the sovereignty of the Emerald Isle stands unredeemed.

I am proud to be a member of that group in the Congress of the United States whose ancestors came from Ireland. We have not forgotten our splendid heritage, nor the sense of fair play which animates all Americans.

I have introduced a resolution calling upon Congress to establish a committee which will work with Britain to correct this age-old infringement on Ireland's sovereignty and return that, which by unassailable right, belongs to her.

We look forward to that day in the near future when the old country, whole and com-

plete, will take her honored place as a member of the family of nations.

The Clan-Na-Gael of Greater Boston, one of the most loyal and vigorous of those groups who have contributed so much to the cause of Irish freedom, meets tonight on a most significant occasion.

We honor the martyrs of Easter Week, secure in the knowledge that one-half of the goal for which they sacrificed, will be reached on tomorrow.

How fitting it is that the proclamation announcing the establishment of the Irish Republic will be issued on the anniversary of the 1916 rebellion. What vindication for the heroes of Easter Week.

Drawing strength from their example, we shall proceed with redoubled strength to work toward that other goal, which will mark the end of partition.

On this joyous evening we celebrate the birth of a free Ireland, and pledge our help to the cause of a united Ireland.

That it will come is as certain as the faith and the courage to be found in Irishmen everywhere.

Newton County Triple-A Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the report of the Newton County, Ark., triple-A program for 1948 from Mr. William J. Nanney. I think this is one of the outstanding reports of our section, and I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

NINETEEN FORTY-EIGHT ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEWTON COUNTY AAA FARM PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This report, on the accomplishments of the Newton County Production and Marketing Administration (better known as the AAA program) for 1948, has been prepared to give the nonfarm group and the farmer himself a better understanding of the aims and accomplishments of the triple-A program.

Since all of our people's health, strength, and prosperity comes from the soil, it is the feeling of this committee that the public's responsibility in conserving our soil is just as great or even greater than their responsibility for building and maintaining our roads and schools. Still we have some who feel that the farmer should bear all the cost in conserving the soil upon which we all depend for our health and prosperity.

In Newton County last year there were 714 farms with a total of 29,962 acres of cropland that reported one or more conservation practices for assistance through the AAA program.

In carrying out these various conservation practices the farmers invested in the neighborhood of $37,500 or about two-thirds of the total cost. The other one-third was contributed by the public in the form of conservation materials or services and payments.

ALBERT H. RANEY, *Chairman.*
OSCAR VILLINES, *Vice Chairman.*
J. T. SEXTON, *Member.*

THE AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The agricultural conservation (triple-A) program has been established by Congress to assist the farmers in the tremendous job of conserving our Nation's soil.

The triple-A program is open to every farmer in the country, regardless of the size or location of his farm. Congress appropriates money each year to be paid out to farmers for conservation practices in the form of conservation materials or services and payments. The money allocated to Newton County in 1948 was prorated to each farm on the bases of 25 cents per acre for cropland, 4 cents per acre for fenced noncrop open pasture, and 25 cents per acre for commercial orchards.

This program is under the direct supervision of a county committee which consists of 3 members. The county committee is assisted in its duties by 30 community committeemen. Then committeemen are elected each year during the month of November and December and any farmer participating in the program is eligible to vote in the election of community committeemen and delegates to the convention. Before a committeeman is eligible to serve, he must have reported one or more conservation practices during the year in which he was elected and derives a substantial part of his income directly from the farm. Any person holding a major office filled by an election held pursuant to law, or any person that has been a candidate during the current year or becomes a candidate for such office is not eligible to serve as committeeman.

Minerals

One of our leading practices in the county is the restoration of minerals in our soils. In applying such minerals to our farm land as superphosphate, potash, and limestone we not only conserve our soil and water resources, but at the same time we improve our national health standard by adding to the plant growth the necessary minerals that are so important to the health of our people.

In 1948 farmers in Newton County applied 774,364 pounds of superphosphate to an estimated 3,871 acres of eligible crops. The supply of potash and limestone available for farmers in this county in 1948 was very small and only 2,671 pounds of potash and 584 tons of limestone were used as conservation materials.

Engineering

Last year there were 33 ponds constructed and five springs developed in Newton County to provide a more plentiful supply of livestock water.

These are two of the outstanding practices in the county. Since stock ponds have been constructed in Newton County through AAA assistance, a great number of our farmers have developed permanent pasture on land that had been of little or no benefit to them before the ponds were constructed.

Pasture development

In Newton County last year farmers improved or established permanent pasture by seeding 57,875 pounds of pasture grass or legume seed. The seed used in improving or establishing the above-mentioned pasture were those grasses and legumes the county committee and representatives from the other agricultural agencies believed to be best adapted to this county.

In 1948 farmers established 214 acres of permanent pasture by sodding Bermuda grass and controlled noxious weeds on 2,689 acres by mowing.

GREEN MANURE AND COVER CROPS

In Newton County last year farmers seeded 72,573 pounds of legume seed on an estimated 3,936 acres to be used as a protective cover. Annual lespedeza, cowpeas, and soybeans were the seeds used most as a cover summer legume while hairy vetch was the leading winter legume used.

Price supports

The price-support program has been established to give the farmer a fair price for commodities he has to sell in relation to the things he buys. The following commodities produced in Newton County are protected by price support: Cotton, corn, wheat, chickens, eggs, milk, butterfat, potatoes (Irish), wool, and others.

Marketing quotas

Cotton and wheat are the only commodities produced in Newton County affected. Allotments are worked out on the basis of cropland and past history of the crop on the farm. The program is administered through the county AAA office.

Financial report

In 1948 Newton County was allocated $13,628 to help the farmer with the cost in their efforts to conserve the soil. The farmers actually earned $18,842.58. With the farmers paying two-thirds of the cost of the conservation, there was an estimated total of $57,000 spent on soil conservation practices in Newton County last year. The total administrative expense for the program in 1948 was $6,191.12.

County committee: Albert H. Raney, chairman; Oscar Villines, vice chairman; Garland Smith member; J. T. Sexton, first alternate; Troy Fowler, second alternate; C. D. Lentz, ex officio member.

Duties of the county committee

The county committee is responsible for the carrying out of the purposes of the program in the county. In so doing the committee shall:

(A) Determine farm acreage allotments, goals, normal yields and other agricultural facts required under the program.

(B) Select the secretary and the treasurer of the county committee, provide for the employment of necessary personnel in the county office and fix the rate of pay for such personnel.

(C) Supervise and direct the activities of the community committees established in the county.

(C) Recommend to the State committee needed changes in boundaries of communities and perform such duties as shall be assigned to them by the State committee or Secretary of Agriculture.

Community committeemen

The following community committeemen were elected in the fall of 1947 by farmer neighbors to serve during the 1948 program year:

"A" Lurton: Andrew Smith, Andrew Freeman, Lurton, Ark.

"B" Bass: Verble Manns, Cave Creek, Ark.; Ira Dodson, Bass, Ark.

"C" Mount Judea: J. T. Sexton, Frank Cheatham, Mount Judea, Ark.

"D" Vendor: W. H. Flood, Claude Smith, Vendor.

"E" Hasty: Bryan Gibson, Will Gregory, Hasty, Ark.

"F" Yardelle: J. Veatle Waters, Haskell Jones, Yardelle, Ark.

"G" Marble Falls: Mirl Neighbors, Marble Falls, Ark.; Doyle Harp, Erbie, Ark.

"H" Limestone: J. Alfred Curtis, O. M. Ogden, Limestone, Ark.

"I" Deer: Joe Wylie, H. R. Heydenrich, Deer, Ark.

"J" Parthenon: W. J. Brasel, Lawrence Vaughn, Parthenon, Ark.

"K": J. A. Harrison, Chester Carter, Jasper, Ark.

"L": J. H. McFerrin, G. D. Stamps, Compton, Ark.

"M": Arthur Sutherlan, Joe Cowan, Fallsville, Ark.

"N": Troy Fowler, George Petree, Boxley, Ark.

"O" Swain: Lon Lee, Cecil Ramsey, Swain, Ark.

Duties of the community committees

(A) Assist the county committee in determining acreage allotments, goals, normal yields, and other agricultural facts under the program.

(B) Inform farmers concerning the purposes and provisions of programs being ad-

ministered in the county through the association.

(C) Assist in arranging for and conducting the necessary community meeting of the association; and

(D) Perform such other duties as shall be assigned to them by the State or county committees.

County office personnel

William J. Nanney, county administrative officer; Mary Jo Spencer, principal clark.

Theral D. Gattis was county administrative officer and Waldo E. Fowler was employed as veteran field officer trainee until the middle of May in 1948. Mr. Gattis was trainsferred to Franklin County and is now county administrative officer of that county, with headquarters in Ozark. Mr. Fowler is now employed as county administrative officer of Searcy County, with headquarters in Marshall.

United States Faces Curbs on New Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Edwin A. Lahey that appeared in Detroit Free Press of Friday, April 22, 1949:

UNITED STATES FACES CURBS ON NEW IDEAS

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—The national atmosphere in which the Taft-Hartley law was passed in 1947 was mainly influenced by the reconversion strikes and the aimlessness of the Truman administration.

But it had been built up carefully for 2 years out in the State legislatures, where lobbying groups with the naked intention of destroying unions pushed through restrictive labor laws in one State after another.

New ripples of State legislation are beginning to appear, this time aimed at subversion. Maybe some of the organizations promoting this legislation are motivated only by patriotism.

And maybe some people's idea of patriotism in these times of international tension is the punitive suppression of every unorthodox political thought, whether expressed in a pulpit, in a classroom, or in a throw-away pamphlet.

One thing seems clear. The clouds now forming in many State capitals will sooner or later gather into a storm that will leave us with the rawest form of thought police, unless citizens and legislators at the local level stop long enough for a look at our history.

That look would show how shabby our periods of repression now appear, from the Alien and Sedition law period of the late 1790's right down to Commissioner Harry Toy's ukase that reporters should sign loyalty affidavits to qualify for the privilege of talking to a desk sergeant in Detroit.

My own State of Illinois, which has produced some great civil libertarians, like John Peter Altgeld, and also some high-class burglars, who shall be nameless, is the latest to be caught in the witch-hunt hysteria.

A senate commission headed by Senator Paul Broyles is investigating subversive activities at Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago.

Unless Broyles and his investigators are an awful pack of slobs, they will find sensational material which will then be offered in the legislature as evidence for the need of a flock of proposed antisubversive bills.

The gimmick in these political investigations of subversive activities in college is that there is no college or seminary worthy of the name where a politician cannot find the type of exploratory thinking and discussion that answers his definition of subversive.

The real mischief will come when this college classroom and campus subversion is used to frighten the Illinois Legislature into the acceptance of a group of bills.

These, in the name of protecting the foundations of government, would turn the process of education into a farce that would drive any self-respecting teacher out of his profession, into a nice clean, cool ditch, with a pick and shovel.

Under the terms of one of the "patriotic" measures proposed by the Broyles commission in Illinois, they could throw a lecturer into the pokey for advocating the unicameral legislature, or for proposing that members of the State assembly meet certain I. Q. tests.

This would be an attempt to undermine the form of government in Illinois.

Illinois GOP Bought Favor of Newspapers With Public Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have always held in high esteem the majority of the members of the Fourth Estate in America. It was, therefore, a very shocking thing to me when I read the disclosures in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of how far the Republican administration in the State of Illinois went in purchasing favors from the publishers and editors of at least 32 newspapers.

These publishers and editors collected more than $300,000 from the State treasury.

Is it any wonder that the GOP received such a favorable press in last November's election? Is it any wonder that readers of newspapers saw so many editorials praising the Illinois Republican administration and booming the head of that since repudiated regime, Dwight H. Green, for the Republican nomination for President?

The canned editorials and news stories colored to praise Governor Green's corrupt administration cost Illinois taxpayers a pretty penny, but they failed in their objective to reelect the Republican treasury raiders.

For the information of the members of the House, under leave to do so, I include with my remarks the disclosures made by the Post-Dispatch as reprinted in the Washington Post yesterday, Monday, April 25, 1949.

PRESS "GRAVY TRAIN" JOLTS ILLINOIS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., April 24.—Political Illinois still seethed today with the revelation that editors and publishers of at least 32 newspapers had been on the State pay roll.

The story, uncovered April 14 by Roy J. Harris, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and George Thiem, of the Chicago Daily News, revealed that the editors and publishers had collected more than $300,000 from the State between January 1943 and November 1948. In some cases it was shown that the editors actually did more or less work at the statehouse. But, wrote Harris:

"Chief function of many of the others was to print canned editorials and news stories lauding the Republican State administration.

"GRAVY TRAIN" JOBS

Most of the editors, Green reported, held "gravy train" jobs such as field investigators and messenger clerks. Since the defeat of Republican Gov. Dwight H. Green by Adlai E. Stephenson last November, the majority have been eliminated from the State pay roll, Harris wrote. He added that those still there were presumably being weeded out.

In addition, Harris reported, 10 relatives of Illinois editors and publishers drew $100,000 in pay from State jobs. He said most of these apparently worked for their pay.

The revelations followed 2 weeks of diligent checking by Harris and Thiem over State pay rolls and comparing what they found with lists of Illinois editors and publishers. They found 33 names connected with 32 newspapers, chiefly down-State weeklies and small-town dailies.

ALSO GOT EXPENSE ACCOUNT

Harris wrote that the largest collector in the investigator-messenger-clerk class was William R. McCauley, copublisher of the Olney Daily Mail, who got $41,281 between 1941 and 1949. As an investigator for the State auditor he also had use of a State-owned automobile and a generous expense account.

The St. Louis reporter quoted McCauley as explaining that he made frequent trips as part of his assignment in connection with school funds and real-estate matters.

In one case, Harris wrote, both the editor and publisher of a newspaper held investigator jobs. He named these as Paul W. Gibson, editor, and Charles H. Clifton, publisher of the Clay County Republican, who received totals of $11,567 and $3,660, respectively.

OTHERS NAMED

Other editors and publishers named by Harris, with the jobs they held and amounts they received were:

George B. Shaw, editor of the Dixon Evening Telegraph; assistant commerce commissioner, $21,399.

Walter E. Smith, publisher of the weekly Freeburg Tribune; agriculture department investigator, $1,628.

Harold J. Cruger, publisher of the Elmhurst Leader and Press; former State printing superintendent, at about $5,500 a year.

Herschel J. Blazer, editor of the Aledo Times-Record; former superintendnt of multigraphing in the printing division, at about $5,000 a year.

Victor L. Smith, editor, Robinson Argus; revenue department investigator, $17,539.

Frederick E. Mueller, publisher, Port Byron Globe; revenue investigator, $14,552.

J. Norris Vallow, publisher, Kinmundy Express; revenue oil inspector, $14,378.

H. K. Pike, publisher, Patoka Register; chief clerk at Vandalia State Farm, $11,211.

H. B. Smith, editor, Newman Independent; highway division investigator, $12,372.

PUBLISHER GOT $10,833

Verle V. Kramer, publisher, Warsaw Bulletin; commerce commission investigator, $10,833.

Sam Little, publisher, Hillsboro Journal; highway division investigator, $10,747.

Charles E. Feirich, publisher, Metropolis News; education department investigator, $9,225.

Richard M. Feingeld, publisher, Henry News-Republic; highway investigator, $8,976.

George W. Miller, editor, Columbia Star; clerk in auditor's office, $6,300.

MESSENGER-CLERK

Lewis A. Randolph, editor, Macomb Journal; highway messenger-clerk, $5,500.

Orville Ryan, publisher, Ashkum Journal; field representative, public instruction, $5,025.

M. A. Curley, publisher, Zeigler News; highway messenger-clerk, $4,950.

Aaron E. Vandever, editor, Nokomis Free Press; highway messenger-clerk, no total shown.

John O. Denson, publisher, Minonk News-Dispatch, veterans' commission messenger-clerk, no total shown.

Bernard L. White, editor, Watseka Republican; auditor's clerk, $3,850.

LABOR INVESTIGATOR

William D. Magill, publisher, Dewitt County Observer; labor department investigator, $3,760.

Steve Choisser, editor, Benton Evening News; highway messenger-clerk, $2,800.

William E. Beck, Jr., publisher, Whiteside Sentinel; auditor's clerk, $2,250.

Lyman E. Smith, publisher, New Berlin Bee and Pleasant Plains Press; treasurer's investigator, $975.

PUBLIC WORKS LABORER

Werner F. Hamilton, publisher, McLeansboro March of Progress, public works laborer, $850.

In a few cases, Harris reported, State payments constituted only pin money.

In 1947, Harris said, Arthur R. Lorch, editor of the Ogle County Reporter, got $50 as a treasurer's investigator; Harry J. Wible, publisher of the Mount Pulaski Times-News was paid $100 by the treasurer, and W. H. Thomas, of the Mount Morris Index, collected $150 from the same office.

Two other newspapermen, Harris wrote, had previously been disclosed as having drawn State pay. He said they were Robert L. Stubbs, managing editor of the Illinois State Register of Springfield, who received $5,620 as a highway messenger-clerk, and Gomer Bath, Peoria Star columnist, who collected $5,800 as a labor department investigator.

Israel and the Americans of Jewish Extraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that I have written for the American European Israeli Recorder:

I have read your first issue of the American European Israeli Recorder, and I particularly enjoyed the article written by Rabbi Gliksman on the Significance of Israel. Especially do I like the paragraph which referred to the love and patriotism which an American Jew must feel for the United States of America, and how this new sensation that he feels in the creation of the State of Israel might affect his loyalty and love by creating a double allegiance. It seems to me that any Jew who was not thrilled, who did not sense a feeling of great joy and ecstasy, who could not hear and feel those rusted chains of bondage thousands of years old—yes, if he could not feel and hear those shackles being broken and removed from his ancestors, he couldn't be a decent Jew—he wouldn't even be a decent human being. This is a sensation which only people that have been held in slavery and bondage and have regained their freedom can enjoy. It is a sensation that is hard to express to those people who have never had the experience.

I was born in Detroit, Mich., of Polish immigrant parents. I was but 15 years of age when Poland was reborn primarily due to the great efforts of our beloved President Woodrow Wilson. Yes; it was the United States of America and President Woodrow Wilson who gave birth to the new Poland after many years of slavery and bondage. It was a great day for Americans of Polish extraction when Poland regained her freedom and liberty. Would the Americans of Polish extraction return to Poland now that Poland was free? Oh, no—after all we were Americans—we were happy because our ancestors had finally broken their chains of bondage and had regained their liberty and freedom. Did this new freedom for Poland mean a lessening of love and loyalty on the part of Americans of Polish extraction toward the United States? No; on the contrary, their love and loyalty for their adopted country was greater than ever.

During the First World War thousands of Americans of Polish extraction, many who could hardly speak Polish, enlisted in the Polish Army under General Haller that was recruited in Canada. They wanted to fight for the restoration of Poland. After the war did they emigrate to Poland? Oh, no; they were Americans, they only fought to rectify an old wrong. They wanted to restore the honor of their forefathers.

Now, let us take the case of the Americans of Irish extraction. The Irish, the Jews, and the Poles have much in common. The Irish suffered starvation and subjugation under the hands of the British; thousands of Irish immigrants came to the United States because of the intolerable conditions in the old country. The torch for the freedom of Ireland was carried highly and with great pride by every American of Irish extraction until finally Ireland regained her freedom. Did the Americans of Irish extraction lose any of their love and patriotism for the United States because of the struggle that they had carried on for many years for the freedom of Ireland? Oh, no; their love for the United States was intensified because the United States was the friend of Ireland and the Irish people.

So today, a new Israel is born. Yes, a new Israel is born because of the fight and the struggle that was put forward by the Americans of Jewish extraction. Again it was the United States of America and the great humanitarian and the great President Harry S. Truman who led the fight to restore freedom and liberty for the Jewish people and to break those chains of bondage. Many Americans of Jewish extraction traveled thousands of miles to join the fight for freedom and to restore the honor of their forefathers. Will the loyalty, patriotism, and love for the United States be lessened because Israel is free? Oh, no. Every American of Jewish extraction will feel an intensification of his love and loyalty for America.

The Jews, Irish, and the Poles in the United States have had the privilege of enjoying a great sensation. The feeling that wrongs centuries old inflicted upon their forefathers have been righted and that they, the sons and grandsons, have enjoyed the privilege of victory in this centuries-old struggle for freedom and liberty. Yes, they will never be confused as to their loyalty to America. What they cherish to the old country is a sentiment, a sense of respect for their forefathers, a desire to shout from the housetops and tell their fellow Americans that they too are sons of freemen. Yes, and to shout with pride that they helped to break and shatter those old chains of bondage and to free their forefathers from slavery.

Freedom for Israel means that America has gone up another rung on the ladder in our fight for freedom and liberty for all of the downtrodden people of the world. America is the land of the persecuted, of the refugee, of the poor pioneer. It was a puny handful of these and their sons who revolted under the gallant George Washington to sever themselves from the oppressions of Europe and to here gain a new birth of freedom. This hardy lot met every obstacle and every challenge, and here created a continent which became a blessing to millions of refugees from all over the world. Our American heritage has taught us to cherish independence, freedom, liberty, brotherhood, and peace for all the people of the world. The new state of Israel will be our friend forever, and the American of Jewish extraction will enjoy a new and greater dignity among his fellow men.

Bills Introduced by Hon. Gordon L. McDonough, of California, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the belief that the people of the Fifteenth Congressional District in California which I represent will be interested in the legislation which I have sponsored in the Eighty-first Congress, I have prepared a brief listing of some of the general bills which I have introduced to date.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this list in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my constituents:

LIST OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO DATE IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS BY THE HONORABLE GORDON L. McDONOUGH, OF CALIFORNIA

TAX REDUCTION

H. R. 204, to repeal the wartime excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles.

H. R. 205, to repeal the wartime tax on transportation of property.

H. R. 206, to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement.

H. R. 207, to repeal the tax on telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities.

H. R. 208, to repeal the wartime tax on transportation of persons.

FLOOD CONTROL

H. R. 871, to authorize the appropriation of $100,000,000 for the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project for flood control.

WATER SUPPLY

H. R. 3650, to authorize the construction of one or more demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the product.

VETERANS

H. R. 1238, to prohibit the deduction of any part of a veteran's pension while he is hospitalized in any Federal or State institution.

POSTAL SERVICE

House Joint Resolution 80, to authorize the preliminary study necessary for the mechanization of the postal delivery service.

H. R. 2192, to establish definite minimum space requirements for post offices.

FEDERAL BUILDING

H. R. 864, to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building in the Los Angeles civic center.

H. R. 863, to authorize the construction of a customhouse building in the Los Angeles civic center.

H. R. 862, to authorize the construction of a post office parcel post building at Los Angeles.

H. R. 861, to authorize the construction of a post office garage building at Los Angeles.

H. R. 1154, to authorize an additional $900,000 for the completion and equipment of the additional story and the extension and remodeling now in progress on the terminal annex of the Los Angeles post office.

TITLE TO TIDELANDS

H. R. 860, to establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

H. R. 80, to establish a United States Air Force Academy to be located in the southern district of the State of California.

H. R. 81, to provide for an additional Military Academy in southern California.

H. R. 82, to provide for an additional Naval Academy in southern California.

CONSUMER CREDIT

H. R. 1552, to amend regulation W with respect to consumer-credit control on the purchase of automobiles so that no down payment shall be required of more than 25 percent and maximum maturity shall not be limited to a period of less than 24 months.

PAYMENT TO STATE FOR FEDERAL OWNED LAND

H. R. 865, to authorize annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein.

LABOR

H. R. 203, to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be abridged.

H. R. 209, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers.

COLORADO RIVER

House Joint Resolution 55, to grant the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system.

PUBLIC WORKS

H. R. 869, to provide for the acquisition of sites and preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

HAWAII

H. R. 866, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States.

Naval Carriers Seen Still Needed Despite Experts' Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, April 18, 1949, entitled "Naval Carriers Seen Still Needed Despite Experts' Statements":

NAVAL CARRIERS SEEN STILL NEEDED DESPITE EXPERTS' STATEMENTS—WRITER HITS INACCURATE VIEWS, SAYS FLEET CAN DELIVER ATOMIC BOMB

(By David Lawrence)

As long as a few Air Force enthusiasts say it, there is no danger, but when the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee declares that the United States doesn't need naval carriers any more and that they cannot deliver the atom bomb, it becomes important to present certain facts that show how inaccurate such statements can be.

In the first place, the Navy can deliver the atom bomb from certain vantage points from a carrier fleet. This has already been officially revealed by the Navy.

In the second place, the Navy doesn't send out carriers alone but protects them with light cruisers and destroyers equipped with antiaircraft weapons so effective that in the last war no suicide planes sank a carrier.

In the third place, Representative CANNON says: "With the signing of the Atlantic treaty we've got the bases." But who will assure that those bases will remain always in allied hands?

CONSTANT HAZARDS

If a Communist government some day infiltrates the Scandinavian countries and seizes the bases, the United States will be lucky to have a big carrier fleet handy to retaliate and to protect the landing of our troops in attempting to recover those bases. As long as the safety of the United States is dependent on the political ups-and-downs of certain countries in Europe, there will be hazards.

Conceivably also, as long as the United States has no other way of protecting itself in waters adjacent to the European continent, the American Government will be constantly importuned to furnish more and more protection and perhaps more and more economic aid lest communism sweep those countries.

The fact that a carrier fleet will be available to send out naval air power is the best assurance against mishandling of this question of land bases by European politicians.

Representative CANNON'S views are not novel. They have been expressed by others who have no real knowledge of the sustained bombing that can be done from the decks of carriers. It will cost the United States only about $9,000,000 next year to carry on certain work on the new supercarrier. Inasmuch as vessels of this kind cannot be built overnight, the carrying forward over the next 3 or 4 years of supercarrier construction is probably the cheapest form of insurance America can take out against the possibility of losing land bases.

There is a school of thought, moreover, which believes that if rockets are developed as predicted, England may not be a safe base for American land planes. Hence it is not good strategy to rule out any important means of hitting at a potential enemy. The carrier fleets, of course, are vulnerable but so are land-based planes, which can be and have been intercepted by enemy planes.

DIFFICULT TARGETS

It is not likely that the enemy would risk the dropping of expensive atom bombs while looking around the north Atlantic Ocean to find a carrier fleet. The very fact that naval ships can disperse makes them difficult targets for plane attacks, especially since the proximity fuse and other inventions have made it possible to ward off attack from the air and from submarines.

In the war with Japan, the carriers fought land-based planes off the Philippines and from the mainland of Japan and neither the submarines nor the Japanese planes sank any American carriers.

Air power launched from carriers is still air power, and there is nothing old-fashioned about using the lessons that won the war in 1945, especially when there is no certainty that in the next 5 years the United States will be able to carry out precision bombing with planes starting from this continent.

If the bases to be obtained from the countries signing the North Atlantic Pact could be absolutely guaranteed—as if anything can be these days—and if they could be held against seizure by the largest land army in the world, there would be less need for the added protection of carriers. But in warfare, it is always best to have as much insurance against possible contingencies as can be obtained.

The win-the-war-in-30-days exponents could be wrong, and then all the weapons of land, sea, and air would be needed to intercept the enemy's atom bombs as they were flown toward American cities. It wouldn't console the American people to learn that the air forces, using land-based planes, could hit 70 targets in Russia while New York or Boston or some other seacoast cities were devastated by atom bombs carried by planes that got through without being intercepted on their way across the ocean.

Pollution of Public Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H BURKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Charles L. Appt, mayor of the village of Rossford, Ohio, dated April 8, 1949:

VILLAGE OF ROSSFORD,
WOOD COUNTY, OHIO,
April 8, 1949.

Hon. THOMAS H. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter especially to you, Mr. BURKE, because I realize that you, of all people in Congress, especially understand our local problem. In fact, thus far, you were instrumental in helping to arrive at a possible solution. Now that you are in a further improved position, and with your thorough knowledge of this problem, I am sure that you will do your utmost to help complete the solution of our pollution-abatement problem, not only here but throughout the State.

A strong movement to eliminate the pollution of public waters is rapidly gaining momentum in Ohio. This movement has made enough headway to show itself in a bill offered in the Ohio Senate. This bill, known as Senate bill 60, presented by Senator Ragan, would make it "unlawful for any city, village, county, or other political subdivision, public institution, corporation, or officer or employee thereof, or other persons, to maintain or permit to be maintained sewers for the discharge of sewage, or industrial waste, into any public waters of the State, unless works or means, satisfactory to the director of health, shall have been installed for treating or otherwise disposing of such sewage or industrial waste."

The feeling that prompted the presentation of this bill to the Ohio Senate was a mere

reflection of the will of the people of Rossford. Their efforts to combat stream pollution date back to 1940, when they incorporated their community in a special effort to promote the construction of proper sewage-disposal facilities.

The plans for a proposed sewage system were drawn up and approved by village officials and the Health Department of the State of Ohio. The cost of the proposed construction was estimated at $240,730. This seems like a large price to pay, until we look at the cost of not putting in the sewage-disposal system. We find that it is costing the village of Rossford, Wood County, the surrounding territory, the State of Ohio, and the Nation, a very high price to continue polluting our public waters. That is why we feel that Congress itself should take action to help local governments correct this condition.

Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Administrator, in a published statement, estimated the cost of waging a successful fight against stream pollution, on a national scale at $3,000,000,000. Legislation to abate pollution was passed by Congress and signed by the President in 1948. This is the kind of action that it takes to get things started. However, this good start has already been made ineffective by the administrative processes incident to such matters. Let us not wait for stench, filth, disease, and death to hand us the bill for 1949. Let us take the future bill we would receive for these inroads on our health, well-being, natural resources, and recreation, and convert the threatened loss into an investment in a healthier, better, cleaner America.

It isn't too much of a price to pay. Every day we are sending money and supplies overseas to help less fortunate nations. The European Recovery Program is costing us over $5,000,000,000. The Berlin Air Lift alone is eating up our money to the tune of $500,000 a day. The results we get for our money in these seem obscure to most of us, but though we do not say that the expense is not necessary, we do ask if it is more necessary than expenditure to protect the health and welfare of our people right here at home.

Repeated efforts by the village of Rossford to eliminate unsanitary conditions arising from improper sewage disposal means have been stymied by the lack of funds alone. The setbacks in the construction of these facilities have cost the village of Rossford, Wood County, the State of Ohio, and the people of the United States, more than is visible to a casual observer.

Every day that sewage disposal facilities are delayed, the health of the Nation is more seriously threatened. The rivers and streams have been polluted to such an extent that to use them for recreational purposes is an open invitation to sickness, paralysis, and death. In 1948, there were three cases of polio in the village of Rossford, 28 in Wood County, 1,169 in the State of Ohio, and 27,658 in the Nation. For the country at large, this represented an increase of 16,601 cases over the previous year. Let us take the liberty to point out that these were only the positively diagnosed, recorded cases, and do not include the total probable cases of polio which claimed their victims without having been identified as polio. On the basis that it costs an average of $185 to hospitalize a victim to check the spread of the disease, and an estimated average of $1,350 to rehabilitate him, the total cost to the Nation of this pollution-aggravated disease reached the stupendous total of $42,455,000 for the year 1948. This cost, measured in dollars, does not even approach the cost in suffering by those who died of the ravages of this disease or have been left as cripples for life.

The loss to the Nation is not limited to the ravages of disease alone. Although no definite figures are available, it is a fact known to all that the fish and wild-life resources of the State and of the Nation have been dealt a blow so severe that it is a matter of speculation as to whether they will ever be able to recover from their set back. The loss to the people, though it might be measured in dollars that they must now spend to seek their recreation and sport in uncontaminated waters, is best measured in the curtailment of their recreational facilities necessary for good health and well being. Again, it is a matter of speculation as to how many nervous and mental disorders can be directly attributed to the curtailment of recreational facilities available to the people on a daily basis near home.

The people of Rossford were cognizant of these conditions when they took the liberty of writing to Congressman MACGREGOR, chairman of the Committee on Public Works, asking for Federal aid. In his reply, Mr. MACGREGOR stated that no Federal aid for a public-works program could be given unless an emergency existed. Since the village of Rossford has passed a resolution condemning pollution, the State of Ohio is in the process of curbing pollution by law, and the Federal Government passed legislation to abate pollution, the conditions described would appear to warrant a declaration of emergency.

We feel that we have a right to expect State and Federal aid in the construction of sewage disposal facilities, and that Congress should adopt a plan of immediate action to help us and others like us, who are striving to cut the cost in human efficiency, health, and life.

Yours truly,

CHAS. L. APPT, *Mayor*.

Naturalization Session, April 4, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include remarks made by Hon. William T. McCarthy, United States district court judge for Massachusetts, on the occasion recently on the admission to citizenship of a number of persons:

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to congratulate you, many of you coming from persecuted lands where freedom had an empty meaning, all of you having become a part of the golden treasury of an American civilization, the perpetuation of which is so necessary for the maintenance of the supernatural in a world that is torn apart by strife, dissension, and strange ideologies.

On July 4 we will celebrate the birth of a great document which is truly the Bible of our democratic way of life. Those great men representing the 13 States, soldiers, statesmen, and warriors, signers of this Declaration of Independence, said in discussing the relationship between the laws of nature and the laws of God: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The spirit and purpose of this great document beacon-lights the manner in which representatives of our form of Government shall remain or leave according to the will of the people. In the very final paragraph of this famous document which was really the preamble to the Constitution they again used the following words: "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States." Then after the expression of moral thoughts they close this memorable document with the following sentence: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." In these words, ladies and gentlemen, did our forefathers give our philosophy of life to serve as a milestone and which our representatives duly elected to public office should use as norms of conduct. Their purpose and object was to lay out an American way of life. Their purpose and object was to have all authority flow from the sanctity of the home. Their purpose and object was to have these things done under the aegis of Divine Providence. Their purpose and object was to have these things done within the framework of a Constitution which they saw to it should have some elasticity because of what they conceived would be the growth and development of our American civilization.

Totalitarianism, communism, and all other "isms" are first cousins to the poisons that would destroy our national life. Please remember that they offer the direct antithesis to what a person receives under our system of government. They offer absolutism, despotism, and above all things extermination of human liberty. Under our form of government a man's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is held sacred and inalienable. In the form of government of communism man becomes a machine of a state controlled by racketeers, because man's rights under communism are subordinated to the state rather than to the family. Every organ of his body and every attribute of his soul is controlled by this weak force.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the challenge you are facing today. You see evidence of it all over this country. You see manifestations of it in universities, yes, in some places where they with devilish cunning classify themselves as churchmen. They are paid hirelings of the devil who see in their conception of world domination nothing but personal power. Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo eloquently approved this. We were warned by our forefathers to be eternally vigilant because they said that vigilance was the price of liberty. New horsemen are riding continuously. Their badges are dishonor and social disintegration and slavery. They tread the highways of the cities and towns of these great United States. Their economic theories, their philosophies of life, and their method of thought challenge the foundation of our form of government. Moral law has little or no place in their society. Man has no wisdom which comes from anything else except personal and scientific achievements. They expel God and all his philosophies, and all his thoughts. Their thoughts are the result of vile conclusions concerning the rights and liberty of men. They continuously foster ideologies by educational systems that reach the hearts of many of the youth of our country. They hold out a beautiful picture of happiness when in truth and in fact they lie and they develop a philosophy of hate and destruction and their secularistic ideas serve as fungus growths for disunity, frustration, and fear. Many of our economic and social troubles are directly traceable to the insidious concept of their philosophy. We should see to it that there be no room in this Nation of ours for these mouthings.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a challenge that cannot be disregarded. You have taken

an oath which obliges you to preserve our Constitution, our rights, and our liberties against any despot who would attempt to destroy us for his own selfish ends. General Douglas MacArthur said, "The problem is physically theological. It involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character."

Let me say to you, ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion that these foundamental philosophies of life which have come down to us through the corridors of time represent attributes which should be near and dear to the hearts of all of us. If we are to save ourselves, we must preserve them against insidious, Godless attacks.

Proposed New Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial on the subject of proposed new postal rates, written by Mr. Thomas W. Gerber of the Canby (Oreg.) Herald:

PROPOSED NEW POSTAL RATES

Did you every think of the Post Office Department as an educational institution? Or as a living, moving force to unify a nation?

Thomas Jefferson did when he and the other founders of the United States of America were putting the new country together. Jefferson clung tenaciously to two ideas which he regarded as fundamentally important to the growth of a nation founded upon the new principles of freedom. These were a public-school system (this was considered rank heresy by many in those days), and a postal service designed and conducted to convey information to the entire population.

He believed that a democracy can endure as such only if supported by a well-informed population. Seeds of distrust and insurrection sprout from misinformation or lack of information, in his opinion, which is as sound today as it was then.

Following out this line of reasoning the adherents of the Jeffersonian theory established what are known as second-class postal rates for publications. They are, of course, much lower than any other rates. They were made so not as a subsidy to encourage publication of newspapers and magazines, but to enable the people of the country to have access to information at the lowest possible cost.

Establishment of second-class rates was a matter of public policy, just as was the inauguration of the Department of Agriculture. Nobody expects the Department of Agriculture to be a direct money-making institution, or even to pay its own way, any more than they expect the school systems to pay their own way by charging tuitions.

Now there is a measure before Congress (H. R. 2945) which would impose drastic rate increases in various categories of postal service, notably in second-class mailings. Those who have studied it declare it would put out of business most of the newspapers and magazines which depend upon postal service for the greater part of their distribution. This might be somewhat exaggerated, but the rates proposed certainly would make it necessary for publications to double or quadruple their subscription rates. This step would result inevitably in wholesale cancellation of subscriptions, and a consequent stoppage of information sources. It would directly contravene the original public policy of second-class rate schedules.

Two magazines, the Farm Journal and Pathfinder have figured that the proposed new rates would cost them $1,701,000 the first year and $2,920,000 the second year and thereafter, which would be, says Pathfinder, "an unsurmountable increase in our cost of doing business."

There have been and will be postal rate increases, and second-class rates can stand some upping. But the solons who drew up the present measure evidently had not heard of the fundamental reason for second-class rates, and the scale now under consideration by the congressional committees on post offices and post roads is not only confiscatory but contrary to public policy.

The Federal Government Should Pay Taxes for Land Owned by the United States in the Several States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the acquisition by the Federal Government of vast land holdings in national-forest land and military and naval bases and for the use of other agencies is creating a serious problem in many of our States. The curtailment in tax revenue to the States and local governments due to these Government holdings which are tax free deprives them of revenue which would be paid on the land if it were under private ownership.

At the same time both State and local governments must spend thousands of dollars annually for the protection of life and property in many of the areas owned by the Government, and must maintain roads and other facilities for the use of people living and working on property owned by the Federal Government.

The loss of this tax revenue presents a serious situation because the property owners in our States must pay higher taxes on their land to compensate for the loss of tax revenue to the State and county on Federal Government owned lands. This results in curtailment of expenditure for improvements in local communities and in the counties and deprives the State of a legitimate source of revenue.

In the State of California alone, the accumulation of land by the Federal Government has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 47 percent of all land within the State. Federal acquisition has extended to 50 percent of all the land in 17 California counties. In 11 Western States it has extended to 47 percent, and in excess of 24 percent of the total land area of the United States is owned by the Federal Government.

I believe it is time for the Federal Government to accept its responsibility to compensate the States at least in part for the loss of tax revenue on lands that are owned by the Federal Government.

I have introduced H. R. 865 to authorize annual payments to the States, Territories, and insular governments by the Federal Government based on the fair value of national-forest lands situated therein for the benefit of the local political subdivisions where such lands are situated. Such payment will avert embarrassing fluctuations of income to many counties to which a stable income is essential to the efficient conduct of local functions of government. It will also remedy inadequacies of contributions to costs of local government in localities where national-forest lands yield little or no revenue.

I believe legislation to reimburse the States and counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of land should receive consideration by the Congress. The California State Legislature has recently adopted a joint resolution requesting such action which I submit to your attention herewith:

Assembly Joint Resolution 22

Joint resolution relative to reimbursing counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of lands within the counties

Whereas the Federal Government owns in excess of 46 percent of the total land area of the State of California and in excess of 47 percent of the total land area of the 11 Western States and in excess of 24 percent of the total land area of the United States; and

Whereas these federally owned lands occupy a substantial part of the total land area of many of the counties of the United States; and

Whereas the counties in the United States wherein federally owned lands are located furnish many services for such land for which there is no adequate return of revenue for such services; and

Whereas Federal contributions to county government are uncertain, because the Federal Government is not under a duty to create any revenue in which local government can share; and

Whereas such revenues being unpredictable in time and amount make it difficult to operate within the provisions of State constitutions and statutes regulating fluctuations in the budgets of local government; and

Whereas there is an increasing demand for a critical reexamination of the Federal fiscal responsibility to local governments because of the ownership of Federal properties within the boundaries of such local governments; and

Whereas lands in private ownership in the counties within the boundaries of which federally owned lands are located are required to assume an extra burden for the cost of services rendered by local government because of the location of such Federal lands in such counties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reimburse the counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of land within such counties; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Views of Mr. Herbert Hoover on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a statement by Mr. Herbert Hoover relating to H. R. 2892 and H. R. 2893, upon which hearings are now being held by the Ways and Means Committee, was read before the full committee today. These two bills relate to revision and expansion of Federal old-age assistance and survivors insurance and the Federal-State public assistance programs.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Hoover's views as expressed by him in his statement and read and made a part of the Ways and Means Committee record of the hearings on these two bills:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 25, 1949.*

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I beg to acknowledge your request that I make some comment on H. R. 2893 and H. R. 2892 which relate to revision and expansion of Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance and the Federal-State public assistance programs.

The following notes relating to the systems existing at present are based upon data collected by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. That Commission did not deal with policy question to be determined by Congress. The views on policy expressed herein, therefore, are solely my own.

I wish to say at once that I strongly favor governmental provision for protection of the aged and their dependents.

The problem before the Nation is to obtain a workable system, with a minimum of administrative cost, a minimum of bureaucracy, adjusted to the economic strength of the country which gives an assurance of security to this group. In my view, we have not yet found that system.

I should like to make two general observations:

1. There is an illusion about the whole Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance. Because the taxes on pay rolls are paid into a trust fund and paid out without appropriation by Congress, there is an idea that these are neither taxes nor Federal expenditures. They are just as much a burden upon our national economy as any other tax or any other Government expenditure. Also, pay-roll taxes, however justifiable, are, like all other taxes, a burden on the standard of living of the whole Nation. A considerable part of the pay-roll taxes paid by employers in the long run is passed to the people as a whole in prices, and a considerable part of the taxes paid by wage earners is passed on by demands for increased wages.

2. There are many desirable things that every American home would like to have, but its income compels it to deny itself, at least temporarily. It is similar with the Nation.

Since this legislation was originally passed in 1935, we have increased the total burden of Federal expenditures from about $9,700,000,000 a year to a prospective $45,000,000,000 a year, included in which are about $23,000,000,000 for defense and European aid—most of which constitutes the cost of the cold war.

Already our economy is up to the limit of endurance under this load. I believe we should go slow and hold further additions to this burden to the absolute minimum. When the cold war is over, we can afford many more domestic improvements.

I can find no satisfactory estimates of the cost of these two proposals if enacted into law. There would be, however, a huge increase in the tax burden on our economy from this legislation. I make some tentative estimates later on.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

1. The old-age problem has been thrust upon the Federal Government largely by the great increase in longevity. Its dimensions are indicated by the fact that there will be by 1950 about 11,000,000 persons over 65 years of age. They will increase in numbers absolutely and relatively, both with the increase in population and with the constantly advancing protections to health.

2. The Nation today is undertaking to solve the problem from three different directions:

First is the joint Federal-State assistance to which I shall refer as "State systems." Forty-eight of the States and three other jurisdictions, with Federal aid, give old-age assistance, dependency, children's benefits, and other social services, based upon individual needs. The variations in the needs requirement are considerable, and in a few States are so liberally interpreted as to be practically universal old-age pensions. The total number of persons given assistance by the State systems is about 2,300,000.

The average amount of payments to the aged in need in all 48 States is $42.02 per month per person. In the 46 most typical States based on need, the average payment is about $39.50 per month per person. These monthly payments vary greatly among the States—ranging from a low of about $20 to a high of about $78 a month in one State. The annual cost averages about $1,200,000,000—about one-half of which is paid by the States and about one-half by the Federal Government.

Second is the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, based upon pay-roll taxes, to which I shall refer as the "Federal Insurance System." Benefits are now being paid out to about 2,260,000 persons at an annual cost of about $556,000,000, and averaging about $25 per person per month, including their dependents. The payments being insufficient for the needy, many must be supplemented by the State systems.

Third is a multitude of old-age pension and retirement systems in the country to which I shall refer as the "independent systems." They are in the main Federal veteran and military pensions and disability systems of this group which extend into the 65-year-age group: Federal civil-service retirement systems; the Railroad Retirement System; the old-age or retirement systems of the States and local governments; the old-age or retirement systems of universities, hospitals, fraternal organizations and other benevolent institutions, insurance companies, businesses, and industries. There is now a new form of old-age and retirement system emerging in particular industries as the result of collective bargaining. These systems together with pensions to veterans, bid fair to be further extended.

The number of persons now receiving pensions or aid from these independent services is estimated at about 2,300,000. The monthly payments under these systems are much higher, on the average, than the other two systems.

Theoretically, there are about 7,000,000 persons now receiving benefits from all three systems. This, however, includes dependents less than 65 years old and there are duplications because in many cases the benefits from the Federal insurance system are inadequate and must be supplemented by the State systems.

FAULTS IN THE PRESENT FEDERAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

3. There are serious faults in the Federal insurance system.

(a) The original concepts, as embodied in the Social Security Act of 1935, were that the money to pay for the benefits would come from employees and employers by a tax on pay rolls, and that the system would be self-sustaining. The original actuarial basis of the system was faulty and was made worse by the legislation of 1939.

One of the methods of this system contemplated building up a reserve fund in the early years to compensate the subsequent increased benefits. The moneys collected from the pay rolls have been, and are at present, in excess of the payments to beneficiaries, and the trust fund of about $10,000,000,000 has been accumulated and invested in Government bonds. The growth of expenditures for benefits under the present act apparently will exhaust this reserve in from 5 to 10 years, and the general taxpayer will be forced to make up the annual deficit. This deficit, it is estimated, will rise ultimately to about $1,700,000,000 per annum.

(b) An additional burden, however, is thrust on the general taxpayer. Under the present system the Federal Government has used the surplus income of the trust fund (amounting to the $10,000,000,000) for its current expenses and placed its I O U (in the shape of Government bonds) in the trust fund for the money thus used. It is estimated that the benefits paid out will begin to exceed the receipts (upon the present basis of the pay-roll tax and benefits) in a few years. When this occurs, the Government must redeem its I O U's from the trust fund. The money to redeem them must come from the general taxpayer. Even if the bonds were sold to the public, ultimately they must be redeemed by the taxpayer. As those who have already paid the pay-roll deductions are also taxpayers, they will, to some extent, be paying for their insurance twice over.

I cannot agree with the economic arguments before your committee which are to the contrary. The simple fact is that the money has been raised by a tax, and except for benefits already paid, has been used as current expenditures by the Government, and must be replaced from somewhere—the taxpayer.

THE PROPOSED NEW LEGISLATION

4. I do not have the technical staff to analyze in detail the effect of the amendments to previous legislation implied in these two bills (H. R. 2893 and 2892). However, I make some over-all observations which may be worthy of consideration by your committee.

(a) I suggest that the committee consider abandoning the whole reserve fund concept and that the Federal Insurance System be put on a pay-as-you-go basis. It should be no more difficult to calculate for a year ahead the amount of pay-roll taxes required to meet the outgo than any other taxes. The present reserve fund of $10,000,000,000 could remain as a balance wheel. It could be drawn upon temporarily when advance calculations of the tax prove inadequate and then could be restored the following year. This procedure would enable the Congress to fix the tax as needed and to appropriate the budget annually. In the latter matter, it has no voice at all at present. Such a method of pay and collect as you go would avoid the faults pointed out in the paragraphs 3 (a) and (b) above.

I am aware it will be contended that this course would deprive the scheme of its purported actuarial basis. As a matter of fact, it has been abandoned under the present system. But more important, the basic fault of double payment by beneficiaries (3 (b) above) destroys all such actuarial contentions anyway. And the same situation will apply to the new legislation as it again proposes to increase reserves, and spend the increased money for current expenses of the Government, with ultimate replacement by the taxpayer.

(b) To visualize what the plans under H. R. 2893 and 2892 mean, it is necessary to reduce them to some sort of figures. It is proposed in H. R. 2893 (Federal insurance system) to increase the taxes on pay rolls, which now amount to about $1,700,000,000 per annum, to about $4,800,000,000. Obviously, this is an increase in tax burdens by about $3,100,000,000 per annum at once.

As I have said, I can find no adequate estimates of the annual expenditures under these two bills. Some estimates of the costs of adopting H. R. 2893 (Federal insurance system) are given, but apparently they do not include all of the features in the bill. I have found no estimates of the cost of the additional grants-in-aid to the State systems under H. R. 2892, or of the other direct expenditures implied in that bill. They are, apparently, large.

The estimated Federal insurance system expenditures under H. R. 2893 alone are:

Present expenditures	$556,000,000
1950	1,750,000,000
1955	3,400,000,000
1960	5,900,000,000

(These figures as to H. R. 2893 are about halfway between the high and low estimates furnished to the committee.)

The very large increase in Federal expenditures is obvious. Moreover, it is also obvious that the reserve fund, in the next 10 years, would be greatly increased. This surplus of pay-roll taxes over the benefits paid out again is to be represented by more bonds and used for current expenses—and ultimately the general taxpayer will pay a large part of the bill.

As a method of increasing Government revenues, it is a tax on the lowest incomes in the country—provided they do not secure an increase in wages to compensate. In such case, however, it falls on the consumer, of which these beneficiaries are the largest group.

The answer to all these dilemmas is to abandon further building of the reserve fund and to put the whole business on a collect-and-pay-as-you-go basis. If my proposal were adopted, even the present pay roll tax burden could be reduced during the next critical years.

(c) Aside from the faults inherent in the Federal insurance system, the ultimate result of this new legislation will be to absorb or extinguish much of the independent systems. The independent systems should be maintained and encouraged. They represent a flowering of American freedom and of moral growth. They have more efficient administration and usually provide greater benefits to their members than do either the Federal insurance system or State systems. In the few instances where, by a change of jobs, a small number of beneficiaries under the independent systems might lose all or part of their rights under these systems, they can be picked up by the State systems.

(d) Another point worth noting is that the powers vested in the Federal Administrator under these two bills could go a long way to extinguish the independence of the States in welfare activities. This can also result in an enormous increase in the number of State, Federal and other public officials necessary for administration. There are probably 30,000 State and Federal officials already engaged in administration even now.

A COURSE OF ACTION

5. My own opinion, having regard for our obligations to prevent suffering by the aged and their dependents due to the increased cost of living, together with the difficult economic situation we face from the cold war, is that we should go slowly and proceed as follows:

(a) The further expansion of reserve funds should be abandoned, and the system should be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

(b) Increase the coverage of the Federal Insurance System but, for the present, undertake none of the other expansions proposed in H. R. 2893 and thus greatly reduce the expenditures required.

(c) Develop the State systems based on need by further Federal grants to provide more adequately for the aged and dependents actually in need (the average now being only $42.02 per person per month, with some States as low as about $20 per month), and to enact none of the expansions in H. R. 2892.

The real and urgent problem is the need group. It is not solved now, nor can it be solved for many years, by the Federal insurance system—even if that system can be made to work efficiently.

Whatever increased cost may be thus required in taking care of our needy and aged, it could be covered many times over by adopting the recommendations for better organization of the executive branch proposed by the Commission.

SEARCH FOR A SIMPLER SYSTEM

6. The committee, in my opinion, should undertake to establish an independent research body to provide analyses of other possible systems. It should be given a year for study.

The reasons are:

(a) On the organizational side both the State systems and the Federal insurance system maintain expensive administrations of the same general problem. The administrative cost of the Federal insurance system is likely, under this bill, to rise eventually to over $100,000,000 per annum. The independent systems do not overlap so extensively in the administration field, and usually are managed more economically.

(b) In the financial support of these three systems the overlap is very great. Many of the independent systems and the Federal insurance system are based upon pay-roll contributions, and thus many contributors are in both systems, are being twice insured, and will receive benefits from both systems. The people do not need to be provided for twice over, and where they are in both systems their deduction burdens are very great and a menace to their families' standard of living.

(c) It is obvious that the State systems must be maintained for many years to come. It would be many, many years before complete and adequate coverage and benefits could be attained by the Federal insurance system. Its benefits, even under the new bill, are inadequate in many instances, and must, in any event, be supplemented by the State systems based upon need.

(d) A careful inquiry might disclose an entirely different system which would avoid the huge costs of administration and the duplication, which would substitute some other form of taxation, more simple and more direct for its support, and which would give more positive security to the aged than this complicated system.

It is worth looking into.

I attach hereto the pages of the Report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and those of our task force (the Brookings Institution), which relate to some parts of this subject.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Our Rising Social Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fast approaching a crossroad, a point which history must mark as the turning point, the place where the American people swing down the road to the socialist state, or the high-water mark of socialistic progress where the tide is turned back to perpetuate the American principles of private ownership and free enterprise.

The ultimate decision must rest in the people's elected representatives, the Congress of the United States. Upon us rests the responsibility not only to our constituents but to all posterity—to generations of Americans yet unborn.

The American people so far have rejected the European brand of socialism which advocates Government ownership of industry and property. But we have been accepting other forms of socialism equally dangerous to the fundamental structure of our democracy, but less obvious.

While private property in America remains under private ownership, the profits of private property and even of personal services are being forcibly shared among nonowners, a practice which if carried far enough will result in the gradual leveling of individual incomes.

In Britain today we see the results of such socialistic encroachments on democracy in process of reaching their ultimate end, and we must decide how far we can proceed toward the Socialist state, and yet check this trend short of the point already reached by the British.

Emerson P. Schmidt surveys our present position and outlines 10 ways in which we are drifting toward the Socialist state in his article. Our Rising Welfare State, which appeared in the April issue of the Nation's Business. This is a comprehensive analysis of the situation, and should receive serious consideration as a warning we may well heed as the hour of decision is upon us.

The article is as follows:

OUR RISING WELFARE STATE

(By Emerson P. Schmidt)

In the November elections Norman Thomas and his Socialist Party mustered a little more than 100,000 votes, a mere quarter of 1 percent of the total cast.

Certainly this is not a very impressive showing for a political organization which has campaigned in every national election since 1900 and whose doctrines have been preached for more than 100 years.

Standing alone, this record would seem to imply that socialism had little political future in the United States.

Such an assumption would be premature.

It is true that almost nobody votes for candidates who call themselves Socialists. Few voted for candidates who called themselves Prohibitionists either, but the country attained prohibition, nevertheless.

It is stretching definitions only a little to say that we have also attained socialism.

Unlike prohibition which raises only the question wet or dry, socialism has complexities which make it possible for a people to have a very extensive brand of it without knowing that they have it. It doesn't go into effect at some designated midnight, it just creeps up by day and by night. Indeed, it is not uncommon, as in our own case, for people to demand some of socialism's subtler enticements while denouncing its more obvious forms.

The European brand of socialism, government ownership of industry, has never had much appeal to Americans. Private property is deeply respected by custom and by law.

But, while we have been warning, and warned, against this brand of collectivism, we have been accepting a comprehensive, thoroughgoing and well-integrated program which is equally but less obviously socialistic. We even forge new arguments to justify this program on moral and economic grounds.

Thus, although private property, for the time being remains in private hands, its fruits are being forcibly and compulsorily shared among nonowners. Simultaneously, the fruits of the personal services of the higher income groups are likewise being forcibly shared. Whether the higher income groups have an inalienable right to the rewards for their endeavor is a question rarely even raised.

The process cuts deeply and, unless stopped and reversed, will cut ever more deeply. Whether it will dry up the incentives to invest in rental housing, machinery, and equipment and in other job-making facilities and thus pave the way for socializing all property and industry, as it seems to be doing in Europe, it is too early to say.

It is not too early, however, to examine the road we are following and the distance we have come. How, then, is this American version of socialism—the welfare state being brought about?

Here are 10 ways:

1. The income tax: Under the progressive income tax, incomes after taxes are undergoing a powerful leveling process. During the New Deal there was much talk of putting an upper limit of $25,000 on individual incomes. The idea is not dead. The figure may be lowered.

Under the ability-to-pay theory of taxation, so long as Smith has more income left after taxes than Jones, Smith has still further ability to pay more taxes. There is no logical stopping place. The logical end of this tax philosophy is the final equalization of all incomes. This final position may be avoided, however, because the tax policy makers themselves are likely to continue to have above-average incomes and might not deem it morally or economically wise to go thus far.

Many salaries in the United Nations and in its various subsidiary organizations are made tax-free. We have just given the President another $50,000 annual income free from all taxes (besides an increase in salary). Perhaps we have just seen the beginning of this wrinkle in the income-socializers' bag of tricks.

The corporation income tax likewise takes a larger toll from the bigger corporate income than from the smaller. After $50,000 of annual net income all corporations pay 38 percent, but the smaller incomes begin at a modest figure and only gradually work up to 38 cents out of every dollar. There is constant pressure for an excess-profits tax to soak the rich although the poorer citizen is just as likely to own a few shares in a profitable corporation as in one which is less profitable.

2. Social security: Employees, generally, pay 1 percent of the pay roll to finance social security while employers pay 3 to 6 percent or more, depending on how you figure it—covering workmen's compensation, old-age, and unemployment compensation. To some extent, social security is a device for spreading income more evenly over a period of time—collecting the premiums during employment and paying out benefits when hazard hits. But, the benefit formulas are generally loaded in favor of the low-income groups. Nearly all social-security programs also have the effect of transferring income from the more productive, more efficient or more fortunate people to those less favorably disposed. The proposed expansion of social security suggests that this method of leveling income may be still in its infancy. We have covered only part of the distance between the cradle and the grave.

3. Federal variable grants-in-aid: In the hospital construction law, the amount of Federal grants to the different States is based in part on average per capita incomes within the State, the bigger slice going to those States where incomes are lowest. The people in the rich States thus pay the hospital construction costs of the people in the poor States. In earlier years Federal grants as for the aged, the blind, and dependent children, were based on some uniform or equal-matching principle. Today it is rare for a Federal grant-in-aid bill to be introduced in Congress without a so-called variable grant-in-aid, the amount of the grant varying inversely with the per capita income among the different States. The pending bill to put the Federal Government back into the direct relief business, and to revise the program for the aged, blind, and children adopts the same variable grant idea.

4. Food allotment: During the depression, with a view both to relief and to transferring more income to farm groups, the "orange and blue" food stamp allotment program was adopted. The extra stamps were the equivalent of good cash to those who got them. A bill recently introduced in Congress would revive this program. Clearly, this opens far-reaching avenues for the further redistribution of income and greater equalization. The law, or more likely the administrative bureau, could decide that all persons with less than so much annual income would get so many stamps entitling them to so much free goods.

5. Rent control: Rent control is a device for transferring income from people who supply housing to people who do not. New York State did not abolish the rent control growing out of the World War I until 1927. The hold which rent control has on the American people today suggests that this method of redistributing income is likely to be difficult to remove even though all the evidence shows that it accentuates the desire for housing and diminishes the supply of new construction, especially in the face of the threat of extending rent controls to new construction.

6. Public housing: Again and again it is argued that private effort cannot provide adequate housing for the lowest-income group. The Government must tax the people with more income so that the low-income groups can live in new housing.

7. Driving down the interest rate: Thrift and savings formerly were rewarded by annual interest earnings of about 5 percent. Insurance premiums earned the same interest accumulations.

Today, interest rates have been cut in half by means of what is called monetary and fiscal policy, a subject a little complicated and subtle, but something we should study a little more.

In the past, periods of prosperity and especially war periods always entailed rising interest rates to help check excessive demand for borrowings and to stimulate the supply of savings. World War II was financed with a constant and low or falling interest rate. This was indeed a stupendous and far-reaching achievement.

Lord Keynes was the father of the engineered, artificially low interest rate which reduces the earning power of capital and savings. This transfers a greater portion of the earnings of capital to low-income groups.

Keynes spoke frequently of the "euthanasia of the rentier" and the "functionless investor." This was an erudite way of saying that there is really no point in paying anybody to save; adequate capital should and could be made available without anyone seemingly having to pay for it.

While he had some misgivings about his own brilliance on this point, his followers adhere rigidly to policies designed to make borrowing cheaper even though the policy reflects itself in a steady dilution of the money supply and a steady deterioration in the value of the dollar. Perhaps Keynes, and especially his followers, did not notice that driving down the interest rate also creates a new problem (or should we say, opportunity?) for the Government, in the form of more old-age dependence, now that, with artificially low interest rates, the capacity of the individual to save for his old age is made more difficult.

This low-interest-rate policy puts the Government in competition with all private lenders, forcing down interest rates all around—a leveling process affecting everyone.

There is a growing conviction among thoughtful people, however, that a society of personal and political freedom and a free enterprise market economy are integral parts of each other.

And it is just beginning to dawn on these same people that a free money market—one in which the interest rate performs its historic functions of determining where to invest, and governing the demand and supply of capital—is also an integral part of the free society.

Government spending and lending for housing, for agriculture, and for innumerable other purposes are all tied in with this further effort of leveling incomes.

8. Minimum-wage legislation: Minimum-wage law bars any worker from a job unless he can find an employer who is willing to pay at least 75 cents, $1, or whatever the fixed hourly rate may be. Whenever the minimum is raised, all the wage rates above the minimum also receive an upward thrust to maintain the historical differentials of the wage structure.

Minimum-wage law has become a device for hoisting the whole general wage level. Here is another way of passing money from one group to another.

9. The labor movement: If one examines the President's economic reports and programs submitted to the Congress as well as the several reports of the Council of Economic Advisers, one discerns a clear-cut policy of utilizing the labor movement to cut down the earnings from job-making to the benefit of the job-holder. While things are said on all sides of this complicated issue, again and again there is much talk of a deficiency of purchasing power. There is much discussion of encouraging wage increases (sometimes with the limitation where they will not cause price increases).

While economists generally agree that deficiency of mass purchasing power is not the cause but the result of depressions, much pressure is generated in Washington in support of the unorthodox and generally unaccepted "underconsumption" theory of boom-bust which is so often utilized to justify the upward wage thrust.

By building up the labor movement through Wagner Act and pulling the teeth of Taft-Hartley the labor unions are encouraged to strive more aggressively for a

larger slice of the national income. The employers are deprived of their natural resistance to encroachments by the unions. Extending the areas of collective bargaining to include numerous fringe and other benefits is another attempt to get for labor a larger and larger slice of the national pie. By reducing the prerogative of management and enlarging labor's voice in management, the earnings of investors are steadily reduced.

As investors become more skeptical of future earnings and the security of investment, the way is paved for "Government going into business" because, it is alleged, private capital won't come forth for investment.

10. Estimate and inheritance taxes: What the Government can't get during your lifetime the Government can get when rigor mortis sets in and your executors begin to look over what's left.

There you have 10 ways by which income is being equalized.

This makes a pattern that is hard for the politicians to resist. Why should the voters not vote themselves a slice of other people's income every 2 years, or at least every 4 years? Why should the politician not lend his hand to this business of taking from the limited number of A's and handing it over to the more numberous B's, even though privately he would not take a tire off A's car or lift a pumpkin from his garden.

It is not hard to find some moral justification and perhaps historical precedents for such a program.

Throughout our Anglo-Saxon history and traditions there has always run a pronounced equalitarian strain.

The Declaration of Independence emphasizes that we are all created equal. The Constitution prohibits class distinction based on hereditary or other titles. We reacted strongly against the feudal caste system. Early in our history we supported universal compulsory common-school education. We were committed to the doctrine of the equal start.

Later this same set of ideas was commonly referred to as equality of opportunity. We felt that if every child were educated, and there were no legal or other artificial discriminations, we would all have this equal start. Then each should be entitled to keep whatever he could earn.

It was the function of Government to create conditions favorable to this equal start.

In 1862 we passed the Homestead Act, for example, under which any citizen, or even a resident alien intending citizenship, could carve out for himself a 160-acre homestead, a place to get a start, a place where he could be himself and make his own living in his own way. In 1890 we passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, designed to prevent monopoly and to give any and all, who had the desire, the means, and the ability, the opportunity to set up in business for themselves.

EQUALIZATION CONTINUES

Our present program, of course, goes far beyond these earlier ideas of equal opportunity, an equal start, and preventing monopoly. The battle against inequalities, it is said, now needs additional weapons.

The economic sanction placed behind this drive toward the equalization of income runs in terms of the boom-bust problem and full employment. Although this rests on tenuous ground, let's take a look at it.

It is said that business profits and individual incomes above the consumption levels are spent more slowly than wage, social security, and similar types of mass income. The worker and social-security beneficiary spend their incomes promptly, thereby returning the money to the income stream. It then can become income promptly to others and helps keep the economic machine rolling.

Savings, whether earned by a business or an individual, tend to lie around in "stagnant pools" in the banks or the treasuries of insurance companies for a time. So it is argued. When the business outlook is dim, these funds are hoarded, thereby deepening depression. So, if we are to assure full employment, full purchasing power and full production, we should shave off the big incomes and a good slice of profits.

This argument has some support among some economists. But nearly all, if not all, would agree that business depressions are caused and influenced by far more complicated factors and that this is altogether too simply a view, a too facile rationale, of a highly technical and interdepartment economic process.

Nevertheless, both on moral and economic grounds, the drive for leveling incomes has support, or as the logician would say a rationale has been found.

Those who would develop some stopping point to the socialization process need equally good or more potent counterarguments and weapons. There are plenty of them but they don't get themselves publicized very well.

These income-leveling weapons are capable of further sharpening and intensifying. For the most part, they are relatively new.

Taken together, they constitute a formidable battery—a powerful engine with 10 cylinders. Add a few more cylinders and enlarge the bore and stroke of each, then we will have a different America. Whether the fuel and lubricants to keep the engine going will dry up remains to be seen, but the experience of other lands that have tried this same type of experiment for some decades suggests that it is easier and more popular to redistribute wealth and income than it is to add to the total supply.

SOCIALISM WILL GROW

The processes of the rising American welfare state are now easily recognized. There is no direct action against them under our established political and social institutions.

Men and women who foresaw the end in the beginning, now nearly a generation ago, see little chance to stop short of the British, who traveled a similar road.

Socialism establishes its own need by forestalling the natural forces of capitalism. The mass of the people develop a psychosis of economic security which destroys independence, risk, and ambition. The politician who is personally opposed to socialism seeks to stay in office by rationalizing that he should remain in power to temper the wilder ideas of the opposition. The middle class, the savers and investors, by their caution and fright, create the very conditions which the Socialist then proceeds to cure.

Underneath it all is a 200-year-old struggle in America—a struggle for democracy to restrain itself against its own destruction.

Undivided Loyalty to United States, Devotion to American Way of Life, and Opposition to Communism Asserted by Students of Kaimuki High School of Honolulu

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present a letter addressed to me by the students of the Kaimuki High School, of Honolulu, with which they have forwarded a declaration bearing the signatures of the leaders of the student body. This declaration is prompted by the presentation for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some weeks ago of a pro-Communist essay by one of the students of this school.

The declaration which follows shows clearly that this individual essay in no way represents the sentiments of the student body of this school and on the contrary expresses a point of view for which they have no sympathy whatsoever.

The letter and declaration follow:

KAIMUKI HIGH SCHOOL,
Honolulu 14, Hawaii, April 9, 1949.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress from Hawaii,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DELEGATE FARRINGTON: Enclosed is a revised copy of a declaration which was presented at a student representative assembly meeting held on April 5, 1949, attended by 33 students and 2 advisers, at Kaimuki High School.

In another student representative assembly meeting held on April 7, 1949, attended by 44 students and 3 advisers, a motion was unanimously passed that copies of the revised declaration be prepared and mailed to each of the persons listed on the declaration, provided that at least a majority of the members would sign the declaration on Friday, April 8, 1949.

We are therefore sending you this attached copy of the signed declaration.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY AU HOY,
President Student Body.
NANCY OYAMA,
Secretary Student Body.

Approved:

DALLAS C. MCLAREN,
Principal.

KAIMUKI HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENT GOVERNMENT,
Honolulu, T. H., April 8, 1949.

DECLARATION

Because we are students of Kaimuki High School and loyal American citizens devoted to the American way of life;

Because there appears to be some damage to our school reputation because of a student speech given in a school assembly in November 1948, which speech did not and does not represent our school or our beliefs and attitudes;

Because the ideas of communism play no part in our lives, and any assumption to the contrary is unfair, unjust, and with no basis in fact;

Because Kaimuki High School has been on record since 1947–48 as favoring statehood;

Because the speech and publicity given to it may have injured the cause of statehood for Hawaii;

Therefore, we the undersigned representatives of the student body of Kaimuki High School respectfully submit the following declaration:

We resent and we reject all implications that communism has any hold whatsoever on the students of Kaimuki High School, and we reaffirm our undivided loyalty to the United States of America and our devotion to the American way of life.

And we therefore are sending copies of this declaration to the following:

The Honorable Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii.

The Honorable Wilfred C. Tsukiyama, president of the senate, Territory of Hawaii.

The Honorable Hiram L. Fong, speaker of the house of representatives, Territory of Hawaii.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States of America and President of the Senate of the United States of America.

The Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Dr. W. Harold Loper, superintendent of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. Edward N. Sylva, chairman, board of commissioners of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. Julius Krug, Secretary, Department of Interior of the United States of America.

Mr. Robert M. Faulkner, supervising principal of Honolulu schools, Territory of Hawaii.

Henry Au Hoy, Student Government President; Walter Ito, Student Government Vice President; Nancy Oyama, Student Government Secretary; James Noharn, Student Government Treasurer; Robert Sasaki, Sergeant at Arms; Fiyiko Zukeran, Interschool Council Chairman; Yuriko Hisano, Room 7 Representative; Alice Sakai, Room 19 Representative; Helen Hiza, Room 38 Representative; Thelma Kaneshiro, Room 9 Representative; Dorothy Haitsuka, Room 15 Representative; Lillian Okuhara, Room 14B Representative; Sadie Ono, Chairman, Archives Committee; Edna Yamamato, Chairman, Assembly Board Committee; Helen Fuchise, Room 4 Representative; Robert Freitas, Chief Police; William Kaneshiro, Representative Library; Feighton Anderson, Representative Room 7; Gaspen George, Cafe Representative; Joyce Matsuda, Room 11 Representative; Lattie Kabayashi, Room 9 Representative; James Hera, Room 26 Representative; Dickey Hamasorki, Junior Class President; Herman Ching, Room 34 Representative; Jean Kashiwamura, Cafe K Representative; Patsy Minatodani, Room 21 Representative; Jane Jo, Annual Editor; Gail Omura, Identification Bureau Chairman; Mabel L. Kam, Handbook Committee Chairman; Nancy Onaga, Newspaper Editor; Harold Abe, Room 31 Representative; M. Freitas, Room 16 Representative; Aswim Young, Room 21 Representative; Katherine Niaus, Room 18 Home Room Representative; Violet Oki, Room 17 Home Room Representative; James Kurashige, Room 24 Representative; Veronica Lim, Room 24 Representative; Grace Oshima, Room 24 Representative; Rebecca Goodaus, Room 34 Junior Adviser; Cathupide Irvine, Senior Class Adviser.

Whereas the United Nations is an organization in being and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order and world law, guaranteed by a world government: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States be requested to direct our delegates to the United Nations to propose or support amendments to its Charter which will strengthen the United Nations and make it a limited world federal government able to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That in the preparation of such amendments our delegates should advocate:

1. Delegation to the United Nations of limited but adequate legislative, executive, and judicial powers:

(a) To maintain such world inspection, police, and military forces as are necessary to enforce world law and to provide world security;

(b) Gradually and progressively to eliminate national armaments (other than those necessary for internal policing);

(c) To provide for dependable revenue to enable the United Nations to carry out its proper functions.

2. Balanced representation of each nation in the General Assembly upon a just formula which will recognize influence in the world, natural and industrial resources, literacy, population, and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.

3. Adoption of a bill of rights assuring fair trial and other adequate protection of persons affected by the Charter and laws enacted thereunder.

4. Reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the calling of a general conference under article 109 of the United Nations Charter to review the Charter and to recommend appropriate amendments thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That this memorial shall not be construed to advocate unilateral disarmament by the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and to the delegates of the United States to the United Nations.

Strengthening the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 3

To His Excellency, the Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

Mining Assessment Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, an interesting suggestion has been made by the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce in reference to annual assessment work on mining claims located on the public domain. Under existing law, which has been temporarily waived, it is required that $100 worth of work be done on every mining claim every year. The Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce has an alternative proposal. It suggests that the holders of mining claims be permitted to do the assessment work required by existing law or alternatively that they be allowed to make an annual cash payment of $17 for each claim. It is proposed that $15 of the $17 be placed in a special road fund which would be used to build roads, trails, and airfields of assistance to the mining industry.

In the resolution the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce has this to say:

The Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce hereby presents to the Public Lands Committees of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States a resolution on certain changes in the mining laws as applied to the Territory of Alaska, as follows:

"Whereas the yearly assessment work of $100 valuation which is required on every 20 acres or fraction thereof of all unpatented mineral locations in Alaska, was originally designed to force development and use of the mineral lands of the public domain; and

"Whereas as such aforesaid assessment work may have accomplished its purpose in the early days of mining, it now, in the very great majority of cases, just causes the performance of useless labor by the holder of an unpatented mineral location which neither develops his particular location nor furthers the development of the mineral lands on the public domain; and

"Whereas rich bonanza mines, both lode and placer, have been worked out since the early gold-rush days in Alaska, so that it is now necessary in order to mine profitably, to hold many mineral locations, to make outlays of large amounts of capital for large and costly machinery, and to employ highly skilled and expensive labor; and

"Whereas due to the present high costs of machinery, supplies, and labor in Alaska, very few, if any, new mining operations are being undertaken, and such operations as have reopened since the last war and consequent shut-down, are now working on a limited and critical basis which bodes ill for Alaskan economy after the present flurry of Government military expenditures are finished; and

"Whereas the Alaskan Territorial Legislature has found it necessary, due to the greatly increased cost of the Territorial government to place a tax on every 20 acres, or fraction thereof, of unpatented mineral location, thereby increasing the burden on an already overburdened industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the following suggestions for the relief of the mining industry in Alaska be presented to the Congress of the United States, to wit:

"1. That the present moritorium on assessment work in the Territory of Alaska be continued for 1 more year, or until July 1, 1950.

"2. That thereafter the owner of any unpatented mineral location be given the choice of either (a) performing the annual assessment work as prescribed by Federal and Territorial laws, rules, and regulations; or (b) paying on or before July 1 of each calendar year an annual fee of $17 in lieu of every $100 of the aforesaid annual assessment work into the office of the recorder of the recording district or precinct wherein the said unpatented mineral location is located.

"3. That (a) $2 of the above $17 annual fee be paid to the above-mentioned recorder for recording purposes, and that (b) $15 of the said fee be accumulated into a special road fund; said fund to be expended as expeditiously as practicable on such roads, trails, air fields, or other mining facilities as may be agreed upon jointly by the Territorial commissioner of mines and the Territorial highway engineer.

"4. That in the event that the owner of a valid unpatented mineral location should elect to perform his annual assessment work as now prescribed by Federal and Territorial law, he shall record on or before July 1 of each calendar year with the recorder of the recording district or precinct wherein the

said mineral location is located a statement setting forth as nearly as may be the nature and extent of the assessment work performed for the said mineral location, the fee for such recording to be set at not over $2.

"5. That in case the aforesaid owner of an unpatented mineral location fails either to pay on or before July 1 of each calendar year the aforesaid $17 annual fee, or to record on or before July 1 of each calendar year such a statement of annual assessment work as heretofore set forth, the said mineral location shall revert to the public domain and be subject to relocation as now prescribed by Federal and Territorial laws, rules, and regulations; provided further, that within 90 days after July 1 of any calendar year any owner of an unpatented mining claim who has defaulted on the payment of the above fee or has failed to record his statement of annual assessment work shall be permitted to reinstate his claims upon payment of the annual fee plus a penalty of $10 per claim, such penalty to be added to the special road fund.

"In explanation of the above suggestions, it is strongly felt by this chamber of commerce that access roads and trails, and small utility airfields are needed by the mining industry to help reduce the high costs which are rapidly crushing the life of the said industry. To make use of a useless and unprofitable expenditure of human effort and money, such as the performance of annual assessment work, and turn such effort and money to a useful and helpful endeavor would be a boost to all of Alaska's normal economy. The suggested annual fee is set at a low figure so as to make the fee preferable to the performance of annual assessment work, leaving such performance to those persons who were actively mining or to those too poor to afford the annual fee."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the proposal of the Fairbanks chamber is the best that could be devised, but I have a strong feeling that it represents a definite improvement over the outmoded and increasingly useless performance of annual assessment work. Whatever the justification may have been for assessment work in the early days of mining in this country the fact is that it has little to recommend itself in logic or in good sense in 1949. There is rather urgent need for a revision of the present law and I hope the Congress will undertake such revision at an early date.

Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am delighted to have this opportunity to have recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this most gracious and deserved tribute to the record of my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, which appeared in the April 13, 1949, issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

THE FORESIGHT OF MRS. LUCE

Connecticut has never been represented in Congress by any person with a better grasp of foreign affairs than Clare Boothe Luce, twice Congresswoman from the Fourth Congressional District. A reading of some of Mrs. Luce's earlier speeches, made in her first term in Congress, shows the amazing foresight and statesmanship which she exhibited—qualities which brought her but little appreciation at the time, least of all in Congress itself.

That was a period of divided counsels, of confused thinking in terms of isolation, in a time of war and anxiety. Mrs. Luce's calm wisdom fell on deaf ears. Besides, she was both a woman and a freshman in Congress, which entitled any self-anointed statesmen with more experience in ward politics and no experience whatever in foreign affairs, to look down upon her.

In a sense, Mrs. Luce was the real originator of the Atlantic Pact which has just been signed and is now waiting ratification by Congress, 6 years after she suggested it.

It was on June 25, 1943, that Mrs. Luce, in discussing our foreign policy, urged Congress not to look upon the shores of this country as our boundary line, but in an age of gigantic air and sea power, to regard the other shores of the Atlantic Ocean as our true frontier.

She urged a military alliance with Britain and her dominions which at that time was the only kind of Atlantic pact possible. The world was at war and other combinations were not then feasible. But with the United States, Canada, and Britain guarding the Atlantic, a first step toward security and final peace seemed possible.

Mrs. Luce knew that her suggestion as to a proper foreign policy would be violently resented in some quarters and distorted for political purposes in others, but she never flinched from an unpleasant responsibility. She said what she thought and meant what she said, in contrast to Governor Dewey's treatment of the same theme at the Mackinac conference in Michigan a long time afterward. Repeating Mrs. Luce's thought almost verbatim and adopting it as his own, Governor Dewey was apparently frightened by the roar of disapproval which came from the isolationists. He hastily dropped the whole matter.

Her early advocacy of an Atlantic pact was not the only instance of Mrs. Luce's ability to think years ahead of her colleagues and to point to the right course long before it had become apparent to others or gained any wide degree of public understanding and popularity.

In these troublous times we need both her mind and her courage in Congress. If the Republican Party could succeed in drafting Mrs. Luce for the United States Senate in 1950, bringing her out of her voluntary retirement, the party would be honoring itself and giving Connecticut a new reason for taking pride in the fact that its delegation in Congress included one of the most gifted and far-sighted women ever to grace American public life.

Veteran Says That Taft-Hartley Law Must Remain To Guarantee Freedom He Fought for in South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert a letter from a veteran in my State who asks for consideration. I urge all Members of the House to read this letter and think on it before they vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

The letter follows:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *February 14, 1949.*
Congressman JOHN SANBORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SANBORN: In regard to the Taft-Hartley law, I hereby wish to state my preference for it to remain as is.

It seems that in the pre-Taft-Hartley days there was no place for the very small-business man; the man who was starting out on shoestring and who did not have the volume of business or the capital to hire his work done but did all his own work.

I am a veteran, 23 years old, and am having a tough time getting started in the concrete-contracting business in a small way. I contract basement floors, sidewalks, etc. There is just enough of this type of work to keep one man and a couple of laborers busy during the summer months. There is no work in the winter to speak of, so a man of my position must make enough in the summer to carry him through the winter.

I buy all my concrete from transit-mix companies (concrete mixers mounted on trucks) since they can sell me concrete much cheaper than I can mix it myself. The union stepped in and black listed the transit-mix companies for selling concrete to me, a non-union contractor. Union contractors have signed a contract that they will not buy from a black-listed company and in order to keep in business the transit-mix companies refused to sell me concrete. This left me two alternatives: first, to put up $2,000, which I did not have, for a mixer of my own and if I did this, I could not compete in price nor service with any of my competitors; second, to sign a buildings and trade agreement with the union. The only thing I could do was the latter and I signed a 1-year contract. According to this agreement, I cannot even so much as pick up a shovel and hand it to a laborer, much less finish my own concrete, which I am very capable of doing. Imagine my position when many jobs require only one man.

I presented this situation to the union. They suggested maybe I should take a 4-year concrete finisher's apprenticeship in their union, pay them $200 and then they would acknowledge me as a finisher; but then I still could not contract and do my own finishing, too.

This is supposed to be a free country but I can see nothing free or democratic about it when we allow the unions in the country to dictate such as I have just described. This certainly is not the freedom which we were told we were fighting for in the South Pacific.

My union contract will expire in 2 months. If the Taft-Hartley law is not repealed and the Wagner Act is not reenacted, I will not be forced to renew my contract. I beg of you, sir, to speak to your colleagues about this matter and to consider not only my plight but thousands of others just like mine located all over the United States when you vote on this matter.

Yours very truly,

R. H. HALEY.

Iowa Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, one-fourth of the grade A land in the United

States is in Iowa. Those of us who represent Iowa in the Congress are always glad to acquaint our colleagues and the country with the fertility and productivity of Iowa soil. Not only is it a great resource of our own State, but it is a magnificent resource for the entire country.

Foremost among the interests of Iowa representatives in the Congress is agriculture. That interest is understandable when it is realized of the extent and magnitude of the richness of Iowa soil. The size of this splendid resource is well summed up in the following statement compiled by the marketing division of the Iowa Development Commission:

One-fourth of the most fertile, arable grade A land in the Nation lies in Iowa which makes Iowa the heartland of the richest agricultural region in the world, according to a statistical review recently compiled by the statistical and market division of the Iowa Development Commission.

Iowa's total area of grade 1 land—commonly called grade A—amounts to 25,983,110 acres of the Nation's total premium acreage. The national grade A land total is 101,037,573 acres. Iowa's total land acreage, including all five grade-type soils, is 35,633,920.

The fertile land of the Middle West, which is contained largely in the States bordering on Iowa, accounts for 70 percent of all the grade A land in the Nation. This fact bears testimony to the supremacy of the Middle West in agricultural productivity. In this rich Midwest region, Iowa contains nearly twice as much grade A land as Illinois, its nearest challenger.

The inventory of Iowa's fabulous soil also repeated the remarkable fact that 97 percent of all Iowa soil is under successful cultivation. No similar piece of land in the world has that percentage of land under productive cultivation.

Another remarkable fact reported is that 70 percent of Iowa's cultivated land is grade A. Iowa's remaining acreage is graded as follows: grade 2, good soil, 6,906,158 acres; grade 3, fair soil, 1,392,680 acres; grade 4, poor soil, 1,007,416 acres; grade 5, soil essentially incapable of tillage, 344,556 acres.

No spot in the world of equal total land area has as large a percentage of grade A soil, the survey indicated.

The following break-down shows the concentration of the Nation's grade A land among the States bordering Iowa, the leader: Iowa, 25,983,110; Illinois, 14,777,030; Minnesota, 12,022,243; Missouri, 8,674,763; Nebraska, 8,120,907; South Dakota, 3,052,320; and Wisconsin, 2,820,276.—(Development Bulletin, February 1949.)

Ice Harbor Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Seattle Post Intelligencer, large metropolitan daily of Seattle, Wash., opposing the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam in the State of Washington:

When a prudent individual finds that his wants outstrip his income he revises his spending plans.

He decides what expenditures are immediately essential and eliminates those items which he can do without for the present.

The Federal Government should follow the same common sense policy.

That, in effect, is the most cogent argument advanced by the Columbia River Salmon and Tuna Packers Association and the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America in opposing the immediate construction of the Ice Harbor Dam on the Lower Snake River, near Pasco.

They don't take the position that the plans for the dam should be abandoned immediately.

But they do contend with considerable logic:

"At a time when the Congress is faced with the problem of stretching appropriations to cover the most essential needs, it appears unwise * * * to start construction of new projects when the pressing need of the Northwest is for the earliest completion of power projects now under construction."

They explain specifically that they feel the completion of McNary Dam and the Hungry Horse Dam and the installation of additional generators in the Grand Coulee Dam should be given priority over all other projects, concluding:

"We emphasize doing first things first."

The argument, which was contained in a brief submitted to the House Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations for civil functions, has force, as the primary purpose of the Ice Harbor Dam is to extend slackwater navigation from Pasco to Lewiston, Idaho.

Surely no one will take the position that it is more important to provide this additional river navigation than it is to increase the hydroelectric-power output of the Pacific Northwest.

The benefits from river navigation are especially questionable in view of some figures submitted in the brief in connection with petroleum shipments now made by water from Portland to Pasco. In spite of these water shipments, it is pointed out, gasoline costs 2.8 cents a gallon more in Spokane than in Portland—which is precisely the rail rate on the shipment of gasoline from Portland to Spokane.

Thus, as the protestants observe, "if there is any savings in the movement of gasoline by the river, it is not reflected in the price to the public."

If the same pattern is followed when navigation is extended to Lewiston, the $12,000,000 expenditure on the Ice Harbor Dam—and many millions more on three additional dams which would be required higher up on the Snake River—might enrich some shippers without any benefit to the consumer.

Of course, the packers and the fishermen's union have a purely selfish interest in the matter.

They are fighting the construction of the dam at this time because they believe it would jeopardize the industry on which they depend for their livelihood.

The public has an interest in this too—because the Columbia River salmon resource supports thousands of people in Washington and Oregon and brings millions of dollars into both States every year, in addition to providing one of our primary attractions to tourists.

The Federal Fish and Wildlife Service is authority for the statement that "the lower Snake dams, collectively, present the greatest threat to the maintenance of the Columbia River salmon population of any project heretofore constructed or authorized in the basin."

The construction of fishways is planned in connection with the dam, but this alone is not sufficient. Consideration must also be given to the habitat of the salmon and its need for proper spawning grounds to propagate and reproduce. It is also necessary that means be devised to preserve the salmon fingerlings on their migration down to the sea.

Fishery biologists are learning more about the salmon every year and are endeavoring to improvise methods to adjust it to the developments taking place in the Columbia Basin. But this takes time. Four years are required to complete an experiment in salmon propagation, as that is the life cycle of the fish.

In view of this it is hard to find any flaw in the reasoning of the packers and the union when they say:

"Until the other dam facilities now under construction are completed, it appears logical that we defer needless construction of dams which our fishery biologists maintain will destroy the salmon.

"Such delay will give us valuable time to make further studies of the salmon.

"The permanency of the salmon resource and its future can best be preserved by the most careful scheduling of construction of dams."

Admission of Soviet Agents to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs:

CARROLLTON MANOR,
Frederick, Md., March 19, 1949.

Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House Office Building, Washington.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LODGE: This is to record, in writing, my most cordial congratulations both to you and to your esteemed colleague, Representative DONALD JACKSON, for your splendid protest against the admission of 23 known Soviet agents to the United States. Your position is right and noble.

Why not raise the following questions, publicly:

1. Would the State Department approve visa applications for Nazi agents, or known Hitlerites?

2. Would the State Department be willing to permit the entrance of known Italian Fascists?

3. Would the State Department attempt to justify the entrance of Nazi-Fascists because of our Government's "unswerving devotion to freedom of information and free speech on any issue, however controversial it may be"? The words in quotation marks, as you probably know, are taken verbatim from the State Department's attempted apology for the issuance of visas to 23 Red Nazis.

As one who has supported the good-neighbor policy throughout the world, I seek an adherence to fair, consistent policies in the State Department.

A few hours after I had congratulated you, publicly, upon the floor of the House of Representatives, where I had opened the proceedings on St. Patrick's Day with prayer, I had the good fortune to meet my dear friend, Judge Michael Francis Doyle, chairman of the electoral colleges of the United States. Judge Doyle, who is a loyal Democrat, advised me that he was indignant with the "Left-wing clique in the State Department," which, in defiance of treaty rights of the United States with the Soviet Union, was reluctant to offer any cooperation to him in his effort to have the Soviet Government re-

instate the visa for the return of a good pastor, Father Antonio Laberge, to the Church of St. Louis in Moscow, the Soviet Union. When he heard from me the nature of the magnificent stand you had taken with regard to the 23 Soviet agents, he pointed out that, if our State Department had shown some disposition to help Father Laberge, the Secretary of State could have insisted that 23 visas would not be conceded by our Government of the United States unless and until the Foreign Office of the Soviet Union had kept its word to readmit Father Laberge, who is not a spy, much less a totalitarian enemy, but rather an angel of mercy in the wilderness of the Soviet Union, which is bound by treaty to allow citizens of the United States to enjoy the rights of conscience as well as the free exercise of religion throughout the U. S. S. R.

This is the same type of thinking which has "leaned us over backward" out in eastern and central Europe; this is the same type of thinking which sold to the President of the United States the self-defeating formula of a "peace and unity" coalition government in China. How much longer will the representatives of the people allow this element to "lean over backward," perhaps out of freedom and democracy into totalitarian slavery?

The Honorable Michael Francis Doyle is at the Mayflower Hotel. Almost single-handed, he has worked, sacrificed, and contributed, generously, to maintain a symbol of religion in Moscow, nearby the Kremlin. He deserves our help and our cooperation. I wish you and he could consult together with a view to liberty and justice. Needless to say, I am at your disposition in this worthy cause. And you are free to use this communication, as you judge best.

Assuring you and Congressman JACKSON of my sentiments and admiration and approval, I remain,

Your friend and well-wisher,

JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of The Americas and World Affairs.

Conservation of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the occasion for these remarks is my introduction of a bill in the House of Representatives as a companion bill to S. 1576 recently introduced in the Senate by Senator KERR of Oklahoma and others. This Nation has long tolerated and permitted the reckless exploitation of her natural resources. Our wilderness frontiers are now gone and their lack has only led to an intensification of soil-mining and depleting practices. Two great wars have led to record-breaking plantings of soil-depleting crops. The haste with which our water resources are dumped into the seas has increased the prevalence and the seriousness of our floods far beyond what our pioneer forefathers knew. Many of our streams and rivers have literally become "too thick to drink, too thin to plow" with the precious topsoil of our farms. Wanton winds have at times made a no man's land of portions of our Great Plains. Only by the most careful soil treatment and protection were the wastes of our Dust Bowl reclaimed at least for the time.

The territory within the drainage basin of the Arkansas-White and Red Rivers has been no exception to the wasteful policy of our prodigal people. This area can claim a goodly share of what was the great Dust Bowl. Despite the devastation we have witnessed and the heavy toll taken in the wealth of our land and water resources, this drainage basin remains one of the richest regions in the world. Thirty-seven different minerals are available here in commercial quantities. The agricultural potential of this region is tremendous even for this country. Add to this the magic ingredient of oil, and you have located within the inner circle of the United States an area possessing phenomenal possibilities for the future. Whether this area becomes waste or wonderland is a part of our responsibility. We must begin planning now how best to utilize every gallon of water that falls in this area and how we can best save, preserve, and enrich the precious topsoil of this region.

The bill which I have introduced is but a step in the direction we must go. The objective of this bill is a comprehensive basin-wide survey of the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins, which cover 227,140 square miles in 8 States. This bill provides for a 13-man commission, representing Federal agencies and the 8 States affected, which commission would complete its studies and surveys and submit its report within 2½ years. The investigations of this commission would include the study of flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, navigation, fish and wildlife resources, pollution abatement, domestic and municipal water supplies, salinity and silt control, recreational development, and improvement of transportation. Heretofore surveys of our river basins have all too often been confined to narrow portions thereof and have reflected the particular interests of the agency making the study. The survey and report sought by this bill would provide an over-all plan of development for this entire region and would coordinate the facilities and technical knowledge of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, Federal Power Commission, Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies, including agencies of the interested States.

This bill contains no authority for any actual construction or development, but in my opinion it would provide Congress with the facts and a pattern on which to intelligently base future legislation aimed at conserving our resources and providing for their maximum utilization and development. Such a program will be not only a great boon to the people of this region but will provide the United States with diversified development, a veritable reservoir of the products of agriculture, industry, and manufacture for times of war and national emergency, and the fruit for more abundant living in time of peace.

Higher Education in the Nation's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by me before a luncheon meeting of the American College Public Relations Association on April 27, 1949, during their thirty-second national convention which is being held in Washington, D. C., this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It seems peculiarly fitting that I should bring to this group a message on the subject, Higher Education in the Nation's Future. So much depends on you, who act as liaison between your institutions and the lay public; so much depends on us, as Federal legislators who are in a position to render great service to higher education, once we are convinced of the importance of doing so. Together, we must work to ascertain the facts, to chart our course, to convince the people of the Nation that quick action is needed, before it be too late.

I hardly think that anyone here today will contradict me when I say that we are living in a critical and decisive time in human history. The advances in science and technology have provided us with a tremendous potential for good or evil. Developments in transportation and communication in recent decades have served to bring all the peoples of the world so close that this is truly "one world." Yet, at the same time, we have developed weapons so devastating and so fearful that another major conflict promises to bring total annihilation to civilization as we know it today. A policy of isolationism is unthinkable in an atomic era. Rather, it is imperative that we concern ourselves with the means of bringing good instead of evil out of this technological and political chaos in which we find ourselves at this point. It is urgent that we act quickly to prevent catastrophe on a scale hitherto unimagined.

Scientists tell us that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, once atomic warfare has begun. That there is "no place to hide" is literally true. Yet, atomic power, if properly applied, offers great potentialities for human betterment. The utilization of this tremendous power depends on the attitudes and purposes of the people who possess it.

In short, the issue before us today is a moral and spiritual one. The only preventive to be effectively applied if we are to avoid a major world conflict will be a concerted effort on the part of the peoples of the world for world cooperation and world peace. We are making hopeful strides in that direction even now, with our North Atlantic Pact and our organizations working for a union of the democracies of the world. But the time is short, and there is much yet to be done in the matter of bringing our people to a better understanding of the urgency of the problems involved, to a broader vision of human development, to a burning desire to take constructive and effective steps to assure a lasting peace.

At this point, may I return for a moment to our topic, "Higher Education in the Nation's Future," to suggest that, without higher

education, it is possible that our Nation may have no future.

Too often in the past colleges and universities have been indifferent to their social responsibilities. Too often the academic life has been regarded as a cloistered, "ivory tower" sort of existence. Emphasis has too frequently been placed on the ability to compose verses in Greek or Latin, to identify obscure authors, to recall dates of occurrences that would have been just as well forgotten long since, to concoct strange messes in test tubes, and so on. Please do not mistake me; I realize the importance of study and research in science and the humanities; what I deplore is the assimilation of facts without a resultant understanding of their significance, or the constant application of analysis without the even more important synthesis that should inevitably follow. The ability to generalize is the most important one thing to be derived from higher education; with it, a person of intelligence is fitted to assume a position of leadership in both professional and public life. Without it, he becomes a mere cog in the wheel of everyday life, an expert in his chosen field, perhaps, but a dud everywhere else.

As a reaction to this unrealistic ecademic attitude to which I referred, there came ultimately an emphasis on vocational education. I agree that vocational education is of great importance in an economically complicated world such as ours; however, I believe that it is a great mistake to overemphasize it. To narrow a person's education to one chosen field or vocation is to make him provincial, shallow, and unable to cope with general problems on any scale, local or national.

It is, therefore, encouraging to note that institutions of higher learning today are placing renewed emphasis on general education, or, as it used to be called, liberal education. Thinking university people have come to realize that much depends on the ability of college students and graduates to bring to the solution of contemporary problems a wealth of information and a method of attack which will result in constructive action, progress, and the development of a type of leadership seldom achieved by those with only a secondary-school education or less. They have viewed the chaotic world conditions and realized that broad forms of adult education are the only means of accelerating social progress to the point that world catastrophe may be prevented. It may truly be said that the future of our Nation depends, as does the future of all civilization, upon the direction to be taken by education in the immediate future.

We are all beginning to realize how dear to us is our freedom, and how dependent that freedom is upon a democratic way of life. We realize how dependent true democracy is upon education and how impossible true education is in a police state. In these difficult days the world looks to America for leadership and for salvation. It behooves America, then, to be the home of original ideas; we can no longer afford to depend upon the Old World, as we did in the past. We must develop our own ideas and theories upon which depend our spiritual and intellectual health and our progress in science and technology. These, it is obvious, must be developed in the American colleges and universities. We must take the best brains and the finest young people that the Nation can produce and develop them to their utmost potentialities. We must teach them democracy as it has never been taught before, in a spirit of conative optimism—that is, in a spirit of conscious, all-out effort to do something about the perpetuation of democracy, rather than sit passively by and lose all by apathy. We must teach them a high code of ethical values, the "general" principles to apply to these world-shaking problems. For, as the basic ideals and ideas of American higher education go, so goes America. And, as America goes, so go the hopes of civilized mankind.

This is the prime need of the Nation today in regard to higher education: the development in limitless numbers of our young people of the mature judgment, the ability to generalize as applied to the solution of current problems and to the exigencies of leadership, and the high sense of moral values that should accompany the democratic way of life, based as it is on the premise of individual freedom and justice for all.

If America is to continue to lead the world from chaos to peace, we must consider more specifically ways in which higher education may contribute to that leadership.

Consider, for example, the Federal Government. Today, as never before in the history of our Nation, there is an urgent need for highly trained personnel, both in the various departments, bureaus, and agencies, and on the professional staffs of the congressional committees. Before World War I a Member of Congress could equip himself fairly well, through personal study, to understand the facts of a given issue. Today's problems, however, are far too complex and too numerous to permit a Congressman to rely only on self-help. He must obtain from many sources the pertinent facts, data, and statistics, brief them, and digest them, if he is properly to inform himself. No one person could be adequately and completely informed in all of the fields generally covered by legislation.

Full realization of this need brought about the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, section 203 of which authorized the Legislative Reference Service to appoint senior specialists in various fields to be available for special work with the appropriate committees of Congress, and also for work with individual Members of Congress. This fulfilled a need, so often expressed by various Members of Congress, for men of learning to do research work in the various legislative fields—men who could take an honest, impartial, nonpolitical view of the facts involved. Considering how quickly Congress has sometimes had to act in recent years on issues of grave international importance, it is significant that the acquisition of this expert assistance has in many instances, through making possible the rapid securing of information, served to speed up the processes of legislation, as well as relieved legislators from their former dependence on outside pressure groups for assistance.

Among qualities to be sought in the selection of these experts, it is to be noted that considerable emphasis is placed on broad general knowledge, rather than narrow specialization; analytic ability; and a scientific spirit—all of which stem from higher education of the finest type.

Many of our best-educated young people can plan today to enter the service of their Government through carreer positions available in the numerous departments, bureaus, and agencies. If we are to strengthen the effectiveness of our Government in the troublous years ahead, it is vital that we continue to attract more and more of these highly trained, but not overly specialized, young people into our Federal service.

Nor can we emphasize too greatly the important role being played by the products of higher education today in the various fields of private enterprise: business, industry, commerce, agriculture. It is important to the future of the Nation that the executives and experts in these various fields have not only a knowledge of their respective specialties, but also the broad general outlook and the high ideals and code of ethics to be derived from the best kind of higher education. There is no place for narrowness, selfishness, and greed in a world unified for peace and the well-being of all. We need people in high places who are capable of taking a long-range view of things, who are visionary, who have a strong moral sense.

Our technological progress, our survival, even in this complicated world of today depends to a large degree upon the findings and the painstaking toil of those brilliant but self-effacing individuals who spend their time in long hours of research and experimentation in the scientific and the various technical laboratories maintained throughout the Nation by some of our progressive private concerns, by governmental agencies, by research foundations, and by the colleges and universities themselves. To train young people to fill these difficult assignments is one of the chief obligations of higher education today. Yet, even in these highly specialized endeavors, sight must not be lost of the duty of science to assume a moral obligation in seeing that its efforts are applied for the enrichment and betterment of humanity, rather than for its detriment. Here again, it would be a grave mistake to be too narrow, a mistake far-reaching in its effects on all of us rather than on the individuals directly involved. In the future there can be no successful political or social policy unless it takes account of the potentialities of scientific endeavor and unless it is based on an understanding of the scientific method. To ignore the current relation between science and humanity would be to invite disaster.

In the midst of all these problems confronting higher education as its all-important role in the Nation's future becomes vividly apparent, is a problem existing within the ranks of higher education itself. I refer, of course, to the current shortage of teachers, both those adequate to instruct in institutions of higher learning and those needed to carry on at the elementary- and secondary-school levels. At the time when the demand for new faculty members is greatest, the number available is at a minimum. It is estimated that, if present trends continue, it would take 40 years to meet the needs on the college level of teaching alone that ought to be met within the next 4 or 5 years. The challenge to higher education at this point is to induce more intelligent, dynamic, attractive young people to take up teaching as a profession. The future of democracy depends on education; the future of education depends on its teachers.

Another point too often overlooked, I think, is the role that higher education can and must play in the education of the general populace. If we are to have an enlightened public, familiar with current large-scale problems and conscious of the part America must play in the immediate future in building a world-peace organization, there is no time to lose. Adult education is no longer an excrescence in relation to the total educational field—it has become a necessity. I believe it was Emerson who advanced so eloquently the idea that a man should continue his education throughout his lifetime; his goal was the continuous improvement of the mind of the individual, and this goal we still recognize. However, our new goal is that of the development of a group of consciousness in regard to democratic principles, of a group purpose to perpetuate democracy, of a group sense of belonging to a still larger group comprising all the democratic peoples of the world—a realistic application of the fundamental Christian principle of the brotherhood of man.

As a legislator, I have had occasion to find only too painfully apparent at times the necessity for the education of the adult public—or, rather, some of its members—in even a superficial understanding of the current issues and trends. It is rather discouraging

sometimes, after one has tried sincerely to act for the best interests of all concerned, to receive correspondence in which one is called a Socialist, a Fascist, or a Communist by someone who obviously has not the faintest understanding of the meaning of any of those terms, nor their social and political implications, nor of the specific issues under discussion. How to educate these people for peace in a democratic world? Do they understand the anatomy of peace or of democracy?

At this point I might raise a very pertinent question: Now that we are the recognized leaders of the world, exponents of the democratic way of life, does it not seem imperative that we should exemplify democracy here at home? How can we do this, except through the affording of equal opportunity for everyone in actuality as well as in theory? And how can this be accomplished except through education, on the adult as well as on the student level? This is, indeed, one of the greatest challenges facing higher education today. Democracy must be lived as well as orated about; it must be taught as something to be practiced in everyday life, not reserved for special occasions.

Now that we have considered some of the ways in which higher education can and must serve the Nation in the future, if we as a Nation are to survive and progress, it is appropriate that we consider briefly the conditions under which higher education is operating today.

It is well known, of course, that at the conclusion of World War II the various colleges and universities of the Nation were literally swamped with veterans attending under the GI bill of rights. This terrific and unprecedented student load has been cared for admirably by the institutions involved, despite the shortage of teachers and lack of adequate plant facilities to meet the situation.

Gradually this veteran enrollment has been tapering off. For example, though veterans formed about half of the Nation's college-student body in 1947, they account for only 42 percent in the school year 1948–49. Yet, despite this decrease, total enrollment is on the increase. The rate of student drop-out is slowing down; and at the same time there is at present in our society a general tendency for an increasing percent of our young people to want to go to college.

Total enrollment in all colleges and universities this year is about 2,410,000; last year it was about 2,338,000. This represents an increase for this year of approximately 3 percent. It also represents an increase of 78 percent above the highest attendance in any prewar year.

That our institutions have been able to care for the enormous expansion in enrollments is a great credit to their diligence and ingenuity. Now they are looking forward anxiously to the years ahead, wondering whether the new enrollment levels are merely a temporary condition, or whether they should plan permanently to care for the expanded numbers of students they have been forced to accommodate during the past 2 years.

Taking into consideration various factors that may influence the situation, such as (1) the number of veterans who will want to continue their education, (2) the already mentioned tendency for increasing numbers of our young people to want to go to college, (3) the birth rate and the number of college-age young people in our population, (4) possible introduction of new forms of scholarship or subsidy for students, (5) economic conditions, (6) possible requirement of military service, and (7) the extent to which institutional facilities are developed to meet the demands, one may make a good estimate by saying that total enrollments in the future are not likely to decrease significantly below the present levels. There may be a leveling-off period in enrollment figures very shortly, but this will very likely be followed in the latter part of the 1950's by further increases.

A significant question may be asked at this point: Will this expanded college enrollment lay a foundation for grave social unrest, widespread personal disappointment, a sense of frustration, if it proves that we succeed in educating more young people beyond the secondary school than can be absorbed in occupations requiring college-level training? Unless this education is directed toward sound social ends, it can prove to be a destructive rather than a constructive influence in our society. According to the recent excellent report by the President's Commission on Higher Education, no one need have fears that there is a possibility of overeducating American youth. The important thing is to see that there is adequate attention to a sound general education and that the occupational or professional education is accompanied by adequate guidance and counseling.

I would say that this greatly expanded enrollment is tremendously encouraging to us who are concerned about the future of democracy. Consider the widened sphere of influence among our total population that becomes possible when we, having conscientiously taught democracy to these young people, send them out among the general populace to practice and preach these all-important principles. Consider the enlightened and public-spirited electorate we should ultimately have if we do our work well.

As we burn with all these sanguine hopes and ideals, let us not forget the very practical consideration of just how we are going to finance higher education in the days ahead. At the present time, higher education in this country obtains its financial support from four principal sources: (1) Student fees, (2) philanthropic gifts, (3) endownment earnings, and (4) appropriations from public funds. The public generally fails to understand the fact that colleges and universities rarely collect through student fees enough money to provide the full cost of instruction, but have had in the past to depend on other sources of income. As for philanthropy, it has steadily declined in the share of total support provided higher education. There are those who believe that, if present economic trends continue, there may be ultimately an increase in such gifts; however, it is doubtful if ever again philanthropy may bear the major portion of the financial burden of higher education, as it once did. As for endowment earnings, their effectiveness and adequacy have decreased proportionately as inflation has increased. The present low rate of return on invested funds, and the probability of low rates for a long time in the future, make it a questionable policy at this time to devote much effort to the building up of large endowments for the support of our institutions of higher learning.

Since the end of the war, the legislatures in most States have been fairly generous in making appropriations for higher education. However, the increased appropriations have scarcely been adequate to care for the expanding enrollment and the higher prices of almost every commodity and service that a college has to purchase.

Whether the Federal Government may be expected to come to the rescue with funds for higher education is the vital question at this time. Certainly it is obvious that the success with which institutions of higher education are able to serve an increasing enrollment will depend to a large extent on the provision of adequate supporting funds. This is where the Federal Government could and should play an increasingly important part.

Those who assert that the basic structure of government provides for a complete separation of the Federal Government and education fail to read into the powers of the Federal Government their full significance for education. We have seen how the Federal Government, through its responsibility to assure the national defense, can draw on both students and faculty of the institutions of higher learning, assign specific programs of training to the institutions, and divert research to the extension of the instruments of war. We have also seen that the Federal Government, through its priority in the field of taxation, has access to funds which might otherwise be available to education through State and local tax and through voluntary contributions. The agency that has priority on the funds is by the exercise of this right accepting also an increasing responsibility for the maintenance of services to the general public, including educational services. Through its responsibility for maintaining the public welfare, the Federal Government again has a power which might well extend to include the field of education. Another example of the powers of the Federal Government with respect to education may be found in the various decisions of the Supreme Court which have affected educational policies in a very direct manner.

The conclusion is clear, then, that the opposition to the further extension of the Federal Government into the field of education, if based on constitutional grounds, has no basis in the fundamental framework of government.

Indeed, the Federal Government has a history of ever increasing aid to education with respect to specific activities. This has been inevitable—a part of the dominant national trend. The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education shows that in fiscal 1947 11 different agencies expended $1,732,000 in aid to post-high-school education. In large part, this aid has been provided through emergency programs scattered through various Federal agencies, with no established governmental policy. It is essential that a sound and stable pattern of continuing Federal support of higher education be developed before the present temporary programs expire. This necessitates the immediate development of a long-range legislative program for higher education, with united support on a Nation-wide basis. Certainly I would enthusiastically support such a program, even as I supported, as a member of the House of Representatives, the various measures introduced in the past in behalf of Federal aid to education.

I would like to quote at this point from a recent address of Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to President Truman: "It becomes increasingly clear that, as our national economy grows more complex, and as the United States assumes a greater position of leadership and responsibility in international affairs, higher education must be made available to every young American who is able to profit from it.

"In the next few years, I believe we must plan, in the light of the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, the best means by which the Federal Government can give scholarship aid to worthy young people who desire to continue their education.

"We Americans believe in a 'free market of ideas.' We are convinced that in the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, only people who have been trained to make sound individual judgments, can effectively resist a dogma or 'party line' imposed from above. If America is to retain its freedom in a world of conflicting ideologies, we must take steps to assure every

American youth the opportunity to receive the highest level of education by which he can profit. A soundly conceived Federal scholarship program is a necessary step in achieving this goal."

In conclusion, then, let us remember the ever increasing importance of higher education in the life of the Nation, its vital importance in the Nation's future. Conversely, let us also remember the important part the Nation will have to play, through the medium of aid from the Federal Government, in assuring higher education of its rightful place in the Nation's future.

Our future depends on it; democracy depends on it; world peace depends on it. We will teach our young people the truth—"And they shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free."

Address by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, Before Midwest Council of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Midwest Council of Young Republicans at St. Louis, Mo., on April 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be with you today. I always appreciate an opportunity to get away from the hectic, hurry-hurry, supercharged atmosphere of present-day Washington and return for a few days to the Middle West. I am particularly glad of an opportunity to meet with you—outstanding young leaders of our party—and to exchange ideas with you on some of the issues of the day.

I wish I could report to you that all is quiet on the domestic and foreign fronts in 1949. I wish I could tell you that my generation has been completely successful in its efforts to promote peace abroad and security at home. Of course, I cannot. A glance at the newspapers, a second at the radio, bring home to us the existence of problems—grave and pressing problems—that confront us on every side. Certainly these are difficult days for all of us. They are days that try men's souls.

There is one bright ray of hope, however. It is to be found in the demonstrated strength and character of the young leaders in our party. Not long ago I paid a visit to Springfield, Mo., for an annual gathering in honor of the immortal founder of our party. I had the pleasure of having dinner with a group of young Republican leaders—some of them I am glad to see are present here today. I can tell you that as a result of that visit I returned to Washington more optimistic about our country's future than for a long time—certainly since last November 2.

I am equally delighted with the aggressiveness and determination shown by you here today. Your ambition, your inspiration, and, yes, your grit are an assurance of the survival of our country, and of our party.

Disraeli once said, "The youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity." Bringing this thought up to date, I would say that America belongs to you. You and the other young people of our country, will be in the driver's seat in the years ahead—and sooner than a lot of people may expect. The inimitable Mr. Dooley once said that his only objection to a certain well-known statesman of that day was: "He wants to make the temporary organization permanent." The impression has been carefully cultivated by the opposition that the Democrat Party is the party of youth. A quick look at the leaders in the administration and in congressional circles should dispel that myth. Isn't it about time that some changes were made in the present temporary organization? Many of you no doubt will not choose to enter public life. But no matter your calling, whether doctor, lawyer, farmer, or businessman—businesswoman or housewife—your opportunities and your responsibilities as citizens will be always with you. A healthy democracy is dependent on the active participation of all of its citizens in the processes of government. There is no such thing as a proxy for your duties as citizens.

America is yours—yours to do with as you choose. I need not remind you of the inestimable value of that which you are about to inherit. Our country today, despite the perils, economic and otherwise which confront us, is the envy of the rest of the world. She did not reach her position of preeminence through accident. Far from it. Her success story is the American system of constitutional government, a free economy, and a free society.

It has often been said that there is no greater truth than that man fails to appreciate what he already possesses. It is always the grass on the other side of the stream that is the greenest. Something is often not appreciated at true worth until it is lost.

And so it is with liberties and human rights—the liberties and human rights that Americans now enjoy. To gain them, men, yes—and women, too—went through the fires of hell. Once won, and seemingly secure, these priceless privileges are left to the care of everyone in general and no one in particular. This is all right so long as no enemy menaces. Today, a determined drive is under way to destroy the social, political, and economic freedoms which have made our country great. Radicals parading under the banner of liberalism (of which they know nothing and care less) now would supplant Americanism with statism. They would substitute for our free economy, a socialized, planned economy. This danger on the home front is more menacing than any rumble of distant drums.

They would weaken and impair the liberties which we have enjoyed under our Bill of Rights and replace them with bureaucratic regulations and dictatorial interpretations, flowing out with monotonous regularity from Washington. They would mold an all-powerful Central Government to regulate our daily lives from the first chime of the alarm clock in the morning to the last weary sigh at night.

Knowing your background and your heritage, I cannot believe you want a bureaucrat in Washington guiding your thinking and telling you about your work—how, and when, and where you shall live, and have your being.

I do not believe you will be misled by the fantastic promises of those who advocate a socialized, planned economy. Planned economy, my eye. It is planned monotony that these long-haired men and short-sighted women would give us.

You may know of the man who was in great trouble and dreamed that he died. When he woke up in another world, an unearthly being told him: "You are now in an existence where you can have everything you want without effort." The man asked for food and more food, for fine clothes, for automobiles, for a yacht, and a palace, and received whatever he wanted merely for the asking. After a few days this type of existence began to pall and the man told his guide: "What I want now is to have a little effort connected with my activities." The being said, "That is one thing we cannot arrange." The man, in desperation, cried: "I would rather be in hell than to go on existing like this." The eerie one said: "Well, where did you think you were?"

We in America have too long neglected to make known the true meaning of our way of life. We have the greatest product on earth to sell and we have fallen down on the job. I hope you young people will profit by the mistakes of the past. You must dig out the facts and get the people to know and understand the unparalleled advantages of our free economy and our free society. Let us sell America.

Just what has our system meant to America? In the first place, the United States, one of the youngest of all nations, has the highest standard of living in the world. We have only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of its area, but Americans today possess 60 percent of all telephones, 80 percent of all automobiles, 51 percent of all radios, and 90 percent of all the bathtubs in the world.

If the proof of the plum is in the pudding, certainly no one can challenge the superiority of the American system of free enterprise.

By way of contrast, let us look at the experience of countries which have fallen prey to the panacea of state control and regimentation. Where could we find better proof that it would be folly for us to abandon our American system? Russia has been experimenting with socialism for 30 years, and today Russia is the poorhouse of Europe.

Take Great Britain, for another example, where far-reaching experiments in socialism are now being carried out. The Government has been acquiring and operating basic industries. This is spoken of as the "nationalization" or "socialization" of industry. Every nationalized industry in England is losing money. In the parliamentary debates on November 16, 1948, Winston Churchill said: "We can now already see that nationalization and state ownership have been a great and costly failure in all the industries to which they have been applied, and this will become more obvious to the public with every day that passes."

Here are some figures to prove that Mr. Churchill knew of what he spoke. During the first year after socialization the British coal industry lost $94,000,000. Civil aviation lost $100,000,000 in the first 14 months of operation.

These nationalized industries have survived thus far only because the American taxpayers have been footing the bill by putting up Marshall-plan money earned under the American system of free enterprise and private initiative.

SHOULD WE FINANCE NATIONAL SOCIALISM IN EUROPE?

Congress recently authorized the continuation of the European recovery program, the so-called Marshall plan, for a further 15 months. The amount of money to be spent will be fixed later when the appropriation bill is passed. I expect to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill when it reaches Congress providing that the administrator of the Marshall plan shall not authorize assistance under the act which may be used by the government receiving it to acquire or operate any basic industry.

I do not intend to discuss the merits of the Marshall plan as a whole, many of the objectives of which are good. What I have to say will be confined to a single phase of it. I should like to discuss with you briefly this evening whether any Congress should permit any part of your money to be used to finance or implement experiments in socialism in the countries of western Europe.

MARSHALL PLAN MONEY HAS ACCELERATED THE NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN EUROPE

Several of the countries of Europe are far down the road toward a completely socialized state. England has already socialized 10 of her important industries. France has socialized 23 of them. This process of socialization in both countries has been accelerated to a great extent by the use of Marshall-plan money. Under the Marshall plan each of the participating countries of Europe submits a plan of what it proposes to do by way of internal reconstruction and relief. The United States makes up the deficit in these national plans. What each nation does internally is supported by the money of the American taxpayers. I shall discuss particularly the case of Great Britain; not because of any dislike of the British, but because Great Britain is a typical case and by far the largest beneficiary under the Marshall plan. The American taxpayers have already contributed under various plans, most of them now unhonored and unsung, over $44,000,000,000 to Great Britain.

The Marshall-plan funds go from America in the form of raw materials for Britain's socialized industries and in many other ways. If the United States had not financed the British socialist program, it could not have been carried out. It was American money (your money) that saved Britain from the inevitable unemployment and lower standards of living which would have come under the socialist program. As a matter of fact, the Marshall-plan money has become a great slush fund to keep the British Socialist Party in power.

Socialism and communism are fruit of the same tree, which has its roots in the theories of Karl Marx. They have the same objective, which is the nationalization of all industry. The Communist is willing to resort to any means, including force and violence to attain this end. The Socialist prefers that the nationalization of industry be obtained by peaceful or democratic methods.

Communism is the form of Marxism which has developed in Russia. The adherents of communism are in control of the U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Socialism is a form of Marxism that has been developed in England and in some of the other countries of western Europe. The British Socialist Party is in control of the Government of Great Britain.

And so we are met with this strange paradox. The United States is spending billions of dollars to stop Marxist communism, but at the same time is spending billions of dollars to subsidize Marxist socialism.

As Winston Churchill has said, the Socialist parties in every European country are "the handmaids and heralds of communism, and prepare the way at every stage and every step for its future advance."

MAY WE EXPECT MARSHALL-PLAN MONEY TO RETARD THE NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN EUROPE?

It has been argued by apologists for the Marshall plan that the Marshall plan is the way to check the advance of socialism in Great Britain. They prefer to think that the Marshall plan will make the British so happy and contented that they will change their present course. This reminds one of the time Will Rogers was asked by a young writer if the field of humor was crowded. "Only when Congress is in session," he said.

Let us look at the record. Keep in mind that the Marshall-plan law was signed by the President on April 3, 1948. Did the British Government turn back from its socialist program in view of the golden prospect of Marshall-plan money flowing from America? Quite the contrary. A month after the Marshall plan was adopted, on May 17, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain and head of the British Socialist Party, assured the party at its annual conference: "We intend to carry on the work to which we have set our hand and with your help we shall win through." On November 2, 1948, Hugh Dalton, former Chancelor of the Exchequer, put it this way: "We shall obstinately persist in carrying out the promises which we made to the electors." But it may be said that was last November—maybe the program of the party has been changed since then. Let us see.

After all, actions speak louder than words. The British socialists are now taking steps in Parliament to nationalize the iron and steel industry. The bill for this purpose has passed the second reading. A few days ago Prof. Harold Laski, the brain truster of the British Labor Party, was in Washington. He said that there are three industries his party plans to nationalize next, but nothing except force would cause him to reveal what they are.

And to bring the record right down to date, on April 12, on Tuesday of last week, a 5-year program for the Socialist Party in Great Britain was announced. In addition to the industries already nationalized, it is proposed that the Government take over the cement industry, all suitable mineral deposits, cold-storage facilities not already publicly owned, sugar manufacturing and refining, and appropriate sections of the chemical industry, and two great insurance companies, the Prudential Insurance Co. and the Pearl Insurance Co., both of which have vast investments in other business enterprises.

Does this look like the Socialist Party is turning back from its program? Who knows better what that program is than the leaders of the Socialist Party themselves? And remember this: If the United States does not finance the program for further nationalization, it cannot be carried out.

It is also sometimes said that we should not place any strings on the Marshall-plan money because the United States should not interfere in the government or in the economy of a foreign country. But bless my soul, the whole Marshall plan is an interference in the economies of other countries on a gigantic scale. We said to Spain at the outset, "We don't like your government. You can't have any Marshall-plan money unless you change it." We interfered in the Italian election in 1948. The American Ambassador made campaign speeches and the Attorney General of the United States addressed the Italian people over the radio on the eve of the election. I do not mean to criticize this, but I do say that it is entirely too late for us to hold up our hands and say with sanctimonious piety, "Of course, we do not wish to interfere in either the government or the economy of a foreign country."

COMPETITION WITH NATIONALIZED INDUSTRY IS UNFAIR TO THE AMERICAN WORKINGMAN

I am concerned about this use of your money because we are creating competition abroad that will rise to plague us. Fortunately we are able to know in considerable detail the plans of the British Socialist Government for the invasion and capture of American markets. Sir Stafford Cripps, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, told the House of Commons on January 27 this year that, "First and most important of all, we must export more goods to the United States. * * *" On April 11, 1949, Mr. Hugh Wilson, president of the British Board of Trade, stated that by 1950 exports to the United States and Canada must be increased by an additional 30 percent. The American businessman and the American workingman have always prided themselves upon their ability to meet fair competition anywhere and at any time. All we have asked is an even break. But we Americans have always insisted that competition be fair. We have put antitrust laws and antimonopoly laws on our statute books to insure that the competition among ourselves is fair. Now we are helping to create in Europe great national monopolies and setting them up in business to compete with American industry and American labor on unequal terms. Nationalized industries have an advantage over private industries in competition with them, and here is the reason: Nationalized industries enjoy freedom from taxation, the advantages of monopoly, and government financial support. Such competition threatens to imperil the welfare of the American workingman.

Let us take the overseas air lines as an example. The American Airlines crossing the Atlantic are having great difficulty in making both ends meet. They find themselves unable to buy the finest planes and the latest equipment for a very good reason—they are losing money. On the other hand, the British Overseas Airways, owned by the British Government, have recently contracted for 10 Boeing Strato-cruisers, at a cost of a million and a half dollars apiece, to be paid for out of Marshall plan money—of course, I mean your money. And so American taxpayers are giving equipment to foreign overseas government air lines and expecting American private enterprise to compete with them. No wonder the American private enterprise in competition is discouraged, and unattractive to thrifty investors.

When the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was considering this matter Senator GEORGE said to Mr. Hoffman, the Administrator of the Marshall plan: "You may be putting a whole lot of industry in this country out of business." Later the great Georgia Senator said, "I have warned you." Mr. Hoffman's comment was, "Sir, I cannot tell you how little concerned I am about European competition." With due respect to Mr. Hoffman, let me make this clear: I believe the time has come for us to be concerned about American industry and American working people. I believe we of the American Congress should say to our fellow citizens who earn their bread: "Our friends, we can tell you how much concerned we are about unfair European competition in the years to come."

I cannot avoid the conclusion that when we think this thing through—at long last—we shall decide not to permit your money, earned under a system of free enterprise and personal initiative, to be frittered away in experiments in socialism on the continent of Europe or in the British Isles.

Collectivism and the Modern Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, last night, in the city of Boston, an impressive banquet was held on the occasion of the

twentieth anniversary of the Boston College Law School, and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made a thoughtful speech which will be remembered by all who were in attendance. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLECTIVISM AND THE MODERN LAWYER

Collectivism is a manifestation of modern industrial development. Unless, quickly appraised and standardized in the American tradition of individual liberty, it threatens to undermine the foundations of free society and subject mankind to a world-wide tyranny more complete and cruel than any that ever existed. It is to the contemplation of this prospect that I invite the attention of the modern lawyer.

We are confronted by the greatest challenge freemen ever encountered. Civilization can endure neither a third world war nor another depression here. Neither men nor nations have recovered from the Second World War. Meanwhile, business leaders and Government leaders stand around helplessly wondering if we stand on the brink of economic collapse, but hesitating with pitiful indecision to use the power of Government to prevent it. There has been no comparable crisis since, in the decade before the Civil War, political leaders in Washington, lacking both vision and courage, wasted their energies in futile debate over half-measures, unwilling to take the strong action that would save the Union. When the issue could no longer be dodged, it had to be settled by the bloodiest war ever fought—until that time.

The modern American lawyer can prevent another such crisis, but only if he is willing to face facts as they are and measure them by the standards of human liberty to which our people have always been devoted.

THE DANGER ABRAHAM LINCOLN SAW

Let us consider the opening sentences of the immortal address of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg in 1863:

"Fourscore and seven years ago," said the Civil War President, "our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great Civil War testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

The danger Lincoln saw was twofold: First, that the Republic by being split asunder would be unable to defend itself, and second, that if it could be split upon the slavery issue, the great ideals of freedom and equality which had inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution would have received a mortal blow. The danger now is that class conflict may rend the Republic and that freedom may then become the victim of arbitrary collectivism.

The threat to popular sovereignty is greater now than it was four score and six years ago when Lincoln spoke. Economic life then was still essentially local and individual. Now it is essentially national and corporate, so that the masses of the people can no longer control the decisions which shape their economic life. Those decisions are made for them, rather than by them. Their economic destiny is controlled by the managers of organized groups instead of by themselves as individuals. Local authority has been disappearing and central authority expanding while over a large part of the world the ideology of the authoritarian state has supplanted the ideology of free government.

Lincoln was confident that if the Union could be preserved, liberty would be safe. The Union was preserved. It was never stronger than it is now, but liberty is in greater danger than ever because a cult has developed that democracy has been outmoded, that the forces of nature, released by science, are beyond the grasp of the masses and therefore that the people, instead of governing themselves, must be governed—in other words, that they must be told what to do.

THE PROLETARIAT HAS DEVELOPED

This is the conflict which every modern lawyer must clearly appraise if he desires to devote his talents to the preservation of what we call the American way of life. The danger to our institutions is more ominous because it has so to speak, caught us unawares. We seem not to have perceived that the dictatorship of the proletariat could not exist unless there were a proletariat, that is to say, a significant segment of the population unable to support itself by its own efforts. Even though a man may be politically free, he is only half free if, at the same time, he is dependent upon some other man or group of men for his economic existence. This is the situation which has developed in our time, right here at home as well as abroad.

Every lawyer knows how deeply rooted in our system is the purpose to protect the economic freedom of the worker. There is no State in the Federal Union which does not exempt from execution for debt the tools by which a man has been accustomed to carry on his trade. The principle was set forth by Coke, one of the great masters of the common law in the quaint language of his time, as follows:

"Thou shalt not take the nether nor the upper millstone to pledge, for he taketh a man's life to pledge; whereby it appeareth that a man's trade is accounted his life, because it maintaineth his life; and thereby the monopolist that taketh away a man's trade taketh away his life."

Few indeed are the men who now own the tools of their trade. Mass production and the assembly line have made the workers dependent not upon the tools they carry in their kits, but upon giant machines which can be owned only by organized capital, and organized capital nowadays is chiefly only collective economic enterprise, that is to say it is furnished by thousands through the sale of corporate stock. Thus it is that 40 percent of all industrial workers in the United States are employed by only one-tenth of 1 percent of all the employers, and 52 percent are employed by only eight-tenths of 1 percent of all the 3,400,000 industrial business enterprises in the country. Thus it becomes plain why we here in the United States who set so much store by rugged individualism find that the collective ownership of the tools of trade and industry has made collective bargaining inevitable. This is why I say economic collectivism has taken us unawares.

ECONOMIC COLLECTIVISM IS HERE

The modern lawyer owes an obligation to himself and to his community correctly to appraise these forces, for economic collectivism leads directly to the authoritarian state. How easy it is to condemn big government without realizing that big government is only the result of the economic conditions under which we live. Regulation of business has always been a recognized function of government, both at common law and in colonial times. When business was predominantly local, government regulation was local. When business became national, regulation became national. When that happens, the people are no longer able to observe precisely what is going on either in management or in government, no matter whether they are the nominal owners of business or its customers.

How these conditions produce authoritarianism may readily be illustrated by a few examples. We have learned not to shudder at the thought of collective bargaining in the field of labor, and I presume nobody in Boston displays much alarm at the thought of the Boston Port Authority, although it is not an example of the town meeting plan. Like the Port of New York Authority, it exercises broad powers of regulation and control that only a few years ago would have been regarded as foreign to our system. The executive secretary of the Northwest Marine Terminal Association defended the authority idea plan a few years ago upon the ground, as he put it, that "the marine terminal industry should be regulated for its own benefit and to protect those in the industry against their own and their competitors' ill-advised actions."

Before we denounce the expansion of big government, therefore, we must first open our minds to the fact that it is not self-generating but is only the inevitable outgrowth of conditions which themselves are the product of the remarkable advances of science and invention within the last 50 years. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Communications Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the National Labor Relations Board are only a few of the agencies of big government at Washington which have been produced solely by the fact that the collectivist economy in which we live left to Congress no alternative but to create them. Debates in the congressional halls do not involve the issue of the existence of such commissions and agencies, but only whether or not they shall be given sufficient authority and money to operate effectively in the public interest. The controversies which fill the headlines seldom have anything to do with the essential issue of whether or not we shall have big government but only over the degree to which it shall be supported. Only last week the Senate debated the Federal public housing bill for days, but when the final vote was cast only 13 Members of that body voted against it. The attack on the measure was by indirection.

These regulatory boards and commissions, the operations of which are the cause of so much current criticism of government, were created only because the business and industry of our time have outgrown the local and State boundaries within which our fathers and grandfathers lived out their lives contentedly. The railroads, the telephone and telegraph lines, the waves of ether through which radio communication passes, the stratosphere through which the airplane flies, all these have utterly changed the world in which we live, and because these instruments of trade and commerce and communication can be built, operated, and maintained only by the collective activity of millions of workers and hundreds of thousands of investors, the public interest can be safeguarded only through the exercise of regulatory authority by the Government at Washington.

THE BATTLE BEHIND THE SCENE

No political party seeks to destroy these boards and commissions. The battle now is waged behind the scenes to make them defenders of special interests rather than custodians of the public interest. It was a great Massachusetts lawyer, afterward Attorney General in the Cabinet of Grover Cleveland, who very lucidly described the technique now so often followed by the collectivist economic interests which resist regulations. President Perkins, of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, who was disturbed lest the Interstate Commerce Commission should cause trouble for the rail-

roads, wrote to Richard Olney asking his advice as to how to bring about the elimination of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Thus replied Mr. Olney:

"My impression would be that, looking at the matter from a railroad point of view exclusively, repeal of the Interstate Commerce Act would not be a wise thing to undertake * * * The attempt would not be likely to succeed; if it did not succeed, and were made on the ground of the inefficiency and uselessness of the Commission, the result would very probably be giving it the power it now lacks. The Commission, as its functions have now been limited by the courts, is, or can be made, of great use to the railroads, at the same time that that supervision is almost entirely nominal. Further, the older such a commission gets to be, the more inclined it will be found to take the business and railroad view of things. It thus becomes a sort of barrier between the railroad corporations and the people, and a sort of protection against hasty and crude legislation hostile to railroad interests. * * * The part of wisdom is not to destroy the Commission but to utilize it."

It is one of the serious defects of government by boards or commissions, particularly when such a board or commission has discretionary powers, that the law itself may be changed merely by changing the personnel of the commission. A complacent member can easily fall into the habit of taking "the business view of things," as Mr. Olney expressed it. "The business view of things" does not necessarily mean the economic or the efficient view of things, but rather only the view which is taken by the managers of the great economic enterprises which have outgrown regulation in the public interest by local government authority, and which, if they are to be regulated at all, must be regulated by the authority of the central government.

JUSTICE BRANDEIS AND THE GIANT CORPORATION

This fact illustrates why it is so important for the modern lawyer to recognize the difference between individual business enterprise as known to our grandfathers and collective business enterprise as known to us. If we are to escape political collectivism, the first essential step is to make sure that economic collectivism shall not gain control of the public authority. The contrast between these two forms of enterprise has nowhere been made more clear than by another great Massachusetts lawyer, Mr. Justice Brandeis, who, in his dissenting opinion in *Liggett* v. *Lee* (288 U. S. 517, 566) described the concentration of economic power as the "negation of industrial democracy."

"The typical business corporation of the last century," wrote Justice Brandeis, "owned by a small group of individuals, managed by their owners and limited in size by their personal wealth is being supplanted by huge concerns in which the lives of tens or hundreds of thousands of employees and the property of tens or hundreds of thousands of investors are subjected, through the corporate mechanism, to the control of a few men. Ownership has been separated from control; and this separation has removed many of the checks which formerly operated to curb the misuse of wealth and power. And as ownership of the shares is becoming increasingly dispersed, the power which formerly accompanied ownership is becoming increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few. The changes thereby wrought in the lives of the workers, of the owners and of the general public are so fundamental and far-reaching as to lead * * * scholars to compare the evolving 'corporate system' with the feudal system; and to lead other men of insight and experience to assert that this 'master institution of civilized life' is committing it to the rule of plutocracy."

Justice Brandeis was describing the collectivist corporation which, in our time, has become the most significant aspect of our whole economic structure. With hundreds of thousands of employees and hundreds of thousands of stockholders who exercise little or no control over either the policies or properties of the corporation, these organizations are dominating a steadily increasing segment of the industrial and commercial activities of the whole Nation. They affect the lives not of the people of one city or one State, but of the people of the entire United States. Their managers may and do determine by their private decisions how much of a given commodity 144,000,000 people may have and the price they may pay for it. Frequently these organizations are members of international cartels which divide among their associates the trade and commerce of the whole world. There are instances too numerous to mention in which these organizations have regulated production, divided territory, fixed prices, and eliminated competition without the slightest authority of government. Some of them are so great that they sit down as partners in business enterprises of world-wide scope with the imperial governments of foreign nations.

In very truth, they have become economic governments. They turn on and off the supply of goods on which all commerce depends. They make compacts in interstate and foreign commerce of which no public authority has any knowledge. Their international cartel agreements have frequently been more far-reaching in effect than formal Government trade agreements over which the Senate sometimes spends weeks of debate in committee and on the floor.

The Constitution gave to Congress the plenary power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." It is precisely this commerce which is now in an excessively great degree regulated by huge corporate enterprises created by the States. The same Constitution which gave Congress the commerce power provided that no State should, without the consent of Congress "enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power." Yet corporations created by the States exercise a power in the field of interstate and foreign commerce which is denied to their creators. All this is because as lawyers we have not distinguished between the rights of the natural person, created by God, and the rights of the artificial corporate person created by the States.

MANAGEMENT IN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

When such corporations were owned and managed by the same persons, it was easy to disregard the difference. Now, however, when ownership and management have been so significantly separated in the giant interstate and international corporations, failure to recognize the difference results in the acquisition by managers of economic powers greater than were ever before exercised by a few men at the top.

This is the condition which has made economic collectivism the distinctive mark of this era. This is the condition which has produced the basic problem the modern lawyer must solve if he intends to contribute to the preservation of individual economic freedom and popular sovereignty in an era which needs and must have the services of the modern giant corporations.

When the political system is controlled by the people in the traditional American way but the economic system is controlled by management at the top, the forces are set in motion which give rise to management in government also. When economic management shall have led to political management, the people will have lost self-government in both fields.

What then are we going to do about it? Our objective should not be to atomize big business any more than it should be to weaken the people's government in Washington. Rather it should be to make them both more responsive to the will of the people. If we would preserve democracy in government, we have no choice but to preserve industrial democracy. If we would escape regimentation by government—and we certainly should—we must first escape regimentation by business management. If private capitalism would save itself, then it must first help to save democracy.

The one thing needful is the rule of order that will preserve the ideal of popular sovereignty in business organization and political organization also. The opportunity of the lawyer and the challenge now presented to him is to help write this rule of order for the economic organizations through which modern business must operate.

It was the failure to produce such a rule of economic democracy that produced the disaster that befell Europe. Economic collectivism led directly to political collectivism. Self-government began to disappear. Totalitarianism took its place. Freedom died wherever totalitarianism took over, and the individual, politically, economically, and even spiritually became the pawn of the state.

AN ECONOMIC CONVENTION NEEDED

To prevent such a disaster here, to preserve our heritage of liberty, we need no punitive program. We need only a preventive program. We need an economic convention now as much as the people of the newly liberated colonies needed the constitutional convention. Such a convention, made up of representatives of business and labor and agriculture, representatives of the consumers and the professions, representatives of the geographical areas and experts who know the nature of our natural resources, would be competent to do the job that is needed. And the lawyers of America who remember that 60 percent of the constitutional convention in 1787 was made up of members of their profession will be eager to make their talents available for the solution of the great modern dilemma of human freedom.

Pray God that we may not delay too long. It is my firm conviction that the policy of the Kremlin is not based on any plan to make war upon the United States. It is based upon a conviction that because of cupidity, the leaders of capitalism cannot avoid a depression. The Communists are waiting for economic collapse in the United States. Such a collapse here would mean that the whole world would fall into the lap of communism.

This, then, is the challenge of our time to the modern lawyer. He has the training. He has the knowledge. Surely he must have the inspiration in this crisis of world civilization to provide the leadership so sadly needed by mankind everywhere, leadership that will preserve political liberty by restoring economic freedom. Without it, peace and prosperity in our time could be the most tragic illusion of all human history.

Labor and Management Dependent on Each Other

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the

exchange of letters on this highly controversial matter of labor and management. It is obvious that neither group is independent and hence there must be a common meeting ground of interdependence of each with the other. As part of my remarks I am inserting a letter and reply which appeared in the New York Sun:

TWO SIDES—ALWAYS

The complete interdependence of business and labor on each other, and the need for management and labor to review each other's ideas is sharply brought into consideration by the two letters reprinted below.

Are workers more important? Or do machines take precedence? This interesting explanation of both points of view illustrates why both important segments of the free-enterprise system must be equally considered:

"To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

"SIR: First, permit me to compliment you for publishing this. Second, permit me to say that seldom have I observed such rank ignorance of basic economics as that displayed by Phelps Adams in his piece The Free Enterprise System.

"It is not enough that he refuses to recognize the importance of cost of living, etc., as rubbing out worker benefits, but he confuses the meaning of terms like communism, socialism, and capitalism itself. The following may help clear away some of his misunderstanding:

"What did you tell that man just now?
"I told him to hurry.
"What right have you to tell him to hurry?
"I pay him to hurry.
"How much do you pay him?
"Ten dollars a day.
"Where do you get the money to pay him?
"I sell products.
"Who makes the products?
"He does.
"How many products does he make in a day?
"Sixteen dollars' worth.
"Then, instead of your paying him, he pays you $6 a day to stand around and tell him to hurry.
"Well, but I own the machines.
"How did you get the machines?
"Sold products and bought them.
"Who made the products?
"Shut up. He might hear you.

"JOEL S. MORGAN.

"NEW YORK."

And here is Mr. Adams' reply:

"MY DEAR MR. MORGAN: What with the high price of paper, it seems worse than profitless to enter into a controversy with you on the issue of which of us is rankly ignorant of what. I do want, however, to make one or two necessary revisions in the highly amusing, cunningly clever and completely cockeyed little colloquy that you presented. I do not even profess to hope that the corrections will succeed in clearing away your own misunderstanding:

"Who is that man sitting over there?
"He's working for me.
"What is he doing?
"He's running that machine in front of him.
"How much do you pay him?
"Twelve dollars a day.
"Where do you get the money?
"I sell products.
"Who makes the products?
"He and the machine he is running.
"How many products do they make a day?
"Fourteen dollars' worth.
"How much of the work does the man do?
"About 5 percent of it—70 cents' worth.
"How much does the machine do?
"Some 85 percent—or about $12 worth.
"How did you get the machine—by selling products?
"Heavens, no. I had to buy the machine before there were any products and before there was even a job for the man.
"Then where did you get the money?
"A lot of people who saved it invested $6,500 in that machine and charged me for using it.
"How much do you pay them for using the machine?
"About 4 percent—70 cents a day.
"Hey, let me get this straight. You pay the man $12 a day for doing 70 cents' worth of work and you pay the owners of the machine 70 cents a day for doing $12 worth of work?
"That's right.
"Good gosh, man, they belong in the booby hatch.
"Shut up. That's what worries me.
"The only essential difference between my story and yours is that mine happens to square with the facts.
"Hoping that you may some day do the same.

"Sincerely,

"PHELPS H. ADAMS."

The Refund of Excess-Profits Tax and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Francis Stacey is very illuminating. It seems that the ability to pay taxes has been abandoned in the huge refund of excess-profits tax and there is a definite tendency to shift the burder of taxation to employment taxes. Since those paying excess-profits taxes during the war were well able to pay them from their business enterprises the volume of which was increased by the activity of the war, there is no good reason that those taxes should be refunded.

Here follows Mr. Stacey's report:

When the Revenue Act of 1945, signed by the President November 8, 1945, repealed the excess-profits tax, effective 1946, it wiped out at one stroke the most ample and the most just tax available for the financial foundation of the social-security program.

Our Federal income tax is based on the principle: Ability to pay. Who has greater ability to pay than the corporation which receives dividends from excess profits? Profits over and above normal earnings of preceding years? Profits derived from taxing the consumers, workers, and producers, farmers, and homemakers, by boosting their excess prices on cost of living?

Today the social-security program, in its four-phase operation, is chiefly dependent for financial support upon employment taxes, $2,038,500,000 in 1947, $2,395,700,000 in the fiscal year 1948.

Public Law 379, approved August 6, 1947, provides for a tax of 1 percent for 1948 and 1949, 1½ percent for 1950 and 1951, and 2 percent after 1951. These employment taxes yielded in 1948 the sum of $2,395,700,000 and are estimated to yield in 1949 $2,610,000,000. From this total the Federal old-age and survivors-insurance trust fund is estimated to receive in 1949 the sum of only $1,754,000,000. (See Secretary of Treasury Report, 1948, p. 59.)

By comparison, note the billions of potential revenue, during the fiscal years 1945-48, we have surrendered to excess profiteers by outright repeal of excess-profits taxes:

YEARLY REVENUE FROM EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES (1945–48)

In the last year of World War II, fiscal year 1945, excess-profits taxes (Revenue Acts of 1940, 1941, 1942) exceeded $11,000,000,000, or, more than five times the cost of the social-security program.

Since that year, excess profits collected by the excess profiteers (as all know) have mounted year by year to the peak in 1948. But the revenue collected year by year by the Government under the repealing act of 1945, has declined to the vanishing point (not yet reported by the Treasury):

	Excess-profits-tax collections	Yearly decrease
Fiscal year June 30—		
1945	$11,003,519,623	
1946	7,822,488,154	−$3,181,031,469
1947	3,566,177,958	−4,256,310,196
1948	305,251,476	−3,260,926,482

Though excess profits grew steadily with increased cost of living from 1945 to 1948, annual revenue from excess-profits taxes was cut down by over $10,000,000,000, or, by more than the total 4-year cost of the social-security program. The burden of social security has fallen upon employment taxes—wages withheld at the source.

In the gradual process of excess-profits-tax repeal—from 1945 to 1948, inclusive—the average annual reduction of revenue is around $3,500,000,000, or, 50 percent more than the cost of the social-security program. What have been the effects upon the national economy? Here is a rough sketch:

EFFECTS OF EXEMPTING EXCESS PROFITS FROM TAXES AND THROWING SOCIAL-SECURITY COSTS ON EMPLOYMENT

1. It has given the social-security program an inadequate support.

2. It has stimulated excess profiteers to raise prices to the inflation danger point.

3. It has raised the cost of living to the highest point in American history—75 percent above prewar.

4. It has shifted the tax burden of social-security support from the backs of those best able to pay—the corporations which harvest excess profits—to the backs of those least able to pay—the low-income workers whose wages are withheld.

5. It has promoted strikes—that have been on the increase since excess-profits-tax repeal.

6. It gives the oldster a less dependable source of living than the Negro received in slavery days.

7. It gives the entire social-security program less than one-half the billions sent to help the needy of Europe 4 years after World War II is over.

8. It destroys security and leaves uncertainty.

This last point is illustrated by the report of the United States Labor Department, that unemployment has increased by 3,500,000 from December 15, 1948, to February 15, 1949, which means that employment taxes, upon which the social-security program depends for existence, is on the decline and is emphatically uncertain.

Grants to the States for social security are less than the grants to Europe under the Marshall plan, and not more than one-half the estimated $10,000,000,000 estimated for the annual support of the North Atlantic Pact.

WHY SHOULD NOT EXCESS PROFITS PAY?

There are profits on the ERP billions shipped to feed and clothe and raise the standard of European living—and the excess profiteers are those who skim the cream off the ERP exports.

There will be huge profits on the $10,000,000,000 yearly which we shall soon have to be sending to 11 foreign countries under the North Atlantic Pact.

Why should not the excess profiteers engaged in the ERP trade and in supporting the 11 foreign countries under the North Atlantic Pact pay their due share in the support of social security in the 48 States of America?

To reverse the case, what would you think of a plan to finance ERP by employment taxes? Who would applaud a plan to finance the North Atlantic Pact from receipts from withheld wages?

If excess profits contributed over $11,000,000,000 in 1945, as excess profits did, to wind up World War II, why should excess profiteers expect and claim tax exemption in the postwar period of World War II, when new profits are in sight?

Approximately one-fourth of the excess profits taxes paid in 1945 will meet the cost of the social-security program. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that employment taxes for support of the social-security program will reach $2,600,000,000 in 1949. But, if unemployment grows at the rate of 3,500,000 in 60 days, as it did from December 15 to February 15, employment taxes will make a like percentage decline, and actual employment taxes in 1949 may not reach $2,500,000,000.

The time has arrived, therefore, when all good excess profiteers should come to the aid of social security for the needy and the unemployed. If for lack of social security, the army of the unemployed grows at the rate of 3,500,000 in 60 days, the time may come when the employed will not be able to pay $2,500,000,000 a year for social security, and, when excess profits will cease.

This Congress is faced with a demand for $5,500,000,000 for the support of ERP under the Marshall plan. During the past few days the North Atlantic Pact has brought before us the vision of coming appropriations which may double ERP expenditures. Who will be the beneficiaries among American taxpayers? Naturally, in the definition of the terms, the beneficiaries will be the excess profiteers.

In time of war, the beneficiaries of war paid the costs of war in the form of the excess profits taxes. They paid on the principle of ability to pay. The principle of ability to pay is the basis of American taxation, not only in wartime, but in postwar time—which is now.

Taxes for war and taxes for social security stand on the same American principle of taxation—ability to pay. If the employer and the wage-earner have the ability to pay, then chief of all and above all, the excess profiteer has the ability to pay—now in the face of a potential world war III, as formerly in World War II.

Security of the 12 nations under the Atlantic Pact hangs upon security of America. Security is the foundation of peace. Security is the foundation of profits. There can be no security if those best able to pay—the excess profiteers—are unwilling to pay their due share—on a parity with the wage-earners whose wages are withheld.

Federal Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two excellent and enlightened editorials relating to the need for a Federal health program. These two editorials appeared in the January 20 and March 31, 1949, editions of the Grand Rapids Herald-Review at Grand Rapids, Minn., and I am sure that they reflect the viewpoint of a vast majority of the people of Minnesota on the health insurance issue:

A GREAT NEED FOR AMERICA

A Federal health program is just about as sure as anything governmental or political can be. Shortsighted public policy on the part of some people and by the doctors of the Nation can bring about a plan of so-called socialized medicine. But such a development is not necessary to achieve the real purposes of that which so many seek.

There are two general types of illness. One consists of common afflictions. They demand some attention by those afflicted and by doctors. The cost of such medical attention is not great and every family can meet that cost just as the public now pays for clothes, food, and fun.

The other kind of illness is tragic in its effect. This is serious illness, the kind that demands much time by the doctor, travel to distant points, extensive nursing care, long hospitalization, expensive treatments or surgery. Such sickness not only causes physical and mental suffering but it is followed by great economic distress.

It is not necessary to tell of the financial misfortunes of serious illness. When members of a family become sick, relief of illness becomes the paramount concern. Family savings of a lifetime will be sacrificed to help a child. Money set aside for education and opportunity will be used. Homes and property will be mortgaged. Often sickness attends the one who provides for the family. Very often it attacks the mother of children so that she cannot carry on her work. Many times the entire earnings of a family go, month after month and year after year, into futile efforts to contend with sickness for which those who suffer or spend are in no way responsible. The cost of serious illness drags prosperous families into uncertainty and distress and makes poverty all the more hopeless.

Certainly physicians understand this as well as anyone. Many good doctors devote a large part of their time and strength to those who cannot pay for their professional services. Yet the American Medical Association takes actions which are short-sighted, discreditable to a great profession and entirely inconsistent with the humanitarianism and sympathy for which doctors, as individuals, are noted.

The American Medical Association says that it is raising $3,500,000 to fight socialized medicine. Such announcements and undertakings are foolish and indiscreet. It puts the doctors on one side of a question, the public on the other side. It gives argument and inspiration to those who will oppose the association. It closes the door to compromise and constructive consideration of a sound method of dealing with a problem involving the welfare and security of millions of people.

The solution most needed is not socialized medicine as this is often described, as it now appears in England, or as is advocated by many in the United States. The first step is economic protection of every family against the devastating costs of serious illness. To bring that about, it is not necessary to control the medical profession. The need is for the public to underwrite the cost of illness, of which medical fees are but a part, that takes more than a certain reasonable amount in a year or which takes more than a safe percentage of the income of a family.

Such a plan will not control the doctor or the choice of a physician. In truth, such a plan will be of great economic help to so many doctors who now give so much of their time and effort to those who cannot pay for professional services.

Such a plan need not be charity by government. The cost should be underwritten by every person who works, through a reasonable deduction from his earnings. Employers may well pay a part, for relief of the great financial distress of illness will be helpful to every employer and to every business institution in America.

Some of the objectives of a health plan are now being met, in part, by insurance proposals. These undertakings have shown the way but have also demonstrated weaknesses. No private plan will ever go far enough to really do this task. No plan that is voluntary or optional will ever give protection to all of those who most need it. There is a place for a great, universally applied and publicly financed health program in America and it can be attained, under sympathetic and sound leadership, without destruction of the medical profession and with immeasurable good to every family and every person in this great land.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY

This newspaper believes that doctors, individually and professionally, are among the best people on earth.

Collectively they seem to be on the wrong track. That is due to an obviously incompetent management of the American Medical Association and its professional publicists and policy makers regarding their approach to the public health program.

There is no need to destroy the practice of medicine.

There is a problem of medical care and expense. This problem is not, primarily, that of paying doctors to take care of trivial and unimportant illnesses.

The need is to protect the public and every citizen against the great hazards of long continued, severe, and costly sickness.

There are comparatively few families who can meet the cost of long sickness, surgery, hospital and nursing care, disability, and loss of time without economic collapse.

When this kind of a threat appears the public should step in and pay the cost of severe illness from the funds which the public has paid for such a purpose. Every person, from his first working days, should contribute to such a plan of protection. Every person, irrespective of his means, should participate in the benefits of the plan.

Such a plan means no disturbance of the present practice of physicians. It means no change in medical practice except that the doctor will be sure of pay for the service he renders.

Private insurance plans are projected. They are useful but inadequate. We have a great life insurance business in America. Nearly everyone has life insurance except those who need it the most. Any health insurance plan must protect every person in America.

The American Medical Association has an opportunity to render great service to its members and to the public. It should take up the torch and run with it.

West's Blunders Aid Kremlin on Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

an article by William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of April 25, 1949. No one questions the penetrating insight and clear understanding which Mr. Simms possesses of our relations with other countries because they are based upon long experience, wide travel, and thorough study. His editorial follows:

WEST'S BLUNDERS AID KREMLIN ON SPAIN

(By William Philip Simms)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—There is reason to believe the United States and other Atlantic Pact powers soon will resume freedom of action with regard to Spain, certainly this year.

This would put an end to a paradoxical and one of the most hypocritical situations in present-day international relations.

Russia regards Spain as one of the three strategically most important countries in western Europe. The other two are France and Italy. Should any one of them go Communist, the other two wouldn't have a chance.

That is why Russia tried so desperately to take over Spain back in the 1930's. The Spanish Civil War did not result from Gen. Francisco Franco's intervention against the republic which ran things after the downfall of King Alfonso. That republic already had been liquidated. What General Franco did was to intervene against the Red regime which Moscow had caused to be set up in Madrid.

General Franco did accept aid from Hitler and Mussolini. And their aid undoubtedly helped him defeat the Reds. But history reveals he gave them nothing in return, despite Axis pressure during World War II.

At San Francisco Russia led the fight to keep Spain out of the United Nations. The Soviets started off with a blunder that set UN circles chuckling. They said any nation which had collaborated with Hitler should be barred from UN membership.

And that would have barred Russia herself. She was Hitler's most notorious, powerful collaborator up to June 1941. It was Stalin and Molotov who made the deal with Hitler and Ribbentrop to wipe Poland from the map and split her territory between them, 50–50.

Quickly, however, Russia saw her error at San Francisco and changed the formula. As amended, it read that any nation helped to power by Hitler would be barred from the UN.

Even this formula, strictly applied, would have barred Russia. For while Hitlerite Germany did not help to set up the Soviet regime, Kaiser Wilhelm II's Germany most certainly did. It was that Germany which transported Lenin in a sealed train across Germany to Russia for the purpose of planting him in power there.

At Lake Success, Russia and her satellites are still doing their utmost to make trouble for Spain. They seek Spain's economic collapse in the belief that political chaos would follow, thus giving communism another chance.

Refusal of the western powers to maintain normal diplomatic relations with Madrid operates as a serious handicap to Spanish recovery.

Incredible as it may seem, therefore, the United States and other western nations are playing into the hands of Moscow.

Feverishly, clear around the globe, Russia and her fifth columns are seeking to overthrow freedom-loving countries. And Spain is a vital part of the west's defense.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard it frequently stated in recent months that if it were not for the leaders in organized labor that the rank and file labor man would readily accept the Taft-Hartley Act. This thing of telling men who do their own thinking that they do not know what is best for them, and that only Mr. TAFT and Mr. Hartley and their friends know all there is to be known in regard to labor relations constitutes one of the grossest affronts to human intelligence we have witnessed in modern times.

All of us learned at an early age that black is not white and from that time forward our God-given intellect is what we have to guide us, and collectively we do a much better job of thinking. The industrial barons and their cronies demand that their brand of righteousness be legislated for those they say do not know what is good for them. And as a further disruptive factor in this entire smear of antilabor technique, the men of labor are being advised to ignore what their own leaders say on the ground that these leaders are misleading them and giving them unsound advice.

Taft-Hartley advocates argue that if labor appreciated the finer things in life and used the tarnished golden rule of Mr. TAFT and Mr. Hartley we could all be happy.

But let us examine this claim that labor does not know what is good for itself.

I cannot believe that any man, be he employee or employer, can convince himself that the Wagner Act was ever anything except good for him. No one can convince me that placing all parties at the bargaining table on the same level is not good for the workingman and his family and all the members of today's complex society. Yet that is what the Wagner Act did, and it is the Wagner Act that we now seek to reinstate instead of continuing to carry on the lawbooks the Taft-Hartley Act.

What the perpetrators of the Taft-Hartley Act really mean is that if the laboring man would close his eyes and stop up his ears and follow those who are not his leaders, that there would be less understanding of what the Taft-Hartley atrocity does to him. His leaders have told him that this new law that was to bring about great labor-management reforms resulted in more strikes, involving as many as 10,000 more in 1948 than in 1947.

Is a law that encourages or precipitates such strikes beneficial to a man who knows what is good for him when he has been told there will be fewer strikes?

Does a man who has been assured by the National Association of Manufacturers that a labor contract is more apt to be lived up to not know what is good for him when he can see for himself that this is not true? Does not the labor man already know that damage suits filed in Federal courts, already overloaded with docketed cases, are designed to sap the finances of his union and to destroy his own effectiveness individually and collectively? And that the direct result of this situation is that peaceful collective bargaining thus will be destroyed? Further, that settlement of disputes can and will be delayed indefinitely?

I am convinced that responsible labor and responsible management procedures in establishing constructive relations now are being disrupted by the Taft-Hartley Act, on which I am prepared to go all the way to repeal. I know of no law that has injured the dignity of man quite as much as this law.

The right to strike is inherent from the Constitution. Yet the Taft-Hartley Act would supply the beginning of the end of the right to strike, if only you will read the declaration of policy introducing the law as explaining its true purpose.

Today, under this law, employees run the outright risk of losing the protective rights under NLRB if they indulge in almost any kind of strike, not alone those strikes outlawed by the act. You and I know that when the courts get through interpreting and inserting their own mental marginal notes in the Taft-Hartley Act that the laboring man, if he does not already know what is good for him is going to learn suddenly some day what is not good for him. This is but a part of the contribution the Taft-Hartley Act is not making to industrial peace.

What about this cooling-off period of 60 days the Taft-Hartley Act provides, and which, according to the NAM, protects him from being kicked out of work through a sudden cessation of employment? Has not the rank-and-file laboring man learned by now that the longer the period between the time a decision is made to strike and the time the strike actually becomes operative is working to his distinct disadvantage?

Does not the workingman know that the sooner the strike starts, the sooner it is settled and that the employer is entrenched behind his surpluses, both of finances and materials, and that he can farm out work during the cooling-off period and have the product back in his plant and delivered before the strike can begin? Is that good for the workingman? And did not the labor leader tell him about that and did not the leader tell him the truth?

And what about that anti-Communist affidavit? Is this any protection for labor? Labor has done a splendid job of protecting itself in this regard. Every day for many months, every time we picked up newspapers, unions were conducting house cleanings in every direction. During the war some Commies got footholds and the Communists were then our allies, or so we were assured. The anti-Communist affidavit has been much more of an insult to laboring men than it

will ever be as a safeguard. Labor knows how to deal with subversives and does it, and no legislative enactment will change it.

What is all this talk about knowing what is good for us? I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you have kept abreast of the news on what the Taft-Hartley Act has done to one of the finest craft unions in the world, the International Typographical Union. The law has been well used by the general counsel of the NLRB to keep this union in the courts continually at a cost of more than $11,000,000 to date. And the cosponsor of the Taft-Hartley Act who says he believes in equalizing the fight actually puts pressure on the general counsel to go out and do bigger things against this union. Who will daresay the members of this union have not already learned what is not good for them?

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time has expired on this debate, but I am prepared to continue this discussion as to whether the union man knows what is good for him or not. Do not sell the workingman short. He does an amazing amount of thinking for himself and his leaders help point the way to sounder thinking.

Remember November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text of the American Federation of Labor declaration calling for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law which was adopted unanimously last November by the sixty-seventh convention of the AFL and reprinted in the AFL weekly news service Tuesday, November 23, 1948:

CINCINNATI.—The American people have spoken. The mandate of a free people, in a free election, has been recorded. The verdict of the ballot box is clear, concise, and convincing.

The major issue of the 1948 presidential campaign was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was submitted to the electorate in one of the greatest series of debates in American political history. What is most significant is that these history-making debates were carried on, not only in the campaign tours of the presidential aspirants, but in every State and city of our land by thousands of speakers. Many of these were candidates for public office, and countless others, including trade-union representatives, sought no office but realized what was at stake, and were determined to keep this issue close to the grass roots of our Republic.

The Taft-Hartley Act amended the Clayton amendments to the antitrust law, in a manner which eliminated the labor rights which had been established.

The Taft-Hartley Act amended the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-injunction Act by making it mandatory that the Board, control of the NLRB, in certain cases, go to the Federal court to secure injunctions against labor. It also provided that in other types of cases, the Board could use discretionary authority in applying for injunctions.

Before the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, employers seeking injunctions in connection with labor disputes, employed their own attorneys. Under the Taft-Hartley Act the Federal Government, the taxpayers, met the cost.

The Taft-Hartley Act contains many provisions making collective bargaining more difficult. It made it impossible for trade-unions to secure union-shop provisions in a collective-bargaining agreement, until an election of the employees had been held.

The Taft-Hartley Act places exclusive authority in the chief counsel of the NLRB, in the determination of all that should be done in a large majority of labor cases.

The Taft-Hartley Act was so drawn that many chains were forged which would not be used, except by a national administration determined to shackle labor hand and foot, or when an industrial collapse threw hundreds of thousands out of employment.

There was in the act definite unfriendliness to organized labor. It was injurious to public welfare. It was injurious to employers who believed in maintaining contractual relations with their employees through collective bargaining.

It did not give prime consideration to public welfare. It did not safeguard labor's rights. The act was a definite piece of class legislation, and for that reason it was intolerable to fair-thinking men, whether in industry or labor. Its operation was rigidly driving a wedge between fair-minded and thoughtful employers and their organized employees.

This issue on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act having been taken to the people for their decision, and having been decided in the affirmative, places the question squarely upon the elected representatives of the Congress of the United States. Will they now carry out the will of the majority of the people as expressed at the polls?

While 9 Senators and 57 Representatives—Republicans and Democrats alike—who voted for the act were defeated for reelection, not a single Member of Congress who voted to sustain the Presidential veto of the act failed to be reelected.

The action of the voters made it clear that they were convinced that the act was conceived in a narrow spirit of retaliation, and passed in a mood of defiance. It must not remain on the statute books to provide disturbance for open-handed and well-considered effort of reasonable men within the labor movement to provide for cooperation with management and establish a more orderly basis for industrial relations in our country.

In the British House of Commons, often described as the Mother of Parliaments, when a government or an administration is defeated in a majority vote of confidence, it resigns and a new government is formed.

American politics provide for no such prompt retirement of a government defeated at the polls, but the spirit of true parliamentary government should prevail in our land.

Members of Congress who voted for the act, and voted to override the Presidential veto, would do well to consider the temper of the times, and the clear mandate of the people in November 1948. In true American spirit these Congressmen and Senators should now accept the will of the majority by repealing the obnoxious Taft-Hartley Act, and reestablishing the Wagner Act with such further congressional actions as is necessary to completely restore the labor guarantee of the Clayton amendments to the Antitrust Act, and all of the provisions of the original Norris-LaGuardia Anti-injunction Act.

There must, however, be no hiatus between the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reenactment of the Wagner Act. The public welfare, as well as that of management and labor, is paramount. The economic health, safety, and welfare of the Nation must not again be placed in jeopardy by the irresponsible action of anyone.

Your committee believes that this is not the time for recrimination, political or otherwise. The critical conditions in the world require that we be united as a people, and increase our strength as a Nation. We need to close our ranks, to build for a better future upon the basis of cooperation. Between management and labor there must be mutual respect and acceptance of both of their responsibilities to the public.

While we are unyielding in our fixed determination to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the full restoration of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the other act hereinbefore referred to, as American citizens we are as deeply conscious of our responsibility to the general public as we are to our membership. After the Wagner Labor Relations Act is restored we will be ready to consider any amendments that may be desirable to improve this act and to strengthen collective-bargaining procedures.

We realize that any activity on the part of management, or on the part of labor, which fails to secure a generous measure of public approval and support, will be used as a reason for the enactment of repressive Federal and State legislation. In taking this position we are conscious of the fact that for every right we enjoy, there exists a corresponding responsibility, and it is with this consciousness that we prepare ourselves for the repeal of the most obnoxious and unsound labor measure which has ever been enacted by Congress.

Minority Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, my home town is not large in population nor is its newspaper large in circulation, as we ordinarily speak of such things. However, both the people and the newspaper possess ample capacity for straight thinking and expression on issues confronting the Nation. The attached editorial comment gives much food for thought, is well worthy of the time required to read it, and a few minutes' reflection on its import. It appeared in the Palestine (Tex.) Herald and Press on Wednesday afternoon, April 6:

MINORITY RIGHTS

Why is it that so many Americans fail to see the dangers of taking away the rights of minorities? Why is it that a desire for an immediate benefit often obscures the menaces now being thrown at democracy itself?

Take the case of President Truman's socialized-medicine program. He is insistent that Congress pass it, and his lieutenant, Oscar M. Ewing, Chief of the Federal Security Agency, is waging a high-pressure campaign to sell people throughout the country on the idea.

The argument advanced by Ewing is that there are only 180,000 doctors in the country, to serve all of the country's 150,000,000 or so people. Everybody needs medical attention,

says Ewing. So the Government should underwrite all medical care for all people.

That sounds good to a lot of people. Medical attention free (but don't forget that you'd pay for it in taxes) has the same appeal as winning on a sweepstakes ticket. But the doctors don't want to be socialized. They don't want to be regulated through a Government bureau. And they argue truthfully that socialization of any group opens the door toward socialization of all groups.

The fact of that argument is pretty well substantiated by President Truman's call for Government-owned steel plants, first step in nationalization of that industry.

The prospect of such steps doesn't scare a lot of people. So what, they ask. What does it matter if we take away the rights of 180,000 doctors or a few steel makers to better the lot of millions.

Well, here's what it means.

The same attitude of taking from the few to help the many can be applied to every trade.

There are only a comparatively few automobile workers; so they could be socialized to benefit the many. Then you would then buy a Government-designed and regulated automobile.

There are only a few—compared to the national population—railroad workers. So it would be logical to socialize them, too. Then you could buy your railroad ticket from a bored and discourteous civil-service worker.

There are only a few newspapers and radio stations. Why not socialize them for the benefit of the many? Then you would get your news filtered through Government bureaus that undoubtedly would eventually eliminate all the news except what the bureaucrats might want you to read.

The dairymen are a minority. Everybody needs milk. So it would follow that dairies should be socialized for the service of the majority, and your child's milk supply could be regulated, or denied, by a bureau.

The thing goes on and on. There is no limit to socialism, once the trend gets under way; for all of us, when you come down to it, are members of minorities in one way or another.

The above looks silly printed on paper, doesn't it? It is silly, but socialism itself is silly. So is totalitarianism. So is communism. But put this in your hat: All those systems of government are kin to each other. All of them call for direction of the people by the Government, and not direction of the Government by the people.

When people direct the Government they are free. When the Government directs the people there is no freedom.

The greatest test of American democracy lies in the hard-headed determination of the people to resist Government encroachment on the rights and the freedoms of the people—all people, all minorities, and all groups.

The test is before us in the plan for socialized medicine. Let us hope that Congress, acting on the sentiments of the majority of the American people, kicks that plan into the gutter where it belongs.

Progress of European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Progress of European Recovery, delivered by Secretary Snyder, before the Federal Reserve Bank Conference of Ninth District Bankers, at the Hotel Nicollet, Minneapolis, Minn., April 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY

The progress of economic recovery in Europe is a matter of vital importance to you officers and representatives of the Federal Reserve banks and to the business community as a whole. In dealing with this question today I do not propose to discuss the techniques of procurement and the banking operations with which you are familiar. I propose instead to look at the subject from the broad viewpoint of what has so far been accomplished and what we can expect in the course of the next 2 years.

The American aim is to assist in bringing about that degree of economic and financial stability in Europe which will make possible a return to normal international financial relations in which chief reliance for capital investment will be placed on the private market.

Thus far progress toward economic recovery in Europe has been encouraging. When the program started in 1948 production in Europe was still behind prewar levels. The financial situation was, to say the least, disquieting. Many of the European countries were suffering from grave inflation, and there appeared to be little immediate prospect of arresting it. Fiscal problems were serious and makeshift solutions only added to the existing disorder.

Of equally grave import, the political situation was far from favorable. Communists sought to interrupt production in order to spread distress and chaos in Europe.

Today the threat of Communist sabotage to the recovery program is being met with the force of democratic power and determination.

Our combined efforts toward economic recovery and political peace have been intensified. Threats still exist, as you well know, but this last year gives us a basis for greater confidence in the future of western Europe.

A notable increase in western European production occurred during 1948, with total output of factories and mines 14 percent above the 1947 level and nearly equal to that of 1938. Favorable weather conditions helped to raise crop production considerably above 1947, although it was still below prewar levels. Output per worker increased as a result of larger supplies of fuel and raw materials, job-training programs, and more food for workers, but it had not yet returned to prewar levels in many industries.

Marked improvement also occurred in western Europe's balance of trade with the outside world. Whereas in 1947, less than 40 percent of the participating countries' imports were paid for from the proceeds of exports, this ratio will probably exceed 50 percent during the fiscal year 1948–49.

In the field of internal finance, the situation has also improved measurably. There has been a healthy movement toward sounder fiscal policy. In many countries resolute efforts are being made toward balanced budgets. Of course, in some countries, much greater efforts must still be made. To finance governments by noninflationary means has necessitated increasing the tax burden and, as far as possible, required the deferment of expenditures for objectives which could be postponed. And we all know how extremely difficult it is to cut expenditures where there are insistent demands upon government to repair the damages caused by war. In large part this work of immediate reconstruction has been completed. The tasks ahead remain formidable, and there are some questionable spots in the present economic picture, but on the whole, the European countries have faced the situation with courage.

With few exceptions, the rapid rise of prices has stopped. In the case of Italy and France, restrictions were imposed on the extension of credit by the commercial banks. Cutting down the volume of currency and rationing of bank credit were two methods of attacking inflation. The object was to reduce excessive demand for commodities by the use of financial restrictions while at the same time increasing those commodities in short supply. A relative stabilization of prices is making possible greater stability in all areas of the economy. With the European price spiral largely arrested and a measure of budgetary stability in prospect, the internal financial situation can form the basis of a sound international economy.

The European recovery program was not intended as a relief program, though we had to provide the foodstuffs and raw materials needed to tide the population over the postwar shortages resulting from the exhaustion of stocks, crop failures, and the decline in international trade. The program is based on the belief that with assistance from this country, Europe will be able to stand on its own feet by 1952, provided that the European countries individually and collectively take the appropriate steps to cope with the problem of their Western Hemisphere deficit. Some of these steps are financial, some of them may involve a considerable reorientation of production and trade.

The period following the Second World War has greatly aggravated the dollar-deficit problem of the Western Hemisphere countries which existed as a very real problem in the interwar period. European countries have traditionally bought more from the United States and other Western Hemisphere countries than they sold here. They made up the difference by their income from investments, by earning dollars for shipping services, and by earning dollars through triangular trade with areas that had a dollar surplus on current account. American tourists in Europe also provided an important net source of dollars.

The war has changed this situation. Income from investments has been greatly reduced since the European countries have liquidated a considerable part of their long-term dollar assets. A large part of their shipping was destroyed. They have not been able to obtain as much from triangular trade as they did formerly. To this extent they may have to reorient their trade so as to sell more goods directly to Western Hemisphere countries. The United States provides the largest potential single market for many types of goods which Europe can produce.

Of course, a nation's pattern of production and export cannot be changed over night. Plants may have to be constructed or modified as to product, location, and other factors. Workers may need to be trained and perhaps relocated. The necessary mechanics of trade, banking, and finance incident to an expansion of exports must be devised to accompany increased sales effort. It is clear that Europe will have to increase further its exports if it is to maintain desirable levels of production and standards of living without dependence upon special aid from the outside.

A stable world in which the free-enterprise system can operate successfully requires balance in international payments. This does not mean that exports must equal imports exactly because, as I have just mentioned, there are many other factors entering into the balance of payments, such as shipping services, tourist expenditures, and most important, capital movements. The importance of these other factors varies from country to country. An increase in American

tourists going abroad will help the situation, particularly for countries like the United Kingdom, Italy, and France. Improvement in the shipping situation will be important for Norway, the United Kingdom, and other nations with large merchant fleets.

For most countries, the basic problem is the matter of exports. It cannot be overemphasized. America has in the past imported thousands of specialized European products—manufactures of steel, textiles, machinery, and equipment of various sorts. We have imported French perfumes and French wines; Italian silks and olive oil; and luxuries and specialties of many types. To some extent the European countries will be able to balance their accounts with the United States by increasing their exports to us of the type of goods which we have generally imported. They must also find markets in this country for many additional products.

Few of the European countries can supply the basic raw materials which we need, but they do have an opportunity to provide us with many types of specialized finished goods, which they can produce more cheaply than we can because of their relatively lower rates of wages. So too, we, on the other hand, can produce more cheaply many commodities which require a great deal of capital, raw materials or the special types of managerial and technical skill which we have.

A second way in which the European countries can balance their payments is by an increase in American capital investment abroad. At the present time, however, American capital is reluctant to go abroad—not only to Europe but to most other countries. The reasons behind this reluctance are evident.

To the extent, however, that the European recovery program is successful, the special risks involved in European investment will be reduced.

While a return to normal reliance on private capital investments abroad is essential, we must stress the importance of balanced international trade. This means, as I have said earlier, that we in this country must try to take more imports from the European countries. In part this is our problem.

Our program of reducing trade barriers and trying to assure equitable treatment of foreign trade through the International Trade Organization and our agreements on tariffs and trade are part of our contribution to the solution of the problem. On their part, the Europeans must make greater effort to produce goods and offer to sell them in Western Hemisphere markets at competitive prices. In some cases this may require an adjustment of their exchange rates.

In the course of the last year, I have appeared several times before congressional committees to discuss this problem. I would like to restate what I have told the Senate and House committees on different occasions. An adjustment of exchange rates in each instance is a matter requiring a difficult decision. For example, it may bring about repercussions on the internal economy of the country making the change. It is also very difficult to determine what is the proper exchange rate—that is, to calculate what the effects of a given exchange adjustment might be. But the fact remains that if the European countries are to balance their payments with the United States and other Western Hemisphere countries, some of them may have to adjust their exchange rates before 1952.

The exchange rates prevailing today were, for the most part, adopted during and after the war, and were accepted by the International Monetary Fund in 1946. Since these rates were adopted there hav been important changes in the world situation and in the economic life of almost all of the countries in the European recovery program. The progress in production and shifts in price levels which have occurred over the last 3 years would indicate that the European payments position should be studied and that this study should include careful consideration of the relationship between existing exchange rates and the progress which must still be made in arriving at international balance.

As we look back over the last year, we can see that progress has been made. Excepting Germany, practically all of the European countries participating in the program have exceeded their 1938 production levels. The prospect of widespread starvation no longer exists. In most countries there is a high level of employment. Consumption standards are still below prewar, but we may expect that by 1952, with favorable conditions, the desired levels will be reached. The problem still is one of inability, under existing conditions, for the European countries to earn enough dollars to pay for their imports from this country and the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

This is the problem on which we must concentrate for the next 2 years. We are hopeful that the proper solutions can be found. It will take effort on their part as well as on ours. When this problem approaches a solution, there will be greater assurance of political and economic stability abroad which is, of course, our objective.

It is our expectation that barring some great international catastrophe, reasonable stability will be attained in Europe by 1952. From then on, we can deal with international economic problems in terms of the more normal patterns of price, trade, and private investment by which our own country has reached its present economic levels.

As you know, the ECA program was long and earnestly considered, both in congressional committee and by the Congress as a whole. You will recall that although debate on the bill was protracted, there was at no time any major disagreement with respect to the merits of the program. Numerous amendments were offered, some of which were accepted, but for the most part those amendments were concerned with details of the program and methods of administering it. The bipartisan nature of the support which the program received is ample testimony of this country's united determination to make every effort toward world economic stability.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the executive council of the American Federation of Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, STATEMENT ON HOUSING LEGISLATION, JANUARY 31, 1949

HOUSING NEEDS

We are alarmed by the acute housing shortage which still confronts the Nation almost 4 years after the war. It is estimated that there is a current deficiency of 10,000,000 homes, and that 5,000,000 additional homes must be built within the next 10 years if the housing needs of the American people are to be adequately met. We should now be building at least 1,500,000 homes annually, but last year private builders constructed only 925,000 dwellings, most of them at prices which workers could not afford.

Indeed, the generally accepted figure of 15,000,000 homes needed during the next 10 years, since it is based on the Housing Census of 1940, may even be an underestimation of the Nation's housing requirements. In view of the large redistribution of population during the war and postwar years, it is quite possible that in terms of the area-by-area need the 15,000,000 figure is too low.

The lack of accurate, up-to-date data indicated by this uncertainty emphasizes the need for a housing census in 1950. We therefore strongly urge Congress to enact as speedily as possible legislation authorizing the Bureau of the Census to take a comprehensive housing census along with the decennial population census in 1950.

NEW HOUSING LEGISLATION

Ever since the war the American Federation of Labor has been in the forefront of the fight for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. However, because this bill never did represent more than a compromise, and because of the long delay in its enactment and the consequent worsening of the housing crisis, it can no longer be considered adequate to meet the existing housing shortage.

We are proud that the American Federation of Labor at its recent convention went on record as the first major organization calling for the erection of a minimum of 1,000,000 units of public low-rent housing, the program which was subsequently incorporated in the President's state of the Union message.

The President's housing program has now been given concrete expression in S. 138. This bill covers such subjects as public housing, slum clearance and urban redevelopment, farm housing, and housing research not included in the very inadequate Housing Act of 1948 of the Eightieth Congress.

We approve particularly the public housing provision of this bill, which calls for the construction of 1,000,000 low-rent units during the next 7 years at the rate of 150,000 a year. In addition, the President has the authority to increase this number by 100,000 in any one year if he determines that this is in the public interest. By using this power of acceleration to the maximum, this country can reach what we consider to be the desirable goal of 1,000,000 units in 4 years.

Although we feel that the bill in many respects is an improvement over the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, we cannot accept it as the solution to our housing problem because it contains no provisions for middle-income families or for agricultural workers and their families.

About 37 percent of American families are in the so-called middle-income group whose annual income is between $2,000 and $4,000. The housing needs of this group, which is ineligible for public housing, have been utterly neglected by private builders, and can only be met by large-scale construction of cooperative and rental housing within the means of these families.

In order to foster large-scale construction of decent homes for middle-income families, savings must be sought in carrying charges, profits, and other costs rather than by reduction of space and lowering of construction standards. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor recommends authorization for direct Federal loans for large-scale rental and cooperative housing. The loans should be made for an amortization period covering the useful life of the dwelling at the going Federal interest rate; they should be made available to public agencies, cooperatives, nonprofit and limited dividend corporations, and private builders who can

conform to the rent schedules which should be established under this program. Of the six housing bills now under consideration in Congress, only the bill introduced by Congressman JAVITS contains this feature. Unfortunately, the size of the program authorized by this bill is entirely inadequate.

We estimate that this type of program would make possible decent housing for middle-income families for which monthly payments would be in the neighborhood of $50 to $60. Because of the reduced financing and other costs, such dwellings would be, on the average, the equivalent of an $8,500 dwelling unit.

We cannot accept as a substitute for this legislation the so-called economy-house drive which has recently been launched by the real-estate interests and by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Federal Government. The elaborate plans for this drive which have been made public cannot conceal the fact that the economy house represents simply an attempt to force middle-income families to accept standards below the level of decent housing. Cost reductions are achieved mainly by such drastic cutting down of living space that the houses are completely inadequate for ordinary family living. If these economy houses should be built in any appreciable numbers, they may well become the slums of tomorrow.

Construction of substandard economy houses is no substitute for a genuine middle-income housing program, but neither is tinkering with the existing program of mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing Administration. Simply increasing the limits on the cost of houses insured under the FHA program and permitting lending institutions to sell a larger percentage of mortgages to the Federal National Mortgage Association will not solve the fundamental problem of reducing financing charges and profits so that the rents of monthly payments of middle-income families wil be at a level they can afford. What is needed is a separate constituent division set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency specifically charged with the responsibility of making direct loans and providing technical assistance for cooperative and other types of nonprofit and limited-dividend housing for middle-income families.

As now written, proposed housing legislation also neglects the needs of agricultural workers. The provisions of S. 138 relating to farm housing would aid only farm operators, but would do nothing for the long-neglected agricultural workers. We urge legislation providing for the construction of housing of permanent and mobile types for stationary and migrant agricultural workers. The responsibility for the housing program for farm labor must be placed in the Department of Labor.

The Record of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Lest We Forget, Let's Look at the Record," written by former Senator Raymond E. Willis, of Indiana, and published in the Steuben Republican, of Angola, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET, LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD
(By Raymond E. Willis)

In these days when the tide of the Republican Party is at low ebb and elective influence in our country is in the hands of a generation which "knew not Joseph" one has a right, if not the duty, to look at the record and judge whether the scandalous, vituperative and vicious charges hurled at the party during the past 18 years can be sustained.

The Republican Party has been variously charged with being a conservative party, a stand-pat reactionary party, the protagonists of princes of privilege, and has been labeled with names that could be fittingly applied to a Benedict Arnold in public life or to a Jesse James in private piracy. Honest Democrats will excuse themselves by saying that everything is fair in war and politics, and "anyways it worked."

In this present day of social and political confusion, the word "conservative" as applied to a party is a quality that sounds desirable. The word "reactionary," like isolationism, is not so good, but its opposite, "liberal," is fast losing favor. Probably "progressive" better represents ahe qualification people are thinking about today.

In spite of the evil charges laid against it, the Republican Party down through the years has a clear record of being a conservative and progressive party. On the other hand, the catchy philosophy of New Dealism has led the country off to the left into the morass of state socialism. Now, greased with Fair Dealism, sober-minded people are fearful for the survival of the American way.

The Republican Party was returned to power in 1921, when the people were tired of Wilson's "New Freedom" and internationalism. It is unfortunate that President Harding's reputation for liberalism is applied more frequently to his personal life than to his public career. Let us look at the record of accomplishment:

Treaty of peace was made with Germany.

Washington naval disarmament conference reduced the heavy burden of battleships and escorts.

Five-power compact established 5–5–3 ration of warships for Great Britain, United States, and Japan and fixed naval-base rights in the Pacific.

Recognition of Russia was denied because of its murderous and barbaric government.

The Federal budget system was established through which the war debt was reduced from 25½ billion to 15 billion in 10 years.

Established War Finance Board to aid in export of farm products.

Advocated a Department of Public Welfare with Cabinet member (now revived as a Truman discovery).

Passed a tariff law to protect American products, giving to Tariff Commission the right to adjust rates within a 50-percent limit to protect the differences in cost of living here and abroad. (This idea was later expanded by New Deal into Hull trade treaties and is now used for political purposes to support governments practicing socialistic schemes.)

Other progressive policies originated and prosecuted during the Republican era of Harding-Coolidge-Hoover, include:

Kellogg-Briand Pact negotiated and signed by all major powers, outlawing war and agreeing to settle disputes through peaceful negotiations. (As effective an international agreement for peace as can be devised if adhered to.)

Held three successful Pan-American conferences greatly strengthening our economic and political relations with our South American neighbors.

Refunded war debts to a level which nations could pay and progress.

Gave to Secretary of Agriculture power to supervise packing houses, livestock yards and boards of trade.

Established Farm Board which spent $500,000,000 in buying up surplus farm products.

Increased loan limits of Federal land banks.

Authorized financial aid to the establishment of farm cooperatives.

Established Farm Marketing Act.

Established Federal Power Commission to regulate Government-owned power resources.

Originated and began constructions of Hoover Dam and Tennessee Valley dams.

Established Reconstruction Finance Corporation to save banks and business.

Established home-loan banks.

Established Emergency Relief Act to loan money to States for public-works projects.

Fostered beginning of rural electrification by loans from Government agencies to projects in Minnesota and other Western States.

Initiated laws for Federal insurance of bank deposits.

All of these progressive measures were instituted with conservative consideration for the future welfare of the country, in striking contrast to the reckless policies and expenditures of the New Deal socialism which has brought this Nation to the verge of bankruptcy. It pays to look at the record.

Navajo and Hopi Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times under date of April 21, 1949, pertaining to the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

Hearings on the long-range Navajo-Hopi bill have brought to light the great needs existing among these people and the importance of immediate action to correct the situation.

The editorial follows:

NAVAJO AND HOPI

It is encouraging that the program of aid so badly needed by the Navajo and Hopi Indians is regarded by the Department of the Interior as a continuing task. These dwellers in the great Southwest have had small attention from the Great White Father in Washington. The Navajo Reservation of some 9,500,000 acres is huge in extent but meager in resources. Chiefly a desert, at a general elevation of about 6,000 feet, it affords magnificent spectacles to the traveler, but only the hardest-won subsistence to its dwellers. Both the Navajo and the Hopi, although they battled stubbornly against the encroachment of the white man in the middle of the last century, have long been his peaceful neighbors.

Experts in the region and friends of its inhabitants in the Interior Department have now informed Congress that the $90,000,000 rehabilitation program is planned on a 10-year schedule and is many-sided in its aim. It will include more and better schools, the development of the natural resources

in the reservation, extension of irrigated farming, and encouragement of small-business enterprises for the Indians. One of the Navajos, chairman of the tribal council, describes their principal lacks as those of water, roads, schools, and communication facilities. He declared before a House committee that the Indians ask only for a chance to help themselves. Surely this chance should come in full measure to the dwellers on the mesas and in the lonely hogans where the arts of weaving, basketry, and silvercraft still retain high standards. After the destructive blizzards of last winter, the need for immediate help is urgent. We have a compelling obligation to aid these fellow Americans.

Address by William H. Hastie to Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by William H. Hastie delivered at the banquet of the National Convention of Americans for Democratic Action, in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The objectives of ADA, even as the name, are in the oldest and best tradition of American Government and politics.

The architects of our National Constitution had such faith in two basic beliefs that they erected an entire structure of representative government upon them. They believed that the great body of the American people would participate actively in the selection of their representatives, chosen to make the laws and to administer them. Men who had just fought and suffered in a long difficult war to win the right of self-government had an understandable faith that all of the people would treasure and exercise their rights as electors under the new Constitution. They also believed that the consensus of the community on issues and men would in most cases be wise.

This magnificent faith in democratic action gave us our political institutions. But we are told, on very good authority, that faith without works availeth not. Certainly the vindication of the faith of the founders in their American plan of government requires work without ending. Good government under the best institutions is neither accidental nor automatic.

In our large country the interest of millions of people in representative government must be aroused and stimulated. Millions must be brought to understand the choices to be made and they must be given a free and fair chance to cast an effective ballot. If any are discouraged by the vastness and complexity of these tasks, let them remember November last. I suppose there are none, 5 months after November, who, at the other extreme, are unduly sanguine about the job of making our political institutions work effectively, and it is perhaps as well that after the dejection of last summer and the jubilation of the fall, events of the winter have brought us back to sober consideration of the functioning of our political institutions.

Much of the attention of this convention has been focused upon the Congress, and rightly so. No other institution of our National Government so constantly reflects, for better or worse, the working of the plan of the Republic. And Congress in action keeps pounding home one inexorable fact of national politics: The Government of the entire Nation can never work well so long as the process of choosing representatives is the antithesis of effective democratic action in any major area of the country.

The true resultant of progressive and reactionary forces and opinion in this country cannot be reflected in the Congress so long as millions of Americans, most of them underprivileged, have neither the opportunity to cast a meaningful ballot nor the information and understanding essential to the making of political choices calculated to promote their own interest. These grave defects in the working of electoral processes are not confined to any part of the Nation, but they are observable in so very many areas of the South, that special and continuing attention should be given to the strengthening of democratic action there. I urge that you make this undertaking, the advancement of democratic action in the South, a major part of the program of ADA.

Undoubtedly this organization will take various steps immediately or in the near future in support of a national program of liberal legislation during the Eighty-first Congress. Some success should attend such efforts. But, in my judgment, until the political climate of the South is changed, until the liberal and progressive forces of that area are greatly strengthened, until the liberal and progressive membership of the Congress elected from Southern States is greatly enlarged the legislative progress of liberal programs will continue to be blocked or at least seriously impeded. If this prediction is correct, the liberal forces of Amer'ca have no intelligent choice but to concentrate upon the strengthening of liberalism in the South.

Only recently I had occasion, speaking in the South, to point out that the predominance of the underprivileged in that area and the disproportionately large advantages to be derived by the South from a national program of liberal social legislation should logically place that section in the forefront of every drive for so beneficial a program. I predicted that with opportunity and understanding the South would come to assume the leadership in American liberalism. Incidentally, one local newspaper reported my speech under the caption "Hastie calls South leader in liberalism." But, if that statement is anticipatory today I believe it can, with sustained effort, be made a current truth during this generation.

I do not minimize the difficulties. Millions with no experience in the exercise of the franchise must be given the opportunity to vote and a zealous interest in advancement through political effort. Racial antagonisms artificially nurtured for a long time must be overcome. New organization must be developed to contest the field with entrenched oligarchy.

Experience has shown that this is a difficult road. Those who have sought to travel it before have turned back. The first attempt followed immediately after the Civil War. It seems almost a contradiction of terms these days to observe that the men then exercising national power were called racial Republicans. At any rate there they were, some motivated by abolitionist zeal and genuine belief in political democracy, others concerned primarily with the preservation of their own power. But, whatever individual motives may have been, all were agreed that each of the Southern States, recently in rebellion, should not return to the prewar feudal oligarchy, but should substitute a more democratic order with both the Negro and the poorer whites fully enfranchised. And so they made the accomplishment of this political revolution a condition precedent to the readmission of the Confederate States to the Union.

What followed has rarely been the subject of competent objective appraisal. Yet I believe it will ultimately be recognized and agreed that the formerly disinherited of the South, poor whites and poor blacks alike, were slowly but surely laying the foundation for an enlightened and democratic community in the years immediately following the Civil War. It ill behooves our generation, which has tolerated and still tolerates our more corrupt and oppressive local political machines, to disparage the reconstruction on the basis of multiple hearsay originating with those whose purpose has been to condemn rather than to describe.

Two or three items must suffice to illustrate my point here. Universal, free public schools were the most insistent demand and stand as the greatest monument to the enfranchised plain people of that time. In South Carolina in 1870, for example, 15,000 Negroes and 11,000 white children were reported as attending the newly opened unsegregated public schools. In State after State there was agreement on the social obligation of the State to educate all of its people. And that was a more advanced conception for those times than any plank of the 1948 Democratic platform is for these times.

In 1872, Reform Party of Louisiana was headed by General Beauregard and other thoughtful citizens who, though veterans of the Confederate Army, turned their backs on the bitter-enders of the Confederacy and at the same time sought to attract the more moderate Republicans to their standard. Here is an excerpt from their platform, and remember it was issued by Louisianians who could be called neither carpetbaggers nor scalawags.

"That we shall advocate by speech, pen, and deed, the equal and impartial exercise by every citizen of Louisiana of every civil and political right guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and by the laws of honor, brotherhood, and fair dealing.

"We shall further recommend that hereafter no distinction shall exist among citizens of Louisiana in any of our public schools, or State institutions of education, or in any other public institution supported by the State, city, or parish.

"We shall also recommend that the proprietors of all foundries, factories, and other industrial establishments, in employing mechanics or workmen, make no distinction between the two races." (Yes, there were many southerners who believed in fair employment practices in 1872.)

At the same time in Florida a reconstruction legislature was fighting valiantly against the encroachments of monopoly. The words of a member leading that fight—he happened to be a Negro—have a contemporary ring:

"The great curse of Florida has been dishonest corporations, rings, and cliques, with an eye single to their central interest. * * * The recent exposé of the Tammany ring in New York has satisfied all right-thinking men that the power exercised by strong bodies, composed of many corporations, is the most dangerous to the public good and safety."

Such was the direction in which the South was moving haltingly, but I believe surely, in the early 1870's. There were bitter men and venal men and stupid men then, even as now, on both sides of controversies. The

postwar economic problems of the area were terrific. Mistakes were made, inexcusable things were done, yet through it all can be seen a people in the midst of revolutionary change moving toward a decent and progressive solution of their problems.

We know the story of how this era died a violent death at the hands of those counter-revolutionists who took up arms but hooded their faces, while the North, having accomplished what it wanted, complacently looked the other way. But it is the life and not the death of the epoch which shows us what we in our supposedly greater wisdom should be able to achieve today.

The agrarian revolt of the eighties and nineties was in all logic the second opportunity to bring to the South a reunion of the still disinherited and to oust the few from selfish domination of the many. It did bring the Negro back into the political picture for a time. But too often the agrarian leaders viewed the Negro as a tool to be used in emergency and discarded rather than a respected partner in an honorable association for remaking the South. Here was a chance to enlist the Negro as an eager volunteer in a people's crusade. Instead, Crusader and Saracen alike sought only to hire him on occasion as a mercenary when their own forces seemed inadequate for the election day battle. The Tom Watsons and Ben Tillmans, great leaders of that epoch, debased then destroyed the crusade they led when they came to make common cause with the reactionary forces they originally set out to defeat, reuniting on the sorry premise that agreement on keeping the Negro down was more important than disagreement along lines of genuine political cleavage. So populism which might have built a new South 50 years ago only left the old order more firmly entrenched and the Negro more securely shackled.

Today and tomorrow we are having another chance, the best chance of all, a chance for the plain people of the South, regardless of race, to make this section a center of progressive and liberal political thought and action.

The prospect is more favorable than ever before for democratic action in the South. The ground swell is apparent and its latent power is incalculable. If leadership has the wisdom to direct people already overcoming their inertia, if the disinherited, all of them, are made to know that they are part of a crusade for a better life, if the spectre of racism is laid by leaders who have the courage to talk straight as well as the intelligence to think straight, the face of the South will be lifted, its stomach will be less empty and what is also important to a genuinely religious people, there will be some soul redemption, too.

There is a nucleus of organized labor which can be expanded vastly with the friendly assistance which such an organization as ADA can afford. There are untapped resources of democratic action in the church and fraternal organizations which are such powerful forces in the southern community. The legal outlawry of the white primary is unshackling the Negro voter, and none of the new schemes hurriedly devised to maintain racial disfranchisement has managed to survive judicial scrutiny. Here are millions of new voters requiring encouragement, organization, and guidance. There is already an emerging southern leadership of men who believe in the South and in democracy too, who are neither dismayed by the great power of entrenched reaction, nor confused by the bogie of race. But such leadership needs all of the help that liberal fellow Americans can provide.

We can anticipate the fulminations against outside interference so often experienced when other Americans try to help their southern neighbors in progressive endeavor. Incidentally, I have never heard similar complaint against any form of outside assistance to apostles of the status quo in the South, and this observation covers the most recent general elections. Fundamentally, of course, whatever affects the functioning of our National Government is every American's business. The body politic is a whole, and we must promote its good health. It is our responsibility to attack atrophy or infection in any portion of that body.

This is the time for calculated boldness. Throughout the Nation the forces opposed to effective and informed political action by all of the people are on the defensive as never before. The lines of reaction are being held with increasing difficulty. Military tacticians tell us that in such a situation a general offensive is called for and can succeed. In such an offensive the strongest and most enduring assault is directed at the point where a break-through will be decisive. It is the translation of this military precept into a plan of political action which I urge upon you tonight.

May I close as I began with a reference to the faith and vision of the men who created our American plan of government. Among the greatest of them were southerners. It was Madison who gave us this ringing declaration of our national political creed:

"Who are to be the electors? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States."

To make ours such a Nation men have planned and worked, and lived and died, leaving to those who should follow them the task of further advancing the basic conception of the Republic. This is our day. I think we shall be equal to its demands.

Address by Governor Bowles, of Connecticut, to Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by the distinguished Governor of the State of Connecticut to the national convention of the Americans for Democratic Action, meeting at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends in Americans for Democratic Action, I can remember vividly my first introduction to ADA. It was early in November 1946. The election was only a few days old and American liberalism had taken its worst beating in a generation.

Jim Loeb was there in my home in Essex to offer his proposal for a new organization that would pull liberals together for practical political action—the kind of liberals whose dislike for totalitarianism in any form—Communist or Fascist—was tough, clear, and uncompromising.

ADA was founded some 60 days later in Washington. At the time, we hoped modestly that it could slow down the swing toward reaction, and perhaps lay the groundwork for future political victories when the people again were ready to move forward.

Events of the last 2 years have proved that our horizons were too limited. We expected much too little. That is because we failed to understand the terrific forces which Franklin Roosevelt had set in motion in the days of the New Deal and in the midst of the Second World War.

In the unhappy days of the 1946 congressional campaign and the Eightieth Congress, our people were trying to find themselves after 4 years of war and the atomic bomb, in a world of misery and confusion. In 1947 and 1948, the American people tasted reaction. They didn't like reaction, and on November 2, 1948, they spit it out.

We are now moving into an age of new party politics.

The most significant aspect of Harry Truman's election was that it was unpredicted. It was surprising. It was unexpected.

In the past, the American people had always voted pretty much as their fathers did. They had left the professional politicians to take care of the details. They had responded only sporadically to outstanding leadership, that is, until 1948. In November 1948, the people moved in and took over.

The Republican Party was blind to what was happening. The men who nominated Dewey at Philadelphia had the right candidate for the wrong age.

The Democratic Party was, for the most part, also unaware of the new forces which were gathering. Except for its bold, forthright stand in defense of civil liberties at Philadelphia, many Democratic leaders were inclined to let nature take its course. In so doing, they set the stage for one of the most remarkable political upheavals in the history of the country.

Because there seemed no real point in anything else, the old-timers agreed to go along with the amateurs who were inexperienced enough to believe that an all-out fight was worth while. Almost by default the people chose their own candidates for Congress, for mayor, for Governor, for Senator.

The Democratic candidate for President also violated all the rules of traditional politics. We went back to the people and asked them what they wanted. While Thomas E. Dewey was telling, Harry S. Truman was asking. And the American people gave their answer in unmistakable terms.

We Americans are a friendly, neighborly people, ours is the Nation of the big dream, the American dream of opportunity, freedom in its broadest sense, a comfortable home and a respectable living.

We Americans are an active people. We admire competence, and we are suspicious by nature of those who do not strive too hard for a living.

We Americans are a sensitive people. We cannot live comfortably among friends and neighbors who are economically distressed or spiritually beaten.

Above all, we Americans like to make things work. Our conception of democracy insists that it be effective. We know that democracy cannot be effective unless it is universal. We know it cannot be universal without being fair.

In times past, we have fought elections on the gold standard, high tariffs, a return to normalcy and it's time for a change. But the words that moved the hearts of our people were concepts like the New Freedom and the New Deal. Those ideas moved us because they hit close to home.

Since VJ-day the American people had grown afraid that their Government was losing touch with these basic American aspirations.

What was fair or decent or democratic about letting inflation wipe out their savings? Why had the politicians killed the veteran's dream of a home of his own?

Last fall, the people of America—in the fresh clear air of their home constituencies—caught a second wind. The liberals took their heads out of the cloud and dangled their feet in the tall grass of this Nation. They got out of their easy chairs and went out to work. They discovered that elections are won not at the banquet tables, but on the sound trucks.

The liberals of America became reacquainted with their neighbors and their friends. Like Harry Truman, they began to ask instead of to lecture. And, as a result, the new party politics got a shot in the arm from the factories, shops and farms all over America.

Our efforts so far to translate the big dream into legislative reality indicates that the "Miracle of '48" is not yet fully understood. It has not been accepted as real. As in all times of great social change, there are always those who prefer not to face up to the truth—even though it stands out bold and clear.

The truth is that the American people will not stand any more being pushed around by politicians. And any political party that persists in ignoring their demands is bound to remain on the side lines.

In Congress, an unholy alliance of Dixiecrats and Republicans has thus far blocked the enactment of the Truman platform. But this is no reason for alarm—yet.

The election proved that the Dixiecrat movement was a movement of politicians and not a movement of the people of the South. Except in two or three States, the Dixiecrat ticket had very little popular support.

I do not mean to say that the people of the South who voted for Truman had the same ideas on all subjects as the Democrats in the North. There were natural sectional differences in outlook. But the majority of the southern people have been basically sympathetic to the major planks in Truman's Fair Deal program exactly as they were sympathetic to President Roosevelt's New Deal program.

The essential liberalism of the southern people is reflecting itself more and more in political events. Sooner or later, this basic liberalism will penetrate into the minds of southern Representatives and Senators in Congress.

I, for one, was not surprised when Governor Scott of North Carolina appointed Dr. FRANK GRAHAM, one of America's greatest liberals, to fill the vacancy in the United States Senate. Nor am I surprised when I read that an antilynching bill with stiff penalties recently passed the Texas Legislature. These are simply the day-to-day signs of the fundamental liberalism of the southern people, finding expression in political life. Eventually, the South may become the stronghold of this American liberal movement.

In the first half of our century, we Americans have survived the ordeal of two horrible wars and a catastrophic depression. We have survived all right, but have we learned?

We have established the right of democracy to exist. Now we must earn the right of democracy to grow and develop. Democracy carries the potential of ultimate freedom—freedom to work and to worship, to speak and to prosper at peace. In the second half of our century, democracy must realize that potential as never before. It is too late for half-conceived measures or half-hearted results.

The last 3 months should prove to us that the day is past when liberals could hibernate between elections. We have taken on a full-time job. We must give that job full-time attention. Americans for democratic action, if it is to live up to its name, must be broader and larger than a clique of good-hearted intellectuals anxious to save the world. ADA must absorb itself into the practical, working political structure of our country. We must go to work with our political friends, give them our time and our efforts, and make the Democratic Party a living instrument of the American people.

Let me speak for a few moments, if I may, about what we in the Democratic Party have learned in Connecticut.

In our State legislature, one house—the senate—was returned last fall with a solid Democratic majority. The other branch—our State house of representatives—is still heavily dominated by Republicans. I will not go into the details of this curious situation other than to say that the Democratic senate was elected more or less on the basis of the popular vote; whereas our Republican house of representatives is heavily weighted in the traditional rotten borough way on the side of our 141 small towns.

Thus, we have in Connecticut a very graphic example of last fall's electoral upheaval. On the one hand are those Democrats who were swept into office on the same tide that elected Harry S. Truman. On the other hand, there is a considerable body of Republican politicians who have managed to insulate themselves from contact with all the people.

Our opposition in Connecticut is not so very different from the coalition of Dixiecrats and Conservative Republicans which has been bucking the President's program in Washington.

In Connecticut, however, our legislature is working, day by day, in the midst of the people to whom it is responsible. It is not possible, as it so often is in Washington, to ignore public opinion as a far away phenomenon.

The result has been that even the most cautious Republicans have hesitated to strike a position comparable to that of the group responsible for the stalemate in Washington.

To the extent that an issue can be sharply defined, the Republican majority in our House of Representatives has had no choice but to go along with the broad principles of a program which is vigorously supported by the overwhelming majority of plain people.

It is vastly encouraging to us in Connecticut to find that no legislator, for example, dared to cast a vote against eliminating racial segregation in the Connecticut National Guard. After years of postponement, this bill was passed unanimously a few weeks ago simply because the people understood at last and cared.

Similarly, a bill to strengthen our State laws on housing evictions was passed with bipartisan support. No family can be evicted now in Connecticut without 1 year's warning, and in most cases evictions are impossible. But when Connecticut people reacted strongly and sharply to the delay, the opposition collapsed.

A proposal to study and streamline our State governmental organization was passed in Connecticut only last week. Originally, a minority attempted to block and pigeonhole this much-needed step toward reform. But under the extreme pressure of popular opinion from all quarters, the opposition likewise vanished into the air.

A model welfare program, including unlimited assistance for needy old people, is likely to pass within a week or two—again because Connecticut people are insisting on action.

There are signs that an aroused and alert Connecticut public will bring similar pressure to bear on low-rental public housing, minimum-wage legislation and a broadening of our unemployment and workmen's compensation programs.

If the people all over America who gave their time and their talents to achieving victory on November 2 will continue that drive and that determination, there can be only one result. If the millions who registered their convictions at the polls will follow up that gesture, the result is inevitable—the kind of legislative progress which we've been dreaming of for generations.

Elections are won in the shops, the stores, on Main Street, and on grass-root farms. Public programs must find their support and their sustenance among the same local voices.

Political activity, let me repeat, is not something to be carried on once every 4 years or once every 2 years. It is something to be carried on all the time. Politics is not merely a matter of winning elections. It is a matter of seeing to it that the elections stay won.

Liberals must abandon the ivory tower, and pitch into the practical realities of politics. The natural tendency of liberals is to think and to talk in abstract, theoretical terms, in terms of sociology and economics. Theory is a valuable background. But nothing gets done in the political world unless it is translated in terms of hard-headed political activity.

The ADA has, of course, come a long way in this direction. Few of its friends or its enemies ever expected ADA to develop into a real political force during the short period of its existence. What I am asking for is even harder work along the same line; in other words, more ADA activities during the so-called off-political season. For the effective political worker there can be no off season. We have got to work—work—work—to drive home the central ideas we stand for—an America of freedom and opportunity for the common man.

Right now we have many jobs to do. One of the most vital is to hammer home the fact that there is nothing inevitable about another economic depression. Depressions are man made—or rather they are the product of human superstitions. During the New Deal, we learned that depressions can be stopped by governmental action. Now we have to learn—and we have to apply the lesson in our political life—that depressions can be prevented by governmental action.

Our NAM friends insist that we must go through another severe economic depression—that it's against economic law for our prosperity to continue indefinitely. This places them in curious agreement with the Marxian Communists. In fact, Stalin has staked his whole policy on the inevitability of a depression in America. If a depression comes in America, he will be able to say to the peoples of Europe—more or less what Hitler told the Germans in the winter of 1932–33. "The American way is the way of starvation and unemployment—only through totalitarian dictatorship can the people be assured of bread and work."

Stalin has bet on the inevitability of a depression in America. Hence, the avoidance of a depression becomes more than a matter of protecting our own welfare and our own freedom. It becomes a matter of protecting the welfare and future of democratic civilization the world over.

After the destruction of OPA, prices moved higher and higher. Food costs went up more than 50 percent, and the housing industry, forgetting the lessons which should have been learned before the war, moved ahead to price itself out of the market. Some adjustment from these high prices has always been inevitable, and that adjustment is here. Let us hope it is no more than just that—an adjustment.

Nevertheless, I, for one, am concerned. In Connecticut today, 83,000 men and women are out of work—that's the biggest unemployment that we have seen in 11 years. This same situation holds true in many other parts of the country.

Most of the experts tell us not to be alarmed, that employment will soon be stepping upward again. I sincerely hope they are right. But let's make up our minds on one thing.

We can no longer put up with idle men, idle machines, and idle money. People all over America—people all over the world—are in desperate need of the goods which we are so capable of producing. If the experts should prove to be wrong—if this adjustment should grow into a recession—we shall need to take action, promptly, vigorously, and intelligently.

If we continue to maintain full employment and freedom of opportunity in America, we shall save ourselves, and we shall stand fair to save the whole world from the grip of totalitarian tyranny. If we fail, then the last and best hope of earth dies with us.

Representative government, enlightened and dynamic, is the basis of all civilization. Representative government involves spade work, leg work and patience. But democracy was never a lazy man's system. Effective democracy must always be the gigantic sum of individual actions. A little bit here; a little bit there; and finally, the colossal impact of millions of hands swing open the door to newer and broader freedoms.

On November 2, 1948, we pushed at the door, and rather to our surprise, it fell open. Let us be determined now and move boldly through that door—toward the new world of peace and prosperity, security and freedom, which Americans have dreamed of since Jefferson. And in the process, let us not be afraid of idealism, the kind of practical, tough-minded idealism that alone can make mankind's dream come true.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "When Medicine Is Socialized," published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, of April 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN MEDICINE IS SOCIALIZED—ENGLISH DOCTOR TELLS TRIALS OF PEOPLE IN HIS COUNTRY

Socialized medicine is attracting much attention but probably not as much as its dangers and its effect on working people and all others warrant. One of the best expositions of how socialized medicine operates is told by Dr. H. A. H. Harris, a consulting surgeon in Chelmsford, England, in a letter to Dr. Wemple Dodds, of Culver Hospital Laboratories, Crawfordsville, Ind. In this letter Dr. Harris says:

"The public had been led by our Socialist tub-thumpers to suppose that, with the coming of the National Health Service, a medical utopia would dawn for them. In point of fact the ordinary working-class patient is less well off than he was before the scheme started. The National Health Service has brought no more doctors, no more nurses, no more hospital beds and, indeed, no more facilities of any kind into service with the result that there are now infinitely more people competing for the same amount of facilities because people who formerly paid for their attention now seek it under the scheme.

"PATIENTS MUST WAIT

"Here is an example. Before the scheme started on July 5, 1948, a general practitioner requiring my opinion upon a working-class patient could get an appointment for him to see me at my out-patient clinic at the hospital that same week. Under this scheme my clinics and those of all my colleagues are overflowing so that a patient has to wait as long as a month for an appointment.

"Similarly with in-patients. Before July 5 all the public ward beds were devoted to patients of the lowest-income groups but now these people have to share the same number of beds with people who could and did afford private accommodation. Inevitably, therefore, they have to wait longer for admission to a hospital. The ordinary family doctor has queues outside his office. Most of the people in the queue are either wanting some sort of form signed or else they are coming with some very trivial ailment with which they would formerly have dealt quite effectively with themselves.

"A proportion of the people in the queue will, however, have some genuine and perhaps serious complaint but the doctor will find it difficult or impossible to give the necessary time to this patient and there is, of course, a grave danger that in the rush he may miss things."

PLAN IS GROSSLY ABUSED

Of the abuse of socialized medicine, Dr. Harris says:

"The scheme is, of course, being grossly abused by the smarter members of the public. The pawnbrokers' shops are said to be full of spectacles which patients have obtained from the state and then proceeded to 'pop at uncles.' Dentistry has developed into an absolute racket. It has been said that we have become a nation of weeping and wailing and national teeth.

"The Minister of Health gave a solemn undertaking that 'any member of the public may use all or part of the scheme' and then proceeded forthwith to deny the right of a patient who prefers to pay for his medical advice as hitherto to get his medicines under the scheme. On the other hand, the Minister has ordained that any foreigner visiting these shores is entitled to all the benefits of the scheme without paying any contribution. There was a case reported in the British Medical Journal a week or two ago of a foreigner who returned to his country with two pairs of spectacles and a complete set of dentures at the expense of the British taxpayer."

EFFECT ON CONSULTANTS

Dr. Harris tells of the effect on the consultants. He says:

"I have yet to meet a consultant who expresses any satisfaction with the scheme. We have become a body of exasperated, frustrated, embittered men. Before July 5 we all used to enjoy our jobs. Now we just regard our work merely as a means of keeping the wolf from the door, and, for some, even that is not possible. Countless forms have to be completed. Our actions are liable to be questioned by local demagogs from the trade-union ranks. A consultant is liable to be drafted to a new neighborhood and he may be denied the right to practice a particular specialty in which he has already displayed his prowess.

"There is no doubt whatever that the Minister is doing all in his power to abolish private practice by making it as difficult as possible for the patient to afford it and by denying the consultants the opportunity of practicing it. His aim is to squeeze us all into the whole-time service, to make us whole-time salaried civil servants. The tragedy is that he may succeed in this with large numbers of the consultants so many of them yield to his pressure either through economic necessity or lack of moral courage.

"SOME GIVE UP PROFESSION

"There are, of course, a few shining examples who have put their principles before everything. I know of men of noble character who have sacrificed careers of brilliant promise and have given up doctoring and become small farmers and such like. One man I know of found more satisfaction in running a fried-fish shop. Many of the younger men are emigrating, and they, perhaps, are our best types, so that our country is in danger of becoming intellectually impoverished. Some of us are not taking all this lying down.

"All sorts of ridiculous regulations have been issued by the Minister," says Dr. Harris. "One of them concerns the scale of fees that a surgeon may charge for operations on private patients in the private ward of a hospital. An attempt has been made to classify all operations into three categories—major, intermediate, and minor. A schedule of these categories has been drawn up."

FANTASTICALLY ABSURD SCHEDULE

"This schedule is so fantastically absurd that one is tempted to think it might have been drawn up by a hospital porter. For instance, the aspiration of a cerebral cyst is called a minor operation and is put in the same category as the removal of a sebaceous cyst. Acute appendicitis is a major operation while adenoma of the thyroid is an intermediate one. The more stout-hearted of us just ignore the whole thing but we shall, I expect, be called to account by the bureaucrats."

Of the effect of the system upon the general practitioner Dr. Harris says:

"Much of what I have already said about the consultant applies equally to the general practitioner and, vice versa, what I say about the general practitioner applies also to the consultant. The general practitioner has lost his joy and his interest in his work and is becoming not much more than a sorting clerk. Many of them are already facing economic ruin, particularly the general practitioner in the rural areas where incomes are in many cases less than half what they were before July 5."

NO REWARD FOR SKILL

"As is inevitable under any socialist scheme there is no reward for skill, energy, and enterprise. Payment is on a flat rate and the dullard and the laggard get the same scale of remuneration as the prodigy. The general practitioners are already worked to death. They have not so far had any epidemic to deal with. The Lord only knows what will happen if and when, for instance, a severe influenza epidemic comes along.

"My general practitioner friends are now, without exception, unhappy men. Pride in their job is waning and, most significant sign of all, I know of none who are bringing up their sons to follow in father's footsteps as happened so very often in the past.

"Now the state has become his master and he can no longer plow his own furrow. The result of this will be, I am sure, that there will be an entirely different type of man going in for medicine. Our future doctors will be small-minded little men with civil-service mentalities and their main concerns will be keeping on the right side of the administrative superiors, the correct filling of forms, watching the clock, and passing the buck."

TO BRINK OF RUIN

"We have now had nearly 4 years of socialism and it has brought our country to the

brink of ruin from every point of view—spiritually, morally, and economically" says Dr. Harris. "The average, not-very-intelligent-but-fundamentally-decent workingman has been debauched and emasculated by this Government of ours. Formerly he was willing to have only what he paid for and to pay for what he had. Now he looks to the all-powerful state to provide him with all his needs. He does not think he ought to have to work for them. The possession of low cunning has become more important and more profitable than character. A slick but unscrupulous intelligence will take a man to the top more easily and more certainly than will honest toil and dogged perseverance.

"Our ordinary man in the street seems incapable of appreciating the obvious truth that socialism leads inevitably to communism, which is its logical conclusion. And he seems incapable of realizing that the nationalization and the class hatred which our socialists spend their time preaching and practicing are the two main props of communism."

ADVICE IS "DON'T"

"Any statements that you may have heard that there has been a change of attitude toward the National Health Service by the medical profession of this country are, quite certainly, deliberate falsehoods and, as you suggest, have probably been issued by the propaganda departments of your left-wing organization," says Dr. Harris. "If your Government should seek to inflict upon you a national health service that even remotely resembles ours then I would repeat to you the famous advice of Mr. Punch to those about to be married—'Don't.'"

It is believed that many who read about and understand the operation of socialized medicine in England will not want it adopted in the United States. President Truman has his ideas about socialized medicine but whether he will be able to impose them upon his country depends upon what Members of Congress do about the subject. It is pointed out that the foregoing article so clearly explains socialized medicine's operation in England that everyone who reads it must see clearly that it is not a scheme for the people of the United States.

IT IS NOT FREE

If anyone does not clearly understand how the plan works in England he or she might read the article again with profit. Socialized medicine is not free as so many persons think. Someone has to be paid for services rendered. The pay comes from taxes. The people who think they would benefit are taxpayers. Therefore, they must pay their share toward the support of socialized medicine.

John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lewis Isn't All Crocodile," published in the New York Sunday News of March 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEWIS ISN'T ALL CROCODILE

When John L. Lewis pulled the 2-week coal strike scheduled to end next Sunday, he orated that he wanted to give his followers time off to mourn the 1,015 coal miners killed last year, and the more than 50,000 injured.

Some of the mine operators promptly retorted that John was weeping crocodile tears, and that what he was really up to was a sharp reduction of the 70,000,000 tons of coal above ground when the walk-out started. A cut in that stock pile would give him a better bargaining position when his United Mine Workers' contract with the operators expires June 30.

We have no doubt that some such thought was in John L.'s massive head, and that grief for the coal mines' dead and injured in 1948 was not the sole reason for the first big strike of 1949.

However, those tears were not all of the crocodile variety. It is a fact that 1,015 men were bumped off in the coal mines last year in various accidents. Further, almost 4,000 were permanently crippled, and the above-mentioned 50,000 were injured more or less seriously.

Coal-mine accidents in the last 30 years in this country have killed almost 55,000 men, crippled about 125,000, and dealt out a total of more than 2,000,000 nonpermanent injuries.

The men who dig the anthracite and bituminous fuels are rated by insurance companies as being engaged in one of the most dangerous of occupations. They are in the same class, insurancewise, with copper and lead miners, building wreckers, sand hogs, electric-power linemen, and oil field shooters and rank just a little below airplane stunt and test pilots.

Safety conditions in the coal fields are improving slowly but, according to various qualified observers, they could improve a great deal faster.

What's the chief reason for this yearly death toll, anyway?

Apparently, there are several chief reasons, all of them bound up with politics, the quirks of human nature, and the inevitable hazards of digging deep holes and tunnels in the earth.

As to politics: There is the long-raging conflict between the United States Bureau of Mines and the mine bureaus or departments of the States where coal is dug.

The Washington agency (at whose temporary director, Dr. James Boyd, Lewis took a crack in this latest strike) has authority to inspect mines for safety appliances, and issue loud warnings in cases where it finds danger of accidents. But it can't enforce all this good advice it is empowered to hand out.

THE HAZARDS OF MINING

Enforcement of mine safety precautions is in the hands of the State bureaus. It is often complained that many of these are lazy, inefficient, timid, or politically beholden to various mine operators.

The United States Bureau of Mines currently hopes to induce Congress to enact a law giving enforcement powers to Federal safety inspectors.

As to the quirks of human nature: It seems that many a coal miner grows careless or fatalistic, or both, as time goes on, and takes to neglecting the simplest precautions against touching off an explosion of coal gas or getting conked by a falling rock or timber. Many of the 1,000-plus annual deaths in the coal fields must be charged up to miner negligence, and there is no sense that we can see in being sentimental or unrealistic about that.

There are still a few operators of the old, hardboiled school who want only to get the coal out, and care nothing for the lives and limbs of their employees. But these are reported decreasing in number as the knowledge gets around that the best way to induce workers to produce efficiently is to keep them reasonably satisfied with their working conditions.

Altogether, it seems to us that what is needed, if coal-mine deaths are to be cut down, is an all-out safety crusade by all parties concerned.

Why shouldn't Lewis' union redouble any efforts it may now be making to teach the boys to keep their helmets on below ground, to obey no-smoking rules, and take all other indicated measures to keep themselves alive? Why not safety education campaigns by the operators in all the mines? And why not some strenuous attention to this matter at the President's Conference on Industrial Safety, opening next Wednesday in Washington?

These coal-mine deaths are a tragic business all around. But the best way not to decrease them is to sit around, wring the hands, and moan that they are inevitable. A lot of them could be prevented.

You Have a Stake in Spain's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "You Have a Stake in Spain's Security," written by my friend, a great scholar, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil and an honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU HAVE A STAKE IN SPAIN'S SECURITY—SOVIETIZED DELEGATES TO UN DELIVER ANTI-FRANCO TIRADES TO HIDE THEIR OWN TREASON—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT URGED TO EXCHANGE AMBASSADORS WITH MADRID, ENGAGE IN ECONOMIC TRADE AND INCLUDE SPAIN IN FREE WORLD DEFENSE PROGRAM

(By Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., S. T. D., Associate Editor of The Americas and World Affairs)

Every good citizen of the United States, whether Protestant, Jewish, or Catholic, has a stake in the security of the Iberian Peninsula. The lifeline of America, in the broad, true sense of the whole Western Hemisphere, runs through the Mediterranean, with Spain a natural bastion behind the Pyrenees. This is not merely the judgment of the man on the street; this is the expert view of those officials in Washington charged with the national defense.

This fact has tremendous importance to every man, woman, and child in America, because, once more, the world is being treated to the obscene spectacle of a Sovietized Polish delegation at the United Nations rising to distract attention from Soviet brutalities in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and China. Obedient to their masters in the Kremlin,

the cringing, alleged representatives of a noble-hearted Christian people will do their best to indict and interdict the 28,000,000 decent people of Spain.

Although the latter may not agree on politics, they stand united against foreign dictation. Best of all, they have finally decided that it is better to hang together than to hang separately. Consequently, until the dawn of a brighter sun on the international horizon, they are working together in order to prevent another civil war and to re-create some measure of prosperity for everybody. Nobody wants chaos.

While the so-called Polish delegates shout against Spain with a view to hiding their own treason to the Polish people, what are the Americans of Polish descent in the United States doing in order to prove that they remember with gratitude the fact that thousands of Polish soldiers in the resistance movement against Hitler were enabled by the Spanish Government to escape from the Nazis and fight against fascism in Italy?

Has it been forgotten that the Iberian Peninsula was the escape hatch from Nazi-dominated Europe not only for thousands of Christians and Jews who made their way to America, but also for patriotic members of the Polish nation who wanted to continue their struggle against totalitarianism by attacking the soft underbelly of the Axis? Inasmuch as the Spaniards made this possible, one would think that every group of Polish origin in America would be loud in protest against the Soviet puppet show against Spain at Lake Success.

WHILE OTHERS LEAD

To the credit of the descendants of the Iberians in America it must be recorded that they have sprung to the aid of the mother country. Throughout Central and South America, the Hispanic Americans are instructing their delegates in the General Assembly to take the initiative in favor of Spain. Democratic Costa Rica, cultured Colombia and Peru, loyal Brazil, and social-minded Argentina are glad to assume the leadership that should be found in our own United States Department of State. An overwhelming majority of the good-neighbor Republics are ranged, intelligently and bravely, on the side of the Spanish people. Although the governments of some of the American Republics may have had their political differences in the past 12 months, as happened in the case of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, they have discovered a new sense of unity and friendship in their espousal of the cause of the mother country.

Every South American, at heart, is chivalrous. Whatever the misfortunes, or even the mistakes of a lady in the household, the Latin knows how to ride to the rescue and, if she be a mother, to throw around her the mantle of charity. Perhaps this is another way of saying that our good neighbors remember that they all are, or should be, good Catholics. At any rate, they are proud and happy to be protagonists, or champions of Spain, in this duel-to-the-death with the Soviet Union.

Moreover, the Latins respect law. They know, what President Franklin D. Roosevelt decided 10 years ago, that the present Spanish administration is the only rightful government in that country, from the standpoint of accepted principles of international law. The South Americans realize that ethics, not expediency, should be our guide.

WHY APPEASEMENT?

No more persuasive statement about the legal aspects of the case has been prepared than that of Dr. George Finch, editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law. Dr. Finch, himself a one-time State Department official, writes as follows:

"I am in full agreement that the exclusion of Spain and some other countries from the UN at the whim of the Soviet Union is but a part of the unfortunate appeasement program which we now hope is a matter of history. There is no basis for considering the 1946 resolution (subsequently canceled by failure and rejection of an identical resolution in the 1947 General Assembly), recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic mission from Spain, as presenting any legal question. In my judgment, the resolution was a purely political one and may be disregarded at any time for political reasons."

This authoritative opinion coincides exactly with that expressed by Dr. Edwin Borchard, the eminent non-Catholic professor of international law, Yale University. According to Professor Borchard, the 1946 resolution, which was repudiated 1 year later, is now "invalid," obsolete, and without the slightest binding power.

How are good citizens, then, to explain the negative attitude of our State Department? The answer is easy. Just as Dr. Finch pointed out, the decision to yield to the Kremlin on Spain was reached at a time when a pro-Soviet clique ruled our State Department. Now, although Soviet sympathizers have been weeded out of our Government, their deeds and their decisions have survived them.

LAST-DITCH BATTLE

There is another angle, interesting to all Christians and Jews who practice their faith. Although Mr. Robert Schuman, a devout Catholic, speaking for the French Government, assured his French charge d'affaires in Madrid that the French Republic favored the inclusion of Spain in the Atlantic-Mediterranean pact, his decision is undermined by M. Leon Jouhaux, Marxist head of a splinter labor group. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, fanatical Marxists, such as Prof. Harold Laski and others, are fighting a last-ditch battle against Christian Spain. As the capital letters of a reversal of world policy toward the Spanish people write themselves on the broad corridors of history, the Marxist International, perhaps just as deadly and as illiberal as the Cominform, is trying to keep the religious factor excluded from organized international life.

Does any Catholic layman, or religious leader, imagine that it is a mere accident that the three most devout peoples in the world, the Irish, the Spanish, and the Portuguese, are blackballed in the United Nations, with hardly a word of protest from any official quarter? It was bad enough to omit all mention of God from the Charter of the United Nations. It was wicked enough to surrender to the Soviets on the question of providing some Divine invocation, sorely needed, for the deliberations of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It was the climax of folly, reversing the good example of our own founding fathers, to pretend that religious leaders could be ignored, while nations that made and make a public profession of faith should be outlawed. Nothing that is irreligious can succeed; nothing that is un-American, in the sense that it overlooks the fountainhead of liberty, should be tolerated, unless subject to amendment and improvement. All who believe in God can unite on that program. And those who believe in God, as opposed to those who pin their faith in dialectical materialism, whether Stalinists or Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx, will champion the cause of Spain.

The best tip-off on the Spanish discussion in the United States Congress came with the kick-off play of the Soviet Union against Spain. It was made by Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, on more than one occasion a mouthpiece of the Kremlin, on March 22, 1949. Rising in the House of Representatives, Mr. MARCANTONIO extended his remarks in the RECORD for two pages.

It was the familiar propaganda line of the Soviet Union. He did not mention the $600,000,000 gold reserve of the Spanish Republic, deftly spirited from Madrid to Moscow: a permanent blow at the standard of living of the Spanish people. He did not refer to the promises made by President Roosevelt, as war-time Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes has reminded us, in writing, in November 1942. Mr. MARCANTONIO did refer to a letter of the President, written less than a month before his untimely death, which reflected the sad, invalid condition of the man who wrote it, unless indeed it was prepared for the President by some of the same pro-Soviet clique to which reference has been made.

After the diatribe by Representative MARCANTONIO, congressional opinion crystallized rapidly. Most of the freshmen Members of the House of Representatives took one look at the speech and openly expressed their minds: "Now we know how to vote on Spain."

MAKE YOURSELF HEARD

Last spring, the House voted overwhelmingly, in favor of including Spain in the European recovery program. If a similar vote were to be taken today, the margin in favor of Spain would be equally favorable.

What, then, is holding up action? To some extent, it is a matter of timing. As soon as the ERP funds and the Atlantic Pact, in its present form, have been ratified in the United States Senate, the people can be sure that, if they make themselves heard, the Government of the United States will see the wisdom, in its own interests and for the sake of its own safety, to adopt the following three points:

1. An exchange of Ambassadors with Madrid;

2. Economic collaboration with a country, whose railroads and industrial plants behind the Pyrenees are the strongest defense line on the Continent of Europe;

3. The inclusion of Spain, already linked with the Atlantic community by nature and by a treaty with its neighbor, Portugal, in the free world defense program.

Write or wire your Senators and Representatives today. Remind them that it was not Spain, but the Soviet Union, that spelled the doom of Jan Masaryk and Edouard Benes. It was not Madrid, but Moscow, that staged the so-called trial of his eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. It was not Spain, but the Soviet Union, that installed the Soviet gauleiter, Jakob Berman, in Warsaw.

It is not Spain, but the Soviet Government, that maintains the iron curtain. It is not the present Spanish Government, but the regime of Generalissimo Josef Stalin, at the head of the Red Army, that aims to enslave and sovietize the world, without mercy, without justice, without God. It is time that Soviet exploitation of the Iberian Peninsula, under the mask of Christian Poland, cease forever.

It is heartening to every American, from pole to pole, to see that our good neighbors have not abandoned the people of Spain. It is, or should be, electrifying to our leaders and to our people to note that, with respect to Spain in Congress, we have a bipartisan, forward-looking foreign policy; both the majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, are in the advance guard of the fight for Christian Spain. Their position is open, public, recorded; they represent the people. And the people have a right to see their Department of State on the side of fairness, national security, world freedom, and Almighty God.

Annual Convention, Society of Newspaper Editors, Endorses Voice of America Program Established by Smith-Mundt Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take genuine pleasure in calling to the attention of the Congress and the country the fact that the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors during its deliberations here in Washington last week passed resolutions endorsing and commending the so-called Voice of America publicity program established by the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act.

Readers will observe that the three recommendations at the conclusion of the report made by J. Russell Wiggins of the Washington Post and his committee were approved by the full convention. It is especially significant, in my opinion, that this great assembly of newspaper editors included in its resolutions the recommendation that the Associated Press and the United Press follow the example of the International News Service in making their facilities available on appropriate terms to the Voice of America news services.

It is my hope and expectation, Mr. President, that the appropriations for this important peace-preserving program will be substantially increased by the present Congress. In my opinion, $50,000,000 per year in these trying times would be little enough to spend in trying to get the rest of the world to understand and appreciate the policies and practices of the United States.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY J. RUSSELL WIGGINS, WASHINGTON POST, ON STATE DEPARTMENT DISSEMINATION OF NEWS

Mr. President and members of the society, this is the third time that a special committee of this society has submitted a report on the foreign-information program of the State Department.

In 1947 a committee headed by Mr. Howard urged that the then existing international situation justified a foreign-information program, noted the dangers inherent in Government dissemination of news and urged the formation of a special committe to make an annual study.

Last year, your committee, headed by Hamilton Owens, made a thorough study of the foreign-information services of the State Department. It held sessions in New York before which the various division chiefs of the foreign-information service appeared. It submitted a report declaring that the committee was "wholly convinced of the national necessity for carrying on and even intensifying the program provided for in the Smith-Mundt bill." It proposed resolutions endorsing the program and urging the press associations to "put their respective reports at the service of the Office of Information and Educational Exchange."

Your committee this year has had the services of two members of the 1948 committee: Mr. Lloyd Felmly, of the Newark News, and Mr. Harold Wheeler, of the Boston Traveler.

The committee has again examined and studied the principal foreign-information services of the State Department; the Voice of America programs of the International Broadcasting Division; the Wireless Bulletin prepared by the International Press and Publications Division; the Air Bulletin which is sent to our diplomatic and consular establishments abroad; the Russian-language magazine Amerika.

In arriving at its estimate of these services, your committee has had sources of information and appraisal not available to previous committees. It has been able to draw upon the report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information on which members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, including the president of the society, Mr. Erwin Canham, are serving. The advisory committee's report, the text of which we trust the members have examined, provides all the information needed to found a judgment of the work of the State Department's foreign-information agencies and to obtain the facts about their programs. This report, based on the first-hand observations of the staff of the committee, has made it superfluous for your committee to submit the detailed report that you might otherwise have required it to prepare. The facts have been clearly stated, the results of the program expertly appraised.

Your committee would join with the advisory committee in concluding that the program is even more important than it was when first conceived; that it is effective as far as it is able to go; that it is inadequate to the requirements of foreign policy in today's world crisis.

Your committee has chosen to repeat as its own recommendation the concluding recommendation of the advisory committee which states:

"In our judgment, the budgetary recommendations which have been sent to the Congress for this program for 1950 are a bare minimum for continuing the beginning which has been made. While it is important to spend well rather than merely to spend a lot, the vital need for broadening this program as speedily and effectively as possible, calls for a much larger expenditure. Indeed, a realistic approach requires that we provide a budget better balanced between the three-pronged program of military, economic, and information policy. A budget which contemplates $15,000,000,000 for military, $5,000,000,000 for economic and only $36,000,000 for information and educational services, does not provide an effective tool for cleaning out the Augean stables of international confusion and misunderstanding."

The committee which reported to you last year feels that events have vindicated its judgment both as to the importance of the program and as to the competence and responsibility of those who have carried it out under George Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Your committee is persuaded that the trend of world affairs, in the last year, has multiplied the force of the arguments for a program of foreign information, submitted a year ago.

The great struggle for the minds of men was a conspicuous part of the cold war a year ago. It is now more clearly than ever the crucial battle of our time.

From the Marshall plan we have progressed to the Atlantic Pact. This is a historic departure in American foreign policy that makes it more than ever essential that people everywhere understand the peaceful aims of the Government of the United States.

The Atlantic Pact binds the nations of the Western World together. It is, however, subject to all the infirmities of all the treaties entered into since the birth of diplomacy. The union that it contemplates will grow into a great reality of world politics only if the peoples associated in this enterprise are united in purpose. And they can be united in purpose only by universal understanding of their common aims.

This Atlantic community cannot become the great force for peace into which we hope that it will grow solely by virtue of its economic assets and its military resources. It will shape its own destiny and fix the course of world history only if it summons up the intellectual and spiritual powers that are the foremost virtues of the western culture it has been devised to defend. These allies are not at the disposal of economists and generals. They can be brought into the struggle by the propaganda of truth and by that alone. We must enter into the contest for men's minds with spirit, vigor, and enthusiasm.

Most American newspaper editors certainly would prefer a world in which the American Government might remain in utter divorce from the subjective presentation of information abroad. Most of them certainly would choose above all other possible worlds one in which private agencies had the sole and exclusive responsibility for disseminating news. Such a world, it is apparent, is not to be had in our time. The Government of the United States, whether it wishes to do so or not, is compelled to engage in a program of foreign information. The best that we can do as newspapermen is to make to that program every contribution within our reach that will make it honest, responsible and effective.

One of the things that is needed to make that program effective is adequate wire services of all the press associations. The members of this society are fully acquainted with the past debates on this subject. They will recall the discussion that took place last year. Most of them certainly share the traditional misgivings that in the past have prompted the Associated Press and the United Press to withhold their services from the State Department. The independence and impartiality of the wire services is as important as ever. No one desires to impair it. However, the situation, since last we met, has changed in two respects. We have less reason to fear that their independence and impartiality would be affected by State Department use, now that we have had a further chance to see the responsible way in which the State Department agencies have used the news given them.

We have more reason to run whatever risk there is, now that the decisive phases of the cold war are at hand. As long as western civilization is worth a struggle, its wars, either cold or hot, will bring forth honest conscientious objectors, who dislike the measures essential to survival. The hard facts of life, however, coerce most of us into the realist's choice between the lesser and the greater risk. We come out of our soul searching convinced that it is wiser to give up something of our way of life for a short time than it is to risk giving up all of it for all time.

These considerations and reflections have caused our committee to recommend that the American Society of Newspaper Editors—

(1) Endorse the program of foreign information as it is now conducted and express the hope that it may be enlarged and expanded until it is operating upon a scale commensurate with the Nation's military and economic effort;

(2) Urge the Associated Press and the United Press to furnish to the foreign information agencies of the State Department

the news services that they require to conduct an effective program of foreign information;

(3) Terminate this special committee so long as the society is represented on the Congressional Advisory Committee created by statute to make a continuing examination of the foreign information programs.

J. R. WIGGINS.
LLOYD M. FELMLY.
HAROLD WHEELER.

Number of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the Family Economics Bureau of Minneapolis, Minn., regarding the number of Government employees—Federal, State, and local.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS.—There is now one Government employee for every six and a half families in the United States; each family's prorata share of the cost of Federal, State, and local government salaries averages approximately $33 a month, or $400 a year, according to calculations by the family economics bureau of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.

Back in 1929 there were approximately 3,100,000 Government employees, or one for every 10 families in the United States, the figures show. Today there are slightly over 6,100,000 civilian employees of our Federal, State, and local governments. Public workers' salaries totaled a little under $5,000,000,000 in 1929, exceeded $15,000,000,000 in 1948, and may hit $16,000,000,000 for the year 1949, according to the bureau.

A force of 6,100,000 employees approximately equals the number of paid workers of all kinds in the three States of Massachusetts, Indiana, and Texas combined, the report says.

Since 1929 the population of the United States has increased 21 percent, the number of State and local government employees has increased 60 percent—from approximately 2,500,000 to 4,000,000, and the number of Federal civilian employees has increased 250 percent—from just under 600,000 to approximately 2,100,000.

After a sharp shrinkage from its war emergency peak of approximately 3,400,000, the number of Federal civilian employees is again increasing at the rate of about 100,000 per year. This roughly approximates the number of wage and salary earners of all kinds in a city the size of Hartford, Conn., or Oklahoma City, Okla., the statisticians point out.

The number of State and local government employees is currently increasing at the rate of about 200,000 per year, or by about the number of wage and salary earners of all kinds in a city the size of Dallas, Tex., or Kansas City, Mo.

Of the approximately 4,000,000 State and local government employees, approximately 1,600,000 are in the field of education. Since 1929 the number of other State and local government employees has increased half again as rapidly as teachers and educational workers, the figures show.

Brannan Plan Needs Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Brannan Plan Needs Army," written by Julian Bradbury, and published in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of April 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANNAN PLAN NEEDS ARMY—AIKEN ALSO FEARS END TO FARM CO-OPS

(By Julian Bradbury)

Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, says the administration's new farm program will take a "veritable army to enforce."

In addition, he told the World-Herald in an interview, the new proposal would:

1. Mean the immediate extinction of all farm cooperatives, since income guaranties would remove the reason for banding together to obtain better prices;

2. Put "virtually complete control of every farm in the country" in the hands of the Agriculture Department;

3. Spawn a "grand rush for the farm when hard times come," and thus, eventually, make so many people into farmers with income guaranties that "farming would become unremunerative" to anyone;

4. Set up a "tremendous political force" at the beck and call of the administration.

Mr. AIKEN is the author of the so-called Aiken law supporting farm products on a sliding scale between 60 and 90 percent of parity which is to go into effect next January.

HAVE TO OBEY RULES

The administration proposes to let farm products seek their own price level in the market and pay farmers the cash difference between their actual income and the income necessary to keep their income equal to what purchasing power was over the past 10 years. Tied in with the plan are mandatory acreage controls and marketing allotments and soil conservation. A farmer would have to abide by departmental regulations to get his cash payments.

Mr. AIKEN believes that the Brannan plan will mean that the whole system of county Production and Marketing Administration committees would have to be greatly enlarged—to a "veritable army"—to make sure farmers abide by the rules.

MUST INCLUDE ALL

"No country has ever undertaken such a 100-percent (income) guarantee," he explained. "It would be absolutely necessary that the Government control all farming.

"But they couldn't stop with farming. They would have to extend controls to other groups of the population."

He pointed out that only in 1947 and 1948 did the farmers of the United States enjoy the 100-percent income which the Agriculture Department proposes guaranteeing to them for all time.

Since the administration program insists that the farmer spend part of his income payments for soil-conservation practices, Senator AIKEN feels that because of fixed charges that would put a minimum on tenant farming—it wouldn't be as costly as paying all the expenses on the place and Government-ordered outlays, too.

WOULD HURT CATTLE FEEDER

The Vermont Senator is noted on Capitol Hill for his fair-mindedness. He puts the welfare of the farmer before partisan politics.

One of the aims of the broad administration program, for example, is to cut down on huge corporate farms. Mr. AIKEN believes that is a worth-while aim, but he fears that the ceiling which the administration is setting on one-farm income—about $25,000—will hamstring the cattle feeder and others.

Suppose a cattleman buys beeves he intends to sell for $25,000. And feeds them hay and grass from the ranch worth $15,000. He gets income adjustments for the hay and up to $10,000 for the cattle, and winds up trying to get his money out of the finished cattle the best way he can.

Secretary Brannan's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Salvaging the Brannan Farm Program," written by John D. Black, Henry Lee professor of economics at Harvard University, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston, Mass., in the issue of April 16, 1949. In the article, Professor Black discusses the farm program which has been proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Charles F. Brannan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALVAGING THE BRANNAN FARM PROGRAM

(By John D. Black, Henry Lee professor of economics at Harvard University)

The farm program presented by Secretary Brannan to Congress last week surely is as unrealistic as some of its more reasonable critics are saying. But this does not mean that it should be cast bodily to the dogs. It has many fine features, such as using an income rather than a price standard, a recent rather than a distant base, and a moving rather than a fixed base, and we should do our best to incorporate these in whatever farm plan is developed.

The feature of the Brannan program that alone almost dooms it to failure is its proposal to get the farmers as high a price for a big crop as for a small one. If the program is adopted as outlined, the 1949 cotton growers will receive $84 per acre if the yield averages 300 pounds per acre, in contrast with $56 with an average 200-pound yield. All the crop history of this country bears testimony to the fact that a crop of high value per acre is followed by larger plantings the next year.

In the ordinary cotton market, an average 300-pound yield brings so low a price per pound as to sell for less money per acre than an average 200-pound yield; and this result has tended in the past to keep crop acreages from expanding following large crops and carry-overs. Secretary Brannan proposes to have the Government step in and prevent this natural adjustment. The sure outcome would be to force fixed acreage controls on cotton and most other crops after every year or two of good crop weather.

The correction for this is to adopt a variable price arrangement, under which big yields

sell at the most for only enough more per acre to cover the extra costs of harvesting the big yields. This would be a modified and improved form of the flexible provision in title II of the present Hope-Aiken Act. The schedule of price adjustments really should be fitted to each crop.

The companion change needed to save the Brannan program is to put the floor under prices of the different commodities at not more than 90 percent of the parity-income standard instead of the 100 percent proposed. This would mean 25-cent instead of 28-cent cotton in 1949; $1.30 in place of $1.46 corn; $1.42 in place of $1.59 potatoes; and $17 in place of $19 hogs. This price would be much less likely to expand production quickly and force marketing quotas, and would reduce very greatly the amount of the tax bill to be collected from the public at large.

If 90 percent of parity instead of 100 would be very helpful, 85 percent would be still more helpful. In fact, 85 percent of the 1939–48 parity-income standard is probably about all that our agriculture can stand in the next 5 years without more extensive control of acreages and marketing quotas, and heavier production or compensatory payments and burdens on the Treasury, than our people will endure.

The Brannan proposals could be strengthened further by providing for an expansion of a sound school-feeding program, to take the place in some measure of the compensatory payments. Such a program calls for planning in advance to produce more of the particular foods needed in school feeding, especially of dairy and poultry products and fruits and vegetables.

Secretary Brannan is apparently able to conceive of a school-feeding program only as a means of disposal of surpluses. He also fails to understand how $2 spent for food used in school feeding and stamp programs can half go for administration and for foods that the consumers would have bought anyway and still add $3 to farm incomes, for the simple reason that the average price of all farm products combined goes up 3 percent for every 1-percent increase in total demand.

The cost of Mr. Brannan's proposed program could also be reduced to advantage if he would require the production payments to be taken largely in the form of soil-conservation aids and the like if they were to be paid in full. The reduction for taking them in cash could be as much as a third or even a half. The special appropriation for soil-conservation payments could be greatly reduced in this way.

Thus revised, the Brannan program could be an improvement on the program of title II in the present Hope-Aiken Act, but not necessarily an improvement on a revised Hope-Aiken Act.

Senate Filibusters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Filibusters Show the United States of America Is Still a Union of States," published in the Saturday Evening Post of April 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIBUSTERS SHOW THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IS STILL A UNION OF STATES

The usual view of Senate filibusters is that they are bad because they thwart the will of the majority and prevent action on important legislation. The assumption usually is that "democracy" means that the will of the majority should invariably prevail, and that unlimited debate in the Senate is a mockery of the purposes of the founding fathers, because it keeps the majority in hobbles. Because the latest filibuster was brought on by the administration's effort to push through the civil-rights bill, the basic issues behind unlimited debate in the Senate were generally overlooked.

Those who thumbed their way through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the Senate's talkathon had the opportunity to learn considerable about American constitutional theory as it applies to majorities and the too frequently forgotten fact that a check on the will of majorities was one of the primary purposes of the American Constitution as originally written. Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, deserves the gratitude of all of us for his extensive quotation from James Madison's Journal of the Constitutional Convention, which ought to be studied by every American, and yet is hard to come by. The fear in 1787 was that a majority of the States would deny to a few States the autonomous rights which they did not wish to surrender to the Federal Union. This anxiety, along with concern for the protection of "inalienable" individual rights from the tyranny of the majority, was not quieted without concessions.

Madison believed that the functions of the Senate should include the power "to protect the people against transient impressions into which they themselves might be led." In addition to a popularly chosen legislative body, "liable to err from fickleness and passion," the Senate should comprise a "portion of enlightened citizens whose limited number and firmness might seasonably interpose against impetuous councils." Finally he believed that such a body would hold the fort when "the major interest might under sudden impulse be tempted to commit injustice on the minority." In other words, if the House, under pressure of popular clamor against an unpopular minority, undertook to put through a constitutional amendment repealing the Bill of Rights, a minority of Senators could still defeat hysteria by debating until the cows came home.

Although far from popular, this year's filibuster was not so badly received as some others in the past, no doubt because the importance of most of pending legislation was obscure. However, there was a widespread feeling that this was no way to run a railroad, and that is true. But is cloture in Senate debates the only answer? The contrast in quality between the debates in the leisurely Senate and those in the machine-controlled House should prescribe caution. A better answer would be some restraint on the part of the Executive and the majority in Congress in their selection of measures to be passed.

As Walter Lippmann effectively put it, "There are certain kinds of laws which, though enacted, cannot be enforced by any means that the majority is able or willing to employ." Rightly or wrongly, southern statesmen in Congress believe that Mr. Truman's civil-rights program comes under that heading. The President made the mistake of trying to translate a set of injudicious campaign slogans into law. There is certainly a good case for the view which Mr. Lippmann appears to hold that death by filibuster for some measures is cheap by comparison with what might happen if the majority always had its way. The important lesson of the filibuster is that, in a Federal Union like the United States, there is still a point beyond which a majority cannot go in asserting itself. The point is not a constant and it may change, even on the so-called civil-rights issue, but James Madison's view that "where a majority are united by a common sentiment, and have an opportunity, the rights of the minor party become insecure" is still a lively concern. Debate in the Senate is one of the few remaining recourses open to a minority which finds what it regards as its rights in danger.

Our Chinese Void

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which apeared in the Manchester Evening Leader on Monday, April 25, 1949, entitled "Our Chinese Void." I recommend the reading of this editorial by all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHINESE VOID

Renewal of active warfare in China reveals in all its shame the absence of an American foreign policy for Asia. We who have boasted that we would help the free peoples of the world to resist the encroachments of communism, must confess that we have neither plan nor intention of maintaining our pledge in the East.

With acceptance of the concept of one world, we cannot be indifferent to the surrender of millions of human beings to Communist control. Apart from the moral issue of maintaining our promise to support the cause of liberty everywhere, there is the direct challenge to our security resulting from the strengthening of Russia's position.

Our attitude would be bad enough if we had a mistaken policy; it is infinitely worse when we have no policy. As a nation we cannot operate in a vacuum in our relations with a major portion of the world.

The official indifference of our State Department can scarcely be endearing us to our friends. They must construe our lack of policy to either abdication of world leadership or inability to formulate any plan. Neither reason can be reassuring.

In a realistic world we must cope with conditions as we find them. We cannot proclaim a brave determination which we enforce only when conditions are favorable and which we abandon when circumstances are less kindly than we had hoped.

A stand which is predicated upon a never-never land of utopian harmony is worse than valueless. It is unconscionable betrayal of the trust of friends.

The fact of Communist domination of northern China is an existing fact. That does not mean we must surrender the balance of Asia. The longer we delay, the more probable becomes the Red conquest of the great remaining areas of independent China.

If all of China goes, the fall of Burma, Siam, the Malayan States, and even India becomes much more of a dread possibility. Since so much of China is gone already, our need is to salvage as much as possible of the balance of southern and western Asia.

The formulation and fulfillment of a firm policy for Asia is a major necessity of emergency nature. With it, we become again the standard-bearer for all the peoples whose love of freedom makes them wedded to our leadership. Without it, we are a fallen giant whose plight will bring regret but not pity from the rest of the world.

Basing-Point System Assesses Flood-Control Program—Cement and Steel in Huge Quantities Used in Flood Control—Basing-Point and Monopoly Lawyers' Arguments Ridiculous—Small Business Fights Movement to Weaken Antitrust Laws

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, cement is a very important commodity in the construction of our great flood-control projects. We are all familiar with the flood walls built of reinforced concrete stretching along the banks of the rivers upon which are situated many of our large cities and numerous towns and villages. We have expended large sums of money on flood-control projects, not only for the protection of our people and their property in our cities and towns, but for the protection of our farmers and vast areas of valuable farm land. These projects are not confined to any one part of the country, but are included in nearly every State where the necessity for flood control is evident. Every such project, whether it be in the great Mississippi Valley areas and the tributaries of the Mississippi, or in other areas, requires enormous quantities of cement and steel.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM ASSESSES FLOOD CONTROL

The basing-point system, prior to the Supreme Court decision, was utilized in the pricing of cement used in flood-control projects as it has been in every construction project, regardless of kind or character. The millions upon millions of barrels of cement and the millions of pounds of steel, which of necessity must be utilized in the control of the devastating floodwaters of our rivers, have been assessed large sums of money to pay for phantom freight under the basing-point system. There is no one who can deny this statement, although the Cement and Steel Trusts would like to deny it; in fact, they would have much preferred that the subject of the basing-point system had never been mentioned. However, the Federal Trade Commission, under its congressional mandate, did bring up the subject of the basing-point system, and the subject was thoroughly exhausted with little or nothing left to say about it after the Supreme Court spoke on April 26, 1948.

MORATORIUM VERSUS BASING POINT

It has been said again and again that the moratorium was an innocent legislative device to clarify the minds of those who, for reasons of their own, did not understand the Supreme Court decision. Is this not a ridiculous premise upon which to base an argument for the need of legislation? The same basing point and monopoly lawyers who argued so vehemently and so learnedly in opposition to the findings of the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement case now are confounded, confused, bewildered, and perplexed in trying to find out what the Supreme Court said on the day the basing-point system was sentenced. But is this question of clarification really one which requires an answer? Is it not a question of seeking a prop by which to return to the basing-point system, thereby setting in motion a long series of actions which will require years to settle? I do not believe Congress should assume the burden of legislation which will weaken the laws we have been trying so long to uphold.

FURTHER PROOF OF BASING POINT BIDDING TECHNIQUE

As further proof of the operation of the basing-point system and its effect on the flood-control program, I include a number of tables of bids on cement received by the Army engineers, for the period April 9, 1947, to March 22, 1948, for various flood-control projects:

TABLE 1.—*Abstract of bids 2,000 barrels American portland cement received by Corps of Engineers, War Department, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Mar. 26, 1947, and bids opened Apr. 9, 1947, serial No. 22–052–47–209, for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries; destination, Vicksburg, Miss.*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Hermitage Portland Cement Co	$2.83	$2.85	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co	2.83	2.85	.10
3	Alpha Portland Cement Co	2.98	3.00	.10
4	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.83	2.85	.10
5	Lone Star Cement Corp	2.83	2.85	.10
6	Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co	2.83	[2]	.10

[1] Awarded by lot to bidder No. 4 as between bidders 2 and 4, because these were lowest bids considering guaranty against increase for 15 days.
[2] No bid.

TABLE 2.—*Abstract of bids for 150,000 barrels American portland cement received by Corps of Engineers, War Department, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Apr. 8, 1947, and bids opened Apr. 21, 1947, serial No. 22–052–47–225, for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries; destination, Vicksburg, Miss.*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.66	$2.68	$0.10
2	Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp	2.66	2.68	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.66	2.68	.10
4	Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co	2.65	2.68	.10
5	Alpha Portland Cement Co	2.65	2.68	.10
6	Lone Star Cement Corp	2.66	2.68	.10

[1] Awarded to bidder No. 4, whose bid was the lowest received that complied with essential requirements of the specifications, for delivery f. o. b. contractor's shipping point.

TABLE 3.—*Abstract of bids for 4 lots of American portland cement received by Corps of Engineers, War Department, Huntington, W. Va. Bids opened May 12, 1947; issued May 1, 1947, serial No. W–46–022–eng–47–136, for Bluestone Dam, Bluestone Reservoir project, New River, W. Va.*

LOT A, 267,000 BARRELS

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	[2]	[2]	.10
3	Medusa Portland Cement Co	[2]	[2]	.10
4	North American Cement Corp	[2]	[2]	.10

LOT B, 162,000 BARRELS

1	Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2.58	2.60	.10
3	Medusa Portland Cement Co	2.58	2.60	.10
4	North American Cement Corp	[3] 2.73	[3] 2.75	.10

LOT C, 75,000 BARRELS

1	Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	[2]	[2]	.10
3	Medusa Portland Cement Co	2.58	2.60	.10
4	North American Cement Corp	[2]	[2]	.10

LOT D, 30,000 BARRELS

1	Universal Atlas Cement Co	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	[2]	[2]	.10
3	Medusa Portland Cement Co	2.58	2.60	.10
4	North American Cement Co	[2]	[2]	.10

[1] All bids received on this invitation were rejected. Purchases were readvertised and rebid as shown below.
[2] No bid.
[3] Bidding on only 87,000 barrels.

The bids on 4 lots of American portland cement were reissued on May 23, 1947, and opened on June 3, 1947

LOT A, 267,000 BARRELS

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Huron Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	$2.58	$2.60	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10
4	Bessemer Limestone & Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10
5	North American Cement Corp.	(2)	(2)	.10
6	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10

LOT B, 162,000 BARRELS [1]

1	Huron Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	$2.58	$2.60	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement	2.58	2.60	.10
4	Bessemer Limestone & Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10
5	North American Cement Corp.	[3] 2.58	2.60	.10
6	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	2.58	2.60	.10

LOT C, 75,000 BARRELS [2]

1	Huron Portland Cement Co.	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	2.58	2.60	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10
4	Bessemer Limestone & Cement.	2.85	2.75	.10
5	North American Cement Corp.	(2)	(2)	.10
6	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	2.58	2.60	.10

LOT D, 30,000 BARRELS [1]

1	Huron Portland Cement Co.	$2.58	$2.60	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	2.58	2.60	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	(2)	(2)	.10
4	Bessemer Limestone & Cement.	2.85	2.75	.10
5	North American Cement Corp.	No bid	No bid	.10
6	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	2.58	2.60	.10

[1] Lot B awarded to Medusa Portland Cement Co. and Lehigh Portland Cement Co. 162,000 barrels.
Lot C awarded to Huron Portland Cement Co., 75,000 barrels.
Lot D awarded to Huron Portland Cement Co., 30,000 barrels.
[2] No bid.
[3] Bidding on only 87,000 barrels.

TABLE 4.—*Abstract of bids 3,000 barrels American portland cement, air entrained, received by Corps of Engineers, War Department, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Sept. 24, 1947, and bids opened Oct. 6, 1947, serial No. W–22–052–48–103, for flood control on the Mississippi River and tributaries*

Bid No.	Bidder	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	$2.98	$3.00	$0.10
2	Lone Star Cement Corp.	2.98	3.00	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	2.98	3.00	.10

[1] Awarded by lot to bidder No. 1 as between bidders 1 and 3, because these were lowest bids considering guaranty against price increase for 15 days.

TABLE 5.—*Abstract of bids 1,000 barrels American portland cement, received by Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Oct. 13, 1947, and bids opened Oct. 24, 1947, serial No. W–22–052–eng–48–130, for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination	Discount per barrel (15 days)
1	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	$3.03	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	3.03	.10
3	Lone Star Cement Corp.	3.03	.10
4	Alpha Portland Cement Co.	3.03	.10

[1] Awarded by lot to bidder No. 1 as between bidders Nos. 1, 2, and 3, one of the four lowest bidders as to price. Bidder No. 4 disqualified by stating right to limit deliveries to 1 car per month and to allow 15 days to ship each car.

TABLE 6.—*Abstract of bids, 144,000 barrels of American portland cement, received by Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Md., advertised Dec. 23, 1947, and opened Jan. 12, 1948, serial No. W–18–020–eng–48–23, for flood control, general*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Per barrel	Paper sacks	
1	Alpha Portland Cement Co. (partial quantity bid)	$2.91	$3.19	$0.10
2	Universal Atlas Cement Co.	2.91	3.19	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co. (partial quantity bid)	2.91	3.19	.10
4	North American Cement Corp.	2.91	3.19	.10
5	Glens Falls Portland Cement (partial quantity bid)	2.91	3.19	.10

[1] Awarded one-half of requirements to each of the following companies: Universal Atlas Cement Co. and North American Cement Co., because of special considerations favorable to the Government in proposed contracts.

TABLE 7.—*Abstract of bids, 2,500 barrels of portland cement, received by Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Feb. 26, 1948, and opened Mar. 10, 1948, for flood control work*

Bid No.	Bidder	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination		Discount per barrel (15 days)
		Item 1	Item 1 (a)	
1	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	$3.23	------	$0.10
2	National Cement Co.	3.23	$3.21	.10
3	Lone Star Cement Co.	3.23	------	--------

[1] Awarded by lot between bidders Nos. 1, 2, and 3, to bidder No. 3, one of the three equal lowest bidders as to price.

It will be noted that on item 1, the Government bills of lading bids, one or two differences are noted in the amount of 1 cent. These differences are in all probability errors in computing freight rates.

On item 1a bids, which are the usual destination basing-point bids, using the tables of the basing-point system, no differences in bids appear, except in the case of one or two bidding companies who bid high for reasons of their own.

TABLE 8.—*Abstract of bids 6,000 barrels of portland cement, received by Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg district, Vicksburg, Miss., advertised Mar. 3, 1948, and opened Mar. 15, 1948, serial No. Eng–22–052–48–338, for flood-control work*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination	Discount per barrel (15 days)
1	Lone Star Cement Corp. (partial bid on 3,000)	$3.09	$0.10
2	Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	3.09	.10
3	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	3.09	.10
4	Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co.	3.09	.10

[1] No award made. All bids rejected on Mar. 23, 1948.

TABLE 9.—*Abstract of bids 10,000 barrels of portland cement received by Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Wash., advertised Mar. 8, 1948, and opened Mar. 22, 1948, serial No. W–45–108–Eng–48–213*

Bid No.	Bidder [1]	Price per barrel f. o. b. destination	Discount per barrel
1	Superior Portland Cement, Inc.	$3.35	[2] $0.10
2	The Olympic Portland Cement Co., Ltd.	3.35	[3] .10
3	Permanente Cement Co.	3.55	[4] .10

[1] Awarded to bidder No. 1 who was lowest bidder considering discount offered.
[2] 20 days.
[3] 15 days.
[4] 10 days.

NOTE.—Item 1 desginates bid on Government bill of lading. Item 1 (a) designates bid at destination price.

SMALL BUSINESS FIGHTS MORATORIUM BILL

As I have previously shown, legitimate small-business organizations and small-business men, as individuals, are voicing opposition to the moratorium bills. Letter after letter indicates an increased fear that the Robinson-Patman Act and other price-discrimination and antitrust laws will be materially weakened by the passage of a moratorium bill. Farm organizations have come out strongly against the basing-point system and have the same viewpoint that is held by all who have reason to fear the ever-growing monopolies in food, in farm machinery, in basic products such as steel and cement, and in many other commodities.

I sincerely hope the tables above will serve to focus the attention of every Member of this House, who is interested in our flood-control program, on the noncompetitive bidding of the basing-point system. The flood-control program is of vast importance, not only from the standpoint of property, which is of the least importance when compared to the lives and health of our people, but to our entire economy. If we are to save our land, flood control is one of the most valuable methods of conservation. Let

us not jeopardize this program or any other program by weakening our anti-trust laws and encouraging monopolistic and unfair trade practices. The passage of any moratorium bill undoubtedly will have just that effect.

Empty Seats in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock entitled "Those 'Empty Seats' in the House and Senate," from the New York Times of April 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THOSE EMPTY SEATS IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Some days ago in this space an account was given of legislation considered and completed by the House and the Senate in the course of April 13, to support the statement that the Eighty-first Congress is a hard-working, not a "do-nothing," body. Several readers who visited the Capitol that day wrote in to ask why so many seats in the two branches were empty when the important business was being transacted.

Howard M. Liechty, of Monsey, N. Y., voiced the perplexity of the others. "To uninformed visitors it seems a mockery when an orator addresses the empty seats of an unheeding group of legislators," he wrote. "Are they vacant because the Members are in committee work? Is Congress so organized that Members cannot listen to and participate in debate on questions weighty enough to warrant their being debated at all?"

To reply requires a survey of the reasons for absenteeism, which are several and rarely the product of neglect of duty in any form. For example, under the rules the Appropriations Committees (45 Members of the House and 21 of the Senate) can and do meet at any time during the sessions, frequently as subcommittees, and that is what some of the absentees were doing on April 13. Second, no matter how distinguished a Senator or Representative may be, he is an errand boy for his State or district, and afternoons offer about the only time he can transact local business with the executive departments and agencies and receive his constituents in the lobbies. Third, the mail from home is heavy and must be answered and session hours as well as nights when his branch of Congress is not meeting must be used for this purpose. Committee meetings take up most of the mornings.

By necessity Members largely rely on the committees they don't belong to for the spade work by which legislation is made ready for introduction and debate. They are furnished with all the transcripts, and many have read these and satisfied themselves on disputed points before debate begins. On April 13, the day this correspondent used as proof that Congress is hard-working that was particularly the case.

SOME CASE HISTORIES

The Senate that day, for instance, was considering the appropriation for a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, and there were very few Members on the floor. Why? Because the issue is not important or Senators were too lazy to take an interest in it? The answer is that advocates of the plant had the votes, which everyone knew, and the opponents could only make a token fight for the record, which they did. But this kept the issue alive, and it will reappear.

This was also true of the District of Columbia rent-control bill, the early stages of debate on the administration's housing bill the authorization of funds for the second year of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the deficiency bill of $600,000,000 that merely carried out Congress' previous pledge to the Veterans' Administration. The sentiment of the House was overwhelming in support of its committee report on the $15,900,000,000 defense bill, and the major disputes had been threshed out before.

Also, when the House sits as a committee of the whole, the presence of only 100 Members is required for a quorum, and divisions on important matters often are tentatively settled by 50 votes to 30. But these decisions can be, and often are, challenged and reversed on a roll call of the entire House. Then the empty seats are few.

WHERE ABSENTEES ARE

Frequently the matter under debate, though of great public interest and political significance, has been argued in principle for years, and the most earnest Members of Congress, certain they will hear nothing new and already determined on their position, will take the opportunity to catch up on the pile of other work that confronts them. For, like all enterprises in which men engage, membership in Congress forces some selection of the matters to which they will give their chief attention at a particular moment. A close and daily observer at the Capitol, whom this correspondent asked for comment, gave these illustrations:

"Representative A of Mississippi, absent from his seat when the Capitol guides are herding visitors into the galleries, will be at the Committee on Agriculture, looking over the latest critical situation in cotton, unless something tremendous is up in the House. Senator X of Ohio, whose advice on fiscal matters is considered vital by colleagues who are busy elsewhere, will be in his seat when a money bill is under consideration, but he will be answering his mail another time. Both activities are within his duty."

Also: Members of the Foreign Relations Committee today had to miss the housing bill debate to listen to Secretary Acheson, popping in only when there was a roll call on amendments.

The broad facts are that most debates in the Senate are as well attended as they deserve; that under the rules of the House there cannot be much worth-while discussion; that legislation does not suffer from absenteeism; and that an empty seat rarely means an indifferent Member. What the occasional gallery visitor sees in his brief inspections is seldom the engine room of Congress. And often when he reads in the newspapers of a historic act on the day of his visit he wonders when that happened, for it was not visible to him among the empty chairs. Yet it may have been done under his eyes by the few occupants and debaters who were present.

This is the system. It has great faults, but inattention to business is rarely one of them.

Injustice to Musicians of 20 Percent Amusement Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Leo Cluesmann, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, and published in the April 1949, issue of International Musician, commenting upon the injustice to musicians of the 20-percent amusement tax.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 20 percent amusement tax is imposed upon all establishments where live musicians are employed and dancing or singing is permitted. This applies to restaurants, hotels, dance halls, theatres and similar establishments. It is the aim of the American Federation of Musicians to bring about a modification of this tax, in view of its detrimental effect upon the employment opportunities not only of members of this organization, but of all sorts of performers and entertainers in the amusement industry; it also affects adversely other employees, such as waiters, cooks, porters, etc.

It has been the experience of this organization that since shortly after the war there has been a falling off in employment in establishments such as night clubs, dance halls, etc. It seems that for a while after the war the people still had a certain excess amount of money to spend for amusement and for that reason there was no objection generally to the 20 percent tax. However, now that the public seems to count its pennies, the payment of the 20 percent in addition to their bills has caused an undue burden, and many establishments have been compelled to close because of lack of patronage, or have installed mechanical music such as Muzak or some other form of wired music, also juke boxes. This results in unfair competition with live musicians, for ironically mechanical music is exempt from tax by the Government, and according to the copyright law no license fee may be exacted by the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), whereas all these various exactions apply where live music is performed. In other words, an employer is compelled to pay a premium for the privilege of having live talent. The proprietor of an establishment where a juke box operates has the added advantage of receiving considerable revenue from its use.

This clearly indicates that live musicians and entertainers are penalized and their employment opportunities jeopardized in favor of mechanical entertainment.

As is well known, when times become bad the members of the amusement industry are the first to feel the effect, and as conditions improve they are the last to benefit thereby.

In many other fields of endeavor the Government makes it its business to assist industries. The farmer is subsidized for the purpose of assuring him of a fair price for his products; and in other cases, such as shipbuilding, our merchant marine service, and the air lines, certain governmental agencies have the function of maintaining

an economic balance. All these industries are now receiving, or have received, substantial help from the Federal Treasury.

But the musician is the forgotten man and his welfare seems to be of little concern, notwithstanding his contribution to morale during the recent war, and the part which music of all kinds plays in our national life.

The musician does not ask for subsidies, only to have the adverse tariff against live music removed in the interests of equity.

Proposals to remove or sharply reduce all such excise taxes as the 20 percent amusement levy are already before Congress; and before these proposals come up for debate, members and officers of locals should call to the attention of their Senators and Congressmen the disastrous effect of this tax on their livelihood.

Wanted—A New Approach to Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address entitled "Wanted—A New Approach to Farm Problems," delivered by Murray D. Lincoln, president, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, at the national convention of Americans for Democratic Action, held at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago on April 9, 1949.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript of Mr. Lincoln's address will exceed by one-third of a page the two pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $175.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED—A NEW APPROACH TO FARM PROBLEMS

The sign on the barnyard gate might very well read: "Wanted, to buy a new approach to farm problems." Or maybe, as an old sailor might say, we just need to get on a new tack.

Anyway, however you say it, I believe we have been approaching our general farm problems in the wrong way, in many respects. We have been trying to solve these problems in much the same way as has industry and labor. Because they have been supporting a program of scarcity—trying to make prosperity by creating artificial scarcities and thereby making prices high—agricultural leaders and Government tried to make the same technique work with agriculture, which simply cannot be adjusted to the kind of a program that industry and labor can make operative—or one, at least, they thought they could.

What has business done that is restrictive and destructive of free markets? Instead of investing in expansion prior to the war businessman invested in consolidation. That might mean any number of devices to bring their market under control. Buying up competitors, as Rockefeller did, was one device. Another was buying up their sources of supply, as Ford and General Motors did. Controlling your retail outlets, as General Electric, Westinghouse, Firestone, and others did. Running a patent factory, as most every progressive corporation does in its research laboratory. Price agreements of all kinds are generally restrictive. Tariffs and corporation controls are certainly restrictive. Small retailers get their legislatures to pass anti-chain-store legislation and price-fixing laws, masquerading under the name of fair-trade laws. Dairy interests get an oleomargarine tax passed.

The unions adopt a rule that restricts paint-brush width to 6 inches—and other feather-bed rules.

Farmers have demanded Government support to prices of wheat, cotton, and corn. They have their AAA's, FSA, soil conservation, cooperative banks, production credit, also oleomargarine-tax laws.

But where has it all taken us? The net result has been to simply continue that historic sequence of booms, busts, and wars, repeated every generation—now in 20-year cycles. And now people all over the world are in revolt. This is a revolutionary period, even if people don't recognize it. It probably is as significant, if not so violent, as the revolutionary period in which we overthrew political kings and emperors, and slowly and tediously put political power in the hands of common people through the democratic or representative process. What we are doing now is to overthrow economic autocracy, economic imperialism, economic exploitation of the masses by monopolistic classes, to work out the process and detail of economic democracy.

Abe Lincoln once said, "There has never been but one central economic problem. That is how to keep a few from saying to the many, 'You work and we eat.'"

Now I don't mean to say that everything we have done is wrong, far from it. But by no analysis that I can make, no test that I can apply, can I convince myself that we are making the progress we could if we would right-about-face in many respects.

But it has been worth trying many of these things if for no other reason than to have tried them and thereby convince ourselves that they will not work satisfactorily.

A few years ago a meteor by the name of Sapiro zoomed across the horizon with a sure-fire solution to the farm problem. We were going to sign farmers up on watertight contracts, through marketing cooperatives, to control farm products and make consumers pay the price we wanted. Industry did it by their controls. Labor did it by strikes, so we said. But it didn't work.

Then we sought the McNary-Haugen bill under the Coolidge administration.

Next, the Hoover Farm Board, which through Government buying and selling was to control prices. And again we turned to industry—the farm-machinery business, which certainly did control prices through regulated production—to get an industrialist who could show us how to do it, Mr. Legge, who left a $100,000-a-year job to do it for agriculture. We accumulated surpluses that only the war saved us from. The oncoming depression finished that. We said it failed because we didn't control production, which led to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This resulted in the setting up of a bureaucracy, about which so many are now complaining—with implications of increasing statism that seems in considerable variance with our long tradition of individualism and independence.

So here we have both legislative and economic action attempts to return to farmers the prices that we thought to be deserved.

Far be it from me to say that this effort was abortive. Some good has been derived from the experience. At least we know some things that won't work.

If nothing else has happened as a result of these legislative attempts to solve the farm problem, at least there has come a strengthening in the determination of farmers to continue to expand their self-help action through the still further development of cooperative marketing, cooperative purchasing, cooperative electric utilities, cooperative finance and insurance, and consumer cooperatives.

And I hope that nothing I say here is taken to mean that I depreciate the efforts of Congress or the different administrations to find a solution to this troublesome farm problem. And neither do I wish to convey the impression that farmers through their general farm organizations should lessen their efforts to have farmers adequately represented in legislative halls to oppose detrimental legislation and work for legislation that we believe will reflect benefit to our group or the common good.

But I do believe that we should not be blind to the fact that agriculture is a minority group so far as votes are concerned. Farmers constitute only 18 percent of our whole population. If we believe in representative government, we must recognize that other groups have the power to take away legislative benefits as well as to grant them. And right now we are witnessing one of those periodic swings of public sentiment. During the depression most anything was granted to agriculture because even city people are generally sympathetic to the problem of our farmers. During the period of high prices in the inflationary period following the war, agriculture received much discredit. We were reminded of the program of scarcity which we had practiced in the past when people didn't have all the things to eat which they needed.

I think our national farm organizations have put too much emphasis on legislative controls and not enough on economic controls. Perhaps it is better to say that we want more economic action even if we have no less legislative action.

I do not believe we can ever legislate ourselves into prosperity any more than you can make people moral or Christian by passing laws. If this is the method we choose we will eventually end up with complete state control. Rather we should use our political power to oppose monopolies in control of raw materials, in distribution, in finance, and to guarantee the greatest degree of true competition and freedom of enterprise.

The farm problem comes about largely through the corporate or monopoly control of prices of what the farmer sells and buys. No business can long remain solvent that sells at wholesale and buys at retail, and has no say about either price. And how are you going to correct that situation by legislation unless you put Government into business head over heels?

Now in another way I think we have been wrong. We approach our problem from the standpoint of price—or markets—export demand and other similar phases rather than the simple one of the primary use for agricultural products—namely, food for human consumption.

Take the dairymen. They seem to be chronically in hot water. Yet in spite of all protestations they keep on producing milk. The situation reminds me of a story told by an old German farmer in northwestern Ohio to one of our fieldmen. He

said, "Louie, I keep books like the boys at the university tell me to and each year, according to the books, I lose money. But every 5 years I buy a new farm—I can't understand it, unless it is the manure they don't reckon on."

I don't mean to belittle the problem of the dairymen, but I sincerely believe if they will begin to think in terms of how to get more milk at a lower retail price into the mouths of hungry people, we will be on the way to finding the method of getting more money into the pockets of dairymen.

Dairymen have tried most every restrictive approach we know about, such as using the health departments to shut out competing milk, refusing to let retail stores reflect possible savings to consumers as against door-to-door delivery, a tax on oleomargarine, a wasteful system of collection and distribution of milk, to say nothing of letting milk distributors through good and bad years get away with a return on their investment that is way out of line for any normal return on average business. These are definite examples of trying to increase prices by restrictive methods.

And I am sure that farmers are not going to improve their chances of success if farm leaders keep up their long-time criticism of labor. We may not like what some labor-union leaders say or do, but they have just as much right to organize to protect their producer interests as farmers have. And the public does not like what some farm leaders advocate, according to some articles that appear in the metropolitan press.

A very successful Boston retail merchant once said that no business ever really succeeds that fights its customers. Railroads have long since learned this and are aggressively moving away from the old public-be-damned philosophy that characterized the day of the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, and the like. Working people are farmers' best customers. The first thing people with average incomes do when they get more wages is to spend more money for food.

Witness the fact that during and since the war when the average city workingman's wage was being raised, the consumption of meat increased 17 percent over prewar. This situation was true for practically every other agricultural commodity.

It would appear that increased wages to labor ought to be one of the best sources of increased income to farmers, just as better income to farmers will be reflected in more purchasing power on the part of farmers for supplies made by labor.

This is true, and would be even more so if our distributive systems didn't take so much from both the farmer and city wage earner. In fact, until we overcome the monopolies and waste in distribution and production, such as manufacturing and control of raw materials, neither the farmer nor the wage earner will receive the return that he ought to get and can get.

And that brings me to my principal suggestion. There is not much use in arguing whether what has gone before is right or wrong. As we face the future we must use the past as a guide and to ascertain what is to be our future course of action.

Are we going back to the old laissez-faire economy? Are we again going to take up the mad race to exploit people as well as nations for the profit of a chosen few? Are we again going back to that rugged individualism where every nation and every person looks out only for himself and let the devil take the hindmost?

Well, if we do, the devil will get most of us by dividing us still further into camps of haves and have-nots, and finally we will face the third world war.

Unless we can give people hope of something except recurring wars, we may face the same kind of situation that has recurred before in the history of mankind—so-called civilization simply fades out for a period.

In attempting to outline our course and determine where and how we go from here, we ought to weigh carefully the following:

1. It is now physically possible to assure everyone reasonable freedom from want, as related to an adequate diet, clothing, and shelter. In other words, because of mechanization and scientific development in both industry and agriculture, we know we can produce the goods to assure this freedom from want.

2. World leadership has come to the United States of America—whether we want it or are ready for it. Our country has been less disturbed physically by the past war. Our productive capacity has been tremendously expanded. We have had a minimum of imperialism. We have demonstrated a good-neighbor policy. Scientifically and mechanically we have much to offer other nations. We are a young nation. We represent people from all nations, we have been assimilated in a reasonably successful manner. Therefore we have sympathies for other nations by blood ties. We were the first to develop mass production in industry and mechanization in agriculture. Essentially we have followed a live and let live policy.

3. As a result of this opportunity for world leadership what we do in this Nation is of crucial importance. Whether we produce for abundance instead of for scarcity, whether we can find the way to maintain an adequate degree of full employment of human and material resources. Whether we can harmonize the class strife already too apparent between labor, agriculture, and industry. Whether we will continue our broad policy of helping other nations help themselves.

Our success or failure in resolving these age-old questions will have world-wide repercussions.

In order to accomplish these desired ends, as I said in the beginning, I believe the first essential is that we firmly resolve to adopt a policy that will put into effect an economy of abundance in place of the economy of scarcity that has been practiced so long in this Nation and the world.

We must eliminate this paradox of hunger and want amidst potential and actual plenty.

We must get more goods to more people at less cost.

We must help ourselves by helping (not exploiting) one another.

If we count ourselves a Christian Nation we should make a greater practical demonstration of our Christianity in our economic and social relationships, both within and without the Nation.

If you accept the premise, you may then properly ask: How can it be done? I have no cut-and-dried plan that can reverse our age-old practices. But I do think it is clear what some of the steps are, and we must expect to improve, improvise, and implement as we go along.

First, we must set our hearts and minds on doing it.

Second, we must take every means to lower costs of production, manufacture, and distribution of both agricultural and industrial products and related services.

Of what avail is this mad cycle of industry asking more profits, labor, higher wages, and farmers higher prices? Each increase passes a greater burden on to all other people in society for the temporary benefit of a few. But to continue this vicious cycle leads only to inflation, deflation, repudiation, and damnation in the form of wars and economic and social collapse.

Third, the fullest effect of the lowering of costs must be passed back to the user or consumer. It will be of no avail if the increased savings of such effective reduction of costs are returned to invested capital held by a few people.

There is an erroneous impression abroad that lower prices mean unemployment and lower farm returns. Just the opposite can be true. As a farmer lowers the cost of producing and getting the food to the wage earner, he can work for less money which in turn lowers industrial costs, which in turn lowers farming costs, and so on. This approach will benefit everyone, not just a few. Granted, this cannot happen overnight. Also, some groups will be temporarily out of balance, but aren't they now?

Now all this can be accomplished within the framework of democracy and representative government. Certain industries have partially demonstrated this already, notably the auto industry. As they lowered costs, their markets have increased, since more people were able to buy automobiles.

To implement this new approach I feel that two factors will be important.

First, is the cooperative movement. And when I mention this I mean all phases of this people's movement. There is cooperative marketing, cooperative processing, cooperative finance, cooperative buying, cooperative utilities, cooperative services of all kinds in which people can benefit by reduction of waste, guaranty of quality and proper use, proper adjustment of service to needs, and of course, very vital to the whole scheme, the return of savings to the use of member and patron of the cooperative unit.

I call the cooperative movement a catalytic agent. A catalytic agent is a chemical that, put in with other chemicals, brings about a chemical change while the agent itself remains as is, or stable.

The entrance of cooperatives into various fields, if successful, makes other businesses do certain things they had not been doing before. This, to me, is the evolutionary way of getting things changed or accomplished.

My hope is that in the not-too-distant future city dwellers—on a vast scale throughout the land—will take up consumer cooperation. And there is evidence they are beginning to do so. If they do that, farmer cooperative groups can then contract direct with these urban groups to supply certain food products and in this way we can go around the present monopolies that control distribution and manufacturing, in many cases. And I am sure that farmers will need the volume of business in cooperative channels, to say nothing of the legislative support of urban people, to bring into being an economy of abundance. The old system of exploitation will not give up easily.

Second is the place of Government in the scheme of things. The Ohio Farm Bureau was one of the first farm organizations in the early thirties to object to the restrictive features of the AAA program, also the regimentation. We said if you ask the Government to do something for you, you inevitably put the Government in a position to do something to you.

And to plow up cotton and kill little pigs, pay farmers to restrict production, is social and economic suicide, so long as anyone, anywhere in the world, is hungry or ill-clothed and ill-housed.

It is fortunate for the country and the world that the soil conservation and improvement phases of our national agricultural program outdid the restriction. Improved fertilization and hybrid seed corn also played their part, so that we have had ample food to met the unprecedented demands of

our civilians, armed forces, and lend-lease during the war and tremendously increased demand for food since the war.

And farmers, of course, have done a grand job of producing in spite of shortages of labor, materials, and other deterrents.

People today are grumbling about Government regulations. To me this is a natural sequence to our demands that Government help industry, labor, and agriculture. I do not feel nearly as critical of Government as some seem to, simply because I believe it to be our own fault, as a people. People have in their own hands the tools to fashion their own destinies. If people will do more things themselves, there will be less for Government to do.

We worry about taxes. The same answer holds true here, outside of war costs, of course. If people will do more things themselves in a voluntary cooperative, free enterprise way, the Government will have to do less and, therefore, spend less tax money,

It has been my observation that Government by itself initiates little, if anything. Government is pushed in by the demands of the different segments of society.

If these economic groups would get together around a table and do a better job of solving their own problems by individual and group action, as well as to put their heads together to work out the details of an economy of abundance and each one's part in it—then they would not leave much for Government to do except to run the Army and Navy and Post Office Department. And no one would object to the Government doing that—at least I think so.

By news releases, advertisements, and the radio, certain business interests today are trying to resell Americans a belief in themselves. They indulge in endless prattle about the free-enterprise system and its advantages.

I don't believe you need to sell the American people on personal freedom, private ownership and enterprise, and the representative form of government. The average American believes in all this—but he needs a practical demonstration that he can participate in and share in its benefits to the fullest extent—and not just talk about it.

Now, personally, notwithstanding my personal prejudices and desires, I see little on the horizon to convince me that we can bring about an economy of abundance without a lot of government initiation and control. And it need not be permanent or detrimental if people in this country will assume the responsibility that is theirs as citizens of a Republic such as ours.

And my hope is that as people gain in wisdom and effective group action, they can, through their own voluntary groups, take over after government has initiated the program, and ease government out. It is true that government seldom gives up a function but that doesn't mean it cannot be done if we are willing to accept the full responsibilities of individually participating in a democratic representative government.

To be realistic I must also record that if farmers, or laborers, or industry by themselves adopt a program of abundance without other segments doing it at the same time, it will of course fail. This is a job we must do together.

Specifically, then, what is the job to be done?

1. Since we know what constitutes an adequate diet—let us first figure out what is our potential power of consumption. This basic research would not be difficult.

2. Secondly, it would then become a governmental function to plan production based upon the necessities of an adequate diet for all of our people.

3. Once we can determine what it is in the best interests of the health of our Nation to consume and when we have made certain that we produce only to satisfy that consumption, then we must see that there is a free flow of these food commodities at a reasonable cost to the ultimate consumer. These recommendations can become realities by the voices of the people being heard through government and through their cooperatives.

Farmers should insist through their national farm organizations, that government more actively oppose and dissolve monopolistic practices wherever they exist.

Also that government action, so long as it is necessary, should be directed toward increasing consumption rather than restricting production—as for example, rather than paying farmers to restrict production, it should be made possible to increase the consumption of farm products such as through the food-stamp plans.

Also to eliminate monopolies in the manufacturing and distribution of such commodities as lumber, electricity, raw materials, farm machinery and the like so that farmers can buy these commodities and other necessary items cheaper.

These and other steps if taken would lead to true free markets, real free enterprise and competition.

Restrictions are the real cause of unemployment and consequent low farm prices. When existing producers have so many hooks in the market, the market is less tempting to new producers. When old capital is well protected against loss, new capital would rather join the old than to try to lick it. The odds favor idle or timid capital. And when money is idle, so are men. And our whole business structure collapses.

It is well known that production, and the wages and profits it creates, must all be spent promptly on consumption or invested promptly in new enterprise, in order to sustain the original production.

Which way do the American people—including businessmen, farmers, laborers, want to go? Do you want an economy of scarcity or an economy of abundance? The decision is in your hands—what you decide will shape America's well-being in the years to come. We can't avoid that decision.

Do We Want Socialized Medicine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Dr. Walter F. Tunks:

DO WE WANT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE?

Today I want to discuss a matter which ought to be of concern to every American—the threatened loss of some of our precious freedoms. It may be that someone will try to read political bias into what I am about to say, or accuse me of being the advocate of the status quo. Well nothing important can ever be said without the risk that someone will twist it to his own prejudice and partisanship. That is what brought Jesus to the cross.

The scribes and pharisees would have been perfectly satisfied if Jesus had stayed within the patterns of conventional religion. But when Jesus insisted that religion be taken out of its dusty pigeonholes and applied to the problems of everyday living—business and government and all human relationships—the traditionists objected and conspired to put Jesus to death. In our churches today there are still people who insist that the minister, like the shoemaker, should stick to his last. Let him preach the old-time religion, by which they often mean "pie in the sky, by and by" as if religion were meant only to secure us a safe passport into Heaven, but not at all concerned with what happens to us here on earth. That was not the mind of Jesus. He was indeed concerned with men's souls. But he knew there is no use preaching to empty stomachs. He knew that soul sickness can be caused by physical disease and mental illness, and he reached out tender hands to heal. Anything that pertains to the welfare of man, he maintained, is the rightful field of religion.

He advocated no special form of government—but he did launch out at graft and corruption, and drove out of the temple the rascals who were turning religion into a private racket. Jesus never advocated any political or economic theory—he did talk about the timeless principles of justice, mercy, and righteousness. He lifted religion altogether out of the realm of legalism, and said that no man has done enough until he goes that hard second mile far beyond the compulsion of law. Jesus set up no league of nations—but he cut straight through racial hatreds, and sectarian prejudices, and nationalistic pride—by talking about the kind of neighborliness and good will that picked up a wounded man on a dark road and cared for him. And the hero of that story was a despised Samaritan, as if Jesus would have us understand that we can never deal fairly with any man except as we see him as our brother, and in spite of his color or his creed, recognize in him something that is precious to God. If someone suggests then this morning that I am talking outside the field of religion, I can only refer you to the New Testament, and Jesus' insistence that anything that pertains to the physical, mental, and moral welfare of man is the rightful concern of us all.

I believe it is high time for church people to be aroused to what is happening in our country. For unless Americans rise now to defend their liberties, as our forefathers did at Lexington and Bunker Hill, we shall awake some day to find our freedom gone, and ourselves living under state socialism, under a completely planned economy of government directives, told in minutest detail what we can do and what we cannot do.

Let's be perfectly clear on one point. The Christian church is not wedded to any economic system. Through the centuries it has lived under many different forms of government. The church has only one standard by which it judges economic systems and governments—how well do they minister to the needs of the common man, giving him health and happiness and the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Some of us recognize that our so-called American way of life, by which I mean our constitutional form of government and our competitive system of free enterprise, are not without serious defects. But we believe that with all our faults and imperfections, the American way of life has given more freedom, a higher standard of living, and promoted the welfare of more people, than has been achieved under any other form of government. We believe that the fundamental principles on which this Republic was founded are sound and worth preserving. But complacency will do more to destroy the

America we love, than all the outside enemies that can be ranged against us. Today a cold war is being directed against the church by a philosophy which is openly and avowedly atheistic, and has frankly stated its purpose of destroying all religion that is not subservient to the state. The amazing thing about this situation is that so many Americans are either unaware or unconcerned about what is taking place. That is our real danger—not so much the threat of communism, serious as that is—but the lethargy of our own people, the spirit of defeatism that prevails, the general feeling that the world is drifting towards collectivism, and that there is nothing we as individuals can do about it.

We hear a lot of talk today about the Bill of Rights and the freedom it guarantees every American citizen. Isn't it time for us to draw up a bill of duties and responsibilities and seriously consider the obligations of good citizenship? We Americans love the word "liberty." We stamp it on our coins. We sing it in our national anthems. We think of it as a part of the very air we breath. In all the earth where will you find any people enjoying so much freedom. Yet how grossly the word "liberty" can be abused. Out in the harbor of New York stands that great symbol of what America stands for—freedom of opportunity for all who come to our shores. It is not by chance that the goddess Liberty holds in her hand a lighted torch. For unenlightened liberty is not a blessing but a curse. It may lead to the worst kind of slavery. "O Liberty," cried Madame Roland, on her way to the scaffold, "what crimes have been committed in thy name." In the French Revolution, the cry went up, "Liberty, equality, fraternity," but soon under the reign of terror the carts were rolling through the streets carrying their helpless victims to the guillotine. Under Czarist rule the peasants of Russia suffered cruel wrong, until the inevitable day of reckoning came. But see what happened as the pendulum swung from one extreme to the other. In the name of liberty a new government was set up dedicated to the cause of the common man. But in reality it has proved only the substitution of one form of slavery for another. We get only glimpses of what goes on behind the iron curtain, but the masses of people still live under tyrannous dictatorship, police surveillance, and Siberian prisons are not different now from what they were under the Czars. Millions of enslaved people can hardly call their souls their own.

You are thinking perhaps that it can't happen here. I hope you are right. Look at some of the things that are happening here. Do the American people want socialized medicine? There is tremendous pressure in that direction. Medical men are well aware that there are grave defects in our present system. All too belatedly the American Medical Association has set up a program designed to correct present abuses, to provide more doctors, and better and cheaper medical care for the masses of people. Many a person within sound of my voice has discovered from his own experience how critical the shortage of doctors is. Recently I was hospitalized in Miami, Fla., with a virus infection that laid me low for many days. Seriously ill and with a high fever, I was in the hospital for over 24 hours without visitation from either a doctor or interne. I am not blaming the doctor—I am not criticizing the hospital. Our hospitals are overcrowded and our doctors are overworked. What I am saying is that the cry for socialized medicine has come from the multiplication of situations like that where people need medical attention and can't get it without dangerous delay.

What we need to consider most seriously is whether the cure that is being proposed in the form of socialized medicine, isn't worse than the wrongs it proposes to right. Other countries have tried socialized medicine. How did it work in Germany, and in France and in New Zealand? We had better find out before we jump at socialized medicine as a cure-all. For 8 months England has been trying socialized medicine—too short a period for anyone to evaluate its ultimate results, but long enough to reveal its obvious defects—the increased burden it places upon both the doctors and hospitals, the superficial examinations, and inadequate diagnosis that are the inevitable result of hurry and pressure and mass treatment of patients. The longest queues in England today are no longer in front of food stores—but in front of doctor's offices. It is all very alluring to promise free spectacles and free dentures to anyone that needs them. But who pays the bills? What government gives away, the average citizen pays for by increased taxation. There is no other way to pull rabbits out of a hat. Somebody has to supply the rabbits of government spending. Do we want medicine in this country to get all tied up with politics, Government red tape, and bungling inefficiency? Well, that is what is being proposed in the plan which the Federal Security Agency is backing—calling for compulsory health insurance. It is based on two theories, both untrue to facts. First, it assumes that our national health is in deplorable shape. Second, that adequate medical care for all can be provided only under a compulsory system. The truth is that with all the defects of our present system of an independent medical profession, we have the best health record of any nation in the world. In our generation 20 years of life have been added to the average expectancy of individuals at birth. Disastrous epidemics have been virtually eliminated. We have stronger, better-fed children than any nation on earth. A child born today into the family of the average American wage earner, without state medicine, has the highest life expectancy in the world.

Lenin said that "socialized medicine is the keystone in the arch of the socialist state." There are at least 10 Communist fronts working in this country in behalf of social insurance. Do you think they are trying to improve conditions in the United States? What they do realize is that compulsory health insurance will bankrupt the United States as it has exhausted the finances of every nation that has ever tried the experiment.

It amazes me to hear people suggest that this question of socialized medicine is no concern of religion. It troubles me when I hear the defeatist attitude of those who say "the world trend is slipping toward collectivism, there is nothing we as individuals can do about it." There is something we can and ought to do about it. We can study the facts. What we need now more than anything else, is a detached and impartial consideration of facts. As one of our Akron leaders well stated it, "We Americans could well do with more exploring and less deploring." But in heaven's name, if we are going to explore, let's experiment forward and upward, not backward. There is nothing new in socialized medicine. Wherever it has been tried it burdened the government with enormous debt, and tied up medical services to the individual with political and governmental red tape, and lowered standards. There is nothing new in state socialism. How any thinking American knowing the past history of collectivism can seriously suggest that we will improve our country by throwing away the principles and the practices that have made this Nation great, and espousing the utopias of socialism, is difficult for me to understand. There is a vast difference between the freedom that comes from self-administered discipline and voluntary restraint, and the freedom that is secured by government restriction. The president of the American Bar Association has well stated the difference. "An elephant in the zoo has the four freedoms we have heard so much about. He has freedom from want, he is fed regularly; he has freedom from fear, his enemies the lions and the tigers are in separate cages; he has freedom of speech, he can trumpet whenever he wants to; he has freedom of belief, he can think anything he likes. The elephant has the four freedoms, yet the most important freedom of all, freedom of movement, freedom to do what he wants, liberty he doesn't have." Freedom, that is a name only, with no substance of reality, is secured for millions of people in the Old World by subservience to the state as the only recognized God. If it happens over here, it will be not because the vast majority of informed and fully aware citizens have passed reasoned and sober judgment on the merits of socialism, and decided that is what America needs. If we lose our freedom, it will be because too many of us took a defeatist attitude, and let this matter go by default.

You have every right to disagree with what I have said this morning. There are two sides to this matter. But no good citizen has a right to say this is no concern of his. All of us ought to study the facts and then act intelligently. A great American once said at a discouraging moment "We have only begun to fight." A great Christian once said, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." "Know the truth" said Jesus "and the truth shall make you free." Enlightened public opinion is needed now if we would preserve the America we love, and move forward to an ever greater future.

Citation to David Dubinsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are appended hereto the remarks made by Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union at a luncheon held in the Hotel Commodore in New York City, on Saturday, April 23, 1949, on the occasion of the presentation to him of a citation in recognition of his twenty years of activity as executive officer of the ILGWU:

I should like to begin by saying that I feel deeply honored and touched by this citation. I feel that it is a high distinction to get this form of recognition from an organization such as the League for Industrial Democracy.

And I trust you will agree with me when I say that most of this honor belongs to the great union which I represent. I am sincerely convinced that in honoring me you are honoring chiefly our International Union, and I am very happy about it.

You have been very gracious to associate this annual luncheon of your fine organization with a personal event in my life, the 20 years of my service as a national officer of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. In all sincerity, it is an event that has all but escaped my own memory.

My appearance here this afternoon at a dinner sponsored by the League for Industrial Democracy, is a symbol of the unity

that has long existed between our union and the liberal intellectual. The LID is an organization of liberal-minded intellectuals. And in some trade union circles, ranging from the IWW to the most conservative, it was the habit to be suspicious and even hostile to the liberal intelligentsia. But, as in other matters, so, too, there has been a change here.

During the last decade, we moved into a period of mutual respect and assistance between the trade unionist and the liberal intellectual.

The unions need the men and women of education. We need their skills, as writers, economists, educators, researchers, engineers, lawyers. I also see the liberal intellectual as a sort of a vital unifying force through which labor can convey its aspirations to other sections of the population: teachers, preachers, artists, authors, philosophers.

Trade-unions need the organizations of the liberals, through which nonworking class individuals are drawn into the direct work of an over-all progressive movement. On the other hand the intellectual needs the unions. The trade-unions are the mass base of liberalism. They provide the manpower, the daily contact with the workers, with actual life, and last, but not least, the realistic touch.

The middle-class liberal and organized labor, then, are mutually dependent. At this gathering this afternoon of the League for Industrial Democracy, under whose roof intellectuals and trade-unionists have long come together, I should like to stress one immediate job. I refer to the education and training of the youth in the theory and practice of industrial democracy. There is no better way of educating—yes—the educators themselves.

Left to itself, youth is neither right nor left, reactionary nor progressive. Hitler knew it. Stalin knows it. We must know it, too—and the program of the LID is to do something about it.

In the high schools and colleges of America there is a generation that tomorrow will formulate the policies of our Nation. That young generation is the America—and, if you please, the world—of tomorrow. We are interested in the future of this generation, in keeping them from falling under reactionary and totalitarian control. We want the youth to learn from our experience. Through organizations like the LID, liberals and labor can unite their efforts to educate the students in the theory and the practice of a dynamic democracy.

Just as the relationship between liberals and labor has changed, so, too, have other changes taken place in American progressivism. This audience need not be told about the tradition of the ILGWU. Our union was never a union that lived by bread alone, neither in our pioneering days of yesterday nor in our prosperous days of today. We always sought to improve the world as we found it. We felt ourselves a link in a great chain of progressive social forces. The letter of invitation from Dr. Dewey adequately described our purpose.

Today, many of these purposes are accepted quite widely. Today, organized labor champions social legislation; minimum-wage laws, unemployment and old-age and health insurance laws, even public power and civil-rights legislation. Today, organized labor is in politics—and, believe me, in politics to stay. Today, American labor is no longer isolationist, but is providing leadership in forming a world federation of free trade-unions. Today, the trade-unions are, as they should be, much more than mere agencies for collective bargaining.

Yes, we have lived through a great and profound change. But we have done more than just live through it. We have had a hand in making it. We didn't just watch history; we made history.

Making history does not always consist of choosing the path of least resistance. Sometimes we must take the course of greatest difficulty.

Let me cite an example. During the recent world war the Soviet Union was forced by Hitler to become our ally. We cooperated with Russia in all good faith to defeat the Nazis.

This led to a period of great confusion among American liberals. They were unable to distinguish between tactics and principle. Whatever was convenient became a conviction. The mistake was both extensive and expensive. It was a strange period to observe: In the very midst of a war against dictatorship, the liberal was surrendering the intellectual and moral distinction between democracy and dictatorship.

It was then very fashionable to confuse Josef Stalin with George Washington. An ambassador wrote a movie script to prove that there was really little difference between Vyshinsky and Oliver Wendell Holmes. The fellow traveler became a bed fellow. For anyone to point out that Russia was still a dictatorship was not only a crime against humanity; it was also bad taste.

How well I remember. I was then at the very center of an attempt to protest the lynching of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, leaders of the Jewish and Socialist Bund of Poland. Stalin gave this bloody proof, right in the middle of the war, that he had not forgotten and would not forget his private war against true democracy.

Only recently I thought back on all the difficulty we had to hold such a meeting. It was brought to mind by the world-wide protest against the trial and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty. Ehrlich and Alter were killed in secrecy—without a hearing, a trial, or even public execution. Yet for Ehrlich and Alter there could only be organized a little meeting because the liberals, yes, the American liberals, and even trade unionists, would not have it otherwise.

One CIO leader was told by another that if he dared to come to speak he would have his nose pushed in. A liberal New York newspaper promised to run an editorial against Russian terror but somehow never got around to it. A magazine editor, who dared to protest the Red lynching in a liberal magazine, lost his job. A trade-union editor who participated fared no better. A United States Senator, of unquestioned liberal persuasion, failed to make an awaited personal appearance. Finally, an outstanding Socialist leader told some friends that maybe it really was a mistake to find fault with the Soviet Union.

Together with a few others, we felt we had no one to consult except our own consciences. We then decided that even if all the world rejected us, even if we stood alone, entirely alone, we would not surrender. We would protest; we would cry out against this crime; we would continue to fight alongside Russia against the Nazi foe, but that we would not sell our souls in the bargain.

I see, in this company this afternoon, the faces of some who had the courage to stand up and be counted. I think that time has paid them the tribute of clear vision and farsightedness.

During the war, there was much talk of the differences between communism and fascism. Undoubtedly, there are differences. But what is really basic is what both communism and fascism have in common.

They are both totalitarian systems driven on by the hunger to conquer the world. Communism came first, it was the father of fascism and nazism. Both Mussolini and Hitler copied much from Stalin, adding barbaric "improvements" to the lessons of the teacher. After fascism was spanked to death, the Russians proceeded to "improve" upon the "improvements." I refer to the new line on Israel. I refer to the rising tide of manufactured nationalism in which Russians claim to have invented everything from electricity to Eskimo Pie. I refer to the barbarous slave labor camps where millions are simply worked to their deaths. I refer to the mass executions and purges.

When communism and fascism clashed, it was not due to any basic differences in principle. The clash arose from the fact that two totalitarian systems, both bent on world conquest, cannot live side by side. When Hitler and Stalin could not agree on how to divide the Balkans, they fell out and went to war. Had there really been irreconcilable differences in principle, there could never have been a Stalin-Hitler Pact and hence there might very well have been no World War II.

Communism, like fascism, must either expand or explode. The choice of the Kremlin is not to explode but to expand, of course. That is why they organize their fifth columns, engage in espionage, prepare saboteurs, infiltrate trade unions to capture or destroy, penetrate churches, colleges, arts, science, poison the wells of liberalism. That is why they seek to capture the imagination and the minds of the youth. That is why they exploit man's love for peace with a week end at the Waldorf and with Paris in the spring.

Because we, in the trade-union movement, were long ago aware of this totalitarian character of communism, we felt the need for active and positive counter measures.

Long before there was a Marshall plan, labor had its own Marshall plan. We sent funds, material aid, and moral support to the free trade unions of Europe, because we realized that free trade unions mean freedom. We helped the European workers beat back the assault of the Communists within the organizations of the workers themselves. In this great work, the American Federation of Labor wrote a great chapter in the ternal struggle for maintaining human freedom. May I here, too, be permitted the immodesty of expressing my pride in the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union for its initiative in this decisive battle to keep free trade unions really free from the Communist poison.

Subsequently, our Government recognized the need to check the spread of communism not merely by methods such as those implied in the Truman doctrine, but also by more direct economic rehabilitation, as in the Marshall plan itself. Yet, with all this, the key question still remains: how are we to fight communism, how are we to contain its spread, how are we to arrest its corrupting influence upon our youth, upon our racial minorities, upon some of our people who like to proclaim from the housetops that they are true-blue liberals?

Is a war against Russia the answer? I say, "No." Much as we hate it, much as we are convinced that the Soviet way is a yoke of slavery on the Russian people, still their form of government, their way of life is the problem of the Russians themselves.

For myself, I am content to lift a page from the speech made by President Roosevelt in Chicago in 1937, in which he suggested that the free world quarantine the Nazi aggressors. Today, the free world must quarantine the Communist aggressors.

Communism, like facism, is a fatal disease. But it is also, like fascism, a highly contagious disease. It is injected into other states by spies and saboteurs. Its germs are carried by dozens of organizations with sweet-sounding titles. It strikes with the quiet of slander or with the thunder of the Red Army. Because this totalitarian regime, like all others, insists upon infecting all the world with its peculiar sickness, communism is not a Russian problem; it is a world problem.

To maintain our health and freedom, we must put communism in quarantine. And that means more than just placing geographic limits on the expansion of Russia's empire. We must deny the Communists in our midst the cloak of respectability and the stamp of approval. We must take positive steps to defend and to strengthen democracy. We must give democracy economic strength. That is the meaning of the ECA. We must give democracy spiritual strength. That is the meaning of our aid, financial and moral, to the free trade unions of Europe; and that is why we must permit the free growth of democratic socialism where the people of Europe so desire.

We must give democracy material and military strength to defend itself against a Soviet offensive or to discourage such an offensive from ever being undertaken. And that is the meaning of the Atlantic Pact. Finally, we must strengthen world democracy by setting a worthy example. We must get rid of our own black sheep. And that's why we must repeal the Taft-Hartley law. We must end segregation and discrimination. We must provide means to educate all our youth, to care for all our sick, to give work to all who want to labor.

Since this event today involves your gracious tribute to me personally, I may be permitted to say that, as I listened to the reading of the citation which you have just tendered me, it brought to me a very vivid recollection that all these nice and laudable things you have said about me and about our union were not accomplished overnight, not through some magic or some lucky circumstances. It was a long, arduous struggle—and the road ahead may be as hard as the road we have traversed.

But, I repeat, the fight against reaction is not the fight of the labor movement only—it is equally the fight of every group and element that stands for liberalism, progress, and social betterment. Your organization, which for more than four decades has carried the torch of education for democracy in the American schools of learning and among the younger groups of the general population, is our natural ally in this struggle.

It is in this spirit of comradeship, with this sense of community of purpose and interests, that I am happy to receive this citation from you. My own appreciation of it, I am confident, will only be matched by the gratitude of our entire membership—as a token of friendship and good will to be long, long remembered.

Infant Death Rate Shocking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, recently disclosed to the other body how organized medicine was "punishing" a doctor who had protested the American Medical Association assessment by prohibiting him from lecturing to practicing physicians on how to save the lives of babies.

This callous disregard for the lives of babies is emphasized by the recent report of the American Academy of Pediatrics on the need for better medical care for babies. A summary of this report is contained in a column by Albert Deutsch, the noted medical writer, in the New York Post of Wednesday, April 13. Under consent, I am inserting this column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CHEATED CHILDREN

(By Albert Deutsch)

If the flood of human sympathy poured out in the tragic case of Kathy Fiscus could be channeled into streams of positive action we could rescue, each year, thousands of American children who die less dramatically but needlessly and just as definitely as Kathy did.

A report has just been published on child-health problems in the United States, a report that ought to prick the conscience of every literate American. It contains the findings of a 4-year, Nation-wide, State-by-State, county-by-county survey of child-health services—the first of its kind—conducted by the conservative American Academy of Pediatrics.

This epochal survey revealed that:

Millions of American children are still being cheated of the benefits of modern medical science, notwithstanding recent advances in child health.

The infant death rate is shockingly high in some of our States—comparable to that of many so-called backward countries—in spite of the fact that infant mortality, generally, has decreased steadily in recent years. The national rate in 1946 was 34 deaths among infants under 1 year of age per 100,000 live births. But in New Mexico, for instance, the infant death rate was 78 per 100,000—three times above the average of the best States.

Health and medical care for children usually follow the dollar sign. States with the lowest per capita income generally have the largest families and the least child-health services.

Children in some States receive less than half as much medical care as those in other States.

One-third of the Nation's 3,500 pediatricians (specialists in child disease) are concentrated in only 3 of the 48 States. New York has five times as many pediatricians in relation to children as North Carolina.

The farther you get from big cities or metropolitan areas the less medical attention is available to the average child. Children living in isolated counties get one-third less medical care than those in or near cities. Deficiencies in physicians, hospitals, clinics, etc., are most marked in the Southern States.

Negro children especially suffer from deprivation of medical care. Only one out of every four Negro babies in the Southeast is born in a hospital, whereas in some areas nearly every baby is born in a hospital.

Children in some States have more than three times as much hospital care than those in some other States. Delaware has 11 times more hospital beds reserved for children than Mississippi has.

Children in poor and remote rural areas have far less chance of getting adequate health and medical service than those in large cities and centers of wealth.

About half of the States have no mental health clinic services for children at all.

In three-fourths of the States there are more than 10,000 children for every pediatrician. General practitioners carry the main load in providing medical care to children. Yet, nearly half of all general physicians have had little or no hospital training in pediatrics before entering practice.

Dental services for children are shockingly lacking in many States, especially in the South, and more especially for Negro children in the South. The lower the State per capita income, the less care children get from private dentists. New York has eight times as many dentists in relation to children as has South Carolina.

Public-health nursing service is incomplete or totally lacking in three out of every five American counties.

Many children of school age live in counties which have no organized medical services in public schools.

Most medical schools provide inadequate pediatric education to their students, who will have to spend much of their future careers as doctors in taking care of children.

Behind these and other cold statistics collected by the American Academy of Pediatrics in its unique survey are a host of little children who sicken and die because they lack proper health and medical care, children who are loved and loving—as was the case with Kathy Fiscus—children with precious individual personalities, children who could be saved if we but will it. We need not stand helplessly by while they die, as we had to in the Kathy incident.

The valuable survey conducted by the American Academy of Pediatrics has been published in book form by the Commonwealth Fund ($3.50), which has a long series of distinguished reports on American health and medicine under its imprint. The United States Children's Bureau and the United States Public Health Service cooperated in the survey, which was directed by Dr. John P. Hubbard for a committee headed by Dr. Warren R. Sisson.

The report simply tells us the score; it makes no concrete recommendations. But constructive action is implicit on every page and waits on public understanding.

Donation of Surplus Federal Property for Educational Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McSWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Columbus, April 19, 1949.

Hon. JOHN MCSWEENEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCSWEENEY: The Governor, at the request of the United States Commissioner of Education, delegated to the State superintendent of public instruction the authority to establish within the department of education a State educational agency for surplus property. The agency is a constituent unit of the department, and was organized on January 10, 1946.

Practically every educational institution in all of the 88 counties within the State has obtained surplus property for utilization in its school program. Since the establishment of this agency, it is estimated that $30,000,000 worth of surplus property (Government acquisition cost) has been distributed to Ohio schools, colleges, and universities.

Prior to the passage of Public Law 889, the State department of education, through the agency, was authorized to approve and dispose of Government surplus in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 249, Seventy-first Congress, and Public Law 460, Seventy-fourth Congress.

House bill 3238, now pending in the Eighty-first Congress, will permit the Federal Government, through the several departments and independent agencies, to make dona-

tions to the State department for warehousing and redistribution to Ohio educational institutions. It is suggested that you review the enclosed documents in connection with the proposed legislation. The educators of Ohio and the State department believe the bill merits favorable consideration.

It is believed the proposed legislation to broaden Public Law 889, is sound because:

1. States' rights are preserved.
2. The bill is bipartisan and noncontroversial.
3. Complicated rules, regulations, and procedures of the various agencies of the Government, make it more expensive for the Government to sell certain kinds of property than to donate it to education.
4. Greater benefits will accrue to the United States if the property is donated to education rather than disposed of through commercial channels.
5. The legislation is permissive—not mandatory.
6. A workable plan is in operation, as administered by the United States Commissioner of Education and the several State educational agencies. Procedures are already established and the machinery for disposal has been in operation from 3 to 5 years.
7. Congress should not overlook any possible source of assistance that will aid education.
8. The United States Commissioner of Education recognizes States' rights—this has not always been true with other Federal agencies. The States oppose Federal agencies dealing directly with schools.
9. Property generated during peacetimes by all agencies and departments of the Government will be of sufficient quantity to maintain a flow of worth-while goods and equipment, that will be of inestimable value to schools, colleges, and universities.
10. Government property was acquired with the taxpayer's dollar—equipment, tools, and supplies no longer needed by the Government, that can be reserviced by school shops, should be made available to education.

During World War II the Congress recognized the value of training in the public schools by appropriating several hundred million dollars from the period June 29, 1940, through July 3, 1945, to train war workers. This money was distributed and the program administered through the Commissioner, United States Office of Education. We believe the Congress now recognizes the value of a sound educational program in peacetimes, as well as during periods of national strife.

Very truly yours,

WALTER G. RHOTEN,
Director, Surplus Property.

ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL STATUTES PERTAINING TO DONATION OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY

Bills to amend Public Law 889 and to authorize all Federal agencies to donate surplus property for educational purposes:

S. 859, introduced by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, February 8, 1949. Referred to Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

H. R. 3238, introduced by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, March 3, 1949. Referred to House Committee on Armed Services.

PURPOSE

To amend Public Law 889, to authorize the head of any department or independent agency of the Government to donate to tax-supported and private nonprofit, tax-exempted school systems, schools, colleges, and universities in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost, except for cost of packing, transportation, and delivery, such equipment, materials, books, and other supplies as may be obsolete or no longer needed by any such Federal department or agency and which may be considered usable for educational purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education. Public Law 889 now limits the authorization of such donations by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

These bills authorize all Federal agencies and independent departments to make donations to education of obsolete or excess personal property no longer needed by the Federal Government. Precedent for these bills dates back to an act, approved February 14, 1927 (34 U. S. C. 546 (a), 44 Stat. 1096, Public Law 615, 69th Cong., ch. 133, 2d sess.), which permitted the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete aeronautical equipment to accredited schools, colleges, and universities. The Secretary of War was authorized to donate the same type of aeronautical equipment to schools, colleges, and universities by an act, approved May 26, 1928 (20 U. S. C. sec. 94, 44 Stat. 753, Public Law 524, 70th Cong., ch. 760, 1st sess.). A permissive act, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to educational institutions machinery, mechanical equipment, and tools obsolete or no longer needed by the Navy, was approved by the President May 23, 1930 (34 U. S. C. sec. 546 (c), 46 Stat. 378, Public Law 249, 71st Cong.).

On February 27, 1936, this statute was amended to include boats and boat equipment (34 U. S. C. sec. 546 (c), 49 Stat. 1144, Public Law 455, 74th Cong.). A similar act authorizing the Secretary of War to make donations of machinery, mechanical equipment and tools for vocational training was enacted February 28, 1936 (10 U. S. C. sec. 1258, 49 Stat. 1147, Public Law 460, 74th Cong.).

These acts were based on the philosophy that educational institutions could use the equipment not needed by the Army and Navy to train students and thus increase the return to the Government through greater public benefits than would be recovered through sale of the property.

This program has resulted in the donation of property of approximately $340,000,000 acquisition value to educational institutions throughout the 48 States, Territories, and possessions of this country.

Public Law 889 was approved on the philosophy that all classes of obsolete and surplus property (with the exception of categories of property exempted by Public Law 600) should be made available for donation by the armed forces for educational purposes without restricting the use of donated personal property to courses of vocational instruction. The enactment of this law has permitted all levels of education to participate in the program.

BASIS OF SELECTION AND DISTRIBUTION

All such property may be donated at the discretion of the head of any Federal department or independent agency and which the United States Commissioner of Education may consider usable for educational purposes; all property which is so donated shall be allocated by the Commissioner on the basis of needs and utilization, for transfer to eligible donees or to the State departments of education or other State agencies so empowered by State law, for distribution to eligible donees.

ADMINISTRATION

By the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.

OPERATION

By the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and the State educational agencies for surplus property.

COMMENTS

History of the program reveals that all bonafide schools, colleges, and universities that are accredited by the several State departments of education, and offering standard curricula, are eligible to receive surplus property. All institutions must be tax supported or private nonprofit, tax exempted under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force still retain the right to make donations of property to those institutions in which they retain special interest, i. e., West Point, Annapolis, etc.

Under the proposed amended act, property would not be donated if needed by other Federal agencies or departments. Certain classes of usable property would probably be channeled through the Bureau of Federal Supply, or its successor for screening by other Federal agencies or departments and the residue not so claimed would be available for donation. This procedure is now in effect with reference to armed forces declarations of surplus property in condition O–2 or better.

This bill is administratively sound, workable, and will produce property of great value to education in relation to administrative costs. The several State educational agencies for surplus property employ over 400 people at a cost of $2,600,000 per year to administer and operate the program on a State level. Schools of all levels throughout the Nation have expressed a keen interest in the continuation of this program.

OPINION

This bill deserves congressional support because:

1. Many of the types of property which become obsolete or are no longer needed by the various departments or independent agencies of the Federal Government are needed and usable by educational institutions for plant operation, plant maintenance, instructional use, administration, plant expansion and modernization.
2. Federal agencies and independent departments which at present do not have the authority to donate property for educational utilization have requested that Public Law 889 be amended in order that donations may be made in the interests of improving educational opportunities for American youth, and furthering parallel research work in educational institutions, thereby securing the maximum public benefit possible through the disposal of obsolete and surplus property.
3. The resources available for meeting the needs of American schools, colleges, and universities are inadequate. No possible source of assistance should be overlooked.
4. Maximum benefits accruing to the Government will be realized only if obsolete and surplus property is donated to schools, colleges, or universities, rather than being disposed of through commercial channels.
5. Contacts made with representatives of the armed forces, Department of Agriculture, Veterans' Administration, Bureau of Federal Supply, Atomic Energy Commission, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, and the United States Office of Education, indicate that these departments and agencies favor amending Public Law 889. If this bill is amended, it will supplement the administration's objective of higher educational standards for all of the youth of the Nation.
6. H. R. 3238 should make further legislation with reference to the disposal of Government surplus property unnecessary.
7. Adequate funds to administer the program through the Federal Security Agency, the United States Office of Education, will yield the greatest maximum benefits to the

schools, when compared with any other plan of Federal aid to education.

[Public Law 91, 66th Cong. (H. R. 3143)]

An act to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade, technical and public schools and universities, other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, under such regulation as he may prescribe, to sell at 15 per centum of their cost to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, and other recognized educational institutions, upon application in writing, such machine tools as are suitable for their use which are now owned by the United States of America and are under the control of the War Department and are not needed for Government purposes. The money realized from the sale may be used by the Secretary of War to defray expenses, except cost of transportation, incident to distribution of the tools, and the balance shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That in the event any such material is offered for sale by said institutions without the consent in writing of the Secretary of War, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

Approved, November 19, 1919.

[Public Law 615, 69th Cong. (H. R. 12212)]

An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete aeronautical equipment to accredited schools, colleges, and universities

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to dispose of without charge, except for transportation and delivery, to properly accredited schools, colleges, and universities for use in aeronautical courses, any aircraft, aircraft parts, instruments, or engines which have been declared obsolete by the Navy Department; and provided that such aircraft, aircraft parts, and engines will not be used in actual flight.

Approved February 14, 1927.

[Public Law 524, 70th Cong. (S. 1822)]

An act to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer or loan aeronautical equipment to museums and educational institutions

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to transfer or loan to museums or properly accredited schools, colleges, and universities, for exhibition or instructional purposes, any aircraft, aircraft parts, instruments, or engines that have become obsolete or impaired to the extent that repair would not be economical: *Provided*, That such aircraft, aircraft parts, or engines will not be used in actual flight: *Provided further*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the transfer or loan or return of said property.

Approved May 26, 1928.

[Public Law 249, 71st Cong. (S. 3185)]

An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to dispose of, without charge, except for transportation and delivery, to properly accredited schools, colleges, and universities, for use in courses of vocational training and instruction, such machinery, mechanical equipment, and tools as may be obsolete or no longer needed by the Navy.

Approved May 23, 1930.

[Public Law 455, 74th Cong. (H. R. 1381)]

An act to amend Public Law No. 249, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy"

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 249, Seventy-first Congress, approved May 23, 1930, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy", is amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "tools" and inserting after the word "tools" a comma following by "boats and boat equipment."(so in original).

[Public Law 460, 74th Cong. (H. R. 8024)]

An act to authorize the Secretary of War to dispose of material no longer needed by the Army

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized in his discretion to dispose of, without charge, except for costs of transportation handling and packing, to such schools as he may select, for use in courses of vocational training and instruction, such machinery, mechanical equipment, and tools as may be obsolete or no longer needed by the Army.

Approved February 28, 1936.

[H. R. 3238, 81st Cong., 1st. sess.]

A bill to authorize all Federal agencies to donate surplus properties for educational purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes," approved July 2, 1948 (Public Law 889, 80th Cong.), is amended (a) by striking out the words of the title of Public Law 889 "To authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes" and inserting in lieu thereof "To authorize Federal agencies to donate surplus property for educational purposes"; (b) by striking out the words "the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized in their discretion" where they appear in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "the head of any department or individual agency of the Government is hereby authorized in his discretion"; (c) by striking out the words "the Army, Navy, or Air Force in which any such Secretary or" where they appear in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "any such department or agency and which"; (d) by striking out the words "the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or Secretary of the Air Force" where they appear in section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "the head of any department or individual agency"; and (e) insert the words "school systems" after the words "tax supported" where they appear in section 2.

[Public Law 889, 80th Cong. (H. R. 5882)]

An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized in their discretion to donate for educational purposes in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost, except for costs of packing, transportation, and delivery, such equipment, materials, books, and other supplies as may be obsolete or no longer needed by the Army, Navy, or Air Force and which any such Secretary or the United States Commissioner of Education, Federal Security Agency, may consider usable for educational purposes.

SEC. 2. All property which the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or Secretary of the Air Force may so donate, except that donated in accordance with section 3 hereof, shall be allocated on the basis of needs and utilization by the United States Commissioner of Education for transfer by the owning agency directly to schools, colleges, or universities, or to State departments of education, for distribution by the State to tax-supported schools, colleges, and universities and other nonprofit schools, colleges, and universities which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; except in any State where another agency is designated by State law for such purposes such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force may donate such of the property specified in section 1 hereof as they consider usable for educational purposes to those educational activities that are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies, or military, naval, air-force, or coast-guard preparatory schools.

Approved July 2, 1948.

[Public Law 889, 80th Cong. (amended as proposed)]

An act to authorize Federal agencies to donate surplus property for educational purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of any department or individual agency of the Government is hereby authorized in his discretion to donate for educational purposes in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost, except for costs of packing, transportation, and delivery, such equipment, materials, books, and other supplies, under the control of such department or agency as may have been determined pursuant to law not to be required for its needs and the discharge of its responsibilities or for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of the Federal Government and which the United States Commissioner of Education, Federal Security Agency, may consider usable for educational purposes.

SEC. 2. All property which the head of any department or individual agency may so donate, except that donated in accordance with section 3 hereof, shall be allocated on the basis of needs and utilization by the United States Commissioner of Education for transfer by the owning agency directly to schools, colleges, or universities or to State Departments of Education, for distribution by the State to tax-supported school systems, schools, colleges, and universities and other non-profit schools, colleges, and universities which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; except in any State where another agency is designated by the State law for such purposes such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force may donate such of the property specified in section 1 hereof as they consider usable for educational purposes to those educational activities that are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, air force, or coast guard preparatory schools.

Seed and Nursery Industry Have Real Shipment Problems Ahead—If

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to me from Henry Field of the Henry Field Seed & Nursery Co. of Shenandoah, Iowa.

Mr. Field has been in the business for over 50 years and knows whereof he speaks. Henry Field seeds and nursery stock is sent into every State of the Union as well as to many foreign nations.

Mr. Field's letter which follows points out in clear, understandable language just why it would be very harmful to the seed and nursery industry and to the general public to boost rates on third- and fourth-class mail, or to cut the long standing maximum package weight in parcel post from 70 pounds to 50 pounds or less.

I respectfully request that every Member of Congress, and especially the members of the House and Senate Post Office Committees, give full study and consideration to Mr. Field's letter, and that nothing be done which will be detrimental to this very necessary and important industry.

HENRY FIELD SEED & NURSERY CO.,
Shenandoah, Iowa, April 21, 1949.

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JENSEN: I recently imposed upon your time by writing you to plead a stop to the tremendous boost in rates on third and fourth class mail being asked by the Postmaster General.

Since then, I have heard there is a request now being made to you to cut the long standing maximum package weight in parcel post from 70 pounds which it has been successful for years to 50 pounds or even less.

I think here are two good reasons for opposing this restriction with all the strength you can muster if you are interested in protecting millions of farmers and small-town buyers:

1. The express company which is trying to push this business out of the post office into their own hands cannot adequately handle the business they already have. In hundreds and hundreds of towns where there is a post office and excellent parcel post service, there is no express service and customers must drive many miles to a town big enough to have express service to get their packages.

We get hundreds of letters a year from our farm and small-town customers saying "Do not send express. The last time you did, we have to drive 70 miles to such and such a town and when we got the package, all the nursery stock was dried. Sent it parcel post."

If the weight or size limits are restricted further, you force us to use the incomplete and less desirable express service. Express doesn't deliver in many cases. The post office goes on its regular routes. Let's see that everybody gets service—not just the big towns.

2. Time and again, our shipments of perishables by express have been tied up by strikes against the express company while parcel post went on through. This happened recently in the New York-New Jersey area where hundreds of our perishable nursery shipments were lost through strike delay. If you limit the size or weight limits further on parcel post, you force us to use the less desirable and incomplete express service.

The post office needs that parcel post business and handles it with dispatch. Don't let the express company have it. They give no service to so many communities.

Very sincerely,
HENRY FIELD SEED & NURSERY CO.,
HENRY FIELD, *President.*

P. S.—I have sent this same letter to TOM MURRAY and OLIN D. JOHNSTON of Postal Committees.

Nebraska Opinions Concerning the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following timely article which appeared in the Southern Nebraska Register of Friday, April 22, 1949.

The article above-mentioned, was written by five representative men of Lincoln, Nebr., and to my way of thinking, they are far superior to any collection of opinions I have heretofore read, and I submit them to fellow Congressmen and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for their earnest reading and consideration.

THE REGISTER FORUM—LABOR LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY SELECTED GROUP OF READERS

(In this fifth of its readers' forums, the Register asked selected subscribers for expressions of opinion on labor legislation pending in Congress.)

PHILOSOPHY OF PRESENT LAW IS ERRONEOUS

Even a cursory reading of Public Law 101—Eightieth Congress—better known as the Taft-Hartley Act, makes it clear that labor legislation in our day has become very complicated business. Within these space limits one can speak only in the most general terms.

The main idea in the old Wagner Act was an optimistic one, namely, if labor and industry could just be made to gather around the conference table, they would of themselves hammer out satisfactory agreements. But it was revolutionary in that it lifted the worker up to a new plane where he was equal in bargaining power with the employer. The exercise of this equal power was too much for the conservative who had been accustomed to running his own business—what he called "the American way of life"—and the Taft-Hartley Act became the counter revolution.

The central idea of the Taft-Hartley law (speaking in very general terms) seems to be that labor and industry are natural enemies who can never get along without Government intervention at almost every step. Incidentally, it is an interesting anomaly to find that the rugged individualists who say "that government is best which governs least" are the same people who are supporting Taft-Hartley.

That a law should not be written in the interests of one side is obvious. It is perhaps less obvious, but equally important, that the central purpose of any labor law should not aim merely at achieving a balance of power between two irreconcilable opponents. Rather, it should become a vehicle, and a legal framework designed to promote and encourage harmonious relations between two interdependent and equally important groups. The Taft-Hartley law fails to meet that test. It is not entirely bad, yet its overall spirit is punitive and petulant. The Congress that passed it was hopping mad at John L. Lewis, and not without reason. In this temper it set out to obtain redress for all the wrongs to industry, real and imaginary, in a dozen years' administration of the Wagner Act. Personally, I would prefer a less vindictive law, and one more in line with recommendations of the great encyclicals that deal with workers and the social order.

Therefore, I think we should go back to the principles of Wagner with necessary changes to bring it up to date, which would include the good features found in Taft-Hartley.

R. T. MALONE.

JUSTICE IS THE WORD

In my opinion, in the event that Congress decides to change the present labor relations legislation, the whole secret of a more effective program is in the appointing of a pro-management, prolabor tribunal as near as possible acceptable to both, to hear and make recommendations before a labor situation reaches the strike peak. Justice is the word.

When labor first began to assert itself, it was unorganized, had no capital to use to present its cause, and hence anything done for it was an appeasement, with little thought of justice.

This is an age-old problem, forecast by Edwin Markham in his poem, The Man With the Hoe, written after viewing Millet's famous painting of a toiler in the field. Markham questioned how the future would deal with this "dumb terror," bowed down with the weight of the world, silenced by centuries, but destined to tear off his bonds and judge the world that so imprisoned him.

Every man is entitled to a living commensurate with the requirements for feeding, clothing, and educating his children, and this holy desire should not be thwarted. Likewise management is entitled to a fair profit on its investment. A tribunal of justice, free from the capital of either side, working with an emergency board appointed by the President, would in my opinion lessen the number of strikes and provide for the common good.

D. JAMES COSTIN.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW SHOULD BE REPEALED

In the best interest of most of the people and the advancement of the American economy the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. This act is entirely one-sided, designed to protect the interests of management and to destroy unionism. In itself it is a lengthy, complicated document, one very difficult to administer. This act deliberately buries in a mass of red tape the Wagner Act's protection for workers to bargain collectively. Many decisions on important issues have been against labor in favor of management. After 18 months of operation under the act, it has created a greater lack of balance between wages, prices, and profits, and its provisions are beginning to weaken the soundness of the American economy. Among other things it has made the settlement of disputes between labor and management more difficult, created more misunderstanding, and is destroying the constitutional rights of men to organize, form unions, and bargain collectively. It is relevant to call attention to this part of the Encyclical on

Labor by Pope Leo XIII: "Workingmen and employers should make free agreements and, in particular, should freely agree as to wages. They (labor unions) exist of their own right."

Now that the Taft-Hartley law has been tried and tested, the sponsors themselves have admitted that important changes should be made. I quote Senator TAFT: "I myself would propose quite a few amendments."

All indications are that we need to get out from under the Taft-Hartley law and return to the principles of the Wagner Act. Briefly, the Wagner Act, passed by Congress in 1935, was a simple, easily administered law that merely forbade interference with the rights of workers to organize, form unions, and bargain collectively. This act was not one-sided, because the American workers have never interfered with the rights of management to bargain collectively. The Wagner Act had a very beneficial effect on the American economy.

In conclusion, the Taft-Hartley Act is unworkable, unfair, deliberately designed to destroy unionism, and a threat to the economic gains of the workers.

CHARLES F. BURDA.

PUBLIC ENTITLED TO FAIR LEGISLATION

What the public demands, and is entitled to demand, is fair legislation that will check both employer and labor excesses, but which at the same time will not destroy any legitimate rights of either labor or industry.

The legislation that we have now was enacted primarily because of the agitation against a few labor leaders and not because the law in itself is a very good thing. The Taft-Hartley law restricts labor organizations from supporting any political candidate financially, yet it permits other organizations to lobby and to spend millions of dollars for legislation to benefit them.

There is no doubt that labor, the same as capital, must be kept within reasonable confines of law and order, but these conditions should be equalized and handled on the basis that labor is not all wrong.

There are objectionable practices in labor organization and there are objectionable aspects to capitalism. What is it that is wrong? It is of course the human beings who are wrong, those who deny and omit all Christian principles; as long as this condition exists there cannot be complete harmony between capital and labor.

Organized labor has promoted better living conditions and high wages, which have created a prosperity that likely is greater for capital than for labor. Some industrialists seem to forget that labor is entitled to a living wage, to rear a family, and to the comforts of life the same as are the men who hire them.

CHARLES G. WALTER.

LABOR PENALIZED BECAUSE OF ANTICS OF ONE LEADER

To prepare anything on the Taft-Hartley Act would take a volume, so I will deal with a few phases of it.

First. The act was passed primarily because of the agitation against John L. Lewis and not because the law in itself is a very good thing.

Organized labor has promoted better living conditions, sanitary work shops, and higher wages, which have created prosperity greater for capital than for the worker; shorter hours, which have contributed to the span of life of man; and countless other benefits to workers in America and all over the world. Yet, because Lewis and a few leaders may have done things that were contrary to general public opinion, certain Senators and Congressmen were instrumental in passing a law that would deprive labor of many of its gains.

It should be remembered that labor organizations are made up of individuals, just as chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations are, and none are perfect, but this law assumes that all labor is bad. For example: Labor officials must file a sworn affidavit that they are not Communists, yet the employer does not have to assume any such responsibility. An employer may be a Communist if he wishes; there is no proof that there are proportionately more Communists among the workers than there are among employers. Every month newspapers and magazines reveal names and pictures of prominent persons, who have others in their employ, who are active in some Communist-front organization (see Life a few weeks back).

Another absurdity in this act is the section that forbids labor organizations to contribute to the political campaigns of any candidate; yet it permits the railroad lobby, the liquor lobby, the manufacturers' lobby, the real estate lobby, and hundreds of other groups to spend millions on candidates and legislation.

There is no doubt that labor, the same as capital, must be kept within reasonable limits, but legislation should not be on the basis that only labor has committed any wrongs.

In reading the Taft-Hartley Act, you will note that the tone is to liberate the worker from his big union bosses. Since when did these legislators arrive at a need to exercise their benevolence for the poor workers? Labor did not ask for this bill; capital was 100 percent behind it.

THOMAS J. CONNELLY.

Why Democracy Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a short essay, Why Democracy Works.

This essay written by Miss Janet Ruth Shelton, a student at Minford High School, Ohio, is so outstanding in its presentation of the principles of democracy that I want the Members of the House to have the privilege of reading it.

WHY DEMOCRACY WORKS

(By Miss Janet R. Shelton, of Minford, Ohio)

Our democracy works because it is a collection of all the good points from historical governments, plus the ideas of the majority of the American people. Democracy means a government of the people collectively, by elected representatives. Yet these are not the only reasons why our democracy works. It works because it lives and grows in the hearts of millions of people, day by day. It works because it is covered by gallons of pure, red, human blood; because it is being pushed forward daily by thousands of gallant heroes who willingly gave their lives so that it would always remain bright and shiny.

Democracy works because its right hand man is freedom. Yes, freedom—freedom to speak; freedom to vote; freedom of choosing our own religion; freedom to own our property and do with it as we like; freedom to sacrifice for our country; and freedom to think.

Our government, a democracy, works because it has the power to enforce the laws which the people themselves, make.

After World War II the war brides coming to the United States were instructed that in playing any game with the Americans always to let them win, because people from the United States resented being beaten in anything. Certainly we like to win. We fight to win, and when a person fights to win he usually does. We fought for democracy—we won it. We're striving for international peace now, and we will win it, too.

Like the ocean seeping through a small hole in a ship, democracy and its policies are slowly spreading into the whole world. Other countries can see how well our Government is working, and they are beginning to lay their foundation for a democracy, too. Democracy's motto is, "That all men are created equal." These words were given to man by God, and with God's help the democracy which is working today will continue to work in the future.

Democracy will remain steadfast because the leaders of today are guiding the leaders of tomorrow. School children of today are given a great heritage free, and a great promise to fulfill a promise to pass this noble heritage on to the future generations. This is a large responsibility, but these are sturdy young shoulders on which it rests.

Yes, this is truly a wonderful country, the smelting pot of the world. A place where everyone has a chance. A chance to become anything his heart desires, as long as he works diligently toward his goal. It doesn't make any difference what color his skin is, what church he attends, or how much money his family has in the bank, he still has a good chance in America.

To the people of America, democracy means the life line of our future. It means the difference between freedom and slavery, the difference between light and darkness. Yes, a darkness illuminated only by the Statue of Liberty and her gleaming torch, leading the world along the steep, rocky path to democracy.

National Press Gave Silent Treatment to GOP Corruption in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, April 27, 1949.

For background on the Post's editorial, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to remarks which I inserted in the RECORD of Tuesday, April 26 (p. A2434).

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Chicago Daily News, and the Washington Post are to be congratulated for maintaining honesty of the press. To these add the East St. Louis Journal and the Belleville News-Democrat.

The Washington Post editorial follows:

THE SILENT PRESS

It has been as much of a shock to us as to any of our readers to see the evidence of political venality among a number of small-town newspaper editors and publishers in Illinois. At least 33 have been named who at one time or another during the ousted Green administration in that State were on the State pay roll. Some of them may have performed certain services to earn their pay. In other cases checks paid out of the State's treasury were obviously compensa-

tion for sale of influence. One publisher received $850 as a "public works laborer." His paper is called the March of Progress! Several other editors and publishers received larger amounts as "messenger-clerks." Those carried on the pay roll as "investigators" gathered in five-figure sums over several years.

The unethical conduct of the individuals concerned is obviously the first and foremost issue. Beyond that is a larger and broader concern: the reputation of the American newspaper press as a whole. For the fact that none of the culprits in this instance owned or operated large city newspapers is morally beside the point. And furthermore, the distinction, if any, will be missed by the ordinary citizen. Too many Americans have an almost innate distrust of the press as it is, and are always ready to gobble up any stray "proof" that all newspapers are venal.

As a matter of fact, the ethics of every member of the press are inevitably of concern to every other member. And this makes all the more infuriating the treatment of this story. It was broken in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Chicago Daily News on April 14. Until the Washington Post heard about it, no other newspaper, so far as we can find out, at least none outside of the Illinois region, picked it up. Nor did either of the two chief wire services convey the story as far as Washington, if they carried it at all.

At best this looks like crass indifference to a particularly juicy bit of news. At worst it looks like a cover-up of scandal within the family. We cannot approve of either. The newspaper press, by virtue of the first amendment, claims special status as a pillar of free and honest government. By the same token it has special obligations. Among these is the duty not to keep its own dirty linen from public view. Nothing can more surely damage the reputation of the American press for honesty and accuracy than failure to acknowledge promptly and openly its own faults.

Work To Be Done—Invocation by the Reverend Daniel M. Cantwell, Chaplain of the Catholic Labor Alliance, Preceding Convention of Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, recently the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization of progressives, dedicated to the achievement of freedom and economic security for all people everywhere, through education and democratic political action, held a national convention in Chicago, Ill.

Before the convention got under way, a prayer was offered by the Reverend Daniel M. Cantwell, chaplain of the Catholic Labor Alliance, which carries a stirring message of action:

The prayer follows:

Eternal Father, we dedicate this convention to Your honor and glory. We know the importance of the work that has brought us here. We acknowledge that we need Your help. With sincerity we invoke it. With conviction we expect it. With love and dedication to You and to our fellowmen we want to accept it.

We are here for the sake of democracy, human rights, and human dignity. That is important to men. It is also important to You.

We are here with a faith in democracy. That means not only a faith in the inherent rightfulness of ballots and assemblies. More, it means a faith in what You have put into men: an image of Yourself, a sharing in Your Spirit. It means a faith in this: that because of this image You the Creator have endowed all men with inalienable rights.

Inalienable rights. And still, among us over 3,000,000 workers are right now unable to find jobs. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

Over 6,000,000 families want to get out of slums. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

Over half of American families still live a hand to mouth existence, are able from their pitiable incomes to save little or nothing. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

For virtually all American wage-earners a guaranteed annual wage is still a far-away dream. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

Millions of Americans are second-class citizens, cannot vote, are discriminated against in getting jobs, are covenanted out of American neighborhoods. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

Millions of citizens around the world need food, tools, hope, and protection. Keep us mindful of them. There's work to be done.

In the family of nations strengthen us to keep the door open to every honorable proposal for peace. To be courageous in the defense of freedom. And to be honest in the evaluation of our friends. In the Western World we would like to see more democratic governments in Spain, Portugal, and Jugoslavia. Hasten the day when these changes will be made—for the welfare of the citizens of those countries, and for the honor of the Western World.

We are grateful that we live under the Stars and Stripes. That we are a part of the government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Through Christ Our Lord may this country and this government never perish from the earth.

Keep us a free people. Make us a prayerful people—one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Amen.

The American Way—What Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Juney Fasick, of Springfield, Ohio:

THE AMERICAN WAY—WHAT IS IT?

(By Juney Fasick, Springfield, Ohio)

I ask a German soldier who was a POW, "What is the American Way?" and I hear his answer, "Why, American way is freedom. You do not have to bow to one man because he says, 'I am God.'" I ask a DP who has lost his home and has been allowed to come to America, and he answers in his broken accent, "American way is opportunity. You can have a good job regardless from where you come." I ask a mother in Europe who had no food for her children, and she whispers with gratitude in her voice, "The American way is giving. The Americans have sent food and now my babies will not die this winter." And then I ask an American who enjoys all these freedoms, and he answers, "The American way? Why, I don't know. Never thought about it too much." Finally, I ask myself, "What is the American Way?"

To find the answer I go back many years, and I see a man in a rough, homespun garment breaking the first clod of ground in the New World with his hand-made plow. "What is the American way?" I ask. He looks thoughtful for a moment and then his countenance changes and his weather-beaten features light up. "The American way is for what I have come here. Here I can worship God as I please." "Then," I think to myself, "the American way is freedom of religion." But still I am not satisfied. I go on and I meet a Continental soldier in a tattered uniform. "What is the American way?" I venture. "It is independence. It's the thing for which I died on Bunker Hill." "Independence," I sigh, "independence and freedom of worship." But this is not enough; I must find out why we are willing to live, serve, and, if need be, die, for this way of life. Continuing my walk on the Highway of Time, I meet another soldier of the Union Army. Still searching for the truth, I ask him the question. He gazes far into the past, and his answer echoes throughout the little valley. "The American way is freedom for every man, regardless of race, creed, or color. It's not good for one man to own another. That's why I died at Gettysburg." "Now," I think, "I am accomplishing something. The American way is freedom of religion, it is independence for each individual." Still searching, I walk on, and I meet another soldier wearing the familiar khaki. "Please, what is the American way?" "Well, it's the thing I died for on Corregidor and the thing my buddy died for in Normandy." "But what is so great about the American way that makes you fight wars and die for it?" I wonder. "You see," he goes on, "you're an American, a free American, free to worship as you please, free to speak as you please, free to listen to anything you please, because no one says, 'Don't listen.' You can vote for those who govern your country. You can petition these officials and have your voice in the Government. But once in a while there are people who rise to power who have other ideals. They think that their way of dictatorship is best. That's why we must fight and die. We are willing to do this to protect the American way. Anything precious must be protected." "Now I'm beginning to understand," I mutter.

I walk out of the past and into the present. What can I find here to show me? And then as I walk down the street of Mytown or Anytown, I see a little Negro boy giving his last piece of candy to the little white boy who has just fallen from his tricycle. And now I know—now I understand completely. It's freedom, but, even more than that, it's sacrificing for others. It's more than an ideal; it's a way of life. It's the American way.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, seldom is it given to any man to be completely loved by all who knew him.

I think, however, that can truly be said of the late Dr. Stephen Wise—a man

whose name was in itself a reverent pun; for Rabbi Wise was wise. He had the wisdom of the ages, the wisdom of love for his fellow men, the wisdom of devotion to his ideals and his religious calling.

I am not given to hero worship; but Dr. Stephen Wise was one of my heroes. I am not given to accepting what I see on the surface as the true man; but I accepted Dr. Stephen Wise at face value. He had a terrible simplicity which shamed those of us who are more worldly, more captivated by the baubles of Mammon, than his great spirit could ever be. He sought the rewards of spirit, not of flesh.

His death was not unexpected; yet it was a great blow to the cause of humanity. There is something of an analogy between his going, and the departure of other great leaders who rose above human limitations. We know that they are not immortal; yet their greatness gives an illusion of unending virtue, and when they die, we have a sense of emptiness in our living.

Mr. Speaker, more eloquent tongues than I have eulogized Dr. Wise, and I cannot presume to place my own words above those of others. Therefore, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD generous portions of the tender and touching eulogy delivered by Dr. David W. Petegorsky, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, at the funeral service of Dr. Stephen S. Wise in Carnegie Hall, New York, on April 22. The text follows:

According to Jewish tradition, one does not eulogize or mourn for the dead during the current month of Nissan. But we gather at this service not to mourn the passing of Stephen Samuel Wise, though our hearts will be heavy with grief for years to come. Nor have we come to eulogize him. One eulogizes those whose achievements can be measured and weighed. We cannot eulogize a man whose achievements are incalculable—incalculable in quantity and in quality; in quantity because he influenced so fundamentally so many fields of human endeavor; in quality because he touched the very souls of numberless persons in every land, touched them as individuals and as human beings.

We gather, instead, to thank God that we, the Jewish people, in the most tragic and the most creative half-century of our history; that millions of persons of all races and faiths who suffered wrong and endured injustice, who dreamed of a better life and a better world—that all of us were blessed for so many years by the leadership and inspiration of this great and noble person.

Today, as each of us recites our acceptance of God's decree, "The Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken; blessed be the name of the Lord," let us, above all, bless the Lord for what He gave. For His gift of Stephen Wise has blessed, and will bless for generations, our country and our people and all the world.

History will inscribe Stephen Wise among the truly great men of our era. It will record that he was a pioneer, a fearless crusader in every worth-while field of social concern—in the cause of justice and freedom for all men and all peoples; for public morality and social welfare; for the deepening of religion and the extension of knowledge; for international peace and understanding. It will tell that he was the beloved and peerless leader of his people who did as much as any man of his time to right a 2,000-year wrong by reestablishing the people of Israel in Israel, its homeland, and who did more than any other man to forge the unity of his fellow Jews in their hours of deepest distress. History will ascribe monumental achievements to his name—the institutions and movements he created and led; the multitudes he moved and inspired; the battles he magnificently waged and won. And, for all of this, he will be remembered as a great Jew, a great American, a great liberal, a great humanitarian—as a giant among men.

But history is an adequate recorder only of impersonal events. It is an extremely inadequate recorder of persons and human beings. The impersonal records of history will enshrine the accomplishments of Stephen Wise. They will not enshrine the man.

Let us, therefore, while our memories of him are still warm and fresh and vibrant, seek to encompass the man. Let us today testify for the generations that thought Stephen Wise was great as a humanitarian, his real greatness was as a human being. Let us affirm for all who will follow that though he was a giant among men, there was no greater man among the giants.

Last year, Dr. Wise paid tribute to Mahatma Gandhi in words far more applicable to Dr. Wise himself than to any other man of our time. He said of Gandhi that he was great because he was "the man who dared to be himself; a man, who, being utterly true to himself, became one of the supreme figures of a millennium."

Superficially, much of the greatness of Stephen Wise may seem to have been in the courage and daring with which he fought on behalf of so many ideals. Actually, his true greatness lay in his daring to be so supremely what he was.

He was a simple man, who dared to remain simple in an age which rewarded cunning and cold calculation and deceit.

He was a man of profound faith and piety; and he dared to retain his faith in a world which mocked and seemed to disprove any faith.

He was a man overflowing with love; and he dared to continue to love during a generation when hate and prejudice and ill-will stalked the earth and crept into the hearts of millions.

And, above all else, he was a Jew, and he dared to be a Jew, a full Jew, a proud Jew, when so many gifted Jews of his time sought escape from their Jewishness as an avenue to success and happiness.

Stephen Wise was a simple man. His mind knew no cunning, no deviousness, no ulterior motives. Whenever he learned of injustice or cruelty or wrong, he knew simply that they had to be challenged and uprooted. And he took the most straight-forward, the most direct path to the fulfillment of that goal. All the world recognized and honored the integrity that came from that basic simplicity. That is why, as in the case of the Hebrew prophet Samuel, whose name Stephen Samuel Wise bore: "And all Israel, even from Dan to Beersheba, knew that Samuel could be fully trusted to be a prophet in the service of the Lord."

Because he was a simple, an uncomplicated person, he gave all of himself, and never less than all of himself, to everything he did. He withheld nothing of himself in whatever he did—whether in so historic an enterprise as building a Jewish state or in alleviating the plight of a poverty-stricken person who turned to him for help. And because his gifts of mind, of soul, of heart, of energy, of articulation were so matchless, by giving all of himself all the time, he inevitably became a leader among men in any cause with which he associated himself.

But Stephen Wise was not only a simple person. He was a man of profound faith and piety. He had a deep and unshakable belief in God, in moral values, in human beings. His convictions were rooted not in social theories or in political dogmas but in an abiding religious and spiritual faith. Out of the depths of that faith came the irresistible force of his beliefs and convictions; the compulsive power which impelled him in every venture he undertook; the indefinable but inescapable moral authority he exercised over all who had contact with him. Adversity could not deter him. The intense physical pain he endured for years, vilification, unpopularity, political reversals—none of these could even momentarily halt him in his relentless quest for justice, for peace, for freedom, for Zion. For his were the faith and spirit of the Hebrew prophets of old whom, more than anyone else, he resembled, and by whom, more than anyone else, he was inspired.

To his simplicity and faith, he added an overflowing love, an abounding love for his people Israel, his country America, his family, his friends, his associates, for ordinary and humble men and women. This quality of love—which his family and his intimates knew so well—is, as much as anything, the key to the understanding of his life. He loved his people and his country, each of his fellow-Jews and his fellow-Americans and his fellow-human beings so deeply that he shared personally and intimately the experiences in which they partook. He shared their sufferings and their anxieties; he felt their needs; he dreamed their dreams. And because his was the sharing, not merely of intellectual or abstract understanding, but of love, his efforts to ease their suffering, to satisfy their needs, to give substance to their dreams, were suffused with the passion of love. He could brook no delay, nor would he calculate any consequences; personal or financial or social or political.

And that love which flowed from him in turn evoked the affection of millions the world over in greater measure, certainly than any other Jew, and probably than any other public figure, of our time. During the war, in the Jewish resistance movements in Europe, the code word for the United States was "Stephania"—for to Jews fighting for freedom, Stephen could mean nothing else but Rabbi Wise and the United States. Jewish soldiers and chaplains have reported that when they landed in remote corners of the globe, when they reestablished contact with Jews who had been isolated for years under enemy rule, the first question with which they were greeted was, "Is Stephen Wise still living?" And the knowledge that he was still with them brought to these Jews relief and reassurance. That sense of security which they felt did not come from the fact that the influence of Dr. Wise was so great. There have been Jews of our day whose influence in the councils of the mighty, in the political chambers of the world, was far greater than his. But the masses of Jews the world over knew that there was no other Jew whose devotion and love for them was fullest assurance that he would make their problems his own, and that he would toil restlessly and ceaselessly for them.

It was out of this abounding love for the people—not the people as an abstraction, but people as human beings—that he drew his deep and abiding faith in democracy. From the people, he drew warmth and inspiration and strength, and he therefore continually sought the people. "I see my brethren" was the theme of his life. Thus he became the articulator of the hopes and desires and needs of millions of people, and thus he fulfilled in such measure God's command to Samuel, "And the Lord said unto Samuel, listen to the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee."

Above everything else, Stephen Wise was supremely a Jew. And being a Jew for Dr. Wise meant not an "accident of birth," a phrase he found so distasteful. It meant being the proud heir to 4,000 years of Jewish tradition, of Jewish learning, of Jewish achievement, of Jewish suffering, of Jewish

nobility, of Jewish dreams. It meant being the heir to the teachings and ideals of Moses and Isaiah and Amos and Hillel and Rabbi Akiba and Maimonides and Herzl. And just as he gave to everything all of himself—all of his abilities and all his faith and all his love—so he gave to everything he touched all of his Jewishness, all 4,000 years of his Jewishness. He sought to give living expression to those teachings; to compensate for all the sufferings; to help fulfill all the dreams. His Jewishness was the oldest and most integral part of himself. In giving himself to whatever he did, he gave—and had to give—all of his Jewishness. Thus he became for the world the supreme and noble symbol of Jews and Jewishness. Out of that Jewishness there came his uplifting and ennobling dignity, his fierce pride. For as the inheritor of the tradition of prophets and princes, of scholars and saints, there was no one, however exalted, before whom he need cringe; no one, however mighty, to whom he need apologize. Thus he taught an entire generation of Jews to walk proudly and with dignity, to act with firmness in the right.

Thus by daring to be so supremely what he was—a simple man, a man of faith, a man of love, a Jew—he became one of the great of this earth. Thus he wrought so much and wrought so enduringly. And thus as he grew greater, so grew the affection in which millions held him.

The Bible tells us of the Patriarch Abraham that "Abraham died in a good old age, old and full of years, and was gathered unto his people." Stephen Wise, who has passed away with a fullness of years, fullness in time and achievement given to so few, had been gathered unto his people, unto the hearts of all people, long before this day. And long after his passing, men and women—the great and the humble, colored and white, Jew and gentile, here, in Israel, in all lands—will continue to gather him unto their hearts; to bless his name and his works; to be inspired by his example.

As we bid his earthly remains farewell, let us thank God for having given us this man, and for having spared him until this day, and let us pray in words written by Dr. Wise himself in a letter shortly before his death: "Into the Hand of God I commend my spirit. May He continue to vouchsafe me His grace and mercy."

Into the Hand of God, we commend this great and good and noble spirit. May He continue to vouchsafe unto him His grade and mercy.

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, within the last 6 months, the State of Texas has been forced to reduce her oil production by almost one-third. Since last January, the Railroad Commission of Texas, our proration and conservation agency for Texas, has reduced our oil allowable three times, cutting the amount of oil which Texas producers can market by some 700,000 barrels a day. This has been necessitated because of tremendous oil imports into this country.

I have just received a resolution passed by the North Texas Oil and Gas Association on this subject. A copy of such resolution follows:

The national oil policy prepared by the National Petroleum Council, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, was approved unanimously. The council is composed of representatives of the domestic petroleum industry and of all oil-importing companies.

The basic policy with reference to imports of petroleum and its products is that they should not be in such quantities as to be harmful to our national economy and security and should be limited to those quantities necessary to supplement domestic production, when produced in accordance with sound conservation practices.

Excessive imports have forced the reduction of domestic production to a level far below the maximum efficient rate. Within the last year we have built up a domestic supply more than adequate to meet our domestic demand: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the North Texas Oil & Gas Association commend the Railroad Commission of Texas for requesting the importing companies to provide figures as to the quantity of petroleum and its products that they each intend to import; and be it further

Resolved, That each and every company or individual importing oil into the United States make public figures as to the quantity of petroleum and its products that they imported each month during the past year and for each and every month in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation that will require each and every importer to furnish the Bureau of Mines, within 30 days after the close of each month, with information as to the quantity of petroleum and its products that they imported into the United States during that month and requiring the Bureau of Mines to release and make public these figures for each importer, separately, immediately; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation that will prohibit imports of petroleum and its products into the United States in excess of such quantities as are necessary to supplement domestic production, produced in accordance with sound practices so that domestic oil will not be supplanted by imported petroleum and its products; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of Texas, and that we particularly urge the Senators from Texas to secure the adoption of an amendment on the floor of the Senate, to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts that will accomplish these purposes.

The Treatment of Greek Seamen in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Naturalization Service—Baltimore district—is using a trade-union blacklist to terrorize Greek seamen sailing to and from American ports.

Greek seamen who are members of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions are subjected to severe intimidation, denied shore leave, and given very unsubtle hints concerning the safety of their families in Greece. Captains who protest in behalf of their crews are put through the same wringer by the immigration officials. Over 100 men were detained aboard their vessels in March alone—men who have been sailing in and out of America for 15 to 25 years. Suddenly, mere membership in a trade-union is sufficient to label them subversive and dangerous to the safety of the United States.

The origin of the blacklist being used to determine membership in FGMU is an indication of its purpose.

In 1943, FGMU, representing over 80 percent of the Greek seamen sailing abroad, signed the first contract with Greek shipowners ever won by Greek seamen. In 1947, the Government-organized Panhellenic Nautical Federation, a maritime union founded by Metaxas, prewar dictator of Greece, signed an agreement with the companies annulling all the gains of the 1943 contract. Then, when it refused to recognize or become a party to this new agreement, FGMU was outlawed, its offices raided and closed in Greece, its leaders arrested and sentenced to death. Overwhelming world-wide protest from every democratic country in the world, from the UN, and so forth, succeeded in winning a stay of execution for the union leaders, but unless protest is sustained effectively, they will be executed quietly and unobtrusively so as not to arouse world protest again.

By governmental decree it became illegal to ask for overtime pay, for extra pay for extra work, for better food conditions, and so forth; all part of the 1943 agreement. The seamen would not recognize the new contract and as a result became victims of intense persecution. Over 1,500 were blacklisted in Greece and a list of 600 names was drawn up of men sailing outside of Greece in an attempt to court martial them for offences ranging from claiming their 6 months' bonus to complaining about unhealthy food.

Use of blacklists in the United States is illegal, yet this trade union blacklist of 600 members of FGMU is being used by the agencies of the United States Government to attack a trade-union, discriminate against members of that union, and thus aid the Greek shipowners' attempt to smash the FGMU.

Greek shipowners today enjoy a unique position. With the Greek Government acting as their agent, persecuting active maritime union members, outlawing the seamen's union, FGMU, and making it a crime to ask for higher wages or better conditions, these shipowners have succeeded in driving standards to far below the American ships. Thus, their operating costs are far lower than American shippers. Further, the Greek Government requires few taxes from them; they pay no taxes to this country, where so many of them reside and hold tremendous interest in property and corporations; they purchase American ships, their purchases are underwritten

by the Greek Government with American money; it is common practice for them to switch the flags of their ships and sail under the flags of countries like Panama and Hondura to pay even lower wages and taxes.

The American merchant marine is being wiped from the seas as an important industry by competition from Greek-owned ships.

The terrorization of Greek seamen here aids no one but the Greek shipowners in their desire to reduce the men on their vessels to the position of slaves. The seamen become more and more hesitant to claim even normal trade-union grievances adjustment.

FGMU is the last obstacle in the way of these shipowners. The actions of the American Government supports their attack, and ultimately the American maritime workers and American maritime industry suffers.

Our Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in considering the problem that has confronted and will confront Congress on foreign relations, there are two thoughts which should predicate our discussion. The first is that this is not a political issue. You will find proponents and opponents of our present foreign policy, in both parties, for it is a bipartisan program. The second is that our foreign policy should be regarded primarily as one designed to protect our own country and our efforts should be regarded and measured in terms of how they have and will serve this purpose. As I interpret the program presently being considered in the Congress, it may be divided into three parts.

The first is the Atlantic Pact and the United Nations. The second is the Marshall plan or ECA and the third is rearming of Europe.

The fear has come to my attention frequently that the Atlantic pact is designed to supersede the United Nations and is a recognition that this instrument has failed. We can only say that while the United Nations has not functioned entirely as we would like, neither has it failed. We—the United States—have attempted in good faith and are going to continue to do so, to make the United Nations work for peace. Now peace is not something that you achieve at one meeting or several meetings. It is something that requires practice and constant effort. As long as the nations of the world are able and willing to bring their problems to the conference table the possibilities for peace are thereby enhanced. Looking in retrospect at history who can help but agree that most of our wars have been precipitated by a lack of willingness to meet at the conference table. With the contention that the United Nations has not been a spontaneous success, I will agree, but it deserves to be continued so long as there is the slightest possibility of keeping the nations working together. That the Atlantic pact supersedes the United Nations is to me an evident untruth, for the Atlantic pact was drawn to reaffirm among peace-loving nations their unity of purpose, and to present a firm front against any aggressor in the world.

There are many technical features of the pact, but I will not attempt to dwell upon them. The main point I wish to stress is that this pact will give the most important nations at UN a common understanding so that there can be no doubt in the minds of any participants of the desire for peace and yet to show in unmistakable terms their united opposition to any aggressor. In comparing the United Nations with the League of Nations, it is fair to say that the failure of the latter can be attributed to the fact that the participants did not really believe in its necessity or usefulness. Developments up to and including the recent World War have charged the nations, particularly those outside the iron curtain of Russia, with the necessity for unilateral action to preserve peace. In light of these circumstances there is every reason to believe that the combination of the Atlantic pact and the United Nations will present a strong concerted effort to achieve world peace and an equally strong deterrent to those who would provoke a war.

The Marshall plan has now been in operation for almost a year. There was a great deal of doubt in my mind a year ago as to what my stand should be on this issue. I might add, parenthetically, that there was a great deal of doubt in the minds of most of the citizens of our district. It was my good fortune to have a personal envoy to Europe to help analyze the problem. This person was Dick Bancroft, of New Castle, Ind., who was traveling in western Europe, and consented to make a study of the matter and the possibilities of success of the Marshall plan while there. His attitude before going was at best very critical of the idea. His report, when he returned, was a very excellent and thorough one. He did visit most of the western European countries and England and had an excellent opportunity to analyze the problem, keeping free from propaganda of the countries he visited. This report advised me that in spite of the objections that were evident we should still undertake the experiment. To Dick Bancroft I think the entire district is deeply indebted, and I want at this time to pay personal tribute to him for his excellent service. The plan has succeeded even better than was anticipated.

It was my privilege recently to be a participant in a session with Paul Hoffman and a few Congressmen. Those attending were both those for and against the ECA program. This forum, which lasted 3 hours, was a very helpful and constructive one. Some of the common objections raised by those opposing the program were that the countries we are aiding will not love us for our help, or that we have done enough now and should quit, or that western Europe could easily be taken by Russia, so that our efforts will be wasted.

Let us analyze the problem as objectively as possible. It was said a year ago that this effort was a calculated risk and I think the same statement is true today. First of all, Mr. Hoffman said the greatest problem he met, when he first became Administrator, was the suspicion on the part of the participating nations. This suspicion was a natural one, and I think you can readily understand that these nations might feel we had some ulterior motive. It is my impression that he has quite frankly told them that we have no selfish purpose, but that we do realize that world peace and balance of power cannot be maintained unless they are revitalized and their democratic governments maintained.

The recovery of these nations has been better than expected, and in many instances their production is almost up to prewar. This production, however, is not enough and is the reason why we must continue an organized program.

Let me say, at this point, that these nations constitute more or less a unit so far as trade and economics are concerned. It is in essence the same situation that we have in our country where all of the states contribute to a balanced economy. That is the reason why the program must encompass all of these countries and a new scale of production be made possible. These nations have lost in the war many of their manufacturing and production facilities. In addition much of their production equipment has either been worn out or is obsolete. Their production facilities have never been the equivalent of our own. Our manufacturing gives to each production worker approximately 7 horsepower in comparison with Europe's 3 or 4. The reason I am mentioning these figures is so that you can realize the necessity for supplying them with critical materials so that their industries can be equipped, which will in turn raise the productivity and standard of living of these peoples. This is a very important question and should be stressed. Even in the short period during which this program has been in operation we have found the Marshall plan to be the only remedy to stay the infiltration tactics of the Russians. This is rather an interesting observation since it was not the primary reason for inaugurating the plan. To be sure we have also provided much by way of food supplies to western Europe. In this category our supplies will be in diminishing quantities in the future, although western Europe will probably never be completely self-sustaining. Italy represents the weakest link in the chain, but has probably made the greatest progress during the past year. Mr. Hoffman himself stated that he had been amazed at the moral regeneration within that country. The entire sector has been so encouraged and improved that the outlook is much brighter than a year ago.

Taking England for example, we can say that she has made a great effort to become self-sustaining. It should be borne in mind that she is exporting 40 percent of her manufacturing production in order to as nearly as possible

achieve a balance of trade. In this respect she would be able to have a balance by 1952, but it has required great self-denial on the part of her citizens, and this remains the best testimonial to her good faith. It is her leadership, among the participating nations, that is making the plan work. Certainly so long as these countries are willing to work to achieve their sufficiency, our plan should be directed toward helping them accomplish this goal. You will hear criticism of the plan to the effect that it may dislocate some of our own production and export plans, and I think this is a fair criticism. However, we should take the long-range viewpoint rather than the immediate one.

By way of illustration I would like to cite the opposition that came from men employed as cradlers of grain to the reaper. This invention did cause a temporary dislocation, but the value of the ultimate contribution to the standard of living of all of us far outweighed the temporary dislocation. We have made our choice as between trying to live as a self-contained Nation or be a part of world affairs and commerce. The invention of the airplane and its modern development and the atomic bomb have, in my opinion, made the decision for us, and we could not live an insulated or isolated existence if we chose. So with regard to the Marshall plan I will conclude by saying, as I did a year ago, that it is, in my opinion, the most momentous decision we have made in a century. And we have adopted a positive program for peace even though it involved a calculated risk.

The question of rearming Europe, the third section of the problem is one I have not determined as yet, in my own mind. We should first of all recognize that we are dealing with the Russians, hence an oriental mind. It is impossible for us, having an occidental outlook, to guess what their decisions will be. Although most of us in Congress are agreed on the first two phases, that is the Atlantic Pact and the ECA, there is much disagreement on the third sector, or rearming of Europe. Some contend that rearming Europe will place Russia in a position where she can do nothing but go to war. There are others who claim that these countries cannot adequately rearm themselves and effect an economic recovery at the same time. They point out that the entire projected cost of our efforts—that is ECA and rearming western Europe—will not exceed the cost of 3 months of World War II.

This question is one that will undoubtedly come in for much debate in the Congress during the next 3 months, but as yet opinions are not entirely formed. Without presenting my opinion as a military strategist, which of course I am not, it would seem to me that if our rearmament efforts are undertaken they could best be utilized in fortifying strategic places in western Europe. I have in mind particularly spots in Denmark or Turkey that are of great vital military importance, for these countries do not have the resources to adequately install the fortifications.

In conclusion I will simply say that our budget for military defense and for foreign assistance are much larger than we would wish. A budget of $16,000,000,000 for our armed services would be too little if war comes within 5 years and too much if it does not. The reason I make this statement is that great proportions of this amount are dedicated to contractual obligations that will require many months to complete. As an illustration, not a single plane flew in World War II that was not on the drawing board before our entry into the war.

It has been a pleasure to be here and discuss this most important national problem with you, and I hope I may have your continued thoughtful consideration of my efforts.

Billion-Dollar Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., by Mr. Floyd Miller, its editor.

I commend the reading of this editorial to the Members of the House for their reflection. That this favored Nation is moving toward state socialism must be apparent to every thinking American. We received the inheritance of freedom from our forebears. Will our posterity be that fortunate or will they receive from us a socialistic state?

The editorial follows:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

BILLION DOLLAR SWINDLE

Personally, I don't like to be swindled, no matter what fancy words the guy uses to cover up. How about yourself?

The people of Oakland County have been taken for a ride for hundreds of thousands of dollars, yet many do not realize it. In fact, the people of the whole United States have been squeezed of vast amounts of money—taken out of their weekly earnings—under a high-sounding phrase.

This swindle is called social security.

That phrase would be a laugh, if it were not so tragic. For it really won't be funny to see trusting citizens reach old age and find they have been cheated by fast talkers who used an appealing word. "Social security" indeed.

Since it is barely possible that some of you haven't kept up with the score, I will recall what has happened. The social-security plan has been in operation for 12 years. Each year it has dipped its hands into the pockets of workers and taken out millions. It has extracted an equal amount from the cash registers of employers.

This take has amounted to $13,394,000,000. That's a lot of billions.

And what was this money taken for? Why, to build up a security fund for the aged and unfortunate.

Where has the money been deposited? What kind of a savings account does the Government have, so that you and I can get our money back when we get old and need it? Answer: Most of it has been spent.

You mean there isn't any big fund to pay us? Did somebody steal the money? Answer—There, there, don't accuse anybody of stealing. It's just what is known as the old political hocus. Of the thirteen billions plus which the kind Government has taken in, it has:

1. Paid out $2,379,000,000 to those who reached the pension age, or to their survivors.

2. Spent $309,000,000 in running expenses. (Bureaucracy is not cheap.)

3. Spent the rest, $10,706,000,000, for various Government bills and left some IOU's in the till. That is practically 80 percent of the total taken from the wage earners and their employers, all for their own future good.

But the IOU of the American Nation, sir, is good enough for me, retorts the man in Washington. Sure it is. Only there is a real catch in this one.

The IOU's which have been left in the Social Security cash register instead of ordinary money are special interest-bearing bonds of the United States. These are good just as long as the Government can collect more taxes or seize property.

And that is the only way the Government can pay back this money. It has to get the money from you and me and other taxpayers or workers.

In other words, the money taken from our pay is not in the bank. When payment is due, the cash will have to be raised by taxes levied on you and me and other citizens. What the bank contains is not cash, but a promise that we will pay ourselves the amount due.

Now the thoughtful Government is proposing to include millions of other individuals in the plan. More money would be poured into Washington, to be spent and replaced by pieces of paper saying we owe it to ourselves.

The same hocus-pocus would be worked with every other phase of the so-called "cradle-to-the-grave security." If the various proposals already advanced by the Administration in Washington were adopted, the workers of the country and their employers (allegedly in their behalf) would have to pay in $5,800,000,000 every year.

Pretty soon the biggest business in the world would be Social Security. And about the smallest and least important thing in this country would be the individual worker and citizen, you and I.

The planned economic state would take care of everything. Seems to me a couple of other fellows tried that not so long ago.

Wildlife Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ZEBULON, GA., *April 10, 1949.*

Hon. A. SIDNEY CAMP,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAMP: In a certain mountainous section of Wyoming there are a number of wild horses, supposed to be descended from horses carried into that section by the Spaniards long ago. These horses are not only harmless but are individually beautiful and collectively quite interesting

as a unique feature of our wildlife assets, as are the buffalo, for instance.

Recently, hunters, far more mercenary than merciful have taken to hunting these horses in a most cruel and heartless manner. They use airplanes and fly low over the herds, scaring the animals into frenzy and keep up the pursuit until the animals are exhausted and fall, or until they are driven into corals from which they are unable to escape. Slitting the nostrils of these helpless victims, they insert wires which they twist to close the air vents and thus make it possible to carry them off for slaughter to make dog food or something out of the carcasses. If unchecked this ruthless butchery will quickly exterminate this entire element of our wildlife possessions. This is not only wickedly inhuman but also wantonly wasteful of an attractive element of our national resources.

You and the other lawmakers of our Nation will confer a great favor upon millions of American citizens whose sensibilities are shocked by those needless atrocities if you will make such acts a punishable crime and will provide refuge and protection for these noble animals, which deserve a better fate than what is now befalling them. Moreover, you will have the satisfaction of having upheld the ideals and principles of enlightened and civilized humanity.

In a few days you will receive a copy of the April issue of Our Dumb Animals, on page 3 of which you will find this situation more fully described.

I assure you that I will be personally grateful and appreciative for whatever you may do in alleviating the suffering of these animals and in preserving them as a worthwhile element of our national wildlife resources.

Yours truly,

MAY BELLE BUSH.

Veterans of Foreign Wars' Golden Jubilee Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, night before last in Wilmington, Del., I attended a testimonial dinner given by the Department of Delaware, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in honor of that organization's national commander in chief, Lyall T. Beggs. It was my privilege and pleasure to be present on that occasion not only as a Member of Congress, but also as a member and past post commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In addition to serving as a testimonial affair in honor of Commander in Chief Beggs, the dinner meeting last night also served to direct attention to the fact that in this year of 1949 the Veterans of Foreign Wars is celebrating its golden jubilee anniversary.

This splendid service-rendering organization, of which I am proud to be a member, had its beginning just 50 years ago when several groups of Spanish-American War veterans banded together in order to be of mutual service to each other, but especially to serve their less fortunate comrades in arms and their widows and orphans. Fourteen years later, in 1913, these groups of men throughout the Nation, who had served overseas during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection and the China relief expedition, merged to form the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which some years later received a congressional charter.

On the occasion of this golden-jubilee anniversary it is well worth reviewing for a moment the purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars as set forth in its charter. There we find this clearly defined, inspirational statement:

The purpose of this corporation shall be to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies whomsoever.

Mr. Speaker, even a brief review of the record of achievement of the Veterans of Foreign Wars will show how closely and effectively this fine organization has adhered to the principles and purposes set forth in its charter. Its splendid work in the field of rehabilitation is known to all. The usefulness and accomplishments of its national home for orphans and widows of deceased veterans has achieved renown as one of the Nation's finest child-welfare projects. In thousands of communities throughout the Nation the Veterans of Foreign Wars has sponsored and successfully carried out a wide variety of projects beneficial to civic welfare, to schools and churches, and to the Nation's youth.

In view of this splendid record of achievement and of continuing purpose, we can see now, Mr. Speaker, that it was with almost unbelievable foresight that those who organized the Veterans of Foreign Wars chose for its emblem the Cross of Malta. That symbol is an expression of the desire of this organization and its members to serve their fellow men, as did the early crusaders who created the Cross of Malta, because they are pledged to defend the principle of human rights in either war or peace.

Harold E. Stassen on the Half Century Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extraordinary address given by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and now president of the University of Pennsylvania, at the midcentury convocation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Friday evening, April 1, 1949:

THE HALF CENTURY AHEAD

(By Harold E. Stassen)

Dr. Compton, Hon. Winston Churchill, President Killian, distinguished guests, my fellow citizens, although I appear, as you know, as an eleventh hour substitute for the President, I assume it is totally unnecessary for me to tell you, with a smile, that I do not speak for him, and that he is not responsible for anything I say this evening.

I am certain, nevertheless, that I can speak for the President and for the people of our country when I give a salute to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for its amazing record of constructive, educational, and scientific accomplishment, and say best wishes and Godspeed to this great institution and to its able, modest, new president, Dr. James Killian.

I am confident that, in the same representative manner, I may word a hearty and respectful welcome to these shores to that gifted and inspiring leader of the people of Britain in "their finest hour," that contemporary Shakespeare, Burke, and Nelson cast in one dramatic mold, the Honorable Winston Churchill.

It has been asked that I speak of the future, that I address my remarks toward the second half of this twentieth century which so shortly will begin. Let me respond that I am not given to prediction, not even to shorter-range prediction, especially not after what happened November 2, 1948. Yet I do recognize with you the importance of thinking ahead. I agree that at the midturn of a century, in this atmosphere of science, a searching inquiry into the humanities is important. I agree that the next 50 years is not too long a time to think about when we reflect that, barring catastrophe, most of the undergraduates of this institution and the other millions of our youth now engaged in study will witness during their lifetime this full half century of which we speak.

There are those who will say, why speak of a half century, when within a few years we either solve the worldwide question of relations of men, or see civilization die in the rubble of an atomic war! Others whisper that atomic destruction, with all its horrors, is but as a bow and arrow compared to the potential devastation of germ warfare. Others say—and that is not all. No one is more keenly aware than I am of the vast capacity for catastrophe possessed by future war or more determined, that mankind must find the way to prevent its occurrence. Yet I here declare that to say now that all thinking should begin and end upon this question of the prevention of a third world war is to introduce a note of sterility into our analysis. It is to shackle our minds at the very moment in history when it is most essential that they be unfettered.

I therefore state, in considered phrases, that if, God forbid, an atomic war does come, civilization will survive. If more than one future world war should come, with all the destructive force of every kind that is developed, civilization will yet survive. I say this bluntly, for I believe that the future course of man requires that there be a toughness of free minds, a searching, long-term thought upon future policy, a complete canvass of considered alternatives, and no blind spots or road blocks in our thinking.

Terrible devastation and destruction and suffering can be dealt out, but, in my judgment, man can never fashion the means of destroying all men; man can never wipe out entirely throughout the world that curious combination of progress called civilization.

Our first concern is not to be for places to hide. Our approach should not be one of either hysteria or resignation. Rather

must we be determined that we will rebuild; we will go on, what e'er may come.

Before turning our eyes to the future, we gain perspective if we recall that when this century began fifty years ago, man had never flown. The first, feeble, fascinating flight by Orville Wright occurred in 1903. Man at the turn of the century moved heavily over land and slowly over sea. Thus handicapped, food moved with difficulty; lands were tilled laboriously. In the first decade of this century, many many millions of people died of starvation and of plagues.

I need not speak of today's nonstop, refueled aerial circling of the world, of many flights at speeds above 500 miles an hour, of some faster than sound, of communication by radio covering the globe every day, of the rapid increase in the transmission of visual messages via television, of production—mass production—and its amazing totals, of medical science and its conquest of major epidemics. What then of the future? Should we not contemplate as a minimum, readily available nonstop travel to any point on the world, communication of message and of picture everywhere, and new developed sources of energy removing old limitations of fuel and transport?

Clearly the physical facts today, and in increasing degree, the projection of these facts, means that our thinking must be world-wide. Our thinking must give more consideration than ever before to the fundamental nature of man and the way in which he should live.

This philosophic approach has greater validity than either an economic, social, military, or political approach, for it affects all these, and more too.

I talk of world-wide, fundamental concepts with humility, with hesitation. But I do hope that I may in some degree stimulate and provoke others, through disagreement and agreement, through modification and amendment, through correction and projection, to contribute a larger measure to the unending dynamic process of thinking our way through to the course we should follow.

It is my view that there are in the world three major streams of philosophic thought as to the nature of man and the way in which he should live. Each is many centuries old. None is held purely and completely by any numerically appreciable group of the people on the earth. Each has felt the cross impact of the other. Each has received impetus, direction, modification from geographic and anthropological fact, from experience and circumstance, from scholarship, and from religion.

The correct evaluation of these three major streams, and the appropriate development of policies at home and abroad are of greater importance for the next half century than any other intellectual pursuits.

These are the three:

The concept of the natural rights of man; that he was meant to be free, of his inherent worth and dignity, of his spiritual quality, of his relationship to God, and of his brotherhood to fellow man.

The concept of the subordinate status of man to man, of his possessing rights only as they are given to him by those in command of the society in which he lives, of might making right, of man's value limited to his material being, with no recognition of his spiritual value, and no God.

The concept of man's little worth, indifference to his rights and welfare, of mystical and primary concern for the hereafter, of life as a vale of tears or a period of suffering, of devotion to a rigid religion and callousness to the conditions of living.

These three might be termed the doctrines of the free and equal man, of the subservient and atheistic man, and of the apathetic and lowly man.

Or they might be labeled the concepts of—

Liberty of man.

Order for man.

Indifference to man.

Each has a diverse and ancient background. None is held and implemented consisely and completely by any peoples.

There are some shreds of evidence of the welling up of the first stream of natural rights in the misty glimpses of earliest history of civilization when the workers on the pyramids and on the drainage projects of the Nile Valley demanded that not only Pharoah's court, but the workers too were entitled to the right to wōrship Ri, the Sun God, and receive the benefits therefrom, rather than to be limited to the worship of Osiris, God of the earth and underground.

In any event the flow is clearly evident in ancient Athens, in the writings of Socrates and Plato and Aristotle with their unfolding views of justice and of law. It is given major impetus by Christianity, in some respects by Judaism, and traces its development to the constitutionalism of ancient Rome, to Magna Carta, to Locke, to the founders of our own United States, to the Declaration of Independence, to the Bill of Rights, to Jefferson, and to Lincoln.

This philosophy of the nature of man has had predominant influence upon the governmental, economic, and social systems of the western civilization, of nearly all the nations of Europe, of the British Commonwealth of nations, of the United States of America, and has had a considerable impact in all other portions of the world.

The second stream, that of materialism and force, is noted in part in the Sophists and Epicureans of ancient Greece, and is traced through the seventeenth century French materialists, through Hobbes, through Hegel and Feuerbach of Germany, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Lenin, Hitler, and Stalin. It is of import now in the ruling groups in Russian and her satellites, in Spain, Portugal, and Argentina, and in North China.

The third stream, that of indifference, springs from the earliest eastern religions; and, although in their theology they place high value on the life of man, yet the extreme mysticism and aesthetic emphasis of the beauty of a spiritual hereafter, when coupled with the poverty and want of overcrowded destitution, cause the principal current religions of Asia and the East—Hinduism, Buddaism, Confucianism, and Mohammedanism—to contribute largely to this stream.

This philosophy is of key significance in all of Asia, including China, Burma, India, Malaya, Pakistan, and also in Africa.

I recognize that a question may arise as to relating Hitler and Stalin, nazism and communism, to the same philosophic stream. But I reply that the attitudes in both instances toward the nature of man and his rights are closely identified, that the bitter clashes in doctrinal statement, and the war between them, rose from their proximity to each other as major, mutually suspicious powers, rather than from any fundamental ideological difference, and that the führer principle of Hitler's system and the centralism of Stalin's system, and the whole approach of ruthless domination and cold-blooded liquidation of those with whom they differed, were of the same cloth.

And some may also question the inclusion of Hindu and Moslem, bitter in their clash with each other, in the third category. But their fanatic hostility toward each other is confirmation of the mystic and rigid beliefs and callousness toward mortal life, rather than a negation of it.

I have a deep and abiding faith that the first stream of philosophic thought, that of inherent right of liberty, is correct as to the nature of man. I believe it points the way for policy and for action in the confusion and clash which has risen so soon and so sharp in the wake of World War II. I am confident it can be the basis for winning through toward the true objectives of mankind. It presents laws as true universally for all men, as are the laws of physical science which we know are valid even though many men do not recognize or believe them.

We should understand its own dynamic, living qualities and our constant effort should be to improve the implementation of that philosophy in economic and social and political systems, and endeavor unceasingly and skillfully, and by peaceful means, to increase the adherence to it in the other portions of the world. We should further seek to improve our system with the aid of the constructive value of the bitter criticism of its economic and social shortcomings made by those who hold the opposing materialistic philosophy. Finally we ought to enrich our doctrine by the more highly developed sense of beauty and by a measure of the tranquility of those who hold the concept of mystical indifference.

In applying the broad theory to specific, hard problems in definite terms, there may be many who, though they have traveled with me thus far, will part company with me on specific suggestions. Nevertheless broad generalizations are of little value unless we give them specific application through proposals for definite action.

If my analysis of the major stream of philosophic view motivating the Communist leadership of Russia and her satellites is correct, then it definitely indicates that their appraisal of relative force will be the key influence restraining or encouraging their aggression. Holding as a fundamental idea the denial of any higher concept of justice or morality, they believe that someone will rule by force and from their standpoint it had better be them. This means in turn that no voluntary release of power over others can be anticipated, no yielding of human rights, no granting of freedoms, unless compelled by the pressure of internal or external, impending or applied force.

Relating this inescapable situation to the specific China problem, we must conclude that by our inaction and by our withdrawal of aid, we are foolhardy thus to contribute to the Communist domination of China. We should move, and move promptly, to bolster the southern half of China, to assist by materials and by counsel in maintaining the independence of Canton, and of the four southern provinces of Kwantung, Kwangsi, Fukien, Hunan, and of Formosa and Hong Kong.

Giving due consideration to European needs and to our own total economic situation and capacity, we should regularly invest a portion of our resources in Asia for the resistance to communism. The amount should be a minimum of $1,000,000,000 a year. It should be administered on an Asia-wide approach, preferably in relation to local provinces and individual projects and in underwriting private endeavor, rather than being funneled through any central, major government.

Clearly the Marshall plan in Europe has been the most significant single right thing we have done since the end of the war. It is a high time that we have a parallel MacArthur plan in Asia. Supported in a major way, it should be long term in its vision, adjusted to oriental conditions, continuous in its execution, carrying the same flexibility of detailed application, and the same concept of objectives and requirement of self-help as the Marshall plan.

If we are right in our philosophic view, then it follows that men everywhere have the right to know the facts and information and ideas from other parts of the world. An individual can pull down a curtain for his own privacy, but no ruler has the right to drop a curtain and close off men from communication with their fellow man.

The program represented by the Voice of America, therefore, should be greatly expanded and ingeniously multiplied. Not only messages by radio, but in addition, the widespread dissemination of printed literature giving facts and information and ideas

should be carried forth. I am informed by men who know that such literature can, with comparative ease, be scattered broadcast over closed borders by means of drifting balloons or from high-flying airplanes during favorable winds. There needs to be a continuous, widespread, dramatic program of printed messages from freemen to all mankind.

In fact, one of my friends suggested that dropping a few Sears, Roebuck catalogs should be included in this program of literature from the sky. Of course, we are actually discussing messages and literature of much wider significance than that of consumer-goods production. I am proposing that we vigorously contest for the minds of men everywhere.

If methods such as these of sending material over borders seem contrary to ancient rules of diplomatic respect for borders, let me emphasize that when officials of governments constantly pour out vitriolic attacks on free peoples, the remedy is not that of trying to block their free speech. The remedy is not infringement upon the right of assembly to hear this party line within free countries. Rather, our doctrine indicates that the response should be widespread dissemination of information. The peoples in Russia and the satellite countries should be continuously told of our views and intentions and objectives, of our desires for peace, of the facts of the rest of the world. We should apply for support from the minds of the peoples in these dictatorially governed nations. The internal pressures for freedom and peace that will come from a well-informed people within these countries can be just as important as the deterrent of our own potential counteracting military force that is available in the event of war. These are times without parallel, and we must ingeniously develop a way in which to carry on the contest of ideas. Winning that contest will be the best assurance that there need not be a grim struggle by military force.

Some men have turned to materialism at a number of points in history when faced with widespread abuses which denied in practice the philosophy of liberty and equality which was professed. The present sway of this coercive materialist concept is directly traceable to reaction against the autocracy of the czars, to the monopolies and unfairness to labor in early capitalism, to the neglect of the responsibility of brotherhood by our west after World War I. Above all, its present extent has been due to the cruel measures of force used by those cold calculators who seized power under its doctrine.

Throughout recorded history, men, after listening to the exponents of this philosophy of order dictated over humanity, have repeatedly rejected it in their minds and struggled for more individual liberty. The plain people will reject it again; they will reject it in Russia; they will reject it in eastern Europe if we but give them the chance by pursuing dynamic humanitarian policies, by sending them the facts, by maintaining alert and adequate military strength, and by never surrendering to the jelly-like course of appeasement.

Of marked interest has been the recent conduct of peoples dominated by the third stream of indifference, and their rapid response to any ray of hope of better life on earth. The favorable change in Turkey and in the Philippines are recent confirmations of this.

Thus, I am encouraged to say that the story of man gives renewed and deeper faith in the inherent truth of our philosophy of the native worth of man, that he was meant to be free upon this globe.

It is likewise imperative that we improve the application of our own philosophy to our own social, economic, and political systems. Certainly, the violations of civil rights, the discriminations and repressions of bigotry, which are too numerous in our country, are directly contrary to the philosophy to which we subscribe. There must be a steady insistence upon progress in this respect.

It would be tragic if this session of Congress adjourned without at least passing the antilynch and anti-poll-tax measures. Major progress must be made in this direction with regard to those portions of our population which have suffered discrimination in their opportunities for education, for facilities of better health, and for decent housing.

Our concept of the nature of man is further guidance, though in a very different manner, in our economic and social policy. It means that those policies, taken as a whole, should contribute to the rounded development, creative capacity, worth-while character, and true happiness of man. The objectives of our economic policies, therefore, must not be limited by the materialist principle of meeting to the maximum degree the physical wants of man. It is undoubtedly true that if government were to take over the distribution of the food of the Nation, at least in theory it could deliver an assigned amount of food to every household every day at less expense than now involved. It is equally true, in theory, that if government took over the distribution of clothing, it could deliver to every person every year allocated clothing at less expense than clothing now costs. The same observation could be applied to other necessities of life.

Let me make it clear that from a strictly material approach I believe that the result of such an attempt would in fact be the loss of interest in production, lower supplies and the failure to attain the material Utopia outlined.

But entirely apart from the question of the successful production of material returns, do you not agree that removing from the individual both the privilege and the responsibility of planning for the provision of necessities, of making choices, of budgeting earnings, of weighing relativities, would result in the end in a people of less resourcefulness, less value of personality, less happiness, less strength of character? Thus I feel the economic socialists are departing from the basic philosophic stream in which we would move. Their concentration upon attempted material service to the many, with disregard for the individual rights and opportunities of the few who are especially talented in various fields, negates the basic tenets of our way of life.

The concept of the natural rights of each man must give rise to a constitutional system that protects man against oppression by the tyrannical rule of a single ruler, of a clique of rulers, or of an unbridled majority itself. Is it not clear that each aspect of the system should serve the many and the few? It should yield dividends in standards of living, in education, and enjoyment, to the many, but it should also keep open the avenues of opportunity for the few who stand out in each category. Such a system should safeguard minorities of whatever kind, and more particularly should be so constituted as to keep open the road for the few to develop and use their unusual talents.

If under the impetus of a short-sighted response to numbers in a democracy, or in revolt against the oppression of rulers, economic, social, and political systems are directed only toward fruits for the many, the result will be a deteriorating mess of mediocrity. The great artist, the inventor, the skilled surgeon, the exceptional scientist, the ingenious engineer, the keen financier, the gifted production manager, the designer, the craftsman, the scholar, each should find his path blocked by no insurmountable artificial obstacles, no excessive man-made handicaps, and each should have before him the fullest of incentive.

The unfolding genius of each of these in a desirable system will in turn yield dividends to the many, yes, to all.

The general attitude of the economic total-socialists of "bringing it to the people" can clearly be overdone. As Toynbee reports, all of history shows that civilizations may deteriorate or abort or ossify when they meet enervating, dissipating conditions, or when they encounter adversity too extreme to surmount. There is every indication from the ancient Egyptian civilization of 6,000 years ago down to modern western civilization, that a challenge of significant nature, but not obliterating in its weight, leads to the most significant development and response. Do not the studies of individual human nature indicate a similar rule? The capacities, of course, are varied, but in relationship to potentiality, a challenge of some adversity and stimulus, not stifling in amount, develops definitely stronger personality, a happier individual, than does either crushed subservience or blissful lassitude. To me this means that attempts to establish a breakfast-in-bed economy for the citizens, is a sad mistake both for the people and for the Nation.

Our unending effort should be to ease those overwhelming burdens which are beyond the capacity of individual man to bear, but we must leave the major normal provision for man's own livelihood and future up to him, himself.

In our economic relationships with those who are of the third major conceptual stream, that of indifference and mysticism, we would seek to stimulate, and contribute toward, the improvement of the very low standards of living in these areas, and at the same time to demonstrate, and lead toward, a higher appraisal of human life. Too often has the Western World been willing to profit by that low appraisal of native human life in the exploitation of colonial resources, instead of demonstrating a higher value for life. There is a small grain of truth in the fictional story of the American investor in dependent area resources who plaintively exclaimed, "I am perfectly willing to educate my native workers but I am afraid that the first lesson learned will be to demand a raise in wages." The Dutch in the East Indies and the French in Indochina are at this time particularly subject to censure for exploitation practices. All of us need to think through our basic policy in dependent areas in the Near East, in Africa, and in Asia, and harmonize those policies with our fundamental doctrince of the nature of man. A greater portion of the returns from the resources of these territories should be retained there for direct and constructive purpose, utilizing the superb experience of western civilization, for the advancement of the native peoples, for their education, their health, for the increase of their production of goods, and the general raising of their standards of living. You will note I have listed education as the first of the various contributions which I urge for these dependent peoples. I know that some will say, pointing to the near starvation of many millions in Asia, that food, food sufficient to place them beyond the miserable subsistence level, should have top and almost exclusive priority. But I submit that if only the supply of food is raised, without an advance in education in its broadest cultural sense, without instilling a higher morality, and without an elevated emancipated status for women, the only result of more food will be a larger population, a larger population to exist at the same level of destitution and misery.

If a man is to make a significant ascent the cultural, educational, ethical side must be lifted at the same time that the food and material production totals are increased. This requires the development by Western nations, with the aid of the trusteeship portions of the United Nations Charter, of a world-wide code of conduct for capital abroad. Excessive risks for this capital must be underwritten by society as a whole, so as

to remove the need or excuse for excessive profit and exploitation.

In a very brief space of time there have come major indications of an amazing development flowing out of the independence of Israel, not only affecting the growth of resources and advancing conditions of living not only in the new nation, but in addition causing a constructive stirring in neighboring Arab states.

Someone could well say that there cannot be a bright prospect for world peace and for progress of mankind unless a mechanism of government is developed on a world level to administer the natural rights of man, to adjudicate differences between peoples, to stabilize and police world situations. Of course this assertion is right. And it is constructive to urge this necessity. But as we analyze the three philosophies I have described, it must appear crystal clear that no major portion of the world that follows the materialistic concept of the nature of man can be included, or will permit itself to be included, in a world administrative machinery unless that apparatus be one dominated by a concept of force. Furthermore unless in all major component parts there is the concept of a higher justice, of natural rights of man, with the self-restraint and self-discipline that comes with it, it is difficult to see how a world structure for administration over all men can be successfully maintained. This means that we had better develop the lesser agencies and commissions and courts and arbitration systems in the Atlantic community and in the broader community of those who move in our philosophic stream, and make an effort to expand a similar concept in other parts of the world.

As a part of this growth we should note the vital necessity for a currency, or medium of exchange, which with reasonable speed and stable convertibility can be the helpful agent for the movement of goods and services between peoples. There must be unceasing concentration upon this major task in the Atlantic community and beyond. It may well be found that an impelling need exists for the establishment of a bank of the Atlantic. Such a bank of the Atlantic should issue an appropriate currency, backed in part by gold, available for those many circumstances in which direct exchange of national currencies is no longer feasible.

The United Nations Charter has within itself the means for strengthening and developing its provisions in all essential respects on the world level. Our Government and other governments should appoint commissions to address themselves to the many complicated and difficult problems that will be involved in establishing a minimum of effective government at a world level. Obviously in its present form, with its vetoes and lack of police power, the United Nations is sadly inadequate to meet its own high purposes.

I would nevertheless caution that we must not underestimate its value, even in its present weak form. Without such an organization, limited though it be, so clear an understanding of the devious and distorted and dangerous policies of the Politburo of Russia could not have been acquired so quickly by the overwhelming majorities of the peoples of the world. Without it, economic recovery from the damage of war could not have moved forward as rapidly as it has. Without it, Israel today would not be a free and developing state, substantially at peace. Without it, we already would have lost the lingering hope of peace with freedom and justice on the earth. Each session of the United Nations and of each of its committees and bodies should be looked upon as an opportunity for a serious, thoughtful, informative discussion.

Clearly our education in the years ahead must convey to our youth an understanding of each of these philosophies, of their manifestations, their meanings, their mechanisms. This can best occur through the development of general education conducted with true academic freedom. We should not attempt to indoctrinate our youth with narrow zeal for America as it is, but rather to open the avenues for personal growth, develop the broad understanding of our basic concepts, instill a deep appreciation of the progress our country has made in relationship to those truths, and encourage a determination to use the avenues of peaceful change through democracy for constantly improving our America and the lot of all mankind. On that road lies, for our youth, the noncorroding, intelligent, effective, satisfying love of America, which we all want our young men and young women to possess.

Of course, we have not attained the ideals marked out by this warm humanitarian philosophy. For true ideals, springing from a great philosophy, are like the stars in the heavens. You cannot ever reach them with your hands, but if you understand them and see their location, they will guide you aright. Such ideals are as valuable, as aids to navigation through the social, economic, and political troubles of the day, as are the stars in the heavens for navigation over the sea, through the air, or across the desert.

As Browning wrote so optimistically, so beautifully:

"Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
Or what's a heaven for?"

We seek for mankind a better life, a more fruitful life, a happier life. An ever deeper understanding of our dynamic philosophy of life, with an unending determination and unfaltering courage to apply it, can lead, yes, I believe will lead, to a brilliant half century now opening before mankind.

Are We Afraid of Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Houses of Assembly in the State of Illinois recently voted to establish a commission to investigate subversive activities at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, in Chicago, Ill.

As an alumnus of the University of Chicago, I am proud of the fact that the university has long been one of the world's foremost educational institutions, and I believe this investigation which I consider hastily conceived and ill-advised may well bring ill-deserved censure upon the university.

Perhaps it should be recalled that it was at the University of Chicago on December 2, 1942, that the first controlled chain reaction in atomic research was first developed. Moreover at the present time the University of Chicago is the operating contractor for the Argonne National Laboratory, which is one of the major installations of the atomic energy program and the center of the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear reaction development program.

The University of Chicago has also achieved Nation-wide prominence through its great books courses, another example of its educational leadership.

The list of achievements of the University of Chicago as well as the eminent scholars it has attracted to its teaching staff have given it an enviable reputation as one of the true centers of this Nation where our basic rights of free speech and opinion and free assembly have attained true maturity.

The following statements by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins and Laird Bell, chairman of the board of trustees, I believe are pertinent to state the credo of the university:

ARE WE AFRAID OF FREEDOM?

(A statement from the chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago)

A serious question is raised by an investigating committee of the Illinois Legislature. The question is fundamental to democracy. It underlies all scholarship and all thoughtful inquiry. Therefore, it underlies the very purpose of a great university. The question is this: In these troubled times are we afraid of freedom?

ONCE AGAIN

In 1935 the Legislature of the State of Illinois empowered a committee to investigate alleged seditious activities at the University of Chicago. Charges were made. Damaging surmises were printed in the public press. The work of the university was interrupted. At the conclusion of the investigation the committee wrote in its report:

"Has the University of Chicago or any of its professors violated either the letter or the spirit of our laws? The answer to this question must be in the negative * * *. Nothing in the teachings or schedule of the school can be held to be subversive of our institutions or the advocation of the Communist form of government as a substitution for the present form of government of the United States." (Majority report issued by Senators Graham and Barbour, June 26, 1935.)

The committee cleared the university. But a university is dependent in the public's appraisal of its contribution, and harm had already been done. Even the generosity of Mr. Walgreen, who contributed $550,000 to the university after the investigation was closed, did not remove the impression created by the headline charges.

This year on March 1, 1949, a group of students from Illinois universities, including a number of students from the University of Chicago, traveled to Springfield to protest the five bills introduced into the State Legislature by Senator Paul Broyles. This they had the right to do. If they were disorderly, we disapprove of their conduct. Immediately following this student protest, House Joint Resolution No. 21 was passed calling for an investigation of the university and stating: "It appears that these students are being indoctrinated with communistic and other subversive theories contrary to our free systems of representative government." This resolution was passed within a few minutes, without customary hearings or referral to committee.

So, once again apparently the university is to be investigated. Once again statements harmful to the university's reputation have been made. We think that the people who have made these statements do not know the facts. Most of the statements are untrue. But the newspaper reader is likely to assume that "where there's smoke there's fire." Therefore, this statement is being made. The truth does not lie somewhere between the allegations of irresponsible individuals and our statement of it. The facts spell the truth, and the truth is the opposite of the charges.

There is no Communist professor at the University of Chicago. There is no Communist indoctrination at the University of Chicago in any course or program in its curriculum.

We know that there is a Communist Club at the university—one of some 200 student organizations. We know also that its membership comprises one-tenth of 1 percent of the total student body, about one out of every thousand. The board, which controls and directs the affairs of this university, could refuse to recognize that organization. But we believe with Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that "with effervescent opinions * * * the quickest way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to the air."

Communism is a term which is used loosely by different people to mean different things. Not everyone who advocates change is a Communist. In times when there is fear of Communist infiltration many persons are afraid of any criticism of things as they are. There is a tendency at such times to put a red label on anyone with whose opinions one may not agree. Universities have as much duty to defend the free expression of opinion within the bounds of legality as they have to prevent what is illegal. If such defense subjects the university to the harassment of a legislative investigation and to the possibility of inadequate or distorted reports of it, we shall nevertheless defend the university's principles with all the vigor we can command.

The trustees and administration of this university are against communism. They are against it because, among other reasons, it is contrary to our free tradition. Communism suppresses ideas. We oppose communism as we oppose all efforts to undermine our constitutionally guaranteed free speech, free press, and free assembly. We oppose communism because we believe in the tradition of individual freedom which men throughout the centuries have fought to preserve. This tradition has been stated by many men in many ways. A few of these stat ments follows:

John Milton, Areopagitica (1644): "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties. * * * And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?"

Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address (1801): "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty (1859): "This, then, is the appropriate region of human liberty. It comprises, first, the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscience, in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological."

Woodrow Wilson, message to Congress (1919): "The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances is to remove the grievances. An unwillingness even to discuss these matters produces only dissatisfactions and gives comfort to the extreme elements in our country which endeavor to stir up disturbances in order to provoke governments to embark upon a course of retaliation and repression. The seed of revolution is repression."

Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Abrams* v. *United States* (1919): "But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

Louis D. Brandeis, *Gilbert* v. *Minnesota* (1920): "The right of a citizen of the United States to take part, for his own or the country's benefit, in the making of Federal laws and in the conduct of the Government, necessarily includes the right to speak or write about them; to endeavor to make his own opinion concerning laws existing or contemplated prevail; and to this end, to teach the truth as he sees it. * * * Like the course of the heavenly bodies, harmony in national life is a resultant of the struggle between contending forces. In frank expression of conflicting opinion lies the greatest promise of wisdom in governmental action; and in suppression lies ordinarily the greatest peril."

Charles Evans Hughes, letter to Speaker Sweet of the New York State Legislature, reported in the New York Times, January 10, 1920:

"If public officers or private citizens have any evidence that any individual or group of individuals are plotting revolution and seeking by violent measures to change our Government, let the evidence be laid before the proper authorities and swift action be taken for the protection of the community. Let every resource of inquiry, of pursuit, of prosecution be employed to ferret out and punish the guilty according to our laws. But I count it a most serious mistake to proceed, not against individuals charged with violation of law, but against masses of our citizens combined for political action, by denying them the only resource of peaceful government: that is, action by the ballot box and through duly elected representatives in legislative bodies."

Alfred E. Smith, in his message vetoing the Lusk laws, which sought to license schools and to require teachers' oaths (1919): "Its avowed purpose is to safeguard the institutions and traditions of the country. In effect, it strikes at the very foundation of one of the most cardinal institutions of our Nation—the fundamental right of the people to enjoy full liberty in the domain of idea and speech. To this fundamental right there is and can be under our system of government but one limitation, namely, that the law of the land shall not be transgressed, and there is abundant statute law prohibiting the abuse of free speech. * * * The profound sanity of the American people has been demonstrated in many a crisis, and I, for one, do not believe that governmental dictation of what may and may not be taught is necessary to achieve a continuance of the patriotism of our citizenship and its loyal support of the Government and its institutions."

THE TRADITION CONTINUES

Opinions such as these are often unpopular, especially when they are spoken in times of stress. But they have been stated again and again by men who were not isolated thinkers but men of action. It is fortunate that in the midst of our present apprehensions and alarms America does not lack men of the courage to continue the democratic tradition.

ROBERT A. TAFT, the Battle Against Communism, address to the Executives Club of Milwaukee, May 8, 1948: "There has been a good deal of talk of outlawing the Communist Party. Of course, under our Constitution, we cannot and should not make it illegal for an American citizen to think communism or express his opinions as long as he does not advocate a violent overthrow of the Government. We cannot afford, if we are going to maintain freedom in this country, to violate the Constitution. We would be killing the very liberty which it is the purpose of our whole policy to preserve against totalitarian attack."

Dwight D. Eisenhower, installation address as president of Columbia University, the expression of his administrative policy, October 12, 1948: "There will be no administrative suppression or distortion of any subject that merits a place in this university's curricula. The facts of communism, for instance, shall be taught here—its ideological development, its political methods, its economic effects, its probable course in the future. The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement if the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism, or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease.

"Who among us can doubt the choice of future Americans, as between statism and freedom, if the truth concerning each be constantly held before their eyes? But if we, as adults, attempt to hide from the young the facts in this world struggle, not only will we be making a futile attempt to establish an intellectual iron curtain, but we will arouse the lively suspicion that statism possesses virtues whose persuasive effect we fear."

Wilbur J. Bender, dean of Harvard College, in the March 1949 issue of the Harvard Alumni Bulletin answered those who criticized Harvard for permitting Gerhart Eisler to speak before the John Reed Society: "I know of no faster way of producing Communists than by making martyrs out of the handful of Communists we now have. Forbidding them to speak would be not only treason to the ancient traditions of Harvard and America: It would be proof that we have something to hide, that we have lost faith in our principles and in our way of life. It would be accepting Communist practices in the name of Americanism. * * * I devoutly hope that the time will never come when we are faced with the sorry spectacle of a great university and a great country trembling timorously in fear of the words of a Communist or of a demagogic commentator."

WHAT ABOUT SPIES?

Today, some men devoted to freedom are worried about spies. They would get rid of all the Reds to eliminate the possibility of espionage. We, too, are against spies. But not everyone who is called Red is a spy. And, more important, not all spies announce themselves as Reds. The danger, if any, does not exist with the noisy agitators. The University of Chicago is engaged in secret projects of vital importance to national defense. The university is under surveillance of professional investigators, agents of the FBI and of the military intelligence units. This, we think, is the way to look for spies. The general suppression of Reds is too simple, too amateurish to be effective. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, is against it.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

The Italian navigator has landed in the New World, and the natives are friendly.

In this cryptic message, so legend has it, the news of Enrico Fermi's successful operation of the atomic pile under the grandstand of Stagg field at the University of Chicago was flashed to Washington on December 2, 1942. It meant that the chain reaction worked, and the first unleashing of atomic energy was under control.

The chain reaction made possible the most terrible weapon in history. It created the greatest economic fact of our time. It opened up endless new vistas for scientific accomplishment.

The work on the atomic bomb took great scientists. It also took great courage. Had it failed, the university might have been charged with the most spectacular boondoggle of all time. Or without the adequate calculations and protections which its scientists provided, the university might have

been responsible for blowing up the northern end of Illinois.

The chain reaction is in a sense only a symbol of the working of freedom in ideas. It is no accident that the world's leading scientists wish to work in the free atmosphere provided by a great university. Freedom is the necessary condition of learning and progress.

Its contribution to the successful production of the atomic bomb was but one facet of the university's wartime activity. Its alumni and its staff served valiantly. It provided numerous trained individuals for positions of grave responsibility. Its facilities were mobilized and its activities ranged from interpretation and training in Chinese dialects and the prediction of weather in the Arctic region to the development of numerous protective measures for armed forces personnel. The University of Chicago has been honored by the Secretary of War for contributing materially to the successful conclusion of World War II.

THE MARKET PLACE OF FREE IDEAS

This university was founded and rose to international prominence under circumstances which are possible only in a free and democratic state. Free interchange of ideas, free research, and the right of its faculty members to engage without restraint in the activities dictated by their judgment and their conscience have been protected and encouraged. Out of this freedom have come the renowned contributions of this university to the humanities and to the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the biological sciences.

"The galaxy of Midwest State universities—Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa—could scarcely have come to their current high standards without the compelling influence of the University of Chicago." (Edwin R. Embree, Harper's Magazine, March 1949.)

It was in an atmosphere of freedom that A. A. Michelson, earliest American physicist to win the Nobel Prize, measured the diameter of a star for the first time; James H. Breasted, America's first professor of Egyptology, furthered the understanding and reconstruction of ancient society; Robert A. Millikan won the Nobel Prize for measuring the charge of the electron; Edgar J. Goodspeed achieved the status of the Nation's foremost New Testament scholar; Arno Luckhardt discovered ethylene gas, used as an anesthetic in millions of operations; Frank Billings demonstrated that teeth and tonsils can be focal centers for the spread of infection; Arthur H. Compton won the Nobel Prize for his pioneer work on X-rays; Charles Merriam rose to eminence as a scholar and teacher of American political thought; Arthur J. Dempster isolated uranium 235, the atomic explosive—these men and the host of their distinguished colleagues produced the achievements which have placed this university among the foremost in the world.

"Some day I would like to take a year off, return to Chicago, and write a book about the University of Chicago, which by any reckoning is one of the three or four most outstanding in the world." (John Gunther, Inside USA.)

It is in that freedom that the men of the university work today to find a cure for cancer, to harness atomic energy for peaceful productive use, to widen our knowledge of the social, political, and cultural forces in all human experience, and to train the teachers, the scientists, the scholars, and the enlightened citizens of tomorrow. It is upon that freedom that the future promise of the university is dependent. As Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, wrote in an editorial:

"For it is that environment, rather than any dogma, that represents the real Chicago story. It is impossible to spend any time on the campus without sensing the vitality of true academic freedom—not the academic freedom which limits itself (instead of being limited from without) to stump speeches or political activity, but the academic freedom which Holmes used to call the open market place of ideas. The spirit of independence, particularly as it applies to research, * * * gives Chicago both its dominant characteristics and its chief claim on the future."

To be great, a university must adhere to principle. It cannot shift with the winds of passing public opinion. Its work is frequently mystifying and frequently misunderstood. It must rely for its support upon a relatively small number of people who understand the important contributions it makes to the welfare of the community and the improvement of mankind; upon those who understand that academic freedom is important, not because of its benefits to professors but because of its benefits to all of us.

Today our tradition of freedom is under attack. There are those who are afraid of freedom. We do not share these fears. The University of Chicago needs the support of those who believe as we do.

LAIRD BELL,
Chairman, the Board of Trustees,
the University of Chicago.

APRIL 11, 1949.

UNIVERSITIES AND REDS

(By Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago)

A university is a community of scholars, it is not a kindergarten; it is not a club; it is not a reform school; it is not a political party; it is not an agency of propaganda. A university is a community of scholars.

Freedom of inquiry, freedom of discussion, and freedom of teaching, without these a university cannot exist. Without these a university becomes a political party or an agency of propaganda. It ceases to be a university. The university exists only to find and to communicate the truth. If it cannot do that, it is no longer a university. * * *

In the past 40 years, universities have taken up the study of economics, politics, sociology, and anthropology. They have been endeavoring to create social sciences, which if they can be created may prove as beneficent to mankind as natural science and the technology which rests upon it. In inquiry into social problems, professors have run into prejudices and fears, exactly as they did in studying natural science and theology. * * *

The political and economic views of university faculties are those of a fair cross-section of the community. The views of those who are studying social problems are worth listening to, for these men are studying these problems in as unbiased and impartial a fashion as any human being can hope to study them.

It must be remembered that the purpose of education is not to fill the minds of students with facts; it is not to reform them, or amuse them, or make them expert technicians in any field. It is to teach them to think, if that is possible, and to think always for themselves. Democratic government rests on the notion that the citizens will think for themselves. It is of the highest importance that there should be some places where they can learn how to do it. * * *

The way to make students Red is to suppress them. This policy has never yet failed to have this effect. The vigorous and intelligent student resents the suggestions that he is not capable of considering anything more important than fraternities and football. * * *

Thomas W. Lamont, partner in J. P. Morgan & Co., has advanced another reason for the interest of students in unconventional doctrines, a reason which is doubtless operating, too. Mr. Lamont says, "I hear complaint that our college professors are teaching too much of socialistic theory. That would not be my observation. These are days," says Mr. Lamont, "when among the teaching forces * * * the freest sort of academic freedom should prevail." He goes on: "But to me it is little wonder that many of our students today are radical. * * * The sort of world they have seen," says Mr. Lamont, "is one of chaos."

If Mr. Lamont is right, instead of attempting to suppress free discussion, we should set ourselves to remedy the cause of radicalism, the chaos of the modern world. I venture to suggest the value of encouraging intelligent, calm, and dispassionate inquiry into methods of bringing order out of chaos. That is the American way.

Look at the universities of Russia and see how they have sunk to be mere mouthpieces of the ruling party.

In America, we have had such confidence in democracy that we have been willing to support institutions of higher learning in which the truth might be pursued and when found might be communicated to our people. We have not been afraid of the truth, or afraid to hope that it might emerge from the clash of opinion. The American people must decide whether they will longer tolerate the search for truth. If they will, the universities will endure and give light and leading to the Nation. If they will not, then as a great political scientist has put it, we can blow out the light and fight it out in the dark; for when the voice of reason is silenced, the rattle of machine guns begins.

Essay Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Ohio, is doing a magnificent job for the young people of our State who are in the high schools. Every year the Department of Ohio conducts an essay contest and the winners are brought to Washington to observe the workings of our Government. I am proud of the fact that Hamilton County has produced two more winners, one being Betty Altenau, 4321 West Eighth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, winner in the ninth-grade contest, and Donald J. Goepper, 7244 Beechmont Road, Cincinnati, winner in the twelfth-grade group.

I have read the essays of these two fine young people and concur in the judgment of the leaders of the Ohio Department of the American Legion that these essays on the American way are fine examples of the spirit of our American school children and I believe deserve recognition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The essays follow:

THE AMERICAN WAY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Betty Altenau)

There are probably as many interpretations for the phrase "the American way" as there are for the word democracy. A Communist lays particular stress on the statement that the Soviet Republic alone has a

really democratic form of government. Yet, how many liberty loving Americans would subscribe to that assertion?

Torrents of essays and speeches are produced on Americanism or the American way, which are equally at cross purposes. They prove principally, by their conflicts of views, that most of us are in much doubt today as to what Americanism really is. We say that the American way is opportunity, or democracy, or individualism and a free economy. Those are the three main answers, but unless qualified all three are inadequate and misleading.

If the American way is opportunity, then what about Europe, which gave to the son of a blacksmith the opportunity to become a duce, a paperhanger to become a führer, and the son of a shoemaker to become the dictator of 175,000,000 people from the Baltic to the Pacific. Is that kind of opportunity Americanism? Obviously not. America gives to no citizen the opportunity for any such unrestricted personal assertion of himself. We are in a land of opportunity but of opportunity limited by law.

Nor is the single word "democracy" a complete clue to Americanism. Democracy means simply the rule of the people, which in turn means simply the rule of the majority. Well, we Americans obviously do not believe in unrestrained majority rule. We have a multitude of constitutional provisions to check it. We know that a majority—as in Colonial Massachusetts in its persecutions of the Quakers—can be tyrannical as a monarch. We are a republic and a democracy limited by law. It is a new foundation under individual liberty, and it is vital to the future of every boy and girl like myself.

To me, the American way means that I have the opportunity, the privilege, and the God-given right to choose my own calling in life, and to rise in that calling as far as my ambition, character, and ability will take me. Regardless of my religion, my color, my politics, my social position, I am free to develop whatever capacities I possess. I am not tagged and indexed, as a cog in a huge machine; nor am I simply a symbol of a class, no more and no less. Under the American way I am looked upon as a creature of God, with certain inalienable rights, and I am considered part of the development of a young, earnest, free country.

I am one of many millions our forefathers must have had in mind when they insisted that our country should be free of classes, and that the welfare of those who were less fortunate was a concern of the community. They knew that the sparks of ability, character, and ambition lie in the boys of the log cabin equally with those of the city home. By this opening of all the windows of hope they assured that skill and leadership for the Nation would be refreshed from all the people instead of lodging in a privileged group. It would give to the Nation the whole strength of the race. Every generation would bring new genius and new leadership for its own problems. They knew that the sum of achievements of all the striving, working, free individuals would make the highest total of national progress; a progress which has lifted living scales more than they have advanced throughout all history prior to the advent of the American Republic, a rise that shifted the burdens of production from the backs of men to the machinery they devised.

In humble prayer, I kneel daily and thank my Creator for the privileges of living in America, one of the most fortunate countries He has ever created.

THE AMERICAN WAY—WHAT IS IT?

(By Donald J. Goepper, Cincinnati, Ohio)

The tall buildings, the blue lake, the brownstone house, the cop on the corner, the general store, the rolling carpet of wheat, television at the corner tavern, the volunteer fire department, the draft law; that is the American way. It can never be taken as a definite feasible term, but rather as an ideal, evolved from the minds and lives of great and common men of the past and present. It is the work of such philosophers and leaders as Socrates, Plato, Christ, Lincoln, Washington and Carver.

This ideal exists in America today; even though it is not as apparent, at times, as it necessarily should be, it is always present and basically important. It is aptly illustrated in the average small town, with its few stores, school, and varied churches, its Saturday night at the show and then Sunday morning at church.

The American way is understanding among men, harmony and cooperation between peoples of different races, customs, and opinions. In reality, it is democracy at work and the fundamental concept of democracy is a belief in the inherent worth of the individual, in the dignity and value of human life. Based on the realization that every human being is endowed by God with certain undeniable rights, democracy is the proudest possession of every American. It is brought about by a free society, a society necessarily composed of free citizens. But men are not free solely because they are democratic. Freedom is a function of the mind and the spirit. It flows from strength of character, firmness of conviction, integrity of purpose. It is channeled by knowledge, understanding, and the exercise of discriminating judgment. Free men are men who not only insist on rights and liberties, but who, of their own free will, assume the corresponding responsibilities and obligations.

The American way has been derived from these basic ingredients in democracy; the right of all men to equality of opportunity, the equal right of all citizens to vote and to hold office, the rights of religious liberty, freedom of speech and all forms of expression, freedom of association, freedom from want and fear and ignorance, the obligation of the majority in power, to respect and protect the rights of the minority.

We in America owe a debt to our forefathers that can never be repaid. But in a greater sense those men made their sacrifices for a definite love of country and did not expect compensation. For this we should be thankful; this debt of the American way could never be repaid.

The American Way—What Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Bobby Grear, of South Solon, Ohio:

THE AMERICAN WAY—WHAT IS IT?

(By Bobby Grear, South Solon, Ohio)

Many great writers and statesmen have attempted to express what we mean by American, but there is within that word a feeling, not capable of being weighed, which reaches to the soul of our people.

The American way means more than life on a continent bounded by two oceans; pride of military power; glory in victories; vast expanse of farms; great factories, mines, and magnificent cities, it is freedom of mind and spirit in man. It is moral and spiritual quality in free men which fulfill the meaning of American. It is more than pride, power, and tradition; it is the right to worship God, to be a good neighbor, the right to bring to your children greater comfort, better education, good food and tender care, and to open to them wider opportunity.

The American way is like a powerful magnet which attracts the downtrodden and oppressed people from other countries. It is like a great workshop with leadership in inventions, commerce, and industry which makes life for the common man and woman happier and richer. There is no place on the whole earth, except here in America, where all the sons of man can have this chance in life.

The American way is fulfilling the aims of the Constitution of the United States of America and can best be described by what is meant by the Preamble to the Constitution.

First, in order to form a more perfect union, it is for us today, by understanding and friendship for the people of all the parts of our country, to honor, uphold, and put into practice the ideal of our forefathers. We seek not only our own betterment but the betterment of all, the good not only of our own group, our own section, our own State, but the good of the United States.

The Constitution gives us the rules for establishing justice, which means that each person should be secure in the rights the Constitution has ordained.

We can be sure of domestic tranquillity only when we put aside all kinds of quarrels and bitterness; when we are done with strikes and lock-outs; when our own capital and labor learn that each prospers only when they work in cooperation.

The common defense means protection from internal violence and external aggression. Police guard our homes, but we are free from search. Military forces keep foes away. We want no useless wars of destruction and we must work for peace among nations.

The general welfare is the good life of one and all. Dangerous work must be made safe; fair wages must be earned and paid to all in industry; education must be improved and extended, and each must have full opportunity to develop into his best self.

Our liberty is bounded by the lawful rights of our fellows. The blessings of liberty belong to this and all generations as a sacred trust, which we must hand down unimpaired to the next generation, and they to the next.

The American way is a hope to continue to use our commanding position among nations to champion the cause of world peace; it is the hope of the world.

Spendthrift Guardian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, most States wisely provide for the appointment of guardians to manage the affairs of spendthrifts.

The laws of the State of Wisconsin define spendthrifts as those "persons who, because of gambling, idleness, or debauchery of any kind are unable to attend to business or thereby endanger their health, life, or property, or that of others, or waste their property so as to endanger their or their families support."

I submit that it is unfortunate that no provision exists for the appointment of a spendthrift guardian for the present administration.

The administration's socialized medicine bill is evidence that this administration is unable to attend to business and is endangering the health, life, and property of the Government and the people of the United States.

I ask the Members of the House to examine this bill. In all of its 163 pages, and 7 titles, there is not one word pertaining to the expected cost of this proposal. In all of its 163 pages and 7 titles, there is not one paragraph providing the revenue to pay for the benefits it describes so glowingly.

The authors admit they have not estimated the cost of this legislation. They contend that it cannot be estimated. We know that it will be enormous. The bill has been drawn in such a way as to bypass the House Ways and Means Committee in order to avoid any reference to its costs or the taxes proposed. Any person, or administration, which would seriously propose such legislation without a careful analysis of where and how we are going to find the money to pay for it is legally and morally incompetent, within the full meaning of any spendthrift statute.

Our country and its people must be protected against the follies of spendthrift administrations. Our economy, our political institutions, our form of government are in jeopardy because of incompetence. We really need a spendthrift guardian right now.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 6

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Secretary of Defense brought into being in 1947, the committee on civilian components, commonly known as the Gray board, which committee was directed by the Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive, objective, and impartial study of the armed forces; and

Whereas said committee on civilian components on June 30, 1948, in its report to the Secretary of Defense, recommended, among other things, that national security required that all services have one Federal Reserve force, which should be accomplished:

(a) By establishing the Reserve forces of the Army under the "Army clause" of the Constitution;

(b) By similarly establishing the Reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

(c) By incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of the "National Guard of the United States";

(d) By incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve under the name of the "United States Air Force Reserve"; and

Whereas on December 15, 1948, the Secretary of Defense recommended to the President of the United States, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard and greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, and allocation of money to the States; and

Whereas the National Guard performed in a highly creditable manner in World Wars I and II; and

Whereas, the several States have need for the National Guard as a military force to cope with disaster therein, and for the internal security thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Congress and the President of the United States hereby are memorialized, unless the very security of the Nation otherwise require, to retain intact the National Guard of the United States, ground and air, as it now is organized under the militia clauses of the Constitution of the United States and thus reserve to the States the controls provided by the Constitution in time of peace and ensure that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the respective States in time of peace; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial forthwith be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and the Members of the Oregon delegation in the Congress.

Maryland's Program of Vocational Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Maryland was one of the first States in the country to establish a permanent program of vocational rehabilitation. It was my privilege in 1942, as Governor of the State, to make available increased funds for needed expansion of facilities and for additional personnel and, in 1943, to bring the State legislation and appropriations into line with Public Law 113 of the Congress, so that work in this vital field was advanced immeasurably.

The accomplishments of our State in this field are depicted in an address of Mr. Tasker G. Lowndes, able president of the Maryland State Board of Education, delivered on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary dinner of the board. Mr. Lowndes is one of Maryland's outstanding citizens and has made a splendid contribution to the educational system of our State.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Gov. Albert C. Ritchie signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act 20 years ago this month, Maryland became the forty-first State to establish a division for the training and placement of disabled adults. Before this important step was taken in 1929, however, considerable spade work had been done by several interested individuals and agencies over a period of 6 or 7 years. Most active in the movement for a vocational rehabilitation program in Maryland was Mr. Charles W. Sylvester, assistant superintendent for vocational education in the Baltimore city schools. Through his efforts, the 1924 session of the general assembly created the vocational training and rehabilitation investigating committee. He was named chairman; Mrs. Marie Bauernschmidt, secretary of the Public School Association of Baltimore, was made secretary; and five other persons representing labor, management, and the legal profession were appointed. With valuable assistance that was rendered by Mr. John A. Kratz, Director of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the United States Office of Education, this committee was able to make a comprehensive report to the State legislature in 1926. It was not until 3 years later, however, that a bill creating the division of vocational rehabilitation in the State department of education was passed.

Unlike most of the laws of the other 40 States, the one in Maryland established a permanent program and provided that the general assembly should supply sufficient funds from time to time to fully effectuate the purpose of the act. It accepted the provisions of the Smith-Bankhead Act of Congress making Federal funds available to the State on a 50–50 matching basis, and thus began a State-Federal partnership in human welfare that has paid tremendous dividends. But the law had several glaring weaknesses: It was restricted to the physically handicapped; it excluded the home-bound; there was no provision for medical treatment, living maintenance, or placement equipment. Whenever such services were needed to supplement vocational training, they had to be secured from other agencies. Unfortunately, an amendment was attached which limited the amount to be appropriated to $5,000 a year for the first biennium, and specifying that not more than $15,000 might be appropriated for any year thereafter.

On September 1, 1929, the supervisor of vocational rehabilitation assumed his duties with the State department of education. During the remaining 10 months of that fiscal year, 113 disabled persons were inducted into service, and the amount of money spent for all purposes was $3,376 from State funds and $3,035 from Federal funds. In spite of the fact that at least a year is required for the successful rehabilitation of a disabled person, 5 of the 113 clients of 1929 had completed their training and were placed in satisfactory employment on June 30, 1930. It is very gratifying to me to note that four of these first rehabilitants are still satisfactorily employed; the fifth worked successfully until his untimely death 3 years ago. The combined income of these first five over this 20-year period has been greater than the entire amount spent by the State for the promotion of the program during the years 1929–42.

So much for the beginning. Let me sketch briefly the high lights of our program from then until now.

In 1932 the first counselor was employed and assigned full time to Baltimore city. In the same year the State appropriation was increased to $10,000; the number of clients

served was 245, and the number rehabilitated, 41.

The next milestone was reached in 1934 when we were able to add three more counselors with Federal funds appropriated through the Emergency Relief Administration. In 1935, the Baltimore public schools added a counselor to render rehabilitation services to all physically handicapped present and former students between the ages of 16 and 21. At a special session in 1936 the general assembly removed the limitation that had been placed on State appropriations when the act was passed, and at the regular session the following year it increased the annual grant from $10,000 to $15,000.

A great step forward was made in 1942. In that year, the State appropriation was increased to $25,000 annually, a district office was established on the Eastern Shore, two additional counselors were added to the State-wide staff, and the State board of education established vocational rehabilitation as a separate division in the department.

It was in 1943, however, that vocational rehabilitation as we know it today was born. Congress amended the Federal act through the passage of Public Law 113, in which Federal funds were made available for 100 percent of the administrative and supervisory costs of State programs, and for 50 percent of all costs of case services. The provision of the act which limited service to the physically disabled was removed, and authority was given for the payment of living maintenance, medical or surgical treatment, and the procurement of placement equipment. Maryland amended her act that same year to keep pace with this new concept of the rehabilitation of all types of the disabled, and developed a plan of cooperation with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation which encompassed the various provisions of Public Law 113. The legislature increased the annual appropriation to $25,000, and since that time every dollar granted by the State has been spent on actual case service costs.

In June of 1944, a specially trained worker who is himself without sight was added to the vocational rehabilitation staff for the purpose of training and placing blind workers on industrial jobs. Prior to that time all of the work done for the visually disabled had been handled by our regular counselors. This special program has met with remarkable success; 42 blind persons were rehabilitated into satisfactory jobs during the first year of operation, and a similar number have been placed each year since. Two years later an additional blind counselor was employed and the work was divided between Baltimore city and the 23 counties.

In 1945, additional district offices were established in Baltimore city and Hagerstown, in 1946 a district office was established in Hyattsville, and in that same year the legislature increased our annual appropriation to $50,000.

In 1947, we launched upon a special project for tuberculous clients with the aid of the Maryland Tuberculosis Association. A specially trained counselor was assigned to the State sanatoria for the purpose of developing training programs to meet the need of patients who were in physical condition to begin rehabilitation. Another milestone of that year was the increase in our annual State appropriation to $100,000.

In 1948, we established a district office to handle the central Maryland clients, and a local office in Chestertown to serve the four uppermost counties of the Eastern Shore. With the opening of these two branches, we completed the decentralization program which was begun in 1942, thus extending the benefits of counseling, training, and placement services directly to the home communities of the disabled citizens of our State.

Concerning the present status of vocational rehabilitation in Maryland, I should like to quote from a report of a recent survey completed by the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: "There are two characteristics of the Maryland agency which are pertinent to these 1948 fiscal operations. The first is that the expansion of the program has been steady and consistent, with emphasis on maintaining established standards in staff training and quality of case services. The second is that over a period of years Maryland has, more than the average State, emphasized careful survey and use of local facilities, and thus has held down its per case * * * expenditures for case services."

What of the future? In submitting to the Bureau of the Budget our request for appropriations during the fiscal year of 1950, we stressed the importance of extending vocational rehabilitation services to two groups which have not yet been reached; namely, the mentally handicapped, and the severely disabled or home-bound. Each of these groups presents special problems that must be handled by specially trained counselors, and the services required for their ultimate adjustment are frequently more costly than the so-called regular program can provide. Experts in the field of the mentally handicapped have stated repeatedly that no program for these persons is complete without proper vocational guidance and training, and satisfactory job adjustment. Our division of vocational rehabilitation is the only agency in Maryland, public or private, that is equipped to do this job, and our main objective for 1950 is to reach out into that field.

The appropriation of funds for erection of buildings and the improvement of physical facilities at tuberculosis sanatoria and mental hospitals is most essential, but that is only the first step. Unless sound and adequate provision is made for the restoration of the patient to reasonably satisfactory vocational adjustment under normal conditions, then our hospitals will remain simply custodial institutions. We want to help make them rehabilitation centers, and we shall seek continuously for the necessary financial aid from the State with which to provide trained counselors and to purchase the required rehabilitation services.

In closing I wish to express the gratitude of the State board of education to all public officials, both Sate and Federal, and to the various private agencies in the fields of health, welfare, and employment for the sincere and wholehearted support which they have given us during the past 20 years. If we continue to work together as a team, then I am sure that the time will soon come when every disabled man and woman in Maryland will have an opportunity to make the greatest contribution of which he is capable.

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April issue of the Typographical Journal pertaining to the right to work:

THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO WORK

One of the main arguments against organized labor making contracts for a closed shop is that it interferes with an individual's right to work. This is an obvious fallacy and the question of an individual's right to work is a tricky one involving both a philosophical and a practical answer. The argument is made by employers because the "statement the individual has a right to work" is instantly appealing. The philosophical application of the statement is rather not that the individual has the right to work but that it is the duty of society to so arrange our economy that there is opportunity for an individual to secure work. Eliminating the question of the closed shop or any organization of wage earners at all, we can approach the question with more clarity. An individual has a right to work only if he finds an employer that is willing to hire him. In this instance the employer has all of the power to say whether or not an individual may work. Certainly that indicates no right to work on the part of the individual.

Those who raise the question of the individual's right to work are actually trying to protect the employer's sole right to hire. The employer does not want to share with a union any part of his power to hire and discharge employees. In the case of the closed shop, the employer has partially restricted his right to hire by voluntarily signing an agreement with a union that he will employ none but their members.

Obviously, it cannot be detrimental to the public policy for a union to share with an employer his absolute right to say whether or not anyone will work for him.

Obviously then an individual has a right to work in any event only if he can get a job. Since an employer may hire whom he pleases regardless of training, religion, race, or creed, it is ridiculous to say that an individual has a right to work which exists separate and apart from the employer's right to hire.

The provisions for the so-called union shop as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act is the first legislative attempt at compulsory unionism and provides that an employer may agree that after a period of 30 days' employment, any employee be required to join a labor union in order to work. This provision preserves to the employer his absolute right to employ whomever he will but coerces the employee into joining the union perhaps against his will and perhaps against the will of the members of the union who may not want to associate with him. Thus the employer is, by law, given authority to select those who will become members of the union. It is easy to see what abuses can be developed through such power in the hands of an employer. Under such a plan an employee is still compelled to belong to a union in order to work but under such circumstances as to nullify the principle involved.

The employer's right to hire individually should certainly not be restricted so that he may not hire collectively, as in the closed shop, since it is the declared public policy to encourage collective bargaining.

The right of an employer to buy only the services of members of a union and the right of members of a union to work only for employers engaging in collective bargaining with their union should not be prohibited.

University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following article from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 25, 1949:

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO SPREADING ITS STORY

(By Herb Graffis)

It's good to get from the University of Chicago background information giving in rather lengthy detail the achievements and contributions of this world-famed establishment. By judgment of competent experts the University of Chicago is rated second or first among American universities. Harvard gets the decision over Chicago in some rounds.

Notwithstanding the magnificent performance of the University of Chicago and the top class of its faculty it is too often placed in the category of a prophet without due honor in its own country. Outside of its association with the development of the atomic bomb the general public of Chicago is inclined, superficially and erroneously, to consider the University of Chicago as an institution where eccentrics flourish.

Perhaps the university doesn't mind. But, in view of the university's able and effective work in popularizing its type of teaching and extending its influence through its radio round table and its boost of the great book courses and night classes, it should be obvious that the school has been trying its level best to make its top scholastic standing of value to Chicagoans who aspire to develop their brains.

Sometimes it has seemed that among the great books which the university recommends for study, How To Make Friends and Influence People might have been ready at the university for some helpful slants on getting the rest of us to appreciate the University of Chicago as its many and great merits warrant. But merely the listing of the school's contributions to higher education, which means all education, is enough to show that if any citizen of Chicago does not recognize the service of the University of Chicago it is more to the disadvantage of that citizen than it is to the university.

I'm ashamed to say I never knew before I saw the background information that the University of Chicago was the first university to operate a regular summer term, to serve with university extension work, to have the junior college idea, to establish the university press operation, to give faculty status to athletic coaches, to have a full-time faculty for its medical school, and to have a dean of women.

Now that the university is beginning to correct the too popular misconception that it is a combination circus and educational institution, we're all going to be stirred into making better use of this tremendous asset.

Coordinated Development of Pacific Northwest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association, meeting in Aberdeen, Wash., on March 6, 1949, passed a very important resolution concerning power and resource development in the Pacific Northwest. The imperative need for a new legislative charter to assist in achieving the full and coordinated development of the region's resources is emphasized in the resolution. This need will be met by enactment of the CVA bill (H. R. 4286) which I have introduced in accord with President Truman's special message calling upon the Congress to create a Columbia Valley Administration. I include the resolution as part of my remarks:

Resolution on Pacific Northwest regional development

Whereas the development of power generation and transmission, and the conservation of natural resources in the Pacific Northwest is essential and necessary to the economic health of this region, representing 13 percent of the land area of the United States; and

Whereas such power generation and transmission is vital to the national security program because of the importance to the chemical and light metals industries; and

Whereas a planned, coordinated, and sustained development is not possible under present statutes; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association meeting in Aberdeen, Wash., this March 6, 1949, That—

1. The Congress authorize by statute a long-range, integrated construction program which will adequately provide for power generation and transmission, navigation, flood control, and irrigation needs of the Pacific Northwest;

2. The Congress provide by statute a long-term financing program for such construction, the financing to be on a sustained basis so that funds will be available at a rate and volume commensurate with the most efficient development of the program;

3. The Congress authorize by statute the application of modern management methods to Columbia Basin development so that the program can be planned and operated on a coordinated basis;

4. That provision be made for a maximum degree of local autonomy in such programing consistent with national objectives.

The Woman Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article from the April 17, 1949, issue of the American Weekly entitled "The Woman Pays" by Sally Young, beauty editor:

THE WOMAN PAYS—UNCLE SAM COLLECTS A 20-PERCENT LUXURY TAX ON SUCH ITEMS AS COLD CREAM AND LIPSTICK, WHILE SHAVING CREAM AND RAZOR BLADES GO TAX FREE—IS THAT FAIR?—ASK THE WOMEN OF AMERICA

(By Sally Young)

Is lipstick a luxury?

"No!" says REVA BECK BOSONE, the volatile Congresswoman from Utah. "I'd sooner leave off my girdle than be without my lipstick."

Is a handbag a luxury?

"No!" says Mrs. CECIL HARDEN, the new Republican Representative from Indiana. "My suit has no pockets, while every man has at least nine."

Are talcum powder, baby oil, deodorants, cold creams, electric light bulbs, flatirons, telephone calls and wedding rings luxuries?

It's up to you—women of America—to answer that question.

If you're like the women I get letters from, I know your answer is a great big "No."

What can you do? Sit right down and tell your Congressman how you feel about paying luxury taxes on necessities.

Tell your Congressman it's high time these nuisance taxes, which were enacted as a war measure, be repealed. The war has been over almost 4 years. Congress promised to remove these taxes 6 months after the war. Tell your Congressman to keep that promise.

The time to write that letter is now, because the 20-percent luxury taxes should be up for consideration about the time you read this.

Tell your Congressman you want the luxury taxes which discriminate against women repealed.

The American Weekly has just interviewed the 25 members of the House Ways and Means Committee. This is the committee in which all tax legislation must originate.

Virtually all of these 25 committeemen admitted that the 20-percent luxury tax is unfair.

But will they do something about it?

WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, told me he sees no hope of relief this year.

JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, ranking member of the committee, said the committee was at the time occupying itself with other matters and he could make no statement on what would happen to the excise tax.

Others said, "The President wants more money. We've got to get it from some place."

And so it's the poor working girl and housewife who foots the bill.

The woman who can afford a $1,000 evening gown doesn't pay a tax.

But if the working girl wants a $300 fur coat she's taxed $60.

At first sight a fur coat may seem a luxury. But 80 percent of the fur coats in this country sell for less than $800.

The girl who buys one usually does so because she wants to keep warm. Also because a fur coat is serviceable. It lasts her 3 to 6 years. And she can wear it anywhere, to work in the daytime and for dates at night.

Working girls don't earn as much as men. Then why should their things be taxed so heavily? Why tax cold cream and lipstick 20 percent while shaving cream and razor blades go tax free? It's unjust.

All the committee members aren't deaf to your plea.

Congressman J. M. COMBS, Democrat, of Texas, conceded that a woman's cosmetics were not a luxury. "To stay young is essential," said he.

Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, of Ohio, admitted his wife had also been needling him about the unfair taxes on purses and cosmetics, and so, for the sake of peace in the family, he's in favor of doing something about them.

STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, stated, "As a member of the Ways and Means Committee I will do my utmost to remove unjust excise taxes and to impose fair taxes. Taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. I am very much opposed to these excise taxes which were imposed as a wartime measure. The war is over."

The unfairness of these taxes was brought home to him recently, he said, when he bought his wife an expensive cloth coat on which there was no tax, and then bought his granddaughter an inexpensive fur coat on which there was the 20-percent tax.

JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, also admitted he had recently felt the bite of the luxury tax when his wife had to rush home to attend a funeral in her family.

The tax on her transportation came to $40.

DAN REED, Republican, of New York, is one of the committee members who has introduced a bill to lower these taxes.

Mr. REED proposes to take the excise tax off certain items, such as baby oil and handbags and reduce other luxury taxes from 20 percent to 15 percent. He figures this could be done despite President Truman's budget increase, if Government expenditures were cut a mere 1 percent.

"The main thing," he said, "is to budge these taxes before they become imbedded, like cigarette taxes now are."

Two other commiteemen, Minority Leader JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, have bills before the committee which would repeal the war-tax rates, putting the prewar taxes back into effect.

This would mean no tax on handbags, and in the case of cosmetics an 11-percent tax on the manufacturer's price.

Mr. MARTIN'S bill would have no tax on jewelry under $25.

* * * * *

In a personal interview, Mr. DINGELL went on to say that he considered the excise taxes unfair and discriminatory against women and wanted something done as soon as possible.

Talking about cosmetics he said, "I consider paint on a woman's face much more essential for morale and good looks than paint on a barn."

On that point many doctors would agree with Mr. DINGELL, for they know about the psychological effects of make-up. When a woman has had an operation, or is past the crisis of a severe illness, one of the first things her nurse offers her is her make-up materials—even if she doesn't think of them first and ask for them herself. As soon as a woman makes herself look better, she feels better—and often that is a big help in making her get better. In some mental institutions, beauty parlors have been established because they have been found to be a definite aid in improving the morale of women patients.

Used in those ways, are cosmetics a luxury? They sound more like a necessary healing treatment.

The British Government, even during its darkest war days, couldn't afford to shut down all manufacture of cosmetics. They learned only too quickly that a woman without her lipstick is a woman without morale.

Not long ago it was reported that in China lipstick thievery and black marketing was going on in the highest strata of society. No hostess dared leave her lipstick unguarded on her dressing table. If she did, she was likely to find a sizable bit of money in its stead. Little comfort that, in a country where money is more easily come by than a new lipstick.

With certain variations the bills presented by Congressmen AIME J. FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island, and JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican of Wisconsin, both committee members, follow the lines of those mentioned.

Most of these bills are aimed at putting the tax back to prewar levels.

But there are two bills before the House that would repeal all luxury taxes completely. Both were presented by ABRAHAM MULTER, Democrat of New York, who is not a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

He's from Brooklyn and his constituents are working girls who need lipsticks to get and hold their jobs. He wants to repeal all excise taxes on luggage, jewelry, furs, cosmetics, light bulbs, travel and communications.

Mr. MULTER stated that he offered his bills in the interests of fairness to women and better business.

He cites the figures on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, and so forth, as estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue. According to their figures, 1948 revenues from these items had dropped approximately $50,000,000 in comparison with 1947.

The repeal of the so-called luxury excise taxes, he says, will stimulate business and turn out more and better goods, employ more people who can then afford to buy better products.

The wartime luxury tax was levied to do just the opposite: (1) To restrict sales, (2) to conserve raw materials:

Obviously, both reasons are completely outdated.

Business needs a shot in the arm rather than stifling restrictions, MULTER believes, and that's why he is in favor of repeal.

"It's up to the women," he said. "The women of America are a great political force. If they are making fewer purchases because of the taxes, and sit down to write their Congressman about it, he has to listen."

Your Congressman welcomes your letters.

Personal letters carry weight.

The more letters the more likely something will be done about it.

That's what Congressmen themselves told us.

When you've written your letter to your Congressman, there's one more person you ought to tackle.

That's the powerful chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, Congressman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, Democrat of North Carolina.

He is the man who leads the way on any tax plan. His influence is so great it might make or break any move to revise taxes.

He says he is in favor of some revision of excise taxes, and agrees that certain women's items now taxed as luxuries aren't luxuries.

But, he also says, "The money for the President's tax bill has to come from somewhere."

At this rate it will come out of the handbag that is already taxed as a luxury. It will come out of the housewife's budget—for what woman can get or keep a husband these days without her lipstick?

It's taxation without representation in the case of babies whose very health and comfort is taxed as a luxury.

But as one Congresswoman said, "If the men of Congress are honestly interested in taxes let's make them fair. How about a $1 tax on each of their pockets."

Most women in Congress felt the same way.

Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican Senator from Maine, stated she was in favor of revision on a lot of things, including oleomargarine and household appliances.

* * * * *

Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican of New York, said, "We must go back to a peacetime economy. The high excise taxes have been extended long enough—too long."

Most every Congressman and Congresswoman we talked to agreed that women had cause for grievance. They admitted the luxury tax is excessive, is unfair to women, and discriminatory against certain industries.

Was the furrier warned when he started his business that his goods would be taxed far beyond his competitor in the cloth-coat business?

Was the cosmetics manufacturer warned? He might have chosen a less competitive field. Or he might not have worked so hard to give us the best cosmetics in the world.

But what does Mr. DOUGHTON promise us?

The most encouragement we received was that after the social security hearings taxes would be taken up.

Will the various bills that are before the committee get a favorable hearing?

Will something actually be done to take the burden off the working women of America?

Si Rosenthal

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House the heroism of two veterans who did not have to fight. One was Si Rosenthal, my friend and the friend of thousands of admirers, the great Red Sox baseball player, who played in the early 1920's, and made a lifetime batting average of .342. The other is his son who was killed in 1943. His son was under age. Si Rosenthal, determined to avenge that killing, entered the service, although he was over age. His minelayer exploded and he is now paralyzed for the rest of his life. He is the only paraplegic who gave a son in this war. These two men make us grateful because we are Americans.

PARALYZED VET MEETS BOAT BRINGING BODY OF HIS HERO SON

BOSTON, April 27.—The boy who was too young and the father who was too old met again today.

It was a wordless meeting. For Si Rosenthal, former Red Sox baseball player, was in a wheel chair. His son, Irwin, was in the flag-draped coffin that rolled down the South Station ramp.

Si is the only paraplegic veteran in the country who lost a son in the same war. He silently reached out to touch the boy's casket. His wife watched grimly, then collapsed. For Si didn't have to fight. Neither did the boy.

Irwin was under age, but he enlisted in the marines. On Christmas day, 1943, he was killed at Cape Gloucester and Si swore to avenge him.

Si was over age and had to fight to get into the Navy. But he did. And during the Normandy invasion his minelayer blew up and Si was paralyzed from the waist down.

That ended the active career of Si Rosenthal, who patroled the Red Sox outfield in the early 1920's and compiled a lifetime batting average of .342. Now Si lives in a specially constructed house and commutes to Cushing General Hospital for treatment.

Doctors are preparing him for another operation next week. But Si couldn't stay in a hospital today. Irwin was coming home, and it was his twenty-third birthday.

The Taft-Hartley Act In Disguise

REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, even though a man attempts to graft the American rose on the cactus of the desert and sprays it with the sweet perfume of Arabia, he has not blunted the thorns of the desert plant. He may dress a wolf in sheep's clothing, but his astute

action will not restrain the animal from attacking Little Red Riding Hood. Yes, he may even disguise the devil himself by making him lily white, equipped with the wings of an angel that he may soar toward the celestial skies, but his deceptive creation will yet be the old devil.

The Taft-Hartley Act, considered to be the most atrocious, deceptive, ambiguous, and nauseating act ever placed upon our statute books by the representatives of special interests for no other purpose than to break the backbone of organized labor and eventually liquidate the Department of Labor, has won the disapproval of organized labor and the American people in general.

This disapproval has caused the clever designers of the Taft-Hartley Act much agony and they have been shedding croccodile tears about the matter. Millions of dollars have been spent by the agents of special interests in spreading spurious propaganda, questionnaires and deception to confuse and mislead the general public. As a result of their desperation, they have created another slicker in the woodpile, if you please. The Taft-Hartley Act has been made more drastic in every respect and now carries the adopted name known as the Wood bill, the reasons being very obvious.

The majority of this Congress well knows the platform on which it was elected. It is mandated to put an end to all such deception and exploitation imposed on organized labor. If it carries out the mandate of the people, it will render an overwhelming defeat to the Wood bill and pass the Lesinski bill.

Somewhat paraphrasing the words of the great commoner, William Jennings Bryan, I say we cannot press down on the brow of labor a crown of deprivation; we cannot crucify man on an empty stomach. The laboring man believes in the integrity of the human soul and he wants a little more than the horny hands of toil and the deep inscriptions which time does engrave during his efforts to create the wealth of our lands that is produced through the vehicles of soil and toil.

The laboring man believes in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. He cherishes the freedom that was incorporated in our American Constitution for him and it is not his desire to see infringements imposed upon this freedom. The injunction procedure without investigation or just cause, as is permissible under the proposed Wood bill, in my estimation, amounts to the same as permitting the officers of the law to search one's home in the absence of a search warrant. To bar organized labor from financially participating in political elections, at the same time allowing special interests, National Manufacturers Association and various other organizations, to spend millions for selfish promotion of their political philosophy, is an unconstitutional practice under our esteemed Constitution of the United States.

Man's greatest enemy is man himself, and before we can set a pattern of peace and harmony for the world, I deem it necessary to change our way of thinking here at home and provide that type of legislation conducive to promoting brotherly love and the welfare of all our people. The Wood bill would mean further exploitation and confusion. The Lesinski bill is designed to promote harmony and respect. May we, this day on which the eyes of the Nation are focused, build for harmony and good will in this Congress.

Unemployment in Connecticut

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, early in February I called to the attention of this House the growing unemployment situation, particularly in my State of Connecticut. More emphatically did I call the attention of the House to that fact when I proposed an amendment to provide $14,000,000 to be sent back to the States to provide necessary personnel to take care of the growing number of unemployment claims. As in my previous remarks, wherein I stressed the fact that I hoped we were reaching the peak of this unemployment, and I continue in that hope and have great concern that we will reach that point shortly and then have a decline in lay-offs and the unemployment claims. However, I have before me this morning the latest release from Hartford which gives the information that the number of jobless unemployment claims amounted to 75,943 during the week of April 18, to 23, 1949:

The number of jobless claimants for unemployment benefits in Connecticut rose to 75,943 during the week of April 18-23. During the previous week there were 71,786 filing and a year ago claimants numbered 27,014. The number filing is the highest in 11 years and was rising steadily since last October when 21,485 were applying.

The Bridgeport office reported the largest group of jobless claimants with 13,147, followed by Waterbury 9,385, New Haven 8,605, and Hartford 7,976. Slightly more than half (52%) of the claim load was in these four offices. The other 15 offices were each under 4,500.

Initial claims, which represent new unemployment, rose to 8,356 from 7,471 for the previous week, and 3,586 for the corresponding week a year ago.

Lay-offs were reported in the following industries: Electric razors 500, electrical appliances and parts 285, hats 225, clocks 175, buckles 120, brass goods 105, sporting goods 100. Other lay-offs varying from 50 up to 100 were reported in telephone equipment, bearings, garment, zippers, rubber footwear, tobacco, and sewing machines industries. Three woolen mills rehired a total of 175.

In the Ansonia district, a manufacturer of small metal objects laid off 20 temporarily.

The Bridgeport office reported lay-offs totaling 145 by two electrical appliance firms and about 50 by a sewing-machine plant with lack of work the reason.

In the Danielson area, an electrical-goods factory laid off 100. A woolen mill was reported to be rehiring from 100 to 150.

In the Hartford office a lay-off of 20 by a dairy company, 50 by a garment shop, and 35 by a special machinery plant.

In the Meriden area, a bearings plant laid of 55 and a communications-equipment firm 90 due to lack of work.

The Middletown office reported that a cosmetics company rehired 20.

In the New Britain area, a zippers factory laid off 50 and buckles company 120 due to lack of work.

In the Danbury area, four hat companies laid off a total of 225 due to lack of work. A machine-products firm laid off 20.

A New London boat company laid off 25 while reorganizing the distribution of work.

In the Norwich area, a canvas cloth company laid off 60 due to lack of orders, and a woolen mill 25.

A Stamford electric-razor firm laid off 500 due to an overstocked inventory.

In the Thompsonville area, two woolen mills rehired a total of 45. A carpet concern laid off 25 and a tobacco company 50 due to lack of work.

In the Torrington area, a sporting-goods concern laid off 100, a clock company 150, and an electrical-appliance plant 40. About 25 from another clock company filed partial claims.

The Waterbury office reported lay-offs of 105 by a brass-goods company, 50 by a rubber-footwear factory, 25 by a clock company, and 25 by a chemicals concern with lack of work the reason in each instance.

Mr. Speaker, because of the many inquiries from my colleagues asking what lines of endeavor are affected, what industries making the greater number of lay-offs, I have given the release in its entirety to the House. Meanwhile, my amendment which was restored by the other body has, as yet, not been acted upon since it is included in the First Deficiency Appropriation bill which is in conference.

Georgia's Last Confederate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta Journal magazine of April 24, 1949:

GEORGIA'S LAST CONFEDERATE

(By Wylly Folk St. John)

Georgia's last Confederate is a spry old soldier of nearly 104, who lives in a little Confederate-gray house in Fitzgerald, Ga.

He is Gen. William Jordan Bush, of Company B, Fourteenth Georgia Infantry. He was a teen-aged private when he fought in the Battle of Atlanta, but he's been an honorary general for years. He is regarded with appropriate awe throughout the State, as the last living Georgian who wore the gray during the War Between the States—the only flesh-and-blood contact with the lost cause that is left to us on this Memorial Day.

The general—who holds in his frail person all the accumulated legend of the gallant rebel-yelling, ragged-uniformed, barefooted army that outfought the Yankees but lost the decision on points—enjoys his distinction to the full. Any battle you mention, he remembers in detail, with a sly twinkle that tips

you off to the fact that while he might not have actually been in that battle, it's up to him as the last Confederate to do the honors for all the boys in gray who were there. He demonstrates with a rusty bayonet how he fixed any number of Yankees, and points out his various battle-scars with glee.

Fitzgerald is a wonderful town for the last Confederate to live in. It was settled, they say, by "some real nice Yankees" shortly after his war. The hotel is called the Lee-Grant, and the original streets were named half for Confederate and half for Federal generals. A month or so ago, the town council voted to name a street also for General Bush.

Called Uncle Josh by half the town and Daddy Bush by the other half, the General is Fitzgerald's most famous and most carefully-taken-care-of citizen. The U. D. C. offers him everything he could possibly want to make him comfortable; the State patrol drives him home in state when he's out late; the ordinary not only brings him his pension check but also the $75 to cash it with; he is always being asked for pictures and autographs; and he gets sheaves of fan-mail. He's senior deacon of his Baptist church, and received his "diploma" as a Mason in 1888. He goes to the Masonic meetings, too. "He stays out until 2 a. m.," says his wife fondly, "and tells me he's been to lodge meeting—and expects me to believe it!"

For a man who'll be 104 next July 10, Uncle Josh is astonishingly vigorous. He can read his Bible without his glasses, he can hear well with no artificial aid, his blood-pressure is perfect and his heart's O. K. He can still dance a jig if you dare him to. He sings Dixie in his quavery brave old voice, also a pseudo-battle-song called Kiss that old gal right square on the mouth. He likes apple pie better than anything else to eat, and the doctor condones it, saying the General will outlive him. Uncle Josh's goal is 120, but he sees no reason to stop there. He has a favorite old rocking chair with a calico cushion in the back, but he doesn't stay in it much. Until a few years ago, he walked downtown every morning to talk over old times with his friends. Now, he has to call a taxi, when his wife's back is turned. Sometimes, when Mrs. Bush, who teaches the sixth grade, misses him, she finds out he has dressed up by himself and "gone out with the girls"—to a U. D. C. meeting. Mrs. Bush has celebrated her twenty-seventh wedding anniversary with the General, whom she married when he was 76 and she was 34. He lived with his first wife 48 years before she died, and had 6 children, 2 of whom are still living. He has 11 grandchildren and more great-grandchildren than he can count. He still handles his own money, giving his wife what she needs for the bills.

As proof of his amazing vitality, he points out that his snow-white hair is turning black again—and if you look closely you can indeed see fresh black hairs in it and in his warrior mustache. He has one fierce blue eye, that glares when he talks about the Yankees and is full of Irish fun when he talks about the girls.

When the Bushes went to see the movie of Gone With the Wind, the General declared that the Battle of Atlanta in the picture was "just like it really happened." When he went to the cyclorama he pointed out in the painting the very tree he was behind, "shootin' like hell" while the battle raged. Mrs. Bush says he almost got violent at the sight of his old enemies, and she had to restrain him from a new charge. "When he saw Sherman on that horse he said, 'Let me at him,' " she reports.

Uncle Josh was a bare 16 when he joined the Gray army. "I told a lie to get into it, and I'd have told another to get out," he says, and then immediately retracts, "No, I wouldn't, either. I fought to the end and I wouldn't have done any other way." He was "near about" the whole time with General Gordon, but part of the time with General Johnston. When asked if the young army did much training before it went into battle, General Bush retorts, "We didn't waste no ammunition practicin'. When we shot, we shot to kill. In them days we didn't have airplanes—it was hand-to-hand fightin'." He brought home a big Confederate flag from the last Gettysburg reunion and he carries it in all the Memorial Day parades.

Until a few years ago there was also one Union veteran left in Fitzgerald, Henry Brunner. On Memorial Day the two old soldiers would go to the cemetery together and put flowers on the graves of their fallen comrades, General Bush decorating the northern graves and General Brunner the southern. When his friendly enemy died, General Bush sent a wreath "from the last of the gray to the last of the blue."

Now General Bush has to place, tremulously, the flowers and laurel wreaths for both of them. There will be tears, no doubt, when emotional southern ladies see his lone indomitable figure car-borne in the parade this year, the last Confederate, wearing his Gettysburg medal and carrying his Confederate flag.

But the small, bent general will not be mournful. He will be gay and gallant, lifting his soft black Confederate-style hat, bowing to the girls as a southern gentleman of spirit does. He will keep up the tradition of Jeb Stuart and Beauregard and the courtly Lee. He will wave his valiant flag as though it were undefeated, while the band plays Dixie this one more time for him, on Memorial Day.

The other men in gray are all gone. Now, at the cemetery, when the bugle softly plays Taps, it is for all the Confederates—except Josh Bush.

There is no other man left alive in Georgia today who fought in '61. It is a lonely eminence.

Here is Georgia's last Confederate.

Taft-Hartley Act

REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, what many Members of this House fail to recognize in their consideration of the Taft-Hartley Act and in the now proposed Wood bill is that this is a grave moral question.

Some who have spoken here today have termed it a philosophical question. This is not correct, for a philosophy may be godless. All labor legislation concerns the dignity of man and must recognize that man has been created by God in His own image and likeness. Hence, all legislation affecting the rights and dignity of mankind must be based on the tenets of Judo-Christian theology.

Labor, and I use the capital L, is an army of 60,000,000 American men, women, and in some cases children. They are human beings who have been given definite rights and attributes by God, Himself, and when unjust penalties are inflicted upon these people an answer must be made to God. These are the people who are the backbone and foundation of the American Nation. For many years in our history they were not recognized as individuals who had both God-given and constitutional rights. They were bartered as if they were a commodity. They were deprived of just wages. They were mulcted by company stores and were harrassed by company police. Further, they were not permitted the right of collective bargaining and could do nothing to further the cause of their families or class. In many instances they and their children were dedicated to a continuing life of poverty which precluded them from education and security. The result was that the Nation contained a vast horde of people without hope and also without purchasing power.

Certain heroic individuals, recognizing the plight of the laboring people after a long struggle, succeeded in unionizing several million of the American workers. These workers, discovering their newly acquired strength and not forgetting the indignities to which their class had been subjected, determined that their spokesmen in the legislative halls of the Nation should do something to alleviate the plight of more than half of our people. That is how the Wagner Act came into existence. During the debate on that measure in these Halls it was said time and time again that nothing but economic chaos could result from its passage. However, we who have lived through the days when the Wagner Act was the law of the land know that it was one of the media that brought unparalleled prosperity to our people and to the Nation. It was during these days that so many American citizens acquired their own homes, cars, refrigerators, electrical appliances, and many other devices that made our standard of living the envy of the world. Each material gain that the workingman received was a benefit for the banker, the farmer, and for every other group. On the moral side, there came a more adequate flowering of democracy itself.

The rights guaranteed under the Constitution, but which were often partially or fully denied to the citizenry, were now recognized. Class, social, and religious distinctions were slowly but surely wiped out. The opportunities for progress denied by birth were now available so that millions of our working people were able to give to their children a higher standard of education than they themselves had received.

The first successful blow at these new-found freedoms was the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act is nothing more than a penal code with all of its penalties directed at labor. Its enactment was and is still considered by the foes of democracy as the opening wedge to the return of the semifeudal state in which labor existed in the latter part of the last century and the early part of the present one.

Today this House is faced with this question: Shall man's inherent dignity be recognized, or shall he be considered nothing more than another commodity on the market? Shall this House hinder the progress of democracy, or shall this House vote to return to a law which will once again make the American workingman and the American Nation the envy of the world?

Potable Water for Domestic, Industrial, and Agricultural Purposes Is Possible From the Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the history of the development of the West has been the history of the continual struggle of man for water, water to keep alive, water for the production of food, water to produce the power to move the wheels of industry.

Water has shaped the development of the West, boomed areas where it could be found, retarded those where it was absent.

As the ingenuity of Americans developed, irrigation methods have kept pace. Water is piped to the cities of California distances of hundreds of miles. Huge irrigation canals create small rivers for the irrigation of farmland. And from these developments and extension of irrigation, the arid desert has become a garden spot yielding major crops that contribute an important share of the Nation's food supply.

But today the far West is an expanding country. Population growth during and since the recent war has been phenomenal and the needs of the people for water in the great industrialized areas of population are already overtaxing existing water supplies and threatening serious water shortages in the future.

And, as in the past, the supply of water will surely change the history of the West, curb and limit its expansion, if new sources of water cannot be utilized.

If new sources of water can be found, the possibilities of development and expansion in the West are unlimited. Untold acres could be reclaimed from the desert and converted to agriculture, and new communities would spring up from the waste land.

The search for water sources is being diligently pursued, and various suggestions have been offered and plans developed. Among others is a proposed vast redistribution of the waters of the Columbia River and even of the Mississippi River.

These suggestions are not without merit and could apparently be utilized to some extent, if no other sources of water could be developed. But the methods of such redistribution of river water would obviously include the building of great dams and the piping of water over distances of a thousand miles.

Such a system would be subject to break-downs, would require constant maintenance, and would be extremely vulnerable if war should ever threaten this country.

It is, therefore, vitally necessary that new sources of water to be devoloped are reasonably close to the area to be supplied and are either sufficiently dispersed or can be protected for security purposes.

Along the shores of the United States lies the world's greatest source of water, the ocean. And the conversion of sea water to domestic purposes is no idle fantasy, but is an accomplished fact. The only barrier to the utilization of the vast resources of the sea has been the prohibitive cost of its processing.

During World War II, in spite of this large cost, it was necessary for the United States Navy to produce millions of gallons of domestic water by the distillation of sea water, and according to the Army Engineers, all the information on the conversion of sea water into fresh water by distillation and by chemical processes which was developed during World War II shows the feasibility of obtaining fresh water from sea water.

The only obstacle to the large-scale production of water suitable for irrigation and domestic uses is the present high cost. And this is an obstacle which should not be too difficult to surmount once the full forces of scientific and technical knowledge and skill is focused upon it, and adequate experimental and demonstration plants constructed.

I have introduced H. R. 3650 to authorize the construction and operation of the necessary demonstration plants for this purpose, and I believe passage of this legislation would be one of the greatest contributions of the Eighty-first Congress to the Nation's progress. Once a satisfactory and economical method of conversion of sea water is developed, it can be utilized as a supplemental water supply for almost every part of the country and can banish permanently the destruction that walks hand in hand with extended drought.

Not only the West will be freed from water shortages, but cities on the eastern seaboard would utilize the sea to augment their supply which occasionally is inadequate. Recently the city of New York found it necessary to urge water conservation to avert water shortage.

Because of the importance of water to the Nation, I urge the favorable consideration of H. R. 3650. If passage of this measure can result in the solution to our water problems and end the bitter struggles for water we have witnessed in the West, there should be no objection to its passage.

Address of Hon. H. E. Aklilou Abte-Wold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by H. E. Aklilou Abte-Wold, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs and Chairman of Ethiopian Delegation to the United Nations:

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, I have taken the floor to address you today on what is the most important problem that has faced my country, since that memorable day when His Imperial Majesty, my august sovereign, addressed the nations of the world met at Geneva on the occasion of the Italian aggression against Ethiopia. The lot of a small country is not an easy one. It is not easy for a small people, however resolute and courageous its leaders, to make its voice heard. We are fortunate, however, in counting among the United Nations represented at this table stanch friends. To those faithful allies Ethiopia remains proudly and eternally grateful.

Ethiopia, who at no time in her long history, has sought aggrandizement at the expense of others, desires nothing more than to live peacefully and independently in her corner of the globe. Without seeking aggression against others we have fought and sacrificed long—and we would like to think courageously—for our independence; an independence, whose long span of life and proud struggle descends from the earliest records of antiquity. I recall in this connection a somewhat picturesque passage of Herodotus which refers to my country and to the mission which that famous conqueror, Cambyses, King of the Persians, had sent to Ethiopia. I am sure that my friend and colleague, the Honorable Delegate from Iran, will not take amiss the following reference to this ancient and glorious leader. Upon reaching the court of the King of Ethiopia, bearing their gifts, the mission was received by the sovereign, who made reply to them as follows:

"The King of the Persians sent you not with these gifts, because he much desired to become my sworn friend—nor is the account which ye give of yourselves true, for ye are come to search out my kingdom. Also your King is not a just man—for were he so, he had not coveted a land which is not his own, nor brought slavery on a people who never did him any wrong. Bear him this bow, and say:

" 'The King of the Ethiopians thus advises the King of the Persians—when the Persians can pull a bow of this strength thus easily, then let them come with an army of superior strength against the long-lived Ethiopians—till then, let them thank the gods that they have not put it into the heart of the sons of the Ethiopians to covet countries which do not belong to them.' "[1]

Our proud and ancient empire was born in the land of Arabia to which we bear today profound attachments and with which our language, written and spoken, bears intimate relation. From Arabia our ancestors migrated across the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden to Ethiopia, passing through and settling in that territory, formerly known as Tigre and today called Eritrea, and also simultaneously through the territory now known as Somaliland. In consequence, our first capital and the cultural and religious center of the empire for over 1,000 years were fixed in the Tigre. Tigre, or Eritrea, was our gateway to the ancient, to the medieval, and to the modern world from the days of Adulis to those of the port of Massawa.

It was only natural, then, that the people of Eritrea should have remained throughout this period identified with us from every point of view: Race, religion, language, culture, habits, and social structure. It was also only natural that this identity should have received recognition throughout the long centuries preceding this day and this moment, when I come before you on behalf of my sovereign and my people. It is, finally, quite understandable that Ethiopia was called to the defense of the people of Eritrea, in particular, against Italian forces, at the Battles of Kaotit, Senafe, Dogali, Amba Alagi, Makalle, and Adua which took place at the

[1] The History of Herodotus, by George Rawlinson, vol. II, published by John Murray, Albemarle Street, London, p. 416, sec. III-21.

end of the last century. I shall not importune you with fastidious recitals of ancient, medieval, and modern documents and authors, who bear testimony to this unity and identity. These facts are available to all who care to glance at that volume Document A/C.1/W.8, distributed by the Secretariat.

The incursion of the Italians, in 1885, therefore constituted the injection of a totally foreign element and a grave diversion of a clear and strong current of national life and tradition. The invasion of Eritrea by the Italians commenced in 1885 and was followed by the three subsequent invasions of Ethiopia of 1894–95; 1895–96, and 1935.

Simultaneously, Italy launches her campaigns of encroachment and aggression against Ethiopia in the territory now known as Italian Somaliland which she likewise constituted as a colony at the end of the last century.

Since those fateful years Italy, not only the Fascist Italy, but also the so-called liberal-democratic Italy, carefully and methodically prepared her eventual mass invasion and occupation of Ethiopia. These attacks, supported by massive armed forces and poison gas, were launched from both former Italian Somaliland and Eritrea in 1935. Between these two jaws Italy sought to crush up Ethiopia in her raging and insatiable hunger for empire.

Let us leave, however, for the moment, the question of the invasion of my country in 1935, to ask ourselves the question what had Italy done during the years following her seizure of these two territories to develop the areas and to promote the welfare of the populations?

I would remind you that the record of maladministration, oppression, stultification and of so-called achievements during this period of 50 years, concerns, quite as much, if not more, the so-called liberal-democratic as the Fascist Italy. Two of the three invasions of Ethiopia were made by this so-called liberal-democratic regime. In Libya, seized, not by the Fascists, but by that so-called liberal-democratic Italy, in Eritrea and in Somaliland, Italian policy, whether under a democratic or under a Fascist regime, remained that which it had consistently been from the start, one of racial hatred, oppression and imperialistic aggrandizement.

It is not my intention, fellow delegates, to deliver a Philippic against Italy in respect of her administration of the former colonies of Eritrea and Somaliland. I have no such intention for the reason, first, that Ethiopia is not motivated by a spirit of hatred or vengeance as regards her traditional enemy, and, second, for the simple reason that I am quite content to let the facts speak for themselves. I do not ask you to believe in or lend any credence to data of Ethiopian sources. In the interest, solely, of achieving a sound and practical solution of the colonial issue, I shall confine myself rigorously to facts from unimpeachable sources, viz, the reports of the commission of inquiry and statements of Italian Government officials. I do not seek to deny that Italy, if only in her own selfish interest and with a view to obtaining colonies of settlement in these desert areas, may have sought to improve conditions. It is, however, apparent that notwithstanding any such efforts, Italy completely failed in her objectives, even though she had 50 years to accomplish them. For reasons that I will adduce somewhat later, I think it will be apparent to all that she could never accomplish them, were she given yet another 50 years for that purpose.

As regards former Italian Somaliland, I would merely remind you that since the Italian Government found itself incapable of assuming the administration of so vast a territory, it passed the responsibility therefor by way of a concession agreement to a company known as the Benadir Co. As the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs at that time stated:

"The Government did not want to spend much money on that colony, and this way out of the difficulty was found as a means of keeping the colony while putting off the real solution of the problem to the distant future. * * * In entrusting the Benadir to a private company, the Government of the time had only one end in view, that of getting it off its hands at any cost."

Under these circumstances, and in view of the maladministration, as well as of the deplorable climate, the Government itself discouraged immigration to Somaliland. At the end of the period of Italy's control, Italians constituted less than one-thousandth of the population consisting of over 1,000,000 local inhabitants, who, according to the publication entitled "The First To Be Freed," prepared by the British Military Administration, entertain "a positive hatred of their ex-masters." Yet, today, Italy claims the return of that territory.

As regards Eritrea, I would remind you of the fact that the Commission of Inquiry of the four great powers has found that the country had been left in an appallingly backward state, notwithstanding 50 years of Italian occupation. Her road communications, according to the report, consisted of earth roads and trucks, and there were no modern roads for vehicles and commercial traffic.

According to the same report, Italy had placed in long-term industrial investment in Eritrea, the equivalent of only $1,000,000.

In the report of the Commission of Inquiry it is stated that—

"At its present stage of development, Eritrea is not in a condition to support its population, even on the basis of minimum requirements" that "Eritrean industry is in its initial stages of development and could only satisfy some of the elementary requirements of the country, the national wealth and revenue at the present level cannot assure the country an independent existence or provide for its development" and that "Eritrea is a backward agricultural and pastoral country and a grain importer."

Consequently, it is not surprising that in this desert region, where Italy has done little, if anything, for the local population or for the development of the territory, there should have been, on the eve of the invasion of Ethiopia and after 50 years of oppression, not more than 5,000 Italians settled in that territory. Today, we have a sorry but striking proof of this fact. At this moment, the British Military Administration is supporting thousands of unemployed Italians to whom the poor country of Eritrea cannot supply opportunities for gaining a livelihood.

For the entire population of Eritrea, the Italians, during their 50 years of oppression, provided only 800 hospital beds or the equivalent of 1 hospital only for the whole country and but 20 elementary schools; whereas had these facilities been supplied in the same proportion as they have beer furnished to the Italian population of Eritrea, the Eritreans would have benefited by no less than 44,000 hospital beds and 1,200 elementary and secondary schools. It is not to be presumed that an Italy which is far poorer than she was before the war, would improve today upon so lamentable a record.

Notwithstanding the almost infinitesimal minority of Italians, such amenities of existence as had been introduced, were, by reason of the racial prejudice which motivated the pre-Fascist and Fascist administrators of Eritrea, denied to the Eritreans themselves. It was this racial prejudice that excluded Eritreans from public cafes, theatres and cinemas and denied to them electricity, water supply and sanitation facilities.

Under the circumstances, it is by no means astonishing that, as I shall subsequently point out, throughout the entire period of Italian occupation, Eritrea has constituted a markedly deficit economy. There is, consequently, reason to concur with former Secretary of State Byrnes, who has recently declared:

"Italy's record of administering the colonies was one of inefficiency and oppression. * * * Investigation disclosed that every year Italy had been in control of the colonies she had incurred financial loss, notwithstanding the fact that her civilian employees were paid pitifully small salaries."

Fellow delegates, as I have already said, it is not my intention to depart from a dispassionate analysis of facts, for the purpose of indulging in any partisan criticism of the Italian regime. However, in order to dispel any suggestion that my remarks might be flavored with any bitter venom against our former enemy, I would refer you to the following statement of Maurizio Rava, Fascist Minister of State, who, in respect of the general Italian position in Eritrea, declared in 1937 (Eritrea e la Somalia, preface by Marshal Badoglio):

"It seemed that these colonies must be a dead weight, a cause of impoverishment. In a word, they were less than useless * * * it appeared that henceforth they had a poor future, reduced almost to the condition of islands without their advantages, deprived of any commercial outlet by the latent hostility of the Ethiopians and the competition of neighboring colonies * * * in short, it might seem that the two colonies of East Africa, and particularly Eritrea, must be preserved for the sake of principle, of national unity, or so that others might not occupy them to our disadvantage, rather than because of any hope of a fruitful result in the future. Today, the two colonies are becoming what they should always have been, the two main outlets of the Empire. Eritrea not only comprises the two important ports of Massawa and Assab, it is also the big market for Ethiopia and particularly northern Ethiopia. Moreover, Eritrea and Somaliland, particularly, of course, Eritrea, are also the outlets to Arabia for the products of Ethiopia."

Marshal Badoglio himself declared:

"The colony of Eritrea, small and poor, with scanty resources and limited possibilities, has led a wretched, poverty-stricken existence, even in the military sense, since 1896."

Why, then, did Italy attach such importance to these desert areas of Eritrea and Somaliland, which had been only a burden to her and which had not served as colonies of settlement? It should be obvious that Italy came into the colonial grabbing contest late by comparison to the other powers with the result that she was left only the choice of invading desert areas in the region of Ethiopia which remained for her for 50 years an unattainable prize. Fellow delegates, I need not importune you with a long recital of evidence and documents which we have at our disposition concerning Italy's aggressive intentions—those not only of Fascist, but equally those of the pre-Fascist Italy—which motivated her retention of these two desert colonies during a period of 50 years for the object of acquiring the rich hinterland of Ethiopia.

It might perhaps suffice merely to refer again to the statement of former Secretary of State of the United States, Byrnes, who has recently declared:

"The colonies had proved of no value to her [Italy] except as a place for military training and, under the treaty we were considering, she would have no need for great areas for training troops."

Likewise, the representative of France observed at the Paris Peace Conference in 1946:

"Italy did not always treat the local populations as she should have. Above all, she transformed these territories into military

bases for the purpose of attacking neighboring countries."

Having thus briefly considered the Italian record in her former east African colonies, we come to the third and last invasion of Ethiopia to which I have referred, invasion carefully and meticulously set up in both Somaliland and Eritrea which then closed as crushing jaws on a defenseless Ethiopia, deprived of access to the sea and the possibility of freely importing arms and subjected to a rain of poison gas against which there was no defense either in the air or on the ground.

Thus after 50 years of pre-Fascist as well as Fascist preparations on the side of the Italians, Ethiopia commenced her long and fateful struggle against the Axis aggressor, a struggle the length of which has been exceeded only by that of the valient people of China. Ethiopia, the first to be attacked in the European theater, was the first to be liberates, now already 8 years ago. It is only proper, therefore, that, under such circumstances, Ethiopia should be the first to receive justice and redressment of the wrongs to which she has been subjected.

Since that liberation, the problem of the former Italian colonies has been fully discussed and rediscussed, not only between and amongst the Big Four, but also amongst all interested states. Italy, the aggressor, has, in fact, been heard more often and fully by the Council of Foreign Ministers than has Ethiopia, her victim. Those hearings commenced in September 1945 and were continued throughout the ensuring year up to and including the Paris Peace Conference.

At the Paris Peace Conference in 1946, the question was again discussed. In view of the support which Ethiopia gained at that conference for her claims to the return of the former Italian colonies in east Africa, and in view of the firm and unanimous insistence of the four great powers that no formula of settlement be included in the treaty of peace, Ethiopia agreed to the postponement provided for by the terms of article 23 of that treaty. This formula provided the four great powers with yet another year to reach a solution.

That year of delay demanded by the great powers became, in fact, a period of 2 years, during which all of the interested states were again heard and reheard. Memoranda were submitted. Discussion followed upon discussion. Italy was heard and reheard. A commission of investigation was sent to these territories and made its reports. The views of the interested states were heard on these reports. New discussions took place amongst the four great powers, ending with the total disunion of the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in Paris in September of last year.

What, then, are the facts and conclusions from all of this long history, which this Assembly must bear in mind, in reaching its decision on the question expressly referred to it by the treaty of peace with Italy, a decision which is of such fateful import for the peoples of the Middle East and of the continent of Africa?

In examining this problem, I must remind you that the question concerns not one, but two territories, namely Eritrea and Somaliland, of vital importance to my country, not only from economic and social points of view but also from the strategic and security points of view. The problems concerning these two interrelated territories are, therefore, necessarily interdependent. Let us endeavor to unravel this skein by turning first to the question of Eritrea. What conclusion may we draw from the preceding remarks?

In the first place, we are dealing with a population identical in its racial, religious, and social patterns with the population of Ethiopia. I have already mentioned the common origins, historical, racial, and political of the peoples of Ethiopia and Eritrea since the period of their migrations across the Red Sea from Arabia. The languages, both written and spoken, of the two territories are intimately related. The written characters remain identical in both countries and the languages retain their intimate connection with the Hamitic and Semitic languages across the Red Sea. National customs in both territories are identical. Family life and village and pastoral communities follow an identical pattern in both territories. Leaders and dignitaries are designated in Ethiopia and in Eritrea by titles indigenous and peculiar to Ethiopia, such as Basha, Blatta, Kentiba, Belatengueta, Grazmatch, Kagnazmatch, Fitaourari, Dedjazmatch, Ras, and so forth. In Ethiopia, as in Eritrea, Christians and Moslem peoples and communities live peaceably and without friction side by side in the same proportions and following roughly the same pattern in both territories.

In consequence, Eritreans definitely are not considered by my compatriots as being foreigners. Would you care to accept some evidence of this statement? For example, Eritreans freely enter Ethiopia without passports or other travel documents and, in fact, many thousands periodically avail themselves of this privilege in order to pass many months of each year on the high grassy plateaus of Ethiopia with their cattle. Eritreans, who have sought repatriation from Italian prison camps or who find themselves destitute abroad, turn instinctively to the Ethiopian Government which unfailingly repatriates them at its own expense.

Under the Italian regime, as I have already mentioned, Eritreans were afforded only the most meager and wretched form of elementary instruction in the 20 small and miserable primary schools which existed in Eritrea after 50 years of Italian oppression.

In consequence, those Eritreans who have benefited by any advanced education or any instruction abroad, have enjoyed those privileges only by the largesse of His Majesty and of the Ethiopian Government. Is it surprising then, that no less than 10 percent of the personnel of the Ethiopian Government are pure Eritreans? These Eritreans occupy posts at all levels of employment in the Ethiopian Government including the Army, the police and the civil services and reaching to the ranks of cabinet ministers and chiefs of diplomatic missions abroad, of whom one, known to you all from many years of conferences, is present in this hall at my side.

When we recall that the entire population of Eritrea is but one-fifteenth of that of Ethiopia, we can see that, notwithstanding the cruel separation imposed by Italian aggression, Ethiopia has already accorded—and for many years past—full measures of representation in the Ethiopian Government to Eritreans. We thus have at hand a large and experienced staff, fully and intimately conversant with all problems of administration in the two areas and ready to assure the reintegration of Eritrea into Ethiopia. Under the regime of Italian oppression, as the report of the Commission of Investigation makes it clear, no such possibilities of political training and experience were afforded to Eritreans. Where else, might I ask, does a comparable situation exist? Where else can a comparable basis be found for the union of two territories?

The second conclusion to which I wish to draw your attention is the fact that according to the report throughout Eritrea, 90 percent of the population is resolutely opposed to the return of Italy in any form. In particular, as regards the three plateau provinces, from 75 to 95 percent of the population are in favor of reintegration into Ethiopia.

It is thus natural, the report of the Commission of Investigation makes it abundantly clear, that by far the largest element in Eritrea urgently demands immediate return to Ethiopia. It would, therefore, seem highly unjust, iniquitous even, to maintain this cruel political separation from Ethiopia, which has only resulted in the repression of representative institutions in Eritrea, and in the vicious policy of political obscuranticism.

The third basic conclusion to which I would wish to draw your attention is the inability of Eritrea to exist as a separate or independent economic entity and its dependence upon Ethiopia. I have already referred in the course of my present remarks to the many statements occurring in the report of the Commission of Investigation as regards the economic insufficiency of Eritrea. Eritrea is a desert country with but limited possibilities for agriculture. The report of the Commission of Investigation states that but 2.6 percent of the area of Eritrea is cultivated. Due to the scanty rainfall and to the porous nature of the soil and rocks, it is difficult, if not impossible, to resort to irrigation or to the impounding of water for storage or hydroelectric purposes. Moreover, the mineral potentialities are markedly restricted. The report bears eloquent testimony to all of these points.

What consequences shall we draw from these basic facts? In the first place, it should be obvious that a grim future of struggle would await any administering authority other than Ethiopia. Eritrea, a desert region, has never been a colony of settlement, the entire European population never exceeding 5,000 settlers before the invasion of Ethiopia. Eritrea can never, in the future, become a colony of settlement for any colonial power. It cannot be imagined that an Italy of whose past inept and futile efforts in administration so much evidence exists, now even more greatly impoverished than before the war, could possibly hope to improve upon such a situation.

In the second place, ever since Eritrea was separated from Ethiopia by the Italian occupation, imports have consistently exceeded exports by approximately 200 percent annually. Abundant data exist on this point, not only from Ethiopian and other sources but also from the report of the Commission of Investigation.

Let us look, however, further into this matter of imports. From all of this data, including the data supplied by the report of the Commission of Investigation, you will note that Ethiopia is by far the largest supplier of all imports into Eritrea, accounting alone for approximately 50 percent of all such imports. And so what, fellow delegates, do these imports from Ethiopia consist? These imports consist almost entirely of foodstuffs essential to keep the population of Eritrea alive. I need not burden you with reference to troubles created over a long period of time among the population of Eritrea by maliciously false rumors to the effect that Ethiopia was from time to time going to cut off the supplies of food to Eritrea. The fact remains for anyone possessing any knowledge of the situation there that no one could hope to administer or would accept the responsibility for administering that territory without being assured in advance of continuous food supplies from Ethiopia.

A third consequence of this economic insufficiency of Eritrea has been the fact that ever since that territory was separated from Ethiopia, the administering authorities, including the British Military Administration to whose disinterested efforts I have pleasure in rendering tribute, have been obliged to resort to heavy subsidies in order to meet the expenses of administration and to keep the colony alive. In this connection, I would invite your attention to the statements on this subject contained in the report of the Commission of Investigation, pages 35 and 48. At this moment the British Military Administration is supporting thousands of unemployed Italians to whom the poor country of Eritrea cannot supply opportunities for gaining a livelihood.

The same comments apply, in particular to the port of Eritrea, Massawa, which is bound by rail with Asmara and by road communications only with Ethiopia, and which serves as the only port of access to and from the northern half of Ethiopia. On the other hand, Assab is but a locality at an indentation on the coast, devoid of all harbor installations and permitting access only to dhows drawing not more than 12 feet of water. Apart from the use of poison gas, the most important single factor contributing to the Italian occupation of my country was the fact that, being cut off from access to the sea, Ethiopia was unable to import the arms necessary for her self-defense.

On the contrary, and this is the fourth general conclusion to which I would invite your attention, Italian interests in this territory are strictly limited. It has never been a colony of settlement or of capital investment, as I have already shown and as the report of the Commission of Investigation clearly points out. The only interest, albeit a highly important one for Italy, is her desire for a base from which to cut off Ethiopia from access to the sea and from which to attack and destroy her by all means within her power. Those means would include not only the eventual mass invasion which we Ethiopians thrice, within a lifetime, victim of Italian lust for empire, do not for one moment doubt would come, but also include economic pressures of all forms rendered possible but cutting us off from the port of Massawa. These economic pressures and threat would be used instantly to build up the inevitable aggression against our country.

As fifth conclusion, I would point out the fact that not only Eritrea but Somaliland have served as bases of attacks and aggression against a peace-loving state. I would remind you that the fateful invasion of Ethiopia was prepared in 1934 from Italian Somaliland and precipitated at Wal Wal in the regions bordering on that territory and that the actual full-scale invasion which was commenced in 1935 was launched simultaneously from both Somaliland and Eritrea. Is it, therefore, a matter of surprise that Ethiopia should consider the solutions to be given to these two territories as intimately related? Thus, Somaliland, the problems of which in so many ways resemble those of Eritrea, cannot be left aside in any solution of the question of Eritrea.

It would appear from the foregoing that Italy had forfeited all right to claim the return to her of that colony. It should be evident, therefore, that the imperial Ethiopian Government cannot agree to, or tolerate, the return of Italy in any form whatsoever to Somaliland. This position is maintained even though following 50 years of gross misrule and oppression, Italy has already, morally and legally, forfeited all right to this area.

For all these reasons, Ethiopia feels warranted in claiming the administration of this area, so long subjected to Italian misrule. The intimate bonds which attach the people of Somaliland to Ethiopia were expressed during the war by the large number of desertions to the Ethiopian armies of Somali troops, who, it will be recalled, had been impressed by force into the armies of the invaders. In the memorandum submitted to the Council of Foreign Ministers in September 1945, will be found a list of these deserter-patriots, as well as names of important officials of the Imperial Ethiopian Government of Somali origin. During the campaign of 1940, the British military forces distributed a proclamation of His Imperial Majesty calling upon the peoples of Somaliland to take up arms against the aggressor and promising them return to their homeland of Ethiopia.

I have already had occasion to point out that the territories of Eritrea and Somaliland were liberated now already over 8 years ago. Since that time, the entire colonial question has been completely and exhaustively discussed by the Big Four and by all the interested states. I will not fatigue you at this time with further reference to the long series of conferences, hearings, memoranda, discussions, rediscussions, proposals, counterproposals, suggestions, and maneuvers which have done little if anything to clarify further a situation already amply clear in itself concerning simple territories and peoples which involve no complications other than the conflict of rival political forces.

The reports of the Commission of Investigation of the deputies of the foreign ministers make it clear that until the status of these territories can be determined once and for all, nothing can be done toward improving the lot of the inhabitants and of releasing the British Military Administration from the responsibilities of an utterly thankless task ably accomplished under most trying circumstances. I can only point out that after 8 years, it is time to bring to an end, by an immediate solution, the sufferings of the peoples of Somaliland and particularly of Eritrea.

To this end, my Government has for many months devoted long and thoughtful study and consideration to the details involved in the immediate reintegration of Eritrea into Ethiopia. A memorandum on this subject is reproduced in the volume Document A/C. 1/W. 8, page 72, distributed by the Secretariat to the delegations. It is therefore, with considerable satisfaction that we note in the report of the Commission of Investigation confirmation of the technical analyses already undertaken by our Government. Thus, as regards the port of Massawa, the conclusions of our Government as to port expenditures and revenues are fully confirmed by the report which indicates, among other things, that by maintaining in force the slight harbor tax of 1½ percent, the revenue thereby produced would not only meet the entire expenses of the port including expenditures for further expansion, but would also leave an even larger sum for contributing to the general budget of Eritrea and reducing thereby, to that extent, budgetary deficits. As I have already explained, Ethiopia is in the peculiar and highly fortunate position of having immediately available Eritreans who have, for many years, been trained in the services of the Imperial Ethiopian Government to assure a smooth and immediate transfer of the administration of Eritrea to Ethiopia, under conditions assuring in advance full scope to Eritrean representation and participation in the Government. I would recall to you that even now, under conditions of political separation, Eritrean participation in the Ethiopian Government already exceeds the population ratio.

As regards the Italian population of Eritrea, I would recall to you the fact that today thousands of Italians live out useful and happy lives in Ethiopia. In order to permit the Italians in Ethiopia to assist their relatives in Italy, my Government has opened wide the doors to the remittance of foreign exchange and of the resources of the country, including foodstuffs. I am wondering whether many other countries here present allow the same facilities to Italians.

In Eritrea as in Ethiopia, our Government is prepared to assure to all Italians who have useful employment there, the same guaranties and freedom of employment that are today being assured them by the British military administration. Ethiopia is prepared to afford necessary and effective guaranties for Italians in Eritrea as regards civil, religious, educational, and legal rights as well as the freedom of work. In this connection, I would invite your attention to the fact that already in Ethiopia, and without any request for formal guaranties, Italians enjoy full protection in the courts and freedom to pursue their trades and occupations. As His Imperial Majesty, my august sovereign, declared at the moment of his return to the Empire, Ethiopia seeks not vengeance but justice. If she obtains justice, nothing will stand in the way of a fruitful collaboration with her former enemies.

Gentlemen, if this committee and this assembly do not face up to their clear responsibilities, their failure would amount to nothing more or less than a revival of that discredited policy of appeasement which we had all hoped to have interred at San Francisco. It would be a frank and brutal sacrifice of moral principles for political expediency.

Fellow delegates, it is time, at last, to think in terms of the small nations of the world.

You will perhaps allow me to recall to you the moving words of the Canadian delegate to the Paris Peace Conference in which he declared:

"To this general attitude there is one qualification, however. And that is with regard to Eritrea. We cannot forget that Ethiopia was one of the first nations to suffer the full force of aggression in consequence of the failure of the system of collective action which had been established precisely to prevent such an occurrence, and that, consequently, Ethiopia should be one of the first to receive redress. * * * The Canadian delegation warmly supports the claims the Ethiopian delegation has put forward, irrespective, however, of any vote, we express the hope which, I believe, is shared by the majority of nations represented here, that the four powers will transfer Eritrea to Ethiopia and thus redress an old wrong and unite in one nation the people of a proud and ancient race. * * * We recogize that as there must be one peace for all, so there should be one justice for all, for men of every race, color, and creed in every part of the world."

My fellow delegates, 12 years ago, the Emperor of Ethiopia, my august sovereign, took the long and painful road to Geneva to ask an assembly of the nations of the world for clear and simple justice. Since that time my country has traversed a long and bitter period of travail and sufferings, and, by a fateful and inexorable logic of events, an historic cycle is being here, today, completed when I, in the name of that same sovereign and of my long-suffering people, stand before an assembly of the nations of the world again seeking for justice. Twelve years ago the voice of my country was not heard and our world went down in flames and ruin. Today, thanks to that wonderful resilience of the human spirit and to our inborn faith and hope in justice, we are all here endeavoring to redeem the structure of international solidarity and understanding. Justice and hope you may not refuse to a small country as you have refused them to her in the past. Justice and hope you may not refuse to all small countries whose sole faith lies, today, in you who are here assembled in this hall. The decision is for you to make, let us have the faith and courage to make it.

Weekly News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly news letter for the week of April 27, 1949:

President Truman's political panaceas are popping out all over the place. The farm

program has great political potentials but the political pill-rolling plan, one of the more radical, is now before you. It is not new. It was tried in Germany and other socialistic countries. It is in operation in England under its socialistic government. It is fundamental in Russia.

Let us look at it. Article 120 of the constitution of Soviet Russia says: "Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to maintenance * * * in case of sickness * * *. This right is insured by extensive development of * * * free medical service for the working people." Since the Soviet Government owns, controls, and operates all business, factories, shops, stores, mills, railroads, farms, homes, and hospitals, and controls all wages and prices and gets all the profits, Russians have nowhere else to look. That is not true, however, in America, the greatest capitalistic country on earth and where individuals and their rights are paramount, where you can, if you will, make your own way.

A similar program has been previously proposed here. The American Communist Party platform of 1928 contained the following plank: "Free medical treatment, medicine, and hospital care for all wage earners."

The Socialist Party (U. S. A.) platform of 1936 advocated socialized medicine supported by public taxation.

Then again in 1940 the Communist (U. S. A.) platform called for a Federal health program and in 1944 they asked for a national health program similar to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

I, for one, think our doctors, nurses, and hospitals have performed a splendid service. The records show that our independent personalized medical practice has given the United States better health, longer life, finer hospital service, and more and better doctors than any other country in the world. The federalized medical service is not free. You and I and everyone else will pay for it in taxes and plenty of them. Why give up that which has proven so good? Of course, there is room for improvement which comes with every passing year. Stop, look, and listen before crossing over to socialism or communism even in part.

Compulsory insurance, compulsory medicine, compulsory controls are not compatible with freedom of opportunity and thought and choice of action and movement that made America.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following letter from Mr. Kern Dodge. No, Mr. Dodge is not a citizen of Mississippi. He is an outstanding man in the engineering profession from Philadelphia, Pa. I commend it to the consideration of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 22, 1949.*
Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It appears that you are all agreed that communism is a vicious thing and should be fought against, and we appropriate many billions to fight its growth and spread in Europe.

What about giving the Un-American Activies Committee even a mere billion to fight the spread of communism here at home? Why not send back the illegally entered communistic alien; and why not deport those who have embraced this doctrine, which is a wrecker of nations and peoples?

Then why not oppose every bill brought before Congress which is basically communistic and which will aid in the breaking down of our Government?

Remember, we were never set up as a democracy where everyone is preaching equality and which has never worked since the world began; because a democracy slides into socialism and then into despotism.

We were set up as a republic with the idea that people should and can govern themselves with just enough governing bodies to keep law and order.

I have read the report to the President about his civil-rights program, and it is a perfect picture of the setting up of a dictatorship. I ask that you oppose all these communistic suggestions.

Immediate action is necessary. Stamping out communism transcends all other measures before Congress.

Yours very truly,

KERN DODGE.

Lifting of Berlin Blockade Will Save American Taxpayers $500,000 Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the second deficiency appropriation measure last week, there was contained therein an item of $43,000,000 for the Army Air Force who has the responsibility of operating the Berlin airlift.

"Operation Vittles," as the Berlin airlift is known in military circles, has been in operation since June 26, 1948, when the Soviet Union closed all surface corridors leading to Berlin.

Now that the Berlin airlift has been in operation for more than 10 months, it may be well for all of us to review the over-all cost to the American taxpayer.

It is interesting to note that the cost of the first 10 months of operation of the Berlin airlift amounted to $149,664,200. The daily cost of this operation is slightly less than $500,000. This means that the American taxpayer is called upon to produce this sum of money every 24 hours.

Breaking down the total cost of $149,664,200, we find the sum divided as follows:

Operation	$45,825,100
Support	57,370,700
Reserve (moneys)	28,958,700
Wrecked planes	7,522,000
Depreciation of aircraft	9,987,700
Total	149,664,200

From the standpoint of actual operations, there are 319 Air Force and Navy planes assigned to do the job.

For the first 10 months of operation, they completed a total of 120,377 flights, lifting better than 1,250,000 tons of foodstuffs and supplies for Berlin.

On April 16, 1949, the Berlin airlift had its best day when 1,089 flights were completed with a lift of 10,905 tons.

While the record of the Berlin airlift is a remarkable one, the Army Air Force had several unfortunate accidents in which pilot and plane were destroyed. As of April 25, 1949, a total of 28 planes were destroyed with the lives of 22 Air Force personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the Army Air Force is not alone in carrying on the Berlin airlift. The United States Army of Occupation in Germany, as of March 31, 1949, has spent approximately $7,000,000 for not only foodstuffs and supplies, but also for transportation and other necessities in support of the Berlin airlift operation.

Taking into consideration the $43,000,000 we appropriated last week, it will not be long before we will have spent $200,000,000 because of the Russian blockade of Berlin.

Development of Columbia River and Its Tributaries by Existing Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report from Lewis A. Pick, major general, Chief of Engineers, outlining the program of development for the Columbia River and its tributaries under existing Government agencies:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington.

Subject: Columbia River and tributaries, northwestern United States.
To: The Secretary of the Army.

1. I submit for transmission to Congress my report on a comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia River and its tributaries for flood control, navigation, power development, irrigation, and other purposes, including fish and wildlife conservation and recreation. The water-resource-development plans presented in this report are of far-reaching significance nationally as well as regionally. The Columbia is one of the world's great rivers. Its drainage basin, comprising about 7 percent of the area of the United States, contains more than a third of the Nation's potential water power. Despite wide variations in precipitation, a relatively large and steady volume of stream flow is available. Without artificial regulation, however, extensive flood damages occur periodically, water supplies for irrigation are inadequate in many areas, economic utilization of the power potential is precluded, and navigation is hampered.

2. The region is currently developing at an appreciably higher rate than the national average and its economy is dependent to an unusual degree on efficient utilization of its vast water resources. Formulation of up-to-date plans for orderly and timely development of those resources is therefore essential. This report presents the most effective plan for such development. It recognizes the magnitude of the problem and the many interests which must be correlated

for a satisfactory solution. The plan provides the means whereby the agencies best qualified by experience to develop the region can proceed efficiently and in consonance with the views and needs of the people of the region.

3. This report is submitted in response to several authorizations by Congress and primarily in response to a resolution adopted September 24, 1943, by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate calling for a review of the original 308 reports on this area which have formed the basis for water-resource development to date. The detailed report of the division engineer is based on extensive and thorough field investigations and engineering studies over a period of several years. It contains data on numerous possible developments for all purposes which will form a basis for further study and selection of projects as needed for many years and it presents recommendations for the immediate authorization of the projects needed in the near future.

4. The needs of the region now and in the future, and possible plans for meeting those needs, were determined in cooperation with the State and local interests affected and with other Federal agencies concerned. More than 30 public hearings were held in various parts of the basin during preparation of the report. Numerous conferences were held with representatives of Federal, State, and local agencies, and with other interested parties. In response to letters from the President on June 1, 1948, and September 16, 1948, following the disastrous floods in the Columbia Basin area, the long-range plans of the Corps of Engineers for development of the basin were reviewed in the light of the 1948 flood and were correlated with the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and of other affected agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. Both during and after preparation of the Division Engineer's report, the facilities of the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee and other established procedures for interagency cooperation were fully utilized. Through these cooperative procedures, the Division Engineer has prepared a comprehensive plan of development that is sound from engineering and economic standpoints, and at the same time meets the requirements of, and is coordinated with, the views of all interests.

5. In order to permit all concerned to express their views on the completed report of the Division Engineer, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors held four hearings in the basin area prior to completing its review of the report. After consideration of the report and the data presented at the hearings the Board concluded that the proposed comprehensive plan is sound framework under which the requirements of all concerned can be met. The Board recommends adoption of the plan.

6. As a means of facilitating and expediting the correlation of plans as contemplated in the President's letters of June 1 and Septemper 16, 1948, copies of the Division Engineer's report were transmitted to the Governors of the Columbia Basin States and to the heads of the Federal agencies involved prior to preparation of the report and recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. Conferences were held among the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Chief of Engineers, and their representatives and matters requiring coordination were discussed by representatives of those agencies with the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce and the Federal Power Commission at meetings of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee. These procedures were extremely effective in bringing into view the complexity of purposes and problems involved and made it possible to reach agreement on the plan as a whole and on the specific points outlined in paragraphs 7 to 17 below.

7. The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation have been satisfactorily correlated with the comprehensive plan presented herewith in all respects, including the number, scope, and purposes of the projects involved, the agency jurisdiction for construction, plans for coordinated operation of projects for the several purposes involved, and procedures for investigating and recommending authorization for construction of projects in the future.

8. The Bureau and the corps are in agreement that the projects outlined in their respective coordinated reports constitute a sound and satisfactory basis for development of the basin. These agencies agree also on the jurisdiction for construction and operation indicated in the recommendations in my report which contemplate that the Hells Canyon project should be considered by Congress for construction and operation by the Bureau of Reclamation.

9. With respect to irrigation development, the Corps of Engineers is in agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation that financial assistance should be provided from power revenues or by other means to help defray the reimbursable irrigation costs that are beyond the ability of water users to repay on the 13 irrigation projects recommended in the letter of June 3, 1948, from the Secretary of the Interior to the President and on future projects found warranted on the basis of regional or national needs. Such support should be furnished from all power revenue-producing projects in the Federal system in the Pacific Northwest and should be available to all irrigation projects that qualify for support in the Pacific Northwest, which includes the Columbia River Basin and coastal areas of Washington and Oregon. The principles underlying extension of this support should be consistent with those embodied in reclamation law. Administration of the financial support should be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

10. The Glacier View project, which is one of the most economically favorable projects considered for the plan, and which is approved by the State of Montana and local interests generally, is strongly opposed by many because it would encroach upon Glacier National Park. A possible alternative to Glacier View, the Paradise project, is objected to by the State of Montana and local interests. In view of these divergent views, it is concluded that neither of these projects should be authorized at this time, and that recommendations for a project or projects that will accomplish the purposes of the Glacier View project should be presented after further study which will be carried on while other elements of the main control plan are under construction.

11. The operation of an increasing number of developments for the storage and use of waters of the Columbia River in the best interests of the region will impose increasingly complex problems. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, with the participation of appropriate officials of the affected States and other governmental agencies, have already initiated studies to determine the best system operation of the projects in the basin. This work should proceed expeditiously and will be augmented as required by the establishment of a jointly financed staff to develop the details of such plans with the advice, participation, and consultation of all appropriate interests to obtain full integration of all individual project operations to insure the best system operation.

12. In order that the further investigations required from time to time in the future for selection and construction of additional projects under the comprehensive plan may be carried out with the maximum efficiency and without duplication of effort, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have adopted cooperative procedures for the investigation, construction, and operation of future projects. It is recognized that the Corps of Engineers should investigate, construct, and operate all navigation improvements and all channel improvements, levees, bank protection, storage works exclusively for flood control, and drainage works related to flood control. It is also recognized that the Bureau should investigate, construct, and operate all Federal irrigation and related drainage and domestic water developments and should dispose of water for irrigation purposes from Corps of Engineers' projects. Within the field of multiple-purpose storage projects and power projects both recognize that the primary responsibility for investigations and construction in the future should be assigned to the agency having predominant interest in the problems of the area involved. The agencies have agreed to a definition of spheres of predominant interest and, insofar as consistent with directives of Congress, will recognize the primary responsibility of each agency in the designated areas and will consult and reach agreement on responsibilities for work in such areas at the outset of investigations and studies for future projects.

13. In addition to the foregoing correlation which was concerned primarily with the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation, this comprehensive plan was coordinated with relation to activities of other agencies in the Department of the Interior and with the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Power Commission. The views and assistance of representatives of the Federal Power Commission and the Bonneville Power Administration were obtained on the power phases of the plan and are presented in the division engineer's report. The Bonneville Power Administration's transmission program and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's lower river fisheries plan are also presented.

14. The importance of the concurrent development of land and water resources in the basin has been recognized throughout the investigation in numerous discussions with the Department of Agriculture and others primarily concerned with the development of the land resources. The condition, treatment, development, and use of the land resources have a positive influence on the amount of water available for beneficial use, on peak stream flows and on sedimentation. In order to insure the attainment of a balanced program of development of both land and water resources, provision should be made for the acceleration of the land resources program in both the planning and operations phases by the Department of Agriculture and others responsible for these activities.

15. The comprehensive plan presented herewith is a carefully prepared framework within which the projects necessary for a progressive, balanced economy in the Pacific Northwest can be built step by step at the rate required to bring about the needed expansion of the region's capabilities. Adoption of the plan at this time is essential for orderly and efficient development. A substantial part of the work proposed is urgently needed and should be authorized now for early construction.

16. Schedules for construction of the projects in the plan should be worked out to meet the needs, as foreseeable from time to time, for flood control, navigation, additional power, irrigation, and the related programs for soil and forest conservation and other activities of the Department of Agriculture, fish and wildlife preservation, power transmission, and other purposes. This can best be accomplished by the agencies concerned through periodic preparation of programs covering the next several years ahead, utilizing the established procedures for coordination among the agencies and States, including the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee. In general, the lower Columbia

River levees and local flood-protection projects throughout the basin should be given high priority in order to secure the maximum relief from floods in the shortest possible time. Similarly, the Willamette subbasin plan should be carried to substantial completion with high priority. In the main control plan, the Albeni Falls, Libby, and other up-stream storage projects are logical first steps because of their flood-control value, the power available at the site, and the benefit to power installations downstream from the storage regulation afforded. The downstream main-stem projects should be coordinated from a timing standpoint with the lower river fisheries plan, as well as with the needs for power, flood control, and navigation. The various subbasin plans should be undertaken under medium priority as progress is made on the projects for the main control plan. In general, the associated plans for fisheries, irrigation, and soil and forest conservation should proceed with high priority. Power transmission construction should proceed in phase with the completion of power generation facilities.

17. The question of adjustments for local loss of taxes as a result of Federal projects is being studied as a national problem by the Federal Real Estate Board. One means of adjustment is afforded by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946, which provides that 75 percent of revenues from leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes shall be turned over to the States for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the counties in which the land is situated. This procedure is applicable to the flood-control projects in the Columbia Basin. Further adjustments for projects in the Columbia Basin plan should be considered as part of the Federal Real Estate Board studies rather than as part of this report.

18. I therefore recommend:

(a) That the comprehensive plan outlined in the report of the division engineer, with modifications as outlined herein and in the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, be approved as the basis for long-range development of the Columbia River Basin.

(b) That the following be authorized for early construction by the Corps of Engineers:

(1) The main control plan (table A of the accompanying report of the Board) less the Glacier View and Hells Canyon projects and the modifications to Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse Dams.

(2) The Willamette and other subbasin plans (tables B and C of the Board's report).

(3) An engineering laboratory (par. 45 (2) of the Board's report).

all at an estimated cost to the United States of $1,570,000,000 for construction and $11,650,000 annually for maintenance, generally in accordance with the plans outlined in the report of the division engineer and with such modifications as the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

(c) That, as a condition to the construction of each levee, channel improvement, or channel rectification project for flood control included in recommendation (b) above, responsible local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will:

(1) Meet the conditions prescribed in the report of the division engineer to satisfy special circumstances at certain localities;

(2) Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way when and as required;

(3) Make all necessary highway, highway bridge, and utility alterations;

(4) Hold and save the United States free from all damages due to the construction works;

(5) Prevent any future encroachment on the project channels;

(6) Maintain and operate the improvements after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

(d) That, as a condition to the construction of open river navigation work and each harbor improvement included in recommendation (b) above, responsible local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will—

1. Meet the conditions prescribed in the report of the division engineer to satisfy special circumstances at certain localities.

2. Provide, without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas necessary for the construction and maintenance of the projects when and as required.

3. Construct, maintain, and operate adequate terminal facilities open to all on equal terms at the recommended harbor projects.

4. Hold and save the United States free from all damages due to construction.

(e) That authority be provided to the Bureau of Reclamation for modification of Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse Dams and for construction of Hell's Canyon Dam, and for their operation for flood control in conjunction with the main control plan projects as contemplated in the report of the division engineer.

(f) That Congress give favorable consideration to the related programs consisting of: The 13 irrigation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his letter of June 3, 1948, to the President; the necessary expansion of the transmission system of the Department of the Interior; programs for watershed treatment and agricultural and forestry conservation and development by the Department of Agriculture; and the lower Columbia River fisheries plan of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(g) That this report, with illustrations and appendices, be reproduced as a public document to facilitate utilization of the data and plans by all concerned in the long-range development of the Columbia River Basin.

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Civil Rights Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, following my presentation of a proposed compromise of civil rights issues to the House in February, I have received innumerable endorsements in many of the Nation's leading newspapers and in letters from every part of the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following excerpts from some of the editorials and letters:

The New York World Telegram: "It is past time to end this destructive battle. It may not be too late to end it by middle-ground compromise such as the one proposed last month by Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas."

The Pittsburgh Press: "Influential southerners have shown encouraging interest in Mr. HAYS' proposal. The situation calls for willingness to meet on reasonable middle ground."

Elmira (N. Y.) Star Gazette: "There is an old proverb about making haste slowly. That is applicable to the civil-rights battle in Congress. Not all the opposition is based on prejudice. Representative BROOKS HAYS, an Arkansas Democrat, recognizes that civil rights is in the cards. He thinks southerners will accept an amendment to the Constitution outlawing the poll tax. In this he repeats what has seemed to us wisdom all the years this issue has been argued in Congress."

The Forest County (Pa.) Republican: "The best answer to the civil-rights question lies in the proposal advanced by BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas."

Lester B. Granger, executive director of the National Urban League, outstanding Negro leader: "The omnibus recommendation by the Arkansas Congressman will undoubtedly seem like milk-and-water stuff to the average supporter of the President's civil-rights program. Certainly it is a considerable dilution of the demands implicit in the bills which have been submitted, but the speech is notable nonetheless because it is a clear recognition by a Congressman from the deep South that Congress has a responsibility for action and because of the spirit of reasonable compromise that it exudes."

Nathaniel Leverone, Chicago businessman: "I have just read your speech on civil rights. I could not endorse it more enthusiastically if I had spent all of my life in Arkansas than I do as a citizen of the United States."

Ed McQuiston, president of the Arkansas Conference of Social Work: "We had a splendid reaction to your clear statement at our convention of the moral basis for a compromise of civil-rights issues. The State conference unanimously endorsed your stand in this matter."

Marvin Hurley, assistant general manager, Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce: "Your position is reasonable, sane, timely, logical, impartial, and fair. You have treated a most perplexing problem with studied analysis and have outlined the most acceptable solution I have seen."

W. T. Couch, director of the University of Chicago Press: "I think you are on the right track, and I hope very much that your efforts will receive Southern as well as other support."

John Alden Powers, Philadelphia insurance executive: "Mr. HAYS has attacked the problem in splendid fashion. I hope he keeps up the good work."

J. Powell Oates, president of the Southern Mattress Co.: "I want to congratulate you on your efforts to compromise the civil-rights program. Yours is the most advanced idea that has been presented to the Congress."

Thomas R. Reid, vice president of McCormick & Co.: "Your approach is one of the best I have seen. Congratulations and best wishes to you."

Joe Hardin, president of Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation: "I want to commend you for the manner in which you are attempting to handle this matter. I agree that if we expect to have State's rights we must accept the responsibility of preventing the loss of liberty to our citizenship."

Slum Clearance in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, Wednesday, April 27, 1949:

SLUM CLEARANCE OUTLOOK

There is encouraging evidence of a renewed interest by Congress in the long-publicized slum-clearance problem here. The

Senate, several of whose Members recently made a tour of familiar Washington alleys near the Capitol, has approved restoration of site-acquisition powers to the National Capital Housing Authority. This would facilitate the NCHA public-housing program for families of low income, most of whom live in the blighted areas inspected by the Senators. There is growing sentiment on the House side in favor of giving NCHA independent land-buying authority, a right of which it was deprived when the District Redevelopment Land Agency was created.

It will take more than the broadening of NCHA powers to wipe out Washington's slums, however. The NCHA is concerned with the lowest income families. The Redevelopment Land Agency was charged by Congress with preparing and carrying out a long-range slum clearance and redevelopment program on a broad scale. Both agencies can operate without duplication or conflict. But the Land Redevelopment Agency has been completely stymied by failure of Congress to provide sufficient money even to do preliminary planning of an adequate nature. It is a disgraceful fact that officials of the agency have had to dig in their own pockets for office supplies and other administrative expenses.

Despite this unfair handicap the agency has managed to produce a preliminary plan for one project, that at Marshall Heights. Hearings on this plan before the District Commissioners have revealed some opposition that may imperil the whole development program; opposition based on the mistaken belief that the program is designed to create colored ghettos. A decision by the Commissioners on the Marshall Heights project is expected shortly. If approved, the agency still will be powerless to proceed with the program unless Congress supplies the $3,400,000 needed to buy the tract and rebuild it. So ultimate responsibility for the fate of Washington slums and for those who live there rests largely with Congress. If recurrent visits to local alleys will spur action, a regular schedule of tours for Members of both Houses should be arranged; until all in Congress have seen the need for positive, effective remedial measures.

Memorial Address by Dr. John R. Abernathy at Funeral of Former Senator Gore, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the memorial address delivered by Dr. John R. Abernathy at the funeral services for former Senator Thomas Pryor Gore held at Oklahoma City on Friday, March 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM—HON. THOMAS PRYOR GORE

(By Rev. John R. Abernathy, D. D.)

By a strange coincidence entirely unknown to anyone present, I am privileged in this solemn hour to pay my humble tribute of love and respect to one who more than a half century ago opened up to me new horizons which have constantly since that climactic hour lured me onward and upward, and though I am now approaching three score and ten years of my pilgrimage, the radiance of a long-remembered day lingers with me still.

A little more than 50 years ago I was living in a one-room log cabin with my widowed mother and a brother 3 years older than I. Life had not been easy for me. My father died when I was a lad 5 years old, leaving my mother with four children and little of this world's goods. Now after the passing years we had rented the little farm and launched out on our own. At that time in Texas we knew but one crop—cotton—and that meant that I would have little time for obtaining an education. Already I had developed a thirst for knowledge, but at times was almost crushed by the realization that perhaps my fondest dreams were destined to vanish into thin air.

Then one day something happened. A little circular delivered at our door announced that on a date near at hand Thomas Pryor Gore, the blind orator, would speak under a brush arbor not more than a quarter of a mile from our home.

On the appointed afternoon I was among those present, and that hour marked a turning point in my life. As I beheld the classic features of the speaker and heard with rapture his deep and musical voice, and his words which were as "Apples of gold in pictures of silver," I suddenly realized that this man rested under greater handicaps than were mine, and that in overcoming these handicaps he was steadily winning his way to the accomplishment of a worthy goal.

For more than an hour he held the audience spellbound by his eloquence, his logic, wit, humor, and pathos. He espoused the cause of the underprivileged, and pointed toward a better day for the toiling masses. I remember in particular he said: "On this very ground where we are now assembled there will someday be an adequate school building and the opportunity for the boys and girls of this community to enjoy the privileges of a high school." His words were prophetic, for on that very site a consolidated high school was built and my brother was president of the school board.

I went home to sleep little that night. All night long I was haunted by the presence of the remarkable man I had heard that afternoon. As I lived over and over again that high hour of inspiration, I said to myself: "If that man with his great handicap can go bravely on and with grit and determination refuse to accept anything less than the highest, why may not I, too, surmount any difficulties and make some worth-while contribution to the progress of the world?"

From that moment my decision was made, and I launched out and to the limit of my ability I have sought to be worthy of the high hour which bfought me face to face with my opportunity.

As I think of the achievements of Senator Gore and his winning battle against his great handicap, I recall the words of the poet Henley, which seem to, in some definite way, reveal the heart and soul of the one to whom we pay our tribute of love and honor:

"Out of the night that covers me
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.

"In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced or cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody but unbowed.

"Beyond this place of wrath and tears
Looms but the horror of the shade,
And yet the menace of the years
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

"It matters not how strait the gate
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul."

The life of this beloved servant of the people is a constant reminder of the fact that he was greater than anything that could happen to him. He made hardships a stepping-stone to higher things.

Through the years to come, his life will be a beacon light to thousands who face life with seemingly little hope of translating their dreams into reality because of handicaps.

In this hour of memory I would have you remember that Thomas P. Gore was a statesman and not a mere politician. He did not keep his ear to the ground to hear what folks were saying or demanding in order that he might readily conform to the cry of the multitude. He was a watchman on the tower ready to interpret to his constituents the signs of the times, and to speak to them with authority on the great issues of the day. Conversant as he was with history, he knew that to live up to his convictions and to answer the stern call of duty would lead to political martyrdom, but he also took the long look and knew that the right would finally triumph. With a vision of a poet and a prophet and the wisdom of the true statesman he saw what the poet James Russell Lowell saw in the days of the long ago:

"For humanity sweeps onward where today
the martyr stands,
On the morrow crouches Judas with the
silver in his hands;
Far in front the cross stands ready and the
crackling fagots burn,
While the hooting mob of yesterday in
silent awe return
To glean the scattered ashes into history's
golden urn."

In the First World War he opposed the entrance of our country into that struggle, and also insisted if men were to be conscripted, wealth must also be conscripted.

This courageous stand ended in his retirement from the Senate, but he continued to battle for the things for which he was willing to give not only his political life, but also his physical life, for with all his strength he continued the fight. When the passions of that great struggle faded away, he was again elevated to his position in the Senate and continued his brilliant career and when finally retired after distinguished service there was no spirit of complaint or bitterness. The sunset hours of life were peaceful, and he sleeps the sleep of the just and good.

I would be recreant to what I deem a sacred duty if I did not, in closing, pay tribute to his beloved wife who through all the years of their wedded life walked the pilgrim years with him. With rare devotion and with a high sense of consecration to a Holy task, she became the medium through which he came to know the world's great literature, music, art, and history, and political economy. Through her eyes he saw the beauty of the sunrise and the glory of the sunset; the majesty of Mount Scott standing like a lone sentinel at the head of the mountain range. When the Senator and his wife were patients in a local hospital recuperating from injuries sustained in an automobile accident, I visited them often, and standing between their beds I clasped their hands and through me they were again joined in that blessed comradeship which began in life's morning. Hand in hand they marched in beautiful glow of life's evening time, and it was: "A light more beautiful than ever gleamed on land or sea."

To this faithful citizen, Oklahoma says: "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Truly it may be said of him as Edwin Markham said of Abraham Lincoln:

"The color of the ground was in him, the red
earth,
The smack and tang of elemental things;
The rectitude and patience of the cliffs;
The good-will of the rain that loves all
leaves;

The friendly welcome of the wayside well;
The courage of the bird that dares the sea;
The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn;
The pity of the snow that hides all scars;
The secrecy of streams that make their way
Under the mountain to the rifted rock;
The tolerance and equity of light
That gives as freely to the shrinking flower
As to the great oak flaring to the wind—
To the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn
That shoulders out the sky.
And his passing is, as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout gainst the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

As the sunset kisses the mountains and the valleys and the broad prairies of Oklahoma this evening, there will be a lonesome place against the sky.

Success of the Berlin Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial entitled "Operation 'Vittles'" which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, April 28, 1949.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I visited Germany last November and for several days studied the operations of the Berlin airlift. I was amazed at the magnitude of the operations and I could see even at that time the favorable effect the airlift was having on the people of Europe.

OPERATION "VITTLES"

The end of the Russian blockade of Berlin is in sight and with it the end of the Berlin airlift.

In order to get a better understanding of the significance of this tremendous operation in which air power was called to rescue 2,500,000 persons suddenly cut off from food, heat, light, clothing, and all other supplies needed to run a big city, we've decided today to review the history of Operation "Vittles."

On June 21 of last year, Stalin's gang of high-pressure boys decided they could force the western powers into agreeing to the Kremlin peace terms for Germany by isolating Berlin. Accordingly they barred all railroad and highway entrances into the city.

But the Russians left a loophole. They had signed a written agreement providing three air corridors from the Allied zones through the Soviet zone into the beleaguered city. They were only 20 miles wide, but that was wide enough.

Gen. Lucius Clay and Gen. Curtis Lemay jumped in, and on June 26 a small fleet of two-engined C-47's made 25 trips carrying 80 tons of supplies into the city. It was not much, but the "Lemay Coal & Feed Co.," as it was dubbed by the boys, was in business.

CLAY AND LEMAY HAD KNOW-HOW

Both Clay and Lemay knew you couldn't supply a whole city of two and a half million people with the planes and men on hand. But Clay knew what the city needed and Lemay knew how to get it there. Lemay, it must be remembered, helped rubbleize that very country in the war, starting with experimental type B-17's and finally burning out Japan with B-29's.

So they sent out calls for bigger planes and more of them, and more men and more supplies, and pretty soon the big four-engined C-54's were jumping off from Alaska, the Caribbean, Hawaii, and Japan to join in the biggest peacetime job the Air Force had ever attempted. The British lent their aid and the United States Navy was called into the picture.

The climax came a week ago Saturday, April 16, when the combined air power made 1,398 flights carrying 12,940.9 tons of supplies into Berlin, the equal of 22 trains of 50 freight cars each. This feat gave the Russians and everyone concerned a very good idea of what air power can do when the men in command put their minds to it.

TWENTY-SEVEN MEN KILLED

The air lift has cost the United States of America $149,664,244. Of this amount, it is estimated that $81,546,400 was spent above the amount which the normal operation of the groups involved would have cost if there had been no air lift. As of noon last Monday, a total of 1,441,105 tons had been hauled. Of this amount, 1,011,399 was hauled by the United States Air Force, 93,653 tons by the United States Navy, and 336,053 tons by the British.

During this 10 months' period 26 Air Force men and one Navy man lost their lives.

The Air Force also lost 18 C-54's, 8 C-47's, and one C-82. The Navy lost 2 R5D's.

GREAT RESULTS

The cost was high, indeed, but here are some of the gains to be considered:

First, the blockade of Berlin was Russia's big thrust in the cold war. Its defeat by air power could mark the turning point toward peace in Europe instead of another war, and we sincerely hope it does.

Second, it demonstrates that when this country commits itself to a job it can do it regardless of obstacles. The supplies were carried despite the Russians' interferences with war games, fighter harassment, and all the other nasty tricks they tried.

Third, it demonstrates that with a sufficient air force in being this country cannot be stopped from reaching its objective in peace or war, no matter what obstacles are present on the surface such as blockades, armies, or navies. We can just fly over them.

And fourth, the lessons learned in handling this large undertaking has telescoped into a few months years of experience which will be of untold value to commercial aviation. And it provided training for our airmen in a short course that would never have been equaled in normal operations.

Disloyal Utterances by Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in an address to more than 2,000 firemen of the city of New York, in that great city on Sunday morning, I felt constrained to take note of the disloyal utterances made in Paris last week by Paul Robeson. Despite the extraordinary benefits which he, as an artist, had achieved under American citizenship, Robeson, claiming to speak for an entire group of his fellow citizens, declared that, in the event of war between the United States and the U. S. S. R., he and those for whom he claimed to be spokesman, would not perform their duties of citizenship on behalf of the United States.

I suggested that if Robeson was so strongly enamored of the Soviet Republics, he should take up residence there and I offered personally to undertake to secure necessary visas for him and any who wished to accompany him.

In the Baltimore Evening Sun of yesterday, there were printed three letters dealing with the Robeson statement, which I think deserve to be brought to the attention of the Congress and our people generally.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that they be printed in the RECORD as a supplement to my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE RIGHT, ONE WRONG

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

SIR: Recently two American Negroes made international news. Both want world peace but each employed different means to achieve it. Time will record that one was right and the other wrong.

Dr. Ralph Bunche, United Nations mediator, will soon be rewarded for his brilliant assistance in terminating the Palestinian dispute. On the little Isle of Rhodes he wrote a peace that silenced the guns. He knew that a workable peace must be fashioned out of unity.

The other American Negro, Paul Robeson, is a victim of Communist intrigue. He is driving a wedge between the white and colored Americans. He is using mendacious lies to divide us. He is the first American Negro to betray his country, for his race has an enviable history of supporting America in war or peace.

We will never be misled by Kremlin-inspired statements. American democracy, with all of its inherent weakness, is precious to us. Its concepts will be morally upheld by all regardless of race or creed. No travesty upon truth will confuse us.

JULIA R. GERBER.

BALTIMORE, April 24.

ROBESON'S RADICALISM

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

SIR: Congratulations are in order for Mr. L. J. Shaw as a result of his excellent letter in protest against Mr. Paul Robeson's radicalism. It would not be just if the Negro race, which has struggled against seemingly insurmountable barriers and obstacles in the way of its attaining the right to live freely and peaceably, were thrown back and punished for the raving and ranting of such an irresponsible fanatic as Mr. Robeson.

The credit brought their race by such great Americans as Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, Dr. Ralph Bunche and a host of others ought not be tainted or menaced by the despicable antics of Mr. Robeson and his few frenzied followers. Certainly his words must be pleasing to the ears of the Ku Klux Klan and Governor Talmadge. The American Negro is a human being, and he feels as great a love and respect for the United States as we whose skin just happens to be white.

In the past war the blood of both Negro and white flowed freely for our country. Don't allow this new Moscow-directed wedge

to separate us and incite that serpent Prejudice to rear its ugly head any higher. Instead, let us pray to God that we may be solidified by a more tolerant and sympathetic attitude toward each other.

WILLIAM S. COOPER, Jr.

BALTIMORE, April 23.

SUGGESTION

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

SIR: We would like to suggest that since Mr. Paul Robeson was in Sweden and so close to the border, he might have stepped over into Russia—and stayed there.

R. M. MARKET.
L. D. SMITH,

BALTIMORE, April 22.

Address by William C. Doherty, President, National Association of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, at a postal rally in New York City on April 24, 1949. The address is an exceptionally fine one, and goes into the history of postal pay raises. This morning I received word that the manuscript was of such length that an estimate of cost was required. The estimate of cost is $225. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed, even though the cost of printing is $225.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most asked and least answered questions among postal workers is: When is the Eighty-first Congress going to enact legislation affecting the welfare of postal personnel?

At the outset, I want to say very frankly that I do not propose to answer that query in full—I wish I could. But unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately, I am not clairvoyant. Over and beyond that, I think it would be presumptuous on my part or on the part of any other representative of an employee group to assert in public or intimate in private that he can read the minds of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives; or that he can solve the intricate equation, involving many, many other factors, inherent in the introduction, processing and final enactment of every piece of legislation.

However, I do have very definite ideas, as well as positive convictions about the legislation now before the Eighty-first Congress touching on the welfare of postal workers.

First of all, I am firmly convinced that postal people are not asking too much.

Secondly, it is my conviction that our requests are reasonable and fair.

Thirdly, and by far most important, postal employees cannot wait forever for relief.

The need for an equitable salary exists now.

The need for an adequate law covering injured employees exists now.

The need for certain adjustments in the Civil Service Retirement law exists now.

The need for a realistic approach to the salary grades for new employees exists now.

The need for justice to the ex-GI exists now.

The need for an equalization in the annual and sick leave law exists now.

The need for a real, honest-to-goodness longevity award exists now.

In short, there is an urgent need for an exploration of the basic law governing the wages, hours of work and other conditions of employment in the Post Office Department. That basic law is Public Law 134, enacted July 6, 1945, more familiarly known as the Reclassification Act.

Before I make any attempt to discuss the legislation before the present Congress in which postal workers are interested, I want the RECORD to show that I, personally, and speaking for the 95,000 letter carriers I have the honor to present, have no desire to have anything but a fine, warm, and friendly opinion of the Eighty-first Congress. Letter carriers feel that the present Members of the Congress are preeminently honest, competent, and patiotic men and women. But to use one of their own favorite expressions, reserving the right to object, letter carriers are beginning to think the Eighty-first Congress is well on the road to acquiring the somewhat dubious title of the slowest-moving Congress, so far as postal employees are concerned.

And just to keep the record straight, there are other departments and agencies in Government that rightfully should be assessed a portion of that dubious distinction, having earned that right by virtue of their delay in reporting on legislation submitted to them for comment. While it is true that within the past several weeks reports have been returned to Congress by various departments and agencies, the fact still remains that it took 3 months in some instances to secure these requested comments. My personal reaction to these long periods of procrastination on the part of Government agencies in matters affecting employees, is that they muffed the ball from a standpoint of labor-management relations. No employee—in Government or private industry—should be expected to have high morale or a keen sense of appreciation for the success of his employer's business when he is made to feel that management is so apparently disinterested in the employee's welfare that it considers 3 months time enough in which to reply to a grievance, or a request for improvement in the conditions of employment.

To digress from the main theme—although it is not totally irrelvant—the thought has often occurred to me that some type of machinery should be made available to the Congress to speed up the information they need to pass on legislation affecting Federal employees, perhaps a fact-finding board, a panel of experts that would dig out the facts. It is difficult to understand why it requires 3 months to turn in a report.

Earlier in my remarks I made the statement that postal people are not asking too much from the Eighty-first Congress by way of beneficial legislation. Let's see if the facts substantiate that statement. At the same time let's inquire into the reasonableness of these requests.

The program endorsed by the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor contains the following seven points:

1. A $650 permanent increase in basic salary for all Government personnel.

2. Complete revision of Public Law 134 and the Classification Act of 1923 affecting nonpostal Federal employees.

3. The elimination of low salary grades for all employees.

4. Credit for all past service in meritorious grades and extension of the longevity principle.

5. Amendment of the United States Employees' Compensation Act.

6. Twenty-six days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave, cumulative indefinitely.

7. Further liberalization of the tirement act.

In unanimously approving this program, the council did not necessarily list the items in any order of importance; as a matter of fact, the council considered each bill important in its own right. Individual members of the council, and even individual organizations within the group conceivably might have a favorite bill—and certainly I have no quarrel with that procedure. The record of the council will show that when the chips are down there is complete unanimity—each organization contributes its share toward the common good.

Taking point No. 1—the salary increase—let's discuss it for a moment. Back in the Eightieth Congress, postal employees petitioned for a wage adjustment on the premise that postal salaries were not in harmony with the economic conditions as they then existed. No matter how the subject was approached and regardless of the method used to arrive at the amount required to bring salaries in line with prices, the absolute minimum requirement was a 33-percent increase, 33.6 percent to be exact. Public Law 900, which became effective July 1, 1948, provided for a 14.5 percent wage boost for postal employees. No mental gymnastics are required to show that we were still left with a 19-percent deficit in our purchasing power. Since that time there has been a slight decrease in over-all costs of approximately 2.8 percent—and I am using a figure furnished me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the period ending February 15, 1949. If we subtract from the 19-percent deficit left over from Public Law 900 this 2.8 percent decline in prices, we still have a glaring deficiency of approximately 16 percent in our purchasable dollar.

Is there anything unreasonable about asking for a wage that will do no more than put us on an economic parity with our neighbors who are employed by private industry? That is all we are asking in our endorsement of S. 558, introduced by Senators OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina; HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Connecticut; and WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, and H. R. 2492, introduced by Congressman EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota, in the House.

In his annual budget message to the Eighty-first Congress, President Truman asked for "more realistic salaries" for Government career employees. At another point in the same message we read: "The Government and its employees should be assured that the salaries paid for positions at all levels are fair compensation for the work performed."

I say without equivocation that postal employees are not now getting fair compensation for work performed; moreover, the Eighty-first Congress has a moral obligation to correct the situation.

It is evident that there is a decided disinclination on the part of the leadership in the Congress and the administration to take early action on salary legislation. Perhaps this attitude is based on the expectation or anticipation that prices will continue to decline. As I pointed out, the total drop in prices for the 7-month period from July 1948 to February 1949 amounted to a mere 2.8 percent. Are postal workers expected to wait until living costs drop the remaining 16 percent which now separates their wages and prices?

In some quarters we find concern about the budgetary situation. We are told that the Federal Government has moved into a deficit status. If this is correct, it is difficult to reconcile the ultra-conservative atti-

tude toward postal employees with the unrestrained spending in some other directions.

The apropriations for the cold war in Europe will cost approximately $7,700,000,000 in 1949, and approximately $11,601,000,000 in 1950.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, recently proposed a new farm bill that is estimated will cost a tremendous amount of money, the exact amount of which the Secretary of Agriculture himself cannot say.

Our program for national defense brought forth the stupendous appropriation of $16,000,000,000.

And no doubt there will be other costly projects; postal employees, as loyal Americans, will have no quarrel with these programs. All expenditures absolutely necessary to safeguard free institutions of Government and our democratic way of life should be authorized; there should be a sound farm program to protect our producers of food from the extremes of our industrial economy. However, it is difficult, most difficult indeed, to reconcile the open-handed attitude toward these problems with the tight-fisted policy toward postal workers.

One word about those twin bugaboos, postal deficits and postal rates. If there is such a thing as a postal deficit, and I have always maintained there is no such thing, then every other agency of the Federal Government should have a check and balance system. In that way it can be determined which departments are operating at a profit, if any, and which are producing revenue equal to or in excess of their expenditures. Then let the experts analyze the field of service given the American people; let them find an equal to the matchless service the postal system provides every man, woman, and child in every town and hamlet in the United States. Following that, let them produce another Federal agency whose operating overhead includes outright and hidden subsidies to the railroads, airlines, and steamships. I believe that if all these things are given their proper consideration, any reasonable person will agree with my contention that a so-called postal deficit is a figure of speech to indicate that actual dollar-and-cents income did not match outgo. As for postal rates, it has been the historical policy of the National Association of Letter Carriers that the Postal System is basically and fundamentally a service institution. Since early Colonial days it has been accepted as such by the American taxpayer; every attempt to deviate from that line has ended in disaster. The sole purpose of the postal service is, therefore, to give swift, certain mail service to the American people at reasonable cost. What a reasonable charge amounts to is something for the Congress of the United States alone to decide.

Letter carriers contend that postal rates and postal salaries are two entirely different propositions. Salaries should have nothing to do with a determination of postal fees, and vice versa. But if rates are to be determined by what it costs in personnel hire to move the mails, then I want it made perfectly clear to the American public that the traditional postal policy of service is being abandoned for profit.

Now permit me to move on to another highly controversial piece of legislation in which all postal employees are vitally interested. I have reference to reclassification. There is much merit in our request for S. 644, introduced by Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR of Maryland, and H. R. 4053, sponsored by Representative JAMES H. MORRISON of Louisiana. Both measures would correct many present inequities in Public Law 134, which as all of you know is the basic law for salary, hours of duty, annual and sick leave, and practically every other aspect of our employment. There is one feature about a reclassification bill which a great many postal people do not seem to understand; namely, that by its very nature, incorporating as it does so many different sections and affecting so many facets of our employment, any consideration of this type of legislation necessarily involves extensive study in committee and lengthy public hearings. There has been plenty of time for consideration of reclassification, but up until now nothing has been done about it by the Eighty-first Congress. My personal opinion is that reclassification has been used in several instances as a smoke screen, a red herring dragged across the path of our salary bill, our longevity bill, our annual and sick leave equalization bill, and so forth.

The enactment of S. 644 or H. R. 4053 would cure a great many ills of the postal service. But as long as it remains pigeonholed in committee, we have no recourse other than to press for the enactment of individual items of legislation included in the reclassification measure. That, of course, we are doing.

There is one subject on which I could spend all of the time allotted to me on this program and even then I would not have said enough in favor of the legislation. I have reference to the elimination of low salary grades. The present ridiculously low entrance wages paid postal employees are a disgrace—I repeat, an unadulterated disgrace.

It is not enough that the entrance salary is low, but the injustice is compounded when we stop to consider that practically all of the new recruits in the service during the past 4 or 5 years are veterans of the military. "What price glory?" they must ask themselves.

There are three important bills that have to do with providing benefits for employees in the lower grades. H. R. 87 and H. R. 927 apply only to military veterans. You are undoubtedly aware that adverse reports on these measures have been filed with the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by the Director of the Budget and the Post Office Department. Briefly the objections alleged discrimination and the cost feature was described as prohibitive. H. R. 87 was estimated to cost $61,000,000, whereas H. R. 927 is estimated to cost approximately $18,150,000. The essential difference between the two measures is that H. R. 927 applies only to employees who entered the service on or before January 1, 1948, and H. R. 87 applies to all employees who entered the service within 3 years following the date of passage of the bill. Both bills would give credit for military service toward salary promotions.

There are certain inequities and discrepancies in the increase that will be given to veterans under both of these bills. H. R. 927, for example, provides that employees who have benefited under Public Law 577 shall not be entitled to benefits of H. R. 927. In effect, this would mean that an employee who had 5 years' military service and was reached for appointment after he had served 3 years in the military, under the provisions of Public Law 577, would only receive $200. However, an employee who was not on the rolls at all and came under H. R. 927 would receive $500.

It is for these and other similar reasons that the National Association of Letter Carriers looks with greater favor on the third of the three bills referred to, H. R. 1704, introduced by Congressman LAURIE BATTLE, of Alabama. It would eliminate completely the four lower grades. Both of these other bills, while they would temporarily correct inequities, would eventually bring about the same situation that existed following the passage of Public Law 134, in that there is a closing date on the benefits of the operation of the law, and the employees following that closing date would have the same complaints as the employees have now. The Battle bill would correct the situation for all time, and is by far the more important bill. S. 391, introduced by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, is a companion bill to the Battle measure.

There are several bills now before the Senate and House which are designed to give employees credit for all past service in determining eligibility for longevity credits provided for in Public Law 134. The principle of longevity awards is based on the theory of rewarding employees for long and meritorious service. That principle is defeated or greatly minimized if no consideration is given past meritorious service. The Lyle bill, H. R. 250, seemingly is the best solution to this problem. It would immediately grant all employees credit for all of their service. I should add that the enactment of this legislation is most desirable for another reason. That is, by increasing the basic wage you thereby increase the average 5-year wage used in computing retirement annuity. I have no doubt in my mind that a great many postal employees would take advantage of retirement if their 5-year average salary could be increased by the amount realized through the enactment of this longevity feature. I am reasonably certain that longevity legislation will be enacted in this session of Congress.

Perhaps one of the really bright spots in our legislative program is the prospects of the measure to liberalize the United States Employees' Compensation Act. The intrinsic merit of this legislation is equaled only by the urgent need for its early enactment.

The present United States Employees' Compensation Act is woefully inadequate in the light of present-day requirements. The act now in effect has remained basically unchanged over a long period of years. Specifically, the benefits are not nearly enough in comparison with today's prices or salary scales. This contention is more easily understood when it is pointed out that the benefits now in effect are computed on the wage standard of 1925—nearly a quarter of a century ago. The present act provides for compensation at the rate of 66⅔ percent of salary. Today, employees injured on the job receive approximately 39 percent of their regular income.

It is not important that I, personally, believe the present law should be brought up to date. But it is vitally important that no future disability case be adjudicated on the basis of a $116.66 maximum monthly payment—with no provision or schedule of awards for the loss of or the loss of the use of a member or function of the body.

Not too long ago one of your own coworkers, Alexander Cook, a New York letter carrier, was killed on duty. You recall the accident, I am sure. You remember how he was returning from delivery of his route; how a woman intent on suicide jumped from the fifteenth floor of an apartment building. She not only killed herself, but she landed on Carrier Cook, crushing him to death. He left a wife and four small children. They receive $116.66 a month from the Government. Likewise, I know all of you are familiar with the tragic bomb accident which permanently disabled Carrier Osborne in Bowling Green, Ky.

The correction for these conditions is incorporated in H. R. 3191, introduced by Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, and S. 1287, introduced by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah.

These bills establish the minimum compensation of $112.50 a month; it also provides compensation at the rate of 66⅔ of the wage loss, plus 8⅓ where the disabled worker has one or more dependents. This is a very fair and modern schedule.

The bill also provides for a scheduled payment of benefits in case of disability, partial in character but permanent in quality, which results in the loss of a member or the loss of the use of a member or functions of the body.

Section 10 of the present act is amended to provide increases in benefits for widows and wholly dependent widowers and children.

Section 11 of the present act is amended to increase the burial benefit to $400—it is now $200.

I think it will be interesting to this audience to know that both the Lesinski bill and the Thomas measure used as a pattern for their schedules the rates provided for in the New York State law. This legislation is eminently fair; it is forward looking; it is socially desirable. I am thoroughly confident that it will be written on the statute books before the current Congress adjourns.

The sixth point of the Government Employees Council is the equalization of annual and sick leave.

If there is anything that raises my blood to a boil, it is to be told that legislation in which letter carriers are interested is objectionable because it is discriminatory in that its benefits are restricted to certain employees. If there is anything more discriminatory in the entire Federal structure than the present annual and sick leave applicable to postal personnel, I would like to know about it.

I want the record to be crystal clear on one thing: letter carriers are not opposed to the 26 days' annual and 15 days' sick leave now enjoyed by most Federal employees; our request for equal consideration is not to be construed as an undermining of the benefits now enjoyed by these other people. Simply stated, we believe equality must prevail in the matter of annual and sick leave as in other fields of employment. We want to be lifted up to the level of other Government employees, we do not want them lowered to our level; postal employees don't do business that way. We want everyone lifted to the same plane.

Representing letter carriers as I do, it is natural that I am more familiar with conditions of employment concerning letter carriers. With no intention of minimizing the stress under which other postal employees work, I know that no job in the postal service is an easy one—a snap, to use the parlance of the day. I am convinced that letter carriers have one of the most arduous jobs in or out of government. Certainly they deserve as much time for relaxation and recuperation from illnesses as that given any employee in the various departments and agencies of the Government.

Permit me to give you a few brief figures to substantiate my statement that letter carriers have an arduous and a hazardous occupation; I think these statistics will convince even the most hardened skeptic that letter carriers richly deserve the fullest equality with other Federal workers in the matter of annual and sick leave.

The Compensation Commission informs me that in computing the frequency of injuries, they use as a basis the rate of disabling injuries per million man-hours. The frequency rate for letter carriers is 17.8. To illustrate the significance of that figure, I want to point out that the frequency in the post office for all employees is 8.8; in the Navy Department it is 6.5; in the Interior Department it is 13.8; in the Federal Works Administration it is 15.6.

The Commission measures the severity of injury on the basis of 1,000 man-hours worked; the severity for letter carriers is .55, compared to .22 for the post office as a whole.

There are several bills in both the Senate and House designed to grant postal employees 26 days' annual and 15 days' sick leave. H. R. 1304, introduced by Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, has received a favorable report in principle from the Civil Service Commission. The report included, however, a notation inviting the attention of the committee to the fact that the legislation would involve a substantial yearly expense to the Post Office Department.

Recently, I had the privilege to serve as a member of an advisory committee to the staff of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Our group made a study of vacation and sick-leave legislation. It was significant that our panel unanimously recommended that postal employees be granted equality in annual and sick leave with other Federal personnel.

This legislation is long overdue; simple justice demands that postal workers be granted 26 days annual and 15 days sick leave, and I might add that justice too long delayed is no justice at all.

In the field of retirement legislation, the representatives of your national organizations have been most diligent in seeking further improvements in our retirement law. I want to say here and now that our retirement law, that is, Public Law 426, enacted last year, is in the main a very fine piece of legislation. True, it needs improvements—there are certain refinements that should be made, but no law is perfect when it is enacted—our retirement law is no exception. But I reiterate, it is a vastly improved law as it now stands; our job is to further perfect it. That we intend to do.

Retirement legislation is a highly complex and intricate mechanism. Perhaps this is not the time or place to enter into an analytical discussion of every phase of retirement. But I do want to give you a brief explanation of some of the more important sections of the present law which the Government Employees Council feels should be amended.

All of you are familiar with that section of Public Law 426 which compelled those already on retirement to choose between the modest increase in annuity provided for in the bill and a widows' annuity. That was and remains a harsh decision to force on anyone. It is cruel to ask a man to make a decision that deprives him of needed income on one hand, and utter disconcern for the welfare of his spouse on the other in the event he predeceases her.

Senate bill 878, introduced by Chairman OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, provides that employees who were retired prior to the passage of Public Law 426 will receive both the $300 increase or 25 percent and the widows' annuities. A Senate subcommittee has favorably reported this measure to the full committee. It appears likely that the full committee will consider this bill at their meeting scheduled for next Tuesday, April 26. According to all indications now, the full committee will also approve the bill. The prospect of passage of this legislation in the present Congress seems very good. It is estimated this bill will cost $13,000,000 a year.

Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, has introduced H. R. 4295 in the House; it is a companion bill to S. 878. Early hearings have been promised in the House.

Another Senate bill, S. 1440, appears to have very good prospects in the present session. This measure was likewise introduced by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It provides that when an employee retires it will not be necessary to make an election to provide an annuity for his wife. The election annuity is automatic—no reduction in the annuity of the employee shall be made.

Experience has shown that over 50 percent of the employees retiring since the passage of Public Law 426 have elected to take the full annuity, thereby making no provision for their wives. It is most unfortunate that those electing to take the full annuity were generally in the lower-income groups. The pressure of living costs compelled them to look for the greatest possible amount of money for immediate purposes.

The Retirement Division has estimated that S. 1440 would cost approximately $25,000,000. The fact remains, however, there will be no effective survivorship program until this type of legislation is enacted into law.

H. R. 4036, introduced by Congressman EUGENE J. MCCARTHY of Minnesota, is a companion bill to S. 1440.

A third bill sponsored by Senator JOHNSTON is known as S. 1189. It not only includes the language of S. 1440, previously described, it also provides for the elimination of the reduction factor for those who retire at age 55 with 30 years' service. As far back as I can remember—and that goes back more than a quarter of a century of postal service—there has been a continuing campaign for retirement after 30 years' service. This bill places a 55-year-age stipulation on that service, but it does incorporate the principle of retirement after 30 years of service. It is a very meritorious bill; it deserves the support of all postal employees. I can assure you that it is receiving the complete support of your national leaders. It is only fair to tell you, however, that a very strong undercurrent of opposition exists against any plan of retirement that provides for a full annuity after 30 years' service at age 55 or any other reduced age.

There are, as I said, many other bills touching on retirement. For example, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER of California, has introduced H. R. 1963 which includes the provisions of S. 878, and it also gives present annuitants the right to have their annuities recomputed under the new formula.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON of Louisiana has sponsored a bill, H. R. 1963, which provides that those who elected to leave a widows' annuity and are predeceased by their spouse shall be restored to a full annuity, just as if they had not made an election.

He has also introduced H. R. 2060, which provides for 30-year optional retirement at the option of the employee only.

Congressman EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, has introduced H. R. 543, which exempts annuities up to $1,440 from income tax. Congressman JAMES C. BOGGS of Delaware has sponsored a similar bill.

Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has introduced a bill, S. 801, which provides an annuity for widows of all employees deceased prior to February 28, 1948.

Thus, we have our job cut out for us.

There are, of course, many other bills of interest to individual postal organizations because they directly affect their membership. The Government Employees Council gladly supports these measures and cooperates with the individual organizations to the fullest extent. I know that letter carriers have received this support in their fight for a uniform allowance, rural-carrier legislation, and village-delivery legislation * * * each peculiar to letter-carrier employment.

We are going down the line for the GEC program * * * the $650 salary bill * * * the compensation bill * * * and all the other measures I have outlined in this address. We want your help. We must have it. This great State of New York has always been in the vanguard of every campaign for a better postal service and improvement in the working conditions of its employees. I am confident the postal workers of New York will never relinquish the honor spot they have always held in previous drives for beneficial legislation.

This State produced one of the greatest Americans of all time—his name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Twenty years ago, when he was Governor of New York, he saw the great need for continually improving our social and labor legislation to keep it from falling behind the times. On one occasion he put his philosophy in these words:

"Labor legislation must be kept in step with changing developments in individual life and forward steps in social welfare."

Postal employees can well meditate on those words. Let's get going together. And if I might paraphrase the immortal words uttered by Farragut during the decisive battle of Moble Bay in 1864, I would leave you with this campaign slogan:

Damn the obstacles! Full speed ahead!

Jefferson, Roosevelt: Two Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an article that appeared in the Farmers Union Herald of April 18, 1949:

JEFFERSON, ROOSEVELT: TWO GREAT AMERICANS

The month of April brings recollections of two great Americans—Thomas Jefferson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Jefferson was born on April 13, 1743. Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945. Jefferson, born a colonial aristocrat, nevertheless set the pattern for modern America and his ideas became the foundation upon which American democracy has been built. Roosevelt, also raised in the upper circles, took over in an age of reversion and reaction and helped guide the Nation forward in the Jefferson tradition. The third and the thirty-second Presidents both had overwhelming faith in the fundamental honesty of the American people and in their common sense.

It was Jefferson's ideas which resulted in making education by the state a fundamental article of democratic faith. Jefferson advocated the emancipation of slaves, It was Jefferson who warned the Nation against the danger of a large standing army.

In choosing his associates, Jefferson's only tests were honesty and knowledge. He is said to have known no social distinctions, writing at one time: "If it be possible to be certainly conscious of anything, I am conscious of feeling no difference between writing to the highest and lowest beings on earth."

Jefferson fostered education of the people with the great faith that ignorance can be eliminated. He believed that majorities rule not only by virtue of force but also by virtue of right. He was the champion of religious freedom, separation of church and State, and the right of the individual to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

Roosevelt, who died on the eve of his nation's victory over fascism, hated war. "I wish," he said, "that I could keep war from all nations, but that is beyond my power."

Rising to the Nation's highest office amidst clouds of economic crisis, Roosevelt turned words into deeds to back up his firm belief that, as he put it:

"Democracy is a living thing—a human thing—compounded of brains and muscles and heart and soul. The service of democracy is the birthright of every citizen, the white and the colored; the Protestant, the Catholic, the Jew; the sons and daughters of every country in the world, who make up the people of this land. Democracy is every man and woman who love freedom and serves the cause of freedom."

A firm believer in the sovereign power of the people, Roosevelt declared: "Americans must forswear that conception of the acquisition of wealth which, through excessive profits, creates undue private power over private affairs and, to our misfortune, over public affairs as well."

To business, Roosevelt said: "In the last analysis, consumer buying power is the milk in the coconut of all business. Whether you own a big department store, or do business in a small way on the main street of a small town, your sales are dependent on how much money the average family in the community is earning."

Storm clouds of economic crisis mass again and a war-weary world hears renewed talk of war. We must have statesmen again who have faith in the people and who hate war if we are not to lose the great gains made under the Jefferson-Roosevelt tradition of liberalism.

Who Pays Federal Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Pays Federal Aid?", which was written by Joe Lee, editorial writer of the Topeka State Journal, of Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO PAYS FEDERAL AID?

States' rights have come to mean, about as much as anything else, the rights of States to hold out their hands to Uncle Sam for extra spending money.

The States never seem to face the fact that it is their own money they are accepting in return for the privilege of licking the Federal boots. Every State government has come to depend upon Federal money grants, or "aid," as it is called, that when Washington says beg the States generally beg, just as when Washington says jump, they jump.

In 1932 Uncle Sam passed $269,000,000 around to his sovereign nephews.

In 1948 he passed out more than 20 times that much, or approximately $5,500,000,000 to the same.

People yell about State taxes, yet accept Federal grants to States out of Federal taxes as if the money were coming from Afghanistan instead of their own pockets. They bow and scrape and thank Washington for the favor. They send delegations to the National Capital to get more favors. Usually such a delegation walks in just as another local delegation demanding tax reduction is packing up to come home. Only the latter type of delegation always returns empty handed.

Take Kansas. According to the State chamber of commerce the State's share of the current Federal budget load is estimated at $486,000,000—almost a half billion—an amount which is more than four times the total of all State, county, township, school, and special property taxes combined.

According to a recent study of State finance put out by the University of Kansas bureau of government research, 21 percent of the State's revenues in 1947 consisted of money shipped to Topeka from Washington under the heading "Grants from the Federal Government." Total State revenues were approximately $112,000,000, so Federal "aid" amounted to about $23,500,000—almost as much as State revenues from income and inheritance taxes, license and privilege taxes, and unemployment taxes, combined.

To top it off, the same Kansas study classified these "grants from Federal Government" under the heading of the State's "nontax" revenue.

Nontax? Where do they think the Federal Government is getting the money—picking it off the Tidal Basin's cherry trees?

Yardsticks—Labor and Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there is one question that seems to me to be basic to our entire consideration of labor-management relations.

That question is, Are the parties upon whom we seek to impose rules and regulations equal? Do they stand before us equally armed and equally powerful? If we impose an equal restriction upon both, does it fall with the same weight upon both?

On that matter, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article published last summer in Life magazine, a magazine that by no stretch of the imagination could be called friendly to labor.

That article sought to prove the might and power of our labor unions. It sought to build up this idea of big labor about which we hear so much. And it sought to do this by showing the amount of money in the union's treasuries.

This article in Life magazine, after surveying all the unions in the Nation—AFL, CIO, railroad workers, mine workers, machinists, and other organizations—added up its figures and found that these 16,000,000 men and women had in their aggregate treasury a sum of approximately $224,000,000.

This $224,000,000 represented all the moneys in the treasuries, plus such funds as were held by banks, insurance companies, and other such institutions owned by labor organizations.

Now, $224,000,000 is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. I would be the last to contend otherwise. But huge as the sum is, it represents merely the assets of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad in 1935.

If all the unions in the country dealt with the Delaware & Hudson Railroad Co.—if they did business with this company—then I would say that they sat down as equals.

But we know that they do not.

Take a specific instance. The United Steelworkers of America is a large organization. According to the Life magazine survey, it had assets of some $5,000,000.

One of the concerns it does business with is the United States Steel Corp., a corporation with assets of upward of $2,000,000,000.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that none of my colleagues would contend that these two organizations are equals in terms of the resources at their command. Yet, they persist in this talk about big labor.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that only in the laws of the United States do our labor unions and our corporations find

equality—or they did find it until the passage of the Taft-Hartley law upset the balance.

The Wagner Act, whose spirit we seek to incorporate in the bill now before the House, merely put into law some fundamental principles of equality with which we all agreed.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we seek to promote genuine collective bargaining, if we seek to establish once again the principle that true bargaining must take place between equals, we must wipe from the statute books the Taft-Hartley law and return to the spirit of fairness and equality that prevailed for the previous decade.

Northwest Miners Support H. R. 1326

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to place in the RECORD a statement of policy of the Northwest Mining Association regarding bills before Congress relative to import duties on certain metals and ores.

While the statement mentions the McCarran-Cain bill, which was a companion measure to a bill I introduced in the Eightieth Congress, it now refers to the perfected bill I am now sponsoring in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 1326.

This bill, H. R. 1326, would encourage the opening up of a new zinc-producing area in northeastern Washington by allowing ores mined there to be smelted at Trail, British Columbia, and returned to the United States duty-free for use here. Since there is no available smelter in the United States which can or wants to handle these ores and zinc is badly needed in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes, this is the most logical new source of zinc supply. It has been estimated that passage of H. R. 1326 would result in creation of approximately 1,000 new jobs for American miners and shippers.

POLICY OF THE NORTHWEST MINING ASSOCIATION BASED ON RECOMMENDATION OF NATIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

That the Northwest Mining Association support the McCarran-Cain bill, or any successor to it that provides for the reentry without payment of duty of an amount of zinc equivalent to that mined in the United States and exported for processing outside the United States. While this is contrary in principle to many actions taken in the past by the Northwest Mining Association, it is held that the bill should be supported; (1) because it will greatly benefit local interests, (2) because the lack of adequate zinc processing facilities makes it impossible to secure equally favorable smelting facilities in the United States, and (3) because the conditions which make export desirable are not believed to be of a permanent nature.

That the Northwest Mining Association oppose any extension of a general suspension of tariffs on copper, lead, or zinc for more than a 1-year term, and to protest vigorously any action taken which extends beyond a 1-year suspension.

Mrs. Nancy Belle Norton, "Angel of the Philippines"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the names "Bataan" and "Corregidor" shook the civilized world in those grim days of 1942 when a handful of Americans and Filipinos held out against the crushing might of a modern Japanese Army.

Caught completely unprepared, these few thousand men were the only opposition we could offer throughout the vast stretches of the far Pacific.

Even we back home could sense that their position was hopeless. Their gallantry touched and shamed all of us. Somehow we felt that we, as individuals, were responsible for their plight. For if America had courageously faced the danger signals which were so apparent for many months before, these men would not have been abandoned to their fate. We would have prepared ourselves and would have been in a position to come to their assistance.

It was the same tragic story of "too little and too late."

The men and women on the peninsula and on the rock would have to fight on as long as humanly possible, to delay the enemy from other operations and gain for the folks back home precious time in which to organize for survival.

The war was going badly for us. It was a question of saving the United States. Some pessimists were saying that the war would last from 8 to 12 years. It would be a long road back to the Philippines and the men and women we were sacrificing to military necessity because we did not have help available for them.

As the news of growing disaster trickled in, another fear clutched at our hearts. What would happen to the men and women taken prisoner, whom we would not see again for many years, if ever? How would they be treated by an insolent foe, intoxicated by his spectacular conquests? How would our people hold up during the long, weary years of imprisonment, taunted by their masters, and hearing nothing of the true state of affairs in the United States? Would they crack under the terrible pressure of fear, hunger, and despair?

The haze of peaceful years has come between us, dulling the sharp outlines of those days when the flag came down on Bataan and Corregidor. In memory you can look back without pain, recalling those qualities of love and mercy which stood out from the general suffering and despair.

One above all we will remember—that of a woman who no longer had the physical vigor of youth to sustain her, but compensated for this with a splendid spirit that never knew the meaning of surrender. She, too, was a prisoner, but the enemy never conquered her faith, her hope, and her charity.

They call her the Angel of the Philippines, but she was also mother to thousands of homesick Americans, seeing to it that thousands of packages got through to them, visiting the hospitalized, and by the lift that her presence gave, bringing the priceless gift of morale without which many might not have survived.

How important this was is revealed in a War Department report which states that several times as many American prisoners of war died, mostly of starvation, forced hard labor, and general brutality, as the Japanese had ever reported. At one prison, Camp O'Donnell, about 2,200 Americans died in April and May of 1942. In the camp at Cabanatuan about 3,000 had died up to the end of October 1942. Even heavier mortality occurred among Filipino prisoners of war at Camp O'Donnell.

The calculated Japanese campaign of brutality against the exhausted, hungry Americans and Filipinos on Bataan began as soon as they surrendered in what thereafter became known among its survivors as the march of death.

Some men made that march of 85 miles in 6 days on one mess kit of rice. Others made it in 12 days without any food whatever. There was very little water. Much of the time the columns were given the sun treatment, which was a deliberate form of torture. Prisoners were beaten, bayonetted, and shot on the slightest whim or fancy. In his orgy of victory, the enemy gave vent to every form of savagery.

It is a miracle that any survived without going mad.

She talked back to the Japs who refused to listen to her and then sought out higher Jap officials in her determination to help the prisoners.

As they saw this frail but fearless schoolteacher standing up to them, perhaps they were reminded of their own mothers, for here was the personification of decency which they did not dare to harm. When they refused her pleas, she did not quit. With persistency and with sublime moral fervor she kept at her task until she was granted permission to carry foods and clothing to the sick and injured of which there were so many.

For her outstanding services, she has since been awarded the Medal of Freedom which is the highest decoration that the Army can grant to a civilian.

But I believe that she merits an even higher honor—namely that of the everlasting thanks of the people of the United States.

There are many people who are worried by personal problems, by developments within our own country, and by tensions on the international scene. To them I recommend the inspiring example of Mrs. Nancy Belle Norton.

From her they will learn that no problem, however hopeless it may appear, is

beyond the saving grace of high courage and devotion to the needs of one's fellow man.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to Mrs. Norton, and I wish her every blessing that grateful hearts may bring.

Newspapers' Death Knell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Oregon City (Oreg.) Banner-Courier on the subject of the proposed increase in postal rates:

NEWSPAPERS' DEATH KNELL

Way back there, some 100 years ago, Congress offered a helping hand to the folks who needed and wanted educational and informative publications, but couldn't afford them because publishers just couldn't get the price within reach because of high transportation and distribution costs.

Congress placed such publications—weekly newspapers and farm journals—in a special class and gave them a low postage rate.

That was a national policy—to disseminate information helpful to the folks who were building America out beyond the city limits.

It still is national policy, but there has come into the first-fostered field, a group of mass-production publications whose aim is to profit from the postal rates through Nation-wide circulation.

To get this circulation, these publications have furnished entertainment rather than education and information. By offering a light, easily read, entertaining publication, they get mass circulation and, having such circulation, could reap fortunes from advertising.

That growth is not in line with national policy as founded way back there and proved sound down through the years.

Now comes the Post Office Department, blind to that policy, and demands that postage rates be increased on all publications as a matter of raising revenue—not in public service.

Further, the Post Office Department takes the attitude that advertising is an evil thing. If a country newspaper carries more than 75 percent of its space in advertising in more than one-half of its issues, that newspaper will be chastised by losing its second-class mailing permit.

Advertising is informative. Much of it is more educational and of wider appeal than the country correspodence that gets the blessing of the post-office arbiters of what is proper for the folks to read.

Under the proposed rates, however, subscribers would have to pay 25 percent more if a country newspaper publisher printed from 25 to 50 percent of the paper's space as advertising. If a paper carries 50 percent or more advertising, the postage rate would go up another 50 percent. The publisher could only pass on this charge to the subscriber; he hasn't a bottomless pocketbook to finance it.

Without advertising, this copy of the Banner-Courier would cost each subscriber about 50 cents. Under the proposed postage rates, it wouldn't cost much more, but it would not be complete, interesting, informative, and educational without the advertising which really pays the bill for the subscribers.

Stifling advertising revenue and increasing rates at the same time is, if approved by Congress, the death knell of country newspapers.

Atlantic Pact: The Road to a Hot War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Farmers Union Herald of April 18, 1949:

ATLANTIC PACT: THE ROAD TO A HOT WAR?

(By Israel Epstein)

A place of gloom today is Lake Success, seat of the United Nations. The lobby talk there is that the Atlantic military pact may kill the UN and even that the current assembly session may be the last. Noting that President Truman appeared at the signing of the pact but declined to officiate at the laying of the cornerstone of the new UN headquarters in New York, many experienced people believe that the United States is determined to bury the UN.

Open voicing of these fears has come not only from many writers and commentators but also from high officials of the UN and its western, as well as eastern, member countries. United Nations Secretary General Trygve Lie condemned the Atlantic Pact when it was first proposed. Australian Foreign Minister Herbert V. Evatt, opening the UN assembly April 5, stressed that "world-wide security * * * can be found only in a world-wide organization," and asked all nations present "not to allow yourselves to be deflected from your purposes, perhaps by the fainthearted, perhaps by the cynical, perhaps by the mischievous."

The UN was founded 4 years ago, as its Charter says, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind * * * to live together at peace with one another and as good neighbors." While verbal controversies have raged within it, it has helped these quarrels to remain verbal rather than military.

The Atlantic Pact, as admitted by no less a person than Republican bigwig John Foster Dulles, who has acted as America's chief UN delegate, is the road to war. "Our fellowship with the people of western Europe and particularly of Scandinavia ought not to seem to bring United States military might directly to Russia's border," he told the Federal Council of Churches of Christ March 8. "I do not know any responsible high official in this or any government who believes that the Soviet state now plans conquest by military aggression," Dulles said further.

"But if the pact goes into operation," he warned, "it would indeed involve a high tribute to the Soviet leaders to assume that * * * they would exercise more self-control than would our people under comparable circumstances, as for example if the Soviet Union had military arrangements with a country at our border."

Winston Churchill, who first coined the phrase "Atlantic community" and afterward helped inspire the Atlantic Pact, boastfully admitted that the pact is a war measure. Churchill said the great mistake of the West after the First World War was "the failure to strangle bolshevism at its birth." While he spoke of "settlement," Herald Tribune columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop analyzed his words to mean "a settlement * * * that may require violent and precipitate action." The Alsops went on to say that "we must force a preventive crisis" before Russia has the atom bomb, meaning launch a war against her before that happens.

The Alsops' interpretation may be taken as the true one because these journalistic brothers are very close to Churchill and Americans who think like him, both in their sources of information and in their ideas. I myself can bear testimony to the fact that Joseph Alsop, the senior brother, talked of a United States-Soviet war as long ago as 1942, long before any vetoes, Czechoslovakias, or other acts which are now used to justify anti-Soviet measures. At the moment the Red armies broke out of Stalingrad and began driving the Nazis out of their country, Alsop, then a captain in General Chennault's Fourteenth United States Air Force, told a dinner group in Chungking, of whom I was one, that "the Russians would have to be stopped." He is still for a war, as is his ex-chief Chennault, who wants United States soldiers to fight for the beaten Chiang Kai-shek in China and like-minded gentlemen much higher up in the political and military world.

Resolution by Iowa General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 23, adopted by the Fifty-third General Assembly of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 23

Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress, at various times, legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertising of alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas it is desirable to place this general assembly on record as not favoring such advertisement in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Fifty-third General Assembly

of Iowa disapproves of the practice of advertising of alcoholic beverages in publications printed in this State or transported into Iowa in interstate commerce, and urges both the Congress of the United States and the next General Assembly of Iowa to take such steps as are necessary to control and eliminate such practice to the end that the general welfare of the people and especially the youth of Iowa and of the United States be safeguarded and protected.

I hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Fifty-third General Assembly of Iowa this 20th day of April 1949.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Local Control of Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, George Fred Falley of Evanston, Ill., former president of Northwestern University Alumni Association, recently wrote his daughter, Priscilla, on the much-discussed subject of Federal support of our public schools. Falley said to his daughter, "We want local responsibility, not Federal," and sent along an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune which his daughter and wife wanted me to call to not only the attention of Members of Congress but to General Eisenhower who is quoted therein. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of Saturday, March 26, 1949]

The little red school house made America. Now America is threatened by the big Red college.—SUBSCRIBER.

CHALLENGE TO COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Congressmen report they are receiving an unprecedented avalanche of letters urging them to make adequate appropriations annually out of the Federal Treasury to support our public schools. Most of these letters are from high-school pupils, obviously inspired by embittered teachers.

The hardships which our teachers experience have led them to forget, if indeed they ever knew, that the basis of our free education comes from our communities. Centralize the schools and you socialize the state.

Influence goes with money. If we turn our public schools over to Federal maintenance we turn them over to Federal influence. Thus Hitler rose to marshal his people to disaster.

Seemingly innocent in the beginning, such a tendency is a menace in the ultimate. Our public schools are supported from the public funds raised by taxation. If the Federal Government taxes to the limit of the people's ability to pay, there is little left with which the people can meet the needs of their community. Town, county, or State should be able, through legitimate tax levies, to raise enough money to build all the schools the community needs, and to pay our teachers the wages they earn but do not get. Our school teachers, school principals, school boards, chambers of commerce, and college presidents are all running away from America when they run to Washington with their tin cups.

Our colleges are impoverished. The college president is today harassed and bewildered by the necessity of raising money just for college maintenance. Donors who think they are contributing to educational causes are too often merely multiplying the college problem. Gifts generally are made to erect a specific building on the college campus which becomes a memorial to the donor.

Dr. Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago, complained years ago that he had no trouble getting memorial halls but no money for chalk.

Few men of means with benevolent impulses make substantial contributions to the college pay roll. Walls are erected over which ivy climbs and about which songs are sung. They impressively embellish the campus. But teachers remain poorly paid.

Time was when the president of a college was looked upon as a spiritual and inspirational force who devoted himself to the cultural life of students and through them to the Nation. Today, there is not a college president in the country of the caliber of Nicholas Murray Butler, David Starr Jordan, Andrew D. White, Charles W. Eliot, or Woodrow Wilson.

A few months ago General Eisenhower was made president of Columbia University. He is now on leave. He has dropped his civilian clothes to again put on the soldier uniform and take an Army job.

As a pedagog, as an administrator of faculty, and as a leader of students the presidency of a great university looked alluring to Eisenhower. But he found he was not supposed to be an inspirational academic marshal of a great student body. Even rich Columbia needed pay-roll money, and a lot of it. Brick, stone, and mortar, stately academic edifices, these Columbia had in plenty. But pay rolls memorialize no names. The general was told to go out and get. The begging job irked the general. So now speculation is current as to whether or not Eisenhower's leave of absence to wear his uniform may not mean his permanent departure from Columbia.

It is complained, and with ample foundation, that our colleges are infiltrated with communistic influences, if not direct communistic teaching. This is true. Yet the overwhelming majority of our high-school teachers and our college professors are good loyal American citizens. Their patriotism and their devotion to our country's cause are above question. But our college teachers find their jobs impose upon them an economic distress that makes any system that might bring them relief look inviting.

So the boy comes back from college to say, "Sure, Dad, the American system is O. K., but it needs radical changes. Don't close your mind to communism. It is a great new force in the world." And the boy got that straight from a teacher who was angry, a teacher who could not hope, on his pittance of pay, to send his own sons to college. Our schools and colleges are fostering resentments instead of cultivating patriotism.

In a recent issue of Collier's a professor tells why he quit teaching. Seven years of intensive study had been given to fit himself for the doctor-of-philosophy degree, necessary to qualify as a grade A teacher in a grade A college at $1,650 a year. When his baby came he couldn't find a bank that would lend a professor the money to pay the necessary doctor's fees. The banker thought a professor was a bad risk. The banker didn't know that he was society's bad risk. He knew that the teacher didn't have the rating given crude labor. But he had no desire to help do something about it.

A recent survey at Rutgers shows that faculty members there spent an average of $708 more in a year than they were paid. They spent it on bare necessities. How did they get the extra $708? By mortgaging whatever they might have or working on the side.

The result of this situation, and there is no intelligent crusade to stop it, is that college teachers are leaving the high vocation of their choice and fitness to take jobs as salesmen, as bricklayers, or plumbers. I know one who opened a liquor store. He said his wife couldn't take it any longer and he had no right to subject her to the privations of the wife of a professor. And our college presidents are going in exactly the wrong way to correct the menace.

Where does our tax money go? It goes to Washington. To the bureaucrats who bungle the people's business. And our college presidents are too dumb to marshal an enlightened protest against the tax abuses that are sending all our school influences into socialism. Our school heads are all rushing to Washington with their tin cups to get on the hand-out bandwagon.

The American way of life is no longer with us. Teachers wonder what has become of it. And there is where our college professors flunk. They do not see the truth so they do not know how to tell the truth.

General Eisenhower recently said: "The United States is in danger of falling under dictatorship through a creeping paralysis of thought and overcentralized government." This is the truth that our colleges do not teach. Our college presidents face a challenge and they do not meet it.

Imagine the impact on Congress were Eisenhower, the civilian, to marshal 100 of our university presidents to Washington to demand that the bureaucratic debauch be ended. That would return us to the American way of life.

History is filled with stories of more astonishing things than that. Our college presidents could serve no greater cause than to save our country. If Eisenhower would lead such a crusade he could save America. He could lead us back to the American way of life where our colleges would again find donors of endowments, local tax levies would again be equal to the community's school needs. And the free schools of the people would again become the "fortresses of our freedom."

Joint Resolution Relating to World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and in behalf of my colleague, Hon. NORRIS COTTON, I include therein the following joint resolution relating to world government which was approved by the General Court of New Hampshire on April 7, 1949, requesting that the Representatives from New Hampshire in the National Congress urge the President and the Congress forthwith to take the initiative in requesting amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

Joint resolution relating to world government

Whereas we believe that world peace can be created and maintained only under a

world federal government, universal, and strong enough to prevent armed conflict between nations, and having direct jurisdiction over the individual in those matters within its authority; and

Whereas in 1945 the General Court of New Hampshire solemnly declared "that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as The Federation of the World"; and

Whereas we are mindful of, and endorse the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a world community favorable to peace, and further believe that every avenue should be utilized so as to transform the existing organization of the United Nations into an effective world government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That our representatives in the National Congress be and hereby are requested to urge the President and the Congress forthwith to take the initiative in requesting amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war. The secretary of state is directed to send a copy of this resolution to our representatives in the National Congress, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the President of the National Senate, and to the President of the United States.

RICHARD F. UPTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
PERKINS BASS,
President of the Senate.
SHERMAN ADAMS,
Governor.

Approved April 7, 1949.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gloomy Reality," published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOOMY REALITY

Addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, predicted a 3-year deficit of $11,000,000,000, and said that if our present rapid trend toward a more powerful Central Government is not halted "we are headed for regimentation equal to that which is now suffered by the English, if not worse."

The Virginia Democrat is a foremost authority on economy in government—or the lack of it. His words have more than ordinary weight, therefore, because he knows what he is talking about. As a matter of fact, however, it hardly requires the services of an expert to recognize that a constant increase in the scope and amount of Federal spending heads inevitably in the direction of a socialized state.

When government grows too great, it must undertake more and more regimentation of the lives of the governed in order to support itself. Our traditional pattern of democratic government was not predicated on the idea that the Government will be everything and do everything.

Senator BYRD's gloomy fiscal outlook did not take into account the recently proposed health plan, or a 70-group air force or universal military training—and it did assume that a high level of prosperity would continue. In other words, the picture may be even blacker than he painted it, unless Congress calls a halt in the onrush of centralization and greater spending.

Social Security Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New London (Conn.) Day of March 5, 1949:

STILL FOOLING THE PUBLIC

The other day Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, New York State Republican in the House of Representatives in Washington, pointed once more to a basic misrepresentation in the social-security system, mentioned here many times before and never remedied. It is, of course, the cynical business of collecting social-security taxes for a definite purpose (the social-security taxpayer fondly hopes that it is to accumulate a credit in his name, so that he may get the money back, and more too, when he reaches 65 years of age) and then turning the cash into the general fund, for ordinary expenses of the Federal Government. Of course, the Government does one more thing; it adopts about the same policy that the small storekeeper may follow when he takes $5 out of the till, goes down the street to buy a couple of shirts. He puts a "chit" in the cash register, saying he has taken the $5 and therefore it will be "light" by that amount, when checked at the end of the day.

But, as the New York State Representative notes, the Federal Government has now collected more than $12,200,000,000 in pay-roll deductions for old-age and survivors' insurance purposes—and has spent most of it for other purposes! The Representative puts it bluntly: "It is not the method of administering the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund, so-called, to which I object, but the failure of the administration to inform the public of the facts. Staggering sums have been collected from pay envelopes to run the Government, on the pretext and representation to the workers that this is an insurance fund from which they will get back many times their payments in later life. Instead, he pointed out, even those who have directly benefited thus far have found their old-age payments, on reaching the age of 65 years, "pitifully small."

The truth is that the whole system is a snare and a delusion, calculated to delude the taxpaying public, and there is no other way of explaining it. The Government takes the money and uses it; it "replaces" the money taken out of the "fund" by putting Government bonds in the insurance trust accounts. But do the bonds mean anything, with relation to the money already paid into the Government's general fund? Not one solitary thing. A Government bond isn't money unless it is sold to someone. You can print a million of them and keep them in a Government vault and they mean exactly nothing. When the time comes for the Government to sell these bonds, it naturally follows that it can get the money. What happens then? The money received for the bonds in due time has to be paid back, with interest, to the purchaser when the bonds are retired. Where does the money come from? You may have two guesses! It comes out of the taxpayers. The taxpayer will pay twice for this social-security purpose.

In short the present working of the social-security system is not honestly explained; it is the kind of maneuver which, on the part of a bank or some other privately operated financial institution, would very likely land someone in jail. Parts of it are so Ponzi-like that it seems remarkable the people haven't arisen in all their wrath and demanded a new and honest approach to the subject.

Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 21, adopted by the Fifty-third General Assembly of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Whereas Iowa produces, both as to value and numbers, more eggs than any other State in the Union; and

Whereas the farm income of Iowa from eggs alone in 1948 was approximately $140,000,000; and

Whereas the people of Iowa are strongly in favor of a fair and adequate price support program for eggs; and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture and all State Extension Departments have approved and promoted a program whereby eggs would be sold strictly on a quality basis, which program resulted in 80 percent of all eggs sold in Iowa being evaluated on standards of quality and grade; and

Whereas in the administration of the support program by the Federal Government only the price of dry eggs has been supported, while the price of frozen and shell eggs has not been supported, with the result that undergrade eggs in the present market command almost the same price as the top consumer grade AA eggs; and

Whereas this policy has destroyed the producer's ability to market eggs on a quality basis according to grade and has undermined the grading program, which formerly encouraged production of a quality product; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to require price support of eggs at the top grade, including frozen and shell eggs, with deductions for undergrade eggs, and to eliminate the present practice of supporting only the price of dry eggs; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the United States Senators from Iowa and to the Representatives in Congress from Iowa and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Fifty-third General Assembly of Iowa this 19th day of April 1949.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Kenneth Royall Resigns as Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Durham Morning Herald and the Greensboro Daily News, both of April 23, 1949:

[From the Durham Morning Herald of April 23, 1949]

KENNETH ROYALL RESIGNS AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Acceptance of Kenneth Royall's long anticipated resignation as Secretary of the Army removes from public life an able official. Royall has the distinction of serving as the last Secretary of War, one of the original Cabinet positions. In this office he was in succession to some of the most notable Americans. President Washington appointed Henry Knox, of Massachusetts, the first Secretary of War when he named the first Cabinet.

John C. Calhoun under President Monroe, Jefferson Davis under Pierce, Edwin M. Stanton under Lincoln, Newton D. Baker under Wilson, and Henry L. Stimson under Taft, and Franklin D. Roosevelt are among the illustrious who preceded the North Carolina attorney in this post.

In addition to the distinction of being last Secretary of War, Royall has the further distinction of being first Secretary of the Army in the reorganization which unified the branches of Armed Services in one Department of Defense. The difficulties in this post were great. In the first place, unification of service was wanted by neither Army nor Navy. Some officers did not appear concerned to make unification a success. With such obstacles, it is a tribute to Royall and his colleagues that so much progress has been made.

North Carolina regrets to see him leave a post of such importance and influence, but she welcomes him home—he has indicated that he will resume his law practice—heartily. The Old North State and the Nation as well will remember gratefully his public service and, noting he is in his prime, will hold him on call for future duties and responsibilities.

[From the Greensboro Daily News of April 23, 1949]

ROYALL RESIGNATION

After doing a difficult job well, Kenneth Royall has resigned as Secretary of the Army. Under the guidance of his exceptional qualities of intelligence, industriousness and resourcefulness the Army has been brought up from the debilitated postwar condition in which it had been allowed to fall and raised to a very considerable measure of power and a "posture of defense."

For this the country owes him a profound debt of gratitude, for it was no easy task. President Truman recognized this when in accepting the resignation which had been tendered more than once he wrote: "In war and in peace you have served your country faithfully and well. * * * Your service has covered the transition from active hostilities and through the period of demobilization and after that the coordination of the Department of the Army into the National Military Establishment. * * * For your part in all of these activities of such paramount importance to the national security, I tender you this assurance of heartfelt gratitude and appreciation."

It was natural and proper that the resignation should have followed the appointment of a new Secretary of Defense, especially in view of the fact that Royall had disagreed with Johnson on several matters including the progress of unification of the armed forces and of the desirability of abolishing segregation in them.

As Royall noted in his letter of resignation to the President, "my recent personal inspections in the overseas theaters have shown the Army everywhere to be in excellent condition and I have confirmed my belief that war is not imminent." North Carolina welcomes home again a distinguished son after a patriotic service effectively performed.

The Economic Balance Shifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of April 25, 1949:

THE ECONOMIC BALANCE SHIFTS

The domestic economic landscape brightened considerably Friday with a further relaxation in consumer credit controls by the Federal Reserve Board. Fears of inflationary pressures, voiced loudly in some administration sectors while vigorously denied in others, were obviously not in the minds of Chairman Thomas McCabe and his fellow Board members when they took this latest action.

Effective Wednesday, installment buyers will have 24 months in which to pay the balance due on their purchases of stoves, dish washers, ironers, refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners, radios, television sets, phonographs, sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, furniture and rugs. The time limit has been 21 months since March 7. The cash down payment rule is now lowered from 15 to 10 percent of the purchase price. The only exception is made in the case of automobiles, which continue at 33⅓ percent. In addition, the blanket exemption for controlled articles under $50 has been raised to $100, which means that retailers may offer products costing less than $100 with no down payment.

It should be noted that installment credit now stands at a peak of $8,000,000,000. However, national income is running at a rate of about $230,000,000,000 annually, and there is no reason to believe the credit total excessive. Yet the demand of many retailers that controls be abolished altogether seems premature. As unrealistic as are the warnings of some of the more inspired economic seers, there are still too many imponderables to risk ending all restraints in the matter of extending credit to consumers. At today's prevailing wages and prices, the newest terms should be sufficiently attractive to permit all who so desire to purchase the controlled articles.

But if the Reserve Board's action is an encouraging indication that supply is again meeting demand, the other side of the coin is not so lustrous. A number of leading appliance manufacturers have recently announced small yet significant lay-offs in their working forces—evidence that the imbalance has shifted the other way. Other areas of the economy, such as metals and textiles show signs of softening. Talk of deflation, disinflation, or recession (take your pick) fills the air.

Without giving undue aid and comfort to the pessimists, it seems safe to say that the time is ripe for mature discussion of the means by which we can avert the more drastic effects of large-scale unemployment and business decline. In this connection, a proposal made by Representative BOGGS merits close attention. He would have the Congress appropriate $50,000,000 a year to stimulate advance planning of non-Federal public works. The resulting "shelf" of construction would be available for immediate execution should the situation warrant.

It takes from 6 to 18 months to plan most public buildings and other projects, and in the absence of blueprints a sudden crisis might find the Government unprepared to act. Last year's total of $14,000,000,000 in private construction would shrivel markedly in the face of a recession, Mr. BOGGS argues, and a heavy backlog of fully planned public projects would be needed to maintain employment on an even keel. Mr. BOGGS' proposal is not pleasant to contemplate, but we cannot afford to ignore the warning it carries.

Filbert Growers Crucified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

MR. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial from the Oregon City (Oreg.) Banner-Courier of recent date on the subject of filbert imports. I have often called the attention of the House to the disastrous results to our filbert growers of our import policy. I commend this editorial to your reading as a further indication of the administration's total lack of interest in this important Northwest industry:

FILBERT GROWERS CRUCIFIED

Fixing tariffs to protect investments and lifetime labors of farmers raising specialty crops is a matter important to the filbert and walnut growers especially the former.

Hence, when the United States Tariff Commission refuses to make a cost study of the nut growers' operations to form a factual basis for tariff fixing, we know that the nut growers are being sacrificed by the administration.

The Tariff Commission didn't want to learn that it costs quite a bit more for the Northwest farmer to raise nuts than it does the peons of Mediterranean nations.

It wants to continue to use the imports of European nuts to trade these foreign growers machinery and other manufactured products from Eastern States where there are a lot more votes than out here in the Northwest.

The Commission's refusal to try to find out facts on costs in order to set fair tariffs and save its own people from bankruptcy is proof enough that the administration's policy is not to protect our economy if it interferes with its plans for political domination of the Nation.

The UN Is You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, would peace will become a reality when, and only when, the hearts of men are ready to receive it. All programs, the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the like are essential, in the over-all development of the people so that at some time in the future they may be prepared to accept the advantages of a world in which peace shall be the motivating spirit.

With these thoughts in mind, it is well for all of us to take notice of any effort to attempt to instill within the hearts of man the blessings of a world dedicated to good fellowship between peoples. Just recently the pupils of the schools of Durango, Colo., have taken part in an editorial essay contest sponsored by the League of Women Voters of that community with the topic, The Unity Is You.

It is my thought that the first- and second-place winners of this contest express, to some extent at least, the attitude of the boys and girls of my district, especially around Durango, in regard to the United Nations. Because these two essays are so straightforward and personal in the thoughts expressed in them, I am sure others may desire to read and enjoy them. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I am having them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

THE UN IS YOU

(By Mary Offutt, Durango High sophomore, age 14)

The United Nations is a wonderful organization, but people just don't know enough about it; and they won't, unless we, the guardians of the future, do something about it. I believe world peace lies in the hands of the young people. Steps must be taken to keep young minds free from hate and vandalism.

People must learn the functions of the UN before they are willing to help, and no one blames them for not knowing. Most adults learn a lot from their children, so teaching the principal facts about the UN should begin in schools. An example could be a Junior UN in every school, where every boy and girl could vote on, discuss, or veto problems presented to them. This way every pupil could learn the function of UN.

Pen pal letters help a lot in morale, and everyone should be urged to write. Both adults and young people should feel this to be a privilege and a duty.

If more backing could be given to universal 4–H Clubs and similar activities instead of to universal military training perhaps another stepstone on the road to world peace would be laid. And adults who organize groups working for world peace need our help and cooperation, too.

I believe if young minds were on other things besides hate and war, adults might soon learn not to hate, and world peace might eventually follow.

If we can accomplish these things, I believe UN, with God's help, can make our world free from war.

THE UN IS YOU

(By Guy Hafer, Smiley Junior High, seventh grade, age 13)

I am a schoolboy who has many opinions on many things.

People who are living in America are very lucky to live in a friendly nation, a country that has many friendly allies.

It is one of my opinions that United Nations should scrap all war material and use the metal for industry and farming material.

All school boys and girls should learn all they possibly can about UN, in reading articles, listening to news broadcasts, and discussing their countries in school classes.

They could also see many educational motion pictures about foreign countries and their people, and in this way understand their customs, interests, education, and occupations.

If older children and parents would not talk about war and fighting people of races, children would learn to like Negroes, Dutch, and other races.

American boys and girls could write to children in other lands and become personal friends with many.

If we boys and girls would do all these things, then we would all learn to be kind and understanding; then we could whip our evil souls.

The Federation of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 10, 1949:

THE FEDERATION OF THE FREE

It is in a way unfortunate that the European recovery program, the North Atlantic Pact and proposals for military aid to western Europe have all come up at once. The Senate's discussion of the ECA authorizations was inevitably affected by these related subjects. Friday's favorable ECA vote of 70 to 7 was encouraging, but the fight over the actual appropriation is still to come. This fight may be bitter and may involve our whole foreign policy. Yet it may have good results in the end if it emphasizes that in our relationships with the free nations we are not building several detached structures. We are building a single structure, which we hope will be a more effective peace palace than the one which took shape many years ago at The Hague. Anything that strengthens one part of this edifice strengthens all the other parts.

The amounts of money we are to spend, the ways and terms of spending have been subjected to questioning and will be so subjected. They should be. Neither House of Congress should be called upon to sign blank checks. But in essence there can be only two opinions on our great enterprise. Either we are committeed by historic circumstance and by the laws of our democratic being to join with other democratic nations in the world's great crisis, or, as the isolationists argue, we can escape that responsibility. Isolationism in the United States has been dying over a long period of years. It is not quite dead. We shall know in the course of the next few weeks how much of it survives.

We believe that honest isolationists must ask themselves, as they have not done before, how their policy would work. We think they would have to admit that isolationism—or any degree of isolationism which involves less than adequate aid to our friends—would throw us back on the defense of our own frontiers. We think it can be demonstrated that such defense, laying aside all moral questions, would be more costly than the policy of mutual aid on which we are already embarked.

If this argument is sound—and it is the argument on which our foreign policy has been based for at least 2 years—we must acknowledge that we cannot break our ties or our obligations toward the rest of the free world. We defend ourselves by uniting for defensive purposes with other countries. We ask the people of those countries to do the best they can economically and strategically to strengthen and protect themselves. Since they cannot now with their own resources do all that needs to be done, we have to come to the rescue. We do this for the same reasons that led us in the old days to build forts in the Indian country and to place coast artillery along our shores. We do it—and we need not call this action wholly unselfish—so that no enemy can safely come at us. For the same reasons, the nations of western Europe are under pressure to break down their own frontier walls and to cooperate among themselves not only in a military way but in coordinating their trade and their finances. If a unity of purpose and practice can be achieved in western Europe, and between western Europe and the United States, a free world will exist which cannot be conquered and almost certainly will not even be attacked.

The advocates of this kind of union would be the last to argue that western Europe should become permanently dependent on the United States. Self-help is the key to success here, as it is for the individual in a democratic society. The nations cooperating under the ECA and under the North Atlantic Pact must be equals in dignity and independence, no matter how much they may differ in wealth and population. Otherwise American aid to Europe would perpetuate the crisis which it is intended to relieve. The United States, if it were to remain indefinitely a source of gifts, would become merely another empire. We want no such empire. We should foresee, and work toward, a species of federation—an organization that might well be described as the federation of the free and into which all nations respecting human freedom would be welcome. We need not think now in terms of institutions. We already have one institution, the United Nations, which, if it could fulfill its purposes, would keep the world free and at peace. Whatever the institutional form, history drives us toward a closer union—not a merging of cultures or a submergence of national parliaments and governments, but an organized readiness to maintain together the democratic way of life.

Hon. John Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I have learned

of the resignation of John Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy. The question of whether or not the Navy's great carrier should have been built was not an issue in his resignation. It was the arbitrary manner in which the Navy was shunted aside—its views not considered.

If the country expects the Navy to continue to demonstrate its fine devotion to duty, then it must insist that the Navy be treated as an equal partner in the business of defense.

John Sullivan followed the only course that a man of integrity could follow.

The Negro and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mrs. Paul Robeson at the Progressive Party dinner April 27, 1949, Hotel Commodore, New York City:

I was very much struck by what Paul Robeson said about American Negroes in relation to a possible war.

I know it's a little unusual for a wife to pay attention to her husband's pronouncements, you know the saying—a prophet is without honor in his own country, in his own home, in his own time—but I thought this one was pretty important, and it certainly raised a storm.

He said, to quote him exactly:

"That it is unthinkable that American Negroes would go to war on behalf of those who have oppressed us for generations, against a country which in one generation has raised our people to the full dignity of mankind."

The professional Negro leaders rushed into print to refute this statement, and to explain that Paul does not speak for the "overwhelming majority of the Negro people."

Walter White, as head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, perhaps the best known of those leaders said, and I quote:

"Negroes are Americans. We contend for full and equal rights, and we accept full and equal responsibilities.

"In event of any conflict that our Nation has with any other nation, we will regard ourselves as Americans, and meet the responsibilities imposed on all Americans."

Now I agree that we Negroes are Americans. Of course we are Americans.

But try and explain that to Rosa Ingram and Amy Mallard and the American courts of justice in Georgia.

Try and explain it to the Trenton six and the American courts of justice in New Jersey.

Try and explain it to the Negroes who worked in the garbage brigades, the laundry and cleaning and labor battalions in the American Army in our last war for democracy.

Try and explain it to the Negroes everywhere who are now trying to get into American public-supported housing, hospitals, schools, and work projects.

We Negroes are Americans, and we know it, but our country keeps telling us, time after time, in heart-breaking ways, that we have no rights and privileges as American citizens—except those it chooses to grant us when it feels indulgent.

So it is natural and inevitable that the majority of American Negroes have come to examine with a jaundiced eye the duties and obligations and responsibilities in their proper place, where they belong, that is side-by-side with the rights and privileges.

I know that every sensible Negro in this country, professional leaders notwithstanding, feels that if he must fight any future war for democracy, the proper place to begin such a fight is right here.

It is in the light of this normal, reasonable conviction that we must examine the relation of the American Negro to a possible war: If our country is attacked, invaded, I believe Negroes, along with other loyal Americans, will rally to our defense.

That's one thing.

But I also believe that if our country drafted Negro Americans, and many other sensible, reasonable, loyal Americans to fight a war in Greece, for a king the Greeks don't want, to fight a war in China, for Chiang Kai-shek, whom the Chinese people don't want, to fight a war for France and Holland, so that Indochina and the Indonesians can be kept in colonial slavery; I really believe that the Government of these United States will have a very hard time, indeed, luring sensible, loyal Americans into fighting such a war.

Now maybe Walter White can deliver up his 500,000 membership of the NAACP, maybe ADAM POWELL can deliver up his membership of the Abysinnian Baptist Church and his Twenty-second District in Harlem, and maybe other professional Negro leaders can deliver up their followers to fight such a war, but I doubt it.

But if they could, that would deliver up a theoretical 2,000,000 at most, men, women, and children.

Then what about the other 12,000,000 unorganized Negroes, the real vast majority of the Negro people? Who speaks for them?

It may well be that a giant Negro, one Paul Robeson, the son of a slave who caught the ear of the world with his golden voice, and who has always used that voice to call the attention of the world to the plight of his Negro people in America, in the West Indies, in Africa, and to the plight of all suppressed and oppressed peoples everywhere, it may well be that this golden Robeson voice is putting into words some of the thoughts of these unorganized voiceless people, this vast majority of the Negro people in this country.

Since he has never asked them for anything for himself, and is not doing so now, they may do well to listen to him. They have nothing to lose by doing so.

Public Works Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Ray C. Kirkpatrick, Director, Labor Relations, Federal Works Agency, before the Louisiana State Federation of Labor, Shreveport, La., April 4, 1949:

As the construction arm of the Federal Government, and as the Federal agency most frequently contacted by local governments about their public-works problems, the Federal Works Agency constantly must be thinking in terms of the future.

By their very nature, public-works projects must be planned painstakingly in advance of construction. The size and cost of most projects require that considerable time be spent in selecting sites, coordinating projects with comprehensive community plans, preparing detailed blueprints and specifications, making financial arrangements and letting contracts.

You know from your experience that it takes from one to two years from the time a job goes on the drawing board until the first construction trades worker reports at the site for employment.

It is generally agreed that a planned flow of public works based on immediate needs, backed up with an adequate reserve that can be called up at any time, is most advantageous to all concerned.

When I say reserve, I do not mean a potential of need but a potential that is blueprinted and ready to go. A reserve shelf of blueprinted projects must be large enough to permit a substantial and rapid expansion of public construction to meet a sharp cutback in private building or a general business recession. In either case, public construction can help to stabilize employment and stimulate recovery.

I don't want anyone to think I'm predicting a depression. But I do think we ought to be prepared. As a matter of fact, preparedness has been made our national policy under the Full Employment Act.

During the war, all but essential construction was halted so that manpower and materials could be concentrated on the war effort. Since the war, emphasis has been on housing.

Compounded through the years of reduced and curtailed public construction, the need today stands, according to the best estimates, as high as $100,000,000,000. Each of you is aware of the needs in your own communities, many of them urgent in terms of the health and welfare of the people. The list includes schools, hospitals, sewer and water systems, highways, conservation projects and public buildings.

Do we have an adequate reserve shelf of public-works blueprints to make the most effective use of this potential?

I want to answer that question with facts. It has been estimated that public construction for 1949 will amount to about $5,000,000,000. The existing reserve shelf has been estimated at $4,500,000,000, or less than the amount of public construction for a single year.

We must also take cognizance of the fact that a trend toward increasing public construction is developing. According to 1949 estimates, public construction will comprise 27 percent of a total of $18,250,000,000 in new construction. Last year, with the total at $17,600,000,000, public construction amounted to $4,000,000,000 or 23 percent. I think you'll agree with me that we do not have an adequate reserve shelf. Then, how can we build up an adequate reserve shelf?

As far as State and local governments are concerned, the Federal Works Agency's advance planning program proved itself to be an effective aid and stimulant.

Under this program, the FWA Bureau of Community Facilities made loans of $55,500,000 for the blueprinting of 7,000 projects with an estimated construction cost of slightly less than $2,500,000,000.

This advance planning program ended in June 1947, when the loan provisions of title V, War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, expired.

In passing, I want to point out that Congressman BOGGS, of this State, has recognized the importance of advance planning and has introduced H. R. 3086 to reestablish this essential planning program.

I want to say a few words to you about the Water Pollution Control Act. The act authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to make grants for the preparation of drawings and specifications for sewage-treatment plants and 2-percent loans for construction purposes.

However, authorization is not enough to make the law operative. Funds have to be appropriated, and this has not been done. The authorization is for $22,500,000 a year for 5 years for loans, and $1,000,000 a year for 5 years for grants.

Considerable attention has been called to the limitations of the law which place a $250,000 ceiling on loans and a $25,000 ceiling on grants.

The United States Public Health Service has estimated the sewerage works needs of Louisiana at $37,656,000, of which only 9½ percent is ready for construction. More than 73.8 percent of the total remains for future planning, while plans are in progress for 16.7 percent.

Other States have similar needs which can be met with the help of Federal aid if and when funds are appropriated under the Water Pollution Control Act.

The need for school facilities is particularly acute. At its recent meeting the United States Conference of Mayors pointed out that the lack of adequate school buildings is severely hampering the education of our children. By resolution the Conference of Mayors urged the Congress to enact legislation providing for low-interest bearing loans and grants to local public agencies for school construction. This school problem is one which affects each of you as skilled construction workers and as public-spirited citizens interested in the welfare of our children and country.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent and enlightening editorial from the Express, Knoxville, Iowa. Mr. Casey, the writer, is a Democrat and a good newspaperman whose editorials are widely read throughout the State of Iowa.

The editorial follows:

Let us pray that socialized medicine never becomes a fact in these United States of America. Theoretically it offers a wonderful promise of medical care without cost to the patient—practically it will result in more disunity than anything that has ever happened to the American people. Patients will flock to the doctors' offices and to the hospitals by the hundreds of thousands; doctors will find themselves engulfed with patients, some with real, and some with imaginary ills; of necessity they will have to be treated in classes with the same treatment to all regardless of the need; it will cost billions of dollars in taxes; the lazy will use it as an excuse to avoid work and secure pensions; it will build up a political power which can finally ruin the entire country. Other nations in the world have tried it with failure and disillusionment. Men and women have died while waiting for the red tape to be untangled. And there are not enough doctors, and there cannot be enough doctors, to administer such a program. Such a step as socialized medicine is pure socialism no matter what else it may be called. If medicine can be socialized then the railroads, the steel mills, the food industry, the farming industry all can be socialized. This trouble could all be eliminated very easily by just letting Russia take over this Nation tomorrow.

Peace Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans who cling to the democratic ideals of popular representative government on which this great Nation was founded watch with sympathetic interest the development of the same philosophy of government in the Holy Land, adapted to the smaller scale and different conditions of the Middle East.

The Republic of Israel is 1 year old.

Israel has, in that year, and in the face of hostile conditions which might have destroyed a less stubborn devotion to freedom and independence, gained relative stability in its political, military, economic, and social problems. Great courage, great vision, and great faith were required to achieve that result in 12 short months.

In a tiny nation in which every man, woman, and child was enlisted in the struggle for freedom, it is impossible to say that any one man was responsible for the result. In a nation of heroes, who is to be called the chief hero?

Nevertheless, a people must have an effective and devoted leadership for efficiency, and much of that leadership in Israel has come—with no lack of credit to other great leaders—from the Honorable Moshe Sharett, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel.

Under leave, I am inserting the text of a recent address by Mr. Sharett in New York, delivered at the dinner forum of the Nation Associates on April 7. The topic of discussion of the forum was Peace: How Can It Be Achieved?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that Mr. Sharett has made a brilliant contribution to discussion of the subject.

PEACE CAN BE WON
(By Moshe Sharett)

(Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Moshe Sharett, delivered the following speech at the dinner forum of the Nation Associates held at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York on April 7. The forum's subject for discussion was Peace: How Can It Be Achieved?)

I suppose it is a commonplace to say that an anxious and restless world can derive little comfort from the reflection that war is not imminent and that with luck it may be averted for a long time to come. What mankind wants is not merely the absence of war but real peace. The mere possibility of another world war is a haunting nightmare. You cannot stand indefinitely on the brink of a precipice and pray that the sense of balance will never forsake you or that you may never be pushed unawares into the chasm. It is an ordeal which may of itself produce the fatal loss of equilibrium.

Each one of us is prone to view the world scene from his particular angle and to draw from his own national experience conclusions which may or may not be of value for international statesmanship. I plead guilty to this egocentric approach. The experience and international position of Israel appear at first glance to be relevant to the point at issue on four main counts.

First, the part played in Israel's establishment by the international authority of the United Nations. The record of the General Assembly in this regard has been a striking demonstration of the capacity of the United Nations for creative statesmanship—its ability to formulate and morally to impose a bold and constructive solution for a complex and explosive international problem. It is true that, as far as the United Nations is concerned, high purpose in the conception of policy has not been equaled by determination and effectiveness in execution. It was the defense army of Israel and not the Security Council which in the hour of decision in Palestine saved Israel and the moral authority of the United Nations from utter collapse. Nevertheless, the role of the United Nations in shaping the country's destiny has proved decisive. The historic resolution of November 29, 1947, has in its broad outline set the pattern of a settlement which has already been woven into the fabric of the world. The Assembly itself never swerved from the course it had once adopted. It resisted twice the attempts made in its own midst to distort and stultify the great decision. The Security Council, after its initial indecision when faced with a brutal defiance of United Nations authority, rallied to arrest the growth of the conflict. In the final stages the achievement of Dr. Ralph Bunche and his associates in bringing to a successful conclusion three successive chapters of armistice negotiations stands as an example of international mediation at once resourceful, effective, and fair.

Second, Israel's paramount and compelling interest in peace. Its birth was attended by a war forced on it by a brazen aggression. Once alive and firmly established, its very breath depends on international peace. Any major outbreak of hostilities on the world scene will immediately affect the Middle East and may engulf Israel in a tidal wave of destructive violence. Israel's imperative need to grow and develop by immigration, influx of capital, and importation of technical skill and scientific talent can only be satisfied in a stable world. A world war would be fatal to that process. Moreover, Israel's vital connection with the Jewish people throughout the world makes peace a supreme injunction of its foreign policy. In the wake of the First World War that people suffered pogroms and economic ruin in eastern Europe. In the Second World War three-quarters of European Jewry were destroyed, and the virus of anti-Semitism became more malignant in many parts of the world. There is no people today which in obedience to a sheer instinct of self-preservation dreads another world war more than the Jews. Israel expects that its claim to be considered a peace-loving nation will be accepted as genuine not because of any supposed ethical superiority but because of its own evident interest in peace.

Third, Israel's potential role in the development of the Middle East. It is a commonplace of the "anatomy of peace" that its maintenance depends not merely on a stable political relationship between nations but on social contentment within each. Gross inequalities of wealth, mass poverty, and ignorance are a perpetual source of internal strife. Undeveloped potentialities lead to external dislocation. Both are most potent menaces to international peace. Weakness or vacuum invites aggression from outside, provoking

conflict among those bent on conquest. Injustice and oppression breed explosion from within, with inevitable international repercussions. There can be no stable peace on the basis of class privilege, mass privation, and general backwardness. It is in this context that the Middle East is one of the world's danger zones. The newly won independence of the Arab countries will remain precarious as long as the empty shell of political sovereignty is not filled with a solid content of economic development and social progress. To this process the state of Israel, by virtue of its own interest and for purely objective reasons, can serve as a powerful catalytic agent. Here again the basic interests of Israel are in full dynamic harmony with those of a constructive world peace.

Fourth and last, Israel's demonstration of the coexistence within its national framework of divergent economic systems and ways of life. This unique diversity in unity is a feature of the Jewish reconstruction effort in Palestine which has as yet received scant attention from the world outside. Two basic principles have governed the social and economic evolution of the new Jewish society: first, the complete social self-determination of the settler—that is, his freedom to choose a form of social life which accords with his ideas; second, the freedom of economic enterprise, individual and collective. As a result, a structure has been built up and is steadily growing wherein different types of production and ownership function side by side, from the ultra-capitalistic and individualist to the ultra-socialistic and collectivist, with various intermediary types in between. In the process of peaceful growth the different forms shade into each other and replace one another as in a living tissue. The foundations of this social order, thus characterized by a symbiosis of socialism and capitalism, were firmly laid in the period preceding our independence. They will be retained and strengthened within the framework of the state. The new state democracy will safeguard these essential freedoms while subordinating them to the national purposes of the state, to its social principles and its international obligations. With all the stresses and frictions obtaining in Israel as in any modern society, there are inherent in this system the makings of a social peace.

This in brief expresses Israel's tenets and experience in grappling with the problem of peace. But it would be unwarranted to project those four elements to the world scene and expect the macrocosm to conform to the microcosm. The results achieved by international statesmanship in Palestine do not demonstrate the capacity of the United Nations to settle graver conflicts and solve problems of wider dimensions. What has proved decisive in the case of Palestine is the fact that the two major powers which stand at the opposite extremes of the world arena have alined themselves, broadly speaking and at least at certain stages, in support of the same policy. Yet this incidental harmony does not yet seem to have established a precedent, and the fundamental disharmony between the two contending giants continues.

As to the pursuit of peace, all nations profess to be consecrated to that high objective. Yet the threat of war grows ominously. It is not enough merely to abjure and repudiate it. The accelerated development of backward territories and the removal of their worst inequalities would certainly make for greater contentment and therefore peace. Yet that avenue of progress alone by no means settles the issue. As such countries develop and mature, they may take their place in one of the two warring camps into which the world is today divided, thereby only enlarging the scope of the conflict. Moreover, the conflict is not now raging primarily in the backward areas of the globe. Its cockpits are rather located in the world's most civilized countries. In more than one country of Europe a struggle is being waged for the mastery of its soul, or rather two souls are struggling for supremacy.

This brings us back to the fourth element—the coexistence in one frame of divergent social systems and outlooks. Here, indeed, is the crux of the problem. For reduced to its fundamentals, the problem of world peace today is the problem of a peaceful development of two distinct social and political civilizations side by side. Whether a synthesis between the two is possible only time can show, provided humanity survives. As long as they diverge, and unless they learn to live together, the threat of a deathly clash will be ever present. If they cannot live together, neither an equilibrium, which cannot but be unstable, nor the preponderance of one system over the other, which must remain indecisive, can avert the catastrophe. The crucial question is therefore: Can they, will they agree to coexist, either forever or until such time as they will merge in some synthesis or one of them will prevail over its rival in peaceful evolution?

The experience of Israel does not, of course, resolve the enigma; yet it offers a clue to its solution. Why has the mutual adjustment of different systems proved feasible in Israel? Because they are subordinated to and united in a transcendent common purpose—the achievement of national salvation. The problem of world peace resolves itself, therefore, into the question: Is there a common world purpose which overrides the conflict between the two divergent political systems?

To that question the answer must be an emphatic affirmative. There is such a common purpose. It is the salvation of mankind. The common denominator of humanity is basic, elemental, and compelling. It is the will to live—the urge to survive. War has ceased to be a gamble between victory and defeat for either party. It spells a certainty of destruction for both, a danger of annihilation for all. Peace and survival have become synonymous. Peace is no longer a means to an end. It is an end in itself; it is life itself. The hope of mankind's survival thus lies in the common realization of the deadly peril. Will that realization penetrate deeply into the mind of man? Will it determine conduct? On the answer to these questions depend the peace of the world and the future of mankind.

Chatham Takes Crack at Holifield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal:

CHATHAM TAKES CRACK AT HOLIFIELD

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHATHAM, Democrat, of North Carolina, suggested last night that General Sherman rides the South again in the person of Representative HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California.

CHATHAM took issue with a statement he credited to Representative HOLIFIELD in which the Californian said:

"I will guarantee you that if the southerners and the Republicans get their coalition working against the Taft-Hartley repeal bill, then about 100 administration Democrats will be ready to fight every bill affecting the South that gets to the House floor.

"I am not sure how it (the fight on the labor bill) will come out, but of this you can be sure—the House will get an opportunity to vote directly on repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. And if it refuses to carry out that pledge of the Democratic platform, then the war with the southerners will be on."

REMINDED OF HISTORY

CHATHAM told reporters: "Representative HOLIFIELD'S guaranty that the war with the southerners will be on reminds me of the history of the Civil War.

"When the hired troops of the North started their march through Dixie, they were met by patriots who were fighting for their homes and fireside. Not until overwhelming strength was mustered was the South conquered.

"If General HOLIFIELD thinks he can scare the southerners by his threats I hope they will accept the challenge.

"The repeal of the Taft-Hartley is not the question—the point is that General HOLIFIELD controls about 100 administration Democrats by his own admission who, upon his command, will attack below the Mason-Dixon line at his bidding.

"I suggest that we of the South not only accept the challenge but would remind the general to read the particulars of the Battle of Manassas—known in the South as Bull Run."

HOLIFIELD was not available for comment.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and thoughtful editorials I have seen recently on the subject of national health insurance was published in the New York Post of April 21. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HEALTH OF A NATION

As President Truman prepares to announce his views on a national health-insurance program, it may be useful to review rapidly some of the main features of the controversy.

Most probably the President will urge a sweeping measure covering medical care, hospitalization, prescriptions, glasses, artificial limbs, etc. He will probably urge amplification of the old Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill to provide for hospital construction, and medical training and research. This broad program would be financed by pay-roll deductions and employer contributions.

As matters stand today about 40 percent of the counties in the United States have no full-time health departments. According to some estimates this fact alone results in 200,000 needless deaths every year. Consequently no one directly opposes the proposition that the Federal Government should move in and help. The question is, how?

AFL and CIO leaders are uncompromisingly behind a national health-insurance program of the broadest and fullest type. Leading the opposition is the American Medical Association, which has $3,500,000 to spend. To the AMA, the administration proposes socialized medicine, a term which is a handy smear for anything which might bring down the cost of illness or lessen the AMA's power to push doctors around.

The AMA actually wants a pauper's law. That is, they want the Federal Government

to put up the money to expand existing voluntary programs. In other words, if you can't afford to join a hospital plan, let the Government pay your dues for you. Or, in still other words, let the Government support anything which the AMA can control; let the Government, in fact, create a Federal Health Department with an AMA-controlled M. D. in charge of it.

The Republican scheme is even franker. It proposes a $280,000,000 expenditure the first year which would be a charity system pure and simple—a straight dole to people who can't pay doctors and hospitals at present rates.

Certainly, we want to give the poor all the help they need. But the problem of improving national health is deeper than any question of poor relief. Any Nation-wide health program worth having should be one that is good for everybody. The maximum number of people should belong to it.

The AMA and Republican schemes are both programs for keeping the costs high and putting anyone who can't meet them on a sort of dole. Much more sensible and infinitely more democratic is a program to bring the charges down, not only for the poor but for everyone else, through an insurance program with the widest possible membership.

And back of, and, in some senses, more important than the cure of the illness of any individual, is Nation-wide aid for medical research, for more and better hospitals, for more and better medical schools. That type of program would lift the level of public health by a pooling of all the Nation's resources.

Judge Learned Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 28. It is a brief but deserving tribute to a fine man, an excellent judge:

LEARNED HAND'S 40 YEARS

For 40 years Judge Learned Hand has graced the Federal bench, almost a quarter-century of this expanse on the circuit court of appeals. The anniversary had its special observances, such as the dinner of his former law clerks. But the stimulation of Judge Hand has been such that it stands alone without formal recognition. His quality is pervasive; as a man, judge, and spokesman of the American ideal, his enduring contribution is unique. The law is his medium, but more than that, Judge Hand is the artist and philosopher adding his own ennobling strain to the national character. From him has come the constant statement of truth as he saw it, for others to be guided and inspired. This is far more than being a judge; it transforms legalism into a superior leadership.

Judge Hand is a man in marvelous accord with himself and the universe. A few years ago he had the notion that he might like to be a physicist if his span could be knowingly repeated, but at the age of 77, Judge Hand thinks that he probably would repeat his career. As he says, "The longer I've been with the law, the better I like it." And for this statement an untold number of people, perhaps even those who never heard Judge Hand's name, can be grateful for his great and good influence.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a thrilling and gripping article written by Josephine Crisler which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of last week, April 23, 1949.

I have known this charming writer for many years. Endowed with a great brain, she is the mother of three splendid sons and the widow of a fine and capable Federal Government executive. She has written an article which has excited the interest of people throughout the Nation. Would that we had more Josephine Crislers in the world.

The Senator mentioned in this article without formal designation is my senior Senator, Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, now President pro tempore of the United States Senate. You will be interested to read this story. It should reveal to you the quick and useful mind and soul of a man who has done so much for Tennessee, the South, and the country. The Senator has served longer than any other man now sitting in the Senate. In all of the years of his marvelous activity, he has never failed for 1 day to do something for his fellow man and for the country he loves. This story gives but one incident out of a rich and full public service.

I SAVED THE PANAMA CANAL

(By Josephine Crisler)

No more fitting description of housework was ever made than that classic by a cleaning woman who said of life, "It's so sort of daily." The monotony creates a lurking fear that you are growing stale. Perhaps that is why, between doing dishes and defrosting the refrigerator, I amuse myself with those quiz columns like Increase Your Word Power, Test Your Horse Sense, and How's Your I. Q.? They take less time than crossword puzzles and the score is occasionally reasurring. For instance, if you know 9 out of 10, you are "superior," 8 is "excellent," and so on down to "good" and "fair." One day I got all 10 right and discovered I was a "genius." I went around for nearly an hour feeling like a member of the intelligentsia. It seemed a sort of pity that such an intellect had to be subjected to the steam of a pressure cooker, the vapor of scalding dishwater, and the dust of a vacuum cleaner. Then the rice boiled over.

But the thrill of being a temporary genius was nothing to compare with the spine-tingling discovery that I had saved the Panama Canal. I know it sounds fantastic, but before you wire me the name of your favorite psychiatrist, hang on until I get that documentary proof out of the desk drawer and I'll tell you how it happened.

First, I ought to explain that I am just a Washington housewife whose husband—a former insurance executive—had been in the Government for more than a dozen years prior to his death a short time ago. You never heard of me before and probably never will again. The only thing you might remember about me is that if the little Dutch boy who put his finger in the dike and thereby saved his country from inundation were alive today, he and I could hold a convention in a telephone booth.

My story begins in 1938, about that time of year when the children were busy cramming for exams. The spring semester, when term papers and finals are the paramount interests, would soon be at hand. We had two sons in college that year, and one in junior high. I was glad they were too absorbed to notice how preoccupied their father had become. He had been like that for months and, it seemed to me, he was finding it harder each day to be his normally cheerful self.

Of course, 17 weeks is a long time to stand up under the strain of being isolated and completely ignored. Those of you who have never worked for the Government and are unfamiliar with that type of hazing will require a little background to make you understand. This was the first time it had happened to John, and it seemed so incredible that we couldn't believe it ourselves.

You see, my husband had been with the same Federal agency for 2½ years. It was one of the largest ever to be organized, and he had played an important part in setting it up. It was his first experience with Government and he had given it all he had. For more than a year he had worked until midnight or after, and spent every waking hour devising means to do the job quicker and for less money. One night he and his administrative assistant discovered they had saved $11,000,000 on one operation, and they were elated. That is, until the next day, when his secretary, who was an old hand, laughed and said, "That's a sure way to be out of a job. No one in this man's Government wants to hear about doing anything for less money. They want the boys who can spend more. You won't last long if you mention the word 'economy.'" But John's experience in a business where efficiency and economy had been practically synonymous was too recent to be shed lightly, and he persisted in his efforts to get the job done without waste and delay.

In his office there were two stenographers, an administrative assistant and a desk piled high with papers. Both phones rang constantly, and the secretary kept a jug of coffee and brought him a sandwich on days when he felt he shouldn't leave for lunch. The men who administered the act sent people in to see him in a steady stream, for there were approximately 35,000 jobs to be filled.

Then there was a change at the top. The chairman of the agency was replaced by one of the other members. The new chairman had lots of friends who had to be put on the pay roll. Many of them immediately began to use the time of a much-needed stenographer, the resources of the agency and their first experience in the Government as a means of getting their doctorates. Lots of books were written on Government time with the use of Government stenographers. No one seemed to think it was out of the ordinary, but to comparative newcomers like us, it did seem a little irregular. Also, a lot of aliens were beginning to be recommended as consultants.

Among his other duties, my husband was chairman of the personnel-selection committee handling top jobs. This seemed to worry him no end. Often he would say to me, "I don't know where all these peculiar people are coming from. Few of them speak English, most of them need a bath, and all seem to have degrees, dandruff and a starry look. But there's a great deal of high-up pressure to put them on and find work for them to do."

In the course of these interviews, my husband had evidently made the mistake of asking, "Are you an American citizen?" and "If not, do you intend to take out your first papers?" The invariable answer to both questions was an indignant "certainly not." But despite his objections and the existing Civil Service Regulations, they got on the

pay roll just the same. Most of them were German or Russian aliens.

John told me he could not, in conscience, approve such applications, when at that time there were hundreds of equally or better qualified Americans who were capable of filling these jobs. He made the mistake of saying so. For him, that was the beginning of the end.

The next morning, he had one stenographer instead of two. His administrative assistant was transferred to another office, mail service ceased, and he was reduced to one phone, which remained strangely silent. An embarrassed messenger, leaving a file on his desk, reappeared a moment later to explain that it was an error, and removed it. That was the last piece of paper to be laid there. His office, which had been a beehive for more than a year, suddenly became completely isolated. Day after day he sat with nothing to do. The iron curtain is not new, and he was definitely behind it. It was the old doghouse technique, effectively designed to make a man quit in disgust.

Most men can't endure it for long, and it is a frightful strain on even the stoutest-hearted, but John stuck it out grimly for 17 sickening weeks—sickening because he felt he was being paid money money he had not earned. Not even the memory of the days and nights and Sundays he and his staff had worked—sometimes completely around the clock—seemed to ease that awful feeling of taking money he had not worked for.

When the doghouse technique fails, there always remains the coup de grâce employed by certain bureaucrats who want to get rid of an official—the job can always be abolished. And, of course, set up again with another occupant and a different title. So they did.

Any long-time Government employee—or, for that matter, any seasoned Washington taxi driver—can tell you there is nothing unusual about abolishing a job one day and setting it up again the next. It's a routine practice in Government circles. The technique is as common as featherbedding or expense-account padding.

When they finally gave the coup de grâce to John, it was something of a relief to us both. The strain and uncertainty were over. We told each other we were glad. He would find something better before long. His work was widely known and had attracted favorable comment. Other agencies were being set up and he would be needed. So the round of the agencies began. Almost every day there was a new possibility, a new hope. It looked promising for a while, as men who knew his capabilities passed his file from one to the other. But always, when it reached the highest level, someone had been tipped off not to put him on. It's a very close-knit corporation, the Government. Old pals, old school ties, the bright boys who share the same philosophy can do a lot with a telephone or a knowing look. The first few weeks we were not discouraged, but finally the pattern was unmistakable.

Savings dwindle fast when nothing is coming in. School was almost over and I was beginning to get panicky. Could the boys go back to college? Were we going to fail them at this important time of their lives? One day I read of the suicide of a man who had been replaced in that same agency by the usual process of having his job abolished. That did it. Suddenly I was mad enough to chew up a nail and spit out a box of tacks. And right then I knew I was going to find the answer to something that was troubling me. I went to the only place I could to ask about it—the office of a Senator from my home State.

One of the secretaries in that office was a charming woman who seemed happy to see me. We sat down. "There is something on your mind," she said, smiling.

"Yes," I agreed, "and I've got to find the answer. Let me begin by asking you a question. You are an intelligent, good-looking woman who has proved herself a competent secretary and an expert stenographer. Will you tell me this: If you went to a foreign country, would you expect to get a good position with the government of that country in competition with its citizens?"

"Certainly not," she said.

"Well, why does our Government employ those who are not citizens and have no intention of becoming citizens? Is there no law against it?"

"There must be," she answered, frowning. "I'll find out." And she picked up the telephone and asked for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The man on the other end said he would look it up and call her right back. We chatted for about 10 minutes. Then the phone rang and the report was in. We had no such law.

She couldn't believe it. "The agencies must be full of Fascists and Communists," she remarked grimly.

I told her of a conversation with another Senator in 1937. In response to my comment on the fellow travelers in the agency where my husband worked, he had observed, "Relatively speaking, there are perhaps not as many in that particular agency as in some of the others. They have swarmed in like flies in a molasses barrel."

My Senator was in committee meeting, but she would call it to his attention the moment he returned, and let me know. I later learned that he, too, was aghast to discover that there was no such law. He couldn't believe it. He had it checked again. Fortunately, my Senator was on the Appropriations Committee—he still is—and it was that time of year for the deficiency appropriation for the independent offices, which in simple language means that the independent agencies, which always spend more than they get, had come up for another handout. It invariably happens just before the new fiscal year begins, which is on the 1st day of July.

Well, the Senator thanked me for bringing it to his attention. He said he would do something about it, and quickly. He didn't like it any better than I did. And when your Senator talks like that, it makes you glad you are an American. It's good to know that even though you are only an obscure housewife, you can talk to a United States Senator face to face. As long as that situation exists, no one can take this country away from the people it belongs to, no matter who tells you the Congress is a disgrace and ought to be abolished.

And so my Senator—who has been called everything you can print and some things you can't—went to work. He said he would do something quickly, and he did. First, he introduced a Senate resolution calling upon the departments and agencies to report the number of aliens in their employ. The result was startling. Civil-service regulations to the contrary notwithstanding, well over 10,000 aliens were on the Federal pay roll.

As I have already explained, the independent offices deficiency bill was then pending. So the Senator tied a rider to it which said, in part: "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States * * * unless such a person is a citizen of the United States * * * or being eligible for citizenship has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States."

The usual lobby—that is, the agency officials regarded as smoothies—hand picked to handle Congressmen and influence legislation, would normally have swarmed up on the Hill to defeat the measure. But unhappily for them, they were caught in a legislative trap. Their deficiency bill, rider and all, had to pass, and quickly. They had to have that money, no matter what, because it was already obligated or spent.

A day or two later, the Senator's secretary telephoned me, "Go ahead and have a good cry. The conferees have agreed, the Senate and House have concurred, and our little rider—God bless it—is the law of the land."

The affected agencies and the never-give-America-a-break group screamed to high heaven. They said the usual. It was reactionary, undemocratic, and discriminatory. But the jig was up. And what's more, it set up a chain reaction. Other legislators, alerted to our threatened safety, attached alien restrictions to the appropriations for other agencies. About 30 days later the military and defense establishments, including the Panama Canal, were covered by similar riders.

Government reporters predicted that only a sprinkling of Federal employees would be affected. No one—not even the Senator, much less I—was prepared for what happened. That phrase "no part of any appropriation * * * shall be used to pay" is pure magic. Guess what? In Washington they went out in droves. But that was nothing compared to the exodus from arsenals, navy yards, depots, airfields, laboratories, experimental research and social agencies. Hundreds went out at Boston, New York, Norfolk, Savannah, Galveston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and the Canal Zone. It was estimated that a total of 10,000 aliens, predominanly Japanese, German, and Russian, were discharged or resigned.

Less than 4 years later we were at war. One day while John was at a staff conference at the Pentagon, a group of officers were berating the Congress in general and my Senator in particular. After all, it's the delightful prerogative of Americans to gripe. But when each in turn had expressed some typical military tribute such as "He's a first class, revolving so-and-so," one very senior officer remarked gravely, "Gentlemen, you can say what you please, but, in my opinion, we have that Senator to thank for the fact that we have the Panama Canal today."

That first little rider became law 10 years ago. It's pretty much the same, except that over the past decade it has grown longer and stronger, with penalties attached. The 1948 version reads like this:

"Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1949, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States * * * unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act, who, being eligible for citizenship, has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with regard to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both." All of which may sound highly legalistic, but it's sheer romance to me. To have had even a small part in such legislation is the answer to a housewife's prayer.

If you want to read it for yourself, you will find it on page 19, title II, general provisions, section 202, of Public Law 491.

As long as it remains a law, I feel I've still got my finger in the dike. Maybe women ought to get mad more often.

Thomas Jefferson: Apostle of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal American on April 13, 1949, and in other newspapers from coast to coast:

THOMAS JEFFERSON: APOSTLE OF LIBERTY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Except the Lord built the house,
They labor in vain that build it."
—*Psalms 127:1*

Greatness is the essence of immortality. Its reach is from horizon to horizon. Its power fills the heart with music from the spheres.

Such a man was Thomas Jefferson. He was the third President of the United States.

We salute the two hundred and sixth anniversary of his birth. We revere his memory. We worship at his shrine. We rejoice in the grandeur of his achievements. He was the eloquent apostle of liberty. He was the father of our democracy.

Jefferson was one of the greatest humanitarians of his age. He was one of the foremost liberators of the human spirit. He was one of the outstanding exponents of Americanism. He was one of the principal architects of the Republic. His fame walks in the pathway of the stars. His name is too great for any one nation, too noble for any generation. His life was as pure as the golden stream of the dawning sun. His friendship for mankind was as deep as the ocean. His faith in the people was the philosophy of his life, the touchstone of his thoughts, and the mentor of his actions. He dedicated his power to the common good of all mankind.

Aristotle taught that man was a social animal.

Jesus taught the moral virtues of man and his relation to God.

Jefferson taught man his proper place in society. He opened the windows into the souls of all humanity.

Jefferson fought his battles with his pen and not with the sword.

Jefferson inspired men by the humility of his greatness, by the inherent trust in Divine Providence, and by the ineffable belief in human brotherhood. He gave liberty and its heroes the Bible of American freedom—the Declaration of Independence. He wrote the words which became marching armies for freedom. He wrote the preamble which set forth the truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. He wrote the undying expression that every citizen is entitled to the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"All men are created free and equal." These words are the foundation stones of good government. These are the words of the apostle of man.

Jefferson named for himself his own passport to immortality when he wrote his own epitaph. It is inscribed upon the monument that rises from his grave at Monticello. "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia."

Here is no boast of offices he held. Here is no boast of honors he bore. Here is recorded in utter simplicity a man's innate greatness—the three imperishable monuments of his crowning glory—human liberty, religious freedom, public education.

The Declaration of Independence is truly a declaration of dependence on God. It is the substance of our Government. It is the insistence of the God-given character of the rights of man. It is the soul that gives America its breath of life. It was to save that soul that we engaged in global conflict.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It has echoed through the years. Its wisdom should be heeded now. It should be engraved upon our hearts. It should be framed and hung on the walls of our homes. It should be carved in the archways over the doors of our schools. It should be read and reread in every pulpit and public place. It should be taught to our children throughout the land.

Today many European countries lie prostrate under the brutal heels of Communistic tyranny. Today communism challenges democracy all over the world. The supreme issue that challenges every American is, "Shall we preserve our American way of life among liberty-loving people, or shall we permit liberty to be wiped off the face of the earth?"

Today the spirit of Jefferson calls for the rededication of the ideals for which he lived, for which he fought and for which he wrought. To us he passed the torch. Let us consecrate ourselves to the principles of our sainted forefathers. Let us remember that its perpetuation is a trust. Let us remember that upon its adherence depends the happiness of millions who owe it allegiance. We must be strong if we are to remain free. A weak and irresolute America is a threat to our liberty, an invitation to war. A strong and resolute America is a safeguard to our security, a guarantee of our liberty. May the law of our land ever rest on the postulate of the law of God. For God's law means peace.

"He is immortal—only he,
Who stands for right unflinchingly
On watch from dark to dawn;
By God's eternal stars he steers,
Nor stays the storms nor fails for fears,
For truth is truth, a thousand years.
God's heroes march forever on."

Let us keep America a free land for freemen.

The Coast Guard Saves Lives and Scores Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations in the Eightieth Congress, of which I was chairman, did much to give impetus to the Coast Guard weather-station program, a program now being encouraged by the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

I was much pleased today to receive the following letter from Capt. A. C. Richmond, of the Coast Guard, regarding the lives saved in the Atlantic early Wednesday morning when a plane was forced to ditch and its crew of four were rescued by the Coast Guard cutter *Sebago* on weather-station duty:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1949.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANFIELD: You undoubtedly noted the news item that a C–47 MATS plane flying the Atlantic developed engine trouble and was forced to ditch in the Atlantic. Fortunately the plane was able to proceed to one of our ships on Station DOG before landing. The pilot made a good landing approximately 100 yards from the Coast Guard cutter *Sebago* and the plane crew of four were picked up by a motor self-bailer from the cutter. The plane sank in 12 minutes after landing, so it was fortunate that there was a weather ship available. There were no passengers on the plane and no casualties or injuries to the crew of the C–47.

Station DOG is one of the stations occupied during the last year as a result of augmenting the ocean weather station program. Knowing of your great interest in this program and the part that you played in seeing that the funds were appropriated to make this work possible, it is a pleasure to call this incident to your attention. I think you may well take justifiable pride in the fact that you had a major part in the saving of four lives today.

Sincerely,

A. C. RICHMOND,
Captain, USCG, Chief, Planning and Control Staff.

House Leader McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, April 17, 1949:

MAGIC OF M'CORMACK

The holy season of Easter is here and as always at Easter time, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of the National House of Representatives, and his charming wife and helpmate, Mrs. McCormack, are again home in Massachusetts with their numberless friends and well-wishers.

The press of the Nation has again acclaimed the leadership of Massachusetts' outstanding citizen for his effective masterminding of America's most important legislative position.

Momentous moments arrive, and critical crises come but Leader MCCORMACK meets them head on. Through his legislative magic, what at one time appear to be insoluble problems, finally go through the legislative channels smoothly and quietly and become a part of the warp and woof of our governmental processes.

Down through the years, House Leader MCCORMACK has demonstrated this extraordinary ability to mold public opinion and to produce legislation which meets almost unanimous approval of Congress.

During the hectic years of the depression, Congressman MCCORMACK was always in the vanguard of our progressive governmental forces that were seeking remedial legislation

to cure the ills which produced such distress, discouragement, and near disaster.

When World War II, with its turmoil, trouble and turbulence, broke upon a disheartened world, again the magic of McCORMACK came into being, and again huge appropriations for armament and defense became law under his guidance. All the necessary legislation to take care of business, rationing, shortages, and a million other dislocations in our national economy, received the magic touch of McCORMACK in the legislative halls at our National Capital.

With the end of World War II, House Leader McCORMACK was again confronted with innumerable requests for his services in straightening out our postwar economy. In addition to our own domestic problems, rent control, housing, veterans' care, taxation, and so forth, there came a crushing burden of legislation whose objective was to crush communism and to further the American way of life.

Thus as time goes on, President Harry S. Truman finds modest Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts as his best bet when it comes to getting things done. Under McCORMACK'S direction, the aid to Greece and Turkey bill, the Marshall plan for European relief, the Economic Cooperation Administration with Paul Hoffman as director, the Treaty of Rio with its necessary appropriations, as an aid to hemispheric solidarity and defense of North and South America, and now the epoch-making North Atlantic Pact with its huge billion-dollar program for rearmament of Europe in order to prevent the spread of Marxian communism and to contain Soviet Russia within its own territorial domain, have all become part and parcel of the legislative burden that our own JOHN W. McCORMACK has had to shoulder.

But Congressman McCORMACK has broad legislative shoulders that have been broadened by 20 years of intelligent, intense leadership. His habit of industry and his intense devotion to his country, to his President, to his church, and to his dutiful wife have made JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, one of America's great leaders and a great Christian gentleman.

May the Honorable and Mrs. John W. McCormack enjoy their well-earned and well-deserved Easter vacation here in their own native State of Massachusetts.

When this holy Easter season shall have come to an end and Mr. and Mrs. McCormack have again returned to take up their great tasks in our Nation's Capital, the magic of McCORMACK and the melody of Mrs. McCormack will be remembered by many, many multitudes of Massachusetts people who treasure this great couple among their friends.

So to House Leader and Mrs. John W. McCormack, we say happy Easter to you both; may God be good to you and spare both of you for many Easters to come, so that America and its citizens may have the benefit of your wise guidance, splendid counsel, and the extraordinary example of exemplary living in a troubled world.

The Railroads and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an article by Ambrose W. Benkert:

CHICAGO, *April 11, 1949.*

The Honorable RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: This is one of the best articles I have read on the railroad situation, and thought you might be interested. If there is anything you can do to help the railroad picture, would certainly be grateful.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR A. FRANK.

THE RAILROADS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Ambrose W. Benkert)

During the past 100 years we have developed under free enterprise the most comprehensive, efficient and dependable railroad plant in the world. It provides the safest service at the greatest speed and the lowest cost that can be found anywhere on earth. This is vital for America, for without the railroads our future would be dismal indeed. Without mass transportation we could have no mass production. Industry would stagnate; commerce would be paralyzed; great cities would disintegrate and our common well-being and national unity would be destroyed.

Why are the railroads so essential? Why are we so vitally dependent upon them?

Because man has not yet developed any other means of transportation for the mass movement of freight and the mass movement of people even remotely comparable in cost and efficiency to power on wheels applied to cars on rails. One Diesel locomotive pulling a freight train of 5,000 tons with a crew of five and using one teaspoonful of fuel oil per ton-mile illustrates the observation. It would take 500 trucks, with each truck carrying 10 tons, to duplicate this feat.

Just last Tuesday here in New York City, headlines in the press announced: "Long Island Railroad wins fare rise to stave off crisis." In its decision, the Public Service Commission of New York said:

"The stark issue and the only present choice seems to be: Is there going to be railroad transportation on Long Island continued and improved, or is there likely to be disintegration of service, confusion, and receivership?"

Here is striking evidence indeed that there is no substitute whatever for this railroad in the transportation of 200,000 Long Island commuters. Even at the increased fares authorized, 5-day tickets will cost the user about 1¼ cents a mile compared with local taxicab rates in excess of 20 cents a mile. Despite the belated order authorizing higher fares, bankruptcy was announced a few days later. Such an occurrence should awaken the public everywhere to support railroad petitions for decent compensation.

The common measurement of freight service is the ton-mile. Last year the railroads moved freight over 700,000,000,000 ton-miles, as compared with 447,000,000,000 in 1929. The average haul was 403 miles. For every man, woman, and child they moved a ton of freight about 600 miles in 1880, and over 4,500 miles in 1947. During the next 24 hours the railroads will move 1,800,000,000 ton-miles of freight, equal to 1 ton for a distance of 12½ miles for every man, woman, and child in the United States. And, in the same 24 hours, nearly 2,000,000 passengers will ride an average of 60 miles.

The cost of freight service during the depression and throughout the war was less than 1 cent per ton-mile, and even today, less than 1¼ cents. No other form of transportation can remotely compete with these charges.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Freight rates and passenger fares are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under Federal laws requiring a rate structure adequate to the needs of an efficient transportation system. For the past 30 years the Commission has substantially met these requirements. It is mandated to do so in the future. This fact, and the innate cost advantage of the railroads over every other form of transportation for the mass movement of goods and passengers, are the two fundamental bases upon which rest constantly improving service of the railroads to future America.

In doing their job, the railroads as private enterprises stand on their own feet without any Government subsidy whatever. They will continue to do so. This is of vital importance to America's future. Every competitor of the railroads is subsidized by the American taxpayer in one form or another. Trucks and busses, river barges, ocean shipping and air lines all are dependent on the taxpayer for their continued operation.

Only the railroads pay their own way. Paradoxically, their taxes are used to subsidize their competitors. Railroads carry 94 percent of the intercity mail and receive less than the air lines get for carrying the other 6 percent.

RAILROAD TAX BURDEN

In 1947, out of every dollar received, the railroads paid out nearly 11 cents (10.8) in taxes. This amounted to nearly $1,000,000,000 in 1947, equal to one-fortieth of the entire tax receipts of the Federal Government. This is important to America's future.

ADDITIONS AND BETTERMENTS

In the 11 years ended December 31, 1948, the railroads spent over $6,000,000,000 on improvements. Of this, over $1,000,000,000 was spent in 1948. This in addition to expenditures for maintenance. The total investment in improvements since World War I exceeds $13,000,000,000. This resulted in improved efficiency and in reduced costs to the public.

PERFORMANCE

For each person in the United States the railroads performed the equivalent of transporting one ton of freight the following distances:

	Miles
1880	645
1890	1,211
1900	1,863
1930	3,142
1940	2,851
1944	5,363
1947	4,567

PRIVATE VERSUS GOVERNMENT OPERATION

In World War I, Government operation of the railroads cost the American taxpayers $1,616,000,000—an average of about $2,000,000 a day, although both freight rates and passenger fares were materially increased.

During World War II, under private operation, the railroads cost the taxpayer nothing. Freight rates remained at prewar levels and passenger fares were advanced but slightly. In the 4-year period (1942–45) the privately operated railroads actually paid the Government $2,500,000 a day in Federal income taxes.

Taking losses under Federal control into account, the Federal Government was nearly $4,500,000 a day better off under private operation in World War II than under Government operation in World War I.

During World War I, under Government operation, passengers paid 51 percent more per passenger-mile and shippers paid 80 percent more per ton-mile.

During World War II, under private operation, passengers paid 2 percent more per passenger-mile and shippers paid 1½ percent less per ton-mile than in 1939.

As compared with World War I, under Government operation, the railroads in

World War II, under private operation, moved each month twice as many troops, performed twice as many passenger-miles of service, moved 5 times as much Army freight and express, 20 times as much Navy freight for overseas, and double as many ton-miles of freight of all kinds—and they did all this with one-fourth fewer employees, one-third fewer locomotives, one-fourth fewer freight cars, one-third fewer passenger cars.

Since 1939 railroad wage rates have increased 86 percent; prices of fuel, materials, and supplies, 118 percent; and the tax bill is 177 percent greater. These greatly increased costs have been offset with rate increases totaling only 52 percent.

This performance record demonstrates the importance to America's future of the railroads constantly having adequate funds for improvements.

Trying to condense the story of railroad accomplishments and railroad indispensability into a few words is like trying to engrave the Lord's prayer on the head of a pin.

INVESTMENT AND CAPITALIZATION

The investment in railroad property as of January 1, 1948, was over $28,000,000,000. This is $12,000,000,000 greater than the total par value of all railroad stocks, bonds, and other securities. Railroad stocks are not watered. They are outstanding to the tune of $12,000,000,000 less than the investment in the property. It is vital for America's future that this fact be known.

The undercapitalization is due to the fact that year after year the railroads have plowed earnings back into property without issuing any stock against such investment. This explains the high earnings per share of many railroads. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe is an example. During the past 4 years, this great railroad showed earnings averaging $15.88 per share per annum. Immediately this figure gives the impression of high earnings. It is cited by labor leaders as proof that the road could pay higher wages, and still make big profits. It becomes a target for shippers who want lower rates and point to high earnings. But actually, earnings are not high on the Atchison. Each share represents not only the original $100 but a reinvestment from earnings down through the years of an additional $200 per share. If the Atchison would capitalize this investment, it would issue two additional shares to each holder of one share and the earnings over the past 4 years would have averaged only $5.29 per share per annum.

Instead of issuing stock to represent this additional investment of $200 per share, the Atchison shows this investment in its balance sheet under "Earned surplus." How many labor leaders and shippers who oppose rate increases look at "Earned surplus" in balance sheets before saying profits are big enough to warrant higher wages and lower rates?

The managements and boards of directors of every railroad in this country are doing the railroad industry and America's future positive harm by failing to issue stock for earnings invested in the property so that the stock at par actually will reflect the whole investment in the propery, not just one-third or one-tenth of the investment.

Net value (after depreciation) of the property investment in all railroads is about $23,000,000,000. To this should be added $2,000,000,000 in cash and nearly $1,000,000,000 in materials and supplies, making a total net investment of $26,000,000,000—on which the 1948 earnings amounted to only 4.3 percent, or about $1,200,000,000. After all interest charges, there was left for the stockholders $711,000,000.

STOCKS NOT "WATERED"

Investment versus capitalization

Recorded investment in railway property	$28,732,752,000
Securities outstanding in the hands of the public:	
Par value of stocks	7,076,379,000
Par value of bonds, equipment obligations, and other funded securities	8,803,937,000
Total	15,880,316,000
Undercapitalization	12,852,436,000

In 1948 American railroads employed an average of 1,327,000 persons. The total payroll amounted to $4,743,000,000, making an average compensation per employee of $3,575. This, the world's highest wage for such work, was made possible by a capital investment averaging $21,650 behind each worker's job. It is estimated that the railroad plant could not be replaced at today's costs for less than $50,000 per employee.

Rates have increased only 50 cents for each dollar of increase in wages and other costs. This greater efficiency has been made possible by continuous investment in the railroad plant:

Year:	*Gross capital expenditures*
1941	$543,021,000
1942	534,897,000
1943	454,282,000
1944	560,112,000
1945	652,980,000
1946	561,957,000
1947	864,689,000
1948	1,250,000,000

TROUBLE LIES IN PUBLIC'S THINKING

In other words, there is nothing the matter with the railroads. They have the finest plant and equipment and the largest cash and working capital position in their entire history. The trouble lies in the thinking of the public about the railroads—due obviously to lack of knowledge.

Adequate knowledge of the facts would lead every right-thinking citizen to favor a square deal for the railroads. So long as the railroads are denied a decent return on their invested capital, and so long as they are compelled to subsidize all their competitors, they are not getting a square deal.

Notwithstanding the present magnificent plant and equipment, hundreds of millions of dollars could be spent right now for additions and betterments to the railroad plant which would result in improved service, increased efficiency, and still lower costs to the public.

During the past few years one Midwestern road spent $80,000,000 in track realinement which reduced this road's transportation costs by nearly 10 percent. On the basis of present gross revenues of $200,000,000, this means a saving of nearly $20,000,000 per annum or 25 percent on the investment. Another railroad has installed an automatic classification yard at a cost of $10,000,000 with commensurate savings.

FINANCING PROBLEM

The expenditure of the vast sums involved in such a program is only possible if the funds can be obtained from the public. Accordingly, the price level of railroad securities and the cost of raising and servicing the funds is a matter of vital concern to America's future. This invites examination of the present situation in the railroad securities market.

What do we find? Stocks of leading roads selling for less than twice 1 year's earnings; bonds at prices to return over 10 percent per annum despite large coverage for interest requirements. Whole railroads priced in the market—some for less than their salvage value, others for less than cash and rolling stock alone—the railroad plant itself being given away.

Assets and earnings are such that on a comparable basis many of these securities are worth enough to make financing possible right now if the facts were known.

Let me repeat: There is nothing basically unsound about American railroad securities. The unsoundness is in the thinking of the public lacking the facts.

To know the fact is of vital importance to America's future. We need a public aroused to give the railroads a square deal and to keep them as private enterprises.

If the withering hand of Government ownership ever falls upon our railroads, God help us all.

WHAT DIESELS CAN SAVE FOR YOU

America has 38,000 steam locomotives. Thirty-two thousand burn coal. Six thousand burn oil. In addition, 5,000 Diesel-motor locomotives are operating on the railroads.

But today each Diesel engine uses so little fuel oil to pull a train that, if all 38,000 steam locomotives were completely replaced by Diesels, the railroads would use fewer barrels of petroleum products than are now consumed in the 6,000 oil-burning steam locomotives alone.

To replace the steam locomotives now would cost $3,800,000,000. This would save the railroads at least $760,000,000 each year. Much of this saving of more than $2,000,000 every day would be passed on to the public in lower passenger fares and lower freight rates.

RAILROAD REVENUES, 1948

(Preliminary)

Sources of the railroads' gross revenues and their relative importance:

		Percent of total
Freight revenues	$7,952,000,000	82.6
Passenger revenues	954,000,000	9.9
Mail	191,000,000	2.0
Express	121,000,000	1.3
All other	408,000,000	4.2
Total operating revenues	$9,626,000,000	100.0

(Mr. Benkert has offered to send you a printed copy of the principles and fundamentals underlying this presentation. For your copy of these principles or for information concerning any particular aspect of the railroads, write to A. W. Benkert, 70 Pine Street, New York 5, N. Y.)

In Newark, N. J., a railroad worker heard Mr. Benkert, walked across the street to a friend's home and said: "Did you hear that broadcast about railroads? I have been a railroad worker all my life and have thought of railroads as rich corporations. That broadcast about what investors have done to make my job possible changed my attitude. Something should be done to get a fair deal for them."

A doctor wrote: "Early in life I began investing my savings in stocks of three railroads. In two my investment was wiped out and the third, which I still hold, is much lower than when I bought it. With this disastrous experience, I have ceased buying although at present prices they seem attractive—if one knew which rails to buy."

A widow wrote: "To care for me in my old age my husband left me railroad stocks, now seriously depressed, but this broadcast gives me hope that something can be done to obtain justice for those of us whose money has been invested in railroads."

These are typical of thousands of responses to Mr. Benkert's presentation. He has, in

few words, portrayed the over-all railroad situation as it has never been presented before.

Only an informed public opinion can get fair treatment for the railroads. A long step toward that would be wide distribution of this broadcast. Every railroad employee should have an opportunity to read it. If they knew the facts, they would see that they will serve their own interests by insisting upon a fair deal for those who provide the capital.

Every railroad stockholder should put these facts behind his demands to his representatives in Congress.

Every one of the 65,000,000 insurance policyholders should be made to realize that part of his future safety depends upon a fair return on railroad securities in which insurance companies have invested many hundreds of millions of insurance policyholders' money.

Whether you are a railroad employee or a stockholder, or just an average citizen, you have—everybody has—a vital interest at stake. You should:

1. Speak to your representatives in Congress. Demand that Congress give the Interstate Commerce Commission a mandate to allow the railroads rates that will allow a fair return on invested capital.

2. Send a copy of this broadcast, with a letter expressing your viewpoint, to your Congressman and two Senators and to your State legislators and governor.

3. Help spread the truths in this folder. Have 5 or 10 others read your copy. Ask for additional copies: Three free upon your request. Buy in bulk as a tuck-in for your mails. Distribute to fellow workers, investors, clergymen, editors, heads of service clubs, community leaders. Bulk prices, postpaid, anywhere: Twenty for $1; 50 to 700, 4 cents each; 1,000 or more, 3½ cents each. We will stand the cost of supplying three free copies, upon their request, to those to whom you distribute. Ask for: The Railroads and America's Future.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.,
205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

Disastrous State Department Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Star of April 27, 1949:

The southward advance of the Chinese Communists, who are advised and controlled by Moscow and its officials in the field, will proceed henceforth as rapidly as the Red leaders desire.

Nothing lies in the path of the Red armies—not even token resistance. In fact, there is no longer any Nationalist Government in China. The officials who took over the Nanking Government from Chiang Kai-shek are scattered now over the vast territory of China.

Some Nanking officials decided to save their skins by joining the Communists as collaborators. Others have taken refuge in far-off places where they hope to remain safely for some time. A handful of others have gone either to Canton or to Formosa, which they hope will remain outside the Communist grasp.

UNITED STATES POLICIES BLAMED

The complete disintegration of the Nationalist armies is due principally to the fact that the American Government—that is to say, the State Department—has stubbornly maintained a policy of doing nothing for the Nationalists.

When the Nationalist armies, lacking vital supplies for the American manufactured equipment, gave way and surrendered or sold American equipment to the enemy, spokesmen for the State Department announced that American supplies would be wasted if sent to the corrupt Kuomintang Government.

Every vestige of resistance was abandoned, however, after the unfortunate statement of Secretary of State Acheson 2 weeks ago saying that America no longer can do anything for the Chinese National forces. According to reports received in Washington from American observers, this statement, which was spread over all of China, was the straw which broke the camel's back.

The tremendous strategic advantage gained by the USSR through the victories of its puppets in the Far East is fully appreciated by all American military men.

OPPOSED TO ANY ACTION

The fact is that a daring attempt to revitalize the Chinese forces in the south by providing them with new American equipment and a large crop of American instructors could still prevent the Reds from reaching the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean. But the Europe-minded State Department is definitely opposed to any action which may involve us in the Far East.

General MacArthur already is on record warning his superiors in Washington of the dangerous situation which will develop, not only on the Asiatic mainland, but also in Japan and the Philippines as a result of Russia taking over the Far East.

The British, who have always been passive partners in that area, are equally alarmed and would like to go into action, but they do not have the means to do so alone. The French, who have expressed the most serious concern over the eventual capture of the whole of Asia by the USSR, are in the same predicament.

The warnings that the reverberations of the spectacular Russian victory in the Far East might affect the whole Asiatic continent as far as Iran and the Arab states have fallen on deaf ears in Washington, where there is a strong desire to refuse to admit that the policy adopted by State Department in the summer of 1946 was wrong.

Vatican Is Pleased by Weizmann Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Times of April 25, 1949, and is worthy of note at this time:

VATICAN IS PLEASED BY WEIZMANN TALK—HIS STATEMENT THAT ISRAEL WOULD RECOGNIZE INTERESTS OF CHRISTIANITY HAILED

ROME, April 24.—The statement of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of Israel, in New York that the Israeli Government was ready to recognize the interests and concerns of Christianity regarding the immunity and protection of holy places was welcomed in Vatican circles today as a conciliatory and reassuring gesture.

However, the Vatican refused specific comment because, it was explained, the text of Dr. Weizmann's speech had barely reached here late this evening.

Officials stated that Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical of April 15, had specifically asked that Jerusalem and its surroundings should have a judicial status, security of which under existing conditions should be insured with the support and cooperation of all peace-loving nations.

It was noted furthermore that he had also asked for an international guaranty of all those holy places which are in other cities and towns in regions besides those situated in Jerusalem.

These, they said, are what the Vatican believes to be the conditions necessary for the protection of the interests of Christianity in Palestine, and that if Israel is ready to accept them, the means can easily be found for a solution.

Dr. Weizmann's statement, Vatican circles remarked, seemed to indicate that the Israeli Government would be willing to give guarantees and to accept international enforcement of those guarantees. The Israeli president, they added, did not express agreement on the internationalization of Jerusalem. This, they said, was not what the Pope had asked in his encyclical. While no opinion could be voiced at this time, officials said that their impression was that Dr. Weizmann's offer might be inadequate.

RECALL PREWAR SITUATION

These circles recalled that from 1870 to 1929 the Holy See was placed in countless awkward positions because the physical existence of the Vatican had been guaranteed only by the Italian state, and its international character had not been recognized by Rome.

They stated that during World War I, the Vatican's freedom of action had been considerably impaired because of its situation in the territory of a nation at war.

A similar situation could develop in Palestine if Israel were involved in a war, Vatican circles said. In that case, Catholics could not have access to the holy places because many of them might belong to the nations fighting Israel. The Israel Government would, of course, apply restrictions justified by the exigencies of war.

On the other hand, if Jerusalem were an international city the situation would be entirely different because its neutrality would be guaranteed by its international juridical status and not affected by the national interests of a state at war.

Catholic officials, speaking in their personal capacity, particularly noted Dr. Weizmann's statement that if there is a genuine desire to reconcile the interests of the Vatican with those of Israel a harmonious solution can swiftly be secured with international consent.

HIDDEN MOTIVE DENIED

This, they said, would seem to imply that Dr. Weizmann suspects the Vatican of having some hidden motive for demanding adequate guaranties to safeguard Catholic interests in Palestine. They stated emphatically that in this event Dr. Weizmann was mistaken.

They declared that the Vatican had consistently abstained from expressing an opinion on the Palestine war. It could not therefore be suspected of having taken sides. Its sole aim, they stressed, was that of safeguarding religious interests and was not concerned with the political aspects of the Palestine question.

This, they emphasized, should be clearly explained because otherwise world public opinion might be led to believe that the

Vatican favored one nation at the expense of another. On the contrary, the Vatican, they said, in keeping with its traditional attitude, was always willing to cooperate with any nation that would respect the interests of the Catholic religion.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include copy of a letter I addressed to the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, and his reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1949.

Hon. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN,
Governor of Puerto Rico,
San Juan, P. R.

DEAR GOVERNOR: In your message to the insular legislature on February 23 you are quoted as saying: "We ought to clarify the situation regarding United States investments in Puerto Rico. It is not the philosophy of the Government over which I preside to seek the closing of factories in the United States in order to have them open in Puerto Rico."

I am interested in securing more detailed information on this matter, which is of vital concern to the textile district which I represent in Congress. For the sake of my constituents, will you kindly answer the following questions?

1. Do you favor complete independence for Puerto Rico?

2. What is the total amount of subsidies granted by the United States to Puerto Rico in each of the following years: 1946, 1947, and 1948?

3. Have you ever entered into correspondence with, or have you ever granted an interview to, any textile manufacturer from Lawrence, Mass., United States of America, on the subject of locating a textile plant in Puerto Rico?

4. What is the minimum wage on the island?

5. Is organized labor active in Puerto Rico? If so, to what extent? Do you approve of collective bargaining?

6. Does the Government of Puerto Rico pay any of its tax revenues into the United States Treasury?

7. What products do the Government-owned plants in Puerto Rico produce? Is it possible for a private industry in the United States to purchase such a plant?

8. For what term of years does your Government grant income-tax and property-tax exemptions to industrialists from the United States who purchase or build plants in Puerto Rico?

9. May goods produced in Puerto Rico be imported to the continental United States free of duty?

10. Has any second-hand textile machinery arrived at Puerto Rico from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, United States of America, during the past year? If so, kindly give details.

Confident that your answers to these questions will help to clarify a situation that is of genuine concern to both of us, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

LA FORTALEZA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
San Juan, P. R., March 22, 1949.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very happy to answer to the best of my knowledge and ability your inquiry of March 8. I feel confident that Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern has answered many of them in his participation and testimony in various House committees, and he will no doubt be glad to give you any further information that you might desire.

Inquiry No. 1: Do you favor complete independence for Puerto Rico?

I was elected by a very large majority on a platform of which the political plank is the right for Puerto Rico to make its local constitution in a manner similar to that in which States do so. The Independentista Party, founded for the express purpose of working for complete independence, constituted the most active opposition to my election and obtained only 10 percent of the total votes.

Inquiry No. 2: What is the total amount of subsidies granted by the United States to Puerto Rico in each of the following years: 1946, 1947, and 1948?

Federal grants and other payments were as follows:

1945–46	$19,358,000
1946–47	15,353,000
1947–48	7,429,000

Operating expenditures of Federal agencies administering grants or payments were as follows:

1945–46	$3,234,000
1946–47	3,215,000
1947–48	2,542,000

Triple A payments to sugarcane farmers fluctuated between $13,271,000 in 1945–46 and $15,492,000 in 1947–48.

Expenditures for armed forces, veterans' payments in all forms, and other functions that the Federal Government normally carries out according to its own policy everywhere under its jurisdiction, regardless of local government factors:

1945–46	$109,447,000
1946–47	93,654,000
1947–48	87,418,000

These latter expenditures, you may readily see, cannot in any way be classified as subsidies, or grants-in-aid any more than similar expenditures could be so classified in any State of the Union.

Inquiry No. 3: Have you ever entered into correspondence with, or have you ever granted an interview to, any textile manufacturer from Lawrence, Mass., United States of America, on the subject of locating a textile plant in Puerto Rico?

I have not. From a search of the files at the Executive Mansion I find that my predecessor did write a circular letter to a number of prominent citizens, one or two of which in Massachusetts, calling their attention to opportunities for industrial expansion in Puerto Rico. I took over on January 2 and in my inaugural speech took occasion to say very explicitly that it would not be the policy of my administration to induce industrialization on the basis of sweatshop labor. In my first message to the legislature several weeks ago, I took occasion to repeat this more explicity by stating that it would not be our policy to induce the moving of industries from the continental States to Puerto Rico, but to induce the investment of new capital, of which our United States economy produces billions every year, to invest itself in this part of the economy where it is most urgently needed. I may add that the executive council which I preside is on record as (1) opposing tax exemption to homework industries; (2) directing the Commissioner of Labor, a member of the executive council, to inquire into the labor relations of any manufacturer requesting tax exemption in order to expand his activities in, not to remove them to, Puerto Rico; (3) opposing the granting of tax exemption to any industry when it is ascertained that its purpose is to close a factory or shop in any State for the purpose of opening it in Puerto Rico. The executive council, I may add, has the power by law to grant or deny tax exemption and its decisions cannot be appealed to the courts by a manufacturer whose petition has been denied.

Inquiry No. 4: What is the minimum wage on the island?

Our minimum wage law requires the fixing of a minimum for each industry, including agriculture, by the minimum wage board after due study and public hearings, according to the capacity of each industry to pay without having to close down. As you probably know our population is 630 per square mile, which is a tremendous figure for an agricultural economy, and therefore industrial development is a must, leaving no alternatives short of economic collapse in a few years or putting our people permanently on a Federal dole, or perhaps both.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the lowest wage paid in Puerto Rico is 15 cents per hour and this is for some manual processes within the needlework industry, where the competition comes from the Orient and where the tariff protection is very low. For other processes in the needlework industry there are different wage minima that range from the stated 15-cent rate to 40 cents per hour.

Under the Insular Minimum Wage Board the lowest minimum is 25 cents per hour. Under the Insular Act, instead of a flat minimum rate as provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, wage scales are provided with specific minimum rates for the different occupational classifications, some of which go above $1 per hour. Most of the insular wage orders prescribe vacation and sick-leave periods with pay.

In 1947, the latest date for which there are complete data, the average wage in the liquor industry was 48 cents an hour; in the sugar industry, 54 cents an hour; in tobacco products, 28 cents an hour; in stone, clay, and glass products, 47 cents an hour.

Inquiry No. 5: Is organized labor active in Puerto Rico? If so, to what extent? Do you approve of collective bargaining?

Labor is well organized in Puerto Rico, partly in affiliates of the AFL, but mostly in local federations and independent unions. I definitely favor collective bargaining and while President of the Senate initiated and supported the insular labor-relations law which guarantees the right of workers to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. A very large part of my constituency, which is of course island-wide, as is that of Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN, is composed of workingmen.

Inquiry No. 6: Does the government of Puerto Rico pay any of its tax revenues into the United States Treasury?

Not directly. Ever since the American flag was raised in Puerto Rico that has been the policy of the Federal Government in order to facilitate the gallant fight that our people have to wage with their very tough economic problems. Indirectly, of course, due to the fact that Puerto Rico is one of the largest markets in the whole hemisphere for continental United States' goods, it produces revenue to the Federal Treasury, as well as employment in continental industries and agriculture (calculated at about 200,000 workers), and income to business and agriculture in the States.

Inquiry No. 7: What products do the government-owned plants in Puerto Rico produce? Is it possible for a private industry in the United States to purchase a plant?

The plants established by the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co., which is a public corporation, produce cement, glass bottles, clay products, paper boxes, shoes. It is not the policy of the government to establish industries in preference to private initiative. Private initiative always has the first crack at establishing a new industry. The government has gone into these few industries when private investors failed to do so. The policy is to sell these industries to responsible citizens or firms from the continental States or Puerto Rico under terms that will safeguard for the public the money invested in them. In the case of cement, the establishment of the government plant acted as an inducement for the opening of a private plant by Puerto Rican investors and both are now functioning successfully. Our need for increasing production is so great that our government sometimes has to run the risks that in the continental States are always run by private venture capital.

Inquiry No. 8: For what term of years does your government grant income tax and property tax exemptions to industrialists from United States who purchase or build plants in Puerto Rico?

The tax exemption is not limited to industrialists from the continental United States. It also includes industrialists from Puerto Rico. The term of exemption is 12 years counting in all cases from the law's date of approval in 1947. We figure that such term is necessary to overcome the natural disadvantages that an agricultural community faces during the period of transformation into an industrial one. Our situation in Puerto Rico is now at about the stage in which yours was in Massachusetts and in the States generally in the first half of the nineteenth century, when government protection was a matter of life and death to infant industries. We do not feel that tax exemption for such a period of years is an advantage but rather an offsetting of many natural disadvantages at this particular period of the island's economic development.

Inquiry No. 9: May goods produced in Puerto Rico be imported into the continental United States free of duty?

Yes; but there is a quota limitation on raw sugar and a very drastic quota limitation on refined sugar. As sugar is, up to now, our principal industry by far, you may readily see how large a limitation on free trade these quotas constitute.

Inquiry No. 10: Has any second-hand textile machinery arrived at Puerto Rico from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, United States of America, during the past year? If so, kindly give details.

No second-hand textile machinery has arrived in Puerto Rico from any State in the Union so far as the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Company knows. The only textile mill now under construction in Puerto Rico is obtaining new equipment from New England firms, such as Draper, Sacco-Lowell, and others. Over $2,000,000 worth of machinery has been imported in the last 12 months from New England States into the island. These orders have no doubt provided job opportunities for many New England workers.

I hope the above information may be helpful in clarifying the situation. Allow me particularly to call your attention to the facts contained in the answer to inquiry No. 3, which constitute a practical air-tight guaranty against the developments with which you are rightfully concerned.

If I can be of any further service, please let me know. Please feel also that you will be sincerely welcome to Puerto Rico at any time when you may wish to take a first-hand look at the situation here and the efforts our people are making to put their economy on its own feet.

Cordially yours,

LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN,
Governor.

Delay by Congress on ITO Held Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a dispatch from Annecy, France, which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, April 26, 1949.

The article tells how our delay in passing the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is tying the hands of the United States representatives in their negotiations on mutually advantageous tariff reductions with 11 other nations.

DELAY BY CONGRESS ON ITO HELD WORRY—OTHER NATIONS UNEASY OVER FAILURE TO RATIFY CHARTER OF WORLD-TRADE BODY

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

ANNECY, France, April 25.—Congressional delay in passing extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is causing serious apprehension among other major world-trading countries as to the future of United States trade policy.

As a practical matter, the delay in extending act ties the hands of the United States negotiators seeking mutually advantageous tariff reductions in talks with the 11 nations here seeking to join a general agreement on tariffs and trade. The United States Delegation can only negotiate on lists prepared prior to studying other countries' full list of offers and demands, which considerably narrows the range of items that can be discussed.

Far most important is the fact that lack of legislative support deprives the United States of leadership in the trade discussions at a time when United States objectives for establishing a framework of regulations conducive to the expansion of private international trade are being threatened on all sides.

The fight against discrimination and burdensome restrictions on private trade and excessive trade barriers has never been an easy one. Evidence is accumulating that soon as there are any signs of weakening on the part of the United States the beginnings of a new world trade structure already laboriously erected start shaking and slipping on its foundations.

In the opinion of trade experts here, if the United States continues to show hesitation in support of principles it has repeatedly laid down, United States exports will soon face in many parts of the world continuous discrimination embodied in permanent or at least long-range systems of preferential tariffs.

Discrimination against United States exports, which is now maintained under an emergency guise, tends to become "normal."

An important straw in the wind is considered here to be a resolution introduced into the economic conference of the countries participating in the Council of Europe now meeting in London. This urged the abandonment of the most-favored-nation clause in commercial treaties of European countries.

While this body has no governmental authority, the support given to this resolution reflects a strong movement just underneath the governmental level in many countries participating in the European recovery program. Its objective is to create a large preferential area within which dollar goods would meet high tariffs and more burdensome quantitative restrictions than other goods.

This is the case now, but adherence of most European countries to the Geneva trade agreement and the assumption that they will ultimately adhere to the Habana charter gives strong leverage to the United States for eliminating discriminations as soon as the emergency period is over. Abandonment of the most-favored-nation clause by European countries would give what are now exceptions to the status of approved practices.

Israel and Arabs Plan Division of Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasing to take note of efforts leading to the establishment of permanent peace in the Holy Land. The following article by Gene Currivan, which appeared in the New York Times of April 24, 1949, is further indication of the fact that Israeli and Arab nations will peacefully settle their problems if improper pressures are not exerted by those whose interests lie in creating turmoil and confusion:

ISRAEL AND ARABS PLAN DIVISION OF JERUSALEM—BOTH OPPOSE INTERNATIONALIZATION AND SEE HOPE FOR OWN AGREEMENT

(By Gene Currivan)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, April 23.—The division of old and new Jerusalem, which seems to be one of the world's perplexing problems, may be solved on the home grounds. While the United Nations Conciliation Commission is preparing to go to Lausanne to discuss the refugee question and ultimate peace, Arabs and Jews have met here without benefit of the United Nations to settle their immediate problems.

This is one of the most important steps taken in the post-cease-fire era and it shows that, as many experts have often said, these two people can get together if left to their own devices.

Neither side wants internationalization, as originally suggested by the United Nations and recently pressed by Pope Pius XII. Their differences are at the moment more or less local in Jerusalem and can be worked out locally with a little patience and give-and-take on both sides.

The outside world aparently is greatly interested in access to the holy places and in their protection. Strangely enough, these matters are considered academic here and not principal obstacles to peace. Except for war itself, which has no conscience, the holy places have been and will be accessible to all when the final agreement is reached. Even with the war there has been no great amount of damage to ecclesiastical places, with the exception of Notre Dame in the new Jerusalem and some synagogues in the old city.

HOLY PLACES UNDAMAGED

But aside from a few shell marks here and there and a hardly noticeable scar on the dome of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, there is nothing to substantiate reports from outside that the holy places were main targets.

The Arabs could easily have hit many sacred structures near which shells never landed. The Jews likewise could have leveled the Arabs' Mosque of Omar in the center of the old city, but they never fired a shot that way; it is the outstanding structure in the walled city and one of the most sacred buildings in the Moslem world.

Both Jews and Arabs have had enough of outside interference by commissions and in-

ternational delegates. Neither side has benefited because it seems that few people understand the oriental mind. Both parties derive from Semitic origin, although there are few Jews now who are not far less oriental than their Arab brethren.

The fact remains that Jews and Arabs have lived together for centuries and can live together again if their international cousins will keep out of the family quarrel. No one can solve family disputes like members of the families themselves.

On that theory, Jews and Arabs comprising a special joint commission met this week in the no man's land near the old city of Jersualem to thresh out their differences. A principal item on the agenda was article 8 of the Israel-Transjordan armistice agreement dealing with the holy places, the opening of roads, and a certain amount of line-straightening.

DIRECT EFFORTS

International bodies can discuss these things for months without arriving at a satisfactory conclusion; but the actual parties concerned, if left to themselves without external pressure, might be able to achieve something tangible.

The main problems are (1) the opening of the Bethlehem-Jerusalem road; (2) opening of the Mount Scopus road to Hebrew University, which is now in the neutral zone and not accessible to the public; (3) resumption of the supply of water to Jerusalem through Latrun, and (4) access to the Wailing Wall.

The Arabs are said to be asking for suburban areas of Jerusalem such as Talpioth so they would have a direct road to Bethlehem. At the moment the Jews hold 2½ miles of the Jerusalem-Bethlehem highway.

The problem in the opening of the Mount Scopus road is similar. The Arabs hold about 1 mile of this road in the New Jerusalem.

While Jerusalem now has a fairly adequate water supply, there may be a deal by which the Arabs will resume the pumping of water to Jerusalem through Latrun if the Jews agree to supply the old city again with electricity.

So far as the Wailing Wall is concerned, it is possible that the Arabs may soon open the old city generally as they did for the privileged few at Easter; and then all the holy places will be accessible.

Free access for everyone everywhere is hardly to be expected before the peace pact is signed, but there is likelihood that Christian pilgrims may have keys to the city and that special arrangements will be made for occasional Jewish pilgrimages to the Wailing Wall.

This was the pious hope of many Arabs with whom this correspondent talked in the old city during Easter Week. The Arabs are badly in need of the tourist trade and would welcome anyone who could bring them dollars or pounds. Their shops are overflowing with fresh vegetables, fruit, canned goods, meat, and all the oriental trinkets that tourists like, but there are few tourists to do the purchasing.

BARGAINS IN ARAB MARKETS

Prices are ridiculously low. The best Arab meal costs less than $1, while the equivalent here in Tel Aviv runs to more than $3. American cigarettes cost 27 cents a pack against 75 cents to $1 here.

An Arab who has a shop in the shadow of the Holy Sepulchre summed it up with the remark:

"The war is over. Let's open the gates. I'm sick of being a prisoner behind these walls."

Every day hundreds of Arabs climb to the top of the walls and look over into modern Jerusalem. They probably wonder why their leaders are being so obstinate. Virtually everyone agrees there will be no more fighting; and most of all they are hoping for the day when the gates again will be open and no one will ask or care whether you are a Jew or an Arab.

A strange phenomenon after all the bitter fighting between old and new Jersualem is that there is little enmity on either side at the moment. Jews in modern Jerusalem do not hate Arabs in the old city and Arabs have no feeling generally against Jews. As in all wars the personal element soon disappears and when scars are healed it is easy to forget who caused them in the first place.

This, however, applies only to near-by Arabs with whom Jews have mingled over the years. It does not apply, for example, to Egyptians, Syrians, or Iraqis. Jews and those "foreign" Arabs with whom they have had very little contact are as far apart as ever.

Only those who have lived in Jerusalem can realize fully how intermingled were Jews and Arabs of that particular area. The old city's gates were never closed. The more wealthy Arabs lived in new Jerusalem and there was the same cosmopolitan atmosphere that could be found in any middle eastern capital.

CONDITIONS NEAR NORMAL

Now that the siege is over and conditions are returning to normal, the Jews are quite happy. They have acquired freedom from fear. However, the Arabs in the old city feel hemmed in and can see no valid reason for it. Some of their leaders still feel a certain degree of resentment against the Jews, but this is understandable. They have suffered considerably and have nothing to show for it but a regimented existence not compatible with the Oriental love for leisure and a free, unencumbered life. The so-called man-in-the-street only wants to get back to the way of living he knew a year ago when he could circulate freely and get the most out of life.

We Must Not Be Afraid of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond B. Fosdick:

WE MUST NOT BE AFRAID OF CHANGE

(By Raymond B. Fosdick)

When the last glacier retreated northward from what is now Connecticut, it left behind, as mementos of its visit, great boulders of rock which are now strewn lavishly across the State. Several of them, as large as a corncrib and many tons in weight, were deposited on my farm, and for 15 years I have watched one of them fight a losing battle with an ash tree. The tree evidently started in a seed lodged in a tiny pocket in the top of the rock. When I first saw it, it was a sturdy sapling that had made for itself a comfortable crevice for its roots. Today its irresistible growth has torn the massive rock into fragments.

This is the law of life. The future belongs not to rigid absolutes, whether they are primal rocks or unyielding social arrangements, but to the thing that can grow, whether it is a tree or a democracy.

It is strange that a principle as familiar as this should today need underscoring, but we are living in years of uncertainty and fear, and fear induces a kind of spiritual astigmatism. To be sure, in our generation we have reason for our fears, and every justification to resist the threat that creates them. But I am thinking of fear as an evil in itself and what it does to human emotions and reactions.

For one thing, fear breeds an instinctive hostility to growth, because growth means change, and in anxious hours men tend to cling to the shelter of the present or to put their faith in nostalgia for the past. But history's current is sweeping us into the future and we cannot stand still, nor is there now any place left to go back to. The illusion that security can be found in immobility, or that safety is dependent upon the absence of change, is perhaps the most dangerous form of imbalance which plagues the minds of men.

Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and reexpressed in contemporary idiom to accord with contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of Magna Carta.

Today the conception of freedom is once again taking on a larger meaning. Our generation is thinking of the threat to freedom which comes from poverty and insecurity, from sickness and the slum, from social and economic conditions in which human beings cannot be free. In many countries, including our own, this new conception of freedom is struggling to make itself articulate, and irresistible change in older points of view is taking place before our eyes.

Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very essence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

Here again we have a familiar concept to which most of us would doubtless subscribe. But it needs to be re-emphasized today because our current fear of communism is driving some of us to believe that change is somehow subversive, and that anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow traveler who should be watched. Not only the House Un-American Activities Committee but similar State committees and various self-appointed groups are creating a climate of opinion definitely hostile to those who fail to conform to predetermined standards, and suspicion is thrown on individuals and organization who dare to think in unorthodox or nonconformist terms.

With the possible exception of John Adams' administration, there is a risk today in being a liberal that has never existed before in the history of this Republic. If you sign a petition to admit colored people to public housing developments, if you favor fair employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you fight for the protection of the rights of the foreign born, if you oppose religious prejudice and Jim Crowism, if you sanction cultural exchange with foreign countries, if you aline yourself with those who are working for more effective labor unions or more adequate medical care, if you take any point of view which involves the implementation of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, you

are apt to be suspected in some circles as a knowing participant in the Communist front, or at the very least as a witless dupe of Moscow's hypnotic influences.

There is hardly a progressive organization or undertaking in the country to which the adjective "communistic" has not been applied in the last few years—from the Tennessee Valley Authority and water power developments generally, all the way to farmers' and consumers' cooperatives and plans for rural electrification. Fingers are even pointed at organizations like the YMCA, the YWCA, and the defunct Epworth League. In many States teachers and college professors have been frightened into sterile silence, and even the pulpit has not been free from fear.

The tragedy of this business is that it plays into the hands of the Communists. It identifies Russia with the process of social change at the same time that it limits us to a bleak and hopeless status quo. It concedes the Soviet claim of concern for the underprivileged while it stigmatizes the achievement and promise of democracy toward this same goal. A prominent doctor, head of a State medical society, recently condemned the idea of the broader distribution of medical care on the grounds that it was being pushed "by Soviet agents in this country."

That is the kind of reckless statement which creates an atmosphere favorable to communism. If the idea of making available to all the people of our country the curative techniques of modern medicine is communism, if communism has a patent on the idea, then communism has something for us which we very much want. But it isn't communism. It is democracy. Its roots go back to the Declaration of Independence, long before Karl Marx was born. It is a translation into social terms of a concept that was first conceived as a political idea. It is part of our developing spiritual testament. It is in line with all that is best in our tradition and hope. It is democracy facing the responsibilities of its maturity.

Those frightened people who use the word "communism" so easily had better reckon with its implications. There are plenty of arguments against communism. It is a facade for a ruthless tyranny. It is a brutal hoax by which millions of confused and hungry people are persuaded or coerced to sign away their freedom in exchange for utopian promises. But to paste a label of communism on the yearnings of men everywhere for a better life, to classify as subversive those goals of equality and human service toward which our democracy is moving, is to concede to the Communists all the best arguments and make a mockery of the faith that sustains us.

It is undoubtedly part of the Communist strategy to frighten us into a position which seems to identify our democracy, not with forward-looking movements related to the hopes of men, but with outmoded patterns of social thinking. If in the eyes of the nations America could appear as a victim of spiritual paralysis, frozen to the present, deaf to the impact of new ideas of human equality which are sweeping the world, it would be an overriding victory for Soviet policy. That is the picture the Communists are trying to paint of us, and that, unfortunately, is the picture that some thoughtless and panicky people in this country are trying, unwittingly, to help them paint.

I do not underestimate the necessity which we face in times like these of keeping the Communists clear of our Government and rooting out treachery wherever it may be found. Split loyalties or loyalties that respond to strings pulled in Moscow cannot be tolerated in positions of power. We must know who our enemies are. But this is a task requiring consummate judgment and skill. If, in a clumsy attempt to exercise evil, we proscribe the good as well, the damage will be irreparable. To act as if the term "communism" covers all the plans and dreams of men for making this world an inviting home to live in instead of a place to freeze and fight and starve in is no more intelligent than using a steam shovel to weed a flower garden.

In our concern over what communism may do to democracy we have overlooked the danger of what we ourselves may do to democracy under the stimulus of fear. Fighting fire with fire is an easy but misleading slogan which has betrayed more than one cause in the past. Challenged by authoritarianism, men begin to build an authoritarianism of their own; they tend to take on the mood and techniques of their opponents; they answer heresy-hunting with heresy-hunting; they become like the thing they fight. That is what fear does to people. If the tactics of the Soviets succeed in inducing us to try to stamp out dissent and to measure loyalty by conformity, if they scare us into a denial of our historic goals, then they have maneuvered us into retreating from the field before the battle has even begun.

If democracy means anything at all, it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom.

This is what our democracy has always meant. We have given it its preeminent place in the world because we have welcomed diversity of opinion, because there has been no fixed creed to which our citizens have had to subscribe, no Siberia for our intellectual and spiritual nonconformists. Our national life has been healthy and vigorous because dissenters have been encouraged to think critically of the political, social, and economic order in which we live.

Indeed, as we look back on our history we realize that the periods when we rose to moral greatness were periods of nonconformity—when Thoreau wrote his essay on civil disobedience; when Seward appealed to the country with his revolutionary thesis: "There is a law higher than the Constitution"; when Theodore Parker from his pulpit in Boston denounced the iniquity of our war on Mexico in words that burned their way into the conscience of the Nation. "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation," said the Supreme Court in the Barnette flag-salute case in 1943, "it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It is this kind of tolerance and adaptability that makes the evolving will of the people effective in reaching new definitions of liberty and equality. It is this philosophy of growth that gives us assurance in the present crisis. The only adequate way to answer the challenge of communism is to continue the building of an economic and social system whose concrete results in terms of the welfare of mankind will far outstrip anything that communism can even promise. Democracy thus interpreted as a positive force can create new hopes and new initiatives in human life and can capture the imagination of the world.

Here is a faith worth fighting for. Stalin boasts of his "new order." We have a new order, too, based on the capacity of each generation to experience what Lincoln called a new birth of freedom. The Communists extol the youth and virility of totalitarianism. In the evolution of democracy we have a world that is perpetually young.

I started by saying that the future belongs to the thing that can grow; a tree can demolish a rock. In spite of the present impetus of its revolutionary program, communism, by encasing itself in an ironclad orthodoxy, is sealing its own ultimate doom. Whether the field is science or economics or literature or art or music, the Kremlin has circumscribed it with an adamantine authoritarianism. The conformist reaction which holds the intellectual and humanistic life of Russia in a vise-like grip can end only by strangling the vitality of the system it seeks to preserve.

In such an atmosphere there can be no flowering of the human spirit; it withers and dies from suffocation. The Communists are fighting against the laws of nature. In their fanaticism they have forgotten, if they ever knew, that stagnation and death await ideas as well as social and economic arrangements which have lost their power to grow. They taunt us for being the supporters of a crumbling status quo, but it is they who are looking backward, they who are trying to build a status quo far more rigid and absolute than anything the world has ever seen. It is they who would put blinders on men and establish boundaries beyond which ideas and dreams shall not be allowed to go.

Four hundred years ago Galileo shook the world with the question: "Who is willing to set limits to the human intellect?" Well, the Communists are not only willing to do it, they are attempting to do it; and in that attempt which flies in the face of history lie the seeds of their own ultimate disintegration.

There is no future for such a system, any more than there is a future for a rock stranded by a glacier. Ultimately the irresistible power of a thing that can grow will shatter it. That is why democracy, rightly interpreted, is the last best hope of earth. It is rooted in the principle of growth; it is adaptable to new concepts of social justice. It is built, not on a fixed creed or on a system of regimented ideas, but on the sure knowledge that frontiers are never stationary, that the thrust of events is steadily forward, that there are no privileged ideas around which magic circles can be drawn to protect them from competition. It is only free men who dare to think. And it is only through free thought, freely expressed, that the soul of a people can be kept alive.

Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy Branded a Communist Front

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Department of Justice has at last discovered the nature of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. This committee has been the mainspring of the successful propaganda campaign throughout our country against any program of effective assistance to China—a campaign which I described here more than 4 years ago.

The mainspring behind the Committee for a Democratic [sic] Far Eastern Policy, the Attorney General belatedly finds has been the Communist Party. Had the Attorney General taken the trouble he could have found many months ago the kind of literature I hold

in my hand about that committee. It is a letter on the official stationery of the Communist Party of New York State calling the attention of the "dear comrades" to the resolutions on China which the committee adopted recently. Incidentally, for several years its recommendations have consistently given a preview of what our State Department would shortly thereafter adopt as its policy on China and the "line" which it would soon begin to pass out to the opinion-forming agencies of our country.

I approve and commend the action of the Attorney General yesterday in revealing officially that the committee is nothing but a Communist front, a fact which the Communist Party itself has been vigorously advertising for months, and months, and months. I fear it is another case of our Government's locking the barn after the horse is stolen; but perhaps it will be of value for people who have naively accepted the vocal advocates of our disastrous policy in China as being unbiased experts on the Far East, to look through the list of directors, sponsors, and consultants of the Committee on a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. It will be found, for example, that at least 15 of them have been trustees, sponsors or writers of the Institute of Pacific Relations, making clear how that organization, which the unsuspecting public has supposed was an authoritative source of objective studies on Asia, has been used to propagate Communist distortions about China rather than the truth. At least a dozen more are prominent and prolific writers and lecturers on China.

The Communist Party's letter recommends the Far East Spotlight, the publication of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, as the only source now available of "the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction."

Read the committee's program for action on China and you will find out what sort of forces and people have been behind the propaganda in this country for policies which have led to the loss within 4 years after the war in the Pacific of what 4,000,000 Americans fought there 4 years to win:

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.
To All Sections and Counties.

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find program for action on China policy, as voted upon by a united-front-action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative, but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organizing Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation—

A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest-spending foreign influences in our Capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy—

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy (use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions.)

Send copies of your organization's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen. Give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere. Send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the political ammunition of facts. The American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant. Only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up to date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: $2 a year. Introductory offer: $1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, $2. Organizational orders for 5 or more, 25 percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue.

(a) The committee can furnish speakers. In the New York City area telephone the speaker's bureau of the committee any afternoon, Bryant 9-6343. In California, the San Francisco area, contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco. Los Angeles area, contact Mrs. Jeanette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speakers to the briefing session on China. First session, Friday night February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks, Bryant 9-6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now. Order prepared post cards from the committee, 1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls, in person and by telephone, on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscription to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office, 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time; any day. Every Tuesday night the staff is "at home" to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy: It harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices, for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY,
111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Ways and Means Committee Denied the Right To Consider Socialized Medicine—Why?

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask in all seriousness why has the President's health bill not been referred to the Ways and Means Committee? Heretofore, all bills introduced in Congress referring to social security have been first referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Are the President and his social-security advisers afraid to risk this socialized-medicine bill with the committee that heretofore has handled all social security legislation? The first social-security law, passed in 1935, was prepared by the Ways and Means Committee after long and exhaustive hearings. This law was extensively amended in 1939 and this amendatory program was all carried on by the Ways and Means Committee.

That legislation provided for old-age pensions and pensions for the blind and aid for dependent children and for other social-security relief. It also included a plan whereby employers and employees should contribute jointly to a fund which should be used as social-security payments to employees after they arrived at the age of 65.

That legislation also carried provisions for the financing of all these pensions and social-security payments.

Then, surely since this proposed health legislation is proposed to be financed in much the same way, it should be considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

The President's socialized-medicine bill is to be financed by the appropriation of a sum equal to 3 percent of the wages of those who are included under the provisions of the bill. This bill is intended to take to a great majority of the American people social security for health and hospitalization and it is to all intents and purposes the same kind of legislation as the original social-security law.

This so-called socialized-medicine bill, the passage of which has been requested by the President, has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The administration has effectively bypassed the Ways and Means Committee, which will now have no jurisdiction over the legislation.

Why this has been done has already caused a great stir among the Members of Congress. It is being pointed out by Congressmen also that the Reorganization Act, passed by Congress just about 2 years ago, specifically provides that all legislation concerning national social security is within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

When a bill has been once referred to a committee, it is a difficult matter to accomplish its re-referral. However, this can be done, and I maintain that it should be done immediately. My persistence in this respect is not to be considered as any reflection on the great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It is evident that those who drafted H. R. 4312, which is the bill that has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, intended to draft it so as to enable it to detour the Ways and Means Committee and land it in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The real test as to which committee should have jurisdiction over this bill is the test as to how the program shall be financed. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has no jurisdiction over tax matters. All tax matters are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

The jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee has been defined both by the Constitution and by the rules of the House. To that committee has been given the responsibility of raising the revenue necessary to implement all legislation passed by Congress.

I should now like to discuss briefly this so-called President's health bill, which contains 163 pages. On pages 147 and 148 of this so-called health bill appears the following language:

(b) There shall be appropriated to the account for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter—

(1) sums equal to 3 percent of all wages estimated to be received during such fiscal year;

(2) sums equal to the estimated cost of furnishing dental services and home-nursing services as personal health-service benefits during such fiscal year; and

(3) any further sums required to meet expenditures to carry out this title.

(c) There shall be appropriated to the account in the fiscal year 1951, a sum equal to 1 percent of all wages estimated to be received during such fiscal year, to constitute on July 1, 1951, a reserve for the purposes specified in section 772 (a).

This language indicates that those who drafted the bill are artfully trying to write language into the bill that will make it appear that the method by which the money is to be secured for financing this program is not taxation. In this language an effort has been made to substitute the Appropriations Committee for the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of raising funds by which this bill can be implemented and made effective. In this bill the participants are required to pay a certain percentage of their wages and salaries, just exactly as the workers are required to pay under the regular social-security laws, heretofore passed by Congress in 1935.

Mr. Speaker, I know no reason why this effort should be made to enact this legislation under different circumstances than those under which all other social-security legislation has been enacted, unless it might be that those sponsoring this legislation felt it could be more easily enacted through the committee to which it was referred than through the Ways and Means Committee.

It might also be that those in favor of this legislation have decided that for purely political reasons it would be better to follow the course which they have followed. If they have no other reasons than political reasons, then I repeat that it is a disservice to the people of the country to attempt to enact such important legislation in any other way than in the accepted, customary way.

It is a well-known historical fact that President Truman spent much of his time in the last campaign in finding fault with the Eightieth Congress. A fair analysis of all the facts would lead any reasonably minded person to the conclusion that Mr. Truman's principal complaint was that the Eightieth Congress had refused to cooperate with him in his wild spending program. Likewise, the Eightieth Congress had passed legislation that reduced taxes very materially. The Eightieth Congress also kept Government spending down, so that the budget was balanced and a very large surplus was shown.

Ever since his inauguration on his second term, President Truman has indicated an insatiable desire to spend money. His budget is the largest ever presented by any President in peacetimes. From the beginning he demanded that Congress pass legislation increasing taxes by at least $4,000,000,000. He has launched programs and demanded passage of legislation which, if passed, would exceed the income of the Government by billions of dollars.

I shall take time here to discuss only two of these programs which I think are the most expensive. Both of these are new programs.

First. He has recommended the passage of H. R. 2892. This bill, if passed, would provide that the Federal Government should enter the field of public assistance to such an extent that eventually all public assistance would be under the control and direction of the Federal Government. This would bring about what the uplifters describe as the "welfare state." The cost of this legislation is variously estimated as from $6,000,000,000 for the first year, to $25,000,000,000 per year within a few years. Just how the President and the Social Security Board, which is under his direction, can advocate the adoption of any program placing such a terrifically heavy additional tax load on the backs of the American people is difficult to understand.

Second. I think the most expensive individual program advocated by the President is his so-called health program as outlined in a recent message he sent to the House of Representatives. In short, he recommends the adoption of H. R. 4312, which is in effect legislation providing for socialized medicine. I have heretofore discussed one feature of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Truman in his message on the socialized-medicine bill, very smoothly slides over the important matter of what it is going to cost. This has been characteristic of all New Deal administrations. They have learned that the easy way to elect is to spend. In discussing his so-called socialized-medicine plan, President Truman evasively said, "Many people are concerned about the cost of a national health program. The truth is that it will save a great deal more than it costs."

When he says that the program will save more than it will cost, he evidently means to take care of all the health needs of all the people. If so, it naturally follows that he does not want to venture a guess as to what the expense will be. It is certain that it will be from $10,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 a year. A well known national writer says, "If Congress approves President Truman's program, social security will cost the American people $1,250,000,000,000 in the next 50 years." The long string of figures in written words is one trillion, two hundred and fifty billion dollars.

I think that nearly every American feels kindly toward every program that will improve the sanitation and health of our people. Likewise, every American would be glad if he could afford to furnish for himself and his family everything that money could buy. However, his good sense indicates to him that it is not for the best interest of himself and his family to incur obligations that he cannot possibly meet. In other words, reckless spending does not guarantee to him and his family happiness and contentment. It almost inevitably brings sadness and positive disadvantages.

As it is with the individual, so it is with the Government.

While I am discussing the President's program for socialized medicine, I should not fail to note that spokesmen for the administration have indicated that this proposed legislation will not be pushed for passage at the present session of Congress, and that it will be held back for consideration in the session of 1950. We must not lose sight of the fact that 1950 is another election year. Socialized medicine would be a splendid platform on which to stand when handing out promises to the American people.

I confidently predict that H. R. 2892, through which the administration seeks

to bring about the "welfare state," will not be recommended for passage by the Ways and Means Committee, and for that reason will not be brought up for consideration in this session.

It is my prediction that the administration for political reasons will not force the socialized-medicine legislation for consideration in this session of Congress, but will withhold it until the session of 1950.

The President's socialized-medicine program is being severely criticized by many of the newspapers of the country. It may be of interest to know that the Cincinnati Enquirer, one of the oldest and most influential Democratic newspapers in the country, recently said:

A proposal can be fine in principle and very grim in actual execution. Therefore, those who react unfavorably to President Truman's shower of blueprints for a vast health program need not feel that they are standing against the public interest. Significantly, not even the Congress elected from President Truman's own party is showing any liking for his idea of compulsory medical insurance.

If it is the Government's business to finance medical care, it is likewise the Government's business to impose a toothbrush tax on everyone and have toothbrushes issued from Government warehouses; to impose umbrella and overshoe taxes, and require that everyone wear GI umbrellas and overshoes on rainy days; to impose a religious tax, and build Government churches which everyone would be required to attend, and so on, ad infinitum.

It is not our intent to try to reduce to an absurdity the proposal of pay-roll taxes for medical care. We mention a few seemingly rather farfetched other possibilities merely to indicate that should the Government take another great step toward official management of our personal affairs, there will be no further logical point at which it should stop. Quite plausibly we would reach a day when the Government withholding tax reached the point of complete confiscation, the Government taking all of one's earnings and doling out only such services and goods as were deemed proper for the individual to have. That isn't the democratic way, nor the American way. It does bear an ugly resemblance to the Soviet way, however well intended the motive.

Our present scheme for improving and safeguarding public health is far from perfect. Much needs to be done—and several of the side recommendations made by President Truman are on the proper course. But we seriously question Mr. Truman's assertion that the Government could do a better job financing health care. Ours is not a pauper state in which desperate recourse to socialized medicine is necessary. We can raise up the low without tearing down the high. And no matter how plausibly presented, the proposed program would not merely elevate the health care of a needy segment of the population, but would act as a brake upon the health care of the whole population. The deeper we enmire the Nation's health care in the tax structure and the more we enmesh it in a Federal bureaucracy, the lower the quality of that care will become.

Mr. Speaker, the social security of our people is greatly to be desired. Those who from poverty or physical infirmity or incapacity cannot help themselves should be assisted freely. Those who wish to contribute to a program that will guarantee them social security in the sunset of their lives should be given an opportunity to do so. The Government should not risk its own solvency in an effort to give everything to everyone who might ask for it and thereby stifle individual initiative which has characterized Americans in all generations and which has brought our great country to its present stature as the greatest Nation of all times.

Reduction in Cost of Government Most Vital Problem Facing Congress Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter and statement from Mr. H. A. Elcock, president of the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce. This frank open statement regarding the steadily increasing cost of government should be read by every American. I am confident this statement of the situation in Idaho could be paralleled by nearly every other State in the Union.

IDAHO STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Boise, April 8, 1949.

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senator BERT H. MILLER,
Representative JOHN SANBORN,
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,

GENTLEMEN: It is my hope that this letter, addressed jointly to you as members of the Idaho delegation in the Congress of the United States, makes you as angry and unhappy as the facts disclosed herein made me.

Of course, it is not particularly important in the global scheme of things whether I am unhappy or ill-tempered. I sincerely believe, however, that each of you have some common interest with me, in the aggregate unhappiness and the combined ill-temper of the citizens of Idaho.

One of my responsibilities is to try to express the composite thinking of a cross section of the citizens of Idaho who are dependent upon the stability of industry, agriculture, commerce, and the professions for their continued prosperity and financial security.

To a certain degree that is also the responsibility of each of you in your official capacities as Senators and Representatives.

Today I made a comparison of Federal taxes collected through the office of the collector of internal revenue in Boise, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1941, and 1948. To this I added the collections made for the same periods of time by the State of Idaho for the use and benefit of the Federal Government's unemployment compensation program.

The total Federal taxes collected in Idaho, for the period ended June 30, 1941, was roughly $8,535,000 and the total for the period ended June 30, 1948, was roughly $83,671,000. This, of course, does not include Federal taxes paid by Idaho citizens on cigarettes, liquor, and similar taxes collected at the source.

The 1948 figure was 9.8 times the size of the 1941 figure and that is what made me angry and decidedly unhappy.

There are several things definitely wrong with this picture.

First of all, we didn't need nearly 10 times as much Federal Government in 1948 as we needed in 1941.

Secondly, we were not 10 times as well able to pay the bill for Federal Government in 1948 as we were in 1941.

Finally, not enough of us are doing anything to stop this trend.

Because you may want to look at the individual items that make up this crushing burden of Federal taxation, I am attaching a copy of the detailed comparison. I particularly call your attention to the fact that the citizens of Idaho paid almost exactly 55 times as much Federal income tax in 1948 as they did in 1941. The combined individual and corporation income-tax payments were nearly 20 times as great in 1948 as in 1941.

On behalf of those citizens of Idaho who must meet the combined cost of living, provide for their future security, and at the same time support Federal, State, and local government, out of their income from whatever source it may be derived, we plead with you to make reduction of the cost of Federal Government your first order of business.

There can be no greater service to our Nation than the preservation of our form of Govenment. It cannot survive if the people of the Nation cannot maintain it in a financially sound condition and a burden nearly 10 times as great as that borne only 7 years ago is clearly beyond the endurance of either the citizens of Idaho or the economy of our State to sustain.

As Members of Congress you will soon be called upon to consider recommendations made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It seems to me that this will afford an opportunity for constructive action looking toward the elimination of many unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government.

It would give me a great deal of personal satisfaction if I could report to our members that each of you has agreed to give support to a program of reduction in the cost of government. Obviously, taxes cannot be reduced until Government expenditures are drastically cut. We are urging this as the only realistic approach to what we believe to be the most vital problem facing Congress today.

Very truly yours,

H. A. ELCOCK,
President.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TAX COLLECTIONS IN IDAHO

The following extracts from reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue show Idaho payments, exclusive of such taxes as liquor and cigarette taxes collected from manufacturers:

	Fiscal year ending June 30—	
	1948	1941
Income:		
Individual	$55,510,079	$1,100,552
Corporation income	14,474,202	2,236,606
Second Revenue Act, 1940		42,204
Excess profits	126,402	
Unjust Enrichment Act		14,711
Declared value excess profits	2,912	64,037
Total corporation	14,603,517	2,357,558
Total individual and corporation	70,113,597	3,458,110
Employment:		
Federal Insurance Contributions Act	3,515,759	1,237,452
Federal Unemployment Tax Act	384,674	142,512
	3,900,433	1,379,964
Railroad employment	205,693	52,419
Total employment tax	4,106,126	1,432,383

	Fiscal year ending June 30—	
	1948	1941
Capital stock	$292	$225,009
Estate	656,868	71,355
Gift	112,367	5,620
Seizures, penalties	225	1,423
Floor tax		76,143
Wholesale liquor dealers	513	12,453
Retail liquor dealers	24,305	33,814
Retail liquor dealers (medicinal)		137
Retail wine dealers	61	
Retail wine and malt dealers	111	
Malt liquors	561,396	249,235
Tobacco manufacturing	112	17
Cigarettes (floor tax)		12,303
Oleomargarine:		
Colored	173	
Wholesalers:		
Colored	160	
Uncolored	1,191	
Retailers:		
Colored	304	
Uncolored	2,734	41
Narcotics	1,431	1,177
Stamp taxes	124,234	22,084
Manufacturers:		
Lubricating oils	3,256	341
Gasoline	189,370	153,446
Automotive parts	6,967	113
Auto truck bodies	4,370	458
Other auto bodies	4,534	
Electrical energy	279,212	174,519
Sporting goods	11,174	
Photo apparatus	264	
Firearms, etc	48	
Electric bulbs, etc	52	
Total manufacturing	499,249	328,877
Retailers:		
Jewelry	604,210	
Furs	138,657	
Toilet goods	276,664	28
Luggage	116,691	
Firearms	1	
Admissions	1,063,572	167,532
Cabaret	188,509	
Club dues	32,334	3,014
Bituminous coal		290
Sugar	82,492	194,629
Telegraph and telephone	42,929	4,010
Leased wires	498	
Local telephone	25,573	
Safe deposit boxes	26,626	5,398
Bowling alleys and pool tables	17,164	
Coin-operated devices	474,283	
Transportation of persons	119,360	
Transportation of property	432,912	
	79,868,935	6,305,087
Unemployment compensation tax collected by State of Idaho for Federal Government	3,802,000	2,230,000
Total	83,670,935	8,535,087

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which I made on April 23, 1949, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the First, Second, and Third California Congressional Districts, in Sacramento, Calif., on the Central Valley project:

One reason I am glad you asked me to come to Sacramento tonight is because here we meet in the heart of the greatest reclamation project on this continent. The news of the discovery of gold, broken at Sutter's Fort—down the street—a hundred years ago, gave assurance of the greatness of your past. On the day when you have news that your waters are going to be put to their fullest use, and for the fullest public benefit, then you will know that the greatness of your future is assured. That day has not come yet, and you are going to have to fight to make it come.

It is not enough to talk about full development. There are too many people who talk about full development of every drop of water for the fullest possible benefit, but who don't act the way they talk. They spend their time helping to destroy the unity, and the legal, and economic and administrative integrity of the Central Valley project. When others are in the thick of the fight for transmission lines and steam plants, they are busy doing something else. They use their time picking away at the law, and at the agency which Congress established as the best way the entire American Nation could extend help in developing the West. In short, as much as they dare, they are a drag on California's efforts to get full development and full public benefit from her water and land, and they hope you won't know the difference.

They try to cover up. They never say they are against full development. You remember the good old spiritual, that says "Everybody (who) talks about Hebbin isn't gwine (going) dere"? There's lots of wisdom and penetration in the words of that spiritual. In the spiritual it was important not to be misled by talk about getting to Heaven. In this great Central Valley it is important not to be misled by talk about getting full development.

Anything less than full development you cannot afford. That is why our Democratic Party has taken a strong and clear-cut stand on reclamation of Central Valley. The Democratic Party knows how to get full development, and we tell the people in plain words how to get it. Because we speak plain words that people can understand—Harry Truman carried the Central Valley for President last November by 50,000 votes. That's the reason why the congressional district next to your own retired Gearhart and sent the Democrat, CECIL WHITE, to Washington.

Let me read our Democratic Party platform to you. This is what we adopted here in Sacramento on the 7th day of last August. We said:

"Water and power are the essential requirements of future industrial and agricultural prosperity of California.

"We affirm the position taken by the Democratic Party in California that the great Central Valley project be completed at the earliest possible time as an integrated basin-wide publicly owned development of our water and power resources by the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

"We endorse and support the principles incorporated in the Federal reclamation law of 1902, specifically acreage limitation and protection against land speculation and monopoly.

"To safeguard these resources and retain them as our public heritage, water must be provided for the maximum agricultural development of family-sized farms, and cheap public power must be increasingly available."

That's a good platform, and every Californian, regardless of party, ought to know what it says. Because that platform spells out a good future for these Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and for all California.

We are beginning to learn what rapid growth means, and the requirements of rapid growth. The Bureau of the Census tells us that the number of people living in our State has grown by 45 percent since 1940. There are nearly three Californians for every two there were 8 years ago. We are larger in population since World War II, by a number equal to the 1940 population of the State of Virginia. And we still are growing fast.

That's one big reason why water and power are the essential requirements of future agricultural and industrial growth and prosperity. Water grows crops—the food and fiber that feed and clothe people. Families need water on the land so they can support themselves by their labors. Water builds communities.

When we talk about new people coming to California, and the need for water and power to support them, don't think it's only their standard of living we're talking about. It's our own standard of living, too. There is no way of keeping ours up while theirs stays down—not for long. New Californians and old—in the long run our standards living will go up or go down together.

I have been talking about water, spread out on the land to grow crops. Now let's talk about the power of falling water. The Chinese coolie can generate water, too. He runs in a treadmill, or inside a great wheel, like a squirrel in a cage. The power he generates lifts water to irrigate rice fields, or to turn the slow wheels of a simple machine. We Americans could do that, too. We are husky enough to irrigate our valleys and turn our industrial wheels by the same power of human muscle and human endurance. But if we did, our standard of living would be the standard of the Chinese coolie.

The better we can water the land in our valleys, and the more power we can generate from falling water, the higher the standard of living of the people of California will be. If ever we get comprehensive development of this Central Valley Basin, the project will generate more than 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, annually.

Isn't everybody in California in favor of all the electric power that we can possibly harness our waters to generate?

You know the answer. It's "No," not unless some people can do it themselves and upon their own terms. Some of the interests which talk the most about building for the progress of California, actually hold back progress unless they think they can control it, actually hold back the building of dams and transmission lines and steam plants unless they can control them. That is the record.

Let's look at the record.

In 1922 the people of the State of California began their present long fight for public power. They began it in the legislature. What did they encounter? The stubborn resistance of the private utility.

That resistance was an obstacle in the fight for public power development but not a tombstone. In 1933 the people of California were asked to say in a special election whether they wanted public water and power development or not; whether they wanted a Central Valley project or not. They went to the polls and they said that they did. They wanted progress in California.

The secretary of state, as you know, places in the hands of every voter a pamphlet containing arguments for and arguments against.

Those who argued against the Water and Power Act told the voters that "It will take 10 to 20 years to absorb the surplus (power) now existing or being developed." That was the counsel given in 1933.

Do you remember, last year, in spite of all the power we've been developing, how your electric clocks all ran slow, and how you missed your appointments and trains, because California didn't generate encugh power to run your clocks on time?

And yet, those who argued against the Water and Power Act in 1933 argued that—

"Profits from energy sales are likely to be illusory in view of the excess electric energy in California (now 50 percent over demand), and, on completion of Boulder (Hoover) Dam, the power available will be twice the amount now sold."

The trouble, they said, was with our surplus California power.

Well, last year the switches were pulled in the San Joaquin Valley by our private utility company, and the pumps of the farmers were stopped. I don't think the farmers have yet forgotten that. I think they remember the help they got from the "excess" electric energy sent up from southern California. Of course we really haven't any excess in southern California, or anywhere else in this State, but that's what some people call it.

Those who supported the Water and Power Act to develop Central Valley told the people the truth. In the election pamphlet of 1933, they said:

"The project will produce hydroelectric power at low cost which will be sold to pay costs of the work. A main transmission line from Kennett to Antioch will make available cheap electric energy to farmers, home owners, and industrialists, as well as cities and districts. * * *

"Chief opposition to this project comes from one source—the Power Trust. Do not be deceived on that score. Admitted representatives of the power companies did their utmost to defeat this recovery program in the legislature and they now seek to defeat it on the ballot. You will be flooded with propaganda against this measure—propaganda issued by the power companies with your money.

"But the issue is clear cut. This act will help your State. It will reduce your power rates. It is vital to every laboring man, every farmer, every businessman. * * *

"Vote for your own interest.

"Vote 'Yes.'"

The people of California did vote "Yes" in 1933. They voted for dams and power plants and transmission lines.

There's one thing about hydroelectric power that we never should allow ourselves to forget. We cannot exhaust the supply of water that falls on our watershed, by using it. Generation of hydroelectric power is perfect conservation. It is a perpetually self-renewing resource.

But our oil reserves underground are not self-renewing. They are dwindling with use. Someday they will be gone. I wonder if those who increase our drafts on oil while they continue to obstruct our use of falling water to generate power ever have thought of that.

The Democratic Party platform we adopted here in Sacramento as we went into last year's campaign, said:

"We affirm the position taken by the Democratic Party in California that the great Central Valley project be completed at the earliest possible time as an integrated basin-wide publicly owned development of our water and power resources by the United States Bureau of Reclamation."

Everybody knows that special interests and their spokesmen in Congress have been blocking the building of public power plants and transmission lines in your valley. It was in February, only 3 years ago, that Mr. Black, of the P. G. & E. in opposing a congressional appropriation to assist your development, made his famous statement in answer to a Congressman's question, Is there any power shortage now? He replied:

"There is none now; there has been none, and there will be none in the future."

It is plain enough that the head of the private utility, that under State law is mainly responsible for keeping this part of California supplied with power, did not know that in two short years more than 5,000 factory workers in the San Francisco Bay area would be counting the dollars cut from their pay checks because of a power shortage. He did not know that the State government of California would make a survey and have to report that in 39 factories the average weekly earnings had dropped from $62.04 in February 1948 to $53.17 in March, because of power shortage. But he should have known it, for the Bureau of Reclamation, which he was opposing, was forecasting it and working to prevent it. The wage earners of San Francisco Bay learned it the hard way, even without the State survey to tell them. And the farmers and everybody else in California learned it when we were put on daylight-saving time, and kept there until New Year's, because power was short.

To all this some skeptic may say, "Well, 5,000 factory workers aren't very many, considering there are millions of them in California." No; 5,000 aren't many, looked at that way.

Back in colonial days in New England, the Sunday sermons were pretty long, and some of the congregation used to get pretty drowsy. So they made it the duty of a warden to go up and down the aisles during the sermon, carrying a stick long enough to reach down the pews. On one end of the stick was a soft tuft of horsehairs; on the other end was a hard round knob. If the tickle of horsehairs wouldn't waken the sleeper, then a rap with the knob would.

If you want to, you can debate the question whether wage cuts handed out to 5,000 factory workers in 1948 were just a tickler, or whether that was a rap on the skull. I say, whichever it was, the Democratic Party in California is wide awake.

Right here I want to say, the House of Representatives in this Democratic Eighty-first Congress has just put through the best appropriation bill for public power in Central Valley that any Congress ever passed. But you will have to keep your eye on the Senate.

Our Democratic Party platform says we must have an integrated, basin-wide development, operated by a single responsible agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. We say that with good reason.

The comprehensive plan for Central Valley calls for 38 reservoirs, hundreds of miles of main canals, thousands of miles of lateral canals and drains, 28 hydroelectric power plants and supplementary steam plants, hundreds of miles of transmission lines, feeder lines and substations, and a canal system that will link every stream in the valley into the project as a unit.

We must have unity, unless we are prepared to see the future of California sold down our own rivers.

It is a complex business to operate a watershed 450 miles long and 50 miles wide, with all those reservoirs and canals and laterals and drains, and power plants and transmission lines. One of the best statements I have ever seen as to why we cannot have two agencies in Central Valley—not two, even if both are good ones—was a statement presented to Congress by Neil Haggerty of the California State Federation of Labor. That was in 1947 just at the time when three chemical plants on the bay suspended some of their operations because power was short. That should have been a tickler to wake up a good many people, even though it was many months before the 5,000 wage earners had their wages cut.

Neil Haggerty recognized it. It didn't take a rap on the skull to waken the State federation of labor, or the Grange.

I want to read a few passages from Mr. Haggerty's statement to the house public lands committee. He said:

"Water control is not the simple task which some may suppose it to be, something to be parceled out to whomever may be ready to build a dam here or there. * * *

"The end to be attained is stability and dependability in the use of every drop of water that can be made available for irrigation, for power, and for the other purposes to which it can be put. This great and difficult end must be achieved by harnessing a resource which in its natural condition exhibits the widest diversity and instability. Along the 500-mile watershed of the Central Valley the rains and snows fall unevenly. From north to south, precipitation tapers off sharply. From year to year it fluctuates in volume irregularly.

"The uses of water caught in the reservoirs also are diverse, changing, and at times contradictory. Flood control demands the emptying of reservoirs in anticipation of coming floods; irrigation demands the filling of reservoirs to capacity while floodwaters are high, with release during seasons after the danger of flood has long passed; power demands the release of water through the turbines steadily and evenly through the year.

"The technical problem of achieving the maximum potential of these uses requires that the intricate system of reservoirs and other works which we are creating shall be so skillfully interlocked in design that the whole shall indeed be greater than the sum of the parts.

"The task of operating the water controls of the great Central Valley development will tax the highest capacities of a master dispatcher of water, one who can foresee by many days the need of an irrigator for water in a field 400 miles away, and the requirement for power of an industry in a distant city.

"Two or more agencies simultaneously attempting to develop and operate so intricate a system of controls can only cause friction and confusion and cannot possibly achieve the full economic potential to which California is entitled. To do this is a task for one agency alone.

"The California State Federation of Labor has watched the drive by special interests to destroy the unity of Central Valley water development for their own purposes with an ever-deepening apprehension."

That's why we must have unity; that's why we must tie the American River and the Kings River and the other river projects close into the Central Valley project. That's why we cannot afford to have sectionalism. We never can get the most efficient use of our limited supply of water for irrigation and for power until we get a unified project with unified operation. Any engineer, any administrator, knows that. Any wage earner and any farmer who stops to think about it, knows that. And some day, with the help of the Democratic Party, if we keep working at it, every one elected to the United States Congress will know it. Even the legislature and the administration of this State will know it.

Our platform says:

"We endorse and support the principles incorporated in the Federal reclamation law of 1902, specifically, acreage limitation and protection against land speculation and monopoly."

The party of Thomas Jefferson doesn't have to be told why speculation and water monopoly are bad. That's bred in the bones of every true Democrat. In 1776 Thomas Jefferson introduced in the colonial Legislature of Virginia his famous bill to abolish entailed estates.

"In the earlier times of the colony," he said, "when lands were to be had for little or nothing, some provident individuals procured large grants; * * * desirous of founding great families for themselves. * * * The transmission of this property from generation to generation, in the same name, raised up a distinct set of families * * * privileged by law in the perpetuation of their wealth (and) thus formed into a patrician order. * * * To annul this privilege, and instead of an aristocracy of wealth, more harm and danger than benefit to society, to make an opening for the

aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for in the direction of the interests of society, and scattered with equal hand through all its conditions, was deemed essential to a well-ordered republic."

What Jefferson meant was, "no democracy can be founded on great landed estates, picked up for speculation and made perpetual." What that means today in Central Valley is, "No water and land monopoly or speculation, especially by corporation farms." The party of Jefferson, by its plank adopted here in the Central Valley, stands squarely in favor of the water limitation in the national reclamation law that Congress first enacted 47 years ago and has reapproved a dozen times since.

It isn't just because we revere the principles of democratic past that we stand for reclamation law. It isn't just because we believe that Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson grasped something of eternal truth and made it warp and woof of American policy. It is also because we believe that the truth they grasped is our guide to a better future. To a better future for this Central Valley.

Nearly everybody knows by this time that when we get all of the waters of the valley put to the purposes of irrigation under the comprehensive reclamation plan, our valley will be a better place if we multiply communities like Dinuba, than if we multiply places like Arvin. And they know that enforcement of reclamation law means fewer Arvins and more Dinubas. That's one reason water contracts containing the reclamation law are winning by popular vote in Central Valley—by a vote that is pretty close to unanimous.

The people of this valley are fair. They want as high a proportion of citizens as possible to make their livings as operators of farms, as men of business or one of the professions, and they want as few as possible to be landless laborers.

You know, without anybody telling you, that enforcement of acreage limitation means better towns and cities to live in, to do business in, and to raise your families in. You know that the fair sharing of reclamation water is going to help us to perpetuate our American democracy.

A citizen of northern California wrote a letter to the chairman of the House Public Lands Committee about a year and a half ago. He was president of a well-known businessmen's club. I do not know his party affiliation, and I do not care. Whatever it is, his letter, written in our own State, expresses the truths that you know, that we wrote into our platform. I want to read you a few passages from that letter:

"We urge first of all that as small-town merchants and professional men we have a dollars-and-cents motive of the very strongest nature in developing and fostering the development not only in Siskiyou County but throughout California of small individually owned land and operated land holdings. We prosper and increase only as the small farm owner and small industrial class prosper and increase. We desire to see the rich agricultural potential of California developed by large numbers of stable, energetic, and intelligent farmers, who and whose families, will patronize us with the strong and stable purchasing power which experience throughout California has, over a long period of years, demonstrated that that economic class possesses. It is not our experience that development of large industrial farms or of tenant farming develops or sustains a large, permanent, nontransient group with strong purchasing power to patronize the merchants, professional men, and service tradesmen of the small country town. We believe the studies of your committee will demonstrate as a fact the proposition that large industrial farms under modern conditions in California are operated by machinery with a small labor force or with large transient labor forces and drain the major portion of the profits into the hands of a few individuals whose requirements do not furnish sufficient business to sustain a large and substantial professional class, or drain the profits into corporate enterprises centered in the large metropolitan areas and that similar results follow from large holdings let to tenant farmers without permanent local ties and with a substantial portion of the income of operation paid to an absentee landlord class. With the tremendous increase of population in this State we feel it cannot be too strongly urged that a large portion of the increase should be diverted not only into the farms as owners, but also into the small country towns of California to furnish the services necessary to such an increased farm population. In our opinion, the repeal of the limitation will not be conducive to the diversion of that increased population into the country areas of California.

"Aside from our own immediate interest in the promotion of the business welfare of our group and of ourselves it is our thought that the strength of American democracy lies in our rural areas, in our small-farm owners, in the small towns and villages of our country. It is our thought that the more people own and operate small farms and small-business enterprises the stronger will be our Nation. In the warmer lowland areas of our State, 40 acres will well support a farmer and his family and provide them not only with the necessaries of life but also with a goodly portion of the luxuries and modern comforts and the children with a sound education. Such results take hard work, intelligence, and some sacrifice, but produce as a whole some of our soundest citizens. The children on such farms learn from earliest infancy the value of industry, frugality, and honesty. The elimination of the limitation will not encourage or foster the growth of that group of our citizenry. We cannot help but feel that its repeal will foster rather a small wealthy class and a transient laboring and tenant class lacking either the wealth or attachment to the community which we deem essential to development and maintenance of sound democracy in our rural areas. We, as taxpayers, who bear the initial cost of the Central Valley's project and other water developments by the Federal Government, are not in favor of use of our tax dollars for the type of development we feel inevitable from the removal of the limitation.

"We shall not labor the point further. The entire matter will, no doubt, be examined in detail by your committee. We do, however, wish to make most emphatic our thought that economically, sociologically, and politically the development which will follow from taking available cheap water to large land holdings at public expense is unsound and not in the best interests of either the State or Nation."

I find it hard to believe that any citizen of this valley, once he gives that statement thought, could do other than to subscribe to it. When I think of how CECIL WHITE rode into Congress on the 160-acre limitation in the very district where opposition to it was supposed to be strongest, then I am sure the Democratic Party will win on this issue. The more people learn about it, the more the people—farmers, labor, businessmen, veterans, church people, citizens—come to the standard that we have raised.

This valley with its resources is your heritage. Our Democratic platform says:

"To safeguard these resources and retain them as our public heritage, water must be provided for maximum agricultural development of family-sized farms, and cheap public power must be increasingly available."

What we are seeking is to release, here in this valley, the American spirit of enterprise. We are opposing the dead hand of monopoly upon you, and the palsied hand of a "regulation" that has broken down under the modern demands for cheap power. We are opposing the private monopolization of speculative gain from public investment in water, or power.

We believe in conserving your natural resources, and in distributing the benefits among you as widely as possible. We believe in creating more sound, American communities in this great Central Valley.

And we know that if we continue to work and struggle for these, our democratic beliefs, under American institutions, we shall win.

ECA Announces New Policy Regarding Procurement of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1949.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Because of the concern which has been expressed by the west coast lumber industry as to its more equitable participation in the European recovery program, we are attaching, herewith, a statement of a policy which we are inaugurating with regard to the issuance of procurement authorizations for the purchase of lumber.

We are taking this method of advising you of this so that you may receive the information at the earliest possible moment. Mr. Mathias Niewenhous, Chief of our Lumber Branch, will be on the west coast during the week of May 2 to discuss these matters with the lumber industry.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD BRUCE,
Acting Administrator.

STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY EFFECTED BY ECA REGARDING PURCHASES OF LUMBER AND PLYWOOD

In the future ECA will request all participating countries desiring to purchase lumber or lumber products for dollars to afford the United States lumber industry an opportunity to compete for the business. Before writing a procurement authorization where the requested area of source is other than the United States, ECA will find out—

(a) What it is they intend to purchase.

(b) Why any other country, instead of the United States, is named as the source.

(c) Whether definite specifications were furnished bidders.

(d) Whether firm bids were requested and obtained from the United States lumber industry and any other pertinent information we deem necessary.

ECA policy on non-ECA dollar purchases by participating countries will be as follows:

In order to be consistent with the United States policy of nondiscrimination and in line with the general policy of ECA, which is to encourage participating countries to be economical in the use of their resources, and particularly their dollar resources, ECA will request participating countries (when using non-ECA dollars)—

(a) To make dollar purchases in the cheapest source;

(b) To canvass all possible dollar sources, including United States sources, in order to insure they are obtaining the lowest possible bids; and

(c) Certainly not to pay more from any dollar source than United States suppliers quote.

ECA recognizes that current market prices are not the sole consideration in the placing of purchase contracts. Where participating countries find that exceptional circumstances warrant paying higher prices with non-ECA dollars from certain dollar sources than prevail in others, they should be prepared to submit reasonable justification for such action to ECA.

ECA is always willing to discuss with representatives of industry any problems affecting their industries. Meetings may be arranged with Howard Bruce, Deputy Administrator; Samuel W. Anderson, Director, Industry Division; or Mathias Niewenhous, Chief, Lumber Branch, Industry Division.

Mr. Truman's Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 29, 1948:

MR. TRUMAN'S BLUNDER

During the general debate on labor legislation in the House on Wednesday, Representative ARTHUR KLEIN, of New York, called for a 1-day general strike (he termed it a "national work stoppage") as a means of demonstrating to "reactionary Republicans and Dixiecrats" that American labor is solidly behind the pending administration bill. He disclosed that he had sent telegrams to the Nation's top labor leaders urging such action.

The New York Member's proposal drew prompt fire from his colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike. These rebukes, it need hardly be said, were richly merited. The suggestion that Congress be coerced into accepting the kind of bill the unions want by a public demonstration of organized labor's economic power is, of course, thoroughly shocking.

Yet who will say that Representative KLEIN'S proposal differs other than in degree from the pointed remarks offered by President Truman at his press conference just as the House was preparing to consider the two rival labor measures yesterday. Mr. Truman chose that particular moment to issue a warning that political patronage might be withheld from those Democrats who refuse to support legislation carrying out the party platform. Moreover, lest the timing of this pronouncement wasn't sufficient evidence in itself of its immediate significance, he proceeded to point out that one of the chief tests of party loyalty would be how Members of Congress voted on repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This action of the President was, in our opinion, profoundly unfortunate. Coercion is no less coercion because it is political rather than economic, and as such it has no place whatsoever in the democratic legislative process. Stronger Executives than Mr. Truman have lived to regret efforts to dictate to Congress under threat of political reprisals. We hope our legislators will have the courage and wisdom to disregard this pressure and deal with this question on its merits as they see them.

Address Before the Clan-na-Gael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Clan-na-Gael, Easter Sunday, April 17, 1949, Hotel Astor, New York:

It is a very high privilege indeed for me to address this historic and militant organization this evening. I have long admired the many contributions which you have made not only to your native and adopted countries but your long-continued, unselfish and unflinching loyalty to the cause of human freedom whenever it was assailed by the hand of the oppressor and the tyrant.

You are aptly described indeed as the vanguard and embodiment of Irish nationality which has nobly kept the national flag and national principles to the front in dark and evil days.

By no means are your contributions confined to the political field alone. In charity and benevolence, literature and history, in the cultivation of the language, letters, art, science, and music of ancient and modern Ireland you have contributed mightily to the best and noblest traditions and aspirations of our race.

Your unyielding and unexcelled devotion in peace and in war to our own beloved and great American Nation and the exalted principles of freedom and justice upon which it is founded have furnished deepest inspiration not to your own members alone, but to millions of true Americans in every walk of life. You have inculcated and disseminated, by your efforts to perpetuate and maintain the true spirit of the Declaration of Independence and to foster, promote, and enhance the historic friendly relations existing between Ireland and America since the days of Washington and Lincoln, an example of stirring and noble patriotism which has certainly never been exceeded in this or any other nation.

Down the unbroken channels of time, suffering under the cruelties of oppression and tyranny, denied their God-given rights as freemen, evicted from their homes, subjected to poverty, want, famine, and pestilence, and finally cast as exiles over the seven seas, there is no story more pathetic, more touching, or more inspiring than the story of the Irish people. In the land of saints, scholars, heroes, and martyrs, whose people have always been passionately devoted to the cause of freedom and the cause of Christ, even the Dark Ages were not able to extinguish the fiercely burning zeal of the Irish for learning and culture.

And when the Goddess of Liberty was in danger, when ruthless and powerful enemies were seeking to disenthrone her and cast what she symbolizes into the discard, it was the heroism of your sons and the blood of your faith and race so gloriously consecrated on the altar of American patriotism in a spirit and to a degree never excelled, which contributed a surging and irresistible force in defense of our country and its priceless institutions, and so I can say to you tonight in the spirit of gratitude and pride as well for my own fellowship with this noble company, "Well done thou gallant Gael, you have fought the fight for liberty, your sons have died to preserve our freedom, your blood has been unselfishly spilled until it has drenched the soil of virtually every nation in the world in defense of the security, freedom of the land, and the perpetuation of its precious heritage of freemen and the dignity of the individual soul."

In the veins of most of us here tonight runs the rich red blood of these Irish martyrs who loved liberty and God so much that they would rather die than live in security and plenty under institutions which would deny them the right to be free and the right to worship their God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Irish contributions have not been confined to the military alone. As I said, they have influenced for the good practically every phase of American life—the church, the courtroom, the hospital, the market place, and the public platform. But the Irish have brought no radical, alien theories to America, they have brought no dictatorships dressed up as bureaucracies, no willingness to attach themselves to communism, fascism, or other isms that would destroy the rights of the individual and kill human freedom. They have brought no supine surrender to the will of unbridled, unconstitutional authority, no weak hearts, no cowardice in the face of danger. They have brought no intolerance, no bigotry, no hatred of others, no feelings of class or caste, no bitterness in their hearts for their fellow American. Their sense of humor, their wit, their simple philosophy of live-and-let-live embellish the Irish character more than any words of mine.

On the other hand, the Irish have brought love of family, devotion to home, obedience to law and constituted authority, love of God, and love of liberty. They have brought loyalty to America, loyalty to freedom and democracy, loyalty to American institutions, tolerance and justice toward their fellow man, and they will never bring themselves to join the ranks of modern destructionists now visible on every hand, who through stealth, subterfuge, and secret conspiracy have infiltrated the American body politic with the poisonous doctrines of communism, hate, and social disorder. For the Irishman knows, from 700 years of tragic struggle for liberty, that when man surrenders personal freedom for temporary security he thereby turns himself over to the whim and caprice of dictators and soon will lose both security and freedom. He knows that if men expect to receive tolerance they must be tolerant themselves and that bigotry, racial and religious persecution are but the means to ultimate self-destruction, as well as the betrayal of democracy's basic rights.

How anyone can gaze even so briefly at the history of the Irish people and then conclude that they can be dragooned into surrendering their independence, their right to self-determination, is beyond my comprehension. As one great Irish patriot said of the oppressors of his country, "They may kill every man in Ireland and the women of Ireland will rise up and fight them. They may kill every woman in Ireland, and the little children will rise up and fight them. They may kill every child in Ireland, and then the blades of green grass growing on holy Irish soil will rise up and fight them."

Yes, my friends, you have been in the vanguard of every fight for freedom, of every struggle to preserve democracy, of every effort to protect the Constitution and its principles of justice and peace.

And together with the great company of Irishmen everywhere you can hold your heads high tonight for the matchless achievements

and accomplishments that have been made in the name of Christianity, freedom, and democracy and in defense of the most precious thing which humankind possesses, the right to his immortal soul and the freedom of his own mind and body.

A great patriot once said:

"Whether in chains or in laurels, liberty knows nothing but victory."

It is very appropriate, therefore, that tonight on the anniversary of the glorious Easter rebellion Americans of Irish blood and their friends should gather here and in other parts of the Nation and world to pay tribute not only to the carrying forward of a great ideal implicit in this historic event but also to the memory of the gallant and passionate lovers of Ireland and of human freedom who gave their all and who unselfishly dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in order that the bitter, bloody struggle of over 750 years should one day be crowned with the brilliant achievement of deliverance from bondage and the glories and triumphs of self-government and independence.

The events we celebrate were not new to this world. They have had many counterparts throughout history. Since the deliverance of the most ancient slave from his chains and shackles mankind has struggled to be free from the curse of tyranny and oppression. Through the centuries the clarion call has rung out. Down through the years the trumpet has been heard sounding the rallying call for liberation and freedom. It was heard in the days of the ancient emperors and of the kings and rulers of medieval Europe. It was heard on the plains of Runnymede and across the fertile fields and valleys of France. It was heard on historic Boston Common and the halls of Philadelphia and at Valley Forge. And it was heard that fateful Easter day in 1916 in the streets of Dublin town.

Like their predecessors of historical time, like the French patriots and the American revolutionists, these men sought no selfish gain. These men sought no personal aggrandizement. These men sought no territorial conquest save what was their own. They sought what the human soul has sought since the dawn of history—the right to be freed from bondage; the right to be delivered from cruel and tyrannical rulers; the right to speak their own minds, to worship the God of their own choice, to set up the government of their own selection; in a word, to find self-expression, self-realization, and self-development through the medium of free institutions.

Great events are often moved by a few. The people, as a whole, are often inspired by a small group. The number of these heroes of the Irish volunteers and citizens' army was not large, but the spirit of freedom, sacrifice, and gallantry which they displayed animated and infused their fellow citizens with an insuperable courage to go forward, never to give up the fight for freedom until it had been won, never to cease resistance until their liberties had been secured, never, never to know the meaning of the word "defeat." Under the then existing orders and edicts of a great imperial tyranny these men were liable to be shot at sight, but their courage was not abated for one moment.

Although hundreds of people were shot and murdered in cold blood, the spirit of the people was never broken. In the words of a great British leader, "Grass can grow over a battlefield, but it cannot grow over a scaffold." The execution of the leaders created martyrs. They aroused a flood of both sympathy and resentment which swept across the land like a prairie fire. The nation was awakened, as it had been many times before, by the blood of its heroes and the sacrifice of its martyrs until the lines of resistance to oppression were redrawn and strengthened, and it was only a question of time until the nation was on its way to the realization of a greater measure of freedom and unity than it had enjoyed for centuries. Just as the shot fired by the humble citizens of Lexington and Concord "at the rude bridge that arched the flood" was heard round the world, the martyrdom and sacrifices of an Irish Eastertide ultimately swayed the sympathies of democratic-minded peoples everywhere and led directly to the capitulation which resulted in the establishment of the Irish Free State.

There were many Irishmen and Americans to whom this first settlement was entirely unacceptable. It was not deemed to be complete. It was not considered to permit full and unlimited autonomy. It was not the desired fulfillment of many of the spokesmen and leaders. But at least it was the beginning of the rebirth of a free Irish nationality and political entity. From the dark days of 1916 and the early twenties there has been a steady march forward in the affairs of the Irish Government and people. Led by a succession of brilliant, farsighted statesmen endowed with great talents, zeal, courage, and statesmanship, it has steadily developed its free institutions, its resources, its native capacity for self-government, and its position among the nations of the world. Like every other nation, it has enjoyed its periods of prosperity and depression, its times of political stability and political ferment, its times of security and apprehension. It has moved through smooth and stormy seas, through changes, vicissitudes, and shifting tides of power and opinion, but, in the main, it has clung to the course of freedom charted long ago by century-old leaders and loyally adhered to by their successors down through the ages.

But there was certainly one essential characteristic of democracy that was still lacking in that government, and that was its God-given geographic unity. Every free state is entitled to that kind of unity. Democracy is ruled by the majority, and seeks the protection of minorities. Practically every modern state has enjoyed this type of geographic unity. It would be incredible and objectionable to Americans, for example, if New York, or California, or Massachusetts were to be severed from the continental United States and permitted to maintain and conduct their separate governments without reference to the over-all authority of the Federal Union. No extensive argument is required to demonstrate the accuracy in principle and practice of the statement that a modern democratic state is entitled to its natural, traditional, geographic unity and the sovereign powers incident to it. Yet that right and that prerogative of sovereignty has been willfully and deliberately denied to Ireland in contravention of every principle of democracy, every canon of self-determination, and every tenet of justice as they are known between men and nations. Ireland was deliberately divided and partitioned by the designing, calculated, and arbitrary action of a superior and powerful imperialistic force. An imaginary geographic line was drawn across the nation in such a manner and with such a purpose as to include the maximum territory that could be included without endangering political control of the servient territory.

The same thing has been done to other small nations, but that does not give moral sanction to the unconscionable act. The same thing in principle has been done to Poland, to Lithuania, to Latvia, to Estonia, and to other free nations now consigned by the arbitrary dictum arising out of compromise and appeasement of the great Red colossus which stands astride of all Europe reaching its powerful tentacles in all directions to encompass the destruction of human freedom, to live in bondage behind the iron curtain.

The rulers of the Kremlin are well on their way to bringing under their dominion and ruthless control possibly half the population of the earth. Some of these gains have been accomplished, just as Irish partition was accomplished, by the drawing of imaginary geographic lines, by the consent and with the approval in some instances of high officials of our own and other Allied Governments. This mighty force of the Soviet is directed at the destruction of organized religion, the destruction of the church and the family unit, which is the one vital social institution upon which our civilization is based, directed at the suppression of the human being to the status of nothing more than slave or serf, and ultimately the envelopment of the whole world in a cruel and fanatical dictatorship in which free institutions shall be forever banished and freedom of the individual and the dignity of the human soul and personality shall be a mere shibboleth.

Like many of you, like all of you, I would profess to believe, during my service in the Congress and before, I have been striving, working, and fighting against these detestable tyrannies which have beset almost every part of our troubled world. I cannot here fully or adequately describe the causes of these developments, the emergence of atheistic radicalism on a world-wide front, the creation of the political, social, and economic Frankenstein which now threatens the world with unwelcome ideologies and streamlined and modernized tyrannies. The causes are no mystery to me or to you, and the sooner this Nation can detach itself through the affirmation of strong, declarative, pro-American policies from the odium, blame, and censure which surrounds these nefarious developments the sooner our great and powerful Nation will rise in respect of our people, the oppressed small nations of the earth and the teeming millions of peoples in so many parts of the world who are helplessly and silently suffering under oppression and who yearn and plead for nothing more than speedy deliverance from tyranny, the reestablishment of their free institutions, the blessings of democracy, security, and peace.

Yes, my friends, I have been protesting with every ounce of my energy against the outrages which have been perpetrated against free peoples, against the principle of self-determination and free government. I have been doing my level best to warn our people against the encroaching spread of communism and subversion at home and abroad which endangers the moral, physical, political, and economic security of this Nation, and which threatens the perpetration of our free democratic way of life for which so many bitter sacrifices have been unselfishly made by millions of boys and men of this and preceding generations.

That is why I am here tonight to join, my friends, with you in your reverent impressive tribute to the Irish martyrs, your rededication to the principles for which they stood and died, your strong resolution to perpetuate and preserve the cause and the gains which their sacrifices insured, and above all your heartfelt pledge in all circumstances to stand loyally, devotedly, courageously, and inalterably by the institutions, liberties, and security of our great Government which, if Christian civilization is to be preserved, must continue to blaze a brilliant, shining, high example, and furnish hope and inspiration to the afflicted peoples of the world. And that is why I must join you also tonight in your demand and plea for full, complete, and unlimited justice for the Irish Nation, for the elimination of partition and for a proper, just, geographic and political unity of that land and government based upon the very principles of freedom and oft-repeated commitments upon which in two great world wars our sons and daughters laid down their lives.

It is our own great free nation that should assume the leadership in existing interna-

tional tribunals and in every other way to right the wrongs and injustices of the past, and to use its good offices and its matchless influence and power in world affairs to rectify oppressive conditions affecting the freedom and well-being of millions of liberty-loving and peace-seeking peoples. I am proud to say that our Government has acted in some instances to insure application of the principle of self-determination and national autonomy to peoples who are entitled to their freedom. We have recently moved together with other nations I am proud to say, and I vigorously joined in the successful efforts to establish a national homeland and free autonomous government for our esteemed and long and bitterly afflicted Jewish breathren. We were thrilled with this great victory for freedom and wish for the new government greatest success in the future. In logic and decency no nation can oppose partition in Palestine and favor it in Ireland. There is a fundamental principle at stake and all true Americans and all lovers of liberty everywhere must rally to its support. Let us seek to effectuate at the earliest date possible the unification of Ireland and the final accomplishment of the age-old dream of Irish patriots and people of a freely ordained, completely liberated, fully coordinated, free autonomous Irish nation.

And by all means, mindful of our own origin, heritage and traditions, let us join with all other oppressed peoples who are seeking freedom to achieve their high aim. Let us secure the Nation against communism and all its evil works, against internal enemies promoting moral decay and spiritual disintegration, against the nefarious conspiracies which are seeking to overthrow our freedom, against all those who are aiming at the destruction of free institutions. If we work resolutely, courageously, and perseveringly toward these great ends we will not only insure the preservation and continued glory and blessings of our own unparalleled democracy, but we will also lend our influence and strength to the eradication of all forms of tyranny, the establishment and reconstitution of free government dedicated to human happiness and the maintenance of a just, lasting peace on this earth and between peoples and men everywhere which will make democracy secure for future generations and give evidence again to a demoralized and languishing world that the beacon light of liberty is still held aloft, shining forth its rays of hope, of inspiration, of justice and spiritual fufillment to those who have suffered and died in order that mankind may remain free.

In that way, truly, it can then be said that men have been delivered from bondage, from oppression and tyranny and that liberty—that great moral ideal of the human race has once again been restored to her throne knowing nothing but victories for God, for country, and the humankind.

As proud Irishmen, faithful soldiers of Christ, and loyal Americans, whose loyalty will endure to the end of time, let us rejoice in our heritage and in the immortal words of the rune of St. Patrick:

"At Tara today in this fateful hour
I place all heaven with its power
And the sun with its brightness
And the snow with its whiteness
And fire with all the strength it hath
And lightning with its rapid wrath
And the winds with their swiftness along this path
And the sea with its deepness
And the rocks with their steepness
And the earth with its starkness
All these I place
By God's almighty help and grace
Between myself and the powers of darkness."

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on compulsory health insurance which was prepared by Dr. Paul R. Hawley, major general, United States Army, retired, and which appeared in the April 16, 1949, edition of the Christian Science Monitor. Dr. Hawley served successively as chief surgeon, European Theater of Operations, as General Eisenhower's medical chief in charge of all medical service for United States Army Forces in the European theater, and as chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration. Since his retirement from active Government service, he has also served as chief executive officer of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Commissions, voluntary health plans which are well known to many Members. He is well qualified to discuss the dangers and fallacies of Federal compulsory health insurance, and I commend his article to the attention of everyone who is interested in the merits of such a proposal.

The article follows:

THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE—WOULD COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE INVADE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS?

(By Dr. Paul R. Hawley)

I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because I believe that it should be the inalienable right of every free American to choose the amount and kind of medical care he shall have, or whether he should have any, provided only that his choice does not prejudice the health of others. "Compulsion" is an ugly word in the American tradition, and it is particularly offensive when applied to the intimate arrangements of our private lives.

I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because no necessity has yet been shown for such forcible intrusion into the personal affairs of American citizens. In Rome, during the days of the empire, the average length of life was 24 years. When I drew my first breath, I had a life expectancy of 43 years. Two thousand years' progress in health care had added only 19 years to the length of the average life—only one additional year of life for each 100 years of progress. A defensible case might have been made for compulsory health insurance during those 20 centuries of snail-like progress.

My youngest grandson, born last year, embarked upon life with an actuarial expectancy of living 65 years. Had he been a girl, this expectancy would have been more than 70 years. Within the short span of my own life, more years have been added to length of life than were added to the previous centuries. Nor has this improvement shown any evidence of slowing up. On the contrary, 6½ years have been added to the average life in the past 15 years—1 additional year every 28 months instead of every century. Never, in all history, has there been a less propitious time than the present for a drastic change in our pattern of health care. To make such a revolutionary change at the very time we are capitalizing so handsomely upon our investment in health would be more than stupid—it would be tragic. It is hard to understand how, in the face of such facts, anyone can advance such a fatuous proposal.

I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because its cost to the taxpayer will be terrific without giving him any return whatsoever upon his investment. No one knows what compulsory health insurance will cost the citizens of this country. The most realistic estimate is that the cost will reach $15,000,000,000 annually when it is in full operation. Lesser cost can be achieved only through lowering present standards of quality. Present costs in England are considerably more than twice the initial estimates made by the socialist government; and there is every reason to apply the same factor of safety to the estimates made by those socialists who are trying to perpetrate this fraud upon the American people.

Pay-roll deductions and employer contributions will not furnish 40 percent of the cost, and even these will be passed on to the taxpayer in increased prices of the goods he must purchase. The remainder of the cost must come directly from the pocket of the taxpayer. Even in these days when money has lost much of its value, the addition of this huge sum to the national budget will be a threat to the solvency of the United States; and the most ardent proponents of compulsory health insurance are wisely silent upon the question of meeting this heavy charge during a business depression.

I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because all it can offer is more medical attention. If we are in need of anything in the field of health, we are in need of better medical care. There is a vast difference between medical attention and medical care. In every country in which compulsory health insurance has been tried it has resulted in doubling the demand for medical attention with the inevitable results that medical care has been proportionately diluted. This increased demand for medical attention has been largely for inconsequential ailments that people ordinarily disregard. Since facilities for providing medical attention are never increased proportionately—and can never meet unrestrained demand without bankrupting the country—people really in need of care are slighted to the extent that the time and facilities of health services are monopolized by neurotics, malingerers, and chiselers. Let no one confuse medical attention with medical care.

I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because it is pure socialism and because its adoption will make the United States a socialistic state. The issue is not whether compulsory health insurance socializes medicine, but whether it socializes the United States. Of the latter there can be no doubt. The adoption of compulsory health insurance will not mean the immediate end of free enterprise in this country, but it will fix the time of the end within the foreseeable future. If we are to learn anything from the history of excursions into socialism, we need only to look at the history now being made in Great Britain. The road to socialism has no turning; and no steps thereon are ever retraced. We have already taken one or two strides along the road. Compulsory health insurance is the greatest stride yet advocated. Once we take that we are irrevocably committed to traveling the entire distance. It is impossible to retrace the steps we have already taken; but we have this opportunity to brace ourselves and declare, thus far, but no farther. If we do not seize this opportunity for a determined resistance, we shall never have another.

These are not empty warnings of impending disaster. One has only to consult contemporary history and that of the immediate past to be convinced that compulsory health insurance has made a mockery of health care, has increased loss of time and earning power of working people, and has placed heavy burdens upon taxpayers. The United

States, the only Nation of importance in which free enterprise exists today, is now supporting almost the entire world. If there were no other reason for the United States to guard jealously its free economy, it would be that there is no nation left to support us if and when we adopt the economic practices of those European nations which are now the principal beneficiaries of our system of free enterprise. It seems inconceivable that any American citizen should advocate that the United States adopt a social system characterized principally by its association with European nations, whose standards of living are at a level which would be intolerable in this country. It is interesting to note, too, that the most vocal of the advocates of compulsory health insurance are to be found within departments of the Federal Government—in theory, but only in theory, servants of the taxpayer, who are using the taxpayers' money in this effort to add to the taxpayer's burden.

Opposition to compulsory health insurance is no denial of the necessity for continued improvement in health services. It is unreal to expect improvement in the techniques of health care at a rate more rapid than now obtains. However, the problems of the economics of health care are not yet completely solved. Great strides are being made toward the solution of all of these problems through voluntary agencies; and there is every indication that full success is not far distant.

Voluntary methods have the great advantages of freedom from political control, efficiency, and economy of operation never obtained in Government agencies, and of forestalling the creation of more and more bureaucracies in Washington. Above all, they leave with each citizen full freedom of choice of when, where, and to what extent he shall seek health care.

Statements by Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Artist's Grave Mistake," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ARTIST'S GRAVE MISTAKE

It is difficult to have any feeling other than sadness and sympathy for Paul Robeson, highly talented Negro singer who has been honored by both races in this country, like Marian Anderson. After he got to Europe on his current singing tour, he must have met some strange characters. He now declares he will sing no more but will devote his life to speaking for communism, thereby reminding again of the grievous harm which the Communists are doing to the colored race for which they claim to be protagonists.

Obviously, Robeson has been misled. Somebody has deceived him woefully. He surely knowns in his calmer moments that he can do more with his wonderful voice to increase the stature and status and hopes and destiny of his race by music than by orations against the very principles of democracy which permitted him to rise in the first place.

White Americans pay great and abiding tributes to Negroes who achieve—people like George Washington Carver, Booker T. Washington, Joe Louis, Dorothy Maynor, Roland Hayes, General Davis, Jackie Robinson. Just a few days ago, Dr. Ralph Bunche, a Negro, after weeks of patient work, brought about a truce in Palestine's war.

Paul Robeson is an artist who has been elevated—yes, and enriched—largely by white people in America. It is just a Communist trick and talking point to array blacks against the very country which makes people like Paul Robeson possible.

Music lovers in Oil City and elsewhere do not want Robeson to stop singing; most organizations of his own race, judging from resolutions, disownings, condemnations, etc., from them now being published, also do not want him to forfeit his esteem and status as an artist for the Communists' mess of pottage.

Address by Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon, Before New York Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Republican Opportunities in the Eighty-first Congress," delivered by me at the annual meeting of the New York Young Republican Club, in New York City, on April 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITIES IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

As a Republican Senator from the State of Oregon, I am justly proud of the record and activity of the Young Republicans of my State.

Many of my former students at the University of Oregon Law School have taken an active part in the growth of the Young Republican Federation in Oregon, and it has been interesting to me to note the effect their participation in that organization has had on their own individual growth, both in personality and leadership and also in helping them become influential members of their respective communities.

The Oregon Young Republican Federation works as an effective auxiliary to the organized Republican Party. It seeks to be of service to the Republican Party in winning elections. It is generally recognized in Oregon that our success in placing our State on the list of Republican States in the last election was in a large measure due to the efforts and influence of the Young Republicans. I firmly believe that the Oregon Young Republicans are now one of the best-informed and effective groups in our State.

However, I know the Young Republicans of Oregon will be the first to admit that there is a lot to be done in Oregon and it has been with that in mind that they are working energetically to organize every county in the State.

It was my privilege to be the principal speaker at the Oregon Young Republican State Convention last December, at which time they elected Mrs. Vivian McMurtrey as their State chairman. Mrs. McMurtrey was formerly the Multnomah County Young Republican chairman, and during her term of office the membership of that group was increased 100 percent. I think her election was a great tribute to the time and effort she has given to the Young Republican Federation.

There are, of course, many ways that the Young Republicans can be of service to the Republican Party, and I think our group in Oregon has examined every avenue and participates in every activity, which will have the ultimate effect of winning elections for the Republican Party.

Through their activities on the precinct level, the Young Republicans have integrated themselves into the regular organized Republican Party, to the extent that at the present time five of the largest counties in Oregon now have county chairmen under the age of 35.

Also, at the Republican State Central Committee meeting last month Sig Unander, who has been an active member of the Young Republican group and who is only 35 years of age, was elected as State chairman of that committee. Newell Elliott, also an active member of the Young Republican group, was reelected as secretary, and Lawrence Neault, a young Republican, of Baker, Oreg., who is also a county chairman, was elected treasurer of the State central committee.

In looking over the list of members of the Oregon Legislature, I find a great many young men who are active Young Republicans. It is my hope to find more and more young men and women on this list in the years to come.

A former State Young Republican chairman, WALT NORBLAD, is now a Congressman; and Bob Elliott, also a former State chairman of the Young Republicans, is now chairman of the Republican Central Committee of Multnomah County, which includes the city of Portland.

You may be sure that the activities of these young men in the Young Republican Federation in a large measure fitted them for the very important offices they now hold in the Republican Party and as elected Republicans to Government positions.

Another great service the Oregon Young Republicans have rendered to the Republican Party has been their educational program and their activity in organizing Republican college groups in our State.

I have always listened to and considered very carefully the suggestions and views of Young Republicans not only in Oregon but also throughout our Nation. Your keen interest in and understanding of the problems facing the Congress and the Nation as a whole is, I assure you, a great help to one in my position in the Congress who wishes to judge each issue on the basis of the facts.

I would like to read an excerpt from a letter I have just received from Steve Anderson, a former State chairman of the Oregon Young Republican Federation. He makes this statement: "We have regarded our organization duty bound to impress the views of young party members upon the official policy of the party, reversing the usual practice of having the policy evolve from the big boys, with the young Republicans taking no part in the formation of that policy, but being expected to go for it and sell it."

It is without a doubt that their attitude in this regard has been very influential in achieving such a large membership composed of the outstanding young men and women in our State. It stands to reason that you are not going to interest young men and women in the Republican Party if they are not given an opportunity to express their views on the

issues which so vitally affect their future welfare.

It is my understanding that your federation is holding a national convention this June in Salt Lake City. You may be sure that I, as well as all others who are interested in the welfare of the Republican Party, will be watching that convention with interest.

I know that your organization, as well as the Oregon Young Republican Federation, will be well represented at that convention and will be cooperating to the best of your ability to make that convention a success.

I have talked to many hundreds of young Republicans throughout the country who are deeply desirous of making the Republican Party a winning party. I have met with many groups such as yours, which are composed of astute, interested, and capable young Republicans who have the know-how in regard to making the young Republicans of service to the Republican Party.

It is my sincere hope that you will all get together at Salt Lake City on a common ground and work out a program whereby you will use your representative young men and women who have that know-how in organizing to activate all the young Republicans throughout our Nation into such groups as yours.

As I stated recently in an article for the Sunday magazine, Parade, those of us in the Congress who are seeking to revitalize the Republican Party and to mobilize its forces behind a forward-looking program, recognize that the greatest organizational need of the party is to change the trend of registration among young people from the Democratic to the Republican Party.

This means that we must insist that the National and State party organizations alike give increased opportunities for party positions and public office to young Republicans.

Your interest and activity in organizing your local, State, and national Young Republican Federation into an effective force within our party, will prepare you for the responsibilities which you will take upon yourselves as leaders in the Republican Party.

The task of modern, liberal Republicans in the present Congress is twofold: To revitalize the party and to mobilize its forces behind a forward-looking program; secondly, to guard against unsound legislative proposals or existing devices endangering the rights of free Americans and our free enterprise system. Let me explain why I feel that this is so.

Republicans need to remember that competition is the dynamic force of a free-enterprise system. Dynamic competitive principles must also be applied by the two major political parties in the contest for votes. The criticism directed at those of us who are fighting for a more modern, forward-looking Republican Party, to the effect that we are proposing a me-too political course of action, overlooks some basic principles of competition.

In the economic life of our free-enterprise system, a successful businessman is always alert to the public's interest in and approval of the merchandise of his competitor. He does not refuse to stock more up-to-date goods when he discovers such goods are filling his competitor's store with purchasers. Rather, he tries to secure better quality goods that will fill more economically the needs of the buying public.

The analogy has its limitations, but does help to focus attention on the fact that the supporters of reaction in the Republican Party need to learn much from business if they hope to satisfy the voters' wants. Their me-too charge against liberal Republicans is but an alibi for their own lack of appreciation of the needs of our people.

Why do liberals find it necessary, and why have they always found it necessary, on the floor of the Senate, to make a great many speeches on the various issues which come before the Senate? For the simple reason that usually they can make, in caucus, little dent on the political organization of their party in the Senate. They always have found it necessary to take their case to the people. It is very interesting over the years to find how, by that process, they have been able sometimes to help their party lift itself by its own boot straps.

It has been very interesting to note that on various liberal issues the Republican Party is much closer to some agreement on those very issues than it was even four short years ago. Take, for example, the general consensus of opinion developing in the Senate that we ought to do something about the Armed Services Reorganization Act. It is very interesting to hear men on both sides of the aisle, who were obviously not in favor of a true reorganization and unification program in fact as well as in name, talking now in terms of the necessity for an Under Secretary of Defense, and for giving to the Secretary of Defense the authority he should have been given in the first place. Such a change in the law is necessary if we are to have a true unification of our armed services, in order to eliminate the petty jealousies, rivalries, jurisdictional disputes, and lobbying on the part of the separate agencies for greater appropriation of funds.

It was about 2 years ago that some of us who consider ourselves liberals in the Congress of the United States introduced an armed forces unification and reorganization bill. It will be very interesting to take that proposed unification and reorganization bill which was introduced by liberals, and which I reintroduced this year, and lay it alongside of some of the proposals being made by those who have not shared our point of view on this as well as on other issues, and see how close they are now to the position we took on the issue 2 years ago.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I say again, that if my party wants to make one of the greatest contributions it can make to the security and the defense of this Nation, it will proceed without further delay to adopt as a major policy a proposal for an effective unification and reorganization of the armed services along the lines of the bill I introduced a year ago.

Again I assert that confusion, inefficiency, departmental jurisdictional strife, and lack of effectiveness characterize the administration of the armed forces of America and will continue to characterize that administration so long as we have a unification law that is neither fish nor fowl. It is only a truce between and among the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, with a Secretary of Defense lacking in effective power to knock heads together at the Pentagon and the Navy Department in an attempt to give the American people a well coordinated, unified armed services organization operating under a single Secretary of Defense with an Under Secretary, a single Chief of Staff, and operating also under a single procurement office.

As I said about 2 years ago—and the evidence has mounted and mounted ever since I said it—there is no question about the fact that any suggestion for a single procurement office covering the procurement for our armed forces stirs up tremendous fears not only in certain vested interests within the armed services, but also within the circles of certain vested economic groups in America.

Once again, I say, convinced as I was 2 years ago, and more convinced than ever today because of additional evidence that section of my bill which calls for a single procurement office would save us at least $3,000,000,000 a year out of the armed services appropriation.

I have the advice of men well informed in regard to the operation of our armed forces administration that my figure of $3,000,000,000 is too low, possibly to the extent of another $2,000,000,000. I prefer to make the understatement as to the possible saving. But I desire to repeat that I think the duplication, I think the waste, I think that what amounts to very questionable practices in the procurement policies of the armed forces of this Government, ought to be stopped, in the interest of national security and defense. It ought to be stopped in the interest of making a contribution toward the establishment of a sounder American dollar, because everything we can do to save without sacrificing the welfare of our country ought to be done. It ought to be done quickly, and the Republican Party ought to make it one of its major endeavors in the Eighty-first Congress.

This year I again invited my Republican colleagues in the Senate to consider a few of these liberal issues, because I would say that the only definition of liberalism for which I stand is that definition which relates to a man's voting record on specific issues. Let me see that record, let me see it in its entirety, and I am not going to have any difficulty, nor will anyone else have any difficulty in deciding in his own mind and heart as to whether or not the specific voting record of any Senator is a liberal voting record or a reactionary one.

Now, take the North Atlantic Pact. I here and now disassociate myself from those Republicans who seem to hold to the view that if we enter into the North Atlantic Pact we are not entering into any moral obligation to protect freedom and self-government from Soviet aggression. We cannot escape it. I do not believe in form over substance. I think we ought to come to the substance of this matter. The substance of this matter is the question of whether or not the American people are willing to recognize that our national self-interest, our own skins, if you will, depends upon our making clear now that we are going to stand out against aggression of totalitarian ideologies against freedom whenever that aggression takes the form of an act of war against a free people.

I do not share the opinion that the issue means that other people will declare war for us, and we shall be thrown into it through the back door. To the contrary, I am satisfied that because of the understandings and machinery which will be set up under any pact, and because of the machinery of the United Nations, the American people have no need to fear that they will not be protected from any possible coalition or devices or strategy that would throw us into war against our will.

No Member of the United States Senate will vote more quickly than I will against any attempt on the part of any combination of people to take advantage of the United States in respect to any professed aggressions against their rights. But when I say that I am not going to kid the American people in regard to the world-security problems which confront us, I wish to make it clear that I believe if we do not keep ourselves strong enough to defend ourselves against Russian aggression and make it perfectly clear to the Soviet Union that we are going to help other people defend themselves against Soviet aggression, we have not a chance of stopping a third world war. But I think we can win the peace if, as a people, we make clear that we went into World War II in support of freedom—in support of freedom for keeps, and not just for the war.

Thus I happen to hold to the point of view that the best evidence we can give to the Soviet Union that she must be willing to live in peace with us and the other countries which join with us in the North Atlantic Pact is to make clear that we will not permit of any aggressions against the peoples who join in that pact.

There are many other international issues upon which I should like to comment; but I wish to reiterate here that I think it is good Republican policy to make very clear to the signatories to the United Nations Charter that we expect the principles of the United Nations Charter to be lived up to by the signatories thereto. That means, of course, that we expect the signatories to the United Nations Charter to live up to the decisions of the Security Council. In my opinion, that means specifically that the Dutch cannot justify ignoring the decisions of the Security Council in Indonesia, and then, by a turnabout, say to us that they are entitled to funds under the ECA.

These things must work both ways. Good faith cannot be limited to Europe in this modern day. A nation either acts in good faith around the world in her relations with all the world, or she does not act in good faith at all.

Last week we had before us in the Senate the public housing bill. One of the amendments introduced by a member of the Republican Party prohibited discrimination or segregation under the act because of race, creed, or color. This created a very difficult political situation for those who have been fighting for civil rights, because this amendment was in effect one of political strategy, as was pointed out on the floor of the Senate.

In my judgment, the adoption of the amendment would have made perfectly certain the defeat of public housing in this session of Congress. The wording of the act itself places the primary responsibility in the local municipalities to proceed with applications for funds under the bill. It was brought out by one of the southern Senators that the adoption of the amendment would result in no applications for housing projects being filed in the Southern States.

Such parliamentary strategy as represented by this type of amendment in connection with other great pieces of social legislation to be voted upon during this session of Congress is a source of great concern to me. The use of such civil-rights amendments to various pieces of social legislation would not solve the great civil-rights issue which confronts this Congress but would succeed in defeating needed social legislation.

I stand ready, as I always have stood ready, to meet the issue of an over-all civil-rights program whenever a majority of the Members of the Senate are willing to go forward with an all-out fight for a civil-rights program. But, as a civil righter in the Senate of the United States, I am not going to be a party to or give support to an amendment which amounts to a bit of embarrassing political strategy, and which, in my judgment, will have the effect not of advancing civil-rights bills but of retarding them.

There is room in the Republican Party for broad differences of opinion on specific issues. In fact, one of the great strengths of our party is to be found in the fact that we have made great progress in our party over the years by hammering out on the anvil of conscionable compromise the differences of opinion which have existed from time to time between conservatives and constitutional liberals within our party.

We Republicans have always recognized the importance to sound Republican government of making steady middle-of-the-road progress within the checks and balance system of constitutional procedures. Conservatives and liberals alike in the Republican Party have rejected the technique of the Democratic Party of circumventing constitutional procedures whenever the Constitution stood in the way of some end sought by the Democrats.

Right now is the time for us to analyze the new crisis in the Republican Party. What do I mean by the new crisis in our party? Obviously, I refer to the significance of the walloping which the voters handed the Republican Party at the polls on November 2, 1948. It is clearly the worst election licking Republicans have taken since 1932, especially when viewed in the light of the long head start which our party was given.

These are days when all Republicans, conservatives as well as liberals, should conduct a searching post mortem in an endeavor to detect any heretofore undisclosed political diseases which killed our party's expectant victory at the very critical time when most of us thought it was aborning. There is no point in trying to rationalize or alibi the political realities which caused our defeat.

So many campaign advantages were handed to the Republican Party during the weeks preceding election day that we cannot, with intellectual honesty, deny the fact that President Truman gave us an unmerciful whipping.

As I listened to the clear evidence of the Communist Party line during the last political campaign in this country, I recognized that if the Communist infiltration should gain a foothold in the social, political, and economic institutions of our country, our system of political democracy and capitalistic economy upon which our individual rights and freedom depend gradually would be weakened.

How should we meet their threat? Those of us who believe so deeply in the personal liberties guaranteed by our constitutional system should join with all other loyal Americans in meeting the challenge of citizen statesmanship in America today. That challenge is to see to it that the capitalistic system is made to work as it can work for the benefit of the common good rather than for the selfish interests of a privileged few.

Many of you in this audience are businessmen and as businessmen I say you must be your own severest critics so far as the abuses of the capitalistic system are concerned. The abuses and disjointures of the capitalistic system should not discourage us but make us rather bear the ills we have than fly to other that we know not of.

Our capitalistic system being a human institution, is bound to develop defects. It is the obligation of a representative government, acting through the elected representatives of the people, to pass whatever legislation is necessary from time to time to check, control, and correct the abuses that develop within our economy.

However, I would point out that the greatest strength we have against the threat of communism is derived from the benefits that can and should flow from our capitalistic system for the welfare of our people as a whole. The best way to preserve and advance legitimate private-property interests in America is to see to it that the capitalistic system constantly improves the standard of living, the health, the security, and the happiness of our people.

We must retain the inducements and incentives of our private-property system because without those economic freedoms we cannot avoid economic statism. However, I deny that the capitalistic system necessarily means the exploitation of the weak for the strong. I grant that too frequently too many have confused a laissez-faire economy with a capitalisic economy. I grant that under a laissez-faire economy the economic pattern takes the form of a repetition of a business cycle of a boom and bust. I admit that a laissez-faire economy produces basically a program of exploiting the weak for the benefit of the strong. However, I contend that a laissez-faire economy and a successful capitalistic system are entirely different economic phenomena.

Further, I contend that without the inducements and the incentive of the private-property system, which is the essence of a capitalistic economy, we cannot escape going down the road toward a national economy of statism.

I am not going to take the time to apply this thesis to a great many issues, but I want to apply it to one.

The one I shall select is considered a very dry issue by many people but it is basic to this whole matter of making the capitalistic system work. It is an issue in regard to which I say most kindly and in a spirit of complete friendliness that our businessmen and thousands of others like them across this country during the last few years have not done all they should do in carrying out their job of citizen statesmanship. I refer to that very dry political subject of taxation reform.

Too many people in America, particularly businessmen, have been making the mistake of discussing taxation from the standpoint of support or opposition to proposals for either tax decreases or tax increases. There has been too much discussion of the taxation problem from the standpoint of personal selfishness rather than from the standpoint of the one great tax need of the country.

What is that need? It is the need for tax revision. It is the need for eliminating from our Federal tax structure the many inequities which are interfering with making the capitalistic system work for the benefit of the common good. It is the inequities in our existing tax structure which are discouraging business incentive and which are preventing the needed investing of millions of dollars of venture capital into new wealth-creating projects so essential to maintaining prosperity in this country. It is only out of new wealth; out of new job-creating enterprises; out of a further development of our economic resources, industrial and natural, that we can ever meet the fiscal problems of our Government.

You will never, in your lifetime or in the lifetime of your grandchildren, meet the fiscal problems of this Government if you try to do it from the standpoint of juggling existing percentage tax rates either up or down. The job of statesmanship in the field of taxation is a job of complete tax revision in order to eliminate the inequities from our tax structure.

If you are not to share part of the responsibility for the failure of the Congress of the United States to adopt a program of tax revision, you must face this problem from the standpoint of the one great tax need of the country, which, I repeat, is tax revision.

I doubt if most of you have been any different from most Americans during recent years in thinking that your tax problems would be solved or at least helped by the adoption of a tax bill by your Congress which would provide for a reduction in tax rates.

However, the juggling of tax rates is not the solution to the tax problem. Rather if the Republican Party wants to try to stabilize the American dollar by adopting a sound tax program it must proceed without further delay to give primary attention to a thorough overhauling and revision of her tax structure. Until someone can show me a better program I propose to continue to offer in the Senate of the United States the tax revision program of the Committee for Economic Development. I have introduced the tax amendments of the Committee for Economic Development in two sessions of the Congress and I intend to introduce them again in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

When the Republican Party was in control of the Eightieth Congress it missed a golden opportunity to pass a tax-revision program. Instead of holding hearings on the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development it played around with the Knutson percentagewise tax-reduction bill and as a result made no substantial contribution to sound tax reform. It is interesting to note that tax experts, bankers, industrial leaders, and economists generally are in agreement that the proposed tax amendments of the Committee for Economic

Development would provide a great incentive to venture capital and would encourage many people in our country to develop new wealth and new job-creating enterprises out of which new tax dollars would flow.

It is my position that the only sound and worth-while, tax-reduction program that the Republican Party can propose is one based upon a thoroughgoing, tax-revision program such as that recommended by the Committee for Economic Development. Both major parties have been playing politics with the tax issue. The Democrats have been appealing for votes on a soak-the-rich tax program and the Republicans have been appealing for votes by promising a percentage-wise, tax-reduction program. Neither party has come to grips with the economic reality that until we eliminate some of the gross inequities in our present tax structure we will not have a stable dollar.

While I do not want to embarrass anyone, still, after noting one item in the news lately I desire to say one word about the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT. I want to say that a published statement of his views, concerning the obligations of our party to go forward with constructive legislation which will meet the needs of the American people, is a statement I once again heartily endorse. It is a cry for liberalism in the Republican Party which some of us, often subjected to bitter criticism for uttering, nevertheless have continued to utter for years and years gone by. We welcome new recruits always. I shall always be happy to join with the Senator from Ohio in trying to lead the Republican Party down the straight road of constructive liberalism for which liberalism the press recently reported he pleaded the other day in a Republican caucus.

I repeat, I think we are getting somewhere. I think we are going to be a different party when we go to the polls in 1950 and 1952 than we were when we went to the polls in 1948. Not only do I think we are going to be a party that pledges itself to constructive liberalism, but if we can go forward with the type of legislation the liberal Republicans are offering in the Eighty-first Congress on taxes, health, labor, agriculture, the Military Establishment, conservation, and other issues of public need, we can go to the polls in 1950 and 1952 with a record of constructive liberalism. Some of us urged more of such legislation in both the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. I think if the Republicans had adopted some of our liberal proposals we would have won in 1948.

The future of the Republican Party, as I see it, will be marked by further defeats unless the party can unite its forces in support of a sound, middle-of-the-road program of constitutional liberalism. Such a program will be unacceptable to the leftists who seek to destroy our capitalistic economy and set up economic statism; it also will be opposed by the political and economic reactionaries—and there are too many in both major political parties—who stand for a laissez-faire economy and a return to the normalcy of the boom-and-bust cycle of the 1920's.

The last election has demonstrated, in unmistakable terms, that these extremist philosophies are not favored by the American people. It is plain, therefore, that constitutional liberals within the Republican Party have a real opportunity. They must offer a program based upon the view that one of the primary objectives of the American system of representative government should and must be to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong. Such a program, however, must be achieved within the framework of a private-property economy and in accordance with the legal principles and guaranties of the Constitution, including its precious bill of (human) rights.

The Young Republicans of the Nation have a great opportunity to revitalize the Republican Party by reorganizing it along the lines of constitutional liberalism. Unless we win the confidence and support of the young voters of America, future defeats rather than victories will confront us. Although the crisis in our party is a serious one, the challenge facing young Republicans to lead the Republican Party down the road of constitutional liberalism is a great one.

The hour is an historic one and the opportunity for political statesmanship squarely confronts us. You must not fail either our party or our country in meeting the challenge of political leadership essential to a Republican victory in 1952.

The Threat of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project to the Economy of Maryland and East Coast Port Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in Baltimore last Friday, at the twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the Maryland Utilities Association, the chairman of the National St. Lawrence Conference, Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, gave a vigorous presentation of the threat posed by the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project to the economy of the State of Maryland and of east coast port areas, generally.

The case against the St. Lawrence seaway project is so vividly portrayed in this masterly address that I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the people of our country, who would be called upon to bear the huge cost involved, may be fully apprised of the situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A more favorable forum than the metropolis of the free State of Maryland for an exposition of the St. Lawrence scheme is not presently known. Over the years, in holding the lines against assaults of the minions of Government subsidy, the efforts of labor and business interests of this State have been highly effective. City and State officials and the members of the Maryland congressional delegation constitute a mighty bulwark.

On the floor of the United States Senate last year, Senator TYDINGS and Senator O'CONOR vigorously fought the St. Lawrence project measure, then known as Senate Joint Resolution 111, and contributed greatly to the outcome, recommittal of the measure to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 57 to 30. The senior Senator from Maryland is now one of the 13 members of that committee, to which the next Senate proposal will be referred. The several bills, already introduced in the House, have been referred to the Public Works Committee, of which Representative FALLON, Baltimore, and Representative BEALL, Frostburg, are two of the 27 members.

The damaging effect the navigational phase of the project would have on the port of Baltimore has been lucidly portrayed before congressional committees by executive vice president Pouder of the association of commerce. At a Senate hearing in 1946, Mr. Pouder stated that, using formulas of a Department of Commerce survey, there was indicated a prospective diversion from Baltimore of 1,056,077 short tons of cargo, or 9.2 percent of the average annual foreign and coastwise traffic of the port for the 10-year period of 1928–37, inclusive. Port workers, numbering 15,000, and investment in port facilities, amounting to $200,000,000, would be adversely affected.

To the power phase of the project less attention in this territory has been given. In a kind letter of instruction, your president, Mr. Hughes, made reference to a multi-purpose project, namely, Raystown, right in your own back yard. Now there's one of those things in the neighborhood from which I originally came—northern New York State.

As the St. Lawrence proposal is ostensibly designed to develop both power and transportation, I had thought of it as a dual-purpose project. Recently I have learned that this designation has gone out of fashion and that all these things are now dubbed multi-purpose jobs. It seems that the planned-economy boys feel that alliterative similarities too closely point the fact that a dual-purpose project might more properly be called a duplicity project. In a very real sense that is the case on the St. Lawrence; as it was in the Tennessee Valley, where the lately canonized Senator Norris gave his famous dictum, "We must make it hang on navigation."

And now look at the thing. None can be so naive as still to believe that the Tennessee Authority is anything much beyond a power project in its primary objective. The little $2,500,000 opener for the New Johnsonville game tells the world what's being played for—and with deuces wild.

There is nothing against multipurpose developments, as such, provided the purposes are honest and justified. There is everything against a plan which is sold to the public as a navigation, an irrigation, or a flood project when the real objective is to put Government into the business of developing public power; when beyond that is the purpose to spread the tentacles—euphemistically called transmission lines—over the economy of an area embracing many States to the destruction of the enterprise processes which have made this country. In the St. Lawrence project, a nonrevenue-producing function, transportation—the tolls proposal is merely a red herring—is arbitrarily assigned an investment burden way beyond even its speculative value to the community, in order to make it seem that collectivism can produce energy more cheaply than it could be produced in the same physical development in the hands of private enterprise.

If anyone doubts the interest of the apostles of public power to blanket the Nation with regional agencies, a program which would obliterate the sovereign States, let him cast his eye around from Passamaquoddy and the St. Lawrence down through the Tennessee Valley, to the Southwest, out to Boulder, north through Hetch-Hetchy to Bonneville and Grand Coulee, east to Fort Peck, through the Missouri Valley, with a few little fill-ins here and there and a few fringe areas which can be taken over once the collectivists have established their framework.

The private power industry has built networks for the correlation of steam and hydro energy to the point where diminishing returns begin to figure. But that isn't enough for the public power advocates. They want supernetworks, whereby the whispering pines of Maine can be heard on the wooded slopes of Oregon, and the sunny savannahs of the smiling South sing to the frigid regions of the frozen North.

Already they are pretty well on their way. A common phrase nowadays is creeping socialism, but it doesn't describe public power. That is definitely a leaping form of socialism. Twenty years ago the public-power boys had in their hands 6½ percent of the electric-generating capacity of the country. Today they have 20 percent. The change has come about while the country was doubling its generating capacity as a whole. Capacity provided by private enterprise grew 70 percent; and that provided by public agencies—Federal and local—grew 500 percent. A report of the Hoover Commission tells us that Federal agencies now have more than 14,000 miles of transmission lines and have tentative plans for the construction of new generating capacity equaling that of all the generating plants of private enterprise in the whole United States at present. Meantime, private enterprise has actively under construction an increase of 39 percent in its own generating capacity to meet the growing needs of its customers.

The canny commissars knew what was slipped over when Muscle Shoals became T. V. A., and today they delight in seeing the river which flows through 7 States drain 48. Sometimes their strategy appears mysterious. This French proverb may then help—forever changing and forever the same. However, their legislative allies speak bluntly. I have in mind a speech made by Senator AIKEN before a luncheon club in Keene, N. H., 3 years ago, in which the Vermont solon said that, "The St. Lawrence project will mean a T. V. A. for the Northeastern States." Maryland and the District are embraced in that proposed Federal power transmission grid.

Should these collectivists succeed in their efforts to hamstring the power industry and to take over great rail systems, having enfeebled them by part-time subsidized competition, does anyone doubt they would move on to new conquests? Savings banks and insurance companies are likely targets. The greed of the collectivists has by no means been abated by their partial ventures into those fields. The mutual life insurance companies and savings banks are tremendous holders of securities in the power and railroad industries.

This question may be asked: Inasmuch as the Federal Government engages in the power business, why should it not engage, on a large scale, in the businesses utilizing this power? Look to the Tennessee Valley, where the duplicity process has plunged the Government into the manufacture of fertilizer and other commodities.

The more rabid of the public power advocates seek to strip the Aluminum Co. of America of its water-power rights on the St. Lawrence. Under the excuse of wartime necessity, that great pioneer in the metallurgical field was forced to disclose its technical knowledge to two favored competitors, which were set up in business with the taxpayers' money. It would be a logical extension of this divide-and-destroy process for the American Muscovites to ask why their vaunted cheap energy should be sold for the private benefit of the capitalistic buccaneers who own this split industry, particularly if they can invoke some "conjure" words like national defense.

Speaking of national defense, our multipurpose projects speedily become multi-reason processes. First one and then another reason is adduced for pushing each of the alleged purposes. The latest trick has to do with iron ores from Labrador, South America, and Liberia.

It seems we are flat on our backs for domestic ore supply; or if not, we shortly shall be; or if not, that's their story and they stick to it, anyhow. And so, instead of developing processes for the beneficiation of our own low-grade ores, including taconite, and keeping alive the miners who work the Mesabi range, we propose to fix it so that a few private exploiters can bring ores up the St. Lawrence during the summer thaw to prevent too active development at Sparrows Point. The difficulty seems to be that all-year-round delivery by the magnificent ships that discharge their ore in this vicinity just doesn't give an excuse for building a power dam on the St. Lawrence.

A recent famous analysis of the state of the Nation hinted pretty broadly at Government in the steel business. Even without that advance notice, it can reasonably be assumed that, should the Government sink a billion dollars in the St. Lawrence canal and harbor entrances, national defense would be advanced as an excuse for collectivizing that industry also. Why should a billion dollars be spent to benefit the Great Lakes steel barons Can't you hear them—haven't you heard them—those socialists with their jaundiced opinion of the profit-and-loss system? To anticipate possible charge that undue importance is attached to political ranting, these words, spoken last week by President Tower, of the American Iron and Steel Institute, are cited. With reference to the campaign against steel, Mr. Tower said, "Behind the barrage of speeches and legislative proposals one may see the shadow of great American industries no longer private enterprises but properties of the state."

And then there is the necessity of developing power for national defense; another of the specious multireasons for the duplicity project. It is sheer fantasy to assume that the proposed power development could affect America's ability to defend herself against a military enemy. That power development would, however, smack of the economic, social, and political philosophy of her one conceivable aggressor. The St. Lawrence job would generate for this Nation only 570,000 kilowatts of firm power. This corresponds to the minimum flow of the river when Lake Ontario is low and ice restricts the river channel. I don't need to tell you that every one of its 240,000 kilowatts of infirm capacity would preempt 1 kilowatt of first-class dependable steam capacity to firm it up. So that on balance the infirm capacity adds nothing to the power supply.

Special pleaders will tell you that 570,000 kilowatts is a lot of power; so it is. It is almost, but not quite, of the dimension of any one of four existing steam plants in the State of New York. It would be almost big enough to take care of the increase in requirements of the State of New York for 2 years. It amounts to 10 percent of that one State's present plant capacity. But were it many times as big, it would not add one flea power for defense or for anything else to the plant capacity of that region. You, as practical utility men, know full well that plants are not built to stand idle; that if a block of 570,000 kilowatts, either your own or that of someone else, came into your area, you would back away to the extent of 570,000 kilowatts from other new construction. It's somewhat worse than that if your competitor is the Public Treasury, with spurious allocations, immunity from taxes and interest rates, predicated on pledging the power of taxation of the people and industry of the Nation. Private investors would have the everlasting daylights scared out of them and be loath to venture equity capital or debt investment. Look at what has happened in the Northwest.

The power aspect has its plurality of purpose. Not only would the 570,000 kilowatts, available even during the winter freeze, make the Nation militarily safe, not only would it relieve a power shortage that never existed in fact, not only would it electrify the farms of one of the most highly electrified farm States in the Union, but it would make energy so cheap that the cotton-duck industry would move from Baltimore to Watertown, N. Y., or possibly Ogdensburg, along with the bromo-seltzer business—and how New York would need the latter.

The pundits of collectivism promise that the St. Lawrence power would mean a saving of $20,000,000 a year against steam power production. That estimate is unsound and the scheme does involve your tax bill and mine; but aside from all that, let's see what old-fashioned arithmetic tells us. By the time the project could be in operation, the State of New York will be using 50,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per annum. Twenty million dollars divided by 50,000,000,000 is something like four one-hundredths of a cent per kilowatt-hour. One twenty-fifth of a cent isn't so significant as $20,000,000.

With reference to an alleged power shortage, consider your own area. The State of Maryland and the District of Columbia in 1938 produced and sold 2,253,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1948 this was more than doubled, reaching the figure of 5,486,000,000, five and one-half billion for short. You know that during that period the Federal Power Commission found your assured capacity consistently on a level with the load requirements in spite of the stupendous burdens you assumed. You didn't have to curtail use as was done in the Tennessee Valley, in the Northwest, and in the Province of Ontario; those notable centers of government activity. The story is substantially the same in New England and the State of New York. With the exception of two short periods of comparative tightness, it has been true wherever free enterprise has been given a chance. Between the end of the war and the end of 1948, 160,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity were completed in this area. And your current construction activities will bring into commission an additional 140,000 kilowatts in 1949 and still another 140,000 kilowatts in 1950, according to schedules published by the Federal Power Commission for the so-called power supply area No. 6. That all adds up to a 34-percent addition to the capacity that was in this area on VJ-day. At this rate your postwar additions will soon be larger than the St. Lawrence power project.

Our telephone friends here are acquainted with the congressional measures to authorize REA to make loans to telephone companies, and thus encourage the building of cooperative lines. In other words, the planned-economy front is working for the socialization of the telephone industry by initial promotion of cooperative telephone systems, financed 100 percent by Washington. Reference has been made to the St. Lawrence subsidy threat faced by great rail systems. The public-ownership movement, patterned somewhat after the British plan, places in jeopardy every system of transportation.

In fine, every branch of the utility industry is confronted with the urgency for bold action. A rear-guard action, however adroitly maneuvered, is apparently no longer the answer. The public-ownership movement must be countered now—head on. During the past 16 years more and more people have been tempted to abandon hope and impassively await the impending deluge toward which their world seems to be headed. Such a mood is temporary. They will soon lay their hands on the steering wheel. There are signs, such as the recent organization of the Independent Electric Utility Operating Company Committee, that that time has arrived in the electric-utility field. It is important that all utility people, throughout the industry, make certain that newspapermen in their respective areas, along with business and labor leaders, are aware of the activities of those who, behind the scenes, connive for public power. Many outstanding labor men are your allies. They not only

know the multiple purposes to be served by public power works but also are cognizant of the multiple tax scheme that makes those works possible; a scheme which has become the staff of life for the march toward socialism. It enables the collection of enormous funds with which to build collectivist projects that, like the St. Lawrence, couldn't pay their own way.

On the note of national defense I close. If either one of the World Wars taught us anything it is that the extraordinary strength of our people, both as combatants and suppliers of munitions, lies in initiative and resourcefulness, backed up by faith in the institutions of liberty. In the next war, if and when it comes, we shall be without prime essentials of defense if we have lost the initiative and resourcefulness and the devotion that comes from living within the framework of freedom. That means we should maintain an economy which is not tax-ridden and discouraged; and above all else, retain a population that has not been taught to look to government for its ideas, its faith, or even for the material things of life. This is a defense to be prized above all else.

GI Home Loan Building Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members the fact that up to the present time the Congress has not tackled the problem of reactivating the GI home loan building program.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 1324, and Senator THOMAS has introduced an identical bill, S. 616, which we believe will help to solve this problem.

The four largest veterans' organizations in the State of California have formed a joint housing committee and have endorsed these two bills. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution which they passed on April 13, 1949:

Whereas the California department commanders present at this conference represent 261,000 veteran members of their constituent organizations in the State of California; and

Whereas the department commanders present represent the major organizations engaged exclusively in preserving the rights and privileges of the 1,350,000 ex-servicemen in California and the American principles for which they fought; and

Whereas the major essential necessary to the Democratic way of life for which our members fought was individual home ownership designed to provide a share in this Nation for all American families; and

Whereas this essential was promised the returning veteran by the grateful citizens of this country but deprived him by selfish interests and unforeseen developments in the ever-changing financial mechanism of this Nation; and

Whereas the Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949, H. R. 1324 and S. 616, will provide a workable solution whereby all veterans throughout the entire Nation can obtain homes for their families as promised them in the original GI bill in 1944: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State department commanders here assembled, of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), with the support and endorsement of their respective organizations, hereby pledge to crusade in behalf of all veterans by aggressively supporting H. R. 1324 and S. 616, the Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949, as the most complete and realistic approach to the problem of acquiring single-family homes for veterans; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all United States Congressmen and Senators with an urgent request that they support the early passage of this vitally needed legislation.

REX F. WHITTEMORE,
Commander, Department of California, American Legion.
S. TEX ROSE,
Commander, Department of California, Disabled American Veterans.
ALVIN F. KIME,
Commander, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
JAMES J. KEHOE,
Commander, Department of California, American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS).

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley Act has been pictured by its proponents as a law that is in the best interests of workers and designed to promote better labor relations. In refutation of this argument that is never buttressed by facts, I wish to submit the following survey of some of the harmful effects of the Taft-Hartley law on trade-unions in New Jersey recently made by the New Jersey State CIO Council:

It is over a year and a half now since the Taft-Hartley law has been enacted. The experience which the American trade-unions have sustained since this law has become operative has fully substantiated the charges made before its enactment that the law provides no solution to industrial strife, but rather has resulted in increased friction between labor and management heretofore enjoying peaceful relations.

In short, the Taft-Hartley law has inspired employers who are still not willing to accept collective bargaining as a permanent fixture in our economic system to invoke Government aid in furthering opposition to the legitimate functions of trade-unions. It has encouraged employer resistance to the justifiable union activities and it has provided antiunion employers with a weapon possessing the potential destructive power to legislate the trade-union movement into obscurity and oblivion.

The Taft-Hartley law is actually a legal invitation to employers to employ the technical restrictions and complex verbiage of the law as a means of first, frustrating union activity, and secondly, attempting to destroy the trade-unions. The law has converted the Federal labor policy from a code for the protection of self-organization and collective bargaining into a twisted instrument capable of depriving the American worker of the benefits of collective bargaining by breaking his trade-union.

An examination of the impact of the Taft-Hartley has made upon labor unions in the State of New Jersey points up the evils inherent in the law.

Its operation in New Jersey has corroborated charges made on previous occasions by impartial students of labor-management relations that the law has:

(a) Prevented trade-unions from performing their legitimate functions.

(b) Thwarted the future development of trade-unions often by placing insurmountable barriers in the path of union organization.

(c) Has failed to offer any solution to industrial strife and has actually increased strikes for organizations.

(d) Offered legal weapons as an incentive to employers to thwart union activity so that labor-management relations which were heretofore harmonious have become strained.

(e) Withheld the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board, forcing unions to resort to strikes in order to gain recognition as collective-bargaining agents.

(f) Offered an incentive to employers to isolate small groups of workers by establishing separate bargaining units, thus weakening the structure of industrial organizations.

(g) Encouraged the return to individual bargaining, in spite of the tremendous advances made by our country under collective bargaining; and

(h) Resorted to a subtle blow against trade-unions by increasing a union's responsibilities for the actions of individuals, while simultaneously weakening the union's disciplinary powers.

The experiences sustained by New Jersey unions have not been unique since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law.

They are but a fabric of the complete pattern of antiunion activities which have been intensified under the inspiration of the Taft-Hartley law.

Here is one particular instance in New Jersey where the Taft-Hartley was responsible for the complete destruction of one labor union.

The collective-bargaining agent for 2,100 employees of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. in its accounting and general departments had been the Communications Workers of America, Accounting Division No. 64. This local participated in the national telephone strike in 1947, and had aggressively engaged the company in arbitration proceedings under the New Jersey State compulsory arbitration law.

During the summer of 1948 the company challenged the majority status of the union. On September 17, 1948, arrangements were completed between the company and the union for a consent election under the auspices of the New Jersey State Mediation Board. Three days later, however, the company announced it was granting additional wage increases of $4 a week.

This was done without consultation with the union and on a completely unilateral basis.

On September 22, 1948, the union filed charges of unfair labor practices against the company, charging violations of section 7, section 8 (a) 1, and section 8 (a) 5.

The union asked the board to proceed under section 10 of the act asking for an injunction to restrain the company from giving wage increases until an election could be held in an atmosphere free from interference from the company's bald attempt to influence the employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization and manipulating a "no union" vote in the election.

The papers presented to Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the Taft-Hartley NLRB,

charged that the company was attempting to circumvent the New Jersey statute calling for compulsory arbitration of labor disputes affecting public utilities; that the company had saved almost $100,000 in retroactive payment alone, and was also endeavoring to get away from its obligation to mediate and arbitrate some 23 issues which the union had presented to the State Mediation Board for several months previous.

In spite of the company's flagrant violation of the law, the general counsel refused to act, stating that he did not believe the law had been violated, and that he only proceeded by injunction in cases that had serious implications and involved large numbers of people.

The NLRB has ruled in a large number of cases that attempts by employers to impose unilateral increases while representative elections were pending were violations of the law.

The general counsel himself had instituted injunctive proceedings against unions where only 10 or 15 people were involved. Yet here were 2,100 New Jersey Bell Telephone employees directly concerned and 20,000 additional New Jersey and 500,000 other employees of the A. T. & T. indirectly affected.

The refusal of the general counsel to prevent a violation of the law in this instance, compared with the haste and speed with which he has acted against trade-unions in other cases, is first-hand evidence of the fact that the Taft-Hartley law is being administered in such a fashion as to bring about the destruction of the trade-union movement.

The attorney for the union in this instance summed up all in a letter to the general counsel, when he stated, "In the circumstances, I have been instructed by my client to withdraw the charges of unfair labor practice. It would be an idle ceremony to process the charge, wait a year or two for its disposition and wind up with a slap on the company's wrist in the form of a cease and desist order."

It is easy to see that a company ill-disposed toward the organization of its employees, can invoke many of the restrictive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law to destroy existing unions and to defeat attempts to organize new unions.

The case cited above presents tangible evidence of the partiality of the general counsel and the Taft-Hartley NLRB.

With the one rare exception in the UAW-General Motors case, injunctions against employers are virtually unheard of. Yet, the general counsel responds with alarming alacrity to the petition of an employer for injunctive proceedings against unions.

There are several instances where this has taken place in New Jersey.

In both cases, the law has been invoked to the detriment of the workers' status while the companies involved have directly benefited from the tactics they employed.

For instance, the case of the CIO United Automobile Workers, representing the 200 employees of the Harnischfeger Corp. in Newark.

In a flagrant display of dictatorial tactics, the company informed the local union that it would not bargain unless the union's president had been replaced.

This attempt to dictate not only wages and conditions for the workers, but also to handpick suitable union representatives was a typical maneuver of the company. The action becomes even more odious when it is realized that the company's objection to the president of the local was predicated solely upon the fact that he was a Negro.

The union president offered to resign in his desire to avoid a disastrous strike. However, the local's members stood shoulder to shoulder in a masterful display of union solidarity and insisted that the democratically elected officers of the union be permitted to carry out the functions for which they were chosen.

On the basis of the company's refusal to bargain with the Negro president, the union was forced to call a strike.

The company, intent upon breaking the union, invoked the Taft-Hartley law, and succeeded in securing an injunction restraining the union from picketing. The intention of the injunction soon became obvious. An advertisement was placed in a newspaper from a nearby town offering employment to veterans at attractive rates of pay, but specifically ignoring all mention of the labor dispute.

The company picked up the veterans at a central point, herded them into cars, drove them to the plant and then attempted to spirit them past the token picket line to scab on the striking auto workers.

It is obvious that the company employed the injunction restricting picketing in order to facilitate the transportation of scabs into the plant.

It is necessary to add, however, with a justifiable feeling of pride, that when the veterans came upon the scene, and realized that they had been unwittingly drawn into a strike situation as prospective scabs, they refused to take any part in the proceedings and returned to their homes.

Today, the plant is closed and the 200 workers have been forced to seek employment elsewhere. The case is just another example where the Taft-Hartley law has served to thwart the processes of collective bargaining and has resulted in the demise of a local union.

Another illustration of the antilabor character of the Taft-Hartley law can be found in a study of the strike of the United Packinghouse Workers against the Swift & Co. in Jersey City a year ago.

Participating in the Nation-wide strike against the country's largest meat packers, members of local 221, of the Packinghouse Workers were prohibited from picketing by an injunction obtained under the Taft-Hartley law.

Then, under the guise of guaranteeing the right to work, the company embarked upon a long-range bust-the-union program. Scabs were imported, violence was fomented, arrests were made, and workers were intimidated. Letters were sent to the strikers informing them of their discharge if they continued to participate in the walkout. Invoking the Taft-Hartley law, the company was able to completely demoralize the workers and as a result the Swift employees were forced to return to work at conditions far below a decent standard.

Another trend discernible in the application of the Taft-Hartley law in New Jersey has been the facility with which employers have been able to attempt to weaken the industrial organization of their unions by invoking the principle of "divide and conquer."

Under the guise of protecting professional workers, the Taft-Hartley law has encouraged antilabor employers to split the bargaining units of the workers in their plants into separate, isolated, weaker units. In many instances, workers who for long periods of time have enjoyed the benefits and advantages of collective bargaining as a member of the industrial unit in a plant, have found that they are no longer able to continue in that manner. In several plants in New Jersey, this has occurred with the worker sustaining serious setbacks from this diminution of his bargaining power, while the employer has used this as a basis to institute wage cuts, and more difficult working conditions.

Two outstanding examples of this trend can be seen in an investigation of the procedures followed by the Wright Aeronautical Corp. in Paterson, and the Westinghouse plant in Bloomfield.

In both instances, salaried employees had been covered by the industrial organization unit in the plant for several years, during which peaceful relations had existed between the union and management. However, upon the passage of the Taft-Hartley law with its invitation to breaking up industrial units into small, weak crafts, serious conflicts erupted, with its resulting defalcations in the processes of collective bargaining.

At the Wright plant, members of the salaried employees union, were excluded from the contractural relations between the company and the union. The union president charged that the many benefits gained for these workers had irritated the company, whom, she added, was bent upon depriving these employees of the benefits of their union.

The Westinghouse plant in Bloomfield witnessed another such attempt by management. After having been members of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America and covered by the national agreement which the UE had successfully negotiated with the company, the salaried workers were carved into three tiny, weak crafts by the company. The technique employed was provided by the Taft-Hartley law. A company-fostered independent union made claims of representation of the salaried unit and succeeded in petitoning for an NLRB election for those groups. The UE was deprived of the facilities of the Board and, being unable to secure a place on the ballot, was compelled to stand by idly while these workers were deprived of their right to choose a bargaining agency of their own choosing.

I may add, in passing, that in direct contradiction to the avowed intentions for which the Taft-Hartley was passed these situations carried with them at all times the imminent threat of a strike for recognition. It is only because of the high sense of responsibility and duty manifested by the union leaders involved that a series of disruptive work stoppages have been avoided.

The Taft-Hartley requirements that all officers of every international or local union must sign non-Communist affidavits before the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board are made available is the one provision which demonstrates more plainly than any other perhaps that this law has singled out trade-unions for restrictive and punitive application.

Of the vast segment of our American economy, labor, and labor alone, has been isolated for the purpose of affirmatively stating their allegiance to the United States. The resentment felt by responsible labor leaders against this single provision has been understandable. An appended corollary has been added, with much justification, I may comment, that perhaps certain American industrialists should sign affidavits stating they are not Fascists.

Experience has shown that our workers are capable of sweeping subversive elements from control in unions. The examples set by the United Automobile Workers, the Maritime Union, the Transportation Workers are precise evidence of this.

The affidavit provision not only violates the American concept of civil and political liberties, but authorizes Government intervention into the internal affairs of voluntary organizations. The fact that such intervention is restricted solely to labor unions reveals the true antilabor nature of the Taft-Hartley law.

Because of the principle involved, several unions have refused to comply with this particular provision of the law. Outstanding among these is the United Steelworkers of America, headed by CIO President Philip Murray, an outstanding foe of communism and totalitarianism.

Yet, because of this one provision, the steelworkers have become enmeshed in a rash of serious conflicts. As a result, we can see that, rather than bringing about a solution of industrial strife, this law has

succeeded in increasing strikes for recognition and has fostered antagonism in situations where harmonious relations previously existed.

The law has also thwarted the organization of new shops. In Bloomfield the 800 employees of the Eastern Tool Co. have indicated their desire to join the United Steelworkers. Backed by the Taft-Hartley law, the employer has refused to bargain, and the union is unable to use the facilities of the NLRB for an election. There are only two alternative paths for the union to pursue: Either forego the organization of these workers or else strike. The result is easy to see.

Similar situations have arisen in other plants in Newark.

Workers in the following shops in the Newark area, International Edge, Cyclone Fence, Continental Can, and Heller Bros., have all been faced with the imminent need for striking in order to maintain or receive recognition of their union.

The experiences of still another CIO union, the United Office and Professional Workers of America serve to emphasize the adverse effect of this bill on labor, and how antilabor employers use it to break labor unions.

Employees of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. had been covered by a UOPWA contract for 6 years prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. However, at the first expiration date subsequent to the effective date, the company informed the CIO workers that they would no longer recognize the union for the purposes of bargaining.

The reason was soon forthcoming. Because the UOPWA had not qualified to use the NLRB, the company had sponsored intervention by an outside group, with the sole hope of holding an election where the Board would prevent the appearance of the UOPWA on the ballot.

There was no question that the loyalties of the individual workers remained with their union. Yet, the company refused to negotiate and simultaneously pushed along the election which they hoped would produce a no-union vote.

At the present time, an NLRB election is scheduled for March 18, at which time the UOPWA will appear on the ballot because of its subsequent action authorizing its officers to sign the non-Communist affidavit.

However, another interesting sidelight appears in this particular case, in that the union which intervened at the solicitation of the company may possibly be unable to qualify for a place on the ballot. The paradox of the situation is that the contesting union is apparently a paper organization, set up at the request of the company and is unable to present proof of an existing organization with responsible officers.

The same union has been involved in still another dispute created by an employer attempting to break the processes of collective bargaining. Here, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. resorted to the same tactics. A contract had been in effect between the union and the company for 6 years, yet at the very first expiration date following the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, the company refused to negotiate, asserting it wanted proof that the majority of the workers desired representation by the UOPWA. Of course, such information was readily available to the company by virtue of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the workers had signed cards authorizing the check-off of their union dues. Yet, impelled by the desire to bust the UOPWA because of the union's inability to secure a place on a NLRB ballot, the company encouraged the intervention of a competing union, which subsequently filed a petition for the election.

Just another interesting note is the fact that the company-inspired intervener could not produce a single signed card in New Jersey to support its claim that it represented the workers.

These are just a few of the situations created by the Taft-Hartley law. The few evils described here are ample proof of the assertion that the Taft-Hartley law contains within it not only the seeds of destruction for the American trade-union movement, but also our entire system of democracy.

There can be no question that the Taft-Hartley has failed to produce the solution for which it was intended. Its application has pointed up dangerous trends. It must be repealed.

Social Security, Whither Bound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1949, Mr. Robert C. O'Hair, well known certified public accountant of Chicago, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means to give them the benefit of his study of H. R. 2893, upon which hearings were then in progress. This concise statement, emanating from an expert in mathematical calculations, and one who has had long experience in public accounting, reveals some startling conclusions concerning this legislation designed to expand Federal old-age benefits and survivors insurance. Believing every Member of Congress will be interested in Mr. O'Hair's views, and, leave to extend my remarks having been heretofore granted, I insert herewith his statement in full:

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Eighty-first Congress of the United States. My name is Robert C. O'Hair, of Chicago, Ill. I am engaged in business under the name of the R. C. O'Hair Co. I am an economist, a certified public accountant, and author of the Federal deposit insurance plan. I am appearing before you in my own behalf.

I am not opposed to a sound plan of Federal old-age benefits and survivor insurance. I am opposed to H. R. 2893 for the reason it is economically and actuarially unsound. Generally speaking, the proposal is to collect a pay-roll tax from 60,000,000 people. The present plan covers approximately 40,000,000. There are 2,500,000 citizens of the United States with incomes of over $5,000 per year. The wages of the other 37,500,000 citizens under the plan should equal the national wage of about $57 per week. Assuming full employment of 37,500,000 at an average wage of $3,000 per year, and the proposed pay-roll tax of 2 percent on the employee and 2 percent on the employer be collected the amount would be $4,500,000,000.

Assuming full employment of 2,500,000 with incomes of over $5,000 per year, and all members of the plan and the proposed pay-roll tax of 2 percent on the employee and 2 percent on the employer be collected, the amount would be $480,000,000. With 40,000,000 covered by the plan, with full employment and maximum taxable wages, the total pay-roll tax collections for Federal old-age benefits and survivor insurance would be $4,980,000,000 in 1950 and thereafter until changed by Congress. Under present law, with 40,000,000 covered, full employment, average wages of $3,000 and a pay-roll tax of 1 percent on employee and 1 percent on employer, the maximum collection for Federal old-age benefits and survivor insurance would be $2,400,000,000.

In the March 1949 issue of American Economic Security, page 14, Mr. O. C. Pogge, director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivor Insurance, Federal Security Agency, wrote:

"However it should be remembered that even to finance the present program, with its low scale of benefits, the tax rate will probably have to be doubled and this would automatically halve the ratio of administrative costs to tax income."

By doubling the tax rate of the present plan the maximum income under above conditions would be $4,800,000,000.

Under H. R. 2893, the maximum tax would be $4,980,000,000. In the calculations I have omitted the tax income on an estimated 20,000,000 in the low-income brackets that is to be added under the proposed legislation. The comparisons drawn here are on the most favorable basis, and show that the additional taxes expected will not exceed $180,000,000 whereas the expanded benefits under the proposed plan, are almost doubled.

If the proposed legislation progresses as outlined with rates of 5½ percent on employee and employer in 1955, collections should reach a rate of $13,000,000,000 per year and in 1990 with a rate of 9 percent on employee and employer collections should reach a rate of $24,000,000,000 a year.

What will be the cost of this expanded plan?

The population growth is expected to level off after it reaches about 175,000,000.

The life span is increasing rapidly and it is estimated that one-third of the population will be over 65 years old. This is approximately 58,000,000 persons, or 29,000,000 families. The annual pension at $150 per month per family would amount to $52,200,000,000. In addition large sums would be required to pay sickness, injury and other impairment benefits for which no direct taxes are collected.

The cost of this program to the United States Treasury for benefits, interest and bond retirements may well reach $35,000,000,000 a year in excess of total taxes collected for this purpose.

To finance such a program, one-third of the population would work to support the other two-thirds. It would require a 100 percent tax on the $21,000,000,000 corporate profits for 1948, the entire savings of all individuals in 1948, estimated at $4,900,000,000 and the deficit would still be $9,000,000,000.

Gentlemen, I submit, that such a plan is economic suicide, and will terminate in one of four ways:

1. Complete socialization of the United States.
2. Imposition of a capital levy.
3. Repudiation of the program.
4. National bankruptcy.

And with any of these will come disillusionment to 100,000,000 Americans, in our Government, our Congress and our national leaders.

The trend toward socialism has been insistent and has been increasing with every session of Congress. Before passing laws that carry the threat of forcing a change in our form of government, I propose a referendum through a national election. Thus, the issue would be put directly to the voters, so Congress can be guided by the expressed desire of the electorate.

I cannot believe the people of the United States would approve of any proposal which would ultimately lead to chaos.

There are many inequalities in H. R. 2893. Among them, the penalty on the self-employed. I do not want to be blanketed into this plan, although I have no objection to making membership optional.

I am not here to recommend amendments to H. R. 2893. Before experimenting further, the present plan should be put on an actuarially sound basis and the trust funds used for the purpose for which they were collected. Gentlemen, I have a plan for your consideration.

Make no change at this time in the present rate or coverage. Change the Social Security Act to require the deposit of all collections of taxes for Federal old-age and survivor insurance to the credit of the Federal old-age and survivor insurance fund in the Federal Reserve bank in the district where the tax was collected.

Change the Federal Reserve Act to permit Federal Reserve banks to make collaterialized loans of funds from the trust account to banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System and to collect a reasonable handling charge, and to make loans to other Federal agencies organized to make self-liquidating loans.

Change the acts creating those agencies to permit them to borrow from the trust fund and issue debentures therefor. This would relieve Congress from appropriating money for this purpose. Some of these agencies have demonstrated over a period of years that they operate without serious losses. It is reasonable to expect these loans would be repaid with interest, and meantime would be employed in the various Federal Reserve districts to aid business, housing and for other constructive purposes.

The Social Security Board would call upon these various Reserve Banks for funds at times and in sufficient amounts to pay their administrative expenses and claims for old-age and survivor insurance.

In this manner the money could be profitably employed in the districts that provided it, and when needed would be available without budget or appropriation consideration.

This plan will not make up the reported actuarial deficit of several billion dollars. It will keep the trust funds from being spent as collected, and provide a framework upon which to establish a solvent plan, either by increasing rates or reducing benefits.

Cancellation of Supercarrier Will Cost American Taxpayers Approximately $20,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently I called to the attention of the House that when the Veterans' Administration canceled 16,000 beds in the hospital program and reported saving $279,000,000, to do so it cost the American taxpayers $13,000,000 in funds already expended for the hospital program.

The other day when Defense Secretary Louis Johnson arbitrarily canceled the building of the carrier *United States*, the same situation prevailed. The estimated cost of the carrier was $189,000,000: (a) 3,000 tons of steel have already been delivered to the Newport News shipbuilding yards; (b) ninety to one hundred thousand tons of steel have been fabricated; (c) lines, drawings, and blueprints have been released to contractors; (d) obligations in firm of intent to contractors, $150,000,000; (e) estimated commitments by shipbuilder to subcontractors for boilers, auxiliaries, and so forth, $10,000,000; (f) actual expenditures by Navy Department to date, $7,500,000; (g) to terminate the contract and all subcontracts, it will cost the American taxpayer approximately $20,000,000.

Thus, if we add the $13,000,000 wasted by the Veterans' Administration to the $20,000,000 wasted in canceling the supercarrier contract, we can truthfully say the American taxpayer has taken a loss of $33,000,000. This is another illustration of poor planning and false economy.

Hollywood's Reply on Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix a letter from Art Arthur, executive secretary of Motion Picture Industry Council. Mr. Arthur's letter attacks with logical arguments the fallacy of the present British quota regulations on American films. This letter was printed on the editorial page of the Los Angeles Times April 25:

HOLLYWOOD'S REPLY ON QUOTAS

In view of the importance of the British quota issue to the thousands of people employed in Hollywood and to the American film industry in general, I have asked Mr. Art Arthur, our executive secretary, to prepare a full statement detailing the American view of the film-quota situation, couched in the form of a reply to Mr. Marthason's letter published April 18.

CECIL B. DE MILLE,
Chairman, Motion Picture Industry Council.

Mr. A. Marthason, of Santa Monica, a resident Englishman, has sent you a letter defending the British film quota aimed at American films. In view of the letter's distortions it would seem to require reply.

The letter lets slip one remarkably frank admission. "Basically," states Mr. Marthason, "it's really not a question of dollars at all." This is a simple fact that we have been trying to convey to both the American and British peoples.

We are glad to have Mr. Marthason place it on the record. It confirms the opinion expressed by Mr. Ronald Reagan, fresh back from England, that restrictive measures aimed at American films had gone far beyond economic necessities born of dollar shortages. It underscores Mr. Reagan's belief that Britain's current difficulties were being used to camouflage actions against American films representing trade warfare totally unrelated to the hardships endured by the British people.

Mr. Marthason observes that "the time is not far off when American films will only be exhibited in England on their merits." That is exactly what the American motion-picture industry is asking. And nothing more. We would settle for that right now.

Our objection is directed at the artificial trade barriers and restrictions that the British Government has erected to keep the British public from responding to American pictures as freely as they see fit. By this quota system the British Government tries to force British audiences to sit through films they don't care for and keep them from seeing American films they prefer.

The results have been disastrous for British exhibitors and humiliating for British producers, as no less than a half dozen British Members of Parliament candidly admitted in the British House of Commons on March 30 last. They included Tom O'Brien, Member of Parliament, and general secretary of the largest British film trade-union.

Similarly the confession of British misguidance was echoed in the House of Lords by the Earl of Drogheda, chairman of the Films Council, and others. Even the Cinematograph Films Council has joined in the admission of grave economic error.

Mr. Marthason professes to believe that the American film industry is afraid of what he calls "stiff competition." On the contrary, we welcome competition anywhere at any time. There are no quotas set up here in America. Any British film is free to play anywhere its merits can develop a demand from American film audiences. The long runs of both "Red Shoes" and "Hamlet" clearly demonstrate that when the American film audiences want to see a picture, their will is law.

But we find a wholly different situation in England where quotas and other artificial trade barriers eliminate precisely the kind of competition the gentleman from Santa Monica says the Americans fear.

The sort of thing that Mr. Marthason advocates is exactly what has disrupted the entire British film industry, shut down British studios, and thrown thousands of British film workers out of employment, while British film exhibitors struggle desperately to keep their theaters open.

Simultaneously, this vain, ill-considered policy is creating new difficulties for the American film industry and developing wholly unnecessary antagonism on both sides of the Atlantic.

Neither Mr. Roy Brewer nor Mr. Ronald Reagan are seeking to tell the British film public "what kind of entertainment they must like." They merely are pointing out how harmful for the British film industry, as well as the American film industry, is the British Government's efforts to tell the British film public what kind of entertainment Britons must like.

We cannot hope that our "resident Englishman" will accept wholeheartedly an American view of the quota situation. Let him, then, listen to comments of Britons as expressed in the British House of Commons and House of Lords.

Tom O'Brien, the member from West Nottingham, declared: "We cannot make people see films they do not want to see—no quota, whether high or low, will succeed in doing that * * * It is my own view as well as that of other people that this 40-percent quota will create further unemployment. Whether we like it or not, we have to have American films."

Oliver Lyttleton, Member for Aldershot: "It is clear that our film industry is in great jeopardy, and the first step to take is to secure the cooperation of the Americans, who are as much hit as we are in trying to clear up the mess."

William Shepherd, Member for Bucklow, declared in the House: "If we pursue a course antagonistic to our American friends, the industry in this country will never really get on its feet. * * * I hope that the president of the board of trade will do all he can in the next 2 or 3 months to try and get some agreement with our American friends. What is happening now is damaging to the interests of both the American and the British industries."

Let Mr. Marthason cup an ear toward the House of Lords as the Earl of Drogheda laments: "It is a fact, I fear, that many

British films produced this year have been very disappointing. * * * We tried to go too far and too fast. * * *"

Let him note the words of Viscount Swinton: "I cannot but agree with the criticism in another place that the handling by the British Government of the American industry has been singularly inept. I must say that I had a large measure of help and cooperation from the American industry. * * * I do hope the board of trade will learn from experience and be more realistic. * * *"

Let Mr. Marthason note the words of Viscount Bridgeman describing the quota as a "fools' paradise" and observing: "The real judge is the ordinary man or woman who goes to the pictures; they are the ones to decide. * * * It is impossible for anybody like the board of trade, (our) producers, or anybody else to keep the public content with something they do not want."

If Mr. Marthason truly is willing that American films be exhibited in England only on their merits, then the Motion Picture Industry Council urges him to write at once to R. E. Barclay, private secretary to Foreign Secretary Bevin, declaring that British quotas should be eliminated immediately.

ART ARTHUR,
Executive Secretary, Motion Picture Industry Council.
BEVERLY HILLS.

The Star Chamber Wasn't As Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I attach herewith, for the consideration of the Members, an editorial from the Traffic World pointing up a serious situation:

THE STAR CHAMBER WASN'T AS BAD

It would hardly be fair to term the proceedings in which the Civil Service Commission, a fortnight ago (see Traffic World, March 19, p. 19), disqualified a number of trial examiners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board star-chamber proceedings. To do so would be unfair to the court of the star chamber, the execrated judicial tool of the Tudors and the Stuarts which, bad as it was, still was less violent to the Anglo-Saxon, and hence the American spirit of justice and fair play.

True, star-chamber proceedings were secret. But those who were hailed before it met their accusers, had an opportunity to plead, and were granted the right to reply to evidence adduced against them. No semblance of such elementary right was granted to those who now find themselves sentenced to the loss of positions in which some of them have performed loyally, intelligently, and efficiently for many years.

Of course, the process by which the Civil Service Commission arrived at the conclusion that these men were not qualified to serve as trial examiners was not a judicial one. It consisted merely of a simple, oral examination before a board of consultants, and a subsequent peremptory notice to the administrative body by which they were employed that they were to be discharged—were to be separated, as the euphonious but hardly less-bitter Federal gobbledegook has it.

The Civil Service Commission, in its press release announcing its action, said, among other things, that the Administrative Procedure Act gave it sole authority over the procedures to be used in removals of trial examiners. There are, we understand, more than a few authorities on the law who disagree with that statement.

Assuming, however, that what the Civil Service Commission said about its sole authority in that matter is true, the Commission must then also accept sole responsibility for the procedures it chose to adopt—and upon it, therefore, must fall the onus for as amazing a perversion of discretion and fair play by a Federal body as has been witnessed in our day.

It is equally hard to understand how a body of consultants, the membership of which included two former presidents of the American Bar Association, a former Assistant Attorney General, and two members of State supreme courts could have lent itself to such a curious course of action.

As we understand it, the oral inquiries were of the sketchiest kind. They have been described to us by some who submitted to them—and who, fortunately, did not fall under the Civil Service Commission's ban—as little more than passing examinations of opinions, with only incidental questions intended to develop the qualifications that the Commission later said the condemned men did not possess.

The Civil Service Commission has declined to make public the names of the examiners involved. Undoubtedly, when appeals from the order are taken, the identities will transpire; and when they do, we predict added amazement on the part of those who do business before the Commission.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, neither the consultants nor the Civil Service Commission itself made any effort to discover whether the examiners they investigated had the approval and respect of the many men in transportation who had, over the years, cheerfully submitted their disputes to those examiners in hearing rooms.

The spirited defense of the unfortunates written by William A. Disque, himself for many years one of the most respected of the Commission's examiners, may well serve as the collective opinion of the larger group of practitioners and traffic men. We quote from Mr. Disque's letter to the Civil Service Commission a single paragraph which should express that opinion:

"I would rather present the average case before an examiner who had years of experience in ICC work or traffic matters, with practically no law experience, than before a good and experienced lawyer, with no ICC or traffic experience."

We commend to our readers, too, the outspoken disapproval of Commissioner Aitchison, who, in his recent address at Chicago, sees the action of the Civil Service Commission not merely as an injustice to faithful and efficient employees, but as a blow at the Interstate Commerce Commission's own prestige. After all, for years, the Commission has tacitly expressed its confidence in the men attacked and its satisfaction in their work. Now, in effect, it finds an outside agency telling it that it lacks discernment in selecting its examiners and in promoting experienced and worthy employees to those positions.

"I tender these men my personal expression of confidence and of appreciation for their loyal, efficient, intelligent service in the past," said Commissioner Aitchison.

The Commissioner, never noted for timidity, exhibited the kind of audacity seldom seen in Government circles when he thus expressed, at one and the same time, his admiration for those who work with him, and his contempt for the Civil Service Commission. In the face of loss of position, which many of the "disqualified" examiners worked long years to attain, there is some consolation in his words.

The commendation, however, may prove small satisfaction to the men ordered discharged should the action of the CSC so bravely defied by the Commissioner prevail. We hope that appeals to the CSC may bring it to a higher regard of the rules of fair play, or failing that, that court action may remedy the injustice.

It Pays To Have Friends in High Places in the Roosevelt-Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1949, an article appeared in the New York World-Telegram which, if true, should be interesting to the taxpayers of the country. In the billions and billions of dollars that America has sent abroad, just how much of it has been for the benefit of special interests? Is the American taxpayer required to support all the royalty of the world in the degree of luxury to which they are accustomed? To what extent have the special interests both at home and abroad profited by the desire of the American people to relieve starvation and establish justice?

Mr. Speaker, incidents are showing up constantly pointing to the fact that the economic royalists who have dominated our foreign policy throughout the Roosevelt-Truman administration have not been unmindful of the needs of their friends. The taxpayers who are burdened with such a heavy load have a right to ask an accounting. The article I refer to is as follows:

COURT SETS ASIDE AWARD OF MILLION MADE TO MOFFETT—CAN'T PAY FOR SERVICE OF KIND, JUDGE HOLDS; APPEAL IS PLANNED

A verdict awarding James A. Moffett, oil executive, $1,150,000 for services to the Arabian American Oil Co., was set aside today by Federal Judge Edward A. Conger.

The office of William P. Maloney, counsel for Mr. Moffett, announced that Judge Conger's ruling will be appealed.

Mr. Moffett had claimed that as a result of his intercessions with such figures as the late President Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins, and Jesse Jones in 1941, the oil company's wealthy concessions in Saudi Arabia were protected.

Granting the motion to set aside the verdict, Judge Conger based his ruling in part on a contention by Joseph M. Proskauer, Aramco counsel, who said Mr. Moffett's suit was contrary to public policy because no man can sell his influence with a public official.

COURT CITES LAW

Judge Conger noted that Mr. Moffett had "an intimate friendship" with the late President, who had appointed him Federal Housing Administrator, a position which the oil official held during 1934–35.

The judge expressed the belief that the oil company selected Mr. Moffett to represent it in Washington "as much, if not more, for his close relations with the President, one who, if anyone could, might obtain relief" for the oil company in its "hour of peril from the man who might be able to help them."

Judge Conger asserted that Mr. Moffett's services "are the kind that the law, says may not be compensated for."

PAID KING IBN SAUD

Mr. Moffett had claimed as the result of his intercessions the British were required to make certain payments to King Ibn Saud out of a $450,000,000 loan granted by this country. The king had demanded the oil company pay him $6,000,000 a year to make up for a wartime diminution in his income, according to the testimony.

A letter was introduced which Mr. Moffett said he received from Jesse Jones, then Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, who had negotiated the British loan.

In it Mr. Jones said that at the "instance of the President and the Secretary (of State) I suggested to the British Ambassador that Britain consider providing King Ibn Saud with such funds as, in its opinion, were necessary to meet his requirements."

We Must Protect Our Chief Agricultural Industry—Dairying—From Unfair Competition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, since appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture in support of the dairy industry and in opposition to the removal of the tax on the butter substitute, oleomargarine, at the invitation of radio station KSL of Salt Lake City I have broadcast an address entitled, "Dairying, the Backbone of Agriculture," which is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

DAIRYING, THE BACKBONE OF AGRICULTURE

My friends of the air, I want to talk to you a few minutes about one of our chief farming industries—a farming industry that has contributed more to the upbuilding of America than any other branch of farming.

The legislation now under consideration by Congress deals with one of the most important issues affecting agriculture and the welfare of the American people.

Our national leaders have long recognized the paramount importance of the dairy industry to the growth and welfare of our country. The Congress in its wisdom has enacted laws to safeguard our principal dairy product—butter—from the destructive competition of cheap butter substitutes.

My friends, the milk cow has followed the pioneer in every State in the Union, bringing sustenance and support to the men and women with their families that have built America. In the covered-wagon days, it was the milk cow and her progeny that accompanied the settlers in their migrations to the Nation's frontiers and supported them with milk, butter, and beef while they reclaimed the land and built the homes and communities of this great country. The old-fashioned churn and the farm wife with her golden rolls of delicious butter did more to sustain the farmer and finance the building up of early-day American agriculture than any other product of the farm. This was so in the South, where now so much of the support of cheap butter substitutes comes from.

Well do I remember as a boy, when I grew up in the Deep South, the system of cultivation followed by my father to increase the fertility of poor land. "Crawfish land" Southern people called it when the little white chimney of the crawfish indicated the deficiency in fertility of the soil. My father practiced what he called "cowpenning the land." A cow pen was built on this poor land and the milk cows were penned on the ground every night. Next spring, the cow pen was moved and a good crop was produced on the land where the cow pen had been the year before. Each year the cow pen was moved to another piece of land and in time the fertility of the farm was built up while the dairy herd thrived and grew. The butter and the increase from the dairy herd was sold in town to finance farm improvements and purchase the machinery used on the farm.

Let me remind you that England has long recognized the importance of dairying and beef production. We are indebted to the English for the excellence and productivity of the dairy herds in this country by their contribution of Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, and Ayrshire milk- and butterfat-producing cows, perfection achieved by generations of painstaking selection and breeding. So it is with their contribution of the beef strains of Shorthorn and Herefords to our matchless herds of beef cattle.

The prowess of the English race in conquering and colonizing many parts of the world must be credited in a large measure to the fighting ability and rugged physiques of her "beef eaters."

When Japan was making a bid for military advancement some years ago, we read that she endeavored to ascertain what could be done to improve her national diet and increase the stature and prowess of her fighters, and we learned that the commission reported that milk, butter, and beef were the answer.

Let anyone show me a community or a country that is devoted to dairying and I'll show you a hardy race and a prosperous people. Today, little Denmark with its dairy farms, its butter and bacon, a byproduct of the dairy, is an example of farm thrift, and national stability to the rest of the world.

Little Holland, with its canals and dairy farms that gave to us and to the world her famous dairy strains of Holstein-Friesian milk- and butterfat-producing cows—a country minus timber, without deposits of coal, iron, or oil, dependent on her farms and dairy herds—was before the war one of the richest of European countries.

Now the processors of cheap vegetable oils, surplus fats and grease have taken over the soap trade and the tremendous business of supplying the Nation's cooking fats and compounds, together with the vast market for lubricants.

They have even come in and taken the market for our dairy product, cheese, with their tinseled, adulterated "cheese" substitutes.

My friends, today there is hardly a grocery store in the country where you can buy a piece of honest-to-goodness full cream cheese. Not content with taking over these vast markets, now these processors of cheap vegetable oils, surplus fats, and grease propose to come in and tear down the last legislative safeguards to the main product of our dairy industry, butter, and flood the market with their cheap butter substitute, oleomargarine, that will masquerade as butter in the stores of many communities and deprive the housewife of any opportunity to buy genuine butter. If the oleomargarine dealers have their way and this law is repealed, when the housewife goes to the store and asks for real butter, she will get the same response we get today when we ask for full cream cheese, "Sorry, we don't keep it."

Now, when the world is struggling with inflation and is crying to us for fats and oils, we are being pressed by these profiteering packing-house companies and the manufacturers of the cheap butter substitute—oleomargarine—to reverse our national policy and tear down the laws that Congress has enacted to protect the purity of the food of our children and safeguard our chief agricultural industry; yes, to protect the very stability of our farm economy by preserving our home markets for our principal dairy product—butter.

They would impoverish the farmer and dwarf our children to enrich profiteering manufacturers and unscrupulous oleomargarine dealers.

My friends, we know and sympathize with the cotton growers of the South. They have been struggling for generations with their soil-depleting one-crop standard—cotton. Naturally, they are demanding a bigger and better market for their byproduct, cottonseed oil. They need the money to buy commercial fertilizers if they are to grow another good cotton crop and more cottonseed oil.

Let me remind you that our Government undertook the construction of Muscle Shoals to provide fertilizer for the worn-out cotton-fields of the South.

There has been a concerted effort in the cotton-growing States to get away from cotton and soil depletion; valient attempts have been made with some success to build up the livestock and dairy industry as a means of increasing the fertility of its worn-out soil.

To meet a temporary price emergency caused by inflation, we are called upon to repeal our laws and deprive agriculture of the security of its dairy industry and the means of maintaining the fertility of the soil.

We cannot, we must not, adopt a short-sighted policy that will bring the standards of agriculture down to the production of soil-depleting crops in order to expand the market for vegetable oil and the purchase of more commercial fertilizer to build up a one-crop soil-depleting industry.

My friends, in the light of a lifetime of observation and experience in watching the growth of the business of manufacturing and marketing cheap butter substitutes and the inroads these butter substitutes have made in the market for dairy products in this country, I cannot bring myself to believe that this Congress can be persuaded to tear down the safeguards of our dairy industry by repealing the last of the laws that previous Congresses in their wisdom have enacted to preserve our basic farm industry—dairying.

Philippine Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, all America was shocked on hearing the news of the wanton murder of Mrs. Manuel Quezon, the widow of our former colleague and the late President of the Philippine Republic; her daughter, and son-in-law.

According to press dispatches this dastardly crime took place at a time when she and members of her party were on their way to dedicate a hospital.

While on the journey the party accompanied by members of the constabulary were ambushed by a large body of "Huks" armed with machine guns. The dispatches state that Mrs. Quezon, her daughter and son-in-law and others of her party were killed and many others wounded.

I know that all necessary steps will be taken to apprehend and punish those responsible. It is war—war against those who would govern by terrorism—war against Communists and Communist-inspired groups whose only object is to overthrow a legally established, orderly government. Our Government should be sympathetic to the Government of the Phillipines if the call should come for aid.

I know I voice the sentiments of our people when I offer heartfelt sympathy to the family and the people of the Philippine Islands.

Art Exhibits for Paraplegics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, "It's funny," said the paraplegic veteran, "I never thought I'd be able to understand what art was all about. But, hell, I just liked these pictures." It was remarks such as this that greeted Look magazine's photographers who recently visited the wards of St. Albans Naval Hospital, where paintings were being exhibited and explained to paralyzed veterans who otherwise never would have been able to see them and experience the pleasure of art for art's sake. I have appended hereto an article from Look magazine, along with a letter from these patients themselves, attesting to the therapeutic value of the exhibit presented them and stating that no effort was made to propagandize them in connection with the exhibit. Certainly the art exhibits can serve an excellent purpose and should be continued. This can be done without lending them to political propaganda, but without art censorship.

PAINTINGS FOR PARAPLEGICS

Paraplegics are paralyzed as a result of injury to the spinal cord. The men who signed the following letter are in the paraplegic ward of the United States Naval Hospital at St. Albans, Long Island. They took their wounds in war action and afterwards. Each has been through the long private hell of getting used to partial life, and each has concluded that life on any terms is worth the candle. These men are quick to resent too much sympathy. Unnecessary favors annoy them. But when their old friends, Carroll and Henrietta Sharon Aument, offered to show them some paintings, they were all for it. There was a party atmosphere in the ward when the Auments wheeled paintings in on mobile units. Pictures, many by well-known artists, were taken to beds and explained. The men talk of them weeks afterward, ask constantly to see more.

MARCH 29, 1949.

To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned paraplegic patients at St. Albans Hospital, would like to state publicly that the art show that was shown to us here at the hospital by well-known artists recently, was not a propaganda show as some Congressmen have stated.

Some of us saw Mr. Carroll Aument's paintings last year and at the time suggested that it might be a good idea to have the show brought out to the hospital to be shown to patients that couldn't get out to see it.

The artists also thought it a good idea and finally arranged for the show to be brought out.

We can truthfully say that most of the fellows who saw the show were very interested in the paintings and found that once they were explained, they were also very educational.

At no time did any of the artists try to inject any kind of communistic propaganda.

We were so well satisfied with the show that we suggest it should be shown more often and to more hospitals where patients are unable to get out themselves to see such shows. We know, because we have seen it, liked it, and benefited by it. We are—

Sincerely yours,

Peter Youakim, Jr.; Lionel La Flamme; Peter J. McArdle [1]; Harvey Andrew Beasley [1]; Leonard Chest [1]; Walter E. March; William G. West; Raymond C. Hansen; Theodore R. Krebs, Andrew W. Mikita, Muncy Lucas, Edward L. Gurka.

Jewish Appeal Is Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter that appeared in the Washington Star of April 27, by Faiz El-Khowri, Minister of Syria. The letter is in response to an editorial that appeared in the Star on April 25.

JEWISH APPEAL EDITORIAL CRITICIZED BY SYRIAN MINISTER

To the Editor of the Star:

As a representative of Syria to this great country, it is obviously my duty to advise my government about everything which serves the interest of both our peoples. It is equally my duty to enlighten the American public—when the opportunity arises—about matters that influence the policy of their Government toward my country and its people.

On the 25th of April I read your editorial entitled, "The Jewish Appeal" urging the American people to help collect the "irreducible minimum" of $250,000,000 "in the weeks immediately ahead." The objectives of the appeal being, as you describe them, humanitarian and of great historical significance, opening up a new era of peace and well-being in the Middle East.

These are certainly noble objectives and describe the nature of the American people who have given the highest example of serving humanity and alleviating suffering everywhere in the world.

But, allow me to tell you frankly, sir, that your objectives are being abused and your dollars are being spent for purposes other than those for which they were given. The fact is that American dollars are used to purchase arms from the U. S. S. R. and its satellites in order to fight and kill the Arabs and to drive them out of their homes.

Thus, the Jews, who were able to play on emotions and sympathy, now have a powerful army and are applying in Palestine against the Arabs the horrible lessons they learned from Nazi Germany.

The peace which you cherish was dominant in the Middle East. The Arabs and the Jews were living as brothers in Palestine until the Balfour Declaration, the American dollar and support and Soviet arms interfered. All these forces cooperated together and peace was driven away, not only from Palestine, but also from the whole Middle East. In its place, chaos, poverty, and homelessness now prevail.

Peace left Palestine with the Arab refugees and will not be reestablished until and unless these 800,000 Arab refugees return to their homes where they were for a millenium of years before Moses, Joshua, Azra, and the modern Zionists like Chaim Weizmann, Ben-Gurion and others.

Finally, I should like to affirm that every dollar given to the Jews and every assistance, moral or material, tendered to them, will only result in further distress and disorder in the Middle East. The fire which the foreigners kindled there will not be extinguished unless they themselves put it out by ceasing to nourish it.

FAIZ EL-KHOURI,
Minister of Syria.

[1] These fellows, being paralyzed from the neck down, and unable to sign their own names, gave authorization to someone else to sign for them.

State of Israel?—Does Its Establishment Impose Jewish Nationality on Americans of Jewish Faith?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which I have received from Mr. Norman Buckner, Pontiac, Mich., which relates to the problem of Israel and Americans of Jewish faith, together with a news item which appeared in the New York Times of April 3, 1949:

JERUSALEM TO BE CULTURAL CENTER—ISRAELIS EXPECT POPULATION TO BE DOUBLE IN 5 YEARS—HALL FOR ZIONISTS IS PLANNED

(By Gene Currivan)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, April 2.—Elaborate plans have been drawn to make Jerusalem the cultural and educational center of Israel and to double the city's population within 5 years. The first step will be to erect a congress hall with 1,800 seats, where the World Zionist Congress will meet in the future.

A comprehensive rehabilitation program, most of which is ready for execution, is being underwritten by the Jewish Agency, the Jewish National Fund, and private capital. Some aspects of it, such as roads, utilities, and the erection of buildings for small industries, are being undertaken by the state itself.

In addition to the congress hall, which will be ready for next year's Zionist Congress, there will be a large hotel in the center of Jerusalem, a university city on Mount Scopus, where the abandoned Hebrew University now stands, and an airport within Jerusalem. Development of the university city must obviously await the outcome of the Transjordanian armistice talks as Mount Scopus at present is a neutral zone between the Israeli and Transjordanian forces.

The Jewish Agency intends to encourage a "back to Jerusalem" movement to bring

back all those who left after the siege and to influence others to make their homes in the city. Work projects have been planned to provide employment for additional thousands while lucrative contracts will be offered to those already in the city.

TO AWARD CONTRACTS

In connection with its housing program for immigrants the Agency will award a contract of $150,000 for beds and mattresses to some local concern. Another contract of an equal or greater amount will be let for doors, windows, and floor blocks.

There will be opportunities for employment in the rebuilding program and on the road to be built around the southern arc of Jerusalem, where vast areas are to be populated.

The hotel planned for the center of the city will be seven stories high and have 150 beds. Construction will start this year.

The congress hall will be one of the largest projects, and construction is supposed to start some time this year. The initial cost has been placed at $900,000, of which one-third each will be paid by the Agency, the Jewish National Fund, and private capital. The building, of a native pinkish granite, will be used for all kinds of international conferences as well as concerts and ballets.

UNIVERSITY CITY PLANNED

On Mount Scopus, where the Hebrew University buildings are now empty and guarded by both Israelis and Arabs, it is hoped to build a university city with educational institutions of all kinds, not necessarily connected with the university itself.

There are also visualized plans for the manufacture of precision and optical instruments and for a large printing establishment for religious books.

The Government will assist this development by transferring more ministries to Jerusalem and providing buildings for them.

The "back to Jerusalem" plan obviously is laying groundwork for an ultimate "Jerusalem the Capital" plan.

APRIL 20, 1949.

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am writing you about a problem that should be of great concern to you in your efforts to guide American foreign policy for the best interests of all the people of our country.

I am an American who happens to be a Jew by religion. I reject the concept that because I am a Jew by religion, I have also a "Jewish" nationality and that through that nationality, I have obligations to the state of Israel or attachments to it or sentiments about it not shared by Americans of other faiths. The state of Israel, to me, is a foreign state, just as China, England, or Pakistan.

I also consider it the responsibility of the United States Government to protect me and 5,000,000 other Americans of Jewish faith from invasion of my American nationality by the Israeli government. And whenever that government, through any of its representatives or instrumentalities, speaks in terms of rights or obligations for "the Jewish people" to Israel, or of Jews to Israel, it is such an invasion of my clear-cut American nationality.

When such an invasion of my American nationality may lead to serious, international political involvements, the failure of the United States Government to protect its 5,000,000 Americans of Jewish faith serves to place them in a position where their security and future status may be seriously jeopardized.

My particular reason, for writing you at this time, is that one such hazardous situation has arisen. I respectfully call you attention to the following facts:

1. The United Jewish Appeal is represented as an American institution. Since it holds itself out to be a philanthropic agency, contributions to it are tax exempt.

2. The largest beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal is the United Palestine Appeal. The United Palestine Appeal, in turn, allocates most of its money to the Palestine Foundation Fund and the Jewish National Fund. The largest beneficiary of the Palestine Foundation Fund is the Jewish Agency.

3. During the past winter, the Jerusalem section of the Jewish Agency came to the United States. A member of that body "without portfolio" was Mr. Eliezer Kaplan, Minister of Finance of the State of Israel. This delegation imposed upon the United Palestine Appeal, a formula and officers that were to the satisfaction of the Israeli Government. In this move, the president of Israel and its prime minister, Mr. Weizmann and Mr. Ben-Gurion, publicly expressed their support of the Jerusalem Jewish Agency's effort. Following the imposition of this formula and these officers, Mr. Sharet, Israeli foreign minister, and Mr. Eban, Israeli representative to the United Nations, have figured prominently in the fund-raising campaign of the United Jewish Appeal.

The direct Israeli interest in and control of the United Jewish Appeal is therefore obvious.

4. Attached you will find a photostatic copy of a despatch from Tel Aviv, taken from the New York Times of April 3, 1949.

Note that the Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Fund, referred to above as beneficiaries, directly or indirectly, of the United Jewish Appeal, allegedly an American institution, are now preparing to spend considerable sums in public-work projects in the city of Jerusalem. These public-work projects are at the instigation and with the approval of the Government of Israel.

5. It is to be observed that this Israeli action is in defiance of and contradictory to the United Nations' resolution to internationalize Jerusalem. I believe that the Government of the United States stands in support of that United Nations' policy.

6. What is involved here then is use of tax-free American funds for the purposes of aiding the State of Israel to satisfy one of its announced territorial objectives, in defiance of all international attitudes about Jerusalem at the present time.

7. This action assumes new seriousness in the light of the Papal Encyclical, reported in the American press on April 16, 1949. With strong Catholic tendencies, in the Latin-American nations, serious damage may be done to our Western Hemisphere foreign policy should the United States close its eyes to the powerful support for Israeli aggression which comes from the Israeli-Government-dominated United Jewish Appeal. In that event, the most serious consequences to Americans of Jewish faith, referred to above, may eventuate.

I consider it of the most extreme importance therefore, that you give due consideration to these facts and that, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, you do all within your power either to separate Israeli national projects from the United Jewish Appeal or compel the United Jewish Appeal to register as the agent of a foreign government and to meticulously comply with the requirements of such registration.

Such action would adequately protect Americans of Jewish faith against the confusion of their status and the consequent confusion of their actions and of opinions about them on the part of their fellow Americans of other faiths. I believe they are entitled to that protection.

If I may be of any further service to you, please let me know.

Very respectfully yours,

NORMAN BUCKNER.

PONTIAC, MICH.

Water and Electric Power Situation in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I released to the press today:

The way I feel about the water and power fight in California is this: Any stream in California, south of the Sacramento River, which is capable of producing enough water to warrant its being harnessed for flood control, is producing enough water to be dammed up for irrigation. Or to make it short: If a stream will make a flood, it will irrigate farm land.

We all know that water is almost like gold in California, south of the Sacramento River, and that it is a crime against future generations to build these flood-control projects and let that water flow into the ocean when we need it so badly for irrigation. Flood-control projects already started should, of course, be rushed to completion, but we know it is foolhardy not to use our streams to produce every kilowatt of electricity that we can, because we are rapidly using up our oil and gas supplies. Posterity will see the day when there is no such thing as oil and gas, and we of the present generation will surely be held in irreverent memory by our descendents if we build these flood-control projects and leave out the hydroelectric power provisions which will supply our progeny with light, warmth, and fuel to cook their food when our gas and oil supplies are exhausted. I cannot understand the viewpoint of men in political life, regardless of whether they are Democrats or Republicans, who are taking the short-sighted position of lining up on this flood-control program with the private power interests to the detriment of our State and its people in the generations to come.

It is easily understood why the supporters of the Army engineers and the private power companies are so closely allied. Any dam built under the Flood Control Act by the Army engineers carries no provision for applying the proceeds from the sale of electric energy to the defraying of irrigation costs. Unless this is done, the cost of the irrigation water becomes so high that the farmers cannot pay it and the project is rendered nonfeasible. This puts the Government out of the electric-power picture and leaves the field open to the private power people, which is just what they want. This is the main basis of the fight by the power interests and we would not be having such a hard time settling the water issue in central California if it were not for the power interests backing up the Army engineers with their political lobbying and money.

In addition to the electric power issue and the flood control versus irrigation issue, there is also the issue of 160-acre limitation. That limitation is, of course, written only into the Reclamation law and would apply only on projects built by the Bureau of Reclamation under Reclamation law and would not apply on projects built by the Army engineers under the Flood Control Act. It is only natural then that the big land owners have combined with the private power monopoly to fight the Bureau of Reclamation and the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party's platform adopted at Sacramento in August 1948 says:

"That the great Central Valley project be completed at the earliest possible time as an integrated basin-wide publicly owned development of our water and power resources by the United States Bureau of Reclamation."

In my opinion the publishers of certain California newspapers and certain of our California Members of Congress are either being hoodwinked, or are lined up with the private power interests through alliance with the Army engineers. Although on the surface these publishers and these Members of Congress are for public power, they play footsie under the table with the private power groups through the Army engineers to the detriment of our future generations in California. It is my intention to expose this whole business on every possible occasion.

One of the first proposals I made immediately after coming to Washington was the proposed consolidation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the civil functions of the Army engineers. This proposal was made in order to stop the fight between these two groups which is so costly to the present taxpayers of our Nation and entails the loss of our natural resources to future generations.

I am glad to state that recently the Hoover Commission has advocated the consolidation of these two agencies and it is my hope that this consolidation will be carried out in the very near future.

The President and Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the House to the splendid publication, The President and Labor Disputes, by Prof. Clinton L. Rossiter, from Cornell University, as published recently in the Journal of Politics. The research of Dr. Rossiter on this interesting question of these additional duties of the President in labor matters should prove helpful to the Congress in our present study of labor legislation.

THE PRESIDENT AND LABOR DISPUTES

(By Clinton L. Rossiter, Cornell University)

Harry S. Truman, speaking to the National Conference on Family Life on May 6, 1948, delivered this illuminating exposition of the powers of the Presidency:

"And people talk about the powers of a President, all the powers that a Chief Executive has, and what he can do. Let me tell you something—from experience.

"The President may have a great many powers given to him in the Constitution, and may have powers under certain laws which are given to him by the Congress of the United States; but the principal power that the President has is to bring people in and try to persuade them to do what they ought to do without persuasion. That's what I spend most of my time doing. That's what the powers of the President amount to."[1]

Another part of this speech, an observation that "children and dogs are as necessary to the welfare of this country as is Wall Street and the railroads," stole the headlines, but those who went on to read this Presidential interpretation of Presidential power in the light of events then transpiring found positive evidence of a notable development in the condition of our first office. That very day and the next such persons as W. T. Faricy, of the Association of American Railroads, and Alvanley Johnston, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers were in the White House being prevailed upon to do what they ought to have done without the President's intervention, namely, come to terms that would spare the country the havoc of a Nation-wide railroad strike. It was plain that the application of this principal power uppermost in Mr. Truman's mind was in the field of labor-management relations.

A cardinal feature of the Presidency in Transition is the evolution of the Chief Executive's role as an emergency participant in labor disputes. Indeed, this is one of the most prominent of those developments that permit us to assume, not alone for the purposes of this symposium, that the Presidency is in one of its great transitional periods. The general expansion of Government activity in labor-management relations rendered necessary by the complete unionization of many basic industries and the rise of industry-wide bargaining has had visible influence upon the Presidential office.[2] The Presidency, in which the elements of prestige and power are uniquely mixed, is an office peculiarly fitted for persuading the American people to do what they ought to do without persuasion and we have simply given the screw another turn in calling upon the final object of the public wishes to become a third party to those labor disputes that are recognized national emergencies. With the normal processes of governmental participation in industrial relations the President has little to do. The scope of this investigation will therefore be confined to his emergency powers in major labor disputes.

The growth of this power has been natural and unforced, for it fits comfortably into the general pattern of Presidential authority. One of the important functions the President performs is that of protector of the peace. There is a "peace of the United States," as Justice Miller reminded us in the Neagle case,[3] and long before his time it had been demonstrated that the President was primarily responsible for keeping that peace. When we think of the hours Mr. Truman has spent since 1945 in writing labor messages to Congress, sponsoring labor-management conferences, appointing emergency fact-finding boards, sending personal pleas to strike-minded union leaders, seeking injunctions from Judge Goldsborough, and seizing plants and whole industries threatened or paralyzed by work stoppages, we can understand how essential a component industrial peace has become in the general pattern of the peace of the United States. The Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 speaks wistfully, if somewhat obliquely, of "sound and stable industrial peace." The prime responsibility of the President for preserving that peace is now, and will continue to be, one of his major, time-consuming concerns.

The authority of the President in labor disputes is best described by classifying the situations in which it can be brought to bear. His powers fall under three headings: (1) the power literally to "keep the peace of the United States," by instituting military action in strikes attended by violence and public disorder; (2) the power to remove obstructions to the flow of industrial production in time of war (or just before and after war) by establishing emergency agencies to settle labor disputes and by enforcing their decisions with seizure and other sanctions; (3) the power to intervene in disputes, not necessarily wartime or touched with violence, that constitute an economic national emergency. The first and second of these powers are well established and will therefore be examined only briefly in this article; the third, in which the elements of transition are most clearly present, will be considered at more length. It goes without saying that these situations can merge; that one great industrial crisis might answer two or all of these descriptions.

The constitutional and statutory sources of the President's authority in each of these situations will become apparent as this discussion proceeds, but another source should be recognized at this early stage. Franklin D. Roosevelt once characterized the Presidency as "preeminently a place of moral leadership,"[4] and nowhere has the moral force of this office been more fruitfully exerted than in the field of labor disputes. It was the inventive Theodore Roosevelt who first discovered that the champions of labor and management are more likely to give heed to the public interest if the field of combat is shifted from a hotel suite to the White House.[5] Since his time the prestige of the Presidency has been the deciding factor in the settlement of some of our most noted industrial struggles. It is a long step up from the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, however excellent a public servant he may be, to the President of the United States, and neither the court nor Congress can contest the moral primacy of Presidential intervention.

I

The particular power of the President to send troops into an area menaced or racked by strike violence is a part of his general power to deploy the armed forces to maintain order and authority throughout the Nation. When industrial relations degenerate into industrial warfare, the President may step in and take whatever military measures are necessary to preserve the peace. In most instances the policing of disorderly strikes is the duty of the State and local authorities. The President will order Federal intervention in two situations only: When he has been requested to act by the proper State authorities, who thereby acknowledge their own incapacity to preserve order (and he may, of course, refuse the request); or when Federal laws and rights are being flouted and the national interest in a restoration of order is clear.

The President may base his actions on both the Constitution and the laws.[6] To his indefinite range of powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive has been added a healthy display of statutes through which Congress has turned over to him the responsibility for "calling forth the militia," and the Regulars as well, "to execute the laws of

[1] New York Herald Tribune, May 7, 1948, p. 16.

[2] American literature on Government and labor has kept pace with the growth of intervention. See generally H. A. Millis and R. E. Montgomery, Organized Labor (New York, 1945), chs. 11–13; E. E. Witte, The Government in Labor Disputes (New York, 1932); Kurt Braun, The Settlement of Industrial Disputes (Philadelphia, 1944); Labor and the Government (Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1935); T. R. Fisher, Industrial Disputes and Federal Legislation (New York, 1940). An excellent review of statutory developments is Federal Legislation on Labor-Management Disputes, Monthly Labor Review, vol. 64, p. 839 (1947).

[3] *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1, 69 (1890)).

[4] New York Times, November 13, 1932.

[5] Lest some sharp-eyed Bull Mooser come down upon me like Byron's Assyrian, let me say that I am aware that T. R.'s historic meeting with John Mitchell and George F. Baer took place at the temporary White House, 22 Lafayette Place.

[6] Bennett M. Rich, The Presidents and Civil Disorder (Washington, 1941), ch. 12.

the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." [7] Just how deeply the use of these powers may cut into the liberties of the people has never been determined, but the best authorities agree that, should circumstances dictate, the full power of martial law is at his command.[8] Since "necessity," whatever that means, is the only limit placed upon the arbitrary power of the Executive prosecuting a state of martial law, "necessity" must also be considered the limit of the President's power to use troops in a widespread condition of strike violence. He may take whatever steps the situation demands, even suspend the writ of habeas corpus for strike leaders (or strikebreakers) who are fomenting violent action.[9] The close tie-in with martial law of the President's power to police violent strikes is illustrated by an incident that took place during the Colorado coal strike of 1914. One of the Army commanders who had been sent into the area of conflict under President Wilson's orders suggested to the War Department that martial law be declared in his district. The answer of Secretary of War Garrison was conclusive and instructive:

"I do not know of anything that you cannot do under existing circumstances that you could do any better if there was a written proclamation of martial law posted in your district.[10]

The first of the great industrial struggles, the bitter railroad strike of 1877, was likewise the first occasion for the exercise of this power.[11] The unexpected violence of that strike, or rather series of strikes, spread over 14 States; 9 governors called for Federal assistance. President Hayes, faced by an unaccustomed form of internal disorder, moved from one step to the next with careful judgment and set a number of precedents that are valid to this day. His view of presidential power in this situation was naturally somewhat limited, for he was a cautious man with a respect for the Federal system and had a horror of innovation. The use of troops was directed to three ends: Answering the formal request of a helpless State, protecting Government property, and enforcing the orders of the Federal courts. Among the outstanding precedents established were Hayes' decision, taken in consultation with the Cabinet, that he could, if necessary, declare martial law; the insistence on formal and proper requests for Federal aid; [12] the issuance of proclamations as required by Revised Statute 5300; [13] and the judicious use of troops under Federal orders to preserve order and protect property, but not to break the strike. The most signal aspect of this incident, however, was the instinctive manner in which the whole Nation, including many of the strikers, turned to the President for aid in restoring order. From this time forward no violent strike on a national scale has taken place without evoking concerted pleas for presidential action.

The next important instance of Federal intervention in the warfare of labor and management, that of President Cleveland in the Pullman strike of 1894, was at once the most forceful and questionable employment of this Presidential power.[14] A 7-week strike of 2,500 workers at the Pullman Palace Car Co. in Chicago, touched off by an arrogant display of "industrial statesmanship" by the officers of the company, became a national problem when the American Railroad Union voted a boycott of all pullman cars. Riots, derailings, burnings, and general obstruction of the railroads occurred at many points in the West, particularly in the Chicago area, and President Cleveland was called upon to preserve the peace. The actions of the President, which were really the actions of Attorney General Richard Olney, were ill-conceived, disconnected, and thoroughly effective in breaking the strike; the procurement from the Federal court in Chicago of an exhaustive injunction,[15] based on the Sherman Act of 1890, against the American Railroad Union, its officers, and "all other persons;" the use of Regular troops to enforce Federal judicial processes, remove obstructions to the mails, and break up "conspiracies against commerce between the States"; the belated issuance of a proclamation advising those who persisted in rioting that they could "not be regarded otherwise than as public enemies";[16] the appointment of a Presidential investigating commission;[17] and the high-handed disregard through all this hurly-burly of the opinions of Governor Altgeld of Illinois. At every point in the course of the strike and its suppression, the wishes of the railroad officials, who acted through their General Managers' Association, found support in the Federal Government's actions. Like Hayes, Cleveland intervened to restore public order; unlike Hayes he accomplished this by judicially and physically breaking the strike. The exertions of the President, however unfortunate, nevertheless set a precedent, especially his arbitrary action in overriding Altgeld's protest against the unrequested dispatch of Federal troops and their deployment within his State. The President, as Revised Statute 5298 should have already made plain, does not have to wait for a State to beg assistance; the Federal principle presents a very low barrier to his use of troops in policing major strikes. Nor should it be forgotten that the Supreme Court gave a sweeping endorsement to the President's course of action in its decision affirming the conviction of Eugene V. Debs of the railway union for contempt of the lower court's injunction.

" 'We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle that the Government of the United States may, by means of physical force, exercised through its official agents, execute on every foot of American soil the powers and functions that belong to it. This necessarily involves the power to command obedience to its laws, and hence the power to keep the peace to that extent. * * *'

"If the emergency arises the Army of the Nation, and all its militia, are at the service of the Nation to compel obedience to its laws." [18]

In the years since the Pullman strike the Presidents have employed this dictatorial competence with more circumspection and less severity, and with considerable success in achieving the limited purposes of this type of intervention. The lessons learned by Hayes and Cleveland, and by a somewhat befuddled McKinley in the Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, strike of 1899, have been put to good employment by the twentieth century Presidents. The refusal of Theodore Roosevelt to be improperly drawn into the Colorado coal strike of 1903–4; the same President's firm actions in the Goldfield, Nev., miners' strike of 1907 when he forced an unwilling governor, who had deceived him into dispatching troops, to police his own bailiwick; the powerful and impartial exertion of force by President Wilson in the Colorado coal strike of 1914; President Harding's use of troops in the West Virginia miners' strike of 1921, in which he prepared but never issued a proclamation of martial law; and Franklin D. Roosevelt's refusal to intervene in several strikes in which the State authorities had by no means exhausted their military resources—all these are instructive instances of the Chief Executive's discretionary power to interpose his authority in industrial warfare.[19]

This power continues in the President's possession, embracing every type of military action from the mere threat of force to outright martial law. His decision to intervene in a violent strike and his determination of the measures necessary to restore order would seem to be conclusive; [20] in the employment of this vast discretionary authority, as in the exercise of most of his great prerogatives, the President's only responsibility is to the political process and the judgments of history. Only in the most extreme circumstances should he order Federal intervention; gubernatorial requests for assistance should be carefully investigated before any action is taken. In view of the increased potency of the National Guard, it seems likely that the President will in fact have less occasion to intervene in the future. The use of this authority must be as neutral as it is sparing. The employment of troops is for one purpose only, the preservation of law and order; never should they be used to break a strike or force a recalcitrant employer to terms. It is interesting to contrast labor's general distaste for the National Guard with its high regard for the Federal troops. It was a great day for American democracy when the arrival of the Regulars in Louisville, Colo., in 1914 was greeted by the strikers with their brass band.

II

The President displays an unusual degree of interest in labor disputes that occur in time of war.[21] As Commander-in-Chief he is concerned before all others that the production and delivery of weapons and supplies continue without interruption. Under the conditions of total war he becomes the dominant figure in industrial relations. His power is exerted along two related lines. First, he makes it his immediate business to see that peaceful relations are maintained between labor and management, and to this

---

[7] See particularly Revised Statutes 5297–5300, U. S. Code, title 50, secs. 201–204. See also title 32, secs. 81a, 81b, 82.

[8] See generally R. S. Rankin, When Civil Law Fails (Durham, 1939); Charles Fairman, The Law of Martial Rule (2d ed,. Chicago, 1943); Frazer Arnold, The Rationale of Martial Law, American Bar Association Journal, vol. 15, p. 550 (1929); E. S. Corwin, Martial Law, Yesterday and Today, Political Science Quarterly, vol. 17, p. 95 (1932); W. E. Birkhimer, Military Government and Martial Law (3d rev. ed., Kansas City, 1914).

[9] Compare *Moyer* v. *Peabody* (212 U. S. 78 (1909)).

[10] Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances, 1903–22, S. Doc. 263, 67th Cong., 2d sess., p. 315 (1922).

[11] F. T. Wilson, Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances, S. Doc. 209, 57th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 9 (1903); Rich, op cit., ch. 5; J. A. Dacus, Annals of the Great Strikes (Chicago, 1877).

[12] Rich, op. cit., pp. 78–79.

[13] For these proclamations, see 20 Stat. 803–805.

[14] Rich, op. cit., pp. 91–109; Wilson, op. cit., ch. 11; Edward Berman, Labor Disputes and the President of the United States (New York, 1924), ch. 1; Almont Lindsey, The Pullman Strike (Chicago, 1942). Cleveland's own story may be found in his Presidential Problems (New York, 1904), ch. 2.

[15] See Felix Frankfurter and Nathan Greene, The Labor Injunction (New York, 1930), pp. 17–19, 62–63, 253–263, and references there cited.

[16] 28 Stat. 1249.

[17] Under authority of 25 Stat. 501. See Report on the Chicago Strike by the United States Strike Commission, S. Exec. Doc. 7, 53d Cong., 3d sess. (1894–95).

[18] *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 578–579 (1895)), citing *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371, 395 (1879)).

[19] For these and other instances, see Berman, op. cit., chs. 3, 4, 6, 7; Rich, op. cit., chs. 8–10.

[20] F. B. Wiener, A Practical Manual of Martial Law (Harrisburg, 1940), pp. 54–55.

[21] On this problem see generally Strikes in Defense Industries, S. Doc. 52, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941).

end institutes special agencies to aid them in resolving their differences. Second, he enforces the orders of these agencies by the application of "indirect sanctions" and prevents critical work stoppages by the ultimate sanction of governmental seizure. The moral force of the Presidency is noticeably enhanced by the fact of war; a plea from the Commander-in-Chief is almost irresistible—almost, not absolutely.

The path that Presidents Roosevelt and Truman followed in the Second World War was unmistakably blazed by Woodrow Wilson in the first. Wilson always evidenced special concern for labor problems; the war gave him repeated opportunities for vigorous action.[22] He set up several boards and commissions to investigate or mediate in particular industries or regions and sponsored important labor-management conferences. The leading wartime governmental agency for the settlement of labor disputes was the 12-man, tripartite National War Labor Board established by Presidential proclamation April 9, 1918.[23] The agency's mandate was to "settle by mediation and conciliation controversies arising between employers and workers in fields of production necessary for the effective conduct of the war."[24] In pursuit of an unusually fair-minded statement of governmental policy, approved by the President and appended to his proclamation, the War Labor Board functioned until August 1919, as a high court of industrial relations. Findings and awards were made in some 490 cases. The importance of the Board's work was attested by the stature of the renowned public servant who acted as one of its co-chairman, William Howard Taft.

The War Labor Board was not based on congressional authority; its decisions therefore found their usual sanction in the force of public opinion. In the rare instances in which they were challenged by labor or management, the President stepped in to force an acceptance and prevent a strike. Twice in the course of the war he was compelled to commandeer the plan or industry that was the arena of the dispute. The persistent refusal of the Western Union Telegraph Co. to heed a decision of the War Labor Board or the pleas of the President led to a joint resolution of July 16, 1918, authorizing Government control; seizure followed 2 weeks later.[25] A similar attitude toward governmental authority on the part of the Smith & Wesson Co., of Springfield, Mass., was met by seizure under section 120 of the National Defense Act of 1916.[26] The most celebrated instance in which workingmen felt the heavy hand of Presidential authority was the Bridgeport case of September 1917.[27] When Wilson learned that certain machinists employed in manufacturing munitions in that Connecticut city had gone on strike in protest against a disappointing award of the War Labor Board, he sent them a strong letter threatening to have them drafted into military service and prohibited from seeking employment in the community's war industries for 1 year.[28] The strikers voted immediately to return to work.

Throughout the war Wilson gave full moral and legal support to the War Labor Board and all other agencies engaged in the amicable adjustment of labor-management grievances. "He acted the part of a fair-minded and intelligent statesman in dealing with the industrial situation,"[29] and his prestige and policies had a healthy influence on the success of the American productive effort. It is a notable fact that the first definite governmental labor policy in our history, the statement of principles heralding the establishment of the War Labor Board, is to be found in a proclamation of the President of the United States.

The labor activities of the Commander in Chief in the First World War were thoughtfully observed by his subaltern in the Navy Department. Franklin Roosevelt moved on familiar ground. In the second war, as in the first, the chief Federal agencies engaged in the settlement of labor disputes were wholly the creations of Executive authority. The most important of these was the National War Labor Board,[30] established by President Roosevelt January 12, 1942, on the ruins of the National Defense Mediation Board. The latter had been set up in March 1941 as a tripartite body with investigatory and mediatory powers in disputes in defense industries,[31] and had functioned with reasonable success in the disposition of about 100 cases certified to it by the Secretary of Labor. This agency's days were abruptly ended by the withdrawal of its CIO members in protest against a rejection of the United Mine Workers' demand for a union shop in the captive mines.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor the President convened a labor-management conference that agreed on three principles: There should be no strikes or lock-outs during the war; all disputes should be settled by peaceful means; the President should create a new agency to handle these disputes. The 12-man,[32] tripartite National War Labor Board functioned until December 31, 1945.[33] In the 4 years of its existence it disposed of thousands of cases through arbitration and mediation. In addition to its executive authority to settle labor disputes, it had important wage-approving duties under the amended Price Control Act of 1942.[34] As it finally evolved, the NWLB sat in Washington as a policy-determining supreme court of labor to which one of its 12 regional boards could refer leading cases and unenforceable decisions.

The enforcement of the Board's orders was once again primarily a Presidential responsibility. The War Department, the War Production Board, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and particularly the Director of Economic Stablization (under an Executive order of August 16, 1943) [35] were called upon to assist in assuring compliance with the NWLB's decisions. Labor was punished by withholding union dues, union security, and retroactive pay raises at seized plants, and by cancellation of draft deferments; management by the denial of essential fuels, material, and transportation, and the cancellation of contracts. The extent to which this business of indirect sanctions can be carried was demonstrated in the first of the two ill-tempered battles between the Government and Montgomery Ward. At one point in the pre-seizure skirmishing the Post Office Department simply withdrew 70 of its 75 employees at Ward's and refused to deliver first-class mail. The effect of this move on both Ward's business and the Nation's farm population has unfortunately not been the subject of a doctor's thesis.

The final sanction of Presidential seizure was resorted to three times in aid of the National Defense Mediation Board, about fifty times in the course of the shooting war, and eight times from September 2, 1945, to September 2, 1948.[36] The President's constitutional power to commandeer plants and industries was supplemented by several statutes,[37] especially the Smith-Connally (War Labor Disputes) Act of 1943 [38] and, in respect to transportation, the very convenient act of August 29, 1916.[39] In the light of the President's constitutional status as Commander in Chief, many of these provisions, especially section 3 of the Smith-Connally Act, were supererogatory. Usually both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman cited all their authorities in one jumbled sentence, leaving it to the commentators to determine which was the most reliable in the particular case. The pattern was set in the very first seizure of the unlimited national emergency, that of the North American Aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif., in June 1941; the President announced that he was acting pursuant to the powers vested in him by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."[40]

Such an overpowering combination was usually sufficient to convince both labor and management of the validity of presidential commandeering. Only once was this power seriously challenged in the courts. The high publicized seizures of Montgomery Ward & Co. were submitted to judicial scrutiny when the Government brought suit for a declaratory judgment to establish the legality of its possession of Ward's retail stores. The intrepid Judge Sullivan of Chicago held that the seizure was improper, since the company was engaged in distribution rather than production. The circuit court reversed this decision, and the Supreme Court held the case moot with the cessation of hostilities.[41] The President's wartime power to seize and operate industrial facilities extends far into civilian territory, especially in view of the Government's contention in the course of this litigation that

[22] Berman, op. cit., ch. 5.

[23] 40 Stat. 1766. The work of this board and pertinent statistics are presented in the National War Labor Board (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1921); A. M. Bing, Wartime Strikes and their Adjustment (New York, 1921); G. S. Watkins, Labor Problems and Labor Administration in the United States in the War (Urbana, 1919).

[24] 40 Stat. 1768.

[25] 40 Stat. 904, 1807.

[26] September 14, 1918. Report of the Activities of the War Department in the Field of Industrial Relations During the War (Washington, 1919), p. 34. See 39 Stat. 213.

[27] Bing, op. cit., pp. 73–81.

[28] The Messages and Papers of Woodrow Wilson (New York, 1924), vol. 1, pp. 515–516.

[29] Berman, op. cit., p. 151.

[30] Executive Order 9017; F. R., vol. 7, p. 237. See generally the publications and decisions of the NWLB, especially its monthly reports; L. B. Bouldin, the Authority of the National War Labor Board over Labor Disputes, Michigan L. R., vol. 43, p. 329 (1944); Wayne Morse. The NWLB, Its Powers and Duties, Oregon L. R., vol. 22, p. 1 (1942); C. E. Warne (ed.). War Labor Policies (New York, 1945); Braun, op. cit., pp. 185 ff.

[31] Executive Order 8716; F. R., vol. 6, p. 1532. See Report on the Work of the National Defense Mediation Board (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1942).

[32] In 1944 the full-time public members were increased to eight.

[33] Executive Order 9672; F. R., vol. 11, p. 221.

[34] 46 Stat. 765; Executive Order 9250; F. R., vol. 7, p. 7871.

[35] Executive Order 9370; F. R., vol. 8, 11463.

[36] See generally Ludwig Teller, Government Seizure in Labor Disputes, Harvard L. R., vol. 60, p. 1017 (1947); G. C. Vietheer, the Government Seizure Stratagem in Labor Disputes, Public Administration Review, vol. 6, p. 149 (1946).

[37] Vietheer, loc. cit., pp. 149–150.

[38] 57 Stat. 163, passed over Mr. Roosevelt's veto. This act came to an automatic end June 30, 1947.

[39] 39 Stat. 619, 645.

[40] Executive Order 8773; F. R., vol. 6, p. 2777.

[41] 58 Fed. Supp. 408 (N. D. Illinois, 1945); reversed in 150 Fed. 2d, 369 (C. C. A. 7th, 1945); certificate denied prior to circuit court's decision (324 U. S. 858 (1945)); held moot (326 U. S. 690 (1945)). See Issues Involved in the Montgomery Ward Seizure, Congressional Digest, vol. 24, p. 67 (1945); Investigation of Seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., Select Committee, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session (1944); 40 Op. Atty. Gen. 83 (1944).

the company deserved seizure because its defiance of the NWLB's orders threatened "the disintegration of the wartime structure of labor relations which * * * cannot survive successful repudiation by a company of the size and economic importance" of Montgomery Ward. This power exists at the time of this writing, as Mr. Truman's seizure of the Nation's railroads May 10, 1948 clearly demonstrated.[42]

The recent lessons concerning the delicate problems of wartime governmental intervention in labor disputes should be thoroughly studied and filed away for future use. The policies, organization, and methods of operation of the first and second national war labor boards would seem to provide satisfactory working models for a third, should the disaster of war overtake us once more. It would be advisable, however, to institute such a board on the basis of a detailed statute rather than again to throw the burden on the heavily laden Commander-in-Chief clause. The next board should have direct, legal sanctions for enforcing its orders. All this speculation depends, of course, upon whether we so much as get a chance to set up our boards and bureaus.

III

The most important aspect of the President's authority in labor disputes is his power to prevent or settle strikes that substantially endanger the health and safety of the Nation. Quite apart from the manifest threat to the national well-being presented by strike violence or the stoppage of war production is the continuing problem of strikes in the basic industries and the transportation system. The American people know from first-hand experience how injurious a widespread work stoppage in the telephone system or steel mills can be, and long before Judge Goldsborough began his lecture course for John L. Lewis we recognized that a strike of long duration in the railroads or coal mines might cause society itself to disintegrate. The powers of the President in this area flow from three main sources: his position as President, the Railway Labor Act of 1926, and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The President need not cite constitutional or statutory clauses to interpose his authority in labor disputes. For 50 years Presidents have been summoning up the prestige of their high office to persuade labor and management to do what they ought to do without persuasion. Whatever statutory techniques of governmental intervention we have at present or may develop in the future, the matchless opportunity of the President to mobilize and express public opinion remains his keenest weapon.

It is not surprising that the first unsheathing of this weapon took place in the incumbency of Theodore Roosevelt, the leading expounder if not practitioner of the "Stewardship Theory."[43] The tactics of the President in the anthracite coal strike of 1902, even his mere participation in its settlement, established impressive patterns of action for those who were to follow him.[44] The personal pleas to both camps in the struggle, the White House conference at which the contestants were reminded (in a high, shrill voice) of the public interest, the appointment without statutory authorization of an investigating commission, the promise of future administrative or legislative action to redress long-range grievances, even the preparation to mine coal with bayonets—all these things, done by Roosevelt in 1902, have been done many times since. He was accused, of course, of having acted in the interest of a second term; yet whatever his motive he forced the termination of one of the most painful disputes in American history in a neutral manner and without breaking the strike. This was the first time that a President had ever intervened to mediate a major labor dispute imperiling the health and safety of the Nation. The Rhadamanthine exertion of moral power, of which this President had more than his share, was decisive in the settlement.

"It illustrated as well as anything that I did the theory which I have called the Jackson-Lincoln theory of the Presidency; that is, that occasionally great national crises arise which call for immediate and vigorous executive action, and that in such cases it is the duty of the President to act upon the theory that he is the steward of the people, and that the proper attitude for him to take is that he is bound to assume that he has the legal right to do whatever the needs of the people demand, unless the Constitution or the laws explicitly forbid him to do it."[45]

Succeeding Presidents have invoked their prestige to ward off or end other disastrous strikes. The personal nature of the office, the fact that the President is at liberty both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can,[46] has convincing demonstration in the labor history of the twentieth-century Presidents. As might be expected, Presidents Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt intervened most repeatedly and decisively, but even Mr. Harding was sent down into the arena by the stern commands of the American public. Several more vigorous techniques have been developed since 1902. Three times (the threatened railroad strikes of 1913 and 1916 and the railroad crisis of 1946) Presidents have sought congressional aid; and four times (the bituminous coal strike of 1919,[47] the railway shopmen's strike of 1922,[48] the miners' strike of 1947,[49] and the threatened railroad strike of 1948[50]) they have taken a leaf from Cleveland's unfortunate book and secured injunctions, with varying degrees of justice and success.

This force first exerted by Theodore Roosevelt is one of those Presidential powers of customary origin that can be used for great good or greater evil. It must be exercised frugally, with impartiality and discretion, and particularly not in such a way—as we shall see that it has been on several occasions—that it cuts the ground from under regular statutory procedures of mediation and arbitration. There are limits to the use of Presidential prestige in the settlement of industrial disputes.

IV

The first of the two present-day statutes in which Congress has explicitly requested the President to be an emergency participant in labor disputes is the Railway Labor Act of 1926.[51] This law was the outgrowth of a long and educational legislative history, for in the field of labor relations, too, the railroad industry was the first to feel the strong arm of Federal power. The pioneer attempt to meet the special problem of railroad labor disputes was an act of 1888.[52] This statute, which provided for voluntary arbitration in the transportation system, singled out the President for a special role. He was empowered to appoint a temporary investigating commission to aid in settling a particular controversy, on his own responsibility or upon application by one of the parties or a State governor. The law was a failure and was used only once, when Cleveland belatedly set up a commission to report on the causes of the pullman strike. Nevertheless, the way had been pointed out for future action.

From here the long trail wound through the Erdman Act of 1898, the Newlands Act of 1913, the Adamson Act of 1916, the period of Federal control from 1917 to 1920, and the Transportation Act of 1920.[53] It was the third of these statutes, the Adamson Act,[54] that Wilson persuaded Congress to enact in an historic effort to settle a major labor dispute by direct legislative action. A struggle over the 8-hour day between the united brotherhoods and the equally united railroad industry was about to erupt into a strike when the President moved in. "I feel that I have the right, therefore, to request, and I do hereby request, as the head of the Government, that before any final decision is arrived at I may have a personal conference with you here," wrote the President to the disputants.[55] A series of White House conferences ensued directly. When the railroad managers rejected the President's proposals, he secured from Congress, in the space of 4 days, a law establishing the 8-hour day, and thus staved off a major strike. Presidential demands for drastic powers to prevent railroad strikes during national emergencies were, like similar demands in May, 1946, effectively sidetracked. This incident convinced both managers and unions that only efficient Federal administrative machinery would prevent every dispute from becoming a subject for extraordinary Presidential or congressional action, and after several more false starts a solution was reached. The Railway Labor Act of 1926 was the product of a joint committee of union and management representatives. This was one labor law that both sides wanted.

The normal administration of the Railway Labor Act is the responsibility of the National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board, two establishments quite independent of Presidential supervision. Only when a railroad labor dispute threatening "substantially to interrupt interstate commerce" cannot be settled by the regular procedures of the National Mediation Board may the President be called upon to act under section 10 of this statute. At his discretion he may then appoint

---

[42] Executive Order 9957; F. R., vol. 13, p. 2503.

[43] See his own statement of this doctrine in An Autobiography (New York, 1913), pp. 388–389, and Taft's rebuttal in Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (New York, 1916), pp. 139–147. See also M. S. Culp, Executive Power in Emergencies, Michigan L. R., vol. 31, pp. 1066, 1077–1095 (1933).

[44] Berman, op. cit., pp. 46–59; H. S. Pringle, Theodore Roosevelt (New York, 1931), pp. 264–278; Report to the President on the Anthracite Coal Strike (Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, Washington, 1903); and T. R.'s account in An Autobiography, op. cit., pp. 504–518.

[45] Ibid., p. 504.

[46] Woodrow Wilson, Constitutional Government (New York, 1908), p. 70.

[47] Berman, op. cit., pp. 176–187. This case, like so many other antistrike injunctions, went unreported. The order may be found in F. B. Sayre, Cases on Labor Law (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 757–759.

[48] *United States* v. *Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.* (283 Fed. 479 (1922); 286 Fed. 228 (1923); 290 Fed. 978 (1923)).

[49] *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258 (1947)).

[50] New York Times, May 11, June 11, July 2, 1948.

[51] 44 Stat. 577, amended by the act of June 21, 1934; 48 Stat. 1185. An act of April 10, 1936 (49 Stat. 1189), extended the provisions of this law to "common carriers by air." See generally Annual Report of the United States Board of Mediation, Nos. 1–8 (1927–34); Annual Report of the Nation Mediation Board, now in its fourteenth year; H. D. Wolf, the Railroad Labor Board (Chicago, 1927), chs. 16, 17; Millis and Montgomery, op. cit., pp. 730–748; Fisher, op. cit., ch. 5; A. R. Ellingwood, the Railway Labor Act of 1926, Journal of Political Economy, vol. 36, p. 53 (1928).

[52] 25 Stat. 501.

[53] For a summary of this legislation see the National Mediation Board's publication, the Railway Labor Act and the National Mediation Board (Washington, 1940).

[54] 39 Stat. 721, upheld in *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332 (1917)).

[55] New York Times, August 16, 1916.

a public emergency board, of whatever size and membership he thinks necessary, to "investigate and report respecting such dispute" within 30 days. For the duration of this period and another 30 days "no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose." With his decision to withhold or publish the emergency board's report and recommendations, the President's statutory competence comes to an end.

For some years the act and its emergency provisions functioned effectively, and the railroad industry was quite free of strikes. Recently, however, the emergency machinery has been overworked and circumvented, and for both these reasons the entire pattern of governmental intervention in railroad labor relations has been endangered. In the first 8 years of the act 11 emergency boards were instituted, in the next 7 only 9; in the single year 1947, 9 disputes were referred to emergency boards established under the Railway Labor Act and 13 to the temporary wartime national railway labor panel created in May 1942 to supplement the emergency procedures under section 10.[56] It is evident that these procedures have virtually become part of the regular machinery, that no major dispute is settled until it has been carried all the way. This, of course, is a result that defeats the very purpose of the emergency provisions. Moreover, informal Presidential bypassing of the Railway Labor Act has injured it considerably. President Roosevelt intervened improperly on several well-remembered occasions by setting up special fact-finding boards, persuading the carriers to grant pay increases in addition to those recommended by one of his regular emergency boards with a veiled promise that rates would also be increased, and even offering himself as arbitrator in one major dispute. Through the use of his great prestige and his status as Commander in Chief he managed to avert railroad strikes in time of war, but he did heavy damage to the act and a disservice to the Board. Nor can it be denied that the railroad strike of 1946 * * * was a direct result of the policy initiated by President Roosevelt and inherited by his successor.[57] The railroad unions had been led to believe that no President would ever countenance a Nation-wide strike, but would step in at the last moment to effect a settlement on their terms. The present efficacy of the emergency provisions of the Railway Labor Act is a matter of considerable uncertainty.

V

The emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley (labor-management relations) Act of 1947 have added, however temporarily, a stout new weapon to the President's arsenal.[58] As in the case of the Railway Labor Act, the President has little to do with the normal administration of this law. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been set up as an independent agency, although the power of the President to remove its Director is unfettered by statute; the National Labor Relations Board remains an independent commission. Title II of the act, under the heading "National emergencies," singles out the President for his new responsibility. He may participate in labor disputes under the following conditions:

"SEC. 206. Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position but shall not contain any recommendations. The President shall file a copy of such report with the Service and shall make its contents available to the public."

According to section 207 any particular board of inquiry is to be "composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine," and has the same powers as the Federal Trade Commission to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers and documents. It may "sit and act in any place within the United States" and conduct public or private hearings. Upon receipt of a board's report, which may not, in contrast to those rendered by emergency boards under the Railway Labor Act, contain any recommendations, the President "may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—

"(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

"(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate."

The anti-injunction provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932[59] are not applicable in the case of this explicitly granted Presidential power. Appeals to the higher courts are authorized.

When an injunction has been issued, the parties to the particular dispute are obligated to make every effort to come to agreement, with the help of the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Service has no power to force terms upon either party. Meanwhile the President is to reconvene the same board of inquiry. If the dispute is still unresolved after 60 days, the board "shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. The President shall make such report available to the public. The National Labor Relations Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer as stated by him and shall certify the results thereof to the Attorney General within 5 days thereafter.

At this time, or sooner, if a settlement has been reached, the Attorney General must move for a discharge of the injunction. The President is to report to Congress the facts and history of the dispute together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action. Meanwhile the strike (or lock-out) may take place without further prohibition or penalty.

Finally, this important exception must be noted:

"SEC. 212. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time."

These provisions, like the whole of the Taft-Hartley Act, are complicated, controversial, and open to conflicting interpretations. The fact that everyone in the Government seems to get in the act at one stage or another cannot, however, obscure the axial position of the President in this emergency machinery. The two most critical steps, the original constitution of a board of inquiry and the petition for an injunction, are matters for his exclusive discretion; and all through this process, from the first White House release announcing that the President is contemplating a resort to the Taft-Hartley machinery to the final recommendations to Congress, his prestige whets the edge of this statutory competence.

The background of these provisions is too familiar to require restatement. Suffice it to remark that all indications pointed to a thoroughgoing readjustment of the Wagner Act long before the Eightieth Congress arrived on the scene. The postwar rash of strikes in major industries brought on a sympathetic rash of bills in Congress; these offered every solution from compulsory arbitration to outright nationalization of basic industry. Considerable testimony concerning strikes injurious to the public interest was taken by the Senate and House Labor Committees.[60] Twenty of the twenty-two persons who discussed this problem before the House committee favored the establishment of emergency machinery; all 20 held an ingrained promanagement point of view. The spokesmen for labor, who obviously had little to do with the proceedings at any stage, were strongly opposed to these emergency powers as arbitrary, one-sided, and impossibly involved.[61] The antecedents of the various techniques in sections 206–210—the fact-finding emergency board, the cooling-off period, the district-court injunction, and the final strike ballot—are easily traced in our labor history.[62] They were thrown together by a Congress determined to do something about strikes that were manifest national emergencies. The threat of a coal strike and the actuality of a 6-week telephone strike accompanied the progress of these provisions through Congress.

Mr. Truman's disapproval of the entire Taft-Hartley Act was mirrored in his criticism of the emergency provisions. "I find that the so-called emergency procedure would be ineffective. It would provide for clumsy and cumbersome governmental intervention; it would authorize inequitable

[56] Executive Order 9172; Federal Register, vol. 7, p. 3913.

[57] H. W. Metz and M. Jacobstein, A National Labor Policy (Washington, 1947), p. 39. See also Elinore M. Herrick's provocative article, Intervention in the Coal Strike, New York Herald Tribune, April 20, 1948.

[58] Public Law 101, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (June 23, 1947).

[59] 47 Stat. 70.

[60] See Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947); Labor Relations Program, hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U. S. Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).

[61] See the House minority report on H. R. 3020, Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, National Labor Relations Board (Washington, 1948), vol. 1, pp. 390–398.

[62] The evolution of the emergency provisions embodied in the original House and Senate bills may be traced in Legislative History, vol. 1, pp. 87–92, 146–151, 214–219, 274–279, 567–569. The Case bill (H. R. 4908, 79th Cong., 2d sess., sec. 6) provided for Presidential fact-finding boards and a 35-day cooling-off period.

injunctions; and it would probably culminate in a public confession of failure. I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes." [62] This was the sum of the President's low opinion of sections 206–210. His own recommendations for a solution to this problem—fact-finding boards and a joint investigating commission—had been embodied in several postwar messages to Congress.[64] The Taft-Hartley provisions were far more than he had requested or was apparently willing to receive. Nevertheless, with the passage of the act over his veto the President stated, "It has become law * * * I shall see that this law is well and faithfully administered." And like many another President before him he seems to have felt no qualms about using a statute of which he had warmly and constitutionally disapproved.

Indeed, Mr. Truman should be the last man to engage "in a public confession of failure" concerning these emergency provisions. With the yeoman aid of C. C. Ching, Tom Clark, and Dr. John R. Steelman (his own special instrument for exercising Presidential powers in labor disputes), the President has made this part of the act work surprisingly well. The emergency machinery has been set in motion on seven occasions; in four of these instances the Attorney General has obtained an injunction. The facts of these disputes should be briefly reviewed.

The President's first use of his emergency powers was initiated March 5, 1948, more than 8 months after they had been placed in his hands. He couldn't have picked a more suitable industry in which to test his authority. A sharp dispute between 1,000 workers affiliated with the Atomic Trades and Labor Council (AFL) and the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp., operating agency for the Atomic Energy Commission of the Government's Oak Ridge plant, ran the full course of the emergency provisions: a three-man board of inquiry,[65] a report to the President that a work stoppage would endanger the Nation's safety, an 80-day injunction (issued by Judge George C. Taylor in Knoxville, March 19),[66] a reconvening of the board, a secret vote by the union to reject the company's final order, a dissolution of the injunction, and at the last moment a settlement with the aid of the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The proceedings were tedious and cumbersome, but they were also successful. A solution was freely reached and there was no strike. It should be noted in passing that the special problems of labor relations in atomic energy projects are now under study by a Presidential board of inquiry consisting of William H. Davis, Prof. Edwin E. Witte, and Aaron Horwitz. The appointment of this board September 3, 1948, was the most outstanding recent instance of nonstatutory Presidential intervention in labor relations.

Nine days after he had appointed the first board Mr. Truman acted again, this time in a dispute between some 90,000 members of the United Packinghouse Workers of America (CIO) and the meat packers. His only action in this instance was the appointment of a three-man board.[67] In the face of this order and a personal plea from Mr. Truman the strike got under way 2 days later. No injunction was ever issued because, with the AFL workers still on the job, the industry was by no means tied up. The strike lasted more than 2 months until the men finally returned to work on the packers' terms. This dispute demonstrated that the President has no power to stop a strike until after the board reports, a truth already pointed out to Congress in the President's veto message.

The third and sixth occasions for employing the emergency provisions involved John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers of America. The facts of his two 1948 tussles with the mine owners are far too scrambled to be set forth here, what with the President, John L. Lewis, T. Alan Goldsborough, Robert Denham, Ezra Van Horn, Speaker Martin, Styles Bridges, Tom Clark, Dr. Steelman, assorted Federal judges and process servers, southern operators, and miners on a holiday storming across the stage and back with "drums, flourishes, and shouts of the people within." The President appointed two boards of inquiry, March 23 and June 19; [68] the Attorney General secured a temporary restraining order April 3 and a full injunction April 26. In the second dispute there was no need for an injunction, although General Counsel Denham of the NLRB obtained one for his own purposes, i. e., forcing Lewis to recognize the designated industry representatives as bargaining agents. It was for disregarding the order of April 3 that Goldsborough imposed heavy fines on Lewis and the UMW.

An emergency board was appointed May 18 to inquire into a dispute between the long-lines workers of the American Union of Telephone Workers (CIO) and A. T. & T.[69] Hearings were postponed at the request of both parties, who were able to reach terms June 4.

Next, the President intervened in a Nation-wide dispute in the shipping industry with mixed results. A scheduled strike of seven of the sea-going unions was blocked by the issuance of a series of 10-day restraining orders in New York, Cleveland, and San Francisco on June 14. A five-man emergency board, appointed June 3,[70] had reported 8 days later that a strike in this industry would seriously menace the national health and safety. The walk-out was subsequently enjoined the full 80 days. Although the east-coast unions and employers were able to come to terms on the major points of contention (wages and the hiring hall) before the expiration of the injunction September 2, no agreement could be reached on the west coast. With the dissolution of the injunction the strike was on; the President made clear at his September 2 press conference that his emergency powers were at an end. The strike, one of the most costly in our maritime history, was not terminated until early December.

Finally, a strike of 45,000 east-coast members of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL) was put off from August 21 to November 9 by order of the New York District Court. In this instance, too, the dissolution of the Federal injunction was the signal for the strike to begin. The duration of this costly stoppage was 18 days. The most instructive aspect of this seventh instance of Presidential intervention under the Taft-Hartley law was the speed with which the three-man board carried out its task; the members were named August 17,[71] held their hearings August 18, and reported to the President August 19.

It is far too early to sit in certain judgment on the emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act. This machinery (or whatever the Eighty-first Congress may wish to substitute for it) must be tested on other occasions, by other Presidents and their labor trouble shooters, and under other conditions than the tense yet prosperous days through which we are presently passing. Provisions that now seem effective and reasonable might yet prove fruitless and dangerous, and the machinery could, like that of the Railway Labor Act, be so overworked that it would become an accepted part of the normal process of collective bargaining in the basic industries. Nevertheless, several facts seem clear on the basis of these pioneer experiences:

1. The provisions have thus far been used with discretion. All the industries in question were "basic," and the actual or probable work stoppages were definite threats to the national health and safety.

2. At least two distressing strikes were successfully balked, two postponed. Injunctions under this act are not likely to be flouted, not after Lewis's unprofitable passage at arms with Judge Goldsborough.

3. This does not, however, represent a revival of "Government by injunction." [72] It is absurd to equate section 208 of this act with the injunction craze of 1880–1930. This is the President of the United States seeking to prevent a national calamity, not a group of employers bent on breaking a strike or wrecking a union with the aid of some notoriously antilabor court. This Presidential power may yet be abused, but so may all his mighty prerogatives. It should be noted that no injunctive period can exceed 80 days; no matter how many temporary restraining orders precede the final injunction, it must be dated back to the first order. Nor, it seems clear, may the President pile one injunction on another.

4. The processes of free collective bargaining have not been damaged in any of these instances. No one has been forced to settle on the Government's terms.

5. The President's powers under this act have been, and will doubtless continue to be, exercised by one of his administrative assistants. From now on one of the "anonymous six" will be a loyal follower trained in labor relations and known to both labor and management as intelligent and fair-minded. It would perhaps be advisable for the President to revive the moribund Office for Emergency Management and put his assistant at its head as his general emergency aide. Other parts of the emergency machinery would seem to be little more than "window dressing." Once a President has made up his mind that a strike or threatened strike is a national emergency, no three-man board is going to tell him that it isn't; nor is his Attorney General's request for an injunction likely to be refused.

6. The last step in this emergency procedure, congressional action directed to the settlement of a particular dispute, should not be held in scorn as impractical and ineffective. The passage of the Adamson Act in 1916 shows how swiftly Congress can move in a manifest national emergency. Should Congress be adjourned, the President would have plausible grounds for calling a special session.

7. Finally, whatever the Eighty-first Congress elects to do with the rest of the Taft-Hartley Act (and it apparently elects to do it to death), these emergency provisions would seem to have at least a sporting chance of survival. In their recent, post-election calls for a swift repeal of the slave-labor bill, even William Green, J. Howard McGrath, and Maurice Tobin have publicly acknowledged the necessity for some sort of governmental authority to cope with labor-

[62] His veto message of June 20, 1947, may be found in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 93, p. 7485, or Legislative History, p. 915.

[64] See President Truman's Plan for Labor Fact-Finding Boards, Congressional Digest, vol. 25, p. 10 (1946).

[65] Executive Order 9934; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 1259.

[66] New York Times, March 20, 1948.

[67] Executive Order 9934A; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 1375.

[68] Executive Order 9939; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 1579; Executive Order 9970; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 3333.

[69] Executive Order 9959; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 2707.

[70] Executive Order 9964; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 3009.

[71] Executive Order 9987; Federal Register, vol. 13, p. 4779.

[72] For a history of the labor injunction, see Frankfurter and Greene, op. cit., pp. 2–47. See also Millis and Montgomery, op. cit., pp. 629–651.

management controversies that endanger the national welfare. In the light of his 1948 performance, Mr. Truman would be guilty of outright frivolity to permit an off-hand repeal of the emergency provisions. No longer can the public interest in the prevention of major strikes be legislatively ignored.[73] A new economic situation has called for the creation of new powers and governmental machinery, and although more democratic and effective methods could and may be evolved, there must be no complete retreat from this forward position. Just for the record, here are some of the additional solutions that have been proposed in the last few years: to institute a system of compulsory arbitration by Presidential emergency boards in all industries covered by the Taft-Hartley and Railway Labor Acts, a drastic step that neither labor nor management cares to contemplate, and with reason; [74] to grant the President the power of seizure in time of peace,[75] a direction in which the States are moving gingerly; [76] to strengthen the Taft-Hartley Act by empowering the President to seek permanent injunctions; [77] to forbid absolutely all strikes in basic industries, an ultra-conservative scheme justly countered by some of the labor unions with proposals for nationalization; and lastly, to permit strikes to take place in the normal course of events but grant the Government large emergency decree powers for purposes of rationing scarce goods and controlling their distribution. Such an act would be based on the British Emergency Powers Act of 1920.[78] Some of these proposals are thoughtful, some absurd, some downright dictatorial and not to be countenanced. The important thing to note is that each recognizes the exclusive responsibility of the President as protector of the peace. Any solution that ignores that fact is doomed to failure.

The President's position in labor disputes is as delicate as his powers are vast. As the final guardian of the public interest he must stand clear of partisanship and wield his weapons with discretion and economy. He must avoid using them in such a manner that one of the parties to a dispute will go out of its way to invite intervention. He must recognize that his powers in this field are emergency powers only, and that the regular processes of collective bargaining and of Government mediation and conciliation are not to be disturbed. He must resist the temptation to interpose his prestige in disputes that are being threshed out, however slowly, by regular statutory and administrative machinery or he will pull down the whole structure of governmental intervention about his ears. Equality for both and vigilance for the public welfare must be the President's high resolve.

And vast though his powers are, we are better off with them than without them. It is reassuring to know that in an economic system that invites and rewards the struggle for self-interest, there is in this direction a boundary beyond which the contestants will push at their peril—and a sheriff to patrol it.

[73] An admirable treatment of the public interest is Jesse Friedin's The Public Interest in Labor Dispute Settlements, Law and Contemporary Problems, vol. 12, p. 367 (1947).

[74] See the address of Senator WILEY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 93, A1034 (Mar. 17, 1947), and the proposals of Representatives CASE of New Jersey, HALE, HERTER, HESELTON, and AUCHINCLOSS, discussed at length in the House hearings, vol. 5, pp. 2896–2930. See also Should the Federal Government Require Arbitration of Labor Disputes in All Basic American Industries? Congressional Digest, vol. 26, p. 193 (1947); Millis and Montgomery, op. cit., pp. 792–829; Julia E. Johnsen, editor, Compulsory Federal Arbitration of Labor Disputes (New York, 1947); Ludwig Teller, Management Functions Under Collective Bargaining (New York, 1947), pp. 326–338.

[75] See the remarks of Representative JAVITS, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 93, p. 3637 (Apr. 17, 1947). The operating problems that face the Government after seizure are indicated by Vietheer, loc. cit., pp. 154–156; Teller, loc. cit., pp. 1056–1057; Executive Commandeering of Strike-Bound Plants, Yale Law Journal, vol. 51, pp. 282, 289–298 (1941).

[76] Teller, loc. cit., pp. 1044–1048.

[77] See the proposals of Representative John F. KENNEDY, Legislative History, vol. 1, pp. 406–407. He would have such injunctions strictly limited, and obtained in the Supreme Court. The present Court has gone a long way, but I doubt that it will go back on *Marbury* v. *Madison*.

[78] 10 and 11 Geo. V, ch. 55. See C. L. Rossiter, Constitutional Dictatorship (Princeton, 1948), pp. 172–177. The coal-conservation orders of the ODT in the 1946 coal strikes are an example of this sort of power.

To Keep Our Freedom Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Dave Beck, executive vice president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America at Minneapolis, Minn., on March 31, 1949:

TO KEEP OUR FREEDOM SAFE

President RUSSELL C. DUNCAN, of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Abraham Lincoln once said, "Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed." We, here in Minneapolis, are not unmindful of the part which labor plays in today's commerce—locally, nationally, and internationally. As tonight's speaker, our program committee has selected a man who has played an important part in organized labor. Dave Beck is executive vice president of the Teamsters' International Union. His headquarters are in Seattle, Wash. Dave Beck left high school after 3 years to drive a laundry truck. Not being satisfied with his high-school education, he took university extension courses in economics, law, business administration, and English. His interest in American education is indicated further by the fact that he now serves as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Washington.

Dave Beck has the reputation of being one interested in the advancement of the American free-enterprise system. He has played an important part in defending what America stands for. In World War I he joined the Navy as a machinist's mate and flew over the North Sea in Curtiss flying boats on anti-Zeppelin patrol.

Ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in introducing Mr. Dave Beck. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVE BECK. Governor Youngdahl, Mayor Hoyer, President Duncan, of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, distinguished guests, my associates in labor, members of the chamber of commerce, and friends, I appreciate this opportunity to come to Minneapolis and to contribute, if I can, for consideration by the people of this area, some of the thoughts which are in the minds of the men and women of labor.

Before saying what is on my mind, however, I wish to voice a definite and distinct protest. I know that there must have been some objections in the membership of the chamber of commerce to inviting a representative of labor to address this great organization. Yet, in all my experience in the trade-union movement, this is the first time they ever appealed to the Almighty to create a weather condition to keep me away. [Laughter and applause.] [It snowed heavily all night and day.]

COULD SETTLE DISPUTE

I want to say in answer to the challenge of my good friend, Governor Youngdahl, that if I were the Governor of the State of Minnesota I would settle the strike of local union No. 544, in which employers in the vicinity of Minneapolis are involved, not later than Sunday night. [Laughter.] I would do it by the following procedure: I would notify the company concerned that unless it reaches a settlement with the union by Sunday night, I would lock their representatives up in the room in the State Capitol with representatives of the union, let them take their lunches in with them, and make them stay there until they settled their dispute. [Applause.] As spokesman for the Teamsters' International Union, I authorize this course of action, and I hereby notify Vice President Sidney L. Brennan that, effective immediately upon the conclusion of this meeting, he is to concentrate all of his efforts and give all of his time to the settlement of this matter.

I would like to take the text for my extemporaneous talk here tonight from the remarks of a speaker earlier in the evening. It is not our aim to tear down, but rather to develop better relationships between labor and capital, through a greater recognition and understanding of the principles which underlie this great Government, so that we may continue the prosperity of this, the greatest Nation in all the world—the Nation which, under the free enterprise and profit motive system, is feeding the entire world; the Nation that under free enterprise is supplying the money for socialized England and other countries which have gone far to the left—and we are doing it through cooperation between capital and labor.

FREE ENTERPRISE BEST SYSTEM

Under free enterprise this country of ours has developed into the greatest nation on earth. The working people of no other country under the sun enjoy as fine conditions of employment, or as high a standard of living, as we enjoy who are members of labor in the United States. I say to my associates in labor, and to industry as well, and even to those who would tear our Government apart: We have made our tremendous progress in labor, and our great industrial development, under free enterprise.

I call upon all who lead labor, and also upon those who lead capital, to redouble their efforts to bring about greater cooperation, to meet across the conference table—with an honest and sincere desire to reach common grounds of agreement, and undertake to solve their problems—for none of their problems are unanswerable.

Unless we adopt such a policy and such a procedure, there will be no freemen, no free labor unions, and no free enterprise. We cannot have a free country unless we have freemen. We cannot remain free unless we merit that freedom by our own intelligent effort. We cannot have freemen unless we have a government based on freedom, which accords to all men and women the freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and freedom to conduct themselves in harmony with the dictates of their own consciences. All these rights to freedom must be recognized, unquestioned.

Above all else, we must respect and defend religion, for if we ever destroy religion, or permit it to be destroyed, we will have lost our safest guide toward progress. If we ever see the time when an oath taken in the presence of the Bible shall be disregarded, then indeed will our civilization come crashing down.

We have other responsibilities as well. We must increase the production of the men and women of labor. We must not stop or delay, we must help speed up the mechanization of industry. We must not interfere in the slightest degree with the developing processes that have made this Nation what it is today.

We cannot compete in the markets of the world, and maintain our American standard of living, and our conditions of employment, unless we are able to do so by greater production schedules and by using to the maximum the ingenuity of capital and the inventive genius of our people. Only by the constructive efforts of capital and labor, working together in unity, can we meet competition in world markets, where such competition is often the fruit of toilers not nearly so well rewarded as our own. [Applause.] We must never permit those in competitive industry to bottle up our inventive progress.

LABOR DEVELOPMENT IN ECONOMIC FIELD

The Governor, earlier in the evening, commented upon remarks which I made with respect to politics. Some of you may disagree with me, and I hope and pray that the time will never come in this country when you will lose your right to disagree; I hope the time will never come when an honest difference of opinion will be denied to the men and women of either labor or capital. I say to you that the American labor movement was developed on the economic field. I trust and hope that American labor will never become involved as an instrument of politics. But, let us, for a moment, appeal to the common sense of those who make up America's economic, social, and business structure. Let us now appeal to reason.

If those who rule political thought in this country impose restrictive legislation upon the working people of this country, which wipes out the gains made by labor upon the economic field, then they will plunge labor inevitably into action on the political field. Whether it be a Taft-Hartley Act, or a Hobbs Act, or any other type of legislation that takes away from the men and women of labor the things they have won through economic action, if such legislation remains long on the statute books, in my personal opinion, for whatever it may be worth, the leaders in this system of free enterprise of ours will be flirting with destiny. The spectre of socialism will indeed soon be hovering over us.

REVIEWS BRITISH EXPERIENCE

Let us in retrospect review the events in England which developed the pattern from which resulted the condition of today. It was a mining dispute, which developed into a general strike, in 1926, which caused those who opposed labor to inflame the public mind of Britain against the unions. As a result, the Parliament passed restrictive laws which set the British labor movement back 50 years. Labor in England has always been more political than economic. In this respect it has been the direct opposite of American labor. The enactment of repressive laws was the immediate cause of plunging the British labor movement more deeply into politics. With what result? British labor did not attain its goal of repealing that restrictive legislation in a year, or in 5 years, or in 10, or in 20. Yet, it continued to develop politically, and to grow, and to expand. At the end of World War II, when there was turmoil and confusion in the British Empire, British labor defeated the man who contributed more to the preservation of his homeland than any other man in history—Winston Churchill.

British labor then took over the machinery of government. It proceeded, as rapidly as possible, with a definite plan to socialize industry. It socialized the Bank of England, the transportation industry, and many others. It is still moving toward an even greater degree of socialism.

Let me ask you this: What man in American industry wants to pay such a price for whatever temporary advantages he might gain through oppressive labor laws?

I say to you: It can happen here. There are organized today in this country between 14 and 15 million working men and women. If, driven to unified action, they become 25 percent as effective in the field of politics, as they have been in the field of economics, they can and they will, in my judgment, rock the entire structure of our free-enterprise system.

OPPOSES SOCIALIZATION

I am one man in labor who does not believe in that philosophy. I am unalterably opposed to the socialization or the communizing of any part of our industry or business. Yet, I am not afraid to face the facts. I ask capital to face them, too, and to meet labor half way in reaching that common ground upon which we can best defend our American way of life.

My friends, we must solve our problems through the processes of evolution. We must call upon the brains and ingenuity and the honesty and integrity and character of men and women, regardless of whether they come from labor or from capital or from that great cross section of the public which is not identified with either side of industrial disputes. We must solve our problems across the conference table.

Lately, the international union which I have the honor to serve has set out upon a campaign across America that is known as an over-the-road checking drive. Newspapermen, radio commentators, magazine writers, and many others overnight have developed in their own minds some overt action on our part, in contradiction to the welfare of industry and the general public. Yet, what are the facts?

We are conducting this over-the-road checking campaign as much in the interest of the capital investment in the industry—the trucking industry of America—as for the welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Why are we doing this? Because we sincerely believe in studying our industries, analyzing their problems, and helping to solve them.

I point out to you what we learned long ago: No one can take good wages, hours, and working conditions from a bankrupt concern.

MUST KNOW OUR INDUSTRIES

Therefore, we must know our industries, study them, analyze them. We must analyze the trucking industry, for instance, not only from the standpoint of the wage earner, but also from that of the manager and the stockholder, and from that of the public. We must study the competitive factors, such as the railroads, and unfair competitors, such as gypsy operators.

I say to you there must be honest, effective regulation of the competitive trucking industry, because if we do not regulate it fairly and effectively this great industry is headed for trouble—financial loss—and let us not forget for one instant that thousands of American towns and communities depend entirely upon the trucking industry for the necessities of life. I do not mean regulation by the present procedure of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the ICC, and many of the State regulatory bodies, are failing to do their job of regulating this industry in the public interest and in the interest of those who are employed in it and those investors who put up the capital to finance it. If this lack of fair regulation continues, the trucking industry, and the railroads as well, will one day come very near the destruction of their capital investments.

Today we regulate all forms of competitive industry under our free-enterprise system when they reach the point of development that requires regulation to protect both the industries and the public welfare.

There is nothing new about regulation of business. We can find instances of regulation as far back in history as the reign of King John in England when the Government regulated a ferry-boat operation in the public interest.

REGULATION MUST BE EFFECTIVE

Today, in America, utility and transportation companies are regulated; rates are made, or established, or denied and vacated by State and Federal bodies. This regulation must be swift and certain; it must be honest and effective, or it is worthless. In our over-the-road check of truck drivers, we will develop many facts which relate to the honesty and effectiveness of both Federal and State regulation. The data we will collect may well prove of inestimable value to the industry from which so many of our members, directly or indirectly, derive their living.

Let me point out to you tonight another abuse that is giving our trucking industry a great deal of trouble, and is working to the disadvantage of the public as well. I refer to the practice of States in setting up artificial barriers which interfere with the free flow of interstate commerce over the highways. In some instances, States have created regulations limiting the weights, size, length and efficiency of trucks, to the great detriment of the industry and the public.

In many instances these regulations differ from State to State, with the result that operators who haul freight in interstate commerce, and who thereby serve the public interest, are often forced to unload their vehicles partially at certain state lines. All this adds to the expense of transportation which the consumer must bear in the end. It does not in any sense serve the public interest. Such regulation tends to destroy the industry, or to prevent it from rendering the type of service to which the public is entitled and which the public has a right to expect.

ABUSES NEED CORRECTING

That abuse must be corrected; that type of interference with interstate commerce must stop. We know full well that this business of erecting barriers at state boundaries to hamper the trucking industry has been influenced by the railroads and others. Such strategy by the competitors of the trucking industry is like using the technique of the Taft-Hartley Act or the Hobbs Act—unfair legislative action against the trucking industry to bring about its destruction through increased costs to the consuming public, both individuals and industries.

COMMON CARRIER IS TARGET

We know that there are thousands of farmers who own trucks and who haul their own merchandise to the market. We have no objection whatever to this. The farmers have a right to do this without the slightest interference from any man or organization. Yet, when the farmer has completed his haul to the city market, if he attempts to haul goods back to other farmers or merchants in his area, he is no longer engaged in the necessary work of running a farm. He becomes a common carrier by motortruck and, as such, he should be, and he must eventually be subject to just as strict and effective regulation as other common carriers who do not happen to operate farms. For, if the farmer is permitted thus to operate

as a common carrier, without regulation, he will injure the transportation system upon which millions depend. He must also be subject to the same safety regulations in the operation of his equipment to protect the public on the highways.

So, we are making an over-the-road check, from coast to coast, for the purpose of obtaining facts from which we can analyze our industry. In this way we will contribute to the solution of the problems of our industry—selfishly, if you will—so that we may receive from that industry a fair share of the prosperity which it earns. We cannot receive any return if our industry is bankrupt.

I do not have the slightest fear of contradiction when I say to you that, from this over-the-road checking campaign we will be able to point out accurately not one, but thousands of violations of the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of the various State commissions, which have been set up so that our free-enterprise system can function in fairness to all concerned. These violations exist because inefficient, or insufficiently financed commissions, are not functioning at all.

INDUSTRY MUST PROSPER

Of course I am interested in the prosperity of industry. I know that it has often been said that Beck is in collusion with employers to pyramid prices in contradiction to the public interest. Let us analyze such statements and see their absolute fallacy. Let us take Minneapolis, as an instance. Would it be intelligent action on the part of the teamsters in Minneapolis to enter into collusive agreements for the purpose of pyramiding prices in the laundry industry, where we have perhaps 400 men employees, while we have 23,000 men and women in the teamster organization who must purchase the service rendered by the laundries? What a fallacy!

ALL NEED TO PROFIT

Yes, we are interested in the laundry industry making a profit. We are interested in the farmer making a profit, and in the dairymen earning profits, and in the manufacturers making a fair return on their invested capital, because if they do not make profits our system of free enterprise will crash. If we lend encouragement and vision and understanding to those who understand the inner workings of the industries which give us our employment, and if we sit down with management in an effort to find ways to make our industries more profitable; if our secretaries and business agents and shop stewards are trying honestly to increase their production schedules, we know that out of that increased production will flow greater prosperity. By reason of it there will be lower prices to the consumers, which will cause demand to increase and thereby bring about industrial expansion, greater consumption, and even greater employment. That is the kind of labor relations I wish to visualize in this country, and to give added impetus. [Applause.]

Some irresponsible columnists, men who have motives other than the development of our country and our industries by finding happy solutions for the problems of labor and capital, accuse the men of labor of being racketeers. I bow my head in humble and sincere apology to both industry and the general public: I admit there have been men of labor who forgot their trust, who were faithless, and who were weak.

SOME FORGET TRUSTS

Yet, others, too, have forgotten their trust. There was a man in labor a few years ago who went up the river in New York for racketeering, but right across the hall from his cell was the former president of the New York Stock Exchange, who also had forgotten his trust. There have even been men who wore the frock of the church, who had dedicated their lives to Christ, who were false to their sacred vows and who forgot the ideals which should actuate all honest men.

Let me say in concluding my remarks on this subject: It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Prisons and Paroles Board of the State of Washington for about 14 months. I had to go over to the city of Walla Walla and sit as a board member to pass upon the applications for paroles and to recommend clemency to the Governor in cases where our consciences dictated that certain men and women should again be given their freedom. I make this statement, and I have repeated it before Rotary Clubs and chambers of commerce in many cities: during the time I was on the prisons and paroles board we had more bankers in that institution than we ever had labor leaders in the entire history of the school on the hill. [Applause.]

I do not condemn all bankers, however, because there have been men of that profession who transgressed the law and who committed overt acts against the welfare of the public, and thereby ended up in the penitentiary at Walla Walla, Wash. Banking is an honorable profession whose members perform a useful and necessary task in the workings of our complicated economy. Many bankers are my warm friends. Nor should the public condemn all labor, and all labor leaders, because a few went wrong.

WAS INVESTMENT BANKER

I was much amused some time after I had related my experience as a member of the Washington State Prisons and Paroles Board when, as I was about to address the Northwest Progress Conference—I had been invited by the publisher of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, who was serving as chairman that year—when a man who identified himself as the president of a Seattle bank, said to me:

"Mr. Beck, I am a little bit afraid that you are going to mention that Walla Walla incident again. If you do, I wish you would emphasize one thing. Please state that they were not commercial bankers; they were investment bankers." [Laughter.]

Therefore in my desire to be fair I said, when I related the incident, that they were investment bankers. I hope that my good friends in the banking profession, and I have many of them, will find some consolation in that charitable expression of mine—they were investment bankers. [Laughter.]

We in free America are today facing a serious problem. It is one that we must deal with directly and positively. We dare not temporize with it. We must not attempt appeasement. I speak of the infiltration of communism and of the acts of those who are not true Americans. We must eradicate them from our society before they find the means to destroy the freedom and the liberty which they now abuse. [Applause.] I do not care where we find them, whether it be in the labor unions or in the teaching faculties of our universities—we must throw them out. [Applause.] I had the privilege as a member of the board of regents of the University of Washington not long ago to help in doing just that. [Applause.]

NO ROOM FOR COMMUNISTS

I hope that our action will be emulated in every university and in every school in the Nation. I say to you that we did not interfere with academic freedom in the slightest degree. We are not, however, going to give those who teach doctrines contrary to true Americanism the right to enter our public forums, either in labor or in education, there to enunciate a philosophy that is being used as a tool to undermine our Government and its free institutions. If we fail to rid ourselves of these disloyal people, then we are not entitled to be recognized as sponsors of good citizenship. [Applause.]

I am in favor of taking the initiative and putting the Communists on the defensive. Let us turn the spotlight of publicity upon these people. Let us know who they are, and where they are spreading their poison, and let's stop coddling them.

SEEK TO UNDERMINE LABOR

Communists come into our labor organizations, and into other groups of our society, not to promote and obtain better wages, hours of toil, and conditions of employment. They are not honestly interested in improving American living standards. They come in to destroy, to breed dissension, to create turmoil, and misunderstanding. The philosophy which they advocate is not intended to build better relationships, or to advance the interests of labor and capital in our free enterprise system—their known objective—about which they boast openly in their Russian press, is to tear down the basic structure of our Government and our economy and to replace it with a communistic dictatorship. I say that is their known objective. There can be no possible room for doubt about it. Since we know this to be true, how, in the name of the Almighty, can we excuse ourselves as Americans if we sit supinely and tolerate them? We will not tolerate them inside the teamsters union. Where and when we find them, we throw them out, and if the door does not happen to be open at the time, they go through it anyway. [Applause.]

I would not deny to any man or woman the right to be a Democrat or a Republican or a member of any other political party, but the Communists do not constitute a political party in the meaning of that term in America, for they are not committed to serve the interests and welfare of our country; they are agents of an alien power which is the antithesis of America. They get their orders from that foreign power and they are traitors to the United States of America. [Applause.] They will destroy religion and the church, if they can, because they see in it a great enemy of communism.

WE ARE UNITED AGAINST TRAITORS

Many of us had to fight our way up. We came from poor families. A great many of you who are before me tonight, toiled and fought your way to the economic positions you now hold. If you did not, probably your fathers did it for you and you carried on. The men and women who founded this Nation suffered dire privations so that their children could build the great industrial structure of America. They hewed a nation out of the forests and the mines and plowed it out of the fertile plains. I may disagree with thousands of businessmen, and labor in America may disagree most heartily with many leaders of industry upon the field of economics, but we have one broad, common ground—we love our country and we will fight for it. We will join our hands and we will unite our forces to hurl back the Communists.

We will never tolerate the teaching to our children the falsehoods of communism, or the philosophy which finds no room for God and religion. So long as we live in the full confidence in the wisdom of the Supreme Being who guides our destinies, we will never accept the apostles of atheism. When we place our hand on the Holy Bible and swear to tell the truth, our consciences do not permit us to speak falsely. I repeat, when this very ideal is cast aside, our civilization will totter on its foundations.

The most important thing in our economic life is to protect and to preserve our free American way, and to build good relations between labor and capital.

Oh, yes; we will make mistakes along the way. The men and women of labor are not immune to error, nor are the men and women of capital. Nor are those who speak for us

and who lead us in matters of government in city, State, or Nation. We are, however, a people and a country experienced in the trial and error method; we admit our mistakes and we continue to go forward, up the hill ahead of us, to a better way of life than we have ever known.

FREE ENTERPRISE OUR BEST HOPE

The only hope for the preservation of our way of life, for the betterment of the conditions and standards of those who toil, lies in our system of free enterprise—a system that permits each man and woman to rise by reason of ability, to start new enterprises, to employ the people, to give them the benefits of progress. We must consecrate ourselves to the attainment of an even better free America; we must destroy all outside influences and interests that would interfere with our forward progress, and, by cooperative agreement between labor and capital, solve our problems together.

May our labor organizations in Minneapolis, and the labor movement of the entire United States, hold out the right hand of fellowship to capital. Let us set our feet firmly upon the one pathway which we can follow together and thereby protect and advance this great Nation of ours to finer attainments in the years to come, thus preserving for generations yet unborn the precious rights and liberties which so many generations, long since forgotten, struggled so courageously to win for us. I thank you. [Applause.]

The Canadian Portion of the Columbia River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia River crosses international as well as State boundaries, and the Dominion of Canada will stand to benefit along with the United States from a full development of Columbia Basin resources. The CVA bill, H. R. 4268, which I have introduced recognizes the joint interest of the two neighboring Nations by declaring:

The cooperation of the Dominion of Canada and its Provinces and other political subdivisions shall be sought to the end that the development and conservation of the natural resources of the region and adjacent area in Canada may be properly integrated.

Recently I received a very kind letter from the Honorable H. W. Herridge, Member of the Canadian House of Commons for Kootenay West, enclosing a speech he made in the House of Commons on the Canadian Portion of the Columbia River Basin, Its Resources and Development. Because Mr. Herridge presents extremely important information which bears upon matters of interest to the Congress, I include his letter and portions of his speech as part of these remarks:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Ottawa, April 6, 1949.

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: As a Canadian Member of Parliament representing the constituency through which the main stem of the Columbia River flows and as a resident of the Arrow Lakes for 43 years, I am very interested in proposals for the development of the Columbia River Basin on both sides of the line.

I receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily and have noted with pleasure your interest in the development of the Columbia River Basin.

For your information, I enclose a few reprints of a speech I delivered in the House of Commons February 21 and 22 on the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin, its resources, and development. In view of our common interest and support for the development of the Columbia River Basin, I look forward to meeting you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. HERRIDGE,
Member of Parliament for Kootenay West.

SPEECH OF H. W. HERRIDGE, MEMBER FOR KOOTENAY WEST, ON THE CANADIAN PORTION OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN, ITS RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT

(Delivered in the House of Commons on February 21 and 22, 1949)

Before proceeding to deal briefly with a review of the resources of the basin, I should like to describe the basin, and I will give the official description, which is as follows:

"The Columbia River Basin is situated in the cordillera on the Pacific slope of the North American Continent where its river system comprises one of the large international drainages shared by Canada and the United States. It includes approximately 259,000 square miles, between north latitudes 41 and 53 degrees and west longitudes 110 and 124 degrees. Of this vast area, some 39,700 square miles form the southeast portion of the province of British Columbia in Canada, while the 219,300 square miles in the United States include almost all of Idaho, the greater part of Oregon and Washington, western Montana and relatively small areas of western Wyoming, northwestern Utah and northeastern Nevada. The greatest width of the basin, from western Wyoming to the Pacific Ocean, is 728 miles, and its maximum length, from its most northerly limit in British Columbia, to its southern boundary in northern Nevada, is 818 miles."

This vast area is capable of great development. The Canadian section of this huge triangle, about which I am going to speak briefly this evening, can be best described as starting from the junction of the Alberta and British Columbia boundaries with the international boundary, proceeding northwest along the ridge of the Rocky Mountain slope to the watershed of the Canoe River which flows into the big bend of the Columbia. Then it turns southwest and follows the height of land between the Columbia Divide and the Thompson Divide for possibly some 30 miles on the west side of the Arrow Lakes, and then, roughly speaking, proceeds southwest toward the international boundary at a point south of Princeton.

There are four great tributaries of the Columbia River which are of major concern to Canadians. They are the Okanagan, the Kootenay, the Pend Oreille and the Kettle. The international character of the basin is exemplified by the course of the Columbia, Kootenay and Pend Oreille Rivers, and is further demonstrated by the Flat Head, Okanagan, Similkameen and numerous smaller streams which cross the international border once or more on their way to the Columbia and its tributaries.

In order to bring to the attention of the House the great resources of the basin I will review them very briefly. I may say that my figures are based on Federal Government reports, provincial government reports, and reports issued by various organizations and commissions. They are only approximate, but they are approximately correct. The Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin has a population of approximately 125,000 people. Of that 125,000 people approximately 42,000 are urban dwellers and 83,000 are rural or country dwellers. The power resources of the Columbia River Basin in Canada amount to about 450,000 kilowatts installed at the present time. The major portion of this is the result of the developments of the West Kootenay Power & Light Co., and the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. on the lower portion of the Kootenay River where they have an installed capacity at the present time of 258,000 kilowatts. The difference between the 258,000 and 450,000 kilowatts is found in some installations on the Elk River and on various smaller streams throughout the basin. The estimated total that can be developed on the main stem of the Columbia beyond the big bend at Revelstoke and to the international boundary is 2,900,000 kilowatts. This amount can be developed with control and regulation. The estimated potential development of electrical energy in the whole of the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin is about 4,000,000 kilowatts. Therefore you can see the great possibilities for the development of power, and the opportunity to apply that power to vast and undeveloped natural resources.

At the present time the agricultural resources of the basin are extensive, although they are capable of immense development. There is a total of 305,400 acres under cultivation. Of that number 75,500 acres are irrigated. An additional 395,000 acres are in use as open grazing land. The value of the 8,000 farms in the basin, with the land, buildings and improvements, is over $60,000,000. The present annual production of fruit, dairy products, grain, livestock, poultry, seeds, hay, honey, and other farm produce, is about $35,000,000. There are still many thousands of acres to be irrigated, many thousands of acres to be cleared, and many thousands of acres to be drained.

Turning to forest resources, 13 percent of the productive forest land in British Columbia is in the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin. It is estimated there are 22,000,000,000 board feet of timber within the basin, of which amount 14,000,000,000 board feet are classified as accessible. That amount is being increased from year to year with the development of bigger logging equipment, and cheaper methods of building roads and developing communications. For some years the annual lumber cut has been over 300,000,000 board feet per year. In addition to that there is an enormous quantity of cedar poles, piling, ties, mine timber, mine props, shingle bolts, fuel wood, and Christmas trees shipped out of the basin annually.

At this point I have no hesitation in saying that one of the largest stands, and possibly the last large stand, of cedar poles on the North American Continent, is to be found in the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin. Tests by the forest products branch of the Department of Agriculture at Washington have proven that the cedar poles shipped out of the basin have the highest tensile strength of any poles shipped from Canada. That results from the fact that the trees grow in a higher climate with somewhat slower growth, and under mountainous conditions.

With respect to mineral resources, mining within the Columbia River Basin portion of British Columbia has been a major industry for the past 50 years until now the average annual production of gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, antimony, bismuth, coal, and by-products of those minerals is well over $100,000,000 a year. The largest nonferrous smelter in the British Commonwealth is operated at Trail by the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co., which also operates vast fertilizer and chemical plants.

The fish and wildlife resources of the basin are plentiful. Fish are found in the rivers, lakes, and streams throughout the whole of the Columbia River Basin, and these are replenished by artificial rearing and stocking operations carried on by the British Columbia game commission. Fur-bearing animals are plentiful in the district with an estimated raw fur value of about $100,000. There are some 500 fur farms at the present time in British Columbia with an annual production of $750,000 a year. A great number of these fur farms are located within this basin.

The basin supplies marvelous recreational resources and opportunities. Outdoor recreational facilities in the Columbia River Basin offer the largest range of sports to satisfy the most particular as to climate, scenery, altitude, transportation, and accommodations. There is no comparable region in Canada that offers such opportunities for aquatic sports, hunting, fishing, camping, mountain climbing, and skiing. With reference to skiing, I want to draw to the attention of the House to two particularly fine community developments within that basin. The first and oldest is the ski jump at Revelstoke on Revelstoke Mountain which is the result of many years of community effort on the part of the people of Revelstoke who were interested in the sport and interested in the young people of that district. Many of the world's champions have jumped on that hill, and many world records have been made as a result of the development of that hill in Revelstoke. Then we have a later development within the last 2 or 3 years on Red Mountain at Rossland where they have one of the finest ski lifts in Canada, constructed at a very considerable cost. There are excellent hills, an excellent lodge, and everything that goes to make for excellent skiing facilities, opportunities for international and intervarsity tournaments, and so on. The ski lift has been developed as a result of the community effort of the people of Rossland and the people of Trail, with excellent cooperation from the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co.

With reference to navigation resources, we have the Columbia River, of which the Arrow Lakes are an extension. You can travel from Grand Coulee to Revelstoke, a distance of over 300 miles. Year by year increasing numbers of American sportsmen and American fishermen seek the pleasure of new scenes and come up from Grand Coulee in their launches. Last summer they stopped on our beach and on the beaches of neighbors of mine, and thoroughly enjoyed themselves. Increasing numbers are making the trip as far north as Revelstoke. Then we have the steamer service of the C. P. R. on the Arrow Lakes, passenger and freight, and the same on the Kootenay Lakes. We have barge service on the Okanagan by the C. N. R. and C. P. R., and service also on the Slocan Lakes.

We know this great basin extending into Canada from the United States can be developed to its fullest extent only through cooperation between these two countries. Before adjourning the debate for this evening I want to conclude my remarks at this point by quoting from a report of a committee of Congress on the Columbia River and its tributaries, appointed in 1943 and 1944, to study the possibility of developing the American portion of the Columbia River Basin. This is what the report had to say, in part:

"From the standpoint of resources the Columbia is the mightiest stream on the North American continent; its potential almost beyond comprehension, for nature in one of her philanthropic moods fashioned the land with such perfection as is nowhere else known."

Mr. Speaker, to continue my saga of the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin, may I point out that international problems respecting waters used within the Columbia River Basin are subject to the provisions of two treaties signed between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain on behalf of Canada. These are dated 1846 and 1909. The treaty of Washington of 1846 established the international boundary between Canada and the United States west of the Rocky mountains. Article II contains a provision with respect to navigation of the main stream of the Columbia River below the boundary of British Columbia.

I had intended to deal with certain aspects of article II of the Washington treaty, but as my time is limited I shall have to leave that for another occasion. Article IX of the boundary waters treaty of 1909 provides for the founding of the international joint commission, to be composed of Canadian and American representatives. That treaty was signed, and the commission came into being under the sponsorship of the late Theodore Roosevelt, who was then President of the United States, and under the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was then Prime Minister of Canada.

I believe most honorable members recognize the fact that the international joint commission is a venture that has borne good fruit, and has stood as a lesson to the world in common sense and good will between nations. The international joint commission established its procedure on February 2, 1912. As a result of that it is now composed of three Canadians and three Americans, with a chairman acting for each section. The respective chairmen take the chair when the commission sits in the United States or in Canada.

The Canadian members at the present time are the Honorable Allison Glen and the Honorable George Spence. There is at present one vacancy. The commission has conducted many investigations and I have read with great interest many of its findings. I attended several of its hearings and am much impressed with the work it has done.

In 1941 the United States authorities applied for approval of certain levels of water that were going to be occasioned by the building of the Grand Coulee Dam. That was after the dam was built, and I intend to have something more to say about that on a later occasion. The Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in 1944 agreed upon a reference to the commission with regard to the Columbia River. The Prime Minister of this country tabled that reference in this House on March 9, 1944. I should like to quote the first paragraph of the reference because it deals in brief with the instructions to the commission with respect to the Columbia Basin investigation. That paragraph reads:

"In order to determine whether a greater use than is now being made of the waters of the Columbia River system would be feasible and advantageous, the Governments of the United States and Canada have agreed to refer the matter to the International Joint Commission for investigation and report pursuant to article IX of the convention concerning boundary waters between the United States and Canada, signed January 11, 1909."

Later the same day the Prime Minister made a statement concerning this reference to the Commission, which was a most important reference insofar as the people of the southeastern interior of British Columbia are concerned. The Prime Minister said:

"The report of the International Joint Commission will not be binding on the Governments concerned, but it is likely that the investigations of the Commission will result in suggestions and recommendations which will be carried into effect by joint action of the two Governments."

Pursuant to that reference the international Columbia River Engineering Board was appointed, composed of four members, two of whom represent Canada. The Canadian members are V. Meek, controller Dominion water and power bureau, and F. G. Goodspeed, assistant chief engineer, public works of Canada. In addition to this board, the Columbia River engineering and the Okanagan engineering committees were appointed, the Canadian members being C. E. Webb, chief engineer, Dominion water power bureau, Vancouver, and M. K. Morton, district engineer of public works, Vancouver.

Immediately after the reference was tabled a full-scale investigation was ordered and is now proceeding. This includes aerial photography, geodetic surveys, topographical mapping, bathymetric surveys, reconnaissance surveys, geological and dam-site investigations, hydrological studies, climatology, soil surveys, survey of forest resources, mineral resources, fisheries problems and recreational resources.

I understand that the estimated cost of this survey to Canada will be approximately $700,000. The entire investigation will disclose the water-power resources which in that part of the country are not now being utilized because of a lack of effective control and agreement. After the investigation is completed it is hoped that public hearings will be held at various points throughout the area particularly concerned, so that the points of view of the people and of all interests can be heard. I may say for your information that public hearings were held in various parts of Canada prior to the actual commencement of the tehcnical investigation in connection with the St. Lawrence waterway. Recently I read in both the United States and Canadian press of proposals which had been made in the United States with regard to the building of a crib dam on the Arrow Lakes for the storage of water. We all know that these are only suggestions or proposals but many people in my constituency and in the adjoining constituency are confused because they think that something is going to develop immediately as a result of these suggestions. We all know that nothing will be done until the joint international commission has reported, and that anything done then will be the result of joint action between the United States and Canada. I have here a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains a resolution presented to Congress on January 24 by Senator Mitchell. In view of the fact that my time is running out I should like to place this resolution on Hansard for the information of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the House?

Some HONORABLE MEMBERS. Agreed.

Mr. HERRIDGE. It is from the Columbia Basin Commission on the United States side of the line and reads:

"Resolved by the Columbia Basin Commission that it hereby requests the International Joint Commission to direct its international board of engineers to give priority to studies and report on the storage of water in Arrow Lakes, British Columbia, so that the commission may decide the amount of storage it will approve there, and if such report be favorable, that the Bonneville Power Administration and the United States, and the proper governmental agency of British Columbia and Canada, then proceed to negotiate for an agreement or agreements for building a storage dam at the outlet of Arrow Lakes to impound 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 acre-feet of water, whereby British Columbia will receive an estimated annual revenue of $2,500,000 to $3,500,000 and the power plants at Grand Coulee Dam and Bonneville will be enabled to produce an additional 500,000 to 700,000 kilowatts of prime power during the winter months, so that said dam may be built at as early a date as feasible, possibly by the winter of 1951–52; and be it further resolved, that the commission urge the State legislature, the Members of Congress from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, the Governors of said States, and the President

of the United States, to join in the above request to the American members of the International Joint Commission and the Premier of British Columbia and the Prime Minister of Canada to join in the above request to the Canadian members of the International Joint Commission in the hope that the threatened electrical catastrophe to the Pacific Northwest during the next 5 years may be averted, and that, instead, both the United States and Canada may have increased development and prosperity and a stronger national defense."

This resolution indicates the interest taken by Americans in the proposed developments in Canada.

I have three or four suggestions to make before concluding what I have to say today. My first suggestion is in connection with the vacancy that exists on the international joint commission. In view of the fact that some of the major decisions of that commission will concern the Province of British Columbia, and particularly the Columbia River Basin within that Province, I suggest that the present vacancy be filled by the appointment of someone resident in British Columbia who is conversant with the opportunities that are presented in the development of this basin.

My second suggestion is that consideration should be given by this Government to the development of the water resources in the basin under public ownership in cooperation with the government of British Columbia. I am recommending the establishment of a Canadian Columbia River Basin authority, and in support of that proposal I should like to quote from the minutes of a committee of Congress which sat in 1933–34 to consider this question and which reported with respect to the United States portion of the Columbia River Basin as follows:

"We believe in private enterprise; in the expectancy of rewards for honest endeavor, labor, initiative, and daring; in the things that have made America great. But some things are too big for private enterprise, and the Columbia River is one of these."

I trust that this suggestion will receive serious consideration. A most favorable situation exists with regard to the public development of the main stem of the Columbia because there is little private interest investment to consider in connection with the development of the potential 2,900,000 horsepower.

Up to date all the proposals in connection with the development of water storage and power have come from the United States side of the line; nothing has happened so far as our government is concerned. The United States are leading us in this direction. I have in my hand the Christian Science Monitor for January 24, 1949, which contains this headline: "Truman orders Columbia Valley Authority plans."

That is in connection with the United States side of the line. Farmer organizations such as the Grange, trade unions, and cooperative societies are all backing the establishment of a Columbia River Authority, but on this side our government remains dormant. I should like to quote again from the Christian Science Monitor of February 14 which contains the following report:

"It would be extremely dogmatic to assert that a river could not be developed except by a valley authority modeled after TVA. But it is irrefutable that, despite the long years of effort by our other resource development and construction agencies, and the millions of dollars of expenditures, the Tennessee is the only river that has been completely harnessed and controlled in the interests of the people."

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that members of all parties in the House would support public ownership and public development of power in an area such as this, if they appreciated the success of TVA.

My third suggestion is that, after this investigation is completed, the question of the development of the Columbia River Basin should be referred to the standing committee on mines, forests and waters to study and report on the use of power resources in the basin. A similar committee was established by Congress to study and report to Congress on the great possibilities in the United States portion of the Columbia River Basin. The people of the Columbia River Basin, which includes East Kootenay, West Kootenay, Yale, and a portion of the riding represented by the honorable member for Kamloops, Mr. Fulton, are greatly concerned in the development of the basin. They are anxious to see the establishment of the pulp and paper industry. They are concerned about secondary industries; they are concerned about the development of power for irrigation in the Okanagan district.

As a result of the interest of the people of these areas, and their understanding of the importance of the question, I have received a large number of letters suggesting that it is time for the people to hold a conference which will include representatives of all types of organizations. I suggest that farm organizations, cooperative organizations, trade unions, boards of trade, women's institutes, rod and gun clubs, municipal councils, irrigation associations, and tourist-camp operators should hold a conference in the near future in order to coordinate their ideas, and in order to be in a position to present them effectively to the commission and to the Government. I suggest that it would be wise for the cooperative organizations of the area to take the lead because they represent the larger number of people. The people do not want the policies for the development of this area determined by directors of companies who reside in Montreal and New York. They want them determined by the cooperation of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, and the people of the area. In any development financiers and industrialists, naturally enough, must first consider profits; engineers must consider kilowatts, technical details, location, and structures. It is the primary duty of the Members of this House to be concerned about the welfare of the people as a whole, and to see that these developments are carried on for their greater benefit, and to their advantage.

My fourth suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that the Columbia River Basin is rich in history and rich in possibilities for the taking of an excellent documentary film by the national film board. I believe if democracy is to function satisfactorily people must be involved in the administration of their own affairs. I believe further that governments of all kinds should do more to inform the people about the development of the country. Dry official reports and scanty newspaper articles are not sufficient. In my opinion all educational authorities should cooperate to present the facts concerning Canada in such a form as to stimulate interest, understanding, and pride in national, provincial, regional, and local developments. I think that the national film board could make a great contribution toward arousing the interest of the youth of our country by undertaking a documentary film covering the development of the Columbia River Basin. I offer that as a positive suggestion toward offsetting the forces of fascism and communism about which many people in Canada are concerned at this time, because I do not believe those forces can be overcome by verbal blasts or merely talking about them. I believe they are going to be overcome by interesting the people, and particularly the young people of the country, in the cooperative development of the resources of the Nation by Federal, Provincial, and municipal governments.

I have endeavored in the time available to present to the House some information concerning the Canadian portion of the Columbia River Basin, and I have endeavored to advance certain suggestions. I trust that many Members of the House, and the Government, will give serious considerations to my proposals. In my opinion a solution cannot be found to our problems by merely emphasizing our rights, but I do believe that we can achieve great things in the development of this basin if all the interests concerned, Federal, Provincial, municipal, corporate, cooperative, and private, are willing to accept their full share of responsibility. What an opportunity the development of the Columbia River Basin, almost unknown to the majority of the Canadian people, offers for the democratic meshing of all these interests.

The residents of the Columbia River Basin do not intend to be silent spectators in the coming drama of development but understanding and active members of the cast playing their parts with purpose, and in harmony, to the benefit of all, and to the benefit of Canada.

Druggists Are Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New Republic in its issue of April 4, 1949.

The article is a comment upon the fact that although the big drug companies are among the heaviest contributors to the fight on President Truman's national health-insurance program, an increasing percentage of the druggists favors the plan.

DRUGGISTS ARE DIVIDED

President Truman's health program is a pill that the American drug industry doesn't intend to swallow. Diligently cooperating with the American Medical Association, the large drug firms are among the top donors to the anti-public-medicine campaign.

Contributions by 26 drug companies to the National Physicians Committee, AMA ally, totaled more than $122,000 last year. Upjohn, Park-Davis, and Eli Lilly each reported $15,000 donations as required under the Lobbying Act. Other heavy contributors included Hoffman-LaRoches, Inc., and American Cynamid, $10,000; Rexall, Mead-Johnson, Abbott Laboratories, Inc., $7,500 each; E. R. Squibb & Sons, Sharpe & Dohme, $5,000 each. Johnson & Johnson, Walgreen, and 14 other drug firms reported contributions of from $500 to $4,000 apiece.

This year even greater financial assistance from the industry is expected by the private medical lobby in view of the growing public approval of national health insurance. The drug interests were warned in the current issue of their conservative trade journal, the American Druggist, which published two opinion polls showing that when the facts of the Truman health program are known, the people favor the plan. The magazine's managing editor, Bernard Zerbe, polled 2,500 druggists throughout the country and found that as of February, 16.8 percent favored national health insurance, as compared with 9.4 percent last December. Editor Zerbe had to admit, "The more the retail duggist knows about the Truman proposal for national health insurance, the more likely he is to favor it."

Another poll, appearing in the same issue, reveals that two out of three opinion leaders in American communities favor the administration plan. Conducted by Maurice Mermey, public-relations expert for several large drug firms, the poll shows that of the 1,500 presidents of civil organizations, 67 percent favor national health insurance. Mermey remarked ominously that the 67 percent "is, indeed, a significant figure, for it foreshadows the possibility of broad grass-roots support for the Truman program. * * * Advocates can be satisfied with their score among citizens' organizations, while opponents have much work and soul-searching ahead as regards this large and important area of public interest."

The outcome of the polls was so alarming that the magazine printed a separate editorial calling on the neighborhood pharmacists to explain socialized medicine and its dangers to their customers and urging physicians and pharmacists to become political as well as professional brothers in arms in the battle to preserve private medical practice.

The profits of the drug interests reached an all-time high in 1948. According to the Department of Commerce, the dollar volume for retail drug stores was $3,693,000,000—an enormous gain over the $1,562,000,000 in 1939. The industry attributes the postwar increase to the widespread lay publicity given recent dramatic developments in modern therapeutics. Actually, the industry fears that the public will stop buying patent-medicine home remedies when good medical care by competent physicians is available. The health bill now pending in Congress would limit Government payments for medicines to prescribed drugs which are unusually expensive. The list of prescription drugs would be broadened as the insurance system expands and is able to pay for more drugs.

While most of the industry cries "free enterprise versus socialization," one drug-trade journal has managed to keep its perspective. The Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter recently editorialized: "With respect to medical care, the drug industry has a unique position—a divided loyalty—and has been leaning somewhat too much toward what it has been told is the sentiment of the medical profession."

Inauguration Address by the Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S. J., President of Georgetown University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, yesterday the Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S. J., was inaugurated as the thirty-fifth president of Georgetown University, the oldest Catholic institution of higher learning in the United States.

His masterful inaugural address is worthy of the attention of scholars throughout the world, and I am happy to offer it for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD, for which purpose I ask unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we approach the halfway mark of the twentieth century, it is becoming fashionable for institutions of learning to issue a report on their raw material: man. Enjoying, as we do, the recent slide-rule computations of a sister institution in Cambridge, our task of yesterday and today has been appreciably lightened. Man, it has been discovered, travels faster and farther but sees less; he joins more organizations but discovers less ground for agreement with his fellow man; he has more means of communication but fewer words of common meaning for mutual understanding; he has more knowledge but less wisdom; more license but less liberty; more wealth but less happiness; in brief, he is a finer piece of mechanism but much less a man than his horse-and-buggy prototype.

Evidence for this summary of man's present status is abundant in current university reports. In the search for a solution to this unfortunate condition the fear has been expressed that man, under the increasing demands of advancing technology has overspecialized the individual and atrophied the social element of his nature. No longer the Protagoran measure of all things, he has become the sole measure of one fraction of one part of one thing and so finds himself reduced to the primeval hazards of the naked isolated caveman. In this contingency, the state is forced to step in for the protection of its individual members and impose a mechanized social structure from above, or from the underground, depending on whether the state operates from Olympus or the Stygian gopher-hole of the Politburo.

This hypothesis covers only part of the current situation and considers merely its secondary causes. Man is floundering today because he has lost his ultimate orientations. He is an individualist not because technological education has taught him this or that unique way of making a living; nor because economic necessity makes it imperative for him to be ruthless toward others and utterly selfish in his own interests. He is choosing bypaths and sideroads; he has run down a thousand blind alleys because his university training has conditioned him to live without God as a transcendant focal point for his thought and activities; has, on the contrary, persuaded him that all design, all purpose, all meaning, if any, are to be found in the squirrel cage of his own ego.

This indoctrination is effective for two reasons. First, man is naturally reluctant to work out any problem to its last decimal point. Hence, when the easy and particularly attractive solution of his own prideful person, apotheosized as destiny incarnate is offered him by a battery of professors properly brocaded with Ph. D.'s who is he to claim that he has been dealt a poor hand from a cold deck of cards? Secondly, no person, be he Einstein squared, can come up with the final answer, if he never learns all the elements of the problem. In this great land of free speech many schools by policy, others by law, are not permitted to disclose all the elements of the problem. This program of academic truncation has induced the prime intellectual heresy of our time; the habit of mistaking a part for the whole.

The three means by which man can attain full stature within the limits of his nature are the religious, moral, and intellectual virtues. I have listed these in the order of their essential importance. As long ago as the thirteenth century it was noted that a charwoman of that day knew more about the meaning of life than did Plato. This plenary knowledge was attributed not to her intellectual or even her moral superiority to Plato but simply to her elementary grasp of religious truths unknown to him. With equal right it can be said today that the lowliest child who has completed his penny catechism knows more about the full meaning of this atom-studded, jet-propelled, televised and UN-riddled universe than the assembled faculty of some of our universities. The reason is elementary and irrefutable. The child knows the first or ultimate causes of things; the faculty has a confused and at best inadequate grasp of secondary causes only. The difference in kind of knowledge is similar to that between the man who made the atomic bomb and the bombardier who releases it on its destructive mission.

Forced by unfortunate circumstances, all of our public and many of our private institutions of learning have abandoned the teaching of religion. It soon followed, as logically it should, that the teaching of the closely allied moral virtues was also discarded. This double default, as I said, has obliged our educational system to present to its students a truncated picture of reality. The consequences are disastrous and will grow increasingly disastrous as they pursue their logical course.

With the abandoning of Revelation in university circles, the acquisition of certain knowledge became an impossible task. Two courses were open to man. Either he was forced to fall back on his fallible reason—a tool which Moses Maimonides had long ago proved to be unequal to the problem—or, he had to resort to a fatuous liberalism, which ranges all the way from polite skepticism to the shoddy "science" (in quotes) of statistics. Preoccupation, the short span of human existence, the infinitude of the world object to be examined, as well as the finite limits of the examining faculty render man's reason inherently incapable of solving the problem. The social possibilities of liberalism, on the other hand, have always rendered this alternative attractive. Its glib versatility produces both on performer and spectator the same giddy effect as the spectacle of a tight-rope equilibrist. It is good theater, good politics, but utter irresponsibility in the face of a crisis. As things are today man must make a decision. The university often does little more than prepare him to sidestep it—gracefully. The Kremlin could ask for nothing more.

Paralleling the ouster of Revelation from our lecture halls is that of authority. Both branch from God in such a way that the rejection of one entails the rejection of the other. For authority without justice is tyranny; justice, however, is impossible without certain knowledge of rights and obligations; and certitude we have seen is lost with the abandonment of Revelation. With authority gone a specious form of liberty enters the scene. "Liberty" (again in quotes) is today's major plague. As practiced, it consists in man's right to do anything in accord with his opinion. That right, he is taught at the university, is his supreme prerogative as the citizen of a democracy. It is, in fact, indistinguishable from license. True liberty, properly defined, is man's potentiality to perform a good action. The full good, however, he cannot know for certain without the controlling assistance of Revelation. Hence, man himself and the world he lives in are at the mercy of opinion's whim.

Opinion, then, the pale image of truth, is the end product of university training today. Could Plato return, he would be astonished to find how modern educators are using his cave. The method he worked out for them in that famous parable of the seventh book of the Republic was quite different from present practice. Uneducated man, he wrote, was chained in a cave with his back to the light. All that he could see (or know) were the shadows cast by the fire against the wall in front of him. Reality—that is to say, the true and the good—chained man could not see. His world of knowledge was the shadow of reality, which is mere opinion. Plato's conception of the twofold purpose of education, therefore, was to free man from his chains and turn him from the shadowy twilight of opinion, first to the world of real

objects and finally to the sun, source of all light (or knowledge) and all reality. When we realize that for him the sun was a symbol of the divine principle, a more inspiring ideal for education is hard to conceive. A more cogent indictment of modern education cannot be imagined.

We live today and are trained to live in the shadow world of opinion. In religion, in philosophy, the arts, morality, politics, the social sciences, in all the areas dominated by man and his vital human interests, we move in the false, heady atmosphere of the race track. One man's guess is as good as another's. Secure in the "science" of his system, he is prepared to take his chance and place a bet. In short, education has trained man to make a game out of life in a way he would never try with a living.

This is laissez faire, nineteenth-century rugged individualism transplanted from the field of economics to the whole world of thought, morality, and life. It is not surprising, then, to note that states have found it necessary to control opinion exactly as they found it necessary to control economics. The state's thinking in this matter is much sounder than that of the resentful individual whose opinion is controlled. Despite the dramatic but puerile dictum of Helvetius there is nothing essentially sacred about an opinion. In fact, in the field of religion, where God has been merciful enough to reveal the truth to mankind, opinion can be blasphemous. At best, opinions are blind gropings for the truth; at worst, they are the stubborn vaporings of ignorance. Actually, an opinion is grounded on nothing but the limited experience and personal interests of the individual. It is not supported by a universal, eternal, immutable law as is truth. The state's opinion, then, is just as good, just as sacred, and just as accurate as the individual citizen's opinion or the majority opinion of all the citizens. (I need not point out how clearly Mr. Truman proved this in the last election.) With man's normal aspirations reduced by university training from a thirst for truth to the spawning of opinions, there is every reason to expect that the state for its own preservation will be forced to establish an opinion-control bureau. There are definite forewarnings of such necessity.

The universities themselves are reexamining their fabulous formula of academic freedom: That Protean pulpit whereon may mount atheist and Catholic; fellow traveler and capitalist; agnostic, liberal, dogmatist, and even an occasional teacher. It is fondly assumed that the untrained nostril of the student will unfailingly detect the sweet odor of truth from this miasma of conflicting opinion belched at him by his instructors. The formula, with all the good faith, tolerance, and urbanity in the world, is impossible. It is highballing toward self-destruction. No contradictory parts can ever add up to a whole. Truth is one, simple, and integral. Hegel's dialectical zig-zag of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis may appeal to a ballet master or the Radio City Rockettes, but it is so much philosophical balderdash to one who has seen the promised land of total reality.

Deprived of God, man will build himself an idol; shorn of revelation, he will cast a mystic aura over the dry fodder of rationalism; deprived of dogma, he will seek emotional refuge in the narcotic of epoch, that stoic suspension of judgment which renders man insensible to the petty clash of conflicting opinions; relieved of objective authority, man will have recourse to the petty might of his own finite judgment as the last court of appeal; if this fails to raise a clear voice or bring calm to confusion, he will then slide into the nirvana of license. At each descending step he has erected an idol to represent the fuller reality on the level above; he is content to accept a diminishing part as a substitute for the whole.

It is with no complacency that I turn from this scene of confusion to the formidable task confronting me. Despite the manifold involutions of most modern universities, their guiding principle is relatively simple. It is the monism of unregenerated but self-sufficient nature. Georgetown University rejects this oversimplification of education's chore, for she maintains with St. Paul that "natural wisdom brings only death, whereas the wisdom of the spirit brings life and peace" (Rom. 8:6). Hence, the goal of true education is dualistic: Both spirit and nature, in the Pauline sense, claim their just measure of attention. No academic system can pretend to be realistic if it fails to account for both factors in its training. Balance between the two and thoroughness in the approach to each must characterize the program.

Our method of training nature was first molded in Plato's Academy some four centuries before the birth of Christ. Homer and Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, and Sophocles have graced the walks of Georgetown as once the groves of Greece. Aristotle has sharpened the wits of our students with his logic and metaphysical complexities. With Justin, Clement, Origen, and Basil, we believe that God prepared the intellect of the world for the advent of Christ by the genius of Greece. With Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustine, and Cassiodorus, we hold that Rome prepared for His coming by teaching the world a moral code of law and order in Caesar, Cicero, and Seneca.

Each individual in his growth to maturity undergoes in a microcosmic manner the intellectual development of the world. What prepared mankind for the coming Christ, now best prepares the individual man for the life of grace. This was Clement's theory of education, restated by Basil and codified by Ignatius when he founded the Jesuit schools. Thus, the patiently tooled truths of pagan antiquity, beautifully encased in the literature of Greece and Rome, were saved and used as a propedeutic for the student's maturing mind to fathom the mysteries of redemption.

If pre-Christian antiquity contributed its treasures and the Middle Ages their theology, the modern epoch, dating from the Renaissance, has introduced science as a new factor of universal knowledge. This element was rapidly and efficiently absorbed by the Jesuit code of education. The names of Sestini, Hagen, and Secchi, Georgetown scientists, indicate more than routine academic interest.

Founded as a college in 1789 by Archbishop Carroll of Baltimore, Georgetown first began offering graduate courses leading to the master's degree in 1820. The astronomical observatory which pioneered in the study of sun-spots and variable stars, was erected in 1841. Her medical school was opened in 1851, her law school in 1870. The Georgetown University Hospital began in 1898. Her famous school of foreign service was established in 1919.

The past is secure but what of the present and what of the future? What of the Greco-Roman classics and theology in this age of nuclear physics, ram-jets, plastics, plexiglass, and orange squeezers? When Moses went up to Mount Sinai to consult with Yahweh about the Ten Commandments, the children of Israel left behind in the wilderness grew impatient and enterprising. Following the disordered bent of man's nature, they erected an idol and worshipped it. That is very ancient history but very modern psychology. Man today after two World Wars is again impatient and enterprising. Where the Israelites had one idol, modern man has many. Idol worship, in the sense of pursuing shadows and deferring to opinions, is a modern disorder. Georgetown University has been iconoclastic in the past and with God's help will wield a heavier hammer in the future.

Throughout her long history she has never lost sight of the man she was training and the destiny freely assigned him by Almighty God. With the Psalmist she has wondered: "What is man that Thou are mindful of him? or the son of man that Thou visitest him?" With the Psalmist she has answered her own question: "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, thou hast crowned him with glory and honor and hast set him over the works of Thy hands." (Psalms 8:5–6.) This is man's earthly destiny, the fruit, we believe of intelligence and moral self-discipline. Man's eternal destiny to be accomplished by the exercise of religious virtues we consider to be equally the concern of education. To this end we have channelled our educational efforts along the lines suggested to teachers by St. Paul: "They are to order the lives of the faithful, minister to their needs, build up the frame of Christ's body, until we all realize our common unity through faith in the Son of God, and fuller knowledge of him. So we shall reach perfect manhood, that maturity which is proportioned to the complete growth of Christ; we are no longer to be children, no longer to be like storm-tossed sailors, driven before the wind of each new doctrine that human subtlety, human skill in fabricating lies, may propound. We are to follow the truth, in a spirit of charity, and so grow up, in everything, into a due proportion with Christ, who is our head." (Ephesians 4:11–15.)

This is our program, this our academic faith to which we are consecrated with all hope in His divine promises, with all love for Him our Creator and Redeemer and with charity toward men of good will.

Address by Hon. Roland J. Steinle at Dedication of Monument to Father Stephen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands a very significant address delivered by one of the outstanding jurists of my State, my good friend the Honorable Roland J. Steinle, judge of the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County. Judge Steinle delivered these comments on the occasion of the dedication of a monument to Father Stephen of St. Benedict the Moor Mission in Milwaukee in my State last Wednesday, April 27.

Within the few pages of that statement can be found a magnificent tribute to a great but humble Catholic priest, Father Stephen, whose life embodied the teachings of the Master—the Way Shower—to love our brothers as ourselves.

But not only is this statement a tribute to this immortal clergyman; it is a fervent appeal for human tolerance, for an eradication of the barriers which unfortunately still separate the men and women of different races, different creeds, different colors, different national origins.

It is a tribute, too, to the splendid progress made by America's colored citizens who have fought in war and strived in peace for this Nation, and who have given to us their devotion as Americans asking only that they be treated fairly and equally. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in reading Judge Steinle's splendid remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This celebration is indeed unique in the annals of our city—yes, of our Nation. We have come, some from nearby and others from afar, to participate in the dedication of this memorial—a magnificent likeness sculptured in stone of an humble Catholic priest, Father Stephen—a devoted follower of the rule of St. Francis, whose life and character and labors amongst us have gained the admiration, the respect, and commendation of thousands upon thousands of people in this land and abroad of every race, of every creed, and of every color.

Would, with all my heart, that one worthier than I had been selected to make this address. Too highly do I esteem the position in which I have been placed here today to feel aught but apprehension. I am thankful for this honor and for this great privilege. Times there are when even hardihood is a virtue; and to such virtue alone do I lay claim in venturing to be a spokesman here today.

Justice, truth, patience, charity, mercy, love of human kind, a burning zeal for the salvation of human souls, simplicity, courage, sacrifice, and confidence in God were Father Stephen's outstanding moral qualities. Strictly and obediently he walked in the footsteps of the founder of the great Franciscan Capuchin Order, never deviating from an exact exemplification of poverty, prayer, humility, and self-denial. His enthusiasm, his energy, his friendly personality, his fortitude as against all obstacles in his quest to save the souls of his brother man, were true reflections of the standards and examples given to the world by his illustrious model, St. Francis.

In his masterful exercise of vision, purpose, planning, building, preaching, perseverance, begging—yes, even contending, in order to correct a great social injustice prevalent amongst the people of our land—I refer to the existing attitude in his time of the white man toward the black man in this country—Father Stephen demonstrated American qualities akin to those of the beloved Abraham Lincoln—yes, and we can go on to say that he actually demonstrated heroic and saintly qualities like unto those of St. Francis himself.

What was Father Stephen's philosophy of life—the guiding start of all his success? I give to you words spoken from his own lips in order that there may be no misunderstanding. This is what he himself said: "Be unvaryingly kind toward all with whom you have to deal, getting rid of every sign of servility as well as of overbearing, arrogance, suspicion, sarcasm, anger, and threatening. Love your fellow men. Love the image they bear—love the blood of Christ with which they were redeemed." Simple words, these, my friends, but behind them is the power and energy and force upon which St. Benedict the Moor Mission for Negroes was developed under the guidance of Father Stephen—I refer to the very excellent boarding school, hospital, and church that stand before us today. Simple words, indeed, my friends, but such that characterized every appearance of Father Stephen in the cities, towns, and villages throughout the length and breadth of this land as he preached the doctrine of the equal rights of all human beings and the dignity of man under the law of God.

It is indeed fitting that this likeness in stone of Father Stephen be dedicated over his grave, for it will serve as a reminder to generations still unborn of his physical being—of the very manner of the man himself. It is to be hoped, too, that these buildings which make up the mission will be kept up, yes, expanded and developed, for in that way his physical deeds shall never be forgotten. But even if all these were to perish, let us thank God that the mighty influence wrought upon the hearts and minds of all Americans by Father Stephen's teaching and preaching regarding the white man's responsibility toward his black brother can never be eradicated, and that through and by the word and deed of Father Stephen, America will ultimately and completely rectify a great wrong that has existed in the past.

As we honor Father Stephen's memory here today, let us not be unmindful of the magnificent work of those who assisted him in this cause and who since his death have carried on in developing St. Benedict's Mission to an even greater level than Father Stephen knew. The Capuchin priests and brothers who have labored here—the self-sacrificing and venerable sisters of the Dominican Order who have so proficiently educated and cared for their charges—the Franciscan Sisters who have given efficient and tender care to the sick and disabled—the teachers and nurses and all others who have performed so nobly, together with the benefactors, the generous men and women who opened up their hearts and their purses to provide the brick and the mortar, the bread and the butter, the books, and the clothes, as well as the equipment for this school and hospital and church, and who today, whether in Heaven or still upon the earth, are thrilled with the knowledge and satisfaction that this is indeed a great work for God and country; all these we remember and salute as we pay our tribute of love and respect to the memory of Father Stephen.

We, the citizens of Milwaukee, take great pride in the fame that Father Stephen's noble efforts have brought to our fair city.

My friends, prejudice and bigotry against the peoples of any race or creed or color are definitely un-American. Father Stephen has taught us that prejudice against our Negro brother is not only un-American, but un-Christian as well.

All American citizens are equal before the law. Our people do not say that he of the darker skin is not equal—nor do they believe that, and yet there are many who practice it. There was a time in the history of this country when people believed that the inferiority of the Negro was supported by science and morality. We have come a long way since a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court determined that a Negro slave had no rights which a white man was bound to respect. Today, any person who still wants to support the inferiority of the Negro must fall back entirely on his own prejudice. Today, every fair-thinking American wants the Negro to believe in what the Negro has been taught—that is, the doctrine of the equality of man in the sight of God—in the right to live, to work, to travel, to learn, to climb up the ladder of success in a democratic fashion. Every fair-minded American will assist the Negro in attaining such objectives. In our own time we find a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Hon. Frank Murphy, saying: "We must become alert to the symptoms of moral decay. We must recognize as centers of infection those who espouse the attitudes of the exaltation of any race or nationality as superior to all others; and the denial of the right of minority groups to compete in any way with the privileged groups; and the denial of the dignity of the human being, and the oneness and solidarity of humanity."

There are some prejudiced minds who declare that the Negro is irresponsible and of low intelligence. Such statement is not based on fact. The Negro first came to America in 1619. He was kept in slavery until 1865. Previous to the Civil War, despite the fact that he had helped to build up the wealth of the South, he was given no opportunity for schooling, no encouragement to think and act for himself. He was freed by the emancipation proclamation and the twelfth amendment of the Constitution. The fourteenth amendment made him a citizen. The fifteenth amendment gave him the right to vote. As a free man in America, the Negro has existed for only 84 years. Authorities are obliged to agree that the rapidity of his progress is one of the marvels of history. Dr. FRANK GRAHAM, president of the University of North Carolina, not long ago said: "It is the acknowledged fact that in spite of all the handicaps of slavery and discrimination, the Negro in America has made more progress in the shortest time than any race in human history."

"Not intelligent," some warped white minds will say of the Negro. The answer to that may be found in going to the halls of the United States Congress and listening to the brilliant expression of mind that falls from the lips of the black man there. Look in upon the metropolitan cities of America and observe the masterful technique of Negro lawyers, doctors, engineers, preachers, educators, scientists, men and women in public service, businessmen, scholars, sociologists, artists, writers, and athletes. The Negro population of America is about one-tenth of the whole. Proportionately, today, the leadership of Negroes compares favorably with that of the whites. In our country's latest military effort the accomplishment of our Negro soldier stands out with great glory.

We must face the facts and bestir the conscience of America, as did Father Stephen. The Negro has not had a fair deal. He has been exploited and held down. He has been lynched and beaten and despised. The weight of this injustice is the fruit of white cruelty. He is entitled to an ending forever of all prejudice and discrimination against him. These can be wiped out entirely if every interested person puts his shoulder to the wheel. Action, rather than words, will do that job.

Let us teach our children to respect all races and religions. Let us in our own lives demonstrate the spirit of good will and understanding; let us challenge the philosophy of racial superiority by whomsoever it is proclaimed; let us support the civil rights and liberties of all citizens and groups—and in the words of a distinguished American writer of our time, Harry Schlacht, resolve always "to cherish the thought that we are Americans; that we will do our best to eradicate from our hearts rancor and hate and prejudice; for if we build in clay our determination will be subject to the storms of time and the winds of the ages; if we build in brick it is destined to crumble under the atmospheric pressure of the heavens; if we build in iron and steel it is destined to flow as water before the smelting processes of the universe; if we build in marble it will not last forever; but if we build in human spirit by means of a righteous example of a common brotherhood, we build for eternity."

It was in that kind of human spirit, with eyes cast upward, that Father Stephen wrought his accomplishments here. Let us do likewise. May the achievements and example of Father Stephen long continue and endure. That is our fondest hope; that is our most earnest prayer today.

Small Corporations Must Pay Prohibitive Expenses to Issue New Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are two chief sources of capital for small corporations. One source is from revenue derived from investments in larger corporations; the other source is from the issuance of new securities on the market. The first source is gradually drying up as large corporations retain an increasingly larger percentage of their profits. As I have stated many times, this retention of excess profits by large corporations is one of the greatest economic evils in this country.

The second source of capital for small corporations (that is, the issuance of new securities on the market) is hindered by the prohibitive expenses incurred by small corporations when they endeavor to float a new issue. The cost of flotation to large corporations is relatively small and decreases as the asset value of the corporation increases. But the discounts and commissions which small corporations are forced to pay to investment bankers in order to issue new securities are so high that small corporations are practically forced to find other ways to obtain capital.

Some significant figures for the period 1945–47 have been prepared by the Securities and Exchange Commission which show the comparative flotation costs for large and small corporations. Small corporations floating securities of less than $500,000 paid 21.91 percent of their total proceeds for expenses. Of that 21.91 percent, 17.71 percent of the expenses were for commissions and discounts and 4.21 percent for other expenses; such as, S. E. C. fee, legal fees, accounting fees, and printing fees. Contrast this 21.91 percent with the neglible 1.15 percent paid by corporations floating issues of $50,000,000 or over. Of that 1.15 percent expense of proceeds, 0.76 percent was for commissions and discounts and 0.39 percent for other expenses. It is clearly apparent that the payments of commissions and discounts to investment bankers is the part of the cost which soared for small corporations and shrank to a minimum percent for large corporations. The cost of other type expenses remained stable irrespective of the size of flotation.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has prepared some illuminating figures showing the cost of floating new issues according to the asset size of the company. For the 3-year period 1945–47 small corporations with assets of less than one million paid approximately seventeen times more to float new issues than corporations with assets of 500 million and over. You will note in the table which is given below that as the asset size of the company increases the percent of commission and discount per $100 proceeds decreases.

Cost of flotation of new issues as a percent of gross proceeds, by asset size of company, 1945–47

Asset size of company (millions of dollars)	Number of flotations	Average size of flotation	Cost of flotation	Commission and discount	Other expenses
		Millions of dollars	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Under 1	71	1.1	16.94	14.95	1.99
1 to 5	160	1.3	12.44	10.31	2.13
5 to 10	108	2.7	7.77	6.46	1.31
10 to 20	105	3.9	5.09	4.02	1.08
20 to 50	98	8.5	3.09	2.33	.76
50 to 100	65	10.9	2.17	1.56	.61
100 to 200	46	27.8	1.89	1.39	.50
200 to 500	30	53.7	1.46	1.04	.41
500 and over	21	111.6	1.01	.63	.39
Unknown [1]	11	20.7	2.09	1.74	.35
All asset sizes	715	12.0	2.48	1.88	.60

[1] This group includes issues of foreign governments, and companies for which balance sheets were not included in registration statements.

Some provision must be made to provide capital for small corporations if our system of private enterprise and initiative is not to be crushed under the weight and power of a few concerns. That help to small corporations could be furnished in several ways: (1) In the form of further regulation of the expense incurred by small corporations in issuing new securities; (2) from stricter enforcement of section 102 of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Code which requires distribution of 70 percent of the earnings of corporations be paid to stockholder; (3) perhaps from the organization of a capital bank within the Federal Reserve System to make long-term capital loans; and (4) through the RFC. The members should consider this serious problem and develop an immediate source of capital for small businesses and corporations.

President Truman and Senator Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the caption "It seems to me," written by M. M. Oppegard and published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of April 24, 1949. The article speaks well of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

WASHINGTON.—Deficit financing rather than an increased income-tax schedule likely will be resorted to in event the congressional appropriations exceed the tax income for the Federal Government.

This seems to be the consensus of those close observers in Washington who look behind the public pronouncements of the tax authorities in Congress, some of whom have indicated there may be need for tax increases.

No one knows better than the members of our national law-making body and other politicians that raising taxes is not popular, even if it is done under the broad principle of soaking the rich.

Therefore, the boys who keep their fingers on the pulse of the voters are looking for some means other than direct taxes to take up any slack that might be necessary between income and outgo. The answer, of course, is deficit financing—in other words, just borrowing more money.

Approximately 300 persons were guests of the Treasury Department last Tuesday night at a dinner preliminary to the Government savings bond drive set for May 15 to June 30, when $1,040,000 in bond sales is the goal.

President Truman made a 5-minute address to the industry leaders invited to the dinner, but his style in that delivery was far more stilted than a brief off the cuff talk he made after going off the air.

In his informal remarks, Truman said nothing that could not be repeated, but the manner of its saying was far different than his formal style.

While reading his brief formal address, he kept his eyes glued to the manuscript much as a person does who is reading something for the first time. This was approximately true, for naturally he does not write his own speeches.

When he spoke informally, he talked rather slowly, selecting his words quite easily as he went along, talking much as any ordinary man rather accustomed to public speaking might say a few well selected words at his luncheon club meeting.

President Truman appeared to those who heard him about the same as he has always seemed in off the record instances—just a small city business man trying to do a job quite obviously a bit too large for his natural capacity.

Many have said the Truman give 'em hell technique of the last presidential campaign was an act, put on in desperation in a dying bid for reelection after he thought, along with the rest of the country, that all was lost.

But that is not quite an accurate appraisal, for Mr. Truman, according to those who have watched him closely day in and in day out as reporters covering the Washington scene, is not an easy-going opponent in any respect.

The President, I am told, is a man of extremes. He will go all the way for someone he likes and who has shown a liking for him, while those who oppose him or arouse his animosity, are faced by a bitter opponent.

It has long been apparent that Truman carries a grudge, in its fullest sense, once it has been established. His bitterness toward Drew Pearson is an instance, for nothing Pearson could do, newspapermen here say, would appease the President's attitude toward him.

In another sphere, the bitterness Mr. Truman feels toward Senator ROBERT TAFT is reportedly the principal opposition TAFT will face next year in Ohio when he seeks reelection.

There is no opposition within the Republican Party to TAFT'S reelection—in fact, quite the contrary is true, and he will have the fullest support of his party colleagues.

As a matter of fact, the opposition to his reelection does not stem so much from the Democratic Party, although it will, of course, put on a big show against him.

TAFT'S real opposition is President Truman, who wants very much to see him defeated in his bid for reelection. Truman blames TAFT, and rightly, too, for much of the opposition to the Truman program and for the barriers it has hit in Congress.

TAFT generally is conceded to be the smartest man in the Republican Party in Congress, and that designation would hold, too, if the Democratic Party were included.

He is the key to the Republican opposition to much of the administration's program, and it is on him that the Truman blame largely falls in complaining about Republican obstructionists defeating the Fair Deal program of the administration.

The administration, apparently, feels there should be no Republican opposition to its program, and yet the program contains so much that the Republican Party always has opposed.

Truman continues to threaten to "go to the country" on a train swing around the Nation and point out that the Fair Deal program is being thwarted by the Republicans.

Of course, it is being opposed by the Republicans. It is what should be expected in the cases wherein the Republicans are giving it the toughest opposition.

The backbone of the Republican Party of the United States—call them reactionaries or whatever you will—has never been content to follow Governor Dewey's "me, too" position, and it is one of the salient reasons why Dewey stumbled at the polls last November.

It is sound, intelligent opposition in Congress to the more fanciful Administration program that the Republicans, and many Democrats, are looking for, and it is around TAFT that this opposition is centered.

My guess is that when all the flying fur has settled in the Ohio senatorial scrap next year, the name of ROBERT A. TAFT still will be on the roster of United States Senators. Certainly no one has proven a greater right to the place.

M. M. OPPEGARD.

Middle Border Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Gov. George Mickelson, of South Dakota, has issued a proclamation designating the second Monday in May as Middle Border Pioneer Day. It is the hope of the citizens of our great middle border area of America that other governors in this region will emulate the splendid example set by Governor Mickelson in providing an occasion on which to honor the pioneers whose contributions have meant so much to our Republic.

I ask unanimous consent to have this proclamation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas all that America is and will be, derives from the ideas, ideals, and deeds of its men and women who have dared to pioneer new paths; and

Whereas we who live in the upper Missouri River Valley are twice blessed with a heritage from pioneers who surged westward on a tide of flatboats and covered wagons until here on our Republic's middle border they met and mingled with kindred who had trailed eastward from the mines of the Rocky Mountains and the ranches of the old Spanish Southwest; and

Whereas to this land of the middle border have come people of all lands seeking the boon of freedom and the opportunity to attain a better life; and

Whereas the democratic ideals of self-reliance and self-development are enshrined in the granite of our mountains and in the hearts of our people, it therefore becomes appropriate that the citizens of South Dakota should take the lead among those who dwell on the middle border in recognition of the great truth that "what is past is prologue."

Now, therefore, I George T. Mickelson, Governor of the State of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim and establish the second Monday of the month of May as Middle Border Pioneer Day, and request my fellow citizens to unite with the society of Friends of the Middle Border in giving special honor to our early settlers and pioneers through public meetings and family gatherings, as well as to review the achievements of such illustrious personalities as the Verendrye Brothers, Captains Lewis and Clark, Jedediah Strong Smith, Father Pierre DeSmet, Struck-by-the-Ree, George Catlin, Henry Weston Smith, Hamlin Garland, O. E. Rolvaag, Gutzon Borglum, James Earle Fraser, Harvey Dunn, and the thousands of our early pioneers and settlers who through exploration, self-sacrificing devotion, and contributions to the settlement and building of this great area, and to our social and cultural patterns, have enriched our lives and will inspire present and future generations to further advances in that finest of all arts, dwelling together in good will and in peace.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of South Dakota to be affixed this 20th day of April 1949.

[SEAL] GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor of South Dakota.
Attest: ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The Greek People's Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Soterios Nicholson regarding the fight of the Greek people for freedom, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTS THE UNITED NATIONS TO HELP GREECE LICK THE COMMUNISTS

To the EDITOR of the STAR:

Perhaps no other country in the world has faced such bitter disillusion as the Greek people in their fight for freedom.

Occupied by a brutal despot for several years, milked bone dry of food, natural resources, and all their material wealth, the Greeks had every reason to believe when the war ended and the Nazis were finally beaten that they could proceed at once with the immense job of reconstruction in their own way, without being harried by other oppressors on their northern borders.

The Soviet Union and Communists in Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, however, had other ideas and plans. They marked Greece for their own and immediately set in motion the age-old doctrine of divide and conquer. They fostered a rebellion against the regime in power and furnished arms and supplies to the insurgents. The loyal Greeks rallied to the support of their Government and with the aid of material assistance from the United States, they have succeeded in beating back the unceasing attacks of the guerrilla forces.

It has been an unending struggle for the loyal Greeks. With supplies received from America, they have routed the enemy and pushed them back into Albania, Bulgaria, or Yugoslavia. Each time would mean final victory, they hoped. But what has happened?

The guerrillas, driven from free Greek soil, have found protection in the countries bordering on Greece to the north and there they hole up until the Red sympathizers bring in more recruits and use Communist funds to again equip and supply them so that all too soon they are strong enough to venture into Greek territory for another fray with troops of loyal Greece. Again and again they have been forced to retreat to the northern borders, where they are assured sanctuary, particularly in Albania.

In an effort to abide by the concepts and ideals of the United Nations, the Greek Government brought the controversy to the UN Security Council many times.

After listening to all parties of the dispute, the United Nations appointed a committee to watch operations along the Greek border and to report their findings. The committee has submitted a recommendation to the UN.

Greece has offered determined resistance to the Communists single handed. Now it is time for the United Nations to act to prevent complete infiltration of Greece by the Balkan Reds. Sufficient evidence is at hand to support a determination of the United Nations to seal the northern borders of Greece and prevent the Communists from achieving their purpose of overthrowing the Greek Government and turning Greece into another satellite of Soviet Russia.

The Greeks have never wavered in their opposition to a form of government which would take from them the priceless gifts of freedom, yet they cannot help but become discouraged and bitter in the knowledge that the fight is never-ending and in a large sense one which they appear destined to bear alone and unaided.

At least those nations close enough to feel the hot breath of the Russian bear on their necks have some feeling of security and are offered the aid of other nations in the event an aggressor moves against them. Greece, however, has no such assurance and apparently must continue to bear the heavy burden until such time as they can resist no more.

It is time for the United Nations to act. The United States, Great Britain, and the

other important powers of the UN should insist upon immediate action by the United Nations now.

SOTERIOS NICHOLSON.

Profit-Sharing Plan for Better Labor-Management Relations

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members this morning an amendment which I expect to offer to the pending labor legislation. I hope the amendment, which I will offer, will be a salutary one. It is along the lines of a bill that I have already introduced and will provide for a tax incentive for the establishment of profit-sharing plans. If I get the opportunity to do so and am recognized at the proper time, I hope to offer this amendment and hope that it will be approved.

I am calling this to the attention of the Members at this time in order to inform them that my proposed amendment will be set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an extension of my remarks.

The amendment is as follows:

Page 45, after line 16, insert the following:

"TITLE II—PROFIT SHARING AS INDUCEMENT TO BETTER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"SEC. 201. (a) Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(bb) Amounts paid by corporations to employees as a share of profits:

"'(1) In general: If a corporation, prior to the beginning of any taxable year, adopts a plan legally obligating itself to pay to its employees a percentage of its profits for such year, 150 percent of the amount of the profits paid for such year under such plan to any employee shall be deductible under this subsection for the taxable year in which paid, and no part of such amount payable to such employee shall be deductible for any taxable year under any other subsection of this section.

"'(2) Special rules: The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply—

"'(A) Only if every employee who is employed by the taxpayer for more than 150 days during the taxable year for which the plan is adopted is entitled to share in the profits for such year; and

"'(B) Only if the amounts payable under the plan do not discriminate in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, persons whose principal duties consist in supervising the work of other employees, or highly compensated employees; and

"'(C) Only to amounts paid to an employee before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of the corporation for which such amounts are paid, and only to so much of such amounts paid as does not exceed 25 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during such taxable year to such employee. In the case of a corporation on the accrual basis, amounts paid after the close of the taxable year of the accrual of such amounts and before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such year shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1), be considered as paid in the year of accrual.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948."

And renumber the remaining titles and sections of the bill accordingly.

If the amendment is offered to the Lesinski bill (H. R. 2032) it will be at page 20, after line 14, under section 403, instead of section 201 of the Wood substitute.

The Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the penetrating news analyst, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, has stated very simply the nub of the objection to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's method of pleasing both farmers and consumers. He says:

There is simply no gimmick by which farm producers' prices can be kept high and food consumer prices can be allowed to drop, unless somebody pays.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his editorial comment, together with an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Guaranteed Farming" and one from the New York Times entitled "A Farm Leader Speaks."

It is heartening to observe that the farmers of this country, speaking through that fine farm organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation, have branded the Brannan scheme for just what it is—not a farm program at all, but a statement of political-economic philosophy. The federation president, Mr. Allan B. Kline, recognizes that the program necessarily involves Government control of all the land and livestock of every farmer in the country. The farmers of my community want no ceiling on opportunity in agriculture. They want no penalty on efficiency.

Such is the attitude of the farmers.

It is, of course, even more objectionable, if possible, to the workingman or the businessman, be he large or small, whose income is to enjoy no comparable benefit.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.]

STATE OF THE NATION—FARM PROGRAM: LET'S TAKE ANOTHER LOOK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If the administration's new farm program can do all its advocates say it will, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan has turned up with a sure-fire formula for perpetual motion.

Mr. Brannan, testifying before the Senate and House Agricultural Committees during the past week, is saying:

That American farmers can be continuously guaranteed high prices.

That American consumers can be assured lower prices.

That all this is not going to cost any more, perhaps less, than the Government has been paying out in its support program during the war years.

Well, that's something. In fact, it is more than something. It is nothing less than political paradise and economic utopia all wrapped in one lovely package.

All we have to ask is whether it is done with mirrors or is there a concealed panel in the magician's box?

With an entirely straight face, Secretary Brannan avers he has nothing up his sleeve; that there is no sleight of hand in his argument when he calmly tells Congress—what many Congressmen like to hear—that at last here is a way of guaranteeing more food at lower prices to the consumer and at high prices to the producer.

And who holds the bag? If the farmer is to gain and if the consumer is to gain, who, exactly, pays the difference?

Mr. Brannan doesn't exactly bear down on this point. In fact, it can be said that he touches it very gingerly. But from all that Mr. Brannan has said of his new program thus far, this is the way it would work:

First, the Government no longer would try to keep up the market prices of major farm commodities. They would be allowed to decline to a normal level dictated by supply and demand. This is just what the consumers would welcome—and there are 140,000,000 consumers. Certainly the consumer wouldn't lose there.

Next, the farmers would continue to get, not the lower consumer-market prices for their major commodities, but high parity prices. These would be guaranteed by the Government and, when the market prices were lower than the guaranteed parity prices, the Treasury would make up the difference. This is just what the farmers would welcome—and there are millions of farmers. Certainly the farmer couldn't lose there.

Finally, and here Mr. Brannan slips quietly into generalities, the Secretary of Agriculture gives the impression that it would be economical to the extent that it may cost less than the price-support program now in operation.

Congress will, perhaps, want to look that statement over a little more closely.

Perhaps it is right here that the mirror is being turned a little bit at an angle; that right here there may be at least a tiny, little concealed panel in the magician's box.

Somebody is going to have to pay, and we might as well face that inescapable fact at the outset. In fact, nearly everybody is going to have to pay, and the country will appraise this program more realistically if that fact is also recognized at the very beginning.

There would, of course, be controls over production, but if they are used to hold production down very considerably, they will be more than the farmers have been willing to accept in the past, and if the controls are not substantial, the amount which the Treasury will have to pay to maintain the subsidy will be greater and greater.

There is simply no gimmick by which farm producers' prices can be kept high and food consumer prices can be allowed to drop, unless somebody pays. The Treasury will pay, and that means that the taxpayer will pay, and that means that nearly everybody will pay.

Then why is Mr. Brannan's plan such sweet politics? For, if it isn't sweet politics—and I wouldn't say it wasn't—it is just about the most palatable method of spending the taxpayers' money yet devised.

There are several reasons why this proposal has been called the most wondrous pill ever compounded in the pharmacy of politics. The benefits to the farmers and the

consumers are immediate and clearly visible. The extent to which the farmers and consumers will have to pay for these benefits themselves out of their own increased taxes are deferred and invisible. There will be no item on the income-tax return which will show the farmer and the consumer exactly how much of his tax he is paying to underwrite the farm subsidy.

Furthermore, the proposed farm subsidy offers a new device for the redistribution of wealth. It works out in two ways. The subsidy goes to the few, relatively, but is paid for by the many, by all who pay taxes. This makes the share which the farmer pays for his subsidy proportionately lower than the rest. Secondly, the benefits which go to the consumer are not paid for uniformly by the consumer in the form of taxes since the income tax, being graduated, does not fall uniformly upon all consumers.

Most farmers seem to welcome the Brannan program, but if the farmer thinks he can get a guaranteed annual income from the Government without heading into Government control of his farming, he is very likely indulging in wishful thinking. And Senator AIKEN, the liberal Republican from the old-fashioned State of Vermont, asks: "If the Government is going to guarantee high prices to agriculture, shouldn't the Government reasonably guarantee high prices to industry?"

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

GUARANTEED FARMING

In the pressure for space following intermittent suspension of this newspaper, the prize exhibit of the Fair Deal has not yet had our comment. We refer to Secretary Brannan's plan for perpetual prosperity for agriculture. This is a scheme, a most ambitious scheme, that looks like a magical effort to give something to everybody. To farmers he promises subsidy payments designed to equate them with other economic groups. To consumers he promises lower prices by allowing agricultural commodities to find their own market level. To the public he holds out the assurance that this program would cost no more than the present system of price supports by which the Government keeps agricultural prices up artificially.

The hitch, of course, is the two-price system that would be created by the Brannan plan. Mr. Brannan uses as a lure the prospect of buying milk at 15 cents a quart. This might be all the consumer would pay directly. But the Government would then make up to the milk producer the difference between the market price and what, under the Brannan formula, was considered necessary to bring a fair income. The consumer would pay for this, too, through taxes, and to that extent the 15-cent price tag on milk would be deceptive.

There is, to be sure, a superficial plausibility about the Brannan program. For one thing, it would recast the farm parity formula in terms of present-day prices instead of as a percentage of 1909–14 prices. Furthermore, theoretically it would end the squeeze in which the consumer pays high prices and then pays taxes to keep prices high. However, it would substitute for price supports a thorough regimentation of agriculture. Far-reaching production and marketing controls would be necessary over virtually every crop, and if estimates proved faulty the system could become a terrific millstone. The consequences of tampering with the delicate ratios in livestock feeding, for example, could be disastrous. Nor does the plan give any assurance that overproduction would be effectively checked; indeed, subsidies unrelated to supply might encourage gluts.

The Brannan approach would scuttle the long-range Aiken farm program before that program has ever been tried. The Aiken law is the first real effort to relate price supports to supply. Beginning in 1950, Government supports will range from 90 percent down to 60 percent of parity, depending on supply. These flexible support provisions have been under constant attack from groups seeking to peg supports of specific commodities at 90 or even 100 percent of parity. In this respect the Brannan program looks like a political sop, for its effect would be to fix most support prices rigidly at above 90 percent of parity.

Farm income has a direct relation to the health of the remainder of the economy, and no one can wish for a return of the days of nonprotection of farm prices. Agricultural price supports are accepted as a necessary compensation for the fact that the farmer, alone of all producers, cannot reduce his production when prices fall. The question is not whether there should be price supports, but whether farmers should be singled out for guaranteed income. The theory behind the Aiken law is to provide a variable floor against depression. If this is to be jettisoned in favor of a rigid system to subsidize farm incomes, how long will it be before other economic groups also demand an income subsidy?

[From the New York Times]

A FARM LEADER SPEAKS

The American Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership of 1,325,000 farm families, is the largest organization of its kind in the Nation. What its leaders have to say on any proposed legislation is always interesting and important; what they have to say on controversial issues affecting agriculture is doubly so. This is not just because the bureau is large numerically and must be reckoned with politically in shaping national legislative policy. It stems, as well, from the fact that the bureau's leadership, over the years, has demonstrated a capacity to evaluate such proposals in their long-term aspects and in their relation to the whole national economy.

Last January a minority headed by certain southern members sought to put the federation on record as favoring a continuance of fixed, high-level supports for farm prices—the policy which is already pointing us toward a revival of the surplus problem from which it took a major war to deliver us only a few short years ago. With the chairmen of the two agricultural committees in Congress backing such a program and with the administration studiously refraining from opposing it, less conscientious leaders might have confined themselves to putting up a perfunctory rear-guard fight on the issue. Not so the leaders of the federation, who fought and crushed the rebellion of this opportunist minority. The Bureau put itself clearly on record as favoring the policy of flexible price supports, the heart of the Hope-Aiken law, whose long-term provisions go into effect in 1950.

The man who led the fight on that occasion for the principle of flexible price supports—a system designed to stimulate production when supplies are low and to operate in reverse when unmanageable surpluses threaten—was Allan B. Kline, the federation's president. Mr. Kline has now let it be known how he feels about the new farm program proposed a few days ago by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. "When someone promises cheap prices for consumers and high prices for farmers on the same items" he told a representative of the United Press at Chicago this week, "it sounds to me like a vote-getting appeal." And he added: "At first glance it looks good for everybody. But farmers had better take a good look at the regimentation and controls involved * * * [This] looks like an agricultural approach to statism." Or, one might add, statism followed by boom and bust.

Who Represents Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, since the recent colloquy on the floor of this House between the very energetic and most aggressive gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, and myself, I have received innumerable newspaper editorials from all sections of the Nation in connection with the matter which we discussed only too briefly.

Of course I have found great satisfaction in the fact that each and everyone of these editorials takes the same position which I have maintained. This naturally comes as no surprise because I have always recognized that I was on the most solid of ground in resenting any attempt to influence my actions as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I would liked to have pursued the discussion further when it originated on the floor of the House but was prevented from doing so on account of the situation which was beyond my control.

The fact that the press of the Nation has taken such widespread cognizance of the issue and the principle involved, has fully justified my action in bringing the matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman from Massachusettes contributed immeasurably to the discussion through his very frank, though I must admit somewhat bizarre statement, relative to his appreciation of what constitutes a Member's responsibility.

Of the many editorials which have come to my attention on the subject I have selected one written by Hermann B. Deutsch, associate editor of the New Orleans Item, which says, in effect, but more poignantly, what all the other editorials have said.

In his usual fluent style and most understandable language, Mr. Deutsch has placed his finger right on the button of the real issue involved in the philosophy of so-called party loyalty as expressed by the President in the White House and enunciated by his floor leader in the well of this House. He goes right to the bottom of the position taken publicly by these two gentlemen and meets the question head-on with a direct answer which cannot be misunderstood or misconstrued.

I was elected as a Democrat by the voters of the First Congressional District of the sovereign State of Louisiana and I sit in this body on the Democratic side of the aisle through their tolerance and through their sufferance and not at the hands or the whim of anybody else except those to whom I am responsible and alone responsible.

My certificate of election filed with the Clerk of the House signed by the Governor of the State of Louisiana, by the secretary of the State of Louisiana, and by the attorney general of Louisiana sets forth under the great seal of the State

of Louisiana that I was elected on November 2, 1948, to the Eighty-first Congress as a Democrat to the House of Representatives by a vote of 36,748. I am officially and formally designated as a Democrat under the laws of the State and the Nation and I sit here as such by that right.

But back to the editorial which is typical of the hundreds of editorials which have appeared throughout the Nation since this matter was brought to your attention.

Here it is and it says eloquently what so many of us are thinking:

WHO REPRESENTS WHOM?

By his astonishing public declaration that congressional votes constitute a test of party loyalty President Truman appears to have reduced his philosophy of government to the level of a precinct squabble. The issue was raised at the week end, when it appeared that outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law had encountered major opposition.

Party disloyalty is punished by party discipline. In Russia that involves exile, possibly forced labor, or in extreme cases, what is euphemistically described as liquidation. In a democracy, it involves loss of prestige, of desirable committee assignments, and of any voice in patronage distribution.

What the President really said, therefore, was: "Vote as I say, or I'll swing the patronage club on you." If there had been any doubt about what he meant, his whip in the lower House, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, swiftly dispelled it, by saying in so many words that it was "Only through tolerance that (anyone who opposed the President) is sitting here (on the Democratic side of the Chamber)."

This seems to reduce representative government at best to the plane of trivial machine politics. At worst, it implies that Members of Congress have a higher duty to their party organization than to their constituencies or their convictions. Let us take the case of Representative HÉBERT, since the McCormack attack was directed specifically at him.

The people of his district have five times elected him to Congress. An overwhelming majority was accorded him last year—after he had voted for the Taft-Hartley bill in the first instance, and to override President Truman's veto of that measure in the second. That stand therefore expressed the majority will of the constituents whom Mr. HÉBERT represents in Washington.

If free government means what it says, the voters of any given congressional district do not send a representative to Congress merely to jump whenever the President or his party whip says "frog." Every President is obviously the candidate of a majority party when he is elected, whoever he is. But if it thereafter becomes the duty—the test of loyalty, in fact—of all Congressmen elected by that majority party to vote unquestioningly as the President directs, why bother to send them to Washington at all? Why not simply let the President say without further ado what should or should not be done?

Our party conventions write party platforms as declarations reflecting the wishes of the majority on each of the individual policies or issues proposed for endorsement. Delegates from the agricultural Midwest, for example, may favor high-price support programs for grain and oppose the labor-union dictatorships which sprang into being under the Wagner Act. Delegates from strongly industrialized communities—Detroit or Hartford—may favor the abolition of all statutory restraints on labor and oppose the price supports which necessarily increase the cost of foodstuffs. Party platforms represent compromises between such ideological conflicts. They are not laws of the party and certainly not the law of the land.

As a practical matter, every President favors his supporters and turns his opponents out to grass. But there is a difference between this sort of give and take and the rough and tumble of a Tammany or Choctaw brawl. In the natural disappointment over his failure to bring a sweeping congressional majority into line with his views, Mr. Truman occasionally seems to forget that he is the country's Chief Executive, not its ruler.

Government Confiscation of Private Property a Moral Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Human Events for this week—April 27—has an article, Our Confiscation of Private Property, which levels an indictment against the United States that calls for a congressional investigation. In the handling of private property of German citizens during the war we have violated international law by confiscatory private property invested in neutral territory. If this is true it is a shocking situation. A very skinny excuse is used to justify the confiscation by saying that the Allies were merely exercising the functions of a German government. Where is our sense of decency? What has become of the ordinary principles of fair play?

And now, Mr. Speaker, what will be our position when the Soviet ascertains the truth of this shameful conduct?

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the article referred to:

OUR CONFISCATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

(By an international lawyer)

The Truman administration, as a part of what the President in his inaugural address called a bold new program, is seeking to encourage foreign investment by American citizens. In the current ECA authorization, as passed by Congress, a large sum is actually earmarked to guarantee private American capital which ventures overseas.

Before Americans put any trust in these assurances they should familiarize themselves with the policy of confiscation of foreign private property which the United States has adopted since the close of World War II. Any American who proposes to invest money in France, for instance, should recognize in advance that if Soviet Russia takes over in that country, his entire investment could be confiscated in accordance with principles now formally endorsed by the United States.

Reversing its historic position with regard to property rights, the United States now apparently maintains that mere military victory justifies any form of confiscation which seems appropriate to the victorious government. Having thus sanctified the primitive principle of force majeure, it is easy to understand why the administration must offer guaranties if it is to lure American capital abroad. But no guaranty approved by Congress is likely to balance the outright sanction for confiscation which our own Government has now established.

The reversal of traditional principle is the work of President Truman's administration. This particular policy of confiscation was not advocated by the New Deal. On the contrary, Secretary Hull, on the eve of World War II, opposed confiscation in the following strong language:

"It is important * * * that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or to those of friendly powers. A * * * taking over of such property, except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results."

Everybody knows that since the close of the war we have officially confiscated much in the conquered nations themselves. But the story of our seizure of private German property invested in neutral Switzerland is little known over here. It may profitably be considered by anybody who thinks that he can safely invest his savings in Latin America, or any other part of the world which might be neutral in another war.

II

An agreement that violated international law, by confiscating private property invested in neutral territory, was forced upon Switzerland 3 years ago. The strongest sort of pressure had to be applied to the Swiss before they would succumb to the hectoring demands of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France, acting in concert, but under American leadership.

The leverage exerted on the Swiss approximated blackmail. Swiss assets in the United States were "blocked" and Swiss traders were black listed by our Government until the "Accord and Annex" was signed in Washington by Swiss Foreign Minister Walter Stucki, on May 25, 1946. Our Government gave little publicity to this disgraceful business. But Americans who visit Switzerland soon learn that this "accord" planted a new and unflattering conception of American morality over there.

"The agreement as achieved," to quote the Department of State Bulletin of June 30, 1946 (p. 1101), "attained the Allied objective of immobilizing and liquidating German property in Switzerland owned by Germans in Germany. * * * Thus, German assets which at some future date could have been employed as a threat to world peace will be removed from a potential safe haven." Communist governments, also at some future date, may have a lot of fun with that official statement of United States policy. Certainly it pays the Communist practice of expropriation the most sincere form of flattery.

In the forced liquidation of German private property in Switzerland, only persons of non-German nationality have been allowed to acquire new ownership. The annex to the agreement further says that "all possible measures will be taken to prevent resale to German persons." No time limit is placed on this penalization of Germans as such—another helpful precedent if the Kremlin wants to liquidate evidences of "Anglo-American imperialism" in China or other Communist territory.

It should be clearly understood that the Truman policy of confiscation in Switzerland applies to all Germans, those who were executed because they fought the Nazis as well as those who actually served the Nazi government. A statement prepared deep within the labyrinth of our Federal bureaucracy makes this plain.

According to "the Division of Economic Security Controls of the Office of Economic Security Policy of the Department of State" the confiscation does not include property looted by the Nazis, "since the Government of Switzerland had long prior to this under-

standing offered to aid in restoring such property to rightful owners." Nor does this particular confiscation apply to German Government property in Switzerland. It was purely private personal property, like summer cottages, bank accounts and investments of German nationals in Swiss industry, that the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France confiscated.

III

A lot of pressure was needed to force the reluctant Swiss into this particular application of Mr. Truman's Fair Deal. As our Department of State itself admits: "The Swiss argued against recognition of the Allied legal claim to such (personal, private) property."

The Swiss Government properly insisted that if German private property were confiscated on Swiss soil, indemnification would have to be made to the owners by Switzerland. The agreement of May 25, 1946, eventually recognized the justice of this argument—in theory. Half of the proceeds of the forced liquidation of German private property in Switzerland was allotted to the Swiss Government, partly to cover the administrative costs of the sorry undertaking and partly to give the German owners some indemnification.

That this indemnification has in fact been satirical is clear on the face of the evidence. Less than half of the funds available from forced sales was even allocated for purposes of compensation. And the agreement further provided that any compensation should be paid by the Swiss Government under Allied supervision, in German money.

This mockery of civilized practice is one of the most distasteful parts of the whole agreement. In order to conceal the raw outrage of confiscation the Swiss Government was allowed to pay some compensation—provided that it did so in worthless currency.

The legal case for this confiscation of private German assets in Switzerland was based on the exercise of supreme authority within Germany by the Allied governments, following the German capitulation. Dr. F. A. Mann, writing in the British Year Book of International Law (1946), detects the flaw in the argument that the Allies were merely exercising the functions of a German government. He says:

"There cannot be any doubt that German municipal legislation confiscating German property in Switzerland would have been held by Swiss courts to be opposed to Swiss public order and would, consequently, not have been recognized. Nor can there be any doubt that no established rule of international law would have justified Germany in demanding recognition for her confiscatory legislation. The principle of the territorial character of confiscation was, until recently, too firmly established to be questioned."

In the opinion of Swiss jurists, the illegal agreement forced upon that country was a clear violation of Swiss neutrality. The American argument was that the question of neutrality did not arise, because the war with Germany had been over for more than a year when the agreement was signed on May 25, 1946.

IV

Nevertheless, steps incident to a war, like this confiscation of private German property in a neutral country, must be regarded as a part of the war activity. And that view was adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Ludecke* v. *Watkins*, on June 21, 1948, more than 2 years after the Truman administration acted on a contrary assumption in regard to Switzerland. The plain fact is that the administration has been playing both ends against the middle, acting as though this country were either at war or at peace, according to which viewpoint seems momentarily advantageous to our officials.

We can scarcely have it both ways. If we were at war with Germany when German assets in Switzerland were confiscated, then Swiss neutrality was violated by our pressure to achieve that end. If we were at peace with Germany, then this enforced confiscation of private assets was sheer robbery, as disgraceful as any similar action by Soviet Russia.

The passage of time is serving only to strengthen the misgivings of American lawyers who realize that the agreement forced upon Switzerland, and the subsequent War Claims Act of 1948, are inimical to every long-range American interest, to say nothing of their incompatibility with international law as traditionally preached by American jurists.

In the Virginia Law Review, for last November, Vernon L. Bounds points out that the foreign investments of our nationals total into the billions. Since that was written President Truman has begun to argue that private, as well as state, investment overseas should be fostered, with governmental guaranties.

How can there be either respect for or confidence in a government which at one moment acts to confiscate private property in neutral countries, yet immediately thereafter speaks of guaranties to those who invest their savings overseas?

It is no wonder that the Soviet leaders find us difficult, when we simultaneously practice and revile communistic theory. As the Virginia Law Review sums it up, with admirable restraint: "There is something anomalous in a public policy which at one and the same time attempts to champion capitalism and confiscation.

(The author, thinking that this article should speak for itself, desires to remain anonymous.)

Fascism in Action Now Available Free Through Members of Congress—Fascist Trends in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have just received an announcement from the Superintendent of the House Folding Room to the effect that each Member has been credited with 190 books on Fascism in Action. These books can be distributed free to constituents desiring them.

In our country today, we have many signs indicating a definite Fascist trend among certain groups. The first thing that a Fascist dictatorship attempts is the destruction of labor unions, farm organizations, cooperatives, and all movements where there is the least evidence of majority rule by the people.

Anyone examining the book, Fascism in Action, will quickly discover some of the same trends in this country at this time that existed in Germany, Italy, Spain, and Japan before they became Fascist countries.

We must continue to fight communism with every weapon at our command, but, at the same time, we should not overlook an equally devastating enemy approaching us from another direction.

Exports and Imports of Lumber

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, after checking the statistics on the exports and imports of lumber, issued by the Office of International Trade, I am convinced that in its attempt to provide aid to the Marshall-plan countries of Europe, the ECA has mismanaged the situation and is strangling the export of American lumber.

Prior to last July, our domestic lumber supply situation was less than satisfactory. While there was no over-all shortage, the supply of many grades and sizes was inadequate. But during the last 10 months, production has exceeded orders and shipments by more than 10 percent. The inevitable result was an increase in mill stocks of nearly 2,000,000,000 feet during the calendar year 1948. Thousands of small mills closed during the fall and winter because they could not find a market for their product; and their employees were thrown out of work. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, prices of lumber have dropped about 3 points a month since last August.

In the meantime, imports of logs and lumber from Canada have increased steadily. In 1947 the United States imported 93,000,000 feet of logs from Canada; in 1948, 165,000,000 feet. Imports of lumber from Canada have increased from 1,126,000,000 feet in 1947 to 1,672,000,000 feet in 1948. In other words, now that lumber is plentiful, imports of foreign lumber are flooding the American market. Indeed, 1948 imports from Canada are the largest in more than 20 years, and closely approached an all-time record high.

A comparison of exports and imports of lumber during the last 2 years makes a sad picture. Imports in the third quarter alone of 1948 were greater than exports in the first three quarters.

Up to 1939 we exported substantially more lumber than we bought. In some years our exports amounted to 8 percent of our total production. Lumbermen depended upon this source of revenue, and our country showed a favorable balance of lumber trade. What was probably more important than the quantity of lumber exported was the balancing effect of exports on the lumber economy. We exported grades and species which would have become a surplus in our domestic consumption. But gradually our imports overtook our exports, and since 1939 the gap between our Nation's purchases of lumber and our sales has widened. Now the situation is critical. In 1948, our total exports of lumber were only 646,000,000 feet as compared with imports of 1,880,000,000 feet.

Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to rehabilitate the Marshall-plan

countries—and it is even now appropriating additional billions. We would therefore expect to find these countries the heaviest importers of American lumber. On the contrary, we find the greatest decrease in imports by the United Kingdom and the other European countries. All this, in spite of the fact that housing is one of the most urgent needs of these countries.

Exports of both softwoods and hardwoods have been strangled. Even during some of the depression years we exported more than a billion feet of softwoods a year; but in 1948 our total exports of softwoods were only 462,000,000 feet, less than half of our 1947 exports. And OIT statistics prove that the decrease was greatest for the United Kingdom and the other European countries. Exports of softwood lumber to the United Kingdom in 1948 were 27 percent of those for 1947. Exports to other European countries in 1948 were 19 percent. For hardwoods, our exports to United Kingdom in 1948 were 42 percent of the 1947 record, and to other European countries 47 percent.

Take Douglas fir, for example. The species constitutes our heaviest lumber export item. In 1947 we exported 294,000,000 board feet of Douglas fir to the United Kingdom; three and one-half times as much as in 1948, when we shipped them 86,000,000 feet. But that tells only half the story. Early in 1947 the British Government sent a purchasing commission to this country to buy up lumber to help take care of the much-needed construction and rebuilding in the United Kingdom. Some of that lumber was shipped the second quarter of 1947, but the greater part of the shipments were made the last half of that year. Although the entire purchase was intended to reach England during 1947, certain orders were still left over, and consequently a large part of the imports credited to the first half of 1948 were actually a part of the 1947 purchase orders. To make a fair comparison, therefore, let us take the last half of each of the 2 years. During the last 6 months of 1947 we exported 234,000,000 feet of lumber to the United Kingdom as compared with 39,000,000 feet the last 6 months of 1948.

A comparison of exports of southern pine to the United Kingdom during the 2 years would be pitiful. In 1947 we exported 38,000,000 feet of yellow pine to United Kingdom as compared to 35,000 in 1948—one eleven-hundredth of the previous year's exports. Exports of southern pine to all countries in 1948 were about 55 percent of that of 1947, but in United Kingdom and the other countries receiving ECA funds our exports became a mere trickle.

Let us look at hardwoods. In the period from 1935–39—and those were depression years—we exported an average total of 310,000,000 feet of hardwoods per year to all countries of the world. Of this total we averaged 207,000,000 feet to United Kingdom and 38,000,000 feet to the other European countries. Europe was our best customer; 79 percent of our shipments of hardwoods went to Europe. By 1947 our exports of hardwoods had decreased to 186,000,000 feet, and by 1948 to 87,000,000 feet. And what about the Marshall-plan countries? In 1948 our exports to the United Kingdom were 15 percent of the depression year averages, and the other European countries 38 percent. Our exports to the United Kingdom in 1948 were less than 40 percent of 1947, and to the other European countries about 45 percent.

Again the annual figures tell only half the story. The last half of 1948 our exports of hardwood to the United Kingdom were 12,000,000 feet as compared with 46,000,000 feet during the corresponding 6 months of 1947. A corresponding drop was shown in exports to other European countries.

In other words, the United Kingdom and Europe, the countries that have received the most assistance through the Marshall plan, have shown the greatest decreases in their imports of lumber from the United States.

But these countries are still importing lumber—not from the United States, but from other exporting countries. In 1948 United Kingdom imported 239,000,000 feet of lumber, of which only 15 percent came from the United States. Thirty percent came from the British possessions, the remainder from Yugoslavia, Finland, and other countries. And these imports are being paid for by funds appropriated by our Congress, or by foreign funds released by ECA appropriations.

The outlook for exporting lumber to the United Kingdom and other European countries is no brighter for the future than during the past year. Less than a month ago, England entered into a trade agreement with Soviet Russia which included the importation by the United Kingdom of substantial quantities of lumber from Russia.

And in the meantime, in spite of our Nation's surplus of lumber, we continue to import logs and lumber from Canada and other countries in far greater quantities than our total exports.

Congress by its recent action has approved the basic principle of financial aid to Europe. I do not take any exception to this principle. I merely wish to point out how policies and directives of Government agencies can at times distort historical trade patterns which American industry, resourcefulness and initiative have developed. I sincerely believe that Mr. Hoffman and his associates are endeavoring to do a good job, and this is not in the nature of a criticism, but merely to point out to him that administrative procedures must be changed in order to afford the American lumber industry an equitable opportunity to compete for the business which is made possible by ECA dollars. After all, it is American industry that is paying for this bill. I have appealed to Mr. Hoffman to correct this entire situation, and I have been assured that something will be done immediately. I hope his action is not too little or too late.

Socialism—Stop It Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the people of this country to understand that our whole economy is about to be swamped by socialism.

Mr. James McGraw, Jr., has been making a valuable contribution to thinking on this most important subject, the latest article appearing in the daily press in the form of an advertisement. I commend it to every Member of this House and under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS CAN HALT THE ADMINISTRATION'S SOCIALIST PROGRAM

In his speech at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Winston Churchill said that America's possession of the atomic bomb is all that has kept Soviet Russia from overrunning Europe and bombing London.

Our State Department knows that there has been another deterrent to aggressive warfare by Russia and a deciding one. That deterrent is the superior industrial strength of the United States. But once Russia approaches our industrial strength, then watch out. For Stalin or no Stalin, there will be trouble. Therefore, the simple table below is worth every American's careful reading. It shows in percentages what Russia did with her national income in 1948 and what we did with ours:

	U. S. S. R.	U. S. A.
	Percent	*Percent*
Civilian use	60	79
New capital equipment and public works	21	12
Foreign aid		2
Defense	13	5
Building of inventories and war stock piling	6	2

These figures for Russia come from The (London) Economist, Britain's influential economic journal.

These figures are estimates based on information from behind the iron curtain, and so cannot be checked directly. But they fit with what is known of Russian development.

The table shows that Russia is straining every resource to build up its industrial strength. When Russia's effort is measured in dollars, and compared to ours, the figures show:

Where we spent $20,000,000,000 to $21,000,000,000 for new industrial plants and equipment last year, the Russians spent $12,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000.

But while we used about $9,000,000,000 of this to replace old equipment, the Russians spent no more than $2,000,000,000 for replacing old equipment. The Russians had much less worn-out and obsolete equipment to replace. They could concentrate their efforts on expanding their industries and buying new equipment.

So—we used only $11,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 to expand our industries.

And the Russians used almost as much to expand theirs—$10,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000.

Russia is gaining industrial strength as fast as we are—and may soon be gaining

faster. The more she gains and the faster she gains on us, the greater is the danger of war.

American industry is pushing modernization and expansion hard. It is doing an heroic job. McGraw-Hill's recent survey shows that industry already has in hand plans to build plants and buy equipment in the next 5 years adding up to $55,000,000,000. Industry plans that investment—and much more—if it can get the money.

On those plans of industry depend our national security.

If these plans of ours are cut back, the Russians will be years closer to their goal of industrial equality—the strength that they need to wage aggressive war successfully.

But more and more our industry's plans are being menaced by socialist policies in Washington. The President continues to urge a further increase in the tax on corporate profits, even though Federal taxes alone now take 38 cents of every dollar of profit. He wants $3,000,000,000 more in taxes on corporate profits now, plus added personal taxes.

Last year corporations spent almost two-thirds of their profits—about $13,000,000,000—for new plant and equipment. This year corporation profits will be lower than last year's $21,000,000,000, perhaps by 20 percent. Subtract a fifth or more from last year's profits. Then adopt the President's proposal and take $3,000,000,000 more in corporate taxes and you raise havoc with planned expenditures for new plant and equipment.

Approval by Congress of the President's tax program would cut industry's program of plant and equipment development by a third or more. That means a major blow to our prosperity as well as our national security. For as capital investment goes, so goes general prosperity.

Further serious damage would be done by congressional approval of the President's industry-control bill. The so-called Stability Act of 1949 (the Spence bill) would severely check industrial progress. That bill would put the Federal Government in the business of providing the added industrial capacity which the tax program would prevent private industry from doing for itself. It would be hard to conceive a better and surer way to dry up private investment in new plant and equipment. For every dollar of Government investment will scare away many times more dollars of private investment. People will not want to risk their money in businesses competing with the United States Treasury. At the same time it will attack private investment in another way. It means that Government would spend your income for you instead of allowing you to spend or invest for yourself. That is the high and quick road to socialism.

American industry needs right now great courage and incentives if it is to carry out its tremendous building program. It needs also a release from the program of a socialist administration in Washington with its systematic discouragement of enterprise and risk taking.

Above all, industry needs assurance by the actions of the Eighty-first Congress itself that there is a future in this country for a system of dynamic capitalism, functioning in a free society. By acting now to strengthen the American people's faith in their industrial system, by providing needed incentives for management and investors, by protecting industry's capacity to buy new equipment, the Eighty-first Congress can sustain American industrial progress and keep us united and strong.

But if we kill freedom of industrial planning and action by unneeded taxes and Government controls we put ourselves—and our friends all over the world—in dire peril.

Nothing would please the Communists more.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Basing-Point System in New Jersey—New Jersey Paid Phantom Freight Charged From Points Outside New Jersey—New Jersey Mills Nonbase Mills—Moratorium Will Perpetuate the System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the basing-point pricing system, the cement industry had basing-point mills, nonbasing-point mills, arbitrary basing-point mills, and for big construction jobs ofttimes special basing-point mills. These points were moved around like pawns in a chess game for the purpose of checkmating any semblance of competition, or to procure the last extractable dollar on the sale and distribution of cement. If perchance a cement producer dared show independence by quoting prices off base, the Cement Trust would rapidly marshall its basing point forces for a punitive expedition which either wrecked or brought to brook the recalcitrant mill.

The State of New Jersey had within its borders in years past cement mills which were non-basing-point mills. That meant that every barrel of cement shipped by the New Jersey mills was priced on the basis of some mill or mills outside of New Jersey. That meant also that the State of New Jersey and its citizens paid freight charges which, by appropriate designation, is now known as phantom freight, phantom in the sense that the destination price for cement in New Jersey included more than the actual rail or water freight charge.

New Jersey in those years had no basing-point mills. I have found no indication that New Jersey ever had a basing-point mill. If the Cement Trust can show me that New Jersey and its citizens ever had the privilege of buying cement based on the mills within the boundaries of New Jersey, I shall be glad to have the information.

The situation with respect to New Jersey points up the problem of the sale and distribution of cement and other basing-point commodities. Granted the raw materials, the manpower, and the capital, any State or any subdivision of a State should enjoy its natural advantages and its citizens should not be deprived of such advantages by unnatural, monopolistic pricing systems.

Whole States, and parts of States having the necessary natural resources for the manufacture of cement, steel, and many other commodities, have been precluded from sharing in these industries because monopolies have used the basing-point system to control markets and prices.

ANTITRUST LAWS SHOULD NOT BE WEAKENED

If the citizens of New Jersey and the citizens of our other States and Territories could but calculate the cost of weakened antitrust laws, the attempt to pass moratorium legislation would come to an abrupt ending. In reality, I do not think calculation is necessary, but simply an awareness and a realization of the need for strengthening rather than weakening our antitrust laws.

Barbiturates

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, Thrill Pills Can Ruin You, from Collier's for April 23, 1949. In this article Dr. Paul Dunbar, the Food and Drug Administrator, who is in one of the best positions to have an authoritative grasp of the situation, sums it up this way when asked what can be done to solve the pressing barbiturate problem:

We have always recognized that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is not well suited to the control of a traffic which lends itself so well to an undercover, bootleg type of operation. There are two approaches to the solution of the problem. One is the enactment of a Federal statute comparable to the Federal Narcotic Act. The other is the passage of uniform State and local legislation. We think, however, that it is unrealistic to expect uniform legislation and support of vigorous enforcement in 48 separate States. The alternative, then, it seems to me, is some form of Federal enactment similar to the Federal Narcotic Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 922, which would federally control the sale of barbiturates, which are just as damaging to the human being as other narcotic drugs. It is a cumulative poison. I hope the bill will pass the House promptly.

The article from Collier's to which I refer above, follows:

THRILL PILLS CAN RUIN YOU

(By Norman and Madelyn Carlisle)

As seemingly isolated events began to be revealed, it was plain to civic leaders in Dallas, Tex., that something strange and terrifying was taking place in one of the city's neighborhoods. High-school teachers reported odd conduct on the part of some of their students. One boy, who had always been quiet and responsible, came to school apparently intoxicated and had to be ejected from class. Others seemed to be in a drunken stupor.

The proprietor of a nearby restaurant protested that his place was being overrun by

patrons who insulted other customers, smashed dishes, and caused such trouble that they were ruining his business. The driver of an automobile seemed to go berserk and rammed his car into another one. In a hotel room that was a shambles, a woman was found dead.

However, these violent events were no mystery to the local police nor to the inspectors of the Federal Food and Drug Administration who were called in. The explanation was frightening, but simple. Someone in the neighborhood was indiscriminately selling barbiturates, the drugs that millions know as sleeping pills. The trail of destruction led them to a pharmacy, where they made a shocking discovery. The files of the pharmacist showed that in 2 months he had sold 126,000 capsules without prescriptions.

But what happened in Dallas was no isolated event.

In Cleveland a hysterical woman telephoned the police to come to her home immediately. When they arrived she was sobbing over her husband, who lay on the floor amid a litter of wrecked furniture. The rug was covered with blood. During a violent spell brought on by long and excessive use of barbiturates, the man had not only smashed the furniture but had cut off two of his fingers on a piece of broken mirror. When he came to in a hospital, he had no recollection of his mad spree.

In Providence, R. I., a murder suspect coolly admitted, that he could have killed somebody during one of his frequent barbiturate black-outs.

All over the country, in urban and rural communities alike, billions of these evil capsules are being sold through bootleg channels or by callous individuals who possess them legally. They are leaving behind them a terrifying trail of human wreckage because laws controlling their sale are either lax or nonexistent. In the last decade, the annual sales of barbiturates have increased 300 percent, reaching an all-time high in 1947. The death toll from barbiturates has jumped 600 percent in the same period, making them the Nation's No. 1 poison killer.

Of course, the history of barbiturates is not completely black. Since their discovery in 1903 they have become one of medicine's most valuable tools. Yet all doctors know that the drugs are frightfully dangerous when misused.

More than a decade ago the American Medical Association warned: "The evils of these drugs include habit formation, toxic cumulative action, [and] their substitution for alcoholic beverages for drunken episodes. Their improper use is a recognized causative factor in many motor accidents and in some criminal assaults."

AGONIZING MENTAL EXPERIENCE

When medical men describe the barbiturates as habit-forming rather than addicting, they do not mean that the habit is not hard to break. They are merely referring to the fact that the barbiturate user can stop taking the pills without suffering the great physical discomfort felt by the narcotic addict. But the mental torment in breaking the barbiturate habit is an agonizing experience.

Nevertheless, under the pressure of modern living, thousands are turning to barbiturates in search of escape. All the warnings in the world won't stop them as long as helter-skelter law enforcement makes it possible to obtain the drugs. The term "sleeping pill" has become a misnomer for substances which are increasingly being used as thrill drugs known as goof balls, yellow jackets, red devils, and red birds.

Just exactly what is the effect of these drugs that are causing both individual and national tragedy? The barbiturates are hypnotics, drugs which depress the central nervous system. They create a sort of twilight zone in which the brain is only partially inhibited. Certain parts of the brain are put out of action, other parts remain active, and the resultant effect is one of chaos similar to that which would take place in an engine if some of the parts were to move forward while others were in reverse.

In 1946 a Collier's article warned that the barbiturate drugs constituted a serious national menace. Since then there has been some legislative action aimed at curbing their illegal distribution. New York City, where the problem was particularly bad, set up its own enforcement agency. Pennsylvania put new teeth into its drug statutes. Illinois passed a model law.

While it would be pleasant to report that the situation is improving, the brutal truth is that day by day it is getting not better but worse—much worse. Typical of the cases still confronting authorities was that in Harlan County, Ky., where a miner went into a rage and tried to kill one of his fellow workers. He was found to possess a quantity of "yellow jackets." A few days later another worker collapsed and died after emerging from the mines. His death was diagnosed as barbiturate poisoning. It was then that the facts came to light. Peddlers were working the coal fields, persuading the workers to buy the capsules at prices of from 25 cents to $1 each.

To get an idea of the immensity of the problem, look at the deadly, upward march of barbiturate production as revealed by the United States Tariff Commission, which keeps a complete record of drug manufacture. A decade ago it was 250,000 pounds a year. In 1947, the last year for which final figures are available, it was 900,100 pounds.

Estimates place 1948 production at over 1,000,000 pounds. Translate that into terms of one-grain capsules and you can get some idea of what such a figure means. There are 7,000 grains in a pound—that means more than 50 one-grain capsules for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Has there been any great medical advance calling for this startling increase in the use of barbiturates? Definitely no, says the American Medical Association. The AMA believes, furthermore, that vigorous editorials in its journal have helped to educate doctors to the need for greater caution in the prescription of the barbiturate drugs. Substantiation of this is found in a statement made in January of this year by the American Pharmaceutical Association, the organization which represents the Nation's pharmacies. It indicated that barbiturate prescriptions had actually dropped rather than increased.

Officials of the Food and Drug Administration, faced with the colossal task of stemming the rising tide of misused barbiturates, have a grim interpretation of where the vastly increased amount of drugs is going. They believe that a substantial part of the increase is pouring into illegitimate channels, which get the yellow and red capsules into the hands of people who should not be allowed to have sleeping pills at all.

The only Federal law to keep the barbiturates in legitimate channels is the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, which was never designed to cope with such a problem as this. Its shortcomings are made worse by the fact that there are only 230 harassed and overworked field agents in the Food and Drug Administration.

State backing for the hard-pressed Federal inspectors varies. Ten States have absolutely no laws against the indiscriminate sale of the drugs. They are Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Wyoming, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. Other States have laws on the books, but back them up like one Eastern State which has one part-time official, a drugstore proprietor. There are only a few States, like New Jersey and Minnesota, where there are adequate laws and sufficient numbers of enforcement officers.

A DRUG-DRINK DISASTER

A further complication of the barbiturate problem is illustrated in a case described by Dr. Austin Smith, famed toxicologist of the American Medical Association. Dr. Smith tells of a college professor's wife who had never cared for alcoholic beverages, but was persuaded to try them with a barbiturate. In a few months she had become not only a habitual user of sleeping pills but also a confirmed alcoholic. This combination of alcoholism and the barbiturate habit is relatively common, but while alcoholism has received vast publicity, the related use of the drug has gone almost unnoticed.

The combination of the two brings on an effect that is explosive. Simultaneously, the user gets a drug that tries to put his system to sleep and alcohol which tries to stimulate it. The resultant tug of war for control can bring about a wallop that makes any strictly alcoholic concoction seem like an ice-cream soda.

The files of the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Public Health Service and the records of hospitals bulge with horrifying cases like that of a woman picked up on the streets of a southern city. Under the influence of the drugs, she had gone on a rampage, ending in a fall which broke both her jaws and knocked out several teeth. Investigators were shocked to discover that a few years earlier, the battered and haggard woman had been a famous beauty, a model for a department store. Now she was operating as a prostitute in a shabby hotel. She testified in court that her downfall resulted from her inability to escape the barbiturate habit.

Anyone who habitually uses the drugs to excess is engaging in a courtship with death. Figures released by the United States Public Health Service reveal that 436 people died of accidental barbiturate poisoning in 1946, the last year for which such statistics are available. On top of this were 538 sleeping-pill suicides. In addition, many deaths officially attributed to other causes may have resulted from barbiturate poisoning.

The confirmed user of barbiturates has plenty of chances to kill himself. He may die from slow poisoning. His weakened system may succumb to illnesses or injuries which he might otherwise have survived. He may be killed in an accident resulting from a barbiturate black-out. He may commit suicide by taking an overdose.

Where do people get these dangerous hypnotics? The answer to that question involves the whole process of barbiturate manufacture and distribution. Because the Federal law and most State laws do not require careful records of their distribution, manufacturers and wholesalers do not find it necessary to exercise great care in the sale of their product. The result is that large quantities of the barbiturates are falling into the hands of unscrupulous distributors.

In Baltimore, police noticed that a certain neighborhood had an outbreak of crime. Men picked up in the area were found to possess barbiturate capsules. The crime wave was traced to a tavern, whose bartender was selling "red devils" as a profitable side line.

When most of the Nation's 55,000 pharmacies abide by high standards of ethics, a few callous pharmacists are enough to release a flood of illicit barbiturates. A drug store in a small Middle Western town was found to have sold 9,268 capsules without prescriptions in 4 months. A California drug store had prescriptions for just 28 capsules in its files; for the period they covered it had sold 10,853 without prescriptions.

What can be done to solve the pressing barbiturate problem? Dr. Paul Dunbar, the Food and Drug Administrator, who is in one of the best positions to have an authoritative grasp of the situation, sums it up this way:

"We have always recognized that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is not well suited to the control of a traffic which lends itself so well to an undercover, bootleg type of operation. There are two approaches to the solution of the problem. One is the enactment of a Federal statute comparable to the Federal Narcotic Act. The other is the passage of uniform State and local legislation. * * * We think, however, that it is unrealistic to expect uniform legislation and support of vigorous enforcements in 48 separate States. The alternative, then, it seems to us, is some form of Federal enactment similar to the Federal Narcotic Act."

Just such a bill was proposed to the Seventy-ninth Congress by Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill was killed in committee. It met a similar fate in the Eightieth Congress. Undaunted, Mrs. ROGERS plans to reintroduce the bill to the new Congress. The measure would:

Restrict sales to prescriptions.

Forbid the refilling of prescriptions, except those designated by a doctor.

Limit delivery of barbiturates to pharmacists and physicians.

Place tight controls on manufacturers.

Provide stiff penalties for violations.

While the Federal measure waits its turn in the full hoppers of Eight-first Congress legislation, legislators in such States as Ohio, California, and New York are fighting hard to get action on the State front. Whatever the method chosen for regulation, no one can deny that the time has come to do something to stop the kind of murder by capsule that occurred in a recent case cracked by Food and Drug inspectors.

GRIM PICTURE OF DISASTER

In a squalid apartment in Kansas City, police found the body of a woman. The evidence in that one-room hell showed that before she died, alone and haunted in the dim half world of the sleeping-pill addict, she had become an animal, crawling about on all fours, eating food off the floor, tearing at the furnishings of the room.

Amid the debris, inspectors found a little white box containing a few red capsules. After a search, they located the woman's husband. Head buried in his hands, he told them a story of despair. For years his wife had taken increasing quantities of the capsules that had transformed her from a decent housewife into a half-demented shadow of herself. He had pleaded with her to go to a sanatorium, but she had always refused. Eventually they had separated.

Where had she obtained the capsules? They had come by mail from a druggist in California, a man named Harry Skepner. The man knew this much because his wife had repeatedly received c. o. d. packages that cost her from $20 to $78, for bottles of from 500 to 1,000 tablets. The inspectors asked him to join them in an experiment. The man signed his wife's name to a note addressed to Skepner, asking for another order. In due course of time a box came, addressed to the dead woman. The inspectors went to work to round up other cases, and found that this single Hollywood druggist was selling tens of thousands of the capsules to people all over the country.

Harry Skepner was found guilty, fined $2,000, and put on probation for 3 years. But every American may well ponder the question: How many like him are going to go right on doing business unless strong laws, strongly enforced, stop their traffic in misery and death?

Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper article from the Roanoke World News of April 28, 1949, concerning the recommendation of the City Council of Roanoke for the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act:

CITY COUNCIL ASKS REPEAL OF T-H LAW—HUNTER, EDWARDS OPPOSE ACTION TO NO AVAIL

City council was on record today, by a narrow 3 to 2 vote, as favoring the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

A resolution calling on the Virginia delegation in Congress to work for repeal of the controversial labor legislation was adopted by the one-vote margin last night.

It urges the Virginia Congressmen to work for enactment of a fair national labor law as advocated by the President.

Offered by Councilman Dan Cronin near the end of a 2-hour special meeting, the resolution, written in Mr. Cronin's handwriting, brought strong protest from Councilman Richard T. Edwards and Mayor W. P. Hunter.

Vice Mayor Benton O. Dillard seconded the resolution, which states flatly that "the best interest of the majority of Roanokers will be served by repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act."

On a showdown vote, Councilman A. R. Minton joined Mr. Cronin and Mr. Dillard and the resolution was adopted. Mr. Edwards and Mayor Hunter dissenting.

Vice Mayor Dillard insisted that his colleagues, as Democrats, should vote for the resolution since repeal of the T-H law had been recommended by President Truman and the National Democratic Committee.

Mayor Hunter and Mr. Edwards reasoned that members of council, as individuals, were free to write their Congressman and express their own wishes but as a body council should take no official action.

In adopting such a resolution, they argued, council was in effect telling the Virginia delegation that Roanoke wants the act repealed, whereas in reality no petitions or requests for repeal have been submitted to the governing body.

Mr. Cronin's resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the city of Roanoke is largely an industrial area and the prosperity and general welfare of the city and its citizens are best served when its citizens in industry are employed under favorable conditions and with adequate compensation; and

"Whereas any strife between management and labor in the city of Roanoke would result in losses to both sides and the public as well; and

"Whereas any labor legislation that puts either management or labor at a disadvantage in free collective bargaining is a constant threat to good relations between employers and employees in the city of Roanoke; and

"Whereas the general economic trend appears to be downward and such conditions tend to bring about differences between management and labor; and

"Whereas the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law places a large part of our population in an inferior category and denies to labor the same speedy processes as are granted to management in matters of unfair practices; and

"Whereas labor is fearful lest the machinery of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act break down the solidarity of its ranks and result in regression in the field of working conditions and wages; and

"Whereas any wage reductions in Roanoke industry would result in having a serious adverse effect upon the business interest in Roanoke as well as upon the standards of living of our citizens and the general prosperity of the city:

"Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Roanoke, Va., That the best interests of the majority of the citizens of Roanoke will be served by the outright repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act by the Congress of the United States and the enactment of a fair and equitable national labor law as advocated by the President; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Honorable CLARENCE BURTON and Members of the Virginia delegation in Congress be apprised of this action and urged to work toward the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of a fair national labor law as advovocated by the President."

Must We Use Our Money To Buy Things From One Part of the British Empire To Give These Things to Another Part of the British Empire?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 29, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, our generosity is boundless—when it comes to dealing with foreigners. We are buying from Canada to give to England. For the information of my colleagues there is inserted herewith a reprint clipped from the Pathfinder magazine of April 6, 1949:

CANADA TRIMS TAXES

Stan Clarke lives with his wife and five young daughters in a modest Toronto home, earns $51.50 a week as a milk-route supervisor. His 1948 income tax equaled 2 weeks' pay.

Clarke generally retires early because he has to start work at 4:30 a. m. But one night last week he stayed up to hear good news from Douglas Abbott, Minister of Finance in the St. Laurent Cabinet.

The good news came from the Abbott budget for the fiscal year beginning April 1. The budget was presented at a night session of the House of Commons. It dropped one out of every four taxpayers, 750,000 in all, including Stan Clarke, from the income-tax rolls. It also passed out income-tax reductions to 2,000,000 others, ranging from healthy slices in the lower brackets to cuts of 5 percent for the select with incomes of $75,000 and up.

POP AND PIPES

Off, too, went the taxes on soft drinks, candy, gum, railway and plane tickets, pullman berths, parlor-car seats, long-distance telephone calls and telegrams. Down went the taxes on jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, pens and pencils, cigarette lighters and pipes.

So far as the government was concerned, the reductions were simply good business.

Besides cutting taxes, the government in March refunded $230,000,000 on the forced-savings program which was in effect during the war. And an extra $370,000,000 will be paid to farmers for wheat sold above the price advanced by the government. All this money will be in the people's hands. It will increase Canada's purchasing power by $1,000,000,000. Most of this will be spent at home and will reduce the amount of goods Canada must sell abroad to keep on an even economic keel.

Canada, chiefly an exporting country, is enjoying unprecedented prosperity because the United States has allotted it a good share of Marshall-plan orders.

Frederic C. Walcott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 1, 1949:

FREDERIC C. WALCOTT

Sportsmen, conservationists, and all lovers of the out-of-doors who want to see America's great heritage enhanced, protected, and improved will mourn the passing of former United States Senator Frederic C. Walcott, who died a few days ago at the age of 79.

In his death, the cause of conservation lost a great and effective champion.

As we review the life of Frederic Walcott, we cannot help but be impressed with his versatility and the extraordinary nature and extent of his public services. He had made a great success as a banker and industrialist before he began to take increasing part in public affairs both on a State and National basis.

Herbert Hoover who knew a good man when he saw one, drafted Mr. Walcott at the conclusion of World War I to help in the rehabilitation of starving Europe. His acquaintance with Mr. Hoover actually began in 1915, when Mr. Walcott was abroad helping to arrange war loans for France and Italy. While there he was asked by the Rockefeller Foundation to join Herbert Hoover in London to investigate food conditions in Belgium and Poland. The result was a flood of aid for both countries, and Mr. Walcott personally supervised the relief work in Poland, gaining the everlasting gratitude of the Poles.

He served as United States Senator from Connecticut from 1928 to 1934, and while in the Senate helped to write the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill—a measure which proved of such indispensable service to the Nation during the depression.

During all of these public services, he had kept up an unremitting fight for national conservation and had become recognized by all interested in that subject as one of its great students and champions. In our State, he served as fish and game commissioner from 1921 to 1929, and after his term in the Senate, served as State public welfare commissioner, during which period he personally sponsored and brought into being the old-age assistance bureau, the department of aid to the blind, and other State departments engaged in welfare and humanitarian work. He approached every problem from the most public-spirited viewpoint, and his active vigorous mind never ceased seeking new achievements.

In the course of his career, Mr. Walcott made a multitude of friends, was loaded with honors, both by our own and foreign governments, was the recipient of honorary degrees from many universities, and became eventually almost a legendary figure of public service. With all of that he was a modest, unassuming gentleman, a loyal and unwavering friend, and a tower of strength to every enterprise with which he was associated.

Socialized Medicine Explored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, outstanding young editors in our State are Larry Paulson, editor of the Sherburn Advance-Standard, and D. R. Peterson and Martha Peterson, co-editors of the Truman Tribune. An excellent editorial by Larry Paulson and the comments thereon by the editors Peterson are timely and appropriate. The editorial follows:

Larry Paulson, editor of the Sherburn Advance-Standard, brings to mind the following question confronting the American people and the medical profession:

"SOCIALIZED MEDICINE EXPLORED

"Let this editorial not be an endorsement of socialized medicine for we do feel that it is not a solution of today's problem. This is proven in the experiment carried out in England.

"But if some plan cannot be devised to give everyone the right of having good medical care we believe the Government will take the job out of the hands of the medical profession and try doing the chore themselves. How they will succeed is questionable.

"Too few doctors are willing to go out into the country and set up general practices. In the larger centers doctors are specialists and enjoy wonderful office hours with good incomes. Here in the small town every doctor is literally worked long hours with twice the patients he should have to treat. An hour's wait when there is no emergency is the rule, sometimes it is longer.

"The public is not too concerned about the cost as money is still plentiful but the time is soon at hand when those suffering from chronic illnesses of long standing will be unable to pay their way."

We do not believe socialized medicine or compulsory health insurance are the answer to the rural people's medical problems. The niche in American freedom would be too deep. The politics involved could easily be the worst type our country has ever witnessed. However, if Uncle Sam would offer to finance the education of young men who desired to enter the medical profession, and in turn have the graduates practice for a fixed period of time in needy rural communities, the problem might be minimized. The cost of such a program would be but a fraction of that involved socializing medicine, and there would be no infringement on American freedom. No doubt a certain percentage of the graduates would grow fond of the small communities, and establish permanent practices where there is now such a demand for doctors. The replacements from the various States' medical schools might easily be heavy enough to take care of the needy communities, where graduates decided not to establish permanent practice. Such a plan would be strictly optional for the medic-to-be, and would involve a minimum amount of regimentation.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal of Secretary Brannan with respect to a new farm bill on the subject of price controls, benefit payments, and so forth, I desire to present a statement from Mr. E. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, the largest organization of farmers in the State of Iowa. Since Iowa is the No. 1 agriculture State, the views of Mr. Hill and the position of his organization certainly must command attention in the consideration of this legislation. Mr. Hill's letter reads as follows:

IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 28, 1949.

Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: I thought you might be interested in the statement issued by the Iowa Farm Bureau board of directors today concerning the farm program. The statement is as follows:

"We reiterate our faith in the Agricultural Act of 1948 as a long-time farm program. We see no particular advantages in the more recent suggestions for agricultural programs over this act. If compensatory payments are necessary and advisable to support the price of perishable commodities, they are already authorized in the act of 1948 to be used at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

"In this act the parity formula has been modernized to bring into proper relationship the various crop and livestock commodity prices and to encourage livestock production. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to proclaim acreage allotments and to submit marketing quotas to a referendum. When either of these is in effect, the minimum support on basics is 72 percent of parity and in more practical application, 78 percent of parity. The Secretary has discretionary authority to support practically all products up to 90 percent of parity if he deems it advisable and may go even higher in the interests of national security.

"The 1948 act contains incentives to shift production to commodities in short supply with a minimum of controls and of cost to the taxpayer. It provides for forward pricing as an aid to intelligent farm production planning.

"We believe reasonable supports or floors are vital to the agricultural economy. However, farmers prefer to obtain parity prices through regular trade channels if and when possible. Sound monetary and fiscal policy, high industrial production, full employment, world trade and a healthy economy are extremely important to long-time agricultural prosperity."

In other words, it is our belief that the present Agricultural Act includes adequate provisions for the support of farm prices and at the same time enough flexibility and discretionary authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent some of the mistakes

in administering the farm program that might otherwise occur.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

E. HOWARD HILL, *President.*

Our Economic Missionaries in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of May 2, 1949:

ABROAD—OUR ECONOMIC MISSIONARIES IN EUROPE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The influence of the American administrators of ECA on the changing pattern of Europe is one aspect of the Marshall plan that has not been sufficiently noted. They are at work in every country receiving American aid, advising, inspecting, passing on projects, allocating funds. Nothing quite like these economic missionaries has ever been let loose on the world. Certainly no group has ever had such power in the economic affairs of other countries as the teams of specialists, technicians and businessmen who implement the ERP on the local level. They are pioneers in a novel enterprise, learning more than any foreigners ever knew of other peoples' business and bringing to these other people American ideals, methods, know-how, and the enthusiasm for organizing that distinguishes the American executive.

These ECA missions are among the most striking phenomena on the European scene. They have a peculiar relationship with governments that only embassies have hitherto enjoyed. In some respects it is more intimate. Government ledgers are open to them, and so are other balance sheets. Bankers and industrialists are as keen to show them as they are eager to show producers how to step up production. The observer who watches them in operation wonders if the impact of the advisers that go with American aid will not have a more lasting effect than the funds they help to distribute.

NOT ALL SUCCESS

The ECA has many functions. Sometimes it seems more than a little brash in tackling problems Europeans have been struggling with for centuries as if nobody had ever dealt with them before. To barge in on another nation's economy with proposals for reform requires enormous tact and a pretty definite assurance that the new plans will work. Occasionally they don't; very often they go against the grain. In economics as in politics we are inclined to take things out of their local context and put them into the American framework. This is unrealistic in both fields.

Take the case of Italy as an example. The Italians are perhaps more eager than most people to cooperate with us. In their desire to reestablish their place in the democratic community, they are anxious to cooperate with all the Western Powers, and have succeeded so well with France that French-Italian ties are closer today than at any time in the history of the two countries. Though France is rich and Italy is poor, their internal and external problems are somewhat the same, and French concern in averting Communist rule in Italy by strengthening the present Government is one reason why France favors putting the former colonies under Italian administration.

It is rather paradoxical that American policy is to take away all the colonies except Somaliland with one hand while working with the other to help finance a scheme to find outlets for Italy's excess population. The interrelated problems that cast dark shadows over the bright picture of recovery in Italy are overpopulation and unemployment. Last week the De Gasperi government announced a double attack on these evils. It came out with a 4-year plan of emigration to relocate nearly a million citizens in other countries and a program of land distribution to divide 3,000,000 acres—government lands and large estates—among the poor peasants.

In both schemes the government has the technical advice as well as the financial help of ECA. American experts have already made plans to develop one district as a kind of pilot project combining land reclamation, road-building, and housing. They know that there is not enough ground on the rocky peninsula to make any distribution scheme more than a palliative, but they desire to show the possibilities of opening up and making better use of every acre of available land.

TWO POINTS OF VIEW

This is an illustration of the kind of work the ECA advisers are engaged in. It is easy to see how influential they can be in shaping the policy as well as the economy of the countries they serve. Most of them are hand-picked men, keen on the job. The agricultural experts in Italy are fervently interested in solving the land problem. They work long hours on it. In their approach to conditions without parallel in the United States they are unusually free from preconceived ideas.

Yet on many points they run into differences which emphasize how delicate their mission is. For instance, they claim good rural dwellings can be built for much less money than the Italians spend on constructing houses with walls three times thicker than they need to be. Italian engineers do an excellent job, they say, in road-building and public works, but they are perfectionsist.

The writer discussed the subject with a landowner in Tuscany who runs a big estate on the mezzadri, or 50–50, system. He admitted that the solid two-family houses he provides for his tenants cannot be built for less than $12,000. "We expect our houses to last for 200 years," he explained. "The same families occupy them for generations even when they do not own the land. Ours is a different way of life from yours, not geared to change, and while, of course, your methods are modern and efficient, and do us a lot of good, perhaps they are better suited to a place where people are on the move than to an old land where we have to stay put and can't replace things easily."

Federal Credit Unions—Federal Credit Union Act Sponsored by Late United States Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas—Progress of Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Two-States Press, of Texarkana, United States of America, for April 28, 1949, carried the following article concerning the local credit union. It is as follows:

LOCAL CREDIT UNION TO BE HONORED

The Morris Sheppard Texarkana Federal Credit Union will be honored for its distinction of holding Federal charter No. 1 during the May 13–15 meeting of Credit Union National Association and the Texas Credit Union League in Houston, it was made known here Monday.

Miss Jean Coopwood, secretary-treasurer of the credit union, has received a letter from James M. Barry, managing director of the TCUL, of Dallas, requesting that the local union furnish a large picture of the late Senator Morris Sheppard for public and prominent display. Barry's letter also requested a history of the local union officers and a history of the organization.

His letter said, in part:

"In connection with the forthcoming meeting of the Texas Credit Union in Houston next month and the once-in-a-lifetime meeting in Houston of the Credit Union National Association, we are desirous of honoring your credit union as Federal Credit Union No. 1. We are proud and always have been proud that the late Senator Sheppard sponsored the Federal Credit Union Act and that we in Texas have been honored by having charter No. 1 with his name in the title of your credit union."

Miss Coopwood said she was currently engaged in compiling a history of the union and would send the pictures as requested. Miss Coopwood said Mrs. Richard Arnold had made available to the union a large picture of her father, the late Senator Sheppard.

It is not known at this time whether an official of the union will attend the Houston meetings to represent the local organization.

Joe C. Dixon is president and H. J. Schlink vice president of the credit union.

In 1934 the Honorable Morris Sheppard, who, incidentally, was one of the greatest humanitarians I ever knew, was sponsoring the Federal Credit Union Act. I appreciate the efforts being made by my home town credit union to honor the late Senator Morris Sheppard. Instead of introducing a bill myself, I joined in the effort to get his bill passed. It was S. 1639. The bill passed the Senate May 4, 1934, and it passed the House June 16, 1934, just 2 days before the end of that session of Congress. When the bill was before the House I made the following statement concerning it, which appears on page 12225 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 16, 1934:

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous support of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wish to commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for bringing this bill out. It is sponsored by Senator Sheppard, of Texas, in the Senate. This is his bill. I think it one of the most important and most meritorious bills we have had before us for consideration at this session of Congress. There are 2,200 credit unions in the Nation today. There are not so many credit unions in this country as there are in other countries. There are literally thousands of them in other countries. These are what are known as baby banks. They serve a great need. Between two and three billion dollars' purchasing power each year is destroyed by reason of excessive interest rates that are paid. This bill is sponsored by public-spirited citizens in the interest of the poorest people of our Nation, one of whom not so long ago borrowed $30 from a loan office and actually paid back $1,080, and was then sued for the original $30.

This bill is opposed by loan sharks and shotgun loan offices. It serves a great need, as I said. Although we have 2,200 of them

in the United States, I think the greatest tribute I can pay to the services of those in charge of these baby banks is that during the depression not a one of them failed. I again want to commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for bringing this very meritorious measure before us for consideration and passage.

The bill was lost in the confusion at the end of the session the night of the 18th of June, and it was only after much trouble and investigation that the bill was finally located and signed by both the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States. It was my pleasure to do the footwork which led to the location of the bill. It was later approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, June 26, 1934.

I have always been a strong advocate of Federal credit unions, and I have been the author of several bills to strengthen the act. The following statement discloses the status of the Federal credit unions in Texas, and also compares their growth with the State-chartered credit unions. It is as follows:

Development of Federal credit unions in the State of Texas 1940–48, inclusive

Year ending Dec. 31—	Number operating	Members	Assets	Loans outstanding
1940	267	63,568	$5,120,200	$4,200,571
1941	298	74,409	6,646,239	5,071,474
1942	289	65,263	6,262,855	2,641,010
1943	264	60,914	6,557,266	2,018,192
1944	244	56,937	7,030,295	1,901,739
1945	235	55,065	7,793,201	2,023,970
1946	237	60,671	9,587,329	3,636,512
1947	245	73,200	12,419,841	6,401,042
1948	268	90,460	16,665,069	11,246,325

Development of State-chartered credit unions in the State of Texas, 1940–48, inclusive

Year ending Dec. 31—	Number operating	Members	Assets	Loans outstanding
1940	89	32,910	$3,176,277	$2,724,237
1941	90	23,985	3,500,000	3,100,000
1942	102	24,233	3,478,502	1,666,151
1943	88	19,859	3,617,758	1,296,617
1944	84	21,015	3,603,765	1,161,873
1945	84	21,152	4,001,991	1,205,926
1946	83	21,407	4,592,643	1,801,190
1947	84	26,204	5,612,468	2,981,042
1948	85	31,204	7,346,460	4,963,053

WHAT IS A CREDIT UNION?

The American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., has prepared an interesting leaflet on credit unions. I have taken the liberty of making a few changes to bring the folder up to date, and I am inserting it herewith. It is as follows:

CREDIT UNIONS

1. What is a credit union? A credit union is an association of persons, united by some common bond or community of interest, joined together in a cooperative endeavor for the following purposes:

(a) To encourage thrift by providing a safe, convenient, and attractive medium for the investment of the savings of its members.

(b) To eliminate usury and increase the purchasing power of its members by enabling them to borrow for productive and other beneficial purposes at a reasonable cost.

(c) To train its members in business methods and self-government and bring them to a full realization of the value of cooperation.

(d) The credit union operates through a board of directors, a credit committee and a supervisory committee elected by and from the members.

2. When was the first credit union organized? Frederick William Raiffeisen organized the first credit union in Germany in 1848. Today, they are operating in almost every country of the world. The first credit union charter in the United States of America was granted in Massachusetts in 1909. There are 12,000 credit unions operating throughout the United States, Canada, Hawaii, Jamaica, and Panama Canal Zone.

3. How does a credit union differ from an ordinary bank?

(a) It promotes systematic thrift by encouraging its members to save small sums at regular intervals.

(b) A credit union can be of service to all—such as a community organization, church parish, school officers' organization, labor unions, factory workers, lodge members, etc.

(c) No elaborate offices, furniture or, in most cases at least, no salaried officials except a treasurer.

(d) Loans are made only to members and for provident and productive purposes.

(e) Character, honesty, and industry are required for membership and on this basis loans are made.

(f) Control is vested in the members on the cooperative principle of one member, one vote.

(g) All profits revert to the members after expenses of operation are deducted.

4. What classes of people do credit unions serve? Groups bound together by a common bond of interest, e. g., the members of a parish, of a labor union, the workers in a factory, groups in which personal acquaintance will serve as an impetus to the work. The size does not really matter. Credit unions have been found to work well in groups of from 50 to 5,000, as long as some bond of interest exists.

5. Why should I become a shareholder?

(a) Every person should cultivate the habit of thrift.

(b) An accident, illness, unusual family condition, or other provident reasons may at some future time, necessitate your needing more money than you have readily available.

(c) Every person should grasp the opportunity to render an unselfish service to his or her fellow workers.

6. How may I become a shareholder? By paying an entrance fee of 25 cents and subscribing and paying either 25 cents, 50 cents, $1 or any possible amount on a $5 share of stock. Only one entrance fee is required.

7. What liability does the shareholder assume? There is no liability to the shareholder, other than obligations agreed upon when subscribing to shares, or when making a loan.

8. What protection is offered shareholders?

(a) The treasurer is bonded.

(b) Payments and withdrawals are made by check and all checks must be signed by the treasurer and countersigned by the president of the board of directors.

(c) All cash receipts must be deposited regularly in a bank the accounts of which are federally insured.

(d) All record books are examined monthly or quarterly by the supervisory committee of the credit union as decided upon by them, as well as once a year by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions or State government authorities.

9. May a member withdraw at will? Yes, a member may withdraw his shares and deposits on any day the credit union is open for business. Should the withdrawal be of a large amount, a specified period of time may be required. All withdrawals must be made at the office. No member may withdraw shares or deposits who owes the credit union money or is the guarantor of any loan.

10. What constitutes the capital of a credit union? The capital of a credit union consists of the pooled savings paid in on shares and deposits by members.

11. How is the capital used?

(a) Loans are made to members for productive and provident purposes, thereby helping the member to help himself. For instance: To pay dental bills, for auto financing, to buy clothing, to buy furniture, to buy other necessities, to pay bills, to pay taxes, to pay insurance, for medical purposes, for educational purposes, for vacation purposes, for business purposes, for building purposes, to cooperatives.

(b) According to the Federal credit union report of 1947 outstanding loans amounted to $91,372,197. During the entire period of Federal credit union operation over 8,000,000 loans have been made to members. These loans total more than $1,000,000,000.

12. Your credit union has loan protection insurance. Loan protection is a plan whereby your credit union is insured against loss due to the death or total and permanent disability of borrowers.

In other words, if an insured borrower becomes totally and permanently disabled before attaining age 60, or becomes deceased before attaining age 70, the balance of the loan is paid in full and the security offered by the borrower is released from any liability.

This service is helpful to the credit union members because the officers will not be obliged to collect further payments from the widow and cosigners, or take over chattels or shares that may have been given as security. It is helpful to the borrower, for he does not have to worry over who will pay the loan if he dies or becomes totally and permanently disabled.

13. What interest rate is charged on loans? The interest rate on loans is never more than 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance or 1 percent per month on each dollar not repaid.

14. How does a member apply for a loan? By filling out an application form, giving full information as to the amount required, purpose of the loan, duration of loan, security offered, and so forth.

15. What constitutes the income of a credit union?

(a) The interest paid on loans by borrowing members.

(b) Interest, if any, on bank balance, including in many credit unions deposits in savings banks.

(c) Dividends on any investments which may have been made.

16. What is done with the yearly earnings of a credit union? After operating costs are deducted and 20 percent set aside in the reserve account for bad loans, the dividend to be paid to members on their shares is decided at an annual general membership meeting.

17. How should a group proceed to organize a credit union?

BILL TO STRENGTHEN CREDIT UNION ACT

At this session of Congress, March 3, 1949, I introduced a bill (H. R. 3201) concerning credit unions, which is as follows:

A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (5) of section 7 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., secs. 1751–72) is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof the following: "with maturities not exceeding 2 years."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (7) of section 7 of the Federal Credit Union Act is hereby amended by striking out "and" after "(d)" and by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph (7) a semicolon and the following: "and (e) in shares of central credit unions."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 10 of the Federal Credit Union Act is hereby amended to read as follows: "The annual

meeting of each Federal credit union shall be held at such time during the following January, February, or March, and at such place as its bylaws shall prescribe."

SEC. 4. The fourth sentence of subsection (d) of section 11 of the Federal Credit Union Act is hereby amended to read as follows: "No loan in excess of $500 shall be made without adequate security, and no loan shall be made to any member which shall cause such member to become indebted to the Federal credit union in the aggregate, upon loans made to such member, in excess of $200 or 10 percent of the Federal credit union's paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus, whichever is greater."

SEC. 5. Section 12 of the Federal Credit Union Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. All entrance fees and fines provided by the bylaws and 20 percent of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividend, shall be set aside, subject to terms and conditions specified in the bylaws, as a reserve fund: *Provided, however,* That when the reserve fund thus established shall equal 10 percent of the total amount of members' shares on deposit, no further transfer to the reserve fund from net earnings shall be required except as needed to maintain this 10 percent ratio: *And provided further,* That no transfer to the reserve fund in excess of fees and fines and 20 percent of net earnings shall be required in any one year.

OBJECTIVES OF BILL H. R. 3201

The object of this bill is to make certain amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act, as follows:

First. Section 7 of the Federal Credit Union Act reads, in part, as follows:

Powers: A Federal credit union shall have succession in its corporate name during its existence and shall have power—

* * * * *

(5) To make loans with maturities not exceeding 2 years to its members for provident or productive purposes upon such terms and conditions as this chapter and the bylaws provide and as the credit committee may approve, at rates of interest not exceeding 1 percent per month on unpaid balances (inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan): *Provided,* That no loans to a director, officer, or member of a committee shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof.

It is proposed to amend paragraph (5) of section 7 by striking out the words: "with maturities not exceeding 2 years."

This would empower a Federal credit union to extend its loans over a period greater than 2 years. It would leave the terms of repayment of loans in the hands of the board of directors and credit committee. This is permissible now under practically all State credit-union laws.

Second. Section 7 of the Federal Credit Union Act reads, in part, as follows:

Powers: A Federal credit union shall have succession in its corporate name during its existence and shall have power—

* * * * *

(7) To invest its funds (a) in loans exclusively to members; (b) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (c) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Governor, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 percent of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (d) and in shares or accounts of Federal savings and loan associations.

It is proposed to amend paragraph (7) of section 7 by striking out the word "and" appearing as the first word in subsection (d) thereof and by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and by substituting for such period a semicolon and by adding after such semicolon "and (e) in shares of central credit unions."

Federal credit unions now have the power to invest their savings in Federal savings and loan associations. This change would make it possible for them to deposit their funds in their own central organizations. Many States do now have central credit unions in which other credit unions may deposit funds and from which other credit unions may borrow. For example, there is an excellent central credit union of this type in North Dakota, one in Minnesota, one in Rhode Island, and several other States. It seems just as reasonable for Federal credit unions to be able to invest their funds in central credit unions as it is for them to invest funds in Federal savings and loan associations.

Third. Section 10 of the Federal Credit Union Act reads, in part, as follows:

Members' meetings: The fiscal year of all Federal credit unions shall end December 31. The annual meeting of each Federal credit union shall be held at such time during the month of the following January and at such place as its bylaws shall prescribe.

It is proposed to change the second sentence of section 10 to read as follows:

The annual meeting of each Federal credit union shall be held at such time during the following January, February, or March, and at such place as its bylaws shall prescribe.

This would permit Federal credit unions to hold their annual meetings at any time during January, February or March, which in many cases would be a great convenience. The members of Federal credit unions are in most cases employees of large corporations and are oftentimes unusually busy during the month of January, which is frequently the close of the corporation's year. It is believed that larger attendance could be obtained at the annual meeting in many cases if the meeting could be held in some month other than January.

Fourth. Section 11, subsection (d), of the Federal Credit Union Act reads in part as follows:

No loan shall be made to any member which shall cause such member to become indebted to the Federal credit union in the aggregate, upon loans made to such member, in excess of $200 or 10 percent of the Federal credit union's paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus, whichever is greater, or in excess of $300 unless such excess over $300 is adequately secured.

It is proposed to amend the fourth sentence of subsection (d) of section 11 to read as follows:

No loan in excess of $500 shall be made without adequate security and no loan shall be made to any member which shall cause such member to become indebted to the Federal credit union in the aggregate, upon loans made to such member, in excess of $200 or 10 percent of the Federal credit union's paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus, whichever is greater.

This change increases the amount which may be loaned without security. Several years ago the Federal Credit Union Act was amended to increase the amount which may be loaned without security to $300. It is felt that in view of present monetary conditions $500 is a reasonable limit. The management of any one Federal credit union of course has the right to set a smaller limit based on conditions within the particular group.

Fifth. Section 12 of the Federal Credit Union Act now reads as follows:

Reserves: All entrance fees and fines provided by the bylaws and 20 percent of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividends, shall be set aside, subject to terms and conditions specified in the bylaws, as a reserve fund against possible bad loans.

It is proposed to amend section 12 so it will read as follows:

SEC. 12. All entrance fees and fines provided by the bylaws and 20 percent of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividend, shall be set aside, subject to terms and conditions specified in the bylaws, as a reserve fund: *Provided, however,* That when the reserve fund thus established shall equal 10 percent of the total amount of members' shares on deposit, no further transfer to the reserve fund from net earnings shall be required except as needed to maintain this 10 percent ratio: *And provided further,* That no transfer to the reserve fund in excess of fees and fines and 20 percent of net earnings shall be required in any one year.

At present the Federal credit unions must set aside fees and fines and 20 percent of net earnings each year in a reserve fund. This change would make it unnecessary for the Federal credit union to set aside anything in the reserve fund after the reserve fund is equal to 10 percent of the total amount of the members' shares on deposit. It would protect the credit union against the possibility of being compelled to transfer more than fees and fines and 20 percent of its net earnings to the reserve fund during any one year. This is a standard provision contained in many State laws. A reserve fund equal to 10 percent of the shares on deposit in the credit union has been found to be ample. At present the reserve fund may be used only to offset those losses which are brought about through bad loans. This amendment provides that the reserve fund may be used to cover any type of loss sustained by the Federal credit union, such as depreciation of securities, and so forth.

Big Muddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most important article entitled "Big Muddy," appearing in the April 1949 quarterly issue of Farm Policy Forum, the nationally known farm journal published at Iowa

State College. This article says in substance what some of us have long contended, namely, that too many cooks spoil the soup—that is the trouble with the Missouri River project today.

The Iowa State farm journal summarizes the intensely interesting and informative study made recently by the Public Affairs Institute, published under the heading, "The Big Missouri: Hope of our West," which has received high commendation from people in all walks of life as the most forthright and thorough appraisal we have had of the Missouri Basin situation. In fact, it was quoted frequently in the recent Hoover Commission task force report which advocated a careful reappraisal of the Missouri Basin flood control, irrigation, and other public works. We would be well advised to consider its findings before making what may turn out to be more wasteful expenditures through appropriations to the Army Engineers' Corps.

For these reasons, I am sure that this carefully written article will prove interesting to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG MUDDY

Every farmer knows that where there's one farm, there must be one boss. He can't expect to make a go of it if he has 10 hired men all telling him and each other what to do.

It's that way on the big river—only more so. More jobs have to be done, and in the right order.

There are 2 big bureaus and more than 10 separate smaller Federal agencies in the Missouri project. All are getting into each other's hair. All are racing to get their feet into the river first and stake out claims that will keep them there forever—whether it is good for the valley's people or not.

The Missouri Valley can be a growing, prosperous region. It can have rich farms, and lots of them. It can have cheap power, and industries. There can be enough jobs in industry to maintain a healthy balance between agriculture and industries.

But it takes foresight, sound budgeting and planning ahead to make such hopes come true. There must be single-minded leadership.

There is nothing approaching this in the Missouri Valley today.

There are still two plans, not one. And the job of working out a single over-all plan hasn't even been tackled.

IMPORTANT NEEDS

There are some 10 great needs in the valley. They have to be worked out as well as men can work them out—not casually, not jealously or compromisingly.

These are the Missouri Valley's fundamental needs: (1) adequate flood control; (2) irrigation at reasonable costs to farmers; (3) low-cost electric power; (4) adequate transportation, lower freight rates, dependable navigation; (5) industrialization, mineral and phosphate development; (6) soil conservation; (7) abundant industrial and household water supplies; (8) recreational facilities; (9) reforestation and reseeding of forest areas; (10) wild-life conservation and management.

These unfinished tasks cannot be separated out into independent problems. They all overlap. This in itself is good evidence that they cannot be handled by separate agencies.

Yet so far the Big Missouri's problems have been dealt with separately. There is no over-all plan. The various unfinished tasks have been glossed over, patched up, or forgotten. Never has a major river development in this country been undertaken on such a pile of shaky, unplumbed and unsquared foundations.

Already the estimates for developing the Missouri Valley run toward $4,000,000,000. The complete project probably will cost much more. Yet all of this money can be frittered away with only a little accomplished.

The way things stand now, farmers don't know what they will have to pay for irrigation water. They don't even know how much water they may get. Navigation interests don't know where they'll come out. And the victims of floods probably will not be protected for some time. The chances for low-cost electric power in the valley are growing slimmer and dimmer every day.

WHO GETS THE WATER?

This question is basic. The two main uses for the Missouri's water are irrigation and navigation. Both need lots of it. And there isn't nearly enough in dry years to give both uses the amount needed.

In a wet year, the flow is far greater of course. So a large part of that extra flow in wet years can be stored up in dams to be used during the dry cycle.

Congress has authorized a 9-foot channel between Sioux City and the mouth of the Missouri. But can the reservoirs supply enough water for both navigation and irrigation during a dry cycle?

Counting the yearly demand of stored water, waste and evaporation losses, water stored during wet years would probably not last more than 7 years in a dry cycle. Our last dry cycle lasted 12 years—1929 to 1940. Whether the present storage plan will do the job depends upon the severity and length of dry spells to come.

If irrigation manages to hold its claim on the water, then navigation may suffer. If the navigation interests get first claim to the water, there may not be enough water for irrigation during dry cycles—when farmers need it most.

Electric power is expected to pay some of the irrigation investment. But in order to pay its share it has to be operating all the year round. The unsettled question of scarce water in dry cycles will make power a weak partner for farms and industry.

OTHER CHANNELS

There are other suggestions in the navigation-irrigation dilemma. Construction costs for a dug channel (with locks like a canal) would be higher. But it would use less water. It might pay out in the long run.

Another suggestion has been to build a 12-foot channel from the mouth of the Missouri to Sioux City. This would take even more water than the 9-foot channel now authorized. But there are sound arguments for it. Whatever the decision, it must be made now—so necessary planning and building can get underway.

The channel must be reliable every year and for the full season every year. Otherwise it will be of little value.

NAVIGATION VERSUS FLOOD CONTROL

The levees and other navigation works that now hold the river within a narrow channel are actually causing floods with less water than before.

It all starts with the topsoil of the Missouri Valley. First, we let it go downstream to rest on the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico. Then we narrowed the river channels and let it rest on the bottom of those channels. Now we're going to have big reservoirs where the silt will all come to rest, gradually filling them up.

A new over-all plan for the Missouri Valley would start with the idea of keeping that topsoil where it belongs—on the land. Only there, in place, can it produce crops for farmers.

And keeping both topsoil and water on the land is the first and most important step in flood control.

DUBIOUS PROJECTS

The dams and reservoirs now planned as part of the Missouri Valley project will irrigate millions of acres of land, and produce millions of kilowatts of electric power.

And the projects themselves will cost untold millions of dollars. Yet there has been no coordinated planning of who will get these benefits or who will pay their costs.

The Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri-Souris water diversion would pump water from near Fort Peck, Mont., across the watershed to the north and let it run down along the United States boundary into North and South Dakota. This would use for irrigation practically all of the run-off of the Missouri River above Fort Peck. It will also raise the level of Devil's Lake, once a pleasure resort.

An alternative to this plan is to irrigate the upper Cheyenne area in eastern Montana. Another project would irrigate the James River area in South Dakota.

All of these projects would give large-scale irrigation to areas which now practice dryland farming. These lands are only semi-arid. In about 4 years out of 10 they get enough rainfall to grow a normal crop. Some of the other 6 years will have low crop yields due to limited moisture; some years will have crop failures.

Irrigation would be needed only during drought and semidrought years. It would be limited to 160 acres on each farm. Obviously if irrigation is not used every year, costs will be much higher for the use that is made of it. Farmers in this region would have to make major changes in their farming practices. No organized survey has been made to find out how many farmers in each area want irrigation and are willing to pay for it.

On the other hand the Garrison Dam project suggested by the Army engineers was thoroughly opposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. It was reported to have "foundation conditions that are inadequate to insure the successful construction and permanent safety of the completed dam." This was the judgment of Warren J. Mead, specialist from Massachusetts Institute of Technology called in by the Army engineers. But the Bureau swallowed its objections to the Garrison Dam in a trade which approved Fort Peck and let the Army go ahead with the Garrison. This trade was part of the "Omaha Compromise of 1944."

At Canyon Ferry, Mont., the Bureau of Reclamation proposes a 2,000,000 acre-foot reservoir and dam. This is above the main power plants of the Montana Power Co. near Great Falls, Mont. (The study leading to this recommendation was financed by the Montana Power Co. to the extent of $50,000, roughly half its cost.)

This Canyon Ferry Dam would greatly increase the amount of firm power that the Montana Power Co. could produce. It would hold back floodwaters in the spring, release them later on when there is less water flow available.

This extra power would be worth many million dollars to the Montana Power Co. over the life of the dam.

What part of these millions in extra profits from the Canyon Ferry Dam should the power company properly pay? No adequate payment has yet been discussed. If the problem is ignored and left as it now stands, the Bureau of Reclamation will simply build the dam with Government funds, and the power company will make millions out of it. None of the revenues thus gained will go toward helping farmers of the State.

Farmers would get very little water for irrigation because the Montana Power Co. already claims all water rights to the upper Missouri.

Still the dam is being started before the amount the Montana Power Co. must pay has been decided. Farmers have little guaranty that they will get any more water for irrigation than they are now getting—and that is very little indeed.

WHO PAYS HOW MUCH

How much will farmers pay for irrigation? How much will electric power cost? As now planned, the river is going to be run mostly for irrigation and navigation. Neither of these allow much for good electric power—firm power all the year around. It never has been decided how much those who benefit from the project will pay toward supporting its costs.

Originally the Bureau of Reclamation hoped that sale of electric power would help pay the costs of irrigation. Returns from electric power sales would pay much of the interest charges on the investments in dams and reservoirs. This would ease the interest burden of the irrigation users.

But this plan too has been blocked. This extra help from the sale of electric power has been limited to one-fifth of the aid that it could give.

The main fact to remember here is that under the present divided management nobody knows for sure how much we will have to pay. There is no strong single agency that can really represent all interests in the valley.

The Army engineers are under no obligation to aid water users with the power revenues their dams earn. In the reclamation law there is such an obligation. But the Army engineers have practically all of the big power dams. They do not have to help out the irrigation work at all.

The original Bureau plans called for writing off some of the construction expense against the benefits from flood control and navigation. But now the Army engineers have 42,000,000 acre-feet of storage above Sioux City alone for flood control and navigation, and for power. They may want to make all these write-offs against their own dams. The Bureau's dams do not add much to navigation or flood control. So more of their costs may have to be paid by water users.

THINGS UNDONE

These are just a few unsettled issues of the present compromise plan for the development of the Missouri Valley. Such major questions cannot be left dangling and undecided. Their solution is vital to the success of the over-all project.

The job of building up industries in the valley—and of getting new ones—has been entirely neglected. It ought to be done well. The hopes of the valley people are tied to industrial development within the area.

Soil conservation, reforestation, recreation—all these and others have to be integrated into the complete over-all plan.

The many important unsettled problems mean simply one thing: The whole job must be reviewed again. It is not too late. Only a single, integrated plan carried out by a single, unified authority can work for the over-all welfare of the valley, its people, and the Nation.

Union-Shop and Strike-Vote Elections—A Legislative Fallacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following article by Fred Witney, of Indiana University School of Business, which is a very fine analysis of the experience under the union-shop and strike-vote election requirement

UNION SHOP AND STRIKE-VOTE ELECTIONS—A LEGISLATIVE FALLACY

Experience with compulsory government union shop and strike-vote elections serves to shed light on the problem of the relationship between union members, on the one hand, and labor organizations and union leadership, on the other hand. An analysis of the results of these elections may also prove to be of value in shaping the appropriate Government approach to labor-management relations. Union shop and strike-vote elections are required under the terms of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and by the provisions of several State labor laws.

Management and labor organizations under the Labor-Management Relations Act may not take action against an employee under a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership provision until a majority or more of those workers eligible to vote in a bargaining unit cast ballots in favor of requiring union membership as a condition of employment.[1] The same law forbids strikes for a period of 80 days whenever in the opinion of the President and the Federal courts a strike would imperil the health and safety of the Nation.[2] After 60 days have elapsed from the date upon which such a strike is enjoined and before the seventy-fifth day, the National Labor Relations Board must poll the workers who would be involved in such a strike on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer. The States of Michigan, Missouri, Delaware, and Alabama outlaw all strikes unless a majority of workers in a bargaining unit vote in favor of striking.[3] Fines and imprisonment may be imposed upon persons violating the strike-vote statutes of these States.

Requirements for union-shop and strike-vote elections rest upon the underlying assumption that a cleavage of interest separates the union member from his organization and that the rank and file need legal protection from union leadership. One Senator expressed this viewpoint in advocating the strike-vote procedure: "I want to protect the worker. It seems to me he is the forgotten man. The individual worker is the man in trouble."[4] Another lawmaker speaking in support of legislation aimed to curtail the opportunity for labor organizations to obtain union security contended that, unless regulated, the requirement of union membership as a condition of employment gives the union leaders such tremendous power over the members that they are apt to use it arbitrarily. * * *[5] Hence the compulsory Government election serves the rank and file as a first line of defense against arbitrary and irresponsible union leadership.

The results of union-shop elections contradict this point of view. From August 22, 1947, the date on which the Labor-Management Relations Act became effective, through August 31, 1948, the National Labor Relations Board conducted 23,752 union-shop elections. Of these polls 23,214 resulted in the authorization of the union-shop provision in the agreements. In these elections 2,599,471 workers were entitled to vote, and 2,248,501 voted. Of the workers voting, 2,120,971 voted in favor of the union shop.[6]

These elections indicate that the rank and file understood the need for union security and collective action. Instead of using the Government-sponsored, and incidentally secret, election as a means to free themselves from union membership, workers overwhelmingly have underscored their desire for the fashioning of strong unions through the requirement that employment rest upon the condition of union membership. The voters have also made it clear that the obligations and responsibilities of union membership should be the prerequisite to the enjoyment of the benefits of collective bargaining. What conclusion is there to be drawn from the experience with the union-shop elections other than that union members are not the reluctant victims of autocratic and irresponsible labor organizations and union leaders, but are rather the willing supporters of their organizations and zealous advocates of effective collective action in the area of industrial relations?

Compulsory Government strike-vote election returns support the proposition that strikes are not called by an arbitrary union leadership in defiance of the will of the rank and file. In a strike poll conducted under the Labor-Management Relations Act by the NLRB, the workers at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, an atomic-energy plant, voted 771 to 26 to support the recommendations of their union representatives and refused to accept the last offer of their employer, the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp.[7]

The strike-vote election experience in the November 1948 west coast maritime controversy also bears on this issue.[8] The NLRB reports that of the 26,965 shoreside employees, members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, not a single employee appeared to cast a ballot. In the strike-vote elections involving the offshore and coastwise employees,[9] the following results are reported:

Number of eligible voters: 8,812.

---

[1] Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, act of June 23, 1947, Public Law 101, 80th Cong., 1st sess., title I, sec. 8 (3) and sec. 8 (b) (2).

[2] *Ibid.*, sec. 206.

[3] Michigan Labor Mediation Act, Act No. 176 of the Public Acts of 1939 as amended by Act No. 318 of the Public Acts of 1947, sec. 17.454 (1). On September 7, 1949, the Michigan State Supreme Court held the Michigan Labor Mediation Act wholly unconstitutional. A short time later the Michigan high court reversed its position and held that only the arbitration features of the law violated constitutional rights. Accordingly the strike-vote requirements of the Michigan law remain in force. Commerce Clearing House, Labor Law Reports, weekly summary, October 7, 1948, p. 8 Missouri S. B. 79, L. 1947, approved July 22, 1947, effective September 10, 1947, sec. 3; Delaware H. B. 212, laws of 1947, approved and effective April 5, 1947; Alabama Act No. 298 (Bradford act), act of 1943, sec. 13. However, the feature of the Alabama law requiring a majority vote in a bargaining unit before a strike can be legal was declared unconstitutional by the Alabama Supreme Court on the ground that the election provision constitutes an unreasonable and arbitrary restraint upon the right of the individual employee to strike. *Alabama State Federation of Labor* v. *McAdory*, Alabama Supreme Court, 6th division, No. 234, October term, 1943–44, May 25, 1944.

[4] Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 55 and S. J. Res. 22, pt. I, p. 73.

[5] *Ibid.*, pt. 3, p. 1177.

[6] From a letter of Mr. Louis G. Silverberg, Director of Information, National Labor Relations Board, dated October 26, 1948.

[7] Labor Relations Reporter, XXII (June 7, 1948), 90.

[8] The information pertaining to the strike-vote experience in the west coast maritime controversy has been obtained from the source indicated in footnote 6, above.

[9] The offshore and coastwise employees are represented by the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; Pacific Coast Marine Firemen, Oilers, Water Tenders, and Wipers Association; and the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards.

Number voting to accept final offer of employer: 296.

Number voting to refuse final offer of employer: 651.

Void ballots: 56.

Workers refusing to vote: 7,809.

These results indicate that employees have either boycotted the strike-vote election procedure of the Labor-Management Relations Act or have voted to sustain union leadership in the west coast shipping dispute. Of equal importance is the conclusion drawn from this experience that compulsory strike-vote elections do not eliminate industrial conflict. The west coast maritime strike continues unabated despite the strike polls. The solution for industrial conflict must be sought in approaches other than the mere polling of workers in strike-vote elections.

National and State lawmakers would have profited from a study of the strike-vote experience under the War Labor Disputes Act.[10] A careful analysis of these results would save much energy and expense in the attempt to eliminate strikes through compulsory Government strike-vote elections.

Under the terms of the War Labor Disputes Act, the NLRB was required to poll war workers on the issue of interrupting war production on the thirtieth day after the receipt of a strike notice. No strike could lawfully take place in a privately operated war plant until the Board had conducted such a strike vote. During the period from June 25, 1943, through June 25, 1944, the first full year of the operation of the War Labor Disputes Act, a majority of the workers polled voted to strike in 203 elections out of the 230 which the Board conducted. However, only 64 strikes actually took place subsequent to the strike polls.[11] In 1945 the Board administered 1,445 strike polls, and a majority of the workers cast ballots in favor of striking in 1,249 of these cases, although only 213 strikes were actually carried out.[12] In view of this experience, it appears that the requirement of strike elections had little influence on the number of work stoppages carried out. Despite the large number of favorable strike votes, workers actually interrupted war production in a comparatively small number of cases after the ballots were taken. Most of these work stoppages probably would have occurred had strike polls not been required. However, since a favorable strike vote provided a basis for apparent Government approval for a work stoppage, one might have expected more strikes than actually occurred.

The results of strike-vote elections under the War Labor Disputes Act invalidate further the assumption of conflict of interest between the union member and his union. These elections have not resulted in the repudiation of union leadership by the rank and file, but serve to highlight the mutuality of their objectives and methodology. The experience with the strike-vote elections required by the War Labor Disputes Act clearly indicates what results to expect from the present labor laws, State and Federal, compelling strike polls as a prerequisite to a lawful strike.

Proper legislation aimed at the objective of improving industrial relations is highly desirable. When labor legislation rests upon invalid assumptions, however, such laws result in more rather than less labor strife, needless public expenditure, and wasted energy. The experience with compulsory Government-sponsored union-shop and strike-vote elections discloses that the assumption of a cleavage of interest between union member, labor organization, and union leadership does not square with reality. This assumption should no longer serve as a frame of reference for lawmakers who would improve labor-management relations through legislation.

FRED WITNEY,
Assistant Professor of Economics, Indiana University.

[10] 57 Stat. 163, 78th Cong., 1st sess., sec. 8 (a) (3).

[11] Monthly Labor Review, LIX (Sept. 1944), 572.

[12] *Ibid.*, LXII (May 1946), 734.

Colorado River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bakersfield (Calif.) Californian of March 12, 1949:

COLORADO RIVER WATER

It will be well for everyone concerned to take a deep interest in the controversy now proceeding in Congress and elsewhere over the waters of the Colorado river.

There is a difference of opinion between California and Arizona over the use of this water. Arizona is implementing its opinion with two bills which have been introduced in Congress, H. R. 934 and S. 75, which call for an appropriation of $738,000,000 for a new and large irrigation project; of this total, it is reported, $420,000,000 is for irrigation operations which would benefit only 4,000 farms. The students of this question point out that this would average around $105,000 per farm.

California spokesmen have also pointed out that the Arizona project will take away water which has already been allocated to California by long-standing Government contracts. This is an important item for consideration.

There is no denying the fact that southern California, along with other parts of the west coast, has had a tremendous increase in population during the past 10 years, and that the demand for water has increased proportionately.

The future healthy and prosperous development of the southern California area depends to a large extent upon the supply of Colorado River water, to which this State is entitled. Strictly speaking, the future development of southern California will have a great bearing on the prosperity of the entire State, and therefore all sections have a direct interest in the solution of this problem.

Because of the location and geographical features of the southern portion of the State, it is difficult economically to secure water, and the possibility of further encroachments upon the water supply of the San Joaquin Valley and other regions cannot be viewed with a casual eye.

Southern California's future water supply increases will have to come from the Colorado River, and it is not illogical to assume that more economical use of the water will thus be made than is done now, since much of the river's flow goes into the Gulf of California and is wasted.

The entire California delegation in Congress has supported a joint House resolution which would authorize the United States Supreme Court to adjudicate the points in this highly important controversy and this should be done before the passage, if possible, of the legislation which would approve the costly irrigation project proposed by the Arizona legislators.

It is therefore a deep concern to everyone in California that the House and Senate joint resolutions be passed and the two bills, H. R. 934 and S. 75, be defeated. In this manner, consideration of all points will be secured from the United States Supreme Court and the purely partisan attempt to collect the waters of the Colorado for use in Arizona alone will be avoided.

California is entitled to consideration on the basis of need and from the standpoint of the number of persons involved. The entire State should stand behind this movement.

Medical Care In Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 1, 1949, entitled "Maryland Is Proving State Can Solve Health Problems Without Federal Aid." This is the first of a series of articles by Agnes E. Meyer and will appear daily in the Post until completed.

MARYLAND IS PROVING STATE CAN SOLVE HEALTH PROBLEMS WITHOUT FEDERAL AID

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

(This is the first of five articles on the Maryland State and the Baltimore City medical-care programs.)

Maryland is giving the Nation convincing proof that a State can solve its own health problems without Federal aid. It is demonstrating in every county and city that local initiative, voluntary cooperation, and citizen participation are the most powerful elements for constructive and efficient action upon which our democracy can count to solve its acute social problems.

Moreover, this State health plan proves that our medical leaders are in a better position than anyone else to mobilize and coordinate the forces involved in the achievement of a practical health program responsive to our ever-varying social and economic conditions. This decentralized program has in fact achieved more than an improvement in health conditions. It has brought about an education in the understanding of community organization and in the use of cooperative endeavor for the common good.

The Maryland plan, in existence 3½ years, is past the stage of blueprints, theory, and planning. It is a smoothly functioning, constantly expanding State-wide organization which has been thought out on such sound principles that they can be adapted to the conditions that exist in a majority of our States. I chose the experiments being made in Maryland because they are adapted to varied rural and semirural conditions as well as those of a large city that happens to have two outstanding medical centers, which have contributed their knowledge, talents, and prestige to the origin and evolution of the program.

My report will describe the organization and the results achieved for the counties by the Bureau of Medical Services, established by legislative enactment under the State department of health in 1945, and a somewhat different plan established in 1947 for complete medical care of relief clients with the medical-care section of the Health Department of the City of Baltimore.

SUGGESTED BY DOCTORS

The State-wide plan, now in operation for 3½ years, was initiated in 1939 by the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland (the State medical society), which proposed in an open letter that a new section or standing committee of the State planning commission be constituted, whose function it shall be to keep under constant survey the problems of medical care for the citizens of this State and to formulate from time to time recommendations for better utilization and for extension of existing facilities, and for the institution of such new facilities as are required. In other words, the doctors of Maryland not only suggested the State health plan, but accepted full responsibility for its organization, its efficiency, the quality of its services and its continuous improvement.

How did this come about? The cooperation of Maryland's medical profession with the public health department is a long-standing tradition. Dr. Robert H. Riley, State health commissioner, has used great wisdom over many years in his relationship with the medical profession. And the traditional interest of the doctors in public health is exemplified by such noteworthy achievements as the purification of Baltimore's water system under the leadership of Johns Hopkins' famous Dr. William Welch some 50 years ago.

It was this sense of responsibility for the general health of the people which prompted Dr. Harry E. Sigerist, professor of history of medicine at Johns Hopkins University to call a meeting in May 1939 of an all-Maryland health conference. More than 100 civic, labor, rural, education, religious and other voluntary groups were represented.

The learned doctor did not foresee what explosive materials he was mixing in this social test tube. The conference practically blew up. The labor leaders shook their fists under the noses of the medical dignitaries who were present and declared they would never again pay a medical bill. The Government would have to do it. The fiery meeting proved conclusively that the people were seething with rage over the medical care they were getting, and that a bitter antagonism to the medical profession was very widespread.

BEGAN WITH INDIGENT

The medical leaders were shocked into immediate action. As Maryland has a State planning commission which is authorized to study any civic problem, they requested the chairman, Abel Wolman, professor af sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins, to appoint a standing committee on medical care, with Dr. Maurice C. Pinkoffs, professor of medicine at the Maryland University School of Medicine, as chairman, to study the health situation throughout the State.

After 3 years of the most painstaking research into the health conditions prevailing in the counties of Maryland, the committee decided that a State program should begin by serving the most helpless segment of the population. It therefore outlined a clearly defined medical-care program for the State's indigent and medically indigent throughout the 23 counties, to be financed by State funds. In presenting the report, the committee stated:

"We are using the term 'medical care' in an inclusive sense to cover all the agencies available in safeguarding and improving the health of the people and in the treatment of disease. It may be interpreted, therefore, as comprising lay and professional medical education, sanitation, preventive medicine, curative medicine, dental and nursing care, and pharmacy. It is evident that there exist today, and, in view of the rapid advances in medical science, that there will always exist difficulties in making available to all the highest standard of medical care. It would be the function of such a committee as we propose to be constantly comparing what is available in the way of medical care in our State with what is known to be valuable and to plan systematically to repair the deficiencies in our present system."

The committee also stressed as "vital that the program for such State-supported improvements in our present system of medical care be devised so as to conserve all of the valuable assets we now possess and not be planned in a manner which would set one form of medical service in competition with another to their mutual disadvantage."

The whole program, indorsed by the State medical society, was passed by the State legislature in 1945. As the problems of medical care in the city of Baltimore were far more complex, the committee members, hard pressed by the advent of war, did not make their report on that situation until 1947. Thus the State program has been in operation 3½ years and that of Baltimore City about 6 months.

FLEXIBILITY ESSENTIAL

In thinking out the administration, it is evident to anyone studying its results that two major objectives were kept in mind that seem fundamental to any national health program. Since the treatment of disease involves not only physical but powerful emotional disturbances, no system of health protection can be effective which imposes a rigid, universal pattern of procedure and ignores the individuality and the varying needs of the people. And, secondly, an administrative system that fails to provide for the professional development of the practicing physician, for consultation services and clinics, for freedom of research and ready access to the latest achievements of research, will defeat its own ends because it would freeze our medical progress at its present state of evolution.

Therefore we must try to understand the skeletal structure of Maryland's new health program before we try to evaluate its spirit and ultimate value.

The State department of health was asked to formulate and administer the program for the counties, as this department seemed the logical organization to integrate the State's whole facilities for health protection. The department of welfare was given the responsibility of certifying its relief clients. The more difficult certification of the medically indigent was assigned to the department of health. Services include not only complete coverage of free medical and dental care but essential supplies, drugs, and biologicals.

To implement the program, the State board of health was authorized to establish an advisory council on medical care, constituted as follows: Two members from the medical and chirurgical faculty, the State board of health and the two medical schools; one hospital administrator, one dentist, and one nurse appointed by their official organizations; director of the State department of welfare, the commissioner of mental hygiene, and the superintendent of the tuberculosis sanitoria, and one member appointed by the Maryland Medical Association. Thus the advisory council has State-wide representation of the highest type and experience. Its special function was to integrate the many agencies on the State level concerned with health.

To administer the program, a bureau of medical care was established under the State department of health, whose chief executive must be a doctor, experienced in the organization and distribution of medical care on a full-time basis.

COUNCIL IS CORNERSTONE

How has the State department of health approached its problem of providing medical care to those citizens of the State whose own financial resources are inadequate? It has recognized from the outset that the services must be efficient if the clients were to be satisfied, and economical, if it was not to meet opposition from the taxpaying public. At the same time, it had to gain the voluntary cooperation of the local physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, and hospitals upon whom the whole operation depended.

Dr. Dean Roberts, who was appointed chief of the bureau of medical services, traveled the length and breadth of the State to stimulate the interest in the program of these various groups. He is the link between the county health officers and the State authorities. It is also his duty to review the scope and course of the program for the advisory council, which he sees as the very cornerstone of the whole administrative system.

Composed of 14 top-flight representatives of the public and private professional groups from all parts of the State, the council has no actual authority, but its recommendations have always been made on the basis of such intensive study of the many problems involved that they have, on the whole, been adopted without modification. The council meets every month to review the program and hear Dr. Roberts' reports. He brings to its attention every major operating problem and reports upon ideas for expansion that are frequently suggested by the county health officers and their local advisory councils. Every significant policy, eligibility criteria, method of application, scope of services offered, rates of payment to doctors, dentists and druggists, method of payment, and other important administrative details are thrashed out at these council meetings.

Since the inception of the program, both the State department of health and its advisory council have felt that the medical care program is in constant evolution. Thus all policies are continually under review and changes are made whenever necessary. Both make a conscious effort to keep the program from crystallizing too rapidly, and it is precisely this ability to adjust the program to new needs that has been the secret of its success.

INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

This flexibility is attained by decentralization and placing authority in the hands of the county health officers, all of whom in Maryland are physicians and full-time employees, intimately acquainted with the local population and its medical problems. In county after county the doctors told me that, from their point of view, the success of the program rests upon the respect of the private practitioners for the local health officer. Moreover, they feel that the program is their program, since they are represented on the local advisory council, which guides the development of all new policies and keeps them within the area of agreement.

The fact that the whole program originated with the State medical society is an important factor in the psychology of the local practitioners. But they were frank to confess that their willingness to cooperate in a State program was accelerated by the hope of avoiding compulsory national health insurance. Some still have fears that the program may get out of their control and encroach upon their private practice unless they keep a careful eye upon all major decisions. But many agree that the contact through the local advisory councils with the Grange, the county agent, the white and colored superintendents of schools, with the welfare departments and the voluntary health organizations has made them more conscious of the social organization of their counties and of the social responsibilities of the medical profession.

"Politics can be kept out of the program," said several others "only because this decentralization permits local supervision by nonpolitical people. It also keeps the program flexible and responsive to local needs. The whole-hearted cooperation of local professional people can only be preserved by this local control and guidance."

Partly, therefore, out of fear, but predominantly out of the growing interest of

the county medical societies, these local advisory councils have developed into highly significant groups which concern themselves not only with the curative program but with the causes of illness, with the cause of poverty, ignorance of proper diet, bad housing, and bad sanitary conditions that prevail in many of the rural counties. The advisory councils bring to bear upon these problems many public and private agencies which had previously functioned without knowledge of each other's activities.

ATTITUDE HAS CHANGED

These articles will attempt to describe not only the impact of this humane medical experiment upon the people who benefit directly by its provisions, but the many unforeseen effects upon the standards of medical practice, the changing attitude of the private practitioners toward the public health officials, and the sense of pride the medical men feel in the efficiency and economy of this State program for the systematic care of people who were formerly dependent upon their charity. The responsibility of government to provide care for the indigent and medically indigent has become generally accepted. And a voluntary, working partnership has been created between the medical profession and the health representatives of the State.

The importance of this step—given the hostility between these two groups in most other States—cannot be overemphasized. It demonstrates that the impasse between government and medicine can be overcome and agreement achieved of far-reaching implications, when a step-by-step approach is made to the larger need for complete health coverage in the States and the Nation.

It was this sense of the far-reaching implications of the Maryland State health program that led the chairman of the committee in medical care to say in his letter of transmission of his initial report to the State Planning Commission:

"While we propose the use of Government funds only for the care of the indigent and medically indigent, we believe this use, in the manner suggested in the body of this report, will encourage more effective integration of all the State's medical resources, private, voluntary, and governmental, and assure more and better health services to all our citizens."

A Timely Subject

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, with devotion to industry, manpower, and the success of our country, I take pleasure in placing in the RECORD a statement released to the press by Mr. Walter C. Ayres stressing the importance of salesmanship both for the profit of the industry concerned, as well as to the progress of the Nation. The release of this timely subject is as follows:

STATEMENT BY WALTER C. AYERS, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, BROOKE, SMITH, FRENCH & DORRANCE, INC., DIRECTOR, DETROIT SALES EXECUTIVES CLUB

What this country needs is more salesmen.

Consider these facts: In 1940, there were about 46,000,000 people employed in the United States. Included in this 46,000,000 were some 3,200,000 salesmen—one salesman to 14 workers in all other fields.

In 1948—in a seller's market due to shortages—60,000,000 people were employed in the United States, but only 3,700,000 were salesmen. The increase in employment from 1940 to 1948 was 14,000,000 people; but, of these, only one in every 28 workers was a salesman.

So today, there is a big deficit in America's sales force and the brutal truth is that the 3,700,000 salesmen presently employed aren't nearly enough to keep our factories, farms, mines and forests producing at a prosperity level. If we are going to have the prosperity to keep 60,000,000 people working, we've got to have more than 3,700,000 salesmen. Probably at least 6,000,000 salesmen will be required to do the job in a buyer's market and we have only about 60 percent of that number now.

That means that more than 2,000,000 sales jobs need to be filled with the greatest possible speed.

Thousands of high school and college graduates just coming out of school, as well as hundreds of thousands of men in other types of jobs, will be able to find profitable employment in the selling end of business. Generally speaking, almost every industry and every type wholesale and retail establishment must have additional sales people if they are to maintain or increase their volume.

Manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers should start now to hire and train the additional salesmen they must have. America cannot remain prosperous without a fully manned sales force.

Federal Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 11, 1949, Miss Loula Dunn, commissioner, Alabama State Department of Public Welfare, made a very able and informative statement before the Committee on Ways and Means of this House with reference to pending Federal social security legislation. I include her statement as a part of my remarks at this time.

STATEMENT ON PENDING FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION BY LOULA DUNN, COMMISSIONER, ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

I am glad to have this opportunity to present to you some of the reasons Alabama is concerned about the subject now under consideration—extension of the social insurances. We are a State where about 70 percent of our 3,000,000 population live in rural areas, and where well over half of our farmers are tenants. Our per capita income in 1947 was only $837, compared with $1,323 for the Nation and $1,842 for Nevada, the State with the highest income. Whereas we ranked eighteenth in population, we were fourth from the bottom in per capita income.

In spite of these facts, Alabama's record is one of a progressive State. This is illustrated concretely by the proportion of the State's revenues that are directed toward human well-being. For example, State-local expenditures in Alabama in 1947 for health, education, and welfare represented 2.21 percent of our income payments for the preceding year. This compares favorably with the national average of 2.27 percent, particularly in the light of existing needs in Alabama. We have had a public program for human welfare since 1919, we provide our children throughout the State with 9-month schools, and we have long been a leading State in providing local health services. In other words, Alabama is a State that cares about the welfare of its people.

Alabama, therefore, is concerned about human security. We recognize that the first step in such security obviously is a job for everyone who can work, including the handicapped. At the same time, we believe that full employment needs to be underpinned with a social-security program that is adequate in all respects for all people. In my capacity as State Commissioner of Public Welfare in Alabama, I see at first hand the causes and effects of insecurity. The responsibilities of a public-welfare administrator encompass both prevention and relief of need. When measures to prevent need are inadequate, it follows that the amount of need will be greater.

You are today considering proposals to extend and strengthen the Federal social-security program through broadening of its social insurance provisions. While I should like immediately to disqualify myself as an expert in the field of social insurance, I come before you today because the two aspects of social security, namely, insurance and assistance, are interdependent and interrelated. They are two faces of a single coin.

Just how closely the functioning of the one program—the insurances—influences the other public assistance is apparent to many of us in Alabama. I should like, therefore, to present to you some of the problems in our own State which we believe are greatly augmented by the present incomplete social-insurance program.

In addition, it is my purpose to indicate some of the relationships of the insurances to other titles of the Social Security Act, and particularly to the administration of public welfare. The urgency of action to broaden the insurance program has been recognized in official resolutions adopted by the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare and the Alabama Association of County Officials. Recently the governor issued a proclamation on the effects of inadequate coverage of old age and survivors insurance, and at its last session the Alabama State Legislature memorialized the Congress on this subject. Thus, in presenting some of the difficulties we face in Alabama because of gaps in the present social-insurance program, I am speaking of problems that are widely recognized not only by various official bodies, but also by individuals throughout the State. By this I mean both the people who now lack and need protection and a cross-section of our citizens who consider social insurance as basic in a well-rounded security structure. Obviously, too, those of us who administer public-aid programs see, daily, problems that adequate insurance could well have prevented.

This perhaps is one of the forceful reasons that public welfare officials throughout the country have indicated their belief that the essential first step in bringing about a balance in the over-all security program is a broadening of the social insurances. The American Public Welfare Association has incorporated this tenet in its official platform, and, as this committee well knows, other State welfare administrators have indicated such a belief in earlier testimony at these hearings.

As I present to you, therefore, some of Alabama's experiences that are closely related to the gaps in the present social insurance structure, it is my belief that I am describing conditions and problems that are national in scope, and, consequently, require remedial action by the Congress.

WEAKNESSES IN THE PRESENT INSURANCE PROGRAM

The Nation-wide security structure set-up in 1935 included both public assistance and social insurance. Provision had to be made through assistance for persons then in need and for those who would not have an opportunity to earn insurance protection. It was anticipated, however, that the social insurances would be the basic program—that full-scale operation of OASI would relieve need by preventing it. Thus, it was expected that welfare loads would diminish as people earned OASI protection, and that the number of beneficiaries under insurance would be greater than the number of assistance recipients.

Experience has shown, however, that the operation of the law, due to its limitations, has not been in accordance with this concept. Though the idea is sound, the law as it now stands does not effectuate it. Instead of insurance offering a basic security for the many, with assistance providing for the residual few, the number receiving OASI benefits is relatively small and the number dependent on assistance is increasing constantly. The insurance program has been unable to perform the role assigned to it for three principal reasons: (1) Not all people are covered; (2) the protection offered is far from adequate, with benefit payments too low; and (3) not all predictable risks are included, chiefly disability.

Alabama figures substantiate this statement forcibly. The first monthly payments under OASI were made in December 1940. At that time there were 3,774 beneficiaries—adults and children—and average payments were $15.25. Recent figures (September 1948) report 31,965 beneficiaries with an average benefit of only $15.42.

Yet, during this same period the number of public-assistance recipients in Alabama rose from 29,066 to 84,048. Average payments rose from $10.15 to $21.28—an increase of over 100 percent in contrast to the slightly more than 1-percent rise in average OASI payments. While more people receive insurance benefits than did 8 years ago, the number in September was less than half the number receiving aid through the welfare program.

One of the reasons it has been possible to raise assistance grants is because the Congress in 1946 and again in 1948 liberalized the assistance aspects of the Federal social-security law. Though payments are too low in the light of present living costs, substantial increases have been possible. In contrast, there has been practically no increase—a mere 17 cents—in average OASI benefit payments. Thus, the Congress has modified a part of the security structure without considering it as a whole. Such action tends to increase the existing unbalance and to relieve the immediate problem without getting at its roots. And while I am aware that amendments affecting assistance have been of positive value in assuring more nearly adequate aid to those already in need, they represent but one side of the whole social-security program. Again this is clear from a review of the present assistance program in Alabama.

THE AGED

More than three-fourths of the applicants for, and recipients of, aid through the welfare offices are aged people, most of whom have had no opportunity to earn even the inadequate protection offered by the present old age and survivors insurance program. In fact, there are nearly five times as many aged assistance recipients in Alabama today as there are aged beneficiaries of old age and survivors insurance, about 71,000 people receiving old age assistance as compared with about 15,000 aged people receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits. Thus, old people receiving public assistance in Alabama number 463 in each 1,000, those receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits only 102 per 1,000. It seems obvious that this unbalanced picture will become even more lopsided if the present OASI program obtains. Only 44 percent of our working population in Alabama in 1945 had protection through social insurance. Employment now is below that wartime peak and coverage is presently estimated at less than 40 percent. Our aged population is increasing rapidly, at 10 times the rate of our total population in the past 8 years. Yet, at present, and until OASI coverage is extended, for many people reaching the sunset of life the only security they can expect will be public assistance based on need rather than social insurance to which they have contributed.

LOW INCOME

A part of this situation stems from factors inherent in Alamaba's total economy. First, we are largely a farming State. The 1940 census showed that 69.8 percent of our population was rural, a figure that compares with only 43.5 percent in the Nation. And our farmers have no old age and survivors insurance protection. Over half of our farmers are tenants.

In addition, Alabama is a State where per capita income consistently has been low. Few people earn a sufficient amount to lay something aside for the proverbial "rainy day." In contrast, many of the Nation's high income States have low recipient rates for public assistance and relatively higher recipient rates for the social insurances. We, therefore, face a double disadvantage: few people earn above marginal subsistence in their working years and few workers have insurance coverage.

When the income level is low, there obviously is the greatest need for the kind of protection social insurance affords. Yet we find the converse to be true. Many States where assistance case loads are small are both high-income States and States with a large portion of their working population protected by insurance. I should like to emphasize here, therefore, that there is a direct relationship throughout the country in the number of old-age assistance recipients and the number of people covered under OASI. Recent figures for Alabama illustrate this point. Our average per capita income for 1947 was $837 and the average for the Nation was $1,323. Similarly, the number of old-age and survivor insurance recipients per 1,000 in Alabama is less than the national average and less than half that of the State with the highest coverage. On the other hand, the number of aged persons per 1,000 in Alabama receiving old-age assistance is more than double the number in the Nation as a whole.

INCOMPLETE COVERAGE

Thus, the incomplete coverage of the insurance program has thrown the whole social-security structure out of balance. This makes more persons dependent on welfare or in danger of becoming dependent and applies not only to old people but also to our younger population. Every child has a right to basic security. Yet, next to the aged, needy children comprise the largest group of assistance recipients in Alabama. Thus, it is in this area, too, that the insurances, meant to guard against the deprivation of parental support, have failed. Our Alabama figures show that there are about 12,500 payments made for over 34,000 child beneficiaries of aid to dependent children through our welfare department. In contrast, there are only 3,200 widows' and 13,400 individual child payments made under the OASI program. The lack of balance is plain. Had the insurances been adequate for the total working population, it seems probable that the numbers would be reversed.

It is not just to the benefit of Alabama that I speak. Our children are the Nation's children. Just as our economic pattern affects the economy of the Nation, so the opportunities afforded Alabama affect the entire Nation. Our child population is about 41 percent, whereas that of the Nation as a whole is only about 31 percent. We have a high birth rate and a high proportion of children in our total population, yet we are experiencing little growth in total population and a large growth in aged population. This means we are supplying young adults to other parts of the Nation. Is it not to the advantage of these other areas that Alabama youngsters have a fair opportunity in life?

Is it not American to give an equal chance to everyone? And is it not part of Government's democratic tradition to help its people guard against want, against circumstances they cannot control? Along with the right to earn his way, therefore, each citizen should have the basic guaranty of security if he is kept from earning by such unpreventable hazards as untimely death, old age, or disability. Likewise, the rugged individualism which is fundamental to the American character creates a preference for security through insurance benefits in which people have participated, rather than for assistance payments based on need. Insurance is impersonal, it is paid in accordance with earnings. Americans, therefore, would rather receive an insurance check than an assistance or public welfare check. Theirs should be the opportunity to earn insurance protection.

Another consideration here that is equally important is the dollars and cents values in the whole program. Is it not a cheaper and sounder investment of public funds to support a participating insurance program than to finance, in whole, an assistance program?

INADEQUATE BENEFITS

The inadequacy of benefit payments (already cited) represents another factor as important as the incomplete coverage of the insurance program. The amounts paid are not compatible with living costs. Recent Alabama figures showed aged OASI beneficiaries receiving about $19 a month, on the average, and children receiving about $12. Obviously, these sums alone represent an insufficient income. Their inadequacy has proved a startling weakness in the total insurance structure.

Besides the inadequacy of coverage and benefits, however, there is a third gap which is of major significance. I refer to the absence of disability insurance. In Alabama more than half of our public-welfare cases are attributable to the disability of the breadwinner. People who long have earned their way find, when physically unable to work, that they have no recourse but public assistance. This is especially true of persons with marginal or subsistence incomes who could never afford to be sick. Neither do they have resources to keep them going through a long period of illness or to finance medical care that may prove costly. Furthermore, when disability makes them permanently dependent, there is a vast waste to society. Oftentimes these people might be able to return to the labor market as producers if they had disability insurance to tide them over. Is it not costly and uneconomical, therefore, for Government to have to provide long-time financial aid for them? Adequate contributory social insurance to provide against disability undoubtedly would be a more practical and economical solution.

EXTENSION OF INSURANCE

It seems clear, therefore, that a choice must be made as to the way we go, both in the kind of protection we offer our people and in how we propose to pay the bill. Two questions immediately are posed. Do we plan to continue our patch-work quilt of

piece by piece amendments to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act with no counterbalancing action on the social insurances? Do we believe it fiscally sound and socially desirable to provide a large program of public assistance and a limited pay-as-you-go insurance system? It seems, out of the experiences since 1935, that we are now at the crossroads insofar as how and in which direction the social-security system of this country moves.

I, therefore, would urge this committee to give favorable attention to the critical need for extending the insurances. I speak as a public-welfare official in a position to see the problems arising from our failure in the area of prevention of need. At the same time, I do not mean to imply that there is not, and that there will not be, need for some public assistance and welfare services. For those who are prevented from earning their security there must be protection through assistance. The numbers prevented from so earning protection, however, should be held to a minimum. Instead of increasing numbers of needy people, we believe that there should be increasing numbers protected by insurance. Immediate extension of the insurance program, therefore, seems to be the sound approach. It is neither logical nor practicable to approach the subject of greater human need by merely upping appropriations to meet that need. Evidence is all too clear as to what happens when you increase welfare expenditures, on the one hand, and fail to reduce the cause of need on the other. Consequently, it is apparent that public welfare can perform its accepted role only when the social-security pattern is balanced by bringing the social insurances into their appropriate position.

ADEQUATE WELFARE PROGRAMS

In addition to the insurances, another element in preventing need is extended social services. Our experiences have demonstrated that friendly counsel often may prevent need just as an insurance check may prevent want. Again, the welfare program and the insurance program are two component parts of an over-all security structure. For the assistance phases of this structure to be adequate, Federal grants-in-aid to States should be distributed on a variable basis so that there may be equity of treatment of people regardless of where they live. All needy groups likewise should be included just as all working people should have the benefit of insurance protection, and payments should be commensurate with need.

Alabama has gone a long way within its available resources to provide adequate assistance. In fact, annual State and local welfare appropriations in Alabama have risen from a little under $1,000,000 in the fiscal year 1935–36 to nearly $10,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Each successive State legislature since 1935 has increased welfare appropriations. Even so, funds are still insufficient to meet existing need either for the aged, the blind, and dependent children who can receive Federal money or for the handicapped and others excluded from Federal benefits. Both the constant formula for allocating Federal grants-in-aid to States and the discrimination against those ineligible for present categories work a hardship on Alabama's disadvantaged people.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, therefore, it is my conviction that the American social-security structure should be implemented with a fuller social-insurance program. I mean fuller as to coverage, benefits, and risks included. Likewise, the assistance aspects of the program should be strengthened to insure adequate and equitable aid to all who fall in the residual group lacking insurance protection. As we move in this direction, prevention will be real and the cost of assistance will be reduced. This, I believe, is inherent in the American tradition which embodies governmental guaranties of equal opportunities for every citizen.

Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I gave over Station WMCA, April 22, 1949:

Since becoming a Congressman I have maintained active interest in the postal service and, in particular, its employees. It has been a pleasure to associate with them and their leaders to discuss the improvement of conditions affecting their employment. Hardly a week passes when I am not personally contacted by Pat Fitzgerald, president of the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks; Henry Berman, legislative representative; and Frank Handman, their national vice president, either in New York City or in the office in Washington.

Many factors have contributed to the growth of our Nation. We have impressed the world, this little struggling Nation of a century and a half ago, the men who laid the rails, who drove the first steam engines across the continent—all of these have helped to make America great and strong.

And yet, very often it is the silent worker whose contributions have not been heralded in song or in book that has been the mainspring in this development. America became great because of the men and women who worked in their jobs for America. Our skyscrapers in New York, our factories in the West, our plantations in the South have all been served by the postal men and women. It was their carrying the message that brought trades and industry to its present state of efficiency.

So tonight we pause to pay tribute to them and in turn to ask you, the American audience, to do justice to their cause. The postal employees appeal to each and every American to write to their Congressmen and Senators urging their support of the legislation I am about to discuss.

The starting salary of today for the new postal worker is $2,250. Based on 1939 purchasing power, such a salary is worth approximately $1,500. Obviously, the cost of living has increased so greatly that present salaries will not maintain a decent standard of living. There has been a slight lowering of prices in certain foods, but the amount of help to the worker is negligible. One can easily imagine the type of life to be led by a single person on such income, but it becomes increasingly difficult to picture the married man with a family groping about to make ends meet. It seems inconceivable that such a task would be required of the men who handle the vast amount of mail that circulates daily throughout the United States. Yes; it seems inconceivable, but such is the case. Thousands of postal workers are in such a position. We cannot allow such conditions to continue.

Not only has this situation forced immeasurable hardships on the family life of the postal worker, but it has seriously threatened the high quality of worker that is found in the Post Office Department. We simply need to remember the high rating of the postal service of the United States. It is the men who run this service who maintain its efficiency. There are very few who will deny praise to our postal system. Why then deny them a living wage? To the intelligent man who finds appeal in the work of the postal worker, where is the incentive to apply for such work with such a salary offer? The answer is quite obvious. Instead of the usual high quality of the worker of the past, the post office will be subjected to employment of less desirable personnel. The implication rests, naturally, in the lowering of standards of our post office system.

Many of my colleagues in Washington have also seen the necessity for action. They have not lain dormant, but have introduced many bills that now await action. I would like to point out a few of the more salient features of the entire pending postal legislation.

We have now before Congress a bill (H. R. 2496) to raise the salary of all postal workers by $650. If passed, this bill will fill a large share of the existing need. I am determined to fight for its passage when it comes to the floor of the House. The Bureau of the Budget yesterday disapproved the increase of $650. Please write and urge your Representatives in Congress to disregard this recommendation.

There is also legislation pending to come to the aid of the veterans who have taken positions with the post office for the first time in the postwar period. They were not employed by the post office prior to their time well spent in the service of our country, but chances are that many of them would have worked for the post office during that time had the war not occurred. In such a case, they would now be in a higher grade, receiving a more substantial income. Bill H. R. 87 feels we owe recognition of the above fact. It makes a reasonable claim for the veterans in that they should be allowed credit in the post-office grade system for the time spent in the war. Up to the present time the post office has been most cognizant of the debt we all owe to the servicemen. The passage of this bill would further pay such a debt, and, in the process, raise a standard of living that has proved so disappointing to the returned servicemen.

We have also an important bill that hopes to erase the present discrimination against postal workers insofar as sick leave and annual leave is concerned, H. R. 1304. At the present time postal workers receive only 10 days of sick leave per year and 15 days annual leave, whereas other Federal workers get 15 days of sick leave and 26 days of annual leave per year. This is one of the more obvious injustices levelled on the faithful postal workers. It must be rectified.

I have just given a few of the many sound pieces of legislation that are being directed to the ears and the conscience of our Congressmen. Soon these bills are due for hearings. They will be firm voices—those voices that go before the committees and plead for justice. Add your encouragement by your letter to your Congressmen and Senators. They will fight for what they know to be fair and worthy. As they plead the deserved praise of the postal worker, they will demand more than praise in return.

Earlier we referred to the postal workers as the silent group that has helped to bind America together, to increase its commerce and its industry. That voice, though silent, will now be heard. It will be heard by the ears of America who will answer tonight the plea of our postal employees.

How many times in your daily life have you, my friends, silently praised the work of these men? I plead with you tonight to lift your voices in their behalf, to fill the halls of Congress with your messages in their behalf. If you do that your elected representatives will follow your thoughts and

then these men who are serving you now and have grown old in the service of the postal ranks will say, "Yes, we have helped make America grow and the American people have shown their gratitude."

An Example Worthy of Emulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in placing in the RECORD the invitation of the Michigan State Employment Service to the June graduate, wherein the services and the ability of the agency is made known to the youth of the State emerging from their studies to the field of American opportunity. In presenting this invitation, I do so with a hope that other States will seek to adopt this idea which should prove very beneficial to the school graduates. The invitation follows:

THE JUNE GRADUATE

Too often the potential abilities of the high-school and college-trained individual are overlooked in the search for people with a background of actual work experience to do a specific job.

While the graduate of today will be a large segment of the labor force of tomorrow, the major contribution to progressive thinking and expanding know-how in the future, will come from this group.

This office deals in employment opportunities for the so-called white-collar worker—people with aptitudes and attitudes for work in the commercial, professional, technical, and clerical occupations.

We can make a worth-while contribution to your endeavor if you list your needs with this office and let us assist in your selection of the June graduate with potential possibilities. Call Trinity 2-4900.

The Late George Gordon Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, friends of George Gordon Battle, noted attorney, have received the news of his sudden death this week end with great sadness. He was a truly great American, one of the kindest men of our time, and he practiced those principles which have made America great.

Born in 1868 in Edgecombe County, N. C., where his father's family had lived for four generations, he was one of 11 brothers and sisters. After his graduation from the University of North Carolina, the University of Virginia, and Columbia University Law School, he began to practice law in New York City in 1891, and there he remained as a distinguished leader in civic enterprises. At the time o his passing he was the active senior partner of the firm of Battle, Fowler, Neaman, Stokes, and Kheel.

George Gordon Battle threw himself with ardor and sincerity into work for human liberty. At one time he headed the Council Against Intolerance in America and, in 1940, he received the medal for the promotion of better understanding between those of different religious faiths.

George Gordon Battle, with his warmhearted, generous nature, was ever a man to champion principles. He was one of the finest champions the movement for equal rights for men and women ever had, and as a great constitutional lawyer went before the platform committee of the Democratic Party in Chicago to personally urge the adoption of a plank on the equal-rights amendment now before Congress.

Under the late Gov. Alfred E. Smith, he directed a study of labor conditions in the cloak-and-suit industry. Politically, Mr. Battle was a Democrat, and always a leader in our party councils. He served as chairman of campaigns for a large variety of civic and charitable enterprises and of governmental commissions. He was chairman of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority in 1933.

As a citizen and a lawyer he will be missed.

Acceptance of Patronage From Republican Administration by Illinois Editors Violated Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith excerpts from a Mutual network broadcast of April 30, 1949, by Joseph F. McCaffrey from Washington:

The thoughtful in Washington this week are mulling over what they believe to be one of the most shameless violations of American freedom of the press in recent years.

It concerns the story of 33 Illinois editors who allowed themselves to be placed on the State pay roll during the regime of Republican Governor Dwight H. Green. Green was defeated last November.

These 33 editors and publishers, mostly from down-State Illinois weeklies were carried on the State's compensation for personal service pay roll for a total of $305,682.

Charged Illinois Congressman MELVIN PRICE, "Is it any wonder that readers of Illinois newspapers saw so many editorials praising the Illinois Republican administration and booming Dwight H. Green for the Republican nomination for President."

But the story isn't so much about the scandal in Illinois. Rather it's in the way the wire services and newspapers outside the State ignored the whole expose. Ignored it with a conspiracy of silence.

The story about the Illinois editors was broken by Roy Harris of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and George Thiem, of the Chicago Daily News.

The Post-Dispatch and the Daily News printed their stories on April 14. No other paper outside the Illinois region—to the best of our knowledge—mentioned the matter during the next few days.

On April 25 the national weekly magazine Newsweek published three-quarters of a column on the Illinois editors.

But not until Monday, April 25—11 days after the story broke—did a Washington newspaper carry it. The Washington Post published a detailed story, crediting it to a special correspondent.

But this 11-day lag was not the Washington Post's fault.

Up to that time not one of the major wire services relayed to Washington a word about the Illinois scandal. In fact, the first wire story to hit the ticker in Washington concerning the scandal came through on April 28—two long weeks after the Post-Dispatch and News first published the story.

So the Washington Post must be credited with enterprising journalism. Unable to get the story from the wire services it subscribes to, the Post went out and got it on its own.

Later, commenting editorially on this conspiracy of silence, the Post said: "At best this (whole thing) looks like crass indifference to a particularly juicy bit of news. At worst it looks like a cover-up of scandal within the family. We cannot approve of either."

So speaks the courageous Washington Post.

With journalistic freedom being hampered throughout the world, every effort should be made here in the United States to keep the press free and vigilant.

No public scandal should be immune from the honest, searching spotlight of an alert free press.

Fred Schilplin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with real sorrow that I learned of the death of Fred Schilplin last Friday morning. A pioneer newspaperman and a community leader during most of his 80 years made him one of great men in recent Minnesota history. Fred Schilplin was not content with being a mere reporter of the news; he helped make the kind of news worth recording.

From all over the United States men who knew Fred Schilplin have sent messages of condolences to his family. There is nothing I can add to these messages of sorrow and high praise. I would only like to present an editorial by Mr. Harold Schoelkopf, managing editor of the St. Cloud Daily Times, printed on the day of Mr. Schilplin's death:

FRED SCHILPLIN

The city of St. Cloud and the central Minnesota community suffered a far-reaching loss Thursday in the death of Fred Schilplin.

An orphan boy who won his first job with this newspaper at $1 a week, his rise to its ownership is the saga of American opportunity for those who are not afraid of honest toil.

From the day he began his newspaper career as an apprentice for the late C. F. Macdonald, Fred Schilplin set his sights on the goal he wanted to reach, and throughout the intervening years devoted to that task his energies, business acumen, and administrative abilities.

It was not an easy goal to attain. The Times was still uncertain of its future in

those early days, and barriers confronted Fred Schilplin that might have turned aside a weaker man. But he was endowed with a stalwart heart and a determination that brooked no failures.

In the process of his growth, he found time to serve the community, the State and the Nation. The people of Stearns County elected him sheriff and he became St. Cloud's postmaster.

After the election of President Roosevelt in 1932, Fred Schilplin was singled out to serve on the Public Works Administration Commission for Minnesota, and later was State director of the Federal Housing Administration for a number of years. He was honored by his fellow Midwest publishers by being elected president of the Inland Daily Press Association, and sat high in the councils of the Associated Press and the National Association of Newspaper Publishers.

But Fred Schilplin's great interest was in his home town and in the adjoining community which came to be known as Central Minnesota. Years ago he recognized this inland empire as one of tremendous business and agricultural possibilities. He was aware that St. Cloud as a city would grow and prosper in direct proportion to the development of the Central Minnesota farmlands, and agriculture never had a better friend.

His advocacy of diversified farming and dairying brought results. Stearns County for years has been the greatest single butter-producing county in the United States, and as this golden tide found the markets wealth returned here one thousandfold.

Mr. Schilplin acquired farms of his own to test his theories, and his Farm Beautiful, located near Pleasant Lake, became one of the State's real showplaces.

He was an enduring friend also of the other great industries here. His influence, exerted in high places, won St. Cloud granite shops many a lucrative contract. His close friendship with officials of the Great Northern made that industry one of the community's real assets.

Like other builders, Fred Schilplin's real worth to us will not be measured in a day or a year or 50 years. What he has created has been done step by step and piece by piece. It is still too early to put all these pieces together, but so strongly have the foundations been built that we are assured the completed structure will be an imposing monument to his life's work.

H. L. S.

Vets Ask Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great number of letters, postal cards and resolutions from veterans and veterans' organizations, asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

I am herewith submitting the resolution adopted by the Chicago Union Labor Post, No. 1277, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The same speaks for itself.

CHICAGO UNION
LABOR POST, NO. 1277,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR COMRADE: At a regular meeting of this post on April 21, 1949, the officers were instructed, by unanimous action, to write each and every ex-serviceman in Congress, asking him, as a veteran of Uncle Sam's fighting forces, to vote for repeal of the un-American, Hitlerlike Taft-Hartley Act.

We ask you to cast your vote for the Thomas-Lesinski bill (S. 249, H. 2032). That bill will make it possible for free trade-unions to survive in America. If free trade-unions don't survive, America will cease to be the America for which you and we fought.

There is no greater indictment of the Taft-Hartley Act, and no better reason for preserving free trade-unionism, than this: In the armed forces of Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini there was not one man with a union card—while in the Army and Navy of the United States the union members numbered millions.

The dictators, in each instance, smashed the trade union of their respective countries as their very first step toward enslaving the peoples of those countries. The country that had the Wagner Act was able to outproduce the countries that depended on nonunion slave labor.

The officers of this post can say emphatically that in discussing the Taft-Hartley bill with veterans they have yet to find one who is even remotely familiar with the law's provisions and favors its continuance. In its abridgement of free speech, free press and free association, and in its injunction provisions which deny to Americans the right of trial by jury, the Taft-Hartley law is a nearer approach to totalitarian tyranny than even Hitler himself dared to make before he actually seized the reins of government.

We sincerely trust, Mr. Congressman, that you will vote to free the American people from the Taft-Hartley yoke. We are sure that by so doing you will deserve well of your constituents in the next election and will deserve well of history.

With our sincere respect and best wishes, we are

Yours in comradeship,
JOHN S. SOMOGY,
Commander.

Israel Refuses To Permit Arab Refugees To Return to Their Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in my remarks an article that appeared in the New York Times of April 29 by Michael L. Hoffman regarding the refusal of the Israeli Government to permit Arab refugees to return to their former homes.

David Ben-Gurion has so informed the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine at a meeting held in Lausanne, Switzerland.

The article follows:

REFUGEES' RETURN BARRED BY ISRAEL—LAUSANNE MEETING HEARS TEL AVIV WILL NOT PERMIT ARABS TO COME BACK TO HOMES

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND, April 28.—The Israeli Government has told the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine that it will not permit the return of Arab refugees to its territory.

This position, it was learned here today, was made known by David Ben-Gurion, Israeli Premier, during the commission's recent visit to Jerusalem to prepare ground for the Arab-Israeli peace talks that opened here yesterday.

While the Israeli authorities have stated that they would prefer to see the refugees resettled outside Israel, they have never publicly rejected the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly that calls for reestablishment in their former homes those refugees wishing to return to Israel.

It is the opinion of many who have followed the conciliation work closely that unless Israel modifies her attitude on the refugees, she is due for some sharp setbacks in her struggle for stability and world recognition.

This has been made plain informally to the Israelis by high United States spokesmen. It is considered probable here that it will be made even plainer by President Truman or the State Deparment prior to the opening of debate on Israel's admission to the United Nation's. The Israelis have been warned that as matters stand, the coalition against their admission is strong enough almost to nullify the United States best efforts on their behalf.

ATTITUDE ONE OF CONFIDENCE

Up to the present, the attitude of Israel has been one of confidence that her membership application would be approved regardless of what progress was made toward the political settlement with her neighbors.

According to Commission sources, France and probably a number of the Latin-American countries will oppose Israel's application because of dissatisfaction with her resistance to the internationalization of Jerusalem. The Scandinavian countries have examined the draft of Israel's report to the General Assembly on the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte and found it wholly unsatisfactory. They are expected to vote against Israel as a bloc.

As the Lausanne talks move slowly through their preliminary stages it seems to some observers that for the first time Israel is on the "wrong" side of almost every point at issue in the eyes of world opinion, as exexpressed through the United Nations resolutions on Palestine. These observers reason as follows:

Israel is occupying territory, notably western Galilee, that has been repeatedly assigned to the Arabs in various partition plans. Israel is acting as if Jerusalem were to be incorporated fully into the new state. Israel is encouraging further immigration of Jewish settlers while rejecting responsibility for the reestablishment of 600,000 to 1,000,000 Palestine Arabs displaced from their former homes.

These are the factors cited in commission circles as reasons why Israel's position has weakened. Of these factors the refugee problem is by far the most important as Mark F. Ethridge, United States member of the commission, underlined in a press conference yesterday. Commission experts who have recently been on the spot consider Israel's refusal to accept the return of at least part of the refugees not only as bad psychology but bad administration.

It is stated that infiltration of the Arab refugees is already taking place. Given the nature of the population, these experts doubt whether any form of policing could effectively keep out refugees determined to return to their homes. This opinion is informally expressed by Arab representatives also.

MOSLEMS SEEK JERUSALEM

DAMASCUS, Syria, April 28.—Deputy Premier Emir Adel Araslan said today that the Moslem world wanted all of Jerusalem and not merely part of the city included by any internationalization plan.

Proposals for the internationalization of Palestine's holy places constitute one of the major issues in the Israeli-Arab peace talks now in progress in Lausanne.

Commenting on the Lausanne conference, Mr. Araslan said:

"It is generally agreed by the Arab states that Israel has not executed any United Nations decisions, especially as regards repatriation of refugees and their compensation, and our policy must be inspired from this fact."

Congress Will Do Its Job for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Trainman News, the official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of April 30, 1949, written by A. F. Whitney:

CONGRESS WILL DO ITS JOB FOR NATION

If Members of Congress were as gullible as the pollsters imply when they spread their misleading propaganda in the press and on the radio, alleging that the Eighty-first Congress will not repeal the Taft-Hartley slave-labor law, it would be most pleasing to them. But the Members of Congress are not gullible, and they do not relish the cheap propaganda that is calculated to lure them in the wrong direction.

These pollsters who were wrong and completely discredited in November 1948 are at it again. Their activity represents pure, unadulterated paid-for propaganda, designed to influence Members of Congress. It will fall flat and boomerang against them as it should, because they assume that Members of Congress are gullible and will fall for canned letters, canned broadcasts, and canned predictions.

These vocalists of propaganda have lost the respect of the American people. They have discredited the press, and are presently attempting to discredit the Congress of the United States.

The administration's new labor legislation has reached the floor of Congress and is being studied, reviewed, and debated. It is being carefully examined and contrasted with the Labor Relations Act of 1947, which crucified labor and discredited its authors. As a matter of fact, the Taft-Hartley Act is so impracticable and discriminatory that many Members of Congress who reluctantly voted to give it a trial are now looking for an opportunity to correct that error.

The situation today is vastly different than it was in 1947, because experience has taught the country that the blunders of 1947 have been costly to industry, have discriminated against labor and have placed many of the Members of the Eightieth Congress in a very bad light.

People who labored under the delusion that all of the Members of Congress who voted for the Taft-Hartley slave-labor bill in the Eightieth Congress will vote to retain it in the Eighty-first Congress are riding for a fall, because Members of Congress are not stupid. They know what happened to approximately 115 of their number on November 2, 1948. They know that not a single Member of Congress who supported the Taft-Hartley bill has been able to successfully defend his vote for it, and the slogan today is, "Brother, I do not plan to go out with TAFT in 1950."

Most Members of Congress are hard-working, honest, respectable gentlemen, who have a desire to be faithful to their trust. They wish to deal fairly with labor, with the farmer, with industry, and to vote for what they believe to be best for all people. They are wholly unlike that discredited Joe Ball, who was defeated by the young mayor of Minneapolis by more than 207,000 votes; or Fred Hartley who did not have the guts to run for reelection because he saw the handwriting on the wall; or EUGENE COX, of Georgia whose record stinks to high heaven. Members of the Eighty-first Congress generally do not dislike labor; they do not oppose labor's right to organize and they are not out to smear labor nor to serve the NAM.

They would blush were they accused of playing ball with biased men like Denham of the Labor Board, or with Fulton Lewis, Jr., or his kind.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen prides itself in knowing something about human nature, and its representatives will not participate in a campaign of high pressure or false propaganda in an attempt to deceive or mislead any Member of Congress. The membership of the brotherhood enjoys the respect and confidence of most Members of Congress, and it proposes to retain this confidence and respect by treating the Members of Congress with dignity and by furnishing such information as will be helpful to them in determining matters placed before them.

The Taft-Hartley law will be repealed because as leprosy destroys the growth and vigor of human beings, the Taft-Hartley law destroys that fine relationship which should exist between management and employee, and it is more dangerous to the welfare of the Nation than any law that was ever perpetrated upon the American people.

Congress will have the support of labor in the administration's program; the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Act, the reinstatement of the Wagner Act with a few respectable amendments, because this program is designed to promote industrial peace, to preserve free and fair collective bargaining; to provide full employment for the people; to make America productive, progressive and secure; to protect democracy, and to applaud those men of future generations who guarantee liberty to every citizen in our great country.

The Hulbert Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks made on the floor this morning regarding the Hulbert flag, and also include in the Appendix certain records and documents from the New York State and Suffolk County Historical Association, I include the following:

CONTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT OF SUFFOLK COUNTY, LONG ISLAND, TO OLD GLORY, 1775

In this nebulous time when no one of us can but think long and often of the future and what it will hold for ourselves and our children, the flag symbolizes our conviction and embodies our hope. The anxiety of Francis Scott Key who cried out off Fort McHenry, "Does the Star-Spangled Banner still wave?" must eternally alert each of us equally through these days of troublous peace, as it does in war, if America is to remain the land of the free.

Signifying for us the abstract entity that is America—the collection of peoples who have gained nationhood through mutually seeking a balance of rights and freedom, maintaining one to make possible the other, the flag is a beautiful and comforting thing. It is beautiful to us as no other flag is beautiful, not for its color, design or fair field of stars; it is beautiful because it is our land's ranges and valleys, its oceaned shores. It is comforting because it is home and defense, our forefathers' promise of brotherhood and prideful, unshackled security.

Emblems have had followers since the days the Egyptians carried their animal-headed spears and the Roman legions went into battle bearing tassled standards, but few of the flags that have waved in history's wind have had a nickname comparable to that of "Old Glory." It concentrates into colloquial love the affection and reverence we bestow upon the Star-Spangled Banner. It makes the symbolic sign of the Nation peculiarly and intimately one's own, and since dying is ever an individual thing for every soldier in every land, this strengthens and sustains.

My home county of Suffolk, one of the 12 colonial counties of old New York, had a part, I believe, in the creation of the Stars and Stripes as we know it today, for at Riverhead, our county seat, in the historical society's brick building there may be seen a tattered red, white, and blue, star-spangled relic. It is 42 by 29 inches with a field 14 by 18¼ inches and is known as the Hulbert flag, since it was carried by the Bridgehampton, N. Y., company of Capt. John Hulbert in the Revolutionary War and taken by him to Philadelphia just prior to the date when Betsy Ross at the request of General Washington made our first emblem.

Many are familiar with the famous Pine Tree flag, the Count Pulaski flag, and that fierce banner with the coiled rattlesnake and the warning, "Do not tread on me." But the Hulbert flag is little known. It was found between the walls of an old house on Brickiln Road, north of Scuttle Hole Road, Sag Harbor, along with a number of Hulbert letters, now in the possession of Morton Pennypacker, Suffolk County historian, and author of an article entitled, "The Hulbert Flag," which was read before the New York State Historical Association in Southampton, N. Y., in 1932, and reprinted in New York State History, volumn XIV, No. 4, October 1933.

I had the pleasure some time ago of reading Mr. Pennypacker's scholarly bit of research, and recently my recollection of it was refreshed by Judge Murray Hulbert, a descendant of the Capt. John Hulbert and a former Member of this House of Representatives.

According to the Pennypacker account:

The first American flag with stars in a blue field was designed in 1775 by Capt. John Hulbert's company of the Third New York regiment, commanded by Col. James Clinton. It was probably made while they were at Fort Ticonderoga, preparing to escort to Philadelphia the first prisoners of war to be exhibited before the Continental Congress.

Weighty matters before the Congress had given little time for the discussion of a design for a flag, although in letters the need of one had been urged. But when Captain Hulbert arrived and reported the successes to the northward it is more than probable that the Members of Congress were so well pleased with the design of the flag of his company that someone asked Francis Hopkinson, who was an expert with his pencil, to make a sketch of it. In fact at a later date Hopkinson included among the items on his bill to the Congress one for sketching the flag of the United States of America.

Captain Hulbert's company was one of a number of organizations to use a flag in 1775 each with distinctive devices: Red and white stripes, a pine tree, an animal, a snake, a crescent. The 28 men composing the Philadelphia Light Horse Troop, when they escorted Washington to New York on his way to Cambridge in June 1775, carried a flag in which 13 stripes were used in one corner, with elaborate painting in the center. It was most natural that Captain Hulbert's Long Island men, familiar with the sea, should adopt the stripes, but copy the sky for their field, and place thereon a star for every State.

Undoubtedly William Richards, a Government contractor, to whom probably Hopkinson showed his sketch of the Hulbert flag, had a flag made and showed it to Members of the Congress.

If the country needed a flag and if a satisfactory design had been found months before, why the delay in adopting it? None can surmise what they were waiting for, or what strong influence may have opposed our having a national flag. We know that on June 14, 1777, the resolution was passed and our flag adopted, and then are perplexed to understand why there was no official proclamation of this resolution until the following September; this was an unaccountable delay. The same causes may have been responsible for the delay before the passage of the resolution.

Letters still exist showing that Richards urged action for the flag resolution without result. Probably he wished the adoption of the flag made with the cooperation of Hopkinson, and questioned the further use of the striped flag with the painted rattlesnake, for he writes under date of October 15, 1776, "It is not in my power to get [flags] until there is a design fixed on to make the colors by."

When Congress adopted the flag resolution its passage had been anticipated, at least by the Pennsylvania Legislature, for on May 29, 1777, this body authorized the payment to Elizabeth Ross of £14 12s. 2d. for making ships' colors which were then stored in William Richards' place.

In the writer's opinion, the discovery of the Hulbert flag solves the problem of a pattern for the Stars and Stripes. Francis Hopkinson sketched it; Betsy Ross deserves some credit, though not so much as her family supposed.

The history of Captain Hulbert's company is necessarily fragmentary but so much of it as the documents reveal follows. The company began its military existence on July 2, 1775, at Bridgehampton, in front of the little church which served the community until 1842. The service on that memorable July day was conducted by Deacon David Hedges. That he fired his hearers with the patriotism of the hour is evident, for at the close John Hulbert gathered the men of the congregation about him at the door, and then and there enlisted 21 for one of the first companies organized in the colony for the defense of national liberty. On the following day they recorded their names and thereupon started after others. Twenty-seven more were added on the 5th, and on the 27th Captain Hulbert advised the Provincial Congress that he had 68 and expected the full enrollment before the end of the month.

Alarmed for their livestock on Montauk the people of Southampton, as soon as they heard that a local company was forming, petitioned to have it assigned to that service, and Burnet Miller, chairman of the committee of Southampton, addressed the Congress as follows:

"SOUTHAMPTON, *July 5, 1775.*

"GENTLEMEN: The committee of East- and South-Hampton, taking into their serious consideration the remote situation from the headquarters at New York, and much exposed to the ravages of our unnatural enemy at this day with regard to our stock in our common field at the Point of Montauk, it being remote from the inhabitants, where any number may land and at pleasure take away our stock which is large, not less than 2,000 neat cattle and three or four thousand sheep, which if taken away would greatly distress us and give them support, which we would by no means do.

"Now considering our situation we request your honorable House to petition General Schuyler that a number of troops be stationed at Montauck and that the company now raising here may be a part until a matter of more importance shall call them away.

* * * * *

"BURNET MILLER,
"Chairman."

The reply to the above letter, 1 week later, merely noted that it was forwarded to General Schuyler.

Then followed a letter to the Committee of Correspondence for East Hampton and Southold, dated "In Provincial Congress, New York, 31st July 1775":

"Gentlemen: By the enclosed copy of a letter from General Washington to General Wooster, we think not unlikely the designs of these ships may be to take provisions from different parts; as Montauck, and other parts of the east end of Long Island are much exposed, we judge it proper to give this intelligence that you might take such methods for securing the stock there, as you shall judge necessary. Hulbert and Griffing's companies can be employed for that purpose till otherwise ordered. I am, etc."

On August 6 an express arrived from Suffolk County, on Long Island, with information that a number of transports, with a considerable body of troops, from Boston, under convoy of five ships of war, had appeared off Montauk Point; that an officer landed, and requested to purchase a number of cattle and sheep, which was refused. The particulars of the proceedings in consequence of this demand must be deferred, till more authentic accounts are received. We hear that the officers of the county militia marched a large body of men to the place of their landing; and on Tuesday last Major General Wooster, with the Connecticut forces, left the encampment at Harlaem, crossed the East River, at Hoorn's Hook, and marched with expedition to act in concert with the militia.

Hulbert's activity is shown in the diary kept by John Lion Gardiner, a paragraph in which reads:

"John Hulbert sent his lieutenant, John Davis from the Fire Place with about 40 men, who landed at Great Pond, marched up by the bay to the swamp and so to the southeast side of the garden. Davis came to the window of the little room where Mr. Miller, [overseer of the property] was abed but did not hear him. He had orders not to come into the house by Hulbert, and well he did, for there were 20 or 30 Tories, and so forth, up chambers and garret abed and asleep."

That they were anticipating long marches is shown by the following letter, dated Southampton, August 16, 1775:

"Captain Holburt. Sir: Whereas I am lame and unable to serve I should be glad if you would take Mr. John Henny in my room he will take my place from the twelfth of this instant and I shall expect my wages till then and I should be glad if you would leave at your house or send a discharge to me George Harris, Jr. (P. S.) I had one pound and one quarter of powder and five pounds and one-half of ball delivered to Sargiant Sayr by order of Lieutenant Havens, and 16 cartridges which I shall expect to be returned."

The next letter indicates that the officers were in uniform for it is a tailor who presents his bill. It is dated Southampton, September 11, 1775.

"Captain Holburt, Sir: John Gould came to me to make him some clothes he said by your order though he brought me no writing one and as he is a stranger to me I thought it not amiss to inform you sir of it and would be glad if you would send me a line by Abraham Jagger to know where I am to get my pay. Sir your humble servant, Silas Cooper."

The bill is for 10 shillings and 6 pence.

The first order to Captain Hulbert is missing but we find when he left Montauk by his letter dated Southampton, September 9, 1775, which follows:

"Gentn.: I should inform you that I marched with my company from Montauk the 7th instant; am preparing to march, and shall set off by the middle of next week. My company will want a number of guns, &c. as the inhabitants that supplied them will not let them go away, pleading the want of them themselves. I give you this timely notice that the company may not be detained long when we come to New York, &c. I am, gentn, your humble servt. John Hulbert. To P. V. B. Livingston, esq."

A list of those who had guns were found among the papers, and is as follows: Jeremiah Gardiner, Jeremiah Sherrell, John Gann, Amos Loper, Isaac Peirson, Samuel Ranger, Zebulon Jessup, Daniel Topping, George Case, Jacob Hick, Cornelius Bassett, Robert Moore, Abraham Leek, Philip Gildersleeve, Jeremiah Bennet, Benjamin Hunt, John Hudson, Abraham Sherrill, James Field, David Smith, Henry Hopping, William R. Hallsey, William Goldsmith, Abraham Loper, Stephen Ludlam, Lieut. John Davis, Lieut. William Havens, James Sayre, John Gould, Samuel Brown, Josiah Osborn, Nathan Hand, Sylvanus Conkling (Serj.), Daniel Hand, George Ludlom, George Henry, Capt. John Hulbert, Jonathan Cook, Cornelius Osborn, John How, Lewis Chatfield, Jacob Miller, William Willie, David Loper, Jonathan Pain, Thomas Baker, Benjamin Sandford, Elnathan Jenning, William Brewster, Edward Howell, Joseph Baley, Nathan Miller, Thomas Jones, Mathew Davis, Daniel Foster, Abraham Jagger, Burnet Cook, Stephen Howel, Silas Hedges, Joshua Sayer, Thomas Rumbelow, Joseph Hoppin, Isaac Smith, Benjamin Chapel, John Henny.

The next document is the letter following:

"NEW YORK, *September 28, 1775.*

"SIR: Your men are to embark at Greenwich, when your baggage is on board, and you are to proceed with the first wind and tide that offers, to Haverstraw Landing, and there enquire whether there be any deserters belonging to Captain Johnston's Company, of your regiment. If there are, you are to take them with you to their company; but if you have a fair wind, you are not to stay there longer than 3 or 4 nor at any rate above 6 hours. Upon your arrival at Albany, apply to the commanding officer there, for orders what route you are to take to Ticonderoga, in order to join your regiment. But if there should not be any there, take the advice of the committee on this matter, and observe it as the rule of your conduct. If your company is not complete, you should draft as many of Captain Greenwel's as have arms to fill yours. I wish you a pleasant passage and march, and am sir,

"Your very humble servant,
"ALEXANDER MCDOUGALL,
"Colonel."

The above letter is addressed to "Captain John Hulbert, of the Third Regiment, now at the upper Barracks, New York." These barracks, a relic of the French and Indian War, were so-called to distinguish them from the lower barracks which were located near the present Battery Park. They were a collection of low structures built of logs, stretching along the upper end of the Common, as the City Hall Park was then called, and reaching from Broadway along Chambers Street to what is now Centre Street.

Another document mentions that at Albany on October 8, they discharged Jeremiah Sherrill, William Miller, Henry Hopping, and Josiah Osborn. They had no deserters and no deaths. The next, dated Albany October 9, 1775, is as follows:

"SIR: You are immediately to draw provisions so as to complete your company for 6 days and apply to Walter Livingston, D. C. General, or his deputy, for the necessary carriages and march your company to Ticonderoga without delay. You are to begin your march early tomorrow morning. Good order among your men is at all times to be enforced, and care taken that the inhabitants whom we are going to protect do not suffer in their persons or property.

"GOOSSE VAN SCHAICK,
"Coll. York Forces."

There is not a hint as to how they reached Lake George, but Aaron Barlow, a brother of Joel the poet, who started 6 weeks ahead of them, kept a diary which probably records their route and similar experiences:

"I went up, he says, to take a view of the Indians, about 500, encamped on Albany Hill. I found them to be a very likely, spry, lustey fellows, dressed very nicely for Indians; the larger part of them had on ruffled shirts, Indian stockings and shoes, and blankets richly trimmed with silver and wampum. August 26, about one of the clock we set out on our journey. It being a cold, wet, uncomfortable day I got a very bad cold. We traveled to Half Moon, there we put up. August 27, very cold for the season. The caravan got up their teams and we went off very early. We went this day about 7 miles above Still Water. August 28, went this day 2 miles below Fort Edward. August 29, being wet we tarried till 1 o'clock before we set out. We went within 5 miles of Fort George. August 30, we set out very early for Lake George were we arrived about 9 o'clock."

Captain Hulbert signed a muster roll which is dated "In Camp at Lake George the 15th of October 1775." If from there they went by boat to Ticonderoga it probably took 2 days more. Barlow's diary reads:

"About 9 o'clock we went on board the Battow for Ticonderoga, it being 35 miles. The wind being ahead we went only to Saberday Point which is 24 miles from Fort George and lodged on green feathers (Hemlock boughs). The next morning we embarked very early. The wind being ahead we came to the landing about 9 o'clock, it being 3 miles from the Fort (Ticonderoga)."

Meanwhile General Montgomery was besieging St. John's on the Sorel River without much success owing to lack of ammunition and heavy guns. Learning that Carleton, supposing the fort at Chambly, twelve miles northward, to be safe while St. John's held out, was neglecting to keep it properly garrisoned, Montgomery sent a detachment under Colonel Bedell of New Hampshire, Maj. John Brown of Massachusetts, and Major Livingston of New York, who on October 19 succeeded in bringing the garrison to an unconditional surrender. The prisoners consisted of 1 major, 2 captains, 3 lieutenants, captain of a schooner, a commissary and surgeon, 83 privates, and 81 women and children. The colors of the seventh regiment of British regulars were also taken.

It is certain that Major Brown returned with the flag. Marinus Willett's Narrative says that Willett escorted the prisoners to Ticonderoga; and Barlow says:

"ST. JOHN'S, October 21st—This day we sent a flag of truce to see if they would give liberty to bring the prisoners and baggage by the Fort at the Lake. They were immediately granted liberty and they were brought this day aboard of our sloop and schooner."

Several days, at least, Hulbert's men had been waiting at Ticonderoga before he was formally notified by General Schuyler to march the prisoners to the Continental Congress, then in Philadelphia. General Schuyler's order is dated November 1, 1775. It is probable that they improved this opportunity to fashion, while there, a flag for their company which would rival the captured trophy.

The next document is an account of the expenses of conducting the prisoners from Chambly to Philadelphia. The first entry is November 2, 1775. This being £3 10s. paid to Samuel Adams may have been a debt contracted while at Ticonderoga. Likewise the second entry of £7 14s. 6d. paid to John Jones on November 4, but by November 5 they were well on their way, for Platt Smith's bill for £3 7s. 6d is then entered. Expenses at Wings, Stephen Tuthill, Ezekial Consign, John Vernon, Elizabeth People and Richard Merifie are all entered before reaching Martha Vernon's at Albany on the 10th. Several bills were contracted at Haverstraw Landing on the 12th and 13th and on the 14th Richard Campbell's bill at Hackensack is entered. Josiah Pierson at Newark follows; William Graham at Elizabethtown has an entry on the 15th, as has Henry Dawson, at Woodbridge; Brunswick has several entries on the 16th, including ferriage. The largest single item of expense was £39 paid for five four-horse wagons from Haverstraw to Trenton. Three two-horse wagons cost £14 8s. and two Philadelphia wagons have another entry. Smaller items mention stage from Hackensack to Trenton and passage from Trenton to Philadelphia and chair and several other wagons for sundry sums. This document shows that they received £248 for the expenses of this trip and expended £214 leaving a balance of £34.

Before their arrival in Philadelphia the Congress has received a letter from General Washington, dated November 8, in which he says:

"Our prisoners, by the reduction of Fort Chambly (on which happy event I most sincerely congratulate the Congress) being considerably augmented, and likely to be increased, I submit it to the wisdom of Congress, whether some convenient inland towns, remote from the post roads, ought not to be assigned them; the manner of their treatment, subsistence, etc., defined."

Congress at once made necessary arrangements but was obliged to change its plans upon receipt of a letter from General Schuyler. The Journals of Congress, under date of November 17, read:

"On motion made, Resolved, That the commissioned officers, taken in the forts of Chambly and St. John's be put on their parole of honour, that they will not go into or near any seaport town, nor further than 6 miles distant from the respective places of their residence, without leave of the Continental Congress, and that they will carry on no political correspondence whatever, on the subject of the dispute between Great Britain and these Colonies, so long as they remain prisoners.

"Whereas the officers taken at Fort Chambly, have been permitted by General Schuyler, to make choice of, and to reside in Trenton, in New Jersey, and the disposition of the prisoners by him made, has been approved by Congress, Ordered, That a copy of the foregoing resolution be sent to the committee of Trenton, and that the Committee be desired to get the same signed by the officers there."

The Journals of Congress for Monday, November 20, 1775, read:

"Capt. John Hulbert, who was sent by General Schuyler to conduct the officers, who were taken prisoners at Fort Chambly, to Trenton, attended and made report of his proceedings and the disposal of the prisoners."

The Pennsylvania Evening Post, November 23, mentions the arrival of Hulbert with the prisoners as follows:

"On Friday last Major Stopford and other officers, with their band of music, taken at Chambly, arrived at Trenton in New Jersey, where they are to remain prisoners of war till exchanged."

A carefully prepared statement among the Hulbert papers shows that 51 of the prisoners were left at Trenton, 6 at Fort George, 3 at Saratoga, 5 at Albany, 1 at Tie Condaroga, and 107 were sent to Connecticut.

Hulbert was probably still in Philadelphia on November 23, for on that day the Journals of Congress record that:

"On motion made, ordered, that $120 be paid to Captain [John] Hulbert, and charged to account of General Schuyler, and that the said Hulbert, after stationing his men at the fortresses on Hudson's River, have leave to be absent 10 days."

It would be interesting to know what induced Congress to grant this 10 days leave. Undoubtedly it gave Hulbert the opportunity to converse with many and it is perhaps significant that his Brookhaven neighbors, within a few days of his visit, applied to the Provincial Congress for "powder, balls, guns, drums, colours and other necessaries," thus being the first company to request flags of the Provincial Congress. Had Hulbert told them that his company had a flag this early request can be readily understood.

The date of Hulbert's arrival at Fort Constitution is not positively known. The island upon which it is situated was the first spot along the river to be recommended for fortification as early as June 13, 1775, and work was started on August 29 of the same year. It had therefore been under way for more than three months when Hulbert's men arrived. About this time it was discovered that unless West Point was also fortified an enemy would have little trouble in capturing Fort Constitution.

Benjamin Franklin who with a committee examined the works three months after Hulbert's men had left, reported "on the bastion, thirteen six pounders and one nine-pounder were mounted; the east bastion mounted seven nine-pounders and one six-pounder; the block house contained eight double fortified four-pound guns, mounted."

Captain Hulbert and the men of his company spent Christmas Day, 1775, at Fort Constitution, as the following letter found among his papers shows. It is addressed to "Captain John Hulbert, Commanding Officer at the Fort on Hudson's River":

"SIR: Your favor of the 20th current was handed to me, and have duly considered its contents. The Congress of our Colony has adjourned till the first of February next. And least the Committee of Safety should not make a board, I have wrote to Mr. Bedlow one of the Commissioners on the subject of the extra pay of the minutemen, and the necessity of calling them in before your troops depart. You should see them posted in the Garrison, and settle the command, before you quit the Fort; and I wish to prevent any accident, you should continue there till a commander of the fort is appointed, which I expect momentarily from the Continental Congress. At all events, the Troops should not leave the Fort, till they are relieved, by as many of the minute Companies as can be accommodated there. You will be particular in seeing the Arms, and accoutrements of the Colony, in the hands of your and Captain Grenell's Companies, secured in Arm chests and take receipts for them at the foot of the Roll of the men's names, who shall deliver them up,

to the end, that neither you nor they be chargeable with them, and that those arms be secured and in readiness to be put in the hands of the Troops, or our fellow Country men as the case may require, for the defense of our bleeding Country.

"Captain Grenell is gone to Philadelphia with a committee of the Congress, on public business. I wish you the compliments of the season, and am with great truth and regard, sir,

"Your humble servant,

"ALEXANDER MCDOUGALL."

It was time for Captain Hulbert and his men to return to their homes and fireside, but they waited until other men came to the fort to fill their places; then, as shown by a bill of expenses found among the other documents, they left Fort Constitution on January 8, 1776. They went to White Plains, to Rye, and were ferried across to Huntington Harbor. They marched to the town of Huntington, where wagons were procured which took them to Smithtown. Other conveyances took them to Benjamin Havens, and then to Southampton, where on January 18, 1776, Captain Hulbert obtained the signatures of every member of the company, after which they were discharged. But they were not long out of service. Most of them enlisted in other companies as soon as opportunity afforded. However, so few of the records of that trying year have survived and so frequent were the changes, that it is difficult to follow the records with any degree of certainty. Captain Hulbert appears to have become colonel on February 20, 1776. He was then second in command of the minutemen under Josiah Smith, but on June 10, he is credited with becoming lieutenant colonel of Colonel Drake's regiment in General Scott's provisional brigade. Records are missing that might show where he was during the Battle of Long Island.

On August 29, 1776, the Provincial Convention resolved "That it be recommended to the inhabitants of Long Island to remove as many of their women, children, and slaves, and as much of their livestock and grain, to the main, as they can; and that this convention will pay the expense of removing the same"; agreeably thereto, Col. John Hulbert 4 days later started moving his effects. Receipted bills show that he sent to Saybrook 6½ loads of household goods, 4 passengers, 1 horse, 1 riding chair, 4 loads of hay, 1 load of wheat, 2 of corn, 4 barrels, and some iron.

Before the end of the month he was selected by General Washington to assist Gen. George Clinton, General Lincoln, John S. Hobart, and H. B. Livingston, in planning an expedition to Long Island. Washington directed them to meet at Fairfield and from there to plan to attack the British forces at Huntington. Hulbert's bills show that he had expenses at Stanford, Norwalk, Milford, New Haven, Durham, and Fairfield, besides expresses from Middletown and to Governor Trumbull. Every detail had been arranged before the middle of October, but the day before they were to start they received orders from General Washington to abandon the enterprise as the troops were needed elsewhere. Hobart in a letter to George Clinton dated Fairfield, October 17, 1776, thus expresses their disappointment:

"MY DEAR GENERAL: Are we to be disappointed in our favorite expedition? Are the good people of Suffolk to suffer without any hope of redemption? Why are the troops ordered from hence just as our expedition is on the point of execution? Surely the army is strong enough without them. I fancy somebody wants to see the Suffolk regiments about him, that he may brag of the Boston folks, for I assure you that they make a very respectable figure on the parade and I dare say will do well in the field; let me entreat you to interpose and prevent this plan from being blasted. Colonel McIntosh will inform you of the state of matters here; all of Smith's regiment that are on this side are ordered to rendezvous at New Haven next Monday."

A few days later, from Peekskill, November 24, 1776, Henry B. Livingston writes:

"GENTLEMEN: I am just informed that Lieutenant Colonel Hulbert is gone to Long Island, and it is very improbable that he will accept his commission. Should this be the case I must beg leave to recommend Major Fish as the most eligible person I can think of as major of my regiment; he is a young man of spirit and ability."

Captain Hulbert's letter to the Committee of Arrangements dated Fish Kill, December 9, 1776, indicates that he had received an appointment, but all details are lacking. It reads:

"GENTLEMEN: I have not the opportunity of returning you my thanks for the honor done me in my appointment by waiting upon your committee, but take this method to acknowledge the favor, at the same time am under the necessity of informing you that it is not in my power to serve, consistent with other affairs that interfere, not from any dislike to the service. Gentlemen, I would presume to recommend Benjamin Marvin as an officer of merit, if any vacancy for an officer of his rank should offer. He has served as a first lieutenant in Captain Griffin's company, the last two campaigns one of which I was with him, and well acquainted with his conduct. I am, gentlemen,

"Your humble servant,

"JOHN HULBERT."

Perhaps few besides General Washington ever knew what were those "other affairs that interfere" which he refers to above. Documents show that shortly thereafter he was engaged in promoting privateering in the sound. He was responsible for many vessels, among them being the brigs *Middletown, Defiance, America,* and *Martial,* the ship *Revenge* and sloop *Mehitable,* with the prize schooners *Adventure, Hudson,* and *Industry.* Then on June 27, 1777, the Council of Safety for the State of New York by vote resolved that "* * * Obediah Jones, John Hulbert, and Thomas Dearing, or any two of them, be and they are hereby authorized and directed to remove, at the expense of this State, to the county of Dutchess, within the same, all such of the refugees from Long Island, now in Connecticut, as are unable to maintain themselves, and are willing so to be removed."

A few days later, on July 3, the council confirmed the appointment and by prohibiting any others from granting permits made their power absolute and their permit necessary for all who crossed the Sound to or from Long Island. This work, with the outfitting of the privateers, occupied his time to the end of the war or at least until April 5, 1782, when he returned to Long Island.

Capt. John Hulbert kept a journal and was careful to preserve letters and other papers which almost 70 years after the above date mysteriously disappeared. Mather in his Refugees of 1776 from Long Island to Connecticut, page 27, says:

"Hon. Henry P. Hedges stated that about the year 1850 he had the Correspondence and Journal of Capt. John Hulbert from Samuel L'Hommedieu; and read and returned them to him. Mr. L'Hommedieu loaned the papers to his nephew, Samuel L. Gardiner; and, in New York City, they were taken from Mr. Gardner's hat and disappeared, perhaps forever."

An advertisement of household premises and saddler's shop is signed: John Hulbert, Sag Harbor, April 10, 1807 tf. Two months later he mortgaged property in Sag Harbor for $200. Nothing that can be relied upon has been found about Capt. John Hulbert after the above date.

It is a matter for regret that among the many books once owned by John Hulbert, but a single copy remains that can be identified. This was recently purchased for the Long Island Collection, and is inscribed in his characteristic script: "John Hulbert, his book, 1774." It is A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections by Jonathan Edwards, published in 1746. Pinned to a fly leaf are leaves from an elm tree planted by President Edwards in front of the house where he lived in Northampton. The bulk of the books from his library formed the nucleus of Bridgehampton's first public library, which was among the early institutions of the kind of this country.

The original flag is owned by William D. Halsey, president of the Sag Harbor Savings Bank, and is in the building of the Long Island Historical Society at Riverhead. Its size is 42 by 29 inches, the field being 14 by 18¼ inches. Miss Gertrude T. Leverich, of Bridgehampton, with infinite care assisted in preparing it for the framing between plate glass. The original documents are owned by the writer and may be examined or studied at any time.

Mr. Pennypacker says much of the Hulbert Company's record is fragmentary, but documents in his possession, and in the public record as well, show that Captain Hulbert took prisoners from Fort Chambly, near St. Johns, to Philadelphia, where the part played by Betsy Ross, one of America's great ladies, is well known. Her humble home, wherein tradition tells us she received Washington, Col. George Ross, a member of the Continental Congress, and the Honorable Robert Morris, is now something of a national shrine.

Old Glory as it flies today has five pointed stars. The stars on the Hulbert flag have six points. That lends credence to the belief that the Hulbert flag was the inspiration for the Star-Spangled Banner, for the famous Ross story tells us the pretty Philadelphia seamstress prevailed upon Washington to use the five-pointed star which he had been reluctant to do since that same star is used in the Washington coat of arms.

The Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of Congress and many persons throughout the United States have given considerable thought and study to the various Hoover Commission reports on the organization of the executive branch of our Government. My main concern about these studies and investigations is that we now have an opportunity to make real savings in the operation of our Government and at the same time improve the services rendered by the Federal Government. We can do this by eliminating the duplication of services of the various agencies and departments and materially reduce the red tape

that confronts all citizens dealing with their Government.

Radio station WTAW at College Station, Tex., has a regularly scheduled program known as The College Speaks and recently Dr. Milton Nance, of the history department at Texas A. & M. College, made a major contribution to these campus discussions by giving an address on the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the radio address by Dr. Milton Nance entitled "The Hoover Commission":

THE HOOVER COMMISSION

As our Nation has grown and society has become more complex, our concept of the nature and functions of government has changed from the individualistic to the paternalistic theory, wherein the state intervenes to promote the general welfare, happiness, and prosperity of all the people—establishing national minimum standards and developing a mythical average man. As a result, our Federal Government is the most stupendous, colossal, gigantic business undertaking in the world today. Records tell us that the Government started off in 1789 with only some 300 civil officers and employees, and that when, 11 years later, the new Capitol on the Potomac was occupied, the total force of office clerks transported thither from Philadelphia numbered exactly 54. Today its 1,816 separate departments, bureaus, agencies, services, administrations, commissions, corporations, and other subdivisions employ over 2,000,000 civilian workers (greater than the population of Philadelphia, our third largest city) with an annual pay roll of over $6,500,000,000. These workers occupy 46,865 separate offices whose combined area is equivalent to 170 buildings like the Empire State. It requires 1,353 pages of fine print in a book weighing 6 pounds, 5 ounces, to present the budget estimates for the Government's operations for the fiscal year of 1949.

Our Government is threatening to outgrow us and become the master rather than the servant. In 20 years it has grown rapidly in size and cost. Some of its agencies are bigger than the whole Government was 20 years ago. Expenditures have advanced from $3,000,000 per year in 1789 to more than $40,000,000,000 in recent years. The per capita cost has increased from $1 in Washington's time to 6 in Lincoln's, 28 in Wilson's and 300 in our own. In 1932 the Federal Government spent 22 percent of every tax dollar—Federal, State, and local—collected in the United States. In 1948 it spent 74 percent of all taxes collected in this country. Federal taxes have increased 19-fold since 1932, and only for 1 year (1947) during the last two decades have receipts exceeded expenditures. The per capital national income between 1914 and 1945 increased 405 percent, whereas the per capita tax burden increased 4,560 percent, and the per capita public debt gained 16,637 percent. The cost of operating our Federal Government today is 20 percent or one-fifth of the total national income, and the cost of all government may take as much as a third of our total national income. A part of this is returned to us in increased services of various types.

The interest bearing debt of the United States increased from $800,000,000 in 1910 to $252,000,000,000 in 1948. Today it is $1,722 per man, woman, and child in the country, or $7,500 per average family. The interest on that debt alone exceeds $5,000,000,000 a year. That is more than the annual cost of operating the entire Federal Government in the years before 1934, except for the war budgets of 1918–21.

The greatest single cause of inflation in the last few years has been excessive government expenditures in proportion of the production of goods and services. But, we might ask, is the increasing cost of government an assurance of our continued prosperity in the future. Only recently have I heard several persons—mind you, hard-work'ng citizens with modest incomes—ask, "What is the use of working when government taxation takes so much of one's earnings?" Those who advocate the so-called welfare state may ponder well what Capt. John Smith said about the common store in the early settlement of the colony of Virginia. Writing about 1617, Captain Smith declared: "When our people were fed out of the common store, and labored jointly together, glad was he (who) could slip from his labor or slumber over his task he cared not how; nay, the most honest among them would hardly take so much true pains in a week, as now for themselves they will do in a day; neither cared they for the increase, presuming that howsoever the harvest prospered, the general store must maintain them, so that we reaped not so much corn from the labor of 30, as now 3 or 4 do provide for themselves."

As the cost has gone up, the people have become more interested in greater efficiency, economy, and responsibility from an organization loosely thrown together over many years by Congress and the President. The cost may be cut either by reducing the service now rendered by our Government, or by reducing the cost of the service, or both. With this end in view, Congress by unanimous vote in July 1947, created the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—better known as the Hoover Commission. The Commission was conceived on a high plane. It was set up on a bipartisan basis with 6 of its 12 members from each major party. Four members each were chosen by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the United States. President Truman chose ex-President Herbert C. Hoover, who, in turn, was promptly named chairman by the group. The names alone of the members inspire confidence, and Mr. Hoover, as chairman, understands the problems of Government, having carried the crushing administrative burden, which every President must bear, and completed a long record of unselfish public service, which has won for him the trust and admiration of millions throughout this and other countries. Twenty-four research task forces were set up under the Commission to dig deeply into the facts about our Government. Each studied some special topic, such as the post office, the armed services, the State Department, agriculture, and the like. The members of the task forces were eminent experts in their field, including 2 ex-Cabinet officers, 13 former under secretaries and assistant secretaries of Government departments, 3 former United States Senators, 5 former governors of States, 10 major university presidents, and many executives with special experience in business. They studied the Government with a view to: Limiting expenditures to the lowest possible amount consistent with efficient performance; eliminating duplication and overlapping; consolidating similar activities; abolishing unnecessary activities; and defining and limiting executive functions.

President Truman directed al. the officials in the Government to give the Commission their full cooperation and to refrain from criticizing the task forces' reports. Both orders have been obeyed. The Commission's report has been completed and submitted to Congress in 18 installments—the last on April 1. An over-all report is to be submitted later. These preliminary reports comprise the most comprehensive study of Government in all history, hammering out a broad pattern for an orderly effective, well-run Government.

The report discloses that aside from a multiplicity and overlapping of many agencies, their officials are enmeshed by thousands of strands of red tape, accumulated by legislative and executive action over half a century, which paralyzes the efforts of the best of them. For example, the paper work involved in processing a Government purchase order costs more than $10 per order, yet half of the 3,000,000 purchase orders which the civilian branches of the Government execute are for items costing less than $10; 38 different Government agencies lend money; 16 different agencies are engaged in wildlife preservation, 34 agencies are engaged in obtaining land, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 4 in bank examinations; 65 in gathering statistics, 14 in forestry matters, 28 in welfare matters, 12 in home and community planning, 25 deal with the Nation's mineral resources, the three branches of the armed services maintain separate recruiting offices in communities when one would suffice, and so on almost endlessly. For every 32 Indians under the jurisdiction and care of the Bureau of Indian Affairs there is one Federal employee, making a total of over 12,000 persons administering the program. It takes the Veterans' Administration an average of 73 days to pay death claims on Government life insurance, whereas private life insurance companies pay 80 percent of their death claims within 15 days. The Commission found that one private company with insurance activities much like the Veterans' Administration has an average work load per employee of four times the Veterans' Administration average. The Commission accused the Veterans' Administration of having an excess of voluminous written instructions on internal methods and procedure which handicaps intelligent execution of its program. It cited 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins, and over 400 circulars. Toll rates on the Panama Canal in 1948 were the same as 10 years earlier, despite the fact that expenses were up 79 percent. The Army dismantled a $16,000,000 camp in Alaska and shipped the lumber to Seattle, Wash., only to have it returned to Alaska by the Interior Department and used 10 miles from the site of the dismantled camp. A farmer wrote the Department of Agriculture seeking advice on the best type of fertilizer to use on his soil. He got answers from five separate offices. All answers were different. The Commission found "a confused Federal supply system where agencies compete with one another for scarce commodities, (and) maintain duplicating storage facilities in the same locality.

During the fiscal year 1949 the Government will spend more than $6,000,000,000 for supplies, matériel, and equipment, but nowhere is there an over-all listing on hand to show whether or not new matériel ordered might possibly be included in more than $27,000,000,000 of goods already paid for in Government warehouses and storage depots. Some Federal agencies were estimated to have sufficient office supplies to last 50 years. The Government owns 850,000 typewriters, or 3.6 typewriters for every employee who uses one full-time or part-time. The Commission found startling waste in the armed forces and padding of their budget requests, which, if eliminated, would save $1,500,000,000 a year—an amount which would have been sufficient to operate the Government any normal year before 1900. The per capita cost of maintaining our Army, Navy, and Air Force in 1949 will be $100, whereas just before World War II, in 1938, it was $8, and just before World War I it was $2.25 a head. The various armed services were found to have asked for $1,100,000,000 for research, but the research experts admitted that they could not spend more than $600,000,000. At present there is one officer in the Army for each

eight men. The Army has 150 major generals. A major general traditionally commands a division, but today there are only 11 divisions.

The Postoffice Department was found to be one of the most inefficient agencies of Government. Its operations are hamstrung by an obsolete and overcentralized administrative set-up and by a maze of outmoded laws, regulations, and traditions which freeze progress and stifle proper administration. It takes 20 percent more money to operate the mail trucks than it does to operate large-scale private transport fleets. Machinery is available for sorting mail twice as fast as by hand, but the Post Office Department has none of this machinery. Many classes of mail service are non-self-supporting. The Commission has recommended that this Department be taken out of politics.

The Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation on the same day recently made public separate reports favoring the construction of a high dam in Hell's Canyon of the Snake River. The Army engineers intended to build their dam 102 miles below Weiser, Idaho; the Bureau of Reclamation 104 miles below Weiser; both dams would be of practically the same height and construction, and would generate approximately the same amount of electricity, but the Army's dam would cost $75,260,000 less than the Department of the Interior's. It cost both agencies $25,000 each to draw up the plans for these dams.

In its survey the commission found waste of money and waste of human effort. "The Nation," it said, "is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch. It has found that great improvements can be made in the effectiveness with which the Government can serve the people, if its organization and administration is overhauled."

It will be impossible to go into all of the commission's recommendations, but a few might be mentioned to illustrate some of its proposals. The Hoover commission has been interested in both centralizing and decentralizing controls. The Civil Service Commission, it said, cannot control the selection of persons in all departments as originally intended. It should fix general standards, but the departments should have more authority in hiring and firing. It often costs more today to fire an inefficient or surplus person than to retain him. The commission stressed the need of grouping agencies according to their major purposes, and its recommendations have been specific. Mr. Hoover told a Senate committee recently that the necessary first step in reorganization was the passage of a bill to give the President a free hand in reshaping the agencies under his direction, and that he should be given full control of the independent boards and commissions, even though experience has taught that when the President is given control over an agency or commission, its independence will be guided to the extent he desires. But this is as it should be. The framers of our Constitution intended that all powers of government should be distributed among three great branches—Congress (legislative), the executive (President), and the courts (judicial). There was to be only one administrative head—i. e., the President. There should be a clear-cut chain of command and responsibility through the whole administrative structure of government, starting with the President at the top, down to the last charwoman. As things now stand, the President has approximately 65 major departments and agencies reporting directly to him. If he gave 1 hour of his time per week to each of these agencies he would have no time left for the broad responsibilities of his office. Mr. Hoover has requested that the President be given authority to regroup these agencies into 20 or 22 operating heads reporting directly to him, and making direct claims on his time. This seems to be a very sound and sensible plan. It would reduce what is called in business the span of authority, so that the responsible executive can maintain a line of authority and responsibility, and at the same time have time for matters of broad policy.

By the centralization of records management under a single Records Management Administration the current cost of storage and keeping could be cut thirty to fifty million dollars by more "birth control" in record making, microfilming, and less expensive storage. The cost of maintaining a single filing cabinet could be cut $29 a year to $2.50 a year simply by moving the records to cheaper containers in a less expensive storage space. The Commission found 3,080,000 4-drawer filing cases costing $154,000,000 at present prices, occupying 18,000,000 square feet of valuable floor space—the equivalent of 6 Pentagon Buildings. It found approximately one-third of the records either outdated, valueless, or duplicated, and, therefore, could be burned without impairing the operations of Government.

The Commission urged an overhaul of taxing methods so as to eliminate the overlapping of national, State, and local taxes; it recommended coordination of the various Government research programs; a revamping of the grants-in-aid system to the States; revision, improvement, and extension of the budget and accounting system; and greater coordination and efficiency in the Federal medical facilities. To clean up the medical muddle the Commission suggested integrating all Federal medical service under two systems—military and nonmilitary.

Already the proposals are running into trouble. On April 1 the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee voted to let either House of Congress kill a reorganization plan proposed by the President by a simple majority vote. The House of Representatives had previously approved the President's request that any shake-up would go into effect unless rejected by both Chambers. The Senate committee, however, agreed unanimously that no executive agency should be exempt from the reorganization authority. In the past, Congress or the President have usually allowed numerous exemptions, and that is one of the main reasons the executive branch is disorganized today. Ever jealous of its prerogatives, and by nature suspicious of any moves that may affect its patronage and influence in administration, Congress has in the past balked at giving Presidents blanket authority to reorganize the administrative branch of the Government. Even when it has yielded, it has imposed numerous stringent reservations. A strenuous fight is ahead. A good reorganization would probably cut the executive pay roll in half. "The vital fact remains," said Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, "that resistance to change is the very thing we have got to overcome. * * * As Mr. Hoover said in the hearings, the whole effectiveness of the reorganization bill can be destroyed by little grasshopper bites of exemptions here and exemptions there. Many agencies and bureaus have already begun to work to get exemptions concerning them written into the reorganization bill. Some are putting a great deal of pressure on our legislators now. One hesitates to say that any Government agency is maintaining a lobby, for that is supposed to be against the law. The fact remains, however," continued Mr. TOBEY, "that some of these agencies have a suspiciously large number of very active friends working in their behalf."

Something must be done to prevent democracy from strangling itself in the coils of bureaucracy. Administrative reorganization, therefore, is vital to our future freedom and prosperity, and the American taxpayer and voter should speak up in their own interest, by writing their Congressman, said Mr. TOBEY, and demonstrate anew that government of the people, by the people, and for the people has not perished from the earth.

The Sentimental Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Boston Herald recently adjudged the best editorial printed in a United States newspaper of over 50,000 circulation on foreign economic policy. This coveted distinction carried with it an award of $500 to editor John H. Crider and a commemorative plaque to the Herald. The competition was sponsored by the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

THE SENTIMENTAL APPROACH

One of our very good friends, who seems to agree with us in other respects, says we are just silly and sentimental about foreign economic policy. We're just do-gooders. In his view UNRRA was sheer waste—operation extravaganza. The World Bank, the International Fund, loans to Britain and France, Italy and the rest were simply misguided altruism. And, to top it all, the Marshall plan, which he calls operation rathole, will prove the finishing touch which will break the American bank while supporting the efforts of foreign powers to train troops which, ultimately, will be fighting our young men. Whew!

Moreover, says this elderly and well-informed gentleman, we are repeating on a grander scale every mistake which was made after World War I. As a matter of fact, this critic was an American delegate to one of the post World War I financial conferences.

The only thing we like about this view is its simplicity. It would be wonderful if everything was that simple. It's not. To tell the whole story of it is to talk mostly of background, of past errors, of changed attitudes of peoples and governments, of different standards, new time-space considerations and a realinement of power in the world. It is too long.

We will attempt to say only enough about it to justify our belief that our critic's view is the sentimental one, ours practical and realistic almost to the point of cynicism. Since our critic talks in broad generalities, indeed, even in absolutes when he says the policies we have supported sapped the vitality of America, we will turn the tables and assume, for purposes of argument, that the absolute reverse had occurred. We did none of the things he objects to. We won the war, closed the doors, and let the rest of the world stew in the blood, muck, and wreckage of war. We spent all the money on ourselves, on developing new weapons, improving the atomic bomb, making our country a virtual fortress. We really enjoyed our postwar boom. It was a happy, madly indulgent orgy.

Suppose that had happened. What about the balance of power situation in the world today? What about our own economic future?

In the first place, imperialistic Soviet Russia would by now have dominated most of the rest of the globe—certainly all but the Americas, and possibly even some parts of the

American continents. For the rest of the world was either too weak, poor, or weary to resist the evangelical ardor of Soviet missionaries backed by the bayonets of the Red Army. If we had friends in the world outside of the Americas, and it is exceedinly unlikely that we would have, they would be unable to help us.

In short our strategic situation in an air-war era would be tragic beyond description. It would have been a grandiose application of the Maginot Line theory of defense behind a fixed line. We might still have a few islands here and there, but there would be no friendly governments which could facilitate the establishment of American bases at points where they would be most useful. Any such bases would have to be fought for and won. Ultimately, the great war might, under such circumstances, have to be fought on American soil. What might have happened militarily had we followed our friend's advice leaves us shuddering at the very thought.

But what about our economic future? What would we have done with all this money we didn't spend on foreign assistance and in support of international financial institutions? Could we have cut our tax rate? Not at all. On the contrary, such a friendless great power, menaced from almost every point of the compass, would have to arm far beyond any point now contemplated. But, again, what about our business, our factories and farms? To whom would we sell once their gigantic output had met the accumulated domestic needs?

It would hardly seem necessary to go on. As for us, the only thing that makes us really happy about the current nervous situation is to contemplate what it would be like if we had followed our friend's advice.

GOP "Grass Roots" Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following timely editorial from the April 30, 1949, issue of Trainman News, official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

GOP "GRASS ROOTS" AGAIN

The Republicans have named a strategy committee and announced plans for more "grass roots" conferences to find out again what the people are thinking and what they expect from government.

Somehow or other we don't have much faith in these conferences. We recall that prior to the last campaign and before previous campaigns, the GOP also did some talking over with the citizenry.

Each time the leaders have come back from the "grass roots," reporting that the people have affirmed the Republican viewpoint, want less social planning, more free enterprise, less labor power and in general a return to the good old days of Coolidge and Hoover, etc.

The peculiar aspect of all this is that although the GOP finds the people in agreement with its aims and ideals, they don't vote for GOP candidates. Is this because the voters think the Democrats can carry out Republican objectives better, or because they agree with Democratic objectives?

Fact is, the Republican Party is in control of a small group of rich die-hards who simply will not permit the rank and file to have a voice in the organization's policy. They pay lip service to some liberal ideas before and after elections, but in between when Congress is voting on issues the GOP conveniently forgets all about it.

If the GOP will consult the election results and Democratic platforms of the past 16 years, they will find out what most Americans want. And if they break away from the moss-backed leadership which blocks giving Americans what they want, there may be a chance for them to win some elections. These phony "grass roots" are just a waste of time and may be charged off as merely Old Guard propaganda.

Socialism on the Defensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 18, 1949:

SOCIALISM ON THE DEFENSIVE

The point has frequently been made that there can be no turning back from national socialism, that once a nation has emerged upon a program of nationalization it feeds upon itself until finally it is all-embracing.

The trend of events in England, since the present Government came in, tends to support this dismal conclusion. Certainly spokesmen for the Government in the last week or two, in announcing plans for taking over half a dozen more industries, including industrial insurance, are proceeding on the theory that the nationalization program in due time will be complete.

Fortunately from the point of view of those of us who are convinced that socialism and democracy are incompatible, the trend in France, where nationalization has proceeded about as far as in Britain, is away from socialism. An Associated Press dispatch from Paris last Saturday reported that the Government had decided that seven publicly owned airplane plants would either be closed or returned to private ownership, that the deficits they have been running were a threat to the budget reforms which are the No. 1 concern of Premier Queuille and his Cabinet.

It is probably not a coincidence that the deficit of the French Government in 1948 was almost precisely the combined deficits of the nation's nationalized industries. Thus the conclusion seems justified that much of the violent inflation that has plagued the French since liberation, and the recurring budgetary crises, which until recently have made both economic and political stability appear remote, have been due in large measure to the incompetence of state-operated industries and the losses they have incurred.

While France proposes to meet the budgetary problem created through the losses from state industries by turning away from it, in some respects at least, the British, it appears from the recent budget message of Sir Stafford Cripps, propose to do so by higher taxes and ever more severe austerities.

Possibly a British public which accepted the present government, and the socialization it promised on the representation that it would improve the nation's standard of living, is becoming skeptical, and a little impatient. The results of the county council elections certainly cannot be regarded as a vote of confidence in the Government. If they do not reflect a mass judgment that the Labor government has failed, at least, they record a measure of displeasure with the dividends it has paid, even with the generous assistance that it has received from this country.

Whatever the future holds both for England and France it is fairly apparent that the testing time for national socialism is at hand. In neither country is it taken as a cure-all or an answer to all the problems of this difficult readjustment period. At the moment in both nations nationalization seems to be on the defenseive. To this newspaper it seems that our government in its foreign-aid policy has been too tolerant of it and its certain significance for our European objective.

Remarks by the Vice President at Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Ninety-second Street YM-YWHA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by Vice President BARKLEY on the occasion of the presentation of distinguished service awards to outstanding Jewish citizens during the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Ninety-second Street YM-YWHA and also a news article written by Jack Nadel in connection therewith. I have secured an estimate of cost of printing, which is $206.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, the Ninety-second Street Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association is celebrating its diamond jubilee, the seventy-fifth anniversary of its organization, and I deeply appreciate the compliment involved in the invitation extended to me to participate in this significant event.

It was very thoughtful of you to remember me in the extension of your gracious invitation to attend, with all that this invitation involves in the way of friendship and good will. To all of you here, I offer my warmest greetings.

We are gathered here this evening on the occasion to which I have alluded as being significant. Lest you should think that the tribute of that word is a facile and inexpensive compliment, I hasten to give you my earnest reasons for so characterizing this occasion.

First, I should like to quote that revered American and masterful phrase-maker, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, little more than a decade ago, observed that the Jewish community-center movement has "created the potent influence of good citizenship, wholesome character, and loyalty to all those forces upon which depend the preservation and development of our democratic institutions."

The Ninety-second Street Y, as it is called, as the Jewish center in the United States with the oldest continuous history, can properly claim credit for leadership and widespread influence in the development of that movement.

Radiating a spirit of high loyalty to the ideals associated with the American way of life, the Ninety-second Street Y has played, and continues to play, a valuable role in the country's life, offering opportunities for physical recreation and for cultural growth and experiences. These are functions which obviously enrich not only the Jewish community, but the very performance and accomplishments of democracy itself. The connection which I have in mind, and which you no doubt visualize, is a direct connection.

The Ninety-second Street Y, like all the other Jewish community centers throughout this country, does not limit the scope of its interests, activities, and program to any particular segment of the Jewish community, but consciously attempts to reach and serve all elements in that community. This organization is the product of a devoted—almost a consecrated—interest taken in it by such historic American Jewish leaders as Oscar S. Straus, Felix M. Warburg, and Jacob H. Schiff. As a maker also of leaders, as well as followers, this organization, known as the Ninety-second Street Y, has a magnificent record, as is witnessed by the names of the 12 distinguished American personages, all identified with this association, who have been cited here this evening for their important contributions to the welfare and progress of our country. But beyond even that unique record, there stands a past, present, and continuing reach of service which—in the satisfactions which it has rendered and is rendering individual's recreational, social, cultural, and adult-educational needs—is simply incalculable. These services are superb and magnificent in their origin and in their effect, and they are inseparable from the collective and individual lives of those who have come under their influence.

It seems to me to be appropriate at this point to make mention of the fact that the Ninety-second Street Y is one of more than 300 Jewish community centers and Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations throughout the United States which are affiliated with the National Jewish Welfare Board. This is known as the JWB—and it is known not only to the Jewish community, but it is also known to that great host of American men and women who served their country during the late war, and to whom the initials JWB spell home and friendly and sympathetic consideration, comfort, and hospitality, morale, and all-around helpfulness. The Jewish Welfare Board, the centers, and the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations are again participating wholeheartedly in the program of the reactivated united service centers, assuming new responsibilities, taking on new obligations, in behalf of the national security program.

The Ninety-second Street Y is an American institution. Undoubtedly, the outstanding element in the character of the Y is the utter wholesomeness of its aims and its program. It is part of a movement which has been characterized by President Truman as "a people's movement—a sacred expression of the finest aspirations of men."

The President of our country has called this movement "a magnificent symbol of service—service in the realms of recreation, culture, and morale to the half million young people and adults who find the Jewish community center an attractive and helpful institution, and of continued service as well to the men and women wearing the uniform of the United States and to the hospitalized veterans."

Perhaps the most dramatic measure of the Ninety-second Street Y's accomplishments is the fact that in a city celebrated throughout the world for the achievements and opportunities of its cultural enterprises, the Y stands out as one of the foremost cultural agencies in that great city. It is, therefore, with confidence and assurance that I assert that this organization, the Ninety-second Street Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association, will never falter in the valued work and the special concept of service to which it has dedicated itself. It will not only be a great service to those who are associated with it, and those who are the beneficiaries of it, but it will offer a stimulating example to all other similar organizations devoted to the welfare of the vast number of young people, in the building of character, and the promotion of hopes that may be fulfilled.

May this great organization, and all of you who are associated with it, realize many additional milestones of happy and constructive gains in this inexhaustible field.

DIAMOND JUBILEE FOR THE NINETY-SECOND STREET Y—BROUGHT INTO BEING IN 1874, THE AGENCY HAS RENDERED HIGH-LEVEL, HISTORIC SERVICE TO NEW YORK JEWRY

(By Jack Nadel, executive director, Ninety-second Street YMHA)

"We, the undersigned, desiring to promote harmony and good fellowship among Hebrew young men and to unite them in an organization tending to improve their social, moral, and mental condition, do form an association under the name and style of the 'Young Men's Hebrew Association.'"

With these words, set down on March 22, 1874, the YMHA was brought into being by a group of persons prominent in the professional and business life of New York. Among them was the Honorable Oscar S. Straus, who, in the course of his public service career, served in the Cabinets of four Presidents of the United States. It was Mr. Straus' view that it would be a useful undertaking to organize a Young Men's Hebrew Association for the cultural and intellectual advancement of Jewish young men.

The first president of the Y, elected on May 3 of that year, was Lewis May, and the first permanent quarters of the Y, opened half a year later, were at 112 West Twenty-first Street. Here the Y's first program of education and recreation was inaugurated.

In less than 2 years, the association was ready for larger quarters and in April 1876 a long lease was taken on a building at 110 West Forty-second Street, which contained a gymnasium, bowling alleys, reading room, club and classrooms and other facilities. These quarters were retained for 10 years, during which time the institution grew and developed. Then the trend of population shifted toward the eastern part of the city and it was deemed advisable to move.

TO LEXINGTON AVENUE

In 1886, a small building was rented at 721 Lexington Avenue near Fifty-eighth Street. Here the activities of the association were carried on for 9 years. For most of the period, prior to this time, the program in addition to the social, recreational and club activities, stressed Jewish interests, giving prestige and support to the institution. From year to year it conducted competitive Hebrew examinations for the city of New York, offered public lectures and courses in Jewish subjects and celebrated Jewish holidays, particularly Purim and Hanukah, on such a large scale that it attracted considerable notice. These events were held in large places like the Metropolitan Opera House, Chickering Hall, and Terrace Garden.

Most of these Jewish activities were conducted in cooperation with the Hebrew Free School Association, which was the recognized agency of Jewish education at that time.

Among the men who were thrown constantly together and who, through the experience gained, were thus able to take up the communal burdens which were thrust upon the Jewish community were: I. S. Isaacs, Daniel P. Hays, Samuel Greenbaum, Morris S. Wise, Sol B. Solomon, M. Warley Platzek, Uriah Hermann, Samuel B. Hamburger, Mark Ash, Henry W. Unger, David Leventritt, Meyer S. Isaacs, Henry Leipziger, and Marcus M. Marks. These men were destined later to occupy high places in judicial, professional, and business life.

THE Y UNDERTAKES

The problem of the Jewish community arising from the influx of Russian refugees in the early eighties became intense because of the lack of existing societies capable of coping with the situation. The downtown sections became crowded with large numbers of these immigrants. The community was confronted with the task of providing for the welfare of these people, a task which increased with every ship that arrived. There was no organized society either uptown or downtown which was prepared to handle the situation and the YMHA thereupon undertook some of this work.

In 1882 the association established a downtown branch, the first Jewish neighborhood center for immigrant groups. The rooms were located at 244 East Broadway, but within a year moved to 206 East Broadway, where a new building had been erected for the Hebrew Free School Association. The activities conducted in the downtown branch included Americanization classes, English for foreigners, an employment bureau, a library, rooms for lectures, forums, entertainments, etc. Here Emma Lazarus, the famous poetess whose immortal words are inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty, taught classes. The work conducted for the immigrants inspired the late Jacob H. Schiff to refer in 1884 to the noble missionary work among the Russians conducted by the YMHA.

The active interest of the YMHA in Jewish education and its cooperation with the Hebrew Free School Association brought about in 1886 a merger of their two libraries into the Aguilar Free Public Library. This library is today a branch of the New York City Public Library system.

In 1889 the YMHA, the Hebrew Free School Association, and the Aguilar Free Public Library combined to establish the Educational Alliance on the lower East Side. Two years later a new organization was formed, making the Educational Alliance an independent institution.

MENKEN IMPRESSES SCHIFF

For the next 2 years the Y experienced financial difficulties and its services diminished. Smaller quarters were taken at 111 East Fifty-ninth Street, in the rooms occupied by the Aguilar Free Public Library. Up to this time the organization had been led by the following presidents:

1874–76, Lewis May.
1876–79, Isaac S. Isaacs.
1879–80, Daniel P. Hays.
1880–81, Adolph L. Sanger.
1881–83, Samuel Greenbaum.
1883–87, M. Warley Platzek.
1887–90, M. A. Kursheedt.
1890–93, Joseph Blumenthal.
1893–94, Edward C. Stone.
1894–95, Julius Levy.

The next epoch in the history of the association began when Percival S. Menken became president of the association in 1895. He devoted himself to reviving the influence of the association by bringing to the attention of the public the desirability of continuing the splendid program which had been developed by the YMHA during the past 20 years.

Among those to whom his appeal made a great impression was the late Jacob H. Schiff, who agreed to help the organization to start anew. In 1898 he presented the YMHA with its first permanent home at 861 Lexington Avenue, near Sixty-fifth Street.

This small brownstone building was equipped with a gymnasium, a library, club, and classrooms. The response on the part of the young people who came to this building was so great that it was soon overcrowded. The satisfaction which came to the directors of the association and to Mr. Schiff was such that the latter agreed to erect a building commensurate with the services the association was rendering the Jewish community. The site selected was at Lexington Avenue and Ninety-second Street, at which corner the Young Men's Hebrew Association has been situated for almost 50 years.

A NEW ERA OPENS

The opening of the new building presented an opportunity for enlarging the scope of the association's usefulness and a new era began in the history of Jewish community service. As the new building was equipped with every type of community-center facility and with accommodations for thousands of young people, it was possible to conduct a full program of religious, recreational, and educational activity.

Percival S. Menken, who labored ardently to make the Y a great institution, died after a short illness, in 1908. The position and prestige of the association were such that a strong and distinguished personality, it was felt, was needed to succeed him.

The Y was fortunate in obtaining the consent of Felix M. Warburg to assume the presidency of the association. Mr. Warburg had been actively identified with the Educational Alliance and other organizations and had taken a lively interest in the Y for some time. He followed his predecessor's energetic devotion to its work and sought to develop its usefulness to an even greater degree. He felt that the Y should spread its influence to other communities in and out of New York, and assistance was given to those which indicated the need of cooperation. Specifically, he recommended to the board that a YMHA be established in the Bronx, where so many young Jews lived. The interest he created resulted in the organization in 1909 of the present Bronx association.

In 1911 Mr. Warburg purchased and presented to the Y two small houses which adjoined the building on the Ninety-second Street side. These were renovated and added to the main building, thus making possible the first swimming pool. It also provided the first residence quarters in a Y building. The accommodations, however, were limited to 10 boys. Other areas, including a billiard room, dining room, and lounges were provided.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FORMED

In 1912 Mr. Warburg conferred with leaders of the other YMHA's and centers to stimulate the formation of a national organization. On October 13 a conference was held in the Ninety-second Street building at which 26 organizations were represented. The idea of a national organization was approved, and a committee of 10 was appointed to outline the plan and scope of the national body. The plan was consummated on November 2, 1913, when, in the same auditorium in which the first meeting took place, 96 representatives from 70 institutions the country over formally approved it and adopted the name of National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations.

In 1912, also, the local organizations, at the initiation of the Ninety-second Street Y, formed a YMHA Athletic League to encourage inter-Y competition. On July 28 of that year the first athletic field day was held at Pelham Bay Park, and 10 organizations participated. The athletic league continued to conduct competitive sports for 2 years under that name until March 3, 1914, when the Metropolitan League of the Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations was formed. The first executive director was Falk Younker, who had been general secretary of the Ninety-second Street Y from 1895 to 1911. The Metropolitan League encompassed all the phases of activity which constituted the program of the YMHA movement.

Both the national and metropolitan organizations carried on their services until the close of World War I, when they were merged with the Jewish Welfare Board, which had been organized during the war in the interest of the Jewish boys in the armed forces. Since that time the National Jewish Welfare Board and the metropolitan section of the JWB have served the YMHA's and Jewish centers throughout the city and country.

Mr. Warburg continued to seek new enterprises for the benefit of the Jewish community. In 1916 he proposed the formation of a Federation of Charities which would become the fiscal agency for the Jewish philanthropic organizations in New York. It would be the central fountainhead to which all contributions for Jewish institutions would be sent and by which all distribution would be made.

After many months of meetings and conferences 21 agencies in New York City approved the proposal, and, on January 1, 1917, the Federation of Jewish Charities came into being. In anticipation of his election as the first president of the federation, he had resigned from the Ninety-second Street board some months before. Dr. I. E. Goldwasser, who had been an active member of the board of directors, was chosen to be the first executive director of the federation.

Thus came to an end one of the most progressive periods in the history of the association.

Good fortune continued to follow the YMHA. Following Felix M. Warburg's resignation as president, the association elected Justice Irving Lehman to that post. Under his guidance, the association expanded and widened the sphere of its influence. Judge Lehman continued the program and policy which had proven so successful under the leadership of his predecessors.

In 1921, an opportunity was presented to extend the services of the association to the young people of the lower West Side. The Boys Club had been operating a building at Thirty-fifth Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues and was seeking quarters elsewhere. Judge Lehman obtained the support of Felix M. Warburg, Joseph L. Buttenwieser, and other Jewish leaders, and the building was purchased. After the necessary alterations, a branch of the Ninety-second Street YMHA was established. Its first president was Harry L. Glucksman, a member of the Y board and executive director of the Jewish Welfare Board.

For 2 years, a full program of activity was conducted for the large number of Jewish boys and girls in the neighborhood. However, the garment center was spreading out, gradually encompassing one structure after the other until it seemed there would remain only office and factory buildings. It was obvious that the Y would soon have no clientele from the immediate neighborhood. In 1923, the building was sold to business interests and the membership was invited to continue their activities at Ninety-second Street.

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

In 1924, the association celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. A series of events took place, culminating with a dinner at the Hotel Astor on March 23, attended by 1,500 members and their friends.

That year Judge Lehman was elected to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York which required him to serve in Albany most of the time. His resignation as president of the Y was accepted with great regret. Happily, he consented to remain on the board of directors, serving until his death in 1945.

The program and prestige of the Y were greatly enhanced during Judge Lehman's administration and he inspired the confidence and support of many prominent citizens, among them Sol M. Stroock, noted attorney and president of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

Mr. Stroock in 1924 succeeded Judge Lehman as president of the YMHA and served only 2 years, when the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies invited him to become its president. Thus the Y gave its second president to the federation.

In 1926, at the annual meeting of the metropolitan section of the Jewish welfare board, the executive director of the YMHA presented a plan for centralizing the employment and guidance services of the agencies in federation, which were conducting separate bureaus. The board of directors supported the proposal, even though it meant the abandonment of a service it had maintained for 30 years, and presented it to federation for consideration. While no action was taken for a number of years, the plan was offered repeatedly until, in 1934, the federation approved the project and the Federation Employment Service came into being. The Y executive director aided the formation of the new organization and, together with several board members of the Ninety-second Street association, has served on the FES board of directors since that time. This was the latest of a long list of extension activities initiated by the Ninety-second Street Y for the benefit of the community.

PROSKAUER BECOMES PRESIDENT

Upon the resignation of Mr. Stroock, the association fortunately obtained another distinguished president. Joseph M. Proskauer, then a justice of the New York State Supreme Court, was elected in 1926. His dynamic personality and keen understanding of communal needs manifested themselves immediately after assuming his office. He recognized the inadequacy of the Y building in meeting the requirements of the many boys, who were seeking not only recreational and cultural facilities, but housing.

Within 1 year after Judge Proskauer became president, he had inaugurated a campaign for a new building to replace the structure which had been donated by Jacob H. Schiff more than 27 years before. The drive for funds began in May 1927 for $1,500,000. The force and energy of Judge Proskauer inspired the board of directors and their friends to convince the community of the justice of their cause. Within a few weeks, $2,100,000 was raised, half of which Judge Proskauer obtained by his own efforts. The old building was demolished in 1928 at which time the membership of the association was retained through the kindness of the Young Women's Hebrew Association, which made arrangements for the use of its building on One Hundred and Tenth Street. Here, for 2 years, the YMHA and the YWHA shared the facilities together. The good fellowship which was developed between the members of both organizations was responsible in large measure for the ultimate merger of interests which took place many years later.

The new building was opened in 1930 as the largest and best equipped Jewish center in the country. Before the doors were opened, applications were received from thousands of young men, seeking to enjoy the extensive program which the wonderful facilities made possible. In addition to the opportunities for Jewish, educational, cultural, recreational, and athletic activities, the building provided, for the first time in any Jewish center, dormitory facilities for young men. Two hundred rooms accommodating 278 persons were made available.

SHIENTAG SUCCEEDS PROSKAUER

The present building is a monument to the services of Judge Proskauer in behalf of

the young people of New York. His devotion to the Y and its aims continued during the 5 years of his presidency and is carried over to the present time—18 years later. It was with the greatest regret that, in 1931, soon after the new building was opened, he was drafted, like two of his predecessors, to become president of federation.

Justice Bernard L. Shientag, who had been a member of the board of directors for a number of years, succeeded Judge Proskauer as president. He was devoted to the work of the association, particularly the Jewish cultural aspects of the program. However, the stress of judicial duties compelled him to resign in 1932, about 18 months after taking office.

Frank L. Weil assumed the office in 1932 and retained it for 8 years. Mr. Weil had come to the board of directors in 1926 with a history of voluntary service which dated back to 1913.

Mr. Weil devoted himself to the development of a creative program, the impact of which is still felt on the cultural life of our city. It was during his administration that the arts, music, dramatics, dance, classes, forums, and clubs advanced beyond the expectations of the most desirable center program, and to this day the association stands high among the important institutions of learning in the community.

In 1938 Mr. Weil saw an opportunity to help the Young Women's Hebrew Association secure more adequate quarters than it occupied on One Hundred and Tenth Street at Fifth Avenue. This resulted from the fact that there was available for purchase the land adjoining the building to Ninety-first Street and east for 120 feet. After consultation with the YWHA, the land was purchased and a new building for the girls was envisaged. Unfortunately, the war necessitated a complete change in the plans.

Mr. Weil resigned his office in 1940 to become president of the National Jewish Welfare Board, succeeding Judge Lehman, who had held the position for many years. As one of the founding agencies of the JWB the Ninety-second Street YMHA was, and still is, a close and active affiliate of the national organization, and its selection for the second time of a Ninety-second Street Y president to head the JWB was received with gratification. Despite the high office which Mr. Weil holds and the many duties which devolve upon him, his first love—the Ninety-second Street YMHA, of which he is an honorary director, still retains his wholehearted support.

YOUNG WARBURG TAKES POST

In 1940, Frederick M. Warburg succeeded to the presidency of the Y, 32 years after his father, the late Felix M. Warburg, was elected to the same office. Frederick was steeped in the services rendered by youth organizations because of his father's association with the YMHA and his mother's attachment to the YWHA, which she served later as president. He came to the Ninety-second Street Y with a strong feeling of loyalty and interest which, unfortunately, he was unable to satisfy fully. In 1942, he joined the armed forces of the United States. Throughout the period of his war service, he followed the work of the association.

From 1942 to 1945, while Mr. Warburg was in the Army, the affairs of the YMHA were in the hands of the vice president and acting president, Louis M. Loeb. To him came the responsibility of directing the war program of the association. This he did with great conscientiousness and he inspired the board, staff, and membership to devote themselves to serving the needs of the community in wartime as well as the Y boys and girls who were part of every branch of the armed services of the United States. Two thousand three hundred Y members wore the uniform of their country; 48 died and 258 were decorated. Committees of members and directors served every need of the young men and women in all parts of the world. Correspondence, gifts, and personal services of all kinds were rendered throughout the war. A canteen was maintained in the building for those on furlough. Space and services were offered to and accepted by local and Federal agencies for many purposes, including enlistments, draft board, air wardens, blood donations, Red Cross instruction, bond sales, and a host of activities which aided the war effort.

One effect of the war was of such importance as to change the character and philosophy of the Ninety-second Street YMHA. In 1942, our sister institution, the Young Women's Hebrew Association, located at One Hundred and Tenth Street and Fifth Avenue, was requested by the Department of War to give up its building for use by soldiers, who needed quarters in that area. The YWHA complied without hesitating even though it meant the withdrawal from the building it had occupied for 28 years. The Ninety-second Street YMHA, recalling the period of 1928–30, when the YWHA housed the boys of the YMHA while its new edifice was being constructed, promptly offered to take the girls into its building for the duration of the war. No restriction was placed upon the activities for the girls and all facilities were opened to them. Two floors or dormitories were turned over to their residents, and physical changes were made in the athletic department so that girls could use the gymnasium and swimming pool.

MERGED IN 1945

This coeducational arrangement proved so successful that, in 1945, when the war ended, it was unanimously agreed that the recreational and residence activities of both organizations be merged into one institution to be known as the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association.

The effect of this change, with all the opportunities for serving the cultural, religious, and recreational needs of young people of both sexes and all ages produced a program of such significance that the numbers and activities increased beyond the physical capacity of the building. The membership rose to 12,000 boys and girls with a waiting list of thousands. Clubs were turned away and classes were limited in number. The cultural activities taxed every area in the building and the Theresa Kaufmann Auditorium and Buttenwieser Hall were used several times a day.

This condition prevails today and once more, as in 1926, the need for another building is obvious.

During this full period of change and progress in the Y, Louis M. Loeb was at the helm. In 1945 he was elected president of the association to carry on the work he had been doing as acting president for 3 years.

The former Young Women's Hebrew Association deserves a place in this recital. It was founded February 6, 1902, by public-spirited women who recognized the need for a center for Jewish working girls and students. The moving spirit in this effort was the late Mrs. Israel Unterberg, in whose home meetings were held at regular intervals. She was elected first president of the association. By the end of the year a building at 1584 Lexington Avenue was rented and it was dedicated to communal service on February 1, 1903. Here classes, clubs, religious services, and recreational activities attracted a large number of members and in 2 years it was necessary to increase its space.

In 1905 the two adjoining buildings were purchased and combined with the first structure. The dedication of the remodeled and enlarged quarters took place on December 16, 1905. In addition to the regular activities conducted up to this time it was now possible to accept girls for residence, and 18 girls were now able to live in the building.

SERVED FOR 26 YEARS

For 8 years the Young Women's Hebrew Association flourished and developed in this building. Its usefulness had long since been established and its need for expansion had been proven. A campaign for funds was conducted in 1911 and, as in the case of the Young Men's Hebrew Association some years before, Jacob H. Schiff made a substantial gift to the institution. This support inspired many others to contribute and led to the erection of a large and commodious building at 31 West One Hundred and Tenth Street, facing Central Park. The new edifice was dedicated on November 22, 1914, and contained a synagogue, gymnasium, swimming pool, class and club rooms, dining room, and residence quarters for 172 girls.

During all this time, Mrs. Israel Unterberg assumed responsibility for the association as its president. She continued to serve for 26 years (1902–1928), although, because of illness, she transferred her duties during the last 4 years to the vice president, Mrs. Felix M. Warburg. In 1929 Mrs. Warburg assumed the presidency and retained the office for 12 years.

Upon the resignation of Mrs. Warburg as president, Mrs. Jerome J. Hanauer, who had been vice president for many years, became acting president until the following year, when Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard became president. Shortly after her election, on July 1, 1942, the building was leased to the United States Army, as related above.

A DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

From 1902 to 1942, the Young Women's Hebrew Association served the spiritual, educational, recreational, and housing needs of Jewish girls in New York City, and the withdrawal from the building on One Hundred and Tenth Street marked the end of an era of distinguished communal service.

The YWHA retained its identity within the YMHA building from 1942 to 1945. As most of the activities for girls were merged with those of the boys, it gave the women's board of directors an opportunity to consider new services in other parts of the city. There were many areas of large Jewish population which were unserved through lack of community centers or neighborhood houses. Rooms were obtained in synagogue buildings, public schools, and other places which were converted for recreational purposes and staffed by professional social workers. The value of these services was promptly recognized and community support was obtained.

In 1945, when the residence and recreational activities of the YMHA and the YWHA were merged into the YM and YWHA, a new organization was formed by the former YWHA board of directors under the name of the Jewish Association of Neighborhood Centers—an active, growing, and valuable addition to the communal services of our city.

And so 75 years have passed since a handful of men with broad vision and devotion to Jewish and American ideals took the first step in a new field of social service. They created an instrument for helping ordinary people do things for themselves—to use their leisure time to satisfy their spiritual, cultural, and social needs; to grow and develop in all directions they showed promise in; to give thought and expression to their own problems and to those of their fellowmen; and to become leaders in the community for the fulfillment of Jewish life and the advancement of society as a whole.

Globalists Run United States, Says Senator Malone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Globalists Run United States, Says Senator MALONE," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Chicago Tribune of April 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBALISTS RUN UNITED STATES, SAYS SENATOR MALONE—BLOOD AND MONEY TIES BARED

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Over cocktails at a recent Washington dinner party, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter was asked by a German Rhodes scholar who really runs the United States.

Sipping on his second old fashioned, the Vienna-born jurist, who has been acknowledged as the outstanding power behind the New Deal throne for 16 years, smiled knowingly and answered sententiously:

"The real rulers of a nation are undiscoverable."

A SENATOR'S VIEW

Senator MALONE, (Republican, Nevada) disagrees with the former Harvard law professor, who has probably a thousand protégés in legal posts in the Government. MALONE holds that the rulers of the country are an active group of internationalists, rooted in Wall Street with common financial and blood ties in the counting houses of London.

The Nevada Senator believes the internationalists entered into a war alliance with the New Deal under which labor and agriculture were promised control of domestic policy in return for voting support and cooperation with the New Deal's foreign policy.

MALONE has repeatedly warned on the floor of the Senate that the New Dealers and the internationalists are selling out labor while pretending to be the friend of the workingman through the international trade organization and the international labor organization. These organizations, in promoting a world-wide New Deal, would flood the United States with cheap goods and cheap labor.

BRITISH LABOR COURTED

The Senator noted that the financial interests of Britain are similarly courting labor in Britain to the extent of promoting socialism in that country in return for support of an imperial foreign policy in alliance with American internationalists.

New Dealers began by despising Wall Street, MALONE recalled. In the second term of Franklin D. Roosevelt, it got a foot in the door of the White House and with the coming of the war became the most powerful force in the Government, both in positions occupied and influence exerted.

For many years Mr. Roosevelt was regarded as the fountainhead of American policy. Since his death the uninterrupted continuance of the policy of international meddling has brought a shift in opinion.

GAIN SINCE LAMONT DEATH

Others believed that the late Thomas Lamont, head of J. P. Morgan & Co., was the most potent behind-the-scenes operator of policy. Since his death there has been an increase rather than a weakening of global meddling.

The New York financial interests and various elements profiting in foreign trade, including many persons who held high Government posts, are now considered as having shaped American policy for the last dozen years.

MALONE noted that these interests have fused groups of widely divergent interests, society figures, New Dealers, labor leaders, and various organizations to pump for international programs. During the war Wall Street had an alliance with the Communists of Union Square on foreign policy.

FIVE MAJOR GROUPS

Behind the policy are five potent propaganda groups which have a criss cross of directorates in banks, insurance companies, and industries, all with heavy interests and even blood ties abroad. Also in this interlocking mesh are Wall Street law firms, the internationalist wing of the press, and internationally minded college presidents.

The five organizations are the English Speaking Union, the Foreign Policy Association, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Foreign Relations Council. Some 100 directors of these organizations hold 35 major bank directorships, 33 in major industries, and hundreds in lesser corporations.

More than 50 held posts in the Government at one time or another. These included Alger Hiss, president of the $11,000,000 Carnegie Foundation, now facing trial for perjury in conection with an investigation of Communist conections. Hiss was a leader of the pro-Soviet block in the State Department.

PLUG FOR ALLIANCE

A round dozen of the directors had a hand in forming United Nations policy in the San Francisco founding conference. Others were heavy promoters of the multibillion dollar Marshall plan and are now plugging for the multibillion dollar North Atlantic alliance.

Many of these are now reaping profits from the American spendings. Winthrop W. Aldrich, director of the Rockefeller Foundation is head of the Chase National Bank. Two other officials of the bank lap over into the Carnegie Foundation and the English Speaking Union.

Figures of the economic cooperation administration for last November disclosed that the New York bank had issued letters of credit for Marshall plan business totaling $108,000,000, 22 millions in 5 weeks. Aldrich was a member of the executive council for Marshall plan recovery.

PROFITS FOR OTHERS

Other banks whose directors were tied in to the do-good organizations profited similarly from plan spending. Corporation directors represented in the internationalist organizations also made large profits.

Many Capital observers are convinced that the nomination of Wendell Willkie and the two nominations of Governor Dewey were projected from internationalist imperialist circles. Dewey was a nationalist in 1940 and lost the nomination bid. When he shifted to the internationalist front he received two chances at the Presidency. Some observers believe the internationalists are grooming him for a third nomination to perpetuate GOP "me tooism."

CITE DULLES PROPOSAL

As evidence of the influence of internationalist imperialists behind Dewey, observers cite the recent proposal before the United Nations Assembly of United States Representative John Foster Dulles. He proposed UN trusteeships over Cyrenaica for Britain and hinted British trusteeships for Tripolitania and Fezan.

Dulles was Dewey's foreign affairs adviser and was expected to be State Secretary if Dewey had won the election. He is chairman of the board of the Carnegie Foundation and as such is credited with having made Hiss its president.

Dulles, a Wall Street lawyer is a director of the Rockefeller Foundation. His brother, Allen, is president of the Council on Foreign Relations. Eustace Seligman, a copartner in Dulles' firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, is a director of the Foreign Policy Association.

PLUNGED TO DEATH

Laurence Duggan, another director of the Foreign Policy Association and an associate of Hiss in the State Department, mysteriously plunged to his death from his 16-story office in New York last December. His name was linked to the Hiss investigation.

Many high Government officials and former Government officials are linked in the do-gooder organizations. Former State Secretary Edward R. Stettinius, a son of a J. P. Morgan & Co. partner, is a director of the English Speaking Union.

Since leaving the State Department, Stettinius has interested himself in exploitation deals. In one of these he is associated with a New York banking syndicate in the development of Venezuela and in another he and a group of associates have staked out Liberia almost as a private development corporation. The group has formed a chain of companies to profit out of timber, transportation, gold, diamonds, and other resources in the African nation.

IN EPISCOPALIAN CHURCH

Stettinius is an Episcopalian like four of the last five State Secretaries. The fifth, Cordell Hull, has not disclosed his church affiliation. The Episcopal Church has strong sentimental ties with the parent Church of England.

Acheson, the present State Secretary, is the son of an Episcopal bishop, born and ordained in England, and a Canadian mother. Out of State Department service he was a member of a law firm with Wall Street clients.

Other Episcopal Secretaries of State are James F. Byrnes, who was born and reared a Roman Catholic and joined the Episcopal Church in young manhood, and George C. Marshall, wartime Chief of Staff. Marshall is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute, which has sentimental associations with Britain because of English support of the slave-holding southerners in the Civil War.

DIED A CANADIAN

Lewis Douglas, Ambassador to Britain, is a director of the Foreign Policy Association, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the English Speaking Union. His father was born a Canadian, went to the Southwest to make his fortune and became an American citizen. The elder Douglas returned to Canada, renounced his American citizenship and died a Canadian. The son was vice chancelor of Canada's McGill University and a New York Life Insurance Co. executive.

W. Averell Harriman, the ECA roving ambassador, is profiting from global spending. His family banking firm of Brown Bros., Harriman & Co. had patronage of more than $21,000,000, according to an ECA report of last November. This has increased in the last 6 months.

William L. Clayton, former State Under Secretary for economic affairs, was one of the leading supporters of the $3,750,000,000 British gift loan and the Marshall plan. ECA records showed that his cotton brokerage firm reaped $28,000,000 in ECA business in the month of August alone. His family has been taking from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 in firm profits in recent years.

SPENT SIX BILLIONS

Nelson Rockefeller, grandson of the founder of the do-gooder corporation, spent $6,000,000,000 as wartime coordinator of inter-American affairs, when other Americans of

his age were in uniform. Rockefeller has formed a corporation for development of South American nations and has launched a series of projects in Brazil from which he and his associates expect handsome profits.

Within the week Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., son of the loudest and longest-speaking Republican supporter of internationalist policy, became associated with Rockefeller in his Brazilian enterprises. Vandenberg, who like Rockefeller, is 41 years old, served through the war in a bombproof public-relations job in the Air Force.

For many years, with one exception, American ambassadors to Britain have been of English descent and largely of the Episcopalian faith. The one exception was Joseph P. Kennedy, Roman Catholic of Irish descent, who sought unsuccessfully to influence President Roosevelt against entry into the war.

JOHN W. DAVIS' ROLE

John W. Davis, onetime Ambassador to England, and unsuccessful Democratic candidate for President in 1924, is a director of the English Speaking Union, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Carnegie Endowment.

Myron C. Taylor, an Episcopalian and former head of the powerful United States Steel Corp. and personal White House envoy for Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to the Vatican, is a director of the English Speaking Union.

Among the prominent Wall Streeters now in or recently in the Government and high in administration councils are James V. Forrestal, William H. Draper, Ferdinand Eberstadt, John Nicholas Brown, Paul Felix Warburg, Bernard Baruch, James Bruce, Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, Lewis Straus, Davis K. E. Bruce, John J. McCloy, Robert Gardner, Archibald M. Wiggins, Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Charles Saltzman, and William McChesney Martin.

HELPED SET UP ECA

The ECA was set up under Paul G. Hoffman, with the advice and counsel of Maurice T. Moore, Wall Street lawyer, who had reorganized Hoffman's Studebaker corporation.

During the presidential campaign, Mr. Truman charged that the Republican Party was dominated by Wall Street and soft pedaled the Wall Streeters in his own official family. At the same time he discounted the military influence in his administration.

The internationalists formed an alliance with brass hats in the war period. Many leading military figures have received high posts in private industry or institutions, like Columbia University, where Wall Street and internationalists have heavy representation. General Eisenhower, war-time allied commander in western Europe, was named president of Columbia. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, former WPA officer who rose to be head of the war procurement machinery, is director of Koppers Co., Inc.

GOT MAJOR POSTS

Other brass hats received administrative or diplomatic posts. General Marshall headed these with his appointment as State Secretary. Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith was Ambassador to Russia. He was succeeded by Admiral Alan G. Kirk, who has served in Belgium. Admiral William D. Leahy was Ambassador to the French at Vichy. Admiral William Standley was Ambassador to Russia during the war.

Many military men held lesser official and diplomatic posts. Their presence brought criticism of the administration as under influence of militarism from various quarters.

Senator MALONE said investigation of internationalist groups and internationally minded individuals might uncover the real rulers of the country.

FRANKFURTER AND LASKI

In this investigation he would not neglect Justice Frankfurter and the latter's association with Harold J. Laski, who occupies a position in the British labor movement similar to that of the jurist to the New Deal. Laski is a frequent visitor to the United States and invariably confers with Frankfurter, who is regarded as the source of many New Deal policies.

Laski has lectured under CIO auspices. He has connections in Wall Street and in Union Square. In Hollywood, where he has been a frequent visitor, he is usually the guest of Charles Chaplin, comedian, who brightens his private life by flirting with radicalism. English born, Chaplin has never taken American citizenship although he has amassed a fortune in this country.

Many observers believe Laski's movements in this country would offer a clew as to its true rulers.

FRANKFURTER AND ACHESON

Frankfurter for many years has taken daily walks with State Secretary Acheson. They are neighbors in Georgetown, oldest section of the capital. In these morning walks, each insists that there is no discussion of foreign or judicial policy, but Washington is skeptical. The two embraced with warmth at a party welcoming in the new year and word of the embrace was all over Washington almost within 24 hours.

It has been estimated that there are as many as 1,500 former Harvard law students of the Justice now in Government posts. Thousands more were in Government during 16 years of the New Deal and left to sell their governmental know-how to Wall Street or industry. Notable among these was Thomas G. (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran, who reputedly built White House and departmental associations into a million-dollar-a-year law practice.

The Harvard influence in Government was felt before the war in promotion of the pre-war draft in 1940. A group, which met in the Harvard Club in New York City, promoted the peacetime draft. Later the group sought to promote a universal draft of men and women.

RECALL PACIFIC NEGLECT

Malone said the tie of the internationalists with London is demonstrated by the fact that during the war the Pacific theater was neglected for the conflict in Europe. Since the war, he said, the internationalists have abandoned China to the Soviets while pumping billions into England and western Europe.

It has been rumored in the Capitol that the Administration is about to make another secret deal with the Soviets under which the Red hand would be recognized in return for lifting the Berlin blockade. This has been denounced as absolutely false by State Department and White House spokesmen.

Previous secret deals with the Soviets which gave the Reds a large sphere of influence in Europe and Asia were supported by Wall Street internationalists. They deluded themselves with the belief that post-war Russia would welcome foreign capital.

Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I recommend at all times the opportunity to give public expression to a firm belief in the patriotism of the Negro people. Over a period of years my close observations of their loyalty to America have enabled me to certify to their devotion to the institutions of this country.

Therefore, it is with much pleasure that I inform the Members of the United States Senate that Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, outstanding educator and president of Morgan State College of Maryland, has repudiated the assertions of Paul Robeson, who at the Paris rally of Communists and fellow travelers had the brazen effrontery to assert that Negroes would not defend the United States if it were engaged in armed conflict with Russia.

Our citizens are proud of Dr. Jenkins and we intend to support him and his associates in their commendable efforts to improve the conditions under which members of the colored race are living. They are our fellow citizens and we owe them an obligation to afford equal opportunities so that they can continue to demonstrate their abilities and readiness to advance themselves for the betterment of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper account of the statement of Dr. Jenkins concerning the Robeson incident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Baltimore Sunday Sun of May 2, 1949]

EDUCATOR DECRIES VIEWS OF ROBESON—MORGAN HEAD SAYS SINGER DOES NOT REPRESENT NEGROES

Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, president of Morgan State College, said yesterday that Paul Robeson "is not privileged to state the views of any appreciable part of the Negro people."

Referring to remarks by the Negro singer and actor at the recent Paris peace rally to the effect that American Negroes would never fight Russia, Dr. Jenkins said:

"Mr. Robeson does not express the views of the Negro people.

"NO QUESTION OF LOYALTY

"So long as Negroes feel that their conditions are improving, so long as the privilege of striving for their rights within the framework of our present governmental organization is maintained, there will be no question of the utter loyalty of America's 15,000,000 Negro citizens."

Since Robeson's statement, there has been a storm of protest from American Negroes denying that the singer is entitled to speak for the race as a group.

DRAWS REBUKE FROM O'CONOR

Robeson, whose accomplishments include selection as an all-American football player in 1915, a Phi Beta Kappa degree from Rutgers University and a 30-year career in movies, stage and concert shows, announced his intention to abandon the theater in 1947 and talk up and down the Nation against race hatred and prejudice for 6 years.

His latest statement drew a rebuke from Senator O'CONOR and the reply that the proper thing to do would be for Robeson to establish citizenship in Russia.

Dr. Jenkins, in his statement, spoke of his own pride in being an American citizen, and said he believed he spoke for the majority of American Negroes when he said that the United States Government "affords a better framework than any other for the optimum good * * * of the general population."

The text of Dr. Jenkins' statement follows:

"I often state, in my own public addresses, that my proudest boast is that I am an American citizen with all the rights and responsibilities which this statement im-

plies. I believe this represents the view of practically all Negroes.

"CITES ADVANTAGES

"We believe that our form of government affords a better framework than any other for the optimum good not only of minority groups but of the general population. We recognize, as do all other thoughtful Americans, that Negroes are unjustifiably denied many citizenship rights.

"But we appreciate the fact that our country is rapidly moving toward the goal of granting full citizenship rights to all its citizens and that our democratic form of government makes this progress possible.

"Negroes are a peace-loving people, but whenever our Nation's security has been threatened they have been among its most eager defenders. Their record in all past wars, beginning with the American Revolution, has been outstanding. They are the only group in our Nation which has used legal and political action to gain the right to join the armed forces of their country."

Loyalty Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1949:

NINE THOUSAND LOSE JOBS IN LOYALTY TESTS—OLD POLICE RECORDS CAUSE FIRINGS

(By Tony Smith)

Soviet spies, ex-burglars, thieves, and sex offenders have been unearthed by the Federal Government's employee loyalty investigation program, it was learned today.

The search for subversives in the Government and among those seeking jobs with Uncle Sam yielded 141,400 sets of fingerprints that matched those kept in the FBI files.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported to Congress that 5.5 percent of the 2,537,843 persons checked had previous police records. As a result, 8,881 persons have been dismissed from the Government service by the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Hoover said.

MANY IN STATE DEPARTMENT

The program turned up 21 live Soviet espionage suspects, 45 Communists, and 108 suspected subversives in the State Department alone, it was reported. All of those subjected to spy investigations have resigned or been dismissed, it was said. The same is true of those known to be members of the Communist Party. Some of them moved on to jobs in the American agencies of the United Nations, Government records show.

Many of the former law violators brought to light by the loyalty check were minor offenders who had served their sentences. Others, convicted of major crimes, were found to be loyal. Some had been rehabilitated, the records showed. A few were still at their old tricks. These were reported to the heads of the departments in which they worked. Some were fired.

EMPHASIS ON ESPIONAGE

Throughout the check the emphasis was on employees and officials of the Government suspected of espionage activities. Here are excerpts from reports on some State Department workers:

"Mr. ———'s file reflected that he is a close associate of suspected Soviet agents. Most of the derogatory information on him was developed in late 1946. There is nothing in the file to indicate he has discontinued working for the Department."

GREATEST SECURITY RISK

"Mr. ———. This former employee's file is the largest in the Civil Service Commission. It reflects that he furnished material to known Soviet espionage agents and that he has had consistent contact with a long list of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. This subject was in all probability the greatest security risk the Department of State has had. He was first recommended for dismissal July 24, 1946. He finally resigned voluntarily December 13, 1946."

Miss ———. Her file shows that she signed Communist Party election petitions on a number of occasions. The Security Committee of the State Department decided she was not a security risk on April 15, 1947. It later decided she should be dismissed on grounds of being an undesirable employee. The subject resigned April 25, 1947. This case shows that the Security Committee is inclined to accept a 'change of heart.'"

THIS FELLOW WAS BUSY

"Mr. ———. Confidential informant reported him to be a member of the Communist Party; a sponsor of the Washington Chapter of the American Peace Mobilization Committee; an attendant at the Communist Youth Internationale in Russia in 1934; an active member of American Civil Liberties Union; a member of a central Communist group spearheading an attack on J. Edgar Hoover; an associate of four known members of the Communist Party."

Chinese Red "Invitation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Chinese Red 'Invitation,'" dealing with the Chinese situation, published in the New York Times of May 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE RED INVITATION

Those wishful thinkers who have suggested that we could (and should) go about doing business as usual with the Chinese Communists may get their eyes opened if there are a few more statements in the vein of the most recent Communist invitation for the West to cooperate. The Chinese Communists are doing their best to make us understand what they mean by cooperation. They invite us to cooperate if we cooperate solely on their terms, and the terms are becoming more and more explicit.

The latest demand is threefold. France, Britain, and the United States must withdraw all semblance of military force from the vicinity of China. The Western powers must sever all conections with the present Government of China. The powers must conclude treaties to "insure the sovereignty, integrity, and independence of the Chinese Republic." (This presumably refers to the Communist regime.)

The effrontery of the Communist accusation against Britain after the Communist assault on British ships on a peaceful mission is well matched by the arrogance of these terms. In respect to the first, it has long been established that the Western powers would be only too glad to withdraw any armed forces from the Chinese area if there were assurance that the safety of their nationals lawfully in that area could be preserved and their normal rights respected. If the behavior of the Communists gave any such assurance there would be reason at once to accede on that point.

On the second score, the Communists are merely demanding that we withdraw our recognition of the legally constituted Government of China, while that government is still in existence, and establish diplomatic relations with a regime that has not yet taken shape. We have already gone far in that direction by withdrawing our moral support from a friendly Chinese Government and even by leaving public officials, helpless as they are, in territory that the Communists have overrun. Now the Communists go beyond the policy of suspended judgment that seems to have influenced Washington. They ask for our outright prejudgment in their favor.

On the third point the Communists seem to have forgotten that we are already signatories to a number of treaties pledging our recognition of the sovereignty, integrity, and independence of China. They have ignored also their prior demand that those selfsame treaties be abrogated by us, since they were concluded with the Government of China and not with the Communist regime.

When General Chennault appears this week before two Congressional committees, those groups will be well advised to ask him for the actual truth about American aid to the Government of China. That truth has not been frankly told in Washington, and many Americans still believe that this country has given $2,000,000,000 in military aid to China since VJ-day, in spite of Secretary Acheson's explanation that that was not what he had meant to imply.

The Communists are doing some clarifying for us in China. We need some clarifying at this end.

Whither Are We Drifting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Whither Are We Drifting" by George L. Hodges, of the St. Paul Journal, St. Paul, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

After being editor of a Democratic paper for more than half a century, it seems impossible for the editor of the Journal to harmonize his views with the present administration at Washington. In fact, he is so disgusted that he cannot even give the devil his dues. Outside of the foreign policy, which has been wobbly at times, the administration has gone crazy about spending the people's money. If people in business life conducted their affairs on the same basis as the Government,

the bankruptcy courts would be overcrowded in a few months. The socialized-medicine proposition sounds crazy to us and will prove to be one of the most expensive affairs ever introduced. It savors of Russian methods. People who believe it means medical care will wake up to the fact they are taxed double for a service to be dictated by the Government. One percent of the cost, used to provide more good local physicians will do the people much more good at a very moderate cost. Probably they will be wanting to socialize the practice of law next.

The move now to spend $7,000,000,000 to erect houses in $10,000, or higher, class means mighty expensive houses to those who occupy them. The proposed plan might apply to the cities, but a $10,000 dwelling in a small town is almost an absurdity. The people who can afford that price house, just do not live in the smaller communities. And there are a lot of these smaller communities. Make the materials available and the people will build their own houses according to their needs. The slums of the cities cannot be cleared with $10,000 houses.

The waste in the duplication of bureaus in Washington is costing the people millions of dollars for which they get no benefit. Hoover is right in his recommendations but his politics are wrong to get his ideas adopted. Party success is evidently placed above national success.

The dubbing of the red hearing as red herrings is an effort to discredit an organization that has done more to alert the people to pending dangers than all the rest of the bunch combined. When this is followed by appointments to high places of men with pinkish tints, and the advocacy of measures with red tendencies, one is set to wondering just where are we heading, anyway?

The Washington bunch does not seem to know there are any people worthy of consideration residing outside of the cities. That bill now being considered making $1 per hour the minimum wage of laborers may be well for men with trades, or even others in the cities, but when it becomes compulsory for people out in the smaller localities to pay common laborers $8 per day, it just won't work. A lot of jobs will go undone, a lot of men who want work will find little, and the aged and those who are physically disqualified to do a full day's work will find themselves clear out.

We freely admit our Democratic partisanship is getting mighty thin.

Editorial Comment by the Wenatchee (Wash.) World on Address by James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Wenatchee World, based upon a speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Advertising Club of New York.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORNERSTONE OF OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

"Advertising cannot make a permanent success of any product that is not fit for success on its own."

That is the view of former Postmaster General James A. Farley, speaking recently at a luncheon of the Advertising Club of New York. Farley, quite a salesman in politics and for a large soft-drink concern, goes on to give us some additional wisdom on the subject.

"It is customary to say that advertising sells goods. I think it is more accurate to say that advertising speeds the sale of goods. In the long run, no product sells because of advertising that would have sold in a lesser degree without it. For if the product is not worthy, advertising simply hastens the day when the whole market has sampled the product and rejected it. Advertising cannot make a permanent success of any product that is not fit for success on its own."

Farley then goes on to describe how much a part of our daily life and standard of living advertising has really become. "Advertising is thus part of a complex system—a routine, a know-how—that includes inventiveness, organization, machine tools and skilled workmanship, and that has resulted in the more universal distribution of more goods at lower cost than the world has ever known."

"When we realize this," Farley concluded, "no one needs worry about the future of advertising. It is with us to stay, because it is one of the cornerstones of our standard of living."

These words of Farley carry added significance as we find our economy leveling off from inflation and bringing in a buyers' market. The manufacturer and retail outlet are now cognizant that good advertising demands first a quality product.

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the proposed North Atlantic treaty is a radical departure from the foreign policy of the United States which has been followed since our Nation sprang from the union created by the ratification of the Constitution by the Original Thirteen States.

Ratification of this treaty and appropriation of the necessary funds to fulfill our obligations under its terms will set us upon an unchartered course the final outcome of which we are unable to foresee.

The North Atlantic Alliance rests on the assumption that in addition to the very large sums already provided or about to be provided for the economic recovery of the 16 Marshall-plan nations, other large sums, or their equivalent in material goods, will be supplied to the alliance members in the hope of averting another major war in which the United States could not hope to escape involvement. The alliance is also expected to curb the further spread of Communist aggression.

Whether the United States can maintain its present standard of living and make provision for its domestic needs and hemispheric obligations, and at the same time give an adequate measure of support and assurance to the strategic areas of defense in western Europe, the Mediterranean, and north Africa, is a question yet to be answered.

But once committed to this course of action, there will be no retreat regardless of what effect this program may ultimately have upon our domestic problems.

The events leading up to the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty by the United States have in a sense been part of our departure from traditional policy, and any evaluation of the new pact and its possible consequences must be made with these steps in mind as well as the specific commitments we have made to other nations in these steps such as:

First. The Marshall plan: The United States is committed to assist 16 western European countries rebuild their economics. The entire cost of the ERP over the period of 4 years now is estimated at $17,000,000,000.

Second. European occupation areas: The United States is committed by various agreements to maintain occupation troops in Germany, Austria, and Trieste until free governments can be established.

Third. Far Eastern occupation areas: The United States is bound to maintain occupation forces in Japan until a free and representative government is established.

Fourth. Truman doctrine: The United States is committed to the support of Turkey and to the maintaining of Greece against external aggression.

The cost of the North Atlantic alliance must be considered, and to date neither the text of the treaty nor official commentary on it has made any effort to define its cost in money terms or its relationship, from that point of view to the cost of the Defense Establishment of the United States.

The best approach to the North Atlantic Treaty must certainly be a thoroughly realistic one. We must recognize the probable contribution this treaty will make toward world peace and to our own national security as well as to the security of the other nations joining in the alliance. We must also admit at the outset that nothing contained in any of the statements officially issued suggest that from any point of view the treaty is ideal or that it would not be accompanied by many and serious problems or that it would not involve numerous and severe hardships for the American taxpayer.

If we favor the alliance, we must be willing to make the necessary sacrifice to provide the materials and funds to make the pact effective.

Study of the North Atlantic Treaty and a résumé of the steps which have led the United States to the desertion of traditional policy in favor of international alliances is important in any consideration of the merits of the pact, and the text of the treaty, the events leading

to it, and the nations which have now signed it are included in the following:

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE RELATING TO THE ATLANTIC PACT (MARCH 1, 1945, TO MARCH 25, 1949)

1945

March 6: The American Republics approve the Act of Chapultepec at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City. In the act the Governments declare "that every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall * * * be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act * * *."

April 25: Fifty nations meet for the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, Calif.

June 26: The Charter of the United Nations is signed by 50 countries which participated in the San Francisco Conference.

July 28: The United States Senate consents to the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

October 24: The Charter of the United Nations enters into effect as twenty-ninth nation deposits instrument of ratification with the United States.

December 24: Secretary of State Byrnes proposes a four-power agreement among the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union for the purpose of keeping Germany disarmed.

1946

March 5: Winston Churchill recommends in a speech at Fulton, Mo., that the United States and Great Britain form a military alliance for mutual defense.

March 19: Iran files official charge with United Nations against U. S. S. R.

May 6: President Truman proposes that the United States arm the Americas for defense.

May 17: The United States proposes joint defense plans with Canada, particularly for the Arctic frontier.

August 21: Seven United States warships are ordered to pay "courtesy" visit to Greece.

1947

March 12: The Truman doctrine is outlined in the President's message to Congress urging United States support of free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation" and appropriation of $400,000,000 in direct aid to Greece and Turkey.

May 15: Congress gives final approval to Greek-Turkish aid bill to implement the Truman doctrine.

June 5: Secretary of State Marshall makes a speech at Harvard advocating agreement on over-all needs as basis for United States economic aid to European nations.

June 17: Foreign Ministers Bevin of Great Britain and Bidault of France initiate conversations in Paris on Secretary Marshall's proposal.

July 12: Representatives of 16 nations which accepted the invitation of Foreign Ministers Bevin and Bidault meet in Paris.

September 2: The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known as the Rio Pact, is signed by the American Republics (19) represented at the Rio Conference.

October 6: The Cominform, new version of the Comintern, organized at Warsaw, is composed of representatives of the U. S. S. R., Yugoslavia, France, Italy, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania.

October 22: General Zdhanov, speaking for the Cominform, asks that Communists everywhere oppose the Marshall plan as an instrument of American imperialism.

October 24: Benelux countries exchange ratifications on their customs union agreement.

1948

February 23: The Community party in Czechoslovakia gains control of the government through a coup d'état.

March 17: The Conference of representatives of Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg on Western Union ends with the signature of a 50-year treaty of collective military aid and economic and social cooperation.

March 17: In an address to Congress President Truman states: "I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them do so."

April 2: Congress passes the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.

April 30: Defense Ministers and Chiefs of Staff of France, Great Britain and the Benelux nations meet in London and initiate joint military discussions.

May 19: The report issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Vandenberg Resolution states that "the committee is convinced that, until the United Nations has been strengthened sufficiently to assure universal security, the best means of reinforcing the security of individual members lies in progressive development of such regional and other collective defense arrangements."

June 11: The United States Senate passes Senate Resolution 239, the so-called Vandenberg resolution, which proposes "association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security."

July 6: Ambassadors to the United States from Canada, Great Britain, France, and the Benelux countries meet with Under Secretary of State Lovett for an exchange of views on European defense requirements.

July 20: It is stated in London that United States and Canadian military experts will join as nonmembers in the consultations of the permanent military committee of the Brussels powers.

September 27: Foreign Secretary Bevin, in a speech before the UN Security Council, states: "If we cannot proceed on a world basis * * * we must proceed on a regional basis."

September 27, 28: The defense ministers of western union in conference at Paris announce agreement on common defense policy and formation of an organization to carry out that policy.

October 4: A military staff is appointed by Brussels treaty powers.

October: Western union forwards estimates of equipment needs to Washington.

October 26: The consultative council of the western union is holding its third meeting in Paris and agrees to seek a North Atlantic security pact.

October 28: Canadian Minister of External Affairs Lester B. Pearson announces that Canada has informed members of the western European union that Canada is prepared to enter into negotiations for a regional treaty of collective security.

November 11: Senator VANDENBERG promises again that the United States will "aid other friendly, independent nations to stand on their own feet in defense of their own freedom."

November 19: Premier Salazar, of Portugal, in an interview, declares: "The salvation of Portugal, western Europe, and the occidental world lies in the formation of a true Atlantic bloc."

November 27: The British Foreign Office announces completion of the draft of a North Atlantic defense pact by delegates of the five western powers.

December 2: U. S. S. R. warns Scandinavian countries against "plans for a Scandinavian military bloc."

December 6: Secretary of Defense Forrestal declares that military equipment must be given generously to Western Europe to give meaning to the Brussels Treaty.

December 10: Negotiations for the North Atlantic Pact open between Acting Secretary of State Lovett, the Minister of Luxemburg, and the Ambassadors of Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

1949

January 10: President Truman, in his Budget Message, indicates that the principal measure of economic and military aid will go to the nations sharing our international objectives.

January 14: A policy statement issued by the State Department cites Soviet opposition to majority policies in the United Nations, Communist obstruction to the Marshall plan, the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, and the Russian blockade of Berlin as leading to the Atlantic Pact.

January 14: The State Department announces that the United States will send arms only "to countries associated with us in collective defense arrangements."

January 20: In his Inaugural Address President Truman recommends that the United States associate itself by treaty in a "collective defense arrangement" with free European countries.

January 28: The Western Union powers announce the creation of a Council of Europe composed of a Council of Ministers, an executive body, and a legislative assembly, representing the national parliaments, with advisory powers.

January 29: The Soviet Union issues in Moscow a white paper asserting that the North Atlantic Pact is intended to establish United States and British domination of the world by force.

January 29: The U. S. S. R. asks the Norwegian Government to clarify its stand on the Atlantic Pact.

January 29: The Swedish Foreign Minister submits to the Scandinavian ministers meeting at Oslo a draft for a three-nation defense treaty outside of the proposed North Atlantic defense pact.

January 30: Plans for a defensive alliance between Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, which had been under discussion for several months, are shelved.

February 1: In answer to the U. S. S. R.'s request of January 29, the Norse Government states that it will not enter into any agreement with other countries obligating Norway to grant bases on Norwegian territory unless Norway is attacked or threatened with attack.

February 6: The Soviet Union offers Norway a nonaggression pact and warns tacitly against joining a North Atlantic defense pact.

February 11: Secretary General of the United Nations Trygve Lie warns against regional pacts unless they recognize the supremacy of the United Nations.

February 17: The Turkish Foreign Minister proposes to the French Foreign Minister an extension of the North Atlantic Pact by a supplementary agreement for the defense of the Mediterranean area.

February 18: Secretary of State Acheson meets with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the North Atlantic Pact.

February 20: Senator ROBERT A. TAFT endorses a strong North Atlantic security pact that would pledge United States aid to western Europe in case of attack.

February 21: A Foreign Office spokesman states that Norway has decided to join in organizing the Council of Europe.

February 21: Greek Foreign Minister Tsaldaris states that western European statesmen understand the desire of Greece

and Turkey for a Mediterranean defense alliance to supplement the Atlantic Pact.

February 22: Maurice Thorez, secretary general of the French Communist Party, states that French Communists would not fight the Soviet Union in the event of a war between that country and France.

February 23: The Minister for External Affairs of Eire informs the Dail that he had explained to the United States Eire's agreement with the general aim of the North Atlantic Pact but that Eire could not undertake any military alliance with the state (Great Britain) responsible for partition.

February 26: Italian Communist leader Togliatti states that in case of conflict between the Soviet Union and Italy it would be the duty of Italians to aid the Soviet Army.

February 28: Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG reassure Secretary of State Acheson that the draft of the North Atlantic Pact was satisfactory to them as it now stood.

March 3: Norway requests and receives an invitation to join conversations on the North Atlantic Security Pact.

March 3: Norway rejects the Soviet offer of a nonaggression pact.

March 4: The Norwegian Ambassador to the United States joins the Ambassadors' Committee in Washington negotiating the North Atlantic Pact.

March 7: A draft of the proposed North Atlantic treaty is completed by the Ambassadors Committee meeting in Washington and is sent to Canada and the western European countries for official approval.

March 8: The Italian Cabinet backs Italy's participation in the North Atlantic Pact.

March 8: Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committe informally endorse the North Atlantic Pact.

March 10: The Danish Foreign Minister arrives in Washington to discuss the North Atlantic Pact.

March 10: The British Cabinet approves the final draft of the Atlantic Pact.

March 10: The Soviet Finance Minister discloses that the Soviet government plans to spend the equivalent of $15,000,000,000 on its armed forces during the coming year, an increase of 20 percent over last year.

March 11: Premier de Gasperi of Italy announces in a session of the Chamber of Deputies that his government has approved Italy's participation in the North Atlantic alliance.

March 12: The Danish Foreign Minister states that he had satisfactory talks with United States Department of State officials regarding Greenland's role in the Atlantic Pact.

March 13: Iceland's Foreign Minister arrives in Washington for talks on Atlantic Pact, stating that Iceland would refuse to grant peacetime bases to any foreign power.

March 14: The Foreign Ministers of the five Brussels Treaty powers begin a 2-day conference to coordinate western European defense organization with the North Atlantic Pact.

March 14: Australia's Defense Minister states that he hopes for a Pacific defense pact similar to the North Atlantic treaty.

March 14: The Danish Foreign Minister presents to the State Department his government's estimate of Danish defense needs.

March 15: The Foreign Ministers of the five Brussels Treaty powers approve the terms of entry into the North Atlantic Pact at a conference in London.

March 15: Iranian officials voice fears that the Soviet Union plans to invoke the 1921 treaty whereby its troops might enter Iran on the pretext that the security of the Soviet Union is threatened.

March 16: The Portuguese Embassy in Washington issues a statement giving support to the principles of the North Atlantic Pact.

March 16: The French Cabinet approves the Atlantic Pact, at the same time expressing desire for further clarification of details of the armament program and military organization.

March 17: Invitations are issued to Italy, Portugal, Denmark, and Iceland to join the Atlantic Alliance.

March 18: The total cost of the Marshall plan for the 4¼-year program is estimated as $17,000,000,000 by Paul C. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator.

March 18: The text of the North Atlantic Treaty is made public, with indications that the pact will be signed during the first week in April.

March 18: Foreign Secretary Bevin champions the Atlantic Pact before the House of Commons, and later, in a broadcast, declares the treaty to be a strong defense against Communist encroachment and a great step toward world peace and security.

March 19: The Italian Chamber of Deputies votes 342 to 170 in favor of Italy's adherence to the North Atlantic Pact.

March 19: A white paper on the North Atlantic Pact is issued by the Department of State.

March 20: The Moscow radio denounces the North Atlantic Treaty and charges that a Pacific pact is being prepared as another link in the plan for "Anglo-American world domination."

March 21: The Russian newspaper Pravda of Leningrad accuses Finland of violating its peace treaty with the Soviet Union and warns against Finnish alinement with the Western Powers.

March 23: Secretary of State Acheson supports the Iranian Government's denial to the Soviet Union that Iran is being converted into an American military base for operations against the U. S. S. R.

March 23: A plan to include France and western Germany in the Benelux customs arrangement is reported to be under consideration.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

(Department of State—North Atlantic Treaty. Publication 3464, March 1949)

PREAMBLE

The parties to this treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security.

They, therefore, agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

ARTICLE 1. The parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ART. 2. The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

ART. 3. In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ART. 4. The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened.

ART. 5. The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

ART. 6. For the purpose of article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the Territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

ART. 7. This treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ART. 8. Each party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the parties or any third state is in conflict with the provisions of this treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this treaty.

ART. 9. The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

ART. 10. The parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ART. 11. This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the

states which have ratified it as soon as the ratification of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other states on the date of the deposit of their ratification.

ART. 12. After the Treaty has been in force for 10 years, or at any time thereafter, the parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ART. 13. After the Treaty has been in force for 20 years, any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the governments of the other parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

ART. 14. This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to the governments of the other signatories.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Washington, the 4th day of April 1949.

Signers of the Atlantic Pact to date: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United States of America.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed since Members of this House expressed their hope that on the next anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution the people of Poland might be able to join with those of Polish descent elsewhere in celebrating that memorable event. But their alien and terroristic rules still prevent it. More than that, those rulers apparently have undertaken more widespread religious persecutions and have increased the terrorism directed toward all opposition to the end that Poland's economy may become completely sovietized. Yet, even in the midst of the misery of millions of Poles, there can be no doubt that courage and hope remain alive. Americans can and do join in paying tribute to the greatness of the people of Poland and in pledging themselves to the ultimate restoration to Poland of its free government under its constitution which no tyrannical oppressor can take from them permanently.

I have read with interest an excellent, brief memorandum on the Polish Constitution, prepared by the Polish-American Congress, Inc. I am glad to make it available to all who read the RECORD by including it in my remarks.

MAY 3, POLAND'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

POLAND—A PARLIAMENTARY COUNTRY

It is impossible to understand the history of Poland, or even the essential character of the Polish Nation unless it is realized that Poland is fundamentally a country in which the parliamentary system is a deep-rooted and age-old tradition. For this circumstance explains the fact that the most important moments of Polish history are concerned with the problem of parliamentarism, and that the Polish Nation as such raised to the forefront of its tradition and history not battles or revolutions, but the date of a fundamental reform of parliament and the system: that of the constitution of May 3, 1791. It is to this event that the following remarks are devoted.

For if we desire to sum up the very essence of a Pole and things Polish in a couple of sentences, then in relations with the outside world it consisted of a romantic struggle, against the heaviest of odds and conditions, for state independence, and internally it was dominated by a principle which at times suffered from exuberant overgrowth, namely, that a Pole regards as legal, justified, and obligatory only that which has been resolved by a decision of the people or their delegates, i. e., by way of plebiscite or parliament.

PARLIAMENTARISM AND THE SLAVS

We have to go a long way back into early history of Poland to understand how Poles came to be and remained devoted to the parliamentary system. For it is particularly characteristic of Poles, who are analogous in this case to the English, that among the Slavonic peoples they were the only nation which remained faithful to the parliamentary tradition throughout all their independent existence, and that irrespective of the processes to which other Slavonic nations were submitted only from the middle of the nineteenth and in certain cases only in the twentieth century. It is obviously difficult to speak of any common Slavonic psychology, despite the common root language, when for a thousand years of history each of the nations in the Slavonic lingual group was shaped in its own distinctive culture, system, and religion.

So we must not overlook for one moment all the various processes, in operation for a thousand years and more, which had the effect of producing only one nation in these central eastern areas of Europe which was primarily a nation of a parliamentary system. We write "primarily" and not "exclusively" because for the sake of objectivity we must recognize that other nations in central Europe were also for centuries, though not uninterruptedly, educated in the parliamentary system. This applies, longest of all, to the Hungarians and Czechs.

THE UNBROKEN PARLIAMENTARY TRADITION

So the Poles are a nation of parliaments, in other words, a nation whose conception of legality requires the absolutely freely expressed agreements of all those interested, and this simply because in distinction from other nations they have been molded in a thousand years of historical processes fundamentally different from those of all their neighbors. Nowhere else on the Continent of Europe, among all the nations and states which have survived to the twentieth century, is the unbroken continuity of existence of parliament a feature of national life. Perhaps the most characteristic and striking similarity, or rather internal accordance between Polish and English, or British history, is the fact that Poland maintained her parliamentary system without a break-down to the end of her independent existence as a state. And it must be added that the form of the Polish-Lithuanian Union has features similar to that of the system uniting Great Britain. Nor must we forget that, even during the years when Poles were divided and governed by inclusions in other states they immediately restored their parliamentary system whenever possible, first in the form of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and the so-called Congress Kingdom of the nineteenth century, and later under the autonomy conceded by Austria.

THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF THE MAY 3 CONSTITUTION

The numerous provisions of the May 3 constitution include certain basic elements which have retained a lasting value for the Polish Nation, as well as a number of valuable, just, and sound decisions which, however, arose out of the political requirements and the relationships existing in Poland at the end of the eighteenth century.

The greatness of the May 3, 1791, constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system, and that is also the reason why this day marks both the crowning act of regeneration of the spirit of the Polish Nation in the second half of the eighteenth century and also a testament of the progressive and evolutionary methods with which the Poles entered political life after the temporary downfall of their own state.

The preamble of the May 3 constitution clearly and unmistakably expresses the motivating force that gave birth to this remarkable and immortal document. Here is its preamble:

"Persuaded that our common fate depends entirely upon the establishing and rendering perfect a national constitution; convinced by a long train of experience of many defects in our government, and willing to profit by the present circumstances of Europe, and by the favorable moment which has restored us to ourselves; free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence, and internal liberty of the nation, whose care is entrusted to us; desirous, moreover, to deserve the blessing and gratitude, not only of our contemporaries but also of future generations; for the sake of the public good, for securing our liberty, and maintaining our kingdom and our possessions; in order to exert our nautral rights with zeal and firmness, we do solemnly establish the present constitution, which we declare wholly inviolable in every part, till such period as shall be prescribed by law, when the nation, if it should think fit, and deem necessary, may alter by its express will such articles therein as shall be found inadequate. And this present constitution shall be the standard of all laws and statutes for the future diets."

SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE

In the very forefront of these lasting contributions we must place the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which sovereignty was also made the primary postulate of the first constitution of the restored Poland, passed on March 17, 1921. In the 1791 constitution this principle was formulated in the words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation. Three distinct powers shall compose the government of the Polish nation, according to the present constitution, viz:

"1. Legislative power in the states assembled.

"2. Executive power in the king and council of inspection.

"3. Judicial power in jurisdiction existing, or to be established."

To any western European who had been reared in French ideas, or even more in the age-old parliamentarism of Britain or in the principles which have been natural to the United States from their very beginning, this principle is almost a truism, and something natural in itself. But in eastern and central Europe it cuts off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared throughout the centuries in the principles of state, and not national, sovereignty.

EXECUTIVE POWER

The philosophy of government discernible throughout this Polish Constitution would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source. We find under article VIII relating to executive power these provisions:

"The most perfect government cannot exist or last without an effectual executive power. The happiness of the nation depends on just laws, but the good effects of laws flow only from their execution. Experience has taught us that the neglecting of this essential part of government has overwhelmed Poland with disasters."

Under this same heading the constitution provides:

"This executive power cannot assume the right of making laws, or of their interpretation. It is expressly forbidden to contact public debts; to alter the repartition of the national income, as fixed by the diet; to declare war; to conclude definitely any treaty, or any diplomatic act; it is only allowed to carry on negotiations with foreign courts, and facilitate temporary occurrences, always with reference to the diet."

HUMANITARIANISM AND TOLERANCE

Throughout the May 3 constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as—

"We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to farm, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own Federal Constitution, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the language relating to religion that—

"The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors, we therefore owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the Republic."

Thus it was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating all her internal causes of decline.

But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles 20 years too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795, which left the Polish nation in the bondage of Russia, Germany, and Austria until 1918.

Our Government Is Approaching the Limit of Bigness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan press in our large cities such as New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Cleveland, maintain a highly paid and well-trained editorial staff. If the New York Times or Chicago Tribune, Kansas City Star, and so forth, writes an editorial on some timely national problem, this editorial is widely copied by many other papers. A recent editorial appearing in a small daily newspaper of Goodland, Kans., is deserving of wide circulation because it sets forth self-evident truths so pointedly. This editorial demonstrates the fact that people living in the wide-open spaces, see very clearly the direction our country is drifting. I recommend it to you for reading.

[From the Goodland (Kans.) Daily News of April 10, 1949]

OUR GOVERNMENT IS APPROACHING THE LIMIT OF BIGNESS

Too many world leaders, including some in Washington, believe complicated political problems can be solved by economic means. The fallacious theory is that if people are well fed, fully employed, subsidized by the Government they will cease to be nationalistic and will be tractable to every Federal directive. Big government is a prerequisite of the theory. It was a prerequisite of Hitler's Germany in 1939–40.

We have extended our own big Government across the seas. Through economic means we are trying to form an economic union of western Europe. We learn we must wait upon political consideration. "We have lived for centuries without the Marshall plan," says Charles de Gaulle, of France. And Winston Churchill says: "While Socialist ministers are boasting of their achievements and of the benefits they have given the public—of which the public is not always conscious—they seem to forget that they are living on the charity of the greatest capitalist free-enterprise state in the world—the United States."

Some day in the not too distant future there will be a reckoning not only of our prodigality but of extension of government into private lives. We have been negligent of the course of our democracy in two World Wars and a severe economic upset in one generation. We have shouldered, almost without thinking, a heavy and steadily increasing local and national tax bill. We have drifted into expenditures and exhaustion of national assets that drive us toward individual and national sacrifices. We face a reduced standard of living, compulsory or voluntary.

If we are the greatest country in the world, we are not without limitations. Our most threatening limitation is that we are allowing our Government to become too big—too big for taxpayers to support.

Basing-Point System Operated in Missouri—Missouri Highways Taxed for Phantom Freight — Hannibal (Mo.) Plant Charged Freight From Eastern Pennsylvania in Early Days—Moratorium Presages Return of Basing-Point System—Small Business Taxed on Every Sale by Basing-Point Monopolists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I desire to demonstrate the basing-point system in action in the great State of Missouri. Bids received by the Missouri State Highway Department from January 6, 1947, through February 26, 1948, show the identity of prices inherent in pricing under the basing-point system prior to the Supreme Court decision on April 26, 1948. In Missouri, as well as elsewhere, it is now possible to get competitive bids on cement. Such bids are not confined to cement, however, but competition is reflected in the purchase of most basic commodities formerly using the basing-point system. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we be not swayed by fallacious arguments advanced for the purpose of passing legislation which will undo all of the gains made in outlawing the basing-point system.

One of the early Portland cement plants built in the United States was erected at Hannibal, Mo. It would be natural to assume that the building of this plant would have been a great boon to Missouri and the surrounding States, since at that time the nearest cement plant was in eastern Pennsylvania. This did not prove to be the case, for every pound of cement sold in the first few years by the Hannibal plant had in its price the element of phantom freight. A very heavy and unjustifiable phantom freight charge, for that phantom was the freight charge from a Lehigh Valley cement plant in eastern Pennsylvania to all destination points in Missouri to which the Hannibal plant shipped. The same charge applied when shipments were made to customers at destinations in neighboring States.

LEHIGH VALLEY "PLUS" ATTEMPTED FOR MISSOURI

As a matter of fact, the cement industry tried very hard to establish the "Lehigh Valley Plus" in the same manner the steel industry had successfully saddled the Pittsburgh Plus on the American economy. While the cement industry was not successful in this single basing-point effort, due to the nature of the industry, it did, as we all know, successfully work out a multiple basing-point system, much to the detriment of our country and its business structure.

LOCAL MATERIALS EVERYWHERE FOR CEMENT

The materials necessary for the manufacture of Portland cement lie in great abundance in the valleys and hills of every State in our country. It is our loss that this valuable basic construction material has not been made available at a low cost on an honest and fair basis for each and every needed improvement, whether it be for homes, highways, flood control, or for any other purpose. It will be even more disastrous if we allow the basing point system, with all of its monopolistic overtones, to creep back by way of a moratorium and once more control the distribution of cement, steel, lumber, food, and the other important commodities so necessary to the comfort, the safety, and the convenience of our people. The phantom is laid and only a Congressional seance in the name of moratorium can bring it back.

The Missouri table follows:

Abstract of cement bids received by the Missouri State Highway Department during the year 1947 and to Feb. 26, 1948

Destinations	Missouri Portland Cement Co.		Alpha Portland Cement Co.		Universal Atlas Cement Co.		Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co.		Lone Star Cement Corp.		Ash Grove Lime & Portland Cement Co.	
	Date of bid	Destination price	Date of bid	Destination price	Date of bid	Destination price	Date of bid	Destination price	Date of bid	Destination price	Date of bid	Destination price
1947												
Rolla	Jan. 6, 1947	$2.63	Jan. 7, 1947	$2 63			Jan. 8, 1947	$2.63	Jan. 7, 1947	$2.63	Jan. 7, 1947	$2.63
Crocker	Jan. 6, 1947	2.67	Jan. 7, 1947	2.67			Jan. 8, 1947	2.67	Jan. 7, 1947	2.67	Jan. 7, 1947	2.67
Lebanon	Jan. 6, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78	Jan. 8, 1947	$2.78	Jan 8, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78
Marshfield	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78	Jan. 8, 1947	2.78	Jan. 8, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78	Jan. 7, 1947	2.78
Springfield [1]	Jan. 7, 1947	2.75	Jan. 7, 1947	2.75	Jan. 8, 1947	2.75	Jan. 8, 1947	2.75	Jan. 7, 1947	2.75	Jan. 7, 1947	2.75
Springfield [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.25			Feb. 25, 1947	3.25			Feb. 26, 1947	3.25	Feb. 24, 1947	3.25
Marshfield [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.28			Feb. 25, 1947	3.28			Feb. 26, 1947	3.28	Feb. 24, 1947	3.28
Lebanon [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.28			Feb. 25, 1947	3.28			Feb. 26, 1947	3.28	Feb. 24, 1947	3.28
Rolla [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.13										
New Florence [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.09										
McCredie [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.09							Feb. 26, 1947	3.09		
Columbia [1]	Feb. 25, 1947	3.09			Feb. 25, 1947	3.09			Feb. 26, 1947	3.09		
Columbia	Feb. 25, 1947	2.59	Feb. 24, 1947	2.59	Feb. 25, 1947	2.59	Feb. 21, 1947	2.59	Feb. 26, 1947	2.59	Feb. 24, 1947	2.59
Boonville	Feb. 25, 1947	2.59	Feb. 24, 1947	2.59	Feb. 25, 1947	2.59	Feb. 21, 1947	2.59	Feb. 26, 1947	2.59	Feb. 24, 1947	2.59
Dexter [1]	Apr. 26, 1947	3.18					Apr. 24, 1947	3.18				
Poplar Bluff [1]	Apr. 26, 1947	3.23					Apr. 24, 1947	3.23				
Hayti [1]	Apr. 26, 1947	3.23					Apr. 24, 1947	3.23				
Portageville [1]	Apr. 26, 1947	3.23					Apr. 24, 1947	3.23				
Sikeston [1]	Apr. 26, 1947	3.16					Apr. 24, 1947	3.16				
Cameron [1]									Apr. 28, 1947	3.16	Apr. 28, 1947	3.16
Hamilton [1]									Apr. 28, 1947	3.19	Apr. 28, 1947	3.19
Lexington [1]					May 28, 1947	3.12			May 31, 1947	3.12	May 28, 1947	3.12
Odessa [1]					May 28, 1947	3.12			May 31, 1947	3.12	May 28, 1947	3.12
Blue Springs [1]					May 28, 1947	3.12			May 31, 1947	3.12	May 28, 1947	3.12
Harrisonville [1]					May 28, 1947	3.19				3.19	May 28, 1947	3.19
Kennett [1]	July 21, 1947	3.32					July 21, 1947	3.27				
Bucoda	July 21, 1947	3.32					July 21, 1947	3.27				
Fredericktown [1]	July 21, 1947	3.24					July 21, 1947	3.19				
Cape Girardeau [1]							July 21, 1947	3.06				
Sikeston	July 21, 1947	2.71	July 22, 1947	2.66			July 21, 1947	2.66				
Springfield	Oct. 28, 1947	3.08										
1948												
New Florence	Feb. 6, 1948	3.12	Feb. 9, 1948	2.84	Feb. 10, 1948	3.12	Feb. 9, 1948	3.12				
McCredie	Feb. 6, 1948	3.12	do	2.84	do	3.12	do	3.12	Feb. 9, 1948	3.12		
Do [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.62					do	3.62	do	3.62		
Columbia [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.62			Feb. 10, 1948	3.62	do	3.62	do	3.62	Feb. 9, 1948	3.62
Boonville [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.62			do	3.62	do	3.62	do	3.62	do	3.62
Jefferson City [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.66			do	3.66	do	3.66	do	3.66		
Cameron [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.53			do	3.53	do	3.53	do	3.53		
Hamilton [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.57			do	3.57	do	3.57	do	3.57		
Bucoda [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.66					do	3.66				
Kennett [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.66					do	3.66				
Dexter [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.55					Feb. 9, 1948	3.55				
Poplar Bluff [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.62					Feb. 9, 1948	3.62				
Portageville [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.62					Feb. 9, 1948	3.62				
Steele [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.66					Feb. 9, 1948	3.66				
Charleston [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.53					Feb. 9, 1948	3.53				
Sikeston [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.53					Feb. 9, 1948	3.53				
Cape Girardeau [1]	Feb. 6, 1948						Feb. 9, 1948	3.41				
Fredericktown [1]	Feb. 6, 1948	3.57					Feb. 9, 1948	3.57				
Rolla	Feb. 25, 1948	3.16	Feb. 25, 1948	3.16	Feb. 26, 1948	3.16			Feb. 25, 1948	3.16		
Lebanon	Feb. 25, 1948	3.35	Feb. 25, 1948	3.35	Feb. 26, 1948	3.35			Feb. 25, 1948	3.35		
Marshfield	Feb. 25, 1948	3.30	Feb. 25, 1948	3.30	Feb. 26, 1948	3.30			Feb. 25, 1948	3.30	Feb. 24, 1948	3.30
Springfield	Feb. 25, 1948	3.26	Feb. 25, 1948	3.26	Feb. 26, 1948	3.26			Feb. 25, 1948	3.26	Feb. 24, 1948	3.26
Rolla [1]	Feb. 25, 1948	3.66			Feb. 26, 1948	3.66			Feb. 25, 1948	3.66		
Lebanon [1]	Feb. 25, 1948	3.85			Feb. 26, 1948	3.85			Feb. 25, 1948	3.85		
Marshfield [1]	Feb. 25, 1948	3.80			Feb. 26, 1948	3.80			Feb. 25, 1948	3.80	Feb. 24, 1948	3.80
Springfield [1]	Feb. 25, 1948	3.76			Feb. 26, 1948	3.76			Feb. 25, 1948	3.76	Feb. 24, 1948	3.76

[1] Denotes high early strength cement. Normal portland cement uniformly 50 cents per barrel less than high early strength. These are delivered prices in paper bags subject to a cash discount of 10 cents per barrel.

Location of cement mills: Missouri Portland Cement Co., St. Louis and Sugar Creek, Mo.; Alpha Portland Cement Co., St. Louis; Universal Atlas Cement Co., Hannibal, Mo., and Independence, Kans.; Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co., Cape Girardeau, Mo. (also warehouse at St. Louis, Mo.); Lone Star Cement Corp., Bonner Springs, Kans.; Ash Grove Lime & Portland Cement Co., Chanute, Kans.

SMALL BUSINESS SUFFERED

Because the basing-point system is a monopolistic device to control prices and stifle competition, small business has suffered greater direct hardships under the system than have public agencies. While the taxpayer has paid millions upon millions of unearned dollars through his governmental bodies for the construction of public works of all types, small business has paid not only through increased taxes, but through the stranglehold which the practices under the basing-point system have on his business operations. The myriad daily transactions of the independent grocer, the tire dealer, the hardware merchant, the electric-supply dealer, and of all the small business enterprises everywhere, are taxed by monopolies for phantom freight in one form or another.

CONSUMERS HARD HIT

Consumers, of course, are the losers in the end result. Every man, woman, and child pays for the upkeep of the basing-point and other systems of price control. For Congress to pass a moratorium bill, which in the smallest degree would delay or restrict our efforts to restrain the powerful and ruthless monopolies in our country, would be to render a disservice to our people beyond calculation.

Socialized Medicine Concerns Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest F. Henry:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE CONCERNS US ALL

(By Ernest F. Henry)

For decades socialized medicine has been practiced unsuccessfully in various parts of the world. For years it has been advocated by certain groups for this country and legislation repeatedly has been introduced into both Houses of Congress to accomplish this objective.

Congress had hardly convened this January when S. 5 was submitted to the Senate to socialize medicine in the United States under the inoffensive title of national health insurance. Companion bills were introduced in the House.

This is not just a problem for the doctors. This is a matter of concern to all of us. It would have a direct bearing on our national economy, the future progress of the medical profession and the health of every citizen.

As are most other "do-gooder" schemes, the arguments for socialized medicine are based largely on false representations and emotional appeal. The proponents say that the state of the health of the American people is indeed pitiful; that unnecessary disease is rampant everywhere; that the number of cases of medical neglect is appalling; that only the rich man can get any medical care; that the poor must ask for charity, and that those that lie between simply can't get charity of medical care.

They say that the distribution of doctors is extremely inequitable; that there are large areas of this country in which medical care is not available; that there are many counties in which there is no hospital.

Now, is our health bad? If it is, we ought to consider what to do about it. It doesn't necessarily follow that, if it were bad, the measure proposed would be a satisfactory solution. But, if it isn't bad, a good deal of force of the argument has been lost. Reports of the United States Public Health Service show that the incidence of tuberculosis, diphtheria, and other diseases is lower in the United States than any other country and substantially lower than in most of the countries where socialized medicine is now in effect.

The statement that there are large areas of the country without medical care is correct but this would not be changed by national health insurance.

One of the points which has been greatly stressed is that national health insurance will be administered locally. "There won't be anything centralized in Washington." A study of the bill reveals that there is no such intention. Whatever local committees are set up, either of the profession or of the public at large, must operate only under the rules and regulations from Washington and they must agree, if they come in under the State plan, as is approved in Washington, to accept the rules and regulations from Washington. We would, therefore, not have local administration but only talk about it.

The power for the administration of the program would be centralized solely in the hands of the Federal Security Administrator. A National Health Insurance Board is to be set up but the program is to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The final authority, therefore, for this entire program is vested in a political appointee without any knowledge in the field of health and medicine. Of the five members of the Board only one must be a physician.

The proposed bill has objectionable features from the beginning to the end but space permits mention of only a few. One provision is that a specialist may be consulted only with the permission of the Govment insurance doctor. If he does not grant permission the patient may appeal. Everyone knows how long it takes to appeal anything in the Government. This means that the patient would continue to suffer or perhaps die pending the appeal or else go to a non-Government doctor and pay a fee just as he does now. However, please bear in mind that in this way he would be paying two fees instead of one because he would still be required to pay for the Government service which he did not get.

National Health Insurance would be financed in 1951 by a deduction of 1 percent from all wages received during the fiscal year. In 1952 and thereafter, by a deduction of 3 percent from all wages. Thus as bait to get the measure enacted the tax would be only 1 percent but would automatically jump to 3 percent the next year. If this bill is enacted and the social-security tax is increased to 3 percent as is contemplated, the individual wage earner would have a total of 6 percent of his salary withheld for social security and medical care in addition to the already large amount for income tax.

If the experience with socialized medicine in England is repeated here, the 3-percent tax would not be sufficient to support the program. In that country the cost of this "free" medical service will probably exceed 250,000,000 pounds a year, instead of the 150,000,000 as originally anticipated. In the view of Health Minister Bevan, that results from the fact that "too many are demanding too much." In other words, people are acting on the theory that they may as well visit the doctor whether they are sick or not because "free" medical service is due them. This situation has reached such an extreme point that Mr. Bevan issued a public statement in which he said: "Don't let us become a nation of hypochondriacs. I ask the public to use their doctors wisely and only when they need them."

There are many who think it is not necessary to consult the medical profession on problems related to medical care, but that legislators, social workers, and other laymen can draw up a complete program, have it adopted, and then expect the doctors to make it work. It should be borne in mind that, no matter what system we employ to obtain medical care, the doctor is the one who is going to have to deliver it. It cannot possibly be delivered by a social uplifter. Yet approximately 90 percent of the doctors have no sympathy whatever for the proposal. Then how could it possibly work?

The American people should realize that they will be the real ones to suffer should socialized medicine become a reality. Not only will they still have to go to a private doctor to get the type of service they now receive, but they will also pay the Government medical tax. Furthermore and foremost, there is little doubt that the future advancement of medical knowledge, learning, and research would be seriously retarded.

This country doesn't need the proposed system of socialized medicine. We have more doctors and medical facilities per family than anywhere else in the world. If those facilities sometimes appear inadequate, it is by comparison only with our splendid new ones. Our skilled worker and family wage earners are covered by a national system of workmen's compensation for injuries on the job; most of our population is entitled to and gets Federal medical care under the existing Public Health Service, Veterans' Administration, and other forms of medical service, or enjoys protection under private programs of insurance companies and industry. Our indigent now get as good or better service than they would under any socialized plan which would simply reduce, through red-tape requirements, the number of hours each doctor could render service.

The building industry, as well as all those believing in the American private-enterprise system, should appreciate the fact that those who would socialize the medical profession would do the same to practically every form of private business. We should be united in opposition to all adventures in state socialism.

Will the World Starve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article, I am pleased to present a thought-provoking theme from the mind and the pen of Mr. Bruce Bliven:

WILL THE WORLD STARVE?

(By Bruce Bliven)

The American people have lately been frightened by one of the grimmest of all specters: World-wide starvation.

The warning has come from a number of sources, but notably from two books by well-known scientists, Our Plundered Planet, by Fairfield Osborn, and Road to Survival, by William Vogt.

These authors say that the earth's population is increasing very rapidly, while the available food supplies are increasing slowly, actually decreasing in many areas.

Says Mr. Osborn:

"Blind to the need of cooperating with nature, man is destroying the sources of his life. Another century like the last, and civilization will be facing its final crisis. * * * The tide of earth's population is rising, the reservoir of the earth's living resources is falling. * * *"

ABANDON CIVILIZATION?

"As nearly as can be ascertained, it takes nature under the most favorable conditions * * * anywhere from 300 to 1,000 years or more to build a single inch of topsoil. Yet what may have taken a thousand years to build can be removed by erosion in a year or even in a single day. * * *"

Mr. Vogt is equally alarming:

"Unless man readjusts his way of living * * * to the imperatives imposed by the limited resources of his environment, we may as well give up all hope of continuing civilized life. Like Gadarene swine we shall rush down a war-torn slope to a barbarian existence in the blackened rubble. * * *

"In the hundred years prior to 1940 the world population more than doubled. * * * Agricultural land, now amounting to little more than an acre per person and shrinking fast * * * is every year producing less food. * * * A few more decades of such abuse as we have subjected [the land] to, will wrest the control out of our hands."

The specific statements of fact which are made by Messrs. Osborn and Vogt are true. But in my opinion the alarming conclusion which they reach, and which has frightened

so many people, is quite unjustified. The problem is far more complicated than most readers of these books realize; a number of factors are omitted which are on the optimistic side. In short, no readers of these words is in any danger of facing general starvation—nor is his son or his grandson. The western nations will not go hungry. Even the East is in little more danger in the future than in the past.

Here are six important facts of which the alarmists do not take proper account:

1. Population increase is not uniform and unlimited. In the western countries growth is leveling off and will turn downward sometime in the next quarter century. The rate of growth is at present largest in the oriental nations, but this will change as these countries shift over to more factories with fewer people on the land.

It is a universal rule that as the standard of living goes up with industrialization, the rate of increase in population (after a preliminary spurt) slows down until the population eventually stands still or gets smaller. There are various reasons. Marriages tend to be later. Families are smaller when children become an economic liability rather than an asset. With more education, various techniques for voluntary control of population begin to be employed.

NO MORE MIGRATIONS

It is also a fact that each continent is a law unto itself in the matter of population. In the modern world large numbers of people cannot move from one great land mass to another without the consent of the people already living on the second. Population pressure can be, and is, fairly severe in certain parts of the world without directly affecting the others.

2. Land can produce more. Modern scientific methods of farming, now applied to only a minute portion of the earth's farm land, increase production tremendously. Farmers in Denmark, for example, get five times as much food per acre on comparable land as do farmers in India. Dr. Robert M. Salter, Chief of the United States Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, calculates that if farmers everywhere practiced the best methods we could produce twice the present food needs of the world.

While soil erosion and exhaustion constitute a serious problem, they are being conquered—in the United States and other advanced regions—by the application of scientific methods. Ralph S. Trigg, head of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, recently told me of some of the soil-conservation techniques now being applied and other aspects of scientific farming. We have managed within the past 15 years to increase the productivity of our farms more than one-third on the same acreage. Food crops have been increased by 40 percent.

Chief factors in this amazing achievement have been the breeding of better farm animals, the use of hybrid seeds for increased yields, better use of soil, improved farm machinery, more and better fertilizers, new insecticides such as DDT, drought-resistant plants, and the successful war on pests.

REGULATING MOTHER NATURE

The great campaign of the agricultural-conservation program, initiated by the Department of Agriculture but carried out on a cooperative basis by the farmers themselves through nearly 100,000 elected farmer-representatives, is a basic factor responsible for this great record of success.

Still further scientific achievements are ahead. The wonderful new growth hormone, 2,4-D, is an amazingly effective killer of certain weeds, was used to rescue the sugarcane fields of Cuba. A stubborn weed, aroma marabu, with an enormous root mass, threatened to overrun them. Dr. Robert L. Weintraub of the United States Army Chemical Corps, pointed out that with the use of such hormones we can create new varieties of growing foodstuffs almost at will. We can develop slow-maturing crops that are safe from late spring frosts and early-maturing crops not damaged by the first bad freeze of autumn.

3. We can increase the supply of land. Millions of acres of potentially useful land are now lying fallow for reasons with which science is at last able to cope. Tropical jungle can now be cleared with the aid of growth hormones at a reasonable cost. Malaria, which has made vast areas unusable, is being wiped out by spraying DDT from airplanes. A new drug, antrycide, has been developed which protects cattle from diseases in Africa. This drug should open up an African region which will produce about as much meat as Argentina.

4. We can get food from the sea. At present, the world obtains only one-half of 1 percent of its food from the ocean. This supply could be increased 100 times if we wished. Commercial fishermen catch, in addition to the few fish which finicky humans are willing to eat, great quantities of "trash fish," nearly all of which could be prepared for human consumption without undue expense.

FISH FARMING

It is possible to raise fish, both salt and fresh-water varieties, in artificial ponds. Preliminary studies in Great Britain indicate that fish raised in ponds and fed on garbage produce a much larger return than does the land itself used in more orthodox ways.

5. There are new food sources: Production of yeast as a food is now past the experimental stage. Production at a pilot plant in Jamaica has proven successful, and a number of additional plants are being built. The end product is a brownish powder, bland in flavor, which can readily be mixed into fruit juices, soups, stews, milk, porridge, ice cream, and many other foods. In nutritive value it's the equivalent of buying beefsteak at 12 or 13 cents a pounds.

Fresh-water ponds contain enormous quantities of Chlorella, a microscopic type of algae. By manipulating its environment, Chlorella can be made to furnish half its dry weight as edible protein, or three-fourths of its weight as edible fats.

RAISING FAT

With the algae from an acre of pond, we can get 1,400 pounds of food in the form of fat. Compare this with 227 pounds of soybean oil or 360 pounds of peanut oil which can be obtained from an acre of dry land.

Dr. Richard L. Meier points out that Chlorella and yeast might be combined into one operation. We can use Chlorella as the food for the yeast, instead of molasses or sugarcane juice. Dr. Meier says that 7,000 acres of land used for an algae-yeast operation can produce as much food as 175,000 acres used for conventional farming. Moreover, it can be land which at present is considered so poor as to be useless.

A wonderful natural process is photosynthesis, by which in green, growing plants, nature turns carbondioxide and water into sugar and other organic materials in the presence of sunlight. If we could duplicate this process, most of the world's food troubles would be over. Great strides have been made, largely with the use of radio-active isotopes.

6. We can cut down waste. Just as important as new sources of food is maximum efficiency in the use of the food we have. Important progress is being made in this direction. We have found that precious vitamins and minerals are destroyed by certain types of cooking; that, for example, vegetables should be cooked in small amounts of water and this water served with them or saved for soups and stews.

QUICK FREEZING HELPS

We also know that many vegetables and fruits lose some of their nutritive elements if there is a long interval between picking and eating. Quick-freezing processes are a great help here, since they preserve most of these qualities.

Messrs. Osborn and Vogt are certainly right in warning us against being wasteful, especially when we remember that the overwhelming majority of all the world's people, including millions here at home, are on a diet which is far below the level required for good health. We need to know much more about food than we do. We need to solve the problem of poverty, which for so many people means inadequate diet even when food is in the market. We must apply intelligent control to the problem of population increase versus food supply.

And if we accept the principle that the problems of food and agriculture belong properly to science, if we will apply generally what the laboratory experts already know, if we will use a little common sense about our common problems, then our future is bright. And you'll be eating beefsteak and French fries for a long time to come.

Jersey City Celebrates Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the annual celebration of Americanization Day, for long a yearly event in Jersey City, took place on Sunday, April 24. Again these exercises and the parade preceding them were conducted under the auspices of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and its auxiliary. The celebration this year was the eighteenth annual demonstration of patriotic devotion on the part of the citizens of Jersey City under the leadership of this enterprising veterans post.

The parade was viewed by 75,000 spectators along the line of march and by several thousand more at Pershing Field in Jersey City where it was reviewed by Lyall T. Beggs, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mrs. Helen Murphy, national president of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary; Sheldon DeBaum, national inspector general of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; former Representative Elmer H. Wene, now State senator from Cumberland County, N. J.; Hon. Frank H. Eggers, mayor of Jersey City and his colleagues on the city commission; and other National, State, and county officials of veteran organizations. The grand marshal was Col. Frank B. Chapman and the aides to the grand marshal were Capt. Francis X. Burke, Lt. Stephen R. Gregg, Sgt. Nicholas Oresko, Sgt. John W. Meagher, all holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, and Col. Harry A. Conroy, veteran of both World Wars. Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr., again occupied the post of general chairman and turned in his usual flawless performance. It is of course impracticable to mention all those who had a part in making the day the great patriotic success it was.

Addresses were delivered by National Commander in Chief Beggs, Mrs. Murphy, national president of Veterans of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary, Hon. Frank H. Eggers, Hon. Elmer H. Wene, Capt. Marion J. Duncan, United States Navy, and myself. I append hereto the stirring address so eloquently delivered by Commander in Chief Beggs and follow it with an editorial comment on the celebration over the years by the Hudson Dispatch, a daily newspaper published in Union City, N. J.

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF BEGGS

SELLING AMERICANISM

Several years ago there was a play on Broadway about George Washington at Valley Forge. In it, the general spoke one line that went something like this: "This liberty we have will seem easy by and by, when nobody has to die to get it."

Those are bitter words, but they have the solid ring of truth. They apply not only to liberty but to the entire democratic concept of life. In times of peace there is a tendency to take our American way of life for granted. We are likely to forget how dear a price we paid to keep our rights as freemen secure.

That is why, many years ago, the Veterans of Foreign Wars set aside the last Sunday in April as Americanization Day, an occasion for reviewing our Nation's history and heritage. It gives us the opportunity to recall to the entire country that the basic principles of Americanism—liberty and equality—were bought with the blood of patriots in '76, and have been preserved through the years only because there were men in every generation ready to fight and die to defend them. On this day, we who have borne arms in the defense of Americanism, repledge ourselves to guard our liberties against every attack, in peace as well as in war.

What is this Americanism to which we have dedicated ourselves? At its core is the great gift this country brought to all mankind—the concept of human liberty. The Declaration of Independence established this as the first Nation based on the rights of the common man. At the very heart of our Constitution are those provisions, known as the Bill of Rights, which safeguard the rights and dignity of the individual. Any time we fail to make good these essential guaranties, the entire structure of our way of life is weakened.

The average American accepts the rights and benefits of democracy without giving them a moment's thought—the right to move from one State to another without notifying anyone; the right to change jobs; the right to fair trial; the right to retain one's nationality; the right to own property—and not be arbitrarily deprived of it; the right of peaceful assembly, such as here today; and to belong to a business or social fraternity, or to a political party or trade union; in short, all of the fundamental rights we enjoy under our Constitution and our form of government. To us it seems strange that these simple things are denied in totalitarian countries.

Most of us have blithely assumed that the basic rights of all Americans are pretty thoroughly protected. But when the Civil Rights Committee published its report a couple of years ago, the entire Nation got a surprising eyeful. The report revealed wide gaps between our democratic principles and our daily practices. It brought to light some very disturbing facts—that many Americans are denied a fair chance for education; that others are denied equal opportunities for jobs, for decent housing, even for medical care.

Although our standards of equality and fair play are higher than in any other nation, imperfections such as these must be eliminated. And the only cure is to insist on more of the benefits of democracy for everyone. This includes better schools, more teachers, and adequate recreational facilities, so that our youngsters will grow up with healthy minds and bodies. It means teaching young and old the glorious lessons of American history—not only of the battles won, but the record of team work among our peoples that led to victory.

In order that we can be better Americans, we must change or revamp our approach and way of thinking. There is today a growing tendency to revert back to the rut that we were in after World War I. The democratic ideal is the noblest political vision that was ever given to mankind. Yet, in our surface way of thinking we measure our benefits from our democracy in terms of the luxuries that we enjoy, such as electric ice boxes, automobiles, and radios. We must realize that a democracy is religious as well as political in its concept and that as God-fearing men and women we know that we gain nothing from religion unless we are willing to labor long and hard in the vineyards of God. Thus it is in a democracy.

We have learned by bitter experience that the best weapon against communism and other subversive "isms" is better Americanism—live it ourselves and demonstrate it to the world.

We of the VFW have dedicated ourselves to this mission. At our 1948 national encampment we resolved to conduct a national educational campaign designed to strengthen each individual citizen's importance, freedom, and right of opportunities, regardless of his religious, racial, or social status.

Today, democracy and communism are pitted against each other in an all-out struggle. The test is not one of arms—and we hope it will never become that—but a conflict of social and economic ideologies. The peoples of the world want desperately to be on our side, although misinformation, ignorance, and Communist propaganda sometimes cause them to have some doubts about us.

It is important that we let the world know about America and what it stands for; and it is odd that we in the United States who have developed the technique of advertising to a fine science, have proven such poor advertisers of America in other lands. Advertising creates consumer demand; develops consumer acceptance. With advertising, manufacturers boast they can sell iceboxes to Eskimos; but we have failed miserably to sell democracy to the Germans, or to the Chinese, or to the Balkan countries.

It is a sad commentary upon American tourists—and upon the average GI who served in Europe and Asia—that they make poor ambassadors for democratic America. The average Yank, when in association with the people of other countries, gained a reputation of being a braggart and a "blowhard." The other night I was talking to an Australian war bride who confessed that she at first considered the Yanks, in general, as great ones to "skite"—which is their slang term meaning to brag. To the Aussies, who themselves are not overly modest in speaking of their accomplishments—it was galling.

The average American, in talking to the natives of other countries, compares the material things of the United States with what the other country has to offer—its trains and streetcars, its roads, hotels, and restaurants, and its plumbing and theaters.

A Jewish refugee from Europe told me that he had heard about the skyscrapers, the superhighway, the big and showy things of America—but it was not until he arrived in the States that he realized that the true worth of Americanism lay not in material things—but in the freedom from fear, the sense of belonging, and the satisfaction of feeling oneself a real person—an important individual. These are the things we must advertise to the world. These are the things that count.

We can overcome Communist propaganda and bring the rest of the world safely within the democratic orbit if we advertise Americanism in its true light, and if we show that we are true to our ideals; that our system of individual freedom, with the spirit of initiative that flows from it, is strong enough to help war-shattered countries rebuild their economies. If the civilization we know is to survive, democracy must be proved to be workable, not only for the United States, but for all the world.

Strength and liberty are indivisible. This applies both in a military and spiritual sense. If we permit the rights of any of our citizens to be disregarded, we weaken our ranks and jeopardize the freedom for all. We must stand guard over our liberties every day of our lives, lest we fritter them away or permit them to be stolen behind our backs. As President Truman says: "The greatest danger is that through apathy or weakness of intention, the citizen may fail to exercise with virility his heritage of democratic freedom and thus let go by default the constructive power history has placed in his hands."

These dangers from within, which are constant, cannot be brushed off by the mere poking of our heads into the sands. Those who adhere to the Communist ideologies are open and bold in their denunciation of our way of life.

Just a few weeks ago Foster and Dennis, the leaders of the American Communist Party, had the supreme gall to publicly proclaim that in the event our Nation became involved in a conflict with Soviet Russia they and their fellow travelers in America would be found fighting on the side of Soviet Russia. This man Dennis is the same individual who out of the other corner of his mouth insisted on his constitutional rights as one of the eleven defendents now being tried in New York. He insisted on a trial by jury with a large jury panel to draw from and also the right to appear as his own attorney. He was asking for constitutional rights given to him from a Government that he would turn against in the event of war with the Communists.

We have laws for the purpose of protecting society. Although this is a free nation—we are free people—we cannot without fear of punishment go out and kill our neighbor, or rob a bank or a drugstore. In my opinion laws should be put into effect to punish and curb these individuals who have openly avowed that they are working toward the destruction of ourselves and our children. I believe that we can go too far in according such individuals all of these constitutional protective rights.

I do not advocate the curbing of their right to speak out their beliefs. That is one of the four freedoms for which you men of World War II fought to preserve. I prefer that we handle these so-called fellow travelers in the manner that was pursued by the VFW comrades in New York last May 1, which is also known as Red Day on Times Square by the Communists here in America. These comrades did not attempt to heckle or prevent the Communist rally. On the contrary, the VFW sponsored a tremendous loyalty day celebration just across the river from Times Square—in Brooklyn.

I did not attend either meeting but read what went on in both places. At the loyalty day meeting, which drew five times as many spectators as the Communist rally in Times Square, the speakers all used as a theme for their subject the pointing out of the good things that we enjoy in America and the fact that we should be more appreciative of those God-given privileges to which I have

hereto alluded. In Times Square the Communist leader, who, by the way, was not sent here from Russia but was born and raised in the Midwest and educated in the colleges of the East, struck out in sarcastic terms against our capitalistic and democratic form of government and spoke only in laudatory terms of the good times to be enjoyed under a Communist-controlled regime under the 14 men in the Politburo of the Kremlin, and continued in a sneering tone to cast aspersions upon the United States.

I thought he sank to a new low level when he ridiculed our American flag. He is quoted as saying that the red in our flag stands for revolution, the blue for despair, and the white for surrender. As I read these remarks I instinctively said, "It isn't so." I laid the paper aside, and in the course of the next 10 days read the paper several times, wondering why I had not destroyed it. It then dawned upon me that perhaps I, as a spokesman for a militant veteran organization made up of men who fought to preserve this flag of ours, should speak out, not only to my comrades and sisters in this country but to all citizens alike, in an affirmative tone as to what this flag stands for.

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are plain everyday Americans, and as such believe that it is well on a day such as this that we recall and refresh our minds as to the true meaning of the Stars and the Stripes. I want to remind you that the red in our flag does not stand for revolution. It stands for sacrifice. A sacrifice that was first made by our founding forefathers who left their bloody footprints on the snow-clad field of Valley Forge. That same sacrifice was made by the boys of '61, clad both in the Blue and the Gray, brother against brother, who were locked in mortal combat at Shiloh, Vicksburg, and at Gettysburg.

Then, too, the red in our flag stands for the sacrifice that was made by the gallant lads of '98, a 100 percent volunteer army, and those who were the founders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who charged the heights of San Juan Hill in the face of a ruthless enemy bullet, or who served with valor and distinction with Admiral Dewey in Manila Bay.

And then, as we turn the glorious pages of history, we find that the red is for the sacrifice made by the khaki-clad doughboys of '17 and '18, who fought and beat down into utter humiliation and defeat what was then regarded as the world's invincible army under the leadership of Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany. And once again we turn the pages of history to find that the red stands for the sacrifice that was made by the some 14,000,000 of American men and women of World War II, who left thousands of their comrades on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

It is well to be reminded that the blue in our flag, instead of standing for despair, stands for loyalty—that same loyalty that was displayed by those young men of certain generations in our history to whom I have just alluded, who defended their country in time of peril. And it is that same type of loyalty that you and I as parents are trying to instill and to inculcate into the hearts and minds of our children.

As christian men and women we know that the white in our flag does not stand for surrender—it stands for purity.

As I read those disparaging remarks I was cognizant of a definite void—that there was something conspicuous in its absence. It was that which was absent that depicted to me the utter stupidity of those 14 men of the Politburo in the Kremlin. They had failed to grasp the significance of the stars in the field of blue, symbolic of the stars in the heavens above; failed to realize that each star stands for a great State, and the 48 States collectively stand for a great freedom-loving Nation—the one that is to be the salvation if we are to have world peace.

So, as we gather here on this Americanization day, I ask that we join together, all the people of this Nation, firm in the resolution that as God-fearing, freedom-loving men and women, not only today but for days and years to come, we shall always look to those same heavens above—wherein dwelleth Him—for inspiration, aid, and protection; may the people of the United States so live that we shall always continue to deserve and receive God's blessing.

AMERICANIZATION PARADE "TOPS" IN NATION

What is probably the greatest demonstration of its kind in the United States, sponsored annually by a single veterans' post, is the great Americanization Day parade and exercises held in Jersey City under the auspices of Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and its Auxiliary.

Tomorrow, in the eighteenth demonstration, it is expected that 25,000 to 30,000 persons will march. Countless thousands more will view this spectacle, which is unsurpassed in its patriotic contribution to the great spirit of Americanism and in its effects as an antidote to the poisonous treachery of communism.

So important is this annual Jersey City outpouring of patriotism that it has become the yearly custom of the national commander of the V. F. W. to drop whatever else he may be doing when the last Sunday in April rolls around in order to be present at Pershing Field both to review the paraders and to address the huge gathering.

This year will be no exception and Lyall T. Beggs, World War I veteran and commander-in-chief of the V. F. W., will come all the way from Madison, Wis., for the affair, again attesting the significance of this growing veterans' organization attaches to the Jersey City demonstration. Also in attendance and listed as one of the speakers will be Mrs. Helen Murphy, national V. F. W. Auxiliary president. State V. F. W. officers will likewise lend their presence.

Fisk Post's yearly patriotic spectacle had its genesis in a desire to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever. It is a living portrayal of Americanism as defined at a joint conference of the commanders-in-chief of the five major veterans' organizations in Washington, February 18, 1927. At that time this definition was adopted:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag, and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

This annual display of American patriotism is not limited to the thousands who join in the parade. Everyone in Jersey City and surrounding municipalities is invited to join in the demonstration as a spectator along the line of march or at Pershing Field. The American flag should be flown from or draped on all homes and other buildings in Jersey City to show its citizens are proud to be Americans.

Mayor Frank H. Eggers, in his annual Americanization Day proclamation inviting Jersey City's citizens to participate, declared: "Freedom-loving peoples the world over look to this great Nation to lead them on the path toward peace and understanding among all nations. May the years ahead find our Nation serving in the forefront in the maintaining and establishment of a just and lasting peace in the world. As Americans, we must ever remain strong in our belief in our cause, firmly resolved to maintain a constant and vigilant guard against the penetration of any isms that have been expressly designed to divide us."

This year's parade, like the 17 which have preceded it, will maintain the high standards reached in recent years and may even surpass previous events in the number of units participating and in the number of marchers. To reach a new peak is difficult, for Americanization Day, starting in a small way back in 1932, has grown to such proportions as to approach the saturation point as far as records are concerned.

In tomorrow's line of march there will be 100 or more veterans', fraternal and civic organizations and about 35 bands. These will come not only from Hudson County but from many parts of the State and the metropolitan area. Flights from First Air Force headquarters at Fort Slocum, N. Y., will cover the parade route during the 3 or more hours of marching, and Army and Navy units will participate.

It is fitting that this year's grand marshal should be Col. Frank B. Chapman of Jersey City, who is slated to retire from the United States Army in June. Colonel Chapman did an illustrious job all during the war and in the years since as commanding officer of the New Jersey-Delaware recruiting and draft induction district. Colonel Chapman will have four Hudson County Congressional Medal of Honor winners as his aids, including Capt. Francis X. Burke, Sgt. John W. Meagher, Lt. Stephen R. Gregg and Sgt. Nicholas Oresko, Col. Harry A. Conroy also will serve in this capacity. George A. Thornton, Sr., is general chairman, and Daniel D. Kamp will be chief of staff and Franklin R. Perkins adjutant. Harold Nievelt is post commander.

Anniversary of the Signing of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, again marks another milestone in the history of the Polish people. It is the one hundredth and fifty-eighth anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution in the year 1791. Many documents are of great historical moment but the Polish Constitution is truly one of the world's great documents of freedom.

For centuries it has fallen to the lot of the Polish people—while being foremost exponents of freedom—to undergo bitter persecution and privation. That is the history of Poland—a history replete with struggle and sacrifice. We in our country are grateful to Poland and to Americans of Polish extraction for their contribution to our liberty. Way back in our primary fight for freedom reign is the name of Kosciusko who fought to secure our own liberty against a great power.

What the Fourth of July means to Americans, the Third of May means to all true Poles—a day of days. Today in the hearts of millions of true Poles, those still behind the iron curtain, and to millions of our own Polish-Americans, burns the light of freedom that some day will bring to that heroic nation a new-born independence, an independence which will allow Poland to govern herself as a nation without outside interference, as in the police state which now exists.

Are We Outsmarted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of April 30, 1949:

ARE WE OUTSMARTED?

Are the American people and the Truman administration being played for suckers all around the world?

Has the first serious venture into internationalism on the part of Uncle Sam, in more than a century and a half, already been productive of disasters which will haunt us for generations?

Is the historic American concept that foreign diplomats, and especially those of Europe, are simply too greedy, too treacherous, too lacking in veracity and idealism—is this skepticism already demonstrated to have been correct?

Did the American people make one of the worst mistakes in our history when they chose to disregard the warning of Washington to stay out of entangling alliances?

Let's look at some facts—then you answer these questions for yourself:

Fact No. 1: For 2 or 3 years, the maneuvers of Russia have kept American attention focused on the problems of Europe. Our national leaders have been so excited about this front door issue, that they forgot all about the back door—China.

In seizing China, as Russia now is doing, Stalin is picking up the greatest military prize in the history of the world!

China has a population of 500,000,000. She is a vast food producer. She has immense unassayed natural resources. Under strong government, her people are hard-working, energetic, tractable. And China sits at the southeastern corner of Asia, dominating the whole South Pacific and the Indian Oceans, with their thousands of important big and little islands.

What other great conqueror—Alexander, Caesar, Genghis Khan, Bonaparte, or Hitler—ever seized so valuable a prize; and won it for so trivial a cost?

Query: Has the Truman administration been befuddled and mousetrapped by Stalin, with the European crisis just a phony to screen his real objective—China?

The fact that the moment Stalin feels sure of capturing all China, he suddenly started conceding everything in Europe, is a point of much significance in considering this query.

Fact No. 2: The entire 2-year strategy in Europe of the Truman administration was knocked galley-west the day when Russia offered to lift the Berlin blockade virtually on Mr. Truman's own terms.

The Berlin crisis has been the thread on which such divergent schemes were strung as the Truman plan (direct aid to Greece and Turkey; the Marshall plan (direct aid to Western Europe); the Atlantic Pact; the rearming of West Europe; and the creation of an independent West Germany.

This whole program is shaken and demoralized by the Russian offer to open up Berlin on whatever conditions we wish—on the understanding, of course, that under the terms of the Potsdam Agreement and many other commitments, Russia must be consulted in the organization of any new German government.

Russia has made this proffer in a way which President Truman cannot refuse to heed. All we have previously demanded now is to be conceded. But think over the impact of this development. If Russia is going to cooperate in the case of Berlin, who can dispute that she may be going to cooperate in the case of Greece and Turkey; and for that matter, throughout the whole of Europe?

What excuse does the offensive-defensive alliance of the Atlantic Pact have, in that event, for being put into effect? What excuse can Mr. Truman offer to Russia, or to the American people, or to the rest of the world, in that event, for persisting in pouring arms into Europe—if the Russian Bear is going to be on his good behavior?

Stalin has trapped Mr. Truman in an impossible position. By agreeing to all American conditions with respect to Berlin, he has forced the President's hand. Mr. Truman cannot refuse to consider the offer. But the moment he resumes negotiations with Russia, on a cross-the-table basis, then the argument that "you can't do business with Russia," on which our foreign policy has been based for the past 2 years, automatically goes out the window.

To those who face the realities of world geography, it is obvious that Stalin could afford to give up almost anything he holds in Europe, so long as he is able to retain China—and be far ahead of the game.

Fact No. 3: The new shuffle in Europe has swung the leaders of Germany into the most powerful bargaining position it is possible to imagine. And they are ruthlessly exploiting their advantage.

Let anyone who doubts this make a very simple test. Get a copy of the Occupation Statute enacted a couple of weeks ago by the American-British-French representatives in western Germany (discussed editorially in this column under the title "Plenty of Nothing") and compare it with the interpretation and agreement released a couple of days ago by the American State Department.

The Statute was tough. The German Government was to be a mere puppet, with the big three powers holding all basic control over the Government. But the agreement as announced commits the big three not to invoke any of its authorities, except under extreme emergencies, and to allow the new German Government virtually complete autonomy.

Trying frantically to win the Germans over to this scheme of an independent government for west Germany, the big three now have gone so far as to stipulate, in effect, that whenever they attempt to overrule or revoke actions of the proposed German Government, it will have to be by unanimous action.

This is accomplished by an elaborate veto arrangement similar in effect, though not in language, to the veto clause of the United Nations Charter. Any one government's representative can delay action of the occupation powers almost interminably. There's a joker provision which will haunt the supervisors of the German Government for many a day, if Russia succeeds in being counted in among them.

Meanwhile, the German leaders are considering the intimations from Russia that Stalin may be willing to arrange for eastern, or Russia-occupied, Germany to be included into the restored German nation. They are using these rumors to try to drive a still better bargain with Uncle Sam.

In other words, in this particular matter, our diplomats have been so thoroughly outmaneuvered that it is apparently the leaders of defeated and occupied Germany who are really writing the terms of their experiment in self-government.

Fact No. 4: As everyone knows, the way by which Russia hopes eventually to conquer the United States is by driving us into national bankruptcy.

In the past four peace years we have been maneuvered into spending some $50,000,000,000 or more in frantic efforts to keep in-between nations on our side instead of drifting over to the Communists. This new spending is on top of gigantic debts and vast internal expenses, and has meant the postponement of innumerable urgently desired domestic improvements.

This has resulted in a frightful drain upon our economy, at a time when we could ill afford it. There have been profound collateral disturbances—much labor unrest, social stresses, failure to return to normalcy and stability; these have grown largely out of the top-heavy peace spending.

Moreover, we have geared our military enlargements up to approximately the scale with which the First World War was fought. Billions each year go into rearmament. Our form of government has been warped out of shape by the increasing domination of the military branch.

Necessarily these spending programs have come to dominate our economy. We are doing business on a get-ready-for-war basis. Inflation has been the watchword.

As many national leaders have pointed out, our leaders have been maneuvered into a position where peace would be deflationary. As it has been expressed, "an outbreak of peace would be an economic disaster."

And now Mr. Truman finds himself threatened with peace; finds Stalin willing to make so many concessions in Europe that continued war preparations on our part may become rank absurdities.

This development, it is worth noting, comes at a moment when we already have had enough disinflation so that confidence in financial circles has been shaken.

Query: Is this all the result of a deliberate maneuver by Russia to force Mr. Truman to go overboard in rearmament spending—and then "pull the rug" on him by starting a peace offensive that cannot be resisted?

There are some of the facts—you figure the answers.

Horizon Still Limitless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Concord (N. C.) Tribune of April 13, 1949:

HORIZON STILL LIMITLESS

"Our horizon is not a whit less limitless and not a shade less promising than that which lay before our forefathers in the blackness which followed the revolution," James A. Farley said in an address before the Kiwanis Club of Syracuse, N. Y.

"We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities to the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American," he said.

"The door to opportunity must be kept open.

"The American boy must be taught from experience that whatever he attains depends upon his own inner integrity.

"We have won the past by hard work and honesty and self-reliance.

"There is no better formula through which we can win the future.

"The greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured if no man-made shadows blur the road."

Mr. Farley, former postmaster general and long-time Democratic Party leader, is an intelligent, patriotic American. He has lived through the changes of the twentieth century and has observed the influences brought to bear upon the American philosophy and the American way of life. And his statement in Syracuse, expressing sound American doctrine, is worthy of more than passing note.

America has become the mightiest and the wealthiest Nation of the world because of the principles of freedom on which it is founded. It has become the leader and the hope of the world for the same reason.

The United States of America will retain its position in world affairs so long as the door of opportunity is kept open—and as long as young Americans practice industry, thrift, honesty, and self-reliance, and reap the rewards for practicing such virtues.

Maryland Solves Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second of a series of articles from the Washington Post, written by Agnes E. Meyer:

MARYLAND SOLVES HEALTH PROBLEM

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

What does the Maryland health plan for the care of the indigent and medically indigent mean to the people? It means profound security, especially for the aged receiving old-age assistance and for the dependent children. It frequently rehabilitates those on general assistance and enables them to become self-sustaining. It has not thus far reached the medically indigent in sufficient numbers to answer the health problems of the border-line income groups.

In Montgomery County recently a little girl of 8 appeared at the office of Dr. William Welsh, one of the leading Rockville physicians, waving the little white card denoting eligibility and dragging a little boy of 6 who had been severely burned. She explained to the amazed doctor that the little fellow's parents were drunk and, as he was her friend, her "best friend," she had looked up the family card of eligibility and gone at once to the nearest doctor's office.

What is significant about the incident is that an 8-year-old child was familiar with the medical plan, that the card of eligibility was so precious that she knew where to find it, and that she also knew it would be honored in any physician's office.

ELIGIBLES AWARE

Whereas the general public is still largely unaware of this important experiment in medical care, the people who are in the eligible class have gradually learned through the welfare department, or through referral from the doctor's office in case of medical indigency, that they are entitled to medical services.

Often the clients walk into the health department to present their problems. In all the smaller counties the health officer sees all the applicants. In the larger counties this responsibility is delegated to a clerk, who refers to the health officer only those cases she feels unable to decide.

The choice of a doctor is left to the client and recommendations are made only when the client asks for suggestions. The doctor is free to take new patients or not, but usually both patient and doctor already know each other.

The doctors throughout the State are paid on a fee-for-service basis, $2.50 for an office visit, $3 for a home visit, and $4 for a night visit plus an allowance of 50 cents for every mile of travel above 12 miles. Though the fees are somewhat lower than those charged in private practice, the physicians are compensated by the knowledge that their bills will be paid in full, whereas in private practice they collect about 70 percent of the total. As every county is running over the budget, the doctors have voluntarily renounced their fees for hospital visits where there is a resident staff, or reduced them where they take full charge of hospitalized patients. The hospital costs are paid out of a separate State fund.

EFFECTS VERY MOVING

The effect of the program on the fantastic number of old people who live alone in a single room is especially significant and very moving. "It's hard enough to be old and lonely," said one dignified old lady in Hagerstown, "but it's terrible to think that you might get sick, and nobody cares." The health funds of the welfare department, now abolished, had always been inadequate. All recipients of relief depended upon the charity of the local doctors, who could give services but not medicaments. Now they can go to a doctor's office and sit among the paying patients, with their heads high, knowing that the visit is paid for at the regular rate. And since the drugs they need are free, the cronic cases such as diabetics have been given a new lease of life.

"If it weren't for my daily dose of insulin, I wouldn't be sitting here talking to you," said one old woman. "And even when we're not sick, we cling to our cards and get them renewed promptly because it's a comfort to know we needn't worry."

It is interesting that very few of the indigent or the medically indigent think of the program as charity. This is due in part to the fact that the health department, which administers the program, is considered a public service to the whole community, rich and poor alike. It has never acquired the stigma of dependency associated with the welfare department.

NO LESS GRATEFUL

The poor mothers of large families receiving aid to dependent children and the women in charge of foster homes, are no less grateful. What is absurd about our social structure is that in Maryland as in most other States, the relief grants are not sufficient to provide rent, clothing, and adequate nourishment by even the most basic standards.

Thus we create illness on the one hand and are obliged to remedy it at far greater cost than the few extra dollars which would give our dependents an adequate diet. Now, when necessary, the doctor can order not only medicines but extra diets for these undernourished children on the relief rolls, as well as vitamins.

The children get complete dental care as well, partly through the schools. Dentures—a very general need even among young people—are no longer provided because they threatened to absorb a disproportionate amount of the budget. For adults, only emergency dental work can be done on the present budget allotted each county by the State, as the back-log of neglect is very heavy, especially among the Negro population. A shortage of Negro dentists as well as doctors exists in all counties.

Eye examinations are also given under the program. Private organizations supply the glasses for children but rarely for the aged. What is important in the medical program for dependent children is that they now receive regular comprehensive medical care, whereas formerly it had to be a life-and-death matter before they got attention. The program is too new to show marked signs of improvement among Maryland's dependent children, but the results are sure to be salutary.

MATERNITY CARE

Perhaps the best over-all program is that for maternity care because it meshes into the existing programs of the health department. The expectant mother is sent by her doctor to the prenatal clinic. For the delivery, whether in the home or in a hospital, the doctor receives $35. Thereupon the mother and baby are referred to the well-baby clinic. As hospital facilities are inadequate in most of the rural counties, by far the large majority of deliveries are in the home.

The program set out to provide bedside nursing. But even in such counties as Montgomery, where the nursing staff is larger in proportion to population, 1 to 5,000 people, nursing schedules in the schools, the venereal disease, tuberculosis, child hygiene clinics, and other services are so heavy that only limited demonstration services can be given, followed by check-ups. Many counties have taken on the program without adding to the nursing staff. Twenty-three additional nurses were distributed throughout the State by the department of public health nursing. Some of these nurses do experiments in time-studies on bedside nursing to ascertain the cost of a well-rounded State-wide program and the economies that would result from reduced hospitalization.

QUALITY UNEVEN

The quality of medical care given under the program is necessarily uneven, if only because the doctors vary in ability and hospital or clinical facilities are inadequate in many counties. But the significant thing is that the quality of medical care is rising, as the local practitioners take more and more advantage of the local diagnostic clinics that have been established in many counties. Here they can consult the leading specialists of Baltimore's medical schools and hear them lecture on recent discoveries.

Sometimes a whole team of specialists from Johns Hopkins or the Maryland University Medical School go to the counties to give an intensive survey of a single medical problem. The local doctors are also invited to come to Baltimore for special lectures at the two medical schools. Another service is rendered to the local practitioner, through the improvement of services and personnel in local diagnostic laboratories of the board of health. This is especially valuable in counties where no other clinical laboratory facilities are available. The two great medical schools in Baltimore have become the hub of a wheel whose spokes radiate into the remotest rural areas and hold the program together.

The expansion of the county advisory committees has also had an educational influence as the doctors become more and more interested in the analysis of local health and medical needs, and in developing new resources designed to meet these needs.

Instead of the usual opposition to insurance by medical societies, the Maryland doctors are already convinced of the need to superimpose upon the medical-care program for low-income groups a system of voluntary insurance to reach down to the present program.

About 610,000 individuals, or 29 percent of Maryland's 2,000,000 population, are now enrolled in the Blue Cross. "At our last meeting," said Dr. John H. Griffin, president of the Charles Medical Society, "the physicians in our county passed a resolution in favor of

voluntary health insurance and agreed to give information concerning health and medical insurance to the consumer. We younger men see our future in voluntary insurance and think all medical societies should do their utmost to expand it."

The fact that the local people themselves are becoming more health conscious is another educational byproduct.

Absence of Prayer at Signing of North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I made some observations on the floor of the House deploring the omission of prayer at the ceremonies held in Washington at the signing of the North Atlantic Pact. My remarks are found on page 3950 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1949, and were as follows:

MINISTER OF GOD ABSENT AT THE SIGNING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE PACT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, April 4, 1949, I attended the ceremonies and the signing of the North Atlantic Defense Pact by the Foreign Ministers of the countries which, together with the United States, formed the North Atlantic community of nations. This pact was signed in the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue, in the city of Washington and District of Columbia, at approximately 5 p. m. Preceding the signing of the North Atlantic Defense Pact, which might appropriately be called a peace pact between the 12 nations, I listened to the addresses of the Foreign Ministers of Affairs of the respective governments represented. I listened to the concluding address by President Truman on this historic occasion. All Ministers, together with the President, lauded the high purpose of this gathering and denominated it an agreement to safeguard the peace and prosperity of not only this community of nations but as a means to maintain, preserve, and protect the peace of the world.

This was a momentous gathering, marking a historic milestone in the history of our Nation. The sovereignty of 12 nations had gathered together, pledging themselves each one to the other to abide by the peaceful principle of United Nations, maintain friendly relations and economic cooperation, to consult together whenever the territory or independence of any one of them is threatened and to come to the aid of any one of them which may be attacked. It was a solemn pledge to work for and guarantee a lasting and abiding peace insofar as human instrumentality might so do.

The ceremonies together with the signing of the mutual pact was most impressive and there was harmony and a note of peace that resounded throughout this gathering, but there was lacking one other minister, the minister of God, to invoke divine guidance and spiritual blessing of Almighty God, who in time and eternity is the Judge of all nations.

No prayer opened this historic ceremony as is the usual custom of our Nation. Only two ministers referred to Deity in their addresses. One was Foreign Minister Dirk Stikker of the Netherlands, and the other was Foreign Minister Carlo Sforza of Italy, both of whom recognized and expressed the moving hand of God in and among nations.

I was both disturbed and disappointed that whoever arranged this program blundered in that they forgot the minister of God. Was it the lack of spiritual courage or the lack of faith and devotion in neglecting to invoke divine guidance and the ultimate success of this peace pact?

This omission of a prayer is but a duplication of what happened at the United Nations Organization at San Francisco and there was no prayer at the opening of that great gathering, and it might possibly be that the history of this organization could have been different had divine guidance been invoked upon the proceedings there. Let us hope that it will not be a stumbling block to the ultimate success of this North Atlantic defense pact, otherwise known as the peace pact signed here. May the prayers and dedication of millions and millions of people in our own and sister nations provide the real consecration for a pact which at the signing seems to me at least to have missed its deepest significance.

That this world shall have a new birth of freedom, of peace, and of brotherhood, and that the governments shall not perish from the earth, there must be born in the hearts of men a universal belief and faith in God.

Let us exclaim with Kipling:

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of commendatory letters and telegrams from both Protestants and Catholics as well as civic groups giving full endorsement to these remarks. I include herewith an editorial by Charles Francis Coe, editor and publisher of the Palm Beach Post-Times, West Palm Beach, Fla., appearing in the Easter edition of April 17, 1949, entitled "In God We Trust":

IN GOD WE TRUST

Representative DWIGHT ROGERS points out to us that the signing of the North Atlantic Pact was achieved without preface of prayer. The Congressman was shocked by this neglect. We agree that he is justly shocked.

Here was a gathering for the purpose of pledging mutual resistance to the advent of a godless world, entering into that agreement without even the formality of seeking divine guidance. Not, we reluctantly suggest, that such guidance would have been followed, even if available. What galls us is the implied self-sufficiency of a group using their own ego by way of supplanting public confidence in them.

Russia sees and knows but one god. That is the Russian state. We know a supreme being, unto whose plan we subscribe ourselves, into whose hands we commit ourselves and our posterity. This is so, even to the extent of stamping upon our money "In God we trust." Ours is a philosophy which places nation second to God. Ours is a theology which believes that man is the creature of God, and the safety of man's institutions is as permanent only as is their dedication to God.

That right here, in our National Capital, men should gather and affront that philosophy, carries a significance which cannot be set forth in mere words. To many, it is expressive of that growing tendency among the ungifted few, to relieve God of any responsibility for ourselves, and, for our posterity. These many, and we think quite rightly, will resent with abysmal conviction, any such self-complacency. This Republic, by the antics of its unelected statesmen, is embarking upon a new and unchartered course, just as did its founders.

Recall, please, that its founders knelt upon rock-bound coasts and with humility committed themselves to the mercies, and asked the blessings of Almighty God. In their humility lay their strength. Their devotion was the chrysalis of freedom in the earth. God richly blessed this land and this people. If it be His will that these blessings shall now be spread into the entire earth, with this people as the sower of the seeds, then surely this people has learned a magnificent lesson upon which to pattern the future world.

To lower ourselves through omission to the level of godless Russia, will blot the pages of history. But it will do more than that. If it leads to the suspicion that Washington doodlebugs have enriched their egos to the point where God is no longer important in their deliberations, then indeed, are we impoverished. Remove God from the daily life and deeds of this Republic, and this Republic becomes a mausoleum of liberty, a monument of desecration, a crypt, in which will be interred the tenets of liberty and the spiritual advancement of the human species.

In God we trust. Not in statesmen intent upon devices of their own. Let that ring forth for all to hear. Perhaps even God would be pleased to know that the phrase has become more than a trade-mark in the marts and machinations of men. Our obligation is to God. Our achievements will be no greater than our integrity with God. Fidelity is our creed. Politics is our greed.

"In God we trust?"

A Friendly Analysis of the Columbia River Bills—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am pleased to include a radio address by myself, being delivered this evening in the State of Washington:

A FRIENDLY ANALYSIS OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BILLS—PART 2

In the first part of this discussion of the four major proposals for development of the Columbia River region, I described the major differences between these various approaches to the general subject. Tonight, I want to touch more specifically on certain important aspects of these bills—particularly the provisions regarding labor relations and local control.

You will recall that I started last week with the original proposal for a Columbia Valley Authority, first introduced in Congress in 1945, and modeled very much after the Tenessee Valley Authority. Then, we had my own bill for a Columbia Interstate Commission, in which I have tried to incorporate constructive means of achieving a coordinated program of Northwest development without creating an all-powerful superstate controlled from Washington, D. C. I have advocated giving the balance of power into the hands of the people who live in the Northwest. The third proposal is the joint Army engineers-Bureau of Reclamation compromise, which would operate through the Columbia Inter-Agency Committee according to present laws and policies. Finally, there is the new Truman proposal for a Columbia Valley Administration—which is not to be confused with the earlier CVA bills. This new CVA would con-

solidate the policy-making functions and operation of some Federal agencies in the Northwest but would carry out most of its project construction through existing agencies, like the Reclamation Bureau and engineers.

Now, there are a few things we all should remember in discussing this whole Columbia River problem. The first is that the Columbia's tremendous resources for power, irrigation, navigation, fisheries, watershed protection, and other uses will be developed—inevitably—in the national interest. Even if no change is made in the present laws, that development will go on. The question, therefore, is not whether the Columbia will be developed, but by whom will it be developed and according to what policies will it be developed and who will control the whole business after it is developed.

The second major question is what kind of an organization will operate the Federal projects in the Pacific Northwest. Under what rules will it function—what will its relations be with Congress, with the people of the region, with its own employees? Any new organization designed to coordinate Federal resource activities in the Northwest must be examined very carefully to determine whether it is acceptable to the people—to farmers, to labor, to business, to the State governments, and local bodies, such as Rural Electrification Cooperatives and Public Utility Districts.

One of the most important parts of any proposal for a coordinating agency—regardless of what name is given to it—is the rules according to which it will hire and fire and deal with its own employees. In this respect, the bills now before Congress differ very greatly. The original Authority bill would have set up a powerful autocracy, which would be subject to no restriction whatever in its personnel policies. There was no protection guaranteed either to clerical or laboring employees, in spite of which many labor leaders supported the bill.

The Joint Bureau of Reclamation-Army Engineers proposal would continue the present employee-manager relationship. Practically all work would be done by contract, with the clerical and administrative employees of the different agencies all under full civil-service protection. Contractors have to follow the same provisions of national labor relations law that other private businesses do.

Under the Truman administration bill, the new agency would write its own rules for labor relations, with only a few minor protections guaranteed by law. Acting as a corporation, the Truman CVA would be required to give substantially the same privileges as are given employees under Federal civil service. But the employees of the CVA would not be under civil service. Furthermore, the CVA, although privileged in all other respects to act as a private corporation, does not have to abide by any of the provisions of national labor-management relations laws to which all other employers must adhere.

But here is the real booby trap for labor in the administration bill: On page 38, in section 15, of the CVA bill, there is this simple sentence:

"Any employee of the Administration may be removed in the discretion of the Board."

There is no qualification whatever attached to that sentence. In the Truman CVA bill, backed by a party which claims to be the friend of organized labor, in a bill which they have asked labor to support and which many labor leaders in the Pacific Northwest have already supported without question—in that bill is a provision more devastating to the rights of labor and the workingman than all the 29 pages of the much-maligned Taft-Hartley Act put together: "Any employee of the Administration may be removed in the discretion of the Board."

There is no provision for appeals, no requirements to show justification for firing an employee, no provision for turning disputes over to a third party for settlement, no system of mediation in case of disputes, no machinery for avoiding or settling costly strikes, no protection of the most important utility operation in the Pacific Northwest against sabotage except by denying the rights of innocent workers. In short, the CVA proposal presently before Congress is an antilabor bill.

Lest there be any doubt whatever about this matter, it should be stated right now that last March, before the CVA bill was sent to Congress, one of the Congressmen from the Pacific Northwest who is particularly friendly to labor wrote to one of the Cabinet officers who was helping to draw up the bill and spelled out to him eight basic provisions regarding labor relations which must be included in any CVA bill to be acceptable from labor's point of view.

Here are those provisions:

1. That all employees shall have security of tenure as provided by the civil-service laws; that is, a seniority system on the holding of jobs.

2. That all employees have transfer privileges with the same grade and seniority as provided by civil-service laws.

3. Provision for coverage of employees under the Federal injured-workmen's compensation laws.

4. That the CVA be authorized and directed to bargain collectively with its employees and that the contracts arrived at by collective bargaining be binding and enforceable in the courts.

5. That, so far as is legally possible, all pertinent Federal laws relating to labor-management relations shall apply to the Corporation, as an employer, and to its laborers, mechanics, and workmen, as employees.

6. That the States in which the Corporation operates be authorized to cover the Corporation's employees under the unemployment-compensation system.

7. That employees of the Corporation be covered under social security.

8. That the Corporation be required to comply with provisions of the withholding-tax laws in cooperation with the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There is only one of the four major proposals for development of the Columbia River system which complies with all eight of those requirements—and that one is my own bill for a Columbia Interstate Commission.

Let's take those provisions, one by one.

The CVA bill says employees shall have rights with respect to security of tenure comparable to those given civil-service workers. My CIC bill guarantees those rights by placing all clerical and administrative employees under full civil-service status. In addition to guaranteeing the same rights to its workers, it gives them an effective collective-bargaining procedure to enforce those rights.

Both the CVA and CIC bills provide for transfer-in-grade of all employees to other jobs in the Federal civil service. However, the CIC bill, by bringing its administrative employees directly under civil service, eliminates the red tape and confusion which would be bound to arise under two separate systems.

Both the CIC and CVA bills provide for coverage under the injured-workmen's compensation laws.

It is the fourth provision that contains the "joker" for labor. The CVA bill authorizes—but does not require—the Corporation to bargain collectively with its laborers. My CIC bill authorizes and directs the Corporation to bargain collectively. The administration CVA bill makes no provision for enforcement of the contracts negotiated by collective bargaining. It gives no guaranty to labor that an agreement, once made, will not be broken by the Corporation the following day. My CIC bill specifically provides that such contracts will be binding upon the Corporation and enforceable in the courts. Without such a provision labor, under the CVA, would be absolutely at the mercy of the Directors of the Corporation.

The CVA bill makes no provision whatever regarding the rules for employment or discharge of employees to safeguard the rights of workers, other than a statement that no political test will be made of prospective employees. The most important part of the CVA bill is that sentence which reads: "Any employee of the Administration may be removed in the discretion of the Board." Politics may not be the test, but there is no doubt in anyone's mind that such a Board would be capable of exercising a tremendous amount of discretion in its handling of employees. By contrast, my CIC bill provides a double measure of protection to its employees. Under my bill, the administrative employees would be directly under civil service, with all the protection that civil service is meant to give. The workers—mechanics and laborers—would be protected fully under the same national labor-management relations laws which apply to workers in all other businesses.

There is absolutely no reason why workers under a CVA or CIC should not have this protection. The only excuse so far offered by any official of the Administration for not giving employees full protection of the Federal labor relations laws is that workers are doing all right in the TVA. There followed, in the reply given to the Congressman who asked for these eight protections to workers, a statement indicating the Administration had no real reason for not giving this protection other than its own desire to maintain absolute control over labor in any CVA that would be set up. The mere fact that labor in the Tennessee Valley has not yet had reason to complain is no guaranty whatever to labor that at some future time Directors might be appointed who were enemies of labor and would take away every privilege granted to labor by administrative fiat. If any such argument were used in this week's debate on the national labor bill in the House of Representatives, the man who spoke it would be laughed off the floor. Yet, in the CVA bill, some labor leaders have already been foolish enough to swallow it.

Finally, both the CVA and CIC bills contain provisions for social security and unemployment compensation coverage and for withholding of income taxes.

No workingman should support any bill for a Columbia Valley Administration which does not guarantee the rights for which labor has fought so long. Although voluntary agreements, such as now prevail in the TVA and such as would be given under the Truman CVA bill, may be all right at present, they are only political privileges extended by a political Administrator favorable to labor. Labor should know full well from past experience that what politicians give, politicians can take away and that labor has no security except what is written into law.

The amazing fact about this comparison of attitudes toward labor under a Columbia Valley Administration is that there already is working, in the Pacific Northwest, a perfectly acceptable pattern of labor-management relations for an organization of this type. It operates in the Bonneville Power Administration and it can easily be transferred over to the new Columbia River agency. That is exactly what I have done in my Columbia Interstate Commission bill. Through it, clerical workers are given all the rights and protections of civil service—and there is absolutely no reason why they should not have them, as Chairman Harry B.

Mitchell, of the Civil Service Commission, told me 4 years ago. The necessary flexibility of operation is obtained by making special provision for hiring of professional and engineering employees. Finally, the men who do the real work—the mechanics and laborers—are placed under the full protection of the same laws which apply to all other workers in private industry. That system—almost exactly as I have included it in my Columbia Interstate Commission bill—is working today in the Bonneville Power Administration. But the proponents of CVA want to junk this successful system and substitute for it a bill which gives nothing to organized labor.

Workers of the Pacific Northwest had better study this proposal carefully before they find they have unwittingly supported a CVA bill which honestly can be described as nothing other than antilabor.

Next week, I will discuss what to me is the heart and soul of any proposal for development of the Northwest—the subject of local control.

Address Before Red River Valley Improvement Association by Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Red River Valley Improvement Association at Shreveport, La., on Tuesday, April 19, 1948:

Mr. President, members of the Red River Valley Improvement Association, and friends, Louisiana is the southern gateway in the extensive network of navigable waters composing the great Mississippi River system. This system joins the Gulf of Mexico with the Great Lakes, and extends—east and west—into the hearts of our greatest agricultural and industrial regions. Louisiana alone is traversed by the Gulf-Coastal Waterway which joins with the Atlantic-Coastal Waterway on the east, and with the Rio Grande Valley on the west. At New Orleans and at Baton Rouge, our State capital, which lies nearly 250 miles inland from the Gulf, are two of the Nation's finest seaports, and the port of Lake Charles is now rapidly moving to the front, so fine are the facilities of this region.

With these and many additional water resources, Louisiana has an active interest in the expressed aims and progressive endeavors of river and valley development. When I therefore urge in Washington continued efforts on behalf of a sound program of water resources development, I am able to promise to those people up there continued support from the people of Louisiana. I believe the Congress of the United States will also continue to work with you in the achievement of this objective. The Congress recognizes fully that the progressive development of our natural resources is a basic requirement in its duty to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the American people, as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution.

No phase of our national life manifests more clearly the American democratic procedure of accomplishment than does the Federal development and control of our water resources. For more than a century and a quarter, the Congress—as respresentatives of the people—has assigned this work to the Army engineers, who, in turn, work closely with the people in making the required studies of proposed improvements, and in constructing the authorized projects. During this long period, succeeding Congresses have relied upon the Corps of Engineers for engineering counsel and for the execution of all Federal rivers and harbors projects. In later years, Federal flood-control work has been added to these responsibilities, together with allied water uses. And the people have played their vital role in this work, generally through associations such as your own.

This has been a happy and historic relationship. It has contributed in large measure to the economic progress of the Nation in times of peace. It has been a vital contribution to victory in times of war. It has encouraged technical advances that have pioneered the entire field of civil and military engineering. And most importantly, it has preserved procedures that are as democratic as the American town meeting.

In the execution of its responsibilities, the Corps of Engineers has built up a decentralized organization that blankets the entire Nation. I believe that when records of brilliant accomplishments and outstanding services to the people of this country are made again and again, those responsible should be awarded high praise, vigorously defended, and maintained in the scheme of Government. Such records have been repeatedly performed by our Army engineers. Congress has depended upon them over the course of many years, and I think this confidence has been wisely placed. For the Corps of Engineers has demonstrated that its personnel is not only highly skilled, but also impartial and nonpolitical in arriving at solutions to our waterway problems. These attributes have won for the Army engineers the unquestioned confidence and appreciation of the American people.

Another thing we like about the Army engineers—a fact that is a constant comfort to the Congress and to the Nation—is that here is an organization performing—and I think performing well—its regularly assigned civil functions, yet stands ready to meet at a moment's notice the challenge of tragic emergency. Whether it is a Texas City explosion, a Gulf coast hurricane, a river flood emergency. or a western snow disaster—wherever catastrophe strikes at the safety of our people—there you will find the Corps of Engineers, getting the job done.

Such an emergency occurred only 2 weeks ago in this State. On Thursday, March 24, a break occurred in the Mississippi River main-line levee near Port Allen. By Saturday night, March 26, the crevasse had been closed by Army engineer crews, and another new record in flood fighting had been made by this organization, to the immense relief of thousands of our people living in the threatened area. To achieve this result, operations were conducted around-the-clock by more than 400 men, many working in water knee deep or worse. The break was closed by the construction of a 1,600-foot rock and sand-bag temporary levee. A temporary loop levee was also constructed as a reserve protection against the closure works. Immediately, the engineers started construction of a permanent main-line set-back levee.

Performances like these are the most remarkable because there was no pre-break mobilization. There had been no main-line failure on the lower Mississippi since 1927. A falling river, 172 feet deep at that point, had made an under-water attack against the leveed bank. The flood fight—which began after the bank and levee had caved into the Mississippi—had to start from scratch. Huge earth-moving equipment had to be moved into the area, together with supplies of rock, timber, sand and bags. Labor had to be recruited.

It was a semimilitary operation involving mobilization, transportation, supplies and technical know-how—all for the purpose of flood combat. Only Army engineer leadership could have done it sucessfully in so short a time. I want to pay tribute to Brig. Gen. Peter Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission, who flew to the scene as soon as word came of the break, and to all his fellow officers and civilian workers for their outstanding performance.

Emergencies such as these cannot be met without money. It was fortunate then—and it is a fortunate condition, generally—that the Army engineers held a reserve amount of unobligated funds, available for use in just such an emergency as the Port Allen levee break. Army engineers have the authority to act in times of a flood fight. Time, however, does not permit appearances before Congress for emergency funds. Some funds have to be there for use when the unexpected happens. And I am thoroughly in accord with the policy of the engineers in keeping a certain amount of money always available for the unexpected.

Break such as the one that occurred near Port Allen can be prevented only by bank stabilization projects—one of the most costly items in the entire flood-control undertaking. Because the lower Mississippi Valley flood-control appropriations have not been sufficient for a period of years, bank stabilization there is still being done on a patchwork basis. The Army engineers are financially unable to undertake the general stabilization program that the Congress authorized some years ago. It is a shortsighted policy, and it could result in more failures like that at Port Allen.

I am in favor of adequate appropriations by Congress for a vigorous prosecution of our water resources development program. In my opinion, it is false economy to reduce appropriations necessary for such urgently needed work. In the lower Mississippi, the world's mightiest river flows between hundreds of miles of great earthen embankments. Held within them, the river is a beneficent friend. Once it breaks out, it becomes one of the most destructive forces known to men.

The Red River Basin in itself constitutes a major problem for the Army engineers. This river, 1,300 miles in length, is one of the world's great streams. It rises in far-east Texas and traverses along the boundary lines of both Texas and Oklahoma, through the State of Arkansas, and flows through Louisiana in a southeastern direction to a confluence with the Atchafalaya River a few miles from the Mississippi in Avoyelles Parish, La. It is badly in need of further work.

In 1945 the record flood on the Red River occurred. I visited many places in the valley which had been flooded and to watch the strenuous effort to maintain the levee line in Louisiana from the Arkansas boundary to Alexandria. I saw the terrifying effects resulting from an uncontrolled stream, thousands of acres inundated, homes destroyed, cattle and poultry killed, and human life placed in grave jeopardy. It was a test of what can really happen in the Red River Valley unless flood control is pushed to the limit. The damages from that flood totaled $16,000,000.

Immediately after my tour over the flood-waters I flew back to Washington to preside over a meeting of Congressmen interested in flood control. At this meeting the Army engineers came forward and made suggestions. I introduced a resolution calling for an interim flood-control plan, and within a few weeks this plan had been filed in the Congress as a result of my resolution. Subsequently I led the fight in the House of Rep-

resentatives to have this plan approved, and now it is a basic law of this land. It calls for a total expenditure of seventy-seven and one-half million dollars for flood control in the Red River Valley Basin.

Operating under this interim plan, called for by my resolution, from year to year we are obtaining funds for the purpose of controlling the floodwaters of the Red River. Such projects as the Shreveport-Bossier revetment project; the big stabilization project from Denison south through Louisiana; the Bayou Bodcau project; Texas Dam project, and many other such projects, are receiving money and being constructed at the present time. As an objective, I have set the beginning of work on the Caddo Dam and Reservoir enlargement project, and the Cypress Creek project, and next year, together with able and vitally interested Congressmen, we hope to have the flood-control program in the valley further stepped up. As you know, the House of Representatives provided about $8,000,000 for this purpose, and we hope this amount will be further increased in the Senate. At this rate, we hope to see the main stem of the Red River protected from floods within the course of the next 5 to 10 years.

Of course, we must then take up the work on the tributaries and this alone constitutes a huge program. It is called the comprehensive flood-control program for Red River and when this program is reported to the Congress by the engineers, I will also begin work on it. I am glad to report to you today that the House of Representatives has given us $50,000 additional money for planning work on the Overton Red River lateral canal. This amount is in addition to the sum of $75,000 previously granted. Before the House of Representatives this year I did not make a fight to obtain construction funds. This was due to the fact that last year the Red River lateral canal had sustained a real set-back when the House committee recommended even against planning for this canal. We therefore were happy to be able to obtain additional planning money, knowing that this action took the black mark from the project which the Appropriations Committee in the Eightieth Congress had placed, and made it ready for the green light for construction money.

I hope the Senate will now act even more favorably than has the House acted. I shall continue to work for the construction of this great project which means so much for this four-State area. I shall continue to work for and fight for the further development of the Red River Valley with all its limitless possibilities and its unscratched resources. I believe the canal is practical and feasible and along with the Army engineers, I firmly believe that it should be constructed.

To strengthen our position in reference to an early construction of the Red River lateral canal, along with the president of your association, I appeared before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, asking that this great organization give a priority position to the construction of the canal. I am pleased to report that our project was one of the seven in the United States placed in this category.

I am interested in further development of Red River for navigation and have joined with my distinguished colleague from Texarkana, Tex., Mr. PATMAN, asking for approval of a resolution authorizing the study of Red River for navigation purposes to Texas, Arkansas, Jefferson, Tex., and other places. I hope that this study proceeds apace and that we will soon have a favorable report upon which we can work.

Mr. President, the possibilities of this program are so vast as to be almost limitless. We are opening up, with water transportation, a veritable empire in the Southwest. The present is seeing, and the years ahead will continue to see, development in this area beyond the dreams of our imaginations. It will see teeming millions of people brought into the Southwest; thousands of new farms opened up and placed in cultivation; hundreds of new industries brought in; and many villages growing into towns and towns growing into great cities. Naturally, I am enthused over this program, and I welcome the wholehearted support, cooperation, counsel, and advice of all our people, and especially of this great organization.

Congressional New York-West Point Tour May 6 to May 8, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, to date, nearly 200 Members of the Senate and House, together with members of their families, have accepted the invitation of Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York City, and Maj. Gen. B. E. Moore, superintendent of the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., to visit New York City and West Point this week end. The following program has been arranged:

SCHEDULE OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL VISIT

FRIDAY, MAY 6

5 p. m.: Arrive New York at Pennsylvania Station, proceeding by foot to New Yorker Hotel, Thirty-fourth Street and Eighth Avenue, immediately adjoining terminal.

6:30 p. m.: Leave New Yorker Hotel by Board of Transportation busses for buffet dinner at the Rainbow Room, sixty-fifth floor, RCA Building, Radio City, and for panoramic view of Manhattan Island.

7:30 p. m.: Move to studio 8H, National Broadcasting Co., same building, for Cities Service radio show.

8:45 p. m.: Leave RCA Building by bus for American Telephone & Telegraph Co. at 32 Avenue of the Americas, near Canal Street, to observe handling of telephone calls to all parts of the world.

9 p. m.: Tour of telephone building starts.

10 p. m.: Leave A. T. & T. Building for New Yorker Hotel.

Arrangements have been finalized for police guard at Pennsylvania Station, on Thirty-fourth Street, west of Eighth Avenue and north of Thirty-fourth Street. Arrangements have been finalized for police escort to accompany busses to Radio City, the telephone building, and return to Hotel New Yorker.

SATURDAY, MAY 7

8:30 a. m.: Leave New Yorker Hotel for bus tour of New York City, following an itinerary which is to include United Nations headquarters site, examples of city, State, and Federal housing, parks, bridges, arterial highways, and airport facilities.

11 a. m.: Arrive New York Stock Exchange, Wall Street, to observe trading on floor of the world's financial nerve center.

11:45 a. m.: Leave New York Stock Exchange for City Hall.

12 noon: Arrive at City Hall for reception by Mayor O'Dwyer and board of estimate in board of estimate chambers. Concert by the police department band and glee club will feature these short ceremonies.

12:20 p. m.: Leave City Hall for pier A to board the S. S. *John A. Meseck* for joint congressional tour of harbor as guests of the Port of New York Authority.

12:30 p. m.: Arrive pier A to board excursion steamer for tour of harbor. The cruise will feature escort by police, Navy, and Coast Guard patrol vessels, a "fly over" by 30 Navy aircraft, a Coast Guard helicopter and a New York Police Department plane. Luncheon will be served aboard the *Meseck* in the main dining salon. Other refreshments such as soft drinks, etc., will also be served. The Fire Department Glee Club will be aboard to entertain the party, as well as lecturers representing the Port of New York Authority, the city of New York, and several Federal agencies. The welcoming address will be made by Mr. Howard S. Cullman, chairman of the Port Authority.

4:30 p. m.: Arrive at pier 84, Hudson River, to disembark for return to New Yorker Hotel.

4:50 p. m.: Arrive New Yorker Hotel.

All required arrangements for police escort during morning sightseeing tour have been finalized. The Department of Sanitation, city of New York, will assign uniformed lecturers to each bus.

While it is felt that the congressional party may wish to be free during Saturday evening to see midtown New York on their own, we are providing approximately 200 tickets to radio shows for members and their families. The New York Convention and Visitors Bureau is also providing copy of the official Visitors Guide for each member of the party.

SUNDAY, MAY 8

9 a. m.: Leave Hotel New Yorker by charter bus for tour of United States Military Academy at West Point.

2:30 p. m.: Leave West Point by bus for return to Pennsylvania Station for entraining to Washington.

5:30 p. m.: Leave New York from Pennsylvania Station by train for Washington.

Arrangements have been finalized through Police Commissioner William P. O'Brien for motorcyle escort by members of his force to the city line where the motorcade will be picked up by State troopers for the remainder of the trip to West Point. This procedure will be reversed on the return trip.

Tickets covering round-trip railroad fare, two nights at the Hotel New Yorker, all meals, baggage transfer and tips, may be purchased Wednesday and Thursday at the office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

The committee in charge of the trip has the assurance of Speaker RAYBURN and Majority Leader MCCORMACK that there will be no important business scheduled for Friday, and that the House will not be in session on Saturday.

If you have not yet made your reservations, please call Representative VAN ZANDT'S office, telephone extension 366.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when a friend is in trouble we are all most sympathetic toward him; when a friend is attacked and beaten down we are moved to rush to his aid; but when a friend is attacked and beaten down, perhaps through our own negligence or by our act unbecoming a friend, we are bewildered and apt to be more than a little

ashamed. Today a friend of our country has been attacked, beaten down, and humiliated, and we are accused of having aided in his humiliation.

The people of Poland, like our own people, are lovers of liberty. It was on the 3d of May in 1791 that Poland adopted its constitution, modeled largely after our own Constitution, and it is today, 158 years later, that this gallant country, overrun by the godless, alien philosophy of communism, and ground under the tyrant's heel, is celebrating its anniversary of freedom. Lovers of freedom everywhere in the world are proud of Poland's determination to continue its fight for those precious things that freedom alone can bring. It is not only the duty and obligation of our country to aid in every way possible, but indeed it is our privilege.

There is no doubt that Poland will rise again, and it is my earnest hope that its resurrection will be hastened by the active assistance of the United States of America. Thereby we may redeem ourselves for any past negligence on our part that contributed to its slavery, and we may have the satisfaction of helping a gallant, unconquerable people, imbued with the spirit of truth, honor, and spiritual integrity.

Curtailment of Alcoholic Liquor Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NEVADA, MO., *April 29, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, are very anxious for the following bills to be passed and hope you will see fit to vote for their passage.

The bills are:

1. H. R. 2428, the Bryson bill, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce and stop its broadcasting over the air.

2. H. R. 3114, the Rees bill, to prohibit alcoholic beverages in and around military establishments.

3. House Joint Resolution 151, the Bryson amendment, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, or possession of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent of alcohol by volume.

4. H. R. 886, the Pace bill, to take beer out of the camps, and alcohol, prostitution, and gambling out of their vicinity.

Hoping you see as we do on these vital bills, we are:

Mrs. Mabel C. Flagor, Mrs. Blanche, Margaret Kamm, Mrs. Annis Thurston, Mrs. Emma Gould, Mrs. H. L. Windler, Mrs. M. L. Packer, Mrs. Teske Speece, Mrs. Roy Mabry, Mrs. Geo. Wilhelmson, Mrs. Herman Koehler Francis, Mrs. L. S. Ware.

MAY 2, 1949.

Mrs. MABEL C. FLEGOR,
Nevada, Mo.

DEAR MRS. FLEGOR: Your letter of April 29 came to my attention this morning and I note that it is signed by several Nevada ladies. I am glad to get your letter and to have your views on the subject. I would be glad to lend my influence at any time to prohibit the further inroads of intoxicating liquors on the morals and integrity of our citizens. The bills mentioned will receive my support when they come to the floor of the House. I realize that liquor is doing a tremendous lot of damage but it seems like the human race has never been content to do without the use of things of that description. Personally, it doesn't worry me and never did because I never became addicted to the use of it but I am glad to lend my influence at any time to help curtail the traffic.

Again thanking you and the other ladies for the nice letter, and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
Member of Congress.

Air Force Secretary Symington Urges Enactment of Legislation To Encourage Construction of Housing in Areas Adjacent to Military and Naval Installations—Make Smyrna Air Base a Permanent Installation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there exist very pressing reasons why our National Military Establishment feels that the early passage of adequate housing legislation is greatly needed. First, there exists a moral problem that seriously bears upon the effectiveness of our defense efforts; secondly, our defense establishment is having much difficulty in acquiring the type and kind of personnel needed; and thirdly, our services are having equal difficulty in keeping those that they do induce into the services. Adequate and proper housing on or near military establishments will go a long way toward solving these problems.

Within the Fifth District of Tennessee, the district which I have the honor to represent, there is situated a large and modern and extensive Air Force installation—the Smyrna Air Base. This base should be made a permanent Air Force installation. Proper housing accommodations on the base or in the cities of Smyrna and Murfreesboro nearby is needed. Passage of legislation pending in the Senate will greatly improve the situation and serve to insure that Smyrna Air Base be made a permanent installation. In this connection, I have today introduced in the House a companion bill to the measure pending in the Senate to encourage the construction of rental housing in areas adjacent to naval and military installations.

I desire to include in the RECORD the statement which Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, recently made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee concerning this pending and needed legislation. The statement of Secretary Symington is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee on behalf of the National Military Establishment in support of this legislation to provide homes for our military personnel.

The National Military Establishment considers that the enactment of this legislation is essential to the continued efficiency of the armed services. Present housing facilities for military and civilian personnel of the National Military Establishment are so totally inadequate in numbers as to fail utterly in meeting the demands. This proposed legislation would greatly stimulate construction by private enterprise of housing units needed by the National Military Establishment.

In order to attract and hold the highly trained, experienced and technical personnel now required by the Departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, it is essential that this personnel be afforded an opportunity to live comfortable and normal lives insofar as military duty permits on a reasonable parity with the average American citizen. Most of them do not now have this privilege.

For example, in my travels to various bases, some of the conditions we have found are almost unbelievable. At Mather Field, Calif., families are living in converted barracks-type buildings where it is necessary to use community bath and cooking facilities. The same applies to Mitchel Field, N. Y. At Chanute Field, Ill., there are several families living in a converted mid-Victorian house where only outside toilets are available. I could name many more specific examples of which the above are typical.

By the very nature of the service, military personnel must be always on order. They must proceed to designated places at designated times for varying durations. As a result, they are considered transient to whatever community in which they currently reside. Under the terms of the existing National Housing Act transients are not considered sound business risks for housing. Many of our people are unable to find quarters at all. Others are forced into slum areas or make-shift dwellings too inadequate to have been considered a part of the available and livable housing facilities of the community in the first place. Moreover, any adequate accommodations that may be available command a price far beyond their means. With the enactment of this legislation, we intend to give priority to caring for the need of quarters for junior officers and noncommissioned officers who are most affected by these conditions.

The result of this situation on the effectiveness of our armed forces is incalculable. Separated families and squalid living conditions combine to produce very poor morale. The resulting problems of replacement and excessive training costs seriously jeopardize the effectiveness of our efforts to provide adequately for the defense of the Nation. The same housing difficulty also greatly retards our efforts for personnel procurement.

In short, Mr. Chairman, there are three very pressing reasons why the National Military Establishment feels that this legislation is urgently needed. First, there exists a morale problem that seriously bears upon the effectiveness of our defense measures. Second, we are having grave difficulty in acquiring the personnel that we need; and third, we are having equal difficulty in keeping those that we do get. Modern warfare demands a much higher percentage of qualified specialists than at any time in the past. Such men, stable and serious as a class, are deeply interested in their homes and families. They are also amply qualified to succeed in civilian life. It is these men, the ones we need most, that we cannot attract or expect to keep if military careers prove a handicap in providing adequate homes for their families.

The housing erected as a result of this legislation would not alone solve our entire housing problem any more than adequate housing alone would suffice to attract into service the number of competent engineers and technicians that are urgently needed. The measure being considered today, however, is designed to provide immediate relief. The basic requirement is, of course, for the erection of a sufficient number of adequate public quarters to house all military personnel. This is also a long-range requirement, the fulfillment of which is of necessity a lengthy process. But the problem is immediate and pressing. This legislation would operate, in the shortest possible time, to provide an invaluable aid in easing this grave difficulty.

This plan has the approval of the entire National Military Establishment. The Federal Housing Administration will suggest certain technical amendments and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that the objectives of this legislation with the proposed amendments should be considered in accord with the program of the President.

United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1949, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Star of April 27, written by Faiz El-Khouri, Minister of Syria. Despite the source of the letter I feel it my duty to assert as vigorously as possible that it contains serious misstatements of fact which at a time when efforts are being made to establish permanent peace in the Holy Land had better have been left unsaid. It is true that the Arabs and Jews were living as brothers in Palestine at one time. They are living as brothers today in the state of Israel and they would be living as brothers today all through Palestine if it were not for sinister and unholy pressures. I speak from personal knowledge, having viewed these things with my own eyes and having heard them with my own ears, not from Jews but from Arabs.

The following letter which appeared in the Washington Star of April 30, 1949, written by Harry Zinder, is a complete answer to that of the Minister of Syria:

DIFFERS WITH SYRIAN MINISTER ON USES OF UNITED JEWISH APPEAL MONEY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I think in the interest of accuracy and honesty it is necessary for me to point out one or two facts which have been misrepresented in the letter written to you by the Minister of Syria, Faiz El-Khouri.

Not a single penny of the money collected by the United Jewish Appeal goes to the government of Israel for the maintenance of its administrative services. The money collected through this appeal is used to bring immigrants to the state of Israel from the DP camps and other places in Europe and from north Africa and is disbursed through agencies especially set up for that purpose. The money is also used to see to it that these people are settled on the land or in business and become useful citizens of the state. It is the taxpayers of the state of Israel who contribute all the necessary funds for the administration of the government of Israel, including its armed forces. Thus, in addition to having fought in the front lines and having been on a wartime footing for over a year as a result of willful aggression by the Arab states, including the Syrian Minister's own country, they are also contributing of their material wealth to see to it that the state continues to function in a democratic and progressive way.

HARRY ZINDER,
Press Adviser, Embassy of Israel.

If the Syrian officials will devote themselves to improving the conditions of their own people they might stir up enough sympathy here so that Americans will contribute to that work as they are doing to similar work in the state of Israel.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley Act contains all the inhibitions and restrictions against labor that the Republican National Committee could purchase for $7,500.

Even though I didn't know anything about the Lesinski bill, I would be assured of its value to laboring men, after I heard the flaming, ardent liberal from Virginia describing it as reactionary.

And if this was not sufficient, I would be more than assured when I heard peons of praise heaped upon the gentleman from New York, by the great Republican from Michigan, when the New York gentleman offered an amendment to the Wood bill, that the Taft-Hartleyites thought would aid in the defeat of the Lesinski bill.

I am only sorry the gentleman spoiled his great laudation by closing his address with insinuations that the gentleman from New York is a Communist.

It certainly recalls the old political aphorism that politics makes strange bedfellows.

Another thing that has aroused my suspicion of the attacks on the Lesinski bill is the constant contention of opposition that the Taft-Hartley bill is a great measure, enacted entirely to benefit the workingman; that it has brought peace and contentment to the labor world.

That it is the greatest labor law ever conceived by the mind of man, and then end up on the sour note that the opposition are all for the Wood bill.

If the Taft-Hartley bill is all they say, how can they desert it and let it sink into oblivion and shout in unison, "We are all for the Wood bill"?

Not all employers of labor oppose the right of their workingmen to join a union, nor do they refuse to bargain about wage and working conditions with such unions.

We have been proceeding here as if all labor were on one side, and all employers lined up on the other, battling or ready to battle to death, for the privilege of writing and dictating all labor contracts.

This is not true, for many great industries recognize and welcome union labor with complete confidence, not only in contracting for wages and working conditions, but depend on the aid of their employees in every matter that affects their trade and industry.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; ever since the advent of union labor the pottery-industry organizations advise their employees to become good union members. In this atmosphere of good will there is no trade or industry that has enjoyed friendship and peace like the pottery industry of America. This industry never could understand the continued opposition of the steel and coal industries to the unions of their employees.

I hold in my hand a letter received concerning this legislation from Mr. J. M. Wells, chairman of the labor committee of the United States Potters Association, which reads as follows:

We have dealt collectively with the Pottery Workers Union on an industry-wide basis for more than 50 years, and have had only one strike of a few weeks' duration more than 25 years ago.

Neither the Wagner Act nor the Taft-Hartley Act had the least particle of influence on our labor relations. We continued to conduct our collective bargaining exactly as we had in the past, and no provisions of our wage agreement were changed under either act.

This amendment not only repudiates the Democratic Party and its solemn pledges made in convention, but it will take Taft off the hook. At least its adoption will be a fine recommendation by the Democrats for the Republican policies of the last session of Congress, and an admission by the Democrats that they were faking and insincere in their promises during the last campaign.

Today we are about to try the case of this unwanted child of Taft-Hartley. Are we going to send it back to its parents, only to adopt its twin, that is even worse and more despised by labor, who will be compelled to live and work under its banal and hateful restrictions?

Those who hope to change the name of this despised labor control bill must believe that if such change is made, that the people will forget its conception and birth.

They hope the people will forget that the real father of the Taft-Hartley law was paid $7,500 as a doctor fee for his attendance at this event. They also hope by the mere change of name that the people will also forget the great celebration that attended its birth when the NAM and its golden lobby sang its praises and took credit for its origin and passage.

Those who love little "TAFTIE" are now shouting to us "Please—Mr. Congress, pass the Wood amendment and get Mr. TAFT off the spot. This will only be a change of name and will preserve the Taft-Hartley Act with its full intent and purpose."

They also tell us "they hate any and all Government controls, but we must keep the Taft-Hartley controls over labor."

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood proposal remove all Federal statutes that have been passed by Congress to protect labor from restrictive court orders.

The Taft-Hartley Act is and was intended to extend governmental dictation over all contracts between unions and employers.

The first reactionary Congress since 1932 reverted to true type and repealed the Wagner Act, because this act refused to regard labor as a chattel to be used in barter and control. It was the first victim of reaction. Labor's rights were doomed from the first day of control of Congress by the NAM.

Fairness and justice for labor; the vision of future yellow-dog contracts; the right of labor to strike; the right even to join a union—all were forgotten and placed at the mercy of a court injunction, for the sole purpose of destroying the right of labor to secure fair labor contracts, and to participate in the election of their choice of representation in the Halls of Congress.

If we are to have either the Taft-Hartley or the Wood amendment written into our statutes, let every opponent of bureaucracy who votes today to support them, forever hold his peace, because he will have fully shown by his vote that he hates the rights of labor to battle for a fair wage and honest working conditions, far more than he hates Government dictation.

Under either of these proposed statutes, no laboring-man's rights are safe, nor can his liberty be secure, when their arbitrary powers are invested in Denham as general counsel for the Board, with authority to defy the Labor Board and ignore the rights of the laboring man.

The Taft-Hartley Act and its reincarnation—the Wood amendment—both deny to labor and their employers the right for a complete union shop.

The cardinal sin of both these proposals is that it restores complete and absolute judicial control over labor disputes.

It compels all union leaders to deny they are Communists, without any reason or cause to suspect their loyalty to their Government.

To those who desire to control labor by the use of court injunctions, let me call to their attention the sufferings that attended the warding of injunctions in labor disputes, in the good old days, when labor was under the absolute control of the courts. Perhaps some like Senator TAFT and his followers desire to return to slave labor of these golden days of labor injunctions, but I can assure you this is not the desire of those who must labor for their living.

During the days of labor control by injunctions, men were killed or wounded, because they dare admit they were members of a labor union.

During the injunction reign, Fanny Sellins, a labor leader, was shot in the back and killed in the great manufacturing State of Pennsylvania, by coal and iron police, because she was walking in the streets of a mining town, claimed by the mining company to be privately owned property.

Under this defense of sovereignty, no law violator was ever brought to justice for the perpetration of this crime, yet this was only one of hundreds of such instances that occurred in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the records are barren of any successful prosecution for murder committed under the defense of violation of injunctive order, even to this day.

I think we can at least see stormy times in the future, if the Taft-Hartley law is not repealed. If we wish to take precautions against these stormy times, you know it is best to push legislation in quiet times, and reform the abuses of the Taft-Hartley Act now.

I do not believe Congress realizes the great danger that threatens labor in the injunction proviso of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It certainly can be used to prevent their right to negotiate contracts on behalf of their members, and their right to strike in order to enforce reasonable contracts on behalf of workers.

Injunctions and injunctive powers alone, kept the membership of all national labor unions to less than four million, until the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts. Since then, in less than 10 years, the membership of labor unions has increased to fourteen millions.

This alone should be a notice to beware of the Taft-Hartley Act for all those who believe in the rights of labor to organize for the protection of their working interests.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, injunctions will again be a weapon to be used by those who hate all efforts that give labor a voice in their own interests, to organize and bargain under contract for wages and hours of work.

As early as 1914, it was admitted by Congress that there should and must be restraints on the power of courts to grant injunctions in labor disputes between employer and employee.

To limit this power, Congress passed the Shield-Clayton Act, now found in United States Code, title 29, section 52, and our courts have construed this act to mean that orderly and peaceful strikes, involving, or as growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment, are protected from prosecution under section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

I assume all Members of Congress are familiar with the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law, but I wonder if they are aware that the author was John W. Davis, an outstanding, able, and eloquent lawyer, and Member of Congress. This law was enacted to protect union labor against court orders in injunction cases, and from outlawing them under the terms of the conspiracy provision of the Antitrust Act.

In 1912, Mr. Davis on the floor of the House, in support of the Shield-Clayton Act said:

> Injunction has been carelessly used. It has been turned to purposes beyond its proper scope.
>
> I denounce as a libel upon American citizenship the assertion that the laboring men of the country are ready at the word to break into lawlessness, or that they sympathize with those who do.
>
> Let us see to it here and now that no pretext hereafter shall remain to him.

In the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Wagner Act, Congress saw to it that labor had no just right of complaint, until the sad day when labor, secure in the belief that no person elected to Congress would ever dare vote away their legal rights, went to sleep; refused to go to the polls and vote for their friends. This by default permitted the election of men to Congress, who for a generation had fought to destroy all legislation that recognized the right of labor to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, mutual aid, and protection, without being regarded as conspirators against their government.

Then came the blow. The first reactionary Congress since 1932 reverted to true type and repealed the Wagner law, because it refused to regard labor as a chattel to be used in barter and control. And in order to restore the "yellow dog" contract, they gave us the Taft-Hartley bill, which restores government by injunction and reduces the dignity of labor to that of a chattel to be bought in the markets of exchange like cattle being led to the slaughter.

Fairness and justice for labor "yellow dog" contracts—the right to strike, even to join a union—all were forgotten in an effort to destroy the power of labor to force fair labor contracts and to study political conditions and records of their Representatives in Congress.

The crimes committed against labor by the abuse of injunctions will never be forgotten, so long as the sordid story of persecutions continues to appear in the volumes of case reports and the histories of labor disputes, reported from 1900 to 1930.

It is the opinion of the average laboring man that the Taft-Hartley law has proven to be a bonanza for lawyers; a fear of loss of job; or a cut in wages and longer hours of employment for the workingmen, who fear and hate injunctions.

Those who remember the jail sentences, starvation, and loss of employment that followed its wake in the "good old days," fear it means the end and destruction of organized labor.

Ever since the Taft-Hartley Act became effective the 90,000 members of the typographical union have been continuously bedeviled by litigation. Every union man knows the same can happen to his craft and his union until it is no more.

Of course, the obvious object of these injunction cases is to break the union, so that men may be employed by dictation, without contract bearing on wages and working conditions. The workingmen of America have not been fooled by the support of this measure by the Eightieth Congress. The vote of 1948, if it proves anything at all, proves that American labor hates and fears the Taft-Hartley Act.

INJUNCTIONS IN NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

To grant to every employer of labor the right to secure injunctions in strikes that may be declared national emergencies, is of course empowering every injunctive-minded judge of the Federal courts to issue injunctions for the purpose of breaking every strike. In granting the

injunctions the court can hold also that such strike is interfering with, or affects, interstate commerce.

With such powers must go the correlative power that whenever any employer of labor refuses to recognize the right of his employees to join any national labor union, or refuses to meet with representatives of labor to bargain about any point of dispute between employer and employee, or refuses to agree and comply with any order of a Federal labor board, then the Government may take over the operation of such business, until the orders of said labor board may be agreed to and complied with.

I am sure no business or laboring man—be he manager or employee—is willing to submit that the business of this country be placed under Government controls and restrictions. But if we insist on such holdings over labor, then Government controls must in fairness be set up—or business will again hold sway and labor again will become a mere commodity to be used and cast aside at will.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Sunday, April 10, carried a most interesting story on the development of the International Ladies Garment Workers' famous health center in New York, where members of the union and their families get the best medical care under a voluntary insurance plan worked out by the union and employers.

Some of the best voluntary health-insurance plans in this country are such programs resulting from collective bargaining between employers and employees. They are far better, on the average, than the voluntary insurance plans available to others. Nevertheless, good as they are, they fall short of what the unions and their members want.

It is significant that the International Ladies Garment Workers, and other unions mentioned in this article, support President Truman's national health-insurance legislation. Although they have better protection than most Americans can obtain today through voluntary insurance, they realize the only real answer to the problem is compulsory, Nation-wide health insurance.

The workers, however, should forcefully tell their doctors, druggists, insurance agents—yes, even their pastors—about their preference and desire for a genuine health-insurance plan else there is danger that the combined opposition welded together by the $3,500,000 slush fund of the American Medical Association plus the wealth and power of unfriendly industrialists and insurance companies will stifle the efforts of the friends of the legislation in Congress, and the plan will be killed.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1949]

UNION'S HEALTH CENTER HERE MODEL OF AID TO WORKERS—ILGWU PROJECT ESTABLISHED 36 YEARS AGO TO FIGHT SWEATSHOP ILLS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In 1910 the women's garment district in New York was centered in the narrow streets of the East Side. The majority of the factories were in dirty, wooden walkups, with splintered and sagging floors. A wood-burning stove in the middle of the room provided the only heat in the winter, and the constantly burning gas jets made the already humid atmosphere intolerable in the summer. In this environment of disease and ill health, the sound of the tubercular cough was almost as familiar as the whir of the sewing machines, for 3 percent of the workers were tuberculous.

As a result of the historic strikes of 1909–1910 and 1910–11 against these sweat-shop conditions, a Joint Board of Sanitary Control was made up of members of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the manufacturers and such eminent public citizens as Hamilton Holt, Lillian Wald, Louis Marshall, and Meyer London.

After their activities for the improvement of working conditions in the trade, the ILGWU in 1913 established a small health center with Dr. George M. Price, a member of this board, as its director. The quarters consisted of an office of 300 square feet of floor space. The staff included, in addition to Dr. Price, a part-time physician, a nurse, and a clerk. The equipment consisted almost entirely of the traditional physician's "black bag."

FOUR HUNDRED AND TEN THOUSAND VISITS IN YEAR

A few weeks ago, ceremonies were held, attended by leaders in Government, medicine, management and labor, marking the expansion of the Union Health Center. Now occupying six floors of a modern union-owned skyscraper at 215 Seventh Avenue, the health center has a staff of 148 physicians, 35 nurses, 5 pharmacists, 27 technicians, and 150 clerical workers. It is an example of the frequently-repeated philosophy of David Dubinsky, its president, that the ILGWU is concerned not only with wages and hours but with the better things of life, such as health and recreation.

Last year, 410,000 visits were made by 68,000 individuals to the center's 51 examining rooms, 22 physical therapy units, 8 X-ray units, and other clinical, diagnostic, and therapeutic services. Largely in the off-work hours after 4 p. m., its resident medical staff, with the aid of a visiting staff of 66 general medical examiners and 68 medical specialists, gave services to an average of 1,300 patients a day in the allergy, arthritis, ear, nose and throat, eye, social hygiene, chest X-ray, general medical, laboratory, X-ray, electrocardiography, and physical therapy clinics.

The excellent nutrition department gave down-to-earth advice on diets, in terms of both need and budget, to 2,000 patients, the social service department assisted 1,300 patients with family, personal, and medical problems, and the drug department filled 100,000 prescriptions.

Aside from the sheer numbers to whom it brings medical services, one of the most impressive factors of the center is the administrative organization devised by Dr. Leo Price, son of the center's founder and the present medical director. For example, each patient carries a metal identification plate similar to those used for department store charge accounts, so that the physician can stamp it on the various records, thus saving time. Each patient also carries a book of stamps issued by his local union entitling him to an average of $30 in medical services during a year.

HEALTH CENTER PATTERN

When a patient comes to the center, a stamp is removed from the booklet and affixed to a detachable section of his clinical record, so that it can be forwarded later to the local union for reimbursement to the center.

Throughout the organization, the mechanical aspects of administration are streamlined, but great care is taken to avoid the loss of the patient-doctor relationship.

Although its services today are a far cry from those of 1913, the center's original charge of $1 a visit has not varied greatly. Today, 85 percent of the services are rendered at $1 or less. Of its nearly $1,000,000 budget in 1948, 82 percent came from fees paid in behalf of the membership by ILGWU local health funds built from employer payments in accordance with union contracts. The remainder came from cash fees paid by patients.

The Union Health Center is not only a singular success from the standpoint of the 200,000 members who benefit from its services, but it has served as an example for similar plans for ILGWU affiliates ranging from Shamokin, Pa., to San Antonio, Tex.

The United Automobile Workers in Detroit also has a plan for limited diagnostic services, and a Labor Health Institute recently was started in St. Louis under the auspices of the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees. Financed entirely by management, the St. Louis plan envisages complete medical care to union members and their dependents. Most recent of the newly started programs is that of the health and welfare retirement fund of the United Mine Workers of America, which thus far has purchased medical care for its beneficiaries from existing hospitals and medical services.

Rather than operate their own medical services, however, most unions providing medical benefits for their members utilize an insurance plan. Illustrative of such groups is the Amalgamated Life Insurance Co., an affiliate of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, which, in its first 5 years of operation, paid out accident and health benefits amounting to $7,165,594 to 107,105 members. Following the pattern of the ILGWU, Amalgamated now is planning a $1,000,000 health center to be situated at 14 East Sixteenth Street, and to be named in honor of the late Sidney Hillman. A similar center is being planned also by the New York Trade Council and the New York Hotel Association.

In most instances unions participate in voluntary health-insurance plans either through commercial indemnity plans or through groups like the health-insurance plan of New York. Under industry-wide welfare funds, the health-insurance plan of New York is providing medical services to 6,000 members of the Painters Union District Council 9; to 4,500 members of the Chefs and Cooks Union Local 89; to 1,600 members of the Luggage Workers Local 60; and to 1,800 members of the Sheet Metal Workers Local 28. A fifth group, the Ornamental Iron Workers Local 580, has arranged to provide health-insurance benefits to its 700 members, beginning in May. Under this plan members of the unions covered receive medical services from any one of the 26 health insurance plan's medical groups in New York.

The great advances made during the last few years in labor's interest and contribution to the health of their workers must be given serious consideration in any long-range planning for the Nation's health.

FHA to Insure Mortgages on "Mixed" Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Post on May 2, 1949:

FHA TO INSURE MORTGAGES ON MIXED COOPERATIVES

(By Charles Abrams)

Franklin D. Richards, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, said today FHA is ready to insure mortgages on cooperative housing projects of mixed racial occupancy.

This Federal agency, which has long encouraged racial segregation in housing and even provides sample restrictive covenants for builders, has been steadily modifying its policies under pressure from racial and civil-rights groups.

Its willingness to insure mortgages on mixed cooperatives is the most recent development.

On December 6, 1948, I published a letter from Assistant FHA Commissioner W. T. Lockwood to James Cassels, secretary of the National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association. Lockwood said that "FHA has never insured a housing project of mixed occupancy" and then ventured "the unofficial and informal statement that we believe that such projects would probably in a short period become all Negro or all white."

My article citing the FHA policy was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Negro and cooperative organizations attacked the accuracy of FHA's policy.

Today Richards said Lockwood's letter had been misinterpreted. "If the sponsors of any cooperative want to have a mixed project," he said, "no regulations, rules, procedures, or internal thinking or policy by anybody within the FHA prevents our giving Federal insurance for such projects. We have in fact already undertaken to insure Bell Park Gardens and another project in New Jersey."

Bell Park Gardens in Queens is subject to a city ordinance barring discrimination in tax-exempt projects, but its sponsors have said no eligible Negroes have yet applied for apartments.

In New York, $30,000,000 of investments have recently been made by insurance companies, savings banks and cooperators in nondiscriminatory projects. These investors have found that in large projects that create their own environment, the presence of some Negroes or other minorities does not hazard the investment. On the contrary, the racial character of the occupancy is stabilized. It is not the same as ordinary neighborhoods of small, separately held parcels where racial infiltrations have caused mass shifts in the composition of the neighborhoods.

Here and in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Los Angeles, public housing projects have successfully mixed their occupancy for more than a decade. Many war projects for higher income groups followed the policy and now private companies have invested millions on the basis of the experience.

The initial impetus for private investment in mixed projects came from the Mutual Life Insurance Co. and the Bowery Savings Bank, who were willing to invest up to 80 percent of project cost without Federal insurance.

Abraham Kazan, director of Amalgamated Houses, has said that so far he has received only three applications from Negro families, and the experience in other projects is that too few Negro families apply. Many members of minority races prefer to live with their own people.

"One Negro family has moved into the downtown project and has been living there for about a month," said Kazan, "and if more eligible Negro families apply we would definitely accept them. Every one of the cooperators knows that the property is subject to the nondiscrimination ordinance," he said, and "the Mutual Life Insurance Co. and Bowery Savings Bank also know that. It has not deterred either financing or investment by either the lending institutions or the cooperators."

Interest rates on the mortgage loans are 3 percent, indicating that the lending institutions consider the investment a prime mortgage security. Kazan said "Not one of the 2,500 tenants has ever objected to the nondiscrimination policy and all of them have been willing to pay $600 per room in purchasing their interest in the project."

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the many hours of debate on the revision of the National Labor Relations Act. Some of it has been constructive, but all too much of it has been punctuated with appeals to prejudice, name calling, warnings of political extinction, and threats to the use of the patronage club. As a physician, I have at times been frankly worried because of the agitation of some of my colleagues whose blood pressure, under their emotional strain, must rise to a dangerous point. All this has obscured the real purpose of passing legislation to cure the evils that have arisen in the conduct of labor-management relations. We must not lose sight of the fact that our purpose is to set up rules for the conduct of collective-bargaining negotiations so they will result to the benefit of the laboring man and at the same time not be harmful to the whole people. This legislation is one of the most important problems from a domestic standpoint that is to come before the Congress. I know it is difficult to strike a happy balance between labor and management and to act in the best interests of the people. I deeply respect the differences of opinion. I question no one's motives. Only by free and open discussion can we explore the many sides of this question and then write legislation which will be fair.

Now as to my attitude on a labor-management law. I am not wedded to the present legislation. I do not think it was as good as its proponents claimed it was, and certainly not as bad as its opponents pictured it. The labor organizations have made the Taft-Hartley law a fetish and are determined to wipe out all reference to its name. I have no objections to that, but I am certain that many of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law must be incorporated into any new legislation. I did say, 2 years ago, when the bill was under consideration, that if after several years' experience, I found it needed amendments, I would support those changes. I am convinced that certain amendments are needed to keep the bill more in balance, not only to meet the public demands but for better relations between labor and management. I believe this Congress can write a fair labor bill, with a common-sense approach which will bring long industrial peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting those amendments to the Wood bill, some of them which labor leaders wanted, and some requested by management. I believe these amendments are in the interest of the public and the workingman.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the President and his leaders coming before this intelligent body of Representatives and demanding that all provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill be wiped out and that the old one-sided Wagner Act be reinstated. That was their first demand.

All the letters coming to my desk from the labor leaders and inspired from that source demands not one single amendment be permitted to the administration's Lesinski bill. I am sure the administration and the labor leaders must know this is impossible.

Two years ago, after extended hearings, both Houses of Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act of 1947. It was passed over the veto of the President. More than 300 Members of Congress—both Republicans and Democrats, voted for the law. The Congress set up a watchdog committee to study the workings of the law and to make recommendations. These recommendations are now being adopted in the so-called Woods amendment to the Lesinski bill. I expect to support those amendments. If the Woods amendment fails, I expect to support amendments to the administration's bill which will be in the interest of the public and the workingman. I understand now that the administration is asking for five or six amendments to the Lesinski bill. If the amendments are good, I will support them, and when the final bill is completed, if, in my opinion, it is better than the old Taft-Hartley law, then I am willing to support the measure. If it is not, I shall vote against the Lesinski bill, with the hopes that we can retain the present labor-management legislation.

This present law is not bad legislation despite all the hue and the cries from the labor bosses that it was a slave-labor bill, and labor was being given a death blow. All checks on public opinion show that the individual workmen, union and nonunion alike are not opposed to provisions of the act and none of them feel in the bonds of slavery. I have taken several polls of my district, and they indicate overwhelmingly their approval of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

I have always maintained an attitude of willingness to vote for changes that would benefit the laboring man and the public. In contrast, the President, until today, has demanded outright repeal of the law and a return to the old, one-sided Wagner Labor Relations Act.

When they reported the bill, they asked for a closed rule, so there would be no chance for the Members of Congress to consider amendments. Such a procedure seems unfair to an intelligent group of men trying to work their will and write good legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the President himself, when the railroad strike threatened to paralyze the Nation, appeared personally before Congress and asked for most drastic legislation—that of drafting the railroad workers into the armed forces. I supported the President at that time because a war was on and the President said it was necessary. I think my vote at that time was a mistake, and fortunately the other body did not act upon such drastic legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there have been only two men who have been able to turn the lights out on the Capitol dome. One was the German paperhanger, who we hope died an inglorious death in the ruins of the Reich Chancellery. The other was John L. Lewis. Not only did he turn the lights out on the Capitol dome, but he caused many a brown-out all over this country. Now certainly any labor-management law must carry some provision which will prevent any one individual or single group from paralyzing the economy of our great Nation.

In my opinion we should adopt the amended Woods bill, or place similar amendments in the Lesinski bill. These changes are in the interest of the public and the laboring man. It will continue to give the laboring man more privileges than he ever had before.

Several Democratic Congresses have adopted amendments to the original Wagner Act because they were needed. I cannot believe that we supported the original Taft-Hartley Act, and you Democrats who supported amendments to the Wagner Act, will not want to throw it all into the ashcan and go back to a measure which experience has shown was not in the best interest of the public or the workingman.

I presume the bill which will finally pass the Congress will not satisfy all of us in several details, but it should be the considered, honest judgment of every Member. Certainly the mistakes I make will be of the head and not of the heart.

My entire approach to the whole subject of labor-management legislation has been on the grounds of what is best, first for the public and then for the man in the ranks of union organization who must work and make a living for his wife and family. What is good for these two groups is good for big business and big labor.

I am not interested in the partisan and gigantic selfish struggle between labor and management who seek to gain advantages for themselves. Both are selfish and want unfair advantages over the other. I hope that Members of Congress can lay aside their extreme partisan views and some explosive statements, and settle down to a calm, reasonable consideration in order to write constructive and progressive labor legislation.

Lone Star Steel Co. Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Tyler Courier-Times Telegraph, May 1, 1949.

Incidentally, I wish to point out that very recently a Tyler citizen, Mr. C. E. Owen, was selected as the chairman of the board of the Lone Star Steel Co. Mr. Owen is a very competent, successful and outstanding businessman. His broad business experience from the time of his humble initial efforts to his more recent impressive attainments fits him ideally to lead the destinies of the Lone Star Steel Co. at this very important time.

Indeed, the editorial clearly and succinctly emphasizes the significance and importance to the great Southwest, as well as to the Nation itself, of the expansion of the Lone Star Steel Co. In the interest of national defense alone, the development of our iron-ore resources in east Texas is justifiable.

I quote for emphasis a part of the editorial at this point:

> East Texas asks for no gift of any kind. It merely asks the RFC to make a safe business loan at a profitable rate of interest.

I believe, from information I have received about the prospective loan, this to be true. It is my hope the authorities of the RFC will give immediate consideration to the approval of this loan.

The editorial follows:

RFC SHOULD APPROVE LONE STAR STEEL LOAN

There is before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at this time an application of the Lone Star Steel Co. for a loan of $75,000,000, with which to build at its Daingerfield plant a steel mill which will produce plate steel and pipe. The original plant has been turning out high-grade pig iron for some time.

Pushing this loan through as early as possible is a matter of urgent concern for the stockholders and directors of this independent Texas-owned industrial concern. It likewise is a matter of much importance to every citizen of east Texas and of the Southwest. With the loan, the Lone Star Steel Co. will be able to produce the steel with which to feed Texas and southwestern factories, which in turn will turn it into manufactured goods needed in this area. Without this mill, such steel must continue to be shipped here from the Pittsburgh, Pa., area at great cost.

A long-term loan of $75,000,000 cannot usually be gotten at the ordinary bank—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is practically the only institution which makes such loans—and this is a very much safer loan than many it makes. In fact this is the type of enterprise for which RFC loans were created.

The building of this steel mill is called the greatest step forward in Texas in a lifetime, ranking along with, perhaps ahead of, the discovery of oil. Such a mill would provide steel for the factories which Texas already has and would provide other factories with material on which to work.

Of even more immediate importance is the pipe mill which would be a part of the improvements provided. This would provide pipe for oil-field operations in the very heart of the oil country. These supplies now are coming from Pittsburgh. The new Daingerfield plant would have $11 per ton on the freight of it shipped in the usual way. But most of large major and independent oil companies would have their own trucks ready to haul the pipe away from the plant as quickly as the newly made pipe becomes cool enough for handling. Drilling operations in many fields in this area are slowed down because of the difficulty of getting necessary pipe. This nearby source of pipe would stimulate drilling over a wide area. Seventy-five percent of the output could be sold in the area within a radius of 400 miles. A survey shows that this urgent demand for oil-field pipe will last for 10 years and that the Lone Star plant can supply only one-eighth of the demand. This insures a steady long-time sale for one of the products contemplated.

Of course, big steel is fighting the building of a steel mill right in the middle of a highly profitable territory, whose trade it has enjoyed alone for so many years. The turning of east Texas iron ore into steel has been a Texas-born idea and enterprise.

East Texas asks for no gift of any kind. It merely asks the RFC to make a safe business loan at a profitable rate of interest. The interest will bring the Government $3,000,000 per year and the taxes on the property will bring the Government another $7,000,000 annually.

To east Texas, the Southwest and the Nation, the development of this great natural resource at a time when the iron-ore beds of the Great Lakes area which supply Pittsburgh are beginning to fail, is of vital importance. It will stabilize prices on steel throughout the Nation and especially in east Texas.

This will bring to east Texas a great new industrial development era. Fabrication of steel products in all of its enterprising cities may overshadow the rich returns now coming from oil.

For the Nation it will mean a great steel-producing area far inland and away from dangers of naval or air attack, which is important in this atomic age. This is important in building up a real defense for the country.

We believe that the $75,000,000 loan sought by the Lone Star Steel Co. is the type for which this Government agency was created. We hope that no time is lost in approving the loan.

On Catholic Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

Hon. James A. Farley, at the dinner opening the drive for St. Brigid's Parochial School fund, Garden City Hotel, Garden City, N. Y., April 20, 1949:

Perhaps it is somewhat venturesome for a man of my background to speak on education before such eminent educators as Bishop Molloy and Father Gannon. All of you probably know that I was actively engaged in politics for over 35 years. Fewer know that I have been engaged in business through those years, except during the 7½ years I served in the Cabinet. Most people associate me with business only for the past 9 years. No one associates me with education. As a matter of fact, I didn't associate myself with it too long. All in all I had 13 years of school, including high school and 9 months in a business college. Most of my education came in the school of life. Because my rating in that school has not been without honors, I feel qualified to speak about education in the world of change.

It may be trite to say we are living in a world of change, yet the ebb and flow of events is such that the truths, concepts and theories of the law of God and the law of man are under calculated attack from men of sinister minds, who grasp power by spread-the disaster-laden doctrine of secularism. A confused and uninformed public opinion makes a nation the ready prey of desperate demagogues. A confused and misinformed mind endangers the soul.

Education, based on our heritage of freedom and justice, is the foundation of any permanent peace for the world. Education, rooted in the laws of God, makes for happiness and salvation. It was not my good fortune to have a Catholic education, but I was happy to provide it for my three children. There was no Catholic school in my Rockland County home. My training in the three R's was in the Grassy Point Grammar School and the Stony Point High School, which were in a small part, in the excellent school system of New York State, and my training in the all-important fourth R—religion—came at my mother's knee and at the hands of gentle young women who drilled classes in catechism.

There are those who profess to see danger in education in the hands of the church. Actually these persons, except for the misguided fellow wanderers, fear the truth, which makes men free. There can be no despotism and no men of vast power where there is freedom—freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of criticism, freedom of assembly, freedom against unreasonable search and seizure, freedom of work, freedom to own property and freedom to act as freemen.

Our heritage is one of freedom under law. This freedom can be and is taught well in many public schools. I believe most sincerely that there are few scoundrels in the teaching profession. There is, however, not a little confusion within our academic halls. Some would have freedom under the law; license under the law. They forget the laws of God.

Teachers of the world are the stonemasons of world peace. They are patiently building the foundations of lasting peace. They cannot build without the mortar of love and understanding which comes from knowledge of the laws of God. The social and economic problems which must be solved in this country and abroad before a just and lasting peace is assured are staggering in their scope and complexities. Yet progress is coming every day if only in thinking and planning in our classrooms.

Everyone in the teaching profession must take pride in knowing that he is a link in the chain of progress. The work of the teacher in combating ignorance and prejudice never dies, for he trains the minds of those who battle these ancient foes of mankind, and he trains the minds of those who will train future champions down through the ages. Man owes everything to his ancestors and his teachers. It is fitting that both should train him in the way of the Lord.

Freedom under the law is at its noblest when it is freedom under God. We cannot have freedom without religion. There is no freedom without religion. There is no freedom among animals, but only the brute law of survival of the fittest. Without religion man is no more than a brute. Our first President recognized that religion is the soul of the Nation. In his Farewell Address George Washington said, and I quote: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports * * * and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education or minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government."

Unfortunately we have a cancerous doctrine on our body politic. Secularism is its name. There are those who would have us believe that the only school where democracy is safe is the school from which God and the things of God are excluded. They would make the law of man supreme.

I am happy that your presence here tonight, the campaign you have planned to raise $450,000 for the erection of Saint Brigid's Parochial School shows that you have not been beguiled by the unholy apostles of secularism. You are taking the words of the father of your country seriously, as you should. You are building a school that will bring the indispensable supports of religion and morality to our State. Your school will be a nursery of religion and morality, as well as the fertile ground of knowledge.

In this connection I would like to return to my experience as a politician. I do not apologize for that profession. It is one in which an honest man may render more service to his fellow man by gaining him security and safeguarding his freedoms than in any other worldly profession. I make exception, of course, to the sacred profession of His Excellency and the reverend fathers, who light the way to everlasting happiness. I must note, however, that politics is the most dangerous of all professions, for in it man is beset by a multitude of temptations for power that may cost him his immortal soul.

Today there is a most urgent need for honest politicians throughout the world. Governments are reaching further into every phase of individual life. Peoples of the world are being beguiled by benevolent governments. Much of this is good and some of it is bad. Benevolence can and has led to despotism. I am not here to discuss this trend, but merely to note it and emphasize that it calls for utmost vigilance on the part of all citizens.

Benevolence in the hands of Communists becomes brutal dictatorship. We should see that benevolence rests in the hands of leaders of religion and morality. This need for Christian political influences in the political life of nations was recognized by Pope Pius XI when he declared: "It is incumbent on all Catholics to prepare themselves prudently and seriously for political life in case they should be called to it." Pope Pius XII deplored the man, "Who either in contempt or because he is discouraged, does not participate in the activities of his country."

In calling for Catholics to engage in political life, the Popes rightfully emphasized that the church is not allied with any party. The church is interested in the morality of all parties. I would like to see more Catholics in politics and more Catholics interested in politics.

As a politician, I would like to see them in the Democratic Party, which is my party. As an American, I do not care what party they are in just so they are active in the party. I know we would have a better country if the morality of the church were exerted on the Government. If Washington were here before you, I think he would sound a warning that sufficient heed is not being given to his plea for religion and morality in Government.

We need and the world needs men of honesty, integrity, intellect, energy and vision in politics. Most of all we need men of religion. For that reason I hope that the campaign you are inaugurating will be a success. The school you will erect will be one in which religion and morality will have a place of supreme importance. And because they will, the children who are to be educated in that school will be given a foundation that will make them better Catholics and better Americans. I hope that a goodly number of the men and women of religion will take an active interest in politics so that they, as better Americans, will make other Americans better Americans and thus help to mold a better world.

The Free Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manila Bulletin of April 21, 1949:

THE FREE IRISH

The freedom of Ireland has been attained without very much notice in these parts. It is a very significant thing. For more years than perhaps any nation on earth the Irish have been seeking their independence from mother England. Wars have been fought over it, and a fighting rebelliousness has been bred into the Irish. The wonder of it is that the rebel spirit didn't make them bad citizens.

They are not bad citizens, they are good ones. Their traditional rebelliousness against England has endowed them with a rough-and-tumble arrogance tempered with high humor and generousness and sometimes a lush sentimentality hidden by a gruff exterior. They have great capacity for hard work and hard play.

Back in the days of the potato famine a large number of Irish emigrated to the United States. Hunger drove them from their beloved land. The Irish found their place in America. They were troublemakers sometimes, but their people were quick to get into trouble and quick to extricate themselves. They were not the brooding kind. It is a peculiarity of Americans that when any of them can claim Irish ancestry they are proud of it, and others a trifle envious.

The Irish have found their way into almost every part of the world, civilized and uncivilized. As with all nationals abroad, many have done well and some have gone back home the worse for wear. But almost always they are well liked. They get along with themselves and with others. Among them all, at home or abroad, there was that everlasting yearning to be a free and independent nation.

That feeling can be well understood in this country. Last Monday independence

was acquired. It was a great day for the Irish. No longer do they have to be distinguished as citizens of the Irish Free State, which in reality was a dominion status, like Canada's, existing since 1921. With India freed, Britain in all good conscience had to cut the tie. The Irish are now fully free of British rule.

They start their independence with a sound economy. Ireland has always been an agricultural country and there is great demand in England for her beef and other produce of the land. It has an army, a small but strong one, with an air force. Its people are poor individually but they face the future with courage and a strong notion that they will not remain that way for long.

The only regret the Irish have is that the six northern counties of Ulster have not joined the free Irish and still belong to England. That pattern follows tradition, North Ireland has traditionally been distinguished from the Free State. Their politics are not the same and they don't think alike. They are not necessarily quarrelsome, but they wish to go their different ways. It is a commentary on the times and disposition of nations that they have this free choice and privilege.

Price Day's Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Baltimore Morning Sun of May 3, 1949, on the career of Mr. Price Day, globe-trotting correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, who was awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished reporting in the field of international affairs. The State of Maryland is proud of this outstanding journalist who has so graphically given to his readers colorful accounts of vital, renowned events.

PRICE DAY'S CAREER

In gathering the material which won for him the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting, Price Day made one trip around the world, and an additional journey to England.

The longer trip took him to London, East Africa, South Africa, India, Burma, Siam, Malaya, Australia, and New Zealand, and thence across the Pacific to the States.

He was in South Africa at the time Gen. Jan Christiaan Smuts began his unsuccessful campaign to retain the leadership of that country, in India at the time of independence and in Burma when U Saw, a former Prime Minister, went on trial as the engineer of the assassination of most of the Cabinet of that country.

A WAR CORRESPONDENT

In the course of his assignment he interviewed, among many others, Smuts, Mahatma Gandhi, and Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India.

He was in the Punjab and in Delhi during the Hindu-Sikh-Moslem riots of the summer of 1947, and reported on those events in dispatches to the Sun.

Before beginning his part in the Sun's study of the British system of nations and dependencies, Mr. Day had served as a Sun correspondent in many areas of the globe.

As a war correspondent, he covered the Eighth Air Force during the winter of 1943–44, and was assigned to the Italian campaign late in March of the latter year.

In Italy, he reported on the offensive that broke the Garigliano-Cassino line in May 1944, the breakout from the Anzio Beachhead, the liberation of Rome, and the campaign up the peninsula as far as Livorno.

From Livorno, he returned south to sail for southern France, and reported the invasion of the Riviera by the American Seventh Army on August 15.

Mr. Day stayed with the Seventh Army until its troops broke the German winter line in the Vosges and reached the Rhine, and then was assigned to write the SHAEF story from Paris, which he did for the rest of the war.

He was the only representative of an individual newspaper present at the signing of the German surrender at Rheims.

COVERED NUREMBERG TRIALS

After the war, he went to southern Germany, made a brief trip to Italy and returned to Germany to enter Berlin with the first American troops.

He remained in Berlin through the Potsdam Conference, and then returned to the States.

In the spring of 1946, he was assigned to the Caribbean, reporting from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Cuba.

A further assignment that year took him again to Germany, where he covered the Nuremberg trials and developments in the Ruhr and in Berlin. He also visited and wrote from Czechoslovakia and Italy.

There followed the British Commonwealth and Empire assignments on which he has worked most of the time since.

GRADUATE OF PRINCETON

Mr. Day was born in Plainview, Tex., on November 4, 1907, a son of John Walter and Zillah Price Day. He went to grade school in Texas and Chicago, and to public high school in Chicago.

In 1929 he graduated from Princeton University, where he was chairman of the Tiger and a member of the Triangle Club.

After graduation he worked variously as caricaturist, decorator of speak-easies, and minor poet, living in New York and Florida.

In the mid-1930's he began writing magazine fiction, and continued in that field until the beginning of 1942, when he became city editor of the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Time, of which his father was editor.

He came to the Evening Sun in August 1942.

He was married to Alice Alexander, of Coconut Grove, Fla., on December 28, 1931, and has three sons, Anthony, 15, who is a student at City College, and Joseph, 12, and Thomas, 10, both pupils at Roland Park public school.

Southwest-American Approves Constitutional Amendment for Abolishing Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clarence F. Byrns of Fort Smith, Ark., is one of America's ablest newspapermen. I am glad to have his approval of my plan for compromising the poll-tax issue by constitutional amendment. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his statement which appeared recently in the Southwest-American:

At last the right-of-way to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting has been proposed in Congress—an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Arkansas' Representative BROOKS HAYS is the author. His resolution would submit to the legislatures of the States an amendment to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting in all States. It includes a provision that the amendment shall be withdrawn if all the States which have poll taxes repeal them before the amendment gets the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures, which is necessary for adoption.

This amendment is the second of a series of "compromise" civil-rights measures which Representative HAYS has been urging. An antilynching bill has already been offered.

In all the controversy about Federal outlawing of the poll tax, people in the South and some in other sections have contended that Congress has no constitutional power to abolish the poll tax. I agree with that view. The Federal Constitution as it now stands fixes the qualification for voting at whatever qualification a State fixes for voters who choose the most numerous branch of its State legislature. The only restrictions in the Federal Constitution prohibit discrimination because of race, color, religion and previous servitude. When Congress attempts to put a new restriction on voting qualifications, it goes beyond its power. That has always been my chief objection to anti-poll-tax legislation. Many of us who oppose anti-poll-tax bills have insisted that the Federal Government can prohibit poll taxes, legally or morally, only when the Federal Constitution is amended to give Congress that power.

Representative HAYS' proposal makes sense. If the necessary majority of the State legislatures approve the Hays amendment then, and only then, Congress will have a right under the Constitution and under a decent regard for the rights of the States to legislate on poll tax.

Only seven States now have poll taxes as voting qualifications. Some of them have the requirement for a poll tax in their constitution. Arkansas had until the election last November. At that time an amendment to the constitution was adopted which gives the legislature power to substitute a registration system as a qualification for voting. The recent legislature did not approve a registration bill. So Arkansas still has the poll tax. There is some difference of opinion as to whether a separate amendment is needed to abolish the poll tax as a voting qualification in this State. I do not think it necessary. The legislature can do that. Others, including Governor McMath, believe a separate amendment is needed to abolish the poll tax as a voting qualification, and such an amendment may be initiated for action at the next general election.

The Hays' compromise measures on civil rights are intelligent and merit serious consideration everywhere. The civil-rights argument is apparently over for this session of Congress. The filibuster victory of southern Democrats and a few Republicans made clear that the civil-rights bill will not pass this session. But the argument will arise again unless some way is found to avoid it. The amendment opposed by Representative HAYS would provide a way to deal fairly with the poll-tax question, and it may be his other compromise proposals will provide a similar solution for the other aspects of this disturbing problem.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Albert Deutsch, in the March 19 issue of the New York Post, had a column telling of two opinion polls from the trade magazine American Druggist indicating popular support for President Truman's national health-insurance legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this column in the RECORD:

RX: HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Albert Deutsch)

Conservative American Druggist publishes the results of two opinion polls offering impressive proof of the growing public sentiment for national health insurance.

One poll reveals that two out of three "opinion leaders" in the United States favor such a system. This poll was conducted by Maurice Mermey, a public-relations expert whose clients include several big drug manufacturers strongly opposed to national health insurance and who is personally opposed to the plan.

Mermey polled 1,500 presidents and program chairmen of citizens' organizations with a combined membership of 40,000,000.

Of those executives who took a position, 67 percent were in favor of national health insurance.

Commenting on the poll, Mermey says:

"This is, indeed, a significant figure, for it foreshadows the possibility of broad grass-roots support for the Truman program. Advocates will also be heartened by the fact that leaders with knowledge of the President's health insurance program favor it more than do other leaders."

Indeed, 79 percent of those who knew details of the plan favored it.

"Advocates of the Truman program can be satisfied with their score among citizen organizations," Mermey concludes, "while opponents have much work and soul-searching ahead."

Another article in the current American Druggist reveals the result of a postal-card poll taken by the magazine's managing editor, Bernard Serbe, among 2,500 druggists. Since the American Druggist is dead set against national health insurance, its article is appropriately entitled: "A Danger Signal. Vote for Truman Health Plan Increases."

The poll shows that, as of February, 16.8 percent of the Nation's druggists favored the Truman health insurance plan, as compared with only 8.2 percent in 1946 and 9.4 percent last December.

The results are especially significant, for the poll was conducted immediately after American Druggist published a debate on the subject between Dr. Morris Fishbein of the American Medical Association and Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing.

Also significant is the fact that the Truman plan is favored by almost 40 percent of the pharmacists in areas of more than 500,000 population. In Eastern large cities, 50 percent favored the plan.

These percentages are particularly impressive in the light of the constant bombardment of antihealth insurance propaganda to which the average druggist is subject by the big pharmaceutical houses, organized medicine and his own organizations.

Finally, the poll of druggists reveals the same significant fact revealed in the poll of opinion leaders, Managing Editor Zerbe writes:

"The more the retail druggist knows about the Truman proposal for national health insurance, the more likely he is to favor it."

The results of these two polls should vastly encourage the advocates of a positive health program for America. What is called a "danger signal" by the American Druggist and the AMA propagandists should be further intensified when President Truman sends his special message on national health to Congress, now expected within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

A Timely Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the April 15 issue of the Evangelist, published in Albany, N. Y., which was prompted by a recent speech of James A. Farley, at whose request, I am inserting the editorial, as follows:

Spending billions in the European recovery plan and binding ourselves to the commitments of the North Atlantic Pact, with all its foreboding implications, in an effort to bulwark America's security against the growth of Communist aggression are half measures as long as short-sighted political considerations continue to outlaw Franco Spain. Western Europe and the British Isles can never be restored to economic stability if the whole Iberian Peninsula lacks prosperity. Nor can western Europe attain the stature of an impregnable fortress against the assaults of Soviet inroads unless vitally strategic Spain can be counted on as an ally. The wall of defense against communism can only be as strong as its weakest segment, and Spain alined with the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact would contribute much to both Atlantic and Mediterranean security. All military authorities and straight-thinking statesmen are in agreement in this matter.

The wisdom of former Postmaster General James A. Farley's demand in his address, last Sunday, to the Glens Falls Knights of Columbus, that the United States renew full diplomatic relations with Franco's government and draw Spain into the circle of nations that are avowedly united in opposing the extension of Soviet domination, deserves the attention of those concerned with safeguarding America.

Much of the opposition to Catholic Spain comes from those who foment religious bigotry or from groups and individuals who are known as fellow travelers and have sympathetic feelings toward Russia.

Accounts of religious persecution of non-Catholic minorities have proved to be false. Charges that Franco's regime opposes political liberty and retards the betterment of the mass of the Spanish people is contradicted by facts. Despite terrific pressure and hindrances from foreign sources, Spain, under the generalissimo, has made amazing strides toward recovery.

Devotion to democracy cannot be acceptable as a true basis for the opposition to Franco's regime, while we continue to tolerate diplomatic and trade relations with Russia and its satellite nations.

Mr. Farley, in his Glens Falls address, gave a realistic means of measuring the fitness of our political allies. He said: "It is not a matter of whether we agree with the politics inside Spain. It is simply a matter of whether Spain is essential to the securities of the democracies."

Mr. Farley continued: "The Spanish war is 12 years behind us but I shudder to think what the situation would be today had the Communists gotten control of that nation. The Pyrenees mountains would today be a Communist fortress looking down the throat of Europe; Gibraltar would be a Communist machine gun looking down the throat of the Mediterranean.

"We botched the job of handling Germany and now we are trying to straighten out the wreckage. We cannot afford another error like it in Spain."

Rudimentary hindsight should compel everyone to acknowledge that the freedom-loving nations of the world owe a debt of gratitude to Franco and the heroic Spanish people who, in defending their country against communism during the so-called civil war, saved Europe from Red engulfment and preserved a frontier for democracy.

Franco's intimation that he would welcome a military agreement with the United States should not be flippantly dismissed. Vociferous opponents of Spain's inclusion into any combine of power that would strengthen our national defense are guilty of a grave disservice to America.

Saving Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal of April 28, 1949:

SAVING OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Greater South Dakota Association points out that Washington planners back up their proposals for Federal aid for education as necessary by the argument that the States are not financially able to bear the burden.

In answer to this claim the GSDA points out that since the planners began this campaign, the States themselves have increased their financial aid for the public-school system from $1,656,798,000 to $3,124,550,000, or an increase of $1,467,751,000, or five times the $300,000,000 proposed by the Federal planners to save the schools.

There are few, if any, States that are not able to support their public schools. Some of them may not be alert enough in the matter. Among these we might mention South Dakota. Recently the South Dakota Legislature has been appropriating $3,000,000 in addition to the distribution of State aid from the interest derived from the State school fund. Unquestionably that amount is insufficient. Undoubtedly, South Dakota should institute a study of State aid to public schools. What other progressive States are doing might be a revelation to the people of this State.

Congressman CASE, we believe, has a far better plan for Federal aid to the public schools than any other that has yet been proposed. His plan will avoid whatever evil there is in the socialist trend of Federal aid in this particular matter. Moreover it is a natural. It will not tax the citizens of the country to further support their immensely valuable system of public schools, but will actually make use of resources that already belong to the people.

CASE'S plan is to transfer to the public schools of the Nation the proceeds from the development of tideland oil. In Minnesota a wise provision of this kind, put into the State constitution in the early days, now brings to education in that State large sums from iron ore found on State school lands.

The Supreme Court of the Nation says that tideland oil belongs to the Nation. As this oil is developed, Congressman CASE proposes that the proceeds be distributed to the schools of the country on the basis of the number of pupils in school in each district. He limits the distribution to $500,000,000 per year, but this figure can be changed if the need for it develops.

The proposal should have the most careful consideration. It appears to have extreme merit along several lines.

It may have a strange combination of opposition. Private industry may object to losing the rich plum of tideland's oil, and the statesmen who hope to make political hay with a new bureau to levy more taxes on the people in the name of education will also object.

If Congressman CASE's bill proves feasible, it will be vastly more substantial help to education than is now proposed, and will relieve the people of the Nation, already overburdened with taxes, from what will otherwise in the end be another billion or more addition.

Is the President Above the Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's piece by David Lawrence raises the question of Mr. Truman's recent threat to purge those who do not do his will; to reward those who obey his wishes.

TRUMAN'S PATRONAGE THREAT HELD POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF LAW—CRIMINAL CODE IS CITED ON REWARDING CONGRESS MEMBERS FOR VOTE

(By David Lawrence)

Has President Truman committed an offense for which, under the Constitution, he could be impeached?

The laws of the United States forbid any person to offer any Member of Congress any bribe or thing of value to influence the vote of such Member. The crime is punishable by fine and imprisonment.

President Truman told his press conference last Thursday that the way that Democratic Members of Congress voted on repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act would be a test which he would apply in filling jobs sought by Members of Congress for their constituents.

Since Mr. Truman controls the so-called patronage of the Government, this is a threat to Members of Congress if they do not vote as the President dictates, and it is a promise of reward to those Members who obey the dictation. Here is what the United States Criminal Code says:

"Whoever promises, offers, or gives any money or thing of value, or makes or tenders any check, order, contract, undertaking, obligation, gratuity, or security for the payment of money or for the delivery or conveyance of anthing of value, to any Member of either House of Congress, or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, either before or after he has qualified, or to any person with his consent, connivance, or concurrence, with intent to influence his action, vote, or decision on any question, matter, cause, or proceeding which may at any time be pending in either House of Congress, or before any committee thereof, or which by law may be brought before him in his capacity as such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, shall be fined not more than three times the amount of such money or value of such thing or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both."

PATRONAGE USED AS CLUB

All Presidents in the past are suspected of having used patronage as a club over members of their party but it is doubtful whether any Chief Executive said so in so many words or offered any Federal jobs specifically in return for a vote by Representatives or Senators on a pending measure. If anything like that has ever happened, it certainly has never been publicly admitted as it was by Mr. Truman last week.

The impeachment article of the Federal Constitution says that any President who is tried and convicted for "crimes and misdemeanors" may be removed from office.

These references to the laws of the land and the Constitution are cited, not because either House will bring impeachment proceedings but to indicate what a hollow mockery has been made of the laws of the United States by politicians.

Today the materialistic background of Federal politics takes it for granted that almost anything goes. A few days ago there were rumors on Capitol Hill that the administration was offering favors in order to line up votes for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. There were reports about public-works projects that were being brought forth from old lists and dangled before Members whose districts and constituents would benefit by such Federal expenditure.

AIM TO PUNISH SOUTHERNERS

Also, a group of proadministration Democrats openly declared that the time had come to punish southern Democrats by ganging up on appropriations needed by the southerners. There seems to be no hesitancy in emphasizing these sordid aspects of present-day politics.

Now, when the President of the United States himself enters the auction of votes and indicates that Federal jobs will be allotted to Congressmen and Senators for their loyalty and in reality in exchange for their votes, it is natural for the administration henchmen to grow bolder on Capitol Hill in their offers of things of value.

One wonders where conviction and principle have gone. One wonders whether the much-boasted democracy and representative government, in its defects, differs very much under the skin from the totalitarian systems where the executive controls the legislature and purges or punishes those who do not go along with his will.

It is a sad commentary on the lack of ethics in government. But, fortunately, only a minority will be affected by the White House threats. The vast majority of Members of Congress will not be bribed or coerced into altering their convictions.

Our Educators' Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Framingham News, Framingham, Mass., Friday, April 22, 1949:

DR. BRIN CALLS SCHOOLS THE KEY TO AMERICA'S DEMOCRACY

The Massachusetts Principals of Junior and Senior High Schools and the Association of Deans last night at a joint dinner meeting at the State Teachers College here were called upon by Dr. Alexander Brin, vice chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Education, to wage a militant public-opinion campaign with "energy, determination, and resourcefulness" to awaken apathetic and indifferent citizens to the realization that no institution in the State and the Nation, vital to the maintenance of the American ideal, can compare with the American system of schools as the key to America's survival as a democracy.

He said that the schools represent the greatest single influence and resource for the preservation and advancement of the character and quality of the American brand of liberty and democracy, which nourished America's progress and created our unique surpassing civilization as the last best hope on earth.

Taking as his theme, "America's Destiny in a Changing World," Dr. Brin, who is also the senior member of the State board of collegiate authority, and editor and publisher of the Jewish Advocate, delivered the principal address, and asserted that "we cannot neglect and starve the school systems of the State and Nation, without imperiling the inner defenses of the structure of democracy itself."

Pointing out that the greatness of the Nation lies not in material wealth alone but in the valor of mind and the character of citizenship, the speaker deplored the loss of many able and intelligent teachers to education who are daily joining the procession from the profession as the greatest potential danger of the threat that American democracy faces disintegration from within.

COUNTERACT FOREIGN IDEOLOGIES

Against the barrage of propaganda for the minds of our young people, Dr. Brin advocated the establishment of courses and chairs in democracy in public and private schools and colleges to counteract the infiltration of foreign ideologies which are threatening to mislead unsuspecting Americans in their conception of true Americanism.

As a further step to make our Nation propaganda-proof and propaganda-wise the speaker urged a large network of neighborhood forums and study groups in every school district as a prime requisite to develop the clarity and power of thought processes and a balanced emotional outlook so that students may protect, with argument and reason, the democratic institutions in the light of current developments in world affairs.

He said that current events should have a place as an important subject in every school curriculum, so to instill in the pupils an interest and appreciation of the times we live in and what is happening currently all over the world, for the laws of today are the history of tomorrow and the pupils of today must be trained to take their places in the world of tomorrow.

He asserted that it was the duty of the schools to teach the great liberties which Americans enjoy, how we got these liberties and what duties and responsibilities these liberties impose, and that we must point out the importance of making it clear to students the ways in which these liberties are threatened and all too often violated. The teachers, he said, should be specific to show where and when human rights are trespassed.

Dr. Brin said the schools should teach the history of tyranny and the facts about governmental systems which compete with democracy, and we should teach no abstractions and generalities but the actual practice

of democracy in daily living. He advanced the deliberate indoctrination for American democracy of children and youth from the kindergarten to the last year of the university, which would include understandings, beliefs, and loyalties with respect to the basic and abiding principles of the American way of life.

LAST GREAT FORTRESS

With a warning that if the pattern of American democracy is to be saved and the causes and circumstances of the decline and disintegration of the old world are not reproduced in this last great fortress of liberty and freedom, Dr. Brin said that it must be done now by the mobilization of all forces that believe that free government to be the best way of life, by rallying to the support of the schools.

He said in the present swift race between education and catastrophe it is our supreme duty to safeguard the deep and abiding faith of the American people in education which began 19 years after the Pilgrims landed here, when they founded Harvard College. Whether democracy lives or dies will depend on the human personality and the character of today's students.

He said that America, may be the last battlefield on which will be fought out the issue whether democracy shall survive or perish. "America is the center and the hope of the world, and we must not only extend the frontiers of democracy in many parts of the world, but to improve democracy at home, which is to serve as a model and inspiration for other countries," he declared.

Dr. Brin warned against the paralyzing pessimism which is hampering the progressive creativeness of the American people to constantly widen and expand democracy and build a better and finer Nation. He said that this is the time to lay the foundation for a richer, broader, more useful national life for ourselves and our children and future generations. "It is up to the educators to stand up against the forces of defeatism, despondency, and despair, and to proclaim that civilization is not ringing down the curtain, and that it is a privilege to be a part of the tremendous times and continue to build a better world on the foundation of justice and peace, and to bear in mind that the very life-spirit of American democracy is progress and it must not be abandoned. We must keep the beacon light of democracy burning brighter than ever, for its very rays are potent to destroy all subversive forces that come within its range.

SERVICE TO COUNTRY

Referring to the recent international mid-century convocation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Brin said, "The convocation has rendered a service to the Nation and to mankind of far-reaching spiritual import by keeping the beacon light of creative thought, with freedom of teaching, freedom of learning, and freedom of utterance as an inalienable right to search for truth. It was a demonstration that our Nation is still a center of light and learning, an intellectual powerhouse in which knowledge as a mighty influence, under the tradition of American freedom, all men are free to build a statelier, finer civilization to be."

Dr. Brin prefaced his address by painting a first-hand world picture of the privilege of living in the United States with a résumé of conditions in European nations as he found them through personal observations and experiences of a recent 2-month tour, which covered 25,000 miles of the European Continent. He said he saw no immediate war on the horizon and that he was convinced that the American spirit and the classic essentials of American democracy are gradually conquering many parts of the world.

Dr. Walter P. Downey, headmaster of the Boston English High School and chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Education, acted as toastmaster.

DISCOVERY OF ATOMIC FISSION

Emphasis was focused on the scientific discovery of atomic fission and its importance in the modern world, in a panel discussion held yesterday afternoon at the Framingham State Teachers College as the annual conference of high school principals and deans went into the second day.

Participating in the discussion under title "Nuclear Fission in Secondary School" were chairman Edgar J. Morgan, principal of Plymouth High School, Dr. Fletcher G. Watson of Harvard Graduate School of Education, Principal Charles M. Frolio of Abington High School, John H. Packard, head of the science department of Plymouth High School, and John G. Read of the B. U. School of Education.

One important point gleaned from the consideration of this topic was the feeling that there was a necessity for providing opportunity for high school students to learn the general background and to gain some understanding of the nuclear fission discovery and its meaning.

Earlier yesterday afternoon a panel discussion was held over the radio on general school problems. Participants in this program were Principal John S. Collins, of Quincy High; Principal Mayo M. Magoon, of Framingham High School; and State Supervisor of Education A. Russell Mack.

Another outstanding speaker during the afternoon was Martha H. Biehle, operations officer of the International Refugee Organization, who described the problems which the IRO tackles and the number of people it must and has handled.

The rest of the day was taken up with special group meetings, with a large number of reports on a variety of subjects having to do with education being given.

OFFICERS ELECTED

Two local educators were elected by their colleagues at association meetings held yesterday afternoon. Dean Dorothy Larned, of the State Teachers College, was chosen president of the Massachusetts Association of Deans and Francis J. Cavanagh, principal of Saxonville Junior High school, was selected as president of the Massachusetts Junior High School Principals Association.

Other officers chosen among the deans were as follows: Vice president, Helen Mulcahy, dean of girls at Lowell High School; secretary, Ruth Rothenberger, dean of Lasell Junior College in Auburndale; treasurer, Virginia Nye, counselor at Weymouth High School; one new director, Prudie Moore, associate dean of admissions at Northeastern University. The deans also adopted a revised constitution at their meeting.

Also elected to serve among the junior high-school heads were the following: Robert Perry, of Reading Junior High School, first vice president; Prescott Sawyer, principal of Normandin Junior High School in New Bedford, second vice president; H. Edgar Pray, of Bigelow Junior High School in Newton, third vice president; and Belding Jackson, of Classical Junior High School in Springfield, secretary-treasurer.

Reports were heard this morning on various subjects. Discussions on television and the use of wire recorders, carried on by Principal George A. Wilson, of Quincy High School, and Principal Donald Dike, of Athol High School, respectively, indicated that immediate employment of such facilities was unlikely.

With regard to television, it was revealed that while many programs which would be useful for educational purposes are being planned, up to the present, programs have not been scheduled at times when they could be utilized for such instructional purpose.

Legislation To Curb Unions Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just as other individuals and other organizations need legislation to regulate their activities, so labor leaders and unions are not above the law. Nor should they be permitted to ignore it.

A news article and an editorial from a Washington paper of last evening illustrate my point.

The news article reads:

BENDIX STRIKERS FOIL ATTEMPTS TO REMOVE FOUR CARS OF DIES

SOUTH BEND, IND., April 23.—An attempt by sheriff's deputies to move four freight cars out of the struck Bendix Aviation Corp. plant was abandoned temporarily tonight because of union resistance.

Two major automobile manufacturers, Ford and General Motors, had obtained an order from Circuit Judge Dan Pyle for removal of the cars. They are loaded with dies used in making automobile parts.

Sheriff Stephen C. Hipsak attempted late today to carry out the order. But massed members of local 9, CIO United Automobile Workers, had blocked the Bendix railroad spur with debris and refused to allow a Diesel locomotive to pass.

Millard E. Stone, Bendix industrial relations director, said no further effort to move the cars would be made until attorneys for Ford and General Motors carried out their expressed intention of getting an injunction. This appeared unlikely before Monday, with Judge Pyle's court closed for the week end.

UNIONISTS MASS AT PLANT

The sheriff said that if an injunction were issued he would arrest anyone who interfered with removal of the cars.

The union members had massed at the plant in response to an appeal broadcast by local 9 officials over a South Bend radio station this morning after Judge Pyle issued the order for removal of the cars.

Police and sheriff's deputies patrolled the streets around the plant after the radio summons was broadcast, but reported no violence.

Sheriff Hipsak said he examined the contents of the four freight cars after getting the order for their removal, and found their contents were dies as specified by Ford and General Motors in their petition.

The sheriff said that after examining the cars he notified union leaders of his intentions to remove them. The union officials refused to permit their removal but the sheriff ordered the locomotive sent to the plant gates anyway, he added.

WOULD NOT FORCE ENTRANCE

Sheriff Hipsak said he would do nothing to cause violence and did not attempt to force an entrance to the plant when strikers stood firm against allowing the locomotive to enter and pick up the cars.

The editorial is as follows:

THE STRIKE AT BENDIX

The current strike by the CIO United Auto Workers at the Bendix Aviation Corp. plant in Indiana is not going to throw the national economy into a tailspin. But the strike is important nevertheless for the light that it sheds on the philosophy which underlies the administration's fight for a toothless labor law.

In its drive to get rid of the Taft-Hartley Act, the administration is proceeding on the assumption that, in the main, legislative restraints on union activities are undesirable. The theory is that unions and union leaders can be depended upon to do the right thing, and that it is not necessary to regulate them by statute.

One of the innocent victims of the Bendix strike is the Hudson Motor Car Co. Hudson, along with General Motors and Ford, relies on Bendix as a principal supplier of brakes. The latter two have not been hurt because they were able to remove from the Bendix plant the dies used in making the brakes for their cars. But Hudson was less fortunate.

When other efforts failed, Hudson obtained an order from a State court requiring that its dies be surrendered. But UAW pickets forcibly prevented the local sheriff from carrying out the court's order. Walter Reuther, UAW president, accuses Hudson of trying to make political capital out of the situation, but he discreetly ignores his own union's defiance of a judicial order.

This is not an isolated instance of lawless union activity. The same thing, or similar things, have happened time and time again. And if the facts were faced candidly, the advocates of the doctrine that unions would not abuse their power if permitted to do as they pleased would find themselves without a leg to stand on.

The necessity for a little thinking on the part of the union rank and file employees in the Bendix Co. is apparent when we note another news story from the Chicago Tribune of May 2, 1949:

BENDIX STRIKERS FEAR JOBS HAVE GONE WITH DIES—COMPANY REPORTS LOSS OF AUTO BUSINESS

(By William Clark)

SOUTH BEND, IND., May 1.—The strike of 7,500 workers in the huge Bendix Aviation Corp. plant went into its twelfth day today with some of the strikers fearful that removal of brake dies from the plant may mean permanent loss of their jobs.

Thirteen truckloads of the dies were taken through sullen but unprotesting picket lines yesterday by Hudson Motor Car Co. and Kaiser-Frazer Corp., who planned to operate them elsewhere to restore the flow of brakes to their assembly lines. Observers doubted whether any of the dies, or more than a part of them, ever would be returned to the Bendix plant.

The corporation's division in South Bend, the Bendix Products division, manufactures aircraft parts in addition to automobile brakes. It is said that if the strike should cause Bendix automobile manufacturing customers to take their brake business elsewhere for good the plant's normal force of 7,500 may be reduced by as much as 2,000 workers.

BUSINESS ALREADY LOST

"We have already lost substantial business" said Millard Stone, Bendix industrial relations director. "Every day the strike goes on we lose more."

The current strike, which began April 20, is the second phase of a work stoppage that began earlier in the month when Bendix discharged 47 workers in a brake department for an alleged slow-down. That followed lengthy bickering between the company and the union, Local 9 of the CIO United Auto Workers, over the manner in which the 47 men were submitting time reports. When the 47 were discharged, the rest of the plant workers walked out in protest but walked back in again a few days later after the company filed a damage suit against them for contract violation. That was phase 1.

The present phase began when the union expanded its complaint about the discharge of the 47 workers into an accusation that the company was demanding a speedup in their department. The union handed the company an ultimatum demanding an adjustment of pay rates in the department, reinstatement with full pay of the men fired, and withdrawal of its damage suit. The company refused and the current strike began. Efforts at mediation to date have failed to modify the stand of either side.

THIRTY-FOUR THOUSAND LAID OFF

The halt in production of brakes has caused some 34,000 workers in the automotive industry to be laid off. April 23 General Motors Corp. and Ford Motor Co. tried to remove dies used for brakes on Cadillac and Lincoln cars, but 500 pickets blocked the railroad spur line into the plant with grease, coal, ties, and themselves. Two days later, after the companies obtained a writ of replevin in circuit court, the dies were removed by truck without violence.

Hudson's first attempt to remove its dies last Thursday also were blocked by pickets who refused to break their double line in front of the truck entrance gate. Hudson obtained a Federal court injunction restraining the union from interfering with the removal operation, and a circuit court order to Sheriff Stephen C. Hipsak to show cause why he did not enforce a writ of replevin to get the dies out. The union's international headquarters warned the local not to risk a contempt of court charge on the Federal injunction. Yesterday's successful removal of dies by both Hudson and Kaiser-Frazer followed. Hudson attorneys indicated they would withdraw their request for a permanent injunction and their suit against Hipsak.

The strike has cost the Bendix employees more than $1,000,000 in wages. Downtown merchants say it already has been reflected in their business.

Radio Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the House on yesterday unanimously adopted the House Resolution 106 expressing its gratitude to amateur radio operators. Along the same general line, I have been requested to ask permission to insert the enclosed statement of W. L. Gleeson, president of the Broadcasing Corp. of America, Riverside, Calif., and at the request of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am pleased to comply with that request. Mr. Gleeson's statement is as follows:

Here's a news item that deserves your investigation and careful reporting as a case of real justice to a fine group of unselfish heroes.

The radio broadcasters are the most abused and worst treated of all American businesses. Especially is this true of about 1,500 independent stations.

Thousands of business firms and commercial-trade associations spend millions each year in printing, labor, and postage on material to be sent to radio stations, and especially to announcers and program people of the stations, in hopes their material will be used, and thus they can gain radio publicity without paying for it. Many of these, when called on for a part of their advertising budget for radio, say the firm in question does not believe in radio.

This condition goes clear on down to the local communities where thousands of advertisers who never question paying other advertising media expend every possible effort to get radio for nothing.

The Government is the biggest abuser of the radio broadcasters. The Government thinks nothing of paying transcription companies for making transcriptions of programs they expect the stations to run free of charge. While it subsidizes the air lines, it pays telegraph, telephone, and railroad companies for their services, and spends eight to ten millions in magazines and newspapers each year in recruiting, with little of the recruiting going to radio. It is expected to work free.

The telephone companies and radio-set manufacturers are real bad ones in that the broadcasters pay the telephone companies about $25,000,000 each year for broadcasting circuits. Also, the telephone directory advertising section of the phone book is one of radio's biggest competitors. Yet the telephone companies, like the railroads, while spending millions in every conceivable paper down to the throw-away sheets, seldom recognize radio, even though it is a top advertising medium. The same holds true for radio-set manufacturers, even though their very livelihood depends on the radio broadcasters.

Utilities usually say, having no editorial potential they don't need to use radio, that their money is spent more for editorial protection than for advertising value.

Radio broadcasters outperformed all public-information media during the war, and it appears now the businessmen are quick to forget this fact, and that Congress has forgotten it, too.

Radio is the most criticized of all businesses and least deserves this treatment, for if a survey were made, it would be found that the radio-broadcasting industry is made up of the most unselfish and self-sacrificing men found in any industry of the United States—a group of businessmen who work harder than any other, trying to please and serve the American people and their Government.

Yes, the broadcasters of this Nation, especially the small independent local and regional station operators deserve a better break, better support, and appreciation from American business, the American people, and their Government.

The sacrificing broadcaster stands in the front line of your national defense. You'll need him badly some day when he is needed to warn you and your family that the enemy is coming, so be smart and give him your support now while you can. Other means cannot do this for you—only your local radio broadcaster. Treat him equally with other advertising media now, and thank God for him when emergency comes.

British Film Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Motion Picture Industry Council on April 6, 1949, concerning the British film quota, which discriminates against the United States:

Faced with the greatest unemployment in the history of Hollywood, in large part due to discriminatory trade barriers set up by

the British Government, the Motion Picture Industry Council, representing every major labor and management group, urges the Government of the United States, through the State Department, to enter immediate negotiations with the government of the United Kingdom, to eliminate these practices which have injured the motion-picture industries of both countries.

We are sympathetic to the postwar difficulties of Great Britain and the great sacrifices of the British people, as is evidenced by the dollar remittance agreement negotiated by Eric Johnston and James A. Mulvey representing the American motion-picture industry. This agreement was entered into at a considerable sacrifice to the American industry.

Notwithstanding, the British Government, shortly after the conclusion of this agreement, broke faith with the American industry by doubling the required playing time of British pictures on the screens of Great Britain. It had been clearly understood at the time the agreement was negotiated that the then existing quota of screen time would not be disturbed.

The raising of this quota did not in any manner help to solve the British-dollar problem. Its only result has been to injure the American industry, deepen the plight of British exhibitors, and add to the unemployment among British film workers. Unless these restrictions are part of a program aimed at the destruction of the American film industry in the world market, we are unable to understand their purpose.

We ask the State Department to take this action under the authority of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and of the International Trade Organization Charter.

Article IV of G. A. T. T., which deals with motion-picture quotas specifically provides:

"(d) Screen quotas shal be subject to negotiation for their limitation, liberalization, or elimination."

A similar provision is contained in article 19 of the ITO Charter.

There is thus complete authority and justification for the Department of State to act. It should promptly negotiate with the British Government to bring about substantial reduction of the present iniquitous quota which artificially restricts playing time of foreign pictures in British theaters.

We express our gratitude for the efforts of California's Senators and Congressmen and other outstanding legislators and members of the administration pressing for action.

CECIL B. DEMILLE,
Chairman, Motion Picture Industry Council.

(Including the following member groups: Hollywood AFL Film Council, Independent Office Workers, Motion Picture Producers Association, Screen Actors' Guild, Screen Directors' Guild, Screen Writers' Guild, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors.)

Assault and Flattery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the broadcast entitled "Assault and Flattery," by B. S. Bercovici, over radio station WOOK, Washington, D. C., April 28, 1949:

The Washington Star yesterday printed a letter to the editor from a reader. It is a strange letter and needs to be reviewed not necessarily for its contents, but for a kind of presumption on the part of the writer. All kinds of people write to the editor about matters which interest and often trouble them, and many of those communications are very interesting and enlightening. As a matter of fact, some letters are more enlightening than some editorials. Let me quote the first paragraph from this particular letter so you may get an idea as to why I say it is an out-and-out presumption: I quote: "As a representative of Syria to this great country, it is obviously my duty to advise my government about everything which serves the interest of both our people." So far so good. But it goes on to say, and I quote again: "It is equally my duty to enlighten the American public—when the opportunity arises—about matters that influence the policy of their Government toward my country and its people. Signed, Faiz El-Khouri, Minister of Syria." The rest of the letter may or may not interest you. What is of interest is that the representative in this country of another government assumes or presumes it to be his duty to talk to the American public about matters that influence the policy of their Government toward his country.

In other words, if by any chance Mr. Faiz El-Khouri should disapprove of any segment of our Government policy, he assumes a right to go directly to the people and complain. Obviously, he thinks it is his duty to inform his Government about matters of concern to both peoples, but I say it is neither his duty nor his privilege to deal directly with the American public on matters which should by right and according to protocol, be brought to the attention of our Government. An ambassador is not an agent of public propaganda. His mission is not one of direct contact with the people. He is expected to deal in the name of his Government with the government of the country to which he is assigned. It is not his business to talk directly to the people. If he has any complaint, it is his duty to take it to the Secretary of State, or if he wishes to go higher, to the President. It is neither ethical nor good diplomatic manners to take up matters with the people through the medium of the press. Obviously, he has a grievance. His grievance is one against an editorial printed in the Star of April 25 on the subject of the Jewish Appeal. He does not like that appeal. Apparently he thinks the United States Government should do something about it. In writing the letter to the editor about matters which influence the policy of our Government, Mr. El-Khouri appears to think that if nothing can be gained from protesting to the State Department, he has the right to go directly to the American people. Sometime ago one of our representatives to a foreign government committed the faux pas of trying to influence elections in that country. The result of the elections was the very opposite of what our representative wished it to be. Soon after that the man was recalled. He had committed a breach of diplomacy. Many years ago a foreign representative to this country allowed himself to express his opinion on our elections. His recall was immediately demanded, and he went home with tail between his legs. The President shapes our foreign policy. The State Department's duty is to make it work. It appears that this gentleman does not subscribe to our foreign policy nor to the way this policy is implemented; therefore, he takes it upon himself—as he puts it—to enlighten the American public about matters that influence the policy of their Government toward his country and its people. The Jewish Appeal has nothing to do with the foreign policy of this country. It is a benevolent and private expression on the part of those who wish to donate money to those in Israel who need a helping hand. Those in the United States who wish to give, do so; those who do not, refrain from helping. The Government has nothing to do with it. It seems, however, that Mr. Faiz El-Khouri thinks the Government is being influenced by this appeal and by the Star editorial, and that the State Department has been asleep at the switch. In which case, the Syrian representative thinks it is his duty to administer a spanking to the Government through the medium of the press and by direct appeal and protest to the American people. His attitude is unique. I don't recall a similar incident except the one I told you about and that was a long time ago, and something was done about it.

The State Department should make a note of this. For, if such a precedent is established, representatives of other nations will assume the right and consider it their duty to go direct to the public and complain about our Government's inability or unwillingness to deal with problems which affect our country and theirs. Now, what is it that bothers this gentleman? He claims that dollars collected here through the United Jewish Appeal are not going to be used in a worthy cause, but that they will go to buy arms from Soviet Russia and its satellite countries with which to fight the Arabs. Thus, he adds, the Jews now have a powerful army and are applying in Palestine against the Arabs the horrible lessons they learned from Nazi Germany. Let us look at this charge. The Jews buy arms wherever they can get them, and I hope the confused Syrian representative will not claim that his Government has not gone out into the open market to buy guns and ammunition—how else could they have undertaken an invasion of Israel? They were lucky enough to be able to get them from the British, and some of those arms looked suspiciously like American equipment formerly shipped to England under lend-lease. Also, the Syrians and the other Arab states invited the war. At no time since the state of Israel was established did the Israeli Army find itself invading neighboring soil. The Syrians and the Lebanese and the Iraquis and the Transjordanians and the Egyptians sent their armies into Palestine—and not, as one Israeli official said, in response to an engraved invitation. The Arab armies were sent back reeling, and I suspect the Syrian representative feels the defeat very keenly. The only Arabs the Israelis have killed were in military uniforms and on Israel's soil without having been invited. To say that the Israeli are applying in their country methods they learned from the Nazis is a callous and unfounded charge. No one has been able to produce factual proof, and if Mr. El-Khouri had the proof he would have incorporated it in his letter. American press representatives have at no time even hinted that the Israel Government has been guilty of oppression. Mr. El-Khouri speaks lightly of the lessons the Jews have learned in Nazi Germany, forgetting that the Jews paid with 6,000,000 lives. People who have suffered such horrors will not use similar methods in their own country. Originally I did not set out to discuss the gentleman's charges, because they are unfounded and also because they have been exploded on numerous occasions in the past. What I thought necessary was to bring to the attention of the American public the fact that a foreign representative had gone way beyond his prescribed duties and presumed to bring a matter of policy to the attention of the people over the head of the State Department. I thought the State Department might be interested.

Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent consideration by the House of legislation to continue the availability of funds for assistance to China, the valuable work being carried on under the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, an enterprise in which the United States and China cooperate, was mentioned.

Unfortunately, the press of time made it impossible to discuss this topic fully. I believe, however, that many Members of this body will be interested, as I was interested, in becoming more fully acquainted with the activities of this agency. I am therefore taking this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House some documents which tell the story more fully than we had the opportunity to tell it during debate.

The first document is a letter to the President of the United States, dated March 25, 1949, from one of the American members of the Joint Commission, discussing broadly the significance of the rural reconstruction program.

The second is a report on the progress of the rural reconstruction program covering approximately the first year since the enactment of the China Aid Act of 1948. It is preceded by a summary and is followed by four annexes.

I am also including three press releases issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration giving information on particular aspects of the joint program of rural reconstruction.

These documents give an encouraging view of the oportunity for help to China wherever it remains free of Communist domination.

CHINA PROGRAM DIVISION,
ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the attention currently being paid to United States policy with respect to China, it appears appropriate, as members of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction appointed by you under authority of Public Law 472, that we present to you directly our views concerning a continuation of United States aid to the program of rural reconstruction being developed by this Commission.

Our opinion is that interests of the United States would be served by a continuation of aid to this program in territory outside of Communist control as long as conditions permit an effective operation. Present indications are that such conditions will continue in substantial parts of south and west China for a period of between 6 months and 2 years or more.

In spite of serious difficulties thus far experienced, the Joint Commission has succeeded in establishing the initial phases of a substantial program aimed at improving the living conditions of China's rural people. One important part of this program aids efforts to increase the production of basic foodstuffs, helping China itself to meet existing shortages now being met in part through United States aid. With assistance from the Joint Commission, important irrigation and dike repair projects will be completed by May 30, 1949; a wide-scale program of seed distribution is being started; and a program for the control of important diseases of work cattle and swine is being carried out in several provinces.

Another important part of the Joint Commission's program consists of aid to significant centers developing a broad fundamental program of rural reconstruction, related to the improvement of agriculture, farm tenancy, education, health, and local government administration.

One such center is the project of the Mass Education Movement in Szechwan Province sponsored by Dr. Y. C. James (Jimmy) Yen. The commission also is assisting an important center building a similar program around a land reform project established under the National Government, and a third center patterned after the program of agricultural extension and home demonstration developed by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is expected that experience gained in these centers will provide sound suggestions for a program to be developed on a much wider scale in accessible parts of China.

An indication of the interests and possibilities in this program in China may be seen in the fact that, as of February 25, 1949, a total of 397 applications for assistance to specific projects had been received. At that date the commission had acted favorably on 37 of them. Among those not yet acted upon favorably are a large number of sound projects worthy of consideration. Other requests continue to come in.

A continuation of United States assistance to this program would present concrete evidence of our country's continued interest in the people of China, especially in the welfare of the large mass of China's population living in its rural areas. Aid to this program has thus far been well received in China and its continuation should help retain the good will of the large number of Chinese who remain friendly to this country. By helping to solve important problems of the Chinese people, such aid, furthermore, would strengthen the position of elements in China that still are resisting Communist domination. Its objectives, of course, are closely in line with those of your excellent statement bringing out Point IV of your inaugural address.

For the future, effective participation in these efforts by the United States will require not only technical assistance but also funds to help meet internal costs of certain operations in the program. Such assistance is being provided at the present time from counterpart funds made available in connection with the ECA program in China. Largely as a result of the rapidly growing inflation and the general deterioration in conditions it has become increasingly difficult to obtain such funds for the purposes of this program. The situation now is such that arrangements must be made to provide United States dollar support to finance a large part of what help is given by the United States.

Due to the circumstance that the other United States member of this commission, Dr. John Earl Baker, is in China, I am presuming to write this letter as though coming from both of us, which I am sure would have his full approval.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND T. MOYER,
Member, Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON THE PROGRAM OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN CHINA PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 407, CHINA AID ACT OF 1948

In accordance with authority given in section 407 of the China Aid Act of 1948, an agreement was entered into between the Governments of China and the United States, signed on August 4, 1948, which provided for the establishment of a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, having authority to formulate and carry out a program of rural reconstruction in China.

It was hoped that an energetic development of such a program would contribute to basic improvements in the living conditions of China's rural people, which gradually would be reflected in a greater measure of internal stability.

By the time preliminary arrangements were complete and the Joint Commission assembled, just 6 months remained of the year for which authority was granted by the above act of Congress. Furthermore, in carrying out its responsibilities, the joint commission encountered unusual difficulties arising from rapid deterioration in the political, economic, and military situation in China, which delayed progress in developing the program.

Nevertheless, steps have been taken to initiate a substantial program. The plan adopted placed special emphasis on efforts to increase agricultural production and to develop, in selected areas, a broad integrated program of rural reconstruction aimed at the improvement of agriculture, adult education, rural health, local government administration and farm tenancy. To date, active support has been given by the commission to projects in irrigation and dike repair, seed multiplication, animal disease control, the integrated program sponsored by the mass education movement, other broad rural reconstruction programs, and a wide variety of small projects established by Government and private agencies.

By February 25, 1949, a total of 379 applications for assistance to specific projects had been received, coming from 22 of China's 26 provinces excluding Manchuria. Of these, at that date, 37 projects had been acted upon favorably by the Commission.

By agreement with the Government of China, expenditures in Chinese currency were to be financed from counterpart funds deposited to a special account in the Central Bank of China, for which purposes up to the equivalent of United States $25,000,000 was to be set aside. The remaining $2,500,000 was to be available in United States currency. As of March 1, 1949, the United States dollar account had been drawn upon to an amount not exceeding $150,000, largely for salaries and travel of United States personnel engaged in this program. The program in China was financed from local currency funds, of which the equivalent of about United States $7,000,000 had been obligated by the above date. Of this amount the equivalent of only about United States $2,600,000 had been turned over to the Joint Commission, due to difficulties experienced by the Commission in obtaining needed funds through the special account. Continued deterioration in over-all conditions, which have underlain these difficulties, has made it apparent that, if the rural reconstruction program is to be continued, its financing must be based principally on the use of United States dollar funds to meet expenditures within China.

TEXT OF REPORT ON THE PROGRAM OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN CHINA PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 407, CHINA AID ACT OF 1948

In accordance with authority provided in section 407 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, an agreement was entered into by the Government of the United States with the Government of China, through an exchange of notes signed on August 4, 1948,[1] which established a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction and dealt with other related matters. This agreement provides that the Commission shall be composed of two members appointed by the President of the United

[1] The texts of these notes appear in Appendix A of this report.

States and three members appointed by the President of China.[2] The three Chinese members were appointed immediately after this exchange of notes and the two American members on September 16. The Commission formally assembled in Nanking on October 1 and, in accordance with a provision in the agreement, elected one of the Chinese members as its chairman.

Authority was given the Joint Commission to formulate and carry out a program of rural reconstruction in China. Poor living conditions among China's rural people, who constitute about 80 percent of its total population, have been a fundamental factor contributing to instability and the spread of communism in China. It was hoped that an energetic development of a rural reconstruction program would lead to basic improvements, which gradually would be reflected in greater internal stability.

I. THE PRESENT PROGRAM [3]

Problems which the Commission agreed should receive attention, in its rural-reconstruction program, can be included under five general categories: Agricultural production, marketing, and processing; farm tenancy; local government administration; rural health; and social education.

To formulate and carry out a specific program aimed toward a solution of these problems, the Commission set up four divisions, each of which was given one of the following general responsibilities:

1. To stimulate the production of agricultural commodities, especially foodstuffs, in areas where the increased production can be utilized to meet existing shortages in coastal provinces now receiving food shipments supplied by the United States.

2. To stimulate the development of a fundamental program of rural improvement in all of the above five categories, carried out in an integrated manner, beginning first in selected areas of limited size but on a practical basis capable of duplication and gradual extension.

3. To establish an extended program of adult social education, with particular attention to literacy education and citizenship education, to create a better understanding of present problems and of the part which citizens can take in their solution.

4. To encourage numerous projects established throughout China by local agencies or individuals, in one phase or another of rural reconstruction, which in total can have a significant influence in bringing about improvements in rural living conditions.

The Commission further agreed upon the principle that in carrying out the program under these four divisions it would work through appropriate existing agencies, which it would strengthen and which later might continue activity initiated with the Commission's help. Assistance to such agencies is based upon applications submitted by them for aid to specific projects. By a discriminating selection from among these applications the Commission is able to encourage developments in line with its objectives and general plans.

By February 25, 1949, a total of 379 applications for assistance to specific projects had been received, coming from 22 of China's 26 provinces, excluding Manchuria. By that date, 37 of the applications had been acted upon favorably by the Commission. Among those not yet acted upon favorably are a considerable number of well-planned projects worthy of assistance. Additional requests continue to come in.

A list of projects to which the Commission had committed itself at the above date, together with sums allocated toward their support, appears as appendix C of this report.

Of the projects which the Commission thus far has emphasized the following are the most prominent types.

Irrigation and dike repair: One of the quickest and most certain means of increasing production in China is through the use and control of water. Applications received from the different provinces almost without exception include a substantial number of requests for assistance to irrigation or dike works, often for the completion of projects already under construction. The Commission has committed itself to assist several projects of this type, of which the two most significant ones are: The repair of dikes in the Tung Ting Lake area, Hunan Province, sometimes called the "rice bowl" of China; and the completion of 11 small irrigation projects in Szechwan Province which, when completed, will irrigate about 30,000 acres of land. Funds for these projects are given as loans, to be returned to a local foundation made up of Chinese and American members, which will administer the money as a revolving fund for other rural reconstruction purposes. A fuller description of the Tung Ting Dike project appears in appendix D of this report.

Broad programs of rural reconstruction: It is quite clear that the improvement of living conditions in China's rural areas cannot be achieved satisfactorily by attention to only one of the existing problems. In many areas all five of the problems to which the Commission is giving attention are serious. Emphasis, therefore, is being placed on the development, in selected districts, of a broad integrated program, aimed at improvement in all these fundamental ways. It is hoped, subsequently, to develop a gradually expanding program applying, on an increasingly wide scale, the successful techniques worked out in the initial centers.

Three such centers are now receiving assistance from the Commission, each one developing toward the same goal from a different initial approach. The first and best developed of these centers is one sponsored by the mass education movement in the third prefecture of Szechwan Province, where a broad integrated program is being developed on a basis of adult literacy education and the organization of producers' cooperatives. The second center, being established in districts near Hangchow, Chekiang Province, is building upon an initial program of agricultural extension and home demonstration patterned after the program of this kind developed by the United States Department of Agriculture. The third center's program, in districts around Lungyen, southern Fukien Province, is building upon an initial land reform project, established under the national government in 1943.

Out of experience gained in these centers, building a broad program upon three important basic approaches, sound suggestions for application under different conditions in the various parts of China should be developed.

A fuller statement of these three projects appears in Appendix D of this report.

Seed multiplication and animal disease control: In its efforts to improve agriculture, the principal source of livelihood for China's rural people, the Commission has paid particular attention to projects which will bring tangible benefits to farmers generally, throughout the parts of China where the Commission is operating. As a result of research carried out during the past several decades, two such projects are now available for the Commission's consideration. One provides for the multiplication and distribution of improved seed varieties, now available at many experiment stations, which are capable of yielding from 10 to 50 percent more than varieties presently used. The second provides for the manufacture of serums and vaccines required in the control of rinderpest among cattle and cholera and erysipelas among hogs—all serious diseases in China—and for a field program to make the serums and vaccines available to farmers in substantial quantities. Initial steps are now under way to develop these projects systematically, over a considerable area of China if circumstances permit. Details are presented in Appendix D of this report.

Local initiative projects: A large number of projects, related in one way or another to rural reconstruction, have been set up in all parts of China through the initiative and largely with the resources of local government or private groups. Under many different conditions in China, they serve as laboratories and demonstration centers which the Commission believes should be encouraged. The following examples, to which funds have been committed, illustrate the range and types of projects of this nature receiving the Commission's assistance:

(a) Citrus rehabilitation project of Lingnan University, Canton	$6,500
(b) Village handicraft projects making table linens, at Swatow, Kwangtung Province	2,000
(c) Land reclamation project on a farm in Hunan Province established with private means, to provide a living for crippled veterans	20,000
(d) Tea improvement extension project, Hsin Yeh Agricultural Middle School, Hunan Province	5,000
(e) A survey of rural health problems in Hunan Province, by Hsiang Ya Medical College, Changsha	5,000
(f) Rural service center in Hsun Hua Chen, near Nanking, sponsored by Ginling College	5,000
(g) Reforestation of White Cloud Mountain sponsored by the Sun Yat Sen University, Canton	6,000
(h) Farm projects in a rural reconstruction center in Kiangsu Province sponsored by the Catholic Cultural Association under Archbishop Paul Yu Pin	12,000
(i) Rural reconstruction projects under the Kiangsu-Anhwei Christian Rural Service Union, in Kiangsu and Anhwei	10,000

II. ORGANIZATION AND SUPERVISION

The program of the Commission is carried out through its four divisions. Division heads and their staff screen projects, make recommendations to the Commission and supervise field operations. Capable Chinese heads of these four divisions have been appointed.

In the field regional offices have been set up in four of the important areas where projects are being carried out, namely, Szechwan, Hunan, Kiangsu-Chekiang, and Kwangtung. In each of these offices the commission has a representative with an appropriate staff. The representative serves as liaison between the Commission and local agencies and assumes direct responsibility for

---

[2] The two American members appointed to this Commission were: John Earl Baker, formerly adviser to the Chinese Government Ministry of Railroads and for many years a relief executive in China; and Raymond T. Moyer, for 15 years engaged in agricultural work in China, and, more recently, in programs of agricultural collaboration carried out by the United States Department of Agriculture in China and Latin America. The Chinese members were: Chiang Mon Lin, prominent educator, several times Minister of Education, and a liberal thinker; Y. C. James Yen, internationally known founder of the Mass Education Movement; and T. H. Shen, a recognized leader in the field of agriculture in China. Chiang Mon Lin was elected chairman.

[3] A formal statement of the objectives and principles on which this program of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction is based appears as appendix B of this report.

the supervision of projects. Other regional offices will be established as necessary.

A group of Chinese and American specialists is employed by the Commisison to give technical assistance in the various fields represented in the program. These specialists advise regarding choice of projects, make field studies of programs for which assistance is requested, help work out agreements with cooperating agencies, inspect and help organize supervision. A small group of well-qualified persons in agriculture, irrigation, land tenure, and health has been assembled. Shifting plans and uncertainties as to future have kept the number lower than is desirable.

Assistance to projects is provided on the basis of a written agreement between the Commission and the cooperating agency. For most major projects to which funds have been allocated, agreements have been worked out and signed. Steps are now being taken to establish agreements governing the Joint Commission's participation in all projects. The necessity of acting quickly appeared to make it advisable, in some cases, to initiate assistance before formalities were completed.

The Joint Commission assumes responsibility for general supervision of all projects to which assistance is provided. This includes: technical supervision, to assure that the quality of work done is satisfactory; and fiscal supervision, to assure that funds are used honestly and for the intended purposes. Provision for this supervision is gradually being built up. A field force of 30 inspectors, under a trained engineer, is now getting into the field to supervise use of the Commission's funds in the Tung Ting dike repair project. Auditors for each regional office are being appointed, responsible to the Commission's controller. Division heads, Commission members and technical specialists are all making field trips for observation. The Commissioner's experience thus far has been too limited to know the degree of success it will have in guaranteeing a completely satisfactory use of funds. By continued effort along lines already established it is believed that reasonable satisfactory supervision and performance will be secured.

III. FACTORS AFFECTING DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM

The Joint Commission was aware that its task was one of enormous proportions. China is a large country, with a population more than three times that of the United States. The problems of its rural people are of many types. Although certain government and private agencies have done excellent work, devising ways to attack these problems and establishing successful programs on a small scale, the proper procedures to follow in developing a national program are often not clearly defined, nor are they always agreed upon by those working in this field. Effective work on a large scale, moreover, requires a well-developed government organization prepared to carry out essential parts of a program; and such an organization does not exist. Well-conceived programs of several types have been undertaken in the past by well-qualified workers at national and provincial bureau levels, but they have not been well supported at the higher levels of the Chinese Government. Funds made available for the support of these programs have always been very limited. War, inflation, and attendant ills have further reduced the Government's support, with consequent discouragement among personnel doing the work. A gradual breakdown of these services of the national government has taken place. Despite these developments, an active interest in this type of work has been maintained among the trained workers in the national government bureaus and in most of the provincial governments outside of Communist control.

Obviously, in a rural reconstruction effort under these conditions, results on a scale calculated to affect the national situation are to be expected only if a well-supported program of significant proportions can be carried out continuously over a period of years. By the time the Commission assembled, 6 months remained of the year for which Congress had granted authority for American participation in this program.

Furthermore, rapid deterioration in the political, economic, and military situation accelerated inflation, introduced disturbances, and created uncertainties concerning the future. The collapse of nationalist resistance in Manchuria and north China made inaccessible a part of the area for which preliminary plans had been developed, and new planning was required. The new plans, developed in general outline by November 20, provided for a program largely in provinces south of the Yangtze River and the large western province of Szechwan. On December 4, the headquarters of the Joint Commission were moved to Canyon, in South China, a base of operations less subject to disturbance than Nanking. Continuing flexibility and adjustment were required, however, in face of constantly changing conditions. Stability and the assurance of continuity in operations, important for the proper development of a program and the assembling of a staff, have generally been lacking.

The Commission constantly found in China evidence of a great amount of public interest in its effort to establish a rural reconstruction program. Its actions were closely followed by the press. Editorials pointed out the potential significance of this program. Commission members were repeatedly invited to present information about the program to well-attended public gatherings. The need for what the Commission was asked to do is widely recognized. There has been general approval of United States aid to such a program.

IV. FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS AND PROBLEMS

Section 407 of Public Law 472 provides that up to 10 percent of the amount appropriated for economic assistance to China, under that act, shall be available for the purposes of this program, in United States currency, or in local currency, or both. This amounted to a total of up to $27,500,000. By agreement with the Government of China, expenditures in China were to be financed from a special account in Chinese currency, the amount obligated for deposit by the Government in that account to be commensurate with the landed cost of ECA commodities and services provided on a grant basis. To avoid rapid depreciation of idle funds, deposits in the special account have been requested on the basis of immediately foreseeable needs. The account was established in the Central Bank, from which it was agreed to earmark up to the equivalent of United States $25,000,000 for the program in rural reconstruction, the remaining $2,500,000 to be available in United States currency.

No detailed report of expenditures has yet been prepared. As of March 1, 1949, the approximate position was as follows:

	Approximate United States dollar equivalent
1. Local (Chinese) currency account:	
(a) Committed for approved projects[1]	$7,000,000
(b) Payments:	
For approved projects	$2,470,000
For administrative expenses	160,000
2. United States dollar account:	
(a) For administrative expenses	33,000
(b) For program expenses	7,000

[1] Commitments are usually made in terms of piculs of rice. This figure represents the revised estimated cost in terms of United States dollars, taking into account rises in the price of rice. The total cost of this rice, as estimated when the commitments were first made, was approximately $4,700,000.

It is obvious from these figures: (1) that a good deal less than the maximum amount of money authorized in section 407 of the act will be drawn upon for the purposes of this program before April 3, 1949; and (2) that actual payments to projects have lagged behind commitments.

Due to the late date at which the Joint Commission assembled and the financial and other uncertainties in the situation, it is doubtful whether the Commission would have been wise in committing itself to a much larger program, before the end of February, than is represented by these commitments. Had money been available, however, payments to the approved projects would by now be much further advanced, and preparation would have been made for aid to a new series of projects to which the Commission desires to give assistance. Of the difficulties experienced during the life of the Joint Commission, the most frustrating one has been the difficulty experienced in obtaining the amounts of local currency due it by agreement with the Government of China and required for the purposes of its program. These difficulties made it necessary for the Commission to postpone approval of important projects, consumed an undue proportion of the staff's time, caused embarrassment in the Commission's relations with cooperating agencies, and led to public criticism of the Commission for its slowness in developing a program.

This delay in making local currency available may be attributed, to a considerable extent, to the rapidly mounting inflation, which increased the Government's need for funds for all purposes and made it difficult for the bank to keep on hand a sufficient quantity of actual notes to meet required payments. At the same time, there was an understandable reluctance on the part of the Central Bank and some members of the Government's Council for United States Aid (CUSA) to resist any tendency to increase the currency in circulation, on the ground that such an increase would accelerate price inflation, at least in the short run. ECA also experienced great difficulty in negotiating with CUSA a satisfactory understanding as to the rate of conversion of United States dollar costs into Chinese currency, and as to provisions for maintaining the value of such currency in accordance with the terms of the Bilateral Agreement between the Chinese Government and ECA.

For a period subsequent to February 2, substantial payments were received at fairly regular intervals, though still falling behind schedule. At the time of writing this report it is again becoming almost impossible to secure the required amount of local currency funds for program purposes, because deterioration in the value of the Chinese gold yuan make it physically almost impossible for the banks to pay out the volume of notes required to represent the equivalent of any substantial amount of United States currency. Furthermore, the use of the gold yuan as a medium of exchange is now greatly limited as a result of waning public confidence in the national currency. It is, furthermore, necessary to consider the danger of inflationary effects following the use of large quantities of notes for local purchases of commodities.

Even assuming the utmost cooperation of all parties concerned, therefore, it is becoming clear that dependence upon counterpart funds for major support of the program of rural reconstruction, already extremely unsatisfactory, will become increasingly impossible. In the case of Taiwan, direct ECA assistance in supplying commodities should facilitate the obtaining of necessary local currency support for the rural reconstruction program. The ECA program, however, does not call for delivery of substantial amounts of aid commodities to many of the provinces in which the Commission now operates. If the rural reconstruction program is to be continued, therefore, some other basis for financing it must be found.

APPENDIX A

Texts of notes exchanged between the American Ambassador and the Minister of Foreign Affairs providing for the establishment of the Rural Reconstruction Commission in China

I. Note from Ambassador Stuart to the Foreign Affairs Minister

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to section 407 of the China Aid Act of 1948, enacted by the Government of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as the act), which provides, among other things, for the conclusion of an agreement between China and the United States of America establishing a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China. In pursuance of the general principles laid down in the act, and in particular section 407 thereof, I have the honor to bring forward the following proposals regarding the organization of the Joint Commission and related matters:

1. There shall be established a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), to be composed of two citizens of the United States of America appointed by the President of the United States of America and three citizens of the Republic of China to be appointed by the President of China. The Commission shall elect one of the Chinese members as chairman.

2. The functions and authority of the Commission shall, subject to the provisions of the above-mentioned section of the act, be as follows:

(a) To formulate and carry out through appropriate Chinese Government agencies and international or private agencies in China a coordinated program for reconstruction in rural areas of China (hereinafter referred to as the program).

(b) To conclude arrangements with the agencies referred to in the preceding paragraph establishing a basis for their cooperation.

(c) To recommend to the Governments of the United States of America and of China, within the limits prescribed by the act, the allocation of funds and other assistance to the program, and to recommend to the Government of China the allocation of such other funds and assistance as are deemed essential to the success of the program.

(d) To establish standards of performance for implementation of the program, including the qualifications, type and number of personnel to be used by cooperating agencies in the program, and to maintain a constant supervision of all phases of the program, with authority to recommend changes in or stoppage of any phase of the program.

(e) To appoint such executive officers and administrative staff as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the program, it being understood that the chief executive officer shall be a citizen of China. Salaries, expenses of travel and other expenses incident to the administrative functions of the Commission itself shall be paid from funds made available under section 407 (b) of the act.

3. In its program the Commission may include the following types of activity to be carried out in agreement with the agencies referred to in paragraph (2) (a):

(a) A coordinated extension-type program in agriculture, home demonstration, health and education, for initiation in a selected group of hsien in several provinces to include a limited number of subsidiary projects suited to conditions in the areas where the program is developed, in such fields as agricultural production, marketing, credit, irrigation, home and community industries, nutrition, sanitation, and education of a nature which will facilitate the promotion of all projects being undertaken.

(b) Consultation with the Chinese Government concerning ways and means of progressively carrying out land-reform measures.

(c) Subsidiary projects in research, training, and manufacturing, to be carried out in suitable locations to provide information, personnel, and materials required by the program.

(d) Projects to put into effect over a wider area than provided for in the coordinated extension-type program specified in (a), any of the above lines of activity which can be developed soundly on a larger scale, of which examples might be the multiplication and distribution of improved seeds, the control of rinderpest of cattle, the construction of irrigation and drainage facilities, and the introduction of health and sanitation measures.

(e) Related measures, in line with the general objectives of this program.

(f) The distribution of the assistance in this program, on the principle of giving due attention to strengthening rural improvement in areas where selected projects can be progressively developed and where their development will contribute most effectively to the achievement of purposes for which this program is undertaken, but that the principle of distributing aid will not be controlled by proportionate or geographical consideration per se.

4. In respect of any decision of the Commission, the approval of the Government of China shall be obtained prior to its execution if the Commission or its Chairman, with the concurrence of the Chinese members, deems it necessary.

5. The Commission shall publish in China and transmit to the Government of the United States of America and the Government of China, in such form and at such times as may be requested by either of the two Governments, full statements of operations, including a statement on the use of funds, supplies, and services received, and will transmit to the two Governments any other matter pertinent to operations as requested by either of the two Governments. The Government of China will keep the people of China fully informed of the intended purpose and scope of the program and of the progress achieved by the Commission in implementing the program, including the nature and extent of the assistance furnished by the Government of the United States of America.

6. The Government of China will upon appropriate notification of the Ambassador of the United States of America in China consider the United States members and personnel of the Commission as part of the Embassy of the United States of America in China for the purpose of enjoying the privileges and immunities accorded to that Embassy and its personnel of comparable rank. It is understood that the Ambassador of the United States of America in China in making the notification will bear in mind the desirability of restricting, so far as practicable, the number of officials for whom full diplomatic privileges and immunities would be requested. It is also understood that the detailed application of this paragraph would, when necessary, be a subject of intergovernmental discussion.

7. All supplies imported into China for use in the program shall be free of customs duties, conservancy dues, and other charges imposed by the Government of China on similar supplies which are imported through regular commercial channels.

8. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of China will consult with respect to problems incident to the interpretation, implementation and possible amendment of the terms of the agreement embodied in this exchange of notes whenever either of the two governments considers such action appropriate.

9. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right at any time to terminate or suspend its assistance, or any part thereof, provided under this exchange of notes. Assistance furnished by the Government of the United States of America under section 407 of the act and pursuant to this exchange of notes shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the Government of the United States of America or any responsibility for making any further contributions to carry out the purposes of section 407 of the act or of this exchange or notes.

10. This note and Your Excellency's reply accepting the above proposals on behalf of the Government of China will constitute an agreement between the two governments in the sense of section 407 of the act. Subject to the provisions of paragraphs 8 and 9, this exchange of notes will remain in force until June 30, 1949, or, upon the request of either government transmitted to the other government at least 2 months before June 30, 1949, until the date of termination of the Economic Aid Agreement between the two governments concluded on July 3, 1948.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

II. Note from Dr. Wang Shih-chieh to the Ambassador

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your note of today's date which reads as follows:

(Full text of Ambassador's note.)

On behalf of the Government of China, I have the honor to accept the proposals contained in the note quoted above.

In recognition of the importance of the program as one of the essential means of achieving the objectives in which the Governments of China and of the United States of America unite in seeking under the Economic Aid Agreement between the two governments concluded on July 3, 1948, the Government of China undertakes to afford to the execution of the program the full weight of its support and to direct cooperating agencies of the Government of China, including the local officials concerned, to give such assistance and facilities as are essential to the success of their undertakings under the program.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

APPENDIX B

Objectives and principles of the program of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (as adopted by the Joint Commission on October 15, 1949)

I. Objectives

A. To improve the living conditions of the rural people.

B. To increase the production of food and other important crops.

C. To develop the potential power of the people to reconstruct their own communities and the nation, thus to lay the foundation of a strong and democratic China.

D. To help build up and strengthen appropriate services of government agencies—national, provincial, and hsien—that are established to carry out measures pertaining to rural reconstruction.

E. To help stimulate and revitalize enterprises of the rural reconstruction movement and other private agencies doing rural-reconstruction work.

F. To offer liberals, educated youths, and other constructive elements, opportunities to participate in a program of service.

II. Principles

1. Relating to program:

A. The emergency nature of the present situation shall be given paramount consideration in deciding on the nature and location of program and projects.

B. First consideration shall be given to projects which will contribute most directly and immediately to the welfare of the rural people, with special emphasis to be given to the improvement of their economic conditions.

C. A literacy program, supplemented by audio-visual aids, shall be an essential part of this program, as a means of furthering education, organizing the people, and developing and selecting rural leadership.

D. New projects in rural reconstruction deserve encouragement, but unless they can show evidence of self-help and self-support for a reasonable length of time, financial aid shall not be considered.

E. Projects which already have been proved successful, under rural conditions, and which are reasonably simple and inexpensive shall be broadcast on a large scale.

F. In general, preference shall be given to those agencies engaged in rural reconstruction having a sound foundation and experienced staff and organization.

2. Relating to procedure:

A. The program formulated by the Commission shall be carried out in cooperation with existing agencies.

B. A correlated approach shall be adopted wherever possible, since the various aspects of rural reconstruction are interrelated, the success of one depending upon the success of the other.

C. A direct extension type of adult education shall be emphasized as the most effective and quickest means of promoting the understanding, acceptance, and correct use of recommended practices.

D. Local initiative shall be fostered and local resources, both human and material, shall be mobilized for the purposes of the program.

E. Assistance to a project in any province shall be contingent upon the willingness of the provincial and local officials concerned to cooperate fully in efforts to carry it out, and to take other steps, themselves, that are essential to the attainment of results expected of the project.

APPENDIX C

Projects to which the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction is committed for assistance, as of Mar. 1, 1949

Project	Province	Sponsoring agency	Amount committed (United States dollars) [1]
1. Irrigation: the completion of 11 partially completed projects	Szechwan	Szechwan Provincial government	$400,000
2. Integrated rural reconstruction program of third prefecture	do	Mass education movement in cooperation with local government.	1,000,000
As loans to—			
Program assisting tenants to become owners. $72,000			
Weaving cooperatives 266,000			
Dyeing and processing plant 30,000			
Pond irrigation 120,000			
Water buffalo purchase 12,000			
Total 500,000			
As grants to—			
Adult education program (4,000 teachers) 250,000			
Supervisory personnel 60,000			
Texts and teaching material 90,000			
Training program 30,000			
Health program 50,000			
Seed multiplication and distribution 20,000			
Total 500,000			
3. Tung Ting Lake dike repair	Hunan	Hunan Provincial government	1,600,000
4. Land reclamation on farm established by private means, to provide a living for crippled veterans.	do	Hunan Crippled Veterans' Rehabilitation Bureau	20,000
5. Distribution cottonseed in Tung Ting Lake flooded area	do	National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.	10,000
6. Reclamation of land held by Keh Chiang College	do	Keh Chiang College, Hunan	30,000
7. Lan Shan rural reconstruction center	do		3,000
8. Tea-improvement extension program	do	Hsiu Yeh Agricultural Middle School	5,000
9. Lin Lake land reform demonstration center	do	Hunan Provincial government, Provincial Bureau of Land Policy.	20,000
10. Survey of rural health problems in Hunan Province, preparing for a rural-health program.	do	Hsiang Ya Medical College	5,000
11. Lung Yen land reform project	Fukien	Fukien Provincial government	30,000
12. Projects to be agreed upon following visit of Commission members to Kwangsi.	Kwangsi	Kwangsi Provincial government	200,000
13. Sheep and wool rehabilitation program or Mongols	Ninghsia	ECA China Mission in cooperation with local authorities.	100,000
14. Rural community industries (for specific projects now being selected).	Hunan, Kiangsi, Fukien, and Kwangtung.	Chinese industrial cooperatives	20,000
15. Chekiang agricultural extension and home demonstration program.	Chekiang	Chekiang Provincial government in cooperation with the National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.	120,000
16. Fish-fry distribution	do	National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.	10,000
17. Citrus fruit industry rehabilitation, Swatow area	Kwangtung	Lingman University	6,500
18. Citrus fruit industry rehabilitation, Canton area	do	Sun Yat Sen University	6,000
19. Handicraft project making table linen, Swatow	do		2,000
20. Pump irrigation, 43 small projects	do	AMOMO (agricultural machinery operation and management organization) Kwangtung regional office.	60,000
21. White Cloud Mountain reforestation, near Canton	do	Sun Yat Sen University	6,000
22. Irrigation and dike repair (small projects in Pearl River Delta)	do	Kwangtung Provincial government	00,000
23. Integrated program of rural reconstruction	do	Kwangtung Provincial government	100,000
24. Rebuilding of silk industry in Kwangtung Province	do	China Silk Corp	140,000
25. Reforestation demonstration centers along the North River and the West River, Kwangtung.	do		1,900
26. Firewood growing demonstration	do	National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.	4,000
27. Farm projects in a rural reconstruction center	Kiangsu	Catholic Cultural Association sponsored by Archbishop Paul Yu Pin.	12,000
28. Rural reconstruction training and demonstration center	do	Ginling College	5,000
29. Rural reconstruction training and demonstration center	do	Nanking Theological Seminary	5,000
30. Wusih rural reconstruction center	do	Wusih College	5,000
31. Kiangsu-Anhwei Christian Rural Service Union program	Kiangsu and Anhwei	Kiangsu-Anhwei Christian Rural Service Union	10,000
32. Wheat-seed multiplication	Kiangsu	Nanking University College of Agriculture and Forestry	5,000
33. Rice borer research program	do	National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.	5,000
34. Improved seed multiplication and distribution	Chekiang, Szechwan, Kwangsi, Hunan, and Kwangtung.	National Government Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in cooperation with Provincial governments.	100,000
35. Animal-disease control	Chekiang, Szechwan, Kwangsi, Hunan, and Taiwan.	do	100,000
36. Improved sweetpotato extension	Kwangsi, Kwangtung, Hunan, and Szechwan.	do	12,500
37. Program of public information and education	Szechwan, Chekiang, Kwangsi, Kwangtung, and Fukien.	(For local currency support of a program carried out under contract by Counsel Services, Inc., Baltimore, Md.)	50,000
Grand total			[1] 4,708,900

[1] Commitments are usually made in terms of piculs or rice. The figures given here represent the United States dollar cost of that rice as estimated when commitments were first made. Rises in the price of rice have since occurred, which were not known for all cases when this table was prepared. As a result, the best information available indicated that the total amount to which the Joint Commission has committed itself for these projects would finally be around $7,000,000, shown on p. 8 of this report, as compared with the total of $4,708,900 as shown here.

APPENDIX D

Description of selected projects illustrating work carried on in the joint commission's program

The following examples will illustrate the type of work represented in projects thus far selected for assistance:

Repair of dikes in the Tung Ting Lake area, Hunan Province: This is the largest project receiving assistance under the rural reconstruction program. Because of torrential rains in 1948 which flooded simultaneously five rivers that flow into the Tung Ting Lake region, widely known as the Rice Bowl of China, water broke through numerous places in the network of dikes protecting agricultural land which normally produces around 400,000 tons of rice. This area was one of the important sources of rice for Shanghai, and Canton also shared its surplus. Approximately 1,000,000 people were affected by the flood.

Upon the urgent request of the governor of Hunan Province, the Joint Commission agreed to provide half the cost of the repair, on a loan basis. A foundation, made up of Chinese and American members, is to receive repayments on the loan and administer the funds in a program promoting other projects of rural reconstruction in that province. It is stipulated that one of the important uses of this fund shall be to help worthy tenant farmers become owners. Funds initially allotted to this project total an equivalent of approximately US$1,600,000.

Seed multiplication and distribution: Before the war, as part of a program sponsored by the Nanking University, college of agriculture and forestry, in cooperation with Cornell University, experiment stations in many parts of China undertook work to develop improved varieties of important farm crops. This effort subsequently was expanded by the National Government. As a result, a large number of rice, wheat, cotton, sweetpotato, and corn varieties have been developed, capable of producing from 10 to 50 percent more than varieties now in most common use. Although previously distributed to farmers on a small scale, no systematic effort has yet been undertaken to multiply these seeds and make them available to farmers generally. The Commission's assistance has been requested to do this.

A system for accomplishing this is being developed, and initial steps are now being taken to put it into effect in five provinces this spring. The advice of American specialists is to be obtained to help insure that the plan is established on the soundest possible basis, for gradual application throughout China. Funds thus far allotted to this program total the equivalent of US$100,000.

Animal disease control: While farm animals in China suffer from the ravages of a large number of diseases, three of them appear susceptible of effective control in a practical program. These diseases are rinderpest among cattle and cholera and erysipelas among hogs. Measures for their control are already in existence as the result of preliminary work done in the Animal Industry Research Bureau of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, aided by specialists and equipment supplied initially by UNRRA and continued by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Plans have been presented to the Joint Commission for a program to undertake the control of these diseases on a large scale, including the establishment or expansion of facilities to manufacture the necessary sera and vaccines and the organization of a field program to make them available on farms. The manufacture of vaccines, and field programs in four provinces, are now under way. Funds thus far allotted to this program total the equivalent of US$100,000.

The third prefecture (Szechwan) rural reconstruction program—sponsored by the mass education movement: Over a period of nearly two decades the National Mass Education Movement, of which Dr. Y. C. James (Jimmy) Yen is director, has promoted the development of a broad program of rural reconstruction, in China, for the purpose of stimulating effort to solve problems of livelihood, education, health, and local government in China's rural areas. One such project began in Szechwan about 2 years ago and has gradually taken root in parts of 3 hsien (counties) in the third prefecture of Szechwan Province, near Chungking. The assistance of the Commission has been requested to complete development of the program in these hsien and to extend suitable parts to 8 other hsien, into an area populated by about 5,000,000 people of whom roughly 80 percent live in rural communities. Its object is, while continuing to experiment in ways of improving rural conditions, to demonstrate on a larger scale what can be achieved by using technique already well worked out. About half of the total cost of this program is being borne by the local people in the prefecture, the remaining half being provided by the Joint Commission.

This assistance will help establish in 4,000 communities of this area mass education classes for adults, which are expected largely to eliminate illiteracy in the area within 1 year. In each of these communities a producers' cooperative will be established, membership in which is limited to farmers actually engaged in farming. A grant also is being given to develop a health program, with emphasis on the control of smallpox, malaria, and gastro-intestinal infections, together with a program related to hygiene, maternity, and child care.

Loans will be given to help develop home weaving on a cooperative basis, from the purchase of cotton yarn through weaving and dyeing. Loans also will be extended for the building of irrigation reservoirs, the acquiring of land ownership by tenants, and the purchase of water buffalo to be owned and used cooperatively. As loans are repaid they will revert to a foundation, to be used as a revolving fund for other rural reconstruction work.

The amount in grants and loans initially allocated to this program totals the equivalent of US$1,000,000.

The Hangchow agricultural extension and home demonstration program: There is available in China a great deal more information which could improve the living conditions of its rural people than has yet been put into use. One of the important reasons for this gap between what is known and what is applied is the lack of a suitable system for getting the existing information to farmers and into farm homes. There is badly needed in China a government service to do for its rural people what has been done for the rural people of the United States through the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

A sound beginning in establishing such a service, following recommendations of the Joint China-United States Agricultural Mission in 1946, has been started in four districts of Chekiang Province, around Hangchow. Results already obtained have stimulated local support, which now provides about half of the needed funds. Four surrounding hsien also wish to initiate a similar program. Because of uncertainties in the situation the Commission will limit its support to the original districts, to which funds are being allocated to improve agricultural services, add projects in home demonstration, and establish health services. If conditions permit this work to continue, the experience gained will help substantially in efforts to establish an agricultural extension and home demonstration program on a national scale. The amount allocated for this purpose to date is the equivalent of US$120,000.

The Lungyen (Fukien) land-reform project: In 1929 the Chinese Communists, under Mao Tze Tung, occupied a portion of southern Fukien Province, where they instituted drastic land-reform measures, putting land into the hands of tenants and killing or frightening away the landlords. Six years later, when this area was recovered by the National Government, the land was restored as far as possible to its former owners. A period of confusion followed, the tenants being unhappy about giving up their newly acquired ownership and the original owners wishing to keep the land. The fact that 64 percent of the land was tilled by tenants, largely held by absentee landlords, and only 36 percent by owner farmers indicates that a real farm-tenancy problem did exist.

To stabilize conditions in the area, the provincial government appointed in 1943 a young county (hsien) magistrate with authority to institute reforms as he felt necessary. He established a system for retransferring ownership to the tenants based on government compensation to landlords for their property and distribution of land according to the number of persons in a family. Results have been very beneficial to the tenants and to the region; and landlords, who also are usually merchants, are now fully reconciled to the arrangement.

Partly stimulated by fear of the Communists, remembering the experience in 1929, six hsien in the surrounding territory now wish to institute a similar program to put ownership of land into the hands of the tenants, the landlords being quite willing to cooperate. At the same time, the local government of the original hsien is asking for assistance in developing irrigation and agricultural improvements to increase production and income. The Commission's assistance has been requested in this program, which may provide many lessons leading to a peaceful solution of the farm-tenancy problem now receiving attention throughout China. The Commission has set aside the equivalent of $30,000 (United States) for this project, but expects to allocate for this program in the near future up to the equivalent of $110,000 (United States).

[U. S. Economic Cooperation Administration press release]

SHANGHAI, January 25.—Dikes to protect highly productive farmland along the south and west shores of Tungting Lake are now being reconstructed with the aid of the Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction. (JCRR).

The JCRR was established as part of the ECA American-aid program to China.

Through its support for the Tungting Lake dike project, the JCRR will not only help safeguard one of the most fertile rice-producing areas in China against spring floods; it will also bring about the establishment of a Hunan Rural Reconstruction Foundation to perpetuate benefits from the American-aid program for the rural population of the province.

The flood-threatened land in Hunan is scattered through 11 hsien and populated by 1,000,000 people. Normally this land produces 400,000 tons of rice a year. Before the war, the area was one of the principal sources of food supply for Shanghai, and it also shipped some of its surplus crop to Canton.

When rainfall is normal, Tungting Lake is an adequate reservoir for the five rivers which traverse the region, including the Yangtze. However, last May, torrential rains affected all five rivers simultaneously. Water overflowed the banks, destroying dikes and inundating the land.

The flooding of land bordering Tungting Lake became the primary economic problem of Hunan Province, and Governor Cheng Chien approached the JCRR for assistance to prevent the recurrence of a similar disaster this spring.

Reconstruction of the dikes began early this month under the supervision of 336 dike offices. Work will be intensive during the winter season when the water is low, and the rebuilding is scheduled to be completed by the end of April to enable spring planting. The dikes are being built 2 feet higher to match an equivalent amount of silting which has occurred in Tungting Lake.

Half the cost of this project is being financed with a loan from the JCRR. The loan is in terms of rice, part of which is being purchased in the immediate region of the project, and the rest at Changsha. (Buying in two places helps keep the price of rice down.) Chinese currency funds used by the JCRR come out of the ECA–CUSA special account.

The JCRR office at Changsha will maintain engineering and auditing inspection of the project.

The JCRR loan will be repaid in from 1 to 3 years, depending on crop conditions, with interest at 6 percent per annum on unpaid portions.

The repaid loan will be put to work for future agrarian benefits for Hunan Province, under the direction of the Hunan Rural Reconstruction Foundation.

The foundation will be established by April 30, 1949. It will comprise 5 or 10 members, with the ratio of 3 Chinese to 2 Americans. The same ratio applies in the JCRR. The chairman of the foundation will be Chinese. Members of the foundation will serve without pay, and they will meet from two to four times a year to consider the application of foundation funds. These funds will be repaid JCRR loans or repaid foundation loans.

The foundation will use its resources to back projects which will increase food production in Hunan and improve the lot of the rural population there.

The foundation can either make loans or grants. Projects in areas from which the foundation derives its funds will be given preference.

One of the main purposes of the foundation will be to aid tenant farmers purchase land. It will be abetted in this work by the formation of producers' cooperatives in connection with the JCRR program. The Hunan provincial government has pledged its aid in the establishment of these cooperatives. Only land tillers are eligible to join the cooperatives. The cooperatives will:

1. Collect rents and pay landowners. This will eliminate the middleman in the collection of rents and help protect tenant farmers.

2. Insure that landowners do not evict tenants unjustly.

3. Prevent raising of rents.

4. Loan funds to tenants for land purchase and buy land for the cooperative. These credit functions will obtain after the cooperatives reach an advanced stage of development.

[United States Economic Cooperation Administration press release]

SHANGHAI, February 3.—An over-all program to improve rural life for 5,000,000 Chinese in the Third Prefecture of Szechuen Province has begun with the support of the Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction.

The program exemplifies the comprehensive rather than piecemeal approach to rural improvement.

The program will concentrate on five main targets of the JCRR: agriculture, farm tenancy, local government, administration, health and adult social education.

A foundation for the project has already been laid by the work of the mass education movement, which started a program in the Third Prefecture after the war. The Third Prefecture is adjacent to Chungking and comprises 10 hsien and one special district.

It is upon this tested ground that the new program will build, extending methods which have already worked successfully and using trained and proven personnel in an area where local initiative has already been aroused.

About half the cost of the program will be borne by the JCRR, which has three Chinese members and two American members, as grants and loans in rice, and the other half by the Third Prefecture, also in rice. Loans will be repaid in rice. The combined JCRR and local effort will make possible the following projects:

1. An attack on the problem of farm tenancy through the formation of 100 new producer cooperatives. Only land tillers are eligible to join these cooperatives. Ninety-two cooperatives already exist in the Third Prefecture, and they have proven effective representatives of the tenants in guarding against illegal cancellation of contracts, increase in rents or sale of land without first offering the tenant a chance to buy.

It is estimated that if the average family of 5 has 10 mou of rice land and 10 mou of dry land, plus small supplementary home industries, it is possible for them to maintain a decent livelihood in a province like Szechwan where the soil is generally fertile.

The program in the Third Prefecture will aid 5 members of each of the 100 new producer cooperatives to purchase 10 mou of land. Sixty percent of the cost will be a loan from the JCRR, and the rest a loan from the producer cooperatives. The JCRR loan will be repaid in installments over a 10-year period, with 6 percent interest per annum on the unpaid portions. The accumulated interest will be paid off in a lump sum at the end of the eleventh year.

2. Spread education among the 1,904,306 illiterate adults and unschooled youth of the Third Prefecture.

The education project will be carried out through the Tao Sheng (pupil-monitor) system. The mass education movement has already used this system to teach one-third of all illiterates in Pishan, one of the hsien in the Third Prefecture. One-half of those in this hsien who should have been in school and were not are now in school.

The success of the Tao Sheng system rests upon voluntary workers in the rural areas who go out and teach their own neighbors. To do this, they need reading material, including basic character primers and texts on the training of other voluntary workers. Publication costs will be defrayed by the JCRR.

In addition, the JCRR will pay for the cost of maintaining one adult education worker in each of 4,000 schools in the prefecture. Twelve thousand regular teachers in these schools will be supported by the local population.

3. Protect and improve the health of the population in the prefecture.

Control of specially prevalant endemic diseases—smallpox, malaria and gastro-intestinal infections—will be pushed. Water supply and sanitation will be improved. As part of a health education program, classes will be held in hygiene, maternity and child care, planned parenthood and nurses' training. The JCRR will back this part of the program with a grant.

4. Help the weaving cooperative movement grow in Pishan hsien. This project will affect directly an estimated 23,000 families in Pishan. These families have 11,000 improved looms and 30,000 wooden looms. But only 12 percent of the owners so far have been organized into a cooperative union which handles transportation and marketing.

The JCRR will provide credit for the establishment of more weaving cooperatives and the building of a dyeing and standardization plant that will enable cooperative cloth to compete more successfully with machine-made cloth.

5. Construction of small-scale irrigation ponds. Streams in the mountainous Third Prefecture can easily be used for irrigation if ponds are built to conserve water. The JCRR will furnish a loan to construct 2,000 such ponds; producer cooperatives will finance the rest with a loan.

6. Increase livestock in the region. The chief source of power for planting and cultivation in the prefecture is the water buffalo. A thousand of these animals will be purchased, and the JCRR will defray three-fifths of the cost with a loan.

[United States Economic Cooperation Administration press release]

SHANGHAI, February 3.—Discussing the new rural improvement program, to be supported by the Joint Sino-American Rural Reconstruction Commission in Szechuen's Third Prefecture, Dr. James Y. C. Yen, Commission member, said:

"The people's interest has been stimulated; the program is not superimposed from the outside, and the people want it. The basic fundamental techniques for rural improvement have been evolved. And local leadership has been developed."

Dr. Raymond T. Moyer, one of the American members of the JCRR, said:

"Experience has shown that an integrated program is necessary in order to really improve the living conditions of the people."

Dr. Moyer said a fundamental task of the JCRR was to "work with existing agencies to build up the concept of what ought to be done in the field of rural improvement and establish the kind of organization necessary to do it."

Like the other JCRR projects, the program in the Third Prefecture will not burn itself out with the accomplishment of its immediate tasks. Through the program, a foundation will be established to continue rural projects in Szechuen Province. The foundation will support such projects with grants and loans, using funds from repaid JCRR or foundation loans.

Panama Canal Security Against Atomic Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, earlier during this session of Congress in extensions of my remarks there were included authoritative articles dealing with the subject of the atomic bomb as regards the Panama Canal and other proposed Isthmian waterways. The first of these was by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, January 13, 1949, A–169 of the RECORD; the second, by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, February 14, 1949, A–755 of the RECORD; and the third, by Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, March 24, 1949, A–1713 of the RECORD.

Recently another comparable contribution was made by Lt. Cmdr. H. B. Seim, United States Navy, the "prize essay" of 1949, awarded by the United States Naval Institute, and published in

the April, 1949, issue of the Institute's Proceedings. Under leave accorded, I include the essay as a part of these remarks, with accompanying notes of the editor, as follows:

The opinions or assertions in this article are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

A graduate of the Naval Academy in 1940, Lieutenant Commander Seim served in South American, West Indian, and Pacific waters before World War II. He was assistant gunnery officer of the U. S. S. *Independence* when she was torpedoed in the Tarawa campaign, and subsequently was gunnery officer on the staff of commander, Carrier Divisions 4 and 5, in Task Force 38. After Japan's surrender, he served in the western Pacific, Philippines, China, and Japan, and is now on duty in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

The author emphasizes the fact that so long as the atomic-warfare threat exists, the national security depends upon the maintenance of the military superiority of the United States in the form of our present atomic advantages, together with other features and elements of military strength in accepted use. That view necessarily implies that the expenditure of our national wealth on projects—such as the proposed sea-level canal at Panama—that do not actually contribute to our general security are to be avoided.

These four articles—I repectfully submit—definitely show that in this age of modern weapons it is not possible to attain even a reasonable protection against atomic explosives by any particular types of construction. The carefully considered statements of these authors are most timely, and they serve to correct the erroneous impression—so industriously presented and widely accepted—that we can construct an impregnable canal at Panama, or elsewhere.

In this general connection there should be kept in mind the most vital consideration—which, I believe, has escaped, thus far, any sufficient discussion—that the atomic bomb is yet in its infancy; and that in a few years it may be actually obsolescent in comparison with what science may evolve. Hence, any plan of canal which, for the sake of argument, might be regarded as proof against serious atomic attack at the present time, would, in undoubted probability, be wholly insecure all too soon; perhaps on or before the completion of any new project.

As heretofore I have sought to indicate, the security of the Panama Canal must depend on the military, political, and industrial might of the United States, augmented by the protective devices and methods which an efficient and tireless scientific effort and ingenuity may produce.

Here follows the very able and informative article under discussion:

ATOMIC BOMB—THE X-FACTOR OF MILITARY POLICY

(By Lt. Comdr. H. B. Seim, U. S. Navy)

A belief that is fast becoming the central core of our national defense thinking appears consistently in many of our national forums; namely, that the atom bomb is a miraculous panacea for all of our military ills. For example, a recent article, based on an interview with Gen. George C. Kenney, then head of the Strategic Air Command states that "today, strategic bombing authorities are concerned with only one bomb load—the atom bomb." However great and awe-inspiring the power of the A-bomb, it is but simple common sense to attempt an evaluation before we accept it as the main shot in our weapons locker. This is particularly important in view of the above-expressed tendency to rely completely and solely on this weapon to preserve our national security. Are we jeopardizing the safety of our Nation by such complete reliance?

No one can dispute the fact that the five publicized explosions of atomic bombs have demonstrated almost unbelievable power. Observations and reports from the first experimental blast in New Mexico, the wartime bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the two test explosions at Bikini indicate decisively that mankind has found the key to unleash tremendous force for destructive purposes. The United States Strategic Bombing Survey has estimated that to produce results similar to the Nagasaki attack approximately 2,200 tons of conventional high explosives and incendiaries for physical damage plus 500 tons of fragmentation bombs for casualties, a total of 270 B–29 loads of 10 tons each, would be required. The subsurface explosion at Bikini on July 25, 1946, was reported to have been at least as destructive as 20,000 tons of TNT. When a force of such potentialities has been revealed as a part of our arsenal, it is certainly not amiss to investigate its effects on both the enemy and ourselves, and the military and political considerations which may govern its employment.

EFFECT ON ENEMY

There are but two examples of the use of the atomic bomb in actual warfare—the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. A review of the results of these two attacks can provide us with an understanding of the effect of the atomic bomb when used against urban targets. In addition, certain lessons may be inferred from the meager reports which have been published concerning the effectiveness of the A-bomb during the Crossroads operation. From these experiences we may make a general assessment of the capabilities and limitations of the bomb insofar as it affects the target.

The Hiroshima attack on the morning of August 6, 1945, caught the Japanese almost completely by surprise; in fact, the explosion came 45 minutes after the "all clear" had been sounded from a previous alarm. The complacency of the Japanese population can be easily understood. Hiroshima had never been attacked in force, but the people were accustomed to seeing stray American planes flying around the city. The United States Army Air Force had been using Lake Biwa to the northeast of Hiroshima as a rendezvous point for bombers which had assaulted the larger Japanese cities. Therefore, little notice was paid by the Japanese to the small group of three planes which approached Hiroshima on that fateful morning. Only one bomber, the Enola Gay, carried a bomb; the other two contained observers and their instruments. Because of this indifference and the lack of adequate warning, most people had not taken shelter.

The bomb burst slightly northwest of the center of the city. The nature of the terrain at Hiroshima was such that the blast and ensuing fire leveled nearly five square miles of the city. The exact number of casualties will probably never be determined. Seventy to eighty thousand people were killed, or missing and presumed dead, and an equal number were injured. The casualties at Nagasaki were somewhat smaller about 35,000 killed and a similar number injured.

Nagasaki was scarcely more prepared for an atomic bomb attack than Hiroshima, although 3 days had elapsed since the first drop. Once again the appearance of the small raiding group of only two planes caused little concern. The newspapers had made only vague references to the Hiroshima disaster. The devastation caused by the explosion was as horrible and complete as at Hiroshima. However, due to the uneven terrain and the absence of a "fire storm," less than two square miles of the city were destroyed.[1] Nevertheless the destruction far exceeded that which any conventional bomb would have achieved. What are the miraculous qualities of the atomic bomb to enable it to inflict such tremendous damage?

The bomb is nothing supernatural or incomprehensible. As do ordinary high explosives, atomic bombs release energy, though on an unprecedented scale. The energy takes three forms—heat, blast or pressure, and radiation. Heat and blast effects are evident in ordinary TNT explosions; the radiation effect is unique to the atomic bomb. The energy released in atomic explosion is of such magnitude and from such a concentrated source that its physical properties are of much greater intensity than in the case of an ordinary bomb. This is because the energy produced in an atomic explosion results from the splitting of an atom of uranium or plutonium into two major fragments, a process called fission, whereas an ordinary explosion is accompanied only by the rearrangement of the atoms of the explosive material. An illustration of this rearrangement may be found in the simple chemical process of burning. For example, the carbon in coal is combined with the oxygen of the air to form carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide, liberating heat and light in the form of fire. The end products—carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide—still contain the original carbon and oxygen atoms. In an atomic explosion, however, there is a transmutation of the fissionable material. In the fission of uranium (U–235), typical end products are barium and krypton, two entirely different elements. These residual particles have masses whose sum is less than the mass of the original material. This reduction in mass results in an enormous release of energy. In theory, the matter is converted into energy at the rate of 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per pound change of mass.

The magnitude of this potential energy supply can best be appreciated if we consider that the entire production of electrical power in the United States in 1946 amounted to 223,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the equivalent of the energy contained in about 20 pounds of matter. However, in practice there are severe limitations on the amount of energy which can be released in an atomic explosion. Actually only a very small percentage of the matter is capable of being converted into energy. The reduction in mass accompanying the fission of uranium or plutonium varies somewhat according to what are the final products, but has an average of about one-tenth of 1 percent. This represents the optimum energy release. Apparently the energy of the bombs used against Japan was actually less than this because the reaction was not complete. Fission in the Japanese bombs was only a small percentage of the theoretical potential. In spite of its fractional efficiency in terms of the theoretical potential, the atomic bomb far overshadows all previous explosives, as demonstrated by the physical results.

As previously mentioned, energy release in an atomic explosion is manifested by heat,

[1] The Japanese city of Kokura was designated the target for the second atom bomb. However, the raiding force found the primary target weathered in, and thus Nagasaki, the alternate objective, became the hapless victim.

blast or pressure, and radiation. The heat energy alone was estimated by Japanese physicists at the astronomical figure of 10-to-the-thirteenth power calories. A fire ball several hundred feet in diameter is formed and the temperature at its core runs into millions of degrees centigrade. At its edge the temperature has been estimated to be from 3,000 to 9,000 degrees centigrade. The fire ball is in effect a small sun, and the heat and light which radiate from it can cause charring, start fires, and kill people. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki charred telephone poles were found as far as 13,000 feet from "ground zero," the point directly beneath the center of the explosion. Mica, with a melting point of 900 degrees, fused on gravestones a thousand feet from the center of the blast. Victims were charred beyond recognition in the immediate vicinity of ground zero. These effects are vastly more intense than any which could be experienced from an ordinary bomb. The blast or pressure results are also magnified.

Pressure at the center rises to tens of millions of atmospheres. At ground zero its force was estimated by the Japanese at from 5.3 to 8 tons per square yard. The blast effects, with their resemblance to the aftermath of a hurricane, were most striking at Nagasaki. Concrete buildings had their sides facing the blast stove in like boxes. Long lines of steel-framed factory sheds, over a mile from ground zero, leaned their skeletons away from the explosion. That the blast effect is tremendous can be readily comprehended from the many pictures of the devastated cities that have been published, and from the damaged wrecks of the Bikini tests. It is much more destructive than the blast from an ordinary bomb. In regard to the third form of energy release, radiation, the atomic bomb is vastly more effective than the usual explosive.

In addition to the emission of heat and light radiation which is common to the ordinary bomb, the atomic explosion also produces dangerous radiations in the form of high-speed neutrons and gamma rays. Gamma rays, like X-rays, can be deadly. Neutrons also have a degenerative effect on the body cells that can be lethal. The high concentration of radioactive emissions at both Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused heavy personnel casualties, even though their duration was very short. The rays proved deadly for an average radius of 3,000 feet from ground zero, and mild effects were observed on people who had been almost 2 miles away from the blast. An odd characteristic of radiation disease is its delayed effect. People who had survived the explosion itself succumbed to the effect of the radiation overdose several days after the attack, in some cases 2 or 3 weeks later. Japaneses casualties from the air bursts were limited to those who had been exposed to the direct radiation from the bomb. People in the underground shelters were largely protected, but the thin walls of buildings proved no barrier to the invisible rays. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki the radioactive by-products of the explosion and the induced radioactivity in other substances (water, earth, machinery, building debris, etc.) were of little consequence. This was not true in the second Bikini test, however. The explosion of the atomic bomb under the surface of the lagoon produced intense radioactivity in the water. It is estimated to have been the equivalent of many hundreds of tons of radium. A column of this radioactive water a mile high and nearly a half mile in diameter rose into the air and then engulfed about half of the target array. These contaminated ships became radioactive stoves, and would have burned all living things aboard them with an invisible and painless but deadly radiation. The implications of possible wartime applications of such methods of radioactive contamination are awe-inspiring.

EFFECT ON US

A tremendous economic and industrial effort is involved in the development and manufacture of atomic bombs and related atomic weapons. Great quantities of raw materials in the form of pitchblende and carnotite ores are required from which the fissionable U–235 or plutonium may be derived. Huge industrial plants containing hundreds of thousands of delicate and precision-made instruments and other equipment are necessary. Great numbers of men, from laborers to highly skilled and trained scientists and top-flight engineers and technicians, must be available. In certain of the processes huge amounts of power are required, and in others an abundant supply of cooling water is a necessity. All of these factors have potential limitations, especially when they may conflict with other possible wartime demands.

The quantity of fissionable material which can be made available is subject to limitation. So far, only U–235 and plutonium have been used in the manufacture of atomic bombs. Both of them are derived from uranium present in raw uranium ores. Uranium is a fairly plentiful material—about four parts in a million in the earth's crust, more plentiful than gold, for example. But only two ores, pitchblende and carnotite, are of value as a source of the uranium metal with the present methods of extraction. Usable deposits of these ores are rather limited. Uranium metal, a combination of U–235 and U–238, represents only a small fraction of the ore. U–235, the part of the uranium metal which can be used as the fissionable material in the manufacture of atomic explosive, is in turn present in very minute proportion. Seven-tenths of 1 percent of the uranium metal is U–235. The remaining U–238 can be processed in an atomic pile to form plutonium, another source of fissionable material.

The separation of U–235 from the uranium metal extracted from pitchblende or carnotite could not be accomplished by chemical methods. Instead, other processes had to be developed to capitalize on the infinitesimal weight difference between the lighter U–235 and the heavier U–238. Four methods were finally devised—gaseous diffusion, thermal diffusion, centrifugal, and electromagnetic.

All of these methods called for the mass production of precision instruments and equipment, some more delicate than any that had ever been manufactured for laboratory work. In the gaseous diffusion process, for example, thousands of containers about the size of a depth charge case were needed. Yet the gas, uranium hexafluoride, was so fiercely corrosive that ordinary metals were unsatisfactory. Only nickel was found to be acceptable, but the first increment of these tanks would have required all of the nickel mined in America for 2 years. The problem was finally solved by electroplating nickel on steel to standards of perfection that were undreamed of in the commercial world. New techniques in cutting and welding glass piping were developed; huge numbers of high-speed pumps of new design were made. Unbelievable standards of operation were achieved. For example, although a vacuum of 1 inch is very good in power-plant practice, the gaseous diffusion plant maintained a vacuum 25,000,000 times greater.

Tremendous amounts of power are required to operate the plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Though they were located in the Clinch River Valley in order to tap the TVA supply, one of the world's largest steam power plants was also erected there. In the manufacture of plutonium a plentiful supply of cooling water was necessary. For this reason the Hanford Engineer Works was built near the Columbia River in the State of Washington. With three atomic piles in operation in 1945 the liberated atomic heat had raised the temperature of the river fractionally, even though the water underwent a long decontamination period before flowing back into the river.

As can be readily seen, the development and manufacture of atomic weapons impose a huge burden on our economy. The capital outlay for the construction of the plants alone is staggering. The original cost of the Hanford Works was $350,000,000. The gas diffusion plant at Oak Ridge, only a part of the establishment at that location, consisted of 63 buildings costing half a billion dollars. It was the world's greatest continuous chemico-physical process factory. The principal building was a windowless U-shaped structure four stories high, 2,500 feet long, and 400 feet wide.

MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS

The adoption of a policy which places sole reliance upon the atom bomb would have severe effects on the pace of military progress, in that it would bring about a stagnation in the development of other weapons and techniques. Having committed ourselves to the use of one weapon and one method of delivery, we would find no incentive to invent new and different means of employing military force. In a world in which scientific achievement can tip the balance in time of war, we would be channeling all of our effort toward one limited objective—progress in atomic explosives to be used solely with long-range bombers.

Our own history provides an example of the damaging effect of sole reliance on an imperfect weapons system. After the Barbary wars, Congress adopted a "gunboat policy" which called for the construction of large numbers of small nonseagoing coastal gunboats, to the exclusion of seagoing vessels. It was reasoned that such a force would deter an attack from overseas and yet would not permit our involvement in conflicts in foreign waters. In the later War of 1812, however, larger enemy frigates and sloops had no difficulty in deeply penetrating our territorial waters. Washington itself was burned by the British. Our internal commerce, dependent upon coastwise seaborne trade, was paralyzed; foreign trade virtually ceased to exist. The resultant depression was one of the worst in our history. Our fleet of 176 gunboats was useless. Our few naval victories were the result of individual frigate and sloop actions in distant waters. A few American ships-of-the-line, in place of the numerous small gunboats, and at no greater cost, could have stopped much of this, besides affording a reasonable measure of protection to our ocean-going coastwise commerce, and even some support to our foreign trade. The gunboat policy was a blunder both from the naval viewpoint and that of national economics. From a purely military point of view, the stagnation brought about by exclusive reliance in a faulty weapons system can lead to fatal weaknesses in other lines which would cause our downfall. This is particularly true when we consider that the effectiveness of an atomic assault is dependent upon our means of delivery.

We face the danger of complete impotency if an enemy is able to develop countermeasures against our delivery agent. In other words, if we confirm as our policy the sole reliance upon one weapon—the atom bomb delivered by aircraft—an aggressor must merely devise a way to counteract either the bomb or the plane in order to render us powerless. At present, the development of a counter-agent to the bomb itself seems unlikely. Likewise, under present conditions, aircraft appear to have the upper hand over the means of defense. Such superiority is not guaranteed, however, for the indefinite future.

There are also several other military considerations which limit the use of atom bombs. Undoubtedly it restricts the variety and flexibility of offense, both from a strategical and tactical viewpoint. Strategically, sole reliance on an air-atomic policy would

not only eliminate the possibility of employing the many other forms of military power but also would exclude the varied use of economic, psychological, intellectual, political, and moral forces. Tactically, it is the same as issuing an arbitrary ruling to field commanders that nothing but flame-throwers shall be used in any and all tactical situations and against any and all targets.

We must also note that the use of atomic bombs can, under some conditions of employment, so pollute and contaminate the objective area that the devastated region is denied to us as well as the enemy.

Finally, it should be remembered that the atom bomb is not economical for use against pinpoint targets. Would we employ the atom bomb, capable of demolishing an entire city, to destroy an isolated railroad bridge? Certainly not, when we recall that the bombs may be limited in number and that each one represents a large investment in dollars alone.

Thus, in deliberating whether to adopt an exclusive policy of absolute dependence on the atom bomb, we must realize that from a purely military standpoint such a course can lead to stagnation of progress in other weapons systems, will create the danger of impotency due to countermeasures against the delivery agent, will seriously limit the diversity of offensive means, can contaminate an objective to our disadvantage, and will demand uneconomical usage against certain targets. Employment of the atom bomb is also subject to political considerations.

POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In discussing some of the political factors which influence the employment of atomic bombs we must bear in mind that military policy is a means to an end. Military policy is an adjunct and corollary to national policy and is governed directly by our broader national aims. Therefore, a policy of sole dependence on atomic weapons must be compatible with the larger policy.

It is a matter of public record that the United States has encouraged and continues to support the world-wide adoption of measures which will bring about effective international control of atomic energy. An integral part of any system of international control would be an international authority to prevent the manufacture and use of atomic bombs for war purposes. A treaty covering this subject would guarantee the right of free and full international inspection and would provide for deterrents against offenses and punishment of offenders, without the privilege of a veto to protect willful violators or to hamper the operations of the international authority. Even though the first attempts to establish such an authority have met with failure, we have not officially abandoned or reversed our policy. If, in the face of this, we adopt a military policy of absolute reliance on the atom bomb, we are either incredibly stupid or blatantly hypocritical. Presuming that we are sincere in our desire to establish international control of atomic energy, a clever potential enemy could cause our complete disarmament by the simple expedient of agreeing to outlaw atomic weapons and institute a system of international inspection. On the other hand, if we are not prepared to accept complete disarmament under these circumstances, we cannot honestly continue to support our previously announced national policy. The choice of a military policy of sole dependence on atomic bombs would be interpreted by most people as a de facto repudiation of our position on international control.

Politically speaking, it would not be necessary to outlaw the use of atomic bombs by treaty to reduce us to impotency. There are many instances in which the employment of atomic weapons would be entirely practicable from a military point of view but would be impossible from a political standpoint. For example, could we justify the use of atomic weapons in a "luke-warm" war?

If in the ideological struggle between communism and democracy, internal communistic elements should overthrow the established constitutional government of a friendly nation, could we use atomic bombs in support of the democratic forces? Could we drop a bomb in Italy, or France, or Latin America, if the local Communists usurped control of the government? Obviously, no. Nor could we retaliate against the tide of communism by dropping an atom bomb on the original source of communistic strength.

Even if a "hot" war should break out, we would find occasions when we couldn't employ atomic bombs. It would not be politically or morally feasible to use the A-weapons in overrun countries. Could we have blasted Brest or Manila into atomic dust in the last war, merely because enemy forces were using those ports as bases for operations against us? Are we to murder hundreds of thousands of former allies or friends just because a few of the enemy are in their midst?

Aside from the moral implications of the adoption of a military strategy which places exclusive reliance on the atom bomb, there are several other practical considerations. Most observers agree that a psychological campaign to wean the enemy population from their leaders would be of marked consequence in a future conflict. Some go so far as to say that the split already exists, and that the exploitation of this fissure would play an important part in achieving victory. Yet, by relying solely on the atomic weapons, we sacrifice this psychological advantage. An announced policy of mass population extermination would insure the unity and last-ditch struggle of an aggressor nation, would weld together the people and their leaders under the barbaric threat of wholesale genocide.

From a purely material point of view, an exclusive air-atomic military policy would have severe repercussions. Atom bombs cannot be made in the small, handy pocket size. Due to the inherent characteristics of atomic fission, the bomb cannot be reduced below a certain critical magnitude. Hence there is also a definite irreducible minimum to its explosive power. It is quite probable that the bomb cannot be made much smaller or less powerful than the Hiroshima or Nagasaki type. Therefore each time an A-bomb is dropped, a large area will be laid waste, including without doubt a considerable number of nonmilitary targets. At Hiroshima, out of a total of 90,000 buildings in the urban area, 62,000 were totally destroyed and another 6,000 severely damaged. Most of these were residential structures, or other nonmilitary targets such as hospitals, schools, stores, etc. This poses the tremendous problem of postwar rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Thus, when considered in connection with our broad national aims, such a policy of absolute dependence is in marked dissonance. It would call for abandonment of our announced position on international control of atomic energy, would deprive us of the conventional instruments of military force for use in a lukewarm war, would leave us powerless to wage war against an aggressor in occupied areas or overrun countries, would make untenable our present strong moral position as the champion of freedom and democracy, would condemn to failure a psychological campaign to exploit a rift between an enemy population and their leaders, and would cancel out the anticipated fruits of victory through the overburdening weight of wide-scale postwar relief and reconstruction.

CONCLUSION

In this discussion we have reviewed briefly the broad capabilities and limitations of the atomic bomb. We have examined the effects of its employment, both on the recipient and on the deliverer, and have analyzed the major military and political considerations which govern its use. From this scrutiny we must conclude that the adoption of a military policy of exclusive reliance on the atom bomb would jeopardize the security of our Nation. The strategy of victory through the sole agent of mass atomic destruction is not only morally untenable, but has dubious chances of success politically and militarily.

However, since the threat of atomic warfare still hangs over us, we cannot cease to maintain our atomic advantage, if only for insurance. Under these circumstances, a sound program for national security would include atomic weapons as well as the conventional forms of military strength. On the other hand, it must be remembered that military force is only a segment of our national power. Military policy must be the servant and not the master of national policy; military might must be used in harmony with the economic, intellectual, psychological, political, and moral factors which also form a part of our national strength. We must keep the atom bomb in our arsenal of weapons, but we must also be prepared to fight a war without it. We must realize fully what an atom bomb cannot do as well as what it can do.

New National Health Program—A Sugar-Coated Pink Pill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, anything that touches upon the fundamental operations of our great medical profession and its related institutions is of truly prime importance to us all. It touches upon the duration of life itself.

On April 25, the revised administration national health insurance and public health program was introduced in two identical House bills, H. R. 4312 and H. R. 4313, and in the Thomas bill in the Senate.

The measure contains 163 printed pages and is designed to provide complete medical, dental, and hospital service for about 85 percent of the population, according to estimates. In addition, the plan calls for greatly increased Federal appropriations for medical education, research, and hospital construction.

Special medical aid for rural areas and grants to States for local health work and crippled children are included in this vast scheme, the cost of which can only be guessed.

The program would be financed partly through a 3 or 4 percent pay-roll tax, jointly shared by workers and employers, and by an initial appropriation of $1,500,000,000 a year out of general funds. The pay-roll tax would be based on earnings up to $4,800. Those self-employed would have to put up as both employer and employee.

As one who looks with disfavor upon any scheme—no matter how well intended—that leads us farther down the road toward planned economy and a so-

cialized state, it is natural that all this fills me with forebodings. America has always been the land of opportunity. But opportunity involves willingness to take a risk. If Government is to care for us from the cradle to the grave, we must of necessity surrender many liberties. We would be forced to limit our horizons to what Government could provide for each one of the 150,000,000 population. The effort of individuals ceases to be a controlling factor in their scale of living. We must be prepared to conform to the general pattern laid out for us all by the bureaucrats. Otherwise, one could not expect to receive even the type of security offered by their paternalism. Personally, I prefer not to surrender liberties even in exchange for a very good mess of pottage—and this is not good at all.

Compulsory health insurance, according to the New York Times, is "the most radical reform yet to be broached by the Truman administration." Of course, it is primarily another big spending scheme and would be one more move in redistributing wealth. The States and individuals with the larger incomes would carry the burden for those with less; not on a basis of necessity, but whether they need help or not.

Additional bureaucrats and file clerks would go on the Federal rolls by the thousands. One can imagine how many public meddlers and clock watchers would be employed with the public footing the bill. We have added 58,000 civilians workers to our already overloaded pay rolls in the last 12 months. Think what would happen if this scheme, which would reach into every hamlet and cross roads, were put into operation.

Another inequity is that, whether or not you or your family is a healthy group, you would have to pay just as much as your neighbor, who might have a great deal of illness or lead a very dissipated life and require constant attention because of his own indiscretions.

Your cost would be predicated on your income—nothing else—and at first you would not be getting any service. While the Government is tooling up, you would be paying and the percentage would go on up as the dream unfolds. According to Mr. Rodney Crowther, of the Baltimore Sun, the total cost of the medical and hospital insurance program alone would run about $6,000,000,000 a year from the start, with the General Treasuary contributing about $1,500,000,000. The medical education, grants for hospital construction, and other features of the health program would cost, he estimates, $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 the first year, and in a few years about $3,000,000,000 annually. Ultimately, the entire health program would cost between $10,000,000,000 and $13,000,000,000 a year.

As a beneficiary of all this, if ill, one would probably be herded into a group of patients, many of them with trifling or imaginary ailments, but determined to have maximum attention.

If you needed a specialist, under the plan you could have the one of your choice in theory, but you would first have to get some official to approve your case. After all the red tape, you might or might not get the specialist you want. Obviously, everybody could not get to the No. 1 expert.

An English doctor told me recently that the worst feature of the British scheme is that hypochondriacs—people with imagined ills—have so crowded institutions demanding treatment that the really sick are lost in the shuffle. Conscientious doctors often are harassed to the point of becoming nervous wrecks.

Insistent demands for attention by the multitude would play havoc with research. Small-time ward leaders would have a grand opportunity for fixing it so the faithful could get to see "Doctor Blank."

Government doctors would tend to become cogs in a machine. Their assignments and careers would be dependent on currying favor with, and gracefully accepting instructions from the higher-ups. Red tape and filling out, in triplicate, quantities of forms would consume countless hours. Bureaucrats would tell the medical practitioner, the surgeon, dentist, laboratory technician, and registered nurse where, when, and how to practice. Blind obedience would be rewarded; initiative and development of new techniques frowned upon.

Anyone who has had contacts with Army or Navy Medical Departments in time of war has seen cases where great surgeons were busy treating malaria and obstetricians or brain specialists caring for blistered feet. He has known of cases where outstanding experts were compelled to use methods or treatments with which they were not in accord because some less skilled officer with higher rank told them what they must and must not do.

In war, such situations can hardly be avoided, but, under normal conditions, they would be well-nigh intolerable.

Under the American system of free enterprise, we have made astonishing progress in combating disease and increasing the average span of human life. As we have been the most successful, how foolish we would be to discard our way for the schemes of nations that have lagged behind.

Our physicians, surgeons, dentists and nurses are giving the citizens of the United States the best service that any country in the world has ever had. Our practitioners devote long hours to charity work. Their ethics, self-sacrifice, and devotion to duty are a great American tradition. Our people receive needed medical care, whether or not they are able to pay. The old family doctor is one of the finest heroes of American life. Why do we need to change so much to make a few needed improvements?

The best available estimate is that not more than 20 percent of the population to any appreciable degree is handicapped in obtaining adequate medical service, either because of lack of means or because of where they live. This minority should receive a helping hand, but it should not be done at the cost of freedom. We will never be able to keep a full-scale hospital at the elbow of every desert-wanderer or lonely lighthouse keeper. We can never entirely destroy the advantages of thrift and of having money in the pocket.

Of course. the advocates of socialization will not be satisfied to halt with the field of medicine, if they conquer it. Lawyers, educators, engineers, all professions had best prepare for similar attacks.

Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves. We are approaching another fork in the road. If we again take a turn to the left we may never be able to find our way back to the straight and narrow path of self-reliance and unlimited horizons. The sweet, sugar-coated pill which we are being offered is also a pink pill—pink like a fellow traveler. An overwhelming majority of the medical profession warn us against it. We better do what the doctor orders and refuse the pink pill. If we don't, Uncle Sam may be sicker than we think.

An Open Letter to the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, some of us from New England feel strongly the financial risks in some of the implications in the recent proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to replace our present system of support prices with a new experimental system of direct subsidies. In connection with a search for some less expensive plan for easing the strain of high cost of living, I invite further public consideration of what appears to be a very simple and practical idea suggested in an open letter sent to the Secretary of Agriculture last November by Leavitt C. Parsons, publisher of Northeastern Poultryman, a farm paper published in Boston, Mass. The letter follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *November 6, 1948.*
Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very sorry I did not have more time to talk with you in Atlantic City a week or so ago, because I am most anxious to get your serious comments on a project I have been studying which, if acted upon promptly and courageously, would help to ease some of our present problems by immediately reducing the cost of living. I feel that a large part of the huge stock of agricultural products that the Government has had to take over in the parity price-support program in order to secure maximum production can now be advantageously used to cut the cost of living through distribution in kind for the benefit of the taxpayers and consumers whose money made the purchase possible. I think this could be applied by you at once to reduce prices at the consumer levels for bread and flour and for milk, poultry, and eggs. Cotton clothing, edible oils, and oilseed end products, like paints, may also be similarly benefited later, but I'm writing you particularly about the treatment of basic foods. In other words, I want your opinion on the feasibility of a suggestion to avoid the hurtful criticism of the agricultural support plan as solely a

subsidy benefiting only one special group. I believe there lies in the continued purchase of high-priced surplus a risk of consumer hostility toward the farmers, and I would like to see an expansion of the original plan to serve as a subsidy for the benefit of all our citizens without losing the present price and profit incentives which insure a strong nation through an abundance of crops and the farmers' freedom from want.

Last year, according to the Department of Commerce, individual incomes in the United States reached a peak of $190,000,000,000 and the first 6 months in 1948 are reported to have been even greater than that rate. The Department estimates that about 69 percent of the net consumers' income is spent in retail stores compared with only 60 percent before the war. They say food stores and women's wear stores get the most of this increase. Further figures indicate that at present 31 cents of the consumer's dollar goes for food against 24 cents before the war. Under the present system of support prices the grain buying agricultural groups get no cash benefit from the huge grain crops we are now raising because the price that they are forced to pay is set arbitrarily by the present antiquated parity formula. Since bread and dairy products and poultry products represent the largest cash outlay in the average household budget, the consumers can expect no relief from these supported prices unless something is done by Washington to relieve the pressure.

The present high purchase prices of grain result also in a squeeze being worked on dairy farmers and poultrymen as well as on those who buy feed for fattening livestock. It is the farmers' reaction to this squeeze that explains the present national shortage of animal units which have dropped from 170,000,000 to 152,000,000 on the farms. Many feel that your Department is not without some responsibility for this situation, because these animal units constitute the protein food reserves of this Nation and their producers need the encouragement of a protective marginal profit. This has been denied them by the operation of the present parity formula that prevents their buying lower cost feed as should now be possible.

I would also like to point out that, as I see it, the financial burden for providing money to support the present huge cereal crops was not covered in the present 1948–49 budget, large as it was. It looks as if this would constitute a further direct claim on the taxpayers in an already excessively tax-ridden economy. This tax burden is in addition to a continued high price for bread, milk, and eggs which cannot go down materially in the face of the $2 support price for wheat and a proportionately abnormal support level for other cereals and oil-bearing seeds which now enjoy a legal claim on the Government for loan or for purchase; in other words, although we have a total cereal crop of 6,500,000,000 bushels the cost of living expressed in terms of the workman's necessities of life must continue high. Our high support price, although stimulating even greater farm production, must also continue to stimulate new wage-price spirals in labor relations.

I think the American people are completely unaware of the additional tax burden they now face as a result of the bounty of nature. It is not unlikely that a half year's cost of the Marshall plan may be exceeded by the new and unbudgeted cash requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation in meeting its immediate legal obligation to provide funds for purchase and for loans on the 1948 surplus crops. Unhappily, the President's budget of last January made no adequate provision for this extensive financing. In the part devoted to the CCC (pp. 1149–1176), the prospective operations of that Government agency were expected to show a net income to the group of $37,894,300. The President explained that he expected loan repayments and foreign purchases to offset expenditures for procurement. However, all this has now changed, and definitely for the worse. It is now apparent that the parity support-price program may need in excess of $2,500,000,000 to meet the current obligations of this fiscal year.

Now, I'm not advocating that the parity-support price covering cereals should be abandoned. In the present world picture any grain surplus is a factor of national economic strength. I do feel, however, that the American people, as taxpayers and as consumers, should not continue to be doubly penalized by the Government's obligation to buy crops with their money and without personal benefit to them. They now suffer direct taxes to provide for the purchase and, in addition, pay indirect taxes in the higher cost of living brought about by the present support-price level on basic food commodities.

This second penalty also applies unfairly to all those farmers that buy grain and, according to your Department, figures of August 15 explains the different course of market trend in two types of farm products during the past year. I feel this whole situation can be cured and prices reduced nationally by direct action from your Department. This can be accomplished by two simple steps.

First, set aside from the assortment of purchased and pledged farm crops controlled by Commodity Credit Corporation a reasonable amount for Europe, measuring such amount so as to reflect truly minimum European needs and not to create a padded vehicle for the disposition of a possibly politically embarrassing grain surplus. Second, compute the relationship of the remaining amount of crops taken over by loan or purchase to the total domestic supply as indicated by the production and carry-over of any commodity. Then give American citizens whose taxes made these purchases possible the benefits of American farm abundance by using this surplus directly to reduce the domestic cost of bread and milk and egg production. It is my personal opinion that in the absence of any sudden war the cash cost of the so-called surplus agricultural products that will be taken over by the Government from American farmers during the current budgetary year will almost equal the value of entire American farm production in some prewar years. Unless some such step is taken there is no relief in sight for the taxpayer and no immediate HCL benefit to American labor, no matter how much the farmer produces and how great the glut.

The extent of the demand on the Treasury in excess of the budgetary estimates will run from two and a half to three billion dollars and may even exceed that amount. Potatoes will call for nearly $100,000,000. Your Department has announced the purchase of flaxseed to September 22 at a cost of $102,000,000 not provided in the budget. Soybean purchases at the present rate of decline in the crop that runs 50 percent greater than the 10-year average may cost from 100 to 150 million dollars more. Official announcements indicate that to October 30 over $200,000,000 have been paid out for purchase and loans for wheat involving 100,000,000 bushels. If the purchase at present rates, totals three or four hundred million bushels above what is shipped to Europe the Treasury must provide an extra six or eight hundred million dollars against a budget estimate of $2,000,000 income from wheat operations. Government purchases of corn may exceed 600,000,000 bushels or about one-sixth of the crop. Since Europe doesn't like much corn, this involves a further investment by the CCC of between eight or nine hundred million dollars.

Although the oat crop equals the wheat crop in bushels, the price ranges only one-third of wheat. However, oats have been selling below the Government-support price and substantial further aid will be called for. The budget allows only one million for loans on oats which it optimistically expected to be wiped out by repayments.

Although I have accumulated much supplemental data, I need not encumber this letter with added discussion of peanuts, barley, rice, and other feed and foodstuffs, since your own information is always more currently accurate than any that I might secure. However, I have reviewed these to indicate that the average taxpayers who are also the average consumers that make our great domestic markets are in large part unaware that they are all contributing directly and indirectly funds for such immense Government farm financing while most of the benefits accrue to only one particular group.

The same arguments that here apply to food could also be applied to other crops. In cotton this year I understand the Government will very likely have to take over at a high support level over 6,000,000 bales of a crop that totals only a little over twice that amount and the same tragic investment with one-sided benefits holds for many other less important commodities.

If our Government allows this situation to continue with its unfair burden on our people, particularly on American labor, I feel those who are in a position to cure it and who don't act, are responsible for any penalties that may befall our national economy. New legislation does not appear necessary, nor need we wait until 1950 for the operation of the new farm bill. The present legal rights and obligations of both farmer and your Department are clearly and definitely established. Some fair means of relief can be brought about by your courageous decision to make available immediately the benefit of all these Government purchases to the American people who are all consumers of bread, milk, and eggs. In its simplest form, this means you will deal directly with only three groups of people. I feel that you already enjoy the power to exercise the same kind of freedom in the disposition of commodities taken over to protect the farmer as the law has given you in the free choice of the crops to which the Commodity Credit Corporation can extend its aid in the form of loans and purchases. The three groups most important in their contribution to cutting the high cost of living through such cooperation would be: 1. The flour mills. 2. The feed mills, and 3. the holders of future contracts.

In the first group, your properly qualified representative could negotiate a trade along the following lines: Tell the millers that after making adequate provision to hold back grain for Marshall plan requirements and a safe margin for carry-over, you would then use the balance for distribution to the American people. Acting upon the same authority that permits the free distribution of food for school lunches and the sale of potatoes at a fraction of their cost, sell these millers for $1 and other considerations all surplus wheat. If this amounted to 20 percent of the total crop, give them 20 percent of their 1948 purchases, understanding, however, in consideration of this bonus they must reduce the trade price of their end product by an amount proportionate to the savings secured through accepting CCC grain. The net result would be to move flour into the channels of trade at a lower price per barrel, and thus through bakeries and retail grocers to cut the cost of bread.

In the case of feed mills, it may be more complicated because of the greater variety of products but the principle is the same. You could offer them the CCC excess Government-controlled corn and wheat and soy and flaxseed, and any other feed supplements understanding that they in turn would pass along to the dairymen and poultrymen and livestock feeders their end product at a proportionately lower price. Thus through cutting

the cost of producing milk and eggs and meat, competition in a free economy would expand production and bring down consumers' living costs.

As to the dealers in future contracts, I'm concerned about them only because they are a necessary part of the machinery of hedging through which big processors avoid speculating in their inventory and confine their profits to their special operations. Sellers are not concerned with this proposal, but buyers of grain contracts who in good faith intend to take a bona fide delivery should be entitled to receive from the Government the same proportionate distribution at their point of delivery as would any of the millers dealing in spot-delivery contracts.

Summarizing this operation, certain obvious and desirable objectives are immediately achieved.

1. The Government is able to cut the cost of living at once, for all these price adjustments would react marketwise immediately.

2. The positive downward trend in the cost of living would definitely end the wage-price inflationary spiral which has also contributed to high prices.

3. This feed cost reduction would renew enough individual profit incentive to make possible a quicker reestablishment of our shamefully short national animal protein reserve.

4. This would not cancel out or weaken the present parity support price system as applied to field crops, but would bring about a lower cash-out cost of living for farm producers which would tend to bring down the parity formula averages against which present excessive prices are computed.

5. It would mean a saving to the American people of from twelve to twenty billion dollars a year, representing the mark-down in terms of new consumer prices brought about by the lower cost adjustment at the point of production.

6. Such clear-cut decisive action is called for in the present crisis which may grow progressively worse. This plan gives to the American people an example of the kind of dramatic and courageous leadership they like to expect and to which they are entitled.

7. Finally, such a plan which obviously encourages the reestablishment of herds and flocks without penalizing the grain growers means also the expansion of our grasslands and thus the building of a new defensive resource against the risk of infertile desert wastes that mark historically the economic decadence of Babylon and China.

I hope you will give this proposal serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

LEAVITT C. PARSONS,
Publisher, Northeastern Poultryman.

Post Office Workers, Long Imposed On, Should Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

POST OFFICE WORKERS, LONG IMPOSED ON, SHOULD BE HEARD

For a long time now the postal employees have patiently hoped that the Government for which they work would make it possible for them to enjoy a higher standard of living, a standard becoming to those in their country's employ. Their hopes have not been realized and once more it seems as if their very natural and justified aspirations are to be completely ignored.

House and Senate bills, with bipartisan sponsorship, would give them aid, but nothing whatever is being done about these bills. Apparently it is the intention of those who do not want the living conditions of postal workers and their families improved, to do nothing, for no hearings on the bills have been scheduled.

These conscientious workers have enjoyed few improvements in their living standards in recent years. The pay of others has jumped, but theirs shows no such agility. And what they ask is really very little, coming from employees who have had so little before this. In addition to an increase in pay, they want veteran employees to be given credit toward promotion for the time they spent in the armed forces. That is, they do not want veterans to suffer for having fought. They ask for 26 days of vacation and 15 days sick leave, which is what all other Federal civil-service workers have been given. A few other small, reasonable and logical improvements in compensation are included in their legislative program.

And nothing at all is being done about the bills that would bring them relief. This is an old and manifest injustice. There should be hearings at once. The public as a whole should know under what handicaps the postal employees live and work. They are deserving workers. They must be heard.

Labor-Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there are few questions presently confronting the Nation more vital than the preservation of industrial peace. If this House can enact a labor measure which will in effect accomplish that end, it will have performed a genuine public service.

When the Taft-Hartley bill was originally pending before the House, I spoke and voted in opposition to it. I subsequently voted to uphold the Presidential veto of that measure. At the time I pointed out, in substance, the various objections to such sweeping and unprecedented legislation restrictive of labor organizations and particularly hampering free collective bargaining. I expressed the fear that punitive laws, directed against a class, were inconsistent with American principles and would cause suspicion, distrust, and ill-will between labor and management and lead to further strife, dissatisfaction, strikes, and other undesirable unsettled social and economic conditions. I also expressed my fears of retaliatory effects.

Clearly my fears and apprehensions have been abundantly fulfilled. Strikes may not have increased in numbers; indeed the contrary is true. But just as I had feared, a spirit of hostility and antagonism has developed among the laboring people who believed, and still believe, that the act was designed to crush or impair labor organizations and imperil their freedom of action in the economic sphere which Americans prize so highly.

Current legislative confusion concerning the shape of labor legislation has not served to alleviate the deep and keenly felt resentment of working people and their leaders that the Congress is endeavoring to regiment and place in a strait-jacket all those who insist upon the rights of recognition, representation, and collective bargaining for labor groups.

There is no question presented here concerning public-welfare strikes because whatever the final shape of this legislation ample power will reside in officials of this Government to protect the Nation against irresponsible and harmful interference with the rights and interests of the American public. The same is true of economic boycotts and jurisdictional strikes and the infiltration of Communists and subversive forces into the field of labor-management relations. Adequate controls are also provided against abuses and excesses which threaten industrial stability. Financial accountability is assured; the rights of individual workers secured as well as the legitimate rights of management. That is as it should be.

I gravely and sincerely question the punitive approach to the solution of these great social and economic questions. Let us stand by the Constitution, by the basic principles of free enterprise for capital and labor, working together, which have enabled this Nation to grow and develop into the greatest instrument ever known in history for conserving the rights of the individual and promoting the common good and the happiness of people. No sound progress can be based in this free country upon laws which the average working man and woman believe to be aimed at the continuity of the representative organizations they have established, as a vital force for protecting their wage and social standards and safeguarding them against hardship, discrimination, and exploitation.

Let us make collective bargaining work effectively, not only in the interest of the working people but also in the interests of the employers and the broader interests of the Nation.

A united America, a strong, integrated, harmonious America, is one of the great needs of the hour. Let us banish bitterness and strife among the classes. Let us have industrial peace and world peace, peace at home and abroad, peace and harmony among labor and management and every other group of the American people. I must oppose the measure presented by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Wear Honor Rosettes—Rodino and House Leader Only "Knights" in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following

article that appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger, Sunday, April 3, 1949:

WEAR HONOR ROSETTES—RODINO AND HOUSE LEADER ONLY "KNIGHTS" IN CONGRESS

WASHINGTON.—Knighthood is in flower in the Halls of Congress. And you'd never know it unless you knew the meaning of the inconspicuous rosettes in the coat lapels of Representatives PETER W. RODINO, JR., of Newark, N. J., and JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, House majority leader.

The rosettes, with white crosses on a black field, entitle MCCORMACK and RODINO to be referred to as "sir," "knight," or "excellency."

"Sir" PETER and "Sir" JOHN wear the rosettes because they are members of the Knights of Malta, Italy's greatest decoration for men who have distinguished themselves as benefactors of humanity.

The only two "knights" in Congress, RODINO was decorated in 1945 and MCCORMACK won his award last year. Neither knew of the other's decoration until January 3, when RODINO, a freshman Democratic Congressman, walked up to introduce himself to the House leader. The handclasp between the two men was more than an introduction; it was an understanding of each other that words cannot describe.

RODINO was knighted by Prince Chigi, grand master of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, for work in helping Italians during World War II. The Congressman was one of the first professional men in Newark to enlist for service after the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor. He also was one of the first to go overseas as a member of the First Armored Division.

AT ANZIO BEACH

He took part in the African invasion and was among the United States soldiers who hit the beach at Anzio. What he saw there he'll never forget, particularly the picture of young boys and girls and old men and women who wanted no part of war but were victims of an Italian government which declared war on the United States. So when Italy threw in the sponge RODINO remembered the broken bodies and wearied faces of the young and old and decided to do something about it.

He conceived the "package brigade"—which meant long hours of writing letters to his folks in Newark and to his many friends all through the State of New Jersey asking them to send food or clothing to him for the people of Italy.

PLAN A SUCCESS

The plan was so successful that soon the packages began flowing into RODINO's quarters at a terrific rate. All told, his appeal brought 4,000 packages to Italy, and he delivered every one himself—some to hospitals, some to charitable institutions, but most of them to individuals he had seen suffering from malnutrition in cities, towns, and villages captured by United States forces.

Soon officials of the Italian Government wanted to know who RODINO was. They learned that he had risen from a private to a captain, being commissioned on the field.

Prince Chigi decorated him as a Knight of Malta. King Umberto decorated him with the highest order of knighthood that Italy could bestow on a foreigner. He made him a knight of Saint Marurizio and Lazzaro. All told, RODINO won 18 decorations for his "extracurricular" activity while still a combat officer in the American Army.

STATUE FOR DAUGHTER

One of his most-prized possessions is a statue of St. Bernadette, which was presented to him by Countess Ratti, sister of the late Pope Pius XI, with instructions that it be given to his daughter, Margaret Ann, as a memento of her daddy's good work in behalf of the people of Italy.

RODINO's efforts for the people of Italy did not cease when the war ended. As a Knight of Malta, he was named a special American emissary to aid relief there in cooperation with the Italian Red Cross.

He was instrumental in sending 20,000 packages of food, clothing, and medical supplies to Italy during postwar days.

Like RODINO, Congressman MCCORMACK won his decoration as a Knight of Malta for his work in behalf of humanity throughout the world, particularly Italy.

Both Congressmen are outstanding Catholic laymen and because of their knighthood are entitled to march ahead of fellow laymen at all religious exercises. MCCORMACK'S wife holds the rarest award from the Pope. The medal entitles her to be known as "Countess Harriet," and as such has precedence even over her husband at Catholic functions.

The Reporter—A New Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto the No. 1 article entitled "The Bold New Program," of a new national fortnightly magazine "of facts and ideas," published in New York, the volume 1, No. 1, of which was issued on April 26, 1949. It is under the editorial direction of Prof. Max Ascoli, the distinguished editor, author, and educator, who escaped from the Fascist terror in Italy to become one of the leading editors and philosophers of the democratic resistance to totalitarianism of our day. The new magazine promises to fill an important place in the consideration of our governmental policy and to be one of the most distinguished journals of our day.

Professor Ascoli says of his new magazine:

We are publishing The Reporter because we think there is room in the United States for a type of reporting free from obsession with headline news and from the conceit of opinions. We believe that the national and international facts which affect the lives of the American people can be gathered, selected, and interpreted with a sense of their causes, interrelation, and possible outcome. We believe that they can be reported in the perspective of what they mean to the American people and what the American people can do about them.

A NEW ERA, A NEW MAGAZINE

The American national interest is definitely tied to the welfare of a large section of the world, but at the same time America is not rich enough or powerful enough to endow the world or to rule it. In the former enemy countries still under American occupation, in the 16 European nations of the Marshall plan, in Asia and in Latin America, to a various and different extent, there are hundreds of millions of people whom America can help—but only if they are willing to cooperate freely with America. The safety and power of America largely depend on the cooperation that we can elicit from nations which are the objects of American assistance. America alone cannot do the job of setting the world on its feet.

If America were what the Communists say it is—an empire in the making—or if it were the hub of an international, which is about the same thing, the problem would be much simpler. We could rule foreign countries with our stooges, we could, as we pleased, use or destroy their resources for the benefit of our own economy, and we could induce their unmanageable leaders to plunge themselves into obscurity—or out of a window. As it is, given the kind of people we are, we have no choice. We must work to create, at home and abroad, the positive conditions that make for freedom, for safeguards of personal and national independence, and for peace.

The article referred to follows:

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM—CAN WE LEARN TO EXPAND CIVILIZATION IN A CIVILIZED WAY?

Not long after President Truman delivered his inaugural address, Secretary of the Interior Krug told the Eighty-first Congress that American reserves of certain industrial materials were "virtually nil." Krug was not out to chill the Nation's blood: He was not at that moment telling the usual story of resources that had been plundered or squandered in the customary reckless ways. He was referring to resources that the United States had never contained in quantity—minerals and metals, for the most part, with singular, useful properties. In the last few decades, American technology has learned how to use them in the production of everything from truck bodies to antitank shells; having discovered the advantages of these largely "un-American" materials, our technicians now cannot get along without them. They come from most of the continents and islands of the world. If they were to cease coming, American production would be severely disorganized. Some phases of it could scarcely continue at all.

American technology runs largely on electricity. To be controlled, electricity must be insulated. Mica, the best insulator known, comes primarily from India. American technology is built very largely of steel, partly of aluminum. Chrome is a necessary ingredient of stainless steel. The best chrome ore comes from Russia. Aluminum has replaced steel for many purposes. The best bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is extracted, comes from Latin America. The harder the uses to which steel and aluminum are put, the higher the temperatures they must withstand, the greater the pressures they are designed to resist—the more they must be alloyed with metals like cobalt and chromium, molybdenum, and vanadium and nickel.

Altogether there are about 150 metals and minerals on which the prosperity of the United States in peace, and the security of the United States in war, depend. Not many are found in sufficient quantity and quality on the mainland or our island possessions. In 1946, the United States imported from overseas 97 percent of its manganese, 100 percent of its tin ore, 73 percent of its tungsten, 40 percent of its vanadium, 47 percent of its bauxite, and unusually high percentages of about 90 other indispensable metals and minerals.

The United States' dependence on the rest of the world is most conspicuous when it comes to metals, but it is not confined to them. In 1946, all the fiber and natural rubber consumed by American industry, and one-quarter of the vegetable oils, were shipped in from overseas. Nor is it likely that, among metals, our impoverishment will continue to apply only to obscure ones; the supply of high-grade rich iron ore in the Mesabi Range can be expected to last only a generation or so.

The percentages show the proportion of key minerals imported by the United States the year after the war ended. During war, America requires far more substantial imports. The weapons of modern warfare, guided missiles, jet planes, and so on, require an increasing amount of chrome, bauxite, and the rest. Congress has appropriated $800,000,000 to stock-pile such materials, but no adequate reserve of them can ever be ac-

cumulated. The industries of cold war—even those of peace—consume the metals and minerals too rapidly. If American industry is to maintain its present output, still more if it is to expand, the supply of raw materials from the rest of the world must be abundant and dependable.

The scarce metals and minerals prevent us from reverting to continental or even hemispheric isolationism. If the pressing demands of technology could force us into technocracy, we would have to plant the American flag on every land in the world. We cannot even dream of doing this; and under no circumstances would we do it. We need the availability of raw materials without assuming the burden of conquering and ruling over every country where they are to be found. We do not want forcefully to impose a pax Americana; we would not know how to. Neither do we want to establish a new type of dollar diplomacy—a scarce-metals diplomacy. We need a global policy as vast and at the same time as intricate and varied as the globe itself. We need an efficient system of organization, in which the possessors and the consumers of the raw materials, participate as equals.

With this problem confronting America, the President proclaimed, on Inauguration Day, his program of making the benefits of our scientific knowledge and industrial progress available to underdeveloped areas.

In these areas—the zones of the diseased, the shabbily dressed, the inadequately fed—a large part of the raw materials that the United States requires lies under or grows in the earth. Now that we count so heavily upon these underdeveloped areas, their inhabitants, for our sake as well as for theirs, cannot remain underdeveloped. If we can effectively pass on to them some measure of technical skill, adequately supported by capital investment, they will be able to produce or extract or grow their special materials in greater volume and with greater steadiness than they can now. The same and similar skills can raise their standards of living, lower their death and disease rates, and provide them with more to eat and to wear. The part of our patrimony that the program offers to share—our technical ability—is, says the President, inexhaustible.

The generosity of the idea is matched only by the difficulty of its realization. Carried out hurriedly, on the assumption that each one of our skills is by itself a miraculous cure-all, the project might bring about nasty results.

The introduction of a new technique presents only minor difficulties in a society that already employs a multitude of modern techniques. By using hybrid corn, European farmers can get larger crops from the same land without increasing their labor. Europe is prepared to make use of the augmented supply; the roads and railroads, the depots and mills to handle the extra corn are already there. But bringing a new technique into a nonindustrial society—where the texture of civilization is spotty and precarious—may be profitless and even highly dangerous.

One of the dangers is that, with the acquisition of a new medical or technological skill, an area will be confronted by an explosive, and temporarily unmanageable, increase in population. In 1945, a village of 3,000 people in British Guiana was chosen for an experiment in the elimination of malaria. Previously, the birth rate and the death rate of the village were evenly balanced. Three hundred and fifty of every thousand children died in infancy. By 1947, DDT had exterminated most of the malaria mosquitoes. The birth rate had doubled; infant mortality had gone down to sixty-seven a thousand. So now the suburb needs more of everything—food, houses, and furniture—and if these are not provided, poverty may keep the population down as disease once did.

The simple passage of a skill from the West to the East, Africa, and the islands—instruction in killing flies, opening mines, cross-pollenizing plants, or operating machines—may mean very little in itself even when it is not actually hazardous.

Not long ago, for example, the British discovered a method of doing away with the tsetse fly, which for centuries had prevented the raising of healthy cattle in South Africa. If South Africa receives sufficient quantities of tsetse killer, it can be made safe for steers. Not enough feed, however, can be grown in or near the best cattle country to support large herds. There is suitable lands for cultivating feed farther north, but it cannot be used until it is cleared and drained, until roads and houses are built, and machinery is installed. If all this were done, a railroad would have to be built to bring the feed to the cattle and another to move the cattle to the sea for export. The elimination of the tsetse fly, in itself, will not increase the world supply of meat, unless it is accompanied by an array of other skills and enterprises of great magnitude.

A great many techniques—each of which picks up where another leaves off—will have to be introduced into the backward areas. This means the shipment of machines, the importation of fuel to make them function, the establishment of training schools.

All this requires capital. The capital can come only from the governments and the businessmen who have it—mostly those of the west. Foreign investors will shy away from enterprises in underdeveloped areas unless they are protected against some of the hazards of investment—sudden nationalization of their properties or discriminatory taxation. They will not invest unless the underdeveloped areas have sound credit and currency systems and agree to abide by certain common rules of business behavior.

With rules established, an additional incentive for private investors to risk their capital in overseas projects could be provided by a scheme to insure private investors against the abnormal business risks that they would not encounter in domestic investment. The wider the risk is spread, the more countries the insurance scheme embraces, the lower the premium investors would have to pay for protection. The United States Government might well take the initiative in setting up this insurance fund for American investors.

How much America can afford to invest overseas is almost impossible to calculate. In 1948 net private long-term American investment abroad reached $761,000,000. A yearly investment of $2,000,000,000 overseas in the immediate years ahead would make a tremendous contribution to the task, and appears comfortably within our capacity. If a climate of hope and confidence is created in which investment could thrive, the primary difficulty would, in fact, be to choose which of the almost unlimited projects foreseeable should be the first to be tackled.

Before the proper climate is created, technology needs to be rescued by another skill—economics—and by another type of know-how—politics.

Knowledge of economics and politics is needed to make sure that the first effects of industrialism on technologically innocent peoples are not wretchedness and rebellion.

Fortunately, the burden of the program does not fall entirely on the United States. Europe can provide many of the products necessary for development, and Europe's need for new sources of raw materials is much greater than ours.

The leaders of the nations participating in the Marshall plan are aware of the fact that the 4-year program will fail irreparably if not enough raw materials start coming in, between now and 1952, from nondollar areas. This is a necessary condition if the Marshall-plan countries are ever to approach the volume of production and of exports that they are supposed to reach within the next 3 years.

The President's new program can be conceived and carried on over a span of decades. The best that we can hope is that by 1952 it will have made a substantial start. It must be developed and articulated enough to take over when the Marshall plan ends. In the period from now till 1952, American investment to help develop the resources of backward areas would be added insurance for the success of the European recovery program, as well as insurance for adequate continuing supplies of the raw materials we need.

The international-payments troubles in Europe can be relieved, in large measure, by the operation of the new program, for they are partly the result of the breaking of the nineteenth century three-cornered trade whereby, for example, far eastern countries earned dollars from their raw-materials exports to the United States, used those dollars to buy supplies from Europe, and thereby provided Europe with dollars to pay for the excess of Europe's imports from the United States. A strong flow of American dollar investment in areas that have little money or industrial skill but plenty of resources would be the best guaranty of a return to freer and steadily expanding world trade.

Finally, America now has a chance to get out of a rather awkward schizophrenia. This Nation, dedicated to the cause of free enterprise and of capitalism, has to a large extent left to the Government the monopoly of foreign spending an investment—an embarrassing and rather silly contradiction.

Was it the need of scarce raw materials that prompted the announcement of the new program, or was it the necessity of obtaining through a peaceful policy that which we could not conceivably conquer by force of arms? Or perhaps it was the awareness of our responsibilities toward the world and at the same time of the limitations of our resources, for we haven't the means to continue indefinitely the Marshall plan or to extend it to Latin America, Asia, and potentially, the whole world. There may be some truth in any one of these motives and in a hundred more. There is always a rather distant relationship between a policy and the various motives that have contributed to its enactment. Moreover, our country has the curious habit of announcing and reaching basic policies as if they were casual improvisations. This was the case when Franklin D. Roosevelt announced the policy of the unconditional surrender and when the idea of the Marshall plan first came out. It is the case with point four. It usually turns out that there was some thinking and planning before the announcement of a new policy, and then, when the announcement is made, thinking and planning proceed with ever-increasing momentum because of the expectation it has aroused in the outside world.

This new program is likely to affect the UN radically, although no one knows now in what measure the UN will contribute to carrying it through. Perhaps the UN can be better strengthened by regional or even bilateral agreements than by debates and resolutions on what to do with the Charter. All these partial agreements buttress at various spots the structure of the UN and provide the conditions for its strength. If multilateral trade is gradually reestablished, the UN will be the gainer. If new nations just emerging from colonialism find in western know-how the way to accelerate the pace of their progress, the UN will again be the gainer.

The major characteristic of the new program is that no matter from which side it is considered, it makes sense. It is rounded, well-balanced—even if it is, and will for

sometime remain, little more than a program for reaching a program. It depends on America, but it doesn't make America the Atlas that sustains the world. It presents extraordinary difficulties, which can be overcome if the technicians and experts of western civilization apply the experience and the knowledge they are supposed to possess and the countries to be developed are willing to accept their responsibilities. The greatest danger is that the program will be carried through by single-minded experts, each following his own approach and technique, independent and unconscious of all the others that are needed if the job is to be done. The program is a formidable test of our capacity to act. It is a greater test of our capacity to think.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days a trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board has decided a case which is of much importance and controversy in my State. It is the Di Giorgio Farms case. The decision reveals certain basic evils not only of the Taft-Hartley law but of its counterpart, the Wood bill, H. R. 4290. I refer specifically to the injunctive and secondary-boycott provisions, so drawn in each instance as to be used to frustrate the congressional will and to injure unions even beyond the professed intent of the Taft-Hartley supporters. Let me point out a few of the facts.

Di Giorgio Farms is a huge agricultural enterprise, covering over 11,000 acres. Some phases of Di Giorgio's business go beyond the agricultural industry. About 1,200 Di Giorgio workers, unsatisfied with their wages and working conditions, organized into two unions to bargain collectively with Di Giorgio. But Di Giorgio rejected a demand that it bargain, and the workers, being agricultural laborers, were not entitled to the benefits and protections of the labor-relations law. They could not use the processes of the Labor Board to require that Di Giorgio bargain with them. The workers had no alternative but to strike. Efforts were made by interested persons to bring about a settlement of the issues, and the matter was the subject of editorial comment in the California press, but Di Giorgio still refused to meet with the unions.

Di Giorgio complained to the general counsel of the Labor Board that the two unions of striking workers were inducing and encouraging employees of other employers to cease doing business with Di Giorgio. The general counsel obtained an injunction against these two unions and also against two other unions whose members had respected the picket lines of the striking agricultural workers. Can we, as legislators, be honestly proud of a law which denies to some workers the right to legal protections accorded to workers in other industries, but which nevertheless subjects them to the liabilities of that law?

The trial examiner, however, decided that the two unions of agricultural workers cannot rightfully be prosecuted under the Taft-Hartley law since the law itself denies to them the right to seek an election or to require Di Giorgio to bargain. But so long as the injunction is outstanding against the unions they must refrain from engaging in conduct which is lawfully their right. Here is an evil in the law which flows from the injunctive provisions and from the separation of functions within the Labor Board by which the general counsel is supreme unto himself. He is empowered to seek injunctions on the call of anti-union employers and to use injunctions to prevent collective bargaining.

But this is not the only evil of the Taft-Hartley law which is pointed out by the decision in the Di Giorgio case. The decision has been publicized in the California press as a victory for agricultural unions and as a substantiation of their claims that they may not be prosecuted under a law whose benefits are denied to them. Although there is some basis for this reaction, there is no reason for jubilation by agricultural workers.

If I understand the decision correctly, from a realistic point of view the victory is largely Di Giorgio's. Legislative history shows that it was not the intention of Congress to prohibit secondary boycotts with the purpose of requiring an employer to bargain where the union had been certified by the Labor Board. Here the agricultural workers tried to secure a certification, but the general counsel and the Board held that they could not do so because agricultural laborers are exempt from the protections and benefits of the legislation. Had the agricultural workers been entitled to achieve a certification, then Di Giorgio would have been required by law to bargain collectively. There would have been no violation of the law by any of the four unions. But the examiner decided that the two secondary unions, which did not cross the picket lines, violated the secondary boycott provisions of the law. Here is another basic evil of the legislation. The very provision which disqualifies agricultural unions from the benefits of the law, works an added hardship by making it unlawful for other unions to aid them to secure collective bargaining, although unions which are not disqualified from using the procedures of the law may legally seek the aid of other unions to obtain recognition and collective bargaining.

Because of the injunctive and inequitable features of the law and the great and unreviewable powers of the general counsel, we have a situation where workers in sympathy with the legitimate efforts of Di Giorgio's employees are forced to continue at work against their will and to aid the antiunion employer in his refusal to accept the democratic procedure of collective bargaining. It is a strange and wrongful law which denies the right of collective bargaining to a group of workers and simultaneously strengthens the hand of the employer in his refusal to recognize and deal fairly with the legitimate aspirations of his workers.

The Wood bill preserves these basic evils of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Lesinski bill, while it does not place agricultural workers on the same footing as other employees and does not require farmers to bargain with agricultural unions, does eliminate the added hardships I have mentioned. It will receive my support.

Analysis of Patronage in Our Political System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday in his usual broadcast, Charles Collingwood, a prominent news commentator and news analyst, confined his broadcast largely to the subject of patronage.

Patronage, because of an honest and forthright statement of the President at his recent news conference, filled the air and newspapers with horror stories. They had discovered that patronage was a part of our political system.

Mr. Collingwood very ably puts patronage in its proper prospective—good or bad—in relation to our political system. He points out what it has been in the past and what it will be in the future. He recognizes political realities and separates them from the hypocritical political nonsense that has filled the airways and newspapers recently.

The broadcast follows:

Political Washington—that is to say, Washington, for this Capital breathes, sleeps, and subsists on politics—Washington is still echoing President Truman's announcement of a loyalty test for Federal patronage. Now, the bestowal of Government jobs according to party loyalty is one of those things like vice, corruption, and the man-eating shark to which the American public believes itself to be unalterably opposed. It's an institution which has engaged the attention of reformers since the founding of the Republic, and by general consent, politicians refer to it as they would to a disreputable relative—which is to say, seldom. Therefore President Truman created considerable hue and clamor when he hinted broadly the other day that the time-honored congressional privilege of naming people to fill Government jobs would go only to good Democrats and one way of telling a good congressional Democrat was by how he voted, as for instance, on the bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, now before the House. Editorial writers all over the country pounced upon the incident, commentators commented, pundits pontificated, politicians shook their heads, for the President, in his ingenuous way, had brought out into the open a subject which politicians believe is better left in decent obscurity. Patronage is not a popular American political institution. In most minds it conjures up sordid images of deals, incompetence, spoils, and boondoggling. It is not a popular institution, but it happens to be an institution which is part and parcel, and a key part and parcel, of the way our American democracy works. And since the President has revealed it in its

nakedness, it might be worth analyzing its importance in our political picture.

The Federal Government employs in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 people; 92 percent of them are covered by civil service. The remaining 150,000 are excepted from the civil service requirements. Of course, a number of the civil-service jobs like postmasterships are subject to political control, but a number of the non-civil-service jobs are of a technical nature where politics doesn't enter in, so we can take a hundred and fifty thousand as a rough estimate of the number of jobs an administration controls. Only a few of these jobs are what you would call plums, that is, paying above $5,000 a year, or involving a good deal of power and influence. Nevertheless, the power of filling those hundred and fifty thousand jobs is a very considerable one. The way that power is exercised is what we call the patronage system.

And the patronage system is the lifeblood of our political organization. American politics is an intricate, delicate, vastly complex mechanism involving thousands of people. Willard Kiplinger, of the Kiplinger News Letter, has estimated that there are in this country a million professionals who make a business of politics. They range from the doorbell ringers on the precinct level up through Members of Congress to the President himself. The whole thing represents rival networks of party workers which theoretically should reach every citizen of the United States. Now, these people have a regrettable tendency to want to get something out of it—jobs, influence, power, prestige. There are some workers in the vineyard of politics who may do it for sheer love of the game. There are some who do it from an idealistic desire to get a better government, but it is one of the things that is wrong with American politics that there are so few of these. Most politicians are in politics for its rewards, tangible or intangible. Therefore it follows that a healthy American political organization, under the present scheme of things, must have some rewards or the promise of some rewards to hand out to its workers. Otherwise it rots and withers away. And that is why as long as American politics is organized the way it is you will never get rid of patronage or the spoils system, or whatever you want to call it. But we digress. These 150,000 jobs, more or less, to which political appointments may be made are used to nourish the organization of the political party in power—in the present case the Democratic Party. They are passed around where they will do the party the most good. It is customary for party leaders, like Congressmen and men who would like to be Congressmen, to have considerable say about who gets what jobs in his area. This allows him to get his men in important places, to be sure of their loyalty, and to build up a hard-working political machine to further his and the party's political progress. This is important to a Congressman who wants to get reelected. And this is what caused the loud screams from those Congressmen who thought the shoe fit when President Truman suggested that Congressmen who didn't go along with him weren't going to get any patronage. When Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, complained that the President was doing no more than buying votes he wasn't objecting to the spoils system—he was objecting to not getting any of the spoils. For Mr. HÉBERT is one of that large group of southern politicians who do not see eye to eye with President Truman, and it was largely to them that President Truman's implied threat was addressed.

Congressman HÉBERT and his like-minded colleagues professed themselves to be very incensed at the President's suggestion that they might be swayed by patronage. Actually, vulgar as it may seem, the distribution of Federal jobs has played a decisive role in some of the greatest events in American history. President Truman's political sin was not that he planned to use it, but that he came right out and talked about it. The thirteenth amendment—which abolished slavery—was only ratified because of the most flagrant use of patronage by Abraham Lincoln. In 1864 Lincoln decided that there had to be an amendment abolishing slavery or else the whole issue of the Civil War would be in doubt. To do this, he found it necessary to bring Nevada into the Union, but he lacked three votes in the House to get Nevada in. So Lincoln called in Assistant Secretary of War Dana and said, "Get the votes of so and so, and so and so, and so and so." Dana said, "What do they want?" Lincoln said, "I don't know. It makes no difference. We must carry this vote or be compelled to raise another million men. It's a question of three votes or new armies. Whatever promises you make," said Lincoln, "I will perform." Well, as it turned out, two of the men wanted internal revenue jobs, and the third wanted a job in the New York customs house. The jobs were promised. The following October, Nevada became a State and promptly ratified the thirteenth amendment. Thus, through the judicious use of patronage, Abraham Lincoln abolished slavery. There's a twist to the story, though. After Lincoln was killed and Andrew Johnson succeeded him, Johnson refused to deliver on the appointments. "I have observed," said Johnson loftily, "that such bargains tend to immorality." Whatever they tended to, Johnson's reneging on the bargain helped open such a breach between Congress and himself that he was very nearly impeached. The importance of patronage to Congress was underlined in a famous incident of the last century when the two New York Senators, Roscoe Conkling and William Platt, resigned their seats because President Garfield refused to appoint their man as collector of customs in New York.

President Cleveland used patronage to force the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. And it was only by the use of this same weapon that Woodrow Wilson was able to get the Senate to confirm Judge Brandeis' nomination to the Supreme Court.

The fact is that patronage is just about the most persuasive argument that a President has with Congress. It is immensely important now because the real political problem in Washington today is the relations between the President and the Congress.

Although the President and Congress are kept poles apart by the Constitution, there are two main avenues by which he can influence the Legislature. One is public opinion and the other is patronage. The President is using both, and he will continue to. He has to. It's the way our system works. That is why one of the half dozen most important men in Washington today is a man you never hear about. He is not in Congress. He is not in the Cabinet. He holds no public office. His name is William Boyle and he is the Democratic National Committee's chief patronage dispenser. He is the man who decides who will get what, who makes the fine distinction between rival factions, who sees that the proper wheels of the Democratic machine get greased. That's how this whole patronage thing came up. Last Wednesday, Boyle, MCGRATH, and other Democratic sachems had a session with the President to get the patronage system streamlined. The next day at his news conference President Truman was asked about it, and it was then that he outlined his now famous loyalty test for Democrats getting patronage. Of course it is based on loyalty. It always has been. That's what patronage means. Jim Farley, who dispensed the jobs in Roosevelt's administration made no bones about it. He said he had a twofold duty, namely to place in office loyal Democrats who at the same time will have the ability to serve in their positions to the credit of their party and their country. So it is now—so it has always been. And patronage to loyal followers is not just a Democratic monopoly. The Republicans do the same thing—or would if they ever got a chance. Last year at this time when the sweet scent of victory hung heavy in Republican nostrils, the GOP-controlled Senate held up thousands of Presidential nominations—11,000, to be exact—because they wanted to put Republicans in those jobs instead of the Democrats President Truman nominated.

Patronage is not, perhaps, a very pretty part of our political life, but it is an essential one, as we are now organized. All the fuss and pother over President Truman's frank admission that jobs will go to those who go down the line with the party, will not change the system one iota. It's like the lady who told the philosopher that she had decided to accept the universe. "By heaven, madam," he said, "you'd better." The patronage system is part of our political universe and no amount of high-minded statements, polite distaste, or viewing with alarm is going to change it. There is just one way to get rid of patronage in politics, and that is for enough people to care enough about politics to be willing to work as hard without thought of reward, as the million professional politicians work today with the carrot of jobs, power, and influence dangling before their noses. Until that happens, it will be as Huey Long once observed. "The man who pulls the plow gets the plunder in politics."

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The North Atlantic Pact" which I delivered over NBC from radio station WMAL, Washington, D. C., on Friday, April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

The President has sent the North Atlantic Pact to the Senate of the United States for consideration. Between now and the time the Senate ratifies or rejects the pact we will hear it praised or condemned—newspapers and radios will be so full of it that the average person will assume one or a number of things about it, but always it will be considered as a single thing with a single purpose. It will be mentioned as something to stop Russia. It will be called an invitation to war. It will be given credit for bringing about a united Europe. It will be mentioned as one complete break with isolationism. It will be many things to many persons. Little that we hear will tell the real story. First of all, the pact is not a thing all by itself. I should like to talk to you about it as I would attempt to explain it to students interested in governments and international relations.

First let me say this—those of us who have been working for better world organization for years are sometimes considered impractical—we are said to be interested in things far off. What we need, say some people, is

a Congress made up of people who are thinking of our immediate interests and not far-off world affairs. I started working for an organized world the year I left college in 1906 and most of that time I have been an idealistic dreamer. Two World Wars have taught us that far-off disputes are very close to us. In fact the only persons in the United States who now think that our international affairs are not important are those who had no relatives in the last war and who pay no taxes.

What is it the President sent us when he sent to the Senate the North Atlantic Pact. He sent us a treaty. The pact will, therefore, be considered just as any other treaty. If it is ratified it will be done, as our Constitution prescribes, by a two-thirds majority. And when it becomes accepted by the other nations we, then, become bound by its provisions and those provisions become part of the law of the land. Under our constitutional system we will be bound to respect the treaty, assume the obligatons under it, and, if we are to be a good member of the community of nations that adhere to the treaty, then we must be ready to do our whole part. But we will be told that we ourselves will be the judges of what our part is—and that is true because our own independence will not be destroyed. International promises are moral promises, first of all, and moral promises may be forgotten if a nation does not wish to live up to them.

That brings us to the biggest of all problems in the development of international law and the substitution of law, duty, morals, promise-keeping and good faith for war. Just as force is the key to keeping the wrongdoer from hurting his neighbor in our civil and State affairs, just so in the final analysis force will keep a wrongdoer among nations from taking advantage of his neighbor. In society any member of society must obey the wishes or at least act within the rules of that society. Just so in international affairs, whenever a community of nations is set up by an agreement the will of that community is expressed by the rules of the community. In a sense then, by the North Atlantic Pact 12 nations have created a community and the pact is their rule for behavior in case one nation either within the group or from without becomes a wrongdoer and, let us say, becomes an aggressor and carries war against one then all will unite to put the aggressor down. Thus you see a wrong against one becomes a wrong against all and all unite to throw the preponderance of the united force against the wrongdoer. If nations learn to act that way in their international affairs, they create a community of nations as large as those who agree to join in the obligations and responsibilities of the pact.

The Atlantic Pact carries the theory that an attack on one will be considered an attack on all. Thus is laid down a principle of collective action or defense.

Let's look at this, first, from the standpoint of history and then from the standpoint of the development of international law. When the Thirteen Colonies began having trouble with England, the mother country, our founding fathers realized that unity of the Thirteen Colonies in withstanding what they considered aggressive action against them was the only successful way in which force of the mother country could be met. When the people of Massachusetts were attacked, Jefferson wrote that an attack on one colony should be considered an attack on all. By that he meant that if England carried war against Massachusetts his own State of Virginia should unite with the others in helping repel the attack. That was collective defense, no more no less. It was effective too—effective in war and all had to fight. We discovered our unity and we decided that unity was good for us in peaceful ways as well as in war and the United States of America became a fact and war between the States seems now completely out of reason. While we maintain an Army and a Navy, the thought of using either against ourselves or any one of the 48 States seems so much out of harmony with our community of interest that we do not rely upon force to maintain any of our peaceful interests among the 48 States. Still, force or the theory of force is always there. Historically, then, collective defense seems feasible.

If any person within a State breaks the rules of the State he is punished by the State and I am sure, after our experiences in the War Between the States, if one of the 48 States tried to be an aggressor and attempted to carry war against another State the force of the United States of America would be used against such a State. Collective defense has therefore shown its power and its possibility.

Now let us see how the same idea has developed in an international way and what it has done in international law. We must remember that collective defense or collective security has its origin in a theory that the whole is greater than any of its parts and that if the whole can be united against a part the whole will have its way. After we became the United States of America and our responsibilities became great as a member of the family of nations and the United States had territory to defend which belonged to all the States and not to any one, that is, after the Northwest Territory became Territory of the United States and after Mr. Jefferson bought Louisiana, we were a great country with great responsibilities in an international sense.

In 1811 under President Madison's recommendation the Congress gave notice to the world that activities close to our borders would be considered as probably threatening our security. Later President Monroe made the pronouncement in 1823, which we now call the Monroe Doctrine, that American welfare, and we might add American peace and security, was dependent upon the peace and security of our neighbors. And Jefferson again, as he did so often, put the ideas in proper words, that all America seemed to understand, when he said, "Let us make this hemisphere one of liberty and freedom." Here we developed a community of interest. An interest which the rest of the world began to respect.

When we come down to President Wilson's time we find him calling this community of interest a regional understanding, implying that the Monroe Doctrine was not just a one-nation pronouncement but that it had community significance and was recognized by the world as being definitely significant. From that time the nations of the Americas began to see that all had one interest—the unity of the Americas. Already the Pan American Union had been set up and was functioning and the Monroe Doctrine was fast becoming a multilateral understanding and all the states in all three Americas were beginning to see duties and responsibilities to each other.

In 1947 the Rio Pact came into being. This was not only a regional undertaking, but it had in it the collective-defensive idea and the words "an attack on one shall be considered an attack on all." This happened after the setting up of the United Nations Charter which provided for the recognition of regional understandings for collective security. Now two great parts of the world—the Americas and the North Atlantic countries, twenty-odd nations in the first and 12 with possible growth in the second—have made within the United Nations these two great regional pacts.

I have said the North Atlantic Pact had possibility of growth. The pact itself provides for that and if other nations join they must come in by the treaty process, assuming the duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the other nations.

Now what have we done in international law? For years text writers have held that wars have been started by willful aggression. How to stop the aggressor then becomes the problem. The family of nations, each being independent within its borders, was recognized. International law was the law which controlled nations in their dealings with one another but war was always recognized as being a possible way of settling differences. War was called the last reason or word of kings. War in theory had to be just to be recognized as proper, but the role of justice remained with the state that went to war.

Then came attempts to find substitutes for war. First came the Court of Arbitration to settle differences so nations would not have to go to war. The First World War produced the theories of a League to Enforce the Peace. After the end of the war we had the League of Nations. With the League came the idea of collective security and the notion that state boundaries should be protected. This was an attempt to put down an aggressor and the whole force of all the states was to come to the support of each other to put down a wrongdoer. After that came the Briand-Kellogg Pact which declared that war should not be used to accomplish a national purpose. This, in theory, outlawed war, and, with war being outlawed people thought that war would be no more. But aggressors arose and we had war in the Mediterranean, then Europe, and finally in the Pacific and we were caught in the Second World War. Now we are thinking hard about how that war got started, the mistakes we made, the things we failed to do and the terrible costliness of it all in death and destruction of wealth. And now we see that war doesn't pay. Look what has happened to both the victors and the vanquished of the two world wars. In one of our Foreign Relations Committee meetings someone said, we simply can't afford to lose a war. I asked, can we afford to win another one—because victory brings responsibility, and peace actually has to be endured just as we had to endure the war. Peace will be costly but it will be worth it.

The North Atlantic Pact represents an almost universal acceptance of the concept of popular sovereignty. How then could America stand in any other place than she stands today in not only supporting and furthering, but actually leading, the culmination of that pact and the universal acceptance of the theory behind it. The spirit of the pact is that such a thing as happened under Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo shall not happen again. The North Atlantic Pact is in complete harmony with the theories of collective security and the action of all the nations of the world to that end.

The pact complements the United Nations. It would be a great implementation to the effort to maintain peace and a great protector of those activities which promote peace. It would help much in removing the causes of war. The Atlantic Pact and the United Nations together represent the greatest strength yet created in the world to substitute peaceful processes for settlements of controversies between nations for the archaic and barbaric notion of "fighting out controversies."

Only a thoughtless person can imagine that we can change the habits of mankind overnight. Ambitious men will strive to get control of government. The threat of the single-will dictatorship surrounds us, but in unity there is strength. If the sensible, peace-loving, democratic peoples of the world will unite, nothing can stop their progress. The experiences of two world wars, the experiences of our own history, the experiences of those peoples who have brought about economic, political and educational freedom for

their own people show that in these institutions there is mighty strength. Individual man acting for the good of men is invincible. We want to develop that individual, which is the basis of freedom. There can be no freedom without men working with a social conscience. The North Atlantic Pact is one more instrument of democratic action in an attempt to substitute the will of the peoples for the will of an autocrat. That it will succeed, there is no doubt in my mind.

Federal Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on April 21, 1949, in this city, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The budget of the United States is read by only a very few, but today it is the most important current publication in the world. What it contains affects the daily lives of millions of people in foreign lands. It implements world policy. It finances tremendous national programs at home. It influences State and local governments. It subsidizes industry and agriculture. It extends directly to the pocketbooks of millions of individuals at home. It is a document of 1,500 pages and contains thousands of items which add to astronomical figures. It deals with the annual spending of nearly one-fourth of the total annual earnings of 142,000,000 Americans. Under the most simplified methods of budget procedure, the complexities of its administration are extremely great, but, under existing methods, the budget confusion is so fantastic that I have frequently heard sincere colleagues of mine differ by as much as from $4,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 in estimates of spending.

No sooner is the budget submitted to the Congress than the President begins to send in supplemental requests which require supplemental and deficiency appropriations. So far, in this fiscal year, one deficiency bill has been enacted, carrying a total of $1,700,000,000, and a second deficiency bill is now under consideration. Our budget procedure is vastly complicated by authorizations before appropriations, which preclude economy.

The Federal Government of the United States is the biggest financial operation on earth, and nothing is as economically important to as many people as the fiscal situation of this country. Yet, under present legislative procedure, neither Congress nor the American public has an opportunity intelligently to analyze fiscal legislation. We attempt to finance vast domestic and world programs through legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether income and outgo are in balance until after the budget is enacted.

The procedure is archaic and the language is confusing. We enact the budget in terms of appropriations, but we must balance with revenue in terms of expenditures. There is no readily available facility for either Congress or the public to translate current and previous appropriations into terms of annual expenditures either by items or by totals.

As Congress passes spending bills under present procedure, it has no idea as to what the over-all total of either appropriations or expenditures will be.

Congress breaks down the appropriation side of the budget message into a dozen or more bills, each dealing with a group of activities. Each bill is handled by a different subcommittee in each House of Congress. They are brought in one by one for passage over a period of 6 months. They are not accompanied by an annual expenditure estimate. There is no way of telling what the total of either appropriations or expenditures is, and there is no way of comparing the effect of the action on the bills with the revenue situation.

A long initial step toward clarity in budgetary legislation and intelligent consideration by the Congress and the public would be taken by the adoption of a single appropriation bill, which would consolidate and total all appropriation items into one act and specify how much of each item could be obligated in the ensuing year. It would be accompanied by a report translating appropriations into expenditures. And, it would be considered as a whole in full view of the revenue side of the fiscal situation. Other Senators and I have introduced such a resolution, providing for a single appropriation bill.

Now, these are days of supersonic speeds and stratospheric altitudes. But to analyze the Federal budget in a 10-minute speech would require the ultimate of both—in combination. All I can offer is a "Byrd's" eye view of our fiscal situation.

The estimates I will give you have been months in preparation and have been checked and rechecked after conference with various officials of the Government, including, especially, those from the Treasury and the Budget. Under tonight's limitation of debate, I cannot elaborate on these estimates as fully as I would like but, within the next week, I will deliver a speech in the Senate, giving my reasons for these predictions in the fullest details.

Here is the "Byrd's" eye view of fiscal 1949, 1950, 1951:

Fiscal 1949 (ending July 1, 1949):	
Income	$39,500,000,000
Expenditures	40,300,000,000
Deficit	815,000,000
Fiscal 1950 (ending July 1, 1950):	
Income	40,900,000,000
Expenditures	44,200,000,000
Deficit	3,200,000,000
Fiscal 1951 (ending July 1, 1951):	
Income	40,900,000,000
Expenditures	48,400,000,000
Deficit	7,000,000,000

These are not appropriation figures. They are expenditure estimates. There is a vast difference. Appropriations are not necessarily expended in the year in which they are approved.

Appropriations enacted in a high revenue year may actually be spent in a low revenue year.

As expenditures, you probably will regard these projections as conservative when you realize that they include no more than a moderate increase for agricultural subsidies, even under the present program. This would rise sharply with a precipitate decline in farm prices. These estimates do not contemplate at all the adoption of the new, so-called Brannan plan, which may cost billions more.

These estimates do not contemplate a 70-group air force. They do not cover any expansion of universal military training, as recommended by the President. If vast projects like the St. Lawrence seaway, new TVA's etc., were undertaken, they would be in addition. These estimates do not include the proposed medical care insurance plan, the cost of which, when fully effective, has been estimated at from $6,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 annually. This program would be financed from a pay-roll-tax trust fund, outside the regular budget.

It is obvious that unless there are acts of heroic retrenchment by Congress—and there is no evidence of this to date—these figures do represent an ultra conservative estimate of the expenditure side of the Federal budget.

My estimates on the income side are dependent on a continuance of the high level of prosperity that existed when the President's budget was submitted.

I am not a prophet, nor do I intend to indulge in crystal gazing. You can do that as well, or better, than I can. Yet, the perilous fiscal situation confronting us is emphasized by the statement of the experts from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that a 10-percent recession in the aggregate personal incomes of all citizens (the chief yardstick by which tax revenue is measured) means a loss of $5,000,000,000 annually in the present tax revenue. Should even this minor recession occur, the deficit estimates I have given to you would be increased by $5,000,000,000, while a 20-percent recession would mean a loss in tax revenue of $10,000,000,000.

The $64 question is: Are we able to maintain the high level of national prosperity, or is our national income seeking a lower level? We do know that under current tax rates, the Federal tax revenue drops in a ratio of about $1 for every $4 reduction in the aggregate of our personal incomes.

The fiscal year 1951 will be the critical year in Government finances, because the full impact of any business decline now would be felt in taxes due during the year which follows. And it is in fiscal year 1951 that we shall reach the delivery dates on huge military production contracts which we have authorized, and it is then that we shall begin paying off heavily also on long-term civilian commitments as the current housing legislation, and other heavy construction projects.

To me, the fiscal picture of our Government is bleak. The prospects are fraught with the gravest public consequences. The crisis is virtually upon us. We have only three courses open. The first is a drastic reduction in spending. The second is a substantial increase in taxes. The third is large-scale deficit financing.

The third course is unthinkable to me. Under current circumstances its adoption would shatter public confidence in Federal securities at a time when the debt is a quarter of a trillion dollars. The citizens who own bonds would ask themselves if the Government cannot balance its budget in this period of prosperity, and in time of peace, then will the budget ever be balanced again? If Congress once again embarks on deliberate deficit financing, I, for one, gravely doubt if ever again the Federal budget will be in balance. Our credit will be wrecked and our system of government destroyed.

Are new taxes the answer? What would be the result of a substantial tax increase on a business economy when it is already receding? By all the rules, new taxes at such a time may easily accelerate a minor business decline into a major recession. Business is never more sensitive to new costs and taxes than it is on a declining market.

Reduction in Federal expenditures can be accomplished only if there is a desire for it and a will to do it. Actually, we have assumed—and we still are assuming—tremendous long-term-expenditure commitments without organized thought for any offsetting retrenchment, and there is no

appreciable inclination to even a token reduction.

Yet, the Federal Government is permeated with waste and inefficiency. With the exception of the interest on the debt, and several other items of similar character, there is not a single category of Federal expenditures that could not absorb a 10-percent reduction in administrative costs without impairment of essential functions.

When we speak of Federal spending, it is significant that the Truman budget submitted in January contains some 40 spending proposals—exclusive of military and foreign commitments—which require new legislation. Some of these, it is true, are for continuation of projects already undertaken, but many of them will open up completely new fields for Government spending.

In contrast with this record, the Truman budget did not recommend the elimination of a single one of the thousands of functions, services, and activities of the Federal Government.

In this connection, it is notable that the number of Federal employees has increased at the average rate of more than 285 a day for the past year, and today the total is about 2,105,000. In fact, all public employees—local, State and Federal—now number more than 6,800,000. This is equal to one public employee among each 9 persons in the entire labor force of the United States.

Any picture of our tax system must include the State, municipal and local taxes. These taxes have recently been increased at such a rapid rate that no current estimate of the total is now available, but it is reasonable to assume a total tax take of at least $16,000,000,000 in addition to the Federal levies.

Another peril we may have to face is that, with Federal deficits may come simultaneously deficits in municipalities, States and localities. Unless retrenchment comes promptly, and there is, I repeat, no evidence in sight to warrant this belief, fiscal 1951, beginning July 1, 1950, will present a serious financial crisis to the Federal Government. Will we meet the issue by sane practices of retrenchment and elimination of waste, or will we place staggering new taxes on a business economy which every prospect indicates will be ebbing to lower levels?

The decision the Congress and the Executive then make may determine our form of government for many years to come. We have gone a long way in Government spending since 1932, when Franklin Roosevelt denounced what he termed the reckless extravagance of the Hoover administration, saying that Mr. Hoover "had thrown all discretion to the winds." Mr. Hoover was then spending about four billions annually, and now we are paying our Federal employees alone nearly $7,000,000,000 each year.

Private enterprise is the foundation stone upon which this Nation has built its freedoms and its progress. It is a good system, and in most respects it is tough and durable. But, we know that it cannot survive excessive regimentation; it cannot survive excessive taxation; and it cannot survive excessive Government competition.

To analyze the Federal budget is a huge job and a tiresome task. But, it is of absorbing interest to those who have been conscious of the trend which has been developing in this country for some time now—toward greater and more powerful Central Government; toward more all-inclusive control over the daily lives of our people and the activities of our business. It is still going forward at a rapid pace.

Unless this trend is halted, we are headed for regimentation equal to that which is now suffered by the English, if not worse. Our strength is the strength of the private enterprise system. Strike it down, and we shall be as Samson with his locks shorn. Foster it, and, throughout the years to come, we shall be the greatest nation on earth—a free nation with capacity and incentive to continue as the mass producer of more goods and materials than all the rest of the world combined. This we can do—in private enterprise—with only 6 percent of the world's population.

Those who, willfully or otherwise, would destroy the American enterprise system, would destroy the freedom of people everywhere. We, alone, are bearing the standard of freedom today. Without the light from our torch, freedom and progress will perish in the world.

Retaining and Improving the American System of Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very excellent address made by my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] on the subject How To Retain and Improve the American System of Medical Care. This address was delivered before the California Medical Association, in San Francisco, Calif., on Friday, April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Cline, ladies and gentlemen, I feel highly honored that you have invited me to come to California to express my views before your organization on a vital issue now before the Congress—"How best to retain and improve the American system of medical care." I am happy to share your program with Senator CAIN, a Republican—a more or less rare specimen in Louisiana. My distinguished colleague and I are in agreement, however, that compulsory health insurance will do violence to our way of life—it will destroy initiative, incentive, and freedom of action, the handmaidens of a system that has given us the highest standard of living and the best medical care of any nation on earth.

For over one-quarter of a century, I have represented my constituency in the legislative halls of Louisiana and Washington, and I have directed much of my attention to the problems confronting your profession. Much progress has been made by the medical profession. I believe I hold a fuller measure of appreciation than most laymen for its splendid achievements.

Those achievements are numerous and far-reaching. A few will bear mentioning: We enjoy better health than the people of any other country on the face of the globe. The average life span has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 67 years in 1948. Our mortality rate established an all-time low in 1948, less than 10 for each 1,000 of our population. We have more doctors, nurses, and hospital beds per capita than any other country. We are blessed with more resources for scientific research than any other nation. And, most important, until now we have enjoyed a political climate favorable to the independent, unfettered medical research that has given birth to these blessings.

I repeat: Until now we have enjoyed a political climate favorable to the independent, unfettered medical research that has given birth to these blessings. Today, the medical profession is under cruel attack. Make no mistake about it. There is a strong and determined movement under way to revise completely our national medical establishment. It has been declared inefficient, irresponsible, and inadequate. As a magic cure for its ills, the reformers would institute a system of socialized medicine. Call it compulsory health insurance, or call it anything else, it cannot escape the appellation of these ugly words "socialized medicine."

Your profession is opposing this effort vigorously, and rightly so. Its members recognize the inherent dangers of such a plan. They know it would destroy the compelling incentive that has sparked American medicine to its great heights—the incentive to learn, to study, to create, to improve existing techniques and to discover new and better ones. They recognize that under its baleful influence scientific achievement would stop its advance and level off on a plane of mediocrity. They know that such a device would destroy the doctor-patient relationship, so universally accepted as an indispensable element of any cure. They know that the scheme would signal the end of medical specialists. To be sure, a new crop of specialists would develop. They would be created, not by the hard route of study and experience, kindled in the sound American spirit of free enterprise and competition, but by Government edict, and savoring of politics. It is inevitable that under socialized medicine the study and practice of medicine would carry no more appeal to our youth than would any other Government position.

As a Member of the Senate who has observed, at close quarters for 13 years, the inefficiencies of Government administration, it requires no stretch of my imagination to picture the chaos and confusion and the enormous administrative cost of a medical program conducted under political direction. It is equally clear to me that such a program, patterned along the lines of President Truman's plan, and starting out as a compulsory health insurance proposal, would eventually and inevitably develop into the same system as is now expanding in Great Britain. The British started years ago with compulsory health insurance, the first phase of socialized medicine. Then they moved last year into its second phase, wherein the patient has a theoretical selection of doctors, and the doctors have the choice of payment on a per capita or a salary basis. Those who choose the per capita basis find that the Government controls their annual income by limiting the number of patients each doctor serves. It is only a matter of time before the British will drift into phase three—complete socialized medicine. The doctors, dentists, and other medical personnel will become salaried employees of the Government, and patients will be assigned by a central bureau.

Your profession is joined in its opposition to socialized medicine by millions of sound-thinking Americans who believe that we achieved greatness, and can retain greatness, only by our adherence to a free competitive system. I know that the majority of the Members of the Congress will strenuously oppose any plan that smacks of socialized medicine. Speaking for myself, I shall in the future, as I have the in the past, strive to maintain a sound, adequate, self-sustaining medical establishment, free from governmental control and restrictions. I wish to make it clear, however, that my policy is not one of obstinate, obstructive opposition. Rather, it is my desire to work with the doctors, dentists, nurses, and other

members of the medical profession to develop a program that will function under our system of free enterprise, and will make available to all segments of society more and better medical care within their ability to pay.

Because of my interest in your problems, and as a result of my legislative experience, I feel a definite responsibility to advise you that you should not maintain a completely negative attitude toward pending legislation. You should foster a plan of your own to counter the attacks made against you. You should cooperate with your lawmakers in an effort to remedy the conditions that give rise to the plans now being proposed.

No one will deny that there are serious inequities in our system of medical care. In spite of the great advances of the medical profession, the evidence shows that thousands of our people go without adequate medical care because they cannot afford to pay the cost of hospital and professional treatment. Many families have had to use their life savings and plunge heavily into debt because of one brief period of severe illness or accident. There are thousands living in our rural sections who are without adequate care because of a lack of clinical and diagnostic facilities or, very often, because of the absence of the services of a general practitioner.

The loudest cries for socialized medicine have come from the following groups: The Government planners, always seeking another experimental toy; the Socialists, who openly advocate absolute Government control; the Communists, who support any proposition that may disrupt our economy and ripen our country for revolution; the loafers who seek any opportunity to get something for nothing. Those groups are the most vociferous, but they are in the minority. Aside from them, however, there is a vast number of honest, sincere, conscientious Americans who believe that something should be done to provide adequate medical and hospital care to all segments of our population within their ability to pay. These people have no ulterior political motives and they are not concerned with social reform. They think of medical care in terms of their own families and neighbors. Many of these people are looking to the State and Federal Governments for relief from an oppressive burden.

The Congress has made a start toward solving the problem. A serious deficiency in our medical establishment is the acute shortage of hospital beds, particularly in sparsely settled areas. In 1946 we enacted a Hospital Act, of which I was a cosponsor. Federal funds in the amount of $75,000,000 per year are authorized, to assist the States to construct hospitals and health facilities. I am cosponsoring a bill to enlarge that program. A recent hospital survey shows that in order to provide the minimum facilities commensurate with good health, the number of existing hospital beds in the United States should be doubled. That will require an expenditure of billions of dollars. We do not expect to meet that goal overnight, but we must substantially accelerate the hospital construction program.

Not only must we build more hospital facilities and distribute them throughout the country on a basis of need, but we must also make those facilities available to all income groups. My State of Louisiana has been providing for many years, facilities for the sick who are financially unable to assist themselves. We operate, at State expense, seven charity hospitals located in various parts of the State, with a capacity of 4,000 beds. Doctors, nurses, operating facilities, laboratories, and medicines are provided at those hospitals, without charge to those who are unable to pay.

Doctors in Louisiana strenuously objected to the program when it was inaugurated, but they soon found that a tremendous load of charity cases was removed from their shoulders. Now they cheerfully contribute a portion of their time free of charge to these charity patients, and the State furnishes all other services.

The same system that has worked so well in Louisiana may be extended to other States. That system might be further improved by providing home and office medical treatment for the low-income group.

I believe that a comprehensive and sound program can be worked out in Congress, whereby the Federal Government, by making grants-in-aid to the States, could assist them in providing adequate medical care for those who are not financially able to pay. Full control and authority for carrying out the programs must be at the State level. I want no part of any plan that will be conducted and managed from Washington.

Several bills have been introduced which embrace that philosophy. I believe they are worthy of your consideration. The grants-in-aid, provided in some of the bills, would be used by the States for broadening the distribution of their medical and hospital services to make them available to all. Part of the funds to be provided could be used by the States to encourage the formation and expansion of voluntary nonprofit health insurance plans. Also, dental services are included in some of the proposed plans to be made available at the discretion of the State.

Some measures provide grants-in-aid to the States to permit periodic medical and dental examinations for school children, and follow-up treatment where the family cannot afford to pay the cost of such treatment; others authorize Federal grants-in-aid to the States to assist in establishing and maintaining adequately staffed and equipped local public health units; and Federal payments are also provided for accredited schools of medicine to encourage the enrollment of more medical students. Surely, from such a wide range of constructive suggestions, it should be possible to reach agreement.

I believe the voluntary nonprofit health insurance plans are the answer to the needs of the middle-income group. With the aid and assistance of the Nation's medical profession, these plans can be expanded to provide the participant with full protection against burdensome medical bills. On a voluntary basis, the program will encourage a healthier, more sound economy, and a more vigorous and progressive medical profession. With the help of Federal grants-in-aid, the States could enable the lower strata of the middle-income group to share in the program at reduced costs. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are thousands of good, conscientious, hard-working citizens whose incomes are sufficient to enable them to make their own way in life, but who cannot afford to pay the full price for comprehensive medical protection under Blue Cross and other voluntary nonprofit insurance plans.

This then is the medical need that confronts our country. It is a basic need. It concerns itself largely with inequitable distribution, mainly influenced by geographic and economic factors. We must recognize this to be true and turn our attention to a remedial program.

We are familiar with the suggestions advanced by the extremists. We must reject them, and find the solution within the framework of our own free-enterprise system. I call upon you, the doctors, and you, the people, to come forth and assert yourselves. You will find a substantial majority of your lawmakers eager to cooperate with you in the development of a sound and adequate program, one that will accomplish the purpose without extinguishing the light of freedom that has made America great.

Can Congress Cure Transportation Ills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today I had the honor of addressing a luncheon session of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, where the general topic of transportation trends was being considered. The subject of my address was, Can Congress cure transportation ills? I ask unanimous consent to insert my address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN CONGRESS CURE TRANSPORTATION ILLS?

With the end of World War II and the conversion of our economy from war to peacetime conditions practically finished American industry still faces serious and varied problems. The war is over but the impact of that war on our economy will never be over. World War II has given us a 50-cent dollar, a high standard of living habit, a burdensome debt load, and excessively heavy taxes. Shortage of labor during the war years drove industry to adopt labor-saving devices which brought about a heavy capital investment and a smaller pay roll. As a result unemployment is increasing and buying power is drying up.

Most products and most services have priced themselves out of the market. Usually following war prices tumble, but this time they cannot because costs of production have not and cannot come down. We may witness the first depression in history when, except for bankruptcy and forced sales, prices will remain relatively high.

These facts are directly related to the transportation industry since expenses and costs of transportation services cannot be materially reduced while demand for such services tapers off. There can be no forced or bankruptcy sales of transportation services. Its charges and its rates are fixed and transport industries must therefore bear the full impact of an economic slow-down.

If it were not for the Soviet-imposed cold war, the present economic situation in the United States really would be alarming. The $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan, plus the $20,000,000,000 rearmament program for western Europe, plus the annual current domestic $15,000,000,000 military expenditure is maintaining a current economic fool's paradise. Disaster is not being halted; it is only being delayed. If Russia suddenly decided to be a good neighbor there would be hell to pay.

The first to feel the pinch and bear the fruits of economic disturbance are the service industries and especially the transportation industry. That is why there is so much interest in this luncheon today. That is why, I suppose, shippers and the many segments of the transportation industry are watching with undisguised concern the current studies of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

We have made tremendous advancement in the productivity of our farms and have improved efficiency in our factories, but our distribution system has not kept pace. This has a primary effect on American cost of living for no matter what the product may be, or how reasonable its cost of production, it

must be delivered into the market place at a cost that will permit its sale price to be within the range that the consumer is willing and able to pay.

Nearly 70 years ago Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission and gave to it vital regulatory powers over the railroads. The national importance of railroad transportation, which was about the only interstate transportation of those days, investment abuses, and unwholesome competitive conditions made Federal regulation necessary. It is important to note here that Congress did not step into this picture until its hand was forced.

As new forms of transportation have come into being regulatory bodies have been set up to exercise over them similar quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers. The object from the first has been to eliminate "dog-eat-dog competition" and to stabilize each transportation service in the interest of shippers and the public generally. All of these Federal regulatory agencies are under the supervision of the Commerce Committees of the Congress.

The successful operation of our vast transportation system—rail, water, highway, air, and pipe line—has a direct bearing on the daily life of all our citizens. The network they afford helps bring about the successful maintenance of a strong national economy. It has permitted us to tap our natural resources in the remotest parts of the Nation, and has made these materials and the products manufactured from them available to all our people throughout the country. It has given the farmer and the miner and the manufacturer a national market for his product. It has given us a uniform national culture from Maine to California. It has stripped Americans of their rugged individualism and spirit of self-reliance and made them dependent upon their fellows everywhere for the necessities of life and limb. But it has united this Nation into one big family with a common objective and a common goal.

In the Transportation Act of 1940, the Congress set forth a declaration of policy which I am certain is familiar to all of you. This declaration calls for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation; for promotion of safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and the fostering of sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers. It requires the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services; promotes cooperation with the several States; and encourages fair wages and equitable working conditions. It is aimed at the development, coordination, and preservation of a strong national transportation system by rail, air, water, highway, and all other means adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the Nation, of the postal service, and of the national defense.

As a member and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I assure you that it is the constant aim of our committee to see that these objectives are carried out. Our committee is just now embarking on a complete study of all phases of our transportation system. Our various subcommittees engaged in this study welcome your cooperation and constructive suggestions. We are interested in all your problems, both large and small. Wherever necessary, we want to improve regulations and strengthen statutes to better carry out the declared policy of the Congress for a constantly improved system of transportation. We want to encourage and protect the investment of capital in these industries. We want to guard against ruthless competition that can destroy rather than improve the heavy investment in traffic facilities.

In the three major studies which we have undertaken respecting air-line, maritime, and surface transportation we are not seeking headlines nor do we expect to turn things upside down. We are determined not to indulge in witch hunts or to make a nuisance of ourselves. We are going about these vital investigations with the solid objective ever before us of being constructively helpful. But we are very serious and will not tolerate obstruction of any kind; if we find evil we will expose it.

According to the Bureau of the Budget, the out-of-pocket contribution American taxpayers are currently making annually to civil aviation is $300,000,000. A major portion goes to air-line operation. That seems a sizable sum for an industry whose total capitalization is but $700,000,000. Nevertheless, in spite of this substantial annual payment the air lines, industrywise, are operating in the red and are insisting upon more generous subsidies. Our committee is determined to find out what justification there may be for these urgent demands.

An executive of one of our western railroads asks: "Would it not seem fair to exclude from taxable income the excess costs of new units (of railroad equipment) above depreciation?" Can anyone tell me why not when we spend billions of tax dollars on airports, highways, and barge lines. The other day the Maritime Commission announced that it had granted $42,000,000 toward the construction costs of a $70,000,000 passenger superliner. Col. J. Monroe Johnson, on the other hand, has been bellowing to the four winds about the precarious shortage of freight cars from a national-defense standpoint.

After 13 years of regulation of the trucking industry by the ICC, the industry is still plagued by "gypsy" operations. The holder of an ICC certificate enters into a trip-lease contract at a cutthroat rate with some poor fellow who has managed to scrape enough together to make a down payment on a truck and who is under pressure to get his hands on a few dollars. To make both ends meet he must run excessive hours and carry excessive loads and forget about the proper care of his truck. Congress delegated supervision of the trucking industry to the ICC to foster sound dependable economic and safety conditions in transportation, but "gypsy" exploitation and truck-leasing turmoil in this regulated industry is growing by leaps and bounds.

Two world wars found the American merchant marine unprepared to face the worldwide transport and auxiliary demands of our armed forces. Fortunately in each instance we were given time to build ships. We should not gamble on a third period of grace.

During the last war this country built the world's largest fleet, a fabulous armada of 6,200 ships, totaling about 57,000,000 tons. Today about 2,000 are in moth balls. Our active fleet consists of about 1,500 vessels, some 1,200 of which are privately owned.

The big questions facing the Congress, the administration, and the people are: How much tonnage do we need in peacetime to carry our share of world commerce? What is the minimum tonnage required in the event of an emergency? What portion of this insurance should the taxpayers bear? How much of the load will private enterprise assume? How much cargo which should move in private bottoms is the Army Transport Service carrying on Government-owned ships? What is the effect of transfers to the Panamanian, Honduran, and other flags on our merchant marine? What is the impact of coastwise and intercoastal movement of cargoes upon our various forms of domestic land transportation?

It is easy to ask these questions. It is more difficult to find the answers. The Congress is well aware that a constructive solution to these pressing maritime problems is essential. It is part of our three-pronged investigation of transportation and, again, because every businessman in this country has a vital stake in the outcome, we invite your cooperation.

In 1936 the Congress established the Maritime Commission and gave it a mandate to foster a merchant marine second to none which would serve as a military auxiliary in time of war.

The Maritime Commission as visioned by Congress is not to be merely a regulatory body; it is given vital promotional and investigatory responsibilities. It charters, designs, builds, repairs, buys, sells, and operates ships. It subsidizes shipping and makes loans on ships on a huge scale. It is big business. It's over-all cost to the Federal Treasury runs well over $100,000,000 annually.

Let us turn now to the practical day-by-day problems which face our economy and therefore our transportation industry. Exclusive of our aid program in western Europe, including rearming, next year this Nation is spending $15,000,000,000 on the construction of our own war machines. This is three times as much as our annual expenditure on all private and public education from the kindergarten to the highest postgraduate college course. It is more than the total investment in our vast railroad system. I do not believe this stupendous expenditure is justified, nor do I believe we can continue its present pace without serious repercussions on our economy. This fiscal year will find us three billion in the red and the next fiscal year we are likely to have a $10,000,000,000 deficit. I need not remind you that deficit spending is alone responsible for whatever inflation we have. If the present military spending spree and the European-aid program are not drastically reduced by next year this Nation will be launched on the wildest inflationary binge of all history. Only Joseph Stalin and his Politburo can be the beneficiaries.

However, if only half of our defense program is warranted, how dare we neglect transportation? When Hitler decided to plunge the world in a catastrophic blood bath his first step was the construction of a superb integrated transportation system. Because of it his war machine was able to function smoothly and for 3 years the world was his apple. Then in 1943 the break came. His warships and submarines were driven off the seas; his railways and superhighways were relentlessly bombed; and his well-defended airways began to crack under the impact of our fleet.

Our own war machine functioned faultlessly only because of our domestic transportation network of rails, highways, inland waterways, ocean shipping facilities, and pipe lines. They turned in a magnificent job. Successful prosecution of modern war depends upon the united effort of a whole Nation. The Kansas wheat farmer, the Colorado miner, and the Pennsylvania factory worker are as much a part of modern war as the man in uniform. They are made effective by linking together through a transportation network the product of their labor.

At least 50 percent of the money we spend on our military machine should go for transportation. An atomic bomb is no good unless you can carry it to the target. The irresistible marine cannot whip his weight in wildcats unless you bring him face to face with the enemy. No army can win unless its supply lines keep pace with it. Food and ammunition and petroleum must be carried to the front lines. This question was put to Gen. Nathan B. Forrest on a Civil War battlefield: What is the sure way to win? Without batting an eye, this doughty military phenomenon snapped: "Git there fust with the mostest," and getting there first with the most is the only way we can hope to win world war III, or, for that matter, any war.

Military people call this science logistics. I call it transportation.

If these truths were not so evident, the Congress might be complacent about transportation. We could let the law of survival of the fittest determine who is to transport what. But in industries having vital defense aspects, the people's representatives cannot and must not sit idly by and permit them to disintegrate.

There are many problems that appear to be present in the operation and improvement of these great distribution channels. Some apply to all branches of the industry and some are peculiar to each separate branch. There is, however, a definite relationship or team play between Congress and all of our modes of transportation. The solution of any of their problems must be accomplished with constant thought as to the effect of such changes or restrictions on each segment of the whole.

The solution is a national obligation, and must be brought about with due regard for our entire public welfare and the benefits to be derived by all our people. But it is not the responsibility of Congress alone, and Congress must be wise enough to realize it. Private management and the proved, expert knowledge gained from long, bitter experience must be given a full opportunity to bring forth the answers to most of these problems. The effort must be made by each group with the objective of reaching the desired result which will prove to be for the best interests of the whole country, rather than the selfish interest of a particular group or branch of the industry. Congress and the regulatory agencies which it has created must guide and assist; not direct and hinder.

The potential to this country in the development of financially stable transportation services challenges the imagination. The advent of the Diesel engine for motive power, both on the rails and on the water; the jet turbine for aircraft; and the new engineering techniques in motortruck and watercraft construction challenge all of us to make use of these tremendous scientific advances for an even better system of transportation. We have not yet attained perfection and we must not stop until that goal has been reached.

The ever increasing complexity of common-carrier services and the destructive rivalry between the different types of transportation are disconcerting. However I hold to the view there will be a useful and necessary place for every kind of transportation now serving us.

Team play between the various modes of transportation is essential. If all are to function at their best, there must be that interrelationship which gives the public the highest degree of service. Rather than spending energy opposing each other, they should apply this same energy in cooperation and teamwork. In the game of baseball, very frequently the best hitter on the team is called upon to make a sacrifice hit to advance one of his teammates to scoring position. While this sacrifice hit may appear to be less glamorous and the immediate personal advantage to the hitter appears to be lost, yet in the over-all picture such a sacrifice may well win the ball game. Similarly, what may appear to be a temporary disadvantage to one mode of transportation may ultimately result in a distinct advantage to all modes of transportation.

This leads to the problem of Federal regulation. The report of your own transportation and communications department committee, headed by your able chairman of this session, has advanced several questions and suggestions. You question whether or not there is a current need to enlarge and clarify the present declared transportation policy of Congress. Should all interpretations of every phase of our national transportation policy, including the rate-making power for all the various transportation branches, be centralized in one Government agency? Is the present rule applied by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the determination of rates fair and equitable?

Finding answers to these puzzles is the subject of the three separate, yet correlated, inquiries our committee is making. For the sake of convenience, we have divided them into three inquiries, but they are to be kept together in one over-all pattern. Please do not jump to hasty conclusions. Remember that our objective is to help and not to hamstring or hinder progress. Congress cannot, of course, cure all transportation ills, but it can prescribe a little preventive medicine.

It is my considered judgment that the inquiries and studies our committee has undertaken will result in recommendations to the Congress and to the industries themselves, which, if adopted, would be of great material benefit to the further development of our transportation systems. It is my hope and sincere belief that with the cooperation of shippers, labor, and management, the Congress will evolve a way to make our transportation industries effective agencies in the public interest.

Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on the occasion of a testimonial dinner given to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at the George Washington Hotel, Washington, Pa., on April 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator MARTIN and Mrs. Martin, honored guests, and ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed an honor and privilege to join you in honoring your favorite son, ED MARTIN. Your presence and your tributes that have been paid him show the high regard in which he is held by his neighbors and friends. And it's what the people at home think of you that really counts.

Many fine things have been said about ED MARTIN, about his accomplishments for the local community, and the service he has given to his native State.

You know him as a neighbor and fellow townsman, but I know him as a colleague in the United States Senate. There he is held in the highest respect by the entire membership, both sides of the aisle. There his great talent for good government reaches beyond the local community and State of Pennsylvania. His actions now affect the whole country; in fact, all mankind.

In a sense, I am an outsider at this testimonial gathering, that is, geographically speaking, since my home is in Nebraska, out there in the wide-open spaces, in the breadbasket of America. But I feel right at home here, sharing your hospitality and good fellowship. And whether we be Pennsylvanians or Nebraskans, we are all Americans. We all dearly love our country.

As I see it, Senator MARTIN has dedicated his life to public service, as lawyer, soldier, State auditor general, treasurer, adjutant general, governor, and now, as the senior Senator of the Keystone State in the United States Senate.

But with all the honors that he so richly deserves, and the tributes that have been paid him, yet, he is just ED MARTIN, and ED MARTIN is a very modest man. He asks no bouquets or testimonials in return for service on the field of battle and the efforts he is making to save his country. If he were asked what he thinks about all these words of praise tonight, he would reply something like this:

"If I could contribute just a little for the good of my fellow man, I would be very happy, but there is much that needs to be done, so very much, if we are to keep our country on an even keel going forward in freedom."

Out of this meeting, out of these words of tribute, our hopes and aspirations are renewed, for we all gain inspiration to do all we can to see that these principles for which Senator MARTIN stands shall not be eclipsed by alien ideologies.

Purveyors of gaudy socialistic wares are doing their utmost to lead us into state socialism. They promise a life of ease and abundance without work, they promise the Government will take care of us from cradle to grave, they promise high wages, low prices, free education, free medicine, free hospitals, free everything.

We are witnessing the biggest give-away show on earth. Come one, come all. Something for nothing—absolutely free.

These "medicine men," with their quack remedies, remind me of something my father said years ago in the horse and buggy days. My dad was a merchant and a farmer. And in those days there were plenty of mule traders and they had stock phrases. They had a language of their own. Dad said: "When a man tells you he has the best mule in the county, watch out. It is probably windy, spavined, stringhaltered, or moon-eyed."

So it is with the "medicine men" of Washington. They are long on promises of billowy pillows of ease, but extremely shy on what the cost will be, the cost in taxes, the cost of living, yes, the cost in robbing the people of their freedoms.

The Baltimore Sun, a leading Democrat newspaper, estimates the monetary cost of the President's social-welfare programs, all wrapped into one package, over a period of 50 years, at $1,250,000,000,000. I repeat: $1,250,000,000,000.

That many silver dollars would make seven stacks, reaching to the moon, and there would be enough left over to pay the national debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. I said trillion dollars, and also pay all your 1948 income taxes.

Confronted by those awesome figures, some of us are like the little boy who, when he saw an elephant for the first time, couldn't believe his eyes. He was so surprised he said: "It ain't real."

But, my fellow Americans, the threat to the financial stability of our country is real, very real. Not only is the financial stability of our country threatened, but our form of Government is challenged. These issues rise above partisanship and sectional interest. They must be met, head-on, by all Americans, who believe the Government should be the servant and not the master of the people.

Senator MARTIN is a leader in this crucial battle. For the life of me, I cannot see what these "medicine men" have to offer in exchange for our American way of life.

Here we have the best country on earth, with most of the good things of life: freedom of choice, freedom to take a job or quit a job, freedom for our workers to organize and bargain collectively, and freedom to come and go as we please. With only one-sixteenth of the world's population and only 6 percent of the world's area, we produce nearly half of the world's goods. We own 46 percent of the world's electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 54 percent of its life-insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, 92 percent of its bathtubs.

We have the best health record, the most churches, the best schools, and the highest standard of living.

Incredible as it seems, I can't believe my own eyes, but there are among us those, some of them in high places in Government, who would take from us the freedoms that made these things possible and impose upon us socialism and police-state methods. Along that road is neither social security nor liberty. National socialism has never worked anywhere. It won't work here.

Our people don't want to be spoon-fed by a paternalistic government at Washington. No matter how they sugarcoat their pills, they are still socialistic. The socialistic planners have included everything in their blueprint. Many sincere, patriotic Americans are attracted to their glittering master design.

Through federalized education the radicals seek to capture control of the school systems. They hope to condition the minds of our youth for state socialism which is the doorway to communism and dictatorship. Oh, I know Congress is only asked to appropriate $300,000,000 this year for aid to education. But once they get their foot in the door it will lead to billions of dollars in appropriations in the coming years. It would grow and grow and grow, like those radio give-away jackpots, like the pyramid clubs of today.

Through socialized medicine the radical planners seek to break into our homes. They hope to disrupt the confidential relations between our people and their family doctors, and parade the ills and finances of our people through Government reports. It is a scheme that soon will cost $6,000,000,000 a year.

Through a socialized food program the radical planners would multiply controls upon the farmers, send bureaucrats snooping into every farm in the land, to check their acreages, their quotas, and their receipts. The self-annointed planners at Washington seek to break the will of the farmers for independence and freedom.

To the farmer they offer as a price for security, a subsidy for food to be paid out of the Federal Treasury; to the housewife they offer low prices in the name of security. But to the taxpayers, and that's all of us, directly or indirectly, they say nothing. They do not tell us they will hand us a bill and will collect it from us in the amount of $5,000,000,000 annually.

I am not talking about socializing England, or collectivizing the farmers of Russia. I am talking about what is happening in the United States. These plans, my friends, are being advanced seriously in Washington. They are offered in the name of security, abundance, all the catch phrases. All of them have strings attached. All of them whittle away our liberties. All of them are infected by squandermania.

The Federal Government does not receive its revenue from some remote place. Tax money does not grow on trees. It comes from the toil and sweat of the people in cities, towns, hamlets, and on farms. It is for them to decide how it shall be spent, not the "medicine men" in Washington. Dollars taken from the people by the bureaucrats in Washington do not return to the people worth 100 cents. Bureaucracy takes its toll.

Keep the money at home, in the local community, in the State, to be spent as you people see fit; where you have control and supervision of your local authorities. That is home rule. That is in line with the principles of the Constitution, under which Federal, State, and local governments are supposed to function in distinct orbits.

Yes, Pennsylvania, our whole country, faces critical situations. We must keep our Government financially strong, we must hew to the line of true Republican principles, if we are to keep our liberties.

What could the freedom-loving nations of the world expect of the United States in forthright foreign policy, if our Government pursues the road to socialism and dictatorship at home.

We can be of little help to freedom-loving peoples, if, by neglect, our own country becomes a bedlam of confusion, with alien-minded rascals running in and out of our Government like water through a sieve. America's resources are not inexhaustible. In our efforts to help other countries, let us be cautious against impoverishing ourselves.

We cherish freedom, freedom of choice, as a people. In war and in peace we have fought to win and keep freedom for the individual. That freedom must be preserved at all costs.

As ED MARTIN has so often said, our freedom could be smothered by big government, big business, and big labor. ED MARTIN has, in no uncertain manner, called that to the attention of the Members of the Senate many, many times. We must be vigilant in protecting small, independent business establishments against obliteration by monopolies. We must preserve their economic freedom, and keep open the door to opportunity. The great strength of America lies in the freedom of the individual to pioneer in new enterprises. That is the great field for youth.

Would we have had a Ford if it had not been for the opportunities and incentives open to small-business men? How about Edison and Firestone? We could not get a Ford, a Firestone, or an Edison under any system of cradle-to-grave, Government spoon-feeding. The right to acquire property is a human right and must be preserved. When the Government takes the bulk of what we earn, Government robs us of our incentive to acquire, it road-blocks progress. Today, some of our tax levies are confiscatory, and have reached the saturation point.

Real progress lies not in more and more Government paternalism, but rather in more and more freedom for the individual, and in constantly widening diffusion of the good things in life among the masses. History reveals that all true progress has been made only when the liberties of the people have been expanded.

The people, when given all the facts, will make the right decisions. I have an abiding faith in their wisdom. But many of them today are being misled by false promises of security, something for nothing.

The founders of our Nation did not promise a life of ease, with the Government managing the affairs of the people. They provided a government in which the individual has freedom of choice, and opportunity to improve himself in all ways.

The Declaration of Independence does not guarantee social security from cradle to grave, or even happiness. The Declaration of Independence declares it is the inalienable right of the people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our forefathers asked only the guarantee of their right to life and liberty, and the right to pursue work for happiness. That is what made America strong, the bulwark of freedom.

It's worth fighting for. Let's join ED MARTIN in helping to keep it that way.

The Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a message entitled "The Polish Constitution of 1791," which he sent to a commemorative meeting held on Sunday, May 1, at Rutherford, N. J., under the auspices of Fairleigh Dickinson College.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is a document of the deepest significance for every one of us who watches today, with mingled hope and anxiety, the trials of the civilized world.

This constitution was primarily the work of a Polish King, Stanislas Augustus II, who was a great patriot and a man of rare wisdom. When he first presented his ideas to the leaders of the great Diet, he apologized, saying that these were "only the dreams of a good citizen." But this was a time for dreams in Poland. It was the springtime of Polish nationalism and Polish democracy, apparently freed at last from the cold grasp of Russian and Prussian despotism. Small wonder that the patriot leaders hailed the ideas of Stanislas as their charter of independence and liberty. Small wonder that when the King offered this constitution to the Diet on the morning of May 3 the gathering adopted it by acclamation and the lights of Warsaw burned all night in triumph.

What was this constitution? It was a wiser document than was realized even by many of those who acclaimed it. Not only did it grant to both townsmen and peasants a measure of freedom such as they had never known before; it also sought to establish efficiency and order under law. It expressed the conviction of its authors that reform without order is a vain and tragic waste. In those turbulent times this was perhaps its greatest promise for unhappy Poland.

Indeed, one of the major results which Stanislas and the other good citizens hoped for from this constitution was the achievement of enough stability in Poland to discourage the aggressive plans of her great neighbors. We know now, of course, that this hope was soon to be tragically crushed by the second and third partitions of Poland in 1793 and 1795. Then, as always, Poland was a victim of geography—situated on fertile rolling plains, with few natural defensive barriers, between the two most ruthless and aggressive nations in the history of modern Europe. When the armies of Catherine the Great and Frederick William marched, Poland lost her freedom, her order, and her very existence at a single blow.

If there is one moral in this story that stands out for us today above all the rest, it is this: Peace, democracy, and orderly living cannot be sealed within the borders of a single nation. We cannot change geography; Poland will always be there on her rich, defenseless plain. All our efforts must be bent instead on the difficult but not impossible task of changing the character of her two

great neighbors, Germany and Russia, whose aggressive appetites in 1914 and 1939 were just as fearful as they were in 1793.

Here, indeed, is the meaning of America's foreign policy today: we are committed to the effort to change the hearts of aggressive dictatorships the world over and to restrain them if they persist in wrongdoing. That is the meaning of our role in the United Nations, where we look forward to the day when Poland will raise her independent voice. That is the meaning of the European recovery program, in which Poland was about to join when the Soviets rudely drew her back, but which still seeks to encourage the greatest possible amount of legitimate trade across the iron curtain. That effort at changing hearts is also the central meaning of the Voice of America broadcasts, which every day speak to Russia for 2 hours and to Poland for 1 hour, telling their peoples the story of the free world. And, finally, that is the meaning of the North Atlantic Pact, which is designed to ward off the possibility of another war until we are able to establish positive peace in the world.

Only when that peace is established can Poland's great people live again in freedom, order, and justice. Perhaps when that day comes another freely elected congress, secure from cynical foreign aggression, will meet in Warsaw to take up again the task of 1791—to ordain and establish a new constitution worthy of the good citizens of Poland.

Civil Rights and Social Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-reasoned editorial entitled "Civil Rights and Social Customs," from the Christian Science Monitor of Boston, Mass., of May 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL CUSTOMS

President Truman is sending his civil-rights program to the Senate in one four-bill package. Quite a lot could be written on the pros and cons of the move as political strategy. Suffice it to say for the moment that the bills have little if any chance for action this session; that it is consistent with Mr. Truman's now-familiar practice of dumping his platform and campaign pledges in the lap of Congress, if only for the record; that certainly, whatever else might be said, it puts the issue frankly and as a whole before the American people.

The civil-rights question is so overlaid with emotion and so buttressed with deep convictions on both sides that one cannot try too hard or too often to keep it in perspective. First, it should be seen that, applied to this package of legislation, "civil rights" is a too-narrow and hence a misleading term. For the forthcoming bills would deal with social customs and attitudes as well as with constitutional guaranties. And the "folkways and mores" of a people are rarely changed directly by passing a law. Even the attempt subjects the best of intentions to serious risks.

Into this category fall legislative proposals which could end up forcing employment of proportionate numbers of any and all groups in any and all establishments, and proposals to end segregation everywhere by Federal fiat. The injustices involved can be better attacked, we believe, by voluntary, extra-legal methods and on the local plane.

But effective guaranties of true civil rights can eventually, although indirectly, bring changes in attitudes and customs sufficient to dissolve at least their crueler accompaniments. And a good case can be made that such guaranties lie within the scope of Federal functions under the Constitution.

Certainly one of the rights of American citizenship is the right to vote on the same basis as others in the same State. The poll tax, which has often been used to bar Negroes from the ballot box, is being progressively abolished by the States themselves. And it is not the only method being used for preserving white supremacy at the polls. So the administration's anti-poll-tax bill seems a bit unrealistic from the practical standpoint. To put the record straight, however, and to cut that much ground from under Communist propaganda here and abroad, such a law on the Federal statute books might have its uses.

A civil-rights commission, to conduct continuing studies of the situation and make annual reports and recommendations to the President, could help greatly to keep public opinion aware of both progress and regressions.

As for lynching, that is the utter negation of all the guaranties of the fifth, sixth, and seventh amendments. No man or woman, guilty or innocent, strung up by a mob, has been allowed to claim his rights to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury, to have the assistance of counsel, or to any of the other protections therein provided.

A Federal antilynching law touches questions of constitutionality. And we do not wish here to argue the relative merits of the administration versus the Ferguson bill (already introduced). But we hope earnestly that the South, if only for its own sake, will not oppose reasonable and soundly worded legislation directed against this peculiarly abhorrent and lawless tyranny wherever it may threaten, North or South.

To do so would be to repeat what Georgia Editor Ralph McGill terms (and applies specifically to the current controversy) "the tragic history of the South—the furious defense of a moral wrong which obscured whatever was right about the South's position. * * *"

The South has much right on its side. It would be a tragedy, indeed, to again becloud it.

Farm Problem in the Spotlight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Josephine Ripley entitled "Farm Problem in the Spotlight," which was published in the Christian Science Monitor on May 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROBLEM IN THE SPOTLIGHT

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—If the Brannan farm program is radical and costly, so is present farm legislation.

Extension of high wartime price supports to 1950 by the Eightieth Congress has the Government involved in the most extravagant price-support operation in its history.

So far this fiscal year (through March 31), the Government has nearly $3,000,000,000 committed to price support in loans, purchases, and purchase agreements. That is far more than ever has been spent for this purpose in any previous peacetime year.

The magnanimous abandon with which the last Congress extended high-cost wartime controls to 1950 in its precampaign wind up is indicated in the fact that it pledged support at 90 percent of parity for the 1948 potato crop, too, even though the potato-support program had already cost the Government $170,169,000 at that time. As a result, the cost of the potato program to date has now risen to $400,000,000.

These rates do not terminate until the Aiken part of the Hope-Aiken Farm Act goes into effect in January with its provision for flexible supports, ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

This legislation was passed in such a rush in the closing days of the final regular session of the Eightieth Congress that few persons realized its import.

Most people are amazed at the similarity between the Aiken law and the new Brannan farm program which has caused such a sensation since its presentation to Congress a few weeks ago.

As a matter of fact, the Aiken Act and the Brannan program differ in only three major respects, as follows:

1. The Brannan program would give 100 percent support to some 10 commodities, while the Aiken Act furnishes 60 to 90 percent support for some 8 commodities.

2. The Brannan plan proposes a new formula for working out a support standard—a standard based on farm income instead of prices.

3. The Brannan scheme sets a unit limit of production on which the farmer may enjoy price support. The Aiken Act sets no limitation.

The greatest difference, of course, is in the number of commodities selected for support, and the rate of support.

All of the various methods of support outlined in the Brannan plan are also provided in the Aiken Act, even to the much-debated production payments.

These permit the Government, instead of buying up surplus commodities, to leave them on the market to fall to their own level. Then it steps in to pay the farmer the difference between the market price and the higher support level.

Many have taken it for granted that this is a new and radical idea. Its purpose is to furnish the farmer price support while at the same time giving the consumer the benefit of lower prices.

It is true that these operations assume broader proportions and more definite outline in the Brannan plan, but they are all in the present law. The Aiken Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

It also makes clear that compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

The Brannan plan would make price support conditional upon compliance with soil-conservation practices, acreage allotment, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements as these are found necessary to curtail wasteful production and disorderly marketing.

Under the Aiken Act any or all of these controls, with the exception of soil conservation, may be applied. Under the Brannan plan, they would be required, under certain conditions.

It is unfortunate that there is no way to estimate how much either of these programs will cost. This is so because grain and other nonperishable commodities acquired by the Government under the price-support program are sold eventually. So the actual cost is not known until those sales are made. If shortages develop in the meantime, grain will bring a good price, and the Government may come out ahead in the operation. This is often the case.

The Brannan plan is serving a real purpose in bringing the whole farm picture into sharp focus at this time so that the country will have an opportunity to know just what a farm program entails, and whether it wants the Brannan program, the Aiken Act—or a combination of both.

Excerpts From Remarks of Hon. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from remarks made by Hon. HUGH SCOTT, chairman of the Republican national committee, at a testimonial dinner given to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at Washington, Pa., on April 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To my mind, Senator EDWARD MARTIN is the embodiment of the kind of hard work and service which brings success to its political party and which results in the preservation of the kind of government which I am sure we all wish to see perpetuated.

Early in life he started out as a precinct worker right in Greene County. Then he became a member of the county committee and later served as its secretary and as its chairman. His ability as an organizer and his willingness to make sacrifices for the party's good soon brought him additional recognition. He was elected a member of the State central committee and in 1928 became State chairman, serving until 1934. It was during his service as State chairman that a solid congressional delegation of his party was elected under his leadership. He has been a delegate to several national conventions and has served as chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation.

After having held various other elective offices he was elected Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1942 and after making a brilliant record in that office was elected Senator in 1946. I am stating but the widely accepted fact when I say that there is no more valuable public servant in Washington today than Senator MARTIN.

His abilities are recognized by men of all parties and those who have no formal affiliation with any party. It is important that we have men like Senator MARTIN in public office and that we keep them there. They are hard to find but we could use more of them.

I trust that I will not be going beyond the bounds of propriety when I mention here tonight that in Washington today we are engaged in a life and death struggle to preserve our representative Republic. It is a struggle that cuts across party lines. That is proved by the record. Back in 1945 the present administration presented a program to Congress which had a very strong resemblance to the Communist Party program in its substance, if not in its form. It was instantly recognized as a program which could not be adopted without doing serious damage to the entire fabric of our Government. It presented much more than a partisan issue. In 1945, if you will recall, the Democrats had majorities in both the Senate and House of Representatives. That was during the Seventy-ninth Congress. That Congress ignored the administration program in its entirety. Congress would have nothing to do with it and said so emphatically. Most of the same program was submitted again when the Eightieth Republican Congress came into office in January 1947. Again it was repudiated by the elected representatives of the people and I might add it was repudiated by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Now, today, we have the same old program with a few added trimmings presented to the Eighty-first Congress in which the Democrats have majorities in the Senate and House. All indications are that once more it will be turned down and I certainly hope it will be, because most of it simply doesn't make sense, or worse.

You hear a great deal of talk nowadays from spokesmen for the present administration who are loud in their complaints that the Republican minorities in Congress are blocking the administration's program of creeping socialism. That is just so much nonsense, because the Democrats have majorities which could pass any program regardless of how Republican Members might vote. That is, the Democrats could do so if they were united in support of a program. Fortunately for the Republic, they are not so united, and I want to express my gratitude to the patriotic Democrat Members of the Senate and House who are standing up for American principle of government despite ruthless pressure from many sources. Republicans, of course, are opposing many of the unsound items on the administration's agenda. We have no apologies to offer for such opposition. We are proud of it. We were not elected to preside over the burial of the constitutional system. But we are also grateful that a sufficient number of Democrats have chosen to support our position to prevent the program from being enacted.

I want to say in all seriousness, and this is not a partisan utterance in any sense, that if the present trend of administration thinking ever prevails in Washington it will mean the end of free government and free institutions in the United States. No one wants that, whether he is a Republican or Democrat, or a member of no party at all. The basic idea underlying most of the administration program is the appropriation of vast sums of money—your money—to be administered by irresponsible and arbitrary political appointees for any one of a hundred different purposes. Some of the purposes are good, some of them are bad, but the method itself is bad in all instances. It is a method which if allowed to develop unchecked will inevitably set up a tremendously powerful political machine, self-perpetuating in its nature and able to buy the people's votes with the people's own money.

Of course, I have my own ideas as to what should be done to put an end to this situation, but this is not the time to make that speech. We will have plenty of those next year and thereafter. Meanwhile, we can all be devoutly thankful that patriotism has risen above partisanship in the present Congress to call a halt on the ruinous proposals of those currently in charge of the executive branch of our Government. Most certainly I hope that we will be able to preserve this bipartisan defense of American freedom as long as may be necessary.

One of the most effective Members of either House of Congress in checkmating the excesses of the present administration is the man whom we are honoring here tonight. I am glad we have him in the United States Senate, and from the fact of your attendance at this dinner, I assume you share my sentiments in that respect.

No man is more worthy of your tribute, more deserving of your confidence. We wish him long life and continued fruitful service in the cause of his beloved country, which he has, in so many varied fields, served so well. Of such men it is truly said: "They deserve well of the Republic."

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject, The North Atlantic Pact, delivered by me over the facilities of radio station KSL at Salt Lake City on Wednesday, April 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

The signing of the North Atlantic Pact represents the culmination of a series of efforts on the part of member nations to provide a substitute for war. The regional nature of the pact might imply a divided world, but continuous reference to the United Nations leaves the pact in a universal realm based upon the concept of one world.

No matter what the world is politically, even if nations divide up into economic blocks, the world still remains one economically. The ideal in accordance with American theory if not practice—a theory based upon the notion of American dollar democracy—leaves the ideal of the one world, economically speaking, the primary purpose of the pact. It recognizes, first, the vast community of interest among whom an aggressor shall not arise. The secondary aspect of the pact represents the theory that there may be aggression from without this community of interest and that the aggressor can be stopped and even put down if there is unity backed by force of the nations of the same community of interest.

The pact invites a continuous adhesion of other states. Therefore, the community of interest can become world-wide. Thus the pact represents the basic theory advanced during the First World War, that war anywhere is of concern to all everywhere.

As far as the pact goes, an aggressor in international law has now become defined and the theory that nations may unite to throw their preponderant force against an aggressor state is accepted as fundamental. The nations who have signed the pact believe in the possibility of an enforced peace, depending upon the use of strength in a united way against an erring state or an attacking aggressor. These theories mark definite strides in the onward march of nations in an attempt to stop war.

The pact also accepts the theory that government, in its final analysis, rests upon force. The force need not be expressed and the theory of the pact is that it will never be expressed. In our own constitutional development, we in America have learned that while all of our institutions are backed in theory by force, force is seldom called upon in our contests between our States or between a State and the whole Nation. Thus the peaceful process is substituted for force which has been proved a possibility in the federal experience of the United States. The hope for the pact is that that possibility will be proved in an international sphere. All that has been done is consistent with what has gone before because the theory of force cannot be removed from government without destroying government. Since the theory of force, therefore, cannot be removed from international control without destroying that control it is in the nonexercise of this theory that the world's hope, the real desire of nations, will be fulfilled.

Let's review what we have done in America to bring us to this position. First, World War I proved the fallacy of what was called the balance of power. Peace, depending on a balance, was destroyed the minute there was a preponderant weight on one side of the balance. Then came the development of World War II. The invention of the submarine and the use of the airplane dwarfed the world so that nations far removed from the center of the fight came to the aid of the Allies, to use their own expression, thinking desperately of their own self-interest. In rapid succession there developed movements for an enforced peace. The League of Nations to enforce the peace; the World Court to settle disputes; and the machinery of government to preserve peace as a common interest has a definite reference in the Atlantic Pact. To preserve the territorial integrity of a sovereign independent nation is reflected not only in the League of Nations Covenant but also in the United Nations Charter.

Americans, because of their early heritage, will take the stand that regional pacts, such as the Rio de Janeiro Pact, the North Atlantic Pact, and agreements for universal action are not alliances. They definitely are not alliances in the old way in which the nations accepted the theory of the offensive and defensive alliance technique. War for the purpose of advancing a national interest has been outlawed by an almost universal treaty. War as an instrument of a national accomplishment remains outlawed and, with the condemnation of the aggressor as we have it in the Atlantic Pact, war as an instrument for the advancement of a national interest remains outlawed. Therefore, if we call the pact an alliance, it is an alliance only in the sense of the new concept of international law which bans war as a proper process to be used by a nation in obtaining its objectives.

In this mere recital comes a condemnation of the acts of aggression carried on by Mussolini, Hitler, Tojo, and their allies. The world has legally condemned the action of aggression of the Second World War. It therefore infers a condemnation of the actions of any future aggressor and, in addition to that, the democratic nations of the world surely condemn any state which is controlled by a single will. In other words, it matters not how much we may point out that there is inconsistency in what the world is doing, the fact remains that those nations which act for and in behalf of the wills of their people have become the states which are recognized as forward-looking. Single-will action is despotism. It is an invitation to tyranny. Therefore, states thus organized receive justly the condemnation of the states where the people's will prevails.

In another way the Atlantic Pact represents an almost universal acceptance of the concept of popular sovereignty. How then could America stand in any other place than the place she stands today in not only supporting and furthering, if not actually leading the culmination of that pact and the universal acceptance of the theory behind it.

Why were the early American States so interested in each one having military rights and privileges? Was it entirely against foreign aggressors they were thinking? No, even we of the United States were suspicious of one another and we did fight a war between States. But such a recurrence, possible still in theory, seems utterly absurd in fact. Why? Because we have learned how to live in such a way that the preponderant will or the preponderant force of the United States is turned against an erring individual State. The will of a Supreme Court decision is not questioned. Neither do we resort to arms for its enforcement.

America rejected the League Covenant. She did not at first adhere to the World Court. We were late in becoming a member of the International Labor Organization. We took definite stands against world organizations which were organized to preserve peace in the world. We attempted other techniques in our aim to preserve the peace of the world. In 1935 we resorted to an enlarged concept of our former theory of neutrality in an attempt to preserve peace. But because of the mandatory nature of the Neutrality Act and the fact that neutrality was generally interpreted as meaning impartiality, when one of the nations of the world started to move against another nation the Neutrality Act was regarded as notice that we would pay no attention to what other nations were doing. This caused us to act equally either against or in behalf of the aggressor and the victim of the aggression. In April 1939 I offered an amendment to the Neutrality Act which provided that the President of the United States might lift the embargo provisions of the neutrality when he saw an act of aggression in favor of the victim of such aggression. This was defeated. In July 1939 President Roosevelt submitted a formal request to the Foreign Relations Committee that something be done so that the force of opinion of the nations and the actual force of the United States might be alined with those nations of the world wanting peace. The Foreign Relations Committee turned down this recommendation. In less than a month after the United States gave formal notice to the world that it would not interfere with an aggression Hitler started his onward march.

In view of the leadership our Nation has developed, the United States has an obligation to the rest of the world to see that such a thing does not happen again. The spirit of the pact is that such a thing as happened under Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo shall not happen again. The North Atlantic Pact is in complete harmony with the theories of collective security and the action of all the nations of the world to that end.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Hubert Wheeler, commissioner, Missouri State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Mo. Mr. Wheeler's letter shows the interest in the school-lunch program and the urgent need for further expansion of this service. I urge immediate consideration of a deficiency appropriation to finance this program until the end of the present school term and sincerely hope that the appropriation for the 1949–50 school year will be sufficient to meet the expanding needs of this very worthy service.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Jefferson, April 30, 1949.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: Federal funds allotted to Missouri for the operation of the National school-lunch program are sufficient only to carry the program through April. It is estimated that an additional $35,000 will be needed to continue reimbursement to sponsors through the remainder of this school year.

Fourteen hundred participating schools, serving over 150,000 children daily, are being notified that Federal funds will be exhausted at the close of this month and assistance must be discontinued unless additional funds are forthcoming.

Reimbursement rates to the schools in Missouri were reduced this year in an effort to live within our apportionment of the national appropriation. It was necessary that we decline applications from approximately 75 schools after all available Federal funds had been committed. Participation in this year's program has expanded far beyond our expectations and it is conservatively estimated that 200 additional schools will request participation in next year's program.

In the interest of the health and welfare of the school children in Missouri, I respectfully urge your support of a deficiency appropriation for completing this year's program and your consideration of an adequate appropriation for the 1949–50 school year.

Yours very truly,

HUBERT WHEELER, *Commissioner.*

United Nations and World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the annual town meeting of

Rowley, Mass., held March 16, 1949, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve peace and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it effective for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government: Be it

Resolved, by the people of Rowley, Mass., in town meeting assembled, That we call upon our representatives in Congress, in the executive department of the United States and in the United Nations, to take note of these truths and forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter of the purpose of making the United Nations into a world govment capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the town clerk to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from this congressional district, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representatives in the United Nations.

Attest: A true copy.

GEORGE A. GOODWIN,
Town Clerk.

Economics A

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 24, 1949:

ECONOMICS A

Sometimes we wish that a course in the rudiments of economics were part of the required instruction in all the high schools of the land. If more people were familiar with the facts of economic life and the history of previous attempts to alter the laws of economics, the hand-out philosophy which seems to permeate the Truman administration would arouse the indignation and scorn which it deserves.

The kind of instruction we have in mind would begin with a study of what constitutes wealth. It would establish the facts that wealth is created through the production of articles and commodities the people want and need and that the Government itself does not and cannot create any wealth.

From these premises several other facts would be adduced. One is that the only wealth the Government possesses or can acquire is that which it takes away in the form of taxes from the people who produce it.

Another is that the Government has no wealth to distribute among the people which it has not first taken away from the people. It cannot give any group additional purchasing power without first depriving other groups of at least the equivalent in purchasing power. And frequently those who receive from the Government must also give to the Government, sometimes, even more than they receive.

However, to continue the class in economics A, emphasis must be placed on the fact that when the Government undertakes to redistribute the wealth, it never gives back as much as it takes away. Just as a professional gambler takes a cut out of every pot in a poker game, the Government takes its percentage out of every deal.

The Government's cut is used to pay the costs of administration. It pays the salaries of the Government employees. It pays the cost of erecting and maintaining the marble palaces in which they work. It pays for the tons of paper they use for keeping the records of each transaction. It pays their telephone, telegraph, and transportation bills and the cost of the publicity campaigns they put on to sell their programs to the public.

Thus it follows that as the hand-out programs are expanded, the Government's cut becomes increasingly larger and the share of wealth that is left for distribution to the people becomes proportionately smaller. Moreover, the Government employees themselves become a pressure group who resist any reduction in the Government spending programs and constantly clamor for more spending and bigger rake-offs for administration costs.

Already the cost of government in the United States—Federal, State, and local—consumes 25 percent of the national income. Nobody knows how much the Federal Government's rake-off would be increased if the administration's give-away program were adopted and nobody in the Federal Government seems to care.

A study of what has happened in other nations and other civilizations in which governments tried to plan and regulate the economy would reveal that no government has ever been able to provide its pepole with both security and freedom at the same time. A government can insure its people freedom and the opportunity to work and to plan and earn their own security. But when a government attempts to plan for and provide security for its people, history has shown that eventually it must resort to police-state methods which curtail and finally abolish the people's liberties.

The United States has devised the best system the world has ever known to insure the liberties of the people and to give them the incentives to work and produce wealth and the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their labors. But politicians seeking to perpetuate themselves in office are offering the people the deceptive lure of getting something for nothing. And neither the politicians nor their followers are aware of the danger in their panaceas to the American system of freedom and enterprise or, if they are aware, they are indifferent.

Perhaps a condensed course in economics should be a required study not only for high-school students, but also for Presidential candidates and members of the Cabinet.

The West Against Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, I make further statement concerning water and power in the State of California in order to keep the record straight.

On March 24, 1948, during my time as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, legislation pertaining to the American River Basin development, near Folsom, Calif., was under consideration. Concerning this project, the President of the United States sent a message to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and subsequently sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. The President stated very clearly in his message to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee his intention to have the dam built by the United States Army engineers and upon completion turned over to the Department of the Interior to become an integral part of the great Central Valley project; the dam to contain 1,000,000 acre-feet of water from which 120,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power could be developed.

In carrying out the President's policy, the cost of water for the irrigationists and water users in the Central Valley would be lessened. As chairman of the committee I was and still am thoroughly in accord with this policy. As it is generally known, there is no interest charge on water developed in Central Valley projects. There is, however, a 3-percent interest charge on hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric power developed on the Central Valley project, which will include the American River Basin project, will continue to pay through the application of the interest component, in behalf of the irrigators, approximately twice what the irrigators are paying directly. This is made possible through present laws and the ruling of the solicitor for the Department of the Interior and in no other way could the irrigationists receive benefits from the sale of hydroelectric power.

Despite this fact LEROY JOHNSON, Representative in Congress from the Third California District, which district comprises a large part of the Central Valley, made the following astounding statement at a Public Lands Committee hearing. I quote from Representative JOHNSON'S statement:

I am not interested in any jurisdictional squabbles between Departments of the Government. I am interested in getting started in the building of this dam and the other works contemplated by this legislation. Since the Flood Control Act of 1944 is the one which made possible the present proposed appropriation of $1,000,000 I think we should not circumvent the very law which authorizes this appropriation. Under that act it expressly provides, by implication at least, that the dams built by the Army engineers are to be operated by the Secretary of War under the direction of the Chief of Engineers.

On page 100 of the hearings on H. R. 4152 and H. R. 4157, regarding the American River Basin project, Mr. JOHNSON appears to suggest that revenues from the sale of power developed by the Army engineers at Folsom, would be available to assist in paying irrigation costs. He says:

Under Interior Department operations any profits from the sale of power go into the reclamation fund.

And he intimates, though perhaps none too clearly, that if power at Folsom Dam were produced by the Army engineers and marketed by the Secretary of the Interior under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, then revenues from the power thus marketed would be covered

into the reclamation fund and would help pay off the irrigation costs of the Central Valley project. Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. JOHNSON is wrong on the law. Revenues from power marketed under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 are required by law to be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They may not be covered into the reclamation fund. Hence, they must not be accounted for as returns on the capital costs of the irrigation features of the Central Valley project or any other reclamation project. The way for irrigation water users in the Central Valley area to get real benefit from power revenues at Folsom Dam is to make that dam and power plant an integral part of the Central Valley project. Once that is done, and not until that is done, revenues from power there produced will indeed flow into the reclamation fund and will indeed help pay irrigation costs.

Carrying out the positive recommendation of Representative JOHNSON to the committee to have the Folsom Dam built by the Army engineers and operated by the Secretary of the Army would mean that the revenues from the sale of power would be deposited in the Federal Treasury and could not be used, under the solicitor's ruling, for the relief of irrigationists and farmers with the result that they would pay at least twice the present cost per acre-foot of water in the Central Valley.

Just recently, in testifying before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations during the course of consideration of H. R. 3734, a bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, again revealed the extent to which he has once again completely misstated the situation in the case of Folsom Dam. In response to a question from Senator ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSON said that he "would like to see the engineers operate" Folsom Dam. This, in spite of the fact, as has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Public Lands Committee of the House that, as a matter of plain physical fact, the Folsom Dam must be operated as a part—an integral part—of the Central Valley project, California. It has been demonstrated time after time that only through operation of the Folsom Reservoir by the Bureau of Reclamation and the control of releases therefrom in concord with control of releases from Shasta Reservoir now being operated by the Bureau of Reclamation can the Folsom Reservoir play the part it should physically, in conjunction with Shasta and Keswick, in supplying water for the over-all needs of the valleys and for the utmost economical production of hydroelectric power.

Again, in his appearance before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. JOHNSON failed to mention—and I cannot overcome the suspicion that his failure was deliberate—that the President had, on two occasions in this very year, recommended transfer upon substantial completion of Folsom Dam for operation by the Bureau of Reclamation. He failed likewise to mention that the Public Lands Committee of the House had reported out a bill to accomplish that transfer. He failed to mention, finally, that in addition to physical integration, one of the most important aspects involved in the transfer of the Folsom Dam to the Bureau of Reclamation will be its financial integration with the Central Valley project. He failed to inform the Senate committee of the fact that, unless such financial integration is accomplished, there will be lost for the benefit of irrigation water users assistance from power revenues in paying off irrigation costs. He suggested that the Folsom Dam is a flood-control structure. If he had but read the testimony before our Public Lands Committee he would have known that the Folsom Dam is not primarily a flood-control structure, although, of course, flood control is an important element there. If H. R. 165 is enacted, as recommended by the President, by the Department of the Interior, and by the Public Lands Committee of the House, the Folsom Dam project will serve the purpose of flood-control protection, of course, but it will also serve to store vast quantities of water for irrigation and other beneficial purposes and to produce quantities of hydroelectric power. If the Folsom Dam is transferred for operation by the Bureau of Reclamation as an integral part of the Central Valley project, it will be operated in concord with other vital parts of the Central Valley project, including Shasta and Keswick, and the revenues from power will be available to assist in paying off irrigation costs. Without these revenues the burden of irrigation costs on water users in the Central Valley will be great.

Edward Hyatt, State engineer and executive officer of the Water Projects Authority of California, appeared at the direction of C. H. Purcell, chairman of the authority, and Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general of California, also appeared and advocated this policy. With the loss of power interest component the irrigators would have to carry that additional burden, which would mean that in their repayment of the capital investment allocated to irrigation, they would have to repay directly a total of two or three times as much as they do under the present allocation procedure and under the present law. This is the first time that a Representative in Congress from California and high California State officials have publicly recommended such an unjust increase to irrigationists and farmers in the Central Valley.

The American River-Folsom Dam and Reservoir project is in the Third California District, represented by Congressman LEROY JOHNSON. It was not, however, until after the forthright Presidential message to Congress, and it became self-evident that the Committee on Public Lands would report a bill giving further assurance of reasonable water rates to the irrigationists and farmers in the Central Valley, that Congressman JOHNSON finally sponsored a bill fashioned after the Engle and Welch bills. In the meantime, Congressman JOHNSON tried to persuade me that legislation was not necessary to build the American River-Folsom Dam and Reservoir project, claiming that the Secretary of War and the United States Army engineers had full authority to do the job. If Congressman JOHNSON's advice to the Committee on Public Lands and to me personally was carried to its logical conclusion, the irrigationists and farmers in the great Central Valley would be compelled to pay double, if not treble, their present water rates.

I have followed the history of the great Central Valley since I was a boy and lived on a farm near Freeport, close to the Sacramento River. I will continue to work as long as I am in public office for the completion of the great Central Valley project which, as I have stated in the past, is as large as the State of Massachusetts, the State of Connecticut, the State of Rhode Island, and one-half the State of New Jersey. When men in high public office in California make such statements as referred to by me and which are part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it prompts the question—Is the West against itself?

Medical Care and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a group of physicians in the city of Chicago advising me that they are very much in favor of extending the principal of social security to medical care. They have taken the position that while there may be necessary changes in the detailed provisions of the bill which was recently filed in support of the President's program for national health insurance, they heartily endorse the extension of medical care to all of the people. It is becoming increasingly apparent that more and more physicians are rebelling against the arbitrary attitude of the leadership of the American Medical Association, which proposes nothing constructive to meet the national health problem—a problem admitted to be existent even by the AMA—and which seeks to prevent progressive measures by resorting to the charge of socialism.

As is stated in the following editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times, which appeared on Thursday, April 28, 1949:

The American Medical Association, along with everybody else, has a duty to offer constructive proposals for the attainment of the goals set by the Truman program.

DOCTORS AND SOCIALISM

The leaders of the medical profession are making a profound mistake in attacking President Truman's health-insurance program as an irrevocable step toward state socialism.

If any irrevocable step toward state socialism is going to be taken in the field of medicine, we believe it will be the failure to establish a system whereby adequate and

comprehensive medical care is made available to the people.

The American people know the benefits of good medical care. "They are demanding their right to it and, if they are barred much longer getting it under a democratic system of social insurance which guarantees the survival of free private medical practice, they will follow the lead of the British and demand it as a right from the Government."

These are the words of 10 Senators and Representatives who are sponsoring the Truman program in Congress. We urge the leaders of medical opinion to ponder them.

Facts cannot be gainsaid, even by so costly a propaganda campaign as the AMA is turning against the health-insurance plan.

It is a fact that the Truman plan does not contemplate Government medicine. It is a fact that the plan would preserve the right of patients to choose their own doctors, and of doctors to choose their patients. It is a fact that under this plan the medical profession would continue to control professional decisions on the prevention and treatment of illness.

We strongly advise the AMA to stop misrepresenting these facts. National health insurance is not socialization. It is the alternative to socialization. It is a means by which the people can combine their resources to provide adequate medical care for all without turning over the whole job to the Government.

At bottom, the argument is between a national system of compulsory health insurance, and some kind of aid or subsidy to voluntary health insurance.

There are several reasons why voluntary health insurance cannot do the job that is contemplated in the Truman plan.

For one thing, the costs are high and the benefits limited. Subscribers to the Blue Cross, for example, pay $3.50 a month, in return for which part of their hospital bills are paid if they go to a hospital. Blue Cross and similar plans provide no coverage at all for the cost of calling a doctor to your home, or of going to the doctor's office. Yet that is how medical expenses most frequently hit the average family.

Voluntary insurance which did provide comprehensive medical care, as well as hospital expense, would cost the average family between $10 and $18 a month. Most families can't afford it.

A national system which took in all employed persons would provide far more comprehensive benefits than is possible under voluntary insurance. Because the expenses would be shared among more people, the cost to each family would be less. And the individual cost would vary with family income, whereas voluntary plans today charge a flat rate regardless of income.

Under the Truman plan as it went to Congress, a person earning $50 a week would get complete medical care and hospital insurance for $3.50 a month, his employer contributing a like amount. A person earning $100 a week would pay $6 a month, that sum also being matched by the employer.

An essential part of the plan is Federal aid for the expansion of medical training—to overcome a shortage of doctors and nurses which has been apparent for years—along with expanded aid for hospital construction.

The goal, as the President said, is twofold: "To make available enough medical services to go around, and to see that everybody has a chance to obtain those services."

There may be a difference over methods or details, but this twofold objective has, we believe, the general support of the people.

Mr. Truman said: "Where there are differences remaining as to the details of the program, we should not permit these differences to stand in the way of our going forward. They should be threshed out with honesty and tolerance, as is our democratic fashion. We should enact the best possible program and then all of us should get behind it to make it work."

Chairman Elmer L. Henderson of the AMA board of trustees was hardly threshing out the issues with honesty and tolerance when he denounced the Truman plan as "a discredited system of decadent nations which are now living off the bounty of the American people."

The AMA, along with everybody else, has a duty to offer constructive proposals for the attainment of the goals set by the Truman program.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Honors Montana War Hero's Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as an American, a Montanan, and an Eagle, I am indeed happy to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the honor which the Fraternal Order of Eagles has conferred on Henry George Gosselin's family of Butte, Mont.

Henry Gosselin served in the United States Marine Corps. As a former marine, I am proud of the record he made with that great organization, but at the same time I am deeply sorry that he did not survive the war and return to his family and his State.

Henry did not have to go to war, but his great patriotism was not to be denied. He made the supreme sacrifice and left a void in his family because of his passing.

Alice Gosselin, his wife, has carried on and raised successfully a fine family. In spite of difficulties which would seem insurmountable, she has never lost faith in herself and her family. Through adversity, she has persevered and today she is not only a proud and capable head of a family but she and her children have been selected as the typical American family by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The story of the Gosselin family is detailed in a story carried in the Butte (Mont.) Standard of April 17, 1949, and the reading of it will be well worth the time of the Members of Congress. I want to extend to Mrs. Gosselin and her family my best wishes and to congratulate the great humanitarian Fraternal Order of Eagles for its choice of this outstanding family. It marks another milestone in the progress of this body of great Americans.

FAMILY OF HENRY GOSSELIN, FALLEN BUTTE WAR HERO, CHOSEN MODELS FOR EAGLES' COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

(By William Clark)

A wife, a son, a daughter, and a home. A hero can die in stanch defense of his country and ask the protection of nothing else, beyond the security of the country itself.

Henry George Gosselin, a Butte boy who gave up his life on the blood-splashed approaches to Saipan so that his family at home need never fear a mainland invasion by swinging samurai, was that sort of fellow. Moreover, the family he left behind in Butte is so completely typical of families throughout the Nation now under the shelter of the Eagles' lodge that it has come in for special honor from the order.

Mrs. Alice Gosselin and her young son, Henry, Jr., and daughter, Lorraine Ann, of 1731 Oregon Avenue, have been chosen by the international Fraternal Order of Eagles as the living models for a new commemorative stamp issued by the organization.

More than 100,000,000 of the stamps produced by the Eagles memorial foundation are being purchased by the order's members throughout the United States and possession The proceeds from the stamp sale will be used to guard the welfare of such families as the Gosselins of Butte.

Through aid from the Eagles' fund, the widow and children of Henry Gosselin are secure in the knowledge that the youngsters' future health and education are assured. Already at the $3,000,000 mark, the fund will grow greater through the sale of the stamps among the 1,000,000 members to guarantee continuing assistance to more than 1,250 sons and daughters of Eagles who died in World War II.

Mrs. Gosselin and her children were selected from a number of such typical appearing families throughout the United States. Their situation was investigated and the family nominated through the efforts of Lester Loble, Helena attorney and past international president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Theirs, of course, is the story of smiling young Henry George Gosselin, a pleasant 29-year-old Butte man who joined the Marine Corps when the Air Corps told him he was too old to fly. Gosselin received his orders from Uncle Sam on the very day his little girl was born.

But even more it is the story of a woman's fine courage. It could well be typical of many an American family which now may lean, in times of stress, on the strength of the Eagles' organization. Mrs. Gosselin as a war widow has had no easy time of things. The Gosselin story figured heavily in the choice of the family to symbolize the widow-son-daughter theme of the Eagles' plan for protection.

Henry Gosselin, son of Mrs. Arthur J. Kinne, was born in Butte. His name is of French origin. He attended the Emerson grade school on the south side and went on to Butte high school.

Among his schoolmates was pretty, honey-blond Alice Derrenger. When the pull of romance grew stronger than the urge to learn from books, the couple married in Butte April 16, 1935. Henry became associated with his stepfather, who operated a tavern, and life with the Gosselins spun along easily.

Henry joined the Butte aerie, No. 11, of the Eagles, just up the street a block from where he worked on West Granite. Henry, Jr., who celebrated his eighth birthday Saturday, was born in 1941. From the time of his birth little Henry was not well.

A nervous disorder manifested itself during babyhood, an ailment which left the ankles and hands partly lame. But the boy, mentally keen and responsive, underwent an operation at the Shodair Hospital for Crippled Children in Helena in late 1947 and convalesced there until April 15, 1948.

The operation helped immensely, and young Henry is showing continuous improvement now. He gets about well on junior-sized crutches, and even without their assistance walks well, if somewhat unsteadily, through the house. He has little or no sight in his right eye. The other eye is strong, however, and he reads well with glasses which he insists he doesn't need much if at all.

His mother says the Sisters at St. John the Evangelist parish school discovered quickly

that Henry could easily bypass the first grade. Accordingly, he began in the second, where he is doing excellent work.

Meanwhile, when Henry was 2, little Lorraine Ann was born.

His father had sought to enlist in the Air Force, but was turned down because of age reasons. He immediately enlisted in the Marine Corps and was told to await his assignment. The orders came on the day Lorraine was born. After a 3-week emergency deferment, Henry Gosselin went off to war as a private. His family never saw him again.

He trained at Camp Pendleton, Calif. A letter to his mother here told of his intention to surprise his wife and children, since a leave was coming up soon. The surprise, though, was of a different nature.

On February 1, 1944—3 months after he was sworn in—Private Gosselin was aboard a ship heading into the Pacific. He was a "BAR" man, a specialist with the Browning automatic rifle.

Roi Island was his first engagement, and he and his fellow marines made that one in stride. Promoted to private first class on Roi, Gosselin had some time at a rest camp, and then came Saipan.

"What do you know about the manner in which he lost his life?" his widow asked.

"Not too much. The Marine Corps was going to fill in the details later, but it never did. I suppose there were so many who went down it was hard to say just what did happen to each one. I understood the Government was to see that I received his personal belongings, but they never came." She smiled wanly at the recollection and added: "I got back 23 letters I had written him—we tried to write each other about every other day—and some of them had been mailed as early as April."

Her husband died on Saipan June 18, 1944.

What were the first days like, then?

"Well, it never seemed real, I guess. Many people, of course, were receiving the telegrams they feared the worst, and when mine came the bottom dropped out. But other people were going on just the same, if they could, and I had to, too."

Gosselin received posthumously the Purple Heart medal and the Presidential Unit Citation which went to the Fourth Marine Division, and had worn the American theater and Western Pacific theater service ribbons, and the Good Conduct ribbon.

The Butte aerie in November that year stepped forward with a check for $100. Since then the Eagles have paid a $55 medical expense bill for young Henry. Some of the boy's medical expense, his mother said, has been borne also by the Montana chapter of the American Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Mrs. Gosselin hasn't applied to the Eagles for further help, at least not yet. She receives a monthly Government pension as a widow and also gets a modest amount each month from her husband's service insurance.

It's a tight squeeze, however. Because of her children and the unusual demands on her time for young Henry, Mrs. Gosselin up to now has had no chance to work. When repairs became necessary on the neat, white home at 1731 Oregon, the widow arranged for it herself with a loan on which she pays a regular amount every month. In addition, she keeps up the taxes and insurance, and feeds and clothes herself and children. It's a large order, a job that takes courage and resource.

In the background stand the Eagles and the great fund. When the time comes, a portion of the fund will help Henry and Lorraine Ann get an education which possibly otherwise would have been denied them.

The Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, May 3, 1949:

THE PACT AND THE PEACE

The possibility of a Berlin settlement and the further prospect it opens up in dealing with Germany as a whole have been stealing the headlines from another project which is indeed basic to this new situation in East-West affairs. But Americans will not lose sight of that project or underestimate its influence.

It is the Atlantic Pact. Its importance can be judged from the fact that while Soviet spokesmen appear ready to forget old obstacles to agreement—the currency tangle at Berlin and even the development of a west German state—Soviet propaganda keeps right on with its attack on the Atlantic Pact.

More than any other single thing, the pact appears to have driven home to the Kremlin the cost of its policies of obstruction in Europe. This is not to ignore the airlift in Berlin, the western counterblockade of the Russian zone, the three-power agreement on Germany, and the speed-up of agreement among western Germans and between them and the western Allies. All these developments, to be sure, have contributed to the West's diplomatic victory in Europe.

But the getting together of the Western World under the pact is the most definitive factor in the global situation today, not excepting the Communist advance over so much of China.

All of which suggests that the West's experience in working together will keep it really working together in all details of future negotiations with the Soviet Union. Already there are encouraging signs that the United States is alertly on guard against Soviet tactics to divide western powers. This is the meaning of Philip C. Jessup's move to make even the preliminary conversations with Russia a four-power and not simply an American-Russian venture.

Russia's representative to the United Nations, Yacob A. Malik, showed a hope that the exploratory talks could be conducted between Dr. Jessup and himself. Such a course could have served no purpose at this time but to create new suspicions among weaker peoples that a "deal" might be in the making between the two strongest world powers which might not serve others' interest.

But Washington has evidently not forgotten the lesson of the Bedell Smith-Molotov exchange, or the more recent effort at Moscow to put the United States in the position of seeming to deal separately with Russia—an effort in which Mr. Stalin tried to exploit questions written to him by an American news correspondent.

When, as, and if East-West negotiations get under way, western powers will have more and more reason to take every move in concert, to weigh together every maneuver, not only of the Russians but of the Germans. For the wedges will be pointed at western unity from both these sources.

In such negotiations the Atlantic Pact will be an important new factor. For the pact stands as a symbol of western unity based on broader and deeper considerations than those which attach to Berlin or to all Germany. Most western peoples must know that the apparent improvement in the international outlook is no reason to relax interest in the pact. On the contrary, the improvement is an effect of the pact, and it justifies continued efforts to strengthen the western community. In doing this, as developments in the last week have indicated, we can strengthen the base for peace.

The Makings of Another China Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention an article concerning a very scholarly and distinguished gentleman, a member of the church hierarchy, whom I had the pleasure of meeting on January 12. This gentleman is a very sincere and devoted head of the Roman Catholic Church in China, whose only aim has always been to keep China free from the Communists.

I include this article by Bob Considine, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on May 4. In some measure it shows the degree of democracy in this distinguished gentleman.

I would entitle this article "The Makings of Another China Tragedy." It follows:

DEATH AWAITS THE ARCHBISHOP WHEN HE RETURNS TO CHINA

(By Bob Considine)

Death will come to Archbishop Paul Yupin, the huge, pleasant, learned Chinese prelate, if he returns to China, his anxious friends keep telling him. But he plans to go back later this month. The spiritual leader and educator of 5,000,000 Chinese Catholics is rated No. 2 on the most recent list of war criminals released by the Chinese Reds. His friend, Chiang Kai-shek, is No. 1.

He has thought a bit about the counsel of his friends, he told us the other night at a downtown restaurant as he tucked a napkin in his clerical collar and delicately went to work on a piece of duck. It is not a new threat in the life of the vigorous scholar who recently flew to Rome to give Pius XII a first-hand account of the collapse in China. The Japs had a $500,000 (American) price on his head during their occupation of his homeland.

"But not to return would be another way of telling the Chinese that they have lost this new war for survival," he said. "Their morale is low enough as it is. I must do my bit to show them that all is not lost. With a lifting of morale, a handful of American officers and, in time, the kind of supplies the United States will give to Atlantic-pact countries, China can still win. That's a fact that is being tragically overlooked here.

"We don't ask for American soldiers," he went on. "If there is one thing in which we are a bountiful country it is manpower. So many Chinese troops have lost faith in their commanders, but though the Communists have spread an enormous amount of propaganda against the Americans, the Chinese still feel that with American officers plotting their battles they could win."

I asked him about his personal danger again. He took off his napkin, revealing

a thin line of magenta vestment beneath his coat and thought before he replied.

"It won't be easy for them to find me," he said. "They have seized or destroyed several of the newspapers and schools and farms for displaced people that I formed, and, of course, my home in Peiping. But I am more nimble.

"I know one thing: if they do catch me, I won't be another Cardinal Mindszenty. I don't want to be that kind of a hero. I will go quickly, but not by suicide. That is against my belief. There are many good men to take my place if I go."

But the archbishop, who was the youngest Catholic bishop in the world at the time of his consecration, is not sure that his death—if it comes—will be the work of Communists.

"Those of us who have devoted much of our lives to strengthening Chinese-American relations are in danger of death at the hands of the good people to whom we appeal," he said with the trace of a smile. "The Generalissimo and Madam Chiang, who is a noble woman, and I—to name a few—have long told our people that their great friend is the United States. The United States, we assured the people, would not let this or that happen to China. But now—"

The archbishop shrugged, and a friend at the table added what he did not choose to add, that General Marshall's "truce" had enabled the beaten Reds to redeploy, that there never was a chance of achieving the American desire for a coalition government in China, that shipments of United States supplies to China were held up, that Communists have exploited ably the stories of graft in Chiang's government.

"America has been kind in many ways to China," the archbishop cut in, gently but firmly. But its present policy toward my country, if it is a policy, is shortsighted. It daily watches our people pushed back and presumes there is no fight left in them. There is. It watches a great land mass taken and hopes, perhaps, that General Mao will be another Tito.

"He won't be, but if he is he'll be killed and replaced by a party liner.

"It watches untold areas rich in natural resources fall into the hands of an enemy of all free peoples, including northern uranium deposits far richer than those of the Belgian Congo.

"And your big-business men are short-sighted, too, in assuming they can do business-as-usual with the Reds. In such a short time they will find it impossible. In such a short time, through force and propaganda, we could find China an enemy of its old friend America. A tragedy too terrible to visualize."

The archbishop worked with his napkin again for a bit. Then he smiled and said: "We have spoken of many unpleasant things. Will you have a beer? But please remember that there is still time. Still time."

The Handicapped—A National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest and work being done in behalf of the handicapped, I am calling the attention of the Congress to a speech by Assistant Secretary of Labor John W. Gibson before the Second Annual Institute for the Employment of Handicapped sponsored by the Eagles in the Eagles Auditorium, Milwaukee, Wis., on April 9, 1949.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles is to be commended for once again taking the lead in this field of social progress and doing its very best to bring light into lives which otherwise would be dark.

The speech follows:

I am always happy to visit the Midwest and talk to people about some of our plans and programs. There is very little that we can do in Washington sometimes except to get people started thinking about problems and perhaps point a way toward solving them. For that reason I appreciate a chance to meet with you today and see what is being done about the employment of the handicapped at the only place where it really counts, where the worker is and where the job is.

What the public-spirited citizens of Milwaukee, inspired by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, have done in planning this meeting here today could be done in thousands of communities across the land. But it isn't being done and its takes leadership such as yours to point the way. This leadership which is being provided by the Eagles, the CIO, the AFL, and the industries of your city is a great help to those of us responsible for the success of the President's program for rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped.

And I wish to assure you that both the President and Secretary of Labor are personally vitally interested in this very human problem which requires a combination of a human and a business solution. The matter of employment for disabled veterans and handicapped civilians receives a great deal of thought and effort in Washington and we are very anxious to assure employers and the handicapped themselves that this is a most important program to the Nation, the State, the community and the citizens of America.

We know that the handicapped workers are only a portion of our labor force. Estimates place the figure at 10 percent. But whatever affects the entire labor force has a much more serious impact upon the handicapped worker. Therefore, I'd like to review briefly the current situation as it appears to me.

The job opportunities of all workers, whether organized or not, depend on current levels of business activity and upon expectations as to the future's economic outlook. For this reason, as I said above, workers have a vital concern with current economic trends and national economic policies as they affect the country's future economy.

Since the guns were silenced some 3 years ago we have experienced a postwar "boom" with all its varied effects. The "boom" has died down to a whisper in many areas and there are signs that it is coming to an end. This is only natural since it was merely a race between pent-up demands and wartime savings which ultimately had to catch up with the supply of goods and merchandise. Backlogs of demand have been worked off in more and more industries and as a result production and employment are being adjusted to what economists are pleased to call normal replacement levels of demands. This means that the old law of supply and demand is again in operaiton in many areas of our economy.

From last September to this February we saw a moderate decline in the general level of economic activity. Employment decreased for the first time in 3 years. Unemployment doubled from 1,600,000 in September to 3,200,000 in February and March. Prices tended to decline reflecting changes in demand and in availability of goods.

This brought out the calamity howlers and even caused delight in the Kremlin behind the grim iron curtain. The question of a serious depression in 1949 was and is of great concern to employers and workers, to the whole world for that matter. I am happy to say that today there is more general agreement than there was a month ago that the chance of any serious depression in 1949 is rather remote. However, the best consensus of the business analysts indicates that business activity and employment will be less than it was in 1948.

That doesn't mean we should reach for a crying towel or fear for the future. For 1948 was an extraordinarily good year from many points of view. It does mean that our relatively optimistic conclusions have serious implications for wage earners, especially those who do not have a great deal of seniority.

You have heard a lot about ours being a dynamic economy, one where the country has to run to stay in place. We must not stand still or we stop progress. We must constantly push forward to keep from sliding backward. This is true, because if we fail to maintain the levels of employment of 1948 we will slowly slip into more unemployment with all that this means to the worker and the Nation. Our total national employment must increase by about 600,000 workers every year if employment is going to keep pace with the increase in the labor force as a result of population growth.

We can't plow under people. We can set limits for entry to and can encourage exit from the labor market by our social security and our other social programs. But this is not enough. We must make plans to absorb a city of workers almost the size of Milwaukee each year into a continually expanding labor market. This we can and must do not only for the good of America and the future of our children but for the continued rebuilding of a war-torn world which will need our productive genius and industrial capacity for future peace and security.

This week in Washington as I was preparing these lines a great historic event took place within a few hundred feet of my office. The Atlantic Pact was signed into life by the representatives of the little people from many countries of Europe. This pact will depend in part on how we in America make future decisions with respect to our national economic policy. In my opinion it is not at all certain that there will be any substantial decline in the level of economic activity for 1949. Although prices are moderating in many parts of our economy I believe it is premature to conclude that we are no longer faced with continued inflationary pressures in certain areas.

I am one who neither points with pride nor views with alarm the moderate adjustments that are taking place in industry after industry. Despite the prophets of gloom in some places there have been no overall declines of any importance in current incomes. On the contrary, there are many signs that as prices are adjusted consumers come back into the market to buy. We may have reached a period of more selective buying but that is not in itself dangerous.

I don't bring you any inside information nor do I intend to offer any predictions. But evidence is certainly on hand that indicates that unemployment already is tapering off. I believe that we will see a healthy rise in business activity and employment this summer. This will result from the normal seasonal factors and from a resurgence of consumer demand as prices are adjusted to lower levels. I think the future looks good.

And that means that all workers, generally, and the handicapped in particular, will have continued employment opportunities in the months ahead.

However, since we are concerned with the handicapped and their employment security as it affects the Nation, I do believe that it is necessary to emphasize some economic facts as they concern the disabled worker.

As employment softens, there is a great tendency to return the handicapped to the n· man's land of insecurity and despair from whence they came. Being in many cases the last hired, they become the first fired. Having little or no seniority, they feel the effects of any economic readjustment quicker and with possibly less cushion than other workers.

This can happen here. My friend Paul Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, tells me that he has noticed an increase in his correspondence from handicapped men and women suddenly faced with the cold and impersonal sign "No Help Wanted" or let out due to these readjustments we mention so casually. In my judgment, such groups as The President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week may not be enough, despite their enviable record and fine work, voluntary help and considerable interest of business and industry in the employment of the disabled will not be sufficient if we slip, slide, or fall into soft spots in our employment picture. It may be that the Congress and the President may be forced to strengthen the hand of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Bureau of Employment Security to guarantee economic opportunity for the handicapped.

Our friends in England have worked out a program which should be of interest to this audience. I recommended such a system several years ago to the Michigan Legislature and it barely failed of passage after passing one House. I consider the British program to have great potentialities and feel we in the United States could gain a lot by making a study of it in operation.

The British program of employment of handicapped is embodied in the Disabled Persons Act of 1944 which is the result of an interim wartime measure of 1941, aimed at using the remaining abilities of a people under constant physical danger from the sky in their own homes and factories. The original act also provided for returning to the stream of commerce and industry those wounded in the war and no longer able to fight and those whose disability was of long standing but who yearned to make their considerable contributions of skill and remaining ability.

The act defines a "disabled person" as being one "who, on account of injury, disease, or congenital deformity, is substantially handicapped in obtaining or keeping employment, or in undertaking work on his own account, of a kind which apart from that injury, disease, or deformity would be suited to his age, experience, and qualifications."

In many respects, the British program parallels our own program of rehabilitation. However, it has a number of unique features which are certainly pertinent to consider at such a meeting here today. The Minister of Labour and National Service administers the act which provides for vocational training and industrial rehabilitation courses. It also sets up a register of disabled persons wishing to obtain employment or undertake work on their own account. It gives employment preferences for ex-service men and women and establishes national and district advisory committees.

In addition to providing for this voluntary register system for the disabled, the act sets out the obligations for employers for certain quotas of disabled workers.

Now, I grant that much of this act sounds like our own program of the Employment Service, the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. But the distinguishing feature is the quota system whereby English employers of 20 or more workers must hire disabled people from established registers in their community. This generally amounts to about 3 percent of the workers in any given business or industry.

However, the employer is urged to participate in the spirit of the law and not the letter so that actually in many cases a higher percent is the rule rather than the exception. In our own country, for example, our civil-service figures indicate that about 7 percent of all federally employed workers are physically handicapped to a degree similar to the definition used by the British Ministry f Labour.

In the most recent report of Great Britain's Standing Committee on the Rehabilitation and Resettlement of Disabled Persons the total number of persons registered in a 3-year period since September 1945 was 905,000. These registrations, incidentally, may be from 1 to 5 years depending on the disability and the likelihood of its future permanance. So this figure includes some duplications, although the average increase monthly is seven to eight thousand.

Since September 1946 the standard percentage for determining an English employer's statutory obligation in respect to the registered disabled has been 3 percent. Of the 905,000 registered, about 887,000 were classified as capable of work under ordinary industrial conditions. Of this 887,000 figure, the number employed in ordinary work has been estimated at approximately 825,000, or 93 percent. However, all these people are not employed by firms under the quota system, for many are working on their own or for employers having fewer than 30 workers and hence not required to participate in the quota system. Estimates of those persons employed in the quota establishments indicate that the handicapped are 4 to 5 percent of the working population in these industries.

The British during the blitz realized that disablement was a problem of employment. They have raised their sights from the traditional basket-weaving and flower-making jobs which were usually forced upon the disabled. The pressure of war made it imperative that something be done and hence the British set up their five-point program under the Minister of Labour.

This program includes, as I have indicated in part, a register of disabled, establishment of a quota, industrial rehabilitation and vocational training when required, special sheltered workshop facilities and use of the best possible selection and placement methods in finding suitable work for the disabled.

In carrying out its responsibility for rehabilitation after the medical and hospital phase of treatment or care was completed, the Ministry of Labour established an industrial rehabilitation center at Egham with the announced purpose of helping disabled men back to work. We have similar rehabilitation centers here in this country, but none that I know of under Government auspices, although our various agencies use Federal funds for rehabilitation of veterans and civilians in these centers.

Because the Egham Center is rather unique I should like to discuss it briefly. Men are physically toned up during several weeks at the Egham Center in Surrey through games, exercises, and massages. Therapy is used under medical supervision where necessary. The men can restudy their English or math or otherwise improve themselves for future employment. They are advised what jobs they can follow most efficiently and receive job training under experts.

The center features considerable recreation and a cheerful atmosphere. Stress is placed upon normal living. The handicapped thus get back into the normal social and recreational channels they were accustomed to prior to their disablement. After weeks and months at the center they learn to live with the handicap, to accept it, and to make the necessary adjustments to work with it. The Egham Center is open to men between the ages of 16 and 50. In some cases older men are admitted.

While at this center the men receive free travel expenses coming and going and free board, room, and laundry. Allowances while at the center are over and above any pension or compensation due them. The very appropriate motto of the center is: "Help men face their future with new hope." This industrial rehabilitation center has placed thousands of English workers on the high road to employment security.

This British program isn't a one-way street, however, for the employer is not required to subsidize the disabled. They expect to receive good work in return for their wage payments to the handicapped, and experience gained in England and also in America proves that they do. Handicapped persons are dropped from the register who are of habitual bad character or who persistently and without reasonable cause refuse suitable employment or who without reasonable cause refuse to attend or complete a course of vocational training or rehabilitation. This is not an arbitrary method, but a man is dropped from the register only after due investigation of the disablement advisory committee, before which the applicant may appear and bring witnesses. The important thing is that the plan is working well, as indicated by the 1949 report.

Quoting from page 14 of this report, I found this statement: "The (handicapped) unemployed on August 16, 1948, numbering 62,079, represented under one-half of 1 percent of that field" (of total employment). Nevertheless, the continuance of a relatively high figure of unemployment among registered disabled persons has been a matter of considerable concern.

I think that bears reemphasis. That continued unemployment of qualified and registered disabled workers is a matter of considerable concern. It is of concern in the United States also and rightfully should be. Latest figures on disabled veterans registered in America with State offices of the Employment Service last month show that more than 90,000 disabled veterans alone are actively seeking employment. Today about half a million handicapped workers could be placed at work if there were jobs available and employers willing to hire these workers. Any way you look at it, that's a lot of people, a lot of productive power lost, a great deal of human ability sidetracked and a tremendous drain upon private charity and public funds.

As long as we mean what we say when we talk about the dignity of the individual—the freedom of the workers of our country—we cannot, we must not, remain disinterested in the face of substantial numbers of unemployed physically handicapped workers. It is particularly sad when we see almost 100,000 disabled veterans shunted to the sidelines in an age they helped make safe for all of us.

Since the employment of the physically handicapped is essentially and almost entirely a manpower function, the United States Department of Labor believes that the responsibility for the operation of this program should rest in the United States Labor Department as it does in England. The President of the United States and the Hoover Commission have recommended restoration to the Labor Department of the United States Employment Service and the Veterans Employment Service which were shanghaied from the Labor Department by the last Congress. We feel that this is both logical and necessary.

As we move into a consideration of legislation for handicapped workers we are confronted with the absolute necessity for more legislation than presently exists. The former special consultant to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Paul Strachan, has persuaded several

distinguished Senators and Representatives to introduce a number of bills aimed at doing a better job for the physically handicapped. There can be no quarrel with the need for better statistics as to the numbers, kinds, and locations of the handicapped in our population. For that reason I sincerely hope that the pending bill to provide for a census of the handicapped will be passed and that we may have for the first time adequate and understandable statistics to serve as a basis for solving the problem of the handicapped.

The proposal for a Federal Commission on Services for the Handicapped appears to have a considerable amount of merit and to be the most inclusive approach to a solution of the problem ever presented in this country. This opinion is shared by many others, including the 12 sponsors in the House of Representatives and the 17 Senators who joined Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, your institute speaker last year, in sponsoring the Federal Commission. This bill, S. 1066, has the unqualified backing of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the railroad brotherhoods, the miners, the machinists, and other large independent unions, as well as many national organizations interested in the welfare of handicapped citizens in this country.

Necessary as is legislation, it is still ineffective without the full cooperation and support of management and labor if our goal of equal opportunity of employment for handicapped workers is to be reached. As you know, the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week has been operating in the Labor Department for more than a year and a half now. However, it has operated without sufficient funds and personnel to do the real job which it could do and should do in bringing all segments of our economy into a fuller cooperative partnership with the Federal, State, and local governments in behalf of the handicapped. I advocate sufficient appropriations to enable the President's committee to do the kind of job we all want it to do.

The President's committee now maintains the only liaison with the Governors of the States and the various State committees interested in employment of the handicapped. It is presently conducting an essay contest among the public and private schools of the country with $2,000 in prizes and five trips to Washington being donated by the Disabled American Veterans and the International Association of Machinists, both members of the President's committee. I am happy to say that Wisconsin schools are among those which have entered the contest. The President's committee also offers awards of merit to all employers having outstanding records for employment of disabled workers. I urge that your local committee consider participating in this program.

I believe that with sufficient funds the President's committee could do considerable necessary research and study work in this field. I believe that we should seriously consider pilot programs for Government employment practices.

In connection with the Federal Government's employment practices, we recently heard from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, who said that placement of disabled veterans in the Federal service "has greatly increased" and that this trend "will continue for many years." He also stated he personally had examining procedures altered so that persons whose handicaps prevented them from adequately participating in written examinations would receive stenographic or secretarial assistance. He said—and I quote: "The Civil Service Commission takes keen pride in its leadership in the field of selective placement of those of our citizens who have physical impairments. We aim to retain that leadership. I have stated before and repeat again that our program concerning the physically handicapped is a definite part of our operations and will be expanded to the fullest extent possible." You can't get a better endorsement than that.

There have been many stirrings of interest and much good work done on the industrial front during the past 18 months, and in this picture you see the organizations of management and labor working together to solve a common problem for the betterment of all our citizens. However, the joint program of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to promote more job opportunity for handicapped and older workers is but a start in the right direction.

Following this lead, individual management executives should develop programs within their own establishments, where they do not now exist, which provide for the continued employment of all workers injured in their employ. Such a program, if adopted generally throughout the country, would pay rich dividends, not only to employers and workers but to the communities of our country.

Two years ago a committee sponsored by the United States Department of Labor on services to the severely disabled recommended setting up rehabilitation centers for the handicapped in all fair-sized communities. One of the groups of the President's Committee is also concerned with community rehabilitation centers which render excellent services in the cities such as your own Milwaukee curative workshop. This job, not only of rehabilitating but also of employing the handicapped, is much too great for the Federal or even the State governments. It can only be attacked and solved in the communities of our country and it is only through the interest of such citizens as those of you in the audience today that any real and lasting solution will be reached.

If the cities and towns of America do not offer simple justice and equality of opportunity to the physically handicapped, then these cities and towns will fail in their responsibilities. All the country has an opportunity once a year to make public protestations of its interest in the economic security of the disabled during the October observance of the congressionally authorized National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. But if we do nothing more than blow the whistle and beat the drums once a year, we actually render a disservice because we build up false hopes and offer empty deeds for fair promises. The progress in State and community organization has been very great in the last 18 months alone. But it must be multiplied so that each community of any size has a working year-round committee for the employment of the handicapped. Such a committee as Milwaukee has is one of the best investments in good citizenship and good economics that I can imagine.

I have discussed at some length the British plan for rehabilitation and employment of its impaired workers, my thoughts on the need for legislation here in America, and the responsibilities of management, the communities, and the States. I also believe that labor can do more than has been done for the handicapped. I say this advisedly, with the full knowledge that labor has rendered more group assistance to the President's Committee than any other of the many types of groups represented.

Labor has issued its credo in the little blue pamphlet, Labor Believes, which has been distributed here today. However, it takes action by the local unions to really make this program mean something. It takes collective bargaining, complete cooperation with management's job-placement plans for the handicapped, and a willingness to adopt some flexibility in seniority clauses in some industries. Here is an opportunity for unions to really pioneer, and the blue print is available for the asking. This in-plant plan for employing the impaired worker, which also has been distributed here today, is certainly simplicity itself. I urge you all to study it and put it into operation.

All that is necessary for success is the heart which I know from experience beats warmly in the breasts of the workers and employers of this land, a heart that expands to help less fortunate workers. There is nothing of charity in the program to employ the handicapped. But there is much of humanity. It is a truism of human nature that those who help others automatically help themselves.

I heard the other day of a case of an English worker who was born minus hands and feet, seemingly a hopeless rehabilitation case. The man today drives his own car to work. The challenge was so great in his case that every effort was expended to rehabilitate him into employment. Artificial limbs were fitted to him. He was taught to wear them and manipulate them. He was given a job although it required having a wheel chair at each end of the streetcar line to get him to and from work. When his employer heard this he bought the man a car. Today he is a respected and hardworking employee. His very presence in the shop has raised the output and the morale of other workers.

I think this little story sums up everything I have been saying. For it took the full cooperation of the Government, the community, the employer, and his fellow employees to make a useful citizen out of a man in a seemingly hopeless condition. And although I wasn't there I am willing to bet that everyone felt better for it.

In dealing with human beings with immortal souls we cannot estimate the good we do in providing suitable employment for the handicapped. But this thing is certain. We know today that an empty sleeve doesn't mean an empty head, a twisted limb doesn't signify a twisted mind, a blinded eye doesn't hide a darkened soul.

A handicap is not an outward manifestation of an inner deficiency. More often a visible handicap is a badge of courage which indicates triumph over obstacles which most of us have never faced. Let us hope that we are never called upon to live with a severe handicap. But if we are, let us hope that we receive the same consideration that we are today asking for others. Remember, in all your dealings with the handicapped, that in a split second you, too, could be in the same condition yourself. And then I know that you will act accordingly.

America's Achilles Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country certainly fall for European propaganda. I use the word "fall" advisedly. If our country gets out of the foreign entanglements in which we are being gradually enmeshed without a terrible fall it will be a miracle. There is inserted herewith a letter received from a prominent citizen of Tennessee and the reply thereto expressing my views on present national trends:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 25, 1949.*
The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I agree with your note written across my letter, to the extent that

you say that this Nation ought to keep out of entangling European alliances. But, we cannot keep peace by building up a mammoth machine capable of carrying death and destruction instantly to all parts of the world. By engaging in the race of armament building, we only increase the tensions which produce wars. Peace is the relationship that exists where law prevails.

I think that you will be interested to learn that the Tennessee Legislature has passed a bill providing for the election of delegates to the World Constituent Assembly, Geneva, 1950. Enclosed is a copy of the bill and a copy of an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean. A similar bill is now pending befor the Pennsylvania Legislature. I am advised that very shortly a bill will be introduced before the Wisconsin Legislature.

I wish the Congress would postpone any action of the State Department scheme for the military alliance until after the 1950 elections. This would give the people of this country a chance to make an authentic proposal to the rest of the world for an establishment of a government for world affairs.

Sincerely yours,

FYKE FARMER.

MAY 4, 1949.

Mr. FYKE FARMER,
Bellevue Drive, Nashville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. FARMER: In answer to your letter of April 25, which was received during my absence in the West, it is reassuring to find that thoughtful people like yourself are giving their attention to the policies of national government and the legislative course being followed by the Congress. In viewing the existing situation in dealing with our international relations, it does not appear from our past experience that many of the policies being followed today in dealing with foreign countries are necessary.

The leaders of this country seem to have a strange mania to meddle with the political affairs of other countries. Looking back over the events beginning with the outbreak of the First World War, it seems to me that the European financiers found our "Achilles heel" in response to propaganda. We were propagandized into the First World War, we were propagandized into financing Europe after the First World War, we were propagandized into the Second World War, and now we are being propagandized into financing Europe and also into rearming Europe, and are thereby being enmeshed into entangling European alliances, the very thing that George Washington warned us against.

It is my feeling that the lives and well-being of the youth of America are too dear to us to be sacrificed on the altar of European greed and militarism.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Freedom of Science—Its Opportunities and Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Freedom of Science—Its Opportunities and Responsibilities", written by Harry Aubrey Toulmin, Jr., of Dayton, Ohio, and published in the Chemical and Engineering News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FREEDOM OF SCIENCE—ITS OPPORTUNITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Harry Aubrey Toulmin, Jr., senior member, Toulmin & Toulmin, Dayton, Ohio)

Our democratic form of government and education has presented chemists and chemical engineers with a challenging opportunity for public service and a golden opportunity for private gain.

History gives us fair warning to be vigilant of our scientific liberties. Germany was once an extraordinary nation of equally extraordinary scientists. Hitler reduced her sciences to a regimented pattern in a state that had murdered the profit motive. Let us not permit our so-called science bills, our Government's easy-money patronage of research, our Government-owned mass of patents, and attempts at political domination of scientists to delude us into making the same mistake.

TWO PHASES OF FREEDOM

In this consideration of the freedom of science we have two areas of adventure: freedom of the individual and responsibility of the individual. Without a proper balance of these two factors we do not get successful results in science, nor responsible leadership, nor adequate protection of the public interest.

Freedom of the scientist—as of any individual—means his right to hold his own social, political, and economic opinions. It does not mean, of course, that as a teacher or official of an educational institution, he is entitled to use his position to advocate those personal views. To permit this would be, in effect, to use the taxpayers' money to present only one side of a question.

Freedom of the scientist should also mean the right to select the things in which he wishes to do his research and the privilege, subject only to considerations of national security, to publish such scientific information as he wishes.

I do not go along with the present trend in some universities toward regimenting scientific and engineering personnel by preventing them from doing research work unless it is controlled by a government, a foundation, or by rigid corporate policies. I do not go along with arbitrary control of patent rights of university personnel as the result of their own work. I do not go along with the contention of some universities that their research foundations can properly participate in studies leading to Ph. D. degrees, accept compensation from commercial sponsors who seek this cheaper form of doing their research, and agree to suppress the publication of the resulting theses until the convenience of the commercial sponsor is served. That is not freedom of science—that is not a true university.

Let me illustrate what possibilities for profit and public progress can come from the minds of men inspired to look to the far horizons. Thirty years ago W. M. Burton discovered how to double the amount of gasoline obtained from crude oil. Thirty years ago Thomas Midgley demonstrated that engine knock was due to a form of excessively rapid burning or detonation of the air-fuel mixture when it is subjected to high pressure. Midgley also found that Burton's cracked gasoline had a greater tendency to knock than straight-run gasoline so he developed tetraethyl lead to reduce knocking. In the meantime, superior cracking processes improved the basic gasoline. Graham Edgar developed a knock-rating scale and we entered the era of octane numbers.

Then came 100-octane gasoline through the pioneering of American oil refinery chemists. That gasoline gave the Royal Air Force the essential speed and altitude advantage which won the battle of Britain in the air and saved civilization. Ten to thirteen octane numbers changed the history of civilization.

In the field of medicine we are just now entering with full force into the age of chemistry. The work of the Rockefeller Foundation and of countless other institutions in the chemistry of blood alone has been as revolutionary as the chemistry of antibiotics.

The vast studies now being made in the field of medicine and chemistry by our Government in Africa are the most essential military precaution that could be taken for the protection of this Nation.

The freedom of science depends upon the inspiration and reward of sciences. If owners and managers really believe in the profit motive, they will share profits. I commend to capital a continuing study of making men partners in results. Patented results can yield vast profits if competently administered and wisely shared. The great problem of industry today is to release through the freedom of science the forces of selfish interest, of initiative, and of creative ideas.

To do this, we must use the thing most talked about and the least shared—the profit motive. Communism melts in the warm sun of shared capitalism. I do not fear the Reds of Russia; I do fear for the selfishness and rigidity of mind of my own clan.

That this is not wholly altruistic, these figures may point out: The textile industry spent 1 percent of sales on research and had an operating profit of 5 percent and the chemical industry spent 3¾ percent on research and secured 18 percent profit on sales. These figures from the National Industrial Conference Board for these two industries and others show this to be a settled rule: Profits increase almost geometrically in proportion to the percentage of money spent on research. Therefore, it would seem good business to increase the compensation of the research workers who produced the maximum ratio of profits.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

When a scientist accepts the responsibilities of public work he dedicates his efforts to the public interest and forever thereafter information acquired in that employment is subject to the rules and regulations of government. To that there can be no exception.

In joining the public group he must weigh every word and every act in his conduct. He must refrain from casual speeches, from misplaced humor, and from idle gossip.

Rectitude of conduct and propriety of actions can only be second to his responsibility to his government. When you regard the service to the public under such circumstances as a privileged responsibility, it is not a restriction of freedom but an opportunity for service that should be welcomed by any normal man, loyal to the flag under which he serves and the government under which he lives and to which he owes the other freedoms of himself and his family.

But to secure such a sense of obligation the government must be wise and fair. The terms of the various science bills cause me grave concern. They smack of regulations instead of coordination of effort in the public cause by private and public institutions working as a team in the public interest.

I see the danger of control by politicians who are not scientists; the danger of power of the director to grant or withhold research funds to control university policies and scientific activities; the power to subject to strong pressure by the Federal agency making the grants on complacent university administrations which will yield to get business.

The best analysis of this situation is contained in the report of the second meeting of the Inter-Society Committee for a National Science Foundation, which recommendations were endorsed by the dean of engineering, Charles E. MacQuigg, of Ohio State University (Science, 107, 235–6 [1948]).

Where things must be done to prevent overlapping of scientific effort to organize our facilities and to finance projects beyond the purse of private industry or public institutions and where general coordination and planning of the scientific attack upon our problems such as given by a general staff in the Army are needed, I go along. When science bills tends to give dictatorial power, dogmatic control, and regimentation of scientists and scientific projects, I rebel. Every nation that has tried this control of science has committed suicide. Russia is doing it right now—and so long as she does it you need never worry about a Russian victory.

SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILLS

That aspect of our proposed science foundation bills which deals with the freedom of science falls logically into two divisions.

The first division has due regard to the rights and limitations upon the individual. No better statement of Government policy could be found, in my judgment, than in the Thomas bill, S. 525, which recites:

"In all research and development activities financed or otherwise supported by the Foundation, the Administrator, with due regard to the national security of the United States, shall make every effort to eliminate restraints upon the free expression of scientific views and to insure full freedom in the exercise of creative talents, in the development of new ideas, and in the methods of research. Any person engaged in such research and development activities shall not be precluded from independently discussing, writing, or publishing his own views and conclusions relating to such research and development; except in cases in which the President, or any person designated for that purpose by him, finds that such discussion, writing, or publication will endanger the national security of the United States" (Chemical Engineering News, 25, 601 [1947]).

OBLIGATIONS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

I hear restive scientists prattle about freedom of information, the rights of scientists, and the international exchange of information, as if they had some private property in the public interest and were free to dedicate it at their pleasure. Such is not a fact. Democracy is not individual license: it is maximum freedom of the individual consistent with protection of the common interest of the majority. That distinction has been ignored by most of those scientists who have gotten themselves into unpleasant difficulties.

Let me illustrate. The writer, as chief of staff of the Army Air Force in France in 1918, was entrusted officially with our operational plans in Europe with the American Expeditionary Force. In World War II that pattern was repeated when, as assistant chief of the Transportation Corps, as the staff officer supervising the Atlantic and Pacific commands of the Overseas Air Force, and as a member of the Army Pearl Harbor Board, the writer was entrusted with the operational plans of our forces throughout the world in many of our vital intelligence, top-secret matters.

A revelation of certain matters originally acquired in 1918 might have handicapped the United States by disclosing a pattern of thinking which later matured into military and naval plans useful in 1941 and today. I could speak only of those things which were officially released or published by others officially. All else of necessity remained a closed chapter in the public interest.

Yet in no sense did I cease to be a free and independent citizen, able in all other matters of my professions and businesses and political activities to write, speak, and assemble freely. That is democracy. That is the restriction that any man should be happy to accept for the privilege of working in the scientific field for the benefit of his Government, for the benefit of all of us.

DANGER OF GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED RESEARCH

The second phase of Government interest in science raises another, but equally practical, consideration in this exploration of the freedom of science. Under these bills, we provide for a distribution of the funds, by contract, for research and development, not only in the Government agencies but among the tax-supported and land-grant educational institutions of the several States. And we provide for contracts with other organizations.

But at this point the critical question arises: What can be published as the result of this employment and what can be monopolized by patents? Let us keep in mind that these are public funds being utilized in the public interest, which is twofold—for national defense and for public health. As to the latter, the freest dissemination of information is provided except as the medical aspects of national defense may be concerned. These acts provide for patents in some cases, license-free but regulated; in other instances, under license; and in still other instances, the resultant patent rights go to the contracting party doing the work, subject to an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license for governmental purposes.

Here again is an attempt to meet that neat balance in a democratic government of preserving to all the people, either for their protection or for their health or for their common enterprises, that common store of information developed from common funds. It can hardly be said that the freedom of the individual entitled him to violate these reasonable rules by publishing, public disclosure, and private patenting, because he must preserve his freedom as a scientist. To say so would also be to say that the unlocked automobile of another citizen is open to private appropriation and use because of the freedom of the individual. The Government has property rights in trust for all of us, and the science foundation bills simply provide for such considerations.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY AND RESEARCH

Neither of these restrictions or opportunities under the National Science Foundation bills touch upon the real heart of the matter which should cause you grave concern. It is this: When you lay the dead hand of Government bureaucracy upon any creative enterprise, you reduce the adventure to one of rules and regulations, of civil-service requirements, to preserve mediocrity in its perpetual vacation at Government expense. You furnish opportunities for so many small minds comfortably positioned, by reason of political affiliation or civil-service good fortune, in situations where jobs are made by keeping a host of rules and regulations to sterilize every thought, every independent action, and every interesting adventure into the field of science.

The thing we have to fear is any expansion of science control by Government agencies except for national defense and national health.

When any university or commercial organization undertakes contracts with such Government agencies, they are giving up precious rights of property, freedom of action, freedom to get results, and freedom of the individual which should not only be jealously guarded but only yielded when the necessity of preserving our democracy so dictates. All of these bills make it too attractive to university administrations and to commercial organizations to take the easy way to a life of unrefined intellectual leisure and easy money.

If such projects are directed by unwise administrations, both in universities and in the Government, as may well be the case in times to come, we will sacrifice scientific freedom, destroy our principal national defense projects and protection, and reduce our scientific brains to the drab level of civil-service employment. Such service was only designed for the routine operations of Government and to protect people whose talents are so common among all of us that they would be the first victims of a change in administration.

REDUCING SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS TO CIVIL-SERVICE STATUS

After 30 years' experience in governmental operations and reorganization of many governmental departments, I can say unequivocally that no cancer in the democratic system is equal to that of the deadening effect of civil service where initiative, independent thinking, and adventuring in new fields is a fundamental requirement.

Where these bills seek to set up unofficial civil-service principles over scientists and engineers, I rebel. That they undoubtedly do. Only the pressure of national defense and the demands of public health can so stimulate action against this deadening disease where we reach a compromise of safety and an adequate modicum of research results.

Anything more will mean the death of the scientists' freedom, the destruction of academic freedom, and the opening to competitive governments of the glorious opportunity of being first. The necessity of to some degree abandoning civil service during the war was many-fold greater than would ever be the abandoning of such restrictions on Government research in time of peace.

Germany nearly won this war. She lost it because Hitler was the greatest exponent of the civil-service principle the world has ever known. He regimented individual scientists and defeated their best efforts by public direction of research into the wrong channels. The result was that the democracies with their independent action caught up with and defeated him.

These same German scientists to our certain knowledge were among the world's leaders. Left alone to work out their own salvation, simply using government funds and facilities for that purpose, they would have had more than a fair chance of again leading the world in critical developments. That they did come so close to doing it under Hitler's management is fair tribute to their exceptional talents in the scientific world.

I speak on this subject with bitter knowledge and experience, charged as I was with the administration of large miltary enterprises, dealing with billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of people. The only real handicap in getting results was the insistence of the Government on imposing, even in time of war, civil-service restrictions, and the demands of unions, running their own civil service, that we should employ individuals irrespective of ability or fitness for the position and that we should adhere to other rules and regulations that were fantastic in their selfishness and a grave detriment to the public interest.

The Atomic Energy Commission is now fighting that great battle. On their success depends the future of this democracy in the challenging race of science and engineering to protect the national interest.

Frankly, I know of no better answer to the invasion of democratic scientific rights than General Eisenhower's inaugural address before Columbia University as its president when he said:

"The concentration of too much in centralized government need not be the result of violent revolution or great upheaval. A paternalistic government can gradually destroy, by suffocation in the immediate advantage of subsidy, the will of a people to

maintain a high degree of individual responsibility. And the abdication of individual responsibility is inevitably followed by further concentration of power in the state. Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management of productive enterprises; its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects, absolute power over our lives."

The regimentation by science bills of science other than for limited national purposes, the Government control in increasing number of patents which are the fruits of Government control of science and scientists, the monopoly by Government of research facilities in universities and public foundations to the exclusion of industry or of fundamental scientific investigations initiated by the universities themselves in times of peace, will inevitably lead to two things:

(a) The nationalization of science and the end of your freedom and the freedom of the industrial enterprises.

(b) A repetition of the situation in Germany where independent scientists lost the race for survival when their research activities were regimented by political considerations directed by politicians and nonscientific laymen.

We won the greatest war in all history without a science foundation bill. Germany lost the greatest war in history with the equivalent of a science foundation bill.

Overtime On Overtime: Longshoremen's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article from the magazine America, edition of April 12, 1949, by the Reverend John M. Corridan, a member of the faculty of Xavier Labor School, New York City:

OVERTIME ON OVERTIME: LONGSHOREMEN'S CASE

(By John M. Corridan)

There isn't a dull moment on the New York docks any hour of the day, and often well into or through the night. Thousands of cases, bales, barrels, and cargo in bulk are swung out from hatches by ship's gear onto the docks. Trucks, lighters, and railway cars discharge cargo onto the piers or into the holds of ships. Fork trucks, four-wheelers, tractors, and trailers twist in and out, moving cargo to and from the dock's edge.

Why all the feverish activity? Because, for profitable operation, the ship's turnaround must be as short as possible. That's why ships are often worked through the night, even though longshoremen receive a night differential of 150 percent of their day rate.

The men breaking out or stowing away cargo in the iron bellies of ships, or moving it to and from the dock's edge, are the longshoremen. As workers, they differ from all other workers in one essential occupational condition: In practice there is no regularity in a longshoreman's working hours, either in clock-time hired or in the number of hours worked on each occasion.

In the early 1900's longshoremen "shaped" every hour. Men looking for dock work gathered in a semicircle at the pier entrance where work was available. The hiring boss in charge picked from this "shape" the men he wanted to work until he "knocked them" off." Picking a man from the "shape" carried with it no obligation to give him any specified hours of work. For the first time, under the present contract, the men receive a minimum of 4 hours' pay between 8 a. m. and 5 p. m., if picked in either of the two daily shapes at 7:55 a. m. or 12:55 p. m.

Working in all kinds of weather, in the narrow confines of hold and dock, surrounded by moving vehicles and spinning machinery, and handling tons of diversified cargo, the longshoreman has a hazardous occupation, particularly at night. It is these factors that account for the historically high differential between the day rate and the night and holiday rates as contrasted with other trades. In 1872, longshoremen were paid the following rates per hour: 40 cents day rate, 80 cents night rate, $1 for Sundays. Since 1872, whether there has been a union or not, whether unions in general were strong or not, long before there were differentials in other industries, longshoring had a day and a night rate, irrespective of the number of hours worked or not worked.

The night rate in New York has been around 150 percent or more of the day. This high night rate had to be paid to get men to work. The differential is not true overtime, since it is not determined by hours worked over and beyond the normal hours for a workday. Seven different courts, including the United States Supreme Court and three United States circuit courts of appeals, together with the Administrator of Wages and Hours, arrived at this definite conclusion based on solid evidence. Highly respected and conservative members of the Federal judiciary have so ruled—Chief Judge John Parker, of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Augustus Hand and Judge Thomas Swan of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, for example. At present, though, there is a bill in Congress (H. R. 858), which would exclude the longshoremen from the protection of the Wages and Hours Act. Moreover, for the past few weeks hearings have been held before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate to determine whether or not H. R. 858 is to be made retroactive in its effects.

Ironically, in practice the vast majority of longshoremen have never been paid true overtime under the Wages and Hours Act. No sooner did the longshoremen win their case before the Supreme Court for unpaid overtime than the shipping industry not only petitioned Congress for a law to remove longshoremen from the scope of the Wages and Hours Act, but also asked it to make that new law retroactive, so as to wipe out the overtime benefits granted to the longshoremen by a previous Congress.

If any group of workers needs the Wages and Hours Act (1938), the longshoremen under the notorious shape-up system of hiring are that group. The purpose of the Wages and Hours Act was, in part, to spread employment reasonably by placing a ceiling over hours. The penalty rate of time and a half after 40 hours in the same workweek was calculated to have that desirable effect.

In an industry where work is irregular, and where there is an unregulated oversupply of men, as there is in New York, and where that work is extremely hazardous, it is absolutely necessary to retain economic penalties which will compel a more equitable distribution of the work available. As it is, the average longshoreman makes only about $2,000 a year.

According to the National Labor Relations Board in New York, no more than 14,000 of the 35,000 New York longshoremen averaged as much as 26 hours of work per week in 1947 and were still working in the port of New York in 1948. According to the central records bureau of the New York Shipping Association, only 22,000 men received 800 or more hours work in 1948. The figures indicate its poor distribution of work opportunities.

The present law requires that when men earn two rates of pay, any computation of overtime must be based on an average of the two rates as a base. An example will show what the law requires. A longshoreman works 40 hours between Monday and Thursday. He puts in 20 hours at the day rate of $1.25 an hour ($25) and 20 hours at the night rate of $1.875 ($37.50). He gets an additional 8 hours work on Friday from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m. Instead of being paid at the day rate of $1.25 an hour ($10), the law requires that he be paid time and a half, using the average rate as the base.

An employer would not be inclined to give a man 8 hours overtime at the rate of $2.265 an hour when he could hire other men at the rate of $1.25 an hour. Enforcement of the overtime provisions of the wages-and-hours law, which the bill (H. R. 858, passed by the House but not yet by the Senate) aims to prevent, would spread work opportunities more equitably among longshoremen. As it stands now, some men earn as much as $5,000 a year, while many more make less than $1,000.

Very little concern for the observance of the Wages and Hours Act has been shown by the shipping industry on the east coast. Despite the fact that since October 1940 the act has prescribed a maximum straight-time workweek of 40 hours, the industry's contracts with the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) called for a 44-hour straight-time workweek all through 1945.

Prior to 1938 the shipping industry never considered the night differential overtime, as it now must. In 1934 Mr. E. P. Foisie, now president of the Waterfront Employees Association of the Pacific coast, declared: "There is practically no true overtime in longshoring—that is, true overtime as adopted by the factory industries. Time in excess of 8 hours is the conventional overtime. Nothing of the sort pertains to longshoremen."

Again, in 1941–42, Mr. Foisie called "overtime," when applied to the longshoreman, a "misnomer."

It is difficult to understand just why the shipping industry failed to comply with the various directives of the Wage-Hour Administrator, and subjected themselves to the risk of 100 percent damages—the penalty for noncompliance. The industry was careful enough to get special-indemnity agreements in their Government contracts which guaranteed reimbursement from the Government in case of future claims. If these claims were delayed, then, through a statute of limitations, reduced to 2 years in 1947, only the Government would be liable for past violations by reason of cost-plus contracts.

Equally difficult to understand is the position of the ILA leadership, which apparently failed to notice the violations, and subsequently, upon notification, opposed the claims of the men. It was a local of the ILA that established the validity of the longshoremen's claims to these overtime payments. In 1941, Local 814 of the ILA filed suit in the Federal district court in Milwaukee against the National Terminal Co. The ILA held that the company was in violation of wages and hours by failure to pay true overtime. The ILA won the suit on May 15, 1943, before Judge Duffy, a former United States Senator from Wisconsin at the time the Wages and Hours Act was passed. Judge Duffy's decision was unanimously upheld by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals on January 28, 1944.

It is difficut, too, to understand how Government agencies could ignore the directives of the Wage-Hour Administrator acting within his competency under the authority

of Congress. The Justice Department is in a strange position. In the name of the War Shipping Administration, the Attorney General is opposing suits brought against private shipping interests. In so doing, he has reversed the Justice Department's position in the Custom Inspectors' case (*U. S.* v. *Myers*, 1944).

Most fantastic of all is the contention of the shipping industry that payment of $500,000,000 in claims would bankrupt the industry (New York World-Telegram, March 11, 1949).

What are the real facts? First, the lawyers for the men give $15,000,000 as the top figure filed for all claims in the United States and its possessions. Second, 95 percent of the money claimed will have to be met, not by the industry, but by the Federal Government under cost-plus contracts.

Equally fantastic is the impression created that these suits are a Communist plot. Of the 26,000 claims filed, non-Communist lawyers represent almost 20,000 men. The case was handled in the courts by the firm of Goldwater & Flynn, of which Edward Flynn, former National Democratic Committee chairman, is a partner. The longshoremen themselves are overwhelmingly anti-Communist. It is just another case of giving credit to the Communist Party where little or no credit is due them—in the hope of smearing good men and their just cause.

The longshoremen are morally and legally entitled to payment for their unpaid overtime. As Senator THOMAS, present chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, said: "No windfalls are involved here, but merely the enforcement of a just debt knowingly assumed" (Washington Post, June 25, 1948). In the present hearings, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, remarked: "It would be a serious thing if Congress should attempt to reverse the Supreme Court in a matter affecting property rights—the workman's ability to collect money that the Court says is due him" (New York World-Telegram, March 11, 1949). There is no telling how serious the longshoremen would consider it.

As to whether or not Congress should pass H. R. 858 (without retroactivity), that remains within the determination of Congress. It is certain, however, that this whole episode points up the reasons why there should be an investigation of the entire industrial-relations set-up of the port of New York by a responsible Government body with power to recommend remedial legislation. Until it is done, peace, decency, and justice will not come to the troubled New York water front. The time for that investigation is now.

Bill McCahill, Friend of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article by the Honorable William P. McCahill, assistant to the chairman of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

This article sums up briefly what has been done in the field of aiding the handicapped. Bill McCahill has done outstanding work in behalf of the handicapped and he is to be commended for the efforts he has put forth and the interest he has shown in behalf of these people who need help so much.

REHABILITATION AND PLACEMENT OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By William P. McCahill of the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, assistant to the Chairman of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week)

At least 6,000,000 handicapped are swelling the labor force of the United States to new peaks. An estimated million additional workers could be employed if certain rehabilitation or training facilities and processes were available to them. Handicapped persons have been estimated to total 28,000,000, including those too old or too young to be in the labor force and those who cannot or do not work. In addition, about a third of a million persons, it is estimated, are disabled every year through various causes. Toward this handicapped population, more and more attention is being given by the Federal and State Governments and by public and private groups and agencies.

Some concern exists today that not enough is being done to rehabilitate the handicapped, although all States and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia are offering a wide range of rehabilitation services under a plan in which the States are to match Federal funds for case services, including training. The Federal Government pays for all costs of administration, placement, and vocational guidance. This program comes under the vocational rehabilitation law (Public Law 113, 78th Cong., 1st sess.), which was passed to allow the States to rehabilitate disabled citizens who are considered to have possibilities for remunerative employment.

The expansion of services to the civilian handicapped has proceeded apace since enactment in 1943 of the Barden-LaFollette amendments which provided authority under the vocational rehabilitation law for virtually every service essential to the restoration, preservation, or development of the disabled civilian's work capacity.

Many Federal Government agencies expend considerable time, effort, and money in behalf of the handicapped. The major part of this work is being done in the Federal Security Agency, particularly since the transfer to that Agency in July 1948 of the United States Employment Service and the Veterans Employment Service. In addition, many private groups or organizations participate in the year-round program of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and devote considerable effort toward rehabilitating and placing handicapped persons.

Much still remains to be done, however, in educating the public and the communities of the Nation on this subject. A rehabilitated worker pays back $10 in Federal income taxes alone for each Federal dollar spent in his rehabilitation. In the fiscal year 1949, the cost of the vocational rehabilitation program will be approximately $25,000,000. Of this total, the States' share will be about $7,000,000. The average cost of rehabilitation per person is less than $500, and it costs more than that to keep a handicapped person on a Federal, State, or community dole.

FEDERAL SERVICES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Civilian rehabilitation: The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (OVR) of the Federal Security Agency has the primary responsibility for rehabilitating civilians. It has a Federal-State relationship with 86 State rehabilitation agencies and services for the blind. The United States Office of Education, also in the FSA, administers Federal aspects of the various acts pertaining to vocational education, an important method of preparing persons for suitable employment, which is one of the processes in vocational rehabilitation.

The services provided through the Federal-State program of the OVR include medical examination; individual counsel and guidance; medical, surgical, psychiatric, and hospital care; artificial appliances; any necessary training; maintenance and transportation of the disabled person while undergoing treatment or training; occupational tools; equipment and licenses necessary for a fair start on the job; placement on the right job; and follow-up after placement. These services have been made increasingly available to applicants. Several of them are free under all circumstances; public funds are used for the others to the extent of the client's inability to pay.

The keynote of the OVR program is cooperation with existing establishments which include hospitals, rehabilitation centers, clinics, workshops, and other facilities already in operation. Two States (Virginia and Pennsylvania) have established their own rehabilitation facilities. Agreements have been signed between the OVR and many public and private agencies and groups, including many of the Federal agencies, which establish a modus operandi toward maximum use of existing facilities. State-OVR agencies also do counseling, apply psychological tests of aptitude, and determine physical capacities under medical supervision.

The 1948 annual report of the OVR shows that 190,000 persons received some rehabilitation services and 62,000 completed rehabilitation into jobs. Approximately 120,000 were receiving rehabilitation services on June 30, 1948. A total of 348,000 had actually been on rehabilitation registers during the previous 12 months. During the month of March 1948, there were 27,629 persons engaged in training under OVR authority, although this figure is misleading, since training is only one of the rehabilitation processes.

Among other Government agencies contributing to the work being done in behalf of the handicapped is the Department of Agriculture. It has asked handicapped workers to investigate the possibilities of farm employment through county agents, and though no statistics are available, a considerable number of impaired workers are now employed or self-employed on farms. The Farmers Home Administration and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation work closely together in rehabilitating disabled persons in the rural areas, and have had considerable success in restoring individuals and entire farm families to self-sufficiency after disease or injury have wrecked their economy.

In December 1946, the Business Advisory Council in the Department of Commerce drafted a five-point statement of policy on the employment of handicapped persons. This was particularly important because it was a statement of businessmen, emphasizing that it was sound economically and important socially to employ the handicapped, and calling upon employers to study the best placement practices and to make every effort to neutralize handicaps.

The Library of Congress has a special division for the purchase and distribution of embossed (braile) and talking (records) books for the blind.

Veteran rehabilitation: The Veterans' Administration has the main responsibility in rehabilitating disabled veterans, and through its system of hospitals exerts a profound influence on the Nation's disabled veterans. The service hospitals also have definite rehabilitation and training programs which make every possible effort to make patients ready to assume full-fledged civilian status.

The Veterans' Administration works closely with the Veterans' Employment Service; the VA Administrator is chairman of the Veterans' Placement Service Board. Through

its administration of Public Law 16 (78th Cong., 1st sess, March 24, 1943) (vocational rehabilitation law), the VA sees that a grateful Nation's debt to its disabled veterans is discharged insofar as is possible in rehabilitating and training them to the point where employment is not only desirable but possible. Although VA has placement responsibility, it generally uses the placement facilities of the VES and the USES.

In this program the disabled veteran obtains school training, both formal and vocational, and on-the-job and on-farm training. In June 1948 there were 224,993 veterans in training, as compared with 249,960 in May 1948 and 16,003 in July 1945, just before the end of hostilities. Of the June 1948 total, 96,787 were in school training, 31,545 in institutional on-farm training, and 96,661 on-job training. These are all vocational rehabilitation or Public Law 16 veterans, as compared with 1,666,518 Public Law 346 (78th Cong., 2d sess., June 22, 1944) (GI bill of rights) veterans in training during June and 2,333,766 in May when most colleges were still in regular session (Veterans' Administration, Statistical Summary, June 30, 1948).

During June 1948, 12,491 disabled veterans applied for vocational rehabilitation and 20,091 applications were pending advisement at the month's end. An additional 40,994 veterans who completed or discontinued their training during the month presumably will enter the labor market or continue further training or schooling. In all, 267,291 veterans were paid subsistence allowances during June under the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The Department of the Army has a program for the enlistment of specially trained amputees or other disabled veterans for limited-duty service. The Surgeons General of both the Army and the Navy keep continually abreast of the latest programs for the rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped. The Department of the Navy has recently completed an informal check on many of its large civilian establishments, and has found that the physically handicapped are not only employed in large numbers but are doing average and sometimes better-than-average work.

Placement: Certain overlapping of responsibility in actual placement of the handicapped led to a cooperative agreement between the United States Employment Service and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Both have placement functions, which in the former case are general, and in the latter more specifically aimed at the handicapped. The USES and OVR take the lead in publicizing the employability of the handicapped. In the fiscal year 1947, local employment offices held counseling interviews with 1,368,000 handicapped men and women, and approximately 236,000 impaired workers were placed in jobs. The USES April 1948 summary of activities for the handicapped in the various States showed 38,077 nonagricultural referrals to jobs and 21,808 placements, of which 11,711 were disabled veterans—an increase over the previous month of 15.1 percent in total, and 14.4 percent in veteran placements. Handicapped placements fluctuate, however, reaching a peak in October and dropping sharply in the following months before gradually building up again. In 1946 and 1947 approximately 30,000 placements of impaired workers were recorded for October, the all-time high being 30,765 in 1947, of which 17,802 were veterans.

The USES has developed a technique in which a handicapped worker's remaining physical abilities are matched against the physical requirements of the particular job under consideration. Information on the latest developments in connection with the USES handicapped placement program is made available in the Employment Service Review.

Through the Veterans Employment Service, the USES exerts considerable effort to influence, employers to hire qualified disabled veterans. The major work of the VES is promotion and stimulation, coupled with placement. The VES cooperates quite extensively with private veterans' organizations and places its limited field personnel in areas of greatest veteran concentration so as to exert maximum influence and obtain maximum contracts and placements.

The Government has become the Nation's largest employer of the handicapped, including a great many disabled veterans. Civil Service Commission records of placements outside the District of Columbia show that from October 1942 to July 1948 more than 95,000 physically handicapped workers, including 31,400 veterans, were placed in Government employment. The ratio of disabled veterans hired during this period, about one to two nonveterans, is disproportionate, because the peak of hiring came during the war years, while veterans were in uniform. In June 1948, 403 veteran and 152 civilian handicapped were placed, a much higher ratio of veterans. A break-down of the placements in June 1948 and for the period 1942–48, by broad types of disabilities, shows that persons with orthopedic defects had the highest total employment, followed by those with defective vision, defective hearing, arrested tuberculosis, and coronary troubles, respectively.

	Placements	
	June 1948	Oct. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948
Orthopedic defects	353	58,327
Upper extremities	128	19,059
Lower extremities	184	31,837
Spinal column	41	7,431
Blind	114	17,905
1 eye	110	16,412
Both eyes	0	831
Industrially blind	4	662
Hearing defects	53	10,186
Hard of hearing	51	8,308
Totally deaf	2	1,878
Tuberculosis arrested	23	4,112
Heart disease compensated	38	9,465
Total	[1] 581	[1] 99,996

[1] This figure exceeds the total number of placements because some handicapped persons have more than 1 disability.

The Commission has a medical director and staff, charged with the responsibility of giving the impaired worker every possible employment and advancement opportunity.

The Congress recently passed a law (Public 617, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) prohibiting discrimination in the Federal service against any worker or applicant merely because of a physical handicap, the second time that the Civil Service Act has been amended since 1883.

The Apprentice Training Service of the United States Department of Labor, while not directly responsible for placing apprentice applicants on the job, reports that many handicapped persons are serving apprenticeships satisfactorily.

Work performance study: Several surveys made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Veterans' Administration compare the work performances of the handicapped and the nonhandicapped on similar jobs. The most recent of these studies has been released in the Bureau's Bulletin No. 923 which gives results of careful studies of 11,028 physically impaired workers and 18,258 unimpaired workers in 1,488 occupations in 109 plants. According to the report, workers with serious physical impairments, who are placed so as to stress what they can do rather than emphasize what they cannot do, are every bit as desirable as workers without such impairments. The study was based on industry's own records and shows that, as a group, impaired workers are as efficient, and as safe from injury, as the unimpaired workers. Absenteeism of impaired workers was only slightly higher—about one more day a year—than that of unimpaired workers. No injuries to the impaired were traced to the handicap, and not a single impaired worker suffered a work injury which rendered him permanently and totally disabled. Although the study states what has always been known, that there is discrimination against the handicapped, it also points out the need for rehabilitation and for the acquiring of definite skills of impaired workers.

THE NEPH WEEK

The Retraining and Reemployment Administration (terminated at the end of June 1947) did considerable work in this field in 1946–47 and initiated the Federal Interagency Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. This Committee has coordinated the national program for the observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, observed annually the first week in October through Presidential proclamation.

The President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, functioning since September 1947, operates a year-round program of public information and education on employment of the handicapped, working through some 150 national groups or organizations represented on the committee. Many of these groups have no connection whatever with the handicapped and others devote their entire efforts to such matters as rehabilitation.

WORK OF PRIVATE GROUPS

Private organizations working for and with the handicapped are numerous. (Some of the more prominent groups are listed in A Directory of Agencies and Organizations Concerned with Rehabilitation and Services to the Handicapped, compiled by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., and Eugene J. Taylor, New York Times, 1947, 133 pp.) Many of them work closely with Government programs, such as that of the President's Committee on the NEPH Week; others are strictly local or regional in character and have no connection with Government.

Among the outstanding organizations are the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped—which sponsored NEPH Week legislation and a recent bill (S. 2896) by Senator SPARKMAN and nine other Senators calling for a coordinating Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped—and the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York—the first rehabilitation center in the United States under the modern concept. Both of these are on the President's Committee.

The Goodwill Industries of America has 93 local units throughout the country which offer handicapped people an opportunity for sheltered or noncompetitive employment and then sell their products to the public. Many communities have sheltered workshops which are private rehabilitation centers. The Curative Workshop of Milwaukee, Inc., is an outstanding example of private initiative in behalf of the handicapped that has lasted through three decades. Many groups help the blind, while others devote their energies to the correction of various ailments. Among the latter groups are the American Hearing Society of Washington, D. C.; and the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Association to Control Epilepsy, the American Occupational Therapy Association, and the American Physiotherapy Association, all of New York.

To recount the excellent work being done by private means would take volumes. Much is being and has been accomplished. Much

more will be and needs to be done in the future in this relatively new field. Working together, business and industry, Government and private groups, communities and citizens are making a concerted attack on the problem of rehabilitation and employment of the disabled.

Labor Power Declines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Dunn Survey has just issued an important summary of a survey conducted by it in connection with the so-called labor vote. We have heard a great deal about this subject, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days. Labor partisans are constantly tossing the threat of political extinction to those of us who refuse to be intimidated. Mr. Dunn says the CIO-PAC is the great American hoax.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the survey:

CIO-PAC, THE GREAT AMERICAN HOAX

1. Labor vote for President declines.
2. Labor vote for Congress declines.
3. Labor vote propaganda.
4. The true size of CIO-PAC leaders.
5. A challenge to CIO-PAC.

The 1948 election established that any power of labor-union leaders to deliver the vote of union members has declined, and has been constantly declining since 1936.

1. LABOR VOTE FOR PRESIDENT DECLINES

In 1948 there were 15,600,000 labor-union members in the United States, and Mr. Truman won 51 percent of the Presidential vote in the 96 counties comprising the 33 largest industrial areas in the country (area defined by Census Bureau).

In contrast, in 1936 there were only 4,700,000 union members, and Roosevelt won 65 percent of the Presidential vote in the same 96 counties—immediately after passage of the Wagner Labor Act. By 1944 there were 13,500,000 union members, and Roosevelt's vote declined to 56 percent in the same industrial areas.

In over two-thirds of the 96 counties in the industrial areas the vote for Presidential candidates supported by CIO-PAC leaders has constantly declined since 1936. These include the counties containing most of the largest cities, such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and Detroit.

Detroit (Wayne County) is generally considered to be the citadel of power of CIO-PAC leaders. In 1936 Roosevelt won 68 percent of the vote in the county—before CIO-PAC existed. In 1944, with CIO-PAC's public support, Roosevelt won only 63 percent. And in 1948, with CIO-PAC's public support, Mr. Truman won only 58 percent of the vote.

2. LABOR VOTE FOR CONGRESS DECLINES

In spite of the great growth in union membership, in the counties comprising the principal industrial areas the Democratic majority for Congressmen was smaller in 1948 than in 1944, 1940, or in 1936, when there was no CIO-PAC.

Democratic vote for Congressmen in industrial areas

	Percent
1936	64
1940	53½
1944	55
1948	53

The total Democratic vote cast for Congressmen in the industrial areas evidences that there was not an uprising of American workers to defeat the Members of Congress who voted for a "slave labor" law (Taft-Hartley).

Total Democratic vote for Congressmen in industrial areas

1936	10,700,000
1940	9,800,000
1944	10,200,000
1948	10,100,000

3. LABOR VOTE PROPAGANDA

Defeated in the 1948 election were 34 Congressmen who voted for the Taft-Hartley law and whose districts included part or all of at least one county in the principal industrial areas. One year before the 1948 election this survey named 24 of these 34 Congressmen and stated that they would be defeated if Mr. Truman won.

At the same time we correctly named 44 of the 64 Republican Congressmen throughout the country who voted for the Taft-Hartley law and were defeated in the 1948 election.

We warned our readers then, November 20, 1947, that the defeat of these Congressmen, and consequent loss of a Republican majority in the House, could result regardless of whether there was CIO-PAC opposition. And we warned against accepting the false claims of CIO-PAC leaders that they spoke for, or delivered the vote of the rank and file union members.

Anticipating exactly what has happened, this survey reported on October 16, 1948, as follows:

"If the pay-roll vote (of Federal employees) is cast as it appears to us, Republicans would lose a conspicuous number of seats in the House of Representatives. The loss of Republican seats would be largely in industrial districts where the Federal pay-roll is centered.

"However, the New Deal-labor leader combine would hail labor's success in defeating the 'enemies of labor' who voted for the Taft-Hartley law, and Republicans would generally acknowledge the claim. Thus, the hoax of the New Deal's labor vote would be rekindled."

(All of the current polls on provisions of the Taft-Hartley law that we have seen show that the large part of union members hold views which are the opposite of the representations made by union leaders. The facts we present here evidence that such polls are correct.)

4. THE TRUE SIZE OF CIO-PAC LEADERS

With 49,000,000 voters, and national campaigns based on propaganda and emotions rather than principles, it is easy to hide the representations each voter makes when casting his or her vote.

However, primary elections are not as subject to such distortions, and they do afford the leaders of an organized minority their greatest opportunity to make effective the vote of those they claim to speak for.

In the 1948 primaries CIO-PAC leaders opposed 109 Members of Congress who voted for the Taft-Hartley law. Ninety-seven of these Members won their elections. Twelve Members were defeated, but only 3 came from industrial States (Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin). Nine defeated Members came from southern and agricultural States, where the number of labor-union members is small (Alabama, Florida, Iowa, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Tennessee).

5. A CHALLENGE TO CIO-PAC

We believe that the facts establish that CIO-PAC leaders do not speak for, nor deliver, the vote of the substantial part of rank and file union members. These facts should prevail in formulating national policies until the time that CIO-PAC leaders establish facts contrary to and at least as substantial as those presented here.

Members of Congress and others to whom national leaders of CIO-PAC represent that they speak for the vote of union members should challenge such representations as false and not representing the voice of rank and file union members.

Members of Congress outside of the New Deal-labor leader combine, should make it known that they are seeking labor-union legislation as champions of the interests of rank and file union members and of the public.

Guided Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star of May 3, 1949:

GUIDED MISSILE COULD PUT AIR FORCE PLANES IN OBSOLETE CLASS—ARMY REPORT ON PROGRESS ON 12,000-POUND BOMB SEEN SOOTHING TO NAVY

(By David Lawrence)

Now comes Gen. Joseph T. McNarney to reveal that the Air Force will have ready within a year a 12,000-pound bomb that can be guided all the way to the target. He says also that American research engineers have made great progress recently toward development of devices to guide missiles with speeds up to 700 miles an hour and with ranges of 5,000 miles.

This is soothing news for the Navy folks who may be feeling depressed about the cancellation of their supercarrier. For it could mean the cancellation of the superbomber of the Air Force as obsolete, too, within a short while.

It raises the question as to whether the Air Force should be permitted to spend billions of dollars for bombers that are not going to be used and, indeed, whether the airplane itself isn't on the way out.

If the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, hasn't yet drafted consolidation directive No. 5, he might logically be writing it. For the passion to concentrate everything in one place here finds a ready outlet in the matter of guided missiles.

ISN'T THIS DUPLICATION?

Today guided missiles are being developed by the Army, by the Navy, and by the Air Force. Isn't this overlapping and duplication? Why shouldn't a new branch of the armed services be created with a status equal to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? Why shouldn't the guided missile force come into being with a general to represent it on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

The thinking heretofore at the Pentagon Building has been that all weapons of one class belong in one service and that it is a mistake to allow the Navy to develop any airplanes to be launched from the decks of ships. The argument has been that all airplanes should be in one service.

Certainly the field artillery have a real claim now. Guided missiles are more like artillery than any other weapon. Logically, the guided missiles could form a new service that would include all guns that shoot into the air. President Truman, as an ex-artilleryman, can appreciate how long neglected the field artillery has been and what its claims now are for control of all guided

missiles. A good case can be made for the guided missile force as a separate entity detached from the Army.

FOUR SERVICES POSSIBLE

It is true that this would make four separate services but that's what unification has brought anyway. There used to be only two services and now there are three. Since the chief reason for a separate Air Force was that it had a new weapon, there seems to be logic in the idea of a separate force to handle guided missiles. There, of course, has been talk of a separate service to take care of submarines but this is in its incipient stages as yet. Some day when submarines are able to come to the surface and launch airplanes and guided missiles, there will be a debate as to which of the existing services shall have the honor of annexing the submarines. But that's in the future.

Meanwhile, the Congress is spending considerable sums on guided missiles. In a sense, this is a mistake. The new doctrine enunciated by the recent order canceling the Navy's research and development of a new carrier apparently is that there must be no new weapons introduced unless the Air Force agrees to it in advance. The guided missile appropriations amount to many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Plainly the whole guided missile program should be reviewed and reexamined because it may well be that it is unwise to spend so much on superbombers for long-range strategic bombing or anything else when—to follow the argument against the Navy's carrier—another 5 years may see the present weapons obsolete altogether.

A National Bulwark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in a recent edition of the Stars and Stripes-National Tribune:

A NATIONAL BULWARK

Since early in the administration of President Woodrow Wilson, when he approved in 1914 a congressional resolution to honor the mothers of America, the second Sunday of each May has been termed Mother's Day. Harshly as some few will believe the world has treated them and far as many have drifted away from the homes of their birth and from the influences that in bygone days surrounded them, there will yet be seen next Sunday, attached to the breasts of a multitude, a fresh carnation. It may be in color to indicate that she who gave us birth is still spared to witness the honor bestowed, or it may be of white to signify that she has passed on to her heavenly reward, but there it will be, symbolizing that love and reverence in which we hold her, the one person who has done more than any other to shape our lives and our conduct, the one who has contributed most to the destiny of the Nation.

Perhaps there are those who have wondered why it is that we, as veterans, have attached so much importance to legislative efforts which point to the ultimate care by this country of the mothers of those who have gone to war that America might live and continue to contribute of its knowledge and its substance to the proper conduct of human relationships. We have received adverse comment from the thoughtless; they insist that, if men come home unmarred by conflict, there can be no later responsibility attached to them or theirs, and we know that our policy of assuring comfort and security to the widows and orphans of those of our honored dead who had the good fortune to live beyond their years in uniform is often questioned Because these men who fought survived and their loved ones sustained no immediate and personal hardship, we are told we owe them nothing. Such reasoning is a dishonor to motherhood, and it demonstrates a callous disregard for the very principles on which this country has thrived.

No mother, who has ever borne a son, has brought him life so that he could be fed into the maws of war. There has been no wife but has suffered crushing sorrow when her man left the home to offer his life in the country's defense, and no widow of a veteran who sought his mate after separation from military service has willed that he die for her benefit. The hope always has been for life and for happiness. The desire has envisioned success for sons and daughters in the arts, the sciences, or trade. From time immemorial all women of the world have uttered fervent prayers that a son might be born, and, once a part of society, they have shared gladly his disappointments as readily as they have cheered his accomplishments. As he grew up and left to brave the wilderness of his future, mother has smiled her farewell, and she has shown equally her courage when he was called upon to war for her protection. No selfishness was in her being, no sacrifice too great. From earliest recollection, that is the thought of her who was sent as a gift from above to cheer the hearts of men, to console in affliction and to sustain in success. That is why she deserves consideration beyond all others and why we wish to share her concern when she reaches a time of need for herself.

Two great wars have been fought by this Nation since Mother's Day was first inaugurated. Scores of thousands of sons and daughters of America have laid down their lives, and more have returned maimed to the womenfolk they cherish. One needs only to know the grief of parting and the proudness of sacrifice to understand what the Nation's mothers have given to its preservation. But they have an even more vital role in the world of today.

The toil and energy which American motherhood demonstrated in the days of the covered wagon was a mainstay in the building of this Nation. The same boundless courage and determination is needed in this hour to prevent the prostration of existing national institutions. Nobody better than the mothers of the land can direct a floundering ship of state away from dangerous shoals of uncertain domestic and foreign policy. They know that the triumphs of wars won are futile unless the rights for which they were fought shall be kept intact. We believe their resolutions to be that this country must yield a fuller and richer life for its people. They have an influence over our elected leaders that is beyond compare, and they are expected to bring it to bear upon those who need to be guided. Only a mother can teach well the lesson that there can be lost with ease all that has been won at awful cost, if some shirk while others toil.

Especially is this true of those women who have lost their sons in the country's service. Never to be forgotten are the little tots who clung to a mother's breast, or the tousle-haired fellows who played at her knee and who, on reaching manhood, went off to war and fought to the death for the right. The fundamental truths which caused that heart-breaking sacrifice have not changed, nor have there been altered the basic purposes for which all other young men have laid down their lives in the national cause. They who bred and loved such men can demand that the principles in which they believed shall be preserved.

President Wilson, in that first Mother's Day proclamation 35 years ago, said, "We honor ourselves and the mothers of America when we do anything to give emphasis to the home as the fountainhead of the State. The American mother is doing so much for the home, the moral uplift and religion, hence so much for good government and humanity." During the passing years events have given her a greater part in the national life. They have widened her prestige and her force for good. As we honor her on a day set apart for the esteem that is rightly hers, and as we credit her with the blessing she has been to humanity, we pledge a continued remembrance of our heritage and swear to guard it, but we call upon her to wield the power that is hers to help us. Neither God nor man will forgive us, should we neglect the mothers of this Nation. Our trust is that they will exercise the moral and physical force which makes of them the bulwark of our country's safety.

German Cartels—Revival in the Making—Truman Seen Facing Pledge To Break Giant German Industrial Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1949:

REVIVAL IN THE MAKING—TRUMAN SEEN FACING PLEDGE TO BREAK GIANT GERMAN INDUSTRIAL CARTELS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman now is faced with responsibility to redeem a war aim to which both he and Franklin D. Roosevelt pledged themselves, which was to break up the giant German industrial and financial monopolies, or cartels, that plunged that nation into aggressive war.

Only recently the President said he never would permit revival of the cartels as long as he was in the White House.

Yet such a revival is in the making. An official verdict that the decartelization program has not been carried out as directed by our Government is before the President in the report made by a special commission sent to Germany late last year by then Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall at Mr. Truman's instruction. The commission consisted of Garland S. Ferguson, Federal Trade Commissioner, chairman; Samuel S. Isseks, New York lawyer, formerly in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division New York office; and Arthur T. Kearney, Chicago business management expert.

PROGRAM ABANDONED

As revealed in detail in news dispatches, the commission found that the decartelization program had been virtually abandoned, and it pinned the blame on top officials in American military government.

How the President may proceed to remedy this situation is suggested by the commission.

Its criticism of top policy officials and its recommendation that the staff responsible

for carrying out the decartelization program be "strengthened" was carried a step further in a supplementary report by Mr. Isseks who urged that three American military government officials, Lawrence Wilkinson, economic adviser, Phillips Hawkins, his deputy, and Richardson Bronson, chief of the decartelization branch, be removed from any responsibility over the program.

Among many other things, the commission also recommended that the program be put under civilian control; that it be kept under American control and not turned over to the Germans; that it be pushed vigorously in a case-by-case method, and that the chief of the decartelization branch be familiar with our antitrust laws, which is basic.

EXCUSE GIVEN BY OFFICIALS

The excuse given by the top officials named who were responsible for changing the policy laid down by our Government was that the policy would interfere with production in Germany. The Commission held that this was not true.

The whole story boils down very simply to two things—our policy and its objectives, and an attitude of mind. Our policy had a double aim—first to break up the giant cartels so they would not be a potential for another war, as they have been for two wars in our generation; second, growing from the dissolution of these giant trusts, to make industry in Germany more democratic.

To carry out such a policy required an understanding of, and sympathy with, that objective. But predominant influence in the set-up in Germany was given to men whose background and experience in big business and finance were hardly conducive to that.

Under such direction it hardly could be expected that anything would happen but what has happened. It is late, but something still might be done to correct an error that may prove dangerous to our national safety.

Super de Luxe Lobbying Group Putting Terrific Heat on Congress To Pass Moratorium or Law To Help Steel and Cement Industries Continue Price-Fixing Schemes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last fall one of the most powerful lobbying groups in the entire United States was quickly formed to help the steel and cement industries. It started off costing $11,000 a month in salaries, plus traveling, hotel, printing, entertaining, telephoning, and telegraphing expenses. The names of the persons backing the lobby are a closely guarded secret. The admitted lobbyist failed to register under the Lobbying Act at the proper time, as required by law. This super de luxe lobby admits writing statements to be submitted on the lobby's side. The chief lobbyist said his efforts are aimed at eliminating the Supreme Court bar to the uniform-delivered-price system of cement and steel companies because, he says, "They feel it would hurt their business." This information is disclosed in an article written by James M. Daniel, Rocky Mountain News Washington correspondent, December 17, 1948, and is as follows:

PITTSBURGH INDUSTRIALISTS PUSH CAMPAIGN FOR BASING POINT LOBBY

(By James M. Daniel)

WASHINGTON, December 17.—Twenty-five percent of the initial organizing expenses of the campaign to legalize basing point price-fixing were put up by Pittsburgh industrialists, a lobby official disclosed today.

MacLean Work, director of Ketchum, Inc., campaign directors, a subsidiary of the Pittsburgh advertising and public relations firm of Ketchum, MacLeod and Grove, said this grubstaking arrangement was to run through January 25.

The Ketchum drive began in September, he said. It is costing $11,000 a month in salaries to Ketchum agents, plus their traveling, hotel, printing, entertainment, telephoning and telegraphing expenses. This amounts to additional thousands, which Mr. Work did not specify.

Asked to name the Pittsburgh industrialists who floated the campaign, Mr. Work said he was "not at liberty" to do so.

WITHHOLDS NAMES

He also said he could not disclose the names of chapter chairmen situated in the cities where Ketchum, Inc., is establishing chapters of its so-called national competition committee. Previously, the associate director of Ketchum, Inc., Walter Megronigle, had told this reporter that his chief, Mr. Work, would give those names.

"I am not at liberty to give those names, either," said Mr. Work.

The chief of the promotional firm did disclose, however, some additional information about the target cities which Ketchum, Inc., has on its list to be visited by solicitors seeking $100 to $1,000 contributions from businessmen.

Chapters are tentatively functioning in Dallas, Houston, Tulsa, Cincinnati, Dayton, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, the home base, he said.

ONE SLATED FOR DENVER

Chapters are to be organized in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul-Minneapolis, Toledo, Detroit, Buffalo, Boston, Atlanta, Louisville, and New Orleans.

Mr. Work revealed that there had been a division within Ketchum, Inc., as to the necessity of registering under the infant congressional Lobbying Act, since the organizing firm does not maintain a Washington headquarters. When in the Capital Mr. Work stays regularly at the Washington Hotel.

He said although the Ketchum outfit began functioning in September, he didn't recall when it registered under the Lobbying Act. According to the files of the House Clerk, Ketchum registered on November 26, somewhere between 60 and 90 days after it set out to do a job on the antitrust acts, if Mr. Work's recollection of September as the starting month is accurate.

Mr. Work said the reason that Ketchum didn't register immediately was, "I didn't think it was necessary."

He repeated Mr. Megronigle's denial that Ketchum, Inc., had prepared the statements which have been laid before the Capehart committee in Washington calling for amendments to the antitrust acts. A super deluxe lobbying job such as the Ketchum Co. is giving its Pittsburgh clients generally involves a full writing job for all the statements submitted on the lobby's side.

There was a slight difference, however, in the way they phrased their statements. Mr. Work said Ketchum hadn't written any of the statements demanding amendment of the antitrust acts. Earlier, Mr. Megronigle said they hadn't done so yet.

Asked why the Pittsburgh sponsors of the National Competition Committee aspired to such a huge lobbying effort aimed at eliminating the Supreme Court bar to the uniform-delivered price system of cement and steel companies, Mr. Work replied in these exact words:

"They feel it would hurt their business."

Address of Hon. William C. Bullitt at Austin, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial in the Houston Chronicle of April 28, 1949, commenting upon the address of the Honorable William C. Bullitt made to the legislators of Texas in a joint session on April 27. Mr. Bullitt's viewpoint is quite interesting. I hope the Members will read it. It follows:

BULLITT'S AUSTIN ADDRESS

It was a powerful address that William C. Bullitt made to the legislators of Texas in joint session Wednesday, combining a somber analysis of the international situation, severe criticism of our foreign policy, and a plea to the legislature to drive our leaders to take effective steps to thwart the Soviet campaign for world mastery.

We should face the situation with our eyes open. As Mr. Bullitt said, "Stalin, like Hitler, will not stop. He can only be stopped. * * *

"What, then, lies before us? War?"

Not necessarily, Mr. Bullitt implied. Not if we take strong action. But he did not merely imply that war will come if we fail to take strong action. He declared flatly that war will come—if Stalin gets possession of all China and Asia; or if we bring ourselves near bankruptcy in a vain effort to strengthen western Europe.

No war—hot or cold—was ever won by defensive action. Yet we are leaving the offensive to Stalin.

No man can dispute the truth of that statement. We are waging a defensive cold war in Europe. In the Far East, we have abdicated; we have turned our back on our historic policy that no great power shall gain control of vast and teeming China.

As Mr. Bullitt, former ambassador to France and Russia and one of the distinguished authorities on foreign policy of our time, pointed out to the Texas legislature, "The most conspicuous triumph of Soviet psychological warfare has been the gradual perversion of American policy toward China."

We entered World War II because Japanese control of China would be a threat to our security. We are letting Russia seize China today; "We are allowing a power which is hostile to us to conquer China, and thus we are making certain the coming of a third world war."

It was a black picture Mr. Bullitt painted. If China goes, he declared, so will the remainder of southeast Asia; India will be at Russia's mercy; so will Japan. "Our children will face assault by overwhelming masses of Communist-driven slaves."

Who can deny that this is the logical sequence of events?

We have been lulled by our confidence in the atomic bomb. Mr. Bullitt declared that our confidence in it may become as fatal to us as the French confidence in the Maginot Line was fatal to France. He cited the fact that our experts estimate Russia will be making atomic bombs by 1952 and will have quantities of them by 1956.

"At the other end of the expanding Communist empire, have we not seized the initiative?" the speaker asked, and then answered his own question, "We have not." We are pouring $16,000,000,000 into Marshall plan aid that is supposed to end in 1952 but which, the recipients say, must not end then.

And, they tell us, they cannot pay for their own rearmament—rearmament which is necessary, if they are to be an effective fighting force. That will cost another $12,000,000,000, Mr. Bullitt estimated, and who is going to pay it? The American taxpayer?

"The only solution, so far as Europe is concerned," he said, "is federation and economic integration. Otherwise," he declared, "this country in an effort to bolster Europe will suffer an inflation so severe that we shall begin to quarrel among ourselves * * * until we lose our national unity and our will to resist." Who can doubt that this is an accurate analysis?

What to do about this dismal situation? Mr. Bullitt urged bold action—aid to the Chinese nationalists in Asia; seizure of the initiative in Europe by sending a truck convoy into Berlin.

He believes that Stalin would not order his troops to shoot if we asserted our right to supply Berlin by surface transport. "For," he said, "time is running in favor of Russia and against us; Stalin will gain strength relative to us, rather than the other way around, as the months and years march on."

"This," he asserted, "is a moment when we can afford to be bold. Indeed, it is a moment when we cannot afford not to be bold.

"What can we do about it? We cannot lead our leaders, but we can drive our leaders by arousing public opinion."

He called upon the legislature to pass resolutions calling upon our national leaders to bring about European federation; demanding that the men who helped bring our country into its present peril be thrown out of the State Department and the Foreign Service; telling our leaders that they will be held responsible "if, by allowing Stalin to control China, they throw away all that was won for us by our men who fought and died in the Pacific"; and demanding that we furnish officers to train the Chinese Nationalist forces, also planes, arms, munitions, and silver for troop pay.

That is the challenge which Williar C. Bullitt threw down to the Legislature of Texas.

The Chronicle is deeply impressed by Mr. Bullitt's analysis of the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves and urges the legislature and all thinking people to give it serious consideration.

Power of Unions Over American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1949:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I present two methods of raising money for foreign relief and some comment on the powers of unions over American citizens:

The Catholic bishops' fund for victims of war, of New York, appeals for $500,000 toward a national total of $5,000,000 to provide food, clothing and medicine for the sick, the aged, and the children in certain war-ravaged countries. A further objective is the resettlement of displaced persons.

This is an appeal, not a demand. There is not the slightest threat, coercion or compulsion. There is no penalty for failure to contribute and the total goal is only $5,000,000 for the entire country for the entire year.

Now I refer to a demand, somewhat sugared, which has been received by members of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, whose president, David Dubinsky, is an old protege of the Roosevelt administration.

He operates a little nuisance party of his own in New York called the Liberal Party. Dubinsky is a Social Democrat. The Social Democratic splinter of the Socialist-Communist scourge is an alien political element in the United States.

Dubinsky's union has so much money that he cannot find legitimate use for it here and thus is forced to spend much of it on European projects.

The idea of reducing the collections would be regarded as a labor-baiting thought. During the war the ILGWU conducted secret, irresponsible espionage in Europe at the expense of American workers who were not informed of these activities.

The expenditures remain secret on the ground, or pretext, that to disclose them in detail would be to jeopardize persons who took part in the underground work. Thus this model among the paternal-socialistic unions cannot account for these expenses nor even submit a report of its secret activities overseas.

On March 18, workers belonging to locals 10, 22, 60, and 89 embraced in the joint board of the Dress and Waistmakers union received a printed letter from their union bosses which was not an appeal for money but a demand and a threat.

It calls on the "members in your shop to do your share in a great and noble cause * * * to carry out this noble responsibility that our membership has taken upon itself, we need greater funds than ever before.

"Thousands of displaced persons are at last on their way from D. P. camps in Germany * * * and looking with hope toward establishing a new, free, and secure life in their newly acquired homeland—Israel.

"Many others are finding new homes in democratic countries of the world. All of them need not only means of transportation, food, clothing and care but also means to find new homes, learn new trades, reestablish themselves and begin life anew—be it in Israel, the United States, or anywhere else * * * the people of Italy are erecting a better life * * * all these brave peoples cannot be let down by us. Their call for help * * * cannot remain unanswered.

"By decision of the general executive board and approval of our union we have pledged contributions to the United Jewish Appeal, the Italian-American Labor council, the Jewish labor committee, Histadrut, and many other organizations * * * to facilitate collection of these funds we ask you to immediately begin collection in your shop: From operators, sample-makers, cutters, and pressers, $7; finishers, drapers, and special machine operators, $5; from cleaners, pinkers, and pressers, $2.50.

"We sincerely hope you will give this prompt attention because registration for vacation benefits will commence immediately after April 1. This collection is to be completed by that date so that all members may be in good standing."

In plainer words, American citizens are required to accept a noble responsibility imposed on them by a small group of all-powerful union politicians, failing which they will cease to be in good standing and thus will become ineligible for vacation funds already earned by them and paid to their individual accounts in the union treasury by their employers.

The union contracts forbid the employers to pay the vacation money straight to the individuals. It must go through the union and the union almost never pays to the individual as much as the employer has paid in his name.

These workers get small pay and every dollar counts.

Dubinsky has been president of the ILGWU unopposed since 1932 and is as strong in his union as Lewis is in the Mine Workers. He publishes semiweekly a paper called Justice at the expense of the members, with his name on the masthead and his picture liberally scattered through the pages always in the most favorable poses and situations.

It is actually a personal organ of propaganda and praise rather than a members' paper.

Israel, the chief beneficiary of the fund to which these American citizens were forced to give money under threat of reprisals, is a sovereign foreign nation with an army, ambassadors, a treasury, and other services.

It would be equally outrageous to force American citizens to give money to the Peron government of Argentina, the Soviet Government, or the British Government. Citizens of Israel are in no greater need of homes and a secure life than millions of Americans.

In Tucson, Ariz., thousands of American citizens live in trailers for lack of money to rent or buy homes. Millions of our own also need transportation, food, clothing, and care. Few Americans have a secure life.

The March 1 issue of Dubinsky's Justice carried five photographs of Dubinsky. In the March 15 issue he led the paper with the announcement, accompanied by a picture, that Dubinsky turned over $250,000 on behalf of the ILGWU to Henry Morgenthau.

It said that last year the union gave $150,000 to the fund. On page four there was a small picture showing a presentation of $7,000 to Luigi Antonini, a vice president and padrone of the Italian-American element of the union, for Italian relief. We are not told whether this is the total allotted for Italian relief.

The organization, called "Histadrut," mentioned in the letter of the joint board as a beneficiary, was identified flatly in this issue of Justice as the Israel federation of labor. It is a member of the Communist-controlled world federation of trade unions.

American citizens in this one labor union, the ILGWU, have been compelled to contribute $400,000 in 2 years to the cause of a sovereign foreign nation.

The Royal Egyptian embassy in Washington reports that 800,000 Palestine Arabs are now refugees from their own homeland. There seems to be no such concern for them in this union.

Without regard for the merits of the rival claims to this homeland it is obviously wrong to use the power of boss unionism to compel American citizens to give of their scanty earnings for the benefits of a sovereign foreign nation or its citizens.

Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
PHILADELPHIA PA., BRANCH,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 2, 1949.

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Postmaster General Donaldson has said postal unions should seek no higher increase in pay than one to which they can clearly show themselves to be entitled. Mr. Donaldson has also said that if last year's increase had been $150 higher, there would not now be any salary increase problem.

We are in complete accord with the Postmaster General in regard to asking only an amount which is justified. Respectfully, we differ from him when he says a $600 increase by the Eightieth Congress would have answered our needs.

Permit me to explain the financial situation of railway postal clerks. Please remember that, although the highest distributor grade will be used as an example, the economic handicap of those in the lower grades is proportionately more severe.

This is the position of the highest distributor grade of railway postal clerk assigned to road duty: Public Law 134 (79th Cong.) set the salary at $2,900 per annum. We were given a $400 increase on January 1, 1946, and last year we received an additional $450. The present salary for the highest nonsupervisory grade is thus $3,750. The New York Times reported on February 26 of this year that for the month ended January 15 the consumer price index stood at 73.3 percent of the August 1939 level. Our comparable salary in 1939 was $2,450. If the index figure is applied to both our 1939 and current salaries, our present income is shown to be deficient by $495.85. This figure ignores tax deductions from which we were completely exempt in 1939. It also ignores other hidden increases in living costs which are not reflected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and which raise the total to well over $650.

The foregoing paragraph illustrates, I believe, that the $650 increase would merely provide for the higher cost of living, and would in no way constitute an advance. Nothing has been said about restoring to us the hundreds of dollars we have lost annually since mid-1946. The same paragraph effectively demonstrates that our requests are reasonable. It demonstrates, too, that anything less than $650 would be completely inadequate.

Respectfully yours,
PAUL A. NAGLE,
Legislative Chairman.

Communism in Harlem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Mr. Neil Scott, 400 Manhattan Avenue, New York City, on the subject of communism in Harlem. Mr. Scott is a distinguished author and journalist. His speech was broadcast over radio station WMCA on the weekly program, Harlem—U. S. A., which is sponsored by Harlem's unofficial mayor, Sherman Hibbitt.

Mr. Scott denies that Harlem is a Communist community and severely criticizes the few Negroes in Harlem who affiliate with the Communist Party, and his speech on communism in Harlem is as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Weaver. Friends, I am delighted to be presented to you by Mr. Weaver, the grandson of the unrivaled fighter for the freedom of the Negro, our own, Frederick Douglass. I know that it will surprise the Harlem Communists, about whom I will speak tonight, to know of this relationship between Mr. Weaver and the late, great abolitionist, since the Harlem edition of the Daily Worker very cunningly carried the picture of Frederick Douglass on its front page masthead.

Friends, at the beginning, let me point out that the number of Negroes who are members of the Communist Party is very negligible. Negroes in America as a rule are American in their customs, their ideology and their innate faith in the democratic form of government under which we Americans live.

Communists among Negroes breed where there is desperation; and in Harlem many Negroes are desperate for food, for shelter, for clothing and, in general for a better share of America. City officials and the uptown politicians do little, if anything, concerning the plight of the Negroes, and the Communists, always on the alert for desperate individuals and desperate situations, promise that, if elected to office, they will bring relief. The intelligent people of Harlem know that they are lying; they know that their salvation rests in attempting to solve their problems in an American and constitutional way; they know that the Communist way is not the constitutional way. But, like drowning men grasping at straws, the weak are quick to grasp at anything that seems to them to offer hope. The Negroes of Harlem are very often too hungry, too cold, or too destitute to reason things out clearly for themselves. The Communists are quick to prey upon such a situation.

The blame for the condition of the Negroes in Harlem, I think, rests as heavily on the backs of our spineless leadership who, instead of fighting for the rights of their constituency, straddle the fence whenever the issues are placed squarely before them.

In campaigns where corrupt political machines are victorious, the jobs are given to district leaders, who in Harlem, for a few dollars allow their mouths to be sealed where the fights and the rights of the people are involved. Those who would really speak out for the people of Harlem are shunted away by the powers that be, and we are victimized by a spineless, arrogant, and treacherous so-called leader, who prefers his job, to job hunting for those who elected him.

The Communists on East Twelfth Street are fully aware of this situation, and make capital of it. During each election campaign they send hundreds of volunteer workers from other communities into the Harlem area to exploit these conditions. They know that the majority of the residents in Harlem are hungry, cold, and destitute and they tell them that their salvation is in the election to city council of a member of the Communist Party who will fight their battles. The final result of this reasoning of this corrupt leadership in Harlem is that a Communist now sits in the city council of the greatest and largest city in the world, claiming to represent the greatest concentration of Negro brains and wealth in the world. And what is the spectacle which the Negroes of Harlem are facing? We face the damaging actuality of a Negro, representing himself to the world as a leader of his people, being tried by the Federal Government for conspiring with others to violently overthrow our Government by force. And the Amsterdam News, the paper published in Harlem, carries this humiliating streamer in its issue of April 2: "Witness links Councilman Davis with Communist plot against United States."

Negroes the world over have their eyes on Harlem. They thought the day would never come when a member of the Negro race, whose loyalty to America is told on the battlefields of every war in which our country has been engaged, would ever be called upon by his Government to defend himself against charges which, if true, amount to treason.

The Communists are now working day and night in Harlem in an effort to convince the residents there that the charges against its councilman are only persecution, and that his only crime is that he has fought and has spoken out for the rights of the Negro people. But, we of Harlem answer back. When? The fight of the American Negro is for justice, equal opportunity, and for complete civil and human rights. Our battles are being fought successfully through the American courts and other constitutional channels by organizations like the NAACP, the National Urban League, the Community of Harlem Civic Association, and hosts of other patriotic organizations and their white friends. The fight is not and cannot be waged from the dingy quarters on East Twelfth Street, on orders from any foreign power, and we in Harlem are awake to that fact.

Harlem seeks a representative in the city council whose time can be spent in the behalf of the people of Harlem; a representative who will not have to spend his time defending himself from seditious, treasonable charges that he seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States while the rats of Harlem gnaw on the brown bodies of our babies. Who is responsible?

You will be surprised to know that in a recent poll taken by my public-relations firm to determine where each of the city officials and Harlem's elected political leaders stood on this subject of Communism in Harlem, not a single Harlem political leader would take a stand, because they couldn't afford to. They know that they are responsible for the Harlem Communist councilman being elected, therefore they lacked the courage to confess their sins to the misled, exploited 500,000 people of my community.

Ah, but my friends, the future is bright with hope. The day is not far distant when the people of Harlem, like the rest of the people of our great city, will be called upon to stand up as men and be counted. And when that count is complete I can predict that the votes will have been cast for a new leadership in Harlem, an American leadership; a leadership not only dedicated to, but one which will see that we get that public market, which the city fathers have promised us for 4 years, and which they are now using for political bait, to be reelected again. We are going to get a new leadership that will secure for us those brighter lights, cleaner streets, decent and ample housing; apartments with heat and hot water; playgrounds, better schools and school facilities, adequate hospitals and health facilities, a leadership not dominated by the uptown chamber of commerce, which is run by nonresidents, not dominated by the spoils system of a corrupt political machine, but a leadership run by the people of Harlem themselves, who fighting side by side, will build and elect a new leadership which will make our Harlem the showplace of New

York City—a virtual paradise of peace, prosperity, and a beauty spot of the world. I thank you.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Telegraph published in Sidney, Nebr., entitled "The Lowe Down."

Mr. Speaker, Jack Lowe, one of the editors of the Telegraph, has written a satire on socialized medicine. It is written in the typical Jack Lowe trenchant wit and sardonic manner. The article will no doubt delight the proponents of socialized medicine and displease its opponents. It does hold up to ridicule and scorn and discredit the fantastic idea of socialized medicine.

The article follows:

THE LOWE DOWN

(By Jack H. Lowe)

Now that Mr. Truman has decided to put the Government in the medical business my worries are over. No longer must I tip my hat to the doctor. No longer must I duck into the alley when I see him coming down the street. Uncle Sam is going to send him a check every month, just like you pay the grocer or the butcher. The new day is dawning. The era of the doctor bill is no more.

Harry has decided that doctors shall change their names for numbers. You won't ask for Dr. Jones when you call for medical advice. You'll ask for "No. 13", and if he doesn't show up within a reasonable time you can call the Federal militia and have him thrown in the clink for contempt of court.

It'll be a cinch to rout out a doctor in the middle of the night. Simply dial the number for the community medical center, start in with "No. 1" and keep counting until you find a doctor on duty. Sooner or later you're bound to hit the jackpot, although it may not be the fellow you want.

Socialized medicine is going to solve all of our worries. No monthly statements from the doctor, no frowns when you ignore your diet or fall off the wagon. Everything will be on a robot basis. You're a machine, the doctor's a machine, and Uncle Sam is a machine. You call him, he treats you and the check comes from Washington. What a sucker Pasteur was, wasting all those years trying to learn something.

It's like this. You'll go into the doctor's office and they'll hand you a ticket with a number on it. It means that you will be treated in turn. If you're dying of ulcers or merely wanting a wart touched up, it's all the same. You're paying the same amount of money as the fellow ahead of you and you either stand in line or die. Pretty soon, a nurse tells you to come this way and you walk into a small room where you fill out some papers (eight copies of course, this being a Government operation) and you swear allegiance to the flag and vow that you aren't a Communist.

These preliminaries out of the way, you step into another room where they have a number of graphs and charts. The Government is great for graphs and charts and you have to prove your aptitude before they can decide which doctor is to treat you. The results are run through a calculating machine, then a long-distance call is placed to Washington for a conference with the Surgeon General (no one working for the Government ever writes or wires—it's strictly long distance).

If it is found that you can qualify for consideration, you then step into the next room where you take off your shirt to prove that the Democratic donkey is tattooed on your chest. This is the final and greatest test. If you voted for Dewey, they send you to the basement where the internes and orderlies use you for a guinea pig. But if you have irrefutable proof of a straight Democratic ticket, you step into the plush-lined office where the head butcher gives you his personal attention.

The nice thing is that it won't cost anyone a cent. It's utopia with the fringe on top. Harry knows how to keep you well for free. They simply take a small portion out of each pay check, after they have nicked you for withholding tax, social security, old-age pension, State aid, and various other items, and you get to take all the rest of your dough home to the little woman, provided, of course, that you can get by the corner saloon without stubbing your toe.

What a wonderful age this is. Chicken every Sunday, frosting on every cake, ruddy health in every cheek, and it's free.

What a fool I was to vote against Harry. When I have my next operation the Government surgeons will use a can opener, and it will serve me right. Socialized medicine, it's wonderful. I'll have my nurses blond, blue-eyed, 114 pounds, and shapely. As a citizen of the United States, I demand my rights.

Maryland Solves Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the third in a series of articles entitled "Maryland Solves Health Problem," by Agnes E. Meyer, and which appears daily in the Washington Post:

MARYLAND SOLVES HEALTH PROBLEM

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

(Third of a series)

Dr. Roberts, State medical director, says that 90 percent of the indigent are now receiving good treatment under the Maryland health plan, whereas the medically indigent for lack of funds, are getting only emergency care. Varying economic conditions play a decisive role. In some of the impoverished counties the budget is not sufficient for the care of the heavy relief rolls.

In Montgomery County, one of the richest counties in the whole country, where the relief load is as low as 728 in a population of 140,000, the number of medically indigent that are reached is at least three times that of the relief clients, or about 1,200 out of a monthly total of 1,500 clients.

In determining medical indigency, great leeway has been given the county health officers. They interpret the regulations wisely and as generously as their budgets permit. In general, the top salary for eligibility is $1,000 per year, per individual. In some of the poor counties, the great number of low incomes sets a limit of $750; $200 additional income is allowed for every additional member of the family.

Thus, big families with higher incomes are eligible, whereas the small family with the same income is not eligible. This is just but it is hard to interpret to the smaller families. The casual worker who refuses to work more days of the week than will just keep his family in food, clothing, and shelter—a common type in our country—is another problem. On a per diem basis, such families are ineligible but they can't be refused medical care without punishing the children. In spite of these complications, most of the health officers do an excellent job of selecting the neediest cases among the border-line income groups. Because medical problems are always involved in these decisions, it is considered advantageous to leave them to the health department.

NO SENSE OF DISGRACE

As the means test is usually condemned as somehow degrading to individual dignity, I listened to some of the interviews to gage the attitude of the clients. Feeling they might resent a witness, I asked their permission to be present. Most of them said "Why sure, why not?" And the conversation with the examining clerk was in this same matter-of-fact tone.

In other words, there was no more sense of disgrace involved than the wealthier clients of the Mayo Clinic feel when they give similiar information as to their incomes. We forget that most hospital patients receive charges graded to income. There is no reason why the lower-income groups should object to it more than the others. In fact, they don't object when it is done in the friendly manner used in these county health departments.

The problem as to who is medically indigent has not yet been solved in general terms. Perhaps it never can be rigidly defined even on a State-wide, much less a Nation-wide, basis, because economic, social, and geographical conditions are so varied in our country.

But Dr. Perry Prather, Washington County health officer, who practiced medicine 40 years in his county before accepting this office, is convinced that if poverty creates bad health, bad health also creates poverty. "Therefore, we preserve the independence and productivity of our marginal income groups," he maintains, "if we protect their health by a tax-supported program. It is more humane and more economical to keep them from sinking into indigency and total dependence upon relief funds."

IN THEIR STRIDE

The county health officers have, so to speak, taken the new medical-care program in their stride. At first they were afraid of the abuses and red tape involved in public medical-care programs. But the administrative procedures and the paper work have been reduced to a minimum. None of the health officers find the program burdensome. But they foresee that an assistant executive will be necessary as the program expands and outweighs in importance the routine responsibilities of a health department.

These health officers are the focal point of the medical program much the way that great American institution, the agricultural county agent, is the link between the farmers and the Federal-State agricultural program. Just as the county agent keeps the farmers in touch with the latest agricultural discoveries, so also the county health officer has become in Maryland the link between the medical practitioners and the great world of medical research centered in Baltimore.

A program of Federal aid to the care of the lowest income groups could, therefore, be readily added to Maryland's existing medical-care programs, if the same policies of administrative decentralization are used which have made the county agent's office one of

the best examples we possess of our American genius for Federal-State-local cooperative endeavor. Before such a program is feasible on a Nation-wide basis, every area in the country would have to have what we need in any case, a full-time physician health officer, experienced in the distribution of medical care.

NO COMPULSION

Although there is no compulsion upon doctors, dentists, or pharmacists to join the program, practically all of them have done so. At the end of each month they send their bills to the county health officer, who forwards them to the State health department, from which payment is issued. Comparison of the reports enables the health officers to detect any accounts that greatly exceed the average. If it is indicated that some doctor is making too many visits to the same client, or has too high a drug bill, he is asked to explain why he is so far out of line with his fellow practitioners.

If the clients become too exacting or are caught shopping around from one doctor's office to the next, the doctors can readily check this abuse of their time and energies. Moreover, the doctors feel that they should themselves handle the occasional chiseling fellow-practitioner and not throw this re-responsibility on the health officers.

"The health officer should be empowered to report any chiseling doctor to his medical society," said Dr. Edward J. Edelin, of Charles County. "It is time that our medical societies took more responsibility for the standards and integrity of the profession. There is no other way for us to clean house." On the whole, the abuse of the program is small, either by patients or doctors, as a result of these decentralized controls.

What hampers the program is the fact that it is uneconomic greatly to expand hospital, diagnostic, and other facilities for a program that serves 3 percent of the population. If health centers or diagnostic clinics are to be developed on a wide scale, the plan must be extended to a larger segment of the population. This in turn depends upon the willingness of the legislature to vote a more adequate budget for medical care of the lowest income groups.

For 1948 the total budget is $543,424.

Hospitalization costs which are paid separately are probably about an equal amount. As the medical-care program reached 19,467 people, the cost per patient per year was about $28. This gives us a fair idea of the minimum cost of such a program if it were extended throughout the Nation. The Maryland budget moreover includes at present only limited dental care and does not meet the incredibly high demand for dentures and eyeglasses.

WELL-OFFICERED

Maryland has an unusual advantage in the high caliber of its local health officers. This is due partly to the fact that the local people are interested in their health programs and give them voluntary support, and partly to the leadership given by the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health. But the health officers will tell you that the superior quality of the State's health and medical programs depends principally upon the amount of citizen participation.

In every county it differs. Most highly organized is large and wealthy Montgomery County. Its nationally known health officer, Dr. V. L. Ellicott, gives credit for the development of the county's well-distributed public health services to the constant support he has had from the lay county council, the county health fund and other voluntary groups, most of whom are represented on the Medical Care Advisory Committee.

On the other hand, in less populated and less prosperous areas like Charles County, where voluntary organizations have limited financial resources, it is the health officer himself, Dr. William Harris, who is obliged to take the lead in coordinating the efforts of the County Medical Association with those of the public and private agencies. But throughout the State, the people of Maryland are becoming ever more conscious of the fact that their health and medical problems must be solved where they arise, in the ever-varying nature of local conditions, and that their solution depends upon widespread community interest and cooperation.

THE FIRST STEPS

As the United States Public Health Service estimates that only 5 percent of the American population have health departments whose basic staffs are complete, the first step in extending Maryland's health plan throughout the Nation would be Federal and State aid for those areas that cannot afford to pay an adequate salary for a full-time public-health officer. For a decentralized medical program such as Maryland's can never be better than the quality of the local health officer.

But a health program, so organized, will not only serve the lowest income groups with a minimum of administrative costs and red tape. It will result in educational benefits to the local practitioners which will be reflected in better health services to the whole population.

As Dr. Maurice C. Pincoffs, professor of medicine at the Maryland University School of Medicine, has pointed out to the Maryland county medical societies: "If we succeed in improving the medical care of our dependent groups, we shall raise the standards of private practice and improve the care of the people as a whole."

"We are very conscious that this is so," said Dr. Ernest Poole, secretary of the Washington County Medical Society. "Perhaps that is the main reason why the doctors have become steadily more enthusiastic about the program. We are all working harder, seeing more patients, and widening our horizons.

"We are not satisfied with the program because it doesn't reach all of the medically indigent who are entitled to it. But it is so close to the people that no politician can use compulsory health insurance to get himself elected in our State. We know we've got something better. In learning how to give the best medical care to the lowest income groups, we are laying the soundest foundation for an effective program of voluntary health insurance."

Dr. Carpenter's Interfaith Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of May 3. I hope that Dr. Carpenter's activity in our community will continue for many years to inspire all of us.

DR. CARPENTER'S INTERFAITH HONOR

For 25 years Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, president of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council, has been active in interfaith work in Brooklyn. Cooperation is a by-word of his and proof of his belief in its efficacy is the fact that he is the author of Peace Through Cooperation. Such has been his work and such his convictions that the Kings County Council of Jewish Veterans could not have made a happier choice in singling him out as the recipient of its plaque for Brooklyn's most outstanding interfaith leader for 1949.

Nor could there be in these times more important work than that in which he has been engaged. He spoke, in accepting the award, of the need for true freedom, justice, and brotherhood in the interests of peace. And in making the award Past National Commander Abraham Kraditor spoke of Dr. Carpenter's endless efforts to promote good relations among the different Brooklyn groups, relations essential to a healthy community. We can hardly hope for peace among nations until we learn the value of peace among ourselves.

Those Intrepid Little Heroes of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Honorable George V. Cavanaugh, city judge, city of Mishawaka, Ind., disclosing how we can pay respect to the homing pigeon that rendered inestimable services during our World Wars:

DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
Mishawaka, Ind., April 25, 1949.

Hon. THURMAN C. CROOK,
Indiana Third District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I first advocated the issuance of a postage stamp nearly 30 years ago. The story is a long one. Mishawaka is a center of pigeon fanciers because of the large percentage of Belgians (all naturalized, good American citizens) and a great many men and women natural born citizens in Mishawaka in the past 50 years, of Belgian descent. Many people do not realize that we gave our best birds to the Government for a nominal sum of $4 a pair in 1917 and 1918, the time of the First World War; that the homing pigeon is protected by Federal and State statute. I, personally, worded the Indiana statute and presented it to the State conservation department; that the Government ever since has maintained a small number of lofts where birds, i. e., pigeons, are reared and trained for the Army and Navy; that they are indispensable.

It seems to me that there never was a time when there was a better time for the obtaining of such a postage stamp. Any denomination would serve our purpose. In the American Racing Pigeon Union there are over 11,000 members. The Mishawaka Liberty (South Bend) and the South Bend club are affiliated with the national organization.

WHY A PIGEON POSTAGE STAMP

Nearly 30 years ago I advocated a United States postage stamp to recognize and commemorate those intrepid little heroes of the air for their work in World War I. Quoting from page 58, "History and Rhymes of the Lost Battalion," by Buds Private McCollum, I find it says, "A great many word pictures, at the time and since, have been painted of the Gethsemane through which the heroic battalion was passing during those 5 days". In this connection it is interesting to read what the chief actor in the drama was writing himself, and sending back to headquarters by his carrier pigeons the only line

of communication left open. Those messages are in the official files of the United States War Department and as as follows:

First message carried from Major Whittlesey: Pigeon No. 1, "We are being shelled by German artillery. Can we not have artillery support?"

The second message: Pigeon No. 2, "Our posts are broken, one runner captured. Germans in small numbers in our left rear. Have located German mortar and sent platoon to get it. E Company met heavy resistance, at least 20 casualties."

Pigeon No. 3, "Germans are on cliff north of us and have had to evacuate both flanks. Situation very serious. Broke through two of our runner posts today. Casualties yesterday 6 killed, 80 wounded. In the same companies today 1 killed, 60 wounded. Present effective strength of companies here 245." (Whittlesey went in with 679 effectives), and so the story ran until his last pigeon was released. After that he went militarily dumb.

His last message read "Men are suffering from hunger and exposure and the wounded are in very bad condition. Cannot support be sent at once?" Whittlesey wrote that message and he gave due credit to his pigeons.

The above are the facts on which I base my case. Not that it is a fine hobby, not that it is followed by thousands of good sports, not that it is fostered in Mishawaka by our good Belgian citizenry, but on their real war record, on the acts of Cher Ami in the Smithsonian in Washington, the bird decorated on the recommendation of Gen. "Black Jack" Pershing himself.

GEO. V. CAVANAUGH,
Judge of Mishawaka, Ind., City Court, and a Pigeon Fancier for a Lifetime.

Servitude for the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, once said:

The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

I live among and represent American farmers who love liberty, and not servitude. Their forefathers fought for liberty, and passed it down as a heritage to them. Neither they nor their sons nor their daughters propose to sacrifice this great heritage to those who would, if they could, deprive them of it through bribes, doles, subventions, and even worse.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Fred Brenckman, formerly Washington representative of the National Grange:

THE PROPOSED NEW FARM PLAN

(By Fred Brenckman)

After several months of intensive study and investigation on the part of the top-flight officials of his department, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan on April 7 submitted the outlines of a new farm plan at a joint hearing before the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. At subsequent hearings before the House committee, Mr. Brannan was questioned at length regarding many angles in connection with the workings of the plan he advanced.

Basically, it may be said that the new plan is in harmony with the pledges given by President Truman during the last campaign, when he proposed high prices for farmers, coupled with lower costs of living for consumers.

NEW SUPPORT FORMULA

The plan advanced by Mr. Brannan would abandon the price parity system established in the early days of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It would provide as a substitute a formula to set a total cash income goal every year. Then the Government would use loans and direct payments or subsidies to attain this income goal for farmers.

Mr. Brannan calculated that the income goal for farm cash receipts in 1950 should be $26,234,000,000, based on March 15 costs. That would be somewhat less than the $27,500,000,000 estimated cash income of farmers in 1949, and it would be well under the 1948 level of $31,000,000,000.

In discussing his plan, Secretary Brannan said:

"The standard of support has been established with reference to income criteria rather than price criteria. A recent 10-year period has been selected as the base. Simplicity of computation and application has been a constant aim.

"The recommended price-support standard for any specific commodity does not represent a parity price nor does the composite average represent parity income as those terms are statutorily defined and commonly understood. This income standard simply represents a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall, and above which I hope to find most farm prices most of the time. It is the minimum level from which we would be working toward narrowing, and eventually closing, the historical gap between farm and nonfarm income."

Taking as a moving base the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings for the years 1939 through 1948, the plan would set up an income-support standard, together with a specific price-support standard for individual commodities.

SOME ATTACHED CONDITIONS

Mr. Brannan emphasized the point that under his plan price supports for farm products could not be separated from the acceptance by farmers of reasonable undertakings to advance or accomplish the over-all objectives of the plan. Among the conditions he enumerated were the following:

1. The observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices.

2. Compliance with or adoption of whatever programs are found necessary to curtail wasteful production or disorderly marketing. Included in this would be such measures as acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements which might be adopted from time to time through referendums or by the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under terms of specific legislation such as is now on the staute books.

3. The limitation of eligibility for price support to a stated volume of production on each farm. This limit would be set at a point that would not encourage the development of extremely large, industrialized farming.

Under the plan advocated by Mr. Brannan, for perishable commodities, such as milk, eggs, and meat, a new system of direct payments would be used. Under this scheme, the Government would allow the market prices for these perishables to vary with supply and demand. The difference between the market price and the sum calculated to be the support level would be given to the farmer in cash.

That it would call for a degree of regimentation far greater than anything that the farmers of America have heretofore known appears to be a safe assertion to make.

The plan is adroitly put together to appeal at one and the same time to both producers and consumers of farm products. Farmers are to get a high income, while consumers are encouraged to expect lower prices.

However, it must not be overlooked that both farmers and consumers would be taxed to raise the money necessary for payment of subsidies. They would also have to pay the administrative costs. There are those who declare that the CIO and the Farmers Union exercised a potent influence in the formulation of the plan, which is supposed to have the sanction of President Truman.

LONG-RANGE THINKING NEEDED

In the development of a long-range farm program it would be well for the farmers to do some long-range thinking. In the early days of the Republic, about 90 percent of the people lived on farms, and they molded the policies of the country. But from decade to decade the farm population has shown a relative decline as compared with the population as a whole. In 1940 only about 22 percent of the population was directly engaged in agriculture. According to estimates of the Census Bureau, only 19 percent of the people of the United States live on farms today. The other 81 percent are consumers.

In the long run, what the majority of the people want in a democracy, they are likely to get, if it is in the power of the Government to give it to them.

It is a fundamental trait in human nature that we try to satisfy our wants in the line of least resistance. While wishing the farmer well in a general way, what consumers want is cheap food. If prices of farm commodities are to be determined at congressional and presidential elections, where majority rules, then the farmers of the country will some day find themselves in a predicament from which it will be difficult if not impossible for them to extricate themselves.

Patriotic Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Monday, May 2, 1949:

UNSUNG FBI HEROES

It is about time that a song of praise was raised for two unsung American heroes. They shot no enemies and won no medals during the war. But there must be plenty of veterans who would not have traded combat duty for the assignment that these two had.

We refer to Herbert A. Philbrick and Angela Colomiris, the FBI informants who recently testified at the trial of the Communist leaders in New York. Mr. Philbrick spent 9 years in the Communist movement. Miss Colomiris was a party member for 7. The former said he received only his expenses from the Government during that time. Miss Colomiris made no mention of being recompensed at all.

Theirs was not only a patriotic service. It must have been of the most nerve-wracking dramatic performances ever given. And without meaning to take any credit from the young woman volunteer, we would guess that what Mr. Philbrick went through was enough to tax his sanity.

He maintained his job and a normal home life. He deceived his family completely. But what is more important, he deceived the Communists. Both he and Miss Colomiris held important positions in the party which gave them, among other things, an accurate line on party membership in their respective groups in Boston and New York.

It is trying enough to most of us whoever went through the experience to spend any length of time with native Communists. They are desperately earnest, tiresomely argumentative, maddeningly illogical and, so far as we have been able to observe, totally devoid of a sense of humor.

But if the obvious non-Communist finds them trying, what must it be like to be a non-Communist who pretends to be a believer? Never once should he lower his guard. Never once when his exasperation approached the breaking point, as surely it must have, could he rise up in meeting, shout "Oh, nuts!" and stalk out. He had to stay and take it and pretend to like it.

Further, the masquerading non-Communist had to take insults from his loyal fellow-Americans in public appearances as a Communist demonstrator. And more than that, he must have been conscious of the ever-present risk of being found out.

When at last Miss Colomiris and Mr. Philbrick were allowed to drop their disguises and appear as themselves their relief must have been worth all the compensation that they deserved and did not receive. But the disclosure of their past activity makes one wondow how many other patriots are performing similar duties, and when they will be relieved of the arduous role of a double life.

Undoubtedly the American Communists are wondering the same thing, and wondering it very seriously. It may be expected that, because of these trial revelations, their vigilance will be redoubled in every cell throughout the country. They will be alert for any suspicious move by other volunteers. And this can scarcely help but make the tension and risk even greater for the invaluable informants who still remain in the Communist ranks.

We don't know exactly what this Nation or its Government can do by way of thanks to these brave young people. But we hope that they will somehow realize that a great many of their countrymen, who have neither the chance nor skill nor courage to do what they have done, appreciate their services deeply. Amid all the emotionalism and publicity that surrounds the campaign against the menace of communism, they are doing a quiet, secret work that really counts.

Yosemite Pays Its Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, some Members of the House, and particularly those on Appropriations, may be interested in the fact that one park pays its way. I wish to place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. John C. Kingman, the chairman of the Mariposa County Democratic Control Committee in my State, in which he shows the revenue collected in Yosemite is $537,090 and the amount of Federal taxes paid is $525,455 for a total of over a million dollars, whereas the appropriation for that park was $543,450 for 1948:

MARIPOSA COUNTY DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
April 20, 1949.

The Honorable CLAIR ENGLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGLE: At a recent meeting of the Democratic Central Committee of Mariposa County, the chairman of the committee was instructed to write this letter to you, sending copies to other California Congressmen and Senators, advising you of the grave concern with which the committee views the present policies of the Department of the Interior regarding appropriations for national parks.

We are sure that you are familiar with the fact that Mariposa County is normally Democratic in the proportion of 2 to 1. We, as the Democratic central committee, were considerably alarmed when our Democratic registration in the election last fall voted for a Republican President, a Republican State senator, and a Republican State assemblyman. You, yourself, were the only Democrat to carry our county. Even more significant were the returns in Yosemite National Park where both precincts, one covering employees of the National Park Service and the other employees of the Yosemite Park & Curry Co., returned Republican majorities. Our analysis of the situation is that this vote was a protest vote against the fiscal policies presently affecting the national parks.

Mariposa County is a sparsely settled county with few natural resources. The tourist trade resulting from visitors to Yosemite National Park is the largest single item in our economy. Since something over half of the land within the county is under the control of the Federal Government, our prosperity depends upon the wisdom with which these areas are administered.

During 1948 the appropriation for the National Park Service in Yosemite was $543,450. Against that amount $537,090 was collected in Yosemite from the sale of automobile permits and public utility services. The actual out-of-pocket outlay made by the United States Government during 1948 in Yosemite National Park was consequently only $6,360.

In addition, from the Yosemite Park and Curry Co. alone, including the payments made by its employees and guests, the United States Government collected in taxes $525,455. We have made no attempt to determine the taxes paid by other corporations and individuals within the boundaries of the Park. On the basis of just these few figures, it is obvious that the operation of Yosemite National Park during 1948 produced a net profit for the Government of something considerably more than $1,500,000.

In a county with a population of about 6,000 persons, $1,500,000 withdrawn from circulation within the county each year is an overwhelming economic handicap. On a national scale, $500,000 is, to use the vernacular, "peanuts." It is less than 1 percent of the amount being appropriated right now for the Central Valley project. That project, more or less, encircles our county and we receive little benefit. Our share of the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent for the conservation of natural resources is $6,360.

We understand that the United States Government has an investment in Yosemite National Park of some $12,000,000. To maintain that investment we believe we can say categorically that no appropriations are made. It is a policy of expediency and short-sightedness which even the smallest private businessman would understand as an extreme in incompetency.

The roads and trails in Yosemite National Park are falling to pieces, the sewage plant is outmoded, the electric system falls so short of meeting present-day requirements that the residents of the park are threatened with power failures each time the weather turns cold. If persisted in, this present policy will cost the Government millions of dollars to replace facilities which could be protected for a relatively small allotment.

Unfortunately, we know that the situation in Yosemite is duplicated in every park, monument, and historical site administrated by the National Park Service. Bernard DeVoto in his column in the March 1949 issue of Harper's Magazine, has presented in capsule form the situation as it applies nationally. It should not be necessary for laymen to bring these things to the attention of the Congress. The local administrators in all of the areas under the supervision of the National Park Service raise these points every year. Because of the restrictions placed upon the office of the Secretary of the Interior, this information is slighted, and it never becomes a part of budgetary requests.

We feel sure that if the situation we are describing were made known to the Congress and to the people at large, policies of the present would be reversed and the National Park Service would be enabled adequately to maintain and preserve these great areas which the people of the United States have set aside for the enjoyment of future generations.

There is no lack of information regarding the specific needs in Yosemite National Park. That the funds required to meet them are regularly screened out of the budget for the Interior Department is scarcely attributable to motives of economy, since that same Department indulges freely in "bull roaring," as DeVoto puts it, in its clamor for ever-increasing sums for reclamation, public power, and other more politically sensitive causes. Nor, in appraising the Department's current efforts to acquire the concession facilities in the national parks, can we escape some misgivings at the prospect of entrusting additional properties to officials who evince so little apparent concern for those already in their hands.

We fully recognize the stupendous financial burden under which the country's economy is staggering. We are aware also of the Democratic Party's pledge to improve the lot of our citizens. Vast sums are being expended toward the redemption of that pledge. But the amounts required for the national parks are so insignificant by comparison that they can scarcely weigh in the total administrative budget. Even if this were not so, there is no consistency in a program which purports to benefit our country while leaving unattended those very areas which an earlier wisdom set aside as America's finest.

Very truly yours,

MARIPOSA COUNTY DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
JOHN C. KINGMAN, *Chairman.*

The Basing-Point System in West Virginia—Cement Trust Deprives Small Business in West Virginia of Natural Advantages—West Virginia Cement Mills Were All Nonbase Mills—Small Business in West Virginia Aggressive, but Needs Protection of Antitrust Laws—Moratorium Would Have the Effect of Nullifying Supreme Court Decision in Cement Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia has had for many years portland cement mills within its borders. West Virginia abounds in natural resources, and materials for the manufacture of cement are found in abundance. But West Virginia cement mills, prior to the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case, April 26, 1948, were non-basing-point mills. That is to say, every time a West Virginian bought a barrel of cement he was paying a price based on a cement mill somewhere else than within the State of West Virginia. The basing-point mills in other States set the pattern of cement prices in West Virginia, and West Virginians paid the bill.

CEMENT TRUST HAD GOOD REASONS FOR OMITTING WEST VIRGINIA BASING POINTS

There were very good reasons why West Virginia has had no basing-point mills—good reasons, at least, in the little black book the Cement Trust used prior to the Supreme Court decision. One mill in southern West Virginia is owned by the Basic Products Co. This company operates another non-basing-point mill in southwestern Pennsylvania; the basing-point mill was its neighbor, Universal-Atlas Portland Cement Co. A second mill in northern West Virginia, near Manheim, is owned by the Alpha Portland Cement Co., which also has a mill at Ironton, Ohio. The Ironton mill was a basing-point mill. The third West Virginia mill, near Martinsville, was owned by the Standard Lime & Stone Co. and apparently was based on two Lehigh portland cement mills, one at Union Bridge, Md., and the other at Fordwick, Va.

Thus, West Virginia was not only bounded geographically by her neighboring States but was also bounded by the Cement Trust, which ringed her with basing points and thereby exacted phantom freight from her citizens and her State government for many, many years.

The West Virginia situation before the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case on April 26, 1948, is just one illustration of a multitude of the inequities which existed under the basing-point system of pricing. In the case of West Virginia a whole State was involved. In other instances parts of States were affected by the system which had for its keystone the addition of arbitrary charges for freight from distant points instead of actual freight charges from the point of origin. This is the system—the basing-point system—that the cement, the steel, and other monopolies would now have legalized by legislative procedure. That is the real intent and purpose of the industrialists who so warmly support a moratorium.

MORATORIUM ONLY USEFUL TO BIG BUSINESS

A moratorium on what? Not a moratorium for a meritorious or a deserving cause. But, a moratorium on unfair trade practices, price discrimination, combination in the restraint of trade, and all of the categories of illegal and unfair business operations. I do not say for a moment that these results are intended by the sponsors of the pending moratorium bills, S. 1008 and H. R. 2222. To the contrary, I know these bill spring from the very best of motives. However, big-business attorneys will read into any moratorium act intentions which the Congress never had and will argue authoritatively through the courts on points already decided. These learned gentlemen will take a word, a comma, or a semicolon and use it like a divining rod to locate the precious metal in the moratorium bill. It is not clarity they seek, for that they have, but confusion with which to unsettle issues previously resolved.

SUPREME COURT DECISION MADE ALL MILLS IN WEST VIRGINIA BASING POINTS

The Supreme Court in its opinion in the Cement case, April 26, 1948, stated in part:

> The core of the charge was that the respondents had restrained and hindered competition in the sale and distribution of cement by means of a combination among themselves made effective through mutual understanding or agreement to employ a multiple-basing-point system of pricing.

The decision of the Supreme Court upheld the charges of the Federal Trade Commission by a 6 to 1 vote. This is the decision which big business immediately attacked on all fronts. This is the decision which prompted the plea to Congress for a moratorium.

Had there been no basing-point system, West Virginia and West Virginians would not have been forced to purchase cement based on points in Virginia, Tennessee, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. West Virginia was entirely surrounded by basing points but despite three cement mills within her borders she had none of her own. So it was that West Virginia paid phantom freight of many millions of dollars, for West Virginia is a highly industrialized State, a good-roads State, and a progressive State as witnessed by her tremendous public improvements.

SMALL BUSINESS IN WEST VIRGINIA ACTIVE AND AGGRESSIVE

West Virginia is blessed with hundreds of small-business enterprises, burrowing deep into natural resources, too numerous to mention, and utilizing the power of coal and water to a high degree. Beautiful glass in all colors of the spectrum is manufactured from West Virginia's fine silicates to grace the windows in our cathedrals and churches. Fine pottery, woodworking plants, steel-fabricating plants, chemicals, coal mining, and the whole gamut of industrial activity is the handiwork of small-business enterprise in West Virginia. To which may be added by way of comment the additional hundreds of mercantile establishments, service units, hotels, garages, and so on, which add to the business structure of the Mountain State. The motto of West Virginia is Montani Semper Liberi—Mountaineers are always freemen. How true this is, and how much truer it will be if our fight to curb monopolies is not thwarted by unwise and unsound legislation—legislation which will restore to big business unnatural advantages that far outweigh any natural advantages that may accrue to small business by reason of availability of raw materials and natural aggressiveness.

The Entire Country Needs a Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert herewith a statement by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Girard Davidson regarding the Columbia Valley Administration:

THE ENTIRE COUNTRY NEEDS A COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

The entire country needs a Columbia Valley Administration—not merely the States of the Pacific Northwest. And the decision to establish this Administration should be made on the grounds of national interest—not on grounds of local or regional interest.

When the TVA was established, it met the needs of the entire country. The whole Nation had paid for years for the cost of floods on the Tennessee; had paid the consequences of the lower incomes of people of the valley; had felt the impact of smaller crop output because of depleted soils in the valley. The lower incomes of the valley meant less business for the rest of the country in selling to the people of the valley electric appliances, housing, food, clothing, and other products. The lower incomes meant more malnutrition and disease, and a smaller number of men able to pass the Army and Navy physical tests.

Today the valley is much richer, thanks to the TVA, and so is the entire country. The country saves about $1,000,000 annually because of the flood-control benefits of TVA, which means that much less call for Red Cross contributions or for special appropriations for flood relief by Congress. And while everybody saves this money, farmers on 6,000,000 acres of the lower Ohio and Mississippi Basins have their crops protected. The power output since TVA was established has increased 10 times, and the rest of the Nation is selling to the people in the valley more electric appliances, and is taking from

the new industries of the valley chemicals, aluminum and other products and employing on these products more additional workers than the new industries employ in the valley itself. The rapid growth of river navigation in the valley has saved the rest of the country millions of dollars in transportation costs on the products it sells to the valley and those it buys from the valley. Farmers all over the country produced more crops than otherwise, thanks to TVA demonstration and developmental work with phosphate fertilizers on thousands of farms both in and outside of the valley. With incomes higher, the health of the valley is much better, malaria has decreased. The rest of the country found the valley better able to provide men for the armed services in World War II.

In the Columbia River area the Nation needs a CVA. Although some problems are different from those of the Tennesee Valley there are undeveloped opportunities that will be fulfilled sooner and at less cost than if there is no CVA. Floods have to be controlled like that of 1948, but there should be one agency at work, not a mixture of State and Federal agencies. There are nearly 29,000,000 kilowatts of water power yet to be converted into electric power, now wasting annually to the sea. This is the equivalent of almost 400,000,000 barrels of oil annually, or one-fifth of what the country now produces. A CVA can develop and sell this power sooner and at less cost than can the three Federal agencies that now separately handle parts of the power problem. The security of the Nation will improve the sooner this power is developed, because very important industries are holding back their expansion until they can get the power. These industries, which have been turned down for expansion in the past 2 years in the Northwest, include aluminum, phosphates, ferro-alloys, and abrasives. All of these products are important in war. The population of the Northwest has increased 35 percent in the past 8 years—three times faster than the increase in the rest of the country. Unemployment, although small, has been three times the rate in the rest of the country. A CVA will mean more job opportunities and relatively less unemployment than if there is no CVA. For the whole country this means more income for people in the Northwest with which to buy goods from other regions.

A CVA will pay off to the Nation the way TVA has. Today, the valley supports the TVA and would vote for it if a referendum were held. But back in 1933, the people of the valley would have been confused by the kind of talk now made against a CVA. The people of the TVA area would have been told they were going socialistic, that they would be giving up their local rights to govern themselves. They probably would have voted against a TVA. But fortunately for them and the country, the decision for a TVA was made by the Congress and the President on grounds of national interest.

A CVA should be decided on the same ground of national need. The arguments against CVA from some selfish people in the Northwest are the old arguments of business groups who mask their opposition to social progress with catcalls of socialism.

Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, wisely advises his fellow businessmen in a recent article in Fortune to become more social-minded. He points out that they opposed workmen's compensation, minimum-wage legislation, insurance of bank deposits, social security, parity prices, and legalized collective bargaining. They said these measures would lead to socialism. But Mr. Johnston calls on businessmen for more social thinking in order to prevent socialism. A CVA represents just that kind of thinking. The TVA helped private competitive enterprise throughout the country. A CVA will do likewise.

There are no valid arguments against a CVA. For the good of the entire country, a CVA must be established.

The Current Trend in the Capital Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. On last Friday night, April 29, at the Mayflower Hotel, here in Washington, Mr. Emil Schram delivered at a general membership meeting of the Washington Board of Trade, an address which I believe is of great interest to the Members of this House. Mr. Schram to my mind is one of the greatest and soundest financial experts in the country. You will recall he was for many years Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. When he resigned that office in 1941 he was elected president of the New York Stock Exchange and has since continued in that office.

Mr. Schram, in his address, sounds a warning when he points out the danger in the growing trend to permit life-insurance companies to buy common stocks. That danger, in my opinion, is real and unless we face it squarely and stop the trend we shall be enmeshed in it. We shall in that event have the greatest concentration of wealth and power in the life-insurance companies which eventually will bring disaster to the companies themselves.

Mr. Schram's address follows:

For 16 years my chief concern has been the problem of capital. It just happens that during the first eight of the period I had an opportunity to observe capital problems through the eyes of a great Government lending agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. When I resigned as Chairman of the RFC in May 1941 to become president of the New York Stock Exchange, I merely shifted the focus of my attention to a great capital market. Although affairs have brought me to the Nation's Capital often in recent years, this is the first time since leaving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that I have had the good fortune to address so distinguished an audience as this in Washington, and I propose to take advantage of it to speak bluntly, hewing close to the line, let the chips fall where they may.

In investment practice, it is often said that to go against the trend is a cardinal mistake. As I have many other problems in addition to convincing people that I have no special claim to being an investment adviser, I shall not pause to wonder what one does when there is no trend in the markets. Very definitely there is a trend in national affairs which it is the duty of every responsible citizen to buck—I refer to the trend to take the line of least resistance and move along blithely with the most widespread current opinion in dealing with our economic and financial problems.

The late Justice Holmes once said that no generalization is worth a damn, adding, with his usual wit, "not even this one." To get away from generalizations, I must appear in a very distasteful role and I resort to the I-told-you-so pattern only to underscore the need for thinking against the trend. Last May, I testified before the United States Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report. You will recall the background. Commodity prices were soaring, construction activity and department store sales were making new peaks, and the monetary authorities were clamoring for new controls to stem inflation. Dire warnings were voiced as to the prospects for, and effects of continued spiralizing of inflationary factors.

At that time I stated that the area of shortages has shrunk. It is my conviction that it will shrink further in coming months as the remaining pipe lines are filled and production and consumption come into greater balance. * * * My thinking is along lines of stability. Provided we keep our heads, I do not fear runaway inflation, nor do I look for the great depression whose failure to appear has so chagrined the Marxian economists and statesmen. * * * We have emerged from the period of shortages and unless the Congress permits the budget to become unbalanced again, I firmly believe we have already entered the postwar period of stabilization."

For a few months, the facts making the headlines seemed to contradict these views, but the underlying forces, as subsequent developments have evidenced, unquestionably were moving in this direction.

My views were rooted in deep faith in the immense productive capacity of American industry and in equal faith that the American people would refuse to be stampeded into a flight from savings.

Without further comment on the past, I now turn to the areas where constructive thinking is most essential, which is merely another way of saying that these are the subjects where moving with the trend is most damaging to the national well-being. In short, among these tendencies are:

1. The trend toward centralization of authority in the Federal Government.

2. The trend toward concentrated financial power and influence of our life-insurance industry, due in part to altered saving habits of the public and the underlying quest for security.

3. The trend toward too much debt both corporate and individual; and

4. The trend toward punitive rates of taxes, in the name of an ill-conceived notion of what liberalism means, and without regard to the economic consequences of such taxation.

1. The centralization of government is in the realm of political science. I shall not pretend any special competence in this field. The eminent Members of the Congress, by whose presence I feel complimented may be relied upon to express in the fullest measure the idea that, after all, ours is still a Federal Government, making all allowance for changing economic and social conditions.

2. The blessings of life insurance need no elaboration and I unreservedly endorse insurance as one of the most tremendous forces for good in our national life and a remarkable illustration of cooperative voluntary achievement. There is no privately owned and managed business which is more affected with public interest than life insurance. Its size alone inspires awe. Life-insurance assets aggregate an amount approximately equal to 35 percent of the combined principal assets of some 14,000 banks comprising our commercial banking system. They are two and one-half times the assets of 533 mutual savings banks, and four and one-quarter times the assets of 3,733 savings and loan associations which are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The size of life-insurance companies is not the most significant fact. Their amazing rate of growth is even more striking. Fifty years ago, life-insurance-company assets amounted to approximately $1,300,000,000. By the end of the following decade, they exceeded $3,000,000,000, and in the next 10 years to 1917 practically doubled again to $6,000,000,000. Between 1917 and 1927, the increase was accelerated and in the latter year their assets had expanded to $14,400,000,000. By the end of 1937 they had grown to $26,000,000,000, and in the subsequent 10 years the increase again approached 100 percent so that at the end of 1947 the assets of life-insurance companies stood at approximately $52,000,000,000 and are now estimated to be in the neighborhood of $57,000,000,000.

In a recent article, Mr. Frank A. Schmitt, of the financial staff of the New York Herald Tribune, made a projection of life-insurance assets in 1957, by applying the smallest 10-year gain in the past half century. The projection brings the figure to $94,000,000,000. It is difficult to comprehend figures running to astronomical proportions. Just one added comparison—currently the market value of the 2,000,000,000 shares of stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange, representing 1,400 different issues, amounts to less than $70,000,000,000.

The sheer size and rapid growth of life-insurance companies inevitably bring them into close contact with the problem of capital and the capital markets. Beginning in the thirties, private placements have become more and more important. The registration requirements under the Securities Acts need not be complied with, for there is no public offering. It has been estimated that during the past 10 years approximately 30 percent of all security offerings by corporations have been placed privately. It may be true that in this matter we are dealing with a logical evolution, but the fact remains that life companies dominate the investment banking industry, and I wonder if the implications have been fully canvassed or whether the facts themselves are generally recognized.

For a time last year life-insurance companies were large sellers of Government securities, mainly long-term issues. Only unprecedentedly large purchases by the Federal Reserve banks at pegged prices prevented possible demoralization of the Government bond market. Unlike member banks, life-insurance companies are not subject to regulation by the Federal Reserve authorities.

Finally, the whole equity-debt problem is illuminated by what has happened in life insurance. Private insurance has been increasing at the rate of approximately $3,500,000,000 annually. In 1948, according to data of the Securities and Exchange Commission, it is estimated that all liquid savings aggregated $4,900,000,000, and private insurance alone absorbed $3,500,000,000, or 70 percent of the total. By reason of the large sums which flow to them, including amortization of mortgage debt and loans, life-insurance companies have necessarily come to play an increasingly significant part in the capital markets.

Since they are in the main restricted to the purchase of bonds and mortgages, and the making of loans, the question has arisen as to whether it would not be wise for life-insurance companies generally to be authorized to buy common stocks or purchase equity interests in real property more broadly. Extensive departures from previous investment practice have already been made. This has come about in two ways: Through the purchase of real property from business interests and the leasing back of these properties to their former owners, and through construction for their own account for similar purposes. They are in the residential construction field for their own account. The latter, in some instances, has been embarked upon pursuant to special legislation granting long-term tax concessions.

This problem, which received some attention in the prewar period, is being turned over intensively in the minds of economists and thoughtful insurance-company executives. It is only fair for me to add that executives of some of the largest life companies remain firm in their opposition to expanding the authority of life-insurance companies to buy equities, whether they be preferred or common stocks.

Simply to avoid misunderstanding, may I emphasize that the very thought of regulation by the Federal Government of the life-insurance industry is abhorrent to me. But if I were a responsible official of a life-insurance company, I would, on my own initiative, want to see a most searching analysis of every phase of the functions and operations of insurance companies. The flow and function of savings as they affect the capital markets generally urgently require reexamination, in my opinion.

3. There is too much debt and too much complacency about the rate at which private debt is expanding. All forms of net private debt (individual and corporate) amounted to $145,000,000,000 at the end of 1945, and at the end of last year it is estimated the aggregate of private debt had risen to approximately $190,000,000,000, probably the most rapid expansion in economic history. In 1948, corporations supplied $10,400,000,000 of their needed funds externally, i. e., aside from funds retained from operations. Out of this sum only about $1,000,000,000 or 10 percent was derived from the sale of stocks, both preferred and common. Our complacency derives from the unparalleled internal source of funds, principally retained earnings, which have been at a rate—partly because of fictitious inventory profits—that obviously cannot be maintained.

When profits turn down, it is the debt-burdened company that is the first to cut production, lay off employees and undercut prices to gain cash. Economists have long recognized that debt accentuates the downward spiral. Let us not forget one of the lessons of the thirties, and at least prove we can learn from the past. Debt adds to the inflexibility of the economic structure. Debt has a habit of becoming due when companies are least able to meet their obligations. Sinking-fund payments that seem light enough in prosperous times can be very troublesome when earnings contract and cash is depleted, and the very existence of old debt makes it difficult to obtain funds. Through a policy of low interest rates, through the practice of permitting interest on debt to be charged as an expense of operation before arriving at net income, and heavy taxes on earnings, we have encouraged getting into debt, and all of this comes on top of the institutional developments which have already created tendencies promoting the increase of debt and sheltered funds. I support the policy of retirement of Federal Government debt in a period of prosperity and high revenues but not at the price of large-scale increase in private debt.

4. The difficulty of raising equity capital today, reflected in the high price that must be paid for it, results from a number of developments of the past two decades. The growing desire of the average individual for security rather than risk and the seemingly more difficult task of entering into competition have been important. I believe, however, that tax impediments strewn in the path of risk takers have been the most significant reason for the failure of capital to perform its traditional function effectively.

It would be pleasant if we were in a position to make substantial reductions in all Federal taxes and thus have a ready solution to the problem. However, our heavy national debt, the continuing drain of pensions and other payments resulting from the recent wars, and our responsibilities in the world today make large tax cuts impossible at present. That is not to say we cannot correct certain features of our tax system that bear most heavily on equity financing, and, in fact, the prospect of a continued high level of taxation makes it imperative that we do correct them if we are to avoid economic stagnation.

Two features of the present tax structure that do most to discourage venture capital are the double taxation of distributed corporate earnings and the treatment of capital gains and losses.

When earnings generated by corporate enterprise are taxed twice at high rates, even large profits made by the business are so whittled down that the income ultimately retained by stockholders is little more than they could have realized by investing an equivalent amount of money in, let us say, a risk-free, tax-exempt bond. Since the corporation is the only device adequate for raising the vast amounts of capital needed in many lines of enterprise today, these taxes discriminate against the owners of corporations and stifle growth and progress in whole sectors of industry. In order to alleviate the situation as soon and as simply as possible, some tax credit for dividend income should be given at the personal level. A credit of this sort would cost less in revenue than is frequently assumed and the cost would be more than justified by the benefit to the economy. If a tax credit stimulated dividend distributions, it might even result in increased revenue to the Government.

Our present capital-gains tax acts as a deterrent to risk taking. A prospective risk taker is acutely conscious of the fact that if his venture succeeds a sizable share of any appreciation in the value of his investment will be taken in taxes when he sells his holdings; on the other side, if he suffers a loss he is allowed only a limited offset against other income. No system could be better devised to discourage risk taking at a time when confiscatory personal income taxes are a real burden. In order to correct the situation, the Government's "take" out of potential profits should be decreased. A move in this direction would stimulate the flow of venture capital by making all investment opportunities more attractive than they are under present capital-gains tax rates. Furthermore, there is a need to increase the amount by which losses can be offset against ordinary income. Existing provisions, written into the law in 1942, welcome as they then were, are insufficient in view of the present inflated price level to give much protection to even the relatively small investor. These suggested revisions in capital-gains taxes would contribute to the stability and orderliness of markets and would probably result in increased Federal revenues. Capital gains are not like ordinary income since they are realized only at the option of the taxpayer. A tax rate so high that it discourages realization of capital gains robs the Treasury of potential revenue.

The tax structure is geared so that, in the words of Prof. David McCord Wright, in his stimulating book Democracy and Progress, "The result is frequently a policy of those 'already there'—a policy which helps monopoly and increases social stratification.

"Most people, when they think at all about the reasoning behind progressive income taxes, suppose that if a man is making a large income he has a large fortune."

And again: "Profits must be, at the least, proportional to risks, and risk is subjective rather than objective. Furthermore, the off-chance, the one-in-a-hundred possibility, of

supernormal profit is among the great impelling forces of investment. History shows that the extraordinary returns on investment rarely survive longer than a generation, and that labor's average real wages have persistently risen with the rise of the national income. The share of 'capital,' in the long run, has been remarkable constant."

I have spoken in behalf of the little fellow in and out of business more than in behalf of established wealth and bigness. I have spoken in the interest of ownership and risk capital—on which debt must rest—and which is the mainspring of the activities which generate taxes.

Tremendous national and international issues hang in the balance. How to rate them in order of importance no two persons would agree, and as time goes on they seem to become more and more intertwined. I have watched with interest exploration of point 4, the bold new plan outlined in very general terms in the President's inaugural address. Under certain conditions its possibilities challenge the imagination. Venture capital admittedly is the crying need of undeveloped and so-called backward areas. Will these areas forget the harsh terms they only recently have used in speaking of foreign investors? Surely, the history of international investment shows the investor is more often sinned against than he has sinned. Investors as well as others are entitled to a fair deal. And that applies to investors at home as well as abroad. I suggest point 5—a fair deal for the investor, not the widow and orphan alone, but for all who risk their savings. This, I submit, is not just a figure of speech. If participations in sound domestic enterprise go begging, on what terms can foreign countries entice American capital, the most desirable form, according to all the experts, being ownership or equity interests?

The responsibility of legislators who are called upon to levy taxes on the order of $40,000,000,000 or more annually is grave. Leadership summoned forth by these responsibilities is not the sole possession of any one party.

The Congress met the challenge of the war in the area of fiscal policy when it enacted the Revenue Act of 1942—a highly constructive measure.

Again, with the close of the war, and faced with the transition to peacetime pursuits, the Congress passed the Revenue Act of 1945—repealing the excess-profits tax. This measure was largely responsible for the ensuing period of prosperity.

More recently, despite stubborn opposition, the Congress again anticipated the need for increased consumer purchasing power and increased savings, and enacted the Revenue Act of 1948. An injustice to the middle class was partially corrected in the adoption of the community property principle.

This is another year of changing economic conditions. The challenge is equally strong. Must we unbalance the budget in the interest of revoluntary social progress, or will leadership demand individual sacrifice to meet the Nation's defense and foreign needs? Does business have to decline and unemployment increase because of a lack of confidence in business quarters, and among those able and willing to save?

The next revenue act, and I bow to the will of the Congress, must revitalize venture capital for the job that is ahead, both at home and abroad. I am firmly convinced that equal courage to face the facts and act accordingly could assure a prolonged period of economic stability. To repeat: Venture capital is the mainspring of a dynamic economy. In the interest of production and jobs, we must have a resurgence of venture capital and restore its effective functioning.

Geological History of Western Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following articles which are written in an interesting manner and set forth a little of the geological history of western Colorado. They call attention to the presence and diversity of unlimited natural resources of my district and its great possibility for future development as a part of the integrated economy of our Nation. Inasmuch as there are four articles, which necessitates more space in the RECORD than is usually allowed for a single issue, I shall have the last two articles inserted at a later date.

STOREHOUSE OF GEOLOGICAL RICHES IN COUNTY OFFERS BRIGHT PROMISE

(By Harry Chrisman)

Colorado is widely publicized as the scenic State. It is not strange that visitors go away deeply impressed with the magnitude and beauty of the mountain scenes. For a mountain towering up twelve or fourteen thousand feet with its sides of granite sticking out is an impressive sight. Likewise, the aspen on a mountainside in October clothed in their beautiful golden yellow that bathes the valley below in reflected splendor is an artistic delight.

SEEN THROUGH DIFFERENT EYES

But things appear different to different eyes. The tourist sees the beauties of nature, the fine paved highways and the wayside inns and cottages that offer him accommodations for the night. The artist finds in the rugged mountain beauty or the stream or lake something to transfer to canvas. Another person finds still something else to admire and applaud. Few of us, unfortunately, have the trained eye of the geologist who finds both beauty and wealth in the Colorado rocks. And the grandest scene of all of the State's wonders is that vast store of riches and beauty beyond the scope of the human eye.

GEOLOGY CAN BE FUN

The geological history of this region is to most of us an unfathomable puzzle. We glance inside a book on geology and are sent reeling by such terms as Cenozoic, Mesozoic, and the whole nomenclatory of the rocks, structures, and periods of geological time. It drives most of us away from geological study, never to return.

It shouldn't really be that difficult. It is possible to gain an elementary understanding of the geological puzzle with a few basic facts at hand and the normal amount of human curiosity. And it is deeply rewarding to do so.

We live in a region, here on the western slope, where nature, in her most capricious and lavish mood, has laid down billions in wealth at our very feet. To appreciate such generosity, in terms of what it can mean to building our community in the future, requires that we make some effort toward a better understanding of the mineral formations of our community and nearby areas that affect us. So let's begin.

EARTH IS TWO TO THREE BILLION YEARS OLD

Geology is simply a history of the earth we walk on. Geologists are men who study this earth. They have reconstructed the early history of our earth by studying the rock structures, how and when they were formed and the effect of water, heat and earth movements on them. They have determined the approximate age of the earth—two to three billion years—and the approximate time that life appeared on it—a long, long time ago.

Certain facts have been established: First, the earth is of an appalling age; second, it has cooled from its first gaseous stage after having been thrown off from our sun, as is generally believed, to a ball with a molten core having a very thin crust which we call "ground." This crust is wrinkled somewhat, as in the mountainous areas of Colorado. Beneath this crust for many thousands of feet is solid basaltic rock. Third, great oceans and seas are known to have made visitations over the Colorado area not once in the past but many times.

It is because of these marine visitations that our geologists are able to give meaning to the rock formations and their fossil contents.

THE CHEMISTRY OF THE ROCKS

The fossils are "petrified" skeletons of former plant and animal inhabitants of the earth. The huge seas provided a developing area for the very low types of early life. Over 1,000 species of insects and 250 species of plant fossils have been discovered in one small lake bottom in Colorado. As millions and millions of the sea-dwelling inhabitants died their bodies drifted down into the bottom of the seas, making a veritable rain of death from above, as it were. These layers upon layers of sedimentation became, as the seas withdrew, thick rock formations that covered the earth. Where today one fossil is found, hundreds of millions of the earth's creatures and plants died and were obliterated and now make up the chemistry of the earth's rocks.

The great eons of time that have expired since the earth was young have been calculated by geologists. A calendar, not unlike our calendar of days, months, and years, has been made. Eras, periods and subperiods have been used—a vernacular common only to the scientist. The geological calendar is somewhat dissimilar in that geological time is reckoned by events rather than by time alone.

GEOLOGICAL CALENDAR SIMPLIFIED

The geologist knows five eras. (We will forego the many subdivisions of geological time in the interest of simplicity.) These eras are called Archeozoic, Proterozoic, Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic. The names sound formidable but stripped down from their Latin roots to good Americanese they simply stand for Ancient Life, Dawning Life, Old Life, Middle Life, and New Life, in that order.

Ancient Life and Dawning Life is the remote period of which even geologists do not pretend to know too much. It extended from the earth's creation down to approximately 500,000,000 of years ago—roughly five-eighths or more of the entire history of the earth. Old Life (Paleozoic) ran from 500,000,000 years ago down to about 175,000,000 years ago. Quite a bit is known of this period and the two that follow. Middle Life (Mesozoic) extended from the previous period down to about 50,000,000 years ago. The "latest" period—New Life—extended down from 50,000,000 years ago to about the end of the last Ice Age—18,000 B. C.

One must remember that in dealing with such tremendous lapses of time figures can only be approximate. The main thing is to establish in the mind the five eras of time, or clip this article for future use. We will then be able to ascertain the approximate

age of, for example, Delta County coal or tell when the oil-shale beds of this region were formed.

As the earth's surface cooled to form the crust, successive mountain-building periods have come and gone. The seas have aided greatly in developing the life forms and in distributing the chemical elements throughout the land surface. The creatures of the earth have left their remains to further add to the chemistry of the rocks.

FOSSILS FOUND AT CEDAREDGE

For example, an expedition in 1937 of Dr. Barnum Brown, curator of the American Museum of Natural History of New York, unearthed near Cedaredge nearly a trainload of rare fossil specimens containing dinosaur's and other reptile's bones. Included in the shipment was a specimen 20 feet long by about 5 feet thick resembling a mammoth horned toad; also a specimen of a "duck-billed" dinosaur. A footprint of a dinosaur in a Cedaredge coal mine gives evidence that the creature, in life, stood nearly 35 feet high and must have weighed many tons.

A fine dinosaur fossil unearthed in Colorado stands in the Colorado Museum of Natural History at Denver. This fellow, as the writer recalls him, was at least 20 to 25 feet high and with a whip-lash tail measuring perhaps 60 feet or more.

It was from such creatures' remains, and from the remains of ancient plant life, when this region was a subtropical jungle lying at the edge of one of the great seas, that the extensive coal fields hereabouts and the oil reservoirs were formed. Over 600,000 acres of coal reserves lay in this State, though but a little over 4,000 acres are presently producing coal. Mineral-resource maps show Delta County almost three-fourths underlaid by vast coal fields. The Colorado deposits of bituminous coal reserves are the greatest of any State in the Nation—over 212,000,000,000 tons.

So the coal that you burn in your stove on a cold winter night was once the vegetation of a massive subtropical forest. This vegetation was at one, or several times, submerged into the waters of the sea. Protected from the open air a selective decay began, with the chemicals in the plant and animal life causing decomposition and chemical change.

HEAT AND PRESSURE MAKE COAL

Covered by sedimentation of the seas this mass was pressed and squeezed by volcanic action and earth movements producing great heat and pressure. Depending on the length of time, the intensity of pressure, speed of decay, and many involved chemical processes, it became either lignite, subbituminous, bituminous, or anthracite coal.

Generally speaking, the older the coal the higher the grade. Delta County coal, for example, is about 50,000,000 years old. Some Colorado coals are older, for coal is mined in Colorado both from the Mesozoic (Middle Life) formations and from the Cenozoic (New Life).

Oil, like coal, is formed from plant and animal decay. Oil and natural gas are almost universally found where the rock strata are rich in organic remains.

THREE CONDITIONS NEEDED TO MAKE OIL

A combination of certain geological conditions are necessary, however, to guarantee the presence of oil in quantity. At least some of these conditions are known to exist in Delta County.

First, there must be a "source" rock. This rock must be rich in the remains of organic matter. Shales are the commonest varieties of such rocks and we find the oil shales in the northern part of the county extending almost halfway down to the center of it, possibly underlying the greater part of the county. Near Olathe the Peterson well has passed into, or through the Mancos shale. The Rangely field has been pumping oil from the Mancos shale for over 20 years with 18 wells now pumping more than 800 barrels daily, so this formation is to be considered tempting to the oil adventurer. At the Moffat and Iles Dome fields oil was reached in the Dakota sands and later the wells were sunk into the Morrison and Sundance formations with good success. These sands are being reached presently by the American Petroleum Co., drilling on Ash Mesa. The Morrison-Sundance formation is the heaviest oil-producing formation in the State, as will be shown later. A show of oil has been made in the Dakota sands at this well in addition to a later show in the Morrison sands.

The so-called Dakota sands on the western slope consist usually of two sandstone members separated by a body of shale. Lower sandstone and shale are old marine beds of the early Mesozoic era, whereas the upper sandstone is of fresh water origin of a later period of that era. This means that the organic life that has given oil content to these sandstones and shales lived somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 to 175 million years ago.

We thus see that this country has the source rock from which oil is taken. A second condition, however, to get oil in paying quantities is that there exist a reservoir rock in which the oil is stored. This rock may be any porous rock, such as sandstone or limestone, closely jointed shales, and even, in some instances, igneous rock formations—that is, where rock has been burned and heated to molten stage.

DELTA COUNTY AT SEA'S BOTTOM

Here we find that in the latter part of the fourth era, mentioned above, an invading sea extended northward through Colorado over what is now our mountain zone, joined itself with a southward leg of a great Arctic Ocean and sprawled itself from what is now the Bering Sea to the Panama Canal and from central Utah to central Nebraska. This great sea laid down a thick deposit of sedimentation in some places 10,000 or more feet in thickness. The deposit was mainly shale—what is now called the successive deposits of Dakota, Benton, Niobrara, Pierre, and Fox Hills shales—a likely bed for the oil reservoirs for which oil men search.

At Florence and at Boulder the wells are pumping from the Pierre shale. The Mancos shale in western Colorado is said to be roughly equivalent to the Pierre shale on the eastern slope. At Wellington and Fort Collins the wells are sunk into the so-called muddy or first Dakota.

Generally speaking, the Colorado oil comes from the cretaceous deposits—that is, from the rock strata of the latter part of the Mesozoic era.

The third condition for oil storage under the earth's surface is that there be a seal or retaining cover over the oil deposit to prevent the escape of the oil in the reservoir. The combination of a source rock, a reservoir, and a sealing rock over the oil deposit so traps the oil that it is held available to the discoverer of the pool.

OIL RESTS IN SAND AND SHALE POCKETS

This sealing rock is usually a dense shale that is impervious to oil but not necessarily impervious to water. Ground waters that have seeped through the rocks beneath the surface all through geological history rise and fall with a forward movement pushing the oil ahead of it into these oil traps or reservoirs. The great earth pressures and mountain-making movements at the close of the Mesozoic era, which caused great heat beneath the surface, have been the agencies that have distilled the oil from the organic remains of plant-animal life of bygone eras.

DELTA COUNTY OIL WELLS PROBABLE

With this background of knowledge of how oil is created and where it may be found, it becomes possible to note with satisfaction that an oil or natural-gas strike in Delta County is not only within the realm of possibility but probability. Nature, in that astonishing middle-life era of geological history gave us such incredible creatures as 40-ton reptiles and tropical swamps and forests as far north as Montana. She also laid down in the earth's breast lavish deposits of mineral ores and oil.

The three conditions for oil making were fulfilled during this era. First, the remains of billions of plant and animal life were deposited in thick layers. This is now our source rock. Second, the subsequent titanic earth movements during the mountain-making periods created the heat which distilled this oil from those bodies. Third, the underground waters have flushed the oil into the traps where we now find—or try to find—it.

WESTERN SLOPE BIG OIL PRODUCER

The first Colorado oil was found at Florence in 1862. This field has since produced more than 14,000,000 barrels of oil. Until the discovery of oil at Boulder in 1901, the Florence wells were our only producers. Since that time 17 pools have been opened up in Colorado—most of them on the western slope. Rangely was opened in 1901, though production was slow and facilities and transportation difficulties caused development to lag until about 1927.

The Moffat and Iles Dome were opened in 1924; the Tow Creek field in 1927, though oil seepages had attracted attention as early as 1900; Wellington and Fort Collins came in in 1908; and the gas fields of Mesa and Yuma Counties somewhat later. Dove Creek, Montezuma County, in December 1948.

The Colorado formation that has been most favorable to oil production appears to be the Morrison-Sundance, in Rio Blanco and Moffat Counties, its 40 wells (December 1943 statistics) having a daily production of 3,906 barrels. The Dakota-Sundance formation boasts 43 wells with a daily production of 1,168 barrels. The balance of the State's wells, 82 in number, show a production of 1,538 barrels daily. The western Colorado wells, judging from these statistics, are producing the great bulk of all Colorado oil.

Undeveloped as are the potential oil resources of the State, still, oil means over $2,500,000 of wealth annually, most of it to the western slope. What may develop later, in oil wealth, no one knows. It is enough to say that the geological history of the region gives most hopeful signs.

Germany's Giant Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John B. Owen, from the Washington Post of April 30, 1949:

GERMAN CARTEL BUSTING HELD 100 PERCENT FAILURE—CLAY ADVISERS BLAMED FOR NULLIFYING PROGRAM

(By John B. Owen)

American occupation officials have failed to smash a single one of Germany's giant monopolies under a crackdown law now 2 years old, investigators said yesterday.

A three-man committee, flown to the scene by the Army last December, found that only one such case was filed, but it was never completed.

It recorded testimony that high decartelization officials were out of step with Presidential policy, fearing it would impede German recovery.

Flatly disagreeing with the view, the committee declared that a democratic economy requires the anticartel policy and will prosper under it. The committee contended that the great trusts greatly facilitated Hitler's war career, and that their elimination will help safeguard peace.

The committee demanded energetic enforcement of antitrust policy—under civilian control. The law itself was enacted by the American military government for the United States zone.

The three men were appointed last December by Kenneth C. Royall, then Secretary of the Army, to study progress of the decartelization program. The monopoly-busting drive was ordered by President Roosevelt and supported by President Truman.

Committee members were Chairman Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., member of the Federal Trade Commission; Samuel S. Isseks, appointed at the suggestion of Attorney General Tom Clark, and A. T. Kearney, recommended by Paul Hoffman, administrator of the European Recovery Program.

The program came under the decartelization branch of the American Military Government. The branch was set up to "deconcentrate" monopolies and eliminate cartel practices.

The sharpest criticism came from Isseks in a supplementary report after his indorsement of the main report. Isseks blamed statements of "the two economic advisers to the military governor" for failure of the anti-monopoly program.

The military governor, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, has had as his economic advisers, first, Maj. Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., until recently Under Secretary of the Army, and, at present, Lawrence Wilkinson.

The two, Isseks said, had repeatedly contended that any deconcentration would delay German's economic advance. The committee report itself said that "it appears" that Clay's economic advisers generally took such a position.

Isseks said the deconcentration program was "completely nullified" when Wilkinson and his deputy, Phillips Hawkins, "pigeonholed," a principal case. Turning to Richardson Bronson, chief of the branch, Isseks said he had never indicated support for the deconcentration plan and any action he took generally was obstructive. Employees of the branch itself, Isseks said, have vigorously supported the program.

Health Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most worth-while comments on President Truman's health insurance message to Congress was contained in a column by Thomas L. Stokes, the highly respected Washington columnist, in the Evening Star of April 25. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TRUMAN PUSHES HEALTH BILL—PRESIDENT SEEN EARNEST IN ATTEMPT TO BRING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO ALL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

As has been forecast, President Truman's health-insurance proposal to Congress was met with the pessimistic response that it would be among the items missing when the legislative record of this session is closed.

As a matter of fact, the President himself anticipated such a chilly reception by the conciliatory tone of his message. He recognized the controversial nature of health insurance, conceding there are differences about details of the program, but said these differences should be threshed out with honesty and tolerance in the democratic fashion and that "we should enact the best possible program and then all of us should get behind it to make it work."

His conciliatory approach should mislead no one, however, about the President's absolute sincerity and determination on this issue. Those who know the man in the White House, who has such a close understanding of the day-by-day problems of our people, know that to him this is one of the achievements he hopes confidently to leave on his record for history, along with the civil rights program. He is very much in earnest and he will be found fighting for it in his characteristic, straightforward way, buoyed by the conviction that a majority of the people in the country support him on health insurance despite the expensive and deceptive propaganda that has been going on at high pitch for months.

PUBLIC SUPPORT AWAITED

He can afford to wait until the public reacts behind his program as it reacted behind him in the last election. It surely will eventually because of some very plain facts that the President recited to Congress, among them:

"As medical education and practice have become better, they have become more specialized and at the same time more expensive. As treatment has become more expensive, families have found it more and more difficult to meet the extraordinary costs of accident, serious illness, or major surgery. Thus, at the same time that our knowledge of how to provide medical care is at its highest point, more and more people are unable to afford it.

"It is no longer just the poor who are unable to pay for all the medical care they need—such care is now beyond the means of all but the upper income groups."

That last sentence should be underlined. The truth of it is known to any one who sits about with his friends talking about the President's health insurance proposal, and that is going on all over the country today. There the personal experience stories of families gradually come out, and there always is the fear expressed in such words as these:

"I don't know what we'd do if there were a major illness or operation in our family today."

And this is not from so-called poor people but from people in what we call the middle class, the bulwark of the Nation. What they have done, of course, in the event of major health catastrophes, and what they will do unless some such method as health insurance is adopted will be to go heavily in debt, with all the frustration that causes, to pay for it and do without other essentials. That is the pride of our great middle class, and it is not to be discouraged, for it indicates self-reliance.

This very commendable attitude of itself is a refutation of substitute proposals now offered in Congress, such as bills that would make grants to the States to take care of those who cannot afford medical care. This would require a sort of pauper's oath. Our people don't like to take help on that basis, and most who really need it will refuse it on account of pride. This includes good, self-reliant citizens who work hard and take care of their families.

Under the President's program they can meet this problem in the honest, self-respected American way by paying for it through insurance, just as they pay for security against unemployment and for old age in the social-security program—and as a right, not charity, or as the President, himself, put it so well:

"Health insurance will mean that the proper medical care will be economically accessible to every one covered by it, in the country as well as in the city, as a right, and not as a medical dole."

Going, Going, Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from Collier's magazine entitled "Going, Going, Gone."

While I do not agree with every single statement in the editorial—for example, I disagree with the greater part of the last paragraph, to cite just one example—I feel that the major points of the editorial should be brought home to all the people in the country:

GOING, GOING, GONE

Colonel Ellis, who owned the famous island that is New York's immigration center today, used to give shore dinners for his friends. They were popular dinners, because everything was caught fresh on the spot. There were ducks and geese and plover, shot in the Colonel's own marshes. There were wild pigeons. There were oysters and clams, dug along Ellis Island's clean, white shores, and lobsters and crabs netted off the rocks. There were salmon taken on their way up the Hudson to spawn.

That was over a century ago, of course. There are no oysters and clams along the clean, white shores now; there are no clean, white shores. The wild pigeon is extinct, the plover threatened with oblivion. If any duck or goose set foot on Ellis Island, he would be deported as an enemy alien. There hasn't been a salmon swimming up the Hudson—or virtually any other major river in the Eastern United States—for 50 years.

Colonel Ellis' island, multiplied by a million, is the sorry story of game and fish in this country today. And our disappearing wildlife is only part of the whole story: a story of heedlessness, and wanton waste, and destruction of the balance of nature, almost to a point beyond repair.

Our forests are going. According to William Vogt's stunning book Road to Survival, which every American should read out loud to his Congressman, the saw-timber requirement for the Nation is 53,900 million board feet, and the annual growth is 35,300 million board feet—a deficit of almost 40 percent, at a time when countless Americans are still looking for places to live. Our cut-over timberlands are littered with slash, where no tree grows. Careless forest fires take a yearly toll of lumber sufficient to build an entire modern city.

Our soil is going. "In the short life of our country," Dr. Hugh Bennett, chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, testified before a congressional committee, "we have destroyed 282,000,000 acres of land which we cannot replace. Erosion is actively destroying 775,000,000 additional acres." If a newspaper reporter stood on the banks of the Mississippi River and saw a herd of a hundred cattle, a flock of sheep and goats, a barnyard full of chickens, a carload of fruit and vegetables, and a silo filled with

grain go drifting past him, it would make all the front pages. But, unnoticed, the equivalent of a 1,000-acre farm floats down the Mississippi every 24 hours—lost to us forever. It takes nature up to 1,000 years to restore 1 inch of topsoil, yet more than half a billon tons of irreplaceable soil are swept down the Potomac River—past the halls of Congress—each and every year.

Our waters are going, ruined by criminal pollution. We laugh at the Chinese who spread their human waste on the fields. We are more civilized; we dump it in our drinking water. Chicago, Detroit, and other cities pour their offal directly into the Great Lakes or the Mississippi.

Our wild life is going, going, and—in the foreseeable future—will be gone. Darwin said in his On the Origin of Species in 1859: "The plenitude of life in any place is dependent on the terrain and food and cover." These are the very things that the hand of man has destroyed. Ever since the first human crept out of the first cave and knocked over the first animal with his spear, we have been upsetting nature's balance more and more. Industrial plants have leveled forest areas, used up the space that once provided food for birds and animals, poisoned through their refuse the surrounding waters where fish and waterfowl once lived. We have taken, but we have not put back. Our controls have been haphazard, too often dictated by politics or selfish interests.

Collier's believes that we should try to restore the balance of nature before our country becomes a true biologic desert. We should battle pollution by State and Federal laws requiring proper disposal of waste. The city of Milwaukee has been doing this for years, and has found that sewage, properly treated, can be sold for profit as fertilizer. We should control wanton deforestation. In Sweden a man who cuts a tree must replace it by planting another. That is a law we could copy here.

We should provide better conditions for what remains of our wildlife. We do not agree with the sentimentalists who would ban all hunting and fishing—unless they go all the way and ban power dams and industry as well. Rather the sportsmen, being the most interested, should be enlisted as the most ardent crusaders. Man, a predator, can help restore nature's balance by fighting other predators who are in competition with man, such as the voracious crow—one crow destroys 20 songbird eggs and fledglings per year—the great horned owl, the goshawk, and sharp-shinned and Cooper's hawk, such predatory fish as the carp and gar, and wildlife's public enemy No. 1—the prowling, uncontrolled house cat. He can work to restore the former habitat of fish and game by building wing dams on streams, by reclaiming barren land, by planting such excellent food and cover providers as grasses, bittersweet, lespedeza, the multiflora rose.

More important, man can and should pay to replace the game that he detroys, just as the factory owner should pay for adequate waste disposal, or the timber owner should plant another tree for each one he cuts. A pay-as-you-hunt plan might be a solution. A hunting or fishing license represents the right to hunt or fish. In addition, the sportsman should pay proportionately for the game he removes—the price to be based on the abundance or scarcity of that variety, its market value, and its replacement cost. The money would be spent to reclaim breeding areas, plant-food supplies, propagate and liberate more animals and birds and fish, to restore nature's balance that we have destroyed.

C. F.

National Correct Posture Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, all over the United States this is being observed as National Correct Posture Week. Many of the mayors of our great cities have issued special proclamations, and in nearly all schools special attention will be given during the week to the posture of school children by the country's teachers.

National Correct Posture Week is sponsored by the National Chiropractic Association, and has been observed for many years past.

Chiropractors, of course, are particularly and acutely aware of the damage done to the human body by bad posture habits. Chiropractors, who are a special kind of physician who base their treatment on the observed relationship between the bones of the back and the nervous system in the human body, are often called upon to undo, or at least to mitigate, conditions which were directly created by poor posture.

They have long preached to the American people that millions of dollars in expenditures for health could be saved by better posture—better posture taught to children in their formative years, and better posture held by adults.

Under leave, I am inserting at this point a statement prepared by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, the Washington representative of the National Chiropractic Association. The text follows:

No greater contribution can be made by the chiropractors of America to the Nation than by improving posture and thus increasing the efficiency of all our workers. Poor posture is expensive, and poor posture habits are responsible not only for many days of lost time, but for poor response to job needs, and eventually for a shortened life of top efficiency.

The problem of poor posture and the low efficiency of workers which it brings on can be approached in two ways.

The first is a long, careful, and well-planned program to teach Americans how to walk and stand and sit in ways which will promote health and efficiency. We have such an educational program under way, and it is having its effect.

However, that takes time. Meanwhile, many postural faults can be helped by direct treatment, or the bad effects can be modified or eliminated.

In both programs individual chiropractors can play a decisive and important role.

They can continue to carry out the program of education. They can explain to their patients how to walk, stand, sit, and lie for the best effect on health. They can give their patients the publications of the National Chiropractic Association on the subject and win the patient's cooperation.

They can also continue to relieve the bad results of poor posture by correcting the misalinements of the spine. Every chiropractor knows that the most minor displacement in the spinal column can bring on sharp pains, often far removed from the spine itself, which disappear under chiropractic treatment.

In the high tension of business and industry workers have to assume strained and unnatural positions for long periods.

These strains pull vertebrae out of line and squeeze the delicate nerves that pass between them. For years the human body will put up with this abuse, then suddenly give out.

Workers who have to work in strained positions should go regularly to chiropractors for adjustment to ward off serious bad effects.

It is well to remember that we are as old as our backs.

Studies conducted by the Chiropractic Research Foundation show that 35 out of every 100 children have faulty posture, while 35 percent of men and women past 20 have spinal defects that are likely to lead to organic diseases unless corrected.

Faulty posture is due frequently to displacements in the spinal column. If displacements in children are not corrected, organic troubles invariably result later in life.

It is the duty of chiropractors to make this Nation posture conscious.

Good posture has long been a thing to be admired—something to delight the eye. From ancient times to the present an erect bearing has been regarded among all races as a thing of beauty. Soldiers marching; a man sitting in the saddle; an athlete publicly displaying his physique; bathing beauties on parade—none of these would have grace and charm without good posture.

It has remained for modern times to discover that erect posture involves much more than something pleasing to look at. Now we know that it is a foundation of good health. Good posture contributes to good health; poor posture to poor health. If some people of bad posture seem to live in a state of moderately good health, it is not imaginary to say that these same people, with good posture, would enjoy better health. In other words, they would live longer, more energetically, more efficiently, and more happily.

The White House Conference on Child Health, held in 1930, recognized the importance of body mechanics in relation to health, as noted by the following quotations from its report:

"The part played by body mechanics, or 'posture' as it is generally termed, in the health and well-being of the child, is another subject receiving more and more attention."

"While the majority of medical schools give instruction on this subject, it is usually scanty or incidental and very inadequate. Yet body mechanics has a part to play in the child-health program, and lack of training facilities for those who must do a large part of the educational work in this field is a serious matter. Definite information on the prevalence of bad body mechanics, its recognition as a causal factor in disturbances of health, and the methods of satisfactory treatment are needed."

Since good posture and health go together on one hand and poor posture and disease on the other it is highly important that every reasonable effort be made to correct postural defects in the formative years of childhood. The early correction of such faulty body mechanics as spinal curvature and inequalities in the length of the legs, will assure not only a healthier and happier childhood but likewise a healthier and more efficient adult life.

Bad posture means that the framework of the body is distorted, and this means that important organs cannot do their normal work. Stooped shoulders, for example, cause a cramping of the organs in the chest—heart, lungs, liver—thereby reducing their vitality and making them more liable to disease. Spinal curvature results in the cramping of important nerves and blood vessels that regulate the activities of vital organs. This means that the nerve and blood supply to those organs is defective and the organs become weak and susceptible to disease.

Good posture, on the other hand, means that the organs have the greatest possible chance to remain in their normal position. And good posture means that nerves and blood vessels are in the best condition to keep the organs strong and healthy.

The idea that good posture contributes to good health is based on the mechanics of the human body and is as sound as any principle that operates anywhere in the field of mechanics. The idea is gaining ground more rapidly now than ever before. And when it finally is accepted for its true worth by the whole populace, there will be a vast improvement in the health and vitality of men, women, and children, everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that one-half of all adults suffer from poor posture with resulting bad effects on health efficiency.

Dr. L. J. Steinbach, of Pittsburgh, made exhaustive studies which showed that 53 percent of adults suffer from the results of poor posture.

Improper posture, the chiropractors warn us, can result in headaches, backaches, and other complaints frequently blamed by the sufferer on unrelated causes.

These are the recommendations made by the National Chiropractic Association:

First. Learn to stand tall, sit tall, walk tall, sleep tall.

Second. Follow a few simple exercises daiy to preserve the strength and tone of the ligaments and muscles which support the spinal column.

Third. Learn to relax completely.

These admonitions, I note, are not at all out of line with the recommendations made by the attending physician of the Congress of the United States.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as we join with the Polish people all over the world in commemorating the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, which set a new mark in liberalism in Europe, we pay tribute to the love of freedom which inspired the writing of that constitution and which was the basis of its enactment to safeguard that freedom.

No people in history have demonstrated a greater appreciation of freedom than the Polish people. No people have sacrificed more for freedom than the Polish people.

But this love of freedom and willingness to fight to maintain it, has not succeeded in keeping the enemy from the Polish soil. Strong foes have subdued and conquered her, but her love of liberty has been the means of helping her to rise from one conquest after another, to take her place among the nations of the world, free and independent. No amount of tyranny could quench that love of freedom, and the ideals of liberty have been passed on from generation to generation.

There has always been a strong bond of friendship between the American and the Polish people. The present Government of Poland, in its criticism of the United States and its democratic government and institutions, is endeavoring to turn the Polish people against the United States. But these statements do not represent the true opinions of the Polish people, because the present government consists of Communists who speak as directed by Russia, and not by the Polish people themselves. Therefore, they must fail in their efforts to sever the bond of friendship which has always existed between the two nations.

But this friendship also carries with it obligations. As a party to the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, we are equally responsible, with the other nations, for the recognition of the present Polish Communist Government, a government which has transformed Poland into a totalitarian police state, policed by Soviet-trained secret police; its economy fast being ruined by nationalization of private property and robbed of its industries through removal of machinery to Russia. Religious and political persecution is being increased. This government, the Polish people were forced to accept without being able to raise their voices in opposition.

This is a denial of the rights granted in the Atlantic Charter, which promised freedom to each nation to choose its own form of government.

As a party to the agreement which resulted in the present Polish Government, we can begin to right the wrong by withdrawing our recognition of the present government in Poland, and with the other free nations, join in a united effort to restore freedom and independence to Poland and the other enslaved nations of Europe. Such action on our part would give them new hope and courage and be to them a sign of our continued friendship.

May the day soon come when the freedom, envisioned by the writers of the Polish Constitution and for which the people of that nation have so valiantly fought and died, may be an established fact. God speed that day.

Honor Roll of National Safety Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to call attention of Members of the Congress to the fact that five towns in Hampden County, Mass., have been placed on the honor roll of the National Safety Council for 1948. The five towns are Agawam, Longmeadow, Ludlow, Monson, and Palmer.

The citizens of those five towns are entitled to congratulations for their cooperation that has resulted in the towns being on the 1948 honor roll. Those townspeople have saved lives and they can well serve as an example for the rest of the country.

Why Defeat Ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, Tuesday, April 19, 1949:

WHY DEFEAT OURSELVES?

It takes some fortitude to read the news these days. Our line of defense, General Bradley tells a nation which had taken rather a fancy to those coast-defense rifles at Sandy Hook, is on the Rhine; we must garrison Germany till hell freezes over or Russia cools off, whichever happens first. A Congressman thinks we'd better atom-bomb Russia. Taxes are going up, and business is going spongy, and from April on the Treasury will write its accounts in red ink. By the end of 1950 it will have cost us $24,000,000,000 to field a team against Russia, and in Washington the Social Security Administrator acknowledges that Mr. Truman's cradle-to-grave insecurity program—that's what it is—will cost us $7,000,000,000 the first year and $20,000,000,00 a year when it really gets going. There goes China; there goes east Germany; there goes another $45,000,000,000—and all we want are peace, 35-cent sirloin, $50 housing, free medicine, and a convertible for Junior.

But to read the news right it takes more than fortitude?

By the year 192 A. D. it was pretty clear what was going to happen to the Roman Empire. Although it took a few more centuries for that confused civilization to learn the mistake it had made, by the end of Lucius Aelius Aurelius' reign the pattern was fixed. The republic was dead, and the state was a Stoic kingship under which good men cooperated for the common weal; an equestrian civil service, personifying the will of the emperor, had displaced the old magistracies; home rule and local pride and personal responsibility had broken down, and the imperial government had eagerly stepped in to do for people (at a price bankrupting the old municipalities) what their fathers had done for themselves; and, to the north and east, the Germans and Persians were steadily increasing the pressure on the borders. Little by little the empire was crumbling, although no Roman had yet noticed it—crumbling in body and mind and spirit. It was still great. But its people, crying in the streets for bread and circus, had abandoned greatness.

Maybe history is bunk. Let's look at 1949. Let's—because we'd better—see where we're going.

What do we have in mind? We can fight Russia hot or cold and beat the pants off it. We can garrison the world and make the world like it. We can guarantee every farmer in the United States a fixed annual income, guarantee every worker a raise whether he has it coming to him or not,

guarantee everyone a doctor of his own (and a maid for his wife). We can do any of these things. But we can't do them all. We cannot have both the guns and the butter.

It's time we make up our mind which must come first. It's time we decide what's indispensable—and then buy that. If our national security is first (there aren't any nays, are there?), then we'd better forget the other $20,000,000,000-a-year business for a while. Because if we go into self-induced bankruptcy, then neither our social security nor our national security will be worth a Confederate dollar; we shall have purchased both at the price of getting neither.

Which shall it be? Bonuses and pensions and socialized medicine and fixed prices and subsidies and the enforced annual wage raise? Or a garrison in Europe, a front line in Formosa, and 200 more atomic bombs? Bread and circus, fellow Romans, or a legion that will stand against the Goths and Persians? Guns or butter?

We need not be Hitlerian about it. There's a patch of middle ground. We want and can have a nation deeply and skillfully concerned with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We can and must afford money for good schools, good hospitals, good roads. We can and must maintain a country of which we're proud and for which we want to lay down our lives if we have to. But we can't go on like this. That's what Russia wants. Self-induced American collapse is Russia's secret weapon. She can wait.

We're pretty close to the hour of decision. It'll take fortitude.

DONALD G. BORG, *Publisher.*

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1949, was the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. We are again privileged to be granted another opportunity to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day, the anniversary of the date on which Poland was first converted into a hereditary limited monarchy. On May 3, 1791, the Polish people discarded class distinction, and the personal privileges were made available to all the people; absolute religious tolerance was established on that memorable day, and provision was made for further reforms from time to time.

This day is Poland's Fourth of July, and it is with a feeling of personal pride that I again raise my voice in behalf of one of the enslaved Christian, democratic, and liberty-loving nations, now deprived of its liberty, its independence, and national sovereignty. For centuries the Polish people were denied liberty. Through almost superhuman effort they overcame all obstacles and established themselves as leaders in fields of art, culture, and science, contributing their share to the progress and betterment of our universe.

Poland, a full-fledged ally of the United States in World War II, and one of the original signatories of the Declaration of the United Nations of January 2, 1942, has been deprived of her independence and national freedom. The history of the last three centuries testifies to the friendship existing between the American and Polish people, and it is our solemn and patriotic duty to employ all rightful means at our disposal to maintain that friendship, to work together with the freedom-loving people of Poland, to help reestablish their independence, and assist in dispossessing the present alien rulers of Poland who have manifested their hostility toward the American people and to our Government. To me it is imperative that the same aggressive forces which seek to destroy free America, and which have already succeeded in destroying the liberty of Poland, be made to retreat and return that which they have acquired through force and aggression.

I have every confidence that the true freedom-loving Pole will succeed in this fight for right. Our unqualified help and support is needed. We must not fail them in their hour of need. We must give them encouragement, and let them know that their friends and allies have not deserted them.

The recognition of the present Soviet dominated Government of Poland which stems from secret agreements which are invalid, is also invalid under the United States Constitution and therefore should be withdrawn. Such withdrawal of recognition of the present puppet Government of Poland would convince the Polish people that the United States does not condone nor approve of the terrorist regime and thus take a stand on the side of the Polish people in their present struggle with enemy forces occupying their homeland and country. We cannot overlook or pardon such transgression and aggression. We must assume the responsibility which is ours, and help to right the wrong which has been done.

I have complete faith in the future of Poland, and know that she will once again proudly stand erect, side by side with us, free and independent, as a testimonial to an indomitable courage and unconquerable spirit which has always marked the history and background of that land of liberty-loving people.

Forestry's Part in Red River Basin Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been intensely interested in the subject of forestry a good many years and have given the subject considerable thought and study. Recently I heard an address by Mr. Charles A. Connaughton, director, Southern Forest Experiment Station, which I consider interesting and informative on this subject and under leave granted, I am placing this address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FORESTRY'S PART IN RED RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

(By Charles A. Connaughton, director, Southern Forest Experiment Station)

I welcome the opportunity to discuss forestry and the part it represents in the development of the Red River Basin. I welcome it not only because it is a subject embracing one of the major interests of the Red River Valley Association, but also because forestry, after many years of being either taken for granted or ignored, is finally moving "into place in the sun," with individuals and public-spirited groups such as this ready, willing, and eager to consider its problems and opportunities.

THE FOREST RESOURCE AND ITS USE

Let's go back some years to start this discussion. When the settlers first visited the lower Red River Basin, they found an almost unbroken body of timber. To them this was a friendly forest providing food, shelter, and fuel. It was a home they enjoyed. They made no particular drain on the resource, but if they did there was ample room to move along to well-stocked virgin ground. But gradually the population increased and began to stabilize. With this came the need for carving land from the forest for agriculture and industry. At this stage the forest was somewhat of a mixed blessing—land had to be cleared but at the same time a portion of the timber cut provided the materials needed for building the facilities of civilization.

In the face of this pressure, the forest yielded. On truly agricultural land as we know it now, it yielded to a higher, more intensive use. Similarly, for urban development it yielded a higher use. However, because of soil limitations or other reasons this clearing of the forest pretty well stopped, with more than half of the area in the basin below Denison Dam still in woods—that's where we are today and have been for some years in the past. To be sure, some land is still being cleared, but basin-wide there are probably about as many acres reverting to forest as being lost at present.

Now with about one acre in every two on forest land, the welfare and economic progress of the Red River Basin are obviously closely associated with the present forest condition, the trend of this condition, and its possible effect on the future. I am going to touch on each of these points. In so doing, I shall use figures which were not collected by watershed boundaries but do in every case include the Red River Basin and can be regarded as precise indicators even though not absolutely applicable to the drainage basin proper.

The first survey of the forest resources and their use in the South, including those of the Red River Basin, was made in the mid-thirties. Following this, a sample reinventory and analysis was made in 1946. This later survey showed that the sawlog timber stand of the Red River Basin is about 60 percent pine and 40 percent hardwood (33,583 M board feet total). In 1947, it was estimated that the total lumber produced in the basin and tributary territory was 1,750,000,000 board feet, of which 70 percent was pine and 30 percent hardwood. The same area in 1947 produced about 1,200,000 cords of pulpwood, of which 96 percent was pine. Forty-seven percent of the drain on the forest was used for lumber, 15 percent for pulpwood, 14 percent for fuelwood, and 24 percent for all other.

It is impossible to obtain a thoroughly confirmed figure on the annual value of the forest products produced in the basin, but

we have estimated that in 1947 wood products at the mill or other point of delivery were worth $99,000,000. Manufacturing added $135,000,000 to this value, making a total of $234,000,000 worth of manufactured wood products produced in a single year. Furthermore, we have estimated that the production of these wood products in 1947 required approximately 42,000 man-years of labor. I have not attempted to compare this information with that from other enterprises in the basin, because the figures are large enough in their own right to show the major importance of wood production and wood-using industries to the economic welfare.

Our surveys show, however, that the production being obtained is making serious inroads into the forest capital. In slightly more than 10 years, the interval between the original forest survey and the reinventory, the pine sawlog volume declined about 25 percent while the hardwood volume dropped 20 percent, or an average of 23 percent. The largest decline was in northeast Texas, the least in southwest Arkansas. This means that cutting, fire, insects, and disease are reducing the sawlog growing stock nearly 2 percent per year.

Considering all trees, which means including those below sawlog size, the picture is somewhat different, but the trend is the same. For pine, the decline over the past 10 years was 14 percent, and for hardwoods 1 percent. The combined total was 8 percent. This means somewhat less than a 1-percent drop per year in trees of all sizes, both above and below sawlog size.

Decline in the Red River Basin is greater than the average for the rest of the South west of the Mississippi River. In contrast to total decline of 23 percent in sawlog volume in the general territory of the Red River, there was only an 11-percent decline for the west Gulf area as a whole. Compared with a decline of 8 percent in the Red River Basin for all trees, there was an actual increase of 2 percent for the west Gulf area. This means the forest resource in the Red River Basin and territory immediately tributary thereto is being depleted more rapidly than in other portions of the west Gulf. I do not have the explanation for this, but it is evident that continuing reduction of the forest-growing stock will undermine at least some of the dependent industries and gradually diminish the importance of this resource in its economic contribution to the region's welfare. Certainly, this situation poses a challenge to this association and others with a common interest.

Thus far I have emphasized the more or less obvious fact that the forest resource has always played a significant part in the basin's development. In so doing, the forests have paid a price. Part of the price, such as clearing of productive agricultural lands, is defensible and sound. However, other things, such as the continuing decline of the sawlog volume on permanent forest land, deserve a critical look and some thought and plans as to the future.

Basing a judgment on the present estimated average volume per acre basin-wide, the forests of the basin probably are not growing more than one-third to one-half as much as they are capable of doing. This means that this resource, important as it is, is working only part time. This being the case, what are some of the things that will reverse the trend and point our timberlands toward full production? Let's start with the most obvious and certainly the prerequisite to all forestry practice—protection from forest fires.

FOREST FIRES

Forest lands of this basin, or anywhere else for that matter, cannot be fully productive if there is careless, promiscuous burning of the woods. In the past this fact has been ignored all too often, but real progress has been made in recent years. In each of the four States in the territory served by your association, effective forest-fire protection organizations are maintained under the supervision of the State foresters, and supported in part by the Federal Government. These organizations have been growing steadily in size and effectiveness. I do not know in detail what each organization feels is still needed, but I recommend consultation with the State foresters by your association as a positive step in building a constructive program for the basin.

One thing, though, that I do know is needed in every State is a fuller appreciation by the public of the damaging consequences of forest fires. This must be obtained by education—education that begins with the children in the school and is carried on in the man-to-man conversations on the street corner or at the forks of the road. This process of education, which is moving in the right direction now, must ultimately proceed to the point where a wildfire in the woods is regarded by the landowner and the general public just as a fire in a man's house. When this time comes, and eventually it will, we shall be on top of our fire problem, and our forest-fire organizations can and will be handled pretty much as a city fire department is at present—ready to attack and control any fire which may start, with the full cooperation of the public in spirit and in action. The prediction that we'll ever reach this point may seem to be an idealistic dream. Perhaps it is, but some dreams come true. I feel confident that this one will, because ultimately the full place and value of our forests will be recognized and when this comes we shall know that we have something that is just too valuable to burn.

CUTTING PRACTICES

Next to fire, the main concern should be with cutting practices. There are right ways and wrong ways to cut timber so as to keep the land fully productive. Oftentimes the right way is not too difficult, although it requires a certain skill and knowledge of forestry fundamentals. At the present, most of our large forest landowners, both lumber and pulp companies, do a very creditable job on their own lands. They are in the business of growing and producing timber, and they know that forestry pays. The bulk of our forest land, however, is held in small ownerships on the farm and otherwise, and generally these owners are not protecting or cutting their woods according to sound forestry practices. The reasons why they do not practice forestry, even of the simplest kind, are as many and varied almost as the number of owners themselves. There are two general reasons, though—one, the lack of forestry knowledge and, second, the failure to appreciate that sound forest practices pay.

To extend forestry knowledge and impart a desire for it, all possible mechanisms must be used. Publicity, demonstrations, and on-the-ground technical assistance are needed. As for publicity, the usual channels, such as the press, radio, speeches, and personal contacts, are available to and are being used by public agencies and private agencies and individuals. This makes a start. Then we need public demonstrations and illustrations of what to do and how to do it. This job is primarily a function of the State agricultural extension services, supplemented by other public agencies and private industry.

Along with these, it is recognized that forest owners who want to do a good job must get some on-the-ground technical assistance. Some of this on-the-ground assistance will come from industry, but in the main it is a public responsibility. The public has already done some of this with convincing results, and at the present there is a bill before the Congress which authorizes expansion of this work to be handled through the State forester in each State. Passage of this bill, which, incidentally, also authorizes expanded extension work, is essential to meeting this problem of getting forestry into practice on small landownerships.

As to showing how forestry pays, each man will want proof on his own land. We do have some information, though, that should start anyone thinking along these lines. Several years ago on our Crossett Experimental Forest near Crossett, Ark., we placed two 40-acre tracts under intensive forestry management. These farm forestry forties are on an area that is quite typical of much of the mixed pine-hardwood forests of the Red River Basin. One forty was a well-stocked area selected to show what could be done with land approaching full production; the other was poorly stocked and not unlike many farm woodlands. Both were managed to produce an annual return, that is, some cutting each year on both areas. The results are convincing evidence that forestry can and does pay.

On the good forty, 11 annual cuts have been made thus far. Approximately 136,000 board feet of sawlogs, 287 cords of pulpwood, 194 cords of fuel wood, and 344 fence posts have been cut in these 11 years. On the stump, these products had a value of $2,116. Delivered at the mill as any other agricultural crop would have been, they were worth $6,897. In 1948, the timber cut was worth $9.36 per acre on the stump, or $22.57 per acre delivered at the mill. Yet today there is not only as much timber standing as when cutting started, but the quality of the remaining trees is much better than originally because the poorer individuals were removed as cutting progressed.

During the 11 years, the average annual return per acre has been $4.81 for stumpage, or $15.87 for the products delivered at the market. If a farmer had harvested and marketed the timber crop as he does his other crops, he would have realized at the rate of $1.50 per hour for the time spent over and above the expenses for taxes, fire protection, interest, and incidental out-of-pocket expenses. We all agree, I am sure, that for timbered hill land this is a good return.

As I mentioned, a poorly stocked stand was placed under management at the same time the well-stocked stand was. This poorly stocked stand of 34 acres started with slightly less than 2,000 board feet and about 8 cords of pulpwood per acre. The objective of management was not only to secure an annual return but to build up the growing stock so that greater and greater cuts could be made in future years. In 10 annual cuts thus far, 32,000 board feet of sawlogs, 142 cords of pulpwood, 158 cords of fuel wood, and 121 fence posts have been cut. At the same time, the volume of standing timber has been increased from 2,000 board feet to 3,350 board feet per acre, while the volume of pulpwood has remained practically constant.

In the 10 cuts products were harvested worth $2.20 per acre annually for stumpage and $8.90 per acre annually delivered at the mill. And bear in mind that standing timber for a future harvest was accumulating all this while at a rate of about 150 board feet per acre per year. In 1948 the return was $5.80 per acre for stumpage, or $10.97 per acre for the products delivered.

These are two illustrations of what forestry means to the pocketbook. Many other illustrations could be cited to show that applying some knowledge, skill, and work will make forestry pay. Furthermore, these illustrations show that forests need not yield intermittent income only, although this may be the best practice in some cases, and that a rather small volume of standing timber can be managed to increase the growing capital constantly at the same time a current income is maintained.

Of course, if we start with bare land there is a somewhat different story, and it is an interesting one to trace briefly. Assume there is bare land to be planted. Usually about 1,000 trees per acre are used. These trees must not only be planted with care, but protected from various sources of damage for several years before any income is possible. In about 15 or 20 years, thinnings for pulpwood and posts can begin, and periodically thereafter thinnings can be made for different products, including sawlogs, as the trees grow larger. Finally, at say 60 to 80 years, the last 80 to 100 trees, which is about what one acre can support in mature timber, can be cut for sawlogs, providing, of course, for natural regeneration of the stand prior to or during the last cut. This is a rather long-time view, but it illustrates rather simply the rudiments of forest management and the general technic which will be followed.

Although we can go a long way toward our goal of fully productive forest land by providing education, demonstration, technical assistance, and evidence that forestry pays, these will not do the whole job. As a supplement, therefore, the United States Forest Service has proposed along with others that each State enact legislation which will require good forest practices. At the Federal level, legislation has been proposed which would make assistance possible to the States in working this out and providing for Federal action if the States fail to act in a reasonable time. Regulatory legislation of this kind is controversial and may not be enacted very soon; however, the need for it in relation to the national welfare is becoming increasingly evident.

PLANTING

Special mention should be made of tree planting. At the present, there is a strong interest throughout the South in tree planting. I presume the same interest exists in the Red River Basin. If so, it should be nurtured, fostered, and constructively directed. I am doubtful, however, that there is nursery capacity to supply the needs for trees. This is a subject, however, with which each State forester is thoroughly familiar. He can advise with you in reference to any special local situation. The bill pending before Congress to aid the States in providing technical assistance in forest management also authorizes expansion of Federal aid to States in nursery production for forest trees, and its enactment will be a step forward in fulfilling the planting needs of the basin.

RESEARCH

Along with an action program in forestry, there is an ever-present need for more basic knowledge. Much research and study is required to meet this need. In the main, forestry research is rather a long-time undertaking and has broad application to many areas and owners. As such it is primarily a public responsibility. The States are doing some work in this regard and the United States Forest Service maintains branches of the southern forest experiment station at three locations in or near the Red River Basin. These branches are at Alexandria, La., Nacogdoches, Tex., and Crossett, Ark. Studies on forest management, forest economics, forest grazing, planting, utilization, and related subjects are in progress. In view of the size of the job, the effort is relatively small and should be expanded, but appreciable progress is being made within the limits of the facilities available. Of extreme value also, as large-scale demonstration and testing areas, are the public forest lands such as the Kisatchie National Forest, the Woodward State Forest in Louisiana, and several well-managed private holdings.

WATERSHED VALUES

Thus far I have discussed forestry mainly from the standpoint of wood production. However, this is only part of the picture. Forestry involves the use of woodlands for other uses as grazing, hunting, and as watersheds. I am not going to dwell on these related values and services of the forest, because in the main when the forest is managed properly these related uses find their place properly also. However, in view of your long-standing interest in flood control, I want to call attention especially to the relation of the forest to the watershed.

We know from research and observation that a depleted plant cover, whether it's trees or grasses, sets the stage for accelerated soil erosion and rapid run-off. With about one-half of the drainage area of the lower Red River Basin in woodland, this is a very important fact to be considered. In the main, if the woods are handled to produce the maximum in forest crops on a sustained basis they will also provide a highly satisfactory watershed cover. This means, of course, that the incentive for forest management lies not only in increasing the wood supply available for industry, but also that better management will have a marked favorable influence on the watershed by stabilizing soil and aiding in regulation of streamflow, particularly of minor tributary streams.

In closing, I'd like to point out that never before has the interest in forestry throughout the Nation been as great as it is today. This interest has been slow in generating, but now it is accelerating and being manifest in many ways. It is no fad, either. It is solid and sincere. The interest of your own association is concrete evidence. This interest must be translated in action, however, and every opportunity seized to take a constructive step forward. By so doing, you as individuals and as a group can strengthen the economy of the Red River Basin and make forestry play an even greater part than before.

Poland's Lost Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who try to keep the accounts straight on the books of life could not help but pause Tuesday, May 3, the official Polish Constitution Day, and recall how that great nation of middle Europe was sold down the river into totalitarian slavery.

It is well that we think for a moment about Poland, for the same aggressive Communist forces that have succeeded in destroying the heritage of the Poles are working to destroy the freedoms of our own country.

Poland, as we all know, was a full-fledged ally of the United States in World War II. It was the first nation actually to feel the weight of the German panzer divisions, for, as is well-known, the attack on Poland in 1939 led to the conflagration that swept the earth in the ensuing years.

Despite the clear fact that the Democratic leadership of the United States had mouthed slogans about "Four Freedoms," and such, this same Democratic leadership sold Poland down the river to totalitarian slavery without reason or excuse. This was done at Yalta, where an ailing President, surrounded by a cabal of suspected American Communists allowed Soviet Russia to include Poland in its economic orbit. It was done in spite of the fact that free Poland had been an ally of the American people in a great war, allegedly a war for freedom, and it was done without consulting the Polish people or their legal, constitutional representatives. On the strength of agreements our Presidents signed at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, Poland has been deprived of 46 percent of its territory and saddled with a "government" hand-picked by Soviet Russia.

On this real Polish Constitutional Day—commemorating the day in May 1791, when the Polish people won their freedom after centuries of oppression. That heritage of freedom was lost a short time later when Russian and Prussian soldiers united on Polish soil and destroyed the country. But Poland later lived again, as we know, when the new nation was born after World War I. But now Poland again has lost its heritage.

There is still hope that some day our American leaders will awaken and that pressure will be brought to bear against the Soviets—enough pressure to make them withdraw from hapless Poland and allow freedom once more to become a hallmark of that Nation. As we know, none of the secret agreements by means of which Poland was delivered into the hands of the Soviet terror by our leaders ever has been fully made public. The United States Senate never has ratified any treaty accepting the present status of Poland, bound, gagged, and blinded to the free world as that nation is. None of the deals made by the executive branch are really valid, although they are effective for a time. These are the deals in which the notorious traitor, Alger Hiss, played a leading part, as is well-known.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be numbered among the friends of Polish freedom today, and to take my stand with the real lovers of freedom in every country and in every clime. It is tragic that we still have men in our executive branch who talk of freedom, but do nothing to spread it into all parts of the world. Let us hope that we can have a new birth of freedom—in Poland and in America—but most of all in Poland, where our double-talking diplomats and two-timing politicians can view the ruins of their own fumblings and bumblings and chicanery. Let us all dedicate ourselves to helping the Polish people regain their lost heritage.

The American Press in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of attending the annual Front Page dinner sponsored by the Lehigh Valley chapter of the American Newspaper Guild, held at Allentown,

Pa. At their dinner, the working newspapermen and newspaperwomen of the Lehigh Valley area had as their guests many of the leaders of the industrial, business, and civic activities of the community, and it was, indeed, a most pleasant affair.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a press release on the remarks I made that night on the strategic place of the American newspaper reporter in the world-wide battle for the minds of men—the so-called cold war.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MYERS CITES PRESS AS KEY WEAPON IN COLD WAR

ALLENTOWN, PA., April 30.—United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, tonight credited the free American press with a key role on behalf of freedom "in the battle for men's minds."

"There are no better arguments we can advance for our way of life than the facts about us—the unvarnished facts on our faults as well as our virtues—as mirrored in our daily news," the acting majority leader of the Senate declared.

MYERS addressed the annual Front Page dinner of the Lehigh Valley Chapter, American Newspaper Guild, in Allentown's Americus Hotel.

He told the newsmen and their guests that by digging up the facts about day-to-day America the press "not only keeps us acutely conscious of our duties—and our failures—as citizens, challenging us to make this a better Nation, but it helps to build world-wide understanding of the real aspirations of the United States." He added:

"Anyone who follows the news here even casually, and who reads about the full and free debates in the Congress and the legislatures, who watches the variety of editorial comment, the columns and the opinion advertisements, readily recognizes that American policy generally conforms to public opinion—sometimes leading it, sometimes following it, but always close to it.

"It is the job of the State Department through the Voice of America and similar projects, to get these facts to the people abroad. And it is doing a real job, an effective job. Many who sought to deny the program funds just two short years ago are now among the foremost advocates of the whole idea, because they have seen how effective it has been.

"From it—from the full and complete range of news it seeks to send abroad, foreigners have come to recognize our real purposes in creating the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact—the purpose of achieving a peace based on justice and freedom for mankind.

"Russian efforts to depict our programs in other lights suffer grievously from the factual accounts we send overseas. And the constant desertions of prominent officials from once-free nations behind the iron curtain to the freedom and safety of America, point up the issue dramatically. On even terms totalitarianism in any form cannot compete with freedom, and our international policies are designed to provide such even terms."

MYERS said it was unfortunate that two of America's leading press services have so far declined to make their daily reports available to the Voice of America and he praised America's editors for their recent declaration in favor of an expanded Government informational program abroad.

"When the Department is denied access to some of the main sources of our domestic news, however, getting the facts about America to publicize abroad is made unnecessarily difficult," he declared.

"I am familiar with the reasoning of the Associated Press and the United Press in declining to supply their daily reports to the State Department for Voice of America use," he continued. "They maintain that if an official Government agency engaging in admitted propaganda activities were to have the use of these services, foreign subscribers to them and foreign readers might begin to question the integrity of the news they send, on the theory that it is the Government telling AP and UP what to write rather than AP and UP telling the Government what the news is and the facts are.

"This position implies a rather alarming condition: That in a nation where the free press is guaranteed by constitutional amendment, the main channels of domestic news could be tainted or even subverted merely by a buyer-seller relationship with our own Government. I am sure AP and UP officials have no fear that such a thing would actually happen; they appear fearful mostly that foreigners might think it was happening.

"On the other hand, if the Voice of America uses its news properly—and I believe it does—the high volume of daily news it undoubtedly carries which is critical in its content of Government policies would be proof to all but fools that this is not 'doctored' news, and we can't waste our time and resources trying to win over the world's fools.

"At the same time, while admitting our infrequent lynchings, we must tell the story of developing racial understanding in America; while conceding spotty unemployment in places while industrial profits are at record levels, we must show—as the Bureau of Labor Statistics is showing in a really magnificently factual and objective new publication for international use entitled 'The Gift of Freedom'—how the average American worker really lives; while admitting to our slums, which are shameful to us, we must also tell about our dramatic housing programs. In other words, we must tell the whole story.

"The rank-and-file newspaperman is the best selling agent America has because he insists on digging up those facts and telling them straight; let the chips fall where they may; let the paper's own editorial policy like it or not; and most of our newspaper editors want the facts told that way, feeling confident that distortion of the news to suit editorial policy is fatal to the newspaper's best asset—reader confidence."

MYERS said he has been tremendously impressed by the fairness of most of Washington's press corps, declaring:

"Our national correspondents, by and large, want whatever story the facts dictate, and they get the facts, too, because they have earned our confidence by demonstrating fairness to all sides.

Basing-Point System Being Outlawed by Supreme Court Causes Strong Effort Being Made To Change the Law So Steel and Cement Companies Can Continue To Violate Price-Fixing Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, James Daniel, Rocky Mountain News Washington correspondent, in his article of December 22, 1948, disclosed how the steel and cement $11,000-a-month lobby was working. A secret meeting was held in Pittsburgh, according to this article, which is discussed in a very interesting way. The director of the lobby said that "the national competition committee is a one-shot operation. Its purpose is to legalize the uniform-delivered-price system. When that is done it will be through." Of course that means that the lobby wants Congress to perpetuate the price-fixing schemes of the cement and steel industries, which has worked at such a great disadvantage to the consumers in this country during the past 25 years. The Supreme Court rendered a decision that will protect the people by outlawing the basing point. Now this group is trying to induce Congress to reinstate it and make it legal. The lobby is working in a very effective way by going to the "grass roots" and getting people who are not acquainted with the facts to write or wire their Congressman to support the lobby's efforts in getting price fixing legalized for the steel and cement companies.

The article is as follows:

BASING-POINT LOBBYISTS FORMING DENVER CHAPTER

(By James Daniel)

WASHINGTON, December 22.—A meeting was held in Pittsburgh a few days ago (Dec. 7, to be precise) for the purpose of deciding the future of Colorado.

The future of all States, not Colorado alone, is at stake. The States standing on the threshold of tremendous expansion are especially endangered, rightly or wrongly, and perhaps stupidly, by the envy and fear of States that already have had some expansion.

At the Pittsburgh meeting you would expect a widespread attendance of businessmen, merchants, taxpayers, housewives, working people. You would think there would be bright lights and amplifying systems, reporters, photographers, and television men.

But you would be making a great mistake.

This was not a public meeting. It was not held in an auditorium. It was held in the Duquesne Club and if you ever have been to Pittsburgh you probably have had it pointed out to you and heard of the legendary figures who go there, the heavy carpeting, and the snowy napery.

PUBLIC NOT INVITED

The public most definitely was not invited to this meeting.

However, reporters and photographers had been notified that something important was to happen. Their city editors told them to go down and wait outside of the Duquesne Club and take a picture and get a story about the new chairman of the National Competition Committee, when he was elected and put on view.

The minutes and the hours dragged by. No new chairman showed his face. Instead one Walter Megronigle, an advertising man, came out. He said there had been no decision about a new chairman. Maybe, he said, cagily, one would be elected December 29 when the committee met in Cincinnati.

EXPLANATION SIMPLE

Today I called Mr. Megronigle to the telephone. I asked him to please explain to the businessmen of Denver how the services of an advertising firm could be worth $11,000 a month plus expenses. That was the sum which Mr. Megronigle's firm, Ketchum, Inc., reported to Congress it was getting paid to persuade Congress to legalize a pricing system which the Supreme Court outlawed in the cement conspiracy cases.

Mr. Megronigle said it was simple.

"We have six men and two girls going out around the country organizing local chapters of the National Competition Committee," he said. "Businessmen give us $100 to $1,000. In return we give them a complete organization, down to local chapters.

ORGANIZING DENVER

"We don't have a Washington office. We have chapters in Dallas, Houston, Tulsa, Cincinnati, Dayton, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh. Harold Huycke is in Denver for us now organizing a chapter there. Eventually we will have 25 chapters.

"The National Competition Committee is a one-shot operation. Its purpose is to legalize the uniform-delivered-price system. When that is done it will be through."

I asked Mr. Megronigle what was the connection between Ketchum, Inc. and Ketchum, MacLeod and Grove, an old-line Pittsburgh advertising firm specializing in institutional accounts. Megronigle said the corporations were "in the same family," that Ketchum, Inc., was organized to perform such jobs as delivering a client a ready-made Nation-wide grass-roots organization.

DOESN'T KNOW CHAIRMAN

I asked him who the chapter chairmen were. He said he didn't know.

I asked him who put up the money originally to found the National Competition Committee. He said he could not say.

I asked him if it wasn't true that the new fashion in lobbying was to avoid anything so conspicuous as a Washington office and contact Members of Congress through local figures in their communities. He said it was.

More on Federal Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly news letter of May 4, 1949, giving more facts on Federal health expenditures:

The President's compulsory socialized-health program will cost somewhere from six to sixteen billion dollars. That means increased pay-roll taxes on workers and employers. That increased tax on employers means higher prices the workers must pay for goods they buy. The only way the workers could ever start to get even would be to get sick. If they do not get sick they pay the other fellow's doctor bill and thus deprive their own families of necessities. It just is not free.

We have a pretty big chunk of federalized medicine and health right now. Between 30 and 40 Government agencies spend money—many, many millions—on various programs relating to health.

Look at one proposed 1950 appropriation bill—in round figures. This one covers the Federal Security Agency under which are the United States Public Health and related programs:

Grants to States for general health	$17,000,000
Mental health	11,600,000
Cancer Institute Research	17,000,000
National Heart Institute	8,725,000
Tuberculosis	9,500,000
Dental health	2,000,000
Venereal diseases	16,000,000
Communicable disease control	7,500,000
Public health hospitals and medical cases	$25,000,000
Hospital construction grants	15,000,000
Federal employees' health	250,000
National Health Institute	12,000,000
Vocational rehabilitation	20,500,000
Water pollution control	1,200,000
Total	163,275,000

Not included in this total is pay for public health personnel, doctors, nurse training, and many other items of administration running into millions of dollars. We must also consider under existing federalized programs, the hospital services to prisons, veterans, the armed forces (and their families), merchant marine, and Federal employees.

Operations of other Government agencies touch on health, too. The Indian Service, Pure Food and Drug Agency, Atomic Energy Commission, Agriculture, Immigration, and the Children's Bureau to mention only a few.

Our remarkable medical and dental services need gradual growth through the constantly expanding voluntary programs. The mushroom growth of an already over-swollen bureaucracy would undoubtedly result in nothing better than mass mediocre medicine.

Can We Afford Our Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the size of our national budget and the size of our national debt are such as to be a cause of concern to every thinking American. At the same time, however, we are faced with a world-wide situation which is potentially as serious as any we have ever known short of actual war—and this situation is not very much short of war.

Last night, in Atlantic City, N. J., I addressed the thirty-seventh annual convention of the Linen Supply Association of American on the subject Can We Afford Our Freedom? In that address I sought to explain not merely that we are shouldering tremendous burdens in our national and international programs, but, more importantly, why we have to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think it is appropriate today when we are acting on a Federal-aid-to-education bill, since this is one of the subjects I discuss in this speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE AFFORD OUR FREEDOM?

In the first 4 months of the Eighty-first Congress nearly 4,500 bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives and about 1,800 in the Senate. Obviously most of those are not going to be passed. But a sizable number of them will come out of committee this year and next year, and will be accorded consideration. Practically every one of them which provides for the expenditure of any Federal funds is weighed by most of the Members of the Congress in terms of this standard: "Can we afford it?"

This standard is applied not only to the appropriation bills providing billions of dollars, as in the case of the military appropriation bill, but also to those authorizing expenditures of $10,000 or $10,000,000. If Federal expenditures are involved, the bill must be justified in those terms or it won't pass. Contrary to what a lot of people think about the Congress, blank checks are just not voted. Our judgment may be faulty once in a while as to whether or not a particular expenditure is fully justified, but I can assure you that in such cases they are errors of judgment and not deliberate attempts to throw away the taxpayers' money.

Forty-two billions of dollars, the budget for the coming fiscal year, is such a simply incredible figure that claims that there is economy represented in such a budget may sound strange, but it is true.

There are no doubt many places in this budget where cuts can readily be made. Cuts are being made all the time. But a cut of $10,000—or even $10,000,000—out of a $42,000,000,000 budget is almost inconsequential in relative terms. Nevertheless, I repeat, reductions in Federal expenditures from Budget recommendations are being made all the time, are supported in many cases by Republicans and Democrats alike, and will continue to be made.

They are made because, although we cannot comprehend the figure of $42,000,000,000, we can appreciate its colossal scope. We are all worried about this national debt which exceeds a quarter of a trillion dollars—if you can visualize such an astronomical figure. We all realize that, if we cannot scale down this debt now at a time of high-level business activity and employment, then we are, in effect, admitting that the debt can never be reduced—and that is an admission that America dare not make.

On the other hand, if you want to send shivers up and down the spine of practically every Member of Congress who must run for reelection in the near future, just talk about raising taxes. The prospect of voting for a tax increase is never a pleasant one to an elected official.

All of these factors taken together reflect the anxiety among the Members of Congress over the justification of each and every expenditure of Federal funds. Do we cut down on Federal expenditures, and resist all new appropriation proposals and hope that our reductions will be sufficient to keep our budget in balance, and perhaps provide a litle extra to apply to the national debt? That seems to be the solution proposed most frequently by many influential Members of Congress, particularly on the Appropriations Committees.

But even if we follow their suggestions, none of these experts is prepared to guarantee that we still achieve a sufficient surplus in terms of this amazing economic level we now enjoy, to make an adequate payment on the national debt—adequate meaning sufficient in terms of such record national income.

The truth of the matter is that we are so extended in our Government activities—yes, even overextended—that any sizable cutback—and by sizable I mean sufficient to make a dent in a $42,000,000,000 budget, sufficient to mean anything when applied to a $250,000,000,000 public debt—is virtually impossible to achieve.

I say virtually impossible because, of course, the budget could be cut by really tremendous amounts, by nearly 40 percent, just by doing away with the Military Establishment. It can be cut by billions of dollars merely by repudiating the interest on the national debt, or by our pledges to our veterans. It can be cut by perhaps ten billions, although that may be a little bit on the high side, by dumping overboard all our foreign commitments.

We aren't going to do any of those things, of course, and that is why I say it is virtually

impossible to cut Government spending by a sufficient amount in this coming fiscal year, and in the next few fiscal years, to enable us to reduce the national debt by any sizable amount.

When we ask ourselves whether we can afford to spend all this money, we reach the reluctant conclusion in most instances that we can hardly afford not to. It isn't a matter of providing some jobs for people. It isn't a matter of getting some good pork for our districts, or our States. It isn't a matter of doing special favors for special interests. It is, unfortunately—and I mean unfortunately—a war chest for the survival of American freedom.

During the war, almost everything we did, almost every dollar we spent, was in connection with the war effort. In that direction few expenditures were considered excessive.

As far as the Federal Government's budget is concerned, that situation is still largely true. And it's too bad. But it's one of those unhappy facts of life which we have to face. World War II has not quite ended for the simple reason that the goals of World War II have not yet been achieved. Our fear is that in seeking to achieve the goals of World War II we might find ourselves in a world war III. On the other hand, we know well that unless those goals are achieved, we face a certain world war III. And with or without a world war III, we constantly face serious dangers to the thing we regard here as most precious of all—and that is our freedom.

Nearly all we do abroad, and most of what we do at home, are essentially activities in defense of the freedom of the American people collectively as a nation, and individually as citizens.

You are justified in wondering whether we have to do quite so much of it, whether it takes quite such a big Government, spending quite such a colossal sum of the taxpayers' money in order to achieve our goals of a free world, and particularly in order to achieve security for our own way of life.

For there is no doubt about it, our Government is simply enormous. Just the other day, a Senator, speaking from the floor of the Senate, said the Federal Government, among other things, is the biggest banker, security holder, life insurer, farm-mortgage holder, landlord, tenant, employer, and spender in the Nation. And he was probably correct.

There is nothing in America more colossal than this Government, and the more we learn about it, and how it operates, the more amazed we become at the multiplicity of the things it has its finger in. President Truman said the other day, that even by spending 16 or 18 hours a day at the job, as we know he does, he cannot keep up with all of the phases of this Government which he personally is supposed to direct.

The Senator who described our Government as the biggest of everything in the country mentioned banking, and said the Government was the biggest banker in the Nation. No doubt it is. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in effect, underwrites the American banking system, guaranteeing the integrity of the vast majority of all banking accounts in the land. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has, at one time or another, bailed out practically every railroad in the country, and was a major factor in financing the expansion of America's war industry. The Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and numerous other agencies are in the banking business, not just casually, but in a big way.

Millions of veterans hold national service life-insurance policies, and so the Government becomes the biggest life insurer. Millions of Americans, home owners and farmers, depend upon the Government for mortgages—not direct Government loans, but loans the Government is prepared to guarantee. And so, we are, in effect, the biggest mortgage holders. We could go down the list, including landlord, tenant, employer, and all the things that the Government is the biggest of, and always we come up with the same conclusion:

Our Government is gigantic because the people insist that it do certain things. The Government as such does nothing on its own. It is put into things, and it is put there by the people.

That does not necessarily mean that all the things it is injected into are good things for it to do. Most of them are. Most of them are vitally necessary activities. Most of them are activities which you support wholeheartedly, and those you don't support are, no doubt, just as wholeheartedly supported by others. There are pressures at work on us all the time—and I for one think that is perfectly proper, for there is no better way of guaranteeing Government in the public interest than by allowing, or even encouraging, all phases of the public interest to have their say, and to say it as vigorously as they can.

Granting that there are undoubtedly instances of duplication in Government functions, many of these duplications do get weeded out. This happens in a number of ways. The Hoover Commission has made many sound recommendations for reorganization of Government agencies. Secretary of Defense Johnson, for instance, has initiated sweeping changes in the national defense organization. And Congress itself, as I said, certainly doesn't write out any blank checks for Government agency spending. Anyone who has read over the annual hearings of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees realizes that Congress tries to go over every aspect of the Federal budget with a fine-tooth comb, demanding an explanation for the expenditure of every dollar. This double checking by Congress comes up at least once each year and no agency of Government escapes scrutiny. Yet the growth of Government continues, despite the fact that Congress has no intention whatsoever of enlarging Government or maintaining it as a colossus just for the sake of Government. We in Congress want to do everything we can to encourage private enterprise and individual initiative to do just as many of these jobs as possible.

The growth of Government has occurred usually in areas where private enterprise simply could not undertake a necessary job with any conceivable hope of operating at a profit. Every one of us would much prefer seeing these jobs done by private capital, by local governments, and State governments. But when, after a long enough time, the people become convinced that a particular job isn't being done, and can't be done, in any other way, they turned to the Government. They have turned to the Federal Government because it is the only organization with a broad enough jurisdiction, a great enough flexibility, and the necessary resources to undertake the problem.

No, their growth of Government hasn't come about through dictation from the top or because of some wily scheme on the part of a few to socialize the country. The Government has grown in response to the increasing complexity of modern national and international life.

Now and then I hear someone express the wistful hope that we should return to the relatively simple kind of Government we had, say, in 1890. But that simply isn't realistic in terms of our complicated, post World War II, twentieth century world. No one has any desire to turn back the clock to our 1890 kind of simplicity. We cannot resist the technological facts of the past 60 years—of man's conquest of the air by radio and television, by airplane and rocket, and by heaven-knows what tomorrow—and we can't resist the other thousands of technological advances man has made in that time which have raised our living standard to the highest level ever. And unless we do resist these facts—and we do return in every respect to 1890—the Government can't return to 1890, either.

This Government spending—on the domestic side, at least—accomplishes, I think, essentially two things. In the first place, it provides the wherewithal for needed effort in essential undertakings which private persons or local and State governments have been completely incapable of, or hesitant about, performing. The second point which I am about to make is one which I feel is very frequently misconstrued or just plain misunderstood. It is this: The whole purpose underlying increased Government activity is to make our system of free enterprise stronger and more secure in its present fields of operation—and to encourage its extension and growth in new fields which it has not yet entered. Through Government research numerous new industries have risen in America, numerous old ones have been rescued from technological obsolescence.

But the biggest single aspect of Government spending today involves our commitments and relations with other nations. All of us I think, will agree that peace is the central problem of our time. And I believe we can all agree that this nervous half-peace we now have is in fact no peace at all. The very best kind of government, the healthiest national economy in the world, can ill afford the terrifying cost of a third world war.

Yet, while we are in agreement as to the urgency of achieving real peace, few of our people seem aware that today the largest part of our Federal budget is devoted to that purpose alone. The proposed military budget for 1950 is only slightly under $16,000,000,000, that figure alone being substantially more than one-third of the total Federal budget requested. The European recovery program for 1950 has been authorized for nearly five and one-half billions, the estimates for furnishing arms to the cosigners of the North Atlantic Pact are around one and one-third billions. These are the direct expenditures, the big ones that have received most of the attention.

In a much larger respect, however, our whole national budget is a cold war budget. Billions of dollars more are devoted to benefits, disability payments, and pensions to our veterans of other wars, and to the payment of interest on war debts. Smaller, but nonetheless important, are the sums we pay in the administration of the reciprocal trade program, the subsidies to our merchant marine and overseas air lines, the contributions to the United Nations, the Voice of America, the operation of our diplomatic service, and the other functions carried out by the Department of State, and a great many others. We are indeed paying a tremendous price for peace.

Can we do away with any of these programs? Hardly; they must be considered together as a part of an integrated whole.

How does the Marshall plan fit into the picture of peace? All of us are aware of Europe's condition as it emerged from the Second World War—its economy wrecked, millions of its people driven from their homes because of war's destruction, or because they had been driven from their native lands by political oppression or military might. The people of Europe were weak from starvation, filled with fear, and almost devoid of hope for the future. Europe's fields were largely untilled and full of mines, many of its factories devastated, and its trade close to a standstill. There were shortages of everything—not just of luxuries—but of the bare necessities to sustain life. A kind of paralysis lay heavy over the land.

Yet beneath that paralysis many things fermented. People who had lived in squalor and misery cried for security. Confusion and uncertainty dominated the scene.

It was under such conditions that communism had won its foothold and usurped its power over the Russian people almost 30 years before. The Communists knew this. The Communists knew their greatest opportunities for furthering their power were at that very moment, and under those very conditions. They knew that the worse conditions became, the easier it would be to find new adherents gathered from the ranks of the desperate, the hungry, the forlorn, and the hopeless. Knowing all this, the Communists did everything in their power to keep Europe in turmoil and in misery to complete the wreckage of Europe's economy, and to tumble the remnants of free government still to be found. Their battle strategy misfired. We beat them to the punch.

We will probably never know how close the Communists came to achieving their aims. There was a time when the Communists must have felt dead certain that they would control the Continent of Europe. They banked on two things in their calculations—first, that America would once more turn its back on Europe, as it had done after World War I—and secondly, that Europe could not get back on its feet in time to stem the rising tide of economic unrest which breeds communism.

But the Communists were wrong—wrong, as they have been, and are, so often. America did not turn its back. And with its own prodigious efforts and help of the interim-aid program and the Marshall plan, European recovery is well under way. Already, there is a new spirit and a new vigor among the people of Europe. Its industries are beginning to hum, and new industries are being built. Its agricultural production is moving up.

Communism is being stopped dead in its tracks at the border of the iron curtain, and the curtain hides turmoil and fear. We can foresee the day that a self-sustaining Europe is once more an active partner among the free nations of the world in a thriving and prosperous world trade. Truly, the Marshall plan has been an invaluable investment in the business of world peace.

But important as economic recovery is to the achievement of security and freedom from fear it is not the sole cornerstone for the building of peace. The Communists, thwarted in their efforts to achieve the domination of Europe through economic destruction, have other cards which they might seek to play in order to win their desperate game.

Russia today has more men under arms than any other nation in the world. Her own force, plus the forces of the satellites she has acquired by threats of aggression since the end of the war, represent, collectively, a gigantic bloc of armed might—a bloc which casts a long shadow of fear over the free nations of Europe and the rest of the world. There is an answer to this constant threat—and that answer is the North Atlantic Pact.

The Atlantic Pact simply reiterates that we, and the free nations of western Europe who sign it with us, have a common stake in the peace of the world. The North Atlantic Pact does not declare war on anyone. And it does not threaten war on anyone. No peace-loving nation has any reason to fear the Atlantic Pact. The only kind of nation which might fear it is a nation which is bent on aggression. The North Atlantic Pact is an insurance policy, and not an act of war. It tells any aggressor that—in the eyes of free people of the world—the business of peace is everybody's business.

But the North Atlantic Pact is a piece of paper. It is the evidence of an agreement among a number of nations upon a common purpose. A piece of paper, backed by nothing more, will not ward off aggression—and a piece of paper by itself is not a counterbalance for millions of men bearing arms. Before the Atlantic Pact really means what it is intended to mean, there must be developed a common plan of military security, and the necessary force to guarantee that security. That takes arms—and money.

These things—the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic agreement, the military support to back them—are immediate, paramount necessities if we are to begin building a permanent peace and a real peace, secured by an effective UN. But even these are short of all that will be required if lasting and genuine peace is to be obtained.

Our best argument for a decent world, a free world, of free peoples, is the argument of the good example. All our efforts are bent toward achieving a decent world, and we think a good world would be one in which peoples in all nations can shape their own destinies as we in this country shape ours, can influence their own government as we, individually, influence ours, can follow the dictates of their conscience, and give full play to their inherent abilities.

In our so-called propaganda activities abroad, we try to show the people in nations threatened by communism, and in those overrun by communism, just how we in America do things, what we stand for, what our hopes and aspirations are. We like to think that freedom, free enterprise, democracy, all do well in America. We are proud of this Nation. We are proud of our opportunities here. We like to think that the weak spots in our economy, the discriminations, the occasional denials of opportunity, are gradually being overcome. But we've got a long way to go.

We have got to demonstrate, not only to our own satisfaction, but to the satisfaction of the whole civilized world, that freedom can mean decent living standards not merely for most of our people, but for all of our people. We can't do nearly so much bragging about free enterprise when we have areas in this country where free enterprise has been synonymous with inhuman and cruel exploitation. We cannot be very smug about American living standards as long as so many of our children grow to maturity with no personal experience with the good things of America, nutritional foods, decent houses, minimum health standards. There's a lot to be done in America to make this the kind of a country which justifies the things we claim for it. Some of our Federal expenditures go into this aim; school lunches, for instance, maternal and child-health-care activities, hospital construction, school aid, and a variety of other programs, all of which, collectively, however, take up only a fraction of this colossal Federal budget. And, unfortunately, they are the activities whose funds are easiest curtailed. The reductions are based on the theory that we can't afford to do everything we like to do.

But look for a moment what happens: An American family, composed of American citizens, living in the squalor of slums, subsisting on an improper diet, denied, perhaps, any of the feeling of dignity that comes from decent living conditions, sees us pouring billions of dollars into the rehabilitation of Europe, sees us pouring other billions into expenditures for arms in order to, as we put it, defend our way of life against communism, and then finds perhaps that we have decided we can't afford Federal housing activities, we can't afford school lunches, we can't afford decent schools. Such Americans may well wonder what this way of life is that we are defending with so many billions of dollars spread abroad and into armaments; some Americans, such as these, may wonder whether the specter of communism is really such a terrible thing.

In the ideological war in which we are engaged, cold war though it may be, we need the enthusiastic support of every American, the enthusiastic participation of every American in behalf of freedom.

Just as we can't afford not to fight for a free world with every resource at our command, so we can't afford not to see to it that each American shares in the opportunities of this great country.

A thriving, prosperous, and healthy America is therefore imperative if we are to maintain freedom. A thriving, prosperous and healthy America means maintaining a continuing growth and development of our free-enterprise system * * * and means maintaining a flexible, friendly government in America—a government not bent on substituting itself for private enterprise, but a government which supports and encourages individual initiative and enterprise all along the line. What I mean here by government encouragement and support are the many, many functions of government which have arisen because of private business needs and which are carried on in the public interest for the protection of business. And by encouragement and support I also mean those functions of government which are designed to eliminate the trouble spots which private enterprise hasn't been able to combat profitably, trouble spots which by their very existence threaten the health of our democratic free-enterprise system.

Yes; the price of freedom is great. The real question, I repeat, is whether we can afford not to pay the price of freedom. We are paying that price now in our fight to win the cold war—or should I say the cold peace, as someone has more appropriately referred to it of late. But whatever we call it—the cold war or the cold peace—our aim and our intentions are to bring this frightened world of ours safely through to lasting peace and freedom for all men. And high as the price of freedom may be, I am confident that we shall be able to meet the bill and make our freedom forever secure.

Seminar for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seminar for Congress," published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEMINAR FOR CONGRESS

Senators WATKINS and DONNELL have dramatized a difficulty that faces most other Senators in trying to arrive at sound and well-informed decisions on questions of foreign policy. These two Republicans happen to be deeply suspicious of the North Atlantic treaty. Not being members of the Foreign Relations Committee, however, they are not entitled to question administration officials in executive session. Of course, they could get their knowledge of the treaty either from prejudice or hearsay, or from columnists or commentators, or from ploughing through the printed records of public hearings. But this was unsatisfactory to them. So they finally took one other course that was open to them: Of asking permission to question witnesses at public hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It was not quite fair of Senator CONNALLY, in grudgingly granting their request, to accuse the two Senators of wanting to impede, delay, and filibuster. Clearly the committee's hearings would become a farce and a bore if every one of the 96 Senators were allowed to attend the hearings and ask questions. But just as clearly, every Senator who is not a member of the committee is entitled in some better method than he now has of informing himself before debating and voting on an issue of such importance as the North Atlantic treaty. So, for that matter, is the noncommittee membership of the House. There the 418 members not on the Foreign Affairs Committee often have to vote on foreign questions, such as the extension of ECA, with little first-hand knowledge.

It seems to us that it is up to Congress itself, and not to the executive branch, to find a new way of enlightening the entire membership. Congress itself has ample resources for organizing informal seminars on these subjects. The nonpartisan professional staffs of the foreign policy committees of the two Houses are well fitted to serve as organizers and moderators. Some of the lecturers at the National War College and the Foreign Service Institute might be invited to speak, as well as ambassadors recently returned from abroad. If all Senators and Representatives did not have the time to attend these sessions, the Senators could at least send their administrative assistants who, in turn, could help to brief their superiors and answer the questions that pour in insistently from constituents.

As it is today, too many Members of Congress feel they are in the dark. And, in consequence, they are apt to develop a sense of grievance which shows itself in irresponsible speeches and votes in the floor debates. We hope the issue will be faced for the sake of the scores of serious and earnest legislators who are groping for greater knowledge of international issues.

District Doctors Wage War Against Pets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, many Members of Congress share with me, I know, a keen sense of disappointment and disapproval over current efforts by the medical fraternity of Washington to secure passage of legislation by the House and Senate which would give them authority to appropriate without compensation the homeless dogs and cats of the District of Columbia for the practice of vivisection. I urge my colleagues and the country generally to protest this blatant attempt by the doctors of Washington to wage war against the pets of the people living in our National Capital.

H. R. 4238 and S. 1703 should be defeated decisively and the members of the American Medical fraternity should be advised that an effort to seize for their use the unclaimed animals of the Washington pound so that they can be tortured and maimed in cruel experiments is not the best way to win freinds and influence people at a time when the whole science of the private practice of medicine is under attack. The greedy desire of these medicos to get pets upon which to practice vivisection is demonstrated by the fact that one of these bills actually provides that any pet which has been unclaimed for as short a time as 48 hours shall be made available—without charge of course—to medical schools and laboratories.

Mr. President, it is to be hoped that there will be doctors in the District who will speak up openly against the passage of these proposed bills. It is inconceivable that the doctors are all of one mind in this attempted raid upon the peoples' pets and the small boys' greatest friend. Let the fight go on against socialized medicine in a program of education and resistance which I shall be happy to join but those who oppose the idea of having the State control their science and dictate their policies should be the last rather than the first to suggest that this same State should exercise its power to deprive others of their pets or to supply animals upon which they can practice the same barbaric tortures that their associates in Nazi Germany practiced upon human beings. Cruelty, sir, is a deadly poison which America should deplore and which the Congress of the United States—and our medical profession—should consistently discourage.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, which provides food for thought and which I hope will stimulate protective action.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIVISECTION

We rise today in opposition to H. R. 4238, a bill introduced in Congress by Dr. ARTHUR L. MILLER, Representative from the fourth district of Nebraska.

H. R. 4238 proposes that all animals at the District of Columbia dog pound which have gone unclaimed for 5 days shall be turned over to the medical schools of this community for the purposes of vivisection.

WE ARE AGAINST IT

Under present law animals which go unclaimed are destroyed by gas. Instead, so the argument runs, let them be turned to good use in the interest of advancing medical science and the health of man.

We think nothing of killing sheep, hogs, and cattle, not to mention an untold variety of fish, fowl and other animals, in order to satisfy our appetites. What harm, then, if a few unclaimed and unwanted dogs and cats are turned over to medicine?

What is a dog's life, anyhow, when measured against that of a human being? Wouldn't you sacrifice a dog to save your child?

So never mind the crackpots, silly women, vegetarians, racketeers, and feeble-minded ignoramuses who don't know what's what. Hand over the dogs. Simple, eh?

THE VANITY OF SCIENCE

But it turns out not to be so simple, after all. The issue here involved is basic. It is whether the word "science" is a magic device that can wipe out every other consideration in matters of public policy just by its mere mention.

Plenty of people seem to think so. Some speak and act as if a man should be allowed to do anything he pleases, in or out of the laboratory—even consort with enemies of the Republic or slip them secrets of our national defense—if he is a scientist.

This vanity has so inflated the scientists that now in New York State there is a scientific campaign on to give doctors the right to kill people intentionally.

The slippery word for such practice is euthanasia, from two Greek words for "well" and "death" and it is used to describe the act of putting somebody away if he asks for relief from a supposedly incurable condition.

The next logical step obviously is to ignore the patient's opinion in the matter and save time, expense, and trouble for all, as Hitler did, by knocking him off on a mere one-way medical say-so.

Indeed, Hitler was completely logical about his "science." He not only was an enthusiastic supporter of euthanasia, but was also a strong man for vivisection. And his scientitsts didn't bother with mere dogs and cats. They used human beings.

VIVISECTION NAZI STYLE

The Nazi prison camps furnished human beings to Hitler's scientists by the thousands, and the scientists tried every conceivable kind of experiment in freezing, burning, breaking, cutting, poisoning, starving, and gorging the human body.

That is just the sort of "absolutely essential" thing done in the United States of America today in our medical vivisection ritualism as practiced on dogs and cats.

Yet what do these same vivisection defenders say about the Nazi experiments on human beings? "Worthless to science."

Now, how can that be? Experiments on dogs and cats prove facts of value to the practice of medicine on human beings, yet experiments on human beings do not. We leave an explanation of that contradiction for the doctors.

For our own part we oppose vivisection because we believe it leads science into ways that are dark and because we further believe science will be more effective when it leaves off whittling dogs and cats, to concentrate on more reliable keys of knowledge.

An example of what can be done if science will only lift its head and look around, is that reported by E. R. Squibb & Co. in its tests of a new drug used in treatment of heart cases.

BETTER WAYS TO FIND FACTS

For years Squibb used what it calls "animal units" in this work, each animal different in its reaction to the "standard dosage." Somebody finally got the smart notion to try something more accurate. Now Squibb uses an electric current. Result: Absolute precision, speed, economy, and reliability.

There is no more real reason for poisoning dogs to test drugs than there was for the scientist Pavlov to kill thousands of them to find out that a dog's mouth waters when he expects food.

The last, the experiments to test "behaviorism," is one of the bloodiest and most ghastly chapters in the whole dictionary of medical voodoo.

It was not science, for it proved nothing that man had not already known and recorded thousands of years before, concerning habit, taste, and conduct. Some time we will take a day off and show up Pavlov and his "experiments" in all their cruel futility.

In the meantime stop H. R. 4238. It is a step back toward barbarism.

Federal "Aid" to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal 'Aid' to Schools," from the Richmond News-Leader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL "AID" TO SCHOOLS

The power to tax is the power to atrophy. John Marshall did not say that. He said that the power to tax was the power to destroy, and even if the word "atrophy" had been in use as a verb in the great Chief Justice's time, he would have hesitated perhaps to use it in the sense of the power to sap and to weaken to such a degree that self-control is lost. Despite that, the truth of the statement is demonstrated, we think, in such legislation as the bill to appropriate $300,000,000 in aid of public education in the States. If we disregard in America the stern and close limits of what may be done effectively and economically by the Federal Government, we shall be guilty of more than the waste of billions of money drawn from the very sweat and blood of taxpayers. We shall do worse than build up a bureaucracy that will be perhaps as arrogant as it is expensive. Once we shift responsibility for public-school education to the Federal Government, we shall weaken every muscle now exercised by the men and women of American communities in the cause of better instruction. Interest is lost when responsibility is. Few things could be worse for public education than to take from the community the direction of the local school and the obligation of self-taxation for that school. When we formalize, we are apt to demoralize.

Danger Signs in the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, headed by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and of which I have the honor to be a member, intends shortly to make a series of significant investigations into the status of our economic situation, which I am sure will be of great value. One of the subjects for investigation is the matter of unemployment.

Yesterday in Atlantic City, N. J., I discussed with ice cream manufacturers of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware some of the economic problems facing us in this transition period from inflation into what we sincerely hope will be a more normal, more stable, and much more sane economy. They are, of course, acutely concerned about economic trends, as are most businessmen.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release on my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. In my talk, I expressed the opinion that we must redevelop what I called "full employment thinking" if we are to avoid serious economic distortions.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MYERS DEMANDS FULL EMPLOYMENT THINKING

ATLANTIC CITY, May 4.—United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, called today for "full employment thinking" in America as the best insurance against a serious business decline.

The Pennsylvania senior Senator, deputy Democratic leader of the Senate and a ranking member of the Joint House-Senate Committee on the Economic Report, said at a convention of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware ice cream manufacturers in Atlantic City's Hotel Traymore:

"Spotty unemployment, softening in some markets, particularly in consumer goods, and resultant industrial cut-backs are dangerous not for what they mean but for what we might be panicked into thinking they mean. They can mean trouble, unless we adjust ourselves to 'full employment thinking.'

"Instead of skimming off top dollars any longer, we must have pricing policies designed to maintain consumer purchasing power at a steadily high rate. And to do that, we must have a renewed sense of employment security.

"Business will, of course, reply that in order to maintain high employment it must have confidence in Government. I can say now flatly that this administration is intent on helping business to prosper. It is an administration which believes wholeheartedly in free enterprise capitalism—but it insists on free enterprise fairness. The fewer crutches we must provide this economy, the better we'll like it.

"It is up to business to demonstrate now, in what is gradually emerging as a normal economy, that the crutches aren't necessary."

Citing recent lay-offs in such industries as electrical appliances, specialty steels, textiles, and other goods, MYERS declared:

"No one can convince me that the American market for these goods is saturated. I don't believe we have nearly enough of any of these goods to satisfy potential demand here at home, let alone abroad.

"It's not that people aren't anxious to buy; in millions of instances, they just can't buy the so-called luxuries which are now regarded as essentials to our standard of living. They can't buy because their savings and their cash went into shelter, food, clothing, during the past 2 years of inflation.

"Yet, with good jobs at good pay, as most of our people have, and with some sense of employment security, which not all of them have, we can maintain for the indefinite future the remarkably high level economy we now enjoy.

"We can do it if prices are geared to mass purchasing power, rather than to top dollar in a scarcity market; we can do it if the purchasing power, in turn, is maintained by full employment."

MYERS said that until prices drop to levels consistent with average income, many needed and wanted goods will move slowly or gather dust on the shelves and racks, and the competition will become strong for the nickels and dimes which should go into "the good things of life, like ice cream."

"But higher carfares, higher gasoline prices, higher rents, continued high prices for homes, and no significant drop in many important cost-of-living items spell real danger. They squeeze all but the essentials out of the average family budget," he continued.

"America's economy was not designed to maintain itself on 'necessity' spending."

MYERS declared that during and immediately after the war, business and labor in America had begun developing a healthy type of "full employment thinking" for the postwar world, out of fear that unless the economy was geared to this kind of thinking, we faced a severe postwar jolt.

"The jolt came," he added, "but it was not the kind we had been preparing for. Rather than a collapse in a war-geared economy, we found ourselves suddenly faced with a dizzy inflation.

"We stopped worrying—most people did—about buying power and solid foundations for our economy to withstand the pressures of eventual deflation and instead the emphasis was on cashing in on the seller's market, skimming off the cream. The cream which was skimmed off in these past 2 years represents literally billions and billions of dollars of purchasing power which isn't there any more—it went for living expenses rather than for living improvements.

"If business will get out and sell—at buyers' prices—and if the mass of consumers can feel reasonably secure in their jobs—and that, too, is largely up to foresighted businessmen, then Government is not going to upset anyone's applecart.

"The only time business need fear 'Government interference' of the kind it doesn't like is when business can't sell its goods and can't provide jobs."

Position of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America Respecting the North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dated April 22, 1949, written by William Scarlett, chairman, department of international justice and good will of the Federal Council of Churches. I think it is a very interesting letter on the subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1949.

No position for or against ratification of the North Atlantic Pact has been taken by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America since when its executive committee last met the text of the pact had not been made public. It is desirable, however, that such past actions of the federal council as may have a bearing upon the forthcoming debate in the Senate be brought to your attention.

I am writing to you in my capacity as chairman of the department of international justice and good will. We believe the considerations here set forth are warranted in the light of pronouncements previously subscribed to by the federal council.

I

The Federal Council of Churches is convinced that war with the Soviet Union is not inevitable. We recognize, and have said, that Marxist communism in its orthodox philosophy, stands clearly opposed to Christianity. But a war with the Soviet Union is believed by us to be improbable, given proper use by the United States of its powerful influence. Accordingly, we hold steadfastly to the view that the avenues of diplomatic conversation between the Soviet Union and the United States should be kept open and used. Such action as may be taken by the Senate on the pact should not be

allowed to close the doors of direct negotiation with the Soviet Union.

II

The churches related to the federal council supported Senate ratification of the Charter of the United Nations in the conviction that the security of our Nation was to be derived from a system of collective security embracing all nations. They still hold to this view.

If, as a result of such action as may be taken by the Senate on the pact, the interest of the American people in supporting and strengthening the United Nations were to be diminished, the consequences might well be inimical to the peace of the world.

III

In the event the pact is ratified by the Senate, many people of our churches would desire that it be so implemented as to give impetus to those acts of government by which the conditions of peace with justice can be established. The federal council believe that if our Nation's leadership is to be worthy, it must develop constructive and creative programs that will capture the imagination and enlist the support of the multitudes whose interest in battling political, economic, and racial injustice is greater than their interest in defending such injustice merely because communism attacks it.

The North Atlantic Pact may conceivably act as a deterrent to the more violent acts of Communist aggression by the Soviet state. However, the ideological thrust of communism cannot effectively be countered by defensive measures. What is required is the transcending of communism by enlarging the areas of political and spiritual freedom and economic well-being throughout the world.

Accordingly, we believe the implementation of the pact, if ratified, should be of such a kind as not to imperil the success of those recovery and reconstructive programs to which our Government is or may hereafter be committed. Senate support of authorization of the funds required to assure the continuous success of the European recovery program is very heartening in this respect.

IV

In the event the pact is ratified by the Senate, the people of our churches would desire that this regional arrangement be not used as a pretext for unduly expanding the influence of the military in the formulation of foreign policy.

The Federal Council's Executive Committee has expressed the view that "if * * * our national power is to serve the ends of peace, our basic national strategy should be made by persons who have faith in the achievability of peace and who are qualified by experience and training to use and to evaluate the great possibilities for peace that reside in moral and economic force in organizations like the United Nations and the World Court and in the resources of diplomacy and conciliation."

We recognize that under pacts of the kind now being discussed our military leaders have their necessary place. Foreign policy, however, far from being accommodated to the views of the military should remain, as heretofore, the prerogative of the President and the Congress.

V

In viewing of the foregoing, we venture to raise the question as to whether it would be appropriate for the Senate, in the event that body votes to ratify the pact, to accompany the instrument of ratification with a clarifying resolution in which the sense of the Senate would be expressed along such lines as the following:

(a) Ratification of the pact is not construed by the Senate as closing the avenues of diplomatic conversation with the Soviet Union;

(b) Ratification of the pact is not construed by the Senate as the equivalent of or as a substitute for a universal system of collective security;

(c) Ratification of the pact is not construed by the Senate as the equivalent of or as a substitute for those curative and creative efforts of government through which it is sought to promote economic recovery, to strengthen the institutions of democracy, and to advance the political and social well-being of subject and dependent peoples;

(d) Ratification of the pact is not construed by the Senate as compromising in any way the prior responsibility of the President and the Congress in the shaping of American foreign policy.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM SCARLETT, *Chairman.*

Labor Law of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. John Kilpatrick, of the editorial staff of the Richmond News-Leader, and published in the Saturday Evening Post.

This article is descriptive of the manner in which the State labor laws, advocated by Governor Tuck, have worked satisfactorily in Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA HAS A LABOR LAW FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES; IT WORKS

(By John Kilpatrick)

When the fight over Taft-Hartley was just working its way into a rassle royal, transit workers of three Virginia cities with a population of more than 600,000 went on strike. In this same period, as Philadelphians recall with a groan, the Quaker City's transit operators also went on strike. There all similarity between the two situations ended.

Philadelphians thumbed it while futile appeals were made to the State legislature. In New York, customers of Consolidated Edison waited apprehensively for gas-and-electric workers to walk out. But the folks in Virginia were tootling along just fine. Their vital public-transit service was being administered under a 2-year-old law that is gaining national attention. In its short life, the Old Dominion's Public Utility Labor Relations Act has come to be regarded as a model.

The Virginia statute is the outgrowth of a touch-and-go situation which developed in the spring of 1946, when the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers teetered toward a strike that would have blacked out 67 Virginia counties. Gov. William M. Tuck invoked a colonial militia law to avert the stoppage, but he saw the need for a more modern weapon. The following January, the General Assembly passed a new, effective labor-relations act.

The law has three key points. One is that labor's right to strike is not denied. A second is that parties to a labor dispute are not required to submit to compulsory arbitration. The third is that the uninterrupted operation of utilities furnishing water, light, heat, gas, electric power, transportation, and communication is declared essential to public welfare. The act's aim is to prevent such interruptions.

Parties to a labor dispute involving a public utility must conduct two bargaining conferences, each of which may extend over a number of days. If these discussions prove fruitless, the Governor must request arbitration. If either side refuses, the union becomes free to strike 5 weeks after filing a strike notice.

More than a dozen such notices have been dropped on Governor Tuck's desk in the course of 80 separate negotiations, but in only three instances have strikes materialized. In those cases, further provisions of the law were invoked to permit seizure by the Commonwealth. A pattern for handling these critical disputes was established in the spring of 1947, when telephone workers went on strike over much of the Nation. They prepared to strike in Virginia too. But during the 5-week period between notice and strike date, Governor Tuck's office wrote the 7,000 telephone employees to ask if they would remain at their positions as employees of the Commonwealth in the event of a strike. Nearly 5,800 replied, of whom 87.9 percent indicated a willingness to work for the State. As it turned out, the major telephone dispute in Virginia was settled a few hours before the strike dead line. The Commonwealth wound up by seizing—for 48 hours only—a 2-county operation on the Eastern Shore.

In the summer of 1948, the Commonwealth had to seize and operate transit lines in Newport News. This past February it seized facilities of the Virginia Transit Co. in Richmond, Norfolk, and Portsmouth, and ran them for an uneventful month. In each case, the operators voted unanimously to remain at their regular jobs as State employees. During a period of State seizure, a Virginia utility must pay 15 percent of its net revenue to the Commonwealth as a service fee. This provision was put in the law as an inducement to management to keep negotiating.

It is quite possible, of course, that some day utility employees may vote not to work for the State at the time of a strike. In that event, provisions of the law would be invoked to permit the Commonwealth to hire and train temporary replacements.

In the meantime, Virginians are in love with their labor law. Spokesmen for organized labor endorse it privately, though publicly they give it their standard long-form denunciation.

Dutch Policy in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the New York Herald Tribune and printed in that newspaper on April 20, 1949, under the caption "Dutch policy challenged." The letter was written by Mr. J. J. Singh, president, India League of America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUTCH POLICY CHALLENGED—MR. J. J. SINGH DISAGREES WITH MR. WEHLE'S VIEWS ON INDONESIAN CONTROVERSY

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I was most surprised at Mr. Louis B. Wehle's contention that the United Nations had no right to intervene in the Indonesian situation, and by the allegations he hurled at the leaders of the Republic of Indonesia.

Let us first take Mr. Wehle's allegation that the Republic of Indonesia was Japanese-inspired and is now in the hands of a group of Communists. The former Dutch lieutenant governor general of the Indies, Dr. Hubertus J. Van Mook, has on several occasions officially repudiated and denied the suggestions that the leaders of the Republic were Japanese puppets. He has admitted, as have other officials of the Netherlands Government, that the Republic grew out of the freedom movement which started in Indonesia at the turn of the century, and that the period of Japanese occupation was used by the Indonesian Nationalists to further their own cause of independence, which had been their goal long before the Japanese threat ever menaced Indonesia.

No responsible observer on the Indonesian scene credits the story that the Indonesian Republic is a time bomb left behind by the Japanese.

As for the question of Communist influence in the Republic, once again, the former Governor General Van Mook himself has stated on more than one occasion, that the Republic is not Communist-dominated. The most striking example of the Republic's real attitude toward the Communists was demonstrated in September 1948, when the Republic's army put down an abortive Communist revolt at Madium, in a matter of 3 weeks, despite the fact that the Republic had been hampered for the last 3 years by a Dutch total land, sea, and air blockade.

Mr. Wehle's allegation that Prime Minister Hatta is a Communist takes on an even stranger note if one picks up newspapers, such as the Daily Worker in New York, or the Worker of London, or any other Communist Party publication in Europe or America, in which not only Prime Minister Hatta, but President Soekarno and the entire Republic of Indonesia are excoriated time and time again as Fascists, anti-Communists, and tools of American capitalism.

The United States State Department, itself, has clearly recognized the anti-Communist attitude of the Republican leaders. Mr. Wehle makes much of the fact that the disorders in Indonesia have prevented the United States of Indonesia from being founded; he alleges that no elections have been held because the Government of the Republic could not control its own guerrilla forces. Maj. Fred Crockett, who went in as a military observer with the Dutch and British forces in the fall of 1945, pointed out in an article he wrote for Harper's some months later that the Dutch troops who went into Indonesia at that time were "trigger happy." There was no fighting in Indonesia at the beginning, but the Dutch, by their irresponsible attacks on unarmed Indonesian civilians, including women and children, provoked some clashes. And finally, when the Dutch Government tried to reinstate the Japanese in cities like Surabaya, full-scale fighting broke out.

Mr. Wehle, himself, claims that the Indonesian people are anti-Japanese and anti-Communist. What he does not seem to understand is that after two sneak attacks by the Dutch, after numerous Dutch violations of existing agreements with the Republic, and after 3½ years of living under all the exigencies of a Dutch land, sea, and air blockade, the Indonesian people are not only anti-Japanese and anti-Communist, but are also and very understandably anti-Dutch.

As for the right of the United Nations to intervene in the Indonesian case, the Security Council of the United Nations has decided, by a majority vote, to permit the Republic of Indonesia to participate in the discussions of its case, as a de facto authority, and the Security Council has taken up this question because it considers the Dutch military action in Indonesia a threat to the peace of the world. The 19 nations which gathered at New Delhi last January also regard the Dutch attack as a threat to international peace. It is certainly the responsibility of the United Nations and not that of one member nation numbering less than 10,000,000 people, to determine what is and what is not a threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. Wehle's contention that the Federalists are anxious to dissociate themselves from the Republic, looks most peculiar in view of the fact that the governments of the three largest states outside of the Republic resigned in protest against the Dutch military attack on the Republic last December. The Dutch, by preventing any political negotiations from being carried on after the agreements were signed aboard the *Renville*, also prevented the setting up of the United States of Indonesia, although the Republic was anxious to have that government established through the holding of a plebiscite in the disputed areas, as provided for in the *Renville* agreements.

Mr. Wehle has quoted from the articles of the United Nations Charter, I quote from its preamble

(a) to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

(b) to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

(c) to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

(d) to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

The Dutch have failed singularly to live up to these noble principles of the United Nations Charter.

J. J. SINGH,
President, India League of America.
NEW YORK, *April 20, 1949.*

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram directed to the President of the United States by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, regarding the labor legislation pending in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The morning press announces reported compromise labor bill drafted by some Democratic leaders of the House. The administration's labor bill has the endorsement of the committees in the Senate and House as well as of labor and liberals, and the proposed compromise is definitely a surrender to the demands of the Republicans and big business. No doubt the proposed surrender was actuated by fear, and I predict that if some of the Democratic leaders disregard the mandate of the people of November 2, 1948, by compromising with reactionaries on the labor bill it will definitely weaken the party and will thrust upon labor an obnoxious law under which it may chafe for years to come. It appears that the lines in Congress are closely drawn between Representatives who are fighting for democracy and on the other hand Representatives who are fighting in the interests of big business. We command the firm position that you have taken throughout in upholding the voice of the people and demanding that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed. The leaders of the Democratic Party must carry out their pledges to the people by standing steadfastly by the administration's bill with no compromise with the interests that would destroy us.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the Marshall plan has now struck at the heart of many of our industries, and the ultimate devastating effect on the employees of our industries no man can foretell. The preliminary effect in some parts of my congressional district is already ghastly. I plead not guilty of casting my vote to throw the people, I have the honor to represent, out of employment. If I had yielded to the propaganda of the internationalists and the interventionists in their raid upon our Treasury there would be little that I could say at the present time to justify my opposition to the Marshall plan.

There has recently been introduced in Congress an ITO—International Trade Organization—which if adopted either as legislation or as a treaty will make the approaching disaster complete. The effect is bound to head this country for a deficit and thus there will be a return to deficit financing. It is time that every person interested in the preservation of our economic system and the retention of our liberties give heed to the trend of the times and in his or her capacity forget emotionalism and use their objective faculties in promoting sound fundamental principles in all phases of our governmental affairs.

An editorial has just appeared in the Jamestown (N. Y.) Shopping Guide under date of May 5, 1949, which I am inserting in the RECORD as worthy of the careful reading of those who realize the importance of protecting the employer, the employees, and the public from the

foreign raids upon our markets and resources.

THE MARSHALL PLAN PAYS OFF IN DEPRESSION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Two thousand jobless Jamestown textile workers now know that the Marshall plan works. Washed out of jobs by a flood of cheap foreign-made textiles, these workers are a part of the great parade of America's unemployed who lost their jobs because their employers could not compete with the sweatshops financed in Europe by our taxpayers' money, and imported into the United States to create dollars abroad.

Thousands of watchmakers have lost their jobs, along with motorcar workmen, because the cheaply made, inferior foreign product flooded our markets to snuff out the superior product made here. By doling out bigger and bigger give-aways to foreign producers, what is today taking place in unemployment is but a mere shadow of what we may expect in the next year.

A year ago, many businessmen and manufacturers were asking Congress to quickly pass the multibillion dollar give-away plan. Any person who questioned the wisdom of this was quickly branded as Communist. Americans were not supposed to think, but follow like sheep.

Along with certain farmers, they thought this a fine place to dump their surplus at a nice profit, even overlooking the fact that they were also taxpayers, and obliged to pay $125 a head to put over this jack pot.

Today, with factories closed, warehouses brimful of unsold goods, and taxes mounting for bigger and bigger world give-aways, a few labor leaders and manufacturers have caught onto the idea behind this plan to create world socialism.

Unfortunately, there is not sufficient demand in Europe for the goods which are being produced in excessive quantities and the chances are that they will have to be sold in the United States. Thereby they will have the unexpected effect of increasing unemployment in this country.

These facts come out of a document which French Foreign Minister Schuman presented to Secretary of State Acheson. Because of its explosive content the document still is being kept top secret.

French perfume, Belgian lace, and Italian, French, and Belgian textile industries, which had a place of their own in the world's prewar economy, now are back to what they used to be before 1939.

Lyons and Milan are producing fine fabrics, used principally for luxury purposes, and Bruges and Brussels are in full swing turning out lace and similar commodities. French vineyards can provide the world with excellent wines, champagnes, and brandies.

Before the war a large part of the production of these goods was consumed in Europe, but now financial and currency crises in those countries prevent former consumers from purchasing them.

French and Italian economists went to London to discuss their problems of overproduction, which within a few months will cause a scale of unemployment which will play into the hands of Communist agitators.

Unfortunately, they found little sympathetic response from the British Government and particularly from Cripps, the British economic dictator.

They urged the British to relax their austerity program and accept some of their luxury goods. They expressed willingness to accept in exchange some of the heavier goods including whisky, which normally has only a limited market in continental Europe.

Not only was Cripps unwilling to accept luxury products from the Continent, the French say, but the British Government even placed obstacles in the way of exports of butter and fresh vegetables, of which there is a superabundance in France today.

It appears that the harshness and predatory policies of the Nazi occupation forces did not seriously deplete Normandy's stock of cattle, and today their number exceeds that of 1938. But even now much of the dairy production is wasted, because the quantities available exceed the demand by far and Britain keeps only a crack of its import door open.

The French argument that the ERP agreements provided specifically for the absorption of overproduction had no effect on the stubborn British economic dictator. When the British accepted the American dole, they promised with such honor as they possess, to accept the surplus goods of any other ERP country. But going back on this, along with repayment of debts to United States, jarred not a man of the Cripps stripe.

Add to these facts the recent tax reductions in beggar countries we keep on the dole, whose politicians tell their people that their socialism is superior to our free enterprise, the fact that half our foreign gifts go to Russia, to further build up that menace to world peace, and you have a picture of what these fantastic deals are doing and will continue to do in the days ahead.

A few days ago, the Reds took over China, equipped with American guns. The $5,000,000,000 of our wealth doled out to that unfortunate land is now safe in the hands of Stalin's barbarians.

Our military experts advise the Reds could sweep across Europe to the Atlantic in 30 days. And we do not even recognize the only country in Europe which has booted out the Communists. Isn't time running out on the promising planners, whose bungling brought about the present crisis?

European countries are preparing to dump their surplus production on the United States. Britain is expected to offer the American people whisky and leather goods at far lower prices.

The reason this program has not yet been adopted is that American tariffs are still high. By summer we must expect an avalanche of luxury goods in this country, manufactured by the Europeans. Prices may be cut sharply.

From the point of view of the American purchaser who is accustomed to luxury goods this may be good news. But American economists frown at the idea of an influx of cheap foreign goods into the United States at this time.

They know what has been done to the American watch industry by cheap foreign labor.

In New England and some Southern States mills are slowing down considerably. Distillers are disturbed by competition of Scotch whisky and French brandies at a price lower than the cheapest American product. Growers in California, New York, and Ohio will worry when they hear that French and Italian wines and champagnes will be offered in the American market at prices with which American producers will have difficulty competing.

The legislators who approved ERP were assured at that time that there was no serious risk of European dumping in the American market, since it was provided in the agreement that the signatories would absorb the overproduction of each other.

Only a limited market is provided in Europe itself. South America is able to use only a small part of Europe's output and Asia provides no outlet at all. In the days before the war luxury goods had a fair market in some parts of China, Singapore, and India. These now are completely closed.

The only present outlet for Europe's goods is the United States, which will have to absorb more than it did before the war if it is to avert an economic crisis in Europe. This comes at a time when we are confronted with an industrial and economic recession and heavier taxes than before.

After we have provided Europe with the means to stage a limited economic comeback, we shall have to consume the goods which we have helped Europe produce, at the expense of American labor.

The suggestion is made in Washington that planners talk frankly to the British and warn them that they must live up to the agreement which provides for unhampered exchange of goods among the nations which benefit from ERP.

The British Socialist Party worried about its latest set-backs and is intent on proceeding with even greater nationalization of some industries within the next 2 years. They have made an utter failure of every private industry they have taken over, so why now be discouraged about using American money to take over a few more industries?

Economic Dictator Cripps is determined to put through industrial nationalization, even if he realizes that the policies he must adopt toward that end might be hurtful to Britain's present allies. Meanwhile, the economy survey is being kept secret lest it influence adversely the American people and the policy of cooperation with western Europe.

BLOWING THE WHISTLE

The House passed the deficiency bill without challenging the deletion by the Appropriations Committee of funds to keep the Freedom Train running around the country another year. The train is a traveling museum of documents bearing on the origins and growth of American liberty, with some extraneous material relating to frauds put over on the unsuspecting public in the name of peace and security.

Consciously or not, the House has done the right thing in bringing the Freedom Train to a stop. In voting $25,500,000,000 within the week and $32,500,000,000 to carry out the crazy plans of the spenders, the House has made a terrific effort to bring American freedom itself to a stop. It is silly to talk about running propaganda caravans around the country to tell Americans they have freedom when Congress is taking the freedom away from them.

No citizen has freedom any longer to do as he will with his earnings. When he collects his pay check, he finds the politicians got there before him. If he saves anything, the administration takes it away from him in quarterly installments. It has mortgaged the future of his children for generations with an enormous debt.

Total taxes—local, State, and Federal—already amount to 37 percent of the total spendable income of all Americans. The impending increase of the spending policy will hoist the tax take to over 40 percent.

Freedom? What freedom is there for provident citizens to celebrate when the politicians pass out price-supported bread and send around its traveling circuses?

WORSHIPPING BAAL

When Alger Hiss (now under indictment by a Federal grand jury for perjury in the notorious spy case) was writing UN Charter in keeping with the mentality and morality of the men he represented, as an appeasement to the barbaric Russians, he kept God out of the Charter. Since then, no prayer has been uttered in its Council.

Now, four long years later UN, conscious of criticism that its charter, the declaration of human rights, and all other of its warrants or prounciamentos never mention or appeal to God, has decided to pay its first official act of deference to the Supreme Being.

In a remote upper room in the $65,000,000 headquarters, now being erected at our expense, in New York, there will be a little prayer room into which the bold politicians hope to crowd God.

Not to give offense to such godless as the Russians or to non-Christians, it is decreed that the prayer chamber be built in a sequestered area of the six-block project.

Originally the plan was secret from the Russians, if not Providence. The design calls for a bare room of Spartan simplicity which will do violence to no man's faith.

People of many faiths were disappointed when no mention was made of God in the United Nations Charter, and many were

shocked to think that the formal exclusion of God from the councils of the UN was a concession to atheism which compounded deference to man with offense to divinity. They protested a situation in which minority membership, representing disbelief in God or espousal of strange gods, was permitted to prevail over majority membership representing traditional belief in a Being Supreme over the affairs of men.

Many persons may consider that the plan, by its very evasiveness and restraint, still carries a certain element of irreverence to Divine Providence.

On the record of the UN in defense of colonial exploitation and in pursuit of international profit-grabbing, the appropriate image would be either Mammon or the brass god Baal. They would be recognizable to most of the representatives, should they ever happen to wander into the chamber of meditation.

COST OF WAR

Now while planners, to cover up past blunders, prepare for the next war—which somebody else will fight and pay for—it is wise to attempt to assess the cost of the last conflict. Nothing resembling an exact accounting can be made—there are too many imponderables and intangibles, which permit of only an informed guess. One of the most thoughtful efforts appears in Harper's magazine in an article by C. Hartley Grattan.

About 10,000,000 members of armed forces lost their lives. The last war was unique in that civilians suffered a heavier mortality than did men in uniform. The casualties from bombing; the planned extermination of whole categories of civilians; the terrible death rate among slave laborers; the losses in underground movements—these and other causes probably were responsible for 30,000,000 deaths. Thus, the total human cost of the war was 40,000,000.

The most obvious and easily unearthed cost is the money actually spent for military purposes by victor and vanquished. This is recorded in national budgets. It came to more than a trillion dollars, $1,117,000,000,000.

Factories, power plants, transportation systems and whole industrial regions were razed on a wholesale scale. Both sides concentrated on attacking dwelling areas—people who have no place to live especially in severe weather are of small value as workers. This loss is estimated at $2,234,000,000,000 (over two trillion).

The depletion of natural resources, the disorganization of economic systems, the value of labor and material seized and carted off by invaders and so on adds up to $650,000,000,000. Adding all the costs up, we have a final, incredible figure of $4,000,000,000,000. And this leaves out the moral cost of war, which is beyond statistics.

We lost 396,637 in dead in the last Global War, plus unknown thousands of permanently disabled, mentally ill, spiritually wounded. To think we can still tolerate in office men who prepare for the next war!

The Plight of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very interesting article from the Washington Star regarding the plight of the Republic of Finland. Finland, the only World War I country who has never defaulted on her debt, is making a gallant fight to rebuild itself, and deserves the complete sympathy and assistance of all of us. I hope that you will all take the opportunity to read this article in full.

FINLAND, STIFLED BY YALTA CURBS, LOOKING TO UNITED STATES FOR RELIEF

(By Jessie Fant Evans)

The plight of the brave, freedom-loving peoples of northern Finland, particularly among scientific and professional groups, is more desperate than elsewhere in western Europe. This is vouched for by Mrs. K. Hilding Beij of 3428 Porter Street NW., a leader in District Red Cross circles.

Fay Pierce Beij, daughter of the late Dr. Ulysses Grant Baker Pierce, pastor for 42 years of All Souls' Church, Unitarian, accompanied her husband to the recent International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics in Oslo, Norway. They traveled extensively and because her husband speaks Swedish fluently, had exceptional opportunities to learn first-hand the condition of Finland's white-collar classes. (Finland once belonged to Sweden and most of the older Finns speak Swedish as well as Russian.)

"It is difficult for us to realize that by the terms of the Yalta Conference a sixth of Finland was transferred to Russia, and what remains has little good farming land," Mrs. Beij said. "All of the present Finland is artificially drained to conserve water, and it is incredible the amount of back-breaking labor required for agriculture. Even so, the people are making a desperate effort to keep abreast of scientific progress in their farming.

"With practically all of their modern farming machinery surrendered to the Russians, the Finns are reduced in many instances to primitive-farming methods."

Forty percent of all the money they make goes to the Russians for reparations, so does the same percentage of their milk production, which is accurately measured. All furs go to Russia.

One-fourth of their income is collected in taxes and they cannot make purchases out of the country, not even to subscribe to a scientific magazine or any other educational type of publication.

ONE IN TWENTY-FIVE CHILDREN ORPHANED

One child out of every 25 is a war orphan and one person out of every nine is a displaced person. Since Finland's principal power plants were in the portion conceded to Russia by the Yalta Conference, the use of both water and electricity is drastically curtailed. Even the bathtub fixtures had been removed in the Kalus-Kirki, principal hotel in Helsinki, which was their headquarters. Spoilage of food in the cities is a problem because of insufficient refrigeration. Telephoning is distinctly limited and regulated, in some places to the morning hours, in others to specified afternoon schedules.

"Yet with all of the regimentation to which the Finnish people must submit, it seems impossible to bend or to break their spirit of independence, or their grim, courageous spirit of humor," Mrs. Beij said. One of their small coins is an exemplification of this. It shows a naked fisherman drawing in a seine by a rope. Its popular meaning is that, even if he has nothing to wear after paying his reparations, there is still a rope to which he can cling.

The admiration of the Finnish people for Americans is genuine. The slogan which they believe applies to all of us is, "Late to bed, early to rise, work like blazes, and advertise."

GIFT PACKAGES GETTING THROUGH

Bright spots in their drab, poverty-stricken existence are the arrival of packages of food and clothing from friends in the United States.

"They are getting through," Mrs. Beij stressed. "Not one of ours has failed to be acknowledged by a grateful recipient with sometimes almost heart-breaking comments upon the utilization of every scrap, even the paper and cord around the boxes. The halter on a milk-giving goat outside the home of a Finnish scientist near one of the agricultural experiment stations last summer was fashioned of bits of twine saved from the United States of America parcels."

Shoes in both city and country districts either have wooden soles or are fashioned of birch bark after the fashion of moccasins. Since few people have had new clothes since 1939, the garments of many are threadbare and an overlay of patch upon patch. Coffee is $10 a pound. Soap is all of the ersatz variety. Ironing is done without heat by means of mangles with heavy, smooth birch rollers filled with stones and so heavy it takes two persons to manipulate them. Yet with all the need, Dr. and Mrs. Beij did not see a beggar in all Finland.

AN EXTRACT FROM A LETTER

This extract from a letter dated April 2 is, they believe, its own plea from a generous response to the drive to be made this month for packages to the Finns:

"It is comforting to think that in some parts of the world it is possible to live in security and without fear or wavering as to the long, safe perspectives ahead."

Fay Pierce Beij's interest in humanitarian service goes back to her student days at the George Washington University in 1917. (She is an A. B. and M. A. from George Washington.)

With World War I under way, Admiral Stockton, president of the university, asked her as a member of its staff in nursing and first aid in the medical school, to represent the institution on Mrs. Larz Anderson's refreshment corps at Union Station, which inaugurated Red Cross canteen work here.

Active in recruitment for the regional blood center here, she and her husband were among the first blood donors. Chairman of the Red Cross First Aid Corps here, she is the leader of one of its four training squads, in addition to her service as vice president for safety services for the Red Cross, which include first aid, accident prevention, and water safety.

Her telephone number is Emerson 5120 and she will be glad to answer inquiries as to how help may be extended to the Finnish people.

Mr. Beij is director of the hydraulic laboratory in the United States Bureau of Standards.

KFI Frost Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by radio station KFI of Los Angeles indicating the high value of its frost-warning service to the public and showing clearly how this great service to the people of the Southwest is performed at a considerable sacrifice of revenues to the station itself. The statement is as follows:

KFI FROST WARNINGS

A new chapter in the story of KFI, Los Angeles' continuing service to the Pacific Southwest agricultural industry: The frost warnings.

For many years KFI, Los Angeles' 50,000 watts on a clear channel, has been serving the $600,000,000 southern California agricultural industry, plus the multimillion-dollar agricultural industry in 70 counties in 6 other States.

One of KFI's unique services has been the nightly frost warnings—for 8 years a fixture in the middle of KFI's evening schedule.

KFI is the only station that can perform this vital service to the fruit and vegetable growers of the Pacific Southwest because KFI is the only station with sufficient power on a clear channel to serve all the growers and ranchers. No other single station—or combination of existing stations—could reach as much of the agricultural industry as KFI's 50,000 watts on 640 kilocycles. It is perhaps not modest—but, nevertheless, true—that KFI is the only southern California station willing to make the sacrifices year after year that this vital public service entails:

(1) Paying the cost of the line charges and other extra costs resulting from this service.

(2) Rebating to advertisers for the time taken by the frost warnings.

In 1948 the most vital chapter in the 8-year history of the frost warnings was unfolded.

KFI's frost warnings became a cause celebre among the radio listeners of the Pacific Southwest. This is the story:

On November 13, KFI was advised by the National Broadcasting Co. that Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., sponsors of the Chesterfield Supper Club, would not permit the interruption of its program by the frost warnings this year.

KFI was asked to move the frost warnings out of the 9 p. m. California daylight-time period into some other time.

This KFI knew was impossible because:

1. Floyd Young's nightly frost warnings are timed to permit maximum accuracy by the forecaster and maximum activity by the growers (who must arrange for firing huge groves in a few hours).

2. After 8 years the growers had learned to expect the frost warnings at a given time—8 p. m. standard time or 9 p. m. daylight time. Many growers would miss this vital service if it were scheduled at another time.

Liggett & Myers would accept none of the alternatives proposed by KFI. KFI made every effort to reconcile the difference with Liggett & Myers, but eventually the choice was reduced to public service versus the advertiser. KFI chose public service and instructed the network to accept immediate cancellation from the sponsor. The cancellation became effective with the broadcast of November 22.

To explain to its listeners who would be tuning in to hear the Chesterfield Supper Club, KFI made the following statement immediately before the frost warning broadcast of November 22:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we earnestly request your careful attention to the following vitally important message from the management of KFI.

"This is the eighth consecutive year in which KFI has broadcast during the winter months the nightly frost warnings, an invaluable public service to the Pacific Southwest's $200,000,000-a-year citrus and agricultural industry.

"In all this time KFI has not asked for listener reaction to this service. We do so now. We should like all of you who hear these nightly frost warnings to write to KFI. A penny post card will do. We have, of course, received much evidence from many sources that these frost warnings help save millions of dollars annually in southern California and far western agricultural crops. But to bring them to ranchers and growers, we have perhaps inconvenienced metropolitan listeners by forcing them to forego from 1 to 5 minutes of radio entertainment.

"We now ask these metropolitan residents, and other listeners with no direct interest in agriculture, are you willing to have us continue to break into your radio entertainment in order to provide this brief but highly valuable service to the richest agricultural area in the entire Nation? KFI, by virtue of its clear channel and 50,000 watts of power, is the only station which can reach all the ranchers and growers in the area. And this hour—9 o'clock California daylight time, which is 8 o'clock standard time—has been determined over a period of years by the grower as the most desirable time to broadcast the warnings. But even if this were not so, and the frost warnings were broadcast at some other hour, they would still cut into the entertainment of some listeners.

"Circumstances have forced us to make a decision—either we discontinue the frost warnings, or we retain them at the expense of dropping from our schedule the Chesterfield Supper Club which has been heard for many years in this segment of time. We ask that you consider carefully these factors: On the one hand, a high-caliber 15-minute musical feature; on the other, immeasurable assistance in the successful fruition and assured harvesting of $200,000,000 worth of the Nation's food products.

"In the opinion of KFI, there is but one choice—the sacrifice of entertainment for service. However, we feel that it is only fair that our listeners be given the chance to either sustain or veto this choice. In the meantime the Chesterfield Supper Club will not be heard.

"Please let us have your opinion, in a letter or on a penny postcard. Please do not telephone. This is our question to both rural listeners and metropolitan listeners: Are you for, or against, the continuation of the nightly citrus industry frost warnings? A penny postcard will do. Address KFI, Los Angeles 54. Thank you."

This single announcement brought one of the greatest floods of mail in the 26-year history of KFI: More than 22,000 letters and wires.

Though more than 50 percent of the letters came from cities, less than one-half of 1 percent recommended dropping the frost warnings. Following is a tabulation of the origin of the mail:

Tabulation of origin of frost-warning mail, totaling 19,796; 2,340 additional affirmative letters were received after following chart was made, bringing the grand total to 22,126:

County classification shows:

Los Angeles	11,611
San Bernardino	2,432
Riverside	2,181
Orange	1,685
San Diego	936
Ventura	572
Tulare	137
Santa Barbara	94
Kern	21
Imperial	20
San Luis Obispo	15
Inyo	9
Placer	8
Sonoma	7
Butte	6
Contra Costa	6
Santa Clara	5
Solano	4
Monterey	4
Tehama	4
Sacramento	4
Alameda	3
San Joaquin, Siskiyou, Lake, and Santa Cruz (each)	2
Del Norte, Kings, Mendocino, Marin, Mono, Nevada, Eldorado, Shasta, San Francisco, Stanislaus, Trinity, Tuolumne, and Yuba (each)	1
Total	19,796

Cities responding in greatest number were:

Los Angeles	3,671
Riverside	1,176
Pomona	708
Long Beach	667
Pasadena	626
Redlands	590
Santa Ana	422
San Bernardino	411
Ontario	383
Covina	352
La Verne	332
Anaheim	320
Burbank	296
Whittier	286
Glendale	281

Only 115 letters were received expressing a preference for Chesterfield Supper Club.

(Press comment was unanimous in favor of KFI's decision to continue the frost warnings. Some of it follows:)

[From the Billboard of November 27, 1948]

FROST WARNING ON KFI CHILLS "SUPPER CLUB"

HOLLYWOOD, November 20.—Chesterfield's Supper Club was canceled over KFI, local National Broadcasting Co. (NBC) affiliate, effective Monday (22), following station's refusal to shift its nightly frost warning broadcasts out of Chesterfield's current 9 p. m., p. d. s. t. slot. Bankroller insisted that KFI discontinue practice of cutting into the first several minutes of Chesterfield's airer to carry weather data, and canceled only after combined negotiations of NBC and KFI failed to settle the matter.

KFI's stand was based on the importance of nightly frost warnings to the $600,000,000 California agricultural industry, contending that surveys have shown the 9 p. m. slot to be the best airing time (8 p. s. t.) for the long established public service feature. Station offered to record Supper Club for later airing with no charge to sponsor, while continuing to carry show in present slot as well. Bankroller nixed the offer, contending that with revised gimmicks now used on club loss of opening minutes would kill show's value entirely.

KFI will continue frost airing as usual and peddle the remaining portion of the 15-minute seg to local bankrollers. Chesterfield, meanwhile, was searching for a new local outlet to take the airer. It was believed a deal would be made either with a rival net or possibly a local indie.

[From the Beverly Post of December 2, 1948]

MOVING IN—SERVICE BEFORE PROFIT

Radio station KFI of Los Angeles deserves a vote of confidence and the loyal support of every citizen of California for the big, broad stand they have taken in the recent controversy between the makers of Chesterfield cigarettes and the station's insistence that it continue to broadcast the nightly frost warnings to the citrus growers in this State.

This all comes about in a very funny manner: Each night during that season of the year when frost is liable to attack the huge orchard areas of this State, not just locally here in southern California but as far north as Fresno, KFI in cooperation with the fruit frost warning service has been broadcasting the possible weather conditions and the chances of frost hitting the many sections interested. This service gives the growers advance notice that it might be necessary for them to smudge to protect this greatest of State industries, the orange groves, against the possible loss of the entire crop due to frost.

Now, it also seems that exactly at that same hour each night the makers of Chesterfield cigarettes have a coast-to-coast broadcast known as the Chesterfield Supper Club, in which several well-known stars are fea-

tured. Comes a demand from the agency representing the makers of Chesterfield cigarettes demanding that this minute or two break into the first part of their program be discontinued and, in a very positive manner advising KFI that unless this service to the people of California is discontinued they would have to cancel this paid program.

KFI believing that service to the people of California, particularly the orange growers, is of more importance than the profit they made from their paid radio program, advised the agency that that was about all they could do because the fruit frost warnings were going to be continued.

So, no more Perry Como and the Chesterfield Supper Club but the service to the people continues.

Upon receipt of notice that the supper club would be canceled, KFI went on the air to the people asking their reaction on this broadcast; they asked that letters be written the station expressing their reaction to the action they had taken. As of this writing, the station has made three appeals for letters and have received 12,000 answers of which they have opened and read 4,000. Over half of the letters opened came from people who are not in the fruit-growing business and live in the cities. Out of that 4,000 there were only 10 letters decrying the action and stating a preference for music as against frost warnings.

During the discussion which prefaced this cancelation of the program a representative of the agency is reported to have stated that they were not interested in selling cigarettes to the country folks but were slanting all of their program advertising toward the folks. who live in the city. That's a silly statement on the face of it because if this person who seemingly had the authority to make such statements really knew California, he would have known that prosperity and success for the orange growers of this State means good business and success for almost every business in the metropolitan section of the State. When the farmers are broke, so are the city folks, who might go back to rolling their own at a lot less cost.

Californians should resent the attitude of the makers of Chesterfield cigarettes and their advertising agency against the better interests of the prosperity of one of the principal industries of this State; they should show their resentment in their cigarette purchases, or the lack of purchase, of their brand.

Again I say, congratulations to radio station KFI, its management, and its policy makers for placing the prosperity of California over and above the profit from a single paid program. Service before profit will win in the long run or I don't know Californians.

Hindsight strongly underscored the importance of KFI's decision because southern California's 1948–49 winter is already established as the coldest in more than 50 years.

Citrus and vegetable losses—despite heavy firing by growers—are already many millions of dollars.

What they would have been without KFI's nightly frost warnings no one can even guess.

Our Country Is Being Taken Over by Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is submitted herewith for consideration of my colleagues a condensation of a recent article on the way aliens are being admitted to this country. This article is by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

At present, the port of New York has records of 28,000 visitors who failed to depart and have not been located; 17,000 transits (persons supposed to be merely passing through the United States on their way to another country) who are still here; and 1,200 students who apparently have decided to invite themselves for permanent residence. That is 47,000 persons on record in the New York district alone. The total number in the country is estimated at 100,000. This is more than usually come in lawfully as quota immigrants in a year.

This alarming situation can be explained only by an incredible lack of interest in halting the traffic on the part of our Government. It cannot be charged to lower-level officials who, all things considered, do an excellent job. The responsibility must be sought at the top political level, which, for some reason, has been willing to close its eyes and stretch the immigration laws. At one time during the war, when our consuls in Europe were working their arms off night and day stamping visas for everybody, our Immigration Commissioner was hurried to Europe with 200 extra clerks in order to speed up the parade. An Assistant Secretary of State says that perhaps 300,000 aliens got visas in this way. As the problem grew worse and while we were rushing hundreds of clerks to Europe to speed up the flood, over 500 men were let out of the force here.

A special priority was given to "professors" and their families. From 1941 to 1945—4 years—we admitted 130 professors and their families from Europe. But in the last 6 months of 1947 alone we admitted 612 professors, wives and children. And 128 of these came from Poland, 17 from Rumania, and 10 from the Soviet Union.

Congressmen have charged that "anyone can get into the United States." So-called experts of all sorts come in as attachés, secretaries, clerks, or servants of innumerable missions and special foreign committees. The country swarms with unscreened, uninvited, and loosely admitted aliens. The danger lurking in the situation is obvious.

Codification of United States Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, designated me as chairman of a subcommittee consisting of ROBERT L. RAMSAY, West Virginia; BOYD TACKETT, Arkansas; EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana; J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware; and ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts, to deal with the difficult problem of revising and recodifying the law. These gentlemen, with the aid of a small but efficient staff, have entered upon the work. Already progress has been made but there is much more to be done.

In the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, May 1, 1949, an article appeared with reference to our work which I believe will be of public interest. Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the said article.

UNITED STATUTES BEING CODIFIED FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE 1873

WASHINGTON.—United States statutes are in a mess, and it's going to take years to straighten them out.

A congressional committee has been working intensively on the job since 1943. When it is done there will be a revised body of laws which a citizen can understand.

The laws were last revised in 1873, when the Forty-second Congress passed and President Grant signed a gigantic piece of legislation which at once repealed every previous general and permanent law and gave the country the so-called revised statutes.

The task took 5 years, but law scholars say it would have been worth doing had it taken twice that long. The result was an indexed, 1-volume, 70-title publication in which all laws were arranged by subject matter, with superseded and repealed laws left out.

Up to that time there was only one way for lawyers, Congressmen and the courts to track down the exact law on any given topic. That was to start at the end of the immense, 17-volume Statutes-at-Large and work back, law by law, to Public Law No. 1, First Congress.

Statutes-at-Large are a chronological compilation of all laws and concurrent resolutions of Congress. A law passes Congress, goes to the enrolling room, thence to the President, thence to the end of the Statutes-at-Large.

Publication of the revised statutes in 1873 made it easy to determine the existing status of any given law by locating the right title, checking the index and looking it up. But since 1873 the Government has been passing new laws at the rate of several hundred every Congress. They can all be found in the Statutes-at-Large, one after the other—in 44 volumes averaging well over 1,000 pages each.

By 1926 the job of law-locating had become so tough again that Congress authorized a complete codification by subject matter. This was not a revision. The law establishing the code stated plainly it was only "prima facie evidence" of the law (not the law itself). The law itself was and is the Statutes-at-Large. Although law offices, Congress, the courts, and all other constant users of the law do their work with the United States Code, not the Statutes-at-Large, the latter takes precedence in case of a discrepancy.

In the latest job of revision eight titles have been perfected by a subcommittee headed by Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, Democrat, of South Carolina, of the House Judiciary Committee, and passed into law. All previous law, on which those eight titles are based, have been repealed. Included in the eight are crimes, copyrights, and judicial procedure.

A Mother's Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, Sunday will be Mother's Day—a day of national recognition and affection. I have had the pleasure of knowing Rev. C. E. B. Ward for many years, and I have admired and respected his steady, patient, self-sacrificing work to

preserve the American home. I know his family and I recognize the way in which they, too, have given their time and efforts to support this work. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I have asked permission to include a Mother's Day message which Dr. Ward wrote recently and sent me from the New York headquarters of the League for the American Home in Carnegie Hall. The message follows:

MOTHERS, FATHERS

Thank God for your children. Thank God that the first responsibility for their manners, sound character, good citizenship, and spiritual welfare is yours. The influences you throw around them in early childhood, when they are wholly or chiefly under your care, determine their future. Their destiny is in your hands. No influences outside your home can afterward permanently change what you have done for them, whether it be for good or ill.

It is therefore up to you to be equipped to lay a good foundation—one of which you can be proud, and on which other persons and agencies can build.

In addition to assuring healthy bodies and keen minds you are obligated to place around them a positive spiritual atmosphere with definite religious instruction. "These words shalt thou teach diligently unto thy children." They have the same capacity for the spiritual as for the physical. Religion taught and practiced in the home guarantees faith and sound character in the child—and successful churches for the future.

A Chicago church tripled its Sabbath morning attendance when 90 percent of its members began observing brief exercises of Bible reading and prayer daily in their homes. All members of the family—baby in mother's arms, the little tots toddling around the room, the older boys and girls trying to sit still in their chairs—all gathered together around the table or in the living room while father opened the big book and read. Then father prayed for every member of the family by name. What happened? Instead of going only to the movies, parks, and ball games on Sundays they were conditioned toward "the church" so that the pastor preached not to an occasionally well filled house Sunday morning but to a second church full and then a third—to three packed houses every Sunday. He denies having become three times as eloquent, but for this growth in church attendance he commends the 90 percent of the parents of his 3,300 membership who have assumed the spiritual responsibility for their own children in their homes.

A Washington politican said, "I'm not surprised that my son wishes to join the church. Ever since he was 6 weeks old I have knelt by his bed and prayed for him. I have been late to political meetings and absent from others, but not 1 day in 18 years have I failed to pray for my son." Thousands of American boys and girls would not be in jails or drifting into crime if parents spent more time praying for them. A Los Angeles mother-grandmother told me she prays 4 hours daily for her four children and four grandchildren. You would look far before finding as splendid a group of eight young people as I met after that Sunday morning service.

But children are also the material from which democracies are built. Home, the first and smallest democracy, is therefore the place to teach and begin building for democracy. "I don't understand why I must be directed" said a 17-year-old lad to his mother. His mother replied, "Unless you learn obedience in the home you are not likely to learn it in school, community, or state." Home laws broken usually lead to broken laws elsewhere. Teaching children in the home to be honest, to tell the truth, to keep clean thoughts, honor parents, respect elders and those in authority, and to serve God lays the foundation for good citizens. Good citizens do not break laws of home, school, State, or Nation.

Godly homes assure sound character, successful churches, and stable governments. Godly homes grow out of God's Word and prayer. Godly homes are the Nation's first line of defense.

Mothers and fathers, think it over.

Federal Old-Age Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter to the editor of the New York Times by George Buchan Robinson on Federal old-age insurance which appeared in the New York Times, May 2, 1949.

I believe the letter effectively disposes of an economic fallacy which unfortunately has had wide dissemination.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE INSURANCE—CLASSIFICATION AS TAX OF PAY-ROLL CONTRIBUTION DISPUTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Reporting, April 27, that ex-President Hoover had written to Chairman DOUGHTON of the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of old-age and survivors insurance, the Times said:

"When benefits begin to exceed the payroll tax receipts, Mr. Hoover contended, the Government would have to redeem its I O U's from the trust fund and the money must come from the general taxpayer. He added:

" 'As those who have already paid the payroll deductions are also taxpayers, they will, to some extent be paying for their insurance twice over."

Mr. Hoover is mistaken. Those who have already paid the pay-roll deductions have been paying once for their insurance. When those same persons shall be taxed to pay Government bonds owned by the social-security fund, principal and interest, they will not be paying a second time for their insurance, as Mr. Hoover argues, but will be paying for debt service.

Mr. Hoover accordingly seems to be the victim of a certain accounting error: The treating of a debt service cost produced by the Government having borrowed, whether from the social-security fund or from others, as if it were instead a cost of old-age insurance produced by the fund's having lent to the Government (i. e., by old-age insurance reserve accumulation of Government bonds). This accounting error has plagued the debate on social security since 1935, although the record of the debate abounds with identifications of it.

Would Mr. Hoover contend, when banks, insurance companies, and Mr. Hoover himself receive interest on Government bonds, or receive the principal thereof when the bonds have matured, that the Government had taxed for the banks, the insurance companies, and Mr. Hoover? He would be incorrect if he should so contend.

TAX FOR DEBT SERVICE

When the owners of Government bonds receive the principal or the interest thereof from the Government they receive as creditors of the Government, and not as the payees of appropriations. When the Government pays bonds or interest it taxes for that purpose, i. e., for debt service, and not for any bond owners, be they banks, insurance companies, private investors, or old-age insurance. The Government will not tax to redeem its I O U's from the trust fund, but, if it redeems its bonds, will tax to redeem its bonds, whoever may own them. That tax, which will be a tax for debt service, should not be described as a tax for old-age insurance any more than another part of the same tax, which should pay bonds owned by Mr. Hoover, should be described as a tax for Mr. Hoover.

The Government is not supporting those who own Government bonds, including the banks and insurance companies, when it pays Government bonds. The Government, in those circumstances, is merely paying to its bond owners what it owes to them, for value paid; and the payments the Government makes are not costs of supporting the bond owners.

Mr. Hoover treated the cost of paying old-age insurance Government bonds, incorrectly, as a cost of old-age insurance. That cost is a cost of the debt service. Mr. Hoover, obviously, assumed that additional money must come from the general taxpayer if old-age insurance owns Government bonds, and that assumption is not acceptable.

The social-security fund—old-age insurance—costs and their origins must be understood if the plan is to have an enduring success.

GEORGE BUCHAN ROBINSON.
IRVINGTON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y., *April 28, 1949.*

The Gift of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I shall deliver on Thursday, May 5, 1949, on WMEX, Boston, Mass.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the time has come for us to affirm our belief in the faith that is America.

We have problems in this country, small as compared with the problems of other countries, but problems none-the-less.

It is our way to face problems in the open rather than hide them under a rigid censorship.

Because of the freedom of debate in this country our difficulties are sometimes magnified beyond their true proportions.

The overwhelming good in our society is sometimes taken for granted and we fail to count our blessings.

This can be dangerous.

While all honest Americans, anxious to correct certain deficiencies, frankly attack these problems with the intent of correcting them, there are others who prefer to dwell on them and thereby create the false impression that our form of government and our free way of life are outdated and inefficient.

In certain parts of the world, people have been misled by this propaganda.

Even here in our own country there are a few who ignore our real accomplishments, and simply because we cannot build a utopia overnight, they are taken in by the false promises of communism, mere promises which conceal a deadly tyranny.

That is why I say that we must acknowledge the positive values in the United States, so that from these truths and these facts we shall be strengthened to tackle our problems constructively.

In line with this, the United States Department of Labor has issued a booklet titled "The Gift of Freedom," which I recommend to those who are of faint heart.

It is a well-documented report which dispels the myths of propaganda with hardheaded facts.

It is a study of the economic and social status of wage earners in the United States, and is living proof of how fortunate we really are.

I want to give you a few high lights of this report.

During the war we succeeded in raising our total economic production in spite of the fact that 13,000,000 men and women were diverted to the armed forces.

There were many prophets of gloom who said that the United States would suffer widespread unemployment at the end of the war as the country resumed a more normal way of life.

But in 1947 total civilian employment averaged over 58,000,000, as against the wartime peak of 54,500,000 in 1943 and the prewar volume of 47,500,000 in 1940.

Even today, with sharp unemployment in textiles and a few other industries, the national total of unemployment is but slightly above the normal percentage.

The increase in the labor force is more than the number which would have been expected on the basis of normal growth in population.

This is despite the fact that hundreds of thousands of war veterans are full-time students under a Government-aid program and are not now in the labor force.

Then there is the increasing number of women who are employed.

This has been brought about by changes in social customs, increased employment opportunites in urban communities and in modern economic life, elimination of many of the burdens of household activities, but probably most of all by the desire of women for an active life and for social, economic, as well as legal, independence.

In April 1948 there were 17,200,000 women in the American labor force, or about 31 percent of all women over 14 years of age.

The large and varied production in the United States has had its material basis in our natural resources.

These are extraordinary and extensive, but the existence of resources gives no assurance of their efficient use.

Other resources have been the resourcefulness and initiative of individuals and the spirit of group cooperation.

These trails arose from a mingling of peoples who came from nearly every country of the world to fashion in the United States a fresh beginning.

That experiment, far from perfect or ideal, has nevertheless been flexible and progressive.

It has embodied individual liberties, incentives, and initiative, but it has combined these with a great variety of group activities, public and private, for purposes discussed freely, adopted by agreement, and achieved with a minimum of compulsion.

Technological progress in various forms has resulted in substantial advances in productivity, as measured in terms of output per man-hour in recent decades.

In transportation, for instance, railroad workers in 1946 handled two and one-half times as much revenue traffic per hour of work as in 1916.

This increase in productivity has benefited workers to a remarkable extent.

For example, the average factory worker can now buy about twice as much as could a worker 30 years ago with his weekly wage at that time.

Thus, the gains of workers have been twofold—an increase in the amount of goods and services their wages will buy, representing a direct sharing of the fruits of rising productivity, and a reduction in hours of work, affording more leisure and a better opportunity to take part in community life.

In the year 1947 the average weekly earnings in all factory industries was $49.25, and is now somewhat higher.

In Seattle, Wash., the weekly pay of an office boy was $32.98. There is no comprehensive sickness insurance plan in the United States. Voluntary group action, however, has provided a substitute for an increasing proportion of the population.

On January 1, 1947, about 40,000,000 persons, or considerably more than 1 out of every 4 in population, were enrolled in organizations providing hospital service on a prepayment basis or were covered by insurance protection against the cost of that service, not only in hospitals but also in their homes and places of work.

The growth of voluntary group action is now extremely rapid.

The number of persons enrolled in approved hospital-service plans increased from 18,881,000 on January 1, 1946, to 24,250,000 on January 1, 1947.

Between 1909 and 1945, the capacity of hospitals which conformed to American Medical Association standards rose 313 percent as compared with an increase of 54 percent in population.

Since 1945, general hospital facilities and especially those for veterans have expanded rapidly.

The life expectancy at birth, for white males, rose from 48.2 years in 1900–02, to 59.1 years in 1929–31, with a further rise to 64.4 years in 1945.

Corresponding figures for white females show an increase in the same period from 51.1 to 69.5.

In the field of education we find that in the year 1947, those in the white age group 25–29 had completed on the average, 12.1 years of school.

Nonwhites in the same age category, had completed an average of 8.4.

More than 180,000,000 books and almost 300,000,000 pamphlets were published in 1939.

The reading of a daily newspaper is almost universal, and the home without a radio is a rarity.

In recent years the people of the United States have modified their traditional individualism by the adoption of a great variety of measures designed to safeguard the security of individuals and to give greater stability to the national economy.

These measures were adopted gradually, in accord with our custom of subjecting new changes in policies to the tests of Nationwide discussion and popular acceptance.

This program is still in the growing stage, consistent with democratic procedures.

Our efforts to reconcile security and stability with innovation and growth seem slow both to those who want full freedom for initiative and those who emphasize the need for protection and security.

The most important immediate cause of the adoption of programs for social security and economic stability was the depression of the early thirties which threw over 7,000,000 people out of work as well as many who were coming to working age by the increase of population.

The Social Security Act of 1935 was designed to prevent the recurrence of such a disaster.

By 1945, about 42,500,000 workers in private industry had wage credits under the unemployment insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

About 45,700,000 had wage credits under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions.

These figures do not include railroad workers covered by special legislation, or Federal, State, and local public employees, most of whom are also protected, especially as to old-age and survivors insurance.

Since the war we have also witnessed an increase in private pension systems, negotiated between unions and employers.

Pending an extension of coverage and an increase of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program, public assistance measures are still required for aiding persons who are not as yet covered or sufficiently protected and who do not have additional savings or income.

Expenditures of this general nature in 1945 by Federal, State, and local Governments totaled about $2,364,000,000.

Advances in prices resulted in an increase in payments to needy persons.

Extensive additional assistance was available through such unofficial agencies as community welfare organizations supported by voluntary contributions.

But apart from these material safeguards and opportunities to which I have briefly referred there are the precious values of freedom whose worth we take for granted because we do not realize what it is to be without them.

I venture to say that if we could set down a group of Russians at a busy intersection in a city or on an American farm they would first be impressed by the bountiful stores, the dress, the motorcars, and the many other features of the high standard of living enjoyed by the average citizen of our country.

But eventually, the Russians would understand that basic freedoms alone make this possible.

The basic liberties of the American heritage were summarized in 1947 by the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

They are based on recognition of the importance of the individual; they include (1) the right to safety and security of the person; (2) the right to citizenship and its privileges; (3) the right to freedom of conscience and expression; and (4) the right to equality of opportunity.

The Committee's purpose was the strengthening of civil rights, and its emphasis was therefore on failures or shortcomings; but these, it was stated and I quote "should not be permitted to obscure the real measure of success."

The report pointed out that the rights of the individual must not interfere with the equal rights of others or with the welfare of the whole group.

Following closely upon these religious and political rights and equality before the law are liberty of choice of occupation and place of residence and freedom from compulsory labor.

If, to reverse the picture, some of our leftwingers could be given the opportunity of living in Russia for a year, their foggy ideas would come to grief under the harsh facts of Soviet slavery.

As Winston Churchill suggests, the purpose of the iron curtain is to keep the Russian people from learning the facts of life in the free world because Communist propaganda would fall apart when confronted by actualities.

In the United States as elsewhere, the selection of one's occupation, the picking of a job, and the choosing of a place of residence are necessarily influenced by family and community background, personal qualifications and ambitions, training, types of economic opportunity, and in wartime by national emergency.

There is this one great difference, however, which the Communists fear that their people may someday learn.

In the United States there are no laws that impair these rights and there are no administrative or police restrictions imposed either on occupational or job changes or on shifts in place of residence.

There is no compulsory labor, and anyone can shift from one occupation or industry to

another and from hired labor to self-employment or can combine self-employment and hired labor. Individuals are at liberty to move anywhere within the United States without a pass, or to leave the country or renounce their citizenship if they so desire.

As Americans we reserve the right to disagree while respecting that same right in others.

To meet the difficult problems of our times we know that the other fellow has ideas which sometimes clear up our own blind spots. We know that a free hearing on any question is the only way to get at all of the facts.

And by mutual concessions we arrive at those areas of understanding which eliminate the extremes of master and of slave.

The fatal flaw in the Communist system is that it will not give new ideas a chance. Everyone must follow the party line set forth by a few men who claim to be all-knowing.

This will lead as surely as night follows day, to sterility and death.

In the meantime we must not be caught napping by this evil as it runs its course or we might become engulfed by it and share its inevitable fate.

As responsible men and women—because there is no freedom without courageous thought and voluntary cooperation—it is necessary for us to measure each day by the new understanding we have gained from it.

Democracy is dynamic! By its faith and its works—coming from each one of the many individuals who make up our Nation—it is the life-spirit that is beholden to God.

In our own hands, as friends and neighbors and fellows in humanity, are these tools for progress if we but use them.

We have roots, yes, which are growing into the future.

Energized by this confident belief that there is no problem without a solution, our future, and that of the submerged millions who look to us for hopeful example, is squarely up to us.

United States Can Well Afford Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Trainman News of April 30, 1949:

SOULE REPORT ANALYZES MEDICAL INSURANCE COSTS—UNITED STATES CAN WELL AFFORD HEALTH PLAN

How much will President Truman's national health insurance program cost the people and can the Nation afford such an ambitious undertaking?

Those are the questions Americans are asking as they weigh the pros and cons of the controversial measure introduced in Congress during the week. The issue, already widely discussed, will increasingly dominate radio and newspaper forums, street-corner and parlor debates as it progresses toward a decision by the lawmakers.

Although most Americans are for this vital part of the Fair Deal program, they are being bombarded with an abundance of American Medical Association propaganda against health insurance, which if permitted to go unchallenged, might seriously jeopardize the measure's chances for enactment.

AMA is spending millions of dollars to defeat compulsory health insurance and is peddling half-truths and smears as fast as its high-powered, highly paid publicists can grind it out.

A report out this week by the Committee on Research in Medical Economics and the Public Affairs Institute shows that the Nation can well afford the small additional cost of national health insurance.

The report, prepared by George Soule, widely known student and writer on economic matters, placed the gross cost of health insurance at $5,500,000,000 and net cost at $1,100,000,000.

Mr. Soule analyzed various estimates of the cost of national health insurance and concluded that the most reliable was one made by the Social Security Administration in 1945 which, revised for increased prices since that time, puts the cost at the $5,000,000,000 figure.

This estimate was based upon the premise that the present corps of doctors would provide about 25 percent more medical care under national health insurance than at present, by using full time the doctors, chiefly younger ones, whose time is not now fully occupied.

AMA FIGURES DISCOUNTED

Mr. Soule gave no serious study to recent AMA estimates that the plan might cost up to $18,000,000,000 a year. He dismissed such estimates with the brief statement that any such cost would mean an average income for doctors of about $80,000 a year.

"Since the number of doctors cannot be increased on short notice," he reported, "the cost of their services during the first year or two after application of the plan cannot be larger than that estimated by the Social Security Administration unless they are to be paid at higher rates than at present."

He also pointed out that hospital benefits are limited by the number of hospital beds available in each locality.

Revising the Social Security 1945 estimates to 1948 prices, Mr. Soule estimated the health insurance costs as follows: physicians' services, $2,459,000,000; hospital care, $1,804,000,000; dental care, $531,000,000; home nursing, $86,000,000; laboratory, medicines, appliances, $560,000,000, and research and education, $19,000,000.

Total cost would be $5,459,000,000 or a per capita annual cost of $37.39.

The actual cost of health insurance, Mr. Soule says, would not be that much, but only the difference between those figures and what we are now paying for such medical care.

"Just as the automobile buyer turns in his old car as part payment for his new one, the American people would thus 'exchange' medical service now received for a somewhat larger amount of service," the report says.

"The cost of the larger amount is estimated at $5,500,000,000. Since this is approximately 25 percent greater than the cost of services now paid for by the insured, the net money cost would be the difference. This would be 20 percent of $5,500,000,000 or $1,100,000,000 for 1 year.

"This cost arises, solely on account of the additional services which the insurance might immediately provide because it would enable people to pay who now cannot afford to do so."

WHAT FIGURE TO CONSIDER

This net cost of $1,100,000,000 amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of the $257,800,000,000 a year Americans were spending in late 1948. This is the cost Americans must consider, the report emphasized, in deciding whether or not they want the benefits of national health insurance.

Mr. Soule estimated that in future years the cost of national health insurance might increase by about 35 percent as the number of doctors and hospitals was increased. But by the time this increase in personnel and facilities was accomplished national production would have increased even more, on the basis of past experience and estimates of the President's Economic Council, so that we would be devoting to additional medical care only one-tenth to one-twentieth of our increased production.

"This means," it was pointed out, "that, on the average, the people of the United States can probably have after 5 years (a) as high standard of living as they now enjoy, plus (b) more adequate medical service, plus (c) a gain of more than 9 percent in other goods and services."

Studying the economic costs of national health insurance, as contrasted with the dollar costs, Mr. Soule found:

"Health insurance would not take much manpower from any other pursuit at the outset because the additional service would be provided by the same personnel now employed. Therefore, any immediate available extra service would be provided without much extra manpower. It would constitute mainly a gain in the productivity of the working force in medicine. We could easily afford to divert the number of workers needed to give us adequate medical service later. In times of depression there would be no real cost because the increased medical expenditures would increase employment and production.

"The number of additional workers in the medical field probably will be 'more than counterbalanced by the numbers released from the production, transportation, and distribution of material goods.'

"Health insurance would tend toward stabilizing purchasing power among the mass of the people, and thus would contribute to stabilizing the economy."

DISEASE REDUCTION NOT INCLUDED

He pointed out that his analysis took no account of the possibility that national health insurance might reduce the total of disease and disability and thus pay for itself many times over. He said "Many millions of dollars are spent every year in paying the costs of disease which might have been prevented or lessened by diagnosis and treatment in early stages," and added that "an enormous number of man-hours of labor are lost to the Nation because of needless disability."

The Soule report was submitted to Congress by the Committee for the Nation's Health, which is leading the fight for President Truman's health program.

The Panama Railroad: A Historic and Epoch-Making Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months illuminating articles on various phases of the Panama Canal discussions have been published, but nothing, I believe, on one of the most vital factors in the construction and operation of the great Isthmian waterway, namely the Panama Railroad.

As that unique and greatly important rail system must, inevitably, be seriously affected by any canal modernization project, it is a matter of current interest

that the April 1949 issue of Railway Progress should carry a well-written and instructive story of the Panama Railroad enterprise, written by Arthur Stanley Riggs. A biographical note, as to the author, appended by the editor, is as follows:

Arthur Stanley Riggs (commander U. S. Naval Reserve, retired) has been a journalist, editor, historian, critic, sailor, naval officer, and the author of many books and magazine articles. He made his most recent trip to Panama in January.

Under leave accorded I am extending my remarks, with inclusion of this recent product of Commander Riggs' facile pen.

ADJUNCT TO THE CANAL—PANAMA RAILROAD

(By Arthur Stanley Riggs)

PRR doesn't always mean Pennsylvania Railroad, or anything like it. In this case it means Panama Railroad, shortest, quickest route from Atlantic to Pacific.

Three centuries ago, ships in the Pacific anchored in the open roadstead of Panama. Other ships in the Atlantic used the open bay at Chagres, where the Chagres River for ages has poured its floods into the ocean, with grim Fort San Lorenzo standing guard on a cliff half a mile or so away to the southeast. Nearly 50 miles of jungle, swamp, and mountain lay between the two seaports, with the mighty Chagres cutting the Isthmus in half. By leading the gold and emeralds of New Granada (now Colombia) and Peru on the back of slaves and donkeys, and marching them in long strings through swamp and jungle to the river town of Cruces, the Spaniards delivered their precious freight to the small vessels and boats that had made their tedious way from the Atlantic at Chagres up to Cruces with the products of Europe to exchange for the treasures of the Americas. From 7 to 10 days were required for the trip.

This natural route was no accident. Columbus had dreamed of finding a route to the east by sailing west. On his fourth voyage, in 1502, he almost found it through the Isthmus of Panama. Explored in 1527, it developed into a highway known as the river route. For centuries it served Spain as a golden artery. Incredible and indescribable events occurred on it, including the Welsh pirate Henry Morgan's capture of Fort San Lorenzo. With no enemy behind him, Morgan boldly led his field army of 1,500 cutthroats along the same water and land trails, to capture and sack the rich city of Panama on the Pacific in January of 1671.

A little more than a century ago, while railroads were still a novelty, one Mateo Klein organized a French company to span the Isthmus and reduce the time of transit from days to hours, the difficulties to relative comfort. In July 1847 the French promoters, having failed to do any work, also failed to pay 600,000 gold francs to the New Granadan Government, as provided in the agreement. Immediately three enterprising Americans, John Lloyd Stephens, William H. Aspinwall, and Henry Chauncey, paid the debt and took over the exclusive concession. They recognized not only the commercial importance of their move, but the historic significance of linking Atlantic and Pacific, and its profound effect upon politics, strategy, and diplomacy as well as business.

COMBINATION RIGHTS

In one important respect the new American company was freer than the original French one, for the concession gave the Americans the privilege of constructing an all-rail line, a combination of canalized river and rail, or a hard-surfaced highroad. That contract was the modest beginning of the Panama Railroad, the first and only American transcontinental line with one stockholder, operating entirely outside the United States, on ground of which we do not own one square inch.

No one in the United States Government apparently had much faith in the undertaking. The Aspinwall syndicate presented a petition for help to Congress, but nothing was done. Undaunted, the three men incorporated the road in New York State in 1848 and began construction on May 2, 1850. By the time the rails reached Gatun, and the first work train went through on October 1, 1851, the $1,000,000 capital was practically spent in building those 8 miles from sea to river. At this crisis, the gold discovery in California that had startled the world in 1849, suddenly brought a horde of wild, impatient adventurers to the Isthmus en route to the gold fields. By December 1851 the prospectors were eager to pay a dollar-a-mile fare for themselves and 50 cents per cubic foot on their belongings for the privilege of riding on open flat cars over those 8 miles of the uncompleted line.

SAVED BY GOLD RUSH

The gold rush thus saved the financially exhausted company. Immediately the embryo road began to make money. As cash came in the rails lengthened and the passenger and freight traffic extended with them, but at a price. The gold fever brought by the prospectors drew heavily upon the road's labor and operating forces, and the Chagres fever—the term loosely applied to malaria, yellow-jack, typhoid, typhus, bubonic plague, and other tropical diseases—was a constant menace with serious fatalities. There was no truth, however, in the widely circulated fable that every tie laid cost a life. Only 853 men died; 140,000 ties were laid. Progress could not be stayed; men were always found to replace the dead.

FIVE-HOUR TRIP

On January 28, 1855, the first transcontinental railroad in the world was opened to through traffic, and ran its first train over the nearly 50 miles between Atlantic and Pacific in 5 hours. Two years later all the details had been cleared up, and the line was operating smoothly. It had cost $8,000,000. This was 14 years before the first domestic transcontinental line in the United States was completed in Utah.

Like everything else on the Isthmus, the story of the railroad is fantastic. Spurned by the Government that today is its sole stockholder and operator, the line earned $12,000,000 in its first 10 years of operation, 50 percent more than its entire cost. It was regarded by Wall Street as the safest of all investments. Then in 1869, 14 years after it began running, it almost went out of business, maintenance was neglected because of lack of funds, and the rolling stock and right-of-way deteriorated rapidly under the corrosive influence of the Tropics.

The cause of the decline is interesting. William H. Aspinwall, one of the three founders of the railroad, was a man of broad vision. He foresaw the importance of a steamship line between Panama and the budding ports of California, Oregon, and Washington, as a key to the vast Pacific trade area, and in 1848 founded the Pacific Steam Navigation Co., which obtained a monopoly of the traffic between Panama and the north. Twenty years later, in 1868, to force lower rail rates across the Isthmus, he routed his ships clear around South America. Travelers immediately preferred the continuous journey by sea to the combination of steamer to Chagres, and later Cristobal, rail to Panama, and the usual wait there in uncomfortable and none too safe surroundings, for another steamer. Rail traffic dropped sharply. In 1869 the completion of the new Union Pacific system, the first domestic transcontinental line, almost killed the Panama Railroad, and the Trans-Isthmian Canal that had been talked about for centuries again emerged as a live issue.

FRENCH CONTROL

When Ferdinand de Lesseps formed a French company to dig the Panama Canal, one of his first acts was to secure control of the railroad, without which the excavation could not be carried on. The French failed, the United States took over the Canal project, bought the railroad's outstanding stock at $141 a share (par was $100), rebuilt it in wiser locations, constructed port facilities, established a tributary steamship line between New York and Cristobal, the Atlantic terminus of the railroad, set up a vast commissary, and finally opened the Canal to traffic in 1914. At last the dream of the ages had come doubly true. The Isthmus was spanned by both a canal and a railroad, with the Canal the major and controlling enterprise.

Discussing the character and operation of the railroad with me in his headquarters at Balboa Heights, C. Z., general manager A. L. Prather enthused about his road. "As a prototype for a model 'pike' the Panama Railroad is ideal," he said. "It is a complete single-track transcontinental railroad less than 50 miles long, serving two busy ports. Communities along its route comprise the towns of Panama Canal employees and the Army and Navy stations. Industrial yards and sidings serve the installations of the Panama Canal, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force bases and depots. United States type railroad equipment is used, and United States operating procedure is followed. The track gage is 5 feet. The main line is block-signalled throughout, with conventional three-indication semaphores.

"Electric power from Gatun and Madden Dam is transmitted on towers, spaced 18 to the mile, which straddle the right-of-way at a width to permit double track, and so constructed that a catenary transmission may be suspended from them. Electric motive power has not been used, however, and is not now contemplated. The principal motive power of the railroad is supplied by trim modern Mogul oil-burners which operate in both passenger and freight service. For switching, short local runs and occasional trans-Isthmian hauls, there are also several Diesel-electric locomotives built especially for the service. Completing the motive power are three gasoline-motor cars or 'Scooters' headed by a streamlined two-unit special used for tourist parties and on official occasions by the Governor of the Panama Canal, who is also president of the railroad."

Although Uncle Sam is the sole owner of the road, it is not a Government enterprise but a private corporation—just another of the many curious contradictions that affect it. Soon after the United States bought control, the road considered giving up its corporate entity and operating as a routine Government enterprise. However, some of the treaties and concessions under which the line exists had a direct bearing on the decision to maintain it as a separate entity, in addition to which it had other distinct advantages as a corporation, among them an operating flexibility of the utmost advantage as an adjunct of the Canal.

The Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 dissolved all completely Government-owned corporations as of June 30, 1948. H. R. 5104, amending the Canal Zone Code to permit reincorporation of the railroad, is now before Congress. The ultimate result will merely be the transference to the railroad of certain business now carried on by the Canal. Otherwise, the character of the Company will not change. The earnings of the line, because of its corporate structure, have been largely plowed back into maintenance and modernization. They have also paid no less than $20,000,000 in dividends into the Treasury, built up a respectable surplus, defrayed the cost of reconditioning the three vessels of the steamship subsidiary after their use during the war, and maintained the two large terminal hotels, the Tivoli at Ancon and the Washington at Cristobal. Not one penny has the road ever asked from Congress.

EARNINGS

A long and elaborate tabulation would be required to show where these astonishing dividends were earned. Partial break-down of the tabulated operating report of 1947, the latest available, shows a total freight-car mileage (including caboose) of 1,276,025, with an average of 12.53 loaded cars per train. Total revenue-producing freight carried amounted to 380,164 tons, which produced a revenue per tone-mile of 11.4 cents, which works out to $35,196.96 per mile of road. In addition to the commercial and company freight, the line handled 41,309 tons for the Army and Navy. Gross freight revenue in 1947 was $2,040,000, a decrease from 1946 of $260,915.53. Gross passenger revenue was $630,000 in 1947, compared to $838,000 in 1946. A total of 234,000 first- and 382,000 second-class passengers were carried in 1947, a considerable decrease.

"As a corporation," Prather says, "the Panama Railroad Company owns and operates in various ways the railroad proper, the steamship line, the cargo docks and piers at Cristobal, the coaling plants, the telephone, teletype and electric clock systems, the Hotel Washington, and the commissary system with its numerous retail stores, warehouses and manufacturing plants. In addition, the railroad operates under lease certain cargo piers and docks at Balboa owned by the Panama Canal, as well as the Canal-owned Hotel Tivoli in Ancon." The Canal would have a hard time to get along without its strong right arm, the railroad.

CHANGE FROM PAST

To old-timers, who recall conditions throughout the Isthmus before the Canal was completed, the present magnificent railroad station in Panama, the imposing tropical type stations at Cristobal and Balboa, the modern coaling and oil wharves, the great piers, are hardly believable. To the casual tourist everything seems as natural as though he were at home. He sits in a comfortable coach and watches jungle and mountain, the tremendous Gatun Lake, deep swamps and the always incredible Canal glide smoothly and easily by in the space of an hour and 20 minutes from ocean to ocean. There is even a short tunnel to make the road complete.

It took the Spaniards 8 days to struggle along the rivers and trails in the same journey. The Church told King Philip II of Spain not to try to dig a canal, because what God had joined together—North and South America—man should not attempt to sunder. But the days of darkness have vanished. The New World Columbus gave to Spain, boldly and with genius carved the channel to East for which he vainly searched, and by cutting the world in two, united it forever with ribbons of water and steel.

The Voice of the Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of April 19 and an article from Newsweek of April 18, both relative to the activities of the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business:

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1949]

STOCKHOLDERS ON THE JOB

Nearly two decades ago Adolf Berle, Jr. and Gardiner Means published the Modern Corporation and Private Property. The work was an elaborate study of the structure and operations of American stock companies, and to the student of corporation finance it provided a mine of new and interesting material. But it is remembered by the general public chiefly for one theme which it developed. That was the theme that 38 percent of the business wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of 200 of the largest corporations.

A fact about the concentration of wealth in the United States that hasn't received nearly as much attention is that those corporations are largely owned and financed by women. Women own more than 52 percent of the stock in General Motors and 47 percent of all railroad shares, and they outnumber men as holders of stock in United States Steel, International Harvester, General Electric, American Telephone, du Pont, and others. In fact, they control 70 percent of the privately held wealth of the country, according to the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, and the FWSAB thinks it is high time that something was done about it.

The federation is a comparatively new enterprise, but one which seems to have a pretty clear idea of where it is going. It isn't plotting the overthrow of present corporate management. It believes, however, that stockholder relations in the case of many of our big corporations can stand refurbishing and tidying up, and that this will be expedited if it has some of its own financial housekeepers on the directorates of these companies. At any rate, Mrs. Wilma Soss, who founded the organization 2 years ago, has announced as the 3-year goal of FWSAB the placing of one or more directors on the board of every major company by 1952.

At the moment the federation is putting much of its energy into a less ambitious but equally laudable campaign. It is trying to break down the practice long adhered to by some big companies of holding their stockholder meetings in places that are comparatively inaccessible. It is idle to talk about democracy in corporate management, they argue, while at the same time placing obstacles in the way of the fullest possible attendance at what should be the corporate equivalent of the annual town meeting. Some companies have seen the wisdom of this sound American argument, and acted upon it. The National Biscuit Co. only last week moved its meeting place to New York from New Jersey, and Socony-Vacuum has submitted a proposal to its stockholders which would enable it to hold its meeting where a large attendance can be accommodated. Others, however, have lagged behind the times in this respect.

These days, declared Justice Ferdinand Pecora last week, corporate management and owners owe it to each other to develop an economic democracy as a bulwark against communism and socialism. It is clear that this up-and-coming group of women stockholders grasps this important point; and one gathers that it means to see that corporate management isn't permitted to forget it.

[From Newsweek of April 18, 1949]

COMPANIES—THE VOICE OF THE WOMEN

Up until 2 years ago Wilma Soss was just another successful public-relations woman, fortyish and married to an outdoor-advertising man. That was before she had her run-in with the males who rule United States industry.

In May 1947, she stood up at the United States Steel stockholders' meeting and argued that there ought to be a woman on the board. Some of the directors present looked like the father of Life With Father, and naturally the matter was quietly interred. But at that moment, says Mrs. Soss, who has a somewhat theatrical manner, the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business was born.

Last week, Mrs. Soss went further. At the first spring meeting of the federation she announced that by 1952 every big American corporation would have at least one woman on its board. Mrs. Soss, a crusader with a liking for statistics, says that women have the power to enforce that mandate. Women, she maintains, control 70 percent of the privately held wealth in the country. They own more than 52 percent of General Motors stock, 47 percent of the railroad shares, and outnumber men as owners of United States Steel, International Harvester, General Electric, du Pont, A. T. & T. and others.

"Women largely finance the 200 companies which Congress calls the concentration of power in the United States," she says. "It's time they helped run those companies."

Man's place: An achievement hailed at the meeting by the 2-year-old federation (which has Hortense Odlum and Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde among its officers) was the election of Helen Lehman Buttenwieser, a federation founder, as a trustee of the Title Guarantee & Trust Co. It was the first time a woman had been named to the board of a New York commercial bank.

Actually, the federation really thinks that men have been getting too big for their britches for a long time. According to Mrs. Soss: "Women had the first money in history. Silver flowed into the temples of the goddesses before there were male gods. Women were the first oracles, and businessmen from all over Asia Minor came to consult them. Women * * * put together society, started industry, agriculture. Men were the warriors and playboys. Only when the mystery of the generation of life became known did men become important.

Mailed-Ticket Business in Canada Booming as Result of Repeal of Excise Tax on Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an Associated Press dispatch from New York City, appearing in a recent issue of the Honolulu Star Bulletin.

This points out that many persons in this country are evading the 15-percent tax on transportation by buying their tickets in Canada.

This tax was enacted during the war to discourage travel. Its continuation on the statute books not only is not justified at the present time, but imposes a particular hardship on the people of the Territory of Hawaii.

The situation resulting from the repeal of this tax by Canada offers another reason for acting now to repeal the tax.

The article follows:

MAILED-TICKET BUSINESS IN CANADA BOOMING

NEW YORK, April 25.—Americans have discovered they can beat the 15-percent travel tax by buying their air-line tickets mail-order fashion from Canada. And the mailed-ticket business is booming.

The bargain gimmick was created March 23 when Canada lifted its 15-percent tax on travel. That tax still is in effect in the United States.

But tickets between any two places in the world served by regular air lines can be purchased in Canada, without restrictions as to the departure point. This is in accordance with an international air-transport association agreement.

Thus a New Yorker wishing to fly to Los Angeles, for example, can write a ticket agent in Canada and pay $299.92 for a round-trip ticket which in the United States would cost about $44.94 more because of the United States tax, air-lines spokesmen said.

The situation on train tickets is somewhat different, because the railroads have agreed to sell tax-free tickets only on trips originating in Canada, according to a spokesman for the New York Central Railroad.

However, it would pay a resident of Seattle, for example, to go to nearby Vancouver, British Columbia, for a round-trip ticket to a distant point like Miami.

Somewhat smaller savings on travel taxes have been possible for some time for persons buying tickets in Mexico.

There, international travelers pay an 8-percent tax on the portion of the trip to the Mexican border—none of the rest of the trip.

Approach to Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this august body an article in the New York Times under the signature of a motion-picture writer, Mr. Philip Dunne, which appeared on Sunday, May 1. Mr. Dunne's article is of great importance in my estimation, because it concerns the current production of a film, which while not a social preachment, is in the tradition of other American-made motion pictures which dramatically present a vital segment of American life and many of its inherent problems.

In his article, Mr. Dunne reflecting the sentiments and convictions of Mr. Darryl F. Zanuck, vice president in charge of production for the Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., in writing of the motion picture Pinky, which touches on the controversial subject of the Negro in America says:

What we say and do on the screen in productions of this sort can affect the happiness, the living conditions—even the physical safety of millions of fellow citizens.

This article which manifests an awareness and concern over the American way of life and which indeed probes into our popular concepts of democracy, prompted me to recall that Mr. Zanuck has meritoriously won for himself in past years, public tribute and acclaim. Mr. Zanuck has garnered such widespread appreciation from the public because he and other of his colleagues have led the entire motion-picture industry in the production of picturizations of many typically taboo topics, including the plight of the migratory workers as depicted in his The Grapes of Wrath, the problems of labor in another of his prize-winning films, How Green Was My Valley, the question of anti-Semitism translated to the screen in his honored motion picture Gentleman's Agreement, the disturbing problem of mental health brought into vivid national focus by The Snake Pit, and now his latest entertainment venture into the field of Americanism—Pinky.

The American motion-picture industry, we must realize, by its attempt to mirror the daily living problems of the American people, has acted as a super salesman for Americanism at home and abroad, and it is for these reasons that I consider the appearance of Mr. Dunne's timely article in the New York Times of sufficient significance and interest to merit inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

APPROACH TO RACISM—SCENARIST OF PINKY EXPLAINS HOW FILM WILL TREAT SUBJECT OF NEGRO PREJUDICE

(By Philip Dunne)

The production of Pinky marks another break with the long-standing taboo against films dealing with the problems of racial and religious prejudice. Last season saw Gentleman's Agreement and Crossfire, both of which were concerned with anti-Semitism. This year in Pinky and at least two other films, the motion-picture industry will touch on the inflammable topic of the Negro in American life.

I think it should be understood that the taboo existed, not because Hollywood producers are reactionary or socially illiterate, as some have maintained, but because the production of a controversial film of this nature entails a very real financial risk. A formal or informal boycott by any group or in any area can turn a legitimately anticipated profit into a loss. In this sense, it takes courage on the part of studio management to embark on such a venture.

CONFUSION

In addition, there has been considerable professional misunderstanding of the word "entertainment." Hollywood is forever exhorting itself to remember that the function of motion pictures is to entertain. To some, this has meant that the industry should confine its efforts to musicals, boy-meets-girls comedies, whodunits, and westerns. But others, I think with more wisdom, have maintained that entertainment can also be fashioned from the raw materials of contemporary life. They have seen the problem as one of presenting these materials, not as preachments, but as living dramatic stories.

When Darryl F. Zanuck assigned me to Pinky, he laid no injunction on me other than to remember that my function was not to lecture but to tell an emotional human story capable of capturing and holding the imagination of the audience. He could, and did, point to his own Gentleman's Agreement as a persuasive example of what he meant.

From the technical point of view, my task was not difficult. I had the advantage of some excellent preliminary writing by Dudley Nichols, who had had to drop the job half finished because of a prior commitment elsewhere. I also had the advantage of the fact that Mr. Zanuck had already accompanied Mr. Nichols up most of the blind alleys such a story offers and thus was able to save me a good deal of useless exploration.

OPINIONS

Politically, the script posed a much more difficult problem. Every American citizen, white or Negro, has his own ideas on the subject of race in America. Few Americans have been able to approach it without passion or prejudice. (It is significant that perhaps the only truly dispassionate and unprejudiced appraisal of the problem is the work of a foreigner, Gunnar Myrdal, in his monumental An American Dilemma.) Like every other American, I hotly defended my own views, as Mr. Zanuck defends his, which differ from mine in detail if not in essence. Mr. Nichols and Elia Kazan, who is directing the picture for Twentieth Century-Fox, hold still different opinions.

We were well aware of our problem: lacking agreement even among ourselves, how could we hope to reach 140,000,000 Americans representing nearly 140,000,000 differing points of view?

The answer, of course, is that our film will present no one point of view as the definitive one. We try to tell a completely personal story. Jeanne Crain, as Pinky, portrays not a race but an individual. The story is Pinky's, not ours, and while the tragic dilemma of her life is induced by the facts of racial prejudice, the solutions she finds are her own and affect only her. Pinky is acted upon by many other characters in our screen play. Some are kind, some brutal, some condescending, some just but harsh. We have tried to present them fairly and objectively, as we have tried to avoid preaching and confine ourselves to the facts. In many ways the writing and production of such a story is a tactical exercise in democratic practice.

OBJECTIVE

But I would not give the impression that we have remained completely neutral, because neutrality is as sterile dramatically as it is politically. Liberal democracy stultifies itself when it rationalizes away all conflict and passion. In our case, I feel that I can safely predict that no member of the Ku Klux Klan will find our film either entertaining or edifying. We neither deny nor condone the bitter fact of racial prejudice; we simply try to dramatize its effect on a girl who might be anyone's daughter, sister, or sweetheart. We are propagandists only insofar as we insist that every human being is entitled to personal freedom and dignity.

We have throughout remained conscious of our obligation to society in projecting such a film. The experience of the war has taught us that the motion picture is a powerful and persuasive vehicle of propaganda. What we say and do on the screen in productions of this sort can affect the happiness, the living conditions, even the physical safety of millions of our fellow citizens.

Beyond that we have tried to consider what the impact of such a film might be on audiences overseas, on friend and antagonist alike. For this reason, among others, we have championed no glib solution of the problem. We have tried only to present it fairly and realistically. We hope that each member of the audience will be moved to seek a solution of his own. If he finds it in his heart, our venture will have been a success.

Grade-Crossing Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, especially since the advent of modern fast automobiles, the grade crossings of America have cost thousands of lives annually. The hazard is greatest in the cities and much study has been made for elimination. The Federal Government in its annual grant to the various States for improving Federal highways provides that part of such Federal grant might be used by the States to eliminate the great American hazard of grade crossings.

Mr. Speaker, out in my district the city of Fostoria, Ohio, has long been subject to the loss of life on grade crossings, but it was unable to pay the entire cost of eliminating the hazard. During the past several years effort has been made and Federal approval has been given to use part of Federal highway funds allocated to the State of Ohio for such grade crossing elimination. The effort of this Midwest community shows what can be done when the citizens go out to eliminate one of the greatest hazards of American life, and I want to include the article Let's Really Abolish Grade Crossings, from the Woman's Home Companion.

LET'S REALLY ABOLISH GRADE CROSSINGS

(By John T. Harris)

Wherever you live, in the city or country, you've probably read something like this in your local newspaper recently: "Three killed when train-auto collide"; "Four die, two injured, in grade-crossing wreck"; "Family wiped out in rail-highway crash."

The headline may vary but the story is essentially the same. Last winter a party of Ohio children bobsledding over an unprotected grade crossing suddenly stiffened in horror. Racing toward them was a gigantic streamliner. There was a futile grinding of brakes. Ten children who had come to frolic in the snow stayed to die in it.

For the almost 2,000 deaths at grade crossings each year—over five every day—you and I are partly to blame. Dangerous conditions persist only because of public apathy. Our neglect and indifference is also largely responsible for the yearly toll of more than 4,000 grade-crossing injuries—injuries that maim, cripple, or otherwise mutilate for life.

Until we act vigorously to eliminate grade crossings these death traps will continue slaughtering and mutilating our families, friends, and neighbors inexcusably.

You may ask: "Why is it our particular concern? Why don't the railroads build viaducts and underpasses"?

The answer, in all fairness, is that the railroads can't possibly do the job alone. It would cost approximately $33,000,000,000—more than all our railroads are worth—to eliminate every grade crossing by constructing a viaduct or underpass. In the United States today there are more than 226,000 such crossings—one for every mile of railroad track. And most were thrown across the rails—by our decision to have new roads—long after the railroad tracks were laid.

It is easy to damn the railroads as inhuman monsters and blanket them with the blame. But, aren't we just making them the scapegoat? Aren't we refusing to recognize that abolishing grade crossings is our problem too? And any way you look at it, we the public will pay the price in the end, either in steeper taxes, higher railroad fares—or human lives.

Of course the over-all task is tremendous. But much can be done if communities go to work at once, locally, if there's a dangerous condition nearby. One small midwestern town recently did that and solved a problem that had harassed it for over 50 years.

Fostoria, Ohio—a town not far from where the children were killed on the bobsled—has five railroad lines crossing the town and one another. Formerly, train and auto traffic often jammed to a standstill, with an estimated loss of one hundred and eighty-seven vehicle hours daily. When seven persons were killed at Fostoria's grade crossings in 1946, the town's 16,000 inhabitants went into action. A citizens' committee measured traffic flow, discovering that 54 passenger trains and 181 freight trains passed through Fostoria's three square miles every day. Sparked by the local newspaper and Parent Teachers' Association, the committee persuaded voters to approve a bond issue overwhelmingly. Result: alert Fostoria is promised four brand-new viaducts and underpasses.

"We did it through teamwork," Fred M. Hopkins, editor-publisher of Fostoria's newspaper told me. "When people and organizations in a town join hands to eliminate grade crossings they get action."

Your community could do the same. In Passaic, N. J., 2 years ago the mother of four small children, was killed at a particularly dangerous grade crossing. For days after the accident the victim's husband stood at the fatal spot soliciting signatures for a petition to the Governor of the State to eliminate the crossing. Civic and fraternal organizations got behind him. Just recently the Passaic Board of Commissioners approved a plan to abolish not only this death trap but all the city's other grade crossings.

In Rockville Center, N. Y., an energetic village transportation committee is now goading State and railroad officials to abolish local grade crossings which have plagued the Long Island town for decades. Some years ago the citizens of Rockville, Md., were so aroused by a tragic school-bus accident at an inadequately protected double crossing that they spurred the State and Federal Government to prompt action in replacing the crossing with an underpass.

Among the larger cities which have virtually eliminated grade-crossing death traps are New York, Syracuse, and Atlanta, Ga. In all three cities local agitation started the ball rolling. Citizens' groups prodded city officials who prodded State highway officials who, in turn, prodded the railroads. "When this chain reaction has been set off it almost always gets results," a grade-crossing expert in the United States Public Roads Administration told me.

Luckily local communities don't have to foot the entire bill. The Federal Government, States, and railroads will share the cost. Far-sighted Fostoria paid less than a quarter of the expense for its project. Half was borne by the Federal Government, a quarter by the State of Ohio and the remaining quarter split between Fostoria and the railroads. The city paid 90 percent, the railroads 10. Moreover, the railroads are also providing additional safeguards by installing a $700,000 interlocking signal system entirely at their own expense.

But usually the problem is not just local; best results can be achieved by working through your State directly. Almost all States now have legislation designed to help abolish grade crossings. These laws differ sharply on just how the States and the railroads will share the expense of building viaducts and underpasses. Before the automobile became common, railroads usually split the cost 50–50 with the States. Many still do. Yet ever since the Supreme Court ruled in 1935—in a decision written by so liberal a justice as Louis D. Brandeis—that "the railroad has ceased to be the prime instrument of danger and the main cause of accidents" at grade crossings, fair-minded States have been bearing a larger share of the cost. New York and Michigan, for example, require that 85 percent of the cost of eliminating grade crossings be paid by the State—the other 15 percent by the railroads.

But many States, and some with bulging surpluses, have good intentions on paper only—the money is there, legislative permission has been granted to spend it, but for one reason or another the work of eliminating grade crossings is not begun. One large eastern State approved a $300,000,000 program many years ago but to date has spent only a small portion of that amount. Here is where concerted action by interested women could achieve miracles.

The practice in many States of spending motor vehicle tax money for nonhighway purposes has seriously held up the elimination of grade crossings and other improvements. According to the American Automobile Association a staggering sum—over two and one-half billion dollars—of highway tax money collected by the States during the last 24 years has been used for purposes other than improving highways.

The money is diverted in a variety of ways. Some States dump part of it into their general funds. Delaware spends a portion for mosquito control, Louisiana for harbor improvement, Utah for the department of publicity and industrial development, Virginia for aviation. At one time Maryland annually diverted $75,000 of its gasoline tax money for oyster propagation. Recently the Georgia Legislature seriously considered increasing its driver's license fee and using half the resulting revenue to establish a school of veterinarian medicine.

Highway tax diversion is on the upswing. In 1947 it was 80 percent greater than in 1946. Rhode Island, for example, diverted over half its highway income in 1947. However, public resentment against diversion is increasing also. To date, 21 States have made diversion illegal.

Find out what your State law is and demand that a fair share of the State's highway revenue be used to abolish grade crossings. Learn what crossings, if any, are scheduled for elimination—your State highway department, public service or public utilities commission, or public works department can tell you. Urge your State legislators to support a stepped-up program.

Need—not politics—should determine which grade crossings should go first. To guide the order in which they are to be removed, Maryland has developed a plan of rating them according to danger.

Today only a little Federal money—approximately $50,000,000 annually—is available for abolishing grade crossings. Urge your Senators and Representatives in Washington to appropriate more. The available funds are administered by the United States Public Roads Administration and divided among the States. If a Federal project is being held up in your vicinity make it your business to learn why.

Unfortunately all grade crossings can't be eradicated overnight with overpasses and underpasses. Some, though, can unquestionably be closed. One of America's leading highway engineers tells me that approximately 30 percent of all our grade crossings could be closed with a little State and local cooperation.

Look around your community to determine if there are grade crossings which can be consolidated or closed outright. Then advise your State highway department. Al-

most all States have laws enabling them to abandon or close little-used crossings. True, the closing of any grade crossing is almost always resisted—people having the slightest need for it frequently invoke political pressure to keep the invitation-to-disaster open. But try to convince any such neighbors of yours that it is worth a little inconvenience on their part to ensure the safety of other citizens. Though we have been abolishing grade crossings since the turn of the century, today there are almost as many as when we began eliminating them, because new roads are still being built across railroads at grades, and crossings which should be closed never are.

Meanwhile, not as a substitute for underpasses and overpasses, but until they can be built, we must protect our remaining grade crossings with far better safety devices. For motorists to stop, look, and listen, while important, is not enough. It may shock you to learn that 85 percent of America's grade crossings are not properly safeguarded, according to the cautious Interstate Commerce Commission, the Government agency regulating railroads. Most grade crossings are still protected as they were in horse-and-buggy days with either the familiar flimsy crossbuck sign or an advance warning sign—both of which are utterly inadequate. And these are often obscured by trees, shrubbery, or billboards, or located too close to the tracks, or desperately in need of paint. At night you might not notice them at all—especially if they are not reflectorized. Is it any wonder that two out of three grade-crossing accidents occur at crossings protected only by such signs?

The best protective device known today is the new automatic short-arm gate combined with a flashing light signal. The signal can be either two alternately flashing red lights (common in the east) or a moving wigwag light on a swinging disk (common in the west) working in harmony with the automatic gate. When a train approaches, the red lights begin to flash. After 3 to 5 seconds the gate, illuminated by red lights, comes down, blocking the right half of the highway and leaving the left clear so that a car can't be trapped. The automatic gate rises only after the tracks are clear in all directions. Automatic gates coupled with flashing lights are even more efficient—as well as cheaper—than 24-hour watchman service. Motorists have been killed because they failed to see a watchman's flagging lantern and every year conscientious watchmen are run down by careless motorists whom they are trying to stop. Alert States and communities are now sharing with the railroads the cost of installing automatic gates and flashing lights.

But the fact remains that the only absolutely safe grade crossing is an eliminated one. A top railroad official told me frankly, "We've experimented for years but must conclude that the only way to stop grade crossing accidents is to get rid of the crossings."

Accidents alone are not the only toll taken by grade crossings. "The time lost at them adds up to millions of dollars every year," says the American Automobile Association. Occasionally its cost can't be reckoned in money. Not long ago a child, injured in a household accident, was being rushed to the hospital in the family automobile. The car was delayed at a grade crossing by a seemingly endless freight train and the child bled to death in his mother's arms.

In this atomic age grade crossings are an anachronism. It would be nice to believe that our highways of tomorrow will be without them. But the job has hardly begun.

Today sharp awakening to our responsibilities and bold action are desperately needed. We can stop this appalling butchery. Any town, like Fostoria, can eliminate grade crossings now—if it is willing to work at it.

Start an active Grade Crossing Committee in your community. It can include city officials, representatives of the railroads, motor clubs, bus and truck companies, parents' groups, fraternal, civic, business, labor and educational organizations. If you wish, the National Safety Council in Chicago and the Association of American Railroads in Washington will help launch your committee.

Remember: when a busload of children is massacred at a grade crossing, when a little girl's head with a blue ribbon still tied to her yellow hair is found beneath the cab of a locomotive, all of us share the blame. Grade-crossing deaths are our common guilt.

Self-Government of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Secretary Warne before the Institute on Indian Self-Government Association on American Indian Affairs, New York, on April 8, 1949:

I am happy to meet with the members and guests of the Association on American Indian Affairs. I feel that the association should be warmly congratulated for calling together the group meeting here to discuss a subject as important as tribal self-government.

We have come around at long last to realize that the Indian people must be partners with the rest of us as we work to solve their problems. It would be a toss-up, I suppose, whether in the past Indians were ignored because of contempt for their ability for finding solutions, or out of a conviction that they could best be helped by dissolving the institutional forms and customs which have kept them Indian. We know that for years it was the deliberate policy of Government, aided and abetted by well-meaning citizens outside of Government, to bring to an end all things Indian—to break up the Indian system of land tenure, to discourage Indian speech, and to frown upon Indian social institutions. It is significant that almost no mention is made of tribal organization in the Meriam survey of 1928, except a passing reference to the fact that some reservation superintendents regarded tribal councils and courts half contemptuously, and in some cases seemed to consider the council rather a nuisance because it served as a forum for agitators.

We need only reflect on that remark to realize that we have made strides since 1928. We may not have solved our problems yet, but I am confident that we have found the method. Once other factors are favorable, the solutions will come.

Problems of human adjustment are never quickly or easily worked out. I still hear voices shouting in the debates on Indian administration, "Move them off the reservations," "Give them their land," "Make them accept their responsibilities," and other advice in the imperative tense. This sounds like the voice of coercion to me, because it allows no chance for Indian views or self-determination. Self-determination is what we want and must have, even when it seems a little alien to us who are aliens in this land.

What we need most is the knowledge which will enable us to awaken in our Indian fellow citizens a desire to move away from the past of their fathers into the future we have arranged for every youngster. The Navajo boys who went away to the war or to war jobs and found that they could not compete on even terms with white boys because of their lack of education were shocked into desiring what we most wanted them to have. They are now exerting effective pressure on the Government to remove the disadvantages under which their people live. That is as it should be. Once the desire is with them, our task is half done, providing always that we act fast enough in the Congress and in our administrative branch to satisfy the desire before it lapses into apathy.

As a Government official, I am chiefly concerned with tribal self-government as a means to an end—the end being the discharge of Federal responsibility in Indian affairs. I grant you that this may be a narrower view than your own discussions may take, but I do not see how I can usefully discuss more than this.

If tribal government can be one of the tools by which the adjustment we desire can be finally worked out, that is most important.

What are these problems of adjustment? You know them as well or better than I. The problems are reflected in poverty, poor health, and lack of educational opportunities.

A few days ago we sent to the Congress, at the request of President Truman, a bill to authorize a 10-year program of basic construction and social betterment for the Navajo and Hopi Indians of Arizona and New Mexico.

You have read the President's ringing words in which he made his request of Secretary Krug: "The United States, which would live on Christian principles with all of the peoples of the world, cannot omit a fair deal for its own Indian citizens."

The Navajo and Hopi peoples were self-supporting in their original environment, but for upward of 80 years that environment has been undergoing change and destruction, and they have increased in number. The relationship of man to nature which, in their early history, had been brought into a tolerable balance, has deteriorated badly. The task which we, with the proposed expenditure of $90,000,000 would undertake is to help these Indian people achieve a new balance, with new tools, new occupations, and a new outlook.

One of the largest of the Dakota Sioux tribes in a recent year had an annual per capita income of just about one-fourth of that enjoyed by the population of our poorest State—a State noted for its heavy composition of poorly housed, poorly fed, and poorly paid share croppers.

The Papago Reservation in Arizona has an infant mortality rate which shames us in the telling; of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-fourth die within the first year; only 125 or less than half reach the age of 18.

In Alaska, where we have responsibilities for 35,000 Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos, tuberculosis destroys the life of our native people at a rate 16 times greater than the mortality rate for this disease in the States.

Recent estimates indicate that upward of 20,000 Indian children of school age are not in school today because there are no school rooms to accommodate them and no teachers. Additional thousands of children attend irregularly and soon stop entirely because their parents are seasonal laborers and have no way of leaving their children to attend school while they are away working.

These are some of the outward manifestations of the underlying fact that all is not well with our Indian people. The problem runs deeper than neglect and lack of opportunity. One source of it rises in the Indians themselves; the other sources must be

sought in the white men who try to do things for Indians.

Let me return to the Navajo and Hopi Indians for a moment to illustrate the nature of the problem. Much has been said recently of the agreement of 1868 between the Navajo tribe and the United States by which the United States undertook to furnish schools and teachers. What has been overlooked is that the Navajos pledged themselves "to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of 6 and 16, to attend school," and the United States agreed to provide a house and teacher "for every 30 children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school."

Until recently the Navajo parents resisted sending their children to school for several reasons: (1) They needed the youngsters as herders; (2) they feared that the children, educated in the white man's school, would be unfitted for Navajo life; (3) or they withdrew children as a protest against Government programs generally.

The experience of the young Navajos during the recent war who were denied equal opportunities with their white comrades brought about a change of heart overnight. Now the Navajos are demanding more and better education, but there are facilities for only 8,000 of the 24,000 Navajo children of school age.

As recently as 1906 one of the largest of the Hopi villages was locked in a bitter internal fight over the question of cooperating with the Government. At one point a troop of military was called in, and but for a cool-headed commanding officer there might have been gunfire. The village settled its question in a bloodless tug-of-war by which the anti-cooperators were pushed out of the plaza. The defeated party moved away and built a new village, and to this day the members of the group have continued to resist the efforts of white men to compromise with them.

From these and thousands of like incidents which might be called to mind, I conclude that there remains in the Indian people, varying from tribe to tribe and probably from individual to individual, an underlying skepticism about the quality of or desirability of living in the white man's society. It is this skepticism, manifested at times as frank opposition, which keeps Indians aloof. So long as that remains, Indians will move but slowly in the direction of being one with us. It is a problem of internal adjustment which cannot be brushed away. Above all, we cannot allow ourselves to become impatient with the Indian who holds back from lack of confidence in our ability to decide what is best for him.

My study of the Indian problem has been intense during the 2 years that I have been Assistant Secretary of the Interior with a general supervisory responsibility over the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but I rely for much of my information on the older students in the Bureau. But this I have learned from humbling personal experience, that there are intelligent Indians with places of leadership among their people who feel that they have ample reason to question the good faith of the whole American people and their Government, and who are doubtful whether there is anything good in the civilization that we offer them. There are others with a crafty knack of adopting just enough of the white man's ways to impress fellow Indians who prey upon their fellows and foster and feed their suspicions. We English-speaking, normally educated Americans can see the basic path of forward progress that our country has set for itself and are not disturbed by political forays and excursions that follow the rabbit tracks of expedience and give a zig here and a zag there to the movement. But such backing and filling in the white administration of Indian affairs has raised a doubt that is real to many Indians that there is an intelligible pattern anywhere in the whole business.

Turning now to the white man himself—administrator, law-giver, teacher, missionary—I find that we have been too prone to make assumptions about Indians which have no basis other than the fact that they are good assumptions among white men. Sometimes they do not have even that much validity.

I find that the Spaniards in the sixteenth century made one assumption which has remained with us with varying intensity of application. The Spaniards thought that the quickest way to civilize the Indians was to tear up whole Indian villages by the roots and to move the people in among Spaniards where they could learn by example. Some of the colonies on our eastern seaboard made similar experiments. Then, beginning about 1880 and for the next 50 years we picked up Indian children on the reservations and shipped them to distant boarding schools, on the theory or assumption that if the children stayed away long enough, and if they were forbidden to speak the parental tongue or learn the tribal ceremonies, they would cease to be Indians. Some of the bitterest critics of white men and of the white man's government in our day are Indians of the generation which underwent that processing.

On the whole, we have assumed that Indians placed in a given set of circumstances would react like a white man in the same circumstances. Thus in 1887 we broke up large tribally owned landholdings into individual parcels and assigned or allotted a piece of land to each Indian man, woman, and child. The assumption was that the Indian on his individual farm would quickly learn the value of good husbandry and all the attendant virtues of citizenship. Why not, it was one of the tenets by which the white man lived? Nothing of the sort happened, or it happened only rarely. The result was that as quickly as the limitations against the sale of these individual parcels were lifted, the Indians sold the land, usually in a poor market or to white land grabbers who felt no compunction at taking advantage of the inexperience of the Indian, and the Indians became dependent on the Government or on their Indian relatives for assistance. Such land ownership held no desirable meaning to the Indian except that land could be sold and the money could be used right away for something that was attractive. One of the principal causes of today's poverty among Indians is traced directly to the workings of the 1887 law.

It is apparent, therefore, that the white man who deals with Indians has the problem of learning and practicing tolerance. We do not even have any longer the comforting assurance that if Indians fail to learn from us, it is not because we fail them as teachers and monitors, but because of their own inferior intellectual equipment. Now that the psychologists have learned to measure intelligence with tests which do not place a premium on English language skills, the Arabic numeral system or other factors common to our culture, we find that in native intelligence, Indian children rate favorably with white children of their own age. In recent tests involving 1,000 Indian children from five different tribes, the high scores made by a few Indian children were far above the high scores registered by public school children in a middle western town.

So we can conclude finally that we need to look into our methods of work and our habits of thinking in this Indian field. The Indian people must somehow come to have confidence in our purposes and our methods, and we in the non-Indian group must learn to inspire that confidence. I can assure you that introspection of this very nature has been going on and out of introspection have come action and method.

During the past 15 years the Bureau of Indian Affairs has rejected as worthless most of the traditional administrative devices of working with native peoples. The Bureau has been unjustly criticized at times for being experimental and for questioning such sacred cows as the academic school curriculum or private land tenure. The work of the Bureau has been solid; its contributions to administrative method in the field of native affairs have lasting value. How else can we account for the fact that for 10 years or more interested Government officials and scientists from Latin America, from Africa, Burma, India, and the hill districts of China have come to study Indian administration in the United States?

Most notable of the Bureau's contributions has been in this very field of tribal self-government—of participation by Indians through their elected and appointed spokesmen in the decisions by which their lives are chartered. Officials of the Bureau have assisted more than 150 tribes, bands, and villages in the United States and Alaska to draft written constitutions and business charters. The formation of such local governments was not for the purpose of taking Indians out of the onward current of American life, as short-sighted critics have charged. The purpose was rather to set up responsible, democratic governing bodies into whose hands the Federal Government might shift the multitudinous supervisory powers which by law had been given to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Transfers of these powers have been taking place in an orderly manner and at an accelerating tempo. By such processes have Indians become partners with us in our joint concern for their physical and spiritual well-being.

The day must come when Indians, as individuals or as organized groups, are fully responsible for their own actions. It would be the height of folly to bring this about by the simple expedient of cutting them off from the protections which their treaties and the laws of Congress guarantee to them. Responsibility can be achieved, and is being achieved, by building upon the people, by helping them to create the organizations through which they can act and by seeking always to broaden the horizon for the individual.

I should not close these remarks without saying that I am particularly concerned over the fate of the Navajo-Hopi 10-year program mentioned earlier. This program represents the first effort of the Department of the Interior to place before Congress the complete situation faced by the Indians of a specific area. We go before Congress annually with a request for funds to operate schools and hospitals, to construct and maintain roads, to provide credit funds for farming operations and so on. In spite of our best efforts to particularize the needs of individual tribes and areas, we never quite succeed in moving the discussion beyond the maze of appropriation detail. There is neither the time nor the opportunity to suggest in full the relationship between this year's request for funds and our ultimate objective with respect to a given tribe. I am frank to say, also, that too frequently there is no direct relationship.

Now for the first time, we take two tribes, one located within the outer boundaries of the other, and explain what has been happening to the resources and to the people of each. We state what ought to be our objectives in terms of physical plant and human rehabilitation. Then we calculate costs and arrive at budget estimates over the years.

We are prepared to present similar programs for a number of tribes. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, with the help of the Indians and its own field and staff personnel, has been devoting the past year to the drafting of such plans. If this could be carried out for at least all the major tribes in the country, we would for the first time be in a position to calculate the magnitude of the task of human adjustment still remaining to be accomplished, and we should begin to

have some idea of the time it is going to take to accomplish.

The Federal Government must discharge its obligation to the Indian people. I know of no honorable way in which that may be done except by proceeding in an orderly way to place the Indian in our society as a fully participating member. It may cost us heavily in dollars, but we cannot afford the heavier cost in loss of prestige which must result if the Indians are left as outcasts in their own homeland.

Judge Frank W. Tomasello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great personal pleasure for me to learn that Judge Frank W. Tomasello has been awarded the William H. Lewis award.

We from Massachusetts are proud of Judge Tomasello. He has rendered distinguished service.

I include as part of my remarks a newspaper report of the award.

JURIST AWARD IS PRESENTED TO TOMASELLO

The newly established William H. Lewis award, to be given annually to one of New England's outstanding jurists, was presented for the first time last night at the Boston City Club to Judge Frank W. Tomasello, an associate justice of the Boston Municipal Court.

The Lewis memorial scroll, established by Iota chapter of Boston University's law fraternity, Tau Epsilon Rho, is awarded in memory of William H. Lewis, first Negro elected to the Massachusetts Legislature.

PRESENTS HONOR

The presentation to Judge Tomasello was made by E. Mark Sullivan, former district attorney and Lewis' first law partner. The judge's wife was present to witness the ceremony.

Principal speaker at the dinner meeting was Judge Lewis Goldberg, of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, who discussed "Democracy Through the Law."

Others taking part in the program included: Dean Elwood H. Hettrick, of the Boston University School of Law; William H. Lewis, Jr., son of the late attorney; Bernard Kaplan, chancellor of the law fraternity's graduate chapter at B. U.; Melvin Chernick, chancellor of Iota chapter; and Wilfred Paquet, representing Governor Dever.

Second-Class Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Mr. L. R. Ward, publisher of the Benton County Review, expressing his views on the proposed postal rates. Mr. Ward has published a weekly paper for many years and is entirely conversant with these problems and the effects of the contemplated legislation.

BENTON COUNTY REVIEW,
Philomath, Oreg., April 19, 1949.

Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: Just a few words about the pending bill to increase postage on second-class mailings.

1. We believe all users of the postal facilities should pay fair and reasonable charges.

2. However, it has not been shown that the Postal Department has an adequate cost-finding system and cannot determine what a fair and reasonable cost should be.

3. We do not wish to be subsidized by the Government, even to the point of securing mailing rates that are subsidies in fact.

4. Under present second-class mailing arrangements papers do give a large amount of free publicity to governmental projects, bond sales, Army, Navy, and other departments.

5. If the Government would pay a fair charge on all of these so-called free publicity releases we are sure the newspapers would be willing to accept a fair increase for postage costs.

6. A free press, in a system dedicated to the free enterprise, must, of course, be maintained. The bill has many features which would seek to destroy a free press as we know it. The American way of life would be materially injured by a curtailment of a wide distribution of reading matter such as most second-class mailings cover.

7. Not only would Government publicity be restricted, the very life of many communities would suffer, such as local campaigns for law enforcement, flood control, civic betterment, distribution of church and civic news, and a long list of similar services rendered by most publications.

8. If a balance sheet could be made up showing the work of the newspapers and magazines in carrying on the war effort, local and State publicity, I am sure it would show the newspapers and magazines giving many times more than they receive in any so-called reduced mailing rates.

Yours truly,

L. R. WARD, *Publisher.*

Incentives Versus Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 4, 1949:

INCENTIVES VERSUS COMPULSION

A previously suppressed portion of the Hoover Commission's report on the national defense has come to light. It sharply attacks the Truman program of regimenting the whole Nation by means of "standby" legislation embodying ironclad control over 25 major facets of the national life. These emergency powers could be invoked not only if the country went to war but also if the Congress should declare that the economic stability of the United States was threatened.

This, then, is not a war program, but a program which could be introduced in time of peace. It would conscript everybody, men and women alike; permit censorship, rationing, price control, allocation by the Government of scarce material, use of public money to build Government-owned industrial plants of any description, control of wages, institution of universal military training, and many other things.

A group working as part of the Hoover Commission under the direction of Ferdinand Eberstadt, former chief of the munitions board, recommended that Congress give short shrift to such totalitarian notions.

The committee suggested instead that the Nation be given "proper directives, proper leadership, proper mechanisms, and proper incentives—that the Nation would produce more under voluntary conditions than under compulsory ones. Wage increases are natural incentives in a capitalist society; so, too, is every man's desire to better himself. Most men work better for the hope of reward than for the fear of punishment."

These statements are so self-evident that it is amazing that anyone should have to emphasize them. Mr. Hoover himself, during his services in the First World War, found that the voluntary method would suffice and that there was no need to think of compulsion in obtaining adequate food supplies for the Nation and its allies. It was characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt that he never gave that system a chance in the Second World War, but hurried to impose every conceivable sort of control as rapidly as possible.

When Mr. Truman is found following in his footsteps, the reason is not obscure. The fact is that some of the New Deal's wartime controls survive and have been absorbed as a permanent part of the New Deal peacetime program, and that very many more of them would have survived and so been absorbed if Congress and the people had not revolted in 1946. Now that his political fortunes have again improved, Mr. Truman has lost no time in seeking to recapture every power the New Deal had in war, and even to exceed those powers with others still more repressive.

The result is that this country is confronted with a boldly avowed demand that every citizen submit to a state discipline no less harsh than ever was imposed upon Germans by Hitler or upon Russians by Stalin. Mr. Truman's predecessor sought to justify totalitarian controls as necessary in war, Mr. Truman himself would adopt them as the essence of a domestic program in time of peace. He would not lack an occasion to proclaim that the Nation's economic stability was threatened. The New Deal debt, spending, and vast program of bureaucratic "services" already have the economy on the ropes.

The American people must make their choice whether they are to surrender to the state or to continue living as free men in the tradition of incentives and rewards which dates from the Nation's beginnings. That choice is before them, here, now.

Keep the Fleet To Keep the Peace—Argument for Larger Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Since, Mr. Speaker, we maintain the position that we shall be attacked and not be the aggressor in any third world war, it follows that enemy

"X" will immediately seek to destroy all our boasted land bases in a repeat of Pearl Harbor. Everybody who might be hostile to us has a perfect blueprint showing the location of all the bases from which our long range bombers might take off, were they the aggressors. I might say that if our possible enemies do not have such maps it is just because we omitted some detail in our public advertising of our defenses and the character of weapons we would use.

Since it is true that the bases, the location of which we have advertised to the world, will be destroyed before we know it, the essential and necessary hope we have is found in a supercarrier, or two, off which guided missiles may be launched and from which planes carrying atomic bomb loads may fly.

Since our land-based planes will have been destroyed in a sneak attack, it seems to me we should have just one chance to save ourselves. A supercarrier, or two, in the Pacific, changing base, and as permanently unlocatable as a Dixie-Democrat at a national convention, could cause a lot of trouble and could save the United States.

You just cannot laugh it off. We still must be mistress of the seas, and to do that a supercarrier, or two, equipped with planes carrying atomic bombs and staffed with guided missiles, is really the answer in this new logistic and strategic war-torn world. The matter of cost is not the issue when the price of liberty is involved.

In this connection I would like to include, under leave heretofore granted, an article by David Lawrence:

ISSUES OF THE DAY

(By David Lawrence)

ARGUMENT FOR LARGER CARRIER

WASHINGTON, April 29—The Navy's case for the building of a carrier larger than previously built has never been given to the public due to the "gag" enforced against the Navy and not against the other services. Here are the essential points in that case:

1. The new carrier known as the "United States" is not a "supercarrier" or a new weapon but a logical development of an existing one.

2. The difference in size between previous carriers and the new one is actually only 100 feet in length and 30 feet in width. The large carriers hitherto have measured 990 feet long and 105 wide. The new one was to have been 1,090 feet long and 135 feet wide.

3. The new carrier would permit its planes to fly 1,700 miles out and 1,700 miles back, whereas the planes of present carriers have a range of only 900 miles.

4. In accordance with the unanimous agreement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reached at Key West recently, the mission of naval aviation was described not as a primary instrument for strategic bombing but only as a means of assisting that mission.

PRIMARY PURPOSE OF CARRIERS

5. The primary purpose of carriers is to obtain and retain complete control of the seas against any threat from land or sea. It is to meet any menace against ships at sea, including those transporting fuel to supply land-based strategic bombers of the other armed services.

6. Included in this primary purpose is the attack upon shore installations from which submarines are sent out to prey on commerce.

7. The chief function of carrier planes in operations near land bases is to drop mines so as to block the egress of submarines through straits and narrow channels that lead to the sea.

8. The use of smaller carriers to hunt and fight submarines would be diminished, and the burden of antisubmarine warfare is increased unless a carrier task force can be depended upon to demolish shore installations where submarines are concentrated.

JET PLANES FROM CARRIER

9. Jet planes were to be flown from the new carrier. It has been erroneously stated that jet planes could not return to the deck of the *United States*. Not only could jet planes land on the deck of the proposed new carrier but they can land also on carriers of smaller size stationed at other locations at sea.

10. The new carrier would be safer and less vulnerable than any ship of any kind ever built. Its construction is of such a nature that nothing in the way of submarine operations, as known today, could sink the carrier. To ward off attack from the air, it has its own radar and fighter planes, which successfully kept every large carrier in the Pacific in the last war from being sunk from the air. No fast or large-sized American carrier was ever sunk by a submarine, either.

WOULDN'T GO THROUGH CANAL

11. The reason for the increase of 100 feet in length and 30 feet in width in the new carrier is that the Navy no longer is limited by the necessity of going through the Panama Canal. It is assumed that any future conflict will be a seven-ocean war and that America will have enough carriers in every ocean to keep control of the seas. The new big carrier, with a task force around it, could be placed at a strategic point in the Indian Ocean near the Persian Gulf or in the North Atlantic. It could protect commerce in the Mediterranean as well as in any ocean. It would cost less to build than it would have cost to build two battleships 5 years ago.

12. The Navy has led the whole world in carrier aviation and now has been frustrated in the natural development of a new weapon which it alone understands and has used to advantage in actual combat.

The real question at issue is whether each armed service shall be the judge of what improvements shall be made on its own weapons, assuming that it can keep within its budget.

Stockholders Deserve a Larger Share of Corporate Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the emphasis in the majority of the discussions on the distribution of corporate profits has been given to the question of possible damage to big business if profits are not retained for expansion and replacement funds. More emphasis should be given to the fact that the people who finance corporations by investing in stocks deserve a larger share of those profits. I have received hundreds of letters from responsible and intelligent citizens giving facts and figures concerning the retention of profits by corporations. I would like to present to the Members some representative statements from those letters:

The first statement is from a manager of small estates. He says:

I happen to manage a good many estates where we must invest part of our money in bonds, and it is every month that I have bonds maturing that were paying 4¼ to 4½ percent and I now must invest the money in good bonds paying 1½ to 2 percent. You therefore can see what a trimming the beneficiaries are getting in these estates by corporations holding on to the dividends. In the first place I think it is a very narrow, short-sighted policy to try and build up corporations from earnings only. The best managed corporations have not done this.

I am enclosing the statement of a company that we own stock in. Please note that this company last year earned $36 a share, and gave the stockholders $5. In 5 years' time their current assets have gone from 25,000,000 to 57,000,000. This is another company that handed us some stock dividends that cannot be distributed to the beneficiaries, and you can't eat stock certificates. In 5 years' time the company earned $83.88 a share. The stockholders have received $13.25 a share, and two 10-percent stock dividends, but you can't buy groceries with them, nor does the Government get any income tax on them.

And here is another:

I am a stockholder in a small corporation, holding 42 percent of outstanding stock, but am in the minority, consequently I do not count. This corporation for the 3-year period 1945–47 shows: Earnings, $218,735; taxes, $89,610; dividends, $10,200; net income to surplus account, $129,125.

If this corporation had paid out in dividends two-thirds of its earnings, the stockholders would have benefited, and also the Federal Government. As it is, both lose. There must be hundreds of such examples.

I am strongly in favor of any measure that would require corporations to pay out two-thirds of their earnings and not allow them to build up these huge surpluses at the expense of Government.

A small-investment banker gave a particularly good summary of the situation:

Today many of our large and medium-size corporations are managed by individuals who have only a nominal financial interest in the enterprise and they seem frequently obsessed with the idea that earnings should be conserved in one way or another, plowed back into expansion, or just left idle in cash—not paid out in dividends. It is my thought that at times this is done to insure the various pension plans for the executives and to minimize the responsibilities and problems of the management. Moreover, the very failure to pay a greater percentage out in dividends aggravates the so-called difficulty of obtaining new equity capital. It is a sort of vicious circle. Managements complain that the public are not responsive to new stock issues, and in my judgment the reason they are not responsive is that managements themselves insist upon arbitrarily retaining an entirely unreasonable proportion of said earnings in the business.

Here is another typical example:

For the past 2 years I have accumulated 300 shares of Emsco Derrick and Equipment (New York Curb market) thinking that from an earnings standpoint for a low-priced stock, it might be a good speculation. For the year of 1946, earnings were $1.91, year of 1947 $2.76, and the past year 1948 their statement shows $5.81 net, a total for the 3 years of $10.48, and during those 3 years only 25

cents have been paid out in dividends. This is, of course, an extreme case of this type. However, at a recent meeting of the board of directors of this company, stockholders were told that they need not expect any dividends for some time, due to a large expansion program on at present and that funds were required for corporate purposes.

The following figures were submitted in a letter from a stockholder in the American Hard Rubber Co.:

I am a stockholder in the American Hard Rubber Co. and I am enclosing pertinent data, as disclosed in their report for 1948. In this report they include a break-down of a 10-year summary: In 1939 net sales were $6,844,833; net income, $497,869; preferred dividends, $181,456, and common dividends, $163,758. Ten years later, in 1948, net sales were $16,378,006; net income, $499,801; preferred dividends, $114,492, and common dividends, $88,477. So with an increase of sales of nearly ten millions, their net income shows an increase of $2,000, and the common dividends have been cut from $163,758 to $88,477. This doesn't indicate any brilliancy in managerial achievement, yet in their analysis of 1948 operations, to emphasize their brilliance, they divulge that compensations paid to 12 officers amounted to $170,552, or 1 percent of the gross, while dividends to common stockholders, $88,477, amounted to one-half of 1 percent of said gross.

An investment securities company president sent the following letter, which indicates that corporation officials have little or no concern about violating section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code:

I was interested in your recent statement that teeth should be put in section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code to compel corporations to pay out two-thirds of net income in dividends. While I realize that there are probably many instances under which such a dividend policy would work hardship on corporations, I believe that there are also many cases where dividends are being unfairly withheld from stockholders.

A week ago today I attended a stockholders meeting of the Harnischfeger Corp., in Milwaukee, Wis., which has recently reported earnings of $11.94 per share for the year 1948. Dividends paid out for that year amounted to $1.25 per share, or not much more than 10 percent of earnings. The directors on that same date declared a regular quarterly dividend of only 15 cents per share in spite of the big earnings for 1948.

According to the enclosed Standard Poor's report, this company in the past 9 years earned a total of $45.57 per share on common stock and in that same period has paid in dividends $5.90 per share. Since 1941 you will note that the book value has increased from $21.18 per share to $58.01 per share and that the net working capital has increased from $4,842,000 to $11,647,000.

I understand that over 80 percent of the common stock of Harnischfeger Corp. is owned by Mr. W. Harnischfeger, president, or members of his family. During the course of the meeting I inquired of President Harnischfeger, who was acting as chairman of the stockholders' meeting, if the directors had given careful consideration to the possible implication of section 102, in the light of their big earnings and their very conservative dividend policy. He informed me that the directors had carefully considered the matter at various directors' meetings and had decided that their policy was not affected by provisions of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

As a stockholder of this corporation I sincerely believe that its management has done a good job in operating the business, but I also feel that in view of the very substantial amount of profits that have been plowed back into the business, this corporation should also give more consideration to dividends for minority stockholders whose problems, from a tax standpoint, are probably not identical with those who control over 80 percent of the stock.

While I believe that the Government must exercise great care in formulating any law that will force corporations to pay out profits that are really needed in the business, it is my opinion that at the present time many managements are deliberately withholding the payment of reasonable dividends because of personal tax considerations. Under such conditions it is not surprising that small investors hesitate to invest their surplus funds in common stocks, which could be one of the answers as to why capital markets are drying up.

Another letter offers some interesting ideas for revision of the tax laws:

May I offer the small support of one citizen to your efforts, and may I also say that many others to whom I have spoken about the matter are essentially in agreement with the comments below:

(a) Many corporations have grown at the expense of the stockholder—who is interested in dividends and not in the size of his company. Why should corporations be allowed to reinvest earnings without permission of the stockholders to whom they really belong? Today they do so. Many corporations appear to be operating primarily for the benefit of their top management. This is unfair. They should be returned to the rightful owners, and only a Federal law can do that.

(b) It would be desirable to eliminate taxes on corporations—then require them to pay out 90 percent of their profits in dividends.

(1) This would give the people with small income—widows, etc., who own a large portion of corporation stocks—a reasonable income, and at the same time well-paid corporation officers who own quite a few shares would pay their just share of tax.

(2) There would be an increased willingness on the part of individuals to invest venture capital in new and smaller corporations. This isn't true today because one stands to lose all—if the venture fails—and gain little (after double taxation) if the venture succeeds.

I believe the Members will recognize this correspondence as being of unusual caliber. The letters are well-reasoned and conservatively phrased. They point out a problem which this Congress should consider at an early date.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address made November 2, 1948, by Hon. Cater Bowie, governor, South Carolina District Civitan International. Mr. Bowie is one of the outstanding leaders of civitanocracy of international renown and has done much to further the cause of good citizenship. I am genuinely proud to claim him as my constituent and personal friend. His address follows:

Mr. President and fellow Civitans of Charleston, I know all of you have heard many times how Civitan was originated. Therefore, I am skipping over the history of Civitan. However, the word "Civitan" was derived from the Latin "Civitas," meaning citizenship.

One requirement of Civitan is that all members must be qualified voters. I hope that everyone in this room is a qualified voter. I also hope that your wives and all relatives are qualified voters.

The Civitan International has suggested, or requested, that clubs do not take any part in politics, that is, sanction or unite together for any particular candidate. This suggestion is to eliminate friction among members within clubs.

However, Civitans, I think the time has come for Civitans of South Carolina, and of the South, to take part in politics, especially national politics.

As all of you know, today is general election day. This is the most important election that we have, and will have for many years to come. I regret to say that the people of South Carolina have always taken the least interest in the general election. This is due to the fact that the primary election has always been a ruling factor in our elections. However, the primary system seems to be losing out for many and various reasons. I may be wrong in the matter, but believe that our present primary system will be abolished within a short time.

I am very sorry to say that a great number of people in South Carolina and throughout the South, and even in this Civitan Club, are indifferent as to what is going on in national politics. These people do not seem to realize that the two major political parties in this country are trying to make a sacrificial goat out of the Southern States. Our way of life in the South is now endangered. Our great-grandfathers, who came here years ago, fought, and many died fighting Indians, helped to make our present way of living in the South possible. They handed us a grand and glorious country, with instructions to please keep it free of totalitarians and dictators, so that we can all enjoy life as we have been enjoying it, and not like the people of European countries, who must abide by the wishes of some dictator.

Our immediate grandfathers fought 4 long years against odds that were never known in previous history so that we could keep our State rights as well as individual rights. I had two grandfathers who fought in this war for 4 years. It was not that they were fighting for what they thought was right—they were fighting for what was right and guaranteed to the States by the Constitution of the United States. If you have any doubt about this, then I suggest that you read the Constitution for yourselves, and you will find, according to the original Constitution, each State was a sovereign State and had the right to conduct its own affairs. They, at that time, were united together in a federation, the same as they are today, for their own protection against any common enemy.

Furthermore, my own father, who is still living, at the age of 12 wore a red shirt and rode with Wade Hampton down the main streets of Columbia, S. C., and helped break down the doors of the statehouse when Governor Chamberlin, the carpet-bag governor, refused to open the doors and surrender the statehouse after his (Chamberlin's) defeat for reelection.

Our way of life in the South, which we have enjoyed from the year 1500, is now endangered. It is endangered by two political parties, who wish to force upon us in the South the FEPC, antilynch law, and other laws so that these two parties may be popular with a certain minority in the United

States. Should the FEPC be enacted it means that the South Carolina Power Co., down the street here, will not have the privilege of employing those whom they wish to employ, nor will they have the privilege of discharging those whom they wish to discharge. If they do, they will be indicted and prosecuted by the Federal Government. I am simply using the South Carolina Power Co. as an illustration—this will apply to me, and all other employers in the United States. Think it over, Civitans—this alone is enough to make every employer shudder.

The antilynch law which they are trying to put on the books is another terrible threat against the South. Why should all county officers in this county (when I say all, I mean everybody on the country pay roll) be responsible for what some hot-headed irresponsible people may do? The city authorities of Chicago, and the city authorities of New York, and other big cities, are not held responsible for mob action, are they? They are not indicted and thrown into jail because some gang happens to kill some person—then why should our county officials be held responsible for some particular mob or gang action?

To sum up the whole matter in a nutshell, it is this: Those political powers in the North intend forcing a certain element down our very throats, and make us like it, and ask for more.

Thank God, we have a few men in South Carolina who have some of the courage of their forefathers, namely: Governor Thurmond, Congressman Mendel Rivers, Tom Stoney, of Charleston, also Mayor Morrison, of Charleston, and a few others. These men are doing all they can, but they cannot fight our battles alone. We must let them know we are with them, and urge them to do their best for us.

We, ourselves, must use the only weapon we have left to fight with against those who intend breaking the backs of the white South. That weapon is our ballot. Use it today, Civitans, or forever hold your peace when undesirables come crowding you out of your place at theaters, churches, railroads, busses—and the very seat where you are now sitting. Thank you.

A Neutral View of Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1949, entitled "The House Stands Firm."

No one can read this editorial without appreciating the clear and forthright statement on what happened in the House of Representatives regarding labor legislation. It ought to be read by every Member who believes in sane, sensible legislation in the field of labor. It ought to stand as an encouragement for clear thinking and a consciousness of our obligations and responsibilities as legislators.

THE HOUSE STANDS FIRM

The House vote to retain the essential principles of the Taft-Hartley law is being hailed as a defeat for President Truman. This, in a sense, is correct, but it would be more accurate to interpret the vote as a victory for common sense.

From the very beginning the drive to scrap the Taft-Hartley Act and to substitute the so-called administration bill has been tainted with fraud. On the one hand, the existing law has been extravagantly attacked on grounds that are without basis in truth or fact. On the other, the administration's substitute has been put forward as a measure that would adequately protect the public interest when, in fact, it would do nothing of the sort.

The set-back in the House might have been averted if there had been any disposition to be reasonable. But reason never entered the picture—at least, not until it was too late. The President, entirely committed to the professional labor point of view, was determined to give the labor leaders what they wanted. Neither during the committee hearings nor in committee would any compromise be considered. The bill which bore the OK of organized labor was rammed through without any real consideration of its merits, and then the President resorted to political strong-arm tactics in a misguided effort to force its adoption. At the eleventh hour, when it became evident that the House would not be bulldozed into taking this measure, the administration leaders there, without formal White House approval, offered six major concessions. Had these concessions been made at the outset, the compromise bill probably could have been passed. But they came too late, and the House on a roll-call vote, adopted the Wood bill, which has been accurately described as a modified Taft-Hartley law.

It is to be expected that this bill will be subjected to the same dishonest attacks that have been made on the present law. Indeed, some labor leaders have already said that it is worse than the Taft-Hartley Act. But these attacks are not true. The Wood bill is a reasonably good labor measure. It retains the essential principle that the public is entitled to some protection from the abuses of organized labor—a principle which was not recognized in the President's bill.

There cannot be any serious doubt that a great majority of the people want this protection. At any rate, the 217 Members of the House who voted for it did so after appraising sentiment in their home districts during the Easter recess, and in spite of every pressure that could be brought to bear against them by the professional labor bosses and the President. This ought to be enough to convince Mr. Truman and his labor allies that they can have a reasonable new labor law if they want it, but that they cannot palm off any measure that is a fraud on the people.

Rent Control Slips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 2, 1949:

RENT CONTROL SLIPS

The Federal judiciary in Chicago is split wide open on the question of enforcing the Federal rent-control laws.

This disagreement seems symptomatic of a general distintegration of the control system. When Congress reenacted the rent-control law it was suggested in these columns that rent control was breaking down of its own weight and that control might not even last the 15 additional months prescribed for it by Congress.

Two United States judges here, William J. Campbell and John P. Barnes, hold that the general Federal practice act bars all suits for treble damages for rent overcharges asking less than $3,000. They are tracking a recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals to that effect.

On the other hand, Judge Michael L. Igoe holds the Philadelphia decision is invalid. In his opinion the clear intention of Congress in the rent-control laws is to open United States courts to all tenants seeking such redress.

The resulting confusion among lawyers, landlords and tenants is easily imagined, with more to come as cases are dropped and refiled in State courts.

The split at the Federal court house came after a flood of treble damage suits that indicated how widespread were private deals of landlords and tenants that did not follow the standards of the control laws. The number of such deals that stick must far exceed the number that wind up in disputes and lawsuits.

Rent control has long since encountered the law of diminishing returns which eventually nullifies all price-fixing legislation. Only in the heat of war passion is it possible for such regimentation to work smoothly.

Berlin and Lake Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of May 4, 1949:

BERLIN AND LAKE SUCCESS

Two events on opposite sides of the world will exert a profound influence on the future of the United Nations. The events are the conquest of China by the Communists, a monumental occurrence whose impact has not yet reached Lake Success, and the preliminary conversations in New York toward a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers on German questions.

Superficially, the only connection of the UN with the Berlin negotiations has been to furnish a convenient meeting place for Messrs. Malik and Jessup. It is true, however, that no institution aside from the governments directly involved has so much at stake in these questions as the United Nations. Nowhere are the Jessup-Malik "conversations" followed with more intense concern than at Lake Success and Flushing Meadow. No delegate, or member of the Secretariat, or observer, doubts that the future of the United Nations will be shaped by the course of these negotiations.

The basic principle of the Charter is agreement among the great powers. Peace, in short, is supposed to be assured by the might of the Big Five acting in concert, and the keystone of the United Nations was the assumption that the Big Five would act in concert to keep the peace as they had done to prosecute the war. It is impossible to consider the United Nations apart from great

power contentions and disagreements; the two are inseparable.

Because of this fundamental principle, every development in the cold war has immediate repercussions in the United Nations. It matters little whether the particular dissension originated inside the organization, as in the veto controversy, or outside, as with the Marshall plan, ultimately the quarrel gets into the United Nations and adds its weight to the mass of frustrations that have accumulated in the course of the years.

The Berlin case might be likened to the straw that broke the camel's back. It was just the last bit too much. When the regular session of the General Assembly met in Paris last September the institution stood on the ragged edge of a crisis owing to the continuous strain of great power contentions. When, on top of this condition, the Berlin situation was given to the Security Council, no one could doubt that UN affairs had reached a genuine crisis.

With Vishinsky's veto of a Berlin settlement on October 25 it became blindingly clear that the UN as originally organized—on great power cooperation—was finished. Since great power cooperation for international peace and security was obviously undependable, something else had to be attempted unless the states were to surrender their search for assurances of peace. Out of this necessity came the Atlantic treaty, which up to the time of the veto was a rather nebulous expedient under tentative discussion. Vishinsky's veto made the situation clear in two respects: it reveals to the Western Powers the full extent of the dangers to them contained in the Russian action in Berlin and simultaneously the futility of further attempts at negotiation with Russia through UN machinery. Frustration had reached its limits.

The Atlantic treaty is an expedient, well within the framework of the Charter, to substitute a regional alliance as an assurance of peace within specific areas, in place of the sweeping and general guaranties written into the Charter. It is an experiment compelled by force of circumstances.

Now, as the Big Four appear on the point of renewing their efforts to make a German peace, the United Nations again faces new and unpredictable developments. Success of the Council of Foreign Ministers might restore confidence in the old concept of big power cooperation for peace. Failure would likely destroy any last vestiges of hope in that direction and force the United Nations toward networks of alliances. Whatever the outcome of the prospective conference, its effect will nowhere be more evident than at Lake Success.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Taft-Hartley Law Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to all of the debate on the bill before us which aims to repeal the Taft-Hartley law of 1947. At times it was difficult for me to realize that I was actually in the House of Representatives where the legislative business for all of the people of this great country is presumed to be conducted.

We are not here, Mr. Speaker, representing labor or management. We are here to write a reasonable law which will govern the conduct of both groups, keeping in mind the paramount interest of the general public. There has been too much bitterness, too many charges and counter charges, in this debate to serve any useful purpose. The heat generated has been intense; the light we seek is very dim. It is indeed a sorry spectacle, Mr. Chairman, when representatives of the people cannot reason together and reach a satisfactory solution of the problems presented by this legislation.

Every Member of this body will admit that the writing of a labor law is a very technical proposition. It should have been written in the committee, but the Democrats refused to follow customary committee procedure. The full committee had no opportunity to amend the bill; in fact, the full committee never even read it, an unheard of practice. And then, to add further insult, the chairman of the committee asked the Rules Committee for a closed rule so this House would be perfectly gagged. This is democracy as practiced by the New Dealers in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the Taft-Hartley bill in 1947. It was a good law then; it is a good law now. I told several labor groups last week that I would vote for any amendment that would eliminate inequities between the parties covered by the present law. I stand on that ground today.

Now let us review some of the charges or complaints that the labor leaders have made against the present law.

First. That unions are prohibited from negotiating for a union-shop contract without being first authorized to do so through an election among the employees involved. Further, that it was not fair to require approval by a majority of the employees eligible to vote rather than a majority of those voting. Under the Wood bill, labor organizations will be able to negotiate union-shop contracts without specific prior authorization of the employees involved.

Second. That the present law is unfair because it makes the nonpayment of dues the sole ground on which unions can demand the discharge of an employee who has been expelled from the union. The Wood bill authorizes unions to compel the discharge of employees who have been expelled from the union.

Third. That the present law prohibited the union hiring hall and the recruitment of workers through a union hiring hall. The Wood bill provides that it will not be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify a union hiring hall when he has jobs to fill.

Fourth. That the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law are unfair because they require union members to "scab" on their brother members. The Wood bill permits employees of the same local to strike against goods being produced for the account of an employer against whom other members of the local are striking.

Fifth. That it is unfair to penalize unions that strike when they fail to give 60 days' notice of their intenton to negotiate changes in contracts. The Wood bill abolishes this requirement.

Sixth. That the provision stating that employees on strike who are not eligible for reinstatement shall not be permitted to vote in representation elections is unfair. Unions charge that this gives power to employers to "bust" unions. The Wood bill provides that employees on strike can vote in representation elections if they have not been replaced for 90 days or more by a permanent replacement. Thus, under the Wood bill, an employer would not be able to bust a union by employing strikebreakers.

Seventh. That it is unfair to require the filing of non-Communist affidavits so long as employers are not required to do so. The Wood bill provides that employers file the same affidavit that union officers do.

Eighth. That the provision which authorizes the general counsel of the Labor Board to get injunctions to prevent secondary boycotts is unfair because no such authority is exercised against employers. Under the Wood bill, mandatory injunctions are abolished and the general counsel is authorized to apply for temporary injunctions against both management and labor.

Ninth. That it is unfair to require an election to be held among employees on the employer's last offer in disputes that involve the national health and safety. The Wood bill abolishes this requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the above changes contained in the Wood bill are made in a sincere effort to meet union criticism of the Taft-Hartley law and to achieve an evenly balanced labor-management policy. That is the aim, I believe, of every Member who has in mind the paramount interest of the general public.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I call attention to a situation that threatens representative government. I refer to the organized pressure that is being exerted on Members in the House Office buildings, in the corridors around this Chamber, and in the packed galleries by labor and management. In all the years of my services in this body, I have never seen anything like it. We are not permitted, under these conditions, to legislate in a calm and reasonable manner. One writer of national reputation has said:

> What a sorry spectacle this is for a Nation which boasts that it is composed of freemen who believe in volition rather than coercion. This bullying of Congress by large pressure groups comprising labor or management factions is the order of the day. What else does the writing of restrictive legislation mean except to apply coercion of law to the economic behavior of certain groups so that, as the political strength of one ascends, the restraints imposed on the other side are increased?

Mr. Speaker, as for myself, I would vote to abolish all the labor law now on the statute books, so that both labor and management might sit around the table and write contracts in the spirit and temper of real collective bargaining. It was with regret that the parliamentary situation was such as to preclude me from offering a motion to that end. While at home during the Easter recess I conferred with groups of union leaders, A. F. of L. and CIO, and I raised the

question about abolishing all this legislation and hardly without exception these men said they could negotiate with management more easily and get better contracts without all this complex legislation. Under the existing conditions, neither labor nor management is free to deal with each other in the spirit of fair play. One side or the other is constantly on guard to avoid the violation of some provision of the law. This situation creates a conflict that is carried into the very negotiations between the parties. If it is to continue it will lead to economic chaos and ultimately to governmental usurpation of business and industry and the enslavement of the free workers in this country.

Incitement to Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 2, 1949:

INCITEMENT TO ANARCHY

A New York Congressman, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, proposed a Nation-wide work stoppage by all union members as a protest against the Taft-Hartley law. His plan found no support among responsible union leaders. But that detracts nothing from the viciousness of KLEIN'S proposal.

Fred A. Virkus, Chicagoan who heads the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, denounced it as incitement to anarchy by a minority group against the great majority of the American people. That is an apt indictment.

How to Increase Gold Production—Gold Miners Are Disturbed About the Unfavorable Position of Their Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, gold mining throughout the world is in the doldrums. Ninety percent of the gold mines in continental United States and Alaska are closed. Canada has been forced to subsidize her gold mines, and the entire economy of South Africa is threatened because the International Monetary Fund opposes the effort of the South African Government to advance the price of gold.

What is the cause and what is the remedy for this situation? This is a question that must be answered and answered right, in the near future, because it does not merely concern the producers of gold, but the economic structure of every country in the world; for despite the contention of the managed-currency boys that they recognize the position of gold in our monetary and economic system only as a concession to orthodoxy, the value of every currency in the world is measured in gold and affected by fluctuations in the price of gold.

The price of gold has not advanced since 1934, while the cost of labor, equipment, and materials required to mine gold have doubled and tripled. Based on the purchasing power of the dollar, the price of gold is the lowest since the founding of this Republic.

Thirty-five dollars, the present price of gold in the United States, is equivalent in purchasing power to only $12.95 prior to 1934. Small wonder that gold miners are closing down.

I have been urged by gold miners and prospectors to suggest some method of increasing the production of gold by putting existing mines into operation and finding new mines.

Personally, I am opposed to subsidizing the mining industry because subsidies are a tax burden on the American people. In my opinion, the most effective way to promote the finding of new gold mines and the production from existing mines is to raise the price of gold to the equivalent of what it was prior to 1934; and since the present purchasing power of the dollar is 37 percent of what it was prior to 1934, the present price of gold should be $56 per ounce. This would not increase the value of gold. It would merely adjust the price of gold to the depreciated value of the dollar, thereby stabilizing both currency and prices; and thus preventing further depreciation of the dollar, which was responsible for the inflationary spiral of 1946.

INFLATION BY LEGISLATION

While everyone is aware that the dollar buys only about one-third of what it bought 15 years ago, few people realize that this depreciation of the dollar was brought about by the enactment of "must" legislation, prepared by those who planned it that way.

I will endeavor to show by simple arithmetic just what this "must" legislation has done to our money in 15 years.

From 1837 to 1934, the amount of gold constituting $1 was 23.22 grains; and since there are 480 grains in an ounce, simple division shows that this set the price of gold at $20.67 per ounce.

In 1934, the amount of gold constituting $1 was reduced from 23.22 to 13.71 grains; and again by simple division, this gives a price of $35 per ounce for gold.

In 1945, through the enactment of Public Law 84, monetary reserves were lowered from 40 to 25 percent, which resulted in reducing the amount of gold constituting $1 to 8.57 grains; and again by simple arithmetic—divide 480 grains by 8.57—we find that it requires 56 of these dollars to equal an ounce of gold. Consequently, the price of gold should have been increased to $56 per ounce.

SUBSIDIZING IMPORTS BY OVERVALUING FOREIGN CURRENCIES

But because we still permit foreign nations to buy our gold at $35 per ounce, foreign currencies are overvalued 60 percent, which has the effect of subsidizing imports 60 percent, and discounting exports 37½ percent. It also permits foreign investors to buy our choicest stocks at 40 percent discount, and sell them at 60 percent premium. Thus, foreign investors and international bankers are getting control of American industry; and subsidized imports from slave-labor countries are pouring into the United States to cause unemployment here and pay interest on foreign bonds held by the international bankers. The New England textile industry has already been reduced to a 4-day week, and we can expect to see this unemployment spread to industries in other parts of the country.

STOCK MARKET NO LONGER BAROMETER OF BUSINESS

Meanwhile, we are taxing free enterprise in the United States to build up socialism in Europe which is committed to the destruction of free enterprise everywhere, while European investors—rather than use their money to build up their own countries—are investing their money in the United States on the basis mentioned above; and, as a consequence, European investments and dollar credits in the United States have reached the staggering total of $26,000,000,000.

Is it any wonder that our stock market is no longer a barometer of American business; that our choicest industrial stocks are quoted at 60 percent of their real worth; and that 3,500,000 men are unemployed?

THE SO-CALLED DOLLAR SHORTAGE

We hear a great deal about the dollar shortage in Europe and other parts of the world, but we should not confuse dollar shortage with a shortage of money or purchasing power in Europe. There is a dollar shortage because, with foreign currencies overvalued 60 percent, anyone fortunate enough to convert foreign currency into American dollars can make a profit of 60 percent, or more, on the transaction.

An example of just how this works is shown by the following excerpt from the Wall Street Journal of September 16, 1948:

> The value of the French franc in terms of gold * * * plummeted to a new low yesterday * * *. An American $20 gold piece commanded 26,200 francs * * *. In the market for paper money, the American dollar was pushed to 440 francs.

This means, of course, that a pre-1934 dollar, which was redeemable in gold, would buy 13,010 francs; whereas our 1948 dollar, which is not redeemable, would buy only 440 francs, or approximately one-third as many.

Now let us pursue this situation a little further. Since, on that date, one 1948 American dollar could be bought with 440 francs, 35 American dollars could be bought with 15,400 francs; and any foreign nation could buy an ounce of American gold with that $35. An

ounce of gold contains 480 grains; whereas an American $20 gold piece contains only 464.4 grains. So it is evident that an ounce of gold would buy more francs than a $20 gold piece, or approximately 27,000 francs.

You will note, that by this simple process, any foreign nation could convert 15,400 francs into 27,000 francs at a profit of approximately 75 percent. This explains the mad scramble for American dollars in foreign countries.

Of course the rates of exchange are different than they were last fall, but the relative ratio of exchange has changed little.

THANK GOD FOR THAT "DOLLAR SHORTAGE"

So let us thank God for that "dollar shortage" because if it were not for that shortage, the international banker-racketeers would drain away our wealth even faster than they have been doing via the United Nations, Bretton Woods, lend-lease, Marshall plan, and now the Atlantic Pact—not to mention that economic absurdity, the Berlin airlift—all of which are instruments in the hands of the internationalists who would make the United States a satrapy in a world superstate, in which we would be outnumbered and outvoted 15 to 1.

The one-worlders are already gleefully pointing to the Atlantic Pact as the first step in world government. Show me an internationalist, who advocates the surrender of our national sovereignty to a world government, and I will show you a potential traitor to our country. One must be blind indeed who does not see that their activities are playing right into the hands of Stalin to bring about an economic collapse in the United States of America.

HOW TO SAVE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

While we are on the subject of the French franc, let us have a look at France's economy. In the $5,500,000,000 just authorized by the Congress for aid to Marshall-plan countries, there is an item of $750,000,000 allocated to France; and yet, not long ago, the Bank for International Settlements estimated that the citizens of France were hoarding about $3,400,000,000 in gold, nearly five times as much as the gold stock of the Bank of France. Why? Because the French people have no confidence in the integrity of their irredeemable paper currency. But, if we and the Marshall-plan countries would adopt a sound monetary system, in which the redemption of currency at face value on demand was guaranteed, this great hidden hoard of gold, held by the French people, would flow into the Bank of France where it would serve as a 40-percent monetary reserve for the issuance of $8,500,000,000 of sound, stable, redeemable curency; and France would require no financial aid from us.

A similar situation exists throughout the entire world; and if the United States would take the lead in adopting a sound monetary system along the lines of that provided in H. R. 2573, we would not only save most of the billions we are now futilely pouring into foreign countries, but we would put the nations of the world back on their economic feet in a matter of 12 months and—best of all—it would cost us nothing.

UNITED STATES MUST ACCEPT ITS RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility for a sound monetary system rests squarely on the people and the Congress of the United States, and if we initiate such a program, other nations, particularly those benefiting under the Marshall plan, will be forced, of necessity, to follow us.

If we fail to rise to our responsibility, the kind of America we have known—the kind of America handed down to us by the founding fathers—is finished.

CAUSES OF 1929 DEPRESSION AND 1946 INFLATION

Perhaps a little explanation is needed regarding Public Law 84 (1945). Prior to 1934, the American people enjoyed the right of redemption of their currency at face value on demand. That is, they could demand and receive from any bank, in appropriate denominations, 23.22 grains of gold for every dollar of paper currency presented. To insure this redemption, our laws required that all currency in circulation be backed by a 40-percent monetary reserve which, for more than 150 years, had been universally recognized as the minimum monetary reserve necessary to insure redemption of currency. Thus, it became axiomatic that currency was worth only two and one-half times the monetary reserve back of it (2½ times 25 percent of 13.71 grains is 8.57 grains).

The violation of this inexorable economic and monetary law was what precipitated the depression of 1929 because, when European banks permitted their reserves to fall from 40 to 21 percent (a drop of 47½ percent, their currencies dropped proportionately. In a frenzied effort to restore these reserves, they sold everything they owned that could be converted into gold; dumped their American stocks on our market and broke our market; withdrew silver money from circulation in India, and dumped silver on the world market, driving the price of silver down from 65 cents per ounce to 26 cents per ounce. This destroyed 60 percent of the purchasing power of that three-fifths of the world's population residing in the Orient and in the Middle East just as effectively as if $10,000,000,000 of their money had been sunk in the Pacific Ocean. You simply cannot destroy the purchasing power of more than half the people of the world without precipitating a world panic and depression.

REPEATING ERRORS OF 1929

In view of what happened in 1929, it is difficult to understand the manner of reasoning of those responsible for the enactment of Public Law 84 (1945), which was sent to the Congress as "must" legislation.

The effect of this law was to depreciate the dollar an additional 37½ percent and cause commodity prices to advance 60 percent; but because this law was enacted at the time price controls were eliminated, 99 percent of the people blame the rise of commodity prices to the elimination of price controls. As a matter of fact, if prices had been frozen at the 1945 level, half of the business and industry in the United States would have been forced to close or go bankrupt.

DOUBLE TALK, EVASION, AND MARXIST JARGON

With these facts before us, with a sharp decline in the prices of raw materials, farm and mine, and 3,500,000 people unemployed, it is very disconcerting for the President's advisers, particularly Leon Keyserling, to give us nothing better than double talk, evasive answers, half-truths, and Marxist jargon.

NOT ENOUGH GOLD IN WORLD TO STABILIZE WORLD CURRENCIES

As stated above, I firmly believe that the price of gold should be advanced to $56 per ounce, but I am not sure that a free market in gold is the answer, because the value of the dollar will fluctuate with the price of gold. For example, if the price of gold should advance to $80 per ounce—and this is possible because there is an acute shortage of gold in the world—the purchasing power of our dollar would drop to 26 percent of what it was prior to 1934, and commodities would advance 42 percent; because when you divide 480 grains by 80, you get 6 grains, which is approximately 26 percent of 23.22 grains, the amount of gold which constituted a dollar from 1837 to 1934.

Advancing the price of gold above $56 per ounce does not increase its value or volume. It merely causes further depreciation of the dollar. It has long been obvious that there is not enough gold in the world to furnish an adequate base to support our monetary structure or supply reserves adequate to insure redemption of currency now in circulation. This base, or reserve, should be doubled; and that can be achieved only by adding silver to gold at a ratio based on the relative production of these two metals. This means that the only sound solution of the world's monetary and economic problems lies in a return to bimetallism along the lines of my bill H. R. 2573.

DANGER IN A RETURN TO THE SINGLE GOLD STANDARD

To return to the single gold standard would be fine for the banks bulging with synthetic dollars, since it would cause these dollars to advance from 37-cent dollars to 59-cent dollars, but it would be mighty tough on the debtors who would be forced to repay borrowed 37-cent dollars with 59-cent dollars.

The shortage of gold also makes it possible for the international bankers to gain control of it through scarcity, and manipulate its price to further their conspiracy to control raw materials, production, distribution, credit, money, and the value of money.

It should be obvious to everyone of ordinary intelligence that there has long been a national and international conspiracy to destroy our domestic economy, and drain away our wealth to the extent that we would be forced to accept the status of a province in a world government, in which we would be outvoted and outnumbered 15 to 1; or would be forced to surrender control of our economy to a band of international banker-racketeers.

CURRENCY THAT IS NOT REDEEMABLE IS FIAT MONEY

The principal instrument of these coconspirators is a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable currency. Currency that is not redeemable is fiat money; and the only way that fiat money or managed currencies can work is through collectivism, or completely government-controlled economy. This means complete coercion of individuals, controlled production, rationing, and price fixing.

Therefore, the only way to escape the net that is being woven about us is to strip the conspirators of the tools with which they work, by adopting a sound monetary system, in which the redemption of currency is backed by adequate monetary reserves of gold and silver, the prices of which are pegged and maintained at fixed and proper ratio. (See H. R. 2573).

In my humble opinion, gold should not be considered a commodity subject to fluctuations in price, but a constant, invariable measure of the value of currencies, goods, and services.

HOLD FAST TO WHAT IS TRUE

We must hold fast to what we know to be true; and refuse to compromise with what we know to be wrong, if we are to be worthy of our heritage. Neither socialism nor a one-world government will solve the problems of the world; they will merely accentuate them.

Three irrefutable truths must be recognized: (1) Our Government cannot give anything to our own people or foreign nations that it does not first take away from our own people, either through taxation or unsound economic and fiscal policies. (2) Our domestic economy is different from that of all other nations and must continue to be different if we are to hold our national supremacy and maintain our high standard of living. We must recognize the fact that free trade is possible only between nations and peoples who have the same standard of living. The United States has but 6 percent of the world's population and 6 percent of the world's land area. Free trade will not bring the other 94 percent up to our standard of living, but will drag us down to theirs. The protective tariff is the keystone in the arch which supports our domestic economy. Remove the keystone and the arch will crumble. (3) Our ancestors did not come to America for security but opportunity; and while a reasonable amount of social security is desirable, yet when social security is extended to the degree that it destroys free enterprise and individual opportunity, the inevitable result will be serfdom. Complete security is enjoyed by those in prison; and not too long ago, 10 percent of our population had complete security—were housed, clothed, and adequately fed—but we fought a great Civil War to end it, because we called it by its right name—"slavery".

SOUND MONEY IS FIRST REQUISITE OF A SAFE AND SANE WORLD

Sound money, which can be best achieved by a return to bimetallism, will not only bring peace and economic stability to the world and save us most of the billions of dollars we are giving away, but will quadruple the recoverable mineral wealth of America and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity we have ever known.

I appreciate that the forces arrayed against a return to a sound monetary system are powerful; that they control many of the avenues of communication; and are deliberately misleading our people with their propaganda.

But the most powerful force in America is public opinion; and by carrying the truth to every home in America, we can defeat the evil forces which would sell America down the river.

It takes courage to fight the entrenched forces of evil—it might temporarily hurt the business or political aspirations of timid souls—but, God hates a coward.

Typical Reaction to Press Goons' Attack on Your Congressman When He Is Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 3, 1949.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am sorry to hear that your honorable father is sick. I pray for his recovery.

May I say that I am fully aware of the stinking Binghamton newspaper, that filthy scrap paper stinks like her editors and always makes an issue out of nothing when the matter is concerning you. They want you to run the United States Government business according to their dictation. You refuse to bow to them because you are a representative of all the people in your district, not representing the local newspaper goons. Their editorial rubbish—think it's a crime for a man to visit his sick father. (I talked to many people about this subject.) But the people have great respect for a person caring for his parents and visiting them when they are sick. It's more important than business, for business is always here while life goes out forever.

The people know your good deeds so as long as you keep up the good work and want to be their Congressman you will be elected again and again in spite of the press' efforts to smear your character.

Respectfully yours,

J. D.,
Binghamton.

Nine Thousand Lose Jobs in Loyalty Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1949:

NINE THOUSAND LOSE JOBS IN LOYALTY TESTS—OLD POLICE RECORDS CAUSE FIRINGS

(By Tony Smith)

Soviet spies, ex-burglars, thieves, and sex offenders have been unearthed by the Federal Government's employee loyalty investigation program, it was learned today.

The search for subversives in the Government and among those seeking jobs with Uncle Sam yielded 141,400 sets of fingerprints that matched those kept in the FBI files.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported to Congress that 5.5 percent of the 2,537,843 persons checked had previous police records. As a result, 8,881 persons have been dismissed from the Government service by the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Hoover said.

MANY IN STATE DEPARTMENT

The program turned up 21 live Soviet espionage suspects, 45 Communists, and 108 suspected subversives in the State Department alone, it was reported. All of those subjected to spy investigations have resigned or been dismissed, it was said. The same is true of those known to be members of the Communist Party. Some of them moved on to the jobs in American agencies of the United Nations, Government records show.

Many of the former law violators brought to light by the loyalty check were minor offenders who had served their sentences. Others, convicted of major crimes, were found to be loyal. Some had been rehabilitated, the records showed. A few were still at their old tricks. These were reported to the heads of the departments in which they worked. Some were fired.

EMPHASIS ON ESPIONAGE

Throughout the check the emphasis was on employees and officials of the Government suspected of espionage activities. Here are excerpts from reports on some State Department workers:

"Mr. ———'s file reflected that he is a close associate of suspected Soviet agents. Most of the derogatory information on him was developed in late 1946. There is nothing in the file to indicate he has discontinued working for the Department."

"GREATEST SECURITY RISK

"Mr. ———. This former employee's file is the largest in the Civil Service Administration. It reflects that he furnished material to known Soviet espionage agents and that he has had consistent contact with a long list of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. This subject was in all probability the greatest security risk the Department of State has had. He was first recommended for dismissal July 24, 1946. He finally resigned voluntarily December 13, 1946.

"Miss ———. Her file shows that she signed Communist Party election petitions on a number of occasions. The Security Committee of the State Department decided she was not a security risk on April 15, 1947. It later decided she should be dismissed on grounds of being an undesirable employee. The subject resigned April 25, 1947. This case shows that the Security Committee is inclined to accept a 'change of heart'."

FIRING RECOMMENDED

"Mr. ———. Appointed to job in State Department in November 1946. On January 7, 1947, a Government investigative agency received information that his brother and sister were possible agents for the Comintern in the United States. Investigation reflects he once was instructor at an institution noted for its radical theories. On February 6, 1947, a Civil Service report said there was evidence of his disloyalty and recommended that he be fired."

Baltimore City Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles by Agnes E. Meyer on Maryland solves health program, now appearing in the Washington Post:

HOSPITALS COOPERATE WITH LOCAL PRACTITIONERS—BALTIMORE CITY HEALTH PLAN

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

(Fourth of a series)

The plan for medical care of the indigent in Baltimore differs from that operating throughout the State of Maryland because the presence of two great medical schools and their hospitals together with city living conditions create different means for the solution of different problems. The eventual success of the Baltimore health plan—it is in operation only 6 months—may revolutionize the social function of the hospital and its relationship to the community.

It will establish a new pattern for solving medical care of low-income groups on a voluntary basis. It may also set definite limits to Federal control under any contemplated laws for a national medical-care program.

Upon completion of the plans for the counties of Maryland, already described in these articles, the State committee on medical care appointed a separate group, with Dr. Powell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, as chairman, to make a comprehensive study of medical-care needs in the city of Baltimore.

This committee emphasized that it is "erroneous to consider the population as separated into two groups, the ill and the well. Health or its converse, illness, is a graded matter for every individual. In a very true sense it may be said that each person is ill to a certain degree and well to a certain degree * * *. Thus the problem of medical care involves a constant screening process that is carried out partially by the individual himself, partially by the physician and partially by the various agencies and organizations that are concerned with maintaining or restoring health."

To gain the support of the medical profession the commitee on medical care presented its report to the Baltimore City Medical Society, the Baltimore Hospital Conference, and several other medical societies and received their endorsement.

CLINICS FOR INDIGENT

Under terms of a legal contract with the city health department, each hospital participating in the new plan agreed to organize and maintain a medical-care clinic for the specific benefit of the indigent. The clinic is the administrative center for all clients and all participating local physicians. Two such clinics have now been in operation 6 months, one under the supervision of the hospital of the University of Maryland, the other under Johns Hopkins Hospital.

The Johns Hopkins clinic adjacent to the hospital has agreed to care for 3,000 relief clients certified by the welfare department. Of these 6,000 have already registered in response to personal letters sent them by the director of Johns Hopkins Hospital, Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, followed by personal interviews with local physicians by Dr. Harry L. Chant, director of the new clinic.

The functions of the clinic are the following:

1. It accepts enrollments, does a complete health examination of each client and keeps the records.

2. It arranges for the assignment of the client to a local participating practitioner. Both the client and the doctor are free to accept or reject the assignment. Payment to the doctor is on a per capita basis, $7 per year per client. This is the total cost to the clinic per client except for free medicaments which are purchased from any druggist on a voucher. The hospital receives $10 per client per year for its supervision of the clinic and the program as a whole. The local practitioners do the home and office care.

3. If a case is beyond the experience or facilities of the local doctor, the hospital takes over the patient in its regular outpatient service. Thus the hospital receives payment for services formerly rendered free of charge to the indigent. It also has the advantage of teaching home care to its students and an opportunity to familiarize them with the family unit, whether well or ill. As the relief clients are a fairly stable group, the first-class students are assigned to the families as health advisers and follow its social as well as its medical problems.

There is great need for teaching and experimentation in this kind of medical care. It is public health work in the deepest and most practical sense. The top medical staff is drawn from the hospital's various classical clinical departments. At the same time there are bilateral opportunities for the practitioners from the neighborhood to receive the guidance of the hospital faculty and to learn through their patients how to use the hospital for their clients.

Thus, practitioners who have usually had but a short period of good training are encouraged to continue their studies. Although the doctors were cautious at first, they found these aspects of the program persuasive. The good relations that were established between the doctor and the clinic through their patients was and still is the best selling factor for the health plan.

THREE-HOUR SESSIONS

Twenty neighborhood practitioners have been appointed by the hospital for the year to work in the clinic for one or more 3-hour sessions per week at a fee of $10. Five of them are Negro doctors. There is no quota. It is simply a matter of finding able men. Most of these men had no previous affiliation with the hospital. The permanent staff, in addition to Dr. Chant, the director, is an assistant clinician and internist to guide the consultations, three nurses, the supervisor, Miss Sarah Green, being experienced in public health nursing, one social worker, and a clerical staff of eight. Two laboratory technicians do blood counts and other routine tests in the clinic.

The total number of cooperating doctors is 91, of whom 68 are white and 23 Negroes, for an area that is predominantly Negro in population.

The average load of patients at the clinic is about 70 per day, as many as possible by appointment. During my visits there was a succession of unforeseen emergency cases, as the clients are encouraged to come in with any kind of problem, medical, social, or emotional. Usually all three factors are combined. "You can set up all the routines you like," said Dr. Chant, "but necessity always upsets them."

THREE THOUSAND EXAMINATIONS

By the end of March 3,000 physical examinations had been completed out of the total registration of 6,000. The number of patients which the cooperating local practitioners accept varies greatly in number. The young men just starting take from 200 to 250, but a large number accept only their old patients.

The clinic is diplomatic in its handling of physicians. It takes care not to upset existing relationships between clients and their doctors. Some of the doctors were encouraged to increase their load when the first payments were received. The busiest doctors stated that the per capita payment of $7 is considered inadequate remuneration.

The abuse of the program by clients was serious at first. Then Dr. Chant sent out notices to clients who are heads of families, explaining that they are privileged to have a personal physician but that the doctor must divide his time among many people. The results of this education as to restraint in the use of free visits were good, and most of the doctors who had resented the excessive visits became reconciled though a few dropped out.

HOME CARE

The initial physical examinations at the clinic, perhaps its most significant feature, have been helped in acquainting the doctors with their patients. If they are confronted with knotty problems which they cannot handle, the hospital staff helps them out. Hospitalization is a problem in Baltimore as everywhere else. There is a shortage of 400 beds for lack of personnel.

But chiefly the medical program is directed toward home and office care by the physician and for consultation services for the physician through the specialized clinics of the hospital.

The new plan is a vast improvement on the ambulatory care given solely through the established hospital clinics, as the clients often failed to return after costly examinations. Now they are under constant observation of a private physician who keeps them under continuous treatment. It is an improvement also on the specialized clinic which examined patients only for its specialty whereas here the examination is comprehensive.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have printed in the Appendix certain editorials, I include an editorial, For the Third Time, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Saturday, April 23, 1949; and Housing and the House, which appeared in the New York Times on Saturday, April 23, 1949:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 23, 1949]

FOR THE THIRD TIME

Again the Senate has passed the housing bill, and again the great decision rests upon the House. This is the answer to America's need for slum clearance and homes. The issue has confronted our people too long; we cannot wait year after year. At this point the Senate has spoken with an unmistakable firmness that more and better housing is imperative, and we hope that the House at last swings into line. The national temper is unmistakable; the best brains of both parties are in agreement on dominant aims and practical details. The final Senate vote, 57 to 13, has a passionate authority that commands an end to distraction.

Senator BRICKER tried to beat down the housing bill on a befogging amendment to forbid segregation as a price for accepting Federal construction funds. It was a proposition that may have tried the souls of

some Senators, but the choice was plain—housing or no housing. In this futile and embarrassing exercise, the Senate saw through the confusion and responded to the immediate welfare. Some who voted against the Bricker amendment may suffer political reprisal, but we trust that their courage will carry its overweighing compensations. Honesty has a way of paying off.

Three times the Senate has earnestly delivered its verdict for public housing. Let the House this time stop its shilly-shallying. We must have housing.

[From the New York Times of April 23, 1949]

HOUSING AND THE HOUSE

"We shall enact comprehensive housing legislation, including provisions for slum clearance and low-rent housing projects initiated by local agencies. This Nation is shamed by the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to pass the vitally needed general housing legislation as recommended by the President."

This was the promise of the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention on July 14, 1948. That promise has now been redeemed in the Senate, with passage of the national housing bill by a healthy margin of 57 to 13.

It now remains to be seen whether the Democrats in the House will also join in redeeming the party platform promise. The membership in the House stands as 260 Democrats, 171 Republicans, and 1 American Labor Party member, so that much depends on how well the majority party holds its lines. This does not by any means absolve the House Republicans from taking a liberal and realistic position on the bill, for their party has repeatedly written, in the House, an unpleasant record on housing, which they will now have an opportunity to expunge. This record was reflected in the weasel wording of the Republican campaign platform, saying: "We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum clearance and low-rental housing only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities."

We invite House Members regardless of party to search their conscience for the honest answer as to whether the need for low-cost or low-rent housing has been met by private enterprise. It was the opinion of 33 out of 35 Democratic Senators voting this week that it had not been, and that was likewise the opinion of 24 out of 35 Republican Senators. It is a sound opinion.

The lobbying opponents of this legislation have made every effort to frighten Congressmen, and their rallying cry has been the bogeyman of socialism. To this we reply that if anything could be counted on to assure a change of our political complexion in the United States for the worse it would be the continued failure of Government to see that average family had a livable home in which to rear its children.

Our Government, at one level or another, and at one period or another, has seen to it that railroads, shipping, and the air lines were subsidized so as to survive and expand, for the general welfare; it has steadily subsidized the postal service; it has helped the farmer, to the extent of billions of dollars; it has protected American business against foreign competition; it has provided public education for the Nation's children; it has aided religious worship through tax exemption; it has assisted the war veteran with educational grants and with pensions. Against this long record of subsidy, we are willing to face the horrendous dangers in a measure that attempts to assure, both through private enterprise and public subsidy, the wholesome and democratic aim that the American family shall have a decent home.

Statement of Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following supplementary statement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan in regard to farm income price-support recommendations before the House Committee on Agriculture, Monday, April 25, 1949:

Since making my farm-program recommendations, the committee's comments and public discussion seem to have centered on three broad questions. These deal with cost, how the proposed program would operate, and the degree of Government control involved. With your permission, I should like to take up these questions a little more fully than has been possible heretofore.

First, let us look at the cost question.

As you know, this question involves many values in addition to dollars. We can and will use certain dollar illustrations, but, as your own experience will verify, our economy is so complex and dynamic that it has never been possible to make accurate dollar estimates in advance for price-support operations.

It has been said that the production payments called for in my proposal would be costly and that the cost must be estimated now. Yet title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 provides for the same kind of payments, and no estimates of the cost of that legislation were ever requested or made prior to its adoption.

Title I of the act of 1948 continued the wartime level of price supports, yet no cost estimates were called for or considered at the time of its adoption, even on potatoes, for which we were then carrying out the most expensive price-support operation in history.

The same point could be made about earlier legislation. New bills and amendments have been enacted year after year on the basis of needs and the benefits to be derived. Actual results have been measured against actual costs, which is the only valid comparison.

My recommendations contemplate the operation of price-support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation, as they are being operated today. And as you know, Congress does not appropriate in advance for the CCC because, for a host of obvious reasons, the dollar requirements cannot be estimated accurately in advance. But Congress has a very effective control over costs. It controls authorizations and appropriations. If a particular program results in a greater outlay than the Congress is willing to continue, the Government's commitment may be changed for ensuing years. No program can cost more, over a period of years, than the Congress makes available.

Another point we need to keep in mind as we deal with the cost question is that we must always make comparisons. It helps no one to compare the costs of one program against no program at all. The American people have already taken the position that the farmer should have adequate returns, and until a better method is brought to light the farm price support method is the one we should use. We have such a program in operation now. We have legislation on the books that is scheduled to go into effect next year. We have had considerable experience in the past.

Due to our expanded productive capacity and the possibility that our foreign markets will diminish, costs under any effective program may increase. The least expensive program in the public interest, for the long run, will be that which encourages the greatest and most efficient consumption of farm commodities which would otherwise be surplus. These facts must be taken into account as we consider the recommended program. An absolute figure without comparisons is bound to be misleading and to give substance to the fallacious arguments of the enemies of price-support legislation.

The real core of the question of cost is how effective we choose to make our program. Obviously, we are not going to get something for nothing in this farm-program business, any more than anywhere else.

In my statement of April 7, I laid before you my views on the public need for a strong farm income and price-support system. I said it can serve the interests of all the people by helping to prevent depression, build bigger markets for industrial goods and jobs for workers, maintain high-level production of farm commodities, conserve natural resources, maintain reserves for national security, strengthen the rural community, and provide consumers increased supplies at attractive prices.

A program that will effectively contribute toward these ends is worth a considerable public investment.

But let us not try to kid anybody—either the farmer or the general public. Any program which is so designed that the public investment is always sure to be small is going to be an ineffective program at the very time a strong program is needed. It is not likely to give adequate service of the kinds I have listed, either to the farmer or to the general public.

What is adequate?

An eastern financial journal says that my proposal "promises to farmers more than they are entitled to." That is a matter of opinion which the Congress is going to settle. But let me emphasize this question: In the public interest, how far down do you dare let farm income slide?

Farm prices already have come down 15 percent since the beginning of last year. The prices paid by farmers have stayed close to their peak level and are currently only about 2 percent under last summer's level. The purchasing power of what the farmer sells has come down to the lowest point since 1942.

Under my proposal, the income standard from which price supports would be computed is 15 percent lower than that actually received last year.

How much lower does the public interest permit farm prices to go without similar cuts for all other groups?

Let me clear up one other point in this connection. My proposal is plainly not a guaranteed-income scheme. If the farmer's production fails for any reason, price support does not help him. This proposal does proceed toward an income objective. It does offer a means of computing price supports from a minimum income standard, recognizing that we are more fundamentally concerned with income than with price. It does offer a means of extending price support to those commodities which are most important in the farm-income picture. But it cannot provide farmers a guaranteed level of income unless Congress should make a flat commitment on every commodity produced by farmers, and I am sure nobody expects this will be done. Under my proposal, farm prosperity would certainly continue to depend upon individual enterprise and abundant farm production as well as upon high-

level employment and purchasing power in the whole economy.

Let me also point out that this is a price-support recommendation—not a consumer-subsidy proposal. I have merely recommended those methods of supporting farm prices which will do most to lick the surplus problem by encouraging consumption. There is a considerable difference between (a) subsidizing consumption with the hope that the benefit will trickle down to the farmer and (b) supporting farm prices in ways which will give consumers the most for their money. I am, of course, recommending the latter. The payment method for use on perishable commodities will enable us to go on producing and consuming somewhere past the level where straight dollar demand would temporarily stop us. That enables genuine demand and our real productive power to exert greater influence in our economy.

There have been a number of reckless estimates of the costs of the proposed program for the year ahead. None of the authors of the statements have estimated the cost of the present program. If I understand the estimates correctly, all of them assume a severe depression and low farm income. I confess that I do not assume a depression. On the contrary, the whole proposal is designed to help avoid a depression by maintaining reasonable farm income.

Some people may be planning on depression, but the Government of the United States must plan otherwise. By action of the Congress, we are committed to a policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. In my opinion, a strong farm program is an essential of that policy.

If national income stays high and reasonably well distributed, farm prices will not rest on the supports and therefore supports will not be costly.

If, however, you assume a depression, then you must be aware that farm surpluses and city unemployment will almost certainly force into existence programs of straight relief and very likely some form of a food-stamp plan which could be very costly. In my opinion, an equal amount of money used for production payments would be much more effective in supporting farm prices and would keep us on the side of preventing depression rather than waiting for it to develop.

With those observations for background, let us now look at how the proposed program would operate for various commodities and try to get an idea of costs as we go along.

For the purpose of the commodity-by-commodity discussion which follows, I am assuming one and the same level of support regardless of whether that level is established under the income support standard formula, the present formula now in force and effect, or the formula described in title II of the act of 1948 or, for that matter, any other formula. In short, I am making a comparative analysis with respect to method only. Obviously a lower support price would mean a relatively lower commitment by the Government and thereby lower losses where any losses to the Government occur. It would certainly mean lower income protection to farm people.

COTTON, TOBACCO, CORN, AND WHEAT

As has been indicated in my previous statement and in subsequent discussions, no change is proposed in method of supporting the farmers' price of cotton, tobacco, corn, and wheat which coincide with the present price-support operations with respect to these commodities. That is, we would use commodity loans and purchase agreements. Therefore, any estimate of loss or gain on these commodities under the proposed program is equally applicable to the present or authorized program.

HOGS

Of the nonstorable or perishable commodities in group 1, hogs present one of the most difficult support problems with which we may be confronted.

For the purposes of an example, let us take a year's production goal of 20,000,000,000 pounds of hogs, live weight, and a price support level of about $16.50 per hundredweight. Then let us assume that we have 1,000,000,000 pounds of live hogs which will not clear the market at a price which will reflect the support price to the farmer. Assuming this excess production, there is an immediate obligation to support the price of hogs through a purchase program, the only method now authorized by law. This would cost about $230,000,000. This estimate is reached as follows:

The initial obligation would be about $165,000,000; this assumes that we would buy the hogs at the farmer's gate and that the acquisition of the hogs could be accomplished with no expense whatsoever to the Government. Everyone knows that this is an unreasonable assumption because we cannot buy hogs at the farmer's gate, nor, in fact, can we buy them at stockyards.

The only practical way to buy hogs is from the packer after slaughtering, processing, curing, and so on. Buying it from the packer in the form of fresh and cured pork would involve the additional expenditure of at least $65,000,000. Immediately upon acquisition of the pork, arrangements must be made for its proper storage. This means additional handling and storage charges by the month. Pork can be kept in good condition under the best refrigeration for only 6 months to 1 year. That being the case, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to go into the world market to find a purchaser within a relatively short time. The pork obviously could not be sold into the American market because it would break the support price. The Government would be faced with a total loss of the $230,000,000 plus carrying and disposal charges, less whatever could be realized from sales to offshore customers.

With this $230,000,000 a production payment to farmers could be made on 21,000,000,000 pounds of hogs in the approximate sum of $1.10 per hundred, live weight (or more if payments were made only on marketings). In other words, the price of hogs, live weight, in the market place could be reduced by $1.10 before it would cost this Government 1 cent more money than it would be obligated to pay under the purchase method. This $1.10 is about 7 percent of the $16.50 assumed support level. If a 7 percent reduction could be carried all the way through to the retail level, it would be possible to reduce the consumer's price of pork by about 7 percent and at the same time give him access to the finished pork product from 1,000,000,000 pounds of live hogs. Perhaps this example is an oversimplification. There are many factors which might influence the final conclusion in a small way in either direction. But we do believe it summarizes the essential facts.

BEEF, LAMBS, AND CHICKENS

I don't suppose anyone on the committee expects us to be in a program of supporting the price of beef cattle and lambs in the near future, but if and when we are, the operation would be analogous to the hog example I have just given. This would also be true with respect to chickens.

EGGS

If we undertook to maintain egg consumption at about the present levels, it appears that an annual commercial movement of about 4,000,000,000 dozen eggs would be required. Let us assume that production or marketings exceed the 4,000,000,000 dozen figure by 300,000,000 dozen eggs. What would be the cost under the present purchase program?

Based on our experience over the last two seasons, the surplus of 300,000,000 dozen purchased as dried eggs would probably cost the CCC about $120,000,000. However, this is again only the initial cost. Additional costs would be incurred because of transportation, storage, and other charges, which might well run another $52,000,000. Since little or no prospective outlets are available for these eggs, the entire inventory would represent a potential loss to the Government.

Under the production-payment plan, this cost of $172,000,000 would allow a production payment of about 4 cents a dozen on the 4,300,000,000 dozen eggs available for the commercial market. This ought to permit a decline in retail prices in excess of 4 cents a dozen and give consumers access to the additional 300,000,000 dozen eggs.

MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

Under the proposed program with regard to milk and its products, we would continue full use of present marketing agreements and orders, extend those programs as and when producers and handlers desire, and continue to use purchases of dairy products as a price-support method wherever this method would be most economical and otherwise consistent with the public interest.

We would not, however, make purchases for which we could not find acceptable outlets.

We would use the purchase method mainly to relieve spot surpluses and seasonal problems which could be met most efficiently in this way.

The board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation recently estimated that $20,000,000 may be required in this type of operation between now and the end of this calendar year. We are just coming into the flush milk-producing season and it is imperative that we make the best possible arrangements to discharge the CCC obligation to support this commodity.

Whenever any large-scale operation becomes necessary, we should use the production-payment method. As a rule, this would cost the Government about the same amount as would purchases and would make more milk and milk products available to consumers at lower prices than would otherwise be the case. It would also call for a greater consumption of our grain and forage production.

As I previously indicated, the payment method could be used, if Congress so decided, not merely to support prices but directly to encourage greater production and consumption of milk. Prices of fluid or class I milk to consumers over the country these past few months have ranged between 22 cents in several eastern cities to a low of 14 cents in one of the major Midwest cities. In a 4-quart container, milk is now selling in grocery stores in Chicago at 16¼ cents a quart.

To the extent that the objective is to increase consumption of milk by lowering the price to the level which will secure the greatest consumption, it may be necessary to use additional sums of money and relate the payments to costs of production, the support operation and the reduced price to consumers.

For whatever assistance it may be to the committee, here is one guide estimate. If a payment of 1 cent were made on every quart of class I milk consumed in fluid form the cost to the Federal Government would be around $150,000,000 per year. It is obvious, however, that to achieve the desired result such a payment would not be necessary on much in excess of one-half of the milk so consumed.

POTATOES

While the demand for the main livestock items is relatively elastic, this is evidently

not true of potatoes. Small changes in market supplies cause much greater changes in market prices. I believe a satisfactory production-payment program can be operated for a great deal less money than we have been spending on potatoes.

When the CCC has fulfilled its obligations under the existing law to support the price of potatoes for the marketing season of 1948, it will have expended approximately $225,000,000. This program will have maintained the price to producers at an average of $1.75 per bushel for grade A potatoes. The total production last year was 445,000,000 bushels. Therefore, in order to maintain this level, it will be necessary to withdraw from the market and dispose of approximately 123,000,000 bushels. With the use of $225,000,000, we could have reduced the price of sales for commercial purposes to about $1 per bushel and retained the farm return at the support level. Consumers would have benefited accordingly.

Let me make it very clear that, in my opinion, the major portion of the potatoes withdrawn from the market during the 1948 season represents excessive and unjustified production, which by the use of production payments, acreage allotments, or marketing quotas, or marketing agreements and orders, should be eliminated in future years so that such losses to the Government on a single crop would not be incurred.

There are other commodities now receiving support, both storables and nonstorables, for which we have made no comparisons, and the general factors would be the same as those previously discussed. Some will continue to be supported.

Some of the commodities not now under support are of sufficient importance to the income of some sections of the country and are of sufficient importance to the national diet that it is conceivable that, at some date in the future, support prices should be made available to them under appropriate circumstances. But to estimate those kinds of factors now does not in my opinion, come within the realm of practicability.

For these reasons and the others already discussed, to estimate the over-all cost of the program would serve no useful purpose.

Another misunderstanding of my recommendations which I should like to clear up has to do with the amount of Government control involved.

This is somewhat related to the cost question. On the one hand, we hear that a program will be too costly, and on the other hand, we hear it said that if we place limits or conditions upon the amount of price support, this is regimentation. The two arguments conflict. It should be clearly understood that the only so-called Government controls involved in my recommendations are those which limit the amount of the Government's commitment to farmers.

I state categorically:

1. That my recommendations call for absolutely no form of authority or control not contemplated by title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

2. That the legislation I have recommended is less restrictive than any so far enacted by virtue of the fact that it offers more encouragement to the abundant consumption and production of farm products and, thereby, offers more protection against surpluses. This program would increase inducements for desirable adjustments without ordering them.

3. That the present legal right of producers to accept or reject by referendum any proposed mandatory limitation upon their marketing should not be infringed. As you know, a farm marketing quota program cannot be put into effect for any commodity unless at least two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum have accepted such regulation. The Secretary cannot even propose such a mandatory limit except under carefully defined conditions which safeguard the public interest.

Farmers fought for the legal rights they now have to impose marketing limits upon themselves. In the view of those who did so, these rights represent an extension, not an infringement, of their freedom. I adhere to this principle.

For the record, let me give you the citations to provisions of title II, Agricultural Act of 1948, and preceding legislation, which carry every type of authority to which my own recommendations refer. Unless otherwise noted, the citations will refer to title II, Agricultural Act of 1948.

Production payments: Section 202 (a).

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas: Sections 311 et seq., Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; sections 203–208 of title II.

Marketing agreements and orders: First provided in section 8, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; also see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1948 (94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A4409) for confirmation that it was the intent of title II, Agricultural Act of 1948, that the Secretary have authority to condition price support for certain commodities upon there being in effect marketing agreements or orders regulating the marketing of such commodities.

Soil conservation as a condition required for price support: See section 8, Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. When the farmer's income was supported in part through payments under this act, full payment to a farmer was conditioned upon observance of soil-conserving and soil-building practices. See also section 202 (a), title II. This lists compliance with production goals as a condition for price support. Under this provision, by administrative determination, a particular acreage of soil-conserving crops would be a production goal upon which price support could be conditioned.

Parenthetically, let me say that with a realistic income and price support in effect, the farmer should be able to operate with more regard to soil conservation than he otherwise could. This is another reason why I regard this recommendation as a fair one.

Limitation of amount of price support per farm: In principle, this is not different from limitations upon the size of conservation payments (see sec. 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the appropriations for such act in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for 1948 and 1949). Nor is it different in principle from limitations upon private use of the public domain such as irrigation water and grazing lands.

With regard to the recommended conditions and limits as a whole, let me make this one observation: Price supports are granted by the public in the public interest, not as a matter of inherent right. The public has also established certain other policy objectives in the field of agriculture. In my opinion, it is entirely proper that the program should connect up the various policy objectives that are naturally interrelated.

Labor-Management Must Reason Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem of labor-management legislation has become a political football. Reason has fled and Congressmen have chosen sides. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that both groups will have to compromise and resolve the problem in the public interest.

In today's Washington News there is an editorial which expresses my views in this matter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it at this point:

MAKE A FRESH START

This session of Congress will not substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act the kind of labor law which the Truman administration and the union leaders have tried—and failed—to bull through.

The votes in the House have made that clear.

This session still can pass a new labor law based on reason and justice—one designed to protect the essential rights of workers and employers alike, to give neither labor nor management unfair advantage and to serve the paramount public interest.

That is what it should do.

But if that is to be done, the administration and Congress will have to back away from their present stalemate, acquire wisdom, and make a fresh start.

Mr. Truman will have to tell the union leaders that he cannot deliver a law completely satisfactory to them.

He will have to tell them that, if they want the Taft-Hartley Act repealed, they must accept an adequate degree of legal responsibility to the public for what they do with organized labor's power; they must, that is, accept some Taft-Hartley principles in any new legislation.

Extremists in Congress, on both sides of the issue, will have to develop a willingness to meet on sensible middle ground.

The present situation is ripe for constructive efforts to reach a reasonable compromise.

In the House, Republicans and southern Democrats proved their ability to defeat the administration's bill, but could not muster enough support to pass their proposed substitute, the Wood bill. So the House has dumped the whole question of labor legislation back on its Labor Committee, which has announced that it will try to write a satisfactory new measure.

The Senate's Labor Committee has rubber-stamped the original administration bill, but passage of that bill by the Senate seems as unlikely as it proved to be in the House.

Many of the Taft-Hartley Act's supporters acknowledge that it is not perfect and are willing to accept new legislation meeting valid objections by labor and the administration—though not to scrap certain Taft-Hartley principles which they consider sound and essential.

Of course, if Mr. Truman, the union leaders, and their followers in Congress want to keep the Taft-Hartley Act on the books as a political issue, they can do that by maintaining a no-compromise attitude. But we are convinced that what most of the American people want is a determined effort to remove this issue from politics by settling it fairly.

A Test of Sincerity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Test of Sincerity," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald, April 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TEST OF SINCERITY

It long has been suspected that the claimed interest of President Truman and his administration in civil rights for Negroes was something less than skin deep. Knowing that any civil-rights program would be filibustered to death by Senators from southern States, which are safely democratic, the President could toy with civil rights for Negroes for the sake of garnering the votes of Negroes in northern States, in many of which they are the balance of power.

It also has been suspected that the administration's claimed interest in housing for the underprivileged was more a vote-getting scheme than it was sincere.

Both suspicions have been proved by events of this week and our own Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART played a major part in proving them.

The administration's public-housing bill was before the Senate for debate. It was claimed by the administration that the purpose of the bill was slum clearance and to provide adequate housing for all underprivileged.

Senator CAPEHART led the fight on the floor of the Senate for two amendments; one was an antisegregation amendment which would insure Negro families equal opportunity to occupy any housing built under the proposed law; the other was to prohibit the leasing of any such housing to Federal employees for the reason that all Federal employees are paid sufficient salaries that they cannot be classed as underprivileged and that they have sufficient incomes to lease adequate housing from private owners.

The amendments took the administration forces by surprise. They didn't want the antisegregation amendment because much of the housing was planned for southern States where segregation is an established institution. To defeat it they were forced to reverse their civil-rights stand and vote the exact opposite of the way they were voting a few weeks ago on the civil-rights bill.

Neither did they want the amendment to exclude Government employees from housing to be built under the bill because much of the housing was planned for Washington, D. C., and other centers where thousands of the faithful among Government employees would be provided with housing, largely at Government expense.

Both amendments were defeated but to do so the administration forces had to show their true colors. Their actions showed that their true interest is not in the welfare of the Negroes or in providing housing for those who are really underprivileged. Their true interest is using Government money to buy votes of minority groups.

Report Lifts Lid on Dangerous Developments in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the May 7 issue of Labor.

REPORT LIFTS LID ON DANGEROUS DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMANY

Big-business men and bankers in the American military government in Germany are opening the way for a third world war, by blocking the breaking up of German "trusts" and "international cartels," which put Hitler in power and built up his military machine for the Second World War.

That sums up an extraordinarily important report, made public this week by a three-man commission which was sent to Germany late last year to see how the military government headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay is carrying out orders issued by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, to end the trusts and cartels.

The sending of the commission was a result of charges and demands made by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat, West Virginia).

The Commission was headed by Garland S. Ferguson, a conservative Republican member of the Federal Trade Commission. The other two members were Samuel S. Isseks, a Department of Justice antitrust attorney, and A. T. Kearney, a Chicago businessman.

They found that, despite the orders, the American "decartelization" officials have not smashed a single one of Germany's giant monopolies, and have left the door open for American big-business men and bankers to resume their old cartel ties with the German magnates who used the Nazis to crush labor unions, and to carry out their schemes for world conquest in the Second World War.

The report names a number of American officials in Germany in distributing the blame, but puts most of it on General Clay's two "economic advisers."

The first one was Gen. William H. Draper, who came from the Wall Street banking firm of Dillon, Read, which played a big part in financing the industrialists back of Hitler.

Draper afterward became Under Secretary of the Army, and went to Japan, where he fixed things up for Jap and American monopolists as he had done in Germany.

Draper's place as Clay's adviser was taken by Lawrence Wilkinson. He was one of the American businessmen and bankers who put on an Army colonel's uniform during the war, and then bobbed up in "strategic" places in the organization supposed to "decartelize" Germany. Incidentally, Wilkinson's chief assistant, a man named Hawkins, is a son-in-law of Draper.

The American people would be shocked by hundreds of statements in the report, but only one can be presented in the space available here. This one was made by Isseks.

He cited remarks and letters of top American military government officials in Germany—before last year's election—saying the trust- and cartel-busting program should not be pushed, because the administration in Washington would change after November 1948, and there would be a change in policy.

In other words, men like Draper and Wilkinson had reason to believe a Republican President, Dewey, would reverse the Roosevelt-Truman policy and give free rein to the German and American monopolists and international cartelists.

State Department Fumbles, Pacific Goes Anti-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

STATE DEPARTMENT FUMBLES, PACIFIC GOES ANTI-AMERICAN

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Secretary of State Dean Acheson is so busy with European affairs that he has had little time to devote to the disaster in Asia. He admits that United States foreign policy has suffered a defeat there. He has not yet confessed the magnitude of our China debacle. Still less has he avowed its cause.

Obviously, the basic reason for the present catastrophe was F. D. R.'s wartime policy of sacrificing all our other allies to his central purpose of winning Russia's friendship. This implied world-wide cooperation between Communists and non-Communists. When this collapsed like a punctured balloon, the United States was left without an Asiatic policy. Since then it has been unable to find one.

Today, this indecision in Washington is jeopardizing the rest of Asia. American prestige there, mountain-high in 1945, has sunk to an all-time low. The United States is so unpopular that to get elected in Manila, capital of a country given its independence by the United States, candidates find it necessary to damn America.

Domestic anti-imperialists like Owen Lattimore attribute this exclusively to Washington's failure to adopt a general hands-off attitude throughout the east. Other experts less sympathetic to the Soviet line believe it comes rather from our conspicuous failure to stick to principle—in other words, to our indecision.

Examples are everywhere.

REHABILITATION PROGRAM FAILS

Take Japan. That small, overcrowded, overindustrialized group of islands can prosper only through the development of overseas commerce. Therefore, the original American idea was to revive Japanese commerce with China for the benefit of both countries. Now China has been lost. Japanese merchants will do business there on Russian terms—or not at all.

Neither the President nor the Secretary of State nor even Douglas MacArthur has yet thought out an alternative.

Again, the loss of China ought to have produced in Washington a new strategical plan for the defense of our Pacific position. One effective way to protect the Philippines would be for the United States, in full cooperation with other Pacific powers, to take over the island of Formosa and hold it temporarily as a neutral "safety zone."

American leaders are, however, afraid of the inevitable charge of "imperialism" which would start in Moscow and reecho throughout Asia. Therefore Formosa will probably be left to the Chinese, that is, to the Soviet Union, whose naval power in the Pacific will then move several hundred miles south.

UNITED STATES OVERSENSITIVE

Obviously, since the United States administration is so sensitive to the charge of "imperialism," one might have expected it to uphold the Asiatic nationalists against the French and the Dutch in Indochina and Java, respectively.

Yet instead, the United States Government has straddled. American interests in Europe are real and urgent. The United States needs the cooperation of the French and the Dutch as much as it needs that of the Asiatics. Yet to Asiatic nationalists in Washington, failure to stand firmly on the principle of full and rapid emancipation shook their faith in America.

Indecision again.

Perhaps the most costly example of our failure to act firmly and swiftly in Asia is the administration's failure to push the formation of an East Asiatic bloc, now more commonly called a Pacific union.

This is the brain child of President Elpidio Quirino, of the Philippines, and of his indefatigable representative at the United Nations, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo. Communist occupation of south China will threaten the Philippines directly. It will endanger the other countries of southeastern Asia. Most of the governments concerned are aware of this and support the idea of the Pacific union. Siam and Burma are ready. So, up to a point, are Australia and New Zealand and Ceylon.

PACT GAINS IN INDIA

India under Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru still hesitates. Pandit Nehru and his handsome sister, Madame Pandit, new Indian Ambassador to the United States, suffer from a belated attack of the "Czechoslovak disease," which is the belief that it is possible for a country to be neutral between Russia and the non-Communist powers. Yet India's decision to remain within the Commonwealth is an indication that neutrality is weakening under the irresistible pressure of circumstances.

But here, too, Washington still hesitates while the Asiatic situation worsens from hour to hour.

Basing Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post under date of April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASING POINT

By a 4-to-4 vote (Justice Jackson not participating) the United States Supreme Court has upheld the Federal Trade Commission order outlawing the basing-point system for rigid steel conduit manufacturers. Because of the split decision the Court issued no opinion—merely affirming the judgment of the lower court. The result is to perpetuate the confusion regarding the legality of pricing practices involving absorption of freight charges.

The FTC contends that in both the cement case decided about a year ago and the steel conduit case, its order was directed against collusive price fixing and that individual use of the basing-point method, if undertaken in good faith for the purpose of meeting competition, is not under attack. However, in the steel conduit case the FTC did not base its order merely on charges of conspiracy. It claimed that the manufacturers have violated the antitrust laws, regardless of the conspiracy charges, by using identical delivered prices with the knowledge that all other firms in the field were using the same price formula. This second count in the indictment differentiates the steel conduit case from the cement case. Alarmed businessmen have interpreted it to mean that a single seller may not meet a competitor's price in any market by quoting an identical price, or use a pricing system if he knows that another seller is using that same system.

To be sure, spokesmen for the FTC maintain that this interpretation is incorrect. Illegality exists, they assert, only when price uniformities are so persistent and rigid, so based on a general determination to act together, as to have the effect of a price-fixing conspiracy. Nevertheless, the decision in the steel conduit case admittedly makes it easier to prove the existence of tacit collusion and causes businessmen to fight shy of any kind of pricing practice that results in identical delivered prices.

Since the Supreme Court failed to clarify the important issue raised in the steel conduit case, legislative action is being urged either to revise the antitrust laws or, as an alternative, temporarily to ban FTC suits against basing-point price systems, if undertaken in good faith. Of course, a moratorium on suits would not solve the problems raised by the basing-point system, but it would prevent hasty changes in existing legislation that might not be in the public interest.

There is little hope that Congress will find time at the present session to grapple with the complicated issues raised by pricing practices. Although revision of laws affecting pricing policies and competition is clearly needed, as Senator JOHNSON says, to solve the problems that are now worrying industry, proposals for thoroughgoing, permanent revision would lead to prolonged discussion and heated arguments. The preferable alternative, therefore, is to pass pending measures temporarily banning FTC orders against noncollusive, delivered price systems and freight absorption. Businessmen would then be freed from harassing doubts about the legality of their pricing policies and the way would be left open for permanent legislation later on, dealing comprehensively with unsolved problems of competition and pricing.

Why Official Misinformation Exaggerating American Aid to China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the New York Times by Mr. Frederick C. McKee, a distinguished American citizen whose devastating questioning of State Department releases seeking to give the American people the impression this Government has given huge and continuous and effective military aid to China is all the more important because he has been an outstanding supporter of administration policies regarding United Nations, Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, and aid to Greece and Turkey:

ADEQUACY OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE QUESTIONED, POLICY CRITICIZED

(The writer of the following letter is chairman of the China Emergency Committee for Aid to Anti-Communist China.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Clearly, the desperate plight of anti-Communist forces in China and the broad southward sweep of Red armies over Asia now compel a reorientation of this Government's policy toward the East. Underlining the critical nature of events, Under Secretary of State James E. Webb advised me in a conference at the Department several days ago: "Our policy in China is under the most serious consideration at this time."

It comes as no surprise that China policy is at this critical hour under serious consideration. Anything else would be incredible. Equally amazing is the State Department's utter and continuing failure to give the American people some explanation of its stand on China.

A United States Government firmly committed to containment of communism, a Government spending billions to carry out that policy in Europe, has offered little more than token aid to stem the Red wave in China. Yet every effort to elicit some definitive policy statement or explanation of this strange action has met either silence or the disappointing rejoinder that we are "waiting for the dust to settle." American voters have been mere spectators in a grim and moving world panorama which vitally affects our lives and those of our sons and daughters to come.

SCOPE OF AID

I write at this time because not only has the State Department failed to provide an explanation of its actions, or inactions; it has issued, at intervals, a series of statements and accounts of aid to China which have created the impression that $2,000,000,000 in military assistance has been accorded China since VJ-day. Obviously, if our country had furnished any such vast military aid since VJ-day, we could have little hope of supplying further effective military aid at this critical juncture. The truth is that the impression of a constant stream of military aid to China, amounting to some $2,000,000,000, is false.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, tried last week to disperse some current false impressions with analysis of a letter of Secretary of State Dean Acheson stating that China had received $2,000,000,000 of military aid since VJ-day. Senator MCCARRAN demonstrated that instead of $2,000,000,000 in military relief Chinese non-Communist forces after VJ-day received only $110,000,000 of usable military aid in time to be of value in last autumn's big campaigns. Nevertheless, in the New York Times "News of the Week in Review" on April 24 your reporter referred to the "$2,000,000,000 in military aid" of which, he wrote further, "it was estimated that 90 percent had been eventually acquired by the Communists. * * *"

The fantastic implications of the State Department's publicly announced figures on United States aid to China must be corrected before any intelligent appraisal of this aid can be made. Such an appraisal must be made if our future policy is to rest on realism rather than fantasy or on misinformation, already so effectively spread that many regard it as fact. At the very least, an answer must be got to the now vital question: Have we given China's non-Communist forces a constant stream of aid; or has it been a pittance? The facts show effective military aid to China since VJ-day totals $105,000,000.

The Department's publicly announced figures list grants and credits to China since VJ-day totaling $1,000,300,000, and classified as "military" aid. Even the Department's break-down, which saw detailed analysis in a few newspapers, denies its own military classification.

ANALYSIS OF GRANTS

The Department break-down details $694,700,000 of the $1,000,300,000 as lend-lease; "military aid under SACO" (Sino-American Cooperation Organization) at $17,700,000; excess United States Army stocks in west China, $20,000,000; and "transfer of United States naval vessels, $142,900,000." The $125,000,000 military grant authorized by Congress in April 1948 was the last item of the break-down.

Of the lend-lease, $335,817,910.56 is reported as service and expenses. This item embodied funds for transportation of Chinese armies from Burma to China and re-

patriation of Japanese. Against the balance of $358,882,085.44 reported in lend-lease account, the Chinese have only issued $105,400,000 in receipts, indicating a wide discrepancy. Furthermore, even of this $105,400,000, we are advised that only about 20 percent represented actual military equipment and ammunition; 40 percent quartermaster's supplies, and the other 40 percent miscellaneous supplies, including medical items. While the latter items are no less necessary than guns and bullets, only guns and bullets kill the enemy.

We are further advised that the item of naval vessels, charged at procurement cost of $142,900,000, included large numbers of landing and similar craft, many without guns or ammunition—all of little or no value in the civil war.

Proper discussion of the $125,000,000 grant for military equipment authorized in April 1948, in order to be realistic, must recognize that the first shipment did not leave the United States until October; and that $30,000,000 of this $125,000,000 is still unshipped—because it has been assigned a B–4 priority, which is much lower than commodities destined for Greece, Iran, and Turkey.

Not only has the Department of State consistently utilized monetary rather than itemized accounts of aid to China, in such reluctant disclosures as have been made, but all efforts thus far to procure a written list of the actual items sent to the Chinese have failed to produce results. Moreover, advices which I consider reliable have pictured an imposing array of obstacles placed in the way of such meager effective aid as has been authorized. For example:

After the $125,000,000 China Aid Act was passed by Congress in April 1948, it was agreed that part of this aid would consist of equipment and ammunition for a 10-division program. Chinese and American representatives in Nanking computed the total cost of this program to be $37,783,386.68, based on 1945 standard list prices. This basis was agreed upon in conferences between the Chinese, United States Ambassador Leighton Stuart and Maj. Gen. David Barr. Subsequently, the Chinese authorities were summarily informed by the Department of the Army, which had agreed to implement the program, that the total cost would be $74,987,810. This latter, said the Army, was because costs should have been computed at current replacement costs.

As a result of this change, only about 50 percent of the 10-division program was fulfilled. The unfinished portion consisted of about one-third of the rifle cartridges and all of the trench mortars, 37-millimeter guns, 75-millimeter howitzers, and their ammunition.

PROCUREMENT COSTS

Not only did all these negotiations delay shipment of supplies desperately needed by the Chinese, but curious discrepancies evolved between prices charged China and those charged other countries for similar goods. This Government charged China $105 per thousand rounds of .30 caliber ammunition, plus $8.40 for loading on cars. The original procurement cost of this ammunition was $45.80 per thousand rounds. We shipped Turkey the same ammunition for $4.80 per thousand rounds—charging Turkey a rate of 10 cents on the dollar of procurement costs.

The examples given above are typical of the long series of negotiations, delays, and inadequacies which characterized American aid to China from VJ-day to the present. During that time the Communist hordes have moved steadily southward, and China's pleas for more effective help, delivered with greater speed, have gone unanswered.

Several Members of Congress have demanded an investigation into the whole China policy—its origin, the reasoning behind it, and the names of those responsible for it. In justice to our democratic system of government, the State Department can do no less than give a definitive explanation of its conduct.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1949.*

International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I consider it a high honor and real privilege to include the following editorial by Wilbur B. Mueller, editor of the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch, which received the 1948 editorial award of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The award and bronze plaque were for editorials on international economic relations. I feel this excellent editorial is both timely and on a most important subject.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

We have in mind the statement of a senatorial candidate who visited this office prior to the election and answered a query about his views on the so-called Marshall plan, now called ECA. We asked him whether he was for it, and he said "Yes." He said he would be for it if it worked, and if it didn't work he wouldn't be for it after, say, 1950.

The common sense view of the Senator-elect, probably, was that in the long run international trade must do its part in pulling other countries out of the economic slough. Perhaps they can be pulled out temporarily by subcutaneous injections of artificial stimulants but unless trade generally is revived together with wholesome currencies, they will slip back into the slough again.

We had a good many conversations on foreign trade with the late George N. Peek, who used to work that angle in Washington when attached to the Roosevelt regime. Peek knew all the angles favored by the Roosevelt people and he explained them gently. He told how and why they ought to work, but the fact is that they didn't work. Foreign trade didn't revive enough to do much good between the predepression slump and the beginning of the Hitler holocaust. Between 1939 and 1945 a normal exchange of goods between the various nations didn't have a chance. Since 1945 too many nations have been "busted," in the vernacular. We are now expected to fight a cold war against Russia and at the same time provide gears that can mesh so the economic machine can begin pouring things out of the hopper.

It is blithely stated here and there that all Europe needs is for the people to get to work, and that is true as far as it goes. But getting to work means more than merely waving the arms and clearing rubble. Capital is needed to rehabilitate the people and cities, but that alone is not sufficient. Desirable old industries must be restored and new ones must be established. If we could restore Europe to her 1932 status economically, that still wouldn't be enough. That is where the disastrous slide in morale was started.

It is assumed sometimes that all we need do is buy European goods so Europe can have dollar exchange to buy from us—but that is only partly true. They need dollar exchange in Latin America and South America, too. The United States is the most powerful industrial country in the world, but we cannot absorb the surplus product of all the peoples of the alphabetical list of countries from Aden to Zanzibar, nor even a moderate part of the exportable surplus. The United States of America is neither a cornucopia nor a bottomless pit.

A few days ago we saw a very beautiful lamp base. It was of a delicate, translucent white, soft to the eye and good even to the touch. We were told it was of alabaster, a sort of stone so soft it can be scratched with the fingernail, and that it is produced and worked largely in Italy. Some alabaster is found in the United States, but people here do not have the patience to carve it into delicate patterns and figures. Italy doubtless has other exportable products, but this is one. Italy has alabaster and the talent to carve it. America wants alabaster. Italy needs our money more than she needs her alabaster. We want the alabaster more than we want certain amounts of money. It is a fair trade and it would be sound trade—sound to its very core.

In south central Europe the natives carve cuckoo clocks which are very popular among Americans who like cuckoo clocks—and the number seems large. In Brazil and elsewhere down below, they produce coffee, and there is tea in China and India, spices in Ceylon, coconuts in the western Pacific and so on, almost endlessly. We want these things and dozens of other commodities that show up in our own industrial processes, such as minerals, chemicals, and vegetable products. When we buy what we actually want and give dollar credits therefor it is sound business.

The trade barriers and tariff walls appear properly only when someone tries to carry coals to Newcastle, and we may as well resign ourselves to the fact that such walls always will exist. Yet a refugee from Czechoslovakia tells us that for some reason they didn't used to grow lettuce in that country. Czechoslovaks obtained their lettuce from the gardens of northern Africa, but at nearly prohibitive cost because of five separate tariffs imposed on that one commodity. The tariffs were not imposed to prevent a scarcity in Africa nor to protect lettuce growers in Czechoslovakia. They were imposed by these two governments, and by those in between, purely for revenue, and some of them may have been for spite.

If the peoples of Europe and elsewhere are to get to work, their governments must quit not only military aggression but also economic and ideological aggression. They must quit trying to bring home the bacon at the expense of other countries. They must restore peace of mind first. In a world shadowed by the blasts of Bikini, this is no time to be rebuilding futile walls with trowel in one hand and pistol in the other.

The United States can supply only sound trade permanently and profitably to the rest of the world. If we try to do more, for too long, the keystone will fail, and the whole structure, too frail even after our most Christian efforts, will be reduced to wreckage.

To sum up what we have been trying to say, there should be no punitive or spite tariffs and no export levies except to prevent shortages. People abroad should be permitted to travel more freely. There should be more welcome mats and fewer iron curtains—and on that issue the free nations should take a more definite stand. Those who like democracy should sell it on its own merits and not by economic pressure; and those who feel otherwise should be required to sell their political commodity rather than inject it hypodermically by stealth. If it is to be a free world, and only in a free world can we have lasting peace and prosperity,

the people must be free to choose their own governments. The world needs peace first, then reconstruction, then that desirable climate when men can see some reward for going to work.

Bungling Strategy by New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a timely editorial that appeared in the Washington Post today.

BUNGLING STRATEGY

The defeat that the administration has sustained is not diminished by the House recommittal of the Wood bill to the Labor Committee. For the action of the House the previous day in rejecting the Lesinski bill in favor of this substitute measure is proof positive that the administration will either have to accept a labor bill modeled along Taft-Hartley lines or else make up its mind to live with the Taft-Hartley Act.

Responsibility for this political debacle rests squarely upon the shoulders of House leaders who refused until too late to consider reasonable amendments to the defective administration bill. A good share of the blame for their strategic defeat is attributable to the shortsighted tactics of labor leaders who fought retention of various protective features of the Taft-Hartley Act that have proved their worth, especially provisions for injunctive relief in case of strikes constituting a threat to the national welfare. Finally, the President himself seriously impaired the chances of passage of the administration bill, first by presenting his lieutenants in Congress with a ready-made bill tailored to fit the specifications of labor leaders, and more recently by trying to coerce Congress into accepting that bill by threatening to deny patronage perquisites to Democrats who voted against it.

The political bungling that led to the rout of the administration has served at least one good purpose. It has shown that Congress cannot be bullied into passing a one-sided labor bill that fails to protect the interests of management and the public as well as labor. Although the Wood bill failed of passage, the House rejection of the Lesinski bill, even in its hastily-amended form, demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that Congress will not approve any labor bill that does not embody most of the safeguards against abuse embodied in existing legislation. If there is to be any new labor legislation at this session of Congress, the administration forces will either have to make further concessions to the demands of opponents or risk the possibility of a legislative revolt that might result in passage of a measure quite as stiff as, or even stiffer than, the Wood bill.

The choice, therefore, appears to lie between retention of the Taft-Hartley Act in unamended form or acceptance of a compromise measure that would eliminate or modify those provisions of the law that have proved undesirable or oppressive without destroying essential safeguards against the abuses that prevailed under the old Wagner Act. Unless a reasonable compromise is reached, the Taft-Hartley Act will remain a political issue, and labor unions and anti-labor groups will continue to put pressure on members of Congress and candidates for office to indorse or oppose changes in the law that may not be in the public interest.

Labor legislation should, of course, be judged solely on its merits as an instrumentality for insuring a system of collective bargaining fair to employers, employes, and the public at large. It is essentially a nonpartisan type of lawmaking, as evidenced by the split party votes in the House. If the administration had proceeded on that assumption it would not have lost political face by making repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act a partisan issue.

Program of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "Program of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the Eighty-first Congress," delivered by me before the convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on April 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it certainly is a pleasure to be here with you this morning. When my distinguished fellow Senator, JOHN MCCLELLAN, of the great State of Arkansas, offered me the opportunity to come and talk to you this morning, I jumped at the chance. I am very familiar with the fine work that your organization has done over the years in fostering cheap water transportation throughout the country. I want to pay tribute to you for your accomplishments along that line.

Back in my home city of Omaha, we are keenly aware of the importance of cheap transportation, particularly water transportation. Omaha is a very important transportation center. We have seen what cheap water transportation has done for other cities. Perhaps we have been just a little bit jealous of the prosperity that it has brought to other cities. At any rate, there are very few Omahans that are not enthusiastic about developing the navigation possibilities on the Missouri River. We realize that a 9-foot channel for barge traffic can make all the difference to our prosperity. That channel is just as vital to the rest of my State as it is to Omaha. The difference in cost of a few cents a bushel to the farmer in shipping his wheat to market may not seem like a lot, but when it applies to every bushel of wheat, and when it goes on for year after year, the cumulative effect on farm prosperity is tremendous. I believe the farmers all through the State realize that fully.

As a topic for this address, Senator MCCLELLAN has assigned me the subject, The Program of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the Eighty-first Congress. I presume I was assigned that topic because of the fact that during the last Congress I was chairman of that committee. As a result of the political overturn of last fall, I am chairman no longer, of course. My good friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, succeeded me in the position. Under those circumstances, perhaps it would be presumptuous to try to lay down the program of the committee. I shall not try to assume the prerogatives of the present chairman. Senator O'MAHONEY and I see fairly well eye-to-eye, however, even though he is a Democrat and I am a Republican. Perhaps it will be in order for me to discuss the work of the committee and explain just how it fits into the Federal activities relating to development of our water resources.

Some of you may recall that the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 combined five of the old smaller committees into one major committee called the Senate Committee on Public Lands, now named the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. One of those former committees was the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I have been a member ever since I came to the Senate in 1941. Since the congressional reorganization, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has continued to handle legislation relating to reclamation development, including broadly the whole program of the Bureau of Reclamation. That is how we get into the problem of our water resources. Senator MCCLELLAN is a high-ranking member of the Public Works Committee, which handles flood control and navigation questions. It might seem that there would be some conflict between the two committees, but, as a matter of fact, we get along extremely well. We both have the same general aims and purposes. In fact, four Members of the Senate are members of both committees.

It is true, however, that there is sometimes controversy regarding the management and development of the possibilities of our rivers. In the West, from about the ninety-eighth meridian of longitude on west, water is very scarce and very valuable. All through the West it is a great problem to secure a dependable supply of water to sustain life and to maintain agriculture. A major part of our activity is concerned with bringing the water in the streams to the land by means of irrigation works. In constructing those works we have to be very careful to secure the maximum benefit from each drop of water. That is the job primarily of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is the function of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to handle the legislation dealing with that problem.

It is a fact, however, that problems do sometimes arise in the use of our water in the West, problems that must be reconciled. Perhaps I can best illustrate this point by referring to our program for development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin.

The Missouri River drains an area of 529,000 square miles, or approximately one-sixth of the land area of the entire United States. It covers a part of the area of 10 different States. In the western and northern part of the basin, in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and the Dakotas, the people are chiefly interested in the possibilities of irrigation and power development. In the lower part of the basin, particularly Missouri, eastern Kansas, and Nebraska, and part of Iowa, the greatest interest is in flood control and the development of navigation. My State, Nebraska, is right in between. It is the only State that lies entirely within the Missouri Basin. In the eastern part of the State there is plenty of rainfall for crop production, and we are very much interested in developing

navigation on the main stream. In western Nebraska, on the other hand, the greatest interest is in irrigation. You can probably understand that for a Senator representing the entire State it is necessary to reconcile the divergent interests and work to help with the attainment of both types of development.

As a general program for developing this entire basin, we are following what is called the Pick-Sloan plan. This is a plan developed jointly by Gen. Lewis A. Pick, for many years division engineer for the Corps of Engineers in our area and now Chief of Engineers, and W. Glenn Sloan, formerly Administrator of the Bureau of Reclamation's work in the valley. Under this plan, the engineers have responsibility and authority for constructing the navigation and flood-control works on the main stem of the Missouri and carrying a 9-foot channel for navigation as far as Sioux City, Iowa. The Bureau of Reclamation has the chief authority for the planning and construction of irrigation works on all the tributaries. The Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture backs up the work of these two principal agencies with smaller check dams, conservation treatment of the soil, and other work to retard water run-off and prevent soil erosion. Various other agencies, such as the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service, also play a part in the plan.

To coordinate the entire construction program, we have a group called the Interagency Committee on which the principal bureaus and also the States through their governors are represented. This committee is charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that construction proceeds in a balanced, efficient manner and that conflicts are ironed out. The construction projects of the various agencies are carefully dovetailed into each other so as to prevent wasteful expenditure of the public funds.

For example, at one project with which I am particularly familiar—the Harlan County Dam on the Republican River—the engineers are constructing the dam. It is to provide flood control, power, and water for irrigation. The Reclamation Bureau is building the irrigation ditches and other irrigation works and is handling the actual operation of the irrigation side of the picture.

To return to the Pick-Sloan plan itself, it is always a problem on our western rivers of being sure that there is enough water to carry out the plans that are adopted. For some years before 1944, there was controversy as to whether there would be enough water for both the irrigation and navigation development. By the terms of the Pick-Sloan plan, this conflict was specifically recognized and reconciled, and the works to be constructed in the basin are adjusted to the master plan, so as to make sure that all the principal needs will be met.

It is important to realize that the Pick-Sloan plan has the stamp of approval of the most outstanding water engineers of the country. Those are the engineers in the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers. Representatives of these two agencies have appeared before Congress and testified that the plan will work and will provide the benefits that are in the program. In other words, the reputations of these men are at stake. The Corps of Engineers feels confident that there will be enough water to maintain the 9-foot channel on the Missouri as far as Sioux City. The Bureau of Reclamation, by endorsing this plan, has made it plain that the program of the Corps of Engineers will not interfere with its plans for irrigation. How then can the sponsors of the MVA expect anyone to believe that a new plan for river development would be superior from an engineering point of view?

I want to emphasize these points because there has been controversy about the whole program for our Missouri Basin development from time to time. The plan has been subjected to criticism from two principal sources during the past few weeks. One source of criticism has been certain task force reports prepared under authority of the Hoover commission, which I shall touch on briefly in a moment. The second source of criticism has been from those who advocate an MVA for the Missouri Basin.

Since the proposed Missouri Valley Authority would be a complete substitute or alternative for the Pick-Sloan plan, it may be worth while examining the proposal in some detail. Evidently the two ideas run along parellel lines. They are both methods for controlling and using the water and related resources of the Missouri Basin. They both have the same goal—that is, to secure the maximum benefits for the people of the region and the Nation from those water resources. Both of them would operate within the same limitations, and that means, primarily, the limited amount of water. The sponsors of the MVA do not pretend that they can create any additional supply of water from the skies, nor secure it from the oceans or from outside the Missouri Basin.

The proposed MVA is not yet a plan for control and use of the waters, of course. It is simply a proposal to set up a board with broad authority which would be supposed to frame such a plan. Naturally, it is difficult to discuss a plan which has not yet been developed. At the same time, we can perhaps get some notion of what is proposed by the MVA sponsors by studying the public statements that have been made in its behalf.

The bill to establish an MVA, S. 1160, was introduced in the Senate on March 2 this year. At that time, three of its sponsors, Senator MURRAY, of Montana; Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, made addresses in support of the bill. I would like to quote briefly from their statements in an attempt to get an indication of just what its sponsors believe is wrong with the Pick-Sloan plan which could be corrected by an MVA.

At that time, Senator MURRAY said: "Between these two great Government agencies there is an irreconcilable and dangerous conflict which is based on a physical condition that they are completely powerless to remove, namely the fact that the navigation-flood control program of the Army engineers depends on impounding and holding a large amount of water for downstream use, while the Bureau of Reclamation requires an ever-increasing amount of water for upstream area irrigation and power generation. Latest engineering studies reveal that there simply is not enough water over wet and dry cycles to meet both needs."

Please note that statement about latest engineering studies. The Senator does not indicate what studies he refers to.

A little later on, Senator MURRAY said: "The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment presumably gives first priority to the upper-basin States on all waters. Yet the Army engineers' program, already authorized, and some of it already being built, requires a tremendous proportion of that very water belonging to the upper-basin States. So the farmers who have been led to believe in the strength of the protection afforded them by this worthy, fair-sounding amendment are apparently putting their faith in an illusive fortress built on sand."

Let me say that if this is Senator MURRAY's fear, I believe he can stop worrying. The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment does give first priority to beneficial consumptive use of water in the basin. That use, including water for irrigation, takes priority over the navigation development. It is absurd to suppose that the Army engineers could take water which the farmers need for irrigation. If General Pick and the engineers suppose that they can secure water for navigation in that manner, they are not as smart as I think they are. I might add that I have a very high regard for General Pick's engineering ability and common sense.

In his address Senator GILLETTE sounds somewhat the same theme. He declares: "The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the backers of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority quickly contended and demonstrated that there was still not enough water in the river for both plans; that the basic conflict continued."

This statement is made in the face of the fact that the engineers of the Army and of the Bureau have staked their reputations on the finding that the plan will work.

Senator HUMPHREY in his address speaks as follows: "I am also interested in the irrigation possibilities of the Missouri. There has been no agricultural justification for hundreds of thousands of acres of the proposed Sloan irrigation projects, and these malpractices might bankrupt tens of thousands of our farm people. It is now obvious that the Pick flowing channels will take millions of acre-feet away from much-needed irrigation." It is evident from that statement that Senator HUMPHREY is not particularly interested in the navigation possibilities of the Missouri.

Altogether, if we can judge from the quotations of its sponsors, one of the principal purposes of MVA, apparently, would be to give up the idea of developing navigation on the Missouri. At least that is the impression that I get. Elsewhere in the discussions on this subject is a suggestion of a slack-water channel with locks. I do not know if this suggestion is made seriously or not. Offhand, it sounds like a suggestion intended to sabotage the whole idea of Missouri River navigation. Turning the broad Missouri into a sort of lock canal, with all the delay and inconvenience to shippers that that would entail, would be a sure way to condemn the river to uselessness.

In passing, I might point out that there are only two reasons given for substituting the MVA for the Pick-Sloan plan. First, the sponsors of MVA are fond of charging that there is a lack of coordination under the Pick-Sloan plan. I have mentioned the effort we have made to meet this problem through the Inter-Agency Committee and through the careful dovetailing of the two plans. Second, MVA proponents are fond of charging that the Pick-Sloan plan is unsound from an engineering standpoint. That type of charge is a little absurd for a layman to make. If there is anything wrong with the engineering program, most of us are not likely to know it until it is proved by an expert unprejudiced engineer. If we must choose between the judgments of Senators MURRAY and HUMPHREY on the one side, and the Army and Reclamation Bureau engineers on the other, it is pretty obvious where the choice should go.

On these two points of criticism, the whole case for an MVA appears to be based. The MVA proposal goes far beyond an attempt to deal with these two phases of the problem, however. It proposes to establish a superboard to control the destinies of the entire basin. This board would be virtually free from control by Congress and would have authority, broadly speaking, to override State water laws all through the valley. This board would apparently have the power to decide along what lines a development should proceed, regardless of the wishes of the people of the valley or their State officials or

their representatives in Congress. Apparently it would have authority to subordinate navigation completely to irrigation, or irrigation to navigation, or both to hydroelectric power. Whatever changes we may need to make from time to time in the Pick-Sloan plan, I do not believe we need give away all our rights.

A little earlier I mentioned the discussion of the Pick-Sloan plan contained in two of the task force reports prepared for the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. In one of these, the report entitled "Water Resources Projects," prepared by A. B. Roberts, a consulting engineer of Cleveland, Ohio, there is a good deal of discussion of the financial aspects of the plan. It is an interesting discussion, although I feel that in a good many instances it makes suggestions directly counter to established Government policy as expressed in any number of Congressional enactments.

From our point of view, the more important task force study for the Hoover Commission is the one on Organization and Policy in the Field of Natural Resources, prepared by the Library of Congress. In fact, it is evident that this report is the main source of the material on which Senators MURRAY, GILLETTE, and HUMPHREY prepared their charges against the Pick-Sloan plan. Yet a careful reading of the task force report does not substantiate the charges.

This task force report makes a number of specific criticisms of the conduct of operations in the Missouri Basin and suggests various changes in administration, some of which may be very sound. When it comes to considering the engineering aspects of the plan, however, it presents no new material worth mentioning. It simply rakes up all the old controversies between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation that were settled and reconciled by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

A little earlier I quoted Senator MURRAY'S statement regarding what he called latest engineering studies on the supply of water available for Missouri Basin development. It is evident that these so-called latest engineering studies are nothing more or less than the Hoover Commission task-force report. This task-force report is not an engineering study at all. It simply quotes again from some of the studies made by some of the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in 1944 and prior years. In fact, there are no thorough, complete engineering studies of the entire Missouri Basin, except those by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. While the studies of these two agencies are kept continually up to date, no over-all summary of their findings has been published since the 1944 reports. In other words, when the sponsors of the MVA claim that recent developments have given us new facts that we did not have in 1944 they are simply talking through their hats.

It is noteworthy that the Hoover Commission itself, including distinguished representatives from the Senate, the House, the executive branch of the Government, and from outside the Government, did not endorse the findings of its own task forces. It presented them purely as suggestions for discussion, and then went on to make its own recommendations. In fact, the Hoover Commission itself did not specifically mention the Pick-Sloan plan one way or the other.

Meanwhile, construction under the Pick-Sloan plan is proceeding rapidly, and a tremendous amount of work is being done despite obstacles. The President's budget for the next fiscal year requested about $104,000,000 for construction by the Corps of Engineers in the Missouri Basin, and about $87,000,000 for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, in addition to smaller sums for some of the other agencies. Although the House of Representatives has reduced these requests to some extent as of today, the House committee has promised in general terms to continue to support the program. In any case, I feel confident that we shall get adequate funds for continued construction either through Senate action or at some other point in the consideration of the appropriation bills. It is evident that the Pick-Sloan plan is still progressing rapidly, and that criticisms of it are no more than the sniping of disgruntled partisans.

They are not delaying its progress yet, nor have they succeeded in forcing through the profound changes in our political processes or our social system which are contemplated in the MVA proposal.

I do not want to give the impression that I believe the Pick-Sloan plan is sacred in every detail, or that we should resist every proposed change. The plan, as constituted at present, has not been determined in every detail. In fact, not every dam in the overall plan has even been authorized as yet. The plan is being changed from time to time in detail as the survey work progresses. I believe we must recognize that additional experience and new facts may require changes from time to time. We should always be willing to consider such proposals.

In fact, one suggestion of the Hoover Commission seems to have a good deal of merit. This is the recommendation for the creation of a Board of Impartial Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects to study and report on the public and economic value of project proposals by the Interior Department and the Corps of Engineers. This new Board would be located in the President's office.

Certainly we cannot have too much of impartial study of proposed projects. In effect, this proposed Board would amount to nothing more than an expansion and strengthening of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget in reviewing these projects. Certainly there is some value in having departmental proposals reviewed by competent and impartial analysts.

The Hoover Commission does not suggest that this proposed Board should also direct the conduct of an impartial engineering survey of the entire Missouri Basin program. If that could be done in an efficient way, I don't believe any of us would object to it. The difficulty would lie in finding engineers who would be truly impartial and fit to conduct such a survey. As I mentioned a moment ago, the only engineers really familiar with the work are those in the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Presumably, there would be no point in directing them to review the findings of their own bureaus. On the other hand, a Board of Review assigned to such a function might be carefully chosen to select a certain set of views. Since the President has endorsed the MVA on a number of occasions, it is reasonable to suspect that a Board carefully selected by him would come out with a ringing endorsement of the MVA. That is a danger to be guarded against if we want to get any worth-while results from a new review of the whole program.

In this address, I have not tried to lead you to any permanent conclusions. I have merely tried to bring you up-to-date with some of the developments from a Washington point of view in the whole plan and program for developing the water resources of the Missouri Basin. I have tried to draw out some of the meat of the present controversy and point to where these various proposals lead us. I hope that all of you, and particularly all of you from the Missouri Basin, will continue to give your best thought and study to these problems. The important thing is to find the right and best solution, and that is far more important than a victory for either one faction or the other in this controversy. We have a common stake in the success of the development of the basin, regardless of which avenue is finally chosen.

First Anniversary of Israeli Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] at the meeting in commemoration of the first anniversary of the Israeli declaration of independence, held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, May 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of I rael have a particular claim to the event we are celebrating on this fifth day of Iyar 5709. But in its largest sense, the declaration issued at Tel Aviv 1 year ago invites a universal celebration, for the search for freedom is never just a local one, nor are the results of that search only local. Whatever increases or diminishes the cause of freedom in one point of the globe does so throughout the globe. Among men who love freedom, what happens to a part of us happens to all of us. We mourn our losses together and we rejoice together in our triumphs.

Tonight, we who love liberty—Jews and non-Jews alike—have a cause to rejoice together. For Israel lives—not only as an idea—not only as the theme of a prayer—but it lives as the Third Jewish Commonwealth. It lives despite all efforts to keep it from being born. It lives despite all efforts to crush its life when it was born. It lives because the ageless vitality of the Jews and their ageless love of liberty produced in our day a generation of Joshuas and Maccabees—a generation that looked to its own faith and its own strength to win a resting place for Israel in its own homeland.

In an epoch filled with practical men—in an epoch which looks with suspicion at any force other than barefaced force—the history of Israel in the past year calls us back to some ancient truths. It reminds us that faith can still move mountains when faith is joined as a handmaiden to a love of liberty. It reminds us that acts of liberation are not achieved by men who make Machiavellian calculations about risks or favorable omens. The liberation of peoples—as Maj. Aubrey Eban said in Washington recently "is an act of faith rising up in defiance of logic and drawing its strength from the moral and spiritual impulses which are decisive in all areas of human conflict."

In this single year, the people of Israel had thrust on them a complex of tasks which other nations have dealt with over many generations of growth. In Israel's case, however, there was no time to deal with them a nibble at a time. A dyke in history had suddenly burst open, and there poured over the Jewish

people a torrent of all the pent-up problems that had gathered density since the first days of the Diaspora.

First, there was the declaration of freedom announced 1 year ago tonight. That alone would command the respectful attention of history. But the year called for much more than a ringing manifesto. It called for much more than a reinforcement of all the established modes of government when the mandatory power vacated the land. The year called for deeds of valor—for a spirit of sacrifice to drive back the invader whose falling bombs could be heard above the declaration of independence. It was contrary to all the primary teachings of Judaism to accept war as a solution to international problems. Israel did not invite war with its Arab neighbors. It pleaded for a chance to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the points at issue with them.

But practical men, making practical calculations, felt there was much to be gained by launching an attack on the infant state. The present misery of countless thousands of Arabs was the bitter fruit of that venture. War was thrust on the Israeli and they had no recourse but to face up to it. The results of the battles that followed made fools of the experts and realists who forgot that the trial of strength in the Holy Land was not merely gun against gun, but rather of spirit against spirit. It was a trial of strength between the spirit of the effendi on the one hand, and the men of the Hagganah in whose hearts and minds there dwelt the souls of the 6,000,000 sacrifices to Nazi barbarism. The latter mastered the field. The effendi fled it.

Yet the military task was but part of Israel's labors in the last year. While its port cities were being bombed—while its settlements were being attacked—while its resources were being heavily taxed to support the armies in the field, Israel faced the task of bringing into the land the scattered remnants who had survived the gas chambers and the crematoriums of Hitler's Germany. Some sense of the magnitude of this task—and it has only begun—can be grasped from a comparative figure: Within the last year alone, the rate of immigration to Israel was 20 times as great as the flow of peoples to the United States at the peak of our immigration phase. This is a staggering feat. It is not without its trials and pains. But the rot of the displaced persons camps had to be ended.

When the total problem of immigration is mastered, the solution offered may prove to be one of the more important social inventions of our day. Many western states are now torn between a need for granting essential economic freedoms to their citizens while at the same time blending those freedoms into the social, economic, and political needs of the community as a whole. A harmony between the interests of the one and the many, between private and public interests, was achieved in Israel before the present wave of migration. And if that harmony can be maintained in the future, we may see another instance where the law goes forth from Zion. Other nations might lay aside doctrinaire solutions which are now competing with one another for mastery over the peoples of the west and look to the way in which peace, justice, freedom, and order have been achieved in the newest state in the family of nations.

The declaration of an intention to be free—the fight in the field to insure the physical integrity of the new state—and the absorption of tens of thousands of immigrants who had to be housed, fed, clothed, and put to work, would alone have justified the hopes held for the future of Israel. But the people of that land still found the strength and the will to hew out a permanent cornerstone for future years. They elected a constituent assembly to draft a basic law by which the new state was to be governed. This is no easy task in tranquil times. For constitution making is the most exacting of political arts. But to undertake it at a time when external dangers were still present—to elect a representative government under conditions which other peoples have cited in justification of dictatorship—speaks volumes on where Israel stands in the ageless struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. By this act, Israel proves it does not pay mere lip service to freedom. It serves the cause of freedom by risking everything in its name.

I have spoken thus far on what the Israeli have done for themselves in the past years. But it is appropriate in this hour to point out that Israel has lifted itself as far as it can by its own bootstraps. President Truman has, of course, extended a powerful hand to Israel in the past. His trust in the new state has been more than justified. Americans of all creeds honor him for his deeds on behalf of the new state. But if the full hope held out for the future of Israel is to be realized, a further helping hand must be extended to it. The people of Israel have won a right to it. There is no reason why they should not get it.

In measuring the consequences of any such help to Israel, two world needs should be borne in mind. First, Israel has a compelling interest in maintaining the peace of the world. As Moshe Sharett pointed out, "There is no people today which in obedience to a sheer instinct of self-preservation dreads another world war more than the Jews." The facts behind Mr. Sharett's observation are self-evident. Israel rests at the crossroads of the world. Any outbreak of general hostilities would immediately engulf Israel and might lead to a ravaging of the new state. The foreknowledge that this would happen makes the maintenance of peace in the world a matter of life and death to the Israeli.

What follows is a corollary.

We know from experience that mass poverty in any nation, gross inequalities of wealth, ignorance, social backwardness, and political instability are forces which breed revolution and war. Such nations either tempt the intervention of stronger ones, or they breed a race of adventurers who divert attention away from domestic problems by waging war on neighboring states. Because of its depressed condition, because it fits the classic description of a political powder keg, the Middle East is marked with a giant danger sign for those who earnestly search for peace. The danger is not abated by maintaining the status quo as the English have tried to do. It is increased. But it can be abated if to the political sovereignty of the Middle East states there is added a policy of social and economic rehabilitation. Money is needed to do this. Technicians are needed. But examples are also needed. And in this respect, Israel can be to the Middle East what Athens was once to the Hellenese in Pericles' day. The course of its own social and economic development may goad the pride of its neighbors to go and do likewise. And to the extent to which they do do likewise, the danger of revolution and war are lessened.

What do these general statements imply in specific terms?

As a first step, Israel belongs in the United Nations where its voice for peace can be heard. Article 4 of the United Nations Charter sets forth the proposition that membership in that body is the right of all "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the * * * charter, and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out that obligation." Israel has repeatedly declared its acceptance of the obligations of the charter. In many respects, it exceeds the qualifications of states who are now part of the United Nations. It is truly independent—while some nations are satellites to others. It is a true democracy—while some states are dictatorships. It has internal stability—while some states are torn internally either by large-scale civil war, or by repeated palace revolutions. Most of the members of the United Nations have already granted individual recognition and I fail to understand why it is so difficult for them to do collectively what they have done individually. I might add in passing, that it seems ironic that the people who taught the world the doctrine of universal peace should be kept waiting hat in hand outside the door of an organization formed to advance that doctrine.

It may be argued that there are still unsolved differences between Israel and its neighbors, and that until they are settled, Israel should be kept outside of the United Nations. Yet if the solution to all differences between states was a criteria for membership in the United Nations, there would have been no United Nations in the first place, or being formed, there would be no need for it. For the Messianic era would be upon us. But the United Nations was formed for the express purpose of solving international disputes. Its very being acknowledges the fact that differences of interest and points of view are an immutable part of this imperfect world. In this connection, experience in Holy Land matters has shown that whenever the parties directly concerned were able to negotiate with one another as equals, the road to peace was straightened out. And until Israel can stand in the United Nations Council on the basis of legal equality with other nations, and not merely as their guest, the road to peace in the Middle East will be a tortuous one.

In November of 1947, the United Nations declared that the state of Israel had a right to come into being. In May of last year, the United States was the first to recognize the new state. And ever after, when the United Nations for various reasons, wavered in its resolve, a strong word from the United States bolstered the wobbly legs. A word from the United States on the matter of admitting Israel into the United Nations is needed now. I have every confidence that it will be forthcoming.

While Israel has won the right of membership in the United Nations, it has similarly won the right to have and hold the new portion of the city of Jerusalem. The area was built by Jews. It was defended by them against hopeless odds. And, in the absence of the old city, it is the closest approximation to the city that forms the heart of Jewish dreams and prayers and hopes. A state of Israel without at least the new city of Jerusalem would be as soulless as a body without a head. President Weizmann has offered what I believe to be a workable approach to the issue of the security of holy places that has been raised. "The Government and the people of Israel," he said, "are conscious of the international interest in the safety of the holy places and the right of free access to them. We pledge ourselves to insure full security for religious institutions in the exercise of their function; to grant the supervision of the holy places by those who hold them sacred; and to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection." In this connection, I should like to observe that if the keys to the sepulcher have been entrusted to an Arab family for generations I believe the world has every reason to be confident that the assurances given by President Weizmann on other holy places will be no less scrupulously

honored. Perhaps one solution may be for the old city to be internationalized so that Christian, Jew, and Arab may all have their places of worship under joint control.

In addition to a ratification of Israel's membership in the United Nations, and its rights to the new city of Jerusalem, there is one further point on which it needs outside help. The problem of Arab refugees, the problem of new migration to Israel, and indeed, the problem of the economic and social rehabilitation of the whole of the Middle East, invites the application of point four in President Truman's inaugural address. It invites American technical assistance and a blend of private and public capital in the development of river authorities modeled after our own TVA. Here at home, the area covered by TVA has been transformed and infused with new life. Where it was formerly disease ridden, impoverished, and sparsely populated, it is now healthy, economically productive, and capable of absorbing thousands of new settlers.

The TVA model can be applied in the case of the Jordan River—with immeasurable benefits not only to Israel but to Trans-Jordan as well. And it can also be applied in the case of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers with immeasurable benefits to Iraq and Syria. These three rivers, around which so much of human history is woven, now invite a high union between technology and diplomacy. They offer themselves as a passageway to the solution of the population pressures of the Middle East, to their economic and social rehabilitation, and to their political stability. In the name of humanity, in the name of the peace of the world, we must offer our own special knowledge and resources to the full utilization of these three rivers. When there is enough for all in the Middle East, the jealousies and hatreds will lessen and the prospects for peace will rise.

I close with the words of President Weizmann:

"The glaring light of public attention is focused upon the state of Israel. More is expected of it than is usually demanded of such small states born in the throes of adversity and crisis. The cultural traditions (of the Jewish people) encourage the world to expect a corresponding achievement by Israel in modern times. (It) cannot hope to surprise the world with any manifestations of material power, and Israel has no deeper longing than to turn its energies into the arts of peace. In this generation, as always before, Israel must make its mark through the achievements of its mind and spirit. I pray that the coming year of independence will be not unworthy of the first, and that Israel will remain forever faithful to its most universal and significant ideals."

To these words of President Weizmann, I add the use of his first name:

"L'Chaim!—To life."

Financial Aspects of the Disabled American Veterans Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that all of my colleagues agree that one of the greatest obligations of our American people is to care adequately for our disabled ex-servicemen—the men who will bear with them throughout their lives the scars and wounds of battle, whether or not they are hospitalized. On several previous occasions—for example, on July 2, 1945, June 8, 1948, and other times—I have commented on the floor of the Senate regarding this outstanding work of the Disabled American Veterans organization. I have spoken very frankly on the financial needs of this organization in order to carry on its indispensable work supplementing Government activities in this field.

Ordinarily I would not even presume to take the time of the Senate to discuss the financial problems of any private organization. I do, however, make an exception in the case of the DAV because I feel that what the DAV needs is not mere verbal tributes, not mere pats on the back, but what it needs is straight, helpful talk regarding its financial problem.

In recognition, therefore, of the needs of Wisconsin's disabled American veterans—yes; the needs of our disabled heroes of all the other 47 States as well—I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a frank statement regarding the financial aspects of the DAV's work.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

WORTHY DAV APPEALS FOR FUNDS

About a year ago, I advised my colleagues that the incorporated trustee of the DAV, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, was then dramatizing its appeal for much-needed funds by full-page display advertisements in many magazines and newspapers, featuring 270 cash prizes, totaling $51,265, which were awarded in an intriguing mosaic patterned cross-word puzzle contest. So successful was the DAV Service Foundation in this new formula of raising badly needed money for a worth-while cause that it acquired more than $1,000,000 net profits therefrom, out of which its board of 13 trustees has so far allocated the sum of $750,000 to the national headquarters of the DAV for its Nation-wide service activities on behalf of war-disabled veterans and their dependents.

This successful experience encouraged the DAV Service Foundation to conduct a second word-puzzle contest, which started during the early part of January 1949, as to which original puzzle-solution entries were submitted up until before midnight of April 30, 1949. Judging by the full-page display advertisements that have appeared in many prominent magazines and metropolitan newspapers throughout the country, the second national puzzle contest conducted by the DAV Service Foundation will probably also prove to be successful.

I understand that official substitute solutions may be submitted by the contestants up until June 29, 1949, after which there will be an evaluation of the relative solutions, with the possibility that the top tied valid high scorers will have to compete in the solution of from one to four sets of five tie-breaking puzzles before the winners of the 330 cash prizes, totaling $100,000, and of the several automobile promptness prizes, will have been awarded.

Inasmuch as my long-time friend the very able Millard W. Rice, is the executive secretary of the DAV Service Foundation (he was formerly national commander and national service director of the DAV, as well as national legislative director of the VFW), I am particularly confident that very meticulous care will be taken in the evaluation of the relative solutions by the contributing competitors in this second puzzle contest—just as was the case as to its first puzzle contest—in determining the final winners. This will be in accordance with the rules of the contest, without any consideration whatsoever as to the location, race, creed, color, or financial or educational status of the respective contestants, but only on the basis of their relative skills in their puzzle solutions, which should be completed by early next fall.

I am sincerely hopeful that the DAV Service Foundation will have been enabled to raise more than a million dollars from its second puzzle contest, just as it did on its 1948 contest, notwithstanding the fact that other organizations have patterned after the formula thus proven to be feasible for raising funds for service-giving purposes.

DAV IDENTO-TAG PROJECT

Many of my colleagues will no doubt recall having received miniature automobile license tags during the last several years, from the Disabled American Veterans. This is another unique and highly constructive method of raising funds. The DAV endeavors to send out such Idento-Tags to all automobile owners, as a result of which it returns about 5,000 sets of keys each month to their respective owners—a very effective Nation-wide key insurance—which results in substantial net profits to the DAV, after payment of all expenses incident to the manufacturing and assembling of the Idento-Tags, processed mostly by handicapped veterans and the dependents of veterans.

I would like to point out that if 100 percent of the recipients of these neat little key-ring Idento-Tags were to return 25 cents or more, the DAV would have no financial problem in maintaining its staff of some 300 full-time national service officers.

These two unique methods of raising funds have heretofore made it possible for the DAV to maintain its invaluable Nation-wide service activities. But such finance-raising projects have not yet been sufficiently successful to enable it to build up as extensive a service set-up as the needs warrant or to build up a much-needed reserve trust fund for the future. Judging by the experience as to World War I veterans, it will be necessary to maintain expert national service officers for the benefit of our World War II disabled veterans for the next 30 years or more.

Although most of my colleagues in Congress, as well as State and local governmental officials throughout the country, probably already know something about how ably and faithfully the DAV serves those Americans who were wounded, injured, or disabled while fighting in our country's wars, I believe that because of the magnitude of its task it is desirable to explore the subject more fully.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S LIMITATIONS

Although virtually all Americans believe that one of the primary obligations of the Government should be to see to it that all of our country's disabled war veterans and their dependents should be adequately provided for, I fear too many of them have erroneously assumed that such obligation must have been already fulfilled. Much as our Government has done for veterans, it has not, cannot, and really should not be expected to provide for an automatic solution for all of the problems of all disabled veterans and their dependents.

It is neither practicable nor desirable that the Government should underwrite all of the problems of all disabled veterans; such an easy method would be detrimental both for

the disabled veterans themselves and for America's taxpayers.

The Government could not, and should not, provide sufficient compensation to every disabled veteran to obviate completely the necessity for receiving income from other sources.

Several Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, during the past 29 years, have clearly, emphatically, and repeatedly stated that the task of rendering adequate service to America's disabled veterans is a job far greater than can be taken care of merely by the Veterans' Administration. The services of a nongovernmental congressionally chartered, volunteer organization, such as the Disabled American Veterans, are essential, if our disabled veterans are to become and to remain adjusted to useful civilian living, through suitable, gainful employment. Only thus can our disabled veterans be saved from dependency upon Government compensation, and be enabled to live as happy, self-supporting Americans.

ASSURING GAINFUL JOBS OUR RESPONSIBILITY

If American citizens, as employers, should fail to provide ample opportunities for the suitable employment of partially disabled veterans, then obviously such disabled veterans would have no other alternative than to seek to become completely dependent upon Government doles. That is not the American way. That is one of the reasons why I have introduced in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses legislation to encourage employers to hire handicapped veterans.

Less than 7 percent of the some 2,000,000 service-connected compensated disabled veterans are rated by the Veterans' Administration as being totally disabled. The remaining 93 percent are considered as only partially disabled and therefore receive lesser rates of compensation. Their inadequate income from disability compensation must obviously be supplemented from some other source, preferably from suitable, useful, gainful employment.

WHY GOVERNMENT NEEDS DAV HELP

In accordance with its congressional charter, the DAV cooperates with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of wounded, injured, or disabled veterans.

The fact that America's war-disabled veterans saw fit to form their own organization—the Disabled American Veterans—should not, therefore, be regarded as an implied criticism against any Federal agency.

During the last 29 years, the DAV has been extending, free of any charge, much-needed advice, counsel, and assistance to scores of thousands of disabled veterans in technically establishing their legal entitlement to governmental benefits to which, under certain legal limitations, restrictions, requirements, and provisions, they may be lawfully, equitably, and factually entitled. Acting as the defendant, the Government is called upon to pay the damages—in the form of disability compensation for service-connected disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, vocational training, and other benefits provided by law—to the successful claimants.

It would be very inconsistent to expect the Government also to furnish the attorney for the claimant.

COMPLICATIONS UNAVOIDABLE

Officials and employees in governmental bureaus must necessarily operate under complicated, technical regulations, legal interpretations, precedents, schedules of disability ratings, service letters, and other guiding policies and procedures in their administration and application of the some 800 laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents. Lest he encroach upon the jurisdiction of some other governmental official within his own section, division, or agency, or with the policies and procedures of some other Federal agency, the jurisdiction of any one governmental official or employee must, naturally, be narrowly circumscribed.

My colleagues have all had sufficient contacts with governmental officials to be well aware of the full significance of this division of responsibility. No matter how much we might simplify government—as constantly advocated by myself and by my colleagues in the two Houses of Congress and outside of Congress—such division of authority is, to some extent, unavoidable.

BAFFLING TO VETERAN CLAIMANTS

It just is not, and probably never will be, completely feasible for any veteran to go to one governmental official, or even to one Government office, to find out what he may be entitled to under any one or more of the numerous laws which might be pertinent, any more so than such an ideal situation can ever prevail as to any corporation which conducts business operations in more than one State.

Our Federal Government is exceedingly complicated, and its requirements are oftentimes utterly baffling to the average disabled veteran. He needs expert counsel as to the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of his claim for any benefit, privilege, or preference, to which he may be potentially entitled under any appropriate Federal law.

WHY A DAV

It was because of the realization of this difficulty—that the Government could not, and should not, be expected to take care of all of the complex, varied problems of America's disabled war veterans and their dependents—that the DAV was formed, some 29 years ago, by distressed, disappointed, disillusioned, disabled veterans of World War I.

Distressed disabled veterans need the helping hand of their own organization, the Disabled American Veterans, formed in 1920, congressionally chartered in 1932, and specifically designated in several Federal laws as a spokesman for America's war-disabled veterans.

THE DAV'S SERVICE SET-UP

Consisting exclusively of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans, the congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans has, for 29 years, been specializing in extending its vital rehabilitation services, free of charge, to all disabled veterans and their dependents.

The DAV has been freely extending badly needed services to scores of thousands of disabled veterans each year, through its nearly 300 trained, experienced, full-time national service officers (all themselves disabled veterans) stationed in DAV service offices located in all of the Veterans' Administration's regional, district, and central offices throughout the country. Supplementing their work, the DAV also has more than 1,500 department and chapter service officers.

All of these service officers are skilled and experienced in the work of helping disabled veterans technically and factually to establish entitlement to any governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled, such as service connections, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, and vocational training.

These service officers also use great resourcefulness to assist their disabled buddies to acquire and to retain adjustment to usefulness and self-support through suitable productive employment.

Let me point out that the peak service load will probably not be reached until 1960. Moreover, it is a fact that inasmuch as sharp curtailments in its budget have caused the VA to trim its staff of contact men, a heavier load has been assumed by the volunteer service organizations, of which the DAV is outstanding.

Specifically designated in several Federal laws as a spokesman for America's war-disabled veterans, and dedicated to the program of rendering needed service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been serving the men to whom the Nation owes a debt beyond payment.

The DAV maintains national headquarters at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, and its national service headquarters at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The present national commander is a great American—Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the hero of Bataan and Corregidor. Vivian D. Corbly is the national adjutant. Its legislative director is Francis Sullivan, its employment director Kenneth C. Bradley, and its director for claims Cicero F. Hogan.

The organization publishes a newspaper—the DAV Semi-Monthly—devoted to the interests of disabled veterans.

INCORPORATED TRUSTEE FOR DAV

As related in my statement concerning the same question 4 years ago, the DAV decided, back in 1931, that the potential donors who support its service program should have the assurance of a continuity of policy as to the expenditure, by the DAV, of all funds contributed. Therefore, the DAV formed a trusteeship, under the laws of the State of Ohio, known as the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

The primary purpose of the DAV Service Foundation is to receive donations from interested social-minded Americans, and then periodically to make allocations, from its accumulated trust funds, to the national headquarters of the DAV—as the operating congressionally chartered membership organization of America's disabled defenders—to enable it to continue to maintain and further to expand its Nation-wide set-up of full-time, expert national service officers, national civil-service officers, and national employment officers.

In order to be enabled to carry on this service activity on a basis commensurate with the responsibilities assumed, the DAV, it has been estimated, should be enabled to expand its service budget up to $2,500,000 per year.

Under the terms of a trust agreement with the DAV, all foundation funds are placed into separate State trust fund accounts, according to the States of origin of the funds raised.

The activities of the foundation are under the supervision of 13 trustees, 10 of whom each serve for 5-year periods, two expiring each year, with the other three consisting of the incumbent national commander and the chairman of the national finance committee of the DAV, and one other.

The president of the foundation is Miles H. Draper, attorney, of Tampa, Fla. Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, of New York City, director of industrial relations of Botany Mills, is chairman of the foundation's finance and budget committee.

The DAV Service Foundation maintains offices at 808 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., and also at 11 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y.

NEEDS ARE GREAT

According to the trustees—all prominent and conscientious civic-minded citizens—a trust fund of $50,000,000 should be built up to meet the DAV's needed annual service budget of $2,500,000.

Every social-minded individual and corporation has the opportunity to support this important work through generous donations to the DAV Service Foundation of money, real or personal property, shares of corporation common stock, preferred stock, bonds

and debentures, assignment of Government bonds, designation in insurance policies and wills, by purchase of its permanent personalized service plaques and Independence Hall wood relic plaques, by becoming a contributing competitor in its annual puzzle contests, and by other methods.

Other constructive plans of raising funds are now being considered by the DAV Service Foundation and if the public is fully informed of the purpose of such funds, I am sure an enthusiastic response will follow.

CONCLUSION

As a United States Senator and as an American, I urge my fellow citizens to contribute out of their generous hearts to the need of our disabled veterans. I know how the average citizen these days is overwhelmed by many appeals from worth-while organizations. I know, too, that the average citizen has his own financial problems during these inflationary times.

But we must never forget that we would not be enjoying our liberty today but for the fact that these veterans were willing to sacrifice their health, their bodies, their very lives on the land, on the sea, and in the sky in order that this Nation might endure.

It is our creed, therefore, that we must fulfill the needs of those men who came back from the war with the scars and pain of battle. Let us fulfill our creed by our deeds. Let's not just pay token tribute to disabled veterans. Our ex-servicemen don't need a lot of "hot air." They don't need a lot of talk, however sincere. They do need constructive aid to help make them self-supporting Americans. They ask so very little and gave us so very much.

We here in the Congress are challenged to enact legislation that will assure their welfare. Over in the House of Representatives now pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee are a considerable number of bills in their interest. I personally, as I have indicated, have introduced legislation to help them and I will continue to do all that is within my power. It was my pleasure to address the graduation class here in Washington, D. C., of a service officer class—many young men who had lost an arm or a leg and yet who are functioning as whole men, stout-hearted, brave, conscientious, and who were embarking upon careers to help their buddies, yes, to help make their buddies adequate.

In the interests therefore of our disabled veterans, I have taken the liberty of referring to this organization and indeed to its financial needs. I know that the American people will endorse my action just as they endorsed in hundreds of letters my previous statements pointing out very frankly the problems of this great group of veterans, the DAV and the DAV Service Foundation.

Address by Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick Before National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers before the annual meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on April 8, 1949.

I take pride in inviting the attention of the Senate to the remarks of General Pick. He has fully set out the objective policy of this seasoned agency as it proceeds with the construction of public works for the control and elimination of floods and the development of our inland waterways and our coastal ports in the interest of our economic welfare and development.

I say that I take special pride in submitting this address by General Pick, for he has been well and favorably known to us in the Missouri Basin and especially in Nebraska, because he served for many years as Chief of the Missouri River Division of the Corps of Engineers with headquarters at Omaha, until his well-deserved promotion to leadership of the entire engineering corps.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

It has long been the custom for the Chief of Engineers to come before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress each year and present an outline, as it were, of the river and harbor and flood-control work assigned to the Corps of Engineers by the Congress of the United States. Consequently, in this, my first appearance before you, as Chief of Engineers, I follow a precedent maintained by many distinguished predecessors. It is a circumstance which I appreciate fully. Yet I hardly need to assure you that I shall give to this office the utmost of my ability to maintain those traditions of the corps which have become bywords among the American people—nonpartisan public service, high engineering efficiency, proper administrative economy, and unswerving devotion to the national welfare.

I hope, in turn, that your Nation-wide organization will continue its fine cooperation with the Corps of Engineers in our extensive civil-works programs.

For many years the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Corps of Engineers have had a common bond in a common objective—the improvement of our waterways and harbors for navigation, commerce, and flood control.

Our earliest responsibilities were in the field of water-borne transportation. In normal peacetime economy waterways have always played an important part. In emergencies of war they have been vital. To meet heavy and immediate demands, our waterways are unexcelled. They are capable of any expansion to relieve overtaxed carriers of rail and highway.

The records of national progress lend emphasis to the importance of the inland shipping industry. Of 95 cities listed in the 1940 census with populations greater than 100,000, 62 are on navigable channels improved by the Federal Government, and our major industrial centers are located where they can take advantage of water transportation.

By the close of the current fiscal year the record of accomplishment of the Corps of Engineers in the improvement of rivers and harbors in the interest of navigation will include as completed projects 190 harbors, 400 locks and dams, and 27,000 miles of improved inland channels.

But rivers and harbors work is a continuing job. To get the greatest value for our transportation dollar, the people must improve their waterways to the fullest practicable extent. No one from those regions need to be reminded of the economic progress to be encouraged by increased improvement of the Red, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and similar streams in the United States. Then, again, there is the need for keeping our improvements attuned to the trend toward larger vessels and greater tow lengths—with 2,000 horsepower towboats moving 14,000 tons of cargo in a single trip.

Among projects waiting to be undertaken are the further improvement of the Mississippi River system's waterways; the completion of our intracoastal waterways; the construction of navigation feeders into inland areas off the Gulf of Mexico; the completion of the Sacramento River project; the completion of the projected improvement of the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Northwest and many others. All of them will contribute greatly to the progress of their respective regions and, consequently, to the economy of the Nation, as a whole.

During the war years, the maintenance of our important waterways and navigation structures fell far behind. This was due to critical shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. The postwar resumption of maintenance has been on a limited scale to conserve the materials and equipment needed by industry for the country's quick conversion to a peacetime economy.

The result has been a large accumulated backlog of such work. In addition to maintenance dredging, there are breakwater repairs needed at many of our coastal harbors. And the badly worn machinery and facilities of older structures in our canalized waterways should be replaced.

The President's budget for 1950 would provide appropriations of $75,000,000 to cover the entire field of maintenance, operations, and care.

We are currently engaged in the construction of 79 river and harbor projects, 23 of which will be completed this year. The President has recommended the appropriation of funds sufficient for construction work on 67 river and harbor projects during the 1950 fiscal year.

Federal flood control on a Nation-wide basis is still in its infancy. The first act for flood control, general, was passed in 1936. The first appropriation act pursuant to the authorization of this 1936 legislation was made for the fiscal year 1938—only 11 years ago. We lost four working years of this short period during the war. Yet by the end of the fiscal year 1948 the Corps of Engineers had completed 172 local protection projects and 56 reservoirs. The cost of these projects amounted to $483,000,000. And I am happy to report that the estimated value of flood damages already prevented by these works exceeds $500,000,000. By the close of the current fiscal year we will have increased the total of completed projects to 60 reservoirs and 201 local protection works.

The 1950 program for flood control, general, as contained in the President's budget, provides for the continuation of work on 156 projects, 60 of which will be completed during the fiscal year. In addition, the program provides for the initiation of two projects—one in Illinois and one in southern Florida. It is estimated that the projects included in this program will provide average annual flood control and other benefits in excess of $260,000,000. An analysis of the benefits and costs shows that the benefits to the Nation during the assumed life of these projects will exceed their cost by more than $5,000,000,000.

While it is seldom possible, within the scope of practical engineering and economics, to prevent all the flood losses that may occur on any river system, we know that approximately 75 percent of the remaining unchecked flood damages can and will be pre-

vented. Flood-control works now planned for future construction, together with those now in operation or under construction, will, when completed, reduce the calculable losses from floods on our Nation's rivers by $700,000,000 annually.

These figures, of course, do not translate into dollar benefits the alleviation of human suffering, protection of life, and stabilization of community enterprise. They place no dollar value to the contribution of projects to our national defense, yet the assurance of uninterrupted transportation facilities and the protection of strategic industrial areas are of vital importance in any national emergency.

Major elements of the general flood-control program are the comprehensive river-basin plans of improvement, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1938.

At the present time, Congress has authorized 15 of these comprehensive plans. They include the Connecticut, Ohio, Missouri, upper Mississippi, Arkansas, Rio Grande, and Willamette River Basins. They also include programs for central and southern Florida, and for the Los Angeles River in California. Congress has further recognized the importance of these basin plans in flood control acts subsequent to 1938, by increasing monetary authorizations until the authorized expenditure for partial accomplishment now totals $1,507,000,000. This is 60 percent of the total monetary authorization for general flood control.

Since these plans include work in the major river basins, where the greatest flood hazards exist, it is important that they be prosecuted at a uniformly rapid rate, in accordance with efficient scheduling and planning. This procedure actually results in ultimate savings in construction costs to the Federal Government. Of even greater importance, however, are the facts that floods continue to occur, and that flood losses will continue until these plans are completed and in operation.

The comprehensive river-basin plans are actually a program for the control and use of floodwaters, and for conservation of the water resources of the Nation. Congress has specifically directed that the Corps of Engineers—in reporting on projects for flood control and other purposes—must consider related water problems and uses—such as navigation, power development, water supply, recreation, preservation of fish and wildlife, and abatement of pollution.

In many cases, dams required for flood control also afford opportunity for development of economical hydroelectric power. To leave this major water use undeveloped would be grossly inefficient and wasteful. Moreover, it would not be in accordance with congressional directive.

To date, we have in operation three multiple-purpose flood-control projects, with an installed capacity of 106,000 kilowatts of power. The Dale Hollow project, in Tennessee, began power production last December. Additional power units are currently being installed at Denison Dam, in Texas and Oklahoma, and at Norfork Dam, Ark. Power installations now authorized by Congress will result in an ultimate installation of about 5,000,000 kilowatts of power. Since there is a general power shortage throughout the Nation, this is an important collateral aspect of the flood-control program.

The drainage problem in the United States is one of great magnitude. Our estimates show that there are almost 24,000,000 acres of undrained potential farmland, and that about 15,000,000 acres of this land can be brought into production, or have its production improved by a combination of drainage and flood control.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress gave legislative recognition to the fact that channel and major drainage improvements are an essential part of—and complement—flood-control improvements. All studies under river-basin planning of the Corps of Engineers recognize this relationship, and certain projects involving major drainage features have already been authorized by Congress.

Recreation is not given economic value in our estimates of benefits to be derived from completed reservoirs.

Yet the recreational needs being served today by our completed reservoirs is strikingly reflected in the record of public patronage. By actual count there were more than 2,000,000 visitors during 1948 at Lake Texoma, which is created by Denison Dam, on the Red River, in Texas and Oklahoma. An estimated 10,000,000 persons enjoyed our reservoirs during the year for boating, swimming, fishing, picnicking, and camping.

As a result of the continuing program of examinations and surveys, a large number of investigations have been completed since the war. Currently we have approximately 500 surveys under way, with reports passing through the various stages prior to transmission to Congress. These investigations represent the first step in the solution to remaining flood problems. The plans recommended are comprehensive in scope and involve conservation and use of floodwaters as well as control.

Outstanding among these reports is the one recommending a comprehensive program of control and development for the Columbia River Basin. This plan calls for a total Federal expenditure of $3,000,000,000. I have prepared my tentative report to Congress on the Columbia Basin plan and have submitted it to the governors of the affected States, and to other Federal agencies, for their comments.

In taking up the reins as Chief of Engineers I am deeply aware—as you are—that although much has been accomplished in river and harbor and flood-control work by the Federal Government, the present is a challenging period. We are confronted with urgent tasks of greater magnitude than heretofore undertaken in conserving and developing our natural resources. As rapidly as sound engineering and the national economy permit, our streams must be harnessed to remove the threat of floods, to eliminate the annual toll of life and property loss, and to put all of our rivers to work for the benefit, safety, and convenience of our people.

In these laudable purposes and objectives of your organization the Corps of Engineers is at your service.

The Basing-Point System in North Carolina—State Divided Arbitrarily by Cement Trust for Basing-Point Pricing—Identity of Bids Reach Perfection Here—Small Business Jeopardized Unless Congress Stands Firm on Moratorium

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has been outstanding in her leadership in the good-roads movement. Early recognizing the significance of motor transportation, North Carolina set about building highways of permanence. Many miles of North Carolina's intricate and modern network of highways are constructed of concrete. Millions upon millions of barrels of cement have been used by North Carolina not only in the construction of highways and bridges but in permanent public improvements of all types. But, prior to the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case on April 26, 1948, North Carolina, like her 47 sister States, was handicapped in the purchase of cement, steel, and other commodities by the basing-point system.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM IN ACTION IN NORTH CAROLINA

The identity of bids received by the authorities in this State year after year had the drab sameness encountered wherever bids were received for cement. As brought out by the Federal Trade Commission in Docket No. 3167 in the matter of the Cement Institute et al., most of western North Carolina was based on the Alpha Portland Cement Co.'s plant at Ironton, Ohio, and the central and eastern sections of the State were based on the Lone Star Cement Corp.'s plant at Norfolk, Va. These two facts together mean that the element of phantom freight, that unearned increment of the Cement Trust, was included in cement shipments to many, many destination points within the State. The record shows in FTC Docket No. 3167 that a higher mill base price was in existence in 1936 for western North Carolina than for parts of Virginia which were closer to the Ironton basing point.

I am confident that North Carolina and North Carolinians are as concerned about the effect of a moratorium on any part of our antitrust and fair-trade-practice laws, as are most of her neighbors and her neighbors' citizens. As a purchaser of large quantities of cement, of steel, and other construction materials, with no steel or cement plants within her borders for private and public improvements, North Carolina is particularly well situated to reap the harmful results of the basing-point system, the system which has for its foundation the control of prices, the restraint of trade, and the harvest of phantom freight with which to create larger and larger monopolies within our basic industries.

Typical of such cement bids were bids received by North Carolina's division of purchase and contract, Raleigh, N. C., on February 22, 1945, bid No. 3896, on 500,000 barrels of portland cement for shipment to various destinations during the period March 1, 1945, to March 1, 1946.

The bidders totaled 14 in number, namely, Alpha Portland Cement Co., Cumberland Portland Cement Co., Giant Portland Cement Co., Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Lone Star Cement Corp., Medusa Portland Cement Co., National Cement Co., North American Cement Corp., Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp., Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co., the Standard Lime & Stone Co., Southern States Portland Cement Co., Universal Atlas Cement Co., and the Volunteer Portland Cement Co.

North Carolina table follows:

Destination	Bidder													
	Alpha	Cumberland	Giant	Lehigh	Lone Star	Medusa	National	North American	Pennsylvania-Dixie	Signal Mountain	Standard	Southern States	Universal	Volunteer
	Destination price	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*
Aberdeen	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80	$2.80
Advance	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Ahoskie	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55
Albemarle	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Alexander	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Almond	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Andrews	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77
Angier	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Apex	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Arthur	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Asheboro	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Asheville	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Ashford	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Ayden	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Aulander	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57
Badin	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Bahama	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Bailey	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Barber	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Barnard	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Barclaysville	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Battleboro	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Battleground	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Bayboro	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Belhaven	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Beaufort	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Belmont	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Benson	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Bessemer City	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Blanche	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Black Mountain	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Bolton	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Bonsal	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Bostic	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Brevard	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Broadway	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Bryson	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Burgaw	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Burlington	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Burnsville	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Burt	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Camden	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57
Canton	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Caroleen	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Carthage	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Cary	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Chadbourn	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Chapel Hill Station	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Charlotte	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Cherryville	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
China Grove	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Claremont	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Clarkton	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Clayton	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Cleveland	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Cliffside	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Clinton	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Clyde	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Cofield	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53
Columbia	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Concord	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Conway	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57
Cooleemee	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Cornelius	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Corinth	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Councils	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Cove	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Craggy	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Cranberry	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69
Creswell	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Crutchfield	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Cumnock	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Currie	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Cullowhee	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Dallas	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Denton	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Dillsboro	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Dover	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Draper	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Dunn	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Durham	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Eagle Springs	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Earl	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
East Laport	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Edenton	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Ela	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Elizabeth City	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57
Elizabethtown	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Elkin	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Ellerbe	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Elm City	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Enfield	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Enka	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Erwin	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Eure	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53
Fairbluff	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Fairmont	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Faison	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Farmville	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Farrington	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Fayetteville	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Fletcher	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Forest City	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78

Destination	Bidder													
	Alpha	Cumberland	Giant	Lehigh	Lone Star	Medusa	National	North American	Pennsylvania-Dixie	Signal Mountain	Standard	Southern States	Universal	Volunteer
	Destination price	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*
Fort Bragg	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76	$2.76
Four Oaks	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Franklin	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Franklinton	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Fremont	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Fuquay Springs	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Garland	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Gastonia	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Gates	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.51
Germanton	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Gibson	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Glass	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Glen Alpine	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Gold Hill	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Godwin	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Goldsboro	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Goldston	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Graham	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Granite Falls	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Grants	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Greensboro	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Greenville	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Grimesland	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Grovestone	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Guilford College	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	3.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Gulf	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Halifax	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Hallison	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Hallsboro	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Hamlet	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Haw River	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Hayesville	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
Hazelwood	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Helena	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Henderson	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Hendersonville	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Henrietta	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Hertford	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Hickory	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
High Point	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
High Rock	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
High Shoals	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Hillsboro	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Holly Springs	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Hominy	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Hope Mills	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Hot Springs	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Hudson	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Hughes	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Huntdale	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65
Huntersville	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Iron	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Jacksonville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Jamestown	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Jonesboro	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Julian	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Kannapolis	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Kelford	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Kenansville	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Kenly	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Kernersville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Kings Mountain	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Kinston	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Kona	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71
Lagrange	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Lake Toxaway	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Lake Waccamaw	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Landis	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Lassiter	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Laurel Hill	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Laurinburg	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Lawndale	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93
Leaksville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Lenoir	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Lewiston	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Lexington	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Liberty	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Lillington	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Lincolnton	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Linden	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Littleton	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Logan	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Louisburg	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Lowell	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Lumberton	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Lumber Bridge	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Mackeys	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Madison	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Maiden	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Mamers	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Manchester	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Manson	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Margaret	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57
Marion	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Marshall	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Marshville	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Maxton	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Mayodan	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Maysville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Mebane	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Midland	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
Millers (Wayne County)	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Milton	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76

Destination	Bidder													
	Alpha	Cumberland	Giant	Lehigh	Lone Star	Medusa	National	North American	Pennsylvania-Dixie	Signal Mountain	Standard	Southern States	Universal	Volunteer
	Destination price	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*	*Destination price*
Mizzelle	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68	$2.68
Mocksville	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Moncure	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Monroe	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Monroe Park	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Mooresville	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Mooresboro	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Morehead City	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Morganton	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Morrisville	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Morven	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Mount Airy	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Mount Holly	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Mount Olive	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Mount Ulla	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Moyock	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53
Murphy	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77
Nashville	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Navassa	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
New Bern	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Newport	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Newton	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Norlina	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
North Wilkesboro	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Norwood	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Oakboro	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91
Oak City	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Old Fort	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Oriental	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Oxford	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Pantego	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Parkton	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Pembroke	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Pinehurst	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Pinetops	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Pinnacle	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Pittsboro	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Plymouth	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Pollocksville	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Polkton	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Potecasi	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Powellsville	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Princeton	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Proctorville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Putnam	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Raeford	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Raleigh	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Ramseur	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Randleman	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Randolphs	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Ranger	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77
Red Springs	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Reidsville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Rich Square	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Roanoke Rapids	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Robbins	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Robinsville	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81	2.81
Robersonville	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Rockfish	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Rockingham	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Rockton	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Rocky Mount	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Roduco	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53
Roseboro	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Rosman	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86
Rowland	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Roxboro	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Roxobel	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Ruffin	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Rural Hall	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Rutherfordton	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
St Paul	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Salisbury	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Saluda	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Sanatorium	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Sanford	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Scotland Neck	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Seagrove	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Seaforth	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Selma	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Shawboro	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55
Shelby	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Siler City	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Siloam	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Smithfield	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Snowden	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.55
Southmont	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Southern Pines	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Spencer	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Spindale	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Spray	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Spring Hope	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Spruce Pine	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71
Stacey	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Stantonsburg	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Star	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Statesville	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Stem	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Stokesdale	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Stoneville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Stovall	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Sylva	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Tabor City	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Tarboro	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Taylorsville	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86

Destination	Bidder													
	Alpha	Cumberland	Giant	Lehigh	Lone Star	Medusa	National	North American	Pennsylvania-Dixie	Signal Mountain	Standard	Southern States	Universal	Volunteer
	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price	Destination price
Thermal City	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78	$2.78
Thomasville	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Tillery	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Toecane	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71	2.71
Topton	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77	2.77
Trinity	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Troutmans	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Troy	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Tryon	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
Tunis	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53
Vanceboro	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Vandemere	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Varina	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Valdese	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Vass	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Verona	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Wadesboro	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Wagram	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Wake Forest	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72
Wallace	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Walnut Cove	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Warrenton	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Warren Plains	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Warrensville	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Warsaw	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Washington	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Waxhaw	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
Waynesville	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Weldon	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
West End	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.87
West Jefferson	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74
Whitakers	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Whiteville	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83
Whittier	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.82
Willard	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76
Williamston	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Wilmington	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Wilson	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Windsor	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.68
Winston-Salem	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
Winterville	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64
Woodland	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61	2.61
Zebulon	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76	2.76

NOTE I.—All the prices quoted above are for delivery in cloth bags.
NOTE II.—The price of high early strength portland cement will be 50 cents per barrel higher than the price for normal portland cement.
NOTE III.—A cash discount of 10 cents per barrel will be allowed for full payment of invoices within 15 days of the invoice date.

BASING-POINT BIDS TO NORTH CAROLINA MUST HAVE BEEN MADE AND CHECKED BY ONE MAN

The prices offered by all bidders were identical. In other words, 14 bidders, bidding to more than 350 destinations, bid prices which were identical. Surely, the law of averages would have had a few prices different. But such was not the case. Therefore, it is a logical assumption that all bids were made and checked by a central figure or a complete affinity of understanding in some written form must have existed among the 14 bidders to produce such perfection.

SMALL BUSINESS VICTIMS OF BASING-POINT PRICING

If our Federal and State Governments could not break through the stronghold of basing-point pricing monopolies, trying as they did year after year, what chance has small business in the face of such tactics, unless the Congress and the courts lend a firm supporting hand to our antitrust laws?

Without this aid, and standing alone, small-business enterprise is in jeopardy. Let us have no moratorium on justice. To the contrary, let us turn our thoughts toward an America free of monopolies; an America where the keystone of our economy—small business—can go forward without looking fearfully over its shoulder at the deepening shadows cast by untrammeled greed and avarice.

Editorial From Long Beach (Calif.) Newspaper on United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for your reading and consideration an editorial which appeared in one of the daily newspapers in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., under date of Monday, April 25, 1949. On the 8th of April 1949, on the floor of this House, I undertook to briefly, but emphatically, urge to your attention that I felt the United Nations Organization was the first hope of world peace. Part of my brief remarks at that time were as follows:

I, from my native State of California, have the utmost faith in the United Nations as the first and best hope for world understanding and cooperation. It was so conceived. It has done a good job; I pray God that its sinews shall be strengthened and perpetuated as a strong, virile, vigilant group.

I am very happy and proud that this daily paper in my own home city has taken its editorial time and space to again call to the attention of its readers the fact that the United Nations Organization has great potential value and that, without the United Nations Organization functioning vigorously and vigilantly, there will be little hope of world peace. I commend the reading of this editorial to your individual and group attention:

ONLY 4 YEARS AGO

It was 4 years ago today 48 nations met in San Francisco to form the United Nations Organization. It was a meeting full of hope. It was planned that the nations would set up a world police force to keep any aggressor from enslaving other nations. The Organization was formed, but the police force was never made a part of the Organization.

During the 4 years since that meeting many nations have been enslaved by the aggressions of Russia. There is constant danger of war because Russia has refused to abide by the principles set out in the UN Charter. War goes on in China. There has been violation of the UN decision by the Dutch in Indonesia. There has not been one major disturbance stopped by UN action. But 4 years is a short time as history is measured.

The UN is meeting in New York City at this time. There are other meetings being held under its directives in other parts of the world. It is now composed of 54 nations and is a place where those nations come together to discuss world affairs. There never has been an organization so set up where so many nations participated.

Being weak because it has no police power, the Organization could do nothing when Russia seized Poland or Czechoslovakia. It has no power in China as the Communist

armies march south. Its weakness stems from the veto which has been used so many times by Russia. By the veto rule one nation can nullify the decisions upon which all the other nations agree.

Although it has become little more than a debating society, the UN still has great potential value. It has been said that as long as men meet and talk over their problems, they will not fight. This was proved a fallacy when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor at the moment her representatives were talking peace in Washington. But there is hope when 54 nations are constantly meeting in an effort to keep the peace.

To take the place of a UN police force, the North Atlantic alliance has been formed. It is recognized as being within the meaning of the UN Charter which allows regional nations to combine their forces for mutual protection. It thus, in effect, becomes a part of the UN. In so doing it strengthens the whole structure. It is something added now which was intended when the nations met 4 years ago.

We, like many others, have been greatly disappointed that the Organization has been unable to guarantee peace. But it seems peace is more assured today than it was a year ago. The nations are meeting constantly and are cooperating to a greater extent than ever before. Four years is a short time. The United Nations continues to be the only world forum. We should continue to support its efforts to bring lasting peace. Without it there would be little hope. With it, there is always hope.—L. A. C.

Peace, It's Terrible—Humorous Sidelights by Columnist Othman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Peace, It's Terrible," by Fred Othman, published in the Washington Daily News of April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE, IT'S TERRIBLE
(By Fred Othman)

Everything was glittering in the Senate caucus room, including the gold stud in the shirt front of the only Senator who looks like a Senator—the white-haired and hot-tempered Chairman TOM CONNALLY, of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The glitter came from the high-power television lamps, cunningly wired into the mammoth chandeliers and throwing multicolored prisms of light from the crystals on Senators, statesmen, and awed high-school students alike.

Awed was right. Up for consideration was ratification of the North Atlantic treaty, and what beats me is why the more important the subject the duller is the palaver that surrounds it. This was important, indeed. And much of the time it was pretty durn difficult to figure out what Warren R. Austin, the United States Delegate to the United Nations, was talking about.

Well, sir, up on the wall was a giant map of the world, showing which nations already had signed the pact that everybody hopes will end wars. And some genius, so help me, had painted out the signatory nations in a dead, flat black. I never did see such a funereal-looking map at what should have been such a joyous occasion.

So Ambassador Austin, who used to be a Senator himself, told in language ponderous why he believed the Atlantic Pact was a good idea.

Four years ago, it seems, the Senators thought they were ending all chance of war when they concocted the United Nations out in San Francisco. They still think it would have worked if it hadn't been for those Communists in Russia going back on their word. That wasn't all. Every time the other nations thought up a good idea the Soviets vetoed it. Thirty times so far they have used the veto, said Austin in a sepulchral voice.

So what we need now, he continued, is the Atlantic Treaty as a kind of backstop for the UN. If anybody starts a war (and it was obvious he was thinking about Russia and nobody else), then the UN gets first chance to stop it. If it can't—and at the moment it seems powerless in this line—then all the fellows who signed the Atlantic Treaty would hop in with their guns to help out the pal who was poked in the eye. This includes us and 11 other nations.

Austin said he figured this treaty in itself probably would scare off any world-wide bullies. And as the UN began to function better and better, he said there would be less and less need for the treaty.

So fine. Along came Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, who said that if the western nations were cooperating so well as it is, then what's the real use of them all signing a sheet of paper, promising to cooperate?

This made Austin sore. He blew up. He shouted, and when finally he calmed down his fingers were trembling. And that's the way it is these days with international peacemakers. Always getting sore and whacking each other with their olive branches.

Endorsements of the Work of the DAV and the DAV Service Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of endorsements of the work of the DAV and of the DAV Service Foundation. I believe that these endorsements will be of real interest to my colleagues and to the American people because they indicate the tremendous and unanimous support of outstanding authorities in this field.

ENDORSEMENTS

Veterans who are disabled as the result of service in the defense of our Nation can never be repaid for the sacrifices they have made. In acknowledging this, our Government accepts a sacred obligation. That obligation is embodied in Public Law No. 16, which provides for the physical and occupational rehabilitation of disabled veterans whose abilities for earning a livelihood have been weakened or destroyed through service to the Nation in war.

The Veterans' Administration is dedicated to carrying out to the utmost the determination of the American people to provide practical and permanent rehabilitation "for those who gave most," the disabled veterans of our Nation.

In this task the Veterans' Administration is receiving valued cooperation from veterans' organizations, employers, and public and private agencies in local communities throughout our land. The help afforded by the Disabled American Veterans is an essential part of this common American enterprise.

As Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I know what the cooperation of the Disabled American Veterans has meant to Veterans Administration in fulfilling its mission. I am sure that the help that the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation gives to our disabled veterans is an important service to the cause of veterans' affairs. (Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

The Disabled American Veterans represents in its name, in its purpose and its accomplishments those veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country. They—more than any others—deserve first call on all we can do.

The DAV has been a great help to us in this important work. We welcomed this help in the past. We count confidently on it for the future.

I am pleased to add my endorsement of the National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Certainly, this program, which has for its objective the rendering of service to those who served, is a worthy one. It merits the support of all who are interested in the welfare of our disabled ex-servicemen. Your efforts are commendable and I wish for your program the success it deserves. (Gen. Omar N. Bradley, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

I want to express to you my admiration of the services which the Disabled American Veterans is giving to disabled veterans. Being a World War I veteran and also a lawyer, I can appreciate what your organization is doing.

It stands to reason that if such disabled veterans are to obtain the full protection that Congress intended, many of them will need the advice and help of persons fully familiar with the laws governing the rights of veterans. I do not believe that this is the type of service that usually could be rendered by the ordinary practicing lawyer. Too often the time spent by the lawyer would be out of all proportion to the amount involved and either the lawyer would be underpaid or the veteran overcharged.

It has been suggested, I know, that the Government might employ persons to act as counsel for the disabled veterans. This would, I am sure, be impracticable. Such employees of the Government almost inevitably develop a psychology which causes them to try to save the Government money instead of seeing that absolute justice is done to the veteran.

Your organization's method for solving this problem is admirable, namely, the training of war-handicapped men as specialists in veterans' legislation who can advise and help a disabled veteran in securing the benefits that Congress and a grateful America want the veterans to have. Your program deserves the support of all. (Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator.)

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S COMMENTS

I am delighted to hear that you are taking effective steps to raise substantial sums for this purpose. Your efforts will be fully rewarded in the lasting appreciation of veterans who will have sacrificed so much for the cause for which we are fighting. (Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

I accept life membership in the Disabled American Veterans with a sense of distinction. Membership in no group in the world carries greater honor than does membership in the Disabled American Veterans. (Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur.)

Be assured that we of the American Federation of Labor who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. (William Green, president, American Federation of Labor.)

The job of providing physical and occupational rehabilitation for America's war wounded and disabled veterans can be accomplished only with the effective cooperation of many other public and private agencies, citizens, and employers. Among the cooperating associations, the Disabled American Veterans has been outstanding.

The DAV helps the Veterans' Administration to help America's war-disabled veterans. Its incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, in turn helps the DAV to maintain its Nation-wide set-up of nearly 300 full-time, trained national service officers. Their technical information, advice, and assistance to individual disabled veterans, and their practical liaison with governmental agencies and prospective employers, has been of such great value as to have justified the Veterans' Administration in furnishing office facilities for them in all of its regional, district, and central offices.

Generous public support of the DAV Service Foundation will assure continuance of the DAV's valuable service activities for the benefit of America's war wounded and disabled veterans and their dependents. (O. W. Clark, Deputy Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration.)

This is to express my appreciation for the important work undertaken by the DAV, on behalf of those who have given more to their country than can ever be fully repaid. Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help those handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled. (Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.)

The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work. (Robert R. Wason, former president, National Association of Manufacturers.)

The Nation's first obligation surely is to stand by its fighting men disabled in the line of duty. The DAV's success in this drive should be desired by all citizens, for an adequate DAV staff will mean that those who have bravely fought and bled for us all will not be disinherited and forgotten. Many pleas are made to the American public. This is one campaign that surely merits the generous support of every one of us. (Editorial, the New York Times.)

STATEMENTS BY TWO AMERICAN PRESIDENTS

The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces who become disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is, indeed, a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens. (The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.)

The Disabled American Veterans are performing a most useful function in helping disabled comrades to help themselves. As I told you during your visit to the White House, our disabled veterans deserve every assistance within the power of the American people.

Surely, in this postwar reconversion period there is no more important and timely work to be done than that of assisting disabled veterans. All Americans should cooperate in the great task of helping these veterans to make as complete a transition as possible to productive civilian life.

I feel certain that all organizations and individuals who are interested in the welfare of our country will assist you. (President Harry S. Truman.)

In a message recently issued to the American public by General Wainwright, the foundation's appeal is put in a nutshell.

"The DAV," General Wainwright said, "maintains a Nation-wide staff of trained service officers. These men, disabled veterans themselves, are on constant duty in all Veterans' Administration offices * * * to help their disabled buddies with all their problems * * * employment, compensation, insurance, hospitalization, and social. They have rendered effective, material assistance to more than a million disabled veterans in their fight to regain independence, security, and happiness, to again lead normal, wholesome, productive lives.

"So, as a good American, will you cooperate by helping us to continue this vital, humanitarian work for the boys who fought for you?"

Citizens who are grateful for the sacrifices of America's disabled veterans will, I feel sure, generously support the vitally important service program sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

How Much Will Free Medicine Cost?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Will Free Medicine Cost?" published in the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise of April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH WILL FREE MEDICINE COST?

The social planners, who believe that the world should be made over to agree with their own viewpoint, have introduced in Congress a bill to provide health insurance, with free medical treatment for everyone.

But free treatment doesn't mean that at all. According to reliable estimates this so-called free treatment would be very expensive indeed.

The bill is misleading because it does not call for any specific appropriations to put it into effect. It says merely that Congress is authorized to appropriate as much as will be needed for each of the services proposed.

Not even the backers of the bill will come out with an estimate of its cost because they have no idea of what it will take to put the various health plans into effect.

A 3-percent pay-roll tax is proposed, but that admittedly is but a nominal amount to raise funds with which to start the health plan, not to put it into effect.

Complete medical service for everybody, including all the appliances needed for the ill, including crutches, wheel chairs, ambulances, false teeth, eyeglasses, and the like, could mount up to an enormous sum.

It would be necessary to educate thousands more young people every year to become doctors, nurses, dentists, various kinds of technicians, and to fill all the other occupations which would go with health services.

One cannot imagine the extent to which the program would expand because the socialization of medicine would mean the necessity to socialize or control related industries.

Take food, for example. Undoubtedly diet has a great deal to do with health and if the Government is to guarantee good health to everyone it might be necessary to supervise the Nation's diet.

Or to go off on another tack. Some people say that thoughts control the functions of the body and that health of the body is related to health of the mind. Will it become necessary for the Government to see to it that everyone thinks proper thoughts and is free from all kinds of mental tensions and worry which contribute to ill health?

To confine ourselves to the bill before Congress, the American Medical Assocation estimates that the bare services called for in the health-insurance bill will be $6,000,000,000 a year. Hospitals and schools and ambulances and eye correction and fixing of teeth would be extra.

W. Rulon Williamson, former actuary of the Social Security Board, who should have a pretty good idea about what is eventually planned by the bureaucrats, estimates that the ultimate cost of the program could go as high as 18 percent of the pay roll of the Nation, might reach a plausible medium of 12½ percent, and would be at least 7 percent, depending upon what free services were insisted upon.

The mounting costs of socialized medicine in England and New Zealand indicates that no matter what plan this country finally adopts, it will be at least twice as costly as the first estimates.

No, we can rest assured that if the Government gets its finger into the health problem of the Nation the taxpayers and the wage-earners will not find that its service is free.

Noted Columnist Justifies Senators Watkins and Donnell in Efforts to Get Truth on Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "In the Nation—The Two Senators on the Far Left," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of May 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE TWO SENATORS ON THE FAR LEFT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—Senate committees tend to become exclusive inner cadres of the exclusive club which is the Senate itself, and they do not relish intrusion upon their deliberations by Senators who are nonmembers. This attitude has exposed, currently, Senators WATKINS, of Utah, and DONNELL, of Missouri, to a good deal of scorn, irony, and shouting in the hearings on the North Atlantic Pact before the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which they don't belong.

But the belief that they are performing a very useful service to a country which too often has been misled on foreign policy it was

asked to approve, and the hope that the country may realize this, seem to sustain them.

Senators WATKINS and DONNELL sit with the committee by sufferance, and on the far left. They are allowed to question the witnesses only after committee members have finished their interrogations. At that point Chairman CONNALLY usually emphasizes the "allowed" part of the arrangement. But in their meek, resolute way the two Senators plod ahead in their campaign to evoke a full and informing debate on constitutional and other issues implicit in the North Atlantic Pact, which they obviously fear would not be forthcoming if the committee did all the questioning.

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

In a letter to Chairman CONNALLY on March 23, requesting the privilege now enjoyed by the two Senators, they virtually gave that reason for the request. "In view of the probability," they wrote, "that the committee has nearly, or perhaps entirely, arrived at the conclusion [that the treaty should be approved in the form submitted by the Department of State], we think * * * every other Senator should be granted the right of participation in both the public hearings and executive sessions to be held by that committee respecting the treaty." Agreeing that nonmembers of the committee should have no voting rights, they asked, however, for permission to question witnesses directly. And they slyly pointed out that among the precedents was the fact that Chairman CONNALLY himself had been "permitted to interrogate witnesses" in connection with a Texas judicial nomination before a committee of which Mr. CONNALLY was not a member.

Their line of inquiry thus far indicates that they are attempting to stimulate complete candor by advocates of the treaty on these points: (1) to what degree, in effect, the pact eludes the constitutional provision that Congress alone may declare war; (2) to what degree it transfers from Congress to the President's decision as to when and how the armed forces of the United States shall be employed to carry out, through creation of a state of war, the obligations assumed with the co-signatory nations.

The two Senators joined forces to this purpose last winter when Mr. WATKINS arose in the Chamber now and then to state anxieties about the North Atlantic Pact and concluded from certain remarks by Mr. DONNELL that the Missouri Senator was of the same mind. Consultation led to the letter of March 23 to Chairman CONNALLY and the presence of the intruders on the far left of the committee table.

"They form a strange pair," is the comment of a daily observer. "They seem a little forlorn, but profoundly determined, a little wilted, but still implacably upright under the chairman's heavy scorn. He treats them as men toward whom charity has worn a little thin, sometimes grumbling remarks in what is rather too loud to be *sotto voice*.

HAVE CLARIFIED ISSUES

But their conscientiousness surmounts all this, and they undoubtedly have clarified the issues and improved the hearings. Whether their efforts will dispose of troublesome questions for Chairman CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG in the floor debate does not seem probable, and there are those who charge them with precisely the opposite purpose. But clearly Mr. WATKINS and Mr. DONNELL are primarily interested in apprising the Senate and the people of the full potential of the treaty before it is approved, both with respect to the obligation to which it commits the United States and the means and methods by which that obligation will be executed. When one recalls that lend-lease was represented by administration spokesmen as a measure leading away from our involvement in World War II, this effort becomes even more commendable.

The Secretary of State has been much more candid than some of his predecessors in conceding the facts of a bold administration proposal in foreign policy. Mr. Lovett, the former Under Secretary of State, was no less, frank, though the questioning took him onto technical ground. The testimony of John Foster Dulles squarely met the issue the two Senators are attempting to clarify. They cannot claim responsibility for this, yet the product is what they are after.

But whether candor or subtlety dominates Senate debate on the treaty, neither tactic can dissolve these realities:

The North Atlantic Treaty commits the United States to regard an attack on one signatory as an attack on all, including the United States. If ratified, it becomes the supreme law of the land. The President is sworn to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. While he may not execute the treaty, before resort to Congress, by methods and means that will put this Nation in a state of war, that will depend on circumstances of which inevitably he will be the judge.

Cartels Could Strangle America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Junius B. Wood, which appeared in the magazine Nation's Business for May 1949:

CARTELS COULD STRANGLE AMERICA

Like giants licking their wounds before returning to battle, international cartels are raising their heads from the ruins of war.

These Goliaths of world trade, their astute strategy cloaked in secrecy, are now mysterious but dominant factors in the world's hopes and efforts for a permanent peace. In their individual fields, they are world governments by their own right and, in many of those countries which they call home, the actual power over the state.

In the moves made so quietly behind the open conferences, the United States is caught in an amazing position. It is the healthy host on which cartels fatten and profit. Our generous billions are rebuilding European nations that wage economic war on us through powerful international cartels which soon can—and some already do—have their former stranglehold on American security and economy. The appeasement of peace is more bizarre than that of war.

Scholars and diplomats can interpret the issue as an academic test to decide whether free competition—the economy of American democracy—or monopoly which is encouraged and fostered by European governments will survive in the world. To our Government attempting to stock-pile strategic materials for defense, to manufacturers at the mercy of foreign cartels for essential raw materials, to the merchant and businessman and to the millions of Americans who pay the bills, it is not academic but real and vital.

Chaste diplomatic language shuns the word "cartel" as suggestive of evil. International commodity agreement is preferred but it means the same. In the plain language of the United States, a cartel is a monopoly, forbidden by law in this country. When the monopoly is in more than one country, it becomes a cartel. An American member of a cartel can be prosecuted under antitrust laws but most other countries encourage and protect them. They are old in Europe, the first in 1470, when Pope Paul II and King Ferdinand of Naples outlawed competitors and pooled production and profits of their alum mines to fight the Turks and Hussites.

If the United States were practical as well as a good-natured Santa Claus to the world, it would not be a willing victim of cartels which threaten its material well-being. The issue will come before the United Nations. Given the cues by their profitable cartels, nations will vote together. The inclination of the world organization will be to strip the United States of what defensive weapons it has against the powerful combinations. The United States must make its own fight.

Cartels to control manufactured products are the most numerous but the United States with its inventive genius, private initiative, free competition and industrial development knows how to cope with them. The situation is different in the face of world cartels which monopolize the production and distribution of raw materials. American private ingenuity has found substitutes for many basic commodities but the fight to get fair treatment for American producers from raw-material cartels must be made through our Government.

The United States is wholly dependent on imports from abroad for many of the raw materials necessary for industry and daily life. Organization set-up, sources, methods of operation and attitude toward the American market differ for each cartel. Brief sketches of several of the most important show the complicated workings of all.

TIN

No tin mines are in the United States and all is imported, either ore or in bars. Even with such substitutes as electroplating, aluminum foil, ball bearings, plastics, cellophane, glass, paper, and noncoated containers, this country needs half the world production of tin or, on a per capita basis, 10 times that of any other country. Mines are in Bolivia, Malaya, Dutch East Indies, Indochina, Thailand (formerly Siam), Nigeria, Belgium Congo, Portugal and Cornwall.

The International Tin Committee, a cartel of governments—Britain, Holland, Belgium, Bolivia, France, and Thailand—controlled 90 percent of the world's tin until dissolved December 31, 1946. It so effectively blocked our Government's prewar attempts to stockpile tin—indispensable for armaments—that Prof. K. E. Knorr wrote: "Civilization may be liquidated but not the tin producers."

As a war measure, our Government built a smelter and refinery at Texas City, Tex., in 1940. Congress has decided to keep it in production until June 30, 1951. The Tin Processing Corp., a Dutch concern, is employed to operate the plant. This same company has charge of the Dutch Government's East Indian tin properties but no criticism is made of its operation of our plant.

The big grief of our Texas City plant is that it cannot get enough high-grade tin concentrates from the tin-producing countries to run at full capacity though the owner of the plant (United States Government) is financing those countries. The plant gets most of its ore and bars from the Hochschild Armaya and smaller mines in Bolivia. The output of the larger Patino mines—basic wage $90 a year—goes to that corporation's smelters in England. Tin mining by dredges in the East Indies, though crippled by Japanese destruction, is cheaper than the deep shafts of Bolivia and the ore is higher grade, making the Bolivian ore doubly expensive.

Since the announced dissolution of the tin cartel, control and distribution of the world supply operates in the framework of the United Nations. A 14-vote study group—Australia, Canada, India, Malaya and Nigeria, United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Bolivia, China, Thailand, and United States—has $40,000 a year for a secretariat in The Hague and a monthly bulletin. A combined tin committee of eight—Canada, India, United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Netherlands, China, and United States—is in Washington.

The study group keeps abreast of the world tin situation; production, smelting, and consumption. With its estimates for a coming year, the Tin Committee meets each January 1, and allocates the expected surplus output, but only of bar tin, to different countries. Although it does not fix prices, limit production, or decide who shall sell to whom, the United Nations Tin Committee has the practical effect of a tin cartel on which the United States, the only nonproducer, is entirely dependent for this industrial necessity. It shows how this country can fare in the United Nations.

The quota of bar tin allocated to a country is what the Committee decides the country needs, not what it wants. A producing country also can hold as much bar tin out of the surplus pool as it wants for its own use. It can sell crude ore without consulting the Committee. This means that, as long as the United States is a member of the Tin Committee, this country is held down to a ration of bar tin but can buy crude ore from whatever countries will sell. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is the exclusive buyer and no private import licenses are issued.

Bar tin is so compact and valuable that smelter-owning countries have severe penalties for smuggling or bootlegging. Tin ore, on the other hand, contains such a high percentage of waste that shipping it across oceans to a smelter, as the Untied States must do, is a big expense. If this country were assured of an open market to buy bar tin, free from cartel or United Nations control, it could shut down the expensive Texas City smelter.

The richest tin mines are owned by governments. If these monopolists, now operating in the United Nations, won't give the United States more tin as a partial return for its loans—a private pensioner might offer to mow the lawn—they might, at least, permit us to build a smelter near their tin deposits to reduce our transportation costs.

INDUSTRIAL DIAMONDS

Of all cartels, the so-called diamond syndicate has the firmest grip on a prime necessity for American industry. London is its home. DeBeers Consolidated Mines, Ltd., of South Africa is its cornerstone but it operates through three subsidiaries: Diamond Corp., Ltd.; Diamond Producers Association, Ltd.; and Diamond Trading Co., Ltd. During a year it sells more than 95 percent of the world production of diamonds. The only ones it does not sell are from Brazil, Venezuela, or Arkansas. American dealers I talked with have an impression that merely handling these will blacklist them from further purchases from the syndicate.

DeBeers bought into companies operating mines in French, Belgian, and Portuguese African colonies but its subsidiary Diamond Trading Co., Ltd., the exclusive selling agency for all mines, is the cartel's most effective weapon for world control. It was the bright brain child of either Cecil Rhodes or Barney Barnato Isaacs who developed an abandoned digging into one of the world's richest mines. Another South African statesman, Sir Ernest Oppenheimer, brought it to the present perfection. As half the profits of a mine may go to a colony and all pay heavy export duties, the four nations are stanch supporters of the cartel.

The United States is the market for 80 percent of world production of industrial diamonds for cutting tools. While industrials are only 28 percent of the value of world production, they are 85 percent of the weight in carats. A mine produces both gem and industrial stones like prize apples and nubbins from the same tree. The Nation does not weep when fewer gems are added to the jewel boxes of Park Avenue dowagers but when the supply of grubby industrials is choked, American industry slows down from jet plane velocity to an oxcart crawl.

The United States tried to break the syndicate fetters with an antitrust suit in 1945. The allegation was that a bank account, advertising agency, an engineer to buy machinery and other employees in the United States put the syndicate within jurisdiction of American courts. The syndicate answered that it did not do any business in the United States and, last July, the court agreed.

American dealers again go to London to buy diamonds. The syndicate's invitations to sights, as its semiannual sales are known, are limited to dealers who can show a certified bill of exchange for $80,000. Even this evidence of ability to buy does not permit a dealer to rummage through the display to pick out stones. They are separated into series of gem or industrial diamonds and further divided into packages. A buyer must take the bad with the good in a package so the syndicate will not be stuck with inferior stones.

When German invasion threatened London, syndicate offices and stocks migrated. An invitation from its best customer to come to the United States was declined. It settled in Canada and Bermuda and stayed out of our jurisdiction. American dealers did their buying there and the syndicate limited our Government's war reserves to a few weeks' supply of diamonds. It is similarly unresponsive to American present efforts at stock piling. Diamonds still must be found where nature has planted them and the syndicate has fenced in the fields.

QUININE

This is a minor item in our annual trade balance but highly important for the health of the country. The growing of cinchona bark, the source of quinine, is a Dutch colonial monopoly but French, English, and Swiss manufacturers and distributors join the Dutch in fixing prices and quotas throughout the world for the finished malaria remedy.

Some cinchona is grown in Sumatra but 95 percent of the world supply comes from Java where the government owns one-tenth of the plantations. The government forbids the export of seeds or increased plantation acreage and requires licenses for exports of bark and then only to approved manufacturers. Adding to government revenues is the primary purpose of the rigid controls—restricted sales and high prices to consumers and low prices to growers. Natives have burned their crops in protest against the bare subsistence prices offered by the government monopoly.

At the same time, the world and the United States in particular suffered from a lack of quinine. Regardless of the relative efficiency of quinine or atabrine and other substitutes as malaria remedies, the medical profession advises supervision by a physician when using substitutes. Malaria sufferers can dose themselves with quinine.

Anticipating war, this government attempted to lay in a reserve of quinine. Negotiations collapsed when Dutch representatives frankly disclosed that Germany would take all they cared to raise. The lack of quinine showed later in the casualty lists of American troops in tropical climates. One consideration for our aid to the Netherlands might well be that we do not again lack the quinine so necessary for life and health.

MERCURY

Cinnabar has been mined in California, Oregon, Texas, and Arkansas. The New Almaden and New Idria mines in California, the latter worked for 100 years, were the last to close. Mercury content was low and labor costs were high.

The United States now depends entirely on Mercurio Europeo, an Italian and Spanish cartel which fixes production and sales, for our needed mercury. It has many industrial uses and is a must for percussion fuzes. The United States should be able to get enough flasks of mercury for its needs as a slight return for aid it is giving the two countries.

QUEBRACHO

Argentina and Paraguay produce 98 percent of the world supply of the tannin needed for tanning leather. Tannin is extracted from quebracho, the hardest of woods. Producers must get permission from their governments and comply with quotas and prices fixed by the Forestal Land, Timber & Railways Co., Ltd., a British corporation whose Spanish name runs to 12 words. After its subsidiaries in the United States were prosecuted by the Department of Justice in 1943 and 1945, it took a tip from the diamond syndicate and now operates from England, Canada, and South America, beyond reach of our laws but not of our markets.

RUBBER

Until the war, the British and Dutch cartels enjoyed a free hand in fixing rubber quotas and prices in a world which they had divided, with the United States as the largest consumer. Their colonies produced 97 percent of the world supply of natural rubber. Foreseeing trouble in 1939, the United States asked for an increase in its quota but the Dutch said they wanted to stock pile for themselves. The Japanese moved in and our source of natural rubber disappeared.

The Nation's determined efforts to meet the crisis are an industrial epic. Millions were invested in plantations on the Amazon where wild trees supplied half the needs of the world 30 years earlier. Factories were built to reclaim used rubber but the greatest accomplishment was a dozen plants to produce synthetic or chemical rubber.

These facilities are Government-owned and privately operated. Congress has decided that they must produce at least one-third of their full capacity until June 30, 1950. Improvements and experience have cut production costs down to those for natural rubber.

East India plantations also are again producing at close to their prewar capacity. Cutting down trees was more difficult for the Japanese than wrecking tin-mining machinery.

Rubber may be the bellwether which will disclose the attitude of the United Nations toward moves of the United States to protect itself from exploitation by cartels. Though not yet stated in open meeting, it has been suggested that if the United States puts into practice its policies for stimulating world trade, supplying other nations with dollar exchange and aiding people of all backward areas, it will withdraw from competition with their production. That could mean closing the synthetic-rubber plants which protect this country from again depending entirely on the cartel.

Those nations which profit so richly from cartels would vote for that. The United States must fight alone. It has the tools if it will use them.

"Combine our international lending with our Government stock piling," is a mild suggestion of Prof. G. A. Briefs, who has many

years of cartel observation behind him. "Cartel countries could be asked for collateral—tin, industrial diamonds or other items on the stock-pile list—when they receive a loan. That is sound banking practice."

The Marshall plan and the Export-Import Bank of Washington assure this Government of sympathetic hearings by nations receiving American loans. American funds can be a powerful leverage on cartel-minded nations. The home addresses of cartels beyond the reach of American laws are in countries receiving loans from the United States. The cartels are not beyond control by those countries. The cartels are big revenue producers for the countries but the governments may consider it better business to tone down cartel demands on the United States and continue receiving loans.

Tariffs and trade are outmoded weapons in an age where all are friends around the table but they can have their uses. Public opinion and good will also have weight, especially with a generous giver. Such drastic and unpleasant remedies should not be necessary. In fairness, American Goverment and industry should be freed from exactions of quotas and prices by cartels which operate from countries receiving United States aid.

That is only fair exchange. It will be far from an even trade but the United States can charge off its short end of the bargain as a prodigal investment for the good of mankind and world peace.

A few months ago 22 nations sat down with our representatives and tabulated what materials they needed from our $16,000,000,000 Marshall plan. They also needed loans from the bank. All transactions should not be one-sided.

It is time to sit down again and tabulate what we need from them—the materials which American industry must have to survive and certainly the 67 commodities which our Government is stock piling for national security.

The Marshall plan already has distributed $4,000,000,000. The Export-Import Bank has made loans. Agreements to protect the United States and its industry from the extortions of foreign cartels must be signed before the last balances are distributed and this country finds itself stripped of bargaining strength.

Bargaining should not be necessary in the first place—merely fair treatment for our country.

Basing-Point Parent Earns Greatest Sum in 20 Years—Big Steel Net for First Quarter 1949 Nearly $50,000,000—Moratorium Would Provide Blank Check on Small-Business Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, without benefit of the basing-point system, the United States Steel Corp., according to an AP dispatch reported in the Washington Star, April 27, 1949, earned more in the first quarter of 1949 than in any like period in 20 years. Had the unearned increment of phantom freight been added to these stupendous earnings that sum might have been many millions more.

After the Cement decision the colossus of the steel industry abandoned the basing-point system. But, Big Steel, the father and perfecter of the phantom twins, "basing point" and "Pittsburgh plus," does not give up easily. Its hand stayed by the courts, Big Steel relies upon the Congress of the United States to obtain the authority it now lacks to once more use the basing-point system.

SMALL BUSINESS THE LOSER UNDER THE MORATORIUM BILL

United States Steel, also a leading exponent of the art of merger, consolidation, integration, and expansion, continues to grow day and night beyond all reasonable bounds. If the Congress intends to preserve and strengthen small-business enterprise and to maintain a healthy business structure, then the moratorium nor any other bill of like character will be allowed to pass.

Keeping in mind the earnings of Big Steel were for only one quarter, the annual rate would approximate $200,000,000. The Wall Street Journal of April 27, in a comparison of the March quarter for 1948 and 1949, shows the 1949 quarter net earnings were almost twice that of the 1948 quarter for the same period.

The Wall Street Journal also brings out the point that "authorized projects still to be completed amounted to $238,000,000 as of March 31. This means a total postwar facilities program of $986,000,000." Think of it—almost a billion dollars dedicated to the cause of monopoly.

It is a grave question indeed when we consider the import of the vast expansion programs that this and other corporations have under way. The intensified programs of integratian, of purchase of competing plants, and of the general expansion of big business should make us pause and meditate upon the direction in which we are going.

Our country has been made great by the effort expended by individuals, whether they be farmers, merchants, manufacturers, miners, or any other form of endeavor under our freedom of choice in vocation or avocation.

I know of no better way to preserve and strengthen our economy than to preserve and strengthen our antitrust laws, certainly the passage of a moratorium bill is diametrically opposed to that proposition.

The article from the Washington Evening Star follows:

BIG STEEL EARNINGS FOR QUARTER LARGEST IN NEARLY 20 YEARS

NEW YORK, April 27.—Business prospects of the steel industry had a sharp vote of confidence today from its largest producer—United States Steel Corp.

Big Steel reported its net income for the first 3 months of 1949 was $49,928,670, largest in nearly 20 years.

The company shipped more steel products—5,491,216 tons—than it ever has in any previous 3-month period.

$1.50 A SHARE DIVIDEND

Its directors boosted the dividend on common stock to $1.50 a share from the previous $1.25, which had been paid since December 1947. It may be noted, however, that a special $1 additional payment was made 3 months ago.

Irving S. Olds, United States Steel chairman of the board, said he hoped dividend payments of this size could be continued. He added the company expected high-level operations to extend "into the third quarter" in the absence of labor difficulties or national catastrophe.

"Business is holding up very well," Mr. Olds told a news conference yesterday after the earnings and dividends were announced. He said the backlog of orders represented 4 to 5 months of operations at current output levels. New orders in the first quarter were 10 percent ahead of the like 1948 period, although the March rate was around 7 percent under that of the final 1948 quarter.

COMPARISON OF EARNINGS

The first-quarter net income was equal to $5.01 a common share and compares with $27,857,341 or $2.48 a share in the like 1948 period, and $41,510,274 or $4.05 a share in the preceding quarter.

United States Steel announced its figures after the New York Stock Market had closed, with the final sale of its common stock here made at $72.25 a share. At San Francisco, where trading still was in progress, price of the shares climbed to a closing figure of $73.50.

The second largest producer in the industry—Bethlehem Steel Corp.—reports its first-quarter results tomorrow.

Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list furnished me by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia of some of the properties and owners who are under active consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY AND OWNER

1317 Ninth Street NW.: Edeleen, Milton.
1323 Ninth Street NW.: Bell, Myrtler.
1230 Tenth Street NW.; Miller, Thomas.
1236 Tenth Street NW.: Taylor, Fountain L.
1238 Tenth Street NW.: Miller, Thomas.
405 Fifty-third Street NE.: Berry, Spencer S.
1213½ Blodgen Court NW.: Hoy, Lewis F.
1907 Capital Avenue NE.: Steward, Gillard J. and Annie J.
220 D Street NW.: Webster, John C. or G.
18 Dingman Court NW.: Lloyd, Fannie L.
19 Dingman Court NW.: Ball, John E.
20 Dingman Court NW.: Nelson, Joe.
21 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Charlotte.
22 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Charlotte.
23 Dingman Court NW.: National Tax Investment Co., Inc.
24 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Blanche Catherine.

25 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Blanche Catherine.
26 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Blanche Catherine.
28 Dingman Court NW.: Lockwood, Blanche Catherine.
29 Dingman Court NW.: Slattery, Mary E.
30 Dingman Court NW.: Slattery, Mary E.
515 Dingman Court NW.: Cusick, Marie Louise.
517 Dingman Court NW.: Cusick, Marie Louise.
112 F Street SW.: Nash, Charles M. and Doris H.
114 F Street SW.: Nash, Charles M. and Doris H.
116 F Street SW.: Nash, Charles M. and Doris H.
118 F Street SW.: Nash, Charles M. and Doris H.
5923 Foote Street NE.: Hall, James.
326 G Street SW.: Downey, John F.
326 Pleasant Court SW.: Downey, John F.
328 Pleasant Court SW.: Downey, John F.
303 H Street SW.: Cullinane, Mary A.
19 McCullough Court NW.: Cummings, Carl S.
20 McCullough Court NW.: Lockwood, Blanche C.
21 McCullough Court NW.: Harris, Lillian V.
22 McCullough Court NW.: Cummings, Carl S.
23 McCullough Court NW.: Mayton, Waverly E. and Geraldine G.
24 McCullough Court NW.: Mayton, Waverly E. and Geraldine G.
25 McCullough Court NW.: Mayton, Waverly E. and Geraldine G.
426 New York Avenue NW.: Morgan, John W.
418 Ridge Street NW.: Troiano, Mary E.
420 Ridge Street NW.: Troiano, Mary E.
434 Ridge Street NW.: Robinson, Willis.
455½ Ridge Street NW.: Lopatin, Harry.
457½ Ridge Street NW.: Lopatin, Harry.
459½ Ridge Street NW.: Lopatin, Harry.
13 Virginia Avenue SW.: Miller, Emilie A.
15 Virginia Avenue SW.: Settle, G. W. and May C. W.
17 Virginia Avenue SW.: Miller, Emilie A.
323 B Street NE.: Drown, Marian Julia.
325 B Street NE.: Drown, Marian Julia.
303 New York Avenue NW.: Greenburg, Harry and Anna.
305 New York Avenue NW.: Gibbs, Constance H.
307 New York Avenue NW.: Schlesberg, Jack and Dorothy.
309 New York Avenue NW.: Schlesberg, Jack and Dorothy.
311 New York Avenue NW.: Schlesberg, Jack and Dorothy.
313 New York Avenue NW.: Keefer, Gertrude M. and Ethel L.
2140 Eighth Street NW.: Guildfield Baptist Church, Inc.
531 Fifteenth Street NW.: Wall, Kit, Jr.
1927 Capitol Avenue NE.: Lewis, Landon H.
413 Ridge Street NW.: Kern, Anna L.
448 Ridge Street NW.: Davis, Kemp.
450 Ridge Street NW.: Elkins, Philip L.
452 Ridge Street NW.: Barrett, William F.
454 Ridge Street NW.: Montegomery, Louise.
456 Ridge Street NW.: Kettler, Carl.
458 Ridge Street NW.: Trachtenberg, Sarah.
460 Ridge Street NW.: Trachtenberg, Sarah.
429 Ridge Street NW.: Hughly, Charles W.
28 D Street SE.: Walling, Helen M.
433 Ridge Street NW.: East, Philip and Irene.
435 Ridge Street NW.: East, Philip and Irene.

The Bold New Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Bold New Program," published in the Reporter for April 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM—CAN WE LEARN TO EXPAND IN A CIVILIZED WAY?

Not long after President Truman delivered his inaugural address, Secretary of the Interior Krug told the Eighty-first Congress that American reserves of certain industrial materials were virtually nil. Krug was not out to chill the Nation's blood: he was not at that moment telling the usual story of resources that had been plundered or squandered in the customary reckless ways. He was referring to resources that the United States had never contained in quantity—minerals and metals, for the most part, with singular, useful properties. In the last few decades, American technology has learned how to use them in the production of everything from truck bodies to antitank shells; having discovered the advantages of these largely un-American materials, our technicians now cannot get along without them. They come from most of the continents and islands of the world. If they were to cease coming, American production would be severely disorganized. Some phases of it could scarcely continue at all.

American technology runs largely on electricity. To be controlled, electricity must be insulated. Mica, the best insulator known, comes primarily from India. American technology is built very largely of steel, partly of aluminum. Chrome is a necessary ingredient of stainless steel. The best chrome ore comes from Russia. Aluminum has replaced steel for many purposes. The best bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is extracted, comes from Latin America. The harder the uses to which steel and aluminum are put, the higher the temperatures they must withstand, the greater the pressures they are designed to resist—the more they must be alloyed with metals like cobalt and chromium, molybdenum and vanadium and nickel.

Altogether there are about 150 metals and minerals on which the prosperity of the United States in peace and the security of the United States in war depend. Not many are found in sufficient quantity and quality on the mainland or our island possessions. In 1946 the United States imported from overseas 97 percent of its manganese, 100 percent of its tin ore, 73 percent of its tungsten, 40 percent of its vanadium, 47 percent of its bauxite, and unusually high percentages of about 90 other indispensable metals and minerals.

The United States dependence on the rest of the world is most conspicuous when it comes to metals, but it is not confined to them. In 1946 all the fiber and natural rubber consumed by American industry, and one-quarter of the vegetable oils were shipped in from overseas. Nor is it likely that, among metals, our impoverishment will continue to apply only to obscure ones; the supply of high-grade rich iron ore in the Mesabi Range can be expected to last only a generation or so.

The percentages show the proportion of key minerals imported by the United States the year after the war ended. During the war, America requires far more substantial imports. The weapons of modern warfare, guided missiles, jet planes, and so on, require an increasing amount of chrome, bauxite, and the rest. Congress has appropriated $800,000,000 to stock pile such materials, but no adequate reserve of them can ever be accumulated. The industries of cold war—even those of peace—consume the metals and minerals too rapidly. If American industry is to maintain its present output, still more if it is to expand, the supply of raw materials from the rest of the world must be abundant and dependable.

The scarce metals and minerals prevent us from reverting to continental or even hemispheric isolationism. If the pressing demands of technology could force us into technocracy, we would have to plant the American flag on every land in the world. We cannot even dream of doing this; and under no circumstances would we do it. We need the availability of raw materials without assuming the burden of conquering and ruling over every country where they are to be found. We do not want forcefully to impose a pax Americana; we would not know how to. Neither do we want to establish a new type of dollar diplomacy—a scarce-metals diplomacy. We need a global policy as vast and at the same time as intricate and varied as the globe itself. We need an efficient system of organization, in which the possessors and the consumers of the raw materials participate as equals.

With this problem confronting America, the President proclaimed, on Inauguration Day, his program of making the benefits of our scientific knowledge and industrial progress available to underdeveloped areas.

In these areas—the zones of the diseased, the shabbily dressed, the inadequately fed—a large part of the raw materials that the United States requires lies under or grows in the earth. Now that we count so heavily upon these underdeveloped areas, their inhabitants, for our sake as well as for theirs, cannot remain underdeveloped. If we can effectively pass on to them some measure of technical skill, adequately supported by capital investment, they will be able to produce or extract or grow their special materials in greater volume and with greater steadiness than they can now. The same and similar skills can raise their standards of living, lower their death and disease rates, and provide them with more to eat and to wear. The part of our patrimony that the program offers to share—our technical ability—is, says the President, inexhaustible.

The generosity of the idea is matched only by the difficulty of its realization. Carried out hurriedly, on the assumption that each one of our skills is by itself a miraculous cure-all, the project might bring about nasty results.

The introduction of a new technique presents only minor difficulties in a society that already employs a multitude of modern techniques. By using hybrid corn, European farmers can get larger crops from the same land without increasing their labor. Europe is prepared to make use of the augmented supply; the roads and railroads, the depots and mills to handle the extra corn are already there. But bringing a new technique into a nonindustrial society—where the texture of civilization is spotty and precarious—may be profitless and even highly dangerous.

One of the dangers is that, with the acquisition of a new medical or technological skill, an area will be confronted by an explosive, and temporarily unmanageable, increase in population. In 1945, a village of 3,000 people in British Guiana was chosen for an experiment in the elimination of malaria. Previously, the birth rate and the death

rate of the village were evenly balanced. Three hundred and fifty of every thousand children died in infancy. By 1947, DDT had exterminated most of the malaria mosquitoes. The birth rate had doubled; infant mortality had gone down to 67 a thousand. So now the suburb needs more of everything—food, houses, and furniture—and if these are not provided, poverty may keep the population down as disease once did.

The simple passage of a skill from the west to the east, Africa, and the islands—instruction in killing flies, opening mines, cross-pollenizing plants, or operating machines—may mean very little in itself even when it is not actually hazardous.

Not long ago, for example, the British discovered a method of doing away with the tsetse fly, which for centuries had prevented the raising of healthy cattle in South Africa. If South Africa receives sufficient quantities of tsetse killer, it can be made safe for steers. Not enough feed, however, can be grown in or near the best cattle country to support large herds. There is suitable land for cultivating feed farther north, but it cannot be used until it is cleared and drained, until roads and houses are built, and machinery is installed. If all this were done, a railroad would have to be built to bring the feed to the cattle and another to move the cattle to the sea for export. The elimination of the tsetse fly, in itself, will not increase the world supply of meat, unless it is accompanied by an array of other skills and enterprises of great magnitude.

A great many techniques—each of which picks up where another leaves off—will have to be introduced into the backward areas. This means the shipment of machines, the importation of fuel to make them function, the establishment of training schools.

All this requires capital. The capital can come only from the governments and the businessmen who have it—mostly those of the West. Foreign investors will shy away from enterprises in underdeveloped areas unless they are protected against some of the hazards of investment—sudden nationalization of their properties or discriminatory taxation. They will not invest unless the underdeveloped areas have sound credit and currency systems and agree to abide by certain common rules of business behavior.

With rules established, an additional incentive for private investors to risk their capital in overseas projects could be provided by a scheme to insure private investors against the abnormal business risks that they would not encounter in domestic investment. The wider the risk is spread, the more countries the insurance scheme embraces, the lower the premium investors would have to pay for protection. The United States Government might well take the initiative in setting up this insurance fund for American investors.

How much America can afford to invest overseas is almost impossible to calculate. In 1948 net private long-term American investment abroad reached $761,000,000. A yearly investment of $2,000,000,000 overseas in the immediate years ahead would make a tremendous contribution to the task, and appears comfortably within our capacity. If a climate of hope and confidence is created in which investment could thrive, the primary difficulty would, in fact, be to choose which of the almost unlimited projects foreseeable should be the first to be tackled.

Before the proper climate is created, technology needs to be rescued by another skill—economics—and by another type of know-how—politics.

Knowledge of economics and politics is needed to make sure that the first effects of industrialism on technologically innocent people are not wretchedness and rebellion.

Fortunately, the burden of the program does not fall entirely on the United States. Europe can provide many of the products necessary for development. And Europe's need for new sources of raw materials is much greater than ours.

The leaders of the nations participating in the Marshall plan are aware of the fact that the 4-year program will fail irreparably if not enough raw materials start coming in, between now and 1952, from nondollar areas. This is a necessary condition if the Marshall plan countries are ever to approach the volume of production and of exports that they are supposed to reach within the next 3 years.

The President's new program can be conceived and carried on over a span of decades. The best that we can hope is that by 1952 it will have made a substantial start. It must be developed and articulated enough to take over when the Marshall plan ends. In the period from now till 1952, American investment to help develop the resources of backward areas would be added insurance for the success of the European recovery program, as well as insurance for adequate continuing supplies of the raw materials we need.

The international-payments troubles in Europe can be relieved, in large measure, by the operation of the new program. For they are partly the result of the breaking of the nineteenth century three-cornered trade whereby, for example, far eastern countries earned dollars from their raw materials exports to the United States, used those dollars to buy supplies from Europe, and thereby provided Europe with dollars to pay for the excess of Europe's imports from the United States. A strong flow of American dollars investment in areas that have little money or industrial skill but plenty of resources would be the best guarantee of a return to freer and steadily expanding world trade.

Finally, America now has a chance to get out of a rather awkward schizophrenia. This Nation, dedicated to the cause of free enterprise and of capitalism, has to a large extent left to the Government the monopoly of foreign spending and investment—an embarrassing and rather silly contradiction.

Was it the need of scarce raw material that prompted the announcement of the new program, or was it the necessity of obtaining through a peaceful policy what we could not conceivably conquer by force of arms? Or perhaps it was the awareness of our responsibilities toward the world and at the same time of the limitations of our resources, for we haven't the means to continue indefinitely the Marshall plan or to extend it to Latin America, Asia, and potentially the whole world. There may be some truth in any one of these motives and in a hundred more. There is always a rather distant relationship between a policy and the various motives that have contributed to its enactment. Moreover, our country has the curious habit of announcing and reaching basic policies as if they were casual improvisations. This was the case when Franklin D. Roosevelt announced the policy of the unconditional surrender and when the idea of the Marshall plan first came out. It is the case with Point Four. It usually turns out that there was some thinking and planning before the announcement of a new policy, and then, when the announcement is made, thinking, and planning proceed with ever-increasing momentum because of the expectation it has aroused in the outside world.

This new program is likely to affect the UN radically, although no one knows now in what measure the UN will contribute to carrying it through. Perhaps the UN can be better strengthened by regional or even bilateral agreements than by debates and resolutions on what to do with the charter. All these partial agreements buttress at various spots the structure of the UN and provide the conditions for its strength. If multilateral trade is gradually reestablished, the UN will be the gainer. If new nations just emerging from colonialism find in western know-how the way to accelerate the pace of their progress, the UN will again be the gainer.

The major characteristic of the new program is that no matter from which side it is considered it makes sense. It is rounded, well balanced—even if it is, and will for some time remain, little more than a program for reaching a program. It depends on America, but it doesn't make America the Atlas that sustains the world. It presents extraordinary difficulties, which can be overcome if the technicians and experts of western civilization apply the experience and the knowledge they are supposed to possess and the countries to be developed are willing to accept their responsibilities. The greatest danger is that the program will be carried through by single-minded experts, each following his own approach and technique, independent and unconscious of all the others that are needed if the job is to be done. The program is a formidable test of our capacity to act. It is a greater test of our capacity to think.

The Welfare State as I See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misinformation—much of it deliberate—being spread about the welfare state. Today, at a luncheon given by the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities for the American Federation of Labor, was asked to speak on the subject, The Welfare State As I See It.

Mr. Cruikshank's speech deserves attention as an excellent statement of the truth about this often-misunderstood subject. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first to express sincerely my thanks to President Shreve and those in charge of planning this panel program for inviting me to participate in a discussion on this subject with these distinguished guests. I am sure those in charge were not entirely ignorant of what the point of view of a representative of the American Federation of Labor would be on this subject. It is a tribute to your sense of fair play and your typical American desire to hear both sides that you have asked me to take part.

The term "welfare state" has become a fighting term. The reason is that it has taken on two quite opposite meanings. There is one meaning ascribed to the term which is based on a concept of the State or Government as something foreign to and removed from the people and which seeks to control, direct, and provide for all the people's needs. Such a program of Government action—whether prompted by good or bad motives—removes incentives from the individual, stifles initiative, and becomes inevitably the master of the people that it set out to serve. Recent history abroad provides extensive support for that view.

To that kind of all-inclusive government activity I know that you as individuals and your organization are unalterably opposed. There we are on common ground. Labor likewise opposes and will oppose with all the force at our command any attempt by any government to control the details of daily

living and our relationships with each other, even if it is alleged to be for our own good. That is why we are against the Taft-Hartley Act.

Both employers and labor must oppose despotism in any form. There is no such thing as a benevolent despot.

There is another concept of the welfare state, however, that is rooted in a quite different idea of the nature of the state. This is the idea that the state can be the servant of the people. The idea that Lincoln expressed as "a government of the people, by the people, for the people" is not three ideas of government, but one. The only kind of government that can genuinely be for the people is one that is by and of the people. The state, like the Sabbath, is made for man and not man for the state.

If a people succeed in maintaining this concept of government the state then becomes the instrument through which they do those things for themselves which they cannot do individually. Though they use the instrumentality of government they are still performing these functions for themselves. Under such a concept individual opportunity can be maintained and enlarged and individual initiative can be encouraged.

Now under such an idea of the nature and the purpose of the state the concept of the welfare state takes on quite a different meaning from that which I first described. In line with this idea which was that held by the founders of our Government it is no question as to whether we should have a welfare state. That question was settled in 1789 with the adoption of the Constitution. The purpose of government in the United States of America was set forth clearly in the preamble of that document where, "We, the people of the United States" are committed until such time as that document is changed to six enduring programs. We are to form, establish, ensure, provide, promote, and secure. The fifth of these action programs to which we are committed is to promote the general welfare through the National Government.

This is reenforced in article I, section 8:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

It is significant that the first defense of a broad power of Congress to act for the general welfare was conducted by Alexander Hamilton in reference to the question of the establishment of a national bank. Opponents of the bank argued that no power was given by the Constitution to the Congress for such a purpose. But Hamilton supported his argument by reference to the general welfare clause.

Since that date there has been a host of enactments sponsored by every political party, that has been developed in our history, of both liberal and conservative persuasion to implement the welfare activities of our National Government. Every time that Congress has passed a tariff act we have engaged in an activity of the welfare state.

In this long development there have been some historic milestones. One of them was the enactment of the Homestead Act of 1862 signed by that most distinguished Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. After a long and bitter battle this was a decision on the part of the people's representatives in Congress to dedicate the vast resources of the public domain to the needs of the plain people as it provided for the settlement of public lands in quarter-section units. I like also to point out to those who allege that the idea of social security is a foreign concept that actually we launched on a social-security program through the enactment of this law. When we so dedicated the public domain we were actually providing a combined old-age security and unemployment compensation program, as a study of the waves of migration from the eastern industrial areas to the valleys of the Middle West in their relation to successive periods of unemployment in the industrial areas will show.

It needs to be pointed out also that this kind of activity by a welfare state was not confined to aiding people in search of family security or who were endeavoring to escape the hazards of unemployment. Vast amounts of land were granted to corporations supposedly as an incentive to the development of our railroad transportation system. In the period from 1850 to 1871 grants of land from the Federal Government and from the States to the railroads amounted to a total of 179,000,000 acres. This is more land area than the total of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, and North Carolina combined.

I am not here to condemn the use of the public land in this manner; I am only pointing out that when we talk about the welfare state we have to remember that the welfare activities of the State have been at least as lavish in the support of business enterprise as they have been on behalf of plain people. I cannot refrain, however, from pointing out that these enormous grants make the claims in this industry which we see in railroad advertisements and railroad-sponsored editorials that this is the only industry that pays its own way appears in rather awkward relation to the established facts.

We need only to look at the budget of the United States Government submitted for the fiscal year 1950 to find that the activities of the welfare state are by no means confined to the extension of aid to unfortunate individuals. A ship operator, for example, has available detailed and expertly prepared charts and tide tables printed by the Hydrographic Office of the Navy at an expense of $4,451,000. In contrast to that those who seek aid from the Federal Government either from management or labor's standpoint in the development of sound labor standards have to rely on the Bureau of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor whose total budget for the year is only $391,000. The Bureau of Labor Statistics operates on an annual budget of $5,450,000. A navigator of oceangoing vessels has prepared for him by the Government annual tide tables that will tell him for every day and every hour of the year the status of the tides and the flow of the currents in every port in the world. But a citizen who is responsible for steering a course in sound labor-management relations finds that the item for printing and binding in the Department of Labor is exactly zero. Twenty-five million dollars is set aside this year for the Agricultural Extension Service. In 1947 we had a tiny budget of $37,000 under which the Department of Labor was providing similar aids to American citizens responsible for furthering understanding of collective-bargaining processes. The Eightieth Congress wiped out even this minute item. It is our contention that if it is worth four and a half million dollars to publish charts and tide tables and twelve million to maintain aids to navigation and another twenty-four million to provide weather information to keep ships from running aground, it is worth at least some comparable figure to aid those in charge of collective bargaining programs from running into the rocks and shoals of industrial strife.

When the frontier was exhausted and the public lands were all settled or given away and we found ourselves still faced with the insecurity of old-age and unemployment, the Government simply continued its basic policy of dedicating its resources and instrumentalities to the aid of people to provide through a system of social insurance against these contingencies. That is how our social-security system came into effect as an activity of the welfare state.

In this connection and in reference to a social security case (*Helvering* v. *Davis*) a notable opinion was written in 1937 by Justice Cardozo of the United States Supreme Court. This opinion runs so directly to our subject that I wish to quote from it at some length. Before doing so I should like to remind you that Justice Cardozo was not a New Deal appointee but was appointed to the High Court by President Hoover, a President who I imagine is not lacking in admirers in this room. Justice Cardozo said:

"Congress may spend money in aid of the general welfare. * * * There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision. * * *

"The purge of the Nation-wide calamity that began in 1929 has taught us many lessons. Not the least, of the solidarity of interests that may once have seemed to be divided. * * * Spreading from State to State, unemployment is an ill not particular but general, which may be checked, if Congress so determines, by the resources of the Nation. If this can have been doubtful until now, our ruling today * * * has set the doubt at rest. * * * The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when the journey's end is near. * * * The problem is mainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least had a basis for that belief. * * * Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all. * * * The issue is a closed one. It was fought out long ago."

It is in the spirit of this decision that we in labor shall seek to employ the instrument of Government to meet other needs that cannot be met by individual action.

One of these areas is in the field of public housing. According to the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency (S. Rept. No. 84 of the 81st Cong., 1st sess.) the facts are that we must be prepared to build or rehabilitate an average of at least 1,300,000 nonfarm dwelling units and between 200,000 and 300,000 farm units each year over the next 12 years if substantial progress is to be made in bettering housing conditions of American families. The record of the private building industry, particularly since the war, establishes conclusively that it cannot handle the job alone since nearly two-thirds of our families who have incomes of less than $4,000 are completely out of the housing market in terms of being able to buy or rent the homes constructed by the private building industry.

In the field of education we decided over a hundred years ago that the education of our children is not properly a field for business enterprise operated for profit and we established a system of free public schools. In the course of our national development we are now faced with the fact that we cannot leave the support of these schools dependent entirely on the uneven financial resources of the localities and States. It has, therefore, become imperative that the one agency to which we all belong by right of birth or naturalization; namely, the Federal Government, must be used to give assistance in meeting the cost of educating our young.

Another common need is for a method of meeting the high and unpredictable cost of medical care through an extension of the principle of social insurance. We do not wish to see the Government in the practice of medicine. We do not wish to regiment doctors or patients. We do not wish to socialize medicine, and no bill supported by organized labor in the United States calls for any such thing. We, the working people of America, seek simply to promote the

general welfare by using the instrumentality of Government to establish a fund contributed to out of our own wages with like contributions from our employers to remove the ever-present dread of doctor and hospital bills that can drive us to the relief rolls and the loan shark.

Experience has taught us that every forward step in the field of social and economic welfare brings some dangers. Advances in this field are no more free from hazards and pitfalls than was the conquest of a continent by our pioneer forefathers. As we seek to utilize the services of Government we must be on guard against Government becoming our master. But we also recognize that people cannot guarantee their freedom by such a simple formula as limiting and crippling the power of their Government.

The essential problem is not one of restricting and limiting the field of Government action but in keeping the control of the Government in the hands of the people so that it remains their servant. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Eternal vigilance and not eternal obstructionism. We gladly join with our friends in business in the exercise of that vigilance. Together we can use, and not be used by, the resources of Government which in another age helped men break through the frontiers to a more satisfactory life.

Next Steps in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the New Republic under date of May 2, 1949:

NEXT STEPS IN CHINA

The fighting drags on in China, but the 20-year war is over. The Communists have taken power in Nanking where Sun Yat-sen once raised the banner of democracy. They have fought in obedience to Soviet orders; but they have won because they came closer to realization of Sun's principles than did the regime identified with the democratic world.

Indifferent to both sides, and utterly weary, the Chinese people have desired only peace. In recent weeks Li Tsung-jen, a sincere and courageous man, spoke for that universal desire. But the final effort to win a settlement, like the war itself, was lost by the unparalleled arrogance, incompetence and corruption of the regime of Chiang Kai-shek. As always, Chiang delegated responsibility and withheld power. He left Li, as acting president, to negotiate in Nanking. From his "retirement" in Chekiang, Chiang commanded the Nationalist armies and immobilized 75 percent of the Government's gold, silver, and foreign-currency reserves needed to combat its financial crisis. The peace terms offered by the Communists were harsh, and in some cases unenforceable. Yet the Communists sent their best leaders to negotiate a settlement. Their discovery that Li lacked any real power may have been as important as their own duplicity in the collapse of negotiations and the resumption of fighting. When the Communist offensive began, it was Chiang who ordered the retreat of the navy and air force to Formosa, and the abandonment without a struggle of the last natural line of defense.

Before the Communists now lie open and undefended the rich rice fields of Hunan, the industry of the lower Yangtze Valley, the great coastal cities of Hangchow and Shanghai. For the Communists these areas present great problems as well as great rewards. They have advanced from an export-surplus area in North China and Manchuria to an export-deficient area. They have experienced great difficulties in occupying Peiping and Tientsin. In Shanghai, 6,000,000 Chinese are kept alive by a rationing system based on American supplies of rice, flour, and petroleum. Those supplies will be cut off, by act of Congress, if Shanghai falls. And normally the Communists would first consolidate their new conquests in rural areas. But if, as A. T. Steele cables from Shanghai, the Communists are pressing forward at Russian insistence, then Shanghai will fall; a constitutional convention of the Communist Party and its front organizations will be called; a new national Government of China will come into being.

It will not be a true coalition government. In local administration it may make use of non-Communist technicians. In policy determination its hard core will be Communist, and linked closely to Russia. All talk of an imminent break between Mao Tse-tung and Stalin seems to us to be coffee-house chatter.

There are conflicts between Chinese nationalism and Soviet imperialism. The Soviet Government alone maintains foreign concessions in Manchuria. It has won control of Outer Mongolia. It is pressing into Inner Mongolia. It has been wringing concessions in Sinkiang from a nationalist delegation in order to make the most of the present situation and to spare the Chinese Communists the onus of yielding new concessions. But for Moscow, locked in conflict on a world front, the Chinese have become the great antagonists of the West in Asia. And the Chinese Communists in turn have chosen sides in the world war they foresee.

In the future, Chinese nationalism may win over Communist subordination to Moscow. Today China's new rulers remember that to bring about their destruction America delivered $3,000,000,000 worth of supplies to their enemy. Ninety percent of these supplies were used mainly by the Communists. But they remember that American bombers shattered their towns, that American fighters strafed their trenches, that American bullets killed their comrades. Their rank and file has been indoctrinated with hatred of America. And the new government of China will be bitterly anti-American. For that hatred toward a nation which has been committed historically to the independence and unification of China we have our military leaders, our Republican Congress and Chian's hobby, led by Henry Luce, to thank.

The State Department, which Republican leaders now berate, has lately shown rare wisdom in China. It has maintained its legations in Peiping and Tientsin. It has encouraged American businessmen, missionaries, and educators to stay on under Communist rule. It has refused to be stampeded into sending more aid to a hopeless cause.

The National government (Dean Acheson wrote Senator CONNALLY on March 14) does not have the military capability of maintaining a foothold in south China against a determined Communist advance. The Chinese Government forces have lost no battles during the past year because of lack of ammunition and equipment. There is no evidence that the furnishing of additional military material would alter the pattern of current developments in China. It would only prolong hostilities and the suffering of the Chinese people, and would arouse in them deep resentment against the United States.

We have rejected the use of nonrecognition as a diplomatic weapon. And when the Chinese Communists establish a national government we shall have to recognize it. Recognition will mean resumption of full trade relations, acceptance of the Communist delegations in the United Nations, and treatment of the Nationalists as rebels. The major decisions will center around the future of Formosa.

Formosa, where Chiang suppressed a genuine independence movement with terrible brutality 2 years ago, is now the scene of a new movement for independence from China. Chiang has transferred his air force and his gold reserve there. He hopes that its airfields and deep-water bases will lead America to take his Formosan regime out of Chinese sovereignty and place it under the protection of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers as part of the Japanese sphere of occupation. The lesson of the last 3 years is surely that any such action would be a foolhardy gamble that is bound to end once more in failure.

Two years ago, in the New Republic, Evans Carlson predicted the exact course of events that have taken place in China. Almost all liberals held the same views. In unregenerate conservatism and unreasoning fear we supported a regime that had no support among its own people. In the name of opposition to communism we pledged ourselves to a regime that paid lip service to the outward forms of democracy and mocked the basic values that those forms exist to serve. It collapsed in the face of a superior economic and social system, and by identifying democracy with its pretentious greed we made its inevitable defeat our defeat. The idea that we could have saved Chiang by more aid, that we should have taken completely a country far larger in size and population than our own, is monstrous. We have neither the capacity, the opportunity, the legal sanction, nor the moral right to intervene in any such way. If our reaction to the events in China starts us thinking in such terms, we could be altogether lost.

The lesson of China is that there are narrow limits to the action of any country; that American aid is always marginal; that the regeneration of a people is primarily a test of that people's own strength; that the strength of a people lies in the devotion of its leaders to the practice of democracy day by day; and that if the strength which democracy offers to an embattled people is denied them, no other aid can replace it, and their battle sooner or later is lost.

The Business of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, before the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Statler Hotel, in this city, last Thursday, May 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I am going to talk to you members of the Chamber of Commerce as one businessman to another. I am responsible for the most important business enterprise in American life today—the business of freedom. If we succeed, your business, your way of life, your right to say what you please, to do what you please, to worship or not as you please, to find fault with your Govern-

ment if you please—all these inherent rights of freedom will remain for you to enjoy.

My job is to make America so strong on land, at sea, and in the air that no aggressor will dare to attack us, or to interfere with our enjoyment of our inalienable rights as free Americans.

I say it is my business because I have the responsibility as Secretary of Defense. In fact, it is your business as well as mine. It is the business of every American. It can succeed only if it has everyone's physical, material, and moral support. It is an insurance business—insurance against war. Each of you as a citizen and as a taxpayer holds one of our policies and each is one of our beneficiaries.

In a sense, it is a new business for our democracy. Prior to Pearl Harbor, the very idea of preparedness was repugnant to millions of our people. Free people abhor war. They do not want to die. They do not want to kill. They want to live and let live. Their very idealism takes their minds off war and preparations for war. Aggressors have recognized that tendency and have tried to exploit it to their own advantage.

In the past, it was the aggressor, the dictator who was always ready for war. Now we have learned what we always should have known, what Washington tried to impress on the American people in the infancy of our historical growth, that to be free we must be prepared. And so our democracy has been compelled to go seriously into the business of national defense.

National defense is big business. This year it is a $15,000,000,000-a-year business. In 1944 it ran to $90,000,000,000. World War II cost us more than $300,000,000,000 for goods and services.

In another major conflict we would require production of arms on a far greater scale than that of World War II. Such a war would call for the most gigantic production effort the world has ever seen.

We know full well not only the cost of war in material resources, but, even more important, its physical horrors and personal tragedies as well. We have no illusions about war as the great crucible for testing and purifying the human race. On the contrary, we know it to be a great destroyer of human and natural resources. And this we knew even before the atom bomb. The total potential destructive and killing power of scientific weapons of mass destruction cannot even be measured now.

We are determined that we shall not be victims of war. We seek to prevent it. We seek to eliminate the causes of conflict. Our support of the United Nations has been wholehearted and sincere. We have never sulked in our tents or withdrawn our memberships when developments did not suit us.

We have come to the aid of nations in distress. We have given generously of our treasure and our resources to strengthen democratic governments all over the world, to help them create and maintain better living conditions for their people, and to discourage the forces of chaos and revolution.

We do not covet the territory of any of the nations we have aided, nor the territory of any country in the world. We have no designs on other peoples. We are free, and are determined to stay free; and we shall resist encroachment upon our freedom with everything we have. That is why we support an Army, Navy, and Air Force. That is why we must be in the business of national defense on a large scale.

We must constantly bear in mind that our industrial and individual wealth makes the United States the greatest prize ever regarded by a would-be conqueror. Our military strength, backed by our total industrial capacity and 147,000,000 loyal Americans, is our line of defense.

National defense must be sound economic business. In time of war, waste may be excusable if it saves human lives, but today every step possible must be taken to get top return for each dollar spent.

Business efficiency—as you are well aware—can result only from eternal vigilance on the part of every person responsible for the expenditure of public funds. Sound policies are needed to guide procurement officials. These things do not come about by chance. They are the results of long years of hard and conscientious work by men who put the national interest first—high above sectional or special interests or the interests of any one segment of American business—large, medium, or small.

Those of us who are engaged in the business of national defense realize that a sound program of preparedness calls for the utilization of our entire productive business system—big business and little business.

We have big business. We need big business. We can thank our lucky stars that we had mills and plants big enough to handle the big war-production jobs of basic metals, and to mass produce and assemble such large items as tanks, and trucks, and ships, and planes.

We have small business too, and they too played a vital role in the victory. For them we can thank the wisdom of our forefathers whose political economic system made possible the establishment and healthy growth of hundreds of thousands of these smaller units, the so-called "small business" of America.

These hundreds of thousands of small businesses, scattered throughout our land, together with our millions of independent farmers, are the essence of our democracy—they are our basic safeguard against the dangers of statism. It is high time that those few power-seeking and merger-mad corporation officials in our midst realize that the enemies of our economic system are gambling on a hope that American big business, by concentrating more and more economic power in fewer and fewer business enterprises, will finally drive us into some form of the corporate state which can readily be seized by a small group of ruthless men to spell the death knell of freedom.

The National Military Establishment appreciates the value of small business to our whole economy and to production of military items particularly and is bending every effort to have it share in its defense program. Let me tell you what we are doing to get orders for small business.

But first, what is small business?

The Military Establishment accepts the definition in the Selective Service Act of 1948, which says a business is small if it does not occupy a dominant position in the trade or industry of which it is a part, if the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and if it is independently owned and operated.

Under this definition 99 percent of the 4,000,000 American business enterprises of all kinds would be classified as small. Since we in the National Military Establishment are interested primarily in production, let us take a look at the industrial business population.

There are approximately 320,000 manufacturing plants in the United States. Again, approximately 99 percent of them are small. The workers in these small businesses comprise 65 percent of all manufacturing employment. They produce 62 percent of the total industrial output.

You will find these small plants in many industries and widely dispersed all over the country. More and more of them are moving to the outskirts of large metropolitan areas or to towns which were formerly only shopping centers in agricultural regions. Their very dispersion offers a special incentive in an atomic age for giving procurement orders to small business.

None of us wishes war, but we must prepare for all contingencies. And if war does come and it proves to be an atomic war, we must assume the big industrial centers of our country will be among the first targets. The main burden of producing war material will then fall on the smaller plants which are scattered in the smaller cities and towns. It is therefore good procurement planning for peace or war to give orders to small business now. In this way we will be developing our potential national assets, strengthen ourselves defensively and alleviate the evils of the huge overcrowded industrial city—and award more and more contracts to the backbone of our free-enterprise system, the small-business man.

The National Military Establishment is interested in small business because it wants to know that the productive capacity of all plants, including the small, is available. It is interested because it feels that small business is one of the institutions we Americans believe in and want. We must not forget that practically every American business in existence today once started as a small business.

The Congress recognizes the deep interest that the American people have in small business. From 1933 to 1944 more than 570 bills and resolutions dealing with one or another of the myriad aspects and problems peculiar to small business were introduced in the Congress of the United States.

In the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 Congress provided that—and here I quote—"a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be placed with small-business concerns."

The Selective Service Act of 1948 carries a provision to the same effect.

On December 12, 1947, President Truman transmitted similar wishes on this matter to the heads of the executive departments and establishments.

And as Secretary of Defense, I intend to carry out the President's wishes in every respect.

Now let me give you some specific examples of small-business contracts awarded by the National Military Establishment.

We recently let a contract for engines for the General Patton tank. The Continental Motors Corp. got the contract. It subcontracted 46 percent of its work to 191 first-tier subcontractors. Of the 191, 133, or 70 percent, received contracts of $20,000 or less. These subcontractors in the main were small businesses producing such items as piston rings, valve springs, bushings, castings, forgings, nuts, bolts, washers, and gaskets. The pattern work on this contract was divided among 10 companies which employ 50 people or less.

A very recent check in the Navy indicates that of the total number of orders placed for materials for a prototype cruiser, approximately one-third went to small-business concerns.

Small business also comes in strong as subcontractors at the second, third, and fourth tier. Total figures on these are not available, but we are planning some case studies to find out the total impact of certain types of large prime contracts on small business.

The role of small business is not confined to subcontracting. To be sure, many small-business men say they prefer to work as subcontractors because they are accustomed to their existing relationships with prime contractors.

In January and February of this year the Transportation Corps of the Army alone placed 62 percent of its 13,000 procurement actions with small business; and they were all prime contractors.

During World War II small business handled thousands of prime contracts. For example, 71 percent of the prime contractors performing work for the Philadelphia ordnance district employed 500 or less; 56 percent of the prime contractors employed 100 or less.

As an excellent example of the geographical dispersion of subcontractors let us consider the six-jet B–47 Air Force bombers now being produced by Boeing. Thirty-two companies throughout the country will participate under the subcontracting agreements in the Boeing prime contract. These companies are located in every section—Pasadena, Minneapolis, Dayton, Dallas, Chicago, Philadelphia, North Hollywood, Rock Island, Wichita, Detroit, and Los Angeles.

How well is the Military Establishment carrying out the intent of the Congress that small business get a fair share of the orders placed? Let us again look at the record.

During the 7 months ending January 31, 778,000 contracts totaling $2,675,000,000 were made by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Preliminary statistical analysis reveals that approximately 70 percent of these purchase actions have been placed with small businesses. These contracts account for about one-third of the dollar volume of procurement by the three departments.

These statistics relate to prime contracts. They do not reveal the total volume of orders that small business is getting as a result of the present defense program.

Small business participation in military procurement varies greatly by item. Nearly 100 percent of some items are bought from small business. Others are chiefly the products of large plants, or are in the developmental stage when best engineering and technical results can be obtained by having all the work done in a prime contractor's plant.

The National Military Establishment is proud of its record with small business. We are not saying that our procurement equals, exceeds, or falls short of being a fair proportion which is the goal we are seeking. That term has never been defined. We can say, however, that it is substantial.

As I have been talking about the billions being spent for national defense, some of you undoubtedly have been thinking "Why am I not getting some of that business?"

The fault is not with us. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force want more companies to want to do business with us. They tell them so—the Navy in its pamphlet, Selling the Navy, the Army in its booklet, Purchased Items and Purchasing Locations, the Air Force in its Guide for Selling to the United States Air Force, and the Munitions Board in its guide on Military Procurement.

Getting business from national defense is a selling job. Far be it from me to give this group of past masters of salesmanship a lecture on the art and science of selling. You know far better than I that its main points are knowing what the customers want, how and where they buy, and then showing how your product fills their needs, when and where they exist.

The salesman who performs these functions, be he owner, employee, or bona fide sales agent of a manufacturer, is always welcome because he renders a valuable service to the National Military Establishment.

But there are others who prostitute the profession of salesmanship who seek to convince the small-business man that only by buying through them can he get orders from the Government. To the small-business man I must emphatically say, "That is not so. There is no need for special brokers, for 15-percenters, for 10-percenters, for even 5-percenters. There is no need for anyone to intervene between small business and the Government to procure Government contracts."

And to those who claim to sell "influence at the right spots" I say, "We will drive you out of the National Military Establishment!" And let those who engage in questionable brokerage activities heed this warning!

Let me repeat: There is no need to have any broker between small business and the Government to procure Government contracts.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the cooperation of the Munitions Board, are intensifying their efforts to make certain that every manufacturer knows how to do business with the National Military Establishment, what is being bought, and what offices do the buying.

Our coordinated procurement program is designed to expedite selling. Of course, the objective is increased efficiency in military procurement, but when the responsibility for buying total military needs in certain items is placed in either the Army, Navy, or Air Force, the results should be good. Right now the Munitions Board is studying the efficacy of this program. Many businesses have indicated that they like our coordinated procurement operation; but one purpose of the Munitions Board survey is to determine its acceptability to small business. Eighty percent of all procurement is now coordinated through the Munitions Board.

We are planning for an all-out effort to assure the national interest—if war is ever forced upon us. Knowing the nature of our potential enemies, anything short of an all-out effort would be criminal; it would be suicidal.

And the greater the all-out effort; the more important small business becomes.

There is a special role for small business which I particularly want to stress. These small businesses are often the firms that can produce the last 10 percent which may spell the difference between victory and defeat.

Say we need 100 items. Our regular sources can produce 90. Ten more are needed for successul operations. We cannot wait for our major suppliers to expand or reorganize their production lines. We have to get the goods and get them quickly.

Here is where the flexibility and organizational simplicity of small business pays off. Frequently, these small-business men can get production on the needed 10 percent while a big company is tooling up.

Out-of-pocket expenditures may be higher for that fraction. In time of war we might have to pay more. But in many cases costs might be less. In any event, in terms of the benefits obtained it would be cheap.

I have heard rumors that small business believes that the National Military Establishment is confining its industrial mobilization planning to a few large companies. These are unwarranted. Let me give you the facts.

The Munitions Board and the three Departments have an industrial capacity allocation program. They are developing specific and realistic production schedules for a substantial number of manufacturing facilities. At present 22,000 have been cataloged, 17,500 of these are small business.

Small-business men may need special help when we call on them for all-out war production. They will encounter technical, managerial, engineering, research, and financial problems which never occur in their normal peacetime operations. How far any outsider, even the Government, can or should go in helping them is a serious question. We are developing plans to review this entire area. You can be sure that in this inquiry we will seek the advice of industry and finance, and particularly that of small business.

In emphasizing our policies to make the maximum use of small business I want to point out that we are not unaware that additional burdens may be put on the three Departments to place orders, supervise, inspect and store. That is a burden I think we all will recognize as warranted and which the Departments will gladly accept in the cause of maintaining free enterprise and in order to keep our economy in diversified shape against any possible emergency.

I have attempt to give you some of the results of our current operations in procurement and to indicate our basic philosophy toward small business as well as some of the plans we are developing. In emphasizing the role of small business I have not forgotten what we owe to big business. The Military Establishment is a team of well-trained officers and highly qualified civilian experts. We draw on industrialists and scientists and businessmen for advice and counsel. But we don't assume that everything can always be perfect and beyond improvement. We need criticism, sound objective criticism. And we welcome it. A democracy thrives on criticism. A dictator cannot take it.

Our military program and our military policies are instruments arising out of the needs of our dynamic American society. Behind them are the determination, the will, the courage, and the faith all America has in these democratic institutions which have made us the hope of civilization. America is again alert. The spirit that permeated our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights and placed us on the side of decency and fair play in two great wars is again manifest. It is the spirit of the Marshall plan. It is the spirit of the North Atlantic Pact, and of our other efforts in all parts of the world to stop encroachments on freedom and peace. In this struggle we offer to humanity a warm and generous heart. We will prevail, for the cause of dignity, peace, and the fuller life is the ideal to which America has ever been dedicated, and the hope of the ages is on our side.

Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD parts of two radio addresses which I delivered recently clarifying the Columbia Valley Administration bill, which was recently introduced.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION BILL, S. 1645

SECTION 1. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill carries out the recommendations made by President Truman in his special message to Congress on April 13, 1949, asking that a Columbia Valley Administration be set up to:

1. Provide a complete program for the many Federal activities dealing with the region's resources, eliminating existing waste and duplication. This agency's powers will be considerably less than those of TVA, since it will not take over functions of many Federal agencies, but will provide a unified development program to be carried out by those agencies working with the CVA.

2. Transfer administration of our development program to the Northwest, so that all interested groups—local, State, and Federal, private and public—can have a voice and participate in the program. This agency will be where the work is to be done—not in Washington, D. C.

3. Carry out complete development of our region's resources to insure a prosperous

future, while maintaining full protection for all local rights including water rights established under State laws.

SECTION 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY

Provides for cooperation with local people and local organizations, and for the Administration's activities to be in accord with national policy. Use of water will be based on beneficial consumptive use, a policy that has always been followed in Idaho.

SECTION 3. CREATION OF ADMINISTRATION

The Administration shall have its offices in the Columbia Valley region. It can be sued in any United States district court in this region by any person or organization.

SECTION 4. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Three full-time directors will be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. All of them must live in the region, and at least two must be bona fide residents of the area at the time of appointment. None of the directors can engage in any other business while serving on the Board.

The Board must furnish an annual report to the President and Congress.

SECTION 5. STATE AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION

The Board is instructed to work with local people and organizations. Advisory councils will be set up and the Board will meet regularly with these councils and representatives of States, counties, cities, labor, business, and all other such groups. These advisory boards will report annually direct to the President on the activities of the Administration.

SECTION 6. GENERAL POWERS

The Administration can build and operate projects for reclamation, flood control, conservation of natural resources, electric power, and navigation. In connection with these projects they can provide for recreational facilities, sanitation, and pollution control, and must protect fish and wildlife.

In securing property needed for these projects, the Administration does not have even the same right of condemnation now used by the Reclamation Bureau and Army Engineers. The Administration can condemn water rights only on land it has acquired for one of these projects; land that will be used for a dam or reservoir. It cannot touch any other water right, and these rights remain fully protected under State laws.

Construction work will be done by private contractors under competitive bidding, except for emergency jobs. The Administration can conduct any of its activities through—or in cooperation with—other Federal agencies, State and local governments, or any other public or private agencies. It will not take over the functions of the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, etc., but after its program is submitted to the President and Congress it may use CVA funds for carrying on projects through these agencies. This achieves the objective of over-all planning and coordination of functions without absorbing all these Federal agencies operating in the region. The only functions taken over by the Administration are the Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, and the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Hoover Commission recommended that these three agencies be consolidated, so this change is actually a reorganization plan on a regional basis.

SECTION 7. COORDINATION OF PLANS

In preparing its programs, the Administration must consult with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and interested organizations and citizens.

Programs must be submitted to the President and to Congress, together with proof that each project is economically sound and is in the public interest.

SECTION 8. TRANSFERS TO THE ADMINISTRATION

Functions and property of the Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, and the civil-works activities of the Corps of Engineers in the Columbia Valley are transferred to the Administration. No other transfers of properties or functions are made by the act. All projects now underway, such as Palisades Dam, will be completed as soon as possible by the Administration.

SECTION 9. DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

The Administration can sell surplus power wholesale under Federal laws giving preference to public bodies and cooperatives. Necessary transmission lines can be built and the power shall be sold at the lowest possible rate in order to encourage the widest possible use.

Power revenues will be used to pay off the total power construction cost with interest, and to pay part of the cost of storing water for irrigation.

The Administration cannot condemn electric utility systems.

SECTION 10. RECLAMATION

Existing laws, such as the 160-acre limitation, will govern reclamation of land. Land to be irrigated by reclamation projects cannot be acquired by condemnation. Existing water rights are protected and future water rights will be acquired under the provision of State laws. The act states in the strongest possible terms that all water rights will be protected. The Administration will not even have the condemnation power possessed by the Reclamation Bureau for the past 45 years, since the only water rights it can touch will be those on land acquired for building a dam, which, of course, would be of no further value.

SECTION 11. ALLOCATIONS AND ACCOUNTS

Estimates shall be made of the cost of each project, and this cost divided according to the purposes of the project. On a multipurpose dam, a certain amount must be charged to power, so much to reclamation, flood control, and all other purposes for which the project is built. These cost allocations must be approved by the President before the project is undertaken.

Complete statements are to be submitted annually, and accurate books shall be kept in accordance with Federal laws.

SECTION 12. FINANCING AND REPAYMENT PROVISIONS

All major projects or new major activities must be approved by Congress in the administration budget program. Once this authorization is received, the Administration has contractual authority to complete the projects on the most economical construction schedule. They will not be subject to unjustified cuts in appropriations, or any of the delays that now force the continual closing down and expensive reopening of reclamation and flood-control projects, with fixed expenses continuing on while no work is being accomplished. Projects can be completed swiftly and economically, saving huge sums of money.

The CVA fund is established in the Treasury. Into this fund go the appropriations from Congress and the administrative revenues. Advances from the fund will be made for projects such as reclamation and power dams, as well as any revenue-producing activity. These advances will be repaid fully with interest over a reasonable period of years but no interest will be charged on irrigation costs. The interest rate will be set by the Secretary of the Treasury. Part of the costs to be repaid by water users can be repaid from other revenue, such as interest on the power investment.

Administration activities that do not produce revenue or have not been authorized must be financed by congressional appropriations.

SECTION 13. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Administration will make annual payments to State and local-taxing units sufficient to offset the loss of taxes on property acquired by the CVA. If the Administration's activities require any special State or local services, payment may also be made to the taxing units to defray these costs.

SECTION 14. PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

Provides for competitive bidding on purchases, except when quantities are small or an emergency arises.

SECTION 15. PERSONNEL

Provides for hiring employees on a merit basis, and for social-security benefits, workmen's compensation, and other necessary protection for all employees. Political tests or qualifications in hiring are specifically prohibited, with penalties provided for violations.

SECTION 16. INDIAN LANDS

Special provisions are made for Indians whose land is needed by the Administration.

SECTIONS 17, 18, AND 19, MISCELLANEOUS

These clauses are the usual ones repealing laws in conflict with the act, providing a savings clause and for the act to be carried out in the general welfare.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON S. 1645, TO ESTABLISH A COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

Question. I'm a farmer. Will CVA take away my water rights?

Answer. Absolutely not. CVA cannot touch your water rights. The bill says in plain language that the Administration cannot affect or in any way interfere with existing water rights. The laws of the State of Idaho shall govern in all matters concerning water rights.

Question. Will the CVA be able to condemn water rights?

Answer. No; the CVA would have even less power of condemnation than is now held by the Bureau of Reclamation. If land is acquired for use in the building of a dam or reservoir, of course the water right on this land is no longer of value and goes to CVA with the land. The bill specifically prohibits the Administration from condemning any other water right.

Question. How will construction of projects be handled under CVA?

Answer. The bill directs the Administration to carry on its construction work by contract with private firms, just the same as the Engineers and Reclamation Bureau do now.

Question. I have received pamphlets and form letters in the mail telling me that a CVA would have power to compete against private business in many fields. Is this true?

Answer. Absolutely not. The Columbia Valley Administration would have no powers that are not now held by existing agencies.

Question. But these pamphlets tell me that CVA can undertake any activity it desires without approval of anyone else. Isn't this true?

Answer. It is not true. All activities, programs, and projects proposed by the Administration must be approved by the President and Congress before any action can be taken. Even a single dam cannot be built until Congress authorizes its construction.

Question. If these projects still have to be authorized by Congress, how can the CVA construct them quicker, and cheaper than existing agencies do now?

Answer. Under the present set-up, the Reclamation Bureau and Army engineers projects are delayed periodically because Congress cuts their appropriations or refuses to give them any money at all. All planning and work must be done on a year-to-year

basis. Under this bill, when a project is authorized by Congress, the Columbia Valley Administration is given contractual authority for the entire cost of the project. It can thus complete it on the quickest and most economical schedule, with no costly delays.

Question. We've heard a lot about the Hoover Commission to increase efficiency and save money in Government through reorganization. What do they recommend be done with the Reclamation Bureau and the civil construction work of the Army engineers?

Answer. The Hoover Commission recommended that these two agencies be consolidated, in order to eliminate present costly waste and duplication. This bill carries out these Hoover Commission recommendations on a regional scale, so it is really a reorganization plan for increasing efficiency and eliminating waste.

Question. Does the CVA take over functions of all Federal agencies in the area?

Answer. No. The only agencies whose functions are turned over to the Administration are the Reclamation Bureau, Bonneville Power Administration, and the civil construction work of the Corps of Engineers. This carries out the Hoover reorganization plan.

Question. But I have received a pamphlet from a group called the Idaho Development Association that says CVA would be an economic dictatorship, since it would take over all the functions of the Grazing Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Indian Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and Geological Survey. Isn't this true?

Answer. It is absolutely false. These agencies retain their present functions under the CVA bill. Groups opposing a CVA seem to work on the principle that Idaho people will read their propaganda but will not read the bill itself or statements of President Truman and the bill's sponsors. Consequently, these propaganda pamphlets are full of such false statements.

Question. How can all the various functions be coordinated if these agencies still retain them?

Answer. After a proposed program for such coordination has been authorized by the President and Congress, CVA funds may be used for carrying out these projects in cooperation with or through the other agencies.

Question. Will projects now under construction be completed under a CVA?

Answer. Yes. The bill specifically instructs the Administration to complete all projects now under way at the earliest possible date.

Question. Are construction costs charged to water users repaid with interest?

Answer. Such costs on all revenue-producing functions except irrigation are repaid with interest.

Question. Will any changes be made in the sale of electric power?

Answer. No. The Administration must sell this power according to Federal law, which means sale only at wholesale, with preference being given to cooperatives and to municipal systems.

Question. What is done with the profit from this sale of power?

Answer. It is used to pay off the cost of construction, with interest, and to pay part of the cost of storing water for irrigation.

Question. Does this bill change the present law limiting farms on reclamation projects to 160 acres?

Answer. It does not. The present 160-acre limitation law is contained in the bill with no change. Anyone criticizing this section is evidently opposed to the present law, as they are the same. Large land companies have been trying for years to repeal this law.

Question. Won't the taxes on my property be raised to make up for the loss in taxes on property or land owned by the CVA?

Answer. No, since this bill provides for payments to the State and local governments sufficient to make up the loss in property taxes.

Question. Will local groups have a voice in CVA operations?

Answer. They certainly will. Advisory councils of local citizens and representatives of various groups will meet regularly with the Board. These advisory groups report directly to the President on activities of the Administration.

Question. Can the CVA condemn land to be placed under cultivation in a reclamation project?

Answer. No.

Question. What about veterans' preference for reclamation lands?

Answer. In accordance with existing Federal laws, preference will be given to veterans desiring to settle on reclaimed land acquired by the Administration.

Question. Can the CVA condemn electric-utility systems?

Answer. No.

Question. The Idaho Reclamation Association tells me that under this bill all water litigation would be taken to a Federal court in Portland. Is this true?

Answer. Absolutely not. The Administration would have no connection with water litigation since the bill plainly states that water rights are under the sole jurisdiction of State law and the Board is prohibited from interfering with any water right.

Question. If I have a grievance against CVA can I take it to court?

Answer. Yes. The CVA can be sued in the Federal court nearest to your home.

Question. Could water needed for irrigation be taken for navigation uses?

Answer. Absolutely not. The bill states water shall be used on the basis of beneficial consumption, and states clearly that irrigation is given preference over navigation.

Question. Couldn't water rights be condemned to insure an ample flow of water for navigation or for the generation of power?

Answer. No. The Administration is prohibited from condemning any water right. As stated before, the only water rights it can acquire are those on land it has already purchased for construction of a dam or reservoir.

An Unfair Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unfair Formula," published in the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNFAIR FORMULA

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., was defeated recently in his effort to improve the formula for distribution of Federal aid to education, but he was on sound ground, nevertheless. The formula that is in the education-aid bill is not fair.

It is quite easy to suspect that some national educators formed an opinion on how they would like $300,000,000 apportioned among the States and then framed a plan that would attain the desired result. Propaganda in behalf of this bill has been a great success, but that does not improve its merit.

For instance, Massachusetts teachers were told by an educational committee that if they would help push the bill through Congress, they might be able to secure a salary increase for themselves from the money which would come to Massachusetts as a share of the $300,000,000. It failed to tell the teachers that Massachusetts will have to put more into the education fund than she receives from it and that there will be less money left in this Commonwealth as a source from which teachers might ask for pay raises.

A research organization has studied the results of the formula when applied to $300,000,000 and some of the payments into the fund and receipts from it would be as follows:

State	Pays in	Receives	Nets
Alabama	$3,056,000	$14,451,000	[1] $11,395,000
Mississippi	1,743,000	15,469,000	[1] 13,726,000
North Carolina	4,209,000	21,070,000	[1] 16,861,000
Massachusetts	9,571,000	4,115,000	[2] 5,456,000
Rhode Island	1,555,000	645,000	[2] 910,000
New Jersey	8,713,000	3,840,000	[2] 4,873,600

[1] Net gain.
[2] Net loss.

At the outset it should be acknowledged that Federal grants-in-aid for education, or any other purpose, must have some relation to the economic status of the States individually. Unless such an arrangement is utilized, the objectives that are sought may be unattainable.

The main reason for using Federal funds for purposes that essentially are interests of the States, cities, and towns is that most of the latter have exhausted their tax sources. The Federal Government can take some money by methods not readily available to them. Of course it all is the money of the people of the States, cities, and towns that goes into the Washington Treasury.

Strong guards are needed to insure that some States do not relax their own taxing powers and rely upon Washington to keep them. There are States that advertise the fact taxes are very low within their borders. Indeed some inform industries they will be taxed hardly anything if they will move their plants to such States. Obviously these States are exploiting the Federal Treasury and must be required to raise more money themselves before becoming entitled to full Federal aid.

The income of a State is a means of judging its economic position and there can be no objection to inclusion of income as an element of the formula of a distribution system. But it should be the actual and true income of a State and not the fictitious figure that is specified in the aid-to-education bill.

This school-aid measure would base part of the hand-out on the average income of a State over a period of 5 years beginning 8 years ago. That is a false income figure. Actual income of today and next year may be entirely different in relation to that of other States.

Further, the income referred to in the bill is prior to Federal taxes. Now everybody knows that in States where incomes are high, the Federal Government makes a high-percentage levy, and the net income after taxes is something entirely different from the gross receipts.

Also, some States have had community property tax laws for many years and any distribution based on income would have a different bearing upon them than in States without community property tax plans during the 5-year period.

Those who think Massachusetts will receive some kind of a financial windfall through the Federal aid-to-education bill should revise their opinions. Massachusetts will suffer a net loss of $5,456,000 through the operation of this bill and therefore will have fewer dollars for financing education without our own State.

It is to be hoped that the aid-to-education bill will not be adopted in its present form. A much more equitable formula is essential. Also, if Federal funds are limited, there must be a study of the priority of various projects. Social security, health, and housing may be found to be subjects more urgently requiring Federal help than education. Food, shelter, and good health surely are prime requisites.

Address by the Secretary of Defense on the Occasion of the Laying of Cornerstone of New American Legion Headquarters Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, at the laying of the cornerstone of the new American Legion headquarters building at Indianapolis, Ind., on Friday last, May 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This ceremony of laying a cornerstone for the new American Legion headquarters, is a consecration to the spirit of our American youth. It is a consecration to that spirit which was ours in 1917, when my own generation of American young men dropped their books and their tools to take up arms for their country. It is a consecration to that same spirit that in 1941 fired a later generation to respond eagerly to the Nation's call in the hour of need—and carry through to victory.

The American Legion has been devoted from its very inception to the fostering of that spirit. It is that spirit that has served so valiantly to protect our liberties in the past, and, today as ever, constitutes our bastion of defense, for ourselves and for our posterity.

As Secretary of Defense, I count upon that spirit of youth to give us peace.

The youth of America harbors no aggressive design on any other nation. Our young men want peace. They want peace for their mothers, their sisters, and their sweethearts. They want peace in which to live and work—to marry and raise children in this free and rich land of ours.

Let no nation deceive itself, however, and read in this desire for peace any note of softness or weakness. In fact, in our very humane and democratic concern for the civilized values lies our real reservoir of strength, our greatest weapon of defense.

We hear a great deal these days about secret weapons and how vital it is that they be kept secret lest they fall into the hands of potential enemies. In the United States we have one weapon more powerful than all the atomic bombs, the guided missiles, the battleships, the airplanes, and the tanks. Precious as it is, we do not fear losing it. It is safe. No enemy can steal it. It will never become obsolete. It will always be modern. And, far from keeping it a secret—we are anxious to share it with others. This weapon is not a mechanical invention or a physical contrivance. It belongs in another realm. It is the spirit of freedom in which we have nourished our youth. This spirit of freedom permeates our history and has served to keep our country ever young and our democracy ever vibrant. This spirit is in the very fiber of our people. From generation to generation, it has renewed itself throughout our great continental expanses—in the rich earth of our hills, in the plains and in the sandy sea coasts—in the cities and the towns. It has prospered in our climate—in the sun, in the rains, and in the harvests.

This spirit of freedom throbs in the farmer's breast as he plows his land—shows itself in the clear eyes of the young men and women in our factories. It is a precious heritage for everyone to share. It warms the heart of Protestant, Jew, and Catholic alike.

So long as we preserve this will to freedom, we need not be afraid. So long as the spirit of freedom flourishes, in the free councils of our towns and the legislatures, America will be secure.

As we dedicate this cornerstone today, it is highly fitting, therefore, that we reflect upon these unchanging principles in a reavowal of our faith in the basic verities of our democracy, that have made us the beacon of hope to freemen everywhere.

These ideals of freedom, that are at the very basis of our democratic Government, may not always be visible to the naked eye—but they are there just the same.

Shortly after World War I, veterans home from the battlefields began to wonder whether it still existed. They looked around. They were shocked and hurt to see that some of the youngsters were not at all like the youngsters they remembered. They were rebellious—seething with unrest, with inner tensions—anxious and restless. So, while we oldsters were fitting back into the old grooves, tried and true, here was a new generation eagerly rushing to a new tempo, kicking up their heels at the ideals we cherished and raucously ridiculing the old order of things.

It was the flapper age. The new music—jazz—was loud and fast. There was excitement—delinquency—yes, a lot of crime. Pretty soon there was a lot of talk that the postwar generation was going to the dogs. And many began to worry whether if faced with real danger, this new generation could take it.

But young Americans kept on being born. Immigrants continued to flock to our shores. The country kept on growing. We had a depression in the early thirties, along with the rest of the world. It was rough. There was grumbling and suffering in the United States. But freedom proved to be a resilient mechanism. Indeed, its springy sinews somehow absorbed the shocks, bore the blows, and carried us through.

On the European Continent—in Germany, in Italy—things did not go so well. There the people were not so lucky. Their faith in freedom proved too fragile. In their despair, they sacrificed their liberties to totalitarian blandishments—to dictators. It was a cruel and fruitless sacrifice. It did not work. It was not long before the world went mad and the Continent was plunged into war.

When World War II struck in Europe, we were just getting back on our feet here in the United States. Wages were rising. Standards of living were improving. We had the prettiest and fastest automobiles in the world and we loved every shiny fender. We had push buttons to make machines do most of our heavy work. And the younger generation was engrossed in a new music called swing. We were having fun.

Then suddenly something happened. And the grocery clerks, the lawyers, the doctors, the pastry cooks, the car salesmen, and swing hep cats—almost overnight—turned themselves into flying-fortress pilots, bombardiers, machine gunners, sailors.

The easy-going factory bosses changed into grim drivers for production for the sinews of battle. We were now the arsenal of democracy.

Thus it was that the German and the Jap who had joked about the soft and pleasure-loving Americans—and had gambled on it—learned the hard way what most of us had known all the time; that an American grocery clerk in a night fighter is a deadly terror; that a pastry cook in a B–17 can aim a bomb as accurately as he lances air holes in apple pies; that a lawyer in a tank does not stop to argue; and that a jitterbug can be light on his feet, fast, and tough, when he parachutes into enemy territory with a machine gun in the crook of his arm.

Once we invoked this real reservoir of our strength, there could never be any doubt of the final outcome.

Today, May 6, marks the anniversary of Gen. Jonathan Wainwright's surrender at Corregidor and brings us back to that trying time in the earlier stages of the war when, for awhile, the American flag was lowered in the Pacific. It is a wonderful commentary on the spirit of our youth, that even during that surrender and throughout those days that followed in the dark prisons of Luzon, our young captives never despaired. And so when they passed each other in the damp corridors they would whisper, "God bless America." They had faith, even in those darkest moments, that our flag would again somehow be gloriously raised, and they would not be daunted.

The men of World War II, like their fathers before them, were peaceful men. True to our traditions, they despised war. Nevertheless, when war came, they assumed their duties with the determined grim knowledge that here was a desperate task which must be carried through to the end. There was no air of vainglorious boasting—just the quiet realization that an aggressor had run amuck in the world molesting freedom everywhere and that before men could resume the peaceful pursuits, the aggressor had to be firmly brought down to unconditional surrender. That mission, our youth accomplished successfully.

I am very proud to be here today to speak on an occasion so similar to the one that brought our World War I leader, Gen. John J. Pershing, here to Indiana's War Memorial Plaza. General Pershing spoke of the valor of the soldiers of World War I. He called on our men and women to shoulder with equal steadfastness, the responsibilities of good citizenship.

I wish General Pershing were here today. We would like to tell him how well we are keeping the faith, how loyally another generation of youth nurtured in the ideals of American life went forth to fight for freedom, and what we are doing to keep that spirit alive today.

When good citizenship again demanded the hard task of war, the call was answered,

and victory was won. The spirit of American youth, and the spirit of freedom have triumphed again. They will always triumph. Here in this hallowed ground the past and its glory live immortal in that spirit—in the memory of young men who gave their lives in two wars.

Those of us alive today—particularly those who have lived through World War I and World War II—know that there are no words properly to express our thanks, our reverence, and our deep affection for those who gave their lives to keep us free. We try as we can, by lasting memorials such as this new building will be, to show our deep feeling of humble gratitude. And we know that the reason our young men have fought in the past—and will fight again if the need should arise—lies in our having the right kind of a democracy, the right kind of freedom; in that spirit of fair play and good fellowship we have in America. These are the ideals that produce such young men and women as ours. These are the ideals of the American Legion.

Our young people are sound, and the undying spirit of liberty courses strongly through their veins.

But it isn't just physical strength that makes America so strong. The real edge we have is freedom—freedom of speech, of religion, freedom to choose our government. The sum of these is freedom from fear. Our Government is our own—it does not belong to any dictators ruling by edict. Here, we are one people. We have no old-world animosities. America takes to her heart men and women whose parents may have fought each other overseas. In this land, they live side by side as friends.

Here in the United States there is no place for any doctrine of racial superiority, or of religious intolerance. Each can worship as he pleases. Each can speak his mind.

This is the American spirit, and to the youth of America who have so richly merited this precious heritage, we today lay this cornerstone.

Intellectuals for World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, of New York. He presents a sorry picture of a once great organization, the American Academy of Political and Social Science. I commend it to every Member of the House.

INTELLECTUALS FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

"You must organize the second-rate intellectuals and use them to popularize Communist ideas." (Stalin to the American Communist Party.)

The fifty-third annual meeting of the approximately 60-year-old American Academy of Political and Social Science was held in Philadelphia, April 8 and 9 last. Delegations were present representing the Governors of 9 States, 95 colleges and universities and 175 international, civic, scientific, and commercial organizations, and one subject of the meeting was World Government. An uninformed visitor might logically have expected words of wisdom from historians, scholars and statesmen based on a lifetime of study and association with world government efforts from the Hague to San Francisco.

Instead, the delegates present, manfully (and old-lady-like), struggled to stay awake through 2 days and nights in the stuffy ballroom of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, lulled by the soothing words of foreign diplomats and 11 Americans. Of the 16, the 5 diplomats and 3 of the Americans (2 from the UN staff and 1 from Alger Hiss's former United Nations Administration Section of our State Department) were quite evidently, and not unexpectedly, obligated to avoid frank discussion of realities in today's explosive world.

Of the other eight, not hogtied by the official responsibilities, one might have expected to learn of the history of past attempts at world government, of the reasons that caused the United Nations of January 1, 1942, to be abandoned for the weaker UN of 1945, and of some of the advantages and disadvantages of a world government, if established.

Of the eight unhampered Americans who spoke, two, Clair Wilcox and Elvin H. Killhefer, debated the International Trade Organization without discussion of world government. The other uninhibited speakers on world government were Cord Meyer, Jr. (president of United World Federalists, Inc.), Randle Elliott (McGraw-Hill correspondent in London), Clark Eichelberger (director of American Association for the UN), Roger N. Baldwin (director of the American Civil Liberties Union), Kermit Roosevelt (who spoke on the Middle East only), and Walter William Van Kirk (of the Federal Council of Churches).

If any of the speakers named had any qualifications either of scholarly standing or practical experience in the field of past world government efforts their biographies as distributed at the meeting carefully concealed the fact from the delegates, as did their speeches. All accepted world government as the ultimate good, though they disagreed on the methods to be followed to this utopian goal.

Young Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr., whose attractive personality and evident sincerity distinguished him from the paid propagandists in the service of world salvation, frankly stated that his organization stood firmly for inclusion of the Soviet Union in their world government, if the Soviets would accept.

This was the nearest that any of the speakers came to the problems that face the world today. That the Comintern is a world government in being today, embracing 27 self-governing republics, as well as certain other areas, that one-quarter of the population of the world owes it loyalty, was not even hinted at. That this red world government claims it will embrace half of mankind by the end of this year when it expects all China and southeast Asia to join it, willy-nilly, was not referred to, nor did anyone hint that a world government including the Soviet Union would amount to a world coalition government, with the usual result to which we have become accustomed the past 3 years.

A large number of Americans are qualified by scholarship and a smaller number of retired diplomats and foreign correspondents who had close association with League of Nations and Hague attempts are qualified to speak from a background of study and reflection, plus experience. The fact that none appeared on the program might lead one to guess that the American Academy is not made up of the second-rate intellectuals at whom Stalin aimed.

The comment of a Chinese auditor, who had apparently ridden in American taxicabs, was "if we had a convention of taxi drivers we'd probably hear more sense."

May 1—Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow Congressmen to join with me in commending the work of the National Loyalty Day Parade Committee, with headquarters at 1111 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which was established to combat the effects of Communist propaganda and other activities on May 1—the traditional Communist May Day throughout the world.

This committee requested civic, labor, and church leaders and veterans' organizations throughout the country to organize competitive patriotic parades or attend religious ceremonies in cities and towns all over the Nation on that day. It asked State governors and the mayors of the country's principal municipalities to endorse its program and proclaim May 1 as Loyalty Day.

Many governors responded stating that the legislators and people of their States, with good reason, resented the fact that the first day of May in each year had been set aside by the disloyal and subversive groups in our country for the purpose of demonstrating their disloyalty and promulgating their insidious propaganda. These governors and mayors who supported the principles of the National Loyalty Day Parade Committee pointed out that it was important that the people of the United States and of the world be not deceived by the May Day celebrations of the subversive groups in their cities and States. They said it should be clearly understood that the vast majority of the people of the United States are loyal to the ideals and ideas upon which our Nation was founded. In the present state of international affairs a rededication to the ideals of our country was considered most appropriate and desirable. Therefore, many governors and mayors, in compliance with the joint resolutions of their assemblies and senates and city councils, proclaimed the first day of May as Loyalty Day.

I call upon my fellow Congressmen to endorse these principles and to commend the work of the National Loyalty Day Parade Committee, its chairman, the Honorable Maurice J. Tobin, and its director, Peter W. Hoguet.

It is more than fitting that we compete in time, spirit, and ideology with those who are tirelessly working to de-

velop propaganda and other activities destructive to the basic principles of our country. I also ask my fellow Congressmen to seriously consider some action toward recognition of Loyalty Day throughout the country. It would be quite proper to pass a resolution that such a day be proclaimed and that the President of the United States be asked to issue a proclamation that May 1, 1950, is designated as Loyalty Day. Such a proclamation could read as follows:

LOYALTY DAY

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the strength and influence of our Nation depend in greatest measure upon the loyalty of our citizens to the principles and ideals upon which our Nation was founded and upon which its greatness rests; and

Whereas we must ever be alert to the danger that confronts us by reason of evil forces seeking to destroy our country by bringing about disloyalty to our Government and the principles and ideals that it embodies; and

Whereas it is fitting that we should set aside a day for the special observance of the principle and obligation of loyalty to our country:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Monday, May 1, 1950, as Loyalty Day, and do set aside that day as a public occasion for the active manifestation of our fidelity to our Government and to the principles and ideals which it symbolizes.

And I urge all patriotic, civil, educational, and religious institutions and organizations, wherever practicable, to conduct exercises or services on that day designed to emphasize and strengthen our loyalty to the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this — day of ——— A. D. 1950, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

By the President:

———— ————,
Secretary of State.

A week ago, through the efforts of the National Loyalty Day Committee and other groups cooperating in their program throughout the Nation, May 1 was observed as an occasion for Americans to renew their allegiance to the democratic institutions which have made our country great. Many leaders—governors, mayors, labor councils, veteran and church organizations recognized that it was appropriate on this date to take stock of the past accomplishments of our Nation and to realize that our future progress depends upon the vigilance with which we safeguard our Republic and work to keep it strong and effective. From Washington several Congressmen helped the national committee in its efforts to encourage as wide a participation as possible in the Loyalty Day program by leaders in the principal cities and towns who were asked to organize competitive patriotic parades or encourage the members of their organizations to attend special religious ceremonies on that day. Most active supporters included Congressmen JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida; RICHARD M. NIXON, of California; OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas; CHARLES R. HOWELL, of New Jersey; JOHN D. LODGE, of Connecticut; and myself.

On May 1 in Los Angeles more than 10,000 people participated in special services in the Hollywood Coliseum and in the evening joined several thousand more in a Loyalty Day parade organized by various civic and labor leaders, including Roy M. Brewer, national secretary IATSE; W. J. Bassett, secretary, Central Labor Council of Los Angeles; Irwin Deshelter, California Council, CIO: Mayor Fletcher Bowron; and Gene Autry, who served as chairman of the committee. Governor Warren recognized the importance of this day and in issuing a proclamation urged the people of California to participate in patriotic observances on this day and pledge themselves anew to the preservation and advancement of our American ideals.

In Boston more than 5,000 persons participated in a special parade from the State House down to Beacon Street to Charles Street, through Boylston and Tremont Streets, to historic Boston Common. Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, in speaking from the Parkman bandstand, said:

The time has come when freedom has to fight back and when champions of freedom everywhere must stand up and be counted.

Mayor James M. Curley and His Excellency Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, were honorary chairmen of the Loyalty Day committee.

In Buffalo, N. Y., the largest Holy Name Society rally ever held was organized through the joint efforts of Austin Roche, president of the Holy Name Society of Buffalo, and Paul Dolan, State commander of the Catholic War Veterans. Mayor Bernard J. Dowd, following the proclamation of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, stated:

It is especially appropriate on this loyalty day, as a matter of religious and patriotic duty that we should assemble in our respective houses of worship to reaffirm our abiding faith in God, to monopolize the spiritual forces of the Nation and to rededicate ourselves to the maintenance of those religious and patriotic principles upon which our American civilization is based.

New Jersey's Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll on April 29 in his proclamation stated:

Whereas we hold it to be self-evident that through undivided national allegiance we may strengthen our national security and, whereas the great freedoms upon which our Nation is founded imply no license to support causes and leaders which would subvert them * * * I call upon all citizens to join in appropriate patriotic parades, rallies, and religious services in their respective communities.

His request was more than answered in the cities of Newark and Trenton by respective Mayors Vincent J. Murphy and Donald J. Connolly. The organizations which took part in the procession were cheered along the parade route and as they passed the reviewing stand in front of City Hall. Grand marshal of the parade was William Swazey, World War II hero of Trenton; General Chairman William H. Falcey led thousands of marchers in a colorful procession which was organized by a citizens' committee which included Frederick A. Clarici, president of the Central Jersey Industrial Union Council, CIO; Joseph G. Landgraf, president of the Mercer Central Times newspapers; Edmund Goodrich, publisher of the Trentonian; William Griffin, program director for WTTM; Comdr. Robert Fisher, Post 93, American Legion; and Col. Ed. Thorp, trustee for the VFW, Mercer County.

In Santa Fe, N. Mex., Gov. Thomas J. Mabry, from his hospital bed, had a statement denouncing communism sent to the Trade Union Courier with the request that it be featured in their Loyalty Day edition. The Governor said:

America need not fear subversive efforts of foreign agents so long as the press, the radio, our leaders, and our churchmen continue to give the public the facts about actual conditions in Russia. No patriotic American would ever be misled by propaganda praising false foreign ideologies.

In Wisconsin, the National Loyalty Day Committee's request for organization of some special patriotic parade or services was answered in Ashland by Thomas E. Anderson, Department Commander of the Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars, who stated that a 2-day district meeting, with National Commander-in-Chief of the VFW Lyle T. Beggs leading the district parade on Sunday, May 1, would emphasize the fact that it was a Loyalty Day parade. In addition Gov. Oscar Rennebohm at Madison said:

Being completely in sympathy with the objectives of the National Loyalty Day Committee, I, Oscar Rennebohm, Governor of Wisconsin, hereby proclaim Sunday, May 1, as Loyalty Day in Wisconsin. We must compete in time, spirit and ideology.

From Charleston, W. Va., Okey L. Patteson, Governor of West Virginia, stated:

I wholeheartedly endorse the Loyalty Day program; best wishes for the success of this campaign.

Gov. William M. Tuck, in the midst of special ceremonies commemorating Virginia's apple blossom festival, called Loyalty Day observance to the attention of the press.

Ir Austin, Tex., Governor Beauford H. Jester said:

The National Loyalty Day Committee has been organized to combat the effects of Communist propaganda and other Communist activities on "May Day," May 1. It is the expressed thought of this committee that we who believe in democracy must compete vigorously in time, spirit and ideology with those who are working tirelessly for principles opposed to and destructive of those principles that are basic in this country. Texans will be entirely in accord with this effort to make May Day "Loyalty Day" instead of "Red Day." Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate May 1, 1949, as Loyalty Day in Texas, and call upon all citizens, civic groups, church leaders, veterans organizations and other groups to endorse and join

in the observance and celebration of this significant day.

In Pierre, S. Dak., Gov. George T. Mickelson called on the people of South Dakota "to endorse and join in services in their communities in observance of May 1 as Loyalty Day."

In Pennsylvania, where Loyalty Day parades last year had the active support of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY and many other civic, labor, and church leaders as well as veterans' organizations, Gov. James H. Duff responded quickly to the National Committee's request.

Gov. Douglas McKay in Salem, Oreg., said he was "glad to endorse the program that the Secretary of Labor is sponsoring to call attention of American citizens to the purpose for the observance of Loyalty Day."

In Ohio special services were held throughout the State and in the city of Cleveland Mayor Thomas A. Burke sponsored with the Catholic War Veterans a special demonstration on the public square.

In answer to Mayor William O'Dwyer's proclamation some 200,000 New Yorkers marched in Loyalty Day parades along Fifth Avenue in Manhattan and Flatbush Avenue in Brooklyn, dwarfing by far the 10,000 to 12,000 Stalinists who paraded on Eighth Avenue in their annual "May Day" event. Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, as grand marshall, stated, "This is an opportunity to express loyalty to the American way of life" and when asked about the Eighth Avenue paraders commented, "If they love Russia so much, I think it would be a good investment for America to provide the boats for them to go over there."

In Albany Mayor Corning's proclamation was followed by a Loyalty Day program on Sunday, May 1, which was highlighted by a demonstration of religious groups, school students, and veterans who paraded to the State capitol steps for special ceremonies.

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY was the principal speaker at a second day of loyalty observances in New York City on Sunday, May 1, when more than 30,000 people attended a demonstration at the Polo Grounds which was sponsored by Francis Cardinal Spellman. Saying he had seen the contrast between life in a free country and life under totalitarian rule, Mr. BARKLEY told the gathering, "Life is worthless without liberty." Attending the Brooklyn parade with Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, which began early in the morning of April 30 and brought out 70,000 paraders, Mayor O'Dwyer said:

> The main purpose of the parade is to let the enemies from within know that the people are on their toes and will not stand for them.

In New Hampshire, George Clark, adjutant of the VFW, Department of New Hampshire, notified each post throughout the State to conduct an appropriate patriotic demonstration, and Governor Sherman Adams unqualifiedly endorsed the program of the National Committee.

In Missouri, Joseph M. Darst, mayor of St. Louis, called on schools, churches, and civic and patriotic organizations to join with him in observance of May 1 as Loyalty Day.

In Minneapolis, Mayor Eric G. Hoyer contacted civic, religious, business, labor, and leaders of veterans' organizations, including Dr. Herbert B. Brunner, Rev. Arnold Love, Rev. E. S. Hjortland, E. J. Grimes, Robert Wishart, Phillip Pillsbury, George Phillips, Cecil Newman, and representatives of all of the veterans' organizations who formed a Loyalty-Day Committee and joined with Mayor Hoyer in issuing a proclamation urging "all patriotic citizens within our city to observe this day in prayer and personal reaffirmation to the fundamental concepts of democracy and the American way of life."

Michigan's Gov. G. Mennen Williams endorsed plans to observe May 1 as Loyalty Day and said:

> I understand that the Pontiac CIO Council has made plans to observe this occasion with a mass pledge of loyalty to American institutions. I think it would be a good thing if every Michigan community could observe this day; the propaganda of groups which use May 1 as a holiday ought to be offset by those who believe in the American way of life.

Polish citizens of Baltimore combined Polish Day and Loyalty Day in the expressed hope that their ancient fatherland would regain its independence from Soviet Russia. Senators MILLARD TYDINGS and HERBERT R. O'CONOR and Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro were joined in the speakers' stand by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier of Poland, who addressed the gathering of several thousand and told them:

> There may be times as at present when an enemy nation gains temporary control over the lives and destinies of the people of Poland, but the fierce and determined action of freedom-loving men and women will prevail against the forces of evil.

Senator O'CONOR said:

> Communism must be recognized as the most dangerous threat of the moment.

Chairman of the ceremonies in Patterson Park was the Honorable Paul E. Burke.

In Augusta, Gov. Frederick G. Payne set aside Sunday, May 1, as Loyalty Day throughout the State and urged civic, labor, church leaders, and veterans' organizations to observe the day with fitting ceremonies to emphasize loyalty to American ideals.

In particular—

Governor Payne said—

> these organizations can work effectively to combat Communist propaganda which traditionally reaches a peak on May Day in many parts of the world.

In the city of Baton Rouge, La., Gov. Earl K. Long stated in his official proclamation:

> It is proper that we expend our best efforts to combat the effects of communistic propaganda and other communistic activities.

In Atlanta, Ga., Mayor William B. Hartsfield requested various civic clubs and other organizations "to utilize May 1 in impressing upon the people of Atlanta the high obligation of every citizen."

In Phoenix, Ariz., Dan E. Garvey, Governor, was joined in a special proclamation by Nicholas Udall, mayor of the city of Phoenix. Said Governor Garvey in his proclamation:

> Whereas in this period of political and economic world turmoil we can no longer accept complacently the benefits of our way of life in these United States, but must work consistently to maintain those benefits, and, whereas, May 1 is a fitting occasion upon which to stress the necessity for combating subversive activity and propaganda and to take up the challenge against those who are tirelessly working to develop a spirit and an ideology destructive to the basic principles of our country. * * * I proclaim Sunday, May 1, as loyalty day in Arizona.

Many other prominent leaders gave their support to the work of this national committee and others lent their names to several local committees in the principal cities of the country. It is hoped that these and other leaders of civic, labor, business, veteran, and church organizations will continue their efforts throughout the year. It is encouraging to know that some plans for next year are already going forward and that the national committee has become a permanent body incorporated under the laws of New York—Loyalty Day Parade, Inc.

It is fitting that the good work of this National Loyalty Day committee should continue and be encouraged by the broadest possible support. Toward that end I wish these remarks to be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that those who have initiated this most worthy project be further encouraged in the continuance of their program. Next year every community will want to join with this committee and go along with their excellent idea. For this year, congratulations and a well done for a good start.

Monthly Rates for Residence Exchange Service in Cities Over 100,000 Population

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following tables of rates in regard to residence exchange service.

I understand the data is estimated to make 3½ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $262.50.

Data is being had from the utilities collection legislative reference, Library of Congress:

Monthly rates for residence exchange service, cities over 100,000 population, Bell System (except Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.)

[Figures in parentheses indicate number of messages or message units included with monthly guaranty]

Exchange	Class	Individual line	2-party	4-party	Additional charge for local messages or message units
Alabama: Birmingham	Flat	$4.00	$3.50	$2.75	
California:					
Los Angeles	do	4.25	3.25		3½ cents.[1]
Do	Message		(60) 2.50		3½ cents each.
Oakland	Flat	4.25	3.25		3½ cents.[1]
Do	Message		(60) 2.50		3½ cents each.
Sacramento	Flat	4.00	3.00	2.50	
San Diego	do	4.25	3.25	2.75	
San Francisco	do	4.25	3.25		3½ cents.[1]
Do	Message		(60) 2.50		3½ cents each.
Colorado: Denver	Flat	4.15	3.65	3.15	
Do	Message		(40) 2.40		5 cents each.
Connecticut:					
Bridgeport	Flat	4.30	3.60	3.05	
Hartford	do	4.60	3.85	3.30	
New Haven	do	4.60	3.85	3.30	
Delaware: Wilmington	do	3.25	2.65	2.25	
Florida:					
Jacksonville	do	5.10	4.10	3.10	
Do	Message	(100) 4.30			3 cents each.
Miami	Flat	5.35	4.35	3.35	
Georgia:					
Atlanta	do	4.25	3.50	2.75	
Savannah	do	3.75	3.00	2.25	
Illinois:					
Chicago:					
Extended	Message	(80) 4.50			First, 120, each 4½ cents. Others, each 3¾ cents.
Do	do		(60) 3.50		First 140, each 4½ cents. Others, each 3¾ cents.
Do	do		(40) 3.00		First 40, each 5 cents. Others each 4½ cents.
Do	Coin	(108) 6.15	(66) 4.00		5 cents each.
Peoria	Flat	4.00	3.50	3.00	
Indiana:					
Gary	do	4.75	4.00	3.50	
Indianapolis	do	4.50	3.80	3.10	
South Bend	do	4.00	3.25	2.75	
Iowa:					
Des Moines	do	4.25	3.50		
Do	Message		(45) 2.75		Do.
Kansas:					
Kansas City	Flat	4.00	3.25	2.75	
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		4 cents each.
Wichita	Flat	3.75	3.25	2.75	
Kentucky: Louisville	do	4.50	3.75	3.00	
Louisiana: New Orleans	do	4.00	3.00	2.50	
Massachusetts:[2]					
Boston[3,4]	do	4.00	3.25	2.75	5 cents.[1]
Extended[3]	do	5.50	4.50		Do.[1]
Extended	Message	(75) 4.50	(50) 3.25		3 cents each.
Do	Coin	(80) 5.00			5 cents each.
Cambridge	Flat	4.00	3.25	2.75	5 cents.[1]
Extended	do	5.50	4.50		Do.[1]
Do	Message	(75) 4.50	(50) 3.25		3 cents each.
Do	Coin	(80) 5.00			5 cents each.
Fall River	Flat	3.25	2.75	2.25	
Lowell	do	3.25	2.75	2.25	
New Bedford	do	3.25	2.75	2.25	
Somerville	do	4.00	3.25	2.75	5 cents.[1]
Extended	do	5.50	4.50		Do.[1]
Do	Message	(75) 4.50	(50) 3.25		3 cents each.
Springfield	Flat	3.75	3.00	2.50	
Worcester	do	3.75	3.00	2.50	
Michigan:					
Detroit	do	5.50	4.75		4 cents.[1]
Do	Message	(90) 4.25	(60) 3.00		4 cents each.
Do	do		(30) 2.50		5 cents each.
Flint	Flat	4.00	3.25	2.50	
Grand Rapids	do	4.00	3.25	2.50	
Minnesota:					
Duluth	do	3.25	2.75		
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		Do.
Minneapolis	Flat	3.25	2.75		
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		Do.
St. Paul	Flat	3.25	2.75		
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		Do.
Missouri:					
Kansas City	Flat	4.00	3.25	2.75	
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		4 cents each.
St. Louis	Flat	4.50	3.75	3.00	
Do	Message		(40) 2.50		Do.
Nebraska:					
Omaha	Flat	4.50	3.75		
Do	Message		(45) 2.75		5 cents each.
New Jersey:					
Camden	Flat	5.25	4.00	3.00	
Elizabeth	do	5.75	4.50	3.25	
Jersey City	do	5.50	4.25	3.25	5 cents.[1]
Do	Message	(75) 4.25			5 cents each.
Newark	Flat	5.75	4.50		5 cents.[1]
Do	Message	(75) 4.50	(55) 3.25		5 cents each.
Paterson	Flat	5.50	4.25	3.25	
Trenton	do	4.75	3.75	3.00	

[1] Charge per message unit for service beyond the initial calling area but within the extended or metropolitan rate area.
[2] All rates shown for Massachusetts exchanges are subject to a surcharge of 5 percent.
[3] Not available in downtown Boston.
[4] Charge is 25 cents less in certain outlying areas.

Monthly rates for residence exchange service, cities over 100,000 population, Bell System (except Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.)—Con.

[Figures in parentheses indicate number of messages or message units included with monthly guaranty]

Exchange	Class	Individual line	2-party	4-party	Additional charge for local messages or message units
New York:					
Albany	Flat	$4.25	$3.50	$3.00	
Buffalo	do	5.00	4.00	3.00	
Do	Message	(75) 4.00			First 125, each 5 cents. Next 200, each 4 cents. Others, each 3 cents.
Do	do		(50) 3.00		First 150, each 5 cents. Next 200, each 4 cents. Others, each 3 cents.
Extended	Flat	6.50			
Do	Message	(75) 5.00			First 125, each 5 cents. Next 200, each 4 cents. Others, each 3 cents.
Do	do		(50) 3.50		First 150, each 5 cents. Next 200, each 4 cents. Others, each 3 cents.
New York [5]	Flat	8.00			5 cents.[1]
Do [6]	do	4.50	4.00		Do.[1]
Extended [7]	Message	(66) 4.25			First 234, each 5 cents. Next 300, each 4½ cents. Next 300, each 4 cents. Others, each 3¾ cents.
Do [7]	do		(57) 3.50		First 243, each 5 cents. Next 300, each 4½ cents. Next 300, each 4 cents. Others, each 3¾ cents.
Syracuse	Flat	4.25	3.50	3.00	
Extended	do	5.00	4.25		
Utica	do	4.00	3.50	3.00	
Yonkers	do	4.00	3.50	3.00	
Extended	do	4.75		4.25	
North Carolina: Charlotte	do	3.75	3.25	2.50	
Ohio:					
Akron	do	4.10	3.30	2.75	
Canton	do	4.00	3.25	2.75	
Cincinnati	do	4.75	3.50		
Do	Message		(45) 2.50		5 cents each.
Cleveland	Flat	5.35	4.05		4 cents.[1]
Do	Message		(55) 2.75		4 cents each.
Columbus	Flat	4.35	3.55	3.00	
Dayton	do	4.10	3.30	2.75	
Toledo	do	4.10	3.30	2.75	
Youngstown	do	4.00	3.25	2.75	
Oklahoma:					
Oklahoma City	do	3.50	3.00	2.50	
Do	Message	(60) 2.75			Do.
Tulsa	Flat	3.50	3.00	2.50	
Do	Message	(60) 2.75			Do.
Oregon: Portland	Flat	4.50	3.75	3.25	
Pennsylvania:					
Philadelphia	do	5.00	4.50		
Do	Message	(60) 3.75			First 40, each 4 cents. Next 100, each 3 cents. Others, each 2½ cents.
Extended	do	(60) 3.50			4 cents each.
Do	do		(45) 2.50		5 cents each.
Pittsburgh	Flat	4.50	4.00		
Do	Message	(60) 3.75			First 40, each 4 cents. Next 50, each 3 cents. Others, each 2½ cents.
Extended	do	(60) 3.50			4 cents each.
Do	do		(40) 2.25		5 cents each.
Reading	Flat	3.25	2.65	2.25	
Scranton	do	3.50	2.90	2.50	
Rhode Island:					
Providence	do	4.50	3.50	3.00	5 cents.[1]
Do	Message		(50) 3.00		5 cents each.
Tennessee:					
Chattanooga	Flat	3.75	3.00	2.50	
Knoxville	do	3.75	3.00	2.50	
Memphis	do	4.00	3.25	2.50	
Nashville	do	4.00	3.25	2.50	
Texas:					
Dallas	do	3.50	2.75	2.40	
Do	Message		(45) 2.25		4 cents each.
Fort Worth	Flat	3.50	2.75	2.25	
Houston	do	3.50	2.75	2.40	
San Antonio	do	3.50	2.75	2.25	
Utah: Salt Lake City	do	4.25	3.25	2.30	
Do	Message		(40) 2.25		5 cents each.
Washington:					
Seattle	Flat	4.75	4.00	3.25	
Extended	do	5.00	4.25		
Spokane	do	4.25	3.50	2.75	
Tacoma	do	4.25	3.50	2.75	
Wisconsin: Milwaukee [8]	do	5.60	4.75	3.90	
Do [8]	Message	(75) 4.35	(60) 3.10		4 cents each.

[1] Charge per message unit for service beyond the initial calling area but within the extended or metropolitan rate area.
[5] Available only in Brooklyn.
[6] Available only in Queens and Richmond.
[7] Charge is 25 cents less in outlying areas in the Bronx and Queens and in Richmond.
[8] All rates shown are subject to a discount of 25 cents for prompt payment.

THE HOME TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.,
Fort Wayne, Ind., April 4, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following information is furnished in answer to your letter of April 1:

Schedule of residence exchange rates applying at Fort Wayne, Ind.

	Monthly
Individual line	$2.75
Four-party line, city	1.75
Eight-party line, rural	1.75
Extensions stations	.75

Yours very truly,
FRANK E. BOHN,
Chairman of the Board.

APRIL 5, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request of April 1, the following is a tabulation of the monthly rates for all classes of residential exchange service furnished in the city of Rochester, N. Y.:

Optional message or flat rates

1 MR, $4.95, including 80 messages; next 120 at $0.0554 each; next 50 at $0.0493 each; over 250 at $0.04 each.
1 FR, $6.00.
2 FR, $4.75.
4 FR, $3.80.

These are interim rates established by the New York State Public Service Commission on November 21, 1948.

Yours very truly,
J. E. WYCKOFF,
Commercial Superintendent.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos.—Monthly rates, residence service, cities over 100,000 population

	Individual line	2-party line
Baltimore, Md.:		
Flat rate	$6.00	$5.00
Message rate	[1] 4.75	[2] 3.50
Norfolk, Va.:		
Flat rate	4.75	3.75
Message rate	[3]	[2] 3.00
Richmond, Va.:		
Flat rate	4.75	3.75
Message rate	[3]	[2] 3.00
Washington, D. C.:		
Flat rate	4.75	4.00
Message rate	[4] 3.75	[5] 2.25

[1] Includes 50 message units. All message units over 50 at 5 cents each.
[2] Includes 40 message units. All message units over 40 at 5 cents each.
[3] Not offered.
[4] Includes 50 message units. All message units over 50 at 4½ cents each.
[5] Includes 45 message units. All message units over 45 at 4½ cents each.

APRIL 6, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SLOWIE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 1, 1949, in which you request a schedule of monthly rates applicable to residential subscribers in the city of Tampa, Fla. Accordingly, you will find attached hereto in duplicate the schedule presently in effect. There is also attached in duplicate a map showing the boundaries of the several rate areas shown on the schedule. The base or first rate area includes all of the territory located within the city limits of the city of Tampa.

These rates have been in effect since July 1, 1926, and this company is preparing to submit a request to the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission for increase in rates and the information incident to the filing is being assembled. It is now estimated that the rates applied for will show an increase of approximately 15 percent over those shown on the attached schedule. If we can be of further service, please advise.

Very truly yours,
D. A. KAFKA,
General Commercial Superintendent.

LOCAL EXCHANGE TARIFF, TAMPA, FLA.

A. Within the base or first rate area, which is bounded by the municipal limits, main station residence rates are as follows:

Individual line	$4.35
2-party line	3.35
4-party line	2.35

B. Within the second rate area, main station residence rates are as follows:

2-party line	$4.35
4-party line	2.60

C. Within the third rate area, main station residence rates are as follows:

2-party line	$5.35
Party line	3.10

D. Beyond the third rate area, main station residence rates for dial phones are as follows:

Party line:	
Within 1 mile beyond third area	$3.85
Within 2 miles beyond third area	4.10

PENNSYLVANIA TELEPHONE CORP.,
Erie, Pa., April 7, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SLOWIE: The monthly rates for all classes of residential exchange service in Erie, Pa., requested in your letter of April 1 are as follows:

Individual line	$4.00
2-party line	3.25
4-party line	2.75
Multiparty line	2.75

Yours very truly,
PENNSYLVANIA TELEPHONE CORP.,
CARL H. MCKENZIE, *President.*

ASSOCIATED TELEPHONE COMPANY, LTD.,
Santa Monica, Calif., April 6, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SLOWIE: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of April 1, 1949, we are showing below the primary hand set station rate applicable to each grade of Long Beach exchange residence service:

Each primary hand-set station	Local service	Extended service
Individual line	$2.75	$3.25
2-party line	[1]	2.75
4-party line	2.00	2.60
Suburban line:		
Zone 1	2.25	[1]
Zone 2	3.00	[1]

[1] Service not offered.

Very truly yours,
ASSOCIATED TELEPHONE CO., LTD.,
EDWIN M. BLAKESLEE, *President.*

Education, Taxation, and the Private-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Education, Taxation, and the Private-Enterprise System," written by M. Vashti Burr, and published in the Pennsylvania Grange News of May 1949. Mr. Burr in his article opposes Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION, TAXATION, AND THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By M. Vashti Burr [1])

One cannot fully appreciate the significance of the numerous proposals for Federal aid to education, particularly those relating to elementary and secondary education, without giving serious thought to education, taxation, and the private-enterprise system as integral parts of the same picture.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

No one can honestly refute the fact that of all the factors which have made America great, with a higher standard of living than any other nation on earth and with a characteristic desire and capacity for helping other peoples, even while maintaining its own high standard of living, there are none so important as the American system of local self-government and the American system of free enterprise.

The Federal-State system and the system of free enterprise are imperilled by excessive taxation and consequently excessive control on the Federal level—first of all by the continuing tendency toward cutting off State and local governments from normal sources of revenue, whereby they may fulfill their own constitutional responsibilities—and secondly by the tendency to lessen incentive and penalize initiative, thus developing a system in which all the people gradually become dependent upon Federal hand-outs, grants, or aid in various guises.

A keystone in the American system of local self-government, encouraged and vitalized in the past by the spirit of free enterprise, has been and should be the American educational system, especially in the field of elementary and secondary education, untrammeled by reliance upon centralized national government.

Yet there are those, and in surprisingly large numbers, or at least vociferous and articulate numbers, who insist that the central government must assume responsibility for all school costs in order to equalize educational opportunity in the interests of

[1] The author, a former high school teacher, has been a practicing attorney of the Pennsylvania bar for 24 years and, since 1942, of the District of Columbia bar. Recognized as an authority on constitutional and tax law, Miss Burr also serves the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as deputy attorney general.

national welfare. They propose extraordinary measures for grants-in-aid to education which will tax all the people heavily, in order to make it possible for the Federal administration to administer aid and guidance to all areas, not only to those comparatively few where, because of special conditions, there seems to be a special need.

In this, as in certain phases of political thought, we find the struggle between what we may call the Hamiltonian and the Jeffersonian concepts.

ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

In 1791 Alexander Hamilton declared "that the interference and aid of governments are indispensable" and he proposed the use of public funds as capital through the public debt. However, the concepts enunciated by Thomas Jefferson prevailed. On the other hand, those who have believed with Jefferson in the theory of the Constitution that the Federal Government is one of limited powers have not been as vigilant as they might have been. Too many seem to have forgotten that the price of freedom from excessive government is eternal vigilance. They have become, apparently, outnumbered by supporters of Hamilton's view (managed economy), to such an extent that the latter may have succeeded in persuading the Congress to a too-wide assertion of Federal power in its interpretation of the interstate-commerce and general-welfare clauses of the Constitution.

The intervention of the Federal Government in the economic system to control, or attempt to control, its swing in one direction or another has become the rule. Economics and politics are so closely intertwined today as to be inseparable. The question has become: "How far shall the Federal Government be permitted to intervene?" If we are to have a free society, with a dynamic economy, we must continue to have the private enterprise system with only so much control as will assure order and establish rules.

Every American, whether he or she supports the family by private employment or has his or her savings invested in private enterprise, must of necessity lend active, informed support to the Members of the Congress and of the State legislatures in their efforts to maintain the Federal-State system of government. We can either

(1) provide the essential services by State [3] and local taxes [2] and by contributing to the Federal Government [3] sufficient moneys to enable the Federal Government to perform its primary functions and to make grants-in-aid on the basis of need to those few States which have not yet become so economically prosperous that they can finance their health, education, and assistance programs out of the State and local tax moneys, or

(2) support the view of many well-meaning pressure groups by saying with them, to our Members in the Congress: "Because there is need in a few States, the Congress should take over the responsibility for financing all State programs in order not to miss anyone."

If we follow the latter course, we not only say to Members of the Congress: "We will not re-elect you to Congress unless you see to it that Federal tax dollars, irrespective of need, are spent in every district you represent." We will, in effect, force the National Government ultimately to take over all State and local, business and individual, responsibility for employment and all public services. In that event, with the Government running all business, private and public, how would the Government raise sufficient revenue? Whatever it takes over is tax-free, as in the case of public lands. It could not any longer tax enterprise or income from private employment, and its principal present source of revenue would disappear.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION—TAX COORDINATION

However, we believe that the American people do not prefer a centralized system analogous to those alien systems wherein the States are mere administrative districts of a Central Government. If they do not, they should express support of those legislators in Washington who adhere to and respect the division of powers between the Federal and State Governments and who appear to be the only champions against all-out violations of the spirit of the Constitution. They should urge those legislators to adopt proposals, such as those made by the Joint Conference of Representatives of the Congress (House and Senate) and the Governors' Conference (1946-48), with the aim of closer relationship and cooperation between the Federal, State, and local governments in the selection of items or subjects for taxation and in the collection and use of tax revenues.[4]

The Eightieth Congress enacted into law one of those proposals, namely to correct the inequities between community property and non-community property States. The other proposals, for which there are many pending bills in the Eighty-first Congress, are (1) reduction or repeal of the transportation and communications taxes and other excise taxes which can be efficiently collected and administered by the State and local governments; (2) a more equitable division of revenue from inheritance and estate taxes, as provided in Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON'S bill in the Eightieth Congress (H. R. 3653); and (3) relinquishment of Federal tax on employers levied to cover administrative expenses of the State employment security programs.

These proposals constitute logical steps toward effecting an adequate arrangement between the Federal and State Governments, and between the States and their local subdivisions, whereby the tax revenues of each will be better defined, more definite, and free from needless interference from other governmental units, and the sources of taxation would, so far as practicable, be allocated or earmarked for each of them.

HOME RULE AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

It is extremely unlikely that the Federal administration will sponsor any proposal to help the States to help themselves by agreeing to let the States have any more tax sources. The trend is rather to encourage State and local governments, and individuals and private enterprise as well, to become dependent upon the Federal Government.

It is now proposed to spend a minimum of $15,000,000,000 in Federal aid for elementary and secondary education between 1950 and 1960, exclusive of billions for institutions of higher learning through scholarships and research programs. Add to this program still other billions for public health insurance at Federal Government expense (meaning at the expense of every American who pays taxes), extended social security coverage, general assistance, etc.—all in addition to the usual expenses of running the Federal Government, international relief programs, defense, and interest on the public debt.

It is absurd to assume that the American people do not know that they can accomplish all of the aids, alleged by the Federal administration and pressure groups to be needed, by financing from private sources (individual and private enterprise) and by State and local government revenues, at a minimum cost, greater efficiency, and within the framework which assures to future generations that freedom of initiative which has made our people free and strong.

The United States Government owes over $250,000,000,000—$6,000 for every American family; the States and their political subdivisions owe $20,000,000,000. If government took all of the wealth of all the corporations, it would not put the country on a sounder financial keel; but it would put the corporations out of business and the workers out of jobs. The Federal Government is costing annually an average of $948 per family now, exclusive of the national debt. Add to that the State and local government spending and we find that government, at present, costs 30 percent of all the earnings of all of the people. In other words, we are spending on government now the equivalent of one-third of our working time and effort. How much further can we go?

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Needless to say, the professors and teachers are important cogs in the American economic wheel. Unfortunately, they have not always been adequately recognized as such—as essential parts of the social and economic system—thus lending fuel for argument for those who would favor having the Federal Government virtually take over the educational systems through a process of taxing and giving aid in the form of grants or loans.

In his excellent article entitled "Fire Bell in the Night," [5] Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, maintains that "the theorist, the technologist, and the production man are in indissoluble partnership; each has his place, but the initiation of the productive cycle is with the professor."

The growing imbalance between the number of faculty members in publicly supported and privately supported institutions has reached the point where the number of teachers employed by the public or paid from the Public Treasury is now vastly larger than those employed by privately endowed or supported institutions. It is a fact, which may be shocking to many, that it is not alone the professor in publicly supported institutions who is now dependent upon public funds for his salary. Most of the larger private institutions are drawing very large parts of their budgets from contracts with the Federal Government. President Wriston points out that "in some institutions this has arisen to 50 per cent or more. In such circumstances," he says, "many professors even in endowed institutions no longer look to endowment—that is, to private enterprise—to supply the tools of their trade and meet the costs of their experiments, or even a substantial part of their salaries. They have become dependent upon Federal funds." As emphasized by President Wriston, "they are not likely to be opponents of the expansion of governmental activities. Not being dependent upon private enterprise, they will have less and less concern for the fate of the enterprise system."

Professors whose livelihood and labor are increasingly dependent upon Federal funds are not going to be inclined to resist Federal "encroachment" or to be greatly concerned over the fact that many privately endowed institutions would find their programs almost crippled if Federal Government contracts were withdrawn. President Wriston sums up the challenge in these words: "Those who have an interest in the preservation of the enterprise system will be well advised to see to it that the private institutions are not weakened further and that Govern-

[2] Forty-six percent of Pennsylvania's State revenue results from taxes on the privilege of doing business on the earnings of private enterprise.

[3] Ten percent of every $1 in the Federal Treasury comes from Pennsylvania.

[4] See S. Rept. No. 1054 (80th Cong., 2d sess.) entitled "Coordination of Federal and State Taxes."

[5] Vol. X, No. 1, Tax Review, January 1949, published by the Tax Foundation, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

ment does not engulf or even dominate higher education."

In view of some of the extraordinary proposals which have been made and are being made in the Congress of the United States, let us underscore that challenge by declaring that those who have an interest in the preservation of the American system will be well advised to see to it that Government does not engulf or even dominate elementary and secondary education.

If the Federal Government (even on the modest scale of only several million dollars per year for the first few years) should take over the responsibility for supplying the means of support of the educational systems in all school districts in all the States, as now proposed, there would be no turning back. It isn't done. Once the responsibility is assumed under a broad authorization by the Congress, it would not only be a recurrent but an everlasting responsibility.

Elementary and secondary education are basic channels through which a centralized government, under the leadership of one who aims to perpetuate himself or his clique in power, could wield extreme, albeit subtle, influence in molding the society in the ways best suited to such an aim. This has been amply demonstrated by nationalized school system in many foreign lands. It would be grist for the mill of a Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin. It must not happen here.

Repairs to the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THF SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Boners in White House Repairs," published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONERS IN WHITE HOUSE REPAIR

I am an architect. During my career I have designed and altered some of the biggest houses in this country. I know as much about residential design and construction and about modern methods as anyone.

The public should fully realize that the Senate Appropriations Committee has approved the estimate of $5,400,000, submitted by the budget, for restoring the White House the press reported that Chairman CANNON, fo the House committee, has expressed it as his conclusion, from the information submitted, that they should tear down the present building and construct a new one and thereby possibly save 13 percent of the estimated cost of restoration (which is a comparatively small saving).

I categorically state that (1) the present White House could be restored so it would be as sound as a new building constructed on the same plans; (2) it would not be possible for anyone to legitimately spend $5,400,000 in properly restoring the present building; (3) to build an identical new building would cost more, without question, than the restoration in these days; (4) it naturally would cost a great deal more to build a bigger White House.

All the experts seem to have agreed that the inner foundation walls need to have footings under them, i. e., a wide base under the bottom of a foundation wall or pier to spread the weight in the ground. But, as to the outer walls, the press reported that Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Administration stated before Congress that "the outer walls are exceptionally thick" and that their foundations have footings 6 feet wide on both sides under them. That is sufficient width for any New York skyscraper. I note that Mr. Reynolds would not express an opinion as to what should be done, as it is not his project. In old times they often did not put footings under inner walls when the foundations rested on firm ground in cellars not affected by frost. In restorations we often put them under such old walls if needed or if they have settled in the interim years. It is not necessary to sink down such foundations themselves to a further depth of 20 feet, as was suggested, in order to reach hard pan—solidified gravel or stone. There are many other methods equally effective and less expensive. Apparently a great many people involved know very little concerning residential construction. A house is not an office building.

As to the questions of design and sentimental value, the White House in its very simplicity and smallness is and always will be a stirring sight to every visitor. It is not a palace, and not even good architecture, but a simple house imbued with its history and events and time, and has won an impressive dignity not equaled by any magnificent palace. With a simple beginning, it has acquired the character of our people, steeped in the traditions of the past—which only old stone, brick, and mortar can retain—through their very struggles and pains it emerged with a quiet serenity. No modern architecture, and most certainly not any flapper modernistic style, can produce such quiet serenity and dignity. We prefer restoration of the old. The famous Truman Gallery was an improvement in a way, in that it relieved the pinched effect of the tall columns in the south portico. If some people believe that our old buildings should be replaced by newly designed ones, then let them begin with the Treasury and the Capitol, which are certainly inadequate.

If the powers of the moment determine upon a new duplicate or entirely different White House, then it should be designed by a most carefully selected group of the leading residential architects of the country. We want no more smug-looking filling stations like the new east wing.

I do not desire to get a finger in the pie and am not a seeker of publicity.

ARCHITECTUS.

The Berlin Airlift

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, events of a stirring nature are under way in Europe. Agents of the major powers are about to confer in Paris on the future of Germany. All persons are following these matters closely.

But I think that all of us here in the House of Representatives would do well to pause in honor of the brave and gallant airmen who brought about the situation whereby the Soviet Union has agreed to talk things over with the western nations.

I refer, of course, to the personnel of the Berlin airlift operation. It was their superb accomplishment, made in the face of terrific obstacles, that compelled the Soviet Union to agree to a conference.

Members of the House, Republicans as well as Democrats, have long known of the great work that the men on the airlift have done. Quite a good many members have made the trip into Berlin by means of the airlift. They have all recounted the excellence of the operation conceived by that brilliant soldier, Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

And the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has been fully aware of what has been going on. I know he is gratified at the performance of our flyers and their ground crews.

Last February 15, Mr. VINSON introduced a bill to establish the decoration Medal for Humane Action for award to persons on duty with the airlift. I think it is a meritorious bill. It is H. R. 2737. It should be acted upon favorably as soon as possible.

The airlift was set up on June 26, 1948. Since then American airmen have made 127,969 flights carrying 1,173,895 tons of goods and passengers into Berlin. Twenty-seven of our men were killed in the course of this work.

The British contribution to the lift, I might add, consisted of 61,278 flights in which 354,355 tons of freight and passengers were transported. Twenty-six of their men were killed.

All of this has brought the cold war into a new phase and most favorable to us.

I might say that one of the men, a very fine correspondent, who has been very much interested in seeing appropriate action of this kind be given to the brave Americans who participated in the successful Berlin airlift is Dick Rendell, of the American Broadcasting Co., who, on several occasions spoke to me about legislation to give to those who participated in this airlift proper recognition through the medium of an appropriate medal. I am sure that if the Committee on the Armed Forces reports out legislation along this line that such legislation will receive the immediate unanimous consideration of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The Problem of the Aged

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under the social-security program we provide for old-age pensions to those over 65, which in my State of Wisconsin averages about $36 a month. Nation-wide these pensions average about $25 a month. Under

the old-age survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act the average payments to beneficiaries will not exceed $36 a month. Then we say to old-age beneficiaries that if they earn in excess of $15 a month their pensions will be taken away. We likewise say that if they become inmates voluntarily or involuntarily of a publicly supported institution they lose their pensions under social security. Thus, we are in effect compelling thousands of our elder citizens to live on annuities that under present conditions cannot afford adequate bare subsistence and reduce them to a level even below, in many cases, the subsistence levels provided for the population of Germany.

A privately operated home for the aged can take in voluntary inmates, and these people can continue to receive their old-age pensions which helps pay for their care. Thousands of these old people are unable to enter such institutions and are compelled to live in constant fear of illness and lack of proper nutrition. It therefore has impressed me for years that this whole program must be reappraised with a view to building fine, decent county homes where people may voluntarily go and still retain their pensions, enabling them to pay the per diem cost of operation and thus receive proper nutrition, nursing, and medical care.

As a step in the direction of accomplishing this end, I have offered legislation in this Congress that would permit the voluntary inmate of county institutions to continue to receive his or her old-age pension. This legislation known as H. R. 947 is before the House Ways and Means Committee. I am hoping that the committee will report the matter favorably at this session.

In addition to that I have offered legislation to change the definition of hospitals in the Hospital Construction Act, known as the Hill-Burton law. Under the present legislation, institutions that provide principally domiciliary care are not included in the program. This would exclude county homes and county institutions for mental diseases generally from receiving hospital construction benefits under the law. My bill would extend the benefits of the Hill-Burton law to provide Federal assistance to the counties in the construction of county homes even though the principal care rendered was domiciliary in character. It would also permit the rehabilitation of the existing structures, and so forth, to provide for suitable homes.

As a part of these remarks I wish to include an editorial dealing with the problem which appeared in the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern. The editorial follows:

FACING PROBLEM OF AGED

At Marshfield a recent incident formed the basis for serious and practical comment in an editorial in the Marshfield News-Herald in regard to a glaring lack of facilities in that community for proper and needed care of aged persons who have no mental health impairments.

The case in question had to do with a woman resident of Marshfield on public relief who had no place to go and in which to live. It was found that the home for the aged at Port Edwards was filled to twice its capacity. The only available county institution that could house her was the Wood County Hospital or asylum, built and operated primarily for caring for incurable mental patients. That hospital also care for about 20 persons who are not mental cases, but are more or less mentally infirm or senile, due to advanced age.

The Marshfield newspaper stated that many Wisconsin citizens have protested this grouping of the mentally ill and those in fairly good mental health in county hospitals originally designed for persons whose mental illness cannot be cured. It said on this matter:

"We have failed to provide sufficient space and facilities in our county home for the aged. That is where this woman belongs. That is where 20 others, now in the Wood County Hospital should be. And any attempt to place blame upon others for sending her, and the 20 others referred to, to that kind of living conditions is not good citizenship. We must shoulder the blame ourselves."

Going into the problem further, the Marshfield Hews-Herald stated:

"It is so easy to slight public charges. It is so easy to overlook the ever-increasing number of aged men and women who must spend the last years of their lives as public charges.

"Eventually, we must meet head-on this problem of providing for the aged. If it means another home for the aged in north Wood County, then it must be built. The problem cannot be sidestepped, even though taxes in all categories and at all levels are steadily increasing. The fact is that there is a sufficient number of patients now in the Wood County Hospital to populate a fair-sized home for the aged. How much happier they would be in more normal surroundings than they are now among younger, incurable mental patients. Let's not attempt to place responsibility or blame upon others, let's shoulder both ourselves. Let's face up to the problem."

Our own Winnebago County also has the serious problem of decent care for aged indigents and action to solve the situation has been slow and uncertain over a considerable term of years.

Since the Winnebago county home was destroyed by fire in 1944, county old-age charges have been boarded out at county homes in various counties. There are, at last report, about 55 of these. This, however, is not the complete picture.

Many persons in the county, at least 150, should now be in a county home. Some are taking up space in Mercy Hospital in Oshkosh. Reports are they are not ill but senile and simply in need of housing care. Others are in private homes, living alone and also in need of care. These homes could be sold or rented to relieve the local housing shortage. Still others are living with relatives who, though not complaining, find it inconvenient and hard to be suitable companions because of age differences.

The county board special committee on the institutions project failed to put over the proposed county asylum plan largely because supervisors felt that cottages or a less expensive county home can and should be provided for the aged first. If an asylum is built first, the home-for-the-aged problem is merely postponed that much longer.

The proponents of the plan for cottage-style old-age care believe a number of cottages can be erected for $300,000 and another $100,000 be spent in fireproofing the old asylum.

The amount of money set aside now for institution construction is $400,000.

In the cottage plan, as used in Manitowoc County, the aged live in units of two, three, or four in a small cottage. Central heating plant, dining room, recreation, and administration quarters are in a master building within a short radial distance from the cottages. Individuals may plant gardens or utilize space around the cottages for recreation.

Winnebago County has its serious problem in respect to the indigent aged and is still far from working out a prompt and satisfactory solution.

A Message That Will Probably Fall on Congressional Deaf Ears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what a refreshing thing it is to see the message from an organization which still believes in and functions under a home-rule program. The greatest civic achievements can usually be credited to those communities where the people believe in themselves, their own courage, their own determination, and build upon their own resources. It is reminiscent of an old saying of 2,000 years ago "You will confer the greatest benefits on your city not by raising its roofs, but by exalting its soul."

I know that the people of West Virginia are proud of this home-rule program, and will look with justified pride upon it.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a most unusual letter from the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce with reference to the subject of Federal aid:

WEST VIRGINIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charleston, W. Va., May 2, 1949.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Under bills pending in the Eighty-first Congress to provide "Federal Aid for Education" to the States, West Virginia would receive $9,360,000 annually, which sum, under provisions of an act of our Legislature would be apportioned 71 percent to teachers' salaries, 29 percent to bus drivers and other school employees.

Regrettably ignored was a request filed February 10, 1949, with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, seeking an opportunity to present the opposition of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce to this Federal "aid" proposal, and we therefore avail ourselves of this means of presenting what seems to be conclusive evidence of the willingness as well as the ability of the people of West Virginia to support their public schools without burdening an already seriously overburdened Federal Treasury.

Figures in the attached table show that West Virginia taxpayers have increased elementary and high school financial support 137 percent during the past 10 years; school teachers' salaries have been more than doubled; and precipitous as the rise of income of West Virginians has been in the past decade, public school support has kept pace with it.

Having increased "State aid" payments from $1,000,000 to $45,000,000 annually in a 15-year period, the people of West Virginia are now centering their efforts on measures designed to increase local financial support

for schools. Based on a 1947 legislative act, $7,000,000 more of local revenues are anticipated by the fiscal year 1951; an act of the 1949 legislature contemplates the eventual release of $72,500,000 of presently impounded bonding capacity for local school building purposes, and the legislature also provided $10,000,000 of temporary aid to schools for buildings, thus making a good start on the problem of a $100,000,000 backlog of school building needs in West Virginia. It is our firm conviction that a Federal aid hand-out would not only retard, but might even reverse the present healthy trend toward greater local and State responsibility for school support in West Virginia.

Respectfully yours,

H. A. STANSBURY,
Managing Director.

Income and related data on elementary and high schools in West Virginia

[Compiled by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Apr. 10, 1949]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Receipts (thousands of dollars)					Total as percent of State income payments	Teachers average annual salary	Per capita pupil cost [1]
	Local bonds	Local revenues	State aid	General school fund (net)	Total			
						Percent		
1928	1,770	24,422	1,000	1,108	28,300	3.8	----------	$55.32
1929	1,408	25,394	1,250	1,273	29,325	3.7	----------	58.79
1930	2,165	26,564	1,000	1,167	30,986	4.5	----------	59.79
1931	297	26,361	1,250	1,194	29,102	4.8	----------	57.44
1932	----------	24,651	925	1,050	26,626	5.8	----------	54.68
1933	----------	20,931	1,175	1,052	23,158	4.9	----------	50.57
1934	----------	12,700	10,500	777	23,977	4.1	----------	42.98
1935	38	12,585	10,500	995	24,118	3.7	----------	52.23
1936	----------	11,859	10,500	1,824	24,183	3.3	----------	52.89
1937	----------	11,363	11,779	1,357	24,499	3.2	----------	53.54
1938	2,899	12,450	13,250	1,244	29,843	4.3	$1,121	56.34
1939	832	12,973	14,000	1,290	29,095	4.1	1,133	57.06
1940	----------	15,198	13,500	1,224	29,922	3.9	1,172	59.20
1941	1,675	14,683	14,150	2,335	32,843	3.6	1,185	58.87
1942	----------	15,829	15,825	3,167	34,821	3.2	1,272	63.94
1943	----------	16,456	17,005	4,636	38,097	3.1	1,276	67.21
1944	----------	16,108	20,225	2,471	38,804	2.8	1,508	79.30
1945	----------	15,969	20,350	2,843	39,162	2.7	1,523	81.10
1946	1,300	16,669	22,417	1,786	42,172	2.5	1,672	87.62
1947	975	19,141	22,559	2,080	44,755	2.3	1,700	91.89
1948	347	21,969	37,299	3,208	62,823	[2] 3.0	2,364	122.60
1949 [3]	----------	22,250	37,599	3,000	62,849	[4] 3.3	2,425	[5] 124.50
1950 [3]	----------	23,300	[6] 44,926	3,000	71,226	[7] 4.0	2,480	[5] 127.00
1951 [3]	----------	24,450	[6] 45,488	3,000	72,938	[8] 4.3	2,550	[5] 126.00

[1] Based on net enrollment.
[2] Based on estimated income payments of $2,100,000,000.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Based on estimated income payments of $1,900,000,000.
[5] Based on estimated net enrollments: 1949, 426,000; 1950, 433,000; 1951, 460,000.
[6] Includes $5,000,000 annually for buildings.
[7] Based on estimated income payments of $1,800,000,000.
[8] Based on estimated income payments of $1,710,000,000.

Sources of data: West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools; State Education Association; U. S. Department of Commerce, and West Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

NOTES.—For fiscal 1946, latest year available for all States, (1) average U. S. teacher's salary was $1,995 and (2) United States average of school expense as ratio of State income payments was 1.72 percent, West Virginia ranking sixth among all the States with 2.42 percent of income payments of that year devoted to local schools.

"DEFAMATION BY RADIO OR TELEVISION

"SEC. 330. (a) Each corporation engaged in chain broadcasting, and each licensee, shall, with respect to each State in which any program of such corporation or licensee will be heard or seen—

"(1) (A) Designate an agent who is a resident of such State for service of process in all civil or criminal proceedings for slander, libel, or defamation which may be instituted in such State, whether in a State or Federal court, as a result of the radio broadcasting activities after the effective date of this section of such corporation or licensee, and (B) file with the Commission the name and address of such agent; and

"(2) Post with the Commission a bond containing such terms and conditions, and in such amount, as the Commission shall determine to be adequate to ensure that such corporation or licensee will appear, where required, in any such civil or criminal proceeding, and will satisfy any judgment or fine which may result from such proceeding.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any individual using the broadcasting facilities of any licensee for the dissemination of any program for which such individual receives compensation to announce, discuss, or comment upon the news or current events, unless, prior to such program, such individual shall have, with respect to each State in which such program will be seen or heard—

"(1) (A) Designated an agent who is a resident of such State for service of process in all civil or criminal proceedings for slander, libel, or defamation which may be instituted in such State, whether in a State or Federal court, as a result of such program, and (B) filed with the Commission the name and address of such agent; and

"(2) Posted with the Commission a bond containing such terms and conditions, and in such amount, as the Commission shall determine to be adequate to ensure that such individual will appear, where required, in any such civil or criminal proceeding, and will satisfy any judgment or fine which may result from any such proceeding."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Protection Against Defamation Over the Radio

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last night Walter Winchell, that persistent little slime monger of the air, attacked the bill which I have introduced in the House to protect the American people from just such impositions as he and Drew Pearson have been perpetrating.

You remember they acted as tools of the Anti-Defamation League, a Communist outfit that has for its object the persecuting of white gentile Americans.

They went on the air and attacked General Patton right in the heat of the war when that great hero was leading our men to victory. By these attacks they disturbed the American people and the administration to such an extent that General Patton was called out, and the war was slowed down with a cost to us of the lives of 70,000 of the finest, bravest men who ever lived.

In any other country in the world they would both have been shot at sunrise.

Last night this little impostor, Winchell, attacked my bill, H. R. 4206, which I have introduced to protect the American people from just such slime mongering as he and Drew Pearson and others have been carrying on.

The time has come when the American people are going to demand that the Congress protect them from just such abuses.

If this measure is not perfect, the committee can amend it. But some such measure should pass now, so as to protect the American people against these unjust attacks.

The bill to which I refer reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to assist individuals who are defamed over the radio or television in recovering damages therefor, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the eminent columnist Lowell Mellett with the usual discernment of his analytical mind portrays lucidly the basic reason for labor's demand for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Even if I tried I could do nothing to express my feelings more forcefully or ably on this subject which I desire to preserve in the RECORD. Mr. Mellett's comments were published in the Washington Star under date of May 7, 1949.

ON THE OTHER HAND—BASIC REASON FOR LABOR'S DEMAND FOR REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

(By Lowell Mellett)

The opposing forces in the battle over labor legislation in Congress still seem as far apart as East and West and it may be that never the twain shall meet. This can be said despite a remarkable development

during the week that might appear to indicate the contrary.

Three of the authors of the Taft-Hartley Act, including Senator TAFT himself, introduced a bill designed to make that bone of bitter contention a little more palatable to labor. The new bill would retain 22 provisions of the present act, while making 29 changes in it. Some of these changes meet, in part, some of the particular protests of labor's spokesmen. But the new bill as a whole is certain to prove as offensive as the bill for which repeal is being demanded. This is because of its underlying philosophy, its general approach to the subject of labor relations.

BAN ON CLOSED SHOP

It is important to understand this, if one wishes to understand labor's grim determination to have the Taft-Hartley Act wiped off the books. The Taft-Hartley law supplanted the Wagner Act, beloved by labor—beloved and perhaps abused on occasion. The Wagner Act had one simple purpose: To protect labor in its right of collective bargaining, its right to make any kind of bargain it could make with employers.

The law now taking its place does something else. It undertakes to say what the bargains shall be, or, at least, what some important parts of any bargain may or may not be. For example, it banned the closed shop. It did this, notwithstanding that important employers had testified they were happy to have the closed shop and others had testified they considered it a legitimate subject for bargaining. The authors of Taft-Hartley thought they knew best and Senator TAFT apparently still thinks that way.

In the revision now offered by Senator TAFT, the ban on the closed shop would be retained, but employers would be "permitted" to notify a union that it needed some men and give the union a "reasonable opportunity" to offer some qualified applicants for the jobs. Presumably, that is the only kind of a bargain on the point that Senator TAFT would make if he were an employer and he sees no reason why any employer should be allowed to do anything he wouldn't do.

WELFARE FUND APPROACH

The same approach is revealed in the matter of welfare funds. Very large employers told the Senate Labor Committee they preferred to have their welfare funds administered entirely by the unions; they wanted none of the headaches that went with the operation. They based their attitude on long and satisfactory experience. Mine operators, confronted with a demand from John L. Lewis for a welfare fund, thought differently; they wanted to help handle the money. So the T-H law decreed joint administration—which, incidentally, appears to be working out badly in the case of the miners. Senator TAFT'S new proposal is that joint control shall not be required if the employer does not wish it.

The point made by labor is that the law should not attempt to regulate the terms or conditions under which welfare funds are set up; that this is something for the employer and his hired hands to work out between themselves—in other words, collective bargaining.

So the evil, or the error, in the Taft-Hartley Act, as labor sees it, is basic, in that Congress has given itself a seat at the bargaining table and, not only that, but a seat for the most part on the employer's side of the table. That is why labor—or the spokesmen for labor—will not be satisfied until the law is rubbed out.

When, and if, that is done, the labor leaders say, it will be time to take up legislation concerning national emergencies, political activities, and other matters not related to collective bargaining.

Address by Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, at a large public rally on "Peace Without Appeasement" sponsored by Common Cause, Inc., at Carnegie Hall on Thursday, May 15. It is a most forthright and realistic appraisal of the exceedingly serious peril which the free peoples of the world face today as the result of Soviet actions in Europe and Asia and of our own Government's incredible folly in refusing for so long to recognize the facts of life regarding the nature of world communism and its leaders and their unchanging determination to achieve subjugation of the whole world:

Ladies and gentlemen, as we gather here tonight as free Americans, millions of people are huddled together in silent, fearful masses in the countries which have fallen under the cruel oppression of Russian communism. We are gathered in the cause of freedom. We desire peace. But we know from bitter experience that peace is a product of strength and unity, that war is a derivative of weakness, and that appeasement multiplies the hazards of war. We know that American freedom is in jeopardy when the freedom of other countries is threatened. We have given somewhat belated but none the less welcome recognition to the indivisibility of freedom in the Marshall plan and in the Atlantic Pact. But we have failed in China and we have failed in those countries of eastern Europe whose ancient civilizations are enslaved by a godless Communist dictatorship. We know that there is no safety for us, that there is no secure freedom for us, and that our peace is at best a precarious interlude between wars as long as this barbaric force is allowed to expand. We know that there is no freedom behind the iron curtain.

Gathered with us here tonight are eminent statesmen, leading members of the clergy, military men, professors, and others who managed somehow to escape from the iron jaws of the modern political monster which threatens the world with another war. We know from them and from countless others that the vaunted Communist paradise is in fact a red hell. We know, in this spring of 1949, while we Americans are privileged to enjoy the manifold pleasures and satisfactions so generously provided by our own blessed America, that in these shattered countries there is neither light nor joy nor love nor certitude nor peace nor help for pain. We know that these suffering human beings look to us for help. They look to us to be steadfast in our faith in freedom. They count on us to discharge the heavy responsibilities which are inseparable from freedom. We can take comfort from the knowledge that our opportunities for useful service, for dynamic leadership are equal to these grave responsibilities.

We can take heart from the success achieved to date by the Marshall plan. We can take heart from the Atlantic Pact as a portent of strength and unity in a dangerous world. We can take heart from the growing power of our national-defense establishment. We can take heart from the diminishing number of Communists in the countries of western Europe. We can take heart from such inspiring events as the Italian election of a year ago. We can be encouraged by the Benelux agreement, by the Scandinavian trade agreements, by the Franco-Italian customs union. We can be encouraged by the growing determination of all free peoples to resist the onward tide of communism.

But essentially we are engaged in a holding action—a holding action which, since the rape of Czechoslovakia over a year ago, has achieved some successes in Europe and particularly in Berlin. It has certainly been a lamentable failure in China.

For the fact is that we cannot win the cold war by a holding action. No war was ever won by holding. Victories, whether in peace or war, are achieved by pressing forward with patience, with imagination, and with courage. The further fact is that if we do not win the cold war, we shall inevitably have war.

Accordingly, it is appropriate that we think deeply about the plight of those millions of people for whom freedom is but a poignant memory and who at this very moment are languishing in the stygian horror of the torture chambers, in the fetid squalor of the prisons, and in the indecent stench of the concentration camps created by our former comrades in arms. It is fitting that we think of them not simply for humanitarian reasons, not just because we are a generous and friendly people, not merely because many of our most talented and loyal citizens came from these countries, but because the capture of the governments of these nations by the Soviet Union is one more step in the determination of the Kremlin to capture the Government of the United States.

The fate of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, of Albania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania, of Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Poland, the fate of the people of Byelorussia, the Ukraine, and Russia itself will be our fate unless we wake up and wake up now. Had we only known it, our own survival as a Nation was threatened when our leaders participated in the betrayal of Poland at Yalta; our own national security was jeopardized at Tehran and Potsdam; our own safety was compromised in the Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, and Italian peace treaties.

In all these countries there is but a small minority of Communists. Indeed, there are more Communists outside than behind the iron curtain. In these countries there are also groups of brave men and women who, in the face of almost unbelievable obstacles, are striving with all the meager means at their command to keep vibrant and vital the faith in freedom for which America preeminently stands. These brave people are entitled to our encouragement and to our assistance.

While it is true that the Berlin blockade has been a set-back for the Kremlin, it is most interesting to note that signs of an agreement regarding Berlin appeared on the diplomatic horizon at the time that the Chinese Communist armies were reaping their greatest victories. Let us not become overoptimistic by the turn of events in Berlin. The rumored end of the Berlin blockade may be followed by a Russian suggestion that all troops be withdrawn from Germany.

Let us rather turn our eyes toward China in an effort to grasp the whole cataclysmic significance of that disastrous defeat. For this defeat will, I fear, postpone the day of deliverance of the people of eastern Europe. The State Department's announced policy with regard to China has been to "wait until the dust has settled." Well, ladies and gentlemen, the dust is settling pretty fast in

China and, intermingled with that dust are the ashes of our great Pacific victories. Crumbled with that dust are the heartbreaking, the irreparable sacrifices by which we won the war in the Pacific, sacrifices which involved the lives of 108,000 Americans. Surely, in the face of these sad sacrifices and the stake which we have in this fateful game, we cannot afford to throw up our hands in despair and say that nothing can be done. These victories are essentially a greater threat to us than to the Chinese. China's historic civilization will vomit up the virus communism even if it takes 100 or 150 years. But western civilization is not geared to such long-term tests.

Make no mistake about it, the evil tentacles of communism are reaching around the world in an effort to strangle the United States. We are at this very moment engaged in a gigantic world-wide life and death struggle for survival and for the preservation of freedom. There is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts, the final confession of men's inability to agree. We need friends to win the cold war. And if, God forbid, we should lose the cold war, we shall need friends to win the war which, in that dire event, would be hard upon us.

We have many friends in the countries of eastern Europe, people of tested courage—people who are ready to devote their time, their energy, and their lives if necessary for the preservation of that freedom for which so many Americans have died. They need our effective assistance and we need their wholehearted collaboration.

While in the larger sense we are engaged in a grim battle for men's minds, communism as an idea has not been contagious. The Communists have never won control in a free, open, fair election. They conquered Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by sheer force of arms. Their armies invaded Bulgaria, Rumania, and Poland. They captured Albania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Hungary by outside pressure, by internal force, and by intimidation, bribery, and corruption.

What are we going to do about it? We used flame throwers in World War II; we used atomic bombs; and yet we are reluctant today to use the methods which might bring us victory in the cold war, thereby avoiding World War III. We must learn to operate in that twilight zone of action in which communism makes its greatest gains.

We must learn how to neutralize and defeat internal aggression.

Ladies and gentlemen, we resisted the attempts of Adolf Hitler to conquer Europe by force of arms. We must prevent the spread of the Communist terror. We must roll back the iron curtain. Our actions must be related to the terrible reality of the threat which is charging down upon us. The fact is that we are now, and for some time have been, involved in a subversive war. But we are not ourselves engaging sufficiently in effective countersubversive activities. The members of the Politburo are handicapped by no such restraints as those which we have imposed upon ourselves. They are waging this conflict by every means short of what we recognize as war. We must do likewise. Such action in no way diminishes the moral quality of our leadership. It enables us to deal effectively with the challenge. The new postwar weapon is not the atom bomb, of which we have made no postwar use, but internal force which the Russians have used with terrible effect.

We must also fight the ideological battle by constant and convincing reaffirmations of our faith in freedom. We must meet the totality of the challenge which totalitarianism has thrust upon us. Our problem is to achieve victory short of a shooting war.

Let us not forget the people who, having recently experienced the brutality of Nazi oppression, are now suffering the cruelty and horror of the Soviet nightmare.

Let us say to ourselves "There but for the grace of God go I."

Let us sound the clarion call of freedom.

And then, mighty in our faith, sure of our sacred objectives, we shall lead the freedom-loving people of this prostrate planet out of the wilderness of doubt, defeatism, and despair and onto the broad sunlit plain of liberty and peace.

Advantages to Employees of the Proposed Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Mr. Ed Weston, president of the Washington State Federation of Labor, outlining the advantages to employees of the proposed Columbia Valley Administration contained in the personnel provisions of the CVA bill, H. R. 4827, which I have introduced:

Mr. EDWARD WESTON,
President, Washington State Federation of Labor, Seattle, Wash.

MY DEAR MR. WESTON: My understanding is that very recently Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON has released for publication a statement which expresses the view that personnel provisions in the pending legislation to establish a Columbia Valley Administration are unfavorable to organized labor.

There is utterly no basis for such allegations. On the contrary, the rights of labor are more effectively protected in the CVA legislation than they are in the operations of the existing Federal agencies now carrying out resources development in the Pacific Northwest. Previously on March 19, when the legislation was being drafted, Mr. TOLLEFSON submitted to Secretary Krug a list of eight points with relation to personnel. These points were carefully considered in the drafting of the CVA legislation. Let me now restate these points and indicate how they are provided for in specific sections of the CVA bills (S. 1645, H. R. 4286, and H. R. 4287) now pending in Congress.

1. "That all the employees of a Columbia Valley corporation shall have rights with respect to security of tenure as provided by the civil-service laws." Section 15 (b) of the CVA bill provides "employees of the Administration shall have rights with regard to security of tenure reasonably comparable to those provided by the civil-service laws." Thus employees of the Administration in having such security of tenure cannot be removed without cause and the usual procedure of justification and appeal.

2. "That all the employees of the Columbia Valley corporation who are subsequently transferred to other positions under the civil-service laws shall be credited for the purpose of seniority for the time spent as an employee of the corporation." Section 15 (b) of the CVA bill also states that "employees acquired by transfer from other establishments or agencies of the United States shall retain all pay, leave, and retirement credits which they held at the time of such transfer, and in case they subsequently are retransferred to positions under the civil-service laws, shall be credited for the purpose of seniority with the time spent as an employee of the Administration." Persons who might be employed by CVA could not obtain civil-service status without complying with civil-service rules. Therefore, CVA could not comply with this suggested point for all its employees. I am certain that labor prefers the language in the CVA bill because it leaves labor unions free to seek the incorporation in their collective-bargaining agreements of provisions which are overlooked in civil-service regulations. You and other labor leaders who have negotiated with Bonneville Power Administration, particularly before the Bonneville Power Act was amended, are familiar with the need for flexibility in this provision.

3. "That all employees of the Columbia Valley Corporation be included under the provisions of appropriate Federal injured workmen's compensation laws." This point is specifically covered in the CVA bill. Section 15 (d) provides in part that "the benefits of the act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 743), as amended, relating to compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries, shall extend to persons given employment under the provision of this act." The act of September 7, 1916, is the appropriate Federal injured workmen's compensation law which relates to compensation of Federal employees for injuries suffered in performance of their duties.

4. "That the Columbia Valley Corporation be authorized and directed to bargain collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing and that the Corporation be authorized to enter into written collective-bargaining agreements which shall be binding and enforceable in the courts of the United States." Section 15 (a) of the CVA bill provides in part that "the Administration is authorized to deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing and is authorized to enter into written or oral contracts with such employee representatives." Any contract entered into by the Administration, including a labor contract, is binding and enforceable in the courts of the United States under section 6 (a) of the CVA bill.

It is appropriate here to answer an unsupported allegation against the labor provision of the CVA bill which is apparently being given wide circulation. Opponents have pointed out that the Jackson and Mitchell bills (H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287) contained the statement that "Any employee of the Administration may be removed in the discretion of the Board." This statement appears in section 15. Through a printer's failure to strike out language crossed off on the draft, the above sentence appeared accidentally in the first print of the two House bills. The bill clerk of the House, when the error was brought to his attention, ordered an official-corrected second printing of the bill which is just now being distributed. The error was caught before printing S. 1645, which was introduced several days following the House bills, and so the Senate bill does not contain this language.

5. "That, so far as is legally possible, all pertinent Federal laws relating to labor-management relations shall apply to the Columbia Valley Corporation or to any contractor holding contracts under the Corporation and all employees of the Corporation and such contractors." Section 15 (h) of the CVA bill provides in part that "the provisions of the act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494), as amended, shall apply to all contracts in excess of $2,000 to which the Administration is a party and which require

the employment of laborers or mechanics in the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of its buildings, dams, locks, or other structures or facilities * * * in the determination of such prevailing rate or rates, due regard shall be given to those rates which have been secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees." Generally speaking, the act of March 3, 1931, provides for the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics on public-building projects. These rates shall be the locally prevailing wage rates and shall be paid weekly at the site of work. The scale of such wages must be posted. Violations by contractors result in withholding of payments, cancellation of contracts, and an inability for 3 years thereafter to obtain the awarding of a Government contract. In addition to the provisions of this act, all pertinent Federal laws relating to labor-management relations will apply to any contractor with CVA as well as his employees, in the same fashion as these laws apply to contractors with other Government agencies. You are familiar, of course, with the provisions in section 6 (e) of the CVA bill which direct the CVA to carry out its construction work by contract, except in emergencies or unusual circumstances.

6. "That the legislatures of the various States located in the region affected by the Columbia Valley corporation be authorized to require the corporation to include its employees in the unemployment compensation program of that State and to make contributions to an unemployment fund as required by the State."

7. "That the employees of the Columbia Valley corporation be included under the provisions of the social-security laws."

8. "That the corporation be required to perform all the necessary functions to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws in the collecting of withholding taxes and the forwarding of same to the Department of Internal Revenue."

These three points are specifically covered in the CVA bill, and the provisions are copied after the relevant sections of the Bonneville Power Administration Act, as amended.

Section 15 (e), (f), and (g) of the CVA bill extends the retirement protection of the Social Security Act to any employees of CVA employed in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of facilities, who are not subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act. It also makes the unemployment compensation tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code applicable to all such employees, and grants the States permission to extend their unemployment compensation acts to include such employees. This would, of course, authorize CVA to make the contributions to State unemployment funds. These sections also require CVA to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws and the collecting of withholding taxes and forwarding of same to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The personnel provisions of the CVA introduced in both the House and the Senate embody and, in fact, go far beyond legislation in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration. Yet it is common knowledge that organized labor has fared very well in its relations with both of these Government organizations.

Using the Tennessee Valley Authority as an example, it can be said that its freedom from disagreement with labor throughout its 15 years of existence has been notable. From its very inception the TVA recognized union labor and entered into collective-bargaining agreements with unions representing various crafts in the trades of the labor field. Since 1937 the American Federation of Labor has set up the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council to coordinate the activities of all the local trade-unions in the federation, and in 1940 this Trades and Labor Council negotiated a written agreement with TVA. As you probably know, this agreement affirmatively provides for the encouragement of employees to participate in employee-management relationships through membership in the unions affiliated with the council.

I will not set forth in detail the various labor welfare programs that have been jointly conducted and administered by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Trades and Labor Council. For a better bill of particulars I bring to your attention an article in the February 25, 1949, issue of the Union Register of Portland, Oreg., the official publication of the lumber and sawmill workers, AFL, entitled "Labor Fares Well Under the TVA Plan."

Labor in the Pacific Northwest has had experience working with the Bonneville Power Administration under laws which did not specifically provide for all of the points noted in this letter. None the less, this experience has proved to be mutually satisfactory, both to the unions involved and to the officials of the Bonneville Power Administration. Consequently, labor through experience has come to trust both the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration. I am convinced that labor will be even more satisfied with the strong safeguards for their rights which the proposed CVA will provide by law and not by administrative ruling.

Sincerely yours,

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Lt. Col. Winfield W. Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, May 6, 1949, it was my privilege to witness the reburial of Lt. Col. Winfield W. Scott with full military honors at Arlington Cemetery. Colonel Scott, a native of Enid, Okla., and the son of my friend and fellow attorney Winfield Scott, graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1924. He transferred to the Army and went to the Philippine Islands in 1939. He died of wounds inflicted upon him in a Japanese prison camp on July 30, 1942. The heroism of this fine American officer can best be summarized by referring to the posthumous citations which he received for the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star.

CITATION FOR THE LEGION OF MERIT
(POSTHUMOUS)

Lt. Col. Winfield W. Scott, while serving on Luzon, Philippine Islands, as commanding officer, Eighty-sixth Field Artillery Battalion (155-millimeter guns) from December 8, 1941, to April 9, 1942, distinguished himself through the performance of outstanding services. Colonel Scott displayed exceptional professional ability in furnishing prompt, accurate, and efficient counter-battery fire, and in delivering harassing concentrations on enemy rear areas and installations. His aggressive leadership, sound judgment, ready initiative, and dynamic force contributed a great deal to the defense of Bataan. His loyalty and unfailing devotion to duty under the most trying conditions and circumstances were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Army of the United States.

CITATION FOR THE BRONZE STAR MEDAL
(POSTHUMOUS)

Lt. Col. Winfield W. Scott, O15916, Field Artillery, United States Army, on April 16, 1942, distinguished himself near Lamao, Bataan, Philippine Islands. On the Bataan "Death March," with men weakened by hunger, plagued by thirst, disheartened by their defeat, he moved back and forth along the column, encouraging them to keep moving to avoid death or injury at the hands of the enemy. When two soldiers, seriously ill, finally had to stop, he saw the Japanese guard rush up furiously, bayonet in hand. Immediately, he rushed to the assistance of the sick men, the Japanese guard lunged fiercely, but Colonel Scott successfully deflected the bayonet thrust. Despite a severe wound he sustained by his action, Colonel Scott carried on with the column and continued to encourage and inspire the men by his own courageous example.

The gallant and courageous conduct of this brave son of Oklahoma and his sacrifice on behalf of his country are a challenge to all of us. He left to take up his work in the defense of his country his son, Winfield Scott, Jr., now a cadet at the United States Military Academy at West Point. I am sure that Cadet Scott will ever treasure the memories of his father and be stimulated thereby and that he will ever maintain the high trust placed in him in the defense of his country. You and I and the family of our departed hero can join with the poet in saying:

Some other world is glad to see
Our star that's gone away;
The light whose going makes our night
Makes somewhere else a day.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 5, 1949, pertaining to the Taft-Hartley repeal legislation which was recently before the House for consideration:

TIME FOR A FRESH START

As a result of a successful last-ditch parliamentary maneuver the administration has succeeded in achieving at least a temporary stalemate in the bitter contest over labor legislation. On Tuesday the House first rejected a compromise bill offered by the majority leadership, then voted, 217 to 203, in favor of the rival Wood bill, sponsored by a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats. However, administration forces were able to put off a final vote on that measure for 24 hours, and in the interval succeeded in swinging enough votes at least to postpone its adoption. By the narrow margin of 212–209 the bill has been returned to committee.

It is expected to remain there pending action by the Senate on a measure of its own.

The move by the House in recommitting the Wood bill takes some of the sting out of the administration's failure either to obtain passage of its own minimal legislative program or to defeat the rival coalition bill by frontal attack. It also provides it, somewhat unexpectedly, with an opportunity to consider afresh its whole approach to the promised revision of the labor law. If it uses this hard-won breathing space wisely, then there is every reason to hope that a moderate and workable labor measure may still emerge from this congressional session. On the contrary, if it insists upon employing the borrowed time to carry the ball, legislatively, for uncompromising labor leaders, then there is nothing, in our opinion, that can save it from the major political disaster which it so narrowly averted on Tuesday.

In reorienting its strategy the administration, we suggest, might profitably begin by dropping, once and for all, the thoroughly fictional theme that Members of Congress whose sense of public responsibility will not permit them to vote for a revival of the Wagner Act in lieu of a modern labor-management bill are guilty of "repudiating the 1948 Democratic platform." It was on the basis of this frequently reiterated argument that the President threatened a week ago to withhold patronage from Democratic Members of the House who opposed the Lesinski (administration) bill.

In view of all the talk that has been heard about the labor plank of the Democratic platform, it is high time, it seems to us, to check back on that document and see precisely what commitments it imposes upon Democratic Party members. The labor plank contains just two proposals bearing directly upon the present legislative controversy. Only the first of these is specific and unequivocal. That is the proposal which says: "We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act."

Every one of the bills that have been introduced in the House during the last fortnight—the two majority bills and the opposition bill—has called for "repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act."

One will look in vain for any mention in the Democratic platform of the Wagner Act or for anything that might conceivably be interpreted as suggesting the desirability of substituting that outworn measure for the present law. What the platform advocates is:

"Such legislation as is desirable to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining; to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employers and employees to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests, and to enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influences."

Since the administration has been the one to invoke the issue of loyalty to the party platform, it is certainly not unfair to ask how its own approach to the problem has conformed to the latter's terms. The answer is, it seems to us, that it has conformed only in its negative proposal to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Aside from this, it has plainly been less interested in achieving legislation which would secure the legitimate rights of both employers and employees than legislation which would be pleasing to the labor unions.

First, it was proposed to combine repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and reinstatement of the outmoded and one-sided Wagner Act of 1935 in one package, letting the question of amendments remain to be taken care of, presumably at some time in the indefinite future. When it finally became apparent that Congress would not stand for such procedure, it produced the Lesinski bill, which was little more than a thinly veneered version of the Wagner Act. That measure's conception of safeguarding the public interest was to scrap the injunction instrument provided for in the present law for use in national-emergency disputes; its idea of securing the legitimate rights of both employers and employees was to provide that the former, but not the latter, must bargain collectively in good faith, and, while the platform proposed to keep (union) membership free from communistic influences, the administration bill dropped all references to the anticommunistic oath demanded under the present law.

The House Democratic leadership subsequently moved to correct five of the more obvious shortcomings of the Lesinski bill. But, welcome as these changes were, it should be noted in all frankness that they were adopted belatedly and for a purely strategic reason. That reason was that a strong combination of Republicans and Southern Democrats had produced a rival measure that was manifestly not only sounder than the administration bill but much more in keeping with the philosophy of the Democratic Party platform.

Whatever ultimate form the pending labor legislation takes, no Democratic Member of Congress should be made to feel, or permitted to feel, that his party loyalty is in question so long as he abides by the spirit of the Democratic platform. To the extent that the final bills presented by both sides—the Wood bill and the Sims bill—conformed to the precepts laid down in that document, the preponderance of credit for that accomplishment belongs clearly to the House membership and not to the administration.

Berlin for China—a Poor Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Star of May 5, 1949:

COMMUNIST ADVANCES IN SOUTH CHINA STRENGTHEN RED HAND IN GERMANY

(By Constantine Brown)

The relentless and unopposed march of Communist forces toward South China and the borders of Indochina, Malaya and Burma has had powerful repercussions not only in Asia but also in Europe, and particularly Germany.

While our State Department ignores the Far East and considers China a poor relation, the U. S. S. R. is taking full advantage of the situation, which both the Europeans and Asiatics seem to understand far better than we do.

Moscow now is smiling broadly at the United States. That this is not a sincere smile is apparent to most policy-makers in Washington and other western capitals.

VICTORY ON PAPER ONLY

The Berlin blockade, which has been spectacular but unimportant insofar as overall military and political strategy was concerned—is expected to be lifted next week, possibly Monday. This will be pictured by the interested officials—who need diplomatic victories, even if they are only on paper—as a great success for western diplomacy.

The conversations between the Big Four for the settlement of the German question will follow in a short time.

The Kremlin now is reported to be willing to accept the new Bonn constitution, which establishes the Western German republic, as a basis for discussion and is willing to have it apply, with certain modifications, to a unified German republic in which the Eastern zone occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be integrated. This would be accompanied by an agreement to withdraw the armies of occupation, under which Russia would withdraw her forces 50 miles from the German border while we would pull our troops back 4,000 miles.

The Soviet has shown keener interest than formerly in having the economic—and particularly the industrial—life of Germany restored as soon as possible after the German republic is reestablished. The politburo expects that rejuvenated state to be associated as closely as possible with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This hope is based on the economic advantages it can offer the German people, rather than on the establishment of Communist ideology in that country.

REDS OFFER MARKETS

While the Western Powers can make but scant promises, such as temporary benefits from the European Recovery Program, Moscow is able to tell the Germans even now that they can have—if they follow an intelligent cooperative policy with the East—the vast Far Eastern markets which Russia is not in a position to satisfy.

These markets in the past were dominated by the Western Powers, which now are being rapidly and effectively expelled. The Germans, who long competed for Far Eastern trade—exports of cheap manufactured products and imports of vital raw materials—feel that with Russia's help they may get almost a monopoly on that vast portion of the world, provided they follow a policy of cooperation with Moscow rather than with the West.

The estimates of the policymakers in the State Department, who believed that America could do business with the "agrarian reformers" headed by Mao Tzetung, have missed fire. Regardless of what the feelings of some Chinese Communist leaders may be, Russia now is the dominant power in the Far East and controls not only the various governments, which are mushrooming in the "liberated" areas, but also their armies.

United States Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Gentlemen, it gives us great pleasure to welcome the Sixth Congressional Board of Visitors to Kings Point. The advice and assistance of the Members of Congress are essential to the continued well-being and development of the Federal Merchant Marine Officers' educational program. We trust that your visit to Kings Point will prove to be informative and pleasant. In turn, we look forward to your support and guidance during the coming year, so that our problems may be resolved in such a manner that we may continue to play an important part in

upholding the position and power of the United States Merchant Marine.

PART I. INTRODUCTION

Following the First World War, American shipping entered into a progressive decline. Quickly built under a wartime construction program, these ships grew old together, and by 1936 we were in sore need of rehabilitating our tonnage with modern designs. After an exhaustive survey of the needs of our merchant marine, the Government set up the United States Maritime Commission and embarked on a strong new program to regain our rightful eminence in ocean shipping. Fortunately for the country, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 commenced to build strength into the merchant marine when it was most needed, for no sooner were fine, newly designed vessels laid down than we were faced with the growing threat of war.

"No material improvement," according to Senate Report 776, "can take the place of a well-instructed, disciplined, and properly organized personnel. While a poor ship may be operated safely by a well-disciplined crew, the best ship can easily come to grief with a poor crew."

The Maritime Commission, recognizing the truth of this statement, carefully laid the groundwork for Government training of officers. The United States had lagged far behind other maritime powers, which for years have had strong officer-training systems in operation. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, authorized the establishment of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps on a permanent basis. Talented young men from every State and Territory could thus for the first time study under a Federal merchant marine officer-training program. Congress authorized the location and building of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, L. I., N. Y., to carry on a strong educational program for the merchant marine on a permanent, national scale. The cadet corps was established March 15, 1938. Prior to the location of its academy at Kings Point in 1942 (after several months of negotiations before Pearl Harbor), shore training of cadet-midshipmen was carried on in the vicinity of San Francisco, New Orleans, and New York. Private facilities were leased for a time in New London, Conn. In these locations relatively small numbers of cadet-midshipmen were educated, but, coincidentally with the permanent location of the academy at Kings Point, the enrollment grew sharply to meet the abnormal wartime need for officers. The site at Kings Point was occupied by the academy in January 1942, and when the academy's permanent buildings were completed, dedication ceremonies were held on September 30, 1943. There were then over 7,700 cadet-midshipment in various stages of their training. Some were in cadet schools in Pass Christian, Miss., and San Mateo, Calif.; others were at sea in the combat zones all over the world, studying their profession at first hand on merchant vessels, and still others were at Kings Point undergoing advanced studies before being examined for their merchant marine licenses as third mates or third assistant engineers.

During the war, 6,634 officers were graduated from the abridged wartime courses. Even before the end of the war, however, plans were being made to improve the curriculum and to work toward the reestablishment of the 4-year course at the college level originally planned for the Cadet Corps before the war. This meant that the studies would embrace a wider field, and cover more of the important general education which could not be done during the war. In 1946, courses and laboratories for physics, chemistry and electronics were set up; the students commenced the study of cultural subjects, including foreign languages, and the curriculum approached the ideal of a well-rounded 4-year engineering program. The original and highly essential feature of 1 year's time spent in practical studies afloat was, of course, retained, and it today represents one of the most important features by which the Cadet Corps graduates competent ship's officers.

In 1947 and 1948 the curriculum was further modified. The Academy had progressed far toward its goal of awarding the Bachelor's degree to those completing the prescribed 4-year course of study. The total number of graduates at this day stands at 8,881 exclusive of the 216 in the class graduating in June 1949. Not only are graduates licensed for service in the merchant marine, and enrolled as ensigns in the United States Maritime Service, but they are also commissioned with rank of ensign in the United States Naval Reserve. Of the more than 14,000 Merchant Marine Officers holding commissions in the Naval Reserve, over 60 percent are graduates of Kings Point. As a group, they represent a strong force for a better merchant marine and a most valuable asset in the armed strength of the country in time of war. The number of cadet-midshipmen in training to become officers has been consistently reduced since the end of the war to fit the needs of a peacetime merchant marine.

PART II. OPERATION

The conduct of the United States Merchant Marine Academy has been carried forward on a progressive basis during the past year. Definite advances have been made in improving the efficiency of the general program. Budget allowances, while below the optimum figure for maximum efficiency, nonetheless have permitted the operation of Kings Point with a reduced complement of cadet-midshipmen.

The Academy has continued to acquire substantial amounts of new equipment and apparatus, much of it at no cost through transfer from other governmental agencies and from manufacturers. In this respect, it may be said that Kings Point is better equipped for its purposes than the average technical college elsewhere in the country. In particular, the United States Navy has been extremely cooperative in making available surplus material for educational purposes.

In June 1948 the graduating class numbered 90 deck officers and 146 engineering officers. Eighty-five percent of this class, according to a survey made by headquarters, were serving as ship's officers or were attached to the shore staffs of shipping companies as of September 1, 1948. The class of December 1948 numbered 5 deck officers and 45 engineering officers, practically all of whom went to sea as officers. The next class, that of June 1949, will graduate shortly with a total of 65 deck officers and 131 engineering officers.

The Academy, at this time, is just completing the transition from the group of cadet-midshipmen, who originally enrolled under wartime conditions to the peacetime group who applied for admission after the cessation of hostilities. It is mainly on this account that our total of graduates has not remained at a steady level each year over the past several years. The number of graduates from Kings Point in the fiscal year 1950 will be approximately 234. Of these, about one-half will be deck officers and about one-half will be engineer officers. A detailed study of the merchant marine has shown that the peacetime total of 1,200 merchant ships will call for the replacement of approximately 1,200 officers each year. It has been found that this proportion represents a normal factor by which the turn-over in the merchant marine may be judged. A total of 250 graduates a year from Kings Point still leaves ample room for other officers graduating from the State maritime academies and from those who have risen to officers' positions at sea through upgrading courses supplied by the United States maritime service schools and in other ways. This relatively small number of graduates from Kings Point may be expected to compete freely with all others for officer positions on board vessels; the Kings Point graduates will by no means prevent officers from other sources from securing positions on board our ships.

The report of the first academic advisory board stressed the necessity of providing a more stable basis for employment for instructors and Academy personnel. The Academy is still lacking in a proper plan for the establishment of tenure and retirement for its staff as is provided for other government and non-government employees. The Chief, Bureau of Maritime Services, has plans for these important measures in process of development, but their official adoption depends in large measure upon the extent of annual appropriations.

It is felt that the size of the staff should be commensurate with that of other similar institutions so that the work load can be properly spread for efficient operation.

The allowance to cadet-midshipmen for the payment by them for their uniforms, other clothing, textbooks, laundry, fees, taxes, travel, and other school necessities remains at $65 per month, whereas the allowance for similar items for the midshipmen at Annapolis and the cadets at West Point and the Coast Guard Academy is fixed by law at $78 per month. This allowance should be equalized.

PART III. ACADEMICS

During the past year the Academy has undertaken many measures to improve the academic program both at Kings Point and during the third class year which the cadet-midshipmen spend at sea on merchant vessels. During this period the Academy has been twice visited by the Academic Advisory Board, which was authorized by Public Law 214, Eightieth Congress, and which is composed of seven prominent educators. This board contributed many highly valuable suggestions and recommendations for the betterment of the academic program, and it is felt that the members of the congressional Board of Visitors will find a review of the measures recommended by these educators to be highly interesting and worthy of close study. It has been recognized by this board that Kings Point has an unusually specific mission, one which embraces many complex problems in giving cadet-midshipmen sufficient training and education in diversified maritime fields such as nautical science, seamanship, engineering and naval science as well as in general education, pure science and ship's business, all a part of the proper education of the present day Merchant Marine and Naval Reserve officer. The curriculum by which the Academy endeavors to carry out its mission is admittedly a very full one and requires further study; yet so important is each constituent part that revision must be undertaken slowly and only after the most thorough diliberation. It may be said that as a general principle the curriculum will be lightened somewhat for the cadet-midshipmen. As a result it is expected that the efficiency of study will be increased owing to the provision of greater amounts of time for study.

The Academic Advisory Board, and the administrators of the Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, of which Kings Point is a unit, recognize the need of providing more stable working conditions for the faculty and other members of the staff, lighter teaching loads in those departments where instructors carry excessive loads at the present time, and continuance of the Academy's present program for the improvement of faculty member's qualifications.

This is done through courses at other universities taken on the instructors' own time.

This academic year saw the appointment of the Academy's first academic dean, Dr. William M. Randall, who came to the Academy from the University of Chicago and University of Georgia. He has had military service in both World Wars; in the last war he was a colonel in the Army Air Force and served for more than 3 years overseas. The Academy is making every effort to raise the level of academies. It is significant to note that the second Academic Advisory Board's report contained these words: "It is the unqualified opinion of the members of the Academic Advisory Board that in quality and amount of work the Academy meets any reasonable standards for the conferring of the bachelor's degree." This is encouraging support for these distinguished educators. The Academy, nonetheless, is continuing to improve the academic program in many ways, chiefly with respect to increasing the internal efficiency of the academic routine.

The month of March 1949 was also high lighted by the visit of the inspection committee from the commission on higher education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This is the authority to which the academy has made application for its accreditation in order to be enabled to award the bachelor's degree to cadet-midshipmen after completion of the prescribed course of study. Composed of persons prominent in the educational field, this committee exhaustively investigated every detail of the operation of the United States Merchant Marine Academy. Their findings will be made known in due course. It is significant to note, however, that the Academy is to be judged to a very large extent upon its mission and its success in fulfilling this mission, and inasmuch as the entire activity of the Academy is directed toward the purpose of graduating well-educated and well-trained merchant marine and Naval Reserve officers, it is hoped that the recommendation of the committee will be a favorable one. The committee itself will present its recommendations to the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and if the latter body acts favorably upon the matter the Academy will then be in a position to carry out the desires of Congress relating to the awarding of degrees by the United States Merchant Marine Academy. This step is looked forward to with anticipation; the authority to award the accredited bachelor's degree, if granted, will mark an important milestone in the Academy's steady growth from its inception up to the present time.

PART IV. CURRENT PROBLEMS

In the final analysis, the outcome of every progressive measure for the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy depends upon the adequacy and stability of the budget structure. Authorized and established as a permanent national academy, on a basis of equal importance with the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies, the United States Merchant Marine Academy needs broad congressional support in order to carry out its mission. In order to resolve the problems of continuing the proper development of the Academy, it is essential that not just the bare operating expenses be met, but that sufficient money be provided for the enrollment of sufficient staff, as well as provision for promotions of personnel, and for a proper retirement plan. We earnestly solicit your support in order that these problems may be solved in the proper manner.

It is important for the efficiency of teaching that the Academic Departments be allotted sufficient funds for the purchase of necessary educational equipment, apparatus, and supplemental items. It is felt that over the past 2 years there has been too little allotted for these purposes; again, the problem is one resolved only by an adequate annual budget.

It is important to note that the nonacademic departments and their activities are also of key importance in supporting the educational program. Thus, the department of public works, department of finance and supply, commissary department and others must have their needs met, and again the degree to which this can be done depends upon the annual budget. The physical plant of the Academy is growing older and the necessary maintenance is increasing in amount each year not only from the increasing age of the plant, but from the fact that a considerable amount of substitute materials went into its rapid construction in a period of scarcity. Thus, ordinary steel pipe was used instead of wrought iron pipe for many services, and the renewals from natural corrosion are proportionately higher.

The departments at large have been most fortunate in securing much surplus equipment—at no cost for the most part—but a tapering off of this method of supplying the necessary departmental stores, supplies, and equipment may be foreseen owing to the natural decline of various surplus stocks from which the Academy has been drawing.

The chapel and library, the construction of which have been authorized by Public Law 485 of the Eightieth Congress, are being planned. An active program for the solicitation of funds for the chapel is under way. For this purpose it has been found essential to separate the two buildings. A national committee, composed of persons of public prominence, will be appointed soon to carry out the active raising of a substantial portion of the necessary funds for the chapel. It will at the appropriate time be necessary for the Congress to provide funds to supplement the private contributions that are obtained as was contemplated by the act authorizing the construction of the chapel and the library.

PART V. PLANNING

The Academy is planning ahead in the academic and administrative fields. The Congressional Board of Visitors may be assured that every effort is being made to anticipate our needs, to match our activities with the needs of the marine industry, and to keep fully abreast of technical developments in seamanship, engineering, the business of shipping, and naval affairs. As an example of the latter, very close relations with the United States Navy are maintained; the Academy is now experimenting jointly with the Navy in giving instruction in naval science from a naval technological center by television to whole classes of cadet-midshipmen.

A major part of the academic planning is in the consideration of the measures recommended by the second meeting of the Academic Advisory Board. The curriculum as a whole is being studied by the academic dean, the academic department heads, and the faculty at Kings Point and the cadet school at Pass Christian.

Teaching methods, examination procedures, grading practices, and similar problems common to all educational institutions are under constant review.

In the field of budget and finance, the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point and its cadet school at Pass Christian seek to gain stability of annual budget and sufficiency of funds. As discussed in earlier parts of this report, many important improvements now being planned will ultimately hinge upon the all-important question of finance.

In summary, the administration of the Academy is actively reviewing its major problems, and the support of the Sixth Congressional Board of Visitors is sought with deep sincerity, to the end that Kings Point may fulfill its mission in merchant marine and Naval Reserve education.

Major War Crimes Trials in Nuremberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Major War Crimes Trials in Nuremberg," written by the Honorable James Morris and published in the April issue of the North Dakota Bar Briefs.

Judge Morris is an associate justice of the North Dakota supreme court, and in 1947 he was called upon to serve as a judge at the I. G. Farben Nuremberg war crimes trials. Participation in the trials has assuredly qualified Judge Morris to make these observations, and his article holds more than passing interest for many thoughtful citizens.

In addition to the foregoing positions of high judicial place, Judge Morris has ably served the State of North Dakota as attorney general, and also as chairman of the Selective Service Board of Appeals. His other public service includes active participation in many civic organizations, all of which have earned for him recognition as one of North Dakota's most outstanding citizens.

I have received an estimate of the cost of printing this article, which is $206.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR WAR CRIMES TRIALS IN NUREMBERG

(By James Morris, Associate Justice, North Dakota Supreme Court)

In early July of 1947 at the instance of the War Department, I left Bismarck for Germany to act as a judge in the trial of major war criminals at Nuremberg, and thus became a participant in a judicial experiment that will long remain a subject of discussion and comment by scholars and students of international affairs. I was accompanied by Mrs. Morris, who had a strenuous time maintaining a household in a foreign land surrounded by strange customs of the Germans and enmeshed in constantly changing regulations of the Americans. Her energy, patience, and devotion to the exhausting task of securing the necessities and some of the comforts of a home made it possible for me to endure the labor of hearing a case and participating in the preparation of its judgment, that occupied over 11 months.

The Nuremberg war crimes trials were the result of a number of conferences between representatives of the United States and some of our allies in the struggle against the Axis powers. These conferences may be considered basic authority for the trials.

In October 1943 representatives of the governments of the United States, China, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom pledged their united action for the organization and maintenance of peace and security, and further stated that they would confer and cooperate with one another and other members of the United Nations to bring about a practical general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the postwar period. The representatives of the three European powers then made a separate declaration regarding Italy in which it was stated that "Fascist chiefs and army generals known

or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice."

On October 30, 1943, a statement on atrocities was signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin warning the guilty of approaching punishment. This is known as the Moscow Declaration.

At the Crimean Conference (Yalta) in February 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin declared that they were determined to bring all war criminals to justice. The surrender of the German Army on May 8, 1945, was followed on June 5 by a declaration of Allied representatives regarding the defeat of Germany and the assumption of supreme authority by the Allies including the provisional government of the French Republic. This declaration provided for the surrender to Allied representatives of those suspected of having committed, ordered, or abetted war crimes or analogous offenses.

In the spring of 1945 Mr. Justice Jackson went to London as a United States representative, in order to start high-level governmental discussions on the establishment of procedure for the trial of major war criminals. These discussions resulted in the London Agreement of August 8, 1945, providing for the establishment of an International Military Tribunal for the trial of war criminals in Germany. Attached to this agreement was a document known as the Charter which set forth in a general way the powers of the tribunal, the procedure to be followed, and definitions of crimes coming within its jurisdiction. These were denominated crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

One trial was held under the Charter. The indictment presented 24 names. One of the defendants was not tried because of ill health. One committed suicide during the trial. One, Martin Bormann, was tried and sentenced to death in absentia. Twenty-one were present at the trial and offered their defenses. The indictment presented against most, but not all, of the defendants charged the crimes heretofore enumerated and the additional crime of participating in a common plan or conspiracy. The trial began November 20, 1945, and the judgment was rendered on September 30 and October 1, 1946.

On December 20, 1945, while the IMT trial was in progress, the military governors of the four occupying powers in Berlin promulgated and enacted Control Council Law No. 10 in order to give effect to the terms of the Moscow declaration, the London agreement, and the Charter of the IMT, and to establish a uniform basis for the prosecution of German war criminals other than those dealt with by the International Military Tribunal. This law included, by reference, the Moscow declaration, the London agreement, and the charter and authorized the occupying authorities to set up tribunals within their respective zones. It defined the following crimes in substantially the same terms as those used in the charter:

"ARTICLE II

"1. Each of the following acts is recognized as a crime:

"(a) Crimes against peace. Initiation of invasions of other countries and wars of aggression in violation of international laws and treaties, including, but not limited to, planning, preparation, initiation, or waging a war of aggression, or a war of violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing.

"(b) War crimes. Atrocities or offenses against persons or property constituting violations of the laws or customs of war, including, but not limited to, murder, ill treatment, or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose, of civilian population from occupied territory, murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

"(c) Crimes against humanity. Atrocities and offenses, including, but not limited to, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, torture, rape, or other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial, or religious grounds whether or not in violation of the domestic laws of the country where perpetrated.

"(d) Membership in categories of a criminal group or organization declared criminal by the International Military Tribunal."

Among the offenses enumerated as crimes against humanity is membership in a group or organization declared criminal by the International Military Tribunal. The charter provided that the IMT might determine and declare, in connection with the conviction of an individual, that the group or organization of which the individual was a member was a criminal organization, and that in subsequent trials based on membership, the criminal nature of the group or organization would be considered proved and should not be questioned. The argument that the Nuremberg trials violated the principle of nullen crimen sine lege, nulla poena sine lege, finds its greatest support with reference to this provision. Most of the tribunals, however, in actual practice softened the impact of this criticism by holding that guilt is personal and that mere membership in an organization declared to be criminal is not sufficient to warrant a conviction. Thus the dangers of embracing the principle of collective guilt and the consequent inhumanity of mass punishment were largely avoided.

The four-power enactment, Control Council Law No. 10, was supplemented in the American zone by a decree of the American Military Government known as Ordinance No. 7 which provided for the establishment of military tribunals within the zone, and made further provisions concerning their powers and procedure. These tribunals consisted of three judges. In some instances an alternate was also appointed who did not participate in the decision unless he succeeded to regular membership upon the disability of one of the regular members. I served on such a tribunal. It was designated as military tribunal No. VI and tried the case of The United States of America v. Karl Krauch, et al., which was popularly known as the I. G. Farben case. This tribunal consisted of Hon. Curtis G. Shake of Vincennes, Ind., presiding judge, Hon. Paul M. Hebert of Baton Rouge, La., and myself. The alternate was Hon. Clarence F. Merrell of Indianapolis, Ind.

The defendants were business, professional men and chemists, who were top officials of the I. G. Farben Industries. Twenty-four were indicted. One of them was gravely ill and unable to attend the trial. He was severed from the case and ordered held subject to subsequent proceedings. The other 23 pleaded not guilty and the case proceeded against them. The trial opened August 27, 1947, and the judgment was rendered on July 29 and 30, 1948. The case was prosecuted by a staff of twelve American attorneys headed by the Chief Counsel of War Crimes. Each defendant was represented by a chief counsel and an assistant. The defense attorneys were all German nationals selected by the respective defendants from a list approved by the American military government. The defendants were also represented by a specialist in international law who was a professor at Heidelberg University. The proceedings were conducted by simultaneous interpretation into English and German and were recorded on a sound track and also stenographically reported.

During the trial 6,384 documents were submitted, 189 witnesses testified, and the transcript covered 15,638 pages of legal cap paper. The testimony was transcribed into both German and English and was made available to the tribunal and the attorneys on both sides during the progress of the trial. An interval of about 3 days elapsed between the testimony and the availability of the transcript. A law library was maintained in Berlin but distance and difficulties of travel rendered it of little value to the tribunal. The trial was held in the main courtroom of the Nuremberg Palace of Justice, a huge, rambling, four-story stone structure consisting of over 600 rooms. In that courtroom a few months before, modern justice had overtaken and brought to trial and judgment the surviving political and military leaders of Nazi Germany. Spectators were permitted to occupy a large gallery and balcony, after being carefully screened and checked by the Army Security Office. Admittance was by pass only, and armed guards were in attendance at all times at entrances to the building and doors of the courtroom. No incident of disorder or rudeness occurred throughout the entire proceeding.

The indictment consisted of five counts. Count 1 charged that the defendants committed crimes against peace by planning, preparing, initiating, and waging wars of aggression and invasions of other countries. Count 5 charged a conspiracy to commit the crimes set forth in count 1. Count 2 charged war crimes and crimes against humanity in the plunder of public and private property, in countries and territories which came under the belligerent occupation of Germany in the course of its invasions and aggressive wars. Count 3 charged the defendants with war crimes and crimes against humanity through participation in the enslavement and deportation of members of civilian populations, the enslavement of concentration camp inmates, including German nationals, the illegal use of prisoners of war, and the mistreatment and murder of enslaved persons. Counts 1, 2, and 3 also said that the defendants were members of organizations or groups, including Farben, connected with the commission of the crimes charged in those counts under which all of the defendants were indicated. Count 4 charged four of the defendants with membership in the SS, an organization which had been declared criminal by the International Military Tribunal.

The defendants denied generally their commission of or participation in the crimes charged against them. They further interposed the defense of necessity. They took the position that such acts which they performed that might otherwise fall within the terms of the indictment were performed under the compulsion of the Reich dictatorship which left to the defendants no moral choice.

All defendants were acquitted of crimes against peace under counts 1 and 5. Eight were convicted under count 2. Four were convicted under count 3. One was convicted under counts 2 and 3, and 10 were acquitted on all counts. There were no convictions under count 4. Thus the trial resulted in 13 convictions and 10 acquittals.

The decision of the tribunal was unanimous in result with respect to all counts, except part of count 3.

In 1941 the Farben organization at the instance of the Reich undertook the construction of a plant for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, gasoline, and oil at Auschwitz, in western Poland near the German border. Forced foreign workers and concentration camp labor was utilized to a considerable extent in construction work and in nearby mines. This labor was obtained from the SS, the organization in exclusive control of the concentration camps at Auschwitz. Farben's control over and treatment

of these workers were hotly contested issues in the case.

Among the defendants were 19 members of the Farben Vorstand, a body roughly comparable to the Board of Directors of an American corporation. A reading of the judgment will disclose that the members of the tribunal were unable to agree upon the inferences of guilt to be drawn from the fact of Vorstand membership and authority. It will also indicate that we were not able to agree whether necessity and the lack of opportunity to exercise moral choice was available as a defense or could only be considered in mitigation of the use of slave labor. The result with respect to count 3 was the unanimous conviction of five defendants, including four members of the Vorstand, the unanimous acquittal of three defendants, and the acquittal of fifteen members of the Vorstand by a vote of 2 to 1, Judge Hebert dissenting.

Under count 2 the defendants were charged with the plunder of private and public property. They took the position that plunder, while it may be illegal, is not a crime under international law, and that as a matter of fact, the acts which the defendants committed did not constitute plunder in any event.

The codification of the laws and customs of war by The Hague Convention of 1907 and the annex to this code is known as The Hague Regulations. Under articles 46, 47, 52, and 53 of these regulations private property must be respected and cannot be confiscated. Pillage is formally prohibited. The right of requisition is limited to the necessities of the occupying force, must not be out of proportion to the resources of the country, and may not involve the inhabitants in the obligation to take part in military operations against their country. The prohibitions contained in these regulations and the definition of war crimes in the Charter and Control Council Law No. 10 form a legal basis for the sufficiency of the charges made in count 2 of the indictment.

There was no evidence of direct participation by any of the defendants in the physical acts commonly known as plunder. On the other hand, it was clearly established that, through the action of some of the defendants, Farben promptly acquired properties in France that had been confiscated by the Reich, and took permanent title thereto. In other instances, acting in the shadow of the German military forces and by capitalizing upon the ever present threat of German military power, they acquired without adequate compensation, substantial or controlling interests in private property in France and Norway contrary to the wishes of the owners. Such acts we determined could be differentiated only in degree from direct acts of plunder committed by the Army or the officials of the German Reich. We therefore determined the participants therein to be guilty under count 2.

A study of counts 2 and 3 and the definitions of the crimes involved therein will disclose that they actually charged crimes which have long been recognized as such in the more simple definitions of the common law and the codes of civilized nations. Murder, mayhem, slavery, kidnaping, plunder, robbery, and theft are not new crimes, though new terms are devised for them. Hundreds of Germans of lesser note were tried for similar crimes in various places throughout western Germany by tribunals composed of Army officers.

The issues involved in the trial of counts 1 and 5 transcend all other issues in the case in both interest and importance. They were predicated on the same facts and involved the same evidence. They were considered together in the judgment. Count 1 consisted of 85 paragraphs. The general criminal charge was contained in paragraphs 1, 2, and 85. The others were in the nature of a bill of particulars. The charging paragraphs read as follows:

"1. All of the defendants, acting through the instrumentality of Farben and otherwise, with divers other persons during a period of years preceding May 8, 1945, participated in the planning, preparation, initiation, and waging of wars of aggression and invasions of other countries, which wars of aggression and invasions were also in violation of international laws and treaties. All of the defendants held high positions in the financial, industrial, and economic life of Germany and committed these crimes against peace, as defined by article II of Control Council Law No. 10, in that they were principals in, accessories to, ordered, abetted, took a consenting part in, were connected with plans and enterprises involving, and were members of organizations or groups, including Farben, which were connected with the commission of said crimes.

"2. The invasions and wars of aggression referred to in the preceding paragraph were as follows: Against Austria, March 12, 1937; against Czechoslovakia, October 1, 1938, and March 15, 1939; against Poland, September 1, 1939; against the United Kingdom and France, September 3, 1939; against Denmark and Norway, April 9, 1940; against Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, May 10, 1940; against Yugoslavia and Greece, April 6, 1941; against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, June 22, 1941; and against the United States of America, December 11, 1941.

"85. The acts and conduct set forth in this count were committed by the defendants unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly, and constitute violations of international laws, treaties, agreements, and assurances, and of article II of Control Council Law No. 10."

Count 5 charged a conspiracy to commit the crimes set forth in count 1.

In the IMT indictment, count 1 charged a conspiracy to wage aggressive war. Under it the 22 defendants upon whom the tribunal passed judgment were indicted; 8 were convicted and 14 acquitted. Count 2 of that indictment alleged the commission of crimes against peace by planning, initiating, and waging wars of aggression. Of the 22 defendants 6 were not indicted under this count. Twelve were found guilty and four acquitted. It will be noted that the first two counts charged substantially the same crimes as those set out in counts 1 and 5 of the Farben case. The Farben tribunal looked upon the IMT judgment with great respect and regarded it as persuasive precedent.

Tribunal No. VI decided unanimously that all of the defendants should be acquitted under counts 1 and 5, Judge Hebert in a special concurrence based his decision almost exclusively upon what he regarded to be the binding precedent of the IMT judgment. The majority of the tribunal found little difficulty in determining, on the facts, that none of the defendants knowingly participated in the planning, preparation, and initiation of wars of aggression in view of the obviously correct declaration of the IMT in connection with the acquittal of Hjalmar Schacht that "Rearmament of itself is not criminal under the charter. To be a crime against peace under article 6 of the Charter it must be shown that Schacht carried out this rearmament as part of the Nazi plans to wage aggressive wars."

Various Farben enterprises produced large quantities of synthetic gasoline and synthetic rubber by means of processes developed by their chemists. Large quantities of nitrogen, the base for most explosives, were also produced. Most defendants were direct participants in these activities. Thus they contributed in a large measure to the ability of Germany to wage aggressive war. Laying aside the question of the effect of the dominating dictatorship and the fact that the Nazi party maintained a supervisor or observer in each Farben plant, the majority of the tribunal considered, as decisive, the general responsibility of the citizens of a nation at war, in the following passages quoted from the judgment:

"There remains the question as to whether the evidence establishes that any of the defendants are guilty of waging a war of aggression within the meaning of article II, 1, (a) of Control Council Law No. 10. This calls for an interpretation of the quoted clause. Is it an offense under international law for a citizen of a state that has launched an aggressive attack on another country to support and aid such war efforts of his government, or is liability to be limited to those who are responsible for the formulation and execution of the policies that result in the carrying on of such a war?

"It is to be noted in this connection that the express purpose of Control Council Law No. 10, as declared in its preamble, was to give effect to the terms of the Moscow declaration of October 30, 1943, and the London agreement of August 8, 1945, and the charter issued pursuant thereto. The Moscow declaration gave warning that the German officers and men and members of the Nazi party who were responsible for atrocities, massacres, and cold-blooded mass executions would be prosecuted for such offenses. Nothing was said in that declaration about criminal liability for waging a war of aggression. The London agreement is entitled 'An Agreement for the Prosecution and Punishment of the Major War Criminals of the European Axis.' There is nothing in that agreement or in the attached charter to indicate that the words 'waging a war of aggression,' as used in article II, 1 (a) of the latter, were intended to apply to any and all persons who aided, supported, or contributed to the carrying on of an aggressive war; and it may be added that the persons indicted and tried before the IMT may fairly be classified as major war criminals insofar as their activities were concerned. Consistent with the express purpose of the London agreement to reach the major war criminals, the judgment of the IMT declared that mass punishments should be avoided.

"To depart from the concept that only major war criminals—that is, those persons in the political, military, and industrial fields, for example, who were responsible for the formulation and execution of policies—may be held liable for waging wars of aggression would lead far afield. Under such circumstances there could be no practical limitation on criminal responsibility that would not include, on principle, the private soldier on the battlefield, the farmer who increased his production of foodstuffs to sustain the armed forces, or the housewife who conserved fats for the making of munitions. Under such a construction the entire manpower of Germany could, at the uncontrolled discretion of the indicting authorities, be held to answer for waging wars of aggression. That would, indeed, result in the possibility of mass punishments.

"There is another aspect of this problem that may not be overlooked. It was urged before the IMT that international law had theretofore concerned itself with the actions of sovereign states and that to apply the Charter to individuals would amount to the application to ex post facto law. After observing that the offenses with which it was concerned had long been regarded as criminal by civilized peoples, the high tribunal said: 'Crimes against international law are committed by men, not by abstract entities, and only by punishing individuals who commit such crimes can the provisions of international law be enforced.' The extension of punishment for crimes against peace

by the IMT to the leaders of the Nazi military and government was, therefore, a logical step. The acts of a government and its military power are determined by the individuals who are in control and who fix the policies that result in those acts. To say that the Government of Germany was guilty of waging aggressive war but not the men who were in fact the Government and whose minds conceived the plan and perfected its execution would be an absurdity. The IMT, having accepted the principle that the individual could be punished, then proceeded to the more difficult task of deciding which of the defendants before it were responsible in fact.

"In this case we are faced with the problem of determining the guilt or innocence with respect to the waging of aggressive war on the part of men of industry who were not makers of policy but who supported their Government during its period of rearmament and who continued to serve that Government in the waging of war, the initiation of which has been established as an act of aggression committed against a neighboring nation. Hitler launched his war against Poland on September 1, 1939. The following day France and Britain declared war on Germany. The IMT did not determine whether the latter were waged as aggressive wars on the part of Germany. Neither must we determine that question in this case. We seek only the answer to the ultimate question: Are the defendants guilty of crimes against peace by waging aggressive war or wars? Of necessity, the great majority of the population of Germany supported the waging of war in some degree. They contributed to Germany's power to resist, as well as to attack. Some reasonable standard must, therefore, be found by which to measure the degree of participation necessary to constitute a crime against peace in the waging of aggressive war. The IMT fixed that standard of participation high among those who lead their country into war.

"The defendants now before us were neither high public officials in the civil government nor high military officers. Their participation was that of followers and not leaders. If we lower the standard of participation to include them, it is difficult to find a logical place to draw the line between the guilty and the innocent among the great mass of German people. It is, of course, unthinkable that the majority of Germans should be condemned as guilty of committing crimes against peace. This would amount to a determination of collective guilt to which the corollary of mass punishment is the logical result for which there is no precedent in international law and no justification in human relations. We cannot say that a private citizen shall be placed in the position of being compelled to determine in the heat of war whether his government is right or wrong, or, if it starts right, when it turns wrong. We would not require the citizen, at the risk of becoming a criminal under the rules of international justice, to decide that his country has become an aggressor and that he must lay aside his patriotism, the loyalty to his homeland, and the defense of his own fireside at the risk of being adjudged guilty of crimes against peace on the one hand, or of becoming a traitor to his country on the other, if he makes an erroneous decision based upon facts of which he has but vague knowledge. To require this of him would be to assign to him a task of decision which the leading statesmen of the world and the learned men of international law have been unable to perform in their search for a precise definition of aggression.

"Strive as we may, we are unable to find, once we have passed below those who have led a country into a war of aggression, a rational mark dividing the guilty from the innocent. Lest it be said that the difficulty of the task alone should not deter us from its performance, if justice should so require, here let it be said that the mark has already been set by that honorable tribunal in the trial of the international criminals. It was set below the planners and leaders, such as Goering, Hess, von Ribbentrop, Rosenberg, Keitel, Frick, Funk, Doenitz, Raeder, Jodl, Seyss-Inquart, and von Neurath, who were found guilty of waging aggressive war, and above those whose participation was less and whose activity took the form of neither planning nor guiding the nation in its aggressive ambitions. To find the defendants guilty of waging aggressive war would require us to move the mark without finding a firm place in which to reset it. We leave the mark where we find it, well satisfied that individuals who plan and lead a nation into and in an aggressive war should be held guilty of crimes against peace, but not those who merely follow the leaders and whose participations, like those of Speer, 'were in aid of the war effort in the same way that other productive enterprises aid in the waging of war.' (IMT Judgment, vol. 1, p. 330.)"

Tribunal No. VI was an American tribunal. The case tried before it was instituted by the chief counsel for war crimes pursuant to the authority of Executive Order No. 9547 issued by President Truman January 16, 1946, which authorized the chief counsel to proceed against Axis adherents, other than those tried by the IMT, before United States military or occupational tribunals. The members of the tribunal were appointed as war-crimes judges by the President of the United States and assigned to the trial of the Farben case by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, American military governor. The chief counsel was a brigadier general in the United States Army. His assistants, though not all American citizens, were employed and paid by the War Department. The marshal of the court and his assistants were American Army officers. No other nation had a voice in who should be tried. Military Government Ordinance No. 7 vested in the chief counsel the exclusive power to determine the persons to be tried by the tribunals. As a courtesy to our allies the chief counsel invited other governments to send observers to the trials. Of a number of observers who appeared from time to time, the Russians were most constant in their attendance. They made copious notes and took photographs of the tribunal in action as well as defendants, witnesses, and court attendants.

Broad rules of procedure were set forth in Control Council Law No. 10 and Military Government Ordinance No. 7. The tribunal sought to apply those rules in a manner consistent with the basic principles of a fair trial within the concept of Anglo-American criminal law. These principles, the majority of the tribunal felt, included the burden of proof of the prosecution, the rule of reasonable doubt, immunity from compulsory self-incrimination, and the right of a defendant to interrogate witnesses who testified against him either from the witness stand or through ex parte affidavits, the use of which was provided by Military Government Ordinance No. 7. Cross-examination was lengthy and consumed much time. Our burden in this regard was somewhat lightened by referring the cross-examination of a number of affiants to commissioners who certified the transcripts to us to be read and considered in connection with the affidavits.

In this article, it has been possible to touch upon only the major issues of the trial. These I believe will have some significance in the future development of international criminal law. Hon. Francis Biddle, the American judge on the International Military Tribunal has said, "War is now no longer seen as a romantic adventure, but as a degrading crime, a crime which cannot be permitted if life itself is to continue. And the only alternative to war is the acceptance and development of a universal law based on the necessity of living together in peace." He proposed the codification of an international criminal law. I urged a similar step in a press interview before leaving Nuremberg. I repeat it here.

The growth of law is the result of calm and deliberate codification and the precedent of judicial decisions. It is a process of development and interpretation. The General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted a resolution directing a codification of offenses against peace and the security of mankind. The success of that effort will have a marked effect on the prospects of peace throughout the world. The greatest stumbling blocks to the just administration of international criminal law are the desire of the victor to sit in judgment on the vanquished and the temptation to tarnish justice with vengeance. The hand that holds the scales of justice can be steadied by an international code that not only defines crimes against peace and humanity but also outlines the basic principles of a fair trial and just punishment, and the procedure by which these may be accomplished.

I Knew a Saint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit a splendid article written by a distinguished citizen-soldier of Jewish faith concerning a stalwart citizen of the United States, a gallant officer and beloved chaplain in our military forces, a hero who shall ever be revered and honored and remembered wherever freemen dwell.

Rev. Father (Chaplain) Lawrence E. Lynch was killed in fighting not only for maintenance of America's "four freedoms," but also to assure the world of tolerance and understanding on the battlefield, on the farm, in the factory, in the school, and in the home.

I commend General Klein's article concerning the martyr, Father Lawrence Lynch, which appeared in the November 1948 issue of Guideposts under the title of "I Knew a Saint."

Father Larry's hallowed body was recently brought back from the battlefield to his own beloved America where he was set to eternal rest and vigilance—to guide us and serve as an inspiration for all Americans and freedom-loving people all over the world.

A few weeks ago, thousands of people paid final tribute to Father Lynch, Catholic Redemptorist. Among those present were Protestants and Jews. Men of every faith gathered to pay homage to this great American.

Following is General Klein's article:

I KNEW A SAINT

(By Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, former commanding officer, Five Hundred and Twenty-third Quartermaster Group, Pacific Theater.)

To have known Father Lawrence Lynch, as thousands of servicemen of all faiths will

agree, was to have contacted divinity in man. If Father Lynch is not a saint in heaven, I'd just as soon not go there. GI Joe, GI Pat, and GI Abe—all of them would feel the same.

I am proud that I was asked to deliver his memorial address, because I was his Commanding Officer in the Pacific, but most of all because I loved him as a friend and recognized him as God's fightingman—true priest and true soldier.

The first time I met him we battled. He strode into my office on Noumea Island in 1944 with fire in his eye and volcanic lava in his voice. As handsome a big husky as I've ever seen, I decided. Successor to the great Father Duffy as Chaplain of the 69th, he would often introduce himself as "Brooklyn's gift to the regiment."

Now he was fretting and fuming with me, his colonel, at what he claimed was foul injustice in not promoting a certain buck private, and he was so outspoken and so vehement that I heard myself threaten to court-martial him!

"All right!" he flared. "But I'm a priest before I'm a soldier, and I'll fight injustice anywhere."

I leaned back. The man's earnestness outweighed the criticism that was downright insulting.

"Go and bring the GI in," I snapped, "and we'll settle the matter right now."

In less than half an hour Father Lynch was back with—a Jew. There was a boy of my own race and creed, and a Catholic priest was fighting for his promotion. What's more, I knew—you can't be fooled on such a matter—that Father Lynch was quite unaware of the point. It never mattered to him whether a soul was white or black, Jew, Christian, or unbeliever. To him each human being was simply a child of God.

I'm wrong. It mattered once to Father Lynch.

It wasn't when he ambled through the barracks in the middle of one of our spirit-straining rainy spells and yanked every pin-up picture off the walls. He didn't stop to mark a man's faith then, but he left for all a picture of Mary, the mother of Christ. It was a lovely and inspiring picture, and with it Father Lynch left a note: "Here's a pin-up picture of the world's most beautiful lady. She loves you, and if you ask her, she'll never refuse your help."

I went to see Mrs. Lynch in Brooklyn when I came home from the war to tell her of Father Larry as I knew him—and I found a rabbi of the neighborhood having a dish of tea with her. The mother who raised 10 children listened to me describe the funeral services of the priestly son killed in action, when 50 priests in 50 jeeps said 50 masses in unison over his Pacific grave—and every sect and creed held memorial services.

She said to me in her thick brogue, "Larry told me if he didn't return from war that I'd hear from him every day. And I do, General. Visitors like yourself, men and boys, letters and gifts—not one day has gone by without a message."

He had a knack for making religion mean something exciting and personal and all-important. His battered old paint box, his typewriter, all were mediums of golden bridges for other men to cross over through his paintings, his writings, his unforgettable sermons and prayers.

I was with him the night a man's creed made a difference, the night of one of the Pacific's most heart rending tragedies—when the Liberty ship *Elihu Thompson* struck a mine off Noumea harbor. I had to supervise the rescue work. Within minutes after the explosion, Father Larry was on the dock. We went out to the crippled boat together in a small crash boat. One by one as they were brought aboard, Father Lynch asked the victim his religion—or looked on the dog tag when the man was too far gone to see what faith he professed.

"Ego te absolvo," he administered the last rites to his Catholic men. And my heart leaped when I heard him half whisper to a Jewish boy, "Sh'mai, Israel, Adonai, Elohenu Adonai echad."

And once when he put his hand over the mouth of a young hysterical kid, he made the sign of the cross on the lad's head, smacked his cheek, and said, "Now you're blessed; all you need is a mug of coffee."

I turned to the doctor beside me and shrugged.

"He's my favorite Irish rabbi," I said.

And he is.

Policies and Principles of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to invite the attention of the Democratic membership of the House to the following address by Mr. Vincent M. Gaughan, executive secretary of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, at Democrat Day, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, on April 28.

Mr. Gaughan's address was given as part of a project to acquaint our young men and women with the background and principles of the Democratic Party.

No consideration of the policies of the Democratic Party today would be complete or worth while without some preliminary observations as to its origin, and to the philosophy of its founder, Thomas Jefferson—for the very principles which Jefferson laid down in the early years of the Republic, principles fortified and expanded through a century and a half of our common political experience, dominate the thinking of Democrats today.

Jefferson and his friends organized a political party in opposition to the Federalists of Alexander Hamilton, the moneyed aristocrats of the day who sought to utilize the new Government for their own enrichment—who believed with sincerity that the stability of government rested on the support of the privileged classes, and could be secured by making government profitable for them.

Jefferson named his party the Republican Party, but in time the Jeffersonians came to be known as Democrats. The Democratic Party, as we know it today, is thus the oldest political organization in the world. One hundred and forty-eight years have passed since the Democratic Party was born, and the principles which gave it birth were these:

The Jeffersonians stood for equal rights to all and special privileges for none.

They believed that governments are not the masters of the people, but their servants.

They believed that the interests of the majority must not be submerged to the greed of a minority.

They believed that the protection of property in its legitimate rights is essential, but that in any conflict between property and men the rights of men come first.

This philosophy prompted Lincoln to say that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

Historically the Democratic Party has been known as the liberal party in American political life.

There is no term in our political lexicon which has been subjected to more misinterpretation, more manipulation, or more abuse than the word "liberal."

The word liberal almost defies definition, for Herbert Hoover is a liberal in his fashion, and Henry Wallace claims to be one too.

That liberalism which has distinguished the Democratic Party is a liberalism of the mind and of the heart.

The bedrock of the Democratic Party faith is the set of principles enunciated time and time again by Jefferson, but Democrats have ever brought an imaginative application of these principles to bear upon the realities of the particular era of history in which they have lived.

Democrats have ever insisted that government must be adapted to the needs of the time. If bold action is necessary to make government responsive to the will of the people or to protect them in their basic rights, the Democratic Party has dared to take such action. If new techniques are essential to strengthen and preserve our free enterprise system, the Democratic Party has dared to experiment. The Democratic Party has never committed the cardinal political sin of repudiating imagination as a component of the art of government.

Coupled with this liberalism of the mind—this broad-minded approach to the problems of government—is the liberalism of the heart manifest in the party's determination that government must serve all the people, and not the favored few. The Democratic Party has never turned a deaf ear to the plight of any segment of our citizenship who need the intervention of government to assure a minimum of human dignity.

Today our Government is called upon for action, experimentation, and for service to the cause of human dignity in a sphere beyond that of the wildest dreams of the founding fathers. The United States is the last great bastion of free enterprise and representative government. With us lies the dual responsibility of rallying the freedom-loving nations of the world to thwart the ruthless expansion of communism; and of preventing an atomic holocaust which would destroy civilization as we have known it.

The Democratic administration has assumed the task of developing a broad strategy to win the peace and to establish favorable conditions for the rebirth of democratic institutions throughout the world. Under our bipartisan foreign policy the United States took the lead in organizing the United Nations; we laid the ground work for economic recovery in Europe through the Economic Cooperation Administration—the Marshall plan—which is turning the tide against Communist political infiltration; under the North Atlantic Pact we hope to deter military aggression upon the nations of western Europe; and we shall soon turn our attention to the bold new program for economic development of the backward areas of the world which was advanced by President Truman in his inaugural address. Here are significant examples of imaginative action by Government to meet challenges imposed by new conditions and events.

No less momentous decisions must be made in the field of domestic policy. It is apparent to all that our free-enterprise system is the keystone in the arch of world peace. The cost of aid to Europe and of military preparedness cannot be permitted to tax our system too heavily, for the entire structure of international order will collapse if our economy should fail. Thus we come to the

basic distinction between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party today.

The Democratic Party believes that the American people must have assurance against economic insecurity and chaos; that they must have adequate health, housing, and educational facilities, and greater protection of civil rights to enlist our full moral and material resources in the cause of peace.

The Democratic Party believes that attainment of these objectives is essential to the preservation of a productive free-enterprise system.

The Democratic Party believes that it is the duty of Government to lead the way toward these goals.

To judge from present-day Republican oratory—such as that which Chairman SCOTT offered you last month—the Republican Party has no affirmative program by which social welfare can be advanced within a free-enterprise framework. It resorts solely to bitter denunciation, hysterical attacks, gloomy predictions of the variety which have cost the Republicans every national election, save one, in 17 years.

A preeminent dogma of the Republican Party, and one which finds its way into the average Republican oration with astonishing frequency, is that a monstrous bureaucracy in Washington, a veritable colossus, is enclosing its vast tentacles about the American economy and squeezing the lifeblood therefrom. This frightening creature, to hear the Republicans tell it, was not spawned until the spring of 1933 when the Democrats moved into Washington. Every dogma should have its day, and this ancient chestnut is effectively disposed of when we consider that after 16 years of Democratic administrations, the American enterprise system has reached record levels of production, income, and employment.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that big government is here to stay—regardless of which party is in power—and it was on its way long before 1933. I say "big government" in the sense that the Federal Government has served, and will continue to serve, as an umpire in our competitive system. This has become inevitable with the growing complexities of our civilization, with new production techniques, new methods of communication and transportation which require Government regulation in the public interest.

Laissez-faire is dead, but no political party perpetrated its demise. The trend toward Government intervention, which began well before the turn of the century with the Interstate Commerce Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act, flourished primarily with the general popular realization that only the Federal Government could halt the growing concentrations of private economic power which themselves endangered free enterprise. It is interesting to note that the constitutional validity of much New Deal legislation was upheld because the Supreme Court relied on decisions handed down by the conservative Courts of an earlier day.

Another fertile source of Republican oratory is the enormity of the national debt, which is justifiably of concern to all the American people. However, contrary to the time-worn Republican charge, the Democratic Party has not saddled the American people with this burden because of any insidious designs upon the national economic system or because of any spendthrift theory of Government. About 89 percent of the national debt directly reflects the cost of World Wars I and II, and the debt could have been reduced somewhat last year if the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress had not preferred to pay off its party's big contributors with a tax-reduction bill heavily weighted in favor of the wealthy.

A third component in the concentrated volley of vitriol which Republican orators constantly unleash at the Democratic administration is that free enterprise is surely doomed if the Democratic Party remains in power. In a recent verbal blast, a GOP spokesman predicted that the United States would have a Socialist government, like that of Britain's labor government, in three more years of Democratic leadership. These ominous warnings have been sounded consistently since the early days of the New Deal, and all have proved as grossly inaccurate as certain prognostications about last fall's election.

If the United States had ever been ripe for a radical alteration in its form of government, 1933 was the year; and in the hands of less scrupulous men, we might then have seen the United States embark down the primrose path of state socialism. But out of the chaos and despair of that era, with millions of our people homeless and jobless, our factories shut down, with hunger and discontent rampant throughout the land, we saw our free-enterprise system, revitalized, invigorated by the curative measures of the New Deal, emerge 8 years later to challenge vast war machines unrivaled in world history. In 4 years, backed by American industrial might, the Allies brought Germany and Japan to their knees.

The New Deal put our Nation on the road to recovery in 8 years because its fundamental philosophy was sound and workable. The theory of the New Deal was that the vitality of the free-enterprise system depends upon the welfare of the workers and farmers who produce and consume its goods and services, and that Government must act to assure a steady flow of purchasing power. If restraints upon the mechanics of the system and upon its entrepreneurs are necessary to this end, they are justified. The opponents of the New Deal adhered to the belief that if the mechanics of the system are left free from all controls, the people who live under it can take care of themselves, and devil take the hindmost.

The American people, in four presidential elections, and in seven of eight congressional elections since 1932, have rejected the trickle-down theory of economic benefits. They have placed their stamp of approval on Government efforts to oversee a fair division of our income, goods, and services among all Americans. A majority of them have come to believe that the Democratic Party program offers the greatest opportunity for individual and national prosperity and well-being in a free society.

This stern political reality has penetrated Republican thinking—both Wendell Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey endorsed the New Deal in effect, but asserted that "we can do it better." Two platforms adopted by the Republican Party promised action by Government in the fields of economic and social life staked out by the New Deal. Yet when the pressure of campaigning is over, most Republicans withdraw into their 1929-model shells, forget their glib promises of progressive action, and pick up their cudgels to renew the battle with the Democratic Party.

There could be no more lucid example of Republican hypocrisy than the GOP stand on civil rights legislation in the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress. Twice by unanimous vote in convention the Republican Party has solemnly pledged its efforts to assure the minimum protection of equal rights for our Nation's largest minority group. Yet when the opportunity arose to revise the Senate rules to permit early consideration of civil rights measures, the Republican leadership was in there pitching—for all it was worth—to block an anti-filibuster rule. Its motive was the mere political expedient of embarrassing President Truman's administration, but this was cloaked in high-sounding phrases about the sanctity of the Senate rules. The American people are quite capable of distinguishing such cynical maneuvers as these, and they will neither forget—nor forgive—the Republican elephant on election day.

Even to those few Republicans who do insist that their party steer the liberal course it has promised, the Republican leadership turns a deaf ear.

I can say without equivocation that if the Republican Party does not come to grips with the political realities, if it does not cease to be the party of obstruction, if it does not lay aside its moth-eaten rhetoric and begin to live up to its pledges to the American people, it will cease to be a significant factor in our political life within ten years' time.

I do not anticipate this prospect with any sense of pleasure or rejoicing. America has become great under a two-party system of government. We need a strong, effective Republican Party—but we need a Republican Party which is in step with the times. The Republican Party can keep in step without sacrificing the principles to which it claims to be devoted. If it cannot break the shackles which bind it to every organized pressure group for special privilege, the Republican Party will surely loose its grassroots supporters to the Democratic Party or to some new coalition group—and we shall witness splinter-party government in the United States.

Today, as in the time of Jefferson, democratic government must be responsive to the needs of the people, and to their will as expressed at the ballot box.

The people spoke November 2. They elected a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress which had pledged them action on issues which not only concern the welfare of our people as individuals, but the future vitality of the Nation as a whole: Issues such as economic stabilization, housing, national health insurance, expanded social security, a fair labor-management relations act, aid to education, development of national resources and electric power.

President Truman's program to enact these pledges into law has come to be known as the Fair Deal.

The Fair Deal is not a revolutionary program. It is not a radical departure from previously-accepted techniques of Government action. It seeks simply to provide what its name implies—a fair deal for every American, whether he or she be investor, businessman, worker, farmer, or housewife. It was not devised in hostility to the interests of any groups of our people, but to advance the prosperity and security of all. The Fair Deal concept is that the economic interests of all our people are interdependent—that the businessman cannot sell his product unless the consumer can buy at a reasonable price, that the farmer will suffer if the workingman's wages are cut, and that the social consequences of inadequate housing, or inadequate distribution of medical care, or failure to utilize our natural resources properly must be suffered by all in equal measure.

No sooner had the Fair Deal program been presented to the Congress than the vast propaganda machines of privilege began to roll.

The lobbyists descended on Washington.

The bogey-man of "socialism" was again created to frighten the people and their Representatives in Congress.

Supposedly responsible Republican leaders, such as Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, were heard to charge that the Fair Deal points to a complete totalitarian system in the United States.

It is easy to loose a flood of distorted propaganda about any legislative issue, a flood limited only by the imagination of the author, the slush funds at the disposal of the lobby which employs him, the durability of its mimeograph machines, and the receptiveness of the Nation's newspaper and magazine outlets to such handouts.

It is even easier to examine the facts.

There is no phase of the Fair Deal which has not been devised to provide a maximum amount of local governmental responsibility, a maximum amount of freedom for private enterprise, a minimum of Federal regulation in view of the task to be accomplished. Time will not permit a close scrutiny of the subtle manner in which the hosts of special privilege have sought to twist the Fair Deal completely out of its context.

However, a notable example is the Nationwide whispering campaign against the Fair Deal's health provisions—a campaign which has been underway for some months now although the administration's health bill was not released until last week.

We Americans can boast of the best medical care in the world, but it is readily attainable by only two groups of people—the very rich, for whom medical expenses impose no financial strain, and the very poor who can pay nothing, and thus are eligible for charity. We need to expand the medical services which are available, by securing more doctors and nurses and by construction of more hospitals, clinics, and research laboratories. We need, furthermore, to make sure that everyone, regardless of income, can benefit from these services without throwing the family budget out the window when serious illness strikes.

How does the administration propose to meet these needs?

The most hotly disputed features of the President's health program is national health insurance.

Contrary to the assertion of Republican Chairman HUGH SCOTT, made with his customary myopic interpretation of political events, the administration does not propose to let your ward leader select your doctor for you. Under the health insurance plan, the patient is still free to choose his physician, and the physician is still free to accept or reject patients. The actual mechanics of the plan, such as the selection of standards of payment, are to be left to local committees of physicians. Both doctor and patient can make private arrangements if they do not choose to use the insurance plan.

In addition to health insurance, the Fair Deal plan calls for Federal aid to medical schools and medical students, and expansion of teaching facilities through Federal funds; for increased Federal aid for hospital construction; for expansion of preventive medicine and public-health services.

Where is the money for physicians' fees to come from? These costs, as well as those for other phases of the health program, are to be borne by a 1½-percent pay-roll tax, similar to that levied for social security—which latter tax has not seemingly disturbed our economy in the 13 years since it was first levied. In the long run the total costs will not exceed the percentage of our annual income which is now spent for medical services and facilities. The increased dollar values and enriched human values to be derived from a comprehensive program such as that envisioned here can hardly be calculated.

These are the facts about the Fair Deal health plan—and they are a far cry from the hysterical shrieks of "socialized medicine," "government compulsion," "totalitarian methods" which are now wafted over the soft spring breezes by those who detect in the Fair Deal some sinister intent to destroy the American way of life.

I am confident that the Members of the Eighty-first Congress will cast aside the veil of half-truths and distortion about all phases of the Fair Deal and will enact substantially the program called for by the mandate of November 2.

The American people have asked for action from the Democratic Party—and they are going to get it.

I have assumed it to be my task here today to offer you a background of the philosophy and the policy of the Democratic Party, and an understanding of the national and international necessities which have shaped the program it offers today—a program which will unleash the vast creative energies of a democratic society in the service of world peace. I have sought also to point out the nature of the sometimes fanatical charges brought against the Democratic Party by its sometimes desperate opponents in the hope that you will be able to distinguish fact from fiction.

I would not consider this task completed without an expression of gratification at the programs arranged here by Professor Arnesom, both for the Democrats and the Republicans. Such special events as these indicate a growing awareness, on the part of our colleges and our students today, of the importance of study and understanding of public affairs by college men and women. With the significant role now played by Government in the lives of us all, it is imperative that Democrats and Republicans alike—particularly Young Democrats and Young Republicans whose future is at stake—insist that our government at every level be managed by competent public servants devoted to the public good.

This presupposes active participation by young people in the game of politics. Active participation, at the minimum, means exercise of the right to vote; and an intelligent understanding of the issues involved. But as far as young people are concerned, political activity means considerably more.

We young people must interest ourselves in the representatives for whom we vote. Candidates for public office are usually selected from a group of men or women who have been identified with political organizations at precinct, county, or State level. Consequently, the young person who may not desire public office himself, but who wants to have a hand in the selection of those who do serve, should begin at an early date to take part in the local affairs of his party.

The highest plane of active political participation is service in public office. There is no finer career to which a young man or woman can aspire. It is essential that we have young men and women in the city halls, the State capitols, in the Halls of Congress today. Youth understands, more readily perhaps than its elders, that government must constantly adapt itself to meet ever-changing conditions; youth is more bold to act if action is needed to provide all the people with the benefits and privilliges which our society offers them; young people bring to the political scene a refreshing vigor and idealism which have sustained our American Government since its inception.

Many of you may be discouraged from entering political life because of the popular notion that a politician is automatically incompetent, if not even corrupt. As Ambassador Claude Bowers points out, "It may be possible to lift the average in political life, but it can never be done so long as able young men, intellectually and temperamentally fit for public service, are led to believe there is something rather shameful about it."

Certainly there are some incompetent politicians; certainly there are some corrupt politicians. But there are some corrupt bankers, doctors, lawyers, and industrialists as well—yet none of these professions are heaped with the abuse and the wisecracks which are often showered on the politician.

Politics is, indeed, an honorable profession, and if there be unwholesome practitioners of the political arts, it is solely because the people themselves do not choose to fulfill their obligations of citizenship by working in party organizations.

There is no profession today which has greater need of an infusion of new blood, new ideas from young people with high and consecrated ideals of service to humankind than politics—for the members of no other profession shoulder such an awesome responsibility for the lives, security, and well-being of their fellow men.

So I invite you to accept your share of this responsibility—no matter what the party. The political life offers no financial reward, and politics is a hard taskmaster. It is a demanding life, yet a challenging experience—challenging because we ever seek to make Government a more effective instrument for realization of the aspirations of our people and the magnificent potentialities of our society—challenging because the hopes of men the world over for a new era of freedom and justice lie in the full fruition of our American dream.

The Press Is the Last Bulwark of Your Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, upon the occasion of receiving the honor award from the University of Missouri School of Journalism for his distinguished service in journalism.

This speech should be read by everyone. He points out that while journalism as it is practiced in the United States may not be perfect, it is the last bulwark of freedom in this country. He emphasizes what cannot be too often emphasized and that is, when the day comes that the press is under Government control the liberties and the freedom of the people will perish forever.

I have often said that the success of our form of government, founded upon the will of the people, depends on an informed public opinion. To give the people the facts and to stimulate public thinking is the responsibility of the press. And the American press has courageously met that responsibility.

The speech follows:

What is "the function of a newspaper publisher?" And more important, what are his responsibilities?

Since all newspaper publishers do not fall into a common pattern, Mr. Philip M. Wagner, editor of the Baltimore Sun, has divided them, rather inadequately, I think, into these five categories:

1. The publisher to whom the nature of his business is a matter of indifference—who would as soon be running a grain or feed business, the prospects of profit being equal.

2. The "dominating, know-it-all publisher, czar alike of business management and editorial page," under whom the editorial staff members are reduced to hacks.

3. The publisher who realizes his limitations on the editorial side but who can't resist asserting his final authority in crucial editorial decisions.

4. The small-town editor-publisher who * * * is best situated to give scope to his talents.

5. The publisher who is primarily a businessman but realizes that the newspaper business carries special obligations, and who deliberately reposes the matter of editorial policy on his editor or editorial writer.

As newspapermen and students of journalism, you will recognize each of these types. There are others, of course.

RESPONSIBLE OWNERS

For the purposes of this discussion, however, I shall confine my remarks to the type of publisher I believe Dean Mott had in mind when he invited me to address this audience.

I refer to the owner-publisher who must stand responsible, in the eyes of the public and his own conscience, for the policies—business, editorial, or both—which in the long run determine whether his newspaper fails or succeeds.

As I have said before, the average newspaper publisher falling into this category, is usually no genius. On the contrary, he is more likely to be a typical hard-working, law-abiding American citizen with a sense of responsibility and a passion for solvency.

Some of them came, as did my father, from the writing ranks. More often, they started in newspaper work as office boys, advertising salesmen, accountants, and circulation solicitors.

Within the last decade, a number of editors have been shifted to the publisher's chair without imposing too much strain upon their indefectibility.

Whatever their origins, the functional tasks before them are well defined.

The owner-publisher is the master of his own destiny. He can, and should, determine whether his newspaper is to be Republican, Democratic, independent, liberal, or conservative.

He must decide what sort of product is produced in his plant. It is wholly within his province to sell his wares on the streets with flamboyant headlines or to concentrate upon home delivered circulation.

He may be constructive, or destructive. He can color the news or insist upon accurate, factual, and unbiased reporting from his staff.

He can be an inveterate crusader for the right as he sees it, or a Casper Milquetoast who is never quite sure about anything.

A publisher can be a nasty, petty, mental pygmy who injects his personal prejudices into the columns of his newspaper, or he may stand for the best in constructive leadership and place his faith in the judgment of his readers to recognize integrity and purpose, and honor it.

Since the days of the pamphleteer, no limitation upon absolute freedom of the press has been permitted under our Constitution. To say that this freedom has never been abused would be short of the truth, but even the abuse of such a priceless privilege is a thousand times less evil than placing shackles upon the right of free speech.

THE READER IS JUDGE

In short, to use a term employed at the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the owner-publisher can be a "journalistic stinker" or uphold and practice the finest traditions of his profession.

Whether he be blatherskite or angel, mendacious or truthful, rogue or gentleman, the fact remains that he will be judged in the final analysis by his readers, and his readers alone.

In the larger cities where two or more newspapers are in competition, the public can vote its preference every day of the week. Unlike politics, intelligent newspaper competition has been known to exert a restraining influence upon the eccentricities, or shall we say, the baser instincts of many a newspaper proprietor.

At least in these competitive cities, the reader can simply refuse to buy the newspaper which, for one reason or another, does not suit his tastes.

In the so-called singleton cities where only one newspaper is published, no such choice is offered. Still, it is interesting to note that where an owner-publisher has the field to himself, he is usually so cognizant of the responsibilities of his position that reader confidence is seldom abused.

I have known several fire-eating editor-publishers who, in the competitive days, fired their blasts and asked questions later. In one-newspaper towns today, these same men are cautioning their editorial writers to be sure of all the facts before taking the mayor for an editorial ride.

In the main, I would say there is a greater awareness of public responsibility by the newspaper which has no competition than in cities where competitive zeal often influences editorial judgment in the wrong direction.

The chief bugbear of the singleton newspaper is the tendency to lose the zest of the game, a tendency which is followed by a gradual deterioration in editorial quality.

CHOOSING A TEAM

The chief task of the newspaper publisher is that of choosing competent department heads and demanding that they work together as an effective team.

Too many newspapers have been ruined by highly priced executives fighting to win departmental, rather than institutional, victories.

Theoretically, the editorial department should have nothing to do with those mighty men of the business office who challenge expense accounts and wage an unrelenting war against waste.

Actually, cooperation between the two is essential and can be accomplished without making the editorial department an annex of the business office.

The publisher's first responsibility is to see that his newspaper has wide reader acceptance. This can be accomplished in only one way: By producing a good newspaper.

There are no short cuts; no promotional gimmicks by which a circulation staff can build circulation over a long period of time with an inferior newspaper.

By a good newspaper, I mean one that presents the news fairly and accurately; has editorial courage and integrity and is aware of its obligation to the community, State, and Nation.

If a publisher begins with that concept of journalism and can couple with it a high degree of managerial "know-how," his newspaper should exert wide influence and be commercially successful.

I mention the profit motive because a newspaper must be profitable in order to maintain its independence and freedom of action.

The critics of the press talk glibly about the influence of advertisers upon newspaper policy. Once or twice, I have experienced such attempts to make us "see the light." Occasionally, we have lost advertising accounts because of our refusal to suppress news.

I am glad to say, however, that such incidents have been rare indeed as most advertisers have an abiding respect for newspapers with editorial integrity.

THIS PUBLISHER IS ALSO EDITOR

In our own organization, the publisher is also the editor. That is because my training has largely been on the editorial side. I have served as reporter, desk man, make-up editor, editorial writer, managing editor, and editor.

I still devote the majority of my time to purely editorial work. This is a rather unique situation in American journalism. The arrangement has its defects, to be sure. No single individual can be an expert on business administration, circulation, advertising, production, labor negotiations, promotion, typography, editorial writing, features, news treatment, and general policy.

Still, it has the advantage of balancing the scales in favor of the editors who produce our newspapers. I am committed to the theory that successful newspaper publishing begins and ends with the quality of the product. No greater assistance can be given to the circulation and advertising departments than the day-by-day insistence of the publisher that the newspaper be first class in every respect.

Our department heads are selected with care and are given the widest authority. Usually, they are men who have come up through the ranks and have been with our organization long enough to grasp our fundamental publishing theories.

In the Knight organization, the publisher works with all department heads and strives to keep an enthusiastic and well-balanced team on the field at all times. We have no favorites, no special pets. A man is judged solely by his ability to produce.

Unlike some other multiple-ownership groups, our editors are under no requirement to follow standardized procedures.

The newspapers are dissimilar in appearance. Each newspaper is tailored for the needs of the city in which it is produced. We have no rigid editorial formula to which every editor must adhere.

Ideas which are found useful in one city are brought to the attention of editors in other cities but they may accept or reject them as they choose.

In the matter of editorial policy, my associate editors find some guidance on national and international questions through "The Editors' Notebook" which appears unchanged in every city.

They are free to disagree with its conclusions, and often do. Just as often, I am persuaded to change my own viewpoint after discussion with the editor who took exception to my conclusions.

In all local matters, each associate editor has absolute freedom of action. Editorial endorsement of candidates is determined in conferences in which the publisher is joined by half a dozen editors and reporters who are most familiar with their qualifications, or the lack of them.

I think my attitude on editorial policy can best be set forth by restating the essence of a memorandum I wrote to A. T. Burch, associate editor of the Chicago Daily News, several years ago. It went something like this:

I hope that in the conduct of the Chicago Daily News editorial page, you and your colleagues will always remember that it is primarily our duty to inform, rather than instruct.

I am not implying that we should be without positive opinions, because it is our duty to cause people to think, and very often this can best be accomplished by stating our views so cogently that no reader of the Daily News can possibly be in doubt as to our position.

Nevertheless, I like the phrase which precedes our editorials, "As We See It—." By its use we indicate that we do have definite views on the subjects of the day but are not completely obsessed with a sense of our own infallibility.

It is unnecessary, I know, to remind you that we must be scrupulously fair to all sides in the presentation of our editorial policies. This does not mean the dilution of our opinions but rather that editorials must be based upon facts that are well documented.

Above all, avoid the use of watered-down, please-everybody editorials which might bet-

ter be consigned to the waste basket. There is no room on our editorial page for verbose "essays" which come to no very firm conclusions.

Remember at all times that you have full freedom to approach every subject with an open mind. We are not obligated to any political party or special interest. The Chicago Daily News has long been renowned for unbiased, factual reporting and the independence of its editorial page.

Let us adhere to that tradition and improve it, if we can, with simple and pungent writing.

THE BASIC OBJECTIVES

That memorandum to Editor Burch of the Chicago Daily News is equally applicable to the Akron Beacon Journal, the Detroit Free Press, and the Miami Herald.

All of our editors fully understand our basic objectives, as my father delineated them so well years ago:

"We are ourselves free, and our paper shall be free—free as the Constitution we enjoy—free to truth, good manners, and good sense. We shall be for whatever measure is best adopted to defending the rights and liberties of the people and advancing useful knowledge. We shall labor at all times to inspire the people with a just and proper sense of their own condition, to point out to them their true interest and rouse them to pursue it."

MEANING OF RESPONSIBILITY

Naturally, serious editors and publishers are disturbed, as I am, by the growing criticism of the press.

It has been charged that we have failed in our responsibility and, in some instances, that we do not fully understand the meaning of responsibility.

It has been charged that we are out of step with the people, and the victories of Roosevelt and Truman are regularly cited as examples of our editorial blindness.

Henry Luce's commission on freedom of the press undertook a study of newspaper behavior. Editor and Publisher has more recently summoned a panel of editors, publishers, and educators to make a joint appraisal of the self-improvement possibilities of American newspapers through studies of specific problems.

Ralph D. Casey, director of the University of Minnesota School of Journalism, believes that the sound, factual, and unemotional analysis of press behavior in relation to public questions and a scientific analysis of the content of the press, unencumbered by political restraint or Government fiat, would exert influence.

"It should have a salutary effect," says Mr. Casey, "on publishers who need to reform both their outlook and journalistic practices. It would strengthen the hands of responsible editors who have a studied concern for a newspaper's character and public service."

Newspapers are also fair game for politicians, labor unions, business leaders, second guessers, grandstand editors, radio commentators, well-meaning clubwomen who believe the comic page is tearing down the character of American youth, and other do-gooders who utter a great deal of child labor nonsense about the poor little carrier boy who delivers the paper to your home.

Individually, I welcome this criticism. There is just as much room for improvement in the newspaper profession as in medicine, law, teaching, and the ministry.

But, in all fairness, it must be admitted that journalism has made comparable advances with the other professions.

In the era preceding my entrance into newspaper work, the country was dotted with personal organs appearing in the form of newspapers which represented political parties, railroad or banking interests, or purely the personal prejudices of the owner without thought for the public good.

Fortunately, in those days of low costs, there were enough newspapers in each community to satisfy the political inclinations of every potential reader and no one had any delusions about the particular ax his preferred newspaper was trying to grind.

Yet, as newspapers, they were sorry examples of journalism as we know it today. So-called news stories, either favoring or attacking a candidate for public office, were twisted without the slightest regard for the facts. Usually, any newspaper's candidate for sheriff was the man who would promise to give it the county printing.

Thundering editorials in the so-called days of personal journalism generated a great deal of heat, but every little light.

Foreign news, except in a few metropolitan newspapers, was virtually ignored.

It was indeed a colorful era in which rival editors smote each other's hip and thigh but judged by present-day standards, the reader who was looking for information and enlightenment had to read all of the newspapers in town to get even a semblance of the truth, and even then he couldn't be too sure.

I started my newspaper career in the fading days of the personal journalists and can testify from experience that ethics, morals, codes of honor, and truth were all thrown into the hellbox whenever demanded by expediency and the ring of the cash register.

Newspaper morals were on a par with the loose ethics of the medical and legal professions of that period, to say nothing of the psalm-singing businessmen who freed their consciences by attending church one day a week. It was a colorful, robust era but the editors of that day would have snorted contemptuously at any such "impertinence" as the Hutchins report.

WHO IS A "STINKER"?

The American press today, served by the great news agencies of the world and competent local staffs, is infinitely superior to the press of any other era or of any other country.

It is increasingly less biased and more informative. With conspicuous exceptions, it endeavors to chronicle the news of its community and the world with objectivity and fairness.

Its editorial objectives spring from the laudable desire of conscientious editors to serve the public welfare.

At no time in the history of journalism have professional standards been so high. The pride of good craftsmanship has not been lost.

Of course, the press needs criticism, provided it is constructive rather than maliciously inspired.

I am disturbed, however, by the members of newspaper panels who serve as self-appointed guardians of press "responsibility" and advocate throwing the "stinkers" out of such organizations as the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Who can define "responsibility" and brand the "stinkers"?

Is your competitor a "stinker," or is it a fellow who lives 2,000 miles away? By what standards can they be judged? Your standards, the public's preference, or their standards?

For one, I should hate to see press responsibility fall into the sort of pattern that determines which real estate man is a realtor and which is not.

Editors would then be nothing but glorified Rotarians, all wearing the same buttons and bows and getting good attendance records by never missing a convention in Washington.

A code of ethics in journalism may serve as a guide, but in the final analysis every individual editor and publisher can observe it only to the extent that his conscience and rectitude of character permit.

God forbid the day when the ASNE or any other newspaper group attempts to disguise thought control as responsibility, or to discipline individual editors on ethical grounds.

I sincerely hope too, that we will never be faced in America as in the Netherlands today, with government advocacy of a measure which attempts to restrain the right of the press to be wrong.

The Dutch, like us, have a constitution guaranteeing freedom of the press. But they now propose to create a jury which would try editors, and reporters deliberately giving false and irresponsible information. Penalties range from fines to suspension for life from journalistic work. Administration of the act would mean licensing of all journalists since no one could follow the profession if the press bureau decreed otherwise.

In comparing the Netherlands measure with the panels which have been discussing press responsibility in this country, the Miami Daily News says quite appropriately:

"There is nothing to prevent any number of 'juries' from being set up by voluntary action in America to point out the errors and offenses of any part of the press. Indictment by the facts can be made freely by anyone. The penalty for the offense, in the long run, has been enough if the offender be exposed.

"To put the force and penalty of law behind such decision as to the truth, that is another matter, a serious one."

LOOSE CHARGES

That brings me, finally, to the observation that the American press is not fully appreciated in our own country.

It is a responsible press as was demonstrated during the war when our newspapers joined in a voluntary code of censorship to divulge nothing of a military or security nature that would jeopardize the all-out war effort.

No laws were passed; there were no penalties for nonobservance except the scorn of public opinion. Not a single newspaper violated that code nor did a single newspaper relinquish its right to criticize the Government or the conduct of our military affairs with all of the vigor at its command.

When charges are made of "press irresponsibility," it is well to examine the source. For instance, President Truman thought Nat Finney of the Minneapolis Star was "irresponsible" when he wrote a series of articles exposing a Government plan to bottle up news in the various departments of Government.

But Finney was awarded the Pulitzer prize for national reporting by the advisory board and the trustees of Columbia University, hardly a group of "irresponsible" men.

William H. Grimes, editor of the Wall Street Journal, recalls one of his earliest newspaper experiences when the editor came to the managing editor and said: "Frank, the safety director just called and said the city hall story is irresponsible." And the managing editor said, "I had a hunch I was underplaying it."

"Every newspaperman," said Grimes, "who ever dug up something that someone else was trying to hide, each one who has stressed a fact someone did not want to face, has been accused of being 'irresponsible.'"

That is a point to remember when loose charges are made about "press irresponsibility." Only in Russia is the press 100-percent "responsible." Joe Stalin sees to it that no editor ever has the chance to be "irresponsible" twice.

FREE IN BEST SENSE

I wonder how many of you will agree with me that the American press is your last bulwark of freedom in this country.

Unlike the radio and television, it is not subject to Government license.

Unlike the motion-picture producers, it does not turn out Mission to Moscow propaganda for the Government disguised as "historical" entertainment.

The press alone, and by the press I mean all printed media, can and does resist the growing encroachments of Government upon individual rights.

Your daily newspaper not only mirrors the news of the world but strives to stimulate public thinking on the questions which affect our daily lives.

It is a free press in the best sense of the word. No censors hover over American editorial desks as they do in nearly every other country in the world. Even in the nations of Western Europe, censorship is very much alive.

Journalism as it is practiced in the United States is far from perfect. But it is a vital press, a courageous press and, I believe, a responsible press.

Disagree with it if you will, indict it for its sins, but never let its voice be stilled for on the day it comes under governmental control, your liberties and freedom will perish forever.

Leadership Necessary To Prevent Sowing of the Seeds of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a luncheon held by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, May 2, 1949, in Washington, D. C., in connection with its thirty-seventh annual meeting:

Mr. Chairman, in early December of 1941, I was scheduled to address a luncheon in Boston, of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and while home, I received a call from our late beloved president, informing me of the Pearl Harbor attack, as a result of which I immediately returned to Washington. The next day, I introduced the resolution declaring war on Germany, Japan, and the Government of Italy.

In early January of 1942, the postponed luncheon took place.

At that time, I predicted we would ultimately defeat the enemy, and I made observations about conditions which would probably exist after the war. Even then, as most of you could do, I could look ahead and see and visualize the destructiveness of the war we were then facing, and which we have since undergone, and that it would leave behind it a world in pain and in distress. It has certainly left in its wake terrible conditions, and trying problems to solve.

And, in passing, might I express the observation, that if the world undergoes another war, with its terrible destructiveness of life and property, and dissipation of the wealth of the world, the winner will also be the loser.

The leaders, who are few in number, of the Soviet Union, should also take notice of this probability. For it is their deliberate policy of misunderstanding, thereby creating fear, uncertainty, and if possible, chaos, to extend their imperialistic and ideological designs, that prevent that international understanding which is so essential for peace. They must not overlook the fact that while the American people are a tolerant people, there is a point in our national interest beyond which we cannot tolerate.

The emphasis I made in my speech to the Boston Chamber, was the necessity for respect and understanding, and that after the war was over, there would be a greater necessity for dynamic democracy than ever before. I mentioned strongly that there will be need for forward-looking, dynamic, constructive leadership in the field of religion, of government, of business, finance, agriculture, labor, and in all walks of human activity.

Certainly, existing conditions call for such leadership in the world of today. Any organization of businessmen, and this observation could particularly apply to your organization because of its Nation-wide sphere of activity, could exert great influence on world and domestic affairs, as well as in other respects. If, for example, instead of responding to fears, and adopting a position of opposition, and inquiring, forward-looking and constructive positions on public questions and matters were taken.

Mere or blind opposition, instead of one of constructive support, or constructive criticism and proposal, result in a loss of confidence and influence in the minds of the people generally. Cooperative and understanding efforts result in confidence and respect.

In the international field, there is a strong recognition of the necessity of our Government, in our own national interest, taking affirmative and effective steps in cooperation with other free countries, in preventing Red nazism or communism from carrying out its attempts to impose its vicious ideology on the world, and thereby to dominate the people of all the nations of the world.

It is most unfortunate that this world challenge to our way of life exists, but it does. We must face and meet it realistically.

Under President Truman's leadership, supported in the Congress in a bipartisan manner, highly commendable, we have taken affirmative action in Europe, and it is having its favorable effects. As long as the Soviet Union persists in its present policies and efforts, we must continue to do so within our means.

The Eighty-first Congress has recently enacted into law an extension of aid to certain nations in Europe to help in their economic and moral rehabilitation. This is necessary as it is a means of stopping international communism, and as we succeed, toward ultimate peace. I might say that conditions in Europe in this conflict are at least 10 times better now than they were a year and a half ago.

In our own national interest, and in the interest of future peace, the North Atlantic Pact should be ratified by the Senate.

As conditions now exist, we should also pass legislation implementing the pact, providing for assistance to the signatory nations to the pact in strengthening their national defenses against any future acts of aggression by the Soviet Union. For, we must remember, the present world situation is due to one basic factor, the deliberate policy of misunderstanding on the part of the Soviet Union.

There is no problem, where differences exist, small or large, that can be solved where even one party to the negotiations fails or refuses to approach its solution with an understanding mind. Where motives are not impugned, where understanding exists, the most serious differences can be finally adjusted. In considering world and domestic problems and legislation relating to them, we should not fail to give full significance to the fact that the anti-God ideology of communism spreads only where widespread poverty and distress exists. It is under such conditions that the false seeds of communism are planted and spread. And, in connection with this fact, it is important that we have enlightened, forward-looking leadership in our own country in the consideration and solution of our domestic questions.

Among many other problems, in our own country, we must give serious consideration to the problem of economic insecurity and its solution. While we can proudly boast of the American standard of living, and properly so, we cannot overlook the fact that millions during their lifetime of productivity, and in old age in our country, are faced with economic insecurity.

I can well remember only 14 years ago when President Roosevelt recommended social-security legislation, that there were those who loudly called it socialism. Such legislation is now accepted by nearly everyone.

This program should be extended to include groups now excluded, and I am confident that this will be done during this session of the Congres. Old age is a condition, if we live long enough, that comes to all persons. I also expect that the earned annuity now paid on old-age and survivors insurance will be substantially increased. An enlightened leadership should support such legislation.

I expect the present Congress will pass an effective housing bill providing for public housing and low-cost housing projects. This bill has already passed the Senate. It is now being considered by the House committee and will be acted upon in the House in the near future. Like social-security legislation of 14 years ago, there are some persons who hurl the charge of socialism against such legislation. It is not socialistic. In these days of an intense economic system operating on all of us, it is simply government exercising and extending its secondary powers and functions to meet an acute problem of great public interest and concern.

The development of our natural resources is now a definite policy of our Government. Whether or not you like it, it is here. I like it. This policy is strongly supported by public opinion. The late President Roosevelt put it into real operation, and President Truman has courageously carried it through to its present completion. Only the other day, in the Interior Department appropriation bill, the final step was taken.

This being so, it seems to me, that certain private interests would exercise common sense as well as good business judgment if instead of following the policy of blind opposition, and engaging in other questionable actions, they would cooperate. I know of no political party that wants to destroy or impair business, but I do know there is a general recognition of the wisdom of marshaling and using our natural resources in the public interest that are being wasted.

There is also a general recognition that abuses in business or finance or elsewhere should not be permitted to exist. That is the basic Roosevelt theory. It is also the basic Truman theory. It is my theory.

I have always felt that there was little difference between a sound conservative and a sound progressive. You will note, however, the use of the word "sound." I have always felt in principle and in policy they are in close agreement with each other, and any differences were more or less of detail and expression.

I have often hoped that persons within both groups could get together often for an exchange of views. In my opinion, such meetings would be productive of excellent results.

The Eighty-first Congress, as you know, is now in session. I have already referred to some of the bills which it has acted upon and bills now before it. You must keep in mind my observation on the necessity for

dynamic democracy. That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt stood for; that is what President Truman stands for. That is what the great majority of the people of America stand for. The latter is very important, because public opinion is a powerful influence in a democracy or a republic. The spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the personality and recommendations of President Truman are the basis for action in this Congress.

It is my opinion that the greater part of President Truman's recommendations, in major form, will be enacted into law before the Eighty-first Congress is over. Already a substantial part of his recommendations are in the process of being enacted into law.

In the Congress, the House of Representatives is far ahead of its schedule. It has already passed all departmental appropriation bills, which is an all-time record.

The Congress has enacted into law the bill authorizing the appropriation of money for the second year of the 4-year financing of the European Recovery Program under the Marshall plan.

The House has also passed several important bills, including the appropriation bill, relating to our national defense. An important bill relating to the strengthening of the Central Intelligence Agency has passed the House of Representatives. A bill relating to the nature, scope, and composition of the Army and Air Force, and authorizing a 70-group Air Force, has passed the House.

The extension of the reciprocal trade agreements law, for 3 years, with the crippling amendments of the last Congress eliminated, has passed the House.

Important recommendations of the President relating to appropriations to extend rural electrification, as well as flood-control and power projects, irrigation and reclamation projects have passed the House.

The Commodity Credit Corporation bill, with authority therein to provide adequate storage space for crops has passed the Senate and will be voted upon in the House and passed this week.

A bill to expand the crop insurance program has been reported out of a House committee, as well as several other bills of import to agriculture and to our farmers.

The House Committee on Agriculture is now considering new basic farm legislation.

The extension of rent control is now a law.

A bill extending time for the making of voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities, which basically affect the cost of living has been enacted into law.

The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reenactment of the Wagner Act with amendments is now being considered by the House of Representatives. This bill has also been reported out of the Senate Committee.

The increase of the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents per hour with extended coverage has been reported out of a House committee.

A bill establishing a new Department of Public Welfare has been reported out of a House committee.

The Senate recently passed a bill providing for certain medical examinations to school children. The general Federal aid to education bill is now being considered by the Senate.

A House committee has reported out a bill authorizing a survey to be made of a number of federally owned buildings and post offices.

A bill liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act of last year has been reported out of subcommittee, and is now being considered by the full committee of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

A House committee is conducting hearings now on an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings on the housing bill passed by the Senate, as well as its own bill.

The appropriate committees of the House and Senate have or will shortly schedule hearings on civil-rights legislation.

The House has passed the most effective executive branch reorganization bill in history. A bill has been reported out of the Senate committee. I am frank in stating the Senate bill is ineffective and meaningless. It will only be through a good basic reorganization bill that the most of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, which in its over-all picture has done a real job, and a difficult one, can or will be carried into effect. The Senate bill will enable any plan submitted by the President to be defeated by the adverse vote of only one branch of Congress. The House bill calls for an adverse vote of both branches.

The success, in my opinion, of the major part of the Hoover report and the President's recommendations being carried into effect, will depend upon this particular provision of the House bill being retained. We might just as well pass no bill at all, as to have this provision of the Senate bill enacted into law.

To summarize my remarks: Forward-looking and constructive leadership in all walks of human activity is essential at this time. Negative or mere opposition leadership, with its attempt to scare everyone with name calling and wild charges that appeal to emotions and not to reason get the headline news. But such leadership has lost its influence with the people, and properly so.

The House of Representatives has done remarkable work, it will continue to do so.

The filibuster in the Senate has brought delay and has held up consideration of important legislation in that body, but in recent weeks a marked improvement has taken place, and I look for further improvement. The Senate can act quickly when it wants to do so.

A substantial part of the President's recommendations in his state of the Union message of last January will be enacted into law during the present session. In my opinion, the major part of it will be enacted before the termination of the present Congress in early January 1951.

I conclude with this affirmative statement. The American people want and will support forward-looking, affirmative, constructive leadership, not only in the field of Government, but in all other fields of human activity.

Turning Back the Clock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a guest editorial which appeared in the most recent issue of Hoard's Dairyman, the national dairy farm magazine which is published at Fort Atkinson, Wis. This editorial, entitled "Turning Back the Clock," should cause a thoughtful pause in the pell-mell rush to oleoize the American diet.

TURNING BACK THE CLOCK

(A guest editorial from the Northeast Farm Foundation)

It is doubtful if the American people realize just what they are doing to themselves in the matter of butter. The metropolitan newspapers damn the butter lobby and shout for untaxed margarine as though they were engaged in some kind of a crusade. And so they are, more or less, unknowingly—a crusade to degrade the American diet for all time; ably assisted by a margarine lobby that has, at the moment, great political power.

This is no brief for special taxes on margarine. We see no economic reason for taxing cottonseed oil, though the attempt to make it into imitation butter is a fraud, against which consumers once sought to be protected. But in the long run, taxation will not stop the public from mixing sawdust with its cornflakes, if the people prefer it.

The American people for a hundred years have been able to take butter for granted, which is something that only a pioneer people, reveling in the lush resources of a virgin continent, could do. In the long history of civilization that has never before been possible for any race. Butter has always been a luxury, reserved solely for the rich and fortunate.

No one knows when that original desert nomad, with a skin bag of sheep's milk slung across his jolting camel's back, first discovered, at journey's end, the peculiar conglomerate which we call butter. Men have known about it for at least 4,000 years, but over practically all of that long span they have reserved it for medicinal use, for a beauty aid, for anointment after the bath, and other luxury uses. Only in the last century has mankind had enough butter to be able to use it as a real food, and then only in a few countries and very sparingly.

Butter is, in our time, the world-wide symbol of earth's highest standard of living. Hitler, when he led the German people down the road to war, had to confront them with the grim modern alternative, "guns or butter." Throughout the world today nations are most readily classified in respect to their economic affluence by the tell-tale blessing or absence of butter on their tables. Even the proud British, one of the most truly civilized peoples on earth, have scarcely tasted it for 10 years and just about the first remark of every Englishman visiting our land is, how wonderful to have milk and butter.

Yes, America has had butter—so bountifully that it has graced virtually every man's table here for a 100 years. Four generations have simply taken it as a matter of course.

We still have plenty of milk and butter, thanks to the most efficient dairy industry in the world. Butter is still reasonably cheap, too. The average wage earner here can buy a pound of butter with fewer minutes of labor than he could 20 years ago.

But now a certain body of consumer sentiment seems to want to turn the clock back permanently toward those cheaper substitutes that less fortunate peoples have always had to use; vegetable oils and byproduct greases. Whipped up together we call it margarine.

There is nothing the matter with margarine. It is undoubtedly wholesome enough, as made now, and will supply the human craving for fat in spreads and cookery. But no masquerade that cotton oil and carcass grease can be put through will ever make them the princely food that is butter.

Cheap imitation butter, a byproduct that can be produced at a fourth of the cost of butter—in other words, yellow-colored margarine—thrown into open competition with butter, can have but one effect on the dairy industry and that is to hurt it. To be sure, our dairy industry will not perish because of this competition but it will gradually dwindle to a smaller output. Insofar as margarine displaces it, butter will gradually become scarcer. Fewer and fewer children in average families will know the taste of it. More and more, butter will become a luxury

for the well-to-do. In a couple of generations we shall, perhaps, be largely a nation of oil eaters, like our poorer cousins in the Old World. Perhaps our patriotic slogan, when we tighten belts for the next war, will be "guns or margarine."

The political fight for imitation butter, so far as it is successful, will move us one long turn around that historic cycle which long ago brought the Orient and part of Europe down to the drab level of a subsistence diet. For a century we have enjoyed the abundance from a highly developed animal agriculture, the richest fruits of this most blessed of all lands. We have lived on the fat of the land, and butter typifies it. Butter is part of that food bounty which includes meat, milk, eggs, cheese, and other livestock products—the rich, protective foods that have lifted the American diet up out of that age-old cereal-and-turnip level of the Old World. These products of animal agriculture are the backbone of the American dinner table, the things that distinguish it.

The descent back toward the cereal and vegetable diet, the loss of those rich animal foods (and once reduced, the animal industry is permanently reduced) is a process that most nations in this day and age would resist to the last ditch. Far older peoples than we would give much to have great livestock industries such as we have, especially the dairy. Those who have been mostly without meats, milk, butter, and eggs are the people who really prize them. Ask the British or German people what they would pay to have butter and eggs once more.

But some American consumers, who over long years have been surfeited to the point of unappreciativeness, seem to regard our incomparable butter industry as a sort of dog in the manger. Some of them seem to have set up dyed cotton or bean oil as a kind of fetish, a cause to champion, a symbol of thwarted privilege.

Well, assume that their cause will triumph; that before the year is out these good folks will be able to spread their bread and shorten their cake with untaxed, ersatz butter. Assume that the deed is done. Then what? Why, then future generations will, perhaps, be able to record that in the year 1949 the American people took steps to rid themselves of one of their most precious foods, to revert to the sardine oils of the poor and backward countries; in short, that they took steps to guide their children's diet once and for all into the torpid orientalism of cheap grease.

All in the name of economic progress.

Uniform Code of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the bill now before the House, commonly known as the military justice bill.

During the recent war I was called upon from time to time to aid and assist in Army court-martial cases. I served on general and special courts, as trial judge advocate on general and special courts, and as defense counsel representing those accused before general and special courts. Also, for a few weeks, though an infantry officer, I was detailed as an assistant judge advocate of an infantry training center.

Since acquiring this background of experience, I have been extremely interested in the efforts that have been made to bring more justice into our system of military justice.

I recognize the fact that an Army or any other military unit has the stern objective of winning wars; that discipline and authority are essential. But I have seen military courts all too often used to mete out harsh and unjust punishments for minor offenses.

I was detailed once as a trial judge advocate to prosecute some 25 soldiers for minor breaches of discipline before a special court martial. There was appointed at the same time as defense counsel a young officer who had no legal training and whose legal services to the accused were not in my judgment very valuable. His services consisted primarily in advising each accused that the best way to get through a court martial was to plead guilty. When I saw what was happening I continued to do my full duty, but did it less strenuously than I otherwise would have done in order to prevent these soldiers from being punished out of all proportion to the offenses which they were charged with committing.

I believe that this bill, if passed, will have a good effect on the morale of the members of the armed services, and that in the system which it sets up they will recognize that justice is the intent of the system.

I am particularly impressed with the fact that enlisted men, if this bill becomes law, may serve on general and special courts. I have long felt that the service of enlisted men on military courts would have a most beneficial effect. The enlisted man will feel that he is a part of the system of military justice. He is due the respect which this bill attempts to give him.

Likewise, I commend this committee for writing into the law the provision that both prosecution and defense counsel shall be trained lawyers. Many of us have argued for this provision a long time.

I am also happy to see that this bill provides for a single law to apply to all the armed services.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this bill also provides for a court of military appeals. A review may be had in this court of appeals by any accused who has been sentenced to confinement for 1 year or more. As I understand it this court of appeals has the power to review both the law and the facts in cases that come before it.

This bill is something new in miiitary justice. There is opposition to it. Undoubtedly, time and experience will point out its defects. The Committee on Armed Services does not claim that it is perfect. They do claim it is a great improvement over the present system.

This bill will not damage discipline in the armed forces. In the long run it will improve discipline. The American soldier, sailor, marine, or airman will appreciate and respond to the fair treatment in matters of military justice which this bill gives him.

Petition of Residents of State College, Pa., Supports Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to enclose the copy of a petition signed by residents of State College, Pa., and presented to me, supporting the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The petition and the signature of those supporting it follow:

We, the undersigned, believe that the Territory of Hawaii has qualified for statehood politically, economically, industrially, educationally, socially, and culturally. We wish to record our considered opinion that the Congress of the United States should initiate such action as is necessary to change the political status of Hawaii from that of a Territory to that of a State of the Union. We request that you present this petition to the proper congressional representatives.

Mrs. Geo. E. Lemmon, Mrs. D. S. Cryder, Mrs. R. E. Marker, Mrs. H. R. McCulloch, Miss Eva C. Van Tries, Mrs. B. F. Hutchins, Mrs. Geo. F. Johnson, Mrs. Kenneth Manning, Mrs. David B. Pugh, Mrs. E. C. Henry, Mrs. C. A. Morgan, Mrs. T. S. Spicer, Mrs. D. W. Carruthers, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mary Elizabeth St. John, Mrs. W. H. Gray, Mrs. F. P. Weaver, Mrs. Randolph Thompson, Mrs. S. Benjamin Swanson, Mrs. C. R. Krister, Elizabeth Morrow, Mrs. Wm. C. Thompson, Mrs. Wm. L. Mudge, Miss Rebecca M. Buck, Mrs. C. A. Lamm, Mrs. H. R. Kinley, Mrs. T. J. Gater, Mrs. Laura G. Davey, Mrs. Frank A. Butler, Mrs. L. R. Parks, Mrs. George Wurfl, Mrs. J. A. Arbuckle, Mrs. John Eliot Allen, Mrs. Thomas Hammonds, Mrs. Paul Bixby, Mrs. W. B. Nissley, Mrs. T. S. Patterson, Mrs. E. R. Bordner, Mrs. Esther N. Hay, Mrs. Kyle M. Alexander, Mrs. Carl M. Furst, Mrs. Vernon M. Albers, Mrs. W. Conard Fernilius, Mrs. Mason Long, Mrs. Harry H. Kauffman, Mrs. Esther Denniston, Mrs. H. W. Knerr, Mrs. E. J. Anderson, Mrs. Chas. W. Reed, Mrs. Donald G. Hay, Mrs. Paul Edinger, State College, Pa.; Mrs. R. E. Woods, Shippensburg, Pa.; Mrs. Geo. L. Porter, Chao-Ying Yuan, Mrs. Clarence E. Furst, Mrs. Charles F. Reese, Mrs. M. J. Reese, Mrs. D. C. Duncan, Mrs. C. A. Burge, Mrs. Norman M. Eberly, Mrs. W. E. Drake, Mrs. V. G. Sprague, Clarise Seeman, Frances Ford Forbes, Mrs. Samuel F. Crabtree, Mrs. A. L. Beam, State College, Pa.; Mrs. V. A. Houston, Lemont, Pa.; Belle H. Lindsay, Mrs. Russell C. Miller, Mrs. Merrill Wood, Mrs. Miriam S. Whitacre, Lillian I. Garbrick, Ione B. Garbrick, Mrs. Thelma M. Betts, A. Jean Doan, Helen S. Battorf, Alice Bright, Mrs. Andrew E. Newcomer, Jr., Ching-Sing Miao, Mrs. Fred G. Merkle, Mrs. Walter T. McCormick, Mrs. I. H. Egolf, Mrs. J. B. R. Dickey, Mrs. J. F. Fuese, Mrs. Harry M. Miller, Mrs. W. R. Shenk, Mrs. Thomas I. Mairs, Mrs. Paul Griggs, Mrs. W. H. Button, Mrs. Margaret M. Beach, Mrs. R. E. Mirshall, Mrs. George R. J. Combs, Mrs. James C. Anderson, Mrs. Christiana W. Appleby, Mrs. Lula Bloom, Mrs. Fred Lininger, Mrs. C. E. Barb, Mrs. D. W. Carruthers, Nora C. Noll, Irene M. McHugh, Sarah

G. Crockett, Cora R. Pearce, Henrietta N. Willard, Christina Odgers, Mary Martin Moss, Nannie Gast, Carrie Gast, Mary Webb, Mrs. S. C. Miller, Mrs. T. E. Holmes, Mrs. Harry G. Huber, Mrs. William Frear, Mrs. John B. Wallace, S. Elizabeth Young, Mary W. Fratse, Ethel D. Bottorf, Margaret G. Glenn, Adelene H. Keeler, State College, Pa.

Watershed Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I made an address by radio on the value of watershed management. I am sure I am not understating this matter when I say that many of us have no idea of what we mean when we speak of watershed management. Watershed management is a very new program. First, we should know what we mean by watershed. A watershed is an area of land drained by small creeks or rivulets sloping the same general direction and finally culminating into large streams, and the land all draining in a general direction, thus finally forming a river basin.

Irrigation companies, municipalities, and industries using water from watersheds are vitally interested in how the watershed is protected—yes, even policed. And of course for the purpose of regulating the flow of the water and directing the use of the water there would be developed lakes and reservoirs. The control of underbrush, the grass, and the trees are all a part of a range-management program.

Today I wish to discuss with you a subject which is close to the hearts of all Coloradoans—water. It is a big subject and too involved to discuss in all its phases during this broadcast, so I'm going to talk about a little-known phase—a phase which will become more and more important as time goes on—watershed management. What is it? How do you go about doing it? Why is it so important?

Water delivered to the farm, to the city, or to the drinking glass must be clear and dirt-free. Water is our most prized possession, but it can be and often is our worst enemy when unregulated floods occur, destroying homes, lives, and property. Watershed management means using and developing those lands and small streams on which water is collected from rain and snow, and delivering it in regular flows.

The process of water delivery, though simply spoken, is very complex. It involves careful study of the weather, particularly rain and snowfall; of stream behavior, especially now that we have built cities on and along flood plains; of soils and plant cover, particularly as these have been altered by erosion, cultivation, logging, and grazing. Each of these factors has a bearing on the other. Change one and you change the character of the other. How far can we change one factor before another will become detrimental to us? Watershed management is a young science. Right now we have to experiment on a watershed basis in order to become acquainted with all the factors governing water delivery. We go about it by experimentation and research later by application and general practice on a watershed.

To get some of the answers to watershed management problems I have conferred with the men at the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. This is a regional research organization supported by the Federal Government. The headquarters for this station is on the Colorado A. and M. College campus at Fort Collins, Colo. This helps to provide for close cooperation between State and Federal programs.

How important is watershed management? If we had unlimited water supplies, it would not be too important other than to find ways and means of keeping sediment out of streams and reservoirs. But each year we are finding more and more use for water by irrigating more land, by building more homes, and by developing more industries. Each year our water supply becomes more limited in relation to needs. Each year the time draws nearer and nearer when we shall have to guard our supplies in the same manner that we husband our soil. How limited will our water supplies become? Is there a relation between the various uses within the watershed—logging, mining, grazing, recreation—to the use of water outside the watershed—farming, industries, cities? There is a very definite relation, as I shall point out. More and more evidence points toward the production of water as being the most important use of a watershed.

Let us look at a few of the things that happen within a watershed. A logger cuts a virgin stand of lodgepole pine in the high mountains. Have you thought what this might mean in terms of snow storage during the winter and spring? Where the trees have been cut there are fewer trees to catch the snow and more of it reaches the ground. In fact where trees have not been cut up to 30 percent more snow is stored to become available for stream flow. You note I say "available." Results of studies of the effect of logging on snow storage are not yet complete on a watershed basis. They are under way and should they demonstrate that more water will be available for use, an important field of watershed management will begin to unfold.

Most of our watersheds are grazed by livestock and game animals. This brings up the question as to what is the best use when the needs of all the people are considered. We need livestock and game and we need good water. Fortunately for all of us, experiments show that under most conditions watersheds in reasonably good condition can be moderately grazed without any harm to the watershed. If grazing is too close, the cover of living plants and litter is reduced to a point where it no longer gives needed protection to the soil.

The heavier the grazing the less water from rain and snow will be absorbed by the soil, but the loss of water absorption by the soil is not serious so long as no erosion of the soil occurs. As soon as that happens we know that the grass and weed cover is not effectively checking erosion and we are putting sediment in the streams to fill up irrigation canals and reservoirs. The water-absorption rate by the soil may be reduced by as much as one-half inch per hour and the plant cover will still be able to hold the soil in place, but if this rate is reduced by one inch or more per hour, the soil will erode and cause much damage. You see, if the water cannot get into the soil, it will flow on the surface and carry soil particles with it. Often a point is reached where this run-off does more harm than good, for once it becomes silt laden, it makes irrigation difficult and domestic water expensive to clear.

A stream that carries too much silt in it—and by too much I mean when you cannot see your hand after you have put your arm up to the elbow in the water—prevents the sunlight from entering the water. Sunlight is necessary for the growth of small plants which produce fish food, thus a muddy stream has no fish and such a stream is no fun for a Sunday picnic either.

Well, those are just a few examples of the kind of information that is now being gathered—information which will give us the know-how of handling and using our watersheds for the greatest number of people in the long run.

There is another point about watersheds to which I should like to call your attention. You have all heard—and many of you have been in—the heavy snows this past winter, in many places the heaviest on record. We hope the snows have passed. Now, let us look in a general way at how the snow is melting. Already, floods have occurred in the Middle West along the Missouri River, the water coming from melting snow at the lower elevations where much of the land is cultivated. Snow melt has not yet started in the mountains where much of the land is covered with native trees and grass. To be sure, when it starts, we will have high water, but no floods unless we get a heavy rain on the snow. It occurs to me that there must be some relation between plant cover and the speed with which water from rain or snow will fill our stream channels and overflow their banks.

As you can see, this phase of our general problem of water—watershed management—is both complex and interesting. So interesting, in fact, that I have received several recent publications and bulletins on the subject. All Coloradans are interested in the subject, for upon it our future welfare rests. Colorado is an agricultural State dependent upon water for its existence. Watershed management is the youthful science designed to perpetuate that existence, a science which studies the relationship of the several watershed uses to one another and how we can make best use of them.

This discussion of watershed management has been very brief. I found it to be a big subject, after all. Let me hear from you if you should like to see and read some of the more recent bulletins and publications on watershed management. I am sure you will find them interesting and informative.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution against compulsory health insurance:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INDUSTRIAL PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS,
Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1949.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: At the thirty-fourth annual meeting of this association assembled in the Hotel Book Cadillac, Detroit, Mich., April 7, 1949, the following resolution was presented and passed relative to compulsory health insurance legislation:

"Whereas under a system of free enterprise the American medical profession has established the world's highest standard of medical care, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major Nation in the world; and

"Whereas the benefits of American medicine now are available to the majority of the people of this country and can be extended to every American through budget-basis voluntary health insurance; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical services has shown that there has been a gradual erosion of free enterprise and a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care to the detriment of the health of the people; and

"Whereas the great advances which have been made in our own specialty under the stimulus of private enterprise would be impeded by any form of Federal control of medicine: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the American Association of Industrial Physicians and Surgeons does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for bureaucratic control; and

"That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress of the United States, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation."

Thanking you for due consideration of this resolution, I am

Yours very truly,
EDWARD C. HOLMBLAD, M. D.,
Managing Director.

A Republican Call to Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting System, Friday, May 6, 1949:

A REPUBLICAN CALL TO ARMS

Good evening, my fellow Americans. In the very beginning I wish to pay my respects to the leader of a political party not my own.

I am sorry I cannot remember his name, but he has long whiskers and clear-cut principles. I refer to the gentleman who ran for President last November on the vegetarian ticket. He was both for something and against something. He was for vegetables and against meat. If it blooms, you eat it; if it wiggles, you leave it alone. Just as simple as that.

My Republican principles are equally clear and simple. When my party was born, it was born for freedom, and it was against slavery. Good Republicans have never wavered from that position. We are today still for freedom and against slavery, regardless of its form; and there are many forms of slavery.

As an example of what I mean, the difference between a peasant in Communist or class-riddled Europe and a farmer in America has been the difference between slavery and freedom, for the American has always been free. He might possibly be a rich farmer, or he might be dog poor. He might be bright and able, or dumb and clumsy. He might be lucky or unlucky. But always the American farmer has maintained his freedom, even despite the traps the New Deal set for him under Henry Wallace.

The New Dealers have never understood or practiced the principles of liberty and of freedom. While they have recognized, as we has been based on devising ways and means problems which demand the attention of the Government, every New Deal effort to help the farmer out of his economic troubles has been based on devising ways and means to regiment him, to enslave him to his Government. For instance, the New Deal administration just recently came up with a new plan to entice to its support not only the farmers, but the consuming public as well, by promising high prices to the farmer for the foodstuffs he raises and low prices to the city housewife for the food she buys.

There is, of course, a hook hidden in this New Deal proposal. To enjoy the high prices promised, the farmer must permit the Government to tell him what to plant, and when to sell his crops—a Pendergast form of farm relief, which in the end can only result in making an enslaved peasant out of him.

The city consumer may be able to buy food across the store counter at lower prices, but later he and other Americans will be called upon to pay more than the difference in higher taxes.

Remember, high taxes also can enslave you. Already the average American has from 1 to 2 days' wages taken out of each week's earnings to pay the cost of Government. Just try next week to take home all of your own pay. You will find you cannot, for much of your earnings is withheld by a beneficent government to pay your income taxes, or under a promise to take care of you in your old age. And, if the Truman administration has its way, more will be withheld to pay for your lumbago, your grocery bill, or what have you.

A slave produces wealth and earns money, but the master takes both under the guise of knowing what is best for the slave. Thus the master makes certain the slave is helpless and easily kept under control. Such policies are exactly the same as those of the Stalins, the Hitlers, and the Mussolinis.

During the coming fiscal year, it will cost $45,000,000,000 to operate the Federal Government—five times as much as was spent in any peacetime year under Roosevelt. If the social-State programs proposed by President Truman are put into effect, it will require an additional $20,000,000,000 annually—or a total of $65,000,000,000—to run the Government. Yes, my friends, Americans can lose their freedom and become enslaved by costly Government and a huge public debt.

Freedom is an indivisible thing. A man cannot lose a part of his freedom and still remain free. He cannot lose the freedom of choice and still call his life his own. The freedom to choose how he will worship, speak, write, rear his children, and work out his own destiny—that is freedom. It was the burning desire for freedom which guided the every move of our founding fathers—freedom of action and freedom of opportunity.

Freemen are usually brave and unafraid; but many brave men have lost their freedom—some through force and others through the subtle growth of governmental waste and bureaucracy. The cancerous cells of communism have been planted here, and we have been moving along the road which inevitably leads to state socialism. The time has come when we should make certain that all our fences are tight.

The true liberal—distinguished from the radical—is one who would liberate. He believes so much in liberty he wishes to share it with every human being. Certainly he is not one who so mistrusts his fellowmen that he pleads, from Moscow to Missouri, to be given stand-by controls or special emergency powers over them.

I have no quarrel with the Democratic Party. It has had a long and honorable life, but in recent years it has been taken over by the New Dealers, the corrupt city bosses, the racketeers of labor, and the fellow travelers of communism. It has, both in deed and in fact, become the radical party.

There is no room in America for two major radical parties. Victory for the Republican cause cannot be won by "me too" candidates or "me too" campaigns. There is no future in attempting to outpromise or outbid the New Deal for votes. The time has come when the Republican Party must have the courage to fight for the principles upon which it was founded—the principles which made this country great and strong, happy and prosperous—the envy of all the world.

Like the vegetarian candidate, the Republican Party must be for something and against something. It must take these positions openly and courageously. We must not be afraid to be against those things which we know are wrong—even if they are, for the moment, popular.

The New Dealers engage in wild spending sprees with public money and charge that the Republicans are against them. We answer: We are. At the same time, we are also for good and efficient government, economically operated.

They propose to give back to union bosses the power to control the working people of this country, and charge that we Republicans are against it. We are. Instead, we are for freedom for the individual worker.

They propose the Government go into competition with private business by building and operating industrial plants, and charge we Republicans are against it. Again I answer, we are. We are also for the opportunity for both the individual citizen and the Nation to grow and prosper under the free enterprise system.

They now propose, under the Brannan plan, to chain the farmer to the wheel of bureaucracy. Undoubtedly they will charge later the Republicans are against that. We will be—unless we again weakly say: "Me, too." Instead, we are for real aid to the farmer under a system which will help him solve his problems but will leave him free to run his own farm as he chooses.

When we insist that Mr. Truman kick the Communists out of the Government in Washington and stop playing footsie with the fellow travelers, we are certainly against some-

thing. We are against the Communists, but we are also for America.

We must have the courage to be against many of the things which Mr. Truman's advisers have talked him into being for—things which, to be charitable, Mr. Truman does not understand. With equal courage we must also be for many things the New Dealers are against.

For instance, we are for economical government, administered without corruption—without the help of the Pendergasts, the Hagues, or the Tammany Halls.

We are for the right of every citizen to earn a decent living under decent conditions, without being subjected to the coercive yoke of either employer or labor boss.

We are for Federal aid to the underprivileged, when necessary, but we are for the administration of such aid by State and local authorities, rather than by the bureaucrats of Washington.

We are for encouraging and helping every man in making provision for his old age, medical care, and housing—each in his own way. But, we believe it is the first duty of each citizen to take care of himself and his own family whenever possible, with the Government stepping in only to prevent hardship and suffering.

We are for the American private enterprise system which has given our people the highest plane of living in the world—benefits which those of other lands can only dream about.

We are for cleansing the political blood stream of America and for kicking the Communists and all other subversives out of our Government.

These simple principles are firmly based on the American system, for which the Republican Party stands. There are others. It is difficult to believe that the Truman administration is opposed to them. Yet, both words and actions prove that it is.

As a great Midwestern editor said a short time ago, "God hates a coward." The Republican Party must have the courage to stand and fight for fundamental principles. The Republican Party cannot just go along. Instead, it must be the strong right arm and the stout shield which protect and guard the rights of each and every individual American. Only by keeping America sound and solvent, strong and free, can we guarantee the fulfillment of our national destiny and the peace of the world.

The American Politburo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the Economic Council Letter for May 1, 1949. We may not agree with all that is contained therein but certainly it is a challenge to this Congress and an investigation, as suggested, could well be made to ascertain what group, if any, is the power behind the scene.

Intelligent men can see the world is in a mess. More particularly, Americans can see they are being rushed to the destruction of their liberties.

There should be no mystery as to how all this has happened—and we believe there is none. Like any other problem it yields to dispassionate analysis.

But is what is happening accidental or by design? And if by design, who are the architects? And why are we being rushed in this direction?

Why have the one-hundred-and-forty-million-odd American people been transformed in 17 years from a free people of incomparable strength, into a people whose liberties have been impaired and are in danger of being destroyed within the next 2 or 3 years?

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

First, just what is it that has happened?

Clearly, we Americans have passed under the control, still temporary but well-defined, of an alien-minded force. Our material savings and our natural resources are being dissipated. Our country has been caused to betray other peoples who trusted in us. America was founded upon Christian tradition; and yet well nigh every Christian tradition has been violated, as well as every important and long-established American tradition.

Much of our means of livelihood, as well as our means of self-defense, has been destroyed. A huge government bureaucracy has been built up. The country has been committed to wasteful schemes that tend to destroy rights of property and discourage individual initiative. The principles of hard work and thrift have been undermined. Morality and religion are at a low ebb. The alien element has infiltrated most of our education and many of our churches.

Laws have been passed that constantly make more difficult the conduct of private enterprise. Through long neglect of the teaching of history in our schools and colleges, few Americans under 40 have any conception of how or why America became great.

No part of the last 17 years has been so filled with attacks by this alien force as during the less than 4½ years since the beginning of the Yalta Conference.

TREACHERY AT YALTA

At Yalta a dying President, incapable of clear thought and prompted by a dying adviser who was ignorant of the affairs at stake and equally incapable of clear thought and who for years had been surrounded by and under the influence of these alien elements—this unhappy, beclouded, dying President was persuaded to sign an agreement which was to betray China to communism and Soviet Russia.

Today, 4 years later, the completion of this betrayal is being consummated before the gaze of a forgetful world, whose attention is being diverted from the tragedy by the well-timed talks of peace in Berlin. And almost certainly with China will eventually go all the rest of Asia, including Japan. Our betrayal of China marked the end of our long-time policy of the open door in China, which, together with the Monroe Doctrine, had long been the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

If it had been in our vital interest to betray China, some argument, however ignominious, might have been raised by some in its favor. But it was not in any sense in our interest. It was in disregard of every American interest.

The same alien element forced us to adopt the policy of unconditional surrender toward both Germany and Japan, although such unconditional surrender resulted in the practical annihilation of Germany and such horrible destruction as at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This policy removed both Germany and Japan, which otherwise could have been reconstructed and made effective barriers to communism.

It ordered the American Army to retire over 100 miles over land taken by our troops from the Germans, in order that Soviet Russia might occupy Berlin and much of the best of Germany. This, like other travesties and treacheries, has never been explained.

This alien element fathered the Nuremberg trials, vehement and vindictive in their inception and in their carrying out, and which, should the United States ever be defeated in war, will be the precedent for the hanging of every important American official, from the President down. It led to the betrayal by us of the leaders of a huge Russian military force who surrendered to American troops and who were turned over by us to certain punishment at the hands of Soviet Russia.

This same influence led to the setting up of the United Nations—an utter failure so far as any interest of the American people is concerned, but entirely understandable as the tool of the internationalists.

AMERICA, A PUPPET OF STALIN IN REGARD TO SPAIN

This same alien influence persuaded the United Nations, this time at the instance of Stalin himself, to call upon the United States and other governments to withdraw ambassadors from Spain. Yet Spain is the one large country on continental Europe that has defeated communism and held it under complete control. She would be the strongest ally the United States could have in Europe.

This same alien influence permitted or ordered the destruction by ruthless force of literally billions of dollars of American military matériel, including airplane engines, precision instruments, and even watches. It sold at the merest fraction of value or gave away other billions of matériel. And much of this matériel clearly found its way into the hands of Soviet Russia. Some of this matériel is at this moment being used by the Soviets to conquer China.

Ex-President Hoover in his report on the military budget said:

"The question of what became of the tanks is only a part of the broader question of what became of the vast quantities of war material on hand at the end of hostilities. The Army has stated that it has material sufficient to equip only 18 divisions, although at the end of the war it had some 89 fully equipped divisions and great additional quantities of material in the pipe line. Disposition of easily replaceable material is readily understood; but loss of complicated, difficult-to-produce military equipment is another matter, especially as the military were put on notice 6 months after the end of the war as to the seriousness of the international situation."

Frank Hanighen in the weekly supplement entitled "Not Merely Gossip" indicates that the scandal of the disappearance of this matériel may exceed that of Pearl Harbor.

Who but treasonable conspirators against America could have ordered it destroyed?

UNRRA

This same alien influence was back of UNRRA, $600,000,000 of whose funds were given to the Communist Government of Yugoslavia, and other funds used to build up Soviet Russia herself. It was back of the surreptitious and illegal admission into the United States of refugees estimated to be at least a million and a half, and possibly as many as three and a half millions. It was back of the fatuous scheme known as ERP and ECA, whereby we are giving seventeen billions of the savings and natural resources of the United States to bolster up Socialist governments in Britain and elsewhere.

As a result of 16 years of this alien influence in the United States, we have today a Federal debt of two hundred and fifty billions and a Federal budget of nearly forty-two billions, but which may reach fifty billions before the present session of Congress is over. We have laws without

number to regiment the people and to supply soft, useless jobs for hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats. And we find representatives of this alien-minded element in vital and cushy jobs in every department of Government, in numbers far out of proportions to their part of the population.

AND NOW

And now this same alien force is demanding—

That we extend social security to 20,000,000 more people at an added cost of several billions a year; that we adopt socialized medicine, though Britain's socialized medicine seems a failure from the standpoint both of physician and patient. That we extend the so-called reciprocal trade treaties, which in somewhat similar form have been on our statute books for 15 years and have largely destroyed the American watch industry, and have weakened others and have been one of the principal causes of this present recession.

That we restore the iniquitous Wagner Act in place of the Taft-Hartley Act, though under the former we had a continual succession of strikes and sabotage, and under the latter we have had vastly improved conditions.

And Congress has already authorized $5,500,000,000 for ECA (authorized but not yet appropriated), although Spain, whose friendship and good will would do more for us than any other country on continental Europe, is still left out; and although Britain and France, the two principal beneficiaries of ECA appropriations, have not only socialized governments and tremendous numbers of Communist Party members, but treaties of alliance and mutual assistance with Soviet Russia which, if they mean anything, would preclude them from joining with the United States against Soviet Russia. Moreover both Britain and France and other beneficiary nations are constantly shipping war matériel, paid for by the American taxpayers, to the U. S. S. R.

THE ITO AND THE ILO

Beyond all this, the Congress is to be asked to ratify the International Trade Organization Charter which would take away from the Congress of the United States all future power over both internal and foreign commerce of the United States, so far as the ITO should decide to exercise that power itself.

The Senate is to be asked to ratify the right-to-organize "convention" of the ILO—the International Labor Organization.

And in both the ITO and the ILO the United States would have one vote out of about 50. Indeed, the ILO pact would by its own terms become binding on the United States even though no other nation should adopt it.

The ITO and ILO are only two of a dozen international alphabetical organizations set up by or affiliated with the United Nations and which, largely by aid of former American New Dealers and other left-wingers from countries of Continental Europe, have been busily engaged in drafting so-called conventions of agreements to be submitted to the various countries for ratification.

If any of these agreements is ratified by the Senate, then under the terms of the Constitution it becomes the supreme law of the land. All Federal statutes and all State statutes inconsistent therewith are thereby wiped out and become of no effect.

Here is an astounding situation. While the great mass of the brain and brawn of America is engaged under private enterprise in carrying on the thousand and one activities that make up American production, industrial, agricultural and otherwise, a few thousand alien-minded busybodies, most of them foreigners, are plotting to take the American Republic apart. And most Americans who are working with them are alien-minded. These people are engaged in cooking up schemes which, if ratified (and they will be ratified unless the American people wake up), will completely transform the Government of the United States.

In fact, they will transform the lives of all the people of the United States. We will have scrapped the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We will have abandoned the century-and-a-half example the United States has given the world. We will have permitted alien schemers to seize all that we have and all that we are and throw it into the common pot with the rest of the world. America will have surrendered. Politicians willing to appease this alien element, together with the left-minded newswriters and alien-subsidized newspapers, will have betrayed the American people.

AUXILIARY GROUPS ARE AT WORK

The alien interest we speak of, like a well-organized army, have long had auxiliary groups that play a heavy part in conditioning or molding opinion, in propaganda of all kinds and in various schemes to punish their enemies.

Thus there is the Foreign Policy Association, always promoting foreign interests, notably those of Soviet Russia, and which is largely guided by the clever Russian-born Vera Micheles Dean.

There is the World Federalists, backed with plenty of money and by nearly all left-wingers, and whose success would end American independence and American liberty. This has as its moving spirit the former New York banker and left-winger, James P. Warburg. Incidentally the bible of the World Federalists is a book by one Emery Reves, which, on the jacket of the book, was endorsed by Albert Einstein, Senator Claude Pepper, Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Thomas Mann, and by leading American churchmen. Perhaps they did not know that Emery Reves was born a Hungarian who changes his name from Reves Imri.

There is also the American Association for the United Nations, headed by that perpetual internationalist who also, as chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies did much to involve this country in World War II—Clark M. Eichelberger.

There is the League of Women Voters which so often is back of left-wing legislation and was a powerful factor last fall in the defeat of many conservative Congressmen of both parties. The league, headed by Anna Lord Strauss, was recently exposed by Lucille Crain and Anne Hamilton in Packaged Thinking for Women, as a result of which a serious split is threatened in the ranks of the league.

And bearing on activities, official and unofficial, designed to punish dissenters and enemies, Judge Edward L. Von Roden, of Pennsylvania, who served on a special commission appointed by Secretary Royall to investigate military justice in Germany, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, 1949, as saying all but two of the Germans in the 139 cases we investigated had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was standard operating procedure with American investigators.

It is clear that this element can be as cruel and ruthless toward individual human beings as it is toward this country in trying to sell it out to international socialism or communism.

AND THERE IS UNESCO

One of the agreements worked out by the so-called UNESCO is an international bill of rights. This will likewise presently come up for ratification.

Does this international bill of rights improve on the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States? It does not. In fact, it destroys many of these existing rights. For instance, it says nothing about any rights of property. And knowing the sources of these proposals, it requires no effort to see that this international bill of rights is just one of the many attempts now being made from various directions and in all sorts of ways to destroy the American Republic.

THE ATLANTIC PACT

Then there is the Atlantic Pact which has just been submitted to the Congress and which we discussed in letter 213. The ratification of this pact will contribute vastly to the dismantling of the free government our ancestors set up.

The Atlantic Pact, if ratified, will be implemented by a new lend-lease bill, to rearm certain European nations. Secretary of State Acheson on April 27 admitted as much to the Senate committee.

The first lend-lease bill was enacted by the Congress in 1941. It was falsely offered to the Congress and the country as a measure to avoid war. It was precisely the opposite, as we and others predicted at the time. It was tantamount to a declaration of war. That lend-lease cost the United States $47,000,000,000.

What did this investment purchase for the American people? First of all, it financed Soviet Russia in building up the most threatening, most powerful nation that has ever appeared on the Eurasian Continent. It purchased the destruction of Germany, the only European country that could have stood up against Soviet Russia. It purchased the socialization of Great Britain and has led to the astounding situation of today where we free Americans, still retaining our private enterprise, are paying to complete the socialization of Britain and other European countries.

And that first lend-lease purchased the destruction of China. We went to war against Japan in order to maintain the open door and protect China. No nation ever went to war and more completely lost what it was fighting for than the United States in its war against Japan. Regretfully, we say that every man who died in our Pacific campaign died in vain.

Not only this, but we have thrown away all Asia, including Japan and the Philippines. For certainly the 80,000,000 Japanese cannot live without food from the China mainland. And they will not get that food now—unless Japan makes terms with Russian-ruled Communist China. And, of course, the Philippines could hardly last overnight.

And, cravenly moved by the Marxist slogan "Imperialism," we are at this moment seeking to compel the Dutch Government to give in to communism in Indonesia.

Hence the first lend-lease, costing us $47,000,000,000, purchased the greatest disaster in history. Is there reason to suppose that the second lend-lease will bring any better result?

Then there is the pending Economic Mobilization Act. This is designed for emergencies. It would give the President of the United States the right in his discretion to declare an emergency and to take over the absolute control of every man, woman, and child in the United States. That control could be as absolute as the control of the Politburo in Soviet Russia for of course the right would be exercised in the discretion of his advisers. And before we were through, that control might be exercised just as ruthlessly as the Russian Politburo ever exercised its control over 170,000,000 Soviet slaves.

For would it not be in the hands of the internationalists that have disrupted the world the past 15 years?

ZIONIST DOMINATION OF AMERICAN POLICY

In November 1947 the Assembly of the United Nations voted to recommend the partition of Palestine between Jews and Arabs.

It was purely a recommendation (the Assembly of UN has power only to recommend). But the Zionists and the American Government chose to treat it as a final determination. As everybody knows, events followed rapidly. The UN and the United States Government backed the Zionists at every point. When American Zionists failed by 100 millions to raise the $250,000,000 they sought in 1948, the Export-Import Bank, under the thumb of our administration, extended a $100,000,000 loan to Palestine. At every turn the new state of Israel has been treated as the first interest of the American administration.

Over a period of 100 years American missionaries, educators, and businessmen had built up in Mohammedan countries a vast good will toward America. America's attitude toward the Zionists who ruthlessly overran the Arabs in Palestine has brooked no opposition from any source. When the British, naturally smarting under the outrageous cruelties practiced by Zionists against the British, showed their resentment, the Washington administration promptly sided with the Zionists and against the British. The systematic campaign to boycott British goods received, so far as we could observe, not the slightest censure from Washington nor in such supposedly American newspapers as the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune. Everything was subordinated to the Zionists.

LET'S HAVE A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The American Politburo, behind the scenes, acts with extraordinary cunning, complete selfishness, and ruthless determination to secure absolute control of America. It has been operating at a growing pace ever since Roosevelt came to power in 1933.

In all the history of the United States, until Roosevelt, no alien element has had more than a passing influence on events. But the alien element now ruling commands huge public funds and the presence in vital Government positions of members of its group. It has the ready services of such smear outfits as the Antidefamation League, and such voices on the radio as Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson serve it well. Through intimidation it terrorizes officeholders, businessmen, and other citizens alike.

To no other force can possibly be attributed the conception and execution of the tragic moves of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations—including the proposals advanced today.

It was alien-minded influence that persuaded Roosevelt to scrap the 1932 Democratic platform and substitute the socialistic New Deal. It was alien influence that involved us in World War II, the most disastrous commitment the United States has ever made. It was alien influence that dominated much of our war policy.

Practically every major decision made with respect both to our domestic policy and practically all our foreign policy has been through the influence of men like Harold Laski and Felix Frankfurter and many others, either aliens today or alien-born or of recent alien descent. A court could well-nigh take judicial notice of the fact that for more than a quarter of a century Frankfurter, in the Harvard Law School, was training his students for future jobs in Washington and succeeded in placing an astonishing number of them in office.

The Congress could perform no greater service toward preserving the foundations of our Republic than to turn the searchlight of fearless investigation on the methods and the identity of this American Politburo.

No other investigation by Congress could throw such light on what has happened to America in the last 17 years, or on how to meet the threats that confront America today.

MERVIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

Education Down South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on Federal aid to education from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 7, 1949:

EDUCATION DOWN SOUTH

Georgia voters have just turned down a proposition which would have raised $45,000,000 for education, roads, and other State services.

This is not surprising, since Georgia is one of the States which would benefit most under Federal aid to education measures now before Congress.

Why, the average Georgia voter must have asked himself, should I raise my local taxes to improve public schools when there's a good chance taxpayers in other States can be persuaded to help foot the bill?

Using the administration-backed Federal aid formula Georgia is due to receive $17,745,000 in school aid while paying out some $4,476,000.

This is the equalization principle by means of which it is proposed to bring schools of the "poor" States up to the level of those in the wealthier States.

Friends of Federal aid say that Georgia and the other Southern States simply lack the resources to support their schools adequately. Even so they are spending proportionately more of their income for education than the other States.

This argument looked pretty good before the war. At that time it was possible to show that the Southern States were spending as much as 3 percent of their incomes for education. In the war years, however, the Southern States enjoyed a larger percentage increase in income than the country as a whole. Last year only 11 of the 48 States spent as much as 2 percent for education. Only one of those 11—North Carolina—was a Southern State.

Mississippi's income climbed so rapidly that its score of educational effort dropped from 3.7 percent in 1940 to 1.7 percent last year. Georgia, whose income rose from $901,000,000 in 1939 to $2,778,000,000 in 1947, was spending only 1.5 percent for education in 1947.

From this it would seem that the South's problem is not so much inability to pay for better public schools as its unwillingness to dig into its own pockets to raise the money.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 4, 1949, pertaining to the Taft-Hartley repeal legislation which was recently before the House for consideration:

A CONSPIRACY COLLAPSES

The approval by the House of the Wood bill, which embodies most of the salient features of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the refusal of the House to accept even a compromise alternative to the administration's Thomas-Lesinski bill, marks the collapse of a brazen conspiracy to restore the dictatorial powers of labor leaders over business and the members of their own unions, contrary to the public interest and the desires of the American people.

It is apparent now that in its final form, regardless of whose names appear on the title, the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1949 will retain many of the major reforms brought about by the Taft-Hartley Act.

These will include the use of the injunction to curb strikes threatening the national health or safety, the requirement for non-Communist affidavits, which probably will be extended to cover employers as well as union officials, assurance of free speech to employers and the requirement that unions as well as employers must bargain in good faith.

There is a possibility also that the new bill will continue the restrictions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, the prohibition against the assessment or expenditure of funds by unions, as well as corporations, for political purposes, and limitations on the closed shop. These provisions may be added to the bill in the Senate if the House does not adopt them.

The Truman administration, conniving with the labor politicians, sought to abolish these reforms and to foist on the American people the one-sided and discredited Wagner Act, under the guise of carrying out its interpretation of the mandate of the voters as expressed at the November election.

But the same voters who elected President Truman also elected a Congress, a majority of whose Members had voted to enact the Taft-Hartley law over the President's veto. They also had a mandate from the people.

Nevertheless, in conformity with his campaign promise to bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, President Truman insisted that Congress accept the old Wagner Act virtually unchanged.

Thus, the President was willing to restore to John L. Lewis, A. F. Whitney, and other leaders of industry-wide unions the power to "pull the switch" on the American economy.

He was willing to abolish the non-Communist affidavit requirement, which gave unions the incentive and the power to oust Communists from responsible union positions.

He was willing to muzzle employers by denying them the right of free speech in their relations with their employees.

He was willing to permit unions to conceal their financial transactions from their members, to refuse to bargain in good faith when it served their purposes so to refuse to engage in jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts and to spend union dues and assessments for political purposes.

The labor leaders cannot complain that President Truman failed to carry out his part of the conspiracy. With unprecedented candor he brandished the patronage club over Congress, promising to reward those Members who supported the administration's labor bill and threatening to punish those who opposed it. He even attempted to disassociate himself from the concessions which Speaker RAYBURN and other House leaders were forced to make, although everyone on Capitol Hill was aware that such a compromise could not be spelled out without someone consulting the White House.

Nevertheless, the American people are not ready to embrace a labor government nor to look kindly on the spectacle of labor organizations attempting to dictate to the White

House or to the Congress. In spite of evidence that the White House is willing to accept such dictation, Congress will not do so.

Correct Decisions Necessary—What Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., of May 6, 1949, entitled "Correct Decisions Necessary—What Are They?":

CORRECT DECISIONS NECESSARY—WHAT ARE THEY?

And now realization is slowly coming to the United States that the forces of communism are still marching ahead in their program of expansion.

For all practical purposes China has gone. There will be fighting and last stands but the Communists have been rolling so steadily that it does not seem possible that any force the Nationalists can organize will stop them.

This all adds up to a most discouraging world picture for us. During the First World War, Russia, England, and France held the Germans, receiving and inflicting millions of casualties while we were preparing to send men overseas. During the Second World War, although France folded quickly under the German impact, Russia and England held and held, while we trained and equipped our men.

But now we have no one to act as a shield for us. Russia, who was an ally, is now an enemy. England is bled white financially and since 1945 has survived only through our aid. France is just beginning to recover, but it will be years before she again becomes a real power. Italy cannot be counted on. Belgium and Holland must be rearmed before they are again effective.

That leaves us, the United States, as the one great power to oppose communism.

The decisions to be made in Washington, during the next few weeks, may easily determine the course of world history during the next few decades.

If we do not give enough military and financial aid to the democratic nations of Europe, then their value as a buffer against the Russians becomes nothing. If we give too much help, then we place too great a burden on our Nation and we will run ourselves into a major depression. And that is exactly what the Russians hope that we will do.

If we give aid to China, chances are that the Communists will capture the equipment and then turn it on the Nationalists. If we do not give aid, we turn our faces against the last hope of even a semidemocracy in China.

If we rearm Japan and allow her to rebuild her commercial empire, we are giving aid and comfort to our former bitter enemies. But if we do not do this, we are discarding a most valuable potential ally.

This is no time for the utterance of pious platitudes and expressions of hope that the Communists will become reasonable. Their record shows that the only type of international politics they understand or respect are those based on sheer power.

Today we must make our moves wisely. Whether or not the men in Washington, or any group of men in the whole world, have the wisdom and foresight to make the correct decisions is very much of a question.

Historic Flight Retraced, Faster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in the New York Times under date of May 9, 1949, headed "Historic Flight Retraced, Faster." I think it only proper to have it inserted in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the first flight across the Atlantic.

HISTORIC FLIGHT RETRACED, FASTER—NAVY MEN SPANNING ATLANTIC IN 15 HOURS, BUT FIRST TRIP REQUIRED 19 DAYS

(By John Stuart)

At 2:10 p. m. yesterday two iron men of the wooden airplane Navy-Curtiss 4 began at Floyd Bennett Naval Air Station to retrace the first flight ever made across the Atlantic, on which they set out 30 years and 8 minutes before.

They were Rear Adm. A. C. Read (retired) and Chief Aviation Pilot Eugene Saytor Rhoades, now a Navy inspector at the Lockheed Aircraft Corp's plant at Burbank, Calif., who were commander and mechanic of the only one of the three starting planes to complete the 1919 flight. The others were forced down at the Azores.

The two men boarded another Navy record holder, the Lockheed Neptune P2V-2, which will land them in Lisbon this morning a little more than 15 hours after their departure, in contrast to the 19 days their first flight required.

The Naval Air Station at Floyd Bennett announced last night that at 10 p. m. the plane was 1,553 miles out from the airfield on its way toward the Azores. A radio message said the plane was traveling at 186 miles an hour ground speed at an altitude of 4,900 feet. It passed over Cape Race, Newfoundland at 8:23 p. m. (d. s. t.).

The plane they are flying is the *Truculent Turtle* that flew from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio, on October 1, 1946, setting a still unbeaten world's record for range at 11,236 miles. Its pilot is Commander Thomas D. Davies, who helped design the plane to carry the atom bomb and who flew it on its long-distance record.

WILL DIP OVER TROUBLE SPOTS

The *Turtle* weighed 61,000 pounds at takeoff. The plane planned to dip low and circle over Chatham, Mass., Halifax, Trepassey Bay, Newfoundland, and the Azores so that the passengers can see the places where they encountered engine trouble and other difficulties on the first flight.

They would have taken off exactly 30 years later except for the delay of speechmaking on the ramp that looked out from the rear of the officers' club over Rockaway Inlet, close to the former Rockaway Naval Air Station, where they had prepared for the flight of 1919.

Three other survivors of the historic flight were absent from yesterday's ceremonies. They were Admiral John H. Towers, now a vice president of Pan American Airways, who was chief planner and flight commander for the 1919 flight; Lt. Walter Hinton, of Manhasset, Long Island, who is in the Far East, and Admiral P. N. L. Bellinger (retired), of Washington.

Rear Adm. Walter S. DeLany, commandant of the Third Naval District here, in opening the ceremonies, said that he, too, had a small part in the first flight. He was executive officer of the U. S. S. *Craven*, one of the fifty destroyers that the Navy had strung along the course as weather stations, course markers, and possible rescue vessels.

Rear Adm. Alfred N. Pride, now Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Navy Department, who also had a part as a junior officer on the escort vessels, said that new interceptor fighter planes and other types were being developed by the Navy to protect the sea lanes from possible attack.

Robert L. Earle, vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp., successor to Curtiss Airplane Corp., which built the NC planes used in the first flight, paid tribute to the advance the Navy had made. The two engines of the *Truculent Turtle*, he pointed out, deliver almost four times the horsepower possible from the four Liberty engines in the NC-4.

Kenneth P. Behr, of the department of marine and aviation, represented Mayor O'Dwyer at the ceremonies.

The *Turtle* took off under an umbrella of 200 Navy fighter and patrol planes.

The *Truculent Turtle* is due to leave Lisbon Wednesday, circle over Plymouth where the NC-4 ended her voyage, and go on to Hortholt, near London.

On Friday the *Turtle* will go to Paris for 2 days at the international air show there.

Is the Marshall Plan Backfiring?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, disturbing reports have been issued out of Geneva, Switzerland, concerning the effect of our so-called European recovery plan. Michael L. Hoffman, writing in the New York Times, states that national economic planning is driving Europe toward increased autarchy and less efficient use of the natural resources of those countries. If this is true, it is our responsibility to act. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article from the New York Times:

EUROPE IS WARNED OF AUTARCHY DRIFT—UN ECONOMIC BOARD CITES NATIONAL PLANNING DANGER—AIMS SAID TO MISFIRE

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, May 6.—National economic planning is driving Europe toward increased autarchy and less efficient use of its resources, according to the economic survey of Europe in 1948 issued by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

In a warning to governments of both eastern and western Europe, the commission economists cite the contrast between the professed aims of international cooperation and actual investment programs as evidence of a dangerous trend.

"The avowed aim of much of the current economic planning is to bring about a higher degree of integration of European economy," the report says. "Yet the observable tendencies appear to move in the opposite direction. This is true, not only in relations between the two great complementary regions, the west and east of Europe, where political cleavages hamper the development of economic cooperation. It also appears to be true within these two regions owing to the rigid trading framework within which economic controls necessarily operate and owing to the absence so far of any satisfactory mechanism for expanding long-range planning to the field of international trade."

In a detailed study of national plans the survey finds that on the whole they have

been fairly well fulfilled. Looking at the longer-range prospects, however, it finds that continued development along the lines designed to bring increased self-sufficiency for each country will lead to decreased self-sufficiency for Europe as a whole.

Production programs of the various countries reveal the trend clearly. For nearly every important group of industrial commodities the western European countries are planning to import less proportionately than before the war to produce more at home.

Whereas 71 percent of petroleum products were imported in 1938, by 1950 the percentage will be only 30 if plans are fulfilled. For rolled steel products, the fall in the share of imports over the same period is from 11.7 to 7.9. For cotton and wool yarn a drop of over 30 percent is contemplated, while for rayon yarn, production plans call for reducing dependence on imports to one-fifth of the prewar figure.

"The test of effective international cooperation will be the extent to which these tendencies can be counteracted by a conscious effort to introduce closer integration into the separate plans and policies," the survey says. "So far little has been accomplished in this direction."

It is implicit in the data assembled by the ECA that the Marshall plan has so far had as its principal long-run effect the encouragement in Europe of this nationalistic trend. The survey points out that both investment programs and supplies of raw materials to western European industry would be impossible of attainment without United States aid in meeting the overseas trade deficit.

Commenting on the survey's revelations of an autarchic trend in planning, Nicholas Kaldor, ECA research director and one of the principal authors of the survey, said:

"This is perhaps the most disturbing feature of the entire economic situation in Europe."

New National Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith for information only a letter and statement by John M. Barnes, of Oakland, Calif., concerning a second capital of the United States. They are self-explanatory and are as follows:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 13, 1949.*
Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Texas Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: Attached herewith is data and recommendations relative to establishing a second capital of the United States. This is in conjunction with your ideas as set forth in a news article by Correspondent Othman. Copies of this recommendation have previously been submitted to President Truman and Senators WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, GLEN TAYLOR, and ALEXANDER WILEY.

I am a general contractor and will submit an informal bid for supervising construction of facilities in accordance with the attached plan. My antecedence include residence in Alameda or Contra Costa Counties since 1926. I am a licensed general contractor with over 20 years' construction engineering and administration experience in development of the East Bay area and the Pacific Northwest. I also spent a number of years with the United States Army on many assignments including post engineer during the construction of Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, executive officer during design of Camp Beale, Marysville, Calif., executive assistant to the commanding general, Ninth Service Command, and also commanding officer of Salt Lake City Army Air Base.

I feel akin toward your people of eastern Texas, having been hospitalized during 1943–44 at the Army hospital, Longview, Tex., and can recall the treatment accorded me by the people there.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. BARNES.

Break-down of approximate cost of auxiliary or cultural capital with underground facilities to be located at heart of United States, probably in the Ozark Mountains near Springfield, Mo.

Land	$3,000,000
Airport	8,000,000
Utilities (water, sewer, gas, electricity, etc)	1,000,000
Railroad facilities	1,000,000
Streets, grading, landscaping	2,000,000
Capitol building (with 1 large and 2 small auditoriums, conference rooms, etc.)	18,000,000
Office buildings (15-dispersed)	15,000,000
Housing (Government employees and officials)	10,000,000
Underground facilities (storage facilities for archives, secret files, technical information, etc., necessary facilities for operation of vital Government agencies)	38,000,000
Individual State building (donation of land and not more than half of cost facilities for each State to be used by State agencies for cultural and liaison purposes)	4,000,000
Total	100,000,000

Location should be in moderate climate, near a mountainous area near center of United States and fairly near large urban area.

These facilities will be used during peacetime by various departments of the Federal Government, for storage of records and scientific data, special congressional committees, special sessions of the Congress during extreme heat or cold weather in Washington. Also shall be a cultural center of the country, and for the enjoyment and educational purposes of all individuals, and for the preservation of State and human rights.

This cultural or auxiliary capital would be accessible to all the people of the United States for their education, welfare, and enjoyment, and for the purpose of giving a western as well as an eastern outlook on national and international affairs. It would also be of obvious advantage should we get involved in another war.

Cost of $100,000,000 is small in comparison with annual cost of military, and Marshall plan. This estimate of cost should be sufficient for at least 10 years, and provide necescary facilities for operation of vital Federal agencies. It is for the purpose of preserving and improving the know-how so vital to the future of not only the United States but the whole world.

RESOLUTION TO BE OFFERED

It is my plan to introduce a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee by the Speaker of the House to consider and make recommendations to the Congress on the following:

First. Whether consideration should be given to the establishment of another National Capital, either to entirely take the place of our present National Capital or to supplement it to be used when desired.

Second. Determine the governmental functions that are now being administered in Washington, D. C., that could just as well be administered in other sections of the United States far removed from the present National Capital.

Third. Consider and submit to Congress plans submitted by architects, engineers and civic or other public-spirited and patriotic persons and organizations on this proposal.

Organized Veterans of Michigan Protest Ilse Koch Commutation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the organized veterans of Michigan, through the Consolidated War Veterans Councils of Michigan, Inc., and the Allied Veterans Council of Wayne County, Inc., have adopted the following resolution protesting the release of Ilse Koch. The Allied Veterans Council, Inc., of Michigan, is a united group representing the United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Red Arrow, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Canadian Legion of Wayne County, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Canadian Corps Association, Polish Army Veterans Association, District No. 6, Marine Corps League, Regular Veterans, Polar Bears Association, Rainbow Division, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Army of the Philippines, R. Schneidewind.

Whereas the 21 veteran organizations of Michigan, representing some 900,000 veterans; and

Whereas the Michigan Legislature, both house and senate; and

Whereas the common council of the city of Detroit; and

Whereas the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, have all joined with the citizens of our State in protesting the pending release of Ilse Koch from her confinement in a German prison for her inhuman treatment of her fellowmen; and

Whereas former prisoners of Buchenwald, together with officials who attended her trial are also protesting her release; and

Whereas her absolute disregard of the rules of war as well as the concepts and precepts of man and God; and

Whereas she has, by her inhuman actions, definitely forfeited her right to ever again mingle with free people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the veterans of the State of Michigan, in the name of our constituted authorities and the people, urge that Congress take definite and positive action against the release of Ilse Koch in the interest of upholding the principles of democracy and justice.

(This resolution was adopted by the organized veterans of Michigan through the consolidated War Veterans Councils of Michigan, Inc., and the Allied Veterans Council of Wayne County, Inc.)

Mr. Speaker, the people in Michigan are much incensed over the release of

this bestial woman. The Michigan State Legislature, the house and senate, and the common council of Detroit, and the Governor of Michigan, together with the 21 veteran organizations, also thousands of other individuals, active in both public and private life, have protested Frau Koch's release.

Al Atkins, an RCAF flier, has brought the Ilse Koch case strongly to public attention. He has already enlisted 600,000 Michigan war veterans in the crusade to keep Ilse Koch behind the bars. At this point, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Detroit Free Press:

BUCHENWALD VICTIM IN PURSUIT OF JUSTICE—AMASSES EVIDENCE IN ATTEMPT TO KEEP ILSE KOCH BEHIND BARS

(By Sam Petok)

Remember Al Atkins?

He's the fiery RCAF flier whose impassioned outburst against the "Bitch of Buchenwald" was published in the Free Press last month.

His lone voice of indignation against the atrocities committed at the Nazi extermination factory has stirred Gen. Lucius D. Clay to examine the possibility of trying Ilse Koch again.

He now is working at rounding up affidavits from the prisoners, like himself, who were imprisoned there.

"I'll take the evidence to General Clay even if I have to swim across the ocean to get there," he promised.

Is Al mad? That's mild understatement. His twinkling gray eyes turn steel and he squares the jaw when he talks about the woman who, he says, made lamp shades out of human flesh.

He's sore enough to make soapbox speeches about the relaxing of Frau Koch's life sentence to 4 years.

"I don't have a plugged nickel and I'm not a public speaker," he said. "But, brother, I'm boiling inside. I keep waking up from the nightmare of Buchenwald in a cold sweat. It was hell."

Al, who lives at 15653 Crescentwood, East Detroit, spent 3 months at the concentration camp as a prisoner of war.

"I was there with 164 other soldiers," he added. "Ask any of those guys. They can tell you Al Atkins wants no mercy for the 'bitch of Buchenwald.'"

He wants the 164 prisoners of war who were in the concentration camp with him to join in a protest against the reduced sentence which will see her out of prison in a year.

For to Atkins, who now lives at 15653 Crescentwood, she was a part of "the terror and horror over the camp that went through you like an electric shock."

No; he never saw Ilse Koch, the red-haired widow of a commandant of the concentration camp, order the tattooed flesh removed from prisoners for lamp shades.

But Atkins says he saw two men from whom the skin was removed and other unforgettable horrors.

"Those other 164 guys who were with me could tell the same thing," Atkins relates.

How did Arizona-born Atkins land at Buchenwald? He joined the RCAF. On July 4, 1944, he was shot down near Chartres.

Some of the crew of the bomber were killed, two got back to England safely, he wandered in a daze for 10 days. He was picked up by the gestapo, who turned him over to the SS.

For a few days he was in Fresne Prison, near Paris, but word came the American Armies were near.

"So the SS put 70 of us in a boxcar, threw in some bread, and locked the doors," Atkins said.

"The 70, without any sanitary facilities, unable to sit except in relays, were locked in the boxcar for 5 days."

"Some men escaped through the floor of the car the third night," Atkins related. "So then they took our clothes away. They shot through the car several times but didn't hit anybody."

Then on the fifth day, the boxcar was unlocked. Instead of being at a prisoner-of-war camp they were at Buchenwald—and its designed terror struck them at once.

A lion on a long leash circled the camp entrance. The guards had man-killing dogs which they sicked on any inmate sluggish at lifting his cap in respect.

"For the first 7 days there were 165 of us prisoners sleeping on rock piles, without even a blanket," Atkins recalled. One of the boys—named Beck—died of pneumonia shortly after.

Then they moved them inside—750 men to a hut—sleeping four to a 4-foot wide shelf. There had been gypsy children, 8 to 12, there before the war prisoners were moved in.

"We heard that they had all been taken away and killed," he said.

Some days they were fed. On others, they weren't. A 12th of a loaf of bread was a man's ration for a day.

In 3 months Atkins' weight went from 196 to 118 pounds at Buchenwald. His mind wavers from terrible memory to terrible memory.

"There were 1,400 Jews in a fenced-off area near us," he said. "Kept like cattle. No buildings there at all. They just threw food over the fence to them."

He remembered a boy, Gurth, and another, who could get under the fence and come over to the Americans.

"They both spoke English. And then one Monday afternoon they took the 1,400 away, Gurth, the other boy, and all the rest, and gassed them."

In October the Nazis forced all the prisoners out to watch the hanging of 18 Englishmen they said were spies, Atkins remembered.

There was personal brutality.

While Frau Koch was informed of her nearing freedom immediately, the information was not released to the press for 3 months.

"Being a woman made her participation more unnatural and more deliberate," the committee said.

"The error in the Koch case is an isolated blemish on the vigilance of our democratic principles of justice."

Ferguson's group discovered that General Clay is bound by no written regulation denying him the power to reconsider his decision.

The special military court he created to try Frau Koch has no precedents—it is governed only by his rules.

That's why Atkins is crying out across an ocean in hopes of being heard.

A medical aide was trying to pry military information out of Atkins as he was dressing deep wounds in his leg. Atkins wanted to know how long it would take his wounds to heal.

"I told him any answers to his questions would be military secrets," Atkins recalled.

"So he jabbed deep into the wounds, breaking them open again and said, 'That's a military secret, too.'"

Through all the terror of the camp ran the whispers of the inhuman woman they called "the bitch of Buchenwald."

"I met two men who had tattooed flesh removed for those purses and lamp shades she was said to make," Atkins insisted.

"They're probably dead now, but what testimony they would have been before that Army board reduced her sentence. The dead make poor witnesses, I suppose."

He brooded a minute and added, "I suppose they think those four crematoriums at Buchenwald were for frying bacon."

"I'm not a violent man," Atkins says, "but if I ran into one of the monsters who ran that camp I'd kill them with my own hands."

Mr. Speaker, not only are the veterans of Michigan aroused and angered at this commutation of sentence, but already veterans in 12 States have joined this crusade against Ilse Koch this past week. Up to this date no satisfactory reply has been received from the military authorities or from General Clay as to why the life sentence was set aside, and why this commutation to a 4-month imprisonment was kept a dark secret from the public.

Verdict of History—Paternalism Greatest Internal Menace to Progress and Security

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following excerpt from a New England letter of the First National Bank of Boston, dated February 28, 1949:

The administration has proposed a Fair Deal program that, if adopted, would impose intolerable burdens and speed the Nation down the road of socialism. It is estimated that this program would raise the total budget to $60,000,000,000 annually within a 5-year period.

On the surface it would appear that providing security from the cradle to the grave for all people is in keeping with an advancing civilization. But irrefutable historical evidence down the ages clearly shows that the protective spirit of government is the greatest internal menace to general welfare, as it undermines the very foundation of security that it designs to establish.

It is held by the proponents of such a program that a nation cannot prosper unless the government watches over its people, protects them against want, and directs social and economic activities through an ever-expanding bureaucracy. But when a government loses confidence in the capacity of its people to rule and to provide for themselves, and proceeds to coddle and pamper them and to shield them against the storms of life, the wealth-creating power of the people is undermined, personal initiative is smothered, and incentives seriously impaired or destroyed. The end result is that the nation becomes impoverished, while free enterprise and self-government are engulfed in some form of regimentation. This is the verdict of history.

Let us call the roll of a few countries that have tried the experiment of doing everything for the people, and soberly note the baneful consequences. There was Greece, the mother of art and culture, that reached the climax of her glory in the Golden Age of Pericles. Under this benevolent dictator the government embarked upon a huge spending program to provide for the wants and entertainment of its people, a large proportion of whom were on the government pay roll. But as the burdens accumulated, and with bankruptcy imminent, Pericles led his people into a disastrous war, and that was the end of Greek leadership.

As Greece fell, the torch was handed to the Romans, who extended civilization over Europe and formed the basis of modern society. But the Roman Empire was destroyed because its citizens became flabby and too weak to defend themselves against the barbarians.

In stating the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire one authority has said: "The pressure of public burdens was an increasing disability that ate the very heart out of the capitalist and the laborer alike; there was no hope to inspire energy or encourage enterprise and the gradual decay culminated in an utter collapse."

When Rome fell, the world was plunged into darkness for 500 years. The torch of learning was burning very low and would have been extinguished if it had not been for the knights and their friends, the monks. As governments became weak, daring and resourceful men rose to the occasion and broadened the horizons, lifted the spirits, and stimulated the energies of the people. Then came the Crusades, accompanied by the flourishing of international commerce with its riches and leisure. This paved the way for the Renaissance, the rebuilding of civilization and the rapid development of learning and culture. Then followed the great discoveries of the New World, and during the reign of Queen Elizabeth Great Britain emerged as the leader of civilization, which leadership she retained until fairly recent times.

In the meantime Spain, too, had her day of glory and at one time was mistress of the world. But as she rose in power her government extended its protective wings so that "* * * everything being done for the people, nothing was done by the people." The nation tottered into stagnation from which it has not been able to emerge.

So in Spain, as in Rome, and in Greece, "* * * it was when things were the most prosperous on the surface that they were the most rotten at the foundation," according to the noted historian, Henry Thomas Buckle.

Then let us skip a few decades to more modern times and see whether the extension of paternalism and government planning has had the same consequences as in earlier times.

Before the war, the Fascist countries abroad held out to their people a utopian plan of full employment, security, and better homes. This was to be achieved by a planned economy financed by government borrowing and spending, while a totalitarian government was to regulate all activities. But after surrendering their freedom for illusory security and military pageantry, the Italian and German people were led into a war of aggression that ended in humiliation and misery. The tragic experience of the Fascist countries should be a stark warning to us of the dangerous course plotted by those who are so anxious to rebuild our society. In the face of indisputable evidence that we are following the same economic and financial pattern, and are drifting along under the same forces, we cannot afford to harbor the illustration that it "cannot happen here."

Before turning our backs upon a system that has served us so well over the decades, we should ponder now, before time has run out, on the price that must be paid should we heed the siren voices of those who would lead us down the road to serfdom. We should be warned that government planning through the ages invariably shows that one step leads to another until finally the entire economy and all institutions are brought under the iron rule of bureaucracy.

At this crucial stage we should also be mindful that it is a recognized part of the Communist strategy to have this country spend itself into bankruptcy in order that we may be softened for easy conquest.

The tragic irony of it all is that after spending $400,000,000,000, sacrificing the lives of 300,000 of our best youth to defeat the Fascist powers, and now spending around $20,000,000,000 to combat communism, we should be pursuing a domestic policy that will inevitably lead to some form of totalitarianism.

So with red lights flashing and fog horns blaring, the American people should be heedful of the danger signals that the many chapters in world history grimly and soberly remind us are warnings of the treacherous reefs upon which have been wrecked so many so-called liberal governments down through the ages.

It should be apparent to all that income and wealth are not created by Government but by the productive efforts of the people. The Government merely siphons the money by means of taxes and borrowings, and then distributes the money through the spending channels.

The government providing for the people is not a novel experiment but can be traced back to dim antiquity. It is atavistic and has a blighting influence on the recipients. What might appear like "manna from heaven" would in reality be a drug that in the course of time would make the people submissive and subservient to those in power. As has been said:

"Thus runs the law, and the law shall run till
the earth in its course is still
That whose eateth another's bread shall do
that other's will."

Portland Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a letter written by Seward P. Reese, dean of the school of law of Willamette University, giving his observations on the operation of the United States veterans' hospital at Portland, Oreg. As there is so much controversy over the conduct of the Veterans' Administration, I commend this letter to the attention of all Members of Congress:

COLLEGE OF LAW,
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY,
Salem, Oreg., April 21, 1949.

WALTER A. NORBLAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: This letter is to say a good word for the Veterans' Administration.

Recently I had occasion to be a patient in the veterans' hospital in Portland, Oreg. I am confident that the diagnosis (laboratory work and analysis by the physicians) and treatment was as good as I could have gotten anywhere. The organization and management of the hospital seemed to be of a very high order.

Incidentally, I do not see how a hospital of that kind could possibly render adequate service if located in a small or medium-size community. In the Portland hospital they have the advantage of the consultation with both the faculty of the University of Oregon Medical College and the leading members of the medical profession in Portland in addition to a very excellently trained staff in the Veterans' Administration hospital.

This letter is, of course, unsolicited and is being written you because I know at times the Veterans' Administration has been criticized and I merely want to put a good word in for an organization when I think it is deserved. This is not intended as a lobby letter but I thought you might be interested in my reactions.

With all good wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,
SEWARD P. REESE, *Dean.*

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of May 5, 1949, pertaining to the Taft-Hartley repeal legislation which was recently before the House for consideration:

BUNGLING STRATEGY

The defeat that the administration has sustained is not diminished by the House recommittal of the Wood bill to the Labor Committee. For the action of the House the previous day in rejecting the Lesinski bill in favor of this substitute measure is proof positive that the administration will either have to accept a labor bill modeled along Taft-Hartley lines or else make up its mind to live with the Taft-Hartley Act.

Responsibility for this political debacle rests squarely upon the shoulders of House leaders who refused until too late to consider reasonable amendments to the defective administration bill. A good share of the blame for their strategic defeat is attributable to the short-sighted tactics of labor leaders who fought retention of various protective features of the Taft-Hartley Act that have proved their worth, especially provisions for injunctive relief in case of strikes constituting a threat to the national welfare. Finally, the President himself seriously impaired the chances of passage of the administration bill, first by presenting his lieutenants in Congress with a ready-made bill tailored to fit the specifications of labor leaders, and more recently by trying to coerce Congress into accepting that bill by threatening to deny patronage perquisites to Democrats who voted against it.

The political bungling that led to the rout of the administration has served at least one good purpose. It has shown that Congress cannot be bullied into passing a one-sided labor bill that fails to protect the interests of management and the public as well as labor. Although the Wood bill failed of passage, the House rejection of the Lesinski bill, even in its hastily amended form, demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that Congress will not approve any labor bill that does not embody most of the safeguards against abuse embodied in existing legislation. If there is to be any new labor legislation at this session of Congress, the administration forces will either have to make further concessions to the demands of opponents or risk the possibility of a legislative revolt that might result in passage of a measure quite as stiff as, or even stiffer, than the Wood bill.

The choice, therefore, appears to lie between retention of the Taft-Hartley Act in unamended form or acceptance of a compromise measure that would eliminate or modify those provisions of the law that have proved undesirable or oppressive without destroying essential safeguards against the abuses that prevailed under the old Wagner Act. Unless a reasonable compromise is reached, the Taft-Hartley Act will remain a political issue, and labor unions and anti-labor groups will continue to put pressure on Members of Congress and candidates for office to indorse or oppose changes in the law that may not be in the public interest.

Labor legislation should, of course, be judged solely on its merits as an instrumentality for insuring a system of collective bargaining fair to employers, employees, and the

public at large. It is essentially a nonpartisan type of lawmaking, as evidenced by the split party votes in the House. If the administration had proceeded on that assumption it would not have lost political face by making repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act a partisan issue.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of May 7, 1949, pertaining to the Taft-Hartley repeal legislation which was recently before the House for consideration:

MR. TRUMAN'S HINT

It is amusing to note President Truman's comment to the effect that defeat of his labor-management bill in the House gives the administration a chance to start over again. Reports of the President's press conference do not make clear whether he sees in this new situation a chance to get the sort of bill he wants or a chance to get an acceptable bill. But in either event the President's remark appears to reflect a subconscious recognition of the blunder of trying to force down the throat of Congress a measure that was drafted in the Labor Department and merely rubber-stamped in the House and Senate Labor Committees.

What the House has said more emphatically than anything else is that it does not like this kind of procedure. Certainly it does not approve of the Taft-Hartley Act in its present form, although it turned down Representative Wood's milder reincarnation of the Taft-Hartley law by only a shaky 3-vote margin. But it is not going to accept a ready-made substitute dictated from the outside with little consideration of the public interest. That is a healthy attitude. If it had been adopted by the administration in the first place, labor legislation to replace the Taft-Hartley Act might be well on its way toward enactment.

The question of immediate importance is whether the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will see the handwriting on the wall. We suspect that the administration's bill which the committee railroaded through, without even giving its members a chance to offer amendments or call a vote on specific provisions, stands less of a chance in the Senate than it did in the House. The Senate does not like to be a cipher in the legislative process. And, since the task of writing a law of such a complicated nature cannot satisfactorily be undertaken on the floor, it will probably send the bill back to committee as did the House.

Will the committee wait for a rebuke of this kind? Or will it recall the measure of its own volition and write an acceptable bill dealing fairly with both unions and employers? All members of the committee know that this intricate economic problem was handled as a mere political football. They would gain in stature if they would take the President's hint and work out a bill of their own in the good old democratic fashion.

Basing-Point Return By Way of Moratorium Predicted by Steel Trust—Basing Point and Monopoly Boys Expectantly Anticipate Action of Congress—Word "Go" Is Eagerly Awaited—Supreme Court Described Basing Point As a Handy Instrument to Eliminate Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal for Saturday, May 7, 1949, in a leading article sounds the keynote of the eager expectancy of the Cement Trust, the Steel Trust, and other monopolies with which the moratorium is awaited. As I have said often and earnestly, the basing-point system is what the basing point and monopoly boys want by way of a moratorium. It may not be the intent to sponsor a moratorium which will legalize the basing-point system and other similar systems, but that is what is expected by big business and that is what will happen if a moratorium is passed.

ONLY WORD "GO" AWAITED TO SCAMPER BACK TO BASING-POINT SYSTEM

The article states succinctly "only the word 'Go' from Congress is awaited." The article supports the basing-point system on the ground that it is advantageous to consumers. It states that the basing-point system enables consumers to avoid a bill for freight all the way from the point of production. The article says:

While a returning buyers' market in metal has brought some freight cost absorption among smaller steel companies in recent weeks, the major producers have continued to steer clear of it. But Wall Street Journal talks with steel men this week make clear-cut the prospect that the entire industry will scamper back to freight bill paying if the congressional green light flashes.

SUPREME COURT DECIDES BASING POINT AS HANDY INSTRUMENT

The Wall Street Journal article throughout is skillfully worded and undoubtedly was designed for the purpose of creating in the minds of its readers the false impression that the basing-point system was good rather than evil. The record in the courts is all to the contrary. The Supreme Court in the Cement case, decided April 26, 1948, said in part referring to the Federal Trade Commission decision:

When the Commission rendered its decision there were about 80 cement manufacturing companies in the United States operating about 150 mills. Ten companies controlled more than half of the mills and there were substantial corporate affiliations among many of the others. This concentration of productive capacity made concerted action far less difficult than it would otherwise have been. The belief is prevalent in the industry that because of the standardized nature of cement, among other reasons, price competition is wholly unsuited to it. That belief is historic. It has resulted in concerted activities to devise means and measures to do away with competition in the industry. Out of those activities came the multiple-basing point delivered price system. Evidence shows it to be a handy instrument to bring about elimination of any kind of price competition. The use of the multiple-basing point delivered price system by the cement producers has been coincident with a situation whereby for many years, with rare exceptions, cement has been offered for sale in every given locality at identical prices and terms by all producers. Thousands of secret sealed bids have been received by public agencies which corresponded in prices of cement down to a fractional part of a penny.

A footnote to the foregoing statement by the Supreme Court included the following table:

The following is one among many of the Commission's findings as to the identity of sealed bids:

An abstract of the bids for 6,000 barrels of cement to the United States Engineer Office at Tucumcari, N. Mex., opened April 23, 1936, shows the following:

Name of bidder:	*Price per barrel*
Monarch	$3.286854
Ash Grove	3.286854
Lehigh	3.286854
Southwestern	3.286854
United States Portland Cement Co.	3.286854
Oklahoma	3.286854
Consolidated	3.286854
Trinity	3.286854
Lone Star	3.286854
Universal	3.286854
Colorado	3.286854

All bids subject to 10 cents per barrel discount for payment in 15 days. (Com. Ex. 175–A.) See 157 F. 2d at 576.

STEEL SPOKESMAN CLAIMS CUSTOMERS RESTLESS BECAUSE THEY PAY ACTUAL INSTEAD OF PHANTOM FREIGHT

It will be noted that the Supreme Court described the multiple-basing-point system as a handy instrument. This is the handy instrument which the Cement Trust, and the Steel Trust, and many others used a sthe punitive weapon as charged by the Federal Trade Commission to restrain and hinder competition by means of a mutual understanding and agreement in the employment of the basing-point system. The Wall Street Journal article states:

"Customers," says one Pittsburgh steel man, "are getting terribly restless over having to pay freight. And they are placing their business elsewhere when they can buy from close-by mills."

In other words, this Pittsburgh steel man claims customers are complaining because they have to pay actual freight instead of phantom freight. This statement is very hard to believe because customers long complained of the Pittsburgh-plus and afterward complained of the few arbitrary basing points the steel industry used to extract phantom freight charges from its customers and to control the steel markets.

STEEL INDUSTRY DID NOT AND NEVER WILL PAY FREIGHT CHARGES

The Wall Street Journal article headlines, "All steel industry will pay freight bills if Congress approves." This state-

ment infers that under the basing-point system, steel mills were in the habit of paying customers' freight bills. This headline is erroneous and misleading because it has never been a practice of steel producers to prepay freight shipments of steel to customers. Moreover, the steel industry does not operate on such a basis and, I predict, never will operate on a prepaid-freight basis. Steel consumers and dealers will understand this statement, which, in my opinion, is made solely for the purpose of aiding the passage of a moratorium bill by Congress.

PITTSBURGH STEEL, LEHIGH VALLEY CEMENT MOST AFFECTED BY ABOLITION OF BASING-POINT SYSTEM

The Wall Street Journal says:

A continuation of f. o. b. mill pricing into a period of stiff competition would probably hurt the Pittsburgh district more than any other steel-producing center. Pittsburgh produces more steel than it normally consumes. This means that unless its mills can sell their steel in distant markets, they will face curtailment of operations.

The concentration of steel production in the Pittsburgh district and the concentration of cement mills in the Lehigh Valley district of Pennsylvania created an overproduction of these two basic commodities in the areas mentioned, so it is not any wonder that the basing-point system had its origin in these districts. It will be recalled that a single basing point for steel originated as the Pittsburgh plus and a single basing point for cement originated as the Lehigh Valley plus.

MOTIVES OF SPONSORS NOT QUESTIONED

I desire to reemphasize that in opposing a moratorium I do not in any way question the high principles which undoubtedly motivated the sponsors of the moratorium bills. That is not my purpose nor will it ever be my purpose. I have the very highest regard for the sponsors of these bills and I know they are actuated by motives which are statesmanlike in their inception as well as in their conclusion. However, I have often said and I say it again, that any moratorium which may be adopted will be used for the purpose of furthering the interests of the basing-point and monopoly boys and to the detriment of our entire economy. The article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

ALL STEEL INDUSTRY WILL AGAIN PAY FREIGHT BILLS IF CONGRESS APPROVES—SOME SMALL MAKERS ALREADY ABSORB SHIPPING COSTS, BUT BIG ONES HOLD OFF—SHARPER COMPETITION AHEAD

Steel makers are ready to return in droves to the practice of helping pay the cost of freighting their wares from their mills to distant customers.

Only the word "go" from Congress is awaited. If the legislators sound the signal it will mean, for factories distant from steel centers, lower costs in making metal products.

Late last year the Supreme Court turned thumbs down on the basing point distribution system as practiced in the cement industry. Under this system, producers pay freight costs on their products to scattered key cities (basing points)—thus enabling consumers to avoid a bill for freight all the way from the point of production. The steel industry used this system. It dropped it after the high-court ruling on cement.

BIG ONES ARE SHY

While a returning buyers' market in metal has brought some freight cost absorption among smaller steel companies in recent weeks, the major producers have continued to steer clear of it. But Wall Street Journal talks with steel men this week make clear-cut the prospect that the entire industry will scamper back to freight-bill paying if the congressional green light flashes.

Congress now ponders a bill to provide a 15-month moratorium on new Government antitrust suits against individual good-faith delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices. Word in Washington is that the bill has good chances of passing.

Motivating the anticipated swing-back to freight-cost absorption, say metal men, will be a steel mill scramble to get business. People who buy steel already find themselves increasingly able to pick and choose among suppliers. Sharply cost conscious, they are taking the offers that call for the fewest dollars.

CUSTOMERS ARE RESTLESS

"Customers," says one Pittsburgh steel man, "are getting terribly restless over having to pay freight. And they are placing their business elsewhere when they can buy from close-by mills."

At least two basic producers in Pittsburgh report they are losing business to other steel firms because of their unwillingness to absorb freight costs and risk the chance of being prosecuted.

E. T. Weir, chairman of National Steel, says the day is near when customers in such big consuming areas as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago are not going to pay more for steel bought from National than for steel bought from nearby suppliers.

The two biggest producers, United States Steel and Bethlehem, are said to be in the best position to compete under an at-the-mill pricing system—United States Steel because of its widely scattered plants and Bethlehem because of its excellent locations along the Atlantic seaboard. But they, too, are expected to start absorbing freight if the moratorium is approved.

TOUGH ON PITTSBURGH

A continuation of f. o. b. mill pricing into a period of stiff competition would probably hurt the Pittsburgh district more than any other steel-producing center. Pittsburgh produces more steel than it normally consumes. This means that, unless its mills can sell their steel in distant markets, they will face curtailment of operations.

The kingpin metal already approaches the overplentiful stage within the steel capital's immediate orbit. One Pittsburgh fabricator of steel forgings was told this week by a steel producer that the supply of steel scheduled to be delivered to him in June is ready for shipment now if he desires it. The same fabricator was also informed recently that additional tonnages of steel are now available and that he "should not feel bashful about asking for it."

Nor are reports like this coming exclusively from big steel-producing centers. Says a manufacturer in Los Angeles:

"Our business is off considerably and I have had to turn down our July steel allotment. I asked the mill people if my doing so would jeopardize our August shipments. Their reply was that what I was doing was a common occurrence these days and that it was O. K."

GLANCE AT THE RECORD

Metal men emphasize that demand for steel is still huge, with the industry's ingot production clipping along at 97 to 98 percent of theoretical capacity. But they also note that the production rate has slipped from the 102 percent of theoretical capacity level reached in March, and they add that, in the past, steel demand has often shriveled rapidly once it started contracting.

In 1921 iron and steel output tumbled 53 percent from the 1920 level. The production of 1930 was 27 percent below 1929, and that of 1932 was 47 percent below 1931. Shortly before the war, in 1938, iron and steel making plunged 45 percent from the level of the preceding year.

During and since the war America's steel mills have been on the biggest production spree in history. This year's output, if the current pace continues, is expected to be around 95,000,000 tons of ingots and castings. The loftiest level of the 1930's was a bit over 56,000,000 tons. The high point of the 1920's was 63,000,000 tons made in 1929.

The Nation's mills poured out more than half the entire world's production of steel last year. Russia's estimated 1948 output was less than one-fourth (20,000,000 tons) that of this country. Great Britain's 1949 production was about a fifth (16,000,000 tons) as large as United States output.

Mother's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Mother's Day address made by me on Sunday, May 8, to the Washington-Lewis Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Fredericksburg, Va., at the home of Mary Ball Washington, the mother of the immortal George Washington:

Mayor Rome, reverend clergy, ladies, and gentlemen of the visible and invisible audience, it is a pleasure for me to join with you on this occasion and particularly as a result of the invitation extended by you through my very close and valued friend and your outstanding Representative in the National House of Representatives, Congressman SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. In Congressman BLAND you have one of the outstanding Members of Congress as your Representative and one of our great Americans.

It is with a deep sense of personal gratification that I come before you today to join in expressing honor and tribute to an American ideal and symbol. Concerned as we are with the many problems of daily existence, our perspective unwittingly becomes narrowed, and there is a tendency to overlook or to take for granted important realities which deserve better attention and respect from most of us.

The ideal and the symbol of motherhood—American motherhood—is one of those realities, and it is, therefore, altogether fitting that this day should be set aside to give us the opportunity to pause for a moment, and with a humility as great as their devotion, tender deserving tribute to the mothers of America.

The setting which you have chosen as the scene for the expression of your tribute is particularly appropriate. The home of the mother of Washington is a shrine which harbors all the sentiments which we are wont to feel upon contemplation of the picture

of a loving mother and a devoted son. Regardless of the fame of the characters themselves, the picture which we are able to conjure up in these circumstances is one which graphically portrays the ideals of maternal excellence and filial affection. It is the portrayal of the uncomplaining mother and the warrior son, and in such a picture we have the personification of the American ideal of motherhood.

No class of our citizens is more worthy of honor than the mothers of America. This is so because of what each member of the class has done and for what each mother in it symbolizes. Collectively, the mothers of America comprise the soul of our beloved Nation—the spiritual entity whose love is all embracing, whose anguish is borne in silence, and whose measure of sacrifice knows no bounds. Yet individually, they are women—human women—endowed with all human frailties and emotions—proud of their country, thinking constantly of their loved ones, and hateful to war, the strength of the family life and of the home—the basis of society—is the wife and the mother.

The actions and feelings of mothers are motivated by a reason and an understanding which they alone can comprehend. They know by bitter experience the soul-sickening gruesomeness of war. To them the blare of trumpets, the roll of drums, and the color and pageantry of war are but hollow trappings because in time of war the mothers of America are made unwilling actors in a devastating tragedy whose lines they take no part in writing. Yet in the enactment of which they are assigned the roles most difficult of performance. And yet, in America, when war comes, they make the greatest sacrifices, doing so willingly that our country might live. To them war means the melancholy sadness of parting, the gnawing pain of anxiety and fearful waiting, and the despair of death.

Having but recently brought to victorious conclusion the greatest war in the history of man, we are today living in an atmosphere of rumors of war. China is a Far Eastern tinder box. Guerrilla warfare is the order of the day in Greece. Tension between Jew and Arab makes the truce in the Near East a precarious reed which may at any time be bent by violence. A militant, aggressive, and atheistic communism is on the march and has absorbed one small nation after another in the maws of iron-clad militaristic dictatorships.

What then must be the thoughts uppermost in the minds of the mothers of America on this day dedicated to their maternity?

In those countries I have mentioned there are mothers today bearing the burden of grief, and in their agony of suffering they cry out to Heaven and the civilized world for nothing more than the blessings of peace. Their cries, I know, are echoed in your minds and in the minds of all American mothers. In answer to those cries, I should like to here record the fact that your Government is determined to preserve and guarantee those blessings by every means consistent with its national dignity and honor.

That is the course to which the present administration, under the able leadership of our Chief Executive, has committed the United States in the field of international affairs.

Marshall-plan aid and economic recovery assistance for Europe might well be compared to the fire-insurance policies which we take out on our own personal property and real estate. Your Government deems it wiser to pay now the premiums on insurance of peace in Europe than to pay later in the medium of blood and American manhood.

It is far more discreet to engage firmly and patiently in a cold war—especially when you are winning it—that it would be to plunge headlong into a reckless course of conduct which would precipitate the chaos of a shooting war.

Ordinary prudence dictates that it is the better part of women to utilize to the fullest extent the machinery of the United Nations for the solution of international problems because we now know that the isolationism which kept us out of the old League of Nations hastened a conflagration instead of preventing one.

In the Atlantic Pact, we have devised a scheme of coinsurance which complements the nature of our participation in the United Nations, and which declares to the Communist coalition that we are ready to back our determination that the democracies will have peace with unity, strength, and common effort.

Underlying all of these tremendous efforts to solve our international difficulties with patient reason and by orderly, rational processes, there is the forward-looking policy which has committed our Government to the doctrine of the "good neighbor." In fact, in view of the generosity with which we have shared our substance with the other nations of the world, it might even be said that we have adopted the doctrine of the good Samaritan.

Our Government, then, and every loyal citizen who owes allegiance to it, ardently desires and earnestly favors the absolute independence, the unimpaired sovereignty, the utmost equality, and the political integrity of every nation, large and small, and by the same token, they wholeheartedly oppose every form of aggression.

This is the true philosophy of enlightened liberalism, and the United States is determined that it shall be recognized and respected by the entire world—even our potential enemies, Russia.

After two devastating world wars, and with all the agencies at hand for the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations, war is unnecessary even as a last resort, and any attempt or desire to engage in one is repulsive and odious. Moreover, if we have not learned the lesson of peace by this time, we will be unworthy of our dignity as men and unfit as custodians of the civilization which has been transmitted to us.

The mothers of America remember too well the lessons learned in the last two wars.

Gatherings such as this one here today bear testimony to the impress which those lessons have left upon our national consciousness. We are gathered together in peace for a noble purpose, and we propose to be able to continue to do so.

Our whole national policy has become imbued with a passion and a zeal for peace—but not to the point where we will accept peace at any price. We will achieve it and retain it with dignity and honor.

The late beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt defined the good neighbor as one who "resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others." There are many parts of the world wherein that definition needs learning and memorization.

Our duty is to breathe and live the broad spirit of this policy, and to make the travail of the present day the beginning of a new era which will witness the triumph of the American cooperative effort to promote the economic, social, and humanitarian welfare of the world, and to erect a solid structure of peace which shall endure forever.

In pursuance of this policy, we are dedicated to the resolve that not only must we stay out of war, but we must lead the way in actually preventing war. All of the acts of our Government leading to this end are eminently praiseworthy, but to make them effective instruments of peace the peoples of the world must be educated to the necessity and desirability of rational and sane settlement of international disputes.

Public opinion should be guided to a "peace preserving and promoting," rather than to a "war avoiding" frame of mind. Upon achievement of such an attitude, peace will be assured to the family of nations, and the common aspiration for its preservation will draw people together in closer bonds of international amity and good will.

Thus while some rampant ideologies foster the burdens of militarism and cling to ideas of "class struggles" and the inevitability of war, we in America stand ready to advance in the spirit of the Golden Rule, and ask for nothing more than the display of the true good will of the true good neighbor.

Peace founded upon morality and justice, and economic rehabilitation, must be our objectives.

The availability of the processes of democracy and the opportunity to foster them abroad present to the people of this Nation the means to spread the doctrine of peace and the occasion to insist upon its enforcement. Our individual and combined efforts are needed for the attainment of these objectives, and if our material resources can help their achievement, we can spend them for no better purposes.

The Old World looks longingly and hopefully in our direction. Our common ties with its peoples strengthen our desire to do our utmost in the molding and construction of a new world order. Thus we have both the opportunity and the duty to persevere in our efforts to build a permanent and enduring peace.

The course has been charted for us. We are well advanced upon it. In the light of the bitter and expensive experience of the past, we would be more than foolish if we permitted any attempts at frustration or annoyance to cause us to deviate from it.

We are agreed that war is a blot upon civilization, and that it is an outworn relic of barbarism. We are convinced that it is wholly unjustifiable in the presence of adequate machinery to promote concord among nations and to prevent aggression.

I cannot stress too strongly the need of constant, vigilant, and concerted efforts on the part of all serious-minded people to avoid our past mistakes. If we fail again, future generations shall indict ours as the one which forfeited our heritage and theirs by default.

The atomic age need not be the age of destruction. It can be the age of realization. The choice is ours.

I can think of no more effective mouthpieces for the propagation of the gospel of peace than the mothers of America. History records no instance of a war started by women or by mothers. Perhaps we will be witness to the fact that their tremendous moral influence is the greatest force which can be exercised to prevent one.

I urge you, therefore, to hold yourselves forth to the world not only with the righteous pride of mothers who have given the greatest gifts at your disposal to your country, but also as living examples of self-sacrificing heroines who will brook no outrage to your abiding sense of the futility of war. None are better qualified than you and the other mothers of America to give to the world the message which your Government has preached since the conclusion of hostilities a few years ago. Moreover, if the hearts of men have not altogether turned to stone, you will be heard.

If through your apostolate of peace you can bring home to the hearts and minds of men your own sense of the uselessness of war, all of your brave sacrifices of the past will not have been in vain, and future generations of American mothers will call you blessed.

Policy on Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial written by Mr. J. H. Van Winkle of the Oregon City Banner-Courier on the background and intent of Congress in originally establishing second class mailing rates.

POLICY ON POSTAL RATES

Before Congress acts on the Postoffice Department's demands for higher postage rates on newspapers and magazines, it would seem proper for the solons to go back and get the intent of the law which established second class rates for publications.

With a revaluation and brighter understanding of this intent, a firm policy could be adopted by Congress to guide its actions along a determined line. This would not only provide measurements to correlate legislation, but it would give the publication industry assurance that laws affecting it would follow a certain pattern.

The original intent of the second class rate law was to help publishers serve their communities with news and information.

In those days, communications are not what they are now. The country newspaper was the one principal means by which the folks could learn what was going on, how their public servants were handling affairs, what new developments in living and progress were coming along, and various other informative and educational affairs.

The intent of that law is clear. And it was not intended that mass circulation publications, with a policy of entertainment rather than information, should take advantage of the low mailing rate.

We believe that Congress could comply with the Postoffice Department's request for more revenue and yet follow the real and honest intent and purpose of the second class rate regulation. This could be done by establishing a higher rate for publications that merely entertain, and leave present second class rates as an exclusive advantage of the publications that inform.

Ode to Kathy at San Marino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following Ode to Kathy at San Marino by Howard Thomas Mitchell in response to the author's request.

This elegy was occasioned by the recent death of little Kathy Fiscus, the result of a fall into a weed-covered, long-abandoned well in a vacant lot at San Marino, Calif.

The poem was first published in the official Assembly Daily Journal, California Legislature, the State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif., page 1940, April 12, 1949. This Ode to Kathy at San Marino is Mr. Mitchell's way of commending the spontaneous emulation of the American spirit as demonstrated by the millions of Americans who offered assistance and prayer for the child's deliverance. It follows:

ODE TO KATHY AT SAN MARINO
(By Howard Thomas Mitchell)

O Master, on high, see Thy child below
Entombed, helpless in this grasping hold;
Holy Christians, toiling at life's release
The love of fellow men shall now increase.

O California, hail thy heroes' souls
More precious than your stately mountains' gold;
Promote not wealth or earthly vanity
Ever hold high this loving humanity.

O America, to valiant hearts in faith
On Palm Sunday, grant thine own kindly grace;
O Saviour, Thy servants emulate well
To merit life eternal, with Thee dwell.

O world, turn thine eyes to San Marino
See this devotion mankind here bestows;
Now shines like stars and beaming sun above
Glows for God and Kathy in divine love.

Resolutions Adopted by the Thirty-ninth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose certain resolutions passed by the recent annual convention of the National Congress of Rivers and Harbors here in the city of Washington on April 8–9, 1949. These resolutions are very important and will be of great interest to all persons who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

On this the occasion of our thirty-ninth annual convention, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, conscious of its obligation to disseminate to its members, and through them to the American people, adequate information and guidance with respect to the development, improvement, conservation, and utilization of our water resources to serve the increasing needs of navigation, power development, flood control, irrigation, and related uses, adopts the following resolutions:

APPROPRIATIONS

Our Nation continues great because it continues to grow and its growth always has been and will continue to be in direct proportion to the benefits derived from its vast store of natural land and water resources. The rate of development of our water resources and the removal of flood threats which hamper the people in their efforts to develop the latent wealth of our Nation are, in turn, contingent upon Federal appropriations. We believe that now is the time when a program to promote this source of income and national welfare should be prosecuted at a vigorous rate consistent with our national economy. Flood control and improvements for navigation, irrigation, power development, soil erosion, and allied purposes are not matters to be put off pending a recession or depression. On the contrary, such improvements should be made as rapidly as possible so as to contribute their part toward continued prosperity and a high standard of living in America. Moreover, at a time when our people are being called upon to support large-scale foreign improvements they are justified in expecting that their improvements at home should continue at the maximum practical rate. For these reasons we urge that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress give full and careful consideration to the recommendations of the agencies charged with the development of our water resources, and that they approve and appropriate adequate funds to prosecute these improvements at an optimum rate.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We restate our belief that the prevention of soil erosion as a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and the closely related major drainage and channel improvement program now conducted by the Corps of Engineers should be accelerated as a beneficial and most important feature in the development and preservation of our natural resources. These programs must outpace the devastation now visiting our fertile slopes and the resulting detrimental effect on the efficiency of our commerce-laden streams. Only then can we be assured of maximum returns from the soil which helped to create a nation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

We commend the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior for the progress it has made in reclaiming the arid and semiarid land in the 17 Western States and emphasize the necessity for continued effort. There is increasing need there for additional Federal projects for irrigation to bring all cultivable lands for which water is available into production for the increasing population of the Western States and to meet our extensive commitments broad. Adequate funds to provide the many facilities for the varied irrigation needs must be available in consistent annual amounts to enable rapid progress to be made and we urge that the Congress provide them.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

In promoting the orderly development of our land and water resources the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been steadfast in its position that hydroelectric power development at Federal dams should be economically justified and consistent with the necessity for such power. Our position is and has been that such development should be confined however to projects located in shortage areas and then only when feasible and as a supplement to existing private supply. Supplemental power from steam plants is questioned as being inconsistent with the policy adhered to by this congress as is the construction and operation by the Government of transmission and distribution systems. Unrestricted and unwarranted competition with private power facilities will continue to be opposed.

STREAM POLLUTION

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress recognizes the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 to be an important factor in the relief of its concern of many years with the pollution of our streams. Therein is contained provisions for the elimination of many of the complications heretofore involved in the division of State and Federal jurisdiction which have been a retarding factor in reaching a satisfactory solution of the matter and in promulgating enforceable regulations. We urge the Congress to provide the authorized funds as rapidly as economically required by the existing agencies for the elimination of this menace to our health and the wildlife population of our country.

FEDERAL BARGE LINE

The pioneer work of the Federal Barge Line in developing inland water transportation has been of great benefit to private operators and can continue to be of inestimable value for some time to come. Much remains to be done, however, in the development of carload and smaller shipments and modern terminals available to all shippers. We strongly urge that no part of its operations be discontinued or disposed of until private operators are able to carry on their own pioneering and are equipped to provide service identical to that now provided by the Federal Barge Line. We commend these important needs to the Congress and urge an increase in the capitalization of the Inland Waterway Corporation so as to provide sufficient modern equipment and terminals.

TIDELANDS

The title to the submerged lands of our Nation should be vested in the States through adequate legislation designed to reserve such submerged lands and the resources therein to the respective States and their people. However, any legislation for this purpose should preserve to the United States the paramount right to continue with improvements for national defense, navigation, flood control, and allied purposes as now authorized and as may be authorized in the future.

REGIONAL OR VALLEY AUTHORITIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has repeatedly expressed its opposition to legislation creating Federal regional or valley authorities and has supported the programs of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and Department of Agriculture for the development of our water and land resources.

We again register and reaffirm our opposition to the creation of Federal regional or valley authorities either by legislative act or Executive order.

We urge the extension of comprehensive basin-wide research and planning similar to the Pick-Sloan plan now operating in the Missouri Basin to other major basins which present similar problems and opportunities, respecting at all times the rights and desires of each State located in such a basin as they may appear.

REORGANIZATION

Economy and efficiency in government are desirable. However we do not believe that grouping the major construction activities of our Nation, including the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, in one agency will accomplish this. On the contrary we believe that the recommendation of the Hoover Commission to consolidate these functions in the Department of Interior would produce the opposite effect. This agency under this proposal could have as its head an officer with an abundance of power, almost dictatorial. His influence could extend throughout the excutive branch and unchallenged could possibly extend even to the Congress itself. The potential patronage and favoritism in one large group, such as the one contemplated, could easily sway the people in all of our States to make demands on Congress far in excess of their requirements for orderly development of our civil works programs. Such a situation would certainly create costly bureaucracy and could not result in saving money. We reiterate our position that the present system produces results without waste and gives to the public the efficiency and economy to which they are entitled. Our public works should not become the basis for an experiment, even if noble in purpose, which is unnecessary.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Our national security and a strong national defense require a modern, efficient merchant marine, built and operated by private enterprise with Government aid to the extent necessary, and supported by public patronage. A progressive shipbuilding program is needed to provide a modern, well-balanced merchant fleet of vessels of all types.

To induce private capital to undertake these responsibilities, favorable economic conditions must exist. It is in the best interest of all sections of the Nation, and particularly the seacoast communities and ports, to actively support such a merchant marine as a continuing national policy so as to avoid dependence upon foreign controlled shipping in our foreign trade, and expensive sporadic wartime construction. We endorse such a continuing long-range merchant marine policy.

THE NEW CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Like his predecessors, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick has been selected from a group of experienced engineer officers to direct the activities of the Corps of Engineers for the next 4 years. His ability to get things done every time and on time has been amply demonstrated in the pages of military history and in the records of emergencies at home. His ability to organize so as to obtain immediate results was recently illustrated in the widely publicized "operation snowbound" in which he directed prompt relief to the blizzard-stricken areas of the West. Into this emergency went the same know-how and determination that made the Ledo Road a reality and that conceived the comprehensive Missouri Basin project that is now under construction. Knowing these things we are happy to have General Pick carry on the century-old traditions of the Corps of Engineers and we are confident that he will continue in the splendid manner in which those who have served before him have done.

Cornelius Cole, Distinguished Alumnus of the House of Representatives and Noted Centenarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a short statement about Cornelius Cole, one of California's most interesting and distinguished citizens. This interesting article is written by Dr. Rockwell D. Hunt, one of the most noted historians in California. While it is sometimes difficult and perhaps not fair to pick any particular man out as the most distinguished in his field, I think it is fair to say that I have frequently heard Dr. Hunt referred to as the man who is the "foremost historian on California history." I note in reading the short article on Cornelius Cole that he once served in the House of Representatives. I had never known that he was a Member of the House. He did serve in the House from March 4, 1863, to March 3, 1865—Thirty-eighth Congress—and in the Senate from March 4, 1867, to March 7, 1873. He rode on the train with Lincoln from Washington to Gettysburg and heard our martyred President make the immortal Gettysburg Address.

In August 1922, the American Bar Association held its convention in San Francisco. Jurists from all over the Anglo-Saxon world were present. At the final banquet, Chief Justice Taft was the toastmaster. The most interesting character of all the persons who were at the banquet, including such great legal lights as John W. Davis, George Wickersham, and others, was Cornelius Cole who at that time was approaching his one-hundredth birthday. The Chief Justice, who I consider one of the most interesting characters in American history, introduced Cornelius Cole and he made a remarkable address for a man of his age. When he talked everyone in the audience was perfectly silent. The purport of his talk was that if the nations of the world would follow the ideals of Lincoln, his idol, we would have world peace. Upon the conclusion of his address he was given a tremendous ovation. The Chief Justice complimented him highly on his excellent speech. He then told Senator Cole that he hoped that he would have many more happy birthdays. Chief Justice Taft said that he knew Senator Cole would, and illustrated his prediction by the following story:

After I had been President of the United States I was elevated to a professorship in the Yale Law School. While Mrs. Taft and I were living in New Haven, one of our neighbors had a ninetieth birthday. To honor Mr. Smith on his ninetieth birthday a reception was held in his honor. As Mrs. Taft and I were standing in line, the couple ahead of us, Mr. and Mrs. Jones, shook hands with Mr. Smith. When Mr. Jones clasped his hand, he said to Mr. Smith, "Mr. Smith, I hope that you will have many more happy birthdays." Mr. Smith's eyes flashed and he looked Mr. Jones squarely in the face and said, "I know I will have more happy birthdays because I have been studying statistics. I find that damn few men die after they are 90."

It is interesting and inspiring for us to know that men like Cornelius Cole preceded us in the House of Representatives. The problems in those days were different than they are today. Our problems are undoubtedly more serious in their future implications, considering the small and shrinking world in which we live and the ghastly powers of armaments today, but he in his day, as I hope we in our day, will meet the issues that face us and do our level best to formulate policies that will be of enduring value to posterity. The interesting article by Dr. Hunt follows:

It was one of the proudest moments of my academic life when in the spring of 1922, before a great, enthusiastic audience, I was permitted to present Cornelius Cole to the president of the University of Southern California for the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The oldest living graduate of the oldest American Methodist college, surviving Member of the United States Senate in the days of reconstruction, for many years our distinguished fellow citizen in Los Angeles—when Senator Cole, then in his one hundredth year, of the class of '47 of Wesleyan University, stepped forward the vast audience

instantly responded by rising to its feet and cheering lustily and long this living incarnation of American history.

Cornelius Cole was born in western New York, September 17, 1822. He died at his Hollywood home November 3, 1924. He saw the light before the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine and lived during the lifetime of every President of the United States save only Washington. His visits to Congress 60 years after he had taken his own seat in the House proved to be a remarkable ovation. Shortly after that visit he was describing his experience to me as we sat in his beautiful home. "That was surely a fine reception the House gave you," I remarked. "I broke it up," he almost shouted in glee. Congressmen gathered about the centenarian—a recess was quickly taken, following which, by unanimous consent, the venerable Californian addressed the House, and his remarks were ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Memoirs of Cornelius Cole is among my most treasured volumes of Californiana. On the flyleaf of my autographed copy the author wrote: "Should you deign to cut the leaves you may observe some errata of the printer, and a few oversights of the author."

He was typical of the best of the California pioneers. His mining operations were brief, likewise his career as a young lawyer in San Francisco; but his political career was long and illustrious. Meanwhile he became editor and publisher of the Sacramento Times in association with James McClatchy. From its very inception in California he identified himself with the Republican Party. He actively assisted in the organization of the Central Pacific Railroad Co. in Sacramento and was intimately acquainted with each of the Big Four—Stanford, Huntington, Crocker, and Hopkins. But because he opposed the plan of the directors to possess themselves of Goat Island, in San Francisco Bay, he incurred their hot displeasure and later averred that they thenceforth ignored the many and valuable services he had rendered.

Cornelius Cole truly earned the right, when contemplating in the sunset of life the wonderful achievements of his State and his Nation, to say, "Et quorum pars fui." And what a privilege it has been for me, a native Californian of a later generation, to enjoy the acquaintanceship and personal friendship of this grand old man. He was the embodiment of the California pioneer spirit at its best.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two resolutions in opposition to compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control. These resolutions were forwarded to me by the New Hampshire Hospital Association and the Fredonwarell Post, No. 17, American Legion, of Groveton, N. H. They follow:

Whereas the American people today lead the world in standards of health, medical care, scientific research, hospital and nursing facilities; and

Whereas this high degree of public health care is a product of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has led to deterioration of medical care and hospital and other medical facilities, with resulting decline in national health: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Hospital Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of New Hampshire, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

LOIS A. BLISS,
President.
MYRON S. BURTON,
Secretary.

WOLFEBORO, N. H., *April 27, 1949.*

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's paycheck for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fredonwarell Post, No. 17, American Legion, of Groveton, N. H., does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of New Hampshire, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Unanimously passed April 28, 1949.

ARNOLD S. TREMOSE,
Commander.
RALPH E. CALKINS,
Adjutant.

Address of Hon. Glenn R. Davis, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS, Member of Congress, Second Wisconsin District, keynoting State Young Republican convention at Portage, Wis., May 7, 1949:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Young Republicans, Republican friends, it is more than a pleasantry for me to tell you that I am happy to be here with you today. It is, rather, a true statement of feelings based on the inspiration and encouragement that comes from appearing before this fine gathering of Young Wisconsin Republicans.

I am proud to be able to come here as one of you, for this permits me to talk to you directly and frankly as a Young Republican to Young Republicans. There is need for frank talk among Republicans, young and old, in 1949. I say that not in criticism nor in discouragement, but rather in recognition of the importance and the significance of our position, as acknowledged youthful leaders of the Republican Party of Wisconsin. I say it because of a conviction that our State and Nation need a strong Republican Party and further that the Republican Party needs us Young Republicans perhaps as has never before been realized.

The Young Republicans of Wisconsin must continue to grow in leadership, in numbers, in organization, in strength, in activity so as to fulfill our share of this need to our country and to our party. Our record in recent years speaks well for the future.

PROGRESS IN WISCONSIN

In 1945, the Young Republican organization of Wisconsin was listed among the casualties of the recent war. In December of that year, the work of reorganization was begun. There are today more working Young Republican county organizations than ever before. There are represented here so far today delegates from 23 counties and 3 college organizations. Coming, as this convention does, on the morrow of a discouraging national election, the attendance here today speaks well for the vitality and resurgent spirit of the Young Republican movement in this State. It speaks well for the spirit, the faith, the enterprise of our State chairman, Dick Smith, and the other members of our executive committee.

With knowledge that we are, organizationally speaking, on a sound basis, and with determination that tomorrow we shall do a workmanlike job of conducting the business of this convention, including the election of competent officers to carry on the work which Dick and his fellow officers have done in the months behind us, let us, as is the habit of youth, look to our hopes and aspirations for the future—our hopes and aspirations as Young Republicans and as Americans.

As young men and women of high ideals of citizenship, we need to recognize that our ideals can be realized only through the practical application of our rights and privileges of citizens—in other words through practical politics. We need to realize that every good citizen is a politician—for politics, while not an exact science, is nevertheless the science of government. In this republican form of government every citizen ought to be a student of that science. Let's recognize frankly that politics is to be the aim, and the objective, and the practice of the Young Republican movement of Wisconsin. Our job is to sell practical politics to other young people as a part of their responsibility of citizenship and to interest youth in working within the framework of the Republican Party. To be successful in this we must offer not only a year-round program of activity, we must be able to demonstrate that the hopes and ideals of young people are best expressed in

the principles and programs of our party. While thus serving as a rallying point for youth we can well serve our party for we must not overlook the fact that we, as individual Young Republicans, are also members of the Republican Party.

NOT JUNIOR APPRENTICES

We have a dual membership just as we have a dual citizenship in our State and Nation. Nor should we forget that the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans is an integral part of the Republican Party of Wisconsin. Your chairman is a vice chairman of the party and sits as a member of the party's executive committee. It has never been intended that Young Republicans shall serve as apprentices before active participation in party and governmental affairs. It has never been intended that Young Republican meetings shall be polite debating societies for the discussion of academic or moot questions. Young people—Young Republicans—are, and ought to be, primarily interested in a program of recognized action.

Specifically, the Wisconsin Young Republicans can:

First, have a lasting effect on our party and its program by taking leadership in a year-round program of political education and discussion. Youth can best sustain necessary party activity in the period after one election is over and before another election is hard upon us again. A youthful group of Republican workers with the initiative and the public spiritedness to make theirs a year-round program will soon find that they are the leaders of their party and that their party has become the leading party in their community. By knowing more, by doing more, we can give meaning to our viewpoints. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and by year-round discussion programs in our local communities we can achieve the knowledge and know-how to be effective in politics and effective in government.

Second, we must make ourselves heard in party councils. Our success as Young Republicans is not measured alone by the size of our membership rolls or the fact that we have live, working organizations in a great many counties in the State. It must be measured also by the number of Young Republicans who are members of county Republican committees, are precinct committeemen or committeewomen, and are in attendance and take active parts in county, district, or State Republican conventions. Again I repeat—we are an integral part of the Republican organization. Our identity as Young Republicans is significant as a meeting ground and as a training school for our work in the senior councils of the party. It is gratifying to note that two of the county Republican chairmen in the Second Congressional District, one of them the chairman of our host county today, are Young Republicans both in years and in activities.

To be specific regarding our part in party councils: Next month the 1949 State Republican convention will be held at La Crosse. Some county meetings for the selection of delegates and alternates to this convention have already been held, others have not. If such a meeting has been held in your county, go back home to your county chairman and ask for a position as alternate to fill any vacancy among the delegates which may exist at La Crosse. If your county meeting has not been held, attend this meeting. Let the Republicans there know that you believe in our party and that you want to be a delegate and can attend the State convention. By this means you will take the first practical step in becoming, as individuals, influential members of the Republican Party of our State.

ENDORSEMENT OF CANDIDATES

There are two important problems which will be brought before the La Crosse convention. One of them will be the question of mandatory endorsement for candidates for United States Senator and the State constitutional offices. I hope your voices will be heard in favor of that resolution. Some of us have had differences of opinion on that measure in years past, but the lessons of 1948 and 1949, it seems to me, are clear. If the Republican Party in Wisconsin is to be a policy-making instrument, if it is to stand for certain principles, we must assume the responsibility, as Republican leaders, of recommending to the rank and file of Republicans, those candidates for State-wide offices who are Republicans in fact, in principle, and in practice as well as Republicans in name. This is the studied judgment of a Young Republican who in 1946 opposed the endorsement of candidates at Oshkosh. There is still room, of course, for honest differences of opinion on this point, as there will always be in all matters within the Republican Party.

I know the bugaboo of bossism will be raised, but I believe this to be true, that the people who will raise the greatest fuss about endorsement of candidates are those outside our party who in 1948 loudly hailed the slate of hand-picked candidates which emerged by long-distance telephone after a huddle of Democratic Party bosses in a coke-filled (so the newspapers said), smoke-filled hotel room a thousand miles away in Philadelphia, Pa. I trust that we Young Republicans will be practical enough to know the true situation, and will not be so naive as to think for a moment that the criticism these people will continue to offer will be in the nature of constructive criticism for the Republican Party.

FEWER DELEGATES SUGGESTED

A second important proposal which I now understand may or may not be presented at La Crosse, is a suggestion for revision of the constitution of the party regarding the allotment of delegates to State conventions. At the present time each county is allotted one delegate absolute, plus one delegate for each 250 votes or major fraction thereof, cast for the Republican candidate for governor in the preceding general election. The suggestion has been made that the number of delegates be cut approximately in half with one delegate for each 500 votes for governor instead of the existing 250. There is sound reason for proposing this change. No one will deny that our recent conventions, to which between two and three thousand delegates have been certified, have been unwieldy and have not lent themselves to the orderly conduct of convention business. On the other hand, in those cases where ample lodging is readily available, or where the business of the convention can be easily and efficiently handled within the course of 1 day, it might be well to keep the broad base of convention attendance which now exists. The site, the lodging, the business, might well determine, within certain reasonable limits, the size of the convention to be desired. For your consideration as integral members of the Republican Party, I should like to submit for your consideration the following proposal for delegate allotment:

"Each county shall be entitled to one delegate absolute, plus a number of additional delegates to be uniformly fixed for all counties by the State executive committee on the basis of the votes cast for the Republican candidate for Governor in the immediately preceding general election; provided, however, there shall be not more than one such additional delegate for each 250 Republican votes (or major fraction thereof) for Governor, and not less than one such additional delegate for each 500 Republican votes (or major fraction thereof) for Governor."

There is a third matter to which I believe we should give our serious attention at La Crosse, and that is the preparation of a tentative State platform of the Republican Party to be prepared by a competent committee in time for dissemination as the basis for thorough debate and discussion by the delegates at the 1950 State Republican convention. Too well do I recall my futile efforts to maintain a semblance of order while the chairman of the platform committee, in the closing minutes of the 1948 convention, presented the report of the platform committee—a recital to which few of the delegates listened, yet that platform was approved unanimously—unseen, unheard. I hope that a resolution can be adopted at La Crosse to provide for the drafting of a tentative party platform by a committee of the representatives of labor, of agriculture, of business, of white-collar workers, of public employees, and of organizational and legislative leaders of our party; that tentative platform for presentation, discussion, amendment, and adoption at the 1950 convention is an order of business prior to taking up the matter of endorsement of candidates.

I believe these three—endorsement, allotment of delegates, preparation for our 1950 platform, are matters in which we as individuals, though not as an organization, can legitimately make ourselves heard at La Crosse to the benefit of our party and the people of our State.

Third, we Young Republicans must be active in government. It is not enough that we shall demonstrate our effectiveness as practical political workers in behalf of Republican candidates, we must furnish some of the candidates of the Republican Party at local, State, and national levels. How many of you have ever sought or ever held political office? All of us cannot be office holders, but many of us who could be competent Republican servants of our Government have never offered ourselves for public service.

Political campaigning and political office holding is a hard lot, discouraging at times and often unappreciated, but they are functions that young people are admirably fitted by youth, energy, and spirit to perform. I know from experience, from having worked with them, that some of the outstanding present and future leaders of the House of Representatives are to be found in the ranks of the Young Republicans. To list a few whose names are familiar to you, DICK NIXON and DON JACKSON of California, the latter of whom addressed our State convention last year; JERRY FORD and CHARLIE POTTER of Michigan; CAL BOGGS of Delaware, and our own JOHN BYRNES of Green Bay, who was the keynote speaker at our National Young Republican Convention at Milwaukee 2 years ago. These are the kind of men that should make us proud that we too, are Young Republicans.

These are the kind of men to whom politics, public service, is a career. Robert Louis Stevenson once said that politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary. Robert Louis Stevenson, of course, was strictly a writer of fiction. It must be true that few people think preparation is necessary, but that, too, is fiction.

At the National Republican Convention at Philadelphia last June, former President Hoover told the delegates: "If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you are wasting your time and effort."

Young Republicans must be active in government, but it must be a responsible stewardship.

CONSCIENCE OF OUR PARTY

Fourthly and finally, Young Republicans—and youth has always furnished the idealism of all generations—must instill within our party a fundamental honesty in political

principle and political practice. We must be the conscience of our party as well as the guardian of its principles. Some of our older brethren who sweated through the misrepresentation and vilification which characterized the campaign of the opposition in 1948 may well wonder whether a conscience pays off in practical politics. As Young Republicans we must prove to them and to the American people that honesty and forthrightness are as important in politics as in any field of endeavor and that there is still enough respect for those virtues in this America to eventually bring down scorn and repudiation upon the heads of those who believe and practice otherwise. Sooner or later the time will come, and the more we Young Republicans do about it the sooner it will come, when the American people will repudiate those who seek to maintain or obtain the control of government on the basis of misrepresentation, half-truths, vilification, and trick phrases. We must be sure that we stand clean and ready when that time arrives.

We must prove to our elders that we are immune to the virus of "gimmeism" which has infected millions of our elders in both parties. We must convince our elders of this generation in all parties that there is but one source of all true and perfect gifts and that that source is not the Government of the United States.

Surely there is a better and a more honest substitute for the New Deal-Fair Deal game of playing one group against the other for political gain, of promising economic advantage through legislative action or executive decree. For surely there is one special-interest group who have been long and sorely neglected—the group who have an unselfish special interest in maintaining the traditions, the institutions, and the practices which have preserved our society of incentive, competition, and individual responsibility.

Today these traditions, institutions, and practices are in grave danger. To hear some of the current mouthings of those who would substitute the methods and practices of the welfare state, you would almost think that the result of November 2 was a mandate to repeal the principles in which we always have believed. Thus, are we always endangered when principles, however briefly, are sacrificed for immediate tangible or material motives.

BIG BUSINESS, BIG LABOR, BIG GOVERNMENT

Yesterday under the New Deal, today under the Fair Deal, our society of initiative, competition, and individual responsibility is endangered by the concentration of three enveloping forces: big centralized business, big centralized labor, and big centralized government.

The Dealers—Fair—indifferent, incompetent, have shown lack of will or inability to control these forces, which, if they continue to expand, will—like a cancerous growth—defile, crowd out, and destroy the sinews, the tissues, and the framework of a society of enterprise, individual freedom, and personal responsibility.

This unselfish group, the great central body of American citizenry, who believe in our society of incentive, competition, and individual responsibility, who believe in our traditions, our institutions, and practices which have heretofore given us moral, political, and economic world leadership—actually the majority of Americans—finds itself outspoken, outmaneuvered, outcampaigned by the noisy champions of the welfare state, and sometimes finds itself compromised and seduced by the economic and political power of a free-spending government.

CHAMPIONS OF SILENT MAJORITY

Who shall champion the cause of this silent majority? Who else but those of us who believe as they believe, who are young enough to fight for what we believe in, who are interested enough to train ourselves, to practice the methods and skills of effective practical politics? Who else can better qualify than we—we young Republicans.

If we accept this challenge, then we shall say to the apologists of big centralized business:

One and one-half percent of the Nation's employers employed 56 percent of the workers of this country in 1946.

Three hundred and sixteen corporations held 40 percent of the total working capital of the United States in 1929 and by 1947 (according to Federal Trade Commission figures) 113 corporations owned 50 percent of the net capital assets of our Nation's industry. In the same year three steel firms accounted for 60 percent of the Nation's basic steel capacities, three business organizations produced 80 percent of our automobiles, three firms made 65 percent of our farm machinery and equipment, three companies accounted for 82½ percent of the tobacco which Americans smoked.

Too many small business concerns have been swallowed up or have disappeared. We suspect you, centralized business, of economic homicide. We don't want to pick on you simply because you're big, but neither do we want you to get the idea that you can throw your weight around to the detriment of the majority of Americans of which we ar acting as self-appointed guardians. Our Republican forebears enacted the basic Federal antitrust legislation, the Republican Eightieth Congress appropriated more money for the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice than any other Congress. We Republicans stand guard against concentration of power in your hands as we shall stand guard against the concentration of power in the hands of big labor or big government.

If we accept this challenge, then we shall say to the apologists of big centralized labor:

In 1933, you had 3,000,000 members. Today you have over 14,000,000. These 14,000,000 members are organized into some 70,000 locals and concentrated into less than 200 organizations. You control over two-thirds of the industrial working force of the Nation. In several basic industries, your organized membership approaches 100 percent. Thirty-two major labor organizations control over 8,000,000 workers.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS ON LABOR

We don't want to pick on you either, big centralized labor, but we don't like the idea of your throwing your weight around to the detriment of the public interest any better than we like the idea of big business doing so. That's why the Republican Eightieth Congress enacted, and a majority of Democrats supported, the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. You called that a slave-labor act, but you were very evasive and indefinite as to how come your membership and wages increased, your working conditions improved, and your involvement in strikes decreased at the same time you were supposedly barred from collective bargaining and enslaved. But, big centralized labor, we believe in a healthy organized labor movement. We shall support your right to collective bargaining. We want you to be treated fairly but in return we want you to recognize the rights of the public, for whom we speak. That's why every Republican in the House of Representatives under 40, every Young Republican, voted for the modified Wood bill, after a number of amendments offered by Young Republicans had been accepted, this past week.

If we accept the challenge of leadership in the public interest, we shall say to the apologists of big centralized government:

This year you will absorb six and one-half billion dollars in salaries, eight times as much as in 1933. You have three and one-half times as many bureaus, four times as many employees. You have 530 Federal offices in the city of Chicago alone, more than there were in the entire Nation in 1933. You have 1,500 tax-paid, full-time press agents in Washington alone. You have a million cars and trucks, nearly one for every two civilian employees. You have 93 different agencies which lend money, 75 which handle transportation problems, 44 which deal directly with agriculture.

You have taken powers unto yourself which traditionally have been, and properly should be, the province of the States. You have made us dependent upon the whim or fancy of your bureaucrats. You have weakened our desire and our capacity to accept local and individual responsibility. You have weakened our will to resist your schemes for a planned society.

But, big centralized Government, we who are young and strong of will are determined to stand against concentration of powers in your hands. We shall, through the instrument of our political party, restore civic functions and civic responsibilities to our State and local governments. We will work for strong and progressive State governments to justify the decentralization of power into their hands. We shall oppose the Federal hand-outs which form the excuse for the existence of many of your bureaus. We applaud the economy efforts of the Eightieth Congress, the only Congress which has given us surplus Federal Government financing in our adult lifetimes. We shall insist on removal of duplication and overlapping agencies. We shall support the reorganization plans of the Republican-sponsored Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Departments, and we shall stand firm against the shameless campaign of opposition which has already begun.

CONCENTRATION UNDER NEW AND FAIR DEALERS

These forces of concentration in business, in labor, in Government, have all achieved their zenith under the protective wing of the Dealers—New and Fair. How strange that the self-styled apostles of "the common man" and "the little fellow" should have nurtured the centralization of the forces which can destroy a free society in which we little people, we young people, shall have a chance through our incentive and on our own responsibility, to carve our own career, to achieve a place commensurate with our skills, our industry, and our ambition.

The fight against the forces of concentration is indeed a challenge to young Republicanism.

In summary, then, I have attempted to outline these four objectives for the Young Republicans of Wisconsin:

1. A year-round program of political education and discussion.

2. Effective participation in the councils of our party.

3. Active participation and responsible stewardship in government.

4. Championship and guardianship of the conscience, the forthrightness, the sound traditional principles of our party and of our Government.

Personally, I believe in these objectives, I believe in the Young Republican movement. I hope that you—my fellow Young Republicans of Wisconsin—can share in the faith, in the determination, that we shall offer to youth—a political vehicle for the achievement of our aims—the continuation of sound government in Wisconsin and a change in Washington to a government

which shall restore a free society in which the enthusiasm, the ambition, the ability of youth shall have an opportunity for recognition—a society in which free men and women shall escape the threatening chains which the concentration of economic and political forces have forged around us. For this, Young Republicans, we must hope, and work, and pray. This is the challenge that we must meet.

The Common Council of the City of Detroit Protests Commutation of Ilse Koch Sentence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Detroit, Mich.:

Resolution by Councilman Garlick:

Whereas voices of protest in strong indignation are being heard against the impending release of Ilse Koch of Buchenwald from imprisonment and against the action of General Lucius D. Clay in commuting her life sentence to a 4-year term of imprisonment; and

Whereas the revolting atrocities of which Ilse Koch is accused have shocked the civilized world: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Detroit, That we protest the action of General Lucius D. Clay in commuting the life sentence of Ilse Koch to a 4-year term of imprisonment, and request the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be well served; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Harry S. Truman, to the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, to Gen. Omar Bradley, and the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives with the urgent request that action be taken in memory of those World War citizens of the United States who made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields in defense of their country and in prison camps.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas: Councilmen Connor, Edgecomb, Garlick, Kronk, Miriani, Oakman, Smith, and the President—8.

Nays: None.

Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by John J. Corson submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on proposed changes in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program and on H. R. 2893. The statement follows:

For 6 years, beginning in 1938, I was Director of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Since then, after a short period with UNRRA, I have been with the Washington Post. While I have been away from the Federal Security Agency, I have followed the developments in social security with keen interest. My experience as a businessman has strengthened my belief in the social insurances. They constitute a good business-like method of preventing poverty and want. I appear before this committee today because many of the problems raised in extending the old-age and survivors insurance system are like the problems we tackled when Congress first established it. I hope that my experience in the early years of the program will be helpful now as you consider H. R. 2893.

All that I will have to say can be boiled down into two major points:

First. I can see no administrative reasons for postponing the extension of old-age and survivors insurance to farm workers, domestic servants, and self-employed workers. Anyone who has had substantial experience in the workings of the present system will agree it can be done.

Second. It is urgently necessary that the old-age insurance system be expanded and its benefits liberalized immediately. If Congress does not extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage and raise benefits, either (a) the veterans and the Townsendites will force through a pension for everyone at 65 and a better one for veterans with staggering costs for the national economy, or (b) the stronger unions will win relatively high pensions for a favored group of employees, and more money will be poured into the relief methods of caring for the aged and dependent children.

At the beginning of the program we had to develop a satisfactory way to get social-insurance contributions paid by every covered worker and his employer. We also had to find a way to keep a record of each worker's wages. Then, as in the case of the present proposal to cover new groups of workers, some people thought the task impossible. They said that it was impossible because—

1. Many small employers were not in the habit of making reports and keeping records of the wages they paid;

2. Many people don't hold steady jobs, they shift from one thing to another and are seldom employed for long at any one job;

3. The country was too big—the workers and employers were too widely scattered geographically to operate under one insurance program.

It was argued that no plan could keep records for workers and employers who were here today and gone tomorrow to goodness knows where—in a few days they would show up anywhere from Maine to California, or Minnesota to Texas.

Now, 13 years later, it is hard to recall these early doubts and even harder to justify them. They have been overcome effectively by an administrative system that now seems simple. Once every calendar quarter each employer lists the name, social-security account number, and amount of wages paid during the quarter to each of his employees. The employer sends this list and the social-security contributions to the collector of internal revenue. The Treasury Department is responsible for the contributions collected, but sends the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance the list of workers and their wages. That Bureau maintains a record of all the wages reported for each employee. Wages for Jim Brown, for example, all are combined into one record even though they were earned in several States and were paid by a number of different employers.

The early doubts as to whether the insurance system could be administered are significant now only to help us evaluate the doubts that it is feasible to extend the system to cover domestic servants, farm workers, and others.

Today some contend it is not feasible to include domestic servants and workers in agriculture under the insurance program. They argue that many housewives and farmers are not in the habit of keeping records of the wages they pay. But under the present system, we now cover approximately 700,000 employers who have only one employee and 700,000 more employers who have only two or three employees. Many of these employers send in simple reports that are perfectly satisfactory, even though written in longhand.

American farmers and housewives who hire workers would have no more difficulty than these employers in reporting the wages of their workers and paying the contributions required. They undoubtedly would be able to operate under either of the two plans that Dr. Altmeyer described. The choice between a stamp-book plan or a simplified pay-roll plan is less important than the fact that, in the recent past, American farmers and housewives proved their ability to cooperate under various stamp systems and programs that required record keeping and reports.

For housewives who managed 10 or more different ration stamps whose value shifted from time to time, social-security stamps of fixed value would be a simple proposition. I recall asking the wife of one of my friends who lived for a while in Uruguay whether she had any difficulty with the social-security payments required for her maid. "Oh, no," she replied. "I always kept a few social-security stamps in the little tin box where I kept postage stamps. Then when I paid my maid, I pasted them in her stamp book."

Keeping a simple record of the wages that he paid would look easy to the hundreds of thousands of farmers who made out reports for agricultural conservation and adjustment programs. Modern farmers are businessmen who make crop loans under the Commodity Credit Corporation. They finance their businesses through the Federal land banks or the production credit associations. They insure their crops with the crop-insurance programs. They prevent waste and increase their efficiency through Government aid for soil and water conservation. Many of these activities require detailed and accurate information about various aspects of their farming. As a matter of fact, many farmers keep a record of the wages they pay because they are deductible as an operating cost under the income tax.

If farmers and housewives can keep such simple records as may be essential, it may still be asked: Does the existence of casual and intermittent employment make it impossible to cover workers in agriculture and domestic service under the insurance program? I think not. In the first place, H. R. 2893 does not propose to cover the most casual jobs. It excludes from coverage wages of less than $25 in a calendar quarter if paid on a "farm" or "not in the course of an employer's trade or business," which would include domestic service. The bill would also prevent a great deal of nuisance reporting by excluding from coverage the earnings of an employer's spouse, parents, or children under age 21. These two exclusions prevent many administrative problems from arising. They should, however, greatly affect the social-insurance rights of persons who earn their living in covered jobs. Many of the persons excluded by these provisions would

be irregularly employed homemakers, students, or retired persons.

Concern over casual jobs in the newly covered areas should not make us forget and neglect the many regular workers who work full-time in these employments. The employment in agriculture and domestic service that is covered by H. R. 2893 probably would cause little, if any, greater administrative difficulty than is met in employments now covered by the program. All jobs in commerce and industry are under old-age and survivors insurance, yet failure to report intermittent, or other short-time work, has not been a major problem.

Take, for example, a typical mover of household goods. Only recently I observed the vans that moved the household goods of a new arrival into a house neighboring my own. Within an hour after finding the house, the driver picked up four men from the streets to unload the goods. A few hours later the job was done and the men were paid off. I watched the transaction; the driver as he paid each worker, wrote down their names and social security numbers on a simple form his company provided. He deducted social-security contributions from the wages, paid each helper and had the helper sign this form as a receipt for his company.

The records of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance show a considerable amount of such short-term employment in presently covered jobs. Indeed, the volume of such employment is an important reason for extending the system, to protect more of the people who now work only temporarily in covered jobs.

The great majority of the farmers and housewives who hire workers do so regularly. A housewife may have a cleaning woman or a laundress only one day a week, for example, but it is every week. One of my secretaries says that she has had the same wash woman for 6 years and she has never missed her regular day. Some housewives and farmers, of course, hire help only from time to time—they may be called intermittent employers. When workers understand the program and have their stamp books, I do not believe that these employers will fail to make the necessary contributions. Like the other problems I have discussed, this one is not new to the insurance program. In commerce and industry there are businessmen who at present only occasionally have hired helpers for whom they report social-security contributions.

Will the widely scattered geographic distribution of agricultural work make its coverage impractical? Again, I think the answer is "No." The widespread geographic distribution of commerce and industry has not prevented the coverage of these types of employment. Many workers now covered by the program live in agricultural and rural areas, and it should not be more difficult to cover other workers in these areas. Nearly half of all farm workers have worked at one time or another in jobs covered by the program and would easily understand its operation in agricultural employment.

As compared with the beginning of the program when we had no administrative organization, the problem of covering a wide geographic area seems simple at present. Today we can build on a smoothly functioning system of almost 500 field offices spread over the entire country. Practically all employers in agriculture and domestic service can be reached by mail carriers and all rural areas have schools, churches, newspapers, and radios. The Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges reach most farm communities with their educational programs. There are few farm communities without farm organizations such as the Grange, the Farm Bureau and the Farmer's Union. Thus, even in remote areas people can be informed of their rights and duties under the program.

Furthermore, the advantages of coverage under the social-insurance program aid in its enforcement. Most persons become informed quickly about programs from which they derive a benefit. Workers will make every effort to secure the protection and benefits of the insurance system. Most employers will get considerable satisfaction in cooperating to provide these benefits.

In respect to the self-employed, the chief administrative problems connected with their coverage are, first, how to determine who is self-employed and secondly, how to determine what self-employed persons have earned from their trades or businesses. Linking the social-insurance reports of self-employed persons to their income-tax reports seems to solve both of these questions satisfactorily.

The doubts as to whether the social-insurance system can grow are the same as the doubts that once existed about its establishment. We overcome these problems with comparative ease, even though they seemed difficult then. I know that similar problems will arise in covering farm workers, domestics, and the self-employed. But they too can be solved. There is no longer any reason to postpone this step in the logical developments of our social-security program on the grounds that it is administratively impracticable.

In my opinion, the coverage of new groups of workers is not only practicable, but I believe such action is urgently needed to preserve the insurance program. In 1935–39, Congress planned to deal with destitution resulting from inability to earn in two ways: To prevent it as much as possible by a contributory social-insurance program which would supplement personal savings, and to care for persons in special need by an assistance program.

Years of operation have proved that this approach is sound. The contributory insurance principle on which it is based was adopted because the desire for self-reliance is fundamental and important to Americans. It was planned that the public assistance program for persons in need would be reduced to a minimum as the insurance program matured.

Yet during the 14 years since the Social Security Act was enacted, the number receiving old-age assistance has more than doubled, the amounts being paid each year by Federal and State Governments to needy aged persons has increased almost tenfold, and the average payment per recipient has more than doubled. The number receiving old-age insurance is still relatively small and the average benefit payment is comparatively low.

Consequently, in spite of the almost universal approval of old-age and survivors insurance and its notably successful administration, this contributory insurance is in grave danger today. When John Q. Citizen can no longer work, it is income he needs to help meet current high living costs. I don't believe the average American likes the prospect of asking for relief. But if he will receive twice as much by swallowing his pride and if the State governments make the needs test more and more palatable, he can be brought to prefer assistance rather than insurance. Yet security for this country's aged can still be put on a basis which guarantees the self-respect of each aged person, a limit to the cost of benefits for the aged, and a source of income from which the bill can be paid. All that can be accomplished by extending and liberalizing old-age and survivors insurance.

And this, it seems to me, is the time for decision. To reiterate what I said at the start—if Congress does not extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage and raise benefits, either (a) the veterans and the Townsendites will force through a free pension for everyone at 65 and a higher one for veterans with staggering costs for the national economy, or (b) the stronger unions will win relatively high pensions for a favored group of employees, and more money will be poured into the relief methods of caring for the aged and the dependent children.

The risks covered by the contributory insurance programs are faced by all gainfully employed persons. Loss of earning power in old age, illness, disability, and death are not limited to persons in commerce and industry. Persons in all walks of life should be given an equal opportunity to provide themselves with protection against these risks within a program of social insurance. My experience in helping to establish the existing system convinces me that it is practicable to extend this protection. I urge that Congress take such action while it is still possible to establish the contributory insurance benefits (rather than free pensions paid for out of general revenues) as the basis for providing security for all aged Americans.

Washington Scenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Washington Scenes," by Edward T. Folliard, which appeared in the May issue of Nation's Business:

WASHINGTON SCENES

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The running battle between President Truman and Congress promises to go on for a long time.

Far from being novel, this kind of conflict is familiar in American political history. It is inherent in our form of Government. The founding fathers, having experienced tyranny, were afraid above all of arbitrary power; hence the division of powers and the system of checks and balances. The result, over the years, has been a good deal of thunder along the Potomac, especially when the man in the White House has sought to lead those on Capitol Hill.

John Sherman, who served in the House, the Senate, and the Cabinet, and who was boomed for the Presidency, wrote in 1895:

"The executive department of a republic like ours should be subordinate to the legislative department. The President should obey and enforce the laws, leaving to the people the duty of correcting any errors committed by their representatives in Congress."

Theodore Roosevelt revolted at the notion that he should be a mere instrument of Congress. Woodrow Wilson, in his turn, shared T. R.'s view.

"The President," said Wilson, "is expected to be the leader of his party, as well as the chief executive officer of the Government, and the country will take no excuses from him. He must play the part, and play it successfully, or lose the country's confidence. He must be prime minister, as much concerned with the guidance of legislation as with the just and orderly execution of law."

In their last years in the White House, both Roosevelt and Wilson found themselves stymied by Congress.

What is extraordinary, even startling, about the struggle between President Truman and the Eighty-first Congress is that it should have come so early. Echoes of his 1948 tirade against the "mossbacks" of the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress had hardly died away when he was feuding with its successor, this one controlled by his own Democratic Party.

What is the explanation for this situation, aside from the traditional strain between the executive and legislative branches? Why is this Democratic Congress, in the case of many issues, refusing to go along with the President?

The answer, in part, is to be found in the 1948 election returns, which were widely misread.

Some exultant Democrats let their imagination run wild after the great upset. Thinking perhaps of the first New Deal victory of 1932, and of the rubber-stamp Congress of the famous "100 days," they expected, apparently, that there would be a clear road ahead for the Truman program.

They were wrong, for two reasons. First, the Democrats, while having nominal control of the Senate and House, do not have majorities large enough to offset the occasional alliance between conservative Democrats from the South and the Republican minority. Second, no emergency exists; and it is only in an emergency—or in the face of an overwhelming public sentiment for a particular policy—that Congress readily yields to White House leadership.

The explanation also is to be found in part in what seems to be a misapprehension about the 1948 Democratic platform.

This is illustrated by the fight over labor legislation. The platform, it is true, called for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. But did it necessarily follow that Mr. Truman's election was a mandate for the kind of labor law the administration afterwards proposed? Undoubtedly, many union members and others voted for the President because of that repeal plank. But it is also pretty certain that a good many people voted for him, not because of that plank, but in spite of it.

It is generally agreed now that Mr. Truman owes his victory to the farmers of the Midwest. Would anybody argue that these farmers are now clamoring for the administration's new labor bill?

The Eighty-first Congress, it would appear, feels that what the American people want is a true balance as between management and labor. And it seems to be a good bet that the labor legislation that is eventually sent to the White House will have a lot of Taft-Hartley in it.

Party platforms, which hardly anybody reads, often are deceitful documents. Designed to bind together various elements of the party and to catch votes, they are rammed through a national convention in the space of a few days. A delegate from the Corn Belt, let us say, will have no sympathy for a labor plank. However, if he thinks it will help his party in the big cities, he will keep his peace—provided, of course, that there is also a plank looking out for his farmers.

Mr. Truman's request for $4,000,000,000 in new taxes may be thoroughly justified in view of the enlargement of our armed forces and our overseas commitments. However, there was no hint of such a request in the 1948 platform. On the contrary, the platform held out the promise of a tax cut whenever that was possible without unbalancing the Nation's economy.

There is almost no sentiment for a tax increase in Congress at this time. Higher taxes, of course, are never popular with the lawmakers; besides, many think that an increase now would be harmful to the economy. If, later on, the Government gets deeply in the red and business is reasonably good, the story may be different.

The successful filibuster of the southern Democrats against a change in the Senate rules, a change designed to clear the way for the administration's civil-rights program, needs no explanation. As the legislators from Dixie saw it, they were being asked to slit their throats, politically.

Some of the interpretations put on this defeat for Mr. Truman were altogether too grim. Perhaps this was because it was coupled with another set-back—the action of a Senate committee in blackballing his good friend, Mon Wallgren. Anyway, one viewer-with-alarm hauled off and said that Mr. Truman's whole program was in ruins.

This was mistaking a battle for a full-scale war. The Eighty-first Congress, it should be kept in mind, is still young. Besides, Mr. Truman's lease on the White House still has 3½ years to go.

Impartial observers at the Capitol believe that Mr. Truman will get a large part of his program through Congress, maybe as much as 60 percent. They don't expect that he will get it just as he wants it; few Presidents ever do. Allowing for the usual give and take, such as made the new rent-control bill possible, they look for action on housing, Federal aid to education, extension of the reciprocal-trade program, and some broadening of social security—all this, of course, in addition to action on the regular appropriation bills and the North Atlantic treaty and the arms program.

They don't look for any action on stand-by controls over prices and wages; at least, not so long as deflation is on. Neither do they expect anything to be done at this session about national health insurance, barring a spectacular compromise.

If Mr. Truman does get 60 percent of his program through this session, it won't be because of any significant change in his relationship with Congress. The fact is, there has always been room for agreement on much of the pending legislation—not only as between the President and the Democrats, but also as between him and the Republicans. The GOP, it should be remembered, also made some campaign pledges.

An election is coming up in 1950, one that will involve a third of the Senate and all of the House Members. As yet it has not been shown that the best way for a candidate to win is to tell the voters he fought Mr. Truman all along the line.

As for the President himself, he seems not too unhappy about the way things are going. Having served as a Senator and also as Vice President, he has a better understanding of the situation down there than had most of his predecessors. He says he bears the lawmakers no ill, and he acts as if he means it.

What about their attitude toward him? Some of the southern Democrats, while not actually disliking him, are bitter.

As for the Republicans, one hears talk among them that Mr. Truman has become cocky.

That is correct, only the phrasing is off. He is cocky, very much so, but he has been for a long time. He was that way even when his political stock was at rock bottom. He's the man who, just about a year ago, stood up before a gathering in the Hotel Mayflower and said: "There's going to be a Democrat in the White House for the next 4 years—and you're looking at him."

The biggest change in Mr. Truman came, not after his election, but in his first year in the White House. At the outset, he complained about the fates that had landed him there, and referred to the mansion as a jail. His embarrassed aides used to call this his "hair-shirt talk." Somewhere along the line—it was about the time that Russia got rambunctious and strikes began to plague the land—he decided that it was time for him to start acting like a President.

Although he is the hardest-working man in Washington, Mr. Truman still manages to get in some reading—much of it dealing with American history and the experiences of his predecessors in the White House. He is, therefore, thoroughly familiar with the long-drawn-out struggle between the Chief Executive and Congress.

If he is tempted to chafe at times, he can console himself with the thought that Lord Bryce, back in the 1870's, found that a Presidential message to Congress had no more effect "than an article in a prominent party newspaper."

Mr. Truman was recently talking about his differences with Congress and the conflicting remarks of newspaper columnists thereon.

"It's a wonderful country," he concluded.

Two Hundred and Forty-seven Firms Charged With Price Fixing in 1 Year—1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, price-fixing seems to be the order of the day. Two hundred and forty-seven firms have had formal charges of illegal price fixing brought against them in 1948 by the Department of Justice, according to a list published in the Machinist for May 5, 1949. Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General, is quoted as stating that only once before in history have so many business corporations been apprehended in a single year for illegal price fixing. With price fixing so prevalent, it is obvious that laws to prevent this practice must be maintained and strengthened.

KEEP ANTITRUST LAWS STRONG

How will a report on price fixing convictions for 1949 and 1950 read if either H. R. 2222 or S. 1008—to provide a 2-year moratorium on prosecutions for certain pricing practices—is passed by the Congress? The prosecutors of the Department of Justice will, I am afraid, find it difficult to equal their record for 1948 if we weaken the laws under which they operate. I am convinced that the moratorium bills will provide the basis for a clever defense by corporation lawyers in cases involving pricing practices. The test of purpose or intent will replace the test of effect in determining the legality of pricing practices. And it does not require legal training to recognize the difficulty of proving the illegality of purpose or intent.

The Machinist states in its article:

In the 12 months of 1948, the United States Department of Justice brought charges against 314 business corporations, including some of the Nation's largest. Each of them has been charged with illegal activity—in

most cases, price fixing in violation of the anti-trust laws. A survey just completed by the Machinist shows that the Justice Department last year filed civil suits against 186 business firms seeking court orders to halt illegal price fixing and other unlawful practices, while criminal action was taken against 152 corporations. In some cases the same firm was named in both civil and criminal actions. In the criminal cases, the United States Government is, for the first time in history, seeking jail sentences for flagrant violations of the anti-trust laws.

For more than 50 years the United States Government has been trying to curb the economic crime of overcharging the American people through illegal trust agreement. It was back in 1890 when Benjamin Harrison was President, that Congress passed the first antitrust law, the Sherman Act. This law is still on the statute books, but it has never been very effective in halting the growth of monopoly.

Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, says one difficulty is that the law is too lenient. In criminal cases the maximum fine that can be levied is $5,000 on each count—a penalty about equivalent to a slap on the wrist to a corporation with millions of dollars in assets.

The Department of Justice is asking Congress to strengthen the antitrust laws by providing stiffer penalties in criminal cases. It proposes that the maximum fine be increased from $5,000 to $50,000 for each criminal violation. If Congress will agree to such a change, Bergson believes the antitrust laws will then have real teeth.

Listed below are some of the firms charged last year with illegal price fixing or other violations of the antitrust laws:

ABRASIVES

Six corporations have been charged with illegal price fixing in the coated abrasives field: Armour & Co., Behr-Manning Corp., Carborundum Co., Durex Abrasives Corp., Durex Corp., and Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co.

BANKING

Thirty-five corporations have been charged with conspiracy to fix minimum commissions, service fees and interest rates in connection with the purchase of homes in the Chicago area: Beesley Realty & Mortgage Co., Inc.; Charles H. Brandt & Co., Inc.; Robert E. L. Brooks, Inc.; Central National Bank in Chicago; Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.; Chicago Federal Savings & Loan Association; Chicago Mortgage Investment Co.; Dovenmuehle, Inc.; Draper & Kramer Inc.; First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago; First National Bank & Trust Co. of Evanston; General Mortgage Investment, Inc.; Great Lakes Mortgage Corp.; Greenebaum Investment Co.; Home Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago; Henry P. Kransz Co.; Washington National Insurance Co.; Western National Bank, of Cicero; Percy Wilson Mortgage & Finance Corp.; Merchants National Bank in Chicago; Midwestern Mortgage Co.; The Mutual National Bank of Chicago; National Bank of Commerce of Chicago; National Boulevard Bank of Chicago; Oak Park Trust & Savings Bank; H. F. Philipsborn & Co.; F. C. Pilgrim & Co.; Quinlan & Tyson Mortgage Co.; Republic Realty Mortgage Corp.; Charles Ringer Co.; The South East National Bank of Chicago; South Side Bank & Trust Co.; State Bank & Trust Co.; and Uptown Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago.

CHEMICALS

Five corporations are charged with eliminating competition by price fixing, pooling of patents, conducting price wars against competitors, allocating markets and customers, and acquiring the plans and properties of competitors: Air Reduction Co., Inc.; International Carbonic Engineering Co.; Liquid Carbonic Corp.; Pure Carbonic, Inc.; and Wyandotte Chemicals Corp.

CULVERT PIPE

Seventeen corporations have been charged with restrictive practices in the manufacture and sale of metal culvert pipe: Beall Pipe & Tank Corp.; Berger Metal Culvert Co., Inc.; the Boardman Co.; Central Culvert Corp.; Choctaw, Inc.; Dominion Metal & Culvert Corp.; Eaton Metal Products Corp.; Eaton Metal Products Co. of Montana; Empire State Culvert Corp.; Illinois Culvert & Tank Co.; H. V. Johnston Culvert Co.; M & M Hiway Materials Co.; Republic Steel Corp.; Thompson Pipe & Steel Co.; Tri-State Culvert & Manufacturing Co.; Wisconsin Culvert Co.; and Wyatt Metal & Boiler Works.

DAIRIES

Forty dairies have been indicted on charges of illegal price fixing on milk sold in Washington, D. C.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Louisville, Ky.; St. Louis; Cincinnati; and Chicago: Alexandria Dairy Products Co., Inc.; American Processing and Sales Co.; Associated Dairies, Inc.; Beloit Dairy Co.; G. H. Berling, Inc.; The J. H. Berling's Dairy Products Co.; The Borden Co.; Bowman Dairy Co.; Capitol Dairy Co.; Carrithers Creamery, Inc.; Cedar Hill Farms, Inc.; Cherokee Sanitary Milk Co., Inc.; Chestnut Farms-Chevy Chase Dairy Co.; The Cooperative Pure Milk Association; The Coors Bros. Co.; Oscar Ewing, Inc.; The J. H. Fielman Dairy Co.; Ewing-Von Allmen Dairy Co., Inc.; Grant Patten Milk Co.; Happy Valley Farms, Inc.; Harvey Dairy, Inc.; The Hyde Park Dairy Co.; Hunding Dairy Co.; The Matthres Frechtling Dairy Co.; Meadow Brook Farms, Inc.; Meadowmoor Dairies, Inc.; Mellwood Dairy, Inc.; H. Miller Dairy Co., Inc.; Pevely Dairy Co.; Richfield Dairy Corp.; Safeway Stores, Inc.; St. Louis Dairy Co.; Simpson Bros., Inc.; Sure Pure Milk Co.; Thompson's Dairy, Inc.; Bon Allmen Bros., Inc.; United-Morning Star Dairy, Inc.; The J. Weber Dairy Co.; Western United Dairy Co.; and H. Woebkenberg Dairy Co.

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS

Nine corporations have been indicted on charges of illegal price fixing in installing electrical equipment in housing: Becket Electric Co.; O. A. Carlson Electric Co., Inc.; City Electric & Fixture Co.; General Electric Supply Corp.; Van S. McKenney Co.; Meletio Electric Supply Co.; Northwest Electric Co., Inc.; Puget Sound Electric, Inc.; and Westinghouse Electrical Supply Co.

EXPRESS

The Railway Express Agency has been charged with making illegal contracts with railroads for the exclusive business of railroad lines.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

Twelve corporations have been charged with tending to create monopoly by restricting dealers, through written or oral contracts, to purchase and sell machinery manufactured by them to the exclusion of other manufacturers: J. I. Case Co.; Deere & Co.; Deere & Webber Co.; John Deere Plow Co.; John Deere Plow Co., Baltimore; John Deere Plow Co., Columbus, Ohio; John Deere Plow Co., Indianapolis; John Deere Plow Co., Lansing, Mich.; John Deere Plow Co., Moline, Ill.; John Deere Plow Co., St. Louis; John Deere Plow Co., Syracuse; and International Harvester Co.

MEAT PACKING

Five corporations are charged with price fixing by using uniform cost formulas for arriving at selling prices: Armour & Co., Swift & Co., the Cudahy Packing Co., and Wilson & Co., Inc.

PAINT

Seventeen corporations have been indicted on charges of price fixing in the sale of paint, varnish, enamels, lacquers, stains, and water-thinned paints: American Marietta Co.; Columbus Varnish Co.; Cook Paint & Varnish Co.; Devoe & Reynolds Co., Inc.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Paint Corp.; the Glidden Co.; Grand Rapids Varnish Co.; Interchemical Corp.; the Lilly Co.; Lilly Varnish Co.; the Muralo Co.; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; the Reardon Co.; Sherwin-Williams Co.; Southern Varnish Corp.; and Wesco Waterpaints, Inc.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Eight corporations have been indicted on charges of conspiracy illegally to control prices on the sale of photomounts: The Chilcote Co.; J. S. Graham Co., Inc.; The Gross Photo Supply Co.; George L. Kohne, Inc.; Emil Loudelka, Inc.; The Medick-Barrows Co.; Sprague-Hathaway Studios, Inc.; and A. Sussman & Co., Inc.

PLASTICS

Seven corporations have been indicted on charges of illegal price fixing on the sale of laminated plastics: Continental-Diamond Fibre Co.; Formica Insulation Co.; Mica Insulator Co.; National Vulcanized Fibre Co.; St. Regis Paper Co.; Synthane Corp.; and Taylor Fibre Co.

Rohm & Hass Corp. has been charged with attempting to suppress competition in the plastics industry.

RUBBER

Three corporations have been charged with illegal patent pooling and allocation or world marketing in late products: Consolidated Rubber Manufacturers, Ltd.; Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., and United States Rubber Co.

SPECTACLES

Seven corporations have been charged with price fixing on spectacles through the device of rebating to optometrists

approximately one-half of the total price paid by their patients for eye glasses: N. P. Benson Optical Co.; House of Vision-Belgard-Spero, Inc.; Uhlemann Optical Co., Illinois; Uhlemann Optical Co., Michigan; White-Haines Optical Co., Delaware; White-Haines Optical Co., Michigan; White-Haines Optical Co., Ohio.

STEAMSHIP LINES

Twenty-five corporations are charged with conspiracy to restrain interstate and foreign trade by agreement which requires shippers to patronize certain lines, and creating a monopoly through a system of contract rates: United States Lines Co.; States Marine Corp.; M. V. Nonsuco, Inc.; Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.: Skibsaktieselskapet Igadi; A. F. Klaveness & Co. A/S; the De La Rama Steamship Co., Inc.; Waterman Steamship Corp.; Prince Line, Ltd.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.; American President Lines, Ltd.; Swedish East Asiatic Company, Ltd.; Nederlandsche Stoomvaart; Maatschappij "Oceaan" N. V.; Aktieselskapet Ivarans Rederi; Isthmian Steamship Co.; Ellerman & Bucknall Steamship Co., Ltd.; Fearnley & Eger; Wilhelmsens Dampskibsakiteselshab; Dampskibsselskabet AF 1912 A/S; The Bank Line, Ltd.; The China Mutual Steam Navigation Co., Ltd.; Silver Line, Ltd.; the Ocean Steamship Co., Ltd.; A/S Besco; and A/S Dampskibsselskabet Svendberg.

STREET LIGHTING

Six corporations have been indicted on charges of price fixing in the street-lighting industry: General Electric Co.; Westinghouse Electric Co., Inc.; Line Material Co.; Union Metal Manufacturing Co.; Pacific Union Metal Co.; and Holophane Co., Inc.

TELEPHONES

Two corporations have been charged with monopolizing the manufacture and sale of telephones and telephone equipment: Western Electric Co., Inc., and American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

TRANSPORTATION

Two corporations have been charged with monopoly of inter-island transportation in violation of the anti-trust laws: Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd., and Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. Ltd.

Two corporations have been indicted on charges of conspiracy in restraint of trade in the shipment of household goods in Washington, Oregon, and California: National Carloading Corp. and Universal Carloading & Distributing Co.

WALLPAPER

Eighteen corporations have been indicted on charges of illegal price fixing on the sale of wallpaper: Asam Wallpapers, Inc.; Atlas Wall Mills, Inc.; H. Blonder Co.; B. & D. Wallpaper Co.; The Birge Co., Inc.; Cook Paint & Varnish Co.; James Davis, Inc.; J. C. Eisenhart Wall Paper Co.; Enterprise Wall Paper Manufacturing Co.; Fisher Wallpaper & Paint Co.; The Globe Mills Inc.; Imperial Paper & Color Corp.; Isgo Wall Paper Corp.; The Prager Co., Inc.; D. Schultz, Inc.; Richard E. Thibaut, Inc.; United Wallpaper, Inc.; and York Wall Paper Co.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADMINISTRATION PRAISED

Capital Comments published by the Democratic National Committee in its May 7, 1949 issue, stated the following:

While big business propagandists were busy blaming labor unions, Government taxes and just about everything but sun spots for 1948 high prices, the Justice Department was very busy trying to protect the public from business price-fixers.

The facts are reported in the current issue of the Machinist, energetic weekly published by the International Association of Machinists. The Machinist set out to find out how business was behaving in the price-fixing field and what the Justice Department was doing about it.

The publication found that the Justice Department filed anti-trust charges against 314 firms last year, and that 247 of these were for price-fixing.

Price-fixing was charged in 19 different industries.

The Machinist survey shows that the Democratic administration has been on the ball in protecting the consumer and the small business man by enforcing the antitrust laws.

Not Enough Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a letter which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal for May 2, 1949, seems to me to give evidence of the need for a national health program. The writer, like so many others, has turned to voluntary health insurance for the solution of his problems in medical costs and has turned in vain. Every day letters come to my desk proving the desperate need of the self-respecting, self-supporting people of this country for a way to meet the costs of the medical care they must have. They do not want charity—they want to pay their way. But no plan has been advanced by the medical profession or any private group which will help them to pay their way. Only Government-sponsored health insurance can do that. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter:

NOT ENOUGH INSURANCE

To the Journal:

In two editorials April 23 the Journal argued the advantages of voluntary prepaid health insurance plans over the proposed Government program. Please tell me where, outside of welfare plans available to members of some unions or employees of a few corporations, can I buy health insurance which will protect me in case one of the following is required:

1. Extensive dental repairs, caused by accident or infection.

2. Prolonged medical treatment which does not require surgery or hospitalization, but which may necessitate costly medicines administered over a long period of time. Such treatment can wipe out a family's savings and force them deeply into debt.

3. Psychiatric treatment, which could prevent hospitalization in any of our institutions so graphically described in the Journal as to make one greatly prefer to be dead than incarcerated in one.

4. Any obscure ailment requiring prolonged laboratory tests and skilled diagnosis, now highly expensive.

At present I am paying out over 3½ percent of my income for insurance covering none of the above. I have Blue Cross for my spouse and myself, which covers part of possible hospital bills and such tests as are done by the hospital, not by the physician. I have private insurance for myself only which covers a limited list of possible operations to which the insurance company contributes part of the fee, and in case of disability from illness or accident not occurring at work pays a small weekly income, less than the one provided by workmen's compensation for those injured at work. For ailments not common to both men and women nothing is paid. If, as proposed, for 3 percent of my income I could get some of the things not now obtainable, I would be very much in favor of it.

A doctor, franker than most, once told us that only the very rich or the very poor get really good medical attention. The present system of medical care presents nightmare problems to those not in either class. I have known too many people whose savings have been wiped out by a lingering or obscure illness in the family or who have not only lost their life's savings but have been plunged hopelessly in debt for doctor's, nurses', and hospital bills.

NEITHER RICH NOR POOR.

RIPON, WIS.

Mother's Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 8, it was my pleasure to deliver an address at St. Gerard's congregation in Milwaukee on the occasion of Mother's Day. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that, following it, there be printed a brief statement on the same theme by Rev. C. E. B. Ward, executive secretary of the League for the American Home which is located in Carnegie Hall in New York. I am grateful to my able colleague, the Honorable John PHILLIPS of California, for calling my attention to the statement of the Reverend C. E. B. Ward.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO MOTHERHOOD

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Father, and friends, it is indeed a great pleasure to address this fine audience, and it seems particularly fitting to speak on Mother's Day here in St. Gerard's Church. St. Gerard, as you well know, is a great favorite with mothers,

and he is the unofficial patron of Catholic motherhood.

THE DEAR NAME OF "MOTHER"

Why do we gather on Mother's Day? What is there about such a gathering which causes us to set aside each year a day to commemorate motherhood? I shall try to state briefly the answer.

The greatest word, of course, is God. The dearest word in any language is mother. There is no human name so enshrined in humanity's affection as this name.

Everything, for most of us which is sweet, beautiful, lovely, and holy, clusters about that name. It brings up pictures of home—babyhood, boyhood, manhood, and mother. It brings up our faith—the Bible—and the teachings of the Master, which she inculcated in us. And she whom we called wife, became not only the mother of children, but our "second mother"—shaping, guiding, and guarding our life.

When we think of mother, even though we are thousands of miles away, it has almost the value of religion, pure and undefiled, because it brings up a living personality that is enshrined in our hearts. Mother and home are the tenderest notes on the keyboard of the human heart.

THE STORY OF CHRISTIAN MOTHERHOOD

Do you remember what Lincoln said: "All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother"?

From early childhood, we followed her advice, we built for her a place in our heart of hearts. The story of Christian motherhood has been the brightest thing on the page of history.

MOTHER'S INFLUENCE IN THE HOME

You and I know that the greatest school of life is the home. Here in the kindergarten class of infancy and childhood she taught us. Here were made the first impressions on this human mind of the child. Here were found fatherhood and motherhood, and we know that here we found the greatest teacher in the world—the mother. And she knew that the most sensitive thing in the universe was the soul of her little child. Accordingly the first impressions are the most important, because they are then made on the memory of childhood, and those impressions—those made by the mother—are the most significant influence in the life of the individual.

A MOTHER'S PRAYERS

I believe the mightiest prayers ever offered come from the lips of mother. Prayers filled with light, aflame with love, winged with faith, and vibrating with spiritual force. The prayer of a mother is the thought of love passing through the universal heart of God, and on its way from soul to soul.

EVERY MOTHER'S PRAYER: PRESERVATION OF PEACE

I could not refer to Mother's Day without saying just a word or two about the subject which is dearest to the hearts of mothers throughout the world—namely, the preservation of peace. Yes, if I may be permitted just a word apart from our main spiritual theme, it is the fondest hope of mothers throughout the globe that never again may any mother's son have to go to war. If we are to keep out of war, we may have to reappraise our entire foreign policy in terms of its true effectiveness.

WHY NOT RESUME FULL RELATIONS WITH MADRID GOVERNMENT?

Not long ago in line with that thought, I asked certain questions in the United States Senate. I asked, for example, why we do not resume full diplomatic relations with Spain. We know the Communists would not want these diplomatic relations resumed. However, we are concerned not with what the Communists want, but with a program that will bring true peace. And so I am hoping that all of my brother Senators will reappraise the Spanish question and will find the path that will lead to true peace.

This is not just a matter for the United States to reconsider. It is a matter for the United Nations to reevaluate. And I know that in your hearts, as in mine, is the prayer that the United Nations, our great instrument for peace, will indeed fulfill the prayers of mankind and will find a solution to war.

THE COURAGEOUS CHURCHMEN BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Just one other thought in relation to the United Nations. As my listeners know, recently the Senate passed a resolution in protest against the outrageous persecution of courageous Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, and other churchmen, who have been fighting for the integrity of the human soul behind the iron curtain. And so today, on Mother's Day, we are thinking of the mothers behind the iron curtain who are deeply devoted to their religious creed and who recognize in Cardinal Mindszenty and other persecuted churchmen the champions of human dignity and human freedom for every mother's son.

You know, when we think of influence, you and I can readily agree that there is no influence in the world comparable to the influence of a Christian mother. You remember that the Bishop of Hippo said to his mother: "Depart, good woman, the child of so many prayers cannot be lost."

It has been said that God only made one absolutely unselfish creature. That is Mother. Certainly, mother love is the nearest that we know on earth to God's love. It is the best symbol of our Maker's love. God is love.

THE MOTHER OF JESUS

No Mother's Day talk to all mothers, and particularly mothers of the Catholic faith, is complete without paying tribute to the great mother of Jesus, the Saviour.

John quotes the great Wayshower as saying: "I am the light of the world. He who follows Me does not walk in the darkness, but will have the light of life."

Under the guiding, loving mother-hand, the Babe Jesus grew to boyhood and from boyhood to manhood, and He brought that light—understanding, guidance and faith—to tired, misguided humanity. All honor to Mary. "Blessed art thou among women."

Speaking to the mothers of today, may I leave these suggestions, because I know you are interested in the preservation of our great way of life.

IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY HAPPINESS

1. We know that the best citizenship comes out of homes which are happy and which are taught the values of the Christian faith. The family is the nucleus of society. Unless the spiritual verities are nurtured in the family, we do not get that permanency and continuity which are so significant in a well-ordered society.

Pope Pius XI said:

"Experience has taught that unassailable stability in matrimony is a fruitful source of virtuous living and habits of integrity. Where this order of things obtains, the happiness and wellbeing of the nation are safely guarded; what the families and the individuals are, so also is the state, for a body is determined by its parts."

WE MUST GUARD OUR GREAT VALUES

2. We here in this great country, with its opportunities for spiritual growth, for the acquirement of reasonable material security, for the enjoyment of what has been known as the American way, with its freedoms, privileges and responsibilities—we are indeed blessed. However, we must ever bear in mind that eternal vigilance is the price of maintaining these great values. We have got to stand guard against the insidious impact of foreign isms, like communism and fascism, Yes, against state socialism.

3. From the very earliest days down to the present, it appears that reverence for the Almighty, the practice of brotherhood, and the sanctity of the home, have been the very foundations of our way of life.

RADIATING THE CHRISTIANIZING INFLUENCE

Let me repeat, if I may. To keep intact our way of life, there must radiate out of the four walls of American homes, the christianizing influence. This is particularly true because our life gets less simple, and more complex. While it is true a good mother, if she finds time, will keep abreast of the current complex developments in our society, the most important part, however, for her to play is that of training her children to become good citizens with faith in the Almighty and with love and appreciation in their hearts for this great land of opportunity and liberty.

CONCLUSION

The very peace of the world depends upon the way that the mothers of America will bring up their children. You all know that America has a new role to play in the world—a role calling for vision of the highest type—not only in statesmen and in business leaders and in labor, but particularly in the mothers of men who mold and shape the human clay into dynamic soul-stuff.

MOTHER'S DAY MESSAGE

(By Rev. C. E. B. Ward)

A CODE THAT WORKS BOTH WAYS

Mothers have always shed tears for their children. Tears might even increase rather than diminish as the children grow older.

Many mothers are sensitive when their children, as they grow older, establish their own homes. Husbands may try to fill the void, but no husband will seriously repeat the query "Am I not better to thee than 10 sons?" Motherhood does not cease when children marry. Marriage does not essentially alter their relation to her.

A mother of 10 children, though 2 still remain at home with her, thinks daily of the 8 absent in their newly established homes.

This may be a mother's weakness, but it is also her strength. She is made that way, and would cease to be a mother if it were otherwise.

HER COMPENSATION

Only one cure is known, which worked so well that it was made into a commandment. Honor thy father and thy mother. Whenever and wherever tried it has worked—comfort and cheer to mother, satisfaction to son or daughter. The first commandment with promise.

IT SATISFIES

Thousands have proven it. Four successful metropolitan businessmen illustrate how they make Mothers' Day worth while all year round:

One, a devoted son, drives 140 miles every week end with his wife and children to spend the day with his mother for her sake. He is the head of a large branch of one of America's greatest mercantile houses.

The second lives in the same suburb with his parents. Every evening of the year, at the close of the business day, he visits his aging mother to assure her of her continued place of importance in his life. He is an outstanding lawyer in the nearby city.

A third, after his father's death, and for the last 10 years of her life, wrote a letter daily to his mother—reminiscent of a childhood made happy, recounting her endless sacrifices during his adolescence, gentle consideration for her poignant suffering at separation from him when he established his

own home, and tender reference to her loss and loneliness in declining years. He sent her a letter every day for 10 years. Upon his death, his wife erected to his memory, for the boys of his community, a building as a memorial to his faithfulness as husband and son, to wife and mother.

The fourth, only three of his 70 college classmates voted him likely to succeed. His social pull was too small to get him into a fraternity. He danced too poorly and was too soberly earnest to suit the girls' tastes. He did not dance at all on Sundays. He neither smoked, drank, nor gambled. Automobiles were too expensive for his use; he was a straphanger. He ate at automats. Yet he was surprisingly popular, notwithstanding these simple habits.

One of his old-fashioned virtues is respect for his parents.

"My father is a better man than I am," he says.

"If you knew my mother you would like her.

"My parents are not half so proud of me as I am of them," he says.

The door of his modest office is open to all who want to see him.

Though a successful businessman, he is not too old to honor his father and mother.

Before World War II he was head of the New York Stock Exchange with a salary of $48,000 a year. Until recently he has been president of the Export-Import Bank, Washington, D. C., and is now Assistant Secretary of the United States Treasury.

A CODE THAT WORKS BOTH WAYS

Mothers have longings and yearnings that you can satisfy, which will react for your own happiness and growth and which will redound to your own honor.

The League for the American Home has functioned many years for a more perfect, happy, and useful home life.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Jefferson-Jackson-Truman day dinner at Tacoma, Wash., on Saturday night, April 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, this is not my first visit to the great Pacific Northwest. On four previous occasions I have had the opportunity of visiting the State of Washington and of seeing something of the vast resources of this picturesque area. I have been here in company with Senator MAGNUSON and Congressmen HENRY JACKSON and HUGH MITCHELL. These distinguished legislators are among my best friends in the Congress. I wish to pay high tribute to them personally and I wish to say that they are men of great ability, of high idealism, and of great hopes for the future of the State of Washington. I could deal at length with the many legislative accomplishments of the legislative leaders, but I am sure you fully appreciate their excellent efforts in your behalf.

Since the time of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the West has been gaining in political importance. Population followed in the footprints of the pioneer, and brought in its wake statehood, congressional seats, and recognition at national party conventions.

This trend today is more pronounced than ever before. The opening up of the industrial potentialities of the West has brought an even greater increase in population. The shift has been more pronounced since 1940; it is of greater moment now because of the congressional reapportionment in 1950, when the next census is completed.

I believe that, more and more, the people of the West will find that their best interests lie with the Democratic Party. I can cite two reasons for this belief: one is materialistic; the other has to do with ideas and ideals.

The material reason is reflected by recounting the respective histories of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party in the fields of irrigation, flood control, and power development.

The Republican Party leadership stands for a sort of colonial status for the West. Since Teddy Roosevelt's day, the GOP has attempted in every possible way to hamstring the development of hydroelectric power for the benefit of all the people. This in spite of the fact that the first Federal move toward full river-basin development, including irrigation, hydroelectric power, and development of other water resources, was achieved in the administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

After the long years of GOP obstructionism, it took the progressive objectives of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration to really start the ball rolling.

Today, under the impact of over 16 years of Democratic tenure in the White House and despite the set-backs of the most devastating war in history and 2 years of Republican control of the Congress, river-basin development is forging ahead with steadily increasing speed.

Throughout the dark days of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era, the private utilities and great financial houses kept the lid on public hydroelectric power development. They held back also progress on the whole front of resource conservation.

The only gleam of light in the resource-conservation field, after Theodore Roosevelt, came during the Democratic administration of the late Woodrow Wilson. Although World War I made it impossible for that administration to embark on a full conservation program, President Wilson was able to put through the development of Muscle Shoals. This was accomplished as an emergency war measure over the bitter opposition of the GOP utility monopolists.

Immediately after the war the new GOP administration closed down again on public power and other resource development. Only bitter battling by a small group of progressive men of both parties kept the Harding administration from turning Muscle Shoals over to the private interests for monopolistic exploitation.

The Democratic administration which came into office in 1933 replaced river-basin development and real resource conservation on a smooth track, with the green light for full speed ahead. The TVA provided phenomenal change in the economy of the Tennessee-Alabama-Mississippi area; the great Reclamation and Army dams and power plants, the broad stretches of irrigated farms in the West, the humming river-basin-development program now being pushed forward by the Department of the Interior, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies stand as indisputable evidence as to what is being accomplished.

This program is designed for the fullest possible development of the Nation's river-basin resources. These new policies and laws provide for widespread distribution to the public of the benefits of low-cost hydroelectric power, irrigation water, and the economic opportunities which such basic resource developments open up.

The GOP record, though, remains one of obstruction to Federal development, and is shot through with attempts to throw the lion's share of the benefits of such development to the big landowners and the private Power Trust. Focal points of the fight against accelerating conservation in the people's interests were aimed by the GOP-controlled Eightieth Congress against such programs as Interior's Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the vital Tennessee Valley Authority steam plant in my own State.

A good example is the fiscal 1949 Reclamation appropriation, where the GOP Eightieth Congress pointed with pride at a record-breaking appropriation of $250,000,000. That sounds good, but let's look further. The appropriation was quietly saddled with crippling limitations which made it impossible for Reclamation to put the money to full use. The measure sought to force Reclamation to turn over public power from its dams for sale and exploitation with a big windfall of profits by the private power companies. Neatly omitted from the bill were requested appropriations for such items as transmission lines for the Havre-Shelby unit in Montana, the Central Valley project in California, and the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado.

The appropriation act did permit construction of the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana, but forbade expenditures for power facilities. An appropriation for a Central Valley project steam plant, needed to give power- and water-short Californians full benefit of the big Central Valley project, was flatly denied. These were just a few of the crippling jokers hung onto the appropriation.

In contrast to this Republican negative approach is the belief of the Democratic Party that we must move forward in reclamation, flood control, and power projects—not only for the good of the West, but for the good of the entire country.

This spirit is exemplified in the President's proposal for legislation to set up the Columbia Valley Administration. As the President has made clear, the entire country needs a Columbia Valley administration—not merely the States of the Pacific Northwest. And the decision to establish this administration should and will be made on the grounds of national interest—not on grounds of local or regional interest. The National Security Resources Board points out that facilities for development of additional power are needed here in the Northwest more critically than in any other region of America.

Let me picture for you our public-power experience in the South. When the Tennessee Valley Authority was established, it met the needs of the entire country. The whole Nation had paid for years for the cost of floods on the Tennessee River; had paid the consequences of the lower incomes of people in the valley; had felt the impact of smaller crop output because of depleted soils in the Tennessee Valley region. The lower income of the valley meant less business for the rest of the country in selling to the people of the valley electric appliances, housing, food, clothing, and other products. The lower incomes meant malnutrition and disease, and a smaller number of men able to pass the physical tests of the armed services.

Today the valley is more fertile, thanks to the TVA, and, consequently, the entire country is richer. The country saves about $11,000,000 annually because of the flood-control benefits of TVA, which means that much less call for Red Cross contributions or for special appropriations for flood relief by Congress. And, while everybody saves this money, farmers on 6,000,000 acres of the lower Ohio and Mississippi Basins have their crops protected. The power output since TVA was established has increased 10 times. The rest of the Nation is selling to the people in the valley more electric appliances, and is taking from the new industries of the valley chemicals, aluminum, and other products, and is employing on these products more additional workers than the new industries employ in the valley itself.

The rapid growth of river navigation in the valley has saved the rest of the country millions of dollars in transportation costs on the products it sells to and buys from the region. Farmers all over the country produced more crops than otherwise would have been the case, thanks to TVA demonstration and developmental work with phosphate fertilizers on thousands of farms, both inside and outside of the Tennessee Valley. With incomes higher, the health of valley residents is much better; malaria has decreased. The rest of the country found the valley better able to provide men for the armed services in World War II.

In the Columbia River area the Nation needs a CVA. Although some problems are different from those of the Tennessee Valley, there are undeveloped opportunities that will be realized sooner and at less cost than if there is no CVA. Floods like that of 1948 have to be controlled. But there should be one agency at work, not a mixture of State and Federal agencies. There are nearly 29,000,000 kilowatts of water power, yet to be converted to electric power, now wasting annually to the sea. This is the equivalent of almost 400,000,000 barrels of oil annually, one one-fifth of what the country now produces. A CVA can develop and sell this power sooner and at less cost than can the three Federal agencies that now separately handle parts of the power problem.

The security of the Nation will be improved when this power is developed. Very important industries are holding back their expansion until they can get power. These industries, which have been turned down for expansion in the past 2 years in the Northwest, include aluminum, phosphates, ferro-alloys, and abrasives. All of these products are important in time of war. The population of the Northwest has increased 35 percent in the past 8 years—three times faster than has been the increase in the rest of the country. Unemployment, although small in actual numbers, has existed at a rate three times as great as that of the rest of the country. A CVA will mean more job opportunities and relatively less unemployment than if there is no CVA. For the whole country, this means more income for people in the Northwest with which to buy goods from other regions.

A CVA will pay off to the Nation in the way that TVA has. We are not interested in just the Tennessee Valley nor the Columbia Valley; we are ambitious for America.

Today the Tennessee Valley supports the TVA and would vote for it if a referendum were held. But back in 1933 the people of the valley would have been confused by the same kind of rumors as are now being spread against CVA. The people of the TVA area were told they were going socialistic, that they would be giving up their local rights to govern themselves. They probably would have voted against a TVA in those days. But, fortunately for them and for the country, the decision for a TVA was made by the Congress and the President on grounds of national interest.

A CVA should be decided on the same grounds of national need. The arguments against CVA from some selfish people in the Northwest are the old arguments of business groups who mask their opposition to social progress with catcalls of socialism.

I am confident that the CVA measure will be passed, because a Democratic Congress will act for the welfare of all the Nation.

I want to talk a little more about how the President and a Democratic Congress are working to better the lot of all Americans. This is a twofold operation. In the field of international relations we are enacting measures to keep our own defenses strong and to encourage the economic recovery of friendly democracies as a bulwark against communism.

At the same time we are moving to better conditions at home, to see to it that all our citizens share fairly in the benefits of our free-enterprise economy. Just a few days ago in the Senate we passed a bill of this type—a long-range housing bill. It took us quite a while to complete action on this bill. There were long and careful committee hearings. There was thorough debate on the floor of the Senate.

Now we had the Democratic votes all along to pass this bill. But we took quite a bit of time. The opposition had its say. This took a lot of time, especially when you consider that in the final vote 24 Republicans voted for the bill and 11 Republicans voted against it. But—and this is a mighty big "but"—Republicans introduced and debated 18 amendments before the final vote on passage of this bill. I bring this up because I know that some Democrats have been discouraged. Not all measures have been moving so rapidly toward enactment as they might have liked. A reason for this slowness is that there are some powerful Republican leaders who feel that the Republican cause is aided by delaying tactics in the Congress.

Thus, they delay passage of a measure as long as they possibly can by dragging out the debate and offering endless amendments; but, if it is a bill they are afraid to oppose on the record of final passage, they go along with the Democrats on the final vote, in order to make a better record for their party. They did this on ECA and on the housing bill.

Of course, if we were to attempt to speed things up, the Republicans would charge gagging of debate and steamrollering. If we hear them out, they seek to charge that we are not moving rapidly enough to do our job.

I don't think this is fair politics nor good strategy; but, if it has you worried, let me give you some really sound ways to judge a Congress—yardsticks by which we invite you to measure the Eighty-first Congress. First of these is the quality of the legislation passed: Is it constructive? Is it part of an over-all program which works for the common good? The Eighty-first Congress can answer, "Yes."

But what of its predecessor, the Republican Eightieth Congress? That Congress had its main success in reversing policies set by Democratic Congresses, in passing measures which the people repudiated at the polls last November—legislation which must be revised or removed by the Eighty-first Congress, adding to its own legislative burdens.

Examples of this are the crippling measures against our reciprocal-trade program, and against the Commodity Credit Corporation (which we are correcting), and the action we are having to take to remove Republican inequalities in labor legislation.

Again, the Eighty-first Congress is moving forward in the fields of health, social security, education, housing, and the other fields where the Eightieth Congress won for itself the "do-nothing" title.

The Eighty-first Congress can meet the test of quality of legislation and of the purpose of its domestic legislation. The Eightieth could not. The Eighty-first Congress is moving forward. The Eightieth moved backward or else stagnated.

I think that, when we finish up this session of the Eighty-first Congress, you will find that we have moved a great stride forward and that we have enacted a large portion of the Truman Fair Deal program.

The CVA is a symbol of the Democratic Party's determination to go forward with the projects that have benefited the economy, not only of the West, but of the entire country.

However, the material gains are far from being the strongest of the ties which should bind the Democratic Party to the ever-growing West. The West will not give its political allegiance merely as a pawn for Federal moneys. Mutual beliefs and convictions are a far more powerful factor. The men who settled the West and those who have moved west in the intervening years since have a firm faith that America is still growing.

The Democratic Party has always believed that America must grow not only bigger, but better, as well. It was Thomas Jefferson who had the courage to seize the opportunity to acquire what was then the vast wilderness of the West. Where would we be today if a Democrat had not had the wisdom to start us on the policy of expanding our Nation from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific?

And where would we have been during the last war if Democratic wisdom had not developed croplands from wasteland and begun the industrial development of the West, so that all sections of our Nation were able to contribute their share to our defense effort?

The Democratic Party today stands firm in its conviction that the continued development of the West builds economic assets which benefit every American in every section of the Nation.

So long as all of us in the East, and the West, and the North, and the South, believe in continuing to build up our economy and share mutual concern for each other's welfare, we will continue to have the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

We shall continue to show to the world that our free American way of life is better than any form of Communist or Fascist totalitarianism. We shall continue to work for real opportunity for every citizen. This same strength in our economy will provide us both a powerful defense against the infiltration of ideas hostile to our way of life, and an equally strong defense against any group which might make the mistake of trying to change American thinking by military might.

The plow, the irrigation ditch which feeds the soil, and the dam which brings electric power to the farm and to the factory—all these are powerful tools in peace or in war if—God forbid—war should ever come again.

All of these are part of our arsenal of democracy, built by free Americans who feared neither man nor the future, but who were deathly afraid of idle stagnation.

The West believes in this great American tradition. So does the Democratic Party. We share the pioneer spirit. There is no longer a geographical frontier to be conquered. But there is another frontier—the frontier of making better use of what we have only half-used, or have wasted, or even, perhaps, have ignored. It's the kind of pioneering that created the power here in

the West and in the Tennessee Valley which enabled other pioneers to develop atomic power.

With God's help we shall see to it that America is always a Nation where the spirit of the pioneer spurs freemen to build a bigger and better America.

Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, at First Anniversary Celebration of Declaration of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on the occasion of the first anniversary celebration of the declaration of the State of Israel, held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on May 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rabbi ABBA HILLEL SILVER. A generation ago, dear friends, a name was written large into the annals of the Zionist Movement, that name was that of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE. [Applause.] It was under his leadership, and by his political guidance and sagacity, that the first revolution favoring the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine was adopted by the Congress of the United States, in 1922. [Applause.]

We are privileged tonight to have the grandson of that Senator here. [Applause.] A Senator in his own right; a distinguished American; one who has been a member of the United States Senate since 1936, with the exception of the years which he spent in war service, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., was a man to whom we turned from time to time when we needed guidance, political help in Government. His name is now being written large in the annals of the American Zionist Movement, alongside of his distinguished grandfather.

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me extreme pleasure to present to you at this time, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. Rabbi Silver, Senator DOUGLAS, Major Eban, ladies and gentlemen, you will have to admit that it is a tough assignment to make a speech after the two speakers you have just heard, but I do welcome this chance to say to you that to be a speaker at this first anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel, is one of the most distinguished honors which could have come to a man [Applause.] A great historian recently said that the birth of Israel was a "millennial event to be measured by the temporal values of thousands of years." To be associated with an occurrence which reaches so far into time is an honor which for me is without precedent.

One need not be a close student of history to feel the importance of the birth of the new State of Israel. Every school child knows of the antiquity of Jewish civilization and of the unique contribution which it has made to human culture. In fact, it is impossible for us to conceive of any culture, non-Jewish or otherwise, if there never had been any Jews. There are, of course, other great peoples who in antiquity contributed to building the foundation of our civilization, but most of them died and disappeared leaving behind them, it is true, a marvelous memory, but nothing more.

The Jews, on the other hand, were not only a great people in the days of antiquity; they have proven themselves to be a great people in this dangerous and rapidly evolving modern world [Applause.] In this respect—as in many others—they have proven themselves to be unique.

Let us look at the facts which speak louder than any eulogies of mine.

Look first at the condition of the Jews at the end of World War II. Six million Jewish people were buried in Europe, and a million Jewish children were deliberately and unbelievably thrown into the furnace. Jewish manpower had been depleted by slaughter as unparalleled as it was vicious. It would have been only human for these dreadful trials to have weakened the fighting spirit of the Jewish people. Others have given up hope with far less cause.

But somehow or other out of its agony, the Jewish people found within itself the force, the faith, and the will to survive. [Applause.]

On the fifth day of Iyar (which is the same as our fourth day of May) Israel proclaimed its independence. [Applause.] It was besieged and blockaded. It had to advance without benefit of international recognition. Its institutions of government were necessarily disintegrating. On its frontiers stood the armies of five Arab states who had manpower, weapons, resources, and military experience which many, if not most, observers believed would surely win the day.

If the Jewish leaders at that time had been shrewd and calculating men, they would have undoubtedly concluded that the odds were too unequal, and that it was the better part of valor to give up the struggle and make some sort of a deal. But to their everlasting credit let it be said that these Jewish leaders were not defeatists. They did not take counsel of their fears. They turned a deaf ear to the voices of despair. Like George Washington at Valley Forge, they felt in their hearts that compromise was impossible, that their cause was right, and that sheer courage on their part would enable it to prevail. [Applause.]

Now you and I all know men whose lives are spent in being shrewd, in making a bet that they will win—in making predictions which come true. Those men don't much care what the nature of their guess may be, just so long as they guess right. That is all they want.

Then there are the other kind of men, the men who never can make a living as crystal gazers or as prophets; men whose predictions are often wrong for the very simple reason that these men are not interested in guessing right, they are interested in making the right thing happen [applause] which is entirely different. They want to make the right thing happen no matter how difficult or how desparate it may appear, and those are the men who throughout history have really influenced the course of human events. It is a quality which every leader in war and in peace must have, or he becomes a speculator, and not a leader. For, if the leaders do not believe in victory, how can the rank and file be expected to advance?

And so the Jewish leaders made their stand in May 1948, and what happened thereafter?

They stood firm against an overwhelming invasion.

They carried the war to the enemy.

They sustained the crushing burdens of mobilization.

They avoided the errors of most newly created nations in that they set up their army on the basis of the highest professional military standards and without flinching carried out a superbly conceived military plan which won the admiration of soldiers everywhere.

So they won through universal recognition.

They established the organs and institutions of democratic administration within sound of the guns.

They brought 220,000 fugitives and wanderers into Israel.

They revived one of mankind's oldest cultures.

They established democracy in that area known as the Near East, or the Middle East, where its ideals and institutions are practically unknown.

They created a home of social and scientific progress in that same sleepy, stagnant area of desperate squalor and degradation.

They made an international judgment of the United Nations into a reality.

And now they are working for a real Arab-Jewish peace which bids fair before long to be an accomplished fact.

Now there is just a bare enumeration. [Applause.]

And I ask: Was there ever in history a more convincing demonstration of vigor, courage, far-seeing intelligence, and lofty idealism?

What was it, in essence, that gave these men the victory? They had, as I have said, a fine plan; but it was not the plan. They had zealous friends abroad; but it was not those friends, greatly helpful as they were, who settled the issue.

The factor that won them their victory was the will to win of the individual soldier. He knew that for which he was fighting, and quietly and soberly, he was willing to die for it if need be. And before he died, he was determined to fight.

This, if I may venture a guess, was the factor which gave the Jewish leaders faith on that memorable May day in 1948 when they made their decision to be brave leaders rather than shrewd calculators. It appears now that almost everyone else was wrong, but that they were not.

The occurrence is similar to events which have taken place in the history of the United States. Before the two world wars the great powers of Europe were correctly informed about our ships and our tanks and our guns and our planes; they had accurate knowledge about our cotton and our wheat, and our oil; they knew exactly the number of men of military age as these were shown in the census reports. But they either had contempt for our manhood or else utterly failed to understand it. On no other basis can their unsuccessful attempts at European and world conquest be explained.

We cannot blame them, for it is indeed hard to understand what it is that makes a man a hero. During World War II, I witnessed unbelievable acts of bravery and saw young Americans advance into almost certain death. I asked myself at that time: "What is it that makes these men so brave?" They were surely not enthused by the tinsel slogans of some fanatical dictator; they were not hypnotized by any politician's words. They were brave because they had grown to manhood in a country in which the individual mattered, in which he was the master and not the servant of the state, a country in which their mothers, and their schools, and their religious leaders had taught them that it mattered greatly whether they behaved themselves or whether they did not; that it was a matter of the utmost importance

whether they were good men or bad men; that it was of the highest moment whether they were brave men or cowards. The thing that won the war for America and confounded all the estimates of these old nations of Europe, was the individual self-respect of the individual young men. What I have said about the United States must also be set down in the case of Israel. It was that individual self-respect, that belief in the dignity of man, that belief in the value of human personality that enabled them to win the day. [Applause.]

Of course it is more than enough to make every Jew feel proud of his heritage, and it is in all truth an event which causes deep satisfaction in the hearts of non-Jews who in whatever way they could, extended their help. In fact, you will, I know, forgive me for thinking at this moment, of my own grandfather who on May 3, 1922, almost exactly 27 years ago tonight, sponsored the Lodge resolution which expressed the support of the United States for the setting up of a Jewish national homeland, and which, we now realize, became the foundation of American policy. [Applause.]

And you will forgive me, perhaps, for saying that the great mobilization of opinion and support and sympathy which occurred here in the United States would not have occurred if it had not been for the man who is modestly sitting here behind me—Rabbi Silver. [Vigorous applause.]

I have seen a good deal in Washington, in the Senate, of people who are advocating causes of one kind or another, and I say to you in all sincerity and not because he is here, that Dr. Silver is in a class by himself! [Applause.] I do not say that simply because he is a dynamo of energy and highly intelligent and very honorable and reliable, because he is all of those things. And I don't just take off my hat to him because he is working 16 to 18 hours a day for this cause—you see him in the Capital, then you see him at the Republican National Convention, at Philadelphia, and probably at the Democratic National Convention too [applause and laughter] although I did not happen to see him there. [Laughter.] And I don't say it because he is working all the time, and he is either on a boat, on a plane, or coming or going. The reason I say that he is so unique is because he never for one second tries to advertise or exploit or in any way aggrandize himself. His mind was always on the cause, and he was constantly thinking of what was going to help the cause, and he is therefore a real illustration of the successful and happy man who submerges himself in something greater than himself. [Applause.]

To change the tone of my remarks a little bit, we may also view with approval, tempered perhaps with a few smiles, the international rush which is now under way to recognize the new Jewish state. Indeed it was not ever thus, but we may charitably say, "better late than never."

We now behold this people who are as old as antiquity and as modern as New York City, looking with its friends and neighbors, ahead into the future.

We look to the negotiations to conclude peace between Israel and Egypt, and Israel and Lebanon, and Israel, and Transjordan, and with all its Arab neighbors.

We look to the day which cannot be far off, when Israel will become the fifty-ninth nation among the members of the United Nations. [Applause.]

Major Eban has said that the State of Israel is the only nation which holds an international birth certificate from the United Nations, and that, he said, is something in the present political world of easy virtue. [Laughter.]

Israel looks forward to the development of its parliamentary democracy and to the perfection of its administration.

It contemplates great schemes of industrial and agricultural development which are absolutely essential if their country, which is not richly endowed by nature, shall be able to support its hard-working population. It looks forward to the fact that the development of Israel itself will have an improving effect on all the nations of the Middle East. The industry and the intelligence of the Jewish people will inevitably raise the standards of health and the standards of well-being for all people in that part of the world. [Applause.] The poverty, disease, illiteracy, and infant mortality which marks life for so many millions of people in the Near East may within the lifetime of us who are here this evening become a thing of the past.

These are a part of the glowing promise which the future holds.

And so I conclude: What has happened in Israel is not only good for the Jews and good for the people of the Near East and good for the United States, it is in all truth good for the whole human race, because in rising from the depths of despair and suffering in which they were flung, to these heights of unbelievable and constructive achievements, the Jews have demonstrated a degree of tough and unbeatable courage which is surely one of the traits which gives man his spiritual dignity and proves the value of human personality. [Applause.]

And so I say that all people, wherever they may be, who believe in the exalted nature of the human spirit will joyously celebrate this first anniversary of the Republic of Israel, and will hail the Jewish achievement as an inspiration and as an example to all of faltering humanity. [Vigorous applause and cheers.]

Proposed Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a compilation of facts and figures relative to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CVA FACTS

There has been a growing tendency during the past decade to adopt a defeatist attitude toward future development and opportunity. Pessimists say that our frontiers are gone and the old pioneering spirit has vanished from the present generation.

My State of Idaho and the entire Pacific Northwest refutes this philosophy entirely. There we have unlimited possibilities in many fields, awaiting only the decision of man to take advantage of them.

Powerful books by Vogt and Osborne have reemphasized the Malthusian theory of steadily increasing populations to feed and a steadily decreasing acreage of fertile soil to grow our food. They paint a gloomy picture of malnutrition and semistarvation facing the world. We feel that our region can take the lead in overcoming this threat by two forms of land development. First, in the Pacific Northwest we have millions of acres of arid land that can be brought under water, and this irrigated land would produce two or three times that of land dependent upon natural rainfall. Second, use of soil-conservation methods developed in recent years can save additional millions of fertile acres. All that is needed is a comprehensive plan to put these methods into operation.

This vast amount of prospective food production is only one of the resources awaiting development. The waters of the Columbia and its tributaries are capable of producing more than 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power; we have more than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber and 60 percent of its phosphate; and we have immense quantities of important minerals, including shale rock capable of producing oil commercially through synthetic methods now being perfected. Truly, this is the land of opportunity awaiting only proper development of these great natural resources. We have the land to provide opportunity for prosperous agriculture. We have the water resources, which can be developed by a system of multipurpose dams so that the enormous quantities of hydroelectric power generated can furnish the financial help needed to irrigate this new land at reasonable cost to the water users. It is no longer economically feasible to build a dam just for irrigation storage or one just for flood control or for power alone. Only by coordination and proper planning can we achieve all these purposes without waste of resources or money, through efficient multipurpose reservoirs combining reclamation, flood control, power, recreation, and countless other benefits.

WHY CVA?

Some people will say, "Why can this be achieved only through a CVA? Why can't it be done under the present system?" Here's why it is not being done, and cannot be done, without a Columbia Valley Administration.

Many different services and functions must be performed to secure this development. Husbanding existing farmland through soil-conservation practices and development of adequate sources of fertilizer, irrigating new lands through building of dams and canals, protection of fish and wildlife, conservation of our forests and range, hydroelectric power generation and transmission—all of these functions must be performed harmoniously and in relationship with each other. Money appropriated by Congress must be balanced among all the present agencies to insure a smooth, steady flow of needed funds. If one agency runs out of money for a particular function, or does not harmonize their activities with the other agencies, a lopsided program results and development is retarded. This is exactly what is happening now. To begin with, major Federal agencies concerned with water and land development in the Pacific Northwest are at odds with one another. The United States Corps of Engineers makes investigations and comes up with certain recommendations. The United States Bureau of Reclamation makes investigations and comes up with different recommendations. The Fish and Wildlife Service makes investigations and comes up with still a different set of recommendations. I need not continue such recital; the Members of

this Congress are not unaware of these conflicts. Thus, to begin with, we can't even get a coordinated plan, reflecting wise and truly comprehensive examination of all pertinent factors, of all values. What we get is a whole number of usually unrelated plans, which we must try to solve in a jigsaw-puzzle manner. Pretty costly jigsaw, I might add. Each time these separate investigations are made they cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then, to try to harmonize them, costs more tens of thousands of dollars. And then, all we have are patchwork programs.

Add to this tangled skein of divergent ideas and facts the individual, unrelated reception each program receives from departmental, presidential, and congressional budget and appropriation committees, and you have what can only be called a mess. The result would be ludicrous if it weren't a tragic demonstration of ineptitude and poor management organization. So it isn't surprising to have the Corps of Engineers recommend dams on the lower Columbia River area which run contrary in timing and scheduling with the plans of the Fish and Wildlife Service for the protection of the migratory-fish runs in that area. Or that the Corps of Engineers recommends a dam on the Snake River in the Hell's Canyon area which is quite different in location, costs, and scheduling from that similarly suggested by the Bureau of Reclamation. Or that the Bonneville Power Administration runs headlong into the Bureau of Reclamation on the marketing of power in Montana or southern Idaho.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Let me quote from the Hoover Commission report on the Department of the Interior. In this report the Commission recommends consolidation on a national scale of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration—the same three agencies that are consolidated on a regional basis under the CVA bill.

Here are some of the Hoover Commission findings, quoting directly from their report:

"DEFECTS IN ORGANIZATION OF WATER DEVELOPMENT AND USE

"There are glaring defects in the organization of these services in the Government.

"(a) There is no effective agency for the screening and review of proposed projects to determine their economic and social worth. There is no effective review of the timing of the undertaking of these projects in relation to the economic need or financial ability of the Nation to build them.

"(b) There is duplication and overlap of effort, and policy conflicts exist between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in construction of, and jurisdiction over, projects.

"(c) There is an inherent conflict between the most efficient operation of storage dams for the purpose of flood control and of dams used for the generation of hydroelectric power. Flood control requires empty storage space prior to the high-water season, the storage of water during the flood season, and the emptying of the dams during dry spells. The generation of hydroelectric power needs as nearly an even flow of water as is possible the year around. And the irrigation cycle, which requires storage of water in the winter months and its release in the summer, conflicts with the continuous flow of water required for electrical operation. As flood-control concepts are in the hands of one agency of the Government and power concepts in another, there is inevitable conflict of the highest importance in design and operation, which can be solved only by a consolidated administration.

"ELIMINATION OF DISASTROUS CONFLICTS AND OVERLAPS

"One of the major reasons for grouping these agencies into the Department of the Interior is the elimination of disastrously wasteful conflict.

"* * * The function of river development is a multiple purpose one, cutting across many of the unifunctional agencies. Experience has shown that parceling out river-development responsibilities among these functional agencies produces endless confusion and conflict. A plan for the development of a river basin cannot be devised by adding together the special studies and the separate recommendations of unifunctional agencies concerned respectively with navigation, flood control, irrigation, land drainage, pollution abatement, power development, domestic and industrial water supply, fishing, and recreation. These varied and sometimes conflicting purposes must be put together and integrated in a single plan of development. * * *

"Under conflicting laws, rival Federal agencies compete for taxpayer money in what often appear to be premature and unsound river-development projects, duplicating each other's surveys and bidding against each other for local support at national expense. * * *

"Enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1936 marked the beginning of a new era of administrative confusion. In that act primary responsibility for flood protection on the main streams was assigned to the Corps of Engineers, and in the upper watersheds to the Department of Agriculture. The most serious consequence from the standpoint of organization was not the division of flood-control responsibility between the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture, but the effect on relations between the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation. As the Corps' original responsibility for navigational improvements was expended to cover flood control and other purposes incidental or related to flood protective works, and the Bureau's original responsibility for irrigation was expanded to include other potential byproducts of irrigation structures, the one agency working upstream met the other coming down. Now we are witnessing the spectacle of both agencies contending for the authorization, construction, and operation of projects in the same river basins, for example in the Central Valley, Columbia, and Missouri Basins. * * *

"Division of responsibility means duplication of surveys and investigations. Elaborate basin-wide surveys and plans have been made in several instances by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, in addition to the comprehensive basin surveys made by the Federal Power Commission and the watershed surveys of the Department of Agriculture. * * *

"Jurisdictional jealousy is inevitable, and costly as well, so long as such organization separation is practiced. Friction therefrom operates as a perpetual drag on efficiency and as a stimulator of group and sectional competition for favor and undue influence. Without more inclusive operating units, plans are made which see only parts of the whole situation, and wasteful expenditure of funds results, while the total objective which might have been attained is only partly realized.

"No effective method has been found for reconciling conflicting opinions and programs.

"The interagency committees have failed to solve any important aspects of the problem * * * because the dominant members, the Corps and the Bureau, have been unwilling to permit interagency committees to settle their differences. The result has been neglect or avoidance by the committees of virtually all major areas of interagency conflict, and concentration instead on technical studies and publicity. * * *

"The development agencies sometimes compromise their differences. After sharp clashes over plans for the development of the Missouri Basin, the Corps and the Bureau announced complete agreement on the Pick-Sloan plan. Analysis of that plan reveals the fact that its contains many projects which previously had been subjected to devastating criticism by one or the other agency. The compromise consisted for the most part in a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other. The result is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious question in this case whether agreement between the two agencies is not more costly to the public than disagreement. * * *

"Each of the two major development agencies, the Corps and the Bureau, not unnaturally tries to stake out claims in advance of the other. Each completes its basin surveys as quickly as possible, and proposes its development plans for authorization. The Executive and the Congress are presented with conflicting proposals prepared by agencies with different water-use philosophies. The plans of the Corps of Engineers are built around navigation and flood-protection features, those of the Bureau of Reclamation around irrigation, with power development and other allied purposes given some consideration by both. Desirable though it would be, it is difficult to forestall authorization until thorough analysis has been made * * * once project plans are announced and publicized such powerful local pressures are usually generated that development cannot be postponed. Occasionally, however, interagency disputes have the opposite effect of retarding worth-while developments for many years, as in the case of the Kings River project in the Central Valley of California. * * *

"There is simply no escaping the fact that so long as the present overlapping of functions exists with respect to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Federal Power Commission, costly duplication, confusion, and competition are bound to result. It has been demonstrated time and again that neither by voluntary cooperation nor by executive coordination can the major conflicts be ironed out. * * *

"An example of duplication and conflict may be found in the plans for a project at Hell's Canyon, Idaho. These were duplicated at a cost very roughly estimated at about $250,000 each by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

"They differed in essential particulars of construction and by over $75,000,000 in cost of erection.

"We have pointed out the inherent conflict in use of reservoirs for flood control and their use for power or irrigation. The greatest power development requires the most even flow of water possible. The greatest flood prevention use is to empty reservoirs prior to the flood season and soon thereafter. With the Reclamation Service in control of one function of some reservoirs and the Army Corps of Engineers in charge of others, there can be only continued friction. The consolidation of these agencies is the only remedy."

There is a great deal more along the same line but these excerpts should show the need for reorganization. We propose to meet this need with a reorganization bill, and that is exactly what our CVA measure is—a reorganization bill that grants no additional powers but which reorganizes our agencies dealing with water resources and provides a plan for unified development of all resources. That is why we call this an Administration and not an Authority, since it does not have the powers of a TVA.

It takes the experience of the highly successful TVA and applies the regional principle to our Columbia Valley with the modifications necessary to meet the different conditions to be faced there. All the powers and functions essential to development already exist in our area, and we propose not to create any new powers, but only to unify and coordinate operations, as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

CONTINUITY OF CONSTRUCTION

A very important improvement over present procedure is provided for in the bill by assuring continuity of construction. All major projects would have to be authorized by Congress, but the Administration would then have contractual authority to complete the project in the quickest and most economical way. Present costly delays, occasioned by periodical lack of funds, awaiting the next fiscal or deficiency appropriation, will be eliminated. As an example, let's take the Lewiston Orchards project. This is a small project to rehabilitate a combination domestic water and irrigation system near Lewiston, Idaho, planned to be completed this calendar year at a total cost of $2,300,000. My reason for using this as an example is that I have just recently received a letter from the manager of the Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District, Mr. Walter Hereth, who says:

"We are very unhappy to learn that the Ice Harbor Dam program has been delayed, and that the appropriations for the Lewiston Orchards for the next fiscal year have been cut $40,500. The original request for $270,000 was what we needed to finish our small project. If the cut is not reinstated, we will have to ask for another deficiency appropriation. Again, if the $270,000 is not made available during the next fiscal year, we will have to continue paying the overhead of about $6,000 per month to maintain the Bureau of Reclamation office, plus the cost of shutting down the job and starting again. This one delay could cost us $50,000; and since these funds must all be repaid by the water users, you can see why we feel the cut of $40,500 is unnecessary and expensive."

If this one delay on a small project will cost $50,000, you can readily see the waste incurred in the entire construction program. This useless waste will be entirely eliminated under the CVA bill, and much earlier completion of projects at a much smaller cost will be assured.

BENEFITS OF TVA EXPERIENCE

It is extremely important that we profit from TVA experience in those matters that equally affect both valleys.

The New York Times, in a recent editorial entitled "TVA After 15 Years" summed up this experience as follows:

"Now we face the problems of other possible river authorities and they are not simple. What TVA has done is to show that they can be solved in a democratic way, with few or none of the evils of a centralized bureaucracy."

TVA has furnished an outstanding example of cooperation between Federal, State, local, public, and private agencies, organizations, and individuals. The TVA Board has developed and carried out its development programs in cooperation with all groups and people in the valley. We have written many home-rule and local-rights provisions in this bill in order to guarantee such cooperation in the Columbia Valley.

In the past, certain interests have circulated a great deal of misinformation about the TVA designed to make people of the Northwest believe that it supersedes State and local agencies, taking over their functions. Nothing could be further from the truth. We need only refer to statements of the governors of the seven Tennessee Valley States as published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"Gov. Prentice Cooper, of Tennessee: 'I can say that the rights of this State and its citizens, far from being restricted or violated by activities of this Federal agency, have been enlarged through enriched opportunities.'

"Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina: 'I am a strong believer in States' rights, but TVA has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State.'

"Gov. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., of Virginia: 'TVA operations in Virginia have not resulted in any encroachment on States' rights.'

"Gov. Simeon S. Willis, of Kentucky: 'There is no reason why TVA should not be able to operate without encroaching on States' rights. The idea underlying the regional valley authority is sound, and it is perfectly reasonable for State and Federal Governments to work together. * * *'

"Gov. Chauncey M. Sparks, of Alabama: 'Conducted as it has been conducted, with vision and regard for local agencies, it has made a tremendous contribution to public welfare.'

"Gov. Thomas L. Bailey, of Mississippi: 'I do not feel that the role played by this Federal agency in Mississippi has constituted any encroachment on our State rights.'

"Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia: 'The only complaint I have regarding TVA is that its influence has not permeated this State further. * * * There has been no encroachment on States' rights.' "

ANTI-CVA PROPAGANDA

Misinformation about both the TVA and the proposed CVA has been spread widely throughout my State of Idaho, with a continuous barrage of slick-paper propaganda, newspaper editorials, out-of-State speakers at meetings presenting only false arguments against CVA with no favorable testimony allowed, and formation of organizations devoted entirely to spreading this misleading and false propaganda. Special interests opposed to development of our region for the benefit of all the people follow shrewd and effective policies in disseminating their falsehoods. Persons in the employ of these corporations, or persons beholden to them through business and financial connections, are placed in key positions in these anti-development organizations. Through the efforts of this key group, many prominent citizens, entirely sincere but misled by the onesided propaganda barrage, are prevailed upon to join these groups and give them an air of respectability. We have no financial backing for a CVA that enables us to compete with this propaganda on even terms, but it is my hope that through the efforts of an expanding group of citizens who want to develop our State, we will gradually be able to present the true facts to the people and gain their full support for this measure.

WATER RIGHTS

I want to mention a few examples of their false propaganda. The main theme, and one which has been very effective among farmers, is that a Columbia Valley Administration would take away farmers' water rights. Anyone who has read the bill knows that this is not true, but we cannot expect busy farmers to secure and study copies of this measure. Consequently, I want to quote the exact words of the bill from the reclamation provisions, section 10 (a), which are as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) No provision for work of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Administration, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing in this act shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof: *Provided*, That the right to the use of water acquired for irrigation under the provisions of this act shall be appurtenant to the land irrigated, and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Administration to acquire property for its authorized purposes in the manner specified in section 6, subject to the conditions and limitations therein stated."

The only other reference to water rights is in the portion of section 6, mentioned above. This section contains the power of condemnation, now held by existing Federal agencies, but this power has been reduced and modified to make it entirely plain that water rights will be protected. The condemnation power is exactly the same as given to the Bureau of Reclamation by the Reclamation Act of 1902, with the addition of the following language in section 6 of the CVA bill:

"*Provided, however*, That the Administration shall have no power to condemn any water right except as it may be appurtenant to land acquired incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, or other projects or facilities."

In other words, the bill says, "Water rights are covered by State law and the CVA will not touch them." If any land is acquired by the Administration for a dam or similar purpose, of course the water right on the land purchased goes with it. This is the only possible way a water right can be purchased, secured, or affected by the CVA. I don't see how a flat guaranty of water rights can be stated any plainer.

MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS

I have on my desk a pamphlet that has been sent to every organization in Idaho, as well as many individuals, listing the addresses of Idaho's congressional delegation and urging that resolutions opposing CVA be sent to them. Why should they oppose CVA? What reasons are given for justifying this demand? Here are the reasons given in this propaganda hand-out—reasons stated as facts—and I quote:

"Their control over the natural resources of Idaho, including water rights, would be almost unlimited."

This statement is ridiculous on the face of it, since we have already seen that the Administration would possess no more power than is now held by existing Federal agencies and will have no power at all over water rights. The remaining arguments are also devoted to water rights, with the statments being made that CVA can condemn all water rights and it would transfer exclusive jurisdiction over Idaho water rights to the Federal court at Portland. Anyone who has read the bill knows that water rights are declared to be subject only to State laws, and the Administration is specifically bound by this doctrine of the sole jurisdiction on water rights resting with the States. This is a fair sample of the propaganda that is being used to combat a CVA. Our Idaho newspapers in general are following the same path of misinformation. Let me quote why the Twins Falls Times-News urges its readers to oppose a CVA in its issue of April 14, 1949:

"We should bear in mind that the CVA would have the right of eminent domain, could nullify provisions of the Idaho constitution and admission act which give Idaho

control of waters of the State; could condemn a water right; could deny water to a farm; could build and operate competitive lumber mills, fertilizer plants and other factories; could go into any kind of business it deemed necessary; could regulate grazing lands; could take over control and development of the natural resources of the State and the region.

"Or, in the words of Judge Stone of Denver, nationally known authority on reclamation law:

" 'CVA would have full power to claim water for its projects under the broad authority by the bill,' and 'through its power of eminent domain for the condemnation of all types of property, it could acquire any vested rights acquired under State laws.'

"That's a lot of power to be taken out of our hands and turned over to the Federal Government without recourse."

There is no resemblance between these statements and the provisions of this bill. Even the quotation from their "nationally known authority on reclamation law" is absolutely false. Incidentally, who is this Judge Stone, whose words seem to carry more weight with the Times-News than do the facts? This is Clifford F. Stone of Denver, who writes anti-TVA propaganda pieces for the Coordinating Committee of 31 National and Regional Land and Water Organizations. This group is closely connected with the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee, and both organizations had, and possibly still have, space in the same Washington office which was also occupied by E. W. Rising, Washington representative for Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., a large firm of contractors with headquarters in Boise, Idaho. Incidentally, this firm does practically all of the construction work contracted by the Idaho Power Co. This Coordinating Committee of 31 National and Regional Land and Water Organizations includes such agencies as the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, a group that obviously is opposed to development of hydroelectric power. This leads us into a very interesting area, one that was thoroughly exposed by Senator HILL of Alabama in the Senate on June 18, 1946. Here is a portion of what the Senior Senator from Alabama said:

"The story of TVA is a story of growth and development of a partnership between the people of a region and their Federal Government. It is a story of which every American can feel proud. By many leaders, both at home and in many foreign lands, it is regarded as an example of the best evidence that a democracy will work, an example of achievement within a framework of freedom.

"This is the story which the Power Trust and its willing henchmen know they must suppress at all costs. To this end their mimeograph machines and presses have been busy—those of the Edison Electric Institute; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; the National Association of Electric Companies; the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee; the 31 national and regional land and water organizations—which includes the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange and the Trinity Improvement Association; the Mississippi Valley Association; the Economic Research and Service Bureau; the National Reclamation Association; the National Tax Equality Association, and even a nationally known publishing firm. From these sources have spewed phony research reports, studies, memoranda, speeches, and even a novel containing undigested and recognizable lumps of Power Trust propaganda.

"All this spew of words professes to discuss the TVA and what it means to the Nation or to various regions. But, when reading this material, one who knows the facts about TVA finds himself in a never-never land of unreality. He learns that TVA multiple purpose dams, which are doing such a marvelous job today, cannot possibly work. He finds that the sole purpose for building them was to drown out farmer Jones' corn crop. He finds page after page of tables, charts, and text in which tax and financial figures are garbled into nonsense. He finds legal contentions solemnly advanced without reference to the fact that they have already been disposed of by the courts. He is told that TVA is a superstate, superstate, superstate, contrary to what the people of the valley know. He finds the smear words 'Communist,' 'Socialist,' 'Fascist,' 'totalitarian,' tossed recklessly about.

"Big money is being spent to prepare, print, and distribute this balderdash. Where does it come from, and why? I propose to find out."

POWER TRUST PROPAGANDA

Senator HILL then tells of the National Electric Light Association, a power-trust propaganda outfit that was replaced by the Edison Electric Institute after its exposé by the Federal Trade Commission. I quote further:

"The EEI itself has taken on some of NELA's discredited activities. For example, let me pick up a current propaganda threat from the EEI. See if it is not reminiscent of NELA days. In February 1944 the EEI put out a 56-page mimeographed tract called An Appraisal of Tennessee Valley Authority, ostensibly only for distribution to EEI members. Of course, it was not an appraisal, but an attack.

"It juggled figures. It discussed flood control in terms of the ancient testimony of power-company engineers, who claimed, in defiance of the records of more than 70 years, that major floods could occur in the Tennessee Valley at any time during the year—testimony which had already been weighed and discarded by the courts. It contained a table attempting to relate TVA payments in lieu of taxes to TVA's total investment, including flood control, navigation, chemical plant, general plant, and even construction in progress, although only its power investment was purportedly under discussion. The computation of the property taxes it claimed TVA should have paid on its facilities included part of the investment in navigation and flood control. To compare TVA taxes with those of utilities, it devised a formula which was based on kilowatt-hour sales, ignoring the fact that almost all TVA power is sold at wholesale. Obviously, it does not produce the same revenues per kilowatt-hour as do the sales of power by private utilities to ultimate consumers at high rates. After inflating TVA power investment by the inclusion of navigation and flood-control facilities, it calculated interest at 4 percent, in spite of the fact that utility companies were then refinancing at much less than that and that the cost of money to the Government was only half that amount. These were the devices EEI stooped to in order to charge TVA with a 'loss' on power operations.

"No two organizations, no two men, could compound so many errors independently. Yet, early in 1945 comes one E. W. Rising, an attorney, of Boise, Idaho, who prepared a 14-page TVA brief, ostensibly on his own initiative, from 'information available to me,' as he expressed it—TVA brief, by Rising. But where did the 'information available' come from? We find that the Rising 'brief' turns out to be based almost entirely upon the EEI tract 'appraising' the TVA, even to the lifting of language verbatim. The same table appears attempting to relate TVA payments in lieu of taxes on power operations to its total fixed assets, including navigation and flood-control facilities, chemical plant, general plant, and construction in progress. The same misleading reference to the flood-control testimony of utility engineers is found in the Rising brief, and again TVA's experimental development and manufacture of high-analysis phosphates is described as a 'loss.' Tens of thousands of farmers and the leading agricultural specialists of the country would call that activity pure gain, but the private utilities have never betrayed any interest in farmers or the Nation's soil.

"With variations, Rising applies the EEI formula for calculating the taxes the utilities would charge against the TVA, again ignoring the fact that TVA's power-generating system is not comparable to the generating and distribution systems of private utilities. And finally, by such means having produced an illusory 'deficit,' Rising indulges in the priceless whimsy of adding to TVA's bill another $10,000,000 as an estimate of Federal income and excess-profits taxes which he says should be paid on an income that he claims does not exist. This rehash of power-trust propaganda was circulated in the West by the opponents of MVA, CVA, and other valley developments, notably by F. O. Hagie, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association—Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, February 16, 1945—an organization which is reported to be dominated by utility, railroad, and contracting interests.

"Apparently encouraged by his local success, we find Rising packing his propaganda tracts in his brief case and heading east. In Chicago, in September 1944, there had been formed the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee, apparently at the suggestion of the National Reclamation Association, managed by Hagie. (Peter Edson, NEA columnist, in Florence (Ala.) Times, July 19, 1945.) In April 1945 another group appeared. A new joint water lobby to oppose creation of more valley authorities like TVA, consisting of 31 national and regional land and water organizations, announced its creation. (Peter Edson, NEA, Washington (D. C.) News, July 16, 1945.) One of the early exploits of this water lobby was to publish the Authority Issue, by Clifford F. Stone in collaboration with other national authorities on land and water subjects, a booklet which, after rehashing much of the propaganda against TVA, attempts to reopen the constitutional issue which was long ago settled by the courts.

"These organizations have moved on Washington now, and here we find E. W. Rising, who got his start rewriting power-trust propaganda. Rising is both finance officer of the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee and member of the coordinating committee of the 31 national and regional land and water organizations. (The Authority Issue, by Clifford F. Stone and others, published by 31 national and regional land and water organizations.) Both these organizations are snuggled together in the same offices at 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C. From these offices are distributed all sorts of misleading propaganda documents against TVA. (This Is Your Job, bibliography of anti-TVA propaganda, published by 31 National and Regional Land and Water Organizations, 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C., including Rising's original Power Trust brief, which was in itself a rewrite of the EEI's appraisal.)"

Senator HILL gives a great deal more information on these and associated Power Trust organizations, such as the National Association of Electric Companies, that are actively opposing all development programs. I have quoted only a small portion of the evidence in order to show the nature of the opposition.

As I stated previously, such persons and such organizations are the base of anti-CVA organizations. Their false propaganda wins over respectable, prominent citizens who have been led to believe that their business or their water rights will be taken from them

by a Columbia Valley Administration. I have every confidence that members of this latter group will join with us in advocating passage of this bill. All that is needed is for the true facts to be presented to them, and I am confident that this can be done through volunteer organizations of public-spirited citizens working for development of our great State.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the most important matter before our National Government today is our national defense. When the House of Representatives approved the construction of the proposed supercarrier for and on the recommendation of the Navy, it seems to me that no branch of the Government should abandon the project without full hearings before Congress and explanations to Congress. No greater mistake could be made than to assume that we can be prepared to fight any possible wars of the future with only the weapons of the past. I take this opportunity to request the House Committee on Armed Services to schedule full hearings on the question of the proposed naval carrier to ascertain whether or not it is in the best interest of our country to complete the construction of this vessel. On the basis of all the facts that I have been able to discover so far, it is my personal present belief that the request of the Navy for this project should be approved and construction speeded. The naval air power and the marines, so valuable to our defense, should not be allowed to wither on the vine. To allow that would be to invite disaster. I wish to include an article from the May 6, 1949, issue of United States News and World Report as follows:

HOW TO LOSE A WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Wars are won or lost at the planning stage—in the years that precede the actual combat.

Hermann Goering insisted on unification of all armed services in Germany and on domination of the whole military establishment by his air force. To the cries of the German Navy for a fleet and for better submarines, he turned a deaf ear.

It was the failure to get control of the seas which defeated Germany. For otherwise the fuel and the supplies needed to support America's huge expeditionary forces could not have been safely transported across the ocean.

It was the inability, in particular, of German seapower to cross the English Channel which saved Britain from invasion in 1940.

In the Pacific, it was Japanese carrier aviation that swept down through the Philippines and on to Singapore almost unresisted.

Naval carriers swept down on Pearl Harbor.

Japanese naval aviation had full control for nearly 2 years thereafter, and the American flag came down in many outposts in a series of heartrending defeats.

It was not until naval aviation was built up that the American Navy won back the whole Pacific and carried the fight to the shores of Japan itself. It was a costly campaign—thousands of American boys were sacrificed because of a blunder in our naval policy in the twenties and early thirties.

Without bases at Guam and Saipan and Iwo Jima and Okinawa—taken primarily by United States Navy carriers and the Marines—the big land-based bombers of the Army Air Force could not have dropped a bomb on Hiroshima.

BRITAIN'S LESSON

Great Britain likewise suffered because she neglected carrier aviation. Thinking only in terms of land defense, the British gave the Royal Air Force complete command of air power, and it didn't develop naval aviation. As a result, serious losses were incurred. The Royal Air Force had no training in operations above the seas against naval vessels. It had no effective training in antisubmarine warfare. It allowed the two German battleships, *Gneisenau* and *Scharnhorst*, to steal through the English Channel at a critical moment because the Royal Air Force was not trained to ward off such operations.

The British Government finally admitted neglect and gave its navy the air arm it had clamored for. The British Navy then had to go to school in the Pacific. In 1945 its first carrier task force was made a part of our carrier fleet. Only during wartime could the British naval arm learn what had been neglected before 1939. This was too late.

SCUTTLING THE CARRIER NAVY

Today history is repeating itself. Advocates of a concentration of effort on only one method of warfare are in the ascendancy in Washington as they were in Berlin, London, and Tokyo before 1939.

The naval arm of the United States is in peril. So also is amphibious warfare as developed and perfected by our Marine Corps.

One of the greatest military organizations of all times—the carrier Navy and the Marines of the United States—is in danger of disruption.

The process is a simple one. Control of funds means control of what weapons shall be developed.

Without consulting the Chief of Naval Operations and without giving the Secretary of Navy the hearing he pleaded for, the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson—acting with the approval of President Truman—canceled the construction funds of the Navy for its new carrier. Previously Mr. Truman had twice authorized the building of the new carrier, and so had Congress on two occasions.

In public protest, John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy, resigned last week. It was a courageous act, comparable to the valor of Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden in their protest against wrong policy in Britain.

A carrier navy is the only kind of navy needed today. It's naval air, plus submarines for offense and defense, that makes a navy. The carrier, of course, does not proceed alone. It is part of a task force protected by other warships with antiaircraft batteries and radar to detect the approach of enemy planes and submarines.

A carrier Navy gives us mobile bases, thus making it unnecessary for America to be at the mercy always of European politicians. It is inexpensive insurance against the possibility that land bases might suddenly be wrested from present control by Communist infiltration into European governments before a war begins.

A carrier Navy can furnish bases in any of the seven oceans where wars are fought in modern times. We will need such mobile bases in the next war, particularly for use in the Indian Ocean and in and around the Persian Gulf and in the Mediterranean to protect our bases in North Africa.

A carrier Navy was never intended to do the job of strategic bombing. This was well done by the Army Air Corps in the last war. Strategic bombing should be the primary function of the Air Force. That is what the Key West agreement said. But it also said that there was no reason why the Air Force should not be given assistance from the naval arm and that this would be an important part of our operations.

A carrier Navy hunts down submarines and protects the supply line of a land-based Air Force.

A carrier Navy bombs shore installations where submarines are concentrated and drops mines in narrow straits and passages inland through which submarines must pass on their way to the seas.

Mine operations are a technical business in which the Navy has spent long years of experimentation.

FIGHT OVER 100 FEET

The new carrier was to have been only 100 feet longer and 30 feet wider than carriers now in the fleet. Yet this change in dimensions meant that our naval aviators could go 1,700 miles and come back to the same ships, instead of going out only 900 miles. This added range meant not only increased efficiency in dropping mines but it also meant protection for the carrier fleet against the land-based aviation of the enemy.

The new carrier called for a kind of construction which would make it unsinkable. Security regulations prevent disclosure of details, but it can be stated positively that no submarine operation known today could sink the new carrier. It would carry its own protection against air attack, too. It should be remembered that no big or fast carrier of the United States Navy was sunk from the air or by submarine in the last war.

The cost of the new carrier is relatively small—the equivalent of the cost of two battleships at 1944 prices. The upkeep expense would be no more than that of any other large ship. The carrier planes themselves would have cost lots of money, but the Navy was willing to sacrifice other parts of its program to build its new carrier.

WEAKENING OUR DEFENSE

This, however, isn't the real point. It isn't merely the desire of the Navy to build a particular type of ship that is the heart of the controversy. The basic principle at issue is whether the Navy can run the Navy and the Air Force can run the Air Force and the Army can run the Army.

Today the veto of what one service shall do is held by the other two services in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is a grave mistake.

The first principle looking toward a sensible solution of all this is to insist that the strategy of the war be decided by the three armed services in collaboration in the future as has been the case in the past. This really has been accomplished already by the unanimous agreement reached at Key West last year by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In that agreement missions were specifically outlined and everybody agreed as to their meaning. Now that agreement has been torn to shreds.

The next principle is to permit each service to be the judge of what tools it needs to carry out its missions.

Once a lump-sum budget for each service is approved by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Budget, the technicians of each service should decide for themselves how to use to best advantage the money allotted.

To allow the Secretary of Defense to decide technical issues of armament could

weaken America's defense. One-man decisions have weakened the arms programs of other countries in the past. It has already done so for America. It's the way to lose a war.

The Basing-Point System and the Federal Government—Cement Bids Over the Years Show Identical Prices—Big Business Expects To Use Moratorium in Monopoly Drive—Congress Must Protect Small Business and Free Enterprise; Monopoly Must Not Be Given a Green Light by Congress To Continue After Being Outlawed by the Supreme Court

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the basing-point system of pricing, as practiced by the cement industry, operated with the same precision on purchases by the Federal Government as it did in purchases by State governments and by dealers, contractors, and anyone else who purchased cement. Identical bid prices over the years were as uniform on bids to the Federal Government as to any one other purchaser of cement. Millions upon millions of barrels of cement have been used by the Federal Government on construction projects by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Reclamation Service, the Army engineers in flood-control projects, the Navy in docks and wharfs, and in fact in all of the far-flung activities our Government undertakes in the interest of public welfare and safety.

ANY DIFFERENCES IN CEMENT BIDS PURELY COINCIDENTAL

Today I summarize several different abstracts of bids to the Federal Government showing absolute identity of prices with one exception. The one deviation which occurred in all these bids appeared to have stemmed from an unintentional error made by one bidder in applying the basing-point formula, since his bid was fractionally above the basing-point price. These abstracts will show the continuing effectiveness of the system, over the years, in producing identity of bids.

In 1934 the Tennessee Valley Authority opened bids on a large quantity of cement for shipment to four destinations. Bidders with plants as far away as Cape Girardeau, Mo., and Clinchfield, Ga., as well as others in nearby Tennessee, northern Georgia, and Alabama submitted bids to the Tennessee Valley Authority which were identical for each destination to the fourth decimal place as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Abstract of bids for shipments to Tennessee Valley Authority on bids opened Oct. 15, 1934. (200,000 to 800,000 barrels or partial quantity at Coal Creek, Tenn.; 100,000 to 700,000 barrels or partial quantity at Wheeler Dam, Tenn.; 100,000 to 700,000 barrels or partial quantity at Wheeler Dam, Tenn.; 100,000 to 700,000 barrels or partial quantity at Sheffield, Ala.)*

Bidders	Plants nearest to destination	Coal Creek, Tenn.	Wheeler contractor	Wheeler Authority	Sheffield, Ala.
1. Alpha Portland Cement Co	Phoenixville, Ala	----------	$1.8798	$1.8398	$1.7008
2. Universal Atlas Cement Co	Leeds, Ala	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
3. Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co	Cape Girardeau, Mo	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
4. Lehigh Portland Cement Co	Birmingham, Ala	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
5. Hermitage Portland Cement Co	Nashville, Tenn	$1.7384	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
6. Cumberland Portland Cement Co	Cowan, Tenn	1.7384	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
7. Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co	Chattanooga, Tenn	1.7384	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
8. Lone Star Cement Co	Birmingham, Ala	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
9. National Cement Co	Ragland, Ala	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
10. Georgia Cement & Products Co	Portland, Ga	----------	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
11. Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp	Kingsport, Tenn. / Richard City, Tenn.	1.7384	1.8798	1.8398	1.7008
12. Volunteer Portland Cement Co	Caswell, Tenn	1.7384	----------	----------	----------

All bids subject to 10 cents per barrel discount for payment in 15 days.

BASING-POINT BIDS BETWEEN YEARS 1934 AND 1947 SHOW SAME IDENTITY OF PRICES

Whether the bids for cement were for large or small quantities, the basing-point system operated with the same perfection. The abstract of bids in Table No. 1 represents a tremendous quantity of cement. The following tables of bids received by the Tennessee Valley Authority during the year 1947 were for relatively small quantities of cement. However, the prices at destination, as you will see, show the same identity in pricing as existed in 1934. The tables follow:

TABLE 2.—*250 barrels of cement for Cherokee project, f. o. b. cars, Jefferson City, Tenn.*

(Bids opened Jan. 24, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	$2.59	10 cents per barrel—15 days.
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	2.59	Do.
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division.	2.59	Do.
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	2.59	Do.
Volunteer Portland Cement Co.	2.59	Do.

Awarded to Hermitage Portland Cement Co. by drawing between equally low bidders.

TABLE 3.—*1,500 barrels of cement for Kentucky project, f. o. b. Gilbertsville, Ky.*

(Bids opened Feb. 14, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	$2.81	10 cents per barrel—15 days.
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	2.81	Net.
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	2.81	10 cents per barrel—15 days.

Awarded by drawing between equally low bidders to the Cumberland Portland Cement Co.

TABLE 4.—*1,500 barrels of cement for Chemical Engineering Division, f. o. b. cars, Sheffield, Ala.*

(Bids opened Feb. 14, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms
Universal Atlas Cement Co.	$2.67	10 cents per barrel—15 days.
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	2.67	Do.
Lone Star Cement Corp.	2.67	Do.
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	2.67	Do.
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	2.67	Do.

Awarded to Cumberland Portland Cement Co. as the only bidder offering firm price.

TABLE 5.—*500 barrels of cement for Cherokee project, f. o. b. cars, Jefferson City, Tenn.*

(Bids opened Apr. 24, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division.	$2.59	Net.
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	2.59	10 cents per barrel—15 days.
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	2.59	Do.
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	2.59	Do.
Volunteer Portland Cement Co.	2.59	Do.

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

TABLE 6.—*500 barrels of cement for Construction and Maintenance Division, Knoxville, f. o. b. cars, Knoxville, Tenn.*

(Bids opened May 7, 1947)

	Price per barrel	Discount terms
Volunteer Portland Cement Co.	2.60	10 cents per barrel—15 days.
Lone Star Cement Corp.	2.60	Do.
Hermitage Portland Cement Co.	2.60	Do.
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp.	2.60	Do.
Cumberland Portland Cement Co.	2.60	Do.
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Division.	2.60	Do.
Universal Atlas Cement Co.	2.29	Do.

Awarded to Volunteer Portland Cement Co. because their bid was most advantageous to the Authority.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM AND THE FORT PECK, MONT., PROJECT

The great Fort Peck Dam, located on the Missouri River, designed to furnish electric power for the great Northwest, has required in its building millions of barrels of cement. Prior to the Supreme

Court decision in the Cement case, April 26, 1948, bids on cement for the Fort Peck project produced prices that were identical to the fourth decimal place. One such bid follows:

TABLE 7.—*Abstract of bids on 600,000 barrels of cement in bulk, and 10,000 barrels in paper, received by the Army engineers for the Fort Peck (Mont.) Dam in 1935*

Name of bidder and plants nearest shipping point	Price destination	
	Bulk, per barrel	Paper, per barrel
Universal-Atlas Portland Cement Co., Duluth, Minn	$2.5054	$2.7145
Huron Portland Cement Co., Alpena, Mich	2.5054	2.7145
Three Forks Portland Cement Co., Trident, Mont	2.5054	2.7145

THE BASING POINT IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Cement Trust in the operation of the basing-point system is no respecter of persons. The Navy buys cement and on bids received by the Navy Department at Brooklyn, N. Y., opened May 29, 1946, for 8,000 barrels of cement, destination Brooklyn, N. Y., on 18 bids received, were identical as follows:

TABLE 8

Name of bidder	Price per barrel	Name of bidder	Price per barrel
Allentown Portland Cement Co.	$2.43	Lone Star (New York)	$2.43
Alpha	2.43	National	2.43
Coplay	2.43	Nazareth	2.43
Edison	2.43	North American	2.43
Giant	2.43	Pennsylvania-Dixie	2.43
Hercules	2.43	Standard Lime & Stone	2.43
Keystone	2.43	Universal	2.43
Lawrence	2.43	Vulcanite	2.43
Lehigh	2.43	Whitehall	2.43

THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM AND THE BUREAU OF PRISONS

The operation of the basing-point system was perfection itself; however, even the Cement Trust, which operated the system, could not maintain a batting average of 1,000 because an occasional weak batter would appear in the basing-point batter's box. On a small order of 1,000 barrels of cement for the Leavenworth Penitentiary on which bids were submitted in September 1935, seven of the bidders batted a thousand, but the eighth one struck out by bidding a price which was 0.5856, ten-thousandths of a cent per barrel higher than the other prices. I feel sure the basing-point player had a tough time explaining to the coach how this happened. The table showing this grievous error follows:

TABLE 9

Name of bidder	Price per barrel	Name of bidder	Price per barrel
Universal	$2.163424	Lehigh	$2.163424
Ash Grove	2.163424	Monarch	2.163424
Missouri	2.163424	Dewey	2.163424
Lone Star	2.163424	Consolidated	2.175280

All bids subject to 10-cent discount per barrel for payment in 15 days.

THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM AND THE FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

The basing-point system of pricing was as effective on bids to the Army engineers for flood control as it was on bids for other Federal projects. The following abstract of bids received by the United States engineers office, Vicksburg, Miss., is of special interest because the invitation called for bids two ways, namely: First, on commercial bills of lading, freight prepaid to destination at Monroe, La., and second, on Government bills of lading with the Government paying the freight on basis of land grant freight rates to the same destination, Monroe, La. The bids showing total value at destination on each of the two methods of bidding resulted in the same identity of prices because of the perfect observance of the basing-point system by each and every bidder. The table follows:

TABLE 10

Name of bidder	Destination cost on Government bills of lading f. o. b. Monroe, La.	F. o. b. local switch, Missouri Pacific R. R., Monroe, La.
Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corp	$2,772	$3,060
Arkansas Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Universal-Atlas Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Cumberland Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Trinity Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Alpha Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Lone Star Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Monarch Cement Co	2,772	3,060
National Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Consolidated Cement Co	2,772	(1)
Volunteer Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060
Georgia Cement & Products Co	2,772	3,060
Hermitage Portland Cement Co	2,772	3,060

[1] No bid.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM PRODUCES AUTOMATIC IDENTITY OF PRICES

These abstracts amply prove that the basing-point system automatically produces such identity of prices as to reduce the basis for awarding supply contracts to award by lot. Neither distance, nor method, nor cost of transportation, nor differences in efficiency and cost of production, nor number of bidders, produces any differences in prices bid.

The Supreme Court in the Cement case decision referred to the basing-point system as a "handy instrument." The 6-to-1 decision of our Supreme Court effectively outlawed the basing-point system after many years of consideration by the Federal Trade Commission and additional consideration by the circuit court of appeals. The identity of prices produced through the use of the multiple-basing-point destination-price system absolutely defeated the Federal Government in its time-honored method of securing the lowest and best bid for commodities paid for with funds authorized by the Congress. The restraint exercised upon the occasional cement producer, who would have gone out and marketed his products on a competitive basis, was often in evidence during the operation of the basing-point system. The combination of cement producers which formed the Cement Trust exercised absolute power over the production of the sale and distribution of cement in the United States. For Congress to pass a moratorium bill, which even remotely permitted the return of the outlawed basing-point system, would be unthinkable.

THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM AND SMALL BUSINESS

I have previously demonstrated the identity of prices to small cement dealers in 20 cities in the United States. Quotations and sales to dealers were no different under the basing-point system than sales to the Federal Government or any other governmental agency. In the case of dealers the Cement Trust allowed practically no profit on carload shipments and on projects requiring a large quantity of cement. Dealers were excluded by the cement mills from submitting bids at the same price which the cement mills bid. Thus, a cement dealer became by custom a handy instrument for the distribution of small quantities of cement in less carload lots. The profit to a dealer on less carload shipments was so small in relation to the cost and handling of the product that dealers, in ordinary times, carried cement more for the convenience of their customers than to make a profit. If cement dealers had not had a variety of items in stock and had he had to depend on his cement sales, he would not have been in business very long. No dealer in cement expected a basic commodity to yield a large profit but through the operation of the basing-point system, which controlled the price and the markets, I doubt very much whether a dealer in cement could show a mark-up which produced more than the cost of handling and distribution.

CONGRESS REQUESTED TO STUDY PUBLIC RECORD AND VOTE AGAINST A MORATORIUM ON ANTITRUST LAWS

We must penetrate the disguises of group monopolies and protect whatever freedom of competition which may still exist in industry and trade instead of amending our antitrust laws by way of a moratorium, as powerful industry pressure groups are urging us to do; let us do the opposite and strengthen our basic charters of economic freedom. Let us protect and foster freedom in the market place and true competition through the only means available—our antitrust laws.

I appeal to my fellow Members of the Congress to study the public record and decide for themselves whether or not we should, in the name of the people, take the risk involved in the passage of a moratorium bill. The public press has contained articles which clearly point out the attitude of big business toward a moratorium of our antitrust laws. Big business expects to use any moratorium, no matter what it says, to climb back into its diamond-studded, solid gold carriage and again drive roughshod over

all competition toward its goal of absolute monopoly. Small business and free enterprise walk hand in hand contemplating the future with outward calm but inward qualms. These twins of our economy must be protected from the onslaught of price- and market-control mechanisms. In the words of the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1949—

The vigor of small business is of topmost importance in a nation that prides itself on the existence of free enterprise. Whether small enterprise can survive in the presence of industrial giants or merchandising chains has been warmly debated in the United States.

I hope that the Congress will not enter the debate on the negative side of weakening our antitrust laws but will array itself on the positive side of the question of strengthening our antitrust laws. Small business and free enterprise must survive, and we, as the legislative body of the Government, are in the best position to see to it that these twins of economic freedom do survive.

Slum Clearance and Public Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the testimony submitted by Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, chairman of the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, on H. R. 4009, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on May 6, 1949:

My name is Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. I am mayor of Baltimore and chairman of the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, the membership of which comprises practically all of the larger cities of the Nation. Approximately 60,000,000 American people live in the cities represented in our organization.

I am appearing before this committee to record the support of the United States Conference of Mayors for H. R. 4009. The Conference of Mayors has had a consistent record of support for a broad slum-clearance and public-housing program. As early as 1935 it took affirmative action in support of a national public-housing program. Each of our annual conferences since 1937 has gone on record in favor of an expanded public-housing program. We vigorously backed S. 866 in the Eightieth Congress.

My own interest in the problems created by bad housing and slums precedes my connection with the United States Conference of Mayors. The city in which I was born and grew up, and of which I am now mayor, has slum areas as bad as any in the country and I have long realized the need for remedial action. During my nearly 10 years in Congress, I was further impressed with the fact that bad housing is not confined to a few large cities but exists in practically all urban areas, and in many rural sections as well. The need for action is Nation-wide.

Earlier this year I had the privilege of appearing, on behalf of the conference of mayors, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in support of S. 138, which subsequently became S. 1070, the housing bill which has just been overwhelmingly approved in the Senate. Since H. R. 4009 corresponds very closely with the Senate bill, my remarks today will necessarily be similar to the statement I made before the Senate committee.

There is probably no single group which is more aware of all the ramifications of the housing and slum-clearance problem than the Nation's mayors. In the last few years our offices have been besieged by distressed citizens pleading for assistance in finding homes for their families. We know of the disrupting effect of the housing shortage upon normal family life, of the families which have broken up, of the children who have had no proper homes during their growing years, and of the marriages which have had to be postponed.

The post-war housing shortage has made the headlines but it is only one aspect of the problem. The evil effects of our slums and blighted areas are more basic than a temporary shortage, and have long been a major concern to the Nation's mayors. We are familiar with the toll that these areas have taken as breeders of crime and disease, and the price paid in warped and twisted lives. Through studies made by various city agencies we have learned of the excessive municipal costs in these areas for public health, fire protection, police protection, and similar services. You have undoubtedly heard the figures which have been collected to prove these points and I will not take your time to cite them again.

The Nation's mayors have been the closest observers of past efforts to remedy these conditions. We know that private enterprise is unable to touch the housing needs of our low-income families despite the notoriously inaccurate claims of certain selfish interests. Private enterprise has not been able to handle this problem in the past and there is no evidence that it would be more successful in the future. If private enterprise could do what has been claimed for it by some who indicate that they are representing the building interests, we would not now have any slums. I do not blame private enterprise for this, but I do blame the exaggerated claims made by the real-estate lobby.

The mayors of this country are completely convinced that public low-rent housing is the only means of providing decent housing for our low-income families. Let me quote you some very impressive figures on this point. Last year a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Housing under Senator WAGNER sent questionnaires to all governors, all mayors of cities over 50,000, and to a number of prominent citizens. Here are some of the results:

1. Practically all of the mayors replying reported that their cities contained a substantial number of low-income families living in slums or other substandard housing conditions.

2. Nine out of ten mayors agreed that within the foreseeable future private enterprise could not provide decent housing, new or old, for these low-income families at rents or costs they could afford.

3. On the other hand, 93 percent of the mayors of cities with existing low-rent public housing reported that these projects, to the extent that they had been provided, were adequately serving low-income families. All said that they had been built and operated efficiently, and that conditions of health, delinquency, and crime had been improved. More than five-sixths of them thought that the cost of city services in the neighborhoods had been reduced and real-estate values increased. All agreed that the projects are not presently competitive with private housing of acceptable standards, and only one mayor indicated that the projects had ever presented any such competition.

4. Sixty-seven out of seventy mayors favored continuation of Federal assistance to local communities in providing public low-rent housing.

This last figure is, I think, really amazing. If any of the charges which have been made against public housing were at all true, certainly the mayors would know, since they have seen public housing operate at close range. If these charges were true there would have been many more mayors opposed to a continuation of the program than a mere 3 out of 70. I can think of no other public issue which could command such complete agreement among mayors.

I have mentioned the charges which have been made against public housing. Let me dispose of a few of them briefly.

It has been alleged that public housing is not serving low-income families and that many upper-income families are residing in public low-rent housing projects. It is true that in the period after the war there were a number of families whose incomes exceeded the limits for continued occupancy. This was primarily due to the fact that during the war a number of projects were diverted from their original purpose and were used to house war workers regardless of income. This diversion was, of course, authorized by Congress. When the war was over these projects reverted to their low-rent status, but it was impossible immediately to remove the over-income families due to the housing shortage. These families have, however, been removed as fast as local circumstances permitted.

In Baltimore, for example, the program for removing over-income families started in May 1947. We have about 5,000 low-rent dwellings in Baltimore, and at that time about 1,000 families were over the limits for continued occupancy. A certain proportion moved out each month, but even so the number continued to rise to a peak of 1,200 in February 1948, since this was a period of rising incomes and additional families became ineligible. Now, however, I am informed by the Housing Authority of Baltimore that, as of the end of March of this year, there were only 416 ineligible families in our low-rent projects, and that even these could hardly be regarded as upper income. The median income of these 416 over-income families was only $2,874 per year. The average annual income of all 5,000 families in our low-rent projects (including the ineligible families) was only $1,742 as of the end of 1948. Furthermore, the average income of all the new families who moved into our low-rent public housing during the year 1948 was only $1,410 per year. I'll leave it to your imaginations to figure out how a family can be raised on such incomes at today's prices.

It has also been claimed that public housing is not needed in order to get rid of our slums. Slum conditions, it is said, could be eliminated if each city were to adopt an adequate set of housing standards and then see that these standards were enforced. These claims seem to have been based, to a great extent, upon our experience in Baltimore with a housing law-enforcement program. This program has attracted national attention as the Baltimore plan. As Mayor of Baltimore and as the responsible head of the city government which is carrying out this law-enforcement program, I want to clear up once and for all the confusion and exaggerated claims which are being made in various parts of the country about the Baltimore plan.

We in Baltimore are justifiably proud of our law-enforcement program. It is chiefly a health and sanitation measure. It is based up a housing code, which sets certain minimum health and sanitation standards, and upon a vigorous program of enforcement of this code. Our enforcement revolves around a specially created housing court, which I believe is the only one of its kind in the country.

The program is designed to relieve somewhat the worst slum conditons until such time as the slums can be torn down and satisfactory housing supplied. It does not do more, simply because to do more would be completely impractical in view of the dilapidated character of the present buildings. The standards set up in the housing code are as high as feasible, but even so are well below those of decent and adequate housing. For example, the code requires the installation of an inside toilet fixture, but it does not require the provision of a bath because there is no space for a bath in most of our slum dwellings. Even the small amount of space needed for a toilet must come from some other room, already too small and crowded.

The Baltimore plan might be compared to first aid administered in the temporary absence of a doctor, which would not be necessary if the doctor were present to begin with, and which in no way eliminates the eventual need for the doctor's services.

Our law-enforcement program does not add one dwelling to our supply of low-rent houses, and at the moment our crying need is for more low-rent dwellings. In fact, a strict law-enforcement program reduces the total supply of dwellings, since some buildings must be completely demolished. Furthermore, such a program must rely upon the availability of an additional supply of low-rent dwellings if it is to be effective in curing one of the principal causes of slums—that is, the crowding of more than one family into a single dwelling unit. I strongly believe that other cities should consider adoption of the Baltimore plan as an interim method of relieving slum conditions to some extent, but don't let anybody kid you into thinking that it is, in any sense, a substitute for an adequate slum clearance, redevelopment, and public low-rent housing program.

An excellent description of the Baltimore plan has just been published in the issue of Atlantic Monthly. Let me quote a few pertinent sentences:

"Anyone who believes that the Baltimore plan is an adequate substitute for tearing down the worst slum areas and building anew is hopelessly deluded. The plan does not provide much-needed minimum housing, nor does it actually rid a city of its slum areas. It does eliminate some of the more obvious sources of disease and provide children, under ideal circumstances, with off-street play space. Yet even if such results could be accurately measured, they would not add up to immense dividends.

"The slums in Baltimore remain slums, with not a single new dwelling unit in all the jam-packed blocks. Some houses have been patched up, to be sure, and there is less sewage standing in backyard puddles, but the blight remains. The sense of achievement that comes with getting a particularly dilapidated house repaired is offset by the knowledge that the occupants of the house are still sleeping three and four to a bed, with all the hazards that accompany overcrowding. Also chastening is the realization that so far, fewer than 30 out of an estimated 2,000 slum blocks have been crossed off as 'completed' in the block-by-block campaign. As one health official remarked, 'We won't live to see the end of this program.'"

I have a copy of the entire article here which I should like to submit for the record as part of my testimony.

It has been said that housing and slum clearance are local problems and should be handled directly by the cities and States without Federal assistance. I am not going to debate the theoretical merits of this question, but I will say that without Federal assistance nothing effective will be done, except in a few of the wealthier States. The areas which have the worst housing needs are those which are least able to help themselves. The problem is one of the most urgent domestic issues confronting the country. For the Federal Government to turn the whole matter back to the States and cities would represent an indefensible neglect of its proper responsibility for the national welfare.

I have so far spoken mainly about public housing because it has caused more controversy than any other aspect of the proposed legislation being considered by this committee. I do not, however, want to overlook two other items included in this bill or in other pending legislation—redevelopment and middle-income housing.

My support for public housing is not inconsistent with my belief that private enterprise should be encouraged and assisted to handle as much of the housing and slum-clearance problem as it can. Private enterprise has not heretofore been able to operate in slum areas because of the high cost of existing properties and the difficulties involved in assembling an area sufficiently large to be usable. Redevelopment, as proposed in title I of H. R. 4009, provides a formula to overcome these difficulties. Use of this formula should enable private enterprise to assume a portion of the job of slum clearance.

The necessity for Federal assistance to redevelopment is illustrated by our experience in Baltimore. The Baltimore Redevelopment Commission was one of the first to be created in the country. Eight official redevelopment areas have been established covering a total of about 400 acres. These areas represent only a portion of our total slum areas. Last November the city overwhelmingly approved a $5,000,000 bond issue for redevelopment purposes. This is the most that the city can afford and yet it will serve to treat only one, or at most two, of the eight areas. H. R. 4009, if adopted, will, in effect, triple our resources and enable us to use private enterprise in tackling a real job of slum clearance.

H. R. 4009 is primarily designed to assist low-income families. These are, of course, the families most urgently in need of assistance, but in centering our attention on this group we should not overlook the fact that there is a middle-income group above the public-housing level, but below the point at which private enterprise is currently providing decent housing. Certain additional legislation has been introduced into Congress designed to deal with this problem through either a liberalization of FHA mortgage insurance or a system of direct loans to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations. I do not wish to comment in detail on this legislation other than to state that the United States Conference of Mayors heartily endorses its purpose.

In speaking before the Senate committee on S. 138 I concluded with a number of recommendations for changes in the bill which were also advocated by other witnesses. I am very happy to note that practically all of these changes have been incorporated in the Senate bill and in H. R. 4009. The two bills are virtually identical except that H. R. 4009 authorizes 1,050,000 low-rent public dwellings in 7 years as against the Senate bill's 810,000 dwellings in 6 years. We believe that the higher figure in the bill before your committee represents a more realistic appraisal of the size of the problem and we strongly urge you to hold to this figure.

As you know, when the housing bill was debated in the Senate a determined effort was made by a small group to cripple the bill through amendments. Many of these amendments appeared plausible on the surface but if adopted they would have effectively blocked proper administration of the bill. Fortunately, all such amendments were decisively rejected in the Senate, but it appears probable that the effort to have them adopted will be renewed in the House. The bill as it now stands is in excellent shape. It is based upon several years of careful study of the problem and of past experience in administering the present public-housing program. Amendments either hastily conceived or deliberately injurious can easily nullify all of this past effort. We would, therefore, urge you to give each proposed amendment the most careful examination.

During the debate in the Senate on the housing bill a number of Senators informed themselves at first hand by touring slum areas here in Washington. I am familiar with these areas for during part of the time I was in Congress I was chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee and made many trips through the District's slums. Bad as these areas are they are not unique. We have sections in Baltimore which, if anything, are far worse—some so bad that they have literally sickened hardened policemen. I would like to extend a personal invitation to any Member of Congress to visit Baltimore and see for himself what these conditions are. Baltimore is very close and a trip over would not take long. If the members of this committee, or any other Members of Congress, wish to make such a trip, please let me know.

We have worked long and hard for adequate housing and slum clearance legislation. Last year the prospects appeared uncertain, but I for one have never lost hope. In Baltimore we have been so confident that the urgency of the problem would eventually be recognized that exactly a year ago the city made a special allocation of funds to our housing authority to undertake a program of advance planning. Now that it appears certain that we will get some action it is gratifying to know that we will be in a position to start work quickly.

Allow me to thank the committee for the privilege of appearing here for the United States Conference of Mayors in support of H. R. 4009.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the New York Times, one on May 4, 1949, entitled "Federal Aid To Education," and one on May 7, 1949, entitled "A Victory for Education."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 4, 1949]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

A Senate committee remarked, in discussing the problem of extending educational

opportunity, that "the facts are now legion, the arguments patent." Senate debate on the bill for $300,000,000 in Federal aid to education, and the attempts at amendment, clearly illustrate, however, that no formula for such aid will ever be reached that pleases everybody. There is no way to be sure that precise justice will be delivered in any formula. Nor will it be possible to institute all desirable civil-rights reforms through the back door of an educational bill without losing the bill.

It was predicted before debate began on this measure, as on the housing bill, that efforts would be made to kill by amendment. We wish such efforts complete failure, in Senate and House. The facts as to need for Federal aid to education are so compelling that side issues and even some honest doubts must yield, we believe, to a principle of putting first things first.

The case for Federal aid to education rests on a simple and obvious set of facts, and it seems to us rather surprising that enlightened people would oppose it. "In our Federal form of government," says the Senate Labor Committee, "the youth of our country are not only citizens of the States in which they reside but all citizens of the entire Nation." If there were no State lines, no one could sensibly argue that a child in Tennessee should be permitted to receive educational opportunity inferior to that received by a child in New York or California. Yet we must assume that such inequality exists when, 2 years ago, about 700 teachers employed in Tennessee's schools had not even been graduated from high school, and many of them had barely been graduated from elementary school. Or in Kentucky, where the committee was informed, in its study 2 years ago of this problem, that more than half of the State's teachers were receiving less than $1,400 a year.

If all States had equal income per capita, if all States had equal pupil population as measured against adult population, then no basis or need for Federal aid to education would exist. Obviously that is not the case. In 1947 the income per capita ranged from $659 in Mississippi to $1,781 in New York State. As for number of children as against the number of adults, which is a crucial measure of the school-financing problem, there were in 1946, 52 children under 1 year old per 1,000 adults in Mississippi, and 29 infants under 1 year old in New York State per 1,000 adults. There you have the combination of facts that demonstrates that no matter what heroic efforts the poor State makes to lift the level of its schooling, it cannot, when faced with a disproportionately large pupil population, provide educational opportunity to match the wealthier States. United States census estimates found about 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17 attending no school whatever in 1947.

It is not only humane and in the democratic tradition to equalize educational opportunity. The constant migration of our people from State to State makes it of national interest. Our welfare, economically and politically, rests upon a well-informed people. An outlay of $300,000,000 in Federal aid to education will not cure, or even satisfactorily allay, all the defects in our educational system. It is a beginning, however, and we cannot in good conscience do less.

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1949]

A VICTORY FOR EDUCATION

Federal aid to education passed the Senate in April 1948 by a vote of 58 to 22. Now, it has passed again, with an even better margin of 58 to 15. This vote does not tell the full story of the strength the $300,000,000 aid measure had behind it, however, for 13 other Senators not voting had announced their support, and 4 others were in favor of the bill, but paired. So the position of 94 Senators is known, and of these 75 were for the bill and 19 were against. This is an impressive testimonial to acceptance of the principle of Federal aid to education, for which a fight has been waged for 30 years or more. The subject has once more been thoroughly and thoughtfully debated. We submit the results to the House with the question whether there is not an inescapable moral responsibility in that body to bring this bill to a vote at the present session.

Last year the House was content to let aid to education die in committee, the same kind of irresponsible treatment given to housing legislation. Here again, as on housing, the Democratic membership, which is in control, now has a mandate from the party's own platform. There are 261 Democrats and 171 Republicans in the House. We shall now see whether the Democrats in that body will make good on their party promises by at least bringing this issue to a vote. There will also be a chance for the Republicans to substantiate their party's platform pledge to advance equality of educational opportunity for all.

The Senate profited by lessons of the past, and refused to be tempted into amendments and byways that would have wrecked the bill's chances. The bill gives even the wealthiest States a minimum payment per child, but it gives a State like Mississippi six times as much as this minimum. Yet the formula safeguards against the mischance that a State might relax its own efforts because of the Federal aid.

The bill proceeds on the assumption that a child's right to a good education shall not be abridged because of the State in which he happened to be born and reared; that, as far as educational opportunity is concerned, all shall be born equal as citizens of the United States. We find this a principle to cherish and fight for, and one whose enactment has been delayed too long. We congratulate the Senate on reaffirming its faith in this principle.

Labor Bosses Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 9, 1949. In this column Mr. Stokes exposes one of the propaganda campaigns to which the American people are being subjected.

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In connection with labor legislation in Congress there's lots of loose and irresponsible, and often angry, talk about labor bosses who are caricatured as ogres or evil spirits who somehow or other are trying to dictate to Congress and Government.

Long years of covering Government and politics and civic affairs, whether in city or State or here in Washington or both, gives the newspaper reporter a good insight into both labor leaders and business and financial leaders. In such experience one learns that the labor boss, if one wants to call him that, stacks up over-all very well alongside those in business and finance who sit at the top of our corporate economy and across the table in bargaining, some of whom are pretty big bosses themselves. Often the edge is distinctly in favor of the labor leader when it comes to sincerity of purpose for the general public welfare. There are some few in both groups who get overly conscious of their power, as in any human society.

But as for dictation of Congress by labor, that is the most absurd myth of our times to any one who lives here daily with Congress and has seen the impregnable barricade raised here in the last 10 years against measures for the interest of millions of people, including labor.

Now that there seems finally a chance to penetrate that barricade, only if a little bit here and there, to get through a few much-needed bills—housing, education, health, increased minimum wage, modification of the harsh Taft-Hartley law—those who are working earnestly at this, as they have been for years, suddenly become evil labor bosses.

TACTICS CALLED VERY QUEER

It's very queer tactics, though understandable, to any one who knows the facts about national politics and forces operating in it.

To get at the real problem involved, it is necessary to go back of the labor bosses to the millions of individuals who work daily in the greatest industrial machine the world ever has seen. They may be set apart as some sinister element called labor, but they are just people, good Americans, who live in your neighborhood, work hard to make ends meet and put their children through school and pay their doctor bills, and who help to make all your comforts and conveniences as well as necessities.

The basic economic fact of today is that those millions must be kept at their jobs and at good wages if the democratic capitalism that we have struggled so to build up is to operate successfully, for that depends upon putting enough into the pockets of our people constantly to buy what they produce. Upon that, too, depends the maintenance of our place in the world at large, and the spread of our sort of system to the world at large. It all goes back to that man and woman in the mill, shop, or forge.

SYSTEM FAILED ONCE

Twenty years ago our system broke down temporarily because we failed to recognize that basic fact in our still new industrial economy. Out of our awakening, among other things, came the organization of labor to protect itself, so it could live, and out of that came leaders to represent working men and women and handle their problems, just as the same sort of leaders arose in business and industry.

It is a humanitarian thing to provide for our people. But that doesn't have to be considered at all. It is a hard-boiled necessity of economics, just plain good business. Big bosses on the industrial management side, some of whom complain so about the labor bosses, should be thankful that labor organization has come along, as a great many of them are. It has done much for them, as for all of us. They are doing nicely. We owe them much, too, for their skill and know-how. But they didn't do it all themselves and they can't keep it going themselves. Some of them seem to think so.

That appears to be the attitude, too, of some in one of our great political parties, the Republican Party, judging from what goes on in Congress. If that attitude persists, if the objective in labor legislation continues to be to punish something called labor and some legendary Frankenstein labor bosses, it can be forecast that the Republican Party never will win another election and will pass away.

That would be the tragedy of our times. For we need two healthy political parties to check on one another. That was the way our great political democracy has been built up, and that is the only way it can survive.

An Answer to McGraw-Hill's Full-Page Advertisement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, McGraw-Hill has again published a full-page propaganda message in the interest of the corporate community and its monopolistic members. This is the seventy-fifth in a series designed to protect the interlocking control of the big corporations over American economy. This latest article which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, May 2, 1949, is even more fantastic than the preceding articles in the series. It is based on a comparison of Russian and United States industrial progress in an attempt to persuade the Members of Congress and the public that unless large corporations are allowed to retain excessive profits for use as costless capital our industrial capacity will fall behind that of Russia. The figures on which this false assumption is based are from the London Economist, which is recognized as one of the outstanding journals in the field of economics, but McGraw-Hill's article completely omits the qualifying reservations given for each percentage by the author of the series of articles in the Economist.

The author of the Economist articles, whose identity is not revealed, has this to say about the results of the third year of Russia's postwar five-year plan:

> Unfortunately it is not easy to evaluate those results on the basis of Russian statistics. This is not because the statistics are essentially false, but because they are presented in propagandist fashion, and because the set of indexes, published by the Gosplan at quarterly and annual intervals are as a rule not related to one another.

The figures from the Economist article were based on information contained in books by N. Voznesensky, chief of the Russian State Planning Commission, and A. I. Notkin, noted Russian economist. McGraw-Hill has assisted the Russians by passing on pure propaganda about Russian accomplishments. The figures quoted by McGraw-Hill indicate that in percentage of national income Russia, in 1948, used 13 percent for national defense, as compared to 5 percent by the United States. But McGraw-Hill does not include the following statement of the London Economist writer in regard to those defense percentages:

> Since every percentage of the American income on defense represents two to three times as much in real armament as every percentage of the Russian income, it follows that Russia can support its present military power out of a lower national income only by spending a higher proportion of it on defense.

I have analyzed this article by McGraw-Hill carefully, and I want to point out some further discrepancies, for the reason that if we accept this article and the others in the series at face value and adopt their recommendations, we are building up the power of a few big corporations which could lead to a Fascist state and to the destruction of our American form of life.

Here is a particularly striking example of the misleading and oversimplified statements contained in the McGraw-Hill article: "Russia is gaining industrial strength as fast as we are—and may soon be gaining faster. The more she gains, and the faster she gains on us, the greater is the danger of war." Contrast that statement with the following sentence regarding Russian steel capacity which is contained in the July 1947 issue of the International Reference Service, United States Department of Commerce: "In terms of American production, the 1950 planned rate of output of the Soviet steel industry, assuming that a substantial proportion of it will be achieved, will just about bring it up to the level of the annual production of the United States in 1913." And here are the figures which are given by the Department of Commerce:

[In million metric tons]

	Soviet planned output for 1950	United States output in 1913	Percent of United States margin	United States output in 1948	Percent of United States margin
Iron ore	40.0	60.6	50.0	103.0	157.5
Coke	30.0	47.0	57.0	67.4	124.6
Pig iron	19.5	31.5	62.0	55.2	183.0
Steel	25.4	31.8	25.0	80.3	216.1
Rolled steel	17.8	25.2	42.0	[1]62.8	252.8
Steel pipe	1.5	2.5	67.0	[1]6.7	346.6

[1] Estimated—figures not yet complete on these two items for 1948.

Most propaganda articles, when they are designed for an intelligent reading public, include figures of some kind to substantiate their statements, but this article by McGraw-Hill (with the exception of the Economist percentages) is noteworthy by its omission of figures in the comparison of United States and Russian industrial progress. The article also fails to mention the heavy percentage of Russian industry in the West and Ukraine which was completely destroyed during World War II.

I am going to give you a summary of United States Government figures on the comparative strength of the Russian and American industrial capacity. For instance in coal production in 1947, the United States produced 561,000,000 tons; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics plus its satellites, 254,000,000 tons—roughly one-half of the United States production. In electric power, the United States produced 282,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; Russia plus her satellites, 71,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours — about one-fourth that of the United States. In the oil industry the United States produced in 1947, 1,856,107,000 barrels of crude oil as compared to 221,506,000 barrels for Russia plus her satellites—about one-eighth that of the United States. In the production of steel ingot and casings the United States had 77,016,000,000 tons; Russia plus her satellites, only 18,366,000,000 tons—about one-fourth of the United States production. These figures show that no one (even McGraw-Hill) should be seriously concerned about the ability of the United States to compete with Russia on the basis of industrial capacity.

Now let us turn to the real reason behind these series of articles by McGraw-Hill. McGraw-Hill states its purpose in various ways as being that of protecting American industrial progress by insuring that sufficient capital is retained for replacement and expansion purposes. The true motivation for these articles stems from the desire of McGraw-Hill to assist the great operating corporations, big financial institutions, trade and business associations to retain their great degree of control over the American economy. These large companies and corporations with billions of dollars in assets are interlocked into an almost inviolable corporate community through the activities of major financial institutions, through particular interests, through firms which render legal, accounting, publishing (McGraw-Hill) and similar services, and through the interlocking directorates of their managements. McGraw-Hill designs these articles to convince the public and the Congress that this corporate community should be allowed to retain its costless capital in the form of profits and to continue to expand its sphere of influence.

Each year it becomes more difficult for an individual to establish his own business. Long-term credit is almost unobtainable by the small-business man. This situation has been influenced by two factors: First, the corporations do not distribute dividends which could be used by small-business men to finance their own ventures; second, the large banks and financial institutions of the country are interlocked so closely with the big corporations that there is little or no opportunity for a smaller plant or industry to receive loans. Even in times of prosperity the corporate community uses its power for its own selfish interests to prevent the establishment of new industries. For example, down in Texas, the Lone Star Steel Co. has met opposition from the big steel companies and from the large banks of the Nation in its efforts to obtain funds to provide for the construction of steel-making facilities. With the large financial institutions interlocked to the big steel companies, it became evident that RFC is the only place where money for a project of this kind can possibly be obtained.

McGraw-Hill expresses opposition to legislation which would provide for the extension of capital loans by the Federal Government to small plants and industries. However, it is the monopolistic control of capital sources by the very

groups represented by McGraw-Hill that has brought our one-time free competitive enterprise to the necessity of turning to the Government for loans with which to establish new businesses and expand existing businesses.

The staff of the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives has prepared a table on the interlocks between 110 companies in the steel, cement, and railroad industries, banks, and other financial institutions. The companies were selected from the largest corporations in the country on the basis of total assets and production. There were 496 interlocks in directorships between the 110 corporations. Only 24 of the companies included in the group, by reason of size, had no interlocks. I want to point out that there were 166 interlocks between the 20 banks and companies in the other 4 groups, and 117 interlocks between the 7 financial institutions and the other companies. With the largest financial companies in the country interlocked so completely with the other members of the corporate community, it is not diffcult to understand why credit channels for small-business men have been almost completely blocked.

Interlocking directorates in 110 American corporations, 1949

[Figures refer to number of interlocks [1] by industry]

	Steel [2]	Cement [3]	Railroads [4]	Banks [5]	Other financial institutions [6]	Total
Steel	0	2	8	20	7	37
Cement [7]	2	0	2	4	0	8
Railroads	8	2	46	72	40	168
Banks	20	4	72	10	60	166
Other financial institutions	7	0	40	60	10	117
Total	37	8	168	166	117	496

[1] If a company shares 2 or more directors in common with another company, each interlock is counted.
[2] Includes 10 largest steel companies on asset basis.
[3] Includes the 11 cement companies which had 62.4 percent of total United States cement capacity.
[4] Includes 39 of largest railroad companies on asset basis.
[5] Includes 30 banks having largest total assets.
[6] Includes 17 insurance companies plus 3 other financial institutions.
[7] Although there appear to be few interlocking directorships in cement, Universal Atlas Cement, which ranks first in capacity, is a subsidiary of United States Steel Corp.

What will be the result of these un-American tactics on the part of the corporate community to control credit sources and prevent the establishment and expansion of small business? One result will almost certainly be a source of greater satisfaction to Russia than the fact that by 1950 her steel capacity will equal that of the United States for 1913. As the concentration of power in the hands of the directors of a relatively few large corporations becomes greater, the danger of our country turning to socialism or fascism is increased. If the policy of retaining profits for costless capital is not checked—and McGraw-Hill, in Business Week, January 22, 1949, states that three out of every four companies plan to get almost all the capital for expansion during 1949–53 from profits and reserves—then, inevitably, a few big concerns will control our entire economy. Certainly Russia will favor such a development, for the next step from such fascistic control would be constant pressure from Communists, both from within and without America, for the establishment of a communistic form of government. A totalitarian government, whether it is Fascist or Communist, is completely inimical to the traditions of our free American people.

The administration's program, with its proposals to distribute to the stockholders their rightful profits and to open credit sources, is an attempt to restore a proper balance to our economy in order that free and independent enterprise can again flourish. It is not an attempt to destroy big business. We all know that big business is absolutely necessary in the present era and is responsible for many achievements which could not have been accomplished by small independent businesses. But big business which stifles competition will eventually stifle itself and our American way of life, and to quote the last sentence from the McGraw-Hill article: "Nothing would please the Communists more."

Friends of the Workingman in the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the following chart taken from the US News, issue for the week of May 13, 1949, which shows labor's gain in the House of Representatives from the Eightieth Congress to the Eighty-first Congress.

I wish to call specific attention to Ohio, where labor had only 4 friends in the Eightieth Congress, as compared with 13 against the Wood bill in the Eighty-first Congress. This represents a gain of 9 votes, 8 of whom are recently elected Democrats and 1 a Republican who had a change of heart. The other 4 were Democrats who also were Members of the Eightieth Congress.

I should also like to call attention to Connecticut, which had no friends who would stand up and be counted in the Eightieth Congress, as against four in the Eighty-first. West Virginia is another good example. The entire West Virginia delegation in the Eighty-first Congress being Democratic and being friendly to labor, as against only two Democrats in the Eightieth Congress who voted for labor.

This chart will show very clearly what labor did in the 1948 election and also point out that labor has a job to do in the 1950 election to pick up the additional 25 or 30 votes that it needs in order to get a fair and honorable labor law through Congress.

LABOR'S NEW STRENGTH IN THE HOUSE

Labor's gain in the House of Representatives from 1948 to 1949 turns out to be 120 votes. That gain still leaves labor short of a majority in the House to get what it seeks. The table below shows the vote in 1948 to sustain the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act. It shows the vote just taken in 1949 against the Wood bill, which labor leaders opposed. Labor leaders mustered 83 votes in 1948 and 203 votes in 1949.

State	To sustain Taft-Hartley veto	Against Wood bill	Labor's gain
Alabama	0	3	3
Arizona	2	2	0
Arkansas	0	2	2
California	7	11	4
Colorado	1	3	2
Connecticut	0	4	4
Delaware	0	0	0
Florida	0	3	3
Georgia	1	1	0
Idaho	0	1	1
Illinois	7	13	6
Indiana	1	6	5
Iowa	0	1	1
Kansas	0	0	0
Kentucky	3	6	3
Louisiana	1	3	2
Maine	0	0	0
Maryland	0	2	2
Massachusetts	5	6	1
Michigan	3	6	3
Minnesota	1	4	3
Mississippi	0	0	0
Missouri	2	12	10
Montana	1	1	0
Nebraska	0	1	1
Nevada	0	1	1
New Hampshire	0	0	0
New Jersey	2	7	5
New Mexico	0	2	2
New York	18	24	6
North Carolina	1	2	1
North Dakota	1	2	1
Ohio	4	13	9
Oklahoma	2	7	5
Oregon	1	1	0
Pennsylvania	4	17	13
Rhode Island	2	2	0
South Carolina	0	1	1
South Dakota	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	6	5
Texas	3	9	6
Utah	1	2	1
Vermont	0	0	0
Virginia	1	1	0
Washington	3	4	1
West Virginia	2	6	4
Wisconsin	2	5	3
Wyoming	0	0	0
Total	83	203	120

Distorted School Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Distorted School Picture," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in he RECORD, as follows:

DISTORTED SCHOOL PICTURE

From the Council of State Chambers of Commerce has come an analysis of the Senate Labor Committee's report on the Federal aid to education bill (S. 246) which merits

more attention than it has had. That is the measure which would distribute $300,000,000 annually (to begin with) among the States for school purposes. A thumping majority of the Senate passed the bill last Thursday.

Of the committee's allegation that present State and local financial provisions for education are "critically inadequate" and have become more so in recent months, the council says:

"Between 1936, when the first real drive for a $300,000,000 Federal school subsidy began, and 1947, the last year for which office of education figures are available, State-local support for schools rose from $1,656,800,000 to $3,124,550,000, an increase of $1,467,750,000, or five times $300,000,000.

"Since early 1947, when Congress last held hearings on the Federal aid bill, State-local support has been further increased by over $900,000,000, which is three times the $300,000,000 sought from the Federal Treasury. Every State has shared in this increase, with the greatest progress being made in the so-called poorer States in the South, which have made the greatest general economic gains since 1940."

The Senate Committee report says:

"According to the United States Census estimates for 1947, about 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, attend no school whatever."

And the Council retorts:

"This statement implies that 4,000,000 children are not in school for lack of schools or teachers. Most States require school attendance only for age groups from 6 to 7 to 15 inclusive. Five and 17-year-olds and in many States 6- and 16-year-olds are not required to be in school. Of the 4,000,000 above referred to, 2,063,000 were only 5 years old, 156,000 were 6 and 1,406,000 were 16 and 17."

These are only two counts in the council's severe and convincing indictment of the Senate Labor Committee. We do not know whether the council is right in suspecting that the committee members negligently signed a report prepared by agents of one of the pressure groups bent on raiding the Treasury, but the suggestion is at least arresting, particularly as the committee held no hearings on S. 246.

Victory on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victory on Education," which was published in the Washington Post of May 9, 1949. The editorial gives good evidence of the fact that the passage of the Federal-aid-to-Education bill was not only a victory for education throughout the United States, but was a personal victory for our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. For a dozen years the senior Senator from Utah has been fighting for the passage of legislation of this sort; so I say the passage of the bill represents a victory not only for education, but a personal victory for the Senator from Utah by reason of his persistent, patient, and intelligent work in that direction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY ON EDUCATION

Many persons and organizations have helped to shape the Federal-aid-to-education bill that passed the Senate last week. In its final form the bill had bipartisan sponsorship and overwhelming support in the Senate. Special credit for its enactment goes, however, to Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Since he came to the Senate from a professorship in the University of Utah, Mr. THOMAS' influence in this field was doubtless felt long before he got into public life. Certainly he has been persistent since he has been in Washington. Twelve years ago he was one of the chief sponsors of a bill that had been worked out by the National Education Association following the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education. Since then successive bills on the subject have borne his name, and he has never lost an opportunity to promote the cause.

Two major obstacles stood in the way of the policy the Senate has now adopted. One was the fear that Federal grants to the educational systems of the States might lead to Federal dictation as to what should be taught in our schools. The other was the feeling that, since education is a local function, the States can finance it amply without aid from the Federal Treasury. In his quiet way, Senator Thomas has probably done more than any one man to expose the fallacy of those beliefs.

It is now well established that Congress can aid the States in various activities in which the people as a whole are interested without plunging those activities into national politics. The insistent demand of the people that their schools be free from governmental pressures and propaganda is probably enough to insure them against Federal control following in the wake of Federal aid. Over a long period of years Senator THOMAS also repeatedly emphasized the inexcusable disparity of educational opportunities between the poor and the wealthy States. The spectacle of an educational system operating on only $24 a year per pupil before the war in Mississippi and other systems spending more than five times that amount in some of the States came to haunt the Senate and everyone else who thought about it. We have a national economy that tends to concentrate income in certain favored areas and compartmentalized educational systems that lay a terrible handicap upon youngsters who happen to be born in the wrong place. Most men who honestly face this fact quickly lose their prejudices against Federal aid to education. By keeping up a drumfire of facts about the inequalities of our educational system and by improving his own bills on the subject from year to year, Senator THOMAS has won a notable victory and we think he is entitled to special congratulations.

Intrigue in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the New Republic of May 2, 1949, I am sure, will prove of considerable interest to my colleagues:

INTRIGUE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By J. T. Teller)

The Big Three of the Atlantic Pact—the United States, Britain, and France—are agreed on the need for drafting the states of the Mediterranean region into the western military alliance, but cannot agree on the precise nature of such alinement, whether it should be direct or subsidiary, through an interdependent regional-security pact.

This division of opinion is rooted in a basic disagreement among the Big Three with regard to the peacetime role each should play in that region. A direct consequence of this dissension was the failure to include Turkey in the Atlantic alliance, although America has poured millions into that country because of the general consensus that the Dardanelles might be one of the first targets for attack in the event of an East-West clash. The Turkish Parliament was dismayed by the exclusion, particularly since Foreign Minister Nejmeddin Sadak had made several trips to Paris and London, where the opposition prevailed, to assure his country's inclusion, and since Italy, primarily a Mediterranean country, had been invited to join the North Atlantic Pact.

Press reports indicate that the primary opposition to Turkey came from Britain's Ernest Bevin. He would rather see her enlisted in an East Mediterranean alliance, formally distinct from the Atlantic Pact, although interacting with it. This East Mediterranean plan is basically not new. First efforts in this direction began some 2 years ago, when the British sought to prevail on Turkey to join the League of Arab States. King Abdullah of Transjordan and the Iraqui Regent, as well as the sisters of King Farouk of Egypt who were ostensibly vacationing in Turkey, visited Ankara at that time in the hope of persuading Turkey to accept the Arab League proposals. Bevin's newest version, as reported in several responsible metropolitan newspapers, omits all mention of the too patently British-sponsored Arab League, and proposes instead that the East Mediterranean alliance in its initial stages consist of Italy, Greece, Turkey, France, and Britain. While thus audaciously barring the United States from direct participation, and hoping in this way to weaken America's peacetime status in the area, this scheme nonetheless seeks to precipitate American commitments in behalf of the new organization by making it a subsidiary of the Atlantic Pact.

However, the conspiracy to exclude the United States is too obvious. If the actual location of the mainland is a qualification for membership in the proposed alliance, France may have some claim to membership because of her Mediterranean shoreline, but Britain has none; if, conversely, it is based on interests in the Mediterranean area, then the United States qualifies for membership no less than Britain and France although it has not a single protectorate, crown colony, or mandate in the area.

America's emergence as a major Mediterranean power is so recent and has been so sudden that neither France nor Britain has had time to become accustomed to the new reality. It was Great Britain who helped make America Mediterranean-conscious (although eventual American awakening was inevitable) by enlisting our military collaboration on a global scale in World War II and welcoming our nominal presence in Iran a couple of years ago, when that country and neighboring Iraq seemed to be threatened by a Soviet demarche.

As a consequence of increasing calls on American collaboration in that region, most effectively dramatized by Britain's proposals, not so long ago, for a joint Anglo-American policy on Palestine, and recalling the shabby treatment accorded American business before the war by British, French, and Dutch oil companies, American planners naturally proposed that it was high time to coordinate our financial and strategic interests, and for America to assert herself as an independent operator in the area, instead of relying on the mediation of European powers.

Even a quick glance at the map reveals the progress made by United States interests in a couple of years. Without a single strip of Mediterranean soil actually administered by our country, the United States has become the foremost western power in the region.

Both Yemen and Saudi Arabia, with American moneys in their treasuries and dependent on American enterprise and technical assistance for the development of their resources, are solidly in the American orbit. Although hugging a policy of neutrality in the east-west conflict, Israel undeniably prefers America over the other western powers, if only for the reason that financial and moral support, as well as manpower reinforcements from the more than 4,000,000 American Jews, are indispensable to the new state if it is to survive.

Egypt, vociferously xenophobic and implacably anti-British, is not averse to doing business with the United States and accepting technical and financial assistance. This places America solidly on both the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. With Israel in control of strategic Elath, on the Gulf of Aqaba, British Far East traders nervously consider the prospect of an Israeli-American competitive combine. Britain's last toeholds in the region are Iraq, where pro-British Nuri as Said Pasha rules through terror, and Transjordan.

By becoming partners in a Mediterranean alliance from which the United States is excluded, Britain and France hope to undermine somewhat American gains in the Mediterranean region and at least become mediators between the United States and the native governments. The inclusion of Turkey, keystone of any east Mediterranean alliance, in the Atlantic Pact, would only have increased American influence.

But added to these major obstacles to the extension of the western alliance to the Middle East is the subsidiary quarrel between Britain and France. Wanting absolute domination of the area, Britain lent her moral support to Syrian and French nationalists at the end of World War II with the result that France was forced promptly to terminate her mandate over Syria and Lebanon.

But France has never really abdicated her interests in the Levant strip of the Mediterranean region. She has been biding her time for a possible return and revenge on Britain. For several years now the Mediterranean experts of the Qual d'Orsay and the British Foreign Office, respectively, have been "jockeying" for position. Thus, it is general knowledge that leading Lebanese politicians, until recently members of the opposition, have been diligently conducting sub-rosa negotiations in Paris for 2 years.

Britain, conversely, has long entertained plans for a Greater Syria, which would be ruled by Abdullah, and in addition to Transjordan and Iraq would include all Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria. Transjordanese agents have for several years been distributing arms among justifiably disaffected religious and ethnic minorities in Syria and Lebanon, in regions contiguous to Transjordan, in anticipation of a day when these groups would rise against their governments and invite Abdullah to annex them.

Hoping to effect a greater pro-British Arab union through the Arab League, Abdullah's British advisers have long discouraged him from making any untoward move against his neighbors while helping him prepare against the day when the Arab League might fail and a greater Syria would be the only way to assure British dominance. That day now seems to have come as a consequence of the repercussions the emergence of Israel has caused in all Arab lands.

Abdullah's invocation of the British Transjordan mutual-assistance pact, on the pretext that Israeli troops had made incursions into his territory, allegations recently disproved by UN observers, has not been lost on Lebanon and Syria. Abdullah's request that British troops take over patroling of the Transjordan-Israeli frontier means to them that he wanted the Arab Legion relieved for operations elsewhere, and they were taking no chances.

An unofficial delegation was dispatched to Paris for the second time in several months. Earlier they had sent delegations to negotiate new backing for their currencies, although the cocky Syrians early in 1948 renounced past financial arrangements with France and asserted that their currency required no foreign backing. This time the delegation was seeking military assistance. Before the French could move in to help the Syrian Government, General Zayim, rumored to be pro-Greater Syria, effected a coup. This stroke, however, has no air of finality, and does nothing to resolve the Anglo-French conflict.

Simultaneously with the news of the invocation of the British-Transjordan treaty by Abdullah, the story broke from Tel Aviv, under the byline of New York Times' Gene Currivan, that the French had promised the Lebanese-Syrian delegation they would send arms "for internal security," which within the context of current events in the Mediterranean region probably means arms for quelling uprisings by those of their nationals who might request annexation by Abdullah. Although a French foreign office spokesman has formally denied the Currivan report, it has received credence in high diplomatic circles in the Middle East, including Hakirya, where Israeli foreign policy is forged. The Israelis bitterly warn that such a move by France would be in violation of the UN Security Council's embargo on the shipment of arms and fighting personnel to the countries involved in the Palestine war. Although for the time being at least the arms would not be used against them, the Israelis are anxious nonetheless because the successful development of their country requires a tranquil Middle East.

The western big-power intrigues in the Mediterranean area not only delay the extension of the North Atlantic Pact to that region, but produce combustive situations which give comfort—and maybe even aid—to the Soviets.

Desperate over the dangers created by Anglo-French-United States dissension, Turkish Foreign Minister Nejmeddin Sadak may soon fly to Washington to tell our Government bluntly what the score is. If his trip brings no results, he may become more amenable to the feelers put out by Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion for the formation of a third bloc, a bloc of Middle East states to bar foreign intrigues and keep the area neutral in the event of an East-West clash. Not that the failure to bring about an eastern Mediterranean alliance is discomfiting to Israel. Intent on steering a middle course between the two great power blocs, Israel would be clamped in a western vise should the proposed western-backed eastern Mediterranean alliance ever materialize.

To Preserve World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Washington, during its recent session, passed House Joint Memorial 13, calling upon the Congress to support a move "to strengthen the present form of the United Nations so that it shall possess the means and legal authority to preserve world peace." Because I believe this resolution represents a widespread feeling in my State, it is of special interest and importance to note the supporting resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Washington State Branch of the United World Federalists, meeting in Yakima, April 9 and 10. The Washington State Branch of United World Federalists is working actively and intelligently in the cause of world peace.

RESOLUTION ON THE ATLANTIC PACT

The Washington State branch of United World Federalists approves the policy statement on the Atlantic Pact adopted by the national executive council of United World Federalists.

The State branch emphasizes those points in the statement which indicate the urgency for the United States basically to alter its foreign policy by increasing its support of the United Nations Organization and seeking to transform that body into a genuine federal world government. This is the only alternative to future pacts, alliances, and a general competitive arms race.

STATEMENT OF UWF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL APPROVED BY THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION

"UWF has already recognized, in the resolutions adopted at Minneapolis the inevitability of the United States being adequately armed to defend its people and territory against the threat of aggression while at the same time recognizing that the probable result of an arms race will be war. However, we have taken the position that any such program for our national armament is no solution to the east-west problem, and that it is essential that a program for the transformation of the United Nations into an effective federation be carried on urgently and simultaneously.

"The North Atlantic Security Pact is essentially a further phase of military preparedness. UWF makes no attempt to predict whether the pact or any rearmament attendant upon it may succeed in postponing war. We urge with respect to proposals to arm Europe that no diversion should be made from ECA assistance to European countries designed to develop their industrial strength for peaceful purposes, inasmuch as such diversion of western European energies and resources from recovery to rearmament would seriously weaken resistance to Communist penetration and subversion.

"UWF reiterates that such success as the pact may achieve will necessarily be of limited duration, that the pact does not and cannot solve the fundamental problem; and that there is no solution to the problem of war except in terms of a universal world government upon which the peoples of the world can rely for that security which their national governments now seek through national military establishments."

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Inasmuch as responsible persons of all parties believe the United States Government has failed to give that full and complete support to the United Nations which was pledged during and after the war, and has increasingly relied upon foreign policy based on force;

And inasmuch as the urgent crisis precipitated by reliance of all nations upon force alone for their security now clarifies beyond argument the immediate and drastic necessity for the rehabilitation of the United Nations by the only effective and conclusive step that can now be taken to prevent war;

We therefore resolve that the Congress, the Executive, and their duly appointed representatives should immediately employ greater determination, efforts, and publicity than those used in the development of power associations, in proposing and supporting in the United Nations amendments to the Charter which would make the UN a federal world government with powers adequate to preserve peace. Only in this way can the United States prove its good faith in its announced postwar objective of seeking peace by world agreement.

Uniform Code of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD deGRAFFENRIED

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1949

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the kind remarks he has made on behalf of the subcommittee which handled this bill now before the House, the Uniform Code of Military Justice bill. As a freshman Member of Congress and as a newcomer to the Committee on Armed Services, I want to say that it has been a pleasure and privilege to have been assigned to the subcommittee which has had under consideration for the past 5 weeks the bill now before this body. We had the expert guidance and learned counsel at all times of the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana. Meetings of this subcommittee were held practically every day while this bill was under consideration and I recall two instances when the committee worked all day on Saturdays. It has been an extreme pleasure to me to have worked with each and every member of the subcommittee and I want to say that in my opinion we now have to present to the House a bill which is workable, a bill which has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services and a bill which I hope and sincerely believe will be adopted and passed by this body.

This proposed code covers both the substantive and the procedural law governing military justice and its administration in all the armed forces of the United States. It provides the sole statutory authority for:

First. The infliction of limited disciplinary penalties for minor offenses without judicial action;

Second. The establishment of pretrial and trial procedure;

Third. The creation and constitution of three classes of courts martial corresponding to those now in existence.

Fourth. The eligibility of members of each of the courts and the qualifications of its officers and counsel;

Fifth. The review of findings and sentence and the creation and constitution of the reviewing tribunals; and

Sixth. The listing and definition of offenses, redrafted and rephrased in modern legislative language.

The code is uniformly applicable in all its parts to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard in time of war and peace.

The drafting of the code was accomplished by the following procedures adopted by the committee:

Initially, the differences which existed between the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy were isolated. To accomplish this, a comparative study of the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy was prepared. A brief was written on each of the 121 Articles of War containing:

First. The text of the articles of war in question;

Second. The text of any amendment in Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress;

Third. Excerpts from the Army Court-Martial Manual construing the article;

Fourth. The text of the corresponding or similar article for the government of the Navy;

Fifth. The text of the proposed Articles for the Government of the Navy.

Sixth. Excerpts from Naval Courts and Boards;

Seventh. A discussion of the differences, if any, between the Army and Navy procedures; and

Eighth. Excerpts of comments on the subject matter of the Articles of War under consideration from the various studies listed in material before the committee.

This background material enabled the committee to consider the differences in the Army and Navy systems, to consider the recent amendments to the Army system, and to study, at the same time, various comments, suggestions and recommendations which have been made in the past in connection with military justice.

A working group of military personnel from the Army, Navy, and Air Force was appointed, which processed all the material before it was submitted to the committee. The working group discussed the difference in the systems and attempted to reach agreement on a uniform provision. Its views were reported to the committee, which either adopted, modified or rejected them. Both the members of the committee and the members of the working group consulted with their own Departments on any questions they deemed appropriate.

To the extent possible, tentative drafts of proposed articles were submitted to the committee. After consideration and upon decision by the committee, the article was drafted in accordance with its instructions and later resubmitted to the committee for final approval. In addition, the committee adopted an outline of the new article, which was designed to segregate the different provisions into logical subdivisions. Under this plan, all the offenses were placed together and the different parts of the code were arranged topically.

The precept of the Secretary of Defense instructed the committee to draft a code uniform in substance and in interpretation and application, which would protect the rights of those subject to it, with a view to increasing public confidence in military justice and without impairing the performance of military functions. The committee has drafted the code in accordance with these instructions and attention is called to the provisions of the code which are designed to provide for uniformity in the adminstration of military justice, to those designed to assure the accused a fair trial, to those designed to prevent undue control or interference with the administration of military justice, and to those designed to preserve appropriate functions.

Among the provisions designed to insure uniformity are the following:

First. The offenses made punishable by the code are identical for all armed forces.

Second. The same system of courts with the same limits of jurisdiction of each court is set up in all the armed forces.

Third. The procedure for general courts martial is identical as to institution of charges, pretrial investigations, action by the convening authority, review by the board of review, and review by the court of military appeals in all the armed forces.

Fourth. The rules of procedure at the trial, including modes of proof, are equally applicable to all the armed forces.

Fifth. The Judge Advocates General of the three Departments are required to make uniform rules of procedure for the board of review in each Department.

Sixth. The required qualifications for members of the court, law officer, and counsel are identical for all the armed forces.

Seventh. The court of military appeals, which finally decides all questions of law, is the court of last resort for each of the armed forces, and also acts with the Judge Advocates General of the three Departments as an advisory body with a view to securing uniformity in policy and in sentences and in discovering and remedying defects in the system and its administration.

There are many provisions included in this code which are designed to insure a fair trial to the accused. First, and foremost, to my mind, is the provision that enlisted men, if this bill becomes law—and I am convinced it will—may serve on general and special courts. I personally

have long felt that the service of enlisted men on military courts would have a most beneficial effect. This provision will serve to engender in the enlisted man the feeling that he is a part of the system of military justice.

Another provision is the pretrial investigation, at which the accused is entitled to be present with counsel to cross-examine available witnesses against him and to present evidence in his own behalf. It has some features of a preliminary hearing and some of pretrial discovery as used in our civil courts. It contains a prohibition against referring any charge for trial which does not state an offense or is not shown to be supported by sufficient evidence. It carries a provision, and one which is of paramount importance, and that is, competent, legally trained counsel at the trial for both the prosecution and the defense is provided for. There is also a prohibition against requesting any statement from the accused without warning, and against compelling self-incrimination, and against reception in evidence of improperly obtained statements, and the provision for equal process to accused and prosecution for obtaining witnesses and depositions and the further provision of allowing only the accused to use depositions in a capital case. This bill provides for the law officer to instruct the court on the record concerning the elements of the offense, presumption of innocence and the burden of proof; provides for an automatic review of the trial record for errors of law and of fact by a board of review with the right of the accused to be represented by legally competent counsel and a provision for the review of the record for errors of law by the Court of Military Appeals, which review is automatic in the case where the sentence is death or dismissal and is upon petition showing probable error of law where the sentence involved more than 1 year's confinement, with the right to be represented by competent counsel. Then there is the provision prohibiting receiving pleas of guilty in capital cases. As to special and summary courts martial this bill completely eradicates all of the differences in the nomenclature, composition, procedure and powers of the intermediate military courts as exists under the present law and establishes complete uniformity as to these courts.

Upon the basis of these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse the legislation now before you and I sincerely believe its enactment will provide the most enlightened system of military justice that has ever been enacted.

A Colony of Spiders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Harold L. Ickes, which appeared in the New Republic of May 2, 1949, briefly but vigorously directs our attention to the conditions in Germany that may soon get out of hand unless we do something about them:

A COLONY OF SPIDERS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

For many months a colony of black-widow spiders has been busily weaving webs intended to cost the United States and its allies the fruits of the crushing defeat of Germany. They would restore to those who made Hitler possible the industries of the Ruhr, without which he would not have ventured to commit his depredations against the democratic nations of Europe. Conspicuous among them are members of the Cabinet, Congressmen, diplomats and soldiers, as well as bankers and industrialists who have been commuting between Wall Street and Washington. In short, American military and civilian officials who are supposed to be solving problems in Germany, preparatory to the State Department assuming a jurisdiction and control that, so far, it has timorously evaded, have been rendering yeoman service to Wall Street financiers and German cartelists, preparatory to World War III.

Instead of listening to the shrill silences of the newspapers, which at times neglect to keep even themselves informed, the people should begin to din into the ears of their Congress their demand that the original plan to dismantle the Ruhr shall be followed without evasion or further delay. They should call for the names of those in the seats of the mighty who have been conspiring to sacrifice the interests of America, and with them any chance of world peace, to the gluttony of the bankers and the industrialists.

If the people should insist upon a searching inquiry by Congress, they would soon learn that the biggest black spider that has been quietly weaving the biggest web of them all is Secretary of the Interior, Julius A. Krug, the well-known textile-mill owner of Tennessee. This official, as to whom there have been suspicions of sympathy for Germany, may not be acting in his own behalf. But certainly he cannot be credited with solicitude for his country, or for world peace. It is he who, despite his seeming sloth, has been industriously working to the end that the unexpurgated Nazis of Hitler may be put again in a position to revive and enlarge the war industries with which Hitler broke the peace of Europe.

Prior to the resignations of Secretary Anderson of Agriculture and Secretary Harriman of Commerce, there was an active cabal in President Truman's Cabinet, the catalyst of which was Secretary Krug, attempting to reverse the policy of President Roosevelt with respect to the coal and steel of the Ruhr. The great war President had promised American fathers and mothers that the war potential of the Ruhr would be scattered and destroyed in grateful recognition of the sacrifice of their sons to Moloch. Naturally, these three associates had the support of ex-Secretary James Forrestal, who, although no longer connected technically with that important former financial ally of the Nazi, Dillon Read & Co., was concerned about its fortunes.

What should be done with the war industries of the Ruhr was a pending question with the Cabinet for months. Finally, President Truman, yielding to the pressure of Messrs. Krug, Anderson, and Harriman, appointed a Cabinet committee to make recommendations. He named as members Secretaries Krug, Anderson, and Harriman, all of them vocal advocates of the policy of handing back what remained of the Ruhr industries to the Germans. No conflicting view was represented. This Cabinet committee, as is the Washington custom, proceeded to appoint a subcommittee, called a mission, to view the supposed corpus delicti and bring in a report. The mission was selected personally by Secretary Krug. The four men constituting it were one Norman H. Collisson, a former naval captain, and sometime on the legal staff of United States Steel; Frank J. Baumis; Julius E. Grof; and Edward Falck. All of these men, particularly Captain Collisson, were close associates of and subservient to Secretary Krug, so that he was in control.

The reparations program itself was not supposed to be subject to the review of this mission. Nor was it authorized to reexamine the facts on which the reparations program was based. However, it did both of these things. One of the members of the commission spent approximately 5 weeks in Germany, and the others, 2 weeks. Chairman Collisson wrote the report and formulated the recommendations. As a contribution to the desired result, Paul G. Hoffman designated this same Collisson as ECA representative in western Germany. The others, who had opposed the recommendations while in Germany, approved them later in Washington.

The supposed object of the mission was to select a small group of plants which should be retained in Germany, the better to serve the purposes of European recovery. As a matter of fact, the report recommended the retention in Germany of practically every steel and heavy-industry plant on the reparations list, without regard to the possibility of utilizing the plants in Germany in the near future. The criterion actually applied was whether the plant could possibly be useful to the German economy at any time in the future. Despite the fact that an international agreement limited the German steel industry to 10,700,000 tons annually, the Krug-controlled mission recommended the retention of plants which would leave German steel capacity close to 20,000,000 tons, with supporting capacity in steel finishing, processing, and engineering. The mission's recommendations would leave in Germany practically the entire plant capacity that existed there at the end of the war, plus that which has been rebuilt since 1945, minus only such plants as were classified as war plants.

The Krug-controlled mission made no attempt to assess the needs of European countries for German machinery. It was concerned only with the needs of Germany. Pursuant to the recommendations, Germany would retain an industrial capacity much higher than it had in 1936, and almost as high as it had at the peak of its war production. As his contribution to World War III, General Clay even supported a $5-a-ton increase for German export coal which would place an added burden upon the steel industry of France and other countries.

The mission naturally maintained intimate liaison relations with Secretary Krug, as well as with Ambassador Harriman. It seemed to regard the Department of State, and that of the Army, as alien organizations. The mission recommended that Marshall plan aid be used as a club to force the abandonment of most of the dismantling program. This was not alien to Hoffman's own desire. It proposed the scrapping of crucial American policies on the basis of the unsupported opinion of its own members that dismantling was technologically wasteful and inefficient. Unfortunately for Captain Collisson and his merry men three, when their report was presented for signature by their principals, only Krug remained of the original Cabinet committee. Krug, of course, was more than willing to recognize the offspring of his personally selected mission, but Secretaries Brannan and Sawyer, after careful consideration, declined to do so. So far as is known, the revival of the German Ruhr

has never been presented to the entire Cabinet.

Whether instigated and directed by King and Collisson or not, an intensive underground campaign has been waged to undermine the German reparations program. According to an article in the November-December 1948 issue of Prevent World War III, by Dr. Jean Pajus, a naturalized Frenchman who has won a high reputation in this country as an economist, "Many pro-German organizations, American firms with prewar economic tie-ups, several Senators and Congressmen, some Quakers such as Felix Morley, speaking for the Sun Oil Co., and others, have been involved in the program." The author also refers to the activities of the [Representative] HERTER subcommittee on Germany, the chairman of which is Representative Francis Case of South Dakota; Prof. Carl Friedrich, of Harvard University; William H. Draper, Jr., at the time Under Secretary of the Army, but now again a vice president of the Dillon Read firm; Prof. William Elliott, also of Harvard, and close to former Reichs-Chancellor Brüning, as well as to Professor Friedrich. Dr. Pajus makes special mention of Representative John Taber, who, according to him, refuses to listen to any arguments in favor of the western nations. He lists as the most active Members of the Senate in the drive to eliminate German reparations, former Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire. He alleges that the latter, when in Germany some months earlier, had publicly called upon General Clay to stop all reparations, regardless of the promises and agreements made with our allies.

There have been other powerful influences at work to bring to a stop the reparations and denazification programs that have been in progress, not only to destroy, or at least to modify, the German war potential, but to reimburse, in part, the Allied countries of western Europe whose industrial plants had been ruthlessly destroyed by the Germans when they could not be dismantled and reassembled in Germany. The record shows that Secretary of the Army Royall (now, fortunately for the people, about to leave the government) testified before the subcommittee on appropriations of the House of Representatives on March 2, 1948. He admitted he had no sympathy with the prosecution of German war criminals in general. In reply to a question by Representative WIGGLESWORTH, Secretary Royall replied "I do not think it would be terribly serious if we stopped them all. * * * The prime objective we have now in Germany, and that we must have now in Germany, is to build a strong nation, both politically and industrially."

It would appear that what America especially has to fear at this time is not active traitors within, or potential enemies without, who would strike a deadly blow at our vitals. So far as the present and the near future are concerned, what we should beware of are the Krugs, the Collissons, the Harrimans, the Drapers and the Royalls, men who are not necessarily wicked or unpatriotic. Such men, in their stupid disregard of what the Germans will do if given the chance, would restore to the Nazis of Germany, the war potential of the Ruhr upon which a new war machine could be erected. It may be that some of these Americans, and others who could also be named, are more fools than knaves, although in justice it must be said that some are more knaves than fools. Into whichever classification they may fall, it is the duty of America's President and America's Congress to protect from such dangerous machinations those overwhelming numbers of Americans whose only desire is to live in a world that is safe, not only from war, but from a threat of war.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, probably few issues before this Congress have created as widespread interest as the various recommendations made regarding a national health policy. Because I realize that every Member of this House is gravely concerned with this problem, I would like to call attention to several serious questions raised in an editorial by Mr. Chuck Rathe, editor of one of Minnesota's outstanding rural newspapers. For 82 years the Sauk Center Herald has played a remarkable role as a community leader, and Mr. Rathe upholds that tradition well. In this editorial he raises questions that we must honestly answer.

HEALTH INSURANCE

WHY MUST IT BE COMPULSORY?

The thing that strikes us quick about the health program that President Truman has submitted is why must it be compulsory? Is everyone in this country no matter his income beyond the pale of good medical care?

The program among other things would set up a vast national insurance network in which everyone who is now eligible for social security would be an automatic member. Membership—prepayment for medical care—would be by withholding from wages matched by an additional payment from the employer.

The medical profession, even as we, all of us, would if this thing seemed aimed at our business, doesn't like the idea. They say it is socialized medicine. Period. At the very least it is nationalized health insurance, and if there's any difference, it's fine as frog's hair.

The thing that really perturbs us is that our freedom of choice about a medical insurance policy is at one fell swoop lost to us. Some indefinite power in the Federal Government, should it come to pass, has suddenly said: Here it is. Take it.

It's utterly silly and stupid to believe in these days the Federal Government will not find its way into almost every business. This is the tone of a lot of our people's thinking. They are asking for security of a sort; this requires some regulation. But the intent of this health program is to improve the health of the Nation, to insure a certain security against the bugaboo of medical costs. But will it any more attract doctors to areas not now being served? Why does a doctor go where he goes? Is it entirely money? The impact of this program is to suggest it is. We're not so naive as to think that all medical men are so high-minded (or so independent of their medical earnings) that their love for medicine is their only pay. As a matter of fact, some of the profession's utter disregard for humanitarian aspects the public thinks their oath binds them to and a certain new-world predilection with collecting bills, almost above all else, has brought the profession to this situation partly. There is, we sense, in the desperate something-must-be-done feeling about too high medical costs a certain lessening of respect for the profession that was once almost a hallowed reverence for the general practitioner.

Medical men are not unmindful of this. There is room for rate adjustment, for more preventive medicine, for community service by the profession, and even for government subsidization for people and areas who cannot have the full care.

A careful casing of the country's medical difficulties will show the areas and the people now without adequate medical care. But any such survey will almost automatically show it to stem from other lacks: proper diet, good housing, warm clothing, and enough education. And no amount of national health insurance planning will correct this in itself.

Why not, then, let the Federal Government aid these areas and these people alone, starting from the influences that add up to improper health and therefore a vast unlimited load of medical attention? Why not let them aid local and State agencies in preventive health programs, in child and student detective clinics, in building hospitals?

Compulsion is a nasty word in our vocabulary. And we would honestly rather have the inadequate care of a harried doctor who didn't know where his next payment was coming from than to be told we must accept a prepayment plan and assembly-line medicine.

Private Utilities Provide Major Funds for Washington State Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the president of the National Reclamation Association, in testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, stated that not a single private utility company made any financial contributions to the National Reclamation Association. Upon being questioned further, this witness admitted that some State associations might receive private-utility funds, but he doubted that such was the case in many instances. Inasmuch as the National Reclamation Association is financed in part by the affiliated State associations, or has some kind of reciprocal financing relationship with them, it is of interest to know more about their sources of funds. Recently the editor of the Wenatchee (Wash.) World, Rufus Woods, published the 1948 financial report of the Washington State Reclamation Association. This report shows that almost 70 percent of the total collections for the year 1948 consisted of contributions by private utilities and railroads. The power companies contributed $5,250 and the railroads $400 to the State Reclamation Association in 1948. A notation, "P. P. & L. $1,000 listed as 40 sustaining memberships" presumably refers to Pacific Power & Light Co. contributions in the form of employee memberships.

Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks the article by Rufus Woods together with a copy of an earlier letter which I addressed to the Washington State Reclamation Association requesting information on its membership and finances:

IN OUR OWN WORLD

(By Rufus Woods)

Congressman HUGH B. MITCHELL has tied in on the National Reclamation Association, declaring that it has become a propaganda

lobby for the private power companies with the power companies contributing two-thirds of the total revenues.

It begins to look as though Congressman MITCHELL may have something there. Some funny things have been happening in this Association. It fostered the iniquitous Rockwell bill which brought out a lead editorial blast even from the strong Republican newspaper, the Portland Oregonian. Among other things, that newspaper said on January 29, 1948:

"The Rockwell reclamation bill as amended and passed by the House of Representatives 232 to 120 last week is the most dangerous threat yet made against the industrial and agricultural development of the Pacific Northwest. It is also a loaded gun aimed at the Republican presidential nominee and Republican Members of Congress, because if the Senate approves it in its present form President Truman doubtless will veto it. The President will make votes and the Republican Party will lose them in the Northwest.

"Powerful interests of the East, the South, and California have at last a vehicle to realize their long-time hope of stifling industrial growth in the Northwest by forcing upward the basic rates of electricity from the Columbia River system. * * *

"The amended Rockwell bill is political dynamite for the Republican Party. But it is also sabotage of the Northwest's future, which intimately is linked with low-cost power. The Senate should bury it beyond hope of revival"

The Senate did bury it. And the voters buried Rockwell under an avalanche of votes.

So the fight for the grand old Columbia Valley still moves on. There are some indications that a Columbia Valley Administration bill may be passed by the present Congress. Of tremendous importance it is, however, that such a bill should be made to properly fit our program in the State of Washington.

In the meantime, there are organizations formed and reformed for the purpose of turning control of the Columbia to the power crowd of New York City. The fiscal report for 1948 shows where Washington State Reclamation Association gets its money:

Washington State Reclamation Association, financial report, 1948

RECEIPTS

Cash on hand Jan. 1, 1948	$64.52
Collections:	
119 sustaining memberships at $25	2,975.00
14.75 active memberships at $10	147.50
National Reclamation Association	687.50
Refund post-office-box rent	7.49
Refund telephone rental	4.90
Contributions:	
Jan. 6: Washington Water Power	2,000.00
Jan. 19: Puget Sound Power & Light	1,500.00
Oct. 7: Washington Water Power	1,000.00
Oct. 23: Puget Sound Power & Light	750.00
Nov. 22: Northern Pacific Ry	100.00
Nov. 22: Great Northern Ry	100.00
Nov. 22: Union Pacific R. R	100.00
Nov. 22: Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul R. R	100.00
Total	5,650.00
Total collections	9,536.91

(Pacific Power & Light, $1,000 listed as 40 sustaining memberships.)

It was the State Reclamation Association, too, which joined with the National Reclamation Association in trying to put over the nefarious Dondero and the Rockwell bills. The Dondero bill would have made it impossible to get any power from Grand Coulee Dam except by those concerns big enough to build a main transmission line to the bus bar at the dam. That, too, could have made a duplication of transmission lines.

The Rockwell bill was an effort to double the power rates in the Northwest.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1949.

Mr. L. W. MARKHAM,
Secretary, Washington State Reclamation Association,
Yakima, Wash.

DEAR MR. MARKHAM: Thank you for the copy of the Washington State Reclamation Association's resolution relative to valley authorities.

I have examined the resolution, which contains sweeping statements and allegations not necessarily related to the facts, and it occurs to me that when the new CVA legislation is introduced, your organization may want to give it a more careful and specific analysis than is indicated by the resolution.

You will find, I am sure, that this CVA legislation gives due and careful regard to appropriate State functions in natural resource development and is designed to encourage the utmost in State and local cooperation. The TVA, as the governors of all the Tennessee Valley States have publicly testified, has worked no injury to State's rights. Constitutional problems as to the respective spheres of State and federal jurisdiction in natural resource development have a long history of judicial decision, and under our system of government are always reviewable in the courts.

CVA legislation is designed to meet practical and urgent needs; namely, to effect coherence and amity of purpose, and operating economies, in the Federal agencies now at work in the Pacific Northwest. As you are doubtless aware, some thirty major departmental units or divisions of the Federal government are involved in one or another phase of resource development in the region. The Hoover Commission has examined these administrative arrangements and has made far-reaching recommendations for reorganization. Because this is a nonpartisan matter, I might quote with approval at this point a recent public statement by Congressman Walt Horan: "To those who have smugly insisted that the existing Federal agencies were doing a good enough job and that no need existed for a program of comprehensive river development, the findings of the Commission's task force are more devastating than any statements I might make."

The CVA, which is an effective answer to these findings, will actually make government resource administration more responsive to the needs and desires of the region than the reorganization at the Washington, D. C., level proposed by the Hoover Commission.

A correspondent who is a responsible person and well-informed about reclamation problems in the State of Washington, writes to me as follows: "The power companies and railroad companies are using the State Reclamation Association merely as a tool to further their selfish interests. They care little about the original intent of the Reclamation Association. Very few farmers and actual irrigationists belong to the Reclamation Association."

In view of the foregoing, I would greatly appreciate receiving from you information in response to the following questions: (1) What proportion of the total receipts of the Washington State Reclamation Association for the year 1948 represents the contributions of private power and railroad companies? (2) How many of the association's sustaining membership payments for the year 1948 were derived from persons employed by private power companies? (3) How many bona fide farmers are paid-up members of the association? (4) How many of the 100 irrigation districts in the State of Washington have contributed to the association during the year 1948?

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL.

American Farmers Want an American Farm Program

REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I wrote a letter to a friend in my district, a copy of which I have sent to other constituents, setting out my reasons for opposing the 90–60 slide-down scale for agricultural products and my reasons for supporting a 90-percent floor price as a minimum. I will insert the letter as part of my remarks.

In connection with my letter, I will also include an analysis of the Brannan farm program, which was prepared by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council, of Sioux City, Iowa.

Mr. Wilken's analysis and my letter are very much in accord and outline a program which can give to the farmer an average of 100-percent parity without any great cost or complicated methods of curtailing production. Through a common-sense program of soil conservation, a shift of crop acres to grass can be obtained at a relatively small cost, as provided in my soil-conservation bill, H. R. 2368.

Such expenditures for soil conservation should be considered as a national investment in the future production and income of the United States. With each $1 of gross farm income translating into $7 of national income, it is imperative that we maintain full employment and a solvent national economy.

I feel that one of the most necessary steps which this session of Congress can take is to restore the 90-percent price floor for 1950 and make it a permanent policy. Such a step will restore the confidence of the American people, which has been severely shaken by the recent drop in commodity prices.

Unless we can fully realize the absolute necessity of maintaining a continuous flow of new wealth from the soil at a prosperous level as a foundation for our national income, the future of our Nation is in great danger. The Government as such has no money and if the huge Federal budget is to be met, we must have a high national income, an impossibility

without first having the proper farm income to create it.

I will also include in these remarks an analysis of my soil conservation bill, H. R. 2368, which I introduced March 23, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1949.

DEAR FRIEND: Regarding the 90 to 60 percent slide-down scale for basic farm crops, versus the 90-percent support prices now in effect on such commodities, in order that you will know just why I am for the 90-percent support base, I will give you the background of what brought about the 90–60-percent provision which goes into effect January 1, 1950, as provided in the Aiken bill.

You know, of course, that the labor leaders made a lot of noise about high cost of food long before the last Presidential campaign got under way. They knew, of course, that it would be popular with most members of the trade-unions to do so, but they did not tell their members that their food bill was costing them a less percentage of their wage dollar than it had during any peacetime period of full employment in the history of our Nation.

The New Deal party has constantly worked overtime in their great desire to prove to labor that they were the champions of high wages and cheap food, while out of the other corner of their mouth telling the farmers they were for a high price for his products. Hence, the New Deal have received a great majority of labor's votes. However, in the last campaign they felt it would be necessary for them to further prove to labor that they were still for cheaper food in order to hold the labor vote. So here is exactly how they did it.

The labor leaders collaborated with high officials of the Department of Agriculture in writing the so-called Aiken long-term agriculture bill. One of the provisions in the bill was the 90–60-percent slide-down scale for basic farm-crop supports. And between the New Deal campaign strategists and the labor leaders the Aiken bill was sold lock, stock, and barrel to the top men of our farm organizations.

The bill came to the Agriculture Committee of the House and the Senate very late in the last regular session of the Eightieth Congress. The House Agriculture Committee turned thumbs down cold on the 90–60 percent provisions. The bill came to the House with the full 90 percent provisions in the bill and was passed by the House in that form.

The Senate Agriculture Committee also held hearings on the bill and inserted the 90–60 percent slide-down scale provision. The bill was then taken to the floor of the Senate at about 2 a. m. one morning during the last week of the regular session of the Eightieth Congress, where Senator AIKEN, from Vermont, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, put the bill through the Senate with very little debate. After which the Senate and House conferees met in almost constant session for several days and nights to thrash out their differences in the bill. The 90–60 percent slide-down scale provision inserted by the Senate versus the full 90 percent House provision was the main point of contention between the two Houses. These conferences between the House and Senate were held during the very last few days of the regular session. The House Members held out for the full 90 percent of parity until about 4 a. m. on the morning of June 20, the very day Congress adjourned. However, a compromise between the Members of the two Houses was effected, and the 90 percent support provision to remain in effect until January 1, 1950, after which time the 90–60 percent slide-down scale was to go into effect. Then the compromise report was brought to the floor of the House about 30 minutes thereafter. The bill was passed by the House and the Senate within a very few minutes thereafter, and in due time the bill was signed by the President.

It is noteworthy that the very next day after the bill was passed prices on most all farm products began to drop and have been on the decline since, and from that day on the unemployment rolls have mounted. Now I am thoroughly convinced that until we repeal the 90–60 percent provision in the bill prices on farm commodities will continue to slide down and unemployment rolls will continue to mount proportionately. Not only will grain prices tumble further, but hog, cattle, and poultry prices will go right down the toboggan with them.

Let us not forget that farm prices were 66 percent of parity on an average in 1931–33, and that during those times not only the farmer, but the businessman, the laboring man and everybody in America were in a serious predicament. I need not remind you of this, I am sure, for I know you are old enough to remember it. There was on an average of 14,000,000 American people who were unable to find work during that era, for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. Now certainly that should be a lesson we dare not forget, regardless of our politics, faith, or vocation.

Ever since my first year in Congress I have cooperated very closely with common-sense economic analysts and many Congressmen, most of whom are from farm States, in search of facts and figures to guide us in the right direction to avoid, if humanly possible, another depression, and possibly the complete destruction of our system of government and everything worth while in our blessed land.

Here is what these many years of research has brought to light. For the past 20 years the records of the Department of Commerce, which are compiled from the records of the Department of Agriculture, Labor, and from other accurate sources in Government records, show that whether it be periods of peace, depression, war, or postwar prosperity such as we now have, the national income has been and is now approximately seven times the farm income. The postwar prosperity which we have enjoyed since World War II has held up mainly because we have had a high farm income due to the fact that basic farm commodities have been supported by our 90 percent parity law.

If you will remember, it was less than 2 years after the close of World War I that farm prices took such a terrific drop which brought about a national depression in 1920. And during the several years thereafter many farmers lost their farms and a lot of business houses closed their doors for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. I remember that era only too well, as I was at that time running a lumber yard in Exira, Iowa, dealing with farmers almost exclusively. Certainly that horrible experience should be a lesson to all of us. It must not happen again. I am thoroughly convinced, after much study, that the 90–60 percent slide-down support scale on basic farm prices will bring about a repetition of a like condition during the era which I have just described.

Doubtless you have heard the argument it is necessary to reduce the price on farm commodities to avoid great surpluses from piling up, which the Government would have to buy and store in greater quantities than would be possible for the Government finances to stand. That argument falls flat with those who have made a deep study of what causes surpluses to pile up, which is, when the buying power of the people is not sufficient to purchase the goods they need for the high standard of living we Americans want and expect. The facts are that a greatly reduced American standard of living will very surely be brought about by a great reduction in prices of farm commodities, since all wealth springs from mother earth, and because as I said before, the national income each year is approximately seven times the farm income; so, unless we maintain a high farm income sufficient to generate a high national income, and thereby assuring high consumption of all goods, Americans will be in serious trouble, and you can bank on that.

Here is something else to think about. Who in America would expect the good Lord to continue to bless us with such abundant crops as we have enjoyed the past 8 years? I am sure, you, like I, will agree that that would be too much to expect of Him who runs nature's business. We are bound to have crop failures in some degree most any year now, and should it become our lot to suffer, say even a 25 percent crop reduction on an average for a period of 2, 3, or 4 years all over America, below the average of the past 8 years, how I ask in all sincerity would we feed and clothe the American people the way they like to be fed and clad, let alone help to feed the world, when now we are exporting only about 3 percent of our farm production?

You will also hear the argument that unless the Secretary of Agriculture is given the authority to reduce support prices as is provided in the 90–60 percent slide-down provision, that surpluses will pile up to such a degree that acreage control will again be necessary. That argument also falls flat when we know that it was cheap farm prices that brought about acreage control in the AAA bill of the early thirties. And the result of that program was that the farmers so fertilized and mined their allotted cash-crop-producing acres, that they produced more than ever, and were obliged to do so to meet their bills.

The 90-percent support-price program on basic farm products—corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, peanuts, and rice—has not cost the American taxpayer one thin dime to date. It has actually made a profit to the United States Treasury, to say nothing about the great benefits to the farmers of America and to our whole economy, and for these reasons I certainly will not be a party to a program which I honestly believe will be destructive to not only the prosperity of our Nation, but also to the peace and progress of our Nation and the world.

You, no doubt, also have heard the argument about the potato situation. I agree that potatoes, which are perishable and cannot be stored for any definite period, should not be supported at the full 90 percent of parity. The facts are that the Potato Growers Association of America suggested to Congress that the support price on potatoes be materially reduced. And the provisions in the Aiken bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to do so. Hence, that argument made by the sliding-down-scale advocates also falls flat.

If our national income is drastically reduced the American market, which is the only stable and good market of the world today, will lose its buying power, and when that time comes we will neither be able to pay our own way nor help foreign nations with loans or free dollars with which to buy our goods or other nations' goods, or to ward off communistic aggression any place in the world, America included.

Records of the past 20 years also prove that for each dollar of gross farm income, labor (which includes all kinds, blue denim, white collar, and professional) receives an income of over $4, so the laboring people have a mighty big stake in keeping the farmer's income on a high level, the source of all wealth. Regarding the businessman's interest in this proposition, I am sure I need not explain to them the need of keeping a high farm income for they know that is the only thing which will insure good profitable trade for them.

A $42,000,000,000 annual Federal tax take from the American people means that each American family pays on an average of over $1,000 per year in direct and indirect Federal taxes. Add to this around $300 which each family is paying per year in local, county, and State taxes, it makes a total outlay in taxes per year for each family of over $1,300. That being a fact, we must surely do two things, keep our national income at the highest possible figure and stop wasting the taxpayers' dollars.

I hope this will explain my reason for opposing any law which will reduce farm income.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

THE BRANNAN FARM PROGRAM—DO WE WANT SOCIALISM OR OUR AMERICAN SYSTEM?

(Prepared by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa)

Memorandum to Members of Congress:

ANALYSIS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BRANNAN'S FARM PROGRAM

Stated briefly, the Brannan farm program as presented to the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate, if analyzed with the use of arithmetic and the record of our economy, is a socialistic gimmick.

Secretary Brannan in his preliminary analysis admits the importance of a stable farm income and makes the important admission that depressions are precipitated by a drop in farm prices. The conclusion is verified by the past record of our economy and is not recognized by some interests that have opposed proper price supports. Price supports are not a form of socialism.

In fact, the basic economy of the United States has always had a price support in the form of the tariff. Over a period of 150 years, the tariff, although at times giving some groups an advantage over others, indirectly helped all groups. For example, the South, with an exportable surplus of cotton, had to sell in the world market, but because of a higher income in the United States the American people consume five times as much cotton as the average citizen in the balance of the world and in this way the South did receive an indirect benefit.

The net result of the tariff was an American price level which averaged approximately 30 percent above the world level. With our natural resources and a higher price level, we were able to create the income for greater per capita consumption and to create the new capital to develop and buy better tools of production to increase our efficiency, the real measure of our standard of living. Price is relative and the real cost of living is dependent upon per-man production.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER NATIONS

This differential in price has created a standard of production and consumption in the United States that, when compared with the rest of the world, is almost fantastic.

It can be illustrated by a few simple facts. The United States has approximately 6 percent of the world's population and produces 25 percent (physical quantity) of the world's goods. Because of our tools of production and the use of power energy the average American worker produces five times as much goods as the average worker in the balance of the world.

As a result of this per man efficiency more goods and services are exchanged and we have a greater turn-over of the dollar value of our raw material or new wealth production. In the case of farm products, the gear wheel of our prosperity, each $1 of gross farm income translates into $7 of national income. (See table attached for the period 1929–48.)

In comparison, the balance of the world has an income approximately two times its gross farm production. As a result of this increased turn of new dollars created by new farm production the 6 percent of the population of the world living in the United States has 45 percent of the income in terms of dollars annually created by world production. With this buying power the American people consume approximately 50 percent of the goods produced from mineral raw materials. Therefore, we have become the gear wheel of world economy. We use 70 percent of the automobiles, half the radios, half the telephones, etc.

To illustrate this differential, over a billion people living in other nations could not afford to use an automobile even though we gave it to them.

IGNORES FACTS

Secretary Brannan and his experts, however, completely ignore this differential and ignore the need of a tariff to adjust the differences in incomes and purchasing power. Without a tariff, the United States will be forced into a position of having to support farm prices throughout the world to protect our own solvency and prosperity. Secretary Brannan seems to have a vague conception of this basic fact and, therefore, brings forth the idea of permitting prices to seek their own level.

On a free trade basis this would be the world level. As an illustration of what this level would be, we can make a comparison with Great Britain. It requires the English worker 19 hours to earn $10 as compared to 8 hours required by the average American worker. In other words, the English worker has a buying power of less than one-half in terms of goods, etc. Following the Brannan proposal to permit prices to seek their own level under a policy of free trade would reduce our price level approximately 50 percent.

This would mean a reduction of over $100,000,000,000 in national income. Out of the remaining $100,000,000,000 Secretary Brannan would have to collect the taxes to pay one-half of his parity income support of $26,000,000,000 or approximately $13,000,000,000. It can't be done and the program will result in a depression and planned scarcity with agriculture under a dictatorship of price and production.

Secretary Brannan doesn't point out that the Federal Treasury has no money except what it can collect from taxes against the national income or by an increase in the national deficit.

SIMILAR TO TRIPLE A

The basic philosophy of the program is similar to the triple-A program of the thirties with its acreage control and marketing quotas. The principal new feature is the direct offer of cheap food to the consumer. This makes it an ideal program to get the votes. By fooling the farmer with a program of assured income, promising cheap food to the consumer, and high wages to labor, he expects to get the support to put into operation a program which will socialize agriculture, the foundation of our American system. The public appeal of this proposal should not be underestimated.

Secretary Brannan's program is quite similar in pattern to English socialism with its subsidized food, etc. Since one of the British leaders has stated that the system of English socialism is the happy medium between our system of capitalism and Russian communism, the program may be the result of a compromise between our economic experts and those of Great Britain. It is in line with the wheat agreement which provides for the sale of wheat at the end of 5 years to the rest of the world at $1.10 per bushel or one-half the price needed to keep the United States solvent.

It is also in accord with the program of the ITO (International Trade Organization) which would divide world markets and allot production in a program of international socialism.

MATHEMATICAL MONSTROSITY

But, even though Secretary Brannan has thrown arithmetic to the four winds, two times two will still make four. The program, if put into operation, will lead the American people and the world into economic chaos. The rest of the world needs a prosperous United States, an impossibility unless we maintain our farm price structure at a proper level so that through the seven times turn of agricultural income we can generate the national income for national solvency, full employment and prosperity.

Instead of thinking in terms of reducing our price to world levels, we should recognize that world problems are the result of too low a price for its raw material production, and that the only way in which we can help the rest of the world is to reorganize foreign exchange and prices at a par with our own. Then the world can earn its income and the international WPA carried on by ECA will be unnecessary.

The key fallacy leading to Secretary Brannan's program is the "cost of living" complex. His experts don't seem to realize that farm income is the source of national income and that higher farm prices do not increase the real cost of living. Stated simply, if the American people are willing to pay 80 cents for beefsteak, the current wage level and national income level can be maintained. If, however, they wish to have 40-cent steak, then they will have to be content with one-half of the current wage level and one-half the national income.

I would like briefly to analyze why agriculture is the gear wheel. In the United States we have about 6,000,000 farms and approximately 3,800,000 other business units. In other words, agriculture has two-thirds of the business units in our economic cycle. It produces approximately 70 percent of all raw materials and 70 percent of all goods sold at retail are made up of the simple items of food, tobacco, beverage, clothing, and shoes. Directly and indirectly approximately 70 percent of our labor is employed in the production, processing, and distribution of farm products and the services incident thereto. A drop in farm prices is immediately reflected in the dollar volume of this 70 percent of our economy and a depression is inevitable as farm prices go below parity, which in business terms is the average cost of production plus the average profit of all business. The severity of the depression will ratio in direct proportion to the percentage of parity.

This constant balance can be illustrated by the following table which sets forth the various incomes at the 1939 price level and at the 1948 price level:

	1939	1948	Percentage increase
Gross farm income [1]	$10,000,000,000	$32,000,000,000	220
National income	72,500,000,000	224,500,000,000	209
Total wages	45,000,000,000	137,000,000,000	207
Retail sales	42,000,000,000	130,000,000,000	209
Expenditures for food [2]	15,800,000,000	48,800,000,000	208

[1] Gross farm income is all products sold for cash and all farm products consumed on the farm or the total value of all farm production.

[2] Expenditures for food are taken from Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce, and do not include tobacco and alcoholic beverages.

1939: Farm price, 84 percent of parity. 1948: 110 percent of parity.

AUTOMATIC BALANCE

Of major importance is the almost equal rise in dollar value for the major segment of our economy since 1939. In 1939 we had 8,000,000 unemployed because of too low a farm price structure and a national deficit of over $3,000,000,000. In 1948 our economy

had recovered from most of the dislocations of World War II and the different ratios were almost the same as 1939.

The record of our economy over the period 1929–48 proves that these segments adjust each other very quickly to the price change in farm products and are a practical constant in their percentage of national income.

In spite of all the comment in regard to the high cost of living in 1948, the Nation didn't spend any greater percent of its income for food in 1948 than in 1939. In fact the percentage was 21.8 percent of the national income in both years. The constancy of the ratio can be illustrated with a further comparison. In 1930–39, an era of low farm prices, the cost of food was 24.28 percent of the national income. In 1946 it was 24.1 percent and 1947 it was 23.9 percent.

When analyzed on a real basis the average American citizen received approximately 15 percent more food per capita in 1946–48 for the same percentage of income than he did in 1930-39. Stated in similar terms, the American worker received more food for an hour of work in 1947 and 1948 than any other period in history. It might be well to point out that the $48,800,000,000 of food expenditures in 1948 was only slightly less than the Federal revenue. Therefore, Secretary Brannan and his aides should be more concerned about governmental expenditures which are extremely high while the cost of living is no greater than in 1939.

Secretary Brannan's experts, instead of realizing this fact, now intend to reduce the price of foodstuffs. If they do, they will reduce the national income in direct proportion and a depression will result. Those who still have a job will have a lower food cost at the expense of the unemployed and Federal deficits for WPA and other Federal projects to create employment. If they pay the taxes for the WPA and food subsidies they will find that their cost of living has increased.

This factor can again be illustrated by the record. In 1948 the Nation spent approximately $90,000,000,000 for food, tobacco, beverage, clothing, and shoes. If, under the Brannan program, the prices of these items are permitted to seek their own level, which as I have pointed out under a free trade program is the world level, the retail sales of these products will drop approximately 50 percent or $45,000,000,000.

As this drop in retail sales volume takes place, the retail merchant will lose the income to pay taxes and current wages. As wages in the retail trade are reduced underconsumption will follow. Secretary Brannan would cure this underconsumption with curtailment of production. Curtailed production will means a reduced flow of raw materials through our economy and further unemployment will take place. This in turn will pyramid the spiral downward and we will find our economy in a regimented depression. Any attempt to collect taxes to balance the budget will give further impetus to the depression.

And with labor and agriculture voting together because of their economic dependence upon the Government, the rest of American industry will be easy to subdue through taxes and capital levies. It's not a very pleasant future to contemplate and becomes utterly ridiculous in the light of facts.

We will continue in our confusion in an attempt to get something for nothing. Lower farm prices, instead of making it possible for the underprivileged to eat, will force the inefficient to be unemployed and a ward of society.

POSITIVE ANALYSIS

With the use of the record of the United States for the 20-year period 1929–48, a clear-cut and positive analysis can be made. For example, the record will reveal that for each 10 percent of parity for agriculture, using the simple comparison of prices received by the farmer as compared to prices paid, there is involved 10 percent of national income, 10 percent of total wages, 10 percent of employment, 10 percent consumption, and 10 percent retail sales volume. In the period 1930-39, using farm prices and factory employment as 100, farm prices averaged 82 percent of 1929 parity and employment was 81 percent.

Parity prices for agriculture cost society nothing. Not until farmers, businessmen, laboring people, and their representatives in government take the time out to check this simple fact, which the record of the United States so clearly proves, will we be able to solve our economic problems.

Brannan and his aides in analyzing the importance of agricultural income seem to recognize that farm income must be maintained to prevent a collapse of our economy. But in some way or other they seem to have gotten their signals mixed up and have started for a touchdown march to the depression goal line.

In all fairness to them, I would like to point out that they are going in the same direction set out in the Aiken farm bill with its 60-percent price floor. The impossibility of the 60-percent price floor can be proved from the record.

In the 5-year period, 1930–34, using the current parity formula, agriculture received 66 percent of parity, or 6 percent more than the floor price in the Aiken bill. We all can remember the unemployment that existed in that period. In the 5-year period 1935–39, agriculture received 84 percent of parity, and in 1939 the census gave our unemployment as 8,000,000, which was approximately 16 percent of our available labor force in 1939, or 1-percent unemployment for each 1 percent that farm prices were below parity. No program can maintain full employment and national prosperity unless it provides an average of 100 percent of parity for agriculture.

Once we realize that the seven times turn of gross farm income into national income is a positive force regardless of price level and that all groups are benefited in direct proportion by an increase of farm production and parity prices for agriculture our problem simplifies itself. It is not a question of what it will cost to maintain farm prices at parity. It becomes a question of what we will lose if we do not support the farm price structure at an average of 100 parity. It becomes a question of general welfare and good business operation. A return to 1939 price levels would mean a loss of at least $125,000,000,000 of national income.

WAR PERIOD

The war period proves the effect of parity prices. After 12 years of depression, 1930–41, in which we spent about $3,000,000,000 per year in boon-doggling—curtailment of imports as a result of the war—gave our economy an opportunity to adjust itself to full production and war costs. By the end of 1941 or before our entry into the war, we were back to a level of full employment and our farm prices had recovered their 1925–29 parity with finished goods:

Price ceilings during the war prevented our economy from adjusting itself to the increase in the national debt. We could have paid for the war on a pay-as-you-go basis. In the 3-year period, 1943–45, our national income exceeded all consumer expenditures during the 3 years by $200,000,000,000. Instead of levying taxes to pay war costs we borrowed the funds from our income. The most ridiculous part of it all was that we even subsidized our food bill during the war and charged it to the national debt.

With the removal of the price ceilings, these adjustments to carry the national debt took place and in 1947–48 we had the highest employment in ratio to population that we have ever had; we had a balanced national budget and the highest per capita consumption of goods in history. Now, however, the effect of a return of foreign production becomes a competitive item under a policy of free trade and currency devaluation. Future expectations of these imports and the reduction of price floors to 60 percent of parity January 1, 1950, under the Aiken bill, have set the stage for lower prices all along the line.

In 1948 the 35 key commodities carried in the Associated Press Commodity Index averaged approximately 186 percent of 1926 as 100. The current level is 160. This represents a reduction of 14 percent Therefore, the national income of $224,500,000,000 in 1948 will drop back at least 14 percent or approximately $31,500,000,000. Our experts call this a mild adjustment. This reduction in national income will force a reduction as compared to 1948 of 14 percent in retail sales volume and 14 percent in total wages, either through a reduction in wages or through unemployment and fewer hours of work per week. A recent report of the United States Department of Commerce points out that 21 percent of our labor is working only 35 hours per week as a result of the price drop. The price drop since January 1 translated into lower tax returns will materially reduce the Federal revenue.

GOVERNMENTAL CONTROL

Much of this price drop can be attributed to the miserable handling of our economy by the departments that now ask for still further controls. The different departments of Government had complete control over the imports and exports of fats and oils. Our annual production of fats and oils represents about 10,000,000,000 pounds. All told, they are about 10 percent of our agricultural economy in the way of income.

In the year 1947 these departments refused to properly allocate fats and oils for the export market even though Europe was desperately in need of fats and oils. They carried out the same policy in 1948 but permitted unrestricted imports. As a direct result in the 2 years 1947–48 we had a net import of approximately 840,000,000 pounds of fats and oils. This glutted our market and resulted in a complete demoralization of the fats and oil prices. Lard dropped from 28 cents per pound to 11 cents. Tallow from 25 cents to 5 cents and other fats and oils, like corn oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, etc., in direct proportion.

This in turn had a repercussion on the livestock market. The packer, in order to recover the losses resulting from a low lard price, penalized the farmer for heavy hogs and penalized the consumer 10 to 15 cents per pound through a higher price for pork chops. The end result was a very bearish situation and hog prices started to tumble. In fact the miserable handling of the fats and oils situation was the prime mover in the commodity price drop.

I would like to apply the fats and oils situation to Brannan's farm program. The support price under his program for corn is $1.46 per bushel. On the 13 to 1 ratio of corn to hogs this would mean a support price of 19-cent hogs. On the basis of 19-cent hogs lard should sell for 25 cents per pound wholesale. But, the planners have permitted it to drop to 11 cents. Now they are going to ask Congress to vote funds to support the hog price, etc.

TARIFF SUPPORT

All of this could have been avoided by the simple process of a tariff at the parity level. The tariff would have prevented the glut in our market and would have supported the fats and oils price and in turn the hog price, etc. If Brannan carries through his program and permits lard to sell at 11 cents per pound, hog prices to balance with it would have to drop to 8 cents per pound. This would force Secretary Brannan to pay the

farmer $22 on every 200 pounds of hogs live weight. Current lard prices are similar to those existing in 1939, and if farm prices were permitted to drop to that level in order to give the consumer cheap food, the Department of Agriculture would have to pay out approximately $18,000,000,000 to maintain Secretary Brannan's $26,000,000,000 parity income level. In addition, 1939 farm prices would reduce our national income to $100,000,000,000.

AN AMERICAN FARM PROGRAM

What has happened in the case of fats and oils can be repeated many times with other products on a free-trade basis. It can happen in textiles, fruits, butter, vegetables, wool, and woolen manufactures, metals, petroleum, etc.

I feel that everyone realizes that the world problem and the danger of communism has its roots in poverty. Why then should we try to solve the problem by helping to perpetuate the low prices for raw materials in the rest of the world and jeopardize our own price level? The greatest aid we can render the world is to maintain a prosperous economy.

Therefore, Secretary Brannan should have come forth with a program to maintain farm prices at parity so as to maintain full employment and prosperity in the United States.

Then he should have recommended that this price be protected with a tariff at the parity level and that this tariff be flexible and in direct proportion to the difference in world prices and the American cost level.

From that as a foundation the State Department could notify the world that we expect them to reorganize their exchange and price structure to conform to that of the United States, and if a wheat agreement is to be signed it should be on the basis of a world price of $2.20 instead of $1.10. Further, that as the world adjusts its economy on a sound and prosperous basis which will not require an international WPA financed by the United States, the tariff will be reduced in direct proportion to the increase in world prices.

Such a tariff would automatically provide an indirect price support at no cost for 85 percent of American production and would be equitable to all groups. To this could be added commodity loans at 90 percent of parity on the eight principal nonperishable crops, representing approximately 85 percent of our harvested production. The tariff at the parity level would support our price level in the same way that it has for 150 years. The farmer should be permitted to produce to the fullest extent compatible with good soil conservation. If a shift in crops is desired it can be carried out through soil-conservation payments, which in turn should be considered as an investment in a future supply of new wealth for the generations to follow. Commodity loans on a known and permanent basis can be carried by the banks in our local communities and would represent an investment in real wealth in the same manner that we maintain the price of our gold supply. A reserve of basic nonperishable crops in case of drought and war would be more valuable than gold.

The cost of such a program would be very minor as compared to a loss of $100,000,000,000 of national income which will result if we do not support farm prices, and could easily be borne out of a national income comparable to the $224,500,000,000 which we had in 1948.

The surplus in the United States has been grossly misrepresented. In 1948 our total exports of agricultural products amounted to $3,420,000,000 and our imports amounted to $3,150,000,000. If we had charged the net export of $270,000,000 to profit and loss, it would be an infinitesimal part of the $224,500,000,000 of national income generated in 1948 through a $32,000,000,000 gross farm income.

In fact, if we had to charge off the entire export of $3,470,000,000 out of a national income of $224,500,000,000 which we know we can have with a $32,000,000,000 gross farm income, it would be a small charge, indeed, to pay for full employment and a solvent United States.

With such a program we can give the world the leadership it needs if the cold war against communism is to be won. If we follow the Brannan proposal, we will end up in a depression that will make 1932 seem like a Sunday-school picnic and communism will have a field day and our socialized economy will be a close counterpart to the Russian system.

The real danger in Brannan's proposal is the confusion it will create. It may tend to confuse Congress and prevent it from repealing the Aiken farm bill, which, if permitted to operate after January 1, 1950, will also plunge us into a depression.

To head off what may be a full-fledged collapse of our economy, Congress, before voting all the funds for foreign aid from an unknown national income, should restore the 90-percent parity-price floor and protect it as I have outlined. From that as a foundation we can make a realistic attempt to restore world economy on a sound basis. Without that as a foundation we will continue to pour the resources of the United States down the rat hole and destroy the economic system that has given 6 percent of the population of the world 45 percent of the income and the highest standard of living in history.

In conclusion, I wish to state that parity for agriculture is the solution to our economic confusion. To have such an economic program does not require socialism, although it does require a better understanding of our own economy.

If retail merchants and the factory workers realized that unchangeable laws of exchange and arithmetic will force a loss of approximately $4.20 in retail sales volume and $4.20 in total wages for each $1 drop in gross farm income, they would want to impeach the President and Members of Congress if farm prices are permitted to fall below an average of 100 percent of parity.

The program of 90-percent commodity loans and a tariff at parity would permit our prices to fluctuate between 90 percent of parity and 110 percent as a ceiling, the indirect effect of the tariff at the parity level. Our economy would average approximately 100 percent of parity, the automatic balance in exchange of goods. It would be strictly in accord with our own American system.

Our forefathers in the Constitution gave Congress the power to levy tariffs and to "regulate the value of the dollar." To provide stability of price at the parity level, the point of equal exchange, is nothing more than a stable monetary system.

The so-called depressions of the past have been due to price dislocations resulting from wildly fluctuating farm prices.

There can be no social security without price stability. Provisions for Government doles become a myth as falling prices destroy the income of the Nation and preclude taxation to pay the bill.

Our annual cycle of production if priced at an average of parity will automatically give us a level of income and prosperity in direct proportion to our ability to produce goods—the real wealth—which determines our economic welfare.

The record of the United States, if properly analyzed, reveals the "key to prosperity," namely, farm prices at parity. We are in a position to give the world a new message of prosperity and peace. Instead of that we find our Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants trying to get something for nothing with a proposal that is neither based on sound economics or our American system.

If we insist on pricing wheat and other farm products at a level of $1.10 per bushel for wheat instead of $2.20, then we must be content with only one-half of our current income and wage level. Yes; then we must be content with socialism and communism instead of economic and civil freedom.

Year	Gross farm income (billions)	Percent gross farm income of national	Mineral production (billions)	Combined or total raw material income (billions)	National income (billions)	Percent of raw material income to national
1929	$13.0	14.8	$5.8	$18.8	$87.3	21.4
1930	10.5	14.0	4.7	15.2	75.0	20.2
1931	7.6	13.9	3.1	10.7	58.8	18.2
1932	5.7	13.6	2.4	8.1	41.7	19.4
1933	6.4	16.2	2.5	8.9	39.6	22.4
1934	7.8	16.0	3.3	11.1	48.6	22.8
1935	9.0	15.8	3.6	12.6	56.8	22.1
1936	10.0	14.9	4.5	14.5	66.9	21.6
1937	10.6	14.4	5.4	16.0	73.6	21.7
1938	9.4	13.9	4.3	13.7	67.3	20.3
1939	9.9	13.6	4.9	14.8	72.5	20.4
1940	10.3	12.7	5.6	15.9	81.3	19.5
1941	13.1	12.6	6.8	19.9	103.8	19.1
1942	17.7	13.0	7.5	25.2	136.4	18.5
1943	23.0	13.6	8.0	31.0	168.2	18.5
1944	23.6	12.9	8.5	32.1	182.2	17.6
1945	24.0	13.1	8.9	32.9	182.8	18.0
1946	27.1	15.2	9.1	36.2	178.3	20.3
1947	33.0	16.2	12.4	45.4	202.5	22.4
1948 [1]	32.4	14.4	15.6	48.0	225.0	21.3

[1] Estimated for 1948.

NOTE.—Gross farm income is total farm production sold, plus farm products used on the farm. Total average percentage of gross farm income to national income 14.3 percent or approximately $1 of gross farm production to $7 of national income.

Average percentage of total farm and mineral production 20.2 or approximately $1 of raw material income, farm and mine, for each $5 of national income. Percentage of parity for raw materials determines the percent of prosperity and each 1 percent of parity for raw materials represents approximately $2,000,000,000 of national income. Society cannot afford to permit raw material prices to go below parity and employment and national income will ratio directly to raw material income in ratios set out above.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2368 BY HON. BEN. F. JENSEN, OF IOWA

On February 7, 1949, I introduced in the House of Representatives the Soil Conservation Act of 1949. This new bill, H. R. 2368—a revised and improved soil-conservation program based on H. R. 4417, which I introduced in 1947—provides for lasting benefits to the farmer and to every American.

This legislation provides a national land policy, and the legislative framework for the effective administration of a United States Department of Agriculture soil-conservation program that will assist our farmers and ranchers to conserve and make proper use of their soil and water resources—and will get the job done in the shortest possible time.

In addition, there are provisions which will help to correct the problem of surplus in certain crops. Land-use-conversion payments will encourage farmers to use some of the land contributing to such surplus for the production of crops for which there is greater demand, such as gras. for meat and dairy livestock and timber. When the proper and necessary changes in land use are made I am sure there will be no need for acreage allotments. In bringing about a balance in agriculture production the Government will be better enabled to support farm prices permanently at a full 90 percent of parity.

By using about $100,000,000 annually of the funds now being used for soil-conservation payments, for land-use conversion payments, as provided in my bill, 24,000,000 acres of land could be converted from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops in the next 6 years. This would bring our food, feed, grain, fiber, and meat production into better balance, and greatly assist in flood prevention, and soil, woodland, and water conservation.

Conservation payments and grants-in-aid are provided in such manner that the taxpayer can be assured that the Nation will receive a dollar's worth of benefits in true, effective soil conservation for every dollar spent. Farmers receive more responsibility in administering their own national soil and water conservation program. No new agencies are established. The Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Production and Marketing Administration are each given more responsibility and without duplication.

If H. R. 2368 becomes the law of the land it will begin to bring "soilicide" to an end, the crime too often committed against the priceless topsoil of mother earth. It will insure a more stable income for our farmers, which in turn will insure an adequate and stable income for workers, business, and industry. It will be an effective program to help reduce price-depressing surpluses; increase the speed and quality of soil-conservation work in the Nation, while strengthening the farmer-managed institutions engaged in such work; keep more rainfall on the land where it falls, and thus lower flood crests and reduce reservoir sedimentation; give better protection of our rich agricultural uplands and bottom lands, human lives, livestock, and buildings; save the taxpayers'—your—money through a more efficient and effective farmer-managed water, woodland, and soil-conservation program; provide the legislative and administrative framework to put our agricultural house in order—for any national or international emergency.

NATIONAL LAND POLICY

A productive and prosperous agriculture is a must for the Nation's prosperity. The wealth of our Nation is wholly dependent upon the productivity of our soil. As the topsoil is destroyed or weakened through erosion or overuse, the productive capacity of that land is lowered. Food costs rise and a lowered standard of living results. This legislation provides that we use our agricultural land within its capabilities for safe production, and that we treat each acre in accordance with its needs.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION SURVEY

Early completion of a Nation-wide survey of our farm, ranch, and woodlands to determine the productive capacity and conservation needs of each acre is provided. A land capability map shall then be made available to each landowner, showing how each acre should be used according to its capabilities for safe production.

CONSERVATION TIMETABLE

A conservation timetable shall be developed as a guide to the Nation in determining the speed with which our farm, ranch, and woodlands should be treated to prevent further extensive damage.

SOUND FARM UNITS

H. R. 2368 will assist landowners in acquiring acreage to complete a profitable farm, and thus reduce much land overuse resulting from uneconomic-size units.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical help for effecting proper land use and conservation treatment shall be made available to all farmers. Inside conservation districts, technical help shall include on-site assistance to plan and apply a properly coordinated conservation program. Until a district is organized, such help shall be limited to helping farmers carry out the more simple but effective conservation practices.

CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

To encourage proper use and conservation of our agricultural resources, land-use conversion, soil-conserving, and soil-building payments and grants-in-aid shall be made available.

Class A: To avoid surpluses resulting from overuse of the land, payments shall be made to assist farmers in converting the use of land that has been for the previous two or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops. This will encourage a balanced production of food, feed, grains, and fiber, and promote a greater production of meat and dairy livestock, and timber crops.

Class B: Payments shall be made to help farmers defray the cost of applying certain permanent or semipermanent soil- and water-conservation measures. Generally, such payments shall be made only once.

Class C: As an added incentive to encourage farmers to hold their topsoil through proper land use, and other soil- and water-conservation practices, class C payments may also be made annually for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility.

LOCAL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND FARMER COMMITTEES

This legislation recognizes that farmers themselves are best qualified to administer their own national conservation program on a local and community level. Farmer-voted conservation districts organized under the laws of respective States and directed by their respective boards of soil-conservation commissioners and supervisors, and county agricultural conservation association, and State Production and Marketing Administration committees shall be the principal farmer-managed organizations through which the Government shall assist farmers with their soil- and water-conservation problems.

AGENCIES TO BE USED

Primarily, three governmental agencies shall carry out the provisions of this act. Each is well-schooled in the art of doing its part in soil and water conservation.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Because it is impractical to separate the technical, conservation payment, and grants-in-aid assistance in soil conservation, erosion control, drainage, irrigation, water-conservation development, and flood prevention on farm and ranch land, the Soil Conservation Service shall be responsible for all such provisions of this act, except for the specific responsibilities of County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production Marketing Administration committees.

EXTENSION SERVICE

This legislation provides for the needed personnel for county extension staffs for educational work in conservation districts and in areas critically in need of conservation treatment not now in conservation districts.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production and Marketing Administration committees shall be the agents of the Secretary of Agriculture in making all class A, B, and C conservation payments.

FEDERAL LANDS

With cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction, all of the conservation survey, time table, and technical assistance provisions of this act may be made available for the conservation of federally controlled lands.

We must save the soil by which we live. Rich productive soil will insure the survival of America.

A Friendly Analysis of the Columbia River Bills—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks today, I include the third and final part of my analysis of the four major proposals for Columbia River regional legislation pending before this Congress. The first part appeared in the RECORD for April 26 and the second was printed in the May 3 issue.

A FRIENDLY ANALYSIS OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BILLS—PART 3

Wherever the subject of Columbia Valley resource development has come up in the past several years, people all over the Pacific Northwest have almost without exception found themselves saying: Certainly, we favor the principle of coordinated development—certainly, we feel that the present methods can be improved—certainly, we hope to find a way of composing our differences—but whatever solution is arrived at, we want to keep for ourselves a definite measure of local control.

In every discussion of this subject, the overriding factor has always been the question of local control. Objectors to the original Columbia Valley Authority bills usually centered their fire on the fact that the CVA would be dominated entirely by Washington, D. C., that the people living in the region would have absolutely no voice in determining the policies according to which the Columbia region would be developed and ruled.

So I think it fitting and necessary that I conclude this series of three discussions of the Columbia River legislation before the Eighty-first Congress with a comparison of the effect upon local control of the Columbia region's resources which would be worked by each of the four major proposals with which we have been dealing. If there is any one consideration which will be overriding in importance when and if these bills are given public hearings in the Pacific Northwest and in the Halls of Congress, that overriding consideration will be, local control.

It was precisely because of the utter contempt for local control—the complete disregard of participation by the people in policy matters—contained in the first CVA bills that I began to work on a proposal to achieve the end of coordinated development and still give the balance of control to the people who live in the region to be served.

It has always been my contention that the people of the Pacific Northwest have no more desire to be ruled from Washington, D. C., than from Wall Street. It has been impossible for me, therefore, to support any bill having to do with the setting up of a new agency for Northwest development in which the people who live within the drainage area of the Columbia River were not given an effective voice in the determination of policy and the administration of the program. In this I have been supported by thousands of farmers, workers, and businessmen, who over a period of many years have been in the "yes, but" category whenever CVA was under discussion. They are the ones who always say, "I'm in favor of the principle of CVA, but I want some provision for local control."

I have said it before—and I want right now to say it again—of the four major proposals for Columbia River development, there is only one in which there is an effective provision for local participation. That one is my own bill for a Columbia Interstate Commission.

Anyone in the Pacific Northwest who says he wants local control of a CVA will be able to do so honestly if he insists that the administration bill be so amended as to include the major local control provisions of my CIC bill. That includes the dozens of Granges, labor unions, and other organizations which in the past few months have sent resolutions and petitions to Congress, placing themselves on record as favoring a CVA, provided it assures a measure of home rule or local control.

Now, let us examine these four proposals and see just what they do provide in the way of participation by the people whose lives and futures depend upon the activities of any Columbia regional agency which might be formed.

The first bill, you remember, was the original Columbia Valley Authority. In it there were only two places in which local interests were even mentioned. The CVA, in drawing up its master plan for the area, would be instructed to enlist the advice and assistance of State and local governments. The CVA was perfectly free to reject that advice. There was no provision for local hearings, formal protest on the part of parties injured by activities of the CVA, or any hand in the selection and approval of the personnel selected to run the agency. There was a statement to the effect that State laws regarding water rights were to be respected—except that the rest of the bill gave the Authority sufficient power to circumvent them almost at will.

There is, to be sure, the joint Reclamation Bureau-Army engineers plan, which was announced April 14 of this year and heralded by the bitter CVA opponents as a States' rights plan. It is, of course, no such thing. It is based on a series of compromises between the differing proposals of these two Federal construction agencies, in which the States concerned had very little to say. It would be carried out through the present Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, which is purely a voluntary organization existing only by will of the several Federal agencies, which set it up and invited the State governors to sit in on its meetings. This Inter-Agency Committee has no statutory authority, can make no decisions binding on anyone, and is not authorized to speak on behalf of any of its member agencies or States.

I have pointed out time and again that many of those who constantly speak of carrying on development of the Columbia region through existing agencies are the same ones who constantly criticize those same existing agencies either for not paying enough attention to the desires of the people or for allegedly meddling in local affairs which are none of their concern. As things are constituted today, it is utterly impossible for the administrators of those agencies to do their jobs and not run afoul of one criticism or the other. I have developed this particular argument several times before and have yet to have any of these States-righters explain the paradox.

The fact remains that today in the Pacific Northwest the people who actually live there have very little to say directly toward determining the policies according to which the Columbia region will be developed. The fact is that on many occasions in the past, the will of the people of the Northwest has been frustrated by action of Federal agency heads or a Congress in which the Pacific Northwest States have only a fraction of the strength necessary to have any real effect upon the majority. This is not a question of partisan politics; it is a question of simple mathematics that the people of the Northwest will have an effective role in the determination of their own future only when it is guaranteed to them by law.

It was because of these objections to the original CVA bill and the impatience I felt with the status quo that I first proposed the Columbia Interstate Commission bill. In it, I have combined a formula for giving to the people of the area the measure of local control they desire and should have. I feel that, regardless of the name given to any agency for the Northwest—whether it be called an Authority, an Administration, or a Commission—the important thing is that the principle of effective local control be incorporated into it.

In my CIC bill, I made two specific sets of provisions for participation by the people. First, I required that a majority of the Board of Directors—four of the five—be residents of the States in the Columbia Valley. One director would come from Washington, one from Idaho, one from Oregon, and one from Montana. These directors would be selected by the President of the United States from lists of nominees to be submitted by the governors of the States concerned. Thus, my CIC bill is the only proposal for Columbia development in which the States themselves have a direct part in naming the operating heads of the agency. Since these directors would be appointed for staggered 7-year terms, there would be a continuity of operation which is required for such an agency. In most other respects, the directors would have the same duties and authority as in the administration bill.

The second provision in my CIC bill which makes it different from the other proposals which have been offered to date, is the Columbia Interstate Advisory Council. This council, under my bill, would be a statutory body representative of the five Columbia region States—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming—whose membership would be appointed by the governors of the States. This council, whose membership would reflect the changing opinions of the people through the normal regular elections, would be the body which would hold public hearings on the Federal resource proposals, would investigate the policies and operations of the agencies in the area, would hear protests and make recommendations to the Congress on behalf of the people of the Northwest.

Since the Advisory Council, under my bill, would be directly representative of the people of the States and would have a positive statutory function under the CIC, it can truly be said that my bill does provide a real measure of local control over the activities of the Federal agency.

Now let us consider the gestures toward local participation which have been included in the administration's new CVA bill. In the statement of policy contained in the opening section of the Truman CVA bill, the agency is required to seek the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations. It even says that this advice shall be relied upon to the fullest possible extent. But, while two members of the Board would have to be residents of the area, the people of the area would have no part in their selection.

In section 5 of the Truman CVA bill, there is a provision that the administration shall make arrangements for consultation and exchange of views with the appropriate representatives of State and local governments, of the agricultural, labor, and business interests and of the general public of the region. These arrangements, according to the CVA bill, are to be made through the establishment of an indefinite number of advisory boards and councils, of indefinite size and composition, none of which shall have any real authority nor even any function other than what the three-man Board of Directors chooses to give them.

The Administration made one further concession to my proposals in stating that these advisory councils shall have the privilege of making reports on the particular phase of Columbia development on which they are supposed to be expert, which reports would be included in the CVA's annual report to Congress. However, since these councils are formed merely at the whim of the directorate, there is nothing in the bill to prevent the Board of Directors from dissolving any council whose report it dislikes or whose advice it cares to spurn. The Board always maintains the power and privilege—in effect—of appointing only such advisory councils as it can be sure will always agree with the Board's own opinions.

Since the advisory councils provided for in the Administration CVA bill have no specific statutory membership, form, or tenure of existence—indeed no existence at all other than what the CVA Board cares to give them—it cannot be inferred in any other way but that these councils will be mere puppets. In no sense can they be said to be in a position effectively to represent the people of the region. Certainly, these very illusory advisory councils provided for in the Administration bill cannot be said to give anything even remotely resembling local control.

Like every other resident of the Pacific Northwest who sincerely wants to see this gigantic program of resource development handled in the most efficient, economical, and representative manner, I do hope that we can have some full-scale public hearings on these Columbia legislation bills—held in the Pacific Northwest where the people most affected can participate in and listen to the evidence—so that all of us can use every good and sound and valid idea we have toward working out the most acceptable solution. It may be that in that manner we can evolve a better approach toward the problem of regional development, of which we can all be proud. To that end, I stand ready and willing to supply, to anyone who will write me, copies of all four of these major proposals, so that you who live out there can study them for yourselves and determine which method you think best. That is the only basis upon which you should make the decisions you must make.

Standard Cyaniding Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lovelock Review-Miner:

STANDARD PLANT CLOSES, WILL BE SOLD, TORN DOWN—INCREASED COST OF OPERATION CAUSES FOLD-UP—GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE, GOLD MONOPOLY ALSO BLAMED

Complete close down of the Standard cyaniding mine and mill took place Wednesday, according to Manager H. L. Hazen.

The big 500-ton cyaniding mill has been taken over by the Western Machinery Co., of Salt Lake City, and will be dismantled and sold. The mining camp of over 100 people will be completely wiped out.

Cause of the fold-up is the stable price of gold while all operating costs rose from a fifth to over twice what they were when operations started.

Figures showing why Standard Mine failed to pay out

	Prewar costs	Present costs	Percentage increase
Mill labor, hourly pay	$0.80	$1.42	77
Electric power, per kilowatt-hour	.0125	.0125	None
Burned lime, per ton	17.50	21.00	20
Cyanide, per pound	.1215	.1475	21
Zinc dust, per pound	.1750	.2275	30
Blasting powder, per pound	.1000	.1400	40
Liners for crusher, per pound	.3167	.4509	43
Liners for rod mill, per pound	.100	.1500	50
Grinding rods, per pound	.0700	.1271	82
Diesel fuel oil, per gallon	.0775	.1460	89
Gasoline, per gallon	.1150	.2460	118

BLAME FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Those involved in the operation blame the Federal Government for the loss of the plant. The Government's monopoly of gold and refusal to allow it to be sold on a free market is blamed directly by them for the shut-down. Had gold been allowed to be sold on a world market, the county and State would have continued to benefit from the big operation.

EMPLOYED 65 WORKERS

The mining, trucking, and milling outfits involved have employed an average of 65. A monthly pay roll of $10,000, was maintained with an estimated $8,000 being spent in Lovelock and a considerable amount in Imlay and Winnemucca. Labor accounted for approximately half the operating costs.

The only cost that didn't go up was power furnished by the Sierra Pacific Power Co. The price remained the same throughout the operation.

STANDARD OIL MEN START WORK

The property was acquired by a group of Standard Oil men, known as the Standard Syndicate in 1935. They took a bond and option on it from a prospector, Jim Lally, and his grubstaker, the former Supreme Court Justice J. A. Sanders. Both are dead. In 1935 development work started and one of the best developed properties in the history of Nevada resulted. The deposit was thoroughly engineered by shafts, winzes, raises, tunnels, and drillings. Numerous checks were made on assays. It was found to be a giant slab that had slid into the area from some unknown region.

The Western Machinery Co. erected a mill on the property, said to be one of the finest in the United States. Nearly all parts were automatic. Essential machinery was in duplicate to prevent break-downs.

All mining was by power shovel and the ore was trucked a short distance to the mill by large trucks. Until the last year all mining and trucking was contracted, the Kirkman Pitt Co. doing most of it. At one stage of operation, the shovels dug into ore that was comparatively rich for the area, but was considered in too far for pit operation. The terraces were carefully watched as some of it was mined. They slid in when no men or machinery were at work but ended operations on that phase.

One of the greatest expenses was removal of overburden, but the decisive thing was the high cost of labor and milling.

The total amount of waste through stripping was 2,335,000 tons. The total tons of ore milled was 1,005,262. Total bullion recovered amounted to $1,634,437. For every ounce of silver recovered, one ounce of gold was obtained, or about 10 cents worth of silver to every dollar's worth of gold. If 40 cents worth of gold that was locked in a form not touched by cyanidization could have been recovered, the mine could have operated indefinitely even at today's prices.

During the last 2 years, average heads fell to $1.65 per ton and average costs increased to $1.60 per ton. The tail loss averaged 40 cents per ton, so it required $2 per ton in the heads to break even. As much as 750 tons of ore was put through the mill over a 24-hour period.

During one period, when stripping could not keep up with milling, old Rye Patch dumps were milled. Only 250 tons per day could be handled but an operation, at least rich enough to pay expenses and keep the crews together, was carrried out.

The life of the mill could have been prolonged had the mine investors been able to get a lease on all the old Rye Patch mine property. They succeeded in making a deal on patented ground but holders of Government ground refused to work anything out. The Standard people refused to take a chance on ore being discovered on patented ground outcropping on other property.

One of the biggest blows given the operation was dealt by the Federal Government Order No. L-208 closing down all gold mines. It was the only industry so treated, except horse racing, which was closed down for a period of 8 weeks during the recent war. The company was practically forced to sell its crushing plant for $25,000. Replacement cost $125,000. The mill, priced at $500,000, had $325,000 paid on it.

As a result of the Government wartime order, the mine was closed from 1942 to the fall of 1945. It took real sacrificing to prevent the mill returning to the constructors.

The company filed on and prospected a large deposit 2 miles north of the original mine. For a time it appeared that it might save the set-up. Recently the mill operated on development ore that proved very profitable, but it turned out to be a pocket. Ore was discovered that could have been milled but the overburden was great. Large sums of money were advanced on the chance that the set-up could be maintained. When it was found that a profitable operation could not be maintained, the close-down order was issued.

Last year it appeared that the Standard plant could be converted to a concentrator of fluorspar. An option was taken by a well-known Nevada financier on the large fluorspar property in Black Canyon, now owned by Schwabrow and Schendel. A search of the market revealed the fact that there was not a large enough market on the Pacific coast to absorb the output and that most of the fluorspar is used in the steel industry in the East.

General Clay and His Great Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Blockade Off May 12," appearing in the Boston Post of May 5, 1949, commending Gen. Lucius D. Clay, and properly so, for his outstanding services and leadership in Germany. General Clay merits the thanks of the American people for his exceptional work and results.

The editorial follows:

BLOCKADE OFF MAY 12

The world heartening announcement is made that the four powers, United States, Britain, France, and Russia, have agreed to lift the Berlin blockade on May 12, preparatory to a new meeting of representatives of these powers to take place May 23.

To be strictly factual it should be said that the Berlin blockades are being lifted on that date, for actually there were two blockades—one imposed by Russia on goods moving to Berlin and a counterblockade by the Western Powers on goods going into the Russian, or eastern zone of Germany. In recent months reports have been leaking out that the Russians were feeling the ill effects of this counterblockade, while because of the air lift their blockade against Berlin was ineffective. So it appears Russia has had enough of this game.

It is more than a coincidence that the man who was responsible for carrying the Western Powers successfully through this perilous crisis, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, has at the same time announced his retirement as military governor of Germany to take effect on May 12. He held on to this post against his desires until the job was completed—and now he should be welcomed home with a great tribute.

For General Clay proved to be an exceptional administrator in a situation where one false move or mistake when the Berlin blockade was boiling might well have precipitated the third world war. At times we were probably closer to a renewal of war than most people realized.

Incidentally, President Truman's policy of retaining outstanding military men in key diplomatic posts, which has been so severely criticized by his opponents, has proved its value in each instance. Who among the pseudo politicians who usually are appointed to these posts, because of their large contributions to campaign funds, could have done so well as Generals MacArthur, Marshall, Bedell Smith, and Clay?

What Russia will now request at the forthcoming conference remains to be divulged, but intimations are being handed out by the Russian press. These suggest that Russia will strive to upset the creation of the new western German state and contend that Germany be unified, with, of course, the object of Communist influence away out of proportion to their present numbers. There will be demands for modification of Allied control of the great steel and coal resources of the Ruhr to guarantee to Russia a certain percentage of this industrial output.

That is a hurdle still to be overcome; but at least we have gained one great victory in the cold war by the lifting of the blockade.

Radio Address of Hon. Donald L. Jackson, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, of California, over the American Broadcasting Co. network on Saturday evening, May 7, 1949:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, as a Member of the Congress and as an American who has a vital interest not only in where we've been but where we are going, I deem it a privilege and an obligation to discuss with the listening audience tonight President Truman's proposal for compulsory health insurance for the American people.

I do not question the President's motives in suggesting another step along the road to all-out and complete control of the lives and destinies of every American citizen, but I must take issue with any program which proposes to extend the area of compulsion by government, which area has spread during the past few years until no life, no home, no business is today in the sunlight of total liberty of action under law.

We Americans recognize and subscribe to the necessity for a reasonable measure of compulsion in our relationships with constituted authority.

We complain about the police officers and the red tape of local bureaucracies in our home communities, but we accept the inevitability of these conditions because of an underlying knowledge in our own minds that the alternative to order and law is chaos and turmoil.

But compulsion from our Federal Government is another matter. The President of

the United States is not Joe Jones, the local constable; nor is Mr. Ewing of the Federal Security Agency a member of your local city council. These gentlemen in Washington are, to most people, simply names, names which have too frequently been associated with raids by the Federal Government upon your weekly pay checks.

Social security is a wonderful thing. To be socially secure means that you have nothing to fear in a social and physical sense. Were it possible to accomplish this desirable end without penalty, such a legislative measure would pass the Congress without dissent. What, then, are the practical obstacles to the achievement of this immediate Utopia without further delay.

Let us consider for a moment the problems of the national health. With respect to health insurance or socialized medicine, as some prefer to call it, I think that we must discuss several basic considerations.

Is there a current need for such legislation? Secondly, if a need does exist, how, and by whom, should it be met. Thirdly, if met by an agency of Federal Government, what will be the probable effects upon (a) those who receive such free medical services; (b) upon those who do not receive them; (c) upon the medical profession itself; and (d) upon those, who for one reason or another do not want such a Federal program. Last, but by no means least, what will be the effect of such programs of Government assistance upon our Federal Treasury, and upon the vigor, initiative, and character of the American people.

Let us first of all consider the need for such a program of compulsory health insurance. Are the health standards of America indeed so poor as to require, under penalty of law, that each citizen subscribe to such a program and make contribution to the Federal Government for insurance under the program whether he desires it or not?

American health standards are among the highest in the world—our mortality rates among the lowest. Statistics tending to indicate that other nations have higher standards should be carefully weighed to determine whether or not the published mortality figures exclude the aboriginal or native populations. The Maori tribes of New Zealand, which country is one of only two nations in the world with a better health index than the United States, are not computed in arriving at mortality and clinical data. In our own case, every segment of our population is considered in arriving at national health figures.

Proponents of compulsory health programs view with alarm figures compiled during the war by the Office of Selective Service, which appear to indicate that American youth is on its last legs. Again, omission of vital information must be charged to the advocates. We had a high rate of rejections during the war, solely because our standards for admission to the armed services were higher than anywhere else in the world. It was not because our young men were physically inferior to the nationals of other countries, but rather because of the fact that we did not induct into service one-armed fliers or nearsighted truck drivers.

Another point that is often overlooked in discussion of our national health is the clinical factor. The school health programs have reached a high state of efficiency here in the United States. Certainly, one out of four American children needs care taken of his teeth, but we know it and are doing something about it. Certainly, there are hundreds of cases of incipient tuberculosis among the school children of America, but American medical men, working hand in hand with American education are discovering these cases, where elsewhere they would go unheeded until too late to arrest.

In brief, American health standards are more adequate and more comprehensive than those of any other country in the world. When one looks for disease it will be found, but no one should draw any hasty conclusions or make comparisons of our national health on the basis of discovery and knowledge. We know of illness and disease here at home only because our efficient clinical methods have brought the conditions to light.

It is generally conceded that the greatest need for adequate medical attention is among the middle class. One entirely unable to pay for hospitalization obtains it in great and modern institutions provided through tax funds for that purpose in almost every city and county of the country. The man of wealth obviously has no problem in this regard. Our concern is the wage-earner, who may or may not, have a few hundred dollars in the bank, but over whom the fear of illness hangs like a constant cloud.

Assuming then, that a need for some type of health insurance does exist, we can move logically to the second consideration of the proposed program—to wit, how, and by whom, should the need be met?

It has long been my conviction that an American hates compulsion, and from this conviction has come my belief that the average American would prefer an honest program directed to his particular needs on a voluntary basis. It is estimated that payroll deductions for compulsory health assistance may approximate as much as 6 percent of a pay check. Add to this amount other deductions for social security, compensation, and sundry other withholding taxes, and the day is not far off when the American workingman will pay out in pay-roll deductions as much as he takes home to the little woman on Saturday night.

If the Government is to assist in insuring better health to the American people, it is my opinion that the assistance can be better rendered at the local levels of government than by building a new Pentagon Building in Washington, D. C. Grants and loans might be made available to States and counties for the construction of additional hospital facilities. Contrary to popular opinion, American doctors represent one of the hardest-working professions in this country. Any projected health program must first of all provide additional qualified personnel. In Great Britain, doctors participating in the socialized health program are required to see and treat from 50 to 100 patients a day, none of whom are required to make any payment at all, and many of whom are not suffering a condition which requires medical attention. The fitting of wigs and false teeth has become a large part of the practitioner's art, all of which penalizes those who are actually in need of medical attention.

With funds placed at the disposal of States, counties, and cities, to be spent according to a plan approved by the Congress, those subdivisions of government could establish realistic programs designed to meet the need of its citizens. I believe that American ingenuity, proceeding on a voluntary and American basis, can meet the need for completely adequate protection.

Ours is the only country in the world today which is expending vast sums of money for research into the causes and cure of those diseases which are the great killers of our day. Funds for the study of cancer, heart disease, and infantile paralysis have placed American medical science in the forefront of research on these medical question marks. Almost every American city provides X-ray and fluoroscope services free of charge in the fight against disease, and the voluntary organizations have mapped and are carrying on a score of battles against other but nonetheless important diseases.

By an extension of, and assistance to, local governments in the fields of health and housing, the Federal Government can make a substantial contribution to American life and living. Conversely, if the Federal Government attempts by force and coercion to demand compliance in programs which are not wanted nor needed by the American people, it can only succeed in a complete demoralization of national and voluntary efforts to solve these great problems.

Let us consider some of the practical difficulties to be encountered in a program of national compulsory health insurance by those who would be most intimately concerned. In the first instance, those who receive the health services would receive a standard of mediocrity of service instead of the present high and efficient standards now accepted. Lack of personnel, complete loss of doctor-patient relationships, bureaucratic dictation, reduction of take-home pay, and an ultimately increased cost of medical attention are the immediately apparent drawbacks to the proposed plan.

Those who do not receive benefits would, of course, be paying for the treatments, the wigs, and the false teeth of those who did. Religious objections on the part of several creeds is a very real problem. Can Congress, which is barred by the Constitution from passing any measure affecting religion, take legislative action to require Christian Scientists to comply with a compulsory health program despite their objections?

What about the millions of Americans, former veterans and nonveterans alike, who are already covered by provisions of other adequate laws and contracts, both with Government agencies and private health agencies? Is the framework of all that has gone before to be destroyed in order to force compulsion upon the balance of the people?

What about the effect upon the medical profession itself, and upon the high clinical and medical standards which have been established through many years of effort? Will the patient of tomorrow become just a number with a slip of paper in his hands, or will he continue to be a human being with problems he can discuss in frankness and confidence with his own doctor.

I have talked with a great many doctors during the course of the past year about these very problems, and almost without exception I have found them to be concerned about their patients and sincerely hopeful that an answer to the admitted problems can be found. To call the members of America's medical profession heartless and self-seeking is to fly in the face of facts, facts which have recorded their unselfish devotion to duty at the scene of every disaster and emergency in our Nation's history. Would the people of Texas City, Tex., call our doctors and nurses callous and unfeeling? Would the parents of little Kathy Fiscus, the youngster who died such a tragic death in San Marino, Calif., a few days ago, call the doctors who stood by day and night waiting the call if needed—would those parents call doctors unfeeling and penurious? I think not. The history of American medicine, from the fever swamps of Panama to the tragedy of Texas City, has been a history of service and of sacrifice, and to render these men and women robots at the beck and call of a Washington bureau would be to consign not only them, but us, to a worse fate than any of us deserve.

In conclusion, and largely because it is one of the most important features of the entire discussion, what about the millions of American citizens, black and white, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat alike, who want no part of the proposed program, because they sense that the Socialist state is inherent in its provisions. They know, these free Americans, that every dictatorship ever conceived in history has made the national health one of its fundamental steps to power. Lenin said, "Socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of the Socialist state," and

it is of interest that all of the Communist-front organizations in this country are in favor of the system for this country. Are they supporting Lenin's words and Truman's proposals for love of America and its heretofore free institutions? Not on your bottom dollar.

We can have better health and a better America, but not by using the methods and the tools of the totalitarian state. Remember, then, when a little of your liberty goes to Washington, it never seems to find its way home again.

Good night, ladies and gentlemen.

Republicans Err By Forming Alliance With Dixiecrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Buffalo Evening News of May 6, 1949:

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS REPUBLICANS ERR BY FORMING ALLIANCE WITH DIXIECRATS

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The loud huzzas about a Truman defeat and a labor defeat over the dogfall in the House on labor legislation may turn out to be premature.

It takes only a short memory to recall similar shouts of jubilation over original enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act 2 years ago and the smug joy of conservative Republicans and their allies when the Republican House leadership bottled up and killed the party's social welfare program in the Eightieth Congress.

Then came, like the dawn, an election wherein the Republican Party found it had played right into the hands of Harry Truman.

There are signs that the party is repeating that performance in the cute trick that its House leadership tried to put over, and almost pulled off, with the Wood bill, a rather good copy of the Taft-Hartley Act for which it enlisted a Southern Democrat, Representative JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, as sponsor. That familiar strategy has worn thin.

Where does this leave the Republican Party today as symbolized in the House, one of its two showcases between elections?

Once again it stands before the public as tying itself up with an economic-political element in the South which backed the Taft-Hartley Act originally and now the Wood bill as an instrument to crush labor unionism in the South.

That is no secret to anyone familiar with the South. In fact, as related here previously, the secret was spilled frankly to the House by another Georgian, Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, one of the few southerners who voted against the Taft-Hartley bill originally. He said during debate on labor legislation that he voted against that measure because: "I was convinced that whatever its purpose, its effect would be just what its effect has been, and that is to hamper union organization."

Mr. LANHAM declared further that in the South the Taft-Hartley law also has had the effect of "actually destroying unions that already were in existence."

One owner of a small chain of textile mills in Texas, who had contracts for several years with the Textile Workers Union of America and had maintained excellent relations with the union, went to officials of the union recently and told them that terrific pressure was being brought upon him by powerful financial, business and political forces in Texas to break with the CIO.

Such forces backed the Dixiecrat movement in the South last year, as this reporter revealed in a tour of the South before election. This Dixiecrat spirit expresses itself through some Members of Congress in the House from the South, though happily not nearly all any more.

President Truman would appear to be in a good position politically, as a result of what happened in the House. He divorced himself long ago from the Dixiecrats.

Now he has as exhibit for the Nation another example of the alliance between it and the Republicans in the House, which is not a pretty exhibit. Republicans in general can't be pleased about this tail to their kite. Senator TAFT indicated as much when he promptly introduced a more moderate bill in the Senate to clear the party's stand.

While labor leaders were resentful over some phases of the compromise that Speaker of the House RAYBURN offered, which was defeated, particularly the injunctive provisions, they cannot turn to the Republicans after that party tied up with its worst enemies.

The Battle of Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Fortnight magazine for April 29, 1949:

THE BATTLE OF HOLLYWOOD

This fortnight Hollywood's collection of congenital fools, infantile pacifists, and actual traitors are making ready for another big show. The Communist People's World has, for several weeks, been grinding out its usual treasonous propaganda about the peace meeting. Lights have been burning late in some Hollywood homes as small groups of party members putter over headline-seeking details. Yes; Henry Wallace is coming to town (Gilmore Stadium, May 13, evening).

There will be the same pack of confirmed anti-Americans and petty intellectuals out beating the tub for Wallace. Charlie Chaplin, Edward G. Robinson, John Howard Lawson will undoubtedly be on hand to act as window dressing—hoping to convince the world that they speak for Hollywood when they stand against ratification of the North Atlantic Pact. Author Thomas Mann, who has been quite useful to Stalinists in the past, has probably been asked to front up the show, lend intellectual dignity, and reiterate the outdated and once-potent pleas of antifascism. Maybe Paul Robeson will be asked again to act as the self-appointed spokesman for his race. This month the singer took it upon himself to discredit his race when he declared in Paris that the American Negro—after the pact—would never again fight for his country. Naturally, reputable colored leaders denied this Communist prattle.

Wallace, as usual parroting the Stalinist line, will devote himself to the topic that war is the inevitable result of Americans fighting Communist aggression. It is slightly akin to racketeer Mickey Cohen leading a panel discussion on the subject Is the Los Angeles Police Department Really Necessary?

Wallace and his booby-trap liberals have lined up the usual Communist cup-bearers to aid in pouring out the party line. Included will be a Swedish lecturer, a left-wing Italian politico, and a British party liner. Nothing like giving the meeting an international tone—which is, indeed, ironically true. Wallace will travel down the coast, speaking in Seattle, Portland, and San Francisco before he reaches Hollywood. You may rest assured that the Hollywood date line is the most remunerative to the Reds.

This event in itself is scarcely worth outlining. But there's a fresh and encouraging involvement in Hollywood this time which deserves laudatory comment. Finally, loyal Hollywoodians have discovered that they have in the past been politically naive—both in their apathy and action—and have organized to effectively fight back.

It is particularly pleasing to add that the group that has banded together to fight Wallace represents the most divergent mixture of political, economic, and social factors conceivable. On less pressing issues they have often been at sword's point. This new organization is called the Hollywood Committee for the North Atlantic Pact. Explains their spokesman: "Our purpose is, first, to prove that the entertainment world stands solidly behind American foreign policy—not that of Russia—and, second, to demonstrate that Hollywood overwhelmingly favors the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact. Our people are weary of the spectacle of a ragged Red fringe claiming the right to speak with authority for Hollywood."

Included in the strength of the group is the American Legion, the CIO, and the AFL, representing all of Hollywood labor, the Motion Picture Alliance, headed by Actor John Wayne, representatives of the Republican and Democratic central committees, many of the industry's producers. Often these organizations have held bitter views of one another. Today they are united against a common enemy.

Also, on the entertainment side, composer Igor Stravinsky, who was attacked by Shostakovitch in New York recently, pianist Artur Rubinstein and Jascha Heifetz, famed violinist, have been asked to take part in the counter-demonstration. The pro-American group will hold its affair at the Hollywood Bowl, either the night preceding or after the Wallace affair. Even crusty James Petrillo of the musicians' union has for the first time in his union's history relaxed his ruling and announced that his musicians will play without pay.

More important, this should definitely separate the sheep from the goats. No movie figure who appears at the Wallace affair can, in the future, assert with a straight face that he's just a liberal. All the liberals will be elsewhere. It will clearly identify that segment of big-name Hollywood which is dedicated to working for the Soviet cause.

Perhaps, too, this pro-American group, built properly, will act as a bulwark against the Hollywood elite who are loyal Americans but have a habit of being nincompoops. It is time that more folk who have propaganda strength usually far exceeding their political wisdom should think seriously of the danger they create by attaching their names to wild-eyed causes. It is time they met their responsibilities as Americans.

Going back but a short time it is interesting to see the names of people who have been used by the Communist Party. While there are undoubtedly multitudinous rationalizations to explain away these connections, the stark facts prove that these people were political saps. Look back at the old American League for Peace and Democracy, the name alone has the usual honeyed tone of a CP front. Included on the list of notables who supported this group were such names as Melvyn Douglas, Donald Ogden Stewart, Dudley Nichols, Irving Pichel, Sam Jaffe. Today most of them must realize they were fooled. But how much damage did they do by lending their names before they found out?

Or take the infamous group, the old Committee for the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Here again the early rosters were full of names of Hollywoodians who played footsie with the CP. Of course, they didn't know it, they'll say. But was it not their responsibility to find out?

Here are some of the big names who gave the CP a helping hand: Larry Adler, Humphrey Bogart, Charles Boyer, George Burns, Abe Burrows, Eddie Cantor, Joseph Cotten, Olivia De Havilland, Joan Fontaine, Rita Hayworth, Arthur Hornblow, Walter Huston, George Jessel, Dalton Trumbo, Lena Horne, Dore Schary, Frank Sinatra, Katharine Hepburn, John Huston. Out of this long list only the Hustons, Dalton Trumbo, and Katharine Hepburn still flirt openly with the far left. But, once again, these many citizens of never-never land lent their names to a cause which was far past the reaches of liberalism. Again, after doing their harm, they stepped out, bewildered, to discover they had been used. It is indeed a sad commentary on our civilization to realize that the man who can lift an intriguing eyebrow or the woman who has an interesting cleavage and thus achieves movie fame is per se a person whose political ideas are eagerly sought and considered by many people.

We hasten to add this is not meant as an unfairness to the film industry. There are too many sensible folk in Hollywood who have not been seduced by fake pleas of liberalism and the usual catch phrases. Many of them are liberals and many conservatives. To name a few: Ronald Colman, George Murphy, Robert Montgomery, Dick Powell, Ronald Reagan, Clark Gable, Jimmy Stewart, Bob Hope, Bing Crosby, Doug Fairbanks, Jr., Ty Power, Joe E. Brown, Frances Langford, Jerry Colonna, Jack Haley, Jack Benny, and many others.

The fact is obvious. These people must realize their obligation to America. The influence of their names far outreaches their political wisdom. It is time that they realize their obligations as citizens or find less dangerous hobbies. Dabbling with America's safety should be avoided by juvenile minds.

Brannan's Farm Program—What Is It All About?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of the Connecticut Farmer contains a most provocative analysis of Secretary Brannan's farm program by two eminent educators in agricultural economics, Stewart Johnson and George Brinegar, of the University of Connecticut. This subject is currently of tremendous interest to all our citizens as its effects will be felt by everyone, be he consumer or farmer. We, who must pass upon the merits of the administration proposal, should examine closely the total impact upon our economic system which would result from its enactment. With the analysis are included the views of the American Farm Bureau and the Connecticut Farm Bureau on the program advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

BRANNAN'S FARM PROGRAM—WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

(Ever since April 7, the State Farm Bureau Federation has been besieged with requests for information about Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan's suggested new farm program for the United States of America. Here is an analysis of Mr. Brannan's program as prepared especially for the Connecticut Farmer by Stewart Johnson and George Brinegar of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Connecticut. These economists have explained the program thoroughly. They have also expressed their opinions of it and have suggested some changes and improvements. The opinions which they express are, of course, their own and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Connecticut State Farm Bureau Federation.)

(By Stewart Johnson and George Brinegar)

The new farm plan proposed by Secretary Brannan on April 7 has been described as spectacular. And differ it does in many respects from the present support-price program based on parity. On the other hand, it is similar in many ways to various proposals made in the past. The purpose of this article is to describe and to appraise the new farm program.

First of all, why do we have any farm program at all? In the past quarter of a century we have seen the McNary-Haugen farm bill passed by Congress and vetoed by President Coolidge, the Federal Farm Board Program under President Hoover, AAA acreage and livestock reduction programs under President Roosevelt, and price supports at 90 percent of parity under President Truman. Why has agriculture in the United States been given special consideration by Government in such programs?

Part of the answer lies in sticky industrial prices and wage rates. As isolated individuals, each supplying a very small part of the total output, farmers have no way to adjust their total market volume to changing demand, and thus have no control over the prices they will receive. They go ahead and produce, and take whatever they can get for their product. Farm prices, therefore, go down faster and further than other prices when our economy is heading downward.

Stripped to its essentials, the basic objective of the new farm program is to prevent a general collapse in farm prices such as those of 1920–21, 1929–33, and 1937–40. If this objective is accomplished, it can help prevent a possible depression which would hit city and farm people alike.

Any farm program, to be successful, must be in the public interest. It must be consistent with a stable, prosperous economy in the United States, it must permit trade among nations, much the same as we now have among the 48 States, and it must make its contribution toward world peace. To a limited extent we will examine the new farm program from this standpoint in the latter part of this article.

Under the present farm program we seem to be heading for trouble. The Government has acquired huge stocks of many farm products through purchases which have been necessary to keep the price as high as that pledged to producers. For even such a minor product as flax, more than $130,000,000 has been spent to keep up the price. For wheat, the cost last year has been about $600,000,000, and for cotton, about seven hundred million. Already the program has cost about $2,500,000,000, and seems likely to cost as much more, barring drought, before the end of 1949.

For this huge expenditure, the producers of some products have obtained material benefits, particularly farmers who produce cash grains, flax, cotton, tobacco, wool, and potatoes. Dairy farmers, on the other hand, have had little direct benefit to date from Government purchases, and have had their dairy-ration prices held high by Government support of grain prices. The program also favors producers distant from their markets relative to those with markets nearby, as in the Northeast.

Despite these differences among products and regions, there seems no doubt that farmers in the United States, as a whole, have had much higher incomes in the past year with the program than they would have had without it. From the standpoint of the public interest, however, the following two weaknesses of the program are evident:

1. Consumers have had to pay twice, once for the taxes to finance the support-price purchases, and again in high retail prices at the grocery store. Using potatoes as an example, a consumer pays not only the cost of the program to divert potatoes out of the market, with millions of dollars' worth of Government potatoes rotting and wasted, but also pays the high retail price resulting from the limited supply after Government purchases are made.

2. The program has retarded world trade, and has been a stumbling block in the way of world peace. It has been said that if goods cannot cross international boundaries, armies will. We cannot sell farm products in the world market if we keep their prices artifically high through price supports. The loss of our world cotton market during the 1930's is an example. Neither are we inclined to permit imports if the market for some product is made attractive, through support-price operations, to producers in other countries. Last fall, for example, we took action to strengthen trade barriers against Canadian potatoes. We are also not inclined to permit goods made from farm products, such as textiles made from cotton, to enter the United States if we are spending huge sums to keep the price of the product high here at home. The writers of this article recognize that many other reasons, some associated with the destruction of resources during World War II, currently are tending to dislocate world trade, and that the support-price program is only one of several obstacles in the way of freer exchange of commodities.

A revision of the present farm program, embodied in the Agricultural Act of 1948 and to become effective in 1950, would substitute flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity for rigid support of prices at 90 percent of parity. Secretary Brannan has recommended that this revision be abandoned before it becomes effective, however, and that the new farm program described below be adopted.

FOUR-PART PROGRAM

The new farm program recommended by Secretary Brannan has four parts:

1. A minimum goal would be established for gross farm income, in other words, for cash receipts by farmers in the United States. This goal would fluctuate from year to year depending on changes in the index of prices paid by farmers for goods used on the farm and in the home. For 1950, the program would assure a gross income of about $26,000,000,000 for agriculture as a whole. This figure is lower than the peak-year cash receipts in 1948 of $31,000,000,000, but three times higher than prewar cash receipts in 1938 of $8,000,000,000.

2. To reach this goal, support prices would be fixed on individual products. To arrive at the support price for a given product, assuming a farm-income goal of $26,000,000,000 in 1950, 25 percent would be added to its 10-year average price in 1940–49.

3. For products which can be stored, such as wheat, corn, wool, and cotton, farmers would sell their products to the Government if market prices were not up to the support level, and the Government would hold the product in storage, much the same as under the present program. For perishable products, such as fruits, vegetables, meats, milk, and eggs, farmers would sell their product in the market in the regular way, and if mar-

ket prices fell below the support level, farmers would receive a Government check for the difference. For an individual farmer the Government check would be based on the average market price received by all farmers, and not vary according to the particular price each farmer received.

4. Farmers would not be eligible for price supports if they did not comply with requirements for acreage restrictions and other limitations on output which might be established. Neither would they be eligible if they failed to carry out certain specified soil conservation practices. For any products on which quotas for individual producers were not established (probably fluid milk, meat animals, poultry, and eggs) large farms would receive support only on part of their production; on dairy farms, the price support would not extend beyond 20 cans daily per farm.

These four points cover the new farm plan in brief. In the remainder of the article, comments are designed to indicate wherein the plan conforms with, or departs from, suggestions made in the past, and possible modifications of the plan.

INCOME SUPPORT DESIRABLE

The first point in the new plan, the setting up of a goal for annual farm income, appears to be desirable. There may be some question of whether the initial goal, a $26,000,000,000 farm income in 1950, is the optimum amount, or whether the index of prices paid by farmers, which has been chosen as the formula factor to adjust the goal from year to year, is the best possible mover, but the principle of establishing an income goal each year appears to be desirable.

It should be recognized, however, that we also need to maintain a stable over-all economy in the United States. To do this, the first need is to define the goal in specific terms. The writers of this article are of the opinion that it would be desirable for the Government to guarantee that the wholesale commodity price index, using the present as a base, be kept between say 90 and 110 for the indefinite future.

This could be done through changes in monetary and fiscal policy from time to time, allowing individual prices to fluctuate freely, but so adjusting tax rates, money supply, interest rates of Government debt, etc., that booms and busts would be prevented. A new national monetary council, as suggested recently by the Hoover commission, could adjust national monetary and fiscal policy to reach this over-all goal, or it could be done by any of several other different ways.

If the whole economy is maintained on a suitable level, if reasonable farm-income goals are set, and if a few other modifications as outlined below are made, it appears to the writers of this article that the suggested method of establishing income goals has considerable merit and could be operated without undue cost to the taxpayers.

ARE SUPPORT PRICES DESIRABLE?

The question may also be raised as to whether support prices on individual products are desirable to reach whatever goal is set. Government payments, if necessary to achieve the minimum set as the goal, could be made according to the value of farm products sold, less purchases of such major items as feed and livestock.

If a goal of $26,000,000,000 farm income were set for 1950, and farmers' cash receipts were $27,000,000,000, no Government payments would be made. But if the cash farm income were only $25,000,000,000, the $1,000,000,000 deficit would be made up by Government checks to farmers at the rate of 4 percent on the value of sales which were made in the preceding year. If an individual farmer had gross sales of $10,000 after allowing for purchases of feed and livestock, he would receive a check for $400. It would not matter at all what the $10,000 was received for—whether wheat, hogs, milk, or eggs.

Administratively, the plan could be operated in a simple manner by basing payments on sales as reported on Federal income-tax returns. This change would be a marked variation from the proposed plan, but probably would receive support from the majority of agricultural economists as being a decided improvement. The elimination of support prices for individual products would avoid the problems of marketing quotas, acreage allotments, etc., resulting from the relative prices of agricultural products being out of line.

Some may object to the direct-payment feature of the new farm plan—the fact that farmers will receive checks directly from the Government to the extent necessary to achieve the income goal which is established. To the writers of this article it appears, however, that such payments have a great advantage in their directness.

Just as there is merit in direct taxes in that the payer more fully recognizes the cost of Government, there is merit in receiving Government payments in a way recognizable as such rather than disguised in the form of loans through bankers, pegging market prices, and other indirect subsidies.

If the new farm plan is not changed so as to base payments, if required, on the value of sales off farms rather than setting up support prices by individual products, there appear to be important advantages to use the production-payment plan proposed for perishable for storable farm products as well. For all farm products, then, consumers would pay only the market price, whatever that might be, with the Government paying the difference if the average selling price for all farmers fell below the support standard.

This change would prevent the piling up and wastage of storable products which, to the authors of this article, appear inevitable under the plan exactly as proposed. Northeastern dairy and poultry farmers who buy large quantities of feed from the Middle West also have a special interest in changing the support procedure for grain to the same as for perishable so that they will have the benefit of cheap feed in years of bumper crops.

If the change were made to payments based on sales value regardless of what particular products were sold, or if the proposed new plan were modified to extend the payment method suggested for perishables to storables, it appears to the writers that it would be possible and desirable to operate the program without the use of any production restrictions—acreage allotments, individual farm marketing quotas, limits to payments based on size of farm, tie-in with soil conservation requirement, and the like, The proposed production restrictions appear to the writers to be the worst feature of the new farm plan recommended by Secretary Brannan. Modifications so that such restrictions are unnecessary are highly desirable. And either of the two ways mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph would help to accomplish the objective of eliminating the need for any and all quotas, acreage allotments, etc.

Let us look for a moment at the question of whether the new farm plan will allocate resources most efficiently as between agriculture and nonagricultural occupations. Whether it will or not depends in large part on the level of national farm income chosen as the goal.

If the goal is on the high side, giving agriculture a higher percentage of the total national income than it has obtained in recent years, too large a share of our resources will be used in agriculture. But if the goal gives agriculture only as high a percentage of the national income as in the recent past, and is adjusted downward if payments under the program exceed a certain specified percentage of farm income from regular marketing, little difficulty would be expected in resource allocation as between agriculture and industry.

Any farm program which bases payments on sales does not meet the problem of those who do not produce a large enough volume to make a good income at any price. And there are several hundred thousand small farmers in the United States who are on the economic border line, not far from the self-sufficient type of inefficient operation which gives them enough to subsist and little more. To give these farmers sufficient income through a price program would mean prices so high that too many resources would be attracted into agriculture, and would wreck the program. For farms on the economic border line, assistance to move to other areas and fields of work should be given through other programs specifically designed to accomplish this end.

As among agricultural products, there is danger that under the new farm plan exactly as proposed, there will be resources used for the production of commodities which are wasted, never reaching consumers, resulting from setting prices of individual products out of line in relation to other farm products. Extending the payment method recommended for perishables to storables would lessen or eliminate this danger. Similarly, the danger would not exist if payment were based on the value of sales rather than establishing support levels for individual products.

One of the chief merits of the new farm plan compared with the present program is that for perishable farm products consumers get the benefit of low retail prices. The objection to the present program illustrated with potatoes—that consumers pay twice, a high retail price plus the taxes to buy excess potatoes which are washed or spoiled—are eliminated. Unless modified on one of the ways already suggested, wastage and spoilage will continue with storable products. If modifications are made, however, the cost to the public of the proposed plan will likely be less than the present program after giving consideration to the benefits consumers will receive through lower retail prices. This will hold true even though payments from the Government probably will be greater under the proposed plan, modified as suggested, than under the present program.

Another important advantage of the new farm plan is that it fits in with free world trade better than the present program. Again, modification of the recommended method of price support for storable farm products is required to make the plan consistent with international welfare. If this is done, the changes made may be expected to contribute toward world peace, certainly a major objective of our time.

It has been pointed out that the new farm plan has certain important advantages over the present farm program, yet needs modification in several important respects in the opinion of the writers. In conclusion, it should be pointed out that perhaps we have not yet advanced far enough in political science to use wisely as much "government" as is called for in the new farm plan. With the modifications suggested, the plan would give individual farmers more freedom in the business decisions they make then they would have under a continuation of the present program; and would guarantee that there would not be a general collapse in farm prices such as occurred in 1920–21, 1929–30, and 1937–40.

Hydroelectric Developments on the Columbia and Snake Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 11), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week I presented testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the subject of hydroelectric developments on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, which involves the area represented in part by the present distinguished occupant of the chair. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my testimony before the committee.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST PROJECTS

(Statement of Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a United States Senator from the State of Washington)

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am interested, of course, in all the projects in this bill because they involve a great deal regarding the policy of the United States in relation to western development. Today I want to speak specifically on four Pacific Northwest projects. These are projects of great magnitude not only to us but to the entire country. They are the so-called Chief Joseph Dam which this committee has discussed on many other occasions under the name of the Foster Creek Dam, the Ice Harbor Dam, and McNary Dam which the committee is well familiar with, I am sure.

Senator GURNEY. The Ice Harbor Dam is the one located on the Snake River?

Senator MAGNUSON. Ice Harbor Dam is on the Snake River in Idaho just above the confluence of the Snake and Columbia Rivers. Its effect would cover both States, Idaho and Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The budget estimate is $12,000,000 and the House did not allow anything.

Senator MAGNUSON. The House allowed amounts for Chief Joseph and for the McNary Dam but cut out the Ice Harbor. I will just direct my testimony to those three projects. I have two other projects here. They are not of secondary importance to me but they are secondary in their magnitude as to power dams and flood-control projects.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THREE PROJECTS

The President's estimate on each of these projects is as follows: For McNary the estimate was $40,000,000; for Chief Joseph, $5,000,000; and for Ice Harbor, $12,000,000.

I want to address myself, as I said, to these three dams. I know your committee has received testimony from the Army engineers, Members of Congress, and others from the Pacific Northwest States. To conserve your time and to avoid repetition, therefore, I will make my remarks as brief as possible.

NEED FOR POWER

First of all, I need not go into the matter of the power deficit in the Pacific Northwest. I think that is pretty much common knowledge to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all three of these multiple-purpose dams?

Senator MAGNUSON. Ice Harbor and McNary. They are not as much as Grand Coulee. Their primary purpose is power although there are irrigation features and of course flood-control features, very important on the McNary and Ice Harbor Dams.

In the latter part of November the Public Utility Departments of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho held concurrent hearings in Seattle to devise ways and means of reducing power consumption among industrial and home users to avoid a complete break-down of the power grid. As a result of the hearings, the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Washington issued certain regulations aimed at reducing power consumption. In addition, a voluntary campaign was instituted to alert all users in the area to the necessity of conserving electrical energy in every way possible at peak hours. In many cases we had brown-outs.

QUOTATIONS FROM TESTIMONY OF CHIEF CONSULTANT ON POWER AND UTILITIES, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

I might report from one of the witnesses so that the record will show what we mean by a power shortage. The chief consultant on power and utilities for the National Security Resources Board, Mr. Edward Falck, testified. I need not tell the committee the reason why the National Security Resources Board was there. We know confidentially we have another important use for power in the State of Washington and in the Pacific Northwest, namely, for the great Hanford project.

Mr. Falck stated in part as follows:

"The load data for this region after 1948 includes some new industrial load which, it is estimated, would be located in the region if adequate power were available, but which will probably not actually exist by 1951 because of power shortage."

He is talking about another industrial load. In my opinion we all know, also, that we have plans afoot for the development of our supersonic laboratories and the only place they can be adequately developed is where there is a great power potential.

"The requirements of such potential new plants, which will probably not be actually served, amounted to 140,000 kilowatts in 1951.

"However, no amount has been included for aluminum-reduction loads in excess of the existing plants of the area."

I might say, for the benefit of the committee, that the aluminum plants which are important to us in this country are taking almost 40 percent of our power load in the area, the greatest power pool there is. The atomic-energy plant, of course, has a stand-by order on a percentage that I should not divulge here.

"Also, included in the estimated loads are about 130,000 kilowatts of industrial load in existing plants, which will not be operated during the peak periods, 1948–49, or at any time when hydroelectric conditions are adverse. Such plants would like to operate but will be prevented from doing so by the power shortage."

Similar testimony was given and substantiated by other witnesses. I think this statement by a representative of the National Security Resources Board is highly significant.

As you know, the National Security Resources Board, the Munitions Board, Bonneville Power Administration, and the Secretary of the Interior have all communicated to the Chief of Army Engineers their deep concern over the existing power shortage and their conviction that all authorized projects on the Columbia and its tributaries should be pushed ahead at maximum speed. These are the agencies of the executive branch most closely concerned with our national security. Their testimony and their judgments have added validity for this reason.

USE OF POWER DESCRIBED

The funds we are investing in multiple-purpose dams in the Pacific Northwest must be evaluated from both regional and national points of view. To the region, an adequate energy base means industrial, agricultural, and business expansion. To the Nation, such expansion means the Pacific Northwest can make its proper contribution to the economic health and strength of our country.

This year private enterprise in the United States invested over $19,000,000,000 in new plants and equipment. It is estimated that in our highly industrialized age the investment of approximately $8,000 is required in plant and equipment to create one job. To maintain employment at a high level, therefore, there must be a continuing flow of investment into new industrial enterprises. It is obvious that such investment will not take place unless there is energy to turn factory wheels.

Failure to bring the great hydroelectric dams in the Columbia and its tributaries into production at the earliest possible date, therefore, has a national impact. In addition, of course, delay in getting generators on the line postpones the time when these investments begin repayment to the Treasury.

I might say again the committee knows those dams that have been built in my area are way ahead of schedule on their repayments.

PRODUCTION DATES FOR POWER

With these general propositions in mind, let us take a look at the specific appropriations for McNary, Chief Joseph, and Ice Harbor Dams.

I am informed that a $45,000,000 appropriation for McNary will permit the first generators to come on the line in December 1953. If the funds for Ice Harbor Dam, cut off by the House, are restored, that dam can be brought into production in 1953.

Senator GURNEY. Is that the $12,000,000?

Senator MAGNUSON. That is the $12,000,000.

If the appropriation for Chief Joseph is increased to $21,300,000, its first generators can come on the line in December 1955.

Senator GURNEY. What would that make the total for Chief Joseph?

Senator MAGNUSON. That would make the total $21,300,000.

I recognize your committee is faced with a very difficult problem. The budget estimates transmitted to Congress proposed expenditure on these three projects, for fiscal 1950, of $57,000,000, divided, as I stated before, $40,000,000 for McNary, $12,000,000 for Ice Harbor, and $5,000,000 for Chief Joseph.

As you and I well know, these estimates represent a recommendation to the Congress from the President. Your committee and the Congress, however, still have the responsibility of deciding, on the basis of all facts available, whether to follow that recommendation, whether to increase one or all of the estimates, or whether to decrease them. Congress does and should decide through appropriations how fast each of these projects should be moved to completion.

INCREASE IN FUNDS REQUESTED

I believe the facts warrant an increase of funds for McNary and Chief Joseph Dams, and restoration of funds for Ice Harbor Dam The committee has already received extended testimony on McNary and Ice Harbor Dams, but I want to make just a brief comment on the latter.

ICE HARBOR DAM

There has been much misunderstanding and controversy over Ice Harbor Dam and the 1950 appropriation for it. Immediately the House committee reported the bill now before you, I noted funds for this project had been denied House action, according to the report, was predicated upon the prohibition in the Bureau of the Budget's submission against use of any of these funds for fish passageways.

POWER PRODUCTION AT ICE HARBOR DAM

The CHAIRMAN. Let me stop you long enough to ask how much power Ice Harbor will produce.

Senator MAGNUSON. I do not have the exact figure.

Colonel JEWETT. The first units on the line will be two units or a total of 130,000 kilowatts.

POWER PRODUCTION AT CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

Senator MAGNUSON. What estimate do we have on Chief Joseph?

Colonel JEWETT. Chief Joseph will bring in three units or a total of 192,000 kilowatts.

Senator MAGNUSON. The full potential of the dam will run into a million kilowatts when they get to all the generators.

Colonel JEWETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You said awhile ago this was the largest producer of hydroelectric power in the country. Does it produce more than the Tennessee River?

Senator MAGNUSON. I meant the whole Bonneville pool which these dams will all check in with, Mr. Chairman.

CONTROVERSY OVER FISH LADDERS AT ICE HARBOR

The House cut this out, as I said, because the budget submission said they could not use any of these funds for fish passageways. I appreciate there has been a controversy out there with the so-called fish people and the people who want to build Ice Harbor Dam.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been a controversy on fish ladders?

Senator MAGNUSON. Way up the river, and those in the lower Columbia where there is a substantial fishing industry, are worried about it, but I have found in my experience that on every dam we have ever built out there, with one exception, Grand Coulee, which is so far up the river, and even then we have had this controversy, it is due to a lot of misunderstanding and fears. I think we have always worked them out satisfactorily. They work out in the long run.

RESTRICTION ON FUNDS FOR FISH LADDERS REMOVED

Now I checked with the Bureau of the Budget to ascertain the reason for this restriction and found out that, while engineering plans for the dam include an estimated expenditure of $9,000,000 for such passageways, there was an honest difference of opinion as to whether such expenditures should be allowed at a time when we are already embarked upon a broad gage fisheries rehabilitation program in the lower reaches of the Columbia. In recent days the Bureau of the Budget has removed the restriction in expenditure of funds in 1950 for fish ladders. In view of the House report, using this as a reason, it seems to me that these funds should now be restored.

CONSTRUCTION AT CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

I am deeply concerned about the appropriation for Chief Joseph Dam. As you know, figures on which the President's estimates are based were submitted by the Corps of Engineers to the Bureau of the Budget last fall in September or October.

On April 1 I wrote to the Chief of Engineers to obtain from him a statement on this subject. Attached to my testimony is a copy of my letter to General Pick and a copy of his reply. Let me quote from his letter. This is what General Pick has to say:

"As you state in your letter, the President's 1950 budget estimate included an item of $5,000,000 for initiation of construction on the project (Chief Joseph). There is also included in the 1949 deficiency estimate an amount of $2,000,000, which if it becomes available in the near future, will greatly assist in getting the job under way. The sum of these two amounts is practically the same figure as was recommended by the Corps of Engineers for inclusion in the 1950 budget. Thus, if both amounts were to be allowed by the Congress, we would be able to perform the work we had originally programed for fiscal year 1950. This program was based on the following appropriations:

"Fiscal year:	
1950	$7,209,000
1951	26,889,000
1952	31,848,000
1953	41,693,000
1954	43,000,000
1955	38,201,000
After 1935	16,518,000
Appropriated to June 30, 1948	642,000,000
Total estimated cost of project	206,000,000

"This program would permit the first three generators to come on the line in December 1956 adding 192,000 kilowatts to the Northwest power pool. Three additional units of 64,000 kilowatts each would come into service each year thereafter until the initial installation of 960,000 kilowatts had been installed."

I want to call your particular attention to the next paragraph. It reads as follows:

"Subsequent to the preparation of our original budget estimate, the Munitions Board, the National Security Resources Board, and the Bonneville Power Administration requested information as to the earliest possible date that power could be made available from Chief Joseph Dam, and what funds would be required to accomplish this objective. It is from this study that the figures, $15,000,000 and $21,000,000, mentioned in your letter, were derived. If a 1950 appropriation of $15,700,000 and a 1949 supplemental appropriation of $3,300,000 were made available, power could be placed on the line by December 1955. * * *

"It was also estimated that the December 1955 date could be met if $21,375,000 were made available in fiscal year 1950, with no supplemental 1949 funds. December 1955 is the date the Bonneville Power Administration estimates power from Chief Joseph must begin to come on the line in order to be of the greatest help in making up the deficit in generating capacity which will exist in the area by 1960. * * *

"In summation, if $21,375,000 is made available in fiscal year 1950 and adequate appropriations are made in subsequent fiscal years, power from Chief Joseph Dam can be added to the Northwest power pool in accordance with the estimated schedule of requirements prepared by the Bonneville Power Administration; otherwise, there will be a delay of at least 1 year."

INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL AFTER BUDGET SUBMISSION

Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear from General Pick's statement that the $21,000,000 estimate was not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, that the facts upon which this estimate is based became available after the Bureau had prepared the estimates submitted to the Congress by the President. As a matter of fact, it was not until the middle of December that Bonneville Power Administration submitted its so-called schedule R to its advisory committee. I sincerely believe that had the Bureau of the Budget and the President had an opportunity to consider the $21,000,000 estimate and the facts behind it, that amount would have been recommended.

Chief Joseph Dam was authorized by the Seventy-ninth Congress. In its 1946 advance program, Bonneville Power Administration urged a construction schedule that would have brought the first three generators on the line in December 1953. Each year since that time construction has been postponed. The time has come when the Congress should appropriate the funds needed to move construction ahead at the maximum engineeringly feasible rate.

The engineers tell me, through this letter and informally, that they can adequately and reasonably and wisely spend the $21,000,000 which would move this whole project for an additional $16,000,000 1 year ahead, a project in which a potential of 960,000 kilowatts will be generated for the area.

HIGH BENEFIT-TO-COST RATIO

This dam boasts the highest benefit-to-cost ratio of all major structures in the Columbia River system. In other words, this is the cheapest dam. This will produce power cheaper than any other dam, I understand, in the world on this power site. In addition, the power generated at this dam will be transmitted to the whole area of the Pacific Northwest, Wenatchee, Spokane, Seattle and Tacoma, where the power deficit is greatest.

Since the first deficiency bill contained $2,000,000 for Chief Joseph, I now urge your committee to increase to $19,375,000 the 1950 appropriation for the project. This will bring the total appropriated by the Eighty-first Congress to $21,375,000, the amount which must be available to bring this dam into production by December 1955.

As a final word on this subject, I go back to my original premise, that the Northwest cannot make its proper contribution to an expanding national economy until the energy required for new, existing, and expanding industrial and home uses is available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have two other projects here which, as I say, are not secondary in importance to me but secondary in their magnitude. If the committee desires me to go ahead with them, I shall be glad to continue. If not, I shall place them in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be placed in the record at this point.

POINT CHEHALIS

Senator MAGNUSON. I might say one of them, the Point Chehalis, is a jetty project with which we have had some trouble. I will put that in the record with the permission of the committee.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"POINT CHEHALIS

"May I now say just a few words about Point Chehalis? On the south side of Grays Harbor on the Washington coast there is a long narrow peninsula separating the ocean from an inland bay. Near the end of the peninsula there is a jetty which projects into the sea approximately 15,000 feet. Heavy storms have destroyed about 2,400 feet of this jetty and the ocean currents sweeping through this break are washing away the peninsula. The bay in behind the peninsula serves as one of the most important fishing bases along the Pacific coast. Unless this peninsula, Point Chehalis, is protected it will soon be destroyed.

"The Army engineers have recommended the construction of a rock levee 7,500 feet long to protect the entire point and a breakwater 1,000 feet long at the entrance of the cove. This project was authorized last year in conjunction with other necessary work in Grays Harbor and the Chehalis River, at an estimated cost of $3,780,000. The budget contains a recommendation of $800,000 for fiscal 1950. I believe this figure should be doubled, if we are to avoid the serious risk of having the fishing basin destroyed through erosion of Point Chehalis before the Army engineers can get sufficient construction under way.

"It is my understanding the $800,000 recommended will permit some trestle work and some enrockment, but is not sufficient to finance enough work to avoid the risk of losing this important asset.

"I hope your committee will consider this question, will interrogate the Army engineers in regard to it, and on the basis of the facts thus developed will appropriate at least $1,600,000 for the project."

The CHAIRMAN. I should like to refresh my recollection at the moment about the Ice Harbor Dam. How much are you asking for, Senator?

Senator MAGNUSON. For the restoration of funds recommended by the budget and the President.

The CHAIRMAN. How much are you asking for McNary Dam?

Senator MAGNUSON. I am asking for $45,000,000. I have not broken those figures down but the recommendation was $40,000,000. What the House bill reported I do not have before me.

The CHAIRMAN. It did not pass in the House.

Senator MAGNUSON. I do not have the figures before me, but whatever they had in the committee. I have the figures in my office.

GREEN RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Now the next project is a flood-control project. I will put the data in the record to save time. In just 2 minutes I can tell the committee what it is.

From the mountains right behind Seattle where the Cascades rise almost abruptly we have several rivers that drop very fast to the sea. None of them is as large as the Columbia River or Snake River about which we have been speaking, but some of them are of quite some magnitude. We have snow in the mountains. Last year the flood worked the other way down the Columbia rather than on the west side of the mountains. We have had the most unusual snow conditions in our State in the mountains that we have ever had in the history of the State. Right behind Seattle, as many of you know, there are two or three passes. In each pass there is an average of 269 inches of snow. If we have a quick thaw with a rain, we are in for a great deal of flood trouble on the west side of the mountains. I only cite that to show the danger now. Next year we do not know, but despite that, even under normal conditions, there is a river called the Green River which rushes down into a place called the Puyallup-Green River Valley, which is the flood plain of Seattle. If you have been in Seattle, you know you can look down on the shipbuilding area within the tidal area. We have had recurring floods every year there causing great damage to this whole valley area, causing damage of millions of dollars. We have tried many things. The engineers are very familiar with the project. It has been going on for a long time and finally we have come to an engineering agreement as to how to control the fields on the Green River and the other two rivers that run in there by construction of a dam.

The matter has not been authorized but a complete agreement has been reached whereby King County, where part of the floods occur, has appropriated $250,000 and have in their next year's budget a subsequent $250,000. The State legislature passed a law, which I will put in the record, after this agreement was reached with the engineers for the contribution of their share which is $1,500,000.

FEDERAL COST

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the Government's share?

Senator MAGNUSON. The actual amount is estimated between $15,000,000 and $16,000,000.

Colonel GEE. The total estimated cost is $16,300,000, of which the State is to furnish $2,000,000. So, $14,300,000 is the Federal Government's share.

Senator MAGNUSON. The State has appropriated $1,500,000 and King County expects to appropriate the other $500,000.

Here is this thing all ready to go, and I understand it will be in the omnibus bill for authorization. Here are $2,000,000 lying there, which will expire at the end of a year and 3 months unless we do something about it. The engineers tell me informally that if they could get from the Congress approval now of, say, from $40,000 to $50,000 for planning money, they could go ahead with this project and we could be almost a year ahead of time.

I appreciate this is an unusual procedure, but in view of the fact that we have the money there available and in view of the fact that we know these conditions are going to continue to recur, I am almost positive that the Congress will approve this project with the State and county participation. Engineers have given it high recommendation as to its feasibility and the financial arrangement that was made. If we could get a small amount, we could go ahead and be almost a year ahead of time on planning. The project, I might say, has cleared the budget.

BENEFIT-TO-COST RATIO

Senator GURNEY. What is the cost-to-benefit ratio on this project?

Colonel GEE. The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.07 to 1.

CHOICE OF SITES FOR DAM

Senator GURNEY. Senator MAGNUSON, do you feel the Army engineers have selected the best sites for power-development purposes out there? I go back to Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Ice Harbor, Chief Joseph, and McNary and all those other sites out there. Do you feel they have selected the best sites for the maximum benefit in hydroelectric power?

Senator MAGNUSON. Not being an expert on that, I do feel that the proof of the pudding is that these power projects that have been selected, that have been completed, have served their purpose and the selection of the site has been well justified. There has been some controversy, I appreciate, but I think that is so technical, and whatever the sites that everybody agrees upon on the Columbia River, which might include some other sites than what we are discussing here, or that have been completed, we hope that ultimately they will be in the power system. So there could not be any controversy; there are only so many sites available.

Senator GURNEY. That is what I am getting at, Senator. Do you feel the people in your area—Oregon, Washington, and Idaho—feel that the Army engineers have hit on the spots that should be first developed?

Senator MAGNUSON. I think so; yes. I think that is the opinion of almost all the people. What controversy we have had has been, in my opinion, a technical controversy, which would be hard for us to know exactly. But now Chief Joseph is probably the finest selection that has ever been made. It might have been built before Grand Coulee had not Grand Coulee been so much a part of the Columbia Basin, the whole multiple program, but for a power site, the Foster Creek site, which is now Chief Joseph, will produce power the cheapest of any other known site in the world, 960,000 kilowatts.

Senator GURNEY. That would indicate then that the Army engineers have selected the best sites.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think so, Senator.

Senator GURNEY. They have selected the best site if it will produce the cheapest of any other power site in the country.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think so, and surely McNary was a good selection for the simple reason it also included navigation and flood control in the lower reaches of the Columbia.

Senator GURNEY. Do you think in the selection of the sites, with Congress appropriating the necessary money for building them, that the Army engineers have provided for the total benefits wherever possible on irrigation, power, and flood control?

Senator MAGNUSON. I think the Army engineers have done an excellent job in the development of the Columbia River Basin insofar as they have had a part of it.

Senator GURNEY. There has been no justifiable criticism then?

ARMY ENGINEERS' ACTION APPROVED

Senator MAGNUSON. Not in my opinion over-all. They have given it good attention; they have shown a deep interest in it. They have done good planning. They have had a vision which sometimes you do not find in these matters, a vision of the potentialities of the area. I think their last report was one of the finest jobs done by any Government agency that I have ever read. It is excellent, complete, and well done.

Senator GURNEY. You would speak just as well of the Bonneville Power Administration and those other bureau-operated projects out there?

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes. We have had some little controversies. I do not think they have been of too great importance. I think the Bureau of Reclamation has done its job well, particularly on the Columbia Basin.

We happen to have, which the Army engineers all know, one of the finest men in the world, Frank Banks, whom you people have heard on many occasions.

JOINT STATEMENT ON GREEN RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

I should like to submit this joint statement for the record on the Green River flood-control project, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the statement will be included in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"SUMMARY OF GREEN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, CONGRESSMEN HUGH B. MITCHELL AND THOR TOLLEFSON, AND SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN

"Prolonged efforts to control periodic floods on the Green-Duwamish River in Washington State have now advanced to the stage where action by Congress is essential.

"We are asking for a provision in the Army civil functions appropriation bill, authorizing the preparation of plans for the work and setting up funds for that purpose. Precedent for this was set in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, approved July 31, 1947, in which the committee stipulated '$200,000 shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans for the Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs in the Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 113, of the Eightieth Congress, and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized.'

"The latter course demonstrates that Congress has, on the strength of approval by the Chief of Engineers, authorized and appropriated funds for such work prior to other authorization and before the project has cleared the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies concerned. The suggestion that authorization and funds be sought through action of the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee on Appropriations is advanced because of two unusual circumstances which, it is believed, Congress will recognize. These are: First, the Green River project can be started almost immediately with $2,000,000 in State and local matching funds, three-fourths of which were voted without objection by the State legislature and one-fourth of which has been earmarked for this purpose by King County. Unless used in the current biennium, the State funds would revert to a special fund and it would be necessary to reappropriate then through action by the next legislature; and, second, State matching money in the sum of $1,500,000 was voted contingent upon the approval and appropriation by Congress of funds to carry forward construction of the project.

"The necessity for the Green River project consisting of construction of a flood-control dam at Eagle Gorge, on the upper reaches of the Green River, has been surveyed carefully and approved by the district and division engineers of the United States Army, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers.

"The engineers' report estimates cost of the dam, to the United States, at $16,300,000 with the $2,000,000 in matching money in addition thereto.

"While the project would not be revenue producing, it is estimated $893,000 in annual benefits would accrue, mainly from abatement of floods, pollution control, and benefit to fish life.

"The following facts relative to the Green River project were compiled from the survey and report of the Army engineers:

"GREEN RIVER BASIN

"The Green River rises in the Cascades at an elevation of approximately 5,000 feet and flows north and west 60 miles to its junction with the Black River. Below the junction, it is known as the Duwamish River and flows north another 12 miles before emptying into Puget Sound at Seattle. The flood plain starts just above Auburn (population 6,000) and comprises a fertile valley 2 to 3 miles wide. Exclusive of Seattle, the basin has an area of 474 square miles and a population of 32,000. Kent (population 3,000) is, next to Auburn, the principal town affected by recurring floods. Tracts of three continental railroads traverse the basin.

"FLOOD HISTORY

"Between November and February are the worst flood months on the Green River. The December 1933 flood inundated 13,800 acres and the December 1946 flood 12,000 acres. The gross area subject to inundation from a flood flow of 40,000 cubic feet per second would be 19,000 acres. The area subject to flooding contains a considerable portion of urban property and facilities, agricultural land and improvements, and transportation and service facilities. The tangible damages from the 1933 and 1946 floods are estimated at $1,750,000 and $1,350,000, respectively, based on 1947 prices.

"ENGINEERS' RECOMMENDATIONS

"Several methods of controlling the floods were surveyed by the Army engineers. A dam and reservoir at Eagle Gorge was deemed most feasible and the best means of controlling floods, providing water storage for municipal purposes, irrigation, and conservation. The dam, with spillway crest of 1,205 feet would create a reservoir with a capacity of 106,000 acre-feet, more than 3 times the amount necessary to control the greatest flood on record (first measurements established in 1931). The project design would provide protection from the standard project flood by reducing its crest discharge of 65,000 cubic feet per second to the safe capacity of the existing channel below the dam. With the end of the spring run-off, water would be stored for release during summer to maintain stream flow.

"COST OF PROJECT

"Cost of the project is estimated at $18,300,000 and the annual carrying charge at $823,139. With $2,000,000 of the cost borne by State and county, total annual carrying charges would be $831,658 due to the interest rate of 3.5 percent applied to non-Federal costs. Maintenance and operation is estimated at $80,000 annually.

"BENEFITS FROM PROJECT

"The Army engineers estimate total annual benefits at $893,000, consisting of $429,000 from prevention of tangible flood damage, $214,000 from increased return from protected agricultural lands, $191,000 from increased returns from industrial lands, and $59,000 from benefits to fish life."

REQUEST FOR POWER PRODUCTION INFORMATION

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the whole picture before the committee in the matter of hydroelectric power out there. I am wondering if the Army engineers could not furnish the information listing all the dams that are before this committee today and also those that have been completed. What I should like to have is the total power that is being produced now from each dam. I should like to have it in one table. Then in another table I should like to have the extra power you can get from these dams that are proposed; the initial installed capacity and the ultimate. Then I should like to have, too, the amount of practically produced power. There must be some information on that. I am not including just the State of Washington; I am talking about the Northwest power pool. I should like to see that all in one place, just a table with the names of the dams and so forth. Finally, I should like to have a listing of the total power produced privately that is hooked in, I understand, with the same system.

Colonel JEWETT. We can furnish that.

The CHAIRMAN. Furnish that for us and we will include it in the record.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER INTERESTS

Senator MAGNUSON. I can remember years ago when I was in the legislature there was a public and private power fight and it became political in many cases, unfortunately; but long since that time there has been a complete agreement between the private power people and the public power people, the PUD's, as to the development of these things we are speaking about before this committee. They meet regularly; they have their own group. There is complete agreement, so far as I know, between them because the private power people realize that when they can buy power from the Bonneville pool at this wholesale rate they have found they can make just as much profit on their investment as when they attempted to build these dams themselves. The private power people, as you will see from these figures, could come nowhere near taking care of these great power demands that we have had in that area, particularly since the aluminum plants and the Hanford atomic-energy plants have showed up.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON EFFECT OF FISH LADDERS

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to most of the testimony with respect to these projects. The only criticism that I have heard is regarding the Ice Harbor project and the objection was based on the fact that the dam was going to be built at 100 feet. A Member of the House of Representatives testified that he feared the fishing industry would be hurt considerably because salmon could not climb the 100 feet in order to spawn. I am wondering if the engineers could put in the record some information to clarify that situation. The Congressman stated that the salmon industry is very large, and I know it is. I should like to know what effect, if any the building of the Ice Harbor Dam will have on the production of fish. I also would like to know whether or not it would be possible to build fish ladders so that the salmon can mount the dam and spawn in the streams above the dam.

Colonel JEWETT. We shall be glad to submit such a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement will be placed in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"The design plans for Ice Harbor lock and dam include fish-passing facilities of the improved type being incorporated in the McNary project. These facilities have been developed through cooperation with Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies as required by law (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.). Based on records kept in connection with the operation of similar facilities at Bonneville, it is believed that the proposed Ice Harbor fish-passing system will be equally successful."

Senator MAGNUSON. The basis of the House rejection, at least in their report, was on the basis that the Bureau of the Budget had made a prohibition against the installation of fish ladders. Now the Bureau of the Budget has since that time, I believe it was last week, removed its objection to that and said it is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. That must be because they have found a way of building fish ladders so the fish can go up to spawn.

Senator MAGNUSON. That is a technical matter. I have always found out there in all these controversies, which are pretty much a fight between the fish and the dams, they resolve themselves. There are ways and means of taking care of that which I cannot technically testify to but I am sure it can be worked out, particularly in view of the removal of this prohibition that the Bureau of the Budget had on the fish ladders.

I thank the committee very much.

Senator GURNEY. I will just say this: The Army engineers say they can build a fish ladder, but to go back to an old saying that we hear so much, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make it drink. You can build the fish ladders but what information do the Army engineers have as to whether or not the fish will use them? I think that is the question.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not see why the ladders cannot be made almost as natural as the present stream. I was in Alaska 2 years ago and saw salmon climb as much as 20 feet.

Visit of the Minister of External Affairs of Ireland

REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the Irish Legation which reads as follows:

IRISH LEGATION,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1949.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Knowing how terribly busy you have been in recent weeks in connection with the very important legislation being considered by the Congress, it occurred to me that you may not have had the opportunity of reading the remarks made by the Most Reverend Dr. Richard Cushing, archbishop of Boston, on the occasion of Mr. Sean MacBride's visit to Boston on the first of May and I therefore take the liberty of sending you a copy of them.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

SEAN NUNAN.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enclosed copy of Archbishop Cushing's speech at a solemn pontifical high mass, celebrated at Boston, be included as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

My principal purpose in speaking at this morning's mass is to bid the Minister of the Irish Republic a thousand, ten thousand-times welcome. This is a historic morning in the history of our cathedral because of the presence of the very distinguished first Minister of External Affairs for the Irish people. I want Mr. MacBride to know that in this region he is very much at home. He is among his own people—and they are very proud of him, both because of the nation he represents—the mother nation of so many Boston people—and because of his personal

gifts and accomplishments. This cathedral has welcomed among its worshippers and visitors many illustrious persons. In my own life I have seen the heads of great states and the leaders of mighty movements present in the pew occupied this morning by Mr. MacBride or in this sanctuary. We have welcomed kings, ambassadors, many and great dignitaries—and our welcome to them all was sincere and cordial. None, however, was more completely taken to our hearts than the representative of a Republic, youngest of the republics in the world, which in turn represents holy Ireland, oldest of the nations of the west.

This is not the place to discuss the political problems of Ireland—nor is it the time to recall the history of Erin and the story of our indebtedness to her. It is not the time nor is it the place to trace the heroic, divinely sustained struggle of the Irish people to preserve their faith and to achieve their freedom. I certainly shall not attempt to tell that story in the presence of a man, who, following in the high destiny of his valiant father and his almost legendary, patriotic mother, has played so brilliant a part in the latter chapters of that struggle. Both in your personal family history, Mr. MacBride, and in the office which you now hold, you are a living symbol to us of the fulfillment of the dreams of Dark Rosaleen's sons—the dreams plus the determination that the Dear Dark Head would one day wear her own crown and Kathleen ni Houlihan would break her bonds and take her free, proud place among the nations of the world.

But without discussing either politics or history, I can and do promise the Republic of Ireland our prayers. Whatever else we owe Ireland, and we owe her much on every level of culture and faith and all good things, we owe Ireland our prayers. Ireland has never ceased to sanctify the earth with prayers; more even than Gaelic, certainly more than English, prayer has been the language of the Irish for these 16 centuries and more. The prayers of the people of Ireland have been the strength of Europe in centuries gone by—they have been the strength of America since her sons and daughters began to come here. We all owe Ireland prayers.

You know, when you come to think of it, prayers are almost the only thing the Irish have ever asked of any other nation—prayers and the recognition of their right to live their own lives in their own way within their own sovereign nation. Other nations have never hesitated to ask us for money—our arms—our very blood. Ireland has only asked for prayers. Other nations, much stronger nations, nations which have always asserted their own superiority and their independence, have invited us to wage their wars and share their adverse fates. Ireland has only asked that we understand her problems, that we sympathize with her aspirations—the aspirations of every self-respecting people, the people of America above all—and that we give her our prayers. To that appeal we respond wholeheartedly this morning.

Her friends in America believe that the prayers of Ireland are close to fulfillment so far as they include the unconquerable Irish dream of national unity. As she was in the days when she sent her missionaries into devastated Europe to revive the embers of the faith of a thousand years ago, so again in these days which once again call out to all the energies of Christian peoples, Ireland is destined to be totally united and completely free. Those who love peace and righteous order will join with those who love Ireland in the prayer for her early and peaceful unity. All the logic of our generation is on the side of the confident belief that Ireland can be united and completely freed without any further bloodshed and without any sorrow to herself or to the present and future generations of the alien people whose rules in days gone by sought to divide and to destroy the Irish Nation. People are wiser now than once they were. New problems from other directions bring them better hopes that old problems, unnecessary problems, can be more graciously solved than once seemed likely. It is to the interest of both England and Ireland, it is to the interest of all the Western World, that any unjust heritage out of the past be rectified and that ill-advised policies perpetuating the mistakes of the past be corrected or abandoned. Certainly the policy of attempting to divide the Irish Nation—the policy of artificially splitting for political purposes a people whom God has united on every other level—is one of the mistakes which all the logic of peace, security, and good order will speedily correct. Good sense and good morality are closely allied. Good sense is bound to prevail in the questions which remain to vex the Irish Republic—and thus all cause for rancor between the two great people who share the Irish Sea will be eliminated and both will be the better for it—and the Western World will be the more united—and the peace will be the more secure.

This summer we propose to visit Ireland in our "Come Back to Erin" pilgrimage. We are going back to visit the parishes and the little towns whence our people came. The mood of our return is one of piety, natural piety and supernatural piety. Hence we style our trip a pilgrimage in the literal sense of the word. Some of our towns and parishes are in the six counties—some are in the present territory of the republic. But we do not say that we are going to Northern Ireland or to southern Ireland. We are going to Ireland—there is only one Irish land. We do not think of our people as northern Irish or southern Irish. There is only one Irish nation. It is to that whole nation that we are going in pilgrimage—in the hope that by our presence we can encourage them and in turn derive inspiration from them. It is for that whole nation that we pray—that God may keep it spiritually, culturally, and in its inward loyalty one, united Irish and holy family—that God may make it in all other ways and in the outward, civil organization of its loyalty one, united, free, God-fearing, and friendly nation.

Your presence here this morning, Mr. Foreign Minister, suggests these thoughts and prompts these prayers. We beg you to bring back to your people the promise of our prayers. We ask their continued prayers for us. It is from the Irish priests and parents that many of us here in Boston first learned to pray. Certainly it would be a great ingratitude if we forgot to pray for Ireland—and a great tragedy if Ireland ceased to pray for us.

God bless you—God bless your people—God bless all who are good to them.

Railroad Mail Rates Called Subsidy for Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in his daily column in the Washington Evening Star of May 9, says there are plenty of instances of subsidy furnished by the Government to private business, but there is apparently only one conspicuous case in which a private business actually subsidizes the Government.

Mr. Lawrence discusses the subject in his daily column, which follows:

RAILROAD MAIL RATES CALLED SUBSIDY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—SENATE AUTHORIZES PROBE TO ATTEMPT EQUITABLE SOLUTION OF PROBLEM

(By David Lawrence)

There are plenty of instances of subsidy furnished by the Government to private business, but there apparently is only one conspicuous case in which a private business actually subsidizes the Government.

This is what the railroads are doing in carrying the mails. So they are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission for an increase in mail pay. This has led to over-all study of the whole question of transportation policy with respect to the mails.

Now the Senate has just adopted a resolution authorizing an inquiry designed to find out how an equitable solution of the problem can be found, with particular reference to the fact that there are three different rates paid by the Government for carrying mail.

For the Government subsidizes the air lines and pays out more than 80 percent of the revenue from air-mail stamps to pay the air-line companies. The Post Office Department, however, collects $668,000,000 a year from the public for first-class stamps and pays the railroads about $26,000,000. So that a very small fraction of the 3-cent stamp goes to the railroads—that is, only 4 percent of 3 cents—while the air lines get nearly all of the present 6-cent air-mail stamp revenue.

EXPENSES INCREASE

Not since the 1920's has there been a real study made of the problem. Meanwhile, operating expenses have gone up so that it costs the railroads, for instance, twice as much as it did then to carry mail. But they have not been able to get from the Government a proper charge for service rendered. The laws of the land say the railroads should get a fair return but, owing to the involved system of making rates, the railroads find themselves stymied. When they ask for an increase, the Interstate Commerce Commission naturally takes testimony from the Post Office Department, and there have been substantial delays because the subject is one of great complexity. Likewise, the Post Office Department is faced with a deficit, anyway, so it hesitates to agree to any increases that augment its expenses.

The railroads, on the other hand, see their competitors, the airlines, being heavily subsidized. While they do not question the wisdom of keeping the airlines going, they do wonder why the railroad should be required to render service without even meeting actual costs. One railroad executive puts it this way:

"The Government is subsidizing some activity through all the processes of the American economy. In transportation the barge lines are subsidized, and we pay taxes to make that up. It is true of the highways; it is true of the airways; it is true with all the various authorities. But the question is why, when all our competitors are subsidized, we should subsidize the Government, and that is what we are doing when we haul mail at less than cost. For our present mail rates, even including the 25 percent interim increase, and considering the 40-hour week to go into effect on the railroads, are just about half our costs."

COMPETITION IS ISSUE

The question of price and competition enters into the picture, too. Thus, the railroads aren't making any money out of handling express or out of handling mails. The more they try to raise their express rates to bring them up to a profit point, the more business they push over into parcel post. The same thing happens with less-than-carload freight. What it amounts to in the end is that the railroads subsidize the Gov-

ernment so that it can handle parcel post at less than it costs the railroads to haul the same articles. This means the railroads are helping the Government to compete with themselves on both parcel freight and express.

Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, who sponsored the resolution which the Senate has adopted, points out that parcel-post rates are different on the air lines and the railroads and ships. He thinks the rates should be coordinated. The Post Office Department pointed out to the Senate that the inquiry proposed is interesting but that it is in the midst of a study of its own.

Meanwhile, the railroads, balked in their attempt to get some action, a few weeks ago filed a request with the Interstate Commerce Commission seeking a 35 percent further increase because the roads learned that the Post Office Department wouldn't be ready to present evidence before the Commission from its own study until sometime in the middle of 1950.

The railroads, unlike private business, cannot of their own initiative increase their prices to meet operating costs. They have to wait on Government agencies—and that is usually a long, long wait.

Ambassador Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington (D. C.) Post for May 9, 1949:

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS—WOMAN AMBASSADOR TO UNITED STATES FROM INDIA HAS LONG STRING OF FIRSTS TO HER CREDIT

The first woman ambassador to the United States has an impressive number of firsts to her credit.

Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, in 1947, was India's first ambassador, man or woman, to the Soviet Union. The previous year she was the first and only woman to lead a national delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. At home, in 1937–39, she was India's first provincial woman minister, holding the portfolio of Local Self-Government and Public Health.

The sister of Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, she has more than justified, in 30 years of public service, her early fight against traditional barriers to participation of women in Indian public life. And while performing these useful services, showing the way to her countrywomen, enduring three prison terms for her political views, and writing three books, she has been eminently successful as a wife and mother.

"PORTRAIT" IS PAINTED

Her beauty, her composure, and her persuasive and effective manner of speaking have inevitably attracted the same attention as have her humanitarianism and her political leadership. Author Pearl Buck once wrote of her:

"Vijaya Lakshmi is so beautiful that one must first become accustomed to the fact. Silvering wavy hair, great dark eyes lively with intelligence, a creamy skin, fine Aryan features, exquisite hands, small bare feet thrust into gold sandals, saris that mold her slender figure into statuesque lines—this is her physical portrait.

"Then one becomes aware of her voice, soft, clear, resonant, speaking a pure English. When one listens, one becomes aware next of what is being said—something very firm, gay, witty, fearless—something worth listening to, whether one agrees with it or not."

A reporter who observed her at the United Nations General Assembly in 1946, wrote:

"It is a joy to listen to her, to watch her snatch points from her platform opponents in debate. Seeing her in action, one understands better the spirit that has upheld both herself and her distinguished brother."

Born August 18, 1900, into a wealthy Brahmin family at Allahabad, Swarup Kumari (as she was named) grew to young womanhood with every advantage money and position could give her. When she was 5, she was taken to England, where a governess was engaged to return to India to lay the foundation for her education. In 1921, she was married to a young lawyer, Ranjit Pandit, and in accordance with Indian custom, was adopted into her husband's clan and renamed.

Mohandas Gandhi had launched his civil disobedience campaign 2 years before, and the Nehru family was drawn one by one into the Nationalist movement. In 1932, when she was the mother of three daughters, the youngest only 3, Mrs. Pandit was first imprisoned for taking part in Indian independence day. Twice again she was jailed for defiance of British orders, her husband and eldest daughter enduring imprisonment with her at different times. Her husband, suffering from the effects of his last imprisonment, died in 1944.

Mrs. Pandit's three daughters all were educated in the United States, the two eldest at Wellesley College under the Mayling Soong (Mme. Chiang Kai-shek) Foundation. She herself first came to this country in 1944 as a delegate to the Pacific Relations Conference at Hot Springs, Va. At the San Francisco Conference of the UN in 1945, she presented the case of India unofficially. As head of the Indian delegation to the 1946 UN General Assembly, Mrs. Pandit succeeded in securing a vote of censure for the racial policies of South Africa.

She is author of So I Became a Minister, My Prison Days, and her autobiography, Sunlight and Shadows.

M. A.

Text of Letter From Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to Cord Meyer, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter from Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to Cord Meyer, Jr., president of United World Federalists, Inc.:

In the present international crisis, I firmly believe that the United States must maintain its defensive military strength. Appeasement and disarmament by the United States alone are certainly no answers to the dangers that we face. I also fully support our effort to rebuild the European economy through the Marshall plan and I will vote for ratification of the Atlantic Pact in order to make it clear that we will stand together with western Europe against armed aggression from whatever quarter.

These measures of military preparation and defense are necessary now, while other nations are free to prepare for war and aggression. But they are only part of a sound American foreign policy. Atomic and biological weapons combined with long-range aircraft have fundamentally changed the nature of war, and no nation in another conflict can hope to protect its people and its cities from widespread destruction. To prevent the disaster of such a third world war, we must do more than prepare for it. We must support the UN and the work it is doing to raise world health and living standards. Rather than abandon the UN because its present structure is weak, we must act to give it the power that it now lacks. I personally believe that a primary goal of American foreign policy must be the transformation of the UN into a world federal government with the authority to make world laws to prevent war and control armaments, with world courts to interpret the law and with inspection and police forces adequate to insure prompt enforcement. By building such a structure of enforceable world law for the common protection of all nations and peoples, we can lift the burden of competitive armaments and use our great scientific resources to sustain life rather than destroy it.

When elected to Congress, I will work with the growing number of Representatives who want America to take the lead toward a governed world and I will vote to the end that our country may play its part in replacing the suicidal game of power politics with the rule of law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.

Congress Serves Notice That It Will Resist Dictation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a pertinent editorial appearing in the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, one of the leading daily papers of Michigan. I believe this editorial expresses the sentiment of a majority of the people living in the district which I represent in Congress.

The editorial reads as follows:

CONGRESS SERVES NOTICE THAT IT WILL RESIST DICTATION

Once again President Truman's decision to meet a situation head on has caused defeat of one of his strongest campaign promises.

A few months ago he lost the battle over civil-rights legislation in the Senate because he chose a fight to the finish rather than to accept a compromise.

Now he has lost out in an attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and restore the old Wagner Act, one large element in this defeat being his loss-of-patronage threat against southern Senators if they did not vote with the administration on its measures.

Two rather obvious conclusions may be drawn from these examples of Mr. Truman's tactics in dealing with the Eighty-first Congress: the executive branch cannot dictate to the legislative without bringing forth serious repercussions, and Congress definitely has not accepted the election last November as a people's mandate for the President's misnamed Fair Deal program.

When our Constitution was drawn up back in 1787, the framers of that document devised a system of checks and balances in the National Government which would give to each of three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial, equal independent status and certain specific powers.

The idea behind this plan was that no one branch of government should become so powerful that it could dictate to either or both of the other branches.

At certain times in our history the legislative branch, or Congress, has been too powerful and influential while at other times the executive has assumed too much power. But in the end, reaction against encroachment by any one branch of government resulted in a more stable balance.

It appears that this reaction is having its effect again today. Congress feels that the President has assumed too much authority and is seeking to exercise powers which belong to the legislative branch. As a result, President Truman, like President Roosevelt before him when he tried to "pack" the Supreme Court, has found that Congress guards its prerogatives jealously and will not tolerate dictation.

At the same time, recent votes in the House and Senate indicate that the people's mandate idea emphasized by certain labor leaders and party bigwigs is not accepted by the lawmakers. In fact, the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats suggests that Mr. Truman doesn't have a majority party in either House of Congress.

Unless the President realizes these facts, and the evidence is all before him, there is a danger that he will ruin his chances of getting much of his legislative program. In regard to some elements of the program that is well and good and no harm will be done to the real interests of the people. In regard to certain other generally accepted or acceptable elements defeat might be unfortunate.

Extension of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance to Farmers and Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Edward S. Foster, general secretary, New York State Farm Bureau Federation, before the House Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C., concerning extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to farmers and farm workers:

EXTENSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE TO FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee on behalf of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation. Our membership is composed of approximately 88,000 New York State farmers located in the 56 agricultural counties of our State.

We urge enactment of legislation to extend old-age and survivors' insurance to farmers and farm workers.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Five years ago the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, in a series of regional meetings throughout the State, discussed with representatives of the executive committees of our 56 county farm bureaus the social-security program in general and old-age and survivors' insurance in particular.

OPPOSE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FOR FARM WORKERS

It was the judgment of those leading farmers at that time that there is little need of or place for unemployment insurance in the farming business.

For the most part, unemployment is not a problem in farming, in spite of the fact that there may be wide fluctuations in farm wages from time to time.

Farm wages are always a compromise between factory wages and farm prices. When industrial activity is high, farm wages are high. When industrial activity is low, farm wages decline.

During periods of high industrial employment, the numbers of farm workers decline due to higher wages and shorter hours in industrial employment. When industrial employment declines, our farms become a great blotter and absorb many of those who lose their jobs in industry. True it is that farm wages decline under such conditions but the number employed in agriculture increases.

FAVOR EXTENSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TO FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Agriculture, unlike industry and business, cannot shut down the production line during periods of recession or decline in the price level. During such periods more employment rather than less employment occurs on farms. Therefore, we quickly dismissed any need for unemployment insurance in connection with farm employment.

At that time many of our leading farmers expressed the opinion that if we are to have the type of year-round farm workers we need on New York State farms, we must seriously consider extending to these workers some of the privileges available to factory workers.

During the summer of 1948 we conducted a series of five regional meetings throughout the State with members of county farm bureau executive committees. Approximately 300 practical farmers, who are making their living by farming, attended and participated in these meetings.

The extension of old-age survivors insurance to farmers and farm workers was one of the principal topics of discussion. We were privileged by having present at these meetings Dr. W. I. Myers, dean of the New York State College of Agriculture, and Dr. T. N. Hurd, Department of Agricultural Economics, to participate in the discussion and to help weigh the advantages and disadvantages of old-age and survivors insurance for farmers and their employees.

At the conclusion of each meeting an informal vote was taken and it was found that well over 90 percent of those participating favored extension of old-age and survivors insurance to farmers and farm workers. In some meetings the vote was unanimous.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

In the call of the annual meeting of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, which was held in Syracuse November 14, 15, and 16, 1948, it was pointed out that the official delegates representing the 56 county farm bureaus would be expected to further discuss this question and formulate a policy for the State farm bureau federation.

The extension of old-age and survivors insurance to farmers and farm workers was given an important spot in the annual meeting program and the matter was discussed at length and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS ARE NOW COVERED BY SOCIAL SECURITY

"Be it resolved, That we urge the inclusion of this group in the old-age and survivors insurance program of the Federal Government."

I do not intend to convey to the members of your committee the idea that this resolution adopted in the annual meeting of our State farm bureau federation expresses the thinking of each of our 88,000 members, for it is doubtful if a very large percentage of these members have given the matter careful study and thoughtful consideration. However, I shall say without reservation that this resolution truly expresses the opinion of the leaders of our 56 county farm bureaus who have given the matter thorough study and consideration.

FARM WORKERS

I doubt if there can be much difference of opinion concerning the wisdom of extending old-age and survivors' insurance to farm workers.

Twenty-five years ago most of our year-round farm workers were young men who were on their way to farm ownership. The situation is now different. Extensive mechanization of our farming operations has not only made possible but has made necessary enlargement of our farms. In New York State we now farm one-third fewer farms and one-fourth less acreage than we farmed in 1900. In spite of this reduction in number of farms and acreage farmed, we are now producing in New York State 20 percent more than we produced in 1900. We can expect much more mechanization in agriculture in the years ahead and undoubtedly we shall have still fewer farms but larger farm units. All of this means that a large amount of capital is now required for a young couple to establish themselves in farming in New York State under modern conditions. Consequently a large proportion of our year-round farm workers have little hope of ever owning farms of their own. More of them are tending to become professional hired workers. In the absence of the incentive of eventual farm ownership we must think seriously about devising ways and means whereby these workers can make more adequate provision for their old age and for their dependents.

Unfortunately, most persons do not think much about the problems of old age till they reach or pass middle life and that is too late to develop independently a very adequate program for one's later years. There is also a tendency, in spite of the relatively high wages now paid farm workers, for these workers to completely live up to current income. In fact many live beyond their current income and become involved in expensive deferred payment plans for automobiles, household equipment, and the like. Like all of the rest of us, some of these workers, through good management and good health, make savings and provide for old age but a very large proportion do not and they are likely to become a public burden on relief when they can no longer work and earn.

The year-around hired man, like the farmer, wants to enjoy a reasonably good standard of living, wants to provide educational opportunities for his children, and wants to enjoy a reasonably good social standing in his community.

We are convinced that extension of old age and survivors' insurance is the kind of protection these workers need most of all. Certainly, unemployment insurance has little or nothing to offer these people.

Systematic deductions from the wages paid these men, matched by employer contributions, will permit these workers to have as good a standard of living as they would otherwise enjoy and at the same time build up some security for old age. Building some degree of old-age security through this form of annuity insurance can certainly improve the morale of workers and contribute toward greater self-respect and peace of mind. Farmers would also find it easier to get and keep good help if they could offer the same incentive as city employers.

THE FARM FAMILY

The best security that could possibly be devised for farmers would be that of a stable price level in line with fixed costs. Violent rise and fall in the price level is the root of most farm ills.

Because of the large amount of investment required in modern farming most farmers have to begin with a substantial farm mortgage plus considerable indebtedness for working capital. The first objective is to liquidate the mortgage and get out of debt. If the farmer is lucky enough to have been born at the right time so that he can go through a period of good prices during his

early years, he may get out of debt relatively soon and be in a position to build reserves for old age. However, if he is unlucky enough to be born at the wrong time, he may be approaching old age before the farm is paid for, or worse yet, he may even reach his old age with considerable debt.

It is customary practice for the farmer and his wife to plow back into the farm business their earnings, consequently, many farmers and their wives when they reach old age have most of their equity tied up in their farm business. If they reach old age during a period of low prices and depression, they may have to sacrifice their farm at only a fraction of its true value to get money to live on and to pay doctor and hospital bills. Such cases are tragic and in spite of working hard and saving all of their lives they may wind up in misery and desperation, too proud to accept relief, yet too poor to live without it.

In the absence of governmental policies to bring about much greater stability in the price level, the farmer who is self-employed, in a highly hazardous occupation, should be given the security of old-age and survivors' insurance. True it is that the benefits to be derived could not possibly give him and his dependents, in the absence of other income, a good standard of living. However, modest payments from an assured source, such as the old-age and survivors' insurance fund, could help greatly in providing the bare essentials as a supplement to whatever other income he might have from personal savings.

It should be kept in mind that old-age and survivors' benefits are not a Government dole—they are not relief—they are systematic payments to those who have worked hard—who have saved and who have reached old age.

CAN FARMERS PAY THE COSTS?

This is an important question. Unlike 50 years ago or even 25 years ago, modern farming is keyed to cash income and cash expenditures. Gasoline has replaced oats as fuel for power on farms. In many cases the oil burner has replaced the chunk stove; electricity has replaced the kerosene lamp; artificial breeding is rapidly replacing the herd sire; taxes are increasing; expenditures for fertilizer, feed and other farm supplies have gone up greatly as a result of higher prices and much greater use. All of these changes while they have made great progress in food production and farm living, simply mean that farmers now have many fixed cash costs to meet. The question arises, can the farmer meet the increased cash costs involved in providing old age and survivors' insurance for his workers and for himself? Certainly, it would be unsound for him to let his buildings, equipment and livestock go uninsured against fire. It would be unsound for him to let his life go uninsured against premature death. It seems equally unsound for him to let his old age go uninsured against the bare essentials of food and a place to live when his earning power is gone.

If old age and survivors' insurance is desirable for farm workers and farmers themselves, and we are convinced that such is the case, then by some means or other farmers will find ways and means to meet the costs involved.

MORALE BUILDER

Of all of the industries in our country, and this applies to the great industrial Empire State, agriculture is the most basic and the most important. It will be in agriculture where we shall make our last great stand for the preservation of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the defeat of communism and the preservation of self-respect.

I sometimes think that the greatest contribution made by our farm organizations and our Agricultural Extension Service has been that of helping farm people to be proud of their profession. Pride in one's profession is essential if one is to make his or her greatest contribution as a productive producer. The New York State Farm Bureau Federation is sure that extension of old age and survivors' insurance to both farmers and farm workers can help both toward greater pride in their professions, can add to contentment and peace of mind and can make many an old age a happy one which otherwise might be blotted with insecurity, despair, and relief dependency.

Belling the Tornado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, news of tornadoes that sweep the interior sections of this country periodically disturb me greatly. I accordingly asked for a conference with the head officials of the Weather Bureau and yesterday afternoon I met with Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of this agency, for the purpose of discussing possibility that some warning might be given threatened areas before a tornado strikes. The Weather Bureau indicates that it is possible to predict weather in which tornadoes are born and the general area in which this weather prevails although it is not possible to predict the germination of the actual tornado. I believe much good can be accomplished by the Weather Bureau in releasing special weather reports informing people in a threatened area that cyclonic winds might be expected and I have therefore asked this office to consider the possibility of a program warning areas that weather conditions exist from which tornadoes may be expected and urging these areas to take appropriate precautions.

I am told that in Louisiana an average of four tornadoes strike yearly and in certain States in the Midwest, as in Nebraska and Kansas, this number is increased to 16 tornadoes per year. Hundreds of lives might be saved and much property damage prevented by timely notice of the existence of cyclonic winds and proper education as to the use of simple safety means and devices to protect life. If this destruction were a result of fire or floods, the Government would have a program. I think we can do much to reduce loss of life and of property resulting from these fearful disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to Hon. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, about this same matter. I produce a copy of this letter for insertion in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER,
Chief of Weather Bureau,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REICHELDERFER: It is probably not possible under the present development of meteorological studies to predict with any degree of accuracy the time or place when a tornado will strike a community. I have felt for some time, however, that atmospheric conditions in which tornadoes develop can be predicted and areas alerted as to these conditions. I have also felt that some suggestions might properly be made by the United States as to the methods that people in threatened areas might use in protecting themselves against a tornado in the event it strikes. It seems to me that methods of protecting life in such a threatened area might be reduced to a fairly simple formula, such as providing slit trenches, cellars, or other places for use during the short period when the devastated effects of the tornado strike. Such a service could easily mean the saving of hundreds of lives yearly and the prevention of thousands of injuries.

I am therefore writing to suggest that your service undertake the obligation of predicting in certain areas conditions in which tornadoes may be expected. I suggest that these predictions be limited as far as practical in area and be worded so as to not unduly excite, at the same time fully warn, those people who live within the area where atmospheric conditions indicate the possibility of tornadic winds.

I shall appreciate your careful study of this matter and your report to me at the earliest possible moment. Tornadoes have been especially frequent and severe this year and I think such a report is most timely.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

And the reply of Mr. Reichelderfer to my letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
Washington, May 5, 1949.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: After our telephone conversation of May 2 and our very pleasant visit to your office, I received your letter of that date in regard to methods of detecting tornadoes, forecasting their occurrence, issuing warnings and furnishing advice in regard to protection measures without undue alarm to the population.

I believe that the information which we left with you at the time of our conference will help to indicate the action that the Bureau has been able to take in this respect. I am quite in agreement with your thought that we should make every possible effort to improve the situation. After our conference, I wrote to the Regional Director of the Weather Bureau at Fort Worth for the purpose of renewing and initiating action in the area in which he is concerned, including Louisiana, and I have forwarded a carbon copy to your office.

In regard to protection measures, we have given considerable publicity from time to time to certain safety measures which the people might take in a tornado emergency. One example is shown in the enclosed copy of an article on the reverse of the Washington daily weather map.

We are giving additional study to the matter in accordance with your suggestion and I shall keep you advised of further action. In the meantime, if you have additional suggestions I shall be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

F. W. REICHELDERFER,
Chief of Bureau.

And the suggestions of Chief Reichelderfer, of the Weather Bureau, which are referred to in the above letter, are as follows:

The Weather Bureau recognizes certain general weather conditions which are favorable for the occurrence of tornadoes, and weather forecasters sometimes foresee the probability of tornadoes somewhere within a relatively large region, amounting to two or three States, or even more, but it has never been feasible to indicate the exact locality in which a tornado may strike.

For that reason the Weather Bureau has generally restricted its warnings to a statement that destructive local storms are likely, in order that the population can be put on the alert. Often severe local thunderstorms occur, but without tornadoes. Under such conditions the Bureau wants to alert the population but is anxious to avoid needless alarm of the population in a large area.

The tornado, as is well known, is a very violent storm of small diameter, with an average path of destruction only about 1,000 feet in width. Long experience in issuing warnings of local storms has led to the conclusion that the alarm caused by tornado warnings will be widespread and very costly in needless disruption to business and commerce and rarely helpful even in local areas in protecting against tornadoes. Many tornadoes, of course, pass through areas which are sparsely settled and do little damage except to trees and crops, which cannot be prevented.

Even after tornadoes develop they are so small that they can slip between reporting stations without being observed. Also they move so rapidly that it is extremely difficult to issue warnings even if they are observed. During the war very dense networks were set up through cooperation of local citizens, with the hope that tornadoes would be seen and reported and warnings could be issued to cities and towns threatened. In the operation of these networks anyone seeing a tornado or funnel cloud is asked to report the facts to the local telephone operator, who will relay the information to the nearest Weather Bureau office. The Weather Bureau official would immediately go on the air over a local radio station to advise the public of minute-by-minute developments concerning the storm. However, tornadoes move very rapidly and often cause limited destruction after which they lift above the ground and skip a considerable distance before the funnel cloud again comes down and destruction is resumed. For these and other reasons, the warning networks have been successful in only a few instances in getting out advance warnings; in other cases a widespread alarm has been occasioned in cities and no severe weather has occurred. This leads to criticism and eventually to a situation where the public no longer heeds any warnings.

The possibility of issuing warnings of tornadoes has been studied intensively by the Weather Bureau since its establishment in 1891, and prior to that time the Weather Service of the Signal Corps made extensive studies beginning in the 1870's. These studies are continuing and are being intensified. It is possible that radar may be of assistance in finding and tracking tornadoes. The Weather Bureau has a few radar installations at the present time and experience with these may point the way to some better method. Radar, however, depends on rain rather than cloud, hence, the radar may simply show that rain is falling without indicating that there is or is not a funnel cloud present. Other studies relate to the charting of electrical discharges in the atmosphere and computation of the instability of the air. All of these possibilities and others that come to our attention are being studied exhaustively.

Mr. Speaker, I present an editorial from the Shreveport Times of May 5, 1949, entitled "Tornado Warnings." This editorial is important and indicative of the attitude of our people regarding Weather Bureau warning of tornado weather. This editorial is as follows:

TORNADO WARNINGS

Representative OVERTON BROOKS has suggested to the Federal Weather Bureau that it operate a tornado-warning service. And the Bureau has agreed to see what can be done, at least on an experimental basis.

The Bureau's objection to tornado warnings is that it is impossible to predict exactly where a tornado will strike, and that a warning broadcast to the entire area where tornado conditions exist would cause needless alarm to many thousands of citizens.

For example, atmospheric conditions conducive to tornadoes might exist over all north Louisiana. A broadcast warning would alert citizens from the Arkansas border to Alexandria, and from Mississippi to Texas. Yet, no tornado might actually be experienced, or one or more might strike in isolated woodlands, inflicting no loss of lives, no injuries, and no appreciable property loss.

The Weather Bureau's contention deserves consideration. Yet, it remains a fact, as Representative BROOKS stated in offering his suggestion to the Bureau, that the annual toll taken by tornadoes is heavy, and no concerted action is being taken by anyone anywhere to lessen that toll.

Our own impression is that a broadcast warning that atmospheric conditions favoring tornadoes exist would cause no consternation in this region. It is rather rare that such conditions develop without the public generally being aware of a tornado feeling in the air. There is no alarm or consternation on these occasions. The usual reaction is alertness, readiness to get indoors if the weather becomes threatening.

A policy of broadcasting warnings might have the beneficial effect of encouraging construction of more tornado shelters underground, in cities as well as small towns and rural areas throughout the Tornado Belt. A good many farms already have this sensible protection, and all of them should have it. Certainly the city dweller who has land to spare would be a good deal less than foolish if he spent a few dollars to provide a safe tornado haven for himself and his family.

And an editorial from the Stamford (Tex.) newspaper on the same subject entitled "Belling the Tornado."

BELLING THE TORNADO

Representative BROOKS, Democrat, Louisiana, had a bright idea this week. He called on the Weather Bureau to furnish public warnings of the approach of tornadoes.

The Bureau took it under advisement, and promised to see what could be done. But it wasn't very enthusiastic. In the first place, the giving of tornado warnings would disturb, perhaps panic, a lot of people, might even paralyze business in the area affected. And, in the second place, a tornado isn't much more predictable than the antics of a hunting pup looking for adventure.

Representative BROOKS pointed out that tornadoes occur mostly in the South Central and West Central States, when a cold front advances from the northwest. He says the Weather Bureau knows when such a front is advancing and knows in general its extent and direction. He thinks that with some analysis and study the weather men might be able to give fairly accurate and timely warnings.

They could not tell people exactly where a tornado would strike, but by alerting people in the area of possible visitation, they could be of some real service, he thinks.

The freakish behavior of these monstrous winds is one of their identifying characteristics. They dip and dab down, then bounce maybe a few hundred yards—or a few score miles—before striking again. They will remove the second story of a house—as happened last week in the edge of Oklahoma City—without harming the first story, or they will whack off a couple of rooms without touching the remaining ones. They will drive a scantling through the 2-foot trunk of a tree, or a wheat straw through a sapling. They will peel the surface of the soil for a depth of several inches, or pull the feathers off a chicken.

Lightning may not strike twice in the same place—usually it obliterates the place from further consideration—but a tornado strikes the same place time and again.

Any additional protection the Weather Bureau can give would be acceptable.

The following is an editorial taken from the Garden City Daily Telegram of May 4, 1949, entitled "What To Do in Blow":

WHAT TO DO IN BLOW

A woman called the CAA weather office during the turbulence Saturday afternoon and said in an excited voice: "I live out here in the country, 20 miles northeast of Garden City. A tornado is coming right at my house. What shall I do?"

What kind of advice would you have given that woman?

There are several suggestions you could make. Such as the fact that she could drive out of a tornado's path by going to one side or the other if she had a fast car. Tornado funnels travel at approximately 40 miles an hour. Or that if she had a good basement to crouch in the southwest corner of it as tornadoes almost always move from the southwest toward the northeast, as the one Saturday did.

With Saturday afternoon fresh in everybody's mind, this is just the right time to uncork some advice as passed along by the CAA weather bureau.

First of all, be sure it's a tornado that's coming and not just a violent thunderstorm. What does a tornado look like? That's not a foolish question. Frosty Flora is getting ready to retire as the Kansas weather man, but he admits in all his forecasting years he's never seen one.

Tornadoes may occur at any hour of the day, but they most frequently come along in the afternoon or early evening. Twister weather is characterized by a sultry, warm, oppressive condition with southerly winds. Great thunderstorms usually are in the vicinity.

A thundercloud approaches from the west or the southwest, usually from the southwest, showing great turmoil and agitation in the cloud, the base of which begins to belly down toward the ground. Suddenly, a rope-like funnel-shaped cloud reaches from the bellied-down part of the thundercloud toward the earth, spinning rapidly counterclockwise. Duck, brother, a twister is heading your way.

This funnel may vary greatly in appearance, but remember, a tornado must have that funnel and a low cloud, no matter how black, isn't bringing a tornado without one.

Tornadoes, which emit a loud roar when close by, travel at an average speed of 40 miles an hour and hardly ever exceed a mile in width, and most of them do not exceed a quarter of a mile in width.

In case of a tornado the safest place is in a cave or underground excavation. People in open country can watch one approach and avoid it by moving to the right or left of its path, preferably to the left of its path which would be to your right if you were facing it. That's because the winds on the left-hand side of a tornado are not as strong and destructive as on its right-hand side.

Persons caught in the open without time to escape from its path should lie flat on the ground in the deepest depression available. If a culvert is close by, crawl into it. In a city the southwest corner of a basement of a frame house ordinarily offers the best protection against injury and flying debris.

Maybe you knew all the things, but a lot of people don't.

Another important item is to report your tornado as quickly as possible. If you are in its path of course you shouldn't worry too much about that until the funnel is gone, but if you see one swirling past your farmhouse get to the telephone and call the weather station.

Which means if you live in the vicinity of Garden City call the CAA. They will report it immediately. Radio warnings will be flashed over radio station KIUL and your word of warning may save lives somewhere ahead. Remember that tornado is only going 40 miles an hour. There is 15 minutes time to warn people who are 10 miles ahead.

The Telegram also will want you to call when you can. Your calls will enable the editor to write the story of that tornado. When it strikes through open country as it did Saturday afternoon, your calls were the ones which gave us the facts and our readers the news.

If you have children old enough to understand, be sure they too understand what to do should a twister head your way.

Remember how to protect yourself best, and how to protect others by reporting that tornado as quickly as you can.

A Lot of Us Are Tired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, fortunately more and more people are growing weary and disgusted with the propaganda handed out by so many "do good" speakers who have the ability to throw a lot of meaningless big words together which presumably earn them their daily bread, but benefit the hearers not at all.

The thought I am trying to express is quite adequately stated in an editorial from the News-Palladium, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., May 6, which reads as follows:

ONE-WAY STREET TO NOWHERE

The internationalist do-gooders must all get their lecture themes from a single source. Every time one comes to town he or she dwells on the importance of American understanding and sympathizing with the people of foreign lands,

Are we supposed to look upon all the shenanigans round about us with sweet tolerance, and at all times overlook self-interest, stupidity, and corruption in others? Maybe that's beautiful idealism, but bitter as they sometimes are, we prefer the facts of life.

Most recent among the sweetness and light school to coach us in brotherly love is Miss Anne Guthrie, of the World Council of Young Women's Christian Association, who delivered two speeches here this week, one before the Rotary Club and one at the annual YWCA dinner.

We read the accounts of both addresses and gathered that America is really to blame for the world's ills. Miss Guthrie exhorted her audiences to "more knowledge of the world, more understanding, and a greater imagination. * * *"

Miss Guthrie is quite right about the need for knowledge and understanding, even if she is a bit naive about the aims of the Chinese Communists, but why give the impression that we aren't sympathetic, and why is nothing ever said about the rest of the world trying to understand us?

If the European relief plan didn't require imagination we don't know what would. And if it didn't require knowledge of Europe's plight and need for aid, what did prompt the American people to rehabilitate Europe at a cost of billions of dollars?

Frankly, after-dinner speakers who earn their fees scolding us for not being altogether happy in our sacrificial role in the world, give us a deep-seated pain which has nothing to do with the chairs they furnish at banquet meetings. A swift kick in the shins is the traditional way to express gratitude for American sympathy and help.

Soviet Backward in Technical Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., May 6, 1949:

CAN STALIN BE TRUSTED? REDS 50 YEARS BEHIND UNITED STATES IN ITS KNOW-HOW—STRONG ON NATURAL RESOURCES BUT CLUMSY IN TECHNICAL PROCESSES

(By Col. James C. Crockett, U. S. Army, retired, a former United States military attaché in Moscow)

The Soviet economy is strong in natural resources and in the volume of war materials it produces but, compared with the United States and Great Britain, it is clumsy and backward in its technical processes. Insofar as human rights and happiness play a part in the economy, the state is extremely weak.

WHOLE ASSEMBLY LINE QUIT FOR ICE CREAM

The manager of a Russian enterprise must be a combined politician, judge, and technical expert. These top men would not have their jobs if they did not belong to the Communist Party. The little bosses must have strong Communist Party supporters who can protect them from criticism and charges when reports from the MVD secret police officer stationed at the plant brings about the replacement, if not worse punishment, of the offender.

The manager of a large rubber-tire plant complained bitterly because once a week an ice-cream vendor would come to the factory gate and ring a dinner bell. At this, the whole tire assembly line would quit work and dash out for ice cream. By the time the workers got back, 40 tires in process would be ruined and have to be scrapped.

He could not stop this work interruption because the ice-cream vendor was a big party man.

It is, however, the workers in Russia who have the most troubles.

LUXURIES ARE OUT

I knew two families who worked in factories near Moscow and lived in apartments owned by the factories.

One, a family of four, occupied a one-room apartment, size 30 by 25 feet, sharing kitchen, bath, and hall with three other families. For this they paid 56 rubles ($6.72) a month. The man's pay was $60 a month, his wife's $48. After paying for food and rent, there was less than $10 left over for all other purposes.

The second family earned a little more and had 2 rooms, each about 25 by 20 feet. The monthly cost of this apartment is 84 rubles ($10.08) per month. After paying for rent and food, the father of this family had sufficient money to buy a suit of clothes and underwear every 2 years, a pair of shoes, a shirt and several pair of socks each year, an overcoat and pair of galoshes about every 5 years. He also could supply his wife and children with clothing on the same scale, but luxuries of any kind were out of the question.

WORKER HELPLESS

The worker can do nothing about his pay, for the state fixes all wage scales. Factory and office workers, according to the Soviet constitution, work 6 days a week and 8 hours daily. They are entitled to paid holidays; but many workers told me there was constant pressure by the bosses and by the trade-unions to increase production.

Wages are based on a norm and extra pay above norms. As efficiency rises, the state raises the norms but does not change the rate for extra pay above the norms. For example, in 1947, norms in several industries were increased as much as 20 and 25 percent. The workers privately griped, yet could do nothing about it because the laborers cannot strike and there is no collective bargaining. The trade-unions, to which all laborers must contribute monthly dues, are in reality organizations to speed up production, maintain discipline, and furnish controls for the laborers.

A laborer cannot get a job without a "popusk" issued by the police—a paper which shows previous places of employment and reasons and authorization for quitting. A workingman cannot quit his job without permission of the manager. Neither can he be absent or late without a proper excuse.

CAN TRY LABORERS

The plant manager in most industries and mines, acting as judge, can try laborers and sentence them to forced labor in the MVD prison camps. The term of punishment is dependent on what disciplinary code is broken.

Where we would use machinery, Russia uses much hard labor. For example, few stores, if any, have a cash register. The amounts due for purchases are figured on a wooden square which has wires strung with wooden balls stretched across it. These are manipulated to add, subtract, and multiply.

There are very few labor-saving devices such as electric irons, dishwashers, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, escalators, lawn mowers, corn shellers, taxicabs, belt conveyors, ditching machines, soap flakes, etc.

In the winter the Moscow streets are kept as free of snow as the streets of any northern city in the United States. But no modern snow-removal machinery is used. Laborers, mostly women, shovel the snow into small wooden boxes which they carry to the street curb or a vacant lot and dump. Later, it is shoveled into trucks and hauled away.

PROCESSES OLD-FASHIONED

Many Russian manufacturing, mining, and agricultural processes are old-fashioned. For example, on the collective farm where I lived for a few months, the wheat was threshed in a very inefficient way. The ends first were cut off the sheaves of wheat. The heads were put into a small shelling machine which chopped them sufficiently to loosen the grain. The grain and chaff poured out of the machine onto a large tarpaulin on the ground. Then, on the first windy day, women laborers with shovels would toss the wheat and chaff high into the air, as the wind blew the chaff away, the wheat would fall on another tarpaulin. From this it would be shoveled into bags.

Despite the great amount of hand labor used, Russia is not so backward in know-how as many people think. She produces masses of excellent tanks, self-propelled artillery, trucks, and tractors and large amounts of good airplanes, rockets, small arms, and other military equipment.

She has constructed great works like the Dneiper Dam and locks, the Moscow-Volga

Canal and locks, the Khimki Port and the White Sea Baltic Canal. Russia also builds engines, tools, and machinery of all kinds.

AIDED BY FOREIGNERS

In doing these things, Russia has received much technical help from foreigners. I have talked to factory managers, mine bosses, and agriculturists who have worked and studied in the United States. Marshall Federenko of the Soviet tank forces once told me that several of his tank experts had worked in Detroit motor plants, but he also claimed the Russian tanks were better than those of the United States. The present head of the Russian trade-unions, Kuznetsov, told me he received his technical education in an American university. These are only a few of the Russians who have gotten their know-how in the United States.

Not so long ago Russia employed thousands of foreign engineers and technicians, and imported great quantities of foreign machinery and tools. But today she has large corps of trained engineers and technicians; she has brought thousands of German technical experts to Russia as prisoners, and she no longer is dependent on foreigners for additional technical aid.

Soviet economy really is that of the Clausewitzian total state. It is geared to the war-making powers of the state and is organized primarily for war-making purposes. One of the ideas of the total state—often discussed in theory at the German War College, but never put into practical application by the Germans—was the distribution of food and industrial production in such a way as to create autonomous military areas within the state. These areas were to be economically and militarily strong enough to fight independently of each other.

HAS GONE A LONG WAY

This theory has become of particular significance in the light of the increased destructive power of modern air and rocket warfare.

Although the job is far from being completed, Russia has gone a long way in the organization of autonomous military areas.

The Moscow area, with its industrial center in the regions of Moscow, Tula, Rybinsk, supports central European Russia, including the Baltic states and Belarussia. With its strategic direction toward northern Europe and the Baltic Sea.

The Donbas area, with its industrial center in the region of the Donetz river, Krivoi Rog Zaporozhe, supports southern European Russia and includes Ukraina and the Caucasus, with its strategic direction twofold toward south Europe and western Iran.

The Magnitogorsk area, with its industrial center in the region of Magnitogorsk, Sverdlovsk, Ufa, Karaganda, supports western Kazakhstan, Turkistan, and Uzbek with its strategic direction toward eastern Iran and India

FIFTY YEARS BEHIND

The Kuzbas area, with its industrial center in the region of Kuznetsk Basin, Stalinsk, Novosibersk, Orsk, supports eastern Kazakhstan and Kirgiz, with its strategic direction toward Kingkiang and central China.

The Angara area, with its industrial center in the region of Irkutsk, Kansk, Cheremkhovo and the Tungas Valley, supports the Far East with its strategic direction toward Manchuria and the Sea of Japan.

The Pechora area, least developed of any, with its planned industrial center in the region of Kotlas-Vorkuta, is planned to support western Arctic Russia, the Karelo and Murmansk, with its strategic direction toward the Scandinavian peninsula and Barents Sea.

Certainly, the objective of Russia economy is to strengthen the fighting capabilities of the Soviet armed forces. There is no question but that it is effective in the production of war material. It is, however, at least 50 years behind that of the United States.

Ronne in the Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to list the firsts accomplished on the Ronne Antarctic research expedition in 1946–48.

The privately financed Ronne Antarctic research expedition returned to the United States on April 15, 1948, after a year's scientific exploration in the Antarctic. Detailed investigations were carried on in 11 branches of science, including meteorology, climatology, solar radiation, atmospheric refraction, terrestrial magnetism, tidal observations, oceanography, glaciology, seismology, cosmic radiation, and geology. Nearly all of these reports have been published through the cooperation of the Office of Naval Research.

A geographical exploratory program was carried out with three airplanes, two tractors, and two dog-team parties. Flights explored and photographed the Antractic's—and hence the world's—last remaining coast line—a 450-mile stretch from Palmer Land to Coast Land at the bottom of the Weddell Sea—and followed the inland extension of the Palmer Land Mountain Range to its termination in a 5,000-foot-high plateau toward the South Pole. Over 60 new place names have been approved by the United States Board of Geographical Names. The geographical and technical-equipment reports have been published and are available.

The narrative of the Ronne Antarctic research expedition will be published this year by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Ronne expedition pioneered in many ways. The list of original accomplishments are as follows:

First, the 23 members of the Ronne expedition, including scientists, pilots, and so forth, exclusively manned and operated their 183-foot, 1,200-ton Diesel electric ship 15,000 miles to and from the Antarctic. Only eight of the men had ever been to sea before.

Second, the expedition's vessel, *The Port of Beaumont, Texas,* was the first motor vessel ever to be intentionally frozen-in Antarctica's icy grip for the duration of the expedition.

Third, this ship made a new record in southern latitude penetration of the pack ice in the Marguerite Bay sector.

Fourth, in order to accomplish the difficult major exploratory objectives, the three airplanes of the expedition made use of a new technique in polar flying—the leap-frog method. Two planes, one the trimetrogon camera equipped exploratory plane and the other carrying gasoline as cargo, flew into the unknown as far as possible. Then both planes landed together. The exploratory plane was gassed and continued into the unknown, while the cargo plane stood by guarding the flight by radio. During the expedition, the three planes made a total of 86 landings in the field, over half of which were unsupported, that is dependent solely upon their own resources to return safely. This record far surpasses that of any other expedition. Up until this time it was considered extremely hazardous to make plane landings out in the field.

Fifth. The expedition was the first to ascertain what geographers had called the world's last remaining major geographical discovery, that is, whether the Antarctic was one or two continents. Flights into previously unknown territory explored the last remaining coast line—a 450-mile stretch—and followed the extension of the Palmer Land Mountain Range. High land was found where a frozen strait dividing the continent was thought possibly to exist. The Antarctic is one continent.

Sixth. A total of a quarter of a million square miles of new terrain was explored for the first time and almost half a million square miles of known area was photographed for more accurate mapping, making a grand total of 700,000 square miles photographed by aerial trimetrogon cameras and tied in with astronomical fixes or ground control points.

Seventh. The three planes flew a total of 39,000 miles and hold an all-time Antarctic expedition record of 346 hours in the air.

Eighth. The first seismological station was established in the Antarctic, which obtained a year's record of world-wide earthquakes. These data were radioed to interested agencies in the United States, permitting more accurate location of earthquakes occurring in the Southern Hemisphere than had been possible previously.

Ninth. A definite correlation between weather information and microseisms—minute earth vibrations—was observed. These data provide valuable research information for this very new science.

Tenth. A tidal station was established and obtained almost a year's continuous tidal data for the first time.

Eleventh. Numerous atmospheric refraction measurements were obtained for the first time.

Twelfth. Continuous recordings in solar radiation during the Antarctic summer months were obtained for the first time.

Thirteenth. Cosmic ray investigations were made on two special plane flights for this purpose for the first time.

Fourteenth. The expedition's geologist was able to spend a total of 154 days in the field, 52 of which were completely devoted to outcrop geologizing. This record is more than the geologists of any previous expedition have been fortunate enough to obtain.

Fifteenth. The expedition was unique in the history of Antarctic exploration in that two women, one of whom was Mrs. Ronne, were included in the group. This is the first time women have ever spent a winter on the Antarctic Continent, or as far as is definitely known have ever set foot on the Continent.

In this connection, I believe it will be of interest to include the following data from the monthly supplement and international Who's Who of January 1949:

Ronne, Finn (ron-e), Antarctic explorer; b. Horten, Norway, Dec. 20 1899; s. Martin Richard and Maren Gurine (Gulliksen) R.;

came to U. S., 1923, naturalized, 1929; degree 24; mech. engr. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Coll., 1922; m. Edith Maslin, Mar. 18, 1944. Designer ship machinery and equipment Bethlehem Steel Co., Elizabeth, N. J., 1923–24; mech. engr. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, 1924–33; accompanied Adm. Byrd's 2nd expdn. to Antarctica, 1933-35; returned to Westinghouse Electric Corp., 1935-39; chief of staff and 2nd in command, East Base, Palmer Land, U. S. Antarctic Service expedition, 1939-41; head, Ronne Antarctic research expedition 1947-48, conducting research in geology, meteorology, tidal and salinity recordings, terrestrial magnetism, cosmic ray and atmospheric refraction measurements, solar radiation, climatology, seismology and geol. exploration using trimetrogon aerial photography; major geog. accomplishment in 250,000 square miles discovered, proved Antarctica to be one Continent with no connection between Ross and Weddell Seas. Served U. S. Naval Reserve, 1941-47. Awarded spl. Congressional medals for participation in 2nd Byrd expedition and U. S. Antarctic service expedition. Fellow Am. Geog Soc. Arctic Inst. of N. A.; mem. Geophys. Union, Am. Polar Soc. Mason. Club: Explorers. Lecturer on expdns. Contbr. news scientific and popular articles on explorations and research to professional jours. and popular mags. Home: 12 Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.

Citizenship for Certain Americans of Japanese Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago on April 22, 1949, petitioning the Congress to enact H. R. 199 granting full rights of citizenship to certain Americans of Japanese origin:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO ON APRIL 22, 1949

Whereas approximately 4,000 Chicago residents of Japanese extraction are not entitled to exercise the rights of citizenship in this city or country because of a discriminatory action on the part of Congress in 1924; and

Whereas some 33,000 sons of these and other Japanese-Americans courageously demonstrated their loyalty to this country by serving in the armed forces during the last war; and

Whereas the President's Committee on Civil Rights in its report in 1948 recognized the inequality and injustice of barring these long-time residents of this country from the rights of citizenship: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 199 which will give to Americans of Japanese origin who came to this country prior to 1929, the full rights of citizenship of which they have been denied up to this time: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators LUCAS and DOUGLAS, and to the Chicago delegation in the House of Representatives.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Friday, April 22, 1949.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 5th day of May A. D. 1949.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Flag Day, June 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, today when many of our country's best-intentioned people are vacuously mouthing of "one world" by way of intimating they are not as yet unanimously decided how to vocatively manage the solar system, it prompts me to pause a while to think on our flag. As it flies untrammeled, high on the mast, we cannot but be prideful, comprehending well how our Stars and Stripes, created for a narrow strip of thirteen freedom-loving colonies, has billowed, parallel by parallel and degree by degree, across a continent.

Expansion has meant the widening of a close-knit ideological unit, our political idea going before. Our Nation, under its flag, is circumscribed by commonality of purpose and interest, and, if we lose our awareness of this, merging into global affinity, we shall have the reverse of an iron curtain—boundaries so diaphanous as to be unnoticed. This, as I see it, this "all-embracingness," is a great and trending threat in the unsettling period of peace we are now undergoing. No longer driven to fever heat by the blood-rousing drums of war, we concentrate spatially on dividing our substance and complicating economic complexities. Now national fervor appears comatose. This is a time of great danger, when, in loving kindness, we may fix our eyes on vague horizons, not seeing what we have at hand.

Though there is less of this hazard in time of war, 8 days after D-day when our forces battered into Europe, and I had been invited as a regent of the university of the State of New York to speak at Flag Day exercises in Brooklyn, I said:

It is well that we should pause and take stock as to what we have builded so well and make sure that in this land of ours we do not cast loose lightly from the governmental moorings, such as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, from which many are convinced, and I believe rightly, that our greatness has been derived.

Today, 5 years from D-day, the need to pause is more than ever with us for our "greatness" as a Nation will not outlast our concept of greatness, so singularly indigenous it is. Without intense love for democracy, there can be no understanding or acceptance of democracy, no lasting democracy anywhere, and no true cherishing of our meaningful flag.

The full text of my Flag Day speech on the steps of Borough Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y., on June 14, 1944, under the auspices of the BPOE, follows:

Exalted ruler and officers of Brooklyn Lodge No. 22 and distinguished members of our order, ladies and gentlemen of Brooklyn and Long Island who are here to observe this solemn ritual—Americans all—it has become my serious duty, and I deem it a signal honor to have been so selected, to say a few words which, whatever they may lack in doing justice to this important occasion, I hope may be compensated by profound earnestness within. For indeed is this a most thrilling spectacle, timed as it is to fit the most momentous period in the history of our country, if not the history of the world. It is not so much what is said, although the spoken word has some slight value, but it is what every one of us have in our hearts that counts.

A flag is a symbol of a group, a community, a country or a nation, and our flag, the Stars and Stripes, is the symbol of the greatest nation ever developed on the face of God's earth. The American flag, conceived in right, fairness, and consideration, which of course includes forebearance and tolerance, stands forth today as a beacon light to a storm-tossed world of battling nations. You all know the history of the American flag and to those, who may wish to have it repeated for emphasis or to refresh their minds, this glorious pageant through the solemn ritual of the Elks under the auspices of Brooklyn Lodge No. 22 of that benevolent and protective order has portrayed this so beautifully and magnificently that I would hesitate to even trespass upon the sacred exemplification you have just witnessed.

As did the mother of one of our earlier and most illustrious brethren physically create the Stars and Stripes, I hope I may not be overbold in making mention that another lady also helped in its creation, one of Quaker persuasion which was the persuasion of a long line of my forebears who were among the prominent whalers and sailing-masters who plied their whaling and clipper ships from the Island of Nantucket in an earlier period of our country's history.

No human emotion in mankind is so deep, so sincere, so moving and compelling as that resulting from patriotic fervor. Love of country through all history has stirred man, and woman of course, to the greatest unselfishness and heights of sacrifice, even unto the willing giving of life itself. Many beautiful and eloquent comments depicting this theme have been written into all literatures, so well known that I need not recount. Suffice it to say that the spectacle of our glorious flag floating to an easy wind creates within us emotions that confound ready speech. Today that flag is being carried on 53 battle fronts on land and sea, and everywhere now it marches triumphantly. Not only is the victory for us but for those oppressed people who have suffered so under the heels of malignant tyrants. We have made sacrifices of course and will continue to make them for a cause that we know to be just, but many there are about the world who have suffered ignominiously and horribly, the more so because they have been for the most part utterly innocent of any provocation.

In Philadelphia a little over a year ago I heard the statement made that peace was never the result of passivity, and that statement struck me as having unusual significance. People have always fought to achieve peace and have had to keep on the alert and fight to maintain it. To our Constitution and Bill of Rights many of our people attribute the growth and well-being of our country, yet few appreciate the long drawn-out battle that brought it into being. General Washington with all his power and influence was unable to bring his own State of Virginia into line until after the necessary

other nine States had ratified the Constitution. Unless Massachusetts by the narrowest legislative vote of 187 to 168 had approved, other States likely would not have followed, and there might never have been a government such as we have come to believe has given more health, welfare, and happiness to a larger number of people over a longer period of years than any other in the world. Of those who labored many months in Philadelphia in 1787, it was said that when they concluded their deliberations they stood in awe of the excellence of the document they had written. As the late Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "No result is easy which is worth having." So I think it is with all of us that the only real satisfaction in life comes from surmounting what at first seem to be insuperable obstacles.

Of course this theory presupposes that the effort is made in behalf of the right. As Lincoln said in the Cooper Union address which brought about his nomination for the Presidency, "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it." There is a doctrine spoken by a humanitarian of humanitarians that rings so true that it could not be wrong. Holmes, too, inspires high idealism when he speaks of man laying "his course by a star which he has never seen" or digging "by the divining rod for springs which he may never reach." Those were the pregnant thoughts, he mentioned as "jewels five words long which great men have given their lives to cut from the raw material."

When everything is going well, so many of us do not have the gratitude in our hearts for those who gave their all that we might benefit, but are prone to carp at and criticise our governmental weaknesses without any sound alternative to offer. It is only when adversity, that greatest of all teachers, visits us that we begin to have some realization of what may have been irretrievably lost. With all our much-vaunted material benefits and scientific advancements, in this half century shortly coming to a close will have been written the 50 bloodiest pages in all history. Hence, it is well that we should have pause and take stock as to what we have builded so well and make sure that in this land of ours we do not cast loose lightly from the governmental moorings, such as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, from which many are convinced, and I believe rightly, that our greatness has been derived.

Just currently from overseas Hanson W. Baldwin, noted military analyst and correspondent of the New York Times, writes from the flagship *Augusta* of the Western Task Force in the Bay of the Seine encouragingly as to the aspects of the invasion of western Europe on D-plus-three-day. And is it not peculiarly fitting that as the first crusade, as it is known in history, was organized in France toward the end of the eleventh century for the liberation of the Holy Land, that the greatest of all crusades that the world has ever known, in today's vast movement of troops and munitions of war, should be in greater part for the liberation of France? It occurs to me that Flag Day, so prominently and properly a feature Elkdom, following so close upon the much-talked-of D-day of June 6, 1944, might well be synchronized therewith as D-plus-eight-day, linking the history of our flag from its first origin with the highest efforts in battle ever known, as we all most earnestly hope and believe will have proved to be the case before many days have run their course.

Flag Day is, I understand, established as a legal holiday on June 14 in the State of Missouri. Armistice Day, resulting from the last World War, is established as a legal holiday throughout the United States on November 11, though three of our States have named it Victory Day. It is believed that out of this present conflagration there must come a permanent anniversary of celebration, participated in not only by our boys who have returned to us but in after years by their children and their children's children. Fortunately in New York, speaking through the mouth of our governor, we have been able recently to announce a program which will super-add material cooperation to the deep emotional gratitude and appreciation, of which we noncombatants at home, the beneficiaries of the heroism and self-sacrifice of our soldiers in far-away lands, cannot fail to be profoundly conscious. Might it therefore not be well for us to consider for this permanent anniversary which we contemplate, June 14, the day of our flag, commemorating for all time the flag unsullied, the flag of deliverance, the flag of never-a-defeat, the flag of recognized predominance at this, we hope, the final stage of the supreme effort of all time.

While paying honor to our flag, we should have an awareness that 1,600 Elks lodges over this broad land are conducting ceremonies such as these here today, though perhaps not with the great attendance this mighty and most populous Borough of Brooklyn makes possible; yes, in every one of the 48 States and the Territories as well, with the sole exception of two, the Elks lodges in Manila and Guam, captured by a treacherous foe. But, not for long. For with our constantly strengthening sea power only awaiting opportunity to strike back and strike back hard, our flag will again fly in its old accustomed places. Always a believer in a big Navy as our country's first line of defense, I hope that never again can we be persuaded not to keep it strong on both oceans. It is appropriate also to remember that each night in Elkdom the eleventh hour is set aside in tender recollection of our brothers who will come no more and those whose homecoming is anxiously awaited. Among this group there are some 70,000 Elks now in the armed services of their country.

And, may I say in closing that, mindful of the past, we keep our eyes steadfast upon the immediate and all-important future, lest in lacking the foresight that though intelligence be ours, we find ourselves at a later day regretful that through impatience, greed, or selfishness we have again been led on to evil days. Power seems to be lasting only when exercised in moderation. And now to those of us whose hearts hang heavy with grief and torn by anxiety may I express the earnest hope and prayer that when another Flag Day rolls around our dear ones will be back with us hale and hearty, and should such unfortunately not prove to be the case, that loss of even life may leave the satisfaction that the sacrifice has not been in vain, but justified by the restoration of a greater and happier world for all mankind.

Evansville City Officials, Labor Group Back Repeal of Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1949

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions; one passed by the Common Council of the City of Evansville, the other adopted by the United Labor Group of Evansville, Ind.

Whereas on the 4th day of April 1949, the Common Council of the City of Evansville, Ind., received and made a part of its minutes a resolution from the United Labor Group of the City of Evansville relative to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the adoption of the Thomas-Lesinski bill, a copy of which said resolution is attached hereto and made a part hereof; and

Whereas the common council has determined to act in accordance with the request of the said resolution and to memorialize Congress for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the adoption of the Thomas-Lesinski bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Evansville, That a copy of this resolution to which there is attached a copy of the resolution of the United Labor Group be transmitted by the clerk of the council to Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART, WILLIAM E. JENNER, and to Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON.

Passed by the Common Council of the City of Evansville, Ind., on this 2d day of May 1949, and, on said day, signed by the president of the common council and attested by the city clerk.

FRED C. FISCHER,
President.

Attest:

THOMAS P. TOON,
City Clerk.

Whereas there is pending before Congress legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and reenact the Wagner Act, known as the Thomas-Lesinski bill, with amendments as recommended by President Harry S. Truman; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law was designed to weaken labor's position at the bargaining table; it threatens the living standards of American workers, deprives them of fundamental human rights and unnecessarily injects the Government into the field of labor-management relations; and

Whereas this law has been directly responsible for a number of strikes in our community; has materially retarded the growth of new unions, and by its encouragement of antiunion employers, aided and magnified conflict between labor and management, and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law was one of the major political issues in this community and the Nation in the last election. The voters in Evansville had a clear choice between a Congressman who supported the law and one equivocably opposed and favoring its repeal. By an overwhelming majority, the pro-Taft-Hartley candidate was defeated: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the United Labor Group hereby petitions the Common Council of the City of Evansville to memorialize Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and replace it with a fair labor-management law, by passing the Thomas-Lesinski bill (H. R. 2032 and S. 249) as recommended by President Truman; be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Common Council of the City of Evansville, to Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART and WILLIAM E. JENNER, Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON, and the newspapers and radio.

Adopted Thursday evening, March 31, 1949, by the United Labor Group, John Soucie, president.